

What Kind of an Animal is a Tree?
Apropos of some Tibetan Reactions
to the *Vimalaprabhā ad Laghukālacakratantra*,
I: 4c and 8c, Part One*

Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp

Abstract: In early Buddhism, as L. Schmithausen has so eloquently shown, plants, including trees, are said to have a liminal existence, inasmuch as there was a marked uncertainty about their sentience. With some exceptions, the general consensus was that they were by and large insentient. This perception hardened in early Mahayana Buddhism where they were excluded from the four ways in which sentient (animal/human life) can take birth, and Bhāviveka (6th c.) argued with some vehemence against the notion that plants were sentient in his *Madhyamakahrdaya* and its auto-commentary, the *Tarkajvālā*. However, a notable exception to the idea that trees are insentient is found in Puṇḍarīka's (early 11th c.)

* All my translations are accompanied by the original text. Except where the Tibetan text itself contains a gloss, I have chosen to dispense with brackets in my translations when I have added information that, in my understanding, is implicit in the texts translated — I thus flagrantly put myself in the position of what U. Eco has called the "model reader." Anyone who knows Tibetan can check and judge their veracity for him or herself, and anyone reading this short paper who does not know Tibetan will justifiably not care and will only get irritated by such optical distractions.

Vimalaprabhā commentary to Yaśas' (?early 11th c.) *Laghukālacakratāntra*. Puṇḍarīka argued that trees were born in one of the four ways in which sentient life takes birth. This raised a number of eyebrows when the relevant passage became the focus of attention of Tibetan scholars. Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) and other fourteenth century intellectuals defended the passage and a series of arguments were levelled in favor of this notion during this time and this continued well into the fifteenth century, particularly, in a series of questions-and-answers of Byang bdag Rnam rgyal grags bzang (1395–1475) and Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po (1385–1438). This essay is the first of a two-part series in which the arguments in support of the question of the sentience of trees in particular was pursued. These two essays also try to demonstrate the extent to which the later tradition tried to justify and defend the anomalous position of the *Kālacakra* literature which, after all, was also part of Buddhist scripture and thus virtually *buddhavacana*, the word of the Buddha.

For Lambert Schmithausen on the occasion of his 80th birthday!

It almost goes without saying that in the last decades few scholars of Buddhist thought have been more concerned with the status of plants and trees, and nature in general, as expounded in the relevant literature than our teacher L. Schmithausen. Already in the 1970s, his students were very well aware of his profound concern with plants and the environment in general. That said, his first foray into the subject of Buddhism's relationship with nature in general was published in 1985 to which he then returned some fifteen years later with a much more detailed version of his earlier contribution and with a focus on the status of plants.¹ In the meantime, beginning with a revision of his lectures that culminated in a large book on the subject,² he captured the imagination of many colleagues and a number of studies have taken their cue from his rewarding contributions,³ this brief essay included. In botany, trees are defined as perennial plants that have a single stem or trunk.⁴ With his customary, deft scholarly precision, Schmithausen has shown that, with one exception, a liminal existence was predicated of plants [and trees] in the early history of Buddhism. That is to say, their status was held to be ambiguous and borderline, and situated somewhere at the interface of the sentient and the non-

1 See, for example, Schmithausen 1995, 1991a, 1991b.

2 Schmithausen 2009.

3 See Findly 2002, 2003; see also Hall 2011: 74 ff. and Schmithausen 2009: 30-100, which includes a survey of other opinions written in reaction to his earlier views, including those of a number of Japanese authors, and rebuttals of many of their arguments.

4 A highly readable recent book on plants and trees in general is Mabey 2016; see also Hageneder's lovely book in Hageneder 2005, which is on trees alone. A fascinating study of a Sanskrit work on trees is provided in Das 1988.

sentient. The exception in question would seem to be a passage in the *Vāseṭṭhasutta* of the *Suttanipāta* where plants are noted as "animate beings" (*pāṇa*), and are enumerated along side and, indeed, are included among animals.⁵ The word *pāṇa* means "animate being," but it is also frequently used in the sense of "animal". However, there is unfortunately no consistency with respect to its use or to what it can refer. In equally demonstrably older Buddhist works, there are a good number of passages that suggest that plants were located on the very edge of nature where obviously animate, sentient, and conscious forms of life are not always easily distinguishable from what appear to be inanimate, non-sentient, and non-conscious things. Schmithausen writes that:⁶

As far as I can see, the canonical texts of early Buddhism do not contain any specific discussion of the matter or any explicit doctrinal statement in either direction: there is neither any express assertion in the form of "plants are sentient beings" nor a straightforward denial stating that they are not.

However, as he points out, this radically changed over time. In fact, we encounter absolute disclaimers of the sentience of plants in, for example, the large compendium of the *Yogācārabhūmi* that was compiled by Asaṅga (4th c.) and Bhāviveka's (6th c.) versified *Madhyamakahrdaya* and the *Tarkajvālā*, the presumed auto-commentary written in prose, and in other later Buddhist treatises.⁷ Given these disclaimers, it may very well have been the case that in some Buddhist quarters there was some resistance to the idea that plants were insentient.

In connection with the *Tarkajvālā*, Schmithausen cites its comments on *Madhyamakahrdaya* IX, 139–147, the penultimate portion of its chapter on Mīmāṃsā thought that is concerned with the rejection of many of its salient ideas. Reading like a conclusion, *Madhyamakahrdaya* IX, 140, and the comment in the *Tarkajvālā* is most explicit on this:⁸

*sacittakā hi taravo na caturyoniasaṃgrahāt /
madhyacchede 'pi vāspandājjadatve⁹ sati loṣṭavat //*

5 Schmithausen 1991b: 64-65, and 2009: 23.

6 Schmithausen 2009: 22-23. For the terminologies employed, see Schmithausen 1991b: 1-2.

7 Schmithausen 1991b: 83-84, 86-94, 102.

8 See Lindtner 2001: 47. Schmithausen 1991b: 79, n. 443, 94, n. 523 has *sacetanā* and *sacittakā* for 140a; The manuscript clearly has *sacittakā*, see also Bahulkar 1994: 49. Further, I have modified Lindtner's translation, especially since *yoni* does not always mean womb!

9 Schmithausen 1991b: 94, n. 524.

[ljon shing sems dang bcas pa min //
skye gnas bzhi ni ma bsdus phyir //
dkyil du bcad kyang bzod pa'i phyir //¹⁰
phag dum bzhin du bems po yin //]

Trees indeed do not have a mind, for they are not included in the four birth-sites of living beings.

They do not move even when cut in the middle, because they are inanimate like a clod.

The second part of the *Tarkaḥvālā's* explanation has to do with someone raising the possibility that we have to assume a fifth birth-site, namely, that trees are born from splitting [?seeds, ?the earth] (*brtol*).¹¹ This is rejected, since it has no bearing on the notion that they are sentient. There is also the argument that since they do not move when they are cut and that they do not feel (*tshor ba med pa*) anything, the inference is that they are therefore inanimate (*bem[s] po*) and mindless.

Addressing at great length the typically East Asian Buddhist notion that plants possess Buddha nature and the labyrinthine intertwinement of various related and implicit concepts,¹² Schmithausen also cites a passage from the "(Mahayanist) *Mahāparinivāṇasūtra*" and the *Śūraṅgamasūtra* that suggest this was the case.¹³ The former explicitly rejects the proposition made by one who was obviously a co-religionist that "[The Buddha] having observed that all trees have life (*srog*) and consciousness ('*du shes*), ...", and unambiguously dismisses this opinion by declaring that texts containing such characterizations are "sūtra and vinaya texts promulgated by Māra."¹⁴ Māra is the Buddhist embodiment of evil and, thus, the idea that trees have consciousness, and are therefore sentient, was quite anathema to the author of the *Mahāparinivāṇasūtra*. So far only available in a Chinese and not in a Tibetan translation, Schmithausen points out that a passage in the *Śūraṅgamasūtra* had been radically misunderstood and that the point made was that it is a wrong belief to ascribe awareness [in plants] where there is none. We cannot begin here to suspend our disbelief, but some time ago

10 The last two lines of the Tibetan 'translation' read: "Because they endure, though cut in the middle, they are inanimate like a clod (*bem po, loṣṭa*).\" To be sure, Tibetan *bzod pa* does not usually render Sanskrit *aspanda!*

11 Schmithausen 1991b: 80, n. 446, and Bhāviveka 1994–2008: 760–61. Most of this is absent in the reproduction of this chapter in Bo dong Paṅ chen Phyogs las rnam rgyal's (1375–1451) treatise, for which see Bo dong Paṅ chen 1969–1981: 411–12 and 2014: 730.

12 Schmithausen 2009: 101 ff.

13 Schmithausen 1991b: 109–15, esp. 113–14, and 119–22.

14 Schmithausen 1991b: 114, n. 291, states that the Chinese translations of the sutra omit the notion of "consciousness."

Li Xuezhū 李学竹 signaled the *apparent* existence of a single, slightly incomplete Sanskrit manuscript of the *Śūramgamasūtra* that was, again *apparently*, first uncovered in the library of Puti [= Bodhi] monastery in Nanyang City, Henan Province, and was then relocated to the Peng Xuefeng Memorial Hall in the same city.¹⁵ However, his note does not seem to have been based on an actual visual inspection of the manuscript and was taken from the internet. It is thus of extremely doubtful veracity!

Much of the disclaimer of the Indic Mahayana dossier that plants are sentient appears to be tied to developments that had taken place in the notions of karma and re-birth. As Schmithausen indicated, the first suggests that plants are not subject to karma since they do not perform "good" or "bad" deeds, the intention or motivation to do either good or evil is absent in them, and the second has it that they are not sentient because they are free from desire and hatred, two ingredients that are essential requirements for the possibility of being re-born. The collections of re-birth stories of the historical Buddha do not, as far as I am aware, contain one single instance of him taking on the re-birth as a plant or tree¹⁶ and, as far as I know, not one single Buddhist work, more accurately, not one single Tibetan Buddhist work suggests that one can be reborn as a plant, even if one might recall literally scores of previous re-births, as did apparently Nam mkha' rgyal mtshan (ca.1160-ca.1230), alias Se mo che ba and Mkha' 'gro shes rab. We read in his capsule biography that was possibly pulled together by Byang sems Rgyal ba ye shes (1257–1320), that among other previous rebirths, he recalled *inter alia* that he:¹⁷

...took on five re-birth (*skye ba lnga blangs*) of a pigeon; then took on twenty re-birth of a vulture...took on ten bodies (*lus...blangs*) of a peacock; took on twenty bodies of an insect (*srin bu*); ...took on three bodies of an ant (*grog ma*); took on five bodies of a goat....

Moreover, plants were not included in the quartet of the possible birth-sites (*yoni, skye gnas*) for animals (and humans and other sentient beings), a locus classicus for which is Vasubandhu's (4th c.) *Abhidharmakośa*, III: 8c-9 [and *bhāṣya*-commentary thereto]; there the four birth-sites in question are:¹⁸

1. egg-born (*anda-ja, sgo nga nas skyes pa*)
2. chorion-born (*jarāyu-ja, mngal nas skyes pa*)

15 See Li Xuezhū 2010: 55-56.

16 Schmithausen 2009: 31-32, 77 ff. does signal that the sources do have him being reborn as a plant-and tree-deity. For a recent survey of the relevant literature, see Skilling and Saerji 2019.

17 Byang sems Rgyal ba ye shes 2007: 43.

18 See the references in Schmithausen 1991b: 79-81.

3. moisture-born (*saṣeda-ja, drod gsher nas skyes pa*)

4. spontaneously-born (*opapātika-ja, rdzus te skyes pa*)

Vasubandhu writes that the last category includes human beings who are born at the very beginning of an aeon, gods, hell-beings, beings in the intermediate state between death and rebirth, as well as serpentine *nāgas* and bird-like *garudas*. And he states that the feature of this kind of birth is that they are born at once (*sakṛt*) with their entire bodies intact.¹⁹

One among several deciding factors traditionally used in the relevant texts to distinguish between the sentient and the non-sentient was the binary opposition of the fixed (*sthāvara, gnas [brtan pa]*) and the mobile (*trasa, jaṅgama; 'gul [g.yo ba]*), where, as is expected, the former can refer to plants and trees in later Buddhist texts.²⁰ But here again things repose in inconclusivity, for this opposition is also often used for animals alone, without reference to plants. We will see that this opposition also played a role in several Tibetan arguments, but this time clearly marking an absolute distinction between animals and plants.

The sources used by Schmithausen for his essays and books on the Buddhist views about plants and nature are especially taken from non-tantric Buddhist literature. The next step would be to investigate what tantric Buddhist literature has to say about the status of plants and nature in general. While I have not surveyed the copious tantric literature for this essay, I did come across what one might consider to be an interesting and, indeed, a very glaring exception to the early Mahayana belief that plants are not sentient. This exception occurs in a very brief passage of Puṇḍarīka's (early 11th c.) *Vimalaprabhā*, the major work of the *Kālacakra[tantra]* corpus, and it was this passage that motivated me to look more closely into this question.²¹ It goes without saying that I am delighted to be able to offer my erstwhile teacher this brief and very modest paper not only in recognition of his eightieth birth year, which he will celebrate at the end of this year [2019], but also as a trifling tribute to the exemplary mentoring and the warm humanity that he gave me when I was his student now so very many years ago.

Let us now fast forward to the fourteenth century, to Zhwa lu, the monastery that lies nestled in the expansive valley that is located not far from Shigatse. For many years her abbot, the great Sanskrit scholar and intellectual Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) was one of several fourteenth century virtuosi in the *Kālacakra* corpus and its associated psycho-physical practices, especially its hexapartite yoga (*ṣaḍaṅgayoga, rnal 'byor yan lag drug pa*), which

19 Vasubandhu 1981: 401-02.

20 Schmithausen 1991b: 59-65. There is increasing evidence, which is not only gained through the special techniques now available in photography, that trees do in fact move in groups, albeit very slowly and, let me be clear, not by using their invisible legs. The Wikipedia article on "Forest Migration" is very informative on this point.

21 The corpus consists of Yaśas' *Laghukālacakratantra*, the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary by his son Puṇḍarīka, and the lost *Kālacakramūlatantra* as transmitted by the Buddha to Sucandra, their distant ancestor, of which we find quotations in the *Vimalaprabhā*. For a detailed study of several aspects of this corpus in Tibet, see my forthcoming *The Magic Wheel of Time and its Reception in Tibet*.

he taught on numerous occasions in the course of his reasonably long life.²² At least three of his disciples have left us the notes (*zin bris*) that they had taken during his many lectures (*gsung sgros*) on the subject. The first two in question were Sgra tshad pa Rin chen rnam rgyal (1318–1388), his successor to the abbatial throne of Zhwa lu monastery, and Chos kyi dpal bzang po (1316–1397). Titled *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud 'grel gyi bshad pa'i zin bris log rtog mun sel*, the notes taken by the latter are neither as rewarding nor as text-historically complicated as those attributed to Sgra tshad pa, since the available witnesses of Chos kyi dpal bzang po's text are free from the problematic glosses that literally litter the notes attributed to Sgra tshad pa.²³ We will presently see that the text ascribed to Sgra tshad pa observes that, in his lectures, Bu ston had addressed an unusual and disturbing passage of the *Vimalaprabhā ad Laghukālacakrantra*, I: 4c — it occurs in the seventh *sekkodeśa* — summary — that, so it would appear, had also puzzled some of his unidentified Tibetan forebears. The passage in question, *tiryagyonīscaturdhā* — in the Tibetan translation *dud 'gro skye gnas rnam pa bzhi* — of the *Laghukālacakrantra* reproduces of course the classic four birth-places where the [re]birth of **animals** (*tiryak*, *dud 'gro*), human beings, and other creatures can occur. Rather surprisingly and, let us call a spade a spade, cryptically, the *Vimalaprabhā* characterizes the last of these as follows:²⁴

upapādukā vṛkṣādayo bhūmīyonirīti / [tathā mahopapādukā rasayoniḥ]

Trees etc. have spontaneous births; the earth²⁵ is their birth-place. [In this way, what has a great spontaneous birth has the taste-birth-place.]

22 For his life, see Seyfort Ruegg 1966, and van der Kuijp 2016: 203-26.

23 For Sgra tshad pa's notes, see below n. 37. For Chos kyi dpal bzang po's notes, see the entry in Karma be legs 2007 [Stod cha]: 34, no. 000291, of a manuscript in 127 folios. A recension of his work is preserved in toto in the large 1635 study of the Kālacakra corpus by A mes zhabs Ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams (1597–1659), for which see Chos kyi dpal bzang po 2012a. Another manuscript of this work in 145 folios with the title *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i 'grel pa'i zin bris* is Chos kyi dpal bzang po 2012b. Its fairly informative colophon relates that Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312–1375) and Mgon po dpal had requested him to consolidate his notes, and that he completed this project in 1363. Both men were disciples of Bu ston and the latter was also one of his biographers. A manuscript of this same work in 140 folios was published in Chos kyi dpal bzang po 2016, but it bears the title *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i zin bris legs bshad mngar ba'i ro bcud*. Titled *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud 'grel gyi bshad pa'i zin bris ma rig mun sel* is yet another manuscript of Chos kyi dpal bzang po's notes. It has not been published, but a 116-folio manuscript is registered in Karma bde legs 2007: 17, no. 000143. A brief biography of Chos kyi dpal bzang po is found in Ri sbug Blo gsal bstan skyong's (1804–after 1874) 1835 study of Zhwa lu Monastery; see Ri sbug Blo gsal bstan skyong 1971: 80-84.

24 Puṇḍarīka 1986: 55; see also Newman 1987: 424-25.

25 For the status of the earth, see Schmithausen 1991b: 46-51. In Buddhist literature, the idea of *rasayoni*, "taste birthplace" seems unique to the *Vimalaprabhā*, although it is found in other works with the sense of "borax." I am not at all sure what this might mean!

Included by Bu ston in his 1335 manuscript edition of the Zhwa lu Tenjur, in his earlier annotated edition in recognition of its high quality, the circa 1270s rendition of the *Vimalaprabhā* by Shong ston Lo tsā ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan and reads here: ²⁶

[b]rdzus te skyes pa ni ljon pa la sogs pa ste [/] sa'i skye gnas so // [de bzhin du rdzus te skyes pa chen po ni / ro'i skye gnas so //] ²⁷

Mnga' ris Chos rje Phyogs las rnam rgyal (1306–1386), the erstwhile student of Bu ston and then afterwards especially of Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan (1292–1361), who was the founder of the Jo [mo] nang tradition, wrote annotations to the *Laghukālacakratantra* and the *Vimalaprabhā* that were based on the so-called "new Jo nang translation," which the team of Lo tsā ba Blo gros dpal bzang po (1300–1354) and Sa bzang Mati Paṅ chen Blo gros rgyal mtshan (1294–1376) prepared in 1334 at the express request of Dol po pa and his most senior

26 See the translation in Shong ston Lo tsā ba 1971a: 426-27 and Shong ston Lo tsā ba 1994-2008: 368. For his rendition, Shong ston Lo tsā ba used the earlier translation by the Kashmirian Paṇḍita Somanātha and 'Bro Lo tsā ba Shes rab grags (12th c.), which he corrected on the basis of two Sanskrit manuscripts from Magadha. A lithograph copy (*rdo par*) of 'Bro Lo tsā ba's translation of the *Laghukālacakratantra* is extant; see Karma bde legs 2007: 2, no. 000001. The catalog of the Peking *Bstan 'gyur* that was analyzed in Suzuki 1961 — see also below n. 28 — is titled *Bstan 'gyur rin po che srid zhi'i rgyan gcig gi dkar chag rin chen mdzes pa'i phra tshoms*; the catalogs of the Snar thang *Bstan 'gyur* and the "Golden Manuscript" *Bstan 'gyur* are sometimes given the same title. However, composed by Phur bu lcoḡ Ngag dbang byams pa (1682–1762) in 1742, the actual title of the Snar thang *Bstan 'gyur* is *Bstan 'gyur ro cag gsung par du sgrubs pa'i dkar chag tshangs pa'i dbyangs*; a slightly incomplete bilingual Tibetan-Mongol manuscript of this catalog is Phur bu lcoḡ 1980. It was there misidentified as "a Madhyamaka text." However, the catalog of ?another Peking edition of the *Bstan 'gyur* by "the old monk" of Za hor Gdong drug bsn'yems pa'i lang tsho and scribed by a Ngag dbang dkon mchog registers Shong ston Lo tsā ba as the translator of both the *Laghukālacakratantra* and the *Vimalaprabhā*; see Za hor Gdong drug bsn'yems pa'i lang tsho 1983: 16a-b — note that *bde skyid* in the title is often used to denote the Kangxi emperor (r. 1666–1722). This catalog is dated 1688 and was allegedly "written" by Dalai Lama V Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho (1617–1684) of the Za hor family, whose attested *nom de plume* was Gdong drug bsn'yems pa'i lang tsho and who also frequently employed Ngag dbang dkon mchog as his scribe. It was evidently compiled by another person while his death was a kept secret for more than a decade.

27 Bu ston Rin chen grub 1971a: 426 prefaces this sentence by *dud 'gro rdzus skyes yod pa* and has *dud 'gro ma yin pa'i* after *de bzhin du*, and then glosses *skyes pa chen po* by *lha*, "god," and *ro* by *ste na[m] mkha'*, "space." The latter should not be considered a hint at a fifth birth-place, but rather as a variety of the fourth one.

disciple.²⁸ Mnga' ris Chos rje's annotations are not dated, but according to their chronological place in his biography of 1387 by Bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan, he must have written these sometime around 1360.²⁹ Here, the only immaterial difference between the two translations is that the Jo nang one has *ljon shing* instead of *ljon pa*.³⁰

Later in the text, the *Vimalaprabhā* comments on *Laghukālacakrantra*, I: 8c [in bold], as follows:³¹

[*idānīm sthāvara jaṅgama traidhātukasya mantrā ucyante /* ***suranaraphaṇino bhūṭayoniśca mantrā iti*** / ... *bhūṭayoniś caturvidhā pūrvoktā / sthāvarayonir meruvṛkśādayaḥ /* ...

The translations of Shong ston Lo tsā ba and the Jo nang pa [here in ()] read here:³²

[*da ni brtan pa dang g.yo ba khams gsum pa^a sngags gsungs pa /*] *lha mi gdengs can 'byung po'i skye gnas dag (rnams) kyang sngags shes pa (omits: shes pa) zhes pa ste /* ... *'byung po'i skye gnas ni / sngar brjod pa rnam pa bzhi'o // brtan pa'i skye gnas ni / lhun po dang shing (ljon shing) la sogs pa ste...*

^a Should we read here the cardinal number *gsum po*[i]?

[Now are stated the mantras of the fixed and the mobile of the three realms.] "Gods, people, hooded ones [= *nāgas*], as well as the birth-places of beings are known to be

28 The 1744 xylograph of the *Sde dge bstan 'gyur* edition contains the last three chapters of the so-called slightly pre-1335 Jo nang translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* in five chapters, whereas the first two chapters are Shong ston Lo tsā ba's translation; see, respectively, *Sde dge bstan 'gyur*, TBRC: W23703, vol. 12, 57-583 [Da, 29a-297a], and vol. 11, 214-553 [Tha, 107a-277a, Da, 1-28b]. This hybridity was also briefly remarked upon by its editor Zhu chen Tshul khriṃs rin chen (1697–1774) in his 1744 catalog, for which see Zhu chen 1985: 624. This change in translator[s] is not made clear at either the end of the second chapter of the *Vimalaprabhā* in the *Sde dge bstan 'gyur* or in the *Bstan 'gyur dpe bsdur ma*, vol. 6, 749. The Peking edition of the Tibetan Buddhist canon contains the Jo nang translation of the *Laghukālacakrantra* and Shong ston Lo tsā ba's translation of the *Vimalaprabhā*; see Suzuki 1961: nos. 4 and 2064.

29 Bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan 2011: 434. This work has two titles: *Chos rje phyogs las rnam rgyal gyi rnam par thar pa* and *Chos rje'i rnam thar dran pa'i gdungs byangs*. It is curious that Mnga' ris Chos rje's undated catalog of the *Bstan 'gyur* in Byang Ngam ring monastery where he was abbot did not explicitly contain the Jo nang translation of the *Laghukālacakrantra* or the *Vimalaprabhā*; see Mnga' ris Chos rje 2010: 13.

30 Mnga' ris Chos rje 2008: 152.

31 Puṇḍarīka 1986: 64.

32 See respectively, the translation in Shong ston Lo tsā ba 1971a: 448 and Shong ston Lo tsā ba 1991–2006: 385; see also Newman 1987: 464. For the Jo nang translation, see the text in Mnga' ris Chos rje 2008: 171.

mantras"... The birth-place of beings are the previously mentioned four kinds. The birth-place of what is fixed involves Meru, trees, etc...

Detour: Oddly, Shong ston Lo tsā ba's translation of *Laghukālacakratantra*, I: 8c: *ha sogs dbyangs rnam dag kyang chu tshod* [inserts here a *rin spungs shad* graph] *lha mi gdengs can 'byung po'i skye gnas dag kyang sngags shes pa //, has sngags shes pa [zhes pa]*, "one who knows mantra,"³³ for *mantrā*, and this is reflected in his rendition of the *Vimalaprabhā*. The mid-eleventh century rendition of the *Laghukālacakratantra* by the team Śrī Dhānapala [read: Dānapala] and Rma Lo tsā ba Dge ba'i blo gros is rather unusual in that the Lo tsā ba, or a precursor, traded the difficult *sragdharā-me tog 'phreng 'dzin* meter of twenty-one syllables per metrical foot of the original text in for the more easily understandable meter with seven syllables; hence *Laghukālacakratantra*, I: 8c, now becomes:³⁴

/ ha stsogs gug skyed dang chu tshod /
/ lha dang myi dang gdengs ka can /
/ 'byung po'i skye gnas kyi ni sngags /

The colophon to what may be the sole extant manuscript of this version relates that the team retranslated the text using 'Bro Lo tsā ba's edition of the ca. 1030 translation of Śrībhadrabodhi and Gyi jo Lo tsā ba Zla ba'i 'od zer as well as a Sanskrit manuscript, and that they had done so at the order of Lha btsun pa Byang chub 'od (984–1078), the royal monk of Mnga' ris.

On the other hand, the very first, translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* by the team of Śrībhadrabodhi and Gyi jo Lo tsā ba reads somewhat differently in what is so far its only extant manuscript:³⁵

[da ni brtan pa dang g.yo ba dang khams pa'i sngags brjod de /] lha dang myi dang
[illegible sublinear note]
gdengs kha can // 'byung po'i skye gnas kyi ni sngags kyi zhes pa la /... 'byung po'i
[sublinear note to skye gnas: skye gnas bzhi]
skye gnas rnam pa bzhi ni sngon du gsungs so // brtan pa'i skye gnas ni / ri dang
shing las stsogs pa'o //

33 Shong ston Lo tsā ba 1971b: 5.

34 See the manuscript of the translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* that is attributed to them in Rma Lo tsā ba [and Śrī ?Dānapala] 2012: 2b.

35 See the manuscript of the translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* that is attributed to them in Gyi jo Lo tsā ba [and Śrībhadrabodhi] 2012: 58b.

The Sanskrit text and these two translations have a rather awkward final sentence that reads as if it is the birth-place of what is fixed that involves mountains, trees, etc. On the other hand, Tsa mi Lo tsā ba Sangs rgyas grags' (12th c.) translation in its equally sole extant manuscript has here:³⁶

[*da ni brtan pa dang g.yo ba khams gsum gyi sngags par bya ste /*] *lha dang mi dang klu rnams dang ni 'byung po'i skye gnas rnams kyi sngags kyi zhes bya ba ni / ... 'byung po'i skye gnas ni gong du smras pa ltar rnam pa bzhi'o // brtan pa ni / ri rab lhun po dang shing la sogs pa'o //*

[Now the so-called mantras of the three realms' fixed and mobile;] the so-called mantras of the birth-places of the gods and *nāgas* and beings...the birth-place of beings is four-fold as stated above. The fixed are Mount Meru and trees, etc.

Given the foregoing, the notion that the *Vimalaprabhā* classified a tree as an animal and a fixed creature, and thus as a sentient and conscious being was certainly not seen as unproblematic and definitely created a number of difficulties. It is for this reason that several attempts were made to resolve this dilemma, attempts that were evidently made early on, but for which the earliest witnesses that we have belong to the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Bu ston did not gloss it in his annotated edition of Shong ston Lo tsā ba's *Vimalaprabhā* translation, but he did comment on it at some length in his lectures on the text. That said, the passage in Sgra tshad pa's *zin bris* text is of interest because it draws, again, as we will see, not unproblematically, attention to an alternate, earlier translation and because it contains several glosses, the origins of which are neither *prima facie* clear nor obvious [to me!]; in addition, I am not altogether certain that I have understood some of its elements. We read that Bu ston had stated that:³⁷

rwa pas {bas} rdzus {brdzus} te skyes pa ni shing la {las} sogs pa zhes bsgyur zhing [gloss: kha cig gis shing 'dud 'gro mi 'ong snyam nas shig tu

36 See the manuscript of the translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* that is attributed to him in Tsa mi Lo tsā ba 2012: 154-55. This work has the *marginal* notation Ka. Tsa mi Lo tsā ba is also known as the "beggar-monk" (*dge slong bsod snyoms pa*); see Sperling 1994: 814, no. 3310; 817, V-VI.6; 816, II.25, 817, V-VI.43, etc. prefixes his name by *sendha ba*, *sen dha ba*, etc., which is simply a [wrong] reflex of Sanskrit *paiṇḍapātika* — in cursive *dbu med* Tibetan, "pa" and "sa" look orthographically indistinguishable — that is, *bsod snyoms pa*!

37 Sgra tshad pa 1971: 169 and Sgra tshad pa 2012: 226 — the text in {} are the variant readings in the latter. The text-historical problems that surround the text that we have of Sgra tshad pa's notes with its plethora of glosses are detailed in my forthcoming work that was indicated above in n. 21.

*bcos pa mi 'thad do //] skad dod la'ang shing yod kyang / ljon pa ste mi'am
ci dud 'gro mi'i gzugs zhes {shes}bshad pas ljon pa rta mgo can nam yang
na mdo sde mdzangs blun nas shing la sems can gyis zos³⁸ pas / shing nyen
pa'i skad dag sna tshogs 'byung ba bshad pa bzhin yin / {omits: /} sems can
yin kyang rnam pa shing du yod pa'i dmyal ba bshad 'dug pas de lta bu la
zer gsung ngo [gloss: mdor na shing gi rnam pa can gyi 'dud 'gro'o //] //*

Rwa Lo tsā ba Chos rab (11th-12th c.) translated *rdzus te skyes pa ni shing la sog pa* [gloss: The correction by some of *shing* to *shig*, "louse," out of consideration that a tree does not approximate an animal is not correct.] and explained that although the passage has the equivalent Sanskrit term for *shing*, the *ljon pa*, that is, that which has the shape of an animal-human being (*mi'am ci*, *kiṃnara*). Therefore, it is like a tree that has the shape of a horse's head or it is according to what is stated in the *Mdo sde Mdzangs blun*, namely, that due to a sentient being eating a tree, the tree emits various sounds of danger.³⁹ A tree is also a sentient being (*sems can*),⁴⁰ since it is explained that it is a hell-being that has the observable quality (*rnam pa*) of a tree; he said it is so. [gloss: In brief, it is an animal that has the shape of a tree].

Tibetan *shing* and *ljon pa* are of course equally respectable renditions of Sanskrit *vrkṣa*, as is the binome *ljon shing*. However, *ljon pa* is also used for *druma*, "tree," as in, for example, the title of a sutra that was translated around the year 800. The **Mahāvīyūtpatti*, the *Lhan dkar ma*, and the *'Phang thang ma* catalogs all have *Mi'am ci rgyal po ljon pas zhus pa* as its title,

38 Hill: 2010: 257, connects *zos* with the stem *za*, "to eat," and has three entries for the stem *za*, whereby *zos* occurs as the past tense in *za₂*, "eat," and in *za₃*, "appear, arise."

39 For the reception and emission of sounds by plants or their bioacoustics, see the path-breaking work of Gagliano, M.S. Mancuso, and D. Robert 2012: 323-25.

40 Sanskrit *sattva*, "being" is the usual equivalent of Tibetan *sems can*, "what has a mind," which has a quite different connotation. Schmithausen 2009: 242-43, n. 713, discusses the various Chinese equivalents of *sattva*, all which include sentience/mentation. Tibetan *sems* is only used in the sense of "mind, mentation" and as the equivalent of Sanskrit *citta*. And on pp. 302 ff., he discusses the lexeme *xin* 心 that is often used in the sense of mind, but also in the sense of "heart" and "centre".

whereas all the xylograph editions of the Kanjur have ...*sdong pos* instead of ...*ljon pas*.⁴¹ Thus, chances are that later editors changed the translation of *druma* from *ljon pa* to *sdong po*; hence this particular *kiṃnara* is styled Drumakiṃnaraṛāja and he is one of four such kings who are mentioned at the beginning of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* as having been part of the audience when the Buddha enunciated the sutra. Kiṃnara are usually depicted as half human and half horse, and are also known as musicians of a sort.⁴² It would seem that the translation of *shing* opened the door for the supposition that it was an orthographic error or oversight for *shig*, but, to be sure, this must have been so only for those who did not or were unable to consult the Sanskrit text. Tibetan *shig* has various Sanskrit equivalents such as *kuṇa* and *yāk(g)a(ā)*, and of course these do not approximate the orthography of *vrkṣa*. A quick reminder: the Sanskrit text of the extant manuscripts of the *Vimalaprabhā* all have: *upapādukā vrkṣādayo bhūmiyonirīti*. In his circa 1424 set of replies to Byang bdag Rnam rgyal grags bzang's (1395–1475) set of queries, Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po (1385–1438) writes that Tsa mi Lo tsā ba's Sanskrit text of the *Vimalaprabhā* apparently had *ri ta* for 'louse,' a word that I am unable to explain at this time.⁴³ He later echoed this very same sentiment in his 1434 commentary on Shong ston Lo tsā ba's rendition of the *Vimalaprabhā*. There he first quotes from what he calls Tsa mi Lo tsā ba's translation:⁴⁴

shig la sogs pa rdzus te skyes pa rnams ni sa las skyes pa'o //

and he follows this with the translation of the text by Shud ke or Yar lung Lo tsā ba Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1242–1346):

rdzus skyes rnams ni shig la sogs pa rnams te sa'i skye gnas so //

Taking *ri ta* as the actual reading of the Sanskrit manuscript[s], Mkhas grub thinks that the

41 See, respectively, Sakaki 1962: no. 1352, Lalou 1953: 322, no. 110, *Dkar chag 'phang thang ma* [and the *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*], comp. Bod ljongs rten rdzas bshams mdzod khang (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2003), 9, and *Bka' 'gyur [dpe bsdur ma]*, vol. 58, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2006–2009), 664-816. For a survey of this sutra, see Pad dkar bzang po's 1445 study of the entire corpus of sutras in the Tibetan Buddhist canons in Pad dkat bzang po 2006: 213-15. The manuscript of Zhwa dmar IV Chos grags ye shes' (1453–1524) cognate work, Zhwa dmar IV 2009, is incomplete and does not include an analysis of this sutra.

42 See the brief entry in Buswell and Lopez 2017: 436.

43 Mkhas grub 1980–1982a: 759-62, and 1997: 220-22, Mkhas grub *circa* 1830: 580-582. Part Two of this essay is in part devoted to an analysis of the back-and-forth between Byang bdag and Mkhas grub on the question of trees being animals.

44 Mkhas grub 1980–1982b: 677.

translations that have *shig* are correct (*shig tu byas pa'i 'gyur bzhin du legs par sems*). That notwithstanding, the manuscript of what is said to be Tsa mi Lo tsā ba's translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* does not bear out Mkhas grub's allegation, for it has:⁴⁵

rdzus te skyes pa ni shing la sogs pa ste sa'i skye gnas so //

Finally, Wu Facheng (9th c.), alias 'Gos Chos grub, or *vice versa* depending on his ethnicity, translated the *Mdo sde mdzangs blun* sometime in the first half of the ninth century from the original Chinese text of the *Xianyu jing* 贤愚经,⁴⁶ but the passage in question is not found therein. In fact, I have not found it anywhere in the Tibetan Buddhist canon!

Turning to Chos kyi dpal bzang po's lecture notes, we have the following statement that rings in harmony with Sgar tshad pa's note:⁴⁷

*rwa pas shing la sogs pa zhes bsgyur¹ /² de la kha cig³ gis shing dud 'gror mi yong⁴
snyam nas shig tu bcos pa mi 'thad de / rgya dpe⁵ la⁶ shing gi skad dod yod pa'i
phyir / des na ljon pa ni mi'am ci dud 'gro mi'i gzugs can /⁷ zhes bshad pas /⁸ ljon pa
rta mgo can lta bu'am / mdo sde mdzangs⁷ blun⁸ nas / shing sdong la sems can⁹ phra
mo mang pos zos pas shing de nyen pa'i skad ngan sna tshogs 'byung ba¹⁰ bshad 'dug
pas /¹¹ ngo bo¹² sems can yin yang rnam pa shing du¹³ yod pa'i sems can dmyal [138]
ba bzhin¹⁴ / 'di¹⁵ yang shing gi rnam pa can gyi dud 'gro'o //*

1 B: sgyur.	6 B: las.	11 B: omits /.
2 C: omits /.	7 B, C: 'dzangs.	12 B, C: omit ngo bo.
3 B: kha l.	8 C: lhun.	13 A: ni.
4 A: 'ong.	9 C: /.	14 C: 4n.
5 B: dpe'.	10 A: omits; C. pa.	15 B, C: 'dir.

Rwa translated "tree, etc." Here, some explained saying that: "The emendation made by some of *shing* to *shig*, "louse," out of consideration that a tree does not approximate an animal is not correct," because the Sanskrit manuscript has the equivalent for tree. Hence, a tree either has the shape of an animal-human *kimnara* or since there is the statement in the *Mdo sde Mdzangs blun* that because many tiny sentient beings were eating a tree, the tree let out various bad sounds of danger;

45 Tsa mi Lo tsā ba 2012: 66b. There, the reading *shing* is of course a trifle suspicious!

46 For the origins of the *Xianyu jing* 贤愚经, see Mair 1993 and 1999.

47 See A= Chos kyi dpal bzang po 2012a: 176, B= Chos kyi dpal bzang po 2012b: 137-38, C= Chos kyi dpal bzang po 2018: 146.

although a tree is in essence a sentient being, its shape is like an existing hell-sentient being. It, too, is an animal that has the shape of a tree.

The third author of a series of notes on Bu ston's lectures on the *Kālacakra* corpus was the aforementioned Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan. For some reason, this series was not included in the edition of his recently published collected oeuvre.⁴⁸ An incomplete, but copiously annotated manuscript of this work that should have contained 90 folios was published as the *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud 'grel gyi 'chad nyan byed pa'i dus lo tsā ba bu ston gyi gsungs sgras zin bris*.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, a number of folios between the sixth and eighth summaries, that is, fols.10b to 20a, are missing, so that we do not have a record of whatever explanations Bu ston may have given of this passage during this lecture. Titled *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i zin bris bla ma'i gsung zer log rtog mun sel*, the series of notes penned by Dpal ldan tshul khriims (1333–1399) during one of his teacher Bla ma dam pa's undated lectures on the corpus, specifically on his own exegesis of the *Vimalaprabhā*, is preserved in A mes zhabs' capacious study that I mentioned above.⁵⁰ As is the case with the notes taken by Chos kyi dpal bzang po, these, too, say nothing substantial over and above what we read in Sgra tshad pa's notes and the very same thing holds for Bla ma dam pa's own substantial study of the *Vimalaprabhā* that he completed in 1363.⁵¹ In passing, we may note in the first place that it is striking that, in his 1365 history of the *Kālacakra* corpus in the Indian subcontinent and Tibet, Bla ma dam pa *nowhere* mentions Dol po pa or the intensive [and disruptive] *Kālacakra* studies that were taking place at Jo nang monastery. Instead, he takes great pains to stipulate that his mentors in the corpus were the great Dpang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa (1276–1342) and the equally great Bu ston, who, in this history, are given fairly detailed capsule biographies.⁵² This is quite surprising, given that he knew Dol po pa fairly well and that he is said to have requested him for a work that became one of Dol po pa's signature writings, namely, his *Bka' bsdu bzhi pa'i don*.⁵³ It is also striking that he *nowhere* mentions Dol po pa in the historical survey of the transmission of the *Kālacakra's* hexapartite yoga that forms the preface to his undated study of this yoga, a work that his disciple Yar klungs pa Seng ge rgyal mtshan had proofread some five times.⁵⁴ I am thus inclined to harbor the supposition that he did not quite see eye to eye with this senior scholar and that these absences may add additional fuel to the idea that his involvement with Dol po pa's composition of the *Bka' bsdu bzhi pa'i don* was not exactly the way in which his

48 For him, see most recently van der Kuijp 2018.

49 Bla ma dam pa 2012a. Its existence was earlier signaled in Karma bde legs 2007: 90, no. 000802.

50 Bla ma dam pa 2012b; see also the manuscript registered in Karma bde legs 2007: 34, no. 000291.

51 Bla ma dam pa 2016a: 289-90.

52 Bla ma dam pa 2016b: 125-32, 139-49.

53 van der Kuijp 2016: 136 ff.

54 Bla ma dam pa 2016c:175-206.

biographer and disciple Lo tsā ba Byang chub rtse mo (1315–1379/80) had described it.

It was in the late 1370s or at the latest in the early 1380s that Red mda' ba Gzhon nu blo gros (1349–1413) of Sa skya monastery circulated what appears to have been an open letter in which he gave a devastating, point by point critique of the alleged Buddhist orthodoxy of the *Kālacakra* corpus and forcibly put forth the idea that it was rife with what he felt were patently non-Buddhist ideas.⁵⁵ It is not entirely clear how he had come to this conclusion. He had pursued his early studies with a number of masters of the tradition that had grown to maturity in Jo mo nang monastery and her dependencies under the influence of the charismatic Dol po pa and his exegesis of the corpus.⁵⁶ The Jo nang tradition was extremely favorably disposed to the corpus and much of its spiritual practices focused on its hexapartite-and *vajra*-yoga. Previous to this or around the same time, Red mda' ba had written an "open letter" that he addressed to the Buddha in which he drew the Buddha's attention to the views that held sway at Jo mo nang and her affiliated institutions, and how he disagreed with them.⁵⁷

Supposing that Red mda' ba's reservations had not yet abated, it is not altogether transparent how he reacted, if at all, when his student Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357–1419) informed him that he had decided to study the *Kālacakra* corpus.⁵⁸ Determined and headstrong, Tsong kha pa may have gone against the wishes of his teacher, but, if so, he probably tried to soften the blow by studying the corpus first with Rtogs ldan Ye shes rgyal mtshan⁵⁹ at distant [from Sa skya] Yang Tshal [gung thang] monastery in early 1389 and then in 1391–1392 with Chos kyi dpal bzang po and Khyung po Lhas pa Gzhon nu bsod nams, another one of Bu ston's main disciples, and thus, aside from Rtogs ldan, *not* so much with one of the many disciples or grand-disciples of Dol po pa.⁶⁰ Given Red mda' ba's reservations, little surprise, then, that he also took exception to the *Vimalaprabhā*'s notion that trees were animals. He wrote the following in a version of this letter that was written in verse with nine syllables

55 Red mda' pa 2015: 113-29; see also Thupten Jinpa 2009, Roloff 2009: 25-28, 216-221, Stearns 2010: 55-60, and Rdo rje snying lcags 2017 and 2018.

56 Roloff 2009: 206-07, 214.

57 Roloff 2009: 307-10.

58 See Rgyal dbang Chos rje 1981: 176.

59 He is most probably the author of a brief survey of the corpus' astroscience, for which see Rtogs ldan 2013. In the colophon, the author pays his respects to Shong ston Lo tsā ba and Bu ston, but relates that he had studied the corpus under Mnga' ris Chos rje and that he wrote it at Nags rgyal hermitage in Jo nang monastery. He signed his work as Rtogs ldan, but a sublinear gloss in red ink adds "Ye shes rgyal mtshan."

60 For this, see Rgyal dbang Chos rje 1981: 168, 176, 187-88, 190.

per line:⁶¹

ljon shing [gloss: *kha cig shing gi rnam pa can gyi sems can yod par bshad pas de yin zhes pa mi rigs te / lung du ka ba sogs kyi rnam pa can gyi sems can yod par bshad pa ni / nyi tshe ba'i dmyal ba yin gyi dud 'gro min / kha cig ljon pa rta mgo can yin zhes pa'ang mi'am ci'i gling sogs mi'i gling du bshad pa dang snga phyi 'gal lo //*] *la sogs dud 'gro'i skye bar bsdus // 'di ni gcer bu pa* [gloss: *srog ldan gyi sde tshan dgu'i nang nas shing dbang po gcig pa can du 'dod pa*] *yi lugs bzang yin //*

The tree [gloss: Some who say "Because it has been explained that there are sentient beings that have the shape of a tree, it is just that." are incorrect; the explanation in scripture that there is a sentient being that has the shape of a pillar, etc., involves a temporary hell-being, and not an animal. Also, some who say that a tree has a horse's head contradicts from front to end with the explanation that the is a human.] etc. is included in the mode of the birth of animals. This is the good position of the Digambara-Jain [gloss: who claim that from among the nine types of living beings, a tree has one sense organ.]⁶²

There also exists a sort of auto-commentary on this open letter that was petitioned by a Nam mkha' rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po (1338–1412) — with these dates I have thus tentatively identified him as the scion of the Rin chen sgang Residence and a nephew of Bla ma dam pa. Thupten Jinpa characterized this little work in part as follows:⁶³

[Red mda' ba] explained that he composed this letter of critical inquiry as a corrective to...the proliferation of false discourses which were in vogue in Tibet...and stemmed

61 Red mda' ba 2015a: 121. The two lines of verse that are definitely Red mda' ba's state: *ljon shing la sogs dud 'gro'i skye bar bsdus // 'di ni gcer bu pa yi lugs bzang yin //*. Another recension of this letter that was obviously written in prose has:

kha cig shing gi rnam pa can gyi sems can thams cad yod par bshad pas / de yin ces pa mi rigs te / lung du ka ba sogs kyi sems can yod par bshad pa ni / nyi tshe ba'i dmyal ba yin gyi / dud 'gro min no // kha cig ljon pa rta mgo can zhes pa'ang mi'am ci'i sogs mi'i gling du bshad pa dang snga phyi 'gal lo // ljon shing la sogs dud 'gro'i skye bar gsungs // 'di ni gcer bu pa yang srog ldan gyi sde tshan dgu'i nang nas shing dbang po gcig pa can du 'dod pa'i lugs bzang yin //

These lines, from a computer input version of this work for which I cannot provide a volume or a page number, are found in Red mda' ba 1999, courtesy of bdr.org.

62 For this notion that is prevalent among the Jains, see Schmithausen 1991b: 14 ff., 103, n. 581, 2009: 36–48.

63 Thupten Jinpa 2009: 323.

from grasping at the literal truth of the Kālacakra and its commentaries. The overall strategy in this self-addressed reply is to argue that all the aspects of the Kālacakra system that are at odds with established Buddhist sutras and tantras must be recognized as interpretable and thus not taken literally.

Unfortunately, Red mda' ba has here nothing to say about the just cited passage.

It almost goes without saying that Red mda' ba's work elicited a number of critical reactions — it would appear that all took the verse-text as their point of departure — and Shar pa/chen Ye shes rgyal mtshan (1359–1406) may very well have been the first among his many critics. What seems to be so far a unique extant manuscript copy of his treatise in which he voiced his criticism has two colophons.⁶⁴ In the first we learn that its author Yes shes rgyal mtshan — "Shar" was added in front of the name in a sublinear note — had completed it in Sa skya monastery on the first day of the waxing half of the month *smin drug* (**kārttika*) of the year *khro bo* (**khrodana*), that is, on 7 August, 1385. We are also informed that his work is a reply to some questions posed by Red mda' ba and that he pays tribute to his teacher Dpal ldan Bla ma dam pa Chos kyi rgyal po — this non-descript epithet probably refers to Mnga' ris Chos rje or Chos kyi rgyal po, who was still alive at the time of his writing and with whom he had in fact studied in 1377, 1383, and in 1385.⁶⁵ The author's name is repeated in the second colophon and, interestingly, there we find included the observation that this work fit the facts after 'Jam dbyangs grags pa had looked it over in terms of scriptural intent and its argumentation. The latter was possibly identical with the 'Jam dbyangs grags pa, about whom we know that he was a disciple of Red mda' ba and the compiler of a recension of his teacher's minor works (*gsung thor bu*).⁶⁶

Shar pa was indeed sharply critical of Red mda' ba in this work. He cites Red mda' ba's two lines of verse *sans* the gloss and reference to the Jains, and then goes for the jugular by using the *Vimalaprabhā*'s own comments on *Laghukālacakratāntra*, I: 4c and 8c; he writes [the cited passages from the *Vimalaprabhā* are in bold characters]:⁶⁷

...zhes rtsod pa ni : ma rtogs par smra ba ste : **dud 'gro'i skye gnas rnam pa 4** // zhes
sogs kyi gzhung rtsa 'grel des : ljon shing dud 'gro'i skye bar bstan na : de skad zer
na bden mod gyi : gzhung rtsa 'grel de dag gis ljon shing dang lhun po sogs pa'i skye
gnas can du bshad kyi : **dud 'gro'i skye gnas ma bsdus so** : gal te bsdus na : **dud 'gro'i**
skye gnas lnga dgos pa la : rtsa bar dud 'gro'i skye gnas rnam pa 4'o : zhes pa dang

64 For what follows, see Shar chen 2012 and for his life and times, see Heimbel 2017: 111-35.

65 Bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan 2011: 31a.

66 Roloff 2009: 273.

67 Shar chen 2012: 559-60.

'gal zhing : *lha mi gdengs can 'byung po'i skye gnas dag kyang sngags // zhes pa'i 'grel par* : 'byung po'i skye gnas ni sngar brjod pa 4n no : bstan [read: *brtan*] *pa'i skye gnas ni lhun po dang shing la sogs pa ste* : ces dud 'gro'i skye gnas 4 las : zur du phye ste bshad pas so : des na shing gi rnam [360] pa can gyi dud 'gro yod par bzhed pa yang mi 'thad la : mi'am ci ljon pa rta mgo can yin zhes brjod pa pa yang mi 'thad de : de rnams g.yo ba'i skye gnas yin la : 'di bstan [read: *brtan*] pa'i skye gnas bshad pa dang 'gal zhing : gong du [b]sdus skyes su gsungs pa ni btags pa tsam yin no //

I say that the argument...was misunderstood, that is, if the *Vimalaprabhā* — commentary on the *Laghukālacakrantra* — basic text "The birth-place of animals is four-fold," shows the tree-birth of an animal,⁶⁸ it were indeed true if that is what it alleged, but these comments of the commentary on the basic text⁶⁹ explain what has the birth-place of a tree and Mount Meru etc., but they are not included in the birth-place[s] of animals. If they were included, then there must be five birth-places of animals, and that contradicts the statement in the basic text [*Laghukālacakrantra*]: "The birth-place of animals is four-fold." And because the commentary [*Vimalaprabhā*] on "Gods, people, hooded ones [= *nāgas*], as well as the birth-places of beings are known to be mantras" indirectly explained the classification that issued from the four birth-places of animals, stating "...the birth-place of beings is four-fold," as was stated previously. The fixed birth-place involves Mount Meru and trees, etc.." Hence, although it is averred (*bzhed*) that there exists an animal that has the shape of a tree, it is incorrect, and also the one who says "The *kiṃnara*-tree has the head of a horse." is incorrect; these are birth-places of the mobile, and contradict the explanation that the tree has a fixed birth-place. And, what has been stated before that they were born by way of being included among animals, is a mere assumption.

Red mda' ba may have been influenced by the impact his earlier reservations had on the scholarly environment in which he lived and worked, and his further reflections appear to have induced him to write as a kind of countermeasure, a much more positive and perhaps even a conciliatory review of the *Kālacakra*.⁷⁰ Indeed, this review shows that he was well steeped in

68 The grammar of the passage is a bit dissonant; one would have expected: *ljon shing dud 'gro'i skye gnas can du bstan na*.

69 I hate to say it, but again something is not quite right here.

70 Red mda' ba 2015b. This work is not dated but the colophon suggests that he wrote it in his retreat at Mount Gangs bu le — this mountain is located to the south-west of Sa skya — where he stayed for some five years towards the end of his life.

the relevant literature and on occasion some passages even leave us virtually speechless or at least should lead us to reconsider his position in Tibetan intellectual history. One of these is his unambiguous juxtaposition of the ontology of "intrinsic-" (*rang stong*) versus "extrinsic emptiness" (*gzhan stong*), the latter being of course the trademark of Dol po pa and his school, and his more than very positive assessment of it against the backdrop of the *Kālacakra* literature.⁷¹

In spite of this obvious about-turn, his earlier objections continued to reverberate in the tradition until well into the fifteenth century and a portion of the planned sequel to this essay will be devoted to an examination the critical reactions to the issue of sentient trees in his open letter by Ye shes rdo rje (?-?), Byang bdag, Stag tshang Lo tsā ba Shes rab rin chen (1405–1477), and 'Gos Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481). For now, it is worthwhile noting that so far neither Tsong kha pa, nor Rgyal tshab Dar ma rin chen (1364–1432) nor Mkhas grub, arguably his three most famous students, are known to have taken public and formal issue with his open letter, even though it contained so much to which they could have taken exception.

Bibliographies

Primary Sources

A mes zhabs Ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams. 2012. *Dpal ldan dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud dang man ngag gi bka' srol zab mo 'chad cing nyams su len pa la nye bar mkho ba'i bstan bcos legs par bshad pa dus 'khor bstan pa'i mdzes rgyan*. In *Collected Works*, ed. Si khron bod yig dpe rnying myur skyob 'tshol sgrig khang, vol. 26, Lhasa: Bod ljongs dpe rnying dpe skrun khang.

Bhāviveka. 1994–2008. *Rtog ge 'bar ba [Tarkajvālā]*. In *Bstan 'gyur dpe sdur ma*, vol. 58: 104–850.

Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan. 2012a. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud 'grel gyi 'chad nyan byed pa'i dus lo tsā ba bu ston gyi gsungs sgros zin bris*. In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs*

71 Red mda' ba 2015b: 155–56. This significant passage was already singled out in Stearns 2010: 59, 346, n. 236. Comparing his text of Red mda' ba's work that was published in 1999 in Kathmandu and the one I referenced, it is clear that the first is in places quite faulty—for example, at the outset, the Kathmandu text has *rgyud 'di lugs kyis bden pa gnyis kyi nram gzhas* whereas the Lhasa text has instead of *kyis* the correct *kyi*, and this of course impacts the translation in no uncertain terms. In addition, it is a pity that in his narrative Stearns omitted to identify the crucial supporting quotations from Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, Yaśas' *Svadarśanamatoḍḍeśa*, and the two verses from the *Laghukālacakratantra's Ye le (Jñānapāṭala)* and *Nang le (Adhyāmapāṭala)* chapters, respectively, on gnosis and the "the inner." Finally, Stearns ends his reproduction and translation of the text in mid-sentence (for *gzhed de / read: bzhed de /*), and fails to indicate the significance of Red mda' ba's use of the honorific *bzhed* (instead of *'dod*), a nuance that I submit should no longer be ignored.

- chen mo*, vol. 35: 1-172.
- 2012b. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i zin bris bla ma'i gsung zer log rtog mun sel*. In *A mes zhabs* 2012: 335-72.
- 2016a. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i 'grel chen dri med 'od las 'jig rten khams le'i rgya cher bshad pa nges don gsal ba stod cha*. In *Collected Works*, vol. 13, ed. Rdzong pa'i dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu khang, Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang.
- 2016b. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i chos 'byung legs bshad sgron me*. In *Collected Works*, ed. Rdzong pa'i dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu khang, Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, vol. 12: 1-173.
- 2016c. *Sbyor ba yan lag drug gi ngo sprod sbas don gsal ba'i sgron ma*. In *Collected Works*, ed. Rdzong pa'i dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu khang, Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, vol. 12: 174-451.
- Bo dong Paṅ chen Phyogs las rnam rgyal. 1969-1981. *Dpyod pa pa de nyid kyi dgag pa, Tshad ma rigs pa'i snang ba'i stod cha*. In *Collected Works*, Delhi: The Tibet House, vol. 7: 370-419.
- 2014. *Dpyod pa pa'i lugs dgag pa, Tshad ma rigs pa'i snang ba'i stod cha*. In *Collected Works*, ed. Hi ma la'i rig mdzod 'tsho bsdu phyogs sgrig khang, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, vol. Ca [6]: 708-33.
- Bstan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag 'jig rten gsum gyi bde skyid pad tshal bzhad pa'i nyin byed* [= *Catalogue of the Peking Tanjur*]. 1993. Ed. L. Chandra, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, vol. 1: 1-289.
- Bstan 'gyur dpe sdur ma*. 1994-2008. Ed. Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang, Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa'i dpe skrun khang, vols. 120.
- Bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan. 2011. *Chos rje phyogs las rnam rgyal gyi rnam par thar pa* [or: *Chos rje'i rnam thar dran pa'i gdungs byangs*]. In *Bod kyi lo rgyus rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs*, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, vol. 50: 391-459.
- Bu ston Rin chen grub. 1971a. *'Jig rten khams kyi le'u'i 'grel bshad dri ma med pa'i 'od mchan bcas*. In *The Collected Works of Bu ston [and Sgra tshad pa]* [1917–1919 Lhasa xylograph], Part 1, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 301-603.
- 1971b. *Mchog gi dang po'i sangs rgyas las phyung ba rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i bsdu pa'i rgyud go sla mchan bcas pa*. In *The Collected Works of Bu ston [and Sgra tshad pa]* [1917–1919 Lhasa xylograph], Part 1, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1-299.
- Byang sems Rgyal ba ye shes. 2007. *Grub thob se mo che'i rnam thar*. In *Dpal ldan dus kyi 'khor lo jo nang du brgyud rim bla ma'i rnam thar*, ed. Bstan 'dzin phun tshogs, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 41-51.
- Chos kyi dpal bzang po. 2012a. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud 'grel gyi bshad pa'i zin bris log*

- rtog mun sel*. In *A mes zhabs* 2012: 134-335.
- 2012b. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i 'grel pa'i zin bris*. In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*, vol. 37: 83-371.
- 2016. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i zin bris legs bshad mngar ba'i ro bcud*. In *Gangs ljongs sman rtsis rig mdzod chen mo*, vol. 102: 85-367.
- Dkar chag 'phang thang ma* [and the *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*]. 2003. Comp. Bod ljongs rten rdzas bshams mdzod khang, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1-67.
- Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*. 2012. Ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, vols. 40.
- Gangs ljongs sman rtsis rig mdzod chen mo*. 2016. Ed. Bod rang skyong sman rtsis khang, Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, vols. 130.
- Gyi jo Lo tsā ba Zla ba'i 'od zer [and Śrībhadrabodhi]. 2012 Tr. *Vimalaprabhā*. In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*, vol. 1: 1-845.
- Jo nang Lo tsā ba Blo gros dpal bzang po and Sa bzang Ma ti Pañ chen Blo gros rgyal mtshan. 2008. Tr. *Vimalaprabhā* [Jo nang translation]. In *Mnga' ris Chos rje Phyogs las nam rgyal*. 2008. Jo nang dpe tshogs, vols. 18-20, ed. 'Phrin las rgyal mtshan, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Karma bde legs, ed. 2007. *'Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*, Stod cha [= Vol. 1], Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Mi'am ci rgyal po sdong pos zhush pa'i mdo*. 2006–2009. *Bka' 'gyur [dpe bsdur ma]*, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang, Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, vol. 58: 664-816.
- Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po. 1980-1982a. **Dus 'khor dris lan, Gsung 'bum thor bu*. In *Collected Works* [1897 Lhasa Zhol xylograph], New Delhi: Mongolian Lama Guru Deva, vol. Ta: 712-73.
- 1980-1982b. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i 'grel chen dri ma med pa'i 'od kyi rgya cher bshad pa de kho na nyid snang bar byed pa*. In *Collected Works* [1897 Lhasa Zhol xylograph], New Delhi: Mongolian Lama Guru Deva, vol. Kha: 97-1114.
- 1997. **Dus 'khor dris lan, Gsung 'bum thor bu*. In *Collected Works* ["the old" Bkra shis lhun po xylograph], Dharamsala: Sherig Parkhang, vol. Nya: 185-231.
- circa 1830. **Dus 'khor dris lan, Gsung 'bum thor bu*. In *Collected Works* [circa 1830 Sku 'bum xylo-graph], vol. Ba: 95a-126b; TBRC: W23693.
- Mnga' ris Chos rje Phyogs las nam rgyal. 2008. *Jig rten kham kyi le'u'i rgyas 'grel*, Stod cha. In *Jo nang dpe tshogs*, vol. 18, ed. 'Phrin las rgyal mtshan, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- 2010. *Bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag dri med 'od kyi phreng ba*. In *Jo nang dpe tshogs*, ed. 'Phrin las rgyal mtshan, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, vol. 23: 1-177.
- Pad dkar bzang po. 2006. *Mdo sde spyi'i rnam bzhag*, ed. Mi nyag Mgon po, Beijing: Mi rigs

- dpe skrun khang.
- Phur bu lcog Ngag dbang byams pa. 1980. *Bstan 'gyur ro cag gsung par du sgrubs pa'i dkar chag tshangs pa'i dbyangs* [slightly incomplete bilingual Tibetan-Mongol manuscript]. In *Multi-Lingual Buddhist Texts in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, Mongolian and Manchu*, vol. 9, repr. L. Chandra, New Delhi: Mrs. Sharadi Rani, 3837-3905, and vol. 10.
- Puṇḍarīka. 1986. *Vimalaprabhāṭikā of Kalki Śrī Puṇḍarīka on Śrī Laghukālacakratantrarāja by Śrī Mañjuśrīyaśa*. 1986. Ed. J. Upadhyaya, vol. I, Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Red mda' ba Gzhon nu blo gros. 1999. *Dus kyi 'khor lo'i dpyad pa las brtsams te bstan 'dzin rnams la 'phrin du gsol ba nor bu'i phreng ba*. In *Collected Works*, vol. ?, ed. Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang, Kathmandu: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang: ?, TBRC: W3JT13308.
- 2015a. *Dus kyi 'khor lo'i dpyad pa las brtsams te bstan 'dzin rnams la 'phrin du gsol ba nor bu'i phreng ba*. In *Collected works*, ed. Si khron bod yig dpe rnying bsdu sgrig khang, Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, vol. 1: 113-29.
- 2015b. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i nges don gsal bar byed pa'i rin po che'i sgron me*. In *Collected Works*, ed. Si khron bod yig dpe rnying bsdu sgrig khang, Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, vol. 1: 136-205.
- Rgyal dbang Chos rje Blo bzang 'phrin las rnam rgyal. 1981. *'Jam mgon chos kyi rgyal po tsong kha pa chen po'i rnam thar* [based on the Lhasa xylograph], ed. Grags pa rgya mtsho et al., Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Ri sbug pa Blo gsal bstan skyong. 1971. *Dpal ldan zhwa lu pa'i bstan pa la bka' drin che ba'i skyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar lo rgyus ngo mtshar dad pa'i 'jug ngogs* [*History of Zhwa lu*], Leh: S. W. Tashigangpa, 1-471.
- Rma Lo tsā ba Dge ba'i blo gros [and Śrī ?Dānapala]. 2012. Tr. *Laghukālacakratantra*. In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*, vol. 2: 1-237.
- Rtogs ldan Ye shes rgyal mtshan. 2013. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rtsis kyi man ngag dri med 'od kyi rgyan*. In *Krung go'i bod lugs gso rig rtsa che'i dpe rnying kun btus*, ed. Bod ljongs bod lugs gso rig slob grwa chen mo, Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, vol. 26: 337-61.
- Sakaki, R., ed. 1962. *Mahāvvyutpatti*. Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series 1, Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Sde dge bstan 'gyur*. TBRC: W23703.
- Sgra tshad pa Rin chen rnam rgyal. 1971. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i skabs su chos rje lo tsā ba'i gsung sgras 'byung ba'i zin bris*. In *The Collected Works of Bu ston [and Sgra tshad pa]* [1917–1919 Lhasa xylograph], Part 27, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 127-368.
- 2012. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i skabs su chos rje lo tsā ba'i gsung sgras 'byung ba'i zin bris*.

- In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*, vol. 35: 173-471.
- Shar chen/pa Ye shes rgyal mtshan. 2012. *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i tshul la rgol ba'i dri ma sel bar byed pa dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyan*. In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*, vol. 36: 535-606.
- Shong ston Lo tsā ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan. 1971a. Tr. *Vimalaprabhā*. In Bu ston Rin chen grub 1971a.
- Shong ston Lo tsā ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan. 1971b. Tr. *Laghukālacakratāntra*. In Bu ston Rin chen grub 1971b.
- 1994–2008. Tr. *Vimalaprabhā*. In *Bstan 'gyur dpe sdur ma*, vol. 6: 254-682.
- Suzuki, D.T. 1961. Ed. *The Tibetan Tripitaka Peking Edition, Catalogue and Index*, Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Tsa mi Lo tsā ba Sangs rgyas grags pa. 2012. Tr. *Vimalaprabhā*. In *Dus 'khor phyogs bsgrigs chen mo*, vol. 3: 1-643.
- Vasubandhu. 1981. *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Ācārya Vasubandhu with Sphutārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*. Ed. Swami Dwārikādās Śāstri, Part I, Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati.
- Za hor Gdong drug bsn'yems pa'i lang tsho. 1983. *Bstan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag 'jig rten gsum gyi bde skyid pad tshal bzhad pa'i nyin byed* [= *Catalogue of the Peking Tanjur*], vol. 1, ed. L. Chandra, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Zhu chen Tshul khriṃs rin chen. 1985. *Bstan 'gyur dkar chag*, Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Zhwa dmar IV Chos grags ye shes. 2009. *Mdo sde'i spyi'i rnam par bzhag pa gsung rab rin po che mchog tu gsal bar byed pa'i snang ba*. In *Collected Works*, ed. Yangs can dgon ris med dpe rnying myur skyob khang, Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, vol. 3: 113-353.

Secondary Sources

- Bahulkar, S.S. 1994. "The *Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā*. A Photographic Reproduction of Prof. V.V. Gokhale's Copy," *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism (Sambhāṣā)* 15: vi+49.
- Buswell, R.E. Jr. and D.S. Lopez Jr. 2017. Ed. *Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*, Princeton University Press.
- Das, R.P. 1988. *Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume. Surapālas Vṛkṣāyurveda kritisch ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert* [Mit einem Nachtrag von G. Jan Meulenbeld zu seinem Verzeichnis 'Sanskrit Names of Plants and their Botanical Equivalents,']. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 34, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

- Findly, E.B. 2002. "Borderline Beings: Plant Possibilities in Early Buddhism," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122: 252-63.
- 2003. *Plant Lives: Borderline Beings in Indian Traditions*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Gagliano, M., S. Mancuso, and D. Robert. 2012. "Towards Understanding Plant Bioacoustics," *Trends in Plant Science* 17, no. 6: 323-25.
- Hageneder, F. 2005. *The Meaning of Trees. Botany, History, Healing, Lore*, San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- Heimbel, J. 2017. *Vajradhara in Human Form. The Life and Times of Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po*, Lumbini International Research Institute.
- Hall, M. 2011. *Plants as Persons, A Philosophical Botany*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hill, N.W. 2010. *A Lexicon of Tibetan Verb Stems as Reported by the Grammatical Tradition, Studia Tibetica. Quellen und Studien zur tibetischen Lexicographie*, Band V, München: Kommission für Zentral- und Ostasiatische Studien Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J. 2016. "The Lives of Bu ston Rin chen grub and the Date and Sources of His *Chos 'byung*, a Chronicle of Buddhism in India and Tibet," *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines*, no. 35: 203-308.
- 2016. "Reconsidering the Dates of Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan's (1292–1361) *Ri chos nges don rgya mtsho* and the *Bka' bsdu bzhi pa'i don*." *Zangxue xuekan 藏学学刊 / Journal of Tibetology*, vol. 14: 115-59.
- 2018. "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History III: The Oeuvre of Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312–1375), Part Two." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* no. 46: 5-89.
- Lalou, M. 1953: "Les textes Bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri srong lde btsan," *Journal Asiatique* CCXLI: 313-53.
- Li Xuezhong 李学竹 . 2010. "Zhongguo fanwen beiyejing gaikuang 中国梵文贝叶经概况 [An Overview of San-skrit Palm Leaf Scriptures in China]." *Zhongguo zangxue 中国藏学 / China Tibetology* 2010 (S1): 53-62.
- Lindtner, Chr. 2001. Tr. and ed., *Bhavya on Mīmāṃsā, Mīmāṃsātattvanirṇayāvatārah*, Chennai: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Mabey, R. 2016. *The Cabaret of Plants: Forty Thousand Years of Plant Life and the Human Imagination*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Mair, V. 1993. "The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of *The Scripture of the Wise and the Foolish*." *Sino-Platonic Papers* 38: 1-95.
- 1999. "The Khotanese Antecedents of *The Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish (Xianju jing)*." In *Collection of Essays 1993: Buddhism across Boundaries – Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*, ed. E. Zürcher et al., Taipei: Foguang Cultural Enterprise Co., Ltd., 361-420.

- Newman, J.R. 1987. *The Outer Wheel of Time: Vajrayāna Buddhist Cosmology in the Kālacakra Tantra*, Part 2, University of Wisconsin dissertation, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Rdo rje snying lcags. 2017. "The Life of Red mda' ba." *China Tibetology* (English version) 1: 56-77.
- 2018. "The Relationship between Red mda' ba and the Jo nang School." *China Tibetology* (English version) 1: 72-88.
- Roloff, C. 2009. *Red mda' ba, Buddhist Yogi-Scholar of the Fourteenth Century. The Forgotten Reviver of Madhyamaka Philosophy in Tibet*, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schmithausen, L. 1985. "Buddhismus und Natur." In *Die Verantwortung des Menschen für eine bewohnbare Welt in Christentum, Hinduismus und Buddhismus*, ed. R. Panikkar and W. Strolz, Frei-burg/Basel/Vienna: Herder: 100-133.
- 1991. *Plants as Sentient Beings in Earliest Buddhism. A.L. Basham Lecture for 1989*. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- 1991/2014. *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*. Studia Philologica Mono-graph Series 6, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, reissued with "Further Addenda et Corrigenda (Dec. 2014)."
- 2009. *Plants in Early Buddhism and the Far Eastern Idea of the Buddha-nature of Grasses and Trees*. Lumbini International Research Institute.
- Seyfort Ruegg, D. 1966. *The life of Bu ston Rin po che. With the Tibetan Text of the Bu ston rnam thar*. Serie Orientale Roma XXXIV, Roma: Istituto Italiano Per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Skilling, P. and Saerji. 2019. "Jātakas in the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra*: a Provisional Inventory I." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhismology (ARIRIAB) at Soka University for the Academic Year of 2018 XXII*: 125-69.
- Sperling, E. 1994. "Rṭsa mi Lo tsā ba Sangs rgyas grags pa and the Tangut Background to Early Mongol-Tibetan Relations." *Tibetan Studies*, ed. P. Kvaerne, Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, vol. 2: 801-24.
- Stearns, C.R. 2010. *The Buddha from Dölpo. A Study of the Life and Thought of Dölpopa Sherab Gyaltsen*. Ithaca: Snowlion Publications.
- Suzuki, D.T. 1961. Ed. *The Tibetan Tripitaka Peking Edition, Catalogue and Index*. Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Thupten Jinpa. 2009. "Rendawa and the Question of Kālacakra's Uniqueness." In *As long as Space Endures. Essays on the Kālacakra Tantra in Honor of H. H. the Dalai Lama*, ed. E.A. Arnold, Ithaca: Snow Lion Publication, 317-30.

◆ Author: Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, Professor, Harvard University.