

**REPLY TO ALEX WAYMAN'S REVIEW OF
THE YOGA OF TIBET**

Jeffrey Hopkins

In reviewing my *The Yoga of Tibet* (*Journal of the Tibet Society*, vol. 3, 1983, pp. 60-63), Professor Alex Wayman attempts in an acerbic way to demolish any credibility of my translation. At best, his supercilious tone might be fitting if his points were correct, but what happens if his argument is not borne out? Let us consider his points one by one.

Wayman uses innuendo, misrepresentation, non-admission of ambiguity, false declaration, and mis-readings of Tibetan to attack the work. He begins with mild innuendo, suggesting that I somehow made up the designations "Parts Two and Three" (p. 43) for the two sections translated in this volume. Wayman says:

The second (pp. 43-203) is a translation by Jeffrey Hopkins of portions of the *Sñags rim chen mo* which he labels "2," calling it "Action Tantra," and "3," calling it "Performance Tantra." (p.61)

Why does Wayman say "which he labels" as if I created the section divisions? Did he not read my "Translator's Note" at the very beginning of the book (p.vii) which identifies the two parts translated here as "the second and third parts of Tsong-kha pa's *Great Exposition of Secret Mantra*"? Did he not read Tsong-kha-pa's own conclusion to the section on Action Tantra (p. 179) where he says, "The second section . . . is concluded," and to the section on Performance Tantra (p.203), where he says, "The third section . . . is concluded"?

Wayman then objects to my translations of the terms *kriyātantra* (*bya ba'i rgyud*) and *caryātantra* (*spyod pa'i rgyud*) as "Action Tantra" and "Performance Tantra" respectively, raising the question:

Is there not also 'action' and 'performance' in both of them? The translator does not even admit to demurring over the words, as though there might have been some difficulty. (p. 61)

Of course, there is this ambiguity, and, as Wayman should have known, the point was raised in volume one in *Tantra in Tibet* by the Dalai Lama (p. 75):

In Action Tantra external activities predominate. In Performance Tantra external activities and internal yoga are performed equally.

and by Tsong-kha-pa (p. 162):

Those who resort to a great many external activities in order to actualize these two yogas are trainees of Action Tantras. Those who balance

their external activities and internal meditative stabilization without using very many activities are trainees of Performance Tantras.

Hence, Performance Tantra does involve external activities or actions but not as much as Action Tantra does. Wayman's attempt to avoid the problem by not translating the terms and simply using the Sanskrit is no solution at all. It merely hides the problem from those who do not know Sanskrit, while for those who do know Sanskrit, the question can still be posed, "Does *caryātantra* not involve *kriyā*?"

Next, Wayman attempts to correct my translation of *brtul zhugs bzang po khyod la bshad* as "explains these pledges to you — a good system of conduct," to "explains to you, O goodly avowed one." He declares that *brtul zhugs bzang po* is vocative, but since it has no case ending itself, it can, in this context, be either nominative, vocative, or dative. As a nominative, it would be appositive to *dam tshig 'di dag* which precedes it; as a vocative, it would have the same reference as *khyod* but not be governed by the dative ending *la*; and as a dative, it would be governed by *la*. The situation is admittedly ambiguous. Although strictly Tibetan syntax, as opposed to translation from Sanskrit, would favor the latter two readings, my guess is that, given that it is a translation from Sanskrit, it is nominative, serving as object of the verb, and I have translated it accordingly.

In my rendering of *slar sdud pa yi tshig gis non*, Wayman does rightly correct my mistranslation of *non* as "augmented" to "should restrain:"

Hopkins, p. 192, citation from *V-A-T*, in fact, its Chap. V, "augmented with the word of withdrawal" for Tib. *slar sdud pa yi tshig gis non*. But *slar sdud pa*, occurring various times, similarly misunderstood, is a grammatical term meaning 'reiteration;' and *non* is a weak imperative of a verb meaning to 'restrain'; hence, "One should restrain by way of the repeated words."

However, the style and content of his remarks are vintage Wayman — supercilious, partly right, but mostly wrong. He begins by saying "in fact, its Chap. V," thereby supplying the reference of the citation from the *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi*. His innuendo is that the citation needs to be supplied; however, my note 195 at the head of the citation gives the exact volume, page, and line reference in the tantra! Then, quarrelling with my translation of *slar sdud pa* as "withdrawal," he makes a totally unfounded declaration that the term means "repeated" because, according to him, it is a grammatical term meaning "reiteration." First, if Wayman is talking about Tibetan grammar, *slar bsdu* (with the prefix *ba* and without the suffix *da*) is indeed a grammatical term, but it refers to the Tibetan equivalent of a period, a full stop (or comma coming at the end of a quote in a sentence that continues). As Tibet's foremost gram-

marian, Si-tu, says:¹

Since the relevant subject of discussion or words are concluded by just it, it is called “a term concluding [any] furtherance” (*slar bsdu'i sgra*) or “terminating term” (*rdzogs tshig*).^[a]

In *slar bsdu* the term *slar* means “again,” like Wayman’s “reiteration”, but Wayman has disregarded *bsdu* which means “collect”; hence, a literal reading of *slar bsdu* is something like “wrapping up anything further”. Simply put, these endings are terminators; *slar bsdu*, even as a grammatical term, does not mean reiteration as Wayman claims.

Second, Buddhaguhya, the foremost commentator on the *Vairocana-bhisambodhi*, himself defines *slar bsdud pa* as meaning withdrawal in his *Commentary on the “Concentration Continuation”* (*bsam gtan phyi ma rim par phye ba rgya cher bshad pa, dhyānottarapaṭalaṭikā*).²

[The *Concentration Continuation*] says, “Having again retracted [literally, bound] the mind through withdrawal.” The drawing back again of the unequipoised mind, moving as it likes back and forth to whatsoever [objects] by way of the eyes and so forth, in the manner of withdrawing the winds of the entire body and the placement [of it] inside one’s own body is withdrawal (*slar sdud pa*). [Thus, the above phrase from the tantra] means, “Having through that withdrawal bound and contracted [the mind] and directed [it] inside”.^[b]

Buddhaguhya clearly defines *slar sdud pa* as the “drawing back again of the unequipoised mind” and the “the placement [of it] inside one’s own body”.³ This meaning of *slar sdud pa* as meditative withdrawal of the mind from sense objects is similar to the meaning of the grammatical term *slar bsdu* as a full stop; in the context of meditation, it is a stoppage of external distraction and “drawing back” inside. Wayman’s “correction” of the translation of *slar sdud pa* from “withdrawal” to “reiteration” is ridiculous.

Third, Tsong-kha-pa, obviously relying on Buddhaguhya, gives a similar explanation, translated in *The Yoga of Tibet* (p. 145):⁴

Furthermore, the non-equiposed mind operating as usual should again be withdrawn and retracted . . .^[c]

Wayman (p. 61 bottom) criticizes me for using Tsong-kha-pa’s expositions that follow verses to get at their meaning, but it can be seen from Buddhaguhya’s exegesis given above that (1) Tsong-kha-pa’s explanation is specifically aimed at explicating *slar sdud pa*, (2) it is, therefore, completely justified to use it to get at the meaning of the term, and (3) Wayman’s rendering of the term as “reiteration”, again, is totally wrong. Wayman’s misunderstanding of the term has led him to think that Tsong-kha-pa’s explanation is not even concerned with explicating it!

to be the most cogent single translation for the general passage. Hence, Wayman's criticism that "The translators of the V-A-T mistakenly translated both by *yi ge*" (p. 61) is unfounded; rather, he has not understood the translators' conscious technique of maintaining a single translation equivalent so that the play on the meanings of the original could be appreciated.

The rest of the review (pp. 62-3), more than half of the piece, is an embarrassingly inept attempt by the reviewer to seal his argument about my incompetence by re-translating a fourteen line passage. First, Wayman criticizes my translation of *sngon du bsnyen pa* as "prior approximation", calling it a "crude expression", his preferred translation being "preliminary service". However, as the Dalai Lama says in his introduction (p. 19), *bsnyen pa* has the meaning of *nye ba*, "approaching" or "coming closer" in the sense that through performing deity yoga one is coming closer to the state of the deity:

For both supreme and common feats deity yoga is necessary, the initial process being called 'approximation' because through imagining the deity one is approaching closer to it.

I echo this explanation in my supplement (p. 208):

The initial period of deity yoga is called prior approximation because one is accustoming to a deity through becoming closer and closer to its state . . .

Wayman's translation of *bsnyen pa* as "preliminary service" suggests service to or propitiation of a deity, but it is clear from the tradition that this is not the meaning in the context of cultivating deity yoga.

Next, Wayman cites three and a half stanzas — he mistakenly calls them "2 1/2" (p. 62) — from the *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi*.^{6(e)} Based on misreading these three and a half stanzas, Wayman first criticizes me for linking the mundane and supramundane yogas with yogas with signs and without signs respectively, in a bracketed addition to the translation, and then he cites the tantra passage. Wayman says:

Then he gives Tson-kha-pa's division into mundane and supramundane and adds in brackets, "which are other names for the yogas with and without signs." This directly contradicts the cited scripture . . .

However, Wayman makes the basic mistake of strangely putting the first line of the third stanza with the preceding two stanzas. Had he followed out the note at the beginning of this passage in which I make reference to Buddhaguhya's citing only the last six lines — the third stanza and the final two lines — in his *Condensation*, Wayman would have seen that Buddhaguhya treats the last six lines as a unit in a section which he himself describes as explaining the "meditative stabilization of signlessness (*mtshan ma med pa'i ting nge 'dzin*)", and that hence

it is perfectly suitable that in brackets in my translation I linked supramundane yoga and yoga without signs.⁷

It is clear from Buddhaguhya's explanation and citation of these lines that the first line of the third stanza — *yid kyi 'jig rten 'das zhes bya* "that called the mentally supramundane" — clearly does not refer to the yogas of the external and internal four-branched repetitions described in the first two stanzas as Wayman would have it. Had Wayman seen this, he would not have made the error of absurdly identifying the supramundane as the external four-branched repetition (or "outward praxis" as he calls it) and of absurdly identifying the internal four-branched repetition (his "inward praxis") as something beyond even the supramundane yoga.⁸ The external and internal four-branched repetitions are sub-divisions of the mundane yoga, the yoga with signs.

Wayman's rendering of Tsong-kha-pa's brief comment on the passage^[f] is also embarrassingly inept. Tsong-kha-pa corrects the notion that "supramundane" here refers to a consciousness in the continuum of a Superior (*phags pa, āryan*) directly realizing emptiness, such a misunderstanding being based on the fact that the term "supramundane" is usually associated with the path of seeing and above. He makes the profound and penetrating point that "supramundane" here has a wider meaning in that it encompasses a consciousness that has the aspect of selflessness — any consciousness realizing emptiness — whether it be conceptual or direct or a consciousness conjoined with it in the sense that the ascertainment factor (*nges cha*) realizes emptiness but the appearance aspect (*snang cha*) appears in the form of a deity. In other words, the supramundane yoga does not have to be devoid of appearance as a deity. As Tsong-kha-pa himself says on the previous page:⁹

Yoga without signs refers to deity meditation and repetition involving meditation on emptiness and does not refer to meditation on emptiness alone. If yoga without signs did refer to just meditation on emptiness, it would be necessary to assert that one could be fully enlightened through emptiness yoga alone since the *Vairocanābhīṣambodhi Tantra* says that both feats can be achieved through the signless.¹⁰

Not realizing that Tsong-kha-pa's remark after the disputed passage is making the same point, Wayman fails to see that supramundane yoga and yoga without signs are the same at least in this sense. Wayman mis-renders the Tibetan cited above as:

The supramundane of this passage does not mean the non-flux (*anāsrava*) of a noble person's stream of consciousness, but is his selflessness character and the *yoga* associated with it.

Wayman has botched the passage. For, (1) *zag med*, rather than refer-

ring to “non-flux”, refers to a non-contaminated *consciousness* of meditative equipoise on emptiness. (2) Similarly, *bdag med pa'i rnam pa can* refers to a *consciousness* having the aspect of, that is to say, realizing, emptiness and not to the yogi’s own “selflessness character”; Wayman simply disregards the particle *can* (“that which has”). Wayman displays an appalling lack of familiarity with standard technical vocabulary.

With what Buddhaguhya’s explanation shows to be a wrong perspective on the passage and a lack of appreciation for technical vocabulary and basic grammar, Wayman finds my insertion of many bracketed expressions to be “a substitute for understanding and communicating the author’s passage”. Here is my rendering:

The supramundane in this passage does not refer to a non-contaminated [wisdom consciousness] in the continuum of a Superior [*directly* realizing emptiness] but is [a consciousness] having the aspect of selflessness [that is, realizing emptiness conceptually *or* directly] or a yoga conjoined with that [in which the wisdom consciousness itself manifests in form].

Wayman’s attempt at correction turns into a dismal display of his own inability either to read Tibetan grammar or to appreciate the basic points being made, nevermind the nuances of Buddhaguhya’s and Tsong-kha-pa’s commentaries.

Finally, a point that Wayman makes near the beginning of his review, about my mode of procedure, raises a basic question about his own. Though he accurately cites a remark from the “Translator’s Note” about my working in collaboration with Tibetan scholars on Part II of the book (comprised by the translation of the sections on Action and Performance Tantras in Tsong-kha-pa’s text), he superimposes a meaning that causes me to wonder about his motives:

Hopkins hopes to demonstrate the correctness of the translation by a remarkable statement in “Translator’s Note”: “Part II was orally retranslated into Tibetan for Lati Rinbochay for the sake of correction and verification, and a complete commentary on the same was received from Denma Lochö Rinbochay.” This is a direct challenge to any reviewer that a criticism of the translation is a disrespect to the learned Tibetan lamas whose precious advice he utilized at every step. Of course, such an attitude goes with regarding the text being translated as something holy. (p. 61)

Since I speak only of orally retranslating into Tibetan my English translation for a lama and of receiving teachings on Tsong-kha-pa’s exposition from another lama, it is very odd that Wayman finds this to be a “direct challenge” to a reviewer such that I am claiming holy authority for my translation. Since it is patently absurd that merely mentioning

those who collaborated on interpreting the text involved an invocation of sacred authority, Wayman's reaction suggests that he is making an excuse for his not consulting Tibetan scholars in his own work. (This recalls his highly defensive and acerbic response to Professor Geshe Sopa's accurate review article, "Some Comments on Tsong kha pa's *Lam rim chen mo* and Professor Wayman's *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real*", in which he shows his sensitivity about not consulting with indigenous scholars.)¹¹ My own opinion is that a translator should utilize all available resources and when highly trained scholars of a religious and philosophical tradition are available for consultation as to meaning and context, a translator would be foolish not to do so if at all possible. Does Professor Wayman mean to suggest that a preferable translation would be done without awareness of the text as it is understood in the tradition of its origin? Is his method more scientific or perhaps even more pure because it draws only on his own readings? Could his method be deemed successful given the inaccuracies that abound in his review? Rather than attacking me for utilizing available sources, Wayman might more appropriately explain his preference for incomplete research, the results of which are obvious from his review.

NOTES

1. In his *Explanation of "The Thirty" and "Usage of Gender"*, *Special Treatise on the Thorough Application of the Language of the Snowy Country, Beautiful Pearl Necklace of the Wise* (Yul gangs can pa'i brda yang dag par sbyor ba'i bstan bcos kyi bye brag sum cu pa dang rtags kyi 'jug pa'i gzhung gi rnam par bshad pa mkhas pa'i mgul rgyan mu tig phreng mdzes), (Dharmasala, n.d), 16.13.

2. P3495, vol. 78, 74.5.2.

3. For Buddhaguhya's explanation of *slar sdud pa* as "withdrawing vitality (or currents of energy)" (*srog slar sdud pa*) see the citation from his *Condensation of the "Vairocanaḅhisambodhi Tantra"* (*Rnam par snang mdzad mngon par rdzogs par byang chub pa'i rgyud kyi bsdu pa'i don*, *Vairocanaḅhisambodhitrantraḅpiḅārtha*) in n.7; also, for his explanation of *slar sdud pa* as "withdrawal from the branches of external repetition to internal repetition" (*phyi rol kyi bzlas pa'i yan lag las nang gi yan lag tu bsdu ba*), see n.8. In all of these, *slar sdud pa* means "withdrawal".

4. *Great Exposition of Secret Mantra/ The Stages of the Path to a Conqueror and Pervasive Master, a Great Vajradhara: Revealing All Secret Topics* (*Sngags rim chen mol rgyal ba khyab bdag rdo rje 'chang chen po'i lam gyi rim pa gsang ba kun gyi gnad rnam par phye ba*), (Dharamsala: Shes rig par khang, 1969), 55b.6.

5. P3490, vol. 77, 284.4.8-284.5.5. In the Dharma Press edition, this is the *Rnam par snang mdzad mngon par rdzogs par byang chub pa'i rgyud kyi tshig 'grel*, vol. 59, text 2663A, and the specific passage is 1432.5-1433.1.

6. *Sngags rim chen mo*, 67a.5. There are minor differences with the tantra as given in the Peking edition (P126, vol.5, 256.2.7) where line four reads *bla med pa'o*; line seven reads *bshubs te bzlas brjod bde ba'i mchog*; and line ten reads *bsdud*.

In English, the passage is:

I have explained [the yoga] having four branches
 With external and internal application.
 This is the unsurpassed worldly imagination;
 Suppressed with the word of withdrawal,
 The mind which has accorded with the deity
 Is taught as the supreme
 Of whispered repetitions,
 Having imagination [of conventional phenomena].

For the 'mentally supramundane'
 Withdrawal [from the external branches of repetition to the internal]
 and so forth are completely abandoned.
 [Oneself and deity] are made undifferentiable in [terms of their empty]
 nature
 Through a mind creating oneness with the deity

And not conceiving of difference.
In no other way is [supramundane repetition] to be done.

The rendering here differs from that in *The Yoga Of Tibet* (p. 187) in that "augmented" has been changed to "suppressed" as per Wayman's correction; "having apprehension" has been changed to "having imagination [of conventional phenomena]" for clarity; what were the first seven lines are now eight in order to accord with the line number in the text; "mentally supramundane" has been put in quotes; and bracketed additions of "form" and "physical" have been deleted (see n.8).

Wayman's rendition (p. 63) is radically different:

I have explained the four members [i.e., in Tibetan *yi ge, mi 'gyur ba, gzi*, and second *gzi*] by outward and inward praxis. Besides, one should restrain by way of repeated words the incomparable mundane one possessed of apprehension (of outward object). I teach that the mind which is consistent with the deity has the best whispered recitation, and is possessed of apprehension (of the deity object), (so) called the "supramundane mind." (The inward praxis) avoids the repetition, and so on; acts as one with the deity and does not conceive a difference. The indissoluble nature is to be made by the mind. There is no other way to make it.

For my criticism of Wayman's translation, see the remainder of the article and the accompanying notes.

7. P3486, vol.77, 106.4.2-104.4.8^[6] In English, as taken from *The Yoga of Tibet*, pp. 197, 199, and 187):

The stages of the yoga for achieving repetition by way of familiarizing with the meditative stabilization of signlessness which has the character of the Truth Body of your own deity are as follows: As before, you should for a while actualise all the factors of the four branches of repetition and so forth, etc., and then analyse the imagined colour, shape, and so on of your deity who is non-dual with yourself, breaking them down into many* particles. Or it is also suitable to do this by way of the reasoning of its [i.e., the divine body] not having been produced from the start and its not being produced, or by way of the reasoning [that is, technique] of withdrawing vitality [wind or currents of energy] [(*srog slar sdud pa*)] through the yoga of turning your mind inside, or by way of not taking the appearance [of colour and shape]** to mind. In accordance with that realisation actualise mere self-knowledge of the mind, without [dualistic] appearance, free from your own divine form body, and repeat mentally whatever your knowledge mantra is. To indicate that, [the *Vairocana-bhisambodhi Tantra* says:]

For the 'mentally supramundane'
Withdrawal [from the external branches of repetition to the
internal]*** and so forth are completely abandoned.
[Oneself and the deity] are made undifferentiable in [terms of their
empty] nature
Through a mind creating oneness with the deity

And not conceiving of difference.

In no other way is [supramundane repetition] to be done.

This is the prior approximation of practitioners.

Buddhaghya explains the meditative stabilization of signlessness and then cites these six lines in isolation, thereby explicitly linking the meditative stabilization of signlessness and the “mentally supramundane” repetition.

*The Peking edition, 106.4.4, does not read “many” (*du mar*) whereas the Dharmasala edition does on 70a.2 but does not on 70b.6.

**Brackets added to the translation as it appears in *The Yoga Of Tibet*.

***For the bracketed addition, see Buddhaghya’s other explanation as given in n.8.

8. Buddhaghya is just as explicit on this point in his other commentary. In commenting on the entire passage, he cites the first eight lines and the last six lines as two separate units, saying that they explain the mundane and supramundane repetitions respectively (P3490, vol.77 286.1.3-286.2.5; Dharma, vol. 59, text 2663A, 1438.4-1439.5):

[The passage beginning with] “I have explained [the yoga] having four branches/ With external and internal application” through to “Is taught as the supreme of whispered repetitions” says that — from between the brief indications earlier of those that have the nature of the ultimate and the conventional — the four branches of conventional repetition, that is to say, three external branches and one internal branch, which I have explained, are worldly repetition and furthermore are supreme among repetitions involving imagination.

“Suppressed by the word of withdrawal” is as [explained] earlier. “The mind which has accorded with the deity” says that the mind is to observe [imagine, or apprehend] this one-pointedly.

[The passage beginning with] “For the ‘mentally supramundane’” through to “In no other way is [supramundane repetition] to be done” comments in detail on the ultimate repetition explained earlier. In that, “Withdrawal [from external branches of repetition to the internal] and so forth are completely abandoned” says that since the supramundane repetition does not observe [imagine, or apprehend] the nature of a thoroughly impure deity, there is no withdrawal from the branches of external repetition to internal repetition.

“Oneness with the deity[s form]” says that the form of the deity and one’s own form are taken as one. “And not conceiving of difference” says that since it is possible for different forms to operate in one place, the taking of the two — the deity and oneself — to be one is not such but is to take the two — the deity and oneself — to be non-different. Also, since it is possible for the non-difference of the two — the deity and oneself — to be in physical nature, in order to dispel [that possibility, the text] says, “are made undifferentiable in [terms of their empty] nature through the

mind." It is not that [their] form and so forth are to be made into one; rather, both minds are to be made undifferentiable in the nature of emptiness.

"In no other way is [supramundane repetition] to be done" says that the supramundane repetition is not to be done in a way other than like this. In brief, observing [imagining, or apprehending] the suchness of the sounds that are one's essence [mantra], one breaks down one's own form in emptiness and thereupon realizes that just as one's own form [is understood] as emptiness, so all phenomena also are the same in [their] nature of emptiness. Since, in that way, all phenomena are undifferentiable in [their] nature of emptiness, one realizes that the natures of oneself and of the deity also are undifferentiable in the character of emptiness and thereupon staying in one-pointed meditative stabilization on emptiness, one mentally makes repetition.^[h]

Wayman bases his interpretation of the three-and-a-half-stanza passage from the tantra on his mistaken placement of the first line of the third stanza (*yid kyi 'jig rten 'das zhes bya*) with the previous stanza. He mistakenly concludes that even the first two stanzas are concerned with the "mentally supramundane". He also mistakenly sees those two stanzas as limited to discussing the "outward praxis", i.e., the external four-branched repetition, whereas they are concerned with both the external and internal four-branched repetitions. Buddhaguhya's statement "'For the 'mentally supramundane'" through to 'In no other way is [supramundane repetition] to be done' comments in detail on the ultimate repetition explained earlier," leaves no room for Wayman's interpretation, for Buddhaguhya's statement indicates that the last stanza and a half are concerned solely with ultimate or supramundane repetition and not with the "inward praxis" or internal four-branched repetition as Wayman would have it. Since Buddhaguhya clearly sees the first line of the third stanza as introducing the topic of the third stanza and the first two lines of the fourth stanza, Wayman's interpretation "that both the mundane and the supramundane *yoga* is subject to 'flux' (*āsrava*)" falls to the ground.

In the above passage, Buddhaguhya mentions an earlier explanation of "Suppressed by the word of withdrawal", but I have not been able to find such in this text. Wayman reports (p. 61) that "Buddhaguhya's commentary for Chap. V of the scripture was lost", and the fifth chapter is where the earlier commentary would most likely have been.

Also, the meaning of *yid gnyis pa* (P3490, vol. 77, 286.2.2 and Dharma, text 2663A, vol. 59, 1439.3) which I have translated as "both minds" most likely refers to the mind of the deity and the mind of the meditator, since, as Buddhaguhya says in his *Condensation* (P3486, vol. 77, 106.4.2) this meditation is concerned with the "Truth Body of one's own deity" (*rang gi lha chos kyi sku*). Buddhaguhya's explanation of this in his *Condensation* (106.4.2-5), cited earlier in this article, makes it clear

that the non-difference is in terms of the “mere self-knowing mind” (*sems rang rig pa tsam*).

In accordance with Buddhaguhya’s explanation, my translation of the passage from the tantra in *The Yoga of Tibet*, p. 187 would be improved by eliminating the bracketed additions of “form” and “physical”. It is clear from Buddhaguhya’s *Condensation*, cited earlier in the article, that initially the yogi identifies physically with the deity, then breaks down that divine body into non-appearance, whereupon a mental oneness is created.

When Buddhaguhya speaks of “the four branches of conventional repetition, that is to say, three external branches and one internal branch”, he appears to be making a condensation of the more usual mode of four branches each for external and internal repetition. He has abbreviated the total of eight branches into three for external repetition and one for internal repetition; Wayman’s failure to understand this has led to many errors in his interpretation.

9. *The Yoga of Tibet*, p. 186, which translated the original Tibetan (Dharamsala: *Shes rig par khang*, 1969, 67a.2).^[i] Since the *Vairocana-bhisambodhi Tantra* itself (see the next note) says that both feats — the common feats and the supreme feat of Buddhahood — can be attained through signless yoga, it follows that if signless yoga were merely meditation on emptiness, one could, absurdly, attain Buddhahood merely through meditation on emptiness.

The sentence beginning on the bottom of page 185 in *The Yoga of Tibet* and ending on line five of page 186 (“Yoga without signs. . . actually realizing it.”) is the typesetter’s combination of the previous and following sentences and should be deleted.

10. Tsong-kha-pa’s student, Mkhas-grub, in an obvious borrowing from his teacher, makes the same point (Collected Works, vol. nya [New Delhi: Guru Deva], 562.4; see also Ferdinand D. Lessing and Alex Wayman, *Mkhas Grub Rje’s Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras*, [The Hague: Mouton, 1968], p. 206):

The first of those [yoga with signs] is deity yoga not conjoined with [realization of] emptiness, and the second [signless yoga] is to be taken as deity yoga conjoined with [realization of] emptiness but is not to be taken as meditating just on emptiness. For, it is said that one is not fully enlightened through having meditated just on emptiness and that through the yoga without signs both feats are achieved.^[j]

Based on a corrupt text (see the Guru Deva printing of the Lhasa edition, nya 562.5, and Lessing and Wayman, p. 206) that reads *ngos grub gnyis ka mi ’grub par*, Ferdinand D. Lessing and Alex Wayman translate the last clause in their *Mkhas Grub Rje’s Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras*, p. 207, as, “it is explained that one does not accomplish both *siddhis* by means of the Yoga without images.” Such would contradict

not only Tsong-kha-pa's text but also the *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi Tantra* which Tsong-kha-pa cites (66b.7 of the Dharmasala edition, p. 185 of *The Yoga of Tibet*):

The excellent Conquerors assert that feats
 Having signs [arise] through that with signs.
 Through abiding in the signless
 That having signs can also be achieved.
 Hence, you should rely in all
 Respects on the signless.^[k]

The word "also" in the fourth line indicates that not only can signless feats be achieved through signless yoga but also those with signs can. Hence, Mkhas-grub's point is that since signless yoga is not just meditation on emptiness, both feats — both common feats and the supreme feat of Buddhahood or both Form Bodies and a Truth Body — can be achieved through it.

That Lessing's and Wayman's text is corrupt is clear from Tsong-kha-pa's text, given in the previous note and confirmed by the Lha-sa old Zhol edition, reprinted by Guru Deva, New Delhi, 1978, ga 159.5.

Feats having signs are identified in *The Yoga of Tibet* in an annotation (p. 185) as "Form Bodies" in accordance with the Dalai Lama's commentary (see p. 37) but can also be identified as common feats as was done by Lochö Rinbochay.

11. Sêe Geshe Sopa, "Some Comments on Tsong kha pa's *Lam rim chen mo* and Professor Wayman's *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real*"; "Alex Wayman Replies to Geshe Sopa", and "Geshe Sopa Replies to Alex Wayman", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 3 (1980), pp. 68-92, and 98-100. See specifically p. 93.

[a]

སྐབས་བབ་ཀྱི་བཅོམ་བུའི་དོན་ནམ་ཚིག་དེ་ཉིད་དེ་ཙམ་.....
གྱིས་བསྐྱུ་བར་སོང་བས་སྐར་བསྐྱུའི་སྐྱ་ཞེས་སམ་ཚོགས་.....
ཚིག་ཅེས་ཀྱང་བུའོ། །

[b]

སྐར་བསྐྱུད་པ་ཡིས་བསྐྱམས་ནས་ནི་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་གསུང་ས་ཏེ།
མཉམ་པར་མ་བཞག་པའི་ཡིད་རང་དགར་འབྱུང་བ་མིག་...
ལ་སོགས་པའི་སྐོན་སུམ་ཅི་སྐར་སྐྱིད་པར་ཕན་ཚུན་དུ་རབ་དུ་
གྱུ་བ་ལུས་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱི་རྒྱུང་བསྐྱུ་བའི་ཚུལ་གྱིས་སྐར་.....
བཀུག་ལ་རང་གི་ལུས་ཀྱི་ནང་དུ་འཇུག་པ་ནི་སྐར་སྐྱུད་པ་སྟེ།
སྐར་བསྐྱུད་པ་དེས་བསྐྱམས་ཤིང་གཅུམ་ལ་ནང་དུ་ཕྱོགས་...
པར་བུས་ནས་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་སྐོན་སུམ་སྟེ།

[c]

དེ་ཡང་མཉམ་པར་མ་བཞག་པའི་ཡིད་རང་དགར་འཇུག་...
པ་དེ་སྐར་ནང་དུ་བསྐྱུས་ཏེ་བཀུག་པ།



[d]
 ཡི་གེ་ཞེས་པ་རང་བཞིན་མི་འགྱུར་བ་ཞེས་པའི་ཚིག་སྟེ། དེ་
 ལ་ཡི་གེ་ལ་ཡང་རྣམ་པ་གཉིས་སྟེ། སྐྱ་དང་བྲང་ཚུབ་ཀྱི་.....
 སེམས་སོ་ཞེས་པའོ། །དེ་ལ་སྐྱ་ནི་སྤྲུག་སྟེ། ཡིག་འབྲུག་སྟེ་.....
 དེས་ཀུན་རྗེས་དང་དོན་དམ་པའི་ལྷ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པར་.....
 གོལ་བ་སྟོན་པ་ལས་རང་བཞིན་གཞན་དུ་མི་འགྱུར་བས་ན་
 མི་འགྱུར་བ་ཞེས་བྲལ་སྟེ། ... བྲང་ཚུབ་ཀྱི་སེམས་ནི་ཟླ་བའི་
 དཀྱིལ་འཁོར་ལ་བྲལ་སྟེ། དེ་བཞིན་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རང་བཞིན་བྲང་.....
 ཚུབ་ཀྱི་སེམས་དེ་ཟླ་བའི་དཀྱིལ་འཁོར་དུ་བྲིན་གྱིས་.....
 བརྒྱབས་པ་སྟེ། ཟླ་བའི་དཀྱིལ་འཁོར་དུ་བྲང་ཚུབ་ཀྱི་.....
 སེམས་ཀྱི་ཕྱག་རྒྱས་བཏབ་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །བྲང་ཚུབ་ཀྱི་.....
 སེམས་དེ་ལ་མི་འགྱུར་བ་ཞེས་བྲལ་སྟེ། ཕྱིན་ཅི་མ་ལོག་པར་
 ཡོངས་སུ་གྲུབ་པས་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རང་བཞིན་ལ་གཟུང་བ་
 དང་འཛིན་པ་ལ་སོགས་པའི་རྣམ་པར་མེད་པར་རྟོག་པ་.....
 ཅན་དུ་མི་འགྱུར་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །



[e]

ཕྱི་དང་ནང་གི་སྒྲིབ་པ་ཡིས། །ཡང་ལག་བཞི་པ་ངས་་་་
 བཤད་པ། །དེ་ཡང་འཇིག་རྟེན་པ་ཡི་སྟེ། །དམིགས་པ་ཅན་
 བྱི་སྒྲིབ་པ། །སྐྱུ་སྐྱུ་པ་ཡི་ཚིག་གིས་ལོན། །ལྟ་ཡི་
 རྗེས་སུ་སོང་བའི་ཡིད། །འུ་བ་སྟེ་བཟུངས་བཅོམ་བྱེད་པའི་
 མཚོག་ །དམིགས་པ་ཅན་ལ་བསྟན་པ་ཡིན། །ཡིད་ཀྱི་
 འཇིག་རྟེན་འདས་ཞེས་བྲ། །སྐྱུ་སྐྱུ་ལ་སོགས་རྣམ་པར་
 སྤངས། །ལྟ་དང་གཅིག་ཏུ་བྱེད་པ་དང་། །ཐ་དད་མ་ཡིན་་་་
 འཇིག་པ་ཡི། །ཡིད་ཀྱིས་རང་བཞིན་དབྱེར་མེད་བྲ། །
 གཞན་དུ་བྲ་བ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། །

[f]

འདིའི་འཇིག་རྟེན་ལས་འདས་པ་ཡང་འཕགས་པའི་རྒྱུད་་་་
 ཀྱི་ཟག་མེད་ལ་མི་བྱེད་ཀྱི་བདག་མེད་པའི་རྣམ་པ་ཅན་དང་
 དེས་ཟེན་པའི་རྣམ་འགྲུབ་ཡིན་ནོ། །

[8]

རང་གི་ལྷ་ཚོས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེའི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཅན་མཚན་མ་མེད་.....
 པའི་ཉིང་ངེ་འཇིན་གོམས་པའི་སློན་ས་བཟུངས་བཅོལ་སྐྱབ་.....
 པའི་སྐྱེར་བའི་གོ་རིམས་འདི་ཡིན་ཏེ། དེ་ལ་རིམ་གྲུ་མ་
 བཞིན་དུ་བཟུངས་བཅོལ་ཡན་ལག་བཞི་ལ་སོགས་པ་ཐམས་
 ཅད་མངོན་དུ་བྱས་ལ་རང་གི་ལྷ་ཚོ་སྐྱེ་བདག་དང་གཉིས་སུ་
 མེད་པའི་ཁ་དོག་དང་དབྱིབས་ལ་སོགས་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་.....
 ཀུན་བརྟགས་པར་སྐྱང་བ་ལ་དུལ་ཤུ་རབ་ཏུ་ནམ་པར་.....
 བཞིག་པར་བརྟགས་པའམ་གཞོན་མ་ནས་མ་སྐྱེས་གིང་.....
 སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པའི་རིགས་པའམ། དེ་བཞིན་དུ་རང་.....
 གི་སེམས་ལ་ནང་དུ་བཟུངས་པར་བྱ་བའི་སྐྱེར་བའི་.....
 སློན་ས་སློག་སྐྱར་སྐྱེད་པའི་རིགས་པའམ།
 དེར་སྐྱང་བའི་ཡིད་ལ་མི་བྱེད་པའི་སློན་ས་ཀྱང་རུང་.....
 རུང་སྟེ། རི་ལྷ་རྟོགས་པ་བཞིན་སེམས་རང་རིག་པ་.....
 ཅམ་རང་གི་ལྷ་ཚོ་གཟུགས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་དང་བྲལ་བ་སྐྱང་བ་མེད་པ་
 མངོན་སུམ་དུ་བྱ་སྟེ། ཅི་རིགས་པར་ཡིད་ལ་རང་གི་རིག་.....



གཅིག་སྟེ་བཞི་རྒྱུ་ལ་བཞད་པ་དེ་ནི་འཇིག་རྟེན་གྱི་བཟུངས་ལ་
 པ་ནི་ཡིན་ལ། དེ་ཡང་དམིགས་པ་དང་བཅས་པའི་བཟུངས་
 པའི་ནང་ན་མཚོག་གོ་ཞེས་པའོ། །སྐར་སྐྱད་པ་ཡི་ཚིག་
 གིས་མོན། །ཞེས་པ་ནི་སྐར་མ་བཞི་མོ། །ལྟ་ཡི་རྗེས་སུ་སོང་
 བའི་ཡིད། །ཅེས་པ་ནི་འདི་ལ་སེམས་རྩེ་གཅིག་དུ་
 དམིགས་པར་བྱའོ་ཞེས་པའོ། །ཡིད་ཀྱི་འཇིག་རྟེན་འདས་
 ཞེས་བྲ། །ཞེས་པ་ནས། གཞན་དུ་བྲ་བ་མ་ཡིན་མོ། །ཞེས་
 པའི་བར་གྱིས་ནི་གོང་དུ་བཞད་པའི་དོན་དམ་པའི་བཟུངས་
 པ་དེ་ཞིབ་དུ་འགྲེལ་པ་སྟེ། དེ་ལ། སྐར་སྐྱད་ལ་སོགས་
 རྣམ་པར་སྤངས། །ཞེས་པ་འཇིག་རྟེན་ལས་འདས་པའི་
 བཟུངས་པ་དེ་ཡོང་སུ་མ་དག་པའི་ལྟའི་རང་བཞིན་ལ་.....
 དམིགས་པ་མ་ཡིན་པས་ཕྱི་རོལ་གྱི་བཟུངས་པའི་ཡན་ལག་
 ལས་ནང་གི་ཡན་ལག་དུ་བསྐྱུ་བ་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་པའོ། །ལྟ་
 དང་གཅིག་དུ་བྱེད་པ་དང་། །ཞེས་པ་ནི་ལྟའི་གཟུགས་དང་
 བདག་གི་གཟུགས་གཅིག་དུ་བྱེད་པའོ། །ཐུང་དམ་ཡིན་
 འཇིག་པ་ཡི། །ཞེས་པ་ནི་ལྟ་དང་བདག་གཉིས་གཅིག་དུ་བྲ་



བ་ཡང་གཟུགས་ཐང་དང་པ་གནས་གཅིག་ཏུ་འདུག་པ་ཡང་།

སྲིད་ [reading སྲིད་ for སྲིད་ in accordance with Dharma 1439.2]

པས་དེ་ལྟ་བུ་མ་ཡིན་གྱི། །ལྟ་དང་བདག་གཉིས་ཐང་མི་དང་།

པར་བུའོ་ཞེས་པའོ། །ལྟ་དང་བདག་གཉིས་ཐང་མི་དང་པ་

ཡང་གཟུགས་ཀྱི་རང་བཞིན་དུ་ཐང་མི་.....

[reading མི་ for མི་ in accordance with Dharma 1439.2]

དང་པ་སྲིད་པས་དེ་བསལ་བའི་ཕྱིར། ཡིད་ཀྱི་ [Dharma

1439.3 reads ཀྱིས་] རང་བཞིན་དབྱེར་མེད་བྲ། །ཞེས་།

གསུངས་པ་ཡིན་ཏེ། གཟུགས་ལ་སོགས་པ་གཅིག་ཏུ་བྱ་བ་

ནི་མ་ཡིན་གྱི་ཡིད་གཉིས་པ་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རང་བཞིན་དུ་.....

དབྱེར་མེད་པར་བུའོ་ཞེས་པའོ། །གཞན་དུ་བྱ་བ་མ་ཡིན་

མོ་ཞེས་པ་ནི་འཇིག་རྟེན་ལས་འདས་པའི་བརྟུན་པ་དེ་རྒྱལ་

འདི་འདྲ་བ་ལས་གཞན་དུ་མི་བུའོ་ཞེས་པ་སྟེ་མདོར་ན་.....

རང་གི་སྟོང་པོ་གང་ཡིན་པའི་སྐྱའི་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ལ་དམིགས་

ནས་བདག་ཉིད་ཀྱི་གཟུགས་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་དུ་བཞིག་སྟེ་.....

ཞིགས་ནས་ཀྱང་ཇི་ལྟར་བདག་གི་གཟུགས་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་དུ་



ཕྱི་ནང་གི་ཚོས་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱང་སྟོང་པའི་རང་བཞིན་དུ་.....
 གཅིག་པར་རྟོག་པར་བྱ་སྟེ། དེ་ལྟར་ཚོས་ཐམས་ཅད་སྟོང་...
 པའི་རང་བཞིན་དུ་དབྱེར་མེད་པས་བདག་དང་ལྟའི་རང་.....
 བཞིན་ཀྱང་སྟོང་པའི་མཚན་ཉིད་དུ་དབྱེར་མེད་པར་རྟོག་.....
 པར་བྱས་ལ། སྟོང་པའི་ཉིང་ངེ་འཛིན་ཅེ་གཅིག་པ་ལ་...
 གནས་ནས་ཡིད་ལ་བརྟུན་པར་བྱའོ་ཞེས་པའོ། |

[ii]
 མཚན་མ་མེད་པ་ནི། སྟོང་ཉིད་སློམ་པ་དང་བཅས་པའི་.....
 ལྟའི་བསློམ་བརྟུན་ལ་བྱའི་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱང་པ་སློམ་པ་ལ་མི་...
 བྱ་སྟེ། དེ་ལྟར་ཡིན་ན་སྟོང་པ་ཀྱང་པའི་ནལ་འཁྲུག་གིས་...
 འཚང་བྱུ་བར་འདོད་དགོས་ཏེ་མཚན་མ་མེད་པས་དངོས་...
 གྲུབ་གཉིས་ཀ་འགྲུབ་པར་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། |

[iii]
 དེའི་དང་པོ་ནི་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་མ་ཟེན་པའི་ལྟའི་ནལ་འཁྲུག་...
 ཡིན་ཞིང་། གཉིས་པ་ནི་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་ཟེན་པའི་ལྟའི་ནལ་...



འབྲུག་ལ་བུའི། རྟོང་ཉིད་རྒྱང་པ་བསྐྱེམ་པ་ལ་མི་བྱ་སྟེ།
 རྟོང་ཉིད་རྒྱང་པ་བསྐྱེམས་པས་མི་རྒྱ་ཞིང་། མཚན་མ་
 མེད་པའི་རྣལ་འབྲུག་གྱིས་དངོས་གྲུབ་གཉིས་ཀ་འབྲུབ་.....
 པར་གསུངས་པས་སོ། །

[k]

མཚན་མར་བཅས་པས་མཚན་བཅས་ཀྱི། །
 དངོས་གྲུབ་རྒྱལ་བ་དམ་པ་བཞིད། །
 མཚན་མ་མེད་ལ་གནས་པས་ནི། །
 མཚན་མ་ཅན་ཡང་བསྐྱབ་ཏུ་རུང་། །
 དེ་བས་རྣམ་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་དུ། །
 མཚན་མ་མེད་ལ་བརྟེན་པར་བྱ། །
