

LEONARD W.J. VAN DER KUIJP

A TREATISE ON BUDDHIST EPISTEMOLOGY AND LOGIC
ATTRIBUTED TO KLONG CHEN RAB 'BYAMS PA (1308–1364)
AND ITS PLACE IN INDO-TIBETAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY*

More than twenty-five years ago, if memory serves, rumors were in circulation that a commentary on Dharmakīrti's (ca. ?600–660)¹ *Pramāṇavārttika* [hereafter PV]² by the great Tibetan scholar and visionary Klong chen Rab 'byams pa of the Rnying ma pa school of Tibetan Buddhism had been sighted. This set the imagination on fire. The prospect of the existence of such a work was all the more intriguing because no treatise of this kind, or any work like it, was listed in the then already published catalogue to his voluminous oeuvre Klong chen pa himself had written towards the end of his relatively short life while in exile in what is now Bhutan. Reproduced by Chos grags bzang po in his biography of his master, this incomplete catalogue registers some two hundred and seventy separate items plus an uncounted number of spiritual songs and an assortment of ephemeral compositions.³ What is more, none of the early indigenous bibliographies list a work by him on Dharmakīrti's thought, let alone on the PV. But this absence should nor induce us to wring our hands, for these bibliographies are as a rule far from comprehensive.⁴ That said, if Klong chen pa were indeed responsible for the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*, as only the colophons of its two extant manuscripts would have us believe, and if it were his sole contribution to Buddhist logic and epistemology (*pramāṇa*, *tshad ma*) – depending on whether the context is primarily Indian or Tibetan Buddhist, I will from now on write either “*pramāṇavāda*” or “*tshad ma*”, instead of the cumbersome “Indian [or: Tibetan] Buddhist logic and epistemology” –, then the rumor may not have been entirely well-founded. As its title indeed suggests, this work to which the ensuing pages are devoted is not a commentary on the PV at all. Rather, it is a critical epitome of the essentials (*de kho na nyid bsdus pa*) – a **tattvasaṃgraha!* – of Dignāga's (ca. ?480–540) *Pramāṇasamuccaya* [hereafter PS] and Dharmakīrti's notions of *pramāṇavāda* in especially his post-PV *Pramāṇaviniścaya* [hereafter PVIN], and the latter's Indian and [a good number of early] Tibetan interpreters.

As far as the Tibetan production of intellectual culture in general is concerned, Dharmakīrti's writings played the same role in Tibet as

Aristotle's philosophical works did among the early Arab and Jewish philosophers and the schoolmen in Europe. Both were paradigmatic figures, with Aristotle having somewhat of an edge on Dharmakīrti for being a less derivative and more universal thinker. For example, Dharmakīrti never wrote on statecraft, biology or poetics. But, like Aristotle, he was also a poet.⁵ The philosopher Dharmakīrti is therefore quite possibly the same Dharmakīrti who is credited with a poem eulogizing the Buddha's final enlightenment and a complicated *dandaka* eulogy of the tantric deity Śrīvajradaka, and who was perhaps also the author of a commentary on Āryasūra's *Jātakamāla*.⁶ It must be said that the latter is in every respect a lacklustre and extremely tedious piece in which even rather simple phrases are given dumbed down explanations; it leaves one with the impression that the author must have written it for children. Both men also have in common the fact that several of their writings are no longer with us⁷ and that the chronological sequence of their extant oeuvre is not free from controversy. Dharmakīrti never had an editor as Aristotle had in Andronicus of Rhodes (1st century B.C.), and the volume of his collected writings is somewhat dwarfed by the sheer scale of the *corpus aristotelicum*. But just as Aristotle provided the impetus for and informed the philosophical and/or theological speculations of these non-Greeks at every turn, so Dharmakīrti is a ubiquitous presence in the vast majority of Tibetan philosophical writing from the late eleventh century onward. Indeed, the Tibetans were willing heirs to what we may call the institutionalization and, thus, the virtual canonization of his oeuvre that, to judge from the commentarial literature of the period, had been put into motion in the subcontinent's Buddhist circles sometime in the middle of the eighth century. We may even go so far as to assume on the basis of what can be gathered from the extant corpus of the philosophical literature of the Indian Buddhists and non-Buddhists that this coincided with his writings usurping the position that had been previously enjoyed in the Buddhist monastic curricula by Dignāga's PS and autocommentary, the first works in which the speculative rational thought of *tarka* was joined with the quest for the foundations of knowledge, with *pramāṇavāda*.

The Chinese scholar-traveler Yijing (635–713/4) is our one and only eyewitness to report on the intellectual climate that prevailed among the Buddhists in the subcontinent towards the end of the seventh century. In his well-known post-691 record of his travels in India and Sri Lanka, he mentions both Dignāga and Dharmakīrti in his enumeration of the names of ten "recent" (*jin*) Buddhist masters. But he clearly singles out Dignāga for his fundamental importance for *pramāṇavāda*,⁸ and he does

so *inter alia* by exclusively listing the titles of his works dealing with Buddhist philosophy and pramāṇavāda, and *not* those by Dharmakīrti. His affirmation that “Dharmakīrti reinterpreted [Dignāga’s] logic and epistemology (*yinming*, **hetuvidyā*)” notwithstanding, he somewhat later says of five contemporary scholars that their emulation of Dignāga amounted to them trying to equal him in his field of expertise. In other words, then, it is obvious that Yijing and his informants privileged Dignāga over Dharmakīrti in the late seventh century. This would mean that the latter’s “reinterpretations” had not gained a hold on their minds. Further, Yijing is credited with having translated the *Jilianglun* (**Pramāṇasamuccaya*[*vṛtti*]) into Chinese (in 710), but it was soon lost. And there is no record that he ever translated anything from Dharmakīrti. The two Chinese translations of Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha*, one by Xuanzang (600/2–64), the other by Yijing, are to all intents and purposes identical, and one wonders why this is so. One theory that has gained some currency is that Yijing was unable to complete it because of the difficulty of its subject matter and that he or his disciples had simply adopted Xuanzang’s version.⁹ However, this hardly squares with the fact that he did a translation of the arguably more complex **Pramāṇasamuccaya*[*vṛtti*]. Whatever else we can conclude from the tiny slivers of information Yijing provides in his travelogue, one implication is that Dignāga’s theories were better known to him than those of Dharmakīrti and that, by a very weak inference, for we do not know how universally applicable his judgement may have been, we might extend his case to the subcontinent’s Buddhist scholarly community at large. If true, then Dharmakīrti had not yet made the impact he was to make a little later in the eighth century as witnessed by the enormous surge in studies written on and reactions to his work. Another inference that we may draw from the combination of Yijing’s remarks and the time-frame in which we see this increase in “Dharmakīrti studies” taking place is that we may have to push Dharmakīrti’s dates forward by one generation. Whatever may have been the case, his oeuvre was intensively studied in especially the northern part of the subcontinent for some seven centuries, continuing in spite of the upheavals of the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, when many Buddhist institutions of learning were badly damaged or destroyed in northern India. There is incontrovertible evidence in the Tibetan records of visiting Indian and Kashmirian scholars that, in such pockets of culture as the Kathmandu Valley and Kashmir, the PV [and possibly the PVIN] and several of its commentaries were formally taught and consulted until at least the first half of the fifteenth century. In Tibet

examinations of Dharmakīrti's thought continue to flourish to the present day.¹⁰

The *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* usually refers to the PVIN as the "treatise" (*gzhung*), but also occasionally cites it as *Rnam nges* (*Viniścaya*). In Tibetan scholarly writing, the term *gzhung* often has the extended meaning of "commented on treatise." Regardless of its numerous excurses, the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* is, structurally, doubtless conceived as a commentary on the PVIN and thus adheres to the sequence in which Dharmakīrti in the rough had organized his subject-matter there, that is, first a discussion of immediate apprehension, then of inference for oneself, and, lastly, of inference for another. Furthermore, given the fact that the term *bsdus pa*, "epitome," occurs in its title, it most likely needs to be squarely placed in the so-called *Tshad ma bsdus pa* genre of Tibetan *tshad ma* literature which, initially, was the trademark of a number of twelfth century scholars affiliated with the Bka' gdams pa school of Tibetan Buddhism.¹¹ The very first occurrence of the expression *tshad ma bsdus pa* in Tibetan, let alone in the history of Tibetan Buddhism, is surely the one found in the early ninth century Tibetan translation of the enormous exegesis of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*, which the Korean Wonch'uk [= Ch. Yuance] (613–96), a disciple of Xuanzang, wrote in Chinese. There the Chinese translator Wu Facheng, better known by his Tibetan title and name 'Gos Lo tsā ba Chos grub, seems to have rendered Chinese **jilianglun* by *bstan bcos tshad ma bsdus pa*.¹² Being simply a reflex of *Pramāṇasamuccaya*[*śāstra*], this [*bstan bcos*] *Tshad ma bsdus pa* has of course nothing to do with what is presently at issue in this paper.

Exactly five centuries from writing the present paper, Gser mdog Paṅ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428–1507) pointed out in his 1502 analysis of the history of the Indo-Tibetan reception of Dignāga's and Dharmakīrti's thought that there were essentially two main exegetical traditions (*bshad pa'i srol*) in Tibet that, in his view, could lay claim to a measure of authenticity as customarily defined by being traceable to *bona fide* Indian precedents.¹³ The first of these had its origin in the writings of Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109). A scholar and Sanskritist *extraordinaire* belonging to the Bka' gdams pa school of Tibetan Buddhism, Rngog Lo tsā ba's primary place of residence during his later years was the monastery of Gsang phu sne'u thog. Located not far from Lhasa, the later exponents of this tradition had, as a rule, either studied at this monastery or in one of the many affiliated institutions that were built in especially the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹⁴ Gser mdog Paṅ chen traces the second tradition back to Sa skya Paṅḍita

(1182–1251) and his disciples at Sa skya monastery, the spiritual and intellectual center of the Sa skya pa school. He follows his analyses of these two by a separate rubric in which he deals with the interpretations of what he calls “later Tibetan generations” (*bod phyi rabs*). Being, in his opinion, rife with a philosophical diction for which there was no [Indian Buddhist] textual support (*khungs med kyi chos skad*) or which was idiosyncratic (*rang lugs kyi chos skad*), he distinguishes within them a non-descript and unattributed cluster of views that prevailed in Tibet for “up to about one hundred years” (*lo brgya lon pa tsun chad du*) as well as the position[s] of the so-called “Dar commentator” (*dar tik mdzad pa*), that is, the substantial *tshad ma* oeuvre of Rgyal tshab Dar ma rin chen (1364–1432).¹⁵ From Gser mdog Paṅ chen’s perspective on things, and as befits a philosopher in a [or, better, his] tradition, neither was in the position to lay claim to the kind of authenticity that would otherwise accrue to a set of views standing in a legitimate or legitimizable exegetical tradition circumscribed and supported by what he considered to have incontrovertible Indian Buddhist precedence.

In connection with the first tradition that had its beginning with Rngog Lo tsā ba, Gser mdog Paṅ chen indicated that two of the defining features of its [post-Rngog Lo tsā ba] exponents were [1] their preeminent focus of attention on the PVIN and [2] the development of a special terminology (*chos skad*) that was put into place independent of earlier Indian models.¹⁶ In his opinion, the *Tshad ma bsdus pa* genre of writing is associated with the appropriation of Dharmakīrti’s thought by that specific branch of this tradition that began with the activities of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169), from *circa* 1152 to 1169 the fifth abbot of Gsang phu sne’u thog. As done above, the term *bsdus pa* can be translated by “epitome” and, not unlike the technical use of the latter in medieval European learning, may be considered a form or genre of commentarial writing. Phya pa was the author of several works on *tshad ma*, including, it would appear, a study of the PV. These notwithstanding, Gser mdog Paṅ chen locates what he calls his three *Bsdus pa Epitomes*, a long, a middling and a short one, at the very inception of the second of these two features. What is more, he singles out Phya pa’s *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* – he calls it “[the Epitome of] middling [length]” (*’bring po*) – as Phya pa’s most influential treatise, and states that it was the platform from which Phya pa had developed his own distinctive points of view about *tshad ma*-related issues that were later designated as “Phya pa’s system.”¹⁷ We may therefore have to distinguish between two kinds of *Epitome*, one that is a special type of PVIN commentary and the other a work in which, as is the

case with the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*, its author topicalized the themes addressed by pramāṇavāda and *tshad ma* into separate rubrics and chapters. Uncannily, as I was writing this essay, two of Phya pa's treatises on *tshad ma* were found among a large collection of very old manuscripts that was recently discovered in Tibet, namely, his *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* and his PVIN commentary.¹⁸ What we can now say is that, in contradistinction with the former, his PVIN commentary was most probably not conceived as an *Epitome*. In fact, there is nothing in this work that might lead us to conclude otherwise. Possibly not insignificantly, this stands in notable contrast with the PVIN exegesis of his disciple Gtsang nag pa Brtson 'grus seng ge (?-after 1195), who explicitly uses the term *bsdus pa* in his title, as does the author of the work currently under review. Quite the opposite holds for the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*. It is indeed clearly an *Epitome*, even though Phya pa did not expressly mark it as such in either the title or in the introductory and concluding remarks. But was it the first of its kind, as Gser mdog Paṅ chen would have us believe? Probably not. Though, with the exception of one, the author of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* makes no mention of the actual or oblique titles of their works, we will see towards the end of this paper that he does cite a good number of philosophers by name, who, he implies, flourished sometime between Rngog Lo tsā ba and Phya pa, and with whose theories the latter had very frequently voiced his disagreement. We do not know how and on what basis he was able to identify these men against whose theories Phya pa had reacted. For, with the sole exception of Rngog Lo tsā ba, neither the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* nor his PVIN commentary identify the Tibetan interpreters whose positions he criticized. It may very well turn out that, when he was writing his *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*, Phya pa was following an even earlier Tibetan precedent as far as the structural and terminological features of his work were concerned. But we can be certain of one thing: There are no obvious parallels for something like the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* in the Indian Buddhist literature. True enough, the architecture of Mokṣakaragupta's (?late 11th century) *Tarkabhāṣa* of uncertain date comes closest to being an *Epitome*, but that is where the similarity between it and the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* stops. Indications are therefore that treatises like the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* developed independent of Indian Buddhist practices of writing commentaries. And the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* structurally and thematically reflects the sequence of topics Dharmakīrti addressed in his PVIN and *Nyāyabindu*. Further, the *Tarkabhāṣa* is not cited in any of the extant writings of Rngog Lo tsā ba, Phya pa, or Gtsang nag pa,

and it is also not referred to in the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdu pa*. It is thus more than merely likely that it was unknown to these men. But we do know that a Sanskrit manuscript as well as a Tibetan translation circulated in Tibet during the first couple of decades of the thirteenth century, at the latest. Our source for this is first of all the biography of Sa skya Paṇḍita by his disciple Lho pa Kun mkhyen Rin chen dpal, where it is related that the former had prepared a translation of this little text when he studied it with Sugataśrī.¹⁹ Secondly, there is a terminological indication in a single passage of Sa skya Paṇḍita's versified *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* and his autocommentary of circa 1219 – unless otherwise specified, both will be henceforth combined under the abbreviated expression *Rigs gter* – that echoes a notion from the *Tarkabhāṣa*.²⁰

One final, minor point. Gser mdog Paṇ chen had written in his earlier 1495 examination of the various councils and the philosophical contributions of the Sa skya pa school that it is well known (*grags*) that a disciple of Sa skya Paṇḍita by the name of 'U yug pa Bsod nams seng ge (ca. 1200–after 1267) alias Rigs pa'i seng ge, was the first Tibetan to write a fullfledged commentary on the PV.²¹ Be this as it may, seven years later, in his history of *tshad ma*, he unambiguously attributes a PV commentary to none other than Phya pa.²² This remains to be corroborated, for not one of the Tibetan works on *tshad ma* or any other subject known to me contains a reference to such an alleged exegesis of the PV. There is no question, however, that Gser mdog Paṇ chen was of the view that the impact Phya pa's study of the PVIN had on Tibetan commentarial practice was far less than that of his *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel Epitome*. But it is likely that matters are not as simple and unequivocal as that, and that the outstanding questions may be resolved when we are in the position thoroughly to study these two works side by side and in the larger context of later and earlier developments in Tibetan *tshad ma*.

Though the two main traditions of *tshad ma* studies produced a very large body of commentarial literature, only a fragment of it has thusfar been bequeathed on us. The current state of our bibliographical knowledge of what tracts their exponents wrote on either side of the equation, let alone their content and inter-textualities, is therefore embarrassingly imperfect and spotted. Indeed, even the very few specimen of the oeuvre of some of these men that have been published in quite recent years still need to be evaluated and properly historicized, before we can even begin to think in terms that have to do with the places they occupy in Tibetan intellectual history, the influence they may have exerted on one or more

local scholarly communities, and kindred issues. I use here the term “intellectual history” in one of the meanings of the expression L. Krieger summarized and articulated in his fine survey of the field, namely, in the sense that it “. . . is geared to register the diachronic development of the individual or group as well as the synchronic relations between ideas and their context within the individual or group. . . .”²³ There are at present fairly good reasons for the fact that, in the study of Buddhist thought in Tibet, attempts to answer such questions as the specific texts and interpretations that had impacted their authors, the individuals with whom they had studied, whom they in turn influenced, as well as their relative importance for the tradition as a whole are by and large outstanding. Given that we hardly have an adequate number of literary sources to do justice to these issues, it is, perhaps arguably, premature for such undertakings under the prevailing, restrictive bibliographical conditions. But things are beginning to look up. Although they are as yet unpublished, manuscripts of a fair number of hitherto unknown twelfth and thirteenth century treatises belonging to the scholarly tradition of *tshad ma*, as well as a few biographies of their authors, have been located in recent years. And it is not undue optimism to suggest that this important positive shift in bibliographical realities may now allow us to reconsider the possibility of writing a kind of intellectual history, albeit thinly described, for this segment of Tibetan learning. Some of those new sources will be briefly noted below and in the main [and for the moment] for bibliographical purposes alone. To be sure, we cannot hope even to obtain mastery over the documentary evidence for a given historical period in its entirety, even if it were available. Many bibliographical lacunae will no doubt persist, and many, if not all, of the literary sources that are currently accessible, actually and potentially, will for this and other less obvious reasons certainly remain half-understood. But we do seem to be slowly reaching the point where we can begin to ask more questions than before and, perhaps, more intelligent ones, even though most of them can not [?yet] be answered.

I hope it will become evident in the remarks that follow, and that these are sufficiently convincing, that the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* is a significant milestone in the *tshad ma* traditions of Rngog Lo tsā ba and Phya pa. But we need to be more exact in our characterization of this work, and I use here the expression “significant milestone” in a very restricted sense. For the few of *us* interested in *tshad ma* and the more broad questions that have to do with Tibet’s literary and intellectual history, it is doubtlessly a significant work. The author provides us with many fresh insights in how certain ideas germane to *tshad ma*

were developed in early Tibet, because of his plethora of references to earlier writers and their theories, not to mention his own incisive analyses in which he demarcates his views from those entertained by others. But, truth be told, there are no obvious indicators of how important his work might have been for the tradition itself. We know as yet nothing about the degree to which it was read or consulted in contemporary and later Tibetan scholarly circles. And it may very well have been rather insignificant on this score. My own limited reading in the literature strongly suggests that it fell dead from the author's pen, since I have yet to come across one single reference to it, explicit or otherwise. Chances are that, not unlike so many other Tibetan works that were never blockprinted, it languished in the author's private chambers soon after its composition, and that it was only read by a few of his immediate students and then, later on, by but very few intellectually curious scholars who had more than likely stumbled over one or the other handwritten manuscript of it through happenstance, rather than because of an informed and focused search. Modern technology has come to its rescue. Now that it has been printed in no less than three thousand copies, new life has been breathed into it.

Before looking at its content, let us first survey some of the more superficial details of the book under review and the two manuscripts on which it is based. It begins with a very detailed table of contents (pp. 1–28), which is followed by an *introduction* (pp. 1–3) from the pen of Byang chub rgya mtsho of Byams 'byor monastery. Byang chub rgya mtsho writes that Padma tshul khriims, the editor of the text, was able to use two manuscripts. A cursive, handwritten *dbu med* manuscript, the first hailed from the library of his monastery in the East Tibetan area of Nyag A dzi rong,²⁴ and was made available through the courtesy of Mkhan chen Shes rab seng ge. The second is a handwritten *dbu can* manuscript. Originally housed in the library of the more recent Central Tibetan monastery of Thub bstan rdo rje brag – this institution was founded by Byang bdag Rig 'dzin Ngag gi dbang po (1580–1639) in perhaps the 1620s –, it became part of the vast but, to all intents and purposes, inaccessible library resources of the Potala in Lhasa. This manuscript is probably none other than the one in one hundred and ninety-six folios listed in the recently published catalogue of writings by authors connected to the Rnying ma pa school found in the Potala.²⁵ Unfortunately, neither Byang chub rgya mtsho nor Padma tshul khriims have anything to say about the paleographical features of these manuscripts that might have otherwise provided some clues about their age.

Anyone working with such manuscripts will know that no two of one and the same work are identical. Padma tshul khriṃs provides no critical apparatus for variant readings, so that, for one, it not possible to affirm that both manuscripts contained the glosses, substantial in number, but less so in content, by an unknown reader (pp. 1, 2, 4, etc.). However, they apparently do share the same lacuna (p. 143), and this might very well indicate that both go back to the one and the same ancestor. They also seem to have shared a number of curious lexical and orthographic features. For example, when given, Sanskrit *buddha* is often written *'bu ta*, rather than Tibetan *sangs rgyas*, Buddhists are at times designated by the hybrid “Tibskrit” expression *'bu ta pa*, the technical term *gtan tshigs* is generally written *he du* (< Skt. *hetu*), and Dharmakīrti is usually referred to as “Dar ma kir ti” rather than by the standard Tibetan translation of his name “Chos kyi grags pa.” In addition, the text inconsistently retains the archaism of a final *d* (*da drag*), a syllable-final *'a* (*'a mtha'*) after nouns ending in low vowels, as in *mdo'*, *brda'*, etc., and a subscribed *y* (*ya btags*) with an *m* plus the high vowel *i*, as in *myig* for *mig*. [The reader can easily correct the occasional reproduction of scribal errors and/or unintended misprints.] Considered archaic for many centuries and, to my knowledge, already absent in fifteenth and sixteenth century blockprints, subscribed *y* in words with the aforementioned features are, again inconsistently, met with in the oldest extant Tibetan blockprint, namely the one of Sa skya Paṇḍita's autocommentary of his *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*. The carving of the blocks for this print was completed on 16 December, 1283, in Dadu, the winter capital of Yuan China.²⁶

To be sure, these Sanskritisms and archaic orthographies give the impression that with the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* we have to do with a work that is anterior to the fourteenth century and therefore, was *not* written by Klong chen pa. True, the cumulative evidence presented below tilts the balance toward this scenario, but we need to be cognizant that an impression based on a text's [or manuscript's] orthographic and stylistic peculiarities is by itself, if not ill, then all too little-informed. For example, the readings *chos kyi grags pa* and *dharmakīrti* (*sic*) are also found side by side in the original manuscript of Skyem pa Tshe dbang's exegesis of the *Bshad rgyud* chapter of the medical text of the *Rgyud bzhi*. And he wrote this commentary as late as 1479!²⁷ In other words, then, the retention of the Sanskrit version of his name in the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* [or, for that matter, of the names of any other Indian Buddhist philosopher] is no guarantee whatsoever for its relative antiquity or that of any

other a text or manuscript. At least by the end of the eleventh century, translating the names of these Indian authors into Tibetan had become standard practice in most circles. In effect, this signaled their complete “enculturation” into Tibetan. Yet, there are some curious exceptions to this. For one, rather than consistently using “Padma’i ngang tshul,” the perfectly acceptable translation of the name of Kamalaśīla (ca. 740–795), the Tibetans, for some reason, more often than not persisted in using its transliteration, as in “Ka ma la shi[or: shī] la,” rather than its translation.

Further, our impoverished knowledge of normative Tibetan orthography and its actual practice is predominantly and unduly based on late, blockprinted texts with their more or less standard [and standardized] orthographies. We understand as yet next to nothing of the editorial procedures to which the texts of handwritten manuscripts could be, or were in fact, subjected while they were being transferred to the printing block.²⁸ The same holds for the nature of the guidelines the editors might have had in hand during this very transfer and the extent to which they were willing and able to exercise their own judgement when making their editorial choices.²⁹ It is also far from clear what kind of editorial freedom scribes, if they understood what they were reading, allowed themselves when copying manuscripts before [and after] blockprinting had come to its own during the first half of the fifteenth century. In a word, general questions of what did and what did not constitute legitimate editorial intervention in Tibet, are still very much part of the largely uncharted landscape of Tibetan letters. We might mention here that the blockprint from the blocks of Sa skya Paṇḍita’s work that were carved in 1283 is not the oldest evidence that we have for the printing of texts in Tibet. A notice of an even earlier indication of printing that has come to my attention is the expression *gzungs spar ma*, “**dhāraṇī* blockprint,” that occurs in the short biography Mchims Nam mkha’ grags (1210–1285) wrote of ’Gro mgon Zhang ston Chos kyi bla ma (1184–1241), where he highlights his subject’s skills in technology.³⁰

Provided that it did not suffer from such intervention, some of the features of the kind we meet with in the manuscript[s] of the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* may, on the other hand, have their origin in the personal idiosyncracies of the author. Indeed, there are analogous instances in other works. Further, if the orthographic conventions of the manuscript on which the publication of Rngog Lo tsā ba’s PVIN commentary is based were faithfully reproduced – there is no reason to suspect that they were not – then these were similar, but not identical. Thus, while it does not have a syllable-final *’a* after nouns ending in

a low vowel, it does have a *ya btags* form-words that have the high vowels *i* and *e* as, for example, in *myed* for *med* and *myi* for *mi*, as well as, inconsistently, a *da drag*, as in *gyurd* for *gyur* [and, for example, in *lkog gyurd* (**parokṣa*) for *lkog gyur*].³¹ Attributed to Rngog Lo tsā ba, the so far unique manuscript of a *dag yig*-speller titled *Dag yig nye mkho bsdus pa* makes no allowance for the aforementioned *ya btags* – it contains no instances of it in the many examples of correctly written words and phrases, so that it has *med* instead of *myed* – and explicitly rejects an “overuse” of the ‘*a mtha*’.³² The manuscript in question quite clearly states in its colophon that it was written by him, and later scholars such as Dngos grub rgya mtsho (ca. 1580) and A kya Yongs ’dzin Blo bzang don grub (ca. 1760–1830) alias Dbyangs can dga’ ba’i blo gros ascribe it to him as well.³³ Be this as it may, I think it can be argued that he was not the author of this work, if only because it contains the term *hor ’dra*, “[one who is] like a Mongol,”³⁴ Referring to a lower-echelon government official, this word makes its first appearance in Tibetan during the time when the Mongols occupied the Tibetan cultural area from 1240 to the 1350s, and thus postdates Rngog Lo tsā ba by well over a century. Rngog Lo tsā ba’s PVIN commentary has the reading *bstan chos* for “treatise” (*śāstra*),³⁵ rather than the consistent *bstan bcos* of the *Dag yig nye mkho bsdus pa*³⁶ [and the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*]. In his study of linguistics, Dar ma rgyal mtshan suggests that it was customary to write *bstan chos* for *bstan bcos* from the era of Chag Lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal (1197–1264), one of his teachers, onward.³⁷ In other words, Dar ma rgyal mtshan, about whom more is related below in connection with his massive corpus of *tshad ma* writing, may have recognized that, in some circles at least, *bstan bcos* was considered an outdated or archaic orthography. The passage in which he makes this comment is virtually reproduced *in toto* in the *Li shi’i gur khang* lexicon of 1536 that is attributed to Skyogs ston Lo tsā ba Rin chen bkra shis (ca. 1495–?).³⁸ However, instead of referring to Chag Lo tsā ba, the *Li shi’i gur khang* mentions in this context [Zhwa lu] Lo chen Chos skyong bzang po (1441–1528). Skyogs ston Lo tsā ba’s master!

Rngog Lo tsā ba’s PVIN commentary occasionally, and inconsistently, preserves such Sanskritisms as *ti ka* (< *ṭika*) and *bar ti ka* (< *vārttika*) instead of *’grel pa* and *rnam ’grel*.³⁹ Notwithstanding the fact that we cannot be certain that these were ultimately the readings of Rngog Lo tsā ba’s autograph – the same applies of course to the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* –, I believe a reverse state of affairs, namely that at some point scribes were responsible for such arbitrary and, indeed,

unnecessary substitutions, is not intuitively obvious. Reading the Lhasa Zhol print of Bu ston's collected writing, we cannot but take note of the fact that Bu ston apparently, and for one reason or another, on occasion chose to use *duḥkha*, the Sanskrit word for "suffering," rather than the *bona fide* Tibetan equivalent *sdug bsngal*. And he extended this curious predilection also once in a while to his citations of the canonical literature. Thus, in his quotation of the *Tibetan* text of PV, II: 196a, in his PVIN commentary, he seems to have gratuitously changed *sdug bsngal* into [the equally bisyllabic] *duḥkha*.⁴⁰ And there is no reason in the world for us to assume that this instance of a [?]willful change in the Tibetan reading of a translated text is an isolated event.

There are, in addition, numerous instances where it is quite clear that editors quite consciously refrained from ameliorating the readings presented in their manuscripts by substituting the Sanskrit terms and personal names in the original manuscripts with their Tibetan translations that, by their time, had become firmly entrenched in the shared lexicon of Tibet's scholarly communities. Rather good examples of this are the retention of *vyākaraṇa* (Tib. *lung bstan*) in the *circa* 800 translation of Vasubandhu's (?4th c.) *Vyākhyāyukti* and the many Sanskrit expressions that are retained in the late eleventh century Tibetan text of Jñānaśrībhadrā's study of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.⁴¹ These are at present solely available in the four printed Tanjur-cans, none of which predate the eighteenth century. Their late dates make their comparison with earlier manuscripts, when available, no necessary, and this is, among other things, precisely what makes the much older manuscript collections of canonical texts found at Dunhuang and, more recently, at Ta pho [or: Ta bo] so extremely valuable.⁴² It is a truism that our ignorance of Tibetan editorial practice has undeniable consequences for the current limits of our understanding of the ways in which texts were transmitted in Tibet, and *vice versa*. For this reason, we are still in many ways at the very beginning of being able truly to edit Tibetan texts, whether they form part of the corpus of translated or indigenous literature, in a manner that takes into account later substitutions of new, updated terminologies (*brda gsar*) for what were judged to be, rightly or wrongly, obsolete or archaic terms (*brda rnying*) and dialect variations (*yul skad*),⁴³ and/or regional or personal orthographic conventions. All of these are in one way or another connected with the absence of any central authority in the Tibetan cultural area from which spelling reform might have originated. Suffice it to say for now that none of these features of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdu pa* are present in the published, blockprinted writings of Klong chen pa, the earliest

of which so far is the 1533 xylograph of his *Theg pa'i mchog rin po che'i mdzod*.⁴⁴

The indifferent colophon, again, of presumably both manuscripts only states on p. 364: "... written by Klong chen Rab 'byams ..."; it thus gives neither the place nor the date of its composition. We know that Klong chen pa signed his works with a large variety of different names. Chos grags bzang po does not relate when he was given the name "Klong chen Rab 'byams pa" or in what context he used it, and the later biographies are divided on this score. Writing as late as 1938, Glag bla Bsod nams chos 'grub mchog (1862–1944) alias Bshad sgrub bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan states that Kumārarāja (1266–1343), that is, Gzhon nu rgyal po, had given the young Klong chen pa this name during his studies with him, which began in 1334.⁴⁵ On the other hand, Lha lung Kun bzang 'gyur med mchog grub has it in his 1725 biography that he had received it from Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan (1302–1364).⁴⁶ Chos grags bzang po's narrative suggests that the two men met for the first time in Gong dkar in *circa* 1350, but Ta'i si tu does not once mention him, let alone recount their meeting, in his own autobiography. Klong chen pa himself remarks *ad* "Klong chen Rab 'byams pa" in the autocommentary to his undated *Chos kyi dbyings rin po che'i mdzod*, that he used the names "Bsam yas pa, Ngag gi dbang po, and Tshul khriims blo gros" [or: "Bsam yas pa Ngag gi dbang po tshul khriims blo gros"] in his more secular compositions, that is, those that have to do with poetry, prosody, lexicography and the like, and that he used "Klong chen Rab 'byams pa" in those that discuss the absolute in terms of [the fairly untranslatable] *gnas lugs bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i klong yangs pa*.⁴⁷

Going back to at least the fourth century A.D., the Indian Buddhist taxonomy of the five domains in which knowledge was classified distinguished between an "inner [Buddhist religious] domain of knowledge" (*adhyātmavidyāsthāna*) and four other domains of knowledge that are secular or "outer" (*bāhyaka*).⁴⁸ Included in the latter are the "domain of knowledge of logic and epistemology" (*hetuvidyāsthāna*, *gtan tshigs rig pa'i gnas*) that is, what was to become *pramānavāda* under Dignāga and Dharmakīrti,⁴⁹ as well as the knowledge domains of linguistics, including grammar, poetics, prosody and the like, medicine and technology. This classification of knowledge more or less held sway in Tibet until the end of the second half of the fourteenth century. Somewhat before or by at least the beginning of the fifteenth century, *tshad ma* and an earlier notion of "speculative, discursive thought" (*tarka*, *rtog ge*) were redefined in some quarters and thence included in the domain of

“inner” Buddhist knowledge.⁵⁰ Thus, given the soteriological context in which, as stipulated, he employed the name “Klong chen Rab ’byams pa”, the colophon’s use of this name is at best peculiar and hardly reflects what he himself had said about his own use of this name. It is therefore more than likely that this name was affixed to the manuscripts. This casts a dark cloud on its authenticity and, more importantly, on the veracity of attributing the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* to him, the more so since it is the sole basis on which he is associated with this work. On the other hand, if it has any historical validity at all, then the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* may not have been written before the mid-1330s, at the earliest.

Klong chen pa is a towering figure in the history of the Rnying ma pa school of Tibetan Buddhism. The evidence for ascribing the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* to him is thus rather thin. It rests only on this colophon. Indeed, there is nothing in the text itself that points to him as its author, let alone that the latter was in one way or another connected with the Rnying ma pa. What the contents do suggest is that the author wrote his work in the environment of the tradition of *tshad ma* analyses that prevailed in the monastery of Gsang phu sne’u thog and in those other institutions of the Bka’ gdams pa school whose philosophers were influenced by it. One important reason why this tradition soon came to be constructed around the view that maintained the centrality of the PVIN at the partial expense of the PV was doubtless not least because of the accurate recognition that it was after all Dharmakīrti’s final if not his most comprehensive word on the subject as a whole, even if he departed from it in but a few relatively minor respects in his later précis, the much shorter prose-text of the *Nyāyabindu*.⁵¹ But this is by no means the whole story. Dharmakīrti wrote the PV as a series of mnemonic verses. This medium does not make it poetry, but it could suggest that he may never have meant to have it “published” or be made available to a larger audience. In an Aristotelian sense, we might therefore consider the PV an acroamatic or an esoteric treatise, one that was intended solely for the inner circle of his pupils. Much has been made in the secondary literature of the two verses that occur at the end of the PV – PV IV, 286 –, where he bleakly summarizes the lack of acclaim with which his work was received.⁵² But their presence only makes sense if, firstly, the PV were “published” and, secondly, if he were the author of this verse. Given the fact that, as far as I am aware, none of the commentators of the PV comment, let alone, include this verse in their texts of the PV, it is more than likely that it is apocryphal. On the other hand, if he had in fact written this

verse and appended it to the PV, then we may have to reckon with the possibility that he had a hand in “publishing” it. I believe this to be unlikely. Further, I think it is not difficult to argue that versification is probably not the best vehicle for writing the kind of philosophy he was intent on. Restricted by the rigorous rules of Sanskrit prosody, clarity of content is often of necessity subordinated to metrical form, and too little space remains for more thorough conceptual analysis. As attested by its Indian commentarial literature, the terseness and ambiguity of the PV’s verses made them quite vulnerable to widely diverging interpretations. Lucretius’ (?–55 B.C.) versified *De rerum natura* is a philosophical tract written in hexameter, but his subject is less abstract than the PV, and thus suffers none of the obvious ambiguities. The analogy works better were we to entertain the possibility of Aristotle having written his *Organon* or Kant his first *Kritik* in verse. By contrast, Dharmakīrti seems to have authored the PVIN, at least in the form as we now have it in a mixed style of alternating verse and prose texts. The Tibetans assessed the latter to be nothing but an autocommentary of the verse-text. A good number of the PV’s verses reappear in the PVIN, at times in somewhat modified form and, though obviously still open to interpretation, the less ambiguous prose-text of the PVIN undoubtedly rendered his thought more easily accessible, at least on the surface. Gser mdog Paṅ chen says as much in his history we cited earlier.⁵³ We may thus hypothesize that the combination of these factors resulted in *part* in the relative downplaying of the significance of the PV in the philosophical communities of the early Bka’ gdams pa.

Beginning with the *Rigs gter*, the exegetical tradition or traditions that developed in Sa skya monastery and its dependencies by and large took both the PVIN *and* the PV as their points of departure, with a clear emphasis on the latter. It or they formed the onset of what Gser mdog Paṅ chen has called the “Sa skya pa exegetical tradition” or “Sa skya Paṅḍita’s exegetical tradition” – the expression is *sa lugs* – of *tshad ma*. This virtual “rehabilitation” of the PV into the Tibetan discussion of *tshad ma* seems to have had its origin in his consideration that Dharmakīrti’s theory of concept formation (*apoha / anyāpoha*) and discursive thought, particularly in view of its consequences for his ontology, curiously not dealt with *in extenso* in the PVIN, but fully articulated in the PV’s first chapter and its autocommentary, were fundamental for the correct appreciation of his thought. It is more than likely that this reevaluation was partly provoked by his studies, in Sa skya, with a number of visiting Indian scholars, foremost among whom was the Kashmirian Śākyaśrībhadrā, from *circa* 1204 to 1210.⁵⁴ Using

the phrase “my ordination abbot” (*kho bo’i mkhan po*), Sa skya Paṇḍita mentions Śākyaśrībhadrā only once in his *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter* autocommentary, namely, in connection with what his master had told him about Śāṅkaranandana’s (ca. 940/50–1020/30) view on the genesis of valid mental apprehension (*mānasapratyakṣa*, *yid kyi mngon sum*) and its causal relation to its “informing” valid sensory apprehension.⁵⁵

In spite of our still very imperfect understanding of how things stood at the beginning of the thirteenth century, it can hardly be denied that it was not so much Sa skya Paṇḍita’s insistence on the fundamental role played by the *apoha*-theory in Dharmakīrti’s thought, as was his interpretation of it, which is of course not the same thing, that resulted in the fracture of what had been until his time generally a fairly cohesive tradition. The opening and closing verses of the *Rigs gter* clearly draw a line that separates him from the Bka’ gdams pa intellectual production of knowledge about [Dignāga and] Dharmakīrti. Even if he may not necessarily have been of the opinion that his view on *apoha* was the direct cause of this fracture, the fact that he distances himself from mainstream Bka’ gdams pa exegetical practice does lend further conviction and credibility to Gser mdog Paṅ chen’s distinction between these two traditions. Writing as late as 1471, the Sa skya pa scholar Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge (1429–1489) passes on an anecdote to the effect that Sa skya Paṇḍita was indebted to Śākyaśrībhadrā for having pointed out to him the centrality of *apoha*.⁵⁶ It is not at all transparent whence this bit of information had come. What we can say for now is that it is not what Sa skya Paṇḍita himself chose to relate about his studies with the Kashmirian master in the *Rigs gter* or, for that matter, anywhere else in his writings. But this is surely not the whole story. No doubt, Go rams pa’s assertion must also be understood in a more restricted sense, that is, in the context of the reification of universals as exemplified by the expression *spyi dngos po ba*, “real universal,” so far attested for the second half of the thirteenth century, which recurred in the more recent Dga’ ldan pa / Dge lugs pa interpretations of Dharmakīrti. Even though none of the available *Épitomes* pre-dating the *Rigs gter* had a special chapter devoted to its analysis, the *apoha*-theory was by no means a neglected area in the Gsang phu sne’u thog tradition. To the contrary, there is ample evidence that Rngog Lo tsā ba himself had fully recognized its significance, even if he only tangentially alludes to it in his PVIN commentary. After all, he was the translator of Dharmottara’s (ca. 740–800) *Apohasiddhi* and Śāṅkaranandana’s *Apohasiddhikārikā*, and Dar ma rgyal mtshan records in his catalogue he had written a summary of the former and a summary

plus commentary of the first section of the latter.⁵⁷ The *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* (pp. 28–39) contains a deliberation on *apoha*, as do the structurally similar *tshad ma* analyses by Phya pa, Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge (ca. 1160–1220), and the later work by Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal (?-after 1270),⁵⁸ but none of them have a separate chapter that discusses it in much detail. Of the sources used for this paper, the earliest one after the *Rigs gter* to have the better part of a chapter devoted to *apoha* is Dar ma rgyal mtshan's *Epitome*, where it is dealt with together with the diad of speech object (*brjod bya*, **vācaka*) and speech act (**vācaka*).⁵⁹

Ever since the *Rigs gter*'s appearance, the signature theories of the exegeses of Dharmakīrti at Sa skya and its affiliated institutions were, among other things and with very few exceptions, a three-fold classification of non-valid cognitions (*tshad min*) and a thoroughly nominalist ontology based on a [perhaps] radical interpretation of Dharmakīrti's notion of concept formation, argued for a length in, respectively, the *Rigs gter*'s second and fourth chapters. In the *Rigs gter*'s first chapter, Sa skya Paṇḍita placed a restriction on the extension of the so-called apprehendable object (*gzung yul*, *grāhyaviṣaya*) or, what is for him, a real object in the philosophical sense of the word “real.” Arguing for its equivalence with what Dignāga and Dharmakīrti after him had called the unique particular (*svalakṣana*, *rang mtshan*), he held that it cannot include anything approximating an objective universal (*don spyi* < *spyi yi don* [*sāmānyārtha*] PV, I: 48b), or a non-existent object he technically termed “what is distinct[ly] present to a cognition, but which does] not exist” (*med pa gsal ba*). The notion of the three-fold *gzung yul* is prefigured at the very beginning of Phya pa's *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*.⁶⁰ In the second chapter, Sa skya Paṇḍita took issue with the Gsang phu sne'u thog theory of five non-valid cognitions, and instead argued for the three of non-cognition (*ma rtogs pa*), misconception (*log rtog* / *log shes*) and doubt (*the tshom*). The *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* (pp. 4ff., 52ff.), to the contrary, includes both the *don spyi* and what it calls “the objective reference of a non-conceptual, false cognition” (*rtog med 'khrul pa'i dmigs pa*) – the latter is identical to Sa skya Paṇḍita's *med pa gsal ba* – in the category of the *gzung yul*, and also adduces an epistemology of five types of non-valid cognitions. The latter ultimately goes back to what we find in one of Rngog Lo tsā ba's two commentaries on the PVIN in which he partly developed his analysis of these in critical reaction to at least the PVIN*ṭikā* by Dharmottara, if not also to his two *Prāmāṇyaparīkṣā* texts, one of which certainly predates the large *Ṭikā*. Rngog Lo tsā ba translated all three into Tibetan and

interpreted Dharmottara as having subsumed the categories of doubt and reflection (*yid dpyod*) under that of misconception.⁶¹ With characteristic selfconfidence, he thunders that “it is clear the [Dharmottara] is quite mistaken” (*shin tu ’khrul bar gsal*). But, to be sure, the jury is still out on whether Dharmottara had really made such a subsumption and, if so, whether he was in error. A work of unmitigated genius, Rngog Lo tsā ba’s PVIN study is extremely intriguing and stands virtually at the very beginning of the Tibetan enculteration of Indian Buddhist pramānavāda. At the same time, it leaves one with a strong impression of having a maturity of conception that is more ordinarily associated with a culmination of something. Finally, it is necessary to underscore that the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* does not at this juncture or, for that matter, anywhere else betray its author’s knowledge of the *Rigs gter*. That is to say, it does not in the least take issue with Sa skya Paṇḍita’s critiques of either position.

But we must also be aware that, for historical reasons, Sa skya Paṇḍita’s appraisal of Dharmakīrti’s thought is double-edged. On the one hand, it is undeniable that his *Rigs gter* falls squarely in the Bka’ gdams pa tradition, since many of his analyses, in form as well as in substance, are indebted to it in one way or another. For this reason, it, too, is in an important sense a *bsdus pa-Epitome*, but with the restriction that it falls into this genre only because it topicalizes areas of Dharmakīrti’s thinking without thematically following the sequence of the way in which Dharmakīrti himself has treated his subjects in the PVIN. It is a telling fact that, like the two treatises by Bla ma dam pa that were signaled above in note 11, he did *not* conceive the *Rigs gter* as a commentary on the PVIN! And we ought not be surprised to learn that other thirteenth century scholars such as Kun spangs pa Thugs rje brtson ’grus (?-1313), a Sa skya pa scholar who had studied *inter alia* the *Rigs gter* under a ’Dar ’Jam dbyangs and Spyang ston Rigs pa’i seng ge at Sa skya, is credited with a *Tshad ma bsdus pa* as well.⁶² On some future occasion, it would be useful to work out the ways in which the authors of some of the *Epitomes* noted in this paper, whether these be PVIN-oriented or not, formally organized the topics from Dharmakīrti that they discuss in their writings. Mkhan chen Ngag dbang chos grags maintained in his *Rigs gter* commentary of 1611 that the sequence of these topics, and thus their conceptual organization, in the *Rigs gter* was problematized by a sentence in Bo dong Paṇ chen’s *Tshad ma rigs pa’i snang ba*.⁶³ He is only partly right. The section on Buddhist logic and epistemology of the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i snang ba* is prefixed by the entire text of the *Nyāyabindu*. The slightly veiled implication is of

course that he was inclined to follow this work's sequence of topics, which begins with a statement defining the valid means of cognition and an analysis of immediate apprehension, goes on to the subject of inference for oneself, and concludes with a survey of inferential proofs and refutations. Following the reproduction of the *Nyāyabindu* is this brief aside that touches on the question of a justifiable sequence of topics when dealing with Dharmakīrti's thought. But Bo doing Paṅ chen does not explicitly point his finger at Sa skya Paṅḍita and but prefaces his remark with the murky "these famous ones among the speculative logicians of later generations" (*phyi rabs kyi rtog ge pa'i ming can 'di dag*). From this passage that consists of only one sentence, it is obvious that Bo doing Paṅ chen did not merely have Sa skya Paṅḍita in mind when he argued how Dharmakīrti's thought ought to be explicated in a manner consistent with the way in which the latter himself had organized pramāṇavāda's subject-matter. Less obvious, of course, is where he would draw the line that would separate chronologically the "earlier" from the "later" speculative logicians. Though otherwise very useful for understanding Bo dong Paṅ chen's many reservations about the views espoused in the *Rigs gter*, Dkon mchog 'bangs' biography of his master sheds no light on this conundrum.

The earliest of the *Epitomes* that can now be consulted is of course Phya pa's *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*, and the possibly unique manuscript of this work falls into the following five chapters.

1. On the Typology of Cognition; 1b–11b
2. On the Definition and Typology of Valid Cognition; 11b–41b
3. On Immediate Apprehension; 41b–3a
4. On Inference for Oneself; 43a–81b
5. On Proof and Refutation; 81b–96a

The first three chapters, then, deal essentially with questions of epistemology and ontology; of these, the third and then the fourth and fifth follow more obviously the chapter sequence of the *PVIN* and *Nyāyabindu*, namely, their second and third chapters. It thus is safe to say that Phya pa would have to be included among Bo dong Paṅ chen's "speculative logicians." Incidentally, what is worthy of note and stands in stark contrast to the *Rigs gter* is that the *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* contains no long quotations from Dignāga's or Dharmakīrti's writings.

On the other hand, Sa skya Paṅḍita's interpretations breached in several respects the threshold which the Bka' gdams pa tradition with all its inherent flexibility was unable to accommodate. It is a telling fact that this occurred at Sa skya monastery, whose liturgies, institutionalized practices and history are at a far remove from those of the Bka' gdams

pa sects, and these no doubt allowed for a deepening of the furrows that indeed had separated them from their very beginnings. Further, we now know that some his disciples, such as Ldong ston Shes rab dpal and Lho pa Kun mkhyen, wrote similar studies, which seem to have been based on the *Rigs gter* – Lho pa Kun mkhyen’s versified work was apparently titled *Tshad ma sde bdun gsal ba’i rgyan*, where *tshad ma sde bdun* refers to Dharmakīrti’s seven treatises on pramāṇavāda. They were not always content to follow their master blindly. In his youthful 1482 analysis of the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter*’s autocommentary, Glo bo Mkhān chen indicates that they did on occasion explicitly depart from him in rather big ways.⁶⁴ The same must be said about the differences in the views on Dharmakīrti that prevailed among other thirteenth century Sa skya pa scholars. For example, ’U yug pa and Btsun pa Ston gzhon (ca. 1240–1310) differed widely in their interpretations of the PV and even the *Rigs gter*. This can be readily gleaned from the literally dozens of remarks made by the latter in his PV commentary of 1298, where he very severely censures his precursor.⁶⁵ Not much has come down to us about Btsun pa Ston gzhon, but what we do know is that his teachers of *tshad ma* were, seemingly without exception, scholars affiliated with Sa skya, and previous disciples of Sa skya Paṇḍita himself. It is different with ’U yug pa. As a young man, he was first exposed to Bka’ gdams pa *tshad ma* while he was a disciple of Gnyal [pa] Zhig [po] ’Jam pa’i rdo rje, a student of *inter alia* Dan ’bag pa and an erstwhile abbot of Gsang phu sne’u thog from *circa* 1199 to 1207. He then set out for Sa sky to engage Sa skya Paṇḍita in a debate. Against his expectations, he had there an experience of “conversion” and promptly became his disciple. This raises a number of questions. Might the marked differences between his and Btsun pa Ston gzhon’s interpretation of the PV have something to do with what he had learned before he had come to Sa skya? And if so, what does this tell us about his PV commentary, which he may have composed before Sa skya Paṇḍita appointed him head of philosophical studies (*mtshan nyid kyi slob dpon*) at Sa skya in preparation of his 1244 voyage to the court of the Mongol prince Köden in Gansu Province? And, further, what does this tell us about Sa skya Paṇḍita himself, if ’U yug pa did write it with his imprimatur? And, lastly, if he had not, could Btsun pa Ston gzhon really lay claim to greater Sa skya pa orthodoxy than ’U yug pa? With the much more frequent mention of ’U yug pa’s work and the dead silence with which Btsun pa Ston gzhon’s was apparently received, the tradition suggests that the answer to the last query is a negative one. But even if we cannot begin to answer these questions at

the present time or even if our limited textual resources only allow for a partial answer, they must nonetheless be raised if we are to become more attuned to the internal dynamics of Tibetan *tshad ma*.

Reading treatises from both traditions, we thus need also be quite cognizant of the considerable amount of interpretive disagreement, often leading to heated polemics, that was part of the inner fabric of these very traditions and, at the same time, take into account the likelihood that, at least from the 1220s or so onward, they may have begun to inform one another in fairly certain terms. But this is not the end of the story. Retaining a sense of authorial agency and freezing the historical process further while remaining within the boundaries of what still makes sense, we may, perhaps arbitrarily, say that Sa skyā Paṇḍita had begun to “write,” as it were, on the subject when he began his formal studies of it under Rkyang ’dur monastery’s Mtshur ston in *circa* 1201, and that his project was only completed with the composition of the *Rigs gter* in perhaps 1219. Over these nineteen years, he was of course subjected to many influences that, we can expect, probably lead to various changes of mind. What is worse, it is not altogether clear whether the texts of the *Rigs gter* that we currently have at our disposal are more or less identical to the ones of 1219, or whether they represent subsequently revised texts. For one, Sa skyā Paṇḍita’s disciple Ldong ston seemed to have worked with a text of the *Rigs gter* that was markedly different from the one that was printed in Yuan China in that it had a different division of chapters. Indeed, Khenpo Appey relates a tradition to the effect that Dmar ston Chos kyī rgyal po (ca. 1198–1259), another one of his disciples, had in fact edited (*zhus dag mdzad pa*) the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter’s* autocommentary.⁶⁶ Further, it is obvious that he did not write the *Rigs gter* in a vacuum. His debt to earlier generations of Tibetan scholarship on Dharmakīrti is at times strikingly apparent. Thus Glo bo Mkhan chen pointed out that he had lifted a substantial section of the eighth chapter of *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter’s* autocommentary, namely the one in which he discusses the definition (*mtshan nyid*) of the definiens (*mtshan nyid*), straight ([*phyogs snga ma’i*] *tshig ji lta ba bzhin*) from Mtshur ston’s work.⁶⁷

One of the interesting features specific to Tibetan studies of Dharmakīrti is the careful investigations of the logic and semantics of the relationships that prevail in a definition among the definiens, definiendum (*mtshon bya*) and definitional instance (*mtshan gzhi*). This was in part in response to the set of issues presented in Dharmakīrti’s works that for one reason or another was never really formally problematized in the writings of his Indian commentators. In the first place,

he had *prima facie* asserted two distinct defining characteristics of the valid means of cognition as such and, in the second, he held, following Dignāga, that it had two different instantiations, namely, immediate apprehension and inference. The key-terminology it employed – the common Tibetan abbreviation for this triad is *mtshan mtshon gzhi* [*gsum*] – is met with in, for instance, Dharmottara’s PVIN *ṭīkā*,⁶⁸ but neither he nor any other Indian Buddhist writers on *pramāṇa* ever conceptualized it to the levels of sophistication that we find in Tibet. This is not to say that the relations obtaining among these three were not a topic of debate among other philosophers of the Indian subcontinent. K.K. Chakrabarti, for one, has eloquently demonstrated that this was indeed the case as far as the Naiyāyika-s were concerned.⁶⁹ If not the first, then one of the first to address this issue in Tibet was Rngog Lo tsā ba. In contrast to other early Bka’ gdams pa authors, he did not, in his study of the PVIN, formally problematize it in his discussion of the definitions of the valid means of cognition – he may very well have done so elsewhere in his voluminous oeuvre. Rather, we learn about his position on the issue from the lengthy passage in which he examines the general definition of the logical mark (*rtags, liṅga*) of an inference.⁷⁰ The textual place of its discussion in Rngog Lo tsā ba’s work notwithstanding, Phya pa, Gtsang nag pa, Mtshur ston, and Sa skya Paṇḍita each take it up in the prolegomena to their analyses of the definition[s] of the valid means of cognition.⁷¹ In keeping with general Indo-Tibetan scholarly practice, none identify the authors or exponents behind the positions they cite of which they were critical. The author of the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdu pa* differs from them on this point in a crucial way in that the long section on the notion of the definition [pp. 62–106] contains many express references to earlier discussions and more often than not identifies their discussants by name.

The keen attention the author thus pays to the problems of the definition and its component parts might also be used in the argument that he was not Klong chen pa. Of course, Klong chen pa’s affiliation with Gsang phu sne’u thog is well attested. Beginning in 1326, he studied there as a young man for some seven years. During this time, his teachers of *tshad ma* included Chos dpal rgyal mtshan, then abbot of its Upper College, and the itinerant Sa skya pa scholar Dpang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa (1276–1342). The *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdu pa* alludes to neither, let alone mention them by name. At its very outset, the author states that he wrote it as a “memorandum” (*brjed byang*). The seeming specificity of characterizing his work as a *brjed byang* belies the term’s inherent ambiguity. For one, he does

not say whether he conceived it as a memorandum to himself, a kind of *summa* of his own knowledge of the subject, irrespective of whence he had derived this knowledge, or as a memorandum based on notes he had taken from the lectures by one or the other of his teachers. In a Tibetan context, a *brjed byang* often precisely refers to a set of lecture notes pulled together by an author and reworked by him to form a seamless narrative. Put crudely, a work of this kind is therefore, authorially speaking, a secondary reflex, for what the lecturer had said was further reflected upon and digested by the *brjed byang*'s immediate author. It would stand to reason that, in either case, the *brjed byang* will to some extent reflect its original source[s]. An early instance of a *brjed byang* is Bla ma dam pa's undated treatise on Sanskrit grammar. Simply titled *Sgra rig pa'i bstan bcos ka la pa'i brjed byang*, this work was based on Lo tsā ba Byang chub rtse mo's (1303–1380) lectures on the *Kalāpasūtra*.⁷² The *brjed byang*, moreover, needs at times to be distinguished from a series of notes and a draft for a study, both of which may be called *zin bris*. But a *zin bris* can also be a record of a lecture. A fairly early example of a *zin bris* is Lho pa Kun mkhyen's *zin bris* of Sa skya Paṇḍita's lectures on Śāntideva's (8th century) *Bodhicāryāvtāra*.⁷³ The collected writings of Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357–1419) contain specimen of both *brjed byang* and *zin bris*. An example of the first would be the *Tshad ma brjed byang chen mo* and of the second the *Dka' gnad brgyad kyi zin bris*.⁷⁴ Indicative of the ambiguity of their authorship, some editions of their oeuvre, like the Lhasa Zhol print, include both these works in the collected writings of Tsong kha pa as well as of his disciple Rgyal tshab.⁷⁵ This could mean that, in theory, the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* might also have formed part of the collected writings of Chos dpal rgyal mtshan or Dpang Lo tsā ba, if editions of their oeuvre ever existed. Klong chen pa's connection with Dpang Lo tsā ba and the colophon's declaration that the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* came from his pen is also problematic for another reason. Dpang Lo tsā ba was quite critical of the triadic conceptualization of the definition to which, as we have seen, the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*'s author has paid such very considerable attention. Only very few of Dpang Lo tsā ba's writings have been sighted or published so far, but he voices his opposition to this triad in no uncertain terms in his undated commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*.⁷⁶ He also says there that his view was not unprecedented, for he signals an earlier remark to a similar effect made by the Sa skya pa scholar Shong ston Lo tsā ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan (ca. 1230–?after 1280) in his otherwise unknown *Blo gros kha 'byed*.

Contrary to post-*Rigs gter* writings on *tshad ma* that belong to the thirteenth century, such as those by 'Jam dbyangs Sho re ba of Brag ram⁷⁷ and Dar ma rgyal mtshan, the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* betrays, as already stated, no overt knowledge of Sa skya Paṇḍita's critiques. Thus, it contains neither arguments formulated in defense of the aforementioned theories so characteristic of the Gsang phu sne'u thog tradition, nor hints of an awareness of the Sa skya pa commentarial literature that had in the meantime grown up around the PV [and the *Rigs gter*] during this same period. These absences are, in my view, powerful indicators that the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* was written not by Klong chen pa, but by a still unknown author who may even have composed it before *circa* 1219. To be sure, much is fraught with uncertainty and, by itself, this kind of negative evidence can never be absolutely compelling without some sort of positive corroboration. Chu mig pa and Lho brag pa Dhar ma seng ge (ca. 1250) are two other distinguished writers on *tshad ma*, who doubtlessly flourished in the post-*Rigs gter* years of the thirteenth century. Yet, neither the former's survey of [*tshad ma* nor his very intriguing commentary of the PVIN, nor the versified study of the same by the latter expressly suggest that they knew or took issue with Sa skya Paṇḍita.⁷⁸ Our eyebrows are raised all the more when we consider that, in the colophon of the first, Chu mig pa uses the alternative title of *Gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba*, *Overcoming All the Positions of Other[s]*. Such a program notwithstanding, the only philosophers he mentions by name in this work, and then also critically, are Rngog Lo tsā ba, Phya pa, his disciple and critic Gtsang nag pa, and 'Jam pa'i rdo rje [= Gnyal zhig].

This very brief sketch of the main differences between the *tshad ma* traditions of Gsang phu sne'u thog and Sa skya is of course all too simplistic and excessively incomplete. If the Bka' gdams pa *tshad ma* tradition is characterized by a plenum of differences of opinion among its membership while still maintaining a measure of cohesiveness and integrity that allows us to maintain this conceptual category, then the very same applies in every way to the Sa skya pa as well. Both show a remarkable elasticity in philosophical tolerance. As we systematically begin to study the twelfth and thirteenth century treatises cited in this paper and learn more of their actual contents and authors as a larger body of relevant biographical literature becomes accessible, much of what has so far been written about them, including the present paper, will no doubt need to be finetuned, if not thoroughly revised. Though heuristically useful, the ambiguity and oversimplification that lie at the very heart of the binary conceptual framework Gser mdog Paṇ

chen introduced in the discussion of the early [*snga rabs*] history of *tshad ma* and the availability of these new sources now invite us to rethink the issues afresh and make an attempt to put forth a scenario that is, paradoxically, at once more nuanced and diffuse. For it goes without saying that the corpus of treatises on *tshad ma* that has surfaced so far will allow us to develop a narrative that is potentially capable of a somewhat greater degree of specificity and depth than the one outlined by this great Sa skya pa scholar. It is therefore now incumbent upon us to be more alert to the fact that neither *tshad ma* tradition is a monolithic or homogenous entity. In fact, the more one reads in the literature, the more one becomes acutely aware that both exhibit a strikingly large measure of what can be called hermeneutic flexibility, meaning that both are inherently able to accommodate a rather surprising variety of different and, not infrequently, opposing positions within their conceptual parameters. Some of these are demonstrably minor and superficial, but others cut a great deal more deeply into their fabric. Mtshur ston is surely an example of the first group. A Bka' gdams pa master under whom Sa skya Paṇḍita had studied from about 1201 to 1204, he accepted the three-fold typology of the apprehendable object, and initially distinguished eight rather than five non-valid cognitions, which he then nonetheless subsumed under the “standard” five.⁷⁹ At the same time, he took severe exception to not a few of this predecessors' interpretations and in doing so he followed well-established precedent in that such other Bka' gdams pa thinkers as Phya pa⁸⁰ and two of his disciples, Gtsang nag pa and Dan 'bag pa Smra ba'i seng ge, to name but three, all had critiqued Rngog Lo tsā ba and others on a good number of points.

But a more interesting example of the kind of problems we have to face up to were we to accept without question Gser mdog Paṇ chen's binary framework is surely afforded in the person and oeuvre of the Bka' gdams pa scholar Dar ma rgyal mtshan, who is better known under two of his sobriquets: Bcom ldan ral gri or Bcom ldan rig[s] pa'i ral gri. A fifteenth century source suggests that his actual name (*dnegos ming*) was “Chos kyi rgyal mtshan”,⁸¹ and this falls nicely in line with the information now provided in his recently surfaced biography. This relatively brief work from the pen of Bsam gtan bzang po relates that he was given the name in religion “Dar ma rgyal mtshan” – *dar ma* < Skt. *dharma* (= Tib. *chos* {*kyi*}) –, when he took his first vows at around the age of eleven from his ordination “abbot” Sgro Rgyal mtshan thar and his “master” Shākya seng ge alias Slob dpon Rtsang pa.⁸² This name apparently remained unchanged when he was ordained

a full monk at nineteen. Undated, Bsam gtan bzang po wrote his so far unique work at the behest of Dar ma rgyal mtshan's nephew, whose own name seems to have been Bsod names rgyal mtshan or possibly, but less likely, Shes rab rgyal mtshan.⁸³ He does not explicitly tell us when his subject was born, but does state that he passed away in 1305, albeit without giving his age.⁸⁴ The actual year of his birth, however, can be extrapolated from two facts. First, Bsam gtan bzang po says that, in 1262, Mchims Nam mkha' grags, its chief administrator (*nye gnas chen po*) Chos kyi byang chub,⁸⁵ and other local luminaries and his former students invited him to come to Snar thang, which he then made his home for forty-four years until his passing. The invitation was apparently prompted by the death of Skyo ston Grags pa 'bum (?-1262) – he had been one of his teachers at this institution –, which, so we are told, took place when Dar ma rgyal mtshan was thirty-five. This means that he was born in 1227. Though Snar thang was the primary locus of his scholarly activity during these forty-four years, he visited and was affiliated with other Bka' gdams pa seminaries as well. One of these was Dpal me tog mdangs can located in Gtsang Ru lag where, according to the information provided by their colophons, he wrote, for example, his *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, a synthetic and topical work on Dharmakīrti's oeuvre, a *Bsdus pa*, and his study of the *Hevajra* tantra titled *Dpal g.yes pa rdo rje rgyan gyi me tog*. Other places with which he was associated during these years also included Chu mig ring mo, Gser khang in Zhwa lu, Sna rings in Shab, Thang skyed and Glas ring.

Dar ma rgyal mtshan cuts a tall and rather unique figure in the early history of *tshad ma*, if only because of the unusual quality and quantity of his manifold contributions.⁸⁶ In terms of quantity, the sheer volume of his literary output in this area strongly suggests the likelihood that he was the most prolific and versatile Tibetan writer on *tshad ma* of his or, for that matter, of any other age. So, when we turn to his published writings on *tshad ma* and, in a necessarily oblique fashion, to those that are as yet unpublished, but whose titles have come down to us, we cannot fail but notice that this corpus blurs in one important respect the contrast that, as was argued by Gser mdog Paṅ chen, existed between the two *tshad ma* traditions. One important marker of this distinction was that the Bka' gdams pa concentrated their attention on the PVIN. As we will see, his oeuvre includes a fullfledged study of the PV, not to mention commentaries on several of Dharmakīrti's "minor" writings. This is an interesting anomaly of which Gser mdog Paṅ chen may not have been fully aware. Given that Dar ma rgyal mtshan's writings in

general, let alone those on *tshad ma*, were by no means commonly available to scholars in the fourteenth century and beyond, it is not at all unlikely that, contrary to his teacher Rong ston Skākya rgyal mtshan (1367–1449),⁸⁷ Gser mdog Paṅ chen had no or only very limited access to them. The reason for his presumed unfamiliarity with them is that he nowhere makes explicit mention of them or their contents and significant departures from the Sa skyā pa interpretations in his own treatises on *tshad ma*.⁸⁸ Further, it does not take much to notice that, in the *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, Dar ma rgyal mtshan was critical of, say, Sa skyā Paṅḍita as he was of many of his fellow Bka' gdams pa philosophers.⁸⁹ But this is of course not at all unusual for this genre of writing. While he was loathe, for example, to share in what in his interpretation amounted to Sa skyā Paṅḍita having reduced all [real] objects to only the *rang mtshan* – he considers this to be “exceedingly in error” (*shin tu . . . 'khrul ba*) –, he did not unambiguously accept the three-fold typology of the apprehendable object. Further, he also argued for holding that there are six rather than five types of non-valid cognitions. Of these, he maintained that three are similar and three are dissimilar to a valid means of cognition as far as their adequation with an object (*don mthun*) is concerned, and he rejected outright the hallowed category of reflection. In other words, then, there is much in this work that separates him from mainstream Bka' gdams pa *tshad ma*.

At this juncture, we can uncontroversially hypothesize that his singular and pretty unusual position within the Bka' gdams pa was first and foremost due to a combination of his own wide-ranging literary and religious interests and his scholarly disposition. To be sure, this is not saying very much. And if his extant oeuvre, outlined by Bsam gtan bzang po, is anything to go on, then his unconventional interests were also not uniquely his, for they echo, to some degree those of another thirteenth century intellectual but even less influential maverick of the Bka' gdams pa, namely, Mchims Nam mkha' grags, as we discover from his biography by Skyo ston Smon lam tshul khriṃs (1219–1299), his student and successor to the throne of Snar thang's abbacy from 1285 to his passing.⁹⁰ We know that Ze'u Grags pa brtson 'grus (1253–1316), one of Dar ma rgyal mtshan's disciples and the tenth abbot of Snar thang from 1304 to 1314, had prepared an edition of his collected oeuvre, possibly sometime after he had relinquished the abbacy in favor of his nephew (?) Ze'u Grags pa shes rab (1259–1325).⁹¹ Indeed, he may very well have compiled this edition as a tribute to and in memory

of his recently deceased master. In this edition, we find the following treatises he wrote on *tshad ma*.⁹²

1. Commentary on the PS⁹³
2. Commentary on the PV
3. Commentary on the PVIN,⁹⁴ etc.
[Commentaries on the seven works on speculative thought (*rtog ge sde bdun gyi . . . ti ka*) {by Dharmakīrti}]
4. Commentary on the *Bahyārthasiddhi* (of Śubhagupta, ca. 720–780)
5. Commentary on the *Apohasiddhi* (of Dharmottara or Śāṅkaranandana)
6. Commentary on the *Dbang phyug [b]rtag pa*⁹⁵

Written independently of Bsam gtan bzang po's listing, a recent, incomplete catalogue of his oeuvre reveals that he may have authored a number of other works on *tshad ma*:⁹⁶ these are the following:

7. A topical outline (*sa bcad*)⁹⁷ of the PS
8. A topical outline of the PVIN
9. Commentary on the *Nyāyabindu*
10. Commentary on the *Hetubindu* (of Dharmakīrti)
11. Commentary on the *Santānāntarasiddhi* (of Dharmakīrti)
12. Commentary on the *Great Dharmottara* (= PVIN *ṭikā*)⁹⁸
13. Commentary on the *Vādanyāya* (of Dharmakīrti)
14. A word for word commentary ('*bru 'joms*) of the *Vādanyāya*
15. Topical outline of the *Vādanyāya*
16. A tract establishing previous and subsequent lives
17. A tract establishing omniscience
18. A large *Bsdus pa*
19. A small *Bsdus pa*

One of these two *Bsdus pa* treatises may very well be his *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, which he composed prior to his PVIN commentary, as the latter refers to it twice.⁹⁹ Zhang ston Bsod names grags pa (1292–1370) wrote in the biographical sketch of Dol po pa – it forms part of his 1360 history of the *Kālacakra* cycle – that his master had studied Dar ma rgyal mtshan's *Bsdus pa* at Sa skya under one of two individuals known as Skyi ston, that is, Shākya 'bum or his nephew Grags pa rgyal mtshan.¹⁰⁰ This little detail suggests that Sa skya's curriculum allowed a good degree of free and non-partisan philosophical inquiry. Indeed, criticism of Sa skya Paṇḍita was tolerated and permissible, and not at all anathema to the prevailing sensibilities at this institution. A khu Shes rab rgya mtsho also connects him with a commentary on the *Nyāyasiddhyāloka* by [a] Candragomin; he quotes

the *Nyāyasiddhyāloka* several times in his *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*.¹⁰¹

One important way for us to come a little closer to understanding an aspect of a scholar's intellectual development, here in terms of *tshad ma*, is to examine what kind of influences he may have been subjected to in the course of his studies. We can do this to some extent, and of course with limited success, when we trace the line or lines of transmission of *tshad ma* and other cognate texts to which he was privy, and identify the various teachers by whom he was taught. Much of this touches on questions of doctrinal affiliation and, ultimately, legitimacy that figure ever so large in the Tibetan tradition. In fact so large, that a special literary genre for this kind of personal intellectual history was created for the precise purpose of describing these lines of transmission. This is the so-called "record of texts received" (*thob yig*) or "heard-studied" (*gsan yig*), in which the author lists what and under whom he had studied. An early, if not so far the earliest, attestation of such a work is the *Mtho' [= Tho] byang* by Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson 'grus grags pa (1123–1193).¹⁰² When dealing with the matter of *tshad ma*, "other cognate texts" would, to be sure, especially include Indian and Tibetan treatises on *madhyamaka* philosophy. Writings on either subject often informed one another, as we begin to witness already in late sixth or early seventh century India, most notably in Bhāviveka's *Tarkajvāla*. Little wonder that much of Bsam gtan bzang po's biography of Dar ma rgyal mtshan is taken up by descriptions of what and with whom his subject had studied,¹⁰³ but it is regrettably quite thin on when and where he had received their instructions.

Dar ma rgyal mtshan's first recorded encounter with pramāṇavāda took place in his teens, when he studied with the east Indian Dānaśīla.¹⁰⁴ The later was one of the eleven junior associates of the more famous Śākyaśrībhadrā with whom he had traveled from the Indo-Tibetan marshes to Central Tibet in 1204. An accomplished scholar of Dharmakīrti's writings in his own right and of those by his commentators Dharmottara and Prajñākaragupta (ca. 800) in particular, Dānaśīla had taught these to Sa skya Paṇḍita on an earlier occasion in Sa skya monastery, as well as, so we are told, a portion of Subhūticandra's (ca. 1050–1110) exegesis of the *Amarakoṣa*.¹⁰⁵ The debt owed him is considerable. For one, the only complete Sanskrit manuscript of Prajñākaragupta's *PValamkāra* that is extant, preserved in Sa skya monastery and recovered by R. Sāṅkrītyāyana (1893–1963) and Dge 'dun chos 'phel (1903–1951), bears not merely his scribal signature, but also contains several glosses taken from its subcommentary by Yamāri

[or: Jamāri] (ca. 1000–1060).¹⁰⁶ No doubt, Dānaśīla was well advanced in years when Dar ma rgyal mtshan first met him. Bsam gtan bzang po but laconically states that he taught him a host of unspecified *tshad ma* treatises (*tshad ma'i gzhung ci rigs pa*). It goes without saying that, in this context, *tshad ma* refers to works on pramāṇavāda, for no Indian or Nepalese scholar active in Tibet ever seems to have taught texts on *tshad ma*, that is, treatises on logic and epistemology that were written by Tibetans. We do not know whether Dānaśīla ever formally put something in writing on the subject of pramāṇavāda / *tshad ma*. Evidence for this is so far wanting. But there can be no question that the gloss *dā na* in the manuscript of the *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog* critically refers to a proposition made by him on an issue that bears on the question of relation and opposition.¹⁰⁷ Further, unlike his colleague Vibhūticandra who had also learned Tibetan [and his other colleague Sugataśrī], he never seems to have returned to the subcontinent. But, like them, his prolonged stay in Tibet had also enabled him to become sufficiently proficient in Classical Tibetan to translate several works by himself (*rang 'gyur*). One of these is his own tiny tract in but three sentences on how books are to be read. Titled something like **Puṣṭakapathopaya* (*Glegs bam bklag pa'i thabs*), the Sde dge print of the Tanjur curiously included it in the *tshad ma* section, though it has nothing to do with the subject.¹⁰⁸ It is for some reason not listed in Dar ma rgyal mtshan's catalogue of writings and translations associated with Dānaśīla, but it is registered in the catalogue prepared by Dbus pa Blo gsal.¹⁰⁹ There it is not subsumed under any one particular generic category. Bu ston, too, included it in his later catalogue of 1322–1326, where he placed it in the general rubric of “various . . . Mahayana treatises,” but he evidently reclassified it in his catalogue of the Zhwa lu Tanjur [if it is to be found therein] as it is absent from the locus of texts in which he had placed it in the former.¹¹⁰

Dar ma rgyal mtshan's apprenticeship in pramāṇavāda under Dānaśīla was followed by the instructions in a more specific literary corpus of pramāṇavāda and *tshad ma* texts, including an unidentified *Tshad ma bsdus pa*, he received from Ston Shag (< Shākya). Like Dar ma rgyal mtshan, this man was also born in Phu thang in Dbus. Later, he even studied the *Rigs gter* with Sa skya Paṇḍita himself. It is for this reason that, in his aforementioned catalogue of translated scripture, he calls him *bla ma sa skya lo tsā ba* – Sa skya Paṇḍita was both a Sanskritist and translator.¹¹¹ This must have taken place before *circa* 1244. Then, very shortly after his ordination as a monk in Dbyar Nyi ma, he worked on Mtshur ston's tract with a Brtson 'grus, the very “abbot” who had

ordained him, whereafter he continued his studies under Skyel nag Grags pa seng ge, who had also been one of Chu mig pa's teachers. In addition to the PV, PVIN, a *Tshad ma bsdu pa*, and a host of cognate miscellaneous treatises (*sde phran ci rigs*) of Dharmakīrti, Skyel nag also taught him the *Rnam 'grel gyi 'grel pa stong phrag phyed dang bzhi pa*. This is of course none other than Dharmakīrti's autocommentary on the PV's first chapter – the nickname bearing on its number of *śloka*-units of text (3,500) is so quoted by Yamāri.¹¹² As for Skyel nag, Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje (1309–1364) says in his chronicle that he had founded a college at Snar thang for the study of Buddhist philosophy (*mtshan nyid gyi grwa sa*) during the era of 'Gro mgon Zhang ston.¹¹³ This means that this college was built sometime between 1232 and 1241. Gser mdog Paṅ chen writes in his 1479 study of Rngog Lo tsā ba and his intellectual legacy that, earlier and as far as *tshad ma* is concerned, a disciple of Phya pa by the name of Bru sha Bsod names seng ge had already founded there a seminary for the study of the PVIN.¹¹⁴ By Dar ma rgyal mtshan's time, then, Snar thang had therefore been a center of sorts for the study of pramāṇavāda and *tshad ma* for some seventy or eighty years. Other teachers of his were [S]kyi ston Grags pa 'bum – was he related to the two Skyi ston-s who taught Dol po pa? – and even 'U yug pa. Thus, though Dar ma rgyal mtshan was institutionally affiliated with the Bka' gdams pa, he, like so many of his contemporaries, was privy to a host of different and, at times, competing interpretations of, in this ease, treatises on pramāṇavāda and *tshad ma* that had begun to dot and demarcate the intellectual landscape and contours of Tibet.

Taken as a whole, it is trivially true that Tibetan Buddhism is permeated with tantric thought and practice. One of its major cornerstones, repeated in many tantric texts, is the sanctity of the master-disciple relationship and the need for the disciple to take on a totally subordinate attitude of reverence and respect for the master, the *vajrācārya*. This relationship is epitomized in the numerous works on *guruyoga* (*bla ma'i rnal 'byor*). After all, the master is the embodiment of the experience of enlightenment, a Buddha. Notwithstanding the fact that non-tantric studies are also permeated by this tantric ethos, these attitudes of reverence and respect did not, at least during the first centuries or so, stand in the way of frank debate. Indeed, a characteristic feature of much of Tibetan philosophical and exegetical writing is precisely that it is polemical and that, moreover, its polemicism does not stop before the alleged sanctity of this relationship. In fact, instances are legion where a disciple is critical of his master's views in a very

public way. We have already seen that Dānaśīla and Sa skya Paṇḍita figure among those teachers of Dar ma rgyal mtshan whom he does not in the least hesitate to criticize in his writings. Another teacher of his, Slob dpon Rtsang pa, that is, Shākya seng ge, must also be included in the long list of Bka' gdams pa authors he critiques. It now turns out that this Rtsang pa may also have written on *tshad ma*, though his work has yet to surface. This is evidenced, for instance, in the published text of the *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, where an unidentified “someone” (*kha cig [na re]*) is cited, who held that¹¹⁵

Neither based on experience, nor on a logical argument, there is a [non-valid cognition] called reflection that ascertains a true object that is hidden [from perceptual cognition].

A sublinear gloss in the unpublished manuscript of this work credits this opinion to a certain *rtsang*.¹¹⁶ The alternation *rtsang / gtsang* is often met with in Tibetan letters, so that one would be naturally inclined to hold that “Rtsang” is short for “Gtsang,” and thus refers to the famous Gtsang [nag pa]. This would be a mistake. For when we turn to the latter’s discussion of reflection in his PVIN commentary, we notice that he viewed the matter at hand in quite different terms,¹¹⁷ and there is so far no textual evidence that he had ever changed his mind about the matter. Another example where the *rtsang*-gloss of the manuscript cannot refer to Gtsang nag pa is met with in Dar ma rgyal mtshan’s critical discussion of the *tshad min* category of misconception.¹¹⁸

Indologically speaking, the author of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* makes several observations that are worthy to be noted. For example, on pp. 106–107, he assigns to Prajñākaragupta the philosophical position of the so-called “mentalist who holds that sense-data are veridical” (*sems tsam rnam bden pa*). In other words, Prajñākaragupta was as Yogācārin. Something along this line was also proposed by, for example, the Rnying ma pa thinker Rog bande Shes rab 'od (1166–1244).¹¹⁹ However, most Tibetan interpreters subscribe to the view that he was a “mentalist who holds that sense data are delusive” (*sems tsam rnam brdzun pa*), that is, depending on their appraisal of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist philosophy, they held that he was either a Yogācārin or a Mādhyamika.¹²⁰ To be sure, this problem needs further study. Later, on p. 119, the author maintains that some non-Buddhists and several disciples of Dignāga – he names here a certain Rgyal ba'i blo gros (*Jinabuddhi) – “claimed that even a wrong cognition that falsely apprehends a white conch as yellow is valid with respect to [its cognition of its] leftward spiraling shape.” (*dung dkar po la ser por 'dzin pa'i she pa yang g.yas su 'khyil ba'i dbyibs la tshad mar 'dod . . .*). The issues that are at stake here in connection with the typology of delusive

forms of apprehension in Dignāga and Dharmakīrti were discussed by, among others. A Wayman, E. Franco and Funayama Tōru.¹²¹ It is of course very tempting to see in “Rgyal ba’i blo gros” a clip of, or a scribal omission for, “Rgyal dbang blo gros” (“Jinendrabuddhi”), who flourished *after* Dharmakīrti, but not later than the eighth century – he may have written his work between 740 and 750 –, and therefore could not have been Dignāga’s student. In fact, judging from Jinendrabuddhi’s analysis of delusive apprehension, it is clear that he is in fact indicated by “Rgyal ba’i blo gros,” for he was of the view that the perception of a yellow of what is actually a white conch is valid because it is non-deceptive as regards the fact that a conch is apprehended.¹²² The currently available record states that Dpang Lo tsā ba was the first to introduce Jinendrabuddhi’s large commentary on Dignāga’s PS *in toto* to Tibetan scholarship – he himself says with some pride that he had translated it in the Kathmandu Valley without having taken recourse to a native *paṇḍita*-informant. It is thus not entirely surprising that Stag ston pa Gnyan [?Dar ma seng ge] does not mention this rendition in his brief history of Indian pramāṇavāda that is datable to the second half of the thirteenth century.¹²³ Further, whereas Dbus pa Blo gsal does not register it in his Tanjur catalogue, Bu ston already lists it in the one he appended to his chronicle.¹²⁴ Thus, Dpang Lo tsā ba had most likely translated this work sometime between 1310 and 1325. This state of affairs could have an unambiguous implication for dating the composition of the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* were it not for an unexpected complication. Namely, a small band of Tibetan scholars who flourished at a time well before copies of Dpang Lo tsā ba’s translation might have done the rounds in the various centers of learning had already either explicitly linked this view to Jinendrabuddhi. An example of the first is Dar ma rgyal mtshan, who has the correct reading of his name: “Rgyal ba’i dbang po blo gros.”¹²⁵ An instance of the second is Chu mig pa. In his examination of the same passage on delusive apprehension, albeit in a slightly different context, the manuscript of his PVIN commentary has “Rgyal ba’i blo gros” and says of him that he was “the disciple of the master [here: Dignāga]” (*slob dpon gyi slob ma*).¹²⁶ What is important in this connection is that, as far as I am aware, Jinendrabuddhi is nowhere referred to by name in the later Indian pramāṇavāda literature, let alone in the context of the discussion of the delusive forms of apprehension. For this reason, there does not seem to be any literary sources on which these Tibetan scholars may have drawn for their information about him, and this, in turn, suggests that they must have been privy to oral information

furnished them by one or another scholar of the subcontinent or the Kathmandu Valley.

On p. 151, the text mentions the late eleventh century “Kashmirian Lord” (*kha che’i jo bo*) Gnya’ na shi (= Jñānaśrī[bhadra]). The by no means uncommon transcription of Sanskrit *jñā* by Tibetan *gnya’* evidently reflects the pronunciation of *jñā* in Kashmir, as Slob dpon Bsod names rtse mo (1142–1182) indicated in his *Yi ge’i bklag thabs byis pa bde blag tu ’jug pa*.¹²⁷ Though rough contemporaries, we may parenthetically note that Rngog Lo tsā ba does not once refer to Jñānaśrībhadra’s work in his PVIN commentary, and it is not in the least unimaginable that he had no access to it. Lastly, on p. 155, the author notes that self-awareness (*rang rig*) was refuted in the *Gtsug na rin po che* and the *Shes rab le’u*. The *Shes rab le’u* points, of course, to *Bodhicāryāvātāra* IX, 17–24, where Śāntideva discusses, and then dismisses, *svasaṃvedana* (*rang rig*) as a viable epistemological category. The expression *Gtsug na rin po che* may reflect Sanskrit *Ratnacūḍa* [pariprcchu]. Of relevance to the discussion of the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsodus pa*’s authorship is that Klong chen pa’s exposition of the rejection of self-awareness in his *Yid bzhin mdzod* and *Grub mtha’ rin po che’i mdzod* employs only the well-known verses of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* III, 48, and X, 568.¹²⁸

As a polemical treatise, the *Tshad ma’i de kho na nyid bsodus pa* packs many punches. It frequently signals the interpretations of a Lo tsā ba (“translator”) – he must no doubt be identified as Rngog Lo tsā ba –, of unnamed “old Tibetan[s]” (*bod bgres po*), and a good number of other Tibetan philosophers who are mentioned by name. As our understanding of early Tibetan intellectual history is in many an aspect vague and indeterminate, it will be of some use of adjoin here the names of the many Tibetan interpreters who are named in the text, together with the page-numbers:

1. [Rngog] Lo tsā ba: 17, 33, 66, 76, 101, 116, 119, 123, 137, 139, 140, 141, 146, 147, 160, 168, 169, 176, 183, 231, 232, 234, 243, 250, 254, 257, 269, 281, 291, 293, 298, 301, 306, 308, 310, 317, 320, 321, 323, 349
2. Jo btsun: 63, 97, 99, 108, 112, 113, 138, 139, 148, 161, 176, 189, 196, 199, 206, 220, 231, 234, 251, 255, 262, 281, 285, 286, 287, 298, 311, 318, 344, 353
3. Zhang Tshes [spong Chos kyi bla ma]: 59
4. Gangs pa [She’u Blo gros byang chub]: 63, 87, 90, 128, 135, 145, 159, 160, 204, 240, 254, 257, 274, 280, 341, 345

5. Rgya [Grag pa bsod nams]: 11, 17, 19, 34, 36, 45, 57, 59, 60, 61, 81, 82, 87, 89, 90, 92, 97, 98, 100, 101, 112, 113, 115, 122, 126, 132, 134, 139, 146, 163, 169, 172, 177, 184, 193, 196, 199, 205, 207, 220, 222, 231, 234, 237, 238, 243, 246, 252, 262, 265, 274, 275, 284, 286, 287, 290, 293, 294, 298, 301, 307, 308, 311, 312, 314, 333
6. Phya [pa]: 9, 11, 34, 37, 49, 51, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 68, 72, 76, 77, 79, 91, 92, 93, 101, 108, 112, 115, 117, 123, 124, 126, 134, 145, 159, 161, 166, 167, 169, 172, 175, 177, 183, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 196, 199, 201, 211, 213, 214, 217, 220, 222, 227, 229, 237, 239, 240, 245, 249, 264, 266, 268, 273, 274, 281, 284, 287, 289, 290, 292, 293, 305, 308, 314, 315, 319, 320, 323, 324, 325, 333, 350, 351
7. Byang chub skyabs: 12, 17, 18, 23, 32, 34, 37, 50, 58, 61, 68, 73, 77, 93, 113, 115, 127, 134, 141, 175, 183, 184, 188, 190, 191, 193, 194, 200, 202, 214, 238, 239, 245, 264, 265, 268, 275, 290, 292, 306, 314, 315, 325, 339, 351
8. G.yor Gnyan 28, 56, 263 [G.yor !Rnyan]
9. Me dig pa: 89, 96, 112, 138, 147, 274
10. Stag pa: 113, 142, 240, 266
11. Gnyags: 245, 273, 345
12. Gong bur can: 342
13. Sna chung Ston pa: 352

The entry on p. 9 of *dge phya* is only superficially problematic. The term *dge* can be interpreted as an abbreviation for *dge slong* (“monk”) or perhaps even *dge ba’i bshes gnyen* (“spiritual friend”), so that *dge phya* can be rendered as “the monk Phya [pa Chos kyi seng ge] or “the spiritual friend Phya [pa].” On the other hand, if *dge phya* is to be taken as a *dvandva* compound, then it could refer to two men, namely, Rma Lo tsā ba Dge ba’i blo gros and Phya pa. The latter is of course the less likely alternative, since not only we would then expect *rma phya*, rather than *dge phya*, but also that Rma Lo tsā ba himself had written something on *tshad ma* apart from his translations. This is of course not unthinkable, but no evidence for this has turned up so far. Not recognized as a Sanskritist, a Dge bshes Mtha’ dge mthong was another senior contemporary of Rngog Lo tsā ba, who enjoyed a reputation for his expertise in *tshad ma*. Thus, Nyang ral Nyi ma’i ’od zer (1124–1192) writes in his chronicle that this Dge bshes and others “increased discriminative insight (*shes rab*),” that is, were actively teaching?, when Atiśa was staying in Dbus.¹²⁹ Be this as it may, this would be one of but very few instances where the our text under review

uses a religious epithet. An example of *dge bshes* (< *dge ba'i bshes gnyen*) prefixed to “Gangs pa” is found on p. 128.

Not a few of the names that appear in the above list are unknown quantities. This notwithstanding, the ways in which the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* cites these men allows us to hazard several tentative relative chronologies. In the first place, Me dig pa, Gangs pa and Jo btsun seem to be anterior to Rgya, and Jo btsun flourished before, or more likely, was a senior contemporary of Gangs pa. This means that he was fully contemporaneous with Rngog Lo tsā ba. A manuscript of one of the PVIN commentaries written by Dar ma dkon mchog (early 13th century) alias Dharmaratna consistently writes “Me tig pa” for “Me dig pa.”¹³⁰ The expression *jo btsun* is a title rather than a name in religion. This Jo btsun must therefore be distinguished from Jo btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan, of whom Glo bo Mkhan chen writes that this no doubt fourteenth century scholar was the author of a PV study.¹³¹ Further, Rgya, a senior contemporary of Phya pa, must be differentiated from Rgya dmar ba Byang chub grags of Stod lung, also a commentator of Dharmakīrti and one of Phya pa’s teachers. Our author did apparently not have access to his work. But Dar ma dkon mchog refers to Rgya dmar ba as “Rgya dmar”, and to the other as “Grags [pa] bsod [nams].”¹³² The otherwise equally unknown Byang chub skyabs appears to have been a contemporary of Phya pa. On occasion, the author seems to assume that he and Phya pa were engaged in a polemical exchange, and this would imply that he had before him several of their writings or, alternatively, an earlier treatise or treatises that cited them along these lines. If there were indeed such an exchange, then an instance of this may be found on p. 314. G.yor Gnyan or G.yor Rnyan can now be identified as a scholar who flourished in the first half of the twelfth century and thus was a contemporary of Phya pa. Rta tshag Tshe dbang rgyal’s monumental 1446–1447 chronicle of the Bka’ brgyud pa school notes¹³³ a certain Dge bshes G.yor Nyan, who taught *tshad ma* to Phag mo gru pa Rdo rje rgyal po (1110–1170) in circa 1137, in Rgya dmar, in Stod lung. Lastly, the clan name “Gnyags” of our text may refer to Gnyags Ye shes ’bar, whose full clan-name, “Gnyags”, and name in religion “Ye shes ’bar”, occurs in an annotation we find in the manuscript of Mtshur ston’s study.¹³⁴

Striking is that none of these interpreters of Dharmakīrti cited by our author seem to have flourished beyond the twelfth century. The absence of any reference to the *tshad ma* oeuvre of Phya pa’s many students such as Gtsang nag pa or Dan ’bag pa might thus tell us something about when he lived. Was he in one way or another personally beholden

to them and was his loyalty such that it prevented him from critically examining their positions? By contrast, Dar ma dkon mchog cites their theories a good number of times.¹³⁵ Dan 'bag pa authored a *tshad ma-Epitome*. A manuscript copy of the latter has so far remained hidden from sight, and a few scattered fragments of his writing[s] were collected by me some time ago.¹³⁶ But Dar ma dkon mchog's thirty-odd references to him now makes it possible for us to gain a much deeper insight into his philosophical views. The treatise of Dar ma dkon mchog that I quoted above also contains fairly lengthy excurses on the ontology of the apprehendable object (*gzung yul*), and the epistemology of conceptual thought (*rtog pa*) and the non-valid cognitions (*tshad min*).¹³⁷ Of interest is that he critiques there the relevant positions taken on these issues by Rngog Lo tsā ba, Me tig pa, Phya pa, and Dan 'bag pa. These critics are again internal to the Gsang phu sne'u thog tradition, and we notice there that, like the author of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*, he takes no issue with Sa skya Paṇḍita.

Given this wealth of paraphrases, it goes without saying that the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* potentially constitutes an extremely valuable dossier on the theories of these philosophers many of whose works have so far not come down to us. Its publication now makes it also possible to embark on a somewhat more contextualized approach to the study of early Tibetan Madhyamaka philosophy, especially in view of several passages in a very difficult work by Phya pa that was recently published by H. Tauscher. The *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*, pp. 8ff. and 287ff. contain a number of relevant parallel passages that point to Phya pa arguing against Rgya, among others.¹³⁸

The *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* as a rule paraphrases rather than explicitly cites from the oeuvre of these Tibetan thinkers, without naming their titles. There is one exception to this. On p. 139, the author explicitly quotes from what he says was written (*bris*) in Rngog Lo tsā ba's "Small[er] Commentary" (*tig* [*< Skt. tīkā*] *chung*) [of the *?Pramānaviniścaya*]. I discuss this passage in my study of Rngog Lo tsā ba that was mentioned before in note 14. Earlier, on p. 128, he cites a quatrain from a work by a certain Rje btsun Spyod pa, namely:

'jug yul nges pa ma rtogs pas //
tshad ma'i mtshan nyid med kyang blo //
'brel pa'i rtsa ba la brten nas //
rnam gzhaḡ dogs 'gogs yid ches rgyu //

I do not know who this may be, but I think it doubtful he is a Tibetan. The technical term *'jug yul* (*pravṛttiviśaya*) is incontrovertibly linked to Dharmottara – he may even have been the very first to use it –, and this suggests that, whoever this Rje btsun Spyod pa was, he most

likely flourished after 800 A.D. Already Rngog Lo tsā ba has this very same verse in his study of the PVIN,¹³⁹ albeit without identifying it as a quotation, let alone providing its author or source. Rngog Lo tsā ba also cites the following verse: *blun po la ni ba lang zhes ll rjes 'brel rgyu mtshan 'ga' las 'dod ll don tsam phyin ci log 'gyur gyi ll sgra ni rang gi don la gnas ll*, without attribution.¹⁴⁰ The *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* cites this verse on p. 186 and correctly says that it derives from “Bar ti ha ra’s treatise” – it corresponds to *Vākyapadiya*, II, 255. This famous verse is also quoted by, for example, Mtshur ston¹⁴¹ and other thirteenth century philosophers.

What kind of tentative conclusions may be drawn from the above? In the first place, though not airtight, the cumulative evidence strongly argues for holding that the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* was written not by the great Klong chen pa, but by another, as yet unidentified scholar who most likely flourished before Sa skya Paṇḍita. Secondly, irrespective of the as yet unresolved ambiguity of its and its author’s position in early Tibetan intellectual history, this very substantial contribution to *tshad ma* once again amply demonstrates the extent to which the Tibetan reception of Dharmakīrti’s thought in particular precipitated, very early on, a plenum of heated and lively debates. We have to thank the editor and those who played pivotal roles in the retrieval and publication of this rarity, Thub bstan nyi ma Rin po che, A khu Bu phrug, Karma Bde legs and others, for their effort that resulted in excavating this work from its undeserved obscurity and restoring it to its rightful place. Yet another treasure from the rich literary legacy of Tibet, it is destined to be of great interest to the handful of us who work in the very arcane field of Tibetan Buddhist epistemology and logic.

NOTES

* This paper reviews Klong chen Rab ‘byams pa, *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*, ed. Padma tshul khriims (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2000), 1–28, 1–3, 1–364. It incorporates some of the bibliographical results obtained during my stay in Beijing from October to December of 1992 and from July to September of 1993, made possible by a generous grant from what was then the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People’s Republic of China, New York]. There I mainly worked in the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities. The manuscripts of texts used for this paper housed in this library are marked “C.P.N.”

¹ The approximate dates for the Indian Buddhist philosophers mentioned in this paper are by and large taken from Steinkellner-Much (1995); but see also Funayama Tōru’s recent “Two Notes on Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti,” *Zinbun* 35 (2000/2), 1–11, and “On the Date of Vinitadeva,” *Le Parole e I Marmi. Studi in Onore di*

Raniero Gnoli nel suo 70° Compleanno, ed. R. Torella, Serie Orientale Roma, XCII, I (Rome: Istituto Italiana per l’Africa e l’Oriente, 2001), 309–325, and my “Authority and Tradition: Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, and the Assumed Place of Īśvarasena and Devendrabbuddhi in the History of Buddhist Logic in India,” forthcoming in *The Tibet Journal*.

² All PV references are based on the edition Miyasaka Yushō published in *Acta Indologica* II (1971/2). I retain, however, the “traditional” sequence of its chapters. Thus, Miyasaka’s chapters 1, 2 and 3 are, respectively, chapters III, I, and II.

³ *Kun mkhyen dri med ’od zer gyi rnam thar mthong ba don ldan, Snying thig ya bzhi*, vol. 9, Tsha (New Delhi, 1970), 64–82 [= *Kun mkhyen klong chen rab ’byams kyi rnam thar*, ed. Bkra shis (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1994), 208–226].

⁴ Useful bibliographies are those found in A khu Shes rab rgya mtsho’s (1803–1875) *Tho yig* in MHTL, 539–543, nos. 11802–11909, *Bod kyi bstan bcos khag cig gi mtshan byang dri med shel dkar phreng ba*, ed. Grags pa (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1985), 617–624, an [incomplete] catalogue of the libraries of Bla brang Bkra shis ’khyil monastery, and Sun-Huang (1989), 339–372.

⁵ Ingalls (1965), 47. Whether our Dharmakīrti did indeed write a work on poetics called *Alaṃkāra*, as we find in Ingalls (1965), 48, note 51, is open to question. Lastly, the poem attributed to Dharmakīrti in Ingalls (1965), 444–445, does not occur in the “Introduction to . . . [the] *Pramāṇaviniścaya*,” as we read in Ingalls (1965), 46, via the information provided by A.N. Pandeya.

⁶ Respectively, TT, vol. 21, no. 1161 [#1158], 58/7-9/1 [Ka, 203b–4a], vol. 24, 1445 [#1442], 69/7–70/3 [Wa, 242a–3b], vol. 45, no. 4156 [#4151], 474/4–532/7 [Hu, 135b–340a]. A Dharmakīrti is registered as the author of an exegesis of the *Hevajratantra*; see TT, vol. 21, no. 1194 [#1191], 390/3–414 [Nga, 236b–321a]. There, he occasionally refers to the views “some masters” (*slob dpon la la, slob dpon dag, slob dpon kha cig*) had entertained, and only once, in 398/1 [Nga, 263b], refers to a teacher by his nickname, namely, *bla ma pu la ha ri ba*, that is, the “guru from / of Pulahari.” An erstwhile see of [the] Nāropā, who passed away in 1041, Pu la ha ri (< Phullahari) was located not far from Vikramaśīla monastery. He also mentions a tale about king Indrabhūti, 404/6 [Nga, 287a], and in 413/6 [Nga, 318b], makes a distinction within the Yogācāra tradition between the so-called *rnam bcaṣ* (*sākara) and *rnam med* (*nirakara) epistemological positions. I believe this Dharmakīrti is the one who originally hailed from Gser gling (*Suvarṇadvīpa), that is, possibly Java, and was a teacher and disciple of Atiśa (ca. 982–1054).

⁷ The fine scholar and philosopher Dar ma rgyal mtshan (1227–1305) alias Bcom ldan rig[s] pa’i ral gri – I will return to him below in greater detail – remarks in his *circa* 1280 catalogue of translated scripture [and a few other matters], in DAR, 34a, that Dharmakīrti had written the *De kho na nyid gsal ba* (**Tattvanīṣkarṣa*) which “had not appeared in Tibet” (*bod na mi snang*). This title was signaled in Chr. Lindtner, “Apropos Dharmakīrti – Two New Works and a New Date,” *Acta Orientalia* 41 (1980), 29, 33–36, who noticed that it was cited in the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* and Jñānaśrīmitra’s *Sākarasiddhiśāstra*. The Tibetan tradition ascribes the first to the late sixth and early seventh century Bhāviveka. Lindtner argued for the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*’s authenticity in his “Adversaria Buddhica,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 26 (1982), 172–184 [and elsewhere], but this has been disputed by *inter alia* Ejima Yasunari and in D. Seyfort Rugg, “Bhāvaviveka / Bhavya,” *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, ed. D. Seyfort Rugg and L. Schmīthausen (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990), 62–67. In the same article, Lindtner also drew attention to another, allegedly lost work of Dharmakīrti with the equally alleged title of *Laukikapramāṇaparīkṣā*, but his interpretation of the relevant passage was firmly rejected in E. Steinkellner, “Apropos of Lindtner’s Two New Works of Dharmakīrti,” *Prajñājyoti. Gopikamoham Bha*

ṭacharya Commemoration Volume, ed. D.S. Sharma and M. Banerjee (Kurukshetra: Nirmal Book Agency, 1991), 277–286. We may add here that the Tibetan tradition is quiet on this alleged work. Mention may be made here of an otherwise unknown Vinaya commentary (*'dul ba'i tī kā*), which Śākyabuddhi (?ca. 660–720) ascribes to the “master,” here Dignāga; see his *PV *tīkā*, TT, vol. 47, no. 4225 [#4220], 115/1 [Nye, 71a].

⁸ For what follows, see *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan, Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, ed. Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaikyoku, comp. Ono Genmyō (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924–1932), vol. LIV, no. 2125, 229b,c, 230a [= Takakusu Junjirō, tr., *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671–695)* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896), 181–182, 184, 186–187]; see also the study of Yijing’s travelogue in Wang Bangwei, *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan jiaozhu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995), 204–205, 207. I should like to thank Professor Wang and my friend Dr. Shen Weirong for providing me with a copy of the latter valuable work, and my student Mr. Toh Hoong-teik for his help in interpreting Yijing. If, as is usually assumed, Dignāga lived to *circa* 540, then the term *jin* would cover a range of some two centuries, which seems to be a little too long for comfort.

⁹ For this, see Ch. Harbsmeier’s *Language and Logic, Science and Civilisation in China*, ed. J. Needham, vol. 7, part 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 361, note 4; see also the sparse remarks in U. Frankenhauser, *Die Einführung der buddhistischen Logik in China*, Opera Sinologica, Bd. 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1996), 187, 262, note 386 – Harbsmeier’s study was substantially completed in 1988 and thus written independently of Frankenhauser. Yao Nanqiang’s recent *Yinmingxueshu shigangyao* (Shanghai: Shanghai sanlian shudian, 2000), 60, does not comment on the relationship of these two translations. The same applies to Katsura Shōryū’s superbly annotated edition and study of the text, for which see the “*Inmyō shōrimonron Kenkyū* (1) [A Study of the *Nyāyamukha*, Part 1],” *Hiroshima Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō* 37 (1977), 108ff., etc. The problem of what are purported to be identical translations of one and the same text by two individuals also surfaces in Tibet. For example, Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) notes in his 1335 catalogue of the Zhwa lu Tanjur that Khro phu Lo tsā ba Byams pa’i dpal’s (1172–1237) and Chag Lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal’s (1197–1264) Tibetan renditions of Śākyasrībhadra’s (1127–1225) short **Bodhisattvamārgakramasaṅgraha* were identical (*'di dang gcig tu 'dug*); see BU, 586–587. How they really could have been identical, if in fact they were, is difficult to assess, unless of course Chag Lo tsā ba had simply copied Khro phu Lo tsā ba’s earlier translation.

¹⁰ The most recent Tibetan PV commentary seems to be Lam rim pa Ngag dbang phun tshogs’ *Tshad ma nam 'grel gyi tīka*, 2 vols. (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1997).

¹¹ See my now dated *Introduction*, pp. 13ff., to GTSANG and the equally dated references cited in note 14. Examples of later summaries written by a scholar of the Sa skya pa school are Bla ma dam pa Bsod names rgyal mtshan’s (1312–1375) *Bsdus pa che ba rigs pa'i de nyid nam par nges pa and Sde bdun gyi snying po rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rab tu gsal ba*. The relevant C.P.N. mss. were signaled in my “Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History III: The Oeuvre of Bla ma dam pa Bsod names rgyal mtshan (1312–1375), Part One,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 7 (1993), 144–145, and also in *Mi rigs dpe mdzod khang gi dpe tho las gsung 'bum skor gyi dkar chag shes bya'i gter mdzod*, vol. 3, ed. Sun Wenjing and Mi nyag Mgon po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997), 459. These are the same that were input in a computer and recently published in *The Collection (sic) Works of Bla ma dam pa Bsod names rgyal mtshan*, vol. Dha (sic) (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 673–930, 931–1137.

¹² See TT, vol. 38, no. 4021 [#4016], 201/7 [Di, 140b]: “. . . also the *Tshad ma bsdus pa* written by Master 'Dzi na (> Ch. Chenna = Dignāga), stated: ‘All cognitiveness of meditative equipoise is a valid means of cognition of immediate perception.’” (= *slob dpon 'dzi nas bstan bcos tshad ma bsdus pa mdzad pa las kyang l mnyam par gzhang pa'i sems thams cad ni mngon sum gyi tshad ma yin no zhes . . . ll*). This passage occurred in the tenth *juan* of the original Chinese text, which is now lost. Inaba Shōju, who retranslated into Chinese the missing portion from 'Gos Lo tsā ba's Tibetan text, rightly recognized that *bstan bcos tshad ma bsdus pa* can only refer to Dignāga's PS [*vr̥tti*-autocommentary]; see his “Enjiki *Genjinmikkyōshi* no sanitsuban no kanbunyaku [Restauration of the Chinese text of the Lost Section of Wonch'uk's *Jieshenmijing shu*],” *Otani Daigaku Kenkyū Nenpō* 24 (1971), 31. As the equivalent of *Pramāṇasamuccaya* [*śāstra*], Chinese *Jiliang* [*lun*] is of course attested in the writings of such other students of Xuanzang as Wengui, Shentai, and Kuiji (632–682). These make no distinction between the verse-text of the PS and the prose of the PS *vr̥tti*, of which only several fragments of the Sanskrit texts have been published so far. If anything, their references, which still require a sustained study, usually point to the autocommentary in which, to be sure, the verse-text is embedded. The seemingly sole quotation from the PS *vr̥tti* in Wonch'uk's large work is not retrievable from either of the two Tibetan translations of the text contained in the Tanjurs. The rendering of Tibetan *mnyam par gzhang* [or: *bzhag*] *pa'i sems* (?Sanskrit *samāhitacitta*) no doubt goes back to something like Chinese *dingxin*. Only available in Chinese translation[s], Dignāga's pre-PS *Nyāyamukha*'s [*zhu*] *xiudingzhe*, “[all] those who cultivate equipoise,” is a possible reflex of the PS' and PS-*vr̥tti*'s *yoginām*,” of the yogis,” as was already indicated in Hattori Masaaki, *Dignāga, On Perception*, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 47 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 94, note 48.

¹³ GSER, 13.

¹⁴ GSER, 12–14, 28–38; see also van der Kuip (1983), 29–96, and Jackson (1987), 105–106, 113–114, 127–131, 165–171, where a number of preliminary details about this tradition are provided. Aspects of Rngog Lo tsā ba's life and scholarship are detailed in my forthcoming *The Life and Oeuvre of Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab*. Paraphrasing Bu ston's 1323 PVIN commentary, Wayman (1999), 147–254, does not situate this work in the Bka' gdams pa tradition or, more specifically, in that branch Bzad ring Dar ma tshul khriims established at Khro phu monastery in the first decades of the thirteenth century. A long-time student at Khro phu, Bu ston received its *tshad ma* transmission from Bsod names mgon po (ca. 1235–1315) alias Tshad ma'i skeyes bu to whom he in fact refers several times in his work; see van der Kuip (1995), 937. Not noting this, Wayman (1999), 153, also says that the tradition of PV studies in Tibet came after Bu ston. But this is not corroborated by the Tibetan literature.

¹⁵ GSER, 42–49, 49–83. For Rgyal tshab and his *tshad ma* writings, see my forthcoming “Rgyal tshab Dar ma rin chen (1364–1432), His Oeuvre, and His Exegesis of Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*.”

¹⁶ GSER, 13.

¹⁷ GSER, 32–33.

¹⁸ The manuscript of his PVIN commentary extends over one hundred and ninety-seven folios, with nine lines per folio. The full title of this work is *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i 'grel bshad yi ge dang rigs pa'i gnad la 'jug pa'i shes rab kyi 'pd zer*. The colophon but states that “[it] was written by the logician-monk Chos kyi seng ge.” It is by no means as overtly polemical as his *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* or his two works on Madhyamaka philosophy that are signaled below in note 138.

¹⁹ Jackson (1987), 108.

²⁰ See SA, 19a [= SSBB, vol. 5, no. 20, 177/1–2 {Da, 20b–1a}] *ad* [presumably] the passage in Kajiyama Yuichi, tr., *An Introduction to Buddhist Philosophy. An Annotated Translation of the Tarkabhāṣa of Mokṣakaragupta*, Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, 10 (Kyoto: Faculty of Letters, 1966), 58–59, concerning *urdhvatā* and *tiryak* universals. This passage of the *Rigs gter* is discussed in my forthcoming paper cited above in note 15.

²¹ *Chos kyi 'khor lo bskor ba'i rnam gzhaq ji ltar grub pa'i yi ge gzu bor gnas pa'i mdzangs pa dga' byed*, *Complete Works*, vol. 16 (Thimphu, 1975), 469: *rnam 'grel lugs kyi rnam bshad kyi thog ma yin par grags l.* The late nineteenth century Sde dge print of 'U yug pa's treatise was published in *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi 'grel pa rigs pa'i mdzod*, vols. 2 (New Delhi, 1982). There is also an earlier Sku 'bum print which I have not [yet] seen.

²² GSER, 12.

²³ See his “The Autonomy of Intellectual History,” *Ideas and Events: Professing History*, ed. M.L. Brick (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 172.

²⁴ For this ancient monastery, the beginnings of which may go back as far as the turn of the ninth century, see the entry in the *Khams phyogs dkar mdzes khul gyi dgon sde so so'i lo rgyus gsal bar bshad pa nang bstan gsal ba'i me long*, ed. 'Jigs med bsam grub, vol. 1 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1999), 211–229.

²⁵ *Rnying ma'i gsung 'bum dkar chag*, ed. Thub bstan rgyal mtshan et al. (Lhasa, ?1992), 7; my thanks to E. Gene Smith for this reference.

²⁶ See my “Two Mongol Xylographs (*hor par ma*) of the Tibetan Text of Sa skya Paṇḍita's Work on Buddhist Logic and Epistemology,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 16 (1993), 279–289.

²⁷ *Rgyud bzhi'i rnam bshad*, ed. Rta mgrin rgyal (Xining:: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2000), 484. For his life and oeuvre, see Byams pa phrin las, *Gangs ljongs go rig bstan pa'i nyin byed rim byon gyi rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs* (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2000), 220–222.

²⁸ Instructive surveys of the kinds of editorial practices that went into the production of the printed Tibetan canon are found in Si tu Paṇ chen Chos kyi 'byung gnas' (1700–1774) catalogue of a Sde dge Kanjur (1733) and Zhu chen Tshul khriṃs rin chen's (1697–1774) catalogue of the Sde dge Tanjur (1744), for which see, respectively, *Sde dge'i bka' 'gyur dkar chag*, ed. Gengdeng yangjin [= ? dbyangs can] (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1989), 310–312 – this catalogue forms part of the so-called *par phul* blockprint of this Kanjur, the first edition of the Kanjur print of Sde dge Si tu Paṇ chen offered his patron the king of Sde dge, Bstan pa tshe ring (1678–1739) – and *Bstan 'gyur dkar chag*, ed. Blo bzang bstan 'dzin and Don grub phun tshogs (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1985), 549–553. Dated 1734 and bearing the same title, a longer recension of Si tu Paṇ chen's Kanjur catalogue is contained in his *Collected Works*, vol. 9 (Sansal: Sherab-ling Institute of Buddhist Studies, 1990), 1–523, where the aforesaid passage is found in identical terms on pp. 412–414. An important contribution to indigenous textual criticism is also A lag sha Ngag dbang bstan dar's (1759–after 1839) as yet unstudied *Yi ge'i mtha' dpyod ma dag pa'i dri ma 'khrud pa'i chab gtsang*, *Collected Works*, vol. Kha (New Delhi, 1971), 585–610. The Sku 'bum print of this work is there incompletely reproduced, as folio 13b was omitted. An interesting and more recent example of a Tibetan editor is Rdo bis Shes rab rgya mtsho (1884–1968), who came under fire for his unorthodox editorial practices in connection with his preparation of the Lhasa Zhol print of Bu ston's collected works from 1918–1923 and the Kanjur from 1924–1931; see H. Stoddard, “The Long Life of Rdo bis Dge bshes Shes rab rgya mtsho,” *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 4th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. Schloss Hohenkammer-Munich 1985*, ed. H. Uebach and J.L. Panglung (Munich: Kommission für Zentralasiatische

Studien. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988), 467 – the dates for his editorial activities are taken from Lis Tshun-hphu'u (< Li Cunfu), “Dge bshes shes rab rgya mtsho'i mdzad 'phrin lo tshigs (1884–1968),” *Dge ba'i bshes gnyen chen po shes rab rgya mtsho* (Xining: ?, ?1996), 502. Shes rab rgya mtsho summarized his editorial practices in his *Dag yig shes bya rab gsal la zhu dag gngang ba'i skabs kyi dpyad gnam* and *Dus gsum gyi rnam gzhas blo mun sel ba'i 'od snang la zhu dag gngang ba'i skabs kyi dpyad pa*, *Collected Works*, vol. 3 (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984), 449–451, 452–456. The first concerns his edition of Dpa' ris 'Jigs med dam chos' (1898–1946) *dag yig*-speller. Its printing blocks were deposited in Zha ho zhan dga' ldan chos 'khor gling monastery, in Gansu, but these were burned during the one of the many campaigns the Muslim-Hui warlord Ma Bufang waged in Northeast Tibet. Shes rab rgya mtsho prepared an edition from a surviving print of these blocks that was published by the Nationalities Publishing house, Beijing, in 1954. It was then reissued several times in Lanzhou by the Gansu Nationalities Publishing House. The short text in his *Collected Writings* reproduces his afterword to the published edition. I do not know when the second work, evidently a verb-table, was published. Albeit unsystematically, the very recent *Dag yig rig pa'i gab pa mngon phyung* (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2000) by Dpa' ris Sangs rgyas also contains much valuable information on Tibetan editorial [mal]practices.

²⁹ A study of Bu ston's little but important work on the editorial practice of copying (not blockprinting!) manuscripts that were to be included in the Tanjur (?the Zhwa lu Tanjur of 1335), the **Bstan bcos bzhengs pa'i chos gnyen pa dge ba'i bshes gnyan rnam kyi snyan du gsol ba*, *Collected Works*, part 26 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 344–346, will be published by K. Schaeffer in the near future. Some issues and written sources bearing on these practices are addressed in the second chapter of my forthcoming study of Rngog Lo tsā ba cited above in note 14.

³⁰ *Gnas lnga mkhyen pa'i rnam thar*, handwritten *dbu can* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002806(10), 258a. The biography extends from fols. 249a–261b of this convolute of biographies that we might tentatively call a **Bka' gdams gser 'phreng*. Another witness of this biography is the twelve-folio handwritten *dbu med* manuscript titled *Dge ba'i bshes gnyen zhang ston pa'i rnam thar* is located under C.P.N. catalogue no. 002834(8). Mchims Nam mkha' grags was the seventh and 'Gro mgon Zhang ston the fifth abbot of Snar thang monastery. The dates for these two abbots as well as those for the ones mentioned below are taken from RGYAL, written by Rgyal mtshan grags pa in 1409.

³¹ RNGOG, 1–2, 23, For the use of the *da drag*, see Ngag dbang bstan dar, *Yi ge'i bshad pa mkhas pa'i kha rgyan*, *Collected Works*, vol. Kha (New Delhi, 1971), 240–243.

³² DAG, 2a. 3a.

³³ For the first, see *Tha snyad rig gnas lnga'i byung tshul*, ed. Nor brang O rgyan, *Gangs can rig mdzod*, vol. 4 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1987), 278. For A khya Yongs 'dzin, see his *Rtags kyi 'jug pa'i dgongs 'grel rab gsal snang ba*, *Collected Works*, vol. 2 (New Delhi, 1971), 432 [= *Pra ti rin chen don grub kyi sum rtags dgongs 'grel*, ed. Grags pa (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1980), 120]. The citation of DAG in Gser tog V Blo bzang tshul khriims rgya mtsho (1845–1915), *Bod kyi brda sprod pa sum cu pa dang rtags kyi 'jug pa'i mchan 'grel mdor bsdus te brjod pa ngo mtshar 'phrul gyi lde mig*, ed. Blo bzang rgyal mtshan (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1957), 154 [= ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1995), 175–176], was briefly dealt with in R.A. Miller, “Some Minor Tibetan Grammatical Fragments,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 115 (1965), 328 [reprinted in R.A. Miller, *Studies in the Grammatical Tradition in Tibet* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V., 1976), 72].

Attributed to “some[one]” (*kha cig na re . . . zer*), Dar ma rgyal mtshan mentions, in his undated study of Indo-Tibetan linguistics, a point of view to the effect that the demonstrative pronoun *de* can indicate not only the perfective, but also the future aspect of a verb; see the *Smra ba'i bstan bcos rgyan gyi me tog ngag gi dbang phyug grub pa*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002357(7), 18b]. The first manuscript of his work contains a gloss below *kha cig* in this individual is identified as *rngog*, that is, doubtlessly Rngog Lo tsā ba. The cited verse is not found in DAG.

³⁴ DAG, 4b.

³⁵ RNGOG, 6.

³⁶ DAG, 1b, 9a.

³⁷ *Smra ba'i bstan bcos rgyan gyi me tog ngag gi dbang phyug grub pa*, 6b [= Ibid., handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002357(7), 5a.]

³⁸ *Brda gсар rnying gi rnam gzhag li shi'i gur khang*, ed. Mgon po rgyal mtshan (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1981), 2, and M. Taube, “Zu einigen Texten der tibetischen *brda gсар rnying*-Literatur,” *Asienwissenschaftliche Beiträge. Johannes Schubert in memoriam*, ed. E. Richter and M. Taube (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1978), 175.

³⁹ RNGOG, 109, 277.

⁴⁰ *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i tī ka tshig don rab gsal*, *The Collected Works of Buton (and Sgra tshad pa)* [Lhasa print], part 24 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 553.

⁴¹ For the first, see TT, vol. 40, no. 4066 [#4061], 373/3–4 [Shi, 99b–100a]. For Jñānaśrībhadrā's work, see the indices to the useful edition of Hadano Hakuyū (Sendai: Tibetan Buddhist Text Society, 1973). The colophon only states that it was “composed” (*sbyar*) by him, and relates nothing about a translator or translators; the same applies to the entries for it in the relevant later catalogues of translated scripture. If it is one, then the translation is far from smooth and certainly not always correct. Indeed, not a few of its renditions of verses from the PV – it is there curiously referred to as *Gtan tshigs (Hetu)*, *Tshad ma'i gnam* (?**Pramāṇakathā*), but more frequently as **Vārttika* (*ba tri[sic] ka* or *bar ti ka*. – are rather unintelligible. Uebe Toshiya, “Jñānaśrībhadrā's Interpretation of Bhartṛhari as Found in the *Ārya-Laṅkāvatāravṛtti* (*'phags pa lang kar gshegs pa'i 'grel pa*),” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28 (2000), 329–360, has studied his quotations from Bhartṛhari's (ca. 450–510) *Vākyapadiya*. It is generally assumed that he is the same as the Jñānaśrībhadrā who wrote a PVIN commentary, which he co-translated with Khyung po Chos kyi brtson 'grus, and who collaborated with Rma Lo tsā ba Dge ba'i blo gros on the translation of Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya*. If so, then he must have been in Tibet around the year 1050, for he collaborated with the same Khyung po in the revision of the earlier translation of the *Abhidhānottaratantra* by Atīśa and Lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po (958–1055). Whether one or two individuals with the same name, he or they hailed from, or are closely identified with, Kashmir (*kha che*). Jñānaśrīmitra is his contemporary. “Jñānaśrībhadrā” and “Jñānaśrīmitra” are at times abbreviated to “Jñānaśrī” (Tib. Ye shes dpal), and this can obviously lead to some confusion, for which see J. Naudou, *Les bouddhistes Kaśmīriens au moyen âge* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968), 178–179. When using this abbreviation, the Tibetan tradition distinguishes between them by adding *kha che* to the first and *rgya gar* [*ba*], “India[n],” or *yul dbus kyi*, “of the middle country (**madhyadeśa*) / Magadha,” to the second; for the term “magadha,” see now P. Verhagen, “Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (1): Issues of Interpretation and Translation in the Minor Works of Si tu Paṅ chen Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1699?–1774),” *Journal of International Association of Buddhist Studies* 24 (2001), 69–70. The Jñānaśrībhadrā who wrote the study of the PVIN, 600, refers to Bhartṛhari or cites a number of verses from his *Vākyapadiya*; see TT, vol. 48, no. 4233 [#4228], 490/3, 5 [Tshe, 184a, 185a], ff.

⁴² As far as canonical manuscripts on pramāṇavāda from Ta pho are concerned, see, for example, H. Tauscher, “Tanjur Fragments from the Manuscript Collection at Ta pho Monastery. *Sambandhaparīkṣā* with Its Commentaries *Vṛtti* and *ṭīkā*,” *East and West* 44 (1994), 173–184.

⁴³ So far, the earliest reference to this binary opposition is the one found in Sa skya Paṇḍita’s circa 1220 *Mkhas pa rnam ’jug pa’i sgo*, SSBB 5, no. 6, 98/4, 99/1 [Tha, 198b, 199a]. He vaguely predicates this distinction on the diction used by “early” versus “later” generations of translators, and then gives a brief list of some words belonging to the “old terminology” that, he says, “are nowadays difficult to understand.” Unfortunately, the exact diachronics of this distinction, if there ever were one, are not further clarified in Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod names lhun grub’s (1456–1532) commentary of 1527, for which see *Mkhas pa rnam ’jug pa’i sgo’i rnam par bshad pa rig gnas gsal byed* (New Delhi, 1979), 452–453. At the end of his slight gloss, he says that he intends to be more explicit elsewhere (*gzhan la bstan par bya*), but I do not know where, if he lived to have done so, he may have written about it. The same absence of specificity holds for the commentaries by Bo thar Bkra shis chos ’phel of 1997 and Mkhan chen Ngag dbang chos grags (1572–1641) of 1601; see, respectively, their *Mkhas ’jug gi rnam bshad ’chad rtsom gsal ba’i me long*, *Sa paṅ mkhas ’jug rtsa ’grel*, ed. Padma tshul khriims (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1998), 204, and *Bstan bcos chen po mkhas pa ’jug pa’i sgo’i rnam par bshad pa blo gsal mgrin pa’i dpal yon*, *ibid.*, 337 [= *Ibid.*, *Collected Works*, vol. III (Darjeeling: Sakya Choepheling Monastery, nd), 586–587].

⁴⁴ F.-K. Ehrhard, *The Oldest Block Print of Klong chen Rab ’byams pa’s Theg mchog mdzod*, Facsimile Edition Series 1 (Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2000).

⁴⁵ *Kun mkhyen chos kyi rgyal po rig ’dzin klong chen rab ’byams kyi rnam thar dad pa gsm gyi ’jug ngogs*, *Kun mkhyen klong chen rab ’byams kyi rnam thar*, ed. Bkra shis (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1994), 41–42.

⁴⁶ *Kun mkhyen chos kyi rgyal po gter chen dri med ’od zer gyi rnam par thar pa cung zad spros pa ngo mtshar skal bzang mchog gi dga’ ston* (New Delhi, 1984), 46.

⁴⁷ *’Grel pa lung gi gter mdzod*, *Mdzod bdun* [Sde dge print], vol. 2 (Gangtok, 1983), 354–355.

⁴⁸ The phrase already occurs in the *Samāhitābhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* in TT, vol. 39, no. 4043 [#4038], 195/5 [Tshi, 132b]. Other relevant passages of the *Yogācārabhūmi* that explicitly deal with the five domains of knowledge are those found in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* ed. N. Dutt (Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1978), 68, 146. For the passage of the *Viniścayanamgrabaṇā* in TT, vol. 39, no. 4043 [#4038], 409/2ff. [Zhi, 187aff.], seems to refer to the *Śrutamayībhūmi* (“in the *sa’i dngos gzhi*”) where all five are explained in great detail; see TT, vol. 39, no. 4043 [#4038], 203/6 ff. [Tshi, 161a ff.]; Yaita Hideomi edited and studied the long passage on *hetuvidyā*, for which see the references in his “*Yogācārabhūmi* and Dharmakīrti on Perception,” in Katsura (1999), 441, note 2; see also Wayman (1999), 5–41. On the role and *raison d’être* of this pentad, see the remarks in P. Griffiths, “Omniscience in the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* and Its Commentaries,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 33 (1990), 85–120, and D. Seyfort Rugg, *Ordre spirituel et ordre temporel dans la pensée bouddhique de l’Inde et du Tibet. Quatre conférences au Collège de France*, Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, fasc. 64 (Paris: Collège de France, Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, fasc. 64 (Paris: Collège de France, 1995), 101ff.

⁴⁹ It is important to bear in mind the fundamentally different conceptions of the reach, range and function of epistemology and logic in the notices concerning *hetuvidyā* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the fragments anent the same that are preserved in Vasubandhu’s *Vādaividhi*, *Vādaividhāna* and **Vādahṛdaya* {and the anonymous

Fangbianxin lun (**Upāyahrdaya[sāstra]*) and *Rushi lun* (**Tarkaśāstra*) available only in the Chinese translations}, and, ultimately, Dignāga's *Hetumukha* and PS. For the **Upāyahrdaya[sāstra]*, see Kajiyama Yuichi, "On the Authorship of the *Upāyahrdaya*," *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition*, ed. E. Steinkellner (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 107–117. Attributed only much later to Vasubandhu – Paramārtha did not do so in his biography of the master, for which see Takakusu Junjirō, "The Life of Vasubandhu by Paramārtha (499–569)," *Toung Pao* V (1904), 269–296 –, the **Tarkaśāstra* was translated from the Chinese into Sanskrit in G. Tucci, *Pre-Dinnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*, Gaekwad Oriental Series, vol. XLIX (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1929), 3–40. Its ascription to Vasubandhu seems only first attested in the catalogue of the quasi-Sino-Tibetan Buddhist canon of 1285–1287, a point made in B. Vassiliev, "'Jushih Lun' – a logical treatise ascribed to Vasubandhu," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* VII (1935–1937), 1014, 20. Details concerning this canon and its catalogue are found in H. Franke, *Chinesischer und Tibetischer Buddhismus im China in der Yüanzeit*, *Studia Tibetica. Quellen und Studien zur tibetischen Lexicographie*, Band III (München: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 69–124. This catalogue suggests that *rushilun* goes back to **tarkaśāstra*; see *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zhonglu, Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, ed. Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaikyoku, comp. Ono Genmyō (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924–1932), vol. 99, no. 25, 230a [no. 1353]. The latter point was taken over in Nanjio Bunyiu's well-known *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1883), no. 1252. However, a misreading of this catalogue's entry led him to write that "It [*Rushi lun*, vdK] agrees with Tibetan"; this work was never translated into Tibetan. Its entry was omitted [and there are others] in the *circa* mid-eighteenth Tibetan translation-*cun*-adaptation of the catalogue by the Mongol scholar Mgon po skyabs, for which see his *Rgya nag chos 'byung* (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1983), 243.

⁵⁰ On this question, see van der Kuijp (1999) and the literature cited there. It lies also at the heart of Dge ba rgyal mtshan's (1387–1462) brief disquisition on the subject in his PS commentary, for which see his *Tshad ma kun las btus pa zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa'i rgyan*, *The Collection (sic) Works of the Ancient Sa skya pa Scholars*, vol. 1 (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 450–452. Undated, Dge ba rgyal mtshan, the third abbot of 'Phan po Na lendra monastery, composed this work at one of the Sa skya pa seminaries that had been built in the meantime at Gsang phue'u thog. He doubtlessly composed it in partial reaction to Rgyal tshab's earlier study of the PS, which the latter wrote sometime between 1424 and 1432. We can of course not rule out the good probability that Dge ba rgyal mtshan had written this PS commentary with Bo dong Pañ chen 'Jigs med grags pa (1375–1451) alias Phyogs las rnam rgyal in mind as well. Of interest is that he often quotes [and corrects] there his earlier study of the *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* which, to my knowledge, has not yet surfaced.

⁵¹ Frauwallner (1982), 687; see also Steinkellner (1979), II, 32, 60, nos. 64, 178.

⁵² See, for example, Frauwallner (1982), 686.

⁵³ GSER, 12: *rang lugs kyi rtsa ba gang yod la slob dpon nyid kyi ... rang 'grel dang bcas pa ni tshig gsal zhing don 'dzin bde la rnam 'grel na tshig[s] bcad du yod pa rnam 'dir lhug par bkral bas na gzhung thun mong ba shin tu mang shing / rnam 'grel las cung zad go bde ba lta bur snang. ...*

⁵⁴ For his *tshad ma* studies in general, see Jackson (1987), 105–163, 171–177.

⁵⁵ SA, 108a [= SSB, vol. 5, no. 20, 221/4 {Da, 110a}]. For Śāṅkaranandana's oeuvre, see Steinkellner-Much (1995), 80–84 and now also H. Krasser, "On the Dates and Works of Śāṅkaranandana," *Le Parole e I Marmi. Studi in Onore di Raniero Gnoli nel suo 70° Compleanno*, ed. R. Torella, Serie Orientale Roma, XCII,

I (Rome: Istituto Italiana per l’Africa e l’Oriente, 2001), 489–508. Of course, we need to be aware that at a number of different possible scenarios may have to be considered when assessing the truth-status of this passage, where he ostensibly relates what Śākyaśrībhadrā had told him: Of the published corpus of fourteenth and early fifteenth century *tshad ma* texts, it is obvious that neither Bu ston nor Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po (1385–1438) set much store in it, and Rgyal tshab does not even mention Śāṅkaranandana in his *Rigs gter* commentary; see, respectively, van der Kuiper (1995), 938, and *A Recent Rediscovery: Rgyal tshab’s Rigs gter rnam bshad*, ed. G.B.J. Dreyfus in collaboration with Shunzo Onoda, *Biblia Tibetica* 3 (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo, 1994), 89b–92a.

⁵⁶ *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter gyi dka’ ba’i gnas rnam par bshad pa sde bdun rab gsal*, SSBB vol. 12, no. 1, 3/1 [Ga, 5a].

⁵⁷ DAR, 37a; see also Jackson (1994), 381.

⁵⁸ MTSHUR is currently being edited by Ms. P. Hugon of Lausanne University. The fact that “lamp of discriminative insight” (*shes rab [kyi] sgron ma*) is part of its title is most probably no accident and very likely a reflex of the subtitle of Phya pa’s PVIN commentary, the “light of discriminative insight” (*shes rab kyi ’od zer*). The manuscript of Chu mig pa’s work, CHU, is divided into the following six chapters: [1] A General Presentation of the Noetic and the Knowable [Object], CHU, 1b–20b; [2] Presentation of the Epistemological Object, CHU, 20b–2a; [3] A General Exposition of Valid Knowledge, 22a–9a; [4] Immediate Apprehension, CHU, 29b–35a; [5] Inference for Oneself, CHU, 35a–57a, and [6] Inference for Another, CHU, 57a–68a. We may add here that Chu mig pa figures with some frequency in Bla ma dam pa’s *Bsdus pa che ba rigs pa’i de nyid rnam par nges pa*, for which see above note 11.

⁵⁹ DAR1. 75–80 [DAR1m, 53a–6b].

⁶⁰ PHYA, 1b.

⁶¹ RNGOG, 32ff. He there takes issue with Dharmottara’s explanation of the phrase “having determined [an object]” (*[don] yongs su bcad nas*), for which see E. Steinkellner and H. Krasser, *Dharmottaras Exkurs zur Definition gültiger Erkenntnis im Pramānaviniścaya* (When: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 78ff.

⁶² See his biography by Rgyal ba’i ye shes (1257–1320), *Kun spangs chen po chos rje’i rnam thar yon tan rab gsal*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002815(5), 31a: *tshad ma rnam par nges kyi gzhung legs par mthun cing : tshig don gsal bar byed pa’i bsdus don mdzad l*. Note the rhetoric of the phrase “agreeing well (*legs par mthun*) [with] the PVIN treatise.”

⁶³ See respectively, the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter gyi dgongs don gsal bar byed pa’i legs bshad ngag gi dpal ster* (New Delhi, 1983), 13–14 the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i snang ba*, for which see *Encyclopedia Tibetica, Collected Works of Bo doing Pañ chen Phyogs las rnam rgyal*, vol. 7 (New Delhi, 1969), 455. This question is probably a Tibetan reflex of the issues surrounding the problem of the sequence of the PV’s chapters that was already discussed in India. Ngag dbang chos grags also briefly dealt with this question in his 1629 *Bod kyi mkhas pa snga phyi dag gi grub mtha’i shan ’byed mtha’ dpyod dang bcas pa’i ’bel ba’i gtam skeyes mkhas pa’i lus rgyan rin chen mdzes pa’i phra tshom bkod pa*, *Collected Works*, vol. IV (Darjeeling: Sakya Choepheling Monastery, nd), 33–36 [= ed. Slob dpon Padma lags (Thimphu, 1979), 59–63].

⁶⁴ One of these was discussed in my “Ldong ston Shes rab dpal and a Version of the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter* in Thirteen Chapters,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 2 (1986), 51–64. The numerous other references still await study.

⁶⁵ His work was published in *Tshad ma rnam ’grel gyi rnam par bshad pa gnas gsum gsal ba gangs can gyi rgyan*, ed. Sun Wenjing (Beijing: Krung go’i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1993).

⁶⁶ *Dkar chag mthong bas yid 'phrog chos mdzod bye ba'i lde mig* (New Delhi, 1987), 34. For Dmar ston, see now C.R. Stearns, *Luminous Lives. The Story of the Early Masters of the Lam 'bras Tradition in Tibet* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2001), 69–72.

⁶⁷ SA, 72b ff. [= SSBB, vol. 5, no. 20, 204/2ff. {Da, 75aff.}], which corresponds to MTSHUR, 7aff. Glo bo Mkhan chen noted this in GLO, 253 [GLO1, 161, GLO2, 255]. The passages in question formed the topic of my “When the Definition Requires a Definition: Some Remarks on *mtshan nyid* by Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge (ca. 1160–1220),” a paper presented at the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference in Hiroshima on 4–6 November, 1997. Needless to say, the edition of this section of the *Rigs gter* in van der Kuijp (1983), 85–95, was premature and urgently requires supersession. A Chinese translation of this section by Luo Zhao, and edited by Huang Mingxin, is found in *Zhongguo luojishi ziliao xuan*, ed. Yu Yu et al. (Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe, 1991), 381–420.

⁶⁸ The terminology occurs in Dharmottara’s PVIN *tīkā*, but Dar ma rgyal mtshan suggests that Dharmottara equates the definiendum with the definitional instance; see DAR1, 53 [DAR1m, 39b]. The *Hevajratantra* commentary attributed to Dharmakīrti’s namesake also knows of this triad, for which see TT, vol. 21, no. 1194 [#1191], 392/6 [Nga, 245a]. This suggests that this triad does indeed have Indian or Indic origins.

⁶⁹ *Definition and Induction. A Historical and Comparative Study*, Monographs of the Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, no. 13 (Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press, 1995), 39–64.

⁷⁰ RNGOG, 201–216, *ad* Steinkellner (1973), 26; see also Steinkellner (1979), 29.

⁷¹ PHYA, 11b–32a, GTSANG, 7a–16a, and MTSHUR, 6b–14b. Phya pa also discusses at length the notion of the definition in his *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i 'grel bshad yi ge dang rigs pa'i gnad la 'jug pa'i shes rab kyi 'od zer* [handwritten *dbu med* ms.], 6a–20b.

⁷² For this work, see my review of P.C. Verhagen, *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Vol. 2. Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), which is forthcoming in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

⁷³ *Byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa'i zin bris 'jam dpal zhal lung. The Collection of the Ancient Sa-skyapa Scholars*, vol. 2 (Dehra Dun: Sa kya College, 1999), 441–686. For what it is worth, Lho pa Kun mkhyen authored this work after Sa skya Pandita had completed his *Mkhas pa rnam la 'jug pa'i sgo*, since he quotes it on p. 477. With some variants, the citation reflects the passage found in SSBB 5, no. 6, 84/4 [Tha, 70b]. It is noteworthy to observe that Lho pa Kun mkhyen repeatedly and explicitly refers to “my lama” – see, for example, pp. 445–446, etc. This makes his work an important resource for gaining an insight into Sa skya Paṇḍita’s understanding of basic Buddhist concepts.

⁷⁴ The first is discussed at some length in T. Tillemans, “On the So-called Difficult Point of the *Apoha* Theory,” *Asiatische Studien/Études asiatiques* XLIX (1995), 853–889, Yoshimizu Chizuko, “*Dr̥śya* and *vikalpa* or *snang ba* and *btags pa* Associated in a Conceptual Cognition,” in Katsura (1999), 459–474, and van der Kuijp (1999), 652–655. A study and translation of the second will be found in Part 2 of D. Seyfort Ruegg’s *Studies in Indian and Tibetan madhyamaka Thought*, which will be published in the *Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde*.

⁷⁵ See, respectively, vol. Pha (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 721–808, 809–895, and vols. Ka and Nga (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 317–347 and 581–663.

⁷⁶ *Chos mngon pa kun las btus kyi rgya cher 'grel pa shes bya gsal byed* (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 36–38.

⁷⁷ *Tshad ma rnam nges gyi 'grel bshad shig don rnam par nges pa nyi ma'i snying po*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 004784(11) [indigenous catalogue no. *phyi zha* 22], 5a, etc. The manuscript comprises one hundred and fifty-three folios., missing are folios 34 and 75–80. The *Mkhas pa rnam la 'jug pa'i sgo* is quoted on fol. 66a, where the quatrains in question correspond to nos. 43–44 in Jackson (1987), 274–275.

⁷⁸ See, respectively, CHU and the *Tshad ma rnam nges kyī ti ka*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 004827(4), fols. 152, and the *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i 'grel pa tsin dha ra tha (sic) rin po che rigs pa'i rgyan*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. ?, fols. 44. Sun-Huang (1989), 358, register a sixty-seven-folio handwritten *dbu med* ms. of the *Tshad ma'i rnam bshad rigs pa'i de nyid gsal ba* by the Gsang phu sne'u thog affiliated scholar (*gsang phu ba*) Sing ha shri [= Seng ge dpal]. They also lists there the *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i 'grel chung tshigs su bcad pa bdun brgya pa* as an alternative title of Lho brag pa's work. I owe a copy of it to the kindness of E. Steinkellner, and this work might just be the *Tshad ma rigs pa'i rgyan*, which Skyi ston Grags pa rgyal mtshan taught the young Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan (1292–1361) in *circa* 1310; see van der Kuijp (1999), 656.

⁷⁹ MTSBUR, 3a–6b.

⁸⁰ For example, Phya pa cites him by his less common name “Blo ldan bzang po” in PHYA, 41b, anent his definition of immediate perception. He writes there politely that Rngog Lo tsā ba's claim “should be questioned” (*'dri bar bya*).

⁸¹ See van der Kuijp (1999), 657.

⁸² BSAM, 3b–4a, 8b. I am indebted to K. Schaeffer for a photocopy of this work. The copy also included the last two folios of a twenty-eight folio manuscript of Dar ma rgyal mtshan's undated commentary of Śāntarakṣita's (mid-late 8th century) *Madhyamakālaṅkāra* titled *Dbu ma rgyan gyi[s] rnam par bshad pa tshig don gsal ba'i me tog*. For a preliminary listing of Dar ma rgyal mtshan's writings, see Schwabland (1994), 21–29.

⁸³ I suspect that his name is imbedded in the following line that occurs in the colophon in BSAM, 25b–6a: ... *'di ni: mkhas mchog de nyid kyī dbon po bsod names kyī lhun po shes rab kyī rgyal mtshan gyis mngon par mtho bas cung zad bskul ba'i ngor: ...*

⁸⁴ BSAM, 19a, 20a–b.

⁸⁵ In RGYAL, Rgyal mtshan grags pa writes that Zha phug pa Slob dpon Chos kyī byang chub was appointed (*bskos nye gnas chen po*) by Tshul khriṃs 'bar, himself the first *nye gnas chen po*. Recognized as a wondrous volitional manifestation (*sprul pa*) of the Sthavira Yan lag 'byung (*Aṅgita), Chos kyī dbang phyug served as *nye gnas chen po* during the abbatial reigns of Snar thang's fourth to sixth abbots, Dpal ldan pa Bdud rtsi grags (1153–1232). 'Gro mgon Zhang ston and Skyo ston Seng ge skyabs (1179–1250) alias Sangs rgyas sgom pa, and during the beginning of Mchims Nam mkha' grags' abbacy. He was succeeded by Grub pa shes rab.

⁸⁶ For his notions of *pramāṇa*, see Schwabland (1994), 44 ff. and his “Direct and Indirect Cognition and the Definition of *pramāṇa* in Early Tibetan Epistemology,” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* XLIX (1995), 809ff.

⁸⁷ See his *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i rnam bshad rtog ge'i snang ba*, *Mngon sum* chapter, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 005148(6), 23b.

⁸⁸ These are listed in van der Kuijp (1983), 267. Gser mdog Paṅ chen's reference to the *Tshad ma rgyan gyi me tog* [by Rig ral] in his 1474 *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi dgongs rgyan lung dang rigs pa'i 'khor los lugs ngan pham byed* [Part 1], *Complete Works*, vol. 9 (Thimphu, 1975), 277, is no doubt a clip for *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, and refers to the passage in DAR1, 126ff. [DAR1m, 87a ff.]. There is also a quotation of a quatrain from an unspecified work by “the Tibetan

paṇḍita Ral gri” in his *Tshad ma rigs [pa'i] gter gyi dgongs rgyan rigs pa'i 'khor los lugs ngan pham byed* [Part 2], *Complete Works*, vol. 10 (Thimphu, 1975), 235. This Ral gri may have to be distinguished from Dar ma rgyal mtshan, and, if so, can perhaps be identified as the late fourteenth century scholar and linguist Nam mkha' smon lam alias 'Jam dbyangs Ral gri, several of whose writings were filmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Reel nos. 731/9 and 881/7.

⁸⁹ For what follows, see in part DAR1, 41–42, 37–40 [DARm, 31b–2a, 28b–30b]. The reference to Sa skya Paṇḍita only occurs in a sublinear gloss, *sa*, in DAR1, 41, line 23 [DAR1m, 31b].

⁹⁰ *Mchims nam mkha' grags kyi rnam thar*, *Bka' gdams gser 'phreng, handwritten *dbu can* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002806(10), 37b–9b.

⁹¹ See the *Dpal ldan ze'u 'dul 'dzin chen po'i rnam thar gsal byed yid bzhin nor bu*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002815(6), 16a. Bsam gtan bzang po refers to this “edition” in BSAM, 20b–1a. Evidently one of his students, the anonymous author of Ze'u's biography does not relate the number of volumes this edition comprised. MHTL, 596, no. 13419 (*sic*) registers a collection in sixteen volumes. This figure is probably based on a note to this effect by 'Gos Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481); see his *Deb gter sngon po* (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1974), 300 [*The Blue Annals*, tr. G.N. Roerich (New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979), 337].

⁹² BSAM, 16b–8b.

⁹³ This is the first recorded Tibetan exegesis of Dignāga's PS. Mkhas grub cites it in his major work on Madhyamaka philosophy – see J.I. Cabezón, tr., *A Dose of Emptiness* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 86 – in connection with Dar ma rgyal mtshan having said that Dharmakīrti had misunderstood Dignāga. Mkhas grub refers several times in his PV commentary of *circa* 1420 to unnamed commentators of the PS [and *Vṛtti*] and alternate readings of the text[s]’ Tibetan translations, one of which was discussed in my “Studies in the Life and Thought of Mkhas grub rje I; Mkhas grub rje's Epistemological Oeuvre and His Philological Remarks on Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 1 (1985), 83–87.

⁹⁴ The remarks on DAR2, his PVIN commentary, in my review in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994), 304–306, were updated in van der Kuijp (1994), 11–13.

⁹⁵ BSAM, 6a, states that he studied the *Dbang phyug [b]rtag pa* (**Īśvaraparīkṣā*) under a Ston Shag (< ?Shākya). This might be a commentary on the *Īśvaraparīkṣā*, the third chapter of Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṅgrahakārikā*. On the other hand, we cannot *prima facie* exclude the possibility that this *Dbang phyug [b]rtag pa* might refer to one or the other of Śāṅkaranandana's examinations

⁹⁶ See the *Bcom ldan rigs pa'i ral gri'i gsung rtsom dkar chag*, 2b, 3b. This computer-generated Tibetan text in eight folios is in circulation in Lhasa. Again, I am indebted to E. Gene Smith for this reference.

⁹⁷ E. Steinkellner, “Who is Byang chub rdzu 'phrul? Tibetan and non-Tibetan Commentaries on the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* – A Survey of the Literature,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 4/5 (1989), 235, observed *inter alia* that the Tibetan topical outline (*sa bcad*) technique may have its origin in Chinese Buddhist commentarial practice.

⁹⁸ The *Great Dharmottara* refers to Dharmottara's PVIN *ṭīkā*. This nickname already occurs in Zhang Gro lung pa Blo gros 'byung gnas' biography of Rngog Lo tsā ba, where he says that his master had written a “commentary on the seven quatrains of the *Great Dharmottara's ngag dang po*”; see Jackson (1994), 381. Dar ma rgyal mtshan's catalogue, in DAR, 37a, refers to it as an exegesis of this work's seven opening quatrains (*dbu'i tshigs bcad bdun gyi shes pa*), and the appendix of Bu

ston's chronicle of 1322–1326, in BU1, 1050 [BU2, 313], calls it the *Chos mchog che ba'i man ngag dang po'i tshigs bcad bdun gyi bshad pa*. Both occur in their listing of Rngog Lo tsā ba's oeuvre. RNGOG, 17, also uses this reflex of Sanskrit *adivak*.

⁹⁹ DAR2, 204, 260.

¹⁰⁰ *Bcom ldan 'das dus kyi 'khor lo'i chos 'byung ngo mtshar rtogs brjod*, handwritten *dbu med* ms. Musée Guimet, Paris, no. 54588; 44b. My thanks to Gene Smith for lending me his copy of the [incomplete] manuscript of this work. This is a piece of information on which the two other studies of Dol po pa's life are silent, for which see van der Kuijp (1999), 656–657. They do, however, state that he had studied an unidentified *Tshad ma bsod pa* under Skyi ston Grags pa rgyal mtsan at Skyi stengs monastery in Dol po in 1310. Might this refer to one of Dar ma rgyal mtshan's works? Was (?)Zhang ston then confused about the place where he may have studied it, or were the others?

¹⁰¹ MHTL, 597, no. 13433 [read *sgron* for *sgrol*]. For this work, see the remarks in E. Steinkellner, "Miszellen zur Erkenntnistheoretisch-Logischen Schule des Buddhismus: IV. Candragomin, der Autor des *Nyāyasiddhyāloka*," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 28 (1984), 177–178. Bu ston writes in his catalogue of the Zhwa lu Tanjur that some had [wrongly] considered this work to have been written not by [a] Candragomin, but by a Tibetan; see BU, 624. This note is absent in his earlier catalogue, in BU1, 971 [BU2, 251]. Dar ma rgyal mtshan's disciple Dbus pa Blo gsal Byang chub ye shes (ca. 1265–1355) alias Rtsod pa'i seng ge, too, held that [a] Candragomin was its author, as is evident from the entry in his *circa* 1310 catalogue of the Tanjur at Snar thang, in DBUS, 57b; DBUS is briefly discussed in my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History IV: The *Tshad ma'i byung tshul 'chad nyan gyi rgyan*; A Tibetan History of Indian Buddhist Pramānavāda," *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*, ed. N. Balbir and J.K. Bautze (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, 1994), 388ff.

¹⁰² For this work, see van der Kuijp (1995), 919–920.

¹⁰³ What follows is partly taken from BSAM, 5a–10a.

¹⁰⁴ DAR2, 521, also refers to him by the Tibetan translation of his name, "Sbyin pa tshul khriims." My remarks in van der Kuijp (1999), 666, about their putative relationship can now be safely ignored. In the listing of Dānaśīla's oeuvre, in DAR, 32b–3a, Dar ma rgyal mtshan calls him *bla ma paṇḍita*.

¹⁰⁵ Jackson (1987), 111. For the latter, see my "The Vicissitudes of Subhūticandra's *Kāmadhenu* Commentary on the *Amarakoṣa* in Tibet," which is under preparation.

¹⁰⁶ Ono Motoi, *Prajñākaragupta's Erklärung der Definition gültiger Erkenntnis (Pramānavārttikālamkāra zu Pramānavārttika II 1–7)*, Teil 1. Sanskrit-Text und Materialien (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000), xiv. Contrary to this, Dge 'dun chos 'phel writes in his **Thog mar lha sa nas phebs thon mdzad pa'i tshul*, *Collected Works*, vol. 1, ed. Hor khang Bsod names dpal 'bar et al., *Gangs can rig mdzod*, vol. 10 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1994), 31, that the manuscript had belonged to his colleague Vibhūticandra.

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, DAR1, 69, line 3 [DAR1m, 49a]: *gang yang kha cig. . .*

¹⁰⁸ TT, vol. 49, no. 4257 [#4252], 166/1 [Zhe, 249b].

¹⁰⁹ DBUS, 78b; the entry for Dānaśīla's little work occurs in its twenty-first chapter, in DBUS, 70a–9a, which was written on the basis of the [?copies of] rare manuscripts (*dpe dkon pa rnam*s) his colleague Rgyang ro [Byang chub 'bum] had been able to secure for the monastery.

¹¹⁰ See, respectively, BU1, 958 [BU2, 241] and BU, 587.

¹¹¹ DAR, 33a.

¹¹² TT, vol. 48, no. 4231 [#4226], 368/2 [Tse, 8b].

- ¹¹³ *Deb ther dmar po*, ed. Dung dkar Blo bzang 'phrin las (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1981), 63. This datum is absent from Mchims Nam mkha' grags' biography of 'Gro mgon Zhang cited above in note 30.
- ¹¹⁴ *Rngog lo tstsha ba chen pos bstan pa ji ltar bskyangs pa'i tshul mdo tsam du bya ba ngo mtshar gtam gyi rol mo*, *Collected Works*, vol. 16 (Thimphu, 1975), 453.
- ¹¹⁵ DAR1, 37: *myong ba dang rtags la ma brten par lkog gyur gyi don bden pa nges pa'i yid dpyod ces bya ba yod de l.*
- ¹¹⁶ DAR1m, 28b.
- ¹¹⁷ GTSANG, 23a.
- ¹¹⁸ DAR1m, 30b [DAR1, 39]: *rang gis sgro btags pa la 'jug pa* (“[a cognitive process that] engages what it has itself refuted”). Dar ma rgyal mtshan dismisses this view. Gtsang nag pa, who countenances the category of *log [par] shes [pa]* instead of *log rlog*, also has a very different view of what constitutes misconception, for which see GTSANG, 23b.
- ¹¹⁹ *Grub mtha' so so'i bzhed tshul gzhung gsal bar ston pa chos 'byung grub mtha' chen po bstan pa'i sgron me*, ed. 'Khor gdon Gter sprul 'Chi med rig 'dzin (Leh, 1978), 159.
- ¹²⁰ G.B.J. Dreyfus, *Recognizing Reality. Dharmakīrti's philosophy and Its Tibetan Interpretations* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 434, 436, E. Steinkellner, “Is Dharmakīrti a Mādhyamika?” *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, ed. D. Seyfort Ruegg and L. Schmithausen (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990), 77, and Vetter (1992), 329–330, n. 8. See also the other references in D. Seyfort Ruegg, *Three Studies in the History of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Philosophy. Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Thought*, Part 1, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Bd. 50 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2000), 30–31, n. 56. A disciple of Sa skya Paṇḍita, Ldong ston also held that Dharmakīrti was a Mādhyamika, for which see the reference in GLO, 47 [GLO1, 31, GLO2, 47].
- ¹²¹ For the last two, see, respectively, “Once Again on Dharmakīrti's Deviation from Dignāga in *pratyakṣābhāsa*,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 14 (1986), 79–97, and Funayama in Katsura (1999), 73–99. Franco briefly revisited his paper in “Did Dignāga Accept Four Types of Perception?” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 21 (1993), 295–299.
- ¹²² See TT, vol. 48, no. 4273 [#4268], 407/5–8/4 [Ye, 27b–30b] and the discussion by Funayama in Katsura (1999), 86–91.
- ¹²³ *Tshad ma'i lo rgyus*, handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 005148(9), 6 fols.
- ¹²⁴ BU1, 972 [BU2, 251].
- ¹²⁵ DAR1, 15 [DAR1m, 9a–ba].
- ¹²⁶ **Tshad ma rnam nges kyi ti ka* (*sic*), handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. ?, 31b. Not registered in Sun-Huang (1989), the manuscript has 152 folios.
- ¹²⁷ *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum*, ed. Bsod nams rgya mtsho, vol. 2 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968), no. 18, 349/2 [1736 Sde dge print, Nga, 325a] [= *Sa skya gong ma rim byon kyi gsung 'bum phyogs gcig tu bsgrigs pa legs bshad gser gyi bang mdzod*, ed. Rdo rje rin chen and Nor bu kun 'grub, vol. 4 (Lanzhou: Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1994), 808]. See also P.C. Verhagen. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet, vol. 2. Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 62–63.
- ¹²⁸ See, for example, respectively, *Mdzod bdun* (Gangtok, 1983), vol. 1, 474, 513, 522–523, and vol. 6, 190.
- ¹²⁹ *Chos 'byung me tog snying po sbrang rtsi'i bcud*, ed. Nyan shul Mkhyen rab 'od zer et al., *Gangs can rig mdzod*, vol. 5 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 470. Might he be identified as Dge bshes Mtha' bzhi Se thang pa, who also enjoyed the reputation of being “extremely learned in *tshad ma*” and who

makes a cameo appearance in Rwa Ye shes seng ge [et al.'s] imaginative narrative, the *Rwa lo tsā ba'i rnam thar* (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1989), 52?

¹³⁰ DARMA, 8b, 10b, 18a, etc. Yet another individual associated with the hamlet of Pu thang, as were Ston Shākya and Dar ma rgyal mtshan, Dar ma dkon mchog possibly wrote both in the first or second decade of the thirteenth century, or perhaps somewhat later.

¹³¹ *Sde bdun mdo dang bcas pa'i dgongs 'grel tshad ma rigs gter la nye bar mkho ba mtha' gnyis gsal byed, Tshad ma rigs gter gyi 'grel pa* ['i rnam bshad rigs lam gsal byed], ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988), 298.

¹³² See, respectively, DARMA, 63b, 67a., etc. and 74b, 75b, etc.

¹³³ *Lho rong chos 'byung*, ed. Gling dpon Padma skal bzang and Ma grong Mi 'gyur rdo rje, Gangs can rig mdzod, vol. 26 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1994), 307–308. The handwritten *dbu med* manuscript of the *Lho rong chos 'byung* under C.P.N. catalogue no. 002448(6), 173b–174a, affords the same reading of the name. On p. 608, Tshe dbang rgyal first mentions a Dge bshes G.yor Nyag who taught Dbang phyug rdo rje the PVIN and Dharmottara's PVIN *tīkā* in Chos pa my na, and notes that, later, Phya pa taught him an unidentified *Epitome* in Gsang phu sne'u thog. The corresponding passage of the handwritten manuscript is a bit messy, but has essentially the same narrative on fols. 368b–9a. In an entry for *circa* the year 1130 in the biography of the Shangs pa Bka' brgyud master Rmog cog [or: lcogs] pa Rin chen brtson 'grus (?1110–1170), we read that a Master (*slob dpon*) G.yor po was one of his friends, but he ought to be distinguished from Dge bshes G.yor Nyan who is noted a little later; see *Bla ma rmog lcog pa'i rnam thar, Shangs pa bka' brgyud bla rabs kyi rnam thar*, ed. Bsod names tshe brtan, Gangs can rig mdzod, vol. 28 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1996), 68–69.

¹³⁴ MTSHUR, annotation on 36a.

¹³⁵ See, respectively, DARMA, 15b, 17a, 22b, etc. and 5b, 6a–b, 18b, etc.

¹³⁶ Van der Kuijp (1983), 96.

¹³⁷ DARMA, 1b–4a, and 4a–11b.

¹³⁸ *Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. Dbu ma shar gsum gyi stong thun*, ed. H. Tauscher, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 43 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 1999). The colophon titles it *Dbu ma de kho na nyid kyi snying po*. A fifty-seven folio *dbu med* manuscript of this same treatise has recently surfaced, which has a few different readings from the first; my thanks to E. Gene Smith for providing me with a copy of this manuscript.

¹³⁹ RNGOG, 257. The first two lines read there: *phyogs phyi ma ni khas mi len te // dang po la yang nyes med kyang blo //*. It occurs in his comment on the passage in Steinkellner (1973), 40; see also Steinkellner (1979), 44–45.

¹⁴⁰ RNGOG, 218. It occurs in his comment on the passage in Steinkellner (1973), 30; see also Steinkellner (1979), 31–32. To be noted is that neither Dharmottara nor Jñānaśrībhadrā quote this verse from the *Vākyapadiya* in their commentaries anent this passage of the PVIN, for which, respectively, TT, vol. 48, no. 4234 [#4229], 574/7–575/1 [Dze, 182b–3a] and TT, vol. 48, no. 4233 [#4228], 496/1–2 [Tshe, 204a–b]. Neither does Jñānaśrībhadrā cite it in his *Laṅkāvatāravṛtti* referred to above in note 41.

¹⁴¹ MTSHUR, 89.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BSAM = Bsam gtan bzang po. *Bcom ldan rig pa'i ral gri'i nram thar dad pa'i ljon shing*. Handwritten *dbu med* ms. Fols. 26.
- BU = Bu ston Rin chen grub. *Bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*. In *The Collected Works of Bu ston (and Sgra tshad pa)* [Lhasa print], part 26, pp. 401–643. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971.
- BU1 = Ibid. *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod*. In *The Collected Works of Bu ston (and Sgra tshad pa)* [Lhasa print], part 24, pp. 633–1056. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971.
- BU2 = Ibid. *Bu ston chos 'byung*. Ed. Rod rje rgyal po. pp. 1–317. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988.
- CHU = Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal. *Tshad ma sde bdun gyi don phyogs cig du bsdus pa gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las nram par rgyal ba*. Handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 004827(4). Fols. 68.
- DAG = [Attributed to] Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab. *Dag yig nye mkho bsdus pa*. Handwritten *dbu can* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 004323(9). Fols. 9.
- DAR = Dar ma rgyal mtshan. **Bstan pa sangs rgyas pa rgyan gyi me tog*. Handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 005968. Fols. 38.
- DAR1 = Ibid. *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po. pp. 1–138. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1991.
- DAR1m = Ibid. *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*. Handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 002468(2). Fols. 95.
- DAR2 = Ibid. *Rnam par nges pa'i 'grel bshad chen po rgyan gyi me to, Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*. In *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po. pp. 139–521. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1991.
- DARMA = Dar ma dkon mchog. *Rtog ge rigs pa'i rgyan gyi snying po*. Handwritten *dbu med* ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 004783(1). Fols. 97 + 1.
- DBUS = Dbus pa Blo gsal Byang chub ye shes. *Bstan bcos kyi dkar chag*. Handwritten *dbu med* manuscript, C.P.N. catalogue no. 0024376. Fols. 81.
- GLO = Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod nams lhun grub. *Tshad ma rigs gter gyi 'grel pa'i nram bshad rigs lam gsal byed* [Sde dge print]. *Selected Writings*, vol. 2. Dehra Dun: Ludhing Ladrang Pal Evam Chodan Ngorpa Centre, 1985.
- GLO1 = Ibid. Ed. Rdo rje rgyal po. pp. 1–262. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988.

- GLO2 = Ibid. *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi 'grel pa'i [rnam par] bshad pa rigs pa ma lus pa la 'jug pa' sgo* [handwritten dbu med ms]. Gangtok, 1970. [In spite of its different title, it is the same work as GLO2 and GLO3.]
- GSER = Gser mdog Paṅ chen Shākya mchog ldan. *Tshad ma'i mdo dang bstan bcos kyi shing rta'i srol rnams ji ltar 'byung ba'i tshul gtam du bya ba myin byed snang ba*. *Collected Works*, vol. 18, pp. 1–138. Thimphu, 1975.
- GTSANG = Gtsang nag pa Brtson 'grus seng ge. *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i ṅi ka legs bshad bsdu pa*. Otani University Tibetan Works Series, vol. II. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1989.
- MHTL = *Materials for a History of Tibetan Literature*, part 3, ed. L. Chandra. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1963.
- MTSHUR = Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge. *Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma*. Handwritten dbu med ms., C.P.N. catalogue no. 004827(5). Fols. 67.
- PHYA = Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*. Handwritten du med ms. Fols 96.
- NGOR = Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po. *Bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag thub bstan rgyas pa'i nyi 'od*. SSBB, vol. 10., no. 157, pp. 357/4–66/4 [A, 286a–304a].
- RGYAL = Rgyal mtshan grags pa. Untitled [incomplete study of Snar thang's abbots and other important personalities]. C.P.N. catalogue no. 002816(14). Foliol. 10.
- RNGOG = Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab. *Tshad ma rnam par rnam nges pa'i dka' ba'i gnas rnam par bshad pa*. Ed. Sun Wenjing. Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1994.
- SA = Sa skya Paṇḍita. *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rang gi 'grel pa*, unpublished 1283 blockprint, C.P.N. catalogue no. 004817. Fols. 190.
- SSBB = *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum*, vols. 15. Comp. Bsod nams rgya mtsho. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968–1969.
- TT = *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Taipei* [= 1744 Sde dge] *Edition*, vols. 53, ed. A.W. Barber. Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc., 1991.

REFERENCES

- Frauwaller, E. (1982). 'Die Reihenfolge und Entstehung der Werke Dharmakīrti's', in G. Oberhammer and E. Steinkellner (eds.), *Kleine Schriften*. Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 22, pp. 677–689. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- Funayama, Tōru (1999). 'Kamalaśīla's Interpretation of 'Non-erroneous' in the Definition of Direct perception and Related Problems', *Katsura*: 72–99.
- Ingalls, D.H.H. (1965). *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: Vidyākara's "Subh āṣītaratmakōṣa"*, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 44. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Jackson, D.P. (1987). *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III). Sa skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāna and Philosophical Debate*. Vol. 1. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 17,1. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Jackson, D.P. (1994). 'An Early Biography of Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab', in P. Kvaerne (ed.), *Tibetan Studies, Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Buddhist Studies Fagernes 1992*, vol. 1, pp. 372–392. Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture.
- Katsura Shōryū (ed.) (1999). *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact of Indian and Tibetan Philosophy*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J. (1983). *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology From the Eleventh to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, Band 26. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J. (1994). 'On Some Early Tibetan *Pramāṇavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing', *Journal of Buddhist and Tibetan Studies* 1: 1–30.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J. (1995). 'Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History VI: The Transmission of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda* According to Early Tibetan *Gsan yig-s'*', *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* XLIX: 919–941.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J. (1999). 'Remarks on the 'Person of Authority' in the Dga' ldan pa / Dge lugs pa School of Tibetan Buddhism', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119: 646–672.
- Schwabland, P. (1994). *A General Exposition of Valid Cognition. The Initial Chapter of Bcom ldan Ral gri's Introduction to Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology*. M.A. Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Steinkellner, E. (1973). *Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviniścayaḥ. Zweites Kapitel: Svārthānumānaḥ*. Teil I, Tibetischer Text und Sanskrittexte. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Steinkellner, E. (1979). *Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviniścayaḥ. Zweites Kapitel: Svārthānumānaḥ*. Teil II, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Steinkellner, E. and M.T. Much (1995). *Texte der erkenntnistheoretischen Schule des Buddhismus*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 214. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sun Wenjing and Huang Mingxin (1989). 'Zangwen yinmingshu mu', in Liu Peiyu et al. (eds.), *Yinming xintan*, pp. 329–373. Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe.
- Wayman, A. (1999). *A Millenium of Buddhist Logic*. Vol. 1. Buddhist Tradition Series, vol. 36. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies
Harvard University
2 Divinity Avenue
Cambridge MA 02138
USA
E-mail: vanderk@fas.harvard.edu