

Transcript

00:00:15 Speaker 1

Welcome to the fourth talk in the second series of our Padmasambhava Uddhyana and Tibet seminar.

00:00:22 Speaker 1

We've had a really excellent programme this Michaelmas term, details of which can be found on our website, and there is still one more talk to come in a week's time on December the 10th from Lewis Doney.

00:00:34 Speaker 1

All our talks are published as video podcasts, freely available from our website, from Apple Podcasts and from other sites too, so please try not to interrupt during the recording.

00:00:46 Speaker 1

However, the discussion period after the talks will not be podcast and are open to the entire audience, so please feel free to express yourselves and ask questions then.

00:00:57 Speaker 1

Today, we're delighted to welcome Professor Dorji Wangchuk, who is widely regarded as one of the most deeply learned and productive members of the contemporary Tibetological community.

00:01:08 Speaker 1

A Bhutan-German national, Professor Wangchuk began his career by completing a nine-year course at the Ngajur Nyingma Institute, a traditional Tibetan Buddhist monastic seminary in South India, which in recent decades has become considered the most important center for Nyingma scholarship in South Asia.

00:01:28 Speaker 1

Dorji Wongchuk then went on to study classical Indology and Tibetology

00:01:34 Speaker 1

at the Universite Hamburg, from where he received his PhD in 2005 for a dissertation on the resolve to become a Buddha, a study of the Bodhichitta concept in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism.

00:01:47 Speaker 1

Between 1992 and 1996, he taught in Tibetan monastic seminaries in India.

00:01:53 Speaker 1

Since 1998, he has been teaching and researching at the Universite Hamburg, where he is currently the Professor for Tibetology.

00:02:01 Speaker 1

His main interests lie in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist texts and ideas, Tibetan Buddhist intellectual history and history of ideas, and Tibetan Buddhist intellectual literary and textual culture.

00:02:14 Speaker 1

He is also the founder and director of the Chen Tse Centre for Tibetan Buddhist Textual Scholarship, a research centre within the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies at the University of Hamburg's Asian Africa Institute.

00:02:29 Speaker 1

with Dr.

00:02:30 Speaker 1

Orna Almogi and Sebastian Nairdish, is also an initiator of the Buddha Nexus Project and is currently a PI in the ERC Synergy Project Intellexus.

00:02:43 Speaker 1

which strives to revolutionize the study of Indic and Tibetic Buddhist intellectual cultures by combining the hitherto well-tried historical philological methods and the history of ideas perspective with cutting-edge computational tools and techniques and a new theoretical approach of intellectual ecosystems.

00:03:05 Speaker 1

So welcome, Dorje.

00:03:08 Speaker 2

Thank you so much for your kind introduction.

00:03:12 Speaker 2

Thank you, everyone, who are taking the trouble to be here tonight, this evening.

00:03:20 Speaker 2

I wish to begin my talk by thanking the conveners of the webinar series, Padmasambhava, Oriana, and Tibet Seminar Series, Dr.

00:03:32 Speaker 2

Kathy Cantwell and Dr.

00:03:33 Speaker 2

Robert Mayer from the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Oxford.

00:03:39 Speaker 2

and Dr.

00:03:39 Speaker 2

Yunyao Jai from the Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University, for inviting me to speak today.

00:03:47 Speaker 2

The primary research question that I attempt to address today is evident from the title of my talk, Were Padma Samoa and Vimala Mitra de facto Sarvadharma Ampratishthana Vadins?

00:04:02 Speaker 2

To clarify,

00:04:10 Speaker 2

To clarify from the outset, by savadharma apatrishtanavadin, I mean one who maintains that the phenomena, whether samsaric or nirvanic, have no metaphysical ground, root, substrate, or locus whatsoever.

00:04:31 Speaker 2

I shall attempt to answer this question by discussing the following four points.

00:04:38 Speaker 2

Where do Padmasambha and Vimalamitra stand in the enigma school of Tibetan?

00:04:44 Speaker 2

Sorry, this is a bit misplaced.

00:04:54 Speaker 2

Where do Padmasambha and Vimalamitra stand in the enigma school of Tibetan Buddhism?

00:04:59 Speaker 2

What are the criteria for identifying them as sabadharma abratishanavadins?

00:05:06 Speaker 2

Are Pammasambhas, what I call five ontological propositions attributable to Vimla Mitra as well?

00:05:14 Speaker 2

Were Pammasambhas and Vimla Mitra de facto savadhama aprtchana vadins?

00:05:23 Speaker 2

Although Vimla Mitra continued to be important, especially in Dzogchen traditions,

00:05:36 Speaker 2

his overall role seems to have been overshadowed by the ever-increasing emphasis of Padma Sambha's role, so much so that the Nyingma doctrine came to be characterized as the doctrine of lotus-born victorious one .

00:05:55 Speaker 2

This shift seems to have occurred mainly due to the treasure phenomena,

00:06:01 Speaker 2

which is, at least in the Nyingma tradition, almost invariably associated with the Padmasambhava cult, so to speak, with Hoffman's Padmaism or Padmaismus.

00:06:15 Speaker 2

But of the several figures associated with the identity of what we call the Nyingma, that is ancient school of Tibetan Buddhism, Padmasambhava and Vimla Mitra have often been paired together as the two of the school's top authorities.

00:06:36 Speaker 2

First, in general, the Nyingma doctrine itself is, according to Mivam Namgil Jamso, defined by conduct that conforms to that of Shantarasita, a philosophical view that conforms to that of Nagarjana, and practice that conforms to those of Padmasambhu and Vimla Mitra.

00:07:01 Speaker 2

Second, according to Paltrul, Shantarakshita, Padmasambhava and Vimla Mitra not only consecrated the Samye temple complex, but Shantarakshita also introduced, established non-Tantric Buddhism in Tibet, whereas Padmasambhava and Vimla Mitra established Tantric Buddhism.

00:07:26 Speaker 2

Third, for Jimilingpa, Padmasambhava and Vimala Mitra are idols of Mahayana practitioners.

00:07:35 Speaker 2

Fourth, Padmasambhava and Vimala Mitra have often been mentioned...

00:07:39 Speaker 2

This is...

00:07:40 Speaker 2

Sorry, sorry, sorry.

00:07:42 Speaker 2

This was too early.

00:07:52 Speaker 2

Padmasambhava and Vimala Mitra have often been mentioned as cases of absorption yogin

00:07:57 Speaker 2

who have assumed the body of great transference, that is Poa Chimpi Kurshengpa.

00:08:06 Speaker 2

Fifth, viewing Pema Sambhoa and Vimala Mitra, however, only in the light of tantric or Dzogchen doctrines, seem somehow too narrow.

00:08:16 Speaker 2

It is for this reason that I think it is worth investigating, whether they propose or presupposed.

00:08:23 Speaker 2

the Sarvadharma Aprishtanavada philosophy based on what Rongzamba often calls exceptional Mahayana.

00:08:31 Speaker 2

This should give us an idea as to where they stand in Mahayana Buddhism in general and whether they were de facto Sarvadharma Aprishtanavadins.

00:08:45 Speaker 2

Before we can answer the question as to whether they were de facto Sabadharma Aprishtanavadins, we need to first answer the question, what are the criteria for identifying Sabadharma Aprishtanavadins?

00:09:00 Speaker 2

Different schools might have different ideas about the criteria for identifying Sabadharma Aprishtanadin.

00:09:09 Speaker 2

In general, for Rongsampa,

00:09:11 Speaker 2

A philosophical proponent who posits the doctrine of exceptional Mahayana (the Thakbachenba Tinong Mahimpa) would qualify as an aparishthana vadins.

00:09:24 Speaker 2

The question remains as to what exceptional Mahayana is.

00:09:28 Speaker 2

To be sure, Rama Zamba explicitly employs not only terms such as exceptional Mahayana (the Thakbachenba Tinong Mahimpa), but also

00:09:37 Speaker 2

Treaties/proposition of exceptional Mahayana, that is tekpa chenpo tinmong mahim be shung, and system of exceptional Mahayana, tekpa chenpo tinmong mahim be tsul, as opposed or juxtaposed to system of unexceptional or ordinary Mahayana, tekpa chenpo tinmong gitsul, and unexceptional or common yana, that is tekpa tinmong.

00:10:11 Speaker 2

Two questions arise regarding this terminology.

00:10:16 Speaker 2

The first concerns whether the attribute exceptional should be understood as qualifying all strands of Mahayana in general, or only a particular strand of Mahayana.

00:10:31 Speaker 2

Contextually, it becomes clear for Rongzompa

00:10:34 Speaker 2

that the term exceptional Mahayana does not denote that all strands of Mahayana are exceptional and hence oppose or juxtapose to Hinayana with Hinayana, but rather

reflects an internal distinction within Mahayana itself, which comprises two strands, an exceptional and an unexceptional one.

00:10:57 Speaker 2

This interpretation

00:11:00 Speaker 2

becomes clearer when he discusses unexceptional and exceptional teachings or positions of Mahayana in general.

00:11:11 Speaker 2

Additionally, the expression unexceptional yana appears to be employed in the sense of unexceptional or common Mahayana.

00:11:23 Speaker 2

The second question concerns whether such a distinction of Mahayana is Rongzongpa's own

00:11:30 Speaker 2

innovation, or he has taken over from an existing tradition.

00:11:36 Speaker 2

The Vivritta Guhyartha Pinda Vyakhya, an Indian commentary on the first chapter of Mahayana Sangraha, that is extent only in Tibetan translation from the early period of translation, does contain the expression

00:11:54 Speaker 2

Exceptionality of Mahayana.

00:11:58 Speaker 2

Juxtaposed to unexceptional or common Mahayana-- exceptional, unexceptional or common to Mahayana and Sravakayana.

00:12:07 Speaker 2

That is .

00:12:08 Speaker 2

And exceptionality and peculiarity of Sravakayana.

00:12:17 Speaker 2

That is .

00:12:22 Speaker 2

If it is construed in the genitive, that is , Tilmong Mayimba seems to be meant not as an adjective, but rather as an abstract noun, and hence, it must mean something like , and thus have to be interpreted as an exceptionality or peculiarity of Mahayana.

00:12:46 Speaker 2

The expression exceptionality of Mahayana is also found

00:12:51 Speaker 2

in the Bodhisattva Guhyartha Pujaka by Adisha.

00:13:18 Speaker 2

In short, one may characterize Asarva, Dharma, and Pratishnavadin as an exceptional Mahayanika.

00:13:29 Speaker 2

We know

00:13:30 Speaker 2

that Rongzongpa has articulated a set of five criteria for the Sabha Dharma and Pratishnavada doctrine on two separate occasions.

00:13:40 Speaker 2

And the five are as follows.

00:13:44 Speaker 2

Exceptional ontology-- that is, .

00:13:50 Speaker 2

Exceptional sociology-- number dulwatinmongmaimba.

00:13:54 Speaker 2

Exceptional gnosiology-- number dulwatinmongmaimba.

00:14:01 Speaker 2

Exceptional cosmology.

00:14:06 Speaker 2

By the way, this includes also exceptional epistemology.

00:14:11 Speaker 2

And finally, exceptional psychology.

00:14:14 Speaker 2

There is dundi dala jupae gangzagi lo tinmong maimpa or nisun maebar jupae tsul tinmong maimpa.

00:14:23 Speaker 2

Rongzongpa's use of lasoppa and that is and so on suggest

00:14:27 Speaker 2

that this is not a closed list of five.

00:14:32 Speaker 2

In fact, there appear to be numerous other related or unrelated criteria.

00:14:43 Speaker 2

To discuss each of these five criteria and to examine whether Padmasambhava and Vimala Mitra fulfilled these criteria so as to identify them as sabha-dharma aparasanavadana would take us far beyond the scope of today's talk.

00:15:00 Speaker 2

Therefore, I wish to take up only one of the five criteria, namely the first ontological criterion, which appears to be the most fundamental one, and which is also, in one way or another, connected with the remaining four criteria.

00:15:17 Speaker 2

Pelmasambhu's Mengata Cheng professes a set of what I wish to call five ontological propositions, which I consider to be related to our ontological criterion.

00:15:34 Speaker 2

In this regard, I wish to address two matters: to briefly present Padmasambhava's five ontological propositions, and to discuss whether and to what extent we can identify these five propositions in Vimala Mitra's two Prajnaparamita commentaries as well.

00:15:54 Speaker 2

First, the five ontological propositions of the Mengata Cheng are as follows:

00:16:05 Speaker 2

All phenomena are intrinsically empty.

00:16:08 Speaker 2

All phenomena are primordially pure.

00:16:20 Speaker 2

All phenomena are totally luminous.

00:16:30 Speaker 2

All phenomena are naturally quiescent or extinguished.

00:16:35 Speaker 2

Fifth, Chathamchenne yene wamrzokpasangye pao.

00:16:39 Speaker 2

All phenomena are primordially awakened.

00:16:45 Speaker 2

To be sure, all of these propositions except number two have also been reinforced by Rongzompa in his Takshin Sulju.

00:16:55 Speaker 2

that is all phenomena are intrinsically empty all phenomena are naturally quiescent or extinguished all phenomena are totally luminous and

00:17:13 Speaker 2

all phenomena are primordially awakened.

00:17:18 Speaker 2

Now, Rongzopa left out the second, namely .

00:17:24 Speaker 2

Perhaps he thought that it is adsensum not so much different from either number one or three.

00:17:32 Speaker 2

Significant here is that the Menata Cheng explicitly regards these five propositions as those of zopachempo.

00:17:41 Speaker 2

It says, .

00:17:47 Speaker 2

Let us now turn to the second matter, namely, examining whether Padma Sambhava's five ontological propositions can be traced in Vimalamitra's two Pranayaparamita's commentaries as well.

00:17:59 Speaker 2

We can observe that the proposition pertaining to the ontological or metaphysical purity

00:18:07 Speaker 2

cannot be found in Vimala Mitra's two Pranyaparamita commentaries.

00:18:12 Speaker 2

Instead, the commentaries profess the idea of sociological or spiritual purity.

00:18:20 Speaker 2

Nonetheless, one may argue that the idea of ontological purity is subsumed under the notion of natural luminosity of all phenomena.

00:18:31 Speaker 2

The idea of, so to speak, those of you who know Chinese or Japanese Buddhism,

00:18:37 Speaker 2

The idea of, so to speak, hongaku is explicit in Padmasambhava's proposition number five, but not in Vimalamitra's two commentaries.

00:18:48 Speaker 2

This discrepancy may be explained by the difference in the text and context.

00:18:54 Speaker 2

Padmasambhava is speaking in a Tantic text within an authentic context, whereas Vimalamitra is speaking in a suttic text within a suttic context.

00:19:07 Speaker 2

Nonetheless, while Vimalam Mitra in his Saptashatika Tikka does not speak of Hongaku or metaphysical Buddhahood as Pedma Sambhava does, he does seem to underscore the idea that the phenomena or factors of ordinary and noble beings are already characterized by awakening .

00:19:37 Speaker 2

Let us now turn to the central question: Were Pemasambhava and Vimala Mitra de facto savadhama-apristanavadins?

00:19:46 Speaker 2

I argue that the defining criterion for identifying someone as a savadhamapristanavadin is their commitment to the proposition that all phenomena, whether samsaric or nirvanic,

00:20:00 Speaker 2

possess no metaphysical ground, root, substrat, or locus whatsoever.

00:20:07 Speaker 2

Indeed, the school derives its very name from this proposition.

00:20:12 Speaker 2

I have chosen to designate this proposition as Mahayana unhypokymism from the Greek hypokymenon or substrat or underlying subject.

00:20:30 Speaker 2

This hypochemism finds expression in several key Sanskrit terms.

00:20:40 Speaker 2

Aprishthana, that is in Tibetan, ten mepa or minepa.

00:20:44 Speaker 2

Aprishthita, rabtu minepa or minepa or nepa mepa.

00:20:49 Speaker 2

Nishraya, ni ashraya, that is ten mepa or ten dhalwa.

00:20:54 Speaker 2

An ashraya is ten mepa.

00:20:57 Speaker 2

Nirmula, tsawa mepa.

00:21:00 Speaker 2

Amula, Tsavamepa again, Amulaka, that is Shime, and Amulamula, that is Tsavame, Tsavachen, Analaya, that is Shimepa, and Aniketar, nemepa.

00:21:19 Speaker 2

In sum, if we apply the criterion of Mahayana and hypochemism as attested in numerous sutric, tantric, and shastric sources,

00:21:29 Speaker 2

Padmasambhava and Vimala Mitra may indeed be regarded as de facto savadharma aparishtthanavadins.

00:21:38 Speaker 2

Let us now turn to another related criterion, namely what I wish to call Mahayana Indivisibilism.

00:21:48 Speaker 2

By this I mean

00:21:50 Speaker 2

that the Mahayana teaching that all phenomena, or more precisely, two modes of reality, are fundamentally indivisible and inseparable, that is, neither separate nor disjunct.

00:22:04 Speaker 2

For Rongzompa, this principle of indivisibility constitutes the core criterion of the Savadharma-aprasanavada school.

00:22:15 Speaker 2

On this basis, we can characterize both the Masambhava and Vimala Mitra as de facto Savadharma aparishtthanavadins.

00:22:27 Speaker 2

Sorry, I have...

00:22:30 Speaker 2

I was a bit late with my slides, so this should show you.

00:22:35 Speaker 2

On the one side, you see , where it says .

00:22:40 Speaker 2

And on the right side, you see a commentary by Vimalamitra, .

00:22:44 Speaker 2

And again, you see on the , it clearly says .

00:22:50 Speaker 2

And again, Vimalamitra says .

00:22:57 Speaker 2

And this idea,

00:23:00 Speaker 2

of course, can be attested also in Sanskrit sources, and here the decisive term is sarvadharma abhedatva.

00:23:09 Speaker 2

Of course, here it's used in an ablative, but we can already see the abstract noun here included in this expression.

00:23:25 Speaker 2

Rongzongpa employs the terms demba ni ermepa and demba namba ni ermepa on several occasions.

00:23:34 Speaker 2

These expressions also occur in Indian sources, though not in scriptures, but only in non-scriptural commentary literature, and predominantly in Tantric commentaries.

00:23:49 Speaker 2

My colleague Ryan Colon kindly points out the occurrence of Sattva Dvaya Abhinna in Shakyarakshita's Abhisamaya Manjari.

00:24:05 Speaker 2

Now, there are some textual problems.

00:24:08 Speaker 2

I still couldn't resolve this issue, and I have also a problem of interpretation, so I will leave it up to the Sanskrit experts to look into this matter more closely.

00:24:23 Speaker 2

But nonetheless, although I'm not a Sanskritist, I wonder whether the Tibetan translators read

00:24:29 Speaker 2

satyadvaya abinna sampana.

00:24:34 Speaker 2

Because if you look at the Tibetan translation, we have shukpa dang dempe.

00:24:44 Speaker 2

And this dang dempe is nowhere to be found in Sanskrit.

00:24:49 Speaker 2

But on the other hand, we don't seem to have anything corresponding nishpanam in Tibetan.

00:24:57 Speaker 2

And also we have this

00:25:01 Speaker 2

in the Tibetan, we have this instrumental, we don't have instrumental, no, we do have the instrumental dempe, but actually Sanskrit has zhukpe or something like that.

00:25:12 Speaker 2

So I also therefore wonder whether the Tibetan translation should have been, yangda, yangda, yangdu, shukpe, dempa ni er me pa dang den shing, sundu, jukpe, ting zen.

00:25:27 Speaker 2

But of course, as I said, we need to let the experts provide us with some insights.

00:25:45 Speaker 2

One question that arises is, if the doctrine of Mahayana indivisibilism, as expressed explicitly by terms such as demba ni ermepa and demba namba ni ermepa is not found in Mahayana scriptures and treatises as Nagarjuna's

00:26:03 Speaker 2

such as Nagarjuna's work, how can one claim that Rongzompa often does, as Rongzompa often does, that the Sava Dharma Abrajanavada philosophy has been taught in all Mahayana scriptures and treatises that are definitive in sense?

00:26:26 Speaker 2

In many Mahayana scriptures and treatises such as Nagarjuna's work, Mahayana indivisibilism has been expressed through the equation.

00:26:35 Speaker 2

So this is an attempt to summarize.

00:26:37 Speaker 2

Virtual/apparent utpana is equal to actual or real anutpana.

00:26:46 Speaker 2

Or we can say virtual or apparent jata is equal to actual or real ajata.

00:26:54 Speaker 2

Or we can say virtual/apparent pratyayahitu janita is equal to actual and real

00:27:07 Speaker 2

atyanta ajata.

00:27:12 Speaker 2

Vimalamitra postulates Mahayana indivisibilism by resorting to Mahayana scriptures such as the Ratnavalka Sutra, Jnana Lokalamkara Sutra, and Ratnakarandaka Sutra, and shastic sources such as Nagarjuna's Yukti Shastika.

00:27:35 Speaker 2

For example, we should see his commentary on the Pranyaparamita Hridaya Tika.

00:27:49 Speaker 2

So what I have attempted in this study today is to examine the place of Padmasambhva and Vimala Mitra within the Nyingma school, the criteria for identifying Sabadhama Aprasanavadins, the attribution of Padmasambhva's five ontological propositions to Vimala Mitra,

00:28:07 Speaker 2

and whether these two ***** were indeed de facto Savadhama Aprishnavadins.

00:28:13 Speaker 2

While several additional criteria of the Savadhama Aprishnavada philosophy remain to be gathered and assessed, I hope to have demonstrated that Padmasambhava and Vimamitra can be regarded not merely as Savadhama Aprishnavadins, but as the crown jewels of Savadhama Aprishnavada thought.

00:28:38 Speaker 2

So thank you so much for your attention.

00:28:46 Speaker 1

Thank you very much, Dorje.

00:28:49 Speaker 1

It's really good.

00:28:49 Speaker 1

Yes.

00:28:50 Speaker 3

Thank you.

00:28:52 Speaker 3

That was a very, very, very interesting talk.

00:28:55 Speaker 3

Thank you so much for that.

00:28:56 Speaker 3

You know, it's wonderful.

00:28:58 Speaker 3

I don't think anyone's done this kind of work before.

00:29:02 Speaker 3

Is it discussed in Tibetan monasteries, this kind of approach?

00:29:08 Speaker 3

No.

00:29:12 Speaker 3

Can I start with a question?

00:29:13 Speaker 1

Yes, please.

00:29:14 Speaker 1

Can we also unmute?

00:29:16 Speaker 3

Oh, yes.

00:29:16 Speaker 3

We need to unmute everybody.

00:29:18 Speaker 3

Yes.

00:29:18 Speaker 3

How do we do this?

00:29:23 Speaker 3

Ask all to unmute.

00:29:28 Speaker 3

And if anyone has a question, you can put the hands up.

00:29:31 Speaker 3

I think it's probably the best way of doing it.

00:29:36 Speaker 3

So if Padmasambhava and Vimalamitra are both Sarvadhama and Pratisthana Vardhins, more or less, what about Shantarakshita?

00:29:58 Speaker 2

How should I?

00:29:59 Speaker 2

First of all, I must confess that I haven't investigated this question, although I was curious, not only Shantarashita, but also Kamalashila.

00:30:09 Speaker 3

Yeah.

00:30:12 Speaker 2

I think this is still, in my view, is still an unresolved question, because on the one hand, it is very clear that both of these proposed what we call Namrangmaimbe Dendam, right, which I call the genuine ultimate reality.

00:30:34 Speaker 2

which is equal to nishpa pancha, freedom for manifoldness, et cetera.

00:30:40 Speaker 2

And I think there is clear proof.

00:30:42 Speaker 2

I mean, we cannot deny that.

00:30:45 Speaker 2

But on the other hand, as the Tibetan tradition, the Madhyamaka tradition clearly points out, that they are defined or at least considered to be yogacara madhyamikas, and as such,

00:31:02 Speaker 2

as a subcategory of S�atantrika Madhyamaka, like Umarang Yupa.

00:31:08 Speaker 2

And now, I think most Tibetan Madhyamaka scholars would admit that one of the main distinction between what we call Savadamana-aprashanavada/prasangika, what later on came to be regarded as Prasangika Madhyamaka, one of the main difference is that

00:31:29 Speaker 2

their attitude to the relationship between the two modes of reality.

00:31:35 Speaker 2

That is, Shantarakshita and Kamalashila would claim that on the conventional level, we cannot deny the efficacy of fire, the efficacy of medicine, the efficacy of poison, etc.

00:31:50 Speaker 2

It has its very undeniable efficacy and characteristics, okay?

00:31:56 Speaker 2

But on the ultimate level, of course,

00:31:58 Speaker 2

It's like leg prasanki kamadiya.

00:32:01 Speaker 2

But the prasanki kamadiya, because of Savadharma apparishnavada, they have a problem with this sort of attempt to distinguish the two.

00:32:08 Speaker 2

I mean, they're defining the relationship between the two.

00:32:11 Speaker 2

And there's what we call the rangiteniki dupa.

00:32:14 Speaker 2

So the prasanki-- no, Shandarakshit and Kamalashila seem to propose that on the conventional level, things have their undeniable characteristics, and we should not conflate

00:32:28 Speaker 2

real poison and fake poison, real medicine and fake medicine, because if you do so, it is dangerous, you might die, you know.

00:32:38 Speaker 2

So, there is undeniable, what we call, characterization of the conventional phenomena as having very specific efficacies, characteristics, whereas Prasanki Madhyamika says,

00:32:55 Speaker 2

this is already a problem, because you see the separateness of the two modes of reality.

00:33:01 Speaker 2

So you do not claim the indivisibility of the two modes of reality from the very outset.

00:33:06 Speaker 2

So you still have to work on something else, you know?

00:33:10 Speaker 2

But in this regard, I don't think that Shantarakshan and Kamala Shera would qualify it to be sarvadham aprishnavadins.

00:33:16 Speaker 2

But having said that, as I pointed out, that there are so many other criterion.

00:33:22 Speaker 2

And unfortunately, I could not bring up this issue.

00:33:27 Speaker 2

For example, the last issue, what I call a virtual a reason, that which is virtually a reason is actually not a reason.

00:33:39 Speaker 2

I suspect that they would also endorse this position, Kamalashila and Shantarakshita.

00:33:46 Speaker 2

So here, some would argue that, well,

00:33:50 Speaker 2

They may not be Savadharma Abhishnavading, but there is some common grounds between the two, you know?

00:33:55 Speaker 2

But I must say that this is a question that bothered me for some time, but I didn't have the occasion to investigate closely.

00:34:03 Speaker 2

So in short, I haven't investigated, and this question is certainly very interesting.

00:34:11 Speaker 2

And I hope that...

00:34:13 Speaker 2

But again, it's also, it depends how we understand

00:34:17 Speaker 2

how we understand Savadharma Abhishnavada and how we understand Yogachara Madhyamaka and so on.