

**PhD DISSERTATION  
THESIS**

**UHERKOVICH LÁSZLÓ**

**THE “MIND ONLY” SCHOOL  
IN THE DOXOGRAPHICAL WORK OF LCANG-SKYA ROL-PA’I RDO-RJE**

**2017**

### ***The topic and the aim of the dissertation***

The topic of the dissertation is examining the thesis of the philosophical school of Mahajana Buddhism the Mind Only (*Citta-mātra*, *Vijñāna-vāda*, *Vijñapti-mātra*, *Sems-tsam-pa*) by the doxographical treaties from the 18th century of the Mongol II. Lcang-skya kutuktu Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje (1717-1786). So far the scientific world has been paid little attention to the text's analysis, translation and understanding, meanwhile many publications have been published of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje's doxographical treaties. Those ones preferred to examine the theory of the Middle Way (*Mādhyaṃaka*) and gave detailed translations reflecting on that. It can be "thanks" to that in the Tibetan-Mongolian culture they paid little attention to the Mind Only philosophy which has historical reasons. Because of it in the hierarchical order of the doxographical (*grub-mtha'*) texts this tenet doesn't value highly. It has got a lot of critics on behalf of the canonical treatises' translations from the Sanskrit language and on behalf of the Tibetan authorship treatises. In spite of it, the work of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje introduces this school very detailed, without any substantive criticism. This is why it can be used as a meaningful source of the unbiased studies to the tend of the Mind Only School and to the research of the Tibetan doxographical (*grub-mtha'*) genre. Because of it this is the main goal of my theses, partial translation and analysis the Tibetan-Mongolian monk-scholar's doxographical work's part on the topic of Mind Only School and partly analyzing and examining the doxographical topic of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje Dag-yig mkhas-pa'i 'byung-gnas for further research.

The basics of the dissertation is the presentation of the ontological and epistemological principles (*gzhi*) of the work of the 18th century Mongolian Lcang-skya khutuktu Rol-pa'i rdo-rje *grub mtha'* *Citta-mātra* (Mind Only School), exegesis and translation of the subchapter, and sub-thesis based on the Tibetan doxographical text of the Mind Only School, *Citta-mātra*.

### ***The content and the structure of the dissertation***

Following the Introduction the dissertation consists eight chapters. In the first Chapter. II outline Lcang-skya Rol-pa'i rdo-rje's life and work based on the data of the previous literature (2.1) introduction of the biography (2.2) the detailed biography. At a long-winded stage I analyze many sources of biographical and historical work connected with the biography and works of Lcang-skya kutuktu Rol-pa'i rdo-rje to confirm his Mongolian-Tibetan-Manju-Chinese intercultural role in political and religious fields. Then I shortly allude (2.3) to the incarnation chain (the previous incarnation) of Lcang-skya 'kutuktuk' (preexistent-line). Following the biographical introduction I touch upon the oeuvre (2.4) of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje, his literary work, and based on literature summaries I write about his significant role played in the translation of the commentary of the Mongolian Buddhist Canon.

II. Lcang-skya kutuktu Rol-pa'i rdo-rje had the leadership role of this achieved aspiration, the emperor of the manju Qing-dynasty K'ien-lung was his personal master (teacher) and commissioned him to be the leader of the scholarly translator and proofreading interpreters' team translating the commentaries (Tangyur) Tibetan Buddhist Canon into Mongolian language.

Before the beginning of the translation he edited the *Dag-yig mkhas-pa'i 'byung-gnas-t* [*Merged yarqu-yin orun neretü toytayaγsan dagvig*], a comparative dictionary of the Mongolian-Tibetan languages with the title the Source of Knowledge, its Mongolian title is *Merged yarqu-yin orun neretü toytayaγsan dagvig, the Source of Wisdom*, or shortly *Merged yarqu-yin orun*. His goal was to use it as the Tibetan-Mongolian basic vocabulary, standard source of the Tibetan Buddhist terminology interpreting the text into Mongolian language.

I intend to introduce a separate chapter on the structure and introduction of this dictionary (3.), referring to research of Ruegg (1973), Sárközi (2010), (Kara, Ligeti) and by individual research. I try to show that this dictionary's glossary, translated firstly to Tibetan and then to Mongolian language, not only simple glossaries but explanatory treatises stand alone.

The (4.) chapter's long-winded part deals with the Tibetan *grub-mtha'* (*siddhānta*) doxographical literature. This literary genre can be related with the genre of the History of Dharma (*chos-'byung*), and as it is interpreted originated from India and formed in Tibet as a philosophical genre, which aimed to present the hierarchical orderly systematic philosophical items. The specification of this genre to show the Indian and Tibetan religious-philosophical systems. After the genre's historical description (4.1) I enumerate with reference to technical literature (Mimaki, Tulku Thondup Rinpoche, Fehér Judit, Terjék), I assign the typology of the doxographical works, *grub-mtha'* (3.2) To review four basic groups inside of this genre like: (1) the works presenting the four Buddhist philosophical tenets (2) the non-Buddhist extrinsic Indian philosophical systems and the four doxographical scriptures of the Buddhist philosophical tenets (3) texts of presentations of the Tibetan sects (4) and the Indian non-Buddhist systems and the Buddhist tenets and the *grub-mtha'* works which presents other religions.

To the typological presentation I rely on my previous researches based on the doxographical sources and on the results of the literature (Hopkins, Cozort, Klein, Mimaki, Gunether, Ruegg). In this chapter I resemble several *grub-mtha'* works and I typify them according to the four types I have chosen. The review of the *grub-mtha'* doxographical genre (4.3) partly expose of the publication of Western literature's researches, on the other hand result of the survey of the original language sources. The original sources in most cases equalled, looks like following the same pattern. Lately in the light of that work of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje *grub-mtha'* doesn't seem so simplified as most texts in this genre, in spite of he shared the thesis of the sect *Dge-lugs-pa*.

By processing and translating the chapter of the doxographical division Dag-yig-mkhas-pa'i 'byung gnas *grub-mtha'* (siddhānta), Mongolian title *Tayalal-un ayimay*, (5.) little work has been published so far. Publication of the Russian Pubaev-Dandarov in 1968 translated and reviewed chapters: Pāramitā and Mādhyamaka. The literature didn't work on the chapter *grub-mtha'*, yet. In this chapter I am trying to correct this shortcoming. This chapter and the interpretation in this chapter from the point of view of the translation is a proof to compare with other sources of the basic text, like some passages of *Shel-gyi me-long* by Thu'u-bkvan Blo-bzang chos-kyi nyi-ma's and the comparison with the work on which the dissertation was based of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje's work *grub-mtha'*. The chapter joining to this of Dag-yig does not fully reflect the same classification criteria like the same author's *grub-mtha'* work. The division of different philosophical systems may differ from each work, but it is an interesting raising what cause the different classification in two works of the same author?

In the essence of the dissertation (6.) we focus our attention on the history of the Mind Only School (6.1) (Citta-mātra, Sems-tsam-pa), and I guide the attention alone on the Indo-Tibetan tradition, I describe the most meaningful canonical scriptures and next to them the researches connected with them. Here (6.2) I used a lot of literary source in the subchapter of the Tibetan adjudication of the Mind Only School (Blumenthal, Wangchuk, Yoshimizu), and I also refer to many polemic Tibetan sources. Very short stage is about the classification of the sub-system of the Mind Only School (6.3), because later I will talk about it through the processed work of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje. After the Introduction of the theories of the Mind Only School in a rather large part (6.4) I deal with the trends of the theory. Regarding to it, we find several sources of literature for the most important teachings (Wood, Nakamura, Anacker, Verdu, Brown, Garfield, Suzuki, Williams, Schmithausen), partly - knowing the texts of the Tibetan Buddhist's Canon - can help, because the translation of the most important texts of the Mind Only School is contained there in. This chapter raises up basic problems and its particular theories like the "omnipotent mind", "absolute mind", the "three characteristics", the "emptiness".

The analyzed and translated texts's exegesis (7.) are divided into two large units: objects of the knowledge (*shes-bya yul*) (7.2.1.) and the knowers, consciousnesses (*shes-byed blo*) (7.2.2). That is, according to the classifications of the objects of the empirical world and of the experiencing types of consciousness. The first part also may be named the ontology of the Mind Only School, while the second deals with the epistemology and the important issues of the psychology of the Mind Only School. It's followed by the objects of the knowledge (*shes-bya yul*), the two truths (*bden-pa gnyis*): conventional or (*kun-rdzob*) imputed and the (*don-dam-pa*) ultimate definition. The "three characteristics" (*mtshan-nyid-gsum*) or determination of the characteristic and then follow the definition of "all the other subsidiaries". Under "all the other subsidiaries" come to the quality of the self-sufficient substantially existent, the difference between the definition of the substantial existent (*rdzas-yod*) and the imputed existent (*btags-yod*), as well as the denial of the self-sufficient substantially existent individuality, so the latter topic is conduction to the epistemological part.

To the explanation of the text could be helpful the thesis and texts of the Indo-Tibetan epistemology (*pramāna*, *tshad-ma*) and from which derived the part of sub-division the mind and cognition, *blo-rig*.

The specificity of the Tibetan text is that it does not provide an important source for quotations, and it also incomprehensibly abbreviates the title of the text quoted. This difficulty can be solved with the usage of the catalog of the canonical literature and using the modern electronic dictionaries.

I reserve a separate subchapter (7.2.4.) for the aspect of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje's classification of the Mind Only sub-schools. The viewpoints are the following: 1. aspect of the context, scripture 2. number of the categories of consciousness 3. epistemological viewpoint, how the mind form or experience the object.

The source of text for translation was (8.) Gzhi'i nman-par bzhag-bstan - presentation of the ontological principles, done by comparison of several contexts, but the bases of the translation was the Beijing (Peking) text editing all works (*gsung-'bum*) of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje.

The modern published texts gave help (Peking, Taipei) in the clarification of the chapters' division, they do not differ basically from the text version of the original Tibetan book format. The difficulty of translation was given that it is an 18th century work and in many cases uses different languages like the classical Tibetan treatises and from these the threefold principle for the evidential syntax of logical computations (the raising of the subject to be proven, its allegation and its reasoning).

Appropriating to the sight of a Dge-lugs-pa scholar's interpretation, the introduction of basic views from the perspective of the Mind of School gives one a kind of ontology and knowledge theory.

It was indispensable for translation to study previously the doxographical (*grub-mtha'*) literature's Tibetan sources (Dkon-chog 'jigs-med dbang-po, Thu'u-bkan blo-bzang chos-kyi nyi-ma, Sera Rje-btsun, Sa-skya Pandita, Kong-sprul Blo-gros mtha'-yas, Tshul-krim rgya-mtsho, 'Jam-dbyangs bzhad-pa'i rdo-rje, Dbus-pa blo-gsal) and the summary of the results of literature (Hopkins, Cozort, Newman, Klein, Mimaki, Lopez, Fehér Judit több műve, Kőrösi Csoma Sándor, Terjék József, Jackson, Carstens, Newland, Dutt, Lhundub Sopa, Mittal, Guenther).

Next to these I analyzed canonical Tibetan scriptures, like *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra*, *Tathāgatagarbha-sūtra* and *Samdhimirmocana-sūtra* -sutra which is known as the basic work of the Mind Only School.

Text of Dka-ba Dpal-brtsegs Chos-kyi nman-grangs (*Dharma-paryāya*) was my help in interpretation. I used electronic dictionaries of Hopkins, Tsepak Rigzin és Terjék József.

Bibliography(10.) I give you the detailed bibliography I have used. In the Attachments (11.), I expose the Tibetan text's transcription,

### ***The sources of the dissertation***

Firstly the dissertation gives summary of the trend Mind Only School thesis by the doxographical work of the Mongolian writer Rol-pa'i rdo-rje who wrote in Tibetan language, based on original texts

from Peking (Beijing). The Tibetan text was printed first in Peking, because of its importance, since 1980 it was published in several modern editions. In my dissertation, I also used similar grub-mtha' theses in Tibetan language to help understand, analyze and later to translate clearly the basic text.

### ***Summarizing the results of the research***

I have analyzed a number of references and Tibetan text sources about the Mind Only School thesis, compared doxographical work of Rol-pa'i rdo-rje with other articles written in this genre. The dissertation can be a step forward from one point of view studying the Tibetan-Mongolian Buddhism, on the other hand it can show significant progress into the research of thesis of the Indo-Tibetan philosophical schools, considering the complexity of the source of the text but in many cases it's essential and previously unknown aspects.

In my work I undertook to analyze and describe the texts of the trend the Mind Only School which have not yet been presented to the scientific world.