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Foreword

The female water-ox year (chu mo glang) of 1073 A.D. witnessed two remarkable events in the religious and intellectual history of Tibet, namely the establishment of Sa skya and gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog monasteries, two important sites for the development of indigenous Tibetan Buddhist scholarship. Sa skya was founded by ’Khon dKon mchog rgyal po (1034–1102), then chieftain of the influential ’Khon clan, some of whose descendants are counted among the greatest scholars of Tibet. gSang phu, on the other hand, was established by the famous bKa’ gdams pa master rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab (fl. early to late 11th century), whose nephew and successor on the abbot’s chair, rNgog lo tsa ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109, hereafter rNgog lo), played a leading role in the transmission of some branches of Indian Buddhist thought to Tibet. It is the latter with whom this book is concerned.

rNgog lo is particularly recognized for his painstaking translations and revisions of Buddhist scriptures, and in fact, during the period of the “Later Propagation” (phyi dar) of Buddhism in Tibet, he was second only to the famous Rin chen bzang po (958–1055) in receiving the title of a lo chen, that is to say, “Great Translator.” With regard to rNgog lo’s translations or revisions of translations, which surpass fifty in number, there immediately come to mind his many renderings of works on Buddhist logic and episte-

---

1 This is a well-known autobiographical verse attributed to rNgog lo: bai ro tsa na nam mkha’i mtha’ dang mnyam|| ska (l)chog rnam gnyis ngyi zla zung cig ’dra|| rin chen bzang po tho rangs shar chen tsam|| kho bo de drung srin bu me khyer tsam||. See KARMAY (1988), p. 17, who quotes from a work of Ratna gling pa (1403–1478). A less common version of the verse, located by VAN DER KUIJP [1989], p. 12, in Lho pa bya bral, rGyal ba’i dbang po karma pas rnying ma la dri ba chab shog tu guang ba’i dris lan chos dbyings ’od gyal (Thimphu: National Library of Bhutan, 1985, p. 94.2–3), opens: bai ro tsa na nam mkha’i thog dang ’dra|| (“Vairocana is equal to the lightning of the sky”).
mology (Pramāṇa), and not surprisingly, he was the foremost Tibetan translator in this field of learning. But his scholarly activities go far beyond that of a mere translator, since he was also a commentator and teacher of high rank.

rNgog lo’s writings bear witness to his wide range of learning, which comprised three different branches of Buddhist philosophy. First of all, he is well known for his contributions to the field of Pramāṇa, and in Tibet he came to be considered as the founder of the so-called “New Pramāṇa [School]” (tshad ma gsar ma). Among his many commentaries are found some of the first indigenous commentaries on this science ever composed in Tibet. rNgog lo’s activities in the area of Tibetan Buddhist epistemology can therefore be regarded as fundamental for the later development of this discipline, and his tradition came to be known in Tibetan literature as the “rNgog tradition” (rngog lugs). Secondly, rNgog lo composed commentaries on the five works known as the “Five Dharmas of Maitreya” (byams chos sde lnga), and through the study of one of these treatises, namely the Abhisamayālaṃkāra, he was particularly concerned with the exposition of Prajñā-pāramitā philosophy (phar phyin), which formed his second main field of interest. Thirdly, rNgog lo is known to have actively taught and commented on the “Three Svātantrika [Treatises] of Eastern [India]” (rang rgyud shar gsam), namely the Satyadvayavibhaṅga of Jñānagarbha, the Madhyamakālāṃkāra of Śāntarakṣita, and the Madhyamakāloka of Kamalaśīla, which formed the textual foundation of the Svātantrika Yogācāra-Madhyamaka synthesis, among whose proponents rNgog lo may be counted. Apart from his activi-

2 ‘GOS LO TSĀ BA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 97 (tr. Roerich [1949/53], p. 70).
3 JACKSON (1987), p. 127. Two of rNgog lo’s Pramāṇa works have been published, namely his commentaries on Dhammakīrti’s Pramāṇaviniścaya, the extensive Tshad ma rnam nge s ki dka’ gnad rnam bsad (Beijing, 1994; also in: KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 419–709), whose existence had already been reported by STEINKELLNER (1992), p. 264, n. 51 (see also KELLNER [1997], p. 495, n. 3, and KRASSER [1997], p. 63, n. 7), and recently the shorter Tshad ma rnam nge s ki don bsdus (in: KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 369–409).
4 It is worthwhile to note that apart from rNgog lo’s scholastic (mtshan ngyid) school, one finds a second, even earlier rngog lugs mentioned in Tibetan historical literature, namely the tantric tradition of the bKa’ brgyud pa master rNgog Chos kyi/sku rdo rje (1036–1102); see below, p. 35, n. 17.
5 With the exception of his commentary on the Dharmadhardmatāvibhaṅga rNgog lo’s works on the “Five Dharmas of Maitreya” have been published, namely his works on the Ratnakāravibhaṅga (see JACKSON [1993a] and KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 289–367), Abhisamayālaṃkāra (see JACKSON [1993b] and KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 125–201), Mahāyāna-sūtravibhaṅga (see KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 207–252), and Madhyāntavibhaṅga (see KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 257–281).
ties as a commentator, he also founded the main teaching lineages of those three fields of learning, and taking all this into account, it may indeed be justified to claim that he “was more than anyone else responsible for the establishment of Tibetan Buddhist scholasticism.”

In CHAPTER ONE of the present book I describe those scholarly publications from the secondary literature which have contributed to our understanding of rNgog lo and his tradition, and I then briefly survey the Tibetan sources (ancient and modern) on the latter’s life. CHAPTER TWO is based on these Tibetan accounts and presents a biographical sketch of rNgog lo. His work as a translator is the subject of CHAPTER THREE, where I attempt to establish a complete list of his translations or revisions of Buddhist scriptures, which are (with only very few exceptions) still to be found in the Tibetan canon today. These works have been briefly examined with regard to their translation colophons (bsgyur byang), which are given in transliteration.

CHAPTER FOUR introduces Gro lung pa Blo gros ’byung gnas, the author of the only known full-length biography of rNgog lo. This biography, which also includes two lists of rNgog lo’s translations and compositions, is partly translated in what comprises PART TWO of the book. The concluding section contains five APPENDICES, which present (1) in a more accessible form the titles of those works dealt with in CHAPTER THREE, (2) the names and “nationalities” of rNgog lo’s collaborators in translation or revision work, (3) the Tibetan text of two lists of rNgog lo’s writings, compiled by two Tibetan authors of the 14th and 15th century respectively, (4) a list of canonical quotations found in Gro lung pa’s biography, and (5) a photographic reproduction of the text under study.

---


7 rNgog lo’s work as a commentator could well have been subject of a separate chapter, if the majority of his compositions had not been lost or unaccounted for. However, some works previously unknown to be extant have now been listed in the catalogue of the collection kept at ’Bras spungs monastery near Lhasa; see DPAL BRTSEGS BOD YIG DPE RNYING ZHIB JUG KHAND, ed. (2004), e.g. nos. 016371, 018550, 018819, and 019536. Even more recently, facsimiles of several manuscripts held at ’Bras spungs and other locations were published in Chengdu in 2006; see KDSB, vol. 1. I have dealt with rNgog lo’s commentaries in my translation of Gro lung pa’s list of rNgog lo’s writings (pp. 109–113), to which I have added those works Gro lung pa did not mention but which are known to have been composed by rNgog lo. Thus, Gro lung pa’s compilation and my additions form a fairly complete list of rNgog lo’s compositions. In addition, the reader is referred to APPENDIX THREE, where two other lists of rNgog lo’s writings have been reproduced. rNgog lo’s work, in particular his commentary on the Ratnagotra-vibhaga, has been examined in the recent doctoral dissertation of Dr Kazuo Kano (Kyoto), which was submitted to the University of Hamburg in 2006, and to whose forthcoming publication the reader is alerted. Shortly before the present book went to
This book is a slightly revised version of an M.A. thesis I submitted at the University of Hamburg in 1997, and I regret that my periodically and significantly shifting interests have prevented me from returning to work on it other than very sporadically since then. I wish to record my profound gratitude to my teacher Professor David Jackson (New York) for his unflagging support over several years. His help was vital in the completion of the present study. I am also grateful to Professor David Seyfort Ruegg (London) and Dr Ulrike Roesler (Oxford) for their readiness to read the original thesis in 2001 and 2005 respectively, which resulted in several corrections and valuable suggestions. I am further indebted to Dr Kazuo Kano (Kyoto) due to whose kindness I could incorporate several important references to recent editions of rNgog lo’s writings. Other friends and colleagues who helped me in various ways include Gergely Hidas (Budapest), Csaba Kiss (Oxford), Emma Mathieson (Chipping Norton), Dr Karma Phuntsho (Cambridge), Dr Somadeva Vasudeva (New York), and Burkhard Quessel (London). The latter not only put his state-of-the-art scanning equipment at my disposal but also shared his encyclopedic knowledge in numerous conversations over the past decade, the contents of which (while certainly of distinctively Tibetan a nature) could unfortunately not be incorporated into this book in a meaningful way.

Ralf Kramer
Munich, July 2007

press Dr. Kano informed me of the following two articles he recently completed: KANO (2007), a critical edition and survey of rNgog lo’s sPrings yig bdud rtsi’i thig le, and KANO (forthcoming), which includes an edition and translation of rNgog lo’s short topical outline of the Ratnagotravibhāga found by R. A. Stein at the Silk Road site of Khara Khoto.

The original thesis also contained a critical edition of the Tibetan text which has now been made redundant by the publication of DRA.M. DUL (2004); see below, p. 74, n. 22. Nevertheless, for the purpose of making the whole text available to the reader of the present book, I have included a photographic reproduction of the xylograph in APPENDIX FIVE.
Part One
Introductory Matter
Bibliographical Considerations

1.1 Non-Tibetan Works of Modern Scholarship

Up to the present day, not many works of modern Tibetological research have been devoted to rNgog lo and his tradition. This was mainly due to the fact that until recently all writings of this important master were neither commonly available nor even known to exist. However, rNgog lo’s importance as a translator of Buddhist scriptures has been long known and had already been duly recognized almost forty years ago (NAUDOU [1968]). In the 1980s two studies were published (VAN DER KUIJP [1983] and JACKSON [1987]) that referred at some length to rNgog lo’s great impact on some branches of Tibetan Buddhist religion, so that some fundamental materials on him are readily available.

In the following bibliographical sketch I would like to describe briefly studies from scholarly secondary literature that contain information regarding historical or other aspects of rNgog lo and his tradition. I will exclude those numerous works that merely refer to him by his name or give inconsequential details. Without including it in the sketch itself, mention is to be made of the English translation of Gos lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal’s Deb ther sngon po (“The Blue Annals”) by G. N. ROERICH (1949/53), which did a lot to spread essential information about rNgog lo’s life.2

R. A. MILLER (1965)

An interesting and up to the present day not well known aspect of rNgog lo’s scholarly work is presented in this article of R. A. Miller. Basing himself on a commentary composed by a certain gSer tog Blo bzang tshul khrims

---

1 As an exception to this, one could mention an article by LAUER (1898), p. 549, which might well contain the first mention of a certain Blo idan shes rab in modern scholarship. This name of rNgog lo occurs within Laufer’s translation of the Za ma tog, where the former is said to have been one of the revisors (another one was Rin chen brang po) of Thon mi Sambho tsa’s Sum cu pa and rTags kyi jug pa. See also RÖTA-TAS (1985), pp. 245–249.

2 Although some basic facts on rNgog lo’s life were thus made accessible through Roe-rich’s work, it remained a common mistake to wrongly identify rNgog lo with his uncle rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab; see e.g. HOFFMANN (1956), p. 117, who erroneously described rNgog lo as a disciple of Atiśa Dīpaṃkarīśāja (ca. 982–1054). A similar mistake had already occurred in TUCCI (1949), p. 680, n. 31, where rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab is said to have been born in 1059. See also MIESEZAHL (1961), p. 40, n. 18.
(1845–1915) on two grammatical treatises attributed to Thon mi Saṃbhota, Miller quoted and translated a very brief grammatical fragment apparently written by rNgog lo.

J. NAUDOU (1968)

This study, which the author delivered as his doctoral dissertation at the University of Paris (Sorbonne), describes in some detail the historical development of Kashmiri Buddhism from the 7th to the 14th century. In the course of that description, Naudou paid special attention to the great impact Kashmiri scholars had on the elaboration of Buddhist logic in general and on the establishment of Tshad ma (Pramāṇa) during the “Later Propagation” (phyi dar) of Buddhism in Tibet (i.e. from the late 10th century onward). In particular he informs us about their role in translating Indian Buddhist texts into Tibetan. Moreover, we learn of the journeys Tibetan

3 The title of this work according to MILLER (1965), p. 327: Bod kyi brda’ sprod pa sum cu pa dang rtags kyi jug pa’i mchan ’grel mdor lugs te brjod pa nga mthar ’phrul gyi lde mig (Beijing, 1957). The edition is said to have been based on an original preserved in the monastery of sKu’bum Byams pa gling in Qinghai province. It has later been reprinted by the Kan su’u mi rigs dpe skrun khang (Lanzhou) and the mTsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang (Xining) in 1981 and 1995 respectively. Another edition was published by Gurudeva Lama in Kathmandu in 1962. None of these editions was available to me.

4 According to MILLER (1965), p. 328, this fragment is quoted on p. 154, lines 19 to 25, of the Beijing edition mentioned in the preceding note. Later, RÖNA-TAS (1985), pp. 254–255, referred to this text again. See also SEYFORT RUEGG (1974), p. 251, who mentioned the work in his partial translation of the Dag yig mkhas pa’i byung gnas by lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje (1717–1786), where it occurs among other “systematic treatises on the new and old terminologies.” VAN DER KUIJP (1989), p. 23, also referred to “a linguistic fragment attributed to Rngog Lo tsā ba,” but he did not specify whether this was the fragment located by MILLER (1965) or a different work. Later, in a short article on the Tibetan script and derivatives, VAN DER KUIJP (1996), pp. 436 and 440, mentioned a manuscript on the essentials of correct spelling authored by rNgog lo, which he had located in the Library of the Cultural Palace of National Minorities (Minzu wenhua gong tushuguan) in Beijing (Dag yig nye mkho bshis pa, 9 folios, ms. 004323[9]). This text was indeed the source of the quotation mentioned by Miller, as it is now obvious from VAN DER KUIJP (2003), p. 424, n. 33. A facsimile of what appears to be a second exemplar of this short work by rNgog lo (with identical length and title as the Beijing copy) is kept in the Bod ljongs dpe mdzod khang in Lhasa and has been published very recently; see KÖZÉ, vol. 1, pp. 93–109. VAN DER KUIJP (2003), p. 392, expressed some doubts concerning the authorship of the “dag yig-speller,” since it firstly contains the term bar ’dra (“one like a Mongol”), which was unknown in Tibet during rNgog lo’s time. Secondly, the work contains the reading bstan bcos for “treatise” and not bstan chos as apparently attested in rNgog lo’s writings and in use during his time.
monk-scholars and translators (among them rNgog lo) undertook to Kashmir in the hope of receiving instructions from those masters.

With regard to rNgog lo Naudou presented several interesting passages, all in chapter six of the book. First of all (pp. 165–166), he described the famous religious council (chos 'khor) that took place at Tho ling (Western Tibet) around the year 1076 and in which—among a number of other young scholars—rNgog lo participated. Naudou based this account purely on information already presented to the scholarly world by Roerich in his translation of 'Gos lo tṣa ba’s Deb ther sngon po, the latter being in fact the author’s only Tibetan source for all matters relating to rNgog lo’s life, which is described in a brief biographical sketch on pp. 171–172 of his book.

Naudou also (and for the first time in the scholarly literature) considered in some detail the work of those Kashmiri translators who, being members of the pandita–lo tṣa ba teams, were responsible for translating numerous Buddhist scriptures into Tibetan. With regard to rNgog lo it is worth mentioning Sajjana (pp. 174–177), Paraḥitabhadra (gZhan la phan pa bzang po, pp. 182–183), Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po, pp. 183–184), and Tilakakalasā (Thig le bum pa, pp. 185–187), who—among others—collaborated with him.

In his description, Naudou listed many works translated through such collaborations. However, as is clear from the beginning of his study (p. 18), he does not seem to have based his findings concerning these translations on his own reading of their colophons, but rather on published catalogues, primarily on that of P. CORDIER (1909 and 1915).

The author’s identifications or localizations of Kashmiri towns through their Tibetan names (pp. 169–171) are quite helpful for deciphering the colophons and should not be overlooked when describing this monograph, which may still be regarded as an indispensable tool for understanding the early intellectual interrelations between Kashmir and Tibet.5

D. SEYFORT RUEGG (1969)

The author of this monograph was the first Western scholar ever to have had at his disposal and to have used rNgog lo’s commentary on the Ratnakosagotrabhāga, one of the oldest commentaries on this work (see particularly pp. 302–304 of his book). Seyfort Ruegg described the text he used as a 66-

5 In this context one could also mention a book by Advaitavadini Kaul that bears the interesting title Buddhist Savants of Kashmir: Their Contributions Abroad (Srinagar: Utpal Publications, 1987). This publication contains some relevant information, but it is in fact purely based on NAUDOU (1968), to which have only been added numerous spelling mistakes.
On pp. 35–36 Seyfort Ruegg presented certain considerations regarding the Kashmiri scholar Sajjana (the son of Mahājana and grandson of Ratna-vajra), who was the author of the only known Indian subcommentary on the *Ratnagotravibhāga*. He is of importance for us, since he collaborated with rNgoṅ lo in preparing the Tibetan translation of this text. As a result of this, Sajjana also passed the lineage of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* down to the latter (p. 36). Seyfort Ruegg was probably also the first to refer to the commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* composed by rNgoṅ lo (p. 126, note 1), but this work was not yet available to him.7

A. I. VOSTRIKOV (1970)

This work of the distinguished Russian Tibetologist A. I. Vostrikov (1904–1937) was originally published posthumously in Russian in 1962, after it had lain unpublished for more than twenty-five years.8 In his treatment of the gter ma genre of Tibetan literature, the author examined the date of rNgoṅ lo’s death as it is for instance found in the *Lo paṇ bka’i thang yig*, a work “discovered” by the treasure-finder (gter ston) O rgyan gling pa (1329–1367, pp. 39–40). According to the latter work, rNgoṅ lo died in a pig year that could only be 1107 (me phag, “fire-pig”). This date—as Vostrikov pointed out—contradicts the year 1109 found in ‘Gos lo tsā ba’s *Deb ther sngon po* and other works, which is the date commonly accepted today.

S. G. KARMAY (1980)

In this article, S. G. Karmay investigated the translation work of Pho brang Zhi ba ‘od (fl. 11th century) and an open letter to the Buddhists of Tibet the latter composed. In the course of his study, Karmay referred to the canonical translations made under Zhi ba ‘od’s order and patronage. For us it is of some importance that Karmay gave a partial translation (pp. 8–9) of rNgoṅ lo’s long translation colophon (bsgyur byang) found at the end of his translation of Prajñākaragupta’s *Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra* (P 5719). Apart from the historical facts found in the bsgyur byang, Karmay’s article does not

---

6 This very exemplar of rNgog lo’s work was reprinted in India in 1996; see JACKSON (1993a).

7 This commentary has also been recently reprinted in India; see JACKSON (1993b).

8 See the preface in VOSTRIKOV (1970), p. 4, which was written in “Leningrad October, 1936.” This early date makes the work an even greater masterpiece. Vostrikov himself was slain in the great Stalinist purges.
contain much biographical information on rNgog lo. However, it is noteworthy for briefly referring (p. 9 and p. 22, note 45) to a work of gSer mdog pan chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507), namely his brief history of the rNgog tradition (rNgog lo tstsha ba chen pos bstan pa ji ltar bskyangs pa’i tshul mdo tsam du bya ba ngo mtshar gti rol mo), which had not been used by any other Tibetologist before.

L. VAN DER KUIJP (1983)

This book of L. van der Kuijp was a remarkable step towards a deeper understanding of Tibetan Buddhist epistemology in general and the impact of rNgog lo’s tradition (rngog lugs) in particular. The whole of its first chapter contains many interesting details regarding rNgog lo’s life and his scholarly career. The biographical sketch, which was compiled by van der Kuijp from different Tibetan sources, surpasses that of NAUDOU (1968) in so far as it is not purely based on ’Gos lo tsā ba’s Deb ther sngon po. In fact, van der Kuijp was the first to make extensive use of the writings of Shākya mchog ldan, whose treatises turned out to be of crucial importance for a history of Tibetan Pramāṇa.9 Moreover, it is worth mentioning that van der Kuijp gave a complete list of rNgog lo’s compositions, namely his many commentaries (pp. 34 and 57), and collected quotations and paraphrases from the writings of Shākya mchog ldan (p. 58). With regard to rNgog lo’s tradition, chapter two contributes interesting remarks on the latter’s successor Phy(w)a/Cha pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169), and on how he modified the rngog lugs.10

E. KAWAGOE (1984)

E. Kawagoe’s brief article represents what appears to be the first Tibetological publication solely devoted to the person of rNgog lo. The article is divided into three parts, each of which deals with one of the three basic parts of rNgog lo’s life (i.e. his birth and participation in the religious council of Tho ling in Tibet, his studying abroad, and the period after his returning home prior to his death). Besides the biographical information, mention was also made of many canonical works which rNgog lo translated.

9 It should be noted that Shākya mchog ldan’s “Collected Works” (gsung ’bum) were only published from Bhutan in 1975, and thus had not been commonly available to previous authors.

10 One may note that prior to this study van der Kuijp had already published an article which appears to be the first publication devoted to rNgog lo’s most influential successor Phy(w)a/Cha pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169) and the latter’s impact on Tibetan epistemological theory; see VAN DER KUIJP (1978).
On p. 1006 [= p. (118)], note 1, Kawagoe listed some Tibetan sources containing information on rNgog lo’s life. However, his abbreviation BLN for one of his sources remains unclear to me.


This book of R. A. F. Thurman does not contain much information on rNgog lo or his tradition and might just as well have been left aside, had the author not presented rNgog lo’s work as a translator in a rather uncommon way. On p. 54 Thurman stated:

It is with the work of rNgog Lo-tsa-ba bLo-l丹 Shes-rab (1059–1109) that the works of Chandrakirti entered the literature of Tibetan philosophy.

He went on to claim that rNgog lo translated Chandrakīrti’s Prasannapadā (P 5260) and Madhyamakāvatāra (P 5261/2). Nevertheless, the colophons of both works do not mention rNgog lo as translator, but rather Pa tshab Nyima grags (born 1055). Thus it remains unclear where Thurman’s information stems from, since he did not name his sources. In addition, Chandrakīrti is generally accepted as a Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika, whereas rNgog lo is regarded as a supporter of the Svātantrika-Madhyamaka. This makes it unlikely—but not totally impossible—that he was so highly involved in the translation of Prāsaṅgika texts.11

With regard to rNgog lo as a philosopher, Thurman referred to him as holding a “strikingly Kantian position” (p. 55). This remark seems to agree with what a reviewer once noted, namely that Thurman “is keen to drop names, particularly of Western philosophers,” because he seems to be “concerned to direct attention to the author rather than to his content.”12 Moreover, Thurman’s position was far from neutral, since he threw a surprisingly unfavourable light on rNgog lo (“Phya-pa was too good in logic to agree with rNgog lo’s notion…”, p. 56), which makes one wonder on which sources his authoritative conclusions were based.

D. P. JACKSON (1987)

This study of D. Jackson contains an enormous amount of information on philosophical aspects of the rNgog tradition. Like VAN DER KUIJP (1983)

11 See below, pp. 69–70, where I have dealt with the question of rNgog lo’s translation of these works in more detail. There I have also specified that he did indeed translate at least two Prāsaṅgika texts. See also VAN DER KUIJP (1985), p. 49.

before him, Jackson made extensive use of Shākya mchog ldan’s works, particularly his histories of Pramāṇa and Madhyamaka in Tibet, thereby furthering knowledge about the indigenous Tibetan traditions of logic and epistemology.

At the beginning of chapter six, Jackson presented rNgog lo as the “Father of Tibetan Pramāṇa Literature,” being one of the forerunners of Sa skya paṇḍita (1182–1251). After having briefly dealt with the former’s independent Pramāṇa treatises, mostly of the bstdus don type (pp. 127–128), Jackson surveyed the literature of rNgog lo’s successors. How rNgog lo classified and interpreted the thought of Dharmakīrti is then examined in the first part of chapter seven (pp. 165–169).\(^{13}\)


These three articles of L. van der Kuijp and S. Onoda should be mentioned together, since they deal with the same subject: the monastery of gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog and its abbatial succession. The monastery, founded by rNgog lo’s uncle rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab in 1073 A.D. (according to VAN DER KUIJP [1987], p. 106, possibly already in 1059 or 1071, the latter date being also attested to in ONODA [1989], p. 205), gained some importance as the main seat of rNgog lo and, consequently, became the centre of his tradition.

At the beginning of his study, van der Kuijp mentioned some historical facts related to the monastery, referring, for instance, to the tomb of rNgog lo, which is said to have been erected in the hamlet of gSang mda’, immediately below the monastery’s compounds (pp. 107–108). Onoda’s articles do not contain new information on rNgog lo, but since they contribute important facts regarding the abbatial succession of the latter’s monastery, it may be justified to include them here.

L. VAN DER KUIJP (1989)

This work of L. van der Kuijp was primarily intended as an introduction to a rare Pramāṇaviniścaya commentary by gTsang nag pa brTson ’grus seng ge (flourished 12th century), and it contains a periodization of Tibetan Pramāṇa traditions up to the early 13th century. In the course of his description, the author also briefly referred to rNgog lo’s role within this process (pp.

\(^{13}\) Note that prior to this work, Jackson had already published two relevant articles. In JACKSON (1985) he described the influence of rNgog lo’s tradition on some early Sa skya pa masters and listed (pp. 22 and 25) the Svātantrika-Madhyamaka lineage which began with him. In JACKSON (1986), p. 15, he mentioned rNgog lo’s importance regarding the reintroduction of Sāntaraksita’s Madhyamakālaṃkāra into Tibet.
Moreover, he later noted the latter’s influence on the introduction of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* into Tibet (pp. 19–20).

M. Mejor (1991)

M. Mejor’s article deserves being included here, since it is only the second study after NAUDOU (1968) to examine in some detail the translation work of rNgog lo. The author paid special attention to the dates of the Tibetan translations and revisions of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the *Pramāṇavārtti-kālāṃkāra* (pp. 182ff.), one of which had been executed by rNgog lo and his Kashmiri teacher Bhavyarāja. Mejor presented a most detailed account of the historical circumstances of the translation work (pp. 182–185), and in the final section (pp. 188–196) quoted the colophons of a considerable number of Pramāṇa works, including many translations by rNgog lo.

D. P. Jackson (1994a)

The “early biography” of rNgog lo composed by his close disciple Gro lung pa Blo gros ‘byung gnas, which Jackson described in this article, has been partly translated in *Chapter Five* of the present book. Consequently, I have referred to Jackson’s article many times below. On pp. 375–377, the author gave a rough summary of the biography’s main contents, listing them verse by verse. Moreover, he also gave complete quotations of the two lists found included in Gro lung pa’s text, namely those of rNgog lo’s translations and compositions (pp. 378–381).14

D. P. Jackson (1993a) and (1993b)

These introductions to two Indian reprints of rNgog lo’s works, namely his *Ratnagotravibhāga* and *Abhisamayālāṃkāra* commentaries, were actually written in 1994 and only appeared in 1996!15 But since the publications themselves bear the year 1993 on their title pages, I use this date when referring to them.

On pp. 2–5 of Jackson (1993a), the author paid some attention to the commentatorial *bsdus don* genre in which the majority of rNgog lo’s independent works had been composed. Jackson (1993b) is of some interest

---

14 I have translated both lists in *Chapter Five* below.

15 Note that a more recent publication of the same author (Jackson [1997]) is virtually identical (at least in the parts concerning rNgog lo) to Jackson (1993a) and will therefore not be separately mentioned. However, it is noteworthy that Jackson (1997), p. 456, contains the text of the missing fol. 1b of the reprint edition of rNgog lo’s *Ratnagotravibhāga* commentary published in Dharamsala.
for us, as it presents the full text of twenty verses of praise which form a rare eulogy of rNgog lo composed by Gro lung pa (pp. 8–15).¹⁶

R. VITALI (1996)
This monograph of R. Vitali mainly concerns the history of Western Tibet (i.e. the kingdoms of Gu ge and Pu rlangs), but it also contains valuable details that are directly related to our subject. On pp. 319–322, for instance, he examined the famous religious council (chos ’khor) of Tho ling, which took place in around 1076. In this context, Vitali mentioned rNgog lo as one of the participants, stating that details of his life and activities “are instrumental in identifying the years during which the Tho.ling chos ’khor was held” (p. 320). This is surely true, but why Vitali settles the dates of rNgog lo as 1057 to 1107 remains unclear. These dates differ by two years from the generally accepted life span (1059–1109).¹⁷ I will return to this problem when treating rNgog lo’s life.¹⁸

L. SHASTRI (1997)
In this publication, L. Shastri examined the circumstances of the religious council of Tho ling, which he dated to 1076 A.D. The author presented Tibetan accounts that shed light on rNgog lo’s participation in that event, including the colophon to rNgog lo’s translation of the Pramāṇavārttikālām-kāra, which he quotes in full on p. 880. Shastri’s article contains interesting details concerning that translation. However, the conclusions he drew from reading the colophon, and in particular his claim that rNgog lo and his Kashmiri teacher Bhavyarāja translated the work before or during the council (p. 875), do not seem to be acceptable for the reasons that I have specified below.¹⁹

D. SEYFORT RUEGG (2000)
In his study of the early history of Tibetan Madhyamaka, D. Seyfort Ruegg provided several bibliographical references to Tibetan accounts concerning rNgog lo and his tradition. He very briefly surveyed rNgog lo’s life and writ-

¹⁶ I have dealt with this work, which is different from the main verses found in Gro lung pa’s biography of rNgog lo, on p. 25 below.
¹⁷ In an earlier publication Vitali gave the years 1059 to 1109; see VITALI (1990), pp. 57 and 98.
¹⁸ See below, pp. 32–33, n. 6.
¹⁹ See below, pp. 65–66, n. 71.
ings (pp. 28–29), before outlining rNgog lo’s doctrinal position and philosophical interpretations (pp. 30–35). Seyfort Ruegg’s work also contains information on rNgog lo’s students (pp. 35–36) and on Phy(w)a/Cha pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169), one of the later successors of rNgog lo on the abbatial throne of gSang phu (pp. 37–41).

DRAM DUL (2004)

Although this publication does not contain any information in English on rNgog lo or his tradition, it is well worth including in the bibliographical sketch as it makes available a critical edition of rNgog lo’s biography by Gro lobsang pa, which is based on a xylograph and a Bhutanese manuscript.20 Thus it presents the same text that was partly translated in PART TWO of the present book.

K. KANO (2006)

This hitherto unpublished doctoral dissertation represents the first thorough study and partial translation of one of rNgog lo’s writings, namely his commentary on the *Ratnagotravibhāga*. In the course of his work the author devoted the whole of chapter 3 to a detailed survey of rNgog lo’s compositions and gave a translation of several episodes from the latter’s life as found in Tibetan historical sources, including a biographical sketch written by Laschen Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1432–1506).21

1.2 Tibetan Sources on rNgog lo’s Life

The Tibetan sources that have been listed in the chronological order of their composition in part 1.2.1 (“Pre-19th Century Accounts”) represent the lim-

---

20 See below, p. 74, n. 22.

21 To conclude the first part of this bibliographical sketch, I should also mention in passing the publication of a number of other works that contain information on rNgog lo’s philosophical position or his life. TAUSCHER (1995) and DREYFUS (1997) could not yet make use of rNgog lo’s independent works but had to resort to secondary Tibetan materials, mainly the writings of Tsong kha pa and Shākya mchog ldan respectively. KRASSER (1997) and KELLNER (1997) are noteworthy inasmuch as they were the first studies to utilize rNgog lo’s larger commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, which was published in Beijing in 1994. The latter work was also used in an article by VAN DER KUIJP (2003), which mentions rNgog lo’s exegetical tradition (*bshad pa’i srol*) and its later exponents. See also DAVIDSON (2005), pp. 258–259, where some basic facts from rNgog lo’s life are related in the context of the introduction of non-tantric teachings from India to Central Tibet. Finally (as mentioned above, p. 12, n. 7), KANO (2007) and (forthcoming) are very recent studies devoted to rNgog lo’s writings.
ited number of works I have come across so far. All of them contain some sort of biographical data on rNgog lo’s life, but this is often, particularly in later works, information that was handed down from generation to generation, from author to author, without significant differences. Consequently, the historical works mentioned at the very beginning may be regarded as the most valuable or authoritative, for the older a work is, the greater is often its value from the historians’ point of view.22 The accounts mentioned in part 1.2.2 (“Tibetan Works of Modern Scholarship”) are recent compilations.

1.2.1 Pre-20th-Century Accounts23

1. GRO LUNG PA BLO GROS ’BYUNG GNAS (fl. 11th to early 12th centuries), Jig rten mig geig blo ldan shes rab gyi rnam thar, 21 folios. This work has been partly translated below, being the only known full-length biography of rNgog lo.24

2. id., Lo tsts ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyi bstod pa gro lung pas mdzad pa, 3 folios. This work consists of twenty verses of praise to rNgog lo, which are different from the main verses found in the other biography by Gro lung pa. It exists as a xylograph (three folios with six lines per side) in the library of the Bihar Research Society in Patna, India,25 and was described and quoted in full by D. Jackson.26 Prior to that, doubtless the same work had already been referred to by H. Eimer, who had at his disposal a microfilm of a xylograph in possession of Yongdzin Trijang Rinpoche, Dharamsala.27

22 In order to keep this study within manageable limits, I was compelled to leave out two sources that are of great importance for the understanding of rNgog lo’s tradition, namely Shakya mchog ldan’s histories of Pramāṇa and Madhyamaka in Tibet. For those latter works, see for instance VAN DER KUIJP (1983) and JACKSON (1987).

23 Full bibliographical information for the works listed below (with the exception of no. 3, which has not been listed separately) may be obtained from the BIBLIOGRAPHY.

24 Apart from the xylograph available to me, two manuscripts of this text are known to exist; see below, p. 74.


26 See JACKSON (1993b), p. 27, n. 16, for the description and ibid., pp. 8–15, for the full text.

27 EIMER (1977), pp. 146–147. Note that according to ibid., p. 146, n. 3, the eulogy consists of 92 metrical lines making up a total of 21 verses. This would mean that D. Jackson’s quotation misses one (the final?) verse. It is interesting to note that Eimer has located another occurrence of this eulogy (without title and colophon) in the liturgical compilation entitled Abus ’gyur chos ade chen lung maams su gung ba’s chos sgyod kyi rim pa skal bzang ngyen rgyan kept in the British Library’s Oriental and India Office Collec-
3. **Shes Rab Seng Ge** (fl. sometime between the early 12th and mid-15th centuries), [no title], 2 folios (= fols. 21b.4–22b.3 in the xylograph edition of no. 1). This brief biographical sketch of rNgog lo is added as a long colophon to Gro lung pa’s biography of that master.

4. **Mnga’ bdag nyang ral nyi ma’ od zer** (1124?–1192?), *Chos byung me tog snying po sbrang rtsi’i bcud*, fols. 511a.1–512a.1 (= plates 341c, 342c, and 343a).

5. **Lde’u jo sras** (fl. 13th century?), *Chos byung chen mo bstan pa’i rgyal mtshan*, p. 148.

6. **Mkhas pa lde’u** (identical to the author of no. 5?), *rgya bod kyi chos byung rgyas pa*, pp. 382–383. The information on rNgog lo is more or less identical to that found in the shorter version of this work (no. 5).

7. **Bu ston rin chen grub** (1290–1364), *bDe bar gshegs pa’i bstan pa’i gsal byed chos kyi byung gnas gsung rab rin po che’i mdzod* (composed in 1322), pp. 907.7–908.3 (= fol. 138a.7–b.3). Apart from giving some basic biographical information, Bu ston also presents an important list...
of rNgog lo’s independent works (pp. 1049.5–1050.4 [= fol. 209a.5–b.4]), which I have quoted in APPENDIX THREE.


9. **YAR LUNG JO BO SHĀKYA RIN CHEN SDE** (fl. 14th century), *Yar lung jo bo’i chos ’byung* (composed in 1376), pp. 126–128.36 Possibly partly based on Tshal pa Kun dga’ rdo rje’s account (no. 8).

10. **STAG TSHANG RDZONG PA DPAL ’BYOR BZANG PO** (fl. 14th and 15th centuries?), *rGya bod yig tshang chen mo* (composed in 1434), pp. 482–483.37 The passage on rNgog lo is clearly based on Tshal pa Kun dga’ rdo rje’s account.

11. **’GOS LO TSĀ BA GZHON NU DPAL** (1392–1481), *Deb ther sngon po* (composed 1476–1478), pp. 392–395, 399–400,38 and other incidental references. It is noteworthy that ’Gos lo tsā ba’s account is the first to quote from the biography by Gro lung pa.

12. **GSER MDOG PAN CHEN SHĀKYA MCHOG LDAN** (1428–1507), *rNgog lo tstsha ba chen pos bstan pa ji lar bkyangs pa’i tshul mdo tsam du bya ba nge mshadow gsum gyi rol mo* (composed in 1479). This work deals with rNgog lo’s tradition in general and includes a biographical sketch of the latter on pp. 445.6–446.3.39 Moreover, it contains a list of rNgog lo’s compositions (pp. 446.7–447.5), which I have quoted in APPENDIX THREE.

13. **LO DGON PA B SOD NAMS LHA’I DBANG PO** (1423–1496), *bKa’ gdamgs rin po che’i chos ’byung nnam thar nyin mor byed pa’i ’od stong* (composed in 1484), pp. 363.1–364.2. This is based on Yar lung jo bo Shakya rin chen sde’s account (no. 9).

14. **LAS CHEN KUN DGA’ RGYAL MTSHAN** (1432–1506), *bKa’ gdamgs kyi nnam par thar pa bka’ gdamgs chos ’byung gsal ba’i sgron me* (composed in 1494 or 1505), pp. 222.2–224.6.


---

37 See *ibid.* for a partial translation.
38 Translated by ROERICH (1949/53), pp. 324–326 and 328.
16. DPA’ BO GTSEUG LAG PHRENG BA (1503/4–1566), Dam pa’i chos kyi ’khor lo bugyur ba rnams kyi byung ba gsal bar byed pa mKhas pa’i dga’ ston, pp. 724–727.40

17. MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO (1523–1596), bsTan rtsis gsal ba’i nyin byed (composed 1566–1587), pp. 112–113 and 115.41


19. SDE SRID SANGS RGYAS RGYA MTSHO (1653–1705), bsTan bcos bai dā gya dkar po las dris lan ’khrul snang g.ya’ sel don gyi bzhin ras ston byed (composed 1688), pp. 953.2–954.5 (= fols. 410b.3–411.5).43

20. DKON MCHOG LHUN GRUB (1497–1557), Dam pa’i chos kyi byung tshul bstan pa’i rgya mtshor ’jug pa’i gru chen [= Ngor chos ’byung], pp. 265.4–267.2. The work was left unfinished by dKon mchog lhun grub and completed (from p. 257 onward, including the section on rNgog lo) by Sangs rgyas phun tshogs (1649–1705) in 1692.

21. SUM PA MKHAN PO YE SHES DPAL ’BYOR (1704–1788), dPag bsam ljon bzang (composed 1748), p. 189.

22. TSHE MCHOG GLING YONGS ’DZIN YE SHES RGYAL MTSHAN (1713–1793), Lam rim bla ma bryud pa’i rnam thar (composed 1787), pp. 178–179. The information found in this work is clearly based on Laschen Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan’s account (no. 14).

23. YE SHES DON GRUB BSTAN PA’I RGYAL MTSHAN (1792–1855), Leg par bshad pa bka’ gdam rin po che’i gsung gi gyes btus nor bu’i bang midzod, pp. 148–149.

1.2.2 Tibetan Works of Modern Scholarship

1. KHETSUN SANGPO [= mKhas bsun bzang po] (1973), pp. 11–13 (based on Ye shes rgyal mtshan’s account [no. 22]) and pp. 127–130 (based on ’Gos lo tsā ba’s account [no. 11]).

Apart from written accounts, the Tibetan tradition also preserves artefacts relating to an important person’s life of a somewhat different nature, namely depictions in the form of blockprints, thangkas, or sculptures. In the case of rNgoṅ lo, it appears as if gSer mdog paṇ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507) actually executed a painting illustrating some miraculous events from rNgoṅ lo’s life, which is said to have been copied in the early 16th century by the well-known Tibetan artist sMan thang pa nang pa Lhun grub pa.44 This thangka is not known to be extant. One depiction that does survive is a painting dated to about 1429 portraying the prominent Sa skya pa master Sa chen Kun dga’ snying po (1092–1158) and including a small picture of rNgoṅ lo in the column on the left.45 Moreover, the xylograph of Gro lung pa’s shorter eulogy contains an illustration of rNgoṅ lo on the right side of fol. 2a.46 A more recent blockprint depiction is found in the 1918 edition of

---

44 JACKSON (1996b), p. 121.
45 Note, however, that Sa chen was not a direct disciple of rNgoṅ lo, though he apparently studied under the latter’s disciple Khyung Rin chen gras; see JACKSON (1985), p. 21. This thangka had already been described by TUCCI (1949), p. 333. More recently, it was reproduced as no. 61 in RHE & THURMAN (1992), p. 201. As I could personally convince myself during this painting’s exhibition in the Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Bonn, May 1996), the inscription identifying the monk as rNgoṅ lo erroneously reads sngog lo tsiṭba ba.
46 For a description of this illustration, see JACKSON (1993b), p. 27, n. 16.
rNgog lo’s Ratnagotravibhāga commentary (fol. 1b, right side, reproduced below). Finally, mention could be made of a 17th-century statue portraying rNgog lo, made of copper alloy with gilding and known to be kept in a Western collection.

---


48 The sculpture has been reproduced and described in DINWIDDIE (2003), pp. 304–307.
The following biographical sketch is far from detailed because the available information is so limited. The text under study in CHAPTER FIVE of the present book, rNgog lo’s biography by Gro lung pa, furnished surprisingly little data on rNgog lo’s life story, and therefore the following had to be based primarily on the shorter Tibetan accounts. For the general outline of my presentation, I have followed an arrangement that divides rNgog lo’s life into three main parts:

1. birth and youth in Tibet up to his participation in the religious council of Tho ling (1059–1076),
2. travels and studies abroad (1076–ca. 1092), and
3. final years and death in Tibet (ca. 1092–1109).

Many Tibetan sources state that three periods each lasted seventeen years (lo bcu bdun phrag gsum).1 R. Vitali has argued, however, that the division into three times seventeen years should not be taken too literally.2 Prior to that, L. van der Kuijp had also pointed out that, due to its symmetry, the “triad of seventeen year periods … may be a reason for being more circumspective,”3 referring to a passage found in a work of Kong sprul Blo gros mtha’ yas (1813–1899) that suggests that rNgog lo spent a total of twenty-five years abroad.4 But still, this assertion goes against the vast majority of other Tibetan historical works.

2.1 Birth and Youth in Tibet (1059–1076)

rNgog lo was born as the son of a certain Chos skyabs, who had taken a woman named dPal mo for his wife.5 The birth seems to have taken place in

---

1 See for instance BU STON, bDe bar gshegs…, p. 908.1 (= fol. 138b.1), or MANG THOS KLU gSGRUB RGYA MTSHO, bsTan rtsis…, pp. 112 and 115.
5 rNgog lo’s father’s name is unanimously attested to in many sources; see for instance YAR LUNG JO bo SHĀKYA RIN CHEN sDe, Yar lung…, p. 127, or LAS CHEN KUN dGa’
the female earth-pig year (*sa mo phag*) of 1059, although this is not sure.\(^6\)
The name the infant received at birth is not known, but it surely was not
Blo ldan shes rab, since rNgog lo was only given that name later when he was ordained. As it is not uncommon in Tibetan biographies, information on the mother (except for her name) is not given, so that we must direct our attention to the father, whose ancestry is relatively well known.

Chos skyabs was the fourth son of rNgog ston rDo rje gzhon nu, an adherent to the rNyin ma pa school, who lived in the village of sGog at the northern bank of the Yar ’brog lake, which is situated south-west of Lhasa in what is today the administrative district (sa khul) of lHo ka.7 rDo rje gzhon nu came from an uninterrupted line of followers of the Vajrakīla cult, who traced themselves back to a direct disciple of the Indian adept Padmasambhava (who visited Tibet in the 8th century).8 An early member of the rNgog clan had been a minister to the Tibetan king Khri Srong lde btsan (born in 742).9 His personal name has not been handed down, but he was known by the epithet “the Great rNgog” (rNgog chen po). This minister was apparently a loyal supporter of his king, since he once defended Khri Srong lde btsan’s life by killing some Chinese soldiers who assaulted him.10 The fact that he held the position of a minister at the royal court would allow us to assume that the rNgog family was of high rank, having probably obtained wealth and influence by that time. Besides Chos skyabs, rNgog lo’s grandfather rDo rje gzhon nu had four other sons.11 His eldest son was the

---

7 This information on rNgog lo’s grandfather is contained in many sources, but DPA’ BO GTSUG LAG PHRENG BA, Dam pa’i chos..., p. 724, seems to be the only account that specifies the village’s name.
8 Ibid.; according to VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 269, n. 77, nothing is said about the rNgog clan in the relevant historical sources concerning this cult. However, the name of the clan may already be found in the earliest sources on Tibetan history; see ibid., p. 269, n. 75.
9 ‘GOS LO TSÅ BA, Deb ther sugon po, pp. 391–392 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 324). As was already pointed out by VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 269, n. 75, DPA’ BO GTSUG LAG PHRENG BA, Dam pa’i chos..., p. 724, simply stated that this ancestor of rNgog lo had been a minister to a “former Tibetan king” (saṅgō bod rgyal po).
11 See for instance TSHAL PA KUN DGA’ RDO RJE, Deb ther dmar po..., p. 66, DPA’ BO GTSUG LAG PHRENG BA, Dam pa’i chos..., p. 724, or MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO, bsTan rtsis..., p. 111.
famous bKa’ gdams pa master rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab. The question whether he and the translator Lo chung Legs pa’i shes rab are one and the same historical person has always caused confusion. Given the fact that the latter accompanied Rin chen bzang po on his way to India in a group sent by lHa bla ma Ye shes ’od already in the late 10th century, it is rather unlikely that he was identical with rNgog lo’s uncle who founded the monastery of gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog more than eighty years later, in 1073. rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab is the “rNgog” referred to in the expression khu rngog ’brom gsum commonly found in Tibetan sources, which denotes the three main disciples of Atiśa Dipamkaraśrijñāna (ca. 982–1054). Legs pa’i

12 According to MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO, bsTan rtsis…, p. 111, rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab was an emanation of Mañjughoṣa. His life would surely deserve a separate examination, but unfortunately not too much has been handed down in the Tibetan sources. Some basic biographical information on him has been gathered by BLO BZANG TSHE RING (1984), pp. 158–159, RI ’BUR NGAG DBANG RGYA MTSHO (1987a), and DUNG DKAR BLO BZANG ’PHRIN LAS (2002), p. 768. See also ’GOS LO TSA BA, Deb ther sngon po, pp. 392–393 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], pp. 324–325), VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 30, and ONODA (1989), pp. 204–205. According to BRUG CHEN IV KUN MIHAYEN PADMA DKA R PO, Chos byung…, p. 378.2 (= fol. 189b.2), rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab was born in the village of sGog, a place already known to us as the residence of rNgog ston rDo rje gzhan pu; see VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 269, n. 76.

13 Lo chung Legs pa’i shes rab is known as a disciple of Lo chen Rin chen bzang po (958–1055) and received the title of a lo chung (i.e. “little translator”) to contrast him from the latter. See for instance MKHAS PA LDE’U, rGya bod…, p. 382, or ’GOS LO TSA BA, Deb ther sngon po, pp. 431–432 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], pp. 352–353).

14 Since MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO, bsTan rtsis…, p. 111, had already pointed out in the 16th century that those two are not one and the same person, it seems that there were early Tibetan historical works in which they were treated as one. Moreover, BLO BZANG TSHE RING (1984), p. 159, pointed out that Lo chung Legs pa’i shes rab was born in Pu rangs and went to India later, whereas rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab took birth in dBus gtsang and is not known to have visited India. The association of the former with Western Tibet is also confirmed by the fact that he was awarded land in Pu rangs by the royal house of Gu ge in gratitude for religious service; see VITALI (1996), p. 330, n. 522. BLA MA DAM PA BSOD NAMS RGYAL MTSHAN, rGyal rabs…, p. 245 (tr. SØRENSEN [1994], p. 459), referred to both masters as different individuals in the very same sentence thus making it clear that they were not identical. Note, however, that in ibid., pp. 243–244 (tr. SØRENSEN [1994], p. 455), it is stated that rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab accompanied Rin chen bzang po on his journey to India. The latter assumption appears to be a mistake. The idea of Lo chung Legs pa’i shes rab and rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab having been two different persons was already briefly touched upon by EIMER (1979), p. 403.

16 See for instance BU STON, bDe bar gshegs…, p. 906.3–4 (± fol. 137b.3–4; tr. OBERMILLER [1932], p. 214). Atiśa’s other two main disciples were Khu ston brTson grus g.yung drung (1011–1075) and ‘Brom ston rGyal ba’i byung gnas (1005–1064), the
shes rab exerted a great influence on his nephew rNgo lo during his childhood and youth. Virtually nothing is known about rDo jje gzhon nu’s second son, Klu khri, about Klu byang, the third son, or Thub pa, the fifth, beyond their names. One suspects that they, together with rNgo lo’s father, were more concerned with the family’s secular affairs than with spiritual ones.

The young rNgo lo must have grown up under favourable circumstances, for his paternal family was said to have been wealthy. The first seventeen years of his life (1059–1076), rNgo lo was apparently brought up by his uncle Legs pa’i shes rab, who also accepted the responsibility for his nephew’s education. Already in these early years rNgo lo is said to have possessed a marvellous compassion, and due to his diligence and superior intelligence he quickly learnt reading, writing, and different kinds of languages (skad rigs).

latter—who was actually Atiśa’s foremost disciple—is generally regarded as the founder of the bKa’ gams pa school.

17 As for other members of the rNgo lo clan (for whom see for instance the index of Roerich [1949/53], p. 1167, where some are listed), I have not been able so far to establish to what degree rNgo lo was related to a certain rNgo Chos kyi/sku rdo rje (1036–1102), who is known as one of the four main disciples (the so-called “four great pillars” [ka chen bzhi]) of Mar pa lo tsā ba Chos kyi blo gros (1012–1097), thus representing a somewhat different religious orientation within the clan, namely that of the bKa’ brgyud pas. Could he have been a distant cousin of rNgo lo’s father? Some information on him is contained in ’Gos lo tsā ba, Deb ther sngon po, pp. 488–493 (tr. Roerich [1949/53], pp. 403–407). For a more recently compiled biographical sketch, see Don Rdor & Bstan ‘dzin Chos Grags (1993), pp. 188–189. It is worthwhile noting that Sde srid Sangs Rgyas Rgya mtsho, Bstan bcos bai du nya dkar po... gya’ sel... p. 953.3 (= fol. 410b.3), mentioned a “paternal grandfather” (mes po) Chos sku rdo rje, who seems to have made a prophecy in connection with rNgo lo’s birth. However, he might simply have been a namesake.

18 Gro lung pa, ’Jig rten mig gcig..., fol. 16b.3: ’byor pa chen po mnga’ ba’i gdung rgyud. See also Jackson (1994a), p. 377.

19 The majority of all sources agree about this; see for instance Stag Tshang Rdzong Pa Dpal ’bo’i Btor byang po, Rgya bsdug yid tshang chen mo, p. 482, or ’Bru gchen IV Kun mkhyen pad ma dkar po, Chos byung..., p. 378.6 (= fol. 189b.6). However, Tshal Pa Kun dga’ rdo rje, Deb ther dmar po..., p. 67, mentioned the period rNgo lo stayed with his uncle as only seven years, probably a misprint in the Chinese edition available to me. Nevertheless, it would also be perfectly understandable if rNgo lo had lived with his parents until he was ten, and if he only stayed with his uncle seven years thereafter. According to Dpa’ bo gTsug lag Phreng Ba, Dam pa’i chos..., p. 724, rNgo lo had to be fostered by his uncle because of some difficulties in his early youth (sku chung ngu’i dus’ a brgyal bar byung bas). Possibly his father died.

20 ’Tshal Pa Kun dga’ rdo rje, Deb ther dmar po..., p. 67.
shes rab from Ka chu also acted as one of his early teachers, although it seems that Legs pa’i shes rab was his main teacher who introduced him to religious practice and monastic discipline (vinaya).

In 1073 Legs pa’i shes rab, in accordance to a prophecy by his master Atiśa, founded the monastery of gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog, an event of some importance for rNgog lo since he would later make this monastery his main seat and follow his uncle as its abbot. Three years later, in 1076, rNgog lo experienced two exciting events. First of all, he was ordained in the presence of his uncle, and on that occasion he received the name Blo ldan shes rab. Secondly, in the very same year rNgog lo participated in the fa-

---

21 Ibid.; ’Gos Lo Tsā Ba, Deb ther sugon po, p. 393 (tr. Roerich [1949/53], p. 325).
22 Gro Lung pa, ’Jig rten mig gcig…, fols. 5a–6a, mentioned at some length that rNgog lo learnt the excellent ascetic restraint (vrata) from his uncle, who himself “spread the aromatic smell of the excellent incense of moral conduct, since [he] had intensively studied the vows of full ordination, the pure (i.e. celibate) conduct (brahmacarya)” (fol. 5a.5: tshangs par snyed pa dge dlo rgyal po la ring du sbyangs pas tshul khrims kyi sogs bzang po i dri nga’i ldang ba).
23 Thu’u bkwan blo bzang chos kyi ngyi ma, Thu’u bkwan grub mthu’, p. 92.
24 On gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog and its line of abbatial succession (gdan rabs), see Van der Kuijp (1987), Onoda (1989) and (1990), and K.-H. Everding’s contribution to the proceedings of the 8th seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies (Bloomington, 1998), still unpublished and unavailable at the time of writing. A short history of the monastery is provided by Ye Shes dbang phyug (1987). Ferrari (1958), pp. 30, 72, 165, and 166, presented the eyewitness account of Jam dbyangs mKhyen brtse’i dbang po (1820–1892), who visited the site in the second half of the 19th century and stated that it had no monastic community, but was a village of laymen (grong nag) by that time. However, as I was informed by Prof. David Jackson, there was a tradition among dGe lugs pa monks of going to debate at gSang phu for a few months of the year. Presumably mKhyen brtse’i dbang po visited gSang phu at a time when the monks were not in residence. According to Van der Kuijp (1987), p. 103, this monastery was partly restored with the financial support of the thirteenth Dalai Lama Thub bstan rgya mtsho (1876–1933), beginning in 1915. However, later (in 1918), Kah thog si tu Chos kyi rgya mtsho (1880–1925) described it as still being somewhat ruined; see ibid., pp. 103–104. Chan (1994), p. 490, gave a recent description of the monastery’s main building. For its geographical location, see ibid., p. 489, and Dorje (1996), p. 219.
25 1073 A.D. (chu mo glang, i.e. “female water-ox”) seems to be the year commonly accepted in the Tibetan sources; see for instance ’Gos Lo Tsā Ba, Deb ther sugon po, p. 392 (tr. Roerich [1949/53], p. 325), Pan chen bsod nams grags pa, bkag gdams…, p. 11.1, or DPa’ Bo gTsug lag phreng ba, Dam pa’i chos…, p. 724. However, according to Van der Kuijp (1987), p. 106, some sources have 1059 or 1071. See also Onoda (1989), p. 205.
26 Gser mdog pan chen skYā ma chog ldan, rNgog lo…, p. 446.1.
27 DPa’ Bo gTsug lag phreng ba, Dam pa’i chos…, p. 725. In ibid. it is also specified
nous religious council (chos 'khor) at Tho ling, the royal temple of the kingdom of Gu ge and biggest monastic complex in Western Tibet. There, at only seventeen years of age, he found himself among the most learned masters and translators from different parts of Tibet (dBus, gTsang, and Khams) and from abroad (India and Kashmir). These scholars had been summoned by rTse lde, the king of Gu ge, and apparently also by the king’s uncle, the famous translator Zhi ba ’od, for revising old Tibetan translations of Indian Buddhist scriptures and translating new texts. For certain reasons, i.e. unsatisfactory translations, this aim was not achieved to the assembly’s (or King rTse lde’s) content, and it was decided to send a group of translators abroad, enabling them in this way to study thoroughly Sanskrit and the relevant doctrines with the greatest savants of India and Kashmir. rNgog lo was among that group of young men, although it seems that he had some difficulties in securing funds for his journey. King rTse lde refused that later in his life rNgog lo used the pseudonym Blo ldan bzang po, since blo ldan and shes rab both refer to a superior intellectual ability. See also VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 31, and KAWAGOE (1984), p. 1006 [= p. (118)], n. 2. The only occurrence of this pseudonym within rNgog lo’s translations is in his translation colophon (byang bsgyur) to the Pramāṇavārttika (P 5709) of Dharmakīrti, which is to a great extent identical to the translation colophon to Prajñākaragupta’s Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra (P 5719); see below, pp. 61–66 (nos. 42 and 45).


29 ’GOS LO TSĀ BA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 393 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 325). The participation of Indian and Kashmiri masters is attested to in Gu ge mkhan chen Ngag dbang grags pa’s mNga’ ri sngal rabs as found in VITALI (1996), p. 67 (Tibetan text) and p. 120 (translation). See also ibid., p. 319.

30 The involvement of Zhi ba ’od is confirmed in rNgog lo’s translation colophon to Prajñākaragupta’s Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra (P 5719, vol. 132, theb, fol. 343a.8–343b.1); see below, pp. 63–66 (no. 45).
to support his wish to study in Kashmir, since the masters then present at Tho ling could also serve as his teachers. Fortunately, dBang lde (also known as dBang phyug lde or ‘Bar lde), who later succeeded rTse lde on the Gu ge throne, agreed to support him, so that rNgog lo could proceed south in 1076.

2.2 Travels and Studies Abroad (1076–ca. 1092)

In contrast to the first seventeen years of rNgog lo’s life, not much can be said about the following years up to 1092 when he travelled and studied abroad. The exact course of his travels remains unknown, but it is possible to establish at least a rough outline of his itinerary.

rNgog lo left Tibet for Kashmir seemingly in the company of five other translators: Rwa lo tsā ba rDo rje grags pa, gNyan lo tsā ba Dar ma grags, Khyung po Chos kyi brtson’ grus, rDo ston, and bTsan Kha bo che. Trav-

51 That is how two of the earliest sources present it: lDE’U JO SRAS, Chos’byung…., p. 148, and MKHAS PA lDE’U, rGya bod…., pp. 382–38; see VITALI (1996), pp. 340–341, n. 538. According to sDE SRID SANGS RGYAS RGYA MTSHO, bsTan boś bai du yda dbkar po…g.ya’ sel…, p. 953.5 (= fol. 410b.5), it seems as if rTse lde did send rNgog lo abroad to translate the Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra; see VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 271, n. 89.

52 dBang lde’s readiness to support rNgog lo is attested to in many sources; see for instance BU STON, bDe bar ghegs…., pp. 907.7–908.1 (= fol. 138a.7–138b.1); tr. OBERMILLER [1932], p. 216 [Obermiller’s translation is incorrect in this passage]). However, according to VITALI (1996), p. 340, dBang lde “was far too young to sponsor rNgog lo, tsa.ba personally at the end of the Tho. ling chos’khor.” Moreover, there remains the question of why rNgog lo could not be supported by his own (wealthy?) family. See also ibid., p. 337, n. 532.

53 According to TSHAL PA KUN dGA ‘RDO RJE, Deb ther dmar po, p. 67, rNgog lo visited Nepal, Magadha, and Kashmir (bal po dang| rgya gar dbus phyogs dang| kha che’ yul du byon ar). If this also corresponds with the sequence of his travels, rNgog lo visited Nepal and Magadha before arriving in Kashmir. However, as his destination was Kashmir there obviously would not have been the need to travel via the countries of the south, when in fact the shortest way lay to the north-west. Thus, to my mind, rNgog lo headed directly for Kashmir, since—as we will see below—other sources relate that he visited Nepal only later in his life. Besides Kashmir and Nepal, GRO LUNG PA, Fg i rten mig ge’ig…., fol. 16b.3, also mentioned Zhang zhung as a place where rNgog lo lived before returning to Tibet. See also JACKSON (1994a), p. 377. Zhang zhung, formerly an independent kingdom destroyed around the 7th or 8th century during the expansion of the Tibetan empire, is generally accepted to have been situated somewhere in Western Tibet; see EVERDING (2000), pp. 260–263. It is interesting that this old name was still in use in the early 12th century, apparently referring to the region of mNga’ ris, including the kingdom of Gu ge.

54 ‘GOS LO TSĀ BA, Deb ther sugon po, p. 393 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 325). According to MANG THOS KLU SGRUB RGYA MTSHO, bsTan rtins…., p. 113, only bTsan Kha bo
elling in a group of six would have been more secure in those days than travelling alone, but whether they reached Kashmir as one party is unknown.

After arriving, rNgog lo took up his studies with a number of renowned masters and seems to have quickly become proficient in the art of translation.35 During most of his time in Kashmir he probably resided in the town of Anupamapura, which appears to be modern-day Srinagar.36 At that place rNgog lo executed a considerable number of translations.37

Among rNgog lo’s many teachers in Kashmir, Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po) played the most eminent role.38 rNgog lo studied the Pramāṇavārttikālāṃkāra of Prajñākaragupta under him,39 although Bhavyarāja is believed not to have been a Buddhist himself.40 Their fruitful collaboration resulted in several translations or revisions of Pramāṇa texts, among them their revision of Subhūtiśrīśānti’s and rMa dGe ba’i blo gros’s translation of Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttika (P 5709) and their translation of Prajñākaragupta’s Pramāṇavārttikālāṃkāra (P 5719).41

Another teacher for Buddhist logic and epistemology was Parahitabhadra (gZhan la phan pa bzang po),42 with whom rNgog lo translated the Pramāṇavinicāya (P 5710) and Nyāyabindu (P 5711) of Dharmakīrti as well as Dharmottara’s commentary on the former, the Pramāṇavinicāyatīkā (P...
Consequently, it was Parahitabhadra who passed the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* lineage down to rNgog lo, who, moreover, also apparently received the reading transmission (*lung*) of the *Pramāṇavārttika* from him.\(^{43}\) It is noteworthy that the same pair, together with a certain Sajjana,\(^{44}\) also revised the Tibetan translation of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (P 5521 = D 4020) of Maitreya[nātha].\(^{45}\)

Sajjana, still another teacher of rNgog lo, is particularly known for passing the *Ratnagotravibhāga* lineage down to rNgog lo,\(^{46}\) probably while they prepared a translation of this text (P 5525). It is interesting to note that one source relates that rNgog lo studied under Sajjana only after he had first left Kashmir for India and then returned back later.\(^{47}\)

Finally, mention is to be made of Tilakakalaśa (Thig le bum pa),\(^{48}\) yet another important collaborator and teacher of rNgog lo during his stay in Kashmir. With him he mainly collaborated on the translation or revision of several Madhyamaka texts on Bodhisattva practice, such as the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (P 5335/6) of Śāntideva.\(^{49}\) Apart from his translations, rNgog lo also wrote many commentaries. Whether he composed them in Kashmir or after his return to Tibet is not known, but since he wrote them particularly on those works which he translated, one may surmise that some were composed while he was engaged in the translation work.

During rNgog lo’s time of intensive study under his Kashmiri teachers, he faced hardships when his supplies became exhausted. Therefore he sent a letter to dBang lde in Tibet, who had already acted as his sponsor prior to his travelling abroad. This letter was an “appeal for gold” (*gers lsong*) for sup-

---


\(^{45}\) This information is only contained in the colophon of the *bsTan ’gyur*; see below, pp. 60–61 (no. 38).


\(^{47}\) *sDe srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho, bsTan bcos bai dū rya dkar po...gya’ sel...*, p. 954.3 (= fol. 411a.3). The same passage contains the information that rNgog lo also studied with a certain Go mi’ chi med after he had returned to Kashmir. This appears to be wrong, since—as we will see shortly—the latter most probably lived in Magadha. Therefore I have some doubts about the reliability of this account.

\(^{48}\) On Tilakakalaśa, see NAUDOU (1968), pp. 185–187.

\(^{49}\) Other Kashmiri teachers or collaborators of rNgog lo included Mahājana, Manoratha, and Vināyaka. On their collaboration, see APPENDIX TWO.
porting his livelihood in Kashmir.\textsuperscript{50} dBang lde fortunately agreed to act as rNgog lo’s patron once again and sent him gold. How long rNgog lo actually stayed in Kashmir is untold, but he did not return directly home from there after concluding his studies. Instead he proceeded further south and arrived in Magadha (in the north-east of India) after an arduous journey.\textsuperscript{51} In Magadha rNgog lo studied the \textit{Abhisamayālāṃkāra} under Go mi ‘chi med,\textsuperscript{52} and both are known for their translation of this text (P 5184), which came to be regarded as the standard Tibetan translation of this work.

Another important master at that time was a certain ‘Bum phrag gsum pa, also known as brTan skyong (Sthirapāla), who also taught the \textit{Pratīṣṭhāna-viniścayā} to rNgog lo.\textsuperscript{53} He became still better known as rNgog lo’s teacher of Prajñāpāramitā philosophy who passed the \textit{Abhisamayālāṃkāra} lineage down to him.\textsuperscript{54} rNgog lo, before returning home, invited this ’Bum phrag gsum pa to Tibet,\textsuperscript{55} where they continued their collaboration.\textsuperscript{56}

Besides his studies in these regions of India, rNgog lo also fulfilled what must have been a long-standing wish, namely to visit and worship the great Mahābodhi temple in Bodhgayā and probably other Buddhist sites.\textsuperscript{57} Then he headed north again and arrived in Nepal, the last stop of his long journey.\textsuperscript{58} In Nepal, rNgog lo worked with Varendraruci, Nyayanaśrī, and Sau-
dita, while he was staying (at least for some time) in a capital of this land. He also worshipped the great stūpas in places such as Bodhnāth and Svayambhūnāth, before he finally returned home in about 1092.

### 2.3 Final Years and Death in Tibet (ca. 1092–1109)

Not much is known about the final period of rNgog lo’s life. The available sources do indicate that after he returned to mNga’ ris in Western Tibet, rNgog lo apparently found dBang lde, his former sponsor, on the throne in Gu ge. dBang lde renewed his support, thus enabling rNgog lo to continue his translation work. The Indian master Sumatikīrti seems to have been one of his main collaborators at that time. They are particularly known for their important revision of Prajñākaragupta’s *Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra* (P 5719), but they also translated a number of works of Vajrayāna origin. Whether or not they stayed in Tho ling when they prepared their translations is not known, but since rNgog lo appears to have been supported by the king of Gu ge, it seems only natural that he would have lived and worked in this area at least for some time. Probably later in life rNgog lo returned to Central Tibet, for one translation in collaboration with Sumatikīrti was executed at sNye thang, south-west of Lhasa. I suspect that this took place after rNgog lo had succeeded his uncle Legs pa’i shes rab as abbot of gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog monastery, since sNye thang and gSang phu are

proceeding to Nepal. From there he returned to Tibet again. This could have been his route if he did not visit Magadha. But since he seems to have done so, it appears much more likely that he visited Nepal, which he could hardly avoid passing through, while travelling home from Magadha. On the other hand, it may have been easier (if what was true in later times applies here) to travel from Kashmir through Western Tibet to Nepal, and from there to Magadha, especially for a Tibetan. But there is no way to know for sure.

59 The translation colophon of Samantabhadra’s *Caturangasādhanaṭīkāsāramañjarī* informs us that Nyayanaśrī and rNgog lo translated this text in a (or: the?) capital of Nepal (*bal yul mthil du bsgyur ba’o* (P 2732, vol. 65, ti, fol. 330a.6)); see below, p. 56 (no. 16). The city implied here presumably was Patan; see VERHAGEN (1994), p. 98.

60 GRO LUNG PA, ‘Jig rten mig gcig…, fol. 10a.3.

61 MNGA’ BDAG NYANG RAL NYI MA ’OD ZER, *Chos ’byung me tog…, fol. 511b.3–4 (= plate 342c).

62 ‘GOS LO TSĀ BA, *Deb ther sngon po*, p. 393 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 325).

63 See the translation colophon of Yamāri’s *Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāratā Suparissuddhi* (P 5723, vol. 136, *tse*, fol. 321a.3), where it is specified that this text had been translated in the temple sNye thang Brag sna bimals shis. sNye thang, a bKa’ gdams pa monastery founded by Bang ston in 1055, is the place where Atiśa died in 1054. On this location, see FERRARI (1958), p. 72, and p. 165, n. 668.
closely located almost opposite each other on different sides of the sKyid chu river, in what is today the county of Chu shul, in the district of Lhasa town (lha sa grung khyer). Besides his work with Sumatikīrti, rNgog lo also continued to collaborate with 'Bum phrag gsum pa, who must have arrived in Tibet by that time.64 Both apparently founded a scriptural seminary (bshad grwa) at Zhwa lu, which is said to have been especially set up for the study of Asaṅga’s Abhidharmasamuccaya (P 5550).65

rNgog lo acted as a teacher of numerous disciples in various regions of Tibet. Already in 1093, shortly after his return, he appears to have taught Buddhist texts to more than 23,000 students,66 a number later surpassed by the thousands of followers he attracted in Lhasa, bSam yas, and other places.67 Among his many students the “four main [spiritual] sons” (sras kyi thu bo bzhi) deserve special mention: Zhang Tshe spong ba Chos kyi bla ma (who succeeded him on the abbatial throne of gSang phu),68 Gro lung pa Blo gros ‘byung gnas,69 Khyung Rin chen grags, and ‘Bre Shes rab ‘bar.70 rNgog lo passed away in 1109,71 after having enjoyed a full life dedicated to

64 Whether ‘Bum phrag gsum pa accompanied rNgog lo to Tibet at his invitation is unknown.


66 ‘GOS LO TSĀ BA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 100 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 73). This passage specifies the date as the 40th year after the death of Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (ca. 982–1054).

67 ‘GOS LO TSĀ BA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 100 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 73). This passage specifies the date as the 40th year after the death of Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (ca. 982–1054).


69 Judging from the fact that Gro lung pa wrote rNgog lo’s biography, it appears as if he was rNgog lo’s foremost disciple. For more information on Gro lung pa, see below, pp. 71–72.

70 TSHAL PA KUN DGA’ RDO RJE, Deb ther dmars po..., p. 67. Another important student mentioned in ibid. is Gangs pa she’u Blo gros byang chub. Further names of students are listed by dKON MCHOG LHUN GRUB, Dam pa’i chos kyi byung zhul..., pp. 266.7–267.1: Gong bu rwa can, Sham po me dig, Me lhag tsher, dMar rgas la, rDog skya bo, and Kre bo mChog gi bla ma. The same list occurs in LAS CHEN KUN DGA’ RGYAL MTSHAN, bk’a’ gdama’, vol. 1, pp. 225.1–2, with the following name variants: Gong bu ra can, dMar sgs lag, rDog skya’o, and Tre bo mChog gi bla ma. See also ‘GOS LO TSĀ BA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 395 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 326). None of these individuals could be identified. Nel pa pandi ta, in his chronicle Me tog phreng ba, is unique in mentioning a certain lHa rje dags po (sic) as one of rNgog lo’s students; see UEBACH (1988), pp. 146–147. It seems unlikely that this was the famous sGam po pa Dwags po lha rje bSod nams rin chen (1079–1153).

71 For other dates found in Tibetan sources, see VOSTRIKOV (1970), pp. 39–40, n. 98.
the propagation of the Buddhist doctrine. He died while travelling on a road near bSam yas\textsuperscript{72} (apparently in a place called Ma ri)\textsuperscript{73}, in what is today the county of Gra nang, south-east of Lhasa. His tomb seems to have been erected in gSang mda’ (near gSang phu), where some ruins are apparently still to be found.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72} 'GOS LO TSÅ BA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 394 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 326).

\textsuperscript{73} GRO LUNG PA (in fact possibly Shes rab seng ge in his concluding addendum), ‘Jig rten mig gcig…, fol. 22a.6.

\textsuperscript{74} CHAN (1994), p. 490. According to VAN DER KUIJP (1987), p. 108, “a reliable report has it that Gsang mda’ was reduced to broken stones during the ‘cultural revolution.’” Hugh Richardson, in FERRARI (1958), p. 166, n. 678, described the tomb as “a small neglected building with a green-tiled roof on the left bank of the skyid c’u, on the main road down that side of the river.” For a photograph, see ibid., no. 51 (also reproduced in SNELLGROVE & RICHARDSON [1995], p. 39). More than three centuries after rNgog lo’s passing the otherwise little known gSang mda’ was to be the birthplace of the famous Sa skya pa master gSer mdog pañ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507); see VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 10.
CHAPTER THREE

As well as for being a commentator and teacher of high rank, rNgog lo was particularly known for his untiring activities as a translator of Buddhist scriptures. Before taking a closer look at his translation work, let us briefly consider why translators played such an eminent role at the dawn of Tibetan scholastic history as rNgog lo did.

3.1 Tibetan Translators: Some General Remarks

The history of Buddhism’s geographical expansion beyond the Indian subcontinent is to a great extent characterized by dedicated translation activities in the various communities concerned. When Buddhism spread from India to the north-west, reaching Central Asia, the first translations into local languages were begun to be made. The first Tibetan translations of Buddhist texts were executed in the 8th and 9th centuries, during the period that was called retrospectively the “Early Propagation” (s nga dar) of Buddhism.¹ It remains uncertain whether translation activities had already commenced as early as the 7th century, at the time of Śrong btsan sgam po (reigned until ca. 641).² If it is correct that he was the first Buddhist king of Tibet as the later Tibetan tradition affirms, there is reason to assume that the first translations were commissioned during his reign.

Thon mi Saṃbho ṭa, minister to the king, and known from later Tibetan accounts as the inventor of the Tibetan script, is said to have translated more than twenty works, for example the Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra (P 784).³ It is impossible to identify any of Thon mi’s translations through translation colophons in the Tibetan canon today, which is of no surprise as any 7th-century translation must have been of insufficient quality considering that the written target language was still in its infancy.⁴ Nevertheless, during those years of

¹ A list of 23 Indian paṇḍita s and 56 Tibetan translators active in Tibet during the s nga dar period, extracted from Si tu pa chen Chos kyi ʿbyung gnas’s sDe dge’i bka’ ʿgyur dkar chag, has been conveniently reproduced by VERHAGEN (2004), pp. 226, 229–231.
² All regnal dates mentioned in the following have been taken from BECKWITH (1987), pp. 227–229.
³ See e.g. BLA MA DAM PA BSOD NAMS RGYAL MTSHAN, rGyal rabs…, p. 70 (tr. SORENSEN [1994], p. 173). SKILLING (1997), pp. 87–89, provides a detailed examination of Thon mi’s translation work.
⁴ According to KAPSTEIN (2003), p. 754, n. 17, any translation activities at that time are unlikely to have gone beyond the level of “experiments.”
growing Tibetan literacy translators began to play a crucial role within the transmission of Indian Buddhist thought to Tibet, taking an exalted position in Tibetan society that they would keep for centuries. One striking aspect of the Tibetan translators’ method is that they produced most of their major translations not alone, but rather in close collaboration with Indian, Kashmiri, or Nepalese panditas. This unsurprisingly also holds true for rNgog lo and his translations. He might have translated some shorter works on his own, but the translations of the longer, more complicated ones were collective tasks, involving at least one “foreign colleague.” In some cases, such as the Pramāṇyparīkṣā I and II (P 5746 and P 5747), where rNgog lo is the only translator mentioned in the colophons, one may suspect that he was nevertheless assisted by one of his pandita informants known from other colophons. In the particular case of these works, the help of Bhavyarāja or Manoratha was suggested. It remains an interesting question as to what the lingua franca between these Tibetan and Indian collaborators was. As several Tibetan translators are known to have studied in the countries of the south (rNgog lo being just one prominent example), there seems enough reason to assume that they may have adopted some Indian language as their working language, even when working with Indians in Tibet after their return.5

5 See DAVIDSON (2005), who in his fourth chapter (“Translators as the New Aristocracy”) described the translators of the 10th and 11th centuries as “the stars of the evolving culture of Central Tibet” (p. 159). About a thousand years after the Tibetans began to compose translations on a grand scale, the last great translation project involving Tibetan translators, the rendering of the Tibetan bsTan `gyur into Mongolian overseen by lCang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje (1717–1786), was completed. On this translation project and the Tibetan-Mongolian lexicon compiled for its purpose, see SEYFORT RUEGG (1974).

6 Interestingly, this pandita-lo tsā ba model led SEYFORT RUEGG (1992a), p. 377, to point out the necessity of Tibetologists collaborating with Tibetan scholars as representatives of the living scholarly traditions of Tibet, although unfortunately this model “has yet to be reflected in the academic structure of universities”. Fifteen years on, the situation at European universities remains almost unchanged.


8 See VERHAGEN (1994), pp. 47–48. Verhagen also pointed out that while many Tibetan scholars are likely to have possessed knowledge of Indic languages, the opposite was also true for at least some Indians, who “mastered Tibetan sufficiently to be able to communicate in Tibetan” (ibid., p. 47, n. 4), occasionally even producing original works in that language (e.g. the 10th-century scholar Smṛtijnānakirti). The establishment of “translation teams” is by no means a Tibetan invention. It is well-known from China, where from the 2nd century onward foreign masters collaborated with Chinese translators in translating Buddhist scriptures, since the knowledge of Sanskrit and Prakrit was scarce among the Chinese; see ZÜRCHER (1984), p. 197.
Concerning the fruit of the translators’ efforts, the Tibetan rendering of a foreign (usually Indian) Buddhist text, it has been suggested that the Tibetan translations are based on highly technical principles of rendering Sanskrit (and occasionally Middle Indo-Aryan and Chinese) into Tibetan. Indeed, early in the 9th century the Tibetans did develop special translation aids for a highly systematic approach to translation. Above all, there was the distinctive language used for religious (i.e. Buddhist) matters, the so-called “Dharma language” (chos skad), which survives up to the present day in the language of Buddhist treatises, but has also found its way into non-religious documents and even the colloquial language.9

However, despite these highly technical principles, D. Seyfort Ruegg was able to demonstrate in a comparison of two Tibetan translations of the same Sanskrit original that Tibetan canonical translations were not always as mechanical as is sometimes thought.10 The work he compared is the Prajñāpāramitāstotra attributed to Nāgārjuna (in fact by Rāhulabhadra), different translations of which are found in the Phu brag/sPu brag bKa’ ‘gyur and Peking bsTan ‘gyur. The first translation was executed by Śāntibhadra and Tshul khrims rgyal ba (born 1011), and the second (P 2018) by Tilakakalaśa and rNgog lo. The comparison revealed considerable differences in the rendering of Sanskrit expressions, caused by stylistic, terminological, and interpretational alterations in the two Tibetan versions.11

The religious language resulted from certain principles of translation expressed in a bilingual (later multilingual) glossary, which was an indispensable lexicographical tool for translation work: the Mahāvyutpatti (Bye brug tu rtogs par byed pa chen po, P 5832),13 a “remarkable attempt at literary stan-

---

9 Seyfort Ruegg (1992a), pp. 382–383.
11 See also Franco (1997) on the different translations of the Pramāṇavārttika.
12 It is beyond the scope of this brief introduction to delve deeper into the indigenous Tibetan science of lexicography (mgon brjod, abhidhāna), one of the “five minor sciences” (rig gnas chung ba luga), and as such considered as one of the four branches of the major science of grammar (sgra rig pa, śabdavidyā); see Seyfort Ruegg (1995), p. 107. Studies on Tibetan lexicography include Wilhelm (1962), Simon (1964), Goldstein (1991), and Seyfort Ruegg (1996) and (1998).
13 The Mahāvyutpatti’s importance had already been noticed by Körösi Csoma Sándor (a.k.a. Alexander Csoma de Kóros, 1784–1842), the great Hungarian pioneer of Tibetology. His translation was published posthumously by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Calcutta) in 1910, 1916, and 1944, and reprinted in Budapest later; see Csoma (1984). Csoma’s work remains the only attempt at translating the Mahāvyutpatti into English, but it is of very little use today since many of his English renderings are incorrect. For bibliographical information on the modern edition of the Mahāvyutpatti (with
dardization”¹⁴ in the form of a glossary of Sanskrit terms with Tibetan equivalents, which enabled a translator “to render the terminology of his text in as exact, regular and unarbitrary a fashion as is humanly possible.”¹⁵ Another important work among the tools of a serious translator, although of a different nature than the Mahāvyutpatti, is the Madhyayutpatti (Bye brag tu riogs par byed pa ’bring po), more commonly known as sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa (P 5833).¹⁶ It is a manual for translators that, in its first part, sets forth the principles of translating Indian Buddhist texts, before then providing explanations of selected entries from the Mahāvyutpatti. Both works were compiled by a group of Indian and Tibetan scholars¹⁷ acting under the order of king Khri lDe srong btsan Sad na legs (reigned ca. 799–815).¹⁸ Presumably in 814,¹⁹ the final versions were promulgated by royal decree (bkas bcad) and

---

¹⁴ HARRISON (1996), p. 73.  
¹⁷ The sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa (ISHIKAWA [1990], p. 1) provides a list of these men: Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, Śī lendrabodhi, Dānaśīla, and Bodhimitra (Indians); Ratna-rakṣita, Dharmatāśīla, Jñānasena, Jayarakṣ ita, Mañjuśrīvarman, and Ratnendraśīla (Tibetans). See also SIMONSSON (1957), pp. 212–213. Following D AVIDSON (2005), p. 385, n. 9, who suggested that the “[language] reforms took time to implement”, it seems quite plausible to assume that the process began during Sad na legs’s reign and ended in Ral pa can’s.  
¹⁸ The Tibetan tradition commonly (and wrongly) places the composition of the Mahāvyutpatti and the sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa into the reign of Khri gTsug lde btsanRal pa can (ca. 815–838), not Khri lDe srong btsan Sad na legs; see e.g. BLA MA DAM PA BSod nams rGyal mtshan, rGyal rabs…., p. 227 (tr. SORENSEN [1994], p. 412). As was demonstrated by Tucci (1950), pp. 14–15, this was due to the fact that both kings were wrongly identified as one and the same individual. See also SIMONSSON (1957), pp. 212–213. Following DAVIDSON (2005), p. 385, n. 9, who suggested that the “[language] reforms took time to implement”, it seems quite plausible to assume that the process began during Sad na legs’s reign and ended in Ral pa can’s.
set as the normative standard, binding on all future translations in the new
language.\textsuperscript{20} In the following years of Khri gTsug lde btsan RaI pa can’s reign
(ca. 815–838), new translations were made under royal sponsorship on
the basis of the officially proclaimed standard,\textsuperscript{21} and most of the previous trans-
lations were gradually revised accordingly during the period that is known as
the “Great Revision.”\textsuperscript{22}

Along with the increasing translation activities of the late 8th and early
9th centuries came the compilation of several catalogues (dkar chag) listing
the corpus of translated works. These catalogues represent the first instances
of a codification of Buddhist literature in Tibet, which eventually led to the
major codification and cataloguing efforts of the early 14th century, culmi-
nating in the compilation of the first bKa’ gyur canonical collection at sNar
thang.\textsuperscript{23} From among these early catalogues, the one known as lHhan (dkar

\textsuperscript{20} SEYFORT RUEGG (1998), pp. 120–122. See especially ibid., p. 121, n. 13, for a thor-
ough examination of the expression skad gsar bcad/chad (paraphrased as “the official and
royally decreed instruction instituting the new language”), known from many colophons
of canonical translations. This expression had already been studied in some detail by
280–281 and 310–311.

\textsuperscript{21} See SKILLING (1997), p. 90, n. 29, for references to “non-standard” translations
preserved in manuscripts from Tun-huang and in the bKa’ gyur.

\textsuperscript{22} It should be noted that this 9th-century language reform was mainly about establishing
rules for the method of translation by modifying the syntax and lexicon of the lan-
guage. The sGra sbyor bam po guyis pa is concerned with grammatical analysis and ety-
mology alone and does not prescribe any orthographical changes, for example the abol-
ishment of the da drag (d in final position as second consonant) or the reversed gi gu (i
graph), two features well attested in numerous Tun-huang manuscripts from later times
(e.g. 10th century). See especially SIMONSSON (1957), pp. 225–226, who concluded:
“Die grosse Revision kann also keine wesentlichere orthographische Reform, sei sie auch
nur von kurzer Dauer gewesen, bedeutet haben” (p. 226).

\textsuperscript{23} See SKILLING (1997), pp. 99–100, for information on the cataloguing and classifica-
tion of translated texts during the 13th and 14th centuries.
ma survives in its canonical version in the bsTan 'gyur (P 5851). There is no consensus as for its date of composition, but strong evidence has been presented in support of either the year 800 or 812. This catalogue, compiled by the well-known translator (s)Ka ba dPal brtsegs and others, lists 736 titles, all but eight of which are translations from Sanskrit, the remainder having been translated from Chinese. Two further catalogues that cannot be dated precisely at present are known, of which only the Phang thang ma is available, while the mChims phu ma is not. Two of these catalogues (i.e. the lHhan (d)kar ma and the Phang thang ma) were named after royal palaces (pho brang), and it remains an open question as to whether they represent inventories of texts kept at these locations, or whether they were named after the places where the translation work was actually carried out.

After the collapse of the Tibetan Empire from 842 onwards, accompanied by political fragmentation with severe religious and social instability, the “Later Propagation” (phyi dar) of Buddhism began in about the late 10th century. This second diffusion was again based upon the work of translators,

---

24 The alternative spelling of the name with “lDan” for “lHan” seems to be a later development as the form lHan (d)kar ma is attested in manuscripts from Tun-huang; see Lalou (1953), pp. 315–316, and Steinkellner & Much (1995), p. xvii.
25 Three modern editions of the lHan (d)kar catalogue are available: Yoshimura (1950), Lalou (1953), and Rabsal (1996). See also Herrmann-Pfandt (2002) for a recent study.
26 See most importantly Frauwallner (1957), pp. 102–203, and Tucci (1958), pp. 46–48, who both identified the dragon year mentioned in the colophon of the lHan (d)kar catalogue as either 800 or 812, where the earlier date was considered the most likely one by Frauwallner. Yoshimura (1950) had argued for the dragon year of 824, a view reiterated much later by Yamaguchi (1985) and also supported by Steinkellner & Much (1995), p. xvii.
28 A modern edition was recently published by the Bod ljongs rt’en rdzas bshams mdzod khang, ed. (2003), pp. 1–67.
29 According to Dr Peter Skilling (personal communication in Oxford, 2004), a preliminary comparison of the lHan (d)kar ma and the Phang thang ma has shown that the latter lists fewer completed translations than the former, which could be seen as an indication for the Phang thang ma representing an earlier phase of translation work.
30 See Skilling (1997), p. 91, for references to these palaces and also to mChims phu, a hermitage above bSam yas.
31 Tucci (1958), p. 46, referred to the lHan (d)kar ma as “the catalogue of the lDan dkar library”, while Bucaille (1987), p. 440, stated that the catalogue was “named after the royal offices where much of the translating work was done”. Skilling (1997), p. 92, offers yet another theory by suggesting that the translations were only commissioned while the royal court was staying at the palaces.
who not only translated many new works but also (and once again) revised some of their predecessors’ translations. Most prominent among the translators of the new period was Rin chen bzang po (958–1055), referred to as lo tsā ba chen po (or lo chen in short), i.e. “great translator.” The term lo tsā ba (var. lo tīsba ba, lo tsa ba, lo tība ba), commonly used in Tibet as a metaphorical expression for “translator,” is obviously not a word of Tibetan provenance. What is its etymology? According to one modern Tibetan dictionary, lo tsā ba means “eye [of] the world” (’jig rten mig). In fact, this is also the meaning of the Sanskrit lokacakṣus (apparently a metaphor for sun), which thus can be identified as the word from which lo tsā ba is a derivation. It was a common procedure for the Tibetans to use dental-affricates (tsa in the above case) for transliterating the Indian palatals (ca), since that was how the latter were pronounced in Nepal and Kashmir.

3.2 Works Translated or Revised by rNgog lo

The sole person after Rin chen bzang po to be commonly referred to as lo chen in the 11th century was none other than rNgog lo. He apparently was not the only translator of his clan, since a certain rNgog Buddhapāla also seems to have been engaged in translation work, although his output was rather low.

The following list enumerates (in the order of the Peking edition of the canon) the works in the bKa’ ’gyur and bsTan ’gyur canonical collections

---

52 Once again mention can be made of Si tu paṇ chen Chos kyi ’byung gnas’s sDe dge’i bka’ ’gyur dkar chag, which lists 81 Indian panditās and 166 Tibetan translators active in Tibet during the phyi dar period. See VERHAGEN (2004), pp. 227–229, 231–235. It is interesting to note that Si tu paṇ chen, while listing rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab, failed to include rNgog lo himself, possibly due to a confusion of uncle and nephew.

53 TDCM, p. 2811. See also DUNG Dkar blo bZang ’Phrin las (2002), p. 1973. Compare also the title of Gro lung pa’s biography of rNgog lo under study in CHAPTER FIVE, which includes the epithet “Sole Eye of the World,” showing clearly that the author was aware of the original meaning of lo tsā ba.

54 MW, p. 906.

55 SEYFORT RUEGG (1966), p. 80, n. 3. A similar explanation, not quite as convincing, was provided by SNELLGROVE (1987), p. 505, n. 196, who stated that lo tsā ba is “a peculiar formation from the Sanskrit root loc-, meaning to shine or illuminate; its use as an honorific title for a religious translator probably developed in Nepal”.


57 See the Tattvamārgadarśana (P 4538), the only work translated by rNgog Buddhapāla identifiable in the canons. The possibility of rNgog lo’s uncle rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab being identical to the translator Lo chung Legs pa’i shes rab, who was a disciple of Rin chen bzang po, has been discussed on p. 34 above.
that, according to their colophons, were translated or revised by rNgog lo. All other translations or revisions attributed to him by Tibetan or secondary sources have not been included in the first two parts of the present list, if their colophons do not explicitly mention his name or the titles by which he was known. Some doubtful works have been mentioned in the third part of the list ("Uncertain Cases").

The colophons have been quoted from the Peking edition of the Tibetan canon. In cases where the Peking colophons lack any proof regarding rNgog lo’s participation in a translation or revision, the corresponding colophons from the sDe dge edition have been cited. For reasons of convenience, the works have been arranged according to the order of the Peking edition. I have not presented information from the colophons in translation, but only in paraphrase, since this should be sufficient for the present purpose. Descriptions of each work include the Sanskrit title, the corresponding number in the Peking or sDe dge edition, author, names mentioned in the colophon (e.g. of rNgog lo’s collaborator[s] or of previous translators/revisors) and a quotation of the translation colophon (bsgyur byang). When quoting translation colophons, I have omitted concluding auspicious elements like bkra shis, etc. The main Tibetan sources for this compilation have been the following:

- the list in Gro lung pa’s Jig rten mig gcig blo ldan shes rab gyi rnam thar (see my translation),
- the items found included in Bu ston Rin chen grub’s bDe bar gshegs pa’i bstan pa’i gsal byed chos kyi ’byung gnas guung rab rin po che’i mdzod,
- Si tu pañ chen Chos kyi ’byung gnas’s sDe dge’i bka’ ’gyur dkar chag (i.e. the catalogue of the bKa’ ’gyur, sDe dge edition),

38 For a more accessible list of all works mentioned, see APPENDIX ONE.
41 Only once, in the case of no. 2 (D 689), this rule could not be followed, since this work is apparently missing in the Peking edition.
42 In my paraphrases I have neglected the frequent occurrence of the expression gstan la phab (often rendered as "established"), whose exact meaning remains uncertain.
43 rNgog lo’s translation collaborators have also been listed in APPENDIX TWO.
44 For complete bibliographical information, see the BIBLIOGRAPHY.
45 Apart from the modern printed edition listed in the BIBLIOGRAPHY, Si tu pañ chen’s
rNgog lo’s Work as a Translator

- Zhu chen Tshul khrims rin chen’s *bTaṅ ‘gyur dkar chag* (i.e. the catalogue of the bTaṅ ‘gyur, sDe dge edition).

Important secondary sources included:
- *Catalogue_D*,
- *Catalogue_P*,
- CORDIER (1909) and (1915) together with the index of LALOU (1933),
- MEJOR (1991),
- NAUDOU (1968),
- NISHIOKA (1980), (1981), and (1983),
- STEINKELLNER & MUCH (1995), and

It should be noted that several titles in the following list are titles reconstructed by the modern editors of the canonical catalogues listed above, and that the original Sanskrit titles of these works remain uncertain. The prefixed elements Ārya- and Śrī- as well as the concluding -nāma have been removed without further notice. Information on authorship is purely based on what is found in the catalogues.

3.2.1 Translations in the *bKa’* ‘gyur

1. *Amoghapāśapāramitāṣaṭparīpūraya-nāma-dhāraṇī* (P 367 [= P 528])
   Translated by Mañjuśrīvarman and rNgog lo, and revised by Chos kyi shes rab.
   \(\text{paṅdi ta manydzu shrii warma dang| lo tśsha ba blo ldan shes rab kyis sgyur te gan la phab pa’o|| lo tśsha ba chos kyi shes rab kyis kyang sgyur te gan la phab po (sic)|| (quoted from P 528, vol. 11, ′a, fol. 227a.3–4)}\)

2. *Amoghapāśakalparājavidhi* (D 689)
   Translated and corrected by Mañjuśrīvarman and rNgog lo.
   \(\text{paṅdi ta manydzu shrii warma dang| lo tśsha ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis sgyur cing zhus te gan la phab pa|| (vol. 33, ′a, fols. 65b.7–66a.1)}\)

3. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (P 734)
   Translated and corrected by Śākyasena, Jñānasiddhi, Dharmatāśila and others; afterwards revised under the order (*bkas*) of bKra shis lHa lde btsan, king of Western Tibet (ruled Gu ge at the beginning of the 11th century).

---

46 Zhu chen’s catalogue is also available as an ACIP computer file.
century) by Subhāṣita and Rin chen bzang po (958–1055) in agreement with a commentary; later corrected and revised by Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (ca. 982–1054) and Rin chen bzang po, after having compared it with a commentary from Magadha; then revised by "Brom ston rGyal ba'i 'byung gnas (1005–1064) in the temple of R[w]a sgreng; finally revised by rNgog lo, using exemplars of the text “collected” (bsags) from Kashmir and Magadha.

3.2.2 Translations in the bsTan ’gyur

4. Prajñāpāramitāstotra (P 2018) of Nāgārjuna
   Translated by Tilakakalāśa (Thig le bum pa) and rNgog lo.

5. Cakrasaṃvarapañcakrama (P 2150) of Vajraghaṇṭa
   Translated by Kṛṣṇapāda and Tshul khrims rgyal ba; later corrected by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.48

48 The translation colophon of another canonical version of the Cakrasaṃvarapañcakrama (P 4624) adds that after rNgog lo and Sumatikīrti had revised the first translation, their revision was revised again by bSod nams rnam par rgyal ba dbang po i sde in accordance with two Indian exemplars (rgya dpe) of the text, using instructions of Buddha-ghoṣa (Sangs rgyas dbyangs) received from Vanaratna (Nags kyi rin chen, born in 1384) of Sannagara in the east (rgya gar gi mHKha' po kriṣṇa parδi daŋ bge dge sloop tshul khrims
rgya gar gyi paṇḍi ta kṛṣṇa pa dang| dge słong tshul khrims rgyal bas bgyur| phyis bla ma su ma ti kirti dang| dge słong blo ldan shes rab kyis bcos pa'o|| dpal pha mtshen pa'i rgyud pa ma nor ba'i bshad pa'o|| (vol. 51, na, fol. 263a.6–7)

6. Abhisamaya-nāma-pañjikā (P 2182) of Prajñārakṣita
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.
rgya gar gyi mkhan po dpal su ma ti kirti dang|| lo tsa ba dge słong blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur ba'o|| (vol. 51, pa, fol. 56b.4)

7. Cakrasamvarapājāmeghañamaṇḍarī (P 2183) of Prajñārakṣita
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.
dpal su ma [ti] kirti dang sgr a bgyur gyi lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur ba'o|| (vol. 51, pa, fol. 59b.1–2)

8. Cakrasamvarabalimaṇḍarī (P 2184) of Prajñārakṣita
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.
rgya gar gyi mkhan po dpal su ma ti kirti'i zhal snga nas dang|| lo tsa ba dge słong blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur ba'o|| (vol. 51, pa, fol. 60b.8–61a.1)

9. Cakrasamvarahastapūjāvidhi (P 2185) of Prajñārakṣita
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.
rgya gar gyi mkhan po dpal su ma ti kirti dang| sgr a bsgyur lo tsa ba dge słong blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur ba'o|| (vol. 51, pa, fol. 134b.3–4)

10. Tattvaśāntihṛdayasaṁsthāna (P 2197) of Dad byed go cha
Translated by Vināyaka and rNgog lo.

11. Tattvaśāntiśānti (P 2259) of Śūnyatāsamādhi
Translated by Varendraruci and rNgog lo.
bal po'i à cā rya bha rendra ra tse dang| lo tshes ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur ba'o|| (vol. 52, pha, fol. 235b.1)

12. Sarvārthasiddhisādhana (P 2260) of Avadhūtipāda
Translated by Varendraruci and rNgog lo.
bal po'i à cā rya bha rendra ra tse dang| lo tshes ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur ba'o|| (vol. 52, pha, fol. 236a.8)

rgyal bas bgyur ba las| phyis bla ma chen po su ma ti kirti dang|| dge słong blo ldan shes rab kyis bcos pa'o|| slar yang shar phyogs sanna ga ra'i mkhas pa chen po dpal nag kyi rin po che'i zhal snga pan [sic] chen sанг rgyas dbyangs kyi man ngag dang sbyar nai gu par mnyan te|| rgya dge guyis dang bstan nas bzhad pams rnam par rgyal ba dbang po'i ide zhes bgyi bas gyar khral tams du zhas chen bgyis so|| (P 4624, vol. 82, pa, fol. 105a.4–7).
13. *Jñānāveśa* (P 2261) of Śūnyatāsamādhi  
Translated by Varendraruci and rNgog lo.  
*bal po'i ā cā rya bha rendra ru tse dang| lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 52, *pha*, fol. 239a.1)

14. *Chinnamundavajravārāhīsādhana* (P 2262) of Śrīmati  
Translated by Varendraruci and rNgog lo.  
*bal po'i pandi ta ā cā rya bha rendra ru tse dang| lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 52, *pha*, fol. 240a.5–6)

15. *Vajrayoginīhomavidhi* (P 2264) of Buddhadatta  
Translated by Varendraruci and rNgog lo.  
*bal po'i paṇḍi ta bha rendra ru tse dang| bod kyi lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 52, *pha*, fol. 243b.6)

16. *Caturaṅgasādhanaṭīkāsāramañjarī* (P 2732) of Samantabhadra  
Translated by Nyayanaśrī and rNgog lo in a capital of Nepal.  
*pandi ta chen po nya ya na shri dang| bod kyi lo tsa ba chen po shākya'i dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bal yol mthil du bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 65, *ti*, fol. 330a.6)

17. *Mandalavidhi* (P 2796 [= P 5442]) of Niskalaṅkavajra  
Translated by Atulyadāsa and rNgog lo.  
*rgya gar gyi mkhan po a du la dha sa dang| lo tshha ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 67, *pi*, fol. 71a.1)

18. *Maṇjuśrīgambhīravyākhyā* (P 2958) of Ghaṇṭa  
Translated by Maṇjuśrīsattva and rNgog lo.  
*rgya gar gyi mkhan po manydzu shri sa twa dang| dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 67, *phi*, fol. 171a.4–5)

19. *Trisamayavyūharājaśatākṣarasādhana* (P 3521) of Kedharanaṇaddhi (?)  
Translated by Go mi 'chi med and rNgog lo.  
*rgya gar gyi mkhan po pandi ta dpal go mi 'chi med dang| bod kyi lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyis legs par bsgyur ba'o* (vol. 79, *nu*, fol. 81a.4–5)

20. *Bhagavadāryamañjuśrīsādhiṣṭhānastuti* (P 3534) of Candragomin  
Translated by Sumatikīrti, rNgog lo, and Mar pa Chos kyi dbang phyug.

---

49 NAUDOU (1968), p. 174, gave his name as Nayanaśrī.
50 The city indicated here presumably was Patan; see VERHAGEN (1994), p. 98.
51 See also P 5104, a different translation of this work, executed by Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna and dGe ba'i blo gros.
52 Mar pa Chos kyi dbang phyug is also known as Mar pa Do pa of Yar 'brog, who is
rgya gar gyi mkhan po chen po su ma ti kira ti’i zhag snga nas|| bod kyi lostdha ba dge srong blo ldan shes rab dang|| mar pa choi dbang phyug gis bogur ba’o|| (vol. 79, nyu, fol. 96a.3)

21. Jñānaguṇabhadra-nāma-stuti (P 3535 = D 2711)\(^53\) of Vajrāyudha
Translated by ‘Bum p brag gsum pa (i.e. Sthirapāla [brTan skyong]) and rNgog lo.

rgya gar gyi paṇḍi ta ‘bum p brag gsum pa dang| bod kyi rNgog lo tsā ba
bogur ba’o|| (vol. 60, nu, fol. 79a.2–3)

22. Pindikramatippaṇī (P 4791) of Līlāvajra
Translated by Saudita and rNgog lo.

bal po dge binyen sau di ta dang| dge srong lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyis
bogur ba’o|| (vol. 85, shu, fol. 50a.6)

23. Prajñāpāramitopadeśa (P 5123) of Kambalapāda
Translated by rNgog lo.\(^54\)
rNgog ‘gyur gtsang ma yin no|| (vol. 87, lu, fol. 155a.5)\(^55\)

24. Prajñāpāramitopadeśa (P 5124) [no author mentioned]
Translated by rNgog lo.

rgya dpe ma rnyed rNgog ‘gyur gtsang ma yin|| (vol. 87, lu, fol. 155b.2)\(^56\)

---

\(^53\) The Peking version lacks the translation colophon, thus I quote from sDe dge.

\(^54\) Although another translators from the rNgog clan is known (see above, p. 51), I do not think there can be any doubt that the “rNgog” mentioned in this colophon (and in the following, too) is to be identified with rNgog lo, since Gro lung pa attributed the translation of this work to him; see below, p. 105, no. (25).

\(^55\) This colophon is somewhat interesting, since a later revisor or editor (perhaps even Bu ston Rin chen grub [1290–1364] who first edited and organized the bsTan ‘gyur) felt obliged to point out that “[this] is a pure (gtsang ma) rNgog translation.” A different translation of this work, completed by Dipamkaraśrījñāna and dGe ba’i blo gros, exists as P 3466.

\(^56\) Here the editor or revisor informs us that he could not obtain the original Indian text (rgya dpe), so that the Tibetan text again had to remain “a pure rNgog translation,” which probably means that it could not be revised. However, one wonders why it should have been necessary to revise a text of rNgog lo, something that was only very seldom done (most prominently in the case of the Pramāṇavārttika [P 5709] by Śākyaśrībhadra [1140–1225] and others, and Sa skya paṇḍi ta Kun dga’ eglal mtshan [1182–1251]; see below, pp. 61–62 [no. 42]).
25. Abhisamayālaṃkāra (P 5184) of Maitreya[nātha]  
Translated by Go miʾchi med and rNgog lo.  
pandi ta go miʾ chi med dang] lo tshha ba blo ldan shes rab kyis ’gyur] (vol. 88, ka, fol. 15b.3)

26. Abhisamayālamkārarāttī (P 5185) of Vimuktisena  
Translated by Go miʾchi med and rNgog lo.  
rgya gar gyi mkhan po shar phyogs kyi dge b NYen chen po dpal go miʾ chi med dang] lo tša ba chen po shākyaʾi dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis ’gyur cing legs par gtan la phab paʾo] (vol. 88, ka, fol. 249a.6–7)

27. Abhisamayālamkāralokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyaṇā (P 5189) of Hari-bhadra  
Translated under the order of king bKaʾsha lHa lde btsan by Subhāśīta and Rin chen bzang po; later corrected and revised by Dīpankaraśrī-sīna and Rin chen bzang po, after having compared it with an exemplar of the text from Magadha; finally revised by Dhīra-paḥa57 and rNgog lo.  
dbang phyug dam paʾi mnag bdag bod kyi lha btsan po gra (sic) bKaʾsha lde btsan gyis bkaʾi rgya gar gyi mkhan po su bhaʾi ta dang] sgraʾs ’gyur gyi lo tsa ba chen po dge slong rin chen bzang pos ’gyur nas] slad kyi rgya gar gyi ma lan po pandi ta chen po di pam ka ra shri dznyā na dang] zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba chen po dge slong rin chen bzang pos yul dbus kyi dge slong yang gtugs nas bcos shing zhus te gtan la phab pa la] de nas dus phyis pandi ta chen pos gzhung ’bum phrag gyis kyis sgrin pa brgyan pa dbhaʾi (sic) pala zhes bya ba dang] lo tsa ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis legs par ’gyur zhin bcos paʾo] (vol. 90, cha, fol. 426a.4–7)

28. Abhisamayālamkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśāvatārī (P 5191) of Haribhadra  
Translated and corrected by Vidyākaraprabhā and dPal brtsegs; later revised by Go miʾchi med and others, and rNgog lo.  
rgya gar gyi mkhan pa bdi yā ka ra pra bha dang] zhu chen gyi lo tša [ba] bande dpal brtsegs kyis ’gyur cing zhus te gtan la phab paʾo] slad kyi pandi ta dpal go miʾ chi med la sgo pa dang] lo tshha ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis legs par gtan la phab paʾo] ’dis kyang bstan pa rin po che

57 According to NAUDOU (1968), p. 160, n. 4, this is Sthirapāla. However, the colophon reads gzhung ’bum phrag gyiṣ…, although this master was commonly known as ‘Bum phrag guum pa (*Triṃkṣa) in Tibetan. Moreover, all available sources (including Zhu chenʾs bsTan ’gyur bkra shag) read Dhīrapāla. But see KAWAGOE (1984), p. 1006 (= p. (118)), n. 11, who also identified Dhīrapāla as Sthirapāla.
Abhisamayālaṃkāra-vṛttipiṇḍārtha (P 5193) of Prajñākaramati
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.

29. Abhisamayālaṃkāra-vṛttipiṇḍārtha (P 5193) of Prajñākaramati
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.

30. Prajñāpāramitāsamgrahakārikā (P 5207) of Dignāga
Translated by Tilakakalaśa and rNgog lo.

31. Prajñāpāramitāsamgrahakārikā-vivaraṇa (P 5208) of Triratnadāsa
Translated by Tilakakalaśa and rNgog lo.

32. Bodhicaryāvatāra (P 5272) of Śāntideva
Translated by Sarvajñādeva and dPal brtsegs from a Kashmiri exemplar of the text; revised by Dharmaśrībhadra, Rin chen bzang po, and Shākya blo gros in agreement with text and commentary from Magadha; finally revised by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo.

33. Prajñāparicchedapañjikā (P 5278) [no author mentioned]
Translated by Atulyadāsa (Mī mnyam khol po) and rNgog lo; well translated owing to the wishes of Li ston rDo rje rgyal mshon.

---

58 This colophon is unique in referring to Sumatikīrti as a Nepalese. He is usually presented as an Indian; see for instance above, nos. 6 (P 2182) and 8 (P 2184).

59 The translation colophon to the Bodhicaryāvatāra has been examined by SAITO (1999), pp. 175–176.
34. Śikṣāsamuccaya (P 5335/6) of Śāntideva
   Translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, and Ye shes sde; revised by Tilakaka-
   laśa and rNgog lo in the monastery of Sūri mda’. 
   *rgya gar gi pa mkhan po dza na mi tra dang dā na shi la dang| zhu chen gyi lo tsta| ba ba bande ye shes sde sbyung cing zbus te gan la phab pa| slad kyi kha che’i paṇḍi ta ti la ka kla shu (sic) dang| lo tsta| ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyi| sri mda’i dgon par zhu thug legs par byas pa’i|* 
   *rgyal ras spyod ’dir dlang thos mang ba|| gung thang dge slong shes rab byung gnas kyi|| blo ldan thig le bum pa’i sems bcung nais|| gezung ’dir nges sbyung legs par zhu thug byas|| de yi dad pa’i mthu dang gezung ’di yi|| che ba nyid kyi ding sang bstan ldan gyi|| lam ’dir jug par ’dod pa’i skye bo rnam| dga’ ba cho ’di phyogs bcur rgyas byed shog|* (vol. 102, ki, fol. 225a.8–b.3)

35. Bodhicittotpādasamādānavidhi (P 5363 [= P 5406]) of Jetāri
   Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo. 
   *rgya gar gi pa mkhan po chen po su ma ti ki rti dang| zhu chen gyi lo tsa| ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyi| sbyung cing zbus te gan la phab pa||* (vol. 103, khi, fol. 283b.8)

36. Trisamvarakrama (P 5375) of Niṣkalaṅkavajra
   Translated by Atulyadāsa and rNgog lo. 
   *rgya gar gi pa mkhan po a tu lya dāru dang| zhu chen gyi lo tsta| ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyi| sbyung cing zbus te gan la phab pa||* (vol. 103, khi, fol. 304b.5–6)

37. Bhadracaryāmahāpranidhānarājanibandhana (P 5512) of Nāgārjuna
   Translated by Tilakakalaśa and rNgog lo. 
   *kha che’i mkhan po thig le bum pa dang| sgra sbyung gyi lo tsa| ba chen po shākya’i dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyi| sbyung cing zbus te gan la phab pa’i||* (vol. 105, nyi, fol. 211a.1–2)

38. Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra (P 5521 = D 4020)60 of Maitreya[nātha]
   Translated by Śākyasimha, dpal brtsegs and others; later slightly cor-
   rected by Parahitabhadra, Sajjana, and rNgog lo. 
   *rgya gar gi pa mkhan po shākya simha dang| zhu chen gyi lo tsa| ba bande dpal brtsegs la sogs pas sbyung cing zbus te gan la phab pa| slad kyi paṇḍi ta pa ra hi ta dang| bram ze chen po sadza (sic) na dang| lo tsa ba dge slong blo*

---

60 Since the Peking version contains no information about the revision I quote from the sDe dge version.
39. *Ratnagotravibhāga* (P 5525) of Maitreya[nātha]
Translated by Sajjana, the grandson of Ratnavajra (Rin chen rdo rje) from Anupamapura (Grong khyer dpe med), and rNgog lo in Anupamapura, Kashmir.

\[
\text{dpal grong khyer dpe med kyi mkhas pa chen po|| bram ze rin chen rdo rje'i dpon (read: dgon) po pandi ta mkhas pa chen po sadzda na dang| lo tsā ba shākya'i dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis| grong khyer dpe med de nyid du bsgyur ba o|| (vol. 108, phi, fol. 135b.6–7)}
\]

40. *Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā* (P 5526) of Asaṅga
Translated by Sajjana and rNgog lo in Anupamapura, Kashmir.

\[
\text{dpal grong khyer chen po dpe med kyi mkhas pa chen po bram ze rin chen rdo rje'i dpon po| pandi ta mkhas pa chen po sadza (sic) na dang| lo tsā ba shākya'i dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis| grong khyer dpe med de nyid du bsgyur ba o|| (vol. 108, phi, fol. 74b.5–6)}
\]

41. *Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavṛtti* (P 5529) of Vasubandhu
Translated by Mahājana and rNgog lo.

\[
\text{dpal} \text{che'i pandi ta ma hā dza na dang| lo tsā ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba o|| (vol. 108, bi, fol. 45a.4)}
\]

42. *Pramāṇavārttika* (P 5709) of Dharmakīrti
Translated by Subhūtiśrīśānti and rMa dGe ba'i blo gros (fl. mid-11th century); then slightly corrected and newly translated by Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po) and rNgog lo in Cakradhara (‘Khor lo ’dzin), east of Anupamapura, in the district of rNam par rgyal ba'i zhing, Kashmir, under the order of king dBang lde (ruled Gu ge at the end of the 11th century), after rNgog lo had studied the text under Bhavyarāja; finally revised by Śākyaśrībhadra (1140s–1225) and others, and Sa skya paṇḍi ta Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1182–1251).

\[
\text{rgya gar gyi mkhan po su bhū ti shri shānti dang| bod kyi lo tsā ba dge ba'i blo gros kyis bsgyur| yang pandi ta skal ldan rgyal po dang| dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis cing zad bcos| dpal ldan dam pa'i las la mngon dgyes pa\rangle\]
\]

61 For the identification of Anupamapura, which appears to be modern-day Srinagar, see NAUDOU (1968), pp. 169–170.


63 dBang lde is known as a sponsor of rNgog lo’s activities in Kashmir and Tibet; see above, pp. 38 and 40–42.
smad med che ba'i bdag can rgyal po mchog||
dge ba'i thugs mnga' nges bas sa skyong ba||
mi yi bdag po dbang lde'i bhas bskul nas||
brtson ldan lhag par dpod ldan 'chad po dang||
nyan po rgyol dang phyir rgyol don nges dang||
'brel gam dga' ston rgya chen myong gya'i phyir||
'dzam gling mchas pa'i rgyan gyur rgyan 'di bsgyur||
lta nyan kun sel gnyis su med pa yi||
don dam rnam dpod lhur len bstan bcos 'di||
gezhung mang don dka' 'grub par dka' na yang||
'bras bu che phyir 'bad par rigs pa yin||
log pa'i rgyun phyogs rjes su zhol gyur pa||
lta ba'i chu bo bzhog par dka' mod kyi||
yang dag rigs pas legs par brda sprad na||
'ga' yi yid la ci ste 'bab mi' gyur||
sgra don gnyis ka nyams su bder lon te||
mun sprul gyis ni ma bslad legs bsgyur ba f||
sdon gya byed dam pa de dag ge||
dri tsam bro ba da la kho kor zad||
dpal ldan kha che'i rigs pa pa'i||
gzugs gi nor bu skal ldan ni||
rgyal po zhes bya la thos nas||
blo ldan bzang po64 'di bsgyur ro||
grong gyer (read: khyer) chen po dpe med kyi shar phyogs na yul 'khor lo
idzin zhes bya ba| grub pa'i gnas su grags pa'i 'dabs rnam par rgyal ba'i
zhing zhes bya bar| kha che'i pandi ta chen po skal ldan rgyal po dang bod
kyi lo tsab ba chen po dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o) ||
dus phyis sa'i steng na 'gran zla thams cad dang bral ba'i mchas pa bsd legs
snyoms pa chen po| shakya shri bha dra la sogs pa rnam dang| shakya'i dge slong
kun dga' rgyal mthan dpal bzang po| bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa
chos kyi grags pa'i gzungs rab dri ma med rigs pa'i mthar thugs tshad ma
rnam 'gre' 'di| sgra don ji bzhin blo yis legs rtags nas| ston pa gangs can 'di
ni kho bo tsam) (vol. 130, ce, fol. 250a.6–b.6)65

64 Blo ldan bzang po is the pseudonym rNgog lo used, since the personal name he
received during his ordination contained two more or less synonymous elements; see
above, pp. 36–37, n. 27.
p. 122–123, he gave a full quotation of the sDe dge version of the bskyug byang,
referring to it as rNgog lo's bskyug byang to the "Pramāṇālaṃkāra." Although (as will be seen below)
the colophons of the Pramāṇavārttika and Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra are identical for a
very large part, this does not hold true for the sDe dge version, which lacks rNgog lo's
43. \textit{Pramāṇaviniścaya} (P 5710) of Dharmakīrti
Translated by Parahitabhadra (gZhan la phan pa bzang po) and others, and rNgog lo in Anupamapura, Kashmir.

\begin{verbatim}
rgya gar gyi kha che'i pandi ta gezhan la phan pa bzang po la sogs pa dang| lo tsă ba blo ldan shes rab kyis| kha che'i grong khyer dpe med du bgyur ba'o||
\end{verbatim}

(5710, ce, fol. 329b.1)

44. \textit{Nyāyabinduprakaraṇa} (P 5711 = D 4212) of Dharmakīrti
Translated and corrected by Parahitabhadra and others, and rNgog lo.

\begin{verbatim}
pandi ta gezhan la phan pa bzang po la sogs pa dang| bod kyi lo tsă ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o||
\end{verbatim}

(94, ce, fol. 238a.6)

45. \textit{Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra} (P 5719) of Prajñākaragupta
According to the first colophon, translated by Bhavyarāja and rNgog lo, and later revised by Kumāraśrī and Zangs dkar lo tsā ba 'Phags pa she rab; according to the second colophon, translated by Bhavyarāja and rNgog lo in Čakradhara, east of Anupamapura, in the district of rNam par rgyal ba'i zhing, Kashmir, under the order of king dBang lde, and later revised by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo. At the beginning of this second colophon (i.e. the bgyur byang of rNgog lo) the activities of Zhi ba 'od, member of the royal family in Western Tibet and a translator himself, and rTse lde, his nephew and king of Gu ge in the 11th century, who acted as patrons for a number of translations, are briefly described. In particular, we are informed that they invited Sunayaśrīmitra (from Vikramaśīla) and Kumāraśrī (from the Kashmiri city of Anupamapura) to Tibet. A bit further the temple Tho ling dPal dpe med lhun gyis grub pa\textsuperscript{67} is mentioned, the place where—most probably around the year 1076 A.D.—the famous religious council (chos 'khor) took place.\textsuperscript{67} kha che'i mkhan po pandi ta skal ldan rgyal po dang| lo tshba ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bgyur| slad kyi kha che'i mkhan po pandi ta ku ma ra shi dang zhu chen gyi dge slong 'phags pa shen (sic)\textsuperscript{69} gys zhus shing bcos te gtan la phab pa||

long translation colophon. The colophon of the \textit{Pramāṇavārttika} has also been examined by MEJOR (1991), pp. 181, 189–190.

\textsuperscript{66} The Peking version lacks the translation colophon, thus I quote from sDe dge.

\textsuperscript{67} On the temple of dPal dpe med lhun gyis grub pa, see above, p. 37, n. 28.

\textsuperscript{68} On this council, see SHASTRI (1997).

\textsuperscript{69} While the Peking colophon gives the name as 'Phags pa shen, the sDe dge colophon (D 4221, vol. 96, ce, fol. 282a.7) reads 'Phags pa shes rab.
bod kyi dpal lha btsan po|| rigs gsum mgon po'i sprul pa| byang chub smsa dpal'i gzhung bryag| mi rje lhas mdzad pa| phyrg pe phdu gi rgyal po chen po shag| kyi'i lde srong lha bla ma zhi ba ‘od kyi zhag snga nas dang| dbang phyug dam pa'i mngag' bdag chen po khris [r]se lde btsan gi zhal snga nas rgyal po'i yang rgyal po'i chen po khan dpon (read: dbon) gyi sku ring la| bod kyi rgyal khams su btsan pa rin po che dar shing rgyas par mdzad pa'i slad du| yon gyi bdag po chen po mdzad de| gyur ma dga' paa kun bcos shing| ma 'gyur ba rnam bsgyur ba dang| dam pa'i chos rgya cher bshad cing| chos mi mthun pa rnam ston la dbab pa'i sgo nas| bod 'bang yang la drin bzhag pa'i thugs dgon kyis rgya gar dbus bhram (sic) ka ma sri la'i gtsug lag khang chen po mkhas pa mgon po 'byung ba'i gnas nas| pandi ta mkhas pa chen po dpal su na ya sri mi tra dga' ba chen pos sphyon drangs| kha che'i grong khyer dpe med nas kyi pandi ta mkhas pa ku ma ra sri sphyon drangs| bod nas dbus gtsang ru bzhis dang| khams rgya'i so yan chad kyi ston pa ma lus pa dang| stod mngag' ris skor gsum gyi sri chags ma lus pa tam zhabs drung chen por tshogs| stod smad kyi lo tshha ba mkhas pa yang drug bsgos nas| yab med khu dpon (read: dbon) gyi thugs dam| sa'i snying po tho ling dpal dpe med lhun gyi grub pa'i gtsug lag khang chen por pandi ta dang| gshis byed kyi mkhas pa rnam kyis theg pa phyi nang gi chos graw mang por dpal ldan70| dam pa'i las la mgon dgey pa| smad med che ba'i bdag can rgyal po mchog| dge ba'i thugs mnga' de bas sa skyong ba||

70 It is interesting to note that from dpal ldan... until the end of the versified part (...bsgyur ro||) the colophon is identical (ignoring some minor orthographical differences) to that of rNgog lo's translation of the Pramāṇavārttika (P 5709, see above, no. 42). This seems to be proof of rNgog lo and Bhavyarāja having translated the basic text and its commentary simultaneously. However, note also that their bsgyur byang (i.e. the part from bod kyi dpal lha btsan po... onward) of the Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra is not included in the sDe dge version of this text (D 4221); see MEJOR (1991), p. 183, n. 68.
The interesting historical information contained in these colophons was first unravelled by Cordier (1915), pp. 441–442. Later, Naudou (1968), p. 184, reconsidered Cordier’s remarks. In ibid., p. 185, he stated, basing himself on the colophon, that the revision of rNgog lo’s translation of the Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra by the Kashmiri Kumāraśrī and ’Phags pa shes rab was:

…une tâche collective, accomplie à Tho-liṅ au vihāra de Dpal Dpe-med lhun-gyis grub-pa [Śrī Anupamanirābhogavihāra], avec l’aide de pandits venus de Vi-kramaśīla, en présence de maîtres (ston-pa) du Dbus, du Gcaṅ, du Ru-bži, du Khams, du Mña’-ris et même de Chine, sous le contrôle de deux Kaśmīriens, Kumāraśrī et Sunayaśrī.

However, Naudou did not illuminate the whole scenario, in so far as he did not mention the second revision of the text (which had already been noted by Cordier). Moreover, following his description, there still remains the question of how the translation of Bhavyarāja and rNgog lo, which was definitely executed in Kashmir, found its way to the place of its first revision through Kumāraśrī and Zangs dkar lo tsa ba ‘Phags pa shes rab at Tho ling.

According to L. van der Kuijp, rNgog lo’s translation arrived in Tibet prior to himself and was revised by Zangs dkar lo tsa ba, who was at that time the only expert on this text in Tibet and had already presented his own translation of it to the scholars and translators (among them rNgog lo) gathered at the religious council of Tho ling (1076 A.D.). Later, after rNgog lo returned to Tibet, he was not content with the former’s revision and, consequently, revised it together with Sumatikīrti; see van der Kuijp (1983), pp. 31–32. Mejor (1991), pp. 183–185, presents a solution to the problem which is similar to van der Kuijp’s, except that he doubts the participation of Zangs dkar lo tsa ba in the council of Tho ling. See also Karmay (1980), pp. 8–9, for a partial translation of the colophon.

Recently, however, the circumstances of rNgog lo’s translation have been presented in a completely different way by Shastri (1997). Using basically the same sources, namely the colophons of this work, he claimed that rNgog lo and Bhavyarāja translated
46. Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāraṭīkā Supariśuddhi (P 5723) of Yamārī
Translated by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo in the temple sNye thang Brag sna bkra shis.72 According to the brief addendum to the translation colophon, the text found in the bsTan ’gyur was “copied from the actual original written by the great translator rNgog.”

47. Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā (P 5727) of Dharmottara
Translated by Parahitabhadra and others, and rNgog lo in Anupamapura, Kashmir.

48. Nyāyabinduṭīkā (P 5730) of Dharmottara
Translated by Jñānagarbha and Dharmāloka; later newly translated and

the Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra before the religious council, which Shastri himself dated to 1076; ibid., p. 875. (In fact, some lines above this assertion, he stated that both translated it during the chos ‘khor.) This appears to be impossible, since the final part of rNgog lo’s translation colophon (grong khyer dpe med du byugur pa’o|) clearly states that the translation took place in Anupamapura (Kashmir), a place where rNgog lo is only known to have lived after 1076. Shastri’s assertion would also presuppose that the Kashmiri Bhavyarāja travelled to Tibet before rNgog lo studied under him in Kashmir. Although this is of course not completely impossible, it remains very improbable.

72 sNye thang is situated in the south-west of Lhasa; see FERRARI (1958), p. 72, and p. 165, n. 668.
revised by Sumatikīrti and rNgog lo, after having compared it with an exemplar of the text from Magadha.

49. Prāmāṇyaparīkṣā I (i.e. *Bṛhatprāmāṇyaparīkṣā*, P 5746)73 of Dharmottara
    Translated by rNgog lo.
    dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba’o|| (vol. 138, ze, fol. 236b.1)

50. Prāmāṇyaparīkṣā II (i.e. *Laghuprāmāṇyaparīkṣā*, P 5747)74 of Dharmottara
    Translated by rNgog lo.
    lo tsā ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba’o|| (vol. 138, ze, fol. 252b.4)

51. Anyāpoha-nāma-prakaraṇa (P 5748) of Dharmottara
    Translated by Bhavyarāja and rNgog lo in Anupamapura, Kashmir.
    kha che’i paṇḍi ta skal ldan rgyal po dang| lo tsā ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis kha che’i grong khyer dpe med du bsgyur ba’o|| (vol. 132, ze, fol. 264a.7–8)

52. Kṣaṇabhaṅga-siddhi (P 5751) of Dharmottara
    Translated by Bhavyarāja and rNgog lo.
    rgya gar gyi mkhan po skal ldan rgyal po dang| lo tsā ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba’o|| (vol. 132, ze, fol. 278b.1–2)

53. Anyāpohasiddhi (P 5754) of Śaṃkaranandana
    Translated by Manoratha and rNgog lo in Anupamapura, Kashmir.
    grong khyer dpe med du| kha che’i paṇḍi ta ma no ra tha dang| lo tsā ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba’o|| bsgyur dpe la gtugs|| (vol. 132, ze, fol. 325a.7)

54. Pratibandhasiddhi (P 5755) of Śaṃkaranandana
    Translated by Bhavyarāja and rNgog lo.
    paṇḍi ta skal ldan rgyal po dang| lo tsā ba blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba’o|| (vol. 132, ze, fol. 326a.8–b.1)

74 Ibid.
3.2.3 Uncertain Cases

In the following the above list is continued with works the translations of which cannot be attributed to rNgog lo with any certainty since they lack translation colophons in all the canonical versions I was able to consult.

55. Cakrasamvaramandalavibhisasamgraha (P 2186) of Prajñārakṣita

Together with Sumatikirti, rNgog lo translated the four very similar works of Prajñārakṣita (P 2182 to P 2185), which were placed directly preceding this treatise in the canons. Moreover, Zhu chen Tshul khrims rin chen in his bsTan ’gyur dkar chag attributed the translation of this work to him.

56. Upadeśopasāmāhāra (P 2957 = D 2106) of Ghanta

The translation of this work is attributed to rNgog lo by Catalogue, and the modern editors of the sDe dge bsTan ’gyur. Although I am not aware of any further evidence to support this, I have included the work here.

57. Pramāṇavārttikatīkā (P 5721) of Śaṃkaranandana

Bu ston as well as Gro lung pa attributed the translation of this work to rNgog lo. Moreover, he is known to have translated two other works of Śaṃkaranandana.

58. Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti (P 5722 and P 5726) of Ravigupta

Bu ston attributed the translation of this work to rNgog lo. This would

---

75 This is possibly why the compiler of the sDe dge catalogue and the modern editors of D attributed this work to rNgog lo. As I have convinced myself, D 1469 (= P 2186) lacks a translation colophon.

76 ZHU CHEN TSHUL KHRIMS RIN CHEN, bsTan ’gyur dkar chag, p. 637.

77 Is it just because the following work (P 2958 = D 2107) by the same author was translated by him? See KAWAGOE (1984), p. 1006 [= p. (118)], n. 14.

78 See NISHIOKA (1981), p. 68, no. 1018. I admit that Bu ston’s enumeration is not so clear at this point, since he does not explicitly mention a translator for nos. 1015–1018, but only for no. 1019, namely rNgog lo. Could this mean that he translated no. 1019 and the four preceding works?

79 Gro lung pa, ’Jig rien mig geig..., fol. 12a.1; see my translation of this part, no. (12).

80 See above, nos. 53 (P 5754) and 54 (P 5755).

81 This work is separately arranged in two different volumes. P 5722 is a commentary on the third chapter, while P 5726 is a commentary on the second chapter of the Pramāṇavārttika; see STEINKELLNER & MUCH (1995), p. 77.

82 See NISHIOKA (1981), p. 68, nos. 1017 and 1016 (but see my remarks in note 78 above).
not be a surprise, since he translated the majority of Pramāṇa works into Tibetan.

In addition to the above works, which lack translation colophons, one could also mention the *Mahācaṇḍavajrapāṇisādhana* (P 5162) of Buddhakīrti, which (according to its colophon) was translated by someone referred to as *lo chen*, a title which during the “Later Propagation” (phyi dar) of Buddhism in Tibet (starting in the late 10th century A.D.) was reserved for Rin chen bzang po (958–1055) and rNgog lo. The colophon states that this *lo chen* executed an “old translation” (*gyur rnying*), which was later revised. According to P. Cordier, *lo chen* here refers to rNgog lo, and the revisor was Tāranātha (1575–1634). But since there is no evidence for rNgog lo having translated this work, I have some reservations to include it even in my list of uncertain cases, since “old translation” might possibly refer to a translation from the period of the “Early Propagation” (snga dar) of Buddhism (7th to 9th centuries). In that case *lo chen* would refer to one of the great early translators.

Furthermore, another work, namely the *Śāntikṛdviśvamātāsādhana* (P 5125), should be mentioned in this context. Both author and translator are unknown, but according to P. Cordier, they are again to be identified as Buddhakīrti and rNgog lo respectively. The source of this information is an “Index mongol” (Cordier’s abbreviation “I. Mo.”). If Cordier’s assertion concerning this work was correct, the chances of rNgog lo’s involvement in the translation of Buddhakīrti’s *Mahācaṇḍavajrapāṇisādhana* (P 5162) would be high, since it was common for a translator to translate more than just a single work of an author.

Finally, according to D. Seyfort Ruegg, Candrakīrti’s major works—the *Madhyamakāvatāra* (P 5261/2), the *Prasannapadā* (P 5260), and the *Catuḥśatakaṭīkā* (P 5266)—were translated into Tibetan by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba (born in 1011), Pa tshab Nyi ma grags (born in 1055), and rNgog lo. But I have not been able to locate any information within the corresponding colophons (D as well as P) that could prove a participation of

---

83 The colophon of P 5162: *lo chen gyis bgyur ba’i ’gyur rnying la zhus dag tsam bgyis pa’o’* (vol. 87, lu, fol. 194a.7–8).
84 CORDIER (1915), p. 263. The identification of Tāranātha as revisor is apparently based on an “Index tibétain” (Cordier’s abbreviation “I.”), the exact bibliographical information for which remains unclear to me.
85 Ibid., p. 256.
86 As before, the exact bibliographical information for this work remains unclear.
rNgog lo in the translations of these works, which, after all, remain the Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamaka texts *par excellence*, their author being commonly regarded as the founder of this branch of Madhyamaka philosophy. It is worthwhile noting that the Tibetan canon contains two different translations of the *Madhyamakāvatāra*, but according to their colophons, which I take as the most authoritative witnesses, the Tibetan translator involved in their rendering was in both cases Pa tshab Nyi ma grags. I thus regard it as unlikely that rNgog lo was so highly involved in the translation of Prāsaṅgika texts, though it must not be overlooked that he did indeed translate two works which, according to D. Seyfort Ruegg, helped “firmly and systematically” to establish “the doctrine of the Prāsaṅgika branch of the Madhyamaka.” These were Śāntideva’s *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (P 5272) and Śiksāsamuccaya (P 5335/6).

Moreover, R. A. F. Thurman also stated that rNgog lo translated the *Madhyamakāvatāra* and the *Prasannapadā*, and that it was due to him “that the works of Chandrakirti entered the literature of Tibetan philosophy.” But since Thurman did not name any sources for this, I can only presume that his assertions are wrong.

---

88 Seyfort Ruegg (1981), p. 71. Most active in translating Prāsaṅgika texts was Pa tshab Nyi ma grags, who may be regarded as a counterpart to rNgog lo, the latter being commonly regarded as a Svātantrika-Mādhyamika. On Pa tshab, see Lang (1990).

89 Ibid., p. 85.

90 See above, nos. 32 and 34. These two works mainly relate, however, to the practice of the Bodhisattva, and not to theory.


92 Thurman could have taken the information regarding the translations from Seyfort Ruegg (1981), but this work is not listed in his bibliography.

93 As for Thurman’s book, see also my remarks above, p. 20.
CHAPTER FOUR

Gro lung pa’s Biography of rNgog lo:
Some Remarks on Author and Text

4.1 Author

Not much is known about the life of Zhang Gro lung pa Blo gros ’byung gnas (fl. late 11th to early 12th centuries), who was commonly counted as one of the four main spiritual sons of rNgog lo1 and is particularly famous for his great exposition of Mahāyāna doctrine, the bsTan rim chen mo.2 No detailed biography of this important master has—to my knowledge—survived.3 His exact dates are unknown, but since some sources4 state that he met Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (ca. 982–1054) in his youth and heard the bKa’ gdams pa teachings from him as well as from ’Brom ston rGyal ba’i ’byung gnas (1005–1064), Gro lung pa might have been born sometime near the end of the first half of the 11th century. This would have made him rNgog lo’s senior by a decade or so, something that is unlikely but not totally impossible. He apparently took birth near the same area as Zhang Tshe spong ba Chos kyi bla ma (another of rNgog lo’s main students),5 namely near gNyal, in lHun rtse county, southern Tibet.6

1 See for instance TSHAL PA KUN DGA’ RDO RJE, Deb ther dmar po…, p. 67.
2 On this work, see JACKSON (1996a), pp. 230–231. Some other works of Gro lung pa have been listed by VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 293, n. 209, based on the items found in A KHU CHING SHES RAB RGYA MTSHO’s dPe rgyun dkon pa….
4 LAS CHEN KUN DGA’ RGYAL MTSHAN, bKa’ gdams…, vol. 1, p. 225.5, and THU’U BKWAN BLO BZANG CHOS KIYI NYI MA, Thu’u bkwan grub mtha’, p. 92.
5 TSHAL PA KUN DGA’ RDO RJE, Deb ther dmar po…, p. 67.
6 That is at least how DPA’ BO GTSUG LAG PHRENG BA, Dam pa’i chos…, p. 728, has it: zhang tsho spong ni gyal cho gso sho bor tshi spong du ’khrung po gro lung pa ’khrung sa’ang phyog mthun du yod. On gNyal, see FERRARI (1958), pp. 126–127, n. 258, and DORJE (1996), pp. 260–261. West of lHun rtse, in today’s administrative district (sa khul) of
Gro lung pa was a member of the famous Zhang clan, and he took Khams lung pa Shākya yon tan (1025–1115) and Po to ba Rin chen gsal (1027–1105) as two of his main early teachers.7 Surely later, rNgog lo (who was only born in 1059 and did not return to Tibet until 1092) became his master. Although one of his closest disciples, Gro lung pa is not listed among the successors of rNgog lo on the abbot’s seat of gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog, and is even said (perhaps anachronistically) to have refused the abbots-hood after the fifth abbot rNam par’phar ba had descended the throne in 1151.8 Consequently, someone else was elected abbot: Phy(w)a pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169), who is said to have been one of Gro lung pa’s students.9 After rNgog lo had died, Gro lung pa was responsible for the erection of 108 thangkas depicting his master and many stūpas erected in his honour on the site of gSang phu.10

The same source that mentions Gro lung pa’s meeting with Atiśa also states that he died in his eightieth year.11 Taking this into account it is obviously impossible to reconcile chronologically his meeting Atiśa, which must have taken place before the latter’s death in 1054, with the year of his supposed refusing the abbots-hood (1151), and his supposed age of eighty at the time of his passing. What remains certain is that he was alive in 1109, the year of rNgog lo’s death, since after that Gro lung pa composed the former’s biography, the text under study here described in the following.

---

1 Ho ka, lies the county of Ho brag, where a place called Gro bo lung (Gro lung would be a possible shortened form of this) is found. Situated near the famous tower of Sras mkhar dgu thog, it was the residence of Mar pa lo tsā ba Chos kyi blo gros (1012–1097); see Dorje (1996), p. 276, and Chang (1994), pp. 698–699. An actual “Gro valley” (Gro lung) exists in the sTod lung bd e chen county, to the north-west of Lhasa. But following the above statement of dPa’ bo gTsug lag phreng ba, who knew Ho brag and the nearby districts quite well, this is unlikely to have been the birthplace of Gro lung pa.

7 Las Chen Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan, bKa’ gdam..., vol. 1, p. 226.2.
9 ’Gos lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal, Deb ther sngon po, p. 404 (tr. Roerich [1949/53], p. 332). Phy(w)a pa studied under Gro lung pa for four years; see Onoda (1989), p. 205. Like rNgog lo before, Phy(w)a pa was a seminal figure in the development of early Tibetan Svātantrika-Madhyamaka. For more information on him, see also van der Kuijp (1978) and Seyfort Ruegg (2000), pp. 37–41.
10 dPa’ bo gTsug lag phreng ba, Dam pa’i chos..., p. 728. See also van der Kuijp (1987), p. 107, from whom this reference is taken. Gro Lung pa, ’Jig rten mig gcig..., fol. 19b.1–6, also reports on the erection of a stūpa for rNgog lo.
11 Las Chen Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan, bKa’ gdam..., vol. 1, p. 227.4.
4.2 Text

Gro lung pa’s biography of rNgog lo represents the earliest and at the same
time only known extensive biography of this master. The work (Jig rten mig
gcig blo ldan shes rab gyi rnam thar [“The Life of Liberation of Blo ldan shes
rab, Sole Eye of the World”]) is written in the truest fashion of a Tibetan
biography belonging to the rnam thar (“religious biography”) genre of Ti-
betan literature. As such, one should not expect it to contain a wealth of
historical information, when it is primarily intended to present the “libera-
tion” (rnam par thar pa, vimokṣa) of a Buddhist saint, that is to say, the
remarkable events from his life that lead to his passing into Nirvāṇa. Thus a
rnam thar may be much better characterized as a hagiography with eulogistic
elements, though it may not be completely bereft of historical facts. G. Tuc-
ci has, with a certain pathos, aptly described works of this genre:

Human events have nothing to do with these works, and how could
they, being a vain flow of appearances (sic) in the motionless gleam of
that void, never to be grasped, into which the experience of truth dis-
solves and annuls us? If earthly events, wars and strife are mentioned,
it is nearly always because some saint influenced their course by his
powerful formulas and exorcisms. Kings, princes and the great ones of
this world have no place there, or they only appear as helpful and pi-
ous patrons. Every happening is thus seen in the light of spiritual tri-
umphs.\(^\text{12}\)

Keeping these words in mind we cannot be surprised when in fact Gro lung
pa in his work did not even mention the years of rNgog lo’s birth and death,
something one might regard as essential for a description of an important
person’s life. But it remains a Tibetan rnam thar, and not a Western biogra-
phy or enumeration of worldly achievements as found in a politician’s or
scientist’s obituary in a modern newspaper. The present rnam thar by Gro
lung pa is one of the earliest surviving examples of the genre,\(^\text{13}\) possibly
unique regarding its complicated and elegant style. Of course, there exist
other early biographies of such masters as Rin chen bzang po (958–1055)\(^\text{14}\)
or Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po (fl. 11th century)\(^\text{15}\), but it is doubtful

\(^\text{12}\) TUCCI (1949), pp. 150–151. For more information on the rnam thar genre, see also

\(^\text{13}\) The biography is mentioned in A KHU CHING, dPe rgyun dkon pa..., no. 10903.

\(^\text{14}\) On the question of the authenticity of Rin chen bzang po’s biography, see MARTIN

\(^\text{15}\) Biographical sources on Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po are surveyed in ALMOGI (2002).
whether either survives in the original early form (i.e. without heavy editing), and neither was composed by a master of Gro lung pa’s stature.

The text of Gro lung pa’s work was available to me as a 23-folio xylograph, copies of which are known to be kept in the library of the Bihar Research Society in Patna, India, and the Library of the Cultural Palace of National Minorities (Mínzu wénhuà gòng yùhúguàn) in Beijing. A third exemplar remains with L. S. Dagyab Rinpoche (Bonn), from whom Prof. David Jackson (New York) could obtain a photocopy in 1989. It is in fact this photocopy from which my own xerox copy was made. A fourth copy was recently reported to exist in a private collection in China. Until now the existence of two dbu med manuscripts of the text has come to my knowledge: one is kept in the National Library of Bhutan in Thimphu, another forms part of the library at Brás spungs monastery near Lhasa. My original plan of critically editing the biography on the basis of all available witnesses has been made redundant by the edition published in the meantime by Dram dul (China Tibetology Research Center, Beijing).

The xylograph has six lines per side (fols. 1b and 2a: five lines) and the blocks measure 46.5 x 6.5 cm (fol. 1b) and 46.0 x 6.5 cm (fol. 2). After the main part of the biography, which concludes with a brief author’s colophon, there follows a short sketch of rNgog lo’s life (fols. 21b.4–22b.3)

17 Van der Kuijp (1995), p. 919. The work is catalogued under no. 002853(1).
18 Jackson (1994a), p. 372. Note that some of the following information concerning the available text edition was already presented in ibid., pp. 373–374, but for the sake of completeness, I cannot avoid repeating the most important points.
20 I owe this information to Prof. Per Sørensen (Leipzig; email of 19th July 2001), who also made the text available to me.
21 The manuscript is listed as no. 017649 in the published catalogue of works kept in Brás spungs monastery; see DPal Brtsegs Bod Yig Rnying Zhing 'Jug Khang, ed. (2004), vol. 2, p. 1563. A facsimile has recently (in 2006) been published by the same group responsible for the 'Brás spungs catalogue; see KDSB, vol. 3, pp. 285–333.
22 Dram dul (2004). Dram dul used the xylograph and the Bhutanese manuscript for his edition. He also mentions an dbu med autocommentary of the biography by Gro lung pa, of which only the first folio was available to him; see ibid., p. xi. The title is recorded as: Lo tsa ba blo ldan shes rab kyi rnam thar mdor bsdus gro lung pa chen po tshigs su bsdzad pa’i rang ĝrel. Dram dul did not yet have access to the manuscript kept at Brás spungs.
23 The measurements are given according to Jackson (1994a), p. 390, n. 15.
24 Fol. 21b.A: bla ma rje btsun dam pa dgaṅ phu ba lo tsha ba chen po la bston pa’i tshig le’ur byas pa’i rnam par byed pa| shakya'i dge lha lung blo gros ‘byung gnas kyi skyar ba rtags
with some additional biographical information, which may be regarded as a long colophon to the main work. This could have been written by the monk Shes rab seng ge, who was apparently in charge of publishing the whole biography.25 He is mentioned in the printing colophon (fols. 22b.4–23a.2) as having prepared the present edition under the order of a certain Rab ’byams mKha’ spyod dbang po, who remains unidentified.26 Since a part of Shes rab seng ge’s addendum and verse 19 of the biography are already quoted together in the late 1470s,27 it is certain that Gro lung pa’s work was accompanied by Shes rab seng ge’s concluding section by that time.28

At the very end of the work (fol. 23a.2–3), we are confronted with a second printing colophon, which indicates that the available print derives from blocks that were recarved in a wood-pig year at rTse bDe yangs shar (the “Eastern Courtyard” of the Potala palace in Lhasa), because the original blocks had become severely worn. The wood-pig year might either have been 1695, 1755, 1815, or 1875,29 and this “reprint” edition presumably “was a so-called ‘Zhol-par-ma’ Central-Tibetan edition, the blocks for which were kept in one of the Zhohl printeries at the foot of the Potala.”30

With regard to the format of the biography, one can easily distinguish two parts, namely the versified text of the forty-three basic verses and a prose

---

25 JACKSON (1994a), p. 373; but see also ibid., p. 390, n. 16.
26 According to ibid., p. 373, “he may have been one of the later rebirth of the Zhwa-dmar subsequent to the 2nd, mKha’-dpyod-dbang-po (1350–1405).”
27 One quotation occurs in Shākya mchog ldan, rNgog lo…, p. 446.5–7. See also below, p. 115, n. 186.
28 For additional information from the colophon (e.g. place-names, name of scribe), see my translation on pp. 116–117.
29 The wood-pig year in question cannot be placed earlier than 1695 (e.g. to 1635), since the Potala’s “White Palace” (pho brang dkar po), where rTse bDe yangs shar is located, was only built from 1645 onward. DRAM DUL (2004), p. xvi, mentioned the year 1935 as another possible date, but this seems doubtful since the xylograph kept by the Bihar Research Society is likely to have been obtained by Rāhula Śāṃkṛtyāyana (1893–1963) during his travels in Tibet before 1935. Of Śāṃkṛtyāyana’s four journeys to Tibet (1929/30, 1934, 1936, and 1938) only the first was explicitly dedicated to the acquisition of Tibetica, the remaining three were specifically aimed at locating Sanskrit manuscripts (which of course does not entirely rule out the possibility that Tibetan texts were acquired, too). I am grateful to Dr Birgit Kellner (Vienna) for information on Śāṃkṛtyāyana’s travels (email of 24/03/2006).
autocommentary on nearly all of them interwoven in between. Previously D. Jackson speculated that the main verses of the biography might be identical to some verses of praise that were also composed by Gro lung pa and exist as a separate work in the library of the Bihar Research Society in Patna.\(^{31}\) In the meantime, however, Jackson could ascertain that the latter is “a completely different work from the main verses” of our text.\(^{32}\) The verses, with only one exception, consist of four lines each (verse 37: five lines), and one can make out three metres:

1. verse 1, the worshipful invocation (mchod brjod) and Gro lung pa’s resolution to expound his subject (’chad par dam bca’ ba), in verses of nine syllables per line;
2. verses 2 to 39, the main contents, in verses of seven syllables per line;
3. verses 40 to 43, the concluding section without autocommentary, in verses of eleven syllables per line. Some lines are not metrical in this part.

In writing this biography, Gro lung pa first expounded each verse (sometimes two [e.g. nos. 26–27] or even more [e.g. nos. 36–39]), which he then expanded and explained by the addition of missing grammatical particles, words, or even whole phrases in the prose autocommentary. These explanations are regularly much more elaborate than the verses themselves.\(^{33}\) Quite often, particularly in the first half of the work, the author supported his statements with quotes from scriptural sources.

The style of Gro lung pa’s work is stately and elegant, with many long nominal clauses often used in apposition. This could be a style which he picked up in part from reading a high amount of scriptural and šāstra language in Tibetan translation. That the author was indeed well read in the Buddhist scriptures is obvious from the extraordinarily many canonical quotations found in his great treatise, the bsTan rim chen mo.\(^{34}\) His biography of rNgog lo also bears witness to this fact, containing three quotations each from Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa (fols. 1b.5–2a.1, 2b.3, 6b.3) and Śāntideva’s Bodhicaryāvatāra (fols. 11b.3, 13a.5, 16b.6–17a.1), two from Bha-

\(^{31}\) Ibid., pp. 373 and 389, n. 10.

\(^{32}\) JACKSON (1993b), p. 7 (This was actually written and published after JACKSON [1994a]!). I have dealt with this brief eulogy by Gro lung pa on pp. 25–26 above.

\(^{33}\) For some basic remarks on how a Tibetan prose autocommentary is composed, see JACKSON (1987), pp. 191–192.

\(^{34}\) See the available computer file of this work, supplied by the Asian Classics Input Project (New York): bDe bar gshegs pa’i bstan pa rin po che la ’jug pa’i lam gyi rim pa rnam par bshad pa, catalogue nos. SL0070–1 and SL0070–2.
vya’s *Madhyamakahṛdaya* (fols. 6b.2, 7a.6–7b.1), and one each from Maitreya(nātha)’s *Ratnakotravibhāga* (fol. 4a.5–6) and *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* (fol. 18b.2–3), and Nāgārjuna’s *Suhṛllekha* (fol. 6a.4).

It is also interesting to note Gro lung pa’s use of some archaic expressions, which are further proofs of the authenticity of the work. On fol. 4a.3 we read *shod dgod pa* for “[mathematical] subtraction,” on fol. 5a.2 *’tshog chas* for “necessities for life.” Zhang zhung as the name that Gro lung pa on fol. 16b.3 applied for Western Tibet (mNga’ ris, including Gu ge) may probably also be regarded as an archaic form.

Until now, I have been able to locate seven quotations from our text (all of verse 19) in later historical works. However, only the two earliest seem to derive from the original text itself (thus proving that it was available to Tibetan scholars of the 15th century), the others being second-hand quotes. The quotations occur in works of the following authors:

1. ’Gos lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal (1392–1481),
2. gSer mdog pan chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507),
3. Las chen Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1432–1506),
4. dKon mchog lhun grub (1497–1557),
5. dPa’ bo gTsug lag phreng ba (1503/4–1566),
6. Sum pa mkhan po Ye shes dpal ’byor (1704–1788), and
7. Tshe mchog gling yongs ’dzin Ye shes rgyal mtshan (1713–1793).

For the sake of providing a rough outline of the work’s structure, the following gives a brief summary of the main topics addressed in the biography:

I. Preliminaries
   a. Obeisance and resolution to expound the subject (fol. 1b)
   
II. Main contents
   a. The manifestation of thousands of Buddhas in this aeon and the appearance of Buddha Śākyamuni in our world (fols. 1b–2b).
   b. The introduction of Buddhism into Tibet and the appearance of rNgog lo (fols. 2b–3b).

---

55 *Deb ther sngon po*, p. 394 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 326).
56 *rNgog lo*…, p. 446.4–5 (only lines two to four of verse 19).
57 *bKa’ gdam*…, vol. 1, p. 223.5–6 (apparently a second-hand quote from no. 1).
58 *Dam pa’i chos kyi byung tshul*…, p. 266.5–6 (either quoted from no. 1 or no. 3).
59 *Dam pa’i chos*…, p. 726 (lines two to four, a second-hand quote from no. 2).
60 *dPug bsam ljon bzang*, p. 189 (lines two to four, either quoted from no. 2 or no. 5).
61 *Lam rim bla ma*…, p. 179 (either quoted from nos. 1, 3, or 4).
c. The supreme physical and spiritual qualities of rNgog lo (fol. 3b–4b).

d. His birth and his studies under rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab and the supreme masters of Magadha and Kashmir (fol. 4b–5b).

e. His adhering to the excellent ascetic restraint (vrata) and his developing the Thought of Awakening (bodhicitta) (fol. 5b–7b).

f. The science of reasoning and its great Indian masters, the state of Pramāṇa in Tibet and rNgog lo’s studies of this science in Kashmir (fol. 7b–8b).

g. The Prajñāpāramitā tradition, its state in Tibet and rNgog lo’s studies of that tradition in Magadha (fol. 8b–9b).

h. rNgog lo’s worship of Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha (fol. 9b–11a).

i. His never being exhausted during his studies (fol. 11a–b).

j. A list of his translations (fol. 11b–12b).

k. His mastery of many scriptures, never being stingy with his teachings (fol. 12b–13b).

l. His clarification of scriptures (fol. 13b–14a).

m. A list of his compositions (fol. 14a–b).

n. His very effective teachings, his commissioning of gold-lettered manuscripts, and his correction of all text he read or just glanced at (fol. 14b–15b).

o. How he motivated his disciples (fol. 15b–16a).

p. His generosity towards those in difficulties, his substantial support of monastic communities, and his acting as a mediator in political troubles (fol. 16a–18a).

q. Things in connection with rNgog lo’s death (e.g. erection of a stūpa and how all disciples lamented over his passing; fol. 18a–21b).

III. Colophons

a. Shes rab seng ge’s colophon (fol. 21b–22b).

b. Printing colophon (fol. 22b–23a).

c. Printing colophon of the “reprint” (fol. 23a).

---

42 This and the remaining topics of the main part have been summarized on the basis of JACKSON (1994a), pp. 376–377. They are not covered by the partial translation of the text found in CHAPTER FIVE of the present book.
Part Two
Translation
Partial Translation of rNgog lo’s Biography by Gro lung pa

The Life of Liberation\(^1\) of Blo ldan shes rab, Sole Eye of the World\(^2\)

I pay homage to the Omniscient One,\(^3\) Teacher of the World!

To the most excellent Protectors of Beings, the Sugata\(^4\) and [his spiritual] sons, who possess the body [of] the Noble Dharma, I pay [my] reverence respectfully [through] the three media.\(^5\) Here, I will expound through faith just a few good [qualities of] the Master of the Doctrine, [my] Guru (i.e. rNgog lo), who has reached a high level [of attainment]. <1>\(^6\)

The chiefs of Sages (muni),\(^7\) although [they] are the same \(^8\) [regarding] their accumulation [of merit and knowledge], [their] spiritual body, [and their] enlightened activity [for others], manifest one thousand forms in this Glorious Aeon (kalpa) because of [their] engaging in activities through inconceivable modes [of action]. <2>

---


2. Tib. \textit{jig rten mig gcig} is a metaphorical expression for “translator;” see TDCM, p. 2811, s.v. lo tsha ba. See also my remarks on the etymology of the latter term on p. 51 above.

3. Tib. \textit{thams cad mkhyen pa} (Skt. \textit{sarvajña}) is an epithet of a Buddha.

4. Tib. \textit{bde [bar] gshegs [pa]} (= lit. “one who has gone into bliss” [i.e. passed into Nirvāṇa]) is one of the ten traditional epithets of a Buddha, on which see Lamotte (1944), pp. 131–132, Simonsson (1957), pp. 270–271, and Griffiths (1994), p. 61.

5. The expression “three media” \(\textit{sgo gsum}\) refers to body \(\textit{lus, kāya}\), speech \(\textit{ngag, vāk}\) and mind \(\textit{yid, citta}\) and is to be understood as an exhaustive list of all possible respectful actions.

6. The main verses of the biography are printed in italics. They have been numbered corresponding to the numbering in Jackson (1994a). It may be noted in this context that no attempt has been made to keep to the original line order of verses in the translation, since the English syntax only very rarely permits this.

7. Tib. \textit{thub pa’i gso [bo]} is an epithet of a Buddha.

Although the leaders of Sages, the Buddhas, all are equally well endowed and excellent regarding [their] infinite accumulation [of merit and knowledge], which [causes] the attainment [of Buddhahood], [their] possessing a body, which [in its] nature is like the great space, [and their] acting to save all beings [through] enlightened activities (phrin las), from among the inconceivably [many] ways through which [they] act, in this Glorious Aeon [they] manifest the arising [of one thousand Buddhas in different material bodies (riṇakāyas)]. [This] has also been pronounced by the master [Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmakośa (VII 34)] in those words:

“All Buddhas [possess the threefold] sameness (samatā) [with regard to] the accumulation [of merit and knowledge] ([puṇya/jñāna]saṃbhāra), [the attainment of] the spiritual body (dharmañkaṇya) and the conduct for the benefit of [other] beings (arthacaryā); not through [their] span of life, lineage and stature.”

From [among] those [Buddhas], [Siddhārtha] Gautama,11 Kinsman of the Sun (ādityabandhu),12 was compassionate through [his] marvellous aspirations (pranidhāna) and austerities (duṣkaracaryā), acting [as] Guide (vināyaka)13 to this world, [where] the five forms of degeneration (kaṣāya)14 are gathered. <3>

The world system (lokadhātu), which was held (i.e. assisted) by the marvellous great compassion (mahākaruṇā) and the great root of merit (kuśalamūla)15 and by the matchless aspirations, which are difficult to carry out and vast in their scope, of one from among those [many Buddhas], this Principal

---

9 Merit (bsod nams, puṇya) and knowledge (ye shes, jñāna) are considered to be the two-fold “equipment” (sambhāra) for awakening; see BHSD, p. 580, s.v. sambhāra.
10 Compare the slightly different canonical version in P 5590 (vol. 115, gu, fol. 24b.5–6): sangs rgyas thams cad tshe dang ni|| choi sku ’gro ba’i don spyod pas|| mnyam pa nyid de sku tse dang|| rigi dang sku bong tshod kyis min]]. See also DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1980), vol. 5, p. 79.
11 Siddhārtha Gautama is the historical Buddha Śākyamuni (ca. 560–480).
12 Tib. nyi ma’i gnyen is an epithet of Śākyamuni referring to his birth in the royal “solar” race; see e.g. MAY (1959), p. 257, n. 924.
13 Tib. mam [par] ’dren [pa] is an epithet of a Buddha.
14 Tib. snyigs ma [lha]: 1. degenerated life (tib ‘i snyigs ma, āyuḥkaṣāya), 2. degenerated views (lha ba’i snyigs ma, drṣṭikaṣāya), 3. degenerated depravity (nyon mongs pa’i snyigs ma, kleśakaṣāya), 4. degenerated beings (sems can gyi snyigs ma, sattvakaṣāya), and 5. degenerated time (dus kyi snyigs ma, kalpakaṣāya); see Mey, nos. 2336–2340.
15 Tib. dge ba’i rtsa ba, i.e. the fundamental wholesome factors or potentialities.
among the Two-footed, the most distinguished among the Śākyas, Kinsman of the Sun, is the world system (mi mjed) [that consists of] one billion [worlds] (trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātu).\(^{16}\)

After [this] Noble Man (satpuruṣa)\(^{17}\) had demonstrated his having obtained the nectar (amṛta) [of immortality (i.e. the Noble Dharma)] at the spot of the bodhimaṇḍa\(^{18}\) on the Jambudvīpa continent of that [world system], [he] brought to completion [his] guiding [of] fortunately endowed [disciples] through such things as [his] setting the Wheel of the Doctrine in motion (dharmacakrapravartana) in holy places such as the six great towns and the realm of gods. After that, Śākyamuni demonstrated the great state of peace (i.e. the passing into Nirvāṇa) in a grove [with] a pair of Śāla trees\(^{19}\), [in] the town of Kuśinagara, [in] the country of the Mallas.\(^{20}\)

For the glory of holding (i.e. assisting) [all] beings, there arose Great Men (mahāpuruṣa),\(^{21}\) such as Vimala,\(^{22}\) who possessed the infinite merit [of] excellently bearing the burden of [performing] the remaining deeds of this one (i.e. Śākyamuni). <4>

After this, [successors] filled with the supporting spiritual powers (adhisthāna) by him (i.e. Śākyamuni), such as the assembly of Arhats\(^{23}\) like Gandha-

---

\(^{16}\) Tib. stong gsum gyi stong chen po[‘i ‘jig rten gyi khami] is the biggest of three kinds of world systems consisting of 1,000³ worlds; see BHSD, pp. 259, 464. For this expression and its meaning in Buddhist cosmology, see the Abhidharmakośa of Vasubandhu, transl. de LA VALLEE POUSSEIN (1980), vol. 2, p. 170 (III 73–74), and also KONGTRUL (1995), pp. 101–105, for the Tibetan interpretation.

\(^{17}\) Tib. skyes bu dam pa; according to BHSD, p. 554, satpuruṣa was normally applied to a kind of lay equivalent of the Bodhisattvas. In the present context, however, it seems to refer to Śākyamuni himself.

\(^{18}\) Tib. byang chub kyi snying po (= lit. "heart of awakening"); according to BHSD, p. 402, "the spot under the bodhi-tree on which the Buddha sat when he became enlightened".

\(^{19}\) For this tree (Shorea robusta), see the description in SYED (1990), pp. 559–571.

\(^{20}\) This refers to the last hours of his life, when he rested between two Śāla trees, passing through a number of meditative states, before reaching the state of parinirvāṇa; see SNELLGROVE (1973), p. 403, and LAMOTTE (1984), p. 42.

\(^{21}\) Tib. skyes [bu] chen [po], i.e. men whose bodies show the thirty-two major and the eighty minor marks (mtshan, lakṣaṇa) of a "Great Man" as listed in Mvy, §§ XVII–XVIII; see e.g. SNELLGROVE (1987), p. 32.

\(^{22}\) Vimala (Tib. rDul bral) was one of Śākyamuni’s disciples; see BHSD, p. 495.

\(^{23}\) Tib. dgra bcom pa (= lit. "one who has conquered the enemy") is the appellation for someone who has reached the highest class of saints among the Śrāvaka tradition. "Ar-
hastin,24 heroes, bearing the burden of [obligation for] the precious doctrine, possessing the inconceivable armour, the root of merit and aspirations, accomplished the remains [of] the deeds of the Victorious One (jina),25 upholding the most excellent nectar of the Noble Dharma, and thereby increasing it [in] the world for nearly 5,000 years.26 It is in the manner exposed [by Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmakośa (VIII 39)]:

“The Noble Dharma [of] the [Great] Teacher is twofold: [Its] nature is verbal transmission (āgama) and realization (adhiṣṭhāna). The [means for] maintaining it are only teaching and practice.”27

Nevertheless, the rulers, etc., who assisted the people of this unfortunate land, [who were] very foolish people having animal faces, led [them] up by the noble path [of Buddhism]. <5>

Among those [nearly 5,000 years] until nearly the seventh [period of] 500 years,28 [called the period] endowed with discriminative understanding (prajñā), the people of the [land] called “the northern snowy land,” the country of Great Tibet, surrounded by many mountain crags and barbarous

hat” is also one of the ten traditional epithets of a Buddha, which the Tibetan translators wrongly traced back to the Sanskrit arsi-han. However, as can be observed in Moy, no. 3531, the correct meaning of this term was also known to them (mchod ’osi, “worthy of being honoured”); see also LAMOTTE (1944), pp. 127, 203–204, SIMONSSON (1957), pp. 269–270, and GRIFFITHS (1994), pp. 61–62.

24 Tib. sPos kyi dngang po [che]; see Moy, no. 704.
25 Tib. rgyal ba is an epithet of a Buddha.
26 This is related to the theory that the Buddhist doctrine will last for 5,000 years before it disappears. This common method of calculation derived from Indian Buddhism and was widely upheld in Tibet, for instance by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364); see LAMOTTE (1988), pp. 191–202, and VOGEL (1991), p. 407.
27 See P 5590 (vol. 115, gu, fol. 27a.8–b.1), and de LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1980), vol. 5, pp. 218–219.
28 This means that nearly 6 x 500 (= 3,000) years have elapsed since the parinirvāna of Śākyamuni Buddha, thus making it possible to calculate roughly that the Buddha’s passing took place sometime in the 22nd century B.C. This date is arrived at by assuming that the period described in this passage is to be placed in the second half of the 8th century A.D. Thus, we are enabled to determine the chronological system that our author Gro lhung pa seems to have followed. It appears to be the system of Atiśa Dipamkaraśrījñāna (ca. 982–1054), which places the Nirvāṇa in the year of 2137 B.C. If our assumption holds true, about 2,900 years (which in fact are nearly 3,000 years) would have elapsed at the end of the 8th century. For the chronological systems used in Tibet, see SEYFORT RUEGG (1992b), including bibliographical references to previous scholarship on pp. 281–282, and ZABEL (1992).
borderlands, were known as the red-faced race descended from a monkey and a rock-demoness.29 The minds [of] even the slightly more fortunate ones were not much superior to [those of] animals. And since [these people] were devoid of noble behaviour and ignorant of the path that benefits in the long run, [they] did not exert themselves for long-lasting happiness [but] rather dwelled tormented by many pointless difficulties.

Later on, [beings] endowed with intelligence, such as [Bodhisattvas], who were protectors supporting those [Tibetans] through noble, particularly kind aspirations, [and] manifested as the masters ruling the whole Tibetan region,30 invited many people who possessed the wealth of intelligence [and] exerted themselves in good deeds, from [countries] such as the Middle Region (madhyadeśa)31 [of India] and China [in] the east. [They] gladdened and studied under [those people] and, as a result, led [the Tibetans] to a higher level and established thoroughly through [their] many efforts the great path of the Noble Dharma. Because of that, through [their] creating in various regions the seeds of virtue of fortunate [disciples], the enlightened activity of the Sage (i.e. Buddha) became clearly visible. As it is said in the Prajñāpāramitā [scriptures]:

“At a later time in the country of the north the Noble Dharma will be widely practised.”

[That path, too, afterwards somehow was thoroughly disturbed through [the acts of] deceit [by] an ignorant person,33 similar to a corpse, cunning [and] evil; [but then] a protector (i.e. rNgog lo), who restored [Buddhism and] became an “Eye” [for it], arose. <6>

That [path], moreover, was disturbed later on by an evil king and others, so that at a certain time even the faithful were helpless like travellers (mgon pa)
who had lost [their] direction, because of the tumult of various nonsensical [babblings] of those trapped ([jug]) in ignorance [and] deceit [and] enslaved by desire, so that the doctrine was weakened. At that time, there appeared a great “caravan-leader” (sārthavāha), who completely restored [Buddhism]: My Guru, the most excellent man.

Out of kindness [he] properly resorted to [activities] such as attracting [disciples] and possessed [good qualities] such as giving (dāna) that has arisen through the correct view. <7a>

This [great master], motivated by great kindness towards [those beings] who, since the remote past, were born and who will be born [in the future], who had fallen away from spiritually useful things and who were tormented by many [forms of] suffering (duḥkha), made [their lives] of [spiritual] use by considering all undertakings, such as accomplishing the four ways of attracting [disciples] (sāmghāvatīti)34 impelled by the Thought of Awakening (bodhicitta)—the basis for all excellent [attainments]—, greatly significant.

Furthermore, [he] accomplished limitlessly [the Perfections] such as [unselfish] giving that does not take the three spheres (trimandala) [of giving]35 into consideration, which had arisen from the correct meditative cultivation [of] the ascertainment [of] the twofold reality,36 (1) of the Realm of Reality (dharma-dhatu), without limit and centre like the space, and (2) of all the conditioned factors (saṃskāra) projected by the magician (mig ’phrul mkhan) [in form] of the latent impressions (vasanā) [that consist] of the diversity (prapañca) [of] various statements, and as a result [he] cultivated [them] (i.e. the Perfections) and practised [them] many times, relying on the complete means (sgrub byed) [for making sure they] did not go to waste and went to the highest [purpose of Buddhahood].

[He was endowed with] a distinguished body, a superior [spiritual] lineage, faith, discriminative understanding, and marvelous kindness. <7b>

---

34 Tib. bsdu ba [i dngos po] bzhi: 1. giving (sbyin pa, dāna), 2. speaking in a kind manner (snyan par smra ba, priyavāditā), 3. conduct for the benefit of others (don spyod pa, arthacaryā), and 4. “(a Bodhisattva’s) adoption of the same (religious) aims for himself which he preaches to others” (as explained in BHSD, p. 569) (don ’thun pa, samānārthatā); see Mey, nos. 925–928.

35 Namely the donor, the recipient, and the act of giving itself; see BHSD, p. 258.

36 The following apparently refers to the “ultimate truth” (don dam bden pa, paramārthasatya) and the “conventional truth” (don rdzob bden pa, saṃvṛtisatya) respectively.
As a consequence of those [performances], [he] was motivated here [in Ti-
bet] through [his] noble, particularly kind aspirations towards us, and as a
result in harmony with the cause (niṣyanda)\textsuperscript{37} of those means of attainment
that were adhered to by himself, [his] mind (rgyud) made up of six senses
(āyatana) obtained an extreme suppleness, [something] uncommon with
other people, so that [he] was seen as a Great Man due to [his] perfectly en-
dowed body, glowing [with] glory through many [major] marks\textsuperscript{38} and [mi-
nor] symmetries,\textsuperscript{39} such as excellent proportion (chu zheng), beauty and im-
pressiveness, [namely] a very large head,\textsuperscript{40} hair black like a bee,\textsuperscript{41} high
forehead,\textsuperscript{42} long eyebrows,\textsuperscript{43} hair of the eyebrows equal [on both sides],\textsuperscript{44}
equally-sized ears,\textsuperscript{45} projecting nose,\textsuperscript{46} lips red like [the fruit of] the Bimba
tree,\textsuperscript{47} long tongue,\textsuperscript{48} well set teeth,\textsuperscript{49} very pure voice,\textsuperscript{50} conch of Dharma
(chos kyi dung),\textsuperscript{51} broad shoulders,\textsuperscript{52} seven protuberances [on the body],\textsuperscript{53} the

\textsuperscript{37} Tib. rgyu mthun pa, i.e. a natural result.

\textsuperscript{38} Tib. [skyes bu chen po'i] mshan (Skt. mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇa), i.e. the thirty-two major
marks of a "Great Man;" see GRIFFITHS (1994), pp. 99–100, for a complete list.

\textsuperscript{39} Tib. dpe byad [bzang po] (Skt. anuvyañjana), i.e. the eighty minor marks of a "Great
Man;" see BHSD, p. 34, for a reconstruction of the original Sanskrit list.

\textsuperscript{40} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 341.

\textsuperscript{41} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 342. Since a bee (Tib. bung ba) hardly has any black hair,
the insect mentioned here could be a bumble-bee.

\textsuperscript{42} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 340.

\textsuperscript{43} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 332.

\textsuperscript{44} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 334.

\textsuperscript{45} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 337.

\textsuperscript{46} Minor mark; see Mey, no. 326.

\textsuperscript{47} Not found in either list; however, listed in Mey, no. 5210. See also TDCM, p. 1827.
JÄSCHKE (1881), p. 368, identified the plant as Monordica monadelpha, "a cucurbita-
ceous plant with a red fruit." For more information on it, see SYED (1990), pp. 463–
466.

\textsuperscript{48} Major mark; see Mey, no. 247.

\textsuperscript{49} Major mark; see Mey, no. 243.

\textsuperscript{50} This item, as it is found in our text (gsung shin tu dag pa) has no equivalent in either
list. Possibly the author thought of a "well-sounding and soft voice" (gsung snyan cing
mnyen pa 'jam pa), a minor mark found in Mey, no. 320.

\textsuperscript{51} This probably refers to the sound of his voice again.

\textsuperscript{52} Major mark; see Mey, no. 251.

\textsuperscript{53} Major mark; see Mey, no. 250. These were two protuberances on his shoulders, two
on his hands, two on his feet, and one on his neck; see GRIFFITHS (1994), p. 100.
upper part of the body similar to a lion,\textsuperscript{54} long [lines on] the palms,\textsuperscript{55} tapered fingers,\textsuperscript{56} copper-coloured nails,\textsuperscript{57} hands soft as cotton,\textsuperscript{58} proportioned [like a banyan tree]\textsuperscript{59} [and] the protuberances of the feet (i.e. the anklebones) not visible.\textsuperscript{60} Furthermore, [he] was ready to engage in activities connected to the noble sciences such as [the science of] letters (i.e. grammar) and [mathematical] subtraction (\textit{shod dgod pa}),\textsuperscript{61} and [he] also possessed a marvellous strength in devoting [himself] to being useful to others with a beautiful smiling face.

As for this [master], because of such [activities] as resorting to Excellent Men since the very time of [his] youth, the positive spiritual inclination (\textit{go-trat}) of the Mahāyāna, which had come from the beginningless seed of discriminative understanding and compassion, properly awoke [in him], [and] as a result of that, [he] was spontaneously endowed with a mind of renunciation (\textit{nirvidā}),\textsuperscript{62} which was preceded by the perception of faults (\textit{doṣa}) and good qualities (\textit{guna}) of existence (i.e. Sāṃsāra) and extinction (i.e. Nirvāṇa), and an effort for the sake [of others]. It was said by the venerable [Maitreya(nātha)] in his \textit{Ratnagotrabibhāga} (I 41):

\begin{quote}
“\text{The perception of faults and merits, which [cause] suffering and bliss—those [experienced] in [Cyclic] Existence and Nirvāṇa—, exists because the positive spiritual inclination exists, and [it] does not exist for those without the positive spiritual inclination.}”
\end{quote}

From that [inclination he] was directed by a firm trust in the exact taking up or rejecting from the subtlest of the subtle the things causing the attainment

\textsuperscript{54} Major mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 254.
\textsuperscript{55} Minor mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 313 (\textit{phyag [gi ri mo] ring ba}).
\textsuperscript{56} Minor mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 273.
\textsuperscript{57} Minor mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 269.
\textsuperscript{58} Minor mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 310.
\textsuperscript{59} Major mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 255 ([\textit{shing n.ya gro dha ltar} chu sheng gab pa]). Information on this tree (\textit{Ficus benghalensis}) is found in SYED (1990), pp. 401–406.
\textsuperscript{60} Major mark; see \textit{Mey}, no. 260.
\textsuperscript{61} According to \textit{TDCM}, p. 2870, where it is found with the slightly different spelling of \textit{shod god}, this is an archaic expression denoting “subtraction.”
\textsuperscript{62} ‘\text{Tib. yid byung ba}; according to \textit{BHSD}, p. 304, ”world-disgust, aversion from worldly things.”
\textsuperscript{63} See the slightly different canonical version in P 5525 (vol. 108, \textit{phi}, fol. 56b.6–7): \textit{srid dang mya n\textgreek{y}a ?\textgreek{a} la de?} | \textit{sdug bde’i skyon yon mthong ba’ di} | \textit{rigs yod las yin gang phyir de} | \textit{rigs med dag la med phyir ro}.”
of happiness (i.e. good deeds) and complete misery (i.e. evil deeds) as one acts through various feelings dependent on one’s [past] deeds in Samsāra, which is suffering, unstable and pitiless. Thereafter, [he] was urged on by an excellent, unflagging faith in such [holy objects] as the three noble refuges (i.e. Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha), which save one from harm and bestow the jewel [of true] happiness, and the teachers who maintain those [three], the spiritual friends (kalyāṇamitra), and [he] was endowed with a matchless power of longing for the permanent freedom from all suffering and for attaining the incomparable [state of] bliss. For this is what was said:

“Since [he] was endowed with faith, [he] adhered to the Dharma.”

[He] further possessed a discriminative understanding, sharp, quick, firm, bright, and matchless, since [it] did not exist as having been produced by anyone whosoever, because of [his] profoundly entering reality (tattva). For as it was said:

“Since [he] was endowed with discriminative understanding, [he] correctly understood.”

[He] also possessed more tormented and loving love and great compassion than a mother, who sees her sole son, beloved and pretty, in the mouth of a tiger, for those [people] who, because [they] are tormented by unbearable suffering or adhere to the causes of that, live in places that are full of undesirable, ugly, and unpleasant [things]. For this is what was said:

“The Great Beings (mahāsattva)64 are very much exhausted by the suffering of pain (duḥkhaduḥkhatā)65 of others.”

Due to powerful causes, even though [he] was born in the evil land [of Tibet], through [his] possessing an outstanding fortune, [he] dwelled in a part of a large town of dBus (i.e. Central Tibet) that was remote, and where [he found] a plentitude of things. <8>

Although [he] took birth in the evil land [of Tibet], [he] demonstrated that [his] latent propensity of habituation (goms pa'i bag chags)66 to the Dharma was not taken away [from him] by defects of the land, and [he] was born in

---

64 Tib. sems dpal chen po is a standard epithet of Bodhisattvas.
65 Tib. sdug bngal gyi sdug bngal is one of the three kinds of suffering, the other two being "suffering of conditioned factors" (du byed kyi sdug bngal, samštārabhākata) and "suffering of change [for the worse]" (gyur ba'i sdug bngal, viparītanārabhākata); see Mvy, nos. 2229–2231, and SchmithAUSEN (1977).
66 TDCM, p. 375, explains this expression as goms 'dri kyi sa bon ("seed of habit").
a nomad region [himself] because [he] removed the despondency of [the inhabitants in] the mountainous and nomad regions and delighted [them]. Thereafter, [he] demonstrated the power of meritorious [activities] performed in an excellent land, and in that [place], too, [he] took as [his] very residence a remote place, noble and sacred, with a plentitude [of] necessities for a convenient life (bde legs kyi ’tshog chas)\(^{67}\) and adequate for the [practice of] yoga, [situated] near a great monastic seminary (slob sbyong gi grwa sa chen po),\(^{68}\) as the cause for [his] not being deteriorated from the noble path [of Buddhism].

Not [becoming] distracted from the highest of paths, [he] possessed [in his tutor] a protector,\(^{69}\) who [belonged to] the lineage [of] a Great Man,\(^{70}\) and [from whom he learnt] the excellent ascetic restraint (vrata), who gave [him] the eye of intellect and properly enjoined [upon him] religious practice.\(^{<9}\)

Also there, since the very [time of his] youth, [he] did not pass time uselessly, and demonstrating uninterruptedly the continuation (mtshams sbyor bar) [of] excellent deeds, [he] adhered to the lineage of a religious master who was renowned like sun and moon on the entire surface of the world. That [master] properly took care of [him], so that such [spiritual qualities as [his] faith rose like the increasing moon (yar ngo [zla]). Therefore, after distancing [him from] the occasions for [his life’s] going to waste, the obstacles to completely studying the noble sciences became small.

From that [master], too, [he] first possessed a protector who thoroughly maintained the noble ornament of the jewel [of] moral conduct (śīla), the origin of all excellent virtues of the highly trained ones, through [his] relying in many ways on the habituation (goms pa) to seek thoroughly for all degrees of knowable things (shes bya), the clear eye of intellect, who spread the aromatic smell of the excellent incense of moral conduct, since [he] had intensively studied the vows of full ordination, the pure (i.e. celibate) conduct (brahmacarya).

Further, [he] was supported by protectors, many [masters] of matchless mental powers regarding all fields of knowledge through their innate and acquired [discriminative understanding] that was not inferior, the crest-jewel

---

\(^{67}\) According to TDCM, p. 2329, ’tshog chas is an archaic term for ’tbo ba’i yo byad (= “necessities for life”).

\(^{68}\) Unidentified.

\(^{69}\) I.e. his uncle rNgog Legs pa’i shes rab, on whom see above, pp. 34–35.

\(^{70}\) I.e. Atiśa Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna (ca. 982–1054).
of scholars of this very land of the northern region and even of Magadha and the land of Kashmir [in] the west, [the latter two] being the origin of knowledge, places filled with the supporting spiritual powers by the Sage, who thought that this very one (i.e. rNgog lo) would be a “great gate” who would benefit the world through such [things] as correct logic, and who gave [him], according to the correct tradition (sgros), the nectar of their knowledge through [their] kindness towards beings, faith [manifested in] an appreciation for the Sage’s doctrine and a great strength [shown in] a diligence of unique courage for the benefit of others.

[He,] moreover, possessed [in his uncle] a protector, a Noble Man exerting himself in gathering the noble riches of those [masters], [his] life [force] of liberation (mokṣa) having become firm through resorting to the Mahāyāna[’s teachings] for a long time and having meditated repeatedly, who engaged [his] mind through the noble [practice] of yoga, not passing time leisurely, in such [things] as the practice of lifting the great burden of the others’ suffering through constant compassion [and] the four ways of attracting [disciples], and who, as a consequence of [his] discarding like spittle the worldly factors71 that developed into personal advantage such as glorifying this life, received the correct instructions [for] the means of the path [of] the Mahāyāna, consisting in the Thought of Awakening, the ascetic restraint of the Sage and the seeking for reality.

Based upon the firm foundation [of] an excellent ascetic restraint, [he] excellently increased the highest Thought of Awakening, extensively trained [his] matchless discriminative understanding and thus possessed the highest energy for realizing an inconceivable accumulation [of preparatory merit and knowledge]. <10>

As a consequence of [having studied under] those [masters], even in this very [country of Tibet], [he] first perceived as a defecation ground (phyi sa’i gnas) infantile (i.e. foolish) ways of behaving such as sexual intercourse 72 and all holding of worldly factors to have real importance through desire and attachment (’dod chen). And with an apperception (saṃjñā) [of things] that

---

71 Tib. ‘jig rten gyi chos; these are possibly the so-called “eight worldly factors,” namely (as listed in TDCM, p. 895) 1. profit (rnyed pa), 2. loss (ma rnyed pa), 3. fame (snyan pa), 4. infamy (mi snyan pa), 5. praise (bstod pa), 6. degradation (smad pa), 7. happiness (bde ba), and 8. unhappiness (mi bde ba).

72 Tib. grong pa’i chos (= lit. “the villager’s custom”), apparently derives from the Sanskrit grāmyadharma, used as a euphemistic metaphor for “sexual intercourse;” see MW, p. 374. This meaning is also attested in TDCM, p. 412, where grong chos is explained as ‘khrig spyod (= “sexual intercourse”).
paid no heed (*yid mi rton pa*) to the entire world, in order to nourish well the firm thought of Nirvāṇa, [he] gradually took up the ascetic restraint of the Prātimokṣa,73 the foundation for all excellent virtues. And then, as a consequence of [his] having trained the mind in the Noble Dharma[’s] monastic discipline (*vinaya*), the pith of the doctrine, [he] abandoned the impurities (*dri ma*) of that [Vinaya teaching], the infractions (*ltung ba*), great desire and so forth, together with [their] causes, and accordingly, [he] kept far removed from the discipline being violated, and thus was decorated by the jewel of moral conduct. As it was explained [by Nāgārjuna in his *Subhilekha*]:

“Your moral conduct is indeed undamaged. You should guard [it] not low, unmixed, unpolluted; discipline has been explained as being the foundation [and] support of all good qualities, like land that is [the foundation of] movable and immovable [things].”74

As a consequence of that, after [he] had entirely seen all these assemblies of beings, which before had become many times such [things] as a beloved mother for oneself, enduring suffering in [their] existence, because of being bound with the great “machine” of delusion (*’khrul pa’i ’khrul ’khor chen po*) and suffering through various kinds continuously over a long time, [he] properly maintained, trained and increased the great tree of the jewel [of] the Thought of Awakening, possessing the root of compassion, brought forth by the moisture of affection that was motivated by [his] being grateful for and repaying past kindnesses to those [beings], [a tree with] an infinite [number] of boughs, leaves, and large flowers, [which are] the practice of skilful means of benefit and happiness for others, [a tree] that was strengthened through the fruit of marvellous vows, mantras, and excellent practice, the distinction of means that are the gate of all accomplished ones, and thus, [he] demonstrated [his] properly having produced the seed of omniscience. As it was said [by Bhavya in his *Madhyamakahṛdaya* (I 6)] in those words:

“The Thought of Awakening, which is the seed of Buddhahood, ornamented by affection, compassion, and great knowledge, should not be abandoned by a wise man.”75

---

73 Tib. *so sor thar pa* (= lit. “individual liberation”), i.e. the code of precepts for monastic discipline in the Vīnaya.

74 See the slightly different canonical version in P 5409 (vol. 103, gi, fol. 74b.4–5): *khyod kyi stul khrims ma nyams mod mi dma* || *ma ’dres ma sgo ma go ssten mar mdzod* || *khrims ni rgyu dang mi rgyu’i sa bzhin du* || *yon tan kun gyi gzhis rten lags par gzung*.

75 See the slightly different canonical version in P 5255 (vol. 96, dza, fol. 2b.1): *byams pa dang ni snying rje dang* || *shes pa chen pos byrgyan pa yi* || *sangs rgyas sa bon byang chub sen* || *de phyir mkhas pas de mi btang*.
Then, in the manner of [Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* (VI 5)]:

“retaining the [moral] conduct (*tshul gnas*) [and] being endowed with learning and reflection, [one is enabled] to thoroughly apply to meditation,”

even in this very [land of Tibet], [he] cleansed the excellent mirror of [his] mind through such [activities] as learning and reflection, from which [he] was not distracted even for an instant, because of [his] diligence in attending to [his] matchless study of the well-taught [scriptures]. After that, the tasting of the Dharma’s nectar through the faculty of discriminative understanding depends on great effort, and [one] should travel, searching, to many sources of great traditions of learning (*rig pa*), lands frequented by most excellent [and] pure men. And since the many beings drawn [there] by the extensive propagation [of] the Sage’s doctrine are of unequal [spiritual] capacities, [he] demonstrated as the sole thing to be practised the resorting to powerful deeds that are to be achieved, and accordingly, [he] studied the sciences in [places] such as the land of Kashmir. Moreover, as a result of [his] special knowledge of etymology, [he] easily ascertained the earlier translator’s traditions of translating (*lo tshha*) and obtained from those an excellent [and] clear eye of intellect that ascertained perfectly words and meanings.

As a consequence of that [clear eye of intellect], [he taught] the oceans [of] the noble nectar, [namely] the science of applying one’s self to excellent reasoning (*rtog ge*), [as follows:] After having first shown a face of kindness to his own students (*vineya*) like a father whose sole beloved son had lost [his] way into a dark precipice (*g.yang sa mun khung*), for [those] excellent vessels of faith (i.e. faithful disciples)—[those] making efforts for the Dharma and the preachers of the Dharma (*dharmabhāṇaka*), prizing and respecting [them] like medicine and doctors—[he made efforts and] was not misled (mi ‘phrogs) by inferior activities, because [he] regarded all objects of desire like straw (i.e. as worthless). And [he] viewed as an ornament (i.e. something beautiful) the practice [of] infinite difficulties, suffering and the endeavours, which others find difficult even to hear about, never mind actually to practise, and [he] could bear to load [them upon himself]. Consequently,

---

76 See the slightly different canonical version in P 5590 (vol. 115, *gu*, fol. 20a.2): *tshul gnas thos dang bjam ldan pas* (*bgo ba* (sic) *la ni rab tu sbyor*). See also DE LA VALÉE POUSSIN (1980), vol. 4, p. 142.

77 Tib. *gdal bya*, i.e. those who are “to be trained” by means of religious teaching.

78 Tib. *rtwa lar geigs pa*, a similar image was mentioned by JACKSON (1987), pp. 167, 179–180, n. 9, who quoted from Shākya mchog ldan and others: *rtsa bzhin* (or *lar*) *dor* (“abandon like straw”).
[he] scooped the collection of supreme wealth of the Saints with hands of joyful and concentrated great diligence like a captain of the ocean going to the island of jewels, and through [his] faculty of discriminative understanding that quickly engaged, clearly and correctly (ma nor ba), [he] tasted plenty of all limits of profound and broad knowable things, which had not even been understood roughly (‘ol spyi tsam) by other people or had not even become objects of [others’] rejoicing. As a result, [he] removed the diseases and impurities, such as the dimness obscuring the three principal fields of learning (vidyāsthāna),79 and since [he] mastered the wealth of the Saints, [he] made [his] body strong, [a body] that was high by [its] rank of helping sentient beings and that had reached the stage of a “King of Dharma” (dharma-marāja). Due to those [qualities], one can say that [he] dwelled well in those [practices] mentioned [by Bhavya in his Madhyamakābhṛdaya (I 5)]:

“Not renouncing the Thought of Awakening, correctly accepting the ascetic restraint of the Sage, and seeking for the knowledge [of] reality, [this] is the conduct that accomplishes all.”80

In particular also:

*The noble science of reasoning, excellent ship for [sailing] the ocean of scriptures [and] excellent wings for [crossing] the sky [of] reality, was well established by [Śākya]muni himself. <11>*

From these [fields of learning], too, the foundation of logical thinking 81—the great science of reasoning, which is the sole [means for] deliverance through the manners such as of a ship or of wings, by which [one is enabled] to experience the distinguished and inconceivable great feast as a result of having arrived on the great island of the jewels [of] good qualities and the excellent place of Great Liberation, after [one] has mainly sailed over the Sugata’s ocean [of] scriptures and crossed the sky of reality—has been explained in manifold ways by parts of the statements of [Śākya]muni himself.

79 The three principal fields of learning here referred to are grammar (gra, śabda), logical reasoning (gan tshigs, betu), and Buddhist philosophy (nang don, adhyātma), which, together with the remaining two, healing (go ba, cikitsā) and crafts (bzo, śilpa), form the set of the so-called “five fields of knowledge” (rig pa’i guṇas luga, pañcavidyāsthāna); see Mey, nos. 1555–1559.
80 See the slightly different canonical version in P 5255 (vol. 96, dza, fol. 2a.6–b.1): byang chub sens ni mi giòng dang|| tshub pa’i brtul zhugs yang dag bren|| de nyid shes pa ’shol ba ni|| don kun bgrub pa’i spyod pa yin||.
81 Tib. ’gal ’brel ’tsul ba bkhyin sens pa (= lit. “thinking according to [logical] contradictions and connections”).
Masters who clarified that [science] included such as the exalted Nāgārjuna and such as Dharmatrāta and Vasubandhu. Nevertheless, for [making it] very clear and thorough, [it was only] due to the noble master Dignāga (Phyogs kyi glang po) that [it] was established. [However], that [science] was not even correctly explained by the master Īśvarasena (dBang phyug sde), student of that one (i.e. Dignāga) himself,84 [but it was] later properly expounded through the seven great treatises (śāstra) on logic and epistemology (pramāṇa)85 [composed] by that king of reasoning, the glorious master Dharmakīrti (Chos kyi grags pa), who appeared in a district of the south [of

---

82 In fact, the xylograph here as well as in the commentary below clearly reads chos skyong (i.e. Dharmapāla), a form that I emended to chos skyob (i.e. Dharmatrāta [see Mvy, no. 3508]) since FRAUWALLNER (1961), pp. 132–137, has shown that Dharmapāla is likely to have lived ca. 530–561, thus making it impossible to regard Dignāga (480–540), whom Gro lung pa mentioned as a later master, as his successor, when indeed he preceded him. Information on Dharmatrāta is found in VAN DER KUIJP (1994), pp. 379–380, where it is stated that the “earliest insertion of this man in Indian Buddhist pramāṇavāda transmissions so far is found in the Chos la ‘jug pa’i sgo of master Bsod nams rtse mo (1142–1182).” See also VAN DER KUIJP (1995), p. 927, n. 21, and JACKSON (1994b), p. 100. A certain Chos skyabs (sic) is also mentioned by JACKSON (1987), p. 442, n. 179, who referred to Glo bo mkhan chen bSod nams lhun grub (1456–1532) and his considering the above together with Vasubandhu and others as early masters of Buddhist logic before Dignāga. Moreover, see the references on Dharmatrāta found in DE LA VALLÉE POUSSEIN (1980), vol. 1, pp. xvii–xviii, and NAKAMURA (1980), p. 43.

83 Tib. [Tshad ma] rnam ’grel (P 5709), composed by Dharmakīrti (ca. 600–660).

84 FRAUWALLNER (1961), p. 141, pointed out that although the tradition regards Īśvarasena (ca. 580–640) as a student of Dignāga and the teacher of Dharmakīrti, “from the point of view of time, these two things are not possible at the same time.” He went on to state that Īśvarasena might well have been the teacher of Dharmakīrti, whereas the “relation to Dignāga as a pupil is a mere external linking together of famous teachers, which is in itself a highly suspicious procedure” (ibid.).

India], being renowned as an emanation of the Victorious One’s [spiritual] son (jinaputra) Samantabhadra (Kun tu bzang po). Nevertheless, those [works that Dharmakirti] composed through unfathomable intellectual powers were not comprehended even by [his] students such as Devendra-buddhi (lHa dbang blo), and therefore, even though [they] wrote many explanations, [they] did not clarify well. Through the excellent explanations of the finely discriminating mental eye, possessing the excellent reliance of moral conduct and faith, such as of the masters Dharmottara (Chos mchog), Prajñākaragupta (Shes rab byung gnas sbas pa) and the brahmin Śaṃkarananda (bDe byed dga’ ba), the basic texts (gzhung), the whole meaning and parts were entirely explained, [and] the world was illuminated as if by sunlight, moonlight, the light of jewels and the light of the Sage.

Moreover, in the past in this land, the exegetical traditions [of] just parts [of] even the basic texts were simply the stupid errors (mun sprul) [of] a place crossed gropingly in the dark. Moreover, as for that [tradition] here in Tibet, even no more than just small parts [of its] basic texts had been translated, and [its] exegetical traditions were very small. [They] could be seen as not more than just approximations [of] groping [hands] (sbar sbur), driven about from behind [by] a wind of arrogance, [arisen] from an erroneous mind through groping about in the dark.

After having seen this state of affairs, [rNgog lo] with great diligence properly studied under such supreme scholars as Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po) and thoroughly illuminated the science of reasoning here [in Tibet] like penetrating sunlight. Therefore [he] considered those [exegetical traditions] very important and gladdened many great scholars (mahāpaṇḍita) such as Parahitabhadra (gZhan la phan pa bzang po), Bhavyabhadra (sKal ldan bzang po), and

86 Tib. rgyal [ba’i] sras is an epithet of Bodhisattvas.
87 The translation of mshan ma la gnam brgyud pa’i sa is uncertain.
88 Bhavyarāja, a Kashmiri logician, was one of rNgog lo’s main teachers (probably not a Buddhist though; see JACKSON [1994b], pp. 94–95) during the latter’s seventeen years of study (1076 to ca. 1092) in Kashmir. Together, they executed a number of translations into Tibetan. For information on their collaboration, see above, p. 39.
89 The Kashmiri Parahitabhadra was rNgog lo’s second main teacher in the field of logic; see above, pp. 39–40.
90 Bhavyabhadra seems to be an erroneous spelling for Bhavyarāja.
Sunayaśrī through the great pains [he took in his studies], and through resorting to the great burden of outstanding diligence, even regarding extremely subtle aspects of both text and sense, [he] gained perfect intellectual illumination, and therefore [he] became a great “Eye” of the Dharma.

Furthermore, having seen the supreme difficulty [of] understanding the Prajñāpāramitā [tradition] and that [its] basic texts had mainly been faultily translated, [rNgog lo] entirely expounded [it], properly accomplishing and completely clarifying [the texts] through [his] outstanding hardships [of studying]. <15>

Even so, as for the state ([gnaṣ] tshul) of the Prajñāpāramitā [tradition], mother of paths of all exalted ones, [its] meaning portion (i.e. doctrinal content) was extremely profound and vast, while the groupings of the text’s words, too, were hard and for the most part also wrongly translated, and therefore [rNgog lo] thought [a correct understanding] depended on instructions of a noble lineage. Even though the knowledgeable living in this [land of Tibet] were for the most part partial to that, all were disturbed by the turmoil of groping in the dark, and [they] were seen as being deceived by many unknown diseases (dal kha) like the vessel of the ocean is disturbed in every direction. Therefore, motivated by the strong force of [his] kindness towards those [ignorant Tibetans], [he] felt great faith and respect towards those [followers] of [Śākya]muni’s tradition in Magadha who possessed the wealth of intelligence and were an “Eye” for that. Consequently, [he] sought [them] out in the southern paths (i.e. in India) that were so difficult to travel through exalted renunciations and applications of exertion hundreds and hundreds of times greater than before, so that on some [occasions he] was deceived by bad messengers wasting [his] possessions and [faced] pointless difficulties because of lying. But since [he] thought that the result of deeds directed at an excellent thing will later arise, [he] did not even show mental weariness and despondency.92

At a later time, [rNgog lo] risked [his] life and, adopting the dress and lifestyle of a beggar, [he] travelled facing repeated difficulties by frightening paths, [but he] somehow escaped all misfortune. And [he] resorted to many [teachers] possessing good characters, preachers of the Dharma, such

91 On Sunayaśrī, see MEJOR (1991), p. 183, n. 70. Sunayaśrī[mitra] of Vikramāśīla is mentioned in the colophon of the Pramāṇavārttikā Lakṣākāra (P 5719) as one of the masters who were invited to the religious council of Tho lìn; see above, pp. 63–65.

92 The exact meaning of this final phrase (’on kyang bzang po’i gnas la giad pa’i las kyi ’bras bu phyis ’byung bas [sic] de’ong po skyo ba dang zhun pa’i bag kyang bstan par mi medad do[|]) remains unclear to me.
as the glorious Go mi 'chi med,\textsuperscript{93} a great wish-granting jewel through many sources of excellent virtues, a great scholar of East [India] who was renowned everywhere because of his coming to Magadha and who had obtained benefit for many beings [and] spread the entire surface of the world with the ornament of [his] good qualities, and Sthirapāla (br'Tan pa skyong),\textsuperscript{94} [whose] neck was adorned with three hundred thousand texts. And [rNgog lo] gladdened [them] through worship and great respect, so that as a result, whichever excellent teaching [he] wanted, [he] received [it from them] correctly. After having accomplished [his] intended purpose according to [his] wishes, [he] properly made major [translation] corrections (zhu\textsubscript{chen}) of the main texts as well as correctly clarified [their] doctrinal contents (don gyi tshul). In the manner expressed [in the verses]:

“Through equally practising compassion and discriminative understanding all the time, [a Bodhisattva] is not distracted from accomplishing the highest accumulation, such as of the [Six] Perfections (pāramitā)\textsuperscript{95} and the [four] ways of attracting [disciples], And at all times a Bodhisattva thinks again and again: ‘What have I done today for the accumulation [of] merit and knowledge or [for] the benefit of others?’”

[rNgog lo’s] powers were infinite [regarding] the Six Perfections, the four ways of attracting [disciples] and the practice of the Dharma (dharmacaryā) divided into ten [activities],\textsuperscript{96} such as compassion that embraces all beings and worshipping the three refuges as part of the two accumulations [of merit and knowledge], led by affection for the students, [those] seeking for the knowledge of Tibet in particular, and [those of] the continent of Jambu-

\textsuperscript{93} Go mi ’chi med is particularly known as rNgog lo’s teacher of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra (P 5184); see above, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{94} After rNgog lo had studied under Sthirapāla (also known as ‘Bum phrag gsum pa) in Magadha, he invited him to Tibet where they are said to have established a scriptural seminary (bshad grwa) at Zhwa lu; see above, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{95} Tib. \textit{pha rol [tu] phyin [pa drug]: 1. the Perfection of giving (sbyin pa, dāna), 2. the Perfection of moral conduct (tsul khrims, śīla), 3. the Perfection of patience (bzod pa, kṣānti), 4. the Perfection of effort (brtson 'grus, vīrya), 5. the Perfection of contemplation (bsam gtan, dhyāna), and 6. the Perfection of discriminative understanding (shes rab, prajñā); see Mvy, nos. 914–919.

\textsuperscript{96} Tib. \textit{chos byi spyod pa bceu}: 1. writing (yi ge 'bri ba, lekhanā), 2. worshipping (mchod pa, piśāna), 3. giving (sbyin pa, dāna), 4. listening (nyan pa, śravaṇa), 5. reading (klog pa, vācana), 6. retaining ('dzin pa, udrāhāna), 7. teaching (rab tu ston pa, prakāśanā), 8. reciting (kha ton 'don byed pa, svādhyāyana), 9. thinking (sens pa, cintāna), and 10. cultivating in meditation (sgom pa, bhāvanā); see Mvy, nos. 903–919.
dvipa in general, [including those] who are considered the foremost [among those] who possess the good fortune of highest virtuousness. Since [his] power was unlimited and since it was supremely difficult to find [someone like him], it was correct\(^97\) to call [him] a “wish-granting jewel.” And since [he] was not distracted from accomplishing the infinite [number of] means of attainment of objects, which guide beings through meditative practice (\textit{thugs dam}) that consists of many excellent practices, [he] was not even satisfied by the gathering of excellent virtues, like the accumulation of water in a great ocean.

\textit{Although the accumulation of enlightened activities of that Principal among the Two-footed is not fathomable by [someone] similar to me, [I] will set forth a little bit\(^98\) [about it], through the power of thorough faith, which has been provoked by the supporting spiritual powers of [this] Master of the Doctrine himself.}  

The mass of enlightened activities of that great [master] outshines a wish-granting jewel, and [it] is more profound and broad than even the great ocean. Thus [someone] like me [with spiritual] capacities extremely unequal [to his], cannot search for [its] limits, since [they] are inconceivable. But since [my] witness, the tongue of respect that arose through having trained the intellect, has experienced a taste collected by [my] hands of great faith, like drops out of an ocean, from among merely the tiny drops of that [master’s] supporting spiritual power and teaching, [I] will set forth, for the purpose of protecting the body of excellent merit, [his] entering the door of complete liberation (i.e. his spiritual career) [in] which [he] made beings mature through [his] faultless undertakings (\textit{rtsom}) of [observing] the three basic [monastic rituals],\(^99\) which are included within the ocean [of] Perfections motivated by the Thought of Awakening.

\textit{[He]}\(^{100}\) worshipped the three most precious things (triratna, i.e. Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha) and, particularly, properly paid homage accord-

---

\(^97\) Although the xylograph clearly reads \textit{rig pa}, at the moment I see no other possibility than to translate as if it read \textit{rigs pa}.

\(^98\) Tib. \textit{thigs tshul} (= lit. “in the manner of drops”).

\(^99\) Tib. \textit{gzhi gsum [cho ga]}, i.e. the confession ceremony (\textit{gso sbyong, posadhā}), the rainy season retreat (\textit{dbyar gnas, varṣā}), and the ceremony performed at the end of the rainy season (\textit{dgag dbye, pravāraṇa}); see \textit{TDCM}, pp. 2421–2422, and \textit{Mit}, nos. 9101–9103.

\(^100\) This verse and its commentary are of a somewhat complicated nature, and my translation of several passages is highly tentative.
ing to the circumstances to the highest assembly through [service] to the
great assembly, to [monks] who suddenly [visited the monastery], [during
his many] over-night stops (dgong mal), to [those who] permanently lived
[in the monastery], and to [those] who only [maintained] the outer char-
acteristics (rtags tsam) [of monks].101 <17>

Namely, for the purpose of worshipping [as] the field (i.e. object) of
merit,102 the Sugata, who possesses the body of the Dharma (dharmakāya),
together with [his spiritual] sons, [he worshipped stūpas at places] such as
Vajrāsana Mahābodhi (rDo rje gdan Byang chub chen po) [in India] and
Svayambhū[nāth], Bhu thang, Šing kun,103 Bodhnāth (Bya ru kha sho),
and Thub pa [in Nepal], where to the foundation there appeared through
[his] mind of faith the forms of the Victorious One together with [his spiri-
tual] sons and of the jewel of Dharma,104 and [he also worshipped] the
accumulation [of] the precious scriptures, which guides beings through [its]
endless supporting spiritual powers, all [those] marvellous and outstanding
[scriptures], which existed [in Tibet] from before and [those] brought
[there] by himself. And since all [of those] holy objects (skyob pa thams cad)
and all religious scriptures (chos) are individually not different in [embody-
ing] the body of the Dharma and ultimate reality (dharmatā), all [holy ob-
jects] are included in each individual one, and as a result of respecting [them
in this way], [he] was filled with unflagging faith. And since from that [his]
mind had a magical command of all teachings (chos), [he] was full of kind-
ness for all beings, as a result of which [he] possessed a firm certainty about
the fruit of such [activities], mentioned in the scriptural passage:

“Someone who applies himself to worshipping the Buddha will not
become subdued by evil.”

Therefore, continually (rgyun [du]) and at times of offering praise, and on
occasions including when beginning to partake [of] such [things] as food
[he] intensively performed worship in every perceivable way,105 through
both, himself and others, by means of [everything] included through the
seven offerings\textsuperscript{106} of things and extensive thoughts, such as (1) palaces and places to live, (2) bathing,\textsuperscript{107} (3) clothes and ornaments, (4) parasols, ornaments, flags (pataēkā), and baldachins, (5) water-bowl offerings, flowers, burning of incense, and illumination, (6) scent, powder, food, drinks,\textsuperscript{108} and [food] to be tasted and to be licked and, (7) different kinds of music. In particular, [he] worshipped the Saṃghas of Bodhisattvas and Śrāvakas, such as the great assembly of [his] followers who strove for the nectar of the Dharma from himself, by [giving them] all good things (bzang dgu) such as teaching the Dharma at the exact time to the Saṃgha in the four directions (i.e. everywhere), and by [giving] medicine. And intensively demonstrating [his great faith] repeatedly through [offering] a great and worthy abundance of such [things] as religious books, gold and silver, silk, ornaments, carriages,\textsuperscript{109} necessary things and fluttering [flags] (lhab lhub),\textsuperscript{110} [he] satisfied [them], and [he] pleased through worthy necessities for life whomsoever, even such [monks] as those suddenly arriving and those departing, who greeted [him] with respect. And even when [he] went wandering in various lands for purposes such as spreading out the great gift of the Dharma, [he] accomplished an abundance of merit that arose out of things through [his donating] many necessities at [his different] places of residence, because of [his many] over-night stops in whatever [place], and so forth.\textsuperscript{111} And [he] made wealthy with excellent [things] all the temples that had been founded by himself for teaching the Sage’s doctrine, and [he] expanded the classes of the three most precious things through [donating] statues (sku gzugs), stūpas, many religious scriptures (dam pa’i chos), riches and many necessities even in [monastic] places that were looked after by other [religious masters]. And because of the words of the Teacher (i.e. Buddha), [he] considered as a field of respect\textsuperscript{112} even those who, due to the impurities of the time, pre-

\textsuperscript{106} I was unable to clearly distinguish the seven items mentioned. In fact, the items enumerated seem to be a mixture of two lists, namely mchod pa brgyad and mchod rdzas bcu, for which see TDCM, pp. 856 and 858 respectively. In the translation I tried to divide the list into seven groups. Note that rgyan occurs twice.

\textsuperscript{107} Tib. sku khrus here presumably refers to the ritual cleansing of a religious image; see TDCM, p. 118.

\textsuperscript{108} The xylograph reads g tung ba here, probably a misprint, since none of the dictionaries or glossaries available to me contains an entry with such a spelling.

\textsuperscript{109} Tib. bzhon pa, i.e. horses or mules as means of transportation.

\textsuperscript{110} Another meaning for lhab lhub is attested to in Mey, no. 6003: vibhūṣaṇa (“ornament”).

\textsuperscript{111} The translation of gang du dgongs (read: dgong) mal la sogs pas is uncertain.

\textsuperscript{112} The meaning of ston pa’i gu ng gi phyogs kyis remains unclear to me.
tended to be monks (śramaṇa) without being monks, [or] who professed to be celibate without being celibate, [or] who spoiled the ornament of ascetics by being concerned with making a living [or] by being enslaved by desire, and [those] who have been said to be the [worst] robbers (chom rkun) of the whole world (lha dang bas pa'i 'jig rten). Not looking down on them, [he] gave [them] what was suitable, [showing] a beautiful face of respect, and therefore [he] never deteriorated from worshipping the Saṃgha, the noble object of [his] offerings; as it was said in a scriptural passage such as:

“As a seed is planted in an excellent [and] fertile field.”

[He] was never satisfied by [his] resorting to spiritual friends, who are the gate [for] the enlightened activities of all protectors, the basis for attaining the complete purified conduct [and] the origin of all happiness. <18>

Furthermore, after [he] had for most of his time taken as [his] teachers even scholars (paṇḍita) beginning with [those] who were versed in only sections (cha) and minor parts (cha chung) of the fields of knowledge for preaching the Dharma, [he had] a perception of [them as] jewels, caused by [their] precious significance, a perception of [them as] an eye, caused by [their] significance of having produced discriminative understanding that was innately born (lhan cig skyes pa'i shes rab), a perception perceived because of [their] teaching the great number of knowable things, a perception of [them as] the great fruit, caused by [their] having produced the final [stage] of complete awakening (saṃbodhi), and accordingly also, a perception of faultless bliss, caused by [their] significance of having achieved the happiness of noble contemplation (samādhi), the means of attainment for that. Through [his viewing them like this], [he never] lacked for gathering the wealth of studying the Dharma’s nectar, too, since [he] studied [under them, serving them] with respect, material possessions, service, and the supplying (sgrub pa) [with necessary things]. [This was so], because [he] thought that the complete purified conduct that arose out of their power would be attained through resorting [to them], since [they] were the gate for the enlightened activities of all Buddhas, the Gurus of beings. According to what has been said, [one] should resort to Noble Men, “since the pure conduct, which depends on spiritual friends, has been pronounced by the completely perfected Sage.” And according to [Śāntideva in his Bodhicaryāvatāra (V 102)]:

“[Never], not even for the sake of [one’s] life, should [one] abandon113 a reliable spiritual friend who is learned in the meaning of

113 As for the tense, I follow the canonical version, which reads gtang (= future stem).
the Mahāyāna and [maintains] the highest ascetic restraint [of] Bodhisattvas.”

Since [he] had mastered the [methods of] translating the Noble Dharma’s scriptures, [he] translated more than 137,000 [ślokas of] Prajñāpāramitā [scriptures and instructions], treatises and basic texts. Since [he] had mastered a matchless method of translating from the Sanskrit language into a different vulgar language (i.e. Tibetan), [he] performed infinite enlightened activities of spreading the precious doctrine also through [his] translating [the scriptures of] the Noble Dharma. Regarding that [activity], in general, from among the scriptures on logic and epistemology (pramāṇa) with more than 72,000 [ślokas, he] for the most part translated “from scratch” (gzhi bsgyur, i.e. without referring to previous translations), [and] a little bit was revised [by him], as a result of which [the following] very correct text[s] remain as “illuminator[s]” that are even more trustworthy than an eye:

(1) the Nyāyabindu (P 5711),
(2) the [Pramāṇa]viniścaya (P 5710), and
(3) three chapters [from] the [Pramāṇa]vārttika (P 5709) [of Dharmakirti].

114 See the slightly different canonical version in P 5272 (vol. 99, la, fol. 15b.2): rtog par dge ba ’i bshes gnyen ni|| theg chen don la mkhas pa dang|| byang chub sems dpa ’i brtul zhugs mchog|| srog gi phyir yang mi gtang ngo||. See also STEINKELLNER (1981), p. 61.

115 This verse was quoted by ’GOS LO TSĀ BA GZHON NU DPA’I (1392–1481), Deb ther sngon po, p. 394 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 326), and partly by GSER MDOG PAN CHEN ŚĀKYA MCHOG LDAN (1428–1507), rNgog lo…, p. 446.4–5 (only lines two to four), thus proving the fact that Gro lung pa’s work was available to Tibetan scholars of the 15th century; see above, p. 77.

116 In the following, the works mentioned have been identified through their Sanskrit titles as far as this was possible. The identifications of some works are questionable in so far as their translation colophons (bsgyur byang) do not mention rNgog lo as translator or revisor but someone else, or are simply missing. But since I always tried to follow the given Tibetan titles closely in identifying the Sanskrit names, I have no other choice but to leave the titles as I found them. Some works have to remain unidentified. Many of the works and their colophons have been examined in more detail in CHAPTER THREE, so that the information given here is reduced to a minimum. Note that from no. (36) onward, the numbers added within parentheses do not correspond to the numbering in JACKSON (1994a), pp. 378–380.

117 I am uncertain about the meaning of le’u guṃ, since the Pramāṇavārttika consists of four chapters. Could it mean that rNgog lo did not revise the complete work but only three chapters out of four?
(4+5) both, the greater and lesser commentaries of master Dharmottara,\textsuperscript{118}

(6+7) both, [his] greater and lesser Pramāṇyaparīkṣā,\textsuperscript{119}

(8) [his] Anyāpoha/-nāma-prakaraṇa,\textsuperscript{120} (P 5748), and

(9) [his] Kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi (P 5751),\textsuperscript{121}

(10) the [Pramāṇa]vārttikālaṃkāra (P 5719) [of Prajñākaragupta],

(11) the commentary on that composed by Yamāri,\textsuperscript{122}

(12) the "Pramāṇa/vārttikānusāra" (i.e. Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā, P 5721) of the Great Brahmin (i.e. Śaṃkaranandana),\textsuperscript{123}

(13) [his] Tshad ma brtag pa bar ma (= "middle" Pramāṇyaparīkṣā),\textsuperscript{124}

(14) [his] [Anya-]apohasiddhi (P 5754), and

(15) [his] Pratibandhasiddhi (P 5755).

From the Prajñāpāramitā [scriptures he translated] more than 48,000 [ślokās]:

(16) for the most part the eighth chapter [of] the "middle" Prajñāpāramitā,\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{118} I.e. the Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā (P 5727) and the Nyāyabinduṭīkā (P 5730).

\textsuperscript{119} I.e. the *Bṛhatprāmāṇyaparīkṣā (P 5746) and the *Laghuprāmāṇyaparīkṣā (P 5747).

\textsuperscript{120} The Tibetan title as it occurs in the list (gZhan sel ba grub pa) is a common abbreviated title also found in BU STON, bDe bar gshegs…, p. 971.4 (= fol. 170a.4) (= NISHIOKA [1981], p. 68, no. 1038). The full title found in the bsTan 'gyur is gZhan sel ba zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa.

\textsuperscript{121} As can be seen from nos. (4) to (9), rNgog lo translated all but one work of Dharmottara, namely the Parallelasiddhi (P 5749), which (according to the colophon) was translated by Bhavyarāja and Pa tshab Nyi ma grags (born 1055). However, KRASSER (1991), vol. 2, p. 10, n. 30, attributed the translation of this work also to rNgog lo. See also STEINKELLNER (1986), p. 12.

\textsuperscript{122} I.e. the Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāratikā Supariṣuddhi (P 5723).

\textsuperscript{123} The meaning of stong ba as part of this title given by Gro lung pa remains unclear.

\textsuperscript{124} Śaṃkaranandana is not known to have composed a work known by this title; see STEINKELLNER & MUCH (1995), pp. 80–84. However, it could be that his Sambandha-parīkṣānusāra (P 5736) was at some time known as Tshad ma brtag pa bar ma in Tibet. At least it is the only work of his that bears the element brtag pa (Skt. parīkṣa) in its Tibetan title ("BreI pa brtag pa'i rjes su 'brun grpaI"). But still, according to its colophon (vol. 137, ze, fol. 44a.3), this work was not translated by rNgog lo, but by Parahitabhadra and dGa ba'i rdo rje.

\textsuperscript{125} This appears to be the Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (P 731). However, rNgog lo is known to have translated the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (P 734), which is not referred to as "middle" Prajñāpāramitā (and which is listed as no. [19] below); see TDCM, p. 2585, s.v. yum rgyas 'bring bsdus gum.
(17) the instruction of that, the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* (P 5184) [of Maitreya(ṇātha)],
(18) the commentary on those composed by master Ārya [Vimuktiśena],
(19) the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (P 734),
(20) the extensive commentary on that composed by the great master [Harih]adra ([Seng ge] bzang po),
(21) the small commentary of that master,
(22) *de’i ti ka rigs kyi byin gyi stod*,
(23) the small commentary of Prajñākaramati (Shes rab ’byung gnas blo gros),
(24) the *Abhisamayālaṃkārakārikāvṛttiśuddhamatī* (P 5199) of master Ratnākara[śānti] (Rin chen ’byung [gnas zhi ba]), and
(25) the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (P 5123/4),
(26+27) both, the root[-text of] the concise commentary *(don bsdus)* of master Dignāga [and its] commentary [by Triratnadāsa].

From among other treatises, [he translated] more than 8,400 [ślokas], some from scratch *(gzhi bsgyur)*, some as revisions:

(28) a later Mahāyāna treatise *(gtsug lag)*, the Dharma’s excellent explanation of Ajita (Ma pham pa, i.e. Maitreya[ṇātha]),
(29) *Dus dang por bya ba mgon po bsdus pa*,
(30) the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (P 5335/6) [of Sāntideva], and
(31) [his] *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra* (P 5272),
(32) the *Prajñāparicchedapañjikā* (P 5278) composed by Dā na shri,

---

126 I.e. the *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti* (P 5185).
127 I.e. the *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyānā* (P 5189).
128 I.e. the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitapadeśaśāstravṛtti* (P 5191).
129 Not identified.
130 I.e. the *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛttipinḍārtha* (P 5193).
131 The colophon of the *Abhisamayālaṃkārakārikāvṛttiśuddhamatī* is silent on a possible involvement of rNgog lo in the translation of this work.
132 There exist two works of this title: P 5123 (composed by Kambalapāda) and P 5124 (authorship unknown). According to the colophons rNgog lo translated both works.
133 I.e. the *Prajñāpāramitāsaṃgrahakārikā* (P 5207) and the *Prajñāpāramitāsaṃgrahakārikāvivaraṇa* (P 5208).
134 This presumably refers to Maitreya[ṇātha]’s *Ratnagotravibhāga* (P 5525).
135 Not identified.
136 Nothing is said about the authorship of the *Prajñāparicchedapañjikā* in P 5278. How-
(33) the Ārya-bhadracaryā[praniṣṭhāna(rāja)]ṭīkā,

(34) Las dang po pa’i tshul,

(35) the [Bodhi]citotpādasmādāmavīdhī (P 5363) [of Jetari],

(36) gNis med thigs pa.

From among scriptures on Tantra, [he translated] more than 8,000 [ślokas]:

(37) the Piṇḍīkṛtasādhanā (P 2661 [= P 4788]) of master Ārya [Nāgārjuna],

(38+39) two commentaries on that,

(40+41) the [Cakrasaṃvara]paśicakrama (P 2150) [of Vajraghaṇṭa] with [its] commentary,

(42) the Caturāṅgasādhanopāyikā [samantabhadrā] (P 2719) of master Buddha[srī]jiṃnāna[pāda] (Sangs rgyas [dpal] ye shes [zhabs]),

(43+44) two commentaries on that, the gNas ldan and the [Caturaṅga-sādhanaṭīkāsāramañjarī (P 2732)] composed by Samantabhadra (Kun tu bzang po),

(45) Rab gnas bsdus pa’i mdo,

(46) the Amoghapāśa[pāramitāṣaṭparīpūraya-nāma-]dhāraṇī (P 367),

(47) rDo rje lcags thag gi gzungs,

—ever, Dā na shri may stand for Dānaśīla; see CORDIER (1915), p. 308, no. 4.

137 Either P 5514 of Śākyamitra, P 5515 of Bhadrāpaṇa, or P 5516 of Vasubandhu. However, according to the colophons, these works were translated by scholars other than rNgog lo. He did in fact translate the Bhadracaryāmahāpraniṣṭhānārājanibandhana (P 5512) of Nāgārjuna.

138 Not identified.

139 Not identified.

140 The colophon of the Pindikrtasadhanā is silent on a possible involvement of rNgog lo in the translation of this work.

141 These appear to be the Pindikrtasadhanapāṣicakramavṛtti (P 2690) of Ratnakara-sānti and the Pindikrtasadhanapāṣicakramāvṛtti (P 2701) of Vibhūticandra, but the colophons of these works are silent on the question of rNgog lo’s participation in their translation.

142 To my knowledge there only exists an autocommentary, namely the Cakrasaṃvarapaśicakramavṛtti (P 2152). But according to its colophon (vol. 51, na, fol. 271a.1–2), this work was translated by Sumatikīrti and Chos kyi dbang phyug.

143 The colophon of the Caturāṅgasādhanopāyikāsamantabhadrā is silent on a possible involvement of rNgog lo in the translation of this work.

144 Not identified.

145 Not identified.

146 Not identified.
(48) the *Abhiṣekavidhi (P 2425) [of Prajñāśrī],¹⁴⁷
(49) the first part (stod) of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasamgitiṭīkā (P 2945)
composed by master Advayavajra (gNyis med rDo rje),¹⁴⁸
(50-51) both, the *Kun spyod kyi rgyud and [its] commentary,¹⁴⁹
(52-61) slightly more than ten [treatises] of Saṃvara (bDe mchog), such
as the basic text and commentary of the Sādhana by Lūhipāda
(Lu i pa),¹⁵⁰
(62-70) nine small [works] from the Vajravārāhi (rDo rje phag mo)
cycle,¹⁵¹
(71) the *Hevajrapindaṭāṭiṭīkā (P 2310) composed by Bodhisattva
Vajragarbha (rDo rje snying po),¹⁵²
(72) a commentary, correctly expounded [through] words, based on the
Kālacakra, composed by master Go mi chen po.¹⁵³

These were all translated “from scratch.”

As for [his] activities such as learning and reading the meaning
[of] basic treatises such as those [mentioned above], through [his]
outstanding [and] faithful diligence [he] despised wealth like [that
of] the gods. <20>

Since [he] trained [his] exalted mind, bright like the sun, [he]
obtained an exact [ascertainment] through the principles of both,
scripture and reasoning, after which, out of [his] great kindness,
[he] distanced [himself] from stinginess (ser sna) and unwillingness
to teach (dpe 'khyud).¹⁵⁴ <21>

¹⁴⁷ The colophon of the *Abhiṣekavidhi is silent on a possible involvement of rNgog lo in
the translation of this work.
¹⁴⁸ The colophon of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasamgitiṭīkā is silent on a possible involvement of
rNgog lo.
¹⁴⁹ Not identified.
¹⁵⁰ Not identified.
¹⁵¹ Not identified.
¹⁵² The colophon of the *Hevajrapindaṭāṭiṭīkā is silent on a possible involvement of
rNgog lo.
¹⁵³ Not identified.
¹⁵⁴ This is how the slightly different spelling dpe mkhyud is explained in TDCM, p. 1635,
namely to keep religious instructions secret due to one’s stinginess. The original meaning
of this term is obviously related to books (dpe) that one keeps (mkhyud) for one’s own
use.
[He] perfectly enjoyed (yongs su spyad pa rmad du byung ba mzdad) through such [activities] as learning and reading those sūtras and śāstras and others, [including] those [works mentioned above] and furthermore the Mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra (P 5521) and the Madhyāntavibhāga (P 5522) of the venerable Ajita (i.e. Maitreyanātha), and many Madhyamaka treatises, such as the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (P 5224) of the venerable Nāgārjuna along with many subcommentaries (vyākhyā), and the works of the master Jñānagarbha (Shes rab [kyi] snying po), the Bodhisattva Śāntarakṣita (Zhi ba `tsho), and the master Kamalaśīla, in the manner stated [in the verse]:

“Someone who maintains reciting, inquiring, comprehending, asking others, and studying (thos pa), his mind will entirely be opened like a lotus [is opened] through the rays of the sun.”

Thereafter, through [his] noble explanations [of those works], too, [he] extensively spread the Sage’s doctrine. Although that [master] thus easily obtained wealth like a great ruler, because [he] applied himself solely to the precious Dharma, as it was explained [by Śāntideva in his Bodhicaryāvatāra (VII 70)]:

“those who maintain the ascetic restraint (brtul zhugs can) are as concentrated as [someone is concentrated when he], carrying a vessel filled with mustard oil (yungs mar) and being supervised (drung bsdad) [by people] [with their] swords drawn, is frightened by being threatened with murder, if [he] spills [some oil],”

155 The latter three masters (fl. mid-8th to early 9th centuries) and their works, known as the “Three Svātantrika [Treatises] of Eastern [India]” (rang rgyud shar guun), namely Jñānagarbha’s Satyadvayavibhaṅga (D 3881, not in P), Śāntarakṣita’s Madhyamakālaṃkāra (P 5284), and Kamalaśīla’s Madhyamakāloka (P 5287), formed the textual foundation of the Svātantrika Yogācāra-Madhyamaka synthesis, the lineage of which was transmitted through rNgoṅ lo. He composed concise commentaries (bsdus don) on all three works (and a subcommentary [rnam bshad] on the Satyadvayavibhaṅga, too, see below) and taught them at his seminary gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog; see JACKSON (1986), p. 15.

156 So far, I was unable to identify the source of this quotation. Note, however, that Gro lung pa also quoted this verse in his biTan rin chen mo, fol. 169a (according to the computer file of this text supplied by the Asian Classics Input Project [ACIP]), where the source is also not indicated. Except for only one difference, namely klog pa (“read”) instead of ’dzin pa (“comprehend”), the quote is identical.

157 See the slightly different canonical version in P 5272 (vol. 99, la, fols. 25b.8–26a.1 [= p. 254.3.8–4.1]): nyungs mar bkang ba’i smod bskur la|| ral gri thogs pas drung bsdad stel|| bo na gud bsdigs jigs pa la|| brtul zhugs can gyis de bzhin bygrims||. See also STEINKELLNER (1981), p. 89.
through [his] firm deportment of excellent contemplation [he] intensively
demonstrated the excellent virtues, such as faith that is not misled by all ob-
jects of desire, [and] entered into reality, the middle of space, without limit
and centre; and out of the high mountain, piled up [with] the immeasurable
jewels [of his] good qualities, there shone forth and burnt brightly [his] dis-
criminative understanding and knowledge, and there arose an excellent
mandala (dkyil 'khor), unbearably sharp and quick. Thereafter, [he] removed
the darkness of ignorance of [those] students158 who were intelligent, had
collected the wealth of faith and took pains in a shining diligence. After that,
[he] was a great sun with a radiating corona of light ('od kyi dra ba 'phro ba)
that opened the lotus of intellect and ripened the crop of virtues. Therefore,
[regarding] the objects, the subtle and vast meanings that do not even enter
the minds of other [people] even roughly or in [their] dreams and are diffi-
cult to obtain even after striving for noble instructions over many lifetimes,
[he] avoided even the slightest (bag tsam) engaging in deceit or arbitrariness,
and having obtained the exact ascertainment from the noble verbal transmis-
sions and the path of reasoning, [he] was one who distanced himself, with
regard to the Dharma, from even the smallest unwillingness as a teacher to
teach, or stinginess, solely through [his] compassionate mind that wished to
accomplish the restricted (nyi tshe) benefit of others.159 (…) 

The corpus of works that were composed by this [master] is as follows:160

(1) concise commentary161 on the Abhisamayālaṃkāra[-nāma-]prajñā-
pāramitā[-upadeśaśāstra] (P 5184) [of Maitreya(nātha)] with [its]
commentary162 (= Ni 3065)163 and

158 The meaning of gdul bya’i thel ldings gzhol bar gyur pa rnams remains unclear to me.
159 Here (fol. 13b.4) ends my translation of Gro lung pa’s work. From the remaining
parts I have only translated the section listing rNgog lo’s own writings (fol. 14a.5–14b.6)
and the colophons (fols. 21b.4–23a.2).
160 The abbreviation “Ni” in the following list refers to NISHIOKA (1983) and his num-
bering of the works attributed to rNgog lo in BU STON, bDe bar gshegs..., pp. 1049.5–
1050.4 (= fol. 209a.5–b.4). VAN DER KUIJP (1983), pp. 33–34, 57, was the first scholar
who identified rNgog lo’s works through Bu ston’s list. See also JACKSON (1987), pp.
161 Tib. don bsdus [pa] (= lit. “summarized sense,” also bsdus don). As it was pointed out
by JACKSON (1993a), pp. 2–5, this particular genre of commentatorial works does also
represent very condensed commentaries in their own right, not only topical outline (sa
bcad) commentaries or summaries as was previously thought by JACKSON (1987), pp.
162 Possibly the commentary of Vimuktisena (P 5185); see no. (18) on p. 105 above.
163 The existence of rNgog lo’s bsdus don on the Abhisamayālaṃkāra had already been
(2) subcommentary [on that] (= Ni 3066),\(^{164}\)
(3) concise commentary on the *Yum brgyad stong pa'i 'grel pa* (= Ni 3067),\(^{165}\)
(4) concise commentary on the *Prajñā[pa]ramitāḥṛdaya* (P 160) with [its] commentary,\(^{166}\) (= Ni 3068),
(5) subcommentary [on that] (= Ni 3069),\(^{167}\)
(6) concise commentaries on the *Mahāyāna[ś]ūtra[ā]laṃkāra* (P 5521),\(^{168}\)
(7) *Uttaratantra* (i.e. *Ratnagotravibhāga*) (P 5525),\(^{169}\)
(8) *Madhyāntavibhāga* (P 5522),\(^{170}\)

reported by Seyfort Ruegg (1969), p. 126, n. 1. Later, van der Kuijp (1985), p. 49, briefly described the work, although it was not commonly available before a photographic reproduction was published in India; see the introduction of this reprint edition (= Jackson [1993b]) for detailed information. See also the recent reproduction of a manuscript of rNgog lo's *bsdus don* in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 125–201.

\(^{164}\) As pointed out by Jackson (1993b), pp. 3 and 25, n. 6, this and the previous work were mentioned in the list of rare books of A khu ching Shes rab rgya mtsho, *dpes rgyun dkon pa*...*, nos. 11470 (phar phyin tik chen) and 11471 (phar phyin tik chung), who classified them as the earliest Tibetan commentaries on the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*.

\(^{165}\) Since the Tibetan title *Yum brgyad stong pa'i 'grel pa* is only vague, the identification remains uncertain. It seems quite likely that the work in question is Haribhadra’s *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyānā* (P 5189), which was revised by rNgog lo. However, van der Kuijp (1983), p. 57, no. 2, tentatively identified it with the *Prajñāpāramitāvṛtti Marmakaumudī* (P 5202) of Abhayākaragupta.

\(^{166}\) There exist at least three commentaries (*ṭīkā*) on this work: those by Vimalamitra (P 5217), Praśāstrasena (P 5220), and Kamalaśīla (P 5221).

\(^{167}\) This commentary of rNgog lo was recently reproduced in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 111–118.

\(^{168}\) This commentary was recently reproduced in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 207–252. There also exists what appears to be a very brief synopsis (*btus pa*) of rNgog lo’s *bsdus don* on the *Mahāyānaśūtra[ā]laṃkāra*, which was first mentioned by van der Kuijp (1987), p. 126, n. 12. The work is found included in Don grub rgyal mtshan, ed., *Legs par bsdus pa bka' gdeam rin po che'i gung gi gces btus nor bu i bang medso* (Bir: 'Tsondu Senghe, 1985), pp. 153–154.

\(^{169}\) rNgog lo’s *bsdus don* on the *Ratnagotravibhāga* was reprinted in India in the 1990s; see the introduction of this edition (= Jackson [1993a]) for more information. Previously, this text had already been used by one Western scholar; see Seyfort Ruegg (1969), pp. 24, 293, 302–304. More recently a manuscript of the work also became accessible through a facsimile reproduction in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 289–367. The existence of a short topical outline of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* written by rNgog lo (and found by R. A. Stein at the Silk Road site of Khara Khoto) is reported by Dr Kazuo Kano in his unpublished dissertation; see Kano (2006), Appendix A, for a diplomatic edition of the text, which is now kept in the British Library (London). See also Kano (forthcoming).

\(^{170}\) This commentary was recently reproduced in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 257–281.
(9) *Dharmadharmaṇāvibhāga* (P 5523) [of Maitreya(nātha)] (= Ni 3070–3073),

(10–13) subcommentaries on each [of the four previous works] (= Ni 3074–3077),\(^{171}\)

(14) concise commentary on the *Mūlamadhyamakārikā* (P 5224) [of Nāgārjuna] (= Ni 3078),

(15) concise commentary on the commentary of that, the *[Mūla-madhyamakārikāvṛtti] Prajñāpradīpa* (P 5253) [of Bhāvaviveka] (= Ni 3079),

(16) concise commentary\(^{172}\) on the *Satyadvaya[vibhāga]* (D 3881) [of Ānāgarbha] and

(17) subcommentary [on that] (= Ni 3086),

(18) concise commentary on the *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* (P 5284) [of Śāntarakṣita] (= Ni 3080),

(19) concise commentary on the *Madhyamakāloka* (P 5287) [of Kāma-laśīla] (= Ni 3081),\(^{173}\)

(20) concise commentary on the *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra* (P 5272) [of Śāntideva] (= Ni 3087) and

(21) subcommentary [on that] (= Ni 3088),

(22) concise commentary on the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (P 5335/6) [of Śāntideva] (= Ni 3082),

(23) summarizing treatise (gehung bshus pa) on the *De kho na la jug pa* (*Tattvāvatāra*)\(^{174}\) (= Ni 3083) and

(24) concise commentary [on that],

(25) concise commentaries on the *Satyadvaya[-avatāra]* (P 5298 = P 5380) and

(26) *[Madhyamaka-]upadeśa* (P 5381) [of Dīpankaraśrījñāna] (= Ni 3084–3085),

---

\(^{171}\) See also A khu ching Shes rab rgya mtsho, dPe rgyun dkon pa…, no. 11472.

\(^{172}\) This work is missing in Bu ston’s list. However, it may be found in GSER MDOG PAN CHEN SHĀKYA MCHO G DN, rNgog lo…, p. 447.1–2, thus demonstrating the independent value of the latter’s list, which apparently should not be regarded as a mere reproduction of Bu ston’s list. See APPENDIX THREE, part 2, no. 16.

\(^{173}\) In addition, GSER MDOG PAN CHEN SHĀKYA MCHO G DN, rNgog lo…, p. 447.2, listed subcommentaries on the *Madhyamakāloka* and the previous work, the *Madhyamakālāṃkāra*. See APPENDIX THREE, part 2, nos. 20 and 21, and VAN DER KUIJP (1983), p. 57, nos. 11 and 12. It is strange, however, that neither Gro lung pa nor Bu ston mentioned these works, which makes one wonder whether they really existed.

\(^{174}\) Unidentified. A more complete title is found in GSER MDOG PAN CHEN SHĀKYA MCHO G DN, rNgog lo…, p. 447.2–3: dBu ma de kho na nyid la jug pa. There exists a *Tattvāvatāravṛtti* (P 5292) of Śrīgupta. See also P 4532.
concise commentary on general [points of] the Madhyamaka [doctrine] (= Ni 3089),\textsuperscript{175}

concise commentary\textsuperscript{176} on the Pramāṇaviniścaya (P 5710) [of Dharmakīrti] with [its] commentary (P 5727) [by Dharmottara] (= Ni 3090),\textsuperscript{177}

large subcommentary [on that] (= Ni 3091),\textsuperscript{178}

concise commentary on the Nyāyābindu (P 5711) [of Dharmakīrti] with [its] commentary (P 5730) [by Dharmottara] (= Ni 3092) and

subcommentary [on that] (= Ni 3093),

concise commentary on the Pramāṇavārttika (P 5709) [of Dharmakīrti] with the [Pramāṇavārttika-]alaṃkāra (P 5719) [of Prajñākaragupta] (= Ni 3094) and

subcommentary on some [sections of] the first chapter’s first part [of the Pramāṇavārttika] (= Ni 3095),

concise commentary on the Chos mchog chen po’i [man] ngag dang po’i tshigs su bcad pa bdun\textsuperscript{179} of the great Dharmottara (= Ni 3096),

explanation [on] some sections (skabs) of the Anyāpoha-[nāma-prakaraṇa] (P 5748) of that [master] (= Ni 3097)

concise commentary on the lesser Prāmāṇyaparīṣṭa (i.e. the *Laghuprāmāṇyaparīṣṭa, P 5747) of master Dharmottara (= Ni 3098),

concise commentary on the [Anyā-]apoha-[nāma-prakaraṇa] (P 5748) [of Dharmottara] (= Ni 3099) and

explanation on [its] first part (= Ni 3100),

---

\textsuperscript{175} This work (dBu ma spyi’i don bsdus) is evidently not a commentary but an independent treatise of a different nature, written in the literary bsdus don style; see JACkSON (1994a), p. 380.

\textsuperscript{176} It is interesting to note that from the following work onward, Gro lung pa uses the term bsdus don, whereas before (except for no. [26]) he only used the forms don bsdus or don bsdus pa (the latter only in no. [24]).

\textsuperscript{177} This commentary was recently reproduced in KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 369–409.

\textsuperscript{178} According to STEINKELLNER (1992), p. 264, n. 51, a manuscript of a work entitled Tshad ma rnam nges kyid dka’gnas rnam bshad ascribed to rNgog lo survives in the Library of the Cultural Palace of National Minorities (Minzu wenhua gong tushuguan) in Beijing. This copy appears to have been the basis for the edition published by the Krong go’i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang (Beijing) in 1994. A manuscript of the same work, apparently kept in a Tibetan monastic library, was recently reproduced in KDSB, vol. 1, pp. 419–705.

\textsuperscript{179} Not identified.
(39) concise commentary on the *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi* (P 5751) [of Dharmottara] (= Ni 3101),

(40) concise commentary on the *[Anya-]*[pahāsasiddhi* (P 5754) of the Great Brahmin (i.e. Śaṃkarāṇandana) (= Ni 3102) and

(41) subcommentary on the first part (= Ni 3103) [of that],

(42) concise commentary on the *Pratibandhasiddhi* (P 5755) [of Śaṃkarāṇandana] (= Ni 3104) and

(43) subcommentary on the first part (= Ni 3105) [of that].

To complete this survey of rNgog lo’s compositions, I add some information taken from Bu ston’s and Śaṃkara mchog ldan’s lists in the following, continuing my numbering from above:

(44) subcommentary on the *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* of Śāntarakṣita

(45) subcommentary on the *Madhyamakāloka* of Kamalaśīla (as mentioned above, n. 173)

(46) *bDud rtsi'i thig le* ("A Drop of the Nectar"), a letter to the Samgha of Tsong ga ru gsum (= Ni 3106). This work was reproduced in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 707–710. The title is listed with slightly different spellings in *GSER MDG PAN CHEN ŚAKEYA MCHOG LDAN, rNgog lo…*, p. 447.5: *bsrong khra ru gsum gyi dge 'duan la spring yig bduod rtsi'i thig pa*. There exists a commentary on this work, written by Śaṃkara mchog ldan (*Pring yig bduod rtsi'i thig pa' rin ma bshaad dpag bsam yongs 'du'i ljon phreng* in: *Complete Works*, vol. 24, Thimphu: Kunzang Tobgey, 1975, pp. 320.6–346.6); see *VAN DER KUIJP* (1983), p. 289, n. 187, and *JACKSON* (1987), pp. 148–149, n. 10, and p. 179, n. 9.

(47) *Dag yig nye mkho bsdu pa*. This is a grammatical treatise, on which see above, p. 16, n. 4. The work was recently reproduced in *KDSB*, vol. 1, pp. 93–109.

(48) *sKyes bu gsum gyi lam gyi rim pa tshigs su bcad pa* ("Verses [on] the Stages of the Path of the Three Individuals"), mentioned by *GSER MDG PAN CHEN ŚAKEYA MCHOG LDAN, rNgog lo…*, p. 447.5.

(49) *Kha che gser slong* (*The Kashmir Appeal for Gold*), a message to Khri bKra shi dbang phyug Nam mkha' btsan (= Ni 3107). The addressee of this message is to be identified with dBang lde (also known as dBang phyug lde or 'Bar lde), who succeeded rTse lde as king of Gu ge at the end of the 11th century A.D.; see *PETECH* (1980), p. 86, and *VITALI* (1996), pp. 337–338, n. 533. It was this dBang lde who is said to have acted as a sponsor of rNgog lo’s activities in Kashmir and—after his return—in Tibet. Apparently, the *Kha che gser slong* of rNgog lo was a request for support (or literally: for gold) to secure his livelihood in Kashmir. The letter is also mentioned by *GŌS LO TŠA BA GZHON NU DPAI, Deb ther sngon pa*, p. 393 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 325). In fact, the composition of such letters of request seems to have been a quite normal procedure in those days, since a similar request for gold, having been made by Rwa lo tsa ba rDo rje grags also addressing dBang lde, is known; see *VITALI* (1996), p. 338.

In addition, one could mention "many letters and small treatises" (*gzhan yang spring yig dang* bsTan bsus chung ngos) referred to by *GSER MDG PAN CHEN ŚAKEYA MCHOG LDAN, rNgog lo…*, p. 447.5, and a *bsTan rim* allegedly written by rNgog lo, references to which
Chapter Five

[Shes rab seng ge's Colophon]\(^{181}\)

fol. 21b.4  

Om Happiness!

That Great Translator, [of whom] a prophecy said:

"the Master of the Doctrine [in] the snowy land [of Tibet], [he] will be ordained in [the area of] lake 'Brog. Blo ldan [will be his name], at the bank [of] the Brahmaputra (lo hi ta),\(^{182}\)"

[when he] reached the age of three times seventeen (i.e. fifty-one years), [he] had perfected [his] body, purified [his] mind, and acted for the benefit of beings.

At first, [he] travelled to India to perfect [his] body. Secondly, dwelling there, [he] sought for knowledge. Thirdly, [being back] in Tibet, [he] acted for the benefit of beings. What need is there to mention [his] other benefitting of beings?

At Lhasa, bSam yas, sGang thog, lHa yangs da lham,\(^{183}\) and Myug gu sna, the numbers of [his] students gathered were 13,700, 13,000 in both [bSam yas and sGang thog], 20,000, and 10,000 respectively, [and] 20,000 male and female Yoga practitioners. [He] had 1,885 assistant teachers (zhar chos [pa]),\(^{184}\) who could teach [through] textual quotation [and] reasoning.

have been located by JACKSON (1996a), p. 238, in the 19th-century list of A KHU CHING SHES RAB RGYA MTSHO, dPe rgyun dkon pa… no. 11107 (rNgoṅ blo ldan shes rab kyi bstan rim) and in a work by Thu’u bkwan Blo bzang chos kyi nyi ma (1737–1802). See also ‘GOS LO TSA BA, Deh ther tag pa…, no. 395 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 326). However, if this text, which is not included in the lists of rNgog lo’s writings (supposing that it is not to be identified with no. 48, which appears to be a work of the lam rim genre), had really existed, should not at least Gro lung pa, who composed a very famous bTan rim himself, have indicated its existence? Possibly it is a dubious addition to rNgog lo’s oeuvre. See also SNELLGROVE & RICHARDSON (1995), p. 160. Further references to hitherto unknown writings of rNgog lo will be listed by Dr Kazuo Kano in the forthcoming publication of his doctoral dissertation.

\(^{181}\) The preceding passage from the end of the list of rNgog lo’s writings to the beginning of the colophons (fol. 14b.6 to 21b.4) is left untranslated.

\(^{182}\) The river here referred to is the sKyid chu, a tributary of the Brahmaputra. On lo hi ta, see e.g. ARIS (1995), pp. 19 and 23.

\(^{183}\) While quoting this passage (see below, n. 186), GSER MDOG PAN CHEN SHAKYA MCHOG LDAN, rNgog lo…, p. 446.5, gave this name as lHa mangs ngan lam. See also DPA’ BO GTSUG LAG PHRENG BA, Dam pa’i chos…, p. 726: lHa yangs ba lam.

\(^{184}\) According to TDCM, p. 2377, zhar is identical to zhor, which bears the meaning of "something secondary to another main thing." Thus, zhar chos pa may be understood as "assistant teacher," and as such it appears to be identical to zur chos pa. On the latter, see DUNG DKAR BLO BZANG ’PHRIN LAS (1993), p. 374, n. 337.
Among them existed 55 who taught the *Pramāṇavārttika*-alaṃkāra and a work by Dharmottara, 255 who taught the *Pramāṇa*-viniścaya, and 1,575 preachers of the Dharma, who taught scriptural teachings. After that Protector of Beings had acted for the benefit of beings in that way, at the age of fifty-one years, his life came to an end in Ma ri.

Irritated by his impermanent body rNgog lo said to his main sons Zhang [Tshe spong ba Chos kyi bla ma] and Gro lung pa [Blo gros 'byung gnas]:

“Someone who enters into the ocean after having thought: ‘After I have climbed aboard this [body], I will go to the other side of the ocean (i.e. reach Nirvāṇa),’ as for [his] body, which is completely destroyed similar to the bursting of a bubble, [he] is entirely deceived by [its] self-nature (svabhāva), which [appears] to be similar [in strength] to an excellent mountain, [but in fact is not]. You, too, should study the Dharma [according to] the [Three] Baskets ([tr]piṭaka):

The ascertainment [of reality] will arise through the means of cognition (pramāṇa) because of seeing the ultimate reality of knowledge.”

After having spoken thus to Zhang and Gro lung pa, rNgog lo passed into the Tuṣita-Heaven near Ma ri [in the area of] bSam yas, at the bank of the

---

185 Could this be Dharmottara’s *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*?

186 GSER MDOG PAN CHEN SHĀKYA MCHOG LDAN, *rNgog lo…*, p. 446,5–7, quoted this passage with only minor differences. ‘GOS LO TSA BA gZHON NU DPAL, *Deb ther sngon po*, p. 394 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], p. 326), gave a paraphrase. Both attributed it to Gro lung pa, proving that Shes rab seng ge’s long colophon, from which the quote is taken, accompanied Gro lung pa’s work already by the late 15th century; see JACKSON (1994), p. 390, n. 16 and 20. However, it is quite remarkable that both, Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507) and ‘Gos lo tsa ba gZhon nu dpal (1392–1481), referred to this passage immediately after quoting verse 19 of the biography (see above, p. 103, n. 115). This can hardly be a coincidence. If Shākya mchog ldan’s quotation had not been so considerably different from gZhon nu dpal’s (and more accurate, too), I would have suspected that the former, who composed his work in 1479, used the latter’s *Deb ther sngon po* as the source of his quotation. ‘Gos lo tsa ba’s work could have already been available at that time (at least in form of a manuscript) since it was written between 1476 and 1478.

187 For *thugs chad* read *thugs bcad par*?

188 Tib., sde snod [gsum], i.e. the “three baskets” of the Buddhist canon, namely collections of texts on the rules of monastic discipline (*dul ba’i sde snod, vinayapiṭaka*), the discourses delivered by the Buddha (*mdo sde’i sde snod, sūtrapiṭaka*), and systematizing works (*mngon pa’i sde snod, abhidharmapiṭaka*).

189 DPA’ BO GTSUG LAG PHRENG BA, *Dam pa’i chos…*, p. 727, gave a partial quotation of rNgog lo’s words. It is interesting to note that he read *chos nyid mthong ba tshad ma’i nges shes* instead of *tshad mas nges shes.*
Brahmaputra. Then, when the corpse was being carried on a cart, an earthquake occurred. Even from the sky [everything] was filled with rainbows, lights and sounds, and the whole ground [was filled] with objects for offering. After that, the corpse was taken to the front (khar) of gSang phu sNe’u thog [monastery], and then the corpse was cremated in the [hamlet of] gSang mda’. [In the course of that,] there appeared [statues of] the Venerable One (bhagavat) Śākyamuni and Mañjuśrī-Arapacana, a five-pointed stūpa, and a conch wound to the right.

A prophecy from the Mañjuśrīmūlatantra says:

“Formerly, for [the benefit of] all beings, I completely renounced the possessions that were hard to renounce. [I] also performed the endless [number of deeds] that are difficult to do. Therefore I became awakened. Near to the snowy region [in] the northern direction from here, someone intelligent (blo ldan) will be born, and for the sake of striving to maintain my doctrine, with regard to philology (yi ge’i sgra) and the objects of explanation, [in him] will arise an unimpeded understanding.”

[Printing Colophon]

Happiness!

Through [his] marvellous deeds for the doctrine of the Victorious One, [he was] the guide to benefit and welfare for the assembly of students. This string of white “water-born” [lotus] (puṇḍarīka) [is]

---

190 Tib. spur shing rta is ambiguous, since spur shing (“wood for burning a corpse”) as well as shing rta (“cart, carriage”) may either be read as compounds.

191 On the monastery of gSang phu (s)Ne’u thog, see above, p. 36, n. 24.

192 gSang mda’ is the place where some ruins of rNgog lo’s tomb are apparently still to be found; see above, p. 44, n. 74.

193 Tib. bcom ldan ‘das (= lit. “[one who] victoriously went beyond”) is one of the ten traditional epithets of a Buddha; see SIMONSSON (1957), pp. 266–268, and GRIFFITHS (1994), pp. 64–65.

194 Blo ldan is the first part of the name rNgog lo received at ordination.

195 Lines 5–6 and 8–9 of this prophecy were quoted by SDe srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtho, bsTan bcos bai du’i rya dkar po… g.ya’ sel…, p. 953.2 (= fol. 410b.3) in connection to rNgog lo. See also SUM pa mkhan po Ye shes dpal ’byor, dPags bsam ljon bzang, p. 189, who quoted lines 5–6.

196 So far I was unable to locate this quotation in the Mañjuśrīmūlatantra (P 162).
the life of liberation of Blo ldan shes rab, successor of the [Great] Teacher (i.e. the Buddha).

Having been urged by an order of Rab 'byams mKha’ spyod dbang po,’197 the basket-holder (piṭakadhara)198 Shes rab seng ge made [this text edition] in the great temple (vihāra) of Gya mtsho phug, in the vicinity of the great religious seminary of dPal ldan dGe ye.199

The swarm of intelligent young bees drinks this essence of wonderful nectar and promulgates many buzzing sounds of joy. May [they] move the top [of their] wings of faith and dance!

In accordance to the sciences (rig byed) [written] on the surface of purely white paper, [the person who] wrote the correct letters [of the printer’s copy] was INga dar. The skilled carver [of] clear blocks was 'Jam dpal, by carving the sides of many pieces of wood (vrksa).

The proofreader of [this text], beautifully produced in this way, was the Buddhist monk (shākya'i dge slong) Tshul khrims seng ge. May the infinite [number] of sentient beings quickly attain the [level] of a completely Awakened One (saṃbuddha) by the merit of this [text].

[Printing Colophon of the “Reprint”]

Since the blocks of this [text] had grown old [and] greatly damaged, [they] were newly made (i.e. recarved) in a wood-pig year200 at [the printing-house of] rTse bDe yangs shar.201

May the excellent virtues spread!

197 Unidentified; possibly one of the rebirths of the Second Zhwa dmar mKha’ dpyod dbang po (1350–1405); see JACKSON (1994a), p. 373.

198 This title refers to someone who possesses (lit. “holds”) a firm knowledge of the (Tibetan) Buddhist canon, or, following HARRISON (1996), p. 75, to a “canon specialist.”

199 Places unidentified; JACKSON (1994a), p. 390, n. 17, suggested a connection to g.Ye/E, a southern district of dBus or to the seminary of Bo dong E, situated at Bo dong in gTsang; see FERRARI (1958), pp. 67 and 156, n. 568. The monastery of Bo dong was in fact the seat of 'Bum phrag gsum pa (i.e. brTan skyon [Sthirapāla]), who was one of rNgog lo’s teachers; see ’GOS LO TSĀ BA GŻHON NU DPA, Deb ther sngon po, p. 420 (tr. ROERICH [1949/53], pp. 345–346), and VAN DER KUIJP (1995), p. 926, n. 20. It is the place where the Sa skya pa master Bla ma dam pa bSod nams rgyal mtshan (1312–1375) received his full ordination in 1331; see SØRENSEN (1994), p. 30.

200 The wood-pig year here referred to might either have been 1695, 1755, 1815, or 1875; see above, p. 75, n. 29.

201 rTse bDe yangs shar is the Eastern Courtyard of the Potala palace in Lhasa.
Appendices
APPENDIX ONE

Canonical Texts Translated or Revised by rNgog lo

It must be stressed that several titles in the following list are titles reconstructed by the modern editors of the canonical catalogues, and that the original Sanskrit titles of these works remain uncertain. The prefixed elements *Ārya-* and *Śrī-* as well as the concluding *-nāma* have been removed without further notice. While this list follows the order of P, the corresponding number of a text’s D version is given whenever the version in P lacks information on the circumstances of the translation.

1.1 Translations in the bKa’ 'gyur

1. *Amoghapāśapāramitāṣaṭparīpūraya-nāma-dhāraṇī* (P 367 [= P 528])
2. *Amoghapāśakalparājavidhi* (D 689)
3. *Aṣṭāḥsasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (P 734)

1.2 Translations in the bsTan ‘gyur

4. *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* (P 2018) of Nāgārjuna
5. *Cakrasaṃvarapañcakrama* (P 2150) of Vajraghaṇṭa
6. *Abhisamaya-nāma-paṭijitkā* (P 2182) of Prajñāraksita
7. *Cakrasaṃvarajāmeghamanaṁjāri* (P 2183) of Prajñāraksita
8. *Cakrasaṃvarahalimaṁjāri* (P 2184) of Prajñāraksita
9. *Cakrasaṃvarahastapājāvidhi* (P 2185) of Prajñāraksita
10. *Tattvagarbhā-nāma-sādhana* (P 2197) of Dad byed go cha
11. *Tattvaśaṁcitāpānīttī* (P 2259) of Śūnyatāsamādhi
12. *Satvārtheśvīṣādāhāna* (P 2260) of Avadhūtipāda
13. *Jñātāviveka* (P 2261) of Śūnyatāsamādhi
14. *Chinnamundavajravāraḥśāndhāna* (P 2262) of Śrimati
15. *Vajrayoginiḥomāvidhi* (P 2264) of Buddhadda
16. *Catturaṅgasādhanaśādhanātākṣaraśādhanā* (P 2732) of Samantabhadra
17. *Mandalavidhi* (P 2796 [= P 5442]) of Niṣkalanikavajra
18. *Manjusriṣigambhiravāksbhāya* (P 2958) of Ghaṇṭa
19. *Trisamayavāhārajāsamatsarasādāhāna* (P 3521) of Kedharanāṇaddhi (?)
20. *Bhagavadāryamaṇjuśrisādhiṣṭhānastuti* (P 3534) of Candragomin

---

1 Vajraghāṇṭa’s *Cakrasaṃvarapañcakrama* is found twice in the Peking edition of the bsTan ‘gyur: P 2150 appears to be rNgog lo’s revision of an earlier translation, while P 4624 is a revision of rNgog lo’s own revision; see above, pp. 54–55, n. 48.
21. Jñānaguṇabhadra-nāma-stuti (P 3535 = D 2711) of Vajrāyudha
22. Piṇḍikramaṭippaṇī (P 4791) of Līlāvajra
23. Prajñāpāramitopadeśa (P 5123) of Kambalapāda
24. Prajñāpāramitopadeśa (P 5124) [no author mentioned]
25. Abhisamayālamkāra (P 5184) of Maitreya[nātha]
26. Abhisamayālamkāratravṛtti (P 5185) of Vimuktisena
27. Abhisamayālamkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyāna (P 5189) of Haribhadra
28. Abhisamayālamkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstravṛtti (P 5191) of Haribhadra
29. Abhisamayālamkāra-vṛttipiṇḍārtha (P 5193) of Prajñākaramati
30. Prajñāpāramitāsamsāgrahakārikā (P 5207) of Dignāga
31. Prajñāpāramitāsamsāgrahakārikāvivaraṇa (P 5208) of Triratnadāsa
32. Bodhisattvavatārā (P 5272) of Śāntideva
33. Prajñāparicchedapratipāṭikā (P 5278) [no author mentioned]
34. Śikṣāsamuccaya (P 5335/6) of Śāntideva
35. Bodhicittotpādasamādānaśāstra (P 5363 [= P 5406]) of Jetāri
36. Trisamvarakrama (P 5375) of Nīlakaṇḍakāśita
37. Bhadracaryayāmabhāpamitāśācondhanirandhana (P 5512) of Nāgārjuna
38. Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra (P 5521 = D 4020) of Maitreya[nātha]
39. Ratnakotravībhaga (P 5525) of Maitreya[nātha]
40. Ratnakotravībhāgaṁyākhyā (P 5526) of Asaṅga
41. Dharmadānagotravībhāga (P 5529) of Vasubandhu
42. Pramāṇavārtta (P 5709) of Dharmakīrti
43. Pramāṇavārtta (P 5710) of Dharmakīrti
44. Nyāyābinduprakarana (P 5711 = D 4212) of Dharmakīrti
45. Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra (P 5719) of Prajñākaragupta
46. Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāratiṣṭhakā Suparīśuddhi (P 5723) of Yamārī
47. Pramāṇavārttikā (P 5727) of Dharmottara
48. Nyāyābindutikā (P 5730) of Dharmottara
49. Pramāṇaparīkṣa I (i.e. *Bṛhatpramāṇaparīkṣa, P 5746) of Dharmottara
50. Pramāṇaparīkṣa II (i.e. *Laghuprāmāṇyaaparīkṣa, P 5747) of Dharmottara
51. Anyāpoha-nāma-prakarana (P 5748) of Dharmottara
52. Kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi (P 5751) of Dharmottara
53. Anyāpohasiddhi (P 5754) of Śāṃkaranandana
54. Pratibandhasiddhi (P 5755) of Śāṃkaranandana

1.3 Uncertain Cases
55. Cakrasaṃvaramandalavidhasamgraha (P 2186) of Prajñārakṣita
56. Upadeśopasamāhāra (P 2957 = D 2106) of Ghanṭa
57. *Pramāṇavārttikaṭīkā* (P 5721) of Śaṅkaranandana
58. *Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti* (P 5722 and P 5726)\(^2\) of Ravigupta

\(^2\) This work is separately arranged in two different volumes. P 5722 is a commentary on the third chapter, while P 5726 is a commentary on the second chapter of the *Pramāṇavārttika*; see Steinkellner & Much (1995), p. 77.
rNgog lo’s Translation Collaborators
Grouped According to Country of Origin

The “nationalities” of rNgog lo’s collaborators mentioned in the following are those that are found in the translation colophons. They should not be taken too literally, since in some colophons certain translators are said to be of a different origin than in other colophons (see particularly the cases of Sumatikīrti and Bhavyarāja).

2.1 Kashmiris
1. Bhavyarāja (sKal ldan rgyal po) P 5709, P 5719, P 5748, P 5751, P 5755
2. Mahājana P 5529
3. Manoratha P 5754
4. Parahitabhadra (gZhan la phan pa bzang po) P 5521 (= D 4020), P 5710, P 5711 (= D 4212), P 5727
5. Sajjana P 5521 (= D 4020), P 5525, P 5526
6. Tilakakalaśa (Thig le bum pa) P 2018, P 5207, P 5208, P 5335, P 5336, P 5512
7. Vināyaka P 2197

2.2 Indians
8. Atulyadāsa (Mi mnyam khol po) P 2796 (= P 5442), P 5278, P 5375
9. ‘Bum phrag gsum pa (i.e. brTan skyong [Sthirapāla]) P 3535 (= D 2711)
10. Go mi ‘chi med P 3521, P 5184, P 5185, P 5191
11. Mañjuśrīśrīsattva P 2958
12. Sumatikīrti P 2150, P 2182–2185, P 2186 (uncertain), P 3534, P 4624, P 5193, P 5272, P 5363 (= P 5406), P 5719, P 5723, P 5730

1 In the colophon of P 5751 Bhavyarāja is referred to as an Indian.
2 In the colophon of P 5272 Sumatikīrti is referred to as a Nepalese.
2.3 Nepalese

13. Nyayanaśrī

14. Saudita

15. Varendraruci

P 2732

P 4791

P 2259–2262, P 2264

2.4 Tibetans

16. Mar pa Do pa Chos kyi dbang phyug

P 3534

2.5 Country of Origin Uncertain

17. Dhīrapāla

P 5189

18. Mañjuśrīvarman

P 367 (= P 528), D 689

---

Nyayanaśrī is not explicitly mentioned as having been a Nepalese, but since it is stated in the colophon of P 2732 that the translation was executed “in a (or: the?) capital of Nepal” (bal yul mthil du), he is likely to have been one; see above, p. 56 (no. 16).

See above, p. 58, n. 57.

While the colophons of P 367 (= P 528) and D 689 refer to Mañjuśrīvarman as a \textit{pandita}, thus making it highly likely that he was a scholar from India or Nepal, the translation colophon of P 3751 mentions a seemingly different Mañjuśrīvarman who is referred to as a “Tibetan translator” (bod kyi lo tsha ba).
Two Lists of rNgog lo’s Works

3.1 The List of Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364)


(lo tsā ba chen pos mdzad pa la| (3065) mngon rgyan  
rgyal ’grel pa dang bcas pa’i bs dus don dang| (3066) rnam bs had dang| (3067) b rgyad st ong ’grel pa’i bs dus don dang| (3068) sher snying ’grel pa dang bcas pa’i bs dus don dang| (3069) rnam bs had dang| (3070) mdo sde rgyan dang| (3071) rgyud bla ma dang| (3072) dbus mtha’ rnam ’byed dang| (3073) chos dang chos nyid rnam ’byed bzhi’i bs dus don re dang| (3074–3077) rnam bs had re dang| (3078) dbu ma rtsa shel| (3079) de’i ’grel pa shes rab sgron ma| (3080) dbu ma rgyan| (3081) dbu ma snang ba| (3082) bslash btus| (3083) de kho na nyid la ’jug pa| (3084) bden gnyis chung ba| (3085) man ngag ste b rgyad la bs dus don re dang| (3086) bden gnyis kyi rnam bs had dang| (3087) spyod ’jug gi bs dus don dang| (3088) rnam bs had dang| (3089) dbu ma sphyi’i don bs dus dang| (3090) tshad ma rnam nges (p. 1050 = fol. 209b) tik dang bcas pa’i don bs dus dang| (3091) rnam bs had chen po dang| (3092) rigs thigs ’grel pa dang bcas pa’i don bs dus dang| (3093) rnam bs had dang| (3094) rnam ’grel rgyan dang bcas pa’i don bs dus dang| (3095) le’i dang pa’i s hod kyi rnam bs had dang| (3096) chos mchog che ba’i man ngag dang po’i thigs b had bs dus gyi bs had dang| (3097) de’i gzh an sel ba’i skabs cung zad bs had pa dang| (3098) slob dpon chos mchog gi tshad ma brtag pa chung ba’i bs dus don dang| (3099) sel ba grub pa’i bs dus don dang| (3100) s Hod kyi rnam bs had dang| (3101) skad cig ’jig pa grub pa’i bs dus don dang| (3102) bram ze chen po’i sel ba grub pa’i bs dus don dang| (3103) s Hod kyi rnam bs had dang| (3104) ’brel pa grub pa’i bs dus don dang| (3105) s Hod kyi rnam par bs had pa dang| (3106) tsong ga ri gu m gyi a ge’ dan la spring yig bs had rtsi’i thig le dang| (3107) khr i bk ra shi sbang phyin nam mkha’ btsan la spring pa kha che gser slogs la sogs pa mang du mdzad do||

3.2 The List of gSer mdog pan chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507)

The following is quoted from Shākya mchog ldan’s rNgog lo tshha ba chen pos bstan pa ji liar bskyangs pa’i tshul mdo tsam du bya ba ngo mthar giam gyi

(p. 446.7) des mdzad pa'i bstan bcos kyi tshogs ni|| (1) mgon par rtogs pa'i rgyan 'grel pa dang bcas pa'i don bsdus dang|| (2) rnam bshad dang|| (3) bryad stong 'grel chen gyi bsdus don dang|| (4) sher snying 'grel pa dang bcas (p. 447) pa'i bsdus don dang|| (5) rnam bshad dang|| (6–9) byams cho os phyi ma bzhi po la bsdus don re dang|| (10–13) rnam bshad re dang|| (14) dbu ma rtsa ba dang|| (15) de'i 'grel pa shes rab sgron ma gnyis la bsdus don re dang|| (16) ye shes snying po'i bden gnyis kyi bsdus don dang|| (17) rnam bshad dang|| (18) dbu ma rgyan dang|| (19) snang ba gnyis la bsdus don re dang|| (20–21) rnam bshad dang|| (22) byang chub sens dpa'i spyod jug la bsdus don (23) rnam bshad dang|| (24) bslab pa kun las btsus pa'i bsdus don dang|| (25) dbu ma de kho na nyid la 'jug pa'i bsdus don dang|| (26) jo bo'i bden gnyis dang|| (27) dbu ma'i man ngag gnyis kyi bsdus don dang|| (28) rnam 'grel rgyan dang bcas pa'i bsdus don dang|| (29) rnam ngs cho mchog dang bcas pa'i bsdus don dang|| (30) rnam bshad chen mo dang|| (31) rigs thigs rgya cher 'grel dang bcas pa'i bsdus don dang|| (32) rnam bshad dang|| (33) cho mchog gi tshad ma brtag pa chung ba dang|| (34) sel ba grub pa dang|| (35) skad cig tu 'jug pa grub pa rnam s kyi bsdus don re dang|| (36) bram ze chen po'i sel ba grub pa dang|| (37) 'grel pa grub pa'i bsdus don re dang|| (38) skyes bu gsum gyi lam gyi rim pa tshigs su bhad pa dang|| (39) btsang kha ri guum gyi dge 'don la spring yig bshad rtsi'i thigs pa dang|| gezhan yang spring yig dang|| bstan bcos chung ngu mang du mdzad do||
Canonical Quotations in Gro lung pa’s Biography of rNgog lo

Gro lung pa’s wording is followed by a quotation of the canonical version as found in P. Variant spellings have been indicated in bold.

4.1 Abhidharmakośa (Vasubandhu)¹

VI 5ab:  
\[\text{tsul gnas thos dang bsam ldan pa}\]  
\[\text{bso gnom pa} \text{ la ni rab tu sbyor}\]  
GRO LUNG PA, Jig rten mig gcig…, fol. 6b.3

\[\text{tsul gnas thos dang bsam ldan pas}\]  
\[\text{bgo ba la ni rab tu sbyor}\]  
P 5590 (vol. 115, go), fol. 20a.2 (= p. 124.2.2)

VII 34:  
\[\text{sangs rgyas thams cad tshogs dang ni}\]  
\[\text{chos sku} \text{ 'gro ba'i don spyod pas}\]  
\[\text{mnyam pa nyid de sku tshe dang}\]  
\[\text{rigs dang sku bong tshod kyis min}\]  
GRO LUNG PA, Jig rten mig gcig…, fols. 1b.5–2a.1

\[\text{sangs rgyas thams cad tshogs dang ni}\]  
\[\text{chos sku} \text{ 'gro ba'i don spyod pas}\]  
\[\text{mnyam pa nyid de sku tshe dang}\]  
\[\text{rigs dang sku bong tshod kyis min}\]  
P 5590 (vol. 115, go), fol. 24b.5–6 (= p. 126.1.5–6)

VIII 39:  
\[\text{ston pa'i dam chos rnam gnyis te}\]  
\[\text{lung dang rtogs pa'i bdag nyid do}\]  
\[\text{de 'dzin byed pa smra byed dang}\]  
\[\text{sgrub par byed pa kho na yin}\]  
GRO LUNG PA, Jig rten mig gcig…, fol. 2b.3

\[\text{ston pa'i dam chos rnam gnyis te}\]  
\[\text{lung dang rtogs pa'i bdag nyid do}\]

¹ For the Sanskrit text of the Abhidharmakośa, see PRADHAN (1967).
4.2 Abhisamayālaṃkāra (Maitreya[nātha])

VIII 10: lha'i rgyal pos char phab kyang||
   sa bon mi rung mi 'khrung lar||
   sangs rgyas rnams ni byung gyur kyang||
   skal ba med pas bzang mi myong||

GRO LUNG PA, 'Jig rten mig geig…, fol. 18b.2–3

4.3 Bodhicaryāvatāra (Śāntideva)

V 81cd: yon tan dang ni phan 'dogs zhing||
   'sdug bsngal ba lâ dge chen 'gyur||

GRO LUNG PA, 'Jig rten mig geig…, fols. 16b.6–17a.1

V 102: rtag par dge ba'i bshes gnyen ni||
   theg chen don la mkhas pa dang||
   byang chub sens dpa' britul zhung mchog||
   srog gi phyir yang mi btang ngo||

GRO LUNG PA, 'Jig rten mig geig…, fol. 11b.3

---

2 For the Sanskrit text of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra, see STCHERBATSKY & OBERMILLER (1929).

3 For the Sanskrit text of the Bodhicaryāvatāra, see VAIDYA (1960).
Appendix Four

byang chub sens dpa'i brtul zhugs mchog
srog gi phyir yang mi gtang ngo

P 5272 (vol. 99, la), fol. 15b.2 (= p. 250.3.2)

VII 70:

yungs mar bkang ba'i snod bskur nas
ral gri thogs pa drung bsdad de
bo na bsod sde 'jigs pa liar
brtul zhugs can gyis de liar bsgrims

GRO LUNG PA, Jig rten mig geig…, fol. 13a.5

nyungs mar bkang ba'i snod bskur la
ral gri thogs pas drung bsdad stey
bo na good bsde 'jigs pa liar
brtul zhugs can gyis de bzhin bsgrims

P 5272 (vol. 99, la), fols. 25b.8–26a.1 (= p. 254.3.8–4.1)

4.4 Madhyamakārdaya (Bhavya)\(^4\)

I 5:

byang chub sens ni mi gong dang
thub pa'i brtul zhugs yang dag len
de nyid shes pa tshol ba ni
don kun sgrub pa'i spyod pa'oo

GRO LUNG PA, Jig rten mig geig…, fol. 7a.6–7b.1

byang chub sens ni mi gong dang
thub pa'i brtul zhugs yang dag bren
de nyid shes pa 'tshol ba ni
don kun bsgrub pa'i spyod pa yin

P 5255 (vol. 96, dza), fol. 2a.6–2b.1 (= p. 3.1.6–2.1)

I 6:

byams pa dang ni snying rje dang
shes pa chen pos brgyan pa yi
sangs rgyas sa bon byang chub sems
de ni mkhas pas bstan mi bya

GRO LUNG PA, Jig rten mig geig…, fol. 6b.2

byams pa dang ni snying rje dang
shes pa chen pos brgyan pa yi

\(^4\) For the Sanskrit text of the Madhyamakārdaya, see Lindtner (2001).
4.5 Ratnagotravibhāga (Maitreya[nātha])

I 41:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{srid dang mya ngan 'das la de'i} \mid \\
\text{sdug bde'i skyon yon mthong ba ni} \mid \\
\text{rigs yod las yin gang phyir de} \mid \\
\text{rigs med dag la med phyir ro} \mid \\
\end{align*}
\]

GRO LUNG PA, ‘Jig rten mig geig…’, fol. 4a.5–6

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{srid dang mya ngan 'das la de'i} \mid \\
\text{sdug bde'i skyon yon mthong ba 'di} \mid \\
\text{rigs yod las yin gang phyir de} \mid \\
\text{rigs med dag la med phyir ro} \mid \\
\end{align*}
\]

P 5525 (vol. 108, phi), fol. 56b.6–7 (= p. 24.5.6–7)

4.6 Suhṛllekha (Nāgārjuna)

\[
\begin{align*}
khyod kyi tshul khrims ma nyams mod mi dma} \mid \\
\text{ma 'dres ma sbags pa dag bsrung bgyi ste} \mid \\
khrims ni rgyu dang mi rgyu'i sa bzhin du} \mid \\
yon tan kun gyi gezi rten lags par gungo} \mid \\
\end{align*}
\]

GRO LUNG PA, ‘Jig rten mig geig…’, fol. 6a.4

\[
\begin{align*}
khyod kyis tshul khrims ma nyams mod mi dma} \mid \\
\text{ma 'dres ma sbags ma gos bsten mar mdzod} \mid \\
khrims ni rgyu dang mi rgyu'i sa bzhin du} \mid \\
yon tan kun gyi gezi rten lags par gungo} \mid \\
\end{align*}
\]

P 5409 (vol. 103, go), fol. 74b.4–5 (= p. 214.1.4–5)

See also the second Tibetan translation P 5682 (vol. 129, nge), fol. 283a.6–7 (= p. 235.3.6–7), which has the following variants compared to P 5409: ma sbags pa dag for ma sbags ma gos in line 2 and legs par for lags par in line 4.

\[5\] For the Sanskrit text of the Ratnagotravibhāga, see JOHNSTON (1950).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>The numbering found in NISHIOKA (1980), (1981), and (1983).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib.</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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