Chapter Two: Tibetan Textual Communities and the Prāsaṅgika Movement

The Indian interest in issues engendered by Candrakīrti's writings around the close of the first millennium enabled Jayānanda to write of the "Svātantrika" interpretation of Madhyamaka to which he saw himself, and Candrakīrti before him, in opposition.[1] We, then, can justifiably speak of a burgeoning "Prāsaṅgika movement"—keeping in mind that we have yet to see an Indian author use the term "Prāsaṅgika"—as a convenient label for those opposed to what Jayānanda calls "Svātantrika" and whose writings explicitly refer to Candrakīrti's writings as inspiration for their opposition to applying the conventions of valid cognition to the ultimate. Rather than the doxographic usage of these terms, in which Tibetan authors sought out doctrinal similarities among the disparate writings of important Indian Mādhyamikas in order to present a coherent and ordered synthesis of Indian Buddhism, in reference to twelfth century developments we can use these terms to refer to burgeoning intellectual movements and appreciate these movements as the initial referents of the terms.

Additionally, as Tibetans began re-importing Indian Buddhism just prior to the onset of the second millennium, translating hundreds of Sanskrit Buddhist texts—many for the first time—into Tibetan and configuring the Tibetan landscape around networks of Buddhist monasteries and temples, we see these competing doctrinal allegiances take the shape of competing socio-political institutions. Around the figures of important Tibetan translators, we can speak

---

[1] We also see the anonymous twelfth century author of the Sanskrit "*Lakṣaòaîⁿkā*" using the term "*svatantrasādhanavādin*"; see Yoshiyasu Yonezawa, "**Lakṣaòaîⁿkā:* A Sanskrit Manuscript of an Anonymous Commentary on the *Prasannapadā*," *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 47, 2 (1999): 1023-1022.

for the first time of living Prāsaṅgika and Svātantrika "schools." This chapter traces the development of these schools in the translation, exegesis, and community formation of several important eleventh and twelfth century figures. Developing themes of the previous chapter, I examine each side's primary philosophical concerns and show how the debates between them led to two distinct schools, in addition to charting the directions for a great deal of the scholastic Tibetan Buddhism that followed.

Territory and Translations in Tibet's Later Diffusion

The great importance of translating the Buddhist canon into Tibetan is suggested by the virtual equation in Tibetan sources of the two "diffusions" (*dar*) of Buddhism in Tibet with the two periods of translations (*'gyur*). The "early diffusion" (*snga dar*) or "early translation" (*snga 'gyur*) in Central Tibet was controlled primarily by the state, as a newly expanding Tibetan empire's widening conquests created contact between Tibetans and Buddhists of India, Central Asia, and China. The Tibetan emperor Trisong Detsen's proclamation of Buddhism as the official state religion led to constructing Samyé Monastery, ordaining the first Tibetan Buddhist monks, inviting the important Indian teachers Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla—the latter reportedly defeating a Chinese Ch'an monk in the Great Debate at Samyé and establishing the "gradual path" of Buddhist practice in Tibet,[2] and translating a massive amount of Buddhist scripture, primarily sátra-based but including some tantras.

Davidson has shown that the bivalent imagery of Buddhist tantra made it appealing to both mendicants, as a religious practice, and rulers, as a model of

---

[2] On this debate, see Paul Demieville, *Le concile de Lhasa* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale de France, 1952).

divine kingship.[3] Tantric imagery of a central deity—with whom a practitioner identifies—in an elaborate palace, at the center of a fortress-like circle (*maṇḍala*) arrayed with lesser deities in smaller circles at the cardinal directions, with an adamantine (*vajra*) wall surrounding all became a powerful metaphor for the rise of semi-feudal lords encompassing and subjecting neighboring lords in the decentralized period following the collapse of the Gupta empire. Kapstein has shown that this metaphor was not lost on the Tibetan emperors who, while not supporting the translation of most tantra, adopted the imagery of Vairocana.[4] Maṇḍala imagery could expand as the empire grew, subjecting neighboring deities/rulers, and offered a cosmic dimension, equating the emperor with a great Buddha. Samyé Monastery, the state-sponsored first Tibetan monastery, itself was constructed on the pattern of the Vairocana maṇḍala.

Pointing to a second imperial Tibetan interest, the Den karma catalog reveals a great wealth of Buddhist treatises of Indian human authorship, including collections of Madhyamaka treatises, Yogācāra treatises, non-tantric cosmological texts, and texts on logic.[5] These early state-sponsored translations speak to what Kapstein called "the charisma of reason"—the appeal that scholastic Buddhist treatises and their carefully constructed logic had to rulers wishing to portray themselves as legitimate centers of a well-ordered universe in

---

[3] Ronald M. Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 118-144.

[4] Matthew Kapstein, *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 60-62.

[5] The *dbu ma'i bstan bcos* (Madhyamaka treatises) are Lalou (Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes Bouddhiques au temps du roi khri-srong-lde-bcan," *Journal Asiatique* 241 [1953]: 333) numbers 573-605, the *rnam par shes pa'i bstan bcos* (Consciousness-[Only] treatises) are numbers 614-654, the *theg pa chung ngu'i bstan bcos* (*abhidharma* treatises) are numbers 686-694, and the *tarka'i phyogs* (logic section) are numbers 695-722.

which their rule was reasonable and logical.[6] These treatises' finely nuanced philosophy would not have been the primary concern of royal patrons.

The early translation period ended with the collapse of the Tibetan empire around 842. This is not to say that all Buddhist activity ceased, as clearly Buddhist practice existed outside of state patronage.[7] In what was known in Tibetan histories as a "Dark Period," formal contacts with neighboring Buddhist lands were broken, as was the monastic ordination lineage. As a measure of prosperity returned to Central Tibet approximately 150 years later, Tibetans sought to renew ordination, initially turning east to the vicinity of the newly formed Tangut kingdom. It is certain that Indian and Kashmiri monks traveled to Tangut lands in these years, some remaining while others traveled onward to the capitol of the Song emperor.[8] We can also note the confluence of accounts in Tibetan historical writing of the "purple-robed monks" who took part in the ordination of the Central Tibetan pilgrims and the accounts of monks in Tangut lands receiving honorary purple robes from the Song emperor.[9] Tibetans very likely turned to this new royal source of Buddhist patronage in order to revive their own monastic lineage.

Tibetan accounts speak of a small group of pilgrims who set out from Central Tibet seeking ordination such that they in turn could revive monastic

---

[6] Kapstein, *Tibetan Assimilation,* 54.

[7] Kapstein (*Tibetan Assimilation,* 11-15) points to the survival of the Tibetan translation language through the Dark Period as evidence for the continuation of Buddhist scholarship, in addition to Buddhist practice, during this period.

[8] See Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhist Relations between India and Sung China," parts 1 and 2, *History of Religions* 6, no. 1 (Aug. 1966): 24-42 and 6, no. 2 (Nov. 1966): 135-168.

[9] Ruth W. Dunnell, *The Great State of White and High* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996), 30 and 188, n.11 records such an event as occurring in 980, the period when Tibetan pilgrims sought ordination to the east.

Buddhism in their homeland.[10] Vitali has shown that following the return of these pilgrims to Central Tibet, several became heirs to imperial temples and founders of new temples and monasteries.[11] One can imagine that these revivalists must have had familial or at least material connection with aristocracy, both in order to make the journey to the east and to undertake building and restoration projects following their return. In certain cases, Tibetan histories tell of these figures returning to their familial lands, building, teaching, and gaining disciples, who in turn built new temples and monasteries. These groups (*sde pa* or *tsho;* "districts") of temples and monasteries linked to a common seat functioned as small-scale political entities or, as van der Kuijp termed them, "administrative-cum-vinaya districts."[12] The re-emergence of hierarchical rule over extended regions of Central Tibet can be attributed to the building efforts of disciples of the pilgrims, whose new centers remained loyal to their teachers' seats. One also finds references to competition and violence between the factions that emerged from the pilgrims, as these groups carved out their territories in Central Tibet.[13]

From this fractured and competitive socio-political landscape, very different from the Imperial period, the "later translation" effort was spawned. At our present stage of knowledge, we cannot precisely map each important Tibetan

---

[10] Craig Earl Watson, "The Second Propagation of Buddhism from Eastern Tibet According to the 'Short Biography of dGongs-pa rab-gsal' by the Third Thukvan bLo-bzaṅ chos-kyi nyi-ma (1737-1802)," *Central Asiatic Journal* 22, nos.3-4 (1978): 263-285.

[11] Roberto Vitali, *Early Temples of Central Tibet* (London: Serindia, 1990), 11 and 37ff. Vitali (p. 62, n. 2) provides a complete listing of these figures from a variety of Tibetan accounts that variously list ten, six, or four pilgrims.

[12] Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, "The Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog and its Abbatial Succession from ca. 1073 to 1250," *Berliner Indologische Studien* 3 (1987): 108-109.

[13] *The Blue Annals,* (George N. Roerich, trans. [Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1949], 378) reports that parts of Samyé were burned in a conflict between two of the originial pilgrims, kLu mes and sBa reg.

translator with a corresponding faction, temple, or clan (indeed, the precise relationships between temple networks, the old aristocracy, and newly important clans are not yet known). We may safely say that the newly formed networks of temples and monasteries sought the same kind of prestige and power that the Tibetan emperor gained in his royal patronage of translation, the poetic legitimation that Sanskrit, even in its translated form, offered.[14] Rather than a central ruler overseeing a unified, large translation project, the later translations were made by heroic individuals who took possession of particular lineages of texts and formed their intellectual property into the cornerstones of their monastic centers. The prestige of Sanskrit radiated from these Tibetan translators, who spent large parts of their lives studying in India, rather than from a central emperor. It contributed to the success of their monastic networks, which must be seen as the forerunners to the great religious orders that would come to dominate Tibetan cultural and political life.

The reasons for Tibetans bifurcating the newly developed Indian lines of Madhyamaka exegesis into competing schools center around translation: texts that had either not yet been written or had yet to gain an Indian following during the early diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet were translated for the first time in the later diffusion—we also see important cases of texts being retranslated—and these translations became the cornerstones of competing proto-sectarian schools. Three categories of texts were chief among the extraordinary amount of material translated in this period: "Highest Yoga Tantras" (*anuttarayogatantra*), tantras utilizing "subtle body" practices that emerged in India after the collapse of the

---

[14] On the idea of the poetic power of Sanskrit, see Sheldon Pollack, "The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, 300-1300 CE: Transculturation, Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideology," in *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, ed. Jan E.M. Houben (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 197-247.

state-sponsored early translations; new interpretations of the logico-epistemological tradition of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti; and Candrakīrti's major writings as well as texts lauding them. While many translators took possession of particular tantras,[15] Ngok Loden Sherab[16] (1059-1109) made his monastic academy synonymous with the study of Dharmakīrti's epistemology and Yogācāra-Madhyamaka, while Patsab Nyimadrak[17] (b.1055) established the study of Candrakīrti's writings in addition to becoming the main teacher in Central Tibet of Nāgārjuna's treatises.

Ngok and Patsab: Textual Ownership and Competing Communities

The Ngok clan affords us one of the more complete pictures of the development of later translation monastic institutions out of the newly re-established ordination lineage. The picture shows a clan that maintained its aristocratic status from Imperial times through the latter diffusion; that split between two competing districts in the early years of the later diffusion; and that built an extremely successful monastic academy, Sangpu, supported by one such

---

[15] For instance, on Drokmi's (*'brog mi*) monopoly of the "Path and Fruit" tantric system, see Ronald M. Davidson, *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, forthcoming).

[16] *rNgog lo tsa ba bLo ldan shes rab.* A biography of Ngok Lostawa, written by his immediate disciple, has recently become available: Dram Dul, *'Jig rten mig gcig blo ldan śes rab kyi rnam thar, Biography of Blo ldan śes rab, The Unique Eye of the World by Gro luṅ pa Blo gros 'byuṅ gnas, The Xylograph Compared with a Bhutanese Manuscript* (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2004).

[17] *sPa tshab Nyi ma grags.* Van der Kuijp ("*Ratnāvali* in Tibet," *Tibet Journal* X, no. 2 [1985]: 4) casts doubt on the year of Patsab's birth, noting that Patsab could consider a trip across the Himalayas in 1136 and was still able to participate in an ordination in 1140. While it does seem unlikely that an 81-year old could even consider a trans-Himalayan trip, Lang ("Spa-tshab Nyi-ma-grags and the Introduction of Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka into Tibet," in *Reflections on Tibetan Culture: Essays in memory of Turrell V. Wylie.* eds. Lawrence Epstein and Richard F. Sherbourne [Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellon Press, 1990], 134) notes that Patsab very likely returned to Tibet from his 23-year sojourn in Kashmir by 1101. If Patsab arrived in Kashmir in 1077, he could not have been born long after 1055.

district and centered around the translations and teachings of its most illustrious member. The formation of the Sangpu academy and its tensions with monasteries of divergent teachings that were associated with competing districts and were yet ultimately aligned with the Kadampa[18] order offers insights into the creation of Tibet's religious orders from proto-sectarian doctrinal and district loyalties, as well as allowing us glimpses into the creation of competing lines of Madhyamaka exegesis.

The Ngok clan was part of the aristocracy during the Tibetan empire; one member was reportedly a minister to the emperor Trisong Detsen.[19] Following the return of the pilgrims with the monastic ordination lineage to Central Tibet, we see divisions in the clan. In 1010, Ngok Jangchub Chungnay[20] became a disciple of Lumay Tsultrim Sherab,[21] one of the pilgrims who returned the ordination lineage to Central Tibet and who undertook renovation and building activity in the Central Tibetan region of U.[22] Ngok Jangchub Chungnay took part in the renovation and expansion of the Imperial Yerpa Temple between 1011 and 1020 and built several affiliate temples, coming to be known as one of the "four pillars"[23] that supported the "roof beams" of Lumay and Sumpa Yeshe Lodro,[24] a mark of his significance in expanding the influence of Lumay.[25]

---

[18] *bKa' gdams pa.*

[19] *Blue Annals,* 324.

[20] *rNgog Byang chub 'byung gnas.*

[21] *kLu mes Tshul khrims shes rab.*

[22] *Blue Annals,* 74.

[23] *ka ba bzhi.* We frequently see important founders and his disciples referred to as parts of a house. The founder seems to be equated with the roof beams (*gdung*), while his most important disciples are the pillars, lesser disciples are doors, planks, and so on. This "construction" metaphor reflects the role of disciples spreading their teacher's influence not simply through teaching but in staking out territory.

[24] *Sum pa Ye shes blo gros.* Sumpa was another of the "Ten Men" who returned the ordination lineage to Central Tibet. He was one of five men from the U (*dbus*) region. However, his importance seems to have been joined with or eclipsed by Lumay's, as the division of U into the

However, in this same time, Ngok Dorje Zhonu[26] maintained ties with the strains of Buddhism surviving from the early diffusion.[27] His son, Ngok Lekpay Sherab,[28] took ordination with Dring Yeshe Lodro,[29] one of Lumay's companions-turned-competitors in returning the ordination lineage to Central Tibet.[30] Ngok Lekpay Sherab made the journey to the east to study with Jowo Setsun[31] (showing that journeys east did not end with the initial reinstatement of the ordination lineage), and to the Western Tibet kingdom, where he worked with the famed translator, Rinchen Zangpo (958-1055).[32] From his travel and study, he seems to have built his own reputation, independently from Ngok Jangchub Chungnay, and built at least three more centers in the Lhasa area, including Sangpu Neutog, just to the south of Lhasa, in 1073.[33] When Atiśa arrived in Central Tibet in 1045, Ngok Jangchub Chungnay hosted him at Yerpa, requesting Atiśa to translate Maitreya's *Sublime Continuum*.[34] Ngok Lekpay Sherab studied with Atiśa at Nyetang[35] and requested that Atiśa translate Bhāvaviveka's *Heart of the Middle* and *Blaze of Reasoning*. These two members of the Ngok clan were

districts connected with the figures from U, reported by Grags pa rgyal mtshan around 1200 (*rGya bod kyi sde pa'i gyes mdo, Sa skya bka' 'bum,* vol. 4 [Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1968], 296.4.2-298.3.3), includes only four names, leaving out Sumpa.

[25] *Blue Annals,* 74-75.

[26] *rNgog rDo rje gzhon nu.*

[27] Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology from the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Century* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1983), 30.

[28] *rNgog Legs pa'i shes rab.*

[29] *'Bring Ye shes blo gros.*

[30] Van der Kuijp, *Contributions,* 30.

[31] *jo bo se btsun.*

[32] *rin chen bzang po;* see *Blue Annals,* 93 and 324.

[33] Accounts of the history of Sangpu (*gsang phu ne'u thog*) are found in van der Kuijp, "The Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog," 103-127.

[34] *Uttaratantra* or *Ratnagotravibhāga.* See *Blue Annals,* 259.

[35] *sNye thang,* built by Atiśa's pre-eminent Tibetan disciple, Dromton (*'Brom ston rGyal ba'i 'byung gnas,* 1004-1063) in 1055. See *Blue Annals,* 324.

both students of Atiśa and yet were key actors in spreading the networks of competing districts.[36] Indeed, van der Kuijp notes that three of Atiśa's main students founded monasteries that were each supported by the four competing "administrative-cum-vinaya districts" into which the U region of Central Tibet was divided.[37] In these instances, we see the new territorial divisions introduced with the return of the ordination lineage superceding clan loyalties and utilizing the prestige of the very same famed Indian teacher to advance competing agendas.

In the next generation, Ngok Loden Sherab, having been ordained by his uncle, Ngok Lekpay Sherab,[38] was part of a contingent of Tibetan translators that the king of Western Tibet convened in 1076 and that subsequently traveled to Kashmir, where Ngok studied for seventeen years.[39] Ngok's most important translations were Prajñākaragupta's *Ornament for (Dharmakīrti's) Valid Cognition,*[40] a commentary on one of Dharmakīrti's most important

---

[36] We also see a third division of the Ngok clan, stemming from rNgok Chos kyi rdo rje (1036-1102) who was instrumental in spreading Mar pa's teachings. See *Blue Annals,* 403 and 667.

[37] Van der Kuijp, "Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog," 108-109. The four districts were Lumay, Ba (*sBa*), Raksha (*Rag sha*), and Dring. Ba and Raksha are together listed as supporters of Nyetang, explaining how three monasteries can be supported by four competing districts. This division of U (*dbu*) is reported by Grags pa rgyal mtshan in his *rGya bod kyi sde pa'i gyes mdo,* 296.4.2-298.3.3.

[38] Van der Kuijp, *Contributions,* 31.

[39] The "religious council" (*chos 'khor*) was convened by rTse lde, king of mNga' ris 'khor gsum at Tho ling; rTse lde's son, dBang phyug lde, sponsored Ngok's trip to Kashmir. See *Blue Annals,* 71, 325; Lobsang Shastri, "The Fire Dragon *Chos 'khor* (1076 AD)," in *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies,* edited by Helmut Krasser, Michael Torsten Much, Ernst Steinkellner, Helmut Tauscher (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), vol. 2, 873-882; and Roberto Vitali, *The Kingdoms of Gu.ge Pu.hrang According to mNga'.ris rgyal.rabs by Gu.ge mkhan.chen Ngag.dbang.grags.pa* (Dharamsala, India: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1996).

[40] *Pramāòavārtikālaôkāra.* Van der Kuijp (*Contributions,* 31-32) notes the confusion that this text was reportedly already translated prior to Ngok Loden Sherab's journey to Kashmir and offers the following solution: The text was indeed translated already by Zangs dkar lo tsa ba 'Phags pa'i shes rab, but this translation was found faulty. Ngok translated it again in Kashmir, whereupon

epistemological treatises that emphasizes the confluence of Dharmakīrti's logic and Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka; Dharmakīrti's second main work, the *Compendium of Valid Cognition*,[41] along with Dharmottara's commentary to it; and Maitreya's *Sublime Continuum,* one of five texts attributed to the future Buddha, Maitreya, primarily concerned with the "Buddha nature" present in all sentient beings. Furthermore, stemming from his studies in Kashmir, Ngok is credited with establishing the Tibetan study of "The Three Mādhyamikas from the East," the main Madhyamaka writings of Jñānagarbha, Śāntarakṣita, and Kamalaśīla.[42]

Upon his return to Central Tibet, Ngok became the abbot of Sangpu Monastery where his mastery of Dharmakīrti's writings increased his fame to the point where he was reported to have 23,000 students.[43] Every important figure in Central Tibet was reported to have studied Dharmakīrti's tradition at Sangpu. In addition to establishing Sangpu as the premier institute for Buddhist epistemology, Ngok wrote summaries (*bsdus don*) of and commentaries on "The Three Mādhyamikas from the East," texts that emphasized the compatibility of

---

his translation arrived in Western Tibet prior to his return, allowing Zangs dkar to edit the translation. Upon Ngok's return, he edited the translation again. This convoluted explanation accounts for the facts that we know about the text. A very similar explanation is given in Marek Mejor, "On the Date of the Tibetan Translations of the *Pramāòasamuccaya* and the *Pramāòavārttika,*" in *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition,* ed. Ernst Steinkellner (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 184-185, where it is suggested that bTsan kha bo che—who traveled to Kashmir with Ngok but returned prior to him—brought Ngok's first translation back to Western Tibet.

[41] *Pramāòaviniścaya*

[42] The *dbu ma shar gsum* are Jñānagarbha's *Distinguishing the Two Truths* (*Satyadvayavibhaṅga*), Śāntarakṣita's *Ornament for the Middle Way* (*Madhyamakālaôkāra*), and Kamalaśla's *Illumination of the Middle Way* (*Madhyamakāloka*).

[43] *Blue Annals,* 73. This tradition needs to be reconciled with the accounts, reported by van der Kuijp ("Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog," 107), that two of Ngok's students, Tshes spong ba Chos kyi bla ma and Gro lung pa Blo gros 'byung gnas, were responsible for expanding Sangpu's physical size, apparently after Ngok Loden Sherab's death.

Madhyamaka philosophy and Dharmakīrti's epistemology.[44] While only three of Ngok's compositions are currently available, thus greatly limiting our knowledge of his views, his reported opposition to Prāsaṅgika accords well with what we see Indian champions of Candrakīrti expounding in this period: Ngok's commitments to the epistemological tradition would place him squarely in opposition to arguments against the inapplicability of valid cognition to the ultimate. As will be discussed briefly below and at length in subsequent chapters, Chapa—who after two generations followed Ngok as Sangpu's abbot—details his opposition to Prāsaṅgika at great length on just such grounds.[45]

In contradistinction to Ngok, Patsab Nyimadrak's interests centered on Candrakīrti's writings.[46] Patsab's ties with aristocracy are less clear than Ngok's. The Pa clan was certainly important during the Imperial period; however, Patsab Nyimadrak was not part of the entourage of translators commissioned by the king of Western Tibet. He studied in Kashmir for twenty-three years, mainly at Ratnaguptavihāra in Śrīnagar,[47] where he translated into Tibetan Candrakīrti's

---

[44] It is interesting that Ngok did not translate these texts anew but instead relied upon the translations done in the early translation period by Ye shes sde and Ka ba dpal rtseg. Clearly, a wealth of materials survived through the "Dark Period" following the collapse of the Tibetan empire. Ngok's summaries and commentaries are not available at present; see van der Kuijp, *Contributions,* 57.

[45] This is not to say that Ngok Loden Sherab's views are exactly mirrored in Chapa's writings. In his commentary to the *Sublime Continuum* (*Theg chen rgyud bla ma'i don bsdus pa* [Dharamsala, India: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1993]), Ngok echoes Śāntideva's proclamation that the ultimate is not a referent of consciousness, a notion that Chapa argues against at length. One hopes for the discovery of more of Ngok's writings in order to illuminate how he understood Śāntideva. As has been noted above, Śāntideva's writings have been interpreted from a decidedly non-Prāsaṅgika viewpoint. One suspects that Ngok, with his emphasis on Dharmakīrti's epistemology, could not have meant, as Jayānanda from the Prāsaṅgika viewpoint wrote, that human valid cognition can play no role in ascertaining the ultimate.

[46] On Patsab, see Karen Lang, "Spa-tshab Nyi-ma-grags," 127-141.

[47] Jean Naudou, *Buddhists of Kaśmīr* (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1980), 210.

two most important works, *Entrance to the Middle* and *Clear Words*.[48] Patsab also translated āryadeva's *Four Hundred Stanzas,* one of the foundational Madhyamaka treatises, and Candrakīrti's commentary on it. Additionally, he retranslated and revised several of Nāgārjuna's most important texts including the *Fundamental Treatise on the Middle.*

The disparities between Ngok's and Patsab's translation activities in Kashmir must have been due to personal inclinations and differing senses of mission. Considering the timeframe—Ngok's stay in Kashmir is reported as 1076-1093; Patsab's stay was likely 1077-1100[49]—and places of their travels, we can imagine that they would have come into contact with the same Sanskrit Buddhist texts; only what they chose to translate differed. This becomes particularly clear when we consider that these two chief Tibetan protagonists in the development of competing schools of Madhyamaka exegesis studied with some of the same Indian and Kashmiri teachers. While Patsab translated Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* with Tilakakalaśa, Ngok translated Dignāga's commentary on the *Eight Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* and Śāntideva's *Compendium of Training* with him. Parahitabhadra taught Ngok Dharmakīrti's *Compendium of Valid Cognition* and *Drop of Reasoning*[50] along with Dharmottara's commentary on the former but is also said to have

---

[48] The former text consists of stanzas and autocommentary; while the stanzas had been translated prior to Patsab's work, by Krṣòa Paòḍita and Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba (b.1011), his translation of the stanzas and autocommentary was the version that became widely known in Tibet.

[49] Lang, "Spa-tshab Nyi-ma-grags," 132 and 134.

[50] *Nyāyabindu;* Ngok translated Dharmottara's commentary on this text with Sumatikīrti who also translated Prajñākaramati's commentary on Śāntideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva's Practice* with Marpa Chos kyi dbang phyug and gNyan Dar ma grags at lCung ka mkhar in dBu ru. Ngok worked again with Sumatikīrti on the translation of another of Prajñākaramati's text, his commentary on the *Ornament of Clear Realizations* (*Abhisamayālaôkāravṛtti-piòḍārtha, sde dge* edition 3795), showing Ngok's familiarity with at least one of Prajñākaramati's texts. The *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* of Vinītadeva was translated in the early diffusion by Ye shes sde.

taught Candrakīrti's *Clear Words* to Mahāsumati, with whom Patsab translated it. Further, Patsab translated āryadeva's *Four Hundred Stanzas* and Candrakīrti's commentary to it with Sákṣmajana whose father, Saìjana, taught Ngok Maitreya's *Sublime Continuum*. Sákṣmajana's grandfather, Mahājana, taught Ngok Maitreya's *Differentiating Phenomena and Noumena,* while his great-grandfather, Ratnavajra, is said to have taught Candrakīrti's *Clear Words* to Parahitabhadra.[51] Bhavyarāja collaborated with Ngok in translating Prajñākaragupta's commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Commentary on [Dignāga's] Valid Cognition,* as well as revising Dharmakīrti's text; he worked with Patsab on the translation of Dharmottara's *Proof of Other Worlds.*[52]

Some of these examples, where Kashmiri is said to teach a text to Kashmiri, may only represent Tibetan attempts to fill in Indian lineages with the names of famed scholars. However, the colophons to the translations mentioned above allow us greater certainty that Ngok and Patsab indeed studied in the same circles. We see many Kashmiri teachers renowned as experts in quite disparate Buddhist literature and that at least some Kashmiris were well familiar with Candrakīrti's writings in the late eleventh century, but not to the exclusion of other studies. Candrakīrti's views, while known in learned, ecumenical Buddhist circles of eleventh century Kashmir, only became the focus for competing schools of Buddhist thought when Patsab arrived in Central Tibet, with Kanakavarman and Tilakakalaśa in tow, shortly after the year 1100.

We often meet accounts that Atiśa established Prāsaṅgika in Tibet. As discussed in the previous chapter, Atiśa clearly favored Candrakīrti's interpretation of the ultimate; the Kadampa school, founded by Atiśa's closest

---

[51] Naudou, *Buddhists of Kaśmīr,* 230.
[52] *Paralokasiddhi.*

Tibetan disciple, Dromton, would be expected likewise to commit to this preference. We know that Naktso, a student of Atiśa, made the first Tibetan translation of Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* (the stanzas, perhaps without autocommentary).[53] However, without the autocommentary—and without Candrakīrti's lengthier companion text, *Clear Words*—Tibetans would have had little hope of appreciating the subtleties in Candrakīrti's writings that led Atiśa to proclaim them to hold the superior interpretation of Madhyamaka. In the nearly fifty years between Atiśa's death and Patsab's return to Central Tibet, Ngok Lekpay Sherab—also a student of Atiśa's—built Sangpu and his nephew, Ngok Loden Sherab, established it as the pre-eminent center of scholastic Buddhism (recall the account of Loden Sherab's 23,000 students). Thus, rather than a Tibet converted to Prāsaṅgika by Atiśa, Patsab returned to find the study of non-tantric Buddhism flourishing without translations of Candrakīrti's most important texts.

Patsab was not immediately successful in establishing his teaching of Candrakīrti's texts. With Kanakavarman and Tilakakalaśa, he worked at two of Lhasa's most ancient temples, Ramoche and Lhasa Trulnang,[54] revising his translations of Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* and *Clear Words*—on the basis of manuscripts different from those he had used in Kashmir[55]—as well as

---

[53] It is possible that Naktso did translate Candrakīrti's autocommentary but that his translation was lost over time and never included in any canonical collection. Tsongkhapa, in his own commentary to Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* (his *dGongs pa rab gsal*), refers several times to what he calls Naktso's translation of Candrakīrti's autocommentary. Another commentary on Candrakīrti's text, written by one of Tsongkhapa's teachers, Rendawa (*Red mda' ba gzhon nu blo gros*), likewise seems to have access to Naktso's translation of Candrakīrti's autocommentary.

[54] *lha sa* (or, *ra sa*) *'phrul snang.*

[55] Ruegg (David Seyfort Ruegg, *Three Studies in the History of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Philosophy, Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Thought, Part I* [Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2000], 45) translates the phrase *nyi 'og shar phyogs* in the colophons to these translations—describing the provenance of the

revising again Nāgārjuna's *Fundamental Treatise on the Middle.* We have no certainty as to when he moved to Gyel Lhakang,[56] built by another of Lumay's "Four Pillars," near his birthplace north of Lhasa. There, the Kadampa Sharwapa sent his own students to study Madhyamaka with Patsab;[57] one wonders if Atiśa's Prāsaṅgika preference survived in some Kadampa circles, where the appearance of Candrakīrti's writings in Tibetan was eagerly awaited. In any case, at some time prior to Patsab's death shortly after 1140,[58] Gyel Lhakang became the center for Prāsaṅgika studies, and for the study of Nāgārjuna's treatises, in Central Tibet, affiliated—like Sangpu—with the Kadampa order but supported

---

manuscripts Patsab utilized at Ramoche—as "eastern borderland," and notes the identification of *nyi 'og* with the Sanskrit Aparāntaka.

[56] *rgyal lha khang* in *'phan yul* was built in 1012 by the bKa' gdams pa Zhang sna nam rDo rje dbang phyug (976-1060). Ruegg (*Three Studies,* 45, n.89) points out that its destruction by a Mongol army in 1240 may account for the lack of information we have on Patsab. The Blue Annals (p. 89) further notes that a rMa bya rNa ra ba (1060-1129) was the abbot of Gyel Lhakang from 1120 until his death in 1129. Patsab's ascendancy may have followed.

[57] *Blue Annals*, 272 and 342; Shar ba pa Yon tan grags's dates are 1070-1141. Both Patsab's and Ngok's monasteries were tied to the Kadampa order. An odd comment in the *Blue Annals* (327) states that rNgog Legs pa'i shes rab and rNgog bLo ldan shes rab were "holders of the Master's treatises," but that Legs pa'i shes rab, having also been a student of 'Brom ston pa, was a bKa' gdams pa. This suggests that the bKa' gdams order was understood as originating from 'Brom ston pa and was not strictly associated with Atiśa's teachings. gSang phu scholars following bLo ldan shes rab perhaps were not considered bKa' gdams pa. It could be that the "followers of Ngok" (*rngog lugs*) were distinguished from "mainstream" bKa' gdams in holding to a Svātantrika position, or it could be that bKa' gdams pa scholars maintained diverse views long after Candrakīrti's teachings first became widely known in Tibet.

[58] If more of Ngok Loden Sherab's (died in 1109) writings become available, we could better pin down the rise of Patsab's teaching career according to whether or not Ngok refers at length to Prāsaṅgika notions. Ngok's denial that the ultimate is an object of knowledge and his followers' opposition to Candrakīrti's views could be rendered more comprehensible if Ngok drew the former notion from Śāntideva's writings, without knowledge of Candrakīrti's positing a similar idea—that is, Ngok may have written before Patsab successfully spread Candrakīrti's writings. Some traditions, discussed below, have Chapa's (1109-1169) students leaving Sangpu to study with Patsab. If this were so, Patsab's fame may have come quite late in his life, as Chapa could not have had students to lose to Patsab until roughly 1130.

by Lumay's district—as opposed to Sangpu's connection with the Dring district—and based entirely on Patsab's translation activities.[59]

What was it about Ngok's translations, on the one hand, and Patsab's on the other, that led to the establishment of successful centers of competing exoteric study? We can look first to the quality of the translations. Saito has shown that Patsab's translation of Nāgārjuna's *Fundamental Treatise on the Middle*—made first in Kashmir and a second time in Lhasa—follows the much older translation of Lui Gyeltsen[60] in places where the older translation is clearly incorrect.[61] A more complete study would likely show instances where Patsab's translation of the stanzas differs from that of Lui Gyeltsen in order to reflect Candrakīrti's explanation of the stanzas. Philological accuracy, a criterion which most Tibetans would not have been in a position to judge, was not a simple matter of substituting Tibetan correspondences for Sanskrit originals but varied both depending on the commentarial tradition that a translator followed and the

---

[59] Patsab is only known to have written one brief text, a "Questions and Answers on Madhyamaka" (*dbu ma'i dris lan*), written to Shar ba pa. This text does not survive but is noted in 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa's *Grub mtha' chen mo* and in A khu Shes rab rgya mtsho's rare books list, *dPe rgyun dkon pa 'ga' zhig gi tho yig.* See Ruegg, *Three Studies,* 45, n.88 and 47, n.96.

[60] *cog ro klu'i rgyal mtshan.*

[61] Akira Saito, "Problems in Translating the *Mālamadhyamakakārikā* as Cited in its Commentaries," in *Buddhist Translations: Problems and Perspectives,* ed. Doboom Tulku (New Delhi: Manohar, 1995), 87-96. Saito shows that Lui Gyeltsen translated Nāgārjuna's stanzas in accordance with Avalokitavrata's massive sub-commentary to Bhāvaviveka's *Lamp for Wisdom:* Avalokitavrata's text, in which Bhāvaviveka's and Nāgārjuna's texts are embedded in their entirety, was translated first, then Bhāvaviveka's and Nāgārjuna's texts were rendered according to Avalokitavrata's explanation. Lui Gyeltsen then translated two additional commentaries on Nāgārjuna's stanzas, Buddhapālita's and the *Akutobhayā,* which in places (Saito lists twelve instances) explain the stanzas differently from Avalokitavrata, and yet Lui Gyeltsen still utilized Avalokitavrata's rendering of these stanzas. In such places, Lui Gyeltsen's translation of Nāgārjuna's stanzas embedded in Buddhapālita's commentary and in the *Akutobhayā* is not in keeping with the explanation these commentaries give; a different translation was required. Patsab's translation of Nāgārjuna's stanzas—which was made according to Candrakīrti's explanation of the stanzas in his *Clear Words*—retained Lui Gyelsten's wording in some places (Saito focuses on one instance) where a differing translation should have been given.

semantic connotations the translator wished to evoke, as we see in parts of Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle,* the stanzas of which Patsab re-translated into Tibetan.[62] Nor can we point to readability as a reason for the translations' success, as the Tibetan translations produce a Tibetan that would have been unrecognizable to literate Tibetans who did not know Sanskrit.

The incomprehensibility of the Tibetan translations points to both the function of the translation and the role of the translators. Writing of the turn across south and southeast Asia in the early years of the second millennium from composing high literature in Sanskrit to composing in vernacular, Pollack comments that the vernacular literature composed under the influence of the "Sanskrit Cosmopolis" was intelligible only to those who knew Sanskrit.[63] Tibetans' translations, rather than compositions, exhibit a similarly Sanskritized language that would have required the translator's explanation to become meaningful to Tibetans. This requirement recalls van der Kuijp's remarks on the importance of oral transmission in the early Tibetan "valid cognition" literature.[64] Van der Kuijp speaks of the importance for Indian *paṇḍitas* to have the proper oral transmission for a text in order to teach it to a Tibetan translator. As already noted above, lines of Indian transmission as reported in Tibetan sources vary considerably and may only represent Tibetan attempts to validate their

---

[62] Tauscher has shown that Patsab edited—in conformity with his re-translation—only the parts of Naktso's translation of Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* that he found most important (Helmut Tauscher, "Some Problems of Textual History in Connection with the Tibetan Translations of the *Madhyamakāvatāra* and its Commentary," in *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy,* ed. Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher [Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 1983], 293-303). Even in those edited portions, we see disparities in the Tibetan including instances, discussed in Chapter Three, where Naktso's translation utilized a term crucial to the valid cognition (*'khrul ba*) tradition in places where Patsab chose a varying Tibetan term (*rdzun pa*).
[63] Pollack, "The Sanskrit Cosmopolis," 244.
[64] Van der Kuijp, *Contributions,* 2-7.

teachings. Van der Kuijp's examples from Sakya Paṇḍita's opus, in which Sapaṇ attributes information to the Indian Śākyaśrībhadra's oral teaching, are more pertinent: there we see a Tibetan translator, teacher, and monastic abbot utilizing his relation with an esteemed Indian as justification for his interpretation of a translated text that, by itself, would have been incomprehensible.

Recourse to well-respected Indians' explanations operated in conjunction with translations that bore the stamp of the Sanskrit Buddhist tradition to enable Tibetan translators an interpretive power with which to teach and form monastic curricula. Kellner suggests the importance of translators' teaching activity as she wonders, regarding the early valid cognition literature, "how to conceive of the interrelation between translational activities, exegetical enterprises and individual interpretation in medieval Tibetan monastic culture."[65] The insights of several scholars of medieval Europe, studying the vernacular turn away from Latin literature, help illuminate the nature of this interrelation. Stock's notion of "textual communities" highlights the communal role of the Tibetan translators: one conversant in both the "high" literature and the vernacular served as a reader for the larger community, an interpreter who delineated the community's views.[66] Ngok's and Patsab's roles as teachers and community leaders are well-attested. We can likewise see that their translation activity parlayed into definite interpretations of Buddhist exoteric literature that served as the "positions" of their respective monastic academies.

---

[65] Birgit Kellner, "Types of Incompatibility (*'gal ba*) and Types of Non-Cognition (*ma/mi dmigs*) in Early Tibetan *Tshad Ma* Literature," *PIATS*, Graz, vol. 1, 496.

[66] Brian Stock, *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 22-23. Anne Blackburn has adopted Stock's ideas in her analysis of eighteenth century Śrī Laṅkan Buddhist communities in Anne M. Blackburn, *Buddhist Learning and Textual Practice in Eighteenth-Century Lankan Monastic Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

As noted above, Patsab's teaching activity did not yield literary productions, but was almost entirely oral. In contrast, Ngok was known to have authored many "summaries" and commentaries on valid cognition texts, Madhyamaka, and all five of the Maitreya texts.[67] Dagenais shows a strong link in European medieval literature between reception, reading, and the composition of glosses and commentaries, which he terms "lecturature," texts born out of reading and responding to received texts.[68] While still lacking much of the period manuscript evidence that could more fully document this, I suggest that the move from translating to teaching for these Tibetan figures can be located at least in part in their readings of their translated texts. Ngok's and Patsab's translations would have required their own readings, whether written or oral, to become intelligible. Stock opines that the commentarial reading of a text is the text that lives in a given community's minds[69] while Irvine sees the "authority of the gloss" marking a text as canonical and then imperceptibly coming to replace it, as the commentarial meaning becomes the meaning of the text.[70] Even more than commentary, in which a Sanskritic term could be explained with recourse both to Indian commentaries and oral explanations, the Tibetan genre of "summary" (*bsdus don*) works to replace the text that it summarizes, as authors no longer follow the order and wording of a text but instead present their understanding of

[67] Van der Kuijp, *Contributions,* 57.
[68] John Dagenais, *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the 'Libro de buen amor'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 24.
[69] Stock, *Listening*, 27.
[70] Martin Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 390. Rita Copeland, in her *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), likewise speaks to the primacy of the commentary, as it can be oriented toward the "changing conditions of understanding" of a community of readers (p. 64), whereas the text itself must remain stable.

its condensed (*bsdus pa*) meaning (*don*). Ngok's extensive use of this genre maps onto the curriculum he established at Sangpu.[71]

The success of Ngok's and Patsab's monastic academies can be attributed in large part to their translation activities when we understand that the value of the translations lie not so much in their philological fidelity but as conduits of the Sanskrit Buddhist tradition. Ngok's and Patsab's roles changed dramatically upon their respective returns to Central Tibet, from student and translator to teacher and leader of monastic communities. Their translations stood as the basis for teaching, structuring the subject matter while at the same time serving to authenticate it. The legitimacy the two gained through their lengthy sojourns in Kashmir added to their translations' power, contributing to their teaching popularity. Built as they were on divergent visions of Buddhist scripture, their institutes' successes would bring the two into conflict over a nexus of issues that centered on the validity of human valid cognition in the attainment of Buddhahood. These divergent visions were known in eleventh century India but only when they became the textual bases of competing Tibetan monastic institutes did they become codified into separate Buddhist schools.

Texts in Conflict and the Scholastic Solution

As Sangpu and Gyel Lhakang, homes to directly competing visions of Buddhist doctrine, were built roughly two days walk from one another, conflict

---

[71] Van der Kuijp ("Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog," 111) lists four topics: valid cognition, the Maitreya texts, cosmology (*abhidharma*), and monastic discipline (*vinaya*). We also know that the Madhyamaka interpretation following Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla was taught there. Among the few of Ngok's texts currently available, we have a commentary on the *Sublime Continuum* (*Uttaratantra* or *Ratnagotravibhāga,* cited above) that adopts a synoptic style, overlaying its own topical outline (*sa bcad*) in order to present the subject matter of the text, and a commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Compendium of Valid Cognition* (*Pramāòaviniścaya;* rNgog blo ldan shes rab, *Tshad ma rnam nges kyi dka' gnas rnam bshad* [Beijing: krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1994), that follows the root text more closely.

between the two was certain to arise. We can surmise that Ngok was familiar with Candrakīrti's writings, given his connections in Kashmir with the same teachers with whom Patsab studied; we can also assume on the same grounds that he knew Patsab. However, the current lack of Ngok's writings coupled with our uncertainty as to when Patsab's fame grew prevent us from knowing whether this debate began in the period between Patsab's return to Central Tibet just after 1100 and prior to Ngok's death in 1109. Nor do we yet see Candrakīrti's ideas figuring prominently in the writings of Ngok's immediate disciples.[72] At present, we can only be certain that Candrakīrti's ideas gained sufficient prominence to provoke a lengthy critique by the sixth Sangpu abbot, Chapa Chokyi Sengé (1109-1169).[73] Despite the fairly close proximity of Sangpu and Gyel Lhakang, it may have been Jayānanda's travels in Central Tibet that engendered the clash between their readings of Buddhist literature.

Jayānanda worked closely with Khu Dodebar on translating several of Nāgārjuna's writings, including a revision of Nāgārjuna's *Refutation of Objections*,[74] and translating his own *Hammer of Logic,* a text that begins with a direct criticism of "logicians following Dharmakīrti."[75] That he promoted

---

[72] I have yet to find any reference to the debates that Candrakīrti's ideas engendered in Gro lung pa bLo gros 'byung gnas's *bsTan rim chen mo;* however, my search of this massive treatise is not yet complete. We do see criticism of Maitrīpāda's *yid la mi byed pa* ("non-attention," literally, "taking nothing to mind") teaching, which may well be related. Gro lung pa was one of Ngok Loden Sherab's main students and Chapa's teacher of the Perfection of Wisdom literature. Van der Kuijp cites an account that Gro lung pa was still teaching at Sangpu when Chapa was the abbot, making it likely that he too took part in the arguments against Prāsaṅgika.

[73] *Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge;* much more on Chapa follows below and in subsequent chapters.

[74] *Vigrahavyāvartanī.*

[75] *Tarkamudgara, rtog ge tho ba,* stanza 1; *sde dge* edition 3869, vol. *ya,* 374b.3-4: *yul dngos stobs kyis zhugs pa yi // tshad mas de nyid rtogs so zhes // chos kyi grags pa'i rjes 'brang ba'i // rtog ge ba rnams smra bar byed /* "Logicians following Dharmakīrti propound that reality is realized through objectively gained valid cognition." As discussed in Chapter Three, Jayānanda criticizes this view at length.

Candrakīrti's interpretation of Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka is certain from his lengthy commentary to Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle,* which was, however, composed after his stay in Central Tibet. He also worked at least once with Patsab Nyimadrak, in addition to Khu Dodebar, on the translation of Atiśa's *Compendium of Sātras,* at the request of Patsab's supporter, Sharwapa.[76] We see reports that Jayānanda met Chapa Chokyi Sengé at Sangpu in order to debate the merits of Candrakīrti's interpretation of Madhyamaka; Chapa is said to have prevailed.[77] Following his stay in Central Tibet, Jayānanda traveled to the Tangut kingdom, Xi-xia, where he took part in the massive translation project from Chinese, Tibetan, and Sanskrit sources into the Tangut language.[78] He also wrote his commentary to Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* in Tangut lands.

While the particulars of Jayānanda's travels, translations, and writings are not found, I propose this tentative chronology. Jayānanda worked with Khu Dodebar prior to leaving Central Tibet for Xi-xia. The ability to date Khu Dodebar would aid us in placing a likely year on Jayānanda's arrival in Central Tibet. We know that Khu was also a student of Patsab Nyimadrak, and that Khu

---

[76] *Mahāsātrasamuccaya, sde dge* edition 3961; the colophon lists Jayānanda, Patsab, and Khu mDo sde 'bar as translators, working in dPal ldan Ya gad at Zhogs.

[77] As reported in Śākya mchog ldan (1428-1507), *dBu ma rnam par nges pa'i mdzod lung dang rigs pa'i rgya mtsho, Collected Works,* vol. 14 (Thimphu, Bhutan: Kunzang Tobgey, 1975), 518. Śākya mchog ldan's account of this debate is drawn directly from Chapa's *Compilation of the Three Mādhyamikas from the East* (*dBu ma shar gsum stong mthun*), in a section where Chapa states a number of (hypothetical) opponent's objections and his own responses. It is possible, but unlikely, that Chapa's text recounts the verbatim contents of an actual debate.

[78] On Jayānanda's role, see Leonard W.J. Van der Kuijp, "Jayānanda. A Twelfth Century *Guoshi* from Kashmir Among the Tangut," *Central Asiatic Journal* 3-4 (1993): 188-197. On the Tangut translation project generally, see E.I. Kychanov, "From the History of the Tangut Translation of the Buddhist Canon," in *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies Commemorating the 200[h] Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Koros,* ed. Louis Ligetti (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadú, 1984), 377-387. And on Tibetan culture among the Tanguts, see E.I. Kychanov, "Tibetans and Tibetan Culture in the Tangut State Hsi Hsia (982-1227)," in *Proceedings of the Csoma de Koros Memorial Symposium, 1976,* ed. Louis Ligeti (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadú, 1978), 205-211.

and Jayānanda worked with Patsab. Jayānanda also worked with another of Patsab Nyimadrak's students, Patsab Gomnag, who went to Xi-xia with Jayānanda and the Tibetan Kungadrak.[79] Jayānanda was thus active in Central Tibet with Patsab Nyimadrak's junior contemporaries, suggesting that Patsab's reputation had already been made; this was likely between 1120 and 1140. Stressing further Jayānanda's relations with Patsab's students and not Patsab himself, we should note that Jayānanda's commentary on Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* contains many citations of this text and one lengthy citation of Candrakīrti's *Clear Words* that differ markedly from Patsab's translations of these texts.[80] Jayānanda certainly did not use Patsab's translations of Candrakīrti when translating his own composition into Tibetan in Tangut lands.

During the reign of the Tangut emperor Renzong (or Renxiao; r. 1139-1193) Jayānanda worked in Xi-xia, holding the position of National Preceptor (*guoshi*), with Kungadrak, who served as Dharma Preceptor (*fashi*).[81] Jayānanda wrote his commentary on Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* in this time and worked on its translation with Kungadrak. While Indian Buddhists were known in Tangut lands from at least 980 and ethnic Tibetans from the neighboring Kokonor region were a constant presence among the Tanguts, Tangut relations with Song China were much more vital, if antagonistic, than relations with its western neighbors until the Jurchen conquest of North China in 1126.[82] Renzong

---

[79] On Pa tshab sGom nag, see *Blue Annals,* 923-928. Given the connection between Jayānanda, Kun dga' grags, and Pa tshab sgom nag and the certainty that the former two worked together on translations in Tangut lands, one wonders whether Pa tshab sgom nag could be the collaborator of Jayānanda and Kun dga' grags known only as Poloxiansheng, who held the office of Imperial Preceptor (*dishi;* see Van der Kuijp, "Jayānanda," 189-190).

[80] Jayānanda's citation of *Clear Words* is in his *Madhyamakāvatāraṭīkā, sde dge* edition 3870, *dbu ma,* vol. *ra,* 108b.6ff.

[81] Van der Kuijp, "Jayānanda," 188-189.

[82] Dunnell, *The Great State,* 27-50. Dunnell records four requests by the Tangut court to Song China for a copy of the Song Buddhist canon between 1031 and 1058. Kychanov ("History of the

initiated the office of Imperial Preceptor and staffed it with Tibetan monks after 1149.[83] This date is a likely terminus for Jayānanda's sojourn in Central Tibet.

Jayānanda was active in Central Tibet, then, during Chapa Chokyi Sengé's maturity, thus lending credibility to the report that the two met at Sangpu. Jayānanda's commentary on Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* had yet to be written during this period; only his *Hammer of Logic* would have been known to Chapa and his contemporaries. Chapa's lengthy critique of Candrakīrti's views in his *Compilation of the Three Mādhyamikas from the East*,[84] Chapa's only text currently available, was clearly written in knowledge of a contemporary portrayal of Prāsaṅgika and not only in response to Candrakīrti's texts; it was written in knowledge of Jayānanda's "smashing" the conventions of valid cognition with his *Hammer of Logic* and Jayānanda's presentation, yet unwritten, of Candrakīrti's views.[85] Jayānanda's commentary, in turn, was written in knowledge of and at least partially in response to Chapa's critique. We do, in fact, see Jayānanda retort to Chapa's criticisms of Candrakīrti's understanding of Buddhahood.[86] The cross-pollination between Candrakīrti's critique of valid cognition's applicability to the ultimate, as portrayed by several important Indian scholars of this period, and the Sangpu tradition that actively

---

Tangut Translation," 381-382) shows the presence of Tangut translations from Tibetan at least from 1085. The Tibetan originals, however, could well have come from the Kokonor region and cannot be used as evidence for Tangut relations with Central Tibet in the late-eleventh century.

[83] Dunnell, *The Great State,* xxiv.

[84] Helmut Tauscher, ed., *Phya pa chos kyi seng ge: dbu ma śar gsum gyi stoṅ thun* (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 1999).

[85] I show in Chapter Three that Chapa's portrayal of Candrakīrti presupposes knowledge of Jayānanda's ideas. It is well possible that Chapa had in mind the portrayal of Candrakīrti by his former students who abandoned his views in favor of Prāsaṅgika, particularly the writings of rMa bya byang chub brtson 'grus.

[86] *Madhyamakāvatāraṭīkā, sde dge* edition 3870, *dbu ma,* vol. *ra,* 146b.5ff, commenting on stanza VI.28. This is discussed at length in Chapter Four.

propagated Dharmakīrti's epistemology took shape from this contact, either personally or literarily, between Jayānanda and Chapa.

Chapa's critique of Prāsaṅgika clearly identifies the philosophical issues at stake in the Prāsaṅgika movement. As discussed in detail in subsequent chapters, the debate focused on: whether or not human consciousness, prior to the direct realization of emptiness, could be valid cognition; whether or not formal inference could be utilized in knowing emptiness; and whether or not a Buddha has cognitive events of any kind—indeed, whether or not the state of Buddhahood bears any recognizable relationship to our mundane state. Chapa's affirmative stance on these issues, and the close relationship he saw between the conventions of valid cognition and knowledge of emptiness, set a course that most Tibetan scholarship would follow. However, during his lifetime, some of Chapa's best students left him in order to study Prāsaṅgika with Jayānanda and Patsab.[87] This loss signals a shift in Central Tibet away from the Sangpu position—which in this period bears the label "Svātantrika"[88]—toward Prāsaṅgika. Just as the contact between Jayānanda and Chapa began the active debate between these conflicting positions, Chapa's "loss" engendered a new type of Prāsaṅgika, one which had to account for Chapa's many and pertinent criticisms. Accommodating the conventions of valid cognition within a Prāsaṅgika view—which to Chapa and Jayānanda would seem ludicrous—would become a hallmark of Tibetan Prāsaṅgika exegesis, the implications of which are still elaborated upon in present-day Tibetan monasteries.

---

[87] Van der Kuijp (*Contributions,* 69) notes a "massive shift in allegiance away from Phya-pa."
[88] In the writings of Jayānanda, Mabja Jangchub Tsondru, and Chapa's student, Sonam Tsemo (who is discussed below).

Three of Chapa's students departed from their teacher in order to study Prāsaṅgika: Tsang Nakpa Tsondru Senge[89] studied with Patsab Nyimadrak; Mabja Jangchub Tsondru[90] studied with Jayānanda, Khu Dodebar, and Patsab; and Tsur Zhonu Senge[91] studied Prāsaṅgika with Tsang Nakpa and Mabja. Mabja's study with Jayānanda and Khu Dodebar suggests that his interest in Prāsaṅgika sprang from Jayānanda's physical or literary presence at Sangpu. In fact, Mabja wrote a commentary, not presently available, on Jayānanda's *Hammer of Logic*,[92] a text translated into Tibetan (and perhaps even composed) during Jayānanda's stay in Central Tibet and so very likely known at Sangpu. Mabja also taught *Hammer of Logic* to Tsur Zhonu Senge.[93] Mabja's commentary on *Hammer of Logic* seems to have been the locus for his extensive discussion of a Mādhyamika's use of the conventions of valid cognition, on which he maintained a decidedly Prāsaṅgika stance.[94] It could well be that *Hammer of*

---

[89] *gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge,* d. 1171. See David Jackson, "Madhyamaka Studies Among the Early Sa-skya-pas," *Tibet Journal* X, 2 (1985): 24.

[90] *rMa bya Byang chub brtson 'grus,* d. 1185. See Jackson, "Madhyamaka Studies," 24 and Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, "Notes on the Transmission of Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvali* in Tibet," *Tibet Journal* X, 2 (1985): 8.

[91] *mTshur gZhon nu seng ge.* See Jackson, "Madhyamaka Studies," 24 and van der Kuijp, "Notes on the Transmission," 8. One of Tsur's valid cognition texts has recently become available: Pascale Hugon, *mTshur ston gZhon nu seng ge, Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma* (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2004).

[92] *Blue Annals,* 343.

[93] Jackson, "Madhyamaka Studies," 24.

[94] Williams notes that Mabja refers readers of his *'Thad pa'i rgyan* to an *dBu ma'i de kho na nyid gtan la dbab pa* for his own more thorough discussion of these issues. Williams suspects that this was the subtitle to Mabja's *Hammer of Logic* commentary; Williams takes as the main title that used by the Eighth Karmapa, Mi bskyod rdo rje, to refer to Mabja's commentary, *Rigs rgyan snang ba.* See Paul Williams, "rMa bya pa Byang chub brtson 'grus on Madhyamaka Method," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 13 (1985): 207 and 220, nn. 7 and 8. The (sub)title bears a close similarity to the alternative title Chapa gave to his *Compilation of the Three Mādhyamikas from the East,* namely, *dbu ma de kho na nyid kyi snying po.* Given this similarity, Mabja could instead be referring to his independent work, *dBu ma stong mthun* (*Compilation of Madhyamaka*).

Logic swayed Mabja away from Chapa's positions and led to him adopting the Prāsaṅgika view, which he then studied in full with Jayānanda and, following Jayānanda's departure to Tangut lands, with Patsab. This would explain how Mabja is credited with linking the two Tibetan transmissions of Candrakīrti's writings—that stemming from Patsab and that stemming from Jayānanda.[95]

Chapa's students would have been well-versed in the Buddhist epistemological tradition that Jayānanda's interpretation of Prāsaṅgika so heatedly criticized. Tsang Nakpa's commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Compendium of Valid Cognition* survives into the present.[96] These students' revolt against Chapa cannot be seen entirely as a rejection of Chapa's epistemological project. Rather, their adoption of Prāsaṅgika began the process of conjoining Candrakīrti's writings with epistemological pursuits, a process that Jayānanda certainly, and Candrakīrti likely, would have found distasteful. While Jayānanda pried Mabja away from Chapa, Mabja did not fully leave Sangpu's epistemological tradition but rather utilized his early training to provide Prāsaṅgika defenses against Chapa's epistemological critique. As will be discussed at length in Chapter Three, Mabja's only presently-known text, a commentary on Nāgārjuna's *Fundamental Treatise on the Middle* called the *Ornament of Disputation*,[97] evinces several developments in a Prāsaṅgika

---

[95] This link is reported in van der Kuijp, "Notes on the Transmission," 8. Van der Kuijp further reports that Tibetan historians disagree as to whether Mabja Jangchub Tsondru studied with Patsab directly or with one of Patsab's students, Mabja Jangchub Yeshe (*rMa bya Byang chub ye shes*). Mabja Jangchub Tsondru's study with Jayānanda make it more likely that he would have studied with Patsab's student, rather than Patsab.

[96] gTsang nag pa, *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i îika Legs bshad bsdus pa,* Otani University TibetanWorks Series, 2 (Kyōto: Otani University, 1989).

[97] rMa bya pa Byang chub brtson 'grus, *dBu ma rtsa ba shes rab kyi 'grel pa 'Thad pa'i rgyan* (Rumtek, Sikkim: Dharma Chakra Center, 1975).

position that are not known to have been held by Patsab and were not held by Jayānanda.

Specifically, referring to the debate on whether a Mādhyamika may employ formal inference, Mabja allowed that a Mādhyamika may hold a positive thesis (a thesis maintaining the establishment of something) conventionally.[98] Mabja states this immediately after citing two positions that later authors attribute to Patsab and Khu Dodebar, respectively, the former holding that a Mādhyamika may only hold a negative thesis (a thesis maintaining the refutation of something) and the latter holding that a Mādhyamika can hold no thesis at all.[99] Following Jayānanda's and possibly Patsab's idea, Mabja maintains that "objectively gained valid cognition" does not exist, an idea anathema to Chapa.[100] Mabja also writes that a Mādhyamika's use of logical consequences does not

---

[98] Ruegg, *Three Studies,* 164; Williams, "rMa bya pa," 205-208; and rMa bya, *'Thad pa'i rgyan,* 41-42.

[99] Ruegg, *Three Studies,* 159-162. There, Ruegg points out that we do not know whether Patsab's view is here stated from an ultimate or conventional vantage point. Additionally, Mabja criticizes a third position, similar to that purportedly held by Khu Dodebar, that a Mādhyamika negates only with respect to the opponent's position and so does not have a negative thesis. This is regarded as Mabja Jangchub Yeshe's position. See Ruegg, *Three Studies,* 166-167. While Mabja Jangchub Tsondru reports these positions, he does not identify who held them; rather, this information is supplied by much later authors. As noted in the Introduction to this dissertation, the recent publications of eleventh and twelfth century Tibetan philosophical literature allows us to begin evaluating the accounts later Tibetan authors gave of these earlier scholars and, as noted there, the results are mixed: we see portrayals of, for instance, Chapa's views that seem to be entirely off base.

[100] In *'Thad pa'i rgyan* (p.41ff) Mabja argues against "objectively gained [valid cognition]" (*dngos po'i stobs kyis zhugs*) or "valid cognition with an unmistaken mode of apprehension" (*'dzin stangs mi 'khrul pa'i tshad ma*) in favor of "valid cognition renowned in the world" (*'jig rten la grags pa'i tshad ma*), noting that the latter category includes the four types of valid cognition that were accepted in non-Buddhist schools, the same four types that Candrakīrti also accepted in the "worldly renown" context: direct perception, inference, analogy, and testimony. Much more on this topic is found in Chapter Three.

imply the statement of a formal inference;[101] this directly answers Chapa's claim that any effective logical consequence operates on the same grounds as, and comes to be identical with, formal inference (see the Materials section). Mabja's views evince a split from Chapa's standpoints and also a development from his Prāsaṅgika teachers that incorporates certain epistemological perspectives and argues against others.

Not all of Chapa's students abandoned his anti-Prāsaṅgika polemic. The second Sakya hierarch, Sonam Tsemo (1142-1182), studied with Chapa and wrote a commentary on Śāntideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva's Practices* that, according to its colophon, was written according to Chapa's teachings.[102] Sonam Tsemo's commentary to Śāntideva's famed text contains the earliest known use of "Prāsaṅgika" and "Svātantrika" for the names of two distinct movements. Sonam Tsemo first uses these terms to distinguish two arguments concerning a Buddha's ability to perceive the things that appear to our ordinary consciousnesses (*snang bcas kyi blo*): Prāsaṅgikas hold that Buddhas do not have this ability because perceiving ordinary appearances entails one's entrapment in saôsāra; Svātantrikas maintain that Buddhas have "conventional wisdom" (*ye shes kun rdzob*) that allows them to perceive ordinary appearances without these perceptions acting as a cause for saôsāra.[103] Following his report of the Prāsaṅgika view, Sonam Tsemo states "That is not correct," notes that his way of arguing for cutting saôsāra is similar to the Prāsaṅgika arguments but that his

---

[101] Ruegg (*Three Studies,* 167-168) notes Mabja's argument against *sgrub byed 'phen pa'i thal 'gyur* ("consequences that imply proof") in his *'Thad pa'i rgyan* (Thimpu edition, 21a; Rumtek edition, 44). I discuss Mabja's arguments in detail in Chapter Three.

[102] bSod nams rtse mo, *Byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa'i 'grel pa,* in *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum,* vol. 2 (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1968), 515.2.5-6 (vol. *ca,* 335a.5-6).

[103] bSod nams rtse mo, *sPyod pa la 'jug pa'i 'grel pa,* 495.4.1-496.1.3 (vol. *ca,* 296a.1-296b.3).

answer differs, then proceeds to state the Svātantrika position.[104] On this issue, Sonam Tsemo clearly maintains a Svātantrika position, in keeping with Chapa's views.

Sonam Tsemo further employs the terms "Svātantrika" and "Prāsaṅgika" in listing arguments concerning the possibility of worldly valid cognition. Svātantrikas maintain its necessity, noting that if there were no worldly valid cognition meditation on emptiness would be pointless. Two varying Prāsaṅgika viewpoints refute worldly valid cognition, one maintaining that all minds are erroneous (*mæṣā, rdzun pa*) and thereby not valid (the extension of this view is that Buddhas do not have minds) and the other holding that "mere yogic conventional [minds]" (*rnal 'byor gyi kun rdzob tsam*), while still erroneous, can be utilized to refute an opponent's wrong conceptions.[105] Sonam Tsemo does not comment here on the validity of one side or the other. However, both passages in which he uses "Svātantrika" and "Prāsaṅgika" offer more information on the issues that separated these developing schools of exegesis in the latter part of the twelfth century. Prāsaṅgikas hold a stark divide between saôsāra and nirvāṇa, disallowing that a Buddha has any mental state concordant with saôsāra and negating any possibility that worldly consciousness can validly know the ultimate. Svātantrikas soften this divide, offering solutions for how a Buddha still perceives what we perceive and how our states of mind can non-mistakenly eliminate false understanding and develop insight into the ultimate.

The third Sakya hierarch and Sonam Tsemo's younger brother, Drakpa Gyeltsen (1147-1216), offers further insight into the manifold interpretations of Madhyamaka in his day and into the issues dividing the Prāsaṅgika and

---

[104] bSod nams rtse mo, *sPyod pa la 'jug pa'i 'grel pa,* 495.4.5-6 (vol. *ca,* 296a.5-6).
[105] bSod nams rtse mo, *sPyod pa la 'jug pa'i 'grel pa,* 511.2.2-511.4.2 (vol. *ca,* 327a.2-328a.2).

Svātantrika interpretations. His *Clearly Realizing Tantra: A Precious Tree* includes a doxographical section that, when dividing types of Madhyamaka, does not use the terms "Prāsaṅgika" and "Svātantrika" but instead employs a five-fold division of Madhyamaka according to assertions on conventional truth, perhaps linking followers of Candrakīrti's thought with "Mādhyamikas of Worldly Renown" (*'jig rten grags sde pa*).[106] Later, when discussing whether Buddhas have conventional states of mind or only ultimate states, Drakpa Gyeltsen recounts four views, calling the last two "Prāsaṅgika" and "Svātantrika."[107] This presentation allows us to see that the issues that the new Prāsaṅgika interpretation engendered did not concern issues of conventional truth but centered around the relationship between a Buddha's rarefied consciousness (although some in this debate would not accept the label "consciousness") and the objects perceived by our ordinary consciousness.

As will be seen in Chapters Four and Five, Drakpa Gyeltsen devotes no small effort to discussing the various views, current in his day, on the relationships between a Buddha's consciousness and ordinary states of mind and between our ordinary states of mind and emptiness. He discusses Yogācāra-Madhyamaka views on nirvāṇa, followed by two unattributed views, one of

---

[106] Grags pa rgyal mtshan's *rGyud kyi mngon par rtogs pa rin po che'i ljong shing* (in *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum,* vol. 3 [Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1968], 15.3.2 [vol. *cha,* 30a.2]) makes this five-fold division into: *'jig rten grags sde pa, bye brag smra ba dang tshul mtshungs pa* ("Mādhyamikas similar to Vaibhāṣikas"), *sgyu ma pa* ("Illusion-[like] Mādhyamikas"), *mdo sde spyod pa* ("Sautrāntika Mādhyamikas"), and *rnal 'byor spyod pa'i dbu ma pa* ("Yogic Practice Mādhyamikas"). The connection between Mādhyamikas of Worldly Renown and Prāsaṅgika is not made overtly by Drakpa Gyeltsen but by his later commentators.

[107] When listing the four views in *Rin po che'i ljon shing,* 21.3.6-21.4.1, Drakpa calls the third and fourth *rgyun chad rab tu mi gnas pa* ("[Mental] Continuum Cutting Thoroughly Non-Abiding [Mādhyamikas]") and *zung 'jug rab tu mi gnas pa* ("Uniting [Method and Wisdom] Thoroughly Non-Abiding [Mādhyamikas]"), respectively. However, when discussing these, the third is called *dbu ma thal 'gyur ba* ("Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka," 21.4.5) and the fourth is called *dbu ma rang rgyud pa* ("Svātantrika Madhyamaka," 22.1.1).

which appears to be a Prāsaṅgika answer to Chapa's criticisms (discussed in Chapter Five) that the Prāsaṅgika presentation of nirvāṇa amounts to nihilism.[108] After presenting the third view, that there is no fundamental difference between Yogācāra and Madhyamaka (a view reminiscent of Ratnākaraśānti's), Drakpa Gyeltsen concludes, "In any case, [these three] differ in their assertions on suchness but assert no differences regarding the mind of enlightenment and the practice of the perfections."[109] The Madhyamaka debates that Drakpa Gyeltsen reports, and around which the Prāsaṅgika-Svātantrika distinction was made, clearly center on various interpretations of how realization of emptiness is made, what transformations that realization entails, and how one so transformed relates to the ordinary world—and not issues of conventional establishment.

Drakpa Gyeltsen's text is extraordinarily valuable for the many interpretations it presents from this period and for the insights it offers into the progress of Candrakīrti's views. One might expect Drakpa Gyeltsen to express a strong Yogācāra-Madhyamaka view, following his older brother. This is in fact evidenced in certain passages. When discussing the views on what state of mind a Buddha has, referred to above, Drakpa favors the Svātantrika position on the grounds that it allows an explanation of non-abiding nirvāṇa.[110] However, when presenting the two truths, he frequently cites Candrakīrti's authority, quoting

---

[108] The three views seem to be varying ways of separating Madhyamaka from Yogācāra; the first two views—Yogācāra-Madhyamaka and, I believe, Prāsaṅgika—state how the Madhyamaka presentation of nirvāòa differs from the Yogācāra position. The third view, claiming no essential difference between Yogācāra and Madhyamaka, does not discuss nirvāòa directly. The Yogācāra-Madhyamaka view concludes on Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 15.4.4 while the second view, introduced only by "certain Mādhyamikas" (*dbu ma pa kha cig*), is at 15.4.4-16.1.2.

[109] Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 16.1.4: *gang ltar yang rung ste de kho na nyid la 'dod pa mi mthun gyi byang chub sems dang pha rol tu phyin pa'i spyod pa la khyad par mi 'dod pas.*

[110] Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 21.4.6 pronounces that the Prāsaṅgika position "is not correct." 22.1.1-4 presents the Svātantrika view that allows for non-abiding nirvāòa and a presentation of a Buddha as both always in meditative equipoise and able to aid sentient beings.

Entrance to the Middle five times and Candrakīrti's commentary to Nāgārjuna's *Sixty Stanzas of Reasoning* twice.[111] One of these citations is given to criticize contemporary Tibetan Madhyamaka viewpoints (*da lta bod kyi dbu ma pa*) while another is given to show Prāsaṅgikas' variance from Candrakīrti's own writings.[112] Drakpa is clearly interested in Candrakīrti's views and aware of Chapa's criticisms of them. His writings, like Mabja Jangchub Tsondru's, evince criticism of the first generation of Tibetans who presented Candrakīrti's teachings—identified as "contemporary Tibetans" or "Prāsaṅgikas"—and, perhaps, an attempt to form a Prāsaṅgika that would accommodate the epistemological concerns of Chapa and others.

One final point on Drakpa Gyeltsen's allegiances concerns how to practice the Buddhist path according to a Madhyamaka view. This concern extends from the relationships between ordinary consciousness and emptiness and between a Buddha's consciousness and our consciousness, as these relationships speak to how one realizes emptiness and becomes a Buddha—how one practices. Again, Drakpa Gyeltsen does not clearly express whether he holds a Prāsaṅgika or Svātantrika view. First, he refers those wishing to practice Madhyamaka to train in accordance with Nāgārjuna's *Precious Garland,* Śāntideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva's Practices,* and Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle.*[113] Later, addressing the issue of how one practices within the doctrine of "emptiness free

---

[111] Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 21.3.2-23.2.5-6.

[112] Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 22.4.6: *de ltar du da lta bod kyi dbu ma pa phal cher yang 'dod do / / yang dag pa ma yin te* ("Most contemporary Tibetan Mādhyamikas assert this. It is not correct.") and 21.4.6-22.1.1: *slob dpon zla grags nyid kyis kyang / rigs pa drug cu pa'i 'grel pa las / bden pa gnyis su 'jog pa ni / 'jig rten pa'i blo la ltos te 'jog go zhes dam bcas pa 'gal bar 'gyur pa'i skyod yod do/* ("Also, [this view] has the fault of contradicting the master Candrakῑrti's assertion, in his *Commentary on [Nāgārjuna's] Sixty Stanzas on Reasoning,* "Truths are posited as two from the perspective of worldly awareness"). I have not been able to locate this quote in Candrakῑrti's commentary and assume it is Drakpa Gyeltsen's paraphrase.

[113] Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 16.1.5.

from extremes," he enjoins "practice in the mode of union [of method and wisdom]."[114] As noted above, he previously equated "Union [of method and wisdom] Thoroughly Non-Abiding [Mādhyamikas]" with Svātantrika-Mādhyamikas. He may then be suggesting that a Svātantrika view accords better with the practical realization of the Madhyamaka view.[115]

The famed nephew of Sonam Tsemo and Drakpa Gyeltsen and the fourth Sakya hierarch, Sakya Paṇḍita Kunga Gyeltsen (1182-1251), may have ended this period of contested Madhyamaka exegesis when he adopted the Prāsaṅgika view.[116] Sapaṇ studied Candrakīrti's *Clear Words* and Jayānanda's *Hammer of Logic* with one of Chapa's lost students, Tsur Zhonu Senge, and Candrakīrti's *Entrance to the Middle* with Drakpa Gyeltsen.[117] Sapaṇ's well-known association with Śākya Śrībhadra and his entourage, including Vibháticandra who—following Prajñākaramati—linked Candrakīrti's and Śāntideva's views, likely was also a critical influence on his Madhyamaka views. Through his study with Śākya Śrībhadra, Sapaṇ broke the Sangpu monopoly over Dharmakīrti's logical writings, making Sakya a center for Buddhist epistemology. His development of a non-tantric curriculum at Sakya marks a new turn in Tibetan attempts, begun by Mabja, to work out Buddhist epistemological issues within a Prāsaṅgika view. The broad acceptance of his epistemological views, consistent with—rather than

---

[114] Grags pa, *Rin po che'i ljong shing,* 26.3.4: *zung 'jug gi tshul gyis nyams su blang ba.*

[115] However, the sources Drakpa cites in explaining this mode of practice are Asaṅga's *Mahāyānasátrālaôkāra,* the *Hevajra Tantra,* and the *Saôpuḷa Tantra.*

[116] Jackson, "Madhyamaka Studies," 27 discusses Sapaò's methodology for distinguishing Svātantrika and Prāsaṅgika and his reasons for holding the latter to be superior. It should be noted that Jackson's equating Sapaò's study of Candrakⅰrti's *Clear Words* with the birth of Sakya Prāsaṅgika study (p. 24) needs to be revised in light of the above discussion of Drakpa Gyeltsen's interest in Candrakⅰrti's *Entrance to the Middle.*

[117] Jackson, "Madhyamaka Studies," 24 and van der Kuijp, "Notes on the Transmission," 8-9.

antagonistic to—Candrakīrti's writings, may mark Prāsaṅgika's final triumph in Central Tibet in the early thirteenth century.

Conclusion: Tibetan Schools of Madhyamaka

The Tibetan evidence of Candrakīrti's impact in the twelfth century shows that the Indian controversies that his writings evoked from around the beginning of the eleventh century were magnified and crystalized in Tibet, leading to two competing movements of Madhyamaka exegesis. The Prāsaṅgika movement, whether faithful to Candrakīrti or not (recall Drakpa Gyeltsen criticizing Prāsaṅgikas for being at odds with Candrakīrti), championed his writings for their denial of the validity of human intellect in realizing Buddhahood and their concomitant radical separation between ordinary consciousnesses and their referents, on one hand, and a Buddha's refined (non-)mental state and its nonduality, on the other. The Svātantrika movement, formed in reaction to Prāsaṅgika (and so different from but overlapping with the Yogācāra-Madhyamaka position that prevailed in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka from the eighth through eleventh centuries), maintained the necessity of formal inference to see through the illusions of sensory data and to gain a reasoned knowledge of emptiness. In this view, human intellect can validly know the ultimate and, once transformed, can still validly know the ordinary world. Whatever the value and accuracy of later doxographies, adherence to these two positions is the meaning of "Prāsaṅgika" and "Svātantrika," respectively, in the first coinings of these terms.

The Tibetan evidence also allows us to speak of Prāsaṅgika and Svātantrika "schools" in twelfth century Central Tibet. While our information about Gyel Lhakang is limited, Patsab certainly established it as a Prāsaṅgika school, training all important proponents of Candrakīrti's writings in this period.

Sangpu was undoubtedly a Svātantrika school, as Chapa—continuing the curriculum of Ngok but now responding particularly to Prāsaṅgikas—focused his interpretation of Yogācāra-Madhyamaka against the rising tide of Candrakīrti's supporters. In Chapter One, I focused mainly on doctrinal and philosophical reasons for Prāsaṅgika's ascendency—elucidating the issues engendered by Candrakīrti's writings and drawing out the ways in which Prāsaṅgikas allied Candrakīrti's views with the dominance of "Highest Yoga Tantras." Here, I have tried to suggest as well the competition evoked when these two opposing views became situated in the fractious environment of twelfth century Central Tibet. Conceiving of Gyel Lhakang, Sangpu, and Sakya as textual communities offers insight into the relationships between texts, doctrines, and their institutional bases, allowing us to appreciate the communal nature of doctrinal texts and the institutional factors that contributed to the success and failure of these doctrines. Indeed, Chapa's students who abandoned his positions abandoned Sangpu. The divide engendered by Prāsaṅgika's popularity may well have been a factor in the split—within twenty years of Chapa's death—of Sangpu into two competing colleges that eventually were absorbed by the Sakya and Geluk orders.[118]

Additionally, the wider competition in which these institutions were placed through their affiliations with the "districts" (*sde* or *tsho*) into which Central Tibet became divided must be taken into account. In addition to the philosophical subtleties of the Svātantrika-Prāsaṅgika arguments and the movement of important figures from one position to the other, the relative

---

[118] One meets with the opinion that it was Sapaò's critiques of Sangpu's curriculum that led to Sangpu's eventual downfall. However, van der Kuijp ("Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog," 113) notes that this split occurred around 1185, which would have been well before Sapaò "reformed" Tibetan *pramāòa* studies.

successes of these districts may well have impacted the success of the Sangpu and Gyel Lhakang monastic institutes and the positions that they inculcated. As we come to understand better the processes through which competing networks of monasteries took the shape of religious orders, we will be in a better position to evaluate the spread of particular doctrinal interpretations and their implementation in monastic curricula.

Additionally, we see that several important doctrinalists-cum-community leaders of this period widened their patronage concerns beyond these districts: the first Karmapa, Dusum Kyenpa,[119] and the founder of the Drikung Kagyu order, Jigten Gonpo,[120] established connections with the Tangut court, the most powerful Central Asian political entity of this time period. The connections we have already seen between Jayānanda (along with at least two of his Tibetan collaborators) and Tangut royalty make it plausible that his Prāsaṅgika view took greater weight due to this association. Jayānanda's influence on Central Tibet's intellectual life may have extended well beyond his physical presence. Further, Sakya Paṇḍita's ties with the Mongol kingdom, which overran the Tangut kingdom in 1227,[121] are well known and put him in a position to influence

---

[119] *Kar ma pa I, Dus gsum mkhyen pa* (1110-1193), who had also studied Madhyamaka with Chapa (van der Kuijp, *Contributions,* 60). Elliot Sperling ("Lama to the King of Hsia," *The Journal of the Tibet Society* 7 [1987], 32-33) points out that Dusum Kyenpa sent his student, Konchog Sengé (*gTsang po pa dKon mchog seng ge*), to the Tangut court, in whose service the latter died in 1218/1219. Upon his death, the "imperial preceptor" (*ti shih*) post was filled by Tishri Repa (*Ti shri Sangs rgyas ras chen,* 1164/1165-1236), who seems to have held the post up until the collapse of the Tangut state in 1227 (Sperling, p. 34, notes that he returned to Tibet at age sixty-three).

[120] *'Jig rten mgon po;* Sperling, "Lama to the King," 32.

[121] Sperling strongly suggests that the pattern of religious advisor established by Tibetans and Tanguts provided the model for Tibetan and Mongol relations; see Elliot Sperling, "Rtsa-mi lo-tsā-ba Sangs-rgyas grags-pa and the Tangut Background to Early Mongol-Tibetan Relations," in *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes, 1992,* ed. Per Kvaerne (Oslo: Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, 1994), 801-824.

the direction of Tibetan monastic education. His adoption of Prāsaṅgika, then, may have had repercussions much wider than directing Sakya's position.[122]

Finally, as I have tried to indicate in the final section, the "triumph" of Prāsaṅgika that led to its status as the highest Buddhist exoteric school did not vanquish the perspectives of its Svātantrika opponents. As any perusal of the later philosophical/scholastic literature will reveal, the issues of how human consciousness in general and formal inference in particular relate to knowledge of the ultimate and how a Buddha relates to the conventional world (particularly, whether or not a Buddha has "consciousness having appearances") continued to be re-evaluated into the contemporary period. As Mabja Jangchub Tsondru began to develop Prāsaṅgika answers to Chapa's criticisms, Prāsaṅgika came in time to stand for (in some interpretations) several positions that Chapa argued for, against the twelfth century proponents of Candrakīrti.[123] The recasting of the Prāsaṅgika-Svātantrika distinction by the likes of Tsongkhapa obscure the nature of the twelfth century debates that generated these two schools of thought and in fact testify to the continuing importance of the views once disparaged as Svātantrika.

---

[122] We can recall (see footnote 56) that Gyel Lhakang was destroyed by a Mongol force in 1240. At least partly in response, Sakya Paòḍita met the Mongol prince Köden in 1247 in order to negotiate Tibetan recognition of Mongolian overlordship. The relationship between Gyel Lhakang and Sakya requires further investigation.

[123] See for instance Tagtsang's (*sTag tshang lo tsa ba Shes rab rin chen,* b.1405) lengthy criticism of Tsongkhapa's Prāsaṅgika, charging that his position is, in fact, Svātantrika, in Jeffrey Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound* (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2003), 527-575.