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Illustrations of two plants and one mineral sometimes identified as \textit{dkar po chig thub} appear at the bottoms of pages 90, 154, and 175. In \textit{Tibetan Medical Paintings} (London: Serindia, 1992), pp. 217 and 223, one plant is identified as \textit{Panax pseudoginseng} and the stone as white pyrolusite or zeolite.

INTRODUCTION

In the history of Tibetan Buddhism, the metaphor of the \textit{dkar po chig thub} has generated a surprising amount of controversy. In the 12th and 13th centuries it triggered serious doctrinal discussions, and in the subsequent centuries the inter-sectarian controversies that it occasioned took a long time to die down. The Tibetan expression \textit{dkar po chig thub}, however, would seem to be innocuous enough. It can be translated as "singly efficacious white [remedy]" or "self-sufficient white [simple]," and it was derived from Tibetan medical or pharmacological terminology—the phrase originally signifying literally a white \textit{(dkar po)} herbal drug or simple that by itself alone \textit{(chig)} was capable \textit{(thub)} of effecting the cure.¹

But it was as a doctrinal metaphor that these words provoked disagreement, for any religious doctrine or practice characterized by this metaphor of self-sufficiency was implicitly said by its proponents to be capable of bringing about by itself alone the complete spiritual cure: perfect Awakening or Buddhahood.

The Tibetan school best known for using this metaphor was the Dwags-po bKa'-brgyud. The expression \textit{dkar po chig thub} is found in the writings of its founder, rJe sGam-po-pa (1079-1153), as well as in those of bla-ma Zhang Tshal-pa (1123-1193), an influential disciple of sGam-po-pa's nephew sGom-pa Tshul-khrims-snying-po (1116-1169). The corresponding doctrinal notion of a soteriologically self-sufficient teaching or factor was viewed with strong disapproval by some other Tibetan religious scholars already in the time of bla-ma Zhang. Its best-known critic, however, was the later scholar Sa-skya Paṇḍita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251), who referred to it and rejected it in several different ways.

¹ See S. Karmay (1988), p. 197f; D. Scyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 100f; and D. Jackson (1990), pp. 26f and p. 73, n. 20. I use the word \textit{simple} as a noun in the sense of "a medicine of one constituent, a medicinal herb." In \textit{Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged}, Second Edition (Cleveland & New York: 1971), the second definition for \textit{simple} as a noun is: "a medicinal herb or medicine obtained from a herb: so called because each vegetable was supposed to possess its particular virtue and therefore to constitute a simple remedy." The medical meanings of this word are sometimes considered archaism.
works including two of his major doctrinal treatises, the stDom gsam rab dbye ("Discrimination of the Three Vows") and the Thub pa’i dgon gsal ("Elucidation of the Sage’s Intention").

Some aspects of this later Tibetan controversy and its background have already been discussed in recent studies. Nevertheless, the relevant passages from sGam-po-pa, Zhang and Sa-skya Pandita’s writings have not yet been systematically gathered together and translated. I would therefore like to present below a translation of all known passages from these masters’ writings that mention the dkar po chig thub metaphor directly. And since the historical and doctrinal contexts of these discussions in Tibet have also not been investigated in any detail until now, I would like to begin by explaining more about those three masters, their careers as teachers, and their doctrines connected with the dkar po chig thub metaphor.

One of the special Great Seal (phyag rgya chen po: mahāmudrā) teachings for which sGam-po-pa was best known was his so-called "introduction to the [nature of] mind" (sems kyi nge sprod), by which the disciple was led to confront and directly recognize the nature of his or her mind. sGam-po-pa is said to have given such Great Seal instructions sometimes not as secret Vajrayāna precepts in connection with initiation and special yogic practices, but rather as a Sūtra-based Great Seal instruction, or even as a doctrine going beyond both Sūtra and Tantra. Later critics such as Sa-skya Pandita (or Sa-paṅ, as he was known for short) maintained, however, that all true Great Seal instructions were Mantrayāna teachings that necessitated full, formal Tantric initiation into a mandala. These masters denied in general the existence of any Sūtra-based or non-Tantric Great Seal, and in particular they considered the existence of any Mahāyāna doctrine outside of the classes of Pāramitāyāna and Mantrayāna to be impossible. Sa-paṅ himself also within the context of the general Mahāyāna criticized the notion that any one teaching or single spiritual factor could claim to be self-sufficient, including any meditative stoppage of conceptual processes in the name of "seeing the nature of mind." What especially infuriated the bKa’-brgyud-pa opponents of Sa-paṅ was that he went on to deny in his writings that the doctrine in question originated with the Indian adept Nāropa, but asserted rather that it was in fact the teaching of the Chinese master Mo-ho-yen, which according to long-standing Tibetan tradition had been refuted by the Indian pandita Kamalaśīla at the bSam-yas debate.

The historical bSam-yas debate—which probably took place in some fashion in Central Tibet during the reign of the great Tibetan king Khri Srong-lde’u-btsan (d. 790s)—together with the Chinese and Tibetan sources on it, has recently inspired a large amount of modern scholarship, and here is not the place to survey it all. Nevertheless, it has become clear that the doctrines at issue at the original debate were not quite as simple or clear-cut as some later Tibetan restatements of them—including the historical summaries by Sa-paṅ and the sources he based himself on—would have us believe. Still, the accounts upon which Sa-paṅ and others based themselves were not mere fabrications, either. They seem in fact to go back to sources that include a version of the sBa’ bzhed history, and similar traditions were familiar to Tibetan scholars before Sa-paṅ such as Nyang-ral Nyi-ma’i-od-zer (1124-1192 or 1136-1204) and Lha’-bri-sgang-pa (fl. late 12th c.). Moreover, one crucial Chinese source

---


I have already touched on many of the same topics and sources in the article D. Jackson (1990), though there I approached the subject from a different point of departure. I have also investigated several related themes in the book: "The Egg and Newborn Lion Cub: Metaphors for the Potentialities and Limitations of 'All-at-once' Enlightenment," which appeared in the proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Tibetan Studies (Narita: 1992).

3 See, for instance, the sources listed by D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 65 and notes 127 and 128.

4 See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 70.

5 On the history of Nyang-ni-ma’i-od-zer, see D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 74ff, and L. van der Kuijpp (1986), p. 148ff. For the relevant texts of both 12th-century sources, see also H. Elmer (1991), pp. 168-172. Lha’-bri-sgang-pa learned this tradition from Jo-bo Sertsun, who was connected with Añjña’s three main disciples; this may therefore represent a mainstream bKa’-gsum-pa tradition. Lha’-bri-sgang-pa characterizes the Chinese master Mo-ho-yen as having advocated the cultivation of prajñā at the periphery of the other perfections, using the metaphor of the soaring king of birds and the person who reaches the peak of the king of mountains. Kamalaśīla is said to have criticized these metaphors, saying that a bird flies by beating its wings stroke by stroke, and that one reaches the top of the highest mountain by taking one step after another. Just so, the understanding of Emptiness by a person of highest capacity also arises from having cultivated compassionate means.
recovered from Tun-huang agrees with such sources in mentioning that Mo-ho-yen used a panacea or single self-sufficient medicine metaphor for his instantaneous, non-conceptualizing method.\(^6\) Doctrinally, too, the points at issue in the original bSam-yas debate did have some strong parallels with the later Tibetan \textit{dkar po chig thub} controversies.\(^7\) The main Indian \textit{pañḍita} at the debate, Kamalaśīla, was evidently attempting to refute the claim of soteriological self-sufficiency for a single method, and this was at the heart of the controversy addressed by his closely related \textit{Bhāvanākrama} treatises and not for instance "subitism."\(^8\) This would accord with the general thrust of Sa-paṅ's critique of a single-sufficient or singly efficacious method.

As one modern scholar has put it:

The question is not whether enlightenment is sudden or gradual, but rather whether the different elements of the path should be analyzed, defined and practiced separately. [If Kamalaśīla is right] ... it is obvious that \textit{upāya}, the altruistic aspect of Buddhism, is not merely an automatic fruit of understanding or enlightenment, and that it should be practiced separately.\(^9\)

This also agrees rather closely with the understandings of the later Sa-skya-pa learned tradition as represented by Go-rams-pa (1429-1489), who summarized the general thrust of the \textit{dkar po chig thub} controversy similarly in his general exposition of Madhyamaka, the \textit{dBu ma'i spyi don}:\(^10\)

The 'Self-sufficient White [Remedy],' which maintains that one can achieve omniscience by meditatively cultivating [insight into] Emptiness alone, has been refuted through numerous reasonings and scriptures by those who see reality without error—such as the great scholar Kamalaśīla and the glorious Sa-skya Pañḍita—who said that you cannot achieve perfect Buddhahood without bringing to completion the aspect of [compassionate, skillful] means.

To the masters of the so-called "sambtaneist" (cig car ba) traditions, however, this was all a fractious tempest in a single, capacious teapot. If a person possesses the insight into Emptiness, they asserted, there is not a single thing that is not included within this factor.\(^11\) The path to liberation, consisting of the Six Perfections, is also completely present in

\(^6\) See P. Demiéville (1952), pp. 122f, who quotes Wang Hsi’s \textit{Cheng-li chüeh}. Here Mo-ho-yen responds to the question of whether more than one "medicines" are or are not necessary to remove separately the three distinct "poisons", i.e. \textit{klesas}. The translation of the question concludes:

S’il en est ainsi, comment donc voulez-vous exterminer les passions en cultivant l’abstention des notions de l’esprit? Les rendre temporairement invisibles, ce n’est pas un moyen de les exterminer radicalement.

[Mo-ho-yen’s reply begins:]


See also L. Gómez (1983), p. 92, quoting the same passage from the \textit{Cheng-ti chüeh} of Wang Hsi, p. 146b:

According to the \textit{Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra}, there is a certain medicinal herb that will cure all diseases in those who take it. It is the same with this absence of reflection and inspection.

This passage had been available in English translation since the appearance of E. Conze, \textit{Buddhist Scriptures} (London: 1939), p. 217.

\(^7\) Some traditional Tibetan historians, including Nyang-ral's \textit{chos 'byung} and the "alternative tradition" of the \textit{aBya bzhed}, indeed attribute the use of the \textit{dkar po chig thub} image to the Chinese side of the debate, who are said to have employed it to refer to their own special teaching. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 100.

\(^8\) In the \textit{cig car ba} manual recovered in Tun Huang (Pelliot Tib. 116) entitled the \textit{dBu’i mgis su med pa tshul gyi pa’i thung}, the very first objection ("adduced by those who since beginningless time have been attached to entities and language") answered is that one cannot awaken to perfect Buddhahood by cultivating the equipment of \textit{Gnös} alone: ye shes kyi tshogs gyi po bsgam pas/ bla na med pa yang dag par rtsogs pa’i byung chub du sangs rgya byas. On this work see L. Gómez (1987), pp. 96 and 153, n. 123. And in the \textit{Bhāvanākramas} (Peking vol. 102, \textit{dbu ma a}), from the very first Kamalaśīla addressed this same point, stressing that other factors—compassion, Bodhicitta and skillful means—must by all means be cultivated. More than once (ff. 56b and 73a.6) he denies specifically that insight into Emptiness alone will suffice: stong pa nyid ’ba’i zhi ma yin nol. E. Obermiller suggested already in 1935 the relevance of the third \textit{Bhāvanākrama} to the debate. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 63-4, and note 121. On Kamalaśīla’s criticism of an isolated "emptiness principle," see ibid., pp. 184 and 190.


\(^10\) Go-rams-pa, \textit{Kgyal ba thams cad kyi thugs ki dgon pa zhub mo dbu ma'i de kha na nyid spyi'i ngyag gis ston pa nges don rab gsal}, vol. 12, ed. Th. Ts. 1:1. \textit{dkar po chig thub} ees bya ba srong nyid khor na bsgom pa thams cad mkhyen pa spyi'i stod pa la ni mukhas pa ka la shi la dang / dpal lad na skyapañña la stod pa don ma ’khrul par guge pa mamns kyi thabs kyi cha ma tshang yus rdo rje ’sangs rgyas spyi'i spyi'i spyi'i spyi'i spyi'. Hence dang rigs pa du ma'i yas nas sun phyu dangzin pas' dir bad pa ma byas soll.

\(^11\) S.Gom-po-pa, \textit{Namchos...} [tha pa rin po che\textsuperscript{\small rgyan}], p. 265.6 (133a): de la bu'i stong pa nyid kyi don dang ldan nal'chos ‘di la ma ’dus pa cig kyang med doll. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), p. 220.
this very thing, for as the Sūtra of the Vajra Concentration (rDo rje ting nge 'dzin gni mdo: Vajrasamādhī Sūtra) states: "If you do not waver from Emptiness, this includes the six Perfections."12 If you dwell within the insight into the ultimate—Emptiness—for even a single moment, this is immeasurably more meritorious than studying, reciting texts, or performing such meritorious deeds as practicing generosity.13 Opponents may well ask: 'If all those excellent virtues and merits are really included within cultivating simply the nature [mind] or 'Mind Itself' (sams nyid), then why did the Buddha teach so many times the stages of skillful means?' The answer is: He taught them in order to guide people of inferior capacities who cannot understand ultimate reality.14

... ...

My treatment of these topics in the following pages is an outgrowth of a wider investigation into the last life and thought of Sa-skya Paṇḍita that I have been pursuing over the last few years. Here I have tried to establish Sa-pa's understandings on these subjects and to ascertain what was at issue when he criticized his doctrinal opponents in these connections. I have also tried to investigate the opposing doctrines in their original writings, to see to what extent Sa-pa's characterizations of their positions were accurate or appropriate. I have no, however, succeeded in presenting the Great Seal masters or their teachings with anything like their original striking power and appeal. The soaring, utterly non-worldly viewpoint from which these masters often spoke is difficult to reduce to a doctrinal system. The Great Seal and similar teachings by their nature do not lend themselves easily to discursive description and historical analyses of the sorts I have attempted.15 Moreover, the traditions themselves insist that these are secret insights which are only conveyable directly—without words or thoughts—by an accomplished master to a qualified disciple.

The Tibetan Great Seal and similar traditions did, however, compose their own written manuals. Such manuals and other doctrinal and historical writings have therefore been the main sources for my depictions of the traditions. Nowadays a number of publications devoted specifically to the Great Seal and the Great Perfection traditions are beginning to appear, including a few translations. I will therefore leave it to people with more insight to point out where my word- and concept-bound analyses have missed the mark!

When quoting from the original writings of sGam-po-pa (and for some of bla-ma Zhang's works, too), I have mainly given the text as it stands. I have not attempted to "correct" the spellings of the published manuscripts I used (which presumably derive ultimately from 12th-century originals) or to bring the text in line with more recent conventions, except where the sense might otherwise be completely unclear. Studies on the early Dwa-po bKa'-brgyud-pa will become much easier when careful editions become available.

The present study on these topics was made possible in part by the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, a research fellowship from which enabled me to begin the relevant research while at Hamburg University in 1988-89. I am also obliged to Prof. D. Seyfort Ruegg for his helpful comments in 1989, when I presented some of the translated passages from Sa-pa's works in a seminar at Hamburg University's Institute for the Culture and History of India and Tibet, and also for his later remarks. I could do some further work while on a fellowship from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science while at Kyoto University in 1990-91. Finally I revised and completed the main body of this study in 1991-2 while working at the Institute for the Culture and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna. I am thankful to Mr. II. Lasic for proofreading the Tibetan texts by Sa-pa presented in the appendix and for much help in compiling the indexes. I am also indebted to Prof. John Clayton, Prof. Lambert Schmithausen, Mr. Burkhard Quesell and Dr. Dan Martin for reading this work and offering numerous valuable

---

12 sGam-po-pa, Dam chos... [har pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 267.5 (134a): lam pa rol tu phyin pa drung kyang 'di nyid la thyang stel rdo rje ting nge 'dzin gni mdo las! stong pa nyid las! ma gnyos nal! pha rol phyin pa drung 'das srol zhes gongs srol. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), pp. 221-22.

13 sGam-po-pa, Dam chos... [har pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 264.2 (132b): de lhar don dam shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa de'i rgyan la dar cig sman gnas na bskal pa'i bar du nyam pa'an! klong pa'am sde ba'i rtsa ba phyin pa la sogs pa byas pa bskyod nams dpag tu med pa che ba yin nol. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), p. 219.

14 sGam-po-pa, Dam chos... [har pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 270.1 (135a): 'o na nga bo'am sams nyid gcig pa bsgom pa la de dag thams cad 'das nal fthabs kyi rim pa mang du gungs pa dag 'byung ba ci ltar yin sbyin nal gnas lung la srong pa'i skal pa dmar pa mak bra'i phyur ter... See also H. V. Guenther (1971), p. 224. Cf. L. Gomez (1987), p. 113, who has studied the remarks of Mo-ho-yen that skillful methods were taught for those of dull faculties.

15 L. Gomez (1987), p. 114, has expressed the predicament well: "...The subits' fixation with making statements from the point of view of absolute truth is inherently disconcerting to anyone seeking doctrinal orientation."
comments. I would like to thank Mr. Burkhard Quessel once again for much help in preparing the final camera-ready copy for publication.

The main task I have undertaken here has been historical. I hope that by my gathering and interpreting these sources, interested readers will be able better to understand a few aspects of the difficult and subtle doctrinal problems faced by Tibetan Buddhists in the 12th and 13th centuries. The Tibetan Buddhist traditions concerned have almost all survived down to the present day (only bla-ma Zhang's tradition has died out, at least as an institutional entity). This means that to some extent the issues, too, live on and are not of purely historical interest. In fact, some of my findings may now and then touch a sensitive nerve of the traditions concerned or seem to verge on the controversial. This is not always easy to avoid when one presents in detail the contents of a controversy! But I should stress that the present study is merely one person's attempt at historical exploration and investigation, and it is by no means the last word. I therefore look forward to the comments of those who come to the subject from other viewpoints.

D. Jackson
Hamburg, August 1993

1

SGAM-PO-PA, SEEING THE MIND, AND THE WHITE SELF-SUFFICIENT REMEDY

Some of the doctrinal roots of the later Tibetan dkar po chig thub controversy lay in the revolutionary reclassifying and synthesizing work of the mature rJe sGam-po-pa bSod-nams-rin-chen (1079-1153), founder of the Dwags-po bka'-brgyud tradition within the Mar-pa bKa'-brgyud.16 sGam-po-pa originally had been trained as a physician (lha rje) and had begun his adult life as a married layman. Indeed, he entered into intensive religious practice only after experiencing the shock of his young and beloved wife's sudden death, which had occurred when he was still in his early twenties (ca. 1100). He became one of the foremost disciples of rje-btsun Mi-la ras-pa (1040-1123), but only after extensive studies in other traditions. Before meeting Mi-la, he had already undergone full monastic ordination at the age of twenty-five (1104) and had sought out Tantric initiations in Lower Dags-po from the master Mar-yul Blo-Iddan. He had also studied intensively in 'Phan-yul under masters of the bKa'-gdams-pa tradition such as Bya-yul-ba, sNyug-rum-pa and Icags-ri Gong-kha-pa. He met Mi-la ras-pa only later, and finally received instructions from him (especially on "inner heat" gum mo) for thirteen months in 1110-11. Only then, after meditating for an additional three years, did sGam-po-pa attain Awakening. He tried to return to see his master Mi-la twelve years later in 1123, but Mi-la had already passed away. He continued a primarily contemplative life for some years, but then later in the 1220s he began his teaching career, which became more and more illustrious with the passing years. In 1126, he met his nephew sGom-pa Tshul-khrims-snying-po, and in 1132, when the latter was sixteen, he had him ordained and instructed

16 The following sketch of sGam-po-pa's life is based mainly on the Blue Annals (Deb ther sgon po) of 'Gos lo-tsa-ba, nyo 21b-26a; G. Roerich, transal. (1976), pp. 451-462. For some information on sGam-po-pa's life, see H. V. Guenther (1955), pp. 90-96, and Guenther (1971), pp. xi-xii.
him. In 1150 at the age of seventy-one, gSgam-po-pa handed over the leadership of his monastic community to that same nephew.

In his maturity, rJe gSgam-po-pa exhibited a penetrating, reappraising genius in the realm of doctrinal formulations, and when it came to method, here, too, he was not afraid to reevaluate, adapt or innovate. Like all skillful teachers, he compassionately tailored his instructions to the needs and abilities of his specific students—a fact that probably accounts for many of the seeming inconsistencies or differences of approach in his writings.

In the later part of his life, he gave increasing attention to transmitting directly the highest Great Seal insight, perhaps in part also as an outgrowth of his own deepened and intensified spiritual insight. What was somewhat revolutionary about the approach gSgam-po-pa adopted was that he sought ways to transmit this insight outside of the traditional Mantrayānā method, which treated it as an ultimate and highly secret "fruit" instruction to be conveyed only after full, formal tantric initiation and in connection with special yogic practices. Certain historians or scholars in the bkA-'brgyud tradition portrayed gSgam-po-pa's Great Seal teaching method as having been in this way a significant innovation within their lineage. The bkA-'brgyud-pa historian 'Gos lo-tsa-ba (1392-1481), for instance, stated:18

---

17 It should also be pointed out that many of gSgam-po-pa's "writings"—including the collections of replies to questions—were probably never corrected or arranged by him. They are groups of replies to questions written at various times and in various contexts, apparently surviving from the notes or memories of the students, and later thrown together in a fairly random order. This probably accounts in part for the situation described by M. Brodo (1985), p. 13: "In this [Phag mo gtu pa'i zhus lam] and in the similar Dus gsum mkhyen pa'i zhus lam nothing seems to have been further from gSgam-po-pa's mind than propagating a single unified theory about something." In his formal treatises such as the famous Thar pa rin po che'i lugs, however, he was setting forth a unified system.

The uneven quality of the collected writings of the early Dvags-po bka'-brgyud-pa masters and the presence of later interpolations within them were noticed for instance by lCan-skyi Ro-pa'i-rdo-rje, p. 459.1 (cha kha 208): 'on kyang 'di dag gi bka' 'bum mauns su stob ma mkhas pa dang mi mkhas pa du mas sin bris ngag nyig mang po bcog 'dag pa la yid brtan mi snang ngol/.

18 'Gos lo-tsa-ba, p. 400 (nya 25b); G. Roerich, transl., pp. 459-60. See also gSgam-po-pa, Writings, vol. 1, p. 271.7: yid ma ches na byin bralbs mi 'byung/ yid ches pa cig la chos mng po mi dgosl chos re r khya yar la ren nas byogn pa yin. "If you do not believe, [the master's] blessing will not occur. One who trusts does not need many religious teachings. One meditates based on individual, separate teachings."

Concerning that [teaching of the Great Seal], rJe-btsun Mid-la had not given the Path of Means (thabs lam) and Great Seal [instructions] separately from one another. But gSgam-po-pa taught the instructions on the Path of Means to those who were suitable recipients of the Mantra teachings, and he gave instructions on the Great Seal to those who were suitable as recipients of the Perfection-Vehicle (Pāramitāyāna) teachings, even though they had not received tantric initiation. He composed then a step-by-step manual of practical instruction called the Lhan cig skyes sbyor, which became popularly known also as "Dags-po's Realization Teaching" (dags po'i rtags chos).19 He taught that although the scriptures mention many essential qualities of teacher and student, a student need not have many qualities; it is enough if he just has devotion. He quickly produced a realization of the Great Seal even in the minds of some unintelligent, poverty-stricken or evil persons. He also composed a treatise on the stages of doctrine of the bkA'-gdam tradition,20 while teaching many practical instructions too. Therefore it was famed that from this time the two rivers of bkA'-gdam-pa and Great Seal became blended.

The 16th-century master gSgam-po spyan-snga bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal (1513-1596?) similarly explained.21

Though in the practice-lineage down to the great Reverend [Mi-la] they mainly cultivated in meditation the instructions of the Mantrayānā and taught the practical instructions on the Great Seal appropriately at the times of [instructions on] Inner Heat (gtum mo) and Luminous

---

19 The Lhan cig skyes sbyor is an instruction which on several levels applied (sbyor) Emptiness as inately and simultaneously arisen (thabs cig skyes). See gSgam-po-pa's Collected Writings, vol. 1, p. 219-224, which is identified as this work by S. Karmay (1988), p. 144, n. 39. It is explicitly said to be a high tantric instruction.

20 Evidently this refers to his famous bstan rtsis treatise, the Thar pa rin po che'i lugs.

21 bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, gSgam-po spyan-snga, p. 216 (108b): 'on kyang rje btsun chen po yon gi sgrub bskyed la gsum snyags kyi man ngag mams gta bo sgrub mngol/ gsum mo dang 'od gsal la sogs pa'i skabs ci rigs su phyag rgya chen po'i gdam pa ston par mdzad pa las/ rje sgrum po pa de tshad med ma'ti thugs rjes kun nas blang stel grol bya mchog dman thams cad kyi rtags sia ba'i ched cul sning po don gi gsum pa phyag rgya chen po 'di nyid rnal du phyag ste bstan pas shin tu 'phel zhih ngays pa dang/ skal pa cen thams cad kyi byod pa bcig pa'i lam du gyer pa yin nol/. Cf. the English translation by L. Lhalungpa, p. 119.
pointing out of the nature of mind, i.e. the "[singly and] instantly decisive" (chig chod) Great Seal.25

Some other masters of the Dwags-po bKa'-brgyud likewise specified that this direct pointing out or seeing of the nature of mind was sGam-po-pa’s specialty, and that this was his dkar po chig thub that later scholars such as Sa-paṅ criticized. The 13th-century ’Bri-gung-po commentator rDo-rje-shes-rab, for instance, stated in his dGongs gcig commentary.26

The Lord sGam-po-pa, using an example from medicine said: “This 'seeing of the nature of mind' of mine is called the 'self-sufficient white [remedy].’”

Bla-ma Zhang (Zhang g.Yu-brag-po brTson-grus-grags-pa, 1123-1193), too, indirectly alluded to the important role of the "pointing out" or "introduction to" (ngo sprobd) in sGam-po-pa’s method by characterizing the Dags-po system as "The introduction to the Great Seal in the tradition of Dags-po-ba,” contrasting it with the other lineages of the Great Seal Instructions (phyag rgya chen po'i man ngtag).27 A little later (p. 557.4), he characterized it as "the pointing out of 'original mind,' Dags-po's making it seen in its naked [essence]" (ngnyug ma'i ngo sprobd dags pos gcer mthong byed).

That sGam-po-pa had laid a special emphasis on the direct introduction to mind was stressed even more strongly by sGam-po-pa’s "grand-pupil" ’Bri-gung ’Jig-rtsen-mgon-po. The latter stated once that from among the many Indian mahāsiddhas, Tog-rtse-pa ("Mattock-man" *Koṭālipa?) was the only one in India who directly pointed out Mind. In the same way, from among the numerous Tibetan adepts, sGam-po-pa was the only one to do likewise.28

22 sGam-po-pa, Collected Writings, vol. 1, p. 453: rnying gis rnam ma rtags na sangs mi rgyal nga ni bsi'gyur bzung ba bas byang rser rtags pa la risis che gcang.

23 sGam-po-pa, Collected Writings, vol. 111.7: phyag zang gi rser kyi ngo bo cir yang ma gnyub par shes nall deli ngag [112] la bzhag pa de las thog pa ci yang med del mam par rtag pa phra mo byang yang mi [s]toll de rang la bitas pas tshur log nas 'ongsh sens kyi ngo bo ci yang ma yin pa las thog pa gyang yang med del....

24 dPa'-bo gTsug-lag-phyub-nga, vol. 1, p. 797f: sku the smead la rser [800] kyi ngo bo ston pa phyag rgya chen po chig chod khe na gso bo mzas del.

25 The term chig chod was used in sGam-po-pa's Great Seal (Phyang-chen) tradition along with chig thub. It also occurs in Great Perfection (rDzogs-chen) writings with reference to their theory (ita ba) such as in the Great Perfection tantra the Seng ge rtseal rdzongs chen po'i rgyud, rNyings ma'i rgyud bca bdun, vol. 2, p. 247.3: dngos pa rang gnas ye shes chig chod kyi ila ba, and p. 248: chig chod kyi ila ba.

26 rDo-rje-shes-rab, Khyad par ila bsgom spod pa'i thogs. [dGongs gcig 'grel pa rdo shes ma], dGongs gcig yig cha, vol. 2, p. 407 (22b): rje sgram po pas smon la dpe byas nas nag'i rser kyi ngo bo mthong ba 'di rkar po gcig thub bya ba yin gcang

27 Zhang, Writings, p. 550.2: dags po bo'i lugs kyi phyag rgya chen po ngo sprod.

A telling event from very late in sGam-po-pa's life is also recorded in the Blue Annals in this connection:29

In the end, when [sGam-po-pa] was passing into Nirvāṇa in the water-female-hen year (1153), two monks each holding a sacrificial cake (ball) in their hands approached, calling out: "We two request instructions on the Path of Means, so pray compassionately accept us!" "Don't let them come near," sGam-po-pa replied. Then one of his attendants advised them: "You should call out saying you are requesting the Great Seal!" Accordingly, those two also shouted out for a long time: "But we are requesting the Great Seal, sir!" Therefore sGam-po-pa said, "Now send them in," and he let them in, and also bestowed upon them the instructions of the Great Seal. In this way he brought up the Great Seal alone from among his teachings.

rJe sGam-po-pa had discovered within himself the treasure of innate wisdom, and for him it was also essential to try to convey it to others. And convey it he did, on a scale never before attempted within his lineage. To do so, he bent the traditional rules restricting how certain Vajrayāna teachings could be transmitted. He did this out of compassion for his students, in order to establish them in what was most important: profound meditative practice and insight. As he once remarked to his disciple Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa:30

"I have broken the command of my master, Mi-la." "How so, sir?" asked [Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa]. "By expounding all the teachings to people." On another occasion he remarked: "I have obeyed the command of my master." "How so, sir?" asked his student. "By devoting this entire life to practice."

sGam-po-pa's Classification of the Great Seal

sGam-po-pa did not, of course, completely reject the old tantric classifications of the Great Seal or the traditional methods for introducing it. Some of his teachings given in the more usual tantric doctrinal context follow the standard formulations, as for instance his public lecture entitled Tshogs chos legs mdzes ma, in which he contrasts the Pāramitāyāna as a "path of accumulation" (tshogs kyi lam) with the Mantrayāna, which is a "path of means" (thabs kyi lam). There he gives what must have been for him a very standard and doctrinaire summary outline of Buddhist systems.31

I. Vehicle of the Śrāvaka (nyan thos kyi theg pa)
II. Vehicle of the Pratyeka (rang sangs rgyas kyi theg pa)
III. The Great Vehicle (theg pa chen po)

A. The Perfections [Vehicle], the Path of Preparatory Accumulation (pha rol tu phyin pa tshogs kyi lam)
1. Mind-Only (sems tsam)
   a. The scriptural tradition maintaining that the cognitive image is true (rnam par bden pa'i gzhung lugs)
   b. The scriptural tradition maintaining that the cognitive image is false (rnam par rdzaun par 'dod pa'i gzhung lugs)
2. Madhyamaka (dbu ma)
   a. "Like an Illusion" (sgyu ma lta bu)
   b. "Not stationed anywhere" (rab tu mi gnas pa)
      i. "Integration in which one does not station oneself anywhere" (zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa)
      ii. "Interruption in which one does not station oneself anywhere" (rgyud chad rab tu mi gnas pa gzhung)

B. The Mantra [Vehicle], a Path of Means (gsang snyags thabs kyi lam)
1. Old versus New [Tantras] (gsar ma/ rnying ma)
2. Outer versus Inner [Tantras] (phyi pa/ nang pa)
3. Father Tantra versus Mother Tantra (pha rgyud/ ma rgyud), etc.

---

30 sGam-po-pa, Writings, vol. 1, p. 446: ngas bla ma mi la'i bka' bcag gzung de tsgug lags zhus pas'i ngas chos thams cad mi la bshad pas gzung' yang dus cig tsa nal' ngas bla ma'i bka' bzhin sgrubs gzung de tsgug lags zhus pas'i ngas mi tsho zad na sgrub pa byas pas gzung ngol.

31 See sGam-po-pa, Tshogs chos legs mdzes ma, Writings, vol. 1, pp. 171-2: ...'jug pa'i sgo bsmi gwis mi khyab pa cig yod kyang'/ bsdu na gsum yin / nyan thos kyi theg pa'i sgor zhus pa dang/ rang sangs rgyas kyi theg pa'i sgor zhus pa dang/ theg pa chen pa'i sgor zhus nas nyams su ten pa'ol/ de la' jug pa'i sgo theg pa gsum yod kyang/ da res nyan rang gi theg pa de mi ston'/ theg pa chen pa'i sgor zhus na sgrub pa nyams su ten pa'i thabs cig stong/ de la yang dbye na gzhung lugs mangs du yod del/ sems tsam mam par bden pa'i gzhung lugs dang/ mam par rdzin par 'dod pa'i gzhung lugs dang gnyis/ dbu ma la sgru ma dang [siec] lla bu dang rab tu mi gnas pa'ol/ de las zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa dang/ rgyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa'i gzhung dang/ gsang snyags la yang [p. 170] gsar ma dang/ rnying ma dang/ phyi pa dang nang pa/ pha rgyud ma rgyud la sogs pa mang du yod kyang/ bsdu na gnyis pha rol tu phyin pa tshogs kyi lam dang/ gsang snyags thabs kyi lam mol.
In this discourse, sGam-po-pa in the end set forth the tantric path, which he characterized as 'the tantric path of means that makes one realize through direct cognition the innate simultaneously arisen gnosia, having identified the correct gnosia on the basis of the 'warmth' of the guru's sustaining spiritual impulse.'32

In another discussion, he enumerated a series of pairs of usual doctrinal classifications, showing the place of both the Great Seal (Phyag-chen) and the Great Perfection (rDzogs-chen: an old Tibetan 'innateist' and 'simultanist' tradition) at the pinnacle of Mantrayāna Completion Stage (rDzogs Rin) practice. The scheme he utilized could be outlined as follows:33

I. Interpretable meaning, conducive to good rebirths
II. Definitive meaning, conducive to clearing away being born
   A. Vehicles of the Śrāvaka and Pratyeka
   B. Great Vehicle
      1. Perfection
         2. Resultant Mantra
            a. Production Stage
            b. Completion Stage
               i. Great Perfection (rDzogs-chen)
               ii. Great Seal (Phyag-chen, Mahāmudrā)

32 sGam-po-pa, vol. 1, p. 172.2: bla ma'i byin brolbs kyi drad la rten nas! yang dag pa'i ye shes ngos zin tel than cig skyes pa'i ye shes ngon ngon smin du rtogs par byed pa'i gsang sngags thabs kyi lam.

33 sGam-po-pa, Writings, vol. 1, pp. 219-220; bka' sde snod rin po che mam pa gsum gyi chos spo ti ri ngag thun pa cig yod kyang! de thams cad kyi byod bya'i don bsdu na gnyis! drang don skye bar [ =ba] bzung bar byed pa'ichos dang! nges don skye ba 'dag par byed pa'i choi sol ... nges don la dbye na gsum yod pa las! nyan rang gs [ =gi] theg pa mi stonl! theg pa chen po'i gsum ngag cig stonl! de la gnyis! pha rol tu phyin pa'i theg pa dang! gsang sngags 'bras bu'i theg pa'ol! da res dang po de mi stonl! gnyis pal gsang sngags [220] 'bras bu'i theg pa de stonl! de la gnyis! bkshed pa'i rim pa'i gsum ngag dang rDzogs pa'i rim pa'i gsum ngag gsum yod pa las! 'dir bkshed rim mi stonl rDzogs pa'i rim pa'i gsum ngag gsum yod pa las! de la gnyis! rDzogs pa chen po'i man ngag dang phyag rgya chen po'i man ngag gsum yod pa las! 'dir phyag rgya chen po'i gsum ngag stonl! de la yang dri bcas dang dri ma med pa gsum yod pa las! 'dir dri ma med pa'i gsum ngag cig stonl. This work is identified as the Lhan cig skyes sbyor by S. Karmay (1988), p. 144, n. 38.

34 In another context, sGam-po-pa linked the distinction between provisional and definitive meaning to that between method and discriminative understanding. See his Writings, Vol. 1, p. 241: drang don thabs kyi lam nyams su len pa dang/ nges don gnas lugs rtogs par byed pa' shes rab kyi lam.

Classifications of the Great Seal

(A) With Impurities (dri bcas)
(B) Free from Impurities (dri ma med pa)

Here the Great Seal and Great Perfection are found as instructions of the Tantric Completion Stage, and this classification scheme would accordingly have been more or less acceptable to followers of the mainstream "New-School" (gsar ma pa) Mantrayāna traditions such as Sa-pa, since it was in harmony with some of the main gSar-ma-pa systems of tantric practice, such as the "Path with its Fruit" (Lam 'bras) instructions. sGam-po-pa expressed similar ideas elsewhere too, sometimes portraying the Great Perfection as occupying a parallel doctrinal position to the Great Seal as one of two practical instructions (man ngag) of the Mantrayāna completion stage (rDzogs rin).

A Śūtra-Tradition Great Seal

One of sGam-po-pa's departures from tradition was apparently his propagating a Śūtra method of the Great Seal, as distinct from the above-mentioned Tantric Great Seal.35 One of his bKa'-gdams-pa contemporaries is said by later authorities to have maintained that the Śūtra basis for sGam-po-pa's special Great Seal teaching could be found in the Samādhīrāja Śūtra.36 (sGam-po-pa himself was traditionally recognized as being the rebirth of the Buddha's disciple Zla-'od-gzhan-nu, or Candraprabha Kumāra as he is known in Sanskrit, who pledged to

35 This is also implied by the statement of 'Gos lo-tsa-ba quoted above: "... He gave instructions on the Great Seal to those who were suitable as recipients of the Perfection-Vehicle (Pāramitāyāna) teachings, even though they had not received Tantric initiation."

36 'Gos lo-tsa-ba, rna 21b-22a; G. Roerich transl., pp. 451f. The first Pan-chen Rin-poche likewise held that the Śūtra basis for a Great Seal teaching could be found in this Śūtra, in the line: chos mams kun gi rang bzhin phyag rgya che! See Gung-thang dKon-mchog-bstan-pa'-sgron-mc, vol. 3, p. 578.3 (8b): pan chen rin po che! mdo ting nge 'dzin rgyal por! chos mams kun gi rang bzhin phyag rgya che! zhes pa khungs su mza! nas mdo lugs la'ang phyag chen gi tha snyad zhal gyis bzhes lal. The word in the Śūtra, however, is simply mūdā, and not māhāmudrā. See Pekcing no. 795, vol. 31, p. 275.1.5 (rdo thu 7a) and vol. 32, p. 33.3 (rdo thu 182a.8): de la thams cad kyi phyag rgya gang zhe nall. See also Dutt, Skt. ed., pp. 21.15 and 643.1; cf. pp. 234.11 and 249.3, where the word mūdā also appears.
become that Sūtra's later propagator.)

Such a Sūtra-based method would have the advantage of avoiding the complicated ritual and practical preparations required for both Vajrayāna teacher and student, and it would widen the range of those who might be taught. But on the other hand it would require the lengthy training of students through the gradual stages of the Mahāyāna.

The later sympathetic dGe-lugs-pa master ICang-skyi Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje (1717-1786) accepted that sGam-po-pa had taught both Sūtra and Tantra methods.

The one who made very famous the terminology of practical instructions called the "Great Seal" was the matchless sGam-po-pa. In the latter's writings there are mentioned two methods for introducing the theory: (1) the tradition of the Perfections Vehicle and (2) the tradition of Mantra, and indeed he applied the term "Instruction in the Great Seal" to both. He also composed treatise[s] that demonstrated, through the quotation of many Sūtras, such points as how within the tradition of the Perfections Vehicle there exists the [authoritative, canonical] teaching of Emptiness as being the Great Seal.

And this was also the opinion of certain bkA'-brgyud-pa masters, with whom bkRa-shis-rnam-rgyal disagreed. One finds the 15th-century translator and scholar 'Gos-lo gZhon-nu-dpal concluding his history of the Mar-pa and Dwags-po bkA'-brgyud with precisely a discussion of this point.

Regarding the realization of the Great Seal, during the time of Mar-pa and Mid-la, [the masters] produced first the Gnosis of inner heat, and then by virtue of that, the realization of the Great Seal. And hence they held it also to be the Perfection Stage [of the Anuttarayoga Tantras]. Dags-po rin-po-che [sGam-po-pa]'s producing a realization of the Great Seal even in those beginners who had not received Tantric initiation was the tradition of the [general Mahāyāna] Perfections. Moreover, Dags-po rin-po-che said to Phag-mo-gru-pa, "The basic text of this Great Seal of ours is this Mahāyānottaratantra Śāstra [Ratnagotravibhūga] composed by the Lord Maitreyan." The illustrious Phag-mo-gru-pa too stated the same thing to 'Bri-khung-pa, and consequently in the writings of Lord 'Bri-khung-pa [Jig-ret-mgon-po] and his disciples there appear many expositions of the Mahāyānottaratantra Śāstra.

In sGam-po-pa's writings a few clearly non-Tantric or "Sūtra-class" instructions of this nature can be found. One example is found among his minor works. It is a teaching that he classified from the beginning as "gradualist" (rim gyis pa), though not specifying at the outset whether it belonged to Sūtra or Tantra.

\[\text{lal. The same author, ibid., points out that sGam-po-pa clearly did teach a Great Seal tradition which did not rely on the Mantrayāna.}\]

\[\text{40} '\text{Gos lo-tsa-ba, p. 632 (nya 141b): phyag rgya chen po'i rigs pa de yang mar pa dang rje btsun mii la gyis kyis rgyis kyi rinp lai snog du gsum mo'gye shes bya baksey nyal} de'stobs kyis phyag rgya chen po'i ngos pa baksey par mdzad pa rtags pa'ri rim par yang bzhed doll dag po rin po che ni] lai dang po pa dbang bskur ma thob pa dag la yang phyag rgya chen po'i nyos pa baksey par mdzad pa ni pha rol tu phyin pa'i lugs tel de yang dag po rin po ches dPal phyag mo grub pa la]' \text{lo skol gyi phyag rgya chen po'i gyung ni becom idan 'das byams pas mdzad pa'eying po chen po phyag mo grub pa la mtha bstan bcos 'di yin zhes gsum sbing/ dPal phyag mo grub pa la yang bzhed] rje 'bri khung pa la de skad du gsums pa' rje 'bri khung pa dpom stob kyi gsum rabs mams su theg pa chen po phyag mo grub pa la tshad pa mang du 'byung ba de yin nor}.\]

See also M. Brodow (1985), p. 12f. Cf. the comments in G. Roerich transl., p. 725, probably originating from dGe-'dun-chos-phel, that "Present day Tibetan scholars, especially those belonging to the dGe-lugs-pa school, do not admit the mahāmādra doctrine as belonging to the Sūtra class." But he mentions the existence of the "dGe-laden phyag-chen."

\[\text{41 sGam-po-pa, Writings, vol. 1, pp. 203.7ff. This instruction is noteworthy for the}\]
Sūtras of a certain orientation.

Here on the threshold of the Great Seal, he still keeps one foot in the general Mahāyāna. The question is raised: "Is then such understanding to be cultivated, if every factor of existence is after all empty?" Indeed, it is, replies sGam-po-pa. For example, even though silver ore has the nature of silver, until you smelt it, the silver will not appear. If you want molten silver, you must smelt the silver ore.46 So, too, even though all factors of existence have from the very first had Emptiness as their nature, they appear to sentient beings as various objects and are experienced as various sufferings. Therefore this knowledge must be cultivated.47

But then he makes a significant shift away from the normal Mahāyāna standpoint. In the following sub-section of the same chapter—namely the sub-section dealing with the post-meditation practice (jes thob)—he sets forth a radically transformed view. Though he urged from the start that the meditator should cultivate merit as much as possible through the Perfections such as generosity,48 he then goes on to teach that all religious practices are included within just the seeing the nature of mind. Giving here a foretaste of the "fruit" and "simultaneist" viewpoint, he quotes several Tantras as well as a few Sūtras of a special orientation.49 Then he concludes on the note that the foregoing gradualist teachings were only intended for the spiritually ill-equipped. And it is in this section that we find him saying (as quoted above):

If you dwell within the insight into the ultimate—Emptiness—for even a single moment, this is immeasurably more meritorious than studying, reciting texts, or performing such meritorious deeds as practicing

---

46 This is more or less the same image as "refining gold," on which see L. Gómez (1987), pp. 123f, et passim. Here I think dugul chu should be read as meaning "molten silver" (dugul thun ma) and not its more usual meaning, "quicksilver." Cf. the term khor chu for "molten metal or brass" and gser chu for "molten gold."


48 sGam-po-pa, Dam chos... [thar pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 263.3 (132a).

49 sGam-po-pa had already quoted one of the classic Indian Buddhist sources for innaicist introspection, attributing it to the Nam mkha' rin po che'i mdo. As is stated correctly in the cig car ba manual in Pelliot Tib. 116, p. 164.1, this verse comes from the rTen 'brel snying po (v. 7) of Nāgārjuna. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 85-6, n. 161. See also H. Guenther, transl., p. 215, note 154.
generosity. If a person possesses the insight into Emptiness, there is not a single thing not included within this factor. The path, consisting of the Six Perfections, is also completely present in this alone. For as the Sūtra of the Vajra Concentration (rDo rje ting nge 'dzin gyi mdo) *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra* states: "If you do not waver from Emptiness, this includes the six Perfections."

Here sGam-po-pa quotes from several Ch'an apocryphal Sūtras,

50 sGam-po-pa, Dan chos... [har pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 264.2 (132b): de ltar don dam shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa de'i ngyang la dar cig trams gnas na bskal pa'i bar du nyan pa'am klog pa'am dge ba'i rtsa ba sbyin pa la sogs pa byas pa bas bsdod nams dpag tu med pa che ba jin neli. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), p. 219.

51 sGam-po-pa, Dan chos... [har pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 265.6 (133a): de lta bu'i stong pa nyal kyi don dngan idan nal' chos 'di la ma' 'das pa ciq kyang med doll. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), p. 220.

52 Regarding the inclusion of all six perfections within one factor (such as the insight into Emptiness, or non-conceptualizing concentration), this was a common teaching of the cig car ba traditions. In Pelpliot Tib. 116 (111h.1) and 117 (verso 6.4) we find for instance a brief treatise attributed to Mo-ho-yen teaching just that, namely the: bSsam bstan byin nrog pa'nang du pha rol du phyin pa drug dang! bcd 'das pa bshad pa'i mdo. Cf. L. Gómez (1983), pp. 79-80 and 121. In his third Bhavanākrama (Skt. pp. 25-6), Kamalāśūtra refuted the thesis that the Six Perfections are included within Dhyāna. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 95, n. 180; 183f and 206. In the Tibetan translation the same objection is stated (P. 5312 sGom pa'i rim pa p. 41.17 [dub ma a 72a]): gel te bSAM gstan ngyi du pha rol tu phyin pa drug 'das pa na des bsten pas pha rol tu phyin pa thams cad bston par 'gyur tel dtel' phyin sbyin pa la sogs pa gshang so ser bsten mi dgos pa skad du bya na yangi de mi rung stel...

sGam-po-pa, Dan chos... [har pa rin po che'i rgyan], p. 267.5 (134a): lta pha rol tu phyin pa drug kyang 'di nyal la shang stel' rdo rje ting nge 'dzin gyi mdo lsal' stong pa nyal la[n] ma gyos nal' pha rol phyin pa drug 'das söl' zhes gnyas söl. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), pp. 221-22.

Studies on these Sūtras are mentioned by Daishun Ueyama (1983), pp. 332f namely the articles of Hironobu Obata (1974) and (1975). Obata interprets the evidence from the Tun Huang manuscripts Pelpliot Tib. 116, 117, 812 and 813 as indicating that a lineage of the Pao Tang School, the tradition of the Ch'an master Wu-chu, had arrived in Tibet via the kingdom of Nan-chao before the time of the bSam-yas debate. In his second article, 18K 25 (2), pp. 170-71, Obata studied nine such 'Sūtras' or similar works found in Tibetan translation, listing them by Chinese titles, giving Taisō numbers, locating most in the IDan kar ma catalogue (nos. 253, 154, 573, 259, 257, 260 and 614), and in the Peking Kanjur (P. nos. 803, 909, 902-3, 930, 922, 805), and indicating where they were quoted in this article from the Tun Huang documents. I am indebted to Ms. Chizuko Yoshimizu for help with this article.

See also J. Broughton (1983), p. 48, n. 6. Here one finds quotations for instances from the gTsug gor chen po'i mdo (the Chinese composition Ta fo-t'ing ching) and the Phyogs su ngags po'i mdo (the Chinese composition Fang-kuang ching). The latter quotation is given including a few, such as the just-cited rDo rje ting nge 'dzin gyi mdo (*Vajrasamādhi Sūtra*), that had been translated at an early time into Tibetan from Chinese and included in later Tibetan canons. Some of these same sources or quotations had been included in a very early Tibetan handbook for practitioners of the (cig car ba) "Mahāyoga" (Tibetan Ch'an) that has been recovered form Tun Huang, and probably they were transmitted by later Tibetan cig car ba traditions. The presence

by sGam-po-pa, but attributed to the Las mam par dag pa'i mdo (Cf. Guenther, transl. p. 223). sGam-po-pa, p. 269.1 (135a):

55 In vol. 32 of the reprinted Peking Kanjur (mdo sna thogs, da), for instance, the "Vajrasamādhi Sūtra" appears, though in its Tibetan title it is called not a "mdo," but rather a 'chos kyi yi ge ('Dharma text'), and it is indicated as having been translated from Chinese. The above quotation is given on f. 131a.5: ngo bo mdo rdos rje drug mthabs pa dkon mchog gsumi mi zhi sde! stong po'i chos mants mi gso brtsa phyin pa drug dang idan mdo. This same quotation is passed by bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, f. 102a; see also L. Lhalungpa transl., p. 113.

R. Buswell (1990), p. 23, describes the work as a "syncretistic apocryphon containing pronounced Ch'an elements," and in a recent book devoted the subject (*The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi Sūtra*, Princeton, 1989) he has compared "catalogue evidence about the dissemination of the text with legendary accounts of its recovery to show that it was written in Korea, sometime around 665 C.E., by an early adept of the Korean Son (Zen) tradition." As Buswell further remarks (ibid.): "Introduced some three decades later into China and then into Tibet, the sutra influenced the subsequent development of the Chinese Ch'an and Tibetan nyiHyung ma-schools.

56 Pelpliot Tib. 116, dHyigs su med pa tshul gic po'i gshung.

57 Some of these works were listed in the IDan kar ma catalogue, and passages were quoted in early Tibetan cig car ba writings. L. Gómez (1983a), p. 401, cites the quotation of the rDo rje ting nge 'dzin in Vimalakīrti's *Cig car jug pa'i mram par mi rong pa'i bsdom don.* Cf. its quotation in gNubs Sangs rgyas-ye'sha's bSsam gstan mig mgyur, p. 162.2.
of such quotations in sGam-po-pa’s general writings had been noticed by certain Tibetan scholars, as alluded to for instance by Thu’u-bkwam Chos-kyi-nyi-ma, who himself attached no particular importance to them:

Regarding the matchless Dwags-po rin-po-che’s [i.e. sGam-po-pa’s] composition of treatises proving the existence of the [Buddha’s] teaching of emptiness in the Perfections (Pāramitā) tradition to be the Great Seal by quoting many Sūtras quotations, some have said: “Such words of the Sūtras do not appear in the canon of the translated Word (bka’ ‘gyur).”

Nevertheless [regarding this] my omniscient Guru has said: “Those Sūtras are found within the canon of the translated Word translated into Chinese. And though they are not worded in exactly identical ways, [passages with] the same sense can be seen also in some other Sūtras translated into Tibetan, such as the Pratypatannabuddhasam-mukhâvasthita[smadâhu] Sūtra (Da ltar gyi sangs rgyas mgon sum du bzhugs pa’i [ting nge ’dzin gyi] mdo).”

The presence of these quotes does, however, raise several questions: Where did sGam-po-pa receive these traditions from? Did he have direct access to Chinese materials that had been suppressed in the late 8th century? Or did he merely learn them from some intermediate source, such as from the writings of one of the early Tibetan Ch’an-influenced “simultaneist” (cig car ba) traditions such as are recorded in the bSam gtan mig sron of gNubs Sangs-rgyas-ye-shes? It seems unlikely that he would have come upon them merely through a random reading of Sūtras.

A Great Seal beyond Sūtra and Tantra

Though some clear indications of a “Sūtra-tradition” (mdo lugs) or “Sūtra-path” (mdo lam) Great Seal presentation method can thus be found in sGam-po-pa’s works, such a terminology may not have actually originated with him. In fact, the 16th-century Dwags-po bKra-shis-brgyud master sGam-po spyan-snga bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal asserted that such a twofold division of the Great Seal teaching method into Sūtra and Tantra had not been sGam-po-pa’s original teachings. Indeed, bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal maintained that such a division was introduced only by later followers of the tradition, though he himself took pains to try to show that the highest Great Seal instructions were not based on Tantric mysticism.58 sGam-po-pa’s real position, according to bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, was that the Great Seal was a third doctrinal class quite outside all other usual doctrinal classifications, including both Sūtra and Tantra. The latter quoted sGam-po-pa as maintaining the Great Seal to be a third (or even fourth) class of teachings that was quite extrinsic to both non-Tantric Mahāyāna and Tantra,60 and in sGam-po-pa’s own writings one finds several interesting expressions of these notions.61 In his answers to his disciple the Karma-pa Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa, sGam-po-pa discriminated the following three approaches to Buddhist practice.62

---


60 See, for instance, bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, sGam-po-spyan-snga, Ngas don, p. 101a (L. Lhalungpa transl. [1986], pp. 110-112), who quotes sGam-po-pa. sGam-po spyan-snga bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal represents sGam-po-pa as having held precisely that the Great Seal was a doctrine independent of the Sūtras and Tantras. See L. Lhalungpa transl., p. 112. As mentioned above, it was bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal’s view that the integration of the teachings into the Sūtra and Tantra systems was a development introduced later by followers of the tradition. See also sGam-po-pa, Tshogs chos yon tan phun thogs, pp. 268.6 and 283.5. But as also mentioned above, the 8th Karma-pa Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje rejected the view expressed in the writings of certain other bKa’-brgyud-pas that the Great Seal linked to Tantric mysticism was in any way inferior to the non-Tantric Great Seal.

61 sGam-po-pa, Dus gsum mkhyen pa’i zhis lan, p. 438 and Writings, vol. 1, p. 268. Some later Dwags-po-bKra-brgyud-pas (especially within the ‘Brig-gung-pa tradition) in certain contexts have not maintained such a threefold scheme because of the unacceptable doctrinal difficulties it would entail (at least in the context of general Mahāyāna doctrinal discussions). See, for instance, ‘Brig-gung rig’-dzin Chos-kyi-grags-pa, p. 45 (23a): mdo snags go’i las chad pa’i lam chig yod na nrogs pa’i sangs rgyas kyi ma gungo pa’i lam du thal bas, and rDo-rje-shes-rab, vol. 1, p. 396.1 (nrg 25a.1).

62 sGam-po-pa, Dus gsum mkhyen pa’i zhis lan, p. 438.6: lam mam pa gsum du ’gro gung ngo’i rjes dpag lam du byed pa dang’ byin bralbs lam du byed pa dang’ mgon sum lam du byed pa gsum yin gung’ m phyit ba’i tshug lam pa rin po tshug pa n nges dpag lam du
1) The "definition" (i.e. scholastic general Mahāyāna) path of the Perfections (pāramitā), which takes inference for its path (rjes dpag lam du byed pa = mtshan nyid lam pha rol tu phyin pa)

2) The Mahāyāna Mantra method, which takes [the guru’s] sustaining spiritual power for its path, based on the stages of generation and completion (byin bralbs lam du byed pa = theg chen gsang snyags)

3) The innately and simultaneously arising luminosity of mind [of the Great Seal], which takes direct perception (pratyakṣa) for its path (mgon sum lam du byed pa = lhan cig skyes pa ‘od gsal [phyag chen])

He further asserted that there are two types of individuals who enter these three paths, namely the gradualist (rim gyis pa) and simultaneist (cig car ba).

The Great Seal is shown to be the highest or ultimate in this scheme by its final position in the threefold enumeration. The key difference that sets it apart here and makes it supreme is what it uses as its special cognitive method, namely direct, non-conceptual perception (the pramāṇa of pratyakṣa)—as opposed to inference or the spiritual power of the master. (In most other contexts, however, the guru’s propelling power or sustaining spiritual impulse is highly stressed as essential for the Great Seal.)

sGam-po-pa comes back to this topic in a subsequent passage, where he speaks of the characteristic practices used by three distinct traditions—(1) the Perfections, (2) Mantra, and (3) "my tradition"—for giving rise to realization (rtogs pa) in the mind. He states:

By the tradition of the Perfections, realization arises in the mind based on the trio of the Thought of Awakening (bodhicitta), [the insight of] "Like an illusion," and Emptiness. By the Mantra tradition, realization arises in the mind based on the trio of the body as deity, voice as mantra, and mind as Ultimate Reality. If you don’t realize it, you don’t attain Buddhahood. By my tradition, [descriptive phrase missing?], by this way of practicing religion, there is no going down, only going upwards. Those of sharpest faculties become Buddhas. Those of middling [faculties] will be born in the five abodes of the

63 sGam-po-pa, Dus gsum mkhyen pa’i zin la, pp. 480.2: pha rol tu phyin pa’i lugs kyi! byang chub kyi sems dang sngag ma lia bu dang! stong pa gsum la rten nas nrog pa rgyud la ’khangs! snyags kyi lugs kyi las bhu! nrog bzhabs pa! yid chos nyid gsum la rten nas nrog pa rgyud la ’khangs! ni nrog sa sang mi rgyal! yu phu’i lugs kyi! chos kyi ’khyer lugs! ’dul yar la ’gro ba las mar la mi ’gro ba yin! dbang po ra bshang sngags pa yin! ’bring phugs pa’i gnas lgar skye ba yin! thu mar yang bshar skyes sngal!

64 sGam-po-pa, Writings, vol. 1, p. 268.6: lam mam pa gsum yin gtung’ de la mam pa gsum nil’ gshi spong ba’i lam ni nyon monga spong bar ‘dul! gnyen po ye shes rgyud la skye bar ‘dul pa nil pha rol tu phyin pa’i gsum pa’i! gshi sgrub ba ni gsang snyags tel ij kar sgrub nil! phyin snod kyi ‘jig rten ge’thal yat khang du bthal’ nang bu bzhid sems can la dang iha mtha bthal’ ba’i! bzung thams [298] cad bzhid rtor bthal’ nyon monga ye shes chen po’i gshi shes pa ni gsang snyag blu na med pa phyag rgya chen po’i don dam = lam?/ rdo rtags pa chen po’i don hell de yung ngs sprong nas chos thams cad la spon du yang med’i! thams cad sems kyi mam ‘phren yin! ’od gsal bar shes pa nil’ gshi shes pa yin gsang ngol

65 Here it is interesting to compare the remarks of D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 131, who in a different context distinguishes three general approaches within Buddhism: 1) a "gradualist" current (of the Sūtras and Sātras) including the "allopathic" use of counteragents and sādhic means, 2) an "innitiate" and "sceptical" tendency which uses a "Nature-curo-" based on the holistic and immediate recognition of Mind, and 3) the "homeopathic" methods of the Tantras by which the obstacles are cured by means of themselves.
cognitive and emotional defilements (kleśa) as the basis for the great Gnosis, is the ultimate reality of the highest Mantrayāna Great Seal, which is also the point of the Great Perfection (rdzogs chen).

The Great Seal and the Great Perfection

Some of the above conceptions are indeed similar to the Great Perfection system of theory and practice, and may have been partly borrowed from or influenced by it. The latter was an ancient Tibetan simultaneist tradition that characterized itself typically as, for instance, "the doctrine that transcends all those of Sātrayana and Vajrayāna." It, too, characterized bydiscounted the efficacy of scriptures, logic, language, concepts, and other ordinary means of knowledge. Why would it need them or other purposeful methods? The fruit was already perfectly complete in the primordial basis of mind; this was the gist of the "Great Perfection." A very early Great Perfection work, the sbsas pa'i rgyun chung, elaborates on the insignificant role intellect and words can play in this matter.

To what extent does something which is the profound Non-Conceptual immediately appear as an object of intellect? [Answer:] The experience of the profound Non-Conceptual, since it is an experience, is not just that [intellectual understanding]. When investigating the phenomenon as it actually is [i.e. phenomena-as-such, the ultimate], one phenomenon cannot get at [another] phenomenon. Therefore, no matter how profound the words are that one states, how could they ever be commensurate with the actual point [of ultimate reality]?

66 See S. Karmay (1988), p. 19. Here Karmay presents the contents of section 4 of the biography of the partly legendary founder of the rdzogs-chen, Vairocana, in which this quality is attributed to the rdzogs-chen doctrine of the legendairy Indian master dGa'-rab-rgod-je.

67 S. Karmay (1988), pp. 74-5:
ji tshan rtog myed zab mo zhi'ig blo'i yul du snang she na
myi rtog zab mo nyams myang bal' myong ba yin phur de nyid myin
ji bzhin ba'i chos brtsad del' chos la chos ni myi' jug bal
ji tshan zab mo'i shig brjod kyang don dang 'tskam par ga la 'gurul.

The 11th-century Great Perfection scholastic Rong-zom Paṇḍita in his defence of the Great Perfection stressed the need for faith over reasoning, and asserted that critical reasoning finds its application only within the sphere of those who maintain the existence of substantially existent entities: "These disproves through reasoning [of yours] are nothing more than the [fictive conceptual] objectifying of one thing standing in mutual opposition to another, by you who hold the theory that substantial entities exist." But what sort of mind could in fact apprehend the absolute? Rong-zom explained by discerning three classes of objects and their corresponding three types of intelligence or perceptual means. The first two types of knowledge functioned through the traditional Buddhist personality "aggregates" (skandha) of "apperception" (sannjñā) and "feeling" (vedanā), and the last would correspond to prajñā, which belongs to the skandha of "mental forces" (sannjñā): 69

(1) A conceptually determined object (dmigs pa) is known by intelligence that discriminates through (conceptually labeling) apperception.
(2) An immediately appearing thing (snang ba) is known by intelligence that discriminates through "feeling" [i.e. simple sense perception].
(3) The phenomenal mark of the ultimate is known by intelligence that discriminates through stainless discriminating understanding.

This three-fold analysis of Rong-zom's differs in details from those of sGam-po-pa, but it is similar in certain important respects—e.g. in its rejecting of conceptual means and claiming a third special means of knowledge for reaching its highest of insights.

On some occasions, sGam-po-pa seems in fact to identify the Great Seal and the Great Perfection in their essentials and to treat them as


69 Rong-zom, Theg pa chen po'i, p. 69a (?9a?): dmigs pa ni 'du shes kyi bye brag tu byas pas [pa'i] blo'i spyd yol lo' snang ba ni tsher has bye brag tu byas pas [pa'i] blo'i spyd yol lo' ngo bo nyid kyi mitshon nyid ni shes rab dri ma med pas bye brag tu byas pas [pa'i] blo'i spyd yol lo'. Quoted here from S. Karmay (1988), p. 128.

Here the term dmigs pa seems to stand for objects of conceptually determined knowledge. The term snang ba indicates the object of non-conceptual or pre-conceptual sense knowledge, and tsher ha "feeling" apparently indicates the most fundamental level of direct sense perception, the bare reaction resulting from contact.
being the same ultimate third path beyond the Paramitāyāna and Tantra. As seen above, he taught that the completion stage is revealed through direct instruction, and that it has two types: instructions of the Great Perfection and the Great Seal. Nevertheless, on still other occasions sGam-po-pa pointedly distanced himself from the radical and unrealistic claims of instant “realization” made by some Great Perfection yogins.

Distinguishing the Perfections Vehicle from Mantra Vehicle

sGam-po-pa used the above sets of doctrinal distinctions to classify the teachings and to orient the student for receiving instructions that would show the way beyond conceptualization and toward direct insight. His schema were nevertheless based upon conceptual distinctions that had been established within the general epistemological theories of the Indian Buddhist Pramāṇa tradition as well as from theories of Tantric practice and Mahāyāna Śūtra interpretation. Moreover, sGam-po-pa’s application of the Parāsitāyāna method alone as being limited to taking the object as a conceptually conceived universal or as an exterior apprehended object, and thus he there remained within a more traditional tantric context. In the first passage he drew a distinction between two classes of objects that each concentrates on in their investigations, namely between external, physical objects and internal, psychological objects:

What is the difference between the Perfections and Mantra [Vehicles]? The Perfections [Vehicle] is what is called “That which takes for its object the cognitive image of the exterior object.” That is because [its followers] dissolve and make empty exterior objects of sense apprehension by means of the reason of their being “devoid of one and many,” saying that if the apprehended objects have been thoroughly investigated, then the fetter of the apprehending subject will become loosened of itself, [as authoritative stated] “There being no apprehended object, there is no apprehending subject for that,” and thus they do not investigate the interior mind that apprehends. The [followers of] Mantra do not investigate external apprehended objects. They impress a seal. They say that the mind … is not established as any nature when one views what sort of nature it may have. That sense of its not being anything is what is called “awareness” (rig pa), and it is the object of experience for Gnosis, whereas this is not seen by a mind that conceptually thinks.

In the second such passage, which is much more corrupt in the available text, the distinction hinges rather on which of the two means of cognition of them was actually not ruthlessly anti-Tantric. At least twice in minor writings published with his public sermon the Tshogs chos yon tan phun tshogs, he specified the Perfections Vehicle (parāsitāyāna) method alone as being limited to taking the object as a conceptually conceived universal or as an exterior apprehended object, and thus he there remained within a more traditional tantric context. In the first passage he drew a distinction between two classes of objects that each concentrates on in their investigations, namely between external, physical objects and internal, psychological objects:

---

70 sGam-po-pa, vol. 1, p. 228: rDo zogs pa’i rim pa gsum[4] nang ston/ de la phyis/ rDo zogs pa chen po’i man ngag dang phyag rgya chen po gnyis yod pa las/ Sce also p. 301.2/ … phyag rgya chen po zer yang nung/ rDo zogs pa chen po zer yang nung stel/ de thams cad kyis/ dgos byed/ sems las su nung ba yin

71 See sGam-po-pa, Dus gsum mkhyen pa’i chos lan, p. 438-39. Here in his reply to the questions of the Karma-pa Dus-gsum-kyen-pa, sGam-po-pa portrayed the rDzogs-pa chen-po as following a more extreme simultaneous (cig-car-ba) doctrine. He relates a story according to which Mi-la rabs-pa is said to have balked the radical rDzogs-chen-pa claims of instant Awakening. Mi-la is said to have pointed to a little boy of about five years of age and said: “The followers of the Great Perfection are like him.” It is like this child saying that he has the powers of a twenty-five-year-old [adult]. The followers of the Great Perfection too speak of ‘Buddhahood now,’’ but it is not really meaningful.” Elsewhere (Writings, vol. 1, p. 162) sGam-po-pa himself does use the simile of the immature human child—along with those of the lion cub and the new moon—as suitable for illustrating the meditator’s first glimpse of the Dharmakāya.

According to another characterization of the Great Perfection attributed to the dge-lugs brGya-yon-bdag appearing just before in the same work (p. 438.1), the rDzogs-chen-pa typically maintained: “If you attain realization (rigs) in the morning, you awaken to Buddhahood in the morning; if you attain realization in the evening, you awaken to Buddhahood in the evening” (nang rogs na nang sangs rgyal/ nu rogs na nub sangs rgyal). But it should be remembered that such claims were intrinsic to the so-called “fruit” (bras bu) instructions, such as the Thog bar precepts (attributed to Mtiraprapa). According to ‘Go lo tsas-ba, nya 12b (G. Roerich tr., p. 430), the great Mi-la rabs-pa first received the Great Perfection instructions from ‘Bre-ston Lha-dga’ at Rong, but without positive results. The latter then recommended that he go to Mar-pa, who introduced his disciples to the absolute through initiation rites.

72 sGam-po-pa, Writings, Vol. 1, p. 265.6: ’o na pha rol tu phin pa dang gsal sngags gnis kyis khyaad par gsal zhes nas pha rol tu phin pa ni don phyi[s]i/ mam pa yul du byed pa zhes bya stel/ phyis bzang ba’i yul/ ‘di cig dang du bral gyis gsum thigs kyis gshigs nas stonggs par byed/ bzang ba med cing der ‘dzin med/ bzang ba’i yul trul chod na ‘dzin pa’i sems sgrig rang brdal zer nas rang ‘dzin pa’i [p. 266] sems la rongs spyod [s-rongs dpod] mi gnos/ gsal sngags ni phyis gsal ba’i yul la rongs spyod mi gnos/ rongs sdebs byed/ sems … rang bzhin ci la bzh ‘dug bstan pas ci ngs nor yang ma grub stel’ de lta ba ci yang ma yin pa’i don de la rig pa zhes bya stel ye shes kyi spyod yul yin pa la/ mam rong gi blo mthong ba ma yin tel

73 Vasubandhu, Trimalkā 28d: gsal ba med pas de ‘dzin medll. Skt.: grāhyābhāive tadgṛhāit.
the object belongs to, i.e. whether it is the universal of conceptual thought and inference, or the particular sense data of direct perception.\footnote{74}

What is the difference between the Perfections and Mantra [Vehicles]? The Perfections [Vehicle] takes as its object the cognitive image of the object-universal. The Mantra takes the actual, direct object (read: *don dngos*) as the "path" [i.e. as the material for use in practice]. "Taking the cognitive image of the object-universal as the path" means the phenomenal mark of all factors of existence are dissolved by the [reasoning of] the absence of one and many, and thereby are unestablished. What is not established as "one" [i.e. as a single thing] is not established as an assemblage. Based on that, having made all factors of existence not established as either one or many, having mentally made [everything] as like the perfectly clear sky and then placing the mind conceptually [in such a state] is what is called "Taking the cognitive image of the object-universal as the object."

The taking of the actual, direct object (*don dngos*) as the path [i.e. as object, is the following]: The path of [yogic] means forcibly subdues, ...

Even when sGam-po-pa sometimes did teach the Great Seal in its traditional Mantrayāna context (i.e. as a "fruit" instruction of the "fruit" vehicle, in connection with the special yoga instructions of the completion stage), he believed that there was no single fixed order for introducing it. The teaching method depended on what type of student was to be taught. Once when he was asked by his student Phag-mo-gru-pa rDo-rje-rgyal-po whether it was better to teach "inner heat" (*gsum mo*) first and the Great Seal later, or in the reverse order, sGam-po-pa answered as follows, pointing out also the dangers of wrongly teaching it: \footnote{75}

Those two [methods] can be distinguished according to the class of individual [to be taught]. That is, for a youthful person with excellent [yogic] channels and elements (*rtsa dang kham*), signs of imminent attainment will come quickly through meditation after having been instructed in inner heat itself. By [then] imparting the Great Seal to him, experience will quickly arise. To a type of person whose psychic "air" (*rhang: prana*) is uncontrollable due to more advanced age, it is better to impart the Great Seal or the *Lhan cig skyes sbyor*.\footnote{76} By imparting the Great Seal from the beginning, it may happen that the student becomes set in wild or lazy ways (*dred pa*), having become bad in deeds when a realization of the Great Seal doesn't arise in the student's own mind.

Thus sGam-po-pa sometimes presented the Great Seal within the Mantra system of special yogas and on other occasions quite outside and removed from that system. Doctrinal justification for the latter approach could be found in the classification of the Great Seal as a separate and distinct third transmission outside of and superior to either of the two normally recognized doctrinal systems of the general Mahāyāna and the usual Mantrayāna.\footnote{77} In this third extraordinary context—which was accessible only to an unusually well-endowed student—the special doctrine was characterized as not relying upon words and concepts or upon special yogic practices or attainments, but as consisting of the disciple's being introduced directly to the nature of his mind by an accomplished, awakened master. The ordinary general Mahāyāna approach, by contrast, relied on scripture and reasoning, and therefore it was automatically suspect because of the inadequacies of the word- and concept-based salvific approaches and cognitive means that such scriptural and rational studies utilized.\footnote{78} sGam-po-pa in fact sometimes verges on criticizing

\begin{quote}
*po'am lhan cig skyes sbyor bta’ dpal sdels dang po nas phyag rgya chen po bta’ dpas rang rgyud la ma skyes par las la ngan du srong nas dpa’ yang long gung*
\end{quote}
even the "ordinary" Vajrayāna along the same lines. In one minor work we find him stating that expositions (bshad pa) of both the Sūtras and Tantras (as opposed to direct practical instructions, man ngag) degenerate or fall to the level of conceptualization (lit.: to the "cognitive image of an object-universal": don spyi’s mam pa la shor).79

All the teachings taught by the Buddha can be summed up within two categories: (1) the exposition of Sūtra and Tantra, for the sake of removing erroneous imputations regarding the object of knowledge, and (2) the exposition of the sense of practical instructions received through an oral transmission, for the sake of impressing the sense upon the mind. From among those two, the first degenerates to the level of the cognitive image of an object-universal, its object of knowledge. By becoming delayed in that, one doesn’t know how to impress it upon the mind and practice experientially. Because one does not know that, [the teaching] will not become the counteragent to the cognitive-emotional defilements and conceptual thinking. Therefore I will not expound [the first kind of teaching] here. The second type, namely the exposition of the sense of practical instructions received through an oral transmission, which is for the sake of impressing the sense upon the mind, is of two types: (a) instructions of provisional meaning, the gradualist path, and (b) the instructions of the definitive meaning, the path of the simultaneous.

Here, following widely established tradition, sGam-po-pa stresses the importance of direct, practical instructions (man ngag) as the sole means for applying the meaning or content of such teachings to the student’s mind in a way that constitutes direct experience. Among such instructions, the "gradualist" (rim gys pa) teaching is said there to be of

---

79 sGam-po-pa, Writings, vol. 1, p. 234.5: ...sangs rgyas kyi gsalings pa'i chos thams cd kyang bsdu na mam pa gnyis shes bya ba sgro 'dogs par bya ba'i phyir mdo rgyud kyi bshad pa dang! de'ang don rgyud la bka' ba'i phyir snyan snyan bsgad gdam ngag gi don bshad pa'i! de'ar yang gnyis yod pa las dang po ni! de'ar sbya bya don spyi's mam pa la shor! de la gyang pas rgyud thog tu bka' nas nyes su len ma she! de ma she pas nyo'ong mongs pa dang mams par rgyud pa'i gnyes por mi! 'gro bar 'chas pas dang po mi ston! gnyis pa rgyud la bka' ba'i phyir snyan bsgad kyi gdam ngag gi don bstan pa! de la gyan! 'phags don gi gdam ngag lam rim gya pas dang! ngas po don gi gdam ngag lam cig car ba gnyis las! dang po mi ston! See also his Tsogs chos bkra shis phun thogs, Writings, vol. 1, p. 150, where he states that for beginners to attain the awakening of Buddha-mind, there are only the two: the Perfection and Mantra approaches: las dang po pa'i bang zang cig sangs rgyas kyi sar 'gro ba la lam gnyis las medl! pha rol tu phyan pa'i lam dang! gsalings kyi lam gnyis yin gsal!

---

80 The statement attributed to sGam-po-pa that his Great Seal method was distinct from and superior to the "three great [traditions]" (chen po gsum) is discussed by S. Karmay (1988), p. 197, based on its occurrence in the dGongs geig commentary of dRo-je-shes-raw, pp. 403-404 (which Karmay attributes to Shes-raw-'byung-gnas). The same quotation appears for instance in Shakyā-mchog-ldan, Legs bshad gser ner, Collected Works, vol. 7, p. 84. Sum-pa mkhan-po said that such a threefold classification into the "Three Greats" was being maintained in his time by some who professed to follow Tsong-kha-pa, though Sum-pa himself rejected it. See S. C. Das ed. (1988), dTog bsam ltan bstan, p. 405. For further references to the "Three Greats" see also L. van der Kuij (1983), pp. 33 and 275, n. 109.

81 sGam-po-pa, dUs gsum mkhyen pa'i shus lan, p. 437.7: dge bshes brgya yon bdag gi zhal nas! hod na nom bu ba na muggar ba'is chos pa mang po yod del rdzogs pa chen [438] po zer ba cig yin [delete: yin y] nang nogs na sangs sngags nub nogs na nab sngags sngags zer ba tshan cig yod! mtsan nyan pa zer ba cig cig dang da bral gnis gis gis nas ngyi 'dis sngags rgya zer ba tshan cig yod! pha rol tu phyan pa zer ba thabs dang shes rab la bren nas ngyi 'dis sngags rgya zer ba tshan cig yod! 'sngags pa zer ba rtsa zung dang thig la dang! bskyed rdzog la bren nas ngyi 'dis sngags rgya zer ba tshan cig yod! bka' gsalings pa zer ba'i skyes bu rab 'bring mam pa gsum la bren pa'i gsalings ngag gi 'dis sngags rgya zer ba tshan cig yod del de tsho yo log nas ni hyed nga la bzlos dang gsalings de tsho yo log nas ni dge ba bci dge ba bci bsgar la las gsal md gsalings. sGam-po-pa advised him that if he did...
1) rDzogs-chan-pa ("Followers of the Great Perfection")
2) mTshan-nyid-pa ("Definitionists"), who dissolve false conceptions through reasoning
3) Pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa ("Perfectionists", i.e. followers of the Pāramitās), who stress [skillful] means and wisdom
4) sNgags-pa ("Tantricists," followers of Mantrayāna ritual and meditative practice)
5) bKa'-gdam-pa ("Those Enjoined by Instructions"), whose special instructions utilize the threefold division of personality types into great, middling and lesser (following the tradition of Atiśa).

This enumeration does not include sGam-po-pa's own Great Seal, which anyway would be understood as surpassing them all (including, interestingly enough, even the Great Perfection, which here is enumerated). This list is significant for its separate specifications of the dialectical (i.e. "definitional"), the "Perfections," and the bKa'-gdam-pa approaches. Thus, though in sGam-po-pa's threefold classifications described above, the "Definitional" (mTshan nyid) and "Perfections" (phar phyin) approaches seem to be more or less synonymous, occasionally sGam-po-pa differentiates them, too, as he does here. The scholars who worked intensively with definitions and logical relations, i.e. the dialectically oriented scholars (mTshan nyid pa) in the gSang-phu-ba tradition of rNgo-glo (1059-1109) and Phya-pa (1109-1169), were already by the mid-12th century recognized as a distinct and significant trend in the religious life of Tibet. sGam-po-pa in his reply to gSung-mkhyen-pa furthermore mentions the bKa'-gdam-pa, mTshan-nyid-pa and sNgags-pa masters as following meditative traditions quite distinct from his tradition of the Great Seal. Likewise in a passage from one of his biographies, sGam-po-pa mentions the dialectician "mTshan-nyid-pa" as distinct from bKa'-gdam-pas proper, though pointing to a fundamental similarity in their approaches, namely asserting that theirs is a mentally constructed Emptiness. sGam-po-pa claimed first-hand knowledge of the doctrines and practices of each of these traditions, and he considered his own approach to be distinct from and superior to them all; indeed, he proclaimed that the masters of the other traditions had no comprehension of his own meditation and insights, whereas he could understand theirs.

---

82 sGam-po-pa, Dus gsum, p. 453.3. After quoting a verse from dGon-pa-ba stressing the need for actual experience, he says: "It's like that. I have knowledge about meditation. I know what you geshes of the bKa'-gdam-pa, teachers of the mTshan-nyid-pa, Mantra practitioners and so on cultivate in meditation. But you don't have any idea what I cultivate in meditation!" The Tibetan text: de dang 'dra säd nga bogom pa la cha yod pa yin bka' gdam-pa'i dege lhes mams dangl mTshan nyid pa'i sion pa mams dangl sngags pa la sogs khyed cag ci bogom nga la cha yod nga ci bogom khyed cag la cha medl.

83 sGam-po-pa, Collected Works, vol. 1, p. 112.5: yang mTshan nyid pa'am bka' gdam-pa lkar 'gung 'dzin gnyis ka gshi ma gnub par skyed med du byas nasl snang ba sna tshogs dkar dmar 'di la yid kyi snang ba a cong che nal mig gs kyang ma mthong bar chos thams.
2

CRITICISMS OF INTELLECTUAL METHODS BY SGAM-PO-PA AND HIS SCHOOL

sGam-po-pa and his followers' presentation of the Great Seal as the ultimate path was thus part of an approach based on and aiming at a special non-conceptual and direct cognition of reality. In it, an accomplished teacher attempted to open the eyes of the student to a direct perception of the mind as the ultimate, by directly and dramatically unveiling the innate wisdom that had been present all along but that had not been recognized until it was pointed out. This approach was also anti-intellectual, or more precisely, "anti-verbal" and "anti-conceptual." It sought to utilize non-conceptual experience directly and to short-circuit or circumvent the mind's rational and verbalizing processes that distance the experiencer from directly seeing ultimate reality. It necessarily discouraged intellectual investigation or reflection. In order to convey this point, and to stress the special nature and superiority of this radically different approach, sGam-po-pa and his followers sometimes derided or sharply dismissed other methods, especially intellectual ones. Buddhists who utilized rational means—i.e. the scholars or "paṇḍita" who insisted on sound inferences and careful definitions of terms—became on these occasions objects for belittlement and sometimes even for withering scorn.

A mild example of such a rejection of intellectual methods is found in a reply sGam-po-pa made near the end of his life to his learned and accomplished Khams-pa disciple Phag-mo-gru-pa rDo-rje-rgyal-po. There sGam-po-pa spoke of the understanding he taught as being utterly beyond the range of intellectual understanding, being "unknown even by a greatly learned man or paṇḍita," saying that it only could arise through the grace of the teacher who transmitted it non-verbally.\(^{85}\)

---

85 sgam-po-pa, sde phag mo gru pa'i shis las, p. 471.7. See also M. Brodio (1985), p. 15. For the complete Tibetan text, see below, Appendix A, part (1). He made a similar
This is not known even by a learned pandita. It is not understood by discriminative understanding (praṇā). It is not within the scope of the dialectician’s activities. As for how this nature can be born within the mind: it arises without words, from [an experience] surpassing the [ordinary] mind, by the force of a sustaining spiritual power when the disciple has had faith and devotion toward a teacher who possesses realization. Its nature is free from any [conceptually framed] affirmation, even for the greatly learned scholars such as Nagārjuna.

This doctrine is not far from the position taken in the "fruit" instructions of the "Thunderbolt Strike" (thog babs) in which the fourth of the five erroneous notions to be dispelled before the direct instruction are given is the idea that realization (rtogs pa) is reached through intelligence (rig pa) or discriminative understanding (shes rab), because in this system realization is said to be reached only through the teacher’s direct, practical instruction (gdams ngag). It is also similar to the basic Great Perfection theory, which maintains that realization consists of directly seeing—without conceptualization—the mind’s primordial nature. To let intellect play any active role whatsoever would obscure the true nature further and would only go on increasing delusion through the fictive activities of conceptual thought.

On the limitations of the "pandita’s" word- and concept-based approach, one can find similar statements in the Tshogschoschenmo, a public sermon that was included in sGam-po-pa’s collected works but not set down in its final form until some generations after sGam-po-pa by dpal Shes-rab-gzhon-nu.

[Regarding this "ordinary knowing" (tha mal gyi shes pa) of the Great Seal, if one understands it, one has learned qualities (yon tan: gnaa) even greater than those of the pandita who is a master of the five fields of knowledge. The pandita takes the cognitive image of an "object-universal" (don spyi) as his cognitive object. He takes language as definitive. He is what is referred to as "knowing all, he is simply destitute." When you understand the above, that is what is referred to as "knowing one, he is learned in all."

Phag-mo-gru-pa on Intellectual Methods

sGam-po-pa’s disciple Phag-mo-gru-pa, to whom some of sGam-po-pa’s above-mentioned answers were directed, later wrote a general graded Mahāyāna treatise entitled Sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa la rim gyis ’jug pa'i tshul "How to Enter into the Buddha’s Doctrine by Stages." Like sGam-po-pa’s similar Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan ("Ornament of the Jewel of Liberation"), it is a work in the bstan rim ("stages of the Doctrine") mold of rNgo grol-tsha-ba’s school. In it one also finds comments on the inadequacy of conceptualizing mind for apprehending the absolute (just as one finds in sGam-po-pa’s "Thar rgyan"). Chapter ten of the work

characterized. See Kun-dga’ grol-mchog, Zhen pa rang grol, p. 439.4 (nga ’78a); dus ’khor snyan brgyud kyi gdams pa gzig shes kun grol gi rnyans khrid chen mo ... (’yi ge med pa’i snyan brgyud).

90 Read here: rdzogs instead of brtogs.

91 Phag-mo-gru-pa, in addition to his studies under Sa-chen and sGam-po-pa, had studied many other traditions. See ‘Bri-gung Jig-rten-mgon-po, Collected Works, vol. 1 (ko), p. 295, where his studies are said to have included: rdzogs chen, zhi byed, thun ’jug a ma na se gung sngags kyi chogs srol gyis phyag rgya chen po’am dpal na ro pa’i chos drug la sogs pa.

According to his disciple Jig-rten-mgon-po, Phag-mo-gru-pa followed a dialectician-style of scholarship when utilizing topical outlines in his compositions, which Jig-rten-mgon-po compared with the practice of the great scholar GTsang-nag-pa, who used to compose many subject outlines. See Jig-rten-mgon-po, Collected Works, vol. 1, pp. 284-5 (142b-143a).

92 On this genre of religious literature, see my article in Tibetan Literature: Essays in Honor of Geshe Sopa (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, forthcoming).

93 Cf. sGam-po-pa, Dam chos..., p. 256.6 (128b): dbu ma nyid du yang brtag tu [129a] med del don la der ’dzin gzi shes pa dang bral ba bio las ’das par gnos pa’od, p. 259.2 (130a) de liar shes rab baml rang ser shes par bya ba’i tshig de dag kyang’ rtag pas bead
has two main sections: A. the cultivation of a union of emptiness and compassion (stong nyid snying rje db ye med bag ston pa) and B. the teaching of the fruit as being the attainment of the three "bodies" (kāya) (bras bu sku gsum thob par bstan pa) (47a.6). Insight into the first can be established in three ways: 1. through reasoning (rigs pas ston la 'bez pa pa), 2. through the instructions of the guru (bla ma'i gtags ngag gis...), and 3. through scriptural quotation (lung gis...). The first two are not to be taught here, he says; only the last. Still, he utilizes concepts and distinctions developed within the Prajñāpāramitā tradition of reasoning to reject the first and to establish the necessity of the second, namely the guru’s instructions.93

Since a theory derived from learning and reflection is [merely conceptual] understanding of the "object-universal," in order directly to understand the cognitive object as an "own-mark" [or "particular"], one needs to cultivate in meditation the orally transmitted practical instructions of the noble guru.

Phag-mo-gru-pa follows these comments with some quotations from the dohas, as sGam-po-pa had similarly done in his own general Mahāyāna treatise, the Thar pa rin po che’i rgyan, when teaching how to cultivate transcendent understanding.94

Bla-ma Zhang on Scholastics

sGam-po-pa’s "grand-pupil" Zhang Tshul-pa (1123-1193) followed sGam-po-pa’s ordering and classifying of doctrine when he wrote his best-known work, the Phyag chen lam zab mthar thug, and he, too, often treated the Great Seal as the highest pinnacle of doctrines situated outside the normal approaches. But like sGam-po-pa before him, he was not perfectly consistent in all his writings. In some contexts, he presented the Great Seal as the highest instruction, but as still within the Mantrayāna,

pa'i nyos nas yin lab shes rab bjam sens kyi don ni shes par bya ba'am par bya ba las 'das pa yin nol. See also H. V. Guenther (1971), pp. 213 and 215.

93 Phag-mo-gru-pa rDo-rje-rgyal-po, Sungs rgyas kyi bstan pa la rim gis 'jug pa'i tshul, 46br: shes bsem gi la bas [ = ba’] don spyi'i go ba yin pasel don rang gi mthun nyal ngyon sum du ngos pa la bla ma dam pa'i snyan bgyod kyi gtags ngag sgom dgos tel.

94 See sGam-po-pa, Dam chos..., p. 260.5 (130b) and H. V. Guenther (1971), pp. 216f.

no doubt reflecting his own extensive training and continuing participation also within the latter sphere.

Bla-ma Zhang, too, was aware of certain basic doctrinal parallels between the Great Seal and the Great Perfection, and like sGam-po-pa, he sometimes classified the two instructions as on the same level or belonging to the same class of teaching. Though I have not been able to trace any record of formal studies of the Great Perfection by Zhang, he was definitely familiar with it, and just as sGam-po-pa did, he viewed it as having a fundamental similarity with the Great Seal—the two occupying in his opinion the parallel ultimate positions within the New and Old Tantric teachings.95 He discusses this at some length in his instructions to the (bKa’-gams-pa?) teacher "Mal the White-headed" (Mal dbu-dkar), where in contrast with the bKa’-gams-pa teachings and the Madhyamaka reasonings and meditations that take devoted conviction as their path, involving merely the cognitive image of an "object universal" (don spyi'i rnam pa tson las mos pa yul du byed pa), the Great Seal and Great Perfection are said to be tantric paths of the guru’s sustaining spiritual power or "blessing."96 In this, Zhang agreed with certain statements of sGam-po-pa, who as cited above on some occasions portrayed the Great Seal and Great Perfection as occupying a similar doctrinal position within the Mantrayāna, and indeed as being in some sense identical.97

Bla-ma Zhang furthermore criticized intellectual thought processes in principle (especially in the context of meditation on the absolute), and in this he is traditionally said to have been strongly influenced by his teacher sGom-pa Tshul-khrims-snying-po. According to ‘Gos lo-tsa’ba’s Blue Annals, Zhang met sGom-pa at age 32 (in ca. 1155) and received then

---

93 As will be discussed below, he did have visions of receiving Great Perfection instructions from early masters such as Padmasambhava and Vimalakirti, and these were recorded in his ‘Sealed book of ‘Chims-phu’ (‘Chims phu bka’ rgya ma). See DPa’bo gTsug-lag-phrang-ba, (New Delhi 1959 ed.) part 1, p. 186.

96 Zhang, Mal dbu dkar la gams pa, Writings, p. 65A:7f; phyag rgya chen po dang gyi rabs pa'i nyos nas yin lab.

97 Cf. the later scholar sGam-po spyin-snga bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal’s similar tantric characterization of the Great Perfection as [a doctrine authoritatively] maintained to be the ultimate of Mantra teachings, the ‘Ariyoga.’ See bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, sGam-po spyin-snga, p. 93b.6; L. Lhalungpa transl., p. 105. The Tibetan text: rdo zogs chen ni ati yo ga zhes pa byang bying byin brisab kyi [655] lam yin pa lat.
from him the Lhan cig skyes sbyor Great Seal instructions. After cultivating this insight in meditation, the power of Zhang's intellectual understanding increased, and he had the feeling that he could understand the sense of many individual words from the scriptures. When he reported this to sGom-pa, the latter replied: "All that is what is called 'investigative knowing' (brtag dphyad kyi shes pa). Meditate without investigating! This teaching of mine puts its hope in the sustaining spiritual impulse [of the teacher]." When Zhang meditated accordingly, then for the first time he distinctly perceived the ultimate nature of all entities. Later in his life when he spoke of how sGom-pa Tshul-khrims-snying-po transmitted these teachings to him, Zhang stated: "In general, there arose distinctly in my mind the spontaneously and innately born [Great Seal] through this noble, holy person, purely by means of a sustaining spiritual impulse that did not rely upon words,..."

It is not surprising, then, that Zhang as a mature master was not very concerned with words, terms or concepts. That he also had no great love for the methods and fine distinctions of the scholiast or logician can also be easily seen from remarks he made in his Lam mchog mthar thug treatise, which he composed apparently in the 1160s. He clarified in one passage the doctrinal basis for this non-verbal and non-investigative approach:

An assemblage of words—no matter how profoundly expressed, and even though expressed numerous times—cannot possibly alight upon the ultimate reality [inherent] in the mind. Critical investigation—however skillful and profound it may be, even though expressed for many limitless aeons—cannot possibly understand the ultimate reality [inherent] in mind because the original nature is not an object for investigative thought. For example, even if you [try to] filter out the planets and stars that appear on the ocean's surface, no matter how excellent a silk filter you may use, you cannot possibly catch even a single planet or star because those planets and stars do not exist as objectively apprehensible entities. For however long it is expressed in words, no matter how excellent your terminology, that is not the ultimate reality. For however long it is amenable to mental investigation, no matter how profoundly you

---

98 This date is perhaps two years too late, because sGom-pa-po, who died in 1153, is said to have been still alive during Zhang's first visit to sGom-po. The other possibility is that Zhang did not receive these teachings from sGom-pa until somewhat later.

99 Gyal-tsa'-ba, Deb ther nyon mo, p. 623.7-624.1 (nya, 171a-b). See also D. Seyfort Ruegg's (1989), p. 104. Cf. the translation of G. Roerich, p. 714. See also Zhang's account in his Shes rab gru ma bstan bzhod pung, v. 40 (20a): slob dpon la zhiis par'i grol ba drag du bstag 'ngag kyi '['khyi] 'di byin bria bstags la de ba yin de ring phyag rgya chen po cig bya dgos gsum nas phyag rgya chen po'i gsal 'ngag gnas na de la sgron ma phags ma bcos pa nam mkha' ba bu'i ngang las ye shes kyi me sbyed de tsug 'de dgos 'de dgos yin snyam pa roong byung slob dpon la zhiis par'i rtags sbyad [+ sbrag dbyad] ma mbdud/+ rtags sbyad kyi sgrub pa yin gsum pa dang yang bsgon pans sngarg bzhin shes rab mngag po roong byung ba de la bstag sbyad du 'dags de'i rjes su ma 'bras bar klong kyiin bzhugs par'i rtags pa la bshag gi shal. Cf. the account in the Rgyal bzhon ma biography, Writings, p. 270.5f. There (p. 271.7) the sentence occurs: shes rab dang/ bstag phyag (=dbyad) thams cad nag pa 'ba' zhig tu 'dags!'

100 Zhang, Writings, p. 557: spyi skyes ba dang pa' 'digs i shig la ma mten po'i byin bria bstags 'ba' zhig gir kho bskyed la tan cigs skyes pa bshag gi shal bu bas...
understand it, that is not the ultimate reality. For however long there is bifurcation into "thing to be viewed" and "viewer," you will not understand the non-dual ultimate reality. In brief, all thoughts of "It is" are the roots of conceptual attachment. By the root of conceptual attachment, the whole of cyclic existence is made to grow. However profound and empty you may conceive [something] to be, it will later on fall down through attachment to phenomenal marks, since that does not go beyond hypostatizing thoughts and phenomenal marks. Those "great meditators" who utilize theories that have been fashioned by intellect are afflicted by the chronic disease of conceptual attachment that postulates positions [through partiality]. Be free from pride, and know [reality] to be the simultaneously and innately born!

And below:\textsuperscript{103}

Having thus understood, you will not be obscured [?] by terms and groups of words, and you will not be touched by the fault of words. Therefore, do not employ words and critical investigation, and don't have attachment through falsely imagining [them] to be the point!

A bit later, Zhang returns to the same themes:\textsuperscript{104}

However skilled you may be at considering and investigating words, it is impossible to understand ultimate reality through intellectual investigation, for it has not been experientially practiced and has not arisen from within. [If] you do not realize the real state of things, your karmic tendencies will not be purified. Therefore don't be attached to words or to the discriminative understanding of dialectics! Practice the instructions of the master!

Zhang did, however, qualify his rejection of words. Ultimate reality does

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., p. 748.6:
\textit{de ilar shes na the snayad thig tsong kiyl} srig [?] par mi 'gur thig gi skyon mi gos/ de phyir thig dang brtag dpjad mi slang zhing/ don tu riom pas zhen pa yang mi byal

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., p. 752:
\textit{ji trim thig la mno zhing dpjad mkhas kyang/} nyang su ma xiang nang nas ma sar bas/
\textit{blo yi brtag pas gnas lugs riogs mi xrid/} gnas lugs ma riogs bag chags 'byong mi xrid/ de phyir thig dang rgo 'gi shes rab la/ ma zhen bla ma'i gams ngag nyams su long/

have a special relation to verbal expression, as he had explained in a preceding passage:

It is not established as a word, it cannot be conveyed through a statement. [But] it is not completely removed from words; it is the basis of all expressions.\textsuperscript{105}

The technique taught by Zhang nevertheless did devalue discursive thought, and it sought to avoid critical, analytical thinking. But it certainly did not recommend the forceful stoppage of all discursive thoughts. Such a conscious blockage was seen as both unnecessary and counterproductive.\textsuperscript{106}

Ignorant people who do not possess the true practical instructions and lack any karmic carry-over from previous practice make twofold divisions, such as into "issued forth" and "not issued forth," conceptual thought and non-conceptualizing, or [ordinary] mind and Dharmakaya. They view discursive thought as a fault and stop it. They desire non-conceptualizing and purposefully try to achieve it. You will never finish sweeping away waves with a broom. Non-conceptualizing that arrests conceptual thought is itself a deluded conceptual thought. It is a great darkness that obscures the Dharmakaya. Without a lot of hurried investigations, relax loosely and concentrate firmly.

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., p. 747.4:
\textit{tshig tu ma gnyu brjod pas bshad du med/} tshig bral ma yin brjod pa kun gi gshil/

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., p. 756.7:
\textit{gams ngag giha/} ma ma zin cing/ skyang pa'i 'phre med mongs pa'i mis/ 'phros pa dang ni ma' 'phros pa/ rong pa dang ni ni rong dang/ [757]
sens dang chos sku guis su phyi/ man rong skyon du bikt shing bkag/
mi rong 'dod chen ched du snyab/ chu riabs phyogs pas phyir mi 'khlong/ rong pa bka pa'i mi rong pa/ de nyid man rong 'khrul pa stel/ cho shur srig ab pa mun chen yin /
brtag dpjad tsab tsab na mang bas/ lhod kyi glog la tsem gis zhog/
'di yin snyan pa gung hyung yang/ dngig zhen sa bon theb pa yin/
tsoas sens ngyi gi skyer gur na/ 'kor ba'i stod po 'phel bar mchol/ sens nyid ye dag 'od gsal las [ = la]/ sgyom pa'i mun pas ma sgrigs shig/ sens nyid me long gya/ med lal/ bsam dun dri ma ma hyugs shig/
ye shes grags bnyan ni mthong ngol/ sens nyid nor bu rin chen 'dil/ mishan nu'i 'jian pas ma gsum shig/
'bras bu dgos 'dod 'gyogs par mchol/ mdor na yin snyam med par zhog/ ma yin snyam pa med par [758] zhog/
yin snyam sens dang mis snyam sensi/ phun chen los pa'i 'dzin pa yin/
Whatever thoughts of "It is this" may arise, [in this] there are planted the seeds of objectifying and attachment. If the sprout of mind that falsely hypostatizes should arise, the tree of cyclic existence will grow. Don't obscure the originally pure luminescence of Mind Itself with the darkness of meditative cultivation.

Don't wipe the impurity of meditative concentration on the spotless mirror of the Mind Itself. You'll not see the reflection of gnosis [reflected within it].

Don't encase this precious jewel of the Mind Itself within the mud of phenomenal marks. This will obstruct [all] needed and desired fruits. In brief, concentrate without the thought, "It is." Concentrate without the thought "It is not." The thoughts "It is" and "It is not" are mutually dependent postulations.

In a subsequent passage, Zhangs the arising of the Gnosis or "realization" (rtogs pa), and the complete stopping of discursive thoughts.107

That dawning of the Gnosis of realization does not arise because of hopes and desires. It won't occur through being skilled in critical investigation. It won't occur through great learning. It is beyond the range of a dialectician.

However thick or vast it may be, that non-discursiveness that stops discursive thought is a great obstruction to the birth of Gnosis.

That secondarily occurring Gnosis of realization does not arise from any such things as hopeful expectation or letting go, from being skilled in critical examination or not being skilled, from great learning or inferior learning, from excellent [yogic] experience or poor, or from strong effort or weak.

"It is known through carrying out the timely sacrifices for the guru, and from one's own merit." "Carrying out the timely sacrifices for the guru" means that it will arise through the power of the sustaining spiritual impulse resulting from having pleased a master who possesses realization.

"One's own merit" means that it will arise in those who possess some karmic carry-over from previous practice.

Therefore that Gnosis of realization, since it is grounded on the path of [the master's] sustaining spiritual impulse, is within the range of those who possess faith. It will arise in those who are respectful. It will be understood by those who have [previously trained themselves through having] practiced. The universal helper [for attaining it] is diligent effort.

It will be seen by those fortunate ones of superior faculties. It won't be fathomed by verbalizers.

The lines quoted by Zhang: "It is known through carrying out the timely sacrifices for the guru, and from one's own merit," originate from the Hevajra Tantra (1 viii 36) and were used by sGam-po-pa in a similar context.

Some four folios later, Zhang summarizes several of the same points:108

That Nirvāṇa in which one does not station oneself anywhere (in either Saṃsāra or Nirvāṇa) is within the range of direct realization alone. That non-duality fabricated by intellect will be understood by

---

107 ibid., p. 759.3:

rtogs pa'i ye shes shar ba del/ a re 'dod kys 'char ba min/ brtags dpod mkhas pa' lung pa min/ thos pa ches bas 'long pa min/ rtogs ge pa yi snyod yul min/ rtogs pa bkag pa'i mi rtog pa'i ji tshan 'thug cing tshan che yang/ ye shes skye ba sgrin chen yin/ rtogs pa'i ye shes shugs 'byung del/ a re 'dod dang grol pa dang/ brtags dpod mkhas dang mi mkhas dang/ thos pa che dang chung ba dang/ nyams myongs dang dang ngan pa dang/ rtsol ba dang dang zhan la srog/ gang gis kyang ni mi 'char stel/ bla ma'i dus thabs bsten pa dang/ bdag gi bsod nams las shes byal/ bla ma'i dus thabs bsten zhes byal/ rtogs ldan bla ma bmyes pa yil/ byin bralbs stobs kys 'char ba yin/ bdag gi bsod nams zhes pa nil/ shyangs pa'i phre can mams la 'char/ de phyir rtogs pa'i ye shes del/ byin bralbs lam la grai pa'i phyir/ dad pa can gis snyod yul yin/ gis pa can la 'char ba yin/ shyangs pa can gis rtogs pa yin/ kun gis grogs ni brson 'gus yin/ skal ldan dbang po rab kys mthong/ tshig mkham mams kys blo mi stong/
those of great learning, and it is within the range of conceptual thought alone. This non-duality that arises from within is purely the spiritual impulse of the Master. Paying respect to the Glorious Master, the definitive knowledge of realization will be born from within.

What understanding does a critical investigator have? I, too, know verbal knowledge. Check [yourself] whether [that kind of knowledge] is proof against adverse circumstances or not!

And a bit later:  

Nowadays religious people, though they are learned in a mass of words, do not understand the meaning. In general, pride and disputation increases.

The reverend masters of the practice-lineage practiced following the meaning. Completely abandoning pride, etc., they realized the sense and fulfilled the intention of scripture and reasoning.

Tilopa did not speak even a single word to Naropa, but all scripture, reasoning and instruction without exception were brought to perfection in Naropa's mind.

Other Criticisms of Conceptual Methods by Zhang

In other writings, bla-ma Zhang's criticisms of intellectual methods and scholastics sometimes became even more exuberant, and occasionally they took the form of sharp personal digs at the alleged spiritual shortcomings of his scholarly opponents. In one of his autobiographical writings, written sometime in the last three decades of his life, Zhang mentions opponents who call his teaching an erroneous or perverse doctrine (log choa), while imagining themselves to be learned, though they merely mouth words uncomprehendingly like parrots. These types of people should not be associated with or told about this special Great Seal teaching, he says, and this is for their own good. Otherwise, if those opponents reject and condemn the teaching after hearing about it, the consequences for them will be most grievous.  

Don't associate with those who, [being] of dull faculties, have not accumulated the preparatory spiritual equipment, have not studied under a spiritual teacher, are confused by the delusion of subject and object, and who mouth words with their tongue like a parrot—externally oriented sorts of people who do not know their own nature, and who are unsuitable for the hearing or own-seeing of the "self-seen" things, whose minds cannot fathom the correct, profound reality because they insistently believe in only [the surface meaning] of those words that the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas have spoken with hidden intention, and who therefore call this "a perverse doctrine that does not accord with the real content of the Dharma," and who thus reject and revile the definitive meaning! Don't mix with such confused ones, who imagine themselves to be learned—don't send them to hell!

Later in the same work, Zhang specified logicians or dialecticians (rtog ge pa) as the ones he was criticizing:

This innate possession of the Dharmakāya by oneself is not within the range of dialecticians who falsely imagine themselves to be learned, moulting words with their tongues while never having meditated, those glib ones infatuated with only external critical investigations, those obstinate ones who maintain a falsely imagined learnedness for what is in fact their own minds being rigid and oppressed by the great

---

110 Ibid., p. 776:

"deng zang dus na chos pa mams// tshig tshogs mkhas kyung don ma rtags// spyin la nga rgyal rson pa 'phel// igrub brgyud bla ma rje btsun mams// don gzi rjes su 'brang te igrub// nga rgyal la sog ri sangs tshil don rtags lung rtags dzongs pa rdzo// til la pas ni nā ro pa lai tshig go thams yang ma giung tshil// lung rtags man ngag thams cad kunl ma las nā ro thug la rdzo//"

111 The great Indian Tantric adept Tilopa and his disciple Naropa are usually counted as the main source for the Mar-pa bKa'-brgyud.

112 Zhang, *Rnam thar shes rab grub ma, Writings*, p. 50.1: dbang po gshu [=rtil] po'i tshogs ma brags cings bla ma mams [=bschen] pas gung chen gi mun pas 'thom shing ne tsha tshig lec sbyong ba'i gang zagl kha phyir bsa'i mi rigl rang nga ma shes shing! rang mthong ba mams kyi [=kyl] rang mthong du mi rmg! thos su m ri sangs rgyas dang! byang chub sens dpa' mams kyi['kyl]? idem por dzongs po tshigs [sic] mams ba' zhi 'la a 'thas pas' zhub mo'i don phyin ci log pa mams bloi m shing zhingl 'di chos kyi babs dang mi 'thun log chos yin zer nas' rigs don spong shing bskar ba 'dubs po' gang zagl gi mug can mkhas su re ba mams dang kha ma 'breds khang dnyal bar ma bskyur! The text, which is based on an old manuscript, is quite corrupt.

113 Ibid., p. 52.2: chos kyi sku rang nyid rang chas su yod pas 'di rtog ge pa sgom ma myong pa'i tshig la lec sbyangs pa'i mkhas su rel' kha sbyang po phyi rol gyi brtag sbyad 'bar zhing ['ba' zhi'] la blo spong ba' rang gi rgyud rengs shing yon mongs pa rang rgyud du sher ba'i gi mug chen pos non pa lai mkhas su rer khas len pa'i gong po 'zen pa'i srog [=srog] tu tshad pa mams kyi sbyod yel ma yin rol.
confusion of the defilements becoming [for them substantially real and] self-constituted, those ones who are caught within the bonds of desire!

Zhang addressed the same opponents in a versified work entitled sNa tshogs zhi gnas:\[1434\]

[This] will not be fathomed by those tongue-users who are conceived about what is a mere object of [conceptual] understanding [accessible] through their critical investigations of mere [minor] experience and mere words, through the bustle (?) of mere purposeful effort. Having concealed [this truth] through their own evil thoughts, they acquire great demerit.

These criticisms by bla-ma Zhang show that his rejection of the scholastic methods was not done out of ignorance.\[15\] Indeed, he had also studied scholastic treatises as a young man before shifting his main interest first to Tantric practices and then to the Great Seal. His comments accordingly embody a shrewd usage of the concepts and doctrines by which the conceptual, rational approach can be countered. Yet in general it vexed him to have to try to express his own realizations in words. Committing his insights to writing also brought him no great satisfaction, but rather frustration or regret in the end.\[16\]

---

114 Zhang, sNa tshogs zhi gnas, Writings, p. 623.3: rtsol sgub rkyang pa'i phrad phud kyi/ tshig rkyang nyams rkyang btags sphyad kyi/ go yul rkyang pas nga rgyal ba'i lce mkhan mans kyi [?] blor mi shong/ rang rog ngan pas bkab byas nas/ shin tu skig pa btags par mch'i 0/ The text is corrupt, though the general sense is clear.

115 See also Zhang, Lam zab mthar thug, pp. 3b and 34a.5. The denial of the value or importance of words in the transmission of doctrine was addressed and rejected by Sa pa in his sDom gsum rab dbye, p. 303.3.2 (na 14a): "Some say we do not need and should reject the profound words and meanings of the scriptures of the perfectly awakened Buddha and the extremely well expressed teachings of the accomplished adepts and learned scholars, because these are partial approximations (na ya = na yan[s]) through words."

la la znga'i sngags rgyas kyi/ gsum rab tshig don zab mo dang/ grub thob mans dang mkhar mans kyi/ shin tu legs par bshad pa'i chos/ tshig gi na yo yin pas nai/ dgos pa med pas dor zhes zer/... Go-rams-pa in his commentary sDom pa gsum...man bshad, p. 152.2, identifies those holding this opinion as "Zhang Tshal-pa and some followers of the bKa'-bgyud Great Seal" (zhang tshal pa dang/ bka' phyag pa la la). Cf. the description of this tradition by Kun-dga'-grol-mchog in his autobiography, p. 481 (nga 576): rtsig gi na yams la don 'shol ba'i bgyud pa ma yan/ don dang don than cig tu sbyor ba'i bgyud pa yin pa'i phyir/ chos tshul 'di la phyag rgya chen po than cig skyes sbyor ces nay zla lar grags srol/. Here Kun-dga'-grol-mchog refers to both Sutra- and Tantra-based Great Seal.

116 In a brief poem written at Bral-dro'i Mon-pa-gdond, he lists his main writings and where he composed them, concluding on a regretful note. See his Writings, pp. 600.1-601.1. The works he lists there are: (1) rNal byor lam ring; (2) Phyag rgya chen po 'tsang bru (both at Bhe-brag?); (3) Bum pa'i phreng ba, at Gong-dkar-mo; (4) Cal cal ring mo, at 'Brog-bu likug-pa; (5) gNyen po yig chung, at Bya mk klar-rise; (6) Mas 'dzeg go rin, at Yud-bu'i-gad-pa; (7) gSangs nghags log len, at sTod-lung mTshur; (8) Kha 'thor sna tshogs, at Byang Byi'-brong; (9) Lam mchog mthar thug, at Thul-gyi-brag; and (10) Kha na 'thon tshad at Mon-pa-gdond. A more complete listing of Zhang's works is given by Padma-dkar-po in his record of teachings received, bKa' bgyud kyi bka' bsum... Works, vol. 4, pp. 453-456 (nga na 73a-74b).
It was inevitable that such a decidedly anti-rational and anti-scholastic doctrine would attract the attention of the dialectically and textually oriented scholars it criticized so sharply. In fact, certain Great Seal doctrines had been the subject of critical discussion among Tibetan scholars even from an early stage in the revival of scholastic studies during the incipient "Latter-Spread of Buddhism" (phyi dar) period of Tibetan history. Resistance to similar teachings is said to have gone back to at least the early-12th century, and in a general way perhaps even a generation or two earlier. For instance, the bkA'-gdam-pa tradition beginning with the master 'Brom-ston rGyal-ba'i-'byung-gnas (1005-1064) is said from the start to have objected to the Great Seal's being taught ('Brom-ston was concerned in general about the suitability of Tantra-based doctrines for the Tibetans), and later some bkA'-gdam-pas took a more neutral attitude of non-approval, saying the Great Seal should neither be practiced nor criticized.

---

117 Sa-pa was thus by no means the first to question the origins and validity of certain Great Seal teachings followed in the Dvags-po bkA'-brgyud, though that has been a common misconception (see, for instance, L. Lhunphya [1986], pp. 434ff, n. 73).

118 Cf. the criticisms of the Great Perfection by those who "know grammar and reasoning," as mentioned by the 11th-century scholar Roa-gzom, Thug pa chen po'i, p. 315.1.

119 Gos lo-tsa-ba relates in the Blue Annals that although Atiśa Dipaṃkaraśrīnāma (ca. 982-1054) had begun to teach Maśāriṣamārga (the Great Seal, 'Brom-ston opposed its teaching. See G. Roerich, transl., pp. 843-4 (da 3a-b). See also D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 1273, n. 98. Prior to this there had been official restrictions imposed on the practice of Tantra. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 130.

120 See 'Gos lo-tsa-ba, the Blue Annals, G. Roerich, transl., pp. 268 (ca 13b), where the early bkA'-gdam-pa dge-bsches Po-to-ba Rin-chen-gsal is reported to have said the Great Seal agreed in sense with the Samādhirāja Sūtra, but that it should be neither criticized nor
Enlightenment by a Single Means

In the middle of the 12th century, too, the approach of sGam-po-pa and that of his successor sGom-tshul are said to have been singled out for criticism by others, whose numbers included dialectically trained scholars (mthshan nyid pa), i.e. probably followers of the gSang-phu Ne'u-thog tradition. sGam-po-pa in particular is said to have incurred the criticism of certain great scholars of scholasticism and Buddhist philosophy because of his introducing young monks directly into the Great Seal insight without their having received any prior religious educational training, and thus for "wasting" many bright young monks. The great scholastic master Gro-lung-pa (fl. early 1100s) of RNgog-lo's home seminary gSang-phu Ne'u-thog is also said to have criticized certain amanuasikāra doctrines of Maitripāda as not being the Madhyamaka, which the later bKa'-brgyud-pas took to be the starting point for various criticisms of their central doctrines by Sa-pa and a number of bKa'-gdoms-pas. sGom-tshul, too, was criticized by some [scholars?] who had never met him but who had nevertheless berated him from afar, as alluded to in a verse of praise said to have been composed in his honor by gTsang-nag-pa (d. 1171), one of Phya-pa's main students.

Thus, by the mid- to late 12th century, these doctrines and their Upholders had already come to be criticized, notably by dialectically trained scholars (rGos ge pa or mthshan nyid pa) who in that period in practiced. See also D. Seyfort Ruegg (1988), p. 1273, n. 98.

121 "Gos lo-tsa-ba, Deb ther sprong po (Blue Annals)," p. 460; Tibetan text p. 400.5 - nya 25b: thos bsam srong du ma snyon ba'i bsam chung mang po yung rongs pa la bkod pa'i mthshan nyid pa'i dge ba'i stbyas gyi chen po 'jug 'zigs gyi blo gsal mang po ybum po pa' chos chud zor su bcag ces 'bar ba la'i gsal gtsang mthshan nyid pa mams nga la bka' bskyon tol..."

The Indian adept Maitripāda was another main source for the traditions of the Mar-pa bKa'-brgyud. For a sketch of what the traditional biographical sources tell us about him, see M. Taitz (1987).

122 See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1988), p. 1257, translating Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje, p. 11 (6a.2); lugs 'di dbu mar chad pa la rigs par smra ba gro lung pa sors dpal byal mang po ma rangs na ma na sna pa sogs ci rigs kyi lugs dbu ma pa'i lugs dang mi thub chen 'jug rgyas par mtshad la'i rtags ci tham la bren nas sa skyen pa chen dang! bka' gdoms pa ci rigs pa 'jug gsal je bsam ma'i pa'i chos mam par dag pa a ma na s'a skor thams cad la sdang zhen byed pa dang!" See also D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 110-11, and n. 212, where the location of Gro-lung-pa's discussion is cited as: bDe bsnying bsam pa rin po che la 'jig pa'i lam gsal rim pa mams par bkhad pa (bsTan rim), i. 377a-b.

123 See the Blue Annals, p. 465; Tibetan p. 405 = nya 28a.2: skal med skye bo ring med ngan brjod kyang/.

Central Tibet probably belonged to the circle of Phywa-pa Chos-kyi-seng-ge (1109-1169) and his disciples or successors, i.e. to the gSang-phu Ne'u-thog tradition. But as just mentioned, the criticisms were not unanimous. The great scholar gTsang-nag btTsun-'grus-seng-ge, for instance, is said to have renounced such negative preconceptions after meeting sGom-tshul personally. Moreover, a bKa'-gdoms-pa dge-bshes who honored sGom-tshul was Phya-sor-ba.

If even the pacific and saintly sGam-po-pa and sGom-tshul-ba were so criticized, then it goes without saying that the more tumultuous and outrageous bla-ma Zhang Tshal-pa would be. Zhang himself reacted bitterly to criticisms of his teachings in one of the autobiographical works that he seemingly wrote in 1166, the rNam thar shes rab grub ma. There he mentioned the criticisms of others who doubted that certain claims of the Great Seal doctrine under discussion were possible, and who in this way abandoned the Buddhist Teaching (di mi srid zer nas lam pa'i chos spon du 'ong pa yin). But he had tried to demonstrate the reverse by quoting statements from a Tantra and from the songs of Saraha, and he then replied himself: "As for whether it is possible or not, look at the mind! (srid dam mi srid pa sems la lobs). He goes on (p. 50.1) to belittle and dismiss such opposing scholars, saying (as translated above) that they were not to be associated with, since by their erroneous hostility to the profound teachings they would go to hell.

In the above-mentioned "Instruction to Mal the White-haired" (Mal dbu dkar la gdoms pa), a work evidently addressed to an old religious scholar (dge bshes) of a non-bKa'-brgyud-pa tradition (presumably of the bKa'-gdoms-pa) who had asked him to be frank, Zhang also mentioned those who were strongly repelled by his doctrine of a sudden awakening that arises from within through the guru's grace (which he admits can occur only very rarely), and who were especially bothered by the notion that this alone was the decisive thing. Zhang's defence of this doctrine is another clear indication that there did exist critics before Sa-
pan’s time who had singled out the notion of soteriological self-sufficiency for rejection.

Bla-ma Zhang Tshal-pa’s Studies and Later Career

In order to understand better the role of bla-ma Zhang and his tradition in these controversies, a little more should be said about his background and his career as a religious master and adept.128 Zhang brTson-grus-grags was born in 1123 at Tsha-ba-gru in sKyid-shod in Central Tibet, the son of a mantra lay-practitioner sNgags-‘chang rDo-rje-sems-dpa’ of the sNa-nam Zhang clan. He was an energetic and forceful person who in his youth and young adulthood put himself through a demanding series of studies and training under numerous outstanding masters from diverse doctrinal lineages. From the age of six to twenty-three his studies included investigations of the main Buddhist doctrinal systems accessible to him: Prajñāpāramitā, Abhidharma, Pramāṇa, and the Tantras. (He also devoted some years to the practice of black magic.) At the age of twenty-five (ca. 1148) he took full monastic ordination in Khams from the mkhan-po mKhar-sgo-pa and the slob-dpon Grab-mkhar-ba, and it was then that he received the name brTson-grus-grags.

In all, he studied under a total of thirty-six (or even forty-five) teachers, from among whom he considered these four as most important:

1. rGwa lo-tsa-ba (a disciple of rTsa-mi)
2. Mal Yer-pa-ba (a disciple of Gling-kha-ba)
3. dNgul-chu Be-ro-ba (the Indian yogi Vairocanavartula, a disciple of Surapāla)
4. rJe sGom-tshul (a nephew and disciple of sGom-po-pa)

In addition, he sometimes added two more teachers to these to make up the list of his six "fundamental masters" (rTsa ba’i bla ma).129

(5) ‘Ol-kha-ba (a disciple of Ba-ri lo-tsa-ba [b. 1040])
(6) Ngam-shod gShen-pa rDo-rje-seng-ge (a disciple of Sa-chen Kun-gda-snying-po [1092-1158])

Besides his instructions from sGom-pa Tshul-khrims, Zhang also received a number of important Mar-pa bKa’-brgyud instructions from the above-mentioned Mal Yer-pa, who was not a disciple of sGom-po-pa, but rather of Gling-kha-ba. This gsum ras-chen, who had studied directly under Mi-la ras-pa and was one of a group of the latter’s disciples known as the “eight cotton-clad brothers” (ras pa mched brgyud).130 Another bKa’-brgyud-pa master who influenced Zhang was the above-mentioned ‘Ol-kha-ba. In addition, he is said to have received the Great Seal teachings of Maitripāda from the Indian tantric yogi (and paṇḍita) Vairocanaraksita.131

Thus bla-ma Zhang was by no means the product of a single pure and homogeneous Dbyangs-pa bka’-brgyud tradition. And in any case, the
given by Zhang in his bBrGyud pa sna thogs kyi bo byang. Writings, pp. 426-433.

128 For brief biographies of Zhang, see dPa’-bo gTsug-lag-phreng-ba, pp. 806-809, and ‘Gos lo-tsa-ba, the Blue Annals., pp. 711-715 (n.ya 136a-137b), G. Roerich, transl., 211-216. There also existed a full-length biography (mam thar rgyas pa) of bla-ma Zhang by Tshal-pa Kun-dga’-ro-rje, according to note 533 to the Deb ther dmar po by Dung-dkar Blo-bzang-phrin-las (Beijing 1981, p. 446). It is not known to survive. See also D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 203, n. 204.

129 See dPa’-bo gTsug-lag-phreng-ba, vol. 1, p. 807. See also Zhang’s own composition, rTsa ba’i bla ma drug gi grol ’debs, Writings, pp. 445-447. The full list of his teachers is given by Zhang in his bBrGyud pa sna thogs kyi bo byang. Writings, pp. 426-433.

130 Zhang has written a fairly extensive biography of Yer-pa. See his Writings, pp. 393-426. For the teachings Zhang received from him, and their lineages, see pp. 427 and 436.

131 On this master’s life, see ‘Gos lo-tsa-ba, the Blue Annals, 33a-b, G. Roerich, transl., p. 844-47. He is thus the same as the above-mentioned teacher of Zhang, dNgul-chu Be-ro-ba. He was an alchemist who travelled all over Asia. On one occasion he is said to have drunk a cup of mercury (hence his epithet, dNgul-chu-ba from dngul chu, "mercury.") Zhang and Khu-bo lo-tsa-ba’s under-Gyal-tshas are listed as two of his three main Tibetan students. According to information received from Dr. Dan Martin, he gave Caturakamvara initiations and daho instructions to Zhang in the 1160’s, after the latter had met rJe sGom-tshul and probably before he composed his Lam zab mthar thug.

That this great yogi was from the city of Kosa in South India, and that Zhang studied under him are confirmed by Zhang’s record of teachings received, Bla ma sna thogs, p. 423 (spellings corrected: dbang dang gSUM nag gnyis ka zhus nas’ thugs pa rDo rje lung cig skyes ’bde mchog lung skyes’ gsum ma dang/’shes ras rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa yi ge cig ma dang/’yi ge drug pa’i snyid thabs/sa ra hui do ha chen mol ka kha’i do hal te lo pa’i do hal’ nog po spyed pa’i do hal’ bi ba pa’i do ha mams zhus sOll. See also the brief account in the rGyal bIon ma, Writings, p. 234 (103b).
controversies that grew up around him do not all seem to have originated in the doctrines he learned from his teachers. On some points he had no doubt followed his own special interpretations and practices, and the lineage he founded—which came to be known by the distinctive name Zhang-pa bk’a-brgyud—continued this tradition. Moreover, a certain amount of the later controversy and tumult in his life would appear to have been the direct outgrowth of his own powerful and almost irrepressible personality. According to one bk’a-brgyud-pa source, the controversies surrounding Zhang had started up even before he had come into contact with the Dwaags-po bk’a-brgyud lineage. On the occasion that Phag-mo-gru-pa and Zhang went to sGam-po for the first time to meet sGam-po-pa in ca. 1152-55, their specific purpose for going is said to have been to see sGam-po-pa and to ask his help in settling some dispute involving Zhang. It seems that sGam-po-pa himself (who was already in semi-retirement) then did not give the same reception or instructions to Zhang. On the other hand, Phag-mo-gru-pa, who was Zhang’s senior by thirteen years, was on that occasion privately summoned and that same evening accepted as a student and instructed in the Lhan cig skyes byor by the aged sGam-po-pa, who had already turned over the leadership of the monastic community to his nephew sGam-tshul-ba.133

Bla-ma Zhang’s rambunctious energy and potential, however, could not be overlooked, and in the end he, too, was by no means turned away from Dwags-la sGam-po empty-handed. Indeed, he is said to have been favorably received there and instructed by the acting head of the community, sGam-po-pa Tshul-khrims-snying-po. He is recorded, in fact, to have gained decisive awakening then when introduced by the latter to the nature of mind.134 For a number of years during this period, Zhang then wandered in remote places, practicing meditation. He became one of sGam-tshul-ba’s chief disciples, and then assumed an important position in Central Tibet by the late 1150s, when he was entrusted to oversee the Lha-sa temples by sGom-pa Tshul-khrims-snying-po (d. 1169), who had pacified some severe political unrest there and had done extensive restorations.135 When his senior colleague Phag-mo-gru-pa passed away in 1170, Zhang performed at Phag-mo-gru the prayers of merit dedication, but apparently did not assume the position of monastic leader.136

Then came trouble. According to later bk’a-brgyud-pa historians, blama Zhang at some point (in the 1170s?) began to engage in wide-scale political activities, violent siddha-like conduct and even armed conflict, so that after a time he was looked at askance by even some of his fellow Dwaags-po bk’a-brgyud masters.137 Nevertheless, the later bk’a-brgyud tradition in general acknowledged him to have reached the highest realization, and he himself professed to the same. Therefore, in theory, he did not have to be bound by conventional morality and could justifiably conduct himself like a Tantric adept or siddha. According to the Blue Annals of ’Gos lo-tsa-ba (nya 137b), Zhang had attained siddhas of realization after receiving instructions from the bla-ma ’Ol-kha-ba. Subsequently he involved himself in some religious building projects in which he used force aggressively to achieve his aims. Some building materials he took from people, some others were freely offered to him, and still others he more or less looted. The same source goes on to relate: “Against those who did not obey his orders, he used to dispatch repeatedly soldiers, and he fought them.” In other words, though he was an enlightened monk, he forcibly pursued certain aims in connection with his religious projects, holding that his detachment and extraordinary attainments made him exempt from the normal consequences of his deeds. As ’Gos lo-tsa-ba relates:138

---

132 See ’Gos lo-tsa-ba, the Blue Annals, p. 558; Tib. nya 68a.5. ’Gos lo-tsa-ba later states, nya 137a.7, that Zhang’s meeting with sGom-pa occurred in Zhang’s thirty-fifth year, which would have been in 1155.

133 See ’Gos lo-tsa-ba, the Blue Annals, p. 558; Tib. nya 68a.5; and ’Bri-gung ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po, Collected Writings, vol. 1, p. 295.6 (148a). This episode is presented otherwise in Zhang’s biography Rgyud blo-ma, Writings, p. 270.6ff.

134 As mentioned above, there is some question about the chronology of Zhang’s meeting with sGom-pa, for ’Gos lo-tsa-ba states, nya 137a.7, that Zhang’s meeting with sGom-pa occurred in Zhang’s thirty-fifth year, which would have been in 1155. This was two years after sGam-po-pa’s death.


137 His violent activities apparently began in the 1170s, after sGom-pa Tshul-khrims and Phag-mo-gru-pa’s deaths. Although the chronology of these events is somewhat uncertain, these activities of his may have coincided with his building of the monastery at Tshal (1175), east of Lhasa on the other side of the sKyid-chu.


139 Ibid., p. 715. The Tibetan text, p. 624 = nya 137b: skabs shig tu bla ma ‘ol kha ba dang mjal gdam pa zhus pas byams pa dang snying rje byang chub kyi sems la bogs thon zhing gub pa bneys nas gtsug lag khang dang lha chen bzhi shing del cha rkyen yang la la la blangs/ la las phuhl la la la bisan phrags la bu mdzad/ bka’ las gal ba mam la damg
[Bla-ma Zhang] engaged in various activities of a tantric adept (siddha), and while these were indeed difficult for others to comprehend [and accept], Zhang himself [explained them] in his Instruction to [the bSam-yas Ruler] Lord Lha-btsan:

"I have abandoned the world. Many years have passed since the link with the world has been completely severed and I have entirely gone beyond into unborn space. Reckoning by these outer activities of mine, many others cannot comprehend [or accept my behavior], except for my stout-hearted disciples. Taken as objects within a worldly value system, these things all are seen to be nothing but apparently worldly activities such as metal casting, residence-bases, the closing off and controlling of roads, [enforcing] secular law, theft, and fighting. But if there fundamentally exists any connection with this world, it has died, sir."

According to a recent Tibetan historian, Zhang led armies against many independent lords in the districts of Lho-kha, 'Bri-khung, and 'Ol-kha, and thus brought under his control the people who had been the subjects of those lords. He became, in effect, the most powerful warlord in central Tibet. The 16th-century scholar and historian dPa'-bo gTsuglag-phreng-ba explained the historical background of Zhang's political and martial activities by asserting that they were the natural consequence of the fragmented political situation existing in those times, and he mentioned the beneficial spiritual consequences for a number of

---

141 dPa'-bo gTsuglag-phreng-ba, vol. 1, p. 808: spyin de'i dus bod rgyal khrims med pa sil bar song ba'i skabs yin pas thams cad la rgya khang rgya lam rgya mtsad dga' 'log tu mi 'da ba mams la drong gsum ngo sogs drag po'i 'phin las mzigad pas slob ma mams la'ang 'khrugs gral du phyag rgya chen po'i nogs pa skyes pa mang du byung zhung dpon dar ma gshen nus 'khrugs gral du bde mchog zhal nthongal.


Zhang's students who participated in the martial exploits Zhang had instigated:

In general, that period was a time when Tibet was without a national law and had become fragmented. Therefore [bla-ma Zhang] restricted the access to mountains, river valleys and roads to everyone. Against those who did not respect those restrictions, he performed acts of aggressive liberated behavior such as military battle. Among his disciples there were many in the service of the Great Seal who was born in the front-line of battle, and the nobleman Dar-ma-gzhan-nu beheld the countenance of Cakrasaṃvara while at the front line.

Zhang is said also to have taught the Great Seal to the Ti-shri Ras-pa, a realization having awakened in the latter through his teacher Zhang's words: "However you may do [or act], that is the Great Seal!" Zhang's well-travelled and widely experienced contemporary Grub-thob O-rgyan-pa remarked: 'Even though the three evil destinies [i.e. existences as animals, pretas and hell-beings] are taught in Tantras to be objects for being liberated [through killing], there was nobody who actually practiced such 'aggressive enlightened behavior' (drag po'i 'phin las) except for Virūpa in India and Zhang Rin-po-che in Tibet.'
mkhyen-pa himself), is said to have stated once, apparently sometime between 1185 and 1188.  

"The purpose of my coming back to Central Tibet (dBus) is to fulfill sGom-tshul's command, who had told me: 'Regardless of what situation you find yourself in Eastern Tibet (Khams), return west!' and to establish a monastery here in the midst of gZhu and 'Tshur, and to offer a hundred volumes written in gold to Dags-lha sGam-po, and to make a request to bla-ma Zhang not to engage in fighting, because people are unhappy with his fighting. I have come for these purposes.' When he beseeched Zhang not to engage in fighting, Zhang consequently grasped his [Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa's] finger, danced about a lot, and henceforth did not engage in fighting. Evidently Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa actually visited Tshal and met bla-ma Zhang there, at which time Zhang had numerous visions. Zhang is said to have consequently abstained from violence for the rest of his life (a period of some five years?). In 1189 when Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa built the "Upper Chapel" (mchod khang gong ma) at mTshur-phu, bla-ma Zhang made an offering of three precious objects.

Zhang's violent approach during that late period of his life contrasted markedly with the pacific and strongly ethical teachings that Mi-la ras-pa is recorded to have given sGam-po-pa. These included the instruction to continue to train oneself in serving the guru, even though one has already understood one's mind as the Buddha, and to continue to observe even small meritorious and moral matters, even though ultimately there is nothing to be cultivated or purified and one has understood that the connection of moral causation is from the ultimate point of view empty like space.

In quite a few of his writings, Zhang discussed or alluded to the disputes and controversies he became embroiled in, and he revealed his attitude toward those activities in instance for a brief autobiographical poem that he composed in a bird year (1177?) at bSam-yas. His rNam thar bsam yas ma, which relates events that occurred at bSam-yas in the fire-bird year 1177, likewise refers to his awareness that others might doubt his attainments because of his various worldly activities. Some of his songs and poems embody a ruthless and sardonic self-criticism which is so extreme that the overall effect is ironical and humorous, though not without an occasional note of witty and discouraged melancholy.

---

144 Glos bo-tsa-ba, Blue Annals, p. 715; Tibetan text, p. 470 – nyer Ma.3, 'The Tibetan: khol bol dhus su 'ong pa'i dgos pa' sgra mthral gyi rnal nas khyod khangs su gnyid sdeg ci byung yar shog gung ba'i bka' sgrub pa dang' gzhu 'tshur gyi bar 'dod pa 'dbs pa dang' dags las sgra par gser gyi gyes bum bhrugs 'bhi bar dang' bla mthang gi 'khrugs pa la'i mams mi dga' bar 'dugs pas' khrungs la 'khrungs pa mi mdzad pa'i zhes ba' 'bhi la la' 'ongs pa yin gung' lhang la 'khrungs pa mi mdzad par zhes pas' gthang gi phyag mdzab la 'jus nas bra mong du brungs nas de phyis chad 'khrungs pa ma mdzad.'

145 This refers to his founding of a monastery at stTod-lung Tshur-phu, which he did so shortly thereafter.

146 A similar passage is found in Si-tu and 'Be-lo, vol. 1, p. 24 (da 12b), including the references to Bla-ma Zhang; zhang zhal pa sgron chen pa 'khrungs pa mdzad pa 'di' ma bar snyan pas bshad 'dbs pa dang' ... gzhung nas tshal du byon! 'khrungs pa bsdurs pas' bla ma Zhang gi rin po che la dag snang mtsha' yas pa gzi gis te! phyag nas 'jus te bro brungs/ phyis skas ma' 'das kyi bar du 'khrungs pa ma mdzad.'

147 Ibid.

148 dPa'-bo, vol. 1, p. 797: spyan rgyal ri dags nas ma'am bya bzhin du zon bag che bar byal zhi ba du ut ba rse reg chung bar byal' rdogs pa shin tu chung bar byal' ni mtshams dang smra bcad dang! 'dag sbag gsum la dus 'da' bar byal' rang smsa sgyos sa rngo kyang bla ma rdo rje slob dpon mi spong ba la bslabl gug shyang gnyis pa rang sar dag kyung thogs chung nge chung ngu nas grol las 'bras nam mkha' la go gya sreg pa chung ngu nas 'dzem.' Zhang elsewhere in his Phyogs chen lam zab mthar thug, p. 88 (206), taught that the practitioner should completely avoid strife: skad cig tsam 'yang 'khrungs mi byal.' See also sphyin-saka bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal and the latter's quotations of sGom-tshul in L. Lhahungpo (1986), pp. 107 and 391; Tib. 96b and 362b. Cf. ibid., p. 372 (Tib. 345b), where sGom-po-pa is quoted as stating that moral cause and effect cease to function after the realization of the Dharmakaya. Cf. also gnubs Sangs-rgyas-ye-shes, bSam gnas mchog gsum, p. 47.2, on no longer needing to observe moral discipline to attain enlightenment once the theory has been actually understood (iba ba rongs nas).

149 Zhang, sNa tshogs zhi gnyis, Writings, pp. 620.7-623.6. See also the verses of criticism entitled the Phyug khrig [or: khrig? mchog ma], p. 664. There was in the previous century a bkag-gdams master named Chag khris-mchog (d. 1087?). Perhaps the writer of these verses ('Breg-'da Phyug Khris-mchog') was a member of the same Chag clan, which subsequently produced the masters Chag dGa-bcom-pa (1153-1216) and Chag Cho-rgyel-pal (1187-1264) in the generations after Zhang.

150 Zhang, Writings, p. 93 (47a): ngari yon tan mi la ma bshad nul' nga ma shi' bar yon tan bshad nul' khongs nas go'i risng' girya dang 'khrungs pa byed' rgyal khrims byas nas 'dli tsam gyi 'dod pa yod pa las' kho la yon tan 'dl'i dra na[m?] 'ong zer nas' sgrig pa kham po che gregs tu 'long ngol.

See for example his pompously and ironically entitled Bla ma zhang ston gnos! bla ma zhang ston rang nyid la shin tu ngo mthar ba'i sgo nas bstod pa, Writings, pp. 666.6-673.2.
In 1187, six years before his passing, Zhang founded his main monastery at Tshal Gung-thang. He built there a huge image of the Buddha (Lha chen dpal 'bar). Later, shortly before his death in 1193, he laid the foundations for his own large reliquary stupa.

Zhang's successor was mNyam-med Shākya-ye-shes (d. 1207), who lead the monastic center from 1194 until his death. Afterwards there followed a succession of abbots at Tshal Gung-thang. Nevertheless, the Tshal-pa bka'-bgyud tradition did not persist as a distinct entity for more than a few centuries; it had already died out by the 16th century, according to dPa'-bo gTsug-lag-phreng-ba.

Large fragments of Zhang's collected writings, including numerous autobiographical reminiscences, are preserved in a modern reproduction, and these must be consulted by anyone seeking a deeper insight into his intense and by no means simple personality.

SA-SKYA PANJTITA AND THE LATER CONTROVERSIES

To say that bla-ma Zhang was one of the more colorful, controversial and intriguing of the 12th-century Dwags-po bka'-bgyud masters would thus be no overstatement. And it is curious that his extreme practices—which even in the eyes of his bKa'-bgyud-pa co-religionists bordered on the scandalous—have so far gone almost completely unremarked by modern scholars. Instead, some of the few modern Western investigators of these controversies (together with certain Tibetans) have maintained that the subsequent inter-sectarian doctrinal disputes of the 13th century arose merely because of the sectarian antagonisms of Sa-sky-a Panijita (1182-1251), who was supposed to have been personally biased against the tradition of Zhang and other bKa'-bgyud-pa.

Sa-pañ was no doubt deeply disturbed by some of what Zhang had done or taught. But his doctrinal criticisms of Zhang's teachings must be treated as genuine—i.e. as serious discussions according to doctrinal, hermeneutical and philosophical principles—and not as mere invective. Moreover, the teachings that Sa-pañ criticized do

---

152 Apparently there was a small dialectical seminary of dge-bshes gZad-pa at Tshal when Zhang was invited there by 'dpon rGyal-tshas a-ma lha-cig, which was subsequently dismantled. See Zhang, Writings, p. 150.6. dge-bshes gzed pa'i mtsan nas kyi gsar 'di tsham bu shig [sic] nas. (I do not know who this "dge-bshes gZad-pa" was, though a bZad-pa Dar-ma-'od was the tenth abbot of gSang-phu, his thirty-year tenure having begun in the last years of the 1100s.) A seminary of the gSang-phu tradition is said to have been founded over a century later at Tshal Gung-thang Chos-khor-gling by Jam-dbyangs Shākya-gzhon-nu (abbot of gSang-phu Gling-smad in the early 1300s) and the Tshal-pa noblemen dGa'-bde. See A. Ferrari (1958), p. 106, and Shākya-mchos-ltan, rNgos lo, p. 452.1. Later this seminary became famous, and it was sometimes enumerated with gSang-phu and sNye-thang bDe-ba-can as one of a triad of the most important dialectical seminaries in Central Tibet in the mid-to late-14th century (gston bde gung gum), i.e. before the founding of the three great dGe-lugs-pa convents.

153 Ye-shes-rtsi-mo, p. 265.

154 Si-tu Paan-chen, p. 81.3.

155 dPa'-bo gTsug-lag-phreng-ba, vol. 1, p. 811.

156 Writings (bka' thor bu) of Zhang gYu-brag-pa bzrton-'grus-grags-pa (Tashijong: 1972).
contradict mainstream Indian Buddhist Mahāyāna doctrine as he understood it, if they are presented as ordinary Mahāyāna teachings. And some of what Sa-paṅ identified as being a "Chinese religious tradition" or a "Chinese-style Great Perfection" within these Great Seal traditions did indeed possess important similarities with Chinese Buddhist meditative school of Ch’an,⁶⁰ and of course with the Tibetan Great Perfection as well.¹⁶¹ Such features have also had a long history within the development of Buddhism in Central and South Asia, and may in fact go back ultimately to conflicting general approaches that already existed as differing strands within Indian Buddhism.¹⁶²

Indian Critics of the Tibetan Great Seal?

One of the reasons that Sa-paṅ may have linked these doctrines with China and with the Tibetan Great Perfection tradition was that the Great Seal as formulated and presented in the Dwags-po bKa‘-brgyud systems was perhaps not recognized as an established Indian Buddhist doctrine by the Indian scholars with whom he had closest contacts, for instance by the

 nya 84a, denied that he had written his own criticisms of the sDom gsum rab dbye out of vexation or annoyance (she sde).

¹⁶⁰ In Ch’an, similar teachings were common; in fact, “see the nature and achieve Buddhahood” became the paradigmatic statement of Ch’an gnoseology, according to R. Buswell (1987), p. 341. The idea is also expressed in the concise saying on Ch’an practice traditionally attributed to Bodhidharma:

A separate transmission outside the scriptures, / No reliance upon words and letters, / Directly pointing to the human mind, / See the nature and achieve Buddhahood.


A similar statement that the understanding of one’s own mind is precisely the Awakening of Buddhahood is found in the Ita ba’i phreng ba attributed to Padmasambhava, and it is quoted there from a source entitled Khams gsum mnam par rgyal ba’i nrog[st]pa as propounding: “The thorough understanding (or realization) of one’s mind is precisely the Awakening of Buddhahood.” The Tibetan: rang sens zo srog pa nglar snyang rgyas byang rgyud med pa byin. See Rong-zom Panḍita Chos-kyi-bzang-po’s Ita ba’i phreng ba commentary, p. 56, and the rtsa b a, p. 9.1.


¹⁶² See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), passim.

pandaṅita Śākyāśrihadrā (1140s-1225)¹⁶³ and the junior pandaṅitas in the latter’s entourage, who had come as to Tibet in the early 1200s.¹⁶⁴ Sa-paṅ may have concluded that if it was not known in India, it had come from elsewhere.

One of the junior Indian pandaṅitas with whom Sa-paṅ had studied a little together under Śākyāśrihadrā (but with whom Sa-paṅ’s relations otherwise do not seem to have been particularly cordial at a later time) was Vībhūticandra.¹⁶⁵ The latter is said to have criticized the Great Seal of the early ’Bri-gung-pa in particular in about 1207, which was before Sa-paṅ rejoined Śākyāśrihadrā’s group and received ordination at Myang-smad in 1208. In particular, Vībhūticandra supposedly slandered the ’Bri-gung-pa, saying, “For wealth, the ’Bri-gung-pa is great,” and that the Great Seal adherent or master there was a great impostor [or sham] (mor ’bri klung ba che zer te phyag rgya chen po ba ’di rtsaun che ba yin zer byas pa). In its wording, at least, this account given in the biography of

¹⁶³ For the sources on the life of this master, see D. Jackson (1990a), introduction.

¹⁶⁴ Indian pandaṅitas are also traditionally said to have been opposed to the Tibetans learning the Dzogschen, and Vairocana is said to have been slandered by the Indians. See S. Karmay (1988), pp. 25-6. These accounts, though legendary, would seem to indicate that from early times there existed some sort of tension between Indian Buddhists and Tibetan followers of the Great Perfection.

¹⁶⁵ Vībhūticandra is said to have refused to honor Sa-paṅ’s uncle Grags-pa’-rgyal-mtshan when Śākyāśrihadrā’s entourage visited Sa-sky, and later he wrote a work on the three vows, his sDom gsum ’od kyi phreng ba (Peking Tanjur, no. 4549), which apparently includes replies to Grags-pa’-rgyal-mtshan’s views and positions at variance with Sa-paṅ’s sDom gsum rab dbye. Taranātha gives a more detailed account of Vībhūticandra’s activities and of his conflict with the Sa-skya-pa in his sByor drug lhan tshibs, Collected Works, vol. 3, pp. 483-86 (19a-20b). I am indebted to Mr. Cyrus Sears for this reference.

L. van der Kuijp (1987), p. 67, n. 7, correctly noted the existence of the above disharmony and alluded to it as follows: “While part of Śākyāśri’s entourage, Vībhūticandra never seems to have met Sa-skya Panḍita and, instead, enjoyed close relations with the ’Bri-gung-pa. It would appear that his view of the interrelationship of the three vows (sDom gsum, mchog朗诵wara) was taken over by the ’Bri-gung-pa whereafter the latter became the target of Sa-skyas Panḍita’s sustained criticism in the sDom gsum [rab dbye].” That Sa-paṅ and Vībhūticandra met, however, can be accepted. Sa-paṅ probably met him together with the others in Śākyāśrihadrā’s retinue at his very first meeting with the latter, and some of the traditionally recorded tensions apparently had their origin in Vībhūticandra’s conduct while at Sa-skyā (where Śākyāśri spent the rainy season retreat in 1210). The study of Sa-paṅ and Vībhūticandra together under Śākyāśrihadrā, moreover, is recorded in Sa-paṅ’s biography by Lho-pa Rin-chen-dpal. See D. Jackson (1987), p. 27. Sanskrit manuscript materials in Vībhūticandra’s hand survived at Sa-skyā and were discovered there in the 1930s by Rāhula Sāṃkṣiptakāya. See also L. van der Kuijp (1987), p. 67. On Vībhūticandra as a Mādhyamika, see D. Seyfort Ruegg (1981), p. 117 and n. 383.
Sa-pan's teacher Šākyāśirībhadra (1140s-1225) by bSod-nams-dpal-bzang-po may have been a later fabrication. The traditional citing of the great wealth of the 'Bri-gung-pa, the kindness of the sTag-lung-pa and the wisdom of the Sa-skya-pa belongs typically to accounts describing a period about four decades later.\(^{166}\) But in any case, it was not presented in that biography for the purpose of discrediting the Great Seal or the 'Bri-gung-pa, for anything, the whole account was meant to show that in spite of Šākyāśirībhadra's refusal to visit 'Bri-gung though he was twice invited, the great Kashmiri master respected and approved of the 'Bri-gung-pa master ('Jig-rten-mgon-po), saying he was an emanation of Nāgārjuna.\(^{167}\) The reason Šākyāśri is said to have given for not coming is that some among his own Tibetan followers—specifically certain bKa'-gdam-pa and the strict Vinaya upholders called "Those [observing] a Single Seat" (gdam gcig pa)\(^{168}\)—might possibly accrue demerit in relation to the 'Bri-gung-pa (because of their lack of faith in him) if the Pan-ch'en Šākyāśri accepted the invitation there.\(^{169}\) According to the same tradition, Vībhūticandra later saw the error of his ways and built a stūpa at 'Bri-gung by way of atonement. It is also interesting that in a different context Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje (1507-1554) cited Šākyāśirībhadra as one of the Indian sources (besides Mitrayogin) for the Great Seal teachings received and transmitted by Khro-phu lo-tsa-ba (b. 1172/3).\(^{170}\)

---


167 There are a number of writings in the collected works of 'Bri-gung 'Jig-rten-mgon-po that mention Šākyāśirībhadra approvingly or that have some connection with his visit to Tibet. See for instance, vol. 2, pp. 249.6-250.7, 254.6-256.7, 493.4-493.5, and vol. 3, pp. 41f, 83f, and 199-201.

168 So called because they observed the discipline of eating only once a day, i.e. at a single sitting (stan gcig pa: aikāsānaka).

169 See bSod-nams-dpal-bzang-po, Sa'i steng na 'gran zla dang bral ba kha che pa rdi ta šākya sti bhadra'm nam thar, p. 45a-b; de nas 'bri khung pa mam s la chos rgye' zhal nas snyi 'khor la bka' gdam pa dang gsal gcig pa la sogs pa maung basl khyed la la phrin cil byung pa srid. 'Gos lo-tsa-ba (G. Roerich, transl., Blue Annals, p. 1070) also mentions Šākyāśirībhadra's refusal of two invitations to 'Bri-gung, and he gives further details in an earlier passage (nya 86a-b; G. Roerich transl., pp. 599-601). 'Gos lo-tsa-ba's account is apparently based on that of bSod-nams-dpal-bzang-po


---

bSam-yas, gTer ma, and the Later Controversy

One curious and probably not entirely coincidental fact about the dkar po chig thub controversy in 12th- and 13th-century Tibet is that two of the masters most involved—bla-ma Zhang and Sa-skya Paṇḍita—both lived and taught for lengthy periods at bSam-yas itself.\(^{171}\) Sa-pan knew that bla-ma Zhang had been active at the historically rich site of bSam-yas, which incidentally was also the locale of many "treasure text" (gter ma) "discoveries" before and afterward. And Sa-pan spoke of the tradition of the Hwa-shang as having come back to life based on "the mere text" (i.e. the mere reading) of rediscovered books.\(^{172}\) But when he mentioned that somebody had recovered Ch'ān texts from caches (where they had been hidden following the debate at bSam-yas), he was probably thinking of someone from the period of sGam-po-pa. The latter had indeed quoted a number of apocryphal Chinese Buddhist cíg car ba materials in his gradualist general Mahāyāna treatise, the Thar pa rin po che'i rgyan ("Ornament of the Jewel of Liberation"), but he is not linked to bSam-yas or to text finds by the usual historical sources.\(^{173}\) On the other hand, one of the teachings of bla-ma Zhang, the so-called "Sealed Book of 'Chims-phu" ('chims phu bka' rgya ma), was a sort of secret gter ma teaching containing Great Perfection initiations and instructions that Zhang had directly received (in visions) from Padmasambhava, Šāntaraśākṣita, and Vimalamitra, presumably while at 'Chims-phu near bSam-yas.\(^{174}\)

---

171 For references to Sa-pan's main seats or residences, see D. Jackson (1987), p. 36, n. 48. Another great Sa-skya-pa master with close ties to bSam-yas was bla-ma dam-pa bSod-nams-rgyal-mtshan (1312-1375). Indeed, from a certain time (the late 13th or early 14th century?) the abbot of bSam-yas came to be appointed from Sa-skya. See also Per K. Sørensen (1986), p. 56f.

172 Sa-pan, DS III 174 = 26a.

173 Some of these Ch'ān works translated from Chinese into Tibetan perhaps remained in circulation after the debate and in the subsequent centuries, and thus may not have been viewed as "apocryphal" in all circles. A number of such translations are listed for instance in the IDeN kar ma catalogue compiled in 812. And as mentioned above, several found their way into the later Kanjur canons.

174 Dpa'-bo gTsug-lag-phyong-ba, (N. Delhi 1959 ed., tha) part 1, p. 186: zhang gyu brag pa'i 'chims phu bka' rgya ma zhes slob dpon padma bo dði satva bi ma la mi tra mams la druga su 'gran pa'i rdogs chen gyi dbang gdam-s ngag yod pa.
Whatever the case, Sa-paṅ definitely had acquired first-hand experience of Zhang's tradition and followers through his travels and protracted stays in Central Tibet. He visited dBuṣ province more than once, and in the 1220s as well as perhaps also in the 1230s, he spent quite a long time at bSam-yas, where Zhang had formerly stayed and which just a few decades before had been a stronghold of Zhang's support—the bSam-yas ruler brTsdal-po Khri-seng having been one of bla-ma Zhang's most ardent supporters.175 (During the years of Sa-paṅ's visit to Central Tibet, the head of Zhang's main temple was one Sangs-rgyas-'bum, who was expelled from this position in 1231 by sGom-pa Ye-shes-'Idan, and only allowed to return in 1242 to found a meditation center [sgom sde.].)176 Sa-paṅ by his criticisms was no doubt trying to counter the continuing influence of bla-ma Zhang's tradition. Since followers of this school were still very active in Central Tibet, his opposition was directed against doctrines still being propounded by living doctrinal foes, and it was correspondingly forthright.

What Was Sa-paṅ Mainly Criticizing?

Sa-paṅ is thus known to have criticized certain of the special Great Seal doctrines taught in the Dwags-po bka'-brgyud, including teachings that are found in sGam-po-pa's writings, and especially some teachings that were later championed (sometimes in perhaps more radical forms) by bla-ma Zhang and his followers. The doctrines he criticized in connection with the dkar po chig thub were most notably:

1. That a single method or factor (even insight into Emptiness presented as the Great Seal) could suffice soteriologically.
2. That the Gnosis (ye shes: fnāna) of the Great Seal could arise through an exclusively non-conceptual meditative method.
3. That the Great Seal could ever be taught outside of the Mantrayāna.

175 dpā'-bo gtSugs-lag-phreng-ba, vol. 1, p. 810.

176 See the Blue Annals, p. 716; Tīb. nya 138b. Though 'Gos lo-tsa-ba does not specify the reasons for this expulsion, according to dpā'-bo, vol. 1, p. 809, it was because of a dispute between religious and secular leaders.

Sa-paṅ rejected these doctrines, denying in particular that they were the Great Seal tradition of the Indian Tantric adept Nārāyaṇa.177 His criticisms were thus based on much more than just the presence of such teachings as "no mentation at all" (ci yid la mi byed pa: amanāsikāra) also in the doctrines attributed to Mo-ho-yen.178 Moreover, his criticisms were not merely attempts at rejecting Maitripāda's amanāsikāra doctrine, which some later Tibetans such as Thu'u-bkwan Choṣ-kyi-nyi-ma (1737-1802) identified as "Maitripāda's Great Seal, the dkar po chig thub."179

Does this mean that Sa-paṅ through such criticisms was totally condemning all Great Seal instructions or all "introductions to the nature of mind"? Not at all. His chief concern in the present discussions was to establish the proper ways and contexts for teaching these. In some of the epistles preserved in Sa-paṅ's works, one does find passages in which Sa-

177 On the life of Nārāyaṇa, see H. Guenther (1963).


179 Thu'u-bkwan Choṣ-kyi-nyī-ma, p. 170.4 (kha 25b.4), portrays Sa-paṅ's criticisms as having been so directed, and therefore rejects them as unsatisfactory, saying: "Since this is clearly not the position of 'performing no mentation at all,' it is evident that the refutations [by Sa-paṅ] in the stDom gsum rab dbyes were improper" (ci yid la mi byed pa'i phoogs ni min par gro bar sdom gsum gi dga' pa rams thub chod kyi guong da mogn no). However, Sa-paṅ never seems to mention specifically that the Tibetan dkar po chig thub involved the lack of "mentation" (amanāsikāra, yid la byed pa), but uses instead such terms as "non-discursiveness" (nimtikalpa: mam par mi rig pa), even when characterizing the Hwa-shang's doctrine in his presentation of the traditional history of the bSam-yas debate.

In the above-mentioned work, Thu'u-bkwan identifies the dkar po chig thub over-narrowly as 'the Great Seal of Maitripāda' (ma' tri' phyogs chen dkar po chig thub), and therefore tries to exculpate Zhang because this doctrine of "complete non-mentation" (ci yid la mi byed pa) is not to be found in Zhang's [Lam ba mchab thug] treatise. Cf. D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 109.

Many later bka'-brgyud-pa understood Sa-paṅ to have been "hostile" especially to Maitripāda's non-mentation cycle. See for instance Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje, p. 11.3 (gs.3), and the translation by D. Seyfort Ruegg (1988), p. 1257. Here other bka'-gdam-pa are also said to have shared this basically negative attitude, which, as mentioned in a previous note, Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje attributed originally to Gro-lung-pa's criticisms of the Yid la mi byed pa as not being Madhyamaka.

Sa-paṅ does not seem to have criticized specifically the amanāsikāra doctrines of Maitripāda. He also did not criticize here the pernicious doctrines that spread in the western Himalayas in the 9th and 10th century, for he considered those and other erroneous doctrines to have been authoritatively refuted and eradicated by previous great scholars such as Rin-chen-brang-po and Zhi-ba'od, as he discusses in a final passage of chapter III (verses 603-6 = 45b) of his stDom gsum rab dbyes. Cf. D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 104.
pañ gives the impression of rejecting an "introduction to the nature of mind" on theoretical grounds. For instance, in his reply to the eleventh question of Nam-mkha'-bum, regarding how one should introduce the mind, he stated: "According to my tradition, since the mind has no nature, there is nothing to introduce. The absence of awareness and the lack of mental activities has been termed the 'mindfulness of the Buddha.'"

But in another epistle, his replies to the questions of the great meditator from sNyi-mo, Sa-paṅ explained himself at much greater length, showing that he did recognize that the understanding of Emptiness, the ultimate reality of the mind, was an essential factor without which Buddhahood was impossible. His denial of the existence of any nature of mind to be "introduced" referred to the paradoxical nature of understanding the absolute: it was an understanding of something about which there was nothing to be understood in any ordinary sense.181

180 Sa-paṅ, bKa’ gsal nam mkha’ bum, p. 416.1.5 (na 243b): dib ba bu cgyi pal’ sens kyi ngo ji tshar spod zer ba la’ kho bo’i lugs kyes sens la ngo bo me med pas sprod rgya mi bsdod’ dam pa med cing yid la bya ba med pa ni sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa zhes ming tu btags pa yin. For Maribhadra on buddhismanu and asambara, see D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 155 and 159f.

181 Sa-paṅ, sNyi mo sgom chen la, pp. 417-418.2 (na 247a-248a). buc drug pa sens stong par rtags pa la sangs rgyas ’byung ngyam mi ’byung zer ba la’ stong pa rkyang pa rtags pa las sangs rgyas mi ’byung’ shes bya thams cad rtags na ’tshang rgya ba yin’ de la’ang rtags lugs gcig yod! don dam pa rtags [247b] rgyu med par rtags pa dang’ kun rdo bzub tu ci snyed yod pa de snyed so xor rtags pa yin!
bcu balun pal khyed rtags ldan shal gcis bzes sam ni bzhes zer ba la’ ngyas don dam par chos gung yang rtags rgya ma ngyed pa’i rtags ldan du khas mi le’l tha snyed kun rdo bzub tu sbya bya rig pa’i gnas lnga shes pas mkhas par khas ’che ba yin’!
bcu brgyad pal khyed kyi gra pa na sens ngo ’phrod pa yod dam zer ba la’ nged kyi gra pa’i na’ang don dam par sens rtags rgya med pa go pa’l shes bya thams cad rtags kun rdo bzub tu sbya bya mkhas pa mang po gatl’ sens la ngo bo med par sens ngo shes pas cang mchis’am!.
bcu dgu pa sens ngo ma ’phron nud bsdod nams kyi tshogs brtags kyang gnas skabs kyi bde bar mi ’gur ram zer ba la’ sens kyi gnas lugs stong pa nyid kyi don ma rtags na bsdod nams kyi tshogs kyi mams grub gi bde ba’i bshad pa’i rtags ma rtags pa bshad kyi ma nger pa la’as mdo’ bsdod nams kyi tshogs ma rtags gling’ shes bya mi shes na sens stong par rtags pa rkyang pa la’ang sangs rgyas can mchis’am! stong par rtags pa rkyang pa rtags ma brgyud pa la’ang sangs rgyas na mchis’am! stong par rtags pa rkyang pa rtags ma bshad pa la’ang sangs rgyas na mchis’am! stong par rtags pa rkyang pa rtags ma bshad pa la’ang sangs rgyas na mchis’am! stong par rtags pa rkyang pa rtags ma bshad pa la’ang sangs rgyas na mchis’am! stong par rtags pa rkyang pa rtags ma bshad pa la’ang sangs rgyas na mchis’am!

Nevertheless, introducing an ignorant person merely to an understanding of the nature of mind was of no great benefit, for that person would remain still ignorant of the most basic essentials. He could hardly even call himself a Buddhist. As Sa-paṅ explained in the "Discriminative Understanding" chapter of his Thub pa’i dgehgs gsal (57b-58a):

[Question:] In general, when one introduces [the nature of] mind, is this an introduction to the nature of mind alone, or does one need to introduce also the nature of external objects? [Answer:] The introduction of [the nature of] mind alone is a non-Buddhist Indian sectarian tradition. That is an erroneous path because by means of it one cannot get rid of the dichotomous postulation of apprehending subject and apprehended object. If one needs to introduce also the nature of external objects, one must critically examine whether those objects have arisen from a creator-god such as Īśvara, as [some] non-Buddhist Indian sectarians maintain, or from "atoms", as the Śrāvakas maintain, p. 58a) or whether from mind, as the [Buddhist Yogācāra] adherents of Mind-Only maintain, or out of interdependent origination, as the Mādhyamikas say.

If these [entities] are held to be either existent or non-existent, one must know scripture and reasoning in order to refute those [views] because they have not gone beyond eternalism or annihilationism. Even maintaining that the appearances [of external objects] and mind are interdependently [originated], one must know the Buddhist scriptures and reasoning. If one does not know those, one will not properly understand the insubstantiality of a person and of the factors of existence. If one has not understood the insubstantiality of a person, [one's meditation] will be no different from that of the non-Buddhist Indian sectarian. If one has not understood the insubstantiality of factors of existence, [one's meditation] will be no different from that of the Śrāvaka. In order to understand the two insubstantialities (bdag med), one must first remove one's erroneous imputations by means of the discriminative understanding born from learning and reflection. Independent of learning and reflection, it is impossible to understand insubstantiality. If one has not understood insubstantiality, one will not know how to cultivate in meditation [a direct understanding of this] insubstantiality. If one does not know

*tshang bust mi多种形式 med pa’i dshul gis *tshang rgya ba re ba legs!
how to cultivate [that] in meditation, there will not arise discriminative understanding born from meditative realization. If discriminative understanding born from meditative realization does not arise, it is impossible for the Path of Seeing of the Saint (Arya) to arise.

In one of his longer epistles, the sKyes bu dam pa, Sa-pan presented in more general terms his opinion about the introduction to the nature of mind.\textsuperscript{182}

... It is not taught in any Sutra, Tantra or great treatise that one can awaken to Buddhahood by a Self-sufficient White [simple method], as distinct from [through] the perfectly replete possession of means and discriminative knowledge. [Some] Sutras and Tantras do indeed teach that one can gain Buddhahood by merely respectfully saluting or circumambulating, and by offering one flower, or by reciting a single dhāraṇī, or by reciting just the name of the Buddha, or by a single act of worshipful reverence, or by the arising of a single thought of Bodhicitta, or by the mere understanding of Emptiness. Yet one should understand those as being [statements with special intention (dgongs pa) or allusion (Idem dgongs), but they are not direct expression. As Maitreyanātha said [in the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra I 20]:

If one understands the sense literally, one becomes haughty oneself and one's mind is destroyed.

For example, if the [various] threads do not come together, the designs on brocade will not appear. And if the seed, water and manure do not come together, [4b] the crop of a field will not appear. If all the interdependently connected [causes and conditions] do not come together, perfectly complete Buddhahood will not arise. Such is my understanding.

Generally speaking, one does require a direct recognition of the nature of mind. Nevertheless, this can be seen to be of two types: good and bad. If one directly recognizes the nature of mind having completed the excellent qualities through [compassionate] means, there will occur the attainment of Buddhahood. But without having completed the excellent qualities, no matter how excellent the direct recognition of mind is, it is taught that [in the best case a person can attain] the Arhatship of the Śrāvaka, in the middling case [he will be reborn in] the sphere lacking even fine substance (ārūpyadhatu), and in the worst case that one will be born in the evil destinies. A statement by Nāgārjuna, namely [MMK XXIV 11]: "If they err in the viewing of emptiness, those of small intelligence will be destroyed," was also stated with this in mind.

Similarly, though ears of grain must come from a field, there are two ways for them to come: good and bad. If the ears appear on completely developed stalks, that will be a good harvest. If they appear on [plants that] have not reached full development, there will be a poor harvest. Likewise the direct recognition of the nature of mind, too, will be sufficient if it occurs at the right time. If it happens at the wrong time, it is of no use. With these things in mind, it was taught in the Akāśagarbha Sūtra that to propound emptiness to those of untrained minds was a fundamental infraction, [teaching this] with the words: "And the proclaiming of emptiness to a living being who has not trained his mind...."\textsuperscript{183} If [thus to teach emptiness is a fundamental infraction], it goes without saying that [there would be an infraction] if it is understood.

As seen above, sGam-po-pa and his successors did prize a certain non-conceptual, non-intellectual, non-verbal approach, and they strongly devalued the reverse. Phag-mo-gru-pa's lnga Idan system of the Great Seal practice even termed the main theory to be cultivated and understood specifically as the "non-discursive theory" (mi rog pa'i la ba). But that referred to the insight into the ultimate, and not really to a meditative method. Moreover, Sa-pan himself agreed that at the final stage, the ultimate could not be known directly by conceptual thought, which could only apprehend its object indirectly through "exclusion of other."\textsuperscript{184} Furthermore, the "non-discursive" method of both sGam-po-pa and bla-ma Zhang clearly tried to avoid certain pitfalls of a forced non-conceptual approach. sGam-po-pa, for example, on one occasion criticized those who would consciously suppress all discursive thought (rog pa), saying: "Some view as a virtue the concentrated placing of mind in non-discursiveness, having stopped all discursive thoughts that appear. But that will not advance one along the Path. Such a thing is called 'lame

\textsuperscript{182} Sa-pan, sKyes bu dam pa, p. 332.2-3 (ff. na 73a-b = 4a-b). This whole passage is translated and quoted below in the Appendix, part II, B.

\textsuperscript{183} On this quotation, see below, Appendix, part II, B.

\textsuperscript{184} See also the sources referred to in D. Jackson (1987), p. 396, n. 95.
Gnosis.” And as mentioned above, Zhang similarly rejected a purposeful suppression of conceptual thought.\(^{185}\)

Ignorant people ... view discursive thought as a fault and stop it. They desire non-conceptualizing and purposefully try to achieve it. You will never finish sweeping away waves with a broom.

Non-conceptualizing that arrests conceptual thought is itself a deluded conceptual thought. It is a great darkness that obscures the Dharmakāya.

**Questioning the Origin of a Doctrine**

One line of Sa-pan’s criticisms was to deny the historical authenticity of how some masters of the Dwags-po bKa’-brgyud presented the Great Seal. In Sa-pan’s opinion, the latter tradition—which was claimed to be from Nāropa—did not derive from its reputed source, but instead from somewhere else. Sa-pan had received three lineages of Nāropa’s “Six Dharmas” teaching and also had studied various dohas including apparently those of Maitripāda, but he had not come across the doctrines in question at that time.\(^{187}\) On the other hand, he must have noticed the strong similarities between certain of the teachings in question and the Great Perfection-like Ch’ an doctrines that Mo-ho-yen had taught, and therefore he concluded that they had been picked up through “merely the

---

\(^{185}\) sGam-po-pa, Works, vol. 2, p. 111.6: la laas rtag pa byung tshad bskor nas rtag med la blo drel’ jog pa la yon tan la bka’ stel’ des lam gzed mi nus ye shes phyé [read: ‘phyé] bo bya ba yin. See also Zhang, Phyang chen lam zab mthar thung, p. 78.2

\(^{186}\) Zhang, Lam zab mthar thung, pp. 756-7.

\(^{187}\) For the record of Sa-pan’s study of the three traditions of the Nā ro chos drug as well as various doha teachings, see the sDom gsun rab dbyar III 656 (p. 320.3.4 = na 48a.4).

As Sa-pan stated in a previous passage of the same work (III 497, p. 317.1.2 = na 41a.2), whatever criticisms he made of this Phyang rgya chen po tradition could only be made through pointing out contradictions with what Nā-ro-pa had taught: “Similarly, a follower of the Great Seal, too, reveres Nāropa, and if there is a contradiction with the basic teachings of Nāropa, that will refute a follower of the Great Seal.”

This is an instance of the general rule that only internal contradictions have any force to disprove when criticizing another tradition through scriptural citation. A little later (III 502, p. 317.1.2 = na 41a.6), he cites the authority of Mar-pa’s lineage of the Nā ro chos drug.

---

\(^{188}\) Sa-pan, DS III 175 = 26a. Cf. D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 109. The phrase yi ge tsam could also have been an ironical reference to the claim of others that these teachings did not rely on words, texts, etc.

\(^{189}\) That these quotations and teachings bear a marked similarity with the early Ch’ an traditions translated into Tibetan in the snga-dar period can be seen from a quick glance at the manuals for followers of the “Mahāyāna” preserved in the ancient Tun Huang manuscript Pei Liot. Tīb.116, namely the dMyigs su med pa tshul ge sgis pa’i ghang. It is also possible that Sa-pan himself had also come across such writings in Central Tibet. Works attributed to Mo-ho-yen’s school enjoyed at least a limited circulation among later Tibetan scholars. Tāranātha, for instance, in an answer to a query (Collected Works, vol. 13, p. 544.4) mentions having seen the mDo sde brgyud be huang. And in the 13th century, such traditions were still being transmitted by certain Tibetan Buddhist masters. The Jo-nang-pa master Kun-spangs-chen-po Thugs-rje-btum-grus, for instance, is recorded to have given a Dzogs-chen and Chinese “Ha-shang” practical instructions to Yon-tan-rgya-mtsho, a teacher of both Bu-ston (1250-1364) and Dol-po-pa (1292-1361): dzogs chen seng phyogs dang’ rgya’i ha yang gi man ngag gi skor mams gnyan ngol. See A-mes-zhab, dPal grang ba’i dam pa’i chos ‘byung ba’i tshul legs par bshad pa’i gnsang ’dus chos kun gsal ba’i nyin byed, p. 133.3 (tsha 67a). I owe the last two references to Mr. Cyrus Stearns.

Somebody would have to study the occurrence of such quotations in sGam-po-pa’s works in more detail in the future. But I think it is safe to say that rje sGam-po-pa (like bla-ma Zhang) did not adopt a critical attitude when dealing with materials stemming from other Tibetan chig car ba traditions. He apparently noted the great parallels in their approach and outlook, and simply accepted them as useful, not concerning himself about their historical background or precise origins. In this he was in a sense remaining true to the spirit of his tradition, though less so to the letter.

\(^{189}\) I have studied one or two of these in ‘Birds in the Egg and Newborn Lion Cubs: Metaphors for the Potentials and Limitations of ‘All-at-once’ Enlightenment,’ forthcoming in the proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Tibetan Studies (Narita: 1992). As I show there, both sGam-po-pa and Zhang had adopted these elements.

An interesting borderline case is where sGam-po-pa implicitly uses the image of the sun obstructed by clouds. (See his Collected Works, vol. 1, p. 218.5) It is not enough merely to use the intellect to remove false conceptual imputations about the nature of things, he says. You also have to get rid of the intellect that removes those. Otherwise it is like removing black clouds but [the sun] still being obscured by white clouds. The Tibetan text: chod byed kyi stes pa’i blo dang mi’ bral tel de dang ma’ bral na sprin nag po’i bsal yang dkar pos bsngri pa dang ‘dra’ol. On this image in Mo-ho-yen’s writings, see L. Gómez
terms of real, historical links with the Mo-ho-yen's writings, and of a real break from or adulteration of the authentic Indian tradition of Nāropa that had been transmitted in Tibet by Mar-pa the Translator (1012-1097) to his student Mi-la ras-pa (1040-1123).

Such newly introduced doctrines, he argued, should not be accepted, because they were the same as those that had already been officially rejected at the bSam-yas debate. He argued further that such doctrinal innovations—like any inventions whatsoever within a traditionalist religious system—were bogus in principle.

sGam-po-pa usually stressed Nāropa as the main source of the Great Seal lineage. Although he mentioned to Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa the differentiation of Nāropa's teachings—which are "possessing meditative cultivation" (btag yod) and "for the time of the path" (lham dus su)—with those of Maitripāda, which are contrastingly described as "without cultivation" (btag med), he himself seems to have stressed rather the

unity of all Dharma and the identity of all meditative experience and realization. Bla-ma Zhang, too, in his record of teachings received from Maitripāda was the Thog bab[s] ("Thunderbolt Strike"), which (like the Lam cig car) he had received from rJe-btsun Yer-pa and not from rJe sGom-tshul. A brief "fruit" (bras ba) instruction by this name is also found in the collected works of sGam-po-pa and indeed is attributed to his authorship. It contains a formulation of several key principles of the cig car ba approach, and if presented as a practice outside the Completion State of the Mantrayāna or as anything more than a description of the "fruitional" Gnosis, it would have been rejected by Sa-pa (for whom

---

193 sGam-po-pa, Das gsum mkhyen, Works, vol. 1, p. 452.2 (tha 13a): da la ba mal 'byor pa lus nga ma shig pa yin! shi[?] nas da la ba bnga log gli gsal la nga cher 'gro ba yin? pha rol du phinyi pa dang! gvang sags sgyis 'khyad ci yod na! lam nye ring la khyad yod! na ro pa'i lug ki sbyogs yod yin! na! tri pa'i lug ki sbyogs med yin! lam gyi dus na sbyogs yod yin! 'bras bu! du sas sbyogs mi sbyogs gis rtsis gsal med! chos thams cad gi yin! nyams dang rogs pa gi yin! 'dod pa yin! Cf. below, 452.6: sbyogs chen rab la sngag mi sngag gi rtsis gsal med [sde med pa yin]!


195 sGam-po-pa's tracing of the Great Seal lineage through Nāropa was not unfair, because this is precisely what Zhang Tshal-pa himself did in his own lineage record, where it is given as one and the same as his Six Yogas lineage: [b]Gyud pa sna tshogs, Writings, p. 439.2: phyag rgya chen po dang! na ro pa? chos drug 'di! dbang du byas nal! bcom lcdn 'das rdo rje 'chang gi sprul pa te lo pas! na ro pa la byin gis brsals! des mar pa lo lha la byin gis brsals! mar ngog miin gnyis kyi rje btsun mi la ras pa la bsal! des bla ma dags po nyid sgom pa la bsal! des bla ma dags po sgom tshul la bsal! des bla ma dags po gyi snang snyed. The Lam cig car ba is also considered by Zhang to be a teaching of Nāropa. See: his lhul ma na snying tsho kyi byung, p. 423.7: rje btsun rin po che ye pa ba la! lam cig char bu la sogs pa na ro pa! gnam gi snying sna tshogs! thugs babs la sogs pa na! tui pa! gnam gi snying sna tshogs! .... The lineage for the Lam cig car ba is given as follows: ([b]Gyud pa sna tshogs, 436.4): lam cig char ba dang! rims kyi dang! kha 'thora bhi! dang bu byas nal! bcom lcdn 'das dpal byas pa no rje! sa bcu pa! byang chub sams rje snying po la bsal! des snyin pa sku te lo pa la bsal! des na ro pa la bsal! des snyin pa! lha brag pa la bsal! des snyin snyed! des snyin frin! bo pa la bsal! des snyin kyi dang! mi la ras pa la bsal! des snyin gi dang! ka bo 'bra! snyin ras chen la bsal! des snyin po la bsal! des snyin bran dang! la bsal!

196 Zhang, Writings, p. 427.


198 Sa-pa in his sDom gsum rab dbye rejected that the rDogs-pa chen-po was a separate vehicle (as maintained in the rNying-ma nine-vehicle system), but he accepted it as Gnosis (ye shes: 'jna). For Sa-pa, such "fruitional" instructions belonged to the "fruit"
"Fruit" teachings belonged to the "Fruit Vehicle"). 199

The tradition of stressing the role of Maitripāda's Great Seal teachings as paramount and of tracing the origin of the key Great Seal teachings through him back to Saraha (and to Nāgārjuna) apparently arose at a stage of the tradition subsequent to the time of sGamin-pa-po-pa and Zhang, approximately during the life of Sa-pa, perhaps even as a response to the questions he had raised. According to the later bKa'-brogypa scholars 'Gos lo-tsā-ba (1392-1481) and Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje (8th Karma-pa, 1507-1554), this origin was asserted especially by rGud-rgshang-pa (1189-1258?) or by both him and his chief disciple. 200 'Gos lo-tsā-ba, alludes to this theme once in his chapter of the Blue Annals devoted specifically to Maitripāda's Great Seal, after having treated the Mar-pa bKa'-brogypa and such masters as sGamin-po-pa and Zhang as holders of a separate and vehicle, the Vajrayāna. See also S. Karmany (1988), p. 147.

199 The title of the work as it appears in sGamin-po-pa's collected writings is Chos rje dags po tha rje'i gsum lugs thog babs kyi rita ba, and it begins with the phrase: "With regard to this instruction of the Great Seal, the Thunderbolt Strike, which is applied on top from above..." (phyag rgya chos po'i gsalams ngag thog babs yas thog tu gsal pa 'di ldas...). To begin with, before the actual practical instruction, five erroneous notions are refuted:
1) Maintaining that a later excellent Gnosis is attained after one has gotten rid of the evil mind that one presently has. (This is unacceptable because as the root of all dharmas, the mind is not to be abandoned in this system.)
2) Maintaining that the five poisons or kleshas are to be purified. (This is unacceptable because in this system the poisons are to be assimilated and incorporated into the path.)
3) Maintaining that realization (rongs pa) is reached after three long acons. (This is unacceptable because in this system, realization is maintained to be right now.)
4) Maintaining that realization is reached through intelligence (ngag pa) or discriminative understanding (shes rab). (This is unacceptable because in this system realization is said to be reached through the direct, practical instruction gsalams ngag pa.)
5) Maintaining that there is a qualitative distinction of better or worse between a Buddha and an ordinary sentient being. (This is unacceptable because in this system, there is no difference between them, beyond the presence or absence of realization [rongs pa]).

The gCig car bai's lam gsto bbor bton ba Thog babs instructions are classified within Padmar-kar-po's gsal yig as belonging to the section gsalams ngag nyams ten gyi skor. See Padmar-kar-po, bKa' brogypa pa, pp. 376 and 377.2.


201 However, he already had briefly made the point at the end of the Mar-pa bKa'-brogypa chapter that rGud-rgshang-pa had explained the [general Mahāyāna] Perfections Mahāmudrā of sGamin-po-pa as being the [system] maintained by Lord Maitripāda. But there 'Gos-lo had concluded with the emphatic assertion that sGamin-po-pa had definitely taught the Mantrayāna Great Seal, too, to his intimate disciples.

202 Some other 16th-century Dags-po bKa'-brogypa-pa such as sGamin-po spyan-snga bKra-shis-nya-mrual (1513-1569) and dPa'-bo gTsug-lag-phreng-ba (1501-1556) carried this historical interpretation further and described their Great Seal doctrine as being a special transmission of the Great Seal that was not transmitted by Nāropa, but rather by Maitripāda, it being the quintessential sense of the Great Seal (phyag rgya chen po snying po'i don) realized by Saraha and transmitted to Nāgārjuna and then to the latter's student Śāvari, who was Maitripāda's master. 203 The 8th Karma-pa Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje, too, portrayed the "Amanasikāra-Madhymakā" (yid la mi byed pa'i dbu ma) of Maitripāda as that "Madhymakā" which Mar-pa, Mi-la and sGamin-po-pa had been teaching. 204 This seems also to have been the position taken by Shākya-mchog-Idan. 205 Such a characterization circumvents the thrust of Sa-pa's original historical criticism regarding its origin with Nāropa (Sa-pa never explicitly criticized the amanasikāra teaching of Maitripāda), and it must be said in favor of this bKa'-brogypa-pa that their tradition did inherit numerous disparate lineages, including a large number of ones from masters other than Nāropa. It is just possible that Sa-pa may also have taken certain gCig car ba doctrinal elements inherited from Maitripāda as having come ultimately from a Great Perfection-like Ch'han origin. But
regarding the existence of at least some Ch'an or Dzogchen contacts somewhere in the lineage, Sa-paṅ was certainly not just imagining things, as can be seen from some of sGom-po-pa's quotations and doctrinal formulations. It can also be said in Sa-paṅ's support that the early Dvags-po bKa'-brgyud-pa masters after sGom-po-pa such as bla-ma Zhang did not always carefully distinguish a separate origin for these teachings, and they sometimes did apparently combine teachings of Nāropa and Maitripāḍa, for example, when accounting for the transmission of the Great Seal.206

When Sa-paṅ called these Great Seal teachings "present-day" (lit.: "present" da lta'i) doctrines or stated in the sDom gsum rab dbyer that the related teachings were not known until after Mar-pa and not before Mi-la, he was implying that they had newly come into currency within that tradition during the time of sGom-po-pa, the great innovator and systematizer of this school. The main Sa-skyā-pa commentators agreed that Sa-paṅ in his criticisms of gcig-thub teachings was chiefly criticizing teachings of sGom-po-pa or his lineage.207 The Dvags-po bKa'-brgyud-pas, too, characterized sGom-po-pa as having been the one who significantly altered the methods of the Great Seal presentation or instruction within their tradition, and a number of bKa'-brgyud-pa masters agreed that most of the great Mar-pa bKa'-brgyud early adepts, including even Mi-la, had combined the Great Seal and Great Perfection.208

---

206See also 'Bri-gung 'Jig-rten-mgon-po, Collected Works, vol. 1 (ka), p. 295, who when describing the studies of his master Phag-mo-gru-pa, enumerated the two traditions of amanatskāra as distinct from the Great Seal, the latter being treated as the same as the Six Dharmas of Nāropa: rdo-rje chen/ zhi hgyur/ thun jigs/ a ma na se guung sngags/ kyi chags srol rgyis/ phyag rgya chen po'am dupa nā ro pa'is chos drug la sogs pa.


208 dpA'-bo gTsug-lag-phe-ba, (N. Delh, 1959, ed., tha), part 1, p. 18c: rje mi la sogs mar pa'i bka' brgyud kyi grub chen phul cher kyi phyag rtags gcig tu ster zhan zhi 'brug 'jig rten mgon po dang thams cad mkhyen pa rang byung ra kyi sogs kyi rtsa 'khor 'lo lnga la sgrub pa bka' brgyud kyi rig lnga dang rtsa phyan la sgrub bsod pa dang/ rje rgyud tshang pa dza landa ro byun dus del 'skor du rdo-rje chen gi grub thab mong po nportun ba dang rje yang dug pa'i thugs dam rdo-rje chen las 'khrungs pa dang zhang snyon brag pa'i 'chams phu bka' rgya ma zhes slob dpod padna bo ddi stwa ma la ma tra mams la dgyogs su gsal pa'i rdo-rje chen gi dbyung dbang rgyas yod pa sogs. dpA'-bo ma nyid kyi yang skyes chen mdzad dang gis rgyu dang du mdzad cing'. Here dpA'-bo is demonstrating that the Great Perfection was widely recognized even among gSa-rma-pa masters, and just before this he cites Pha-dam-pa Sangs-rgyas and the latter's teacher Buddhaguhya, as Indian teachers of the Great Perfection, as well as one of the teachers of Śākyasvabhadrā whom I have not able to identify.


210 There is a tendency among some modern students of Tibetan Buddhism to lose sight of this fact. See, for instance, S. Matsumoto (1990), p. 19, who finds something...
case of such widely experienced and broadly based Buddhists, one must always ask on what level they were speaking and from what doctrinal standpoint, thus keeping their multifarious background in mind. If we were to consider Sa-pan as a mere dialectician or scholastic of the general Mahāyāna, for instance, we would completely lose sight of the full dimensions of his own spiritual life, the deepest level of which consisted of his experiences through Tantric meditation. We would then also lack an adequate background for understanding his doctrinal discussions of Tantric practice.

Many sources indicate that Sa-pan, in addition to his other fields of expertise, was highly proficient in the theory and practice of the Mantrayāna. Tantra was the main subject of his studies in his youth, and he was the main recipient of a vast amount of Vajrayāna teachings from his uncle, the preeminent master Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan. Many of his studies with the Indian pandits such as Śākyasriabhadrā were also devoted to Tantric subjects. Later in his life he continued to devote considerable efforts to Tantric subjects—by actively transmitting the same lineages to his nephew 'Phags-pa (1235-1280) and many other disciples, by his discussions of related issues in his doctrinal treatises, and by his editing the vast corpus of Tantric writings left by two of his uncles (bSod-nams-rti-mo and Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan) and his grandfather (Sa-chen Kun-

dga'-snying-po). Once or twice it seems that Tantric doctrines influenced his interpretations of important topics even within a more general Mahāyāna context.214

One of the main principles Sa-pan appealed to for making his critical comments was that of genuine lineage. The importance of authentic origins and unbroken later transmission was recognized by all Tibetan Buddhist traditions, though especially by the Vajrayāna, and this principle, which is both religious and historical, opened another avenue for evaluating the authenticity of doctrines. For his own knowledge of Tantric precepts and practice, Sa-pan, too, had to depend in large part on the explanations given to him by competent masters who faithfully upheld the lineages in question.215 When he noticed great divergences between two traditions claiming similar origins (or strong similarities between those claiming dissimilar origins), he considered himself entitled to ask what particular lineages both parties were following—i.e. what the "pedigree" of the teaching had been. In this way, questions about unusual or doubtful doctrines could sometimes be approached through a concrete historical question of origins. The answers given to such questions could also open the way for further investigations, because after one had identified the basic lineage of the other tradition, one could then pinpoint the contradictions between the original tradition and its later manifestation.

For Sa-pan and his tradition, it was essential for a Buddhist to preserve and maintain the core doctrines and vital practices of Indian Buddhism. He believed that to do this, a Buddhist adherent had to

213 On this editing work by Sa-pan, see D. Jackson (1987), p. 244, n. 15.

214 See Sa-pan, Thub pa'i dzogsh ga'ral, p. 31.4.3 (62b), and D. Jackson (1990), p. 98, n. 94.

215 Incidentally, Sa-pan himself is said by his biographer and student Lho-pa kun-mkhyen Rin-chen-dpal to have received Great Seal and Great Perfection instructions under sDyi-bo-thas-pa, though no further details are given. See D. Jackson (1987), and pp. 27 and 36, n. 42. He himself mentions in the sDom gsum rab byel (III 656 = 48a) his having received three lineages of Nāropa’s Six Dharmas teachings, and in his Nga bskyad ma'i yrel pa, p. 151.2.3 (tha 305a), he lists the Phyag-chen and rDzogs-chen among the instructions known among the “Elders of Tibet” (bod byres po) that he had received, as opposed to those recognized among the great Tantric adepts of India: dgehan yang rgya gar gi grub pa thub pa'i ma'byor gi dang phyag mams la grags pa'i gdams ngag phal che la dang’i bod byres po mams la grags pa'i lha' gdams pa dang' zhi byed pa' rdogs pa chen po dang' phyag rgya chen po la sogs pa nas geod kyi bar dal' yongs su grags pa'i gdams ngag thams cad thos shing khong du chad pa dang' lam de dag gi rim gis pa dang' cigs char bar grags pa'i jug thslu thams cad kyang shes slob.
discern carefully his own theory and practice from those of other Buddhist
and non-Buddhist traditions. In the realm of vows or ethics, three main
traditions and several sub-traditions had been inherited from Buddhist
India and should, in his view, be distinguished and kept distinct, even
while practicing all of them. These main traditions were (1) the Vinaya
system of monastic discipline belonging to the Sāravaka tradition, (2) the
Bodhisattva vow system belonging to the Paramitāyāna, and (3) the
Vajrayāna vows of the Tantras. Sa-pam devoted one of his main
works, the sDom gsun rab dbye, to discriminating these systems and to
clarifying their interrelations. According to him, it vitiated the power of
the respective traditions to blur these essential distinctions and to practice
teachings of one system according to the principles of another.

Sa-pam adhered, moreover, to the traditional opinion that Buddhist
Mahāyāna doctrine in general should be carefully divided into two
departments: (1) the common approach of the Bodhisattva path with its
Perfections (pāramitā) and very long-term project, and (2) the special
Mantrayāna approach, with its special short-cut methods and its cultivation
of the two stages (rim pa: krama) of Tantric meditation. Both paths had
as their goal the direct understanding of the ultimate or śānyāta through
meditation and the cultivation of compassionate skillful means, though
the methods and ways of meditation were different for each. Within the
general Mahāyāna, one sought to win insight into reality through the
Madhyamaka theory (which could only be approached through preliminary
learning and reflection) in connection with the cultivation of various other
compassionate means and qualities.

For the Mantra approach, the highest "non-elaboration" (nispānapca: spros bral) theory (i.e., the ultimate truth) to be known was the same as

that of the Madhyamaka, but the methods for knowing it were different. For practicing within the Mantrayāna, one had to be first
formally initiated into the mandala by a qualified master and there
introduced to the insight into ultimate reality, which would gradually be
intensified and stabilized through the two stages of Tantric meditative
practice. Regarding the latter approach, Sa-pam wrote in his Epistle to the
Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions (Phyogs bcu’i sangs
rgyas...):

...It is taught that the cultivation of the Great Seal is a Gnosis arisen
from consecration and a special meditative absorption (samādhi)
of the two stages [of Tantric meditation].

Or as he summed up in the sDom gsun rab dbye (III 162-165):

Even though that meditation [of yours] may be excellent, it is not
higher than the meditation of the Madhyamaka. Though that
meditation of the Madhyamaka is indeed excellent, still it is very

---

216 See also sGam-po-pa’s comments on the need for integrating the three vows within
one person: Writings, vol. 1, pp. 158 and 163.6. ‘Bri-gung Jig-ret-mgon-po, too, strongly
insisted on this point, pointing to the example of both Atiśa and Phag-mo-gru-pa. See his
collected works, vol. 2, pp. 63.4 and 343.2.

217 As will be described more fully below, one of the extreme doctrines Sa-pam
criticizes in this regard was a radical doctrinal relativism that maintained that all vehicles
were true in their own context. sDom gsun rab dbye III 410 (36b-37a): kha cig thag pa
rang sa nall bden pa yin zhes kun la srog/2.

218 See also sGam-po-pa on the need for preliminary learning and reflection within
the general Mahāyāna: Writings, vol. 1, pp. 211 and 216.6.
difficult to be understood. As long as the two preparatory assemblages are not completed, for so long will that meditative cultivation not reach perfection. Its completion of the two preparatory assemblages is taught to require an innumerable aeon. Our Great Seal is the Gnosis arisen from tantric consecration and the spontaneously arisen Gnosis that has arisen from the meditative absorption (samādhi) of the two stages. A realization of this can be achieved in this life if one is skilled in the means of the Mantra [teachings]. The Buddha taught no other understanding of the Great Seal besides that.

Moreover, according to Sa-pan and the tradition he followed, the term mahāmudrā did not belong or apply to the Pāramitāyāna Madhyamaka, but rather was properly used only within the Mantrayāna.

In brief, then, Sa-pan held that there were only two possible methods to penetrate and know the ultimate within Mahāyāna Buddhism. The first, viz. the slow method of the Bodhisattva on the general Mahāyāna path, was based on scripture and reasoning, and was approached through preliminary learning and reflection. The second, viz. the quick method of the Vajrayāna, was based on the initiations and instructions of a qualified Vajrayāna master and was carried out through the meditative practice of the two stages.

5

SA-PAN’S PRINCIPLES
OF CRITICAL DOCTRINAL SCHOLARSHIP

The intellectual context of Sa-pan’s controversial writings and also the broader background to the above discussions become still clearer the minute one begins to look into his aims and methods as a scholar of Buddhist religion and philosophy. One of Sa-pan’s chief aims was carefully and critically to preserve and transmit the established traditions of Indian Buddhism. He overtly set forth much of his scholarly program for this purpose in the manual of scholarly practice he composed, namely the mKhas pa rnam ‘jug pa’i sgo (mKhas ‘jug), and he also explicitly explained or implicitly utilized these methods in his other major doctrinal or philosophical treatises such as, most notably, the sDom gsum rab dbye and Thub pa’i dgongs gsal. From what he stated in these and other works, one can see that his goals as a scholar and also the principles guiding his doctrinal criticisms derive from long-standing Indian Buddhist intellectual traditions. This should not be surprising for, as just mentioned, one of the things he urged most strongly was critical fidelity to genuine tradition.

In reading the following characterizations, however, one should keep in mind that Sa-pan was here discussing intellectual procedures that were recommended for the level of learning and reflecting, i.e. for the context of studying, teaching and debating within the general Mahāyāna. This method, however, did not apply directly to Tantric practice, and even in the non-Tantric Mahāyāna it was inadequate for the final steps when penetrating ultimate reality, in Sa-pan’s view. For the latter task, conceptual mind would not do: at a higher stage, the only approach was through the concentrated direct insight of a yogi.222 On this higher

---

222 See for instance Sa-pan, Thub pa’i dgongs gsal, ff. 63b-64a; KhJ I 34 (84.3.4); and KhJ III 37, autocommentary.
level, then, Sa-pan’s Mahāyāna doctrine had more in common with the approach of sGam-po-pa, et al., than with those Tibetan masters who taught that intellect could directly engage and fathom the ultimate.  

The Legitimacy of Doctrinal Criticisms

As a scholar of the general Mahāyāna, Sa-pan adhered to the Indo-Tibetan tradition that accepted, by and large, that debate or philosophical disputation between upholders of different traditions were legitimate and important ways for settling conflicting doctrinal claims. Such disputational activities formed in fact a necessary aspect of the career of many scholars in this tradition—just as necessary as, for instance, the explication of texts or the composition of treatises. The composition of a critical or controversial treatise combined in a single activity all three of the so-called “entrance gates for the wise”—i.e. composition, explication and debate—to which Sa-pan devoted his mKhas ’jug treatise.

In other words, Sa-pan held that there could be principled and justified controversy or doctrinal disputation, and that it was legitimate to engage in such discussions. This point was accepted by Indian philosophy in general, and by Dharmakirti and his school in particular, whose views later came to influence the whole Tibetan learned tradition. In Dharmakirti’s manual of disputation, the Vaidanāyāna, it is maintained that proper disputation is motivated by the desire to guard the truth and to defend genuine tradition. It should not be motivated just by the desire to win or to vanquish the opponent, and it must use honest methods: sound reasoning grounded in objective fact or based on the citation of scriptures accepted by the opponent was the sole criteria by which a definitive judgment could be reached. It must also avoid ignoble and blameworthy methods such as trickery, deceit, slander, abusive language, etc.

Traditional Tibetan Buddhist scholars found it useful to differentiate carefully the criticism of a person (gang zag) from that of the doctrine (chos) he maintained. Within this tradition, even “minor” faults such as redundancy or irrelevancy were considered grounds for “defeat” during a formal debate, for the only legitimate function of a debater was soundly to state either the arguments proving his position or the reasoning that refuted the opponent.

Sa-pan’s criticisms were often phrased in rigorous, straightforward terms, and therefore some adherents of the traditions he criticized felt that he had overstepped the boundaries of mere doctrinal criticism, and that in doing so he must have been motivated by vindictive personal animosity. Sa-pan himself had been fully aware that his motives for

---

223 Cf. P. Williams (1992), pp. 196ff. Still more similarities would be found in the Mantrayāna traditions maintained by Sa-pan, but he does not discuss these in detail in this predominately non-Tantric context. For more on the opinion of Sa-pan and other Tibetan scholars on the role played by mind in knowing the absolute within the general Mahāyāna, see D. Jackson (1987), p. 396, n. 95. sTsang-nag-pa for instance held the opposing view that the ultimate could be reached through reasoning (rga pa myed pa).

224 sGam-po-pa in his Tshogs chos legs mdzes ma, p. 187, by contrast, advises his followers to avoid sectarianism and not to indulge in criticisms of other religious traditions, specifying that the great faults which this would entail for both followers of Sūtra and Tantra. He does allow as an exception criticisms through which one rejects a lower philosophical theory and enters a higher one, as is mentioned in the Bodhicaryāvatāra, chapter 9. Cf. the much later Padma-dkar-po, Phyang chen gan mdzod, p. 189.3-6 (3b), who accepts the legitimacy of doctrinal criticisms and exhorts others not to get angry when their own traditions are criticized!

225 See T. M. Much (1991), pt. 1 (Stk.), pp. 22.22-23.1, and part 2 (German transl.), p. 51. See also E. Steinkeillner (1988), pp. 1441-43. Sa-pan discusses this in his Rigs gter rang grel in the commentary to XI 3ab. See also his mKhas pa mams ’jug pa’i sgo, III 12-13 (D. Jackson [1987], p. 329) and the references in the same publication, p. 378, n. 27. Sa-pan stresses there the fundamental motivation as being to maintain one’s own doctrines honestly.

226 The situation was of course far more complicated in actual practice, because, as will be described below, both sides could maintain some scriptures which one of them interpreted for instance to be of only “provisional meaning” (drang don). To avoid a self-contradiction, they could interpret the contradictory scripture as not having “definitive meaning” (nges don).

227 This was stated by Dharmakirti in the opening verse of his Vaidanāyāna. See M. T. Much (1991), part 1, p. 1; and part 2, p. 2. See also the Rigs gter rang grel, commentary on verse XI 4cd. See also D. Jackson (1987), p. 324 and n. 11.

228 sGam-po-spyin-snga bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, for instance, attributes the criticisms of Sa-pan to a sheer wish to criticize, questioning whether Sa-pan was dispassionate in his criticism or uninfluenced by personal feelings, jealousy, etc. See L. Lhunrug (1986), pp. 105f et passim; spyin-snga bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, p. 936b: smra ’dod pa’i tshad ma yid, p. 94b,1: rang gi the ’dod bden pa’i sgub pa’i rdzun nbo kha nor stod sel, p. 94b,4: ma rgs byun nu bryon nas smra ba dge gnis mams kyi snying yul ma yin pa’i phyib, p. 976b: phreng dog gi sgo nas sgo bki skur ’debs smra bas rtsi nge, etc. Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje also takes a similar tack at times. See the translation of D. Seyfort Ruegg (1988), pp. 1257 and
making such criticisms would be questioned, and therefore he devoted one of the final sections of the sDom gsum rab dbye to a discussion of the legitimate aims and motivations of doctrinal criticism as well as to the history of such criticisms in India and Tibet. At the end of the treatise, he listed the various religious lineages that he had received himself, and he denied accordingly that his criticisms were one-sidedly biased.229 Before that, he declared that if perchance in an uncollected moment he has been guilty of any vilification of others, he renounced that as a morally reprehensible mistake.230 But as he explained further:231

If you say that the differentiation of erroneous from correct religion is anger and jealousy, in that case, how [otherwise] are sentient beings to be saved from the ocean of cyclic existence?

To differentiate carefully right doctrines from wrong was thus for Sa-pañ crucial to the task of maintaining the Buddhist Doctrine, and thus for making possible liberation itself.

1262, and Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje, pp. 11 and 15 (6a.3 and 8a.5). Padma-dkar-po too becomes on occasion quite exuberant in his criticisms, terming Sa-pañ’s comments “a madman’s words” (smyon pa’i tshig) in his Phyang chen gan mdzod, pp. 580.1 (198b) or as “the mad leaping of a Tibetan” (bod smyon mchung), ibid., p. 589.3 (201a). In his Kian ka gzhom pa’i gsum, p. 563 (sha nga ba) he states that the mere objections (kian ka) of a biased ordinary individual (so so skye bo) cannot disprove anything because such people praise their own side and dispraise the positions of others: so so skye bo dag ni rang gi la bstdod gzhan phyo gya la smod pa’i de dag gis kian ka tsam gis ci la gpro la and adds that there is no use gazing with the blind eye of bias: phyo gya ’dzin sgar ba’i nig des bta’as kyang cir.’

229 Sa-pañ, sDom gsum rab dbye III 660 = p. 320.3.6 (na 48a):
de phyir chos mams phal cher thod/ des na bdag la phyogs lhung med/
de phyir gyi bo snyad pa’i/ blo ldnas mams kyi; ’di ltar zung/
230 Ibid., III 625 = p. 319.4.4 (46b.4):
bdag ni sams can kun la byams/ gar dang kun la bdag mi smod/
byrugs la smod pa’i de dag mi sngags/
231 Ibid., III 633, p. 320.1.2 (47a.2):
chos log pa dang ma log pa’i/ mams par dbyer ba byas pa la/
sdang dang phreng dog yin zer nali/ ’na ’khor ba’i rgya mtho las/
sams can mams ni ji stob stog/
Cf. also above, 46b.

Justification for this Approach in Sa-pañ’s Epistle to the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas

In another of his critical writings, the shorter but very important Epistle to the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of the Ten Directions (Phyogs bcu’i sangs rgyas...), he explains and justifies the background and principles of his critical work, as he himself understood them. These are degenerate times, he states, and most of the Buddha’s doctrine has already disappeared from the world. In Tibet in particular, there have proliferated a swarm of erroneous opinions, whereas genuine doctrines as well as their practitioners receive little honor or support. The teachings of the great masters of India are purposefully avoided, while the false opinions of (Tibetan) impostors are widely spread among the ignorant as “teachings of Tantric adepts (siddha).” In this depressing situation, he chose to play an active role, based first of all upon learning and understanding:232

[In] the world, possessors of discriminative understanding are rare. Possessors of merit are extremely few. Therefore upholders of the jewel of the Noble Doctrine, Your scriptures, are rare. Having understood that, and fearing that the Shākya [Sage]’s doctrine would disappear, I studied most of the scriptures and [ways of] reasoning, in order to learn well myself and intending to benefit others, too.

By virtue of that, I have understood a bit about the establishment of what is erroneous and non-erroneous regarding the essentials of religion.

He then invokes the Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, learned masters and adepts as his witnesses, saying that he will explain to them what criticisms he has made, and upon what basis.233

229 Sa-pañ, Phyogs bcu’i sangs rgyas, p. 324.2.3 (na 56b):
’jig rten shes rab ldan pa dkon/ bsdod nams ldan pa shin tu mngon/ des na dam chos rin po che/ khyed kyi gcang rab ’dzin pa dkon/
230 de tlas shes nas shkya yul/ bstan pa nhung par btags pa dang/
bdag nyid legs par shes rgyud dang/ gzhun la phan par bsam nas nii/
lung dang rigs pa phal cher byang/ de yi stobs kyi chos kyi gnad/ ’khrul pa dang ni ma ’khrul pa’i/ mams gnas cung zad bdag gs gsal/
231 Ibid., pp. 324.2.6-3.4 (na 56b-57a):
des na bdag gi ’byad mi ’byad/ re shig gsum par mdzad du gsal/
Therefore I beg You to listen briefly to [these statements] of mine [about what is] "correct" and "incorrect."
In your word, the following is stated: "Monks or learned scholars should accept my word having investigated it like gold, through burning, cutting and rubbing, but [should] not [accept it merely] out of reverence."
Moreover, [I] have kept in mind what is stated in a Sūtra, namely: "You should not condemn that which is worthy of praise, and you should not praise that which is worthy of condemnation." I have also understood as true that which Ratnakaraśānti said: "A lack of faith is the chief of enemies; an excess of faith is an occasion for great delay. That is because the omniscience [of a Buddha] is understood through correct cognition (pramāṇa); through devotion, there will not come about omniscience."

Accordingly, I have seen that in all the divisions (or "baskets") of scripture and in all the great treatises, all errors have been energetically refuted, [and] that which is not erroneous is established. Desiring to lead a noble life, I too have followed that [doctrine] and have made a few discriminations of religious doctrine. Most intelligent upholders of the scriptures are pleased by that. [But] most unlearned, unintelligent, angry and passionate people speak ill of it.

Procedures and Principles of Debate

The main function of debate or legitimate "controversy," as Sa-pan conceived it, was to preserve and defend established tradition, i.e. the Buddha's doctrine. Whether in a formal debate or a critical composition, the aim should be to uphold the established tenets of a valid and recognized tradition. Sa-pan explained this when he set out step by step the following ground rules of formal debate.

Preparatory Steps of Debate

Disputation should be done methodically, he tells us in section III of his mKhas 'jug, beginning by identifying and observing the roles of those taking part. The two main participants in a debate are: (a) a proponent who maintains his own tradition, and (b) a respondent who tries to refute that. The third participant, likewise essential to the debate, is an arbiter who impartially witnesses and judges the debate.

The proponent who takes part in a disputation should do so motivated by the wish to protect the Doctrine (KhJ III 1). In fact, all doctrinal debate should be for the sake of "making known the unmistaken facts of the matter, with the aim of maintaining one's own doctrine" (KhJ III 12). It should not be motivated by desire and hatred, or aim at just attaining it as the first path for those possessing the strength of burning energy (brtson 'grus 'bar ba'i stobs 'ldan). Those Bodhisattvas who for the sake of Awakening practice for long periods through extreme difficulties are heroes, he thinks. For a synopsis of this interesting work, see S. Katsura (1979).

234-235 These quotations are also quoted by Tsong-kha-pa near the beginning of his Drung rgyas legs bshad snying po. R. A. F. Thurman (1984), p. 190, n. 12, located the quote also in Śāntarakṣita's Taivastamāra. See also Donald S. Lopez (1988), p. 5.

236 I have not yet identified the source, but here Ratnakaraśānti was speaking in a non-Tantric context. Near the beginning of his Prajñāpāramitotpadeśa (Peking 5579, Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag, sems tsam, ku 151b.2, he contrasts the approaches of the Tantric and non-Tantric Mahāyāna, specifying that the former is easier, quicker, and for those whose minds are "increased" (made strong) through faith (dad pa mam par 'phel ba'i blo can mam). The Bodhisattva's path produces its fruit through long difficulties, and
victory for oneself or vanquishing the opponent. Why? Because the latter sort of disputation will not protect the Doctrine, and it will develop into anger and enmity, which are the causes for rebirths in evil destinies.

Generally speaking, then, one should practice disputation that "accords with Dharma" (i.e. agrees with moral or religious principle); it should be the debate of a "noble person." Elsewhere Sa-paṅ explained what such religiously principled debate meant, and stated that a noble person such as the Buddha could thus not be meaningfully opposed in principled debate.²³⁸

All criticisms should thus be made by truthfully and straightforwardly stating the defects of the opponent's established philosophical tenets (Khj III 13). They should not be made in any other way. Sa-paṅ specifically rejects as illegitimate such methods as: attacks against personal faults, through deceit, self-praise, abusing others, tormenting others, maintaining one's tenets merely out of attachment, caviling against other's tenets out of hatred, and all stratagems that are neither sincere nor to the point, such as nonsensical prattle, laughter, dancing, talking too fast to be intelligible, etc., etc. These all amounted to a defeat for oneself if one practiced them, but they were not capable of defeating the opponent. The latter point was particularly important, and Sa-paṅ also explicitly rejected all deceitful means as incapable of upholding a doctrine. Not only does deceit fail as a defence, he says, but it makes the defended doctrine itself impure (Khj III 14). For example, in debate it is going too far if one party cries out "I have won" merely because the opponent is sitting there silently. If the mere occurrence of silence could decide the outcome, then might would make right: it would be enough to threaten or otherwise intimidate the opponent until he became speechless. Such manipulations obviously have no place in the sincere pursuit of truth.

A System of Established Tenets should be Maintained

In doctrinal debate, it was assumed that the participants each belonged to an established school or tradition, and that in the debate each would maintain his respective system of established philosophical tenets (grub mtha': siddhānta). Debaters should explicitly affirm which system of tenets they maintain. When Sa-paṅ spoke of these "established tenets," he had in mind the four main Indian Buddhist systems or the various recognized non-Buddhist systems of India. (The Tibetan Buddhist schools were not considered to have their own siddhānta, and in this period their identities as separate doctrinal entities were less rigidly defined than they became later.)

Sa-paṅ mentioned (Khj III 38-39) the exceptional case of some Mādhyamikas who attempt to refute others without advancing or professing a system of established tenets. Furthermore he had already stated (Khj III 17-18) that when one does maintain the established tenets of a system, one is only required to maintain those tenets that one advances at that time and that are immediately relevant to the topic at hand. One did not have to maintain all statements ever put forward on any topic whatsoever by every single master within one's own philosophical school.

The importance of identifying and maintaining a genuine Buddhist tradition could hardly be stated more clearly than by Sa-paṅ when he described what for him constituted a doctrine that could be legitimately learned or taught (Khj II 3, autocommentary).²³⁹

As for the religious doctrine to be learned, one must study and expound that religious doctrine that the Buddha proclaimed, that has come down through a succession of learned masters, that was cultivated through meditation by the Tantric adepts (siddhās), that was expounded by the great scholars (panditas), that was translated [from Sanskrit to Tibetan] by translators, and that is well known among all the Indian and Tibetan learned adherents to the scriptural traditions.

The Illegitimacy of Doctrinal Inventions

In this very traditionally minded context, all innovations were considered illegitimate by definition. As Sa-paṅ went on to say:²⁴⁰

²³⁸ Sa-paṅ, ThGS, p. 46.4.2 (92a).

²³⁹ Sa-paṅ, Khj II autocommentary, p. 94.4.6-95.1.2 (pha 190b.6-191a). See also D. Jackson (1987), p. 12, n. 20. A similar approach is said to have been officially decreed after the bSam-yas debate. See dp'as-bo gTsug-lag-phreng-ba, vol. 1, p. 380: lo tas sa bsgrur pa dsi tas ma bshad// nyid pos bka' btags sbyste bdag ma byas pa'll chos la spyad du mi rung bka' khrims byogsal//. The twofold criteria for acceptance—namely, the existence of a genuine Indian source and of a valid transmission—see D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 131, and (1966), p. 27f.

²⁴⁰ Sa-paṅ, Khj, p. 95.1.2 (191a).
If [the doctrine] is not such [an authentic one], the learned masters of India will deride it, and they will disapprove, saying: "The Buddha taught no such religious doctrine. To expound a religious doctrine of one's own fabrication harms the Doctrine." Even nowadays I see the learned masters of India delighting in the correct exposition of scriptures and reasoning by Tibetans. [And] I see them deriding those [teachings] that are not in harmony with scripture and reasoning, saying: "This is not the Doctrine of the Buddha."

Tibetan novelties and inventions were thus, for him, unacceptable in principle, and in this he saw himself as agreeing with the Indian masters of his time. Implicit in this rejection of new doctrines was the idea that the Buddha had taught his Doctrine well and completely, and that the basic philosophical positions had already been worked out by the various Indian schools on all topics considered most important. Newly formulated ideas or interpretations that had no affiliation to any existing system of tenets were not worthy of serious refutation. Therefore, simply to demonstrate that a doctrine had no ascertainable origin or no authentic source among the established systems was enough to discredit it. It held no water to say "But this is my guru's teaching!" if such a teaching ignored or contradicted the original doctrine of that school (DS III 513 = 41b). Sa-paṇṭ appeals to this principle that innovations are bogus in principle at least twice in the sDom gsum rab dbye (DS III 481 and 514 = 40a and 41b).

An important corollary of this was that one should be able to show that the tenet or point of doctrine one maintained had a recognized place in the system of religious practice or philosophical tenets that one upheld. If it could be shown to be no innovation, then the opponent was obliged to refute it by other reasoning, while maintaining himself his own system of established tenets (cf. DS III 482 = 40a). Incompatibilities between siddhānta systems should be resolved through reasoning (DS III 489 = 40b; KhJ III 40).

Having asserted that teachings without established origins were not really worthy of being contested in debate, Sa-paṇṭ nevertheless conceded that sometimes it was permissible or even desirable to refute them. He feared that if they were allowed to spread unchecked, such teachings might proliferate so widely that they would crowd out the true doctrine, like rank weeds choking out the desired crops. As he said in the KhJ (III 41-42):

The philosophical tenets that are adhered to by learned men are two: Buddhist and non-Buddhist. [Anything] besides those are tenets that have been haphazardly considered [or constructed] by the ignorant. (KhJ III 41)

Thus these two are suitable as objects for learned persons to prove or refute. But new philosophical tenets that are other than these and that were fabricated by ignorant persons are empty of reasoning [and] in contradiction with the scriptures. [They are] falsehoods concocted by "non-virtuous friends" [i.e. sham spiritual teachers] for the sake of [acquiring] the necessities of life, [and they are] tenets upheld by ignorant people out of desire and hatred. But since they originate from no authentic source, they are indeed unworthy of refutation or proof.

Nevertheless, if errors spread excessively like weeds [growing] in a field, they will hurt the doctrine of the Buddha. Consequently one should appropriately refute them by means of scripture and reasoning. For even if passionate and angry fools do not understand, it will be understood by learned men who dwell in rectitude.

Here in the Land of Glaciers there also exist many tenets of ignorant people that are different from [the tenets of the Buddhists and non-Buddhist Indian sectarians]. Because ignorant people can easily understand [those], learned men have usually ignored them. (KhJ III 42)

In the sDom gsum rab dbye he went even further, stating that if a doctrine contradicted dharma (religious principle), it should be refuted through scripture and reasoning (DS III 510-11 = 41b). Moreover, he argued that if one accepted a fabricated doctrine, one would thereby lose the basis for rejecting other false doctrines. As he stated (DS I 241-243):

---

241 Sa-paṇṭ, KhJ S1b; D. Jackson (1987), pp. 273 and 343f.
242 Sa-paṇṭ, sDom gsum rab dbye, I 240-243 (13b-14a):

sangs rgyas gsum dang ma mthun yangl! 'di 'dra bden par 'dod na ni //
lag ten phyin ci log ghan yangl! (241) 'khrul zhes bshi hod par mi nus tell
lung dang 'gal ba' chos yin par! rang bcon thams cad mishungs pa la/!
'ga' zhih bden la 'ga' zhih nill (242) brta 'wa' yin zhes dpad mi nung/!
mu stegs la sogs chos log kyangl! sun dbang bar ni mi nus tell
lung rigs med par mishungs pa la! (243) bden brta 'wa' ba nus ma yin/!
If you maintain that such [erroneous practices] are true even though they do not accord with the Buddha's word, then you will not be able to say about other erroneous practices either that they are false. For, being doctrines which contradict authoritative scripture, they all are alike in being inventions, and it is not acceptable to investigate them, saying "Some are true" and "Some are false." Nor will you be able to refute erroneous doctrines such as those of the Indian non-Buddhist sectarian, for you will not be able to differentiate true from false, since [both your and their traditions] will be alike in their lacking authoritative scripture and reasoning.

The Only Two Criteria: Scripture and Reasoning

There were only two means for decisively rejecting or accepting tenets: logical reasoning and scriptural quotation.\footnote{On the limitations of these two, see 'Bri-gung 'Jig-rten-mgon-po, Collected Works, vol. 4, p. 409, where Atśa is quoted.} Mastering this pair was the basis for his own critical scholarship.\footnote{Sa-pa, Phyoigs bceu'i, p. 324.2.4-6 (na 56b): kh Yad kyi gsum rab 'dzin pa dkon'i de lkar shes nas shakya yi/ bstan pa nub par dogs pa dang/ bdag nyid legs par shyang phyir dang/ ge han la phan par bsams nas nill lung dang rigs pa phal cher shyang/ de yi stobs kyis chos kyi gnod/ khrul ba dang ni ma khrul ba'i/ man gzhag cung sad bdag gs gos l/ See also the brief work Lung riggs man dag... that he devoted precisely to this topic (as will be summarized below).} These means also had to be applied consistently and universally; otherwise, as Sa-pa maintained in the passage just quoted, one would lose the basis and possibility for refuting other erroneous doctrines (DS I 242-3).\footnote{Sa-pa, DS I 242-3 = na 13b-14a.}

Reasoning

Legitimate controversial discussion should be conducted in accordance with the long-established traditions of Buddhist epistemology and logic, the high points of which were Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, but which had a history of development even before them. It was agreed that when one argued in favor of a certain tenet, one's argumentation had to be stated in the form of sound inferences or formal statements of proof. The subject of the inference had to be acknowledged by both sides, and the reason had to be based on objective grounding or on scripture maintained by both sides or at least by the opponent. The reasoning should be logically consistent and be free from the recognized logical fallacies.

Identifying Logical Flaws. The main job of the critic was to identify the logical flaws in the opponent's statements of proof. These flaws, when occurring in the formally stated inference, were the failure of any of the three logical characteristics or "forms" (shul gum: trivṛtya) of a sound reason. Otherwise, when examining the opponent's general reasoning or interpretation, other fallacies of a more general nature could also be identified, such as:

1. logical inconsistency (gal) (DS I 17 = f. 3a; I 119-120 = 8a)
2. logical or semantic "overextension" (ha cang thal bar 'gur: atiprasanga) (KhJ III 14, autocommentary; DS I 83 =6a; II 28 = 15b, etc.)
3. infinite regression (thug med: anavasthā) (DS II 28 = 15b)
4. the entailment of some other undesired and absurd consequence (thul 'gur: prasanga)

Sometimes Sa-pa also criticized the opponent's reasoning more generally, describing it as rash or unconsidered (gzu lom). (DS I 201 = 12a)

Problems of Terminology or Semantics. Sometimes Sa-pa identified a problem in the opponent's designation of terms. Some terms might be generally inappropriate or unacceptable (mi 'thad) for reaching the opponent's interpretation, or the concepts implied by the terms might be incompatible (gal) for reaching the opponent's interpretation (DS I 86-7 = 6b). One specific problem of designation that he identified was that in which a positive designation had been erroneously imputed to a thing based merely on the absence of a thing's opposite (DS I 77-81 = 6a). Or two Tibetan technical terms that the opponent understood as different might be explained as synonymous, being merely different renderings of the same Sanskrit original term (DS III 392 = 36a).

Sometimes, too, Sa-pa found it necessary to distinguish between a mere designation, and the thing as properly defined (mchab nyid pa) (ThGS 73b). It was of no use to quibble over mere designations or
terminology.246

Exhausting the Logical Possibilities. A general method of argumentation that Sa-paṅ used on occasion was the typical scholastic procedure of analyzing or examining a subject in a way that exhausted all logical possibilities (DS I 122 = 8a). One way to do this was to reduce the matter to an either/or choice between two mutually exclusive possibilities, for instance A and non-A (DS II 38 = 16a). This employed the law of excluded middle.

Replies. In debate, the reply consisted of identifying the logical fault of the opponent’s proof. In other contexts, objections of the opponent could be answered either through the actual direct reply (lan ral ma or lan dangos) or through parallel reasoning that answers “in kind” (mgo lsgre or mgo snyogs) (DS I 222-225 = 13a; ThGS 10a-b).247

Scriptural Quotation

Quotation of scriptures was the basic way for giving additional support to one’s argument in debate or discussion. Moreover, when dealing with extremely difficult matters, scripture was the only recourse, since inference based on objective facts gained through direct perception could not prove anything regarding the “completely hidden” objects such as Buddhahood, the dharmadhātu, etc., those objects being inaccessible to direct perception. Still, scripturally or consensually based logical marks (yid ches pa’i rtags) should not contradict the ordinary pramanas of direct perception and inference. And they could not be cited against followers of other traditions who did not maintain them as their own.

Scripture and tradition required an authentic origin for them to be valid (DS III 135 = 24a-b).248 In other words, to have any force, a quotation had to have originated from a work that was recognized as belonging to an established corpus of authoritative writings (such as a Sūtra, Tantra, or recognized sāstra) or as belonging to the writings of a recognized master. Conversely, if a doctrine was nowhere to be found in the authentic scriptures, it was unacceptable (DS III 388 = 38b-39a). Just what constituted the general Buddhist canon or corpus of accepted translations of Indian Buddhist writings had not yet been firmly established in Sa-paṅ’s day, and this complicated matters. The bkAs ’gyur and bsTan ’gyur canonical collections as we now know them had yet to be compiled. Still, Sa-paṅ is said to have made some contributions to the process by rejecting a number of apocryphal Sūtras from the proto-canon.249

The Danger of Apocrypha. Sa-paṅ considered the possibility of meeting with inauthentic scriptures to be very real. As he apparently knew from experience, some putative translations of Indian Sūtras and Tantras were definitely later Tibetan forgeries. Sa-paṅ in his works even names a few of such spurious works.250 To cite them and to try to trace back their origins to the Buddha Vajradhara (in the case of Vajrayāna texts) was an occasion for self-contradiction, he held (DS III 508-9 = 41b). He listed the following types of inauthentic works:

(1) volumes recovered from hidden caches (gter nas byung ba’i glegs bstan)
(2) religious traditions stolen from others (gzhan nas brkas pa’i chos lugs)

247 See also Go-rams-pa’s sDom gum rab dbyer’i mam bshad, p. 193.2. See further Sa-paṅ’s comments in his Chog lo’i zhis lan, 232a: bod na’ang nulo bskal sgog skyi ma bya ba la sogs pa man po gda’ stel, and 234b: dri ba bcu gcig pa grang snags gser snying la dad kyis snyan ba’i rgyad sse sngon lags sngags pa’ang sngags snying ma la lha mo snyan snyad dang! bum ni thod mkhar la sogs pa shin tu man bar gda’i gser ma la bod kyis snyan ba’i rgyad dus ’byung dang’ phyag na rdo rje mkha’’gro dang! ra li ngyi shu rta bshi la sogs pa shin tu man po brjod kyis mi lang ba cig gda’ stel thams cad gsal ba ston na phug thugs pa’i rgya’i snyad snyid kyis dpod mdzod!’ Bri-gung dPal’dzin’s controversial treatise also listed numerous questionable works, especially of the Old School. This critique was quoted verbatim by Shākyā-nachog-rje in his sDom gum rdi’i legs bshad gser gzi’i thar ma, but this led to further questions, to which he gave his definitive replies in his Collected Writings, vol. 17, pp. 528ff.
249 As mentioned above, sGam-po-pa too acknowledged the need for a genuine origin and a valid linear transmission. See his works, vol. 1, p. 216: bsgnyad pa dang mi ldan na gsal ngag khyad par can mi ’byung ba’i skyon yod dOl.

250 Sa-paṅ, DS III 539 = 42b-43a; and see also Go-rams-pa’s sDom gum rab dbyer’i mam bshad, p. 193.2. See further Sa-paṅ’s comments in his Chog lo’i zhis lan, 232a: bod na’ang nulo bskal sgog skyi ma bya ba la sogs pa man po gda’ stel, and 234b: dri ba bcu gcig pa grang snags gser snying la bod kyis snyan ba’i rgyad sse sngon lags sngags pa’ang sngags snying ma la lha mo snyan snyad dang! bum ni thod mkhar la sogs pa shin tu man bar gda’i gser ma la bod kyis snyan ba’i rgyad dus ’byung dang’ phyag na rdo rje mkha’’gro dang! ra li ngyi shu rta bshi la sogs pa shin tu man po brjod kyis mi lang ba cig gda’ stel thams cad gsal ba ston na phug thugs pa’i rgya’i snyad snyid kyis dpod mdzod!’ Bri-gung dPal’dzin’s controversial treatise also listed numerous questionable works, especially of the Old School. This critique was quoted verbatim by Shākyā-nachog-rje in his sDom gum rdi’i legs bshad gser gzi’i thar ma, but this led to further questions, to which he gave his definitive replies in his Collected Writings, vol. 17, pp. 528ff.
(3) doctrines one has composed [oneself] (bṛtsams chos) 
(4) doctrines based on dreams (mi lam chos) 
(5) doctrines which had been [merely?] memorized (blo bzung ba yi chos lugs)

Scriptural Contradictions. When the participants in a debate both maintained the same scriptures, they could use them against each other. But if the two disputants came from different traditions, then only the other party’s own scriptures could be used against him, and not one’s own. As he stated in the skyes bu dam pa (333.2.6 = na 75a): “If you do not contradict the established tenets that you yourself maintain, then there is no harm even if you contradict (read: ‘gal) the established tenets maintained by others.” It was likewise pointless to quote one’s own scriptures against the opponent if the latter did not accept them as his own (DS III 491 = 40b; KhJ III 31-32). To disprove an opponent through scripture, one always had to show him to be in self-contradiction. For instance, one could cite the texts or early teachers of a lineage to refute the later followers of the same lineage (DS II 6 = 14b; III 490-1 = 40b, 496-8 = 41a). Therefore, it was necessary to determine from the beginning the opponent’s basic lineage or school was.

Interpretation as the Main Escape from Apparent Scriptural Self-Contradictions. If in the course of a debate or controversy, one disputant was charged with being in contradiction with his own scriptures, and there did indeed seem to be a contradiction, he needed then to be able to explain these contradictions as being merely apparent and not real (KhJ III 33). In order to reply satisfactorily, he needed to show the true intended sense of the scripture, and therefore it was necessary to draw certain hermeneutical distinctions, such as between scriptures spoken with a hidden or ulterior intention and those simply spoken directly with no special intention. The debater had to be able to show for instance that the scripture in question was not literally binding because it was spoken with a special or hidden motive. Sa-pan also mentioned these hermeneutical principles near the end of section II of the KhJ, because they were presupposed for successful explication of scripture through the method of “objections and replies”.

Through [the method of] objections and replies, one should establish the purport of the text by means of scripture and reasoning. (KhJ II 33)

There exist words and meanings that are extremely weighty and difficult to understand, apparent mixtures of non-Buddhist Indian Sectarian and Buddhist established tenets, and many subjects for debate regarding the differences of theory and practice not only between the Greater and Lesser Vehicles of Buddhism, but also within the Lesser Vehicle, between the four basic monastic communities and the eighteen schools that developed from them. And also within the Great Vehicle, there are differences between the Perfections (Pāramitā) and Mantra [approaches], and there are many apparent contradictions of established tenets such as in the Perfection (Pāramitā) [Vehicle] between Yogacāra and Madhyamaka, and within the Mantra between the four yogas of Tantras. Consequently, one should expound by establishing [one’s subject] through [stating] the objections [of opponents] and the replies [of one’s own school], making use of both scriptural quotations and logical reasoning. For if on such occasions one does not ascertain [the matter] through objections and replies, one will not know wrong doctrine from right.

That person who knows the "six alternatives" is extremely learned at explaining texts. (KhJ II 34)²⁵²

For the explanation of major scriptures, one needs to know the "six alternatives" [or six principles of interpretation], which are: (1) special intention (dgongs pa), (2) without special intention (dgongs pa ma yin pa), (3) provisional meaning (drang ba'i don), (4) definitive meaning (nges pa'i don), (5) literal (sgra ji bzhiin pa), and (6) non-literal (sgra ji bzhiin ma yin pa).²⁵³

(1.) Statements [having] special intention. By understanding the four intentions (dgongs pa, Sanskrit abhiprāja) such as "sameness" (samaśa) and the four allusions (idem dgongs, Sanskrit abhīsaṃdhi) such as "the allusion of introduction" (avatāraṇābhīsaṃdhi), one will understand the apparently contradictory words and meanings of the

²⁵² Sa-pan, KhJ, pp. 101.2.5ff = 203b ff.

Buddhas and bodhisattvas, and therefore they will become non-contradictory. I have not written on these in detail, fearing that [my text will become] excessively long. Therefore [to learn more], one should refer to such works as the *Mahāyānasūtrālāṁkāra* [Skt. XII 16-18].

(2.) Statements without special intention are words and meanings that themselves directly convey the intended import of the Buddha without one's having to seek another special intention as above.

(3.) [Provisional meaning] is [found in teachings given] for the sake of assisting some sentient beings. [Such teachings,] though not the truth, conform with those [sentient beings'] dispositions, and gladden and lead their minds, and serve as the basis for them afterwards to enter into definitive meaning.

(4.) Definitive meaning is the sense that is correctly understood by individuals of sharp capacities through following the words themselves. One should understand the preceding two [types of meaning] in more detail from such [scriptures] as the *Samādhiratnasūtra* [Sūtra].

[Object:ion] All the Buddha's words are of definitive meaning alone, but they cannot possibly be of interpretable meaning, for if there were such a thing as interpretable meaning it would mean that the Buddha uttered falsehoods.²⁴ [Reply: Those persons who say this] are simply ignorant of the intent of the Sūtras and Tantras. For if [all the Buddha's utterances] were exclusively of definitive meaning, the different doctrinal systematizations such as the three *kāyas*, the three "baskets of scripture" (*tripitaka*), and the three trainings (*riṣiyā*) would for the most part contradict each other, and how could there be disparate doctrinal systematizations in the definitive meaning of ultimate truth? [Such doctrinal differences] were established based on conventional usage, the surface-level truth, [and] provisional meaning.

Furthermore, if such statements [by the Buddha] as "I have perfectly understood all dharmas ...," and also: "I have become wholly awakened. There exists nobody like me ...", were of definitive meaning, infinitely great faults would be entailed. For instance, there would be the consequence of [the Buddha's] postulating a self like the non-

Buddhist Indian sectarian, and also his indication of past and future would establish the three times as substances.

(5.) Literal [expressions] are those that signify the sense in exact accordance with the words, such as [the words] "the salutary" (*dge ba*) and "the preparatory accumulations [or 'equipment'] of merit and Gnosis," and such statements as: "Generosity leads to the enjoyment of wealth, and moral discipline leads to happiness."²⁵⁵

(6.) The non-literal consists of words that signify something different from their usual referent, such as the line "father and mother are to be killed."²⁶ And instances of [such non-literal usages] are found in the Sūtras and Tantras, and in some poetical treatises. Fearing that [the present work] will grow too large, I have not written in detail about these methods [here]. If one does not know the "six alternatives," one will err whether teaching Sūtra or Tantra, for as Candrakīrti said:²⁵⁷

"Whoever says that he has definite understanding without the 'six alternatives' is just like someone who, wanting to look at the moon, looks at the tips of his fingers."

Sa-paṅ employed these six "alternatives" or "limits" in various passages of his *slDon gsun rab dbye* and other doctrinal writings in order to interpret the scriptures and to refute their erroneous interpretation. He often employed these principles separately in other combinations or separate pairs, not counting them as a set of six:

(1) Types of "explicational statement" (*bshad pa*). He divided these into three types: (DS I 139–40 = 9a; III 416 = 37a): (a) having a special intention (*dgongs pa*), (b) having a hidden intention (i.e. as allusion) (*ldem por dgongs*), and (c) having straightforward intent (*drung por dgongs*).

(2) Types of meaning (*don*): definitive (*nges don*) or provisional (i.e. indirect) meaning (*drang don*) (DS I 142–3 = 9a; III 411 = 37a). Sometimes he identified a scripture as having one or the other kind of meaning. He showed for instance the faulty identification

²⁴ This is the *dgongs geṅ* ("single intention") doctrine of Brid-gung Jig-rten-mgon-po. See the latter's *Collected Works*, vol. 4, pp. 409–410, where he specifically speaks against analyzing according to the 'six alternatives' and states, "All is definitive meaning alone" (*thams cad nges don 'ba' shig pa'i...*). Later *dgongs geṅ* commentators explained how *this* was to be interpreted.


²⁵⁶ See also KH III 24 and D. Jackson (1987), p. 386, n. 58.

²⁵⁷ This was probably from Candrakīrti's *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra:* *gsGrum ma gsal bar byed pa zhes bya ba'i rgya cher 'gyel pa* (P, vol. 137, no. 2650). The exact quotation has not yet been located, though the work refers many times to the application of the 'six alternatives.'
of provisional as definitive (DS I 155-6 = 9b-10a). He also strongly objected to the notion that all scriptures were of definitive meaning.

(3) Types of expression: literal (sgra ji bzhin) or non-literal (sgra ji bzhin ma yin pa) (DS III 411 = 37a). These two overlapped closely with 1(c) and 1(ab) respectively.

In addition, Sa-pan utilized a number of other basic distinctions to classify scriptures, doctrines or practices in his DS and elsewhere. To list some of the main ones here:

(1) Different "Vehicle": mundane (jig rten) or supramundane (jig rten las 'das) (DS III 412 = 37a, 523-4 = 42b)
(2) Buddhist versus non-Buddhist doctrine or practice (DS I 143 =9a; cf. ThGS 48b)
(3) Different systems of established tenets (siddhānta: grub mtha') (DS I 19-20)
(4) Different categories of Buddhist doctrine: theory (lta ba) versus practical conduct (spyod pa) or meditative cultivation (sgom pa) (DS III 518ff = 42b).
(5) Different levels or classes of Buddhist vows (sdom pa), i.e. distinguishing among the three classes of vows: Pratimokṣa, Bodhisattva, and Mantra. He clearly distinguished between the Śrāvakā Pratimokṣa and the Bodhisattva vows (DS I 1-3 = 2a; I 35-39 = 4a; I 151-154 = 9b) or between the Pratimokṣa and the Mantra (DS I 27 = 3b)
(6) Different levels of truth: surface (kun rdzob) versus ultimate (don dam) (DS III 70-71 = 21a-b)
(7) Different levels of doctrinal importance, i.e. whether a teaching is an essential or crucial doctrine (gna'd) or merely an incidental one (DS III 421 =37a-b, 460-1 = 39a)
(8) Difference between relatively coarser (rags pa) or more subtle (phra ba) doctrinal formulation or systematization (rnam gzhan) (ThGS 75a).

There also existed several more technical conceptual schemes that had important scholastic applications, such as the threefold scheme of definitens (mtshon byed), definiendum (mtshon bya), and exemplification of the definiendum (mtshan gzhi) (ThGS 63b). But the above should be enough to show the sophisticated tools that scholars in this tradition had at their disposal.

Hierarchy of Importance

Underlying the utilization of these various concepts and procedures lay a number of basic presuppositions, sometimes explicitly discussed and sometimes not. One of the fundamental points was that there was a hierarchy of importance in doctrine, a hierarchy of levels (skabs). Higher and lower levels—i.e. different doctrinal or philosophical contexts—should not be confused. Otherwise any discussion will be at cross-purposes. One should also know what are the vital points (gna'd), and these should not be injured or vitiated even slightly (DS III 460-1 = 39a, cf. III 421 = 37b). Where a distinction between two levels has been made, one should recognize and follow the higher or most important of the two. For example, one should follow the definite meaning, and not rely on provisional meaning (DS I 160-1 = 10a; III 416 = 37a). One must know that certain scriptural statements had a special intent that the words themselves do not make explicit. In such cases, one must try to discern the underlying or deeper intention. Certain sayings to the same effect were well known in the Indo-Tibetan tradition and they derive from canonical authority, as for instance the four "reliances" (pratisarana).

(1) Don't rely on the person (gang zag), rely on the doctrine (chos).
(2) Don't rely on the letter (tshig), rely on the spirit (don).
(3) Don't rely on the provisional meaning (draṅ don), rely on the definite meaning (nges don).
(4) Don't rely on ordinary consciousness (rnam shes), rely on Gnosis (ye shes).

Similarly, as mentioned above, it was essential to discriminate and specify which sphere of doctrine was being discussed: Was it theory (lta ba), or non-concentrative practical conduct (spyod pa), or meditative practice (sgom pa) (DS III 518ff = 42b)? These were essential distinctions even from the time of the bSam-yas debate, and the official judgment which arose from the debate (as transmitted by the sBa-bshad tradition and the standard Tibetan histories following it, such as those of Bu-ston and dPa'-boGTsug-lag-phreng-ba) addressed each of these categories separately. According to the judgment, henceforth Tibetans

258 See E. Lamotte (1988); M. Kapstein (1988), p. 160f; etc.
were to follow: (a) for theory, the Madhyamaka tradition of Nāgārjuna,259 (b) in non-concentratve conduct, the six perfections, and (c) in meditation, the cultivation of insight into the absolute through the three kinds of discriminative understanding.260 Such distinctions sometimes allowed a scholar to clarify seeming differences of doctrine as mere confusions of doctrinal category or context. As mentioned above, Shākya-mchog-Idan was one who used them as a legitimate avenue for explaining and justifying the dkar po chig thub metaphor in terms acceptable to other doctrinally trained scholars.261 And indeed, many of the points of apparent difference between later S-a-skya-pa and Dwags-po bKa'-bgyud-pa scholars could be resolved in a similar way.

Such basic distinctions and principles could be learned. Once learned, they should be applied in the appropriate cases (DS I 187 = 11a). But to begin with, one had to base oneself on a solid and wide knowledge of scripture. That way, even if one erred, it would only be a mistake regarding the incidentals and not the essentials (DS III 527-531 = 42a-b). S-a-pa spelled out the necessary attainments of a religious scholar when he described in his skYes bu dam pa epistle what sort of scholars or "noble individuals" (skyes bu dam pa) he hoped would examine and investigate the differences between what his and others’ interpretations of doctrine.262

Noble individuals who understand how to discriminate the letter and the spirit regarding these [doctrines], who are masters in the essentials of scripture and reasoning, who are not ignorant in the content of the Perfection and Mantra [systems], who know how to practice without contradiction the essential points of the practical instructions and basic treatises, [who understand] the division of parts of Sūtras according to provisional meaning and definite meaning and who understand without error the vital points of intention and hidden intention, i.e. learned scholars who know how to explain literal and non-literal expressions, those possessing discriminative understanding which is capable of analyzing the meaning, dispassionate ones who dwell in unbiased rectitude, whose minds are not possessed by the demon of base philosophical tenets...."

Doctrinal Relativism

Implicit in all this was thus that one must know how and when each principle or distinction should be applied. Each established system of practice could claim to some extent its own validity within its own level or context. The different Buddhist monastic traditions, for instance, were each valid for their adherents (DS I 175-185 = 10b-11a; KH III 21, autocommentary). Just because they differed, one could not say one was ultimately right and another one wrong. As long as one had committed oneself to a certain system of practice and discipline, one was bound by its regulations. Moreover in religious teaching, as in gardening, certain methods were appropriate for one situation but completely inappropriate for another (DS I 195-8 = 11b; cf. II 11-13 = 14b-15a; KH III 32, autocommentary).

A sort of pragmatism thus existed on the level of practice—the rightness or wrongness of practice depended on its efficaciousness in bringing one to Buddhahood. But on the level of theory, there was never a lapse into relativism. By putting a theory or tenet in a wider context or applying a higher level of analysis to it, one could show it to be unreasonable or unacceptable. Higher views refute the lower, but not vice versa.263

259 It is said that the previous ruler Khris JDe-strong-btsan had already issued a decree in favor of Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 130, n. 250.

260 The last specification regarding meditation was crucial because the first two types of discriminative understanding (shes rab: prajñā) were namely those arising from learning and reflection. (The third was of course that which arises from meditative realization.) This account of the judgment is based on the sBa bzhed tradition. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 83f, who points out the similarities between the accounts of Bu-ston (Chos ‘byung 129b), dPa’-bo (mKhas pa’i dga’ ston 119a) and Padma-dkar-po (Chos ’byung 165a). The Chinese Tun huang materials such as the Cheng-li chieh (l. 129a), however, state that the outcome of the debate was an edict authorizing the Ch’An teachings. See D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 83.

261 Shākyamchog-Idan, Phyug rgya chen po gsal bar byed pa’i bstan bcos tshangs pa’i khors los gshis blo’i dregs pa nyams byed, Collected Works, vol. 17, p. 344 (76).

262 S-a-pa, skYes bu dam pa, p. 332.3.2 (na 75a): ‘di dag tshig dang don gis mam dbya shes pa’i lung dang rigs pa’i glad ma mchas pa’i pha rol tu phyin pa dang gshang ngags kyi don la mchog pal gzhung dang gsam don gi ni’ gal bar nyams su len pa shes pa’i drung don dang nges don gis mdo’i cha phyed pal dgos pa dang Idem dgyung kyi glad ma’khrul par thugs su chud pa’i sgra bzhin pa dang ji bzhin ma yin pa’i tshig ’chad shes pa’i mchas pa’i don mam pa’i byed pa’i mus pa’i shes ral can’ chugs sduang med cing gza bor gnas pa’i grub mtha’ nang pa’i gdon gis blo ma bslad pa’i skyes bu dam pa mams

263 Cf. Śāntideva, BCA IX 3ed-4ab. Cf. also Sa-pa’s KH III 45 and 52.
Thus to say that each doctrine was ultimately "true in its own place" (rarg sa na bden) was unacceptable (DS III 410 = 36b-37a). As mentioned above, one of the extreme doctrines Sa-paṅ combatted in this regard was a radical doctrinal relativism that maintained for instance that "All vehicles were true in their own context." Go-rams-pa in his sDom gsam rab dbye commentary ascribed this doctrine to such people as "Dampa Phydro-chung-ba, etc.," evidently referring to the early Zhi-byed master Dampa Phyar-chung, the first Tibetan instructed by the Indian siddha Dampa Sangs-rgyas (d. 1117). According to 'Gos lo-tsa-ba, Dampa Sangs-rgyas introduced him to a special instruction according to which Tantra and Pāramitāyāna did not need to be distinguished.

Sa-paṅ strongly criticized in his sDom gsam rab dbye (III 133-136 = 24a) doctrines that belonged to neither Pāramitāyāna nor Mantrayāna nor Śrāvakas. He emphasized the need for a doctrine to have an authentic origin within one of the accepted systems of Indian Buddhism, saying:

Most contemporary Buddhists do not belong to the religious tradition of the Perfections, because they do not practice the three Disciplines. Because they lack initiation and the two stages [of tantric practice], they do not belong to the doctrine of the Vajrayāna. Since they don't know the Vinaya section of the scriptures, they are not a religious tradition of the Śrāvakas, either. Alas, [to] whose doctrine can they [belong]? Even though there may be many sons who have no [acknowledged] fathers, they cannot be included within a patrilineal family lineage. Just so, religious practitioners who have not originated from an authentic source are not [to be included] within the [Buddhist] Doctrine.

The Need to Apply Criteria Impartially

Finally, one of the features of Sa-paṅ's procedure was that it was best applied by "dispassionate" (chags stang med pa) people who dwell in "unbiased rectitude" (gsal bor gnas pa). The critical principles should in fact be impartially applied—as much to himself as to others. Sa-paṅ invited others to employ the same criteria against himself, if they applied, saying, for instance: "If I possess the fault I criticize others for [here especially: bogus innovations], then let the learned disparage me!" (DS III 515 = 42a). Or as he stated in his sKyes bu dam pa:

If my words are true, then may you noble ones say: "Well done!" But if this is faulty, then refute it through scripture and reasoning!

And still more broadly, in his Phyogs bcu’i sangs rgyas..., he invited the displeasure of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, whom he had invoked as his witnesses, if what he was teaching was erroneous:

If I am teaching falsely, then may you [Buddhas and Bodhisattvas] disapprove of me; but if I am teaching truly, then may you be pleased with me!

But when asked certain delicate questions, sometimes he gave just a general indication of his answer. Then, diplomatically skirting a direct reply, he advised the questioner to conduct his own thorough investigation of the matter—i.e. to apply the appropriate criteria himself.
Sa-pan's Outline of Critical Method

Probably the best and most succinct summary of Sa-pan's critical "theological" method is given in one of his own brief, versified works, which is the Dege edition bears the title "Why it is Necessary to Expose in Conformity with Correct Scripture and Reasoning" (Lung rigs mam dag dang mthun par 'chad dgos tsul). The work belongs to the period of the author's mature doctrinal writings: it post-dates the Tshad ma rigs gter (composed ca. 1219?), and probably his sDom gswn rab dbye (composed ca. 1235?), as well. In some lists of his works, it is even referred to as the "basic text" (rta ba) of the sDom gswn rab dbye. Though it seems unlikely that Sa-pan himself ever gave it this title, the little work does in a way reveal the critical principles otherwise best exemplified by the sDom gswn rab dbye among his major works. Even though the work has already been translated into English, its contents can be clarified still more by presenting them again here in paraphrase and translation.273

The introductory first verse of the work summarizes the author's own qualifications for stating the principles which follow: He was a Buddhist monk who had widely studied under learned masters, who possessed an intellect capable of critical discrimination, who kept carefully moral discipline, and who possessed the correct philosophical theory. The next verse (v. 1) clarifies his pessimistic historical view and his personal motivation: Though the Buddha's teaching has once flourished in India and has been effectively introduced into Tibet through the work of the great translators, nowadays it has largely declined, he states. But (verses 2-3) wishing to make the Doctrine flourish once again, he studied and made himself proficient in the traditional fields of knowledge, the collections of non-Tantric and Tantric scriptures, and the universally recognized systems of established philosophical tenets (of India).

He mentioned (v. 4) that a precedent for his activities could be found among the critical works of past great Buddhist scholars, and that he

pa'i chos lugs 'di rgyud sde dang sde snyod dang mthun mi mthun ci rigs par gda/ 'di yang dag pa'i lam du gyur mi 'gyur khyed rang gis legs par dpyod.  

273 See J. D. Schoening and P. K. Sørensen (1988), pp. 42-49. For the versification, I follow that study. For references to other previous studies touching on this work, see D. Jackson (1987), p. 50.

considered himself to be following in their footsteps:

The learned have discriminated erroneous philosophical tenets from those which are not erroneous. Following them, I, too, have investigated a little through scripture and reasoning.

What sort of criticisms had Sa-pan himself already made? He mentions here (vs. 5-6) first of all that Tibetan dialecticians of his day for the most part maintained a position similar to that of non-Buddhist Indian dialectics, according to which such things as substance (dravya), individuals (viśeṣa), attributes (guna), genus (sāmanya) and relations (sambandha) were accepted as real entities. He says he has already refuted these theories thoroughly, indirectly referring to his previously composed treatise on Buddhist epistemology and logic (Pramāṇa), the Tshad ma rigs gter. Secondly (v. 7), he has heard (or read) many erroneous expositions of the basic scriptures such as the Prajñāpāramitā, Abhidharma, treatises of the Viñapti(mātra) and Madhyamaka philosophies, as well as the four classes of Tantras in the Mantrayāna system. He has (v. 8) also seen some vow-imparting rituals conducted in ways that did not conform with the Sūtras or Tantras—in the Pratimokṣa system, beginning with the vows of refuge, in the conferring of the Bodhisattva vows through the formal engendering of the Thought of Awakening (bodhicitta), and in the conferring of Vajrayāna pledges through tantric initiations. (vs. 9-10) In the realm of certain yogic practices and insights of the highest Tantras, too, he has seen some explanations which did not agree with the word of the Buddha. Accordingly (v. 11), he critically investigated these through scripture and reasoning, saying regarding the established tenets of those traditions: "These [tenets] are acceptable," and "These [others] are not acceptable."274

Then he mentioned (v. 12) the mixed reception that his critical investigations had found in Tibet, and his own advice to others in the face of those partly negative reactions:

Concerning that, some have said "Excellent!" Some others have said, "That is unacceptable!" Even so, those endowed with discriminative understanding should investigate it well. If it is acceptable by way of reasoning, then accept it! If it is not so, then you should reject it.

274 The doctrinal criticisms he referred to here were no doubt chiefly those he had made in his sDom gswn rab dbye, which he structured as a discussion of the three systems of vows.
What criteria were to be applied when accepting something through reasoning and scripture? He explained (vs. 13-14):

Acceptance, too, should be done through scripture and reasoning. With scripture, furthermore, take the definitive meaning as the decisive criterion. Don't rely on provisional meaning! With reasoning, moreover, you should uphold objectively grounded reasoning. Fallacious reasoning is pointless. To accept and reject after examining the intention is the way of the learned. To hold as chief the teachings of the non-Buddhist Indian sectarianists and the tradition of the "old [Tibetans]"²⁷⁵ is the conduct of the ignorant.

Through this method, noble individuals could maintain the Noble Dharma as the highest of religious traditions, he added (v. 15). And if one did so, the Noble Dharma itself would reach its highest intention.

On that thought, he ended the main body of his versified summary of method. But he was still not quite finished. The prose colophon that remained gave him one more opportunity to make several important points. For instance, he took pains explicitly to reject a biased approach, both for himself and others, urging instead the principled application of this method as a widely applicable and individually verifiable procedure:

Therefore, in conformity with the teaching of the noble gurus and following scripture and reasoning, I have expounded the stainless Sūtras and Tantras of the Lord Buddha—this tradition being established through scripture and reasoning, taught by the learned, accomplished by the adepts, and being something to be passed through by the Saints. [And in so expounding them,] I have said: "This way is acceptable." But I have not expounded that through a biased mind. Therefore I respectfully request everyone to examine with an honest, open mind whether what I have expounded here accords with scripture and reasoning or does not.

²⁷⁵ Sa-pañ refers with the term "old [Tibetans]" (gim po) to his Tibetan Buddhist predecessors in general, and not just to such earlier dialecticians as phywa-pa. As mentioned above, he uses the similar term bod byes po in his Nga brgyud ma'i gryul pa p. 151.2.3 (tha 305a) to refer to traditions he seems to have considered as specifically Tibetan, and there he mentions: the Great Seal, Great Perfection and the dba' dge-rgyas-pa (Tibetan followers of Atisha's tradition). In his Tshad ma rgyas gter gnyen grel, Sa-pañ refers generally to the Tibetans as bod mams, bod phal cher, and bod 'ga' zhi. In one passage of the work, however, he contrasts bod snga rabs pa with the bod kyi rtag ge pa phyi rabs pa.

His Reaction to the Reception of his Criticisms

Thus he also used this opportunity to sum up his conception of what constitutes the body of the Buddha's genuine teachings—namely, those doctrines of the genuine Sūtras and Tantras that agree with scripture and reasoning, that have been expounded by the recognized great scholars, that have been meditatively cultivated by the Tantric adepts, and that constitute the very spiritual path traversed by the saints on their way to Awakening. He denied that his own critical conclusions about what is acceptable doctrine (i.e. genuine, effective Buddhist tradition) had been reached through partisanship, and he invited others to apply the same criteria to his conclusions, and thus to test those conclusions for themselves. Implicit in this is that he saw himself as appealing to a more objective and more widely applicable standard of truth. His own conclusions, he believed, could be verified by other honest and disinterested parties.

Most worldly people praise living beings who refute the Noble Doctrine. Because I have refuted non-religion, most worldly people speak ill me. Most worldly people do not [appreciate or] follow after the Buddha [who is] kind toward the world. These worldly people
follow [Kāma], the deceiver who has flowers for arrows. Alas, people of inferior merit propitiate demons because they have lost their divine heritage!276

Thus, while I have made refutations and proofs in conformity with scripture and reasoning while investigating what is erroneous and non-
erroneous in meaning and wording, most worldly people speak ill of me through thoughts of desire and aversion. But You [Buddhas and Bodhisattvas], who possess the eye of omniscience, are pleased. Just what the Master Nāgārjuna said has come to pass, namely: "The teaching was not taught by the Tathāgatas for the sake of disputation, but it burns the theories of others like fire burns firewood."277

I, too, have not taught with the thought of disparaging others. And yet, by teaching in accord with Your scriptural divisions, this has burned the religious traditions of others. When one lays down a plumb line straight, it annoys those having crooked shapes. In the same way, by [my] establishing Your teachings [correctly], those [followers of] counterfeit doctrines are not pleased. I am without desire and aversion, but if, wishing to preserve the doctrine, I speak truthfully, then the person I address becomes furious. If I speak a falsehood, it is a great evil.278

Now, [reverently] folding my hands, I implore the Buddhas in [all] ten directions: Am I to speak the truth, or should I speak falsely? If

I speak truly, all those who speak falsely are angered. But if I speak falsely, I fear that it contradicts Your word. Moreover, if I protect the Doctrine, this refutes all erroneous doctrines. But if I preserve the feelings of worldly people, this promotes erroneous doctrines. If I speak truly, it offends the feelings of others. If I speak falsely, it destroys the Doctrine. If I abstain from speaking, the matter will not be understood. Therefore the noble conduct is difficult!279

276 Sa-pa, P'yogs bco'i sangs rgyas, pp. 327.1-2 (na 62a-b):
'gro ba dam chos sun 'byin pal/ de la 'jig rten phal cher bstod//
bdag gis chos min sun phyang bas/ 'jig rten phal cher bdag la smod//
sangs rgyas 'jig rten thugs brsde la/ 'jig rten phal cher rjes mi 'jug//
shu byed me tog rda' can gyi/ rjes su 'jig rten 'di dag 'brasg//
kye ma bsod nams dman pa'i mill/ tha skal chad pas 'byung po sgnyi//

277 Ibid.: deitar don dang tshig dag gis/ 'khral dang ma 'khral dpyad pa lal/
lung dang rigs pa mi 'gal bar/ bdag gis dga'ug sgrub byis pa last//
'jig rten phal cher chags sdang gis/ bsams pas bdag la smod mod kyis//
thams cad giig pa'i spanyo mnga' ba/ khayed ni bdag la sde byes par bsams//
'phags pa klu sgrub 'di skad dui/ chos 'di de bzhin gshegs mams kyis//
tsgod pa' don du ma sungs mod/ 'on kyang 'da ni gzhon ta mams//
me yis b rigs shing bzhin du bregd/ zhes sgungs pa de thog tu bab//

278 Ibid.: bdag kyang gshan la khayod good pa/ bsams pas bshad pa ma lags mod/
'on kyang khayod kyis sde smod bzhin/ bshad pas gshan gi chos lags bregd/
thig ksad drang por bshag pa na/ ya yo can mams sams la gjan//
de bzhin khayed kyis sgrubs sggals/ chositar bcos mams myaes ma gars//
bdag la sde sde ma madis mod/ 'on kyang bsatan pa bsrng 'dod pa/
bdens par bsanzas na pha rol khor/ bzhedun par bsanzas na sgig pa le//

279 Ibid.: da ni phyogs bco'i sangs rgyas lal/ thal sgyan nas ni don 'di zhul/
bdag gis bden par bsran lags sam// 'on te bzedun par bsran ba hgyi/
gal te bden par bsran [=sma?] na nill/ bzedun par bsran ba thams cad khor/ de stis [] bzedun par bsran [=sma?] na nill/ khiedy kyis gshung dag gal du dog//
gshan yang bsatan pa bsrun na nill/ chos log thams cad sun 'byung 'shall//
'onte 'jig rten sams bsrun nall/ chos log la yang bstod 'tsal lo//
bden par bsran na gshan sams bregd// bzedun par bsran na bsatan pa 'jig//
bsran ba spangs na don mi rogs// des na dam pa'i sphyog pa dka//.
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LATER COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION

Some useful additional help for understanding the historical and doctrinal points discussed by Sa-pan is given by later Sa-skya-pa commentators, among whom the learned royal monk of Mustang, Glo-bo mkhan-chen bSod-nams-lhun-grub (1456-1532), occupies a prominent position. The latter was one of the greatest commentators on Sa-pan’s writings. He gave some very pertinent explanations for instance in his *Khral spong dgongs rgyan*, a treatise in which he tried to develop further the replies Go-rams-pa bSod-nams-seng-ge (1429-1489) had given to the controversial questions raised by Shākya-mchog-ladan about certain passages in the *sDom gsum rab dbyer*.

To lend additional support to Go-rams-pa’s answers, and to show that Go-rams-pa had adhered to well-established tradition in making his remarks, Glo-bo mkhan-chen gathered and quoted a number of lengthy quotations from relevant works. In the present instance, he cited in fact teachings given by his own main teacher, rGyal-tshab Kun-dga’-dbang-phyug (1424-1478), the highly accomplished nephew of Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzung-po (1382-1456). Kun-dga’-dbang-phyug had served as 4th abbot of Ngor from 1465-1478, and his authority extended to both camps for he had been a Vajrayāna master not only of Go-rams-pa (who served after him as Ngor abbot, 1483-86) but also of Shākya-mchog-ladan.

The source cited and quoted by Glo-bo mkhan-chen was not something actually preserved among Kun-dga’-dbang-phyug’s writings; rather, it was a record of his explanation set down in writing by one of the latter’s disciples, a certain lDan-ma bka’-bcu-pa bSod-nams-dpal, who had questioned Kun-dga’-dbang-phyug and did not want to forget the answer.

\[280\] On his commentarial writings, see D. Jackson (1987), pp. 212ff and 221, n. 20.

\[281\] For more on these works, see D. Jackson (1991), pp. 234-37.
he gave. Glo-bo mkhan-chen cited this reply at length, stating that it supplied the answer for instance to the following doubt raised by Shākya-mchog-Idan about a verse in the third, i.e. Tantric-Vow, chapter of the sDom gsun rab dbye (III 505 = 41a):

I ask what was the intended meaning of the basic text [that is, of Sākya Panḍita’s sDom gsun rab dbye] about whether or not the Six Dharmas [of Nāropa] existed in the lineage down to Lord Mi-la [ras-pa, 1040-1123]. If it did exist, then since this is maintained to be Nāropa’s lineage, what is the contradiction? If it did not, then what were the three ways in which [Sa-pan] received the three traditions of the Six Dharmas?

Glo-bo mkhan-chen begins his reply:282

It is widely said that there occurred some investigations regarding this point even from the very first, and nowadays, too, one can see many who have their doubts. But only the present words of the noble revered Kun-dga’-dbang-phuyug, written down by the same master’s direct disciple lDan-ma bka’-bcu-pa [bSod-nams-dpal], is certain to be the continuous teaching transmission [from Sa-pan], and it definitely serves to answer these questions. It states as follows:

The mtShur-bu Gu-shri283 had said to lDan-ma bka’-bcu-pa: 'Detailed knowledge about Śākyamuni is possessed by Ananda. Detailed knowledge about Virūpa is possessed by you Sa-skyas-pas. Detailed knowledge about Nāropa and Mar-pa [1012-1097] is possessed by us, the Dwags-po bka’-brgyud-pa. Therefore whether or not there existed the Six Dharmas after Mi-la and whether Mar-pa had an initiation-rite for Vajravārāhi is known by us, but not by you! ....'284

lDan-ma bka’-bcu-pa respectfully reported this to the lord master Vajradhara [Kun-dga’-dbang-phuyug], who replied:

"Generally speaking, [Sa-pan] in the sDom gsun rab dbye and Thub pa’i dagongs gdal has refuted what most of these incorrect Great Meditators have done: namely, squandering their own profound religious tradition of Nāropa, and haphazardly following as their own practice the religious teachings of other [traditions] such as the Great Perfection, and then, without receiving the maturing tantric empowerment of their own tradition, granting the Great Seal instructions and practicing it wrongly. But how could [Sa-pan] have refuted the essence of the Great Seal taught by the accomplished masters such as Nāropa and Maitripāda?

"Also, generally speaking, Mar-pa possessed a complete and unerring collection of religious instructions of the four Tantric classes, including those of the Father Tantra Gubyasamāja. The Great Meditators have probably not known the matter exactly. The Lord Nārotapāda possessed two religious traditions: (I) the religious tradition of long lineage, the intact instructions, and (II) the religious teaching of the essence, the profound sense.285 To my knowledge, the first are all these religious instructions of the three [Cakrasamvara traditions]—Lūhipāda, Ngṣnapāda and Ghantāpāda—which came down through the paṇḍitas such as the Pham-mthing-pa brothers [of Nepal]. To my knowledge, the second are all these religious teachings given by Vajradhara to Tilopa, by him to Nāropa, and by him to Mar-pa lo-tsa-ba.

To my knowledge, this teaching called "the Profound Sense, the Six Dharmas of Nāropa," is a way of practicing through practical instructions a summation of the entire sense of the Cakrasamvara Basic Tantra by way of six points, which are namely: (1) the dharma of empowerment, which ripens, (2) the dharma of the path of means, which liberates, (3) the dharma of the gnosis of the Great Seal, which is realization, (4) the dharma of the pledges and vows, which is an assistant, (5) the dharma of the great stimulation of benefits, which is the conduct, and (6) the dharma of the Fruit, which is spiritual accomplishment.

Kun-dga’-dbang-phuyug goes on to describe these six teachings one by one, enumerating, for instance, the practices belonging to the Path of Means.

282 Glo-bo mkhan-chen, sDom pa gsun, pp. 310ff (51b-).

283 Probably he was Go-shri dpal-bycar-don-grub (ca. 1427-ca. 1489), who served as regent of mtShur-pa at the death of Karma-pa mThong-ba-don-Idan in 1452-3. A brief sketch of his life is given in Si-tu and Be-lo, vol. 1, pp. 525-6 (da 263b-264a). He is counted as the first rGyal-tshab sprul-sku.

284 A section discussing the phag mo'i byin brags controversy has been omitted here for the sake of brevity.

These consist of the practice of the Stage of Generation, in full or abbreviated form, and the instructions of the Stage of Completion, being six instructions including the three basic teachings: Inner Heat, Clear Light and Phantom Body, and the three branch teachings: Dream, Thought-transference at death, and the Intermediate Stage.\(^{286}\) He continues:\(^{287}\)

The reason that it is so is this: Mar-pa gave to Mesi-stone\(^ {288}\) the full set of teachings of the four classes of Mother Tantras. The latter bestowed it on 'Khon sGyi-chu-ba dKon-mchog-'bar. He gave it to Sa-chen [Kun-dga'-snying-po 1092-1158]. And it came down to the Dharma master Sa-pan through an intact lineage. The great cotton-clad yogi Mi-la in the company of rNgog-ston Chos-sku-rdo-rje received from Lord Mar-pa the empowerment based on the Basic Tantra of Cakrasamvara, the exposition [of the Tantra], as well as the practical precepts of the Six Dharmas of the Profound Sense. After receiving this, he practiced it as something transmitted only a single generation. And when such disciples as Ras-chung rDo-rje-grags-pa [1083-1161] and Dways-po lha-rje [sGam-po-pa] requested the Profound Sense, the Six Dharmas of Nāropa, he did not confer the Tantric empowerment in the way he had received it from Mar-pa, but instead had them receive the empowerments from others. And then, bestowing [on them] each of the six dharmas of the Completion Stage and giving an instruction in the theory [of the ultimate], he made this the tradition of giving the full instructions. Therefore, even though Mi-la had received from Mar-pa those six instructions of the dharmas of empowerment, which matures, and the rest, according to their own tradition, Dways-po lha-rje and the others had not received them. With this in mind, [Sa-pan] said (DS III 505 = 41a):

Down to Mi-la, there was nothing besides that instruction called "The Six Dharmas of Nāropa."

After concluding the second part of this record of Kun-dga'-dbang-phug's teachings (which addressed a related controversy), Glo-bo mkhan-chen quoted still another such text attributed to Kun-dga'-dbang-phug as set down in writing by the same I丹-ma bka'-bcu-pa, this one explaining how Sa-pan himself could assert in the sDom gsun rab dbye (III 655 =48a) that he had received three traditions of the Six Dharmas when he himself had also stated that the Six Dharmas had not been transmitted after Mi-la.\(^ {289}\)

On another occasion [I丹-ma bka'-bcu-pa] asked: "Did Mar-pa lo-tsab-ba bestow the Profound Path Six Dharmas of Nāropa upon all four of his own great disciples? Since the Dharma Master [Sa-pan] taught that after Mi-la there was no Six Dharmas of Nāropa, doesn't this contradict the statement [in the sDom gsun rab dbye] that he himself had received "the three traditions of the Six Dharmas of Nāropa"?

Kun-dga'-dbang-phug answered: "To my knowledge, Mar-pa, while expounding the Basic Tantra of Cakrasamvara, bestowed on all four the complete content of the Profound Sense, the Six Dharmas of Nāropa. But as for instructions given according to the basic works of separate practical precepts such as the "Vajra Song of the Six Dharmas," these [Mar-pa] only gave to Mi-la. For example, it is like instruction in the separately existing practical precepts of the Five Stages (rin lnga) and Six Applications (shyor drug) [which is given] even though the full sense of the Five Stages and Six Applications is present when explaining the Tantras of Guhyasamājā and Kālacakra. [Sa-pan’s] statement [DS III 505 =41a-b] that after Mi-la the Six Dharmas did not exist had in mind that the complete set of the Profound Sense Six Dharmas, comprised of the maturing Dharma of empowerment and the rest, did not exist [any more]. His statement [DS III 656 =48a] that he had received three traditions of the Six Dharmas had in mind his having received the Six Dharmas of the Stage of Completion, comprised of Inner Heat and the rest.

The firmly Tantra-based Sa-skya-pa tradition (which based itself on a large corpus of gSar-ma-pa Tantric exegesis and precepts) considered it to be of the highest importance to give such secret instructions as the Path of Means and the Great Seal only in their original fully Tantric context in which Nāropa and his lineage down to Mar-pa had formulated and

---

\(^{286}\) See also H. Guenther (1971), p. xv, n. 1.

\(^{287}\) Glo-bo mkhan-chen, sDom pa gsun, p. 313.5 (53a-b).

\(^{288}\) This was Mes-ston-pa bSod-nams-rgyal-mitshan, who founded the most important exposition lineages passing from Mar-pa. See G. Roccich transil. p. 405; Gos lo-tså-ba, nya 3b.

\(^{289}\) Glo-bo mkhan-chen, sDom pa gsun, pp. 317.3f (55a-b).
transmitted them. In Sa-paṅ’s view, the disciples of the great anchorite Mi-la had dispensed with some of the necessary points of ritual and instruction, and in this way Nāropa’s full tradition had suffered.290 (Mi-la according to this account had not given the consecrations himself, but had let his disciples receive them from others, as was also quite legitimate.) Later followers of the Sa-skya-pa order, such as Glo-bos mkhan-chen, continued to stress as essential the transmission of Tantric empowerments together with the other practical precepts and instructions.

Comments by Shākya-mchog-laden

Another key 15th-century authority for understanding why Sa-paṅ criticized the dkar po chig thub and related traditions of the Dngags-po bKa’-brgyud was the scholar and commentator Shākya-mchog-laden (1428-1507), author of the above-mentioned hundred-odd questions regarding Sa-paṅ’s sDom gsum rabs dbye. Shākya-mchog-laden was well versed in both Sa-skya-pa and bKa’-brgyud-pa traditions, and seems to have attempted in places to harmonize the seemingly disparate doctrines of Sa-paṅ and sGam-po-pa.291 Regarding the present discussion, he attempted to give his own explanations of the same controversial statements in Sa-paṅ’s sDom gsum rabs dbye (III 505-6 = 41a-b) that he had earlier called into question.292

Down to Mi-la, there was no [Great Seal instruction in the lineage] beside that instruction called the "Six Yogas of Nāropa." After discarding the Six Yogas and while cultivating the instructions of others such as the "Path with its Fruit" (Lam ‘bras) and the Great Seal, they maintain that those are Nāropa’s lineage. Needless to say this

contradicts [the tradition of] others. It contradicts even their own tradition!

When trying to explain these lines, Shākya-mchog-laden proceeded with great caution and deliberate exactness: like a tightrope walker, his every step was precise, and every movement calculated to avoid tipping too far toward either side.293 He was in a delicate position because of his close links on the one hand with the Sa-skya-pas (his main teacher had been a student of Rong-ston, 1367-1449) and on the other hand with the Rin-lung-pas (then the rulers of Tibet), and hence with their close associate the Zhwa-dmar Karma-pa Chos-grags-ye-shes (1453-1524). He also enjoyed warm personal relations with the Zhwa-nag Karma-pa himself, Chos-grags-rgya-mtsho (1454-1506). Nevertheless, in his role as commentator on this work, Shākya-mchog-laden seems to have agreed with Sa-paṅ to a considerable extent when explaining some of the above-mentioned controversial passages in the sDom gsum rabs dbye, saying for instance that little can be seen to distinguish the theory (lta ba) of the master Mo-ho-yen as better or worse than that of the (Great Seal) exponents of "this bKa’-brgyud," though he stressed the superiority of the non-meditative practice (spyod pa) of the latter, and warned that it should not be falsely criticized.294 He specified carefully which particular unacceptable doctrinal statements of the early bKa’-brgyud-pas he believed Sa-paṅ had in mind when he criticized the "present-day Great Seal" as a "Chinese tradition of the Great Perfection," and then asserted.295

Concerning how those matters are unacceptable, [Sa-paṅ] composed the basic works that identify the modern-day Great Seal and the Chinese-tradition Great Perfection as one and refute them.

---

290 See also M. Brodico (1985), p. 351, who contrasted the method of another of Mi-la’s students, Ras-chung rDo-rje-grags, with that of sGam-po-pa. The former had more strictly maintained the Mantrayāna and “Path of Methods” context of these instructions.


292 Sa-paṅ, sDom gsum rabs dbye, chapter III, verses 506-507: nā ro chos drug zhes bya’i rlung/ mi la yan chad de las med/ chos drug tor nas lam’bras dang/ phya’ng ngya cher po la sogs pat/ gzhon gyi gzhams ngag bsgom bzhin dful/ nā ro’i brgyud pa’ ded byed pat/ gzhon dang ’gal ba bta cits smos/ ltags lugs kyang dang ’gal ba yin/

293 In the relevant section of his Leggs khide ges gi thar ma, Collected Works, vol. 7, p. 85, Shākya-mchog-laden incidentally displays a good familiarity with bKa’-brgyud-pa doctrines such as the dGongs ge,ig, quoting the latter twice (pp. 84.2 and 85.1) in connection with sGam-po-pa’s views on the chen po gsum gis ma reg pa and dkar po chig thub.


295 Shākya-mchog-laden, ibid., p. 84.7-85.1: don de dag mi ’thad pa’i dbang du mdzad nas/ dbring sang gi phya’ng ngya cher po dang/ rgya nag lugs kyi rdzogs chen gnyis don gseg tu mdzad nas’gog par mdzad pa’i gzhung mams guangs pa yin noll.
He goes on to quote the sDOM gsam rab dbye passage (III 347 = 34a), "Some say one needs merit dedication after cultivating the Self-sufficient White [Remedy]...", specifying that these remarks were directed against upholders of sGam-po-pa's tradition, and that therefore here the main things criticized were the failure to identify the real Great Seal and the terming of such a wrongly conceived "Great Seal" as a "Self-sufficient White [Remedy]." But according to Shaky-mchog-lidan, Sa-pa-n was not (here at least) demonstrating that contemporary meditators of the Great Seal were practicing the religious tradition of the Chinese master Mo-ho-yen.296

Still later in the same work, Shaky-mchog-lidan explains Sa-pa-n's position in these words:297

So you ask what is [the meaning]? [It is this:] Among the followers of Naroopa's tradition down to Mi-la there was no mastering of such teachings as the Lam 'bras or the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] (dkar po chig thub) called "Great Seal," which is different from that Six Yogas of Naroopa. But the Lord Dags-po lha-rje [sGam-po-pa], having discarded the emphatic cultivation of solely the Six Yogas within his own tradition, took as his meditative cultivation the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] which was termed "Great Seal." And Phag-mo-grupa, having apparently achieved realization through mastering the Lam 'bras, and while cultivating instructions other than those from Naroopa, concealed that other lineage and maintained that he upheld the lineage of Naroopa alone. Doing this contradicts both their own and other traditions. This is what [Sa-pa-n] stated in composing the [sDOM gsam rab dbye] treatise....

And once again in the next section he presents Sa-pa-n's position as being precisely:298

[Question:] So what is [the intended sense]? [Answer:] It means: 'If one invokes the lineage of Naroopa while cultivating that Chinese-tradition Great Perfection which had been given the name 'Great Seal,' it contradicts both traditions.' As it is said in this very same work: 'The present-day Great Seal is for the most part a Chinese religious tradition.'

Shaky-mchog-lidan no doubt had good reasons for indicating sGam-po-pa as the one who introduced the Great Perfection-like "dkar po chig thub" (with its non-Tantric sens kyi ngo phor) into the bKa'-brgyud-pa Great Seal stemming from Naroopa. And as a doctrinal innovation within Mar-pa and Mi-la's tradition, it could be termed a "present-day Great Seal" (da lta'i phyag rgya chen po), Sa-pa-n maintained. But Shaky-mchog-lidan's own attitude toward these criticisms by Sa-pa-n, while not overt rejection, is hardly that of zealous, uncritical acceptance either. He lives up here to his obligation as a commentator to penetrate and accurately represent the original author's intention, yet he is somewhat constrained in his agreement, and elsewhere when no longer a commentator and when writing a treatise specifically in defense of the Great Seal and as a follower of the latter tradition, he does of course express contrary opinions or tries to clarify misunderstandings and bring into harmony ostensible disagreements. For instance, in one of his treatises in justification of the Great Seal in the Daws-po tradition, he referred to the Hwa-shang comparison in these words:299

296 Shaky-mchog-lidan, ibid., p. 192: 'a na ci zhe na, mid la yan chad du ni naro pa'i [b]gnyud 'dzin dag la na ro'i chos drug de las gshus-lam 'bras dang' phyag chen gyi ming can dkar po chig thub sogs la goms par byed pa med la'i rje dags po lha rjes chos drug kun rang [b]gnyud la nan tan du goms par byed pa bor nas phyag rgya chen po'i ming 'dogs can gnyi dkar po gi gch thub la gsum du byas pa dang' phag mo gnus pad lam 'bras goms pa grub pa brnyes pa lta bu' naro ta pa las ghan gi gsum gsum gshis dui bgrugpa pa gshas de dag gsum nang rje na ro pa' kha na' [b]gnyud 'dzin du 'dod pa ni rang gshas gyi lugs gnyis dang 'gall' zhes bstan bcos mdud pa...''

297 Shaky-mchog-lidan, ibid., p. 195.5.

298 Shaky-mchog-lidan, ibid., p. 194.6: 'o na ci zhe na phyag rgya chen po ming thugs pa de gsum bzhin du la' ro' bgrug pa 'led na lugs gnyis dang 'gal zhes pa'i don tel' ji skad du' gzhung 'di nyid las da lta'i phyag rgya chen po ni phel chen phyag rgya chen lugs yin...''

299 Shaky-mchog-lidan, ibid., p. 344.2: "la ba yas babs hwa shang gill bgyon dang rin chungs zhes gsungs med kyang/ sngags lugs phal cher la ba nas'i btsams te lam la'i phyag pa bshad/ In his Phyag rgya chen po'i shan byed [the first of two identically titled works], Collected Works, vol. 17, p. 365, Shaky-mchog-lidan summarizes very clearly the opposing lines of argument of Sa-pa-n, which had been introduced and discussed from another viewpoint on pp. 355-6. Also in his gSer gyi thur ma las btsams pa'i dogs good kyi 'bet gsal rab gsal man gnas sad nges don rab gsal, Collected Works, vol. 17, pp. 529.5 and 541.5, he discusses the references to the "Chinese-tradition Great Perfection" (phyag rgya chen po'i lugs kyi rtags chen) within a larger exposition of the mentions of the nNyin-ma-pa in the sDOM gsum rab dbyor, and he clarifies his own quoting of 'Bri-gung dpal-'dzin's criticisms in the gSer gyi..."
Although [Sa-pan] has said that the theory descending from above is the same as the meditation of the Hwa-shang, in most of the Mantra tradition it is explained that one should enter the path after beginning with theory.

A little bit later he explains and justifies the dkar po chig thub notion.\(^{300}\)

The "self-sufficient white [remedy]" refers exclusively to theory, but it is not an expression denigrating the preparatory accumulations of merit. Moreover, it means precisely that the Great Seal by itself alone is sufficient, there being no necessity to exert oneself in applying separate remedies to the individual afflictions (kleśā) and thought-constructions.

In both his direct comments and his independent treatises, Shākyam-chogy-Itdan thus makes much of the distinction between "theoretical" (ita ba) scriptural statements and those relating to non-concentrative "practice" or "conduct" (spyod pa), a distinction that Sa-pan himself stressed in his sDom gsum rab dbye.\(^{301}\)

In some other treatises and replies to the great Karma bKa’-brgyud-pa masters and their Rin-spungs-pa patrons, Shākyam-chogy-Itdan’s defenses of this tradition are even more ambitious and elaborate. There the teachings of sGam-po-pa, which started with some revolutionary reordering and synthesizing, seem to have forced upon Shākyam-chogy-Itdan the necessity for further synthesizing and harmonizing, which he attempts sometimes in light of yet another theoretical system, that of the "Emptiness of Other" (gzhan stong) Madhyamaka.\(^{302}\)

The Reception of Sa-pan’s Ideas among Later dGe-lugs-pa Scholars

Sa-pan’s interpretations of the doctrinal and historical points in question were received in various but generally positive ways by later adherents of Tsong-kha-pa. Some highly influential clerics, whose opinions are accepted as more or less definitive in their respective colleges and whose influence thus continues strongly down to the present, accepted Sa-pan’s ideas as basically correct.\(^{303}\) ‘Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa Ngag-dbang-brtson-grus (1648-1721), for example, exhibits in his monumental Grub mtha’ chen mo a very close agreement with Sa-pan. In the course of his rejection of certain rDzogs-chen and Phyag-chen doctrines as a spurious Madhyamaka, ‘Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa quotes the sDom gsum rab dbye at least twice.\(^{304}\) He also refers to the "Replies to the Karma-pa [Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje]" (Kar lan) composed by both Se-ra rje-btsun Chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan (1469-1546) and Pa-n chen bSod-nams-grags-pa (1478-1554).

Similarly, Sum-pa mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal’-byor (1704-1776), the elder contemporary and senior of Thū’u-bkwan Chos-kyi-nyi-ma at the A-mdo monastery of dGon-lung, openly espoused in his famous history of Buddhism the criticisms found in Sa-pan’s sDom gsum rab dbye, quoting the latter work at length. He also repeated the identifications that it was Zhang Tshal-pa who was being criticized, for instance in connection with the dkar po chig thub.\(^{305}\)

The comments of ICan-skyi II Rol-pa’rdo-rje (1717-1786) in this context were, by contrast, considerably more qualified and circumspect.

---

\(^{300}\) Shākyam-chogy-Itdan, Phyag rgya chen po gsal bar byed pa’i bstan bcos sthangs pa’i ‘khor los gzhan blo’i drags pa nyams byed, Collected Works, vol. 17, p. 344 (7b): dkar po chig thub zhes bya bail ita ba rgyang pa’i ldag cha nas/l yin gyi bsod nams tshogs dag la’i/ skar ba tibs pa’i tshig ma yin/l de yang nyon mongs ma’i par gnal/ so so’i gyen po la’i de tshad la/ bad mi dgos par phyag rgya chel/ gug phug chog pa’i don ntid do’i

\(^{301}\) Sa-pan, sDom gsum rab dbye, III, verses 517-519 distinguishes scriptures relating to "theory" (ita ba) from those of "practice" (spyod pa) and "meditation" (bshom pa): dper na phyag dang mchog pa dang/ sbyin dang tshul khrims sogs mi dgos/ sems bsnyed dbang bskur bya ma dgos/ bsam gsum klong pa’i lugs mi dgos/ dge dang sdi’g pa gnyis ka med’i/ sngog rgyas sogs can yod min sogs/ ‘di ’dra gsungs pa’i lung ma’i kun/ ita ba yin gni bshom pa dang/ spyod pa gnyis kyi lung ma yin/

\(^{302}\) See also D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 105-8.


\(^{304}\) Ibid., fl. 648.6 (18b): ‘jam mgon sa skya parshu ta’i sdom gsum lai da ma’i phyag rgya chen po dang/ rgya nag lugs kyi rdzogs chen lal/... don la mnam par dbye ba med’i. See also p. 658.2 (23b): blus po phyag rgya che bshom pald... 

\(^{305}\) See S. C. Das ed. (1908), dPags bsam ljon bzang, pp. 403ff.
As the latter wrote in his well-known treatise on philosophical schools:

The term 'Self-sufficient White [Remedy]' (dkar po chig thub) had no wide dissemination before Zhang Tshal-pa; Zhang 'Tshal-pa even wrote a treatise which treated the 'Self-sufficient White [Remedy]' as its main subject. It appears that this was also the main object refuted by Mañjunātha Sa-skya Pañcita.

Many later [scholars belonging to] our own and other [traditions] also seem to have made many refutations of this thesis. If the thesis asserted by Zhang 'Tshal-pa himself consists in the thesis of 'no entertainment whatsoever,' then those refutations are right on target; but I do not wish to elaborate on it [here] in detail.

Thus the lCang-skya sprul-sku mentioned Sa-pa as a main doctrinal opponent of Zhang. But he was not that clear himself about what actually had been at issue. For him, the really telling later criticisms in this connection had rejected the "non-entertainment" (amanaskāra) doctrine. But he was not completely sure whether or not this was what Zhang had actually been maintaining by his 'Self-sufficient White [Remedy]' doctrine.

lCang-skya Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje's comments seem to have served as the point of departure for the further remarks of his younger contemporary Thu'u-bkwan Chos-ki-yi-nyi-ma (1737-1802). The latter was in fact one of the few dGe-lugs-pa scholars who directly disagreed with Sa-pa on these points, and when touching on these topics in the bKa-brgyud-pa chapter of his survey of Buddhist philosophical and religious systems, he indeed tried to be even-handed and conciliatory toward the bKa-brgyud-pa. As briefly alluded to above, Thu'u-bkwan portrayed Sa-pa's criticisms as having been directed against "non-entertainment" (as might easily be read into lCang-skya's account). He therefore rejected them as unsatisfactory, saying: 'Because this [bKa-brgyud-pa teaching] is clearly not the position of 'performing no mentation at all,' it is evident that the refutations [by Sa-pa] in the sDom gsum rab dbye were improper." Since Thu'u-bkwan had narrowly specified the dkar po chig thub to be precisely "the Great Seal of Maitripāda" (ma'i tri phyag chen dkar po chig thub), he could attempt to exonerate Zhang here simply on the grounds that such a teaching of "complete non-mentation" (ci yang yid la mi byed pa) did not occur in Zhang's work.

The comments of lCang-skya and Thu'u-bkwan seem to show that the discussion was by their time going on at a greater remove from its original context, with only occasional direct reference to what Sa-pa or Zhang had actually written. Moreover, both of the latter scholars had close associations with the Manchu Imperial court in Peking, and they could distance themselves—both geographically and doctrinally—from the sectarian frictions of Central Tibet.

dBal-mang dKon-mchog-rgyal-mtshan

The still later A-mdo scholar dBal-mang dKon-mchog-rgyal-mtshan (b. 1764) wrote in 1833 an interesting work that briefly describes a number of key differences between the bKa'-brgyud, rNying-ma and Sa-skya traditions. Though other passages of dPal-mang's work seem more even-handed, in his section 3 on the bKa-brgyud schools (vol. 6, p. 288.6ff = cha 37a), he quotes the sDom gsum rab dbye several times with obvious approval. In one passage he gleefully repeats the critical lines of Sa-pa that identified the "Neo-Great Seal" with the Ho-shang's discredited teachings, applying these lines to his contemporary "red-hatted" rivals in the "New-Tradition" (gar ma) schools:

![Image}

---

306 lCang-skya Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje, p. 459.2 (cha kha 20b): dkar po chig thub ces pa'i ming ni zhang thsal pa yam chad du dar gysas che gsal med cing zhang thsal pas dkar po chig thub la gso bo byas pa'i sttan bcos kyang mtha' drol / 'jam mgon sa skya pa chen goi dgag pa mtha' yul yi gso bo ying la yin par snang ngsol / phyis kyis rang gshen nos kyang / 'di phyogs la deig pa mngag pa mtha' drol par 'dag la/ zhang thsal pa rang gi sde pa la ci yang yid la mi byed pa'i phyogs gyar pa yin na deig pa de dag snang stel zhib par spro ma 'dod drol'/ Ch. D. S. Lopez (1989), p. 266. The passage was also noted by D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 104, n. 205.

307 Thu'u-bkwan Chos-ki-yi-nyi-ma, p. 170.4 (kha 25b.4).
Nowadays one can see many cases of even those red-hatted "New Tradition" followers who pride themselves on being "Old Tradition" and, imagining the Great Seal and Great Perfection to be one and the same, practice like the Hwa-shang who [had represented] one of the two religious tradition into which [Buddhism] had become divided [in those old times]. As is stated in the sDom gyun rab dbyes....

He goes on (f. 38b) to mention the similarity between the terminology followed by many New and Old traditions such as the Great Seal and Great Perfection whereby the meditative cultivation of Emptyness is called "recognizing the nature of mind" (sams ngos 'phrod pa).311

Gung-thang dKon-mchog-bstan-pa'i-sgron-me

The attitude among the dGe-lugs-pa toward the Great Seal and dkar po chig thub controversies was further complicated by the fact that a significant number of them accepted the existence of their own "dGe-Idan Great Seal" tradition (dge ldan phyag chen).312 Evidently the latter tradition, which claimed to descend from Tsong-kha-pa through the so-called dBen-sa snyan-bryug, received significant support from the eclectic first Pan-chen Rin-po-che Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan (1567-1662), though Pan-chen bSod-nams-grags-pa (1478-1554) for example had already written a "Great Seal" manual for it. But the 5th Dalai bla-ma Ngag dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho (1617-1682)—never a big lover of the original bKa'-bryug-pa traditions—was not at all pleased that a "dGe-ldan bKa'-bryug" was springing up in his very midst.313

This historical information was provided by Gung-thang dKon-mchog-bstan-pa'i-sgron-me (1762-1823), who in his dGe ldan phyag rgya chen po'i khrid kyi zin bris zhal lung bdud rtsi'i thigs phreng mainly recorded the explanations of his main teacher 'Jam-dbyangs-bshad-pa II dKon-mchog-

311 dBal-mang dKon-mchog-rgyal-mtshan, p. 293 (39b): gshar yang phyag chen pa dag dang / rdzogs chen pa sogs gsar mnying miang po zhig gsal / srong nyid bsgom pa la sams ngos 'phrod pa zhes pa'i tha snyad brags.


7

POSTSCRIPT

One of Sa-paṅ's most influential contributions to the religious and intellectual history of Tibet was no doubt the efforts he made to strengthen rational and critical methods in order to preserve and transmit genuine tradition. He insisted on the importance of discriminative intellectual insight and conceptual clarity, and he sought to apply critical, intellectually rigorous standards carefully and conscientiously in nearly all spheres of religion, philosophy and scholarship. This, I believe, was at the bottom of his great concern with mastering the principles and methodologies of each branch of scholarship, and then propagating them through teaching and writing. Nowhere was this concern made clearer than where he treated differences of doctrine in a controversial or didactic context, trying to evaluate and verify or reject philosophical or doctrinal statements through the use of criteria that were themselves definable and defensible.

But as seen above, his critical method was never that of a rootless agnostic or skeptic. It was always used in the service of tradition, i.e. to defend the recognized doctrines and practices of Indian Buddhism to which he was heir. To be effective, his critical method had to be based on a very wide and deep knowledge of scripture and doctrine. Moreover, learning and reflection were not ends in themselves, nor were they, in Sa-paṅ's view, sufficient means for knowing the absolute. Still, some of his opponents viewed such a rational, critical procedure as a non-productive trap or as a dangerous, potentially self-destructive two-edged sword. These opponents included certain contemporary followers of Tibetan "all-at-once" contemplative traditions, who from the start placed little emphasis on (or even belittled) critical intellectual examination and who affirmed the primacy of direct, non-conceptual apprehension of the ultimate. For his part, Sa-paṅ argued forcefully to the contrary that to maintain Buddhist tradition publicly was part of the duty of a Mahāyāna
master, and that there was no other principled way to do so besides the method of reasoning and scripture. Moreover, in the realm of religious practice, Sa-pa maintained that there was no way to prepare oneself for higher yogic insight within the non-Tantric Mahâyâna, apart from an understanding gained through learning and reflection.

That other viewpoints on these controversies continued to be maintained in Tibet was demonstrated by the replies to Sa-pa’s criticisms by subsequent bKa’-brgyud-pa masters from the 16th century onward, and even by the occasional further questions by and differences between later Sa-skya-pa commentators. Regarding the precise origins of sGon-po-pa’s Great Seal teachings, moreover, modern scholars would probably agree that they were complicated and are still not very well understood, much like some of the doctrines that might have influenced their formulation, such as, most notably, the Great Perfection, Zhi-byed and gCod-yul.

Modern readers of Sa-pa will find nothing surprising in many of his critical remarks. But certain others of his judgments might seem too narrow and tradition-bound. Modern, more eclectic-minded students of Buddhism, for instance, might ask: “What difference does it make if certain Tibetan traditions were linked to Ch’an traditions through some ancient connection? Isn’t Ch’an also a legitimate tradition of Buddhist meditation?” But for a Tibetan Buddhist it would seem that one could also derive a doctrinal link however ancient and indirect—was a difficult thing to do, precisely because of the bSam-yas debate and its later ramifications.

Faithful modern practitioners of the traditions in question might also

---

316 Some would moreover say that the basic historical question remains unanswered: “How could the non-Tantric doctrine of Mo-ho-yen have been the origin of rDo-rigs-chen or Phyag-chen traditions, which are largely Mantrayāna-based teachings?” Similar lines of argumentation had in fact already been advanced in the 16th century by Padma-dkar-po and bKhra-shis-rnam-rgyal, on which see D. Jackson (1990), p. 95, n. 87. Sa-pa evidently thought he had recognized some extrinsic, non-Tantric elements as having been newly introduced by sGon-po-pa into the originally Tantra-based lineage of Nāropa and Mar-pa. His criticisms and identifications, however, do not relate to the whole tradition, but rather to only a few restricted aspects of it: for instance, to the non-Tantric “Sutra-path” practice of introducing the Great Seal as the nature of mind, and to the notion that to realize the nature of mind through such a non-conceptual introduction will suffice to bring about Buddhahood.

317 Dam-pa Sgam-rgyas, for instance, is said to have taught sGom-pa dMar-sgom the “Instruction on the three Singly and Instantaneously Decisive [Factors].” See ‘Gos lo-tsa-ba, p. 809.4 (na 21a): sgom pa don mar sgom la chig chod gsum gyi gsum pa; G. Roerich, transl., p. 911.

---

reply: “Even supposing sGon-po-pa did incorporate a few Ch’an or Great Perfection elements (such as from the Sem-sde teachings) into his Phya-chen instructions—so what? These teachings are of a similar kind, and anyway, as a fully enlightened master, sGon-po-pa knew what he was doing. We put our trust in the blessings of the master, and what really counts after all is the results—the insight of Awakening. Without that, all this ‘religious’ talk is just a mass of dry words.”

In a more general doctrinal context, too, one could reply (as Shâkyamchog-Idan had done) that even the dkar po chig thub metaphor is acceptable on the level of theory (la ba) when characterizing insight into the absolute.318 The ultimate intent of the Buddhahs and siddhas is only one. The liberating insight of Awakening is the desired “cure.” These statements belong primarily to the realm of theory and refer to the fruit.

Meanwhile the main thrust of the innateist and simultaneous traditions has not been effected much by such questions or controversies.319 They remain today the preeminent meditation lineages of Tibetan Buddhism, the unbroken continuation of generation after generation of highly accomplished masters. They can rightly style themselves, for example, “lineages of the sense” (don brgyud) and not of the mere “word,” and “lineages of meditative practice” (sgrub brgyud), as opposed to lineages of mere exposition. Putting their main emphasis on inner realization, the masters of these traditions have traditionally been less conservative and more iconoclastic regarding outer forms. Amongst themselves the masters of these traditions—namely, of the Phya-chen, rDo-rigs-chen and Zhi-byed—have also noticed their common, overriding similarities. Sometimes, too, they have tended to drop certain distinctions of teaching or practice among themselves. And this was quite natural. After all, when one is drunk on the wine of highest realization, one does not draw philosophical or sectarian distinctions.320

318 Shâkyamchog-Idan, Phya-chen po gsal bar byed pa’i bs tan bcos tshangs pa’i rkor los gzhis blo’i drep pa nyams byed, Collected Works, vol. 17, p. 344 (7b).

319 Many masters of these traditions did not feel called upon to refute such criticisms. See L. Lhalungpa (1986), p. 434, n. 73, and p. 451, n. 130. But some scholarically trained scholars noted the difficulties of maintaining these doctrines in a general Mahâyâna doctrinal context. See for the example of ‘Brug-rig ’dzin Chos-kyi-grags-pa, as quoted in D. Jackson (1990), pp. 66f, and mentioned above in note 61. And in fact his comment on the strict impossibility of a sig car ba approach had already been taught by ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po. See the latter’s Collected Works, vol. 3, p. 5.1.

This sort of eclecticism, however, contrasted with another deeply rooted tendency in Tibetan Buddhism, which manifests itself within the simultaneist schools as well. This is the tendency to preserve separately and discreetly the teachings of each lineage. For a tradition to be unmixed (lugs ma 'dres pa) was in general a point to be praised and esteemed among Tibetan Buddhists. But for the simultaneist traditions, a certain sort of eclecticism was almost inevitable. By nature they tended to affirm the One behind the multifarious Many. Theirs was a synthesizing, equalizing insight, no doubt akin to what is described on the level of Buddhahood as the Gnosis of Equality (mnyam pa nyid kyi ye shes). This insight was not primarily cognizant of the discreetness and diversity of things. For the moment, such analyzing, discriminating insight was suppressed, though on the level of Buddhahood a transformed discrimination, too, was acknowledged as an essential aspect, as for instance in the Gnosis of Analytical Understanding (so sor rtag pa'i ye shes)."321

Two Legends

Were the pair, discrimination and concentrated insight, irreconcilable on the level of meditative practice? And on the doctrinal level, could one balance the tendencies toward eclecticism and conservative traditionalism? There were no easy answers. Each Buddhist meditator or tradition was forced to find its own balance and "middle path" between these contrasting tendencies. Certainly there was something almost paradoxical in the relationship of such complementary "opposites" as the two opposing tendencies among Buddhist practitioners—the gradualist, intellectual analytical procedure of the scholar on the one hand and the simultaneist, innateist realization of the yogi on the other.

That these two poles were somehow inextricably linked would also seem to be expressed, for example, through the legendary life stories of two Tantric adepts of India: Kọṭāli the mattock-man and Śāntipa the great scholar. It will perhaps be remembered that the early bKa'-brgyud-pa master 'Jig-rten-mgon-po once asserted that sGam-po-pa was similar to the Indian mahāsiddha Tog-rtsa-pa ("Mattock-man") in one important respect: from among the many Indian and Tibetan adepts, these two alone each laid a special emphasis on the direct pointing out of Mind.322 The common approach of these two might therefore be considered the embodiment of an extreme innateist pole of theory and practice. The opposed gradualist pole, by contrast, could be said to have been embodied in Indian Buddhism by such a great master-scholar and teacher as Ratnakaraśānti, known to the Tibetans as "Śānti-pa." The latter was a highly competent scholar of both the general Mahāyāna and the Mantra Vehicle who at one stage became a doctrinal opponent of Maitripāda, according to one tradition. It was indeed Ratnakaraśānti who wrote one of the strongest explicit statements of the danger of excessive faith (within the general Mahāyāna), and the necessity for using the means of knowledge (pramāṇa) for gaining the omniscience of Buddhahood—a statement that Sa-paṅ quoted when arguing for the importance of a critical approach within the general Mahāyāna.323

But in the legends of the great siddhas, what is the relationship of the Mattock-man and Śāntipa? At first glance, Mattock-man the siddha would seem to have been the hero of both tales. Yet without the master Śāntipa’s kind instructions and inspired oversimplifications (pointing out the mind as the field to be tilled), the Mattock-man would never have left off scratching at his little patch of earth. Though he later became Śāntipa’s teacher, the Mattock-man could not have become so had he not also been the other’s student. Śāntipa, too, was paradoxically both teacher and student of the other. But let the stories speak here for themselves.

The Story of Mattock-man the Solitary Farmer324

Once in a remote spot in central India, four day’s journey from the city of Rameśvara, a man named Kọṭāla (the mattock-man) was hoeing on a hillside for the sake of establishing a farm and settling there. As he was working, the great Buddhist teacher Śāntipa, who was on his way back to Magadha, happened to pass by.

321 Cf. also the traditional division of the Buddha’s Gnosis into ji ita ba and ji snyed pa mskyen pa'i ye shes.


323 Sa-paṅ, Payogs bu'i...p. 324.3 (57a).

324 The tale has been abridged. Cf. the translations of James B. Robinson (1979), pp. 155-157; and K. Dowman (1985), pp. 238-241, no. 44, who calls the Mattock-man “the peasant guru.”
"What are you doing?" asked the great teacher.  
After first inquiring politely after the master's health, the man replied: 
"I am hoeing the hillside."

"Why are you doing that?" asked the teacher.  
"All the evil rulers have oppressed and afflicted us, destroying our homeland. And since we have no homeland, I am going to make my home and dwelling here in this spot, after I have excavated this hill."
WORD: Šántipa replied: "If I had a spell and instructions for hoeing hills, wouldn't you want it?"

The Mattock-man said he would, so Šántipa instructed him as follows:

By such work as yours,  
the body has grown tired.  
So this is very bad work.  
It is six wrong kinds of action:   
Hoeing the land is [your] generosity.  
Not harming others is moral discipline.  
[You have] patience which patiently accepts suffering,  
diligence which exerts itself in that, 
concentration which is not distracted from that,  
and the discriminative understanding which understands that—  
Thus you have six wrong kinds of activity.  
You should avoid those, and practice the six correct activities.

Revering the teacher is generosity.  
Guarding one's own mental continuum is moral discipline.  
Patience which patiently accepts the nature of mind, 
diligence which cultivates that,  
concentration which is not distracted from that,  
and the discriminative understanding which understands that—  
Cultivate these at all times!

"Please tell me a little more about the meaning of that!" requested Koṭāli.  
Šántipa continued: "Revere the teacher. Since all pleasure and pain comes from your own mind, cultivate the sense of one's own primordial mind. Moreover, one's own changeless primordial mind is like the hill. The awareness that is lucid and unceasing is like the hoe. So dig! The pair of (meditation and?) diligence are like your two arms. You must always hoe with them." To that he added this verse:

All pleasure and pain comes from the mind.  
Through instructions, hoe the hill of mind!  
Even though you hoe a hill of dirt,  
you won't realize the primordial great bliss!

The peasant cultivated those teachings, and after twelve years he attained siddhis. After performing many helpful deeds for other beings, he passed directly to the Đākiṇī realm in that very body.

The Story of Šántipa, the Great Scholar  

Once in India at the great Buddhist seminary of Vikramaśila there lived the outstanding scholar Ratnākaraśānti who was known as Šántipa.  
A Brahmin by birth, he attained great eminence as a Buddhist teacher who had mastered all traditional arts and sciences.  
His fame spread far and wide, and finally reached the ears of a ruler of an island off the southern coast of India. The latter and his people invited Šántipa to come and teach them the Buddhist doctrine, which the scholar-master after due consideration agreed to do. He spent some three years teaching in that place, and finally returned to India heavily loaded with precious gifts of all sorts.

On his return journey he travelled much of the way overland, and at one point passed through a desolate, mountainous tract that took seven days to cross. It was at this time that he met the peasant Mattock-man and taught him.

After his return to his home monastery, Šántipa grew old and infirm, and his vision failed. His students drove him around in a buffalo cart, and (since he had lost his teeth) he lived on a diet of finely ground foods. When he reached about one hundred years of age, he entered a twelve-year meditation retreat.

During those same years the peasant Mattock-man, his student, was also in meditation retreat. But while Šántipa practiced discursive

---

325 I have abridged the first part of the story severely. Cf. the translations of James Robinson (1979), pp. 60-64; and K. Dowman (1985), pp. 94-99, no. 12, who calls Šānti-pa "the complacent missionary." I do not know what relation, if any, this legend has to the life of the historical master Ratnākaraśānti.
contemplation, his student was absorbed in non-conceptual insight, and he attained the highest attainment of the Great Seal, dwelling in primordial reality. When Śāntipa left his retreat hut, his students attended him reverently. But when Mattock-man arose from his meditation all the dākinīs as well as various divinities came to anoint him with nectar and to honor him. They all said: "This is the real Vajrasattva." ... He himself said: "Until I received my guru's instructions, I tilled this external hillside. Now, after gaining his instructions on tilling this hill of the mind, I have won mystic attainment (siddhi)."

The great god Indra and his retinue invited Mattock-man to come to such heavens as the divine realm of the Thirty-three. But he refused, saying: "I must go to pay homage to my guru, who is kinder even than the Buddha." ... With his supernatural vision Mattock-man saw that it would take him six months to make the journey on foot, so instead he projected a mental body which made the journey in an instant. He bowed and paid homage to his guru and the retinue of students. But then he realized that he was invisible to them. He materialized his physical body, and then repeated many times his respects.

"Who are you?" asked the teacher.
"I am your disciple," replied the Mattock-man.
"As I have countless disciples, I do not recognize you."
"I am the the Mattock-man," he replied. Teacher and student then recognized each other, and they happily conversed as some length. Then Śāntipa asked him what attainments he had gained from his practice.
"Following your instructions, I have obtained the attainment of the Great Seal, the highest Dharmakāya," he replied.
"I have given highest priority to teaching, but not to meditative practice," said Śāntipa, "and I have not myself directly experienced the ultimate reality that I teach, while you have devoted yourself primarily to practice, but not to teaching, and have directly encountered the ultimate. I have even forgotten the instructions I gave you. Please return the teachings to me and also show me the attainments you have achieved."

The Mattock-man took Śāntipa to a remote place and revealed many qualities of the Dharmakāya, also returning the instructions to his teacher. Śāntipa then practiced these instructions for twelve more years, whereupon he finally gained the highest attainment of the Great Seal. Then, after serving others faithfully, he passed away to the Dākinī's Realm.
Part I

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF SGAM-PO-PA AND ZHANG

These subjects remain open for discussion, and detailed investigations in the future will no doubt clarify further the main doctrinal points involved, their historical antecedents, and their later ramifications. But when trying to follow such a Tibetan doctrinal controversy, a modern reader must first of all try to discern which doctrinal context each remark belongs to. If presented as a Mantrayāna "fruit" teaching, for instance, many of the doctrines of the Self-sufficient White Remedy would become acceptable even to Sa-pan, who had rejected them in a general Mahāyāna doctrinal context. Debaters who fail to clarify from the beginning which level of doctrine is being addressed and which lineages or systems of established tenets are being followed will soon be speaking at complete cross-purposes. Similarly, the modern reader of such a discussion who fails to clarify the same things will soon be completely at sea.

Moreover, before trying to make sense of the later stages of a Tibetan doctrinal discussion, the modern reader should try to ascertain exactly what the main early participants (here, sGam-po-pa, Zhang, and Sa-pan) themselves actually said on the relevant points. In order to facilitate this, I present here in translation all the presently known instances of the expression dkar po chig thub in the writings of rje sGam-po-pa, bla-ma Zhang, and Sa-skya Paṇḍita.

A. sGam-po-pa’s Mentions of the dKar po chig thub

(1) The Reply to Phag-mo-gru-pa’s Questions

A first occurrence of the phrase dkar po chig thub in sGam-po-pa’s writings is in his reply to the questions of his learned and accomplished
Kham-pa disciple Phag-mo-gru-pa rDo-rje-rgyal-po. There he speaks of the realization he teaches as being utterly beyond the range of intellectual understanding (being unknown even by a greatly learned man or pandita and beyond the range of a dialectician) and asserts that it is only arises through the grace of an accomplished teacher who transmits it nonverbally and non-conceptually to a devoted, reverential disciple. Even the greatest scholars such as Nagarjuna can assert nothing regarding its nature. He adds:

When it has arisen, since this has become a Self-sufficient White [Remedy], i.e. full liberation through knowing one thing, Buddha[hood] is acquired in oneself.*

To translate the passage in full:

[Phag-mo-gru-pa] asked: "In that case, by what is the nature acquired?"

[SGam-po-pa replied:] "It is acquired through the sustaining spiritual impulse of the guru, from one's own reverence and devotion, and by the power of meditatively cultivating through diligent effort, whereas otherwise it will not be acquired. For as it is also stated in the Hevajra Tantra:

The innately born is not told by another, and it is not received from anyone. It is known through observing the timely sacrifices for the guru, as a result of one's own merit. This is not known by a learned scholar, a pandita. It is not realized through discriminative understanding. It is beyond the range of a dialectician. For the nature to arise in the mind: it will arise without words, [in a way] beyond the range of intellect, by the power of the sustaining spiritual impulse, from a guru who possesses realization, by a student who respects and reveres him. Its nature is devoid of any assertion [that can be made], even by greatly learned scholars such as Nagarjuna. As it is said in the Hevajra [Tantra]:

There is no meditator, nor anything to be cultivated in meditation. No deity, nor any mantra. There is not even the slightest thing to be cultivated in meditation. The deity and mantra reside in a nature possessing no [conceptual] elaborations.

"And as stated in the Manjushrinamasangiti, v. 86":

He realizes the three times as time-less; he understands all benefits for all living beings.

"Accordingly, when it has arisen, since this has become a Self-sufficient White [Remedy], i.e. full liberation through knowing one thing, Buddha[hood] is acquired in oneself. Since by that, the fetter that binds one to cyclic existence has been loosed of itself, one's own mind achieves the level of great bliss."

The Tibetan text, re phag mo gru pa'i zhus lan pp. 471.6-472 (da 236a-b), cf. rTsibs-ri spar-ma ca 2, f. 4b:

'o na ngo bo gang gi sgyed pa lags zhus pas/
bla ma'i byin brilbars dangi rang gi mos gus dangi brtson 'grus kyi bsgom pa'i stobs las sgyed kyi de las gzhon du mi sgyed del de yang dgyes pa rdo rje las/
gzhon gyis brjod min lhan ci skyes// gang du yang ni mi sgyed del// bla ma'i dus thabs bsten pa dangl rang gi bsod nams las shes byas// ces so//
"di mkhas pa padri tas kyang mi shes// shes rab kyi mi rtogs// rtog ge ba'i spyod yul ma yin\[ p. 472 = 236b] ngo bo rgug la skye ba la bla ma rtogs ldan cig la slob ma mas gus byin brilbars kyi stobs kyi tshig dang brag ba blo'i yul las 'das pa las rab 'char tel// ngo bo 'phags po klu sgrub la

---

327 This is Hevajra Tantra I 11, the canonical Tibetan in Snellgrove's edition being: bsgom pa po med sgom pa'ang med// tha med sngags kyung yod ma yin\[ spros pa med pa'ang rang bo la// sngags dang la ni yang dang gnas//.

328 The text in the Peking edition, vol. 1, p. 120.36 (rgud ka 5b) is apparently corrupt: das gsum dus med rtags par gnas// sans can kun kyi chu choen//. The actual reading in Tibetan should be: dus gsum dus med rtags pa po// sans can kun kyi chu choen po//. See Ronald Davidson (1981), p. 56, "The term dus thabs is Skt. parva "observance, sacrifice offered at a fixed time."
sogs pa mkhas pa rams kyhas len dang bral ba yin tel dyges pa'i rdo rje las!
bsgom pa po med bsgom bya med/ lha med sngags kyang yod ma yin/
bsgom par bya ba cung zad med/ spros pa med pa'i rang bzhin la/
thas dang sngags na yang dag gnas/
shes pa dang/ 'jam dpal las kyang/
dus gsum dus med rogs pa po/? sems can kun gyi don kun rig/
tses gsums pas/ de skyes pa'i dus nal 'dkar po cig thub cig shes kun gro/ du
song bas/ sangs ngas rang la myed/ des 'khor bar 'dzin pa'i sprog rang gsal
du 'gro bas/ rang sems bde ba chen po'i sa non bya ba yin gsum/.

(2) The First Occurrence of the Expression in his Reply to Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa

A second place where the expression 'dkar po chig thub appears in sGam-po-pa's writings is near the beginning of his reply to the questions of Karma-pa Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa. The latter had received instruction from sGam-po-pa, and then after a few days of meditating, he underwent an experience of great lucidity, though he had had no idea where it had come from. sGam-po-pa advised him:

That is the "Self-sufficient White [Remedy]." Such will always occur tomorrow, the next day, and later, and therefore you should use a warm curtain behind you, wear thin clothing, and so meditate. You will probably be able to bind consciousness (shes pa) to your service.

The Tibetan, Dus gsum mkhyen pa'i zhus lan, p. 376.7 (tha 187b), cf. rTsibs-ri spar-ma, ca 3, f. 1b-2b:

bla ma rin po che la physis kho bos gdam ngag cig zhus nas/ bsgom pas zhag 'ga' lon pa dang gang nas byung cha med pa'i gsal sing nge ba'i nyams cig byung zhus pas/
de 'dkar po chig thub bya ba yin gsum/ sang guangs dang phis thag tu de tshug 'ong ba yin pas rgyab yol dro bar gships gos bgrab par gvis las [=la?] bsgoms dang/ shes pa (b)kol tu bgrab par 'dag gis gsum/

(3) A Second Occurrence in his Reply to Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa

The third known usage by sGam-po-pa of the expression is found in the same work. In this context, Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa had requested explanations of the tantric Path of Means (thabs lam). sGam-po-pa's reply (ibid., p. 380 = 189a-b) stressed the sufficiency of the very thing that he always taught (kun tu bshad pa des chogs). To give a complete translation of the passage:

Moreover, one day [Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa] told [sGam-po-pa] that he would like to request the Path of Means [instructions].

[sGam-po-pa] replied: "That very thing that I always teach will do. If you don't meditatively cultivate that, then in the intermediate stage (bar do) it will not help even if you know the practical instructions. If you, too, are able to cultivate that still more, it will suffice to foster just that. Also at the time of the intermediate stage it should be cultivated. The Clear Light will follow it. The natural Clear Light will come out to welcome [you] in advance."

[Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa then] asked: "If I am able to cultivate [it], will that suffice?"

[Je sGam-po-pa] replied: "The 'Self-sufficient White [Remedy]' refers to that. I, too, have nothing besides that."

The Tibetan text:

yang nyin cig thabs lam zhu byas pas/ de go kun tu bshad pa des [189b]
gcho/ ma bsgoms na bar dor gdam ngag shes kyang mi phani/ khyed rang yang da rang bsgom nus na de skyangs pas chog par 'dag/ bar do'i dus tshod
du yang bsgom/ od gsal de'i rjes su 'brang/ rang bzhin gyi/ od gsal gis mgon
[=sngon] bsu ba yin gsum/

bsgom nus na des chog gam zhus pas/
rin po che'i zhal nas/ 'dkar po cig thub de la byed pa yin/ nga la yang de las med gsum/


330 Compare also the statement in sGam-po-pa's Collected Works, vol. 2, p. 327.5: "I have nothing else to view besides the 'Nature of Mind' (sems nyid) alone": nga la bta rgyu
sems nyid gzig pu las med.
Summary

Thus sGam-po-pa used the phrase dkar po chig thub with a definite awareness of its meaning as a self-sufficient remedy. (This was its original medical meaning, and he, the Doctor of Dwhags-po [dwhags po lha rje], had after all been initially trained as a physician before becoming a great meditator.) In the first instance he employed the expression when describing to Phag-mo-gru-pa how the insight imparted through this teaching was enough to enable one to find the Buddhahood within oneself: "Because this has become a Self-sufficient White [Remedy], i.e., full liberation through knowing one thing,..." In the first usage with Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa, such a nuance is not so obvious from the context. But he used the phrase to characterize very positively the first meditative experience of great lucidity that had arisen for Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa after the latter had been instructed and had meditated for a few days. He called it a "Self-sufficient White [Remedy]" and predicted that it would continually arise in the future, also predicting that Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa would have success in bringing consciousness under his control. The second time he used the words with Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa, however, he employed them to stress precisely the sufficiency of the Great Seal insight he normally taught, and to say that such specialized Tantric instructions as on the bar do would be of no use if one had not mastered this most central of teachings.

B. Zhang Tshal-pa's Mentions of the dKar po chig thub

(1) A First Occurrence in the Phyag chen lam zab mthar thug

Zhang Tshal-pa's most important use of the dkar po chig thub metaphor is traditionally held to be found in his Great Seal treatise the Phyag rgya chen po lam zab mthar thug, one chapter of which is entitled "Showing it [i.e. the Great Seal] to be a Self-sufficient White [Remedy]" (dKar po chig thub tu bstan pa). Zhang nowhere explicitly defined the expression dkar po chig thub in this chapter or elsewhere, and he actually used it only once there, and then merely in the title appearing at the chapter's end. There the words are used metaphorically to characterize the main point of the chapter: that the realization of the nature of mind is sufficient in and of itself to bring about spontaneously and instantaneously the simultaneous consummation of all virtues, including Buddhahood itself. This point is succinctly expressed in the opening verse (rTsibs-ri ed., p. 107.5; nga 2, f. 30a.5):

In the moment of realizing [the true nature of] your own mind, all "white" (i.e. excellent, virtuous) qualities without exception are effortlessly completed simultaneously.

rang sems rtags pa'i skad cig mar/ dkar po'i yon tan ma las pa/. bsgrub pa med par dus gcig rtags/!

Probably there is a play on the word dkar po chig thub here, since the word "white" (dkar po) appears once, and the element "one" (cig/gcig) appears twice. Here, however, "white" (dkar po) is a quality of what comes to completion, instead of the agent effecting that, and cig/gcig forms a part of both the ideas of "an instant" skad cig ma and "simultaneous" dus gcig.

Zhang makes similar points earlier in the treatise, for instance in the first chapter, where he says:

[When] you definitely understand [the nature of] your own mind, all the Gnoses of Nirviṣṇa will arise as great bliss. Therefore, since everything without exception issues forth from your own mind alone,
if you recognize the reality of your own mind, you will come to know the reality of all sentient beings. [By] knowing that, you know all dharmas such as Nirvāṇa. Thoroughly understanding all dharmas, you pass beyond the whole of the three-realm [universe]. By knowing the one, you becomes learned in all. If the root falls over, the leaves naturally fall over. Therefore establish only [the nature of] your own mind!

The Tibetan, rTṣi-bṛ ed., p. 53 (nga 2, f. 3a):

rangs nges rogs myna 'das pa yil/
ye shes mtha’ yas b’de ba chen por shar/
de phyir ma las rang gi sens nyid las/
‘phros phyir rang rongs chos nyid ngo shes nall/
sens can kun gvi chos nyid shes par ‘gyur/
de shes myna ‘das sogs chos kun shes/
chos kun yongs shes khams gsum kun las ‘dasll/
gcig shes pas ni kun la mkhas par ‘gyur/
rtsa ba ’gyel bas lo ’dab ngang gis ’gyell/
de phyir rang rongs gcig pu gtan la dbabll/

(2) A Second Occurrence in the Same Treatise

A second case of the usage of this expression is found in another section of the same work, the brief chapter on vows or "pledges" (dam tshig). Here Zhang presents this tradition as a system of practice in which the ordinary monastic vows are taken to be mainly the concern of "beginners." The system includes the achieving of: special Tantric yogas, the experience of non-conceptualization, the nature of one’s own mind, non-duality, and the "not going beyond the true nature of things" (dbyings las mi ‘da’ ba’l don). This entire short ninth chapter (rTṣi-bṛ ed., pp. 99-100; nga 2, f. 26a-b) could be translated as follows:

How are the pledges to be observed? While a beginner, you should not break the command of the Sugata-Guru, i.e. the vows such as the Pratimokṣa [monastic discipline]. (1)

When cultivating the “channels” (rtṣa) and “winds” (rlung), you should abandon all things not conducive to bliss and heat.

After the experience of non-conceptualizing (mi rtog) has arisen, you should avoid all factors inimical to meditative absorptions (samādhi).

(2)

Having seen the nature of your own mind, you should abandon all harm to the mind.

After the realization of non-duality has arisen, you should avoid all specially directed activities (ched du bya ba). (3)

In all cases your own mind should be made the "judge" (lit.: "the witnessing arbiter") dpa’ng po.

Having realized the reality of not going outside "the true nature of things" (dbyings), that "nothing-to-be-guarded" (or: "the unguardable," snyung du med) is the highest pledge. [It] is called the "Self-sufficient White [Remedy]." (4)

dam tshig ji llar bshun zhe nall/ dang po’i las pa’i dus tshod du’ll/
so so thar pa’i sdom pa sogs’ll bde gshogs bla ma’i bka’ mi bcag’ll (1)
rtsa rlung bsgom pa’i dus tshod dulu/ bde drod mthun phyogs mams spar’gl/
mi rtog nyams myong shar gyur nas’ll ting ’dzin ’gal rkyen thams cad spar’gl’ll (2)
rang rongs ngo bo mthong gyur nas’ll sens la gnod pa thams cad spar’gl/
gnyis mdz rogs pa shar nas nil/ ched du bya ba thams cad spar’gl(3)
kan la rang rongs dpa’ng por zhog’ll dbyings las mi [26b] ’da’i don rtogs nas’ll/
snyung du med de dam tshig mchog’ll dkar po gcig thub bya ba yin’ll (4)
dam tshig le’u ste dgu pa’o’ll ll/

(3) An Occurrence in Zhang’s Man ngag snying po gsal ba’i bstan bcos

The third and last place where bla-ma Zhang is known to have used the expression is in a briefer instructional treatise, the Man ngag snying po gsal ba’i bstan bcos. Here Zhang stresses the need for the disciple’s previous preparation and for the guru’s grace, and says (p. 705.7-706.1) that when through those conditions one knows the ultimate reality of one’s own mind (rang gi sens kyi[s] = kyi) de kho na nyid rogs par gyur na), one goes in that very moment to the highest level of all the Buddhas (dus gsum gis sangs rgyas thams cad kyi go ‘phang mchog skad cig de nyid la bsgrdo par byed do’ll). Others of less merit, however, will not understand this doctrine, and therefore he warns that it is important to keep it very secret.
How to gain the master's grace and hence the ultimate insight? He explains (p. 711.7):

That which gladdens the guru
brings about perfect completeness without depending on anything [else];
that is the great "Self-sufficient White [Remedy]."

gang gis bla [712] ma mnyes byed pa'i gang la'ang mi lhos phun sum
'tshogs/
dkar po chig thub chen po yin/

The second line is a gloss of the phrase dkar po chig thub, similar to sGam-po-pa's placing of the phrase cig shes kun grol in apposition to dkar po chig thub in one of his usages of the expression.

Zhang expressed very similar teachings in his Phyag chen lam zab mthar thug (rTisb-ri ed.), pp. 78.6-79.1 (15b-16a), though there two factors are stressed as necessary for the attainment of realization: the teacher's grace and the student's previously acquired merit. (Zhang based himself here no doubt on the Hevajra Tantra I viii 36 quoted also by sGam-po-pa.) Later in that same work (p. 96, 24b.1), he stressed the master's grace as the singly decisive factor: bla ma'i byin brlabs 'ba' chig yin/. Zhang devoted another brief treatise to the importance of the guru's grace: gNad kyi man ngog, Writings, pp. 696.7-703.5, and stressed the same point in his Mal dbu dkar la gdams pa, p. 656.4.

Summary

Zhang Tshal-pa thus used the expression dkar po chig thub metaphorically in the three differing contexts of soteriology, gnoseology, and ethics. In each case it characterized a single factor that was believed to be sufficient to effect the highest good. In his view: (1) the evocation of the awakened guru's spiritual power or grace is sufficient by itself to effect realization in the qualified student, (2) the insight into the nature of mind so conferred to the disciple is sufficient to actualize all enlightened qualities and realizations, and (3) the liberating insight into the nature of mind likewise has the power to resolve all moral dilemmas.

Part II

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF SA-SKYA PANḌITA

In the pages that follow, I will present all occurrences of the expression dkar po chig thub that I have been able to locate in the writings of Sa-skya Paṇḍita. These occurrences are found in the following four treatises:

1. sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba
2. sKyes bu dam pa rnam la spring ba'i yi ge
3. Thub pa'i dgongs pa rab tu gsal ba
4. Phyogs bcu'i sangs rgyas dang byang chub sms pa rnam la zhu ba'i 'phrin yig

These writings (here arranged in their approximate chronological order) are all mature works of Sa-pa. Two of them—the sDom gsum rab dbye and Thub pa'i dgongs gsal—are independent "technical treatises" (bstan bcos: sāstra) on Buddhist doctrine. Of this pair, the sDom gsum rab dbye is to a large extent a critical or controversial treatise. In it, Sa-pa uses an exposition of the interrelations and distinctions between the three systems of vows as the framework within which he makes many criticisms of contemporary Tibetan Buddhist theories and practices. He mentions the dkar po chig thub, for instance, in chapter 3, where he investigates the tantric system of vows, in the sub-section in which he examines Great Seal traditions.

The second of the two major doctrinal treatises—(no. 3) the Thub pa'i dgongs gsal—also contains a number of such criticisms of contemporary traditions, but here they are much less prominent, the main line of exposition being concerned mainly with setting forth positively the path of the Bodhisattva's practices, following a traditional ordering of key topics as found in one verse of the MSA (XIX 61-62). The mentions of the dkar po chig thub occur in the chapter on the Six Perfections, in the section on the Perfection of Discriminative Understanding.
A. Criticisms of the Self-sufficient White Remedy
in the sDom gsum rab dbye

(1) The First Occurrence (p. 309.2.2-309.4.2 [na 25b-26b])

Even if [they] cultivate the Great Seal, it is merely a cultivation of the closing off (kha 'tshom) of discursive thought. Regarding the Gnosis born from the two stages [of tantric meditation practice], they do not know [it] as the Great Seal.

The meditative cultivation of the Great Seal by the ignorant is taught to be for the most part a cause of [rebirth] as an animal. If not [reborn as an animal], they are born in the sphere lacking even fine material (arūpadhātu). Or else they fall into the cessation of the Śrāvaka.331

Even though that meditation may be excellent, it is not higher than the meditation of the Madhyamaka. Though that meditation of the Madhyamaka is indeed excellent, still it is very difficult to be realized.

As long as the two preparatory assemblages are not completed, for so long will that meditative cultivation not reach perfection. The completion of the two preparatory assemblages is taught to require an innumerable aeon.

Our Great Seal is the Gnosis arisen from tantric consecration332 and the spontaneously arisen Gnosis that has arisen from the samādhi of the two stages. The realization of this can be achieved in this life if one is skilled in means.333 The Buddha taught no other realization of the Great Seal besides that.

Therefore, if you feel confident appreciation for the Great Seal, practice it according to the basic scriptures of the Mantra tradition.


Regarding the present-day Great Seal and the Great Perfection (rdzogs chen) of the Chinese tradition, in substance they are without difference, except in a change in the designation of names of "descending from above" and "climbing from below" as "Simultaneist" and "Gradualist." 334

The appearance of such a religious tradition occurred in exact accord with what the Bodhisattva Šantaraksita had foretold to the king Khrü Srong-lde'u-btsan. Listen, for I shall relate that prophesy:

"O king, here in this Tibetan land of yours, the [traditions of] the non-Buddhist Indian sectarians will not arise because the Ācārya Padmasambhava has entrusted [it] to the twelve guardian deities (bstan ma).

Nevertheless, through the cause of several interdependent [causes and conditions], the [Buddhist] religious tradition will become twofold. And regarding that, to begin with, a Chinese monk will appear after my death and will teach a Simultaneist path called the 'Self-sufficient White [Remedy].' 335

At that time, invite from India my student the great scholar called Kamalaśīla, and he will refute him. Then, order that the faithful should practice in accord with his religious tradition."

Afterwards everything came to pass just as he had said. After the disappearance of that Chinese tradition, the religious tradition of the Gradualist was widely propagated. Later the royal polity disappeared, and based on merely the written texts of the fundamental treatises of the Chinese master, they secretly changed the designation of the name of that [tradition] to the Great Seal. This having been done, the Great Seal of the present day is for the most part a Chinese religious tradition. 336

As for that which is the Great Seal of Nāropa and Maitripāda—those respected one[s] maintained that very thing just as it is mentioned in the Mantra [tradition] Tantra: "That [mudrā includes] karma, dharma, samaya and Mahāmudrā." Ārya Nagārjuna, too, taught [the Mahāmudrā] thus as the fourth mudrā: "If, by not understanding the karmamudrā one does not understand the dharmamudrā, the understanding of even the name of the Mahāmudrā will be impossible." 337 In the other great Tantras and great treatises too, the Great Seal has been prohibited to the person who is unconnected with tantric consecration.

If one understands the Great Seal that is the Gnosis arisen from the consecration, 338 there is no longer any dependence on all efforts possessing phenomenal marks (nsthan ma).

Nowadays some people, having transformed the mind [of the student] through mere reverence toward the guru, introduce a partial cessation of conceptual thought as the Great Seal. 339

The Tibetan text, chapter III, verses 160–182 (pp. 309.2.2–309.4.2 = na 25a-26a):

phyag rgya chen po bsngom na yang/! rtag pa kha 'tshom nyid bsngom gyi/ rim gyis las byung ye shes la/ (160) phyag rgya chen por mi shes so/ blun po phyag rgya che bsngom pal/ phal cher dus 'gro'i rgyu ru gsung/ min na gzugs med khang su skye/ (161) yang na nyan thos 'gog par lung/! gal te de ni bsngom legs kyang/! dbu ma'i bsngom las lhaq pa med/! dbu ma'i bsngom de bzung med kyil/! (162) 'on kyang 'grub pa shin tu


337 Sa-pan in his ThGS, 50b-51a, attributes this passage to the Catuśramudrānīcayo of the Tantric Nāgarjuna. A similar passage is found in the canonical version of P. 3069 Phyang rgya rshi gser la dbang pa, vol. 68, p. 259.2.6 (rgyud gser mi 82b): chos kyi phyag rgya ma shes pas las kyi phyag rgya bcos ma 'ba' zhiug las ihan cigs skyes pa'i rang zhin bcos ma ma yin pa ji bar 'byung zhin skyey bar 'gur/'. Cf. bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, 88b-89b; L. Lhalungpa (1988), p. 100, where a work by the same title is attributed to Maitripāda. This work was apparently by a 'Klu-grub-snying-pa' who quotes as an authority (l. 82b.6) the famous rTen 'brel snying po verse beginning: bstan bar ba ba ci yang med/ 'gtag pa tsha ba bu cung sad med/... There was a work entitled Phyang rgya rshi pa attributed to Nāgarjuna whose authenticity was doubted by certain scholars of both India and Tibet. See Shākya-mchog-ldan, Legs bshad gser gyi thu 'grub ma, vol. 7, p. 81.6-83.5. This doubt is also briefly addressed by Go-rams-pa, sDon gsun ... 'khrul spong, p. 263.1.5 (45b).


kyang\[1\]

\[1\] kyang: a term used to denote a spiritual leader or guru.

de yi ming 'dogs gsang nas nill phyag rgya chen por ming bsgyur nas//
da lta'i phyag rgya chen po nill (175) phal cher rgya nag nugs yin//
nā ro dang ni me tri pa// phyag rgya chen po gang yin pali//
de ni las dang chos dang nill (176) dam thig dang ni phyag rgya chell//
gsang sngags rgyud nas ji skad dull sgsungs pa de nyid khong bzhed doll//
'phags pa klu sgrub nyid kyis kyang// (177) phyag rgya bzhis par 'di skad gsang//
las kyi phyag rgya ma shes pali//
chos ky phyag rgya 'ang ni shes nall phyag rgya chen po'i ming tsam yang// (178) rtops pa nyid ni mi srid gsung//

rgyud kyi rgyal po gzhan dang nill//

"The Second Occurrence (p. 313.3.1-3 [na 34a])"

Some say that the three "Bodies" (kāya) [of Buddhahood] arise as an effect from a Self-sufficient White [Remedy] (dkar po chig thub). However, an effect cannot arise from a single [cause or condition]. Even if an effect could arise from a single [cause or condition], that result, too, would be a single thing, like the cessation (nīrodha) of the Śrāvakā.340

Some say that the dedication of merit is needed after cultivating this "singly efficacious" (chig thub) [practice]. In that case the "singly efficacious" would become two-fold. If, in addition to that, one requires

340 For a discussion of this verse and Padma-dkar-po's replies, see D. Jackson (1990), p. 48ff.
such things as going for refuge, the generation of bodhicitta, and meditative practice involving a tutelary deity, the "singly efficacious" would be manifold. Therefore, such a tradition of a "singly efficacious" (chig thub) [practice] has not been taught by the Buddha.341

The Tibetan text, chapter III, 346-350:

kha cig dkar po chig thub las// (346) "bras bu sku gsam "byung zhes zer// gcig las "bras bu "byung mi nus// gal te gcig las "bras bu zhig//

"byung yang nyan thos 'gog pa bzhi// (347) "bras bu de yang gcig tu 'gyur// "ga" zhir chig thub bsgoms pa yil// rjes la bsgo ba bya dgos zer//

'o na chig thub gnyis su 'gyur// (348) de la'ang skyabs 'gro sens bskyed dang//

yi dam lha bsgom la sogs pa// dgos na chig thub du mar 'gyur//

des na chig thub 'di 'dra'i hugsl// (349) rdzogs sangs rgyas kyi gsungs pa med//

(3) The Third Occurrence (p. 315.4.4-5 [na 38b]):

The Conqueror has taught in all Sutras and Tantras that the root of all dharmas is emptiness whose essence is compassion, i.e. the integration of [skillful] means and discriminative understanding.

Some say that simple freedom from discursive elaborations is the Self-sufficient White [Remedy]. I fear that this, too, alters the essentials. Even though a few other doctrines that are not essentials may be incomplete or redundant, or are a little bit mistaken, this will not be capable of producing a great fault. If the essentials of the Teaching are altered, however good the other [parts of] the teaching are, one will not attain Buddhahood [thereby].

The Tibetan text, chapter III, 447-49:

gnad mams min pa'i chos gzhed 'ga'll ma tshang ba dang lhag pa

---

341 For a discussion of this passage, see D. Jackson (1990), pp. 35f.

342 This was discussed above by Sa-pa in his DS, III 3ff = 18b.

343 As noted in the dissertation of J. Botton (1985), introduction, this tradition was identified by Go-rams-pa (sDows gsun mdo dba' mhad, p. 153.2) as that of the dge-dup of Phyang-sor-ba, who gave the Bodhisattva vows to all manner of disciples after having dreamt of Maitreya on a great throne imparting the vows to a large gathering.

344 This refers to the fable of the foolish rabbit who panicked after hearing the loud splash (合唱) of something falling into the water, and who ran away, heedlessly spreading the rumor that something terrible and sinister was afoot. It is more or less the same as the fable of the rabbit who cried out: "The sky is falling!" See also L. Lhalungpa (1986), p. 454, n. 163. bKra-chis-rnam-rgyal, f. 289a, uses the same image in a critical reply to Sa-pa (see L. Lhalungpa, p. 307).
B. Sa-pan's Treatment of the dKar po chig thub in his skYes bu dam pa mams la spīng ba'i yi ge

In this work, the expression dKar po chig thub occurs in a summary and further discussion of the bSam-yas debate, pp. 331.4.6-332.4.3 (na 72a-74a = 3a-5a). A part of this passage has already been presented above in chapter 4.

The Chinese master said: [Regarding] the cause for birth within Cyclic Existence, [it is] the outcome of one's not recognizing one's own nature (rang ngo rang gis ma shes pas). If one recognizes one's own nature, one awakens into Buddhahood. Therefore, if one directly recognizes mind (sems ngo 'phrod), [that is] the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] (dKar po chig thub)\(^{345}\) [3b]

[The Chinese monk] composed five treatises. In order to establish the basic doctrinal tradition of this [or: of his], saying "It is sufficient to rest if one has confronted and recognized mind," [he wrote] the bSam gタン nyal ba'i khor lo. [To] reveal the main points of that, [he wrote] the bSam gタン gyi lon. To clarify [read: gsal?] its key points, [he wrote] the bSam gタン gyi yang lon. To establish through reasoning the practical instructions on that, [he wrote] the Ita ba'i rgyab sha. In order to establish it through scripture, [he wrote] the mDo sde brgyad cu khungs.\(^{346}\)

And regarding the religion of his tradition, [he maintained that] there existed the two traditions of "Simultaneist" and "Gradualist," the so-called "descending from above" and "climbing from below."\(^{347}\) "This [tradition] of ours is the simultaneous tradition that is similar to the eagle's descent from the sky," he said. Kamalaśila refuted those [tenets], and having done so, he composed the great treatises such as the three Madhyamaka Bhaṁavākāramas and the Madhyamakāloka. Then the king Khi Srong-Idbo-btsan had his [the Chinese master's] religious teachings concealed in


\(^{346}\) For some references to these works attributed to Mo-ho-yen, see D. Jackson (1987), p. 403, n. 104.

hidden caches, and ordered that henceforth in the Tibetan domain whoever practiced the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] would be punished. The historical accounts of these things can be seen to be in agreement [in the ancient records of] the rGyal bzhd, the dPa’ bzhd, and the Bangs bzhd.348 I, too, set forth following the Ācārya Kamalaśīla. I see that the intended sense of the Sūtras, Tantras and Śastras is also this.

[From the Self-sufficient White [Remedy], the [attainment of] omniscience regarding all objects of knowledge is impossible. I understand that omniscience is achieved through an understanding of emptiness that is skilled in various [compassionate] means through the tradition of either the Mantra or Perfections [vehicles].

As it is said in the Bodhicaryāvatāra (IX 12):

And that illusion that arises from various conditions is various. Nowhere is it the case that a single condition is capable of all.

And as it is said many times in the [Pramāṇa] Vārttika, such as (II 136c-):

From the becoming adept (goms pa), over a long period, at many means in numerous ways, [4a] the faults and excellent qualities will become manifest.

And (II 132a):

The Compassionate One, wishing to overcome suffering, applied himself to means. That goal [achieved through] means is ‘hidden.’ It is difficult to explain.

And [as stated in the Mahāyānasūtraśālākhāra]:349

Just as the particular features of the knotting makes a cloth brightly colorful or not, so too the power of the motivating force makes the Gnosis of liberation brightly colorful or not.

And as it is said in the Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi Tantra:350

The teaching [by the Buddha] of disciplines and Gnosis that possess no means was expounded by the Great Hero for the sake of introducing the Śrāvakas into that. Those who are the Buddhhas of the past, present and future attained the unconditioned highest vehicle, having trained in that which possesses means and discriminative knowledge.

And likewise it is not taught in any Sūtra, Tantra or great treatise that one can awaken to Buddhahood by a Self-sufficient White [simple method], as distinct from [through] the perfectly replete possession of means and discriminative knowledge. It is indeed taught in [some] Sūtras and Tantras that one can gain Buddhahood by merely respectfully saluting or circumambulating, and by offering one flower, or by reciting a single dhāraṇī, or by reciting just the name of the Buddha, or by a single act of worshipful reverence, or by the arising of a single thought of Bodhicitta, or by the mere understanding of Emptiness. Yet one should understand those as being [statements with special] intention (dgongs pa) or allusion (ldan dgongs), but they are not direct expression. As Maitreyanātha said [in the Mahāyānasūtraśālākhāra I 20]:

If one understands the sense literally, one becomes haughty oneself and one’s mind is destroyed.

For example, if the threads do not come together, the designs on the brocade will not appear. And if the seed, water and manure do not come together, [4b] the crop of a field will not appear. If all the interdependently connected [causes and conditions] do not come together, perfectly complete Buddhahood will not arise. Such is my understanding.

---

348 On the sBa’ bzhed and the others, see D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), pp. 67ff and n. 136. Sa-pan’s mention of these sources was noted by A. Vostrikov already in the 1930s. These sources were also cited by Sa-pan in his TKGS 58b. See also the references in D. Jackson (1987), p. 403, n. 104.

349 MSA IX 35. Cf. Sa-pan, DS III 366-68 (34b-35a), where the same passage is quoted:

dgra bcom pa dang rang sangs rgyas // rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas mam pa guum //
mam par grol bar mtshungs na yang (366) // bzung ngan thabs khyis physe ba yin //
de yang rdo rje rgyan las ni // ji la myud pa’i hrye brag gis //
gos la tshon bkra mi bkra ba (367) // de bzhin ’phre ba’i dthang gi s //
grol ba’i ye shes bkra mi bkra // de skad thugs pa’ang don ’di yin //

gang dag ’dus pa’i sangs rgyas // de bzhin gang dag ma byon dang //
gang yang de la’i rgyud po mams // thabs dang shes rab ldan pa la //
bstabs nas bla med byang chub ni // ’dus ma byas pa des thob bo //
’thabs dang mi ldan ye shes dang // bstabs pa dang kyung bshad pa ni //
’da pa’ bo chen po nyan thos mams // de la guang ba’i phyir bshad do //

Note that in Sa-pan’s quotation, the order of the verses is reversed. The first three quarters have been condensed, and the wording differs slightly here and there, for instance reading byang chub instead of rgyud pa, de instead of des, guangs pa instead of bshad pa, and geug pa’i instead of byung ba’i. These differences do not materially affect the meaning, and may reflect an intermediate source or quotation from memory.

350 Peking Tanjur rgsis the 185b (p. 268.3.7):

dgang dag ’dus pa’i sangs rgyas // de bzhin gang dag ma byon dang //
gang yang de la’i rgyud po mams // thabs dang shes rab ldan pa la //
bstabs nas bla med byang chub ni // ’dus ma byas pa des thob bo //
’thabs dang mi ldan ye shes dang // bstabs pa dang kyung bshad pa ni //
’da pa’ bo chen po nyan thos mams // de la guang ba’i phyir bshad do //
Generally speaking, one does require a direct recognition of the nature of mind. Nevertheless, this can be seen to be of two types: good and bad. If one directly recognizes the nature of mind having completed the excellent qualities through compassionate means, there will occur the attainment of Buddhahood. But without having completed the excellent qualities, no matter how excellent the direct recognition of mind is, it is taught that [in the best case a person can attain] the Arhatship of the Śrāvaka, in the middling case [he will be reborn in] the sphere lacking even fine substance (arūpadhātu), and in the worst case that one will be born in the evil destinies. A statement by Nāgārjuna, namely (MMK XXIV 11): "If they err in the viewing of emptiness, those of small intelligence will be destroyed," was also stated with this in mind.

Similarly, though ears of grain must come from a field, there are two ways for them to come: good and bad. If the ears appear on completely developed stalks, that will be a good harvest. If they appear on [plants that] have not reached full development, there will be a poor harvest. Likewise the direct recognition of the nature of mind, too, will be sufficient if it occurs at the right time. If it happens at the wrong time, it is of no use. With these things in mind, it was taught in the Akāśagarbha Sūtra that to propound emptiness to those of untrained minds was a fundamental infraction, [teaching this] with the words: "And the proclaiming of emptiness to a living being who has not trained his mind...." If [thus to teach emptiness is a fundamental infraction], it goes without saying that [there would be an infraction] if it is understood. Also [that which was related] in the Ratnakūta Sūtra—how five hundred [monks] who would have attained Arhatship if Sāriputra had taught the Dharma were reborn as five hundred hell beings as a consequence of Maruṣitra's teaching of the Dharma—was taught in order to refute the direct recognition of the nature of mind without the full development of the excellent qualities.

Therefore (?), regarding the teaching of the two—the Gradualist and the Simultaneist—in the Tantras, [some] say the following: "If, after gradually learning the vows such as of temporary ordination (gnyen gnas) and the theories of the Śrāvaka, Mind-Only and Madhyamaka, one then receives consecration and practices the two stages [of Tantric meditation], one is called a 'Gradualist.' Whereas one who in the very beginning [5a] received the Tantric empowerments and trains in the two stages is called a 'Simultaneist.'" But I have not seen in the Sūtras or Tantras the teaching of Gradualist and Simultaneist [approaches] of those sorts, such as are nowadays widely known.

Moreover, two ways of teaching can be seen: (1) a gradual application [of the student] afterwards to practice having first taught him the theory, and (2) a subsequent teaching of theory, [after having taught him the practice from the beginning]. Yet, while these two are dissimilar stages of the path according to the particular features of mind, I have never seen them explained as Gradualist and Simultaneist.

In general, our master, the great Lord of Dharma of Sa-skya [Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan], has taught: "Whether one does teaching or practice, if it accords with the Word of the Buddha, it is the Buddha's Doctrine. If it does not accord, it will not be the Doctrine." This, my good sir, is the significance also of our own energetically accomplishing [the teachings] in accord with his word. I request that you investigate whether this tradition is correct or incorrect.

The Tibetan text:

rgya nag mkhan po na rel 'khor ba skye ba'i rgyu rong ngo rang gis ma shes pas lai/ rang ngo rong gis shes na 'tshang rgyal de'i phyr sems ngo phrod na dkar po [72b] tshig thub yinl 'di yi zhung 'dags pa la sems ngo phrod na na nyal bas cho ga zer nas/ bsam gtan rnal ba'i 'khor la/ de'i gnad ston pa bsam gtan gyi lon/ de'i gags sel ba la bsam gtan gyi yang lon/ de'i gdams ngag rigs pas sgrub pa la lta ba'i rgyal shal/ de lung sgs ride bvyed cu khungs zhes bya ba bstan bcos lnga byas/ de'i lugs kyi chos la yang yas 'bab dang mas 'dseg ces bya ba/ cig car ba dang/ rim gyis pa'i lugs gnyis yod pa last/ nged kyi 'di khyung nam mkha' las bab pa dang 'dra/ cig car ba yin zer rol/ de dag slob dpon ka ma la shi las sun phyung nas/ dbu ma bsgron rim gsum dangl/ dbu ma snang ba la sogs pa bstan bcos chen po mdzad doll/ de nas rgyal po khrig srong lde bstan gyis/ kho'i chos lugs rams gter du sbas nas/ de slan chad bod kyi rgyal khams su dkar po chig thub cu byed la chad pa yod do zhes khrims bcas/ 'di dag gi lo rgyus mams/ rgyal bzhes/ dpa' bzhes/ 'bangs bzhes mams mthun par sngag/ bdag gyis kyang/ slob dpon ka ma la shi la'i rjes su 'brangs nas bskad/ mdo rgyud bstan bcos kyi dgongs pa'ang 'di yin par mthong/ dkar po chig thub la shes bya thams cad mkhyen pa mi srid/ gcangs sngags sam pha rol tu phyin pa'i lugs kyi thabs sna tshogs la mkhas pa'i stong pa nyid go ba thams cad mkhyen pa nyid grub par go/ de'ang spyod 'jug las/
dsna tshogs rgyen las byang ba yil/ sgu ma de yang sna tshogs nyid/ rkyen geq gis ni kun nas pali/ gang na yang ni yod ma yinl/
'phrod pa la gregs med/ 'di dag la dgrangs nas/ nam mkha'-sni yngpo po'i mdo las/

blo sbyang ma byas sems can la/ stong pa nyid ni sgrugs pa dang/ zhes blo ma sbyangs pa la stong pa nyid bshad pa la rtsa tshang 'byung nas/ stong nyid go na smogs ci dgos/ dkon mchog brtsed pa las/ sha ri'i bus chos bshad na dbang bcom lnga bgrag 'gro ba zhig/ jam dpal gyis chos sgrungs pas/ dmyal ba pa lnga bhrungs skyes pa'ang/ yon tan ma rdzogs par sems ngo 'phrod pa dag la phyir sgrungs pa yin/ des na rgyud las rim gyis pa dang/ chid car ba gnyis sgrungs pa nil/ bshnyen gnas la sogs pa'i sdom pa dang/ nyan thos/ semi tsam/ dbu ma'i la ha rim gyis sbyangs nas/ phyis dbang bskur bya stel/ lam rim gyis la slob nas/ rim gyis pa zhes bya la/ dang po [74a] nyid du gtags sngags kyi dbang bskur tel/ rim pa gyis la slob pa la cig car ba zhes zer tel/ deng sang grags pa'i rim gyis pa dang/ cig car pa de lta bu mdo rgyud nas sgrungs pa ma mthong/ yang dang po lta ba bstan nas/ phyis spod pa la rim gyis sbyor bal/ dang po spod pa la rim gyis sbyangs nas/ phyis lta ba ston pa'i brki gnyis sngags stel/ 'di gyis blo'i bye brag gyis lam rim 'di dra ba yin gyis/ 'di dag la rim gyis pa dang/ cig car ba bshad pa ma mthong/ spod nged kyi bla ma chos rje skya pa chen po'i zhal nas/ bshad pa dang lag len gang byed kyang/ sngags kyi gyis rgyud dang mthun na sngags bstan pa yin/ mthun na bstan par ma gyur las/ sgrungs/ nged kyi kyang de'i gyur bsnyin 'bad nas bsgrub pa'i don langs/ lugs 'di 'thad ma 'thad mam par dpyad par zhu/
C. Sa-pan's Refutation of Earlier and Later dKar-po-chig-thub Doctrines in the Thub pa’i dgongs gsal

The following discussion is found in the Thub pa’i dgongs gsal, pp. 24.4.3-26.1.4 (tha 48b-51a).351

(1) Account of the bSam-yas Debate

The refutation of a previously appeared Chinese tradition. In the time of the king Khri Srong-lde’u-btsan, there was a Chinese monk who taught the following: "Words have no real pith. By means of a dharma of conventional usage [expressible through words and including conventional practices] one will not gain Buddhahood. If one understands the mind, that is the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] (dkar po chig thub). Having composed treatises entitled bSam gtan nyal ba’i khor lo, bSam gtan gyi lon, [bSam gtan gyi] yang lon, [Ta ba’i rgyab sha, and mDo sde bryad cu khungs, he spread throughout the realm of Tibet this doctrine of the Self-sufficient White [Remedy].

Then, because that doctrine did not accord with the [Buddhist] religious tradition of India, [49a] the king invited dBa’ Ye-shes-dbang-po [to court] and asked him which religious tradition was true, that of India or of China. Ye-shes-dbang-po told the king:

Ācārya Śántarakṣita stated this in the testament that he left behind: "The heterodox [non-Buddhist] religion will not arise [in Tibet] because the Ācārya Padmasambhava has entrusted the Tibetan realm to the twelve guardian deities (bstan ma). But it is the "greatness" [i.e. essence] of dependent origination that things appear in pairs—day and night, right and left, waxing and waning [of the moon], and [even] pure and impure [Buddhist] religion. Consequently, after I have died, there will appear a Chinese master. And there will appear [his] doctrine, a denigration of means and discriminative understanding called the Self-sufficient White [Remedy], which will teach that one gains Buddhahood through merely the understanding of mind. Since the Lord Buddha taught in a Sūtra that one of the five impurities, the impurity of view, is the delighting in emptiness, it is the nature of

351 Cf. Roger Jackson (1982), pp. 91-93.
things that not only [some people] in Tibet, but all individuals in whom the five impurities thrive, delight in that. If this spreads, it will harm the doctrine of the Buddha in general. Therefore, at that time, you should invite from India my disciple the great scholar named Kamalaśīla and have him debate with the Chinese master. Then let the tradition of whoever wins be followed!“

Since [Santarākṣita] foretold this, I beg you [O king] to act accordingly.

[The king] then invited Ācārya Kamalaśīla and [convened a meeting]. At bsam-yas the king and the learned men acted as witnessing arbitrators, and collected all weapons. When garlands of flowers had been placed in their hands, the disputants vowed to bow [in respectful submission] to the victor and to discard the defeated tradition. They also assented that whoever did otherwise should be punished by the king.

At that time, in the row of Kamalaśīla, there were only several adherents of the Indian religious tradition and a very few others such as the minister Gos. [49b] In the row of the Chinese preceptor, there was assembled a very large group that included the royal consort of the Bro clan named Byang-chub and the chamberlain (gzim mal ba) gCo-rma-rma.

At that time, the Ācārya Kamalaśīla elicited his opponent’s position by asking: “What is the religious tradition of China like?” The Chinese master then replied: “Your religious tradition, which begins with taking refuge and generating a resolve to attain Awakening, climbs from the bottom up, like a monkey climbing to the top of a tree. This religious tradition of ours consists of attaining Buddhahood through merely understanding the mind, having cultivated in meditation the absence of conceptual thinking, because one cannot attain Buddhahood through a Dharma that consists of accomplishing actions [e.g. religious duties]. Our tradition is called the Self-sufficient White [Remedy], because it is a religious teaching that descends from above, like an eagle descending out of the sky onto the top of a tree.”

To that Kamalaśīla replied: “Both your analogy and your meaning are unacceptable. Of these two, first of all your analogy is unacceptable. Does that eagle descend from the sky to the top of a tree after having taken birth suddenly with completely developed wings? Or does he descend having first been born somewhere [on the ground] such as on a crag and then having developed wings? The first [alternative] is impossible. And the second is suitable as an analogy for the gradual approach, but it is not suitable as an analogy for the simultaneous approach."

Then, when the Chinese preceptor had no reply regarding his analogy, the Ācārya Kamalaśīla said: “Not only is your analogy wrong, but your meaning is also mistaken. What is that meditative cultivation of non-conceptualization? Is it merely the stopping of one part of conceptual thought, or does one have to stop conceptual thinking in its entirety? If you say it is the stopping of one part, then the consequence would be that such things as sleep and fainting would also be 'non-conceptualizing,' because they possess a mere stopping of one part of thought. If you say it is the stopping of conceptualizing thought in its entirety, in that case [I must ask:] When you meditatively cultivate non-conceptualizing, do you or do you not need to formulate beforehand the thought, 'I will cultivate non-conceptualizing'? If you do not need to, [50a] then that meditative cultivation would arise in all sentient beings of the three realms of existence (dhātus), for meditation would be born even though a thought of meditating had not been formulated beforehand.

"If you do need to formulate beforehand the thought of cultivating non-conceptually, since that is itself conceptual thinking, your assertion of meditatively cultivating non-conceptualization is ruined. Just as, for example, one's observance of silence is broken if one says, 'Don't make any noise!'"

Thus, with such words as these, Kamalaśīla refuted [that doctrine] by means of scripture and reasoning. Thereupon the Chinese master lost the capacity to respond. At that, the king said: "If you have an answer, then please give it." The master responded: "I am as if struck on the head by lightning; I know no answer." The king said: "In that case, offer the garland of flowers to the Ācārya and beg his pardon. Abandon the religious tradition of the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] and practice according to the religious tradition of India that does not conflict with either scripture or reasoning." [The king] promulgate throughout Tibet the edict: "Henceforth whoever follows the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] will be punished." And the Chinese texts were gathered together and hidden in a cache at bsam-yas.

Thereupon the Chinese master felt distraught and returned to his residence. It is said that when going he accidentally left behind at the religious school one of his shoes, and that on the basis of that sign he prophesied to his followers: "When the doctrine of the Buddha is about
to perish, there will yet remain a little of my doctrine—as much as a shoe.\textsuperscript{352} Afterwards learned religious teachers of Tibet said: "Though the Chinese master did not understand religious doctrine, he did know a bit about prognostication, for that [leaving behind of his shoe] is the reason why nowadays people are discarding genuine religious traditions and are going over to the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] that holds that one attains Buddhahood by the direct recognition of mind." [50b] I have also seen written in another testament (\textit{bka' chems}) an account that a Chinese monk other than that preceptor left his shoe behind when despondently leaving for China, and that the above [prediction] was said about his shoe being left behind. Then the Chinese master lit a fire on top his head and facing toward Sukhāvatī in the west, he passed away. gCo-rma-rma the chamberlain committed suicide by beating his sexual organ, and so on and so forth. Here I have not set down the rest of the story because this book will become too long. But one should read about it in the rGyal bzhed, dPa’ bzhed and 'Ba’ bzhed histories.\textsuperscript{353}

(2) Refutation of A Present-day Great Seal Linked with that Tradition

The Refutation of the Tradition of Recent Generations [which Follows That]. Nowadays there are some people [who teach the following] instructions on the Great Seal:\textsuperscript{354}

Avoiding the three delaying diversions (\textit{gol sa}) and the four occasions of lapsing (\textit{shor sa}), one should cultivate the innate [mind], letting it be original, unaltered and relaxed, like the spinning of a Brahmin's [sacred] thread. They say the sense of that is: Meditational cultivation of the Great Seal can become delayingly diverted in pleasure, luminosity or non-conceptualization. If one becomes delayingly diverted in pleasure, one will be reborn a god of the sphere of desire (kāmadhātu). If one becomes delayingly diverted in luminosity (gsal ba), one will [be reborn as a god] in the sphere of "fine material" (rupadhātu). And if one becomes delayingly diverted in non-conceptualization, one will be born in the sphere lacking even fine material (arupadhātu).

The four occasions for lapsing are (a) lapsing into [erroneous conceptions of] the original nature [of the ultimate] (gshis la shor), (b) lapsing into [erroneous] meditative cultivation (bagom du shor), (c) lapsing into [erroneous conceptions of the] path (lam du shor), and (d) lapsing into [erroneous] "sealing" (rgyas 'debs su shor). Avoiding these, one should place the mind in the "original" (so ma), "unaltered" (ma bcos), "relaxed" (lhugs pa), "softly at ease" (bol le), and "loosened" (?) (shig ge) state, like the spinning of a Brahmin's sacred thread.

This [teaching] follows the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] of China, but it is not the Great Seal taught by the Buddha. Moreover, the Great Seal in general was not explained in the Sūtras, Vinaya or Abhidharma scriptures. In particular, I have never seen in those the teaching of a Great Seal (Skt. mahāmudrā) such as this. In the four divisions of the Tantras, there are explained [the four mudrās] as in the passage: "karma, dharma, samaya and Mahāmudrā."\textsuperscript{355} But the above is not the system of those four. In the Catuṣmudrānīṣṭa of Ārya Nāgārjuna it is said:\textsuperscript{356}

If those who do not understand the karmanamudrā will not understand the dharmamudrā, [51a] how will they understand even the name of Mahāmudrā?

Likewise, that sort of the Great Seal is refuted in the Tantras and [tantric] treatises, though here I have not written down the [relevant] quotations from scripture because they belong to the Mantra tradition.

[Question:] Even though this [Great Seal] may not be explained in the Sūtras, Tantras and treatises, is there any contradiction in practicing them? [Answer:] The above [teaching] contradicts the Sūtras and Tantras, and it is clearly unacceptable from the point of view of reasoning [when one analyzes it]. The reason is that it is a greater delaying diversion to be

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{352} On the motif of the shoe or boot left behind, see D. Seyfort Ruegg (1989), p. 13, n. 16.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{353} These sources were also quoted in the skYes bu dam pa 3b. For more references, see above, note 348.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{354} This is attributed by bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal (263a) to rje Phag-mo-gru-pa. See also L. Lhalungpa (1986), p. 278.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{355} bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal, f. 89a, refers to these four as appearing in Nāropa's commentary on the Hevajra Tantra and in Mālripaḍa's (sic) Catuṣmudrānīṣṭa. See also L. Lhalungpa (1986), p. 100.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{356} The similar quotation found in the Phyag rgya bzhī gstan la dbab pa (P. 3069) appears in the translated section of the stDom gnun rab dbyae, part 2A.1 (DS III 177-8). See above, note 337.}
born as a god with no freedom to practice religion than to be born as one of the gods of the three [above-mentioned] delaying diversions, since all Sūtras and Tantras contain the prayer: "May I not be born in the eight circumstances that lack the freedom to practice religion!" Another reason is that some methods of [meditation through] letting one's mind remain in an unaltered state are explained as the "meditative cultivation of delusion" (rnogs pa'i sgom pa), being mentioned with the words:

One who meditatively cultivate [unconscious, unaware] delusion will attain delusion through delusion.

And another reason is that it has not even the slightest difference from the Self-sufficient White [Remedy] of the Chinese master.

Furthermore, for the attainment of Buddhahood, even worse than the eight circumstances lacking the freedom to practice religion are the delaying diversions of the Śrāvaka and Pratyekabuddha. .... [Several lengthy quotations follow, here omitted.]

The Tibetan text:

gsum pa nyan thos dang theg chen gnyis ka ma yin pa sangs rgyas kyi bstan par 'dod pa dgag pa la bzhis stel/ sngon byung ba rgya nag gi lugs dang/ de'i rjes su 'brang ba phyi rabs pa'i lugs dang/ deng sang gtags pa sens tsam mam med kyi sgom la phyag rgya chen por 'dod pa'i lugs dang/ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa liar snang phyag rgya chen por 'dod pa dgag pa'o/ dang po ni rgyal po khris srong lde bstan gvi dus su rgya nag gi dge longs na rel/ tshig la snying po med tha snyad kyi khyos 'thig mi rgyas sens rtags na dkar po chig thub yin zer/ de'i bstan bcbs bsam gtan nyid ba'i 'khor lo/ bsam gan gti lom/ las gong lom lata iba rgyab shal mdo sde brgyad cu kunugs zhes bya ba btsams nas dkar po chig thub 'di bod kham gsangs cad du 'phel lo/ der rgya gar gi chos lugs dags ma mthun nas dpa/ ye [49a] shes dbang po rgyal pos spyan drangs rgya gar rgya nag gi chos lugs gden dris pas/ ye shes dbang po zhal nas slod slob zhi ba mtshos zhal chams 'di ltar bzhag stel/ bod kham 'di slod spon padma 'byung gnas kri bstan ma bca gnyis la gtag pas mu stegs ni mi 'byung/ 'on khyog nyin misban dang gyas gyon dang yar ngo mar ngo dang chos dag ma dag gnyis gnyis 'byung ba rten 'grel gvi che ba yin pas/ da 'das pas 'og tu rgya nag gi mkhan po zhiig 'byung des thabs dang shes rab la skur ba 'debs pa dkar po chig thub ces bya ba sens rtags pa 'ba' zhiig gis 'tshang rgya'o zhes zer ba gcig 'byung bar 'gyur/ de bcom ldan 'das kyi s mdo lasl snyigs ma lnga'i nang na lta ba'i snyigs ma zhes bya ba stong pa nyid la dga' ba yin par gsangs pas bod kha nor ma zad snyigs ma lnga bdo ba'i gang zaq thams cad de la dga' ba chos nyid yin/ 'di 'phel na sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa spyi la gnod pasl de'i tse nga'i slob ma ka ma la shi la zhes bya ba'i mkhas pa chen po de rgya gar nas spyan drangs la rgya nag mkhan po dang rtoss du chung dang rgyal ba de'i lugs gyig zhiig ces lung bsan pas de lta mdaz 'tshul/ zhes zhus nas slob dpon ka ma la shi la spyan drangs/ bsam yas su rgyal po dang mktas pa mabs kyi 'dbang po byas nas thams cad kyi mthson cha mams bsud/ lag tu me to g gi phreng ba gtag nasl gang rgyal ba la btud de pham pa'i lugs porl de ltar me byed ba mams la rgyal pos chad pas good par dam bcas pa'i tshel/ ka ma la shi la'i gral du rgya gar gyi chos lugs 'dzin pa 'ya/ dang bion po 'gos [49b] la sogs pa nyung/ zad cig las ma byung/ rgya nag mkhan po'i gral du rgyal po'i btsun mo 'bro za byang chub dang gz[i][n] dmal ba ge co ma ma la sogs pa lshogs pa shin tu che bar 'das sol/ de'i tse slob dpon ka ma la shi last/ rgya nag gi chos lugs ji ltar zhes phyogs snga dris pa nal/ rgya nag na rel khyed kyi chos lugs skyabs 'gro dang sens bsksed nas bsung nas spre'u shing rtsers 'dreg pa ltar mas 'dreg yin/ nged kyi chos lugs 'di bya byed kyi khyos 'thig mi rgya bas mam par mi rtog pa hsgoms nas sens rtogs pa nyid kyi 'tshang rgya stel/ khyung nam mkha' las shing rtsers 'bab pa ltar yas 'bab kyi chos yin pas dkar po chig thub yin no zhes zer rol/ de la slob spon gvis dpe don gnyis ka mi 'thad pa las thog mar dpe mi 'tshad de/ khyung nam mkha' las glo bur du 'dab gshog rdzogs par skyes nas shing rtsers 'bab hau/ brag la sogs par skyes nas rim gyis 'dab gshog rdzogs par byas te 'babl dang po ni mi srid lai/ gnyis pa ni rim gyis pa'i dper rung gi gcig car ba'i dper mi r nag ngol/ de nas mkhan pos dpe la lan ma thebs pa dang/ der slob dpon gyis khyod kyi dpe nor mar ma zad don yang 'khral tel/ mam par mi rtog pa sgnom de ci mam rtom phyogs gcig bkgak pa tsam yin nam/ 'nam rtom mtha' dag dgsa dgosl phyogs gcig bkgak pa yin no zhe na/ der ltar na gnyid dang brygal ba la sogs pa yang nam par mi rtog par thall/ rtogs phyogs gcig bkgak pa tsam yod pa'i phyir rol/ 'nam par rtog par mtha' dag bkgak pa yin no zhe na/ der ltar khyod mi rtog pa sgnom pa'i tshie mi rtog pa hsgom snyam pa'i rtog pa sngun du gton dgos sam mi dgosl mi dgos na khamgs gsum gvi gyis can thams [50a] cad la'ang sgom skye bar thal tel/ hsgom snyam pa'i rtog pa sngun du ma btang yang sngom skye ba'i phyir rol/ mi rtog pa sgnom snyam pa'i rtog pa sngun du gton dgos na de nyid rtog pa yin pas mi rtog pa hsgom pa'i dan bca' nyams
tel dper na smra bcad byas pa yin no zhes brjod na smra bcad shor ba’am\lc ca co ma byed ca cor ’gro ba bzhin rol/ zhes bya ba la sogsa pa lung dang\lc rigs pas sun phyung ba dang! rgya nag mkhan pa spobs pa med par gyur tel/ der rgyal pos smras pa/ lan yod na gsungs shig/ mkhan pos smra bal’ mgor thog brgyab pa dang mshungs pas lan mi shes rol/ rgyal pos smra bal’ de litar na slob dpon na la me tog phreng ba phul na bzdor par gsal tel/ dkar po chig thub kyi chos lugs bor la lung riggs dang mi ’gal ba rgya gar gyi chos lugs bzhin du gyi shig/ da sman chad dkar po chig thub ’di sus byed kyang chad pa gcod dol/ zhes bod kham kun tu khriims bcas tel/ rgya nag gi dpe mams bsdu nos bsam yas pa sger du sbas sol/ der rgya nag mkhan po yi mug ste rang gi gnas su song/ chos gwa der lham las pas ltras de la dpags na sangs rgyas kyi bsan pa ’jig khar nga’i bsan pa tham tsam las pas ’gyur rol/ zhes ’khor mams la lung bstan no zhes grag gol/ phyis dge ba’i bshes gnyen mkhas pa mams na rel/ rgya nag mkhan pos chos mi shes kyang ltras cung zhad shes pa zhiq ste deng song chos khangs ma mams bor te sans nga ’phrod pas sangs rgya bar ’dod pa dkar po chig thub du ’gro pa rgyu mishan de yin gsung/ bka’ chems kyi yi ge zhan zhiq las ni mkhan po ma yin pa’i ha shang gzhon zhiq yi chad de rgya nag tu ’gro ba’i tshe lham las [50b] pa la dpags nas de skad zer zhes yi ger bris pa’ang mthong ngol/ der rgya nag mkhan po mngo la me sbar te nub phyogs bde ba can du kha bltas te ’dasl gzi dmal ba gco ma ma rang gi dbangs nas lceibs zhes bya ba la sogsa pa ’dir yi ge mangs pas ma bris tel/ rgyal bzhed dpa’ bzhed ’ba’ bzhed mams su bla bar bya’ol/ gnyis pa phyi rabs pa’i lugs dgag pa nil’ deng sung ’ga’ zhiq phyag rgya chen po’i gdamu dag/ gol sa gsum dang shor sa bzhill/ spangs te mnyug ma bsgom par byal/ bram ze skud pa ’khal ba litar/ so ma ma bcos lthag par b thugs/ ces bya bai don phyag rgya chen po bde gsal mi rtag pa la gol ba ltar lde yang bde ba la gol nal ’dod kham ks kyi litar skyel gsal ba la gol nal/ gsaus khams/ mi rtag pa la gol na gsaus med du skye bal/ shor sa bzhis ni phyag rgya chen po gshis la ltar ba’i bsgom du shor bal/ lam du shor bal/ rgyas ’dehs su shor ba’ol/ de dag spangs te bram ze skud pa ’khal ba litar/ so ma dang/ ma bcos pa dang/ lthag pa dang/ ’bol lel’ shig ge ’jog pa yin no zhes zer rol/ ’di rgya nag gi dkar po chig thub kyi rjes su ’brang ba yin gyi sangs rgyas kyi gsungs pa’i phyag rgya chen po ma yin tel/ de’ang mdo sde dang/ ’du la bal’ mngon pa gsum nas spyir phyag rgya chen po bshad pa med/ bye brag tu ’di ’dra’i phyag rgya chen po bshad pa ma mthong! rgyud sde bzhis nas! las dang chos dang dam tsig dang! phyag rgya chen po zhes bshad pa yod del’ de dag gi lugs kyang ’di ma yin tel/ slob dpon klu sgrub kyi phyag rgya bzhis par/ las gyi phyag rgya mi shes pa de dag gi ni chos kyi phyag rgya’ang shes par ’i gyur nal/ [51a] phyag rgya chen po’i ming tsang yang shes par ga la ’gyur zhes gsungs tal/ de bzhin du rgyud sde mams dang! ’bstan bchos mams las de lta bu’i phyag rgya chen po bkg stel/ lung mams ni gsang snags yin pas ’dir ma bris sol/ gal te mdo rgyud bstan bcos nas ma bshad kyang nyams su blangs pa la ’gal ba cang yod dam snyam nal ’di mdo rgyud dang ’gal zhiq dang pas mi ’thad par mngon tel/ de’i rgyu mishan gol sa gsum gvi lhar skye ba pas/ mi khom pa’i lhar skyes pa gol sa che stel/ mi khom pa’i gnas brgyad du skye bar ma gyur cig ces mdo rgyud kun las sman lam btab pa dang/ rmons pa’i sgom pa dang yin pal/ rmons pas mngos pa ’bho par ’gyur/ zhes blo ma bcos pa’i dang las ’jog pa’i tshul ’ga’ zhiq rmons pa’i sgom par bshad pa phyir dang/ rgya nag mkhan po’i dkar po chig thub dang khyad par cung zhad med pa’i phyir rol/ yang ’bshang rgya ba la mi khom pa’i gnas brgyad pas kyang nyans thos dang rang sangs rgyas gol sa che stel
D. Criticisms of the dKar-po-chig-thub or Great Seal in Sa-pa'n's Phyogs bcu'i sangs rgyas dang byang chub smsa pa thams cad la phul ba'i yi ge

In this work, the criticisms of the dkar po chig thub is found on pp. 326.2.3-326.3.2 (na 60b.3-61a.2 = 6b-7a):

"[O Buddhas and Bodhisattvas,] in Your scriptures it is taught that the cultivation of the Great Seal is a Gnosis arisen from consecration and a special meditative absorption (samādhi) of the two stages [of tantric meditation]. Some people, regarding the Self-sufficient White [Remedy], introduce [it] as the Great Seal. [They teach the following] and term it "Great Seal":

Having avoided the four occasions of lapsing and the three delaying diversions, one ought meditatively to cultivate the primordial mind (mnyug ma).
Like spinning a Brahmin thread, one should leave it in the original, unaltered, relaxed [state]."

When I examine the sense [of] this, I see the following: If one leaves it in its original state, it is just [fibres of] wool. If one makes it into a thread, it is altered. Therefore there exists here a fault in the analogy.357

Moreover, I see the faults of meaning, as follows: If one attained the Great Seal merely by avoiding the three delaying diversions, the Śrāvakā cessation, too, would be that.358 'The thought, "I will avoid the four occasions for lapsing," is not the Great Seal. [But] without [that] thought, one is unable to avoid them. If one could avoid them even in the absence of [that] thought, why would the Great Seal not arise effortlessly for all sentient beings? Therefore if it is the Great Seal itself, it is without delaying diversions and occasions for lapsing. If it has them, it is not the Great Seal.359 [61a = 7a]
Therefore [You, O Buddhas and Bodhisattvas,] have not taught a Great Seal of such a religious tradition.

Consequently [I] do not maintain that Great Seal which was not taught in the Tantras. When I announce that publicly, those who do not know the Tantras become angry.

Who is right, those angry ones or I? O Conquerors and Sons, I pray that you consider [this].
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mDo sde brgyud cu khungs 169, 173, 177, 182
rDo rje ting nge 'dzin gis mdo 5, 6, 22, 23
sDom gsum 'od kyi phreng ba 69
sDom gsum rabs dbye 2, 52, 68, 69, 73, 78, 80, 81, 84, 87-89, 91, 94,
Shes rab grub ma 44, 51, 57, 62.
Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum 160
Seng ge rtsal rdzogs chen po'i rgyud 13
gsang snags lag len 53
gSer gyi thur ma 80, 84, 105, 129, 131, 132, 163
bsam gtan gzi yang lon 169, 173, 177
bsam gtan gzi lon 169, 173, 177, 182
bsam gtan nyal ba'i khoro lo 169, 173, 177, 182
bsam gtan mig sgron 24, 65
Lhan cig skyes sbyor 11, 16, 33, 43, 52, 60

Sanskrit Proper Nouns

Atiśa Dipamkaraśrījñāna 3, 36, 55, 80, 88, 102, 118
Amanasikāra-Madhyamaka 83
Ānanda 124
Indra 145
Īśvara 75
Kamalāśīla 3-5, 22, 162, 169, 170, 178, 179
Kālacakra 40, 127
Kṛṣṇapāda 125
Koṭāli, Koṭālipa 13, 142, 144
Guhyasamāja 109, 125, 127
Ghaṇṭāpāda 125
Cakrasaṃvara 59, 63, 125-127
Candrakīrti 109
Ḍākiṣṭha 144, 146
Ṭāntrika 86
Ṭīlopā 50, 125
Dignāga 102
Dharmakīrti 92, 93, 102

Nāgārjuna 21, 40, 70, 77, 82, 83, 112, 120, 150, 162, 163, 172, 181
Nārotpāda 125
Nāropa 3, 50, 73, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 124-128, 130, 131, 162, 181
Padmasambhava 43, 68, 71, 89, 162, 177
Pāramitāyāna 3, 11, 15, 17, 30, 31, 85, 88, 90, 114
Pratīyāśamāti 58, 117, 137
Pramāṇa 26, 30, 42, 58, 85, 96, 117, 143
Buddha Vajradhāra 105
Buddhaguhya 84
Mañjuśrī 172
Mañjuśrimitra 151
Madhyamaka 5, 15, 18, 35, 43, 56, 73, 83, 88-90, 107, 111, 112, 117,
Sanskrit Terms

agada 4
atiprasaadga 103
anavastha 103
anuttarayoga 19
abhijivya 107
abhisaamhdi 107
amanasikara 56, 73, 83, 84, 134
ayana 33
arupadhatu 76, 161, 172, 181
avataraabhisamhdi 107
arya 76
upaya 5
cakrayana 33
karma 25, 30, 63, 82, 83, 124, 129, 133, 152, 162, 181
karmamudra 163, 181
kamadhautu 181
ekaya 42, 89, 165
krama 88
klea 27, 28, 132
guna 41, 117
jaana 55, 72, 81
thathagata-garbha 20

Tantra 2, 13, 15, 18, 19, 24, 25, 30, 34, 40, 49, 52, 55, 57, 76, 85, 86, 89, 92, 105, 119, 125-127, 159, 151, 158, 162, 171, 181

tripitaka 108
triyana 33
triiksha 108
trisampara 69
traitryajna 103
dravya 117
dharm 23, 51, 80, 98, 101, 118, 125-127, 137, 162, 172, 173, 177, 178, 181
dharmakaya 20, 30, 47, 51, 65, 78
dharmadhatu 104
dharmamudra 163, 181
dhyana 22	nirodha 165
Nirvaga 4, 14, 49, 68, 155, 156
nirvikalpa 73
nisprapaarca 88
paashita 1-6, 29, 39-41, 59, 67-69, 71, 89, 134, 149, 150, 159
parva 150
paramita 24, 26, 88, 107
paramitayana 3, 11, 15, 17, 30, 31, 85, 88, 90, 114
prajna 3, 40, 112
pramana 26, 30, 42, 58, 85, 96, 117, 143
Pratimoksha 110, 117, 156
pratyaksha 26
Pratycka 15, 16, 33
Pratyekabuddha 182
prasanga 103
prana 33
balita 14
bodhi 141
bodhicitta 4, 26, 59, 76, 117, 166, 167, 171
manasikara 73
mantra 11, 15, 16, 18, 26, 27, 30-34, 37, 43, 58, 88, 107, 110, 113, 132, 142, 151, 161, 162, 170, 181
mahanyakta 151
mahamantra 2, 16, 17, 19, 83, 90, 162, 163, 181

Mahayana 3, 18, 20, 21, 25-27, 30, 33, 41, 42, 68, 71, 85-88, 90-92, 96, 139-147, 149
mahasiddha 21, 142
mudra 17, 163
yoga 32
yogin 58, 59, 91, 126, 142
rupadhatusu 181
vijñana 29
Viniyana 70, 85, 88, 114, 181
vicha 117
vedana 29
sastra 19, 105, 159
SUNYATA 85, 88
Sravaka 15, 16, 33, 75, 76, 88, 110, 114, 161, 165, 172, 182, 187
Sravaka Pratimoksha 110
samata 107
samaya 162, 181
samadhi 89, 90, 157, 161, 187
samjna 29
sambandha 117
saman 117
siddha 61, 62, 95, 114, 143
siddhanta 98, 99, 100, 110
Sutra 2, 4-6, 17-20, 22-25, 30, 34, 52, 55, 68, 76, 77, 92, 96, 105, 109, 171, 172, 177, 181
skandha 29
stupa 66, 70

Other Names, Terms and Titles

Blue Annals 9, 14, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 64, 70, 72, 82
Central Tibet 3, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 66, 72, 79, 135
Bodhidharma 68

Ch'an 22-24, 68, 71, 78-80, 83, 84, 112, 140
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