Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 46 (1992)

Heft: 1: Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May

Artikel: Controversies in Tibetan Madhyamaka exegisis : sTag tshan Lotsba's critique of Tson kha pa's assertion of validly established phenomena

Autor: Tauscher, Helmut

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146966

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 19.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

CONTROVERSIES IN TIBETAN MADHYAMAKA EXEGISIS: STAG TSHAṄ LOTSĀBA'S CRITIQUE OF TSOṄ KHA PA'S ASSERTION OF VALIDLY ESTABLISHED PHENOMENA.

Helmut Tauscher, Vienna

Ever since the works of Candrakīrti were introduced into Tibet during the second transmission of Buddhism and propagated by Pa tshab Ñi ma grags (*1055)[1], the Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka has increasingly gained predominance and Candrakīrti has widely been accepted as an authority within Tibetan Madhyamaka traditions. Nevertheless, various Tibetan scholars have – equally basing themselves on Candrakīrti's teachings – arrived at diverging, even contradictory, interpretations, which has given rise to a number of controversies, in particular between Tsoṅ kha pa's dGe lugs pa and the Sa skya pa tradition.

sTag tshaṅ Lotsāba Śes rab rin chen (*1405)[2] is considered to be Tsoṅ kha pa's main critic from among the Sa skya pas. In his *Grub mtha' kun śes nas mtha' bral grub pa źes bya ba'i bstan bcos (+ -rnam par bśad pa legs bśad kyi rgya mtsho)* he points out 18 'contradictions' (*'gal ba*), which are based on the assertion that *saṃvṛti* objects are established by valid cognition.

The Grub mtha' kun śes, according to the colophon composed in 1463 (*chu mo lug gi lo*), is a verse text of 207 stanzas arranged in five chapters plus five concluding stanzas; its rNam bśad discusses in 145 (114 in text B)[3] folios the doctrine of the two kinds of *nairātmya* according to the various Buddhist schools.

The first part of its Prāsaṅgika section is – under the heading "Negation of [mere] appearance" (*ltar snaṅ dgag pa*) – devoted to the discussion of these 'contradictions'.

> "Those who, in [postulated] succession of the venerable Candrakīrti, accept – after (analytical) investigation by many arguments – the impure, erroneous appearance as established by valid cognition, have [to bear] a big burden of contradictions in this way [as discussed below]."[4]

1 S. BA I, 341ff.

2 For short biogaphical notes s. *Cristal Mirror* VI, 436

3 Text A and B both represent a print from dGa' ldan phun tshogs gliṅ; except for the different number of folios, they are largely identical. The only variant readings in the passage translated in this paper are: 219,5 *bskyed* : *skyed*, 221,5 *bstan pa* : *bsten pa* (s. n.55), 222,1 *srogs pa* : *srog pa*, 222,3 *gñis pas* : *gñis kas* (s. n.60), 224,1 *sogs na* : *sogs ni* (s. n.68), 227,2 *kho bo* : *kho bos* (s. n.74), 227,6 *lta la* : *lta ba* (s. n.77).

4 V,11 (23,2f.) / *gaṅ dag dpal ldan zla ba'i rjes 'braṅs nas // ma dag 'khrul pa'i snaṅ ba*

Commenting on this stanza, the first sub-section, "Presentation" (*bstan pa*), deals with these 'contradictions' in general; the second sub-section, "Explanation" (*bśad pa*), discusses the 18 contradictions in detail; the third, "Reasoning" (*rgyu bstan pa*), bases them on Tsoṅ kha pa's undue application of logic to Madhyamaka doctrines:

> "The reason for the big burden of contradictions of this kind is that, despite [Candrakīrti's] saying again and again that [the phenomenal world exists only] for world[ly cognition] without (analytical) investigation, [Tsoṅ kha pa] analyzes [the objects of the phenomenal world] and proves [their conventional existence] after giving proofs (*utpatti* ?) due to the force of applying logical argumentation."[5]

The outline of the text is, according to sTag tshaṅ's own *sa bcad* (abbreviated, page references are to text A):

1	bdag lta'i 'dzin staṅs spyir dgag pa (= chap.I of the root-text)	44,2- 56,5
2	(bdag lta'i 'dzin staṅs) so sor dgag pa	56,5-325,3
21	gaṅ zag gi bdag dgag pa (= chap.II)	56,5-102,1
22	chos kyi bdag dgag pa	102,1-325,3
221	rags pa dgag pa (= chap.III+IV)	102,1-201,2
222	(chos kyi bdag [!])[6] phra ba dgag pa (= chap.V)	201,2-325,3
222.1	dbye ba mdor bstan	201,4-206,4
222.2	rnam gźag rgyas par bśad	206,4-312,6
222.21	miṅ can gyi dbu ma dgag	206,5-208,4
222.22	don ldan gyi dbu ma bśad	208,4-307,2
222.221	raṅ rgyud (bśad pa)	208,4-213,5
222.222	thal 'gyur bśad pa	213,5-307,2
222.222.1	ltar snaṅ dgag pa	213,5-241,3
222.222.11	bstan (pa) (= V,11)	213,5-223,3
222.222.12	(don de rnams rgyas par) bśad (pa) (= V,12-18)	223,4-240,3
222.222.13	rgyu bstan pa (= V,19)	240,3-241,3
222.222.2	yaṅ dag bsgrub pa [dbu ma chen po yaṅ dag bśad pa]	241,3-307,2
222.23	sgrub byed kyi gźuṅ khuṅs bstan pa	307,2-312,6
222.3	rtag chad gźan spaṅ	312,6-318,4
222.4	legs bśad du ma spro ba	318,4-325,3
3	bśad pa mthar phyin pa	325,3-326,6

tshad grub tu // rig[s] pa du mas dpyad nas khas len pa // 'di la 'gal ba'i khur chen 'di ltar yod / (Transl. also Hopkins 1983, 540).

5 V,19 (24,3f.): */ de ltar 'gal ba'i khur chen yod pa'i rgyu // rnam dpyad med par 'jig rten ñid las źes // yaṅ yaṅ smras kyaṅ rtog ger goms pa'i mthus // 'thad pa bcug nas dpyad ciṅ bsgrubs pas so //* (Transl. also Hopkins 1983, 539f.)
For a detailed refutation of sTag tshaṅ's position s. 'Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa, Grub chen 18,4-19,5 + 675,1-815,4. I wish to express my gratitude to Geshe Lobsang Dargyay, Calgary, for pointing out these passages.

6 In the root-text chapter V (21,4-36,4) is entitled *phra ba'i bdag gñis bkag nas mtha' bral sgrub pa* (36,4).

Although the name of Tsoṅ kha pa is mentioned neither in the root text nor in the autocommentary, in general it is quite clear from sTag tshaṅ's point of departure that his polemics are — as understood by the dGe lugs pa tradition[7] — directed against Tsoṅ kha pa, who incorporates to some extent Dharmakīrti's logic into Madhyamaka doctrine,[8] without, however, taking recourse to independent inference (*svatantra anumāna*). In connection with his particular definition of the basis of distinction (*dbye gźi*) of the two realities as the objects of cognition (*śes bya*), which is synonymous with 'existing' (*yod pa*), and, on the other hand, with his interpretation of *saṃvṛtisatya* as that aspect (*ṅo bo*) of existing 'things' which bears the qualities falsehood and delusion, rather than as the appearance of this aspect to an erroneous cognition, even *saṃvṛtisatya* has to be interpreted as conventionally existent (*tha sñad du yod pa*). This, in turn, requires the state of being established by valid cognition (*tshad mas grub pa*).[9]

sTag tshaṅ, on the other hand, takes as the basis of distinction the objects of cognition only in their non-analyzed and non-investigated form (*ma brtags ma* [: *pa*] *dpyad pa*, Grub mtha' kun śes rnam bśad 263,2f., 269,2-272,5), and thus defines *saṃvṛtisatya* as the object perceived by a non-investigating erroneous cognition (*ma dpyad 'khrul pa'i śes ṅor rñed pa'i rñed don*, 264,1). Only in this respect does he accept the distinction of valid and invalid cogni-tion etc.; he does not accept valid cognition with regard to *saṃvṛti(satya)* in the case of [even] cursory investigation[10]

7 Cf. e.g. 'Jam dbyaṅ bźad pa's arguments in n.78; Thal raṅ 9a5-9b8, quoting Grub mtha' kun śes (as "rTsod yig") V,11-19.

8 Cf. Seyfort Ruegg 1989.

9 S. e.g. LRChen kha 27b5-38b1 (Wayman 221-242), dGoṅs gsal 101b2; cf. Tauscher 1991, n.69,71.

10 For sTag tshaṅ's position, a distinction of three phases (*gnas skabs*) of the path is important. In a modern treatise it is explained by the ex-abbot of 'Bras spuṅs sGo maṅ, bsTan pa bstan 'dzin, on the basis of Grub mtha' kun śes rnam bśad 247,4-304,5: Without investigation, all phenomena (*chos*) exist, at the time of cursory investigation *paramārtha(satya)* does not exist, but *saṃvṛti(satya)* does, and at the time of thorough investigation all phenomena [and thus both realities] are non-existent (Draṅ thig 213,10-14: *sTag tshaṅ lo tsā bas dpyad pa rim pa gsum byas te ma brtag ma dpyad pa'i tshe chos thams cad yod / cuṅ zad brtag pa'i tshe don dam med ciṅ kun rdzob yod / śin tu brtag pa'i tshe chos thams cad med kyaṅ gźan ṅor yod par bśad pa daṅ / ...*). — This position of sTag tshaṅ is criticized by mDzes rgyan 300,15ff. (transl. Lopez 267) as being without Indian foundation. Cf. Hopkins 1987, 334.
Perceived by a non analyzing and non investigating erroneous cognition is *lokasaṃvṛti* which is — according to the world only, but not according to the Madhyamaka — distinguished as 'true' or 'false'. Conventional cognition of cursory investigation

(... *ma dpyad pa 'jig rten la grags pa'i tshad ma daṅ tshad min gyi rnam gźag daṅ / ... khas len mod kyi / kun rdzob 'jal ba'i tshad ma źes bya ba raṅ lugs cuṅ zad dpyad pa'i ṅor med pa kho na ste /*, 269, 2-4); 'established by valid cognition' (*tshad grub*) means the same as 'undeceiving' (*bslu med*) and 'able to exist independently' (*tshugs thub*) (215,5f.),[11] which of course cannot be applied to *saṃvṛtisatya* within Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka. The assumption of something 'undeceiving' within conventional transaction is, according to sTag tshaṅ, the distinguishing position of the Pramāṇa school, shared to a large extent with the Svātantrika.[12]

In detail, however, not all of sTag tshaṅ's arguments can clearly be connected with Tsoṅ kha pa's assumptions, some of the positions criticized are even rejected by Tsoṅ ka pa himself;[13] occasionally the polemics might not be directed against Tsoṅ kha pa exclusively, and the possibility of (deliberate-ly ?) misunderstanding, or of minimal differences between the respective views of sTag tshaṅ and Tsoṅ kha pa[14] should be taken into account.

This paper does not claim to discuss all these possibilities or to evaluate the sTag tshaṅ – Tsoṅ kha pa controversy thoroughly; it will give a translation of the general "presentation" (*bstan pa*) as well as of the "explanation" (*bśad pa*) of the first three of the 18 'contradictions', following 'Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa, who refutes these three (together with

perceives the subtle 'impermanent' (*anitya*) and the appearance to the succeedingly gained [gnosis] (*pṛṣṭhalabdha[jñāna]*) of Śrāvaka-Arhats, Pratyekabuddhas and Bodhisattvas below the 7th *bhūmi*, which is **yogisaṃvṛti* or 'mere *saṃvṛti*' (*saṃvṛtimātra*), where the distinction between 'true' and 'false' is not possible, also called 'the Mādhyamika's *saṃvṛti*'. – Cf. dGoṅs gsal 102b6-103a1 (Tauscher 1990, 251f.,n.56) – (Grub mtha' kun śes rnam bśad 266,2-6: *mtshan gźi ni ma brtags ma dpyad pa'i 'khrul ṅo'i chos can rags pa rnams ni 'jig rten gyi kun rdzob daṅ / cuṅ zad dpyad ṅo'i tha sñad pa'i blo'i rned don phra ba'i mi rtag pa daṅ / ñan raṅ mi slob pa nas byaṅ sems 'phags pa man chad kyi 'phags pa'i rjes thob kyi snaṅ ba rnams ni mal 'byor pa'i kun rdzob bo // ... / phyi ma la ... dbu ma pa'i źes sbyar źiṅ / de gñis las kun rdzob daṅ po la sṅon po daṅ zla gñis 'jig rten kho nas bden rdzun du 'dod pa'i phyir ma dpyad kun rdzob la yaṅ* [: *gaṅ*] *log yod ces bya'i dbu ma raṅ lugs la min te /*; 246,5f.: *raṅ lugs mal 'byor kun rdzob la yaṅ log med pas kun rdzob tsam por 'dod pa ...*).

11 Cf. Hopkins 1983, 172,n.122 and, including 'Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa's rejection, 676,n.727.

12 Grub mtha' kun śes rnam bśad 245,4f., quoting a Sa skya abbot (? *chos rje pa*) in agreement with Grags pa rgyal mtshan's lJon śiṅ: *rJe btsun chen po'i mNon rtogs ljon śiṅ sogs na'aṅ gsal ba ltar / Chos rje pas / dbu tshad gñis kyi khyad par ni // tha sñad du yaṅ mi slu ba // 'dod pa tshad ma'i lugs yin te // raṅ rgyud phal cher de daṅ mthun /.*

13 Cf. e.g. 'contradiction' <3>.

14 This is demonstrated – with regard to the innate concept of a self (*bdag 'dzin lhan skyes*) -in Hopkins 1987, 117f.

'contradiction' 14) in his Grub chen (cf. n.5) in one section (*mṄon rjes gñis 'dod tshad ma mi 'dod 'gal*, 19,2 + 746ff.).[15]

* * * * * * *

The second (chapter) has (two sub-chapters): Negation of [mere] appearance (*ābhāsa*) and Proof of the real (*tattva*);

The first (among those) has (three sub-chapters): Presentation, Explanation and Reasoning.

<213,5> 1 (Presentation)

The later Tibetan Buddhist (*bstan 'dzin*) Mahāpaṇḍita[16] accepted Candrakīrti's system literally in (his) youth; later on (his) critical investigation did not improve, but statements such as: "Tibet is full of [scholars who propagate] convention supported by arguments in general and [by the argument of] part and compilation in particular, and also the Madhyamaka [deals with/knows] the power (? *byin rlabs=mthu/ adhiṣṭhāna*) of *saṃvṛti* which is dependent (and) undeceiving, proclaimed by the Svātantrika and [...]"[17] are perfectly all right (*dag byaṅ*); and by the statement: "There will be no reliability (*anāśvāsikatā, anāśvāsa*) [within their relation], if action (*karma*) and (its) fruit (*phala*) are posited only to mistaken [consciousness]"[18] (he) is refuted: The supposition (*'dod*

15 For 'Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa's refutation of sTag tshaṅ's position regarding valid cognition (*tshad ma*) s. also Tshig gsal stoṅ thun mun sel, presently studied by Ch.Yoshimizu at the University of Vienna.

16 ... *mkhas pa chen po dag;* Tsoṅ kha pa and his followers (?)

17 Not identified

18 Not identified; no such statement by Tsoṅ kha pa is known to me. He does, however, argue that causality would be impossible if the teaching of non-substantiality was taken literally as meaning total or [even] conventional non-existence (LŚÑ 120a6-8 [Thurman 250]: ... *de yaṅ 'jig rten gyi tha sñad du yin gyi don dam par ni ma yin no // źes blaṅ dor daṅ rgyu 'bras sogs la yaṅ yaṅ gsuṅs pa ltar 'dod kyi spyir ṅo bo ye med dam tha sñad du med par mi 'dod la ... don dam par med pa sgra ji bźin par 'dod na rgyu 'bras sogs mi ruṅ źes pa'i don yin te /*). However, he also strictly rejects the argumentation that the objects' not being established by their own characteristic makes causality impossible, as this assumption would mean taking the proof of emptiness of own-being (*svabhāva-śūnyatā*) as its refutation. (LŚÑ 123b5-7 [Thurman 256]: *raṅ gi mtshan ñid ky[i]s ma*

pa) according to the multitude of all [these] scholars, (i.e.) that all the many consequences, (viz.) that even without analysis by an absolute cognition (*rig pa*) a bull (seen) in dream and a bull (seen) while awake equally serve a purpose with regard to a conventional cognition; that a perception (*blo*) having the appearance of the hair [seen by a *taimirika*] and a perception having the appearance of "blue" are equally [to be destinguished as] mistaken (or) not mistaken;[19] and, above all, that there is no reliability within [the relation of] action and (its) fruit; etc. are [in agreement with] the system of Candrakīrti and Śāntideva, bears a lot of contradictions (*'gal sogs*).

<214,4> Additionally, 'empty' and 'originating dependently' generally mean the same, as is said in detail in statements (such as):

grub na ... rgyu 'b[r]as sogs med par 'gyur ro źes smra ba ni / raṅ gi mtshan ñid kyis grub pa'i raṅ bźin gyis stoṅ pa'i sgrub byed mthar thug pa la gnod de mthar thug par 'dzin pa yin no ...). — Cf. LRChen kha 75b7-76a4 (Wayman 319f.), where a "Chinese teacher", i.e. Hva śaṅ (Wayman n.303), is named as representative of this view.

rTsa ṭik XVII (karmaphalaparīkṣā, 302a3-311a6) argues, in accordance with Pras, against the view that the [fixed] relation of action and its fruit proves *saṃsāra* to be existent (as own-being). (Pras 302,3: *atrāha / vidyata eva saṃsāraḥ karmaphalasambandhāśrayatvāt //*; rTsa ṭik 302a4f.: ... *'khor ba ni raṅ bźin gyis yod de las 'bras kyi 'brel ba'i rten yin pa'i phyir ro /*)

19 These two 'consequences' are seemingly directed against Tsoṅ kha pa's position that even incorrect (*mithyā*) *saṃvṛti* is *saṃvṛtisatya*: A reflection, e.g. — even though established as being empty as (substantial) form (*ākāra*) — is not different from something which is real for a *saṃvṛti* cognition that takes the reflection [or anything else] as established by own-being. It is, however, not *saṃvṛtisatya* inasfar as it is taken as the (substantial) form, the reflected thing. (dGoṅs gsal 103a5-8: *de'i phyir gzugs brñan byad bźin gyis stoṅ par grub kyaṅ / gzugs brñan raṅ gi mtshan ñid kyis grub par 'dzin pa'i kun rdzob kyi ṅor bden pa yin* [: *ma yin*] *pa la 'gal ba ci yaṅ med pa'i dṅos po yin pas kun rdzob kyi bden pa yin no // des na gzugs brñan kun rdzob kyi bden pa min par gsuṅs pa ni / brda la byaṅ pa'i 'jig rten gyi kun rdzob kyi ṅor byad bźingyi gzugs brñan lta bu de / byad bźin yin pa de brdzun pas de la ltos pa'i kun rdzob kyi bden pa min pa la dgoṅs kyi / ...*), cf. rTsa ṭik 356b6-8 (LRChuṅ 303b2-5).

Things like 'blue' etc. do not exist as established by their own characteristics, nevertheless they do exist as exterior things; in the same way a reflection, which does not exist as the -reflected — (substantial) form, does exist and is viewed as belonging to the (sense-)domain of form (*rūpāyatana*). It serves a purpose inasmuch as it produces the respective sense perception. (dGoṅs gsal 101b4-7: *sṅo sogs raṅ gi mtshan ñid kyis grub pa daṅ / gzugs brñan byad bźin du yod pa mi srid kyaṅ / byad bźin du med pa'i gzugs brñan yod pa bźin du / raṅ gi mtshan ñid kyis grub pa min kyaṅ sṅo sogs yod dgos la / de yaṅ phyi rol gyi don du yod pa bźin du gzugs brñan yaṅ gzugs kyi skye mched du bźed pa yin te / 'og nas gzugs brñan gyis de snaṅ ba'i dbaṅ śes skyed par yaṅ gsuṅs so //*).

> "Homage to the excellent, incomparable *munīndra*, who taught empti(ness) and dependent origination as the Middle Way [and] as equivalent" [VV v.72][20]

and:

> "Dependent origination is explained as emptiness; this (in turn) is [the same as] metaphorical designation; this is the Middle Way" [MK XXIV,18][21].

Not only [the view that] the two, the appearing [as] object, subject etc., and empti(ness), i.e. non-substantiality – as something established as real does not depend on anything [and can] therefore not be admitted as [originating] dependent[ly], and something established as dependent and supported is not established as real – join in one substratum, also [the view that] for a person who understands dependent (origination) an induced ascertainment (*ṅes pa 'dren pa*)[22] of mutual assistance is neccessary with regard to empti(ness) due to appearance and to appearance due to empti(ness) is [admitted in the] Madhyamaka system. The Svātantrikas, however, add: 'as mere own-being or nature is conventionally established on top of the object, true own-being does not exist'; and as here (in the Svātantrika system) – not making even this (addition) – no own-being or nature at all is [possible] on top of the object, and (as) e.g. action and agent in the case of burning by fire are not merely designated by the mind, [an own-being] on top of the object does exist only conventionally as undeceiving and able to exist independently (*tshugs thub*). Therefore the statement, which is written down not only once but again and again, (viz.) that there is no reliability [within the relation of cause and effect] if the two, action and agent for whom mutual assistance is neccessary, are posited only to an erroneous mind, is the main point in the multitude of contradictions, because in the Great Madhyamaka there is absolutely no other own-being (as) reason for negation (*dgag rgyu*) beyond the action and agent which are able to exist independently from the side of the object.

If (someone objects that) 'able to exist independently' (*tshugs thub*) has not been mentioned [at all], [the following has to be taken into consideration:] If something is not able to exist independently, [its

20 VV v.72 acc. Vaidya; final sentence acc. Johnston/Kunst: *yaḥ śūnyatāṃ pratītyasamutpādaṃ madhyamaṃ pratipadaṃ ca / ekārthāṃ nijagāda praṇamāmi tam apratimabuddham //*

21 MK XXIV,18: *yaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ śūnyatāṃ tāṃ pracakṣmahe / sā prajñaptir upādāya pratipat saiva madhyamā //*

22 *raṅ yul la yod med yin min gyi sgro 'dogs bcad nas ji bźin legs par śes pa'o* (Tshig mdzod)

determination as] being established by valid cognition (*pramāṇasiddha*) is contradictive, because the meaning of 'established by valid cognition' is 'undeceiving', and the meaning of 'undeceiving' does not exceed [the meaning of] 'able to exist independently'.

<215,6> Now a different (matter): To take – in [postulated] accordance with the system of the venerable Candra(kīrti)[23] – the agent (*byed pa*) [in the case of] the Buddha's gnosis which knows the phenomenal (aspect of existence) (*ji sñed pa mkhyen pa'i ye śes*) as the valid cognition which examines *saṃvṛtisatya*,[24] this is the root of the whole complex of contradictions.[25] In the commentary to the Madhyamakāvatāra (verse):

> "Delusion (*moha*), as it obscures the own-being (*svabhāva*), is *saṃvṛti*" [MAv VI,28a][26]

the presentator (*'jog byed*) of the first of the two, *saṃvṛtisatya* and false *saṃvṛtimātra*,[27] is explained as afflicted ignorance; in the same (text) it is said:

> "Therefore, in the first place, *saṃvṛtisatya* is determined by the totality of the limbs of existence (*bhāvāṅga*) due to the force of afflicted ignorance." [MAvBh 107,17f. (rearranged)]

23 Cf. V,11a; s. n.4

24 Cf. the chapter "Ji sñed pa gzigs pa mi 'thad pa'i rtsod pa spaṭ ba", rTsa ṭik 360a5-361a8, for the greatest part identical with LRChuṅ 309a1-310a4 (cf. dGoṅs gsal 110b3-8). – According to Tsoṅ kha pa, *saṃvṛtisatya* has to be object of the Buddha's omniscience, in particular of his *ji sñed pa mkhyen pa'i ye śes*, because *saṃvṛtisatya* is also existent (*yod pa*), i.e. an object of cognition (*śes bya*). However, the appearing of phenomena defiled by the residues of nescience to the Buddha takes place exclusively via their appearance to persons defiled by nescience; only the appearing of all entities as non-substantial etc. is founded in the Buddha's gnosis itself but not as (absolutely) real. (rTsa ṭik 360b6f., 361a1f.: *saṅs rgyas kyi ji sñed pa mkhyen pa'i ye śes la ma rig pa'i bag chags kyis bslad pa'i don snaṅ ba na / ma rig pa'i bslad pa yod pa'i gaṅ zag la de dag snaṅ ba kho na'i sgo nas saṅs rgyas la snaṅ ba yin gyi / ... / de ltar na ji sñed pa mkhyen pa'i raṅ ṅos nas ni / dṅos po thams cad bdag med pa daṅ ... bźin du snaṅ gi bden par mi snaṅ la /*).

25 This passage (up to 220,2) is dealt with in detail in Grub chen 675,1-695,3.

26 Cit. BCAP 353,3: *mohaḥ svabhāvāvaraṇād dhi saṃvṛtiḥ*

27 i.e. objects of the phenomenal world taken as (absolutely) real and not (absolutely) real respectively. For sTag tshaṅ's division of *saṃvṛti* cf. n.10.

The presentator (*'jog byed*) of the second is explained as being the mere ignorance of[28] the Āryas of the *śrāvaka* and *pratyeka(buddha)[yāna]* who are no [longer] learning (*mi slob pa 'phags pa*) and the [still] learning ones of the *mahāyāna*, who have a gnosis endowed with appearance, as they are, after complete abolishment of the former presentator (i.e. afflicted ignorance), endowed with non-afflicted ignorance [only]; as it is said from:

> "For those (who consider the *saṃskāras* as existing in a similar way as reflections)[29] [the *saṃskāras*] are of (artificially) produced nature, but not (absolutely) real, because [these Āryas] are free from the (illusory) conception of reality" [MAvBh 108,2f.]

etc. [up to]:

> "This (= *'du byed / kun rdzob tsam du 'gyur ba*), in turn, does appear to the Āryas who have (their) object(s) endowed with appearance, as [for those Āryas] only that (kind of) ignorance is effective, that has[30] the characteristics of the obstacles of the knowable (*jñeyāvaraṇa*) (but ...)" [MAvBh 108,6-8].

Concerning the Buddhas it is said that there is a presentator not even of mere *saṃvṛti*, let alone of *saṃvṛtisatya*; as (with) the statements:

> "(... but it does) not (appear) to those who have object(s) without appearance. Concerning the Buddhas — as they are in every respect totally enlightened with regard to all phenomena — (it is maintained that)[31] [every] activity of mind (*sems*) and mental factors (*sems las byuṅ ba*) is abolished for good (*gtan log pa*)" [MAvBh 108,8-11]

and also below:

> "As[32] the mind is annihilated, this (*chos sku*) is made manifest by the (*loṅs*)[33] *sku*" [MAvXII,8d]

28 216,3 *kyi* (corr.) : *kyis* (text A and B)
29 216,4: *de mams* represents MAvBh 108,1f.: *'du byed gzugs brñan la sogs pa'i yod pa ñid daṅ 'dra bar gzigs pa mams*.
30 216,4 *mtshan ñid can* (MAvBh) : *mtshan ñid*
31 Supplementation acc. MAvBh: *log par 'dod pa yin no* instead of *log pa yin no*
32 217,1 *sems 'gags pas* (MAv) : *sems 'gags pa*
33 Supplementation acc. dGoṅs gsal and R.

and:

> "As[34] (you) have correctly understood [reality] as being of homogeneous nature, you, o purely knowing one, understand [all] object[s] of cognition with [every single] moment [of your cognition]" [MAv XII,2cd]

it is explained that non-dual gnosis is without object.

<217,2> When with regard to (this explanation) the objection, that a cognition knowing the object is not possible if the object is without appearance, is formulated with (the words):

> "If (being) calm (*źi ba*) is the reality (*de ñid*), one does not approach it by means of the intellect (*blo gros*)" [MAv XII,3a],

[as a reply] it is said with (the words):

> "If[35] non-arising is the reality" [MAv XII,4a/]

etc., that [even in the case of a non-arising object ?] the agreement of the object's mode of existence (*gnas tshul*) and (its) mode of appearing to the cognition (*blo*) is conventionally called 'understanding of the object by cognition', when – according to the generally known (fact) that this cognition understands this object, because it exists endowed with the modality of the object – for a non-arising object also the cognition is non-arising [and thus these two are] like water poured into water; but it is not said that an object without appearance is not established. And also in the (Bodhi)caryāvatāra (with the words):

> "If neither being nor non-being offers itself to the mind (*blo*), it gains, for there is no other possibility, calmness, being without objective support" [BCA IX,35][36]

it is explained that gnosis (*ye śes*) has an object without appearance; and as reply to the objection, that in this case the undertakings of proclaiming the doctrine etc. would not be possible, it is said:

> "Like here by a strong potter" [MAv XII,6a] etc.,

34 217,2 *gyur pas*; *gyur nas/- na* (MAv); *gyur pas na* (dGoṅs gsal)

35 217,3 *yin na*; *yin źiṅ* (MAv)

36 BCA IX,35: *yadā na bhāvo nābhāvo mateḥ saṃtiṣṭhate puraḥ / tadānyagatabhāvena nirālambā praśāmyati //*; translation acc. Steinkellner

and:

> "Like the wish-fulfilling gem, like the wish-fulfilling tree, that satisfies the wishes [of the beings], in this way the body of the Victorious One appears by the force of [maturation of the beneficial deeds of the] devotees (*'dul bya*) [and] the vows [taken by the Buddha while he still was a bodhisattva]." [BCA IX,36][37]

And in reply to the objection:

> "How could [any] fruit arise through libation towards a mindless [being]?"

[with the words:]

> "[This is possible] because it is thought that [the fruit of libation] is the same with regard to the living or the extinguished [Buddha]" [BCA IX,39][38]

it is replied that a pervasion [of being alive and bringing fruit] is not established, but it is not said that a mindless [being] is not established.

<218,2> Because of these (misinterpretations) mislead, Kha rag Byaṅ gźon[39] and others even say that these two teachers (Candrakīrti and Śāntarakṣita) assume the Buddha to be without gnosis (*ye śes*), but the investigation(s) of the dispute as explained (above) show a perfectly complete under-standing of the absolute reality (*de bźin ñid*) of all objects of cognition, which is multiple [but/and] of homogeneous nature [by] 'appearingless intuitive knowledge at the time of intense concentration' (*mñam gźag snaṅ med pa'i ye śes*)[40] to be existent.

<218,4> [Objection:] According to the explanation in 'Grel chuṅ don gsal:

> "How are those necessarily accepted non-dual mind and mental factors to be comprised (*bsdu*)?" [AAV 156,4-6][41]

37 BCA IX,36: *cintāmaṇiḥ kalpataruryathecchāparipūrṇaḥ / vineyapraṇidhānābhyāṃ jinabimbaṃ tatheksyate //*; transl. acc. Steinkellner (supplemantations acc. BCAP)

38 BCA IX,39: *acittake kṛtā pūjā kathaṃ phalavatī bhavet / tulyaiva padyate yasmāt tiṣṭhato nirvṛtasya ca //*; translation acc. Steinkellner.

39 I could not identify any scholar of this name. — A later successor of Kha rag sGom chuṅ (second half of 11.century), the founder of the system of *kha rag skor gsum* (= *byaṅ chub sbyoṅ*). Cf. BA 266, 269, 999ff. (?)

40 For the translation of the term cf. Obermiller 21.

41 AAV 156,4-6 (on VIII [*dharmakāya*],6); (Nāgarī)83,11: ... *avaśyam advayās cittacaitāḥ katham abhyupagantavyāḥ ?*

this (i.e. the Buddha's) gnosis necessarily consists of mind and mental factors.

> [Reply:] "As this is [merely] Svātantrika position, there is — with reference to [any] other system — no refutation whatsoever to be formulated",[42]

and accordingly also [the statements expressing this idea]:

> "Even by one (single) gnosis of one who knows the whole circle of objects of cogniton is encompassed" [SDVV 188, v.(2)ab][43]

etc. are the words of the commentary of the Satyadvaya(vibhaṅga).

<219,1> [Objection:] Why (then) are in the (Madhyamaka-)Avatāra itself [the following statements given]:

> "There is [only] one (means of) valid cognition, viz. the gnosis of the omniscient"[44]

and:

> "The gnosis [consisting in] the knowledge about all modes (of existence) (*sarvākārajñatājñāna*) is characterized as direct perception" [MAv VI,214ab][45],

and [in addition] the extensive explanation of a differentiation into the 10 forces (of the Tathāgata)[46], (viz.) the knowledge of the basic condition and of the non-basic condition (*sthānāsthānajñānabala*) etc.[47]

[Reply:] The first two (statements) are suitable as explanations of 'appearingless intuitive knowledge at the time of intense concentration'; the last one and [the statement] in the (Bodhi)caryāvatāra:

> "Buddhas and Bodhisattvas see everything unimpededly" [BCA V,31ab][48]

42 Not identified

43 SDVV 188, interpolated verse (2ab), with variant readings in pāda a: *mkhyen pa'i ye śes gcig gis kyaṅ*; SDVV: *mkhyen pa'i skad cig gcig gis ni* "In a moment of insight it encompasses every object of knowledge" (Eckel 102). Cf. MAv(Bh) XII,2

44 Not identified; not in MAv

45 Variant readings in pāda b: *mṅon sum mtshan ñid can du 'dod*; MAv: *mṅon sum źes bya'i mtshan ñid do*; cf. SDV 37d: *thams cad mkhyen pas mṅon sum gzigs //*.

46 MAv(Bh) XII,19-31

47 Cf. Waldschmidt 385,n.18

48 BCA V,31ab: *buddhāś ca bodhisattvāś ca sarvatrāvyāhateksanāḥ /*

are statements about the *niṣyandakāya*'s ('body of natural outflow', *rgyu mthun pa'i sku*)[49] way of knowing the object of cognition [as it is] manifested in the appearance to the adepts, and about [this] *kāya*'s way of being born, etc.; and if the *niṣyanda-nirmāṇakāya* is merely the Buddha's magic transformation or resembling of a body, and one determines [somebody] as knowing, because [he] shows how knowledge [is gained], by showing anew how awakening is caused, [the Nirmāṇakāya-Buddha] even becomes awakened anew.

<219,5> Now a different (argument): [If it were not as explained above] for a person endowed with *karma* and *kleśa*, these appearing vessel and juice (*snod bcud* = insentient world and sentient beings) would consequently not be produced by *karma* and *kleśa* [as their] own causes, and would consequently not appear by force of *karma* and *kleśa* [as] the causes of error; and for the fully awakened Buddha obscurations would appear as obscuring other forms, red flaming hot irons (*lcag bsreg̣s dmar 'bar ba rnams*) as burning the bodi(es), and rain-showers of weapons (*mtshon cha'i char ba rnams*) as cutting the bodi(es) to pieces, etc., because, apart from the mere non-appearing of these (things) as (absolutely) real, (they) are established by [some, i.e. conventional] valid cognition in the way they appear to ordinary people (*so skye*), (i.e.) as physically existent (*rdos bcas*) etc., and in addition they are mainly established by the Buddha's valid cognition.

49 In the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra *niṣyandabuddha* is, acc. Suzuki 1930, 142ff., 208f., an early form of the later *sambhogakāya* (s. BHSD); cf. KTA 7a2: *saṅs rgyas sku ni rnam gsum 'dod // chos daṅ rgyu mthun sprul pa ste /* and, commenting on it, KTV 35a1: *rgyu mthun pa ni loṅs spyod rdzogs pa yin par lta bar ste / chos kyi dbyiṅs kyi rgyu mthun pas* .... Acc. Suzuki 1928, 235 *niṣyanda* and *nirmāṇa-buddha* can hardly be distinguished. — RGV I,145 *niṣyanda* is, together with *dharmadhātu*, an aspect of *dharmakāya* (cf. Seyfort Ruegg 1969, 275). — Candrakīrti, however, explains *niṣyandakāya* as originated from either *dharmakāya* or *rūpakāya* (interpreted as *sambhogakāya* by Jayānanda 404a4) but different from them (MAvBh 363,11-13: *chos kyi sku las byuṅ ba 'am gzugs kyi sku'i mthu las byuṅ ba yin yaṅ ruṅ ste / ji skad bśad pa'i sku las gźan du gyur pa rgyu mthun pa'i sku* ...) Tsoṅ kha pa's commentary on this passage presents *niṣyandakāya* as "'result-body' (**phalakāya*), as the nature of the *nirmāṇakāya* is being the natural outflow of the *dharma* [and/or] *sambhogakāya*" (dGoṅs gsal 258b8f.: ... *sprul pa'i sku'i ṅo bo ñid chos loṅs kyi rgyu mthun pa ste 'bras bu'i sku* ...). It cannot, however, simply be identified with *nirmāṇakāya*, as the separate discussion of the latter at a considerably later point (MAv[Bh] 398,14-399,9) indicates.

<220,2> Now a different (argument): In order to prove that the Buddha's body is the *jñānakāya*, which is free from elements and the physical phenomena of a body (*lus bem chos*), it will be senseless to contemplate the path of the apparitional body (*māyākāya*) etc., as [this contemplation] is the virtue of measuring all physical phenomena with the mind. [The path of the apparitional body] does not correspond to the path which bears fruit, because, while (*śiṅ*) it is absolutely necessary to do away with appearing already prior to [the attainment of] the 'intuitive knowledge at the time of intense concentration' of a [still] learning [Ārya] and each sphere (*dkyil 'khor re re*) of the path of mantra, at the time of [gaining] the fruit (i.e. buddhahood) all (phenomena) appear. Necessarily the object (*chos can*) is becoming increasingly clear while [the contemplator] is — [starting] from the 'intuitive knowledge at the time of intense concentration'[50] of the path of seeing (*mthoṅ lam mñam gźag ye śes*) — becoming more and more concentrated, because all objects appear to the 'intuitive knowledge at the time of intense concentration' of the fruit.

<220,5> Therefore it is the main mistake of those who adhere to this system [of Tsoṅ kha pa's interpretation of the two realities ?], to have taken the Buddha's gnosis for the main (valid) cognition examining *saṃvṛtisatya*, because [if the Buddha's gnosis were the main valid cognition for *saṃvṛtisatya*] consequently the applying of *saṃvṛti[satya]* to the world [as it is done in the verse]:

> "Worldly conventional reality and reality in the absolute sense" [MK XXIV,8cd][51]

would be impossible, and because it is said again and again that *saṃvṛtisatya* is constituted by the innate worldly concept of 'I' (*ṅar 'dzin*) that bears the name 'delusion' (*moha*), but not seen by pure gnosis; (this is said) in numerous [statements such as:]

> "While being renowned as non-imagined, (the self) [results] from delusion" [MAv VI,164d][52]

and:

> "Because (*saṃvṛti* objects) are result, we say — in consideration of the world['s view] — '(they) exist', although they do not exist" [MAv VI,81cd]

50 The translation of the terms is of Obermiller 21.

51 MK XXIV,8cd: *lokasaṃvṛtisatyaṃ ca satyaṃ ca paramārthataḥ //*

52 MAv VI,164d; MAvL (Le Muséon 12, 326,n.5): *akalpyaprasiddho mohād asti*

and:

> "For whom should [the Bodhisattva] practise compassion? — It is [the being] that is imagined by the delusion which is accepted for the sake of the result [of buddhahood]" [BCA IX,76b-d][53]

and:

> "[If] there is no sentient being, whose is the result? — Correct! But [we] assume that [efforts (*īhā*)] [result] from delusion". [BCA IX,77ab][54]

<221,3> Objection: In this case there will be no need for acceptance and rejection.

[Reply:] [This is not correct; on the contrary] due to the understanding in this way [that *saṃvṛtisatya* is constituted by the innate worldly concept of 'I' (*ṅar 'dzin*) that bears the name 'delusion' (*moha*), but not seen by pure gnosis (above, 221,2f.)], one will undertake great efforts with regard to acceptance and rejection. If one knows that the tuft of hair appearing to a *taimirika* does not appear to a pure eye, as it does not exist on top of a [real] object, one realizes the own eye as having the defect of being stained; thereafter one searches for a medician, pays great respect to his words, and drinks the very strong (*mi zad pa, tīvra*) medicine; and those who, after postulating that [*saṃvṛtisatya*] is established by conventional valid cognition, hold the most ridiculous view that (*-'i gad rgyaṅs sgrogs pa rnams*) [the relation of] action and result [should be] ascertained by valid cognition do not have such a completely pure conduct of the three doors (of body, speech and mind) — like applying oneself to the adherence to[55] the conduct [of seeing one's own defects, consulting the medician, and taking the medicine] — which (conduct is represented) by the exponents of this (= Prāsaṅgika ?) system, the *jo bo chen po* Atiśa, his (transformed) manifestation (*rnam 'phrul, vikurvaṇa/vikurvita*) Pa tshab Ñi ma grags, the great *lotsāba* sKyabs mchog dPal bzaṅ po,[56] and those who are nowadays counted among the expo-

53 BCA IX,76b-d: *kasyopari kṛpeti cet / kāryārtham abhyupetena yo mohena prakalpitaḥ //*; translation acc. Steinkellner

54 BCA IX,77ab: *kāryaṃ kasya na cet sattvaḥ satyam īhā tu mohataḥ /*; transl. acc. Steinkellner

55 221,5 *bsten pa* (text B) : *bstan pa*

56 cf. BA II, 632f.: Dharmasvāmin dPal bzaṅ po, 1257-1310, sTag luṅ monastery, Marpa-line (??)

nents of an opinion (*chad pa, anta/aṃśa*)[57] in accordance with these (teachers). – [This] detailed (explanation) [should] suffice.

<222,1> Objection: Various (things) might have been said, but as the clear explanation of the four means of valid cognition, viz. perception, inference, scriptual testimony and analogy, at the end of the 'Joint (general meaning) of a thousand (passages) of the Prasannapadā' (? *tshig gsal stoṅ thun gyi mjug tu*)[58] is [merely] a Prāsaṅgika position, the former Tibetans also distinguished Prāsaṅgikas and Svātantrikas [as those who accept] many and few means of valid cognition, because the statement:

> "[...] because the Prāsaṅgikas assume four [means of valid cognition] to be ascertained, and the Svātantrikas, according to the Pramāṇavārttika, [only] two, perception and inference"[59]

is also acceptable.

[Reply:] Neither,[60] the former [and] later Tibetans, are of this opinion, because [the mentioning of] the four means of valid cognition is [merely] a report of worldly assumption, but not an establishment of (their) own position, as in the conclusion [of the respective passage in the Prasannapadā] it is said:

> "Therefore the world establishes the cognition of a thing (*don*) in this way through the four means of valid cognition." [Pras 75,9][61]

57 Cf. KPv 28: *gcig tu chad par smra ba, ekāntavādin* + n.9 of Weller's translation.

58 *stoṅ thun*: (1) *gnad don stoṅ phrag du ma thun thun du bsdus pa ste spyi don* / (2) *graṅs gnas śig* (Tshig mdzod).
The name "Tshig gsal stoṅ thun" seemingly refers to Prasannapadā on MK I,1, towards the end of which (Pras 75,2-9) the four means of valid cognition are discussed. – One section of sToṅ thun chen mo (473-506), entitled "dBu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshig gsal gyi mtha' bźi'i skye ba 'gog pa'i stoṅ thun", gives a very detailed analysis of Prasannapadā on I,1. 'Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa in his Tshig gsal stoṅ thun mun sel discusses the Prāsaṅgikas' view on valid cognition on the basis of Pras; whether he intended to refer to mKhas grub rje's text or directly to the respective passage of Pras I cannot decide. The expression *"bod sṅa ma tshig gsal gyi stoṅ thun byed mkhan"* (Tshig gsal stoṅ thun mun sel 554,1), however, might indicate that he uses *"stoṅ thun"* also as a technical term and not only as part of the name of a text or text-passage.

59 Not identified; Tshig gsal stoṅ thun mun sel (579,5f.) ascribes this position to "many old Tibetans" (*bod sṅa ma maṅ po*) and qualifies it as "mere talk" (*gtam kho na*). – In general the "reply" rather than the "objection" would reflect Tsoṅ kha pa's position.

60 222,3 *gñis kas* (text B) : *gñis pas*

61 Pras 75,9: *tad evaṃ pramāṇacatuṣṭayāl lokasyārthādhigamo vyavasthāpyate//*

If this (statement) does not prove it in this way, it is also not correct to say that because of the statement:

> "(...) is real according to the world, the rest is, according to the world, established as false" [MAv VI,25cd]

[the differentiation of] correct (*tathya*) and incorrect (*mithyā*) *saṃvṛti* is the system of the world, but not [Candrakīrti's] own system.[62]

<222,6> Objection: How is this? This (second statement) looks very much the same [as the first], therefore also [the differentiation of] correct and incorrect [*saṃvṛti*] is, in turn, to be stated as [Candrakīrti's] own system.

[Reply:] (This) is not correct. It is said:

> "Here exists, just as for somebody awake, the (same, above mentioned) triad[63] for him, as long as he is not awake." [MAv VI,53ab]

As frequently the answer has been given that a horse [or] ox [seen in a] dream and [seen while] awake exist in the same way, as long as the cause for the error is not abolished, and in the same way do not exist after (this cause) is abolished, the statement that in the Madhyamaka's own system, too, there exists no correct [and] incorrect [*saṃvṛti*] abides in the meaning. Therefore, not giving up this acceptable [position], in the Madhyamaka's own system valid cognition and invalid cognition are to be assumed as non existent with regard to *saṃvṛti* taken as the basis.[64]

<223,2> Therefore, by these (assumptions), [viz. on the one hand] the necessary cognition of *dharmanairātmya* for Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas [represented by the Prāsaṅgikas], which is not accepted by the Svātantrikas, and [on the other hand] also the [combination of] Madhyamaka [and] Pramāṇa(vāda) [bearing] the proud name '[two] lions with their necks crossed'[65], willingly accepted [by the Svātantrikas], which the Prāsaṅgikas do not assume, beneficial factors are compiled; thereby [also] a summary of the many contradictions is given.

62 For Tsoṅ kha pa's explanation of this view s. dGoṅs gsal 100a5-b1 (rTsa ṭik 356a2-5), cf. Tauscher 1991, n.122.

63 s. MAv VI,51cd/: *mig daṅ mig gi yul daṅ des bskyed sems / gsum po*

64 223,2 *gźir* (corr.) : *bźir* (text A and B)

65 Acc. the Chinese translation of Tshig mdzod (s.v. *mjiṅ ba*): *seṅ ge mjiṅ* 獅子交頸 *bsnol* Grags pa stobs rgyas from 'Bras spuṅs Blo gsal gliṅ interprets the expression as "fearless lions".

<223,4> 2 Detailed explanation of these matters (*don*)

<1> Object etc.:[66] As the explanation that one does not understand the meaning of *saṃvṛti* if one does not take it as false, is quite correct, and in the Prāsaṅgikas' own system *saṃvṛti* is [in fact] understood as false, there is a contradiction between the assumption of the *saṃvṛti* object as totally false and deceiving, and the assumption of the cognition which is its subject as undeceiving valid cognition, because the cognition cannot be a valid cognition if the respective object is deceiving (*slu chos yin*). E.g., a cognition to which tufts of hair appear. The statement: "also the appearing of tufts of hair, two moons, etc. is valid cognition" is a stronger realistic concept than [held by] even the realists.

[The fact] that *saṃvṛti* is delusive (*slu chos yin pa*) is [stated in] many [passages like]:

> "The Exalted one has said that anything of delusive character (*moṣadharman*) is to be called false. All conditioned (*saṃskṛta*) (elements of existence) are of delusive character, therefore they are false" [MK XIII,1][67] etc.

<224,1> <2> Accordingly, For this [particular] object etc.:[68] The object

66 V,12a (23,3): *yul kun rdzob daṅ yul can bslu med 'gal* / "The contradiction that the object is *saṃvṛti* and the subject undeceiving".

67 MK XIII,1: *tan mṛṣā moṣadharma yad bhagavān ity abhāṣata / sarve ca moṣadharmāṇaḥ saṃskārās tena te mṛṣā //*

68 V,12b (23,3): *yul der 'khrul daṅ de la tshad ma 'gal* / — "The contradiction that [a cognition] is an error for this [particular] object and valid cognition for the [same object]."; 224,1 *sogs ni* (text B) : *sogs na*.
Cf. LRChen kha 27b5ff. (Wayman 221ff.), where — refuting the logicians' assumption — it is denied that sense perceptions are valid cognition with regard to the particular/own-characteristic (*svalakṣaṇa*), but conventional cognitions are not in general denied to be valid cognition (cf. Tauscher 1991, n.73,74,96). This, in turn, means that validity and invalidity of conventional cognition do not, in fact, refer to the same object. Conventional cognition is valid cognition with regard to the thing as such, not with regard to its own-being or absolute reality. Or it is valid cognition with regard to the conceptual object (*źen yul*), the object of a correct conceptual cognition like inferential valid cognition (cf. Tshig mtshod) [and also with regard to the object of engagement (*'jug yul*)], but erroneous with regard to the appearing object (*snaṅ yul*). Tsoṅ kha pa does not, to my knowledge, formulate it directly in this way. Commenting on MAv VI,26, however, he argues that not everything perceived by an erroneous cognition is conventionally existent; being established by valid cognition is the basic requirement. In particular, conceptual objects perceived by erroneous cognition are not even conventionally existent, whereas with regard to the appearing objects sense perceptions perceiving form, sound, etc. as established by their own-characteristics, as they are corrupted by nescience, and sense perceptions perceiving reflections, echo, etc.

under discussion (*chos can*), the eye-perception of ordinary men (*tshur mthoṅ*), which is renowned as non-erroneous, should not be valid cognition for the form[-aspect] (*rūpa*), because it is erroneous cognition for the form[-aspect]. Also the logic reason (*rtags, liṅga*; in this case erroneous cognition [*'khrul śes*]), even more so the predicate (*bsal ba, apoha*; in this case invalid cogni-tion [*tshad ma ma yin pa*]), is called erroneous for the form[-aspect], and also clearly (*dṅos su*) accepted [in this way], because it is defiled by the concept of (establishment as) true (*bden 'dzin*). In the Catuḥśatakaṭīkā it is said:

> "Whatever is, after imposing (*samāropa*) these sense cognitions as direct perceptions, imagined thereby as valid cognition for the object of cognition[69], is something highly incoherent (*ma 'brel ba, apratibaddha*). While non-delusive cognition is seen in the world as valid cognition, the Venerable One said that even (sense) perception, as it is constructed, has the qualities of falsehood (and) delusion, and [is] like an illusion. Something which has the qualities of falsehood (and) delusion and is like an illusion, is not non-delusive[70], because (this cognition) appears in another way with regard to a thing that exists in one way. It is not correct to imagine [any cogni-tion as being] a valid cognition of this kind (as explained above), because it would follow that even all cognitions are valid cognition." [CŚṬ 197b5-7 (ad XIII,1)]

<224,6> When the need occurs to rephrase (*skyogs bśad*) the clear statement (made) in this (quotation), viz. that a perception (*blo*) which is constructed by *karma* and *kleśa* and defiled by the concept of (establishment as) true (*bden 'dzin*) is not valid cognition, and that a valid cognition which cognizes (*'jal ba*) the [per se] false *saṃvṛti* is not possible, [then the position that] (the property of) being erroneous with regard to a certain object is pervaded by 'not being valid cognition with regard to the (same object)' is [accepted in] the system of the realists, but the Mādhyamikas

are both erroneous cognition, to be distinguished only as subtle and gross. (dGoṅs gsal 101a8-b4: *'dis ni lugs 'dis blo 'khrul pa cig gi ṅor yod pa la / kun rdzob tu yod par 'jog zer ba legs par bkag go / ... / de ltar na tha sñad du yod pa la ni tshad mas grub pa cig dgos so // de 'dra ba'i źen yul mams tha sñad du yaṅ med kyaṅ snaṅ yul la ni de ltar mi bźed do // da lta gzugs sgra sogs lṅa raṅ gi mtshan ñid kyis grub par dbaṅ śes la snaṅ ba ni / ma rig pas bslad pa yin pas śes pa de daṅ / gzugs brñan daṅ brag cha sogs snaṅ ba'i dbaṅ śes mams la / phra rags tsam ma gtogs pa snaṅ yul la 'khrul ma 'khrul la khyad par med ciṅ / ...*).
For the distinction of the various types of objects s. Napper 28f., 99ff.; cf. also Kuijp 65,n.234,235.

69 224,3 *gźal bya la*; CŚṬ: *gźan* "... with regard to something else" (i.e. something different from the *tshad ma*, i.e. the *gźal bya*).

70 224,5 *mi (b)slu ba ma yin te* (CŚṬ) : *mi slu ba yin te*

[should] actually have written: "(We) do not assume that, although eye-perception is erroneous with regard to *rūpa*, (this being erroneous with regard to a certain object) is pervaded by 'not being valid cognition with regard to the (same object)'." This is a great violation of Candrakīrti, because the [necessary consequence]: 'It would follow that all cognitions are valid cognition, because it is correct to consider as valid cognition even [a cognition] of the kind that shows in a different way a thing which exists in one way' is directly contradictory (*dṅos 'gal*) to Candrakīrti in [all] three areas (*'khor gsum*).[71] Immediately following this gross complex (*'du*) of contradictions of this kind (is) also the extremely boastful pride of calling that correct which is not correct[72]; (this) is nothing but the fault of corrupting the teaching.

<225,5> Accordingly: In reply to the opinion that origination from another is established by worldly valid cognition (*tshad ma*) [stated in the verse]:

> "Origination of one (thing) from another, however, is perceived by ordinary people (*'jig rten pa*)" [MAv VI,22c],

it is said:

> "Fools are not fit as authority (*tshad ma*)" [MAv VI,30d];

not explaining [this verse] as meaning that in general those (cognitions) are — in the Mādhyamikas' own system — not valid cognitions with regard to either of the two truths, and in particular do no harm at the occasion of investigating reality (*de kho na ñid*), it is said again and again that [sense perceptions] are [indeed] not valid cognitions with regard to reality (*de kho na ñid*), but [nevertheless] conventionally valid cognitions; [this] too, is in immediate contradiction [to the verse of Candrakīrti quoted above]: In this case origination from another would be conventionally established, and this cannot be accepted, because according to the statement:

> "because by this argumentation [origination from another] is [proved to be] incorrect even conventionally" [MAv VI,36c],

71 Cf. *mtshan ñid rtsod skabs kyi 'khor gsum ste rtags bsal khyab gsum* (Tshig mdzod) — *hetu, apoha* (= *sādhyadharma*), *vyāpti*.

72 225,4 *mi rigs pa ... rigs* (corr.) : *mi rig pa ... rig* (text A and B)

it has to be taken as a speciality (*khyad chos*) of this (Prāsaṅgika) system, not to assume origination from another even merely conventionally and (because) it has been said many times.

<226,2> Objection: Origination from another is not established even by worldly valid cognition, as by (the statement):

> "Even according to the world origination from another does not exist" [MAv VI,32d]

[and not by the verse you mentioned above ?] a direct answer is given to: 'Origination of one (thing) from another' [MAv VI,22c/].

[Reply:] It might be like this, if one applies [the above] to worldly spontaneous (*raṅ dga' ba*) (cognition) which has not analyzed and not investigated; you, however, have related it to the Madhyamaka's own system and, further-more, to (a cognition) which has analyzed a little.[73] In this case the two, seed and sprout, that are established as real things, have to be the same substance if they are not established as different substances; therefore do not accept worldly valid cognition for the Madhyamaka's own system!

<226,5> In this case, here (the expression) 'world' should not refer to somebody who does not adhere to a doctrinal system (*grub mtha'*), who has not obtained the noble path, who is not ordained, etc., whereas the cognition that is called 'world' in this context, is that which considers the former and later [phases (*skad cig*) of the 'I' or any other phenomenon] (to be) one [continuous phenomenon], without analyzing (and) investigating the world called 'innate concept of a (real) I' (*ṅar 'dzin lhan skyes*), which has been persistent since beginningless (times), (which happens) in cases when the Madhyamaka view has not arisen or, although it has arisen, one is without memory-perception (*dran 'dzin*) due to a defect of the directly perceiving agent (*byed pa mṅon gyur ba*). And, by this (world[ly] cognition) directly seeing smoke on the mountain-pass, and cognizing that there is fire behind the mountain-pass because of the indicator of this (perceived smoke); the ascertainment that something is meaningful (in accordance with) the word of an authority (*yid ches pa'i tshig don ldan*); taking, on grounds of the resemblance to a gayal, also a bull as having hoofs; etc. (such kinds of knowledge) we[74] call 'established by valid cognition', and as (expressions such as): 'I am seeing [these facts]

73 Cf. n.10

74 227,2 *kho bos* (text B) : *kho bo*

according to (the absolute) reality' etc. are conventional usage, these (kinds of knowledge) are determined as worldly valid cognition; and as these (kinds of worldly valid cognition) distinguish between true and false with regard to a horse (seen) in a dream and a horse (seen) while awake, also the distinction between correct and incorrect (cognitions) is very well made [with regard to worldly cognition]; there is, however, not the slightest possibility of taking – on grounds of [the assumption that] the ascertainment that the two (correct and incorrect objects according to worldly cognition) are equal with regard to (their) efficiency for an erroneous (cognition) and equal with regard to (their) inexistence for a right cognition is Candrakīrti's own system – (correct and incorrect objects) for one.[75]

<227,4> <3> rjes etc.:[76] Also (the statement): 'Furthermore, while the Svātantrikas' proof-formulation does not exist, inference does exist' is not correct, because: As in this case (whatever) is an inference would only be an inference [as described] in the chapter of '(inference for) one's own sake' [where it is treated] without proof-formulation, here inference is accepted in the way it is usually explained, (i.e.) as inference acknowledged by others; and, if there is an inference acknowledged by others, there also has to be a proof-formulation acknowledged by others, and the Jina has also said many times: "Whatever is impermanent, is sorrowful" etc., and there are many proof-formulations [also within Madhyamaka texts], by the teacher (Nāgārjuna) himself (in statements such as):

> "Something that does not see itself, how can it see other (things)?" [MK III,2cd][77]

75 Cf. n.19

76 V,12c (23,3f.): *rjes dpag yod daṅ bsgrub ṅag med pa 'gal* / — "The contradiction [to assume] that inference does exist and the proof-formulation does not exist."

77 MK III,2cd: *na paśyati yad ātmānaṃ kathaṃ drakṣyati tat parān* //; 227,6 (pāda c) ... *mi lta ba* / (MK, text B) : ... *mi lta la* /

etc., and the detailed description of five-membered proof-formulations given by Buddhapālita and Candrakīrti in the commentary of this (verse).[78]

78 BMV 55f.; Pras, commenting on MK III,2 (114,1-5), does not mention any five-membered proof-formulation. However, this verse is, without being directly quoted, referred to in Pras 34,6-10 (on MK I,1) in form of a syllogistic argument.
It is not clear to me which of Tsoṅ kha pa's statement(s) this third 'contradiction' is based upon in particular, or against which of Tsoṅ kha pa's assumptions the argument is directed. It seems not to criticize the acceptance of inference (as means of valid cognition), but — given the fact of accepting inference — the denial of proof-formulation in general; the specification "the Svātantrika's" mentioned in the initial statement is not taken account of in the argumentation. But in LRChen kha 79b1-84a5 Tsoṅ kha pa clearly accepts, even basing his explanations on the sources mentioned by sTag tshaṅ, proof-formulation in general and rejects only the independent (*svatantra*) type of inference. His statements: "... (MK III,2). Syllogistic arguments (*sbyor ba, prayoga*)* of that kind are called 'inference acknowledged by others'. ... (Pras 34,4f.) does not (mean that) no syllogistic argument is formulated because (of the fact that) the formulated syllogistic arguments are maintained not to be independent and to have only the aim of refuting the proposition of others" (79b7-80a2: ... *źes ... sbyor ba 'di dra mams la gźan la grags pa'i rjes dpag ces zer ba yin no // ... źes sbyor ba bkod ba mams raṅ rgyud min pa daṅ gźan gyi dam bca' ba 'gog pa tsam gyi dgos pa can du bźed pas sbyor ba mi 'god pa min no /*) could even serve as a direct answer to sTag tshaṅ's accusations. — For a detailed discussion of Tsoṅ kha pa's position regarding this topic cf. Seyfort Ruegg 1989, in particular §§ XI, XII.
'Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa expresses this very drastically: There is no reason for this accusation; as in the writings of Tsoṅ kha pa and his pupils there is not a single word stating that proof-formulation does not exist, (the formulation of sTag tshaṅ's third 'contradiction') is (mere) raving (?) due to being severely drugged with sleep or to severe *timira*-disease (Grub chen 758,2f.: *sgrub ṅag med daṅ rjes dpag yod pa 'gal / źes pa tsam las 'grel bar yaṅ smra rgyu mi snaṅ la rje yab sras gaṅ gi gźuṅ na'aṅ sgrub ṅag med pa'i tshig zur tsam yaṅ gtan med pas na gñid kyis myos pa'am rab rib kyi nad tshab[s] che bas brlab brdol yin no /*).
* *sbyor ba* in this context stands for *sbyor [ba'i] ṅag* (80a7), *prayogavākya*; cf. also Wayman, n.315.

Bibliography

AAV — Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛttiḥ Sphuṭārthā (Haribhadra). Ed. Rama Śaṅkara Tripāṭhī, Sārnāth, Vārāṇasī 1977 [Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica 2]

BA — The Blue Annals. Transl. by G.N.Roerich, 2 vols, Calcutta 1949, 1953

BCA — s. BCAP

BCAP — Bodhicaryāvatārapañjika.- Prajñākaramati's Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva. Ed. by L.de La Valleé Poussin, Calcutta 1901-1914

BHSD — Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, by F.Edgerton. Vol.II: Dictionary, New Haven 1953

BMV — Buddhapālita. Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti. Tibetische Übersetzung. Hrsg. Max Walleser, S.-Petersburg 1913 [Bibliotheca Buddhica XVI]

Cristal Mirror, Journal of the Tibetan Nyingma Meditation Center. Berkeley

CŚṬ — Catuḥśatakaṭīkā [Bodhisattvayogācāra°].- D 3865

D — Edition von Derge = Sde dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Bstan ḥgyur - preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo. Ed. by J.Takasaki, Z.Yamaguchi, Y.Ejima. Tokyo 1977-

Draṅ thig — lTa ba'i ñams mgur thun moṅs ma yin pa A ma ṅo śes kyi bsdus don gnad kyi draṅ thig daṅ / de'i rnam bśad grub bźi'i sñiṅ nor (bsTan pa bstan 'dzin). Mundgod 1977(?)

mDzes rgyan — Grub pa'i mtha'i rnam par bźag pa gsal bar bśad pa thub bstan lhun po'i mdzes rgyan (lCaṅ skya Rol pa'i rdo rje). Sarnath 1970

Eckel — M.D.Eckel: Jñānagarbha's Commentary on the Distinction Between the Two Truths. New York 1987

dGoṅs gsal — dBu ma la 'jug pa'i rgya cher bśad pa, dGoṅs pa rab gsal (Tsoṅ kha pa).- P 6143

Grub chen — Grub mtha' chen mo ('Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa'i rdo rje).- Grub mtha' rnam par bźag pa 'khrul spoṅ dgoṅ lṅa'i sgra dbyaṅs kun mkhyen lam bzaṅ gsal ba'i rin chen sgron me, und Grub mtha' rnam bśad raṅ gźan grub mtha' kun daṅ zab don mchog tu gsal ba kun bzaṅ źiṅ gi ñi ma luṅ rigs rgya mtsho skye dgu'i re ba kun skyon. The collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje. Ed. by Ngawang Gelek Demo, vol.14, New Delhi 1973

Grub mtha' kun śes — Grub mtha'kun śes nas mtha' bral + Grub mtha' kun śes nas mtha' bral sgrub pa źes bya ba'i bstan bcos rnam par bśad pa legs pa bśad kyi rgya mtsho (sTag tshaṅ Lotsāba Śes rab rin chen). Thimpu 1976 [acc. Hopkins 1983]. 1-37

Grub mtha' kun śes rnam bśad text A: s. Grub mtha' kun śes, 39-327
text B: Toyo Bunko 2249

Hopkins 1983 — J.Hopkins: Meditation on Emptiness. London

Hopkins 1987 — J.Hopkins: Emptiness Yoga. Ithaca, New York

J — Jayānanda: Madhyamakāvatāraṭīkā.- P 5271

lJon śiṅ — rGyud kyi mṅon par rtogs pa rin po che'i ljon śiṅ (Grags pa rgyal mtshan).- Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum. Compiled by Bsod nams rgya mtsho, vol.3, Tokyo 1968. 1-70

Kuijp	L.W.J.van der Kuijp: Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology. Wiesbaden 1983
KPv	The Kāçyapaparivarta. A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class. Ed. A.von Staël-Holstein. Shanghai 1926 Translation: F.Weller: Zum Kāśyapaparivarta. Heft 2, Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Textes. Berlin 1965
KTA	Kāyatrayāvatāramukha.- D 3890
KTV	Kāyatrayavṛtti.- D 3891
Lopez	D.S.Lopez: A Study of Svātantrika. Ithaca, New York 1987
LRChen	Lam rim chen mo [sKyes bu gsum gyi ñams su blaṅ ba'i rim pa thams cad tshaṅ bar ston pa'i byaṅ chub lam gyi rim pa] (Tsoṅ kha pa).- P 6001
LRChuṅ	Lam rim chuṅ ba [sKyes bu gsum gyi ñams su blaṅ ba'i byaṅ chub lam gyi rim pa] (Tsoṅ kha pa).- P 6002
LŚÑ	Draṅ ba daṅ ṅes pa'i don rnam par phye ba'i bstan bcos, Legs bśad sñiṅ po (Tsoṅ kha pa).- P 6142
MAv	Madhyamakāvatāra par Candrakīrti, Traduction Tibétaine. Publ. par L.de La Valleé Poussin, St.-Pétersbourg 1907-1912
MAvBh	Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya (Candrakīrti) s. MAv
MAvL	Madhyamakāvatāra. Introduction au Traité du Milieu de l'Ācārya Candrakīrti avec le Commentaire de l'Auteur, traduit d'après la version tibétaine par L.de La Vallée Poussin. Le Muséon N.S. 8 (1907), 249-317; 11 (1910), 271-358; 12 (1911), 236-328
MK	Madhyamakakārikā.- Nāgārjuna, Mūlamadhyamakakārikā. Ed. by J.W.de Jong, Madras 1977
Napper	Lati Rinpochay / E.Napper: Mind in Tibetan Buddhism. Ithaca, New York 1980, ^{3}1986
Obermiller	E.Obermiller: The Doctrine of Prajñā-pāramitā as exposed in the Abhisamayālaṅkāra of Maitreya. Leningrad 1912
P	Edition von Peking = The Tibetan Tripiṭaka. Peking Edition. Reprinted under the supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto. Ed. by D.T.Suzuki, 168 vols., Tokyo and Kyoto 1955-1961
Pras	Prasannapadā.- Mūlamadhyamakakārikās de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti. Publ. par L.de La Valleé Poussin, St.-Pétersbourg 1903-1913
R	Red mda' ba gŹon nu blo gros: dBu ma la 'jug pa'i rnam bśad De kho na ñid gsal ba'i sgron me. Sarnath 1983
RGV	Ratnagotravibhāga.- The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaraśāstra. Ed. by E.H.Johnston. Patna 1950
SDV	Satyadvayavibhaṅga (Jñānagarbha) s. Eckel
SDVV	Satyadvayavibhaṅgavṛtti (Jñānagarbha) s. Eckel
Seyfort Ruegg 1969	D.Seyfort Ruegg: La Théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra. Études sur la Sotériologie et la Gnoséologie du Bouddhisme. Paris
Seyfort Ruegg 1989	D.Seyfort Ruegg: On Pramāṇa theory in Tsoṅ kha pa's Madhyamaka philosophy. Proceedings of the Second International Dharmakīrti Conference, Vienna, June 11-16, 1989. Ed. E.Steinkellner, Wien 1991, 281-310

Steinkellner	Śāntideva, Eintritt in das Leben zur Erleuchtung (Bodhicaryāvatāra). Lehrgedicht des Mahāyāna aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt von E.Steinkellner. Düsseldorf-Köln 1981
Suzuki 1928	D.T.Suzuki: The Lankavatara Sutra, As a Mahayana Text in Especial Relation to the Teaching of Zen Buddhism. Eastern Buddhist IV/3,4 (1927-28), 199-298
Suzuki 1930	D.T.Suzuki: Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra. London [acc. BHSD]
Tauscher 1990	H.Tauscher: Saṃvṛti bei Tsoṅ kha pa [I]. WZKS 34, 227-254
Tauscher 1991	H.Tauscher: Saṃvṛti bei Tsoṅ kha pa [II]. WZKS 35 (in press)
Thal raṅ	Ṅag dbaṅ dpal ldan: Grub mtha' chen mo'i mchan 'grel dka' gnad mdud grol blo gsal gcis nor źes bya ba las dBu ma thal raṅ gi skabs bźugs. Ed. Bhikshu Guru Deva Lama, Sarnath, Varanasi 1964
Thurman	R.A.F.Thurman: Tsong Khapa's Speech of Gold in the *Essence of True Eloquence*. Princeton 1984
sToṅ thun chen mo	Zab mo stoṅ pa ñid kyi de kho na ñid rab tu gsal bar byed pa'i bstan bcos sKal bzaṅ mig 'byed (mKhas grub rje).- sToṅ thun chen mo of mKhas-grub Dge-legs-dpal-bzaṅ and other Texts on Madhyamika Philosophy. Ed. lHa-mkhar Yoṅs-dzin bsTanpa rGyal mTshan, New Delhi 1972, 1-523
rTsa ṭik	rTsa śe ṭik chen [dBu ma rtsa ba'i tshig le'ur byas pa ces by ba'i rnam bśad Rigs pa'i rgyà mtsho] (Tsoṅ kha pa).- P 6153
Tshig gsal stoṅ thun	mun sel Tshig gsal stoṅ thun gyi tshad ma'i rnam bśad zab rgyas kun gsal tshad ma'i 'od brgya 'bar ba skal bzaṅ sñiṅ gi mun sel ('Jam dbyaṅs bźad pa'i rdo rje).- Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje. Ed. by Ngawang Gelek Demo, vol. 11, New Delhi 1973, 483-619
Tshig mdzod	Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo. 3 vols, Beijing 1985
VV	Vigrahavyāvartanī (Nāgārjuna).- E.H.Johnston and A.Kunst: The Vigrahavyāvartanī of Nāgārjuna, with the Author's Commentary. Bruges (Belgium) 1951; Madhyamakaśāstra of Nāgārjuna. Ed. P.L.Vaidya, Darbhanga 1960. Appendix 5, 277-295
Waldschmidt	E.Waldschmidt: Ein zweites Daśabalasūtra. Mitteilungen des Institutes für Orientforschung [Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin] VI/3, 1958, 382-405
Wayman	A.Wayman: Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real. Reprint, Delhi 1979
WZKS	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Südasiens