

Gateway to Knowledge

*The treatise entitled
The Gate for Entering the Way of
a Pandita*

by
Jamgön Mipham Rinpoche

VOLUME IV

Translated from the Tibetan by
JAMES GENTRY & ERIK PEMA KUNSANG

RANGJUNG YESHE PUBLICATIONS
Kathmandu, Nepal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents of previous volumes 7

PART ONE ~ THE FOUR SEALS OF THE DHARMA 9

- 23. All Conditioned Things Are Impermanent 11
- 24. Everything Defiling Is Suffering 21
- 25. Nirvana Is Peace 27
- 26. All Phenomena Are Empty and Devoid of a Self-entity 35

PART TWO ~ THE FOUR RIGHT DISCRIMINATIONS 65

- 27. Right Discrimination of Meaning and Dharma 67
- 28. Right Discrimination of Definitive Words 77

PART THREE ~ RIGHT DISCRIMINATION OF READY SPEECH 93

- 29. The Four Reasonings 95
- 30. The Four Reliances 123

EPILOGUE 137

Acknowledgements 143

29

THE FOUR REASONINGS

In accordance with the stages of having gained mastery over the triad of Dharma, meanings and definitive phrases taught above, by attaining the ready speech of fearlessness in expounding, debating and composing on the meaning of the Exalted Word, one becomes endowed with the power to accept the fortunate and to refute proponents of wrong views. That is to say, bodhisattvas attain the ready speech that is inexhaustible even if they were to explain each and every word and meaning for an ocean of eons.

In this context I shall explain correct reasoning, the means for attaining the supreme ready speech of flawless doctrinal intelligence by which one does not have to depend on others for the content of the Exalted Word.

If one were to summarize all the contents of the Dharma taught by all buddhas there would be nothing which is not included within these two: the mundane relative truth and the ultimate truth. One should therefore correctly develop a definitive understanding that ascertains these two by means of the twofold valid cognitions that scrutinize them.

How should one proceed? One should understand them in accordance with the four principles of reason that have been taught in the sūtras: 1) the principle of efficacy, 2) the principle of dependence, 3) the principle of reality, and 4) the principle of valid proof.

These are as follows. All phenomena of saṃsāra and nirvāṇa arise and appear in the manner of dependent origination. Independent of causes and conditions, it is not feasible for them to appear by themselves, like

a flower doesn't appear in the sky. Therefore in brief, just as a complete collection of causes such as a seed, water, warmth and the rest has the ability to produce a sprout, all functions performed in which a certain cause produces a certain effect are called the "principle of efficacy." The fact that everything that is an effect, such as a sprout and so forth, is definitely dependent upon its own causes is called the "principle of dependence."

In that way, everything that has the ability to produce a certain cause creating a certain effect and everything that is an effect dependent upon its causes are feasible as mutual causes and effects, and therefore facts. It is like how virtuous actions produce pleasurable effects and non-virtuous actions produce suffering, or how a rice sprout grows from a rice seed. It is not a fact that they produce the opposite, such as suffering due to virtue and pleasure due to non-virtue, or a rice sprout growing from a barley seed.

These first two principles of reason enable rejection and acceptance, and engagement and withdrawal with respect to all phenomena, by means of understanding what is and what is not factual about them. Therefore, all the sciences such as technology and the others, as well as all the mundane and supramundane schools of philosophy have a thoroughly analytic grounding in these two modalities. Consequently, science and philosophical schools become more refined and sublime in direct proportion to one's mastery in understanding what is and what is not factual.

The principle of reality is as follows: conventionally all phenomena subsist according to their own respective natures, as earth is solid, water is wet, space is non-obstructive and the like. That is to say, even a single phenomenon like a pot has the character of multiple categories—those established, like being impermanent, being material, and so forth; and those posited in terms of elimination or negation, such as not being consciousness, not being permanent, and so forth. However, in brief, a specifically characterized phenomenon, which is an object of direct perception, like a substantially existent pot, is joined to the conceptual mind through various categories of different conceptual properties, like its production, impermanence, and the like, which are imputed to the pot by means of other-exclusion. Thus, phenomena fall

into the two modalities of substantiality and imputability. From these are fashioned the various categories of conventions in conformity with objects, such as specifically characterized phenomena and generally characterized phenomena, universal and particular, contradiction and relationship, definition and definiendum and so forth. Based on these one becomes non-deluded with regard to all objects.

What is thus posited in terms of the triad of cause, effect and nature are the three principles belonging to the context of analyzing the conventional. Ultimately when analyzed by means of the reasoning of the vajra-splinter, one does not observe any cause producing any effect. When analyzed by means of the refutation of arising from an existent or nonexistent thing, there is also no arising of effects based on causes. When analyzed by means of the reasoning of the absence of singularity and plurality, there is no nature of solidity and so forth established whatsoever. Therefore, that phenomena abide as the nature of the three gates of emancipation—cause devoid of phenomenal characteristics, effect un-wished-for, and essence, emptiness—is the ultimate reality.

The principle of efficacy and the principle of dependence are also included within the conventional reality of things, in the sense that it is a reality that fire is hot, that fire is efficacious in burning and that fire is dependent upon kindling.

For this reason, all the parameters of reasoning come down to the principle of reality, after which there are no further reasons to seek. It is like how the heat of fire, which is the reality of things, cannot be denied by anyone at all.

When subsuming the meaning of the three previous principles in such a way, the meaning of exactly how the cause, effect and nature of all phenomena conventionally subsist is their conventional condition or reality. And that the triad of cause, effect and nature are devoid of self-nature is their ultimate condition or reality.

In brief, the three former principles have been taught in terms of bringing about a definitive resolution to the meaning of the two truths.

These are called principles because it is quite suitable and reasonable that the nature of all phenomena would subsist in such a way; or these are called “reasoning” for their evaluation in conformity with such.

In this way, “the principle of valid proof” is so called because assessing properly and unerringly the meaning of the two truths (i.e. that which is to be assessed) is established by the power of fact. This is because of being proof, which is endowed with proper validity.

By means of what is such validity proven? It is by means of two types of valid cognition: the valid cognition that directly perceives as manifest phenomena both conventional objects, how things appear, and ultimate objects, how things are; and the valid cognition that infers another incontrovertible thing from the manifest appearance of evidence that enables one to assess an obscure phenomenon.

That is to say, the direct perception of a conventional nature, is for instance directly seeing a blue *utpala* flower with an unmistakable visual cognition.

Direct observance of an ultimate nature is like the wisdom of composure of the noble ones.

Inference of a conventional object is like inferring fire from smoke or impermanence from being produced.

Inference of the ultimate is like inferring emptiness by means of syllogisms such as the absence of singularity and plurality, and so forth.

How many kinds of valid direct perception are there? There are four kinds:

1) Valid sense direct perception is a non-conceptual, unmistakable cognition that has arisen based on the ruling condition of a sense faculty with physical form. Unmistaken visual cognition and so forth make it five-fold. The appearance of one moon as two, effectuated by the cause of an erroneous sense faculty, is a spurious direct perception, and not a valid cognition.

2) Valid mental direct perception is a non-conceptual, unmistakable cognition that has arisen based on the ruling condition of the mental faculty. Things like a non-conceptual mind following an erroneous sense faculty, or a dream perception are not valid cognitions.

3) Valid yogic direct perception is a non-conceptual, unmistakable cognition that has arisen based on the ruling condition of the yoga practice of shamatha and vipashyana. Things like the vivid appearance of skeletons from having become habituated to repulsiveness are not unmistakable and therefore not maintained to be valid cognition.

“Yogic direct perception” is maintained to be with appearance, like the yogic direct perception that is aware of conventional things that are covered or obscured objects; and without appearance, like the yogic direct perception that perceives selflessness.

4) Direct self-cognizing perception is all primary and subsidiary mental states, by their own cognizant nature, being non-conceptually and unerringly cognizant of themselves. It is such that any cognition taking place, be it mistaken or unmistaken, is unmistaken and non-conceptual in terms of it simply experiencing itself in its own cognizant presence.

Since the objects of these four types of direct perception appear as specifically characterized phenomena distinct in terms of space, time, and attribute, they are free from concepts that apprehend sound and object combined.

In general, if there were no such thing as these “mundane direct perceptions,” then because evidence too has its basis in being observed with an unmistaken cognition it would also be nonexistent. Then, because all the categories of the full gamut of appearance, like the origination of something from a cause, its cessation and so forth would be nonexistent, one would not understand their nature as emptiness either. For it is said:

Without relying on names,
The ultimate meaning will not be realized.

In particular, if there was no sense direct perception, one would not perceive objects like visible forms and the rest. If there were no mental direct perception, there would be no awareness that collectively cognizes all external and internal objects. If there were no direct yogic perception, a cognition that realizes things beyond the scope of ordinary beings would be impossible. These three are therefore presented as such. All of them are cognitions directly experiencing their respective objects.

The basis of all experience is rooted in self-cognition. An object experienced directly does not require further proof. Based on an unmistaken mental cognition experiencing its own presence, doubt is

resolved. Thus, the self-cognizing awareness is the final basis of all valid cognition.

Moreover, inference is ultimately based on direct perception. And the basis of direct perception is ascertained through self-cognizance, in that it is rooted in an experience of an unmistaken mind, after which there is no need to seek additional proof, like the experience of pleasure and so forth.

Second is inference. What kind of cognition performs the act of inferring? It is the conceptual mind, and nothing else. What is meant by "conceptual" here? It means that which apprehends only the universal form of any given object that appears to the mind, while combining it with its name. For example, that which conceptualizes or mentally expresses "pot" and "pillar" is called "conceptual mind."

Human beings like small infants and animals like horses that do not know how to apply names also have the mere universal image of food, drink and so forth appear to their minds. Although these images are not combined with names, such beings engage in and withdraw from objects by means of the concepts of universal images that are suitable to be combined with names. Such can be illustrated through an example. Even without actually seeing water, an animal tormented by thirst will, upon hearing the splashing sound of running water, have the image of water appear to its mind, make noise with an expression of wanting it, and know to pursue the water for a long distance.

The conceptual mind apprehends the mere universal image of objects by way of combining their location, time and form. And by means of formulating the various conventions of rejecting or accepting in relation to them, all names are established. Otherwise, no inferences or topics of learning could be taught at all. For what appears to direct perception is only the fragmentary, specifically characterized phenomena of the spatial segments and moments connected to something's specific location in its specific time, subsisting distinctly from one another. Since such is not suitable to be combined with names, there is no application of the meaning of names to this alone.

Such conceptualization does not simply produce the understanding of objects seen in the present, applying to them names, types, and so forth, which is simply called "relative conceptualization" or

“conceptualization based in evidence.” It also assesses obscure objects that are not immediately apparent by means of concepts about the past by way of recollection, concepts about the future by way of wanting something to manifest, concepts that apprehend evidence, the basis of inference, and concepts about signified objects to be inferred from evidence. Thus, if there were no conceptual inference, then like a newborn infant that does not understand to be frightened of fire, one would not be able to engage in or refrain from what should be adopted and abandoned, whatsoever.

Conceptual mind is also two-fold: unmistaken, like conceptualizing a rope as a rope and conceptualizing a mirage as a mirage; and mistaken, like conceptualizing a rope as a snake, and a mirage as water. From among them, it is based on unmistaken conceptuality that one can unerringly discern all the conventions of knowable objects throughout the three times.

How is it that the conceptual mind should infer some other obscure phenomenon? Phenomenon based on which some other phenomenon can be comprehended is called “evidence.”

To elaborate, the establishment of some evidence as a property belonging to the position of a thesis is the first criterion, which is called the “property of the position.” If evidence has not been established with respect to some issue under dispute there is no point in analyzing logical concomitance. Thus, one should initially analyze whether or not a piece of evidence, like being produced, pertains to some subject, like pot.

Once the evidence has been established, one analyzes the relationship between that evidence and the property of the thesis to be proven. That the thesis to be proven is entailed by the evidence is the second criterion, called “positive concomitance.” For example, it is like how “impermanence” is entailed by the evidence of “being produced,” because one ascertains through valid cognition that if something is produced it is necessarily impermanent.

Alternatively, when the property of the thesis to be proven is reversed or non-existent the evidence too is reversed such that its existence is impossible. It is like how if something is not impermanent its

being produced also does not occur. This is the third criterion, called “negative concomitance.”

These two final criteria are described as the ascertainment of positive and negative concomitance by means of valid cognition. And in the context of illustrating those through examples, they are explained as “what pertains to all concordant factors and is the opposite of all discordant factors.”

The three criteria being complete in that way makes for correct evidence, which is capable of establishing the thesis to be proven. Without these being complete, it is a spurious syllogism, in that the evidence is not established, and so forth—its manner includes multiple internal divisions.

How many illustrations are there for evidence that is correct? There are three: resultant evidence, natural evidence, and evidence of non-observation. There are two kinds of positive evidence. These are resultant evidence, in which a cause is inferred via an effect based on the relationship of causality; and natural evidence, in which the evidence establishes another property through the relationship of identity.

There is also the non-observation of something that could feasibly appear, or the negation of something through the observation of its opposite. Since both of these actually negate the essence of something to be negated, they are called “evidence of non-observation.”

As for their internal divisions, in terms of how syllogisms are put forth, resultant evidence is fivefold. There are syllogisms of resultant evidence that directly prove causes, as in “The subject, on a smoky pass, there is fire, because there is smoke.” Likewise, there are those that prove a preceding cause, as in “The subject, billowing blue smoke in space, is preceded by a previous fire as its cause, because of being smoke.” There are those that generally prove a cause, as in “The subject, the appropriated aggregates, are associated with their causes, because of being temporary objects.” There are those that prove causes in their particularity, as in “The subject, a sense cognition to which blue appears, is associated with its observed-object condition, because of being a sense consciousness.” There is also resultant evidence, which infers properties of causes, as in “The subject, a lump of molasses in the mouth, has form, because of having flavor.” This is resultant evidence

because it actually infers the previous molasses flavor from the present one, and, because it infers that the combined presence of both the previous and present flavor and form was produced by a previous cause. Through this fine differentiation between such multiple ways that exist for proving causes by way of effects one should understand all similar types in which causes are inferred through effects, such as the stability of a receptacle based on the water inside it not shifting and the like, as included within resultant evidence.

Among natural evidence, there are syllogisms with natural evidence based on qualification, as in "The subject, sound, is impermanent because of being produced, or because of being created." And there are syllogisms with natural evidence free of qualification, like adding to the same subject and thesis to be proven the evidence "because of being something that exists as an entity." In terms of the style of expressing the evidence, the former demonstrates the subject as the result of something else, and thus it is as though it relies on something else. The latter evidence is the mere essence of the subject expressed in an independent manner, thus it is called "independently free." Yet, beyond mere verbal presentation there is no difference in meaning between these.

Syllogisms with evidence of non-observation are two-fold: non-observation of something that does not appear and non-observation of something that can appear. The first of these is as follows: "The subject, here on the floor in front, a person to whom a flesh-eating demon is far removed from is uncertain whether or not there is a flesh-eating demon, because, since it does not appear to him, he does not observe it."

Such a statement, which in this context is for proving that something is absent because of not having observed it, is two-fold: things that cannot appear and things that can appear.

The first is as follows: objects that are remote in terms of location, time and nature cannot be observed by a person for whom they are remote objects, despite their presence. For despite the presence in this location of things like flesh-eating demons and bardo beings, since they are not things that appear to such a person, it is taught that, "He does not observe them." Thus, the fact that it is things that do not appear, which are not observed, demonstrates that there is no genuine

engagement with them in accordance with reality, meaning that one analyzes whether one can be certain about their presence or absence. This has the further goal of differentiating it from its contrary. If these were things that could appear then they would be negated by not being observed.

The way in which this goes into syllogistic evidence involves only the negation of the convention of being certain about something's presence or absence. As for the way in which its evidence is presented in syllogism, presenting its evidence as, "because there is no valid cognition that perceives flesh-eating demons in the mind stream of one for whom they are remote objects" would not correspond with the meaning of not observing what does not appear.

In brief, the non-observation of something that does not appear in actuality teaches not to exaggerate or denigrate things that cannot be inferred, as people do not rightly know what is fitting for each other, and so forth.

The non-observation of something that can appear is two-fold: the non-observation of something that can be observed and observation of something's opposite.

The first of these includes non-observation of nature (*rang bzhin ma dmigs pa*) as in "The subject, in this house, there is no pot, because of not observed with a valid cognition to which it could appear."

The first category also includes the non-observation of a related item. This further includes the non-observation of the cause, as in, "The subject, on the lake at night, there is no smoke because there is no fire." It also includes the non-observation of the entailing factor (*khyab byed*) as in "The subject, on the stony crag over there, there is no *aśoka* tree because there are no trees." And it includes also the non-observation of the direct effect (*dnegos 'bras*) as in "The subject, in the circular wall devoid of smoke, there is no direct result of smoke because there is no smoke."

Within the category of the observation of the opposite, there are two types of syllogism: those based on a non-coexistent opposition and those based on mutually exclusive opposition.

The first of these is twelve-fold. Taking the issue under dispute to be "The subject, in the direction over there," and taking the evidence

to be “because it is engulfed by fire,” the property to be proven is construed as “there is no cold sensation,” “there is no unobstructed capacity of a direct cause of a cold sensation,” “there are no goose bumps as the result of cold,” and “there is no sensation of snow.” These respectively constitute syllogisms involving the observation of the nature of an opposite in terms of nature, cause, result and encompassed factor.

Moreover, negating the above four of “cold sensation” and the rest by putting forth as evidence “covered completely by billowing smoke” for the same issue under dispute as above is the observation of a result that is opposite in terms of nature and the other three.

Negating the four of “cold sensation” and the rest by putting forth as evidence “covered completely by a sandalwood fire” for the same issue under dispute is the observation of an encompassed factor that is opposite in terms of nature and the other three, thus making four more.

Moreover, some Tibetan scholars maintain that there are sixteen syllogisms involving the observation of an opposite. They add to the previous ones the negation of all four by putting forth as evidence “covered by the unobstructed capacity of a direct cause of fire.”

Other scholars have emphatically rejected that, saying: “The direct cause of fire is not fire. The moment just before the production of the direct result is. Thus, it cannot function as evidence.” Despite such, because there is generally no direct cause of a cold sensation where there is the potent capacity of the direct cause of fire, the other three would also not be present. Consequently, in such syllogisms there is only the absence of opposites in actuality. Nonetheless, since the previous opinion of twelve syllogisms is easier to apply, we should maintain such in this context.

With opposites of mutual exclusion, direct opposites have no evidence and no thesis to prove involving the observation of opposites because they end up being the same object. For example, in “The subject, sound, is impermanent because it is produced, or because it emerges with effort,” the opposite of the encompassing factor is negated based on presenting an encompassed factor that indirectly opposes it. This is also called “an opposite problematized by valid cognition.” Here, from the perspective of the exclusion of the opposite, the mere moniker of non-observation is indeed suitable. However, when considered

from the perspective of the inclusion of impermanence through negating the excluded permanence, non-observation ought to be included among natural evidence.

Moreover, as indicated by such, contradictory mental states are also to be included among natural evidence and therefore have not actually been construed as a category of syllogistic evidence. This is because, like the unobstructed capacity of a direct cause, it is difficult for ordinary beings to ascertain them.

A reasoning in which a collection of causes is complete in number is also included among natural syllogisms. In this way, all other syllogisms possessing the character of the three types of evidence should likewise be include among them. This is like how the reasoning of absence of singularity and plurality involves the non-observation of the encompassing factor of truth.

Properly understanding in such a way, by oneself, a certain fact by means of a correct reasoning is called "inference for one's own benefit." Whereas, expressing to another person as well, based on the former, the proof of a certain fact, in conformity with reason, while refuting those who speak inconsistently with fact is called "inference for another's benefit."

When refuting the position of an opponent, the factor of the issue under dispute is held as an issue of interrogation, not something that has already been established or rejected through valid cognition. This means that proof is not garnered for something that has already been established by valid cognition in the perception of both parties, like fire being hot, or something that has already been rejected by valid cognition, like fire being cold. Rather, a reason of proof is put forth in the case when something like sound is held as an issue of interrogation because there are different positions that maintain it to be permanent or impermanent, respectively.

To elaborate, when proving something, an autonomous syllogism with the three criteria complete must be enlisted. This is because the evidence must be established according to valid necessity and not by mere acceptance.

Refutation also includes both autonomous and consequential language. In order to refute an opponent who claims that sound is

permanent one can independently put forth something like, “Sound is impermanent because it is produced.”

It is also suitable to project an unwanted consequence for the opponent by putting forth evidence that is established by his admission, as in, “It follows that the subject, sound, is not made because it is permanent.” Thus, a consequence is projected based on how the evidence was already established, by his admission, even as a valid necessity. These two have multiple categories.

One who debates with another should do so through having gained complete certainty in diverse topics. This means that he should be familiar with the terminology and content of the topics taught in his own and others’ scriptural traditions. He should be learned in interrogating and responding, and in communicating the proper understanding of extensive and abbreviated topics.

As someone who has stabilized his training of fearlessness, he should communicate clearly. He should thus speak by rejecting what is irrelevant, like improper words, and enlisting that is relevant. Through possessing such verbal “adornments” he should express the issue under discussion clearly, eloquently enlisting complete syllogisms, along with examples, endowed with the three valid cognitions—direct perception, inference, and authoritative testimony that has been authenticated by the three-fold analysis. He should speak thus at a location where there is a king and a master, or a crowd, capable of serving as a judge or a witness to the speech. It should be someone who understands what is correct and incorrect and can thus properly determine who wins or loses. The speech of the proponent who has fully established the truth of his thesis through speaking in this way will be carried far and wide and become renowned.

Nevertheless, the Blessed One said that a bodhisattva who sees the rarity of the following twelve occurrences in actuality “should exert himself in virtuous activity and not debate with others.” The following are scarce:

1. To understand the profound meaning of the sacred Dharma,
2. To engage in discussion with the motivation of wishing to understand,

3. A learned assembly capable of properly adjudicating the meaning,
4. To abandon the faults of disparaging others, deceit, harsh words and the like with a mentality that is disturbed by the fault of attachment to a negative position,
5. To speak without being disturbed,
6. To speak while safeguarding others' minds,
7. To speak while maintaining meditative composure,
8. To speak without any concern about victory or defeat,
9. To be without disturbing emotions in victory or defeat,
10. To meditate on virtuous factors, since one cannot remain at ease once the disturbing emotions have arisen,
11. To settle the mind in equipoise without meditating on virtuous factors,
12. To be liberated even while resting evenly.

Accordingly, most debates stem from only the faults of attachment or aversion. Thus, few can discern the meaning as it is. But if one can enlist various topics and debate these without such faults, properly analyzing the meaning of the Victorious One's Exalted Word by means of authentic reasoning, this will serve to refute false Dharma and spread the tradition of real Dharma.

Among the four principles of reason taught above, the latter, the principle of valid proof, can be divided in terms of support into the two aspects of direct perception and inference. It can also be divided in terms of the thesis to be proven into the two aspects of the relative analysis of appearance and the absolute analysis of emptiness, or, into three aspects when including the valid cognition of the ultimate analysis of the two truths inseparable.

When dividing it in terms of the style of argumentation, there are four aspects of proving and negating, in which things are proven or negated either existentially or copulatively. There is also provisionally the dyad of proof and negation, and ultimately its culmination in the object of one's own individual self-awareness, the freedom from mental constructs beyond negating and proving.

30

THE FOUR RELIANCES

Based on properly analyzing the genuine condition of the two truths through the two types of valid cognition or the four principles of reason, as outlined above, there will arise authentic certainty free from the defilements of lack of understanding, misunderstanding or doubt. At that point, the four reliances will automatically take place.

No matter what kind of person a teacher is, he cannot purify or liberate you. If the teaching he gives is truly meaningful, it is proper to adhere to it. But if it is not meaningful, it is improper to adhere to it. Thus, one should not rely on the person but on the teaching.

As for the teaching, moreover, the expressing words are merely utilized for the purpose of communicating meaning, just like a finger pointing to the moon. If one understands a certain meaning based on the words that present what is intended, then the purpose of the words is exhausted and therefore should not be pursued further. If one embraces the elaboration of words, they increase endlessly and will impair one's understanding of meaning. Thus, one should not rely on the words but on the meaning.

The content taught by the Exalted Word, moreover, has the two aspects of a provisional expedient meaning taught out of necessity and the definitive meaning that does not have a merely expedient meaning. One should therefore fully settle upon and retain, by means of reasoning, the content of all the different levels of Dharma-gates, which were spoken as methods for taming disciples based on the Buddha knowing their respective dispositions, faculties and inclinations. There are, for example, the following kinds.

The implication of another intent due to necessity is like when the Teacher himself, implying equality, said: "At that time I was Buddha Vipasyin."

The implication of another meaning is like the statement, "All phenomena are devoid of identity," or "There is no form, no sensation." These are not merely conventions, but imply the absolute.

The implication of another time is like the statement "By merely retaining the name of a certain buddha one will be reborn in his realm." This implies that one will at some time certainly be reborn there, although there is no certainty that one will take rebirth there as soon as the present life is over.

The implication of a person's inclination is like describing that generosity is inferior and praising discipline to a person who is inclined to hold only generosity as sufficient. In fact, discipline is indeed superior to generosity. The necessity involves individual purposes.

Indirect implication primarily involves not the literal sense, but refers obliquely to something else. There are four types.

Indirect teachings aimed at introducing people to the path are given to shravakas in order to introduce them to the teachings in a gradual way. They are taught in view of what exists on a relative level only, such as the statement that there is no self of person, but that the phenomena of form and so on do exist.

Indirect teachings on the nature of phenomena are taught in view of the three natures, or from the ultimate perspective. They include such teachings as those on the absence of inherent identity and teachings on primordial nirvāna.

Indirect teachings connected with antidotes are expressed in order to eliminate what should be relinquished from the mind streams of disciples. These are like the statement "I was Buddha Vipasyin," which was said, as explained above, in order to relinquish a disparaging view based on perceiving a qualitative difference between the buddhas.

As an antidote to the disparaging view that the Dharma is easy to obtain, the Buddha said, "Understanding the teachings of the Mahayana dawns once one has worshipped buddhas equal in number to the grains of sand in the river Ganges."

For the sake of the lazy, who think, “I cannot train in the path!” the Buddha said that by praying for Sukhāvātī one will be reborn there. This was said, as before, with a view to another time.

Then for the benefit of those who are satisfied with only a trifling root of virtue, the Buddha belittled that virtue and praised another. This was said with a view to people’s inclinations, as stated earlier. These four are expressions made based on a certain intention.

Then in consideration of individuals’ attitudes, but not based on any other intention, in front of people who were proud of their caste, beauty and wealth and so on, the Buddha praised others, so that they might develop humility.

As an antidote to the attachment to defiled objects, he praised the superiority of supermundane riches.

To those overcome with grief and remorse at having committed misdeeds like harming a sublime being he taught how even harming buddhas and bodhisattvas establishes a positive connection. This was taught in view of the pleasure that is produced once a confession is made or a fault is exhausted.

For those indeterminate bodhisattvas wishing to turn away from the Mahayana, it was taught that there is only a single vehicle. This was said in view of the ultimate, and does not imply that on a provisional level there are no results for each of the three vehicles.

Through the Dharma of the supreme vehicle taught in that way all such obstructing faults will be overcome. Such was said in the *Two Verse Dhāranī*, applying to someone who memorizes the following phrase, or brings its meaning to mind:

[Disparaging buddhas and the Dharma,
Laziness and satisfaction with a trifling,
Attachment and behaving arrogantly,
Regret and the turning away of the indeterminate—

These have become obstructions for sentient beings.
Through the sublime vehicle taught as their antidotes
The faults of these obstacles
Will be fully relinquished.]

It is said that were one to commit to memory these two verses teaching the eight faults, such a supremely intelligent person would obtain ten qualities. What are they?

1. The potential of buddha nature will fully develop.
2. At the time of death, one will obtain a supreme state of rapture

These two are qualities that emerge as tangible phenomena in the same lifetime.

There are also eight intangible phenomena that emerge in future lives. These are:

3. An excellent body born according to one's wish,
4. The excellent recollection of all one's past lives, and
5. An excellent teacher, encountering the buddhas.

These are the three supports for the path.

As for the path:

6. One will receive the teachings of the supreme vehicle from a Buddha.
7. One will become interested in that vehicle, and in conjunction with that interest, acquire a profound intelligence capable of fully ascertaining its meaning.
8. One will obtain limitless doors to meditative samadhi on the pure bhumis.
9. One will obtain limitless doors of retention.
10. Ultimately, one will swiftly attain great enlightenment.

If even the qualities of memorizing two verses of the sublime Dharma are as extensive as this, then there is no need to mention the rest of the Dharma. Therefore, one should develop the wisdom of retaining the whole of the Dharma and being learned in finely discerning its intent.

Indirect teachings expressed in metaphors are indirect teachings expressed metaphorically in order to counter the disparaging perception of certain non-Buddhists and others who maintain that the Exalted

Word of the Buddha is easy to understand. The meaning to be understood is other than that expressed literally. For example, it is said:

One should know the essence in the essenceless.
 One should be thoroughly afflicted by the afflictions.
 If one can perfectly abide in the perverse,
 One will attain sublime enlightenment.

To explain what the intended meaning behind this is, it was said with the following indirect intention in mind: the Sanskrit terms "*sāra/sara*" are applicable to both "essence" and "movement." Therefore, one should exert oneself diligently in mental training, understanding the essence to be an absence of wavering. One should also be "afflicted" by the afflictions of hardship while training in discipline. One should also perfectly adhere to training in wisdom, which is "perversely" opposite of clinging to purity, pleasure, permanence and self. With this as the cause "one will attain sublime enlightenment."

Similarly, in the *Udānavarga* it is said:

Father and mother should be slain.

The intention behind this is that craving and ignorance are to be relinquished. All such similar statements are known as "indirect teachings expressed in metaphors."

As illustrated by these implied and indirect styles of teaching, any content among the Exalted Word behind which there is an ulterior intention, purpose, or that problematizes actual fact, is of expedient meaning. On the contrary, all statements established by the reasoning that scrutinizes the ultimate should be understood as definitive in meaning.

Moreover, statements made exclusively with the purpose of taming disciples are not literal. Such include all the statements similar to the teachings demonstrating the ten continua of karmic action, such as when the Buddha said "My back hurts," and the rest. Buddha was indeed utterly without the faults of karma and suffering. Yet, out of the intention to tame disciples he had the intention of pretending as

though he did have these faults. Such should be understood according to what he said in the *Sūtra of Inconceivable Secrets*. In addition, understanding the difference between the content taught by the higher and lower vehicles, one should engage in the ultimate meaning. This is why it is said, “Do not rely on the expedient meaning, but on the definitive meaning.”

Even in terms of the definitive meaning, it can either be the apprehension of a mere universal belonging to the conceptual sphere, or it can be the individual self-awareness of an inexpressible, specifically characterized phenomenon belonging to the sphere of non-conceptual wisdom. From among them, as long as one adheres to the extreme reference points of negation and affirmation, existence and non-existence and so on, one does not transcend the realm of conceptual cognition. But when one has obtained the sublime appearance of wisdom, when there has clearly manifested the goal of the total pacification of dualistic conceptual constructs, in accordance with the nature of reality, free of negation and affirmation, rejection and acceptance, then one has plumbed the depths of the Dharma. Therefore it is said, “Do not rely on conceptual cognition, but on wisdom.”

When one possesses these four reliances just as they were explained, then just as butter is extracted from milk and butter-cream is in turn extracted from butter, one will comprehend the ultimate intent of the Thus-gone-one’s Exalted Word, and then gain mastery over self-arisen wisdom appearances as vast as space. Through this, the eight treasures of eloquence will unfold. What are they? It is said in the *Lalitavistara*:

Through not forgetting, the treasure of recollection,
 Through mentally discerning, the treasure of doctrinal
 intelligence,
 Through comprehending the form of all sūtra collections,
 the treasure of understanding,
 Through fully recollecting all that was learned, the treasure
 of retention,
 Through satisfying all sentient beings with eloquent
 exposition, the treasure of ready speech,

Through fully protecting the sublime Dharma, the treasure
 of Dharma,
 Through not severing the family line of the Three Jewels,
 the treasure of awakened mind,
 And through attaining forbearance in the Dharma of non-
 origination, the treasure of accomplishment—
 One will attain these eight great treasures.

Accordingly, a being who has attained the right discrimination of ready speech endowed with the eight treasures will uphold the Buddha's teachings, illuminate for sentient beings what should be adopted and abandoned, and ultimately establish them in unexcelled buddhahood. One should understand this point in greater detail from the *Sword of Insight for Fully Ascertaining Reality*.

This concludes the section on right discrimination.

EPILOGUE

In this way, I have set down and explained well the ten topics of learnedness, the four seals and the four right discriminations. Thereby, the main body of the treatise is fully completed.

This treatise is a flawless commentary on the intent of the entire Exalted Word of the Victorious One, a sublime entrance gate for people of this good eon.

Therefore, if you try to comprehend it with respect and persistent diligence, you will attain inexhaustible temporary and ultimate qualities.

Why is this treatise called *Gateway to Knowledge*? It is because you become “knowledgeable” through achieving the light of the perfect Dharma resulting from learning, reflection and meditation; “pure” by possessing the qualities of the three trainings of practicing the Dharma correctly; and endowed with the “excellent” activities of bringing benefit to the teachings and to sentient beings.

The way of those who possess knowledge is, in brief, to be endowed with the threefold wheel, the embodiment of the triad of teaching, practicing and activity.

The unmistakable “gateway” to initially “entering” such a way is to study and reflect upon this treatise itself. That is the reason for its title.

This special treatise that demonstrates concisely, comprehensibly and clearly all the key points of the profound and extensive content of the Exalted Word and its commentaries was composed after I understood these via doctrinal intelligence. It is a treasury of all topics of knowledge and a precious mine for the Abhidharma of the Mahayana.

If you understand it well you will be unhindered in exposition, debate and composition and thereby be able to clarify the teachings of the Victorious One.

Based on that, you will gain mastery over the infinitely praised splendor of qualities for accomplishing the vast purpose of benefit and wellbeing for all sentient beings.

The treasury of the four right discriminations—
If you rely on their manner, even with minor effort
You will enjoy and delight infinitely
In the resplendence of the profound and vast Dharma.

Uncorrupted by desire for gain, honor and fame,
Out of faith in the teachings and for the welfare of others,
In order that the sublime Dharma be upheld, and to the
supreme deity,
This was eloquently composed. May it benefit the doctrine
and beings!

May Mañjushri enter the minds of those who learn this
book, so that
They attain eminent retention, eloquence and doctrinal
intelligence!
By this virtue may all beings
Attain the state of the Lord of Supreme Knowledge!

May I too, until attaining unexcelled enlightenment,
Possess throughout all lifetimes eminent doctrinal
intelligence of the profound and vast!
May I throughout all lifetimes be accepted by the victorious
ones,
And uphold all the sublime teachings of the Mahayana!

May everyone who acquires a connection to me and to this
teaching
Attain a vajra-like mind and body throughout all rebirths!

May they conquer demons and obstacles
 And have the auspicious goodness of spontaneously
 accomplishing the twofold benefit!

Previously I had the wish to write this text and therefore created only a rough outline before putting it off for over a year. Subsequently, there was talk expressing disappointment and concern that since I was overpowered by illness and the like I might leave the text unfinished. Hearing of such talk, Sherap Ösal, who lives together with me, vehemently urged me out of his positive intentions. Out of compassion, I summoned my energies despite the difficulties of enduring the pangs of illness. I thus completed the ten topics of knowledge in the third month of the Iron Ox year (1901) at Gatö Tashi Chöling.

Later still, after I arrived in Rudam, the supremely wise Gurong Tulku conceded to print the text and thus urged me to compose an addendum to the previous version. For this and other reasons, the one known as Mipham Jamyang Namgyal—a name assigned by the scholar and adept Gyalpo Lachok in connection with four concrete reasons—completed this text at the navel of Auspicious Sunlight chamber, the abode of precious Dzogchen Choktrul the Fifth—gatherer of the virtuous signs for the doctrine and beings with the lasso of his all-accomplishing activity—at the top of the religious estate of Rudam Dzogchenpa Orgyan Samtan Ling, in the large community of Shedrup Chö, on the 11th day of the waxing moon endowed with the auspicious conjunction of Castor and Jupiter, in the 1st month, under the constellation ruled by the sun god, at the beginning of the Water Tiger year (1902) of Geche adorned with the marks of the eight auspicious signs of virtue, amidst the satisfaction of numerous spatial and temporal marks of virtue. Through this composition may the precious doctrine of the Victorious One spread and develop throughout all directions! Mangala