

THE JOURNAL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
BUDDHIST STUDIES

CO-EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

*Gregory Schopen*  
*Indiana University*  
*Bloomington, Indiana, USA*

*Roger Jackson*  
*Fairfield University*  
*Fairfield, Connecticut, USA*



EDITORS

*Peter N. Gregory*  
*University of Illinois*  
*Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA*

*Ernst Steinkellner*  
*University of Vienna*  
*Wien, Austria*

*Alexander W. Macdonald*  
*Université de Paris X*  
*Nanterre, France*

*Jikidō Takasaki*  
*University of Tokyo*  
*Tokyo, Japan*

*Robert Thurman*  
*Amherst College*  
*Amherst, Massachusetts, USA*

ASSISTANT EDITOR

*Bruce Cameron Hall*  
*College of William and Mary*  
*Williamsburg, Virginia, USA*

*Volume 10*

*1987*

*Number 2*

# CONTENTS

## I. ARTICLES

1. Pure Land Buddhist Hermeneutics:  
Hōnen's Interpretation of  
*Nembutsu*, by Allan A. Andrews 7
2. Sa-skya Paṇḍita, the White Panacea and the Hva-shang  
Doctrine, by Michael Broido 27
3. Indian Commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra*: The Politics  
of Interpretation, by Malcolm David Eckel 69
4. Notes on Nāgārjuna and Zeno in Motion,  
by Brian Galloway 80
5. Note on a Chinese Text Demonstrating the Earliness  
of *Tantra*, by John C. Huntington 88
6. The Inscription on the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and  
the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India  
by Gregory Schopen 99
7. Background Material for the First Seventy Topics in  
Maitreya-nātha's *Abhisamayālamkāra*,  
by Gareth Sparham 139

## II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *The Genesis of an Orientalist: Thomas William Rhys Davids  
and Buddhism in Sri Lanka*,  
by Ananda Wickremeratne  
(A.P. Kannangara) 161
2. *The Legend of King Asoka: A Study and Translation  
of the "Asokavadana,"* by John S. Strong  
(Bardwell Smith) 165

3. *Nāgārjuna: The Philosophy of the Middle Way*  
by David J. Kalupahana  
(Karen Christina Lang) 167
4. *Tibet—Bon Religion: A Death Ritual of the Tibetan Bonpos,*  
by Per Kvaerne  
(Michael Aris) 175

### III. SPECIAL SECTION

- Title/Author Index of Vols. 1-10, compiled  
by Bruce Cameron Hall 181

# Sa-skyā Paṇḍita, the White Panacea and the Hva-Shang Doctrine\*

by Michael Broido

ngo-bo . . . skyes-pa'i dus-na/dkar-po  
chig-thub gcig-shes kun-grol song-bas/  
—sGam-po-pa<sup>1</sup>

rjod-byed tshig-gi steng-du glegs-bam mang/  
/brjod-bya don gcig ston-la thams-cad 'khril/  
/de phyir gcig-shes kun-grol bka'-rgyud-kyil/  
/bla-ma'i zhabs-la rnam-kun phyag bgyi'o/  
—Padma dKar-po<sup>2</sup>

## 1. Introduction

According to Sa-skyā Paṇḍita, the White Panacea (*dkar-po chig-thub*) is a *mahāmudrā* doctrine newly adopted by unnamed persons, evidently the bKa'-brgyud-pas as specialists in *mahāmudrā*, and bearing a suspicious relationship with the noxious doctrines of Hva-shang Mahāyāna, the Chinese Ch'an master defeated by Kamalsāṣila at the bSam-yas debate.<sup>3</sup> As a result of this debate, the Buddhist doctrines officially permitted in Tibet were those of the gradual, staged (*rim-gyis-pa'i*) variety; and Sa-skyā Paṇḍita is complaining that doctrines of the sudden (*cig-car-ba'i*) variety are being reintroduced into Tibet by the bKa'-brgyud-pas and the rNying-ma-pas.

The colloquial use for *dkar-po chig-thub* is of a medical plant, perhaps ginseng. Now the point of the analogy between ginseng and *mahāmudrā* is not merely that just as ginseng cures all diseases, *mahāmudrā* cures all defects of the personality. When the bKa'-brgyud-pas use the word on their own account, as does Zhang Tshal-pa (1123–93) in his important *mahāmudrā* work *Phyag-chen lam-mchog mthar-thug*,<sup>4</sup> the idea is rather that once the disease, whatever it was, has been cured by means of ginseng *there is no need to take any further medicine to cure it*, and similarly

once *mahāmudrā* has been attained there is no need to do anything further in order to remove defilements. Thus, following attainment it is unnecessary and useless to enquire what the defilements were; in this form the analogy is connected with an old Buddhist one, according to which the person who is suffering from a disease wants it cured, and does not want to be told its name. Ginseng (*mahāmudrā*) is the cure. In more specifically *vajrayāna* language, the White Panacea (*dkar-po chig-thub*) is thus connected with seals (*mudrā*).

However, in the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye* Sa-skyā Paṇḍita ignores the views of the bKa'-brgyud-pas and takes the word to stand for a complete quietism, a "do-nothing" attitude towards the doctrine, and claims further that this is the heresy of the Hva-shang. The present paper presents Padma dKar-po's replies to some of these attacks, mainly as given in his *Phyag-chen gan-mdzod*. Evidence will be given for the following theses:

A. The term *dkar-po chig-thub* was used by Zhang Tshal-pa in the *Phyag-chen lam-mchog mthar-thug* in the sense of "(*mahāmudrā* as) the only cure for defilements" (*kleśa, nyon-mongs*), that is, to convey the idea that once *mahāmudrā* has been attained, there is no more effort to be made, and the practitioner should act effortlessly (*anabhogacārya, lhun-gyis grub-pa'i spyod-pa*). The text of the *dKar-po chig-thub* chapter of this work is in Appendix A, and a summary is in Section I below; it is straightforward, and the thesis stated here is plainly supported by it. From the materials given in Appendix A we see also that the notions of "sameness" (*mnyam-pa-nyid*) and non-duality are precisely *not* dealt with under the White Panacea (*dkar-po chig-thub*) but in an earlier chapter of the *Lam-mchog mthar-thug*.

B. There is no evidence for the systematic use of *dkar-po chig-thub* by bKa'-brgyud-pas earlier than Zhang Tshal-pa. The word has certainly been used once or twice by sGam-po-pa, but not in any technical sense or as part of a doctrinal scheme.

C. *dKar-po chig-thub* used by Padma dKar-po only when replying to the attacks of Sa-skyā Paṇḍita and to questions from people in other traditions. Padma dKar-po never uses the term on his own account. It plays no independent role in the bKa'-brgyud-pas' own rather complex conception of *mahāmudrā* (part of which is sketched below). Nevertheless, Padma dKar-po does

accept the thesis expressed by Zhang Tshal-pa (see A above) in terms of this word.

D. In the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*, Sa-skyā Paṇḍita is not working with any clear conception either of the White Panacea (*dKar-po chig-thub*) or of the Hva-shang doctrine.

E. Notwithstanding Padma dKar-po's qualified acceptance of the *dKar-po chig-thub* notion (C), he rejects completely the thesis that his tradition merely follows the views of the Hva-shang.

F. In rejecting this identification of the bKa'-brgyud-pa view with that of the Hva-shang, Padma dKar-po mainly follows the orthodox position as set out in the third *Bhāvanākrama*. Though he does not give a full exposition of the Hva-shang doctrine (as he sees it) he does set out certain matters (independently of Kamalaśīla) on which he is in agreement with the Hva-shang. Thanks to the valuable work of Japanese and other scholars, ably summarized and continued in a recent article by Luis Gomez, we now have a fair idea, independent of Kamalaśīla, of what the views of Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen really were.<sup>5</sup> In section 3, I set out some of these views of Mo-ho-yen, following Gomez, and compare them with observations about the Hva-shang which Padma dKar-po puts forward in his *Phyag-chen gan-mdzod* and elsewhere. In making this comparison, the crucial point to be grasped on the bKa'-brgyud-pa side is the particular notion of "no mental activity" (*amanasikāra*) which is in use, namely that based on the ideas of Maitripa.<sup>6</sup> Padma dKar-po contrasts this notion of *amanasikāra* with the view of the Hva-shang, and shows that they are incompatible. The failure to grasp this essential point is probably the most serious defect in the polemic of Sa-skyā Paṇḍita (insofar as it is directed towards the bKa'-brgyud-pas).

G. Sa-skyā Paṇḍita and others identify the "quick entry to the path" (*cig-car 'jug-pa'i lam*) of the bKa'-brgyud-pas with the "sudden gate" (*cig-car 'jug-pa'i sgo, ston-mun*) of the Chinese. According to Padma dKar-po, this identification is confused; the two views differ in two quite general ways, independently of the point about "no mental activity" (*amanasikāra*) briefly mentioned under F. First, the Hva-shang view is a view about the nature of goal-attainment in Buddhism *quite generally*, while the view which Padma dKar-po does hold is a view about the

path, and not the goal, applying only to certain people and not others. Second, the Hva-shang view is part of the *hetuyāna* and has no application to the *vajrayāna*, while Padma dKar-po's *cig-car 'jug-pa'i lam* is part of the *vajrayāna* and is irrelevant to the *hetuyāna*.<sup>7</sup> These points about the Hva-shang view, as made by Padma dKar-po, seem to be adequately confirmed by the Tun-huang materials.

H. As is well-known, Sa-skyā Paṇḍita objected to the bKa'-brgyud-pa view according to which there is a *mahāmudrā* in the *sūtras* as well as the *tantras*. According to G, it might seem as though Padma dKar-po is going to be in difficulty defending this bKa'-brgyud-pa view, at least for the "sudden" (*cig-car*) type of person. Padma dKar-po's general defence of the notion of *mahāmudrā* in the *sūtras* has been presented elsewhere.<sup>8</sup> *But his notion of a sudden type of person applies only to the tantras, indeed, only to the anuttarayogatantras; so in the sūtras the problem never arises.*

K. Of the detailed *mahāmudrā* doctrines propagated by the bKa'-brgyud-pas, Sa-skyā Paṇḍita has attacked the "five aspects" (*lnga-ldan*) system of the 'Bri-gung-pas with particular force. I suggest that these attacks may be explained by personal animosity of the Sa-skyā-pas towards Phag-mo Gru-pa rDo-rje rGyal-po, the originator of the "five aspects" system.

## 2. The bKa'-brgyud-pas on the White Panacea

2.1 sGam-po-pa used the phrase *dkar-po chig-thub* occasionally<sup>9</sup> but there is no reason to think he associated any technical sense with the word. It is not found where we might expect it (in relation to the subject-matter) in the *sGom-tshul zhus-lan*. Generally speaking, sGam-po-pa avoided as far as possible the use of specialized technical terms. For example, if anything in Buddhism is ever invented by anybody sGam-po-pa was the inventor of the *lhan-cig skyes-sbyor (sahajayoga)* system of *mahāmudrā*. (While the idea of a goal common to both *sūtras* and *tantras* goes back to Nāropa,<sup>10</sup> sGam-po-pa was the first person to teach them both on a parallel basis). Yet sGam-po-pa himself avoids the term *lhan-cig-skyes-sbyor*, preferring to substitute a brief explanation of what it stands for. Similarly he avoided the words *dkar-po-chig-thub* and *yid-la mi-byed-pa (amanasikāra)*, preferring just to

say directly whatever it was that he wanted to say.

The standard bKa'-brgyud-pa source for *dkar-po-chig-thub*, and the one usually mentioned by bKa'-brgyud-pa writers and scholars, is the chapter of that name in Zhang Tshal-pa's *Phyag-rgya chen-po lam-mchog mthar-thug*. There is not the slightest reason to think that what is described by Zhang Tshal-pa in this famous work has anything to do with quietism or with the views of Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen (regardless of whether the Ho-shang was really a quietist or not). As we see from the text, given in Appendix A, the whole chapter is a series of aphorisms listing the various stages of Buddhist practice and saying *what has to be the case for them to be complete*. This question of completeness is adumbrated for the moment of *abhisambodhi*<sup>11</sup> (v. 1), for [refuge in] the three jewels (vv. 2–4), for *bodhicitta* (vv. 5–6), for the six *pāramitās* (vv. 7–9), for the two accumulations of merit and awareness (v. 10), for the four stages of *abhiṣeka* (vv. 11–12), for the stages of generation and completion in *sādhana* practice (v. 13), for various paths and *bodhisattva*-levels (v. 14), for the three *buddhakāyas* (v. 15), and for the four stages of view, cultivation, action and goal<sup>12</sup> (v. 16). The very last verse alone is not on this topic of completeness; but it emphasizes that right up to buddhahood, *karma* and its ripening continue to exist and it is necessary to renounce evil and to accumulate merit. The White Panacea doctrine, as thus set out by Zhang Tshal-pa, is clearly a doctrine applying both to the *vajrayāna* and to the *lakṣaṇayāna*. And in the *vajrayāna*, it applies to both the “sudden” and “gradual” types, as Padma dKar-po understood these terms, since the difference between these two types is primarily in the specific content of their practices, and not in the generalities adumbrated by Zhang Tshal-pa or in their both having to traverse an extended path.

I have gone to some trouble to exhibit this text, not only because of its intrinsic interest but because it is older than Sa-skyia Paṅḍita's criticisms and is therefore not open to the charge of having been produced as a way of averting those criticisms.

2.2 The bKa'-brgyud-pas have used *mahāmudrā* in various ways:

- (a) for one of the four *mudrās*
- (b) as a synonym of, or close variant on, *madhyamaka*



- (c) as a name of various techniques of meditation
- (d) as a name for various systems of meditation practice

(a) *Mudrā* means “seal,” and *mahāmudrā* means “the great seal”; the Tibetans use it in this sense in both masculine and feminine forms. While the *karmamudrā* is a real woman and the *jñānamudrā* is a visualized image, the *word mahāmudrā* does not stand for any particular thing which symbolizes something else; it is the sealing or binding together of items experienced in *nirvikalpajñāna* with that *nirvikalpajñāna* itself and as such has ground, path and goal phases (see (b) below). The Tibetans emphasize the notion of “not going beyond” as part of “seal” (*phyag-rgya*); as Guenther has rightly pointed out, on the basis of Padma dKar-po’s *Gan-mdzod* itself, this idea goes back to Mi-la-ras-pa. This is the point at which the *dkar-po chig-thub* notion connects with the notion of *mahāmudrā* as one of the four *mudrās*.

(b) For the bKa’-brgyud-pas, *mahāmudrā* has another, related sense similar to one sense of *madhyamaka*. In particular there is a *sūtra-mahāmudrā* and a *tantra-mahāmudrā*, and they represent the same attainment (only the methods involved are different.)<sup>13</sup> This point has been strongly disputed by the Sa-skyapa; there is also a slight difference here with the dGe-lugs. In the *tantras*, *mahāmudrā* is often described as “the origin of all *dharmas*” and identified with the *dharmakāya*. This does not mean that all the *dharmas* originate from *mahāmudrā* in the sense of some causal theory<sup>14</sup> but that the *dharmas*, as concepts or descriptions of the items of experience, have *mahāmudrā* as their *place of origination (skye-gnas)*. (There is an important element of metaphor in this phrase.) In the *tantras*, this is symbolized by taking *mahāmudrā* to be the *yonī* or *bhaga* or *dharmodaya*. The parallel with *madhyamaka* is emphasized by the parallel way in which the *tantras* (and sometimes the *sūtras*) take Prajñāpāramitā as a deity and as the *dharmodaya*. In as much as *mahāmudrā* is the place of origin of the *dharmas*—the descriptive part of experience—the realisation of *mahāmudrā* as the great seal means just letting the mind rest in its experiencing *without becoming attached to the labelling concepts* which arise in the course of experience; concepts which are, as the bKa’-brgyud-pas well understood, a necessary part of experience (including seeing things properly,

*paramārthatas*) and not something to be swept away into some sort of chaos of disconnected appearances. *dKar-po chig-thub* is another way of expressing this same idea.

The bKa'-brgyud-pas hold that *mahāmudrā*, regarded as the place of origin of all *dharmas*, is the ground, path and goal of the entire process of freeing oneself from delusions. For Padma dKar-po, ground-*mahāmudrā* is the integration of the two *satyas* (*bden gnyis zung-'jug*), path-*mahāmudrā* is the integration of insight and means (*thabs-shes zung-'jug*), and goal-*mahāmudrā* is the integration of the two *buddhakāyas* (*sku gnyis zung-jug*). He uses exactly the same language for the description of *madhyamaka* as ground, path and goal.<sup>15</sup> In each case a feature-universal (*paramārtha-satya*, *prajñā-pāramitā*, *dharmakāya*) is integrated with items of particular sorts falling under certain general categories (*samvṛti-satya*, *upāya*, *rūpakāya*).<sup>15a</sup>

The seal (*mudrā*) is the understanding that in each case, items of that general category depend on the feature-universal for their identity *as* items of that category. Put this way, the connection may seem trivial; but it is given content, especially in the case of the two *satyas*, by the identification of *paramārtha-satya* with the radiant light, of *upāya* with the *bodhisattvas'* *upāya-kauśalya*, and of the *rūpakāya* with the *nirmāṇakāya* and *sambhogakāya* of the Buddha. Dol-po Shes-rab rGyal-mtshan, by contrast, took *mahāmudrā* as itself *subject* to the two *satyas* (further identified as *gzhan-stong* and *rang-stong*) rather than as the principle which *subjects* the ordinary items of experience *to* the *satyas*. Since in this way he had nothing to keep the two aspects of *mahāmudrā* together, the temptation to reject one (*rang-stong* = *samvṛti-satya*) and keep the other (*gzhan-stong* = *paramārtha-satya*) was irresistible; but then, as Padma dKar-po pointed out, the integration (*zung-'jug*) has disintegrated.<sup>16</sup>

(c) As ground and goal, *madhyamaka/mahāmudrā* is essentially one, though of course it will have various aspects. As path, it is very various, and there is a tendency to use *madhyamaka* more strictly of the *sūtra*-level methods and *mahāmudrā* of the *tantra*-level methods. All the many techniques of the *upāya-mārga* which may lead to the goal of *mahāmudrā* may *ipsissimo facto* be thought of as falling under path-*mahāmudrā*; and this was how phrases like "mahāmudrā meditation" (*phyag-chen sgom-pa*) were used by the early bKa'-brgyud-pas. Accordingly it is senseless to com-

plain, as Sa-skya Paṇḍita does in the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*, that the *dkar-po chig-thub* is not one but many. *dKar-po chig-thub*—remaining in *mahāmudrā* as the place of origin of the *dharmas*—is precisely what holds the many together as one, and so is not itself subject to the notions of one and many (*gcig dang du bral*),<sup>17</sup> even in a purely conventional logical sense.

(d) Sa-skya Paṇḍita's complaint is formulated semi-explicitly as an attack on the "five aspects" system of *mahāmudrā* meditation (*phyag-chen lnga-ldan*). This system was a speciality of the 'Bri-gung-pas, and there appears to be something especially pig-headed about the attack as directed against the originator of the *dgongs-gcig* doctrine. It may become slightly more comprehensible (though not really excusable) if we recall that the *lnga-ldan* system was actually originated not by 'Bri-gung sKyob-pa 'Jig-rten mGon-po, but by his teacher Phag-mo Gru-pa rDo-rje rGyal-po; while it was practiced especially in the 'Bri-gung tradition, it was also handed down in the other bKa'-brgyud-pa traditions, and we have works on it from the hands of Padma dKar-po,<sup>18</sup> Si-tu Chos-kyi 'Byung-gnas<sup>19</sup> and many others. Now Phag-mo Gru-pa was the principal pupil of sGam-po-pa; but before meeting him, he had been to many teachers and studied many doctrines, and in particular had learned the entire *lam-'bras* system from Sa-chen Kun-dga sNying-po<sup>20</sup>; this is why there are various bKa'-brgyud-pa transmissions of the *lam-'bras*, such as that recorded by Padma dKar-po.<sup>21</sup> After the death of sGam-po-pa in 1153, Phag-mo gru-pa sought Sa-chen out in order to ask him questions; but Sa-chen refused to see him,<sup>22</sup> and since then the name of Phag-mo Gru-pa has not been heard of much in the Sa-skya tradition, in spite of his vast fame elsewhere. It is tempting to speculate that Sa-skya Paṇḍita's attack on the *lnga-ldan* system may have been motivated by animosity towards Phag-mo Gru-pa, rather than towards sGam-po-pa or 'Bri-gung-pa.<sup>23</sup>

2.3 Another way of considering the connection between Padma dKar-po's view of *dkar-po chig-thub* and the Hva-shang view is to look at his account of the latter and consider whether it involves the former or not. In chapter 5 of the *Phyag-chen gan-mdzod* Padma dKar-po considers at considerable length a passage from the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye* in which the variety of

*mahāmudrā* which Sa-skyā Paṇḍita is attacking is identified with “Chinese rDzogs-chen.”<sup>24</sup> *dKar-po chig-thub* is not even mentioned in Padma dKar-po’s discussion of these notions; proof enough, it would seem, that he uses the *dkar-po chig-thub* notion only when it is imposed on him by others, as by Sa-skyā Paṇḍita earlier in the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*.

In fact the refutation of Sa-skyā Paṇḍita’s remarks is surprisingly straightforward, even though it has a slight twist to its tail. Padma dKar-po starts by pointing out that Sa-skyā Paṇḍita has got the actual story of the bSam-yas debate wrong, according to Kamalaśīla’s own account.<sup>25</sup> At a first debate, Kamalaśīla and the Hva-shang were not present,<sup>26</sup> the *rtsen-min* (gradual, *rim-gyis*) persuasion being represented by Ye-shes dbang-po, sBa’ dPal-dbyangs and others, while the sudden persuasion (*ston-min*, *cig-car*) was represented by Jo Byang-chub and Sru Yang-dag.<sup>27</sup> On this occasion the *rtsen-min* (gradual persuasion) “pleased the king.”<sup>28</sup> A second debate was then held between the principals<sup>29</sup> and “the sudden persuasion was refuted by reasoning and scripture; the Hva-shang and his pupils remained defenseless, and Kamalaśīla was garlanded with flowers.”<sup>30</sup> It is difficult to imagine a more conventional account.

But as I said, there is a twist at the end. The doctrine of the Hva-shang is a pure Mahāyāna doctrine, having nothing to do with the *vajrayāna*, while the Indian *cig-car-ba* doctrine of Tilopa, Nāropa and Padma dKar-po is a *vajrayāna* doctrine. There is no *cig-car-ba* notion applying to the *sūtras*. *Śamathā* and *vipāśyanā*, though not part of the *upāya-mārga* (and in that sense not *vajrayāna techniques*) are nevertheless based on the *Vairocanābhīśambodhi-tantra*<sup>31</sup> and so require *abhiṣeka*. In any case, the point is academic; though the *ghan-cig-skyes-sbyor* method of *mahāmudrā* includes the elementary forms of *śamathā* and *vipāśyanā*,<sup>32</sup> nobody seriously supposes that a *cig-car-ba* would practice these elementary techniques. The important point here is that according to the bKa’-brygud-pas, a *cig-car-ba* can attain insight immediately following *abhiṣeka*; this has been denied by Sa-skyā Paṇḍita, in passages quoted by Padma dKar-po elsewhere in the *Gan-mdzod*.<sup>33</sup> But this point is in no way affected by the repudiation of the Hva-shang view, of course.

Padma dkar-po describes the relation between the Hva-shang view and the *vajrayāna* thus:<sup>34</sup>

The objector (Sa-skya Paṇḍita) claims that the Chinese tradition is a form of *rdzogs-chen*, but this is not observed. It is a *sūtra*-level *bhāvanākrama*, while *rdzogs-chen atiyoga* is nothing of the sort. Had it been *rdzogs-chen* [which the Hva-shang was speaking of], Kamalaśīla would have been unable to refute it by referring to the *sūtras* and to the *Vairocanābhisambodhitāntra*. Accordingly the two methods [of the Hva-shang and of Kamalaśīla] both belong to the *lakṣaṇayāna*.

Padma-dKar-po continues<sup>35</sup> with a long quotation from the third *Bhāvanākrama* which specifically refutes the Hva-shang's view. He then considers the contrast between his views of the *cig-car-ba*/*thod-rgal-balrim-gyis-pa* distinction as a distinction of different paths (and the persons who follow them) within a certain conception of what all those paths are based on and are leading to (viz. *mahāmudrā*), and the view attributed to the Hva-shang by Sa-skya Paṇḍita (probably wrongly, according to Padma dKar-po) according to which *everybody* would be a *cig-car-ba*. Padma dKar-po was strongly opposed to the latter view<sup>36</sup>; and here<sup>37</sup> he points out that if the arguments in the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye* have any force at all, it is only against this view held neither by the bKa'-brgyud-pas nor, probably, by the Hva-shang.<sup>38</sup>

He then<sup>39</sup> mentions various internal inconsistencies in Sa-skya Paṇḍita's exposition of the *lam-'bras* doctrine, but it would take us too far afield to go into all this here. The chapter (and the whole work) conclude with a discussion of more specific point of dispute concerning the relation between *samathā* and *vipaśyanā* and related matters.

### 3. *The Essence of Mahāmudrā as the Medicinal Plant* dKar-po chig-thub [*Removing All Defilements*]<sup>40</sup>

Here we give a translation of most of the section of the *Phyag-chen gan-mdzod* in which Padma dKar-po treats the White Panacea (*dkar-po chig-thub*) doctrine. The treatment revolves entirely around criticisms of the bKa'-brgyud-pas appearing in the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*, whose verses are quoted (without acknowledgment, save by a "*kha-cig ni . . .*" or similar).

"In his commentary on the *Hevajra-tantra*,<sup>41</sup> the great translator [Mar-pa] said

All *dharma*s,<sup>42</sup> from the most subtle through to motion, are not established on their own account. Having thus understood *sahaja-prakṛti* as the view, one cultivates it, and this is *samāhita*, etc. However, if what is cultivated is *samāhita* without *pr̥sthalabdhā*, it is [merely] a simulacrum of *sahaja-jñāna*. It has been said to me and others that from the viewpoint of one who understands *mahāmudrā* thus, all *dharma*s of *saṃsāra* and *nirvāna* arise from it,<sup>43</sup> and are its emanations. Accordingly, even a man with little merit who, having understood that the whole of view, cultivation of the view and action are *mahāmudrā* and having cultivated [the view] for a long time, will attain realization. So what is the point of paying attention to anything else? So it has been taught.

“So at the time of understanding there is no need to consider any other *dharma* than *mahāmudrā*. And in Ācarya Jñānakīrti’s *Tattvāvatāra* we find:

Though the Exalted One has the nature [*bdag-nyid*] of *dharmakāya*, *vajra-bodhicitta* is also the essence [*ngo-bo-nyid*] of the *tathāgatas*. Further, *prajñāpāramitajñāna* is non-dual and is to be realised by the *tathāgatas*. The inseparable union of *mahāmudrā*<sup>44</sup> is the same, and it has the nature of *mahākaruṇa*. Since it has the nature of *bodhicitta*, it is the natural *yoga*<sup>44a</sup> of all merit. Thus, its cultivation leads completely to countless results. Accordingly, the cultivation of non-dual *mahāmudrā* is what all *yogins* who attain countless results have in common. So the Exalted One taught that there is but one vehicle, as it taught with certainty in the *Buddhasaṅgītisūtra*. There is no vehicle separate from the *dharmadhātu*, the essence of the awareness of non-dual *mahāmudrā*.”

Here Padma dKar-po expresses what he wants to say in quotations, hardly using his own words. He now introduces the first of two quotations which he will attack, both from Sa-skya Paṇḍita’s *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*, without however mentioning either the author or the work.

“Others, however, have said<sup>45</sup>:

Some say that the three *kāyas* arise as an effect from the *dkar-po chig-thub*. However an effect cannot arise from a single [cause]; and one which did would be single, like the *nirodha* of the *śrāvakas*.

“These remarks are inconsistent [*rang-la gnod-do*]; the middle one contradicts the first and last. Why is that? It is unanimously agreed that no effect can arise from a single thing, and yet here the *nirodha* of the *śrāvakas* is called an effect which arises from a single cause.”

In any case, these arguments of Sa-skya Paṇḍita are irrelevant, since we are not talking about causation in a technical sense. Padma dKar-po now gives a series of nine quotations which simultaneously illustrate four points. First, there is one place of origin of all *dharmas*, which has been called many different names, *mahāmudrā*, *sems-nyid*, etc. (a point dealt with in more detail under the next quotation from the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*). Second, various paths or methods originate there. Third, they all have one common effect or product. Fourth, it is essential not to go beyond this one *mahāmudrā*. All these topics belong to *dkar-po chig-thub*, but the last is especially characteristic.

“The wrongness of this [view expressed by Sa-skya Paṇḍita] is shown by Saraha<sup>46</sup>:

Mind alone is the seed of everything, from which proceed whatever exists and whatever is at rest. Homage to mind, which, like a wish-fulfilling gem, grants the desired result!

“And again by Saraha<sup>47</sup>:

From one root grow two branches,  
And from these two grows one fruit.

“Avalokiteśvara says<sup>48</sup>:

The hero-stage, the *svādhiṣṭhānakrama*, is pure, but is not the path of freedom. There is only one wholly pure stage,<sup>49</sup> the *buddhas* say, from which liberation follows.

“And in the *Kālacakrantra*<sup>50</sup>:

This single thing<sup>51</sup> is fivefold; the *abhisambodhi* of the highest exalted ones is of twenty kinds, and has the character of many different sorts of illusion. By means of this same bliss in an instant there is the (desired) result, and not by action of any other nature (*svabhāva*). Here the means is unchanging, instantaneous (sic) and is in that which enters the *sahaja-dharmadhātu*.

From bliss there is the further wish for bliss, instantaneous, *sahaja*, and wanting nothing else; they arise from the *skandhas* but also from an instant of bliss, from pure *dharmas*<sup>52</sup> and from what is pure, like the roots, leaves, flowers and fruit from the sowing of a single pure seed.

“And from other examples. For instance the *Yogīnīsañcārya*:

Only from great bliss, only from experiencing it, comes the dance of the multifold.<sup>53</sup>

“And many other *tantra*-passages make the same point. But we find it also in the *sūtra* literature, as for instance:

There is mainly one inseparable vehicle, for it is inseparable (sic) from the *dharmadhātu*.<sup>54</sup>

“and

Since it is inseparable from the *dharmadhātu*, it is not suitable for different types<sup>55</sup>; differences between distinctions in the *dharmas* are dependent [on the *dharmadhātu*].

“Further there is a contradiction with perception. Further still, it would follow that all the arguments establishing that there is just one ultimate vehicle are wrong.”

The next quotation from the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye* is directed against the ‘Bri-gung-pa tradition of *mahāmudrā* called *lnga-ldan*, in which five aspects of *mahāmudrā* are stressed, viz. *bodhicitta-mahāmudrā*, *devakāya-mahāmudrā*, devotional *mahāmudrā*, *abhiṣeka-mahāmudrā* and *vidyā-mahāmudrā*. Obviously, as Padma dKar-po will point out, it does not mean that these are *five different mahāmudrās*<sup>56</sup>:

Some say that after cultivating *dkar-po chig-thub* there must be a dedication of merit. But in that case there are two *chig-thub*. Indeed, if there is to be refuge, generation of *bodhicitta*, meditation on deities and *yidams*, etc., there must be many *chig-thub*. So this notion of *chig-thub* cannot be the teaching of the *buddhas*, and it is a clinging to substantiality and is the opposite of the Muni’s celebrated voidness.<sup>57</sup>

“This objection is childish [Padma dKar-po replies]. It would make just as much sense to say, within your own [tradition], that it is impermissible to arrange the two *kramas* in order. It is a mere conversational device to say that everything can be viewed only as *paramārtha*-[*satya*]. On the same level, in your own tradition one would have to say that [all generation of *bodhicitta*] is generation of *paramārtha-bodhicitta*.”



Padma dKar-po now gives numerous quotations from Indian sources (*Guhyasamāja*, *Hevajra*, *Kālacakra*, *Vimalaprabhā*, *Saṃpūṭa*, *Ḍākārṇava*, *Yogīnīsañcārya*, *Prajñāpāramitā*) showing separately for each of these five aspects of *mahāmudrā* how it is treated as standing for the whole; on Sa-skya Paṇḍita's view it would follow that all these Indian sources were foolishly confused. It would be tedious to reproduce all these quotations; I will give one example of each type.

“The following example of *bodhicitta-mahāmudrā* would be wrong<sup>58</sup>:

Bodhicitta in its *saṃvṛti* and *paramārtha* forms is generated by means of the *maṇḍalacakra* and the *svādhiṣṭhānakrama*

“Also the following example of *devakāya-mahāmudrā* would be wrong<sup>59</sup>:

The true abode of the deity and the *mantras* is in their nature of being *niṣprapañca*.

“So would be the following example of devotional *mahāmudrā*<sup>60</sup>:

Maitreya said: How should the *buddhas* and *bodhisattvas* look upon the *vajrācārya* who has given *abhiṣeka* for *Guhyasamāja*, the body, speech and mind of all the *buddhas* and *tathāgatas*? Son of a good family, all the *buddhas* and *bodhisattvas* should look upon him as upon *bodhicitta-vajra*. Why is that? Because the *ācārya* is equal to *bodhicitta* itself, the two are inseparable.

“And similarly *mahāmudrā* may be expressed in terms of *abhiṣeka*<sup>61</sup>:

Power is transferred by the great bliss of knowledge of things as they are, in the *abhiṣekas* of *mahāmudrā*; the *maṇḍala* has no other origin.”

The examples of *vidyā-mahāmudrā* are too complex to be pursued here.<sup>62</sup> Padma dKar-po also gives examples of various other types of *mahāmudrā* (not specially associated with the *lṅga-ldan* system). It may be obtained in the mode of *gshis*,<sup>63</sup> in the mode of *gnas-lugs*,<sup>64</sup> by purification, etc. The essential point is that what is thereby attained is always the same, even though the methods differ; and so once one method has been pursued to

the end, there is no need to take up another. This is the point of the verse quoted after the title of this paper; similarly Padma dKar-po quotes the *Ḍākārṇava*<sup>65</sup>:

By cultivating one instruction, all instructions are understood. Just as by attaining one *bhūmi*, all *bhūmis* are attained, so by attaining one instruction, all instructions are attained.

“And in a *sūtra*:

Though in the various realms of the world I have spoken various *sūtras* using various words, the intent<sup>66</sup> is the same. Meditating on one saying is like meditating on all.

“and in the *Prajñāpāramitā*:

Fully knowing the *sūtras* on one *dharma*, one fully knows the *sūtras* on all *dharms*.

“To seek for another means after having attained this *mahāmudrā* would be like looking for the same elephant which one had already found and abandoned [and this is the point of the White Panacea]. The sense of this is already found slightly in the *Prajñāpāramitā* and in the *dohas*.

This concludes the second chapter of the *Phyag-rgya chen-po man-ngag-gi bshad-sbyar rgyal-ba'i gan-mdzod*, summarizing the content of the notion of *mahāmudrā*.”

#### 4. A Direct Comparison Between the Views of Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen and Kun-mkhyen Padma dKar-po

In the previous section we saw how Sa-skya Paṇḍita distorted the views of the bKa'-brgyud-pas; but it has not been possible, in the absence of Chinese comment on his *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*, to consider to what extent he has also distorted the views of Mo-ho-yen. In this section we will bypass Sa-skya Paṇḍita altogether, and make a direct comparison between the views of Mo-ho-yen and those of the bKa'-brgyud-pas as represented by Padma dKar-po. We will not be particularly interested in those points of similarity which they shared with the rest of the Bud-

dhist world (since it hardly seems necessary to reply to Sa-skya Paṇḍita's charge<sup>67</sup> that they were not Buddhists at all). Rather, we will be concerned with points on which they agreed in opposition to Sa-skya Paṇḍita, and with points on which they simply disagreed. We will find important points of both types. To the extent that there are points of great importance, concerning their respective "sudden" doctrines, on which the bKa'-brgyud-pas differed from Mo-ho-yen, it seems that Sa-skya Paṇḍita was simply wrong in his sweeping identification of the two. On the other hand there *are* points of similarity; and while it would be of interest to see whether these are shared also by the rNying-ma-pas, that would go beyond the scope of this paper.

The comparison is made possible by the analysis of Tun-huang and other fragments of old works plausibly attributed to Mo-ho-yen by Japanese scholars, and surveyed recently by Luis Gomez [G83]. Gomez notes a very interesting inconsistency in the materials thus attributed to Mo-ho-yen: the Chinese language *Tun-wu ta-sheng cheng-li chüeh* (Pelliot 4646), claiming to be a report of the bSam-yas debate, is a very polemical work, while the works of which Tibetan fragments are extant seem much less extreme and polemical. Given that Kamalaśīla was also a participant in the debate, a direct comparison between him and Mo-ho-yen might well emphasize the *Cheng-li chüeh*; but that is not our purpose here. With the one exception of the attack on Sa-skya Paṇḍita, the works of Padma dKar-po on which I will rely are not polemical at all, and are written for members of his own tradition; and these seem more appropriately compared with the Tibetan-language fragments assembled and translated in Appendix 2 of [G83]. They are also more likely to be relevant for a quite different reason: whatever the actual views of Mo-ho-yen, translations of his works into Tibetan are more likely to have influenced Tibetan perceptions of him<sup>68</sup> than the probably<sup>69</sup> untranslated *Cheng-li chüeh*; for Chinese was not a language widely appreciated in Tibet.

On the whole, the *Cheng-li chüeh* passages quoted by Gomez do show Mo-ho-yen as radically different from Padma dKar-po. The following points would be totally unacceptable to Padma dKar-po<sup>70</sup>:

A. If one sees conceptions as no conceptions, one sees the Tathāgata. To understand this single thought is in itself the

greatest merit, surpassing by far all the merits that one could obtain by cultivating good *dharma*s . . . (p. 90)

B. You claim that common persons should not follow this method. For whom, then, were these teachings left by the *buddhas*? (p. 91)

C. The defect in conceptualization is that it has the power to hinder the original omniscience of all living beings . . . (p. 91)<sup>71</sup>

D. The duality of need and non-need, etc., have meaning only in the relative realm. (p. 98)<sup>72</sup>

E. A being of sharp faculties does not need medicine to be cured or a boat to cross the river (of *samsāra*) (p. 98)<sup>73</sup>

F. The sudden approach has been taught for the *prthagjana* also. (p. 99)<sup>74</sup>

G. When conceptualizations are given up, there is an automatic attainment of all virtues. (p. 99)<sup>75</sup>

There remains, indeed, only one striking feature in common between the Mo-ho-yen of the *Cheng-li chüeh* and Padma dKar-po: the insistence that wisdom and means cannot exist in isolation from one another.

The comparison becomes more interesting when one looks at the Tibetan fragments. Rather than quoting isolated sentences, I will hang a more continuous discussion on the metaphor of the white and black clouds which is used by Mo-ho-yen.<sup>76</sup> The central idea behind the metaphor is that good and bad thoughts both have to be given up, so that the nature of mind is not obscured, just as both black and white clouds must be absent if the sun is not to be obscured. This metaphor is not wholly repugnant to Padma dKar-po; and yet when we look more carefully at what it means to Mo-ho-yen and to Padma dKar-po, we see that there is still not very much in common.

First, even in the Tibetan fragments, Mo-ho-yen still insists that sooner or later, everybody has to practice the sudden way of abiding in no-mind.<sup>77</sup> But for Padma dKar-po, there are certainly people who will attain buddhahood through the practice of the gradual path alone. They attain it, typically, in the intermediate state, and by the methods of the *upāya-mārga*. There is no parallel to this in Mo-ho-yen.

Accordingly, for Padma dKar-po the metaphor, if it is relevant, is relevant only to the "sudden" type of person. Now this

kind of person does indeed suffer from attachment to concepts, whether good or bad, and where there is such attachment, the concepts (or the attachment to them) obscure mind or the radiant light. To this extent Mo-ho-yen's metaphor does apply. But the central point of the *cig-car-ba* notion (for Padma dKar-po) is that the concepts need not merely play the role of obscurations. The mind, or the radiant light, can also illuminate the concepts themselves, which now become the object of mental activity. And the *cig-car-ba* is able to see the nature of the concepts and by means of this insight to liberate himself. For the *cig-car-ba*, then, Mo-ho-yen's metaphor, while not exactly wrong, misses the point. A more apt analogy would be that of a man standing on a mountain peak and seeing the clouds below him, illuminated by the sun. The *rim-gyis-pa*, by contrast, is like a man standing at the bottom of the same mountain totally unable to see the sun (at any rate if he is not on the path of insight<sup>79</sup>). All he can do is to perform meritorious actions.

A point on which the Tibetan fragments of Mo-ho-yen are very unclear (at least as Gomez is able to render them) is the general nature of the path. Is there a path at all, according to Mo-ho-yen? In some passages he seems to write as though there is no path. Elsewhere, it seems more as though the path just is the practice of non-conceptualization, etc. Now if there is no path at all, we certainly have a sharp contrast with Padma dKar-po, for whom there is a path, even for the "sudden" type.<sup>79</sup> But if non-conceptualization is *the path*, then we have something corresponding, in Padma dKar-po, to a rather low level of practice, and not to the *amanasikāra* doctrine of Maitripa; this point is reviewed more carefully in Appendix B.

In spite of these important differences between the Mo-ho-yen of the Tibetan fragments and Padma dKar-po, we do find some points of similarity which are more specific than merely having the Mahāyāna in common, e.g.<sup>80</sup>:

One should not contrive [conceptualizations]; rather, one should not pursue them, one should not oppose them. It should be so that there is no artificial construction<sup>81</sup> [of conceptualizations].

Why is this? When the mind abides in them no more it should then not be made not to abide. When the mind does not examine, it should not be made not to examine. To do so would be to contrive [further conceptualizations].

And further<sup>82</sup>:

It is not a matter of whether one should accept or reject all *dharma*s or anything else; rather it is a matter of not giving rise to concepts or acceptance or rejection. . . . If concepts arise, one should not think anywhere of being or non-being, purity or impurity, emptiness or the absence thereof, etc. One does not think of non-thinking either. . . . But if one were to experience non-examination and does not act according to these concepts, or accept them or become attached to them, then every instant of mind is liberated at every moment.<sup>83</sup>

In spite of the imperfections of the materials available to Gomez and others (and in spite of the imperfections of my understanding of Padma dKar-po), this kind of more detailed comparison really does show up the hollowness and emptiness of Sa-skya Paṇḍita's invective. Because Sa-skya Paṇḍita has not taken any trouble to make clear *in exactly what ways* the *mahāmudrā* is like the Chinese or the Hva-shang view, he can be refuted by pointing to any difference one can find; and of course Padma dKar-po has no difficulty in finding important and substantial differences. Nevertheless, there are interesting parallels; and these do emerge more naturally from the Tibetan fragments of Mo-ho-yen than from the *Cheng-li chüeh*, rather as one would expect from Gomez' characterization of these two sources.

For a number of years now, it has been fashionable, in the study of Chinese Buddhism, to emphasize those features which are held to be indigenous rather than imported from India. The distinction is perfectly reasonable; but to my mind, the insistent emphasis has now become an orthodoxy which demands re-examination if it is not to stultify further progress. In particular, it has become fashionable to talk as though Indian Buddhism was concerned entirely with paths, stages and scholasticism, while only in China do we find a concern with direct experience. And as regards Tibetan Buddhism, since most scholars are familiar only with the varieties represented by writers such as Sa-skya Paṇḍita—thoroughly scholastic, and considering only the graded path—there has grown up the tendency to identify it with the scholastic tendencies in Indian Buddhism, and to connect any element in Tibetan Buddhism which stresses direct

experience with China. In this way, contemporary scholars risk repeating the very mistakes of Sa-skya Paṇḍita.

Really, there is no alternative to asking, separately for each system of doctrine or doctrinal notion found in the Tibetan literature: did this come from India? did it come from China? or is it a Tibetan innovation? Sa-skya Paṇḍita is a poor guide here, but Padma dKar-po is not quite unbiased either. He strove continually to demonstrate that the essential elements of his tradition derive from India, and are not Tibetan (or Chinese) innovations. And it has to be said that within the Tibetan cultural context, he was completely successful. After the time of Padma dKar-po, the charge that the bKa'-brgyud-pa doctrines are merely Tibetan or Chinese innovations was never seriously raised again. While we have no need to take everything he says at its face value, it does seem to me that a number of the points he made have stuck.

1. The main bKa'-brgyud-pa doctrines are squarely based on the works of Nāropa, Maitripa and Atīśa. These are Indian historical personages, whose historical connection with early Tibetan bKa'-brgyud-pas (especially Mar-pa Chos-kyi Blo-gros) can hardly be doubted.<sup>84</sup> To this argument, stressed so much by Padma dKar-po, we might add the gloss that many of the principal works of these three Indians upon which the bKa'-brgyud-pas rely are still available in Sanskrit versions from India and Nepal, and thus transmitted independently of the Tibetans. For instance, almost all the works of Maitripa described by Padma dKar-po as belonging to the Amanasikāra cycle are available in Sanskrit in the *Advayavajrasaṃgraha* (see Appendix B).

2. That the *vajrayāna* part of the bKa'-brgyud-pa doctrines can have come from China is impossible. Padma dKar-po's argument, that even the standard Tibetan accounts of the bSam-yas debate provide no room for the possibility that the Hva-shang doctrine could be a form of *rdzogs-chen*, applies with equal force to any other advanced form of *vajrayāna* and is really decisive. In any case, there is no reason to think that the *anut-tarayogatantras* of the late translation (*gSar-ma*) type were ever practiced in China except in circles directly connected with Tibetan culture. Far from the Chinese having brought them to Tibet, it was the Tibetans who brought them to China.

3. In the case of the non-*vajrayāna* form of *mahāmudrā*, the

situation is just as clear. The *cig-car-ba* notion (as used by the bKa'-bryud-pas) is simply irrelevant here. The *sūtra* doctrine of mahāmudrā is the doctrine of the *Samādhirājasūtra*.<sup>85</sup>

Nevertheless, once these essential points have been taken on board, Padma dKar-po is not unsympathetic to the possibility of some parallelism or mutual influence between Chinese ideas and those of the bKa'-bryud-pas. What possibilities are there?

1. It is possible that the reception in Tibet of bKa'-bryud ideas on the *tantras* may have been assisted by the presence of Chinese ideas on the *sūtras*. Possibly Maitripa's *amanasikāra* doctrine, for instance, bears some relation to ideas which have circulated in China at some time. Conceivably such ideas could have originated independently in China, rather than being brought there from India; and conceivably they may have passed into Tibet from China. But in order to find out if this is so, we need research, not dogmatic claims about the nature of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism.

2. As regards the rNying-ma tradition, the argument that its *vajrayāna* doctrines originated in China is explicitly refuted by Padma dKar-po and this refutation is equally decisive.<sup>86</sup> The non-*vajrayāna* parts of the rNying-ma doctrine do seem to have undergone Chinese influence, recorded, for instance, in the *bSam-gtan mig-sgron*. Since this influence occurred at a period long before the bKa'-bryud tradition developed in Tibet, a favourable reception for the ideas of Maitripa and others may indeed have been prepared by the presence in Tibet of just these ideas. Only very detailed research, such as is hardly being undertaken at the moment, can establish whether this is so or not. Meanwhile, the polemics (as Roger Jackson has rightly called them) of Sa-skya Paṇḍita throw very little light on these difficult problems.

*Postscript: Was There a White Panacea Doctrine in the Early Transmission Period?*

After this article had been completed in the summer of 1986, there appeared in this *Journal* a note [K86] by Leonard van der Kuijp, in which it is pointed out that (contrary to what Roger



Jackson claimed in [J82]), Sa-skya Paṇḍita was not the first person to equate *dkar-po chig-thub* with some form of Chinese Buddhism; Nyang-ral Nyi-ma'i Od-zer (1124–1192 or 1136–1204) did so in his *Chos-'byung* (NC). Van der Kuijp also gives some more speculative grounds for thinking that the association may go back to earlier works such as the *sBa-bzhed*.

Van der Kuijp's note suggests a variant approach to this problem, and one which is certainly worth investigating. In particular, it would be desirable to understand better the explanations of *dkar-po chig-thub* which he quotes from Sa-skya Paṇḍita's TG and other sources, concerning which he says "Striking is the number of 'buzz-words' used in these characterizations; such terms as *rang-ngo*, *sems ngo-'phrod*, and *rtogs* are 'loaded' with specific connotations found especially in the rNying-ma-pa *rdzogs-chen* tradition as well as certain *mahāmudrā* teachings of the Dwags-po bKa'-brgyud-pa schools and sects." It would be most desirable to know just with what specific connotations these "buzz-words" are "loaded." As far as I know, *ngo 'phrod-pa* quite standardly means "to show the nature (of a thing)" (Jäschke, Das). Consider then the following passage from Sa-skya Paṇḍita's *sPring-yig*, quoted by van der Kuijp:

*rgya-nag mkhan-po na-re / 'khor-ba skye-ba'i rgyu rang ngo rang-gis  
ma-shes-pas lan / rang-ngo rang-gis shes-na 'tshang-rgya / de'i phyir  
sems ngo-'phrod-na dkar-po chig-thub yin / . . . zer-nas*

This *seems* to mean simply: The Chinese abbot said: "The reason for *samsāra* to arise is that one does not know one's own [mind]; to know one's own mind is to rise into buddhahood. Thus if the nature of mind is known, there is *dkar-po chig-thub*. . . ." Is there more to the remark than this?

The association with the Nyang-ral Chos-'byung is suggestive rather than interesting for its own sake; after all, sGam-po-pa, who died in 1153 while Nyang-ral was still a young man, had used the term *dkar-po chig-thub*, and so the association does not, by itself, show that this term applied literally (rather than by mere analogy) to any form of Chinese Buddhism. Jackson's remarks [in J82, p. 96 (2) and (3)] that there is no evidence for it still, strictly speaking, holds true. However, towards the end of his paper van der Kuijp suggests a much more promising

approach when he says that various accounts of the bSam-yas debate “seem to indicate that the association of *dkar-po chig-thub* with the Chinese goes back to pre-*phyi-dar* Tibetan literature. . . .” As we will see, this does not make it at all plausible, as he speculates in the same sentence, that “there might just be some substance to Sa-pan’s linkage of some of the Dwags-po bKa’-brgyud doctrines with those promulgated by the Chinese in eight-century Tibet.” Still, van der Kuijp deserves credit for pointing out the alternative possibility, namely that *dkar-po chig-thub* may have been used of a Chinese doctrine quite different from that of the bKa’-brgyud-pas.

Padma dKar-po has made this very point in his *chos-'byung*, in discussing the origins of the bSam-yas debate:

Far away in lHo-brag mKhar-chu the pupils of Ho-shang Mahāyāna were increasing. He spread the doctrine that virtuous action of body and speech do not lead to buddhahood, but *amanasikāra* does; this was called *ston-mun*. dPal-dbyangs and sBa Ratna and others followed the Ācārya (Śāntarakṣita) to some extent; in Chinese this [view] was called *rtsen-min*. In Tibetan it is called *cig-car-ba* and *rim-skyes-pa*. Thus a dispute arose as to whether these [Chinese and Tibetan terms] are consistent [with each other]. The King decreed that it should be done according to the method of the Ācārya. At this the *ston-mun-pas* became angry, and said that the *rtsen-min-pas* ought to be killed.<sup>89</sup>

Padma dKar-po’s remark is ambiguous. On the face of it, it does seem as though he is dividing the *rtsen-min* view into *cig-car* and *rim-skyes*. This seems to be consistent with everything he has said in the *Phyag-chen gan-mdzod*, as I have discussed at such length in this article, about how his *cig-car* doctrine (and the *khregs-chod* of some of Padmasambhava’s followers) is not the (*ston-mun*) doctrine of the Hva-shang. Yet the remark could just be taken as meaning that *ston-mun* = *cig-car*, *rtsen-min* = *rim-skyes*; and it is this ambiguity, it seems, that led directly to the bSam-yas debate. The urgent problem, according to this view, is to work out just what that Chinese doctrine was.

Suppose, then, that evidence became available that the term *dkar-po chig-thub* was applied at an early date to some form of Chinese Buddhism. What light would it throw on Jackson’s main claims concerning Sa-skyā Paṇḍita? There are two possibilities:

(a) The Chinese used the term similarly to the bKa'-brgyud-pas, and (b) they used it quite differently.

a) If the Chinese used *dkar-po chig-thub* similarly to the bKa'-brgyud-pas, then the evidence presented in the present paper shows decisively that this use does not apply directly to the doctrines of Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen. The hypothesis accepts Sa-skyā Paṇḍita's association of bKa'-brgyud-pa doctrine with China; but the evidence then vindicates Jackson's view that dragging Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen into the matter is polemical.

In any case, the supposed similarity in the use of *dkar-po chig-thub* can extend only to the *non-vajrayāna* applications. On the Tibetan side, these applications consist of the perfectly orthodox and innocuous limitation principles relating to the paths, stages and *pāramitās* given by Zhang Tshal-pa (see Appendix A). Plainly, these have nothing to do with the elements in Chinese Buddhism which various Tibetans have complained about.

b) If the Chinese used *dkar-po chig-thub* quite differently from the bKa'-brgyud-pas, then it is Sa-skyā Paṇḍita's attacks on the bKa'-brgyud-pas which stand convicted of polemic; there is no longer any reason to associate them with Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen any more than with any other Chinese doctrine. This point applies regardless of whether the hypothesized Chinese White Panacea doctrine was similar to the doctrine of Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen or not. As we will see later in this Postscript, this seems the more likely of the two possibilities.

Be this as it may, it cannot justify van der Kuijp's intemperate attack on Jackson's conclusions. The substance of Jackson's comments on Sa-skyā Paṇḍita is vindicated by the analysis just given. On the doctrinal points underlying them, Jackson summarized his views in the following paragraph [J82 p. 95–6], in reading which we should remember that he was using the word "White Panacea" strictly of the bKa'-brgyud-pa doctrine of that name:

It is quite possible that Chinese views exercised an influence on subsequent Tibetan schools, but if they did, it is far more likely that they affected the rNying ma tradition, which unquestionably originated at a time when Chinese masters were active in Tibet.

The White Panacea—quite apart from being mentioned nowhere as a *gter ma*-based teaching—is in the mainstream of the Bka' brgyud tradition. Zhang Rinpoche was a disciple of sGom pa, who was in turn a direct disciple of sGam po pa. He was, thus, squarely in the lineage that reached back through Mi la ras pa and Mar pa to the Indian *siddhas* Maitripa. . . . Tilopa and Nāropa. The White Panacea, therefore, belongs to the second diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet, whereas direct Chinese influence was only marked during the first; and the White Panacea's determinable antecedents are Indian, not Chinese. It is true that there exist the further possibilities (a) that there may have been Chinese influence on the Indian *siddhas*, and/or (b) that there may have been current in Zhang Rinpoche's time left-over Chinese ideas that may have inspired him. There is no evidence at present for either possibility; even if there were, the probability that both Hva-shang Mahāyāna and Zhang Rinpoche taught the same doctrine, known as the White Panacea, would be remote.

Every single statement in this paragraph of Jackson's is supported by the evidence gathered in the present paper.

Many of these matters were further taken up in the Jordan Lectures, delivered by David Seyfort Ruegg at SOAS in London, in the Spring of 1987. These lectures on the bSam-yas debate focussed mainly on the older Tibetan *chos-'byung* materials, and Indian doctrinal sources; unfortunately, Prof. Seyfort Ruegg was unable to say much about the influence of the debate on the subsequent development of Buddhism in Tibet. He did make the following points relevant to this paper:

(a) The word *dkar-po chig-thub* is found not only in early Tibetan sources, as already mentioned, as a Chinese doctrine associated with the Hva-shang; a similar word is found in the *Cheng-li-chüeh*, and is there said to be a doctrine described in the *Mahāparinirvānasūtra*. The Sanskrit is *agada*. The Alternative Tradition of the *sBa-bzhed* even claims that Śāntarakṣita criticized such a doctrine as "a defilement of view" (*lta-ba'i snyigs-ma*). A passage in the *bSam-gtan mig-sgron* confirms Padma dKar-po's point that *dkar-po chig-thub* was something separate from the *vajrayāna* doctrines that were circulating at the same time.

(b) *Agada* means simply "medicine" or "medical treatment," and this metaphor no doubt applies both to the Hva-shang's

doctrine and to the later bKa'-brgyud one. Nevertheless there seems to be no reason to think that the two doctrines have more in common than this general typological similarity.

In the *hetuyāna*, according to Padma dKar-po, there is the ordinary progress through the *bodhisattva*-levels and paths, and the usual instantaneous *abhisambodhi*. See Appendix D (taken from ch. VII of his commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*). In his fourth Jordan seminar, Prof. Seyfort Ruegg gave a valuable analysis of these materials, as they appear in Haribhadra's *Aloka* on the same chapter. He also gave an account of the *vyutkrāntika* (*thod-rgal-ba*) as he appears in the same class of literature. This account confirms that Padma dKar-po's notion of the *thod-rgal-ba* is indeed *not* based on these *sūtra*-level sources, just as one would expect from the *vajrayāna* sources which he does quote (see note 7).

#### *In Memoriam*

bKa'-brgyud-pa scholarship has suffered by the recent death of the 'Brug-pa scholar mKhan-po Nor-nyang (Ngag-dbang Dri-med Zla-zer), who was associated during his whole life with Ngag-dbang bDe-chen 'Gyur-med rDo-rje (Thugs-sras Rin-po-che), spending the earlier part of his life at Padma dKar-po's foundation of gSang-sngags Chos-gling, and living in Darjeeling after 1959. mKhan-po Nor-nyang was particularly expert on the Zab-mo Nang-gi-don. "bKa'-brgyud" means "oral transmission," and mKhan-po Nor-nyang did not write much. He preferred not to teach at length, but made brief observations intended to help the student to develop his own understanding of a complex doctrine or text. On *madhyamaka* he held the striking view that there is quite literally no such doctrine and that the only way to read *madhyamaka* texts is in the light of one's own understanding. Some of the opinions mentioned in this paper without specific references are either opinions he held himself or points which he regarded as generally valid for the bKa'-brgyud-pa traditions.

## APPENDIX A

Extracts from Zhung Tshal-pa's Phyag-chen lam-mchog mthar-thug

## THE CHAPTER ON SAMENESS (MNYAM-PA-NYID)

rTsis-ri sPar-ma nga, 29b1

1. //de-ltar lta-ba'i gnas-lugs dang/ /sgom-pa spyod-pa dam-tshig dang/  
/bras-bu-la-sogs chos-rnams kun/ /rang-gi sems-kyi cho-'phrul yin/
2. /sems-nyid rang-rig gsal-ba'i ngang/ /gsal-tsam-nyid-na rang-bzhin stong/  
/mkha' ltar ris-du-chad-pa-med/ /phyogs-med mtha' dbus ngos-bzung med/
3. /de-lta-bu-yi sems-nyid-lal/ /blta-bya-lta-byed gnyis-med-pas/ /lta-ba  
med-cing rtogs-pa'ang med/ /bsgom-bya sgom-byed gnyis-med-pas/
4. /bsgom-pa-med-cing nyams-myong cang/ /goms-bya goms-byed gnyis-med-pas/  
/goms-pa-med-cing ma-goms-med/ /yengs-pa yengs-mkhan gnyis-med-pas/ [29b5]
5. /ma-yengs-med-cing yengs-pa'ang med/ /spyad-rgyu spyod-mkhan gnyis-med-pas/  
/spyod-pa-med-cing spyad-pa'ang med/ /thob-bya thob-byed gnyis med-pas/
6. /bsgrub-pa-med-cing 'thob-pa'ang med/ /nam-mkha' stong-pa'i dkyil lta-bur/  
/rgyu dang 'bras-bu gnyis-med-pas/ /skyed-pa-med-cing smin-pa-med/
7. /ye-nas stong-pa'i sems-nyid-lal/ /sgrub-pa-med-cing byang-ba'ang med/  
/bems min rig-stong dbyer-med-pas/ /ye-shes med-cing mi-shes-med/
8. /de-ltar lta-sgom-spyod-pa dang/ /dam-tshig dang ni 'bras-bu-rnams/  
/sems-nyid od-gsal ngo-bor ni/ /mnyam-par shes-pa'i sgom-chen-lal/  
/blta-bya lta-byed zhen-med-pas/ /zhen-med lta-ba'i rgyal-po yin/
9. /bsgom-bya sgom-byed zhen-med-pas/ /zhen-med bsgom-pa'i rgyal-po yin/  
/spyad-bya spyod-byed zhen-med-pas/ /zhen-med spyod-pa'i rgyal-po yin/  
/thob-bya thob-byed zhen-med-pas/ /zhen-med 'bras-bu'i rgyal-po yin/

/mnyam-pa-nyid-kyi le'u ste bcu-gcig-pa'o//

## THE CHAPTER ON THE WHITE PANACEA (DKAR-PO CHIG-THUB)

rTsis-ri sPar-ma nga, 30a5

1. //rang-sems rtogs-pa'i skad-cig-mar/ /dkar-po'i yon-tan ma-lus-pa/  
/bsgrubs-pa med-par dus-gcig rdzogs/
2. /sems-nyid bar-snang lta-bu-lal/ /sku-gsum ye-nas lhun-gyis grub/  
/sangs-rgyas dkon-mchog de-ru-rdzogs/
3. /sems-nyid spros-bral 'dod-chags-bral/ /dam-chos dkon-mchog de-ru rdzogs/  
/rang-bzhin skye-med phyir mi-ldog/ /rnam-rtog sna-tshogs grogs-su shar/  
/dge-'dun dkon-mchog de-ru rdzogs/
4. /de-ltar dkon-mchog-gsum-po yang/ /rang-sems rigs-par rdzogs-pas-nal/  
/gzhan-la skyabs-su-'gro ma-dgos/ /nges-pa'i skyabs-'gro de-ru rdzogs/

5. */sems-nyid spros-dang-bral-ba-lal /zhe-'dod rang-don gzhi-med-pas/*  
*/smon-pa byang-sems de-ru rdzogs/ [30b4]*
6. */lhams-cad 'khrul-bar go-ba-yis/ /dmigs-pa-med-pa'i snying-rje shar/*  
*/gzhan-don lhun-gyis grub-pa-yis/ /'jug-pa'i byang-sems de-ru rdzogs/*
7. */sems-nyid bar-s nang lta-bu-lal /'dzin-chags bdul-dang-bral-bas-na/*  
*/sbyin-pa'i pha-rol-phyin-pa rdzogs/ /mtshan-ma'i dri-ma dag-pas-na/*  
*/tshul-khrims pha-rol-phyin-pa rdzogs/*
8. */stong-pa-nyid-la mi skrag cing/ /khong-khro'i sa-bon bcom-pas-na/*  
*/bzod-pa'i pha-rol-phyin-pa rdzogs/ /rig-stong rgyun-chad-med-pa'i phyir/*  
*/brtson-'grus pha-rol-phyin-pa rdzogs/ [31a1]*
9. */rtse-gcig ye-nas lhun-grub-pas/ /bsam-gtan pha-rol-phyin-pa rdzogs/*  
*/log-rlog mtshan-ma rang-grol-bas/ /shes-rab pha-rol-phyin-pa rdzogs/*
10. */ci snang grogs-su shar-ba-yis/ /thabs-chen bsod-nams tshogs-chen rdzogs/*  
*/gnyis-su med-pa'i don rtogs-pas/ /ye-shes tshogs-chen de-ru rdzogs/*
11. */sems-nyid bar-s nang lta-bu lal /lus-kyi dri-ma gtan-med-pas/*  
*/bum-pa'i dbang-chen de-ru rdzogs/ /ngag-gi dri-ma ye-dag-pas/*  
*/gsang-ba'i dbang-chen de-ru rdzogs/*
12. */yid-kyi dri-ma'i gnas-med-pas/ /shes-rab ye-shes de-ru rdzogs/*  
*/cha mnyam dri-ma'i gnas-med-pas/ /bzhi-pa'i dbang-mchog de ru-rdzogs/*
13. */rang-rig rang-gsal go-ma- gags/ /sku mdog phyag-mtshan cir yang snang/*  
*/bskyed-rim miha-'dag de-ru rdzogs/ /gsal-ba'i ngos-bzung med-pa-yis/*  
*/rdzogs-pa'i rim-pa de-ru rdzogs/ [31a6]*
14. */rang-sems od-gsal gnyis-su med/ /lhag-gis rtogs-pas mthong-ba'i lam/*  
*/rgyun-chad-med-pa bsgom-pa'i lam/ /'bad-rtsol-med-pa mthar-phyin-lam/*  
*/gang yang 'gag-med drod-rtags mchog/ /sa-lam drod rtags de-ru rdzogs/*
15. */ci yang ma-yin chos-kyi skul /ci yang snang-ba sprul-pa'i skul/*  
*/cir snang chos-skur longs-spyod-pas/ /'bras-bu sku-gsum de-ru rdzogs/*
16. */rang-rig bar-s nang lta-bu-lal /'phyogs-ris-med-pas lta-ba rdzogs/*  
*/dmigs-zhen-med-pas bsgom-pa rdzogs/ /blang-dor-med-pas spyod-pa rdzogs/*  
*/nyams-pa-med-pas dam-tshig rdzogs/ /lhun-gyis grub-pas 'bras-bu rdzogs/*
17. */sems-nyid od-gsal stong-pa-lal /snga phyi dus-gsum phyogs-cha-med/*  
*/lji-srid bdag 'dzin yod-kyi bar/ /lta-sgom-spyod-'bras-dam-tshig yod/*  
*/las dang las-kyi rnam-smin yod/ /sdig spangs bsod-nams bsags-pa gces/*

*/dkar-po gcig-thub-tu bstan-pa'i le'u bcu-gnyis-pa'o//*

We see that almost the entire chapter is taken up with various statements about how the three jewels, the six *pāramitās* and other aspects of the Buddhist path are complete when various conditions are satisfied: the whole subject of the chapter is *not going beyond* this completeness. Zhang Tshal-pa makes this point even more explicit in an earlier passage (26a6):

*/dbyings-las mi-'da' don rtogs nas/ /bsrung du med-de dam-tshig mchog/*  
*/dkar-po chig-thub bya-ba yin/ . . .*

## APPENDIX B:

*The Twenty-Five Sources on Amanasikāra*

*Yid-la-mi-byed-pa'i chos-skor nyi-shu-rtsa-lnga*, S33b2 (cf., also P16a). Bu-ston's names for the works (*gSan-yig* 58b1) are in square brackets. For further information see his *bsTan-bsgyur dKar-chag*, 48b1-49a6. The detailed correspondence between the various listings is not always obvious, and they all seem to contain various lacunae. From the Zhwa-lu *bstan-bsgyur* the *amanasikāra* works have passed into all the other editions of the *bstan-bsgyur*. Information from the Tohoku catalogue is recorded in curly brackets { }. Most of these works are available in Sanskrit in the *Advayavajrasamgraha*; Sanskrit titles in round brackets ( ) are from this source. The order and numbering and the very informative headings given here are those of Padma dKar-po. Bu-ston's titles include information not given in the later catalogues; evidently his classification was based on slightly different principles from Padma dKar-po's.

According to Bu-ston, the works are all by Maitripa (*dKar-chag* 48b5-6; *gSan-yig* 58b6); "Maitripa," "Awadhūtipa" and "Advayavajra" are names for the same person (*dKar-chag, ibid.*). Both Bu-ston and Padma dKar-po record that Bu-ston learnt this cycle of works from 'Phags-od Yon-tan rGya-mtsho, his favourite teacher, from whom he learnt the *Pañcakrama* and many other cycles.

1. *thun-mong grub-mtha bstan-pa rin-po-che'i 'phreng-ba (tattva-ratnāvalī)*  
[*thung-mong-gi lta-ba ston-pa rin-po-che'i 'phreng-ba*] {2240}
2. *de'i don sngags dang sbyar-ba do-ha-di* {*dohanidhi-nāma-tattvopadeśa*  
2247}  
[*thun-mong dang sngags ston-pa do-ha-ti*]
3. *rtsod-spong yid-la mi-byed-par bstan-pa'am bdag-med gsal-ba*  
[*sgra-la skyon spong-ba yid-la mi-byed-pa ston-pa*] {2249}  
(*amanasikārādhāra*)

*thabs khyad-du (?) gsod-pa bzlog-pa'i phyir lta-ba ngan-sel [-1a]*<sup>87</sup>

5. *lta-ba ngan-sel-gyi dran-pa* {*kudrṣṭi-nirghāta-ṭikā*, 2231}  
[*lta-ba ngan-sel-gyi dka'-'grel dran-pa, dKar-chag* 47b2]
6. *las dang-po-pa'i bya-ba mdor-bsdus (kudrṣṭi-nirghātādhikarma)*  
[*las dang-po-pa'i bya-ba ston-pa lta-ba ngan-sel*] {2229}

*sngags-lam dbang-dang-'brel-bar bstan-pa-la*

7. *dbang nges-bstan*  
[*dbang bzang-ngan 'byed-pa dbang nges-bstan*] {*sekanirdeśa*, 2252}
8. *dgos-pa mdor-bsdus (sekatānvaya-samgraha)*  
[*dbang-gi dgos-pa mdor-bsdus-pa*] {2243}



9. *dbang-gi pra-khrīd* (sic) 'am/ bya-ba mdor-bsdus (*saṃkṣiptasekaprakriyā*)  
[*dbang-gi lag-len ston-pa dbang-gi prakriā* (sic)] {2244}
10. *dbang rnam-dag* (*pañcākārah*) {2245}  
[*chos thams-cad rnam-dag-gi don ston-pa rang-bzhin lnga-pa*]

*rgyas gdab-kyi don-la*

11. *phyag-rgya lnga-pa* (*pañca-mudrā-vivāraṇa*) {2242}  
[*lha'i rnal-'byor-sogs ston-pa de'bzhin-gshegs-pa'i phyag-rgya lnga-pa*]
12. *dga' bcug lnga-pa* (*premapañcaka?*) {2246?}  
[*snang-stong dbyer-med ston-pa dga'-gcugs lnga-pa*]
13. *mi-phyed lnga-pa* (*nirbheda-pañcaka*) {2238}  
[*sangs-rgyas sems-can dbyer-med-du ston-pa mi-phyed lnga-pa*]

*zung-'jug de-nyid lta-ba shan-'byed-pa-la*

14. *dbu-ma drug-pa* (*madhyama-ṣaṭka*)  
[*snags-kyi lta-ba ston-pa dbu-ma drug-pa*] {2230}
15. *lhan-skyes drug-pa* [*spyod-pa ston-pa lhan-skyes drug-pa*]  
[*sahajaṣaṭka*, 2232] (in ADVS but untitled)

*lta-ba de dang-ldan-pa'i zung-'jug bshad-pa-la*

16. *theg-chen nyi-shu-pa* (*mahāyāna-vimśika*) {2248}  
[*gang-zag gsum-gyi sgom-thabs ston-pa theg-chen nyi-shu-pa*]
17. *de-nyid nyi-shu-pa* (*tattvavimśika*)  
[*sku-gsum ston-pa de-kho-na nyi-shu-pa*] {2250}

*rab-tu mi-gnas-pa ston-pa-la*

18. *bde-chen gsal-ba* (*mahāsukhaprakāśa*) {2239}  
[*bksyed rdzogs tha-mi-dad-du ston-pa bde-chen gsal-ba*]
19. *zung-'jug nges-bstan* (*yuganaddhaprakāśa*) {2237}  
[*lthabs-shes-rab dbyer-med ston-pa zung-'jug gsal-ba*]

*lta-ba'i go-rim dpe dang sbyar-ba-la*

20. *rmi-lam nges-bstan* (*svapnanirukti*)  
[*lta-ba dpes bstan-pa rmi-lam nges-bstan*] {2233}
21. *sgyu-ma nges-bstan* (*māyānirukti*)  
[*spyod-pa dpes bstan-pa sgyu-ma nges-bstan*] {2234}

*zab-don bsdu-ba-la*

22. *de-nyid bcu-pa* (*tattvadaśaka*) {2236}  
[*spyod-pa'i don gtan-la dbab-pa de-kho-na-nyid bcu-pa*]
23. *de-nyid rab-tu bstan-pa* (*tattvaprakāśa*) {2241}  
[*gang-zag gsum-gyi rtogs thabs ston-pa de-kho-na-nyid rab-tu bstan-pa*]

*zab-mo'i khyad-par phra-mo ston-pa-la*

24. *rab-tu mi-gnas-par gsal-bar ston-pa (apratīṣṭhānaprakāśa) {2235}*  
 [lta-ba'i don gtan-la 'bebs-pa rab-tu mi-gnas-par gsal-bar ston-pa]  
 25. *mi-rtogs-pa rtogs-par-byed-pa* <sup>xxx</sup>

Padma dKar-po then goes on to mention other verse works by Maitripa, the commentary by Saroruha and other secondary works. These works were all transmitted by Maitripa (S34a2) to Vajrapāṇi, Ti-phu, and Mar-pa (separately); Padma dKar-po gives lineages descending independently from each of these three (and at 34b2 he forgets to mention that Ras-chung learnt the cycle from Ti-phu-pa). Bu-ston gives only the Ti-phu/ Ras-chung lineage (gSan-yig 57b4).

This list of books (though not the lineage information) is also found in P. Padma dKar-po there sketches three different conceptions of *amanasikāra*. First, it can be the denial that there is any abiding-place or foundation (*gnas sa'am rten-gzhi*) for the object of perception. This view is based on the *Samvarodaya*. Though it is perfectly adequate as a conception of *samathā* for the common person (Padma dKar-po says, 11a2), at the present level it is just what is to be rejected. Second, *amanasikāra* can be a quite general repudiation of mental events and mentation as *cūṭābhisamśkāra-manaskāra* (*sems-byung sems-pa'ang sems mngon-par-'du-byed-pa'i yid-kyi las-te*, etc.); this view is said to be based on the *Hevajra-tantra*, though the lines quoted by Padma dKar-po are not in the present form of that *tantra*. This second notion of *amanasikāra* seems most similar to the quietism attacked by Sa-skya Paṇḍita. According to Padma dKar-po (K4a1), Sa-skya Paṇḍita has confused the limited application of the first form at an elementary level with a quietism of the second form. In any case, for more advanced persons, both these forms are rejected by Padma dKar-po. The third form of *amanasikāra* accepts appropriate mental activity (*tshul-bzhin yid-la byed-pa*), namely that where the initial A (of *amanasikāra*) stands for "unoriginatedness" (*A-yig skye-ba-med-pa'i don-du byas-te*. . .). This can be found in the *Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṅgīti* and its great commentary. (Padma dKar-po quotes a *sūtra* and a *tantra* explanation from this commentary, emphasizing the Indian origin of the view that *mahāmudrā* is found in both *sūtras* and *tantras*). This is the version of the *amanasikāra* doctrine found in the works of Maitripa and accepted by the bKa'-brgyud-pas. Of course it remains to be explained what constitutes appropriate mental activity. Padma dKar-po's views on this have been set out in [B85].

Accordingly, we see that most of the sources for Maitripa's *amanasikāra* doctrine and most of his works on it clearly belong to the *vajrayāna*. Nevertheless the basic notion seems to be applicable both to the *hetuyāna* and to the *vajrayāna*.

The first chapter of the *Phyag-chen gan-mdzod* (P) contains an extremely illuminating account of all the main sources of the *mahāmudrā* doctrine, according to the traditions drawn upon by Padma dKar-po. A translation of this chapter, and indeed of the whole work, would be a great step forward for *vajrayāna* studies. Much of the material presented is quite different from that found in sGam-po-pa bKra-shis-rnam-rgyal's *Phyag-chen zla-zer*, of which a translation was recently published. Valuable though it is, the *Zla-zer* is merely a compendium of aphorisms and *man-ngag*. The *Gan-mdzod* is a work of reconstruction; that is, it provides an articulated structure, within which the mass of traditional details can be seen as intelligibly ordered.

## APPENDIX C

*Amanasikāra in the Sūtras*

Padma dKar-po on ch.6 of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*: A, 158a–159a. The passage a6 suggests that even here in the *sūtras* he has the Maitripa notion of *amanasikāra* in mind (see Appendix B).

158a1: //skyabs drug-pa ni. . [phar-phyin drug dang] sangs-rgyas rjes-su dran-pa'i mthar-gyis-pa'i mngon-rtogs-sogs-pa/ chos/ dge-'dun/ tshul-khrims gtong-ba/ lha rjes-su dran-pa'i mthar-gyis-pa'i mngon-rtogs drug. . .

a6: /'dir bstan rjes-su-dran-pa'i don nil chos thams-cad dngos-po-med-pa'i ngo-bo-nyid-du yid-la-byed-pas dran-pa-med cing yid-la-byed-pa-med-pa ste/ yid-la-mi-byed-pa'i sgra amanasikāra/ A yang-dag-pa'i don-du-byas-nas yang-dag-pa yid-la-byed-pa dang/ A dgag tshig-tu byas-nas yid-la-mi-byed-pa zhes bya'o/

b1: /chos thams-cad dngos-po-med-pa'i ngo-bo-nyid-du yid-la-byed-pa des de-bzhin-gshegs-pa-la gzugs-sogs-su yid-la-mi-byed-pa dang/ mshan dang dpe-byad-la-sogs-par/ tshul-khrims-kyi phung-po-sogs-sul stobs-bcu-sogs-sul rten-cing-'brel-bar-'byung-bar yid-la-mi-byed-pas sangs-rgyas rjes-su dran-pa rnam-pa lnga dran-pa nyer-bar-bzhag-pa-sogs/ /byang-chub yan-lag/ 'phags-lam brgyad-pa-rnams-kyi sgom-pa rim-pa-bzhin mos spyod mthong bsgom-du'o/

b3: /de-bzhin dge-mi-dge lung-ma-bstan yid-la-mi-byed-pas chos-kyi gsum (sic) sngar bzhin skyes-bu zung bzhir phye-ba'i phyir mi-ldog-pa yid-la-mi-byed-pa dge-'dun-gyi/ sems dang-po bskyed-pa-nas gzung-ste ma-nyams-pa/ skyon-med-pa/ ma-'dres-pa/ nag-nog-med-pa/ mchog-tu-'dzin-pa med-pa/ dbang-'byor-ba/ mkhas-pas bsngags-pa/ shin-tu rdzogs-pa/ ting-nge-'dzin sgrub-par-byed-pa'i tshul-khrims-pa gnas-te/ de-dag yid-la-mi-byed-pa tshul-khrims-kyi/ chos dang zang-zing yid-la-mi-byed-pa gtong-ba'i 'dod-pa'i lha rigs drug-tu skye-ba'i rgyun zhugs phyir ong/ gzugs dang gzugs-med-pa ni spyod-pa'i phyir-mi-ong-ba yid-la-mi-byed-pa lha'i/ mdo-sde-gzhan-las lha'i rigs gnyis rjes-su drang-par bya-ste/ dga'-ldan-pa dang gnas-gtsang-ma-pa'o/

## APPENDIX D

*The Moment of Abhisambodhi in the Sūtras*

Padma dKar-po on ch. 7 of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*: A, 159a-160b.

159a4: //skabs bdun-pa-la bzhi las/ dang-po rnam-par-smin-pa ma-yin-pa'i zag-pa-med-pa'i chos thams-cad skad-cig-ma gcig-la mngon-par rtogs-pa nil chos-kyi dbyings rang-gi ngo-bor/

*dngos gcig dngos-po kun-gyi ngo-bo-nyid/  
 /dngos kun dngos-po-gcig-gi ngo-bo-nyid/  
 /gang-gi dngos-gcig de-bzhin-nyid mthong-bal  
 /de yi dngos kun de-bzhin-nyid-du mthong/*

*/zhes 'byung-ba'i phyir mang-po gcig-tu sdud-par ma-zad-kyil/ sbyin-pa-la sogs-pa'i  
 ye-shes dmigs-par-bya-ba'i skad-cig re-res kyang dngos-po so-sor nges-par 'dzin-te phyin-  
 ci-log-dang-bral-ba'i (159b) dngos-po sbyin-sogs-nas dpe-byad bzang-mo'i bar thams-  
 cad-kyi zag-pa-med-pa'i chos kun-tu-'char-bas bsdus-pa'i phyir thub-pa byang-chub-  
 sems-dpa'i skad-cig-ma gcig-pa-yi mngon-par-rdzogs-par byang-chub-pa'i rtogs-pa 'di  
 ni shes-par-bya'o/*

*159b2: /ji-ltar zag-pa-med-pa'i chos-gcig-la dmigs-pa'i bsgom-pa-la zhugs-pa-na zag-  
 pa-med-pa'i chos-thams-cad sdud-par nus zhe-nal don 'di-la 'jig-rtan-pa'i dpes bstan-  
 par-bya-bal/ ji-ltar skyes-bus sngon bzo-bo mkhas-pas byas-pa'i zo chun-gyi rgyud thams-  
 cad rdog slabs gcig-gis bskyed-pa-thams-cad cig-car 'gul-ba ltar/ sngon-gyi smon-lam-  
 gyis 'phen-pa dang/ chos-kyi dbyings-kyi mthus skad-cig-ma gcig kho-na-la zag-pa-med-  
 pa'i ye-shes-su dmigs-na rigs-mthun-pa thams-cad shes-pa de-bzhin-nol*

*159b4: /gnyis-pa rnam-par-smin-pa'i zag-pa-med-pa'i chos-thams-cad skad-cig-ma  
 gcig-la mngon-par rtogs-pa nil/ de'i rjes gang-gi tshel gnyen-po skyes-pas mi-mthun-pa'i  
 phyogs-thams-cad-dang-bral-bas-na rnam-par-byang-ba'i phyogs-kyi chos-dkar-po-  
 thams-cad-kyi rang-bzhin shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa rnam-par-smin-pa chos-  
 nyid-kyi gnas-skabs-su skyes-pa de'i tshe skad-cig-ma gcig-la mngon-par-rtogs-par  
 byang-chub zhes-bya-ba'i ye-shes-sol*

*/gsum-pa mtshan-nyid-med-pa'i chos-thams-cad skad-cig-ma gcig-la mngon-par rtogs-  
 pa nil/ de'i og-tu sbyin-pa-la-sogs-pa'i spyod-pa-yis gnas-skabs-na rmi-lam-lla-bur  
 phung-po-lnga'i chos-kun-la nye-bar-gnas-nas rmi-lam 'drar rtogs-nas kun-nas nyon-  
 mongs-pa dang rnam-par-byang-ba'i ngo-bo'i chos-rnams mtshan-nyid-med-pa-nyid-du  
 skad-cig-ma ni gcig-gis rtogs-pa'o/*

*160a2: /bzhi-pa gnyis-su-med-pa'i mtshan-nyid-du chos-thams-cad skad-cig gcig-la  
 (sic) mngon-par-rtogs-pa nil/ de'i og-tu yun-ring-mo-nas bar-chad-med-par gnyis-su  
 snang-ba spang-ba-la goms-pa dbang-du-gyur-pas gnyis-su snang-ba'i bag-chags  
 drungs-phyung-ba'i byang-sems-kyi rmi-lam dang ni de mthong-ba-nyid gnyis-kyi tshul-  
 du mi-mthong-ba ltar/ chos-rnams gzung-ba dang 'dzin-pa gnyis-su-med-pa de-ltar-bu-  
 yi chos-nyid yin-no, zhes chos-thams-cad-kyi de-nyid skad-cig-ma gcig-gis mthong-ba  
 skad-cig-ma gcig-gis mngon-par-rdzogs-par byang-chub-pa yin-no/*

*skad-cig-gis mngon-par-rdzogs-par byang-chub-pa'i skabs-te bdun-pa'o/*

## APPENDIX E

## Structure of the Phyag-chen gan-mdzod

- rjod-byed tshig-gi phyag-rgya chen-po-la gnyis*  
*gzhung phyag-rgya chen-po'i rab-dbye-la gsum*  
*bshad-bya tshig-gi skor-la gsum*  
*grub-sde bdun, 4a2 (Jñānasiddhi, etc.)*  
*snying-po skor-drug, 12a3 (Saraha Doha, etc.)*  
*yid-la mi-byed-pa'i chos-skor nyi-shu-rtsa-nga, 16a3 [See Appendix B]*  
*gdams-ngag nyams-len-gyi skor, 19a2*  
*rtogs-pa byim-rlabs-kyi skor, 19b5*  
*lhan-cig skyes-sbyor gtso-bor 'don-pa'i rgyu-mtshan, 21b3*  
*brjod-bya don-gyi phyag-rgya chen-po-la gnyis*  
*bshad-bya phyag-rgya chen-po-la gnyis*  
*gzhan-gyi phyin-ci log-tu bshad-tshul, 26a6*  
*ma-nor-ba bka'-brgyud-pas bstan-tshul-la bzhi*  
*phyag-rgya [bzhi'i] rnam-grang-s-las gang yin-pa, 29a3*  
*phyag-chen de rang-gi ngo-bo ci-lta-bu yin-pa, 32a2*  
*nges-tshig mdo-rgyud gnyis-kar bstan-tshul, 35a6*  
*de dkar-po chig-thub-tu 'gro-ba'i gnad bshad-pa, 40b3 [see Section 3]*  
*'chad-byed bla-ma'i man-ngag-la gsum*  
*lhan-cig skyes-sbyor-gyi don dang tha-snyad bshad-pa, 47a5*  
*de gtan-la gang-du phab-na rtogs myur-ba'i gnad bshad-pa, 77a2*  
*ji-ltar gtan-la 'bebs-pa'i tshul zhib-mor bshad-pa-la gsum*  
*sems-nyid lhan-cig skyes-pa chos-sku'i gnad-kyis lta-ba gtan-la dbab-pa-la gnyis*  
*gnas-lugs phyag-rgya chen-po bshad-pa, 84a6*  
*'khrul-lugs phyag-rgya chen-po bshad-pa, 84b6*  
*snang-ba lhan-skyes chos-sku'i od-kyi gnad-kyis sgom-pa nyams-su blang-ba-la gsum*  
*[cig-car-ba, 96b5]*  
*thod-rgal-ba [rnal-'byor bzhi 'grus-te], 102b5*  
*rim-gyis-pa'i lam, 123b4*  
*snang-sems dbyer-med lhan-skyes-kyi gnad-kyis 'bras-bu mthar-phyin bya-ba, 153a5*  
*rtsod-pa spang-ba-la gnyis*  
*dngos-su rtsod-pa, 162b4 [see Section 2]*  
*sgyu-thabs-kyis rtsod-pa'i lan, 172a2*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADVS: *Advayavajrasamgraha* (GOS)  
 HT: *Hevajra-tantra* (ed. Snellgrove)  
 KT: *Kālacakrat Tantra* (ed. Lokesh Chandra)

Works by sGam-po-pa bSod-nams Rin-chen (*rtsib-ri spar-ma*, vol. *nga*)

- DS: *Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa'i zhus-lan*  
 PG: *Phag-gru'i zhus-lan*  
 GT: *sGom-tshul zhus-lan*

Works by Sa-skya Paṇḍita (*Sa-skya bka'-bum*)

DS: *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*  
 TG: *Thub-dgongs rab-gsal*

## Works by Bu-ston (IHa-sa ed.)

SY: *bKa'-drin rjes-su dran-par byed-pa 'i gsan-yig*  
 KC: *bsTan-bsgyur-gyi dkar-chag yid-bzhin nor-bu dbang-gi rgyal-po'i phreng-ba*

Works by Padma dKar-po (*gsung-'bum*, gNam-'brug sPar-ma ed.)

A: *mNgon-par rtogs-pa'i rgyan-gyi 'grel-pa rje btsun byams-pa'i zhal-lung*  
 C: *Chos-'byung bstan-pa'i padma rgyas-pa'i nyin-byed*  
 G: *dBu-ma gzhung-lugs-gsum gsal-bar byed-pa'i nges-don grub-pa'i shing-rta*  
 K: *Klan-ka gzhom-pa'i gtam*  
 M: *dGe-bshes mar-yul-pa'i dris-lan legs-par bshad-pa'i gzhi*  
 NR: *Ngam-ring mkhan-po'i brgal-lan*  
 NT: *rNam-rtog chos-sku'i dris-lan snying-po'i don-gsal*  
 P: *Phyag-rgya chen-po man-ngag-gi bshad-sbyar rgyal-ba'i gan-mdzod*  
 PL: *Phyag-rgya chen-po lnga-ldan-gyi khrid-dmigs yid-kyi snye-ma*  
 PZ: *Phyag-chen zin-bris*  
 S: *bKa-'brgyud-kyi bka'-'bum gsil-bu-rnams-kyi gsan-yig*  
 T: *sKyid-shod stag-lung-ma'i zhus-lan*  
 ZG: *Jo-bo Nāropa'i khyad-chos bsre-'pho'i gzhung-'grel rdo-rje 'chang-gi dgongs-pa gsal-bar byed-pa*  
 NC: *Chos-'byung me-tog snying-po'i sbrang-rtsi'i bcud* or *Nyang-ral Chos-'byung* by Nyang-ral Nyi-ma'i Od-zer (see [K86] for details)  
 PT: *Phyag-chen lam-mchog-gi mthar-thug* by Zhang Tshal-pa, see Appendix A  
 PZK: *Phyag-chen lhan-cig skyes-sbyor dngos-gzhi 'i khrid-yig cung-zad spros-pa sems-kyi rdo-rje'i nges-gnas gsal-bar byed-pa* by 'Jam-dpal dPa'-bo (rTsis-ri sPar-ma *kha.nya*)

- [B79] M. M. Broido, "The term dngos-po'i gnas-lugs in Padma dKar-po's *gzhung-'grel*" in *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson: Proceedings of the 1979 Oxford Conference on Tibetan Studies*; ed. Aris and Kyi (Oxford: 1979) 59–66.
- [B84] M. M. Broido, "Padma dKar-po on Tantra as Ground, Path and Goal," *J. Tib. Soc.* 4 (1984) 5–46.
- [B85] M. M. Broido, "Padma dKar-po on the two Satyas," *JIABS* 8,2 (1985) 7–59.
- [BR83] J. Broughton, "Early Ch'an Schools in Tibet," in [GG83].
- [GG83] R. Gimello and P. Gregory (eds.) *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen*, Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism No. 1.
- [G83] L. O. Gómez, "The Direct and Gradual Approaches of Zen Master Mahāyāna: Fragments of the Teachings of Mo-ho-yen" (in [GG83]).
- [G67] H.V. Guenther, *Tibetan Buddhism in Western Perspective* (Emeryville: 1977).

- [GN] H.V. Guenther, *Yuganaddha* (np., nd.).
- [HB85] A. W. Hanson-Barber, "'No Thought' in Pao T'ang Ch'an and Early Ati-Yoga," *JIABS* 8 (1985) 61–73.
- [J82] R. Jackson, "Sa-skya Paṇḍita's Account of the bSam-yas Debate: History as Polemic," *JIABS* 5,2 (1982) 89.
- [K86] L. van der Kuijp, "On the Sources for Sa-skya Paṇḍita's notes on the bSam-yas debate," *JIABS* 9,2 (1986) 147–53.
- [YS83] Yanagida Seizan, "The Li Tai Fa Pao Chi," in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet* (Berkeley: 1983).

### NOTES

\*Research supported in part by the Spalding Trust.

1. PG 4b2.

2. T 22b5.

3. Sa-skya Paṇḍita has also identified the White Panacea (*dkar-po chig-thub*) with Chinese doctrine in the *Thub-dgongs rab-gsal*. I shall make less use of this source, though Padma dKar-po has discussed some points from it in his *Klan-ka gzhom-pa'i gtam*. Sa-skya Paṇḍita's attacks on Chinese (*rgya-nag*) Buddhism are discussed in Roger Jackson's useful [J82]. The section of the *Thub-dgongs rab-gsal* most relevant to the present paper follows immediately on the section translated by Jackson, and is called "The Non-Buddhist tradition which follows them" (i.e., the Chinese: *de'i rjes-su 'brang-ba phyi-rabs-pa'i lugs*). As this section title suggests, Sa-skya Paṇḍita there tries to make it appear that his Tibetan opponents are not really Buddhists at all. Throughout this part of the *Thub-dgongs rab-gsal*, there is a repeated, slogan-like identification of the *dkar-po chig-thub* with Chinese Buddhism (e.g., 'di *rgya-nag-gi dkar-po chig-thub-kyi rjes-su 'brang-ba yin-gyi sangs-rgyas-kyis gsungs-pa'i phyag-rgya chen-po ma-yin-te*, 50a5; . . . *rgya-nag mkhan-po'i dkar-po chig-thub dang khyad-par cung-zad med-pa*, 51a3). As in the *sDom-gsum rab-dbye*, so also here Sa skya Paṇḍita makes no attempt to state what he understands by *dkar-po chig-thub*.

4. See Appendix A.

5. There is also a considerable literature on the possibility that Ho-shang Mo-ho-yen may have belonged to the Pao T'ang school of Ch'an; see [HB85] and [BR83]. These works give relevant references to the *bKa'-thang sde-nga*. Yanagida Seizan has shown [YS83 30–32] that 'Tsong-mi and others have criticized this school along lines broadly comparable with the criticisms of Mo-ho-yen which are conventional in Tibet.

6. See Appendix B.

7. Padma dKar-po sets out the Indian sources for the three personality types *cig-car-ba*, *thod-rgal-ba* and *rim-gyis-pa* in some detail in P (4a2 ff.). These sources are all vajrayāna works, namely:

(a) *cig-car-ba*: Guhyasiddhi, ch. 1; Jñānasiddhi ch. 18; Sahajasiddhi II; Tattvasiddhi (Kyerālipa); King Do-has;

(b) *thod-rgal-ba*: Guhyasiddhi, ch. 3; Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi, ch. 4-5; Jñānasiddhi ch. 19; Queen Dohas; rTse-mo Dohas;

(c) *rim-gyis-pa*: Guhyasiddhi, ch. 4; Jñānasiddhi ch. 20; People Dohas.

See the Postscript for further comments on these sources.

In the *hetuyāna*, according to Padma dKar-po, there is the ordinary progress through the *bodhisattva*-levels and paths, and the usual instantaneous *abhisambodhi*. See Appendix D.

8. See [B85], which also contains a fairly detailed account of the *cig-car-ba/rim-gyis-pa* distinction, as used by Padma dKar-po.

9. PG 4b2 (see the introductory quotation); DK 1b2.

10. See [B85], p. 16 and note 46. Padma dKar-po discusses the use of the word *mudra* (*phyag-rgya*) in the *sūtras* at P 35a, but the issue here is not so much whether the word *mahāmudrā* appears in the *sūtras* or not but whether goal-attainment in *sūtras* and *tantras* is the same.

11. See also Appendix D, where this point is taken explicitly (from the *abhisambodhi* chapter of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*).

12. For sGam-po-pa and Padma dKar-po on view (*lta-ba*), cultivation (of the view) (*sgom-pa*), action (*spyod-pa*) and goal (*bras-bu*), see [B85].

13. As usual, the *vajrayāna* involves *abhiṣeka* and the *upāya-mārga*, the *hetuyāna* does not. See also note 9.

14. The repudiation of the idea of the *dharmakāya* as the origin of *dharmas* in a causal sense is a central theme of Maitripa's form of the *amanasikāra* doctrine, according to Padma dKar-po. See Appendix B. That causal conception leads to a mentalism which is contrary to the *madhyamaka*.

15. See [B85] and also [B84].

15a. See P. F. Strawson, *Individuals* (Methuen 1959) on sortal and characterizing universals (pp. 168–172), and on feature-universals (p. 202). In [B79, pp. 62–4] these notions are applied to the two *satyas*, to *mahāmudrā* and to various *vajrayāna* notions, as discussed by Padma dKar-po at ZG 14b1 and elsewhere. Here in the last paragraph of p. 63 the words “and *sems* is a feature-universal” should be struck out. Padma dKar-po's discussion is based on the parallel between the two *satyas* and a flower (sortal) and its perfume (feature) (HT II.ii.35–36), and on the connection *mahāmudrā/paramārtha-satya/sems dngos-po'i gnas-lugs*. For a more detailed discussion see my “The Simile of a Flower and its Perfume,” to appear.

16. See [B85] again. Nineteenth century *gzhan-stong-pas* such as Kong-sprul abandoned this view of Shes-rab rGyal-mtshan's. They used *dbu-ma chen-po* (Great Madhyamaka) for an experience-oriented *madhyamaka*, in which *paramārtha-satya* is identified with the radiant light, in contrast to a mere *siddhānta*; and while *gzhan-stong* is still retained to describe the fact that the radiant light is not merely a great blankness and so on, the correlation of *gzhan-stong/rang-stong* with the two *satyas* is dropped, and so they were able to use a notion of integration (*zung-'jug*) very similar to that of Padma dKar-po.

17. A similar use of *gcig dang du bral* and similar phrases is very common in rNying-ma-pa writings, especially those of Klong-chen-pa.

18. See PL.

19. lNga-ldan-gyi khrid-yig Si-tu chos-kyi 'byung-gnas-kyis mdzad-pa, 6 ff. (*gDams ngag mdzod* vol. 9).

20. Phag-mo Gru-pa told sGam-po-pa that Sa-chen had recognised him as having attained the signs of heat characterising the *darśanamārga*. (As this



anecdote is recorded in the *Phag-gru'i zhus-lan*, sGam-po-pa pretends not to believe him.) It is interesting to consider Sa-skya Paṇḍita's criticisms of the bKa'-brgyud-pa view of the relation between the *darśanamārga* following *abhiṣeka* and that following the *laukikāgradharma* (DR 54ab) in the light of this well-known story.

21. SY 460; the transmission from Sa-chen to Phag-mo Gru-pa is recorded explicitly there, as well as being the subject of various anecdotes in the *Phag-gru'i zhus-lan* and elsewhere.

22. On Sa-chen Kun-dga' sNying-po's unwillingness to meet Phag-mo Gru-pa after the death of sGam-po-pa, see Padma dKar-po's *Chos-'byung* 271a: *de-nas yar byon-te thugs-la bla-ma Sa-skya-pa chen-po de chos dri-ba-la dgyes-pas da nga la (?) bshod rgyu thogs-pa-med snyam byon/ de res dri-ba tsam yang mi-mzad-par spyan rtsa 'gyur 'dug-pas/ bla-ma de myur 'grongs-par mkhyen/ . . .* This incident is recorded too in the *Blue Annals* and in some of the hagiographies of Phag-mo Gru-pa.

23. The political prominence of the Phag-mo-gru-pas and the threat which they later represented to the Sa-skya paramountcy did not exist during the lifetime of Sa-skya Paṇḍita, and in any case had nothing to do with Phag-mo Gru-pa rDo-rje rGyal-po himself.

24. P 161b4, DR 51a4:

*de-lta'i phyag-rgya chen-po dang//rgya-nag lugs-kyi rdzogs-chen-la/  
 'yas 'bab dang ni mas 'dzag gnyis//rim-gyis-pa dang cig-car-ba//  
 'ming 'dogs bsgyur-ba ma-gtogs-pa//don-la khyad-par dbye-ba med/ etc.*

The terms *yas-'bab* and *mas-'dzag* are connected with the heat practices (*gtum-mo, caṇḍāli*) of the *sampannakrama* (cf. also note 20).

25. P 162a6.

26. P 163b3.

27. P *ibid.*

28. *lhas-sras kyang dges-so, ibid.* b5.

29. *ibid.*

30. *rigs-pa dang-lung-gis cig-car-ba bkag ste/ Hva-shang slob-ma-dang-bcas-pa spos-pa-med-par byas/ me-tog-gi 'phreng-ba yang slob-d'pon Kamala-la phul-lol, ibid.* 164a2.

31. Even for Kamalaśīla, as in the second *Bhāvanākrama*, P 164b5.

32. *Phyag-chen zin-bris* 4a1 ff. and 'Jam-dpal dPa'-bo on it. See also Appendix B.

33. P 26ab & c.

34. P 165a1. Another version of the argument that if the Hva-shang method had been *rdzogs-chen*, it could not have been refuted by the type of argument used by Kamalaśīla, is given by Padma dKar-po at M 16a2.

35. P 165b1-168a2.

36. See [B85].

37. P 168b6.

38. On the basis of the materials provided by Gomez, it is not really clear whether, in the Tibetan sense, the Ho-shang held that everybody is a

*cig-car-ba* or not. He does seem to have thought that everybody would eventually have to practice the sudden method, but at least in the more moderate Tibetan fragments he concedes that this is not appropriate for everyone in the condition they actually are now.

39. P 169a3 ff.

40. [*phyag-rgya chen-po*] *de dkar-po chig-thub 'gro-ba'i gnad* (as the section heading): P43b-50a. cf. Appendix E.

41. Similar observations are said to be found in other early Tibetan commentaries on the *Hevajra-tantra*, such as the *Rin-chen rgyan-'dra'* (by rNog mDo-sde) and the *bKa' yang-dag-pa'i tshad-ma* (by rNog Chos-rgyal).

42. The ambiguity of "dharma" here can cause confusion. A Mādhyamika will take it in a linguistic sense, as a property ascribed to something, as in *pramāṇa*. Taking it as a separate item, as in the *Abhidharma*, leads to mentalism; while the early *bKa'-brgyud-pas* probably were not mentalists (sGam-po-pa certainly not), the way they expressed their views can encourage this confusion. See note 14.

43. I.e. from *mahāmudrā*.

44. *phyag-rgya chen-po'i gnyis-su med-pa'i sbyor-ba* (\**mahāmudrā-advayayoga*).

44a. *rang-bzhin-gyi rnal-'byor* (\**prakṛti-yoga*); the words *rnal-'byor* and *sbyor-ba* (note 44) are very similar and have more to do with inseparable union than with what is generally called "yoga" in the West. That Padma dKar-po uses *rnal-'byor* in this way was first pointed out by Guenther [G67, p. 85]; see comments in note 76 of [B84].

45. DR 69a1, P 45b2.

46. *Dohakośa* 43, translated [G67 p. 164]. This translation is broadly correct, but nothing in the texts justifies Guenther's song-and-dance about the presence of the particle **-nyid** in the Tibetan and its absence in the Apabhraṃśa; even the Tibetans apparently bow down to *sems* as well as *sems-nyid*.

47. *Dohakośa* 110, very similar to an important verse in the *bKa' yang-dag-pa'i tshad-ma*, and as such commented upon at length by Padma dKar-po in the *gzhung-'grel* (129a5). This verse is typical of Padma dKar-po's conception of *mahāmudrā* as ground (single), path (multiple) and goal (single). Cf. numerous references in [B85] where, in discussing the difference between the *sūtras* and the *tantras*, he says they have the same single ground and goal but the *tantras* show a great variety of paths.

48. Quoted also by 'Jam-dpal dPa'-bo in his PZG on PZ.4ba1; the passage is sometimes said to be from the work *Rin-chen Padma dKar-po*.

49. The words "only one stage" (*rim-pa gcig-pu*) here refer to *mahāmudrā*.

50. KT V.62 and V.57.

51. I.e., the single bliss of the *buddhakāya* in the previous line, KT V.61d (*buddhasya kāya bhavati . . . ekasaukhya*, etc.).

52. KT III.97-8 and especially the *Vimalaprabhā* on them. See my "Killing, Lying, Stealing and Adultery: A Problem of Interpretation in the Tantras," to appear in the *Proceedings of the 1984 Kuroda Institute Conference on Buddhist Hermeneutics*, ed. Lopez.

53. *du-ma'i gar*.

54. *chos-kyi dbyings-la dbyer-med-phyir/gtso-bo'i theg-pa dbyer-ma-mchis!*; this quotation is probably from the *Mahāyānasūtrāṅkāra*.

55. Probably different types (*kula*, *gotra*) of people.

56. Indeed, there is something pig-headed in Sa-skya Paṇḍita's ascription of such a view, even only by implication, to the author of the *dgongs-gcig* doctrine; perhaps this does something to explain Padma dKar-po's impatient dismissal of it.

57. DR 69a3, continuing the passage n. 45; P 42b6.

58. HT II.iv.29.

59. HT I.v.11.

60. GST XVII, prose following v.51.

61. HT II.ii.31.

62. *Vidyā-mahāmudrā* is essentially the understanding of *mahāmudrā* by means of an inner cognition (*vidyā*, *rig-pa*). This is an important topic which has been treated badly in the literature, and needs fuller treatment than is possible here.

63. *gshis* is the capacity of things to be cognised in *paramārtha-satya*. See [B85].

64. *gnas-lugs*: literally, the way things are, but here a technical term related to non-dual cognition [B79].

65. P 46b1.

66. *don*, *artha*.

67. E.g., "The outsiders' method following the Chinese" (*rgya-nag-lugs . . . kyī rjes-su 'brang-ba phyi-rabs-kyī lugs*, TG 50b2 ff.).

68. This will particularly apply to observations about Mo-ho-yen's views in contemporary Tibetan writings such as the *bSam-gtan mig-sgron*.

69. However Pelliot 823 may be a translation of parts of the *Cheng-li-chüeh*: see [G83, p. 86]. In assessing the "Tibetan-language fragments" in contrast to the *Cheng-li chüeh* I have therefore ignored the fragments from Pelliot 823.

70. Page references are to Gomez' article [G83].

71. This remark directly contradicts the central doctrine of the bKa'-brgyud-pas concerning *mahāmudrā*, viz. that, *properly seen, concepts simply are the dharmakāya*. See [B85a]. Padma dKar-po was often asked questions about this doctrine, and devoted several short works to it, e.g., NT and NR.

72. For Padma dKar-po, this kind of distinction between relative and absolute realms is unintelligible. The differences remain whatever they are—what changes is how they are taken.

73. For Padma dKar-po, *cig-car-ba* and *rim-gyis-pa* alike need medicine; but what is medicine for one is poison for the other.

74. For Padma dKar-po, most *prthagjanas* are *rim-gyis-pa*.

75. Padma dKar-po's attitude towards virtue is quite conventional. The *cig-car-ba* is what he is partly because of the previous accumulation of virtue. This brings us to one of the oddest features of Sa-skya Paṇḍita's equating of the bKa'-brgyud-pas with the Ch'an master Mo-ho-yen. What would be Padma dKar-po's view of somebody who simply sat down and renounced concepts (or who renounced attachment to concepts, to bring the proposal nearer to

*mahāmudrā*)? History does not record, but I suspect that such behavior would be regarded as bizarre in the extreme; partly because of the importance of the previous accumulation of virtue, and partly because of the overriding need for the *bla-ma*'s *adhiṣṭhāna*. (The 'Brug-pas are specialists in *guruyoga*.)

76. [G83], p. 114 (from Stein 709, second fragment).

77. [G83], p. 110 (from Stein 709).

78. More accurately, what the **rim-gyis-pa** cannot see is *the clouds as illuminated by the sun* (i.e., the obscurations as illuminated by his own perceptions of those obscurations). It is perfectly possible for a **rim-gyis-pa** to reach the path of insight (*darśanamārga*). He may, in that case, change into a **cig-car-ba**; but this does not normally happen—the distinction is not in principle one of successive stages (*gnas-skabs, avasthā*). He can remain a **rim-gyis-pa**, proceeding through the appropriate paths (*mārga*) and levels (*bhūmi*). Being on the path of insight, he has that insight; but his inner nature *is not such that he can use this insight to cure his own defilements*, and this is why he still has to proceed through the usual stages and why he cannot be given the entire path at once. In terms of my analogy, then, a **rim-gyis-pa** who is not on the path of insight does not see the sun at all and has no insight of any kind. A **rim-gyis-pa** on the path of insight does have occasional glimpses of the sun, but they are not sufficient to illuminate the clouds (properly).

79. It is easy to get confused by the words "sudden" and "gradual." For Padma dKar-po, the **cig-car-ba** is a person who has moments of genuine insight (like the sun shining through the clouds) and is presented with the whole path in one go, as it were. Nevertheless *his goal arises in stages* ('*bras-bu skye-ba'i rim-pa*). The **rim-gyis-pa** has no moments of full insight (other than those directly due to *abhiṣeka*) and is presented with the path in stages (see preceding note) but for him *goal-attainment is sudden* (cf. Appendix D). Indeed, if Mo-ho-yen's view is mainly a matter of goal-attainment (rather than of stages of the path), then its analogy with the bKa'-brgyud-pa view *is with the rim-gyis-pa and not with the cig-car-ba*. But I will not pursue this point, since the whole of Sa-skya Paṇḍita's observations then became irrelevant; for Sa-skya Paṇḍita has quite uncritically adopted the traditional view that **ston-mun** is to be identified with **cig-car**.

80. [G83] p. 117 (from Stein 709, second fragment).

81. *bcos-pa*, see notes 47 and 70 to Appendix 2 of [G83]. Gomez rightly stresses that these works are translations from Chinese, not Sanskrit; still, *bcos-pa* stands, in many *madhyamaka* texts, for the difficult terms *kṛtaka* and *kṛtrīma*. See [B85] for Padma dKar-po on these terms. The connection of these terms with artificiality in the *mahāmudrā* context has been made by Guenther [GN 101] in relation to a passage of Maitripa's *amanasikāra* writing also quoted by Padma dKar-po (P 27b) who attributes it to the work *dBang-bskur nges-bstan* (work 7 in Appendix B; ADVS pp. 32–3).

83. But Mo-ho-yen's next sentence goes beyond what Padma dKar-po would accept: "By cultivating the mind in this way, one awakens perfectly as soon as one is free from all false concepts and all past habitual tendencies."

84. And in this respect the Dwags-po bKa'-brgyud is unlike the dGe-lugs, who trace their *mahāmudrā* doctrines to a vision of Mañjuṣoṣa by Tsong-kha-pa.

85. The tradition that sGam-po-pa was an incarnation of the *bodhisattva* Candraprabhakumara, guardian of the *Samādhirāja*, was so well established that in many texts “Zla-'od g'zhon-nu” is used, without explanation, for sGam-po-pa rather than for the original Candraprabhakumara.

86. See [HB85] for a comparison between Pao T'ang Ch'an and early rdzogs-chen, based on the *rDo-rje sems-dpa' nam-mkha' che rtsa-ba'i rgyud skye-ba med-pa*, which concludes their incompatibility on similar grounds.

87. Padma dKar-po lists three *lta-ba ngan-sel* works: *thabs khyad-du gsod-pa bzlog-pa'i phyir lta-ba ngan-sel dang/ lta-ba ngan-sel-gyi dran-pa dang/ las dang-po-pa'i bya-ba mdor-bsdus/ . . .*; in S the extra work is numbered 4. Other sources make no reference to this third work.

88. This work, numbered 25 in S, appears in all versions of Padma dKar-po's list but does not seem to appear in the other lists.

89. *de'i ring (lho-brag mkhar-chu)-la rgya'i ha-shang Mahāyāna'i slob-ma dar-te/ lus ngag-gi chos-spyod dge-ba-byas-pas sangs-mi-rgya-ba dang/ yid-la-mi-byed-pas sangs-rgya zer-ba'i lugs-dar/ de-la ston-mun-du grags/ dpal-dbyangs dang/ sba ratna-la-sogs-pa nyung-shas shig mkhan-po'i rjes-su 'brang/ de-la rtsen-min rgya'i skad yin/ bod-skad-du cig-car-ba dang rim-skyes-lu (read: -pa) zer/ de-dag ma-mthun-par rtsod-pa-na/ rgyal-pas ācārya-bodhisattva'i lugs bzhin-du gyis shig gsungs-pas/ ston-mun-pa-rnams khros-te/ rtsen-min-pa ril gsod zer/ (C, 164b).*