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Preface

Jam-yang-shay-pa (1648-1722) wrote the *Decisive Analysis of (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations”: Precious Lamp Illuminating All the Topics of the Perfection of Wisdom* between 1712 and 1718. It is a very long composition in eight parts filling two volumes of his Collected Works (vols. *ja* and *nya*) and is one of the last textbooks he wrote. It is a testament to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s phenomenal intellect and breadth of learning.

The *Decisive Analysis* is written in the Sang-phu commentarial tradition that goes back to the famous translator Ngog Lo-dan-shay-rab (1057-1109), the nephew of the founder of Sang-phu monastery and a student of the Indian scholar adept Dipaṇkāra Atisha (982-1054). Ngog Lo-dan-shay-rab, like Atisha, privileged Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* for gaining a correct understanding of the *Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras*. Amongst the many explanations of Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* extant in India, Ngog Lo-dan-shay-rab privileged Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary*, revising the Tibetan translation of his work and writing a *Summary* of it.

---


*b* Maher, “Knowledge and Authority,” 164, “Throughout his later life...Jamyang Shayba’s literary production diminished also.”

*c* gsang phu.

*d* prajñāpāramitā.

*e* lo chen.

*f* rngog blo ldan shes rab.

*g* abhisamayālāṃkāra.

*h* abhisamayālāṃkāraṇāmādprajñāpāramitopadeśāśtravīrti.

*i* Ngog Lo-dan-shay-rab’s *Topical Summary of the “Treatise of Instruction on the Perfection of Wisdom, Ornament for the Clear Realizations” / Topical Summary (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gvi Tik chung zhes bya ba /bsdus don)*, (Institute of Tibetan Classics edition); translated by Gareth Sparham, *The Perfection of Wisdom Tradition: Three Classic Selections* (Wisdom Publications,
Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* stanzas 1.3-4 says:\(^a\)

The perfection of wisdom will be thoroughly
Explained by way of eight categories.
Exalted-knower-of-all-aspects, knower of paths,
Then knower of all,

Completely realizing all aspects,
Passed to the peak, serial,
Momentary thoroughly complete enlightenment,
And body of attributes are the eight.

Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* breaks down the eight clear realizations\(^b\) taught in these two stanzas into seventy main topics. As explained in more detail below, the embedded table of contents of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Decisive Analysis* is loosely based on these seventy topics.

Jeffrey Hopkins and Jongbok Yi’s *The Hidden Teaching of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras*, a translation of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Eloquent Presentation of the Eight Categories and Seventy Topics: Sacred Word of Guru Ajita*\(^c\) published earlier in this series, identifies each of the eight categories and the seventy topics, giving for each a brief definition, subdivisions, and, where appropriate, its location within the path and ground structure of Great Vehicle Buddhism. We direct readers to that work, published online in this same series, particularly to the table of contents where the names of each category and topic are conveniently given.

Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* and Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* are the root texts of the *Decisive Analysis*. They give Jam-yang-shay-pa’s book its basic structure. Besides them, Jam-yang-shay-pa accords two Tibetan Perfection of Wisdom commentaries an equally authoritative status. These are Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drags-pa’s (1356-1419)\(^d\) long *Perfection of Wisdom commentary* called

---

\(^a\) This is Jeffrey Hopkins and Jongbok Yi’s rendering of the stanzas, available online at [http://uma-tibet.org/edu/gomang/phar_phyin/seventy.php](http://uma-tibet.org/edu/gomang/phar_phyin/seventy.php). I have made a slight change in the last line.

\(^b\) *abhisamaya, mngon rtogs*.

\(^c\) This is *dngos po brgyad don bdun cu’i rnam bzhag legs par bshad pa mi pham bla ma’i zhal lung*, vol. 15, 111-173, in Maher’s Appendix 1, 321. Maher gives no date for the text, nor do Hopkins and Yi.

\(^d\) *tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa*. 
Golden Garland\(^a\) (finished in 1398), and the Ornament of the Essence\(^b\) by Tsong-kha-pa’s close associate and disciple Gyal-tshab Darma-rin-chen\(^c\) (1364-1432) written ca. 1420.

The structure of Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations and Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary is concentric. After making homage to the Perfection of Wisdom (and in Haribhadra’s case the luminaries in the tradition), and setting down a statement of purpose, both works set forth the eight categories, then give the subdivisions of each of the categories, and finally explain each of the topics in slightly more detail. The structure of the two Tibetan Perfection of Wisdom commentaries, Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland and Gyal-tshab’s Ornament of the Essence, is similar, though both are much much longer and more detailed works.

Taken in its entirety Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Decisive Analysis also has a concentric structure, based as it is on these four root texts. In the first part of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Decisive Analysis, however, the section translated here covering only his analysis of the homage and statement of purpose sections, the larger structure of the text is not obvious.

With that in mind the opening section of the current book is structured as a series of chapters based on the traditional divisions used down to the present day by debating teachers in Go-mang\(^d\) monastery:\(^e\)

1. Openers of the Chariot-ways
2. Presentation of Beings of the Three Capacities
3. On the Person of Maitreya and his Works
4. Explanation of Maitreya’s Stanza of Homage
5. Presentation of the Not-one-and-many Reason
6. Dispelling Objections to Three Knowledges
7. Presentation of Nirvāṇa
8. Presentation of the Wheels of Doctrine

\(^a\) Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom as well as (Haribhadra’s) Commentary: Golden Garland of Eloquence (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mgon par rtogs pa’i rgyan ‘grel pa dang bcas pa’i rgya cher bshad pa legs bshad gser gyi phreng ba).

\(^b\) Explanation of (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations” and (Haribhadra’s) Commentary: Ornament for the Essence (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mgon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi rtsa ba ’grel pa dang bcas pa’i rnam bshad snying po’i rgyan).

\(^c\) rgyal tshab darma rin chen.

\(^d\) sgo mang.

\(^e\) These chapters have been supplied by Lo-sang-gyal-tshan.
This structure is implicit in the text, but the chapters and chapter titles are not actually present in the Tibetan version.

Jam-yang-shay-pa prefaces these “chapters” (following the model of the four root texts) with an introductory section of ornate stanzas of homage to the luminaries of the Perfection of Wisdom tradition in India and Tibet, starting with the Buddha and ending with Ngag-wang-lo-sang-gyatso the Great Fifth Dalai Lama\(^a\) and his tutor Pan-chen Lo-sang-chö-kyi-gyal-tshan.\(^b\)

He follows this, in an introductory section of the first chapter, “Openers of the Chariot-ways,” with a survey of the Perfection of Wisdom literature. The metaphor employed in “Openers of the Chariot-ways” is of a jungle that is hard to penetrate, and of a strong cart that blazes a clear trail through the jungle so that others can easily follow. The jungle is the Perfection of Wisdom literature, and the carts or chariots are the exegetes—Nāgārjuna and Maitreya in one way or Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga in another way, according to Jam-yang-shay-pa—who have made the meanings and topic of the Perfection of Wisdom literature clear for later readers.

In the Sang-phu tradition the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras are divided into seventeen mother and child sūtras.\(^c\) Mother sūtras are those that explicitly teach the eight clear realizations (listed in Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* 1.3), and Child sūtras are those that do not do so. Jam-yang-shay-pa references Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* which in turn bases its list on the *Fruit Clusters of Scriptures*, a Perfection of Wisdom commentary in the Sang-phu tradition by Bu-tön Rin-chen-drub (1290-1364).\(^d\) The list is not exhaustive, but identifies the most important long Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras and many of the shorter versions.

The six Mother sūtras are:

1. *One Hundred Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra / Hundred Thousand* (śatasahasrikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phisin pa stong phrag brgya pa / ‘bum)
2. *Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra / Twenty-five Thousand* (pañcaviṃśatisahasrikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phisin pa stong phrag nyi shu inga pa / nyi khrī)

---

\(a\) ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho, 1642–1682.

\(b\) pan chen blo bzang chos kyi rgyal mtsan, 1570–1662.

\(c\) yum dang srax.

\(d\) bu ston rin chen grub, the famous editor of the Translation of (Buddha’s) Word (*bka’* ‘gyur) and Translation of the Treatises (*bstan* ‘gyur) and prolific author.
Amongst these, Jam-yang-shay-pa primarily cites “the Extensive, Middle, and Condensed Mother Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras,” that is, the Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eight Thousand versions, and amongst these primarily the Twenty-five Thousand and Eight Thousand. Readers should be aware that the word “mother” (Tibetan yum) in the Perfection of Wisdom literature is just an abbreviation; although in some contexts it has a specific meaning, in general it is used to avoid having to continually use the longer term “perfection of wisdom.”

The eleven Child sūtras are:

1. Seven Hundred Perfection of Wisdom / (saptāśatikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa bdun brgya pa)
2. Five Hundred Perfection of Wisdom / (pañcaśatikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa lnga brgya pa)
3. Three Hundred Perfection of Wisdom / Vajra Cutter / Diamond Sūtra (prajñāpāramitā vajracchedikā, sher rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa rdo rje bcod pa/ sum rgya pa)
4. One Hundred and Fifty Perfection of Wisdom Principles (prajñāpāramitānayaatsapatāpancaśatikā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i tshul brgya lnga bcu pa)
5. Fifty Perfection of Wisdom (prajñāpāramitāpañcaśatikā, ‘phags pa bcom ldan’ das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa lnga bcu pa)
6. Twenty-five Doors to the Perfection of Wisdom, pañcaviṃśatikāprajñāpāramitimukha, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i sgo nyi shu rtsa lnga pa)
7. Questions of Suvikṛțatavikrāmin: An Exposition of the Perfection of Wisdom (suvikāntavikrāmipariprccchāprajñāpāramitānirdeśa, ‘phags

---
a yum rgyas ’bring bsdus gsum.
Maitreya and Haribhadra make it clear at the beginning of their respective works that they are explaining the words of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras. Having done so, they largely leave it up to their reader to relate what they say to a specific section. Similarly, Jam-yang-shay-pa, as explained below, gives an initial context for each topic or section in his Decisive Analysis, but otherwise rarely relates explicitly what he is saying to a specific passage in a sūtra. The distance of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s text from the actual words of the Sūtras should not, however, be mistaken as a sign of their less than central importance in his Decisive Analysis.

In the final part of his introductory section Jam-yang-shay-pa sets forth the main Indian commentaries connected with Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations and Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary. Jam-yang-shay-pa again references Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland as the source of his list. I borrow here from Jeffrey Hopkins and Jongbok Yi’s The Hidden Teaching of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras a most helpful chart giving these commentaries.

Twenty-one commentaries on Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations

I. Correlating the Ornament with specific Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras
   A. Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra
      1. Āryavimuktisena (’phags pa grol sde, ca. 6th century C.E.). Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the ‘Superior Twenty-Five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra’: Ornament for the Clear Realizations.” This is the first extant commentary based on the Ornament, commonly abbreviated in Tibet as nyi snang (Illumination of the “Twenty-Five”)
      2. Bhadanta Vimuktisena (btsun pa grol sde). [Sub]commentary (to
Āryavimuktisena’s “Commentary” on (Maitreya’s) “Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the ‘Superior Twenty-Five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra’: Ornament for the Clear Realizations”

3. Haribhadra (seng ge bzang po, ca. 8th century C.E.). Twenty-five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra / The Eight Chaptered

4. Ratnākarashānti (rin chen 'byung gnas zhi ba). Pure Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations” / Purity

B. One Hundred Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra

5. Dharmashrī. Explanation of the “One Hundred Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra”

C. Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra


D. Stanza Summary of the Perfection of Wisdom


11. Dharmashrī. Key to the Treasury of the Perfection of Wisdom

E. One Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras

12. Smṛtijñānakīrti. Indicating Through Eight Concordant Meanings the Mother Perfection of Wisdom Taught Extensively in One Hundred Thousand, Taught in Medium Length in Twenty-five Thousand, and Taught in Brief in Eight Thousand [Stanzas]

II. Not correlating the Ornament with specific Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras

---

a The eight are the eight clear realizations, that is, the eight categories.

A. Two commentaries on Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary

B. Three summaries
   A summary of Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary
   16. Prajñākaramati (shes rab ’byung gnas blo gros, 950-1030). Summary of (Haribhadra’s) “Commentary on (Maitreya’s) ‘Ornament for the Clear Realizations’”
   Two summaries of Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations
   17. Atisha (dīpamkaraśrījñāna, mar me mdzad ye shes, 982-1054). Lamp Summary of (Maitreya’s) “Perfection of Wisdom”
   18. Kumārashrībhadra (bkra shis rgyal mtshan). Summary of (Maitreya’s) “Perfection of Wisdom”

C. Two other commentaries on Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary

D. One treatise
   21. Abhayākaragupta (died 1140).* Ornament to the Subduer’s Thought, a general explanation of Buddha’s word, the final three chapters of which mainly teach the topics of Maitreya’s Ornament.

Among these, readers should be aware that Jam-yang-shay-pa cites the

---

*a This is the date of his death according to H. Nakamura, Indian Buddhism, a survey with bibliographical notes, Osaka: Kufs Publications, 1980.
Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra, like most Tibetan writers, a in Haribhadra’s version contained in the Translation of the Treatises (bstan ‘gyur) listed here as the Twenty-five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra or Eight Chaptered. This version is called the Eight Chaptered b because it inserts the names of the eight categories from Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations into the Sūtra.

Amongst the commentaries, Jam-yang-shay-pa relies mainly on the commentaries by Āryavimuktisena and Haribhadra and, within Tibet, principally follows Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland and Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence. To the extent that Jam-yang-shay-pa treats Tsong-kha-pa and Gyal-tshab, along with the third member of the Ge-lug triumvirate Khay-drub-ge-leg-pal-sang c (1385-1438), as authoritative it can be said his Decisive Analysis is written from a Ge-lug-pa d perspective.

Here a slight digression is necessary to explain why Jam-yang-shay-pa takes both Tsong-kha-pa and Gyal-tshab’s Perfection of Wisdom commentaries as roots texts, rather than just Tsong-kha-pa’s commentary alone. Tsong-kha-pa wrote his Golden Garland some eight years before he began publishing a series of works in which he sets forth his mature views. Summarizing the mature period during which Tsong-kha-pa completed his most influential books Jeffrey Hopkins says:

e In 1402, at the age of forty-five, he wrote the Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path f ... Five years later, when he was fifty, he began writing a commentary on Nāgārjuna’s Treatise on the Middle called Ocean of Reasoning g ... He began writing the Treatise

---

a The exception is Dol-po-pa She-rab-gyal-tshan (dol po pa shes rab rgyal mtshan, 1292-1361) who unequivocally rejects Haribhadra’s version.

b le’u brgyad ma.

c mkhas grub dge legs dpal bzang.

d dge lugs pa.


f Stages of the Path to Enlightenment Thoroughly Teaching All the Stages of Practice of the Three Types of Beings (skyes bu gsum gyi nyams su blang ba’i rim pa thams cad tshang bar ston pa’i byang chub lam gyi rim pa).

g Explanation of (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle”: Ocean of Reasoning / Great Commentary on (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle” (dbu ma rtsa ba’i tshig le’u byas pa shes rab ces bya ba’i rnam bshad rigs pa’i rgya mtsho).
Differentiating Interpretable and Definitive Meanings: The Essence of Eloquence...After completing The Essence in 1408, \( ^a \) he returned to commenting on Nāgārjuna’s text...In 1415, he went on to write the Medium Exposition of the Stages of the Path, \( ^b \) and finally, at age sixty-one, one year before his death, he wrote a commentary on Chandrakīrti’s Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle.” \( ^c \)

In his mature works Tsong-kha-pa says that three of the five treatises of Maitreya (Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras, Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes, and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon) \( ^d \) are from a provisional Mind-Only\( ^e \) perspective. He says the Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle \( ^f \) is written from a definitive Middle Way Consequence\( ^g \) school perspective, and the fifth of the five treatises of Maitreya, the Ornament for the Clear Realizations, is written in part at least from the Middle Way Autonomy\( ^h \) school perspective.\( ^i \)

Jam-yang-shay-pa is aware of issues raised by early opponents of Tsong-kha-pa, in particular by Rong-tön Shay-ja-kun-rig\( ^j \) (1367-1449), whom he names explicitly, and whose “mistaken” views he cites on a

\( ^a \) Hopkins takes the date from Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp, “Apropos of a Recent Contribution to the History of Central Way Philosophy in Tibet: Tsong Khapa’s Speech of Gold” in Berliner Indologische Studien 1 (Reinbek, Germany: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1985), 68, n. 2.

\( ^b \) Medium-Length Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment to be Practiced by Beings of the Three Capacities (skyes bu gsun gyis nyams su blang ba’i byang chub lam gyi rim pa).

\( ^c \) Extensive Explanation of (Chandrakīrti’s) “Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’”: Illumination of the Thought (dbu ma la ’jug pa’i rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal).

\( ^d \) The three are Maitreya’s Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras (mahāyānasūtrasāraṃkāra, theg pa chen po’i mdo sde rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa); Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes (madhyāntavibhāgaṇārikā, dbu dang miha’ rnam par ’byed pa tshigs su byas pa); and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon (dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga, chos dang chos nyid rnam par ’byed pa).

\( ^e \) cittamātra.

\( ^f \) mahāyānottaratantraṅśāstra, theg pa chen po rgyud bla ma’i bstan bcos.

\( ^g \) prāsaṅgika.

\( ^h \) svātantrika.

\( ^i \) This is spelled out by Gyal-tshab in his Ornament for the Essence and Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle.” Gyal-tshab describes himself as recording the view of his teacher Tsong-kha-pa.

\( ^j \) rong ston shes bya run rig.
number of occasions. Rong-tön’s objections, already voiced by his teacher Yag-tön Sang-gyay-pal\(^a\) (1350-1414), are reiterated and refined over a period of 300 years, in particular by the Sa-kyā\(^b\) scholar Go-ram-pa\(^c\) (1429-1489), the Sa-kyā Jo-nang scholar Shākya Chog-dan\(^d\) (1428-1507), and the eighth Karma-pa Mi-kyō Dor-je\(^e\) (1507-1554). Gyal-tshab and Khay-drub head a long line of Ge-lug writers who responded vigorously to these criticisms of Tsong-kha-pa’s views over this same period.

Rong-tön contrasts the views implicit in Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* with the mature views Tsong-kha-pa sets forth in his later works. He observes that in his *Golden Garland* Tsong-kha-pa both praises Maitreya as a great opener of a chariot-way of explication on a par with Nāgārjuna, and yet says some of Maitreya’s works are written from a mistaken point of view. Rong-tön also points out Tsong-kha-pa gives great importance to Haribhadra while at the same time relegating Haribhadra’s views to a lower Middle Way school that in the final analysis is wrong. Behind these somewhat superficial criticisms lies a deeper engagement with Tsong-kha-pa’s explanation of the two truths. Whereas Tsong-kha-pa unites valid cognition with a strong refutation of existence (criticized as nihilism) in his presentation of ultimate truth; and unites a rejection of totally valid cognition with commonly-accepted existence (criticized as realism) in his presentation of conventional truth, Rong-tön denies valid cognition plays a role in an ultimate beyond all conceptualization, and presents the Mind-Only works of Maitreya as giving the correct explanation of conventional truth. In particular, Rong-tön gives to Maitreya’s *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle* a central role in explaining an ultimate that is non-dual with the clear light\(^f\) of mind.

Gyal-tshab’s *Ornament of the Essence*, written ca. 1420, must be seen in the context of these criticisms of Tsong-kha-pa. It is a reworking of Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* to avoid contradictions with Tsong-kha-pa’s mature views. Jam-yang-shay-pa, writing in the early 18th century, cites both Tsong-kha-pa’s and Gyal-tshab’s Perfection of Wisdom works as authoritative in order to avail himself of the stronger, more defensible presentation of Tsong-kha-pa’s views.

---

\(^a\) g.yag ston sangs rgyas dpal.
\(^b\) sa skya.
\(^c\) go bo rab ’byams pa bsod nams seng ge.
\(^d\) gser mdog pañ chen shākya mchog ldan.
\(^e\) mi bskyod rdo rje.
\(^f\) ’od gsal.
OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK

The structure of the Openers of the Chariot-ways chapter follows a pattern shared with Decisive Analysis literature that can be seen as a mark of this particular genre. First there are three headings:

1. the passage the section takes as point of departure and expands on,
2. a syllogism, and
3. decisive analysis.

Here in this text, under the first heading Jam-yang-shay-pa gives a context to his analysis by citing the relevant passage from Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* and/or Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* and by relating it to a section of a *Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra*. He usually just cites the first and last words of the passage, or even just the first word expecting his readers to be familiar with the texts. In the English translation the cited passages are given in their entirety inserted into the body of the text.

The second heading is essentially a stylistic device that allows a writer to summarize the accepted content of a contextualizing passage within presenting it as a formal syllogism. It makes the third heading “decisive analysis” syntactically possible.

This third heading is the major one. Most of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s book is presented under this third heading, and indeed, it gives the Decisive Analysis genre its name and Jam-yang-shay-pa’s own specific work, *Decisive Analysis*, its title.

This third section, also called decisive analysis, is divided into three parts:

1. refuting mistakes,
2. positing our own system, and
3. dispelling objections.

Usually Jam-yang-shay-pa explicitly spells out the three parts, but in some of the chapters they are implicit. In such cases the missing headings have been inserted into the body of the text in parenthesis.

---

*a* spros.

*b* shyor ba.

*c* mtha’ dpyod.

*d* The abbreviation is dgag bzhag spang, that is, ‘khrul ba dgag pa or gzhan lugs dgag pa, rang lugs bzhag pa, and risod pa spong ba.
The arguments set forth and refuted in the first part ("refuting mistakes") are to be understood in the light of the second part ("positing our own system"). Sometimes the second part is very brief, simply giving the tenable point of view as Jam-yang-shay-pa accepts it. Since the mistaken arguments Jam-yang-shay-pa refutes in the first part may be wrong in only a very small particular, a reader may sometimes find it helpful to look at Jam-yang-shay-pa’s own system in advance. In many cases, however, it is only possible to fully understand the logic of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s own system by seeing it in the light of the many mistakes it seeks to avoid. In such cases a reader would do better to work through the mistakes teased out in the sometimes complicated exchanges set forth in the first part, and only then try to understand Jam-yang-shay-pa’s own view.

The third part “dispelling objections” meets objections raised to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s system. On some occasions there is a subtext to the point being raised.

The main complexity in the text is to identify the views that are accepted and the views that are rejected. To aid readers, the accepted views have been highlighted in blue, and the rejected views highlighted in red. It is relatively easy to sort out who accepts what when the opponent is a luminary of another Tibetan sect opposing Tsong-kha-pa (like Rong-tön, for example), but it is particularly difficult to sort out who accepts what when the views being rejected are by earlier Ge-lug-pa writers whose works have been adopted by other Ge-lug-pa monasteries as authoritative. The intra-Ge-lug controversies, as Jeffrey Hopkins has shown in his monumental work on Tsong-kha-pa’s Treatise Differentiating the Interpretable and the Definitive: The Essence of Eloquence, are often sharper than inter-sect controversies.

---

EDITIONS CONSULTED

Two basic editions of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of the Interpretable and the Definitive* were consulted:

1. *bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi mtha’ dpyod shes rab kyipha rol tu phyin pa’i don kun gsal ba’i rin chen sgron me*, TBRC W22186.6, which is a PDF of *bla brang bkra shis ’khyil, bla brang brka shis ’khyil dgon*, publishing date unknown. Abbreviated reference: “2011 TBRC bla brang.”


The digital Tibetan text of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of the Interpretable and the Definitive* provided in this book was supplied by the Drepung Gomang Library of Go-mang College in Mundgod, Karnataka State, India, which was likely based on both of above editions. It has been edited primarily in accordance with the “2011 TBRC bla brang.”
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.
The Collaborator

Lo-sang-gyal-tshan is a Ge-she at 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. In particular, he provided crucial assistance with filling in the dialectical moves throughout the text and by responding to questions and engaging in discussions about the meaning.
Jam-yang-shay-pa’s

Decisive Analysis of (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations”

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 the ellipsis indicator when it has been filled in.
Decisive Analysis of the Treatise (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations”: Precious Lamp Illuminating All the Topics of the Perfection of Wisdom

[Stanzas of Homage]

With faith, having taken him as a crown ornament, I make a heartfelt bow
To the feet of the all-excellent tutor Mañjushrī who throws light
On the teaching in general of the Sage like [the sun] in charge of the twelve constellations of the zodiac,
And on the topic of the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom] that gives birth to the four supreme offspring.

---

a Jam-yang-shay-pa Ngag-wang-tsön-drü’s (’jam dbyangs bzhad pa ngag dbang brtson grus, 1648-1722) Decisive Analysis / Decisive Analysis of (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations”: Precious Lamp Illuminating All the Topics of the Perfection of Wisdom (mtha’ dpod / bstan bcos mngon par rigs pa’i rgyan gyi mtha’ dpod shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i don kun gsal ba’i rin chen sgron me). The title is written in Sanskrit transliterated first in in the ornamental letters of the lan tsha (rañja/rañjana) script, then transliterated in Tibetan capital (dbu can) letters, and finally translated in Tibetan letters. The Sanskrit version is: prajñāpāramitāśāstra-saṃkṣéptaśraya ratna-pradīpānam-aśvāṣṭra-abhisamayālaṃkāra-samanta-vicica viharati sma.

b The translation of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s stanzas, some of which are quite difficult to construe, is based on Mu-gay-sam-tan’s (bsam gtan rgya mtsho/ðmu dge bsam gtan, 1914-1993) A Beautiful Garland of Glosses for the Stanzas in Jam-pal-yang-shay-pay-dor-je’s “Decisive Analysis of the Perfection of Wisdom” (’jam dpal dbyangs dngos bzhad pa’i rdo rje’i phar phyin mtha’ dpod kyi snyan ngag gi tshigs bcad rnam kyi tshig ’gre l me tog ’phreng mdzes) in bsam gtan rgya mtsho’s gsung ’bum, vol. 2 (Zi ling: mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997). The four supreme offspring are Hearers, Pratyekabuddhas, Bodhisattvas, and Buddhas.

This stanza is also written in the three types of script. The Sanskrit is: bhānānaṃ dvādaśāśmabhūḥ munīśaśadāḥ sah samānyāś catupatamatpanam mātārthanaḥ / kaskara paridharaṇaḥ paśc[i] caśikhi paramacanah / namakara hṛdaya na śīkhasāṃskṛta sārdhena.
Even from the first time you became a Bodhisattva you were incomparable because of the courage of your supreme surpassing aspiration, and the reverberations of the Bodhisattvas’ marvelous melodious praise of you as “The While Lotus” filled all the directions. Please, Kinsman of the Sun, incomparable Lion of the Shākyas rest the nails of your toes in the lotus lake center of my heart place.  

I bow to the feet of that Protector’s ambassador, The Undaunted (ajita) Protector [Maitreya] conqueror of the four Māras Who simultaneously sustains all the hundred ten million continents with the doctrine,
Who directly perceives the three secrets of the Sage.

I bow to [Mañjushri] the single father who is fully enlightened from an infinite beginning but still,
Because of the power of his prayers, in the form of a Bodhisattva produces all the Victors, the guides.
Hey! Please bestow on me the intelligence That makes clear all the topics in the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom].

Please Sarasvati, nimbly nimbly unravel the knotty difficult points for me,
You who just from a moment of sincerely sincere belief
Bestow the supreme crown jewel of a scholar’s scholarship that makes
More and more of all types of knowledge dawn clearly on an ignorant heart.
Thinking how hard it is to realize the topics of the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom] Asaṅga\textsuperscript{a} meditated
And achieved in twelve years the great stream of the Gaṅgā river of Maitreya’s tradition,
Spreading it from the world of gods through all the human worlds.
You and your brother [Vasubandhu] are the eyes of living beings.\textsuperscript{b}

The fame of Āryavimuktiṣena\textsuperscript{c} and Haribhadra\textsuperscript{d} who captivate the minds
Of humans and gods, a fragrant smell wafting from the sandalwood trees learned in exposition
In dense jungles of eloquent explanations in the middle of Indian mountain ranges
Of authors of Perfection of Wisdom commentaries rises up even above the Peak of Existence.

\textsuperscript{a} Asaṅga, \textit{thogs med} fl. c. 350-400(?).
\textsuperscript{b} Vasubandhu, \textit{dbyig gnyen} fl. c. 350-400(?).
\textsuperscript{c} 'phags pa \textit{rnam gro}s de, fl. 5th-6th century? At the end of the only extant Sanskrit manuscript (Nepal-German Ms. Preservation Project, Reel no. A37/9, folio 110b3) he gives his name as ārya-vimuktiṣeṇa (ārya-bhiṣṇor ārya-vimuktiṣeṇasya kaurukulyārya-samātyasyānekodāra-vihārasthāṣṭhyācārya-buddha-dāsa-naptuḥ); this spelling is corroborated by Haribhadra’s spelling (Wogihara, I, line 20). However, on his title page Corrado Pensa in \textit{L’Abhisamayālaṃkāratīti di Ārya-vimuktiṣena} (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1967) gives his name as Āryavimuktiṣena, as does Karl Brunnhölzl in \textit{Gone Beyond} (Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 2011). Earlier (except on the title pages of my translations) I have given his name as Ārya Vimuktiṣena as has John Makransky in \textit{Buddhahood Embodied} (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1997), and James Apple in \textit{Stairway to Nirvāṇa} (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2009). I have come prefer Āryavimuktiṣena, but throughout this publication I am using the format of the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies which is Āryavimuktisena.
\textsuperscript{d} seng ge \textit{bzang po}, fl. c. end of 8th century.
The translators and paṇḍitas, the kings and the ministers, and particularly all the many learned beings who disseminated Perfection of Wisdom texts, radiating out the illumination of the Doctrine into these valleys when they were sunk in the gloom of ignorance even while surrounded by [white sparkling] snow mountains—they are all objects of homage.

I pay homage with reverence to the banner raised up on high in mundane existence by [Tsong-kha-pa\(^a\) with] a Good Mind (Lo-sang) Famous (Drag-pa) as the [second] Victor who, as prophesied by the Sage, in a human performance of Mañjushrī established [his time in this degenerate age] as a golden age by doing all of a Buddha’s deeds, by [explaining] scripture and [accomplishing] realization [of doctrine], and by putting the three trainings into practice and so on.

---

\(^a\) tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa, 1357-1419.
I pay homage to that [second] Victor’s Ambassador (Gyal-tshab), a the Dharma lord (Je) endowed
With the seven jewels (Rin-chen) who is [friend to] all the offspring of that lord, who, having found
The exalted wisdom that understood his [Tsong-kha-pa’s] system just as he spoke it,
Saw all dharmas as they really are and excellently taught it to transmigrating beings.

And I pay homage to the single friend and leader of transmigrating beings at the summit of the topknots
Of ten million scholar practitioners (Khay-drub), b who has a glorious excellent goodness (Ge-leg-pal)
As pervading master [Vajra] holder of a hundred families [of tantra], and as a scholar and religious person
Is a good man (Zang-po) perfectly established as endowed with all good fortune.

I pay homage with reverence to the two, the father Victor [Pan-

---

a Gyal-tshab dar-ma-rin-chen (rgyal tshab dar ma rin chen, 1364-1432).
b Khay-drub-ge-leg-pal-zang-po (mkhas grub dge legs dpal bzang po, 1385–1438).
chen Lo-sang-chö-kyi-gyal-tshan\(^a\) and his sons,
The succession of emanation bodies [down to the Great Fifth Dalai Lama]\(^b\)
Who spread wide over the whole ocean-clad earth the yellow-hat tradition of teachings
Famous as a banner flying magnificently in mundane existence.

Through good fortune have I found this celestial wish-fulfilling tree
Hung with a net of ten million jewels of scripture and reasoning,
Fragrant with superior language pervading the ten directions,
And giving forth all the desired perfection of wisdom topics.

Some get puffed up just from seeing the words, certain others
Just plagiarize what has already been said, and most shoot arrows while in the dark
About the words and meanings. I am not explaining here those disputatious works
Written out of attachment and hatred because they are not worth refuting.

---

\(^a\) pan chen blo bzang chos kyi rgyal mtshan 1570–1662.
\(^b\) Ngag-wang-lo-sang-gya-tsho (ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho, 1617–1682).
Without conceit, out of compassion I am explaining here with scripture and reasoning.
The topics of the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom] spoken by our Teacher [the Buddha].
As explained by his ambassador [Maitreya], as in the great chariots’ systems that I discovered.
Through the kindness of eminent persons, so you who are intelligent should listen.

1. Openers of the Chariot-ways

Our incomparable Teacher himself first generated the aspirational mind [toward enlightenment] in the body\(^a\) [of a person] in a hell, then from [a ritual given by] Mahā Śākyamuni while the [Brahmin] boy Illuminator,\(^b\) he generated the practical mind [toward enlightenment]. Then, he accumulated the collections [of merit and wisdom] for three countless eons, and finally, in the body [of a person] in the Highest\(^c\) [Pure Land], reached Buddhahood. As a supreme emanation body, here on this [Rose-apple (jambu)] Continent he set forth 84,000 heaps and doors of doctrine, amongst which the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras are supreme because Dharmamitra’s Clear Words says:\(^d\)

Amongst all the 84,000 heaps of doctrine spoken [by the Buddha] the best, perfect, foremost, and consummate are just these Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras.

\(^a\) *rten,* or “life-support.”
\(^b\) Bhāskara (*snang byed*).
\(^c\) Akaniṣṭha (*'og min*).
\(^d\) Dharmamitra’s Explanation of (Haribhadra’s) “Commentary on (Maitreya’s) ‘Ornament for the Clear Realizations’”: Clear Words (abhisamayālaṃkārakārakāpajñāpāramitopadesāstraṇī prasphutapadā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mgon par rtogs pa ’i rgyan gyi tshig le ’ur byas pa ’i ’grel bshad tshig rab tu gsal ba), lha sa, shes phyin, nya, 2a.7-2b.1.
Regarding the commentaries on the thought of those [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras], there are many because:

- there are:
  1. Nāgārjuna’s Collections of Reasoning,a
  2. Dignāga’s Summary of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra”,b
  3. Kashmiri Daṃśṭasena’s Conquest Over Harm,c and

    a The six are:
    1. Treatise on the Middle, prajñānāmamālamadhyamakārikā, dbu ma rtsa ba ’i tshig le’ur byas pa shes rab,
    2. Refutation of Objections, vigrahavyāvartanikārikā, rtsod pa bzlog pa ’i tshig le’ur byas pa,
    3. Seventy Stanzas on Emptiness, śūnyātāsaptatikārikā, stong pa nyid bdun cu pa ’i tshig le’ur byas pa,
    4. Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning, yuktāṣṭāṣāhasrikārikā, rigs pa drug cu pa ’i tshig le’ur byas pa,
    5. Treatise Called the Finely Woven, vaidalyaśūtrānāma, zhib mo rnam par ’thag pa’i zhes bya ba ’i mdo.

    b prajñāpāramitāpiṇḍārtha, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phin ma bsdus pa ’i tshig le’ur byas pa / bregyad stong bsdus don. The Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra is the aṣṭāḥśāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phin pa bregyad stong pa.

    c Daṃśṭasena’s Extensive Explanation of the Superior One Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eighteen Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras / Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers (āryaśāhasrikāpānicavaiśāhasrikāśāhasrikāśāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-ḥṣattikā, ‘phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phin pa ’bum pa dang nyi khri ’ngag stong pa dang khri bregyad stong pa ’i rgya cher bshad pa / yum gsum gnod ’jom / gnod ’jom che ba), Peking 5206, vol. 93. The Three Mothers are the One Hundred
4. the Foremost Holy\textsuperscript{a} (Maitreya’s) *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*\textsuperscript{b} renowned to earlier Tibetans as the four openers of the chariot-ways [that is, openers of the path for different traditions of explanation],

• and in terms of the actual fact, in accordance with the *Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra*,\textsuperscript{c} the commentaries abide in two [types]—a mode of commentary on the explicit teaching, emptiness, and a mode of commentary on the hidden meaning, the clear realizations.

There are ways in which the first four comment [on the thought of those Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] because:

1. Nāgārjuna comments [on the thought of those Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] in the six Collections of Reasoning that refute a truely estab-

\textsuperscript{a} rje btsun.

\textsuperscript{b} Stanza Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom: Ornament for the Clear Realizations (abhisaṃyālāṃkāra / abhisamayālāṃkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstraśekhā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’i rgyan gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan zhes bya ba’i tshig le’ur byas pa).

\textsuperscript{c} Teaching of Akṣhayamati Sūtra (aksayamatinirdesa, ’phags pa blo gros mi zad pas zhus pas lung bstan pa). Jens Braavig (Akṣayamatinirdesāsūtra [Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1993]) has edited the Tibetan with Sanskrit fragments and provided an English translation.
lished] actuality, the proposition [taken up by our own and others’ Pro-
ponents of Truly Established Things];
2. Dignāga comments on the Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom in
the manner of thirty-two topics;
3. Kashmiri Damṣṭasena' comments on the topics of the Three Mothers
in the manner of three approaches and eleven formats;
4. the Ornament for the Clear Realizations comments [on the thought of
those Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] in the manner of eight categories.

For, Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:

Though there are also many treatises that comment on the thought
of these [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras], the chief are “the four
great openers of the chariot-ways” renowned to earlier [Tibetans].

---
a Tsong-kha-pa’s Extensive Explanation of (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Real-
ization, Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom” as well as
(Haribhadra’s) Commentary: Golden Garland of Eloquence (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin
pa’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan ‘grel pa dang bcas pa’i rgya cher
bshad pa legs bshad gser gyi phreng ba), (zi ling: tsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang ed.,
1986 [the page numbers are the same as vols. tsa and tsha in the gsung 'bum/ tson kha
pa/ (mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang/). TBRC W20510. 11: 11-519. zi ling: mtsho
sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1999.
http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O4CZ18573|O4CZ185734CZ18862SW20510]),3, (Lhasa gsung
'bum('), vol. tsa, digital copy available from ACIP, http://asianclassics.org/re-
lease6/flat/S5412I1_T.TXT), tsa, 3b.,6; English translation by Gareth Sparham, Golden
edition; Sparham, Golden Garland.
The first [which is that the way Nāgārjuna comments on the thought of those Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras in the six Collections of Reasoning that refute a tru(ly established) actuality, the proposition (taken up by our own and others’ Proponents of Truly Established Things)] is established because there are the six:

1. the *Treatise on the Middle*, refuting [in general the proposition of] tru[ly established] actualities [by our own and others’ Proponents of Truly Established Things]4
2. the *Refutation of Objections*, an extension of the meaning of the first chapter of that [*Treatise on the Middle*]
3. the *Seventy Stanzas on Emptiness*, an extension of the meaning of chapter seven
4&5. both the *Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning* and the *Precious Garland*, refuting the tru[ly established] actualities [propounded] by our own [Buddhist] parties in particular5
6. the *Treatise Called the Finely Woven* [or *Fine Pulverization Treatise*], refuting the logicians’ sixteen categories of proofs of tru[ly established] actualities.

Furthermore, Khay-drub-ge-leg-pal-sang’s *General Presentation of*
the Tantra Sets\(a\) explains that the Foremost Holy Ren-da-wa\(b\) asserts five


\(b\) Ren-da-wa Shön-nu-lo-drö (red mda’ ba gzhon nu blo gros, 1349-1412) in his [Commentary on Chandrakīrti’s] Supplement to [Nāgārjuna’s “Root Stanzas on the Middle Way [called Wisdom]” (dbu ma la ’jug pa), Rje btsun red mda’ ba gzhon nu blo gros zhab sgyung ’bum pod lnga pa (Sa skya’i dpe rnying bsdu sgrig khang; 2009), 21-22; the relevant section in which Ren-da-wa does not mention the Precious Garland is:

Nāgārjuna’s works are twofold: commentaries on the profound view factor and commentaries on the vast activities factor. Nāgārjuna’s commentaries on the profound view factor, moreover, are twofold: treatises for cutting off superimpositions with [wisdom arisen from] hearing and thinking and quintessential instructions for practice with [wisdom] arisen from meditation. Nāgārjuna’s treatises for cutting off superimpositions with [wisdom arisen from] hearing and thinking, moreover, are threefold: texts excising (tshar gcod pa) wrong statements, texts looking after the fortunate, and texts engendering respect for the Teacher. Nāgārjuna’s texts excising wrong statements are the Collections of Reasoning because they repudiate with reasons all eternalist and nihilistic statements of our own [Buddhist] and other [Nonbuddhist] schools…Amongst these, Nāgārjuna’s Collections of Reasoning is twofold: refuting propositions of truly established actualities and refuting the reasoning of logicians proving [such]. Also, Nāgārjuna’s texts refuting the proposition of a truly established actuality are twofold: demonstrations of refutations of others’ systems that are stated as positive inclusions (yongs gcod, pariccheda) and a dispelling of objections to our own system stated as a mere negation (rnam bcad, vyavaccheda). Also, Nāgārjuna’s texts demonstrating refutations of others’ systems that are stated as positive inclusions are twofold: a refutation of both our own and others’ systems in common and a specific refutation of our own systems. Nāgārjuna’s text refuting both our own and others’ systems in common is the Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Called Wisdom. Nāgārjuna’s text specifically refuting our own systems is the Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning. Also, Nāgārjuna’s texts dispelling objections to our own system stated as a mere negation is twofold: the Refutation of Objections dispels in general the objection that propounding the absence of inherent existence contradicts reasoning, and the Seventy Stanzas on Emptiness dispels in particular that propounding that compounded things are not produced and do not disintegrate contradicts scripture…The second, Nāgārjuna’s text refuting the reasoning of logicians proving [propositions of truly established actualities], is the Treatise Called the Finely Woven.
Collections of Reasoning and that the Foremost Precious [Tsong-kha-pa] asserts six as above.

It follows that a certain [Avalokitarata’s] making the Totally Fearless into one of the Collections of Reasonings is not logically correct because this [Totally Fearless] is not an autocommentary on Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle Called Wisdom because it cites as a source [Nāgārjuna’s student], “Also the holy Āryadeva[…].” In the twelfth century, Ar Chang-chub-ye-shay (ar byang chub ye shes, fl. c. 1100) in his Explanation of (Haribhadra’s) “Commentary on (Maitreya’s) ‘Ornament for the Clear Realizations’” (mngon rtogs rgyan gyi ‘grel pa rnam ’byed), Ar byang chub ye shes kyi gsung chos skor: bka’ gdams dpe dkon gees blus. 2. (Krung go’i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007), 293, already mentions “Six Collections of Reasoning,” though without listing them.

a Totally Fearless (mūlamadhyamakavṛttiya-kutobhaya, dbu ma rtsa ba’i ’grel pa ga las ’jigs med).

b lha sa, dbu ma, tsa, 98a.6. The point is that a master would not cite his student.
The second [which is the way that Dignāga comments on the *Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom* in the manner of thirty-two topics] exists because it explains in the manner of thirty-two consisting of:

1. foundation [the speaker of the *Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom*]: our Teacher [Shākyamuni];
2. sphere of influence: his Bodhisattva and Hearer and Solitary Realizer retinue;
3. actions [to be performed by the retinue]: how to practice the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom];
4.-13. meditations [that are the objects practiced]: the ten;
14.-29. divisions [of the objects of those meditations]: the sixteen emptinesses;
30. signs [of erroneous and nonerroneous modes of practicing those]: the signs of demonic activities and of irreversibility;
31. falling [where if practiced wrongly]: bad rebirth when having rejected the perfection of wisdom;
32. benefit [of practicing well]: merit that comes from writing down the Perfection of Wisdom, a merit greater than from filling up a trillion⁴ [worlds] with seven precious substances and offering that.

For, Dignāga’s *Summary of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom*

---

⁴ *stong gsum*, a thousand to the third power.
Sūtra” says:a 

[Buddhas] have expounded on the foundation, sphere of influence, and actions along with meditations, divisions, signs, falling, and benefit.

It treats the ten meditations and the sixteen emptinesses individually.

The third [which is the way that Kashmiri Daṃṣṭasena comments on the topics of the Three Mothers in the manner of three approaches and eleven formats] exists because:

the three approaches are described as:

1. The approach of condensed teaching of the topics of the Three Mothers [that is, the brief, medium, and extensive Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] in four modes [about who, why, in what, and how Bodhisattvas train in the Perfection of Wisdom] for those who understand through mentioning the beginning,b is [the single sentence] after the [sūtra’s] Introduction, [where the Supramundane Victor says]:c

---


b In contrast to requiring elaboration on the aspects.

c This is found, for example, in Haribhadra’s Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra in Eight Chapters (paṇḍavaṁśāḥśaḥśrikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nying nying pa’i le’i bṛgyad ma), lha sa, shes phyin, ga, 26a.1, which is the basis of the translation by Edward Conze, The Large Sūtra on Perfect Wisdom (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), (hereafter Conze, Large Sutra). This is the version in Paṇḍavaṁśāḥśaḥśrikā Prajñāpāramitā, ed. with critical notes and introduc-
Shāriputra, a great Bodhisattva who wants to fully know all phenomena should make effort in the perfection of wisdom.

2. Then, the [second] approach is from there up to the end of the exalted-knowledge-of-all-aspects [section]—a middle length teaching in the ultimate mode for those who understand from an elaboration in aspects.

3. The [third] approach is the rest from there on, stemming from the knowledge of paths [section up to the completion of the Sūtra] for the sake of those who have a liking for words, explaining at length a teaching in the two truths mode.

and the eleven formats are described as:

1. one format where [the Supramundane Victor] addresses and explains to Shāriputra
2. then a format which is the explanation at length by Subhūti
3.-10. then the Shakra, Subhūti, Maitreya, Subhūti, Shakra, Subhūti, Maitreya, and Subhūti formats
11. then the format where Ānanda is [addressed by the Supramundane Victor and] entrusted [with the Sūtra].
For, Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* says:\(^a\)

The textual commentary *Conquest Over Harm* that is the Extensive Explanation of the two, the Extensive and Medium-length, and the Eighteen Thousand Mothers [that is, of the One Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eighteen Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras]\(^b\) comments on the Mothers in terms of three approaches and eleven formats.

---

\(^a\) *mtsho sngon* edition, 5; ACIP edition, *tsa*, 4b.2; Sparham, *Golden Garland*, vol. 1, 7.

\(^b\) There are two books called *Conquest Over Harm* (*gnod ’joms*), this one commenting on the One Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eighteen Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras (Peking 5206, vol. 93) and another one commenting only on the One Hundred Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra (Peking 5205).
Someone\textsuperscript{a} says: This [textual commentary \textit{Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers}] is written by Vasubandhu.\textsuperscript{b}


\textsuperscript{b} The confusion over the author and name of this text arises because the name of the text given in the catalogues does not match the name given in the text itself, and the catalogues do not give an author.

This text is the second \textit{prajñāpāramitā} commentary in the oldest catalogue (\textit{lhan kar ma} 515) (Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, \textit{Die \textit{lHan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte}. Kritische Neuauflage mit Einleitung und Materialien} (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2008. Denkschriften, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, number 367. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, number 59), 293. There it is called \textit{shes kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'bum dang nyi khri lnga stong dang khri bryad p'ai rgya cher bshad pa}.

In the catalogue to the Peking edition (Suzuki 1955-61) number 5206 and so on this text is called \textit{'phags pa 'shes kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'bum pa dang nyi khri lnga stong pa dang khri bryad stong p'ai rgya cher bshad pa}. The Sanskrit title given there \textit{śatasāhasrikāpālacakāvsanātāḥ śahasrikāśādiśrāsaḥ śahasrikāprajñāpāramitābhrṝṣṭikā} may be simply a reconstruction from the Tibetan title because there is no information about it in the colophon beyond the statement that it was translated by the famous Ye-shay-day (\textit{ye shes sde}).

This text is better known by the name \textit{yum gsum gnod 'joms} (\textit{Conquest Over Objections to the Three Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras]}). Elsewhere I have shortened \textit{Conquest Over Objections} to \textit{Defense} for stylistic reasons. This name comes from the last line of the text's opening stanza \textit{‘di yi gzhung 'grel gnod 'joms bya bar 'dod} (dpe bsdur edition, 645), “I want to make a commentary on the texts, [that is, the \textit{Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras}] to make a conquest over harm [that is, objections].” If one takes \textit{bya ba} as short for \textit{zhes bya ba} it would be explicitly a title, “I want [to make] a commentary on the texts, [that is, the \textit{Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras}] called ‘Conquest Over Objections.”

In the \textit{Mahāvyutpatti} the term \textit{gzhung 'grel} renders \textit{paddhati}. Under this entry Monier-Williams gives the translation “a well-trodden path.” There it is used to mean, amongst other things, a particular type of commentary. The \textit{Mahāvyutpatti} gives for \textit{gnod pa choms}
pa the word marditakaṁṭaka (“Thorn-crusher”), where a “thorn” (kaṇṭa) also has the same sense as a “thorny argument”; cp. the similar compound marditaśatrakaṁṭakaṁ in the sadharmapuṇḍarikāvatāra (Vaidya, 242.1); Tibetan dgra’i isher ma dkrugs so, dam pa’i chos pad ma dkar po’i mdo (Iha sa, mdo sde, ja, 248b.1). Based on this probable Sanskrit reconstruction, the title would be Well-trodden Path Crusher of Thorny Arguments [Against the Perfection of Wisdom Śūtras(s)], or Well-trodden Path Conquest of Objections to the Three Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Śūtras]).

The name of the text is important for understanding why some say the author is Vasubandhu. (I have discussed these issues in detail in “Demons on the Mother: Objections to the Perfect Wisdom Śūtras in Tibet,” in Changing Minds. Contributions to the Study of Buddhism and Tibet in Honor of Jeffrey Hopkins, ed. by Guy Newland (Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, 2001).

In the opening stanzas of his Illumination Commentary (abhisamayālaṁkāra-vyākhyā ālokā, short Tibetan title rgyan snang, Illumination of the “Ornament”) Haribhadra makes homage to (a) Vasubandhu whom he appears to slightly criticize: bhāva-bhāva-vibhāga-paśa-nipunajñāhīṁmānānataḥ / ācāraya vasubandhur arthakahathane prāptas-padaḥ paddhatu (Wogihara’s edition, 1); āngos dang āngos med rnam dbyeu phyogs la mkhas par shes pa’i mgon gnyis mθo ba / slob dpon dbhyig gnyen gnyis ni gzhung gi ’grel par don bshad pa la gnas thob gyur (sde dge shes phyin, cha, 2a.2). “The master Vasubandhu, towering in the pride of a clever knowledge of views about the division of being and nonbeing, attained a position describing the topics in his Paddhati.” (Here too the word paddhati is rendered into Tibetan by gzhung gi ’grel pa; the gi and pa are dictated by meter.)

At the end of the Commentary called “Following the Tradition of Her Ladyship [the Perfection of Wisdom]” (bhagavatī-cūryānusārinī-nāma-ryākhyāna, man nag rjes ’brang), a little read Indian Perfection of Wisdom commentary by Shi-wa-jung-nay (zhi ba ’byung gnas, *śāntākara), it says (sde dge, shes phyin, ba, 316b.3-6):

Explanations other than that of the Paddhati are not to be accepted. This is because Superior Maitreyanātha spoke on account of the fact that the master [Vasubandhu] would explain five hundred śūtras. So how could he [Vasubandhu] make a wrong explanation? Since [Vasubandhu] explains [in the opening stanza of his Paddhati] that it is on account of [his] guru’s instruction that “I want to compose clearly a Paddhati that is a ‘Conquest Over Objections’ to the Perfection of Wisdom Āvatāra,” he thus shelters in the quintessential instructions that came from exalted presence, the Superior Asaṅga himself.” (de bzhin du gzhan la yang gzhung ’grel las log pa’i gzhan rnam s kyi bshad pa gzung bya ma yin pa nyid do // gang gi phyir slob dpon dbhyig gnyen mθo sde lṅga brgya bshad pa’i phyir ’phags pa mgon po byams pas bka’ stsal pa de bas na / ci ltar phyin ci log tu bshad pa mdzad, bla ma’i man ngag las gzhung ’grel gnod ’joms gsal por bya bar ‘dod, ces bya ba bshad pa’i ’phags pa thogs med kyi zhal snga nas nyid kyi man ngag la skyabs su byed do.)

Based on this exchange some Tibetan writers say Vasubandhu wrote this text (the paddhati, gzhung ’grel). In particular, Dol-po-pa Shay-rab-gyal-tshan privileges this text over Maitreyā’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations as an explanation of the Perfection of Wisdom Śūtras, and excoriates Haribhadra as a writer in a degenerate age whose works have no value (see his shes rab kyi phar rol tu phyin pa man ngag gi bston bcos mgon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gnyi rnam bshad mdo’i don bde blag tu rtogs[s] pa. ‘Dzam-Thang Edition of the
Our response: It follows these statements [by someone that this textual commentary Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers] is written by Vasubandhu and so forth] are not logically feasible, because this textual commentary Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers is renowned in earlier old works to be composed by Daṃṣṭasena. [That this textual commentary Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers is renowned in earlier old works to be composed by Daṃṣṭasena] entails [that these statements by someone that this is written by Vasubandhu, and so forth] are not logically feasible; the reason [which is that this textual commentary Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers is renowned in earlier old works to be composed by Daṃṣṭasena] is established because the Phagthang catalogue describes the textual commentary on the three Perfection of Wisdom [Sūtras], Conquest Over Harm, and translated by the translator Ye-shay-day, as by Daṃṣṭasena, and the textual commentary on only the Hundred Thousand, Conquest Over Harm, as by [King] Tri-song-de-tsan.

Collected Works of Kun-Mkhyen Dol-po-pa Shes-Rab-Rgyal-Mtshan, ed. by Matthew Kapstein (Delhi: 1992), vol. 4 (mā), part two, 373). Others like Ar Chang-chub-ye-shay and Tsong-kha-pa say the author is not Vasubandhu. Ar says, “Some say there is a Paddhati by master Vasubandhu that connects [Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations] Treatise with the [Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom in] Eight Chapters. I doubt anybody exists who has even seen that.” (p. 294 slob dpon dbyig gnyen gyis mdo le'u brgyad ma dang bstan boos shyar ba'i gzhung gi 'grel pa yod zer yang / sus kyang mthong ba tsam yod pa mi 'dra'o). Citing the different title in the catalogues and other evidence, Tsong-kha-pa in his Golden Garland (mtsho sngon edition, 5; ACIP edition, tsa, 4b.2; Sparham, Golden Garland, vol. 1, 7) says the author is probably the Kashmiri Daṃṣṭasena (kha che sde, damṣtraena/damṣtrāsena).

Since in this present book for the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies the general principle is to keep with the literal Tibetan rendering, we are using “textual commentary” to translate gzhung ’grel.

a Ye-shay-day, ye shes sde (fl. 8th century).
b Tri-song-de-tsan’s (khris rtsong sde btsan, 755-804) Extensive Commentary on the One Hundred Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'bum gyi rgya cher 'grel pa, satasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitābhyāṣṭikā; Peking 5205).
The fourth [which is that the way the Ornament for the Clear Realizations comments on the thought of those Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras in the manner of eight categories] exists because the Foremost Holy Maitreya explains the corpus of the long, middling, and short Mothers [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] in nine or five cycles as eight categories and seventy topics, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:¹

The Victor Ajita composed the Ornament for the Clear Realizations systematizing the contents of the Mothers as the eight clear realizations and seventy topics, and connecting them with the stages in yogic practice.

I will explain whether these [four—Nāgārjuna’s Collections of Reasonings, Dignāga’s Summary of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra, Daṃṣṭasena’s Conquest Over Harm, and the Foremost Holy Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations] are or are not openers of chariot-ways below [on the occasion of (examining) the statements by earlier Tibetans that “The openers of the chariot-ways who did not rely on other commentators are limited to Nāgārjuna, Dignāga, Vasubandhu, and the Foremost Holy Maitreya” and so forth (see below, 84)].

Hence, there are twenty-one Indian commentaries on the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* because there are twelve that correlate it with [specific] śūtras and nine that do not. The first [which is that there are twelve that correlate the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* with specific śūtras] is established because there are the twelve consisting of:

FOUR [THAT CONNECT THE *ORNAMENT* WITH THE EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND]
1. Āryavimuktisena’s *Commentary on the Twenty-five Thousand*,
2. Bhadanta Vimuktisena’s *Subcommentary on the Twenty-five Thousand*,
3. the Master [Haribhadra’s] commentary [called] the *Twenty-five Thousand in Eight Chapters*,

---


*b Haribhadra’s *Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Śūtra in Eight Chapters* /
4. Ratnākarashānti’s *Purity* commentary on the *Twenty-five Thousand*,\(^a\)

**ONE THAT CONNECTS THE ** Ornament with the **ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND**

5. the commentary widely attributed to Dharmashrī from Kashmir;\(^b\)

**THREE THAT CONNECT THE ** Ornament with the Brief [EIGHT THOUSAND]

6. the Master Haribhadra’s long *Illumination* commentary on the Eight Thousand;\(^c\)

7. Ratnākara’s *Quintessence*,\(^d\)

8. Abhayākara’s *Moonlight*,\(^e\)

**THREE THAT CONNECT THE ** Ornament with the Stanza Summary

9. Haribhadra’s *Easy Pañjikā*,\(^g\)

10. Buddhajñāna’s *Stanza Summary Pañjikā*,\(^h\) and

---

Twenty-five Thousand in Eight Chapters / Eight Chapters
(paścimavesatīhasīkāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phrin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa/le’u brgyad ma).

\(^a\) Ratnākarashānti’s Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations”: *Purity* (abhisamayālāṃkārakāvīrtīsuuddhamatīnāma, mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi ’grel pa’i tshig le’ur byas pa’i ’grel pa dag ldan).

\(^b\) Dharmashrī’s Explanation of the “One Hundred Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra” (śatasāhasrikāvīvarāṇa, stong phrag brgya pa’i rnam par bshad pa).


\(^d\) Ratnākarashānti’s Commentary on the Difficult Points of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra”: *Quintessence* (ārya-aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā-paṇjikāsāratnamā, phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phrin pa brgyad stong pa’i dka’ ’grel snying po mchod).

\(^e\) Abhayākara-gupta’s Commentary on the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra”: Moonlight of Essential Points (aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāvṛtti-marmakaumudī, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phrin pa brgyad stong pa’i ’grel pa gnad kyi zla ba’i ’od).

\(^f\) Stanza Summary of the Perfection of Wisdom (prajñāpāramitāsāncayagāthā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phrin pa sṅgod pa tshigs su bcad pa).

\(^g\) Haribhadra’s Commentary that Makes the Difficult Points of the “Stanza Summary of the Precious Qualities of the Supramundane Victorious [Mother]” Easy to Understand (bhagavatīratnaāsasamcyagāthāpaṇjikāsubdhiṅnāma, bcom ldan ‘das yon tan rin po che sdbus pa’i tshig su bcad pa’i dka’ ’grel).

\(^h\) Buddhajñāna’s Commentary on the Difficult Points of the “Stanza Summary” (saṃcayagāthāpaṇjikā, bsdus pa tshig su bcad pa’i dka’ ’grel).
11. Dharmashrī from Kashmir’s *Key to the Treasury;*\(^a\)

*[ONE THAT CONNECTS THE ORNAMENT WITH] THE ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND, TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND, AND EIGHTEEN THOUSAND PERFECTION OF WISDOM SŪTRAS*

12. *the Teaching Through Eight Concordant Meanings*\(^b\) widely attributed to Śrījñānakīrti.

For, Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* says:\(^c\)

> With respect to commentaries following this *Ornament* there are twelve that correlate it with [specific] sūtras.

\(^a\) Dharmashrī’s *Key to the Treasury of the Perfection of Wisdom* (prajñāpāramitākośatalā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i mdzod kyi lde mig).

\(^b\) Śrījñānakīrti’s *Indicating Through Eight Concordant Meanings the Mother Perfection of Wisdom Taught Extensively in One Hundred Thousand, Taught in Medium Length in Twenty-five Thousand, and Taught in Brief in Eight Thousand* (prajñāpāramitāmārtikā-satāsāhasrikābhacchāsanapāclcavimsātisāhasrikāmādhyaśāsāṣṭāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭāsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातस्मातsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭάsāṣṭातस्मातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭāt

\(^b\) Śrījñānakīrti’s *Indicating Through Eight Concordant Meanings the Mother Perfection of Wisdom Taught Extensively in One Hundred Thousand, Taught in Medium Length in Twenty-five Thousand, and Taught in Brief in Eight Thousand* (prajñāpāramitāmārtikā-satāsāhasrikābhacchāsanapālcavimsātisāhasrikāmādhyaśāsāṣṭāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭāsquashāsanāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭातsāṣṭāt

\(^c\) *mtsho sngon* edition, 9; ACIP edition, *tsa,* 6b.5; Sparham, *Golden Garland,* vol. 1, 11.
The second [which is that there are nine that do not correlate the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* with specific sūtras] is established because there are nine consisting of:

1. Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* [that reveals the topics],
2. and its [Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary*’s] two subcommentaries—Dharmamitra’s *Clear Words* and
3. Serlingpa’s *Illumination of the Difficult to Realize*,
4. and its [Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary*’s] Summary by Prajñākaramatī,
5. the two *Summaries* of the root text [Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*] by the Elder [Atisha],
6. and Kumārashrī,
7. Ratnakīrti’s *Ratnakīrti’s Commentary*,
8. Buddhajñāna’s *Wisdom Lamp Garland Commentary*,

---


*b* Prajñākaramatī (shes rab ’byung gnas blo gros, 950-1030), *Summary of (Haribhadra’s) “Commentary on (Maitreya’s) ‘Ornament for the Clear Realizations’”* (abhisamayālambākāravrītīpiṇḍārtha, mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi ’grel pa’i bsdu s don).

*c* Atisha, *Lamp Summary of (Maitreya’s) “Perfection of Wisdom”* (prajñāpāramitāpiṇḍārthapradīpa, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i don bsdu sgron ma).

*d* Kumārashrīḥadhra, *Summary of (Maitreya’s) “Perfection of Wisdom”* (prajñāpāramitāpiṇḍārtha, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i don bsdu s don pa).

*e* Ratnakīrti, *Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations’”*: A Portion of Glory (abhisamayālāṃkāravrīttikīrtikalānāma, mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi ’grel pa grags pa’i cha).

*f* Buddhajñāna, *Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Supramundane Victorious Mother Perfection of Wisdom: Ornament for the Clear Realizations’”*: Wisdom Lamp Garland (abhisamayālāṃkārabhāagavyati-prajñāpāramitotpadeśaśastraḥprajñāpāramitāpiṇḍārtha, bcom ldan ’das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i
9. and Abhayākara’s *Ornament for the Thought of the Sage*.\(^a\)

As Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* says:\(^b\)

There are twenty-one commentaries…and nine that do not.

“Widely attributed” [means] there is doubt [as to the attribution].\(^c\)

The second root reason\(^d\) which are the modes of commenting on the explicit and the hidden meanings] exist because:

1. in accordance with the *Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra* the glorious Nāgārjuna differentiates the definitive and the interpretable of the Middle Way system through his Collections of Reasoning, and the Victor Maitreya also explains it similarly in his *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle*\(^e\) and *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*, which Asaṅga also explains in his *Explanation of (Maitreya’s)*

---

\(^a\) Abhayākaragupta, *Ornament for the Thought of the Sage* (munimatālaṃkāra, thub pa’i phyrga pa’i phyrga).


\(^d\) Maitreya’s *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle*, or *Great Vehicle Treatise on the Sublime Continuum* (mahāvānoittaratrantrasāstra, theg pa chen po rgyud bla...
“Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle,”
a
2. and in accordance with the meaning of the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought,b the Foremost Holy Maitreya differentiates the interpretable and the definitive in his Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras, Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes, and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon,c and [Asaṅga’s] Five Treatises on the Grounds and Two Summaries do it following those, [that is, Maitreya’s Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras, Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes, and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon].

ma’i bstan bcos).
a Asaṅga’s Explanation of (Maitreya’s) “Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle” (mahāyānottaratantraśāstravyākhyā, theg pa chen po’i rgyud bla ma’i bstan bcos kyi rnam par bshad pa).
b Sūtra Unraveling the Thought (saṃdhinirmocanasūtra, dgongs pa nges par ’grel pa’i mdo).
c Maitreya’s Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras (mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra, theg pa chen po’i mdo sde rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa); Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes (madhyāntavibhāgaśākārikā, dbu dang mtha’ rnam par ’byed pa tshigs su byas pa); and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon (dharmaḥmaṭāvibhāṅga,chos dang chos nyid rnam par ’byed pa).
d “Five Treatises on the Grounds” renders sa sde lnga, that is, the subdivision of Asaṅga’s Grounds of Yogic Practice (yogācāraśāstra, rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa) into five sections. Jeffrey Hopkins in the bibliography of Maps of the Profound (Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, 1060-1061) gives the usual list:

1. Activity of the Grounds, bhūmivastu, sa’i dngos gzhi
2. Compendium of Ascertainties, viniscayasaṃgrahani, rnam par gtan la dbah pa bsdu ba
3. Compendium of Bases, vastusaṃgraha, gzhi bsdu ba
4. Compendium of Enumerations, paryāyasamgraha, rnam grang bsdu ba
5. Compendium of Explanations, vākhyāmukhasamgraha / vivaranasaṃgraha, rnam par bshad pa bsdu ba.

He lists the Two Summaries (sdom rnam gnyis) as

1. Summary of Manifest Knowledge, abhidharmasamuccaya, chos mngon pa kun blus

According to Situ Paṇchen’s introduction to the De-ge (sde dge) edition of the Translation of the Treatises (bstan ’gyur) (folios 150-151), there are seven works of Asaṅga. Of the seven, the sa sde Inga (“set of five grounds”) are the root. Amongst them, the sa’i dngos gzhi (“fundamental ground”) “teaches the way to enlightenment for a single person by summarizing the conditions under seventeen grounds.” What are the seventeen? The first two grounds are from the perspective of the basis for the practice—the continuum of the collection of eight consciousnesses. The 3rd to 5th grounds are the bare fundamental stage of the first concentration, when it is special, and from the second concentration on up.
Taken at different times (gnas skabs) there are four grounds within those: with meditative stabilization in the Form and Formless realms, without meditative stabilization in the Desire Realm, without mind (when absorbed in the cessation of discrimination and feeling, and absorbed in cessation), and with mind (otherwise).

The last eight are the three all-inclusive grounds: the hearing, thinking, and meditation grounds when the basis is taken in a series; the three Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Bodhisattva grounds (because there are just the three vehicles) when taken from the perspective of the results you get to; and the last two grounds that are the results of the three vehicles.

The second of the seven works of Asaṅga (and second of the five in the set of five levels) is the Compendium of Ascertainments. It is like a commentary on the sa'i dngos gzhi and in particular ascertains that the defilement and purification sides are the basic topic that it has to talk about.

The third, the Compendium of Bases shows how the sa'i dngos gzhi (“fundamental ground”) brings together in itself the three scriptural collections. In its opening précis it brings together the three scriptural collections, but in its detailed section only the Vinaya and Sūtra scriptural collections.

The fourth, the Compendium of Enumerations ascertains the presence of many specific synonymous passages about defilement and purification.

And the fifth, the Compendium of Explanations teaches the subject matter, the language a buddha uses when speaking, and how it functions as teaching.

Of the two summaries (making up the sixth and seventh of the seven works of Asaṅga) the Summary of Manifest Knowledge brings together its subject matter under five headings: definitions, ascertaining the truths, ascertaining the dharmas, ascertaining the attainments, and ascertaining the discourses, and teaches tenets shared by the Hearers and Yogācāra such as the production, lasting, and perishing of dharmas, as well as tenets like the eight consciousnesses and three natures.

The other is the Summary of the Great Vehicle.
The first [which is that in accordance with the Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra] the glorious Nāgārjuna differentiates the interpretable and the definitive of the Middle Way system through his Collections of Reasoning, and the Victor Maitreya also explains it similarly in his Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle and Ornament for the Clear Realizations, which Asaṅga also explains in his Explanation of (Maitreya’s) “Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle] is established because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says: 

Following the former Sūtra, the protector Nāgārjuna differentiates between interpretable and definitive,

and:

In Maitreya’s Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle it is explained that the extensive, medium-length, and condensed Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] and the Matrix of the One-Gone-Thus Sūtra\(^b\) clearly teach without difference that the object of observation of the path is the emptiness of true existence of all phenomena, the ultimate truth free from all proliferations that:

- is to be taught at a later time to those whose continuums have been ripened through familiarization with the system of Cognition-Only
- and is to be taught right from the first to those in the Great

---

\(a\) Gyal-tshab’s Explanation of (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations” and (Haribhadra’s) Commentary: Ornament for the Essence (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi rtsa ba ’grel pa dang bcas pa’i rnam bshad snying po’i rgyan); hereafter cited as Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence (rnam bshad snying po rgyan), kha. 3b.1, and 4a.3-4b.1; Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only parts of the first and last lines of the second passage; I have provided the entire citation.

\(b\) Matrix of the One-Gone-Thus Sūtra (tathāgatagarbhāsūtra, de bzhin gshogs pa’i snying po’i mdo).
Vehicle lineage who have the supreme faculties
• and definitely must be realized even to attain Hearer enlightenment and Solitary Realizer enlightenment.

Since the master Asaṅga in commentary on that\(^a\) made clarification exactly in accordance with [Maitreya’s] thought, you should not think that he differs from the protector Nāgārjuna, the opener of the chariot-way relative to the first differentiation of the interpretable and definitive, because he is following just him [Nāgārjuna].

The second [which is that in accordance with the meaning of the Sūtra

\(^a\) Asaṅga’s Explanation of (Maitreya’s) “Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle (mahāyānottaratantraśāstravyākhyā, theg pa chen po ’i rgyad bla ma ’i bstan bcos kyi rnam par bshad pa).
Unraveling the Thought, the Foremost Holy Maitreya differentiates the interpretable and the definitive in his Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras, Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes, and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon, and (Asaṅga’s) Five Treatises on the Grounds and Two Summaries do it following those] is established because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says: Following these three treatises, [the Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras and the two Differentiations,] and in accordance with the way the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought differentiates the interpretable and definitive, the Master [Asaṅga] in his Five Treatises on the Grounds, two Summaries, and so on opened well the chariot-way of Cognition-Only.

---

a Maitreya’s Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras (mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra, theg pa chen po ’i mdo sde rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa); Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes (madhyāntavibhāgakārikā, dbu dang mtha’ rnam par ’byed pa tshigs su byas pa); and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon (dharmadharmanvibhaṅga, chos dangchos nyid rnam par ’byed pa).

b kha, 4a.1-2.

c The Five Treatises on the Grounds are:

1. Grounds of Yogic Practice (yogācārabhūmi, rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa)
2. Compendium of Ascertainments (nirṇayasaṃgraha / viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī, rnam par gtan la dhab pa bsdu ba)
3. Compendium of Bases (vastusaṃgraha, gzhi bsdu ba)
4. Compendium of Enumerations (paryāyasaṃgraha, rnam grang bsdu ba)
5. Compendium of Explanations (vivaraṇasaṃgraha, rnam par bshad pa bsdu ba)

d The Two Summaries are:

1. Summary of Manifest Knowledge (abhidharmasamuccaya, chos mngon pa kun btus)
2. Summary of the Great Vehicle (mahāyānasamgraha, theg pa chen po bsduś pa)
Thus, [my] explanation of the Master [Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning*] Commentary in line with:

- most of the twenty-one commentaries of the Country of Superiors [India],
- and primarily the two *Illuminations*\(^a\) by Āryavimuktisena and by Haribhadra,
- and the *Ornament of the Essence* which is quintessential instructions about how to put the topics into practice in detail that Tsong-kha-pa bestowed on the Precious Gyal-tshab at Ra-dreng,\(^b\) when at a later time Tsong-kha-pa studied the Perfection of Wisdom with the Foremost Holy [Mañjushrī], and Gyal-tshab took them down as notes

has three parts: the meaning of the title, the meaning of the text, and the meaning of the conclusion.

---

\(^a\) The “two *Illuminations*” (snang ba gnyis) are *nyi snang* and *rgyan snang*, standard abbreviations for Āryavimuktisena's Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “*Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the ‘Superior Twenty-Five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra’: Ornament for the Clear Realizations*” and Haribhadra’s *Explanation of the ‘Eight Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra’: Illumination of (Maitreya's) ‘Ornament for the Clear Realizations,***

\(^b\) *rwa sgreng.*
This has two parts: title and translators’ homage.

A. TITLE

This is:

Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom Called Ornament for the Clear Realizations”

B. TRANSLATORS’ HOMAGE

This has two parts: the number of the set of pages and the translators’ homage.

1. The number of the set of pages

This is:

\[ \text{aJam-yang-shay-pa cites only the beginning and end of the passage. This renders the Tibetan title } \text{shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyn pa’i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan shes bya ba’i ’grel pa (sde dge sher phyn, ja, 78bff.), which is based on Haribhadra’s title, Elucidation of the Stanza Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom Called Ornament for the Clear Realizations (abhisamayālakārakārikā śāstra-vivṛti) as found in Koei H. Amano, Abhisamayālakārakārikā śāstra-vivṛti. Haribhadra’s Commentary on the Abhisamayālakārakārikā śāstra edited for the first time from a Sanskrit Manuscript (Kyoto: Heirakuji-Shoten. 2000). Hereafter this is cited as Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary, based on the short Tibetan title ‘grel pa don gsal.} \]
The first set of pages.\textsuperscript{a}

2. The translators’ homage

This is:

Homage to all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.

These are easy [to understand].

II. MEANING OF THE TEXT

This has three parts: the way the explanation is introduced, the way the actual explanation is arrayed, and the way the explanation is brought to its conclusion.

A. THE WAY THE EXPLANATION IS INTRODUCED

This has three parts: expression of worship and commitment to give an explanation, establishing it is reasonable to compose the commentary, and the reason for humility and generating enthusiasm.

\textsuperscript{a} The notation \textit{bam po dang po} ("the first set of pages" which is equal to about 300 lines of an original text) is inserted into Haribhadra’s text here by the Tibetan translators, as is their homage.
1. Expression of worship and commitment to give an explanation

[Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* says:]

Respectful homage to the perfection of wisdom
In order to open up
The *Versified Ornament* of those
As an ornament for all.

This has two parts, syllogism and decisive analysis.

**a. Syllogism**

The subject, the master Haribhadra, makes praise and homage to all three perfections of wisdom—text, path, and result—because while expressing the good qualities of the three perfections of wisdom he bows the three doors [of his body, speech, and mind], because Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* says:

Respectful homage to the perfection of wisdom.

and because with “perfection of wisdom” he praises by way expressing good qualities, and bowing is homage.

---

* Both the 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (7b.1) and the 2015 Lhasa Go-mang (5a.7) misread *ka ri bhā tra.*
There is a purpose in his making praise and homage, because it is in order to:

- accomplish the two aims of oneself and others;
- pacify impediments
- and comment on the Ornament of the Mothers, that is, [Maitreya’s] Versified Ornament for the Clear Realizations, in the manner of an ornament that highlights all three—the extensive, middle-length, and condensed Mothers [that is, the One Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras], because Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary says:

  In order to open up
  The Versified Ornament of those
  As an ornament for all.
There is a purpose in [his] making a commitment to compose the text with “in order to open up” because it is in order to bring the composition to a [successful] conclusion, because Tsong-kha-pa’s *Golden Garland* says:\(^a\)

“Open up” means to open up just the topics; this is [Haribhadra’s] commitment to compose [the text].

and Nāgārjuna’s *Tree of Wisdom* says:\(^b\)

The excellent do not make many promises,
But if they do rarely make a commitment,
Like a picture carved in rock, they do not
Do otherwise, though they might die.

The subject, this *Clear Meaning* Commentary, has the four—\(^12\)—a purpose and so on—because:

1. the Sūtras and the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* together with their contents are the subject matter;
2. realization that Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* is a clarifier of the three *Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras]* is the purpose;
3. the exalted-knower-of-all-aspects that the intended trainees of this *Clear Meaning Commentary* will attain is the essential purpose;
4. and the relationship of the latter with each of the former among the three [the subject matter, the purpose, and the essential purpose] is the relationship—this being implicitly indicated.

---


\(^b\) *prajñādāṇḍa/nitiśāstraprajñādāṇḍa*, *shes rab sdong bu/ lugs kyi bstan bcos shes rab sdong bu; lha sa, lugs kyi bstan bcos, ngo*, 103b.6.
The first [part of the reason which is that the Sūtras and the Ornament for the Clear Realizations together with their contents are the subject matter] is established because it mainly explains the contents of the Sūtras and the treatise [Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations], because Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary says:

[The Versified] Ornament of those [Mother Sūtras].

The second [part of the reason which is that realization that Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations is a clarifier of the three Mother Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras is the purpose] is established because this [realization that the Ornament is a clarifier of the three Mother Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] is the intent to be achieved by the Commentary, because Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary says:

As an ornament for all.

and Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland of Eloquence says:

The second [that is, the purpose] is the realization that it is an ornament for all three Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras].

---

The third [part of the reason which is that the exalted-knower-of-all-aspects that the intended trainees of this (Clear Meaning Commentary) will attain is the essential purpose] is established because attaining this is the final purpose, because Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary says:

the perfection of wisdom

and Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:\textsuperscript{a}

The third [the essential purpose] is the attainment of the pristine wisdom of a One-Gone-Thus, or, by a different name, the perfection of wisdom, when in dependence upon this [Clear Meaning Commentary] hearing, thinking, and meditation arrive at final completion.

\textsuperscript{a} mtsho sngon edition, 21; ACIP edition tsa, 14a.3-4; Sparham, Golden Garland, vol. 1, 25.
The fourth [part of the reason which is that the relationship of the latter with each of the former among the three (the subject matter, the purpose, and the essential purpose) is the relationship—this being implicitly indicated] is established because, in regard to the relationship among these, there must be a relationship of method and that arisen from method, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says: a

The fourth [that is, the relationship] is that the treatise and the purpose or the two purposes [the purpose and essential purpose] are related as cause and effect; this [relationship of the latter with each of the former among the three—the subject matter, the purpose, and the essential purpose] is implicit.

b. Decisive analysis

I. With respect to the master Prajñākaramati’s accepting such [a presentation of the opening stanza of Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary], Dharmamitra’s Clear Words [Subcommentary on (Haribhadra’s) “Clear Meaning Commentary”] says:b It follows that

---

b 2011 TBRC bia brang, 8a.6; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 6a.3. Here Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’ (gung thang dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me, 1762-1823) Beginnings of an Annotative Commentary on (Jam-yang-shay-pa’s) “Decisive Analysis on the First Chapter of the ‘Perfection of Wisdom’” (hereafter Beginnings of an Annotative Commentary), (phar phyin skabs dang po’i mtha’ dpyod kyi mchan ‘grel rtsom ’phro; hereafter
In general five types of commentary (ʼgrel pa) are described: (1) a meaning commentary indicating the essential points completely (don gyi gnad tshang bar ston pa’i don ʼgrel); (2) a commentary on the difficult points explaining the difficult points in particular (dka’ gnad bye brag tu bshad pa’i dka’ ʼgrel, pañjikā); (3) a word commentary that glosses words focusing finely on the components of words (tshig ’bru zhib tu gnyer ba’i tshig ʼgrel); (4) a verbal commentary indicating just the measure of obtaining the meaning of the words (yig don gyi thob tshod tsam ston pa’i ngag ʼgrel); and (5) an extensive commentary indicating expansions together with branches (’phros pa yang lag dang gcas te ston pa’i rgya cher ʼgrel). Among these [Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary] is the first.

(4b.5) [Jam-yang-shay-pa’s text says:] because Dharmamitra’s Clear Words [Subcommentary on (Haribhadra’s) “Clear Meaning Commentary”] says: “It is impossible for it to be accomplished thus through the [Clear Meaning] Commentary alone.”

(pha) Dharmamitra’s own system asserts as the four [subject matter and so on]:

1. the verbal subject matter (sgra’i brjod bya) is the stanzas (tshigs su bcas pa, kārikā) [of Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations]
2. the meaning subject matter (don gyi brjod bya) is the Mother Producer of Victors (rgyal ba bskyed ma, jinājanī) [the Perfection of Wisdom understood as the three exalted knowledges and so forth, according to Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho (gung thang blo gros rgya mtsho, 1851-1928/1930), Clarification of the Meaning of the Thought of the Two—the “Decisive Analysis on the Perfection of Wisdom: Jeweled Lamp” by the Supreme Lama Jam-yang-(shay-pa) and the “Annotative Commentary” by the Foremost Named Dipam (Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me), TBRC W1KG21227-L1KG21259, 14b.1]
3. the purpose is the good composition of [Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning] Commentary [which Dharmamitra asserts is in Haribhadra’s continuum according to Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho]
4. the essential purpose is realization in dependence upon [Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning] Commentary [by its trainees] that Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations is an ornament of all three Mothers [the One Hundred Thousand, Twenty-five Thousand, and Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras].

It follows that his own system that he posits is not logically feasible because it is not logically feasible that the composition of [Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning] Commentary is the purpose of [Haribhadra’s] composing the Commentary. It also follows that his way of refuting the other’s [that is, Prajñākaramatī’s] system is not logically feasible because of the inner contradiction in (i) explaining that its essential purpose, the exalted-knower-of-all-aspects, does not exist because of the reason “it is not accomplished through the [Clear Meaning] Commentary alone,” and (ii) explaining that the exalted-knower-of-all-aspects is the essential purpose of the root text [Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations].
the purpose and the essential purpose are not logically feasible because an exalted-knowledge-of-all-aspects cannot be attained through [Haribhadra’s] commentary alone.

Our response: [That an exalted-knowledge-of-all-aspects cannot be attained through (Haribhadra’s) commentary alone] does not entail [that the purpose and the essential purpose are not logically feasible]. The reason [which is that an exalted-knowledge-of-all-aspects cannot be attained through (Haribhadra’s) commentary alone] is established because Dharmamitra’s Clear Words [Subcommentary on (Haribhadra’s) “Clear Meaning Commentary”] says:

It is impossible for it to be accomplished thus through the [Clear Meaning] Commentary alone.

It follows that this [exposition by Dharmamitra] is not logically feasible rather than the earlier [assertion by Prajñākaramati which Dharmamitra refuted] because if [attaining nonabiding nirvāṇa] is not logically feasible as the [Clear Meaning] Commentary’s essential purpose because it alone cannot bring it about, then attaining [nonabiding] nirvāṇa is not logically feasible as the essential purpose of the root text [Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations] because it alone cannot bring it about, since without depending on the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras the nonabiding nirvāṇa cannot be attained. For, Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says: [Dharmamitra’s own refutation and presentation] are not logically feasible rather than that [assertion by Prajñākaramati which he refuted].

Thus it follows that his own system is even more logically infeasible than [his] refutation of the earlier assertion by Prajñākaramati.
2. Also, someone says: It follows that all three perfections of wisdom [that is, text, path, and result perfections of wisdom] exist as the objects of expression of homage of this Clear Meaning Commentary because the syllogism, [that is, the above syllogistic explanation of the stanza of homage] is logically feasible. You cannot accept [that all three perfections of wisdom exist as the objects of expression of homage of this Clear Meaning Commentary] because it is reasonable that he makes an expression of homage only to perfection of wisdom texts. It follows [that it is reasonable that he makes an expression of homage only to perfection of wisdom texts] because through praising perfection of wisdom texts, by implication he praises the other two [that is, path perfection of wisdom and result perfection of wisdom] as well.

Our response: [That through praising perfection of wisdom texts, by implication he praises the other two (that is, path perfection of wisdom and result perfection of wisdom perfection of wisdom) as well] does not entail [that it is reasonable that he makes an expression of homage only to per-

---

\[2011 \text{ TBRC } \text{bla brang}, 8b.3; 2015 \text{ Go-mang Lhasa, 6a.6.}\]
fection of wisdom texts]. The reason [which is that through praising perfection of wisdom texts, by implication he praises the other two (that is, path perfection of wisdom and result perfection of wisdom) as well] is established because it is like praising, by implication, all eight clear realizations through praising the three exalted knowledges, because the Middle-length Mother [the Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra] says:

Homage to the perfection of wisdom is homage to the pristine wisdom of exalted knowledge of all.

At the juncture of the statement of no entailment [that is, that through praising perfection of wisdom texts, by implication he praises the other two (that is, path perfection of wisdom and result perfection of wisdom) as well does not entail that it is reasonable that he makes an expression of homage only to perfection of wisdom texts], you cannot accept [that it is reasonable that he makes an expression of homage only to perfection of wisdom texts] because all three perfections of wisdom are explicitly indicated in this expression of homage by Haribhadra, because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says:

---

a The three exalted knowledges, or three exalted knowers (mkhyen gsun), are exalted-knowers-of-all-aspects (rtam mkhyen), knowers of paths (lam shes), and knowers of bases (gzhi shes).

b Haribhadra’s Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra in Eight Chapters (pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa/ le'u bryad ma), lha sa, shes phyin, nga, 176b.4.

c kha, 5a.5-6.
“Respectful homage.” To what? To the text, path, and result perfections of wisdom.

Furthermore, it follows that all three perfections of wisdom exist in what is explicitly indicated by this [expression of homage] because even though, in general, statement or expression in praise of the text also makes it by implication [into a praise] of the other two perfections of wisdom, here he is mainly praising all three. It follows [that here he is mainly praising all three] because (1) there is genuine evidence why the praise is mainly of all three [that is, text, path, and result perfections of wisdom, and (2) there is also a genuine purpose.

The first [part of the reason which is that there is genuine evidence why the praise is mainly of all three, that is, text, path, and result perfections of wisdom] is established because it is so that the intended trainees of this [Clear Meaning Commentary] will understand they mainly must put all three [text, path, and result perfections of wisdom] into practice. It follows
[that the praise is so that the intended trainees of this Clear Meaning Commentary will understand they mainly have to put all three text, path, and result perfections of wisdom into practice], because it is so those [intended trainees of this Clear Meaning Commentary] will understand that to attain the result perfection of wisdom they need to listen to and think about the text perfection of wisdom and put into practice the path perfection of wisdom until they are about to be fully purified [that is, enlightened], because Haribhadra’s Great Commentary [the Illumination] says:\(^a\)

Thus, since through the gradual arising of understanding having the nature of hearing, thinking, and meditation they attain the pristine wisdom knowing all aspects, it has gone beyond, that is, it has gone to very completion, due to which it is a perfection of wisdom.\(^b\)

and so forth.


\[\text{evam-ādi-śruta-cintā-bhāvanāmaya-jñānodaya-krameṇa sarvākārajñānādhibhagāmāt pāram prakāraśa-paryantam etāt vigrhyāv.} \]

\[\text{’phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa bgro yad stong pa’i bshad pa mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan gyi snang ba (sde dge: shes phyin, cha, 18b.1;}}\]

The second [part of the reason which is that there is also a genuine purpose for mainly praising all three] is established because [it is so that (the intended trainees of this *Clear Meaning Commentary*) will realize that the sūtras’ subject matter—all three perfections of wisdom—is the subject matter of the root text [Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*] and the commentary [Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning*] because Haribhadra’s *Great Commentary* [the *Illumination*] says:

\[\text{ atas trividhām api tat-sambandhinīṃ prativarṇikopadeśa-rahitam prajñāpāra-
mitām eva prādhānyād adhirārayet avadhāreyam. na tu teṣam eveti. bodhitraye
sya nānaṇṭāya kṣakavṛtvādhikārāt. tathā hy atraiva vakṣyaīt: śrāvakabhāmāv api
śikṣātākāmenyam eva prajñāpāramitāiva śrotavyādī.}

\[\text{rgyan snang, cha, 18b.4-5:}

\[\text{rnam pa gsum ka yang shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa nyid do zhes bya bar
bzung ba yin te/ gtsos bo las dbang du byas pas so / de rnam nyid kyi ni ma yin
te/ ’di med na mi ’byung bas byang chub gsum ka ’i dbang du byas pa ’i phyir ro
// de yang ’di nyid las nyan thos kyi sa la slob par ’dod pas kyang shes rab kyi
pha rol tu phyin pa ’di mnyan par bya’o zhes bya ba la sogs pa ’chad par ’gyur
ba yin no//}

Translated Sparham, *Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā*, vol. 1, 200. Here I have supplied in translation the full passage that Jam-yang-shay-pa abbreviates.
Even all three aspects [text perfections of wisdom texts, path perfections of wisdom, and result perfections of wisdom] are determined as perfections of wisdom themselves, this being treated in terms of the main ones. [However,] it is not only [the perfections of wisdom] of those [Buddhas] because since it is indispensable [for all three enlightenments of Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Buddhas], it is treated in terms of all three enlightenments [of Hearers, Solitary Realizers, and Buddhas]. Moreover, it will be explained right here [in the *Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra*]:

Even those who want to train in the grounds of a Hearer should hear this *Perfection of Wisdom.*

and so forth.

and because Gyal-tshab’s *Ornament for the Essence* says:

By mentioning [that he respectfully bows to] the texts, he brings in the other two as well, so here you should take it as all three [perfections of wisdom].

and because Gyal-tshab’s *Ornament for the Essence* also says:

It has a subject matter because it teaches the topics of the sūtras and the treatise [Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*].

---


b *kha*, 5a.6.

c *kha*, 5b.2.
3. Also, someone explains: That [stanza of homage] indicates only the object of refuge.

Our response: It follows that this also is not logically feasible because even though Haribhadra’s [Clear Meaning] Commentary [only] says, “[Respectful homage] to the perfection of wisdom,” it teaches all:

1. the mode of behavior
2. objects of observation, the three jewels,
3. hearing
4. thinking
5. meditating
during that time [of going for refuge], because it is like, for example, the fact that the sentences in the condensed [Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra] explain [all the topics explained in the Hundred Thousand and Twenty-five Thousand]. It follows [that it is like, for example, the fact that the sentences in the condensed (Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra) explain (all the topics explained in the Hundred Thousand and Twenty-five Thousand)] because that [stanza of homage] explains the first [the mode of behavior when going for refuge], also teaches the second [the objects of observation, the three jewels], also explains how to hear, also

---

a 2011 TBRC bla brang, 9a.6, 'di nyid kyi s; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 6b.7, 'di nyid las.
b 2011 TBRC bla brang, 9b.1; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 7a.1.
explains how to think, and also explains how to meditate.

The first [which is that the stanza of homage explains the mode of behavior when going for refuge] is established because since [Bodhisattvas] have to be conscientious on all three occasions of hearing, thinking, and meditating, they must sit cross-legged, because Haribhadra’s Great Commentary says,18 “In a clean area Bodhisattvas in a cross-legged posture.”

The second [which is that the stanza of homage teaches the objects of observation, the Three Jewels,) is established because it teaches that they observe all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas because Haribhadra’s Great Commentary says:

Having previously observed the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, from the viewpoint of the bare words (ming) they thoroughly observe with the root mind (rtsa ba’i sems) the modes of the perfection of
wisdom that teach all phenomena as selfless, and with an analytic mind (rjes su dpyod pa’i sems) they investigate the divisions of its connotative units (tshig) by way of its chapters and so forth.

and such is also explained on the occasion [of the fourth chapter of Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations where it says], “Faith observing Buddhas and so forth.”

The third [which is that the stanza of homage explains how to hear] is established because through such an approach [Bodhisattvas] apprehend through connotative units (tshig) or bare words (ming) with their root, or initial, mind because Haribhadra’s Great Commentary says, “from the viewpoint of the bare words (ming) they thoroughly focus with the root mind.”

The fourth [which is that the stanza of homage explains how to think] is established because preceded by such a [conscientious and cross-legged]
mode of behavior, refuge, and so on they analyze with analytic thought\textsuperscript{a} that the words [that is, connotative units] do not and do have the [full] meaning and so forth because Haribhadra’s \textit{Great Commentary} says:\textsuperscript{b}

[Then they enumerate with numbers the divisions of states of the eight clear realizations, ascertain with comprehension each clear realization’s nature, (ascertain) with realization the nonexistence of superimposition and deprecation, and make a logical decision through definite realization through direct and inferential valid cognition;] they analyze the topics of the perfection of wisdom with an \textit{intensely analytic mind} (\textit{rnam par dpyod pa’i sems}) by way of four such aspects, and they analyze by way of two aspects that the connotative units individually do not have the [full] meaning and collectively have the [full] meaning, respectively.

\textsuperscript{a} Correcting \textit{rjes su spyod} in 2011 TBRC \textit{bla brang} (10a.2) and 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (7a.7) to \textit{rjes su dpyod} in accordance with \textit{rgyan snang, cha}, 18a.6-7.

\textsuperscript{b} Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the beginning and end of the passage; I have translated the entire citation and added what precedes it to make the four aspects clear to the reader; with this addition it continues from the previous long citation.

\textsuperscript{c} Correcting \textit{rjes su spyod} in 2011 TBRC \textit{bla brang} (10a.2) and 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (7a.7) to \textit{rjes su dpyod} in accordance with \textit{rgyan snang, cha}, 18a.6-7.

\textsuperscript{d} Correcting \textit{rnam par spyod} in 2011 TBRC \textit{bla brang} (10a.2) and 2015 Go-mang Lhasa...
The fifth [which is that the stanza of homage also explains how to meditate] is established because [Bodhisattvas] must meditate through the root, or first, mind and taking to mind the intensely analyzed signs, because Haribhadra’s *Great Commentary* says:¹

Then, with a *mind of definite apprehension* (*nges par ’dzin pa’i sems*) they apprehend the signs in accordance with how they have been intensely analyzed; with a *mind of summarization* (*sdom pa’i sems*) the topics—as they have been analyzed—are fit together with the root mind that focuses on the bare words; and with a *mind of hope together with aspiration* (*’dun pa dang lhan cig pa re ba ba’i sems*) they meditate on these topics in which they are intensively training.

[That the stanza of homage explains the mode of behavior when going for refuge, also teaches the objects of observation, the three jewels, also explains how to hear, also explains how to think, and also explains how to

---

¹ Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the beginning and end of the passage; I have filled in and translated the entire passage.

² Correcting *lhan cig brtse ba’i sems* in 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (7b.2) to *lhan cig pa re ba’i sems* in accordance with *rgyan snang* (cha,18a.7), 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (10a.4), and Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho-tsho’s *Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Decisive Analysis”* and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s *Annotations,* TBRC W1KG21227, 16b.1.
mediate] entails [that it is like, for example, the fact that the sentences in the condensed (Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra) explain (all the topics explained in the Hundred Thousand and Twenty-five Thousand)] because these [ways to hear, think, and meditate] are the meaning of the sūtra passage [in the Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra], 

"Founded on the perfection of wisdom." Haribhadra’s Great Commentary says:

Thus, through the stages of first generating consciousnesses having the nature of hearing, thinking, and meditation they realize pristine wisdom knowing all aspects, whereby it goes beyond, that is, goes to the far limit, and hence is a “perfection of wisdom.”

a The passage occurs near the beginning of the sūtra; Jam-yang-shay-pa’s point is that Haribhadra finds all of these meanings in this brief clause in the sūtra. The context of the clause is:

Then the Supramundane Victor said to the venerable Subhūti, “Subhūti, have confidence [to explain] how—founded on the perfection of wisdom of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings—the Bodhisattvas, the great beings, emerge into the perfection of wisdom. (pratibhātu te subhūte bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ prajñāpāramitām ārāhīya bodhisattvā mahāsattvāḥ prajñāpāramitām nirṇāyāy īti)

Furthermore, making an expression of worship to all three perfections of wisdom here on this occasion has another purpose as well because it has the purpose of realizing Great Vehicle refuge through thus making [an expression of worship to all three perfections of wisdom]. It follows [that another purpose of making homage to all three perfections of wisdom here is realization of Great Vehicle refuge] because [making an expression of worship to all three perfections of wisdom here on this occasion] has the purpose of knowing the Great Vehicle refuge, explicitly indicating in this [expression of worship] (1) the Buddha jewel contained within the result perfection of wisdom and (2) the doctrine jewel contained within the path perfection of wisdom, and thereupon understanding (3) the community that properly achieves that [doctrine jewel] as the refuge assistant. That [it has the purpose of knowing Great Vehicle refuge] follows because the root [text, Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations,] and [Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning] Commentary both make an expression of worship so that it will be known that going for refuge must precede the beginning of hearing, thinking, and so on, because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says:

You should know that authors of treatises initially state an expression of worship in order that [readers] will know that going for refuge must precede the beginning of any religious activity of hearing, thinking, meditating, and so on.

\(^a\) *kha*, 5b.6.
2. Explanation establishing it is reasonable to compose the commentary

There are four stanzas in Haribhadra’s [Clear Meaning] Commentary about how he is in possession of the quintessential instructions of earlier masters:\(^a\)

Acting from complete affection due to affection for migrators,

\(^a\) These and the following stanzas are from Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary, Amano edition, 3; ʼgrel pa don gsal (lha sa, sher phyin, ja, 78b). Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the first lines of the two passages. I have provided the entire citation.
The Superior Asaṅga, refuge,
Having listened to the protector Ajita [Maitreya],
Made an exposition of the great treatises.20

Friend to the welfare of migrating beings, Vasubandhu—
Principally evincing his own inclination—
Provided commentary thoroughly depending
On objects of knowledge being [the nature] of inner [mind].21

Included among Superiors (ārya),
The one called Vimuktisena also,
Having seen that what they had done were not done [exactly],
With intelligence dwelling in the middle, also made explanatory
differentiation.22

After that, the Vimuktisena
Dwelling on the ground of faith,
Not finding all of the treatise,
Made an explanation concordant with him.23

There are two stanzas in Haribhadra’s [Clear Meaning] Commentary
about the two—how he is in possession of the wisdom realizing the inner
topics,24 and hence that it is reasonable for him to compose the commen-
tary:

How amazing that I have found
The treatise of all these
Which were illuminated in that way

---

20 Known as Āryavimuktisena.
And just some did not find exactly as it is. 

This profound path, extremely 
Difficult to find by such 
Was luckily found through the force of the Buddha. 
It is reasonable for scholars to explore it.

[Decisive analysis]
This has three parts: refuting mistakes, positing our own system, and dispelling objections.

Refuting mistakes]

4. Some earlier Tibetans say: The openers of chariot-ways who do not rely on other commentators are limited to four—Nāgārjuna, Dignāga, Vasubandhu, and the foremost holy Maitreya.

Our response: It follows that the two—Dignāga and the author of the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras]—are not openers of chariot-ways because Dignāga’s Summary of

---

a I have inserted the subtitles because this and the following two sections “positing our own system” and “dispelling objections” anticipate the format Jam-yang-shay-pa will use for each of the topics he discusses at length in later sections.
b 2011 TBRC bla brang, 10b.5; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 7a.1.
the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra” follows Asaṅga’s system, and the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] cites passages from Nāgārjuna.

The first [which is that Dignāga’s Summary of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra” follows Asaṅga’s system] is established because the two modes of commentary by that [Summary of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra”]:

• the mode of commentary on the [Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom] Sūtra about achieving meditation on emptiness as an antidote to the ten distracting conceptualizations, that is, apprehensions of a self of phenomena
• the mode of commentary on the meaning of the three characters and the sūtra

follow Maitreya’s Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes and Asaṅga’s Summary of the Great Vehicle because Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:a

Though it is renowned thus [that those four each commented on the thought of the Mother Sūtras without relying on other commentaries on the thought], the main topics discussed in Dignāga’s Summary of the “Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra”:

1. the mode of commenting on the Sūtra passage giving guidance on achieving the sixteen emptinesses as antidotes to the ten distracting conceptualizations, and
2. the mode of commenting on the Sūtra passage on the three natures [where Dignāga says]:b

---

b prajñāpāramitāpiṇḍārtha, stanzas 27-29ab; Tucci, 57:

prajñāpāramitāyām hi trīn saṃsārita deśanā / kalpitam paratantram ca pa-
rinispannam eva ca // nāsītyādpadaṁ sarvaṁ kalpitam vinivāryate / māyopa-
In the Perfection of Wisdom
The teaching is based on a triad:
Just the imputational, the other-powered,
And the thoroughly established.

With words like, “It does not exist,”
[The Buddha] refutes all the imputational.
By means of examples like illusions,
He demonstrates the other-powered.

By the fourfold purification
He proclaims the thoroughly established.
In the Perfection of Wisdom
There is no other teaching.

respectively evince what is in Maitreya’s Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes and Asanga’s Summary of the Great Vehicle; hence, it does not comment separately from the Doctrines of Maitreya.

mādīdṛṣṭāntah paratantrasya deśanāḥ // prajñāpāramitāyām hi nānyā buddhāsya deśanāḥ

bṛgyad stong bsdus don; lha sa, shes phyin, pha, 293b.4-6.
The second [which is that the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] cites passages from Nāgārjuna] is established because the author [of the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers] is not Vasubandhu, and [the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers] cites Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” in the context of the sixteen emptinesses and of the absence of truly established production and cessation and of the absence of truly established thoroughly afflicted and purified [classes of phenomena]. The first [which is that the author (of the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers) is not Vasubandhu] is established because Daṃṣṭhasena composed it, because Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:α

It is renowned in earlier old works that this Conquest Over Harm was composed by the Kashmiri Daṃṣṭhasena.

and because in commenting on [the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra passage],β “in the final five hundred [year] period,” it states Shāntarakṣita’s mode of explanation.

The second [which is that (the Conquest Over Harm concerning the Three Mothers) cites Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle. Called “Wisdom” in the context of the sixteen emptinesses and of the absence of truly established production and cessation and the absence of truly established thoroughly afflicted and pure (classes of phenomena)] is established because Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:a

The textual commentary [Conquest Over Harm], having cited passages from Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” in the context of the explaining the sixteen emptinesses and the non-existence of production and cessation and of the thoroughly afflicted and pure [classes of phenomena].

and because since its explanation of how emptiness is empty is like the Enumerators’ (Sāṃkhya) other-emptiness, it does not accord with any Mind-Only School or Middle Way School, and hence it is refuted at length in Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence.b

---

a mtsho sngon edition, 7; ACIP edition, tsa, 6a.3-4; Sparham, Golden Garland, vol. 1, 9-10.

5. Also, someone says: A person who comments under his own power on the thought of the [Buddha’s] high sayings is the definition of an opener of a chariot-way.

To that, someone flings the fallacy: Subhūti would be [an opener of a chariot-way].

Our response: For the former, it [absurdly] follows that the subject, Asaṅga, comments under his own power on the thought of the [Buddha’s] high sayings because of being an opener of a chariot-way. It follows [that the subject, Asaṅga, is an opener of a chariot-way] because of being the opener of the Mind-Only chariot-way. It follows [that the subject, Asaṅga, is the opener of the Mind-Only chariot-way] because of opening the Mind-Only way in his Five Treatises on the Grounds in accordance with the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought, because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says:

the Master [Asaṅga] in his Five Treatises on the Grounds, two Summaries, and so on opened well the chariot-way of Cognition-

---

a 2011 TBRC bla brang, 11a.6; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 8b.1.
b 2011 TBRC bla brang, 11a.6, reads yang kho na re; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 8b.1, reads yang kha vig.
c kha, 4a.1-2; this is the latter part of the citation above, 57; the earlier part is cited just below.
You cannot accept the root [consequence that Asaṅga comments under his own power on the thought of the (Buddha’s) high sayings] because he follows the three—the Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras, Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes, and Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon which are commentary by the Foremost Holy [Maitreya], because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says, \(^a\) “Following these three treatises, [the Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras and the two Differentiations].”

\(^a\) Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence, kha, 4a.1; see the previous footnote. The full citation is:

Following these three treatises, [the Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras and the two Differentiations.] and in accordance with the way the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought differentiates the interpretable and definitive, the Master [Asanga] in his Five Treatises on the Grounds, two Summaries, and so on opened well the chariot-way of Cognition-Only.
For the latter [who in reaction to the above statement:]

A person who comments under his own power on the thought of the (Buddha’s) high sayings is the definition of an opener of a chariot-way.

...flings as a fallacy. “Subhūti would be (an opener of a chariot-way),” our response is: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the subject, Subhūti, is capable of explaining the meaning of the perfection of wisdom without depending on another because [according to you] he comments under his own power on the meaning of the perfection of wisdom. If you accept [that Subhūti is capable of explaining the meaning of the perfection of wisdom without depending on another], it [absurdly] follows that it is not that even though [Subhūti] is not able to teach under his own power (1) endless doors of meditative stabilization of a Victor’s child and (2) the noumenon, [the Buddha] empowers [Subhūti’s] speech in order to make known that the Buddha’s power is inconceivable because you accept [that Subhūti is capable of explaining the meaning of the perfection of wisdom without depending on another].
under his own power (1) endless doors of meditative stabilization of a Victor’s child and (2) the noumenon, (the Buddha) empowers Subhūti’s speech in order to make known that the Buddha’s power is inconceivable, it [absurdly] follows that the statement in Haribhadra’s Great Commentary:  

[The Buddha empowers Subhūti] for the sake of helping those who are trained upon seeing power, thinking, “Inconceivable is the power of the skillful means of the One-Gone-Thus because even those incapable in all aspects teach!”

is not logically feasible because [according to you] it is not that even though he [Subhūti] is not able to teach under his own power, [the Buddha] empowers his speech in order to help them have faithful devotion in him [the Buddha]. There is entailment because there is a meaning of “even those incapable in all aspects teach!”

\[\text{acintyo vā tathāgatānām upāya-kausālaprabhāvo yasmāt sarvathāśaktenaśpi deśyata iti prabhāvāsandalasāvaneśvinēyānām}\]

\[\text{rgyan snang, cha.17b.4-5; Sparham, Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā, vol. 1, 198.}\]
Furthermore, it [absurdly] follows that the meaning of the statement in Haribhadra’s *Great Commentary*:\(^a\)

By way of empowering [his] speech\(^b\) to expound the perfection of wisdom, [the Supramundane Victor said] to the Superior Subhūti [when his mind was on something else, “Make it clear” and so on in order to make him focus].

is not established because [according to you] it is not the meaning of that [passage in Haribhadra’s *Great Commentary*] that Subhūti’s speech has been empowered [by the Buddha] to give such an exposition [of the perfection of wisdom]. You have come [to assert the reason].\(^c\)

\[^a\] Haribhadra’s *Illumination of the “Ornament,”* Wogihara edition, 22:

\[
\text{prajñāpāramitābhāṣaṇam prati vāgadhiśā言advāreṇāryasubhātim}
\]

rgyan snang, cha, 17b.5; Sparham, *Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā*, vol. 1, 198. The bracketed material is drawn from Haribhadra’s text.

\[^b\] Depending upon the context, *vāgadhiśā言advārena* can also mean “authorizing by voice,” as distinct from other ways (by physical gesture or by thought) in which a One-Gone-Thus might start an amanuensis off on a discourse, and indeed this may be such a context here.

\[^c\] The term *rtags song* means *rtags khas blangs song ba*.

\[^d\] *Eight Thousand* (aṣṭasahasrikāprajñāpāramitā, 4; Wogihara edition, 29):

\[
yat kimcid āyuṣman śāriputra bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhāṣante deśayanty upadīṣyanty udārayanti prkāṣayanti samprakāṣayanti sa sarvas tathāgatasya puruṣakāro veditavyaḥ
\]

*Purāṇa* saḥ, bṛgyad stong, 3a.6-3b.2; Conze, *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines and its Stanza Summary*, 83. The Indian and Tibetan translators rendered *puruṣakāra*,
All that the Hearers propound, teach, demonstrate, express, illuminate, and thoroughly illuminate is to be known as the power of the person of the One-Gone-Thus.

is not established because [according to you] it is not the meaning of that [passage in the *Eight Thousand*] that the teaching of such by the Hearers is the power of the One-Gone-Thus. If you say that the reason [which is that it is not the meaning of that [passage in the *Eight Thousand*] that the teaching of such by the Hearers is the power of the One-Gone-Thus] is not established, you have come [to contradict your assertion that Subhūti comments under his own power on the meaning of the perfection of wisdom].

If you say there is no entailment [that is, that it is not the meaning of that (passage in the *Eight Thousand*) that the teaching of such by the Hearers is the power of the One-Gone-Thus does not necessitate that the meaning of the passage from the *Eight Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra*:

All that the Hearers propound, teach, demonstrate, express, illuminate, and thoroughly illuminate is to be known as the power of the person of the One-Gone-Thus.

is not established], then it very absurdly follows that there is not a single power of the person of the One-Gone-Thus!

which might seem merely to mean “a person’s act/work/effort,” as *skyes bu' i mthu*, “a person’s power/magic/force/might.”
Furthermore, it very absurdly follows that the manifold statements in many sūtras, “Through the Buddha’s power venerable Shāriputra [said],” and the explanations (1) in the Questions of King Dhāranīśvara Sūtra where it says, a “The freedom of Hearers comes from words,” and also (2) in the root text [Maitreya’s Ornaments for the Clear Realizations, V.15d] where it says, 28 “Actualities endowed and non-endowed,” are not logically feasible because [according to you] those [Hearers] teach the perfection of wisdom under their own power.

a TBRC W26071 (Lhasa, 148) mdo sde, vol. 57, 267b.3, which reads sgra rjes ’gro for sgra phyir ’gro. This line is cited in Dharmamitra’s Explanation of (Haribhadra’s) “Commentary on (Maitreya’s) ‘Ornament for the Clear Realizations’”: Very Clear Words (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phin pa’i stong pa’i rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa’i ’grel bshad tshig rab tu gsal ba), (sde dge phyin), 57b4:

ji skad du ’phags pa’i byaṅ chub sems dpal ba’i sde snod las / nyan thos rnam kyi rnam grol sgra phyir ’gro

on Haribhadra’s commentary in his Clear Meaning Commentary:

Scripture says, “Hearers rely on instruction by others and awaken to their own enlightenment,” and they also “turn others to the wholesome by a spoken demonstration of doctrine.”

Dharmamitra adds, “That is also why they are called ‘trainees’ (slob ma), because they definitely need a ‘master’ (slob dpon).” He is explaining Maitreya’s Ornaments for the Clear Realizations, II.6, concerning Solitary Victors:

Because the self-arisen realize [enlightenment] by themselves,
They also do not need to be taught by others,
[Whereby] it is said that the wisdom
Of the rhinoceros-like is more profound.

Dharmamitra’s citation is found in the Bodhisattva Scriptural Collection (āryabodhisattvapiṭaka, ’phags pa’i byaṅ chub sems dpal ba’i sde snod), sde dge, dkon brtsegs, kha, 255b.1-294a.7, and ga, 1b.1-205b.1; lha sa, dkon brtsegs, ga, 139a.2; cp. ga, 132b.3.
Therefore, due to this [evidence that those Hearers are unable to teach the perfection of wisdom under their own power] it is established that even Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga are not able to explain [the perfection of wisdom] under their own power, because those who have not attained the going-as-a-hero meditative stabilization are not able to explain [the perfection of wisdom] under their own power, because Chandrakīrti explains this [same point] in his Commentary on (Nāgārjuna’s) “Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning.”

\[\text{a yuktiṣāṅkāvṛtti, rigs pa drug cu pa'i 'grel pa.}\]

\[\text{b The version of this sentence in the 2015 Go-mang Lhasa edition (9a.6) eliminates one reason clause:}\]

\[\text{དེས་ན་འདིས་ནི་Ȧི་Ȧིབ་དང་ཐོགས་མེད་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་།}
\[\text{རང་དབང་Ȧི་Ȧིབ་པཤད་མི་Ȧིབ་པར་Ȧི་Ȧི།}
\[\text{དཔའ་བར་འགྲོ་བའི་ཏིང་ངེ་འཛིན་མ་ཐོབ་པར་དེ་མི་Ȧིབ་པར་ȣིགས་པ་Ȧིབ་ȣ་པའི་འགྲེལ་པར་Ȧི་Ȧི་བས་བཤད་པའི་ɿིར་}\]

\[\text{[9a.6]དེ་དག་གིས་ȷིན་Ȧི་Ȧིབ་Ȧི་Ȧིབ་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི་Ȧི

\[\text{[9a.6]དེ་དག་gom-pa'i 'grel pa.}\]

\[\text{\[9a.6]དེ་དག་gom-pa'i 'grel pa.}\]
6. Also, someone says: a Openers of chariot-ways are limited in number to two, Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga, because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says: b

Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga who, like the sun, illumined
The supreme teaching of the Conqueror for beings below, on, and above the earth
Through opening well chariot-ways for the two modes of the scriptures of the One Gone to Bliss.

Our response: This does not entail [that openers of chariot-ways are limited in number to two, Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga] because it is merely indicating that [openers of chariot-ways] are limited to those two [Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga] with respect to those having the basis of a human who differentiate the interpretable and definitive. You cannot accept [that openers of chariot-ways are limited in number to two, Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga] because the Foremost Holy Maitreya, the author of the Ornament [for the Clear Realizations], is an opener of a chariot-way. It follows [that the Foremost Holy Maitreya, the author of the Ornament [for the Clear Realizations], is an opener of a chariot-way] because:

- the opener of the chariot-way commenting on the meaning of the profound [emptiness], which is what is explicitly indicated in the Mother

---

a 2011 TBRC bla brang, 12b.1; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 9a.6.
b drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP edition, 1a.3-4. The translation is taken from Jeffrey Hopkins, Emptiness in the Mind-Only School of Buddhism (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1999), 67. The lines are from a homage at the beginning of Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence; Jam-yang-shay-pa omits the words expressing homage since they are not relevant to his point; with them the first two lines of the translation are:

I bow down with the top of my head to the feet
Of the honorable Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga who, like the sun, illumined…
c mi’i rten can, that is to say, those who are humans.
[Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras], as the Middle Way, and
• the opener of the chariot-way commenting on the hidden meaning, the
clear realizations, as the Middle Way in eight categories and seventy
topics,
are limited to only the two, Nāgārjuna and the Foremost Holy Maitreya
[respectively] because Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland says:a

So it is [as Dharmamitra explains]—two commentarial systems on
the perfection of wisdom, the Foremost Holy [Maitreya]’s and
Nāgārjunapāda’s.

7. Also, someone says:b It follows that Asaṅga is not an opener of a char-
iot-way because he [Asaṅga] commented on the two systems, Mind-Only
and Middle Way, following the two openers of chariot-ways, the Foremost
Holy Maitreya and Nāgārjuna.

---

a mtsos sgong edition, 8; ACIP edition 6a.6; Sparham, Golden Garland, vol. 1, 10.
b 2011 TBRC bla brang, 12b.5; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 9b.3.
Our response: [That Asaṅga commented on the two systems, Mind-Only and Middle Way, following the two openers of chariot-ways, the Foremost Holy Maitreya and Nāgārjuna] does not entail [that Asaṅga is not an opener of a chariot-way] because he is an opener of the chariot-way of Mind-Only without depending on a commentator having the fleshly shape of a human. The reason [which is that Asaṅga is an opener of the chariot-way of Mind-Only without depending on a commentator having the fleshly shape of a human] is established because he opened the chariot-way of Mind-Only based on three [of the five] Doctrines of Maitreya—the two Differentiations [the Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes and the Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon] and the Ornament [for the Great Vehicle Sūtras], and even though he did not cite the scriptures of Nāgārjuna, nevertheless following his reasoning he commented on Maitreya’s Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle as the Middle Way system.

a mi'i sha tshugs can.
b The five Doctrines of Maitreya (byams chos lnga) are:

1. Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle, mahāyānottaratantraśāstra, thāg pa chen po rgyud bla ma'i bstana bcos
2. Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon, dharmaḥarmatāvibhāṅga, chos dang chos nyid rnam par 'byed pa
3. Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes, madhyāntavibhāṅga, dbus dang mthong rnam par 'byed pa
4. Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras, mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra, thāg pa chen po'i mdo sde rgyan gyi tshig le'u byas pa
5. Ornament for the Clear Realizations, abhisamayālāṃkāra, mngon par rtags pa'i rgyan.
The first [part of the reason which is that Asaṅga opened the chariot-way of Mind-Only based on three (of the five) Doctrines of Maitreya—the two Differentiations (the Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes and the Differentiation of Phenomena and Noumenon) and the Ornament (for the Great Vehicle Sūtras)] is established because Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says:

Following these three treatises, [the Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras and the two Differentiations,] and in accordance with the way the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought differentiates the interpretable and definitive, the Master [Asaṅga] in his Five Treatises on the Grounds, two Summaries, and so on opened well the chariot-way of Cognition-Only.

---

a kha, 4a.1-2, cited above, 57. Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the beginning and end of the passage.
b The Five Treatises on the Grounds are:
1. *Grounds of Yogic Practice* (yogācārabhūmi, rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa)
2. *Compendium of Ascertainties* (nirñayasamgraha / vinīcāyasamgrahaṃ, rnam par gtan la dhab pa bsdu ba)
3. *Compendium of Bases* (vastusamgraha, gzhi bsdu ba)
4. *Compendium of Enumerations* (paryāyasamgraha, rnam grang bsdu ba)
5. *Compendium of Explanations* (vivarayasamgraha, rnam par bshad pa bsdu ba)
c The Two Summaries are:
1. *Summary of Manifest Knowledge* (abhidharmasamuccaya, chos mngon pa kun btus)
2. *Summary of the Great Vehicle* (mahāyānasamgraha, theg pa chen po bsdus pa)
The second [part of the reason which is that even though Asaṅga did not cite the scriptures of Nāgārjuna, nevertheless following his reasoning he commented on Maitreya’s *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle* as the Middle Way system] is established because he equally describes the two—the *Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras* and the *Matrix of the One Gone Thus Sūtra*—as teaching the absence of true existence, because Gyal-ishab’s *Ornament for the Essence* says:

In Maitreya’s *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle* it is explained that the extensive, medium-length, and condensed Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] and the *Matrix of the One-Gone-Thus Sūtra* clearly teach without difference that the object of observation of the path is the emptiness of true existence of all phenomena, the ultimate truth free from all proliferations that:

- is to be taught at a later time to those whose continuums have been ripened through familiarization with the system of Cognition-Only
- and is to be taught right from the first to those in the Great Vehicle lineage who have the supreme faculties
- and definitely must be realized even to attain Hearer enlightenment and Solitary Realizer enlightenment.

Since the master Asaṅga in commentary on that³ made clarification exactly in accordance with [Maitreya’s] thought, you should not think that he differs from the protector Nāgārjuna, the opener

---

³ *kha*, 4a.1-2, cited above, 55. Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the beginning and end of the passage.

⁴ *tathāgataagarbhasūtra, de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po'i mdo.*

of the chariot-way relative to the first differentiation of the interpretable and definitive, because he is following just him [Nāgārjuna].

You cannot accept the root [consequence that Asaṅga is not an opener of a chariot-way] because he is the opener of the chariot-way of Mind-Only.

8. About this formulation someone says:a Asaṅga is not an opener of a chariot-way without depending on another commentator having the fleshly shape of a human because of commenting on Maitreya’s Treatise on the

---

a 2011 TBRC *bla brang*, 13a.4; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 10a.1.
Our response: [That he comments on Maitreya’s Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle following Nāgārjuna] does not entail [that Asaṅga is not an opener of a chariot-way without depending on another commentator having the fleshly shape of a human] because even though due to the reason [that he comments on Maitreya’s Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle following Nāgārjuna] he is not the opener of the chariot-way of the Middle Way, he opened the chariot-way of Mind-Only without depending on a human commentator such as Nāgārjuna and so forth.

9. About this, someone says:a It follows that whoever is an opener of a chariot-way of the Middle Way necessarily is an opener of a chariot-way because whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of Mind-Only necessarily is an opener of a chariot-way. It follows [that whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of Mind-Only necessarily is an opener of a chariot-way] because Asaṅga is that [an opener of a chariot-way]. If you accept [that whoever is an opener of a chariot-way of the Middle Way necessarily is an opener of a chariot-way], it follows that the subject, the master Buddhapālita, is that [an opener of a chariot-way] because of being that [an

---

a 2011 TBRC bla brang, 13a.6; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 10a.2.
opener of the chariot-way of the Middle Way]. The reason [which is that Buddhapālita is an opener of a chariot-way of the Middle Way] is established, because of being the opener of the chariot-way of the [Middle Way] Consequence School.

Our response: [Being the opener of the chariot-way of the (Middle Way) Consequence School] does not entail [being the opener of the chariot-way of the Middle Way]. The reason [which is that Buddhapālita is the opener of the chariot-way of the Middle Way] is established because he is the initial opener of the tradition, like a chariot’s pathway, of establishing the thought of Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” as the absence of true existence mainly through consequences. It follows [that Buddhapālita is the initial opener of the tradition, like a chariot’s pathway, of establishing the thought of Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” as the absence of true existence mainly through consequences] because Chandrakīrti explains that he opened a tradition that way [of the thought of Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” as the

\footnote{Correcting min in 2011 TBRC bla brang (13a.6) to yin in accordance with 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (10a.2).}
absence of true existence mainly through consequences], because Tsong-kha-pa’s Treatise Differentiating Interpretable and Definitive Meanings: The Essence of Eloquence says:\(^a\)

In the Clear Words [Chandrakīrti] having demonstrated that Bud-dhāpalita does not assert autonomy and having demonstrated (1) many proofs that it is unsuitable for a Proponent of the Middle Way to use autonomous [syllogisms] and (2) much damage to the opposite position, [he]\(^b\) opens the chariot-way [of the Middle Way Consequence School].\

\[^a\] drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP edition, 81b.5; La Vallée Poussin, Prasannapadā, 14.1-36.2. The translation is taken from Hopkins’ draft translation in “Emptiness in the Consequence School of Buddhism,” 69.

\[^b\] 2011 TBRC bla brang, 13b.3; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 10a.5.

10. About this, someone says:\(^b\) It follows that in this [passage from Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence] the demonstrator (1) of many proofs
that it is unsuitable for a Proponent of the Middle Way to use autonomous [syllogisms] and (2) of much damage to the opposite position, autonomy, is Buddhapālita because Buddhapālita is the opener of the chariot-way where [Tsong-kha-pa] says, “opens the chariot-way.”

Our response: [That Buddhapālita is the opener of the chariot-way where (Tsong-kha-pa) says, “opens the chariot-way,”] does not entail [that in this (passage) the demonstrator (1) of many proofs that it is unsuitable for a Proponent of the Middle Way to use autonomy (syllogisms) and (2) of much damage to the opposite position, autonomy, is Buddhapālita] because even though Chandrakīrti is the demonstrator of the proofs and the refutations, Buddhapālita opened the chariot-way of the Consequence School. It follows [that even though Chandrakīrti is the demonstrator of the proofs and the refutations, Buddhapālita opened the chariot-way of the Consequence School] because he [Buddhapālita] proves the meanings in Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” mainly by way of consequences, because Buddhapālita’s [Commentary on (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle”] says:a

a buddhapālita-mālamadhyamakavṛtti; the first lines of the extract as found in Chandrakīrti’s Clear Words (La Vallée Poussin, Prasannapadā, 14.1) are:

na svata utpadyante bhāvāḥ/ tadatpādavayarthyaḥ/ atiprasaṅgadosācca/ na hi svātmanā vidyamānāṃ padārthānāṃ punarutpāde pravojanamasti/ atha san-napi jāyeta/ na kādā cinna jāyeta/

dbu ma rtsa ba’i ’grel pa buddha pa lī ta (sde dge, dbu ma, tsa, 161b-4-6. Jamyang-shay-pa cites only the first, middle, and last lines of the extract, minus the last reason clause. The translation is from Hopkins, Maps of the Profound, 474, as modified in his draft publication “Where is the Middle?” which includes translations of the source texts for Jamyang-shay-pa’s presentation of the “Opposite of the Consequences” (thal bzlog) and “Comaptibly Appearing Subjects” (chos can mthun snang ba) sections in his Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti’s) “Supplement to Nāgārjuna’s ‘Treatise on the Middle’”: Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Meaning of the Profound, Entrance for the Fortunate / Great Exposition of the Middle (dbu ma ’jug pa’i miha’ dpyod lung rigs
Things are not produced from self because their production [again] would be just senseless and because production would be endless. It is thus: the production-again\(^a\) of things already existing in their own entities is purposeless. If, though existent, they are produced, they would never not be produced. Hence, that also is not accepted. Therefore, respectively, things are not produced from self.

They also are not produced from other. Why? For it would [absurdly] follow that everything would be produced from everything.

They also are not produced from both self and other because [such] would entail the fallacies of both [production from self and production from other].

They also are not produced causelessly because it would [absurdly] follow that everything always would be produced from everything and because there would be the fallacy that all endeavor would be just senseless.

gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang ’jug ngogs / dbu ma chen mo). Hopkins points out that Jam-yang-shay-pa emphasizes the importance—for understanding Bhāvaviveka’s objections—of Buddhapālita’s lead-in question and answer and final sentence within which this extract is embedded but which Jam-yang-shay-pa does not cite here; Hopkins has dealt with the issue at length, highlighting the originality and clarity of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s explanation.

\(^a\) yang skye ba, punarutpāda.
[That Buddhapālita’s Commentary on (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle” says this] entails [that Buddhapālita proves the meanings in Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” mainly by way of consequences] because since in [Nāgārjuna’s] root text there are no more than consequences, the master Buddhapālita does not set forth other than mainly consequences also in [his] commentary, because Chandrakīrti’s Clear Words says:a

*Objection* [by the hypothetical Bhāvaviveka]: It is the custom of commentators to set forth syllogisms at length.

*Answer:* That also is not so because when even the master [Nāgārjuna] commented on [his] Refutation of Objections, he did not set out syllogistic statements.

At the juncture [where I said] no entailment[b] [in response] to [the opponent’s presenting] a root [consequence], the reason [which is that Buddhapālita is the opener of the chariot-way where (Tsong-kha-pa) says, “opens the chariot-way.”] is established because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says:c

---

[a] The translation is from Hopkins, Meditation on Emptiness, 497, and his draft “Where is the Middle?,” 176, where he translates the same citation in Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Great Exposition of the Middle, 225a.

[b] legs ldan ’byed, c. 500-570?.

[c] drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP edition, 81b.3. The translation is from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft translation of Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence in the volume titled
In the translations [into Tibetan] of the texts of our own schools [the determination]—upon having examined whether to assert autonomous [syllogisms] or consequences—that “autonomous [syllogisms] are not logically feasible [but] consequences are logically feasible” does not explicitly occur in texts other than those of Chandrakīrti and his followers.36

11. About this formulation someone says: It follows that it is not logically feasible that Buddhapālita explains by way of consequences because Emptiness in the Autonomy School in the section on “History of the refutation of autonomy and others’ system of explaining its meaning,” 139.

a The 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (10a.1) has a perpendicular stroke (shad) here, whereas the 2011 TBRC bla brang (13b.6) has a dot, likely seeking not to give the impression that this is a quotation.

b 2011 TBRC bla brang, 14a.3; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 10b.4.
Bhāvaviveka asserts that Buddhapālita also asserts autonomous [syllogisms].

Our response: [That Bhāvaviveka asserts that Buddhapālita also asserts autonomous (syllogisms)] does not entail [that it is not logically feasible that Buddhapālita explains by way of consequences] because [Bhāvaviveka says this] in consideration that that since autonomous [syllogisms] are not manifest [in Buddhapālita’s text], even many [unwanted] consequences cannot establish a meaning because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says:

Even Bhāvaviveka did not think that he differed from Buddhapālita with respect to asserting or not asserting autonomous [syllogisms]; his appears to be a system in which it is taken for granted [that both masters agree] in asserting autonomous [syllogisms]. Because of this essential, he also did not assert that he and Buddhapālita differed even about the object of negation in the refutation of an inherent nature with respect to phenomena and persons.

This is clear in Khay-drub-ge-leg-pal-sang’s Compilation on Emptiness.

---

a don.
b *drang nges legs bshad snying po*, ACIP edition, 81b.6-82a.1. The translation is from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emptiness in the Consequence School,” 76. Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the beginning and end of the passage.
12. Also, someone says: It follows that whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of the Autonomy Middle Way School is necessarily an opener of a chariot-way because this is so with respect to the Mind-Only School [that is, whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of the Mind-Only School is necessarily an opener of a chariot-way].

Our response: [That whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of the Mind-Only School is necessarily an opener of a chariot-way] does not entail [that whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of the Autonomy Middle Way School is necessarily an opener of a chariot-way]. If you accept [that whoever is an opener of the chariot-way of the Autonomy Middle Way School is necessarily an opener of a chariot-way], it [absurdly] follows that the subject, Bhāvaviveka, is an opener of a chariot-way because of being the opener of the chariot-way of the Sūtra Autonomy Middle Way School. [Whoever is the opener of the chariot-way of the Sūtra Autonomy Middle Way School] is necessarily [an opener of a chariot-way] because the way of the Sūtra Autonomy Middle Way School and the chariot-way of the Autonomy Middle Way School were simultaneously opened. It follows [that the way of the Sūtra Autonomy Middle Way School and the chariot-way

---

\(^a\) 2011 TBRC *bla brang*, 14a.6; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 10b.6.
of the Autonomy Middle Way School were simultaneously opened] because Bhāvaviveka initially opened the great pathway in which:

- the three characters as posited by the Mind-Only School are not the meaning of the thought of [any] sūtra;
- and even though other-powered, thoroughly established, and imputational phenomena are not truly existent, they are established by way of their own character,

because Tsong-kha-pa’s *The Essence of Eloquence* says:

Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* explains in detail this pathway opened by Bhāvaviveka in which Bhāvaviveka comments that the meaning of the three characters described in the *Sūtra Unraveling the Thought* as commented on by the Yogic Practitioners is not the meaning of [any] sūtra but has a Middle Way meaning.

---

*a drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP edition, 59a.6-59b.1. The translation is from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emptiness in the Autonomy School” at the end of the section titled “How Śāntarakṣita and Kamalashīla Explain the Meaning of the Sūtra Unraveling The Thought,” 48.*

*b madhyamakālōka, dbu ma snang ba.*

*c Jig-may-dam-chö-gya-tsho’s *Port of Entry*, 443.25 (Taipei edition).*
13. Also, someone says: It follows that the subject, Shāntarakṣhita, is an opener of the chariot-way of the Middle Way School because of being an opener of the chariot-way of the Middle Way Autonomy School. It follows that the subject, Shāntarakṣhita, is an opener of a chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School because of being an opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School.
Our response: [Being an opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School] does not entail [being an opener of a chariot-way of the Middle Way Autonomy School]. The reason [which is that Śāntarakṣhita is an opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School] is established because after Bhāvaviveka opened the Autonomy School, [Śāntarakṣhita] opened the way of the Autonomy system of a Middle Way School in which external objects do not exist because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says:\textsuperscript{a}

It is good [to take this], in accordance with the master Ye-shay-day’s\textsuperscript{b} assertion, as that the master Śāntarakṣhita opened the way of the Middle Way tenet system in the mode of the nonexistence of external objects in conventional terms.

\textsuperscript{a} drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP edition, 55a.1-2. The translation is adapted from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emptiness in the Autonomy School” in the section titled “How Śāntarakṣhita and Kamalashīla explain whether external objects exist or not in conventional terms,” 37.

\textsuperscript{b} Ye-shay-day’s (ye shes sde, fl. 8th century) Distinctions in the Views (lta ba'i khyad par), in bstan 'gyur (sde dge, 4360), TBRC W23703.206:428-457 (Delhi, India: Delhi Kar-mapae chodhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 213b.2-213b.4:

\texttt{bar gyi mkhan po sānta raksi ta zhes hya bas ā cārya a sam gas rnam par shes pa tsam du bshad pa'i bstan bcos rnal 'byor spyod pa mdzad pa la brten te/ kun rdzoh tu de'i lugs dang mthun par rnam par shes pa tsam du bsgrubs la/ don dam par rnam par shes pa yang rang bzhin med par bshad pa'i dbu ma'i bstan bcos dbu ma'i rgyan zhes hya ba zhig mdzad de/ dbu ma'i bstan bcos lugs cung zad mi mthun pa gnyis byung bas/ ā cārya bha byas mdzad pa la ni mdo sde pa'i dbu ma zhes btags / ā cārya sānta raksi tas mdzad pa la ni rnal 'byor spyod pa'i dbu ma zhes btags.}
14. About this, someone says: It follows that Shāntarakṣhita is not the opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School because prior to Shāntarakṣhita, (1) Āryavimuktisena and so forth explained a Middle Way in which external objects do not exist and (2) Bhāvaviveka refuted that [Middle Way explained by Āryavimuktisena and so forth in which external objects do not exist].

Our response: [That prior to Shāntarakṣhita, (1) Āryavimuktisena and so forth explained a Middle Way in which external objects do not exist and (2) Bhāvaviveka refuted that (Middle Way explained by Āryavimuktisena and so forth in which external objects do not exist)] does not entail [that Shāntarakṣhita is not the opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School. The first reason [which is that prior to Shāntarakṣhita, Āryavimuktisena and so forth explained a Middle Way in which external objects do not exist] is established because Haribhadra’s [Clear Meaning] Commentary (see above, 83) says:]

[Included among Superiors (ārya),]
The one called Vimuktisenad also,
Having seen that what they had done were not done [exactly],
With intelligence dwelling in the middle, also made explanatory differentiation.  

---

a Correcting ṇtar lags in 2011 TBRC bla brang (14b.6) to ṇtar lags so in accordance with 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (11a.5).
b 2011 TBRC bla brang, 14b.6; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 11a.5.
c Stanza 4, Amano edition, 3; Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the last three lines; the first line is added in brackets for context.
d Known as Āryavimuktisena.
e Asaṅga and Vasubandhu.
The second part of the reason [which is that prior to Shāntarakṣhita, Bhāvaviveka refuted that Middle Way explained by Āryavimuktisena and so forth in which external objects do not exist] is established because prior to [Shāntarakṣhita, Bhāvaviveka] refuted the explanation by a certain Proponent of the Middle Way [Āryavimuktisena] that it must be established first that external objects do not truly exist as in the Mind-Only School and then afterwards that the mind does not truly exist, because Bhāvaviveka’s Lamp for (Nāgārjuna’s) “Wisdom:” Commentary on (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Fundamental Treatise on the Middle” says:**

Even if it is asserted that having first taken up cognition-only, one later thoroughly forsakes it, rather than having dirtied [oneself]

---

*a prajñāpradīpīlamadhyamakavṛtti, dbu ma'i rtsa ba'i 'grel pa shes rab sgron me. The sde dge edition (dbu ma, tsha, 247a.1-2) reads:

gzan yang rnam par rig pa nye bar blang ba yang byas nas gal te/ de yongs su gtong bar yang 'dod na ni 'di ltar 'dam drzab 'khru bas ni reg par thag bzing ba bzang ngo // don ngo bo nyid med pa nyid du brtags pa bzhi du rnam par shes pa yang bdag med pa nyid dang skye ba med pa nyid du rtogs par byar rung ngo.

Jam-yang-shay-pa is citing the passage directly from Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence (drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP 54b.2-3), which is perhaps his helpful paraphrase of the passage, reading:

‘di la shes rab sgron ma las/ dang po rnam par rig pa tsam blangs nas phyis de yongs su gtong bar 'dod na yang 'dam drzab kyis shags nas 'khru ba las dang po nas ma reg par thag srin ba bzang ste/ phyi rol gyi don ngo bo nyid med par rtogs pa bzhi du rnam shes kyang bdag med pa dang skye ba med par rtogs par byar rung ngo//ches gsungs te

I have adapted the translation of Tsong-kha-pa’s version from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emptiness in the Autonomy School,” 29-30.
with mud and then washing, it would be better from the beginning not to touch it and maintain distance. Just as one realizes external objects as natureless, so it would be fitting to realize consciousness also as selfless and not [ultimately] produced.

[That Bhāvaviveka’s Lamp says this] entails [that prior to (Shāntarakṣhita, Bhāvaviveka) refuted the explanation by a certain Proponent of the Middle Way (Āryavimuktisena) that it must be established first that external objects do not truly exist as in the Mind-Only School and then afterwards that the mind does not truly exist] because even though Avalokitavrata asserts that the opponent is a proponent of the Mind-Only School, the opponent is a certain Proponent of the Middle Way because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says:

It is evident that he is refuting the assertion by a certain Proponent of the Middle Way that trainees definitely must be taught in such an order.

\[\text{drang nges legs bshad snying po, ACIP edition 54b5-6. The translation is Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emptiness in the Autonomy School.”}\]
You cannot accept the root [consequence that Shāntarakṣhita is not the opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School] because even though prior to him, [that is, Shāntarakṣhita,] there were a few\(^a\) such systems [asserting the nonexistence of external objects], without developing\(^b\) as a great tradition\(^c\) they were not suitable to be a chariot-way, just as, for example, when there is a small path, it is not suitable to assign it as a roadway for a chariot,\(^d\) because Tsong-kha-pa’s \textit{The Essence of Eloquence} says:\(^d\)

Therefore, even though such a system also arose [prior to Shāntarakṣhita] in merely a minor way, [it is good—in accordance with the master Ye-shay-day’s\(^e\) assertion—(to take it) that the master Shāntarakṣhita opened the way of] the Middle Way tenet system upon extensively composing texts in the mode of the nonexistence of external objects in conventional terms.

\(^a\) \textit{re gnyis}.
\(^b\) \textit{btod pa}
\(^c\) \textit{srol chen po}
\(^d\) \textit{drang nges legs bshad snying po}, ACIP edition, 55a.1-2. The translation is from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emptiness in the Autonomy School,” in the section titled “How Shāntarakṣhita and Kamalashīla explain whether external objects exist or not in conventional terms,” 37; the bracketed material is from Tsong-kha-pa’s \textit{The Essence of Eloquence} cited above, 114.
\(^e\) \textit{ye shes sde}. 
Hence, there are many upholders of the way also of the Yogic Practice Middle Way School because the Foremost Precious [Tsong-kha-pa] asserts that:

1. Proponents of the Middle Way School resembling [Mind-Only] True Aspectarians are, for instance, Shāntarakṣhita, Kamalashīla, and Dharmakīrti;
2. Proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School resembling [Mind-Only] Tainted False Aspectarians are, for instance, the two, Haribhadra and Jetāri;
3. and a Proponent of the Middle Way Autonomy School in agreement with [Mind-Only] Untainted False Aspectarians is, for instance, Kambala.

The first [reason which is that Proponents of the Middle Way School resembling (Mind-Only) True Aspectarians are, for instance, Shāntarakṣhita, Kamalashīla, and Dharmakīrti] is established because Advayavajra’s Ten Stanzas on Suchness says:

\[ na sākāranirākāre tathātām jñātum icchataḥ \]

\[ tattvadaśaka, 1ab, edited by Haraprasad Shastri in Advayavarjasamgraha, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series 40 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1927), 49: \]

\[ Karl Brunnhölzl identifies Advayavajra as Maitripāda in Straight from the Heart (Ithaca: Snow Lion, 2007), 177, “Maitripa took the name Advayavajra.” He gives his dates as 1007-1085. \]
Those wanting to know suchness
Should not do so in the manner of Aspectarians or Non-Aspectarians.40
and the great scholar (paṇ chen, mahāpāṇḍita) Sahajavajra’s Commentary on (Advayavajra’s) “Ten Stanzas on Suchness” says:a

The exalted presence Shāntarakṣhita and so on assert the Aspected Middle Way; [Shāntarakṣhita] says:

These things we and others propound
Do not inherently exist
Because of being devoid of inherent existence
As one or many, like a reflection.

and so on, with Sahajavajra citing the entirety (yongs rdzogs)b of Shāntarakṣhita’s Ornament for the Middle,c because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says:d

De kho na nyid bcu pa, sde dge, rgyud, wi, 113a.1; P3080, vol. 68 275.3.1. Sahajavajra’s Commentary (identified in the next note) identifies the main meaning of “aspected” as the Aspected Middle Way School (rnam pa dang bcas pa’i dbu ma) and “nonaspected” as the Nonaspected Middle Way School (rnam pa med pa’i dbu ma).
a Sahajavajra’s Commentary on (Advayavajra’s) “Ten Stanzas on Suchness” (tattvādāśa-kaṭīkā, de kho na nyid bcu pa’i rgya cher ’grel pa), sde dge, rgyud, wi, 164b.5-6; P3099, vol. 68, 297.4.6ff. Karl Brunnhölzl has translated this work into English in Straight from the Heart, 192-252.
b In detailing the system of the Aspected Middle Way asserted by Shāntarakṣhita and so forth Sahajavajra cites from among the 97 stanzas of Shāntarakṣhita’s Ornament for the Middle (madhyamakālaṃkārakārikā, dbu ma rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa; sde dge, dbu ma, sa, 53a.1-2) the first stanza and then skips to 61-66, 69, 70, 84, and 91-93. Thus, Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “entirety” (yongs rdzogs) likely means “an impressive amount,” not the entire treatise.
c madhyamakālaṃkārakārikā (Masamichi Ichigō edition), 1:
nihsvabhāvā ami bhāvas tattvataḥ svaparoditaḥ / ekānekasvabhāvena viyogāt pratibimbavat

Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the first line from the translation of Sahajavajra’s commentary (de kho na nyid bcu pa’i rgya cher ’grel pa, sde dge, rgyud, wi, 164b.5), bdag dang gzhan smras dngos po yis. The translation bdag dang gzhan smra’i dngos ’di dag at dbu ma rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa (sde dge, dbu ma, sa, 53a.1) is superior.
d legs bshad snying po, ACIP 56a.6. The translation is from Jeffrey Hopkins’ draft “Emp- tiness in the Autonomy School,” in the section titled “How Shāntarakṣhita and Kamalashīla explain whether external objects exist or not in conventional terms,” 42. Jam-yang-shay-pa cites this passage in his Great Exposition of Tenets; for it and Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s extensive explanation, see Hopkins, Maps of the Profound, 765-769.
This system [the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School] asserts that the aspects of blue, yellow, and so on are effective things;\(^a\) it also comments on Dharmakīrti’s assertion in this way; hence, it is a Middle Way School that in conventional terms makes assertions in accordance with True Aspectarians.

There is entailment\(^b\) because [this system, the Yogic Practice Middle Way Autonomy School] asserts that blue, yellow, and so on—factors that are objects of experience by direct realizations of them—\(^c\) are real conventionalities established in accordance with how they appear,\(^d\) because Shāntarakṣhita’s *Ornament for the Middle* says:

---

\(^a\) *dngos po.*  
\(^b\) *mngon sum du rtags pa'i myong bya'i cha.*  
\(^c\) *yang dag kun rdzob, tathyasamvrti/samyaksamvrti.*  
\(^d\) *madhyamakālāṃkāraṅkāriṇī* (Masamichi Ichigō edition) 64bcd; *dbu ma rgyan gyi tshig le’ur byas pa, sde dge, dbu ma, sa,* 55a.6. Masamichi Ichigō (213) translates the entire stanza:

One should understand that conventional (truth) is in essence (1) that which is agreeable and tacitly accepted only as long as it is not investigated critically (*avicāryaikaramaṇīya*); (2) that which is characterized by arising and decay; and
Realize that these having the attribute of production and disintegration,
Are [real] conventionalities having a nature
Of being able to perform functions.

and his Autocommentary to the “Ornament for the Middle” says:\textsuperscript{a}

These conventionalities are not in their nature just mere verbal conventions; they are things that are seen and accepted.\textsuperscript{a}

The second [reason which is that Proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School resembling [Mind-Only] Tainted False Aspectarians are, for instance, the two, Haribhadra and Jetāri] is established because Haribhadra’s [Clear Meaning] Commentary\textsuperscript{c} says:\textsuperscript{c}

A mere cognition that has the character of the aspect of the apprehender is also eliminated, […]nondual[…]\textsuperscript{a}

and Gyal-tshab’s Ornament for the Essence says.\textsuperscript{d}

A mere cognition—apprehending unmistakenly—that has the character of the aspect of the apprehender is also eliminated.


dharmadharma\textsuperscript{3} whatever has causal efficiency.

\textsuperscript{a} madhyamakālamkāravṛtti, dbu ma rgyan gyi ’grel pa; sde dge, dbu ma, sa, 70b7.
\textsuperscript{b} Correcting tha snyad tsam gyis in 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (12a.2) to tha snyad tsam gyi in accordance with 2011 TBRC bla brang (15b.6).
\textsuperscript{c} Haribhadra’s Clear Meaning Commentary on Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations, Amano edition, 90: tām api laksanām vijñaptimātratām avadhāyādāvaya-jhānam.
\textsuperscript{d} kha, 287a.3-4. See the previous endnote for a lengthier citation.
and because Jetāri’s\textsuperscript{a} \textit{[Auto]commentary on “Differentiating the Sugata’s Texts”} says:\textsuperscript{b}

\begin{verbatim}
'di las kyang dbu ma pa yin te/
sna tshogs snang can don rnams la //
gal te gcig nyid mi rigs na //
re zhig gcig bu'i blo de nyid //
sna tshogs su ni ji liar snang //

zhes phyogs snga ma bslang ba sngon du 'gro bas /
ji lta ji liar don bsams la [ce, 126b, pa] //
de lta de liar rnam dben [ce, 126b, 'brel] zhes //
mkhas pa rnams ni [ce, 126b, kys] gang gsung ba //
de ni dngos stobs 'ongs pa yin //
sna tshogs gcig na ci zhig 'gyur [ce, 126b, gcig la sna tshogs de cir 'gyur] //
blo de la ni mi 'gyur ro //
gal te don 'gal 'di 'dod na //
de la kho bo ci zhig yin // [ce, 126b, gal te don rnams bdag nyid 'dir //
'dod na de la ngas ci bya]

zhes gsungs pa'o //

rnam par shes pa'i skabs nyid nas //
gang gis dngos po rnam dpyad nas //
de nyid du na de dngos med //
gang gi phyir na de dag la //
 gcig dang du ma'i rang bzhin med //

ces bya ba 'di las kyang yin te // phyi rol dang nang thun mong du sun 'byin pa
\end{verbatim}
[You can know that Dharmakīrti] is a Proponent of the Middle Way also from this [passage in Dharmakīrti’s Commentary on Dignāga’s “Compilation of Prime Cognition” which begins]:

[If oneness is not reasonable]
In objects appearing variously,

[…and concludes] This suchness of the Middle Way illuminated by the holy Superior Nāgārjuna and asserted by the holy master

---

a Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the first line of the first stanza that begins a complex argument; this first stanza is:

If it is not reasonable that objects
Appearing variously are a unity,
How then does this single awareness
Appear variously?

pramāṇavarttika, pratyakṣaparivarta, mngon sum le’u, 208:

citrāvabhāṣeyarthṣeyu yadye katvām na yuṣyatē | saiva tāvat kathāṃ buddhirekā
citrāvabhāṣinī
tshad ma rmams ’gre gvi tshig le’ur byas pa; sde dge, tshad ma, ce, 126b.1:

sna tshogs snang can don rmams la // gal te gcig nyid mi rigs na // re zhiṅ gcig
pu’i blo de nyid // sna tshogs su ni ci lha snang //

The entire argument is given in Tibetan in the previous footnote; see also the commentary in Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s Annotations, TBRC W5926-3831, note zha.
Dharmakīrti[a].

There is entailment,* because he cites and explains a False Aspectarian passage in Dharmakīrti’s *Commentary on (Dignāga’s) “Compilation of Prime Cognition,”* and he explains that even though defilements do not

---

*a Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only part of Jetāri’s concluding remark, sufficient to make the point that the reality asserted by Dharmakīrti is the same as that illuminated by Nāgārjuna. The complete remark is:

Thus, this suchness of the Middle Way—understood from the scriptures of the Supramundane Victor, thoroughly certified by valid cognition, illuminated by the holy Superior Nāgārjuna, and asserted by the holy master Dharmakīrti—is suitable to be asserted and to be cultivated by the intelligent.

Jeffrey Hopkins, in “Synopsis of Chapter 9: Maitreya’s Middle and Extremes and Other Scholars” in his *Emptiness in the Mind-Only School,* 337, in a detailed analysis of stanza 4 from Dharmakīrti’s *Commentary on (Dignāga’s) “Compilation of Prime Cognition”* chapter three (pratyakṣa):

If all are without capacity,
The capacity of sprouts and so forth is seen in seeds and so forth.
That is asserted conventionally.
How? Let it be so!

*aśaktam sarvam iti ced bijāder aṅkurādiṣu | dṛṣṭā śaktih matā sā cet samvṛtyāṣtu
yatā tathā (gal te thams cad nus med na // sa bon sogs ni myug sogs la // nus mthong gal te de kun rdzob // 'dod na ci ste de liar ’gyur)*

conveys the essential reason why Jam-yang-shay-pa characterizes Jetāri’s analysis of Dharmakīrti as a Middle Way Autonomy Tainted False Aspectarian. Jetāri cites stanza 4 from Dharmakīrti immediately before the passage Jam-yang-shay-pa cites here. Hopkins, drawing from the exposition by Ngag-wang-pal-dan, says:

In the second reading, Dharmakīrti is taken to be not a Proponent of Mind-Only but a Proponent of Non-Nature. An impressive lineup of Indian scholars—the eighth-century Ravigupta, the eighth-century Shāntarakṣhita and his spiritual son Kamalashīla, the ninth or tenth-century Prajñākaragupta, as well as Jetāri and so forth—identify Dharmakīrti’s stanza in this fashion. They attribute the first line to Dharmakīrti himself as a Proponent of Non-Nature; the second line to the opponent; the third line to Dharmakīrti; and the final to the opponent.

According to the second reading, the stanza is:

[A Proponent of Non-Nature such as Dharmakīrti] says: All are [ultimately] without the capacity [to perform functions].
[Response by a Proponent of True Existence:] The capacity [to produce] sprouts and so forth is seen in seeds and so forth.
[The Proponent of Non-Nature, for example, Dharmakīrti, responds:] This is asserted conventionally.
[Response by a Proponent of True Existence:] How? Let it be so!
permeate\textsuperscript{a} the nature of the mind, afflicting emotions pollute\textsuperscript{b} the entity of consciousness in accordance with Asaṅga’s *Summary of the Great Vehicle*:\textsuperscript{c}

It is asserted as pure like the purity
Of the water constituent, gold, and space.

The third reason [which is that a Proponent of the Middle Way Autonomy School in agreement with (Mind-Only) Untainted False Aspectarians is, for instance, Kambala] is established because Sahajavajra’s *Commentary on (Advayavajra’s) “Ten Stanzas on Suchness”* cites a passage from

\textsuperscript{a} zhugs
\textsuperscript{b} bslad
\textsuperscript{c} This couplet is not from Asaṅga’s *Summary of the Great Vehicle* (mahāyānasamgraha, theg pa chen po bsdus pa) but from Maitreya’s *Differentiation of the Middle and the Extremes*, I.16 (madhyāntavibhāgakārikā, dbyu dang mtha’ rnam par byed pa tshigs su byas pa, sde dge, sens tsam, phi, 41a.3). In Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of Tenets* he similarly mistakenly says that these two lines appear in both Maitreya’s *Sublime Continuum* and Asaṅga’s *Summary of the Great Vehicle* (see Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound*, 769); the more likely meaning is that similar statements occur in these texts.
\textsuperscript{d} 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (12a.5) reads *don rnam las*; 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (16a.2) reads *don rnam la*. 
the *Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom* composed by Kambala:

The Unaspected Middle Way also is asserted by One Having a Woolen Blanket for Clothing [that is, Kambala] and so on; he says:

> Defilements produced from the substantial cause
> Obscure the indivisible entity.
> [An awareness like a lump of crystal
> Appears in another format.
> (When) the wise (examine) just how it is
> These appear dualistically.
> Because the mental aspect is mistaken,
> Apprehended-object and apprehending-subject are different.

…

> The aspect of magical illusion causes mistake—
> A factual elephant and appearance as that
> For the wise do not exist as effective things.

---

a Above at first mention, his name is given variously depending on the edition, *lwa ba ba* (2011 TRBC *bla brang* 1bb.2) and *lwa ba pa* (2015 Go-mang Lhasa 12b.1); now here it is evocatively *lwa ba'i na bza' can* meaning “one who has a woolen blanket for clothing” (2011 TRBC *bla brang* 16a.5 and 2015 Go-mang Lhasa 12a.7), and then *lwa ba ba* (2011 TRBC *bla brang* 16a.5) but *lwa ba pa* (2015 Go-mang Lhasa 12b.1); the extract cited below from Tsong-kha-pa’s *The Essence of Eloquence* similarly evinces this variation, *lwa ba ba* (2011 TRBC *bla brang* 16a.6) but *lwa ba pa* (2015 Go-mang Lhasa 12b.2). The three times when the final *ba* appears in the *bla brang* edition is likely due to the Am-do penchant for replacing *pa* with *ba*. The ACIP edition of Tsong-kha-pa’s text ([*drang ba dang nges pa'i don nam par phy'e ba'i bstan bcos legs bshad snying po*](https://example.com); 56b.1) reads *lwa ba pa*. Brunnhölzl gives his name as Kambala and Kambalāmbara. The extract cited in our text is not in *sde dge* edition of the Tibetan translation of Kambala’s *Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom/ Nine Stanza Summary of the Perfection of Wisdom* (*bhagavatī prajñāpāramitānavaślokapindārtha*, bcom ldan ’das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i don bsdus pa’i tshigs su bcad pa dgu pa; *sde dge, shes phyin, ma*, 1b.1-2b.3) or his [*Auto*commentary](https://example.com) ([*stikā, rgya cher ’gre[, pa*; *sde dge, shes phyin, ma*, 2a-6a]). A similar passage appears in Kambala’s *Garland of Lights* (*ālokamāḻprakaranā, snang ba’i phreng ba zhes bya ba’i rab tu byed pa; *sde dge, dbu ma, ha*, 52a.3-4: *lhag pa’i dri ma skyes pa yis // rang gi ngo bo nges rtogs bsgrigs*). Brunnhölzl, *Straight from the Heart*, 366-367, renders the stanza into English:

> With their insight into themselves
> Obscured by stains born from clinging,
> Minds appear in the form of something other,
> Just as crystals do.
and so forth.

[This statement] entails [that a Proponent of the Middle Way Autonomy School in agreement with (Mind-Only) Untainted False Aspectarians is, for instance, Kambala] because Tsong-kha-pa’s The Essence of Eloquence says:

The panḍita Sahajavajra explains that Proponents of the Middle who in conventional terms assert, in accordance with False Aspectarians, that the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth do not exist as effective things are as commented upon by the master Kambala.

and because Kambala’s Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom cited [in Sahajavajra’s Commentary on (Advayavajra’s) “Ten Stanzas on Suchness”] also says:

\[ drang ba dang nges pa'i don rnam par phyed ba'i bstan bcos legs bshad snying po, ACIP, 56b.1-2. \]

\[ tattvadaśakṣīkā, de kho na nyid bcu pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa; sde dge rgyud, wi, 165b.1. \]

This extract is contained in the ellipsis in the citation above; see Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s commentary in the footnote there. As above, the passage is not in the Tibetan translation of Kambala’s Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom, but again a similar passage appears in his Garland of Lights (ālokamālāprakaraṇa, snang ba'i phreng ba zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa; sde dge, dbu ma, ha, 52a.4-5: sms ni rnam par bslad pa'i phyir // gcig nyid gnyis

\[ a \]

\[ b \]
Because the mental aspect is mistaken, 
Apprehended-object and apprehending-subject are different.

Our own system

Someone having the aspect of a Bodhisattva Superior who comments well on the thought of the Victor’s high sayings without depending another commentator having the fleshly shape of a human is the definition of an opener of a chariot-way.

There are three of those [openers of chariot-ways] because, as already established through scripture and reasoning, there are the three:

• concerning the openers of a chariot-way of the Middle Way there are two—the opener of the chariot-way of the explicit teaching of emptiness, Nāgārjuna, and the composer of the Ornament [for the Clear Realizations] who commented on the hidden meaning as the eight categories of clear realizations, [Maitreya]
• and the master Asaṅga who commented on the meaning of the Mother [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] as Mind-Only.

Also, openers of chariot-ways having a human basis who differentiate the interpretable and definitive among the Victor’s high sayings are limited to two because those are limited to the two—the masters Nāgārjuna and

su snang ba yin // gzung dang ’dzin pa'i dbye ba la // shin tu mkhas pa cis ma yin.

a 2011 TBRC bla brang (16b.1) reads phyir dang; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (12b.2) reads phyir.
15. **Someone says:** It follows that Maitreya’s *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle* is a treatise that opens a chariot-way because the author of the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* is the opener of a chariot-way. [That the author of the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* is an opener of a chariot-way] extremely does not entail [that Maitreya’s *Treatise on the Later Scriptures of the Great Vehicle* is a treatise that opens a chariot-way] because even though [the author of the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*] is an opener of a chariot-way, whatsoever treatises that [the author of the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*] has composed do

---

\footnote{2011 TBRC *bla brang*, 18b.5; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa, 14b.2. Because of its relevance this debate has been moved here for the sake of this publication.}
not need to create the opening of a chariot-way, and because his mode of opening a chariot-way is to comment on the hidden meaning—all the sequence of the clear realizations—as the eight categories, whereby the Ornament for the Clear Realizations is a treatise that opens a chariot-way. The reason [which is that the Ornament for the Clear Realizations is a treatise that opens a chariot-way] has already been established.

---

\[\text{not the same as the eight categories, whereby the Ornament for the Clear Realizations is a treatise that opens a chariot-way]\]

---

\[\text{The reason [which is that the Ornament for the Clear Realizations is a treatise that opens a chariot-way] has already been established.}\]

---

\[\text{a 2011 TBRC bla brang (18b.6) reads srol 'byed par byed; 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (12b.3) reads srol 'byed.}\]
Endnotes by Jeffrey Hopkins

1 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s (gung thang blo gros rgya mtsho, 1851-1928/1930) Clarification of the Meaning of the Thought of the Two—the “Decisive Analysis on the Perfection of Wisdom: Jeweled Lamp” by the Supreme Lama Jam-yang-shay-pa and the “Annotative Commentary” by the Foremost Named Dipa (Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me), 6a.4, points out that according to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Decisive Analysis earlier Tibetans posited both these texts and the authors as openers of the chariot-ways. Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s (gung thang dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me, 1762-1823) work is his Beginnings of an Annotative Commentary on (Jam-yang-shay-pa’s) “Decisive Analysis on the First Chapter of the ’Perfection of Wisdom’” (phar phyin skabs dang po’i mtha’ dpyod kyi mehan ‘grel risom ’phro).

Thus, here Jam-yang-shay-pa deliberately words these four as treatises; Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho (6a.3) explains:

Although Kön-chog-jig-may-wang-po’s Beginnings of a Composition on Dependent-arising (Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, vol. 7, 353/3a.4ff.) says that earlier Tibetans did not posit persons as openers of the chariot-ways, and some others say that only persons are posited, that in Jam-yang-shay-pa’s Decisive Analysis the two—treatises and persons—are posited is the thought of Tsong-kha-pa’s Golden Garland:

Though there are also many treatises that comment on the thought of these [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras], the chief[…]

and:

Moreover, the great being Nāgārjuna…


2 Brackets are from Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Decisive Analysis” and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s “Annotations” (jam dbyangs bla ma mchog gi phar phyin mtha’ dpyod rin chen sgron me dang rje di pañ mśhan can gyi mchan ’grel gnis kyi dḥongs don gsal bzar pa skal bzang ’jug ngogs), TBRC W1KG21227, 6a.5: rang gzhan gi sde pa dngos smra ba rnams kyi bsgrub lhar byas pa’i bden dngos.

3 kha che nche ba’i sde. Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhya, Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India (Simla, India: 1970; reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990), gives as alternate names Daṃṣṭrāsena, Diṣṭasena, Daṃṣtasena, Daṃṣtāsena, Daṃṣṭyasana, and so forth. Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s Precious Lamp (290.1) cites the ’phang thang gi dkar chag as identifying Daṃṣtāsena as the author. In his La Théorie du Tathāga-thagarbha et du Gotra (61 and 325) D. S. Ruegg identifies the author as Daṃṣṭrāsena. Here, Jam-yang-shay-pa’s usage of the transliterated Daṃṣṭṭasena is being followed; see below.

4 Brackets are from Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Decisive Analysis” and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s “Annotations,” TBRC W1KG21227, 6a.5: rang gzhan gi sde pa dngos smra ba rnams kyi bsgrub lhar byas pa’i bden dngos.

5 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho (Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Decisive Analysis” and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s “Annotations,” TBRC W1KG21227, 6a.5)
explains (1) that the *Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning* proves that from accustoming to the pristine wisdom realizing the absence of true existence nirvāṇa is attained and (2) that the *Precious Garland* proves that from it omniscience is attained, due to which these two texts are said to refute the truly established actualities propounded by our own Buddhist sects in particular.

6 Identification by Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho (Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa's "Decisive Analysis" and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me's "Annotations," TBRC W1KG21227, 6b.5).

7 The late Ge-dun-lo-drö speculated that the author of this commentary may have been named Akutobhayā, and thus his text is called the *Akutobhayā Commentary* much as Buddhapālita's commentary is called the *Buddhapālita Commentary*.

8 Brackets from Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho's *Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa's "Decisive Analysis"* and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me's "Annotations," W1KG21227, 6b.5.

9 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho's *Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa's "Decisive Analysis"* and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me's "Annotations" (TBRC W1KG21227, 9a.3) identifies a passage in Bu-tön Rin-chen-drub's (bu ston rin chen grub, 1290-1364) *Cluster of Scriptures / Extensive Explanation of (Maitreya's) "Ornament for the Clear Realization, Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom"* as Well as Its Commentary (lung gi snye ma/ shes rab kyi phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtags pa'i rgyan zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa'i rgya cher bshad pa) where he cites "Daṃṣṭasena's Commentary on the One Hundred Thousand" and a passage in his *History of the Religion* (chos 'byung) where he does the same, as well as a reference to his taking the commentary on all three Mothers to be by Daṃṣṭasena and then calls for analysis as to which of two commentaries Bu-tön posits as the means of opening the chariot-way.

Earlier, this reason was presented as:

in terms of the actual fact, in accordance with the *Teachings of Akṣhayamati Sūtra*, the commentaries abide in two [types]—a mode of commentary on the explicit teaching, emptiness, and a mode of commentary on the hidden meaning, the clear realizations.

The achievement of high status (elevated states within cyclic existence) and definite goodness (liberation from cyclic existence and the great liberation of Buddhahood).

12 The four, as laid out just below, are subject matter (brjod bya), purpose (dgos pa), essential purpose (nying dgos), and relationship ('brel ba).

13 About how this clause is read, Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho's *Clarification* (TBRC W1KG21227-L1KG21259, 14b.6) says:

Therefore, if the statement in Jam-yang-shay-pa's textbook “It follows that this is not logically feasible rather than the earlier” (de snga ma las kyang mi 'thad par thal) is taken as “It follows that this presentation of your own system and execution of a refutation by you [Dharmamitra] are not logically feasible rather than the earlier assertion by Prajñākaramati that you refuted,” it fits together with the thought of Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me's *Annotations* and Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis* because the passage from Tsong-kha-pa's *Golden Garland* also is [saying], “Rather than Prajñākaramati, the two—the refutation and presentation by you—are not logically feasible.”

14 The last reason clause in the brackets are from Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho's *Clarification*, TBRC W1KG21227-L1KG21259, 14b.4.

15 Above (61), where Jam-yang-shay-pa stated:
The subject, the master Haribhadra, makes praise and homage to all three perfections of wisdom—text, path, and result—because while expressing the good qualities of the three perfections of wisdom he bows the three doors of his body, speech, and mind, because Haribhadra's *Clear Meaning Commentary* says:

Respectful homage to the perfection of wisdom.

and because with “perfection of wisdom” he praises by way expressing good qualities, and bowing is homage.

16 Or “transcendent wisdom.”

Haribhadra’s *Clear Meaning Commentary* says:

Respectful homage to the perfection of wisdom
In order to open up
The *Versified Ornament* of those
As an ornament for all.

17 This passage is the first of five contiguous extracts from Haribhadra’s *Illumination of the "Ornament,"* Wogihara edition, 22-23; rgyan snang, cha, 18a.3-18b.1; Sparham, *Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Alokā,* vol. 1, 198-199. Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho (Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Decisive Analysis” and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s “Annotations,” TBRC W1KG21227, 15b.5, TBRC W2CZ7948-1KG10272, 16a.2) lists the six minds (sems drug) evident in Haribhadra’s exposition and describes them:

From among the six minds described in Haribhadra’s *Great Commentary:

1. The *root mind* (rtsa ba’i sens) is an awareness apprehending by way of mere term-generalities [verbal images], “My treatise in which I am engaged is the Eight Thousand [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra].” This [root mind] is posited ranging from immediately upon having engaged in the Eight Thousand by way of hearing and so forth.

2. The *analytic mind* (rjes su dpyod pa’i sens), according to Pal-mang Rin-po-che (dpal mang dkon mchog rgyal mshan rin po che, also called Wal-mang Kön-chog-gyal-tshan, dbal mang dkon mchog rgyal mshan, 1764-1853) in his Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Great Vehicle Sūtras”: Blossoming Flower of the Subduer’s Teaching (mdo sde’i rgyan gyi ‘grel pa thub bstan rgyas pa’i me tog) involves the two, hearing and thinking observing the chapters, count of stanzas, and so forth of the Eight Thousand; he associates rjes su dpyod pa’i tshig dang in Jam-yang-shay-pa’s textbook with the mode of performing thinking (bsam pa byed tshul) [in the next mind, the third mind].*

3. The *intensely analytic mind* (rnam par dpyod pa’i sens) is twofold, analyzing meanings (don la dpyod pa) and analyzing words (tshig la dpyod pa).

a) Analyzing meanings is fourfold:

   (i) *Enumeration* (bgrang ba) is to apprehend the mere count of the eight categories and so forth.

   (ii) *Comprehension* (gzhal ba) is to apprehend the individual natures of those [eight categories and so forth].

   (iii) *Realization* (rtogs pa) is an awareness clearing away superimposition and depreciation with regard to the characters, modes of practice, and so forth of those [eight categories and so forth]. When this is generated, has one engaged in the meaning of the Eight Thousand through states
arisen from thinking (bsam byang)? [When it is taken as being so,] it fits together with the statement in Gung-thang Kün-chog-tan-pa-drón-me’s Annotations, “In order to gain states arisen from thinking with regard to the Ornament…one must know the modes of practice.”

(iv) **Definite realization (nges par rtogs pa)** is an awareness again and again recalling the modes of practice and so forth of those [eight categories and so forth].

b) **Analyzing words/ connotative units (tshig la dpyod pa)** [or analyzing letters (yi ge la dpyod pa)] is twofold:

   (i) **Apprehending as not having meaning (don med par ’dzin pa)** is to apprehend merely individual words/ connotative units or merely each chapter as not having the meaning of fully teaching the meaning of the Mother [perfection of wisdom]

   (ii) **Apprehending as having meaning (don dang bcas par ’dzin pa)** is to apprehend the collection, that is, the thirty-two chapters, as having the meaning of fully, explicitly teaching the meaning of the Mother [perfection of wisdom]. Since this analyzes the way the words teach objects of expression, it is different from the **analytic mind** [the second of the six minds].

4. The **mind of definite apprehension (nges par ’dzin pa’i sems)** is an awareness abiding one-pointedly individually analyzing the meanings expressed in those [eight categories and so forth].

5. The **mind of summarization (sdom pa’i sems)** is a meditative awareness upon having brought those altogether, “The modes of practicing the meanings of this text in which I am engaged are such-and-such.”

6. The **mind of hope together with aspiration ( ’dun pa dang lhan cig pa re ba ba’i sems)** is a mind of dedicating (bsngo ba’i sems) the roots of virtue of the first five minds to complete enlightenment.

The final three [minds] are associated with the ways of performing meditation.

* Jam-yang-shay-pa, however, appears to elide the second and third mind, resulting in an awkward sentence, which could be a scribal error.

The entire passage in Haribhadra’s *Great Commentary* is:

In a clean area Bodhisattvas in a cross-legged posture, having previously observed the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, from the viewpoint of the bare words (ming) thoroughly observe with the **root mind** (rtsa ba’i sems) the modes of the perfection of wisdom that teach all phenomena as selfless, and with an **analytic mind** (rjes su dpyod pa’i sems) investigate the divisions of its connotative units (tshig) by way of its chapters and so forth. Then they enumerate with numbers (bgrang bas) the divisions of states of the eight clear realizations, ascertain with comprehension (gzhal bas) each clear realization’s nature, [ascertain] with realization (rtog pas/ rtogs pas) the nonexistence of superimposition and deprecation, and make a logical decision with definite realization (nges par rtog pas/ nges par rtogs pas) through direct and inferential valid cognition; [they analyze the topics of the perfection of wisdom with an intensely analytic mind (rnam par dpyod pa’i sems) by way of four such aspects, and they analyze by way of two aspects that the connotative units individually do not have the [full] meaning and collectively have the [full] meaning, respectively. Then, with a **mind of definite**
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apprehension (nges par 'dzin pa’i sems kyi) they apprehend the signs in accordance with how they have been intensely analyzed; with a mind of summarization (sdom pa’i sems) the topics—as they have been analyzed—are fit together with the root mind that focuses on the bare words; and with a mind of hope together with aspiration (‘duan pa dang lhan cig pa’i re ba’i sems) they meditate on these topics in which they are intensively training. Thus, since through the stages of first generating consciousnesses having the nature of hearing, thinking, and meditation they realize the pristine wisdom knowing all aspects, it has gone beyond, that is, has gone to the far limit, and hence is a “perfection of wisdom.”

1. [སེམས་དཔའ་ལ་ལོག་བས། སེམས་དཔའ་ལ་དམིགས་པ་འོ།]
2. [ཆེས་རབ་ཀྱི་ཕ་རོལ་ȣ་蚌ན་པའི་སེམས་ཀྱིས་ཐ་དོན་པའི་སེམས་ཀྱིས་དེ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ཚིག་གི་རབ་ȣ་ȣེ་བ་ལེɹ་ལ་ཐེག་པ་]
3. [ȷམ་པ་བཞིས་ཤེས་རབ་ཀྱི་ཕ་རོལ་ȣ་蚌ན་པའི་དོན་ལ་ȣེ་བ་]

a) [ȷམ་པ་]

(i) སེམས་ཀྱི་ལོག་པ་འོགས་པ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་མཁྱེན་བོད་པའི་འོག་པས་

(ii) སེམས་ཀྱི་དབང་པོ་འོག་པས་པོ་མཁྱེན་བོད་པའི་འོག་པས་

(iii) སེམས་ཀྱི་ལོག་པ་འོགས་པ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་མཁྱེན་བོད་པ་

(iv) སེམས་ཀྱི་ལོག་པ་འོགས་པ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་མཁྱེན་བོད་པ་

b) [ȷམ་པ་]

(i) སེམས་ཀྱི་ལོག་པ་འོགས་པ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་མཁྱེན་བོད་པ་

(ii) སེམས་ཀྱི་ལོག་པ་འོགས་པ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་མཁྱེན་བོད་པ་

Kingly practices, Kingly practices, Kingly practices, Kingly practices, Kingly practices.
19 Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*, IV.33; this is the first line of two stanzas on the divisions of concordances with a portion of liberation, also called the path of accumulation:

[IV.33]
Faith observing Buddhas and so forth,
Effort having giving and so forth as its objects of activity,
Mindfulness of the excellent attitude,
Nonconceptual meditative stabilization,

[IV.34]
Wisdom knowing phenomena
In all aspects—comprising five aspects.
It is asserted that complete enlightenment
Is realized easily by the sharp but with difficulty by the dull.

20 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s *Annotations to (Haribhadra’s) Small Clear Meaning Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations”: Clearing Away the Darkness for Those Wanting Liberation* (*mngon rtogs rgyan gyi ’grel chung don gsal ba'i mchan ’grel kun bzang zhing gi nying ma thar ’dod mun sel*), TBRC W00EGS1017126 (PDF of Lhasa (?); dge ldan legs bshad gsung rab’grem spel khang, 2006), vol. 1, 5.5-8.10, gives a detailed commentary on the stanza, which in selective paraphrase is:

From complete—surpassing—affection due to affection for migrators out of compassion, the causal excellent attitude, performing practice for twelve years and acting to give his flesh to a female dog,

Asaṅga, a Superior due to having attaining the third [Bodhisattva] ground, refuge from suffering for others—the excellent undertaking—

**Having listened to** the *Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras*, the Five Doctrines of Maitreya, and so forth from **Ajīta** [Maitreya]—undaunted by worldly gods—**protector** of sentient beings, in the Joyous Pure Land for fifty human years,

**Made an exposition**, *Compendium of Ascertainments* of the great treatises, commenting on the meaning expressed in the *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* and the Mother Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras without connecting the explanation to them.
The great chariot Asaṅga, despite having practiced at achieving a meeting with Maitreya for three years, did not gain even a sign, due to which he was discouraged, but when leaving [his cave], he saw an old man rubbing a piece of iron with wool, who said he was making a needle and praised his effort; so, Asaṅga turned back. Again, having practiced for three years, he was leaving when he saw that drops of water had worn down rock, whereupon he generated an attribute of effort. Again, having practiced for three years, he was discouraged and left, but saw that the feathers of a birth had worn down rock [coming into and leaving his cave], whereupon he returned for another three years. Though he practiced for twelve years, a sign had not arisen, and so, discouraged, he went outside, where he saw a female dog whose lower abdomen had been chewed up by worms. Generating compassion, he cut flesh from his thigh [so he could remove the worms and feed them on his own flesh], whereupon he saw the dog as the protector Maitreya, and [being taken] to the Joyous Pure Land, he heard the Great Vehicle Manifest Knowledge Mother Sūtra, the Five Doctrines of Maitreya, and so forth. [Returning to this world] he opened the Mind-Only way in accordance with the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought.

Friend due to fulfilling the desired aims of migrating beings through teaching the causes of their welfare, high status and definite goodness, Vasubandhu—

Principally evincing his own inclination adhering to true establishment in his textual commentary on the Twenty-five Thousand Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra—

Provided commentary in the Cognition System [Mind-Only School] in accordance with the earlier commentary by Asaṅga

Thoroughly depending on objects of knowledge being of an inner nature.

Included among Superiors (ārya) due to having generated supramundane pristine wisdom,

The one called Vimuktisena (rnam par grol ba’i sde) because of being released (grol bas) from the objects to be abandoned by the path of seeing also,

Having seen that the commentaries done by the earlier two masters were not done exactly in accordance with the meaning of the Mother [Sūtras] since they were done in accordance with the texts of Cognition-Only or since Vasubandhu had not given up adherence to Cognition and Asaṅga made his [commentary in terms of mind-only] for the sake of taming Vasubandhu,

With intelligence dwelling in the middle—the meaning of the Mother and of [Maitreya’s] treatise free from the extremes of permanence and annihilation
and realizing such or with unbiased intelligence—properly differentiated
the topics in commentary connecting the *Ornament* with the Twenty-five
*Thousand.* Gyal-tshab’s *Explanation* says that thereby it is not redundant,
and also the general stages of the vast paths also are concordant between this
and the two earlier masters.

23 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s *Annotations to (Haribhadra’s) Small Clear Meaning
Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations,* vol. 1, 10.8-11.21,
gives detailed commentary on the stanza, which in selective paraphrase is:

**After that** explanatory differentiation by Āryavimuktisena, the one called
Bhadanta Vimuktisena
Whose special good quality is **dwelling on the ground of faith,** the path of ac-
cumulation,
**Not finding** the full teaching of the eight clear realizations in **all the treat-
tises**—the extensive, medium-length, and brief [Perfection of Wisdom
Sūtras],
**Made a Commentary,** explaining the Twenty-five *Thousand** concordant with
the mode of connection with only the Twenty-five *Thousand* found by **him.**

24 According to Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s *Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Dec-
cisive Analysis”* and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s “Annotations” (TBRC
W1KG21227, 16b.5) this means that he has generated the wisdom realizing the meaning
of the Mother (*yum don rtogs pa’i shes rab skyes pa*).

25 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s *Annotations to (Haribhadra’s) Small Clear Meaning
Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations,* vol. 1, 12.1-12.15,
gives detailed commentary on the stanza; his commentary according to Gyal-tshab’s *Or-
ament for the Essence* is, in selective paraphrase:

**How amazing that** I have **found the treatise** fully revealing the stages of clear
realization of all the middle path,
The essential meanings of **all these**—the Extensive, Middle-length, and Brief
*Mothers*—**which,** in the manner explained above,
Four earlier scholars **illuminated in that way** the words and/or the meanings
And among the two [half-]brothers and the two Vimuktisenas and so forth **just
some did not find** the meaning exactly as it is.

26 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s *Annotations to (Haribhadra’s) Small Clear Meaning
Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations,”* vol. 1, 12.15-13.8,
gives detailed commentary on the stanza, which in selective paraphrase is:

**This profound path**—the clear realizations and the meaning of emptiness—
**extremely difficult to find**
Since it was not found even by **such** aforementioned four scholars
**Was luckily found through the force of** empowering blessings by the Mait-
reya *Buddha* upon seeing his face [that is, encountering him] in dreams.
Therefore, it is **reasonable for** unbiased scholars to **explore it.**

27 Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of Tenets* (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 394)
cites Asaṅga’s *Summary of the Great Vehicle:*

In all Perfection of Wisdom [Sūtras] non-conceptual pristine wisdom is taught
as an antidote to ten distracting conceptualizations.

and goes on to detail how the antidotes are taught (ibid, 395):
It is explained that all meanings of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras are included in antidotes to the ten distracting conceptualizations of Bodhisattvas:

1. Antidote to conceptualization of the non-existence of effective things: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “While existing as a Bodhisattva,” and so forth.
2. Antidote to conceptualization of effective things: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “A Bodhisattva is not to be seen as real,” and so forth.
3. Antidote to conceptualization of superimposition: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “The name Bodhisattva is not to be seen as real. A Bodhisattva is not to be seen as real. The perfection of wisdom is not to be seen as real,” and so forth.
4. Antidote to conceptualization of depreciation: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “It is not due to emptiness.”
5. Antidote to conceptualization of oneness: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “That which is the emptiness of form is not form,” and so forth.
6. Antidote to conceptualization of difference: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “Form is not other than emptiness. Form itself is emptiness; emptiness is form.”
7. Antidote to conceptualization of entity: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “Subhūti, it is thus: This so-called ‘form’ is only a name,” and so forth.
8. Antidote to conceptualization of attribute: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “The entity is not produced, not ceased, not afflicted, not pure,” and so forth.
9. Antidote to conceptualization of an object as like the name: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “Having individually assigned those phenomena with fabricated names, they impute conventions in accordance with adventitious names; they manifestly adhere to them in accordance with how conventions were imputed.”
10. Antidote to conceptualization of a name as like the object: Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say, “Bodhisattvas do not see all those names as real. Due to not seeing them as real, they do not adhere to them,” and so forth.

In an attempt to try to uncover why Jam-yang-shay-pa cites this line, let us supply the context of the two stanzas in the fifth chapter of Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations, V.15-16, in which it is embedded:

(1) Not going forth in accordance with the intents,
(2) Definitely holding paths to be non-paths,
(3) Production as well as cessation,
(4) Actualities endowed and non-endowed,
(5) Dwelling, (6) destroying the lineage,
(7) No seeking, (8) no cause,
(9) And observing opposition

Are the other conceptualizations of apprehending-subjects.

Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s Meaning of the Words, 78b.5, explains that these two stanzas are concerned with conceptualizations conceiving of a partaker (longs spyd pa po), that is to say, an enjoyer or user that is qualified by imputed existence but which is seen as truly existent. These conceptualizations occur in ten contexts, namely, upon observing certain types of persons which are described briefly in the above two stanzas and which he amplifies as follows:

Conceptualizations conceiving of a partaker—qualified by imputed existence—as truly existent upon observing:
(1) a being (skyes bu, puruṣa\(^8\)) who does not go forth in accordance with the three great intents [great mind, great abandonment, and great realization]

(2) a being who definitely holds Great Vehicle paths to be noncorrect paths

(3) a being who realizes the production and cessation of causes and effects as made by entities only imputed conventionally

(4) a being who knows the actualities of forms and so forth as endowed (ldan pa), that is, as not ultimately having divisions, and as non-endowed (mi ldan pa), that is, as conventionally having divisions

(5) a being who dwells adhering to the true existence of forms and so forth

(6) a being who destroys and reverses the attitude of the lineage—that is, seeking mere peace—of Hearers and so forth

(7) a being who when realizing emptiness, holds merely it to be sufficient and thereupon has no desire seeking Buddhahood

(8) a being who has no cause, that is, cultivation of the perfection of wisdom

(9) a being who observes (dmigs pa)—that is, has (yod pa)—the opposing actualities interfering with enlightenment such as devilishness and so forth

...are conceptualizations of apprehending-subjects other than the previous, that is, conceptualizations apprehending imputed existence.

\(^8\) Often translated as “person.” See Hopkins and Yi, Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s Explanation of (Maitreya’s) Treatise “Ornament for the Clear Realizations” from the Approach of the Meaning of the Words: Sacred Word of Maitreyanātha, on the 46\(^{th}\) Topic, Path-of-seeing peak trainings, V.15-16.

The relevance of both this and previous citation from the Questions of King Dhāranīśvara Sūtra to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s point is unclear; the relevance may be that if Hearers need to seek teaching from others and if they are bound by misconceptions about true existence, then the only way that they could teach about the perfection of wisdom and its manifold divisions would be through the power of the Buddha.

29 Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me (Difficult Points, 16.8) takes “supreme teaching of the Conqueror” (rgyal ba’i bstan pa mchog) as referring to Buddha’s teaching in general but even more so to the Great Vehicle of inseparable wisdom and method, since the profound emptiness and the vast Bodhisattva deeds are, respectively, the transmissions (bka’ bab) of Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga.

30 Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me (ibid., 15.17-16.8) takes “two modes” (tshul gnyis) as referring to two different great ways of positing what requires interpretation and what is definitive—as found in the two systems of the Middle Way School and the Mind-Only School for commenting on the final thought of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras.

31 gsung rab, pravacana; more literally, “high sayings.” Rather than the written word, the main field of reference of this term is the spoken word. Gung-tang (ibid., 15.1-15.17) explains that in this context of paying homage to Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga for differentiating the interpretable and the definitive among Buddha’s scriptures, this term refers to Buddha’s scriptures in general and mainly refers to the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras since not only the Proponents of the Middle but also the Proponents of Mind-Only hold the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras to be the chief of all sūtras. For the Proponents of Mind-Only hold that the intended trainees of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras are sharper than the intended trainees of the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought, since they can understand the three natures and three non-natures just from hearing the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras, without having to rely on an explanation such as that given in the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought.
The Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras are the treasury that is the basis for the differentiation into what requires interpretation and what is definitive, whereas the Sūtra Unraveling the Thought and the Sūtra of the Teachings of Akṣhayamati are the keys to that treasury, in that they show how to make the differentiation. Gung-tang therefore concludes that here “scriptures” refers not to those two sūtras but to Buddha’s scriptures in general and mainly the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras.

32 Jam-yang-shay-pa in his 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 / Great Exposition of Tenets (grub mtha’i rnam bshad rang gzhan grub mtha’ kun dang zab don mchog tu gsal ba kun bzang zhing gi nyi ma lung rigs rgya mtsho skye dgu’i re ba kun skong/ grub mtha’ chen mo) says:

Around just after the master Asaṅga opened the way of the Mind-Only School upon having come to this world, the master Buddhapālita wrote a commentary on Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom” and thereby opened the way of the Consequence School. For:

- in general there are eight commentaries on Nāgārjuna’s Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called “Wisdom”
- and although the other six commentaries mostly use syllogistic statements, this master flings many consequences.

Most of the explanations in the commentaries by masters [who wrote texts] other than the Akutobhayā Commentary and the Clear Words that are mentioned in Bhāvaviveka’s Lamp for (Nāgārjuna’s) “Wisdom” are seen to be in the class of syllogisms…The master Buddhapālita refutes each of the four extreme types of production through consequences and similarly does commentary within using many consequences. The Buddhapālita Commentary contains many [statements of consequences] such as, for instance (in commenting on Nāgārjuna’s Treatise on the Middle, I.1):

About that, respectively, things are not produced from their own entities because [if they were] their production [again] would be just senseless and because production would be endless. It is thus: the production again of things already existing in their own entities is purposeless. [Also] if, though existent, they are produced, they would never not be produced; hence, that also is not asserted. Therefore, respectively, things are not produced from self.

They also are not produced from other. Why? For it would [absurdly] follow that everything would be produced from everything.

They also are not produced from both self and other because the fallacies of both [production from self and production from other] would [absurdly] follow.

They also are not produced causelessly because it would [absurdly] follow that everything always would be produced from everything and because there would be the fallacy that all endeavor would be just senseless.
As is evident in the next debate, Jam-yang-shay-pa takes the agent of “opens” to be Buddhapālita. It is not entirely unusual in Tibetan for the agent of the past participle and the agent of the main verb to be different, but here it is especially counterintuitive. Jam-yang-shay-pa and his followers stand alone among the major Ge-lug-pa scholars in taking the agents of the verbal in this sentence this way.

34 Jam-yang-shay-pa in his Great Exposition of Tenets expands on Tsong-kha-pa’s statement:

After Bhāvaviveka opened the way of the Autonomy Middle Way School, the master Chandrakīrti refuted autonomy in the master Bhāvaviveka’s system. Having, moreover, not just refuted it but refuted it well, he established the system of the Consequence School as not shared with the Autonomy School and below. For although Buddhapālita opened the mere way of the Consequence School, it was not clear whether to assert autonomy or not, whereas Chandrakīrti demonstrated in many ways:

• that Buddhapālita did not assert autonomy
• proofs that it is not suitable for Proponents of the Middle to use autonomous
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[syllogisms]  
• and, oppositely, damages to autonomous syllogisms and establishment by way of the object’s own character

whereupon he established [the Consequence School] as unshared. For instance, Chandrakīrti’s autocommentary on the Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) “Treatise on the Middle” says, “May scholars ascertain that this system is unshared.”

Jam-yang-shay-pa then proceeds to lay out Chandrakīrti’s presentation in considerable detail; see Hopkins, Maps of the Profound, 481-500.

35 The reference of no entailment is to the beginning of debate 10 where Jam-yang-shay-pa responded: [That Buddhapālita is the opener of the chariot-way where (Tsong-kha-pa) says, “opens the chariot-way,”] does not entail [that in this (passage) the demonstrator (1) of many proofs that it is unsuitable for a Proponent of the Middle Way to use autonomy (syllogisms) and (2) of much damage to the opposite position, autonomy, is Buddhapālita].

36 Jam-yang-shay-pa’s point is that Buddhapālita opened the chariot-way of the Middle Way Consequence School by using many consequences, and Chandrakīrti in addition clarified the unsuitability of autonomous syllogisms and suitability of consequences. For discussion of this issue, see Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s Clarification of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s “Decisive Analysis” and Gung-thang Kön-chog-tan-pay-drön-me’s “Annotations” (TBRC W1KG21227, 20a.1).

37 *rang rgyud mi gsal bas.* In other words, Bhāvaviveka thought that although Buddhapālita did not manifestly state autonomous syllogisms, Buddhapālita intended their inclusion since Buddhapālita would have agreed with Bhāvaviveka that consequences alone cannot generate inference of the meaning intended to be communicated. Therefore, Bhāvaviveka considered that even Buddhapālita would eventually state the intended communication in the form of an autonomous syllogism.

38 Gung-thang Lo-drö-gya-tsho’s Annotations to (Haribhadra’s) Small Clear Meaning Commentary on (Maitreya’s) “Ornament for the Clear Realizations,” vol. 1, 8.17-8.28, gives detailed commentary on the stanza, which in selective paraphrase is:

*Included among Superiors* (*ārya*) due to having generated supramundane pristine wisdom,

*The one called Vimuktisena* (*rnam par grol ba’i sde*) because of being released (*grol bas*) from the objects to be abandoned by the path of seeing
also,

Having seen that the commentaries done by the earlier two masters were not done exactly in accordance with the meaning of the Mother [Sūtras] since they were done in accordance with the texts of Cognition-Only or since Vasubandhu had not given up adherence to Cognition and Asaṅga made his [commentary in terms of mind-only] for the sake of taming Vasubandhu,

With intelligence dwelling in the middle—the meaning of the Mother and of [Maitreya’s] treatise free from the extremes of permanence and annihilation and realizing such or with unbiased intelligence—properly differentiated the topics in commentary connecting the Ornament with the Twenty-five Thousand. Gyal-tshab’s Explanation says that thereby it is not redundant, and also the general stages of the vast paths also are concordant between this and the two earlier masters.

39 Jam-yang-shay-pa makes a similar statement in his Great Exposition of Tenets:

Hence, although prior to that time there were indeed mere Proponents of the Middle who accorded with the Yogic Practitioners, only the master Shāntarakṣhita is the opener of the chariot-way of the Yogic-Autonomy Middle Way School because this master, just after even Chandrakīrti, set up a great way upon extensively composing texts such as the Ornament for the Middle—root text and commentary—which present such a system. Although even prior to this there existed the mere way, this does no damage [to Shāntarakṣhita being the opener of the chariot-way] because it is like the fact that in the world for a road on which great chariots can travel the mere existence of a road is not sufficient, a broad and great highway is needed. The master Ye-shay-day says:

Then, the master Shāntarakṣhita made a different Middle Way system, teaching—based on Yogic Practice [that is, Mind-Only] treatises—that external objects conventionally do not exist and that the mind ultimately is without inherent existence. Thereby, the Middle Way School arose in two forms.

Translation from Hopkins, Maps of the Profound, 503-504.

40 Tenzin Gyatso, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, commenting on stanza 1bcd, says in Kindness, Clarity, and Insight, trans. and ed. by Jeffrey Hopkins (Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion, 1984), 201/228:

With respect to philosophical view, the Translator Marpa explored the view of emptiness under the direction of Maitrīpāda, who in his Ten Stanzas on Suchness (tattvadāsākā, de kho na nyid bcu pa) says:

Not Aspectarians, not Non-Aspectarians,
Even Proponents of the Middle who are not adorned
With the guru’s speech are only mediocre.

He says that both True and False Aspectarian Proponents of Mind-Only do not have the final view and that even within the Middle Way School, those who are not adorned with the quintessential instructions of the guru are mediocre. In commentary on this, Maitrīpāda’s student, Sahajavajra, identifies the “guru” as the glorious Chandrakīrti, making it clear that Maitrīpāda considers Chandrakīrti’s quintessential instructions to be essential if the view is to be supreme. Thus, Maitrīpāda’s view, and hence Marpa’s, is that of Chandrakīrti’s Middle Way
Consequence School.

41 The entailment here is difficult to track down; it may be located in the citation from Tsong-kha-pa’s *The Essence of Eloquence*, namely: that this system’s assertion that the aspects of blue, yellow, and so on are effective things entails that it is a Middle Way School that in conventional terms makes assertions in accordance with True Aspectarians.

42 In his *Great Exposition of Tenets* (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound*, 768) Jam-yang-shay-pa makes a similar statement immediately after citing the same quote from Tsong-kha-pa’s *The Essence of Eloquence*:

> For they conventionally assert that since the aspects of appearances as blue and yellow are objects of experience of direct valid cognitions, real conventionalities—established the way they appear—are established merely in a relaxed and comfortable way (*nyams dga’ dga’ ltar*) in the perspective of non-analytical and non-investigatory awarenesses.

In his *Annotations* to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of Tenets* Ngag-wang-pal-dan challenges the relevance of Jam-yang-shay-pa’s bringing up here Shāntarakṣhita’s assertion of real conventionalities when he says:

> Tsong-kha-pa is explaining that by reason of [Shāntarakṣhita’s] asserting that the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth are effective things, he accords with True Aspectarians; Tsong-kha-pa is not explaining that due to [Shāntarakṣhita’s] way of asserting real conventionalities he is established as in accordance with True Aspectarians.

43 In his *Annotations* to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of Tenets* (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound*, 766-768) Ngag-wang-pal-dan says:

> It can most clearly be proven that the master Shāntarakṣhita accords with True Aspectarians through eight stanzas [in his *Ornament for the Middle*, stanzas 52-60 with an initial stanza for the False Aspectarian’s position,] refuting that aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth are non-effective imputations (*dngos por med pa’i kun brtags*). It is as follows:

**False Aspectarian:** Sense consciousnesses are not generated in the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth. For example, due to colors being placed near it, though an unaltered crystal remains pure, aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth clearly appear [in it] through the force of the ripening of predispositions for error deposited beginninglessly [in the mind], as is the case, for example, with a lump of clay appearing as horses, elephants, and so forth through the force of mantra and substances. Therefore, the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth are non-effective imputations like the falling hairs that appear to someone with an eye disease.

**Refutation:** There are eight refutations.

1. The consequence that experience of aspects would not be feasible: It [absurdly] follows that the subject, aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth, are not feasibly clearly felt and experienced because of not being effective things. [Not being effective things] entails [not feasibly being clearly felt and experienced] because a consciousness separate from an effective thing that is an aspect—that is, devoid of an aspect—is not observed [that is, does not exist].

2. The consequence that consciousness would not be feasible: It [absurdly] follows that the subject, consciousness, is not feasibly consciousness of an aspect because
it does not have an aspect, as is the case, for example, with pain not having pleasure and white not having blue.

3. Explicit experience (dngos su myong ba) would not be feasible: It [absurdly] follows that the subject, an aspect, is not feasibly explicitly experienced because of not being the substantial entity of consciousness, as is the case, for example, with a sky-flower.

4. Experience of the imputational (brtags myong) is not feasible: It follows that the subject, consciousness, does not experience an aspect upon imputation because an aspect would not have the capacity of generating a consciousness into having [its] aspect, as is the case, for example, with a horse’s horn.

5. The consequence of non-relation with consciousness: It [absurdly] follows that it is not feasible that when consciousness experiences, it experiences various aspects because aspects and consciousness are unrelated, since they are not related as one entity (bdag gcig 'brel) and are not in a relation of derivation (de byung 'brel; provenance).

6. Occasional arising would not be feasible: It [absurdly] follows with respect to the subject, an aspect, that if it does not have causes, [its] occasionally arising [sometimes being produced and sometimes not being produced] is not feasible because of not relying [on causes], and it follows with respect to the subject, an aspect, that if it has causes, it is an other-powered nature because of being produced from causes.

7. The consequence of there only being [consciousnesses having] the aspect of the apprehender [that is, only self-cognizing consciousnesses]: If [consciousnesses having] the aspect of the apprehended [that is, consciousnesses knowing another object] do not exist, then it [absurdly] follows that the subject, consciousnesses, are only [consciousnesses having] the aspect of the apprehender [that is, only self-cognizing consciousnesses] because of being consciousnesses that do not have the aspect of the apprehended. If it is accepted [that consciousnesses are only consciousnesses having the aspect of the apprehender, that is, only self-cognizing consciousnesses], then it [absurdly] follows that [a consciousness having] the aspect of the apprehender [that is, a self-cognizing consciousness], like a pure crystal sphere, devoid of the aspect of the apprehended does not exist because whereas it would be suitable to observe such, it is not observed.

8. The consequence that [an aspect] is an other-powered nature: If you are saying that although an aspect does not exist in fact, it appears through the force of mistake, then it follows that the subject, an aspect, is an other-powered nature because of relying upon mistake or arising from the force of mistake.

44 This is in commentary on V.20; Maitreya’s Ornament for the Clear Realizations (V.19-20) says:

In a nature without cessation
What type of conceptualization
Is extinguished by the path called “seeing”?!
What aspect of nonproduction is attained?!

Whereas the others on the one hand [assert] phenomena as existent,
I reckon the statement by the Teacher on the other hand
That the obstructions to objects of knowledge
Are extinguished to be amazing.
Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s *Meaning of the Words* comments:

In that truly established defilements have a nature without cessation—that is, new cessation of the previously existent—what truly established, previously existent type of conceptualization that is to be abandoned by the path of seeing is extinguished?! And what aspect of nonproduction—that is, previously nonexistent annihilation of the about-to-be-produced—is attained?! That is to say, an extinction is not suitable to be attained.

Whereas the others, Proponents of [Truly Established] Things, assert on the one hand that external and internal phenomena ultimately exist, I, Maitreyanātha, reckon the statement by the Teacher Buddha on the other hand that the obstructions obscuring objects of knowledge are extinguished to be amazing because if things are truly established, obstructions are not fit to be abandoned.

Hopkins and Yi, *Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s Explanation of (Maitreya’s) Treatise “Ornament for the Clear Realizations” from the Approach of the Meaning of the Words: Sacred Word of Maitreyanātha.*

45 Jam-yang-shay-pa makes a longer citation of this in his *Great Exposition of Tenets* (Hopkins, draft translation, not included in his *Maps of the Profound*, 769):

Due to thinking, “If there is no apprehended, there is no apprehender,” a mere cognition that has the character of the aspect of the apprehender is also eliminated, whereupon it is determined that “This sole nondual pristine wisdom really exists.”

Ngag-wang-pal-dan (TBRC W5926-3831, *Annotations, za*, 63a.5) challenges the relevance of this passage to Jam-yang-shay-pa’s point that Haribhadra accords with False Aspectarians based on Gyal-tshab’s exposition of it and Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s opinion that both True Aspectarians and False Aspectarians would agree on the point:

That this passage [in Haribhadra’s commentary on the fifth chapter of Maitreya’s *Ornament for the Clear Realizations*] establishes Haribhadra as concordant with False Aspectarians is a very great basis for analysis because the meaning of this passage is as Gyal-tshab’s *Ornament for the Essence* says:

Due to thinking in the subsequent period, “If an apprehended-object does not exist as another substantial entity, a nonmistaken apprehender to which apprehended-object and apprehending-subject appear as different substantial entities does not exist,” a mere cognition—apprehending unmistakenly—that has the character of the aspect of the apprehender is also eliminated, whereupon it is determined and taken to mind that “This sole pristine wisdom without the duality of apprehended-object and apprehending-subject is a really existent entity.” This means that as an imprint of that realization the nondual consciousness has not abandoned the apprehension of true existence, but it is not suitable to mean that by its own power it induces the conception of true existence and sets up the tenet of true establishment. As explained earlier, it teaches that in the subsequent period an apprehender to which apprehended-object and apprehending-subject appear as different substantial entities is understood as mistaken and that an apprehension [of
such] as nonmistaken is overcome.

and because both True Aspectarians and False Aspectarians do not assert that an apprehender to which apprehended-object and apprehending-subject appear as different substantial entities is nonmistaken.

46 The entailment is likely that Jetāri’s explanation entails that he is a Proponent of the Middle Way Autonomy School resembling Mind-Only Tainted False Aspectarians.

47 Correcting *rnam rdo rje* in 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (16a.3) and 2015 Go-mang Lhasa (12a.5) to *rnam rdo rje pa* in accordance with the citation of the same passage in Jam-yang-shay-pa’s *Great Exposition of Tenets* 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (pha, 132b.1) followed, admittedly, by a strange perpendicular stroke (*shad*).

48 Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the first two lines; he makes a longer citation of this passage in his *Great Exposition of Tenets* which has been added here to fill out the ellipsis in this citation to make it more meaningful even though it itself contains an ellipsis before the last three lines. Ngag-wang-pal-dan (*Annotations, dbu ma pa, ra*, 64a.4) reports that he did not find this passage in either of two dissimilar Tibetan translations of the *Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom* or its commentaries; his own commentary in that note, nevertheless, illuminates the passage:

In its measure of abiding, an awareness—that is, a sense consciousness—not transformed by aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth, indeed remains like a lump of pure crystal not transformed by colors. However, ordinary common beings through the force of defilements produced from the substantial cause—which is the ignorance arisen from the thorough maturation of beginninglessly deposited mistaken predispositions that obscures the nondual and indivisible entity of (1) the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth and (2) consciousness—
perceive in another format, that is to say, perceive consciousness transformed by aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth. When the wise analyze this, the mode of subsistence of consciousness just as it is, the entity of the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth and consciousness, appears dualistically, unixed individually. Because through the force of the mind’s mistake the aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth while not existing as effective things appear so, apprehended-object and apprehending-subject also appear as different substantial entities, like, for example, through the force of being affected by a substance* and mantra not only does a horse of a magical illusion appear but its being a horse also appears. In that way, for the wise—who realize the measure of abiding—those aspects of blue, yellow, and so forth are imputationals that do not exist as effective things.

Since not even a bit of this passage appears in the two dissimilar Tibetan translations of the Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom or its commentaries, I wonder whether this is not the text Nine Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom.

* According to the late Ngag-wang-leg-dan (ngag dbang legs ldan, 1900-1971), Ge-she of the Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastic University and Abbot Emeritus of Gyu-may Tantric College in Lhasa, Tibet, this is a salve rubbed on pebble or stick, for instance, that is the basis of conjuring which—through the power of mantra recited by the magician, which affects the eye consciousnesses of both the audience and the magician—causes it to appear as a horse in Ngag-wang-pal-dan’s rendition.