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Technical Notes

It is important to recognize that:

- translations and editions of texts are given in the Bibliography;
- the names of Indian Buddhist schools of thought are translated into English in a wish to increase accessibility for non-specialists;
- for the names of Indian scholars and systems used in the body of the text, ch, sh, and sh are used instead of the more usual c, s, and s for the sake of easy pronunciation by non-specialists; however, cch is used for cch, not chchh. Within parentheses the usual transliteration system for Sanskrit is used;
- transliteration of Tibetan is done in accordance with a system devised by Turrell Wylie; see “A Standard System of Tibetan Transcription,” Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 22 (1959): 261-267;
- the names of Tibetan authors and orders are given in “essay phonetics” for the sake of easy pronunciation; the system is aimed at internet searchability;
- titles of added subsections are given in square brackets;
- definitions are in bold type.
Preface

JAM-YANG-SHAY-PA

Jam-yang-shay-pa Ngag-wang-tsön-drü was born in the northeastern Amdo Province of Tibet in the Earth-Mouse year of 1648 east of the Blue Lake. At the age of five he was blessed by the Fifth Dalai Lama, from whom he later received monastic vows. Having studied the alphabet at age seven with his uncle, who was a monk, he mastered reading and writing and six years later became a novice monk, excelling among his fellow students by his ability quickly to understand texts and disputation. He went to Lhasa at age twenty-one to further his studies at the Gomang College of Dre-pung Monastic University. Arriving in Lhasa in 1668, he offered a presentation scarf to an image of Mañjushrī in the Jo-khang Temple, where the statue reportedly favored the young scholar with a smile, due to which he became known as Jam-yang-shay-pa, “Smiled Upon by Mañjushrī.” Six years later he received full ordination and at twenty-nine entered Gyumay Tantric College. From age thirty-three he spent two years in meditative retreat in a cave near Dre-pung.

At the age of thirty-eight in 1685 he published the first of his major works, Decisive Analysis of (Tsong-kha-pa’s) “Differentiating the Interpretable and the Definitive”: Storehouse of White Lapis-Lazuli of Scripture and Reasoning Free from Mistake, Fulfilling the Hopes of the Fortunate, commonly called Great Exposition of the Interpretable and the Definitive. In 1688 he published another of his great expositions, the Treatise on the Presentations of the Concentrative and Formless Absorptions: Adornment Beautifying the Subduer’s Teaching, Ocean of Scripture and Reasoning, Delighting the Fortunate, commonly called Great Exposition of the Concentrative and Formless Absorptions. He published the Root Text of Tenets: Lion’s Roar in 1689, and published the Great Exposition of Tenets—its prose auto-commentary—ten years later in 1699, and between those two, in 1695, he published the Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakirti’s) “Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’”: Treasury of

---


Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate also called the Great Exposition of the Middle.

At age fifty-three in 1700 he became abbot of Go-mang College and in 1709 at sixty-two returned to Am-do Province where he founded a highly influential monastery at Tra-shi-khyil in 1710. Seven years later he founded a tantric college at the same place. He wrote prolifically on the full range of topics of a typical Tibetan polymath and, having received honors from the central Tibetan government and from the Chinese Emperor, died at the age of seventy-three or-four in 1721/2."b

Partly because of the close connection between Go-mang College and the Mongolian peoples stretching from the Caspian Sea through Siberia, who were predominantly Ge-lug-pa by this time, Jam-yang-shay-pa’s influence on the Ge-lug-pa order has been considerable. His life manifests a pattern typical of many influential Tibetan religious figures—child prodigy, learned scholar, disseminator of the religion, politician, priest to political personages, monastery leader, yogi, magician, popular teacher, and prolific writer.

THE GREAT EXPOSITION OF THE MIDDLE

The text translated here is a portion of Jam-yang-shay-pa Ngag-wang-tson-drü’s Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti’s) “Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle,’” Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate, also called Great Exposition of the Middle, a commentary on Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drag-pa’s Illumination of the Thought, Extensive Explanation of (Chandrakīrti’s) “Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle.’” It belongs to the debate-oriented decisive analysis (mtha’ dpyod) genre and is the textbook (yig cha) for the study of Tsong-kha-pa’s The Illumination of the Thought at Go-mang Monastic College. In most Ge-lug-pa colleges there are a separate general-meaning

---

a bkra shis ‘khyil.
b See Maher, “Knowledge and Authority in Tibetan Middle Way Schools of Buddhism,” 164.
c ‘jam dbyangs bdud pa’i rdzod rje ngag dbang brtson grus, 1648-1721/1722.
d dbu ma ‘jug pa’i mtha’ dpyod lugs rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang ‘jug ngogs/ dbu ma chen mo.
e Tsong-kha-pa blo bzang grags pa, 1357-1419.
f dbu ma la ‘jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal.
commentary and a separate decisive analysis commentary for seminal texts such as Chandrakīrti’s *Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle,”* but in the Go-mang Monastic College Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* is taken as the general-meaning commentary on Chandrakīrti’s *Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle,”* and Jam-yang-shay-pa composed a very lengthy decisive analysis.

**THE COMMENTATOR**

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan is a Ge-she of the Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastic University, Mundgod, Karnataka State, India, who also served a six-month term as Disciplinarian at the Tantric College of Lower Lhasa in Hunsur, India. In October, 2015, he assumed the position of Abbot of Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastic University in Mundgod, India. He has worked with translators of the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies since 2013. His oral comments are clearly marked with his name and are slightly indented within three-sided boxes.

**EDITIONS CONSULTED**

Two basic editions of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Decisive Analysis of the Middle* were consulted:

1. *dbu ma la ’jug pa’i mtha’ dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang ’jug ngogs.* Published at Go-mang College, Lhasa, Tibet, date unknown. Interlinear reference in the Tibetan text “[G##a/b].” Abbreviated reference: “2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa,” so named because of being acquired in Lhasa, Tibet, at Go-mang College in 2015 by Jongbok Yi for the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies. This version was likely originally printed at Go-mang College, Lhasa, Tibet, during Jam-yang-shay-pa residence at Go-mang College. (To be made available at UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies, uma-tibet.org.)

2. *dbu ma la ’jug pa’i mtha’ dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang ’jug ngogs.* TBRC W22186-11KG10676: 1-442a.3, which is a PDF of: *bla brang bkra shis ’khyil,* a mdo. Interlinear reference in the Tibetan text “[L##a/b].” Abbreviated reference: “2011 TBRC *bla brang,*” so named because of being acquired by E. Gene Smith for the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center at the request of the

---

*a This edition was provided to the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies by the late E. Gene Smith (1936-2010) in 2010.*
UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies in 2010. This edition, which is a revision of the above edition, was originally printed in La-brang-tra-shi-khyil monastery founded by Jam-yang-shay-pa after his return to Am-do. In general, it is the preferred edition, though not always. This edition has spawned other editions such as:


The digital Tibetan text of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of the Middle* provided in this book was supplied by the Drepung Gomang Library of Go-mang College in Mundgod, Karnataka State, India. It is likely a slightly revised version of the 1999 codex mentioned in item #c. It has been edited in accordance with the “2011 TBRC bla brang” and the “1987 Old Go-mang Lhasa” editions as well as other sources.
Jam-yang-shay-pa’s

GREAT EXPOSITION

OF THE MIDDLE

Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti’s) “Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’”: Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate

In situations of debate the Tibetan text and the translation are highlighted in three colors: black, blue, and red. Blue print presents what Jam-yang-shay-pa considers to be right positions, while red print represents what Jam-yang-shay-pa considers to be wrong positions. Words in black are other information or function structurally. In the Tibetan, a turquoise background indicates material added in place of ellipses, and a magenta highlight sets off ellipsis indicators when the elided part has been filled in.

The translation of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s text is at the margin, and the oral comments of Lo-sang-gyal-tshan are indented.
B) DECISIVE ANALYSIS{3 PARTS}

This has three parts: refutation [of others’ mistakes], presentation [of our system], and dispelling [objections to our system].

1’ Refutation [of others’ mistakes]

17. The statements in a certain [Commentarial Explanation assert:]

The difference between the “excellent enlightenment” [of the second line in this passage from the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra:]

O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers.
We proclaim the excellent enlightenment
And also intensively set forth the terms of enlightenment.
Hence we are like adamant Hearers.]

and the “enlightenment” [of the third line] is that the one where excellent is not mentioned is a Hearer’s enlightenment and that where excellent is mentioned is complete enlightenment. Jayānanda’s Commentarial Explanation says:

---

b Here, Jam-yang-shay-pa is triangulating Chandrakīrti’s citation in his Autocommentary (221a.4) of a passage from the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra and Tsong-kha-pa’s allusion to and rejection of Jayānanda’s explanation of the second and third lines of that stanza (7a.2-3) against Jayānanda’s own words, which Jam-yang-shay-pa cites now. See Tsong-kha-pa, dbu ma la ’jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal, in grung ’lum (tsong kha pa, bkra shis lhan po par rnying, ldi lir bskyar par bgyab pa), BDRC W22109:24.9-584 (PDF of New Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1979), 5a.5-6. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 62.
c Jayānanda, dbu ma la ’jug pa’i ’grel bshad (madhyamakāvatāraṭīkā), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge, 3870), BDRC W23703104: 4-731 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa cheodhe, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 7a.1-3. Above (2011 BDRC bla brang, 14a.4; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 11b.2; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 19.13), Jam-yang-shay-pa has byang chub pa yi, which matches Chandrakīrti’s citation in his Autocommentary (221a.4) of these lines from the sūtra. At 7a.2-3, Jayānanda has byang chub pa’i zhes pa ni, and in citing him, here (2011 BDRC bla brang 14a.5; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 11b3.; 2007
Here, “enlightenment” is said of the enlightenment of a Hearer that has the characteristics of the knowledge of extinction and of nonproduction, due to which, therefore, the term excellent is not mentioned.

and Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:

Although someone [Jayānanda]\(^b\) indeed says that because the word “excellent”\(^c\) is absent in the third line [of the quote from the *White Lotus*, the former enlightenment is the Great Vehicle enlightenment and the latter the Hearer enlightenment, the thought of Chandrakīrti’s commentary is that the first is to be taken as the Great Vehicle enlightenment and the second as the path proceeding to it.]

and so forth.

---

Taipei codex reprint, 19.14) Jam-yang-shay-pa has byang chub pa ni zhes pa ni. Also, where Jam-yang-shay-pa has de'i phyir dam pa'i sgra ma smos so (2011 BDRC bla brang, 14a.5-6; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 11b.3; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 19.16-17), Jayānanda has de'i phyir ’dīr dam pa'i sgra ma smos so (7a.2).


\(^b\) *Explanation of (Chandrakīrti’s) Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’* (madhyamakāvatāratīkā, *dbu ma la ’jug pa'i ’grel bshad*), P5271, vol. 99; Toh. 3870, *dbru ma, ra*, 7a.2.

\(^c\) dam pa.
Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the two, the supreme among fruits and the path of Buddhahood [that Chandrakīrti identifies in his] Auto-commentary [when he says,] “The supreme of fruits or the path of unsurpassed, thoroughly complete Buddhahood,” are not individually posited respectively as the excellent enlightenment and the enlightenment of [these lines from the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine] Sūtra:

[We proclaim the excellent enlightenment
And also intensively set forth the terms of enlightenment]

because [according to you, Jayānanda, the difference between “the excellent enlightenment” (of the second line) and the “enlightenment” (of the third line) is asserted to be that the one where excellent is not mentioned is a Hearer’s enlightenment and that where excellent is mentioned is complete enlightenment].

If you [incorrectly] accept [that the two, the supreme among fruits and the path of Buddhahood (that Chandrakīrti identifies in his) Auto-commentary (when he says) “The supreme of fruits or the path of unsurpassed,
thoroughly complete Buddhahood,” are not individually posited respectively as the excellent enlightenment and the enlightenment of (these lines from the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine* Sūtra:

(We proclaim the excellent enlightenment  
And also intensively set forth the terms of enlightenment)]

then it [absurdly] follows that even here it is an occasion of explaining the mode of proclaiming the enlightenment of the Lesser Vehicle to others because you have [incorrectly] accepted [that the two, the supreme among fruits and the path of Buddhahood (that Chandrakīrti identifies in his) *Autocommentary* (when he says) “The supreme of fruits or the path of unsurpassed, thoroughly complete Buddhahood,” are not individually posited respectively as the excellent enlightenment and the enlightenment of (these lines from the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine* Sūtra:

(We proclaim the excellent enlightenment  
And also intensively set forth the terms of enlightenment)]

You cannot accept [that even here it is an occasion of explaining the mode of proclaiming the enlightenment of the Lesser Vehicle to others] because it is an occasion of the mode of proclaiming [the enlightenment] of the Great Vehicle.
[That it is an occasion of the mode of proclaiming (the enlightenment) of the Great Vehicle] entails [that you cannot accept that even here it is an occasion of explaining the mode of proclaiming the enlightenment of the Lesser Vehicle to others] because here, other than that, it is an occasion of describing [certain Bodhisattvas] as Hearer-Proclaimers by way of how they proclaim the paths and fruits of the Great Vehicle.

It follows [that here, other than that, it is an occasion of describing (certain Bodhisattvas) as Hearer-Proclaimers by way of how they proclaim the paths and fruits of the Great Vehicle] because the meaning is that “we Bodhisattvas who without practicing the profound proclaim the fruit of the Great Vehicle or the paths that progress to that, as do Hearers, deserve to be criticized.”
kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:*

Those two reasons are why [these] Bodhisattvas are similar to Hearers, but the actual meaning of hearing and proclaiming applies [only] to Hearers.

Someone [Jayānanda] indeed says that because the word “excellent” is absent in the third line [of the quote from the White Lotus], the former enlightenment is the Great Vehicle enlightenment and the latter the Hearer enlightenment. However, the thought of Chandrakīrti’s commentary is that the first is to be taken as the Great Vehicle enlightenment and the second as the path proceeding to it.

18. **About this formulation, someone says:** It follows that even Bodhisattvas are Hearers because having heard advice from the Buddha they then cause others to hear it.

---


*b* *dam pa*.

*c* 2011 BDRC *bla brang*, 14b.5; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 12a.1; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 20.8.
Our response: [That Bodhisattvas having heard advice from the Buddha they then cause others to hear it] does not entail [that even Bodhisattvas are Hearers] because although Hearers hear of the paths of the Great Vehicle, they only proclaim them without practicing them even slightly, whereas Bodhisattvas practice them.

19. Someone says: a Whoever is a Hearer necessarily has [the features of] the etymology of Hearer.

Our response: It [absurdly] follows that the subject, a Hearer in the Formless Realm, has [the features of] the etymology of Hearer because of [being a Hearer].

You have asserted the entailment [which is that whoever is a Hearer necessarily has (the features of) the etymology of Hearer].

a 2011 BDRC bla brang, 14b.6; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 12a.2; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 20.11.
You cannot accept [the consequence, which is that a Hearer in the Formless Realm has (the features of) the etymology of Hearer.] because in the Formless Realm there is neither listening nor explanation.

It follows [that in the Formless Realm there is neither listening nor explanation] because of being like the explanation by Abhayākaraguptapāda\(^a\) that when [Hearers of the Formless Realm] come to the Desire Realm they have form and sense powers but without a continuum [of form and physical sense powers since they took rebirth from the Formless Realm].\(^b\)

20. **Someone says:**\(^c\) Whoever is a Solitary Victor\(^d\) is necessarily a person who is a medium realizer of suchness.

**Our response:** Well then, it [absurdly] follows that whoever is a Solitary Victor necessarily has realized emptiness because [according to you, your]

\(^a\) *’jigs med ’byung gnas shas pa*, d. 1140.

\(^b\) About such Hearers, Tsong-kha-pa writes:

> Although there are some Hearers—such as those in the Formless Realm—whom this etymology does not cover, there is no fault because the features of an etymology do not have to cover all instances for a term to be used as an actual name (*dngos ming*), as is the case, for example, with using “lake-born” (*mtsho skyes, saraja*) as an actual name for a lotus grown from dry [soil].


\(^c\) 2011 BDRC bla brang, 15a.2; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 12a.4; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 20.15.

\(^d\) *rang rgyal*.
thesis [that whoever is a Solitary Victor is necessarily a person who is a medium realizer of suchness] is logically feasible.

If you [incorrectly] accept [the consequence that whoever is a Solitary Victor necessarily has realized emptiness], it [absurdly] follows that the subject, a Solitary Victor on the path of accumulation who has not realized emptiness [has realized emptiness] because of [being a Solitary Victor].

You have accepted [that whoever is a Solitary Victor necessarily has realized emptiness].

The sign [which is that a Solitary Victor on the path of accumulation who has not realized emptiness is a Solitary Victor] is established because there are [Solitary Victors on the path of accumulation who have not realized emptiness] because Maitreya’s *Great Vehicle Treatise on the Sublime Continuum* says:

> The sun’s disc blazing with light,  
> Is not seen by those without eyes.

---

21. Someone says: If you say that Hearers and Medium Buddhas, that is, Solitary Victors, are born from Monarchs of Subduers, well then, it follows that a Solitary Victor is a Medium Buddha because you have asserted [that Hearers and Medium Buddhas, that is, Solitary Victors, are born from Monarchs of Subduers].

If you [incorrectly] accept that a Solitary Victor is a Medium Buddha, it follows that [a Solitary Victor] is a Buddha because you have [incorrectly] accepted [that a Solitary Victor is a Medium Buddha].

---

b Because of the immediately following gloss of “Medium Buddhas” as “Solitary Victors” this part of the statement is acceptable; otherwise, Tsong-kha-pa does not agree with the translation “Medium Buddhas,” for he says (dbu ma la 'jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgon gs la, BDRC W22109.24:9-584, 5b.1-4; translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 63-64):

[About the translation of “Medium Realizers of Suchness” into Tibetan as “Medium Buddhas” (sangs rgyas ’bring):] In accordance with the meaning of Chandrakīrti’s saying in his commentary that the term tattva-buddha applies to all three persons [that is, Hearers, Solitary Victors, and Buddhas], it is good [to take this term] as in the identification by some that tattva-buddha (realization of suchness) applies to all three. For, when in accordance with the statement that “tattva is suchness (de kho na nyid, tathatā), and buddha is realization (khong du chud pa),” it is taken that “realization of suchness” (de nyid rtags pa) is the meaning of the term [tattva]/buddha, this applies to all three persons, and hence the term “realizers of suchness” (de nyid rtags pa) also denotes “Solitary Realizers” (rang sangs rgyas). Whereas this is the case, it was translated [into Tibetan] as sungs rgyas (buddha). Although in general the term buddha is translatable as sungs rgyas (“Buddha”), it is inappropriate in this context. Since it is also explained that the term buddha is used for the “spreading of lotus petals” and “awakening from sleep,” it is not necessary to translate it only as “Buddha.”
[That a Solitary Victor is a Medium Buddha] entails that [a Solitary Victor is a Buddha] because whatever is a medium vehicle must be a vehicle.

Our response: [That a Solitary Victor is a Medium Buddha] cannot be accepted.

22. About this formulation, someone says: It follows that Chandrakīrti’s saying in the Autocommentary:

This term “buddha”—tattva-buddha—applies to all three, Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and unsurpassed, thoroughly complete Buddhas.

is not logically feasible because the term “Buddha” is not used for the three, Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Buddhas.

---

a 2011 BDRC bla brang, 15a.5; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 12a.7; 2007 Taipei codex re-print, 21.2.

b dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bs Had pa, 221a.5; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 3.18-20.

c Tsong-kha-pa finds fault with the translation of tattva-buddha as sangs rgyas kyi de nyid, which seems to mean “a Buddha’s suchness.” He maintains that tattva-buddha should be translated into Tibetan not as sangs rgyas kyi de nyid but rather as de nyid rtogs pa, which means “realization of suchness” and “realizer of suchness.”
Our response: [That the term “Buddha” is not used for all three, Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Buddhas] does not entail [that Chandrakīrti’s saying in his Autocommentary on his own Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) Treatise on the Middle:]

This term “buddha”—tattva-buddha—applies to all three, Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and unsurpassed, thoroughly complete Buddhas.

is not logically feasible] because since this [translation of this word] is a very bad translation," the meaning of [the passage in Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary]:

This term “buddha”—tattva-buddha—applies to all three, Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and unsurpassed, thoroughly complete Buddhas.

is:

This term “realization” (khong du chud pa)—realization of suchness (de nyid khong du chud pa)—applies to all three, Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Buddhas.

because it is not necessary to translate the term buddha only as Buddha (sangs rgyas).

a 'gyur shin tu mi legs pa.
b Jam-yang-shay-pa has cited Chandrakīrti and then, taking his lead from Tsong-kha-pa (5b.1-4, translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 64), has brought out and made explicit the meaning that Tsong-kha-pa sees in the citation from Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary by substituting “realization” (khong du chud pa) for Buddha (sangs rgyas) and pairing that with “suchness” (de nyid, tattva), yielding “realization of suchness.” By replicating most of the sentence cited from Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary and making the appropriate substitutions, Jam-yang-shay-pa has in effect corrected the translation and shown the reader what Tsong-kha-pa understood the Sanskrit original to mean and would have wanted the Tibetan translation to read.
It follows [that it is not necessary to translate the term “buddha” only as Buddha (sangs rgyas)] because the term buddha is used for many [meanings], such as awakening from sleep, the spreading of lotus petals, and learnedness, because also further on [Chandrakīrti’s Supplement, VI.87a, says]:

Just as expansion with regard to suchness is described as buddha, and in his Seventy Stanzas on the Three Refuges Chandrakīrti says:

---

\(\text{a dbu ma la 'jug pa, 208a.7; dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa, 277b.6; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 185.10. Tsong-kha-pa’s commentary in the Illumination of the Thought is:}\
\(\text{b Chandrakīrti, gsun la skyabs su 'gro ba bdun cu pa (triśārānasaptati), in bstan 'gyur (sde dge), BDRC W23703.112:503-508 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhe, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982–1985); in bstan 'gyur (dpe bsdur ma), BDRC W1PD958445:685-692 (pe cin: krung go'i bod rig pa'i dpe skrun khang, 1994–2008). Though I have not found these lines in Chandrakīrti’s Seventy Stanzas on the Three Ref-}\
\)
Because of having awakened from the sleep of ignorance and
Because awareness has expanded to objects of knowledge,
Buddha.

and because of explanations from many [sources] such as Chandrakīrti’s
Commentary on (Āryadeva’s) “Four Hundred Stanzas on the Yogic Deeds
of Bodhisattvas” and the Great Drum Sūtra.

I, have found lines resembling them. Toward the beginning of this treatise Chan-
drakīrti writes (251a.2):

Definitely released from the paths of the three times
Awareness thoroughly expanded to objects of knowledge
The closure of delusion has been destroyed; therefore
Buddha, like a lotus thoroughly expanded.

Just after that Chandrakīrti writes (251a.2):

Reversed from the sleep of ignorance

and a little further along (251a.3):

The continuum of the sleep of ignorance has been severed and
Genuine exalted wisdom has definitely emerged; therefore
Whoever thoroughly awakens is buddha
Like a person awakened from sleep.

Lines similar to those cited by Jam-yang-shay-pa do appear in Vimalamitra’s Commentary
on Expressing the Names Accurately, Lamp Illuminating the Meaning of the Names
(mtshan yang dar par brjod pa’i ’grel pa mtshan don gzal bar byed pa’i sgron ma,
nāmasamjñāvidvitināmarthaprabhakaracaranañātipa), in bstan ‘gyur (sde dge), BDRC
W23703.49:4-78 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun
khang, 1982-1985), 5a.2. There one finds:

des dang/ shes bya la yang blo rgyas phyir/
sangs rgyas padmo lit par sangs rgyas/

One could translate these three lines in the following way:

Furthermore, because of having awakened from the sleep of ignorance and
Because awareness has expanded to objects of knowledge,
Buddha, like a lotus awakened and expanded.

Chandrakīrti, byang chub sems dpa’i rnal ’byor spyod pa bzhi brgya pa’i rgya cher ’grel
pa (bodhisattvayogacaracatuḥsatakaṭikā), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge, 3865), BDRC
W23703.103:62-479 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun

b rnga bo chen po’i le’u’i mdo (mahābherihārakaparivartasūtra), in bka’ ’gyur (sde dge
par phud, 222), BDRC W22084.63:170-254 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey,
23. Also, [Jayānanda,] the author of the Commentarial Explanation, asserts:

a There is evidence/a reason for calling [Solitary Victors] “medium” because of being by reason of their inferiority to Buddhas and superiority to Hearers. [Solitary Victors] are superior to Hearers because Solitary Victors have abandoned the conceptualization apprehending apprehended-object and apprehending-subject as different substantial entities, whereas Hearers have not abandoned it, and for that reason, in merit also they are superior to Hearers, because Jayānanda’s Commentarial Explanation says:

From [Chandrakīrti’s saying] “due to the feature of an increase of merit and wisdom” and so forth, the feature of the increase of

---

b dbu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad, 7b.3-4.
c The phrase that Jayānanda has taken from Chandrakīrti is found in the Autocommentary at 221a.6. Then, where Jayānanda’s treatise has:

bsod nams dang ye shes gong du 'phel ba'i khyad par gyis zhes bya ba la sogs pa la/ ye shes gong du 'phel ba'i khyad par ni rang sangs rgyas rnams kyis gzungs ba'i rnam par rtog pa spangs la/ nyan thos rnams kyis ma spangs pas so/ bsod nams gong du 'phel ba'i khyad par ni ye shes gong du 'phel ba'i khyad par dang Idan pa las shes par bya'o/ (dbu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad, BDRC W23703104,7b.3-4)

Jam-yang-shay-pa’s treatise has:

bsod nams dang ye shes gong du 'phel ba'i khyad par gyis zhes bya ba la sogs pa las/ ye shes gong du 'phel ba'i khyad par ni rang sangs rgyas rnams kyis gzungs ba'i rnam par rtog pa spangs la/ nyan thos rnams kyis ma spangs pas bsod nams
wisdom is that Solitary Realizers have abandoned the conceptualization of the apprehended-object but Hearers have not abandoned it, due to which the feature of the increase of merit is to be understood through the feature of the increase of wisdom.

and Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:

\[
gong \text{ du } '\text{phel ba'i khyad par ni ye shes gong du '\text{phel ba'i khyad par las shes par bya'o'} (2011 BDRC bla brang, 15b.6-16a.1; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 12b.5-6; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 21.16-19).
\]

\[\text{a Tsong-kha-pa, } \text{dbu ma la 'jug pa'i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa dbang gsal, BDRC W22109:24.9-584, 5b.6. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 65-66, for Tsong-kha-pa’s full statement. The stanza is:}
\]

\[\text{It is to be known that the paths of the rhinoceros-like}
\]
\[\text{Are included completely within abandoning conceptualization}
\]
\[\text{Of apprehended-objects [as external objects], not abandoning [conceptualization]}
\]
\[\text{Of apprehenders [as truly existent], and the support.}
\]

\[
Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s meaning-commentary is:
\]

\[\text{It is to be known by Bodhisattvas that the paths of Solitary Realizers, as illustrated by the rhinoceros-like, are included completely within the three features of (1) abandoning conceptualization of apprehended-objects, that is, adhering to forms and so forth as external objects, (2) not abandoning conceptualization of apprehenders, that is, adhering to consciousnesses as truly existent, and (3) the person who is the support that is the achiever [practitioner] or the support that is the noumenon, the object of observation of achieving.}
\]

\[\text{See Jeffrey Hopkins and Jongbok Yi, Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s Explanation of the Treatise “Ornament for the Clear Realizations” From the Approach of the Meaning of the Words: The Sacred Word of Maitreyanātha (UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies, version, 2014: uma-tibet.org), in “b’ Entity of the path (II.8),” 179-180.}\]
A certain [Jayānanda’s mistaken] proposition [is] that the meaning of Solitary Realizers’ surpassing Hearers in terms of wisdom accords with the statement in Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* (II.8a), “Abandoning conceptualization of apprehended objects [as external objects].”

Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that on this occasion [of the Middle Way Consequence School] it is logically feasible that in accord with Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* the three Superiors have three dissimilar types of realization of the view because that feature of an increase of wisdom [namely, that Solitary Victors have abandoned

---

a *Explanation of (Chandrakirti’s) Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’,” Toh. 3870, *dbu ma, ra* 7b.3.
the conceptualization apprehending apprehended-object and apprehend-ing-subject as different substantial entities whereas Hearers have not aban-doned it,] is logically feasible. You have [incorrectly] asserted the sign [which is that the feature of the increase of wisdom—that Solitary Victors have abandoned the conceptualization apprehending apprehended-object and apprehending-subject as different substantial entities whereas Hearers have not abandoned it—is logically feasible].

If you [incorrectly] accept [that on this occasion (of the Middle Way Consequence School) it is logically feasible that in accord with Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations the three Superiors have three dis-similar types of realization of the view], it [absurdly] follows that Superiors who are definite in the lineages of Hearers and Solitary Victors necessarily do not realize emptiness because between the two modes of expla-nation in Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations, that system in which Hearers do not abandon conceptualization as apprehended objects [which here is the conceptualization apprehending apprehended-object and apprehending-subject as different substantial entities] is logically fea-sible. You have [incorrectly] asserted the sign [which is that between the two modes of explanation in Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations, that system in which Hearers do not abandon conceptualization as apprehended objects (which here is the conceptualization apprehending apprehended-object and apprehending-subject as different substantial en-tities) is logically feasible].
You cannot accept [that Superiors who are definite in the lineages of Hearers and Solitary Victors necessarily do not realize emptiness] because Chandrakīrti explains that all three learner Superiors are similar in realizing emptiness and you too are an asserter of this. It follows [that Chandrakīrti explains that all three learner Superiors are similar in realizing emptiness and you too are an asserter of this] because [your] Commentarial Explanation says: a

**Question:** Hearers understand the selflessness of persons, but how do they understand dependent-arising to lack inherent existence?

**Response:** Since just as Hearers and so forth also have the understanding of the selflessness of phenomena and so forth, so here [Chandrakīrti’s Supplement, 1.8d] indicates that “On [the seventh ground,] the Gone Afar, b [Bodhisattvas] surpass [Hearers and Solitary Realizers] also by way of intelligence.” c

---

a  dbu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad, 5a.7-5b.1.
b  dūrāṅgama, ring du song ba.
c  Tsong-kha-pa’s commentary on this line in his *Illumination of the Thought* is:

When those first ground Bodhisattvas arrive at [the seventh] the Gone Afar ground, they outshine Hearers and Solitary Realizers not only by way of their conventional mind of enlightenment but also surpass—that is, outshine—them by way of the power of their intelligence, their ultimate mind generation.

Where Jayānanda has:

nyan thos rnams kyis gang zag gi bdag med par shes pa yin gyi…nyan thos la sogs pa rnams la chos kyi bdag med pa shes pa yod pa de ltar ring du song ba de ni blos kyang lhag ces bus ‘dir sion to

Jam-yang-shay-pa has:

nyan thos rnams kyis gang zag gi bdag med pa shes pa yin gyi…nyan thos la sogs pa la yang chos kyi bdag med pa la sogs pa shes pa yod pas/ de ltar ring du
and because Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:\(^a\)

[Jayānanda’s proposition] is not reasonable because here in the [Consequentialist] system it is said that the realization that all phenomena do not inherently exist occurs in both Hearers and Solitary Realizers and because even the one who proposes the above [namely, Jayānanda] himself asserts this tenet [when later he says that Hearers and Solitary Realizers realize the emptiness of all phenomena].

---

\(^a\) Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma la ’jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal*, BDRC W22109.24:9-584, 5b.6-6a.1. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 66. This citation from Tsong-kha-pa’s treatise begins precisely at the point where the previous one left off, thus giving the reader a more complete picture of Tsong-kha-pa’s assessment of Jayānanda’s interpretation. Where Jam-yang-shay-pa has *lugs ’dis*, Tsong-kha-pa has *lugs ’dir*. 

---
24. Regarding how Hearers and Solitary Victors are formed, [Jayānanda] the author of the Commentarial Explanation says: If one wonders:

“It follows that the fulfillment of the desire of Hearers and Solitary Victors—the attainment of Foe Destroyer—through the Subduer’s teaching the profound dependent-arising is not logically feasible, since it is apparent that there are many Hearers and Solitary Realizers whose desire is not fulfilled in the lifetime in which dependent-arising is taught.”

a certain one [Jayānanda himself] asserts that in response to this [Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary] says:

Some moreover who, though they have become skilled in realizing the ultimate from only listening to the teaching of dependent-arising, indeed do not attain nirvāṇa in just this lifetime; nevertheless, it is certain that practitioners of the teaching will attain a fruition of the desired effect in another lifetime, as is the case with the effect of an action the fruition of which is definite.

Jayānanda’s Commentarial Explanation says:

---


b The qualm addressed by Jayānanda responds to an immediately preceding passage in Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary (220a.5-6):

How? Because when Buddhas arise, it is for the sake of engaging in teaching nonerroneous dependent-arising, and also Hearers and so forth through the stages of hearing, thinking, and meditating upon that become thoroughly completed in accordance with their intense inclination.

c dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa, 220a.6-220b.1; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 2.11-17. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 73, note a.

d Jayānanda’s treatise (dbu ma la 'jug pa'i 'grel bshad, madhyamakāvatāraṭī, in bstan
Question: It is apparent that, despite dependent-arising having been taught, some do not attain the states of Hearers and so forth; hence, why would it then be said that Hearers and so forth will be fulfilled through the teaching of nonerroneous dependent-arising? In order to indicate an answer to this [Chandrakīrti stated]:

Some moreover who, though they have become skilled in realizing the ultimate from only listening to the teaching of dependent-arising, indeed do not attain nirvāṇa in just this lifetime; nevertheless, it is certain that practitioners of the teaching will attain a fruition of the desired effect in another lifetime, as is the case with the effect of an action the fruition of which is definite.

and so forth.

[Jam-yang-shay-pa adds:] Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:\(^a\)

One [Jayānanda] asserts that [Chandrakīrti’s passage] indicates an answer to, “It is seen that though dependent-arising is taught, some do not attain the states of Hearers and so forth; hence, Hearers and so forth will not fulfill [their desired aim, attainment of Foe Destroyer] through the teaching of dependent-arising.”

---

\(^a\) Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma la ’jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dngong s pa rab gsal*, BDRC W22109.24-9-584, 7a.6-7b.1. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 74. Where Tsong-kha-pa (7a.6), 2011 BDRC bla brang (16b.4), and 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa (13a.7) have *rtен ’brel bstan yang*, 2007 Taipei codex reprint has *rtен ’brel bstan kyang*.
Also, a certain Tibetans assert: [This passage in Chandrakīrti’s treatise] is an answer to thinking that whereas it would be reasonable [for the fruit] to arise immediately after practicing the meaning of dependent-arising, it does not, and therefore the fruit also will not be produced later. Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:

others [that is, Tibetans] explain that this indicates an answer to:

“Whereas it would be reasonable for that fruit to arise immediately after practicing the meaning of dependent-arising/nonproduction, it does not, and, therefore, the fruit also will not be produced later.”

---

a 2011 BDRC *bla brang*, 16b.5; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 13a.7; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 23.1.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: “Formed” (skrun) means that the Buddha taught the profound dependent-arising, in dependence upon which students brought this into experience through practice, and in dependence upon their practice they attained the effect, the state of a Foe Destroyer. This is what “formed” means here. However, there are those who have qualms about this. If some listen to the doctrine in the presence of the Buddha and then attain the state of Foe Destroyer in that same lifetime, it may be said that the Buddha formed them. However, there are many who listen to the doctrine in the presence of the Buddha and then do not attain the state of Foe Destroyer in that same lifetime. Some attain the state of a
Stream Enterer\textsuperscript{a} and die before attaining the state of a Once Returner\textsuperscript{b} or Never Returner.\textsuperscript{c} Others attain the state of a Never Returner and die before attaining the state of a Foe Destroyer. May it be said that the Buddha formed the ones who did not attain the state of Foe Destroyer in the lifetime in which they heard the doctrine from him? If so, how? There’s the qualm.

For them it does not add up, and they dispute the assertion that is being examined here. They will allow that the Buddha has formed some Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers, but they cannot see their way to affirming that the Buddha has formed all of them. This is the objection that Jayānanda believes Chandrakīrti to be addressing at this point in the \textit{Autocommentary},\textsuperscript{d} and he mistakenly thinks that it applies both to Hearers and to Solitary VICTORS. In his view, the passage from Chandrakīrti’s \textit{Autocommentary} cited just previously indicates an answer to two problems:

1. When Hearers and Solitary VICTORS attain the state of a Stream Enterer, they have not attained the fulfillment in the state of a Foe Destroyer that they desire. To attain the state of a Stream Enterer will be of some benefit, but it will not provide the fulfillment they desire as a Foe Destroyer.

2. These Hearers and Solitary VICTORS do not attain the state of Foe Destroyer despite the Buddha having taught the doctrine of dependent-arising and their having listened to it. How then may it be said that, in dependence upon the profound dependent-arising having been taught, they complete what they desire? It will not do to say such.

Succinctly stated, that is the qualm as Jayānanda sees it.

Jayānanda has misread Chandrakīrti, and his misreading may originate in the way Indian books take shape. In most of them, the wrong idea is implicit and the answer is given explicitly. In others, the wrong idea is explicit and the answer is implicit. In still others, both the wrong idea and the answer are given explicitly. Thus, in the great Indian books we find considerable variety. On this occasion, the wrong idea is not stated explicitly in Chandrakīrti’s \textit{Autocommentary}; rather, it is the answer that is given explicitly. This

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{a} rgyun zhugs, śrotāpanna.
\item \textsuperscript{b} phyir 'ong, sakrdāgāmin.
\item \textsuperscript{c} phyir mi 'ong, anāgāmin.
\item \textsuperscript{d} dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa, 220a.5; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 2.6-7.
\end{itemize}
leaves the reader having to depend upon the answer to figure out just what wrong idea is being answered. Through the force of the answer one comes up with the question which it answers. Jayānanda faced just such a problem. He had to work backwards from Chandrakīrti’s answer to the question, and he concluded that Chandrakīrti was considering a problem that applied equally to Hearers and Solitary Victors. That’s where he went wrong.

Here’s how he went wrong: There are Hearers who, from the time they attain the fruit of Stream Enterer until they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer, will of necessity take birth in the Desire Realm seven times. At the end of this series of births they attain liberation. Such Hearers are known by the compact name “seven times in mundane existence.” There are also Hearers who are Never Returners, that is, they will not take birth in the Desire Realm but will take birth in the Form Realm or the Formless Realm. For instance, they may take birth in the highest of the Five Pure Places in the Form Realm, called Not Low. There are many possibilities for such a Hearer’s births. In general, they have attained the fruit of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, and Never Returner but have not attained the fruit of Foe Destroyer. They die, and then they take birth in a higher realm, in either the Form Realm or the Formless Realm. If they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer with a birth in the Form Realm as their support, will their having listened to the profound doctrine previously mean that later as Foe Destroyers they were formed by a Buddha? Some say they were not. Jayānanda takes this qualm to be the topic here.

However, if asked to identify the main qualm addressed in the passage from Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary being considered at this point, it must be said that Chandrakīrti is replying to particular qualms about Solitary Victors rather than about Hearers. How so? Solitary Victors do not rely upon either a Buddha or a master, another person, in their final mundane existence, that is, in the lifetime in which they attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer. If they do not rely upon another for instruction, how could

---

\(a\) rgyun zhugs kyi 'bras bu.
\(b\) dgra bcom pa'i 'bras bu.
\(c\) srid pa lan bdan pa.
\(d\) phyir mi 'ong, anāgāmin.
\(e\) 'og min, akaniṣṭha.
\(f\) rang rgyal la dmigs bsdal gyi dogs pa.
it be said they have been born from the speech of a Buddha? It would seem like a contradiction, wouldn’t it? If we think of circumstances like our own and we say that some fellow has become learned without relying upon a teacher and then pointing a finger at someone say, “That is his teacher,” haven’t we contradicted ourselves? Similarly, if we say that a Solitary Victor has been born from the speech of a Buddha, has been formed by a Buddha, has been taught by a Buddha and in dependence upon that instruction attains the state of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer, and also say that a Solitary Victor attains the state of Foe Destroyer without depending upon a master, does it not seem that we have contradicted ourselves? That leads to qualms.

An opponent would challenge us, saying “These two notions contradict one another, don’t they?” To which we reply, “They do not.” For, that Solitary Victors do not rely upon a master means that in their final lifetime, Solitary Victors do not rely upon a master, another person. Also, that Solitary Victors have been formed by a Buddha does not mean that a Buddha taught them in that final lifetime, that final mundane existence. Rather, it means that previously, over the one hundred eons during which those Solitary Victors accumulated merit on the path of accumulation, they relied upon a Buddha or another master. Due to the power of having relied upon a Buddha or a master during those many eons, it comes to pass that in their final mundane existence Solitary Victors do not need to rely upon a Buddha or a master. Had Solitary Victors not listened to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha or a master on the occasion of the path of accumulation, they would not have attained the state of Foe Destroyer without relying upon a Buddha or a master in their final mundane existence.

Chandrakīrti offers an example that helps to understand this main point. We accumulate actions in lifetimes prior to those in which we experience the effects of those actions. The pleasure and pain we experience in this lifetime come about as the ripening of actions, but the actions need not have been accumulated in this lifetime. Rather, we have accumulated those actions in previous lifetimes, and they have ripened in this lifetime. Similarly, if due to having listened to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha or other masters in previous births practitioners attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in this lifetime, it may be said that they have done so in

---

\[\text{tshogs lam, sambhāramārga}\]
dependence upon a Buddha’s or other masters’ having taught the doctrine. In that sense we may say that they have been formed by a Buddha.

Jayānanda goes awry when he mixes Hearers into this highly focused discussion. He thinks that Chandrakīrti is also addressing qualms in regard to Hearers. No, the qualms that Chandrakīrti is putting to rest apply not to Hearers, in regard to whom there are no qualms, but rather to Solitary Victors, for as we have seen, the words that describe Solitary Victors can be misconstrued to produce an apparent internal contradiction. When it is said that Solitary Victors attain the state of Foe Destroyer without relying upon a Buddha or another master and that they have been born from the speech of a Buddha or another master, until those two statements are reconciled they do seem to contradict one another. No such apparently explicit contradiction affects the presentation of the paths of Hearers—in regard to Hearers no one harbors the qualm that those two statements evoke in regard to Solitary Victors. After all, Hearers may and do rely upon a master in the lifetime that constitutes their final mundane existence.

Our response: With respect to those two, well then, it [absurdly] follows that on this occasion qualms are to be eliminated mainly with respect to both Hearers and Solitary Victors because [your presentation of] the mode of objection and reply are logically feasible [according to you].

If you [incorrectly] accept [that on this occasion qualms are to be eliminated mainly with respect to both Hearers and Solitary Victors], it [absurdly] follows that the qualm thinking that it is not logically feasible that “Hearer Foe Destroyers are produced from the Buddha’s speech” is the greater qualm [on this occasion] because you have [incorrectly] accepted [that on this occasion qualms are to be eliminated mainly with respect to both Hearers and Solitary Victors].
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: By this Jam-yang-shay-pa asks whether or not the opponent has strong qualms that Hearers are produced from the Buddha’s speech.

It cannot be accepted [that the qualm thinking that it is not logically feasible that “Hearer Foe Destroyers are produced from the Buddha’s speech” is the greater qualm (on this occasion)] because qualms [stemming] from the name Hearer and its meaning are smaller, and because all four systems of tenets assert in accordance with the passage from the Questions of King Dharanīśvara, a “The thorough release of Hearers proceeds in accordance with [a master’s] words,” and because also in many sūtras the explanations of how many persons attain the four fruits and so forth when individual meanings are taught are extremely numerous, and because therefore these evince a mode of objection and reply in which the meaning of this section has not been realized, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought says, “These are explanations by those who have not understood the meaning of this section.”

\[\text{Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: By this Jam-yang-shay-pa asks whether or not the opponent has strong qualms that Hearers are produced from the Buddha’s speech.}\]

It cannot be accepted [that the qualm thinking that it is not logically feasible that “Hearer Foe Destroyers are produced from the Buddha’s speech” is the greater qualm (on this occasion)] because qualms [stemming] from the name Hearer and its meaning are smaller, and because all four systems of tenets assert in accordance with the passage from the Questions of King Dharanīśvara, a “The thorough release of Hearers proceeds in accordance with [a master’s] words,” and because also in many sūtras the explanations of how many persons attain the four fruits and so forth when individual meanings are taught are extremely numerous, and because therefore these evince a mode of objection and reply in which the meaning of this section has not been realized, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought says, “These are explanations by those who have not understood the meaning of this section.”

---

\[\text{Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: By this Jam-yang-shay-pa asks whether or not the opponent has strong qualms that Hearers are produced from the Buddha’s speech.}\]

It cannot be accepted [that the qualm thinking that it is not logically feasible that “Hearer Foe Destroyers are produced from the Buddha’s speech” is the greater qualm (on this occasion)] because qualms [stemming] from the name Hearer and its meaning are smaller, and because all four systems of tenets assert in accordance with the passage from the Questions of King Dharanīśvara, a “The thorough release of Hearers proceeds in accordance with [a master’s] words,” and because also in many sūtras the explanations of how many persons attain the four fruits and so forth when individual meanings are taught are extremely numerous, and because therefore these evince a mode of objection and reply in which the meaning of this section has not been realized, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought says, “These are explanations by those who have not understood the meaning of this section.”

---

It cannot be accepted [that the qualm thinking that it is not logically feasible that “Hearer Foe Destroyers are produced from the Buddha’s speech” is the greater qualm (on this occasion)] because qualms [stemming] from the name Hearer and its meaning are smaller, and because all four systems of tenets assert in accordance with the passage from the Questions of King Dharanīśvara, a “The thorough release of Hearers proceeds in accordance with [a master’s] words,” and because also in many sūtras the explanations of how many persons attain the four fruits and so forth when individual meanings are taught are extremely numerous, and because therefore these evince a mode of objection and reply in which the meaning of this section has not been realized, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought says, “These are explanations by those who have not understood the meaning of this section.”
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Jam-yang-shay-pa replies that it is not possible to have great qualms about the name Hearer. Above, we considered the etymology of Listener-Hearer (nyan thos) and Hearer-Proclaimer (thos sgrog). To listen means that one listens to others who explain the paths one must practice, and then one practices them; having done so, one attains the fruit. Afterwards, one causes others to hear that one has attained the fruit; therefore one is called a Listener-Hearer. Alternatively, one hears of the paths of the Great Vehicle from others, and although one does not practice those paths oneself, one proclaims them to others; therefore one is called a Hearer-Proclaimer. The former etymology—that one listens to others’ instruction, practices it oneself, and then proclaims to others that having done so one has attained the fruit—seems to be the more commonly accepted one. In any case, there are far fewer qualms about the name Hearer and its meaning than there are about the name Solitary Victor and its meaning.

“Thorough release” is to be posited as the fruit of Foe Destroyer, that is, release from cyclic existence. Thus, one would say, “I have attained the state of Foe Destroyer and have been released from cyclic existence.” This would fulfill the explanation of Listener-Hearer as those who cause others to hear of what they have accomplished.

Reading the sūtras, one learns of many occasions when, as the result of the Buddha having spoken the doctrine in a certain place, right then and there some students generated the intention of the Great Vehicle, some attained the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer,
some attained the fruit of Stream Enterer, and so on. Does one ever read that at that time and place someone attained the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer? Apparently not. Regularly one reads that a person attained the fruit of Stream Enterer, another attained the fruit of Once Returner, and a third attained the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer. Though Solitary Victors vary individually, we know that in their final cyclic existence none of them rely upon a teacher. They are all the same in this way.

If we consider Solitary Victors at the path of accumulation, we may speak of a time when and a place where they hear the doctrine. Having heard the doctrine, do they attain the four fruits then and there? No.

Solitary Victors may be divided into three groups. Among them, rhinoceros-like Solitary Victors have the sharpest faculties. Having previously generated a path of accumulation, they are then able to actualize paths of preparation, paths of seeing, paths of meditation, and paths of no-more-learning—all four—on a single seat [that is, in one continuous session of meditation]. Congregating Solitary Victors are of two types: greater and lesser. They have slightly duller faculties. Both types generate paths of accumulation and paths of preparation in a previous lifetime. Then, in a subsequent lifetime, they generate paths of seeing, paths of meditation, and paths of no-more-learning. Generally speaking that is what is said. However, whether or not such Solitary Victors generate paths of seeing at the very time and place of hearing the doctrine or only later after meditating in solitude upon what they heard previously deserves some consideration.

Reading in the Translated Word of Buddha, one comes to many passages saying that upon hearing the doctrine a person was established in the teaching, another achieved the fruit of Foe De-

---

*a rgyun zhugs, śrātāpanna.
*b bse ru lta bu'i rang rgyal, khadgavisāṇakalpa-pratyekabuddha.
*c sbyor lam, prayogamārga.
*d mthong lam, darśanamārga.
*e sgom lam, bāvanāmārga.
*f mi slob lam, aśaikṣamārga.
*g tshogsSpyod.
*h tshogs spyod che chung gnyis.
*i bka’gyur.
stroker, and so forth. That upon hearing the doctrine someone attained the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer, either at that time or during that lifetime, seems unlikely. If there were such persons, that would disorder the arrangement of a Solitary Victor’s series of the fully qualified paths. Many times we hear of someone attaining the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer, but when if ever do we hear of someone attaining the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer? Hence, in regard to the birth of Hearers and Solitary Victors from the speech of the Monarch of Subduers, the main of the qualms to be resolved concern Solitary Victors rather than Hearers.

Summarizing the dispute, Jam-yang-shay-pa remarks “these evince a mode of objection and reply in which the meaning of this section has not been realized.” He does not mince words: The person expressing qualms about Hearers is objecting without understanding the meaning directly relevant to this section of Chandrakirti’s Supplement. Jam-yang-shay-pa buttresses his assessment by citing Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought, which says, “These are explanations by those who have not understood the meaning of this section.” That is the point that Jam-yang-shay-pa is making here: There are many who attain the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer on the occasion of hearing the doctrine but none who attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer on that occasion. Consequently, there are fewer qualms with regard to Hearers and greater qualms with regard to Solitary Victors.

Hence, the main place with respect to which qualms are to be eliminated is Solitary Victors, and among them, with respect to Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers, because:

1. generally as for the majority of Solitary Victors who are on paths of accumulation, those that actually occur in the retinue of a Buddha are many, and
2. as for Superiors although the two congregating [Solitary Victors] attain the first three fruits, these occur in the retinue of a Buddha, and

---

a See above, Error! Bookmark not defined..
b See above, 45.
c tshogs spyod.
3. in the final cyclic existences of even all three [types of] Solitary Victors\(^a\) they do not rely upon a Buddha or a spiritual friend,\(^b\) whereby the qualm thinking it is not logically feasible that they are formed by the Buddha is greater.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Most Solitary Victors who are on paths of accumulation listen to the doctrine as members of a Buddha’s retinue. They listen to the doctrine at the sites where the Buddhas speak it. They become disciples of these Buddhas [over those many lifetimes].\(^c\) They travel with those Buddhas.

“The two congregating” refers to the greater and lesser congregating Solitary Victors that I mentioned just previously. The term in question, tshogs spyod, packs a lot of meaning into two words. Here, tshogs (assembly, collection) means an assembly of Solitary Victors, and spyod (conduct, practice) means that this assembly of Solitary Victors works together as a group; in particular, they meditate together. Rhinoceros-like Solitary Victors keep to themselves, meditating alone and in solitude. Unlike them, greater and lesser congregating Solitary Victors work together as a group while training in the paths of Solitary Victors. In brief, they “congregate” (tshogs) and engage in the “conduct” (spyod).

---

\(^a\) Rhinoceros-like Solitary Victors and the two types of Congregating Solitary Victors, Greater and Lesser.

\(^b\) ade ba’i bshes gnyen, kalyāṇāmitra.

\(^c\) sangs rgyas kyi dge phrug.
of their paths. These three types of Solitary Victors differ in the sharpness of their faculties: duller in the case of the greater congregating, medium in the case of the lesser congregating, and sharpest in the case of the rhinoceros-like.

When the two congregating Solitary Victors attain the first three fruits, which are those of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, and Never Returner, they do so in the retinue of a Buddha. In their final lifetimes within cyclic existence, all three types of Solitary Victors, that is, the greater and lesser congregating as well as the rhinoceros-like, do not rely upon a Buddha or a spiritual friend.

The first [sign which is that generally as for the majority of Solitary Victors who are on paths of accumulation, those that actually occur in the retinue of a Buddha are many] is established because rhinoceros-like Solitary Victors who are definite in that lineage and who are on paths of accumulation, having accumulated the collections for a hundred great eons in the presence of a Buddha, actualize [the remaining paths] from the heat [path of preparation] on up in one lifetime, and at the time of the path of accumulation the majority of congregating [Solitary Victors] only please a Buddha with service in his presence.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Solitary Victors of this type accumulate the collections while together with a Buddha for one hundred eons. Then they actualize all the remaining paths in one lifetime: the four levels of the path of preparation—heat, peak, forbearance, etc.

---

a tshogs zhiṅg sbyod pa.
b phyir 'ong, sakṛdāgāmin.
c phyir mi 'ong, anāgāmin
d rtse mo, mūrdhan.
e bzod pa, ksānti.
and supreme mundane quality—a—the path of seeing, the path of meditation, and the path of no-more-learning. The hard work in which they engage comes at the time of the path of accumulation. By contrast, it is not definite that congregating Solitary Victors will complete their paths within one hundred great eons. Some require even longer. For instance, Solitary Victors who are not definite in that lineage may enter the paths of Hearers initially and later enter the paths of Solitary Victors.

This is because the *Sūtra on Returning Kindness* says, “Solitary Realizers reach the end by means of a hundred great eons” and Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of Reasoning* explains that a certain type of congregating [Solitary Victor], acquainting with a Buddha through the heat, peak, and forbearance paths of preparation, does not [at that time] actualize the fruit.

Others

Having pleased a Buddha with service complete the generation
Of partial concordance with definite discrimination.

---

*a jīg rten pa'i chos kyi mchog, laukikāgyadharmā.

*b theb mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas drin lan sras pa'i mdo, rgya yi skad du de'i phāng bya na phur po'u in kyeng sū phim de'i ayir, in bka' 'gyur (sde dge), mdo sde, vol. 76. BDRC 22084076:173-396 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1976-1979), 86a2-198b7.

*c Ngag-wang-leg-dan explained that “lesser congregating Solitary Realizers (*tshogs spyod chung ba*) attain the first three of the four levels of the path of preparation—heat, peak, and forbearance—but not the fourth, supreme qualities, in the presence of a Buddha and then actualize the remaining paths (including the four fruits) alone.” Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 75, note a.

*d Bhāvaviveka, *dbu ma'i sning po'i 'grel pa rtog ge 'bar ba (madhyamakāṛdayavrtti-tarkajvālā)*, in bstan 'gyur (sde dge), BDRC W23703.98 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 146b.2.

*e nges 'byed cha mthun, nirvedhabhāgīya.*
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: They please a Buddha with work that gives joy to a Buddha. Listening repeatedly to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha, on that occasion they generate partial concordance with definite discrimination, that is, they attain paths of preparation. Thus, while with a Buddha they generate the heat, peak, and forbearance paths of preparation, but they do not actualize the supreme mundane quality path of preparation or the path of seeing at that time.

The second root sign [which is that as for Superiors although the two congregating (Solitary Victors) attain the first three fruits, these occur in the retinue of a Buddha] is established because Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of Reasoning* says: a

Others attain the fruit during the presence of a Buddha  

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Of the three types of Solitary Victors, one completes the path of accumulation during the presence of a Buddha, but there is no talk of them attaining the path of preparation; a second attains the heat, peak, and forbearance paths of preparation during a Buddha’s presence; and a third, described in this passage from Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of Reasoning*, attains the fruit of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, and Never Returner during a Buddha’s presence but does not actualize the fruit of Foe Destroyer. In light of this, we may say that none of the three types of Solitary Victors attain the state of Foe Destroyer while a Buddha is present.

[That Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of Reasoning* says this] entails [that as for Superiors, although the two congregating (Solitary Victors) attain the first

---
a *rtog ge 'bar ba*, 146b.2-3.
three fruits, these occur in the retinue of a Buddha] because it is explaining
that “in dependence upon a Buddha’s presence, solely [the state of] Foe
Destroyer is not actualized, but the first three fruits are attained.”

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: In dependence upon a Buddha’s presence
they are able to attain the fruit of Stream Enterer, Once Returner,
and Never Returner. Solely the state of Foe Destroyer is not actu-
alized.

The third root sign [which is that in the final cyclic existences of even all
three (types of) Solitary Victors they do not rely upon a Buddha or a spir-
itual friend, whereby the qualm thinking it is not logically feasible that
they are formed by the Buddha is greater] is established because (1) at the
time [of their final cyclic existence] they do not rely [upon a Buddha or a
spiritual friend,] and (2) for that reason qualms are greater.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: During the lifetime when they attain the state
of Foe Destroyer, Solitary Victors do not rely upon a Buddha, nor
do they rely upon any other spiritual friend. Because they do not
rely upon either a Buddha or a spiritual friend in their final cyclic
existence, some wonder whether they attain the fruit of Solitary
Victor Foe Destroyer in dependence upon a Buddha. If not, then
may they be said to have been formed by a Buddha?

The first [sign which is that at the time of their final cyclic existence, they
do not rely upon a Buddha or a spiritual friend] is established because all
three of those having the lineage of Solitary Victors are similar in that due
to being prideful from the start, they make the aspirational prayer to become fully purified in the absence of a master, in accordance with which in their final cyclic existence without relying upon another they actualize their own enlightenment independently, because Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of Reasoning* says:

In the absence of a Buddha
And in the absence of a master
These three attain Foe Destroyer.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: They wish to become Buddhas. They desire the best. Moreover, they intend to do so without needing to place their hopes in anyone other than themselves. Thus, they display great pride. For a period of one hundred eons they make such aspirational prayers.

Therefore, this is the thought of the *Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra* where it says, “Question: What is skill in the vehicle of Solitary Realizers?” and so forth, and also of the *Sūtra on the Ten Grounds*, and since it is the

---

*a* rang byung gi sgo nas, literally, by way of their own arising.

*b* rtog ge 'bar ba, 146b.3.

*c* blo gros mi zad pas bstan pa (aksayamatinirdeśa), in bka’ gyur (sde dge par phud), BDRC W22084.60:159-350 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa coedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1976–1979), 127b.2.

*d* mdo sde sa bcu pa (daśabhūtikāsūtra), in bka’ gyur (sde dge), vol. kha, BDRC 22084036 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa coedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1976-1979); also, in nges don mdo skor, BDRC W22275.6:208-389 (sDe dGe dGon Chen: sde
thought of Asaṅga’s *Actuality of the Grounds,*\(^a\) his *Grounds of Bodhisattvas,*\(^b\) Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland of Eloquence,*\(^c\) and so forth, do not adhere to what the foolish have concocted.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: In Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland of Eloquence,* this is addressed in the second chapter,\(^d\) concerned with knowers of the paths that know the paths of Solitary Victors.\(^e\) There Tsong-kha-pa clearly describes the ways in which Solitary Victors teach the doctrine silently by way of physical gestures, how they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer without relying upon others, and other aspects of their being in accord with what has been argued here. Tsong-kha-pa explains the meaning of the *Sūtra on the Ten Grounds,* Asaṅga’s *Answer of the Grounds,* and other such texts clearly.

Know that with a single slingshot stone of reasoning this has driven away a hundred birds of misconceptions:

- thinking that the two—Solitary Victors who are common persons\(^f\) and those who are Superiors—do not come into a Buddha’s retinue,

---

\(^a\) Asaṅga, *sa’i dngos gzhi/ rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa (bhūmivastu/ yogācārabhūmi),* in *bs tan ’gyur (sde dge,* 4035), BDRC W23703.127:4-567 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985).

\(^b\) Asaṅga, *byang chub sems dpa’i sa (bodhisattvabhiṣkāra),* in *bs tan ’gyur (sde dge,* 4037), BDRC W23703.129:4-427 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985).

\(^c\) Tsong-kha-pa, *legs bshad gser ’phreng,* in *gsung ’bum/ tsong kha pa (bkra shis lhun po par rnying),* BDRC W29193.18:5-580 (Dharamsala: Sherig Parkhang, 1997); also BDRC W22109.3219 (gedan sungrab minyam gyunphel series, Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1977).

\(^d\) *skabs gnyis pa.*

\(^e\) *rang rgyal gyi lam shes pa’i lam shes.*

\(^f\) *so so’i skye bo, prthragjana.*
thinking that Solitary Victors lack the Approachers and Abiders,\(^a\)
or thinking that they lack the eight half-pair sets of persons.\(^b\)

I have already elaborated upon these extensively in the *Explanation of “Tenets.”*\(^c\)

---

\(^a\) *zhugs gnas*: Approachers to and Abiders in the fruit of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, and Foe Destroyer.

\(^b\) *gang zag ya brgyad*: the four pairs of Approachers to and Abiders in the fruit of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, and Foe Destroyer.

\(^c\) *Explanation of “Tenets”: Sun of the Land of Samantabhadra Brilliantly Illuminating All of Our Own and Others’ Tenets and the Meaning of the Profound [Emptiness], Ocean of Scripture and Reasoning Fulfilling All Hopes of All Beings* (grub pa’i rnam par bzhag pa ’khrul spong gdong lnga’i sgra dbyangs thams cad mkhyen pa’i lam bzang gsal ba’i rin chen sgron me). For Jam-yang-shay-pa’s portrait of the Vehicle of Hearers and and the Vehicle of Solitary Victors as they are presented in the context of the Consequence School, see Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound: Jam-yang-shay-ba’s Great Exposition of Buddhist and Non-Buddhist Views on the Nature of Reality* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 2003), 970-972. Since Jam-yang-shay-pa here refers to his *Explanation of “Tenets”* as already written, this calls into question Derek Maher’s tentative dating of its publication as 1699, four years after his dating of the publication of the present book, the *Great Exposition of the Middle*, in 1695.
tem that describes them as dissimilar. The Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School\textsuperscript{a} describes dissimilar principal objects to be abandoned. If the paths are presented as they do, then the eight Approchers and Abiders are asserted for Hearers but not for Solitary Victors. Why not? The eight Approchers and Abiders correspond to different degrees of having abandoned the afflictive obstructions, but because the afflictive obstructions do not serve as the principal objects to be abandoned by Solitary Victors, the eight Approchers and Abiders are not posited for them.

The other Buddhist systems of tenets—the Great Exposition School, the Sūtra School, the Mind-Only School, the Sūtra Autonomy Middle Way School,\textsuperscript{b} and the Consequence School—maintain that Hearers and Solitary Victors abandon the same objects of abandonment; therefore, they posit the eight Approchers and Abiders not only for Hearers but also for Solitary Victors. Here, Jam-yang-shay-pa addresses and dismisses the qualm some may harbor, that in the system of the Consequence School the Approchers and Abiders are not posited for Solitary Victors. The mention of the eight half-pair sets of persons touches upon the same issue.

The second sign [which is that for that reason—at the time of their final cyclic existence they do not rely upon a Buddha or a spiritual friend—the qualm is greater] is established because there are greater qualms thinking that if [Solitary Victors] are formed by Buddhas, then the meanings of having arisen independently and of Solitary Victor, explained previously as due to not having depended upon others, and of being called “Realizers of Conditionality”\textsuperscript{c} due to understanding the meaning by way of a mere condition, are not logically feasible.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: One qualm would be that, if they are formed by Buddhas, then the meaning of having arisen independently and conquered on their own without depending upon another does not obtain. As for the other qualm, one may ask how they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer if in their final cyclic existence they do not depend upon another master. It is by meditating upon profound dependent-arising that they come to realization. In what manner do they realize dependent-arising? “By means of a mere condition they understand the meaning.”

In previous births Solitary Victors will have accumulated the collections for a hundred eons on the path of accumulation, whereby they become unlike others.\(^a\) When Solitary Victors come to their final cyclic existence, perhaps as a small child they pass through a burial ground.\(^b\) Seeing there the corpse of a human being or maybe just bones, they naturally wonder how this has come to be. The inquiry begins there. The bones have come about in dependence upon the death of a human being. This we can see with our own eyes. Why do human beings die? Because they have been born. Having been born, they will die. From what does birth come? Birth comes from the accumulation of good and bad actions.\(^c\) Continuing to investigate and analyze, they eventually reach all the way back to ignorance.\(^d\)

In this way Solitary Victors trace all the steps in the reverse process\(^e\) of dependent-arising and understand them. Here, “condition” refers mainly to this. A human being dies, leaving bones or a corpse. Later, Solitary Victors see them. This serves as the condition for understanding the forward process\(^f\) of dependent-arising as well as the reverse process of the dependent-arising of cyclic existence. In dependence upon understanding the meaning of dependent-arising, Solitary Victors realize true sufferings and the

\(^a\) gzhan dang ma 'dra ba.
\(^b\) dur khrod.
\(^c\) las bzang ngan.
\(^d\) ma rig pa, avidyā.
\(^e\) lugs ldog, pratiloma.
\(^f\) lugs 'byung, anuloma.
true origins of suffering in direct perception, whereby they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer.

“Realization of a condition” refers primarily to this: in dependence upon a mere condition, Solitary Victors attain realization without the need for others to say this and that.

[That there are greater qualms thinking that if (Solitary Victors) are formed by the Buddhas, then in regard to that the meanings of having arisen independently and of Solitary Victor, explained previously (as) due to not having depended upon others, and of being called “Realizers of Conditionality” due to understanding the meaning by way of a mere condition, are not logically feasible] entails [that for that reason—at the time of their final cyclic existence they do not rely upon a Buddha or a spiritual friend—the qualm is greater] because Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says, “since there are greater qualms about the Monarchs of Subduers’ giving birth to Solitary Victors, [qualms about this] should be singled out and eliminated but they did not do so.”\(^a\)

\(^a\) Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma la ‘jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal*, BDRC W22109.2:9-584, 7b.2. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 75. Jam-yang-shay-pa has given de ltar na de la dogs pa che bas de la… as the first portion of this passage. In Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought*, the passage begins with thub dbang gis rang rgyal bskrun tshul la dvogs pa che bas de la… About the controversy that Jam-yang-shay-pa has been exploring in this section of his treatise, Hopkins writes, “Tsong-kha-pa’s problem with these two explanations of the challenge that Chandrakirti is answering is that they view the challenge and therefore the response as concerned with both Hearers and Solitary Realizers whereas Tsong-kha-pa views Chandrakirti’s concern as being only with Solitary Realizers, since they necessarily do not become Foe Destroyers in the presence of Buddhas” (Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 75, note a).
25. Someone says: It follows that, except for merely listening to [an explanation of] emptiness, the objects of the qualms of this [objection] necessarily have not realized emptiness because the main elimination of the qualms of this [objection] is an elimination of qualms in regard to Solitary Victors, whether common persons or Superiors, who without attaining even merely states arisen from thinking and states arisen from meditation with respect to profound dependent-arising—why even mention abiding in the fruit!—in the lifetimes in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha, are definite in a later birth to attain [the fruit of] Foe Destroyer.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Here, the opponent goes back to the previous objection and pursues another aspect of it. That Solitary Victors do not attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in the lifetimes in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha and may not attain other fruits cannot be questioned.

In addition, when Buddhas teach the doctrine, they speak of emptiness, and the opponent contends that except for merely an explanation of the meaning of emptiness when Solitary Victors listen to a Buddha explain the doctrine, Solitary Victors necessarily do not realize emptiness in that lifetime. Set aside abiding in the fruit of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, or Never Returner, they do not give rise even to states arisen from thinking or meditation with respect to profound dependent-arising. Implicitly the opponent acknowledges that they do give rise to states arisen from
It follows [that on this occasion qualms are to be eliminated mainly in regard to Solitary Victors, whether common persons or Superiors, who—without attaining even merely that which has arisen from thinking and that which has arisen from meditation with respect to profound dependent-arising (why even mention abiding in the fruit!) in the lifetimes in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha—are definite in a later birth to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer] because there must be Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers who while near those Victors do not attain states arisen from meditation with respect to the profound dependent-arising.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: There must be such Solitary Victors who while near or in the vicinity of a Buddha do not attain that which has arisen from meditation with respect to dependent-arising. Must also be those who do not attain that which has arisen from thinking? No. Various terms come into play: arisen from meditation, wisdom arisen from meditation, meditative stabilization that is a union of calm abiding and special insight, special insight, and so forth. Let us consider four in particular: special insight observing emptiness, meditative stabilization that is a union

---

a thos byung, śrutamayī.
b rgyal ba, jina.
c thad du.
d drung du.
e sgom byung.
f sgm byung gi shes rab, cintāmayiprajñā.
g zhi lhag zung 'brel gyi ting nge 'dzin.
h lhag mthong, vipaśyanā.
i stong nyid la dmigs pa'i lhag mthong.
of calm abiding and special insight observing emptiness,\textsuperscript{a} state arisen from meditation observing emptiness,\textsuperscript{b} and wisdom observing emptiness.\textsuperscript{c}

Are these four individually distinct\textsuperscript{d} or are they the same?\textsuperscript{e} Are a state arisen from meditation and wisdom that has arisen from meditation the same? What about special insight and meditative stabilization that is a union of calm abiding and special insight? Are they the same or are they disparate?\textsuperscript{f} They must be the same. The attainment of special insight observing emptiness and the attainment of meditative stabilization that is a union of calm abiding and special insight come at the same time. Similarly, the attainment of wisdom arisen from meditation observing emptiness\textsuperscript{g} and the attainment of a state that which has arisen from meditation observing emptiness\textsuperscript{h} are the same. In fact, all four of these are almost certainly the same.

Now, meditation must precede that which has arisen from meditation. As for what is to be cultivated in meditation, we may posit (1) meditation in order to attain calm abiding not yet attained and (2) meditation subsequent to attaining calm abiding in order to attain special insight not yet attained. To attain a state arisen from meditation, meditation preceded by a state arisen from thinking is undertaken, whereby calm abiding is attained. Calm abiding having been attained, to attain special insight not yet attained, further meditation is undertaken. When, in dependence upon meditation undertaken in order to attain special insight not yet attained, this special insight has been attained, at which point a state arisen from meditation\textsuperscript{i} has been attained. Thus, these four must be the same.

As for wisdom arisen from meditation, the entity of special insight\textsuperscript{j} is customarily said to be wisdom, and the entity of calm abiding and special insight observing emptiness,\textsuperscript{a} state arisen from meditation observing emptiness,\textsuperscript{b} and wisdom observing emptiness.\textsuperscript{c}

\begin{itemize}
    \item[a] stong nyid la dmigs pa'i zhi lhag zung 'brel gyi ting nge 'dzin.
    \item[b] stong nyid la dmigs pa'i sgom byung.
    \item[c] stong nyid la dmigs pa'i shes rab.
    \item[d] so so.
    \item[e] gcig pa.
    \item[f] khag khag.
    \item[g] stong nyid la dmigs pa'i sgom byung gi shes rab.
    \item[h] stong nyid la dmigs pa'i sgom byung.
    \item[i] sgom byung.
    \item[j] lhag mthong gi ngo bo.
\end{itemize}
abiding is said to be meditative stabilization. Thus, although we have two verbal conventions—arisen from meditation and wisdom arisen from meditation—to attain a state arisen from meditation one must attain wisdom arisen from meditation, apart from which there is no attainment of a special insight that is not of the entity of wisdom. In any case, wisdom arisen from meditation observing emptiness is attained only at the beginning of the path of preparation. Calm abiding observing emptiness can be attained on the occasion of the path of accumulation, but special insight observing emptiness is not attained on the path of accumulation. That comes only with the attainment of the path of preparation.

Our response: [That there must be Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers who while near of those Victors do not attain states arisen from meditation with respect to the profound dependent-arising] does not entail [that on this occasion qualms are to be eliminated mainly in regard to Solitary Victors, whether common persons or Superiors, who without attaining even merely states arisen from thinking and states arisen from meditation with respect to profound dependent-arising—why even mention abiding in the fruit!—in the lifetimes in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha are definite in a later birth to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer].

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: A Solitary Victor who does not attain states arisen from meditation has not necessarily failed to attain states arisen from thinking.

The sign [which is that there must be Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers who while near of those Victors do not attain states arisen from meditation with respect to the profound dependent-arising] is established because Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary says.

---

a zhi gnas kyi ngo bo.
b dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa, 220a.6-7; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 2.12-13. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From...
Some moreover who, though they have become skilled in realizing the ultimate from only listening to the teaching of dependent-arising

and Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:

although some bearing the lineage of a Solitary Victor become skilled in realizing the ultimate from only listening to the Teacher's setting forth dependent-arising,

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Both passages—the one from Chandrakīrti’s *Autocommentary* and the one from Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought*—mention realization of the ultimate. Note that both say that this Solitary Victor’s realization of the ultimate arises from “only listening to” an explanation of dependent-arising. This realization did not arise from meditation. Rather, it came by way of inference, and as inference it arose from thinking. One thinks about what one has heard, investigating and analyzing by considering it closely, and what comes from that may be called arisen from thinking. If one were to meditate upon the meaning that has emerged from that practice, then one would attain that which has arisen from meditation. The two passages cited here by Jam-yang-shay-pa refer mainly to inferential realization that is a


b _nyan pa kho na._

c _rjes dpag, anumāna._
similitude of special insight.a

[That such is said] entails [that there must be such a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer who does not attain that which has arisen from meditation with respect to profound dependent-arising while in the company of that Victor] because the meaning of each of the two eliminations,b “only listening to,” does exist.

Therefore, not only is it unsuitable to say that they only listen to [the teaching of dependent-arising] but do not realize dependent-arising/emptiness, but also it is unsuitable to assert that in the lifetimes in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha they also actualize the state of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer because Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary says, “Indeed [they] do not attain nirvāṇa in just this lifetime;“c Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought says, “Indeed they do not attain a Solitary Victor’s nirvāṇa in just that present life;“d and the manner in which the fruit of the three [types of] Solitary Victors is accomplished has already been explained previously.e

---

a lhag mthong rjes mthun pa. 
b rnam bcad, viccheda.  
c dbu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa, 220a.7; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 2.13-14. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 73. 
e See above, 49.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: To say that they only listen to the doctrine and do not realize emptiness will not do. Nor will it do to say that in addition to realizing emptiness they also attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in a lifetime in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha.

Both “this birth” and “the present life” refer to what human beings see. How so? Suppose someone does good work in an earlier part of his or her life and then in a later part of that same lifetime becomes an important and powerful person. We see the entirety of the ascent to power and influence. Now consider someone who has done good work in a previous lifetime and then in the present lifetime does not work hard but nevertheless becomes a grand and significant person. In that case we see the effect but we did not see the accumulation of the cause. When one points to the current lifetime by speaking of “seen phenomena,” one means that both the performance of the cause and the experience of the effect are seen in that very lifetime. For instance, if someone were to attain all four fruits in a single lifetime, beginning with the fruit of Stream Enterer and continuing through to the fruit of Foe Destroyer, those would be described literally as “seen phenomena.”

In any case, the citation from Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary—“Indeed they do not attain nirvāṇa in just this lifetime”—tells us that the fruit of Foe Destroyer is not attained in that very lifetime, as does the passage from Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought.

The last part of the sign [about the manner in which the fruit of the three types of Solitary Victors is accomplished] may be illustrated by considering the final cyclic existences of the several

---

a Lo-sang-gyal-tshan is about to explain mthong ba'i skye ba and mthong ba'i chos, which I have translated as “this birth” and “the present life,” respectively. Etymologically the Tibetan could say “the seen birth” and “the seen phenomena”; his explanation nicely illuminates those etymologies and the meanings of expressions.

b mthong ba'i chos, literally, seen phenomena.
types of Solitary Victors. In their final birth, rhinoceros-like Solitary Victors attain all four fruits: Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, and Foe Destroyer. Some congregating Solitary Victors attain the path of preparation in a lifetime in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha. Some congregating Solitary Victors attain the first three fruits—Stream Enterer, Once Returner, and Never Returner, but not the fruit of Foe Destroyer—in a lifetime in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha. In fact, none of the three types of Solitary Victors attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in a lifetime in which they hear the doctrine from a Buddha. Only in a later lifetime, one in which they do not rely upon a Buddha or any other master, do Solitary Victors attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer. In this way they are all the same.

Also, although [some] are persons having a Solitary Victor’s lineage listening to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha, [their] actualization of nirvāṇa in the lifetime that is their final cyclic existence upon listening to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha exists because although their actualization of a Solitary Victor’s nirvāṇa in that way [described above] does not exist, [their] actualization of a Hearer’s nirvāṇa does exist.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Here we have a subtle analysis. We begin with [the general category of] those who have a Solitary Victor’s lineage. Also, they are persons who listen to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha. Having listened to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha in the lifetime of their final cyclic existence, they actualize nirvāṇa. What has happened? Having come to this lifetime bearing the lineage of a Solitary Victor, they listen to the doctrine in a Buddha’s presence. Aiming high, they have thought, “I will enlighten myself.” However, listening to the doctrine in a Buddha’s presence, the prospect of enlightening oneself has come to seem rather difficult; so, gradually they come to think, “Were I
to stay with the Buddha, continue listening to the doctrine, and attain the fruit of a Foe Destroyer, that would be quite acceptable.” In this way, relying upon a master in their final cyclic existences, they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer. But what sort of Foe Destroyer have they thereby become? They have not attained the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer; rather, they have attained the fruit of a Hearer Foe Destroyer. In fact, they have descended from the paths of a Solitary Victor.

Initially, they entered the paths of a Solitary Victor. For a hundred eons they have accumulated the collections of merit and wisdom. Coming to their final cyclic existences, they still think, “I will actualize the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer.” Gradually this seems not to matter so much; rather than work so hard, why not just attain the fruit of a Hearer Foe Destroyer? In this way they descend from the paths of a Solitary Victor. When they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer, what sort of Foe Destroyer have they become? They have attained the fruit of a Hearer Foe Destroyer.

In sum, bearing the lineage of a Solitary Victor, they entered the paths of a Solitary Victor. Then, descending lower, they attain the fruit of a Hearer Foe Destroyer. By way of contrast, among Congregators there are those who initially enter the paths of Hearers and then later, having been encouraged to do so, they come to regard the attainment of the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer as inadequate, feel the need to attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer, and ascend to the paths of Solitary Victors. When they eventually attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer, it is the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer that they attain.

It follows [that although (some) are persons having a Solitary Victor’s lineage listening to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha, (their) actualization of nirvāṇa in the lifetime that is their final cyclic existence upon listening to the doctrine in the presence of a Buddha exists] because actualization of such [a Hearer’s nirvāṇa by] those having the indefinite lineage of a Solitary Victor exists, because the exclusionary elimination\(^a\) and the inclusionary elimination\(^b\) [suggested by the phrase] “some bearing the lineage of a Solitary Victor” in Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought*.\(^c\)

\(^a\) rnam bcad, viccheda.
\(^b\) yongs gcod, pariccheda.
\(^c\) Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma la ’jug pa'i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal*, BDRC
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: In this section we are considering those whose lineage as a Solitary Victor is indefinite. That their lineage is indefinite means that it is not steady. In some sense they approach this in an easy-going manner. If they attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer, that will be fine; if they do not attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer and instead attain the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer, that too will be fine. To be steady in their resolve they would have to be set upon their goal: “Only this will do, nothing else.”

26. Someone says: Whoever is a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer necessarily possesses the feature of an increase of merit and wisdom as described here [in Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary].

Our response: It [absurdly] follows that the subject, a Solitary Victor who is of a single continuum with [a Hearer who proceeded in the manner of]


a ma nges pa.
b bṛtan po med pa.
c gtan ’khel ba.
e Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary mentions that Solitary Victors surpass Hearers by way of an increase of merit and wisdom. See dbu ma la ’jug pa’i bshad pa, 221a.6, La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvatāra, 4.1-2.
simultaneous [abandonment of corresponding objects of abandonment,\(^a\) possesses the feature of an increase of merit and wisdom as described here] because of [being a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer].

Background: Cyclic existence is divided into three realms and nine levels. The first level is the Desire Realm. The next four levels are the four divisions of the Form Realm, called the Four Concentrations. The last four levels are divisions of the Formless Realm. Each level has nine series of obstacles that are to be abandoned; big big, medium big, and small big; big medium, medium medium, and small medium; big small, medium small, and small small (see charts following). Thus, if trainees proceed serially, they have to pass through eighty-one steps, that is, through a series of nine steps on each of the nine levels.

Simultaneous abandonment is the simultaneous overcoming or abandoning of, for example, each of the big big of the nine levels. Thus, one who passes through the path of meditation with simultaneous abandonment has only nine steps to accomplish instead of eighty-one.

**Cyclic Existence: The Three Realms and Nine Levels**
(from the highest levels to the lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Formless Realm (gzugs med kham, ārupadhyātā)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Peak of Cyclic Existence (srid rtse, bhavāgṛa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nothingness (ci yang med, ākiṃcaya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Limitless Consciousness (rnam shes mtha’ yas, vijñānāntya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Limitless Space (nam mkha’ mtha’ yas, ākāśāntya)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Form Realm (gzugs kham, rūпадhātu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Fourth Concentration (bsam gtan bzhi pa, caturthadhyāna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Third Concentration (bsam gtan gsum pa,试试adhyāna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Second Concentration (bsam gtan gnyis pa, dvitīyadhyāna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 First Concentration (bsam gtan dang po, pratamadhyāna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) gcig car ba / cig car ba, sakṛt.
I. 1 Desire Realm (’dod kham, kāmadhātu)

Gods of the Desire Realm (’dod kham kyi lha, kāmadhātudeva)
Those Who Make Use of Others’ Emanations (gzhan phrul dbang byed, paranirmitavaśavartin)
Those Who Enjoy Emanation (phrul dga’, nirmānarati)
Joyous Land (dga’ idan, tuṣita)
Land Without Combat (’thab bral, yāma)
Heaven of Thirty-Three (sum cu rtsa gsum, trayastriṃśa)
Four Great Royal Lineages (rgyal chen rigs bzhi, cāturmahārājakāyika)
Demigods (lha ma yin, asura)
Humans (mi, manuṣya)
Animals (dud ’gro, tiryañc)
Hungry ghosts (yi dvags, preta)
Hell-beings (dmyal ba, nāraka)

Practitioners on the way to attaining liberation from cyclic existence achieve the four fruits of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, and Foe Destroyer. A Stream Enterer is one who will never again be reborn as a hell-being, hungry ghost, or animal. A Once Returner will be reborn once more in the Desire Realm. A Never Returner will never be born again in the Desire Realm. A Foe Destroyer has overcome the afflictive emotions and thus is completely liberated from cyclic existence.

The Eight Approachers and Abiders are beings who are approaching to or abiding in the fruits of Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, or Foe Destroyer. The Four Abiders are persons who have fully accomplished, or who abide in, these fruits. (See the chart on the next page.)
To repeat: Simultaneous abandonment is the simultaneous overcoming or abandoning of, for example, each of the big big obstacles of the nine levels. Thus, one who passes through the path of meditation with simultaneous abandonment has only nine steps to accomplish instead of eighty-one.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: We already know the general account of how on the occasion of the path of accumulation Solitary Victors accumulate the collection of merit for one hundred eons. Suppose it is then said, as it is here, that this must be the case with a Solitary
Victor who is of a single continuum with [a Hearer who proceeded in the manner of] simultaneous [abandonment of objects of abandonment]. First we need to understand what it means to abandon objects of abandonment simultaneously. In the enumeration of the twenty aspirants to virtue, the fruit of Foe Destroyer may be attained in one of three ways. Some attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer

\textsuperscript{a} dge 'dun, samgha. For a brief introduction to the twenty aspirants to virtue, Hopkins, \textit{Maps of the Profound}, revised 229, cites Long-döl Ngag-wang-lo-sang’s (klong rdol ngag dbang blo bzang, 1719-1794) \textit{Vocabulary Occurring in the Perfection of Wisdom} which describes Haribhadra’s system (phar phyin las byung ba’i ming gi rnam grangs, Collected Works, Āṇa-Piṭaka Series, vol. 100 [New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1973]), 159.9/4a.5:

What are the twenty aspirants? There are five concerning Stream Enterers, three concerning Once Returners, ten concerning Never Returners, an Approacher to Foe Destroyer, and a Rhinoceros-like Solitary Realizer.

\textit{Five Stream Enterers}

1. Approacher to Stream Enterer with sharp faculties—a follower of fact
2. Approacher to Stream Enterer with dull faculties—a follower of faith
3. Mere Abider in the fruit of Stream Enterer
4. Stream Enterer who will be reborn from a god lineage into a god lineage two or three times
5. Stream Enterer who will be reborn from a human lineage into a human lineage two or three times.

\textit{Three Once Returners}

6. Approacher to Once Returner
7. Mere Abider in the fruit of Once Returner
8. Special Abider in the fruit of Once Returner with one interruption who will take rebirth once as a god of the Desire Realm before passing from sorrow.

\textit{Ten Never Returners}

9. Approacher to Never Returner
10. Never Returner who passes from sorrow in the intermediate state on the way to the Form Realm
11. Never Returner who passes from sorrow upon rebirth once in the Form Realm
12. Never Returner who passes from sorrow with great exertion upon rebirth once in the Form Realm
13. Never Returner who passes from sorrow without great exertion upon rebirth once in the Form Realm
14. Never Returner who flies, taking only two births: in the Form Realm—the Brahmā Type and the Highest Land and then passes from sorrow
15. Never Returner who flies half-way, taking rebirth only three times: in the Form Realm—Brahma type, any of the pure lower places, and Highest Land and then passes from sorrow
16. Never Returner who transmigrates in all stations, taking rebirth in sixteen of the form levels [but not Great Brahma] and then passes from sorrow in the Highest Land
on paths described as leap-over. Some attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer [by abandoning their objects of abandonment] serially. Some attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in dependence upon paths that [abandon objects of abandonment] simultaneously. Those who [abandon objects of abandonment] simultaneously enter the paths of Hearers. Having done so, they attain a Hearer’s paths of accumulation, preparation, and seeing. Subsequently, they attain paths of meditation. When they reach paths of no-more-learning, at which point they have attained the fruit of Foe Destroyer, some have become Hearer Foe Destroyers, but others have gone the way of Solitary Victors. What are we to make of those who have taken the paths of Solitary Victors? Initially they entered the paths of Hearers. This means that on their paths of accumulation they did not accumulate merit for one hundred eons because Hearers do not do that. This undermines the position taken by the opponent, who has asserted that the general portrait of Solitary Victors as accumulating merit for one hundred eons must be so for all Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers.

It follows [that the subject, a Solitary Victor who is of a single continuum with (a Hearer who proceeded in the manner of) simultaneous (abandonment of objects of abandonment), is a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer] because all Middle Way and Mind-Only Schools assert a [Solitary Victor who], due to the power of aspirational prayers, upon not meeting a Buddha present in the last mundane existence actualizes the state of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer because Asaṅga’s Summary of Manifest Knowledge says, “A Buddha not arising, they become Solitary Victors.”

17. Never Returner who attains peace in this life when the path of seeing is attained, having conquered desires included within the levels of form
18. Never Returner with the manifest corpus of the eight meditative liberations, which are attained and not degenerated.

[One] Approacher to Foe Destroyer
19. Approacher to Foe Destroyer
[One] Rhinoceros-like Solitary Realizer
20. Rhinoceros-like Solitary Realizer

a thod rgal.
b rim gis pa.
c Asaṅga, chos mngon pa kun btus (abhidharmasamuccaya), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge), BDRC W23703.134:89-241 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa chodhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982–1985), 110a.5-110b.2.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Those who proceed in the manner of simultaneous [abandonment of levels of objects of abandonment] attain the fruit of Stream Enterer, thus attaining the path of seeing. However, they do not need to attain the fruit of Once Returner and Never Returner. Instead, after attaining the fruit of Stream Enterer they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer. How is this so? To proceed in a simultaneous manner is to abandon all of the equivalent degrees of the afflictions with respect to each level of the three realms at one time.

For the most part, if the fruit of Foe Destroyer is attained in the very same lifetime in which the fruit of Stream Enterer is attained, then it must be the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer that is attained. When it is not possible to attain the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer in the very same lifetime in which the fruit of Stream Enterer is attained, they make a strong aspirational prayer along the lines of, “Having taken birth when a Buddha is not present, may I attain the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer in that lifetime.” Then, due to the power of this aspirational prayer, having taken birth in a time and place in which a Buddha and also Bodhisattvas are absent, they attain the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer.

It is important to understand the circumstance in which this aspirational prayer came to be made. To repeat: Since it had proved impossible to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in the present lifetime, they had then made the prayer to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in a subsequent lifetime, and in addition to do so in the manner of a Solitary Victor. Due to the power of that aspirational prayer, they attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer. This way of attaining the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer

---

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Those who proceed in the manner of simultaneous [abandonment of levels of objects of abandonment] attain the fruit of Stream Enterer, thus attaining the path of seeing. However, they do not need to attain the fruit of Once Returner and Never Returner. Instead, after attaining the fruit of Stream Enterer they attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer. How is this so? To proceed in a simultaneous manner is to abandon all of the equivalent degrees of the afflictions with respect to each level of the three realms at one time.

For the most part, if the fruit of Foe Destroyer is attained in the very same lifetime in which the fruit of Stream Enterer is attained, then it must be the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer that is attained. When it is not possible to attain the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer in the very same lifetime in which the fruit of Stream Enterer is attained, they make a strong aspirational prayer along the lines of, “Having taken birth when a Buddha is not present, may I attain the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer in that lifetime.” Then, due to the power of this aspirational prayer, having taken birth in a time and place in which a Buddha and also Bodhisattvas are absent, they attain the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer.

It is important to understand the circumstance in which this aspirational prayer came to be made. To repeat: Since it had proved impossible to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in the present lifetime, they had then made the prayer to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in a subsequent lifetime, and in addition to do so in the manner of a Solitary Victor. Due to the power of that aspirational prayer, they attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer. This way of attaining the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer
due to the power of aspirational prayer is asserted by the Middle Way and Mind-Only Schools.

and the *Buddhapālita Commentary* says:

It is thus: it will be accomplished only quickly in the personal direct perception of those who have entered into that [suchness].

---

*a* Buddhapālita, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa buddha pā li ta (buddhapālitanālamadhyamakavṛti)*, in *bstan 'gyur (sde dge, 3842)*. BDRC W23703096:318-563 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 246a.4-246b.1. Also: in *bstan 'gyur (dpe bsdur ma)*, BDRC W1PD95844057:471-792 (pe cin: krung go'i bod rig pa'i dpe skrun khang, 1994-2008), 657.11-658.1. Where Jam-yang-shay-pa has der zhus pa 'rnam kyi bdag nying mgon sum du 'phral kho na la 'grab par gyur *ba'i phyir ro*, both the sde dge and dpe bsdur ma (657.11-12) editions of the Buddhapālita have der zhus pa 'rnam kyi bdag nying kyi mgon sum du gyur pa 'phral kho na la 'grab par 'gyur ro. Further along, where Jam-yang-shay-pa has *de dag gi* sgoṅ goms pa'i rgyu las byung ba both the sde dge and dpe bsdur ma (657.21) editions have *de dag gi* sgoṅ goms pa'i rgyu las byung ba. Here, the translation follows the readings given in the editions of the *Buddhapālita Commentary* included within the *Translation of the Treatises* (*bstan 'gyur*).

*b* de kho na, tattva. This comment by Buddhapālita follows his explanation of the ninth and tenth stanzas of the eighteenth chapter of Nāgārjuna’s *Treatise on the Middle* and introduces the eleventh and final stanza of that chapter. About the ninth stanza, Buddhapālita says:

Not known from others, quiescent,
Not proliferated by proliferations,
Without conceptuality, without diversity-
These are the characteristics of suchness.

Concerning “Not known from others,” [that suchness] is not known from others is the meaning of “without scripture, [suchness] has become my direct perception and is personal direct perception.” “Quiescent” is the meaning of “the very entity is empty.” “Not proliferated by proliferations” is the meaning of “free from the phenomena of the world.” “Without conceptuality” [is the meaning of] not having imputed “this” and “this!” “Without diversity” [excludes the multiplicity that suchness] “is on one hand this yet on the other is also this,” [for] the object [suchness] is indivisible.

In that regard, because [suchness] is without conceptuality, therefore it is not proliferated by proliferations. Because [suchness] is not proliferated by the phenomena of the world, therefore it is quiescent. Because [suchness] is quiescent, therefore it is not diverse. Therefore, that just such a nature, a knowledge known by oneself [and] not known from others, is the characteristic of suchness is what is to be understood.
By those who have not made the collections [of merit and wisdom] it is not accomplished quickly, yet for them it will definitely be accomplished in other lifetimes. The master Āryadeva says:\footnote{Āryadeva, \textit{Four Hundred / Treatise of Four Hundred Stanzas} (bstan bcos bzhi brgya pa zhes bya ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa, catuhśatakaśāstrākārikā), in \textit{bstan 'gyur (sde dge)}, BDRC W23703097 (Delhi, India: Delhi Kar ma bpam choedhey, Gyalwa sungr ab partun khang, 1982–85), VI.22, 10a.2–3. Also: in \textit{bstan 'gyur (dpe bsdur ma)}, BDRC W1PD95844.57:783-825 (pe cin: krun go'i bod rig pa'i dpe skrun khang, 1994–2008), 801.18-20. Citing Āryadeva, the \textit{Buddhapālita Commentary} (sde dge, BDRC 23703096, 246a.5-6; dpe bsdur ma, 657.13-16) reads: \textit{de nyid shes pas 'di la ni 'dod chags bral ba ma thob kyang}}
Though those who know suchness do not attain
Separation from desire here, in other lifetimes
They will definitely attain it without striving,
As in the case of actions [whose effects are definite to be
obtained].

and Nāgārjuna’s Treatise on the Middle says:\(^a\)

Though the complete Buddhas do not appear
And Hearers also have disappeared,
A Solitary Realizer’s pristine wisdom
Arises without support.

That being so, for those who have grown slightly familiar with
this, even if they are affected by not having the condition, that is,
if perchance a complete Buddha does not arise or that even Hear-
ers have disappeared, a Solitary Realizer’s wisdom—not known
from another—produced by the cause consisting of their having
previously familiarized [with suchness] will be strongly produced
through merely a condition without relying [upon a teacher who

---

\(^a\) XVIII.12.

The versions of Āryadeva’s treatise included within the editions of the Translation of the Treatises (bstan 'gyur) noted above both read:

de nyid shes pas gal te 'dir
mya ngan 'das pa ma thob kyang
skye ba phyi mar 'bad med par
nges par thob 'gyur las bzhin no

The two renditions differ in several respects. Among them, the second line looks more meaningful than the others. If the Buddhapālita Commentary has, in the second line, migrated from mya ngan 'das pa, (“to have passed beyond misery”), that is, nirvāna to 'dod chags bral ba, or separation from desire, then it is at least interesting that the Great Tibetan-Chinese Dictionary (bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo, 1415, col. 2) defines 'dod chags dang bral ba as “separation from attachment to all the afflictions of the Desire Realm, [that is, the rank of a] Foe Destroyer” (′dod nyon mtha’ dag la chags pa dang bral ba ste dgra bcom pa). Although by different routes, the two versions arrive at the same outcome. Here, I have translated the lines as they are given in the Buddhapālita Commentary, from which Jam-yang-shay-pa has drawn his citation.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: When Buddhapālita says that “This will be accomplished only quickly as the personal direct perception of those who enter into that [suchness],” he means that that those who enter into paths on which the equivalent levels of the afflictions are abandoned simultaneously will almost certainly attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in that very lifetime. However, there are some who familiarize with suchness slightly but do not attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in that same lifetime. For a long time they have cultivated the paths of those who abandon equivalent levels of the afflictions simultaneously. That prior familiarization serves as the condition enabling them to attain the wisdom of a Solitary Realizer without relying upon others in their final lifetime, that is, in the lifetime in which they attain liberation from cyclic existence.

Here, brgya la should not be mistaken for the word that means
one hundred and that indicates a lot. In particular, it does not refer to Solitary Victors extending the accumulation of merit for one hundred eons while on the path of accumulation. Rather, in this context brgya la means perchance or “merely at the limit of possibility.” Thus, it means extremely rare, hardly ever occurring, unlikely. It has the sense of “even if this were to come to pass.” Here it suggests the bare possibility of a time in which complete a Buddha does not arise and even Hearers have disappeared. In such circumstances one does not encounter a lama or gain the opportunity to receive instruction, which is what is meant by “not having the condition.” In the absence of a teacher, and in lieu of a teacher, they rely upon previous familiarization.

That Asaṅga and Buddhapālita say this entails that all Middle Way and Mind-Only Schools assert a (Solitary Victor) who, due to the power of aspirational prayers, upon not meeting a Buddha present (in that Solitary Victor’s) last cyclic existence actualizes the state of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer because, since “perchance a complete Buddha does not arise” is explained as [meaning] merely at the limit of possibility, it is implicitly explained that if Buddhas or Hearers were to arise [these Hearers] would not become Solitary Victors, and because Chandrakīrti’s Clear Words also says:

As is stated [in Nāgārjuna’s Treatise on the Middle (XVIII.12ab)]:

When the complete Buddhas do not appear
And Hearers also have disappeared,

that is, at a time of this being so, the condition of teaching the

a srid mtha’ tsam.
b gal srid ’di ’dra’i eig ’byung pa yin na yang.
c rkyen dang mi ldan pa.
d Chandrakīrti, dbu ma rtsa ba’i ’grel pa gsal ba (mālamadhyamakavyaprasanapadā), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge, 3860), BDRC W23703.102:4-401, vol. ‘a (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa chodhel, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 122a.2-4, commenting on Nāgārjuna’s Treatise on the Middle (XVIII.12). Also: in bstan ’gyur (dspe bsdur ma), BDRC W1PD95844.60:22-535 (pe cin: krung go’i bod rig pa’i dspe skrun khang, 1994-2008), 298:1-9. The Sanskrit is:

athāpi kathamcit -saṃbuddhānāmanutpāde śrāvakānāṃ punah kṣaye | sati, āryamārgopadeśaṃkāryaṃ apavrataśrāvyavaiṣyāt na syād dharmatattvātīmṛtādīgamaḥ, tathāpi pūrvaśāntaraśādharmaśāgovārṇavahetiśūladeva aitihalaukikapadeśaṃprakṣaṇām api pravivekāstvātābhānapravartanānaṃ svāyambhuvan -jīhānaṃ pratyekabuddhānāmasamsargaśpravartate ||12||
paths of Superiors is not complete, due to which the ambrosia of suchness is not attained. Nevertheless, from the power of the cause consisting of hearing about suchness in other, previous lifetimes, the condition of mere reliance on thorough isolation is attained, and thus “a self-arisen, self-enlightened’s pristine wisdom is produced without support.”

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: If in their later lifetime Buddhas or Hearers were to arise, then these practitioners would attain the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer. Jam-yang-shay-pa explains this clearly in ways that other commentators do not. Most others say that if the fruit of Foe Destroyer is attained in that lifetime, that is, in the lifetime in which the doctrine is heard from a Buddha, then the person is a Hearer, and if the person does not attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in that lifetime, the attainment of that fruit only in a subsequent lifetime makes him or her a Solitary Victor. Most

\[a\] This is Chandrakīrti’s creative restatement of the last two feet of XVIII.
others explain the matter that way. Jam-yang-shay-pa sees this differently. He agrees that of course there are practitioners who in a subsequent lifetime attain the fruit of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer; however, he does not agree that all of those who attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in a subsequent lifetime will do so as Solitary Victors. He emphasizes “perchance” or “in the unlikely event,”a which here indicates the mere possibility of an unfortunate time. If Hearers are present in the world, such persons may find a good teacher and request instruction in the doctrine. In that case, then in their final cyclic existence they do rely upon a master, that is, upon someone other than themselves. That makes them Hearers rather than Solitary Victors.

[The meaning implicit in the citation of “perchance a complete Buddha does not arise” from the Buddhapālīta Commentary on (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle” and the passage from Chandrakīrti’s Clear Words] entails [that all Middle Way and Mind-Only Schools assert a (Solitary Victor who), due to the power of aspirational prayers, upon not meeting a Buddha present (in that Solitary Victor’s) last mundane existence actualizes the state of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer] because owing to the power of aspirational prayers made with intensity, those who are definite in the lineage of Solitary Victors actualize the fruit only in a Buddha’s absence, whereby to indicate that “in the unlikely event” and “whatever may happen to be” [have the sense of] merely possible due to a haphazard fluke is without meaning.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Because these persons do not attain the state

\[ \text{brgya la.} \]
of Foe Destroyer in this lifetime, they make the aspirational prayer to do so in a later lifetime. In fact, these practitioners make the aspirational prayer to be born in a place where a Buddha does not arise.\(^a\) stey \textit{dbang gis} means without a plan\(^b\) and superficially occurring\(^c\) in contrast to work done with a good plan in place.\(^d\) It has also the sense of something occurring without striving.\(^e\)

This refutes saying that the meaning of “some bearing the lineage of a Solitary Victor”\(^f\) in Tsong-kha-pa’s \textit{Illumination of the Thought} is that Hearer Superiors do not enter the paths of Solitary Victors [that is, it refutes that no Hearer Superiors enter the paths of Solitary Victors]. In regard to this, the proofs consisting of scripture and reasoning are very numerous.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Those who proceed in a simultaneous manner\(^g\) initially enter the paths of a Hearer. Due to circumstances they may end up attaining the fruit of a Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer. Here it is said clearly that there are indeed Hearer Superiors who enter the paths of a Solitary Victor. This can be a difficult

---

\(^a\) sangs rgyas 'byung ba med sa.
\(^b\) 'char gzhi med pa.
\(^c\) 'phral gyis.
\(^d\) 'char gzhi sgrigs nas las ka byed ya.
\(^e\) stabs legs.
\(^g\) gcig car ba.
point. Among the eight grounds of the Lesser Vehicle, a [the second] is called the ground of lineage. a When one attains a Lesser

a *dman pa sa brgyad.* Kön-chog-jig-me-wang-po identifies the eight:

[A]ccording to the general procedure of the scriptures, the eight lesser grounds are: (1) the ground of seeing the wholesome, (2) the ground of lineage, (3) the ground of the eighth, (4) the ground of seeing, (5) the ground of diminishment, (6) the ground of separation from desire, (7) the ground of realizing completion, (8) the ground of Solitary Victors.

Illustrations of these are, respectively, as follows: The path of accumulation of Hearer is called the ground of seeing the wholesome because it is the path of initially seeing the wholesome phenomena of purification.

The Hearer path of preparation is called the ground of lineage because from that [path of preparation] one attains non-mistakenness with regard to one’s [Hearer] lineage.

A clear realization of an Approacher to Stream Enterer is called the ground of the eighth because it is at this [ground of the eighth] that the first of the eight Approachers and Abiders—the four Approachers: Approacher to Stream Enterer, Once Returner, Never Returner, and Foe Destroyer; and the four Abiders in the Fruits—this being Approacher to Stream Enterer] is attained.
A clear realization of an Abider in the Fruit of Stream Enterer is called a ground of seeing because one has for the first time by means of a supramundane path directly seen the selflessness of the person.

A clear realization of an Abider in the Fruit of Once Returner is called a ground of diminishment because, having abandoned two of the three [sets of] the afflictions of the Desire Realm [that is, the three great and three medium of the nine afflictions], those have diminished.

A clear realization of an Abider in the Fruit of Never Returner is called a ground of separation from desire because [the person] has separated from desire for all the afflictions of the Desire Realm.

A clear realization of a Hearer Foe Destroyer is called a ground of realizing completion because of having realized that one has completed the activities of one’s path.

The clear realizations of a Solitary Victor are called grounds of a Solitary Victor because of being exalted knowers of one who possesses the quality of not needing to depend on another teacher in his or her last lifetime in mundane existence. The clear realizations of learner Solitary Victors are also included within this [ground of a Solitary Victor].

Kön-chog-jig-me-wang-po’s text extracted from Elizabeth Napper, *Traversing the Spiritual Path: Kön-chog-jig-may-wang-po’s Presentation of the Grounds and Paths: with expansive oral
Vehicle ground of lineage, beginning then and continuing until one actualizes the fruit of one’s own paths one does not change to another vehicle. Prior to that, that is, while on Hearer paths of accumulation, one’s future course remains indefinite. One may feel dissatisfied with the Hearer’s vehicle, come to see the vehicle of the Solitary Victor as more attractive, and ascend to that slightly higher vehicle, entering the paths of Solitary Victors. Additionally, some Hearers decide to enter the paths of the Great Vehicle.

Thus, at the path of accumulation, Hearers’ future course has yet to become definite, and it is possible that they will change to another vehicle. However, once they have arrived at a Hearer’s path of preparation, which corresponds to the ground of lineage of that vehicle, they do not change to another vehicle before attaining a Hearer’s path of no-more-learning, the state of a Hearer Foe Destroyer. Yet here we have an exception: a Hearer Superior who proceeds in a simultaneous manner and who by circumstance—“the condition of teaching the paths of Superiors is not complete”b—finishes the path without the support of a complete Buddha or other Hearers. Rather, they rely upon familiarity with the paths gained in previous lifetimes. These persons entered the paths of Hearers and in due course proceeded on a Hearer’s paths of meditation in the manner of simultaneous rather than gradual abandonment. However, prior to attaining the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer, they entered the paths of a Solitary Victor. In this case, a Hearer Superior has changed to another vehicle, that of a Solitary Victor. Jam-yang-shay-pa has examined this here in part so as to clarify the meaning of [Tsong-kha-pa’s having written] “some bearing the lineage of a Solitary Victor.” With the case of the Solitary Victor who has proceeded in the mode of simultaneous abandonment, he seeks to demonstrate that Tsong-kha-pa did not mean that Hearer Superiors never enter the paths of Solitary Victors.c

Still, another qualm remains unresolved: What does “not change to another vehicle” actually mean? The rule specifies that

a rigs kyi sa, gotrabhāmi.
b See above, page 81.
c For further discussion of this passage in Tsong-kha-pa’s treatise, see Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 71, note a.
a Hearer who has attained a ground of lineage of the Hearer Vehicle will not change to the paths of Solitary Victor prior to attaining the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer. However, in this case that change has come to pass. We had thought that “not change to another vehicle” meant “prior to attaining the fruit of Foe Destroyer,” but clearly it does not. Adversity may dictate otherwise.

Many qualms swirl around this type of practitioner. For instance, the earlier paths of a Solitary Victor serve as the causes of the later paths, and a Solitary Victor’s later paths arise as the effect of the earlier paths. If one is to attain a Solitary Victor’s path of no-more-learning, a Solitary Victor’s path of meditation must precede that. Similarly, if one is to attain a Solitary Victor’s path of no-more-learning, a Solitary Victor’s path of meditation must precede it. In this case the path of no-more-learning of this Solitary Victor is for sure a Solitary Victor’s path of no-more-learning, but what about the paths of meditation preceding it? Are they a Solitary Victor’s paths of meditation, or are they a Hearer’s paths of meditation? If they are a Solitary Victor’s paths of meditation, one then asks about the path of seeing preceding them. Was it a Solitary Victor’s path of seeing? It must follow that it was not.

This is difficult enough, but when one considers the variety of systems, things become even more difficult because in some systems Hearers and Solitary Victors have similar types of realization, and in others their types of realization are dissimilar. The system of the Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School posits dissimilar types of realization for Hearers and Solitary Victors. In that system it is difficult to imagine Hearer Superiors who change to the vehicle of a Solitary Victor. The system of the Sūtra Middle Way Autonomy School posits similar types of realization for Hearers and Solitary Victors, for there these two types of practitioners have similar principal objects of abandonment and objects of meditation. In that system they differ mainly in that unlike Hearers a Solitary Victor accumulates the collection of merit for one hundred eons and so forth. There it is probably permissible for a Hearer Superior to change to the vehicle of a Solitary Victor. Not so in the system of the Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School, where Hearers and Solitary Victors have disparate principal objects of abandonment and objects of meditation. Still, here we are focusing upon the system of the Consequence School, where

---

\(^{a}\) rtags rigś 'dra mi 'dra ba'i lugs.
Hearers and Solitary Victors have similar types of realization. For that reason, in the system of the Consequence School a Hearer Superior may change to the vehicle of the Solitary Victor.

27. **Someone says:** The two collections in a Solitary Victor’s continuum are collections. **Others say:** There are no collections in the continuum of a [Solitary Victor]. **Still others say:** In that [the two “collections” in a Solitary Victor’s continuum] do not have all the characteristics of a collection, the convention of collection is nonexistent, and so forth.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: To become a Buddha, one must accumulate the collections of merit and pristine wisdom for at least three periods of innumerable great eons. The distinguishing features of the two collections are posited from the viewpoint of their effect. When one has become a Buddha, one has two bodies: a Body of Attributes and a Body of Form. The Body of Attributes may be posited as the imprint of the collection of pristine wisdom, and Form Bodies may be posited as the imprint of the collection of merit.

In dependence upon accumulating the collection of merit, later, on the ground of a Buddha, a Complete Enjoyment Body and an Emanation Body are established. In dependence upon accumulating the collection of pristine wisdom, later, on the ground of a Buddha, a Pristine Wisdom Body of Attributes and a Nature Body are established. These collections—the ones that have these

---

a 2011 BDRC bla brang, 19b.4; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 15b.1; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 26.18.
b chos sku, dharmakāya.
c gzugs sku, rūpakāya.
d longs spyod rdzogs pa’i sku, sambhogakāya.
e sprul pa’i sku, nirmanakāya.
f ye shes chos sku, jñānadharmakāya.
g ngo bo nyid sku, svabhāvikakāya.
Bodies as their imprint—are posited in the Great Vehicle but not in the Lesser Vehicle, that is, not for Hearers and Solitary Victors. Nor of course for those who have not entered a path. Nevertheless, Solitary Victors do accumulate collections of merit and wisdom for one hundred eons. This brings us to a qualm. What exactly are the collections that they accumulate? One fellow says these are indeed collections. Still others say that the collections of merit and pristine wisdom that Solitary Victors accumulate for one hundred eons do not have all the characteristics of a collection, and thus there are those who say that, while one does speak of Solitary Victors cultivating paths for one hundred eons, even the verbal convention of “collections” does not come into play, that is, there is no such talk.

As we are about to see, Jam-yang-shay-pa disagrees with all of them, and the dispute pivots on the meaning of saṃbhāra, the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan term tshogs [translated in English as “collection”]. Saṃbhāra is said to mean that which bears its own effect, great enlightenment.a Thus a collection has the ability subsequently to issue forth the effect, unsurpassed enlightenment. This brings us to a qualm. What exactly are the collections that they accumulate? One fellow says these are indeed collections. Still others say that the collections of merit and pristine wisdom that Solitary Victors accumulate for one hundred eons do not have all the characteristics of a collection, and thus there are those who say that, while one does speak of Solitary Victors cultivating paths for one hundred eons, even the verbal convention of “collections” does not come into play, that is, there is no such talk.

As we are about to see, Jam-yang-shay-pa disagrees with all of them, and the dispute pivots on the meaning of saṃbhāra, the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan term tshogs [translated in English as “collection”]. Saṃbhāra is said to mean that which bears its own effect, great enlightenment.a Thus a collection has the ability subsequently to issue forth the effect, unsurpassed enlightenment. What Solitary Victors accumulate does not have that power. They accumulate a collection of merit for one hundred eons, but the effect they attain is the state of Solitary Victor Foe Destroyer. They do not attain a Buddha’s Body of Attributes, Complete Enjoyment Body, or Emanation Body. From this viewpoint it is said that their collections do not have all the characteristics of a collection.

Our response: There are many such wrong conceptions. It follows that these are not logically feasible because (1) although the two collections in a Solitary Victor’s continuum do exist, they do not have all the characteristics of a collection, and (2) with respect to the merit and so forth in [a Solitary Victor’s] continuum, the verbal convention of collection is set forth in sūtra.

a rang 'bras byang chub chen po 'dzin pa.
b rjes ma 'bras bu bla med byang chub 'byin ya gi nus pa.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: It would be a mistake to say that the two collections in the continuum of a Solitary Victor are collections, but it is not a mistake to say that two collections do exist in the continuum of a Solitary Victor, and thus it is a mistake to say that two collections do not exist in the continuum of a Solitary Victor. Moreover, to suggest that the verbal convention of collection simply has no place in the discussion of a Solitary Victor’s paths cannot withstand the evidence of sūtra. The merit accumulated by Solitary Victors and for that matter Hearers as well is indeed spoken of with the verbal convention of collection. Where? In sūtra. However, the two collections in the continuum of a Solitary Victor do not have all the characteristics of a collection because that which has all the characteristics of a collection has the capacity to issue forth a Buddha’s two bodies, the Body of Attributes and Form Bodies. Or one could say that a collection has the capacity to serve as the cause of a Buddha’s two bodies, the Body of Attributes and Form Bodies.

The first [sign, which is that the two collections in a Solitary Victor’s continuum do exist but do not all have all the characteristics of a collection] is established because the two collections in [a Solitary Victor’s] continuum are not collections.

It follows [that the two collections in a Solitary Victor’s continuum are not collections] because Solitary Victors do not have two collections that have

a tshogs yin.
b tshogs gnyis yod.
c tshogs gnyis med.
d tshogs mthshan nyid pa.
e chos gzugs kyi sku gnyis byin ya gi nus pa yod mkhan.
f chos gzugs kyi sku gnyis rgyur gyur ya gi nus pa yod pa.
all the characteristics of a collection, due to which [Solitary Victors] are inferior to Buddhas because Chandrakīrti’s Autocommentary says:*

they do not have the collections of merit and pristine wisdom, [the great compassion,] the omniscience, and so forth [of a Buddha], due to which [they are inferior to thoroughly complete Buddhas; hence, they are medium].

Therefore, the glorious Chandrakīrti explains that they are not collections because of this.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: If Solitary Victors had collections that have all the characteristics of a collection, there would be no need to

---

* dbu ma la ’jug pa'i bshad pa, 221a.6-7; La Vallée Poussin, Madhyamakāvratāra, 4.3-5. Tsong-kha-pa paraphrases this passage in his dbu ma la ’jug pa'i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal, BDRC W22109.24:9-584, 5b.5-6. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 65. There, Tsong-kha-pa says:

Solitary Victors (rang rgyal) surpass Hearers through their feature of increased reliance on practicing merit and pristine wisdom for a hundred eons, but since they do not have the two collections of merit and pristine wisdom, nor the compassion engaging all sentient beings at all times, nor an exalted-knower-of-all-aspects and so forth, they are inferior to complete Buddhas; hence, they are medium.

For Jam-yang-shay-pa’s previous citation of this passage and its context, see Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 37. Here, Jam-yang-shay-pa has omitted thugs rje chen po dang, I have added this to the Tibetan text reproduced here, completed the citation, and translated it.
say that they are inferior to Buddhas because one becomes a Buddha in dependence upon having accumulated the collections for three periods of innumerable great eons, and so they too would become Buddhas.

The second sign [which is that with respect to the merit and so forth in (a Solitary Victor’s) continuum, the verbal convention of collection is set forth in sūtra] is established because not only that, although there are many descriptions of mere merit and pristine wisdom in general with the term “collection,” among them:

- that which has the functionality of setting up the imprint [that is, its effect] which is the Form Bodies is a fully qualified collection, and
- that which does not have this functionality is an imputed or secondary collection.

It follows [that not only that, although there are many descriptions of mere merit and pristine wisdom in general with the term “collection,” among them:

- that which has the functionality of setting up the imprint [that is, its effect] which is the Form Bodies is a fully qualified collection, and
- that which does not have this functionality is an imputed or secondary collection]

because this is the thought of Nāgārjuna, the father, and his spiritual children, and the Foremost Precious [Tsong-kha-pa], the master Haribhadra, and so forth, because the Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra says:

they accumulate the collection of the merit of giving and they accumulate the collection of the merit of ethics [in a manner] unlike that of Hearers. They hear little [doctrine] but are earnest [in their practice of] the doctrine. In serving and attending the Buddhas, the Supramundane Victors, they are not slack. Their faculties are middling.

and because in accord with this Tsong-kha-pa’s Illumination of the Thought says.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{a} blo gros mi zad pas bstan pa (aksayamatinirdeśa), in bka’ ’gyur (sde dge par phud, 175), BDRC W22084.60:159-350 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1976-1979), 127b.3-4.
\item Tsong-kha-pa, dbu ma la ’jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal, BDRC
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Although there are indeed cases of using the mere term “collection” for merit and pristine wisdom in general, the principal usage of the term “collection” is for fully qualified merit and pristine wisdom as in the statement in Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* that a collection is what holds the fruit due to being a means of unmistakenly attaining highest enlightenment:\(^a\)

By being entities of thorough attainment, they hold the great enlightenment; therefore, great compassion and so forth are collections.

The two [that is, merit and pristine wisdom] that do not contain this meaning are secondary collections.

---

\(^a\) ‘grel pa don gsal (spun thārtha), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge), BDRC W23703.86:158-281 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 91a.7-91b.1. As Hopkins notes in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 67, note c, this is one from among the so-called twenty-one Indian commentaries on Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* contained in the Translation of the Treatises (*bstan ’gyur*).
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Not only is the merit that a Solitary Victor accumulates over the course of one hundred eons called a collection of merit but also the virtue in which common, worldly people engage is commended by saying that they thereby accumulate the collection of merit quite nicely. This illustrates the manner in which a mere accumulation of merit is described with the verbal convention of collection.

Among the six perfections, the practices of giving, ethics, and patience are regarded as contributing to the collection of 'jig rten phal pa.

---

a 'jig rten phal pa.
b phar phyin, pāramitā.
c sbyin pa, dāna.
d tshul khrims, śīla.
e bzod pa, ksānti.
merit. Effort\(^a\) is regarded as contributing both to the collection of
merit and to the collection of pristine wisdom. Then, the practices
of meditative stabilization,\(^b\) such as the cultivation of calm abiding,\(^c\) and pristine wisdom\(^d\) are regarded as contributing to the col-
lection of pristine wisdom.\(^e\) However, the six perfections are not
posited in regard to those who have not entered paths as well as
for Hearers and Solitary Victors. Thus, one distinguishes mere
giving from a perfection of giving.\(^f\) Those who have not entered
paths engage in giving, as do Hearers and Solitary Victors; they
also engage in practices of ethics; they do not, however, have the
practices of a perfection of giving or a perfection of ethics.\(^g\) De-
nspite not rising to that level, the merit they generate is described
with the verbal convention of collection.

So what’s missing? Here Jam-yang-shay-pa has said that
whether an accumulation of merit and pristine wisdom has all the
characteristics of a collection is to be known by their effect. Is its
imprint a Buddha’s Form Bodies? If so, it has all the characteristics
of a collection. However something seems not quite right here.
In the first part of the sentence Jam-yang-shay-pa mentions both
merit and pristine wisdom, whereas in the second part he mentions
only Form Bodies. It would have been good to mention also a
Body of Attributes by saying “they set up their imprint, the effects,
the Body of Attributes and Form Bodies.”\(^h\)

2' Presentation of our system

There is a way in which the two, Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroy-
ers, have been produced from their own cause, the Monarch of Subduers,
because previously, at the time of the paths of learners, they heard the
Monarch of Subduers’ doctrine of profound dependent-arising, through

---

\(^a\) brtson 'grus, vīrya.
\(^b\) tīn སྒྲོན་འབྲིང་འཛིན་, samādhi.
\(^c\) zhi gnas, śamatha.
\(^d\) shes rab, prajñā.
\(^e\) ye shes 'khyi tshogs, jñānasambhāra.
\(^f\) sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa, dānapāramitā.
\(^g\) tshul khrims 'khyi pha rol tu phyin pa, śīlapāramitā.
\(^h\) 'bras buchos gzugs sku'i lag rjes 'jog rjes.
which they completed, that is, gained, their desired fruit. The sign [which is that previously at the time of the paths of learners they heard the Monarch of Subduers’ doctrine of profound dependent-arising, through which they completed, that is, gained, the fruit that is their desire] has already been established. As for Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers, although in their final cyclic existences, not depending even upon mere speech expressed by others, not to mention Buddhas, they observed mere bare bones in a charnel ground or the like, analyzed the branches of dependent-arising in their forward and reverse processes, and actualized the state of Foe Destroyer, this was generated by its own cause, the speech of the Monarch of Subduers, because this is an effect, generated by the speech of the Monarch of Subduers [heard] in other lifetimes, accomplished as definite to actualize thus, like, for example, the effects of actions definite [to issue forth their fruit in a later lifetime], because Āryadeva’s *Four Hundred* says:

> Though those who know suchness do not attain
> Nirvāṇa here, in another birth
> They will definitely attain it without striving,
> As in the case of actions.

and Nāgārjuna’s *Treatise on the Middle* says:

> Though the complete Buddhas do not appear
> And Hearers also have disappeared,
> A Solitary Realizer’s pristine wisdom
> Arises without support.

---

*a* For an outline of the forward and reverse processes, see Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound*, 977, notes a and b. For a more extensive discussion of these twelve branches, see His Holiness the Dalai Lama, *The Meaning of Life: Buddhist Perspectives on Cause and Effect*, trans. and ed. Jeffrey Hopkins (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2000).

*b* *bstan bcos bzhi brgya pa zhes bya ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa*, BDRC W23703097, 10a.2–3. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 72

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: When Hearers or Solitary Victors who have yet to attain a path of no-more-learning, a prior to which they must continue to learn, attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer, no longer needing to train further in the paths of their own vehicle, they become non-learners. b That much is clear. Where do the paths of learners

\[
\text{a mi slob lam, ašaišamārga.}
\]

\[
\text{b mi slob pa, ašaiša.}
\]
begin? Should those on paths of accumulation\(^a\) be posited as learners or not? Qualms attend this question because some place the boundary at the path of preparation\(^b\) and say that the paths of learners begin there. They contend that those below the path of preparation do not qualify as learners, and thus they do not include those on a path of accumulation among learners. Others consider paths of accumulation and paths of preparation both to be paths of learners. Thus, opinions vary, but no one has qualms about those on paths of seeing\(^c\) and meditation,\(^d\) for everyone agrees that they are learners.

Here we see that Jam-yang-shay-pa posits paths of accumulation as paths of learners. How do we know that? Jam-yang-shay-pa has begun by asserting “a way in which the two, Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers, have been born through their own cause, the Monarch of Subduers,” supporting his thesis by noting that “previously, at the time of the paths of learners, they heard the Monarch of Subduers’ doctrine of profound dependent-arising, due to which they completed, that is, gained, the fruit that is their desire.” For the reason to apply both to Hearers and to Solitary Victors, those Solitary Victors must be on paths of accumulation, which in turn must then be paths of learners.

If asked why some draw the line at the path of preparation, that is, do not consider those on paths of accumulation to be learners, I would attribute this mainly to the attainment of the meditative stabilization that is an union of calm abiding and special insight,\(^e\) the accomplishment of which marks the beginning of the path of preparation. Those on paths of accumulation do not have it. I suspect the distinction comes by way of that difference.

When Jam-yang-shay-pa says that Solitary Victors do not depend “even upon mere speech that is expressed by others,” one supposes this to mean that they gain nothing from conversation with others, or something like that. Not only Buddhas but also Hearers or other learned persons do not influence them in this final lifetime. What does inform them? Well, they come upon bones in a charnel ground, and that starts something. A charnel ground

\(^a\) tshogs lam, sambhāramārga.
\(^b\) sbyor lam, prayogamārga.
\(^c\) mthong lam, darśanamārga.
\(^d\) sgom lam, bhāvanāmārga.
\(^e\) zhi lhag zung 'brel gvi ting nge 'dzin.
could be any of several things. Muslims and Christians bury their
death in the ground. Hindus and the Buddhists of Tibet burn the
bodies on a fire. When the bodies are burned, only bare bone and
ash remain. A Solitary Victor comes upon such bare bones and
observing them wonders, “How has this come to be?” Someone
has died. The body has been burned. A few bones attest to the
death. Or maybe a bird has eaten a corpse, leaving only bones.
One way or another, someone has died. How has death come
about? From birth. This much even we understand. The Solitary
Victor looks further, asks “How has birth come to be?” and under-
stands that we have been born due to the power of actions accu-
mulated in previous lifetimes. Of course, this leads to another
question: how were those actions accumulated? The Solitary Vic-
tor realizes that actions were accumulated by ignorance. Putting
this all together, the Solitary Victor configures the reverse pro-
cess of the twelve branches of dependent-arising.

Here, “reverse process” means moving from the end to the
beginning, from death to ignorance, rather than from the begin-
ning to the end, which proceeds from ignorance to death. In this
case, at the very end we have bones. Those bones have provoked
the Solitary Victor to investigate and analyze, to ask “How have
they come about?” The first step brings him or her to death.
Death? Death comes from birth. And birth? Birth comes from ac-
tions, actions from ignorance. In this way one considers the re-
verse process of the twelve branches of dependent-arising.

The forward and reverse processes of the twelve branches of
dependent-arising may be examined in the context of the thor-
oughly afflicted class and also in the context of the thoroughly
pure class. As such the contemplative understanding of these
twelve branches may be cultivated in four ways: the forward and
reverse processes of the afflicted class, and the forward and re-
verse processes of the pure class. Through doing so, a Solitary
Victor will in time realize them in direct perception.

In the lifetime in which Solitary Victors attain the state of a

---

\(\text{a ma rig pa, avidyā.}\)
\(\text{b lugs ldog, pratiloma.}\)
\(\text{c rten ’brel yan lag bcu gnyis.}\)
\(\text{d kun nas nyon mongs kyi phyogs, saṃkliśṭa/saṃkleśa.}\)
\(\text{e rnam par shyang ba’i phyogs, vaiyavadānika/vyavadāna.}\)
\(\text{f mngon sum du rtogs.}\)
Foe Destroyer, they do not listen to the speech of a Buddha. However, they did hear the speech of a Buddha in previous lifetimes. Having listened to a Buddha’s teaching previously, later when they come upon bare bones, Solitary Victors are able to understand the meaning and implications of those bones. The actualization of the state of Foe Destroyer in a lifetime in which Solitary Victors do not hear the Buddha’s teaching, which is accomplished in dependence upon the capacity\textsuperscript{a} that was placed in the continuum by listening to the teachings in a previous lifetime, is compared to “the effects of actions that are definite.”\textsuperscript{b} Those words direct us to consider the accumulation of the action in a previous birth and the necessity of experiencing the effect of that action later. The meaning this has in the Consequence School\textsuperscript{c} does not differ significantly from the meaning it has in the other higher systems of tenets. However, the Great Exposition School\textsuperscript{d} differs from the higher systems in asserting that the effect must definitely be experienced, that is, they deny the possibility of purifying nonvirtue by breaking it apart, which one does by means of the four powers that constitute an antidote to such actions.\textsuperscript{e} In the higher systems of tenets, when an action is definite,\textsuperscript{f} then its effect will eventually be experienced, but in those systems “definite”\textsuperscript{g} does not mean that its effect must be experienced. It means rather that the preparation for the action, its execution, and its conclusion have been performed in full. An action may be definite, and it may be great in strength, but if one breaks it apart by way of the four

\textsuperscript{a} nus pa.
\textsuperscript{b} nges pa'i las kyi 'bras bu.
\textsuperscript{c} thal 'gyur pa, prāśaṅgika.
\textsuperscript{d} bye brag smra ba, vaiśāṣika.
\textsuperscript{e} gnyen po stobs bzhi. Four powers serve as antidotes to ill-deeds in the sense that by relying upon them one can purify the action that has established within one’s own continuum the inevitability, barring such purification, of effects that one dreads. Going for refuge to the Three Jewels and engendering the aspiration to attain Buddhahood as the means to further the welfare of all sentient beings is an example of the first of the four powers, the power of the support (rten gyi stobs). Remorse ('gyod sems) is the second of the four powers, the power of thoroughly driving out the offense (rnam par sun 'byin pa'i stobs). Taking upon oneself the appropriate restraints is the third of the four powers, the power of turning back from faults (nyes pa las slar ldog pa'i stobs). Applying oneself to virtuous activities of body, speech, and mind is an example of the fourth of the four powers, the power of using antidotes (gnyen po kun tu spyod pa'i stobs).
\textsuperscript{f} nges pa'i las.
\textsuperscript{g} nges pa.
powers that constitute an antidote, one purifies the action and will not have to experience its effect. In either case, the action was accumulated in a lifetime prior to the lifetime in which its effect is experienced. Similarly, Solitary Victors listen to the teachings of the Monarch of Subduers in many lifetimes and attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer in a lifetime subsequent to those in which they listened to the teachings. Their attainment comes about as the effect of having listened to the Buddha’s teachings, for which reason they have been born from the Buddha. At the same time, it may also be said that, in the absence of Buddhas and Hearers, the pristine wisdom of a Solitary Realizer arises, that is, is attained, without depending upon others.

With respect to the subject, Foe Destroyers of the Lesser Vehicle, there are reasons for calling them Listener-Hearers and Hearer-Proclaimers because, having listened to instruction in the presence of another, at the time of attaining the fruit oneself one proclaims [these instructions] to others, due to which [one is called a] Listener-Hearer, and having heard from others of the path and fruit of the Great Vehicle, not practicing them even slightly oneself one proclaims them to others, due to which one is called a Hearer-Proclaimer.

With respect to the subject, Foe Destroyers of the Medium Vehicle, there are reasons for calling them Medium Realizers of Suchness because the term Realizer of Suchness is used for those of all three vehicles who have

---

\(^a\) 2011 BDRC "bla brang", 20b.6; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 16a.5; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 28.8.

\(^b\) 2011 BDRC "bla brang", 21a.2; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 16a.6; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 28.12.
nothing further to learn, and since they are able to extend the familiarization with merit and pristine wisdom for one hundred great eons they surpass Hearers, and since they lack the two collections, distinctive great compassion, and omniscience, they are inferior to Buddhas, due to which they are called “medium,” because Tsong-kha-pa’s *Illumination of the Thought* says:\textsuperscript{a}

Solitary Victors surpass Hearers through their feature of increased reliance on practicing merit and pristine wisdom for a hundred eons, but since they do not have the two collections of merit and pristine wisdom, nor the compassion engaging all sentient beings at all times, nor an exalted-knower-of-all-aspects and so forth, they are inferior to complete Buddhas; hence, they are medium.

---


\textsuperscript{b} Correcting *stan* to *bsten* in accordance with the citation in Levinson, *How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born From Buddhas? Beginning*, 2, May 2017 version, 65.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Here, Jam-yang-shay-pa calls them Medium Realizers of Suchness\textsuperscript{a} rather than Medium Buddhas.\textsuperscript{b}

Therefore, it is necessary to translate [the first line of the first stanza of Chandrakīrti’s Supplement as]:

Hearers and Medium Realizers of Suchness are born from the Monarchs of Subduers because Hearers and Solitary Victors are not renowned as Buddhas here.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: “Medium Realizer of Suchness”\textsuperscript{c} fits nicely into the Consequence School’s design of the three vehicles of Sūtra but not into the framework that the Autonomy School gives us. Both the term and its meaning fit comfortably into a translation of Chandrakīrti’s Supplement, where we are working with the Consequence School, but to apply that evenly to other contexts, such that buddha comes to mean “Realizer of Suchness” wherever \textit{pratyekabuddha}\textsuperscript{d} and Medium Buddha\textsuperscript{e} are considered, would distort the presentations of systems where those terms should not be understood to mean these.

Hearers and Solitary Victors do not have fully qualified collections because Hearer and Solitary Victor non-learners do not have the imprint of the two collections, that is, the marks and beauties. [That Hearer and Solitary Victor non-learners do not have the imprint of the two collections, that is, the marks and beauties] entails [that Hearers and Solitary Victors do not have collections that have fully qualified collections] because the master, the Superior [Nāgārjuna] said:\textsuperscript{f}

\textsuperscript{a} de nyid rtogs ’bring.
\textsuperscript{b} sangs rgyas ’bring.
\textsuperscript{c} de nyid rtogs ’bring.
\textsuperscript{d} rang sangs rgyas.
\textsuperscript{e} sangs rgyas ’bring.
\textsuperscript{f} rin po che’i ’phreng ba. Translated by Hopkins in Nāgārjuna’s Precious Garland, stanza 212ab.
The Form Bodies of the Buddhas
Arise from the collection of merit.

and Nāgārjuna’s Precious Garland says:\textsuperscript{a}

Thus these two collections
Are the causes of attaining Buddhahood.

Similarly, Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary says:\textsuperscript{b}

By being entities of thorough attainment, they hold the great enlightenment; therefore, great compassion and so forth are collections.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: If Hearers and Solitary Victors did have collections replete with the characteristics of a collection, then later when they had attained the fruit of Foe Destroyer the imprint of those collections would be apparent. When I hold something in my hand, the lines of my hand leave a trace, an imprint, that serves

\textsuperscript{a} rin po che’i ’phreng ba. Translated by Hopkins in Nāgārjuna’s Precious Garland, stanza 213ab.

\textsuperscript{b} ’grel pa don gsal, 91a.7. Translated by Hopkins in Levinson, How Are Hearers and Solitary Realizers Born from Buddhas? Beginning, 2, May 2017 version, 67.
as a sign of having held that thing. If Hearer and Solitary Victor learners had collections, then the marks and beauties [of a Buddha] would appear on their bodies when they had attained the fruit of Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers; the marks would serve as a mere sign of the collections they had accumulated.

In a parallel fashion, those traveling the paths of the learners of the Great Vehicle accumulate collections for three periods of innumerable great eons, subsequent to which the thirty-two marks and eighty beauties of a Buddha arise as the imprint of those collections. In brief, a Buddha’s body is adorned with thirty-two marks and eighty beauties. From what do those marks and beauties arise? From the collection of merit. It is important to understand that the two collections have different imprints. The collection of merit establishes a Buddha’s two Form Bodies as its imprint. The collection of pristine wisdom establishes a Buddha’s twofold Body of Attributes as its imprint.

The etymology of collection (tshogs), moreover, is that because the letter saṃ augments bhāra, the Sanskrit equivalent [of tshogs, collection], from saṃ [the meaning of] “thorough attainment” comes forth; from bhā [the meaning of] “by entity, great enlightenment” comes forth; and from ra [the meaning of] “causing to hold” comes forth, because although Hearers and Solitary Victors are similar in lacking the great compassion that carries the burden [of furthering the welfare of others], they are not without difference in regard to intention, lineage, faculties, and so forth, because in accordance with the Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra, the Sūtra on the Ten Grounds says:

---

a gzugs sku, rūpākāya.
b chos sku, dharmakāya.
c mdo sde sa bcu pa, BDRC 22084036, 189b.1-3. Jam-yang-shay-pa’s citation of these lines from the sūtra differs in some respects from the passage as it is given in the sde dge and lha sa recensions of the bka’ ’gyur (for the latter see BDRC W26071043,100b.5-101a.2). There one finds:
Above that, when these paths of the ten virtuous actions are thoroughly cultivated by means of an aspect of wisdom, with a limited intention and a mind frightened by the three realms, without great compassion, and following [what has been] heard from others, that is, following terms, the Vehicle of Hearers is thoroughly established. Above that, when one thoroughly trains without placing dependency on others, [with the intent to] self-actualize purification, without great compassion and skill in method, and by understanding the profundity [of dependent-arising by means of] this conditionality, the Vehicle of Solitary Realizers is established.

I have marked the differences by putting in bold the departures from the passage as it is given by Jam-yang-shay-pa.

\(^a\) 2011 BDRC bla brang, 21b.4, reads gzhan gyis drin and 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 16b.7, reads gzhan gyis drin; gzhan gyi drin is preferable.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Neither Hearers nor Solitary Victors have the great compassion that carries the burden of others’ welfare. They do have the compassion that thinks “How delightful it would be if all sentient beings were free from suffering.” They also make the aspirational prayer, “May all sentient beings be free from suffering.” However, there is a further degree of compassion, one that thinks, “All sentient beings need to separate from suffering, and I will bring about their separation from suffering.” With this resolve one voluntarily takes upon oneself the burden of ensuring that all sentient beings without omitting even one attain that separation from suffering. While Bodhisattvas do have that degree of compassion, Hearers and Solitary Victors do not, and in that respect these two are similar. Still, they differ from one another in regard to intention, lineage, and faculties.

3' Dispelling objections to our system

It follows that this [passage in the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra], “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,” describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Śāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers because that [passage] has indicated

---

a gzhan don khur du 'khyer ba'i snying rje chen po.
b sems can thams cad sngag dang 'bras na snyam pa'i snying rje.
c sems can thams can sngag dang 'bras bar gyur cig.
d 2011 BDRC bla brang, 21b.6; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 17a.1; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 29.15.
e 'od srung.
Hearers in the Buddha’s retinue to be such.\(^a\) If you accept [that this (passage in the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra), “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,” describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers], it follows that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers because you have accepted [that this (passage in the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra, “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,”) describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers].

Our response: [This explanation] is accepted due to its predominance.

[The opponent’s rejoinder:] It cannot be accepted [that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers] because those two [Kāshyapa and Shāriputra] became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: In the Mantra system it is taught that the person speaking the doctrine, those listening to the doctrine, and the

---

\(^a\) For the previous discussion of this passage from the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra, see above, page 17.
person asking questions are all emanations of the Buddha and are all of a single continuum, but this is not taught throughout the system of the Great Vehicle [and thus does not apply here in the Sūtra Great Vehicle]. Still, in the Sūtra Great Vehicle it is taught that the person speaking the doctrine attained Buddhahood in a previous eon, long after which he came to this land and showed an aspect demonstrating how one begins at the basis, trains in the paths, and becomes a Buddha. Similarly, members of that Buddha’s retinue may show the aspect of Hearers but in fact are practitioners of the Great Vehicle. To human beings such as ourselves Shāriputra, Kāshyapa, and so on show the aspect of Hearers but actually are Bodhisattvas dwelling on high grounds.

With that as background, the opponent on this occasion is drawing attention to the line “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers” and those present in the vicinity of the place where this doctrine was spoken, that is, the Hearer Foe Destroyers Shāriputra, Kāshyapa, and many others. In particular, when the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra* was spoken, among the retinue are Shāriputra, Kāshyapa, Ānanda, and others. It is said that they are the ones who pleaded with the Buddha, saying “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers.” These words are understood to mean that the Buddha has spoken the doctrine extremely well but those responding in this way find themselves unable to practice [the Great Vehicle doctrine] because assuredly they are Hearers, who will however explain it to others despite their inability to undertake to practice it themselves. From this, the opponent draws the consequence:

It follows that this [passage in the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra*], “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,” describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers because that [passage in the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra*] has indicated Hearers in the Buddha’s retinue to be such.

Accepting this consequence draws another:

It follows that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers because you have accepted [that this (passage in the *White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra*, “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,”) describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers].
Then, with Jam-yang-shay-pa’s giving the response of his own system:

[This explanation] is accepted due to its predominance.

an appeal is then made to what is well known throughout the world: Shāriputra is a Hearer, and Kāshyapa is a Hearer. Implicitly this acknowledges the Great Vehicle’s uncommon way of regarding them, but for the moment that is set aside. This explanation draws another consequence from the opponent:

It cannot be accepted [that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers] because those two [Kāshyapa and Shāriputra] became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime.

In that very lifetime they became Bodhisattvas. How then could they be Hearers? According to the mode of explanation [in Jam-yang-shay-pa’s own system] Kāshyapa and Shāriputra first entered the paths of Hearers and continued until they attained the fruit of Foe Destroyer. Subsequently and in that same lifetime they entered the paths of the Great Vehicle, which accords with the tenets of the higher schools who hold that Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers must eventually enter the paths of the Great Vehicle.

Our response: [That those two (Kāshyapa and Shāriputra) became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime] does not entail [that it cannot be accepted that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers]. It follows [that those two (Kāshyapa and Shāriputra) became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime] because Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* says, “The Bodhisattvas, the great beings,” the Superior Shāriputra and so forth.”

*āryavimuktisena, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mgon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi 'grel pa (puñcaratnasiddhihasriārājtriṣudarśanābhisamayālaṁkāra), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge), BDRC W23703.80 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982–85), 30a.1.

*b* sems dpa’chen po, mahāsattva.
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: To the argument that Kāshyapa and Shāriputra are not Hearers because they became Bodhisattvas in that very lifetime, we reply that the reason does not entail the thesis. Both the opponent and Jam-yang-shay-pa assert that they became Bodhisattvas in that very lifetime. However, Jam-yang-shay-pa sees no contradiction between asserting that they did indeed enter the paths of the Great Vehicle in that very lifetime and that in accordance with what is widely renowned they are Hearers.

To be clear, it is the opponent who proposes that:

this (passage in the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra), “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,” describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers because that [passage] has indicated Hearers in the Buddha’s retinue to be such.

Jam-yang-shay-pa accepts this, and the opponent then draws a second consequence:

It follows that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers because [you have] accepted [that this (passage in the White Lotus of Excellent Doctrine Sūtra, “O Protector, today we have become Hearer-Proclaimers,”) describes the Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra, and so forth, as Hearer-Proclaimers].

Jam-yang-shay-pa then responds that:

[this explanation] is accepted due to its predominance.

The opponent turns on his intended target, our system, and argues that:

It cannot be accepted [that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra, and so forth are Hearers] because those two [Kāshyapa and Shāriputra] became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime.

To that, Jam-yang-shay-pa replies:

[That those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime] does not entail [that it cannot be accepted that Kāshyapa, Shāriputra,
and so forth are Hearers].

That Kāshyapa and Shāriputra have become Bodhisattvas in that lifetime does not entail that it cannot be accepted that they are Hearers. The denial of entailment also tells us that Jam-yang-shay-pa accepts the sign, which is that those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime. In fact, both the opponent and Jam-yang-shay-pa assert that Kāshyapa and Shāriputra became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime. However, they disagree in regard to what this entails. The opponent wants to paint Jam-yang-shay-pa into a corner where he must either deny that they became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime—a position he has affirmed—or deny that they are Hearers. With “no entailment” Jam-yang-shay-pa responds that he does not need to choose between those two assertions. Jam-yang-shay-pa feels he is free to hold both of those positions without contradicting himself.

Someone else says: [That the Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand says, “The Bodhisattvas, the great beings, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth”] does not entail [that those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime].

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Both the initial opponent and Jam-yang-shay-pa agree with the citation from Āryavimuktisena’s Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand, but now a new opponent has arrived, and this person does not accept the entailment. In this denial of entailment, the new opponent does not agree that Kāshyapa and Shāriputra became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime and to the previous reason:

because those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime

would reply that the sign is not established.

It can be difficult to identify the various parties to a debate. Let’s sort this out. In a section dispelling objections to our system

---

a 2011 BDRC bla brang, 22a.2; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 17a.3; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 29.20.
it is usually the opponent who initiates the debate and raises problems for consideration. In our reply we then defend our system. That is what it means to dispel objections. Remember that the examination of any topic proceeds by way of Refutation of Others’ Mistakes, Presentation of Our System, and Dispelling Objections to Our System. In the Refutation of Others’ Systems it is mainly the opponent who makes assertions that our system then refutes. This is followed by our system’s presentation of the assertions we consider to be true. In the Dispelling Objections to Our System someone else alleges flaws in our system, disputing our positions and requiring us to defend them. Thus it consists mainly of an opponent or series of opponents asserting positions contrary to our own and our replying in support of our system. However, in this final section we sometimes find that in the midst of a dispute some third person barges in and introduces an assertion that neither the opponent nor our own system finds acceptable, at which point our system and our opponent become allies arguing against the interloper. In this way these debates resemble those of democracies in which parties that disagree with one another on some points may nevertheless form alliances in other circumstances. Witness the factions in the government of India, where this goes on all the time.

Let’s spell this out carefully: Jam-yang-shay-pa has accepted that Kāshyapa, Śāriputra, and so forth are Hearers. His first opponent has countered that this consequence cannot be accepted because in that very lifetime they became Bodhisattvas. To that, our system has replied that the sign does not entail the thesis, that is, we are comfortable (1) with their being Hearers, in accord with general renown, and (2) with their having become Bodhisattvas in that same lifetime. To ensure that we have considered every angle, Jam-yang-shay-pa supposes that someone questions their having become Bodhisattvas in that same lifetime by saying:

It cannot be accepted [that Kāshyapa, Śāriputra, and so forth are Hearers] because those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime

and then also by saying:

\[\text{gzhan lugs dgag pa.}\]
\[\text{rang lugs gzhang pa}\]
\[\text{rtos pa spong ba..}\]
The sign [which is that those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime] is not established.

To establish that they did become Bodhisattvas in that lifetime the passage from Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* is adduced as a sign:

It follows [that those two became Bodhisattvas in that lifetime] because Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* says, “The Bodhisattvas, the great beings, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth.”

At that point a third person enters the fray and while accepting that Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* does speak of “Bodhisattvas such as the Superior Shāriputra,” denies that this entails that in the very lifetime in which they became Hearer Foe Destroyers Kāshyapa and Shāriputra also became Bodhisattvas.

The interloper now states the supposed problems with maintaining our system:

Well then, it follows that the Shāriputra of “The Bodhisattvas, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth” is the Hearer Shāriputra who is one [member] of the Supreme Pair because your proof is logically feasible.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: The new opponent who challenged the entailment draws out the implications of affirming the entailment by asking whether the Shāriputra to whom Āryavimuktisena’s refers is the Hearer Shāriputra who is one member of the Supreme Pair. “You” is the initial opponent and Jam-yang-shay-pa, both of whom consider the passage from Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* to be a valid source demonstrating that in the very lifetime in which Kāshyapa and Shāriputra became Hearer Foe Destroyers, they also became Bodhisattvas. The new opponent continues:

---

a *khyod.*
b *khyod kyi sgrub byed.*
It cannot be accepted [that the Shāriputra of “The Bodhisattvas, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth” is the Hearer Shāriputra who is one (member) of the Supreme Pair] because that [Shāriputra of “The Bodhisattvas, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth”] is another, a Bodhisattva who bears the name of that [Hearer Shāriputra who is one (member) of the Supreme Pair].

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* does mention someone bearing the name Shāriputra, but that Shāriputra is not the Shāriputra who was a Hearer, a member of the Supreme Pair, and present in the retinue of the Buddha. It is someone else who went by the same name.

That a new opponent has jumped into the debate should not surprise us all that much. When we debate publicly in the courtyard such things happen quite often. Two people debate, with one of them, the challenger, standing and the other, the defender, sitting on the ground. The defender parries with a reply and then some other person protests, “No, that’s not it!” That fellow has leapt into the debate shoving the challenger aside, and the debate goes on with a new player and a new configuration. That is precisely what is happening here, and as in this case so in the courtyard it is often a citation of scripture that leads to this kind of revolt. Someone who was listening intently off to the side understands either the meaning or the implications of that scripture differently and just has to mix it up with the others. Here the third person does not take the passage from Āryavimuktisena’s *Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand* to mean that this Shāriputra the Bodhisattva is Shāriputra the Hearer later in the same lifetime in which he and Kāshyapa had become Hearer Foe Destroyers. The new opponent continues:

It follows [that that Shāriputra of “The Bodhisattvas, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth” is another, a Bodhisattva who bears the name of that
(Hearer Shāriputra who is one of the Supreme Pair) because [in his Blaze of Reasoning] Bhāvaviveka says:

The Bodhisattvas called by the names of the Shāriputra who wore the clothing of a Hearer and so forth are foretold in scripture and because of that scriptural citation from the Illumination of the Twenty-Five Thousand [“The Bodhisattvas, the great ones, the Superior Shāriputra and so forth”].

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: In this citation from Bhāvaviveka’s Blaze of Reasoning we see something similar to the new opponent’s construction of the scene. To be sure, Bhāvaviveka’s “Shāriputra who wore the clothing of a Hearer” is none other than the Hearer Shāriputra who is one member of the Supreme Pair. However, Bhāvaviveka has fixed his gaze upon Bodhisattvas prophesied in scripture, among whom one has been designated with the name Shāriputra.

Therefore, although someone says, “The Supreme Pair and so forth are of a single continuum with the Buddha, due to which they are emanations,” it follows that this is not logically feasible because Shāriputra had sharp faculties but inferior interests, due to which he fell to the Lesser Vehicle. It follows [that Shāriputra had sharp faculties but inferior interests, due to which he fell to the Lesser Vehicle] because Bhāvaviveka’s Blaze of Reasoning says.

---

a rtog ge ’bar ba, BDRC 23703098, 173b.1.
b rtog ge ’bar ba, BDRC (sde dge) 23703098, 169b.5-7. BDRC (dpe bsdur ma) W1PD95844.58 (pe cin: krung go’i bod rig pa’i dpe skrun khang, 1994–2008), 412:10-17.
Despite already possessing sharp faculties, some types of sentient beings desire inferior attributes and are not skilled in method, due to which initially they abandon the afflictions. When [the One-Gone-Thus] sees that they have the good fortune to [accomplish] great enlightenment, they attain a prophecy of this by the One-Gone-Thus. Subsequently, although they have abandoned [contaminated] actions and afflictions, in a naturally attained birth, having accumulated the distinctive collections of great enlightenment, they will attain distinctive realization, like the great Hearer Shāriputra and so forth.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: It has been suggested that the Supreme Pair and in fact all the others present in the retinue of the Buddha are of a single continuum with the Buddha. In this way an explanation appropriate to Mantra has been misapplied. In the root tantra of

The dpe bsdur ma edition of Bhāvaviveka’s treatise corrects the sele dge edition’s lung nad par mdzad to lung nod par mdzad. This translation follows the dpe bsdur ma edition.
the Guhyasamāja\textsuperscript{a} one hears “The doctrine is me, the agent is me, the retinue also are me.” In dependence upon this passage it is understood that all aspects of the mandala are the principal deity. Carrying that reasoning into this context someone has concluded and explained that also in Sūtra the members of the Buddha’s retinue are of a single continuum with the Buddha. It is not so.

Jam-yang-shay-pa’s treatise does not tell us who holds that:

The Supreme Pair and so forth are of a single continuum with the Buddha, due to which they are emanations.

Jam-yang-shay-pa, from Shāriputra’s inferior interests, has drawn the consequence that despite his sharp faculties Shāriputra cannot be of a single continuum with the Buddha and therefore cannot be an emanation of the Buddha. In support of that analysis, Jam-yang-shay-pa cites Bhāvaviveka.

Previously we discussed Shāriputra’s falling to the Lesser Vehicle due to an unfortunate episode with a mischievous demon. It is worth asking when he fell. Did he fall to the Lesser Vehicle in the lifetime in which he attained the state of a Hearer Foe Destroyer, or did he fall in a previous lifetime? We have heard the story of his falling to the Lesser Vehicle, but if we look closely at what we know of him, do we find a story attesting to his having fallen in the very lifetime in which as one member of the Supreme Pair he enjoyed a place in the retinue of the Buddha Shākyamuni? Initially he followed the ways of non-Buddhists and studied with many non-Buddhist teachers. This fulfilled none of his desires; nevertheless he became a teacher of non-Buddhist paths and taught non-Buddhist doctrines to many disciples. Even so, he continued to search for a good teacher. Eventually he met the Superior Ashvajit\textsuperscript{b} and saw clearly that he was someone of excellent conduct. Impressed by Ashvajit’s peaceful and gentle manner, Shāriputra thought his teacher must be good. He engaged Ashvajit in conversation and asked “Who is your teacher and what does he say?” For his part, Ashvajit had excellent conduct but dull faculties. Although able to repeat the Buddha’s words, he did not un-

\textsuperscript{a} de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi sku gsung thugs kyi gsang chen gsang ba ’dus pa zhes bya ba brtag pa’i rgyal po (sarvatathāgatakavākyavākyarahaśyaguhyasamājāmadhakalparāja), in bk’a’gyur (sde dge par phud), BDRC W22084.81 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa chodhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1976–79), 181-297.
\textsuperscript{b} rta thul.
derstand their meaning well. Despite this shortcoming, in dependence upon what Ashvajit did say, Shāriputra realized the truth in direct perception and thus attained a path of seeing. Subsequently, Shāriputra met the Buddha and in following him attained the fruit of Foe Destroyer.

Apart from this, one hears no story of his having engendered the mind of enlightenment integral to the Great Vehicle. Thus it seems unlikely that he would have fallen from the Great Vehicle to the Lesser Vehicle in that same lifetime in which he attained the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer. It must be that he generated the Great Vehicle mind of enlightenment in a previous lifetime, when he was a king whose name I have forgotten. The story of his unfortunate encounter with a demon whose mischief led him to lose that mind of enlightenment must refer to that former lifetime. Having fallen, he entered a Hearer’s path of accumulation and abided there until in a later lifetime he attained a path of seeing and the fruit of Foe Destroyer. Remembering that a Hearer’s journey from the path of accumulation to the fruit of Foe Destroyer requires a minimum of three lifetimes—“Swiftly, in three mundane existences liberation [is attained]”—one must ask how if Shāriputra had descended from the Great Vehicle and entered a Hearer’s path of accumulation he would in that very lifetime have gone from the path of accumulation to the fruit of Foe Destroyer. Such does not occur. Hence, it seems more plausible that the story of his fall from the Great Vehicle refers to a previous lifetime. When he meets Datül, Shāriputra has no interest in the Great Vehicle, which looks like a lot of trouble. Thus, Jam-yang-shay-pa characterizes him as someone unsuitable to be of a single continuum with and an emanation of the Buddha:

Shāriputra had sharp faculties but inferior interests.

The passage from Bhāvaviveka’s Blaze of Reasoning that Jam-yang-shay-pa has cited explains circumstances pertinent to entering the paths of the Great Vehicle.

That these sentient beings:

a myur ba srid pa gsam gyis thar. Vasubandhu’s Treasury of Manifest Knowledge (chos mngon pa’i mdzod, abhidharmakosa), in bstan ’gyur (sde dge, 4089), BDRC W23703.140:3-51 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapa chodhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 19b.4, and also in bstan ’gyur (dpe bsdur ma) BDRC W1PD95844.79:20-81 (pe cin: krung go’i bod rig pa’i dpe skrun khang, 1994-2008) 44.20.
are not skilled in method
means that they do not understand the extreme of annihilation.

Because they are not skilled in method:

initially they abandon the afflictions
which means that they strive to attain the fruit of Foe Destroyer.
In time, they will:

have the good fortune to [accomplish] great enlightenment
which means that they will then have the capacity to attain the enlightenment of the Great Vehicle and will be of that lineage. A Buddha sees that such a person has that good fortune and foretells his or her attainment of great enlightenment. Having obtained that prophecy from the One-Gone-Thus, a person of this sort enters the Great Vehicle, accumulates the collections of merit and wisdom, and attains unsurpassed enlightenment.

Scientists would describe the difference between the intelligence of a human being and the dullness of an animal in terms of the constituents of the different bodies. When we look at the difference in capacity, we see virtue attained by birth. Having taken birth as a human being, if one then engages in study, through the power of such study one’s virtue rises to a higher level. In that increase, we see virtue arisen from application. Also, some things seem to arrive automatically, as if out of nowhere. We say that they are naturally attained. To maintain that they do not rely upon causes and conditions or that they arise on their own would be mistaken, but they do not require the exertion that the others do.

Those who wander helplessly from lifetime to lifetime within the Three Realms of cyclic existence take birth due to the power of [contaminated] actions and afflictions. By contrast, when Hearers have attained the fruit of Hearer Foe Destroyer, they no longer

---

a chad mi'ha'.
b nus pa.
c rigs.
d skyi thobs kyi dge ba.
e shyor byung gi dge ba.
f hob de ga la.
g chos nyid kyis thob pa.
h rang byung.
take birth due to the power of [contaminated] actions and afflictions, for those have been abandoned. When Hearers who have attained the fruit of Foe Destroyer enter the paths of the Great Vehicle, they must accumulate the collections for three periods of innumerable great eons. The births they then take as human beings and so forth are called births naturally attained. They are not born due to the power of [contaminated] actions and afflictions, for those have been abandoned. Nor are they born due to the power of aspirational prayers, for only Bodhisattvas who have arrived at high levels of realization can take birth in that manner. In fact some books do say that Hearers can take birth by the power of aspirational prayers, but here those births are spoken of as naturally attained. Taking such births, they accumulate the collections and eventually become Buddhas.

Moreover, Shāriputra and so forth were prophesied in that lifetime, for on the occasion of Mind-Only it is explained that they would enter [the paths of the Great Vehicle] in that lifetime but at the time of a [nirvāṇa] without remainder would not. Still, in accord with the Descent into Laṅka it must be said that there is entrance [into the paths of the Great Vehicle] from a [nirvāṇa] without remainder as well.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: It is Jam-yang-shay-pa who asserts this. That Shāriputra and others were prophesied in that lifetime means that in that lifetime it was prophesied that entering the Great Vehicle they would accomplish unsurpassed enlightenment. Of course, this prophecy does require them to enter the paths of the Great Vehicle. Well, from where? The School of Mind-Only
Following Scripture\(^\text{a}\) contends that they may enter the paths of the Great Vehicle from a nirvāṇa with remainder but not from a nirvāṇa without remainder, for they regard a Hearer’s nirvāṇa without remainder as that person’s final vehicle.\(^\text{b}\) For that reason, if Hearers are to enter the paths of the Great Vehicle, they must do so from a nirvāṇa with remainder. When Jam-yang-shay-pa says:

> on the occasion of Mind-Only it is explained that they would enter [the Great Vehicle] in that lifetime but at the time of a [nirvāṇa] without remainder would not

he is reporting what the Mind-Only School’s own books have to say about this. However, the Descent into Laṅka Sūtra affirms that Hearers may enter the paths of the Great Vehicle from a nirvāṇa with remainder and that even after having attained a nirvāṇa without remainder, Hearers may enter the paths of the Great Vehicle from there. The Descent into Laṅka Sūtra serves as an authoritative text for the Mind-Only School, and they assert it literally.\(^\text{c}\) Bear in mind that this mention of the Descent into Laṅka Sūtra does not give us Mind-Only’s explanation of its own system. It represents rather what higher systems of tenets force upon them, for the higher systems say that Mind-Only has no choice other than to assert that Hearers may enter the paths of the Great Vehicle from a nirvāṇa without remainder because that is what the Descent into Laṅka Sūtra says. Jam-yang-shay-pa’s treatise does not identify the passage from the sūtra that serves as the source for this assertion.

30. **Someone says:**\(^\text{d}\) It follows that for Hearer or Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers to enter the paths of the Great Vehicle is not logically feasible because there is no way for them to make a thousand children and so forth after having taken birth as a universal monarch\(^\text{e}\) on the first ground [of a Bodhisattva].

---

\(^{a}\) lung gi rjes 'brang gi sems tsam pa.
\(^{b}\) mthar thug gi theg pa.
\(^{c}\) sgra ji bzhin pa khas len pa.
\(^{d}\) 2011 BDRC bla brang, 22b.2; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 17a.7; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 30.12.
\(^{e}\) 'khor lo sgyur ba, cakravartin.
It follows [that there is no way for them to make a thousand children and so forth after having taken birth as a universal monarch on the first ground [of a Bodhisattva] because they have no afflictions.

Our response: [That they have no afflictions] does not entail [that there is no way for them to make a thousand children and so forth after having taken birth as a universal monarch on the first ground (of a Bodhisattva)] because although they have no afflictions, emanating afflictions that resemble tusks they further the welfare of sentient beings, and because Bodhisattva Superiors making children that way is not due to having succumbed to afflictions.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: *kho na re* tells us that we are about to hear once more from an opponent we have faced recently, who has more to say to us. According to this opponent, it will not do to say that those who have attained the state of Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers later enter the paths of the Great Vehicle. For those who enter the Great Vehicle, there is a lot of work to be done. When they attain a Bodhisattva’s first ground, they take

\[ nyon mongs \text{che ba itar} \] which Lo-sang-gyal-tshan reads as \[ nyon mongs \text{mche ba itar}. \]
birth as a universal monarch, wed one thousand queens,\(^a\) and produce one thousand children who further the welfare of sentient beings. It is a lot of work, and those who have attained the state of Hearer and Solitary Victor Foe Destroyers cannot do it. The opponent attributes their incapacity to having finished abandoning the afflictions. Jam-yang-shay-pa replies that the absence of afflictions has no such implications. He describes their participation in the work of a universal monarch as the emanation of afflictions that resemble tusks. What do you think _che ba_ means here?

JBL: That although they have no afflictions they pretend to be greatly afflicted, as if they were playing at it?

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: I suppose it could mean that, but I think it does not. You are familiar with the tusks\(^b\) of an elephant, aren’t you? Now, what work do an elephant’s tusks do?

JBL: Beats me. Do they serve as weapons?

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: Impressive, aren’t they? Our teeth chew our food. That’s their job. An elephant’s tusks certainly do not chew an elephant’s food. From the look of it, this word should mean greater in the sense of greater and smaller,\(^c\) but not much comes of reading it that way. When one gazes upon the tusks of an elephant, they appear to be impressive teeth, but they cannot do the work of teeth: chewing, cutting, slicing, grinding, and so on. As tusks, this image serves as an example.

JBL: Are they false teeth?

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: No, an elephant’s tusks are actual teeth but cannot do the work of teeth. In a similar way the passion of a universal monarch for his wives produces children but in fact such a monarch does not have the affliction of desire. He does produce children but not in the way that the common people of the world\(^d\) do, that is, through the power of desire, as the fruit of which children are born. When Bodhisattva Superiors take birth as universal monarchs, they are able to further the welfare of sentient beings by producing children. Through those children they are able to influence and affect the many people who will trust the lineage of those whom they know to be a king’s actual children. However, they do not produce children through passion, which they have

---

\(^a\) _btsun mo_.

\(^b\) _mche ba_.

\(^c\) _che chung gi che ba_.

\(^d\) _’jig rten tha mal pa_.
abandoned. Despite having abandoned passion, they remain able to produce children, and in that sense a Bodhisattva Superior makes children without succumbing to afflictions.

This is because Bhāvaviveka’s _Blaze of Reasoning_ says:\(^a\)

> Therefore, only Bodhisattvas of the eighth ground having separated from afflictions, though similar to Foe Destroyers, manifestly emanate by means of method the five attributes of the Desire Realm,\(^b\) and thereupon advise Bodhisattvas, in the course of which they also display conduct that, vast and multifarious, resembles that of those who have afflictions.\(^c\)…This being so, despite having separated from desire, due to the power of compassion they display dance poses emanating the conduct of afflictions.

---

\(^a\) rtog ge 'bar ba, (sde dge) BDRC 23703098, 170b.7-171a.4, (dpe bsdur ma) BDRC W1PD95844, 415.2-19.

\(^b\) 'dod pa'i yon tan inga.

\(^c\) Jam-yang-shay-pa has an ellipsis until
Lesser Vehicle who later enters the Great Vehicle; thus here we see that, in his *Blaze of Reasoning*, Bhāvaviveka explains that a Bodhisattva who attains the eighth ground has abandoned the afflictions. From that point forward, only the obstructions to omniscience remain to be abandoned. Nothing else.

We may compare this with the system of the Middle Way Consequence School, where it is held that a Bodhisattva who attains the eighth ground has abandoned the afflictions utterly and from the attainment of the eighth ground onward will proceed to abandon the obstructions to omniscience. While both the Sūtra Middle Way Autonomy School and the Consequence School explain that with the attainment of the eighth ground a Bodhisattva has abandoned the afflictions and from that point forward has only the obstructions to omniscience to abandon, they are not saying the same thing. In the system of the Consequence School, until one has finished cleaning away\(^a\) the afflictions one cannot begin to cleanse\(^b\) the obstructions to omniscience. The work of abandoning the obstructions to omniscience cannot begin until the work of abandoning the affective obstructions has been completed. The system of the Autonomy School has it differently. In their system, from the time at which the uninterrupted path of the path of meditation that is a first ground\(^c\) has been generated, that and subsequent uninterrupted paths do the work of abandoning both the afflictions and the obstructions to omniscience. However, because the afflictions are easier to abandon, their abandonment finishes before the obstructions to omniscience have been completely abandoned. Correspondingly, because the obstructions to omniscience are more difficult to abandon, after all the affective obstructions have been abandoned some obstructions to omniscience remain to be abandoned. In contrast to the Autonomy School, the Consequence School holds that until all of the affective obstructions have been abandoned none of the obstructions to omniscience can be abandoned. The Autonomy School does not agree with them. They hold that the work of abandoning the obstructions to omniscience does proceed as one traverses the ten grounds of a Bodhisattva but because they are easier to abandon, all of the affective obstructions have been abandoned when a Bodhisattva

\(^{a}\) *gtsang ma bzo.*

\(^{b}\) *byang.*

\(^{c}\) *sa dang po sgom lam bar chad med lam.*
reaches the eighth ground of a Bodhisattva. In this they differ from the Consequence School. The latter’s insistence that none of the obstructions to omniscience are abandoned before the eighth ground constitutes an uncommon position—one not shared with others. Of course, it is also true that what the two schools posit as the obstructions to omniscience differs as well. Thus they agree that with the attainment of the eighth ground of a Bodhisattva the afflictive obstructions have been abandoned but differ in regard to the location where one begins to abandon the obstructions to omniscience and also the very substance of those obstructions.

The Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School, the Sūtra Middle Way Autonomy School, and the Middle Way Consequence School differ considerably in regard to how those definite in the lineage of the Great Vehicle\(^a\) abandon the two obstructions. The Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School holds that those definite in the lineage of the Great Vehicle abandon the afflictive obstructions and obstructions to omniscience together, that is, the processes of abandoning those two obstructions begin at the same moment and end at the same moment. In dependence upon the uninterrupted path at the end of the continuum,\(^b\) the afflictive obstructions and the obstructions to omniscience have simultaneously been abandoned and with that one has become a Buddha.

The Sūtra Middle Way Autonomy School holds that the processes of abandoning those two obstructions begin at the same moment but when the eighth ground of a Bodhisattva has been attained, the afflictions have been abandoned, in contrast to which the obstructions to omniscience will not have been abandoned until one has come to the end of the continuum. Thus they differ slightly from the other branch of the Middle Way Autonomy School, the Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School. Those of the Consequence School say no to both. They hold that prior to abandoning any portion of the obstructions to omniscience one must have abandoned the afflictive obstructions completely and entirely. Only when the afflictive obstructions have been abandoned completely can the work of abandoning the obstructions to omniscience begin. This latter process starts only after the eighth ground has been attained. Thus the three Middle Way Schools differ from one another in these ways. The words from Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of*

\(^a\) *theg chen rigs nges.*  
\(^b\) *rgyun mi'yi bar chad med lam.*
Reasoning cited here:

Only Bodhisattvas of the eighth ground, free from afflictions, are similar to Foe Destroyers

serve as the source permitting us to understand that the Sūtra Middle Way Autonomy School asserts that upon attaining the eighth ground Bodhisattvas definite in the lineage of the Great Vehicle have abandoned the afflictive obstructions.

It is worth reminding ourselves that Bhāvaviveka is not speaking of Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyers who have entered the Great Vehicle; rather, he is speaking about eighth ground Bodhisattvas whose Great Vehicle lineage is definite. In producing a thousand children they act as if they have afflictions. It has been suggested that Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyers would not be able to produce children because they have abandoned the afflictions, such as desire. However, if Bodhisattvas whose Great Vehicle lineage is definite and who have attained the eighth Bodhisattva ground, at which point they have abandoned the afflictions, can produce children, then it is reasonable to conclude that Bodhisattvas who have the prior realization of a Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyer, which means that they have already abandoned the afflictions and in that respect resemble Bodhisattvas whose Great Vehicle lineage is definite and who have attained the eighth Bodhisattva ground, can upon entering the Great Vehicle also produce children. At the least we know that with this citation Jam-yang-shay-pa has asserted this to be so by making the general point that, as can be known from the conduct of Bodhisattvas whose Great Vehicle lineage is definite and who have attained the eighth Bodhisattva ground, a Bodhisattva can produce children even in the absence of such afflictions. The opponent has argued that a Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyer cannot enter the Great Vehicle and traverse the paths of the Great Vehicle because in order to do so he or she would need to produce children since this would require sexual passion, which a Bodhisattva who has the prior realization of a Foe Destroyer no longer has because of having previously abandoned the afflictions. For the opponent this places the Great Vehicle beyond the reach of a Lesser Vehicle Foe Destroyer. Jam-yang-shay-pa argues that to have overcome the afflictions does not stand in the way of a Bodhisattva’s production of children since Bodhisattvas see the production of children as necessary and so despite having abandoned sexual passion they display the aspect of the afflictions.
and in every respect appear to have the afflictions when in fact they do not. When one looks upon a universal monarch with this in mind, one is inclined to say that such a king must be the emanation of a Bodhisattva abiding on a high ground.

Bhāvaviveka then introduces a passage from sūtra by noting that, in order to discourage sentient beings, Bodhisattvas give away the four continents. This is followed by poetry taken from a sūtra; the stanzas cited here support the more prosaic statement of the same meaning that Bhāvaviveka has given just previously. A single Bodhisattva emanates one thousand children or causes one thousand children to be born. This emanation of children does not resemble emanations in movies. The children may be emanations but nevertheless they are born from a woman, one must then school them, and so forth. This does not come about automatically. There is work to be done.

To us it appears that the Bodhisattva takes a woman and embraces her passionately. Most likely the woman too is an emanation of the Bodhisattva. Generally, the Bodhisattva has abandoned passionate desire, but we see the Bodhisattva enjoying sex with a woman. The display resembles theater in which people engage in all the activities of life, talking with one another and so on, making it all look as real as life. When we look closely we see that body follows mind such that the gestures of the body seem plausible when they mirror and express thought; in the absence of such synchronization, they seem lifeless and unpersuasive. In the literature on the stages of the path\(^a\) it is said that when a Buddha displays an ordinary aspect\(^b\) it is necessary to display an ordinary aspect of body, speech, and mind—all three—rather than for instance an ordinary aspect of body unaccompanied by an ordinary aspect of mind. Thus when a Buddha displays the aspect of a king the kingly aspect must inform body, speech, and mind. In this sense the aspect of ordinariness must be coordinated and displayed across the whole spectrum of body, speech, and mind rather than merely in one area or the other. This being so, when we consider the display someone presents we may see faults, but we must remember that when the aspect of ordinariness is displayed, body, speech, and mind must be in concert. We should reflect upon this when, for instance, a lama or teacher seems to be a little irritated. It may well

\(^a\) lam rim.

\(^b\) tha mal pa’i rnam pa.
be that the teacher is merely displaying an aspect of ordinariness.

Moreover, such appearances resemble the appearances of dreams and illusions. Those who have abandoned desirous conduct may see the conduct of desire in a dream, and when they do, the appearance in the dream looks real. Probably it does not occur to them that “I am someone who has abandoned the conduct of desire.” When we see a dream of this and that, does it occur to us that, “Within the dream it is so; in fact it is not”? No, for the most part it does not. Similarly, in waking life we see as if we were asleep, and we who see in this way are as if asleep. When we awaken from sleep we understand that what we saw was not what it appeared to be.

Although he has separated from desire, by means of the power of compassion the yogi emanates the afflictions, as if he were so afflicted. Here the display of dance poses refers to the performance of a role in theater. One acts as if things were so despite their not being so. If one plays the role of a king, then one must act as if one were in fact a king by embracing the articles of a king, sitting upon a king’s throne, engaging in the august speech of a king. I suspect that those who perform in such theater, imagining themselves to be kings and knowing it all the while to be illusory, have an easier time of it when it comes to meditating upon a deity, generating clear appearance of the deity, and cultivating the pride of the deity.

31. Someone says: It follows that the verbal conventions of Great and Medium Buddhas are suitable because the verbal conventions of greater and lesser Enjoyment Bodies are logically feasible.

---

*a* lha’i gsal snang.

*b* lha’i nga rgyal.

*c* 2011 BDRC bla brang, 22b.6; 2015 Old Go-mang Lhasa, 17b.3; 2007 Taipei codex reprint, 31.1.

*d* longs sku/longs spyod rdzogs pa’i sku, simbhogakāya.

*e* Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Eloquent Presentation of the Eight Categories and Seventy Topics: Sacred Word of Guru Ajita explains the limited usage of “greater and lesser complete enjoyment bodies”:

When divided terminologically, there are two, greater and lesser complete enjoyment bodies. The greater is equivalent with a complete enjoyment body of a Highest Pure Land, and the lesser is equivalent with an emanation body of a Highest Pure Land.
Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that this lesser Enjoyment Body is a lesser Buddha because [according to you] your innermost assertion [that the verbal conventions of Great and Medium Buddhas are suitable] is logically feasible.

If you [incorrectly] accept [that this lesser Enjoyment Body is a lesser Buddha], then since [this lesser Enjoyment Body] would be even lesser than a Solitary Victor and is incoherent, do not proliferate [assertions] such as these.

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan: This comes of course from “Medium Buddha”a in the first line of the first stanza of Chandrakīrti’s treatise, a translation that, following Tsong-kha-pa’s assessment, our system regards as mistaken. In some sense the debate draws out the folly of this translation and displays its ridiculous implications. Here the opponent proposes that the translation needs no repair.

See Jeffrey Hopkins and Jongbok Yi, The Hidden Teaching of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras: Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Seventy Topics and Kön-chog-jig-may-wang-po’s 173 Topics (Dyke, VA: UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies, version June, 2015: downloadable at uma-tibet.org.), 418. The complete enjoyment body in that Highest Pure Land emanates an emanation body that merely comes to be called a “complete enjoyment body,” whereas this emanation body actually is not a complete enjoyment body. Thus, the verbal conventions of greater and lesser Enjoyment Bodies are indeed used within this qualification, whereas the verbal conventions of Great and Medium Buddhas should not even be used.

a sangs rgyas ‘bring.
because of the usage of the verbal convention of greater and lesser Enjoyment Bodies. So why not medium Buddha and lesser Buddha? Jam-yang-shay-pa plays this out: Fine, and so a greater Enjoyment Body is a greater Buddha. Since according to you a Solitary Victor is a medium Buddha, a smaller Enjoyment Body must a smaller Buddha. What could be more ludicrous? The opponent has said nothing meaningful, and the objection does not bear upon the discussion of how Hearers and Solitary Victors are born from the Monarchs of Subduers. Dismissing this objection as irrelevant, Jam-yang-shay-pa concludes this portion of the treatise with four lines of poetry.

In the broad sky of the assertions of the supreme learned of the Land of Superiors
A thousand lights of analysis radiate whereby the moon of the arrogant
Who fancy themselves to be learned, the stars and planets of fallacious explanation,
Are destroyed and with that the lotus garden of the Subduer’s teachings blooms.
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Jules B. Levinson graduated from Princeton University in 1975 and soon thereafter began studying at the University of Virginia under the guidance of Dr. Jeffrey Hopkins and the eminent Tibetan scholars invited by the University’s Center for South Asian Studies. In 1994 he received a doctoral degree in Religious Studies from the University of Virginia. In addition to the previous volumes in the present series, his publications include *Essential Practice*, a translation of lectures given by Thrangu Rinpoche on Kamalashīla’s *Stages of Meditation in the Middle Way School*, and a contribution to *Moon of Wisdom* in which he translated Karmapa Mikyö Dorje’s commentary on Chandrakīrti’s refutation of the Mind-Only School in the latter’s *Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) “Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Called ‘Wisdom.’”* For many years, he has served as an oral translator for Thrangu Rinpoche, Khen Rinpoche Tsül-trim-gya-tso, and several of the younger teachers whom they educated. At present, he lives in Boulder, Colorado, where he works for the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies and occasionally teaches seminars at the University of Colorado at Boulder.
This book offers a continuation of the translation of the beginning of Jam-yang-shay-pa Ngag-wang-tsön-drü’s Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti’s) ‘Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’’: Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate, also called Decisive Analysis of the Middle and Great Exposition of the Middle. Since its publication in 1695, Jam-yang-shay-pa’s remarkable treatise has served as a textbook crucial to the study of the Middle Way School in the Gomang College of the Drepung Monastery and related institutions throughout Inner Asia. It brings sharply into focus the manner in which the Indian master Chandrakīrti’s momentous Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) “Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Called ‘Wisdom’” both enhances Nāgārjuna’s reasoned inquiry into the meaning of emptiness and departs from other explanations of Nāgārjuna’s thought. In addition, Jam-yang-shay-pa’s mature and relentlessly uncompromising exploration of the most meaningful themes that Chandrakīrti touches upon either briefly or at length gradually assembles an exhaustive clarification and vigorous defense of the revolutionary reading of Chandrakīrti’s Supplement that Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drag-pa had composed three centuries earlier.

This third volume analyzes in a decisive manner the torrent of questions that arise when one attempts to understand clearly and precisely just how Hearers and Solitary Realizers are, in different ways, born from Buddhas. Relying upon Tsong-kha-pa’s insightful explanation of Chandrakīrti’s Supplement, and augmenting it with rigorous explorations of terminology, scriptural sources, and elements fundamental to a systematic account of the paths traversed by Hearers and Solitary Realizers seeking liberation from the beginningless cycle of death and rebirth, Jam-yang-shay-pa employs the technology of syllogistic debate to reach a definitive statement of the Middle Way Consequence School’s portrait of the journey Hearers and Solitary Realizers make toward the fulfillment they so earnestly desire as well as the manner in which they finally attain liberation.
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