

THE LION'S ROAR THAT PROCLAIMS ZHANTONG

BY JU MIPHAM NAMGYAL



BY TONY DUFF

THE LION'S ROAR THAT PROCLAIMS ZHANTONG

BY JU MIPHAM NAMGYAL

TONY DUFF
PADMA KARPO TRANSLATION COMMITTEE

Copyright © 2010 Tony Duff. All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photography, recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system or technologies now known or later developed, without permission in writing from the publisher.

First edition, January 2010; revised February 2011
ISBN: 978-9937-8244-6-0

Janson typeface with diacritical marks and
Tibetan Classic Chogyal typeface
designed and created by Tony Duff,
Tibetan Computer Company
<http://www.tibet.dk/tcc>

Produced, Printed, and Published by
Padma Karpo Translation Committee
P.O. Box 4957
Kathmandu
NEPAL

Committee members for this book: translation and
composition, Lama Tony Duff; editorial, Tom Anderson;
cover design, Christopher Duff.

Web-site and e-mail contact through:
<http://www.tibet.dk/pktc>
or search Padma Karpo Translation Committee on the web.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	v
THE LION'S ROAR THAT PROCLAIMS ZHANTONG BY JU MIPHAM NAMGYAL	1
GLOSSARY	39
SUPPORTS FOR STUDY	51
TIBETAN TEXT	55
INDEX	71

INTRODUCTION

“Zhantong”¹ or Other Emptiness is an abbreviation of the phrase meaning “empty of other”. It is a Tibetan term which was not created until the 12th Century C.E. in Tibet. It was created at that time by Yumo Mikyo Dorje whose followers eventually established a base in Jomo and became known as the Jonangs. One of the great hierarchs of the Jonang School, Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen [1292–1361], wrote many commentaries that clarified the meaning of “zhantong”.

Longchen Rabjam, whose dharma writings are held to be amongst the greatest to be found in Tibetan literature, was a contemporary of Dolpopa. Longchenpa himself writes in a way that clearly says that the view of the Nyingma tradition

¹ Tib. *gzhan stong*. Although it is often written as “shentong” in the West, that transliteration shows some misunderstanding of Tibetan pronunciation. Extensive explanations of Tibetan pronunciation explaining why it should be pronounced “zhantong” and not “shentong” will be found in the *Standard Tibetan Grammar, Volume I, The Thirty Verses of Minister Thumi* by Tony Duff, published by Padma Karpo Translation Committee.

is zhantong in style so it is no surprise that Jamgon Kongtrul the Great, writing later in the 19th century, lists the greatest of Zhantong advocates in Tibet as Dolpopa, Karmapa III Rangjung Dorje, and Longchenpa.

After Longchenpa, the greats of the Nyingma tradition have always said that the Nyingma tradition follows a zhantong style presentation. For example, one of the greatest of scholars in the 19th century, Ju Mipham Namgyal, wrote many texts that explicitly presented and upheld that view. Two particularly lucid and forceful presentations that show specific aspects of zhantong are found in a pair of texts attributed to him, *The Lion's Roar that Proclaims Zhantong* and *The Lion's Roar that is One Thousand Doses of Sugatagarbha*. The first of the two is the text presented in this book. Although Mipham is referred to as the author of this text and the text is even included in Mipham's *Collected Works*, Mipham did not write the text. It was composed by one of his students based on teachings heard from Mipham. This is well known within the tradition and can be understood from the colophon of the text where the actual author, Jamyang Lodro Gyatso, explains that he heard the teaching from Mipham, who is also known as Jampal Gyepay Dorje.

The *Lion's Roar that Proclaims Zhantong* focusses on the issues of emptiness and the two truths as they are proclaimed within the Zhantong system. The text begins with a clear explanation of the lineage of teachers through which the Zhantong view came down from the Buddha, then mentions the main texts of the system, and then lays out the particulars of the view of zhantong emptiness and the two truths corresponding to that view of emptiness. All of this happens in very short

but cogent piece at the beginning of the text. Following that, most of the text consists of a long argument with opponents of Zhantong. The argument goes through a number of major points of disagreement between Zhantong followers and their opponents in order to expose the particularly subtle and hard to understand view of Zhantong. Both sides are very well versed in the Buddha's teaching with the result that the arguments engage deep points of philosophy which cannot be understood without significant knowledge of the system.

Do the opponents have faces? Very broadly speaking, the Nyingma and Kagyu traditions are Zhantong followers and Gelug and Sakya traditions are their opponents. However, the Sakya tradition had some some great masters who were Zhantong followers and the Sakyas tend not to engage in public argument over whether Zhantong is correct or not. On the other hand, followers of Tsongkhapa—principally the Gelugpa tradition—have been very vocal about their disbelief in the Zhantong view and much of the argument in this book sets forth their way of arguing against Zhantong. Thus, although they are not explicitly set up as the opponent, it is understood that their face is behind the arguments. In regard to this, it is noteworthy that Mipham is reported to have said later that he was not attacking anyone in particular but was trying to make the view of Zhantong as clear as possible by setting up this kind of argument.

Over the years I have received significant amounts of teaching on this and other related texts by some of the great experts of this view, people like Khenpo Palden Sherab, Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso, and others. In doing so, I have accumulated extensive commentary which I intend to use as the basis for a

detailed book of teaching on *Lion's Roar that Proclaims Zhantong*. However, some very confused translations of this text have recently appeared, so I thought it best to immediately make this text available in a clear and correct translation.

The prefatory section of *Lion's Roar that Proclaims Zhantong* is a short but particularly clear presentation of the main points of the Zhantong view. The prefatory section is thoroughly explained in a book called *The Other Emptiness*². One of the features of *The Other Emptiness* book is that—unlike this *Lion's Roar that Proclaims Zhantong*—it does not get bogged down in the arguments of the detractors of Zhantong but lays out Zhantong as a teaching which is a practical path to enlightenment.

I am often struck by the fact that Zhantong is mostly misunderstood amongst non-Tibetans, who have come to think of it as an exercise in philosophical argument. Although this teaching provoked a war-like philosophical argument over the centuries in Tibet, it is not because the teaching itself is about philosophical argument or that its followers are a war-like lot. Rather, it has happened because a particular group of Buddhists in Tibet took to disliking it and lined up every means of argument—and often very corrupt argument—that they could muster against it. When the teaching is heard from a true holder of its lineage, one realizes that the emptiness of other which is the namesake of Zhantong is an utterly practical teaching meant to be used for practice, not for argument.

² To be published by Padma Karpo Translation Committee, author Tony Duff.

Despite what its detractors would have us believe, this is the teaching of the Buddha and it is consistent with the view of Mahāmudrā and Great Completion.

It would be enjoyable to continue on here and fill in the details of this very practical teaching but that would lead to a lengthy exposition, which is not the purpose of this book. Other books from Padma Karpo Translation Committee will fill in those details.

Further Study

Padma Karpo Translation Committee has amassed a range of materials to help those who are studying this and related topics. Please see the chapter Supports for Study at the end of the book for the details.

Sanskrit

Sanskrit terms are an important aspect of a technical book like this. They are properly rendered into English with diacritical marks. For the sake of precision, diacritical marks have been used with them throughout this book.

May we find the non-existent view
Of existence of non-existence
In which nothing whatsoever is present
But all phenomena of *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa* appear.

Tony Duff,
Swayambhunath,
Nepal,
February 2011



Ju Mipham Namgyal
Mural on the wall of Dzogchen Monastery, Tibet.
Photograph by the author, 2007

THE LION'S ROAR THAT PROCLAIMS ZHANTONG

NAMO GURU MAÑJUŚHRĪYE

The Conqueror, the lion among men³, Kinsman of
the Sun⁴;

Maitreya of great maitrī, Asanga, and their lineage;
And those who roared like fearless lions in the Land
of Snow—

³ Tib. mi yi seng ge. “Like a lion amidst his followers, the Buddha proclaimed the ultimate level of teaching in a lion’s roar”, invokes the image of the fearless and final proclamation of the truth. It uses the vocabulary of the teachings on profound view found in the third turning of the wheel of dharma. This vocabulary immediately indicates that a teaching belongs to this level. Thus, these words are used in the title and preface of this text.

⁴ Skt. ādityabandhu, Tib. nyi ma’i gnyen. This is a very ancient Indian term connected with sun worship. Used here, it indicates that the Buddha was a *kinsman* or member of the Sun-worshipping Śākyā race.

Bowing down, I pay homage to all of them⁵.

The treasury of the secret of the vast reaches of
 conquerors with their sons,
 The quintessence of the foremost instructions⁶ of
 the sūtras and tantras of definitive meaning⁷,
 And the excellent revelation of the many experts
 and accomplished ones of India and Tibet—
 The proclamation of the profound Middle Way—
 will be briefly explained here.

⁵ The ultimate teaching given in the third turning was passed from the Buddha to his regent Maitreya in particular. “Maitreya of great maitrī” is a play on words meaning “Maitreya (he of loving kindness) of great loving kindness”; the implication is that he had the kindness needed to hold and spread these teachings to sentient beings. He transmitted these ultimate teachings to the great Indian master Asaṅga who was responsible for their explaining them within this world. After Asaṅga, master Maitrīpa was the Indian mainstay of the teaching who was responsible for its transmission into Tibet. A number of lineages of his teaching appeared within Tibet, with the main ones being established by Karmapa Rangjung Dorje, Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen, and Longchenpa, as described in the book *Other Emptiness* published by Padma Karpo Translation Committee.

⁶ For foremost instruction, see the glossary.

⁷ Skt. nītārtha, Tib. nges don. One of a pair of terms. The other is Skt. neyārtha or Tib. drang don, translated here as “provisional meaning”. The reasons for these choices of words are explained in *The Other Emptiness*.

Now, concerning this, the advocates of Zvantong established the great way⁸ of the profound, definitive meaning, Great Middle Way⁹ based on the single point of understanding found¹⁰ in the conqueror's word that is the teachings of the final wheel of definitive meaning that show the non-regressing, indestructible, permanent path; the teaching of his regent, a lord of the ten levels¹¹ that is the *Great Vehicle*

⁸ Tib. gzhung. This term means “main way” or “main system” and also means “main text”. Khenpo Palden Sherab stated that here it is equivalent to (Tib.) “lugs srol”, meaning main way or system. This is not just any way or system but the highway or the governing system within the Buddha's teaching.

⁹ The Great Middle Way is a name given to the Middle Way (Skt. madhyamaka) of the Zvantong system. The term “great” distinguishes it from lesser Middle Way schools such as Svatantrika and Prāsaṅgika Middle Way schools.

¹⁰ ... progressively ...

¹¹ Lord of the ten levels (Skt. bhūmi) is an epithet for a bodhisattva mahāsatva who has not only arrived at the tenth level but has completed all of its training. He sits as lord over all the ten levels as he awaits his final passage to buddhahood. Here, it is the conqueror's regent, Maitreya.

Note that, despite the common appearance of “bodhisattva” in Western books on Buddhism, the Tibetan tradition has steadfastly maintained since the time of the earliest translations that the correct spelling is bodhisatva. In support of this, experts such as Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche have proclaimed that “bodhisatva” is the correct spelling and explained the reasons for it.

*Highest Continuum*¹²; the profound meanings taught by noble Asaṅga and his brother¹³; the sūtra definitive meaning scripture of Guardian Nāgārjuna that is found in the *Collection of Praises*; and so on; the mantra vehicle tantras *Glorious Kāla-chakra*, and others; and the commentaries clarifying their intent, such as the *Trilogy of Mind Commentaries*, and so on. This establishment of the profound, definitive-meaning, Great Middle Way has with it the key point of the most profound and vast intent¹⁴, but nowadays everyone—knowledgeable or not—who takes on the responsibility of propounding it to others only imparts prattle, extreme confusion. Therefore, I will explain briefly how the system actually is.

In order to arrive at a certain¹⁵ determination of the tenets of Zhantong, you must first determine, in accordance with the system of Guardian Nāgārjuna, that all dharmas lack self-nature. Without that understanding, you will not arrive at a determination of the way that the fictional is empty of self entity¹⁶ and the way that the superfactual is empty of other¹⁷

¹² Tib. *rgyud bla ma*.

¹³ Asaṅga's brother was Vasubandhu.

¹⁴ Of the Buddha.

¹⁵ “In order to arrive at a certain determination ...” has the meaning, “If you are wanting to definitely arrive at a fully correct ascertainment ...”.

¹⁶ Tib. *rang ngo nas stong*. Here, “rang ngo” is short for “rang gi ngo bo”. Some have suggested that it means “empty of itself”. That is not wrong in the sense that it is the other side of “empty

(continued...)

so, to begin with, you have to determine freedom from elaboration as a fact¹⁸ arrived at through individual, personal knowledge¹⁹. After that, you realize the superfactual²⁰ version

¹⁶(...continued)

of other”. However, it has to be understood that, when talking about the fictional case of beings in *samsāra*, it means that the phenomena comprising the fictional are empty of the self entity which will be overlaid on them by the processes of ignorance. This is the standard terminology used by Kagyu and Nyingma for this case. The Gelugpas understand this term but do not use it as their main form of expression of this case. They use “*rang bzhin gyis stong pa*”, though in their presentation they say that “*rang ngo nas stong pa*” has the same meaning. Perhaps so, but the ramifications are different. The Gelugpa argue that the fictional is empty of true existence with which the Kagyus and Nyingmas do not agree. This leads to one of the hot topics of debate in this area, one which Mipham takes up at length later on. At any rate, here, the words mean that a phenomenon of the fictional, *samsaric* level is empty of an own entity, with “own entity” meaning a solid, real thing that something itself is at root.

¹⁷ Fictional and superfactual are our greatly improved translations for “relative” and “absolute”. For these terms, see the glossary. Briefly, “*samvṛitti*” is a Sanskrit term meaning “a deliberately produced *fiction*” and “*paramārtha*” is a Sanskrit term meaning “that *superior fact* that appears on the surface of the mind of a noble one who has transcended *samsāra*”. Having these meanings correctly in mind is crucial to being able to understand the view in general but especially certain points of the *zhantong* view.

¹⁸ For fact, see the glossary.

¹⁹ Tib so sor rang gi rig pa. Khenpo Palden Sherab states that this refers to “so sor rang rig pa’i shes rab”, meaning “individual, self-
(continued...)

of that meaning of freedom from elaboration using a subject²¹ which is no-thought wisdom²². At that point, both object and subject having become such that the actual mode²³ and the apparent mode are synchronized, this will be called “the su-

¹⁹(...continued)

knowing *prajñā*”. The key point is that this first step concerns *prajñā*, not wisdom. The second step is the transcendence of *prajñā* and arrival at wisdom.

²⁰ For *prajñā*, see the glossary. *Prajñā* is used to realize superfact by investigating the object known to consciousness. That superfact, which is a freedom from elaboration, is then more deeply realized by no-thought wisdom, which is the subject rather than the object. By doing so the mere or flat or blank emptiness which is a freedom from elaboration is turned into a full emptiness, one that possesses the excellence of having both all phenomena and all the good qualities that go with wisdom.

²¹ Tib. *yul can*. The second turning of the wheel teaches investigation of the “*yul*” object whereas the third turning of the wheel teaches arrival at the “*yul can*” subject knowing the object. These two steps in this order constitutes the Zabantong approach.

²² Sometimes something very elegant in Tibetan needs to be paraphrased to make it clear. This last piece is saying, “First you investigate the object using *prajñā*; by doing so you arrive at freedom from elaborations. Then you turn that freedom from elaboration into its superfactual form by realizing it with wisdom rather than *prajñā*, through looking at the subject rather than the object”. It is as simple as that.

²³ Tib. *gnas tshul*. Actual mode is the same as actuality, for which see the glossary. However, actual mode has a counterpart “*ap-
pearing mode*” and the two must be understood as pair.

perfactual”²⁴ and, in relation to that, when objects and subjects become such that the actual and apparent modes are not synchronized²⁵ that will be called “the fictional”²⁶. When analysis is done with a valid cognizer of conventional analysis²⁷, we have the distinctions “deceptive and not deceptive”, “confused and not confused”, and, in relation to that, whatever is not deceptive and not confused is to be classified as superfactual and the reverse to be classified as fictional.

²⁴ Tib. snang tshul. Appearing mode meaning the appearing situation which is merely how it appears and not its actual mode.

²⁵ “Synchronization” and “non-synchronization” are translations of “mthun” and “mi thun,” which were translated as “in accord” and “not in accord” just two paragraphs above. The use of these terms was suggested by the incomparable Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche when he was working on this text with his Nalanda Translation Committee, of which I was a member. These terms have a very practical sense, which fits with this being a practical rather than philosophical teaching.

²⁶ This sentence is a definition of the two truths according to the zhantong style. It is not defined on the basis of ultimate analysis but conventional analysis. When the subject has its fact appearing to it in accordance with the actuality of the situation, then you have superfactual truth. When not, you have fictional truth.

²⁷ Tib. tha snyad tshad ma. For valid cognizer, see the glossary. A conventional valid cognizer operates at the level of conventions, where conventions are defined as the conceptual names and verbal expressions of them which have been agreed on as the means of referring to something. A conventional valid cognizer works within the arena of conventions. It is different from an ultimate or superfactual valid cognizer which works within the arena of superfact.

It is not that the advocates of Zhantong have made up a new classification of the two truths. The two ways of positing the two truths—which are the definitions just explained above of “emptiness and appearance that is universally known” and “the synchronization or not of the actual and appearing modes”—have been taught from the outset in the sūtras and great śāstras²⁸. The latter one is taught in *Distinguishing Dharma and Dharmatā* and is also found in *The Highest Continuum*²⁹ when it states,

The dhātu is empty of the adventitious ones,
 Those with the characteristic of separability³⁰;
 It is not empty of the unsurpassable dharmas
 Those with the characteristic of non-separability.³¹

and in the commentary to that³² which says:

²⁸ The great śāstras are the great treatises that correctly comment on the teachings of the Buddha in the sūtras.

²⁹ These are the two of the five treatises of Maitreya and Asaṅga in which this particular presentation is obviously found. The most popular verse that sums it up is the one shown from *The Highest Continuum*.

³⁰ The correct reading here is Tib. “rnam dbye bcas pa” with the meaning shown; some Tibetan editions have it corrupted.

³¹ The correct reading here is Tib. “rnam dbye med pa” with the meaning shown; some Tibetan editions have it corrupted.

³² This is Asaṅga’s own commentary to those verses in his commentary to *The Highest Continuum* and is included as a third place where this particular presentation is obviously found.

Tathāgatagarba is empty of that which is separable, that which could be removed³³, all the sheaths of the afflictions; it is not empty of that which is inseparable, that which could not be removed³⁴, the inconceivable buddha dharmas³⁵ which surpass in number even the sands of the river Ganges.

And the great charioteer Noble Nāgārjuna said³⁶:

Just as clothing which is cleansed by fire³⁷
 That has been sullied with various stains
 Will, if placed in fire, have
 The stains burned up but not the clothing,

³³ Tib. bral shes pa. Thrangu Rinpoche states that this is equivalent to “bral rgyu yod”. He explains that this is a case where the Tibetan verb “shes pa” meaning “to know” comes to mean “could not be known as ...” and finally to mean simply “can be” or “could be”.

³⁴ Tib. bral mi shes pa. The negated form of “bral shes pa”; see the previous note.

³⁵ Thrangu Rinpoche explains that, of the ten meanings for dharma, the meaning in this case is Skt. “guna”, Tib. “yon tan”. In other words, buddha dharmas here means “buddha qualities”.

³⁶ In his *In Praise of the Dharmadhātu*.

³⁷ This is clothing, not a cloth, which Indian tradition says is made of a substance available in the god realms and not affected by fire. The equivalent on our earth would be clothing made of asbestos fibre.

So, the luminosity mind³⁸
 Having the stains of passion, and so on
 Has the stains consumed by the fire of wisdom,
 And not the luminosity.

The sūtras that show emptiness³⁹—
 As many as were taught by the conqueror—
 All turn away the afflictions⁴⁰
 But do not damage the element⁴¹.

And the Dharma King, Rigden Mañjuśhrīkīrti, said⁴²:

The emptiness of the aspect-analyzed skandhas⁴³

³⁸ This does not mean the luminosity of samsaric mind but the “luminosity type of mind”. It refers to sugatagarbha.

³⁹ Thrangu Rinpoche comments that, beginning with this line, the point is to show that sugatagarbha is not empty and that the reason for teaching emptiness is to settle that all appearances are emptiness. The Buddha teaches this way in order to overcome afflictions but in doing so is not teaching that the sugatagarbha is non-existent.

⁴⁰ Tib. ldog. This verse has been translated as “were taught for the purpose of turning away the afflictions” but Thrangu Rinpoche states that taking the Tibetan “phyir du” in the line as “for the purpose of” is a mistake; the literal meaning of the lines here, that they do remove the afflictions, is correct.

⁴¹ Skt. dhātu, Tib. khams.

⁴² ... in his famous, great commentary on Kālachakra ...

⁴³ Here, “skandha” includes all dharmas of samsāra. It is deliber-
 (continued...)

Lacks substance⁴⁴, like a plaintain tree;⁴⁵

⁴³(...continued)

ately stated this way, rather than referring to “all dharmas of samsāra”, because the practical instructions on doing this kind of aspect analysis teach doing the analysis in relation to the skandhas.

Two different types of analysis are being mentioned here: aspect analysis and overall analysis. The first corresponds to the empty of self (rangtong) approach and the second to the empty of other (zhantong) approach. The first is the use of logic alone which results in the emptiness alone of phenomena. The second is the use of direct perception with wisdom which brings an emptiness unified with wisdom and hence with all of the possibilities of appearance. Thus, if you use aspect analysis you end up with no essence, comparable to the way that a plaintain tree is hollow. However, if you use overall analysis you get an emptiness that is not just lacking in everything but has the excellence of all aspects, which is that it is unified emptiness and appearance. Since it is wisdom, the appearance is the buddha qualities.

⁴⁴ Tib. *snying po med*.

⁴⁵ Tib. “chu shing” is the name for a plaintain tree. The tree is hollow; it has no core, which is literally what the verse says. In this case, it means that the emptiness is of no value and also that the emptiness has nothing in it, is just a blank. This is in comparison to emptiness which is known through overall analysis. That kind of emptiness in Kālachakra literature is specifically known as “emptiness having the excellence of all aspects”. The term means wisdom which is the realization of unified appearance-emptiness and so is an emptiness that has all the various aspects, meaning the buddha qualities, with it.

The emptiness having the excellence of all aspects⁴⁶
 Is not like that.

Following on from that, this statement⁴⁷ that “the superfactual is not empty of self entity” has been made in total accord with the latter formulation of the two truths. And, in regard to this, it is imperative to understand that this second set of truths is being proclaimed using the distinction of one stopped⁴⁸ and definitely should not be understood as a formulation of the two truths of appearance-emptiness done using the distinction of different facets in one essence⁴⁹.

Following on from that, appearances of the confusion of non-synchronization of the actual and appearing modes are called “fictional” for the reason that, even though they have appeared to the confusion, they do not exist in that way in fact.

⁴⁶ Tib. “rnam pa kun gyi mchog ldn pa” is a term for a particular type of explanation of emptiness, one in which the emptiness fully has all appearance, too. In this case, Thrangu Rinpoche points out that it is similar to sugatagarbha.

⁴⁷ ... which our system makes ...

⁴⁸ Tib. gcig pa bkag pa'i tha dad.

⁴⁹ Tib. “ldog pa” can refer to a conceptual image of conceptual mind in which case it might be called an “isolate” or “negative image” but that is not the meaning. Here, in the case of emptiness, it simply refers to the appearances which are the multiple facets coming from one entity. See “ldog pa” in *The Illuminator Tibetan-English Dictionary*.

The appearances of the other situation⁵⁰ are called “existing in the superfactual” and “truly existent” for the reason that they exist in the way they appear to non-confusion’s sight and are not harmed by the application of valid cognition⁵¹.

This does not require that appearances that have become separated from emptiness are truly existent. The reason is that, from the outset, the dharmadhātu has been taken to exist as the unity of appearance-emptiness, emptiness having the excellence of all aspects and then that kind of actuality has been proclaimed as superfactual truth.

Thus, that kind of superfact is not empty of its own entity. If we give an example using convention, it is like this: superfactual truth must be put as a multicoloured rope and fictional truth as a snake, then they have to be distinguished as conventionally existent and not existent and, with that, it is impossible that both are confused or both are true⁵².

⁵⁰ The Tibetan here can be misleading. It is an abbreviated repetition of the words opening and giving the side of the subject presented in the last sentence. The last sentence presented one side of the possibility; this sentence is now presenting the other side. The words here should be read to mean, “The appearances of the non-confusion of synchronization of actual and appearing modes ...”

⁵¹ “Harmed by the application of valid cognition” means that when something is investigated using a validly knowing mind (a *pramāṇa*) and is found to be faulty or not true it has its status reduced from being true to something less than that.

⁵² The example of a rope and snake is very common in these sorts
(continued...)

Thus, superfact is not empty of its own entity for the reason that superfact has both object and subject of non-confusion; and, it is not possible for a valid cognition that would, in regard to that existence, by trying to say that it is not like that, stop it from being so; and it is the meaning already established by the reasoning that was initially sent to establish emptiness; and, having been established by a correct valid cognizer that analyses for conventional truth, there is no one in the worlds with gods⁵³ who could attack this and be true.

That being so, the superfactual from its own side is true and unerring. Because of the dharma that makes it that way, it is never empty; if it were empty, there would have to be a valid cognizer that set it as confused and false, but that is not

⁵²(...continued)
of philosophical discussions.

In old Tibet, ropes were made from woven cords of black and white yak hair, giving them not a striped but a variegated appearance. At dusk—and I have personally experienced it—it is very easy to see a tent rope and believe that it is a snake in front of you.

An important thing to understand about the rope and snake analogy is that analogy is not fixed. Its meaning will change according to the philosophy being explained. For instance, the way that a Zhantong proponent will use it when explaining his own position will usually differ from the way that his opponent will use it when explaining his position.

⁵³ Tib. “lha dang bcas pa’i ’jig rten” literally means “worlds having gods”. Gods here means the gods whose intellectual capabilities far exceed those even of very intelligent humans. Thus, this means that no-one, no matter how clever he might be, could argue against this and still be within an honest line of argument.

possible. If it were possible, then peace, *nirvāṇa*⁵⁴, would have to change to something that is not worthy of reliance. However, the only ones who would proclaim that would be the *māras* and *Tīrthikas* who advocate their positions without valid cognitions; those who respect this doctrine would not advocate such a thing.

Actuality, that kind of superfact, exists primordially. However, confused appearance—which has not been realized as such and which does have a valid cognizer that establishes that it is not true and is confusion itself—in this system is given the name “fictional”, a name whose meaning corresponds to the meaning “obscuration”⁵⁵. Thus, superfact is empty of that fiction; that which has the name fiction—those objects and subjects constituting confused appearance—is empty of self-entity; and the example is like a rope is empty of a snake.

⁵⁴ The term here is literally “peace *nirvāṇa*”. True peace is what sentient beings seek, therefore peace was an essential part of the teaching of a number of Indian religions at the time of the Buddha. For the Hindus, Śiva was defined as perpetual peace and one had to achieve oneness with his state to gain that peace. The Buddha on the other hand explained that peace was to be found in the attainment of one’s own *nirvāṇa*.

⁵⁵ “Obscuration” translates the Sanskrit term “*vṛitti*” which is the root of the Sanskrit word “*samvṛitti*” meaning “fictional”. *Samvṛitti* does not have the literal meaning of “obscuration” but has the meaning of “obfuscation”. In normal use in the Sanskrit language, *samvṛitti* means “a deliberate fiction”, “a hoax”, “a lie that deceives”, which is exactly what the fictional appearances of sentient beings are and do.

It is absolutely necessary to proclaim it that way. According to the schools of other tenets that speak out against Zhan-tong, lack of true existence is to be established using the examination of the superfactual, so it would not be all right to proclaim that is to be refuted, and, similarly, freedom from elaboration is to be established by reasoning that analyses for the ultimate, so it is not to be refuted. You see, if they made no proclamation of lack of true existence and freedom from elaboration, they would have not the slightest establishment that would allow them to say, "These are the tenets of my school". In a similar way, if the superfactual also were self-empty like the fictional, then we would not know how to make the definitions that the superfactual is not confused and does exist as actuality, and that the fictional is confused and does not exist in its entity⁵⁶. "Empty" here is a case of investigation into which basis of emptiness is empty of which dhar-mas.

If the superfactual were empty from its own side, then, when a valid cognizer⁵⁷ analysed for truth or falsity in confused appearance and non-confusion's appearance, there would not be the difference of one being negated and one not, whereby the rope and the snake would come to both equally exist or equally not exist.

⁵⁶ Meaning that the superfactual does not exist in the entity of the superfactual, which is exactly the meaning of "empty of other".

⁵⁷ ... or a valid knower being used to validate what it is being given to evaluate ...

That empty⁵⁸ of the fictional certainly does fulfil the requirements⁵⁹ of emptiness. That true existence is not existent with the result that true grasping is a confused awareness and because of that is deceptive and wandering in samsāra. Thus, both object and subject in the case of that kind of confusion are this case's fictional so, if, because of having become empty due to that, it does not fulfil the requirements of emptiness, then even lack of true existence would not meet the requirements of emptiness and putting an end to grasping at truth would not fulfil the requirements of meditation on emptiness.

Likewise, through putting an end to objects and subjects of elaboration, emptiness free from grasped-grasping⁶⁰ is totally accomplished in this system. All the elaborations of the dualistic appearances of grasped-grasping are contained within confused objects and subjects, therefore they are defined in this case as the fictional. Now, if the superfactual being empty of the so-defined fictional does not fulfill the requirements of being empty, then freedom from elaboration also will not fulfill the requirements of being empty and freedom from elaboration's rational mind would not fulfill the requirements of emptiness meditation.

⁵⁸ ... which is the superfactual type of being empty ...

⁵⁹ “Fulfil the requirements” means that some specified item can actually do what it is required to do within the context being considered. For emptiness, it means that the definition of emptiness put forward by anyone will actually have to function as emptiness in the way that the Buddha has specified.

⁶⁰ For grasped-grasping, see the glossary.

If you ask, “Well, is that superfunctional not a lack of true existence and freedom from elaboration?” the answer is, ‘How could it, as something which was not a lack of true existence and not freedom from elaboration, also be the superfunctional?! It would be like this case’s fictional!’ You might think, ‘Well, if the superfunctional is lack of true existence and is empty, then how is it that you can say it is “true existence and is not empty from its own side?”’ The answer is that you people have definitely not understood the meaning of our statement that this case’s “true existence and not empty” are established by and exist for the valid cognizer that analyses conventionally, so you end up just attacking us.

If you ask, “Well then, are you proclaiming that it is true existence and at the same time is lack of true existence and that it is emptiness and at the same time not empty?!”, then the answer is, “Where do we do that?! You define the fictional member of the two⁶¹ as appearance and the superfunctional member as emptiness then, in regard to that, at the time of superfunctional analysis, it not being all right for you to refute them⁶², you assert lack of existence and freedom from elaboration. In the same way, our system maintains the fictional as confusion and the superfunctional as non-confusion and also maintains a superfunctional of non-confusion and the true

⁶¹ Tib. “ya gyal” meaning “member of the two”. He is talking about appearance and emptiness and refers to each of the two as one member of the two.

⁶² In other words, “Your main tenet is that the fictional is appearance and the superfunctional is ...”.

existence of that superfactual of non-confusion, it not being all right to refute them”.

Because of that, the great charioteer Asaṅga personally stated:

When something is lacking something, it is empty of that.

Whatever it is that is left there, that exists.

In accordance with that, it is always necessary when setting up a system of establishments and negations not only to refute what is not established by reasoning but also to proclaim unrefuted the meaning that is established by reasoning. If everything is equally refuted, then, because the valid cognizer performs the function of establishing the difference between correct and incorrect dharma that does the expressing and the meaning to be expressed by it would be wrong, no certainty at all could arise from that refutation of everything equally, and that would not be all right.

If someone has the thought, “But won’t they proclaim dharmaḥātu which is beyond establishment and negation, the object of individual self-knowing?”⁶³, then we should ask, “Why?” If he replies by saying, “Because you have set up a system of proclamations of refutations and establishments where the refutations are unilateral⁶⁴ and so, not maintaining

⁶³ In other words, “Don’t you proclaim the dharmadhātu which is beyond affirmation and negation as an object of prajñā?”

⁶⁴ In this book, “unilaterally” translates the Tibetan term “mtha’ gcig tu” which means that a person or group do or say something
(continued...)

the refutation of everything, remain at a level that has reference points”, then the answer goes as follows. Dharmadhātu which is the object of individual self-knowing is beyond establishment and negation, therefore we make our assertion of the superfactual in relation to such. That kind of existent superfactual that does exist as the superfactual and its established by us here using conventions that makes it into something with affirmation and negation, are not contradictory. If there were not this proclamation of a superfactual that conventionally is established as not empty from its own side, then the superfactual divorced from refutation and establishment also would become non-existent! For that reason, conventionally, if the proclamation “lacking a nature”⁶⁵ is reversed, it turns into establishment of existence of nature and similarly, if the superfactual empty from its own side, became, like that, non-establishment of such, then the superfactual, in not being the superfactual, would be the fictional.

⁶⁴(...continued)

and when they do so, they do it as a flat assertion. In other words, they are so convinced of their position, that they make their statement or argument without any consideration of any possibility that they might be wrong.

In a debate, it means that a person in debate is just refusing to see the possibilities being proposed by the other side. They hold tenaciously to their ideas, without following the argument and being open to change.

⁶⁵ The standard proclamation of empty of self emptiness, and especially the proclamation of Tsongkhapa and his followers, that all dharmas are (Tib. “rang bzhin med pa”) without a self-nature.

If someone were to think, “If such superfactual which is existent as something that, from its own side, lacks all true existence and all elaboration, were not to fulfill the function of emptiness, then various faults⁶⁶ would accrue: the mere words found within the convention ‘the superfactual is not empty of itself’ would become an incurable view of attachment to emptiness as a thing⁶⁷; there being no equality of existence-peace, it would become a superfact that stands alone and which is permanent and eternal; and so on”, then that person would be someone who has not understood even the beginnings of this great tenet system; emptiness is lack of true existence and freedom from elaboration as proclaimed, so how could there be true existence and elaboration in it? The mere expression “superfactual exists in the superfactual”, made using the conventions “empty” and “not empty” to show that it is not fictional, is part of this case’s establishments. Therefore, if proclaiming it that way conventionally turns into something that has a view that references emptiness as a thing, then proclamation of lack of truth turns emptiness into an incurable view of attachment to the concept token⁶⁸ of

⁶⁶ Mipham explicitly shows two faults here, though the wording of the Tibetan indicates that many faults can be shown.

⁶⁷ Tib. *dngos po*. A “thing” in Buddhist definition is necessarily an object of samsaric mind. This comment is based on one of Nāgārjuna’s assertions.

⁶⁸ Tib. *mtshan ma*. Concept tokens are the structures of conceptual mind that conceptual mind uses for perception. For example, you could see a table in direct visual perception or you could think “table” in a conceptual perception of a table. In the latter

(continued...)

a non-thing and, equally, proclamation of freedom from elaboration turns emptiness into an incurable⁶⁹ view in which what is inexpressible is referenced as a thing.

In short, in this case, the bases for the designations “superfactual” and “fictional” are object and subject that are without and with confusion respectively, and, we proclaim that that not confused superfactual exists as an object of not confused rational mind, is true for it, and that it is empty of the fictional, the confused side. Conventionally, it is not empty of itself; we maintain that it exists in the sight of the noble ones. If the superfactual were empty of itself, then it could not be defined as the basis of emptiness of the fictional. In that case, the difference between which dharmas do and do not exist as the object of the noble one’s equipoise could not be made. Thereby, the superfactual not being the superfactual and the fictional not being the fictional, the superfactual would become of equal status with the fictional. In view of all this, the proclamation must always be made like this or it will not be all right, and, all faults that might be found in it will be equally incurred by those who advocate emptiness as lack of true existence and freedom from elaborations.

⁶⁸(...continued)

case, there is a conceptual structure or token that is the label “table” used by conceptual mind when it thinks “table”. A non-thing is a conceptualized idea accessed through a concept token.

⁶⁹ This does not mean merely an untenable view; it means a view which, once you have it, you will not be able to undo. It will catch you in its grips and keep you there; that is how bad it is.

The pair of things *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa* becoming two separate items when taken from the perspective of existence and non-existence is not a non-equality of existence and peace. It is never possible conventionally for something to be both confused *samsāra* and unconfused *nirvāṇa*; while *samsāra* appears but does not exist as it appears, the nature of *samsāra*, primordial purity's superfact that abides as the great *nirvāṇa*, is one of this case's establishments wherein it is referred to as “equality of existence and peace”. In everyone's system, the fact of all dharmas primordially abiding in the superfactual *dhātu*⁷⁰ is referred to with “equality of existence and peace”; no-one makes a proclamation of *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa* having a common locus.

Furthermore, the superfactual is not empty of the superfactual: if the superfactual were empty of itself, the consequence would be that that superfactual not being the superfactual would be the fictional, confusion's appearances! Listen here, you people who mount a full assault on that proposition with your counter-assertions! You advocate, “A vase is not empty of a vase but a vase is empty of true existence”, don't you? In view of that, if it is tenable to proclaim that all conventionally-existing dharmas not being empty of self are empty of other, self-existence, then the proclamations you yourself make are consistent with “the superfactual is not empty of the superfactual”! If you say, “If the superfactual is not empty of the superfactual, it will not be empty of true existence”, then the answer is that it is the same for vases, and so on.

⁷⁰ The phrase “all dharmas primordially abiding in superfactual *dhātu*” shows the meaning of ultimate dharmadhātu.

Following on from that, because our superfactual is not empty of the superfactual but is empty of the fictional, it is proclaimed to be empty of all—and I am not even going to bother to consider confused appearances, falsity, taken as true existence—the fictional's dualistic appearance. If that⁷¹ does not fulfill the function of being empty, then, not being empty of all fictional's dualistic appearances, how could putting an end to a disparate true existence of the imaginary⁷² domain, fulfill the function of being empty? Our approaches are equivalent: just as you maintain that true existence is put to an end but lack of true existence is not ended, not stopped, and not all right to be refuted, we maintain that the fictional confusions are put to an end but superfactual non-confusion is not put to an end, not stopped, and is not all right to be refuted.

In short: you use reasoning to establish lack of true existence; that reasoning does not refute the fictional; the fictional

⁷¹ “That” being our superfactual. In zhantong, the basis of being empty is the superfactual. What it is empty of is the fictional. And, that being empty of that does fulfil the function of emptiness. However, if it did not, if what we have said is not enough somehow, then if you look for some other thing, some other true existence, which has nothing to do with that reality, then that is not going to fulfil the function of emptiness either. How could it do so given that it would be a disconnected type of emptiness? Khenpo Palden Sherab here says that the meaning of the Tibetan “yan gar ba” is “mi ‘brel ba”—“disconnected, having no connection”. It is merely an imaginary phenomena, one which is nothing but a concept.

⁷² Tib. kun brtags. That which is nothing but a concept.

becomes the basis of emptiness; and you proclaim that the superfactual is not empty of the fictional. On the other hand, we proclaim that the basis of emptiness, the superfactual, is empty of the fictional. The result for you is a cut-off emptiness which is a basis of emptiness being emptied of true existence by a non-affirming negation for lack of existence and an emptiness of disparate true existence due to cut-off fictional appearances not empty from their own side. In this, the basis of emptiness abides as something that never has melding of the two, emptiness and appearance, into union, with no possibility ever of the equality of existence and peace in the face of such two truths. Continue on like this, I tell you, and come down right on the actual meaning!⁷³

In our system, the object, emptiness, and the subject, wisdom, together are superfact, and, the two in the authentic's fact are the two truths appearance and emptiness without separation because of which superfactual dharmadhātu is not a cut-off emptiness; not being empty of inseparability's bodies and wisdoms, it abides as the primordial, spontaneously-present svabhāvikakāya. Your superfact, a cut-off non-affirming negation, is a non-thing which has become separated off from conventional appearances. It never has had, does not have, and never will have any bodies and wisdoms! The fictional

⁷³ He is urging his opponent in a positive way, saying, “Hey, keep going with this train of argument that I have laid out for you; it will lead you past your stubbornly held mistaken ideas and finally bring you to a right way of thinking about this!”

entities which have become separated away from it exist⁷⁴ but

⁷⁴ They have become separated away from the non-affirming negated superfact. That kind of superfactual is a non-thing and non-things cannot perform a function, it has been explained. Non-affirming negation merely results in the putting aside of things within the context of rational mind and does not reach the superfactual reality of a thing, so, really speaking, it cannot help fictional things to become empty. In other words, just realizing that you do not have this kind of non-affirming negation does not help anything to be actually empty. It is like thinking that you do not have goat's horns on your head.

He addresses them saying, “Your superfact—which is the same as saying emptiness in this case—is just a concept that you have of something not existing and is separate from the actual fictional entities. Thus, your kind of superfact does not help you to have bodies and wisdoms and it does not do anything for actually being empty. It is just an imaginary phenomenon, so it cannot help to bring the realization of actual superfactual truth having bodies and wisdoms.”

As a practical comment, I would point out here that someone else might then get the idea that this kind of approach is a total mistake in terms of meditation practice. It could be. First, you determine that all phenomena are empty. You use your rational mind to look at each different phenomenon and find that it is not true, it lacks truth. The result of doing so is an emptiness that appears to the rational mind. In the Middle Way system it is called “an accountable superfactual”, where accountable has the sense of something that has been calculated and accounted for by rational mind. That is not the real emptiness but, by doing this kind of meditation again and again, the meditation goes higher and higher until finally you do see, in direct perception, actual emptiness. In the Middle Way system, this emptiness is called

(continued...)

it does nothing to help them being empty. Each one stays on its own, never mixing with the other because it is not all right for them to mix. In view of that, since the root of *samsara*,

⁷⁴(...continued)

“the unaccountable superfactual” because it is beyond the calculating and accounting of the rational mind.

Note that what I have just explained is not the same as what is being argued against here. In what is being argued against here, as in “a vase is not empty of a vase but empty of true existence”, phenomena are supposedly discovered to be empty of true existence.

Khenpo Palden Sherab said, “This is a very dangerous approach; it is very bad. Why? Because if a phenomenon is not empty of itself, then what would it be empty of? True existence is just a name that the opponents have given. What is this true existence of theirs? In fact, it is just a name. Because it is just a name, saying, ‘I am empty of true existence, the house is empty of true existence’, and so on does not solve anything. And then where is this true existence? Where? It is just an imaginary thing concocted in mind.”

He continued, “When you meditate on our Buddhist view, if it is emptiness that you are practising, then that has to be determined in total relationship to the appearances that are empty. If you say, as Tsongkhapa’s followers do, that, ‘The appearances are not empty of the appearances but are empty of true existence’, then you are saying something that even the Buddha did not propose, neither in Prajñaparamita nor in Secret Mantra. The Buddha only ever talked about appearances being empty of themselves, as in ‘form is emptiness’, and he said clearly that that emptiness’s entity is its luminosity nature, wisdom. Therefore, this other way of talking that uses the words, ‘A vase is not empty of a vase but empty of true existence’, really is very bad, very dangerous”.

true grasping, is without its object, both object and subject of that sort are the fictional—confusion—and because of that, in your system, the fictional has to be posited only as true existence and true grasping.

Appearances of conventionalities are not the superfactual because they are not emptiness and are not the fictional because they are either non-confusion's appearances or are able to withstand the analysis that analyses for the superfactual. In addition, there is the point that this is not a withstand-ing analysis of being truly existent but a withstand-ing analysis of conventionalities not empty from their own side. In view of that, lack of true existence and all conventionalities become the superfactual. Only true existence becomes the fictional. True grasping, being substantially existent⁷⁵, is like the vase, and so on.

It is tenable to maintain that the object consisting of true appearance⁷⁶ and the subject consisting of true grasping both are the fictional related to the non-synchronization of actual and appearing modes, and that lack of true existence and the grasping of lack of true existence are the superfact of the actual and appearing modes. It is not tenable to proclaim a system that posits the superfactual as both object and subject lacking dualistic appearance and the fictional as both of them

⁷⁵ Tib. rdzas su yod pa. This has the same sense as “dngos po”, which is defined in Tibetan as “don byed nus pa”, “that which has the ability to perform a function”.

⁷⁶ Tib. “bden snang”, which is short for “bden par grub pa’i snang ba” appearances that are those of true existence.

having it: if vases, and so on are not empty from their own sides, then the existent dualistic appearance and the rational mind that grasps the duality are object and subject of actual and appearing modes synchronized, with non-existence of dualistic appearances and non-existence of dualistic grasper becoming the confused consciousness of the actual and appearing modes not being synchronized.

In short, in your system, if it is the case that what is to be refuted by reasoning is true existence alone and hence what is to be discarded by emptiness meditation is true appearance and true grasping alone, then, if it is that and not anything else, why would not all fictional entities, which are empty of true existence, appear in the equipoise of the noble one trainees? If you say, “They are not to be refuted by reasoning but are stopped by the path, so do not appear”, then we answer, “If that invisibility-stick-like path, having made existent things disappear, makes non-existent items appear, then as was said:

Why is what exists not seen and what does not exist seen?

What kind of darkness is this?

This kind of path is astonishing indeed!

In our tradition, when there is direct sight of the superfactual, that is the domain of no-thought wisdom having no dualistic appearances of object and subject, so how would it have true existence and true grasping in it, how would it have both objects of elaboration and elaboration in it? Having designated that as the superfactual and having taken that non-confusion superfactual as the basis of emptiness, it is said to

be “empty of object and subject on the confused appearance, samsāra, fictional side”.

The entity of the superfactual is beyond elaboration
but

When the superfactual has been established, what
that is

Has been distinguished from the fictional, and then
what could be wrong

With this style of proclaiming them as non-
confused and confused?

Because they lack self-nature, all dharmas are free
from elaboration, but

Those insistent establishers of non-affirming
negation, having negated “free from
elaboration”,

Take shelter in a tenet system made of merely the
words,

“We proclaim unilaterally, ‘lack of self-nature’”.

When they do so, even though the style of their
proclamation that

“The superfactual is not empty from its own side”

Is not a style of assertion they want to have, their
way of proclaiming

Lack of true existence leaves them helpless not to
proclaim such.

If “The superfactual is not empty from its own side”
is advocated,

Then the superfactual does exist as the superfactual
itself and that is good.

If “A vase is not empty from its own side” is advocated,

Then the two parts upheld—all dharmas not being empty, the view of eternalism, and

An empty which is a short-lived empty which is a non-thing—

Accomplish the basis of the views of eternalism and nihilism.

“The superficial is permanent, true, and not empty”,

Is proved by conventional valid cognition, and, if that is known,

All of the virtues of the path are held and the bad views

Of attachment to the extremes of eternalism and nihilism are stopped.

It is accepted by those famed for expertise in the Land of Snow that,

“Not all eternal is the view of eternalism, not all nihilate is the view of nihilism.

Not all existent is the extreme of existence, not all non-existent is the extreme of non-existence”.

And if you, following that, analyse well with conventional valid cognition, then

You will find that the differences that do exist of permanent and impermanent,

Empty and not empty, true and false, existent and non-existent

Are not extremes but differentiations understood by rational mind.

It is accepted by all the expert and accomplished ones who advocate Zhantong that

“The wisdom that analyses for the ultimate
superfactual

Does not have in it the complexities of existence,
non-existence, and so on”.

You make the proclamation that, even in the face of
the analysis that analyses

For the superficial, “there is an elaboration of lack
of truth”.

These are then existent in the face of the analysis
that analyses for the superficial, and,

Whatever it is that exists as the object of the sight
of the superficial

Is not empty and is truly existent, so

If someone explains that kind of reference, what is
the contradiction?

If, in the sight of lack of truth, mind saw lack of
truth become empty,

How would that be different from not seeing lack of
truth?

If you think that that lack of truth also is seen as
empty,

What is wrong with saying vases, and so on are seen
as empty?

If vases, and so on are empty of truth, not empty of
themselves,

Because if they were empty, vases, and so on would
not exist conventionally,

Then why won't it be the same for

The superficial which is not empty in the face of
the sight of the superficial?

In short, if you ask us, “What is the meaning of the statement, “The superfactual is not empty from its own side”?”, the answer is, “The meaning is that the superfactual truth is not empty of the superfactual truth”. You say in reply, “If that is so, the superfactual becomes truly existent”. And we say, using the same reasoning, “If a vase is not empty of a vase, that vase becomes truly existent”. If you then say, “If a vase were empty of a vase, then, since that vase would not be a vase, wouldn’t the vase become non-existent conventionally?” We reply, “All right, let us accept that and follow it through: given that to be the case, if the superfactual truth were empty of the superfactual truth, it would follow that the superfactual truth would not be the superfactual truth, and the superfactual would also become non-existent even conventionally, and it is the same”.

Because of that, for a reasoning consciousness that analyses for the superfactual, lack of truth, freedom from elaboration, emptiness, and the superfactual are proclaimed as what is to be established; it is not tenable to proclaim them as what is to be refuted. Therefore, the lack of truth, and so on of these things must be unilaterally proclaimed as “is” and not proclaimed as “is not”. Thus, the superfactual and emptiness must be proclaimed as true, existent, and not empty, and not proclaimed as not true, non-existent, and empty. The equipoise wisdom sees the superfactual, sees and apprehends lack of truth, and so on mentioned above, and those things do exist as its object and are true, thus that must be proclaimed and thus it is not all right to proclaim that wisdom would see them, would apprehend them, that they would exist as its object but “are not true” in the face of it. Similar to that, for the superfactual and emptiness, it will be proclaimed that, in

the face of the noble ones' sight, they also exist, are truly existent, and so on.

If someone says, "If they are proclaimed to be truly existent, that will not stop attachment to truth in emptiness", the answer is, "In regard to that, it is not all right to stop attachment to truth conventionally". The thought that thinks, "In the true fact there is true existence", is not the attachment to truth to be stopped by reasoning and the path; it is similar to your "Apprehension of lack of truth in lack of truth is not to be refuted".

As for true existence that would withstand the analysis for the superficial—in this case analysis is not required because the superficial itself has, earlier, already been determined by reasoning that established it and because it is included within being empty of true existence contained in the explanation of being empty of the fictional.

Therefore, just as you state that, even though there is no true existence in lack of truth, it is never all right to have stopped apprehension of lack of truth, so we say that, even though the superficial is empty of dharmas that withstand the analysis that analyses for the superficial, it is not all right to have stopped the apprehension of superfact itself as truly existent and as not empty of its own entity. Because of that, our positions are the same in every respect.

When a superficial analysis is done, there will not be any proclamation that whatever withstands analysis and whatever dharmas are not put to a stop by it exist in the superficial, and, similarly, to maintain that true existence alone is to be

refuted by the reasoning consciousness that examines for the superficial and is to be discarded by no-thought wisdom but then to assert that all dharmas are to be refuted and abandoned by those two is like the view of Hashang, which is highly mistaken. In their view, by both understanding and wisdom, the object, the superficial, which is empty of the fictional, and the subject, wisdom, and whatever dharmas are seen by wisdom are superficial, and are not refuted and not abandoned; this is well established. However, if one holds that one should refute and abandon all objects of reference⁷⁷ at all times, then all dharmas of whatever nature and extent become what is to be refuted by reasoning and the path. This is nihilistic emptiness in which nothing whatever exists, like space.

In this way then, all those of the Land of Snow who view these proclamations that the Zvantong advocates make as a bad thing for the future of Tibet have themselves, through their own proclamations which are intended not to do so, established all the proclamations of Zvantong.

For that reason, all that is existent, all that is non-existent, all that is truth, all that is not empty does not turn into being an extreme and every rational mind apprehending such does not turn into an apprehender of an extreme. The Bhagavat said, “Whether existent as existent or non-existent as non-existent—the authentic is fully known just as it is”, and accordingly, when the *prajñā* that differentiates in post-attainment has nicely differentiated the ways of existence and non-exis-

⁷⁷ Tib. *dmigs pa*.

tence—truly existent and not truly existent, empty and not empty, and so forth—there is no rejection to be made of these classifications because they are establishments that have been made by the valid cognizer that analyses the facts of the whole extent of conventionalities that are, without mixup, individually distinguished.

The supreme human, the refuge, the Lion of the
Śhākyas

Proclaimed to the retinue of those who were
unflinching

The lion's roar of just this definitive-meaning
essence, the ultimate, and

Those who obtain certainty in it win the prophecy
of non-returning.

The great rivers of thought of the lord of the tenth
level, the regent Invincible⁷⁸,

And of Nāgārjuna and of Asaṅga who dwell on the
noble ones' levels,

Are one in the expanse of wisdom,

Therefore, to see them as contradictory is just one's
own mind at fault.

All dharmas have an entity empty nonetheless,
Their nature luminosity, the dhātu of bodies and
wisdoms,

⁷⁸ Ajita, meaning Invincible, is another name for Maitreya. He has the prophecy of being the next supreme nirmāṇakāya buddha given by the Buddha himself and nothing can prevent that from happening to him.

Is, primordially, spontaneous presence; they abide
like the sun and its rays.

This is the way of the Great Middle Way, unified
appearance-emptiness.

In the sight of the noble ones, the superfactual truth
is non-deceptive

And the fictional, confused dualistic appearance is
false;

This supreme explanation is like a jewel torch that
Bestows the eye of prajñā that makes distinctions of
actual and appearing modes.

Through it, may you intelligent ones who are
genuine and fortunate

Produce the eye that sees in this profound way,
And, having entered the mansion of the definitive-
meaning essence,

Amass the wealth of the two aims of self and other.

May the harvest of the virtue of working at this, like
the brilliance of the new autumn moon,

Eliminate the torment of the five degenerations and
Make the grove of moon lilies of the Capable One's
teaching, scripture and realization,

Blossom wide, swelling the ocean of complete
liberation.

For myself, through all my births may I be accepted
by the Protector of Loving Kindness Guru⁷⁹,

⁷⁹ This name refers to Mipham, the guru of the writer. It is a play on words on Maitreya's name, thus making joining Mipham to the
(continued...)

Perfect my ability in scripture, reasoning, and
 foremost instruction, and then,
 With my dwelling at the peak of the snow mountain
 of the supreme vehicle,
 Broadcast the sound of the fearless lion's roar.

The all-knowing lord guru, Mipham Jampal Gyepay Dorje, was the only lion who roared in the snowy tracts. This text is based on brief teachings heard from him in person. I, Jamyang Lodro Gyatso, used them as the starting point, then added my own verses at the beginning and end, then edited the whole into this text at my residence, the dharma centre Glorious Zhechen Temyi Dargyey Ling. By this, may the long-lineage system of the definitive meaning Great Middle Way⁸⁰ spread and flourish in all directions, and so remain for a long time!

⁷⁹(...continued)

main expositor in this world of the Zhantong teaching.

⁸⁰ The “definitive meaning Great Middle Way” is the name given to the Middle Way of the Zhantong system.

GLOSSARY

Actuality, Tib. gnas lugs: A key term in both sūtra and tantra and one of a pair of terms, the other being “apparent reality” (Tib. snang lugs). The two terms are used when determining the reality of a situation. The actuality of any given situation is how (lugs) the situation actuality sits or is present (gnas); the apparent reality is how (lugs) any given situation appears (snang) to an observer. Something could appear in many different ways, depending on the circumstances at the time and on the being perceiving it but, regardless of those circumstances, it will always have its own actuality of how it really is. The term actuality is frequently used in Mahāmudrā and Great Completion teachings to mean the fundamental reality of any given phenomenon or situation before any deluded mind alters it and makes it appear differently.

Adventitious, Tib. glo bur: This term has the connotations of popping up on the surface of something and of not being part of that thing. Therefore, even though it is often translated as “sudden”, that only conveys half of the meaning. In Buddhist literature, something adventitious comes up as a surface event and disappears again precisely because it is not actually part of the thing on whose surface it appeared. It is frequently used in relation to the afflictions because they pop up on the

surface of the mind of buddha-nature but are not part of the buddha-nature itself.

Affliction, Skt. kleśha, Tib. nyon mongs: This term is usually translated as emotion or disturbing emotion, etcetera, but the Buddha was very specific about the meaning of this word. When the Buddha referred to the emotions, meaning a movement of mind, he did not refer to them as such but called them “kleśha” in Sanskrit, meaning exactly “affliction”. It is a basic part of the Buddhist teaching that emotions afflict beings, giving them problems at the time and causing more problems in the future.

Confusion, Tib. 'khrul pa: In Buddhism, this term mostly refers to the fundamental confusion of taking things the wrong way that happens because of fundamental ignorance, although it can also have the more general meaning of having lots of thoughts and being confused about it. In the first case, it is defined like this “Confusion is the appearance to rational mind of something being present when it is not” and refers, for example, to seeing an object, such as a table, as being truly present, when in fact it is present only as mere, interdependent appearance.

Dharmadhatu, Skt. dharmadhātu, Tib. chos kyi dbyings: This is the name for the range or basic space in which all dharmas, meaning all phenomena, come into being. If a flower bed is the place where flowers grow and are found, the dharmadhātu is the dharma or phenomena bed in which all phenomena come into being and are found. The term is used in all levels of Buddhist teaching with that basic meaning but the explanation of it becomes more profound as the teaching becomes more profound. In Great Completion and Mahāmudrā, it is the all-pervading sphere of luminosity-wisdom, given that luminosity is where phenomena arise and that the luminosity is none other than wisdom.

Dharmakaya, Skt. dharmakāya, Tib. chos sku: In the general teachings of Buddhism, this refers to the mind of a buddha, with “dharma” meaning reality and “kāya” meaning body. In the Thorough Cut practice of Great Completion it additionally has the special meaning of being the means by which one rapidly imposes liberation on oneself.

Dharmatā, Skt. dharmatā, Tib. chos nyid: This is a general term meaning the way that something is, and can be applied to anything at all; it is similar in meaning to “actuality” *q.v.* For example, the dharmatā of water is wetness and the dharmatā of the becoming bardo is a place where beings are in a samsaric, or becoming mode, prior to entering a nature bardo. It is used frequently in Tibetan Buddhism to mean “the dharmatā of reality” but that is a specific case of the much larger meaning of the term. To read texts which use this term successfully, one has to understand that the term has a general meaning and then see how that applies in context.

Enlightenment mind, Skt. bodhicitta, Tib. byang chub sems: This is a key term of the Great Vehicle. It is the type of mind that is connected not with the lesser enlightenment of an arhat but the enlightenment of a truly complete buddha. As such, it is a mind which is connected with the aim of bringing all sentient beings to that same level of buddhahood. A person who has this mind has entered the Great Vehicle and is either a bodhisatva or a buddha.

It is important to understand that “enlightenment mind” is used to refer equally to the minds of all levels of bodhisatva on the path to buddhahood and to the mind of a buddha who has completed the path. Therefore, it is not “mind striving for enlightenment” as is so often translated but “enlightenment mind”, meaning that kind of mind which is connected with the full enlightenment of a truly complete buddha and which is present in all those who belong to the Great Vehicle. The term is used in the conventional Great Vehicle and also

in the Vajra Vehicle. In the Vajra Vehicle, there are some special uses of the term where substances of the pure aspect of the subtle physical body are understood to be manifestations of enlightenment mind.

Entity, Tib. ngo bo: The entity of something is just exactly what that thing is. In English we would often simply say “thing” rather than entity. However, in Buddhism, “thing” has a very specific meaning rather than the general meaning that it has in English. It has become common to translate this term as “essence”. However, in most cases “entity”, meaning what a thing is rather than an essence of that thing, is the correct translation for this term.

Fact, Skt. artha, Tib. don. “Fact” is that knowledge of an object that occurs to the surface of mind. It is not the object but what the mind understands as the object.

Fictional, Skt. saṃvṛti, Tib. kun rdzob: This term is paired with the term “superfactual” *q.v.* Until now these two terms have been translated as “relative” and “absolute” but these translations are nothing like the original terms. These terms are extremely important in the Buddhist teaching so it is very important that they be corrected, but more than that, if the actual meaning of these terms is not presented, then the teaching connected with them cannot be understood.

The Sanskrit term saṃvṛti means a deliberate invention, a fiction, a hoax. It refers to the mind of ignorance which, because of being obscured and so not seeing suchness, is not true but a fiction. The things that appear to that ignorance are therefore fictional. Nonetheless, the beings who live in this ignorance believe that the things that appear to them through the filter of ignorance are true, are real. Therefore, these beings live in fictional truth.

Fictional and superfactual: Fictional and superfactual are our greatly improved translations for “relative” and “absolute”

respectively. Briefly, the original Sanskrit word for fiction means a deliberately produced *fiction* and refers to the world projected by a mind controlled by ignorance. The original word for superfact means “that *superior fact* that appears on the surface of the mind of a noble one who has transcended *samsāra*” and refers to reality seen as it actually is. Relative and absolute do not convey this meaning at all and, when they are used, the meaning being presented is simply lost.

Fictional truth, Skt. *samvṛtisatya*, Tib. *kun rdzob bden pa*: See under *fictional*.

Floatters, Tib. *rab rib*: This term has usually been mistakenly translated as “cataracts”. It is the medical term for eyes with a disease known as *Muscaria volante* in Western ophthalmology. The disease is common to a large portion of the world’s population and has the common term “floaters” given to it by the medical profession. Almost anyone who looks out at a clear source of light will see grey threads, sometimes twisted, sometimes straight, floating in the field of vision. When an eye is moved, because the gel of the eye shifts, the floaters can seem to be like hairs falling through the field of vision and so are sometimes called “falling hairs”. They seem to be “out there” when in fact they are shadows being cast on the retina by fissures in the gel inside the eye. The point is that they seem real when in fact they are an aberration produced by an illness of the eye.

Foremost instruction, Skt. *upadeśa*, Tib. *man ngag*: There are several types of instruction mentioned in Buddhist literature: there is the general level of instruction which is the meaning contained in the words of the texts of the tradition; on a more personal and direct level there is oral instruction which has been passed down from teacher to student from the time of the buddha; and on the most profound level there are foremost instructions which are not only oral instructions provided by one’s guru but are special, core instructions that

come out of personal experience and which convey the teaching concisely and with the full weight of personal experience. Foremost instructions or *upadeśha* are crucial to the Vajra Vehicle because these are the special way of passing on the profound instructions needed for the student's realization.

Grasped-grasping, Tib. *gzung 'dzin*: When mind is turned outwardly as it is in the normal operation of dualistic mind, it has developed two faces that appear simultaneously. Special names are given to these two faces: mind appearing in the form of the external object being referenced is called "that which is grasped" and mind appearing in the form of the consciousness that is registering it is called the "grasper" or "grasping" of it. Thus, there is the pair of terms "grasped-grasper" or "grasped-grasping". When these two terms are used, it alerts one to the fact that a Mind Only style of presentation is being discussed. This pair of terms pervades Mind Only, Middle Way, and tantric writings and is exceptionally important in all of them.

Note that one could substitute the word "apprehended" for "grasped" and "apprehender" for "grasper" or "grasping" and that would reflect one connotation of the original Indian terminology. The solidified duality of grasped and grasper is nothing but an invention of dualistic thought; it has that kind of character or characteristic.

Luminosity or illumination, Skt. *prabhāsvara*, Tib. *'od gsal ba*: The core of mind has two aspects: an emptiness factor and a knowing factor. The Buddha and many Indian religious teachers used "luminosity" as a metaphor for the knowing quality of the core of mind. If in English we would say "Mind has a knowing quality", the teachers of ancient India would say, "Mind has an illuminative quality; it is like a source of light which illuminates what it knows".

This term been translated as “clear light” but that is a mistake that comes from not understanding the etymology of the word. It does not refer to a light that has the quality of clearness (something that makes no sense, actually!) but to the illuminative property which is the nature of the empty mind.

Note also that in both Sanskrit and Tibetan Buddhist literature, this term is frequently abbreviated just to Skt. “vara” and Tib. “gsal ba” with no change of meaning. Unfortunately, this has been thought to be another word and it has then been translated with “clarity”, when in fact it is just this term in abbreviation.

Mind, Skt. chitta, Tib. sems: There are several terms for mind in the Buddhist tradition, each with its own, specific meaning. This term is the most general term for the samsaric type of mind. It refers to the type of mind that is produced because of fundamental ignorance of enlightened mind. Whereas the wisdom of enlightened mind lacks all complexity and knows in a non-dualistic way, this mind of un-enlightenment is a very complicated apparatus that only ever knows in a dualistic way.

Prajña, Skt. prajñā, Tib. shes rab: A Sanskrit term for the type of mind that makes good and precise distinctions between this and that and hence which arrives at correct understanding. It has been translated as “wisdom” but that is not correct because it is, generally speaking, a mental event belonging to dualistic mind where “wisdom” is used to refer to the non-dualistic knower of a buddha. Moreover, the main feature of prajñā is its ability to distinguish correctly between one thing and another and hence to arrive at a correct understanding.

Rational mind, Tib. blo: Rational mind is one of several terms for mind in Buddhist terminology. It specifically refers to a mind that judges this against that. With rare exception it is used to

refer to samsaric mind, given that samsaric mind only works in the dualistic mode of comparing this versus that. Because of this, the term is mostly used in a pejorative sense to point out samsaric mind as opposed to an enlightened type of mind.

The Gelugpa tradition does have a positive use for this mind and their documents will sometimes use this term in a positive sense; they claim that a buddha has an enlightened type of this mind. That is not wrong; one could refer to the ability of a buddha's wisdom to make a distinction between this and that with the term "rational mind". However, the Kagyu and Nyingma traditions in their *Mahāmudrā* and Great Completion teachings, reserve this term for the dualistic mind. In their teachings, it is the villain, so to speak, which needs to be removed from the practitioner's being in order to obtain enlightenment.

This term has been commonly translated simply as "mind" but that fails to identify this term properly and leaves it confused with the many other words that are also translated simply as "mind". It is not just another mind but is specifically the sort of mind that creates the situation of this and that (*ratio* in Latin) and hence, at least in the teachings of Kagyu and Nyingma, upholds the duality of *samsāra*. In that case, it is the very opposite of the essence of mind. Thus, this is a key term which should be noted and not just glossed over as "mind".

Realization, Tib. *rtogs pa*: Realization has a very specific meaning: it refers to correct knowledge that has been gained in such a way that the knowledge does not abate. There are two important points here. Firstly, realization is not absolute. It refers to the removal of obscurations, one at a time. Each time that a practitioner removes an obscuration, he gains a realization because of it. Therefore, there are as many levels of obscuration as there are obscurations. Maitreya, in the *Ornament of Manifest Realizations*, shows how the removal of

the various obscurations that go with each of the three realms of samsaric existence produces realization.

Secondly, realization is stable or, as the Tibetan wording says, “unchanging”. As Guru Rinpoche pointed out, “Intellectual knowledge is like a patch, it drops away; experiences on the path are temporary, they evaporate like mist; realization is unchanging”.

A special usage of “realization” is found in the Essence Mahā-mudrā and Great Completion teachings. There, realization is the term used to describe what happens at the moment when mindlessness is actually met during either introduction to or self-recognition of mindlessness. It is called realization because, in that glimpse, one actually directly sees the innate wisdom mind. The realization has not been stabilized but it is realization.

Sugatagarbha, Tib. bde war gshergs pa'i snying po: This is a Sanskrit term literally meaning “the birthplace of those who go to bliss” and used as a name for the buddha nature. The buddha nature is the potential that we all have which allows us to go to the state of enlightenment, the blissful state beyond all the unsatisfactoriness of normal existence. Sugatagarbha has the same basic meaning as tathāgatagarbha though its use indicates a more practical way of talking whereas tathāgātagarbha is more theoretical. A discussion which uses the term sugatagarbha is one that is talking about the practical realities of an essence that can be or is being developed into enlightened being.

Superfactual, Skt. paramārtha, Tib. don dam: This term is paired with the term “fictional” *q.v.* Until now these two terms have been translated as “relative” and “absolute” but those translations are nothing like the original terms. These terms are extremely important in the Buddhist teaching so it is very important that their translations be corrected but, more than

that, if the actual meaning of these terms is not presented, the teaching connected with them cannot be understood.

The Sanskrit term literally means “a superior or holy kind of fact” and refers to the wisdom mind possessed by those who have developed themselves spiritually to the point of having transcended *saṃsāra*. That wisdom is *superior* to an ordinary, un-developed person’s consciousness and the *facts* that appear on its surface are superior compared to the facts that appear on the ordinary person’s consciousness. Therefore, it is *superfact* or the *holy fact*, more literally. What this wisdom knows is true for the beings who have it, therefore what the wisdom sees is *superfactual truth*.

Superfactual truth, Skt. paramārthasatya, Tib. don dam bden pa:
See under *superfactual*.

Superfactual truth enlightenment mind, Tib. don dam bden pa'i byang chub sems: This is one of a pair of terms; the other is *Fictional Truth Enlightenment Mind* *q.v.* for explanation.

Surface, superficies, Tib. rnam pa: In discussions of mind, a distinction is made between the entity of mind which is a mere knower and the superficial things that appear on its surface and which are known by it. In other words, the *superficies* are the various things which pass over the surface of mind but which are not mind. *Superficies* are all the specifics that constitute appearance—for example, the colour white within a moment of visual consciousness, the sound heard within an ear consciousness, and so on.

Upadesha, Skt. upadeśha, Tib. man ngag: See under *foremost instruction*.

Valid cognizer, valid cognition, Skt. pramāṇa, Tib. tshad ma: The Sanskrit term “*pramāṇa*” literally means “best type of mentality” and comes to mean “a valid cognizer”. Its value is that it can be used to validate anything that can be known. The Tibetans translated this term with “*tshad ma*” meaning an

“evaluator”—something which can be used to evaluate the truth or not of whatever it is given to know. It is the term used in logic to indicate a mind which is knowing validly and which therefore can be used to validate the object it is knowing.

Valid cognizers are named according to the kind of test they are employed to do. A valid cognizer of the conventional or a valid cognizer of the fictional tests within conventions, within the realm of rational, dualistic mind. A valid cognizer of the ultimate or valid corner of superfact tests for the superfactual level, beyond dualistic mind.

Wisdom, Skt. jñāna, Tib. ye shes: This is a fruition term that refers to the kind of mind, the kind of knower possessed by a buddha. Sentient beings do have this kind of knower but it is covered over by a very complex apparatus for knowing, dualistic mind. If they practise the path to buddhahood, they will leave behind their obscuration and return to having this kind of knower.

The Sanskrit term has the sense of knowing in the most simple and immediate way. This sort of knowing is present at the core of every being’s mind. Therefore, the Tibetans called it “the particular type of awareness which is there primordially”. Because of the Tibetan wording it has often been called “primordial wisdom” in English translations, but that goes too far; it is just “wisdom” in the sense of the most fundamental knowing possible.

SUPPORTS FOR STUDY

I have been encouraged over the years by all of my teachers to pass on the knowledge I have accumulated in a lifetime dedicated to study and practice, primarily in the Tibetan tradition of Buddhism. On the one hand, they have encouraged me to teach. On the other, they are concerned that, while many general books on Buddhism have been and are being published, there are few books that present the actual texts of the tradition. Therefore they, together with a number of major figures in the Buddhist book publishing world, have also encouraged me to translate and publish high quality translations of individual texts of the tradition.

Padma Karpo Translation Committee (PKTC) was set up to provide a home for the translation and publication work. The committee focusses on producing books containing the best of Tibetan literature, and, especially, books that meet the needs of practitioners. At the time of writing, PKTC has published a wide range of books that, collectively, make a complete program of study for those practising Tibetan Buddhism, and especially for those interested in the higher tan-

tras. All in all, you will find many books both free and for sale on the PKTC web-site. Most are available both as paper editions and e-books.

It would take up too much space here to present an extensive guide to our books and how they can be used as the basis for a study program. However, a guide of that sort is available on the PKTC web-site, whose address is on the copyright page of this book and we recommend that you read it to see how this book fits into the overall scheme of PKTC publications. In short, PKTC has published a series of titles in connection with the main topic—the view of Other Emptiness—of this book and all of them should be read in conjunction with this book:

- *Maitripa's Writings on the View*—the main Indian source of the Tibetan views of Other Emptiness by Tony Duff
- *The Noble One Called “Point of Passage Wisdom”, A Great Vehicle Sutra*—one of the ten sutras from the third turning of the wheel cited by Zhantong advocates, by Tony Duff

Also, the book *Gampopa's Mahamudra, The Five-Part Mahamudra of the Kagyu* lays out the Kagyu Mahamudra teaching very clearly using several important texts of the Kagyu tradition; the view expressed in those texts will be clearly seen to resonate with Maitripa's teaching.

We make a point of including, where possible, the relevant Tibetan texts in Tibetan script in our books. We also make them available in electronic editions that can be downloaded free from our web-site, as discussed below. The Tibetan text

for this book is included at the back of the book and is available for download from the PKTC web-site.

Electronic Resources

PKTC has developed a complete range of electronic tools to facilitate the study and translation of Tibetan texts. For many years now, this software has been a prime resource for Tibetan Buddhist centres throughout the world, including in Tibet itself. It is available through the PKTC web-site.

The wordprocessor TibetDoc has the only complete set of tools for creating, correcting, and formatting Tibetan text according to the norms of the Tibetan language. It can also be used to make texts with mixed Tibetan and English or other languages. Extremely high quality Tibetan fonts, based on the forms of Tibetan calligraphy learned from old masters from pre-Communist Chinese Tibet, are also available. Because of their excellence, these typefaces have achieved a legendary status amongst Tibetans.

TibetDoc is used to prepare electronic editions of Tibetan texts in the PKTC text input office in Asia. Tibetan texts are often corrupt so the input texts are carefully corrected prior to distribution. After that, they are made available through the PKTC web-site. These electronic texts are not careless productions like so many of the Tibetan texts found on the web, but are highly reliable editions useful to non-scholars and scholars alike. Some of the larger collections of these texts are for purchase, but most are available for free download.

The electronic texts can be read, searched, and even made into an electronic library using either TibetDoc or our other software, TibetD Reader. Like TibetDoc, TibetD Reader is advanced software with many capabilities made specifically to meet the needs of reading and researching Tibetan texts. PKTC software is for purchase but we make a free version of TibetD Reader available for free download on the PKTC web-site.

A key feature of TibetDoc and Tibet Reader is that Tibetan terms in texts can be looked up on the spot using PKTC's electronic dictionaries. PKTC also has several electronic dictionaries—some Tibetan-Tibetan and some Tibetan-English—and a number of other reference works. The *Illuminator Tibetan-English Dictionary* is renowned for its completeness and accuracy.

This combination of software, texts, reference works, and dictionaries that work together seamlessly has become famous over the years. It has been the basis of many, large publishing projects within the Tibetan Buddhist community around the world for over thirty years and is popular amongst all those needing to work with Tibetan language or deepen their understanding of Buddhism through Tibetan texts.

TIBETAN TEXT

ଅଣା । କର୍ମଶୁଦ୍ଧିଶ୍ରୀଘେ । କୃତ୍ସମିଧିଶେଷିମାତ୍ର ।
ଏଥେବା ପ୍ରମାଣକେ ପ୍ରମାଣପାଇଶାମେଦ୍ସତ୍ତ୍ୱଦ୍ୱାରା । ଏବେବା ତଥା
ରହିଶାମେଦ୍ସେବିଶ୍ରୀଶାପା । ମିଦାଗୁର୍ବାଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶୁଦ୍ଧରକଥା
ଥି । ଏବେବୁମାଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶୁଦ୍ଧରକଥାକୁପାଇଶୁଦ୍ଧରକଥା । ମିଦାଗୁର୍ବ
ମଦ୍ସତ୍ତ୍ୱଦ୍ୱାରାଶ୍ରୀଦ୍ୱାରିଶୁଦ୍ଧନା । ଏଥିଶାମିଦ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି
ଦ୍ୱାରାଶୁଦ୍ଧପା । ବିବରମିଦ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ମିଦାଗୁର୍ବ
ପାଇଦ୍ୱାରାଶ୍ରୀଦ୍ୱାରିଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । କୃତ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି
ପାଇଦ୍ୱାରାଶ୍ରୀଦ୍ୱାରିଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । କୃତ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି
କେବାପାଇଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମିଦ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମି
ପାଇଶାମେଦ୍ସତ୍ତ୍ୱପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମିଦ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମି
ଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମିଦ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମି
ଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି । ଏଥିଶାମିଦ୍ସମାପନଶୁଦ୍ଧପାଇଶି ।

INDEX

- cut-off emptiness 25
- cut-off fictional appearances 25
- deceptive 7, 17, 37
- definitive meaning 2-4, 38
- definitive meaning Great Middle Way 38
- dharmadhātu ... 9, 13, 19, 20, 23, 25, 40
- dharmas lack self-nature ... 4
- dhātu 8, 10, 23, 36
- distinction of different facets 12
- distinction of different facets in one essence 12
- distinction of one stopped . 12
- Distinguishing Dharma and Dharmatā* 8
- Dolpopa v, vi, 2
- Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen . v, 2
- domain of no-thought wisdom 29
- dualistic appearance ... 24, 28, 29, 37
- dualistic appearances of grasped-grasping 17
- electronic dictionaries 54
- electronic editions 52, 53
- electronic texts 53, 54
- emptiness .. v, vi, viii, 2, 6, 10-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-29, 33, 35, 37, 44, 52
- emptiness and appearance 11, 25
- emptiness having the excellence of all aspects 12, 13
- emptiness of disparate true existence 25
- emptiness of other viii
- empty 4, 5, 4, 8-36, 45
- empty of itself 22, 23, 27
- empty of other 4, 11, 23
- empty of self entity 4
- empty of that which is separable 9
- empty of the fictional . 17, 22, 24, 25, 34, 35
- equality of existence and peace 23, 25
- equipoise of the noble one trainees 29
- examination of the superfunctional 16
- excellence of all aspects . 11-13
- fact .. viii, 5, 7, 12, 23, 25, 27, 34, 40, 42-45, 48
- fearless lions 1
- fiction 15, 42, 43
- fictional ... 4-5, 7, 13, 15-18, 20-26, 28-30, 34, 35, 37, 42, 43, 48, 49
- fictional is confused 16
- fictional is empty of self entity 4
- final wheel 3
- fire of wisdom 10
- foremost instructions 2, 43, 44
- formulation of the two truths12
- freedom from elaboration .. 5-6, 16-18, 21, 22, 33
- fulfil the requirements 17
- Gelugpa vii, 5, 46
- grasped-grasping 17, 44
- Great Middle Way 3, 4, 37, 38
- great śāstras 8
- Guardian Nāgārjuna 4

Highest Continuum 4, 8
Illuminator Tibetan-English Dictionary 12, 54
In Praise of the Dharmadhātu . 9
 inconceivable buddha dharmas 9
 individual, personal knowledge 5
 invisibility-stick-like path .. 29
 Jamgon Kongtrul the Great vi
 Jampal Gyepay Dorje .. vi, 38
 Jamyang Lodro Gyatso vi, 38
 Jomo v
 Jonang School v
 Jonangs v
 Ju Mipham i, iii, vi, xii
 Ju Mipham Namgyal ... i, iii, vi, xii
 Kagyu vii, 5, 46, 52
 Kālachakra 4, 10, 11
 Karmapa Rangjung Dorje .. 2
 Kinsman of the Sun 1
 lack of true existence . 16-18,
 21, 22, 24, 28, 30
 Land of Snow 31, 35
 lion among men 1
 lion's roar i, iii, vi, viii, 1, 36, 38
Lion's Roar that is One Thousand Doses of Sugatagarbha vi
Lion's Roar that Proclaims Zhan tong iii, vi, viii
 Longchen Rabjam v
 Longchenpa v, vi, 2
 Lord of the ten levels 3
 luminosity .. 10, 27, 36, 40, 44
 luminosity mind 10
 Madhyamaka 3
 Maitrīpa 2
 Maitreya 1-3, 8, 36, 46
 māras 15
 meaning that is established by reasoning 19
 meditation on emptiness .. 17
 Middle Way 3, 4, 26, 37, 38, 44
 Mind Only 44, 46
 Mipham's Collected Works vi
 multicoloured rope 13
 Nāgārjuna 4, 9, 36
 nītartha 2
 new classification of the two truths 8
 neyārtha 2
 noble one 5, 29, 43, 52
 non-affirming negation .. 25,
 26, 30
 non-confusion's appearance 16
 non-regressing 3
 non-synchronization .. 12, 28
 not confused 7, 16, 22
 not deceptive 7
 not empty of its own entity 13, 14, 34
 not existent 13, 17
 not synchronized 7
 no-thought wisdom 6, 6, 29, 35
 Nyingma v-vii, 5, 46
 object and subject .. 6, 14, 17,
 22, 28-30
 object of individual self-knowing 19, 20
 objects and subjects of elaboration 17
Ornament of Manifest Realizations 46

- Other Emptiness* .. v, viii, 2, 52
- other tenets that speak out
 - against Zhantong .. 16
 - Padma Karpo Translation Committee .. i, ii, v, viii, ix, 2, 51
 - paramārtha .. 47
 - peace .. 15, 21, 23, 25
 - Protector of Loving Kindness Guru .. 37
 - rational mind .. 17, 22, 26, 27, 29, 31, 35, 40, 45
 - reasoning .. 14, 16, 19, 24, 29, 33-35, 38
 - reasoning that analyses for the ultimate .. 16
 - requirements of emptiness .. 17
 - requirements of meditation on emptiness .. 17
 - sands of the river Ganges .. 9
 - second set of truths .. 12
 - second turning of the wheel .. 6
 - self-empty like the fictional .. 16
 - self-nature .. 4, 20, 30
 - snake .. 13-16
 - stains .. 9, 10
- Standard Tibetan Grammar* . v
- stopped by the path .. 29
- study and translation of Tibetan texts .. 53
- study program .. 52
- subject .. 6, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17, 22, 25, 28-30, 35
- substantially existent .. 28
- sugatagarbha .. vi, 10, 12, 47
- superfact .. 6, 7, 13-15, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 34, 43, 48, 49
- superfactual .. 4-7, 12-14, 16-26, 28-35, 37, 42, 47-49
- superfactual analysis .. 18, 34
- superfactual is not confused .. 16
- superfactual is not empty of the superficial .. 23, 24
- superfactual of non-confusion .. 18, 19
- synchronized .. 6, 7, 29
- sūtras .. 2, 8, 10
- sūtras and tantras of definitive meaning .. 2
- sūtras that show emptiness .. 10
- tathāgatagarbha .. 9
- Tirthikas .. 15
- that which could be removed .. 9
- that which could not be removed .. 9
- the fictional .. 4, 5, 15-18, 20, 22-25, 28, 30, 34, 35, 37, 49
- the superficial .. 4, 5, 14, 16-18, 20, 22-26, 28-30, 32-35, 37, 49
- third turning .. 1, 2, 6, 52
- third turning of the wheel .. 1, 6, 52
- third turning of the wheel of dharma .. 1
- Tibetan grammar .. v
- Tibetan text .. iii, 52, 53, 55
- Tibetan texts .. 52-54
- Trilogy of Mind Commentaries* 4
- true existence .. 5, 16-19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 34
- true existence is not existent .. 17
- true grasping is a confused awareness .. 17

truly existent 13, 28, 32, 34, 36 conventional truth 14
two truths vi-8, 12, 25 valid knower 16
two truths of appearance-
 emptiness 12
 śhāstras 8
ultimate teaching 2
valid cognition . 13, 14, 31, 48
valid cognizer . . . 7, 14-16, 18,
 19, 36, 48, 49
valid cognizer of conventional
 analysis 7
valid cognizer that analyses
 conventionally 18
valid cognizer that analyses for

view . . . v-x, 1, 5, 21-23, 27, 28,
 31, 35, 52
view that references emptiness
 as a thing 21
wheel of dharma 1
Yumo Mikyo Dorje v
zhantong . . . i, iii, vi-viii, 1, 3-8,
 11, 14, 16, 24, 31, 35, 38, 52
zhantong style presentation vi
zhantong view vi-viii, 5



Tony Duff has spent a lifetime pursuing the Buddha's teaching and transmitting it to others. In the early 1970's, during his post-graduate studies in molecular biology, he went to Asia and met the Buddhist teachings of various South-east Asian countries. He met Tibetan Buddhism in Nepal and has followed it since. After his trip he abandoned worldly life and was the first monk ordained in his home country of Australia. Together with several others, he founded the monastery called Chenrezig Institute for Wisdom Culture where he studied and practised the Gelugpa teachings for several years under the guidance of Lama Yeshe, Lama Zopa, Geshe Lodan, and Zasep Tulku. After that, he offered back his ordination and left for the USA to study the Kagyu teachings with the incomparable Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche. Tony was very active in the community and went through all possible levels of training that were available during his twelve year stay. He was also a core member of the Nalanda Translation Committee. After Chogyam Trungpa died, Tony went to live in Nepal where he worked as the personal translator for Tsoknyi Rinpoche and also translated for several other well-known teachers. He also founded and directed the largest Tibetan text preservation project in Asia, the Drukpa Kagyu Heritage Project, which he oversaw for eight years. He also established the Padma Karpo Translation Committee which has produced many fine translations and made many resources for translators such as the highly acclaimed *Illuminator Tibetan-English Dictionary*. After the year 2000, Tony focussed primarily on obtaining Dzogchen teachings from the best teachers available, especially within Tibet, and translating and teaching them. He has received much approval from many teachers and has been given the titles "lotsawa" and "lama" and been strongly encouraged by them to teach Westerners. One way he does that is by producing these fine translations.

PADMA KARPO TRANSLATION COMMITTEE
P.O. Box 4957
Kathmandu
Nepal
<http://www.tibet.dk/pktc>