rGya dmar ba - *dBu ma'i de kho na nyid*: Translation

(Pascale Hugon [pascale.hugon@oeaw.ac.at] & Kevin Vose [kavose@wm.edu])

NB: This is a work-in-progress and should be used and referred to as such. Only parts of the texts and the marginal annotations (appearing in orange) have been translated (those that have been edited in the document "edition"). The parts with a grey background consist in preliminary notes and should be disregarded at this stage. The present translation represents our current understanding of the text and is, when necessary, updated upon translating other portions. It may not be exempt of typos and mistakes, which will be corrected in the future. Only preliminary annotations are provided.

For more information on this document, see
http://www.ikga.oeaw.ac.at/RGyadMarBaByangChubGrags_dBu_ma_de_kho_na_nyid

First published online: 2.10.2017
Last update: 12.06.2019

****

0. Invocation

I bow to those [[[Who? Those who know the two truths. What are they? Here's a simile:]]] who are the sunlight of knowledge and the moonlight of kindness who dwell without abiding [[[at the limits of great wisdom and surpassing compassion]]] in the sky [[[of knowledge]]]—reality devoid of proliferations [[[the ultimate]]]—of a world which is like an illusion [[[conventional]]]. [[[We speak of the center of boundless knowledge like we speak of the center of the sky.(?)]]]

[[[He praises the perfectly and completely Enlightened Ones by recollecting their virtues, and praises his lamas by recollecting their kindness.]]]

I salute the lord,[1] bodhisattva [[[Gangs pa blo gros byang chub]]][2] of [[[endowed with]]] stainless [[[devoid of any defilements, consisting of ignorance and mistaken cognitions]]] discriminative intellect, who has the treasure of boundless virtues, known in the world to be like the sun, an illuminator. [[[Just as the sun is known to all as luminous, this one too is known to those who hear as knowledgeable and virtuous.]]]

1. Statement of Purpose

The root of all faults is attachment to [things having] characteristics and hence is to be eliminated. Wishing to achieve excellences for the sake of oneself and others [[[this is the ultimate purpose]]], I will explain so that the absence of nature of all phenomena [[[this is the topic]]] will be realized [[[this is the purpose (of the treatise). This is indirectly the connection between them.]]][3].

---

[1] We take *rje btsun dag* as honorific, rather than plural, given the identification of the object of the homage.

[2] The annotator identifies the object of homage as Gang pa blo gros byang chub; the verse uses the latter two parts of this name, *blo gros* ("intellect") and *byang chub,* here part of "bodhisattva."

[3] Cf. Broido 1983: 5: "The *dgos-'brel* of a work is often discussed under five headings, viz. the *text (rjod-byed, abhidhāna), its *topic (brjod-bya, abhidheya), the immediate *purpose (dgos-pa, prayojana) for which it was written, the more *distant purpose (dgos-pa'i dgos-pa or nying-dgos, prayojanaprayojana), and the *connection ('brel-ba, sambandha) between them.".

2. The three characteristics within the Two Truths and the division of provisional and definitive meaning[4]

2.1 Summarized explanation

By turning three times the wheel of the dharma consisting in the twelve divisions of the Buddha's words, which are collected in the two or three baskets,[5] (the Buddha) made clear the system of the middle, free of the extremes of deprecation and reification [[[It is free of the superimposition of existence because the duality of object and mind, or cognition, and so forth, do not exist ultimately. It is free from the extreme of non-existence because although these things do not exist, we do not call them non-existent.]]], by means of the three characteristics within the two truths.[6] [[[This is the summarized explanation.]]]

2.2 Extended explanation

2.2.1 The three characteristics within the two truths according to the respective philosophical systems

2.2.1.1 Hearers

[[[Hearer]]]* sectarians accept as the definitive meaning of the middle that rejects the two extremes [[[Since they assert object and mind, the dependent character, they do not make the deprecation "non-existence"; insofar as these are devoid of a personal self, they do not superimpose the existence of a personal self]]] the meaning of the three characteristics [[[two are ultimate; the twofold imputational character[7] is conventional]]] being taught within the two truths, namely [[[the

---

[4] Elements of this discussion might have their source in the *Madhyamakāloka* (to be investigated further).

[5] Vetturini (2007 : 65) records that Lo dgon pa bSod nams lha'i dbang po (1423-1496), the author of the *bKa' gdams rin po che'i chos 'byung rnam thar nyin mor byed pa'i 'od stong* ("Myriad Rays of the Sun"), mentions three or four turnings of the Dharma Wheel, and "twelve scriptural categories or three baskets (tripiṭaka) which may be considered the Buddha's word (dvādaśāngabuddhavacana)." Vetturini (n. 292) lists the twelve as they are identified in the dByangs can lha mo, a dictionary of Buddhist terminology: 1. *mdo* (sūtra), 2. *dbyangs kyis bsnyad pa* (geya), 3. *lung bstan* (vyākaraṇa), 4. *tshigs bcad* (gāthā), 5. *ched brjod* (udāna), 6. *gleng gzhi* (nidāna), 7. *rtogs brjod* (avadāna), 8. *de lta bu byung ba* (itivṛttaka), 9. *skyes rab* (jātaka), 10. *shin tu rgyas pa* (vaipulya), 11. *rmad byung* (adbhūta) and 12. *gtan phab* (upadeśa).

[6] The "three characteristics" (*mtshan nyid gsum*) are here the characterizations 'dependent' (Skt. *paratantra*), 'imputational' (Skt. *parikalpita*) and 'perfected' (Skt. *pariniṣpanna*) related to the model of the Three Natures (Skt. *trisvabhāva*) developed by Indian Buddhist idealist philosophers such as Asaṅga and Vasubandhu (both c. 4th–5th c.). See Wood 1991: 31-60 and Thakchoe 2016 (§3.1).

[7] In Chap. V, v. 14, a distinction is made between two kinds of incorrect conventional corresponding to the substantialists' imputational character, namely, conceptualizations and mistaken non-conceptual (i.e., hallucination etc.).

sayings of the initial (turning)]]] positing [[[the duality of]]] object and mind, which are the dependent character [[[these are held to be true as entities, whereby the phenomenal self of object and subject is also asserted to be true]]], [[[as the object in the perspective of being]]] devoid of personal self as the ultimate.
*[[[We accept the following: With regard to the basket of the Hearers, Hearers are practitioners who depend on teachers; Solitary Buddhas do not depend on a guru; bodhisattvas are those who practice in such a way for the welfare of others.]]]

2.2.1.2 Mādhyamikas

[[[Taking into account what is said correctly,]]] Mādhyamikas accept in that way (that is, as the definitive meaning of the middle that rejects the two extremes) the meaning of the three characteristics being taught within the two truths, namely [[[the sayings of the intermediate (turning)]]] explaining the emptiness of all characters [[[dependent and imputational characters are both conventional; the perfected character is ultimate truth]]], such as real cause and effect, as the ultimate [[[all superimpositions as true on these dependent characters that are like illusions are the imputational character. The perfected character is (the emptiness of all characters)]]].

2.2.1.3 Yogācāra

The Yogācāra accept in that way (that is, as the definitive meaning of the middle that rejects the two extremes) the meaning of the three characteristics being taught within the two truths, namely [[[the sayings of the final (turning)]]] positing the dependent character, mere cognition, [[[Taking that as true, the imputational character superimposes onto that (mere cognition) the duality of object and subject as the phenomenal self and personal self; that (mere cognition) being]]] devoid of the dualism of object and subject, and so forth, as the ultimate.

Table 1: The three characteristics within the two truths				
Conventional Ultimate Definitive meaning (according to the author)				
	turning of the wheel	dependent	imputational	perfected
Hearers	1st	object and mind (asserted to be true as entities)	personal self	object and mind devoid of personal self
Mādhyamikas	2nd	illusion-like cause, effect, etc.	superimposition of dependent characters as true	emptiness of all characters
Yogācāra	3rd	mere cognition	superimposition of mere cognition as dual (subject/object) and as having phenomenal self and personal self	mere cognition devoid of dualism, etc.

This might also be referring to the division of the imputational character into the "authentic imputational character" (*kun brtags mtshan nyid pa*) and the "conventional imputational character" (*tha snyad tsam du yod pa'i kun brtags*). (REF)

2.2.2 Teaching the distinction between the provisional and definitive meanings

The way things are [[[the system]]] is set forth from the perspective of disciples.

> [Verse 1]While the sage spoke in manifold ways [[[cultivating the dharma as antidotes to the 84,000 afflictions]]] in accordance with disciples [[[(as said in *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* X.406) "according to the illness"]]],
>
> It is said that the absence of character [[[the sayings of the intermediate (turning)]]] is the definitive meaning; the rest [[[the initial and final (turnings)]]] are of provisional meaning.

[2.2.2.1] Distinction in terms of establishment/invalidation by reasoning

[[[A further distinction between the definitive and provisional meanings: the nature of things that is established by reasoning is the definitive meaning; scripture that is invalidated by final reasoning is of provisional meaning.]]]

The three characteristics taught within the two truths [[[in the initial and final occasions]]] —namely [[[(according to) the sectarians and Yogācāra]]] the dependent character and perfected character are posited as ultimate; the imputational character alone is said to be conventional—is a saying of provisional meaning. Indeed, according to the system of others' [[[people]]] thinking, even the ultimate itself [[[which is taught (in that system) but is not true in that way]]] [[[when Mādhyamikas correctly explain, the dependent character they assert]]] is just false conventional.

Both the imputational character—cause and effect [[[being true]]] as ultimate and so forth—and the dependent character—illusion[[[-like cause and effect, which Mādhyamikas themselves accept to be true as such]]]—are posited to be conventional, and the emptiness of all characteristics ultimately is taught. This is a saying of definitive meaning because it does not invite another meaning [[[(when one observes) "it is not true as such"]]] and [[[once it is known]]] it is not to be rejected. This is because it is something [[[the dharma taught in the intermediate (turning)]]] that abides for [[[when analyzed by]]] final reasoning and what has a meaning opposite [[[to the dharma taught in the intermediate (turning)]]] is (to be rejected)[8] [[[is invalidated by reasoning]]]. [[[(This is) of provisional meaning.]]]

[2.2.2.2] The purpose of the sayings of provisional meaning

[[[Objection: The intermediate teachings alone suffice; the initial and final teachings are not necessary. Why are they taught through some intention?

---

[8] The literal reading of the text (*bzlog pa'i don can yin*) invites the understanding "and it has a meaning that is opposite," which is does not make sense. In our translation, we solve the problem by relating "*yin*" to the "*ma yin*" in the preceding sentence. It is possible that the text is faulty and should read *bzlog pa'i don can ma yin* ("it does not have an object that is opposed"). But one should observe that the annotations try to make sense of the text as it is, by supplementing "*la rigs pas gnod pa*," leading to the reading "what has an opposite meaning is invalidated by reasoning."

(In answer) to that, there are three parts: the purpose of intentional teaching; the intentional ground; and the invalidation of what is literal.[9]]]]

[2.2.2.2.1] The purpose of intentional teaching
[[[It is taught]]] In order for those [[[the sectarians]]] whose perspective is terrified of [[[the teaching of]]] emptiness because they adhere to characters to enter the teaching gradually and in order to safeguard those [[[people]]] who would adopt a nihilistic view by taking the Buddha's words regarding the absence of all characteristics to the letter [[[they understand non-existence in every way through the teaching "from form to omniscient consciousness, [all things] are non-existent"]]][10],

[2.2.2.2.2] The intentional ground
intending the dependent nature [[[illusion-like dependent arising]]] to be existent as correct conventional,

[2.2.2.2.3] The invalidation of what is literal
[[[The valid cognition that invalidates what is literal should be added.]]]
[the Buddha] taught the initial and final wheel of the dharma [[[the general meaning of the baskets]]].

[2.2.2.3] Specific explanation of the definitive meaning
[[[The specific explanation of the definitive meaning has five parts: the meaning of the term; the division of the scriptural tradition that teaches that; establishing the details [of the scriptural tradition]; negating attachment to entities; and the effects of cultivating emptiness.]]]

2.2.2.3.1 The meaning of the term
[[[The meaning of the term has four parts: the literal meaning of the term [[[This is the intention of the sutra]]]; presenting the genuine one (?); ?; the reason to apply [this term] to the state of affairs and the texts]]]

2.2.2.3.1.1 The literal meaning of the term
The wheel of dharma of the absence of characteristics, the precious sutra collection of definitive meaning, is a meaning that is taught directly in sutras such as the three Perfection of Wisdom, i.e. the extended one, the middle-length one, and the brief one, and a meaning that is to be understood [[[indirectly]]].

---

[9] On the trio of the "purpose" (*dgos pa*), the "intentional ground" (*dgongs gzhi*) and "invalidation of what is literal" (*dngos yin pa la gnod pa*) see Seyfort Ruegg 2010, chapters 7 ("Purport, Implicature, and Presupposition: Sanskrit *abhiprāya* and Tibetan *dgongs pa/dgongs gzhi* as Hermeneutical Concepts") and 8 ("An Indian Source for the Tibetan Hermeneutical Term *dgongs gzhi*, "Intentional Ground""). Phya pa makes frequent use of these categories when analyzing passages of Scriptures in his commentary on the *Madhyamakāloka*. Seyfort Ruegg (2010: 198, n. 12) mentions their use by bSod nams rtse mo (1142-1182), who had been a student of Phya pa. They are further discussed by Sa skya Paṇḍita (bSod nams rtse mo's nephew) in the *mKhas 'jug* and the *sDom gsum rab dbye*.
[10] Maybe a quote from the **Āryacandragarbhaprajñāpāramitāmahāyānasūtra.*

[a]   The first: the essence of the path that has an object is condensed in the eight chapters [of the Perfection of Wisdom] into the five paths, the path of accumulation through the path of no more learning.[11] That is also explained in the instructional treatises, along with related texts. [[[This is not taught here.]]]

[b]   The second [[[the essence of the object being condensed in the two truths]]] is explained by the Collection of Reasoning, along with related texts [[[by texts related to the Collection of Reasoning]]]: principally, [[[this is taught:]]] the path [[[whose essence is realizing that]]] and what it perceives [[[i.e., its object]]].

1. The state of affairs, the path and the texts are "the Middle Way"

1.a The state of affairs is "the Middle Way"

What is perceived by the path, the two truths [[[whose duality is found in reality]]], is the state of affairs called the "Middle Way" because, whether [[[the two truths are]]] taken individually or interrelatedly, they are beyond the extremes of reification and deprecation, namely permanence and annihilation and so forth. [[[As for the conventional, in as much as one accepts that as long as causes exist, effects also exist, one does not subscribe to annihilation. With the elimination of causes, effects cease, and so one does not subscribe to permanence. For this very reason, it is free from reification and deprecation. Since the ultimate is beyond all expression, it is free from permanence and annihilation, as well as reification and deprecation. Based on both (truths), conventionally, since one accepts that effects come from causes, there is freedom from annihilation; ultimately, since one accepts that nothing is established whatsoever, there is freedom from superimpositions.]]]

1.b The path is "the Middle Way"

What takes as its object that previously described state of affairs [[[the wisdom that realizes the two truths]]] is the path that is the "Middle Way" as well, because it realizes the elimination of all extremes.

1.c The texts are "the Middle Way"

The texts [[[sūtras and treatises]]] that express those (two truths) are also the "Middle Way" because they express the elimination of all extremes [[[namely, reification and deprecation]]].

2. The state of affairs, the path and the texts are "the Perfection of Wisdom"

Those [[[three]]] are the "Perfection of Wisdom": the path that is the "Perfection of Wisdom"; the state of affairs that is the "Perfection of Wisdom"; and the texts that are the "Perfection of Wisdom."

2.2.2.3.1.2 Presenting the genuine one

2.a The path is "the Perfection of Wisdom"

As for the path, assigning the genuine wisdom within the stage of ordinary beings [[[it is the inferential cognition that examines the absence of nature]]] or assigning it within the path of seeing [[[it is the wisdom that directly beholds the ultimate]]]

---

[11] The five paths are: tshogs lam, sbyor lam, mthong lam, sgom lam, mi slob pa'i lam (path of accumulation, of joining, of seeing, of meditation, of no more learning)

differ in many ways. However, master Dignāga assigns it [[[genuine wisdom]]] only to [[[buddhahood (at the end of)]]] the path of no more learning, as it is said:

> The Perfection of Wisdom is non-dual; [[[the wisdom is gnosis]]] that gnosis [[[which is non-dual gnosis]]] is [[[found in]]] the Tathāgata.
> Since the state of affairs, which is the result [[[genuine wisdom]]], is endowed with them [[[texts and the path]]], the path and texts [[[which are wisdom]]] are designated by the word (for) that [[[for that, which is the genuine result]]].[12]

However, in general, genuine wisdom is indeed encapsulated within the path [[[all three (presentations) agree on accepting (genuine wisdom) for the path]]].

2.2.2.3.1.3 ***

[[[How can a conventional cognition be wisdom?]]] Conventional seeing as an illusion is wisdom from the point of view of not conceiving the three spheres (of agent, action, and object), and so there is no contradiction with (the verse ending with) "It is explained for the sake of cognizing the ultimate"[13] [[[cognizing the state of affairs is explained to be wisdom]]]. This is like the saying, "The giving that precedes giving is wisdom."[14] [[[While giving is conventional, when it is encompassed in wisdom it is perfected.]]]

2.2.2.3.1.4 The reason to apply this term to the state of affairs and the texts

2.b The state of affairs is "the Perfection of Wisdom"

As for the state of affairs [[[being the Perfection of Wisdom]]], it is because it is what is perceived by wisdom, because it is explained:

> [I bow to the mother of the Jinas of the three times,]
> Perfection of Wisdom, who is ineffable, inconceivable, unutterable.
> Unborn, unceasing, she is of the nature of space,
> [And in the scope of *so so rang rig ye shes*.] [15]

One expresses with the word for that [[[the perceiver]]], that which it (the perceiver) perceives, like *pratyakṣa*, etc.. [[[Like blue, the object of that (i.e., of *pratyakṣa*) is called "blue *pratyakṣa*."]]][16]

2.c The texts are "the Perfection of Wisdom"

As for the texts (being the Perfection of Wisdom), this is because they are the cause of wisdom and they express it, just as one calls the words that are the cause of inference by the name of that [[[i.e., of inference; namely they are called "inference

---

[12] Dignāga, *Āryaprajñāpāramitāsaṅgrahakārikā*, verse 1.

[13] Asaṅga, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* XVI.15c.

[14] *Āryaprajñāpāramitāsaṃcayagāthā*, Tib. *'Phags pa shes rab kyi ph arol tu phyin pa sdud pa tshigs su bcad pa*, D34-1-5a.

[15] Kun dga' snying po (*Ānandagarbha), *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*, Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyi 'khor gyi cho ga* D254b; Ratnakīrti, *Yogacaturdevastotra*, Tib. *sByor ba bzhi'i lha la bstod pa* D247b. Translation: Kapstein 2000: 111.

[16] The word *pratyaksa* in Sanskrit, as well as the word *mngon sum* in Tibetan, can refer either to a perception or a perceived object.

for others"]]] [17]; or again, one calls a treatise on [[[that expresses]]] epistemology "epistemology."[18]

2.2.2.3.2 The division of the scriptural tradition that teaches that

i. Setting forth the opponent's position
As for delineating the meaning to be understood in the discourses *(bka')* that are Middle Way texts:
Previous generations made a twofold convention:
- foundational Madhyamaka[[[The scriptures of Nāgārjuna, who received the prophecy of enlightenment, are foundational because they cannot be refuted.]]] and
- Madhyamaka that takes sides.

Madhyamaka that takes sides, are explained [[[by previous generations]]] to be (three) regarding the ultimate:
- Illusion-like,
- Non-Abiding, and
- Paradoxical;[19]

and (three) regarding the conventional:
- Yogācāra,
- Sautrāntika, and
- "Compatible with Both" or "Unspecified."[20]

[[[The refutation of that:]]]
That is not sound because regarding Paradoxical [[[(for instance, on one hand) since it perceives something as having parts it is not one and since it is not (one), it is not many; on the other hand the perception of something having parts entails being one; therefore (there is a paradox)]]] and so forth, since bad conceptions are limitless,[21] such side-takers would be innumerable [[[since one must count also *nag po rim*

---

[17] This reference to the metaphorical application of the term "inference" (Skt. *anumāna*) to inference-for-others (Skt. *parārthānumāna*) goes back to Dignāga (PSV ad PS 3.1ab) and Dharmakīrti (PVin 3 ad PVin 3.1ab). The term "inference" refers directly to "inference-for-oneself," which is a mental event. An inference-for-others, on the other hand, consists in a statement meant to indicate to the opponent a triply characterized reason, and thereby enabling her to achieve an inference-for-oneself. Dignāga and Dharmakīrti describe the metaphorical application of the term as that of the effect to the cause (*kāraṇe kāryopacārāt*).

[18] This metaphorical use of the term *tshad ma* speaks in favor of considering the expression *tshad ma* figuring at the beginning of the title of a number of Tibetan epistemological works as a "topic marker." (E.g., Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge's *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*).

[19] More literally:
   1. Those who claim [that phenomena are] like illusions (*sgyu ma ltar smra ba*)
   2. Those who hold [that phenomena] do not abide whatsoever (*rab du mi gnas par 'dod pa*)
   3. Those who hold what is paradoxical to be ultimate (*'gal 'dus don dam par 'dod pa*)

[20] "Not incompatible with both traditions" (*gnyi ga'i lugs dang mi 'gal ba*) or "Those who judge by apprehending in general (?)" (*spyi bzung zhal che ba*).

[21] The phrase "bad conceptions are limitless" is also found on 29a7 after the enumeration of the main four non-Buddhist systems to be refuted.

lu²²]]]. [[[Further, regarding the conventional]]], it is not sound because there are those [[[such as Jñānagarbha]]] whose assertions are similar to the Vaibhāṣikas, who are not included among Sautrāntikas and Yogācāras; it is impossible to assert something compatible with both Sautrāntika and Yogācāra; and if one held tenets that were compatible with both, which are incompatible (with each other), it would not be suitable for those who reason to be scholars.²³ Not making a judgement (?) but repeating both systems without taking any position oneself is not found in texts.

ii. Presenting our own position

Thus, regarding the ultimate, there are two: Illusion-like and Non-Abiding; regarding the conventional, there are two:
  – Yogācāra [[[these are twofold: True Aspectualists and False Aspectualists]]] and
  – Realists.²⁴
And [[[regarding Realists]]] objects are asserted in accordance with Sautrāntika or in accordance with Vaibhāṣika.

Table 2: Subdivisions of Madhyamaka		
rGya dmar ba's own position		
According to previous authors		
Foundational	That takes sides	
	Regarding the ultimate	Regarding the conventional
	i. illusion-like ii. non-abiding iii. paradoxical	i'. Yogācāra ii'. Sautrāntika iii'. 'Compatible with both' or 'Unspecified'
According to rGya dmar ba		

	i. illusion-like
	ii. <u>non-abiding</u>
		i'. Yogācāra
		ii'. Realists
		    ii'a – in accordance with Sautrāntika
		    ii'b – <u>in accordance with Vaibhāṣika</u>

2.2.2.3.3 Establishing the details [of the scriptural tradition]

What is to be realized in the sutras of the absence of characteristic will be established as the definitive meaning by delineating the system of the two truths, in accordance with our own way of taking sides, along with refuting others.

---

²² This is probably the name of philosophical or religious system. It is not found in the famous list of 120 names of doctrines in Bhāviveka's *Tarkajvālā*. If referring to an Indian system, "Nag po" could refer to Kṛṣṇā. In Tibet, "Nag po" could refer to the black Mahākāla. "Rim lu" may indicate a "succession of knots."

²³ rGya dmar ba may here simply call this position unreasonable or he may provide an analogous case, in which "being reasonable" should be associated with "being learned" but here it would not be (because of still being compatible with "not being learned" as well).

²⁴ Literally: (those holding) the existence of external objects (*phyir rol don yod pa*).

3. Explanation of the division of the two truths

[Verse 2] Here, the explanation of the division of the two truths is to be known through six points: the basis of division, the meaning of the division, the meaning of the terms, the specification of the number, the definitions, and the valid cognitions (that establish the definitions).

There will six points: the basis of division (I), the meaning of the division (II), the meaning of the terms (III), the specification of the number (IV), the definitions (V), and the valid cognitions (that establish the definitions) (VI).

I. The Basis of Division

Here, we assert the basis of division to be object of cognition without specification (literally, "mere object of knowledge") [[[that is, not qualified by another property]]], (cognized by anyone) from omniscient knowers to the tiniest insects.

II. The Meaning of the Division

[[[Here, from among the three ways (of being distinct)[25]]]] The meaning is that (the two truths) are two in terms of merely negating identity; they are property-possessor and property without division between appearance and emptiness, because one cannot speak of (their) identity or alterity. But it is not the case that they have the exact same defining characteristic or that they are different natures.

Here, (there are four options): (A) there is absolutely no difference; or, if there is (a distinction), (B) a distinction of natures; or (C) a distinction of properties for the same nature; (D) a distinction in terms of merely negating identity.

The first (A) and second (B) are to be refuted by the four respective faults stated in the *Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra.*[26] The third (C) and fourth (D) are to be examined from the distinction between the Illusion-like and Non-Abiding perspectives.[27]

1. The view of Geshe pa
[[[According to Geshe pa]]]

---

[25] The three are (B), (C) and (D) listed below.

[26] The source of the discussion is SNS III.3–5, where one finds the refutation of the view that the characteristic of the conditioned (*ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid*) and the characteristic of the ultimate (*don dam paʾi mtshan nyid*) are different (*tha dad pa yin*), and the refutation of the view that they are not different (*tha dad pa ma yin*). The sūtra aims at showing that the ultimate transcends the notions of identity and difference with the conditioned. The four faults indicated in the sutra are rephrased here in the form of arguments by consequence. For an analysis of Phya pa's views on the same topic see Hugon 2016: 908–929. A preliminary discussion of rGya dmar ba's views in the *dBu ma de kho na nyid* and his *bDen gynis rnam bshad* is to be found on pp. 925–928.

[27] See n. 78.

1. The view that the two truths are distinct properties for the same nature (C) does not have the four faults stated in the SNS (against the view that there is no distinction)

[[[As for the stated faults (there are four): (i) when seeing the conventional, one would also see the ultimate and therefore it would follow that one would attain nirvāṇa; (ii) just as defilements increase in dependence on the conventional, it would follow that they would also increase in dependence on the ultimate; (iii) just as the ultimate is without distinction, it would follow that the conventional is also without distinction; (iv) just as the conventional cannot be sought apart from seeing and hearing, it would follow that the ultimate also could not be sought apart from seeing and hearing.]]]

For those who accept a distinction of properties for the same nature (C), the four faults of the *Sūtra* (against the view that there is no distinction) do not apply.

(i) There is no fault of attaining nirvāṇa when seeing the conventional

There is no contradiction for there to be superimpositions when seeing the conventional because even though the ultimate is seen, it is not ascertained, just like momentariness [[[just like superimposition of permanence when seeing blue]]]. Therefore, there is no [[[fault of]]] attaining nirvāṇa.[28]

(ii) Three is no fault of increase of defilements in dependence on the ultimate

There is no contradiction for one [[[the conventional]]] to be the support of thorough affliction but for the other property [[[the ultimate]]] which has the nature of that [[[the conventional]]] not to be [[[the support of affliction]]] [[[because they are two distinct properties]]], just like [[[for instance]]] blue is desired but momentariness is despised [[[by someone]]]. Thus [[[for this reason]]], there is no [[[fault of]]] increase of defilements in dependence on the ultimate [[[as there is with the conventional]]].[29]

(iii) It is not the case that conventionalities are not distinct

There is no contradiction for subjects to be mutually distinct but for their properties not to be distinct, as it is said (by Dharmakīrti): "(Similar instances) are things which are similar on account of (possessing) the universal which is the property to be proven [[[e.g., smoke, etc.]]][30]."[31] If it were otherwise [[[if there is no similarity on account of a

---

[28] SNS III.3: *gal te ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid dang / don dam paʾi mtshan nyid **tha dad pa ma yin par gyur na** ni des na byis pa so soʾi skye bo thams cad bden pa mthong ba yin par yang ʾgyur / so soʾi skye bo kho nar gyur bzhin du grub pa dang / bde ba bla na med paʾi **mya ngan las ʾdas pa ʾthob par yang ʾgyur** / bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs paʾi byang chub mngon par rdzogs par ʾtshang rgya bar yang ʾgyur ro //*

[29] This fault is different from the second fault in SNS III.4: *gal te ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid dang / don dam paʾi mtshan nyid **tha dad pa ma yin par gyur na** ni / des na ji ltar ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid kun nas nyon mongs paʾi mtshan nyid du gtogs pa de bzhing du don dam paʾi mtshan nyid kyang kun nas nyon mongs paʾi mtshan nyid du gtogs par ʾgyur ro //*

[30] The property to be proven is actually "fire".

[31] PVin 3 D202a2; P299b1; NB_Tib D232a1-2. This is Dharmakīrti's definition of "similar instance" (*sapakṣa*) in an inference. For instance, when inferring that there is fire on a mountain pass because

12

universal]]], since mutually distinct property-possessors could not have any commonality [[[something like a mountain (cannot have any commonality) with a kitchen]]], their properties also could not [[[the mere fire on the mountain would have no commonality (with the kitchen)]]]. Thus, it is not the case that conventionalities are not distinct [[[in the way that reality is not distinct]]].[32]

(iv) It is not the case that the ultimate could not be sought apart from seeing and hearing

While we accept that [[[the ultimate]]] is not to be sought as a different entity [[[from the conventional]]], it is a differentiation of characteristic, just as even though one realizes blue, momentariness is (still) to be known [[[the entailment between being of the same nature and not being sought as a different characteristic is not established]]]. Thus, it is not the case that the ultimate is not to be sought apart from seeing and hearing.[33]
[[[Well then, are you positing that the faults of the *Sūtra* are not forthcoming?]]]
Therefore, if one does not accept even a mere distinction of characteristic [[[if one does not accept a mere distinction of exclusion properties]]], there is no doubt that these faults are to be stated.

2. The view that the two truths are distinct natures (B) is liable to the four faults stated in the SNS (against the view that there is a distinction)[34]

If (the two truths) are distinct natures, there are four faults.

(i') Nirvāṇa would not be attained when seeing the ultimate

[35] Even when one manifestly sees the ultimate, since one would (still) perceive the conventional––the support of thorough affliction––separately [[[from the ultimate]]], nirvāṇa would not be attained.

---

one observes that there is smoke, the similar instances are all the loci where there is fire (for instance, a kitchen).

[32] SNS III.5 a: *gal te ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid dang / don dam paʾi mtshan nyid **tha dad pa ma yin par gyur na** ni / des na ji ltar don dam paʾi mtshan nyid ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid thams cad la bye brag med pa de bzhin du ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid thams cad kyang **bye brag med pa** dang /*

[33] SNS III.5 b: *…rnal ʾbyor pa dag ʾdu byed rnams la ji ltar mthong ba dang ji ltar thos pa dang ji ltar bye brag phyed pa dang ji ltar rnam par shes pa las gong du don dam pa yongs su ʾ**tshal bar yang mi ʾgyur** ro //*

[34] On this set of four arguments and their source in the SNS see Hugon 2016: 925–925.

[35] SNS III.3: *gal te ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid dang / don dam paʾi mtshan nyid tha da dpa yin par gyur na ni / des na **bden pa mthong ba** rnams kyang ʾdu byed kyi mtshan ma dang ma bral bar ʾgyur* (a) */ ʾdu byed kyi mtshan ma dang ma bral baʾi phyir bden pa mthong ba mtshan maʾi ʾching ba las rnam par ʾgrol bar yang mi ʾgyur* (b) */ mtshan maʾi ʾching ba las rnam par ma grol na / gnas ngan len gyi ʾching ba las kyang rnam par ma grol bar ʾgyur* (c) */ ʾching ba de gnyis las ma grol nab den pa mthong bas grub pa dang / bde ba bla na med paʾi **mya ngan las ʾdas pa thob pa ʾang mi ʾgyur*** (d) */ bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs paʾi byang chub mngon par rdzogs par ʾtshang rgya bar yang mi ʾgyur ro* (e) */*

(ii') The ultimate could not be the true nature of the conventional
[36] [[[Something that is a distinct entity (from something else) cannot be the true nature (of the latter).]]] Just like the pot (cannot be the true nature of) the blanket, the ultimate could not be the true nature of the conventional [[[because the ultimate and conventional are distinct entities]]].

(iii') The selflessness or mere non-establishment of the conventional would not be the ultimate
[37] Just as the mere non-establishment of a pot is not a blanket [[[because these two are distinct entities]]], the selflessness or mere non-establishment of the conventional is not the ultimate [[[because the two are distinct entities]]].

(iv') Afflictions and purification would occur simultaneously in a single continuum
[38] Just as the cognition of a pot and a blanket [[[occur at the same time]]], [[[if the two are distinct]]] since their apprehension is established to be individual, thorough affliction and purification would arise in the same continuum simultaneously [[[they would occur at the same time]]].
[[[So said Geshepa.]]]

2. Analysis of the arguments against view (B) in A.2 above
[[[(The opponent) sets forth rejoinders in order to correct that position (I.e., B) and (we) teach that these rejoinders are not suitable]]]

1. Rejoinders against the four faults against view (B)[39]
Objection: Such a way of thinking has to be analyzed for the following reasons:

---

[36] SNS III.4: *gal te ʾdu byed ki mtshan nyid dang / don dam paʾi mtshan nyid tha dad pa yin par gyur na ʾang / des na ʾdu byed kyi mtshan nyid thams cad la don dam paʾi mtshan nyid **spyiʾi mtshan nyid du gyur pa ma yin par** ʾgyur ro //*

[37] SNS III.5 a: *gal te ʾdu byed ki mtshan nyid dang / don dam paʾi mtshan nyid tha dad pa yin par gyur na ni / des na **ʾdu byed rnams kyi bdag med pa tsam dang ngo bo nyid med pa tsam nyid don dam paʾi mtshan nyid yin par yang mi ʾgyur** /*

[38] SNS III.5 b: …***kun nas nyon mongs paʾi mtshan nyid dang / rnam par byang baʾi mtshan nyid kyang dus gcig tu mtshan nyid tha dad du grub par** ʾgyur ro //*

[39] In the four subsections that follow, the author analyzes each argument according to the rules of inference set by Dharmakīrti. These require that (a) the logic reason qualifies the subject, and that (b) the logical reason entails the property to be proven. If (a) fails to obtain, the logical reason is termed "non-established." Characteristic (b)—entailment—fails to obtain if a counter-example can be found, i.e., a case that is qualified by the logical reason but not by the entailed property. In the arguments under consideration, which are arguments by consequence (analogue to *reductio ad absurdum*), what the logical reason entails is not properly speaking a property "to be proven" but rather is part of an "absurd conclusion," something that the opponent is not expected to subscribe to. It is hence referred to in the summarizing tables as "entailed property." While the rules of inference require that (a) and (b) obtain in reality and are ascertained by a means of valid cognition by the cognizing subject, the rules of argumentation by consequence only require that (a) and (b) are accepted by the opponent (which can be the case even if they do not obtain in reality).

1.1 Rejoinder against the first fault (i')

[[[(As for) the first fault (i'),]]] (it does not apply) even if (the two truths) are distinct natures, insofar as, **(a)** when one sees the ultimate, perceiving the conventional is not ascertained to occur. [[[The logical reason, "the conventional is perceived separately," is not established at the time of seeing the ultimate.]]]
(b) [[[Even if we allow that it is established]]] becoming thoroughly afflicted due to merely perceiving the conventional is not ascertained by the Noble Ones.[40] [[[This is because although the Noble Ones perceive conventionalities such as form, they do not become afflicted.]]] [[[If one thinks in terms of a more specific logical reason,]]]
(c) Even if (the logical reason) is "because of perceiving the conventional separately [[[as a separate nature]]] from the ultimate," it [[[i.e., the more specific logical reason "perceiving the conventional separately"]]] entailing "being thoroughly afflicted" is not established in any case.
Therefore, how do you draw the conclusion that there is no nirvāṇa?

Fault (i') against position B				Rejoinder against (i')
Subject	S	when one manifestly sees the ultimate	First characteristic of the logical reason (C1): L occurs for S	(a) C1 does not obtain
Logical reason	L	perceiving the conventional		
Specific logical reason	L'	perceiving the conventional separately from the ultimate	Second characteristic of the logical reason (C2): L entails K	(b) C2 does not obtain (counterexample: the Noble ones)
(Directly) entailed property	K	one would have thorough affliction		(c) C2' does not obtain (counterexample: any case)
(Indirectly) entailed property	T	nirvāṇa would not be attained	Second characteristic of the specific logical reason (C2'): L' entails K	(d) T does not follow

1.2 Rejoinder against the fourth fault (iv')

For the same reason, the final argument by consequence (iv') (does not apply) because **(a)** there is no ascertainment that they are undoubtedly perceived individually, even though they are different entities. [[[The logical reason, "being perceived simultaneously,"[41] is not established. Even if we allow that it is established,]]]
(b) Due to merely perceiving that [[[that is, the conventional]]] at the time of this [[[of seeing the ultimate]]], there is no ascertainment [[[by the Noble Ones]]] of the consequence that there is thorough affliction [[[due to merely perceiving the conventional]]] at the time of purification.

Fault (iv') against position B				Rejoinder against (iv')
Subject	S	the two truths having distinct natures	First characteristic of the logical reason (C1):	(a) C1 does not obtain

---

[40] The text literally reads "**by** the Noble ones", but this should probably be understood as "in the case of the Noble ones", as the interlinear note makes clear.
[41] Actually, the logical reason is "being perceived individually". The note adds the specification that this perception is simultaneous, which is essential for the conclusion to be drawn, namely, that affliction and purification are simultaneous.

Logical reason	L	being apprehended individually		L occurs for S	(b) C2 does not obtain (counterexample: the Noble ones)
Entailed property	K=T	thorough affliction and purification would arise in the same continuum simultaneously		Second characteristic of the logical reason (C2): L entails K	((c) T does not follow)

1.3 Rejoinder against the second and third faults (ii'),(iii')

[[[One must analyze to whom the two intermediate faults are addressed, those who accept or do not accept that the two truths are distinct.]]] **(a)** If one accepts that (the two truths) are distinct natures, one would accept the two intermediate arguments by consequence.

(b) If one does not accept that [[[i.e., that they are distinct]]], the logical reason [[["because they are distinct"]]] would not be found in reality or accepted. For whom would such an argument by consequence be voiced? [42]

Fault (ii')/(iii') against position B					Rejoinder against (ii')/(iii')
Subject	S	(the two truths)		First characteristic of the logical reason (C1): L occurs for S	(a) For supporters of B, K=T is accepted
Logical reason	L	having distinct natures			
Entailed property in (ii')	K=T	the ultimate could not be the true nature of the conventional		Second characteristic of the logical reason (C2): L entails K	(b) For detractors of B, C1 is not established and not accepted
Entailed property in (iii')	K=T	the selflessness or mere non-establishment of the conventional is not the ultimate			

Thus, these faults (i'–iv') are to be rejected. [[[The argument is that the faults of the Sūtra do not apply.]]]

2. Teaching that the rejoinders are not suitable replies

2.1 Regarding the rejoinders against first and last faults (i'), (iv')

(a$_i$*) We accept that the conventional is the support of thorough affliction. [[[The conventional is the *** object of the Noble Ones and the object of ordinary people. Pleasant and unpleasant are superimposed on it.]]] If that [[[i.e., the conventional that is the support of affliction]]] is a different substance from the ultimate, it is not contradictory to perceive it [[[i.e., the conventional]]] separately, even when manifestly seeing the ultimate. [[[Just like, since a pot and blanket are distinct, when one perceives the pot, it is possible to perceive the blanket also.]]] Therefore, the occurrence of thorough affliction is not prevented [[[because it is possible]]]. Therefore, the conclusion of the first and last arguments by consequence are implied. But they cannot be accepted.

---

[42] (a) means that an opponent who accepts position B would actually also accept the conclusion drawn in the argument by consequence (Cf. below 2.2 on whether the conclusion could be eliminated by Scriptures or has to be accepted). It follows from (a) and (b) that the arguments (ii') and (iii') are not proper arguments by consequence.

[Argument assuming the acceptance that "there is liberation through having made manifest the ultimate"]

(d_i*)

Alternatively, [[[since this is the intention of the Sūtra/if (you) say that this is the intention of the Sūtra]]] the assertion of liberation through the cause consisting in having made manifest the ultimate would be entirely impossible [[[for you]]] because, on account of perceiving the conventional **(L)** [[[which is separate from the ultimate which is being taken directly but separately]]], the support of thorough affliction that has the character of being superimposed as suffering and so forth, is not undermined [[[by this separate apprehension of the ultimate]]]. Just like by ascertaining sound to be impermanent, the apprehension of a pot as permanent is not excluded, because they [[[the two truths]]] are distinct objects.

As it is said (in PV II.222ab):

> If its object is not refuted, it is not possible to reject it.[43]

Thus, liberation through the cause consisting in having made manifest the ultimate would be entirely impossible.

Further, even if it were (possible), **(c_iv*)** having thorough afflictions at the very time [[[of making manifest the ultimate]]] **(K)** would not be contradictory and would be possible, just like superimposition of a pot as permanent [[[is possible]]] at the time of ascertaining sound to be impermanent, because **(a_iv*)** it is not contradictory to perceive individually **(L)** [[[because the objects are distinct]]].

In summary, in so far as it is not contradictory to apprehend erroneously conventionalities **(a_i*)** and to see the ultimate separately **(a_iv*)**, the mere possibility of the asserted position [[[that there is liberation through the cause consisting of having made manifest the ultimate]]] is refuted (=**d_i***) and the undesired position [[[it is not desired that it is possible to perceive thorough affliction separately at the time of seeing the ultimate]]] follows (=**c_iv***).[44]

(b_i*)

[[[Having previously had the doubt that (becoming afflicted due to perceiving the conventional) is not ascertained by the Noble Ones, a specific (logical reason) was taken.]]]

Even without relying on [[[the specific logical reason, i.e.,]]] the specific apprehension of the conventional that is the support of thorough afflictions **(L' in i')**, there is no fault **(b)** that (becoming afflicted due to perceiving the conventional) is not ascertained by the Noble Ones [[[(the fault) "it is not ascertained because even though the Noble Ones see the conventional, they do not become afflicted"]]].

---

[43] C. Pecchia (personal communication) proposes the translation "If its object (the self) is irreproachable/faultless, it is not possible to relinquish it" for this half-verse. "It" refers to affection (*sneha*). Possibly, this verse is cited here to show the parallel with the case of affliction: thorough affliction (K) cannot be relinquished, because its support–the conventional–is not undermined.

[44] Namely, for proponents of B, that nonT is the case for S in (i') is not established, and that K=T follows for S in (iv') is established.

This is for the following reason: Even though there is the mere apprehension of the conventional **(L)** [[[for the Noble Ones]]], [[[the Noble Ones]]] making manifest the emptiness of all characters [[[(making manifest) as empty]]], which is the true nature [[[or, the natural state]]] of conventionalities, is incompatible with apprehension [[[as distinct from the ultimate]]] under a mistaken aspect [[[as having afflictions]]]. But [[[for you it would follow that]]] these [[[that is, the occurrence of false superimpositions on the conventional and making manifest the ultimate]]] are compatible in the position of (the Two Truths) being [[[asserted to be]]] distinct [[[in reality]]].

Fault (i') against position B				Rejoinder against (i')	Rejection of the rejoinder against (i')
Subject	S	when one manifestly sees the ultimate	First characteristic of the logical reason (C1): L occurs for S	(a) C1 does not obtain	(a_i*) C1 obtains: it is not contradictory for L to occur for S
Logical reason	L	perceiving the conventional		(b) C2 does not obtain (counterexample: the Noble ones)	(d_i*) Given S and L, K and T follow; holding S and notT is impossible for proponents of B
Specific logical reason	L'	perceiving the conventional separately from the ultimate	Second characteristic of the logical reason (C2): L entails K	(c) C2' does not obtain (counterexample: any case)	(b_i*) In reality, for Noble ones K is incompatible with S and L. But for proponents of B, K is compatible with L, thus C2 obtains
(Directly) entailed property	K	one would have thorough affliction	Second characteristic of the specific logical reason (C2'): L' entails K	(d) T does not follow	
(Indirectly) entailed property	T	nirvāṇa would not be attained			
Fault (iv') against position B				Rejoinder against (iv')	Rejection of the rejoinder against (iv')
Subject	S	the two truths having distinct natures	First characteristic of the logical reason (C1): L occurs for S	(a) C1 does not obtain	(a_{iv}*) C1 obtains: it is not contradictory for L to occur for S
Logical reason	L	being apprehended individually		(b) C2 does not obtain (counterexample: the Noble ones)	(c_{iv}*) (Given S and L), K/T is not contradictory and is possible for S
Entailed property	K=T	thorough affliction and purification would arise in the same continuum simultaneously	Second characteristic of the logical reason (C2): L entails K	((c) T does not follow)	

2.2 Regarding the rejoinders against the two intermediate faults (ii'), (iii')

Fault (ii')/(iii') against position B				Rejoinder against (ii')/(iii')	Rejection of the rejoinder against (ii')/(iii')
Subject	S	(the two truths)	First characteristic of the logical reason (C1): L occurs for S	(a) For supporters of B, K=T is accepted	(a) K=T is not accepted. It is eliminated by the reasoning that establishes the opposite (but not by the Scripture that states the opposite)
Logical reason	L	having distinct natures		(b) For detractors of B, C1 is not established and not accepted	
Entailed property in (ii')	K=T	the ultimate could not be the true nature of the conventional	Second characteristic of the logical reason (C2): L entails K		
Entailed property in (iii')	K=T	the selflessness or mere non-establishment of the conventional is not the ultimate			

[[[If one thinks:]]] One does not accept the middle two consequences (ii', iii'), does one? [[[In this regard, there are two points: refuting others' position and presenting the answer according to our own position.]]]

2.2.1 (Jo btsun's) Refuting others' position[45]
Suppose one [[[Jo btsun]]] would conceive of the following:
If one says that it is not the case (that one accepts the consequences), as this is eliminated by scripture [[[because it is established by scripture that the ultimate is the true nature of the conventional and the mere selflessness of the conventional is the ultimate (=nonK/nonT).]]], (one [i.e., Jo btsun] replies:) [[[We do not accept that one's own scripture establishes one's own scripture.]]] How can you say that the [[[posited]]] consequence (from a logical reason) that is contradictory with scripture is [[[eliminated]]] by scripture? [[[Scripture is not accepted (to have this power); if scripture is accepted (to have this power)]]] It would have sufficed to say [[[in the first place]]], "[[[It is said (in the scripture) that]]] those two [[[i.e., the two truths]]] do not have different natures."
Why should one depend on the action of scripture that eliminates something (to be) accepted that follows indirectly (from the premises in an argument by consequence)?[46] [[[Once one has stated, based on scripture, that what is explained to be the subject and its nature, etc., is not like that[47], then what is the use of putting forth an elimination by scripture of what is accepted (following the premise)?]]]
If it [[[the preceding]]] is not the case [[[if nothing is achieved by stating, through scripture, that it is not the case that the natures (of the two truths) are distinct]]], then scripture would not be suitable as a means to eliminate a thesis [[[i.e., as what is presented as eliminating what is accepted (following the premise)]]][48] either.

2.2.2 Presenting the answer according to our own position
That the ultimate is the real nature of the conventional (notT=notK) must be accepted [[[through just reasoning]]] without depending on scripture. Otherwise, [[[because]]][49] it is unsuitable for that very conventional that is different from the ultimate [[[in your assertion]]] not to have some natural state of being just as it is,

---

[45] We understand here that the "others' position" that is being refuted is that the conclusion of the consequence can be refuted through Scripture, and that the arguments against this position were put forward by Jo btsun. In spite of the problematic "*rtog na*" at the end of this section (which we translate: "suppose one would conceive"), rGya dmar ba does not reject these arguments.
[46] Or: "Why would the elimination of (what the opponent) accepts, which follows indirectly, depend on the action of scripture?"
[47] We understand this to paraphrase the previous sentence, namely, that the first premise is said not to obtain based on scripture (*chos can* and *chos nyid* would be referring to the subject and to the logical reason).
[48] The author of the annotations understand *dam bca'* in the sense of the conclusion of the consequence. But *dam bca' ba'i sel byed du* could also refer to scripture being a means to invalidate a thesis in inference for others, following Dignāga's definition of a thesis.
[49] Without the additional "because" (which appears in the gloss) it is difficult to construe the sentence in Tibetan

i.e., as the object of analysis by final reasoning, this [[[natural state]]] precisely, which is the true nature of that [[[[conventional]]]], is the ultimate itself. Therefore, the [[[object]]] separate [[[from the conventional]]] asserted [[[by you]]] to be the ultimate, isn't the natural state of anything, nor the partner of anything, (it is not) the ultimate that is [[[asserted to be]]] the true nature of all phenomena, and is not what is decided upon in the context of analyzing whether the conventional is identical (to) or distinct (from the ultimate) and [[[therefore]]] there is no affirmation or negation [[[of identity or distinction]]] with regard to this [[[i.e. your ultimate]]] that is like something freely imagined.

Therefore, the [[[two]]] consequences apply to (your) combination of incompatible items: when asserting, (i) for the conventional, which is the object of mistaken awareness, that its true nature—[[[the natural state of]]] being just the way that it is, i.e., as the object of analysis [[[by reasoning]]]—is the very ultimate, [[[this has been analyzed above (?)]]] saying that (ii) these two [[[that is, the two truths as you have asserted]]] have distinct natures.

Due to just that [[[the presentation of consequences to one who accepts that (the ultimate) is the true nature of the very conventional and that the two (truths) are distinct (natures)]]], when anyone [[[i.e., any supporter of a philosophical system]]] presents the two truths in terms of being either [[[false, objects]]] of mistaken awareness or [[[true,]]] objects of non-mistaken awareness, the [[[two intermediate]]] consequences apply (to the two incompatible assertions): (i) insofar as, (for) the object of mistaken (awareness)[[[e.g., (an awareness) apprehending mother-of-pearl to be silver]]], the emptiness of truth as such [[[of being silver in the case of mother-of-pearl]]] is the perfected (character) devoid of the imputational (character), this is generally asserted [[[by the opponent herself]]] without depending on Scripture, and yet (ii) the assertion that these [[[the imputational and the perfected (characters)]]] are asserted to be distinct.

Thus, [[[insofar as the elimination of the conclusion (thal ba) does not depend on scripture (in our opinion)]]] (I) think there is no fault [[[that it is not reasonable for scripture to eliminate consequences (thal 'gyur)]]][50].

3. Refuting the view of a distinction of properties for one nature (C)

If [proponents of view C] say:
[[[From the perspective of the exclusion property of being the support of afflictions, on the basis of which impurity increases, it is conventional; from the perspective of the exclusion property of being the support of mental purification, on the basis of which it is a basis for the extinction of all obscurations of the embodied, it is ultimate. Therefore,]]][51] Is it not the case that it (the division between the Two Truths) is a distinction of properties for the same nature, like produced and impermanent? This is explained clearly in the *Commentary to the Eight-Thousand (Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra)*. Also, it is explained in the *Ornament of the*

Middle Way that when one sees the conventional, the ultimate appears but is not ascertained. Similarly, in the *Lamp of the Middle Way*, the meaning of the sūtra passage, "Not seeing anything at all," is explained to be a term-bound negation (i.e., in the sense of "Seeing nothing at all"). In that way, it is clear that these (texts/authors) assert that illusion is the ultimate, and so this is [[[must be]]] accepted.

We answer: No, because this [[[the acceptance that illusion is the ultimate]]] is invalidated by scripture and reasoning.

1. Refutation by scripture (that illusion is ultimate)

- The *Diamond-Cutter Sūtra* states, "Any phenomenon for a manifestly, completely Awakened One is neither true nor false." [[[This states that illusion is not the ultimate.]]]
- The *Spell for Entering into the Non-Conceptual* states, "Non-conceptual wisdom [[[of meditative equipoise]]] knows all phenomena to be like the center of the sky; [[[If illusion existed ultimately, it would be correct that it is known by the wisdom of meditative equipoise; but this is not the case.]]] subsequently attained wisdom knows all phenomena to be like illusions."
- Innumerable (scriptures) teach by way of the example (of space exclusively), such as the (*Eight-Thousand Stanza*) *Perfection of Wisdom:* "Sentient beings use the words 'Seeing space.' Consider the meaning of 'like seeing space'."[52] [[[When calling not seeing at all "seeing", if (the ultimate that is seen were) like an illusion, why (does the sūtra say) this cannot be considered through another example?]]]
- (The *Teachings of Akṣayamati Sūtra* states), "There is not even movement of mind pertaining to the ultimate; how much less could it expressed in syllables?"[53]

---

[52] Alternative translations of this passage are for instance:
- Conze 1973: 32: "A vision of space is a being, so they declare. A vision like that of space, so should you consider that object! Thus has the vision of Dharma been expounded by the Tathagata. But it is not possible to report on that vision by definite statements [that differ from it]."
- Hopkins 2008: 131:
  "Analyze how space is seen as in the expression
  By sentient beings in words, "Space is seen."
  The One-Gone-Thus teaches that seeing the *dharma* is also like that.
  The seeing cannot be expressed by another example."
- Apple 2016: 709: "Sentient beings call that "seeing space." Through examining this meaning of how to see space, in this manner, the Tathāgata indicates seeing dharma as [8a] well. [This type of] seeing is not relatable through another example"

[53] Eckel (1987: 74, 121) translates: "Ultimate truth cannot even be known, let alone conveyed in syllables."

- [[[Mañjuśrī's Questions to the Conqueror's Children about the mode of existence of the ultimate (states),]]] "Conqueror's children, since it is known to be devoid of stain, it is just said to be pure."[54]

These are to be elucidated in that way.

2. Refutation by reasoning (that illusion is ultimate)

It [[[the assertion that illusion is ultimate]]] is also invalidated by logic because there is nothing that proves it and there is (an argument) that invalidates it.

2.1 There is nothing that proves (that illusion is ultimate)

[[[Of the two (potential) means of proof, there is no perception (that proves that illusion is ultimate); it would have to be an inference through (the reason) 'neither one nor many.']]]

(a)
In the case of the verbally-bound negation of 'one or many' [[[in the sense of not being established because of being non-existent]]] [[[if you assert that to be the logical reason]]], (the reason) would be inconclusive because of rabbit's horns, and so forth. [[[This is because even though the logical reason is actually found in (those), these are not established (?) to be existent as illusions.]]][55]

(b)
In the case of a term-bound negation, namely if one asserts (as a logical reason) "because of appearing while not existing as one or many," then (the reason) is deviant with regard to illusion-as-ultimate. [[[Inferring a specific from the general is deviant, like inferring śiṃśapa from tree-without-specification.]]] [[[This is because correct conventional and so forth, which also do not exist as one or many, appear.]]][56]

(c)
In the case of a characterized [[[logical reason,]]] namely, if one asserts "because of appearing while being neither one nor many and being the object of reasoning," [[[Since 'being the object of reasoning is not found for correct conventionals, there is no inconclusiveness, however]]] the characterized [[[reason]]] is not established due to the nature of the reason [[[devoid of one or many]]] and the characterization [[[appearing and being the object of reasoning]]] being incompatible because objects of reasoning [[[which others positively assert]]] do not go beyond being one or many [[[these are not established to be neither one nor many]]]. [57]

---

[54] Or: Since the conqueror's children are known to be devoid of stains, they are said to be pure. But the gloss suggests that the « conqueror's children » are the persons spoken to in the sūtra.
[55] In the *bDen gnyis ti ka*, rGya dmar ba gives the argument in the form: "it would be inconclusive, because it is present in rabbit's horns, etc., which do not exist as illusions."
[56] "Appearing" is equated here to "illusion" in general, whereas the property to be proven is illusion-as-ultimate, i.e., a specific instance of illusion.
[57] Presumably "reasoning" refers here to reasoning consciousness, whose object is the ultimate. Therefore such a reason would not characterize correct conventionals.

If this were not the case [[[that this (reason, neither one nor many) is not a means of proof]]], [[[namely, if one does not concede (?) this difficult point as a refutation]]] Dignāga's proof of ultimate non-duality [[[as experienced]]] on account of there being an invalidation of duality [[[of subject and object]]] [[[as the Idealist accepts]]] and clear experience [[[as being devoid of the duality of subject and object]]] would become a correct reason [[[that is not invalidated]]] and so Idealism could not be refuted.[58]

Given that the explanation in the *[Madhyamaka-]āloka* refutes (Dignāga's argument), stating, "the experience as true of a nature for which there is the invalidation of duality [[[of subject and object]]] is not established and a proof of the specific [[[instance of experience]]] --ultimate [[[experience]]]-- from the general – experience-without-specification -- is inconclusive," it is also to be stated here (with regard to the putative logical reason for proving that illusion is ultimate).[[[(As said above in (b) and (c):) "This is because if one posits (as the logical reason) appearing-without-specification while not existing as one or many, (the reason) is inconclusive due to the correct conventional and if one posits a characterized (logical reason), appearing and being established by reasoning, (the reason) is not established because the nature of the logical reason and the characterization are incompatible."]]]

Similarly, by this analysis, the refutation of the four alternatives of arising, etc.,[[[The verbally bound negation, devoid of production from the four alternatives, is inconclusive because of the donkey's horns; (the term-bound negation) appearing-without-specification while being devoid of production from the four alternatives, (in which) something specific is deduced from the general, is inconclusive because of correct conventional; the characterized (reason is not established) because the nature (of the reason) and the characterization are incompatible. This also applies to other cases.]]] are not suitable logical reasons (to prove ultimate illusion), and so there is no means of proof.

2.2 There is something that refutes (that illusion is ultimate)
There is something that refutes:

[a]
The meaning of illusion is the collection of being empty of truth and being a dependent arising; from that perspective [[[of being empty of truth and being a dependent arising]]], correct conventional also is (illusion), and so these [[[the two, ultimate illusion and correct conventional]]] would be indistinguishable.

---

[58] A parallel is being drawn between the logical reasons considered in (b) and (c) above and the two arguments of Dignāga. If the aforementioned reasons were acceptable, in a parallel way, Dignāga's arguments would be bullet-proof. But, as shown in the next paragraph, they are actually refuted in the *Āloka* (probably Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*).

Objection: We accept that there is no distinction pertaining to the nature. But as for the defining characteristic, there is a distinction [[[of defining characteristic]]]: when something is seen, it is a support devoid of desires because defilements are extinguished for all the embodied – this is what it is to be ultimate; the opposite is (the defining characteristic) of conventional.

Answer: The ground for positing illusion, based on the concept of a collection of two properties [[[void of truth and being a dependent arising]]] is also the [[[very same]]] ground for (positing something as) correct conventional. Thus, it is not correct (for something) [[[a single concept]]] to be the support of purification [[[from the perspective of ultimate illusion]]] and the very opposite [[[(from the perspective of the) conventional, to be the support of affliction]]], [[[because there is no distinction of concept; for instance:]]] just like based on the (same) concept of being momentary, the state of depression and the state of desire are incompatible.

[b]
[[[The analysis of the negandum also is similar:]]] Furthermore, if illusion is established by reasoning, one must investigate whether it is established as one or established as many and whether it is produced from self or produced from other.

Opponent: The investigation [[[in terms of being one or many]]] does not apply to illusion.

Answer: If it does not bear investigation [[[while it can be illusion]]], (illusion) being something ultimate that is established [[[positively]]] by reasoning is undermined.

[c]
Moreover, [[[the one who accepts in this way (that illusion is the ultimate) is surpassed in view even by the Substantialist Idealists]]], it is said (in the *Thirty Stanzas on Consciousness*):

> [[[The Idealist,]]] Having in thought "These two are 'mind only'"
> If one places anything at all [[[the support of a positive determination]]]
> before oneself through contemplation,
> It [[[the entity that is placed before oneself]]] does not abide in this mere
> (Consciousness).[59]

---

[59] We translate on the basis of the Tibetan and in line with the interpretation of rGya dmar ba according to the interlinear note that follows, namely, that the "non-abiding" of the support of meditation means that it is a simple negation. The canonical version reads "through apprehension" rather than "through meditation".
Kellner and Taber (2014: 747) translate the broader passage: "As long as cognition does not abide in mere-cognition the burden of the duality of apprehension does not cease. For even through the apprehension, '[All] this is mere cognition', one does not abide in that [cognition] alone, because one [still] places something before oneself. If, on the other hand, cognition does not apprehend an object-support, then it stands firm in being mere cognition because, due to the absence of that

[[[rGya said: Some people hold that the two – the perfected and the dependent – are one nature. This also is not correct. Even the Idealists assert that the support of meditation is a simple negation. And the Mādhyamikas also assert that. And so, if it were to be identical with an implicative negation (or, negation with a positive remainder), it would be a mistaken cognition, and therefore would not be suitable as the path.]]]

And (saying, in the *Thirty stanzas on consciousness*)

> The established [[[i.e., perfected]]] (Nature) is the complete absence of the preceding one [[[the imagined (cf. v. 20)]]] in that [[[i.e., the dependent]]].[60] (It) [[[this perfected nature (is)]]] is not different [[[and is]]] not non-different [[[from the dependent]]]; it is said to be like impermanence, etc.

Vasubandhu explained the perfected to be inexpressible as the same as or different from the dependent through the example of impermanence consisting in non-existence after destruction being inexpressible as the same as or different from entity.

And Asaṅga said (in the *Collection of the Great Vehicle*),
> If the [[[external]]] object were established as the object [[[positively, as the object that is the support of meditation]]]
> There would be no non-conceptual cognition [[[because it would be conceptual, there would be no non-conceptual wisdom]]]
> In the absence of that, it is not possible to attain Buddhahood.

In that way, even the Substantialist Idealists assert that the support of meditation, the perfected, is a simple negation and so meditating on non-duality is meditation on emptiness. This being the case, meditating on illusion as the support of positive determination [[[I.e., in the case of Jo btsun positing illusion as established by reason]]] is the perfection of the fruition of a weary intellect.

2.3 [Contestation – Jo btsun's claim]
[[[According to Jo btsun, insofar as one asserts the subject to be appearing, because one understands the collection, in terms of the 'elimination of non-relation' (Skt. *ayogavyavaccheda*) between the property 'absence of nature' and the property-bearer, it is not possible to refute the logical reason consisting in the simple negation of one or many.]]]

[object] which is grasped, there is [also] no grasping of that [cognition which would grasp the object]."

[60] We translate on the basis of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan canonical version. The Tibetan version in the *dBu ma de kho na nyid*, which reads *dag* instead of *gang*, is problematic.

Having this (i.e., the preceding refutation) in mind, since we assert as a logical reason the simple negation of one or many, the other faults [[[when set forth above]]] do not apply.[61]

And since illusion is the probandum consisting in a universal that is a collection [[[of being a dependent arising and empty of truth]]], what would be the need to explain the pervasion [[[of the reason]]] by that [[[collection]]].

And since the rabbit's horn is endowed with the property to be proven [[[i.e., absence of nature]]], it is a similar instance. Yet, we do not assert positive concomitance in an example that (must) be a universal that is a collection.[62]

Thus, the teacher Dignāga said (in the *Compendium of valid cognition*, 2.11):
> The logical reason that is [[[a property that is]]] non-deviant from the property [[[to be proven]]] has to be shown elsewhere [[[in an example]]].
> When it [[[the logical reason]]] is established in that [[[property possessor]]], (the) property-possessor is made known to be endowed with that (property to be proven).[63]

[[[this property possessor (is made known to be endowed with the property) to be proven]]]
[[[the collection of (the property-possessor) and the [property] to be proven (is made known)]]][64]

[[[Given concomitance with an example that [has] the property to be proven]]] If this wasn't the case, [[[the logical reason]]] 'smoke' would also be inconclusive (with regard to proving fire) because it is found in the kitchen which lacks a fiery mountain.

The answer (to that absurd consequence), that it (i.e. 'smoke') is actually a similar instance [[[and thus there is no inconclusiveness]]], etc., is the same [[[in all cases]]]. [[[(Namely): "The rabbit's horn as well is endowed with the property 'absence of nature', hence it is a similar instance, hence there is no inconclusiveness]]]

---

[61] That is, the faults mentioned for options [b] and [c] in 2.1 above

[62] In 2.1 (a), the objection against the reason as *med dgag* was that it would be inconclusive because the reason as a simple negation is found in rabbit's horns, which are not illusions.

[63] Translated on the basis of the Tibetan. The Sanskrit reads, rather "the non-deviance of the logical reason with regard to the property has to be shown elsewhere."
Hayes (1980: 256) translates: "It is the invariable relation of the indicator with the (inferred) property that is pointed out elsewhere. When it is established there, it will make the property-locus known to be endowed with that property."
Hayes (1988: 243) translates: "But it is the sign's inerrant occurrence with the property that is pointed out elsewhere. When known there it will make the property-bearer known to be endowed with the property."

[64] The two glosses offer redundant explanation of the sentence, but cannot be read together.

Thus, [[[what Jo btsun teaches is:]]] it is extremely difficult to refute illusion itself, which has to be accepted, insofar as the collection consisting in the 'elimination of non-connection'⁶⁵ with 'absence of nature' appears in inference.

Objection: Then, this [[[simple negation of one or many]]] is a correct logical reason to prove that [[[, yes?]]].
[[[Since Jo btsun is himself mistaken, (here is) the refutation of this.]]]
Answer: Taking as the probandum the collection consisting in the 'elimination of non-connection or of non-collection' [[[as Jo btsun does]]], what is this so-called "non-connection" that is what is to be eliminated [[[, which is a negandum]]]? Is it [[[is this negandum]]] the [[[mere]]] verbally-bound negation of 'connection' or [[[is the negandum]]] a term-bound negation?⁶⁶

(a) In the former case,
    (i) Since the negation of a negation [[[i.e., of the verbally-bound negation of connection]]] is an affirmation [[[of connection]]], it isn't suitable that it (the verbally-bound negation of one and many) is a negating logical reason.
    [[[If one thought that it is an affirming logical reason,]]]
    (ii) And it is not suitable that what [[[the logical reason consisting in a verbally-bound negation]]] is taught as entailing a property [[[to be proven]]] that is a verbally-bound negation [[[since you say that the non-collection or non-connection of the subject and 'non-existence of nature' is negated]]] is an affirming logical reason.⁶⁷
    (iii) And there is no other (sort of) logical reason [[[apart from affirming and negating]]].

Objection: [[[If one asserts that (the reason) is a negating reason,]]] [[[There are two forms of negation, verbally-bound and term-bound; from those two, this is the second.]]] It is a logical reason that negates in that it applies as a term-bound negation.
Answer:
(No,) Because, by saying (in the *Commentary on valid cognition*)
        This is because by this one [[[i.e., non-perception]]], a negation is established
        for an entity without a real part being included (/accepted)
        (And) the previous probans [[[i.e. essential property and effect]]] affirm a
        term-bound negation.

---

⁶⁵ The "elimination of non-connection" (*ayogavyavaccheda*) is one of the three kinds of affirmation distinguished in Indian philosophy, the other two being the "exclusion of connection with that which is other than the qualificand" (*anyayogavyavaccheda*) and "exclusion of absolute non-connection" (*atyantāyogavyavaccheda*). See Kajiyama 1973.
⁶⁶ We would read: 'brel pa myed par dgag [[[tsam]]] ŋam [[[dgag bya]]] ma yin par dgag pa zhig.
⁶⁷ This might point out to the sādhyadharma 'non-existence of nature' being a verbally-bound negation, or to the phenomenon that is the sādhya being a verbally-bound negation, because of the way the sādhya is conceived of.

a term-bound negation is explained (by Dharmakīrti) to be affirmed (not negated) (by the logical reason consisting in essential property or effect), and because it is logically correct (that it should be so).

And since this [[[a term-bound negation]]] and the logical reason [[[neither one nor many]]] are not established to be connected, the former [[[the probandum that is a term-bound negation]]] cannot be inferred (from the latter) [[[from the logical reason 'neither one nor many']]]. And if it were inferred although not connection is established, there would be absurd consequences [[[it would follow that 'pot' would be inferred from 'blanket']]].

(b)
Objection: [[[According to dGe bshes pa, when speaking of "elimination of non-connection"]]] What is to be eliminated (i.e., non-connection) is a term-bound negation because what is to be eliminated is the appearing subject existing as an ultimate entity.

Answer: [[[We also accept that.]]] However, when we speak of "the negation of non-collection or non-connection [[[of the appearing subject and existing as an ultimate entity]]]," it is not the case that a collection, in which non-connection is negated, is established. Since that [[[the probandum which would be the negation of non-connection]]] is a verbally-bound negation, it is not the illusion that is the same nature as dependent arising. [[[Thus, it is actually not the probandum, in which illusion is the property to be proven.]]]

These points will be explained when identifying the five elements (of the inference establishing the definition of conventional truth).[68]

2.4 (Gangs pa's teaching of four faults)

Moreover, this [[[reason-established illusion]]] has four faults:

    i. It (illusion) is not suitable as the probandum because the characteristic of the negandum applies (to it)
    ii. Absurdity would follow
    iii. Coming together of contradictories
    iv. It is similar to the analysis of 'genuine'

i. It (illusion) is not suitable as the probandum because the characteristic of the negandum applies (to it)

What is the characteristic of the negandum for the Madhyamaka?[69]

---

[68] In chapter VI, 1.2.1.

[69] The characteristic of the negandum is:
(a) Established by reasoning
  (1) Veridical = established by reasoning
  (2) Veridical = established by reasoning to be veridical ($\neq$ Established by reasoning)
  (3) Veridical = resisting analysis
  (4) Veridical = genuine
   (4.1) Genuine = capable of causal efficacy

(a)
If one holds that it is the intentional object [[[the entity]]] accepted to have a nature that resists analysis and investigation [[[by reasoning]]],[70] the ultimate itself,[71] we answer that it [[[the characteristic of the negandum]]] amounts to the following: the intentional object which is analyzed by final reasoning, which is established by reasoning and not invalidated, called "ultimate entity". Therefore, if illusion also was the object analyzed by final reasoning [[[i.e., established by reasoning (as you claim)]]], it [[[illusion]]] would be the negandum.

Opponent's answer: What is [[[an entity established by reasoning to be]]] *veridical* is the negandum. But illusion is [[[established by reasoning to be]]] falsidical, therefore it is not that [[[i.e., the negandum]]].

Retort: What is the meaning of "veridical"? [[[Since one does not find another (meaning) than 'established by reasoning']]]
Opponent's answer (1): (The meaning of "veridical" is:) Established by reasoning and not invalidated.
Retort: Illusion [[[that you assert]]] also would be the negandum [[[because it is established by reasoning and not invalidated]]].

Opponent's answer (2): [[[Having thought that 'established by reasoning' and 'veridical' are different,]]] What is established by reasoning *to be veridical* is the negandum. But [[[illusion is established by reasoning to be falsidical, hence]]] what is established by reasoning – without specification – is not [[[the negandum]]]. Therefore, there is no fault [[[that it follows that (illusion) is the negandum]]].

Retort: On account of what division between 'established by reasoning' and 'veridical' [[[indeed, the two are synonyms]]] do you characterize ('established by reasoning') with 'veridical' (i.e., saying 'established by reasoning *to be veridical*')? [[[This means that a distinction between these two is not found.]]]

Opponent's answer (3): 'Veridical' means resisting analysis.

Retort: If the meaning of 'resisting analysis' depends on an analyzing awareness [[[one accepts that it resists analysis by some awareness]]][72], is the analyzing

---

(4.2) Genuine = ultimately causally efficient
(5) Veridical = Found to be one or many when analyzing
(b) Basis for eliminating afflictions
[70] The term "brtags" is also linked on f. 16b with the characterization of the negandum as "imputed". But because of the place of "rigs pas", the understanding "imputed by reasoning" is unlikely, and the current translation seems correct. In support, cf. 4a1, on the discussion about investigating whether illusion is produced by itself or other.
[71] This seems to correspond to the position ascribed to Gangs pa in 16b5: *dgag bya ni rigs pas dpyad du snyed pa'i rang bzhin du khas blangs pa'i zhen yul dngos po nyid de*
[72] The meaning of "su" in the interlinear note is unclear.

[[[awareness]]] final reasoning or something other than that [[[a conventional awareness]]]?
  - In the former case, illusion is established as the negandum [[[because it would resist analysis by final reasoning]]].
  - In the latter case [[[if it is analyzed by a conventional awareness]]], even if one applies the term 'veridical' [[[to the object of conventional awareness]]], it is not the negandum [[[consisting in something genuine]]].

Opponent's answer (4): Veridical means genuine.
Retort: [[[When thinking 'What is the meaning of genuine?']]] Even if you call it by a different name, we consider the characteristic of the meaning. [[[Therefore, the fault remains.]]]
[[[So, if one asks 'what is called genuine?']]]
Opponent's answer (4.1): It is what is analyzed (in the verse of the *Ascertainment of valid cognition* saying:)

> What is capable of causal efficacy, this is here what is ultimately existent.

[[[This is the negandum.]]]
Retort: Is it [[[i.e., this causal efficacy]]] causal efficacy found as an object of reasoning or is it causal efficacy without specification? [[[In the first case,]]] illusion would also be that [[[i.e., a negandum]]] [[[because it has causal efficacy found as an object of reasoning]]] or [[[in terms of causal efficacy without specification]]] (something causally efficient) would not be suitable as a negandum [[[like an entity from the point of view of appearance]]].
[[[Furthermore,]]] if you accept something [[[anything at all (?)[73]]]] that has a nature empty of causal efficacy to be 'veridical', [[[this is also what is asserted by Geshespa]]] it is also the case that it is not the negandum.

Opponent's answer (4.2): [[[Illusion is not ultimately causally efficient. But the negandum, 'what is genuine']]][[[is characterized by that (i.e., 'ultimate')]]] It (i.e., 'what is genuine') is *ultimately* causally efficient.
Retort: If 'ultimate' [[[the property that characterizes causal efficacy]]] is different from 'established by reasoning', you must state the [[[respective]]] definition of that [[[of those two, established by reasoning and ultimate]]].

Opponent's answer (5): [[[The distinction is the following:]]] 'Veridical' [[[is]]] what is found to be one or many when analyzing; 'illusion' [[[is established by reasoning; however, when analyzing whether it is one or many]]] is not established by reasoning *to be these.* [[[It is established by reasoning, however, it is not established by reasoning *to be veridical*]]] And so [[[therefore]]] there is a difference [[[a distinction]]] between 'veridical' and 'established by reasoning.'

---

[73] The meaning of the note "ji zhig cig du" is unclear.

Retort: In general, 'object [[[positively]]] established by reasoning' entails (establishment as) 'one or many' [[[therefore it is also 'found to be one or many when analyzing']]]. [[[However,]]] If 'found to resist analysis by reasoning' is not suitable as the characteristic of [[[i.e., to posit as]]] 'veridical', then, one can also not define it [[[i.e., 'veridical']]] by '[[[found when analyzing]]] being characterized as one or many' (i.e., by 'found *to be one or many* when analyzing'). The same arguments [[[as when saying 'found to resist analysis by reasoning' is not sufficient to be 'veridical']]] apply.

[[[Although one applies many names, such as 'veridical', 'genuine', 'causally efficient as an object of reasoning', etc., the meaning is not different from 'established by reasoning'.]]]

[[[If one searches for a difference between 'veridical' and 'established by reasoning', there are faults.]]] Therefore, 'established by reasoning' itself, [[[is]]] the meaning of veridical, [[[but]]] is not established apart from the negandum.

(b)
Opponent's suggestion: As for (illusion being) the negandum, we call 'the ultimate' that which is the intentional object accepted to be the object of pure wisdom, the basis for extinguishing afflictions when it is seen.[74] Hence, illusion is not such (and so is not an ultimate entity) [[[therefore there is a distinction]]].

Retort: [[[No.]]] Any object [[[(such as) illusion]]] that is attested by correct reasoning becomes an antidote for error when correctly meditated upon and so is the very basis for the extinction of afflictions and is also the very object of pure wisdom, which is made manifest (through) the cultivation of just that. Therefore, since illusion would be (for you) an object that is attested by reasoning, its having the characteristic of the negandum is established.

ii. Absurdity would follow
For the very same reason, absurdity would follow.

(Consider the following inference proving that illusion is veridical:)

"What is 'established by reasoning' is 'veridical,' for example, like something established as veridical by reasoning [[[like you yourself assert, to be (established by) reasoning *to be veridical*]]], or like something established conventionally by conventional reasoning, (for instance) that blue is veridical [[[conventionally, blue is veridical]]].

---

[74] KV: The opponent here is trying to distinguish illusion from the ultimate. It's not that the ultimate is the *dgag bya*, ultimate entity is the *dgag bya*. And the opponent wants to say that illusion is neither. Alternatively: The negandum called 'the ultimate' is the intentional object accepted to be the object of pure wisdom when something is contemplated, namely the basis for the extinction of afflictions.

Illusion is established by final reasoning, therefore… [[[it is veridical]]]"

[[[Others say:]]]

('Established by reasoning') is a fallacious logical reason (to establish that illusion is veridical):

i.   'Establishment by reasoning' without specification is [[[an]]] inconclusive [[[reason, thinking that it would amount to inferring a specific from the general.]]]

ii. 'Established [[[by reasoning]]] to be falsidical' is contradictory [[[(because) being falsidical and establishment by reasoning are contradictory]]][75]

iii. 'Established [[[by reasoning]]] to be veridical' is not established.

And so you must state the difference [[[the distinction]]] between 'veridical' and 'established by reasoning.' Just like (stating the difference between 'existent' and 'impermanent'), teaching [[[to one who asserts that gods' or demons' pots exist but are permanent,]]] that, one does not say

      (≅ ii) "Because it exists as permanent, it is impermanent" [[[which is contradictory]]]

  nor

      (≅iii) "Because it exists as impermanent, it is impermanent" [[[(because these) cannot be logical reason and what has the logical reason (I.e., the property to be proven)]]]

  Rather, one points out:

      (≅i) "That which is asserted to be [[[existent as]]] permanent [[[this flesh-eater's pot]]], because it exists – without specification - …[[[it follows that it is impermanent]]]

[[[(I.e., you should state:) We do not posit 'established to be falsidical' or 'established to be veridical' as logical reason, but we posit 'established by reasoning without specification':]]]

Thus (if no specification is involved), 'established by reasoning' does not go beyond 'veridical', so (these two) cannot be logical reason and what has the logical reason (i.e., property to be proven) [[[namely, positing (as logical reason) for 'veridical' 'because it is established by reasoning' would amount to saying 'it is veridical because it is veridical']]].

[[[But this is not the case for the definiens of 'veridical.']]] Hence, here, from the definiens '[[[due to being]]] established by reasoning', applying the definiendum, the convention 'veridical,' follows. The entailment has already been established.

---

[75] According to the note, the logical reason is here « contradictory » in itself, not in the sense that it would prove the opposite of what is to be proven.

[[[Some people understand as follows:]]]

Therefore, if it was the case that because (something) is established by reasoning *to be falsidical*, it is *veridical* (=option ii above) somebody could say [[[in a parallel argument]]]:
"because [[[sound]]] is established by reasoning *to be impermanent*, it is *permanent*."
To that, (using the same parallel) one would need to ask (if option i above is chosen, and the argument is made that [[[by positing as a logical reason the definiens, one can infer the convention of the definiendum]]]): Just like the definition of 'veridical' is 'attested when analyzed by reasoning' (without specification) [[[isn't it?]]] [76], the definition of 'permanent' would be 'established by valid cognition without specification,' no?
[[[If this is the case, one could (say) "Because this impermanent thing is established by valid cognition (without specification), it follows that it is permanent". But since this is not the case, it is not parallel[77].]]]
This is nonsense.

iii. Coming together of contradictories
(D1) If 'established by reasoning' [[[positively]]] were not contradictory with 'falsidical' [[[although it is contradictory, then one could make the parallel argument,]]]

> (D2) white would not be contradictory with black.

> (D2') Answer: If something is white, how can it be black?

(D1') Parallel answer: If something is falsidical, how can it be established by reasoning? This is the same!

(Retort:)

(D1) If one said [[[when one says]]], " 'Illusion' is contradictory with 'established by reasoning to be veridical', but why would it (i.e., illusion) be contradictory with 'established by reasoning to be falsidical'?"

> (D2) '*white*' is contradictory with '*non-white* black' but why would it (i.e. white), just by being white, be contradictory with black (without specification)?

---

[76] The "pas sam » at the beginning of the note is difficult to translate. It may be related to the interrogative particle at the end of the parallel statement.
[77] A possible interpretation of the expression « 'go mi 'gre » would be that the parallel does not hold in the case of illusion. Namely, the opponent would accept that one can conclude from 'illusion being attested when analyzed by reasoning' (without specification)' that 'illusion is veridical'.

(D2') Answer: It (i.e., white) is contradictory to black precisely in that it is white

(D1') Parallel answer: It (i.e., illusion) would be contradictory with 'falsidical' precisely in that it would be established by reasoning, because the definition of 'veridical' is not different from that [[[established by reasoning]]].

iv. It is parallel to the analysis of 'genuine'
[[[Jo btsun also says this; here are the details:]]] [[[There are two positions.]]]

(a)
(D1) What is the fault in accepting 'genuine, veridical entity' [[[as the negandum]]]? Having stated [[[the faults]]] "(does this veridical entity) [[[exist]]] upon production or [[[exist]]] without being produced" and so forth,

> (D2) one should analyze whether illusion, given that it is established by reasoning, is established by reasoning upon production or without production.

> (D2') If one says: Whether explained as produced or not produced, it (illusion) is falsidical due to its very lack of establishment.

(D1') (We retort, in parallel) It [[[the negadum, what is genuine]]] is genuine due to its very lack of establishment [[[as produced or not produced]]]

(D1) (Opponent's answer) If it is not established [[[as produced or not produced, and so forth]]], this impairs its being veridical, genuine.

> (D2) (In parallel) If [[[illusion also]]] is not established when analyzing, this impairs its being an object to be cognized by reasoning.

(b)
[[[Further, this is the second (view):]]]
[[[If some say: how would the investigation in terms of one or many apply to illusion asserted to be emptiness? (One answers:) If it is asserted to be emptiness, is it established as a simple negation or established as an implicative negation? In the first case, it is like the Non-Abiding (position). In the second case, given that it is asserted positively, it does not surpass the investigation in terms of one or many.]]]
(D1 Opponent) The analysis of produced or not produced does not apply to the illusion that is accepted to be falsidical.
(D2) This analysis would not apply to a genuine entity either.
(D2') A genuine (entity) does not surpass being produced or not produced, being one or many, and so forth.
(D1') This is the same for illusion accepted to be an object cognized by reasoning. In general, falsidical without specification has no basis for analyzing in terms of a veridical one or a veridical many and so forth; the analysis of entities does not apply

to such a non-entity. However, as for this very thing [[[falsidical illusion]]] asserted to be an object attested [[[positively]]] by reasoning, it is just the same in every way.

4. Our own position (=D)

Thus, it is not the case either that (the two truths) are distinct properties of a single nature. We assert as a convention that they are two due to the mere negation of identity; in reality, their being two makes no sense. For example, floaters [[[in an appearance that is a mistaken cognition]]] and the void of that [[[i.e., of true floaters]]] are not like that (distinct properties of a single nature) because they are not perceived simultaneously [[[because a non-mistaken cognition perceives the sky devoid of true floaters, but does not perceive floaters]]].
Further, this is because [[[something]]] being one essence [[[with something]]] entails (that they are) properties of entities (or real properties?), like product and impermanence; but here, there are not two properties of entities [[[that we could refer to as "appearance as floaters" and the "void of those"]]].
[[["Aren't they two natures?"]]] They are not distinct either because there are no independent floaters apart from the void [[[of true floaters]]].
Thus, one cannot speak of identity or alterity for emptiness with regard to floaters [[[(appearing) in mistaken cognition]]] or for appearance with regard to mere emptiness [[[of true floaters]]]. In the same way, in reality, [[[conventional]]] appearances apart from the void [[[of a true nature]]] are not established independently and so there is no alterity. Absence of proliferations is also not a conventional entity and so it is not something of the same nature as would be ascertained among two properties of entities. The meaning of the division (is that the two truths are two) in terms of the mere negation of identity; (they are) property-possessor and property without identity or alterity.
Since we analyze the meaning of the division in that way, we hold in common with Śāntideva and Jñānagarbha the system of Madhyamaka that takes sides regarding ultimate truth (i.e., the non-abiding position).[78]

---

[78] In a parallel passage in his *Byang chub ṭīka* (59b4–5), rGya dmar ba specifies that his position on the meaning of the division relies on the Non-abiding position–which he identifies as Śāntideva's view–whereas those holding the Illusion-like position subscribe to position (C) (*dngos po cig la chos kyi dbye ba*) (*dbye ba'i don 'di ni rab du mi gnas pa'i lugs la ltos ste rnam par bzhag pa'o // sgyu ma lta bu' ni byas pa dang mi rtag pa bzhin du bden pa gnyis dngos po cig la chos kyi dbye ba gnyis su 'dod mod kyi / slob dpon 'di 'i lugs ma yin pas snga ma ltar yin no //*).

III. The Meaning of the Terms

1. Explanation of the Meaning of the Terms

[Verse 3]

> **Truths are asserted to be two in dependence on the perspectives of erroneous and non-erroneous consciousnesses.**

Concealed

Concealed are consciousnesses that are erroneous in the sense of obscuring [[[reality and the arising of the path]]]; *saṃvṛti* is known to mean what obscures.[79] Since it is true in so far as it is true in that [[[erroneous]]] perspective, it is the true as object of the concealed. That itself is called "what is concealed" in so far as it is the referent of the erroneous concealer; it is not established in reality. It is said [by Nāgārjuna (in *Yuktiṣaṣṭika* 35)]]], "Since the Conquerors have declared that nirvāṇa alone is true, what wise person would not think, 'the rest are wrong.'"

Ultimate
[[[The meaning of the term, ultimate]]]

Since it is to be sought [[[by beings]]] as a goal, it is an object (*don*): a consciousness that is reasoning that sees correctly. Since just that [[[reasoning consciousness]]] is excellent and superior, it is also supreme (*dam pa*);[80] because it is a consciousness that realizes reality, having the nature of being non-delusive regarding the object, reality, it is not invalidated. Since it is true in that perspective [[[of a reasoning consciousness]]], it is true (*bden pa*); it is true as an object of the ultimate (*don dam pa*).

2. Refuting a particular part of the explanation (of others)

2.1. Setting forth the explanation of Gangs pa
[[[Setting forth the explanation]]]

The following is said [[[by Gangs pa]]]:

> Regarding this, there is the mere invalidation of existence [[[, the negandum]]]. The mere non-establishment of existence is taken conventionally to be true from that perspective [[[of a reasoning consciousness]]]; however, there is nothing whatsoever

---

[79] rGya dmar pa here offers an explanation of the Tibetan term, *kun rdzob,* with reference to the Sanskrit term, *saṃvṛti,* meaning "what obscures." See *Satyadvayāvatāra* 15ab.

[80] The author explains here the term *don dam pa* ("ultimate") as the conjunction of *don* and *dam pa*. On various explanations of paramārtha in the Madhyamaka tradition see Nagashima 2004. Cf. for instance SDVV ad 4ab: tshul gsum pa'i rtags kyis bskyed pa'i rtogs pa gang yin pa de ni dam pa yang yin la / don yang yin pas don dam pa'o //. See also PsP (494,1): paramaś cāsāv arthaś ceti paramārthaḥ /.

that is attested [[[that is, established]]] [[[in the sense of a positive determination]]] as true as an actual object [[[of a reasoning consciousness]]].[81]

Objection: If there is nothing attested as an object, how could reasoning conventionally take anything to be true as an object?

Answer: The invalidation of existence by reasoning, the negation of existence by reasoning, and mere non-establishment are merely just taken conventionally as the object of that [[[reasoning consciousness]]]. In so far as there is nothing attested [[[in the sense of a positive determination]]] as an object, the Conqueror's sons remain silent.

In so far as reasoning merely completes the invalidation of existence, these meanings of the terms conveying "true as the object of ultimate reasoning" merely characterize the etymological explanation; they are not the definition. [[[If they were]]] What is conventional for omniscience [[[which has the nature of gnosis]]] does not entail obscuration [[[which is the meaning of the term, conventional]]]. As for reasoning consciousness also, it amounts to explaining the meaning of the term from the perspective of being a goal to be sought and being superior [[[if being true in that perspective was asserted to be the definition, ultimate truth would not be possible: since it is free of all extremes of existence, non-existence and so forth, ???; if it were possible, it would become the extreme of non-existence.]]]; since in reality it has the nature of being concealed, it is not ultimate.

2.2. The negation of that (i.e., Gangs pa's explanation)

With this in mind, we explain [[[regarding the refutation of a particular part of that explanation, namely, saying that there is nothing attested as the epistemic object of a reasoning consciousness, there are two items:]]]: There is actually something attested as the object of reasoning [[[our own position]]] and that there is not something attested is to be negated [[[this is our own position]]].[82]

2.2.1. There is actually something attested as the object of reasoning

This is explained by the following four points: the absence of nature is to be asserted as an epistemic object; it is not the case that realizing that (absence of nature) is not correct; there do not come to be proliferations through realizing; the fact that accords with conventions is attested.

2.2.1.1. The absence of nature is to be asserted as an epistemic object

While it might be the case that the invalidation of existence [[[, the negandum]]] is completed by reasoning and that this is the mere non-establishment of existence [[[we ourselves also accept this]]], while precisely that [[[that is, the absence of nature]]] is not the object of a valid cognition that affirms, why wouldn't it be the object of a valid cognition that negates? The very non-establishment of existence is the definition of non-existence. If one [[[namely, you]]] accepts that the completion of the invalidation of

---

[81] This is repeated in Chap. V, 12[1].i
[82] This is repeated in Chap. V, 12[1].ii

existence by reasoning is just the non-establishment of existence, then the definition of non-existence is indeed recognized [[[(there is recognition) as non-existence]]] by reasoning [[[that is, one realizes non-existence]]] [[[Therefore, non-existence is established as the epistemic object of valid cognition]]].

[[[Objection: If it were established as that, it would be the proliferation of non-existence.]]]
There is no [[[setting forth]]] "non-existence" attested in dependence upon existence. Since "dependence" means to be of benefit, is there anything positive [[[a positive non-existence]]] that benefits from existence? Or, would it be the case that [[[complete]]] (non-existence) is the repeated sublation of a passed existence? We do not assert a [[[non-existence that is a]]] companion elicited by its pair [[[for instance, "absence of nature"]]], and so forth, to be the meaning of non-existence; rather, the definition of that [[[namely, non-existence]]] is just the non-establishment of existence. That is attested [[[the definition of that (non-existence is attested) for emptiness]]] even though one does not experience an existent established from the beginning.
- If one accepts that [[[the absence of nature is a non-existence in the sense of the mere non-establishment of existence]]], then if one asserts [[[that there is realization (of that)]]] from reasoning, whereas it is incorrect [[[to realize that]]] from mere words, do you deny [[[saying "there is not (such a thing)"]]] while accepting [[[the absence of nature as an epistemic object]]]?
- If one does not accept the mere non-establishment of existence [[[which is the meaning of non-existence]]] due to its non-existence, then the negandum [[[ultimate nature]]] would become existent [[[because the negation of a negative is a positive]]].
Therefore, "the completion of the invalidation of existence by reasoning, which is the mere non-establishment of existence" is to be recognized as the meaning of non-existence.[83]

2.2.1.2. It is not the case that realizing that (non-existence) is not correct
Objection: There is just the invalidation [[[by reasoning]]] of existence [[[the negandum]]]; there is no realization of non-existence [[[through taking it as an epistemic object]]].

Answer: No one accepts the realization of non-existence in the sense of positively realizing. The mere elimination of the negandum is the definition of non-existence; when reasoning eliminates the negandum [[[(eliminating the negandum being) the definition of non-existence]]], reasoning indeed realizes that. If reasoning did not eliminate it, would it be eliminated by a mistaken cognition? How awful! [[[And further, when reasoning eliminates it, non-existence is established to be the epistemic object of a valid cognition.]]]

---

[83] Thus rGya dmar ba agrees here with the proponent of 2.1, but holds this not to be just a convention.

2.2.1.3. There do not come to be proliferations through realizing

Objection: There is merely invalidation toward existence, the negandum [[[by reasoning]]]. If it [[[that is, a reasoning consciousness]]] realizes as an object "non-establishment" or "mere elimination," then there would be the proliferation of non-existence.

Answer: That would be true if one asserted any positive determination as a referential object [[[of a reasoning consciousness]]]. Positive determination is the operation of establishment [[[of a valid cognition]]]. On the other hand, the operation of elimination is the mere elimination toward existence, the "non-establishment of existence." We do not assert [[[valid cognition that is]]] a negative realization other than [[[apart from]]] reasoning eliminating the negandum because there is no other definition [[[for a valid cognition that negates apart from the elimination of existence]]]. If there were proliferations on account of just this [[[on account of the mere elimination of the negandum by reasoning]]], then it would be the same [[[for you, Gangs pa,]]] also [[[that proliferations would ensue]]] in the case of the "mere invalidation of existence" because positive determination is not asserted differently. [[[For two things that have the same definition, it is not reasonable for a fault to apply to one but not the other.]]]

2.2.1.4. The fact that accords with conventions is attested

Objection [[[someone says]]]: If one calls the mere elimination of establishment [[[that is, existence]]] "realizing non-existence," then this has the same meaning as not negating (/the fact that accords is not a negation).

Answer: It is not a mere name because the fact of realization is attested. This is because the very non-establishment of existence in this way [[[that is, in the way things are]]] is attested to have the definition of non-existence; and, the superimposition of it not being attested in that way (as non-existence) is eliminated [[[also by reasoning]]]. The very elimination of the superimposition that is [[[apprehended to be]]] the opposite of something (*x*) is the definition of realizing that (*x*), just as [[[for example, in the context of affirmation,]]] the very elimination of the superimposition [[[as non-blue]]] that is the opposite of blue is the realization of blue. Therefore, valid cognition has the exclusion of what is other as its object. The elimination of the superimposition that is the opposite of, namely, what is other than, existence [[[just as yellow and so forth, (which is other than) blue]]] is the definition of realizing existence. The elimination of the superimposition [[[of existence, the negandum]]] as being other than non-existence is the definition of realizing non-existence. Just as when a valid cognition [[[that realizes fire from smoke]]] positively determines a probandum [[[fire]]] there is realization by a positively determining valid cognition, when a valid cognition eliminates a negandum, why wouldn't there be realization by an eliminative valid cognition? The definition of non-existence is not other than mere elimination. Therefore, if one (still) maintains that it is not an object of realization in accordance with those facts [[[of the realization of non-existence and the realization of existence]]], this would apply the convention [[[saying that a non-entity is not an epistemic object of valid cognition]]] differently but the definition of [[[the eliminative]]] realization [[[of non-entity]]] is attested and so we have no fault.

2.2.2. That there is not something attested is to be negated

As for the negation of there not being something attested as the object of reasoning, we will state [[[two items:]]] the invalidating argument in four points—a reasoning consciousness would not be a consciousness; it would be an invalid cognition; nature would be established; and your thesis would contradict your own words—and the negation of the proof for the statement of that not being attested.

2.2.2.1. The invalidating arguments

2.2.2.1.1 A reasoning consciousness would not be a consciousness

If the absence of nature is not accepted to be an epistemic object, is it [[[not being an epistemic object]]] due to [[[the absence of nature]]] not being an object of awareness although it is attested as non-existent or is it due to its non-existence not even being attested? In either case [[[that were considered]]], [[[we set forth the faults that]]] a reasoning consciousness would not be a consciousness [[[and it would not be a valid cognition]]] because it would not have an object of cognition, like [[[for example]]] a pot.

It is not the case that that [[[the reason]]] is not established because
- [[[if one thinks it would have an epistemic object]]] in relation to [[[investigating]]] conventional objects, [[[in relation to that]]] it is not a reasoning consciousness [[[for whom would there be a reasoning consciousness that lacked an epistemic object?]]]; and
- [[[according to what you assert]]] the ultimate is not an object of cognition or awareness; and
- there is no other [[[object of cognition apart from those two (conventional and ultimate)]]]; and
- even if there were, it [[[the cognition that investigates (that which is other than conventional and ultimate)]]] would not be a reasoning consciousness in relation to that [[[that is, that consciousness (would not be a reasoning consciousness in relation to) this other epistemic object]]].

[a] Gangs pa
[[[Gangs pa's assertion indicates that there is no cognition without an object of cognition.]]]
[[[The answer to that is said to be the following: If one says that it exists in reality, it could not be a cognitive agent of something to be cognized because it does not have a present object of cognition. If one says that it has an object of cognition, we answer that a cognition that would be a basis is absolutely impossible. This is the genuine answer.]]]
If someone said [[[If someone answered]]] that appearances existing as the nature of dependent arisings (is the object of cognition), you would say that since it is a cognitive agent of something to be cognized [[[that is, (appearances) existing as the nature (of dependent arisings)]]], it [[[the reasoning consciousness]]] is a cognition.[84]

---

[84] The opponent wants a reasoning consciousness—which is held by this opponent to lack any object of cognition—to be counted as a cognition due to the subsequent cognition that appearances are of the nature of dependent arisings.

[[[This is not correct; if it was like that (there would be the following consequence from the parallel argument):]]]
A visual cognition that apprehends a pot would be a cognition of everything possible [[[a pot, a blanket, and so forth]]] and impossible [[[self, primordial nature, and so forth]]] in the three realms; this is because if someone objected that a pot [[[apprehended by a visual cognition]]] exists in the nature of everything [[[possible and impossible]]], you would respond that it is a cognitive agent of something to be cognized [[[by visual cognition]]]. If you agree, [[[then self, primordial nature, and so forth would have the same nature as pot; if one accepts the existent of a knower without an object, we conclude]]] since all things—such as a stick-holder without a stick—would be possible, [[[in that case]]] absurdities would ensue.

Further (suppose the following argument:), regarding the claim that permanent things, such as space, exist as entities, suppose it was said that because they will become causally efficacious [[[which is the definition of entity]]] they [[[space and so forth]]] are called causally efficacious [[[and so exist as entities]]], we argue that it is not suitable for something [[[such as space]]] to be causally efficacious merely because they will become [[[causally efficacious]]].
(*Mutatis mutandis,*) that [[[reasoning consciousness]]] also is established not to be a cognition [[[because regarding the claim that appearances having the nature of dependent arisings serves as the object of cognition, the reasoning consciousness is not established to be a cognition merely because (appearances having the nature of dependent arisings) will be cognized]]].

[b] Lotsawa
[[[Lotsawa's assertion explained in the small commentary on *The Two Truths*]]]
Here [[[suppose the following answer:]]], reasoning consciousness is of two types: [[[utterly]]] non-conceptual [[[gnosis]]] and inference [[[that eliminates actual proliferations]]]. The first operates without distinction from the object of cognition [[[their duality is utterly not established]]], and so is like pouring water into water; it is just accepted [[[in the small commentary on *The Two Truths*]]] that it is not a cognition. Regarding the second [[[that is, inference]]], if one says that it is a cognition [[[because it has an object of cognition]]] in relation to the mistakenly assumed object of positive determination [[[thinking, "I realize the absence of nature"]]] [[[even though in reality the ultimate surpasses objects of cognition]]], is the mistakenly assumed object not an epistemic object of a valid cognition or is it?
- In the prior case [[[if it is not]]], the cognition would not be a valid cognition [[[because the epistemic object is not that (mistakenly assumed object) and there is no other (object)]]].
- In the latter case [[[if it is]]][85],
  - If it [[[the mistakenly assumed object]]] is the object of a valid cognition that investigates the non-concordant ultimate, the ultimate would be established as an epistemic object.

---

[85] The note mistakenly reads *ma yin ba.*

- ○ [[[Although the non-concordant ultimate is not the epistemic object of a reasoning consciousness,]]] If (the mistakenly assumed object) is the object of a conventional valid cognition [[[if one held that option, the epistemic object of a reasoning consciousness does not come to be established through establishing the epistemic object of a conventional valid cognition; what would be the benefit?]]], then the latter just would not be a reasoning consciousness that investigates the ultimate.

[c]
Objection: The mistakenly assumed object of a reasoning [[[consciousness]]] of the ultimate (or, ultimate reasoning consciousness) is just conventional.

Answer: It is valid cognition with regard to just that because inference engages just the object of thought.

[d]
Objection: When analyzed by another introspective awareness, since the conventional positive determination is attested as the mistakenly assumed object it is a cognition in the perspective of that [[[mistakenly assumed object]]]. However, it itself [[[inferential cognition]]] is deluded by nature regarding its own engagement [[[by way of thinking "I realize the absence of nature]]], and so the positive determination itself [[[when directing the mind]]] is conceived of as a mere elimination [[[of the negandum]]]; therefore, [[[its being valid cognition comes from the elimination, but]]] (inference) is not valid cognition in relation to the positive determination.

Answer: The elimination is established to be the epistemic object, just as, for example, a concept [[[a fiery mountain pass]]] that is just positively [[[inferentially]]] apprehended is conceived of as a particular [[[the fire behind the mountain pass]]] and thereby, the particular is taken to be the epistemic object [[[of inference]]].

Although there are statements that non-conceptual gnosis [[[which is asserted to be like pouring water into water]]] has its continuum cut [[[since there is (this statement)]]], calling a brahmin's son "fire" does not give him a nature of fire. [[[Similarly, even if the convention "gnosis" is applied, it is not correct (that it is actually gnosis?) because (according to the previous statement) that does not exist.]]]

2.2.2.1.2 (A reasoning consciousness) would become an invalid cognition
A reasoning consciousness would become an invalid cognition because of not having an epistemic object, like a cognition arisen from words.

[[[This is established by reasoning.]]] The definition of valid cognition is attested in relation to an epistemic object: being non-delusive in relation to its determined object[86] or illuminating a previously unknown object.[87] [[[This being Lotsawa's system, we assert that (a valid cognition) not having an epistemic object is not established.]]] Thus, there is

---

[86] Per Dharmottara's definition.
[87] Per Dharmakīrti's definition in PV II.5.

no denying the entailment. This is said to be correct [[[by followers(?) of Jotsunpa / the Honorable Jotsunpa]]] in other contexts also, as when establishing a convention [[[when establishing (something) as a synonym (of something else)]]][88], [[[it is an invalid cognition]]] on account of its not having an epistemic object. There is absolutely no fault of the entailment not being established according to the position [[[asserted by Lotsawa]]] of (these two) not being logical reason and what possesses the logical reason (that is, the property to be proven) [[[(in the proof) "because of not having an epistemic object, it is an invalid cognition"]]].

In the position asserting that the ultimate is not an epistemic object, one must accept that the logical reason [[["because of not having an epistemic object"]]] is a property of the subject, as previously explained [[[there is nothing else apart from conventional truth[89] and ultimate truth]]].[90]

[a]

If it is said, "the negandum itself is not an epistemic object," [[[by way of saying, "This does not exist" when it does not exist,]]][91] (what about the probandum?) The [[[direct]]] epistemic object of inference is the probandum of the logical reason [[[therefore, the logical reason negates that negandum]]]. Therefore, if one negated that [[[(the probandum) asserted to be the epistemic object]]], (the logical reason) would become a contradictory (reason) turning around the probandum [[[and the negandum]]]. The negandum would become a similar instance because it is a probandum [[[this is because the epistemic object of inference is the probandum of the logical reason; that negandum also would be the epistemic object of the inference]]][92], just as fire is something to be proven by smoke.

If [[[one thinks that]]] the epistemic object of inference [[[that has come to be the negandum]]] is not the probandum of the reason [[[but is a convention consisting of a negation]]], [[[well then,]]] why would inference rely on the logical reason?

One might say, "[[[It relies on the logical reason in so far as]]] The logical reason negates that [[[negandum]]]."

Well then, the negation would be established as the epistemic object [[[of inference]]].

[[[Accepting that negation is established to be the epistemic object of inference,]]] One might say, "The negation is a property of the negandum [[[and so the negandum is an epistemic object]]]."

---

[88] Perhaps referring to "being an invalid cognition" and "not having an epistemic object" being synonyms, this being reported as Lotsawa's position in the notes to V.1.2[3][a.2]4[d], folio 9b2.

[89] Here, *tha snyad kyi,* rather than *kun rdzob.*

[90] See section III.2.2.1.1.

[91] The note might explain what a negandum is or might refer to the non-existence of a reasoning consciousness's epistemic object.

[92] The note here seems to take the argument in a different direction.

The negation and the negandum would not be contradictory [[[if these two are property and property possessor]]]. The negandum would also be a similar instance because it possesses the property to be proven [[[the negation]]]. If the negandum is a similar instance,]]] A similar instance is not also something to be negated.

2.2.2.1.3. Nature would be established
[[[In connection with the last of the two options given above,]]][93]
Objection: It is not just that it [[[the absence of nature]]] is not an object of investigation; it is not attested ultimately even as being non-existent. [[[If it is not attested even as being non-existent,]]]

Answer: Nature would be established, for it is said (in PV 4.221),

> *How would the negation of a negation be anything other than an*
> *affirmation.*

Objection: Even though it is not attested as non-existent, it does not come to be existent because of being free from all extremes.

Answer: Could you negate both of two things [[[namely, the existence and non-existence of nature]]] that are mutually eliminative [[[in the sense that the affirmation of one eliminate the other]]]? In that case, even though one negates that the logical reason is found in dissimilar instances, it would not come to be found [[[in similar instances]]]; [[[since they are direct contradictories that affirm and eliminate each other, by negating that the reason is found in dissimilar instances it is established to be found in similar instances; this is the rule.]]] (If this could be so) it would not have been said [[[by Dharmakīrti (in PV 4.224ab)]]], [[[regarding the logical reason in dissimilar instances,]]]

> *If it is not excluded from that, does one accept that the logical reason*
> *applies [[[to dissimilar instances]]]?[94]*

Objection: It [[[what is said about (the rule of double negation)]]] is conventionally so.

Answer: If the negation of non-existence does not come to be [[[real]]] existence ultimately, it is the same conventionally, as well [[[that is, negating the presence (of the logical reason) in dissimilar instances would not establish its existence in similar instances]]].

2.2.2.1.4. Your thesis would contradict your own words
There would also be a contradiction with your own words: the thesis of non-existence— "it is not existent"—negates "it is not non-existent." For instance, the statement "all inferences that establish epistemic objects are not valid cognitions" negates their having an epistemic object. On the other hand, the inference that negates that, which ascertains on the basis of one's own words, establishes the possession of an epistemic object [[[that

---

[93] At the start of section III.2.2.1.1.
[94] Dharmakīrti seems to accept that the logical reason would apply, and so this statement supports rGya dmar pa's claim of that one cannot negate both of two things that are mutually eliminative.

44

is ascertained by way of another (means)]]]. Since that very (inference) is included in the general negation of inference [[[that all (inferences) are not valid cognitions]]], its having an epistemic object has been negated; something else that establishes an epistemic object (would be required) to establish that (the inference) has an epistemic object.

2.2.2.2. The negation of the proof for the statement that this is not attested
Having stated in that way the invalidation of (the claim that the absence of nature) is not attested as non-existent,[95] we negate the proof [[[that establishes "non-existence is not attested"]]]. [[[The reason:]]] One or many, production from the four alternatives, and so forth, [[[being devoid of which (the opponent presents as) applying to non-entity not being attested]]] do not pervade non-entity; therefore, being devoid of those [[[being devoid of one and many and so forth]]] does not eliminate being attested as non-entity [[[which is the opposite position from your assertion that (the absence of nature) is not even attested as a non-entity]]] ultimately for form and so forth.[96] And how would dependent arising and so forth, which also are not contradictory with being attested as a non-entity ultimately, negate non-entity? [[[It is not appropriate to state, "(the absence of nature) does not exist even as a non-entity because of being (a dependent arising)."]]] The means of proof for non-entity being not attested ultimately are not different from the means of negating that.

[2.3. Conclusion]
In that way, through (the arguments that) there is something [[[a non-entity]]] attested as the object of ultimate reasoning and through negating that (even a non-entity) is not attested, we do not consider correct what the teachers [[[(Gangs pa)]]] say, namely: the mere invalidation of existence, the negandum, by reasoning is just conventionally taken as true in the perspective of reasoning, but there is no epistemic object of reasoning (cf. III.2.1 above).

Therefore, being true in the perspective of obscuring in merely grounded in the etymological explanation [[[but this is not the definition; this is correct]]]; however, there is no fault in taking "being true in the perspective of reasoning" as the definition [[[of ultimate truth]]].
This [[[accepting "true in the perspective of reasoning" to be the definition]]] is not invalidated either by the fact that reasoning [[[consciousness]]] is a concealing truth. Since reasoning is a goal to be sought by those who (want to) remove obscurations, it is an object (*don*); since it is superior as being characterized as non-delusive with regard to the ultimate, it is supreme (*dam pa*); and so it is asserted to be ultimate (*don dam*).[97] However, it is not asserted to be ultimate truth.

---

[95] In sections 2.2.1.3 and 2.2.1.4.
[96] It would seem "form and so forth" is carried over from the usual subject of the "devoid of one and many" inference that establishes the absence of nature; the idea seems to be that the logical reasons would apply to form and so forth but would not apply to the absence of nature regarding form and so forth.
[97] See above, n. 80.

Thus, that [[[a reasoning consciousness]]] which is ultimate from the point of view of eliminating proliferations [[[but]]] is included among the concealed from the point of view of appearances [[[the nature of the awareness that is a reasoning consciousness]]]. [[[Since the awareness that is a reasoning consciousness eliminate proliferations, it is ultimate; in relation to its nature, since it is an appearance, it is concealed. Therefore, while engaging the same entity, truths are two: they are distinct in the sense of not being one because one is appearance and the other is emptiness.]]] However, when dividing the definition, being attested as the object of that which is ultimate from the point of view of reasoning [[[this]]] is held to be the definition [[[of ultimate truth]]]; it is absolutely not the case that the definition of ultimate truth is impossible and so forth.

3. Summary
Thus,

[Verse 4]

> **We assert that the mere invalidation of existence, (existence being) the negandum, is the meaning of the non-establishment of existence**
> **Although just that is not an object of affirmation, it is attested as the object of a negating awareness.**
> **Although it is not set forth as the object of a positive determination, one realizes the elimination of the negandum.**

[Verse 5]

> **For this very reason, the absence of proliferations is not merely nominal, because mere elimination is attested to be the definition of realization. Therefore, it (elimination of the negandum) is attested as the object of reasoning.**

[[[These (verses) summarize the position of (elimination) being attested as the object of reasoning.]]]

[Verse 6]

> **If this was not the case, it would be difficult to posit reasoning as a consciousness or a valid cognition.**
> **Because there would be the consequence that nature would be established, because this would contradict your own words, because there are refutations, and because there is no proof, (the absence of nature) is not not attested as the object of reasoning.**

IV. The specification of the number

[Verse 7ab]
Truths are asserted to be determined to be two because there isn't another (consciousness) apart from the two [[[erroneous and non-erroneous]]].

1. Lotsawa's position

1.1 What Lotsawa asserts

{the determination of a two-fold object of knowledge amounts to the determination of a two-fold consciousness (erroneous/non-erroneous);
Engaging the object mistakenly and engaging it non-mistakenly are mutually exclusive, therefore a third possibility does not exist; this is ascertained by the application of a single valid cognition.
There is no mutual dependence because it is the same realization that determines that consciousness is twofold and that the object is twofold.
The object of non-erroneous (cognition) is not invalidated by the emergence of another cognition, therefore it is called "permanent/stable". The object of erroneous (cognition) is invalidated (by the emergence of another cognition), thus it is conventionally referred to as "impermanent"
[[[That much is said to be correct]]]}

1.2. Objections with regard to that (i.e., Lotsawa's assertion)

{Objection: non-erroneous cognition and (something) being true as its object does not work for the partisans of the view that no nature whatsoever is established, because a nature (the non-erroneous cognition and the true object) would be established. If one divides the truths into two by imagining this (even though it is not possible), one could also imagine a third option, thus affecting the numerical determination.
Reply: If one says that one asserts two truths because non-erroneous cognition is possible; and one says that there is no third truth because a third option is not possible, this destroys the truth; but this is not what we say.
We say that that it is because another than the two options is not possible.
There is nothing apart from the conceptual cognition 'I accept without analyzing' and the conceptual cognition 'I accept after having analyzed and examined in reality' – this is ascertained by a conventional valid cognition.
→ the object of these two is also established not to go beyond the two options of what is to be accepted.
One calls "object of non-erroneous (cognition) the option 'to be accepted upon analysis" and the other is called "object of erroneous (cognition).
A truth beyond these two, that would be an option, is to be negated". }

2. Explanation considering that

{rGya's refutation of part 2 above}
{The position of others is that the negandum is the ultimate; thus the numerical determination of the two truths based on the negandum is not correct. One should

make the numerical determination based on the probandum (i.e., the absence of nature)

2.1 Specification of the number based on the negandum is incorrect

{It does not work either according to the Non-abiding Madhyamaka position or according to the substantialists, nor in some kind of general view accepting that the two-fold object establishes a two-fold truth, and then proceeding to refute an ultimate nature.}

2.1.1 Incorrect in reliance on our system or that of others
...

2.1.2 Improper in a common system
Suggestion: All proponents of philosophical tenets assert the object of non-mistaken (cognition) [[[the ultimate]]] and that [[[the object]]] of mistaken (cognition) [[[the conventional]]] within the two truths. Indeed, by saying

<div align="center">

(citation)

</div>

etc., it is not contracictory, having made a numerical determination based on a common system [[[of the proponents of philosophical tenets]]], that one negates an ultimate nature in our own system [[[Madhyamaka]]].

Answer: Given that we do not assert a non-mistaken awareness and a veridical object [[[of that awareness]]], it would only be the system of others [[[because it would not pervade our system]]], but how would it be a common system [[[of all proponents of philosophical tenets]]]?

[[[If one says: it is the common system of the substantialists (, we answer)]]] A common system of the substantialits does not come forth in this context and is not necessary
...

Therefore, a numerical determination based on the negandum is incorrect. Otherwise, the negation of distinction [[[and unity]]], etc. [[[of concept and definition, etc.]]] also should be explained in reliance on this [[[the ultimate that is the negandum]]].

2.2 Presenting the specification of the number based on the probandum

[[[The last of what was previously divided into two]]] It is presented based on the probandum [[[absence of nature]]] precisely. This is explained in three points:
    (2.2.1) Status of object and subject based on th eprobandum
    (2.2.2) No invalidation [[[for Madhyamaka]]] due to the absence of ultimate inference
    (2.2.3) The negandum is not suitable as an object of reasoning

2.2.1 Status of object and subject based on the probandum

...

Answer: The very negation without specification is the definition of non-entity, the object of elimination. And it has been explained [[[above]]] how this [[[non-entity]]] is attested as an epistemic object and its [[[i.e., absence of nature]]] being non-attested is negated by saying

[=Verse 4]

> **We assert that the mere invalidation of existence, (existence being) the negandum, is the meaning of the non-establishment of existence**
> **Although just that is not an object of affirmation, it is attested as the object of a negating awareness.**
> **Although it is not set forth as the object of a positive determination, one realizes the elimination of the negandum.**

etc. Answer to these verses!
Thus, we rejoice.

2.2.2 Not invalidated due to the lack of ultimate inference

...

Objection: if an ultimate [[inference]]] does not exist, a veridical object that depends on this [[[inference]]] is impossible.

Answer: It may well be the case that since the ultimate son of a sterile woman is impossible, ...

2.2.3 The negandum is not suitable as an object of reasoning

The reasoning that cuts proliferations takes as its epistemic object the negandum. Indeed it is stated:

> *The two means of valid cognition have an entity for their object.*

and

> *(citation)*

etc.

Thus, if one says: Although there is a reasoning [[[inference]]] born from a reason [[[the apprehension of a logical reason]]], there is not something veridical as the probandum in terms of "ultimate veridical [[[absence of nature]]]," one should say, in summary:

[Verse 9]
What is to be inferred is the probandum of the logical reason
What negates this becomes a contradictory reason
And the negandum would become a similar instance.
[Verse 10]

If what is to be inferred were not the probandum of the logical reason

It would be difficult for what makes it be inferred to rely on a logical reason.
If one objects that it is because it is negated by the logical reason
Negation would be established as the epistemic object [[[of inference]]]
[Verse 11]
And if negation were a property of what is negated,
Negation is not contradictory with negandum, and
Since the negandum is established to be a similar instance,
Negation would not be correct.

Thus, the explanation subsequent to the rejection of objection is not considered to be correct.

V. Definitions

[1. The actual definitions of the two truths: the respective definitions of the two truths according to our own position and explaining the teachers' statements]

1.1 The respective definitions of the two truths according to our own position

[[[illegible note (Finally, presentation of one's own position)]]]
[Verse 12ab]

> <mark>For the sake of explaining: non-veridical objects of cognition are concealed; the opposite is the other</mark>

1.1[1] On the Definition of Concealed

Objects of cognition that do not withstand analysis are concealed. This very meaning [[[that is, that objects of cognition that do not withstand analysis are concealed]]] is captured by the statement, [[[that is, the root text,]]]

> *Just that which is as it appears is concealed [SDV 3cd]*

in so far as it expresses the object of apprehension engaged in terms of unanalyzed appearances, because of the explanation [[[in the commentary]]] [SDVV ad 3cd], "concealed truth exists in that way, not genuinely. [[[If [it is not genuine], it is clear that it does not withstand analysis.]]]"

[[[If one takes object of cognition without specification to be the definition of concealed,]]] Object of cognition, that is, object of awareness, without specification is not accepted to be the definition [[[of concealed]]] because

- it [[[that is, object of cognition]]] is a distinct phenomenon [[[that is, it has a (distinct) intension]]][98] from "concealed" [[[as Jo btsun said]]] and [[[or, alternatively,]]]
- the definition would be over-extensive, applying to the ultimate.

[a]
Objection [[[If one said that the definition (of "concealed") consisting in object of cognition without specification is not over-extensive, applying to the ultimate]]]: Is not the ultimate beyond all cognition and expression? [[[If, therefore, it is not an object of awareness, it is not correct that anything non-existent would be that; however, it is nowadays unanimously accepted that awareness takes as its object the horn of a rabbit covered in mud, although it is not existent when analyzed.]]]
Answer: We have already explained [[[in verse III.2]]][99] that (the ultimate) exists [[[and is established]]] as it is as an object of cognition; we negate that it does not exist as such.

---

[98] *don ldog*
[99] See also section IV.2.1, folio 8a1.

51

[b]

Objection: It [[[that is, the definition of concealed]]] is empty [[[of truth]]] when analyzed [[[comment: *shes bya mi dges par* "if not satisfied (*dgyes pa*) with object of cognition" or "without bifurcating (*dgas pa*) object of cognition (into conventional and ultimate)"]]] without specification.

Answer: (No) because while (empty when analyzed without specification) can define ultimate void [[[of truth]]] without specification,

- it [[[that is, void of truth]]] is a distinct phenomenon [[[that is, it has a (distinct) extension]]][100] from "concealed" and
- it is over-extensive, applying to the ultimate [[[truth]]].
- [[[It would follow that a sharp horn existing on the head of a rabbit, because of being empty when analyzed, would be concealed.]]]

[c]

Objection: The aggregate [[[of the two, empty when analyzed and being an object of cognition]]] also would over extend, applying to the ultimate [[[because the two individual parts apply]]].

Answer: What is empty when analyzed, which itself is also an object of cognition, [[[that is, a common basis (of the two)]]] definitely over extends.

Therefore, [[[the unspecified aggregate is not suitable and]]] we do not accept the above as definitions individually, but (we accept) the specified aggregate [[[namely, that object of cognition taken as a common basis that itself is not veridical when analyzed]]]: any object of cognition, not veridical, in that way, [[[namely, in the way that would be correct from the point of view of analysis]]] when explained.

[[[Nevertheless, [[[according to some, a restriction applied to object of cognition]]] 'non-veridical when explained itself' suffices (to define concealed). Indeed, the ultimate is true when analyzed; it is not established to be non-veridical. If that alone is not proper and 'object of cognition' is added, there would be over-extension because the phenomenon exists in entities.[101] [Reply:] Absurdities would ensue because the phenomenon (non-veridical?) would be limitless.]]]

All proponents of philosophical systems assert that as the definition of concealed. [[[Objection: Well then, what are the dissimilarities among philosophical systems?]]] The only dissimilarity [[[namely, (a dissimilarity) in the definitional basis]]] is due to Mādhyamikas asserting that it [[[the definition of concealed]]] is also found in the dependent. [[[Idealists assert that it is found in the personal self and phenomenal self and the duality of subject and object. Vaibhāṣikas[102] assert that it is present in personal self as either of the two, (objects or minds).]]][103]

---

[100] *don ldog*

[101] Argument unclear

[102] Text reads *bye brag pa* instead of the usual *bye brag du smra ba.*

[103] Cf. 2.2.1, Table 1

Therefore, this agrees with what is said [[[by the Lotsawa]]] about the valid cognition that determines the concealed, namely that it consists in [[[or, established by]]] the operation of the two valid cognitions that negate veridical and [[[(as said) by the Lotsawa in his small commentary on the two truths]]] determine on the level of appearance,[104] because (the two aspects of concealed thus determined, 'non-veridical' and 'object of cognition') are precisely the epistemic object of the valid cognition that determines the definition. [[[Thus, their taking 'object of cognition' as the definition is mistaken.]]]

1.1[2] Ultimate

(The word "the opposite" in verse V.1b means) "the opposite of an object of knowledge that does not exist in that way when analyzed." [[[The meaning of the root text's (verse 3cd) "what is different is the other of the pair" is just this.]]] It remains in reality, when a mind [[[that is, a reasoning consciousness]]] analyzes it. It is said [[[by (Jñānagarbha) in his *Satyadvayavibhaṅga,* when commenting on that]]] "What is ultimately veridical is ultimate truth; this means just truth that is concordant with reasoning."

That is the definition of the ultimate according to all proponents of philosophical systems. [[[Indeed, Idealists assert that it applies to consciousness that is empty of the duality of object and subject. Vaibhāṣikas[105] assert that it is found in both object and mind empty of personal self.]]] The only dissimilarity [[[with Realists]]] is due to Mādhyamikas asserting that it [[[that is, the definition]]] is found in the absence of proliferations, whereas (the) others assert it [[[that is, the definiendum]]] for real phenomena. Thus, it is said to be attested by reasoning to be devoid of all extremes, such as non-existence, which are drawn from the pairs, permanence and annihilation, existence and non-existence [[[this is what is called ultimate truth]]].

[a]
Objection: How can the void of all extremes be the object of reasoning?
Answer: This is because reasoning eliminates all extremes [[[it (that is, devoid of all extremes) is attested (by reasoning to be the elimination of all extremes)]]]; this was already explained. [[[If one thinks, "Is not this contradictory with the statement that objects of awareness are concealed?"]]] (The *Bodhicaryāvatāra* IX.2cd) states,

> *The ultimate is not in the scope of awareness; awareness is asserted to be concealed.[106]*

In as much as all objects of awareness that are referents are concealed, and in as much as an entity of awareness that does not engage by way of feeling and positively determining is impossible, just so this [[["awareness is concealed"]]] is said because of the mind's mode of self-experiencing. In that way, all awareness is pervaded by being concealed. However, some awarenesses, from the point of view of eliminating proliferations, are

---

[104] Or, "that it consists in the negation of veridical and the operation of the two valid cognitions that determine appearances." In either case, the two-part mental operation would encompass the two parts of the definition of concealed, non-veridical and object of cognition. See also Section VI.1.1.
[105] Text reads *bye brag pa* instead of the usual *bye brag du smra ba.*
[106] Text reads *blo ni kun rdzob yin par 'dod* for *blo ni kun rdzob yin par brjod.*

both "object" (*don*) and "supreme" (*dam pa*) and so there is a distinction of definition.[107]
[[[The nature of an awareness that is a reasoned insight and concealed are of the same nature; therefore, ultimate and concealed are of the same nature. However, ultimate truth and concealed are not of the same nature because it would be contradictory for real and unreal to be of the same nature.]]]

1.2 Explaining the statements of the teachers

12[1] [[[Refuting others (i.e., Gangs pa)]]]

12[1].i [[[Stating (others' view)]]]
[[[If one analyzes Gangs pa's assertion, the definitions of the two truths are presented as follows in a way that would not align with the conventions of the text of the commentary.]]]
Consider the following explanation of the definitions in terms of "what accords with appearances and what accords with reasoning":

- [[[As for "what accords with appearances"]]] the objects of the eye, and so forth, that are engaged without analysis, from cowherds to the omniscient.
- [[[As for "what accords with reasoning"]]] the objects of inference that eliminates actual proliferations or the object in the gnosis that does not conceive ever. [[[When speaking of what accords with reasoning]]] "Object of reasoning" amounts to merely the elimination of existence [[[the object of negation]]]. [[[In the case of reasoning]]][108] there is nothing attested as an object.[109]

12[1].ii [[[Negating others' view]]]
We accept the definition of the ultimate in that way [[[according to Gangs pa]]], providing the answer that explains [[[as above]]] that the mere elimination is attested as an object that accords with reasoning but negating that (an object) is not attested.[110]

[[[Negation:]]]
As for what is concealed being "what accords with appearances," [[[the (proposed) definition of concealed]]] that is, being an object of a non-analytical awareness, while this would amount to being non-erroneous, if non-erroneous without specification was the definition, it would be the case that 'produced' could be the definition of 'impermanent.' Thus, in the case of appearance without specification and being concealed, which are distinct [[[intension]]] exclusion properties [[[(they) are (distinct exclusion properties), and (in the case of) distinct exclusion properties]]], it is not suitable

---

[107] Namely, a distinction between the definitions of "ultimate" and "ultimate truth." rGya dmar pa here plays with the etymology of *don dam pa,* "ultimate," taking apart the two words, *don* and *dam pa,* to show that some awarenesses qualify as *don dam pa.* The annotation will show, however, that those awarenesses that qualify as ultimate still are not ultimate truths.

[108] The annotation reads only *rigs pa,* which might suggest that "reasoning" itself does not exist as an object.

[109] This concords with the position ascribed to Gangs pa in Chap. III, 2.1.

[110] This is clarified in section III, 221 and 2.2.2, in which rGya dmar ba presents his own position and refutes the position ascribed to Gangs pa.

for one to define the other because [[[if it was suitable, as in the case of 'produced' and 'impermanent']]] absurdities would ensue.

[[[Furthermore,]]] If pleasure, form, and so forth were established as appearing [[[without specification]]] without analysis [[[and negating their veracity were not necessary]]], then the meaning of concealed [[[namely, appearance without specification]]] would already be established; [[[one thinks, "What would be the need for a valid cognition that ascertains being concealed, which consists in negating veracity?"]]] therefore, an argument establishing that they are concealed, via negating their being ultimate, would be pointless. [[[One thinks, "Without negating veracity, appearance without specification is not established as what it is."]]]

Objection: "Non-analytical appearance" or "appearance without specification" is indeed established [[[without negating veracity]]].
Answer: What is the meaning of "non-analytical"? If it is "in the perspective of erroneous," [[[because an object cannot be established as erroneous without negating veracity]]] then you accept the invalidation of veracity. Similarly, if by merely saying "appearance without specification" you negate veracity, we agree. [[[Insofar as you agree with the thought of tradition, we offer no refutation.]]]

12[2] [[[Setting forth Jo btsun's system]]]
[[[Furthermore, completing (the discussion),]]] The teachers, spiritual friends, [[[Khyung and Lotsawa]]] state as follows: [[[setting forth Jo btsun pa's system]]] the definition of ultimate truth surpasses even object of knowledge without specification; it is not an object of awareness in any way, such as 'empty' or 'not empty.' Thus, (Śāntideva) said

The ultimate is not in the scope of awareness.

12[3] [[[Refuting objections to our own system (i.e., Jo btsun's system)]]] (dGe bshes pa's answers)

[a]
Objection: It is contradictory to set forth object of knowledge without specification as the basis of division (of the two truths)[111] and [[[when explaining the meaning of the terms]]][112] it is contradictory for reasoning to be ultimate and its object to be veridical.

Answer: This is like, for instance, the following: The inferential cognition (of fire from smoke) merely conceives as [[[the external]]] fire itself something superimposed [[[that is, a concept appearing to awareness itself]]] through the force of the ripening of tendencies of conceptual cognitions as fire and so forth from the beginningless past. However, it [[[inferential cognition]]] does not take as its object a particular [[[that is, an external fire]]]. This [[[that a particular is not the object of inferential cognition]]] is what is asserted when analyzing by introspection.[113] And yet it is asserted that, from the

---

[111] Section I, "The basis of division".
[112] Section III, "The meaning of the term".
[113] *rang bzhin sems dpa'* seems to be a variant of *rang bzhin sems pa,* the latter translating *svabhāvacintā.* The term could refer to a cognizer, rather than a cognition, and perhaps stems in

perspective of the [[[the inferential]]] awareness itself, [[[that is, since (this very cognition) wrongly assumes that it realizes a particular, based on that]]] it has a particular for its object. [[[Similarly, from the perspective of reasoning, the absence of nature is taken as an object. However, when analyzing by introspection (of the reasoning cognition), the ultimate is not set forth as an object once reasoning has completed the invalidation of existence, the negandum. Therefore, there is no contradiction in setting forth a division of objects of cognition based on this perspective.]]]

[b]
Objection [[[it is said]]]: By way of saying

> When one sets forth (the ultimate) as an object from the perspective of what is asserted within a reasoning consciousness [[[that is, (reasoning) claiming "I take the absence of nature as an object"]]], then when analyzing by introspection [[[the setting forth of (the ultimate) as an object]]] reasoning [[[merely]]] invalidates existence [[[the negandum]]] but there is no such thing called "the ultimate" that is an epistemic object [[[of an inferential cognition]]], that would become an object [[[of a reasoning consciousness]]].

[[[ultimate truth as]]] a division of objects of cognition from that perspective [[[based on a reasoning consciousness thinking "I realize the absence of nature"]]] is [[[merely]]] set forth. [[[But you say that when analyzing by introspection, the ultimate is not set forth as an object]]]. [[[However,]]] When introspection searches, it applies the convention "ultimate" to what is beyond all cognition and expression [[[what is beyond the object of that reasoning consciousness]]] and in doing so introspection takes as its object what is beyond all cognition and expression [[[that is, the ultimate]]]; (the latter) [[[ultimate truth]]] becomes its [[[that is, introspection's]]] object of cognition.

Answer: Do the words [[[that express]]], "a particular is not a referent of words," express [[[that is, refer to]]] that [[[a particular]]] which is not a referent? [[[It someone answers, "This (statement) merely negates a particular being a referent of words; it is not the case that a particular is taken as an object by these words," then by parallel reasoning,]]] Thus, that [[[introspection]]] merely negates (ultimate truth) being attested as an object of cognition [[[of a reasoning consciousness]]] but [[[introspection]]] does not set forth (ultimate truth) as an object. In so far as it is merely a matter of negating what is established, the Conqueror's sons remain silent.

This (i.e. the answers to [a] and [b]) is what is said [[[by dGe bshes pa]]].

12[4] Refutation of dGe bshes pa's answers
[[[The refutation:]]] Analyzing what precedes (there are five points): the example is not established; since the object is not fitting, one cannot dispel objections; there are errors regarding the very reasoning that dispels objections; the meaning that is explained [[[here]]] contradicts other statements [[[stated in epistemological treatises]]]; and, this is invalidated by previously explained reasoning.

---

part from the term, *byang chub sems dpa'. svabhāvacintā* occurs in *PV* III.350 and *PVin* I, p.37.7. Phya pa chos kyi seng ge's commentary to the latter cites the expression as *rang bzhin sems dpa'.*

12[4]1 The example is not established:
[[[Thus, the meaning of saying "inferential cognition is both valid cognition and not valid cognition" is as follows:]]]
- Since there is no experience of the particular fire, and so forth, (the latter) [[[a particular fire]]] does not come to be the apprehended object [[[of the inferential cognition]]]. Since it conceives of what is superimposed [[[that is, the apprehended object]]] as being external [[[that is, as a particular fire]]], (it) [[[inferential cognition]]] is erroneous concerning what is apprehended.
- On the other hand, [[[inferential cognition is a valid cognition with regard to the intentional object, thus]]] it cannot be negated that the particular is the very epistemic object that is conceived because the two valid cognitions are similar in having the definition of valid cognition with regard to the intentional object [[[because these both have epistemic objects from their respective perspectives]]].

[[[Objection: If one thinks that this is because it is not the case that inference takes a particular as an object when introspectively analyzing,]]] we ask

Is this introspective awareness valid cognition or not?
- If it is, how could inference whose object is negated by that be posited as valid cognition? [[[That is, since (inference's object is negated by that, how could it be posited as valid cognition?)]]] It could be (valid cognition) in relation to what is apprehended [[[if it is posited (in this way, inference would be) erroneous]]] or from the perspective of what is conceived [[[in relation to (what is conceived, inference) is posited as valid cognition because it has an epistemic object]]]. If it is [[[still]]] posited [[[to be valid cognition]]] from the latter perspective, even though introspection negates the intensional object, [[[the absurd consequence would ensue that]]] all awareness would be valid cognition.
- If it [[[that is, introspection]]] is not valid cognition, inference is established to just have a particular as its object [[[because what is not valid cognition cannot negate the epistemic object of the valid cognition, inferential cognition]]].
Therefore, the example is not established.

12[4]2 Since the object is not fitting, one cannot dispel objections
[[[2. The object is not fitting]]] Similarly, if introspection negates [[[the intensional object,]]] the elimination that is mistakenly assumed [[[and conceived]]] to be realized from the perspective of what is asserted within a reasoning consciousness, then it is not proper for reasoning [[[consciousness]]] to be valid cognition [[[because the intensional object has been negated by another awareness (namely, introspection) and]]] there is no occasion for inference being a valid cognition regarding something [[[that is, the apprehended object]]] other than the object of thought [[[that is, the intensional object]]].

Objection: It is in regards to the mere elimination of existence [[[that inference is valid cognition]]].

Answer: Just that being the epistemic object has been explained many times already [[[for example, (1) the mere non-establishment of existence is the definition of non-

existence and (2) the awareness that understands in that way is understanding non-existence]]].[114]

Therefore [[[for this very reason]]], one cannot dispel objections.

12[4]3 There are errors regarding the very reasoning that dispels objections
[[[3.]]] [[[It would follow that this introspection would be the valid cognition that delineates the non-concordant ultimate and teaching the invalidation of asserting that]]] [[[With regard to the latter, there are four parts: devoid of proliferations would be established to be the epistemic object of introspection; it would become an affirming awareness; there would be infinite regress; and it would not be necessary.]]]

12[4]3[1]
[[[It would follow that this introspection would be the valid cognition that delineates the non-concordant ultimate]]]
Otherwise, if one conceives of (the ultimate) as the object of a reasoning consciousness, by saying that introspection surpasses even the object of that [[[that is, of a reasoning consciousness]]], this very introspection that eliminates all proliferations would be [[[it must be]]] the reasoning that delineates the non-concordant ultimate.

Objection: Why not?

Answer: Because (of the following):

12[4]3[2]
[[[Teaching the invalidation of asserting that]]]

12[4]3[2.1]
[[[Devoid of proliferations would be established to be the epistemic object of introspection]]]

- The very elimination of all proliferations, such as the object of reasoning and so forth [[[by way of saying that (introspection) surpasses even (the object of reasoning)]]], would be established as the epistemic object of that [[[that is, of this introspection]]]. Alternatively [[[while that might be the case]]],

12[4]3[2.2]
[[[It would become an affirming awareness]]]

- If [[[it were the case]]] that [[[introspection]]] negates what reasoning eliminatively takes as its object, it becomes an affirming awareness [[[because the negative of a negation is an affirmative]]].

(In the event that introspection has no object at all,)

---

[114] See sections III.1.1 and III.1.2.

- If it [[[that is, introspection]]] does not posit any object, it would not be suitable to be a consciousness [[[because it would not have an object of cognition]]] or a valid cognition [[[because it would not have an epistemic object]]].

It is also because (of the following):

12[4]3[2.3]
[[[There would be infinite regress]]]

- It is not suitable for just this [[[that is, introspection]]] to be perception [[[for those of limited vision]]] and so it must be inference. In so far as this is the case, what is wrongly assumed to be the object of that [[[[introspection (which is an inference)]]] would need to be negated by another introspection, which is (also) an inferential cognition. Therefore, there would be no end [[[in so far as each wrongly assumed object of introspection would need to be negated by a second introspection (thinking), "it does not exist in that way"]]].

12[4]3[2.4]
[[[It is not be necessary]]]

- If it [[[(that is, the mistakenly assumed) object of introspection]]] does not need [[[to be negated by a second (introspection)]]], then the object of the former [[[that is, of a reasoning consciousness]]] also does not need (to be negated) [[[by introspection]]], due to parity of reasoning.

Objection: The object that is mistakenly assumed by this very introspection is included among the objects of inference in general [[[since it is claimed that (introspection) is beyond all objects of inference in general]]]; therefore, there is no need for another negation [[[apart from (the negation) we set forth; therefore, it is not the case that there is no end]]].

Answer: If one applies the negation having included its own [[[that is, introspection's]]] epistemic object [[[that is, the object that is mistakenly assumed]]] among the objects negated [[[(thinking), "I am beyond even my own object"]]], it is possible that the unlearned could hold that it is not an inference, or that it is not the case that it is a valid cognition that has an epistemic object for its object, or that all statements are false [[[there is a contradiction between previous and subsequent words]]]. It is not possible that valid cognition itself could apply [[[that it could apply when its own object is negated]]]. All valid cognitions invalidate an opposing object [[[because they have an exclusion for their objects]]]; it is not possible that they would negate their own object.

12[4]4 The meaning that is explained [[[here]]] contradicts other statements [[[stated in epistemological treatises]]]
[[[4.]]] Additionally, it would be contradictory [[[for yourself, Jo btsun,]]] with the statements:

- [[[In the context of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* determining the number of valid cognitions]]] The fact that a consciousness that is different from perception and inference does not have an epistemic object serves as a valid reason to negate (that consciousness) being valid cognition.
- Since it is correct that the epistemic object of non-apprehension is a non-entity, reasoning that negates a cause, and so forth, does not invalidate [[[a non-entity being an epistemic object]]].[115]

[[[These statements are contradictory with (your asserting) here a valid cognition that lacks an epistemic object and not stating that a non-entity can be an epistemic object of a valid cognition.]]]

[a]
Objection: [[[Even without an epistemic object,]]] The mere non-establishment of existence is taken conventionally to be the epistemic object.

Answer: If (a consciousness) lacking an actual epistemic object were a valid cognition, then language and comparison would be also [[[valid cognition in so far as they lack actual epistemic objects]]].

[b]
Objection: Since it [[[that is, a reasoning consciousness]]] mistakenly assumes that it cognizes an absence, it has an epistemic object.

Answer: [[[Does (what is mistakenly assumed) have or not have (the definition of epistemic object)?]]] If what is mistakenly assumed has the definition of epistemic object in that way, devoid of proliferations [[[such as the wrong assumption of realizing the absence of nature]]] also would be established as an epistemic object. If you accept that [[[to be valid cognition], through taking it as an epistemic object from the perspective of thought even though it does not have the definition (of epistemic object), then it would also be the case for language and comparison [[[that they are valid cognition]]].

Therefore, we do not subscribe to positing a consciousness that does not cognize an object of cognition or a valid cognition that does not realize an object. [[[Since the Lotsawa accepts that not being a valid cognition and not having an epistemic object are synonyms, this other case also is not valid cognition.]]]

12[4]5 This is invalidated by previously explained reasoning

[[[5.]]] Additionally, if devoid of proliferations is not an object of awareness, it would be difficult for you to provide an answer to the following:

> We accept that the mere invalidation of existence, the negandum, is an object
> [[[that is]]] not established to exist [[[to be an (existent) entity]]];

---

[115] This second statement suggests Dharmottara's position that a non-entity serves as the probandum of a non-apprehension inference.

> Even though it is not an object of an affirmation, it is found to be an object of an awareness that negates [[["it does not exist"]]].[116]

2. Definition of the respective kinds of conventional

2.1 The definition of the respective kinds that we assert

{v. 13: no division pertaining to the ultimate apart from concordant and actual; otherwise only division is between ultimate and conventional.}
{v. 14: division of kun rdzob into incorrect and correct, matching the ultimate that the substantialists classify as dependent and perfected; the substantialist's parikalpita is for the Madhyamaka a twofold subcategory of incorrect conventional}
{v. 15: rGya adopts as a definition of correct/incorrect conventionality causal efficiency/absence of causal efficiency pertaining to the appearance of an object of cognition that is not true. The teacher(s) explain differently/elsewhere.}

2.2 Analyzing the assertions of the teachers

2.2.1 The teachers' views

{According to lo tsa ba, these three are to refute mistaken conceptions:
SDV: the perfected void of the imputational is ultimate
PV/PVin: what is causally efficient is ultimate
Sthiramati: dependent origination is the ultimate.
Jo btsun explained that one does not need all of the three, nor the additional fourth of previous scholars 'common appearance'}

2.2.2 Refutation of that

{'Causally efficient' or 'dependently arisen' define, respectively, 'entity' and 'produced', but not 'correct conventional' – the latter is a different concept.

(Jo btsun:) If the definition 'non-erroneous' (mi 'khrul), dngos po=yang dag kun rdzob. No need for proof of kun rdzob refuting don dam bden.}
(Gangs pa:) Any of the three can define it, stating the three is an illustration (upalakṣaṇa) (i.e., not a definition, lakṣaṇa); the old Tibetans' definition 'commonly appearing' also.
Agreement on the definiens 'implicative negation of imputation' which amounts to causal activity void when analyzed'. The other two definiens define something else.
(Lo tsa ba) 'void of imputation' indicates the nature of correct conventional (but does not define it); it lacks substantial establishment as definiens, and would be an over-extensive definiens (applying also to hallucination, etc.)
Therefore, 'void of imputation' is only indicative, and the respective definitions are to be found in SDV 12ab.}
[a]
…

---

3. What has this definition

3.1 Refutation of other systems (regarding Mādhyamikas that take sides)
311 Jo btsun

VI. The means of valid cognition

1. The means of valid cognition establishing the definiens of conventional truth

1.1 The direct means of valid cognition establishing the definiens of conventional truth

[Verse]
{Just the conventional nature is established by perception that apprehends form etc. or by inference. But awareness being mistaken and the object being like a mirage is established indirectly via the action of these two means of valid cognition, relying on the negation of truth. However, [[[for "those who look on this side"]]] a valid cognition that directly evaluates falcidity is not possible.}

1.2 Rejecting the rejoinder that there is the same fault as the one posited with regard to illusion
...

1.3
...

1.4 Rejecting the rejoinder that appearance would become ultimate

{Thus, the following [[[rejoinder]]] is also rejected:
> Since appearance is not the negandum, it is not invalidated by reasoning. And it is established by the reasoning that evaluates appearance itself. Therefore, since it is established by reasoning and not invalidated by reasoning, it would be ultimate.

Indeed, the awareness that evaluates appearance is, in this context, not established by reasoning; by negating a veridical object, on establishes (awareness) to be mistaken.}
[[[Up to here, this is the statement of Zangs pa Jo btsun.

[[[Here, what dGe bshes Gangs pa says is correct, namely: the awareness that evaluates appearance, from the point of view of reasoning consciousess, does not bear on mistaken objects. But it just positing a convention ?)
Objection: ...]]]

Also, other teachers [[[Gangs pa]]] explain: ...
Thus, it is not necessary to reject the rejoinder. [[[One does not admit that it is mistaken]]]

2 The means of valid cognition of "those who look on this side" – Following Gangs pa she'us account

Thus, it must be understood to be established from the action of the two means of valid cognition of "those who look to this side."

The reasoning that negates 'veridical' itself is what determines 'ultimate'. And it is itself [[[to be understood by]]] the inference of "those [[[people]]] who look to this side".

Therefore, I will present it based on the practice of other teachers [[[She'u]]] who state:

(2.1) The identification of the five members: subject, etc.

(2.2) How to apprehend inference based on those

(2.3) ...

(2.4) The result of practice: the non-conceptual wisdom that corresponds to appearance

2.1 The identification of the five members: subject, etc.

i. The subject

The subject can be either what is termed "internal or external" or what is termed "stated by myself or others", namely, according to appearance.

[[[Jo btsun]]] It is the appearance without specification, not characterized as being true or false. Not being characterized as true or false, common appearance is established...

The following explanation [[[... by Gangs pa]]] has the same meaning.
    What appears and what is imputed, taken together, is not established for us [[[Buddhists]]]; and what is distinct from imagined is not established for the opponent [[[the Tirtika]]]. ... is not the subject. One posits as subject appearance without distinction of what appears and what is imputed.
But the previous convention [[[that of Jo btsun]]] is the correct one.
...

ii. The negandum

(1) Khyung rin chen grags: The negandum is what is imputed

The negandum [[[according to Rin (chen) grags), is what is imputed. And it is imputed as follows:]]] is what is accepted by those who conceive something to be real to have a nature that is found to resist analysis.

If one analyses [[[this negandum]]],

- it is not an awareness [[[the latter is established by reflexive awareness, therefore it cannot be negated]]]

- it is not what appears to it (i.e., to awareness) [[[this also cannot be negated]]]

- it is not external [[[because what is established as a particular also cannot be negated]]]
- It is not a superimposition [[[because it exists insofar as it is superimposed, it is not to be negated either]]]
[[[Then what is it?]]]
It is what is determined to be [[[a particular]]] external to the superimposition. It is thus characterized as 'imputed' [[[insofar as it is determined to be an object external to superimposition]]].

> *Thus, here [[[in the context of the negandum]]], it is correct to negate just what is imputed in this way [[[the determination of something superimposed to be external]]]. (SDV 30ab)[117]*

> *The negation of imputation is characterized by the negation as "genuine." (SDV, intermediate verse following v. 30)[118]*

These (verses), etc. explain that what is imputed is the negandum. It is what one oneself superimposes as being veridical in the sense of resisting analysis, and has the characteristic of being determined to be external [[[without knowing it to be superimposed]]].

(a) Criticism of Śaṅkara(nandana)'s position: the negandum is what is real
Thus, the Brahmin Śaṅkara(nandana) explains that reality without specification is the negandum, because it is said PV 1.210…
…
Thus, what is imputed [[[by mind]]] through superimposition to be existing as resisting analysis, [[[this that exists as resisting analysis,]]] which is imputed as an external particular, this itself is the negandum.

(2) Rejection of a rejoinder against Jo btsun himself, by dGe bshes
Objection: [[[The objection:]]] If this imputation is neither one nor many, since the logical reason would occur in the negandum, it would be inconclusive. And if it is not neither [[[one nor many]]] it would become real.

Answer: [[[of dGe bshes: "]]] When considering its nature [[[or mode of existence]]], in reality, (what is imputed) is neither one nor many. In reality, it is grouped with the **similar instances**, what is devoid of nature. Therefore there is no inconclusiveness.[119] It is the negandum from the point of view of being apprehended as real through a superimposition. Since it is thus understood to be one or many, the logical reason does not occur (in it).[[["]]]

---

[117] Eckel translates: It is right to use [reason] to deny just what is imagined.
[118] Eckel translates: When we negate [the things] that [others] imagine, [the qualification] "in a real sense" does not qualify the negation.
[119] The reason would have been inconclusive if it was present in **dissimilar instances**.

Let us consider this (previous answer of dGe bshes). [[[There are seven points]]]

(i)

What is imputed is not the negandum. Otherwise [[[if what is imputed were the negandum]]], the part that is the negandum from the perspective of being apprehended to be real via a superimposition is one or many, but being in reality neither, the logical reason is not in reality inconclusive. Therefore, what would help it not to be inconclusive from the point of view of superimposition?
A superimposition itself can be imagined to be something real that is neither one nor many, therefore from this perspective also, (the logical reason) would sometimes be inconclusive.

(ii)

Further, the subject 'imputed' alone itself is a **dissimilar instance** because it is a negandum from the perspective of being apprehended to be real by a superimposition. And if it is also a **similar instance** given that, in reality, it is included in what lacks a nature, there would be a third group among the established groups of instances, therefore, one could not eliminate a third group by these two [[[affirmation and negation]]].

For this very reason [[[that a third option is not eliminated]]], it is not contradictory for probandum and negandum to be co-refernetial. Therefore, even when the probandum [[[the lack of nature]]] is established, the negandum would not be eliminated [[[because the two are not contradictory for a single basis]]].

(iii)

Further yet, even though in reality [[[the negandum]]] is devoid of nature, it is not proper that it would be a similar instance [[[in reality]]], because [[[according to you]]]… and since the imputed negandum [[[that you assert]]] would then not be negated, from some perspective it would be included in similar instances. Therefore since it resides in dissimilar instances exclusively, and because the logical reason occurs there, it is just inconclusive.

…

(iv)

(v)

(vii)
[Summarizing Verses]

(4) Own position = The correct position stated by other scholars (=Gangs pa)
Then what is it?

(4.1)

What is called "negandum" is not asserted to exist. If it existed, it could not be negated.

It is not what is imputed, because it (the latter) is a similar instance. Thus, the identification of "absence (of the logical reason) when it (the property to be proven) is absent" would be negated.

…

Thus, saying "if entity is the negandum, when established it cannot be negated; when not established, why would one doubt that it is negated" is ignorance of the way valid cognition negates…

Thus what other scholars state [[[Gangs pa]]] is to be known to be correct:
"the negandum is the intentional object accepted to be established by reasoning and not invalidated, whose nature resists expression(/analysis?)".

The intentional object that is accepted is not established to be real, therefore by ascertaining the absence (of the logical reason) in the absence of reality, one negates the intentional object of that. This is said because all imputed things are apprehended object of [[[a conceptual cognition consisting in]]] acceptance.

Thus, saying that what is imputed is the negandum is done in consideration of the intentional object that is superimposed [[[being the negandum]]]. And when determination arises, it is in consideration upon the elimination of superimposition [[[what is superimposed is explained to be the negandum.]]]

(4.2)

In this regard,
(a)
The assertion [[[of Gangs pa she'u]]](?) that illusion is established by reasoning also is refuted by (the argument that) when identifying the negandum, there is overextension (to illusion), etc.
(b)
Also, in addition, the following [[[assertion]]] is also refuted:
>   Some say:
>>   The subject is asserted to be without conceptual distinction from the negandum. If this [[[subject]]] is not negated, the appearance as subject is not eliminated, therefore, because… this very [[[subject]]] is what to be eliminated.

Namely, when the logical reason is established for this [[[subject]]] it would be inconclusive. And if it were not inconclusive, the logical reason would not be established for this negandum. Therefore, if one accepts the method of negating the pervader of the subject that is to be negated, it is inconclusive. And if one accept the method of elimination from dissimilar instances, it would be non-established. Therefore this amounts to accepting contradictory things.

Objection: From the perspective of the subject the logical reason is established [[[therefore there is no fault of being non-established]]]; but from the perspective of the negandum, [[[the logical reason]]] does not occur [[[thus there is no fault of being inconclusive]]]

Answer: if they are supposed to be conceptually non-distinct, this is improper!

Objection: It is proper by relying on two ways of cognition [[[evaluating what appears and reasoning consciousness]]]

Answer: Because the relying properties would need to be two, it would infirm their being conceptually non-distinct
….
…
(c)
Also, some assert that the subject and [[[the negandum]]] being one nature but distinct concepts is negated from the perspective of reasoning, and therefore the nature of appearance is negated [[[as well]]].
…
… because the logical reason occurs in what has the negandum it is inconclusive, and if it does not odccur it is unestablished.
Objection: When 'produced' is to be established to be a logical reason because it has the three caracteristics, since (the logical reason) 'endowed with three characteristis' occurs in what has impermanence that is not the logical reason, it is inconclusive.

Answer [[[by Gangs pa]]] "endowed with three characteristics" is put forward with regard to what is to be proven…

(d)
Further, some assert that trom this very perspective it is precisely a negandum but as mere appearance it is not negated at all. This amount to assert toghether 'it precisely is, and it precisely is not'
…
(e)
Some [[['phur ston]]] assert the following: The negandum is the object that is not contradictory when analyzing what is called "ultimate". When negating it, the combination of incompatible items is what is to be proven….

This is absolutely incorrect
…
(3.3) Gangs pa's own assertion
Thus, the negandum is the intentional object that is accepted to have a nature that is obtained when analyzed by reasoning, a real entity. If one says that it exists, since it is pervaded by one or many. This is precisely what is to be negated by the inference

(that infers) the non-conception as pervaded from the non-conception as the pervade.
So is it explained.

(5) Partial refutation of Gangs pa's explanation

With regard to what precedes: if the negandum and the subject are distinct concepts and a single nature, since the logical reason occurs in [[[the subject]]] what possesses the negandum, it may well be the case that it becomes inconclusive [[[as Gangs pa (said)]]].
However, the idea that "in the context of the proof that 'produced' is a logical reason (because it has three characteristics), the logical reason does not occur in what is impermanent that is not the logical reason" does not appear in the words of the logicians. Indeed, a person could be a Brahmin because of being endowed with a property that makes one a Brahmin, and could also not be a Brahmin because of having some other property [[[such as being an object of cognition]]], isn't it?
If something is void of property to be proven it is a dissimilar instance. It does not become a dissimilar instance because of having another property [[[than that to be proven]]].
Otherwise, try to get rid of the fault that 'smoke' would be inconclusive because it occurs [[[in the kitchen]]] which is different [[[from similar instances]]] from the perspective of it being a kitchen [[[because 'having the fire that is also on the hill' and 'kitchen' are conceptually distinct]]]
…
…

iii. The probandum

[[[According to Gangs pa]]] the probandum is a simple negation, the mere elimination of a veridical entity. The assertion that an implicative negation – such as 'illusion' or 'joined incompatible items' - is the probandum has already been refuted. In this regard, making the positive determination of absence the probandum by negating reality is similar to the case of illusion, etc., therefore it becomes ultimate.

Objection: But the simple negation consisting in mere elimination also is the deed of reasoning, therefore, it would become ultimate.
[[[The idea is the following: "negation" is general, but "negation of the negandum by reasoning" is specific, therefore they are conceptually distinct.]]]
….
… this was explained [[[by Gangs pa]]].

[[[rGya (says):]]]…
Negation of the negandum and negation are the same thing. The specification "negation by reasoning" is not mistaken with regard to ultimate, because here there is invalidation with regard to the reasoning that analyses, and even though negation is not affirmation, it is an object of investigation [[[because is it being investigated as being eliminated]]].

It has already been said that for this very reason [[[investigation as eliminated]]], there are no proliferations, etc.

iv. Logical reason

The object consisting in the logical reason. In general, there are (the ones) putting forth a proof and (the ones) putting forth a refutation. The former is, for instance 'dependant arising', the latter is, for instance, the Diamand-cutter that negates via the distinctive explanation of the cause, or the negation of (the four options of) production, annihilation, existence, non-existence, that negates via the explanation of the effect, or the negation of the four options of arising, that negates via the analysis of both cause and effect, or the neither-one-nor-many that negates via the analysis of the own nature. They are innumerable.

With regard to them because there are extensive places that analyze, for each, by what valid cognition pervasion and qualification of the subject are established, we will not tell that.

Now, because.. we will analyze it. It has two (points): qualification of the subject and pervasion.

1.

[[[The position of Khyung]]]]

...

2. rGya

v. The example

The object consisting in the example is, for instance, a reflection, etc....

2.2 How inference relies (on these 5 items)

The way inference relies (on these 5 items): the analysis of whether the subject appears or does not appears.

...

For them, among (the two options): it does not appear due to its being the negandum and it does not appear due to its not being an object,

2.2.1 Refutation of the former (by Jo btsun)

The refutation of the former (by Jo btsun) (is as follows)

2.2.1.1 There is a means of refutation

...

22.1.2 There is a means of proof

2.2.2 Refutation of the latter (by Jo btsun)

2.2.2.1 Opponent's (=Gangs pa) position

The position of some people (stated by gangs pa) is the following:

... because it is not the object of this it does not appear, just like sound to the eye...

Thus it might well be the case that it is not the negandum, but it (still) does not appear due to not being an object.

2.2.2.2 Statement of the refutation

(6 points)

2.2.3 Common (refutation) of the two
2.2.4 Rejection of the faults (by Gangs pa)
2.2.5 Rejection of the faults (by rgya)?
2.2.6 Rejection (of the fautls) via analysis
…
[[[according to rGya]]] Thus the answer given by explaining that the subject appears is, in general, correct.
2.2.8 The position of Gangs pa according to which it does not appear
2.2.9 Refutation of Gangs pa by rGya

(?) 2.2.2.3.4 Negating attachment to entities

(29a5)

…

2.2.2.3.5 The effects of cultivating emptiness
(30b1)

Bibliographical references

SNS   *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra. L'Explication des Mystères. Ed. et trad. par E. Lamotte*. Louvain, Paris, 1935: Bureaux du Recueil.

Apple 2016   J. Apple, An Early Bka'-gdams-pa Madhyamaka Work Attributed to Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 44 (2016) 619-725.

Broido 1983   Michael Broido, "A note on *dgos-'brel*." *The Journal of the Tibet Society* 3 (1983), 5-19.

Conze 1973   Edward Conze, *The short Prajñāpāramitā texts*. London, 1973: Luzac&Co. Ltd.

Eckel 1987   Malcom D. *Eckel, Jñānagarbha's Commentary on the Distinction Between the Two Truths*. New York, 1987: SUNY Press.

Hayes 1980   Richard Hayes, "Diṅnāga's Views on Reasoning (*svārthānumāna*)." Journal of Indian Philosophy 8 (1980), 219–277.

Hayes 1988   Richard Hayes, *Dignāga on the Interpretation of Signs*, Dordrecht, 1988: Reidel.

Hopkins 2008   Jeffrey Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom*. Ithaca, New York, 2008: Snow Lion Publications.

Hugon 2016   Pascale Hugon, "Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge and His Successors on the Classification of Arguments by Consequence (*thal ʾgyur*) Based on the Type of the Logical Reason," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 44.5, pp. 883–938 (DOI: 10.1007/s10781-015-9285-4).

Kajiyama 1973 Yuichi Kajiyama, "Three Types of Affirmation and Two Types of Negation in Buddhist Philosophy," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17 (1973), 178–195.

Kapstein 2000   Matthew T. Kapstein, Review of *We are all Gzhan stong pas: Reflections on The Reflexive Nature of Awareness: A Tibetan Madhyamaka Defence*. By Paul Williams. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 7, 105–125.

Kellner and Taber 2014 Birgit Kellner and John Taber, "Studies in Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda idealism I: The interpretation of Vasubandhu's Viṃśikā." ASIA 68.3 (2014), 709–756.

Nagashima 2004   Jundo Nagashima, "The Distinction between Svātantrika and Prāsaṅgika in Late Madhyamaka: Atiśa and Bhavya as Prāsaṅgikas." *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism. Saṃbhāṣā* 24 (2004), 65-98.

Seyfort Ruegg 2010   David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Buddhist Philosophy of the Middle. Essays on Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka*. Boston, 2010: Wisdom Publications.

Thakchoe 2016 Sonam Thakchoe, "The Theory of Two Truths in India." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition). Ed. Edward N. Zalta (ed.). URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/twotruths-india/>.

Vetturini 2007   Gianpaolo Vetturini, *The bKa' gdams pa School of Tibetan Buddhism*. [Revised version of the Ph.D. thesis accepted in 2007 at SOAS, University of London]. http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/rarebooks/downloads/Gianpaolo_Vetturini_PhD.pdf.http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/rarebooks/downloads/Gianpaolo_Vetturini_PhD.pdf.http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/rarebooks/downloads/Gianpaolo_Vetturini_PhD.pdf.http://himalaya.socanth.cam.ac.uk/collections/rarebooks/downloads/Gianpaolo_Vetturini_PhD.pdf.

Wood 1991 — Thomas E. Wood, *Mind Only: A Philosophical and Doctrinal Analysis of the Vijñānavāda*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press (Monograph No. 9, Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy), 1991.