

An Introduction to the *sDom gsum kha skong* and Annotated Translation and Critical Edition of Its Third Chapter*

Sonam Jamtsho
University of Hamburg.

Introduction to the *sDom gsum kha skong*

he *sDom gsum kha skong* of Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge (Go rams pa, henceforth, 1429–1489)¹ represents a comprehensive and mature work on the various aspects of Tibetan Buddhist doctrines and praxes, by the author, composed in verse form and accompanied by a separate topical outline and a response to scholarly inquiries, where he identifies the proponents of the positions critiqued in the work. In the latter, Go rams pa identifies, by name, his primary intellectual interlocutors and ‘rivals’ whose positions he subjects to systematic critique. The text engages with many of Buddhism’s fundamental philosophical concepts and meditative practices as they were transmitted to Tibet through an extensive process of translation, transmission, and interpretation spanning more than seven centuries. This transmission is most notably exemplified by the rendering of thousands of technical treatises from Sanskrit into classical Tibetan. Given its comprehensive scope, this work can be characterized as an intellectual history of Tibetan Buddhism during its author’s time.

The main body of the text consists of Go rams pa’s critical analysis, evaluation, and exploration of various scholarly positions that emerged in the period between Sa paṅ’s death and Go rams pa’s own entry into Tibetan intellectual discourse. While the title might suggest that it serves *merely as a supplement* to Sa paṅ’s magnum opus, the

* This paper is a revised and expanded version of a section of a master’s thesis submitted at the University of Hamburg in 2019 by the author.

¹ The full title of this work is *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba’i kha skong gzhi lam ’bras gsum gsal bar byed pa’i legs bshad ’od kyi snang ba*. For a discussion on sources of Go rams pa’s life, see Heimbel 2020, and for brief sketches of his life, see Cabezón et al 2007. For a detailed list of Go rams pa’s works, see Jamtsho 2020.

sDom gsum rab dbye,² it is more accurately understood as a continuation of that seminal work, both in spirit and methodology.³ As Go rams pa himself articulates in the epilogue, this work serves as a corrective measure against the proliferation of 'innovative ideas' (*rang bzo*) that he perceived as having deviated from the Buddha's intended meaning.⁴ Such innovations, he argues, lack both scriptural foundation and logical coherence, thereby misleading less informed practitioners and distorting Buddhist practices as embodied in the three sets of vows. In an orthodox tradition, like the Tibetan Buddhist one, an accusation of *rang bzo* is a serious case, and its rhetorical value is great.

Unlike the majority of *sDom gsum* literature,⁵ Go rams pa's *sDom gsum kha skong* is not primarily prescriptive in nature, cataloging the numerous vows, pledges, and commitments incumbent upon Buddhist practitioners. Rather, it functions as an analytical treatise that meticulously examines the theoretical frameworks, practical instructions, and ritual practices established by scholars within their shared Buddhist tradition. Thus, the work possesses both polemical intent and apologetic dimensions.

To contextualize, I will first provide an overview of other scholarly works by the author addressing the three vows and summarize the remaining chapters, which are not translated here, in the *sDom gsum kha skong* text. Additionally, I will compile an inventory of the commentarial literature that has emerged around this work throughout subsequent centuries, followed by a short discussion of the specific chapter being currently translated and edited.

This context is followed by translation and edition. Given the technical nature of Buddhist concepts discussed in this text, I have provided explanatory footnotes to the annotated translation, drawing primarily from Go rams pa's other works. Additionally, I have indicated parallel passages in the author's other writings and

² For an introduction and transition of this work, see Rhoton 2002. On the life and works of Sa paṇ, see Jackson 1987.

³ Sa paṇ, at the end of his *sDom gsum rab dbye*, exhorts learned scholars to engage in refutation of spurious doctrines and practices. See *sDom gsum rab dbye* (p.94): *gal te lung dang rigs pa'i gnad// shes pa'i blo can rnams kyi de// legs par dpyod la dgag bsgrub gyis//*. Go rams pa seemingly took up this challenge and invitation, with gusto and zeal.

⁴ See *sDom gsum kha skong* (p.704): *de dag lung dang rigs pa yis// rnam par bsal nas gnad rnams la// skal ldan ma 'khrul spyod pa'i phyir// bstan bcos chen po 'di byas so//*. The citations from the *sDom gsum kha skong* in the footnotes are based on the reprint of the sDe dge xylograph edition.

⁵ For sources and discussions of some of the representative literature on the three vows, see Sobisch 2002.

referenced ideas expressed in primary sources that Go rams pa considered authoritative. The annotated translation is based on the critical edition included in this article.

The *sDom gsum kha skong* contains extensive references and quotations primarily from Tibetan Buddhist canonical literature. Source identification has been conducted mainly through consultation with the Tibetan canons, with Sanskrit parallels referred to in the endnotes where available. It should be noted that while the works Go rams pa referenced are of Indian origin, he accessed them through their Tibetan translations. For instance, Go rams pa's numerous quotations from the MMK, in this chapter, have been traced to its version as preserved in the two Tibetan canons, documented in a recent edition of this work. All citations are identified and documented in the critical edition's endnotes.

1. Go rams pa's Works on *sDom gsum*

Go rams pa composed numerous works of different genres and various lengths on the theme of the three vows. The following is the list of these works:

a. *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i rnam bshad rgyal ba'i gsung rab kyi dgongs pa gsal ba*

This is Go rams pa's seminal commentary on Sa paṇ's renowned and provocative treatise, the *sDom gsum rab dbye*.

b. *sDom gsum rab dbye'i spyi don yid bzhin nor bu*

It is the author's account of the sources, ritualistic practices through which one receives the three vows, the nature of the vows received, and their implications in terms of pledges, and resolution to seemingly contradictory prescriptions in different frameworks of the three vows.

c. *sDom pa gsum gyi bstan bcos la dris shing rtsod pa'i lan sdom gsum 'khrul spong*

Go rams pa's answers to the questions Shākya mchog ldan⁶ put forward on many of Sa paṇ's remarks in the *sDom gsum rab dbye*.

d. *mDo rgyud kun gyi don bsdus pa snying po yid kyi mun pa rnam par sel ba*

⁶ For an introduction to the life of this scholar, who is contemporary of Go rams pa, see Komarovski 2012.

Go rams pa's textual outline of Sa paṇ's the *sDom gsum rab dbye*, which he used in his commentary on the latter.

e. *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tub dbye ba'i kha skong gzhi lam 'bras gsum gsal bar byed pa'i legs bshad 'od kyi snag ba*

The work discussed below, whose third chapter is translated and edited here.

f. *sDom gsum kha skong gi bsdus don*

Topical outline of the *sDom gsum kha skong*.

g. *Dam tshig dang sdom pa'i rnam gzhas zab don bdud rtsi'i snying po*

It is a short work on the theme of tantric pledges, presented within the framework of different classes of tantras. This and the next works are not included within the reprint of Go rams pa's collected works made in India, but are present in the Xylographic print available in Tibet.

h. *Dam tshig rnam bshad zab don snying po bsdus*

This is a lexical commentary on a basic work that teaches the fourteen root downfalls.

i. *rNal 'byor chen po'i sdom pa'i gnad bye brag tu bshad pa zab don bdud rtsi'i nying khu 'chi ba med pa'i go 'phang sbyin pa*

This is a verse work on the nature, etymology, ritual, etc., associated with the vows and commitments of *yoginītantra*.

j. *Zab don bdud rtsi'i nying khu 'chi ba med pa'i go 'phang sbyin pa'i rnam bshad bdud rtsi spel ba*

An auto-commentary on the previous work.

k. *'Dul ba rgya mtsho'i snying po*

An independent work summarizing the essentials of *Vinaya*, a literary corpus that primarily discusses the rules and regulations, guiding the behavior of ordained ones in a monastic setting and private life.

2. The Structure and Contents of the *sDom gsum kha skong*

The text is structured in five chapters of varying lengths, composed in verse form, except for a brief prose colophon at its conclusion. The work is organized around the interrelated yet distinct themes of ground (*gzhi*), paths (*lam*), and resultant states (*'bras bu*) in Buddhist soteriology—a traditional framework encompassing Buddhist doctrine, praxis, and the transformational state that practices are

purported to bring forth.

In the first chapter of the *Kha skong*,⁷ Go rams pa examines the theoretical framework and complex questions surrounding Buddha-nature. He presents his interpretation alongside what he considers "erroneous" understandings held by various Tibetan scholars, critiquing them through scriptural citations and logical reasoning. For Go rams pa, as for other Buddhist scholars, these two approaches are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary, demonstrating both natural and cultivated philosophical sophistication. The concept of Buddha-nature is analyzed from both sūtric and tantric perspectives and is contextualized within the broader framework of *gotra* (*rigs*), which encompasses the notion of innate spiritual disposition and intellectual propensities.

In this chapter, he examines five distinct perspectives on Buddha-nature and related issues. Go rams pa's theoretical position maintains that Buddha-nature represents a union of unconditioned, continuous-unimpeded luminosity and emptiness free from the four extremes (*gsal stong zung 'jug 'dus ma byas*)—his interpretation of Buddha-nature from the Madhyamaka philosophical perspective. This chapter can be used cautiously as a valuable historical record of Tibetan Buddhist intellectual discourse, documenting how scholars theorized and systematized various conflicting ideas regarding the ontological nature of Buddha-nature (*Tathāgatagarbha*, *de gshegs snying po*) presented in diverse Indian sources. The subject matter is both historically multifaceted and conceptually complex. Go rams pa provides a concise overview of how the concept of Buddha-nature was understood and explicated across various doxographical schools of Buddhist philosophy.

In the first chapter's discussion of *gzhi*, Go rams pa addresses the positions of five scholars:

a) The perspective of dGe lugs scholar Darma rin chen,⁸ who proposes that Buddha-nature constitutes merely a negation of inherent existence concerning the mind afflicted by defilements, and this is effected through and established with logical reasoning. This non-implicative negation (*med dgag*) follows the logical refutation of the inherent nature concerning the mind. Go rams pa argues that this conception cannot represent Buddha-nature nor serve as a foundation for spiritual training, as it functions neither as a basis for saṃsāric experiences nor for nirvāṇic bliss, being merely a negation.

⁷ For a translation of this chapter, see Jorden 2003.

⁸ For this identification and summary of the position criticized, see *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.56). For the presentation of the idea and its criticism, see *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.648.5-649.1).

b) The interpretation of Rong ston Shes bya kun rig,⁹ who categorizes Buddha-nature into two types: Conditioned and Unconditioned. Go rams pa contends that accepting Buddha-nature as a conditioned phenomenon represents a fundamental error characteristic of Buddhist realist philosophy.

c) The position maintained by Bu ston Rin chen grub and numerous contemporary scholars across western, central, and eastern Tibet,¹⁰ who assert that Buddha-nature is exclusively possessed by Buddhas and absent in unenlightened sentient beings. Go rams pa argues that this contradicts both worldly conventions and numerous scriptural pronouncements where the Buddha explicitly states that all beings possess Buddha-nature.

d) The theory proposed by many contemporary philosophers (*deng sang gi mtshan nyid pa phal cher ro*),¹¹ who maintain that two purified states—the naturally pure reality (*rang bzhin rnam dag*) and reality free of adventitious stains (*blo bur dri bral*)—are contradictory. Go rams pa argues that these states are not only non-contradictory but identical, differentiated only provisionally within the context of practitioners' spiritual development.

e) The philosophical stance of Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan,¹² who maintains that the Perfected Nature (*pariniṣpanna*, *yongs grub*) is hypostatically established, possessing inherent nature.

Go rams pa's analysis demonstrates remarkable intellectual independence, extending his critique across multiple schools and scholars, including his teachers, here Rong ston being an instance. The chapter's primary focus, however, centers on his critique of Dol po pa's views, a prominent proponent of the influential and controversial 'Emptiness of Other' (*gzhan stong*) school of Middle Way philosophy in Tibet. Go rams pa's principal contention with Dol po pa's position lies in the latter's attribution of absolute quality to Buddha-nature and its various implications, particularly regarding the hermeneutics of sūtras from the second and third turnings of the wheel of dharma and their associated treatises. Furthermore, Go rams pa identifies what he

⁹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.56), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.649.1-649.3).

¹⁰ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (pp.56-57), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.649.3-651.5).

¹¹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.57), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.651.5-652.4).

¹² See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.56). Go rams pa also adds some other scholars, to whom he attributes the positions under investigation. See *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.652.4-659.6). On this figure, see Stearns 2010. For a collection of essays on the literature and doctrines of Jonang, see Sheehy et al, 2019.

perceives as an inconsistency between Dol po pa's theoretical framework and meditative practices. Through meticulous analysis, Go rams pa demonstrates divergences between Dol po pa's views and those of Nāgārjuna, whom Dol po pa claimed as authoritative. Notably, despite his philosophical criticisms, Go rams pa appears to maintain profound personal respect and admiration for Dol po pa, as evidenced by several laudatory¹³ verses in this work and explicit expressions of admiration in other influential writings, even while critiquing his positions.

The subsequent three chapters address matters concerning the Vows of Individual Liberation (*prātimokṣa*, *so sor thar pa'i sdom pa*), the Vows of Bodhisattvas (*byang chub sems dpa'i sdom pa*), and the Vows of Awareness Holder (*rig pa 'dzin pa'i sdom pa*). According to Go rams pa, these three tiers of vows comprehensively encompass the entire spectrum of Buddhist paths¹⁴ and spiritual practices, ranging from monastic disciplines through meditation on emptiness to advanced tantric practices and constructions of receptacles. These practices, far from being contradictory, serve to reinforce and deepen one another's experiential dimensions. Moreover, Go rams pa emphasizes that successful engagement with the more advanced practices necessarily requires a firm grounding in the foundational ones.

In the second chapter, Go rams pa defines the essential nature of the Vow of Individual Liberation as "the avoidance of harming others and its causes" (*gzhan gnod gzhi dang bcas pa spang ba*). These causes comprise the afflictions—the underlying psychological and emotional states from which physical and verbal actions arise, rooted in both the misidentification of the person and dichotomizing conceptualities. In this chapter, he again conducts a comprehensive analysis of five distinct doctrinal positions and practical applications of Vinaya liturgies and rituals concerning the Vow of Individual Liberation, as practiced and disseminated by five prominent Tibetan scholars.

The scholars whose views Go rams pa critically examines are:

a) Numerous Piṭaka holders who,¹⁵ confining themselves

¹³ For example, Go rams pa speaks of Dol po pa, in the *sDom gsum kha skong* (p.659), as follows: *bdag ni dpal ldan dus 'khor gyi// srol 'dzin nyams rtogs mthar phyin pa'i// skyes chen brgyud pa 'di dag la// yid ni shin tu dang mod kyi//*, and in his *lTa ba'i shan 'byed*, he says (p.420): *mkhyen rab dang thugs rje phul du byung zhing nyams dang rtogs pa'i dbang phyug kun mkhyen dol bu ba shes rab rgyal mtshan...//*.

¹⁴ For example, see the author's comments in *sDom gsum spyi don* (p.331): *de yang sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa'i nyams len ma lus pas dom pa gsum gyi khong su 'dus pa yin te/*.

¹⁵ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.58), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.660.2-661.3).

exclusively to the *Abhidharma* and *Vinaya*, maintain three principal positions: that the *Prātimokṣa* possesses the nature of inanimate matter (*sdom pa gzugs can du 'dod pa*), that its sub-classification is definitively established as eight (*grangs rigs brgyad kho nar nges pa*), and that it is invariably relinquished at death (*'chi tshe gtong bas khyab pa*). Go rams pa critiques their interpretation as overly restricted to a single classical Buddhist philosophical school.

b) Shākya mchog ldan,¹⁶ who proposes a tripartite classification of the *Prātimokṣa* vows while asserting the absence of Indic sources regarding its definition. Go rams pa refutes these claims by citing authoritative Indian textual sources.

c) Nam-mkha'-bsod-nams,¹⁷ who interprets "the avoidance of harming others and its causes" (*gzhan gnod gzhi dang bcas pa spang ba*) as specifically characterizing the Bhikṣu's vow rather than as a general characteristic of the Vow of Individual Liberation. Go rams pa counters this interpretation by referencing widely accepted Indian sources.

d) Nam-mkha'-bsod-nams's¹⁸ practice of conferring bhikṣuṇī vows through exclusively male assemblies (Sangha). Go rams pa addresses this by examining the historical precedent set by Indian masters who established Tibetan monastic practices, highlighting the discrepancies between his opponent's practices and their shared Indian antecedents.

e) Shākya mchog ldan's¹⁹ position that while only three individuals may simultaneously receive Bhikṣu's vows from a single community bestowing the vows, more numerous candidates may receive śrāmaṇera vows concurrently, from a single group of ordainers. Go rams pa challenges this view by citing the authoritative pronouncements of Sa skya masters, who are their shared intellectual and religious predecessors.

This chapter notably demonstrates that Go rams pa's critical analysis extends within the Sa skya tradition itself, as exemplified by his extensive engagement with Shākya mchog ldan, with whom he shared both his monastic preceptor and Vajrayānic Guru. Indeed, these two intellectual giants are renowned for their scholarly disputes concerning the three vows and various other doctrinal matters.

The third chapter, which forms the focus of this article's translation and editorial work, is summarized below.

The fourth chapter examines the conceptual foundations and meditational practices of the esoteric Vajrayāna tradition, analyzing

¹⁶ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.58), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.661.3-662.6).

¹⁷ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.58), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.662.3-662.6).

¹⁸ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.58), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.662.6-663.6).

¹⁹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.58), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.663.6-664.3).

various positions expounded by Tibetan scholars. The initial section primarily addresses practices related to the four classes of Tantric scriptures and offers *corrections* to what Go rams pa perceived as *misinterpretations* by Tibetan practitioners and scholars. In the first half of this chapter, Go rams pa presents and thoroughly analyzes the views of nine scholars regarding crucial theoretical and practical aspects of the four Tantric classes.

The nine scholars and their respective positions, as documented in Go rams pa's responses to philosophical queries, are systematically analyzed as follows:

a) Bo dong Phyogs las rnam rgyal's position²⁰ that maintains receiving single empowerment in Vajrayāna contexts is equivalent to receiving all multiple empowerments. Go rams pa critically assesses this position as fundamentally contradicting numerous explicit pronouncements made by Buddha in the Tantric texts.

b) The practitioners of Vajrayāna from traditions other than Ngor-pa²¹ who are criticized for disclosing Vajrayāna secrets to uninitiated individuals. Go rams pa emphasizes that maintaining secrecy regarding Tantric practices from those who are uninitiated and have not undergone proper empowerment represents one of the fundamental obligations of Tantric practitioners.

c) The third position being critiqued is Tsong kha pa's²² understanding of 'Vajra sibling' relationships among Tantric practitioners. Go rams pa argues that this interpretation presents an overly restrictive understanding of this crucial tantric social bond.

d) The proponent of the next position being investigated is Bo dong,²³ who contends that beyond the greater path of accumulation (*tshogs lam chen po yan chad*), the paths of all three vehicles are attainable exclusively through Tantric practices. Go rams pa identifies this position as problematic, as it contradicts fundamental Buddhist path structures.

e) Tsong kha pa's position on self-generation²⁴ is the next theory critiqued, and it contends the existence of self-generation (*bdag bskyed*) practice within Kriyātantra. Following Sa skya masters' precedent, Go rams pa demonstrates this as an interpretative error, at least from his perspective.

f) Ngor-chen's students' misinterpretation,²⁵ who misconstrue the

²⁰ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.59), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.675.4-677.5).

²¹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.677.5-678.1).

²² See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (p.678.1-678.6).

²³ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.678.6-681.3).

²⁴ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.56), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.681.-682.4).

²⁵ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.56), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.682.4-688.1).

retinues in the six worldly *maṇḍala* of the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana*, interpreting them as actual worldly beings. Go rams pa argues that this interpretation fundamentally diminishes the nature of tantric enlightened deities.

g) dGa' gdong pa, who was one of the main commentators on Sa paṅ's *sDom gsum rab dbye*,²⁶

who maintains that the practice of two stages (*rim gnyis*) exists within the practice context of the three lower tantric cycles. Go rams pa identifies this position as contradictory to Sa paṅ's authoritative teachings, which both scholars ostensibly accept.

h) Tsong kha pa,²⁷ who argues that "phenomena appearing as a deity" should not be interpreted literally as external phenomena manifesting as a deity, but rather that the 'mental image' appears as a deity. Go rams pa contends that this interpretation contradicts the fundamental teachings presented in authoritative tantric scriptures.

i) The last position criticized here is of Jo nang master.²⁸ This scholar maintains that among the three natures, only the perfected nature should be cultivated and meditated upon as a deity. Go rams pa argues that this position reflects Dol po pa's realist ontological commitments more than authentic tantric teachings and practices.

This comprehensive analysis demonstrates Go rams pa's systematic critique of various interpretations of tantric Buddhism, highlighting his commitment to maintaining doctrinal authenticity while engaging critically with contemporary scholarly perspectives. His critiques span multiple dimensions of tantric theory and practice, from ritual requirements to philosophical interpretation, consistently emphasizing fidelity to authoritative textual sources and established lineage teachings.

In the second section of this chapter, he conducts a detailed analysis of seven secondary 'corrupted' practices about Vajrayāna. These positions and their respective advocates are as follows:

a) All Tantric practitioners of his era,²⁹ except for those following the Ngor tradition, who erroneously enumerate 'one' offering substance and mantra as 'ten' during fire offering rituals and associated liturgies—a practice which Go rams pa equates to deceiving the enlightened Buddha.

b) The Bo dong adherents,³⁰ who maintain that the generated deity departs while the guest or the invited deity remains following the

²⁶ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.688.1-688.6).

²⁷ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.688.6-691.1).

²⁸ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.691.1-694.1).

²⁹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.694.1-694.4).

³⁰ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.60), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.694.4-695.3).

offering liturgy.

c) The tradition of *sPos khang pa Rin rgyal*,³¹ who, according to *Go rams pa*, introduces an innovative yet problematic practice of depicting the retinue deities' heads facing inward on ceiling-mounted paintings.

d) The meditative visions of the *Myang* meditator³² and his particular interpretation regarding the structural composition of the Medicinal Buddha's mansion.

e) A prevalent practice in the *sGom sde* valley³³ involving the burning of the deceased's name without performing the requisite ritual—an act *Go rams pa* condemns as a grievous transgression.

f) Certain *Jo gdan*³⁴ practitioners, who consider the twelve retinues of Medicinal Buddha as mere worldly beings, thereby deeming them unworthy of prostration or refuge. Additionally, numerous centers in the *gTsang* region engage in prostration and offerings to the deity's seven hundred servants—practices that contradict fundamental Buddhist principles regarding refuge and its appropriate objects.

g) All traditions except *Ngor*³⁵ that roll sacred texts from the end when placing them inside sacred objects, which our author considers an inauspicious practice.

h) *Bu ston*'s doctrinal position³⁶ advocating the depiction of male deities beneath female deities in paintings intended for placement at the base of relics and sacred religious objects.

In this chapter, *Go rams pa*'s critique demonstrates remarkable complexity, addressing both his contemporaries, predecessors, and social practices. While the technical matters discussed herein address fundamental practices of Tibetan Buddhism and present considerable challenges in their resolution, *Go rams pa* approaches these contentious issues with remarkable scholarly rigor and directness.

The fifth and final chapter addresses Buddhahood—the state of complete enlightenment or awakening—manifested through spiritual transformation. The resultant state is examined through the concept of 'body and gnosis' (*sku dang ye shes*). This examination encompasses perspectives from four doxographical schools of exoteric Buddhism and four classes of Tantric scripture with their associated esoteric concepts.

In this chapter, *Go rams pa* analyzes two distinct Tibetan positions

³¹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.695.3-696.2).

³² See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.696.2-697.1).

³³ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.697.1-697.6).

³⁴ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.697.6-698.3).

³⁵ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.698.3-698.6).

³⁶ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.698.4-699.6).

regarding resultant Buddhahood and its relationship to sūtric and tantric presentations, employing both scriptural citations and logical reasoning. These positions are:

a) Tsong kha pa and certain scholars from Go rams pa's tradition³⁷ who maintain that the eleventh and twelfth stages taught in tantras should be subsumed under the tenth stage of the sūtric path presentation—a position Go rams pa criticizes as conflating distinct perspectives and failing to appreciate their hierarchical relationships.

b) Scholars within Go rams pa's tradition who,³⁸ while accepting the thirteenth Vajrayāna stage, subsume the three kāyas and four gnoses of sūtric Buddhism under the eleventh and twelfth Vajrayāna stages, rather than recognizing them as aspects of final Buddhahood.

Throughout these chapters, Go rams pa demonstrates sophisticated engagement with authoritative scriptures and confrontation with opposing viewpoints, eschewing mere commentary. This work represents a culmination of his contemplation and understanding of the breadth of Tibetan Buddhism's Indian heritage and beyond. It serves as a comprehensive synthesis of his major works and distinctive positions across various subjects, offering valuable insight into the materials. Notably, Buddhist logic and epistemology—subjects on which Go rams pa wrote extensively—remain the only major themes of Tibetan scholastic traditions not addressed in this work.

The pre-colophon verses articulate Go rams pa's motivations, self-assessment, and aspirations for the work. He emphasizes that his composition stems not from philosophical antagonism or desire for recognition, but from genuine concern for preserving authentic Buddhist dharma. He draws parallels between his work and that of Indian scholars like Nāgārjuna, who refuted mistaken views within both Buddhist and non-Buddhist traditions, and early Tibetan translators like Rin-chen-bzang-po and masters such as 'Brog-mi and 'Gos, who challenged 'perverted religious paths' while propagating Vajrayāna teachings.

Go rams pa observes that following Sa skya paṇḍita's passing, Tibet witnessed a proliferation of views lacking a scriptural foundation and logical basis, leading to confusion regarding the three vows' essential practices and compromising their efficacy in achieving enlightenment. His treatise thus serves as a corrective measure. The prose colophon details the composition's circumstances, location, timing, scribe, and dedication. The work was composed in 1478, Earth

³⁷ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.700.3-701.6).

³⁸ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.61), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.700.6-702.3).

Dog year, at Thub bstan rnam rgyal.³⁹

3. Commentarial Literature Inspired by the *sDom gsum kha skong*

The *sDom gsum kha skong* of Go rams pa has been one of the most instrumental and significant texts within the Sa skya lineage, and its influence continues to be evident through its prominent position among the constitutive texts in the curriculum of Sa skya's monastic seminaries. This prominence can be attributed primarily to its authorship by Go rams pa, whose works occupy a distinguished position among Sa skya scholars and, by extension, scholars of other Tibetan Buddhist denominations. Many Sa skya scholars regard it as a natural continuation of Sa paṇ's *sDom gsum rab dbye*, thus considering it a core contribution to the doctrinal position of Sa skya and a robust defense of its orthodoxies.

Another significant reason for this work's continuous study lies in its subject matter. The text presents a sustained critique of Tibetan thinkers and ideas, primarily pertaining to Buddhist theories and practices. However, it is not merely a passive recording of intellectual developments; rather, it represents active participation in and critical assessment of these philosophical deliberations and their implications. The text examines and analyzes subjects ranging from Madhyamaka philosophy to Buddhology, including detailed discussions of Vinaya rituals.

The *sDom gsum kha skong* has attracted the attention and scholarly engagement of numerous prominent Sa skya tradition scholars since Go rams pa's time, resulting in several fascinating commentarial and explanatory works. The following list encompasses works directly associated with this text:

a. The *sDom gsum kha skong gi bsdus don*, a concise work by Go rams pa himself, composed at his monastery. This text serves as a topical outline (*sa bcad*) of the *sDom gsum kha skong*, employing an exegetical methodology widely utilized within Tibetan commentarial traditions.

b. Another significant work essential for understanding this text is Go rams pa's *Dris lan pad mo bzhad pa*, written in response to a series of scholarly inquiries from one of his contemporaries. The first question specifically addresses the identification of scholars whom Go rams pa refutes in his text.

c. *sDom gsum kha skong gi rnam bshad legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba*, an

³⁹ See *sDom gsum kha skong* (p.705): *sa pho khyi'i lo la rta nag rin chen rtse thub bstan rnam par rgyal ba'i dgon par sbyar*||.

extensive and detailed commentary on the root text by Klu sgrub rgya mtsho, a preeminent Sa skya scholar of his era. This voluminous work, completed in 1565, offers a comprehensive analysis, though it occasionally diverges from Go rams pa's other works. The commentator ingeniously resolves apparent contradictions by distinguishing between the textual intention and the authorial intention (*gzhung gi dgongs pa dang mdzad pa po'i dgongs pa*).

d. *sDom gsum kha skong gi rnam bshad legs par bshad pa rgyan gyi me tog*, composed by mKhan po Nga-dbang-chos-grags, represents another significant commentary that closely follows Go rams pa's interpretative approach. In the colophon, the author acknowledges his primary reliance on Go rams pa's writings while also citing his utilization of Klu sgrub rgya mtsho's commentary.

e. *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i kha skong gzhi lam 'bras gsum gsal bar byed pa'i legs bshad 'od kyi snang ba'i rnam bshad 'od kyi snang ba rgyas par byed pa*, another commentary authored by Byams-pa-rab-brtan, who served as one of the abbots of Go rams pa's monastery. In addition to composing Go rams pa's biography, he critically engages with Klu sgrub rgya mtsho's interpretations, particularly challenging the latter's creative distinction between authorial and textual intention.

f. An annotated Commentary on the root text was composed by the recently deceased mKhan po Sangs rgyas bstan 'dzin (1904-1990), entitled *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i kha skong gzhung don rab gsal*, published in Darjeeling in 1969.

g. Although direct examination has not been possible, there are reliable reports of another significant commentary on this root text existing in manuscript form, written in *dbu med* script by rTa nag Chos rnam rgyal, another future abbot of Go rams pa's monastery.

4. Summary of the Third Chapter of the *sDom gsum kha skong*

The third chapter examines the Buddhist Middle Way through dual perspectives: the practical aspects of Bodhisattva Vows and their supporting theoretical foundations. These interconnected themes are analyzed through the philosophical framework of the Middle Way, specifically regarding the development of perfect understanding (*nges shes*) of its philosophy, meditative practice (*dbu ma'i lam*), and philosophical viewpoint (*dbu ma'i lta ba*).

Go rams pa initiates the chapter by articulating his comprehensive position on the Bodhisattva path. His interpretation emphasizes the simultaneous cultivation of two elements: the magnanimous practice of exchanging self with others, and the cultivation of insight that realizes emptiness devoid of the four extremes.

The remaining section of the chapter synthesizes numerous philosophical arguments he developed in opposition to various Tibetan scholarly interpretations, particularly those of Tsong kha pa's understanding of the Middle Way theory.

The critique encompasses the following philosophical dimensions:

1. Ontological theories examining the nature and relationship of the ultimate and relative truth
2. Investigation of the methods of gaining direct or inferential cognitive access to the ultimate truth and its liberating potential
3. Analysis of the validity of logical principles, such as double negation, in establishing emptiness
4. The hermeneutical principles of reading various authoritative sources
5. The manner of experientially leading neophytes into the meditative cultivation of the view

While Go rams pa's critique primarily addresses Tsong kha pa's work, he additionally examines other contemporary scholarly positions regarding emptiness theory and its meditative cultivation.

a) The first position Go rams pa criticized in this chapter is attributed to Tsong kha pa,⁴⁰ who maintains that the Bodhisattvas' practice of self-other exchange is strictly limited to the exchange of self-cherishing and other-cherishing attitudes, excluding the exchange of virtues/non-virtues and happiness/unhappiness. Go rams pa contends that while the physical exchange of attributes is impossible, mental cultivation should encompass both the exchange of cherishing and the contemplative exchange of happiness and suffering, including their respective causes.

b) The next section also addresses Tsong kha pa's⁴¹ assertion that 'Freedom from four extremes (*mtsha' bzhi spros bral*) parallels mental quietism, attributed to certain Chinese traditions. Go rams pa identifies this as a fundamental misinterpretation of the Madhyamaka view advocated by early Tibetan scholars, including Sa skya lineage founders.

c) Translator sKyabs mchog dpal⁴² proposes that conventional truth transcends both existence and non-existence. Go rams pa critiques this as undermining the principle of interdependent origination governing conventional phenomena.

⁴⁰ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.58), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.665.1-666.3).

⁴¹ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.59), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.666.3-671.2).

⁴² See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.59), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.671.2-672.1).

d) The next position critiqued is the constantly shifting positions of Shākya mchog ldan's,⁴³ who theoretically initially deny the conventional existence of self to later affirm both self and self of person (*bdag dang gang zag gi bdag*) at the conventional level.

e) The last position criticized is the methodology employed and advocated by lCang ra abbot to lead neophytes in the contemplation of emptiness.⁴⁴ He advocates familiarization with the object of grasping (*zhen yul*) through verbalization as essential to cultivating the Middle Way view. Go rams pa criticizes this approach as diminishing the crucial roles of scholarly study and contemplative reflection.

This comprehensive analysis demonstrates Go rams pa's broad critical engagement with diverse Buddhist philosophical traditions and scholars across various lineages and schools of thought.

He ends the chapter with a succinct summary of the bodhisattva's vow or practice as cultivation of a view of emptiness free from all extremes, imbued with compassion.

5. Annotated translation

The following annotated translation of the third chapter of the *sDom gsum kha skong* is based on the critical edition, appended in the next section. Most of the explanatory footnotes are drawn from Go rams pa's other writings.

The Vows of Bodhisattva⁴⁵
are either obtained from⁴⁶

⁴³ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.59), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.672.1-674.2).

⁴⁴ See *Dris lan pad bzhad* (p.59), and *sDom gsum kha skong* (pp.674.2-675.2).

⁴⁵ Go rams pa defined the Bodhisattva vows as 'A special establisher of full enlightenment, an intention with associated mental factors abandoning the contradictory forces.' This definition indicates that the Bodhisattva vows are causes that bring forth complete enlightenment (Buddha-hood) as their result, and their essential nature is a particular mental factor called 'intention' [*sems byung sems pa*]. See Go rams pa, *sDom gsum spyi don* (fol.183a1): *byang sems kyi sdom pa'i mtshan nyid/ rdzogs pa'i byang chub kyi sgrub pa khyad par ba gang zhig / mi mthun phyogs spong ba'i sems pa mtshungs ldan dang bcas pa'o /* . For a discussion of *sems byung sems pa*, see mChims chen, *mNgon pa'i rgyan* (pp.136.3-136.5): *sems pa ni gang zhig yod na khab len gyis lcags ltar yul drug la dmigs nas sems mngon par 'du byed cing sems dmigs pa la g.yo bar byed pa yid kyi las tel*.

⁴⁶ Regarding the differences in liturgies between the two schools in granting the Bodhisattva vows, see Go rams pa, *sDom gsum spyi don* (fols.189a1-191a1) and *gSung rab dgongs gsal* (fols.68b-71b2).

The two great traditions of Māhāyāna, the Madhyamaka ⁴⁷ or Cittāmātra, ⁴⁸

or obtained from the ritual propounded in the various tantric scriptures of the mantra.

Having obtained the (awakening) mind of aspiration⁴⁹
[and awakening the mind of] application,⁵⁰

⁴⁷ According to Go rams pa, this tradition originates with the celestial Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and descends through Nāgārjuna, later being formulated by Śāntideva in the third chapter of his classic *Bodhisattvacaryavatara*. See Go rams pa, *sDom gsum spyi don* (fol.189a1-189a3): *gnyis pa byang sems kyi sdom pa len pa'i cho ga la dbu ma lugs dang / sems tsam lugs gnyis las/ dang po ni/ mgon po 'jam pa'i dbyangs nas 'phags pa klu sgrub yab sras la brgyud de/ rgyal sras zhi ba lha'i phyag srol jo bo pu nya shr'i las byung ba rje btsun sa skya pa yab sras kyi phyag len du mdzad pa de yin la//*. For a detailed explanation of the liturgy and ritual, see Sa paṇ , *Sems bskyed kyi cho ga*.

⁴⁸ According to Go rams pa, the generation of the bodhicitta in the Cittāmātra tradition originates with the celestial Bodhisattva Maitreya and is transmitted through Asaṅga, later being systematized by Candragomin in his *Samvaravimśaka*. See Go rams pa, *sDom gsum spyi don* (fol.189a3-189a4): *gnyis pa ni/ mgon po byams pa nas thogs med sku mched la brgyud de slob dpon tsan dra go mi'i phyag srol jo bo rje dpal ldan a ti sha las byung ba dge ba'i bshes gnyen bka' gdams pa rnam kyi phyag len du mdzad pa de yin no//*. For a detailed academic discussion of these two traditions, see Wangchuk 2007. Sa paṇ, in his *sDom gsum rab dbye*, asserts that even the śrāvaka system encompasses three generations of mind, corresponding to the three different goals to be attained. See Sa paṇ , *sDom gsum rab dbye* (fol.14a6-6): *sems bskyed la ni nyan thos dang // theg pa chen po'i lugs gnyis yod // nyan thos rnam la sems bskyed gsum // dgra bcom rang rgyal sangs rgyas so//*.

⁴⁹ The mind of aspiration (*pranidhicitta*) constitutes a category of bodhicitta that aspires to achieve complete Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings. In his various commentaries on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, Go rams pa presents divergent definitions of this bodhicitta. In his more mature works, which presumably reflect his definitive position, Go rams pa maintains that bodhisattvas on the ten grounds also possess the mind of aspiration. However, in other writings that closely align with his teacher Rong-ston's interpretation, Go rams pa contends that the mind of aspiration exists exclusively within the mental continuum of ordinary beings. See Go rams pa, *sBas don zab mo*, (fol.43b6-44a1): *smon 'jug gi sems bskyed mtshan nyid pa theg chen gyi tshogs lam nas rgyun mtha'i bar du gzhang pa//*. See also Go rams pa, *sBas don rab gsal* (fol.9b4-9b4): *dang po'i mtshan nyid/ so so skye bo'i rgyud kyi theg chen sems bskyed gang zhig /theg chen gyi bslab pa'i grogs kyis ma zin pa*.

⁵⁰ The mind of application constitutes a division of bodhicitta, which represents a vow to practice the path toward attaining complete

The preservation of the three disciplines of training is ⁵¹ becomes the essential practice. {3.1}

Practicing these, in union,⁵²
[namely] the bodhicitta of exchanging self with others ⁵³
and [the cultivation of the] view free of fourfold extremes
is the main aspect of the conduct of this [i.e., Bodhisattva vows]. {3.2}

About this, someone⁵⁴ claims the essence of exchange
is exchanging the cherishing [i.e., the self-cherishing and the
other-cherishing],
not the exchange of virtue [and] non-virtue, happiness [and]
suffering,
since these cannot be exchanged. ⁵⁵ {3.3}

In this case, the exchange of cherishing,
too, will not be the true meaning of exchange,

Buddhahood. In his mature work, Go rams pa asserts that the mind of aspiration and the mind of application are of one nature. For a detailed discussion of these two divisions of mind and their relationship to mental factors and the ultimate bodhicitta, see Go rams pa, *sBas don zab mo* (fols. 41b1-46b4).

⁵¹ The three trainings comprise: the discipline of refraining from harmful actions (*nyes spyod sdom pa'i tshul khrims*), the discipline of accumulating virtuous actions (*dge chos sdud pa'i tshul khrims*), and the discipline of benefiting sentient beings (*sems can don byed kyi tshul khrims*).

⁵² These refer to two fundamental practices: the exchange of self with others and the wisdom of realizing emptiness from the four extremes.

⁵³ The practice of exchanging self with others is an aspect of bodhicitta—a spiritual practice that was developed and refined by the eighth-century Buddhist master Śāntideva in his work *Bodhisattvacaryāvatara*. The fundamental principle involves transforming our conventional mode of relating to others through self-cherishing and egoistic perspectives into other-cherishing and compassion.

⁵⁴ Somebody here is rJe tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa. For an extensive discussion of the life, works, and legacies of this towering figure, see Jinpa 2019.

⁵⁵ Sa paṇ also addresses early Tibetan opposition to Bodhisattva practices of the exchange of self with others. See Sa paṇ *sDom gsum rab dbye* (fol.16a):
*byang chub sems kyi bslab pa la // bdag gzhan mnyam brje gnyis su gsungs // kha
cig brje ba'i byang chub sems // bsgom du mi rung zhe su smra // de yi rgyu
mtshan 'di skad lo // bdag bde gzhan la byin nas ni // gzhan sdug bdag gis blangs
gyur na // smon lam mtha' ni btsan pa'i phyir // bdag ni rtag tu sdug bsngal
'gyur // des na 'di 'dra'i byang chub sems // bsgom pa de dag thabs mi mkhas //
nor ba chen po'i chos yin lo //*.

since one similarly cannot exchange the cherishing.
 If, though, this cannot be actually exchanged,
 but can be practiced within the mind,
 then it applies similarly to the others, too.
 Who, in actuality, could exchange
 one's and others' happiness and suffering? ⁵⁶ {3.4}

Not exchanging happiness and suffering in the mind
 [and claiming] to exchange cherishing is a contradiction.
 This is like not sharing food with others,
 but instead consuming it by oneself. {3.5}

Refuting the exchange of [one's] virtue [and another's] non-virtue
 is [going against] Nāgārjuna,⁵⁷ the second Buddha,
 who declared, "May [the result of] their non-virtuous [action] ripen in
 me and
 may [the result of] my virtues [action] ripen in them."
 How is your position not contradictory to this?
 Refuting the exchange of happiness [and] suffering [goes against]
 The *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra*, which states,
 "If one does not genuinely exchange
 one's happiness [and] others' suffering,
 Buddhahood cannot be attained, and
 There is no happiness even in the saṃsāra."
 How is [your position] not contradictory to this?

How will you answer appropriately?
 If illogical consequences are flung
 based on the meaning of the quote from the *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra*
 by placing your tenet as a subject [of the debate]? {3.6}

In brief, by bifurcating the desirables and the undesirables in mind,
 [and] granting all desirables to others,
 and accustoming oneself to accept all undesirables for oneself,

⁵⁶ Go rams pa's fundamental assertion is that while one cannot literally transfer one's virtue and happiness to others or assume others' suffering and non-virtuous actions, these qualities can and should be exchanged as a mental training exercise.

⁵⁷ Go rams pa refers to Nāgārjuna as the second Buddha due to his foundational contributions to Mahāyāna philosophy. See Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi don*, (fol.6a5-6a5): *gnyis pa ni 'dzam bu'i gling du sang rgyas gnyis par grags pa'o//*. For an introduction and translation of the topical outline of this work, see Kassor 2014.

[is taught in] the *mDo sde dByug gsum phreng ba*⁵⁸ and
In a treatise like the *Śikṣāmuccaya*,
The *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra* and so on.

Their intentions are taught to the spiritual teacher [ʼBrom] sTon pa⁵⁹
by glorious Atisha,⁶⁰
as the profound meaning of experiential instruction.
Later on, it flourished in this mountainous realm.
[I have] seen the detailed meditation explanation
by Sangs-rgyas-bsgom-pa⁶¹ and so on. {3.7}

With the supreme, venerable masters of Sa skya,
among the two pith instructions⁶² of Mahāsiddha Virūpa,
they have the transmission of this practice [i.e., the exchanging self
and others],
that illuminates the practice [of Bodhisattva]. {3.8}

That and the two aforementioned traditions
do not differ [and] are
the essence of Buddha's teaching.
The blessing will arise even for those who merely admire it. {3.9}

Someone⁶³ asserts that freedom from the proliferation of the four

⁵⁸ I could not locate this text within various currently available Tibetan Buddhist canons.

⁵⁹ ʼBrom ston pa rGyal ba'i 'byung gnas (1005–1064), one of Atiśa's principal disciples, established the Rwa sgrenge monastery, which subsequently became a significant center of the bKa'-gdams-pa lineage. See Roerich 1988: 251.

⁶⁰ For a comprehensive account of this Indian master's life and works, see Roerich 1988: 241.

⁶¹ This master reportedly served as an instructor at sNar thang monastery. For detailed information regarding Atiśa's teachers and his role in disseminating Mind Training teachings in Tibet, consult Klu sgrub rgya mtsho's *Nor bu'i phreng ba* (pp.362-364).

⁶² The two instructions comprise methodologies for guiding practitioners of lesser and greater faculties. The technical Tibetan terminology for these is *sKal dman rim 'jug pa bkri ba'i gsung ngag rdo rje tshig rkang* and *sKal ldan cig char ba bkri ba'i spros med rdo rje tshig rkang*. The practice of exchanging self with others, fundamental to Mind Training, is presented within the broader framework of Triple Experiences (*snang ba gum*) in both contexts. Reference Klu sgrub rgya mtsho, *Nor bu'i phreng ba* (pp.364-365).

⁶³ In this passage, Go rams pa summarizes the distinctive Madhyamaka philosophical interpretation of Tsong-kha-pa Blo-bzang-grags-pa, one of Tibet's preeminent intellectual and religious figures, as presented in his major commentaries and original works. See Go rams pa, *Dri lan pad mo*

extremes⁶⁴

is not different from the view of a Chinese monk,
[hence] it is an erroneous [view].

[The correct view is, therefore,] grasping at the lack of essentiality,
after logically negating inherent existence.

This is the ultimate view of the Madhyamaka.

All [practitioners of] three vehicles realize this [view of emptiness],
Therefore, there is no difference in the view [of three vehicles].

The delimitation [of] inherent existence according to
Svātantrika school, is, [for an entity, to be established
from its own side without depending on the mind.

Yet, this is a common negandum.

If something is found when seeking the meaning designated by name,
This, then, is the meaning of inherent existence.

The negation of this is an uncommon feature
of the Prāsaṅgika.

If one understands these differences in the negandum,

All of the perverse conceptions of
refuting every object grasped by cognition,

By logical analysis will be undermined.

On the other hand, after having refuted the inherent existence,

If one also needs to refute grasping at the lack of inherent existence,

Then the preceding cognition will turn out to be one with a fault
[and] subsequent [cognition] will become infinite.

[The opponent] says [if one] refutes the lack of inherent existence,
it will become an inherent existence

on account of understanding the true meaning

(fol.30a1-30a2). For a study of Tsong kha pa's philosophy, see Jinpa 2003. For a book-length study of the differences between Tsong kha pa and Go rams pa, see Thakchoe 2007. Additionally, see Cabezon et al, 2007 for a substantial discussion of the differences between these two scholars of Madhyamaka in Tibet.

⁶⁴ The four extremes encompass existence, non-existence, both existence and non-existence, and neither existence nor non-existence. Go rams pa interprets these as potential modes through which the mind apprehends objects and constructs subject-object duality. To pacify the mind's habitual object-grasping, these objects must be analyzed through logical reasoning. For an extensive dialectical examination of establishing freedom from the four extremes, consult Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi don* (fols.81a5-86a4). Go rams pa's conception of extremes or manifoldness (*spros pa*) includes all characteristics of positive and negative phenomena (*dgag sgrub kyi chos kyi mtshan ma thams cad*), language (*ngag*), and causes (*rgyu*). See Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi don* (fol.47).

through the double negations. ⁶⁵ {3.10}
 These degenerated views should be refuted
 by scripture and reasoning. {3.11}

[The assertion] that maintains the following two as similar,
 Namely [position] of a Chinese monk, who, without any analysis,
 suppresses conceptual thoughts casually [and]
 espousing this to be the supreme form of meditation,
 And here, the untenability of the proliferation of the four extremes
 On the occasion of examination through reasoning,
 [and] the proposition of non-grasping as the [Madhyamaka] view,
 Is the word of the devil rejecting the profound [view]. ⁶⁶ {3.12}

Moreover, in the *Ratnakūṭa*,⁶⁷
 [Buddha] taught existence [and] non-existence, both as extremes,
 [and] the center as the middle.
 This, too, is proclaimed to be unteachable [and] inexpressible.
 [According to you] this [i.e., Buddha's discourse], too, will become
 indistinguishable from the view of the Chinese [monk].
 Similarly, [in] the *Samādhiraśasūtra*, [Buddha taught],
 Since existence, nonexistence, purity and impurity, and so forth,
 There are two extremes; therefore, one should avoid these and
 should not abide even in the middle.
 In the *Prajñāpāramitā*, engagement with every duality,
 like emptiness and non-emptiness, and so on,

It is said to be engagement with characteristics.
 And also in the *Samputatantra*, it is said;
 "One should not meditate on emptiness,
 Nor should one meditate on non-emptiness.

⁶⁵ These highly technical subjects warrant detailed independent studies beyond the scope of current research. For Tsong kha pa's exposition of his views, see his *Lam rim chen mo*, particularly the *lhag mthong* chapter. For English translation, refer to Cutler & et al 2014. For philological studies, consult Ruegg 2000 and 2002; for philosophical analysis of Tsong kha pa's Madhyamaka writings, see Jinpa 2003.

⁶⁶ Go rams pa's rhetorical language occasionally exceeds conventional bounds. In one notable text, he questions whether the visionary deity allegedly communing with Tsong-kha-pa might have been demonic. See Go rams pa, *lTa ba'i shan 'byed* (fol.244a4): *mdo rgyud kyi gnad dang mi mthun na thabs la bslu ba'i bdud yi dam gyi gzugs su brdzus nas chos log ston par gsungs* / .

⁶⁷ For the same criticism leveled against Tsong kha pa's position, see Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi ston* (fols.76b6-77b1).

A yogi who has not abandoned emptiness
has not completely abandoned non-emptiness.
Grasping at emptiness and non-emptiness
will generate numerous conceptual thoughts.”
This, too, will turn out to be
not different from the view of the Chinese. {3.13}

Maitreyañātha in the *Uttaratantraśāstra* says,
The truth of cessation cannot be analyzed
In terms of the four modes, existence and non-existence,
and both and neither.
Likewise, in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, it says;
“One should not speak of ‘emptiness’
Nor should one say ‘non-emptiness’
Nor should one speak of ‘both’ or ‘neither’.
Also from the same text,
The four extremes are refuted
With regards to the Blessed One’s
abiding and the parinirvāṇa.
Likewise Kulika Puṇḍarika
And Āryadeva declared as follows,
“Neither existence; nor non-existence;
Nor both;
nor the nature of either.
[The ones] liberated from the four extremes are the Madhyamakas.
This is the reality of the wise one.”
These again will turn out to be without
differences from the Chinese view. {3.14}

In this regard, [the opponent] explains
the meaning of non-existence and nor non-existence as
intended for convention [and] ultimate,
[and says] therefore [the scriptures] do not undermine him.
In that case, all appearing phenomena will
exist on the ultimate level and will not exist on the conventional level
because it is not neither [i.e., not existence nor non-existence].
Recall the three-fold acceptance. {3.15}

Someone ⁶⁸ explains the meanings of the four: existence, non-

⁶⁸ According to oral tradition, this defense of Tsong kha pa is attributed to dGe legs dpal bzang, one of his principal disciples. For a further critique of this defense by Go rams pa, see his *dBu-ma-spyi ston* (fols.88b3-89a2). Indeed, Klu sgrub rgya mtsho attributes this clarification to the followers

existence,
 And so forth, as not having the inherent [nature].
 Taking these four as the subject [of investigation]
 and 'negating inherent [nature]' as a predicate
 is not taught in the treatises of the father and heirs.
 Instead, with regards to [the subject], the going and abiding of the
 Bhagavan
 And [on] the non-dual gnosis and so on,
 the four [extremes] are negated. {3.16}

Grasping at the non-implicative negation,
 Having negated inherent existence, as the view of Madhyamaka
 is undermined by the reliable scriptures explained earlier.
 It is said to be a root downfall in the Tantras. {3.17}

If there are no differences in the views of the three vehicles,
 It contradicts Ajitanātha,⁶⁹
 Who taught the three hierarchies of realization of non-essentialities for
 the three vehicles
 , and that the [the paths of] application, seeing, and meditation of
 Māhāyāna
 as surpassing [the paths of] application, seeing, and the meditation
 of the lower vehicles on account of the view.⁷⁰ {3.18}

Venerable Nāgārjuna taught about the
 differences in realizing the characterlessness in all aspects,
 and not realizing all of it [by the Māhāyānist and Hinayanist,

of dGe legs dpal bzang's *sKal bzang mig 'byed*. See Klu sgrub rgya mtsho, *Nor bu'i phreng ba* (p.373): *gnyis pa ni mkhas grub rje'i skal bzang mig 'byed kyi rjes 'brang kha cig na re//*. For a translation of this work, see Cabezón 1992.

⁶⁹ Ajitanātha serves as an epithet of Maitreya. This interpretation is derived from the second chapter of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, wherein the author establishes a distinctive classification between the ultimate realizations attained by practitioners of the three vehicles.

⁷⁰ Regarding the various sources concerning the non-essentialities realized by practitioners of the three vehicles, see Go rams pa, *sBas don zab gter* (fols.140b2-150a3). Here, he examines the two principal strands of Māhāyāna, attributed respectively to the seminal figure of Maitreya and to Nāgārjuna, as preserved in the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* and *Mūlamadhyamaka*. For Go rams pa, these two authorities offer equally authoritative commentaries on the Māhāyāna system, making it inconceivable to consider one correct and the other erroneous.

respectively].

Furthermore, Candra[kīrti]'s teaching on the difference of views, through discriminating cognition, not conceptualizing the three spheres,

inconceivable nature, and so on, contradict [with your assertion].

It is also refuted by reasoning,

Because Sugatagarbha will be realized from

The path of seeing of the lower [vehicles].

[If you] accept this, [then Śrāvaka will] transcend birth, and others,

Which originated from action [and] afflictions.

It [also] contradicts Venerable Asaṅga,

who declared that the Śrāvaka [and] Pratyekā[buddha] are

not endowed with an eye to see the [Sugata]garbha. {3.19}

If all [the scholars of] Svātantrika [tradition] refute

The existence of an object from its own mode without depending on cognition,

This will contradict [your position], which asserts that Bhavya, accepts external phenomena as existing from its own side.⁷¹ {3.20}

Is it on the conventional or the ultimate level, the acceptance of not finding nominally designated objects when searched?

If it is on the conventional level, then the designating name,

too, will be non-existent on the conventional level

because these, [the designating name and designated object], exist through mutual dependence.

Thus, in the *Mūlamadhyamaka*, it is said,

“Agent depends upon the action and

action too, apart from arising

Depending on the agent,

There is no cause for its existence.

By the [example of] agent and the action,

know [this fact] for the rest of the entities too,”

this is taught [and] rest of the entities [referred] are

the one signified, signifier, and so on.

This is said to apply to all that exists through dependence. {3.21}

⁷¹ For Go rams pa's own understanding of the differences between these two sub-schools of Madhyamaka, see Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi ston, lTa ba'i shan 'byed*, and *lTa ba ngan sel*. For a translation of the last work, see Tshering et al 2005. See also Santina 1995. For a comprehensive collection of essays examining the differences between the two traditions, see Dreyfus & McClintock 2003.

If it means not finding
 On the ultimate level,
 all phenomena are not findable on the ultimate level,
 which is commonly accepted by both Prāsaṅgika [and] Svātantrika,
 therefore, how can it be a unique attribute of only one [tradition]?
 {3.22}

If the reduction of the object grasped by the mind
 Through logical analysis is a misconception,
 Then from the Buddha onwards,
 all the scholars [and] realized beings of India [and] Tibet
 will turn out to embody this misconception.
 This is because they all refuted the grasped objects of dualistic
 concepts,
 like emptiness and not emptiness, and so on. {3.23}

Your assertion will be undermined,
 If the inherently existing object, grasped by the conceptual cognition,
 is refuted,
 through the arguments of being neither one nor many.
 If, on the other hand, it is not refuted,
 how can the misconception of grasping at true [existence] be refuted?
⁷² {3.24}

If [I] accept that the preceding [and] following [cognitions] as
 underminable and infinite [respectively], when the conceptual mind
 investigates the mode of existence of a phenomenon,
 what will afflict my [position]? ⁷³
 Whatever refutation is made against this [position],
 how will it not harm these [following statements of Nāgārjuna]?
 In the *Mūlamadhyamaka*, he says,

⁷² This appears to be a problematic interpretation of Tsong kha pa's perspective, since for him, it is precisely the hypostatized or 'inherent existence' that must be negated through Madhyamaka's reasoning. Here, Go rams pa suggests that negating inherent existence would contradict Tsong kha pa's tradition—a mistaken attribution. Furthermore, Go rams pa seems to contradict his own presentation of Tsong kha pa's view in his *dBu ma spyi ston*, where he explicitly states that for Tsong kha pa, the negandum of Madhyamaka reasoning is restricted to 'inherent existence.' See Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi ston* (fol.86a6): *dbu ma'i dgag bya ni bden pa kho na yin la*. Similarly, in another work, Go rams pa presents Tsong kha pa's system as one in which the negandum is specifically defined as inherent existence; see Go rams pa, *lTa ba ngan sel* (fol.309b5-310a1).

⁷³ For a detailed analysis of these issues, see Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi ston* (fols.87b1-88b3).

“Self is nominally designated.
 Non-Self, also, is taught by the Buddhas.
 It is also taught that neither self nor nonself [exist],”
 Likewise, again from it [following is stated],
 “All are real, or unreal,
 All is both real and unreal,
 All is neither real nor not real.
 This is the Buddha’s precepts.” {3.25}

Although within the meditative equipoise of the exalted one,
 When all proliferations are totally pacified,
 the two-fold faults do not exist
 since the preceding [cognition] does not grasp. {3.26}

Accepting the understanding of the true meaning
 through the double negations,⁷⁴
 When analyzing the mode of existence through reasoning,
 How does it not go against
 Lord Nāgārjuna,[who said],
 “By fully [and] accordingly realizing reality,
 [one] will not assert non-existence [and] existence.
 Therefore, if it becomes non-existent,
 Why will it not turn out to be an existence?
 If, by refuting the existence,
 becomes implicitly non-existent,
 Similarly, why by refuting non-existence,
 Will it again, not turn out to be existence?” {3.27}

The designation ‘Middle’ will turn out to be not inappropriate
 because when refuting either one of the extremes,
 it necessarily becomes the other, [for example],
 turning out to be the extreme of annihilationism when refuting the
 extreme of eternalism, and so on. {3.28}

Someone,⁷⁵ even on the conventional level,
 espouses the view of freedom from the four extremes,
 like non-existence or non-existence, and so forth. {3.29}

This contradicts the statement of the Teacher [who] in the Sūtra said,⁷⁶

⁷⁴ For parallel arguments, see Go rams pa, *dBu ma spyi ston* (fol.89).

⁷⁵ This someone is the translator sKyabs mchog dpal.

⁷⁶ Go rams pa extensively critiqued this position, providing a detailed analysis of both the logical foundations and scriptural citations that its

“Worldly beings will disagree with me;
 I do not contest with them.
 Whatever worldly beings say, either existence or non-existence,
 I, too, advocate that.”
 Considering this, even Candra[kīrti] exhorts to accept,
 existence [and] non-existence distinctively [on the conventional level],
 Since refuting existence, non-existence, while establishing the
 convention,
 will be impaired by the ways of worldly beings. {3.30}

This is also harmed by logical reasoning
 since all conventions are
 not beyond the four extremes;
 Therefore, the system of the convention will become untenable. {3.31}

[I will] explain how this [assertion], also contradicts experiences.
 Regarding food, clothing, fire, water, and other [phenomena],
 When asked about their existence or non-existence, if the
 Madhyamika
 Asserts as neither existence nor non-existence,
 this is not only inconducive to the immediate purpose
 but will lead to quarrels with others. {3.32}

Even on the conventional [level],
 Neither existence nor non-existence is required for [the explanation
 of] remote entities,
 and the [existence of] effect on the occasion of its causes, etc.⁷⁷
 For the rest of the phenomena that are suitable to appear,
 Distinctly articulating either as
 existence, nonexistence, is, is not, etc., is the tradition of the
 Madhyamaka. {3.33}

[I] heard someone maintaining ⁷⁸ that the person exists on the
 conventional [level]

proponent maintains as the basis for these theories. For a comprehensive account, see Go rams pa's *dBu ma spyi ston* (fol.36a).

⁷⁷ One of the distinctive philosophical positions of Madhyamaka that Go rams pa maintains is causal indeterminism, a theoretical stance that maintains deliberate ambiguity regarding both the existence and non-existence of an effect during its cause, and conversely.

⁷⁸ The primary proponent of this theoretical framework is Shākya mchog ldan, a contemporary of Go rams pa .

and the self does not exist [on the conventional level].

This is because it is in the systems of non-Buddhists that holds self and person to be a synonym.

As for the proof [he says],

the cognition realizing selflessness as realizing the mode of existence of phenomena, and grasping at self as not engaged with reality. {3.34}

In this case, the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtras* and treatises of Nāgārjuna, the father [and] the heirs, will turn out to be the treatises of non-Buddhist since they teach these [i.e., self and person] to be synonymous. {3.35}

The [following] twelve agents are proclaimed

In the sūtras, namely,

Self, sentient beings, life force,

person, nourisher, being,

lord, mind-born, doer,

experiencer, perceiver, and seer. {3.36}

Ārya Nāgārjuna states that

The object of observation of self-grasping in [the statement],

“Until there is grasping at the aggregates,

There is self-grasping,” as mere I.

The twelve agents

are designated as synonymous with it [i.e., the mere I]. {3.37}

This [i.e., the mere I] cannot be found

when searched by five or seven-fold [reasoning]

about the aggregates.

Yet, illustrious Candra[kīrti] teaches that,

through the association with the illustration of the wooden chariot,

Concerning the unanalyzed worldly consensus,

depending upon the ones that which is appropriated,

parts, and members,

These are posited as an appropriator,

part possessor, and as whole [respectively].

Do not deny this when debating [and]

Do not deceive disciples when teaching.⁷⁹ {3.38}

⁷⁹ For a detailed exposition of the implications and his analysis of the relationship between the self and the psycho-physical aggregates, see Go rams pa, *lTa ba ngan sel*, (fol.339b2): *gang zag rdzas yod rigs pas dpyad nas dgag / brten nas btags pa'i gang zag rnam par gzhaḡ rigs pa'i tshul de dngos po kun la bsgre ba'o//*.

The proof is also superficial.
 It will be similar to the cognitions, realizing
 the unborn, characterlessness, non-elaborateness, and others.
 Because an origination etc., exists on the conventional level. {3.39}

When criticizing others [he] refutes by saying that,
 If one gets liberated by seeing
 The ultimate non-existence of self,
 Then seeing the non-existence of the son of a barren woman will also
 liberate.
 This refutation seems to be
 directed at Nāgārjuna, who said,
 "The existence of self [and] what belongs to self
 is reversed in the ultimate.
 Because fully knowing
 the ultimate as it is, duality will not appear."
 If one is confused even concerning a coarse system like this,
 what will happen to the subtle ones?
 This consequence will be similar to your own system,
 of the non-existence of self on the conventional [level] and
 the non-existence of aggregates, etc., on the ultimate level.
 Investigate if one knows the system of reasoning.
 Establishing philosophical positions by
 relying on popular speech and
 abandoning the system of treatises
 will become a laughing stock if seen by the learned ones. {3.40}

The [word] self and all the factors appended with
 The terms 'phenomena' and 'person,'
 and the meaning of self in [the phrase] 'no-self,'
 is explained as being established from one's own nature,
 [and] is considered even to be non-existent on the conventional level,
 by Buddhapālita and Chandra[kīrti].
 Distinguished separately
 when calling these and the agent as a self.⁸⁰ {3.41}

⁸⁰ A principal commentator on the present text notes that although the author attributes this position and the subsequent one to Shākyamchog ldan, this attribution is questionable, particularly concerning one of Śākya-mchog-ldan's major works on Madhyamaka. See Klu sgrub rgya mtsho, *Nor bu'i phreng ba* (p.404).

Someone⁸¹ asserts that the primary reasoning
 Negating the self of a person is its unfindability
 when searched through seven aspects [of analysis],⁸²
 In relation to the five aggregates.
 Therefore, the person and the self of a person are not different.
 Both are said to exist conventionally
 But are non-existent ultimately—
 This is the Madhyamaka system's position. {3.42}

The position asserting that these two have no difference is
 The system of non-Buddhists and Saṃnitiya [and] it does not exist in
 other [systems].⁸³ {3.43}

Otherwise, phenomena too will turn out to be
 essential phenomena since the search is the same.
 If [you] accept this, then when the post-meditative equipoise of the
 exalted one
 realizes the non-essentiality of phenomena,
 realize the non-existent of mere phenomena. {3.44}

The reason [given] should be known as the reason of the effect,
 of gross intelligence.
 This is because the meaning of this [analysis] is
 when searching for a person in seven manners,
 and if it is found [under analysis],
 it will become the self of the person. {3.45}

Someone⁸⁴ maintains that when guiding the
 mind-stream of the trainee by the view of Madhyamaka,
 First, getting habituated to the
 strings of conceptual thought that follow
 Verbalization 'I' is a sign of getting acquainted with

⁸¹ This is a position attributed to Shākya mchog ldan, Go rams pa's contemporary.

⁸² For Go rams pa's detailed exposition of the seven-fold analysis, which serves as a deconstructive critique employed in the Madhyamaka system to demonstrate the philosophical unsustainability of conventional notions of identity, see *lTa ba ngan sel*.

⁸³ See Go rams pa, *lTa ba ngan sel* (fol.342b-3) for his concise presentation of how self or personal identity is conceptualized according to the hierarchical classification of philosophical schools.

⁸⁴ The primary teacher and practitioner of this methodology is dGe ldan pa, who follows the doctrinal tradition of an abbot of lCang ra.

The conceived object of innate self-grasping
 And multiple signs will appear then.
 Afterward [he] declares, the appearance of
 non-implicative negative to cognition,
 through familiarization with the conceptual thoughts
 that follow the verbalization of 'no-self.'
 This is [proclaimed] as the penetrative insight
 that realizes the ultimate mode of existence. {3.46}

The familiarization with the conceived object of view of self
 Through familiarization is the system of non-Buddhists.
 This does not exist in the [tenet] systems from
 Kashmiri Vaibhāṣika up to the Madhyamaka. {3.47}

This is already refuted
 by Maitreyañātha, who said,
 "There is no need to generate the view of self
 [since] it is habituated from the beginning-less time." {3.48}

If merely familiarizing with conceptual thoughts
 which follows verbalizations of no-self
 realizes the view of Madhyamaka,
 then the hearing [and] reflecting on the
 reasoning system taught in the
 Ocean-like treatises of Madhyamaka will become redundant.
 [Because] there is no difference in the mode of meditation
 of the two, the wise and the fool. {3.49}

If something like this is a special insight,
 then the conjoined meditation of it with calm abiding
 will become impossible
 because this follows the verbalizations. {3.50}

Alas! Strange indeed is the degenerative time.
 Though fools possibly could hold this [view],
 what is that trust [in this system] by the
 one learned in the treatises of Madhyamaka? {3.51}

In brief, for those wishing to practice the view ⁸⁵

⁸⁵ For a concise exposition of Go rams pa's establishment of the Madhyamaka philosophical view and its subsequent development into meditative insight, see Go rams pa's *lDan ma tshe rgya skyabs kyi dris lan* vol.10 (fols.72b3-74a5) and *Rin byang dri lan* vol.10 (fol. 71a1-71b3). For a

[and] conduct of Mahāyāna without error,
 It is the [cultivation of] emptiness, free from the four extremes,
 whose essence is [imbued with] compassion.
 The Third Chapter On the Vows of Bodhisattva. {3.52}

6. Critical edition

A Critical Edition of the Third Chapter of the *sDom gsum kha skong*

6.1. Sigla

A= *sDom gsum kha skong*, an independent block print located among the books at 'Bras spung monastery, with the serial number 06625. The printing colophon indicates preparation by Shākya seng ge and confirms that the print was carved within a few decades following Go rams pa's death. The third chapter of the *sDom gsum kha skong* is found between fols.8b7-13a3.

B= *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i kha skong gzhi lam 'bras gsum gsal bar byed pa'i legs bshad 'od kyi snang ba*. In *Kun mkhyen go bo rams pa bsod nams seng gye bka' 'bum*. 13 vols. sDe dge Xylographic edition, vol.9. The third chapter of the *sDom gsum kha skong* is found between pp.664-675. The pagination is affixed on the reprint, with traditional foliation indicated on the page's right side. I have opted to follow the pagination. This is a reprint from 1979 by Sakya College in Dehradun, based on a woodblock print reportedly edited by mkhan chen 'Jam dbyangs rgyal mtshan, the third abbot of rDzong sar khams bye bshad grwa, at the beginning of the last century.

6.2. Editorial Policies and Signs

The parenthetical numbers appended to the side represent the chapter and passage numbers. I have adhered to the author's outline, with each passage corresponding to the specific content of the respective outline.

Go rams pa's work is replete with quotations from various Indic and Tibetan sources. To trace the historical context, sources, categories, and terminology employed by Go rams pa, I have identified and provided the sources of his citations in the endnotes. For canonical sources within the *bKa' 'gyur*, I relied on the sTog and Peking editions,

translation of the first work, see <https://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/gorampa-sonam-senge/response-to-denma-tsegyal-kyab>.

while for *bsTan 'gyur* sources, I used the sDe-dge and Peking editions. I used modern editions of canonical works when available. Sanskrit references were also provided whenever these became available.

When identifying Go rams pa's quotations within the canonical transmission, I have included individual work ID from various catalogs and—when possible—the folio number (distinguishing between recto [a] and verso [b]), along with line numbers to facilitate easy reference.

The following abbreviations are used for sources in the endnotes, with corresponding numbers representing the respective canon IDs:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | <i>sTog bka' 'gyur</i> | T |
| 2 | <i>Pe cin bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur</i> | P |
| 3 | <i>sDe dge bka' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur</i> | D |

The following editorial signs are employed:

<i>em.</i>	emendation
]	Preferred reading
<x>	Folio/page change.

6.3. A Critical Edition.

byang chub sems dpa'i sdom pa ni || pha rol phyin pa'i dbu <A9a>
 sems kyi ||
 srol chen gnyis las thob pa'm || gsang sngags rgyud sde las gsungs
 pa'i ||
 cho ga dag las thob kyang rung || smon 'jug sems bskyed thob nas ni
 ||
 tshul khriims bslab pa rnam pa gsum || bsrung ba nyams len dngos
 gzhi yin || {3.1}

de yi gtso bo spyod pa'i cha || bdag gzhan <B665> brje ba'i byang
 sems dang ||
 lta ba mtha' bzhi'i spros⁸⁶ bral gnyis || zung jug nyams su len pa yin
 || {3.2}

de la kha cig brje ba'i don || gces 'dzin brje⁸⁷ ba nyid yin gyi ||

⁸⁶ spros] B, sbros A

⁸⁷ brje] B, rje A

dge sdig bde sdug brje min te || brje bar mi nus phyir zhes zer ||
{3.3}

'o na gces 'dzin brje ba yang || brje ba'i don nyid min 'gyur te ||
brje bar mi nus mtshung phyir ro || dngos su brje bar mi nus kyang
||
blo yi steng du sbyor zhes na || de ni cig shos la mtshungs te ||
rang gzhan bde dang sdug bsngal gnyis || dngos su brje bar su yis
nus || {3.4}

blo la⁸⁸ bde sdug mi brje na || gces 'dzin brje ba 'gal ba ste ||
kha zas gzhan la ma byin par || rang gis zos pa ji bzhin no || {3.5}

dge sdig brje ba bkag pa ni || sang rgyas gnyis pa klu sgrub kyis ||
bdag la de dag sdig smin cing || bdag dge ma lus der smin shog |¹
ces gsungs pa dang cis mi 'gal || bde sdug brje ba bkag pa ni ||
byang chub sems dpa'i spyod 'jug las || bdag bde gzhan gyi sdug
bsngal dag |
yang dag brje bar ma byas na || sangs rgyas nyid du mi 'grub cing ||
'khor ba na yang bde ba med ||² ces gsungs pa dang cis mi 'gal || c
spyod 'jug lung don de nyid la || khyod kyī grub mtha' chos can du
||
bzung nas thal ba 'phen na ni || chos mthun lan nyid gang la 'debs ||
{3.6}

mdor na blo la 'dod mi 'dod || gnyis su phye ba'i 'dod pa kun ||
gzhan la ster zhing mi 'dod kun || rang la len par goms pa ni ||
mdo sde⁸⁹ dbyug gsum phreng ba dang || bstan bcos <A9b> bsrlab
btus spyod 'jug <B666> sogs ||
dgongs pa dpal ldan a ti shas || zab don nyams khrid sgo nas ni ||
bshes gnyen ston pa nyid la gnang || phyi nas gangs ri'i
khrod 'dir 'phel ||
sangs rgyas bsgom⁹⁰ pa la sogs⁹¹ kyis || bsgom tshul zhib tu shad
pa'ang mthong || {3.7}

sa skya'i rje btsun mchog rnams la || rnal 'byor dbang phyug bir wa
pa'i ||
man ngag gnyis⁹² las 'di nyid kyī || nyams len gsal ba'i bka' babs

⁸⁸ The words *blo la* are effaced in A.

⁸⁹ mdo sde] B, mdo snga A

⁹⁰ sangs rgyas bsgom pa] B, sangs rgyas bsgoms pa A

⁹¹ sogs] B, swo A

⁹² gnyis] B, gnyes A

bzhugs || {3.8}

de dang⁹³ sngar gyi bka' srol gnyis || khyad par med pa sangs rgyas
kyi ||

bstan pa'i snying po yin pa'i phyir || mos pa tsam la'ang byin
rlabs⁹⁴ 'byung || {3.9}

kha cig mtha' bzhi'i spros bral ni || rgya nag dge slong lta ba dang
||

khyad par med par nor ba yin || rigs pas bden pa bkag rjes su ||

bden med nyid la zhen pa ni || dbu ma'i lta ba mthar thug ste ||

theg pa gsum char 'di nyid ni || rtogs phyir lta ba khyad par med ||

bden⁹⁵ tshad de yang rang rgyud pas || blo la ma ltos yul ngos nas
||

grub pa nyid la 'dod gyur kyang || de ni dgag bya thun⁹⁶ mong ste
||

ming gis btags don btsal ba'i tshe || rnyed pa bden tshad du byas nas
||

de nyid 'gog pa thal 'gyur ba'i || thun mong⁹⁷ ma yin khyad chos yin
||

dgag bya'i khyad par 'di rtogs na || blo yis gang du zhen pa'i yul ||

rigs pas dpyad nas 'gog pa yi || log rtog thams cad khegs par 'gyur
||

gzhan du bden pa bkag rjes su || bden med zhen pa'ang 'gog dgos
na ||

blo ni snga ma gnod bcas dang || phyi ma thug med nyid du 'gyur
||

bden <B667> par med pa 'gog na ni || bden par yod⁹⁸ pa nyid 'gyur
te ||

dgag pa gnyis kyis⁹⁹ rnal ma ni || go ba'i phyir zhes 'dzer bar byed
|| {3.10}

lta ba'i snyigs ma 'di dag ni || lung dang rigs pas dgag par bya ||
{3.11}

rgya nag dge slong ma dpyad par || rang dgar rtog pa bkag pa la ||

⁹³ The words *de dang* are effaced in A.

⁹⁴ byin rlabs] B, byin brlab A

⁹⁵ bden] B, illegible in A.

⁹⁶ thun] B, ngun A

⁹⁷ thun mong] B, thun mongs A

⁹⁸ yod] B, yong A

⁹⁹ kyis] A, kyi B

sgom gyi mchog tu smra ba dang || 'di ni rigs pas dpyad pa'i tshe ||
 mtha' bzhi'i spros pa <A10a> ma rnyed pa'i || 'dzin med lta bar smra
 ba gnyis ||
 mtshungs zhes smra ba stong pa nyid || zab mo spong ba'i bdud
 tshig yin || {3.12}

gzhan yang dkon mchog brtsegs pa las || yod med gnyis po mtha' re
 re ||
 byas nas dbus ni dbu ma ste || de yang bstan med brjod¹⁰⁰ med par
 ||³
 gsungs pa de yang rgya nag gi || lta ba nyid dang khyad med 'gyur
 ||
 de bzhin ting 'dzin rgyal po las || yod med gtsang dang mi gtsang
 sogs ||
 mtha' gnyis yin phyir de spangs nas || dbus la'ang mi gnas gsungs
 pa dang ||⁴
 yum las stong dang mi stong sogs || gnyis la spyod pa thams cad ni
 ||
 mtshan mar spyod pa gsung⁵ pa dang || yang dag sbyor ba'i rgyud
 las kyang ||
 stong pa bsgom par mi bya ste || stong min bsgom par mi bya 'o ||
 stong pa mi spong rnal¹⁰¹ 'byor pas || stong min yongs su mi spong
 ngo ||
 stong dang mi stong gzung ba la || rtog pa nyung min skye bar 'gyur
 ||⁶
 zhes gsung pa yang rgya nag gi || lta ba nyid dang khyad med 'gyur
 || {3.13}

mgon po byams pas rgyud bla mar || 'gog bden yod dang med pa
 dang ||
 gnyis dang gnyis min rnam <B668> pa bzhir || brtag par mi nus
 gsung pa dang ||⁷
 dbu ma rtsa ba'i bstan bcos las¹⁰² || stong ngo zhes kyang mi brjod de
 ||
 mi stong zhes kyang mi bya zhing || gnyis dang gnyis min mi bya
 ste ||⁸
 zhes gsung gzhan yang de nyid las || bcom ldan bzhugs dang mya
 ngan las ||
 'das pa gnyis la mtha' bzhi yi || spros pa bkag par mdzad pa dang
 ||⁹

¹⁰⁰ brjod] B, rjod A

¹⁰¹ rnal] B, rnel B

¹⁰² The word *las* is effaced in A.

rigs ldan pad ma dkar po dang || 'phags pa lha yis 'di skad du ||
 yod min med min yod med min || gnyis ka'i bdag nyid kyang min
 pa ||
 mtha' bzhi las grol dbu ma pa || mkhas pa rnams kyis de kho na ||¹⁰
 zhes gsungs pa yang rgya nag¹⁰³ gi || lta ba nyid dang khyad
 med 'gyur || {3.14}

de la yod min med min don || kun rdzob don dam la dgongs pas ||
 nged la gnod pa med ces zer || 'o na snang ba'i dngos <A10b> po
 kun ||
 don dam¹⁰⁴ yod dang kun rdzob tu || med pa¹⁰⁵ gnyis kar thal 'gyur
 te ||
 gnyis ka min pa min pa'i phyir || rnam gsum khas blangs dran par
 gyis || {3.15}

kha cig yod med la sogs bzhi || bden par med pa'i don yin zer ||
 bzhi po chos can du bzung nas || bden pa bkag pa bsgrub chos¹⁰⁶ su
 ||
 yab sras gzhung las ma gsung te || thams cad bcom ldan gshegs
 bzhugs dang ||
 gnyis med ye shes la sogs la || bzhi po bkag par gsungs¹¹ phyir ro ||
 {3.16}

bden pa bkag pa'i med dgag la || dbu ma'i lta bar zhen pa ni ||
 sngar bshad yid¹⁰⁷ ches lung gis gnod || rgyud las rtsa ba'i ltung bar
 gsungs¹² || {3.17}

theg gsum lta ba khyad med na || mi pham mgon pos theg gsum la
 ||
 <B669> bdag med rtogs pa rim gsum dang || theg chen sbyor mthong
 bsgom pa gsum ||
 dman pa'i sbyor mthong bsgom gsum las || lta bas 'phags tshul
 gsungs dang¹³ 'gal || {3.18}

klu sgrub zhabs kyis mtshan med ni || tshang¹⁰⁸ bar rtogs dang ma
 rtogs pa'i ||
 khyad par gsungs¹⁴ shing zla bas kyang || 'khor gsum mi dmigs she

¹⁰³ rgya nag] B, rgyan A

¹⁰⁴ don dam] B, bden par A

¹⁰⁵ med pa] B, bden pa A

¹⁰⁶ bsgrub chos] *em.*, sgrub chos AB

¹⁰⁷ yid] B, ying A

¹⁰⁸ tshang] B, tshangs A

rab dang ||
 bsam gyis mi khyab chos nyid sogs¹⁰⁹ || lta ba'i khyad par gsungs
 dang 'gal ||¹⁵
 rigs pas kyang ni gnod pa ste || dman pa'i mthong ba'i lam nyid nas
 ||
 bde gshegs snying po mthong bar 'gyur || 'dod na las nyon las byung
 ba'i ||
 skye sogs rnams las 'das 'gyur zhing¹⁶ || nyan rang snying po lta ba
 la ||
 mig dang mi ldan gang zag tu || thogs med zhabs kyis¹¹⁰ gsungs
 dang¹⁷ 'gal || {3.19}

blo la ma ltos yul ngos nas || grub par rang rgyud kun 'gog na ||
 bha byas phyi don rang ngos nas || grub par khas blangs smras
 dang 'gal || {3.20}

btags don btsal tshe ma rnyad don || tha snyad don dam gang
 du 'dod ||
 tha snyad yin na 'dogs byed kyi || ming yang tha snyad med 'gyur
 te ||
 de dag phan tshun ltos grub phyir || de skad du yang dbu ma las ||
 byed po las la brten byas shing || las <A11a> kyang byed po de nyid
 la ||
 brten nas¹¹¹ 'byung bar ma gtogs¹¹² par || 'grub pa'i rgyu ni ma
 mthong ngo ||
 byed pa po dang las dbang gis || dngos po lhag ma shes par bya ||¹⁸
 zhes gsungs dngos po lhag ma ni || brjod bya rjod byed la sogs pa ||
 ltos grub kun la 'jug par gsungs || {3.21}

dam pa'i don du ma rnyed pa || de don yin na chos thams cad ||
 dam pa'i don du mi rnyed <B670> par || thal rang gnyis ka mthun¹¹³
 pa'i phyir ||
 gcig¹¹⁴ gi khyad chos ji ltar 'gyur || {3.22}

blo yis gang du zhen pa'i yul || rigs pas dpyad nas 'gog pa ni ||
 log rtog yin na sangs rgyas nas || bzung ste rgya bod mkhas grub
 kun ||

¹⁰⁹ sogs] B, so B

¹¹⁰ kyis] B, kyi A

¹¹¹ brten nas] B, rten nas A

¹¹² gtogs] A, rtogs A

¹¹³ mthun] B, 'thun A

¹¹⁴ gcig] B, cig A

log rtog de dang ldan gyur te || de dag stong dang mi stong sogs ||
gnyis 'dzin zhen yul bkag phyir ro || {3.23}

gcig dang du bral gtan tshigs kyis || rtog blos zhen yul bden grub pa
||
'gog na khyod kyī dam bca' nyams || mi 'gog na ni bden 'dzin gyi ||
log rtog gang gis khegs par 'gyur || {3.24}

ci srid rtog blos yul gyi ni || gnas lugs dpyod par byed pa'i tshe ||
snga phyi gnod bcas thug med gnyis || 'dod thog yin na gang gis
gnod ||
'di la gnod byed gang brjod pa || dbu ma rtsa ba'i bstan bcos las ||
bdag go zhes kyang btags 'gyur zhing || bdag med ces kyang bstan
par 'gyur ||
sangs rgyas rnams kyis bdag dang ni || bdag med 'ga'¹¹⁵ med ces
kyang bstan ||¹⁹
ces gsungs gzhan yang de nyid las || thams cad yang dag yang dag
min ||
yang dag yang dag ma yin nyid || yang dag min min yang dag min
||
'di ni sangs rgyas rjes bstan pa'o ||²⁰ zhes gsungs pa la cis mi gnod
|| {3.25}

'on kyang 'phags pa'i mnyam gzhaḡ ngor || spros pa thams cad
nyer¹¹⁶ zhi'i tshe ||
gnyis po'i skyon yod ma yin te || snga mas zhen pa med phyir ro ||
{3.26}

rigs pas gnas lugs dpyad pa'i tshe || dgag pa gnyis kyis¹¹⁷ rnal ma ni
||
go ba mgon po klu sgrub kyis || yang dag ji bzhiḡ yongs shes <B671>
pas ||
med dang yod par mi 'dod pa || <A11b> de phyir med pa par 'gyur
na ||
ci phyir yod pa par mi 'gyur || gal te yod pa sun phyung bas ||
don gyis 'di ni med par bslan || de bzhiḡ med pa sun phyung bas ||
yod par ci yi phyir mi bslan¹¹⁸ ||²¹ zhes gsungs pa dang cis mi 'gal ||
{3.27}

¹¹⁵ 'ga'] B, 'gag A

¹¹⁶ nyer] B, nye A

¹¹⁷ kyis] *em.*, kyī AB

¹¹⁸ bslan] B, slan A

dbu ma'i tha snyad mi rung ste || rtag mtha' bkag tshe chad mtha'
sogs ||
mtha' gnyis gang rung bkag pa'i tshe || cig shos der ni 'gyur phyir ro
|| {3.28}

kha cig tha snyad tshe na yang || yod min med min la sogs pa ||
mtha' bzhi'i spros bral smra bar byed || {3.29}

'di ni mdo las ston pa yis || 'jig rten nga dang rtsod byed kyi ||
nga ni 'jig rten mi rtsod de || 'jig rten yod med gang smra ba ||
nga yang smra zhes gsungs²² dang 'gal || 'di la dgongs nas zla bas
kyang ||
tha snyad 'jog tshe yod med sogs || 'gog na 'jig rten gyis gnod pas ||
yod med so sor smros zhes¹¹⁹ gsung || {3.30}

rigs pas kyang ni gnod pa ste || kun rdzob thams cad mtha' bzhi yi
||
spros pa nyid las ma 'das phyir || kun rdzob rnam gzhang mi
rung 'gyur || {3.31}

myong ba dang 'gal bshad par bya || zas gos me chu la sogs pa ||
yod med dris¹²⁰ tshe dbu ma pas || yod min med min smra byed na
||
skabs kyi don yang mi 'grub cing || gzhan la klan kar 'gyur ba
mthong || {3.32}

kun rdzob la yang bskal don¹²¹ dang || rgyu yis dus na 'bras bu sogs
||
yod min med¹²² min dgos pa'ang yod || lhag ma snang rung chos
rnams la ||
yod med yin min la sogs <B672> pa || so sor smra ba dbu ma'i lugs
|| {3.33}

la la bdag dang gang zag gnyis || rnam grang yin smra mu stegs
gzhang ||
yin phyir tha snyad du yang bdag | med phyir gang zag yod par 'dod
||
sgrub byed bdag med rtogs pa'i blos || yul gyi gnas tshul rtogs phyir
dang ||

¹¹⁹ zhes] B, shes A

¹²⁰ dris] A, des B

¹²¹ bskal don] *em.*, skal don AB

¹²² med] B, mad A

bdag 'dzin yul gyi gnas tshul la || ma zhugs phyir zhes smra ba thos
|| {3.34}

'o na yum gyi mdo rnam dang || klu sgrub yab sras gzhung¹²³ lugs
rnam ||
mu stegs gzhung lugs <A12a> su 'gyur te || de dag rnam grang
gsungs phyir ro¹²⁴ || {3.35}

de yang mdo las bdag dang¹²⁵ ni || sems can srog dang gang zag dang
||
gso ba skyes bu shed bdag dang || shes skyes¹²⁶ byed po tshor po
dang ||
shes pa po dang mthong po ste || byed pa'i skyes bu bcu gnyis
gsungs || {3.36}

de don 'phags pa klu sgrub kyis || ji srid phung por 'dzin yod pa ||
de srid ngar 'dzin yod²³ ces pa'i || ngar 'dzin dmigs yul nga tsam la
||
byed pa'i skyes bu bcu gnyis kyi || ming gi rnam grangs btags par
bzhed || {3.37}

de nyid phung po rnam la ni || rnam pa lnga'am rnam bdun gyis
||
btsal ba'i tshe na mi rnyed kyang || ma dpyad 'jig rten grags pa'i ngor
||
rang gi nye bar blang bya dang || cha shas dang ni yan lag la ||
brten nas len pa po dang ni || cha shas can dang yan lag can ||
'jog pa shing rta'i dpe dang ni || sbyar bar dpal ldan zla bas gsung
||²⁴
rtsod tshe 'di la ma snyon¹²⁷ cig | 'chad tshe slob ma ma slu¹²⁸ zhig |
{3.38}

sgrub byed kyang ni ltar snang ste¹²⁹ || skye med mtshan med spros
med rnam ||
rtogs <B673> pa'i blo la mtshung pa ste || skye sogs tha snyad du
yod phyir || {3.39}

¹²³ gzhung] A, gzhud B

¹²⁴ ro] B, ra A

¹²⁵ dang] B, dad A

¹²⁶ shes skyes] em., shed skyes AB

¹²⁷ snyon] em., bsnyon B, smyon A

¹²⁸ slu] A, bslu B

¹²⁹ ste] B, sta A

gzhan la skyon brjod tshe na bdag | don dam med mthong grol 'gyur
 na ||
 mo gsham bu med mthong bas kyang || grol bar 'gyur zhes sun 'byin
 smra ||
 sun 'byin 'di ni klu sgrub kyis || bdag yod bdag gi yod ces pa ||
 'di ni dam pa'i don du log | gang phyir yang dag ji lta ba ||
 yongs su shes pas gnyis mi 'byung ||²⁵ zhes gsung pa la brjod par
 snang ||
 rags pa'i rnam gzha¹³⁰g 'di 'dra la'ang || 'khrul na phra mo ji
 ltar 'gyur ||
 rang lugs tha snyad bdag med dang || phung sogs don dam med pa
 la'ang ||
 tha ba 'di ni mtshungs 'gyur te || rigs pa'i rnam gzha¹³⁰g shes na dpyod
 ||
 gzhung lugs rnam gzha¹³⁰g dor nas ni || phal pa'i ngag tsam la brten
 nas ||
 grub mtha'i rnam gzha¹³⁰g 'jog byed pa || mkhas pas mthong na bzhad
 gad¹³¹ gnas || {3.40}

chos dang gang zag tshig zur la || sbyar ba'i bdag dang chos thams
 cad ||
 <B12b> bdag med ces pa'i bdag gi don || sangs rgyas bskyang¹³²
 dang zla ba yis ||
 ngo bos grub pa la bshad nas || tha snyad du yang med par bzhed
 ||
 de dang byed pa'i skyes bu la || bdag ces brjod pa so sor smros ||
 {3.41}

la la gang zag bdag 'gog pa'i || rigs pa'i gtso bo gang zag nyid ||
 phung po lnga la rnam bdun gyis || btsal tshe ma rnyed pa yin pas
 ||
 gang zag dang ni gang zag bdag | khyad par med phyir gnyis ka yang
 ||
 tha snyad du yod don dam du || med pa dbu ma'i lugs zhes <B674>
 smra || {3.42}

gnis po khyad med mu stegs dang || mang bkur lugs yin gzhan la
 med || {3.43}

¹³⁰ rnam gzha¹³⁰g] B, rnam bzha¹³⁰g A

¹³¹ bzhad gad] B, gzha¹³¹g gad A

¹³² bskyangs] B, skyangs A

ghzan du chos kyang chos bdag tu || 'gyur te btsal tshul mtshungs
 phyir ro ||
 'dod na 'phags pa'i rjes thob kyis || cho kyis bdag med rtogs pa'i tshe
 ||
 chos tsam med par¹³³ rtogs par 'gyur || {3.44}

sgrub byed blo gros rtsing ba yi || 'bras rtags nyid du shes bya ste ||
 de don gang zag rnam bdun gyis || btsal tshe rnyed na gang zag gi ||
 bdag tu 'gyur ba'i don yin phyir || {3.45}

kha cig dbu ma'i lta ba yis¹³⁴ || gdul bya'i sems rgyud 'khrid pa'i tshe
 ||
 thog mar nga zhes brjod pa yi || rjes 'brang rtog pa'i phreng ba nyid
 ||
 goms pas ngar 'dzin lhan skyes kyis || zhen yul nga nyid rnyed pa'i
 rtags ||
 mtshan ma ci rigs 'byung bar 'dod || der¹³⁵ rjes nga med ces brjod pa'i
 ||
 rjes 'brang rtog pa goms pa las || med dgag blo la shar ba nyid ||
 gnas lugs mthar thug rtogs pa yi || lhag mthong yin zhes sgrog¹³⁶ par
 byed || {3.46}

bdag lta'i zhen yul goms pa yi || sgom pa mu stegs lugs yin gyi ||
 kha che bye brag smra ba nas || dbu ma'i bar la lugs 'di med || {3.47}

'di nyid mgon po byams pa yis || bdag tu lta ba bskyed mi dgos ||
 goms pa thog ma med dus can || ²⁶ zhes gsung pa yis 'di bkag zin ||
 {3.48}

nga med ces ni brjod pa yi || rjes 'brang rtog pa goms tsam gyis ||
 dbu ma'i lta ba rtogs na ni || dbu ma'i gzhung lugs rgya mtsho las
 ||
 gsungs pa'i rigs pa'i rnam gzhas la || thos bsam don <B13a> med
 nyid 'gyur <B675> te ||
 sgom pa'i tshul 'di blun po dang || mkhas pa gnyis la khyad med
 phyir || {3.49}

'di 'dra lhag mthong yin na ni || 'di dang gzhi gnas zung 'brel du ||

¹³³ par] em., pa Ab

¹³⁴ yis] B, yi A

¹³⁵ der] B, de A

¹³⁶ sgrog] B, sgrogs A

sgom pa mi srid nyid 'gyur te || brjod pa'i rjes 'brang nyid yin¹³⁷
 phyir || {3.50}

kye ma snyigs ma'i dus 'di mtshar || 'di 'dra blun pos 'dzin srid
 na'ang ||
 dbu ma'i gzhung la sbyang pas kyang || 'di la yid ches ci zhig yin
 || {3.51}

mdor na theg chen lta spyod gnyis || ma 'khrul nyams su len 'dod na
 ||
 mtha' bzhis dben pa'i stong pa nyid || snying rje'i snying po can yin
 no ||
 byang chub sems dpa'i sdom pa'i skabs te gsum pa'o || {3.52}

7. Conclusion

The third chapter of the *sDom gsum kha skong* represents a nuanced scholarly exposition and critical analysis of the Madhyamaka philosophical tradition as it was articulated and contested in the Tibetan intellectual landscape during the fifteenth century. This chapter offers a sophisticated methodological approach to examining the intricate doctrinal variations and contemplative methodologies prevalent among different Madhyamaka schools of thought during this pivotal period. A further study is required to trace the ideas critiqued in this chapter within their proper contexts and in the works, where they are advocated, to see whether the criticizer presented the ideas accurately or not, and whether the judgments passed are warranted or not. This, unfortunately, falls beyond the scope of the current article.

8. Bibliography

Works from the Tibetan Buddhist canons referred to in the endnotes are not listed here. Instead, their respective standard IDs are provided within the endnotes and the catalogs in which these numbers are given are listed in the bibliography.

Tibetan Sources

- bSod nams seng ge, *dBu ma la 'jug pa'i dkyus kyi sa bcad pa dang gzhung so so'i dka' ba'i gnas la dpyad pa lta ba ngan sel*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.5 (Ca), fols. pp.512-751.
 —. *Dris lan pad mo bzhad pa*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.10 (tha) pp.53-

¹³⁷ yin] A, min B

- 65.
- *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i rnam bshad rgyal ba'i gsung rab kyi dgongs pa gsal ba zhes bya ba*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.9 (Ta), pp.1-323.
 - *Kun mkhyen go bo rab 'byams pa bsod nams seng ge'i bka' 'bum*. In 13 vols. Dehradun: Sakya College, 1979.
 - *lDan ma tshe rgya skyabs kyi dris lan*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.10 (Tha), pp.142-143.
 - *lTa ba'i shan 'byed theg mchog gnad kyi zla zer*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.5 (Ca), pp.417-508.
 - *rGyal ba thams cad kyi thugs kyi dgongs pa zab mo dbu ma'i de kho na nyid spyi'i ngag gis ston pa nges don rab gsal*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.5 (Ca), pp.1-415.
 - *Rin byang dri lan*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.10 (Tha), pp.97-100.
 - *sDom pa gsum gyi bstan bcos la dris shing rtsod pa'i lan sdom gsum 'khrul spong*, In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.9 (Ta) pp.489-619.
 - *sDom gsum rab dbye'i spyi don yid bzhin nor bu*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.9 (Ta), pp.325-489.
 - *sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba'i kha skong gzhi lam 'bras gsum gsal bar byed pa'i legs bshad 'od kyi snang ba*, In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.9 (Ta) pp.645-705.
 - *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon rtogs rgyan gyi gzhung snga phyi'i 'brel dang dka' ba'i gnas la dpyad pa sbas don zab mo gter gyi kha 'byed*. In *Kun mkhyen bka' 'bum*, vol.7 (Ja) pp.1-453.
- Grags chen bco brgyad*. 58 vols. Darjeeling & Kathmandu: Sakya Chopheling Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies and Sachen International, 2005–2013.
- Klu sgrub rgya mtsho, sDom gsum kha skong gi rnam bshad legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba*. In *Grags chen bco brgyad*, vol.41 (pp.263-543).
- Kun dga' rgyal mtshan, sDom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba*. In *Sa skya bka' 'bum*, vol. 12(Na) pp.1-95.
- mChims 'jam dpal dbyangs, Chos mngon pa mdzod kyi tshig le'ur byas pa'i 'grel pa mngon pa'i rgyan*. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1989.
- Ngag dbang chos grags, sDom gsum kha skong gi rnam bshad legs par bshad pa rgyan gyi me tog*. In *Ngag chos bka' 'bum*. Vol.6 (Cha) pp.133-306.
- Sa chen Kun dga' snying po et al., dPal ldan sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum*. 15 vols. Reproduced from the 1736 sDe dge Edition. New Delhi: Sakya Center, 1993.

Secondary Literature

- Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara (ed.) (1960), *Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- Cabezón, José Ignacio (tr.) (1992), *A Dose of Emptiness: An Annotated translation of the sTong thun chen mo of mKhas grub dge legs dpal bzang*. New Delhi: Sri Satguru Publication.
- Cabezón, José Ignacio & Dagyal, Geshe Lobsang (trs.) (2006), *Freedom from extremes: Gorampa's "Distinguishing the Views" and the Polemics of Emptiness*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Cutler et al (The Lamrim Chenmo Translation Committee) (2014), *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment*. Vol.3. Boulder: Snow Lion.
- Rhoton, Jared Douglas (tr.) (2002), *A clear Differentiation of the three codes Essential Distinction among the Individual Liberation, Great Vehicle, and Tantric systems The sDom gsum rab dbye and six letters*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dreyfus, Georges B.J. & McClintok, Sara L (eds.) (2003), *The Svātantrika-Prāsaṅgika distinction: What difference does a different make?*, Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Hahn, Michael (ed.) (1982), *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī: Vol.1, The Basic texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Jackson, David P. (1987), *The Entrance Gate For The Wise (Section III): Saskya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Jamtsho, Sonam (2019). *A Study of the Life and Works of Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge, and a Translation and Critical Edition of his sDom gsum kha skong*. MA Thesis, University of Hamburg. (Unpublished).
- Jinpa, Thupten (2002), *Self, reality and reason in Tibetan Philosophy Tsongkhapa's quest for the Middle Way*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002.
- (tr.) (2006), *Mind training, The great collection*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- (2019), *Tsongkhapa: A Buddha In The Land of Snows*. Boulder: Shambala.
- Johnston, E. H. (ed.) (1950), *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānattaratāntrāsāstra [includes both the Ratnagotravibhāga and Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā]*. Patna: The Bihar Research Society.
- Jorden, Ngawang (200), *Buddha-nature Through the eyes of Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge in fifteenth-century Tibet*. Unpublished dissertation submitted at Harvard University.

- Heimbel, Jörg, (2020), *In need of donations: A Letter written by Go rams pa to encourage the collecting of offerings in eastern Tibet*. In *On a Day of a Month of the Fire Bird Year. Festschrift for Peter Schwieger on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (pp.331–358). Publisher: Lumbini International Research Institute.
- Kassor, Constance E, (2014), *Thinking the Unthinkable/ Unthinkable the thinkable: Conceptual Thought, Nonconceptuality, and Gorampa Sonam Senge's Synopsis of Madhyamaka*. Unpublished dissertation submitted at Emory University.
- Komarovski, Yaroslav (2012), *Visions of Unity: The Golden Paṇḍita Shakya Chokden's New Interpretation of Yogacara and Madhyamaka*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Lévi, Sylvain (ed.) (1983), *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra: Exposé de la doctrine du grand véhicule*. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co.
- Roerich, George N. (tr.), *The blue annals*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988.
- Santina, Peter Della (1995), *Madhyamaka schools in India: A study of the Madhyamaka philosophy and of the division of the system into the Prāsaṅgika and Svātrantika*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995
- Seyfort Ruegg, David (1981), *The literature of the Madhyamaka school of philosophy in India*. Germany: Otto Harrassowitz.
- . (2000), *Three studies in the history of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamika Philosophy, Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamika Thought Part 1*. Vienna.
- . (2012), *The Buddhist Philosophy of the Middle, Essays on Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka*, Wisdom Publication: Boston Wisdom.
- Sheehy et al. (eds) (2019). *The Other Emptiness: Rethinking the Zhentong Buddhist Discourse in Tibet*. New York: SUNY
- Sobisch, Jan-Ulrich (2002), *Three-Vow Theories in Tibetan Buddhism: A Comparative Study of Major Traditions from Twelfth through Nineteenth Centuries*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Lidwig Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden.
- Stearns, Cyrus (2010), *The Buddha From Dolpo: A Study Of The Life And Thought Of The Tibetan Master Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen*. New York: Snow Lion Publications.
- Suzuki, Daisetz T. (1961), *Tibetan Tripitaka: Peking Edition-Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto*. Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Tsering, Tashi & Tillmann, Jürgen Stöter (trs.) (2005), *Removal of wrong views: a general synopsis of the "introduction to the middle" and analysis of the difficult points of each of its subjects*. Kathmandu: International Buddhist Academy; Taipei: Free Distribution by Corporate Body of the Buddha Educational Foundations.
- Thakchoe, Sonam (2007), *The Two Truths Debate: Tsongkhapa and*

- Gorampa on the Middle Way. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
 Tadeusz Skorupski (1985), *A Catalogue of the stog palace Kanjur*.
 Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
 Ui, Hakuju et al. (1934), *A Complete Catalogue of The Tibetan Buddhist
 Canons. (bka' 'gyur and bstan 'gyur)*. Sendai Japan: Tohoku
 Imperial University and Saito Gratitude Foundation.
 Ye, Shaoyong(ed.) (2011), *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā: New Editions of the
 Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese Versions, with Commentary and a
 Modern Chinese Translation*. Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company.

-
- ¹ *Rājaparīkathāratnāvalī* (p.161): *bdag la de dag sdig smin cing// bdag dge ma lus
 der smin shog / /*, see Hahn 1982, p.160 for parallel Sanskrit text.
- ² *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra* (D3871, fol.28b4-4: P5272, fol.33b1-1): *bdag bde gzhan
 gyi sdug bsngal dag / yang dag brje bar ma byas na// sangs rgyas nyid du
 mi 'grub cing // 'khor ba na yang bde ba med//*, see Bhattacharya 1960, p.170
 for parallel in Sanskrit.
- ³ *Kāśyapaparivata* (P760, fol.114b2-4; T11.43, fol.220b3-5): *'od srungs yod ces
 bya ba de ni mtha' cig go / med ces bya ba de ni mtha' gnyis sol// de gnyis kyi dbus
 gang yin pa de ni / dpyad du med pa/ bstan du med pa/ rten ma yin pa/ snang ba
 med pa / rnam par rig pa med pa/ gnas med pa ste/ 'od srungs 'di ni dbu ma'i lam
 chos rnam la yang dag par so sor rtog pa zhes bya'o //*.
- ⁴ *Samādhirañjasūtra* (P0795, fol.29a5-5): *yod dang med ces bya ba gnyi ga mtha'//
 gtsang dang mi gtsang 'di yang mtha' yin te// de phyir gnyi ga'i mtha' ni rnam
 spangs nas // mkhas pa dbus la'ang gnas par yong mi byed //*.
- ⁵ *Aṣṭāsahasrikāprajñāpāramitā* (T15, fol.9a4-9a7; P743, fol.7a3-5): *gal te gzugs
 la spyod na mtshan ma la spyod do// gal te gzugs kyi mtshan ma la spyod na
 mtshan ma la spyod do// gal te gzugs kyi mtshan ma'o snyam du spyod na mtshan
 ma la spyod do// gal te gzugs kyi skye ba la spyod na mtshan ma la spyod do// gal
 te gzugs kyi 'gag pa la spyod na mtshan ma la spyod do// gal te gzugs kyi 'jig pa
 la spyod na mtshan ma la spyod do// gal te gzugs kyi stong pa'o snyam du spyod
 na mtshan ma la spyod do//*.
- ⁶ *Saṃpūṭitantra* (P26, fol.257a7-8; T344, fol.317b7-318a1): *stong pa bsgom par
 mi bya ste// stong min bsgom par mi bya'o// stong pa mi spang rnal 'byor pas//
 stong min yongs su mi spang ngo// stong dang stong min gzung⁶ ba las// rtog pa
 nyung min skye bar 'gyur//*.
- ⁷ *Mahāyanauttaratantraśāstra* (D4024, fol.55a3-4; P5525, fol.55a7-55b1): *gang
 zhig med yod min yod med ma yin yod med las gzhan du'ang // brtag par mi nus
 nges tshig dang bral so so rang gis rig zhi ba// dri med ye shes 'od zer snang ldan
 dmigs pa kun la chags pa dang // sdang dang rab rib rnam par 'joms mdzad dam
 chos nyi ma de la 'dud//*, see Johnston 1950, pp.20-21 for Sanskrit.

- ⁸ *Mūlamadhyamakārika* (p.376): *stong ngo zhes ni mi brjod de// mi stong zhes kyang mi bya zhing // gnyis dang gnyis min mi bya ste// gdags pa'i don du brjod par bya//*. See the same page for Sanskrit.
- ⁹ *Mūlamadhyamakārika* (p.458): *bcom ldan mya ngan 'das gyur nas// yod par mi mngon de bzhin du// med do zhe'am gnyis ga dang // gnyis min zhes kyang mi mngon no // bcom ldan bzhugs par gyur na yang // yod par mi mngon de bzhin du// med do zhe'am gnyis ga dang // gnyis min zhes kayng mi mngon no//*. See the same page for Sanskrit.
- ¹⁰ *Vimalaprabhā* (D1347, fol.270b6-6; P2064, fol.186a2-3): *yod min med min yod med min// gnyis ka'i bdag nyid min pa'ang min//, Jñānasāmuccaya* (D3852, fol.27b3-4; P5252, fol.30b2-2): *yod min med min yod med min// gnyis ka'i bdag nyid kyang min pas// mtha' bzhi las grol dbu ma pa// mkhas pa rnams kyi de kho na'o//*.
- ¹¹ *Mūlamadhyamakārika* (p.458): *bcom ldan mya ngan 'das gyur nas // yod par mi mngon de bzhin du // med do zhe'am gnyis ka dang // gnyis min zhes kyang mi mngon no // bcom ldan bzhugs par gyur na yang // yod par mi mngon de bzhin du // med do zhe'am gnyis ga dang // gnyis min zhes kyang mi mngon no //*. See the same page for Sanskrit.
- ¹² *rDo rje theg pa'i rtsa ba'i ltung ba* (P3308, fol.222a6-7): *ming sogs bral ba'i chos rnams la //der rtog pa ni bcu gcig pa //*.
- ¹³ *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (D3786, fol.3a2-3, fol.7b4-4, fol.8b7-7; P5184, fol.3b1-2, fol.9a2-2, fol.10a8-8): *dmigs pa mi rtag la sogs pa // bden pa'i rten can de yi ni // rnam pa mngon zhen la sogs 'gog //, bsam mi khyab sogs kyad par gyis // khyad zhugs bden pa'i spyod yul can //, sgom pa'i lam ni zab pa ste // zab mo stong pa nyid la sogs //*.
- ¹⁴ *Lokāṭīṭastava* (D1120, fol.69b3-3; P2012, fol.80a8-80b1); *mtshan ma med la ma zhugs par // thar pa med ces gsungs pa'i phyir // de phyir khyod kyis theg chen rnams // ma lus par ni de nyid bstan //*.
- ¹⁵ *Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* (D3862, fol.227b6-7; P5263, fol.273b4-5): *theg pa chen po bstan pas ni chos la bdag med pa tsam 'ba' zhis ston par byed pa ma yin gyi // 'o na ci zhe na/ byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi sa dang pha rol tu phyin pa dang // smon lam dang snying rje chen po la sogs pa dang yongs su bsngo ba dang tshogs gnyis dang bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i chos byid kyang yin no //*.
- ¹⁶ *Mahāyanauttaratantraśāstra* (D4024, fol.57b4-4; P5525, fol.57b8-8): *ji bzhin yang dag mthong ba'i phyir // skye sogs rnams las 'das gyur kyang //*, see Johnston 1950, p.47 for parallel Sanskrit text.
- ¹⁷ *Mahāyānottaratantraśāstravyākḥā* (D4025, fol.112b2-3; P5526, fol.117a1-2): *mdor bsdu na/ gang zag bzhi po 'di ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po mthong ba la mig dang mi ldan par rnam par gzhas pa yin te/ bzhi gang zhe na/ 'di lta stel so so'i skye bo dang / nyan thos dang / rang sangs rgyas dang / theg pa la gsar du zhugs pa'i byang chub sems dpa' ste /*, see Johnston 1950, p.74 for parallel Sanskrit text.
- ¹⁸ *Mūlamadhyamakārika* (p.142): *byed po las la brten byas shing// las kyang byed po de nyid la// brten nas 'byung bar ma gtogs par/ 'grub pa'i rgyu ni ma mthong ngo//*. See the same page for Sanskrit.
- ¹⁹ *Mūlamadhyamakārika* (p.302): *bdag go zhes kyang btags gyur cing // bdag med ces kyang bstan par gyur// sangs rgyas rnams kyi bdag dang ni// bdag med 'ga' med ces kyang bstan//*. See the same page for Sanskrit.

- ²⁰ *Mūlamadhyamakārika* (p.304): *thams cad yang dag yang dag min// yang dag yang dag ma yin nyid// yang dag min min yang dag min// de ni sangs rgyas bstan pa'o//*. See the same page for Sanskrit.
- ²¹ *Rājaparīkathāratnāvalī* (p.25): *yang dag ji bzhin yongs shes pas // med dang yod par mi 'dod pa // de phyir med pa par 'gyur na //ci phyir yod pa par mi 'gyur // gal te yod pa sun phyung bas //don gyis 'di ni med par bslan // de bzhin med pa sun phyung bas // yod par ci yi phyir mi bslan //*, see Hahn 1982, p.24 for parallel Sanskrit text.
- ²² Quoted in *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya* (D3862, fol.276a2-3; P5263, fol.328b5-6): *bcom ldan 'das kyis 'jig rten nga dagn lhan cig rtsod kyi/ nga ni 'jig rten dang mi rtsod de/ gang 'jig rten na yod par 'dod pa de ni ngas kyang yod par bzhed do// gang 'jig rten na med par 'dod pa de ni nga yang med par bzhed do//*.
- ²³ *Rājaparīkathāratnāvalī* (p.15): *ji srid phung por 'dzin yod par// de srid de la ngar 'dzin yod //*, see Hahn 1982, p.14 for parallel Sanskrit text.
- ²⁴ *Madhyamakāvatāra* (D3861, fol.212a6-212b2; P5281, fol.257a3-6): *bum pa snam bu re lde dmag dang nags tshal phreng ba ljon shing dang // khang khyim shing rta phran dang 'gron gnas la sogs dngos rnam gang dag dang // de bzhin gang dag sgo nas skye 'dis bsnyad pa de rnam rtoḡs bya ste// gang phyir thub dbang de ni 'jig rten lhan cig rtsod mi mdzad phyir ro// yan lag yon tan 'dod chags mtshan nyid dang ni bud shing la sogs dang // yon tan can yan lag can chags dang tshan gzhi me la sogs don dag / de rnam shing rta'i rnam dpyad byas pas rnam bdun yod pa ma yin zhing // de las gzhan du gyur pa 'jig rten grags pa'i sgo nas yod pa yin //*.
- ²⁵ *Rājaparīkathāratnāvalī* (p.13): *bdag yod bdag gir yod ces pa// 'di ni dam pa'i don du log / gang phyir yang dag ji lta ba// yongs su shes pas gnyis mi 'byung //*, see Hahn 1982, p.12 for parallel Sanskrit texts.
- ²⁶ *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* (D4020, fol.32b2-2; P5521, fol.36b1-2): *bdag tu lta ba bskyed mi dgos // goms pa thog ma med dus can //*, see Lévi 1983, p.155 for parallel Sanskrit text.

