

- 99 Amdo Gedun Chöphel (1994), vol. ii, pp. 287–8.
- 100 *rGyan 'grel*, pp. 63, 237.
- 101 Other works where Mipham touches on this include his *Mādhyamika* writings such as *sTong thun seng ge'i nga ro*, *mKhas 'jug* and his annotative commentary on MK.
- 102 An absolute negation in Tibetan dialectics is one in which, having negated the negandum, nothing is either directly or indirectly affirmed. It is like the negation in the statement 'there is no vase'. An implicative negation is one in which, after negating the negandum, something is affirmed or implied, as in the statement, 'this is not a golden vase'. A golden vase is negated but something else is being confirmed. See *dGongs pa rab gsal*, pp. 142–3 = ff. 82–3; *Drang nges*, p. 278–81; *rGyan 'grel*, p. 229 and Karma Phuntsho (1997), p. 45–48. See also Seyfort Ruegg (2000), pp. 224–6.
- 103 *Prasannapadā*, p. 7 (B. 13).
- 104 For Mipham, see *Nges shes sgron me*, Question I/3; *gSung sgros*, p. 486. For Geluk source, see *dGongs pa rab gsal*, pp. 140–1 = ff. 81–2; *Drang nges*, p. 282.
- 105 *Rab lan*, p. 136; *'Jug 'grel*, p. 539; *gSung sgros*, p. 487; *mKhas 'jug*, p. 385.
- 106 Ibid., p. 537; *Nges shes sgron me*, Question I/8–16; *gSung sgros*, pp. 438, 471.
- 107 The general *rang stong* and *gzhan stong* controversy deals with the nature of *tathāgatagarbha*. Zhantongpas such as the Jonangpas, based on sources such as *Tathāgatagarbarhasūtras*, *Ratnagotravibhāga* and *Kālacakra*, argued that the *tathāgatagarbha* is an absolute reality inherently endowed with the qualities of the Buddha. It is therefore not empty of its nature but only of other things, that is, the adventitious defects of *samsāra*. Karmapa Mikyod Dorje in some of his works and Śākyā Chogdan toward the end of his life advocated a version of *gzhan stong* asserting the sublime gnosis to be innate and absolute, thus not empty of its own nature but of impure defects. Rangtongpas such as Gelukpas and Mipham, based primarily on the *Mādhyamika* treatises, argued that the *tathāgatagarbha*, like all other phenomena, is empty of its own being. Hence, it is not absolute. However, even among the Rangtongpas, there are two currents of thought with regard to the intrinsic presence of the Buddha's qualities in the *tathāgatagarbha*. On the one hand are those who profess a soteriological process of gradual acquisition and progressive cultivation, and on the other, those advocating an innatism, in which the soteriological thrust is in revealing the latent qualities through elimination of the obscurations. The Gelukpas and most Sakyapas belonged to the first, viewing the *tathāgatagarbha* as the seed of Buddhahood and denying that it is endowed with the qualities of the Buddha. Other Rangtongpas such as Mipham, like the Zhantongpas, professed the innatist theory by accepting the latency of the qualities of the Buddha in the *tathāgatagarbha*. Mipham criticizes both the *gzhan stong* absolutists, who assert the *tathāgatagarbha* to be absolute and established with own being even on the ultimate level, as well as the Rangtongpas who argue that the *tathāgatagarbha* is empty not only of own being but also of the latent qualities of enlightenment. See Introduction, p. 16–17; Chapter 2, n. 62. Mipham's accusation of Gelukpas of having to espouse *gzhan stong* viewpoint in the current context is however not particularly related to the theory of *tathāgatagarbha* but to their theory of Emptiness *qua* absence of hypostatic existence.
- 108 *gSung sgros*, pp. 445, 545; *sTong thun seng ge'i nga ro*, p. 590.
- 109 Ibid., p. 437.
- 110 Ibid., pp. 548–9: Mipham remarks that if the extrinsic Emptiness of a vase being not empty of itself but of hypostatic existence is acceptable, the Gelukpas should also embrace the extrinsic Emptiness of the ultimate being not empty of itself but of dualistic conventional phenomena. He further remarks that people of Tibet should assess which of these two *gzhan stong* concepts is better. See *Nges shes sgron me*, I/9.
- 111 *dGongs pa rab gsal*, p. 203 = f. 117b.

NOTES

- 112 *mKhas 'jug*, p. 385.
- 113 *gSung sgros*, pp. 436–7; *'Jug 'grel*, pp. 545, 607.
- 114 *Ibid.*, p. 438.
- 115 *Ibid.*, p. 440.
- 116 *Nges shes sgron me*, Question I/9; *'Jug 'grel*, p. 537.
- 117 *Ibid.*, Question I/10.
- 118 *Ibid.*, Question I/12.
- 119 *'Jug 'grel*, p. 607.
- 120 *Rab lan*, p. 258.
- 121 *Nges shes sgron me*, Question I/18–19.
- 122 *Ibid.*, Question I/20–2.
- 123 *'Jug 'grel*, pp. 541–2.
- 124 *Ibid.*, p. 603.
- 125 *Ibid.*, p. 541; *mKhas 'jug*, p. 385; *gSung sgros*, p. 537.
- 126 *Nges shes sgron me*, Question I/8–18; *'Jug 'grel*, p. 541.
- 127 *gSung sgros*, p. 531.
- 128 *'Jug 'grel*, p. 541.
- 129 *Ibid.*, p. 537–9.
- 130 *gSung sgros*, p. 438; *don dpyod kyis bum pa med par ma 'grub na/ bden grub ji ltar khegs/ med par grub na de nyid don dam par stong pa yin gyi/ de las gzhan pa'i bden grub yan gar ba 'gog pa'i rigs pa ci/*
- 131 *'Jug 'grel*, pp. 544–5; *de'i phyir bum pa bden grub gzhan gyis stong pa'i lugs 'di'i ltar na/ bum par snang ba nyid rang gi ngo bos mi stong par 'dod pas bum pa bden grub tu 'gyur te/ don dpyod kyis dpyad na chos rang gi ngo bo nyid med par ma rtogs pa de las bden grub gzhan med do//*
- 132 *Ibid.*, pp. 541, 545.
- 133 *Ibid.*, p. 547.
- 134 *Ibid.*, pp. 595–6; *rGyan 'grel*, pp. 64–5.
- 135 *gSung sgros*, pp. 504–5.
- 136 *'Jug 'grel*, pp. 547–9.
- 137 *dGongs pa rab gsal*, pp. 201–14 = ff. 115–20; *Drang nges*, pp. 166–7.
- 138 *Ibid.*, p. 156.
- 139 *'Jug 'grel*, p. 601; *gSung sgros*, pp. 509–10. See Chapter 1, n. 23.
- 140 *Ratnāvalī*, I/35: *skandhagrāhō yāvad asti tāvad evāhamityapi/ ji srid phung por 'dzin yod pa// de srid de la ngar 'dzin yod//*
- 141 *'Jug 'grel*, p. 601.
- 142 *Rab lan*, pp. 261, 296; *gSung sgros*, p. 481.
- 143 *gSung sgros*, pp. 431–2; *spyir 'khor 'das gnyis kyi snang ba ni nam yang rgyun chad mi srid la/ snang ba yod na de stong pa la stong nyid du btags kyi/ snang ba med pa ri bong gyi rwa la sogs pa ni stong pa nyid kyi don ma yin te/ tha snyad du med pa yin pas/ ri bong gi rwa rwa stong gi tha snyad sbyar yang gtan med kyi don yin no// stong pa nyid ni tha snyad du yod pa'i chos rnams kyis chos nyid yin te/ . . . des na stong pa nyid 'di tha snyad du yod pa'i chos thams cad kyi rang bzhin nam gnas lugs su bsgrub par bya ba yin gyi/ tha snyad du med pa zhig gi chos nyid du bsgrub bya ni gtan min no//*
- 144 *Ibid.*, p. 432; *de'i phyir stong nyid zhes pa tha snyad du yod pa'i chos rnams kyi chos nyid yin la/ stong nyid yan gar du gnas pa dngos po la mi srid do/*
- 145 *gSung sgros*, pp. 447–8.
- 146 *Ibid.*, pp. 542–9.
- 147 It might perhaps be clearer to render *bden grub* as truly existent to understand this particular reasoning. He argues that the vase being not empty of vase conventionally would mean that it has a true conventional existence. Hence, it would contradict to say

- that it is not truly existent. His point is that if the statement is taken on the conventional level, the vase should either have no true existence conventionally by being empty of itself or be truly existent.
- 148 *Rab lan*, p. 262; *Jug 'grel*, p. 595; *gSung sgros*, p. 504.
- 149 *Ibid.*, p. 261.
- 150 *gSung sgros*, p. 444.
- 151 *Jug 'grel*, p. 543.
- 152 *Ibid.*, p. 544.
- 153 *gSung sgros*, pp. 438–9.
- 154 MA, VI/141: *rang khyim rtsig phug sbrul gnas mthong bzhin du// 'di na glang chen med ces dogs bsal te// sbrul gyi 'jigs pa'ang spong bar byed pa ni// kye ma gzhan gyi gnam por 'gyur nyid do//* Tsongkhapa cites this in his *Lam rim*, p. 645 against those whose delimitation of negandum are over-narrow. Mipham cites this against the Gelukpas in his *gSung sgros* by rephrasing it likewise: *tha snyad dngos po mi stong 'dzin bzhin du// chos gzhan stong pa yin ces dogs bsal bas// dngos zhen mtha' dag 'jig par 'dod pa ni// kye ma gstan gyi gnam por 'gyur nyid do//*
- 155 *Rab lan*, p. 137: *da lta rang re yi blo gsal 'ga' zhig// snang ba lang ling de rang sar bzhag nas// dgag bya rwa can zhig tshol bar 'dug kyang// a ma rgan mo de bros dogs 'dug go//*. The term *rwa can* or ‘possessing horn’ is a metaphor for a non-existent thing and mother is an epithet of Prajñānapāramitā.
- 156 Amdo Gedun Chöphel (1994), vol. ii, pp. 292, 311; Bodpa Trulku (1996), p. 158.
- 157 *Ibid.*, pp. 291–2.
- 158 *Ibid.*, p. 290.
- 159 *Ibid.*, p. 292: *'ga' zhig gis bum pa/ ka ba sogs rigs pas 'gag na thams cad med par lta ba 'i chad lta skye snyam nas 'jigs pa ni don med pa 'i sems khral te/ mdun na mthong bzhin pa 'i bum pa 'di gtan med do snyam pa 'i chad lta zhig so skye rang ga ba la skye bar ga la srid/ gal te de 'dra 'i blo zhig skyes na bum pa mthong rgyu yod/ reg rgyu yod pa dngos su shes pas/bum pa 'di nga la snang rgyu 'dug kyang snang bzhin du gtan nas med do snyam pa 'i blo rang shugs kyis skyes pas blo de 'dra ni snang ba ltar du med par 'dzin pa 'i snang stong gnyis tshogs kyi dbu ma 'i lta ba de yin gyi/ chad lta ga la yin/*
- 160 Hopkins (1983), p. 544.
- 161 Napper (1989), p. 147.
- 162 Newland (1992), p. 18.
- 163 *Rab lan*, pp. 256, 261; *gSung sgros*, pp. 479–82.
- 164 *Samcayagāthā*, I/13; *Samādhirājāśūtra*, IX/27; *Kaśyapaparivarta*, p. 56; MK, XV/7, XV/10, XXII/11–2, XXII/14; *Catuhśataka*, VIII/20, XVI/25; *Jñānasārasamuccaya*, 11, 29. See Seyfort Ruegg (1977) and Seyfort Ruegg (2000), pp. 139–47.
- 165 Seyfort Ruegg (1977), p. 9.
- 166 Sera Jetsün Chökyi Gyaltsan (1989), vol. i, p. 178–9: *de ltar ma yin na/ chos thams cad chos can/ yod pa yin par thal/ med pa ma yin pa 'i phyir/ ... gzhān yang/ chos thams cad yod pa yang yin/ med pa yang yin/ gnyis ka yang yin/ gnyis ka ma yin pa yang yin par thal/ chos thams cad yod pa yang ma yin/ med pa yang ma yin/ gnyis ka yang ma yin/ gnyis ka ma yin pa yang ma yin pa 'i phyir/ rtags khas/*
- 167 ‘Reversion of is and reversion of is-not’ or *yin log min log* is a topic in *bsdus grwa*, that is roughly the law of double negation. The basic rules are: reversion of *x = non-x* and reversion of reversion of *x = x*. Thus, any odd number of reversion of *x = non-x* and any even number of reversion of *x = x*. However the reversion of *non-x = x*, and any number of reversion of *non-x* shall amount to *x*. See Phurchog Jampa Gyatsho (1993), pp. 32–7.
- 168 *Rab gsal*, p. 386: *'dir dgag pa gnyis kyis rnal ma go zhes rgya bod kyi mkhas pa 'i rigs pa yang khas che mod/ rang gsod pa 'i mtshon cha rang gis brdar ba ste/ bden med du med na bden grub dang/ bden grub ma yin pa min na 'ang bden grub tu 'gyur ba 'i*