

Chapter III

THE ESSENTIAL CENTRIST MESSAGE

1. STATEMENTS FROM *THE TEACHING OF AKSHAYAMATI* SCRIPTURE

The Savior Nagarjuna and his (spiritual) son (Aryadeva) did not differentiate interpretable and definitive by means of a direct reference from a source in a scripture differentiating the two. Nevertheless, (the matter) is explained by implication from the way in which they explain the meaning of the scriptures. Furthermore, the *Lucid Exposition*, the *Wisdom Lamp Commentary*, and the *Central Way Illumination*¹ take the *Teaching of Akshayamati* as authority when they set forth the interpretation of interpretable and definitive. Therefore, that scripture should be taken as authoritative here. The *Teaching of Akshayamati* statement is:

Which scriptures are definitive in meaning? Which are interpretable? Those teaching superficial realities are interpretable in meaning. Those teaching ultimate realities are definitive in meaning. Those teaching various words and letters are interpretable. Those teaching the profound, the difficult to see, and the difficult to understand, are definitive. Those scriptures that teach as if there were an owner in the ownerless, using various expressions such as “self,” “living being,” “life,” “soul,” “creature,” “person,” “humanity,” “mankind,” “agent,” “experiencer,” etc., are interpretable. Those scriptures that teach the doors of liberation, the emptiness of things, signlessness, wishlessness, inactivity, non-production, creationlessness, non-occurrence, beinglessness, lifelessness, personlessness, and ownerlessness, etc., are definitive in meaning. Rely on the latter, not the former.²

The first two phrases align interpretable and definitive with the two realities in distinguishing them from the point of view of subject-matter. The next two phrases do not depart from this arrangement, since “teaching the superficial” is teaching various meanings employing various expressions, and “teaching the ultimate” is teaching the meaning that is difficult to understand, which is the universality of the cessation of mental fabrications. The last two phrases describe the methods of teaching involved in teaching the superficial and the ultimate. To teach as if self and living beings exist is to teach the superficial, which does not apply to merely that, but also to all teachings of the existence of functional things which require an agent. To teach the emptiness and non-production of things is to teach their realitylessness, and to teach the nonexistence of living beings, etc., is to teach personal realitylessness; and such a method of teaching teaches the ultimate. From the fact that both (persons and things) are mentioned (as non-existent here), it follows that both are shown to be existent in the former (superficial) teaching (although only persons are referred to there explicitly). The teaching of the ultimate is not a matter of taking some other permanent thing as a ground and expounding it as non-production, etc., but is rather an indication of the truthlessness of such grounds as persons and things such as aggregates etc., since the ultimate reality is the mere exclusion of their truth-status.

The *Lucid Exposition* explains that the (following) differentiation of interpretable and definitive in the *King of Samadhi Scripture* agrees with the above: “The specialty of the scriptures of definitive meaning is known according to the teaching of emptiness by the Sugata. And all teachings which mention ‘person,’ ‘living being,’ and ‘creatures’ are known to be interpretable in meaning.”³

To be sure, scriptures of interpretable meaning do “lead” disciples, but that is not the meaning of the “to-be-led” (*neya*) (portion of the term *neyārtha* [interpretable meaning]). Rather the meaning of the “to-be-led” is the process of interpretation, in which it is necessary to “lead” the (obvious) meaning of the scripture around to a different meaning.

There are two types of needs for interpretation. The first (arises when a statement is obviously figurative, and) requires interpretation: for example, the statement “having killed father and mother ...” wherein “father” must be interpreted as “evolutionary entanglement” and “mother” must be interpreted as “craving.” The second (arises when a statement lends itself to

misinterpretation through a confusion of realities), as, for example, when (someone misinterprets) the statement “from bad and good actions arise the effects of suffering and happiness,” by saying that its reality is just what is said, and there is no other reality of those (actions and effects). (It then becomes necessary) to explain that the (ultimate) reality of those two things (can only be understood) by interpreting the statement’s obvious meaning otherwise.⁴

Therefore, the *Central Way Illumination* declares: “How do we define definitive meaning? It is that which is explained logically and in terms of the ultimate, since it cannot be interpreted by others in any other way.”⁵

If interpretable and definitive were to be equated with inexplicit and explicit meanings, “logically” would be enough, but “in terms of the ultimate” is stated, since the former is not enough. Therefore, according to the (second) method explained above for alternative interpretation of the meaning of a statement, such a statement as “sprout is produced from seed,” is interpretable in meaning, since, although there are rational means of validation of its explicit meaning, it is not in terms of the ultimate.

Therefore, since the statement of the non-existence of true production of things is logical and its explicit meaning cannot be interpreted otherwise, as if it were not the reality of those things, scriptures with such (statements) are definitive in meaning, because they cannot be otherwise interpreted according to either of the (above) two processes of interpretation.

(In sum), the scriptures themselves are taken as that characterized as interpretable or definitive, being established as such according to whether or not their meaning needs to be otherwise interpreted. In this case, interpretable and definitive correspond to superficial and ultimate, which (correspondence) is illustrated in the *Facts of the Stages* declarations of the four reliances; reliance on the teaching and not the teacher, reliance on the meaning and not the words, reliance on the definitive meaning and not the interpretable meaning, and reliance on the holy wisdom and not on (ordinary) consciousness.⁶

The *Ornament of Wisdom-Illumination Scripture* declares that “definitive meaning is the ultimate.”⁷ Since the *Teaching of Akshayamati* statements of non-production, etc., teach the ultimate, only non-production, etc., are the ultimate, and only indications of that are to be accepted as definitive in meaning. It is not to be supposed that, since on particular occasions the negatees are without qualification, non-production, etc., are not literally

intended, hence not definitive. For, when such qualification as, for example in the *Hundred Thousand*, “It is in terms of popular conventions, and not in terms of the ultimate,” is applied to the production of things on one occasion, it is to be understood as applied by implication on other occasions also, and hence even those statements which do not explicitly mention (such qualification) are literally acceptable.

2. EXPLANATION OF THEIR MEANING; SAVIOR NAGARJUNA’S EXPLANATION

THE EQUIVALENCE OF RELATIVITY AND REALITYLESSNESS

The scriptures declare both the existence and the non-existence of production and cessation, etc., some of them explaining the statements of non-production, etc., as definitive in meaning, and some of them explaining them as interpretable in meaning. If there were any logical refutation of the literal validity of the explanations of the non-existence of production, etc., in the ultimate or by intrinsic identity, then it would be correct to explain the objective self, which is that negated in “selflessness,” as merely the imagined reality which is the intrinsic identifiability of things posited by ascriptive and descriptive designation, and which is substantial subject-object dichotomy, and to explain the ultimate reality as the absence of those (selves). However, there is no such refutation, because the existence of reality established in the ultimate, or by intrinsic identity, would utterly preclude the dependence of effects on causes and conditions.

Therefore, in the face of the fact of the non-existence of establishment by intrinsic identity because of dependence on conditions, if we insist that, without intrinsic identifiability, bondage-liberation, action-abstention, and cause-effect, etc., would become non-existent, then that insistence is to take the ultimate proof of emptiness of intrinsically identifiable reality as the ultimate refutation of emptiness! This explanation is the system of the Champions founded by the Savior Nagarjuna, which teaches the reasoning proving that the meaning of the *Mother Scripture* and those scriptures that agree with it cannot be otherwise interpreted but is definitive in itself; and teaches the reasoning refuting the literal validity of those scriptures that disagree with it.

As for the *Elucidation of Intention* statement that those who see no intrinsically identifiable status (in things) hold the view that repudiates all three natures, it does not refer to everyone who sees in that way, but only to those disciples who lack superior intelligence. Therefore, the Teacher declared such according to the mental capacities of the disciples, and not as his own belief. For, since the disciple of superior intelligence realizes emptiness with respect to intrinsic identity from the necessity of establishment of causality itself, such a vision (of absence of intrinsic identity) becomes a method to negate views that repudiate reality. (However), for the (less than superior) disciple, the *Mother Scripture* becomes interpretable, and the *Elucidation of Intention* definitive in meaning, just as (Aryadeva) states in the *Four Hundred* that it is better to teach “self” than to teach “selflessness” to the disciple who is not properly receptive to the teaching of selflessness.⁸

The *Wisdom* mentions the argument that (attempts to) refute the literalness of the *Mother Scripture*, etc., by arguing that all arrangements of life and liberation would be invalid, since production and destruction of things would be impossible if they were empty of intrinsically identifiable reality, (as follows:) “If everything is empty, there will be no production and no destruction, and the consequence of the non-existence of the four holy truths will be inevitable for you!”⁹ To this (Nagarjuna) answers: “If everything is *not* empty, there will be no production and no destruction, and the consequence of the non-existence of the four holy truths will be inevitable for you!”¹⁰ (emphasis added).

He states that the import of emptiness of intrinsic reality is equivalent to the import of relativity, since in the case of non-emptiness of intrinsic reality, relativity, which is production and destruction, would be impossible, and all arrangements would be invalid; whereas all these are very much appropriate in the case of emptiness of intrinsic reality.

Through logical determination of this very rule in the Centrist treatises, the Master (Nagarjuna) explains that there is not the slightest logical refutation of the literalness of the scriptures that declare the truthlessness of production, etc., and since there is no other way to explain them as interpretable, they are very much established as definitive in meaning. Intending this, the *Lucid Exposition* declares: “The Master composed this Centrist treatise in order to show the difference between scriptures of interpretable meaning and those of definitive meaning.”¹¹ Thus

(Chandrakirti) answers the objection that statements of the existence of the eight (properties), from cessation to diversity, and the statement of their non-existence (in the description of relativity), are mutually contradictory. He then continues:

Not knowing the intention of such teachings, one feels doubt; “Herein, which is the teaching whose meaning is true? Which is the teaching with ulterior intention?” Some of lesser intelligence understand interpretable meaning as if it were definitive. Hence, the Master composed this treatise, in order to clear away both doubts and confusions through references and reasoning.¹²

The *Scripture Synthesis* answers the question about the profound by quoting the scriptures that teach the profound such as the *Hundred Thousand*, the *Diamond Cutter*, and the *Seven Hundred*, etc. Further, the *Canon of Reason* makes certain the impossibility of interpreting the meaning of these (scriptures) otherwise than taught. Therefore, (the Master) believed these to be definitive in meaning, and statements differing from them to be intentional.

The *Disclosure of the Spirit of Enlightenment* declares that the statements that negate external things and establish reality in mind alone are not literally intended: “the Muni declared—‘All these things are only mind!’—in order to eliminate the fears (of emptiness) of the naive. (Nevertheless,) that is not the reality (of things).”¹³ (Finally,) the *Jewel Garland* declares:

Just as the grammarians make one read the grammar, the Buddha teaches the Dharma according to the tolerance of the disciple. To some he teaches the Dharma to refrain from sins, to some to accomplish virtue, to some as dependence on dualism, and to some as freedom from dualism; (finally) to some he teaches the profound, terrifying practice of enlightenment, whose essence is emptiness and compassion.¹⁴

The first sentence states that the Teacher teaches the Dharma in accord with the intelligence of the disciple. The next two phrases refer to the teachings concerned with ascendant status¹⁵ (in the world). The next phrase refers to the teaching of the non-existence of personal self and of the existence of both subject and object for those in the class of the two disciple

schools. The next phrase refers to the teaching of the existence of the emptiness of duality, that is, the non-existence of the subject-object dualism, for certain disciples in the Universal Vehicle class. The rest of the passage refers to the teaching of the awesome Dharma of (integrated) realitylessness and great compassion for the disciples of extreme intelligence who are oriented toward the Universal Vehicle.

Therefore, as long as we are not capable of the establishment of all arrangements such as bondage-liberation, etc., upon the doctrine of truthlessness, we must differentiate some things that are untrue from some things that are true. For it is necessary to lead (such disciples) gradually, by teaching partial aspects of selflessness, and it is not proper to present universal emptiness when (it would be misinterpreted to mean that) there is no basis upon which to establish causality. Therefore, (the Buddha) declared the procedure of refuting reality in persons and almost not refuting it in the aggregates, and the procedure of refuting substantial subject-object difference and not refuting the reality of the emptiness of duality (itself).¹⁶

However, when we are able to realize the very import of relativity as the import of realitylessness, there is no point in making any such differentiation, because we are quite capable of the admission of the validity of all arrangements upon that very basis which is the negation of intrinsic reality. Nevertheless, even for those in the Supreme Vehicle class who are in little danger of nihilistic views about causality, etc., there are a great many who, although somewhat roughly negating truth, the negatee, fail to negate it precisely. For, in the face of precise negation, so many lose sight of the functional basis of all systems verified by validating cognitions. Hence, the *Elucidation of Intention* differentiation of interpretable and definitive still appears to be an extremely skillful technique for guiding a great many disciples to the Universal Vehicle.

Finally, as that scripture is explained to be teaching according to its disciples, we can understand the teachings that agree with it, as the same. Thus, we can understand how Asanga, the author of the treatises elucidating its intention, explains also according to the inclinations of his disciples, and does not accept the meaning he explains as his own personal interpretation.¹⁷

CELEBRATION OF THAT FACT AS THE ESSENTIAL IMPORT OF ALL SCRIPTURES

The Master praised the Lord in many treatises from the point of view of his declaration of relativity, having seen this very declaration of the equivalence in meaning of emptiness by intrinsic reality and relativity to be of the highest excellence, distinguishing our Teacher from other teachers. (The Lord's declaration was:) "By the very reason that origination depends on causes and conditions, things have no intrinsically identifiable reality."

(The Master salutes the Buddha as follows,) from the *Wisdom*:

I praise that perfect Buddha, the Supreme Philosopher, who taught us relativity, free of cessation and creation, without annihilation and permanence, with no coming and going, not a unity nor a plurality, (which is the) quiescence of mental fabrications and the supreme bliss!¹⁸

Also from the *Philosophical Sixty*: "I salute Shakyamuni, the herald of relativity, by which law, creations and cessations are abandoned!"¹⁹ And from the *Rebuttal of Objections*: "I salute that incomparable, perfect Buddha, who made the declaration of the equivalence of meaning of emptiness, relativity, and the central way!"²⁰ And from the *Inconceivable Praise*: "I salute the Incomparable One, whose wisdom was matchless and inconceivable, and who declared the realitylessness of interdependently originated things!"²¹

The first (of these quotations) declares that relativity is free of cessation, etc., eight (attributes). The second declares that it is free of them by reason of being relativity. The third declares that "relativity," the "central way," and "emptiness of intrinsic reality" are synonymous. And the fourth teaches that cessation, etc., are free of intrinsically identifiable existence for that very reason.

All the Discourses of the Teacher proceed from the two realities, the ultimate and the superficial. Since we will not understand the reality of the teaching if we do not know the differentiation of these two, we also will not understand the procedure to explain the Discourses from the point of view of the two realities. For, all teachings of various subjects that are dependently designated and dependently occurrent, are in terms of the superficial reality, and the ultimate is no more than just that emptiness which is the lack of intrinsic identifiability by that reason (of relativity).

The *Emptiness Seventy* statement is:

The peerless transcendent Lord taught this relativity of things because of the fact of their emptiness of reality. The ultimate meaning is no more than that, but the Lord Buddha correctly designates all varieties of things, relying on conventional expressions.²²

Its commentary explains that the ultimate “is no more than that emptiness of reality of all dependently originated things.” Thus, since (the Master) accepts the ultimate reality in this way, and establishes it as merely the exclusion of the self, the negatee, in relativity, the ground of negation, the systems of both the Champions agree, except for some differences on the qualification of the negatee, and it is incorrect to establish the ultimate reality in any other way. Furthermore, as for the belief in the truth-status of that (ultimate reality) itself, the *Wisdom* states: “Who entertain the view of emptiness are declared to be incurable!”²³ that is, that it is an incurable view, and the *Transcendental Praise* states it to be ridiculous: “Since you taught the nectar of emptiness in order to eliminate all mental fabrications, whosoever becomes attached to that (in itself), you find utterly ridiculous!”²⁴

Since the existence of relativity as nature-possessor and ultimate reality as nature, that is, as support and supported, is (presented) according to conventional cognition and not according to the rational cognition of immaculate equanimity, according to this latter there is of course no contradiction, such as that of existence of a nature without any naturepossessor, (since all duality is eliminated in the pure-object-ultimate). And in regard to existence in the (other kind of) ultimate, that involved in the analysis of the reality of things existent by intrinsic identity, since an isolated nature cannot remain without a nature-possessor, the former (Idealist) system maintains that if the relative reality were empty of intrinsic identifiability, the perfect would also become unestablished by intrinsic identity. Moreover, this (Centrist) system declares, “Since the created is not established, how can the uncreated be established?” Thus, both systems agree repeatedly with the scriptural statement, “If form itself were not apprehended, how could the reality of form possibly be apprehended?”²⁵

(Finally), the statements in the *Philosophical Sixty* that “liberation is the only truth,” that is, that it alone is true, and that created things are false and prove to deceive, must be understood by interpreting the meaning of “false” and “untrue” as “deceptive,” and the meaning of “true” as “non-deceptive.”

Hence the “truth” in question here is not that truth which is established by intrinsic identity, which is in question during the analysis of establishment and non-establishment in reality. These created things are said to be “false,” or “deceptive,” as they deceive the naiveminded by appearing to be established by intrinsic identity, when in fact they are not so established, as for example, (someone) is said to be deceiving if he pretends to be helpful, when he is not really helpful at all. Similarly, liberation, the ultimate reality, is said to be “true,” or “non-deceptive,” because it is not deceptive by appearing (to be established by intrinsic identity), as in the former case (of the superficial), to the person who directly beholds it. ²⁶

The heterodox schools, who do not believe in the relativity which is the dependent origination of persons and things, but believe in the truth (-status) of both, fall into the abyss of the absolutistic and nihilistic views. And those orthodox schools who, in spite of their admission of the relativity of both (persons and things) believe in their establishment in reality or by intrinsic identity, also come under the influence of absolutistic and nihilistic views.

Therefore, (Nagarjuna) believes that this very rule of the admission that persons and things which are dependently originated are devoid of intrinsic reality, like the reflection of the moon in water, is the best door to the abandonment of absolutistic and nihilistic views for those who desire to be free of them. As the *Philosophical Sixty* declares:

Those who insistently reify an independent self or world—alas!—they are deprived by views (such as those of things’ being) permanent or impermanent. And those who believe that dependent things are still established in reality—how could they fail to be affected by the fallacies such as permanence etc.? But those who believe that dependent things are neither real nor invalid, but are like the reflection of the moon in water—they are not deprived by views!²⁷

Absolutism is eliminated by the fact of the non-establishment in reality (of persons and things), and nihilism is eliminated by the fact of the functional capacity of each thing, as it is not invalidated by losing that capacity (just because it is not established in ultimate reality). Therefore, while admitting the emptiness of the intrinsic reality of these internal and external things, to maintain that such emptiness is annihilation of the

superficial contradicts the systems of both the Champions, who emphatically maintained that relativity is free of both permanence and annihilation. Nevertheless, there are many self-styled Centrists who still believe that, or else hold the similar belief that superficial things are empty even of their own entities, both beliefs being misunderstandings of the meaning of the expression “self-empty.” They further claim that “there is no method that demonstrates to us that these internal and external things of relativity are free of absolutism and nihilism!”²⁸

It is not surprising that the heterodox, who advocate the permanence of things, should not admit relativity, believing things to be established in truth, since that is the prescription of their own teachers. However, the belief in the truth-status (of things), while asserting relativity, which is the origination (of things) dependent on causes and conditions, is utterly absurd. Thus, the *Philosophical Sixty* declares:

For the believers in “Being,” who live by upholding a supreme thing, to stay on such a path is not surprising in the least. But, for those who believe in universal impermanence, relying on the path of the Buddha, to continue to uphold the supremacy of intrinsically real things with arguments—that really is astonishing!²⁹

Thus he declares the absurdity of those who believe that production and cessation, etc., as defined cannot be reconciled with non-existence in truth, or with (non-existence) by intrinsic identity.

Since this freedom of relativity from permanence and annihilation is so extremely difficult to understand, the Teacher himself thought that if he taught the profound teaching as he understood it, others would not understand it, hence he should stay for some time without teaching.³⁰ As it is stated in the *Wisdom*: “Thus, knowing the profundity of this teaching to be so difficult to understand for those of lesser intelligence, the Muni’s heart was very much averse to the teaching of the Dharma!”³¹

However, it seems that (Nagarjuna), the first great Champion, did not (believe) this (realization) in itself to be that difficult, as he explains that the difficulty of understanding is for those with less than superior intelligence, for whom a misunderstanding of this rule may be disastrous (and not for those with the superior intelligence). Thus, he goes on to encourage (us) by saying that we should strive to understand the meaning of reality, avoiding

neglect of either both word and meaning or else just meaning of this system, and avoiding the nihilism which finds no place to establish causality, etc.; as in the *Jewel Garland* (as follows:)

Thus, by such misunderstanding, one is ruined. But by true understanding, one attains immediate happiness and ultimate enlightenment. Therefore, abandoning repudiation and the nihilistic view, make the supreme effort for authentic knowledge to accomplish all goals!³²

The Master's many other statements of logical reasonings in his explanations of the profound meaning of the scriptures should be recognized as factors contributing to the realization of this (rule of emptiness-relativity), and thus we should train ourselves in the meaning of the central way. Finally, since I have already explained this pattern of reasoning frequently elsewhere, and since I intend to compose a commentary on the *Wisdom*, I will not go any further here.³³

¹ By Chandrakirti, Bhavaviveka, and Kamalashila, respectively.

² *Aksayamatinirdeśasūtra* (AMN) TG, P, ga (Skt. PPMMV p. 14, ls. 5-9): *katatne sūtrāntā neyārthāḥ katame nītārthāḥ I ye sūtrāntā mārgāvatārāya nirdistāimā ucyante neyārthāḥ I yesu sūtrāntesu ātrnāsattvajīvaposapurūṣapudgalamanujamanusyakārakavedaka nānāsabdairākhyāyante yesu cāsvāmikarp sāsvāmikatvena nirdistāin te neyārthāḥ / ye sūtrāntāḥ phalāvatārāya nirdistā itna ucyante nītārthāḥ / yāvad ye sūtrāntāḥ sūnyatānimittāpranīhitānabhisarnskārājātānutpādā bhāvanīrātmānihsattvanīrjīvanihpudgalāsvāmikavimoksamukha-nīrdistāḥ te ucyante nītārthāḥ /*

The Sanskrit is more abbreviated than the Tibetan, as might be expected from manuscripts much later than that from which the Tibetan translation was made. Also, this version equates “interpretable” with “cause,” and “definitive” with “effect.”

³ SRS, Skt. PPMMV ls. 11-12: *nītārthasūtrāntaviśeṣa jānāti yathopadiṣṭā sugatena sūnyatā / yasmin punaḥ pudgalasattvapuruṣa neyārthato jānāti sarvadharmān //*. (Ed. corrects from Tib. - *puruṣo* for *puruṣa*, and *neyārthatām* for *neyārthato*) (p. 14).

⁴ That is, although this statement is acceptable conventionally, when it is taken as ultimate reality, as if it were made in ultimate terms, it has no truth-status ultimately, and hence must be interpreted otherwise to understand ultimate reality, or emptiness.

⁵ *Madhyamakāloka* (MAlok), TG,D, f. 149v4-5.

⁶ These four reliances are not peculiar to Asanga's *Bhūmivastu*, but can be found with variations in the AMN, the BBh, and the MSA. See *Gun Thang*, p. 45 ff.

⁷ *Jnānālokālamkārasūtra*, KG, P, ga. (Also called *Sarvabuddhavisayāvatāra-*.)

⁸ CS VIII, k. 5.

⁹ MMK (called *Wisdom* according to Tib. *rtsa shes* 'nickname') XXIV, k. 1 (Inada, p. 144): *yadi śūnyamidam sarvamudayo nāsti na vyayah / catīrnāmāryasatyānāmabhāvaste prasajyate //*

¹⁰ MMK XXIV, k. 20 (Inada, p. 148: *yadyasūnyamidam sarvamudayo nāsti na vyayah I catīrnāmāryasatyānāmabhāvaste prasajyate //*

¹¹ PPMMV I, p. 13, 1.9: *evedam madhyamakāsāstram pranitamācāryena neyanītārthasūtrāntavibhāgopadarsanārtham /*

¹² PPMMV I, p. 13, Is. 22-24: *yasyaivam deśanābhiprāyānabhijñātayā samdehah syāt —kā hyatra deśanā tattvārthā kā nu khalu ābhiprāyikīti yaścāpi maṇḍabuddhitayā neyārthām deśanām nītārthāmavagacchati tayorubhayor api vineyajanayoh ācāryo yuktyāgamābhyām sam śayamithyājñānāpākaraṇārthām śāstramidamārabdhavān //*

¹³ *Bodhicittavivaraṇa*, Nagarjuna, TG, P, tsa, k. 13.

¹⁴ RA IV, k. 94-96 (edited by P. L. Vaidya, Darbhanga, 1960, *yathāiva vaiyākaraṇo mātṛkāmapī pāthayet / buddho vadattathā dharmam vineyānām yathākṣamam // keśāmcidavadaddharmaṃ papebhyo vinivṛttaye / keśāmcitpunyasiddhyartham keśāmcid dvayāniśritam // dvayāniśritamekeśāṃ gambhīraṃ bhīrubhīṣanam / śūnyatākaruṇāgarbhamekesām bodhisādhanam //*

¹⁵ Skt. *abhyudaya*. Opposite of *nihsreyasa*.

¹⁶ That is, the procedures of the Individual Vehicle and the Idealists, respectively.

¹⁷ Tsong Khapa refers especially to Āryāsanga, whom he believes to have elaborated the whole Idealist system in adaptation to the needs of the period and people, while himself having attained the true understanding of the central way, as revealed in his commentary on the RGV in particular.

¹⁸ MMK I, salutatory verses. Inada, p. 38: *anirodhamanūtpādamanucchedamaśāśvatam / anekārthamanānārthānāgamamanirgamam // yah pratītyasamūtpādān prapancopāśamam śivam / deśayāmāsa samhuddhastam vande vadatām varam //*

¹⁹ YS., k. 1.

²⁰ VV, k. 72 (edited by P. L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 1960, p. 295: *yah śūnyatām pratītyasamūtpādām madhyamām pratipadam ca / ekārthām nijagāda praṇamāmi tam apratimasambuddham //*

²¹ *Acintyastavana*, k. 1.

²² ŚS, k. 65-66.

²³ MMK XIII, k. 8 (c.d) (Inada, p. 93): *(śūnyatā sarvadṛṣṭinām proktā nihsaranam jinaiḥ) ye śām tu śūnyatādrṣṭistānasādhyān babhāṣire //*

²⁴ *Lokātīstava*, k. 1.

²⁵ Of course, the two systems draw quite different conclusions from this fact, the Idealists maintaining that both relative and perfect must therefore be established by intrinsic identity, and the Centrists maintaining that therefore both ultimate and superficial are not established by intrinsic identity. Here, Tsong Khapa wishes to emphasize the fact that both agree that, at least, one alone cannot be ultimate, as regards the ultimate which is establishment by intrinsic identity. Hence, the Jo-nang theory that the ultimate alone is established by intrinsic identity, or in truth, etc., is denied any support from the authority of either system.

²⁶ This is another blow to the Jo-nang belief.

²⁷ YS, k. 44-46.

²⁸ This position is similar to the Jo-nang in sacrificing the relative for a notion of a solitary absolute, but differs slightly in emphasis, tending toward nihilism, whereas the Jo-nang tends toward absolutism. The two positions in the text are called *rang stong* and *chad stong* respectively, and the Jo-nang position, *gzhan stong*.

²⁹ YS, k. 41-42.

³⁰ Compare PPMV, p. 217, Is. 13-16: *adhigato mayā dharmo gambhro gambhhravabhdso tarko tarkavacarah suksmah panditavijnavedaniyah I sacettamaham paresdmarocayeyam pare ca me na vibhavayeyuh sa mama vighatah sydt cetaso nudayah sydt I yannvahamekakaranye pravivikte drstadharmasukhaviharamanuprpto vihareyam //*.

³¹ MMK XXIV, k.12 (Inada, p. 146): *ataśca pratyudāvṛttam cittam deśayitum muneḥ / dharmam matvāsya dharmasya mandairduravagāhatām //*.

³² RA II, 1s. 22-23 (Vaidya ed., p. 302): *durjñātena tathānena vināśamadhigacchati / samyagjñātenātra sukham bodhim cāpnotyanuttaram // tasmādatra pratikṣepam drṣṭim tyaktvā ca nāstikim / samyagjñānaparam yatnam kuru sarvārthasiddhaye //*.

³³ Tsong Khapa refers here to the LTC portion of LRC, composed several years earlier, and to the RG, which he composed immediately after completing the work here translated.