

# Studies in Btsun pa Ston gzhon's *Pramāṇavārttika* Commentary of ?1297


## Part One: Preliminary Observations and the Import of its Title

Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp

### ABSTRACT

Hitherto little known, Btsun pa Ston gzhon was a thirteenth and early fourteenth century scholar who was active in, among other places, Sa skya monastery, the Yuan capital of Dadu (present-day Beijing), and in his monastery of Gnyan phu in Tshes spongs. He apparently wrote two studies on Buddhist logic and epistemology of which so far only his exegesis of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* has become available. In this article, I begin a study of the latter work, which, even if it appears to have remained largely unknown to later Tibetan intellectual circles, offers very important insights into Tibetan Dharmakīrti studies of the thirteenth century, the vehement disagreements he had with 'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge (13<sup>th</sup> c.), his senior fellow Sa skya pa intellectual and the first Tibetan *Pramāṇavārttika* commentator, and how attempts continued to be made in finetuning Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Pramāṇavārttika* translation.

### PREAMBLE

he existence of what appears to be a rare if not a unique manuscript of a commentary on Dharmakīrti's (ca. 550 or ca. 600-60)<sup>1</sup> versified *Pramāṇavārttika* by the elusive and largely

---

<sup>1</sup> The approximate dates of the Indian Buddhist philosophers whose focus was logic and epistemology (*pramāṇa*) are taken from E. Steinkellner's and M.T. Much's very useful *Texte der erkenntnistheoretischen Schule des Buddhismus*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 214 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995). This valuable resource is continued on-line at <http://east.uni-hd.de/>. In this connection, we should also mention the rewarding essays on the transmission of the Sanskrit and Tibetan text[s] of the *Pramāṇavārttika* in E. Franco, "The Tibetan Translations of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the Development of Translation Methods from Sanskrit to Tibetan," *Tibetan Studies*, vol. 1, ed. H. Krasser et al. (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 277-288, and especially B. Kellner, "Towards a Critical Edition of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 52-3 (2009-10), 161-211. For the recent argument for the period of ca. 550 for Dharmakīrti's activities, see

forgotten Btsun pa Ston gzhon — *btsun pa* is of course an honorific word for "man of the cloth, monk" — was first signaled, so it would appear, in the handy catalog of translated Indian Buddhist works on logic and epistemology (*pramāṇa*) and indigenous Tibetan works on the same (*tshad ma*) that Sun Wenjing and Huang Mingxin compiled now some twenty-five years ago.<sup>2</sup> It is a matter of good fortune that this work now lies before us in printed form from the experienced editorial pen of the same Sun Wenjing, making it the second thirteenth century Tibetan *Pramāṇavārttika* exegesis that is now available to those whose intellectual curiosity on occasion compels them to venture into the arcanae of *tshad ma*.<sup>3</sup> In an ideal world, unique manuscripts of this kind would be made available in a facsimile edition or, perhaps better and cheaper, they would be scanned and then posted on the Internet. But for better or for worse, we did not live in an ideal world when, fortunately, I was able to acquire a microfilm copy of the original manuscript in 1993. This placed me in the happy position to be able to consult it along side the printed edition; it also allowed me to provide more details about it than Sun considered useful or necessary. Even more fortunately, modern technology has prevailed in the meantime, and the microfilm has been scanned and is now available for consultation in reasonably legible form on the web

---

H. Krasser, "Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḥ," *Devadattiyam. Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*, ed. F. Voegeli et al. (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 587.

<sup>2</sup> See their "Zangwen yinming shumu," *Yinming xintan*, ed. Liu Peiyu et al. (Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe, 1989), 358.

<sup>3</sup> Sun also edited an *dbu med* manuscript in 123 folios of one of Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab's (ca. 1059-1109) two studies of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, namely, his *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). This *dbu med* manuscript, which lacks the first folio, is listed under C.P.N. catalog no. 005153(1) – C.P.N. refers to the Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities, in Beijing; see also their "Guonei bufen dushuguan(shi)so zangwen yinming shumu," *Yinming xintan*, ed. Liu Peiyu et al., 358. Another incomplete *dbu med* manuscript of the same work in 132 folios, but one of greater interest in view of the many glosses it contained, was cataloged under C.P.N. no. 005139(1). As is indicated in *Bod khul gyi chos sde grags can khag gi dpe rnying dkar chag*, ed. Ska ba Shes rab bzang po et al. (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2010), 209, no. 00711, what appears to be the same manuscript — it also consists of 132 folios! — is currently located in the Theg chen gling seminary of Se ra monastery. Another manuscript of this work in 144 folios was recently published in *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 1, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006), 419-705, and again, this time in printed form, in *Rngog Lo tsā ba blo ldan shes rab kyi gsung chos skor*, Bka' gdams dpe dkon gces btus, vol. 3, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2009), 53-359. The original manuscript was apparently incomplete; fols. 133-144 [638-705] were taken from another manuscript of the same.

at tbrc.org W26440. The manuscript's pagination with Arabic numerals in the upper left corner of every folio side is of course of recent vintage and must have gone in tandem with the preparation of its eventual publication by Sun.

While Sun's edition of Ston gzhon's work was published as long ago as 1993, to my knowledge it has to date been by and large ignored in the secondary literature. Aside from my own use of it in an earlier paper, T.J.F. Tillemans is the only one known to me who has also referenced it.<sup>4</sup> But this is really not that difficult to explain. In spite of the great strides that have been made in recent years in our understanding of the early development of Tibetan Buddhist *tshad ma* and the accompanying enculturation of Indian Buddhist *pramāṇa* in Tibet, especially through the recent stellar contributions by P. Hugon,<sup>5</sup> it is still a rather little visited area of scholarship. However, what is perhaps less easy to explain is the silence surrounding this and Ston gzhon's other, earlier cognate work, on which see briefly below, within the scholarly communities of the Sa skya pa school, let alone those of the other schools of Tibetan Buddhism. One could suggest various hypotheses. For example, it may have been the case that no one outside his immediate circle of intellectuals considered his contributions to be landmark studies in the field. If so, they would have quickly fallen out of use and become victims of the grindstone of history. Or, to put it differently, while they may have indeed been studied by a relatively small band of intellectuals, other cognate tracts nonetheless quite rapidly superseded them and whatever memory of them there was, dissolved into an unintentional forgetfulness. Perhaps the reason for it was a mere accident or a sheer fluke. It is a truism that the paths taken by the fecund history of the Tibetan commentarial literature on virtually every conceivable subject are littered with treatises that for one reason or another fell by the wayside. They were taken from the monastic library's bookshelves with decreasing frequency until they were consistently ignored and then completely forgotten. Or, what seems even more likely, Ston

---

<sup>4</sup> See, respectively, my "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 (1999), 646-72, and his *Scripture, Logic, Language. Essays on Dharmakīrti and His Tibetan Successors* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1999), 183, n. 5, and the similar gloss on p. 270, n. 12.

<sup>5</sup> See above all her hugely impressive *Trésors du raisonnement. Sa skya Paṇḍita et ses prédécesseurs tibétains sur les modes de fonctionnement de la pensée et le fondement de l'inférence. Édition et traduction annotée du quatrième chapitre et d'une section du dixième chapitre du Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, 2 vols., Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 69, 1-2 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2008), and her other cognate publications that can be gleaned from her CV that is available on-line

gzhon had not been able to attract a following of disciples and patrons that was sufficiently large to ensure a more widespread dissemination of his oeuvre. On the other hand, we should not discount the possibility that the reason for the neglect of his work within Sa skya pa circles should be sought in his repeated and severe critiques of many of the interpretations offered by 'U yug pa Bsod nams seng ge (ca. 1195-after 1267), alias Rigs pa'i seng ge. After all, 'U yug pa was among the most senior disciples of Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182-1251), the founder of Sa skya pa *tshad ma* studies, and it may very well be that Ston gzhon's hard-hitting critiques did not sit well with the later Sa skya pa orthodoxy. But this argument has its weaknesses. We know that 'U yug pa was the first Tibetan commentator of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and possibly also the very first to write a commentary on the versified *Rigs gter*, which his master may have completed in 1219 – the *Rigs gter* and its autocommentary marked the beginning of the so-called Sa skya pa or *Sa lugs* tradition of Tibetan *tshad ma* studies.<sup>6</sup> But we are still a long way off in being able to explain the fact why neither 'U yug pa's nor Ston gzhon's treatises appear to have enjoyed much overt attention from such fourteenth century Sa skya pa *Pramāṇavārttika* commentators as Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312-75) and Red mda' ba Gzhon nu blo gros (1349-1413). It is of course quite possible that Bla ma dam pa and Red mda' ba were content to let the Tibetan translation of the *Pramāṇavārttika* speak for itself, with a minimum amount of hermeneutic interference from its Indian and Tibetan commentators. If true, then they would appear to be following in the footsteps of the exegetical method Sa skya Paṇḍita himself had sought to employ in his *Rigs gter*. To be sure, things are but a little different when we examine the two surveys of *tshad ma* that Bla ma dam pa had written in 1342. He only notes 'U yug pa a few times in these and he does not at all refer-

<sup>6</sup> For some remarks on the *Sa lugs*, see my "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 31 (2003), *passim*, and also Hugon, *Trésors du raisonnement. Sa skya Paṇḍita et ses prédécesseurs tibétains sur les modes de fonctionnement de la pensée et le fondement de l'inférence. Édition et traduction annotée du quatrième chapitre et d'une section du dixième chapitre du Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, vol. 1, 95-130. 'U yug pa's *Rigs gter* commentary was recently published in RGR. For a survey of the *Rigs gter* commentaries that have been published to date, exclusive of 'U yug pa's important work, see Hugon, vol. 2, 373-8. For a complete Chinese translation of the text of the 1736 Sde dge xylograph of this work, see the *Liangli baozang lun*, tr. Mingshing Fashi (Taibei: Dongchu chubanshe, 1994). I should like to thank Dr. Gao Zezheng, Chengdu, for kindly providing me with a copy of this work. An earlier Chinese translation by Luo Zhao and edited by Huang Mingxin of the first eight chapters [of the same Sde dge xylograph of the text] was published in *Zhongguo luoji shi ziliao xuan*, ed. Lu Yu, et al. (Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe, 1991), 267-420.

ence, at least not overtly, Ston gzhon.<sup>7</sup> Several fifteenth and sixteenth century Sa skya pa [and Dga' ldan pa] writers on the *Pramāṇavārttika* do mention 'U yug pa,<sup>8</sup> and Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod nams lhun grub (1456-1532) took issue with his *Rigs gter* commentary on several occasions in his own 1482 study of the text.<sup>9</sup> Whatever the case may have been, the causal complex, the *hetusāmagrī*, as the Indian Buddhist logicians would say, that led to the excavation, publication, and consequent rescue from oblivion of these writings of Ston gzhon and 'U yug pa is a rather fortuitous one in that, as I especially hope to show for the first in the pages that follow, these should be judged as significant achievements for a variety of reasons. In other words, my argument regarding their importance does not merely reside in the fact, to paraphrase a well-worn phrase, "because they are there." Truth be told, being "there" is hardly an adequate reason. Rather, these treatises are important tesserae in the expansive mosaic of the *tshad ma* tradition in Tibet even if, as is not impossible, the tradition regarded Ston gzhon's contribution a far cry from being exemplary and that its silence on the matter was politic.

<sup>7</sup> See *Bsdus pa che ba rigs pa'i de nyid rnam par nges pa* [or: *Tshad ma mdo sde bdun 'grel bshad dang bcas pa'i snying po rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rnam par nges pa*] and *Sde bdun gyi snying po rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rab tu gsal ba* [or: *Sde bdun mdo 'grel pa 'grel bshad dang bcas pa'i snying por gyur pa rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rab tu gsal ba*], *Collected Writings*, vol. Da (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 673-930, 931-11378. What also stands out in these texts is that Bla ma dam pa profusely cites from Jinendrabuddhi's (ca. 710-70) commentary on Dignāga's (ca. 480-540) *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and Mokṣakaragupta's (ca. 1050-1200) *Tarkabhāṣā*. This probably has everything to do with the fact that he had studied these texts with their translator Dpang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa (1276-1342). Judging from the disproportionate large number of references, his primary, but by no means his only, target of criticism in these is the positions taken earlier by Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal (13<sup>th</sup>c.). I hope to return to this interesting and controversial thinker on another occasion.

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po (1385-1438) in MKHAS, vol. Tha, 945 and vol. Da, 357 [=MKHAS [1], 300, 657], and Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge (1429-89), who, in his *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary of 1474, refers to a position on the ontology of the universal that G.B.J. Dreyfus, *Recognizing Reality. Dharmakīrti's Philosophy and Its Tibetan Interpretations* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 190-1, quite rightly traced to 'U yug pa.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, his NYI, 16, 27-8, etc. [=NYI[1], 16, 27-8, etc.; NYI[2], 12, 18-9, etc.]. In spite of the different titles, these are three editions of the same work; see also J. Kramer, *A Noble Abbot from Mustang. Life and Works of Glo bo Mkhan chen (1456-1532)*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 68 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2008), 191-3. Interestingly, the *Rigs gter* studies of G.yag ston Sangs rgyas dpal (1348-1414), Rong ston Shākya rgyal mtshan (1367-1449), Gser mdog Paṅ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428-1507), Go rams pa, Mus Rab 'byams pa Thugs rje dpal bzang po (14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup>c.), Mang thos Klu sgrub rgya mtsho (1523-96), and Mkhan chen Ngag dbang chos grags (1572-1641) but rarely mention him.

The present essay, the first installment of my assessment of Ston gzhon, his work, and the intellectual-historical context of both is divided into five sections. In the first of these [1], I briefly discuss the relationship of the manuscript and the printed text. This sets the stage for the next section [2] in which I survey the salient external features of those Tibetan studies of the *Pramāṇavārttika* that preceded him and the one study with which he was assuredly quite familiar, namely, 'U yug pa's commentary. The section that follows it [3] gives an overview of the Sa skya [or Śa skya school affiliated] monasteries where the *Rigs gter* and the *Pramāṇavārttika* were taught and the three *Rigs gter* commentaries that were written by Sa skya Paṇḍita's disciples. Depending on obvious context, I will at times use *Rigs gter* to denote both the verse text as well as the prose autocommentary. In the next section [4], I examine the little that is reported about several thirteenth century individuals who are also referred to as Ston gzhon and include in my narrative the briefest of outlines of the life of whom I believe to be our Ston gzhon. Owing to the restrictions placed upon me by the paucity of relevant sources, the descriptive picture that emerges of him is admittedly not very thick on details. And in the last section [5], I consider the meaning and implication of the title of his work and consider a few of its introductory verses. Different aspects of Ston gzhon's treatise and his commentarial practice will be considered in the immediate sequel to this essay. These will focus on his method of exegesis, discuss his sparing use of the *Rigs gter* and in tandem with this indicate the deep problems that are associated with the transmission of the text of this work and that of its autocommentary, and examine in some detail the recommendations his teachers had made to him for making certain changes in the received Tibetan translation of several of the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s verses.

### 1. The Manuscript of Ston gzhon's *Pramāṇavārttika* Exegesis

The manuscript of Ston gzhon's work consists of one hundred and ninety-one folios and is written in a rather exquisite cursive *dbu med* script. The indigenous catalog number of the unknown monastic library in which it was originally deposited appears as *phyi zha 5* on the upper-center of the title folio - the term *phyi* seems to indicate that it did not belong to the original holdings of the library in which it was housed and that it had recently, whenever that may have been, come in from the "outside." The manuscript was one of the close to a hundred thousand manuscripts [and xylographs] that were taken to Beijing in the early 1960s, that is, prior to the "Cultural Revolution". There they formed the largest part of the holdings of the newly estab-

lished China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities, which, so I was told, was the brainchild of then Premier Zhou Enlai. It turns out that Zhou's alleged directive to collect these manuscripts [and xylographs] was surely quite prescient and fortuitous. Indeed, there is no question that, had these manuscripts not been carted off to Beijing at the time, many would have fallen victim to the countless bonfires that lit up the thin Tibetan skies in the late 1960s as Chinese *and* Tibetan Red Guards burned or plundered whatever they could get their hands on while rampaging through the countless temples and monasteries that dotted the landscape of those huge tracts of land where Tibetan Buddhism [and of course also Bon] held sway, wreaking havoc on the Tibetan literary heritage.

The majority of folios of the manuscript of Ston gzhon's work contain eight lines; occasionally they have only seven. Editorially speaking, the manuscript is almost pristine for, unlike many others that I have seen, it contains very few interlinear or marginal glosses. It does, however, at times have very short, corrective notes that owe their origin to the manuscript's proofreaders. These anonymous proofreaders, one of whom may have been the unknown scribe of the manuscript himself, evidently made these corrections to the copied text on the basis of a comparison with the readings of the manuscript of which it was a copy. In other words, these notes have as a rule naught to do with a later reader's comments on Ston gzhon's interpretations. It is gratifying that when we compare the manuscript with the published edition, the latter attests to the general meticulousness and reliability of Sun's efforts. An edition of this kind can of course never be a substitute for the original. And the first few folios deliver up but a few oversights or minor misreadings in the edited text so that research into Ston gzhon's *Pramāṇavārttika* study can by and large afford to dispense with an inspection of the original manuscript.<sup>10</sup> However, it should be pointed out that Sun made many editorial "corrections" of the nominal suffix *ba* for the original *pa*, as in *snang pa ~ snang ba*, *'byung pa ~ 'byung ba* etc. And he also incorporated what I take to be the proofreader's corrective glosses, albeit without signaling where exactly these were found in the manuscript.<sup>11</sup> We probably have to reckon with at least two different proof-

<sup>10</sup> For example, STONm, 2a, of the manuscript has *khyad par tu* which the printed text in STON 5, 1.1 reads as *khyad par du*. I will henceforth only refer to STONm when its text departs from STON.

<sup>11</sup> The following sublinear glosses [in bold characters] are found in fol. 2a of the manuscript: STONm, 2b, 1.5: *...gti mug rna[m]s las ~ STON, 5, 1. 23; STONm, 2b, 1.7: nyon mongs pas nyon mongs pa ~ STON, 6, 1.5; STONm, 2b, 1. 8: de dag ni ~ STON, 6, 1. 8. The places where the first and the third are to be inserted are marked with a "+" sign; the third has a dotted line connecting the +-sign with the gloss. For such*

readers, since these glosses sometimes occur in two different scripts, *dbu med* and *dbu can*, on one single folio.<sup>12</sup> On occasion, these editorial glosses are extremely difficult to read and this is no doubt the reason why Sun omitted these in his edited text.<sup>13</sup>

Needless to say, a very useful feature of his edition is that the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s verse-text is printed in bold characters, thereby making it easy to distinguish the commentary from the commented on text. The manuscript itself facilitated this, for the verse-text is highlighted therein through the use of different color ink. No printing blocks seem ever to have been carved for Ston gzhon's work. Indeed, as I suggested above, it seems to have fallen dead from the author's pen, for I have yet to come across an explicit mention of it in the subsequent Tibetan *tshad ma* literature. Not even the great Gser mdog Paṅ chen, Glo bo Mkhan chen, the former's erstwhile student and later one of his more uncompromising critics, or Mkhan chen Ngag dbang chos grags and Bdud 'joms dpa' bo (1582-?), all of whom display in parts of their oeuvre a keen interest in the historical and theoretical developments of *tshad ma* studies in Tibet, expressly mention him or his treatise.<sup>14</sup> The only occasion where a Ston gzhon is mentioned as a disciple of 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po (1235-80), Sa skya Paṅḍita's nephew, and a teacher of Nor bu bzang po is a gloss in the chapter on *pramāṇa* / *tshad ma* of Ngag

---

markers and a great deal more items having to do with manuscripts, see C.A. Scherrer-Schaub, "Towards a Methodology for the Study of Old Tibetan Manuscripts: Dunhuang and Tabo," *Tabo Studies II. Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions and the Arts*, ed. C.A. Scherrer-Schaub and E. Steinkellner, Serie Orientale Roma LXXXVII (Rome: Istituto Italiana per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 1999), 3-36, and C.A. Scherrer-Schaub and G. Bonani, "Establishing a typology of the old Tibetan manuscripts: a multidisciplinary approach," *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*, ed. S. Whitfield (London: The British Library, 2002), 184-215 [= *Ibid. The Cultural History of Western Tibet. Recent Research from the China Tibetology Center and the University of Vienna*, ed. D. Klimburg-Salter, Liang Junyan et al. (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 2008), 299-337].

<sup>12</sup> STONm, 2b, l. 5, 8.

<sup>13</sup> STONm, 25a *ad* STON, 67, l. 2-3.

<sup>14</sup> For Ngag dbang chos grags, see the relevant portions on *tshad ma* in the texts that are included in his collected writings, vol. IV; these followed from his 1629 *Bod kyi mkhas pa snga phyi dag gi grub mtha'i shan 'byed mtha' dpyod dang bcas pa'i 'bel ba'i gdam skyes dpyod ldan mkhas pa'i lus rgyan rin chen mdzes pa'i phra rtsom bkod pa*, *The Collection (sic) Works of Mkhyen (sic) chen Ngag dwang (sic) chos grags*, vol. IV (Darjeeling: Sakya Choepheling Monastery, 2000), 30-61 [= *Pod chen drug gi 'bel gdam*, ed. Slob dpon Padma lags (Thimphu, 1979), 52-110]. For Bdud 'joms dpa' bo, see the second chapter of his as yet unpublished 1634 critical review of Ngag dbang chos grags' *Pod chen drug gi 'bel gdam*, the *Rgyal ba'i bka' dang dgongs 'grel gyi gzhung lugs brgya phrag dag las legs bshad kyi gdam du bya ba rgya bod kyi grub mtha' rnam par 'byed pa lung rigs rgya mtsho'i snying po mkhas pa dga' byed rin po che'i rgyan, dbu med* manuscript in 51 folios.



dbang chos grags' treatise.<sup>15</sup> Being a gloss we cannot of course unequivocally assume that it originated from this learned author's pen.

## 2. Pre-Ston gzhon Tibetan *Pramāṇavārttika* Exegeses

It should go without saying that Ston gzhon did not work in a vacuum and that, aside from the Tibetan translations of the Indian commentarial literature on Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and Dharmakīrti's oeuvre, he was very much aware of the considerable corpus of Tibetan assessments of the writings of and positions taken by these Indian philosophers. In this and the next section, I will only focus on the *tshad ma* writings of Sa skya pa philosophers of the thirteenth century, that is, of those who were exponents of the incipient *Sa lugs*, for it is not unreasonable to assume that Ston gzhon was familiar with a substantial number of their relevant writings. This is of course not to say that we will completely ignore the large number of *tshad ma* contributions made by members of the *Rngog lugs* tradition[s] that, beginning with Rngog Lo tsā ba's writings on *tshad ma*, was initially centered in Gsang phu sne'u thog monastery in Dbus after which it spread throughout many other Central Tibetan monasteries belonging to the Bka' gdams pa school during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, their focus on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* in particular must also be taken into account, the more so because of the intimate relationship that this work has with the *Pramāṇavārttika* on textual and philosophical levels. On another occasion, I hope to devote a separate study of this tradition's history and how it developed during

<sup>15</sup> *Bod kyi mkhas pa snga phyi dag gi grub mtha'i shan 'byed mtha' dpyod dang bcas pa'i 'bel ba'i gtam skyes dpyod ldan mkhas pa'i lus rgyan rin chen mdzes pa'i phra rtsom bkod pa*, 37 [= *Pod chen drug gi 'bel gtam*, 64]. For the circa mid-fourteenth century Nor bzang[s] dpal which when written in full would give "Nor bu bzang po dpal [bzang po]" and might have been Btsun pa Ston gzhon's disciple, see my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History IV: The *Tshad ma'i 'byung tshul 'chad nyan gyi rgyan*: A Tibetan History of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda*," *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*, ed. N. Balbir and J.K. Bautze (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, 1994), 375-93. See also *infra* n. 77.

<sup>16</sup> For some notes on this exegetical tradition, see my "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," *passim*. See now also *Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge. Tshad ma Shes rab sgron ma*, ed. P. Hugon, *Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Heft 60 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2004), *passim*, as well as Hugon's remarkable *Trésors du raisonnement. Sa skya Paṇḍita et ses prédécesseurs tibétains sur les modes de fonctionnement de la pensée et le fondement de l'inférence. Édition et traduction annotée du quatrième chapitre et d'une section du dixième chapitre du Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, vol. 1, 15-94.

these centuries, but in this essay I have had to draw a line in the sand and, at my peril, made the decision to exclude it from my historical narrative.

To be sure, Ston gzhon's work as such had several important precedents. It is by now well known that the Tibetan tradition holds that the very first of the long string of *Pramāṇavārttika* commentaries written in Tibet until the present day<sup>17</sup> was the one authored by 'U yug pa. A xylograph belonging to the late nineteenth century Sde dge printing blocks of his work, the *Rigs mdzod*, was reprinted in 1982, and has been profitably used on several occasions in the secondary literature. 'U yug pa's work now also appears to be extant in a somewhat earlier xylograph from Sku 'bum monastery and the manuscript[s] on which that one is based may be differently filiated than the one[s] of the Sde dge print. To my knowledge, a xylograph from these blocks has not yet surfaced. The reason why printing blocks for the work of this Sa skya pa scholar should be carved at Sku 'bum – after all, this is a Dge lugs pa and not a Sa skya pa monastery – is most likely due to the circumstance that, as Mkhas grub had written in his biography of Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357-1419), his master Tsong kha pa had been profoundly moved by 'U yug pa's comments on the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s second, *Pramāṇasiddhi* chapter, when he studied it under a Bsod nams grags pa in 1378.<sup>18</sup> It is well to remember that Sku 'bum was built on the site where Tsong kha pa was born. The recently published typeset edition of this treatise is based on the Sde dge and Sku 'bum xylographs, as well as on what is evidently a much older manuscript from 'Bras spungs monastery.<sup>19</sup> The work itself is undated and will most likely remain so, unless 'U yug pa's biography or other sources turn up that have something to say about this matter. For this reason, the parameters that can be used at present to date it are a trifle too broad to be altogether informative. Thus, it is not really helpful that, as things stand now, we can say with some confidence that 'U yug pa wrote the *Rigs mdzod* after Sa skya Paṇḍita and the Kashmirian scholar Śākyaśrībhadrā (1127-1225) plus unnamed others had either reworked the earlier Ti-

<sup>17</sup> The last one may very well be Lam rim pa Ngag dbang phun tshogs, *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi tika* [gzur gnas dgyes pa'i mchod sprin], 2 vols. (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1997). The author completed this work in 1996 in 'Bras spungs monastery.

<sup>18</sup> *Rje btsun bla ma tsong kha pa chen po'i ngo mtshar rmad du byung ba'i rnam par thar pa dad pa'i 'jug ngogs*, *Collected Works* [of Tsong kha pa, Zhol edition], vol. Ka (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 37-8 [= Sku 'bum edition, ed. Grags pa rgya mtsho (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1982), 32].

<sup>19</sup> See the text in RM and RM[1].

betan translations of the *Pramāṇavārttika* by Rma Lo tsā ba Dge ba'i blo gros (late 11<sup>th</sup>c.)<sup>20</sup> and Rngog Lo tsā ba or, which is perhaps unlikely, had translated anew the *Pramāṇavārttika* in its entirety sometime between 1208 and 1212. It is even possible that he wrote the *Rigs mdzod* after Sa skya Paṇḍita and his two young nephews, including the nine year old 'Phags pa, had left their ancestral see of Sa skya in Gtsang, in 1244, for Prince Köden's Mongol court in Liangzhou, present day Wu Wei, in Gansu Province, P.R.C. The precise mechanism of, and the identity of the persons involved in, this reworking or re-translation of the text is open to question. But for the sake of convenience, I will henceforth attribute the final result to Sa skya Paṇḍita alone. Regardless of the extent of his involvement in the process, being without a good knowledge of written Tibetan, Śākyaśrībhadrā was certainly not in the position to give it his final imprimatur.

If many of the lineages of transmission through which copies of the texts of the Indian Buddhist *pramāṇa* tradition were handed down in the Indian subcontinent, in Kashmir, and in Nepal still rest in silent obscurity, those that traversed the Tibetan landscape in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are of equal complexity as to make it extremely difficult to map them out, even if only in part. What exacerbates this uncomfortable situation is that many of these still remain hidden from our scrutiny, because of the relatively limited number of biographical or autobiographical sources that are presently at our disposal. During these centuries, we must reckon with an intricate interplay of manuscript traditions and interpretations between, on one hand, the subcontinent proper, Kashmir and Nepal, and their reception in Tibet, on the other. Many of these interplays were the result of Tibetans having made contacts with individuals belonging to certain intellectual communities during their protracted stays in the northern reaches of the Indian subcontinent. Members of the Dpyal family are a rather good illustration of this, even if there is so far not one iota of explicitly formulated evidence in later sources that their work impacted in any way on the history of *tshad ma* studies. Thus we learn from Bya btang pa Padma rdo rje's 1546 composite study of this family's history that Dpyal Ban[dhe] or Lo tsā ba 'Byung gnas rgyal mtshan had studied *pramāṇa* under the famous Smṛtijñānakīrti (ca. 950-1040), who himself hailed from Kashmir.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> For an *dbu med* manuscript in 45 folios of Rma Lo tsā ba's translation of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* that was cataloged under C.P.N. no. 004806(5), see my "On Some Early Tibetan *Pramāṇavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing," *Journal of Tibetan and Buddhist Studies* 1 (1994), 4.

<sup>21</sup> What follows is taken from his *Dpyal gyi gdung rabs za ra tshags dang gang gā'i chu rgyun gnyis gcig tu bris pa kun gsal me long*, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying

One of 'Byung gnas rgyal mtshan's grandsons was Rgyal ba'i blo gros and he studied the same under Khyung po Lo tsā ba Chos kyi brtson 'grus who, with the Jñānaśrībhadrā, co-translated the latter's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*. Some sources occasionally refer to Khyung po Lo tsā ba as Khyung, but he must clearly be distinguished from his much junior contemporary Khyung [po] Rin chen grags of Myang stod. In the short biography Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson 'grus grags pa (1121/3-93) wrote of his master Rg[w]a Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (ca. 1080-1150) that, staying in Gtsang, Rg[w]a Lo tsā ba had studied the *Chos mchog* [= *Dharmottara*] with a certain Dge bshes from Mi nyag / Tangut [= Xixia] and the *Pramāṇavārttika* under a Dge bshes Khung.<sup>22</sup> Although the text has "Khung," I am inclined to conjecture that we ought to read it as "Khyung" and that he may be identified as Khyung Rin chen grags. He was one of Rngog Lo tsā ba's disciples and known for his work on *tshad ma*. "Dharmottara[*s* (ca. 740-800) *pramāṇa*]" most likely refers to his large *ṭīkā*-commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya*. In his massive ecclesiastic history of 1447 that is in the main focused on the development of the Dwags po Bka' brgyud pa school and sects, Rta tshag Tshe dbang rgyal relates that a certain Dbang phyug rdo rje (ca. 1145-?1206) first studied the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the *Dharmottara*, that is, his *ṭīkā*, under a certain Dge bshes G.yor nyag[s] in Chos pa myu sna.<sup>23</sup> He then left for Gsang

---

zhib 'jug khang (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2008), 26, 29, 37, 41, 93.

<sup>22</sup> See his *Dpal gyi rnam thar, Writings (bka' thor bu)* (Tashijong: The Sungrab Nyamso Gyunpel Parkhang, 1972), 362: *tsang du dge bshes mi nyag pa la chos mchog tshar cig gsan / dge bshes khung la rnam 'drel* [read: 'grel] *tshar cig gsan pa la / ...* For a different translation, see E. Sperling, "Rtsa mi Lo tsā ba Sangs rgyas grags pa and the Tangut Background to Early Mongol-Tibetan Relations," *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. Fagernes 1992*, ed. P. Kvaerne, vol. 2 (Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, 1994), 809. A nineteenth century manuscript of an edition of his collected oeuvre that was originally compiled by Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje (1309-64) in four volumes was recently published by the Huangsi in Beijing. It contains a severely truncated *Dpal rgwa lo'i rnam thar* on pp. 541-44 in the first volume [Ka] of this collection, which formed a part of Tshal pa's 1352 biography of Zhang G.yu 'brug Brtson 'grus grags pa, the so-called *Dgos 'dod re bskong ma'i 'grel pa* (Ka, 533-75). In 2007, Kun bzang tshe 'phel compiled a new *Life* of Rgwa Lo, which was recently published in a compilation of various texts having to do with him, for which see *Dpal chen rgwa lo'i rnam thar rags bsdu lus can dad pa'i gsol sman ngo mtshar lung gi nyi ma* (np, nd), 4-25.

<sup>23</sup> See *Lho rong chos 'byung*, ed. Gling dpon Pad ma skal bzang and Ma grong Mi 'gyur rdo rje, Gangs can rig mdzod 26 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1994), 618. The corresponding passage in *Bka' brgyud rin po che'i lo rgyus phyogs gcig tu bsgrigs pa'i gsol 'debs rgyas pa [dbu med manuscript in 541 folios]*, C.P.N. catalog no. 002448(6), 368b-9a, has a slightly messy text, though it essentially preserves the same reading. For this important work, see my "On the

phu sne'u thog for further studies under Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109-1169). Dpyal Rgyal ba'i blo gros' grandson Dpyal Kun dga' rdo rje (ca. 1110-50) first studied *pramāṇa* under Khyung Rin chen grags. In his case, we must definitely reckon with the very good possibility that he was also introduced to ideas that were becoming part of *tshad ma*, that is, ideas that were becoming part of the Tibetan acculturation of *pramāṇa*. While Khyung Rin chen grags was his first teacher of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, he also studied *pramāṇa* under a certain Paṇḍita Amaracandra and Sukhaśrībhadrā. Written in a proto-Maithilī script that is characteristic of the tenth to twelfth centuries, R. Sāṅkrṭyāyana (1893-1963) discovered in Tibet what now appears to be a unique manuscript of the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*. Its colophon identifies a certain Amaracandra, a *paṇḍita*-cum-physician, as the one who had written it down (*likhāpitam idaṃ*).<sup>24</sup> This man did not go unnoticed in the early Tibetan studies of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* itself. In his substantive exegesis of this work, 'Jad pa Gzhon nu byang chub (ca. 1150-1210) also noted a Paṇḍita Amaracandra who, according to him, had attributed the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* to Asaṅga and to a Rgyal [ba'i/po'i] sras (\*Jinaputra/\*Rājaputra) what he refers to as the *ṭikā*-commentary.<sup>25</sup> I suppose that these are one and the same Amaracandra! Apropos of Sukhaśrībhadrā, one of his claims to fame that I am aware of is that he gave Sākyaśrībhadrā his novice-*śramanera* vows in *circa* 1150. Now called Myang stod Jo btsun Khyung – jo btsun has

---

Fifteenth Century *Lho rong chos 'byung* by Rta tshag Tshe dbang rgyal and Its Importance for Tibetan Political and Religious History," *Lungta* 14 [*Aspects of Tibetan History*, ed. R. Vitali and T. Tsering] (2000), 57-76. For references to some of this Dge bshes' interpretations, see my "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," 416.

<sup>24</sup> See *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, ed. N. Tatia, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series no. 17 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute 1976), 156. For early *Abidharmasamuccaya* studies in Tibet, see my "Notes on Jñānamitra's Commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*," *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners. The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*, ed. U.T. Kragh, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 75 (Cambridge: Department of South Asian Studies, 2013), 1388-1429. Colophons often carry important historical information that can point us to seeing unexpected interconnections. For a general study of these and other "paratexts", see Lab phan 'dum Blo bzang blo gros, "Bod kyi bstan bcos sam rtsom yig gi kha byang skor bshad pa," *Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig* 4 (1994), 115-142, and for a select number, see M. Clemente, "Colophons as Sources: Historical Information from Some Brag dkar rta so Xylographies (*sic*)," *Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici* II (2007), 121-58.

<sup>25</sup> *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i ṭikka shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me, Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 40, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 38. See also my "Notes on Jñānamitra's Commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*," 1411, 1417-8.

the sense of a monk from an aristocratic family – this same Rin chen grags also instructed Kun dga' grags, Kun dga' rdo rje's eldest son, in the essentials of *tshad ma*. Kun dga' grags then proceeded to the sub-continent where he studied *pramāṇa* in Magadha under unidentified teachers. All these men all belonged to one branch of the Dpyal family, namely, the one that issued from Gsal rab snying po, the first of Lo tsā ba 'Byung gnas rgyal mtshan's two sons. Turning to his second son Mchog rab snying po, we learn that his grandson Lo tsā ba Shes rab 'od zer studied *pramāṇa* with a certain Sādhukīrti and others.

There really is no question that, in the early thirteenth century, Śākyaśrībhadra and such select members of his entourage as Sugataśrī, Saṅghaśrī, Vibhūticandra, and Dānaśīla embodied a crucial nexus for Tibetan intellectual history. One fundamental outcome of their contacts with members of Tibet's educated elite was that their activities inserted updated sources of transmission lineages of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and related writings on *pramāṇa* into the history of *tshad ma*. For example, we know that, excepting Vibhūticandra, all these men instructed the young Sa skya Paṇḍita in this subject. One of the consequences of these activities was of course that these transmissions were able to spread far and wide in Central Tibet and beyond, for the mature Sa skya Paṇḍita had a substantial number of students. For now, we also know that the Bengali scholar Dānaśīla taught the *Pramāṇavārttika* to Chos kyi dbang phyug (1192-1247) of Gnas rnying as well as a host of unspecified writings of the *pramāṇa* tradition to Dar ma rgyal mtshan (1227-1305), alias Bcom ldan rig[s] pa'i ral gri.<sup>26</sup> But this is but the tip of the iceberg and one cannot even begin to guess how many other Tibetans received instructions from him and his colleagues, let alone the extent to which this may have played a role in the ongoing Tibetan exegeses of these Indic writings.

'U yug pa and Ston gzhon were not the only individuals who, in one way or another, were associated with the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s transmission at Sa skya and wrote commentaries on it. Though they have yet to be recovered, we can now add at least three other studies of the *Pramāṇavārttika* that were written during the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, namely those by Dar ma rgyal mtshan, 'Jam dbyangs Rin chen rgyal mtshan (1257-1305) and 'Jam dbyangs skya bo Nam mkha' dpal (ca. 1260-1320). Primarily active at Snar thang

<sup>26</sup> See, respectively, Mnyam nyid rin chen's 1522 history of Gnas rnying, the *Skyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam par thar pa rin po che'i gter mdzod* [undated xylograph in 88 folios], 17b, and my "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," 410-1. For Gnas rnying's history, see now R. Vitali, "The History of the Lineages of Gnas rnying Summarised as its 'Ten Greatnesses,'" *Tibet, Past and Present: Tibetan Studies* 1, ed. H. Blezer (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 81-107.

monastery and one of the Bka' gdams pa school's great intellectuals of the thirteenth century, Dar ma rgyal mtshan cannot be readily pigeonholed into one or the other Tibetan *tshad ma* tradition and it is perhaps best to create for him the separate rubric of "independent scholar." According to his biographer Bsam gtan bzang po,<sup>27</sup> the majority of his teachers of *tshad ma* belonged to the *Rngog lugs*, but the young Dar ma rgyal mtshan had also taken the initiative to go to Sa skya to study the *Rigs gter* and presumably the autocommentary with Sa skya Paṇḍita himself. Later, 'U yug pa taught him the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and the *Pramāṇavārttika*, and the other works by Dharmakīrti, except for his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the autocommentary on the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s first chapter. Dar ma rgyal mtshan himself was the author of a *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary that has yet to surface. He refers his reader to it in his exegesis of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, a work that appears to have been the first of its kind in Tibet.<sup>28</sup>

Virtually nothing seems to have been handed down about 'Jam dbyangs skya bo's life and oeuvre. All that we know about him so far is that he was a disciple of both 'U yug pa and btsun [pa] Mdo sde dpal (ca. 1220-90).<sup>29</sup> Both men enjoyed reputations of having expertise in *tshad ma*, though Zhang btsun is not reported to have written anything on the subject, at least nothing is related about him having done so. But Ston gzhon does mention him as one of his teachers who had recommended changing the reading of the Tibetan translation of a verse of the *Pramāṇavārttika*.<sup>30</sup> However, we do know that he was

<sup>27</sup> *Bcom ldan rig ral pa'i rnam thar, Collected Works*, vol. Ka (Kathmandu: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang, 2007), 1-30.

<sup>28</sup> *Tshad ma kun las btus pa'i rgya cher bshad pa rgyan gyi me tog, Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 53, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 5b [454]. For an edition of this work with a long introduction, see L.W.J. van der Kuijp and A.P. McKeown, *Bcom ldan ral gri (1227-1305) on Indian Buddhist Logic and Epistemology: His Commentary on Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 80 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2013).

<sup>29</sup> For what follows, see, respectively, Dngos grub rgya mtsho's circa 1600 *Tha snyad rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gsal bar byed pa blo gsal mgrin rgyan legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba*, ed. Nor brang Ö rgyan, *Gangs can rig mdzod 4* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 300-1, D.P. Jackson, *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III). Sa skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*, vol. I, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 17,1 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1987), 139-42, 144, and my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History VI: The Transmission of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda* According to the Early Tibetan *Gsan yig-s*," *Asiatische Studien / Études asiatiques* XLIX (1995), 923, 929.

<sup>30</sup> STON, 435.

the author of a series of notes (*zin bris*) on the narrative tales that illustrate some of the points Sa skya Paṇḍita had made in his *Thub pa'i dgongs pa rab gsal*, tales he had heard from the master himself.<sup>31</sup> Since Sa skya Paṇḍita presumably wrote this work in what is now Gansu Province and since he never returned to Tibet after he had left in 1244-5, we can draw the conclusion that Zhang btsun was part of the circle of his disciples who had traveled with him to Gansu or that he had journeyed to where Sa skya Paṇḍita was staying at a later date. In addition to having been a student of Sa skya Paṇḍita and rising to a highranking official in Sa skya itself, Zhang btsun may also have been a Sanskrit scholar of sorts, as we will see in the sequel to this essay.

Returning to 'Jam dbyangs skya bo, it is reported that he was active in Sa skya and that he taught the eighteen year old Dpang Lo tsā ba the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the *Rigs gter* [and the *Hevajratantra*] and, later, the *circa* eighteen year old Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290-1364) also studied the *Pramāṇavārttika* with him together with 'U yug pa's commentary. Dpang Lo tsā ba himself first journeyed to the Kathmandu Valley at the age of twenty. This was the first of some seven trips to the Valley. Upon his return to Tibet from what may have been his second trip to the Valley, sometime between 1297 and 1304, he prepared a retranslation of Abhayākaragupta's (ca.1065-ca.1125) famous *Munimatalaṃkāra*, and other treatises, in Sa skya. As a reward, the upper echelons of the monastery headed by 'Jam dbyangs skya bo lavished many gifts and honors on him. 'Jam dbyangs skya bo's own exegesis of the *Pramāṇavārttika* is listed in the handy bibliography of Sa skya pa school scholarship compiled in the main by the learned Mkhan po Appey [A pad].<sup>32</sup> It seems to have had little impact, for I have yet to come across references to it in the *tshad ma* literature that is now available.

We are fortunate to be in the possession of a reasonably reliable source for Rin chen rgyal mtshan's life in the form of the slightly incomplete manuscript of a biography that was written by his erstwhile disciple Byang sems Rgyal ba ye shes (1257-1320).<sup>33</sup> Rgyal ba ye shes

<sup>31</sup> A handy edition of this work, *Thub pa'i dgongs gsal rgyal sras 'phags pa'i lam gyi sgrung 'grel zla ba'i 'od zer*, is found in *Dpal sa skya pa'i gsung rab*, vol. 11, Lam rim, comp. Mkhas dbang Tshul khriims rgyal mtshan and Mkhas dbang Padma dam chos (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang / Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004), 340-605. The Sde dge print was published earlier in *Thub pa'i dgongs pa gsal ba'i bstan bcos kyi mdo rnam par bshad pa rin po che'i gter*, *Selected Works of Glo bo Mkhan chen*, vol. 2 (Dehra Dun, 1985), 253-539.

<sup>32</sup> *Dkar chag mthong bas yid 'phrog chos mdzod bye ba'i lde mig* (New Delhi, 1987), 36.

<sup>33</sup> *Chos rje 'jam dbyangs chen po'i rnam thar yon tan rgya mtsho* [dbu med manuscript in 24 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004381(10), 6b. For this manuscript, see my "Apropos of Some Recently Recovered Texts Belonging to the *Lam 'bras* Teachings of



begins his hagiography by stipulating that his master was a wondrous and willed manifestation (*sprul pa*) of the bodhisattva 'Jam pa'i dbyangs (Mañjuḥṣa) and that even some reliable persons had foretold that he was or would be a wondrous emanation (*rnam 'phrul, \*vikurvaṇa*) of Sa skya Paṇḍita himself.<sup>34</sup> Clearly, this is but another way of saying that his intellectual abilities were quite impressive, to say the least. His father was Rje btsun skyabs, a member of the Zhang zhung clan (*rigs = gdung rus*) that had settled in the vicinity of Sa skya, and his mother was a lady with the name Shes rab skyid. It is curious that the biography is silent about the fact that he was a scion of the family that controlled Sa skya's influential Shar Residence (*bla brang*). Rgyal ba ye shes mentions that Rin chen rgyal mtshan had received his three successive vows (*sdom gsum*) from 'Phags pa, albeit without giving the dates for these occasions. He apparently first studied at Bo dong E, not at Sa skya, and traveled from there to Sa skya for the purpose of paying his respects to 'Phags pa. We know that 'Phags pa resided there from *circa* 1264 to 1267 and from 1274 to 1280. Given that Rgyal ba ye shes explicitly states that Rin chen rgyal mtshan had studied *abhidharma, prajñāpāramitā, and vinaya* texts in Bo dong E, we can, I believe, safely assume that he must have met 'Phags pa only after his return from the Mongol court of Emperor Qubilai in 1274. This meeting marked the beginning of what was to become a lustrous career. When a certain Lama E pa [= ?Khon ston Thugs rje rin chen, alias 'Jam dbyangs 'Khon ston or E pa Zhang] had passed away, 'Phags pa requested that he take up teachings duties at Sa skya's Shar Residence. This was his first official post. He then established his reputation as a redoubtable scholar in a more visible way at the age of twenty-three in late 1280, when he shone in a series of public monastic debates that formed part of the funerary ceremonies (*thugs dgongs rdzogs par mdzad pa' chos 'khor*) held for the recently deceased 'Phags pa. Upon their return, the imperial envoys that were present on this occasion brought his abilities to Qubilai's attention. His learning, the connections of his family, and the absence of a male heir of Sa skya's 'Khon family in Sa skya paved the way for him ultimately to be appointed by the Mongol court in Yuan China as abbot of the Bzhi thog Residence in late 1287 or early 1288. This meant that he was in fact Sa skya's Grand Abbot. His impressive performance

---

the Sa skya pa and Ko brag pa," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17 (1994), 188-90.

<sup>34</sup> When not otherwise specified, what follows is based on *Chos rje 'jam dbyangs chen po'i rnam thar yon tan rgya mtsho*, 1b-7b. On fol. 3b, reference is made to Rin chen rgyal mtshan's record of his studies, his *gsan yig*, titled *Rin po che'i phreng ba*, for information on the lineages of transmission to which he was privy. This work has not yet been located.

during the ceremonies he presided over on the occasion of the passing of 'Phags pa's nephew and then current Imperial Preceptor Dharmapālarakṣita on December 24, 1287, was witnessed in person by the Mongol prince (*rgyal bu*) Ga pa ju pa [or: Ga sa ju sa]<sup>35</sup> and other Mongol and Tibetan notables, who had no doubt reported this event to the court as well. The passage in question reads *slob dpon chen po dharma pha la'i chos 'khor*, which I interpret as a religious gathering that was held on the occasion of Grand-Master Dharmapālarakṣita's passing. There is no question, then, that his appointment as Grand Abbot ultimately laid the groundwork for him to become Imperial Preceptor to Emperor Öljeitü [the Chengzong Emperor r. May 10, 1294 - February 10, 1307] at the Mongol capital in China proper from 1304 to 1305.

Bo dong E was one of the many monasteries where thirteenth century Dharma-kīrti studies consisted primarily, but certainly not exclusively, of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the *Tshad ma bsdus pa*-Summaries, and was therefore foremost an institution that was part of the *Rngog lugs* tradition of Dharmakīrti exegesis. We thus have to reckon with the very high probability, as we must also in 'U yug pa's case, that Rin chen rgyal mtshan was quite conversant with the literary tradition[s] of the *Rngog lugs* and had most likely formally studied one or more specimen of this genre. Rgyal ba ye shes registers a *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary from his pen, which he had authored at the request of a certain Khang ston and others.<sup>36</sup> Reflecting the three characteristics of a bona fide scholar, as codified by Sa skya Paṇḍita in his *Mkhas pa rnam la 'jug pa'i sgo*, namely, that such an individual should have expertise in the principles of composition (*rtsom*), explication (*'chad*), and disputation (*rtsod*), Rgyal ba ye shes even goes so far to compare him to Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and Dpa' bo, that is, here, Aśvaghōṣa, in the ninth of the two dozen or so quatrains around which he had constructed his biography in verse and prose:

*gzhan gzhung sun 'byin phyogs kyi glang po bzhin //*

<sup>35</sup> I have not been able to identify this prince in L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan che [avec des notes supplémentaires par Paul Pelliot]* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1945) and his *Le chapitre CVIII du Yuan che*, Tome I (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954). Another Mongol prince Te mur bo ka is mentioned in connection with the funerary ceremonies held at Sa skya for the deceased Dus 'khor ba chen po, Rin chen rgyal mtshan's eldest brother, the Kālacakra expert (*dus 'khor ba*) Ye shes rin chen (?1248-94). For Te mur bo ka (< Mon. Temür Buqa), see L. Petech, *Central Tibet and the Mongols. The Yüan-Sa skya Period of Tibetan History*, Serie Orientale Roma, vol. LXV (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1990), 30-1.

<sup>36</sup> For what follows, see *Chos rje 'jam dbyangs chen po'i rnam thar yon tan rgya mtsho*, 9b-10a.

*rang gzhung 'god legs chos kyi grags pa mtshungs //*  
*sdeb sbyor dpa' bo ji 4n rtsom mdzad pa //*  
*dus 'dir bstan 'dzin mchog khyod la phyag 'tshal //*

Refuting textual traditions of others, like Dignāga;  
 Good at establishing one's own textual tradition, similar to  
 Dharmakīrti;  
 A poet, a writer just like \*Ārya Sūra/\*Aśvaghoṣa;  
 At this time, I pay homage to you, supreme one among the  
 upholders of the Buddha's Teaching!

Chos nyid ye shes' detailed 1775 study of the Gnyags family and Gle lung monastery in Mus records that Rin chen rgyal mtshan taught the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the *Rigs gter* to Mus chen Rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po (1287-1347) at Sa skya in 1299.<sup>37</sup> Be this as it may, I have yet to come across references to his work in the *tshad ma* literature that is available to me.

Lastly, this *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary was not Ston gzhon's only or first work on *tshad ma*, for he himself notes his earlier effort, which was apparently titled *Tshad ma rigs pa'i de kho na nyid snang ba*.<sup>38</sup> This tract has yet to surface, but its title suggests that he did not simply conceive it as an exegesis of a Tibetan translation of a work belonging to the Indian Buddhist schools of logic and epistemology. Rather, he appears to have written it as a synthetic study of Buddhist logic and epistemology as a whole. Unfortunately, he mentions it only once, namely in connection with his comments on PV, IV: 23c-d, where he considers this verse to be Dharmakīrti's final deliberation on the purport of "object, state of affairs" (*artha*) of Dignāga's phrase "an object / state of affairs the proponent of a proof has himself understood" (*svaḍṛṣṭārtha*) as found in the definition (*mtshan nyid*) of an inference-for-another (*parārthānumāna*) or proof in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* [= PS, III: 1b].

### 3. Pre-Ston gzhon *Rigs gter* Exegeses

Owing to the relative paucity of the published thirteenth century biographical and autobiographical literature, we are still rather ill informed about where the *Rigs gter* was able gradually to insinuate itself in the monastic curricula other than the one of Sa skya monas-

<sup>37</sup> *Gnyags ston pa'i gdung rabs dang gdan rabs*, ed. Rta mgrin tshe dbang, Gangs can rig mdzod 31 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1997), 133.

<sup>38</sup> STON, 388.

tery, whether primarily as an object of study as such or as representing a set of competing positions which, it was felt, needed to be refuted. In fact, there was till now little evidence that it was studied in institutions other than Sa skya during that time. However, things are a-changin'. With the sources that have become available in recent years, I think one can now reasonably argue that it must have formed part of the curriculum of a limited number of other Central Tibetan monastic institutions as well as of those monasteries in Khams and Amdo that had either been founded by Sa skya Paṇḍita himself from 1244 onwards or where he was able to wield some influence on their intellectual lives. The same applies to those that were later founded and indirectly administered by his nephew 'Phags pa and the disciples they shared, such as Sga A gnyan dam pa Kun dga' grags (1240-1303). In his 1467 study of Sa skya monastery and her ruling families, Stag tshang Lo tsā ba Shes rab rin chen (1405-77) suggests that Sa skya Paṇḍita's influence was felt in the following institutions:<sup>39</sup>

Two major sees:

1. Sa skya
2. Ling chu (< Ch. Liangzhou) *rtser khab* in the north (*byang phyogs*)<sup>40</sup>

Three middling sees:

---

<sup>39</sup> See his *Dpal ldan sa skya pa'i 'khon gyi gdung rabs 'dod dgu'i rgya mtsho* [dbu med manuscript in 34 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002537, 19a. We find the same passage in A mes zhabs' 1629 study of the same, for which see *Sa skya'i gdung rabs ngo mtshar bang mdzod*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986), 145; this passage is also cited in G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, vol. II (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co. Ltd., 1980), 680, n. 40. The date of Stag tshang Lo tsā ba's passing, the end of November of 1477, is given in what appears to be an excerpt from 'Jam dbyangs Chos kyi dpal 'byor's biography of his master that functions as a supplement to Stag tshang Lo tsā ba's autobiography, for which see *Gtsang stag tshang lo tsā ba shes rab rin chen rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po'i rnam par thar pa'i kha skong yid ches gser gyi ljon pa*, *Collected Works* [of Stag tshang Lo tsā ba], vol. 2, *Mes po'i shul bzahag*, vol. 30, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe nmying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007), 61.

<sup>40</sup> For this place, see K.R. Schaeffer and L.W.J. van der Kuijp, *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri*, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 64 (Cambridge: The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, 2009), 26-7, n. 54. No doubt we have to consider the four monasteries in the Liangzhou [= present day Wuwei] area that are associated with Sa skya Paṇḍita, namely, the Lha khang sde to the south, Padmo'i sde to the west, Rgya mtsho'i sde to the north, and Sprul pa'i sde to the east of Wuwei, in Gansu Province, PRC.

1. Bsam yas in Dbus
2. Rkyang thur [= 'dur] in Nyang stod<sup>41</sup>
3. Sreg shing in Shangs

He adds that there were countless more minor places in the Tibetan areas where he had been active and where his influence was palpable. In Smar khams, Sa skya Paṇḍita and 'Phags pa wielded some influence in Dpal gyi sho monastery, which the founder of the Smar pa Bka' brgyud sect Shes rab ye shes (1135-1203) built in 1167, as well as other institutions in Smar khams such as Tsom mdo gnas gsar, which was founded in 1200 by 'Gro mgon Rin chen dpal (1170-1249).<sup>42</sup> The Sde dge xylograph of Sa skya Paṇḍita's collected oeuvre contains a letter he had written to the latter — he is there called 'Gro mgon Rin chen of Sho monastery — as well as one he addressed to the monastic community of Sho, whereas 'Phags pa had composed a good number of pieces in Smar khams as early as 1253 and then later in 1275-6.<sup>43</sup> Writing a little less than a decade after Stag tshang Lo tsā ba, Gtsang Byams pa Rdo rje rgyal mtshan (1423-98) relates a similar scenario for the main Sa skya pa monasteries during 'Phags pa's time in his 1475

---

<sup>41</sup> Sa skya Paṇḍita had studied there in his youth with none other than Mtshur Gzhon nu seng ge, and its history is ever so briefly outlined by Tāranātha (1575-1634) in his undated *Myang yul stod smad bar gsum gyi ngo mtshar gtam gyi legs bshad mkhas pa'i jug ngogs*, ed. Lhag pa tshe ring (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1983), 109-110 [ed. Don grub phun tshogs (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2002), 105-7]. Given that he mentions the Gtsang pa Sde srid family at great length, including Karma bstan skyong dbang po (1606-42), who ascended the throne in Shigatse in *circa* 1621, we can be certain that he must have written it sometime between 1621 and 1635. Also known as *Myang chos 'byung*, it was included in vol. 23 of the 1999-? 'Dzam thang edition of Tāranātha's collected writings, as it was in *Jo nang rje btsun tā ra nātha'i gsung 'bum dpe bsdur ma*, vol. 44, *Mes po'i shul bzhas*, vol. 86, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe mnying zhib jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2008), where the cited passage occurs on p. 112-3.

<sup>42</sup> See the remarks in the biography of Spyan snga ba Byang chub grags (1208-77), Sho dgon's third abbot in the anonymous seventeenth century compilation *Dpal ldan smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar su khar rna'i phreng ba*, *Smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar phyogs sgrig*, ed. Padma tshul khirms (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006), 181, and also those in Byang chub 'od zer's late sixteenth century *Tsom mdo gdan rabs kun btus*, *Smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar phyogs sgrig*, ed. Padma tshul khirms, 103 ff.

<sup>43</sup> For Sa skya Paṇḍita's letters, see SSBB, vol. 5, nos. 39-40; for 'Phags pa's Smar khams-related writings, see the useful listing in Y. Fukuda and Y. Ishihama, tr., *A Study of the Grub mthaḥ of Tibetan Buddhism* [in Japanese], vol. 4, *Studia Tibetica*, no. 11 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1986), 53, 57-8.

study of the ruling families and Sa skya monastery; there we have the following:<sup>44</sup>

Four major sees:

1. Sa skya
2. Me tog ra ba inside the imperial palace of Ta'i tu (< Ch. Dadu)
3. The imperial palace of Shan to (< Ch. Shangdu)
4. Sprul pa'i sde in Byang ngos, near Liangzhou

Three middling sees:

1. Dpal gyi sde chen in Chu mig
2. Rtso [= Tsom] mdo bsam 'grub in Mdo khams
3. Dpal gyi sde chen in Shing kun [= Lintao]<sup>45</sup>

The minor sees: where major Sa skya pa masters had stayed.

Retreats:

1. Mount Wutai
2. Lha rtse'i brag
3. Kha'u skyed lhas brag phug

Furthermore, there is some evidence that the *Rigs gter* was studied in Mongol-occupied China as well, albeit most likely by the Tibetan seminarians who were affiliated with the temples or monasteries of the capital cities of Dadu and Shangdu. For one, we have an early xylograph of the autocommentary, the printing blocks for which were prepared under imperial patronage, specifically under Čabi (?-1284), Qubilai's senior wife, and her daughter-in-law Kōkečin, in the Mongol capital of Dadu in 1284.<sup>46</sup> The recent rare book exhibition at

<sup>44</sup> *Sa skya mkhon (sic) gyi gdungs rab (sic) rin po che'i 'phreng ba* [incomplete dbu can manuscript in 90 folios], Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Reel L 591/4, 32b.

<sup>45</sup> For this monastery, see the notes in my *The Kālacakra and the Patronage of Tibetan Buddhism by the Mongol Imperial Family*, The Central Eurasian Studies Lectures, 4, ed. F. Venturi (Bloomington: Department of Central Eurasian Studies, Indiana University, 2004), 44 ff.

<sup>46</sup> 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), 280-3, 291-3, and now also Ska ba Shes rab bzang po, "Investigating Tibetan Language 'Yuan Blockprints' [in Chinese]," *Zhongguo zangxue* 1 (2009), 41-2. A xylograph from these blocks is apparently ex-

the National Library in Beijing, which I visited on December 18, 2013, showcased an early Yuan period, seventy-folio xylograph of the Śākyaśrībhadrā-Sa skya Paṇḍita translation of the *Pramāṇavārttika*. It had a right-hand marginal notation of Ka, suggesting that it was the first volume in an unidentified series. The very brief colophon states that the printing blocks were prepared under the aegis of the third Imperial Preceptor, that is, 'Phags pa's nephew Dharmapālarakṣita (1268-1287).<sup>47</sup> Among the other Yuan xylographs of Tibetan texts were Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Sdom gsum rab dbye* in sixty-five folios,<sup>48</sup> the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* plus an unidentified Vinya text.

Apart from the places that were mentioned above, there are also several indications in the biographical literature that Sa skya Paṇḍita's text[s] was [or were] taught and studied in Central Tibetan monasteries other than Sa skya. A first, albeit somewhat ambiguous indication of this is provided in the biographical sketch of Gser sdings Chos sku 'od zer (1214-92) in *Bya btang Padma gar dbang's* study of the transmission of the *Sha wa dbang phyug gi snyan rgyud* which he completed in 1538.<sup>49</sup> He writes that sometime in the 1230s the former had studied *tshad ma*, among other subjects, under Sa skya Paṇḍita in Stag thog, a locality in Gtsang that was located not far from Sa skya itself. The *Rigs gter* was also studied in Nag phug, a place that was equally located in Gtsang. The very influential Nag phug pa Shes rab 'od zer (13<sup>th</sup> c.), alias 'Jam dbyangs gsar ma, began his *tshad ma* studies with exponents of the *Rngog lugs*. But we learn

---

tant in Brag dkar rta so monastery, for which see *Bod khul gyi chos sde grags can khag gi dpe rnying dkar chag*, ed. Ska ba Shes rab bzang po et al., 41, where it appears to be called a "Chinese xylograph" (*rgya nag spar ma*).

<sup>47</sup> For additional notes, see my forthcoming "The *hor-par ma*-Mongol Xylograph of the Tibetan Translation of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* (*Tshad ma rnam 'grel*)," *Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology* 9 (2014).

<sup>48</sup> Ska ba Shes rab bzang po, Zangwen 'Yuanban' kao ["Investigating Tibetan Language 'Yuan Blockprints'," *Zhongguo zangxue* 1 (2009), 45; the colophon states that the carving of the blocks was completed on August 12, 1299 in the Mchod rten sngon po in the capital of Dadu (*ta'i tu*) and that it was "established" (*grub*) in the Mchod rten dkar po. For the latter, the famous White Stupa, see H. Franke's breathtaking "The Consecration of the 'White Stupa' in 1279," *Asia Major* 7 (1994), 155-184. See also Xiong Wenbin, *Yuandai huangshi chengyuan shikande zangwen fojing* [Tibetan Buddhist Scriptures Published with the Financial Aid of Members of the Yuan Dynasty's Imperial Family], *Zhongguo zangxue* 3 (2009), 91-94, 99. Clearly, the printing blocks for the text were carved under the auspices of the then reigning Imperial Preceptor Gags pa 'od zer (1246-1303) of Sa skya's Khang gsar Residence.

<sup>49</sup> See *Zab chos sbas pa mig 'byed kyī chos bskor las paṅ chen sha wa dbang phyug gi snyan rgyud rdo rje sum gyi bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar dad pa'i rnga chen*, Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project Reel no. L 451/6, fol. 34b.

from his rather short autobiography that later in his life he had also studied the *Rigs gter* with Sa skya Paṇḍita in Sa skya. This took place shortly after the 1240 Mongol invasion of Tibet. He had already made his residence in Nag phug, to which he had invited Sa skya Paṇḍita in 1243, just before the latter began his journey to Gansu in 1244.<sup>50</sup>

But more rewarding facts are forthcoming from Rgyal ba ye shes' study of the life of Kun spangs pa Thugs rje brtson 'grus (?-1313), the much celebrated founder of Jo nang monastery.<sup>51</sup> We learn from this work, which is very short on dates indeed, that a certain 'Dar 'Jam dbyangs [or: ?Rdo rje 'jam dbyangs] and Spyang ston Rigs pa'i seng ge<sup>52</sup> had introduced the young Kun spangs pa to the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the *Rigs gter* at an unspecified location, after which he went to Sa skya in circa 1266-7 to become fully conversant with Dharmakīrti's oeuvre. There he continued his studies under a certain Mkhas pa Gnyan.<sup>53</sup> After his sojourn in Sa skya, he left for Brag ram monastery where Dar ma 'od zer taught him the writings of Dharmottara and Prajñākaragupta (ca. 800), both of whom were natives of Kashmir. A center of *Rngog lugs* studies, Brag ram had been founded by Bo dong Rin po che Brtson 'grus rdo rje (1200-?) and Dar ma 'od zer appears to have been his disciple and successor to the abbatial throne. We should be aware that the study of these two Kashmirian Buddhist philosophers in combination has an interesting historical precedent in the life of Rngog Lo tsā ba himself when he was a student in Kashmir as well as later in his adult life as one of the first Tibetan interpreters of *pramāṇa*. Indeed, Rngog Lo tsā ba often juxtaposes their views in his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary where we see him more frequently siding with Prajñākaragupta than with Dharmottara, and where he is sometimes also inclined to go his own way. Dharmottara and Prajñākaragupta were innovative thinkers who in their writings

<sup>50</sup> See *Rje btsun nag phug[s] pa'i rnam thar* [dbu med manuscript in 19 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004381(7), 14a-b. For this manuscript, see my "Apropos of Some Recently Recovered Texts Belonging to the *Lam 'bras* Teachings of the Sa skya pa and Ko brag pa," 186-7.

<sup>51</sup> The following is based on *Kun spangs chen po chos rje'i rnam thar yon tan rab gsal* [dbu med manuscript in 40 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002815(5), 17a ff, 31a [= Ibid., *Dpal ldan dus kyi 'khor lo jo nang pa'i lugs kyi bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar*, ed. Karma bde legs (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004), 96-8, 120-2]. For the manuscript, see my "Apropos of Some Recently Recovered Texts Belonging to the *Lam 'bras* Teachings of the Sa skya pa and Ko brag pa," 190-3.

<sup>52</sup> The manuscript has here: *spyang ston rigs pa'i seng ge blo zur gyi drung du* /..., whereas the printed text has: *spyang ston rig pa'i seng ge'i bla zur gyi drung du*. I must confess that am unclear about either!

<sup>53</sup> He may be tentatively identified as the Stag stog pa Gnyan who was probably a disciple of 'U yug pa and who authored an early history of *pramāṇa*, the *Tshad ma'i lo rgyus*; see my "On Some Early Tibetan *Pramāṇavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing," 8-10.



often went well beyond the letter of Dharmakīrti's texts. And beyond that, Prajñākaragupta was frequently critical of Dharmottara as well, so that to engage both authors in tandem was indeed a very sensible intellectual practice. In fact, Śākyaśrībhadrā and Dānaśīla were reputed for their expertise in their writings in particular and Sa skya Paṇḍita had made it a point to study these under them. Completing his studies at Brag ram, Kun spangs pa then left for Shab in Gtsang ru [or: Lcang ra] to study the unspecified commentary on *tshad ma* of Nag phug pa under a certain Mkhas pa Rta ste gseng rgyal or Rta'i lte ba seng rgyal. Neither name offered by the two texts of his biography that are available to me make any sense and I wonder if this man were none other than Stag sde pa Seng ge rgyal mtshan (1212-94) who, among other things, was also one of Dpang Lo tsā ba's first teachers and the editor of a manuscript of Rngog Lo tsā ba's translation of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*.<sup>54</sup> Then, in circa 1270,

[Manuscript:]

...dbus rtsang du rtog ge ba la chu mig seng ge dpal mkhas:  
khong gis: dpal chos kyi grags pa la lan med kyi thal 'gyur bcu  
gsum yod ces thos...

[Modern printed text:]

...dbus gtsang na rtog ge ba la / chu mig seng ge dpal mkhas /  
khong gi dpal chos kyi grags pa la lan mod kyi thal 'gyur bcu  
gsum yod ces thos...

That is to say, Kun spangs pa had heard that Chu mig pa had isolated some thirteen undesirable consequences (*thal 'gyur, prasaṅga*)<sup>55</sup> in the course of what turns out to have been his study of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*. Chu mig pa contended rather boastfully that not even Dharmakīrti had been able to offer a reply to these. It is obvious that the text of the manuscript contains the superior readings and I can confirm that this is the rule rather than the exception! Aside from this, Rgyal ba ye shes is not quite accurate here. It is true that Chu mig pa included thirteen *thal 'gyur* arguments in his commentary, but he did not write that it was in his view Dharmakīrti who could not reply to

<sup>54</sup> "On Some Early Tibetan *Pramāṇavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing," 1-3.

<sup>55</sup> For the *prasaṅga* in Dharmakīrti, see *inter alia* T. Iwata, *Prasaṅga und Prasaṅgaviparyaya bei Dharmakīrti und seinen Kommentatoren*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 31 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1993).

these consequences. Rather, Chu mig pa himself wrote no one had been able to make answer to these from Devendrabuddhi onward, and he added the following note to the thirteenth *thal 'gyur*:<sup>56</sup>

*'di ni lan med pa'i thal ba bcu 3 pa yin no // gzhung 'dir rang gi  
phyogs la slob dpon lha'i dbang po blo gros man chad kysis lan  
gdab par mi nus pa'i thal 'gyur bcu gsum yod par bdag gis  
[149b] mthong ngo //*

*This is the thirteenth undesirable consequence for which there is no answer. In this work, I have observed that his [Dharmakīrti's] own position has thirteen undesirable consequences to which the commentators from Master Devendrabuddhi on were unable to make a reply.*

At this time, Chu mig pa was staying in Snar thang monastery and Kun spangs pa decided to travel to Snar thang to study Chu mig pa's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary and the *Tshad ma bsdus pa* with the author himself.<sup>57</sup> Rgyal ba ye shes relates that he ended up disagreeing with Chu mig pa in no uncertain terms, that he took the more senior scholar to task in a public disputation and, if we are to believe this biographer [and disciple], that he emerged victorious from the debates and thus effectively plunged Chu mig pa into ignominy.

Kun spangs pa first taught the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the *Rig gter* as an assistant (*zur chos pa*) of 'Dar Byang chub skyabs in the monasteries of Don mo ri, Chos sdings, and other places. He then took the grand institution (*sde chen*) of 'Khyog in G.yas ru as his see (*gdan sa mdzad*), where he taught a series of exoteric subjects, including *tshad ma*. Thereafter, he was invited to teach in Rkyang 'dur which, as Rgyal ba ye shes states, was Nag phug pa's see (*gdan sa*). Nag phug pa's nephew (*dbon po*), the assistant (*zur chos pa*), the chief administrator of the monastery (*dpon po*) Seng ge mgon po, various lesser officials of the monastery (*sde'i dpon chung*), the ministers (*blon po*) and financial sponsors got together and made him an offer of seven large religious estates (*chos gzhi*) with Rkyang 'dur being the main one.

<sup>56</sup> See his *\*Tshad ma rnam nges kyi tika* [*dbu med* manuscript in 152 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004827(4), 148b-9a [= *Ibid*, *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 87, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 302-1].

<sup>57</sup> The *Tshad ma bsdus pa* most probably refers to his *Tshad ma sde bdun gyi phyogs gcig du bsdus pa gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba* [*dbu med* manuscript in 68 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004827(1) [= *Ibid*, *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 87, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 314-449].

Then placing in his hand the white conch-horn that had been Nag phug pa's personal property, they requested that he assume the monastery's abbacy. Note here that this monastery and the estates attached to it must have been pretty respectable in size and at least large enough to have a substantial number of officials running it. Of course, he could not but accept the invitation and assumed the grand position (*go cha chen po*) of abbot. Among other texts, he taught there the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and the *Rigs gter*, and apparently composed two treatises during his tenure as abbot of this monastery, one on Centrist-Madhyamaka philosophy titled the *Dbu ma'i rigs pa gsal bar byed pa rdo rje 'phreng ba*, and the other on *tshad ma*, the *Tshad ma bsdu pa*, which was based on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*. That is all we learn about *tshad ma* from Rgyal ba ye shes' biography of Kun spangs pa. As far as his own intellectual biography is concerned, we have a study of his life that was written in 1362 by Mnga' ris Chos kyi rgyal po (1306-86), *alias* Phyogs las rnam rgyal.<sup>58</sup> It is obvious from this biography of which the first half reads more like a record of teachings received, that Rgyal ba ye shes was mainly interested in tantric theory and practice of the Gsar ma as well as the Rnying ma traditions, but he appears to have studied *tshad ma* at Sa skya monastery with Rin chen rgyal mtshan.

Lastly, a certain Bsod nams rin chen was another teacher of the *Rigs gter*. He taught the text to Shangs Rin chen seng ge (?-?) in possibly Sreg shing, as did Zla ba 'od zer and Dpal ldan ye shes, albeit this time in Sa skya.<sup>59</sup> The latter also taught 'U yug pa's *Rigs pa grub pa*, his commentary on the *Rigs gter*, on which see below. Interestingly, Bcom ldan pa, that is, no doubt Dar ma rgyal mtshan, also instructed him in a *Tshad ma bsdu pa*. This may be a reference to his very own *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, a treatise that is structurally similar to the *Rigs gter* and Chu mig pa's *Gzhan phyogs rnam rgyal*.

According to the numerous glosses of one manuscript of Dar ma rgyal mtshan's treatise that link various positions on Dharmakīrti with their putative authors, Sa skya Paṇḍita was one of this scholar's many targets of criticism, whereas Chu mig pa does not seem to figure even once in his cross hairs.<sup>60</sup> Later, as a mature scholar, Rin chen

<sup>58</sup> See Chos kyi rje byang chub sems dpa' chen po'i rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che'i *gter mdzod kun las btus pa* [slightly incomplete (fol. 1 is missing) *dbu med* manuscript in 32 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002780, 4a.

<sup>59</sup> For this and what follows, see his autobiography in *Shangs kyi bla ma chos rje rin seng pa'i rnam thar*, Sa skya lam 'bras Literature Series, vol. 1 (Dehra Dun: Sakya Centre, 1983), 349-50, 355.

<sup>60</sup> These identifying glosses are only present in the 95-folio manuscript of C.P.N. no. 002468(2). They are absent in the text published on the basis of this manuscript in *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Krung go'i bod

seng ge was invited to the Mongol imperial court in China and was apparently escorted to one of the two capital cities — here most probably Dadu — by a party of imperial envoys that was led by the Director (*dben shri* < Ch. *yuanshi*) Dpal skyes, who most probably was a Tibetan official connected to the Department of Tibetan and Buddhist Affairs in Dadu. He stayed there for nine years in the capacity as head of the Rigs grwa, that is, the seminary for the study of logic and epistemology, where he taught the *Pramāṇavārttika* and *Rigs gter* some eight times every year!

I suspect that if not their conceptual content then at least the differentiation and demarcation that is implied in the expressions *Rngog lugs* and *Sa lugs* had their origin in the acute considerations of the maverick Sa skya pa scholar, the great Gser mdog Paṅ chen. From his vantage point, it is obvious that for him the latter expression refers not only to the *Rigs gter* and the enormous body of exegetical literature that had spun from it up to his own *floruit*, but also to the commentaries on the *Pramāṇavārttika* that were composed by his student[s] and the later fourteenth and early fifteenth century Sa skya pa philosophers. But it was Glo bo Mkhan chen who noted the existence of some three *Rigs gter* commentaries by Sa skya Paṅḍita's own students, namely the previously noted *Rigs pa grub pa* by 'U yug pa, the *Rigs pa'i snang ba* by Rong ston chen po and the *Sde bdun gsal ba* [*'i rgyan*] by Lho pa Kun mkhyen, each of which thus date from the thirteenth century. Jackson must have had the aforementioned passage from Glo bo Mkhan chen in mind when he wrote that these three texts were topical commentaries (*don 'grel*) on the *Pramāṇavārttika* and not on the *Rigs gter*.<sup>61</sup> He makes this remark in his description of a manuscript of the first chapter of a work on the *Pramāṇavārttika* that is indeed subtitled *Rigs pa'i snang ba*.<sup>62</sup> He understandably conjectures this work to have been written by Ldong ston. That Glo bo Mkhan chen's text confuses Ldong ston with Rong ston chen po is problematic and I cannot offer an explanation for it. If Ldong ston were in-

---

kyi she rig dpe skrun khang, 1991), 1-138, as they are from the *dbu med* manuscript that was published in the *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgribs*, vol. 54, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 329-515.

<sup>61</sup> See his undated *Sde bdun mdo dang bcas pa'i dgongs 'grel thad ma rigs gter la nye bar mkho ba mtha' gnyis gsal byed, Thub pa'i dgongs pa rab gsal dang tshad ma rig[s] gter skor*, vol. 1 (Dehra Dun: Pal Evam Chodan Ngorpa Centre, 1985), 63 [= *Ibid.*, *Tshad ma rigs gter gyi 'grel pa*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988), 293].

<sup>62</sup> See his "Sources for the Study of Tibetan *Pramāṇa* Traditions Preserved at the Bihar Research Society, Patna," *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition*, ed. E. Steinkellner (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 100-1.

deed confused with Rong ston chen po [Shākyā rgyal mtshan], then we can affirm that it was not because the latter's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary or his exegesis of the *Rigs gter* had the subtitle of *Rigs pa'i snang ba*, for their subtitles were, respectively, *Rtog ge'i snang ba* and *Nyi ma'i snying po*. Nonetheless, he cites the *Rigs pa'i snang ba* several times in his *Rigs gter* commentary, and explicitly connects it once with Ldong ston chen po.<sup>63</sup> Glo bo Mkhan chen writes in connection with the *gzhung*, "the authoritative treatise," which here is not to be understood as a reference to the *Pramāṇavārttika* but rather to the *Rigs gter*:

*gzhung de nyid la'ang dpal ldan paṇḍi ta'i //*  
*rigs tshul gsal bar dpyod ldan 'u yug pa //*  
*rigs pa'i seng ge'i rigs pa grub pa dang //*  
*rong ston chen po'i rigs pa'i snang ba dang //*  
*kun mkhyen lho pa'i sde bdun gsal ba ste //*  
*don gyi 'grel byed rmad byung rnam gsum byung //*

Also with respect to that very text of Sa skyā Paṇḍita, there arose three wondrous commentators of the meaning of the text, having the intellectual acumen (*dpyod ldan*) for clarifying the argumentation of lustrous Sa skyā Paṇḍita:

- [1] 'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge's *Rigs pa grub pa*
- [2] Rong ston chen po's *Rigs pa'i snang ba*
- [3] Kun mkhyen Lho pa's *Sde bdun gsal ba*['i rgyan]

In his own exegesis of the *Rigs gter*'s autocommentary, Glo bo Mkhan chen cites positions held by "'U yug pa" and "Rigs pa'i seng ge", and not once one that was entertained by an "'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge." The first three passages he cites and links to 'U yug pa can be easily traced to 'U yug pa's *Rigs pa grub pa*.<sup>64</sup> But what about those passages that he connects to a Rigs pa'i seng ge? The first three are not retrievable from the *Rigs pa grub pa*,<sup>65</sup> so that we are thus led to conclude that we must distinguish between his "'U yug pa" and "Rigs pa'i seng ge." Who might this Rigs pa'i seng ge have been? I would suggest that he is Byang chub dpal bzang po (1287-1375), alias Bka' bzhi pa Rigs pa'i seng ge. His biographer and disciple Seng ge bzang po wrote in his 1419 biography that he had composed a *Rigs gter* com-

<sup>63</sup> See the NYI, 111 [= NYI[1] 72, NYI[2], 112].

<sup>64</sup> This is RGR, for which see above n. 6. For the references to 'U yug pa, see NYI, 16, 27, 61, etc. [=NYI[1], 12, 18, 40, etc.; NYI[2], 16, 27, 61, etc.], which relate to RGR, 3, ?, 24, etc.

<sup>65</sup> NYI, 28, 162, 296, etc. [= NYI[1], 19, 104, 188, etc.; NYI[2], 27, 163, 302, etc.].

mentary.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, Glo bo Mkhan chen's references to Ldong ston clearly indicate that whatever his work may have been called, it had very much to do with the *Rigs gter*.<sup>67</sup> However, as I indicated above, not once do these link Ldong ston to any title of a work, let alone to one that is subtitled *Rigs pa'i snang ba*! The same cannot entirely be said without some ambiguity of Glo bo Mkhan chen's notices concerning Lho pa Kun mkhyen,<sup>68</sup> although they do make clear that his work did at least in part deal with the *Rigs gter*, even if the title suggests that it was conceived as an introduction to Dharmakīrti's oeuvre. But then this was also the intent of the *Rigs gter*! Glo bo Mkhan chen's commentary draws attention to a good number of text-critical problems that beset the various "editions" of texts of the *Rigs gter*, and this aspect of his work is rather unusual as far as Tibetan texts go. When we place this along side his obvious interest in the history of ideas and the exegetical development of *Rigs gter* studies, we can only conclude that much of his work was composed under the direct influence of Gser mdog Paṅ chen, even if it is also quite transparent therein that he did not always agree with the master, which is something he articulates with some poignancy in his autobiography.<sup>69</sup>

The recent publication of the edited text of a full manuscript of Mi nyag 'Jam dbyangs grags pa's substantial autobiography will hopefully soon prove to be of immense value for the study of late fourteenth and early fifteenth century Khams in particular, for he was a great traveler and was quite well connected in this region. This work deserves close scrutiny. His dates have not yet come down to us, but we know that he was somewhat of a disciple of Mi nyag Mkhan chen Rin chen bzang po (1317-83), alias Rma Se Ston pa, and especially of Ye shes rdo rje dpal bzang po, the author of Rin chen bzang po's un-

<sup>66</sup> See his *Mkhan chen bka' bzhi pa chen po rig[s] pa'i seng ge'i rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che'i rgya mtsho*, *Mi nyag mkhas dbang lnga'i rnam thar*, ed. Thub bstan nyi ma (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986), 71. A synoptic version of his biography by Skyed legs sprul sku Nam mkha' rgyal mtshan was published in *Mkhas shing grub pa'i skyes chen mi lnga'i rnam thar ngo mtshar snang ba* in *Mi nyag 'jam dbyangs grags pa'i rang rnam*, ed. Mi nyag Thub bstan chos dar (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2005), 312-8. Skyed legs Sprul sku is a contemporary scholar about whom I know nothing.

<sup>67</sup> NYI, 15, 47, 56, etc. [= NYI[1], 10, 31, 37, etc.; NYI[2], 15, 47, 56, etc.]. The first of these citations 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.

<sup>68</sup> NYI, 38, 111, 114, etc. [= NYI[1], 25, 72, 74, etc.; NYI[2], 38, 112, 115, etc.].

<sup>69</sup> Kramer, *A Noble Abbot from Mustang. Life and Works of Glo bo Mkhan chen (1456-1532)*, 159-64. His reference to "our own learned teachers" (*kho bo'i bla ma mkhas pa dag*) in NYI, 33 [= NYI[1], 23; NYI[2], 34], is without a doubt inclusive of Gser mdog Paṅ chen.

dated biography, as well as of Karma pa V De bzhin gshegs pa (1384-1415) with whom he stayed at the court of the Yongle Emperor (r. 1402-24). We can therefore triangulate the year of his birth to *circa* 1370. Rin chen bzang po had founded Rā tī Byams pa gling monastery in 1364<sup>70</sup> and the young 'Jam dbyangs grags pa first visited it at the age of nine. This seems to have been a rather well endowed institution with a very fine library, one that with the usual ups and downs over the centuries amazingly still exists to this day. What is unusual is that he mentions in his autobiography a number of titles of what are ostensibly rare thirteenth and fourteenth century treatises of *tshad ma* and the names of their authors, two of whom are definitely Sa skya pa scholars, namely, Shong ston [Lo tsā ba] Rdo rje rgyal mtshan (13<sup>th</sup>c.) and Gnas drug pa Blo gros mtshungs med (14<sup>th</sup>c.).<sup>71</sup> He attributes to both a *Tshad ma bsdu pa*, a generic term that can indicate a kind of *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary or a text like the *Rigs gter*, and it is possibly not insignificant to keep in mind that Shong ston Lo tsā ba was of course one of Ston gzhon's teachers! Unfortunately, his work has not surfaced so far, but its subtitle may have very well been the *Blo gros kha 'byed*. Dpang Lo tsā ba cites this work, which is most probably a treatise of *tshad ma*, in connection with the concept of definition (*mtshan nyid*) in his undated *Abhidharmasamuccaya* commentary.<sup>72</sup>

In sum, then, the places where we have reason to suspect that the *Rigs gter* to have been part of the curriculum or where the *Sa lugs* held sway are the following:

In Gtsang:

Sa skya	Rkyang 'dur
Stag thog	Don mo ri
Sreg shing	Chos sdings

In Dbus:

Bsam yas

In Khams:

Sho monastery	Tsom mdo gnas gsar
---------------	--------------------

<sup>70</sup> See *Khams phyogs dkar mdzes khul gyi dgon sde so so'i lo rgyus gsal bar bshad pa thub bstan gsal ba'i me long*, comp. Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi chos lugs lo rgyus zhib 'jug so'o et al., ed. 'Jigs med bsam grub, vol. 3 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1995), 121.

<sup>71</sup> *Mi nyag 'jam dbyangs grags pa'i rang rnam*, ed. Mi nyag Thub bstan chos dar, 5-6.

<sup>72</sup> See his *Chos mngon pa kun las btus kyi rgya cher 'grel pa shes bya gsal byed* (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 38. For Dpang Lo tsā ba's treatise, see my "Notes on Jñānamitra's Commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*," *passim*.

In Amdo:

Dpal gyi sde chen in Shing kun (= Ch. Lintao)  
Sprul pa'i sde

In Yuan China:

Dadu  
Shangdu

In addition to the two institutions in Khams, and those that were affiliated with them, there were a number of others that, according to local histories, were founded either by Sa skya Paṇḍita, by 'Phags pa, or by their mutual disciple Sga A gnyan dam pa Kun dga' grags (1230-1303).<sup>73</sup>

#### 4. A Profile of Ston gzhon's Life

Like so many other Tibetan scholars, Ston gzhon has yet to be placed on the map of thirteenth century Tibetan intellectual history, a map that has till the present remained more or less a blank and barren document, punctuated only here and there with a major figure whose writings more often than not were either irretrievably lost or awaited their lucky recoverer and publisher. Many of the lines that would otherwise connect these men [and several women] because of their shared institutional, scholarly and spiritual practice-oriented affiliations have now all but faded from historical memory. And only a concerted effort at carefully sifting and reading through the available literature, which remains a mere fragment of what was written in highly literate Tibet, will enable us fruitfully to connect some of the dots through which an outline, a profile — and it will never be more than that — of an individual can emerge. Such a profile allows us a modicum of access to the intellectual lives of these men and women, their interaction, and the influence they may have exerted on their contemporaries and later generations. The present section, which aims to shed some light on the life of Ston gzhon, is a first attempt at doing precisely this, but, being of necessity relatively thin on details, it is at a considerable remove from being an unqualified success. Alas, no manuscript of his biography or autobiography, if ever one existed, has come to light so far! Further, since only very few of the available sources other than his *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary relate

---

<sup>73</sup> See *Khams phyogs dkar mdzes khul gyi dgon sde so so'i lo rgyus gsal bar bshad pa thub bstan gsal ba'i me long*, comp. Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi chos lugs lo rgyus zhib 'jug so'o et al., ed. 'Jigs med bsam grub, vol. 1-3.



anything that would otherwise cast light on his life, his institutional status, and the people with whom he was involved, the difficulty of finding out more about him is exacerbated by the fact that *ston gzhon*, a contraction of [at a minimum] *ston pa gzhon nu*, is by itself an unusual name in religion. Two possibilities offer themselves in the interpretation of this phrase. Given that it is not entirely likely that it is in fact a bona fide name in religion, we could interpret it as a sobriquet, meaning "the young teacher." The term *ston* is short for *ston pa*, which is a title of sorts that we often come across in especially pre-fifteenth century Tibet. In this sense, there are prima facie at least four men in the thirteenth century who, since they share this nickname, if it is one, may be considered potential candidates for the identity of our Ston gzhon. These are: Sbas pa Ston gzhon, Cog ro Ston gzhon, Skag pa Ston gzhon — in each case, *sbas*, *cog ro*, *skag* are toponyms — and just Ston gzhon. 'Gos Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392-1481) writes that, born in 1244, the first was associated with Spyil bu monastery in 'Chad kha, which was located in 'Phan yul, roughly to the north of Lhasa.<sup>74</sup> The connections of this Bka' gdams pa institution's ruling family with especially Sa skya Paṇḍita and 'Phags pa are such that his identity with our Ston gzhon can by no means be *a priori* excluded. But we know nothing else about him and the question thus remains open. The second and third are registered in the Sa skya pa scholar Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po's (1382-1456) lengthy record of what he had studied with his teachers and the lineages through which they were handed down, his *Thob yig*.<sup>75</sup> Skag pa Ston gzhon would probably be too old to warrant serious consideration, as he appears to have been a contemporary of Sa skya Paṇḍita. But the chances are better than good that the Ston gzhon from Cog ro<sup>76</sup> is the

<sup>74</sup> *Deb gter sngon po*, ed. L.Chandra (Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1976), 250 [G.N. Roerich, tr., *The Blue Annals* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979), 280]. 'Gos Lo tsā ba's narrative seems to be largely based on the same kind of sources that were at the disposal of Yar lung Jo bo Shākya rin chen sde while he was writing his ecclesiastic history of 1376; see his *Chos 'byung*, ed. Dbyangs can (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 112-3. Sbas pa Ston gzhon is there associated with the "five treatises of Maitreya" and Madhyamaka, and not with *tshad ma*. Of course, this means nothing by itself, and we can most certainly assume that he was familiar with *tshad ma* as well. Using the dating proposed by Dung dkar Rin po che in his dictionary, tbrc.org dates the year of his birth to 1223.

<sup>75</sup> *Thob yig rgya mtsho*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 36, 88/1, 61/3.

<sup>76</sup> Perhaps writing late in his life, Nyang ral Nyi ma'i 'od zer (1124-92) relates in what has been assumed to have been his chronicle that there were three places in Central Tibet called Cog ro; one in Dbus, one in Shangs and one in Nyang; see *Chos 'byung me tog snying po sbrang rtsi'i bcud*, ed. Nyan shul Mkhyen rab 'od gsal, Gangs can rig mdzod 5 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 112.

author of our *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary. Not only does Ngor chen state that he had studied with 'Phags pa a corpus of the writings of the founding fathers of the Sa skya pa school, but he also associates him with a Chos kyi brtson 'grus, who was one of his students, and [indirectly] with a certain Sangs rgyas rin chen who in turn was one of the students of the latter. We shall see below that Ston gzhon as the author of the *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary mentions two men with these very names in the colophon of his work. Ngor chen mentions the fourth individual, Ston gzhon Rdo rje shes rab, in his catalog of Indian and Sa skya pa commentaries on the *Hevajratantra*.<sup>77</sup> He is there said to have written a series of notes (*zin bris*) that follow 'Phags pa's views on the tantra. And it is for this reason that I would be inclined to hold that he is identical with Cog ro Ston gzhon. In each of these instances, we cannot of course exclude the possibility that gzhon [nu] is the first part of a larger compound reflecting his actual name in religion, an instance of which we meet in Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan's (1302-64) autobiography, where mention is made of Ston pa Gzhon nu 'od.<sup>78</sup> If so, then we would have to write his name not as "Ston gzhon," but as "Ston Gzhon."

In his very brief introduction, Sun summarizes only some of the information Ston gzhon imparted in the colophon of his work and notes that 'Gos Lo tsā ba mentions him in the following lineage along which the *Pramāṇavārttika* was transmitted in Tibet: Sa skya Paṇḍita → 'U yug pa → Zhang btsun Mdo sde dpal → 'Jam dbyangs skya bo → Dpal ldan pa [= Dpal ldan seng ge or Dpal ldan tshul khri] → 'Jam dbyangs Ston gzhon → Nor bzang[s] dpal.<sup>79</sup> But there is more that can be extracted from his *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary for, happily, his work offers a number of other significant details about his

<sup>77</sup> *Kyai rdo rje'i 'grel pa'i dkar chag*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 58, 286/1.

<sup>78</sup> *Bka' chems mthong ba don ldan, Rlangs kyi po ti bse ru rgyas pa*, ed. Chab spel Tshen brtan phun tshogs and Nor brang Ö rgyan, Gangs can rig mdzod 1 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1986), 139.

<sup>79</sup> *Deb gter sngon po*, 307-8 [Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, 346], where "'Jam dbyangs skya bo" was misread as "'Jam dbyangs Sa skya pa," 'Gos Lo tsā ba comments that Mkhan chen Rgyal mtshan bzang po (1350-1425) had isolated this unusual line after some research; for the latter, see the *Deb gter sngon po*, 685-6 [Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, 781-2]. The Mkhan chen also figures in Zhwa dmar IV Chos grags ye shes' (1453-1524) 1517 biography of 'Gos Lo tsā ba as his *karmācārya* when he was fully ordained as a monk in 1410. Earlier, in 1403 and 1405, Bsam grub bzang po had taught the *Pramāṇavārttika* and Nor bzang dpal's commentary (*nor bzang tik*) to the young 'Gos Lo tsā ba. For these data, see Zhwa dmar IV's *Dpal ldan bla ma dam pa mkhan chen thams cad mkhyen pa don gyi slad du mtshan can nas smos te gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che mchog tu rgyas pa'i ljon pa* [dbu can manuscript in 74 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 003259(11), 4b-5a [= 'Gos lo gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam thar, ed. Ngag dbang nor bu (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004), 11-2].

life and teachers. In fact, it most probably contains much more information about him than I have been able to excavate, for it remains true that a measure of familiarity with a certain epoch or tradition in Tibetan Buddhism can simply not compete with, nor be a substitute for, the kind of learning a native scholar living in that period could bring to his enjoyment of a work. Such a savvy contemporary would no doubt have several occasions to wrinkle a smile when, in his perusal of Ston gzhon's study, he was picking up on a subtle allusion or a learned innuendo anent a contemporary intellectual, work, or event. Doubtless, many of these must have flown over my head unnoticed, but a little experience with the period does open a few doors, especially when we come somewhat prepared for what we might find. For example, the fourth of the six verses with which Ston gzhon introduces his work reads *śleṣa*-like<sup>80</sup>:

*shes bya kun la kun nas sbyangs pa'i blo gros mchog gi lus  
rgyas shing //  
mkhas rnams dga' ba'i yon tan brgya phrag du ma'i brgyan gyis  
rnam par mdzes //  
dri med bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan brtan par skyong mdzad lhar  
bcas 'gro ba'i dpal //  
chos rje chos rgyal bzang po'i zhabs pad dri ma med la gus  
phyag 'tshal //*

*Expanding the corpus of the supreme intellect that has been  
trained in every respect regarding all that is knowable,  
Beautified with the ornament of many hundreds of qualities that  
delight the learned,  
Protecting the stability of the victory banner of the stainless  
Teaching, the lustre of heaven and the world,  
Reverential homage to the stainless lotus feet of the good, reli-  
gious lord, the religious king!*

As indicated by bold letters, this verse is obviously a collage of various parts of a personal name. And already a first reading will alert the attentive reader that his use of *chos rje chos rgyal*, "Lord of religion, King of religion," alludes to the fact that someone important is most probably being alluded to in this verse. Once we recognize that *blo gros* of line one, *rgyal mtshan* and *dpal* of line three, and *bzang po* of line four form the name in religion "Blo gros rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po," we can identify the individual to whom he pays homage

---

<sup>80</sup> STON, 3.

as 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po.<sup>81</sup> But this is not all, the verse also hides the name in religion of Sa skya Paṇḍita, as indicated in bold letters:

*shes bya kun la **kun** nas sbyangs pa'i blo gros mchog gi lus rgyas  
shing //  
mkhas rnams **dga'** ba'i yon tan brgya phrag du ma'i brgyan gyis  
rnam par mdzes //  
dri med bstan pa'i **rgyal mtshan** brtan par skyong mdzad lhar  
bcas 'gro ba'i **dpal** //  
chos rje chos rgyal **bzang po**'i zhabs pad dri ma med la gus  
phyag 'tshal //*

*Expanding the corpus of the supreme intellect that has been  
trained in **every respect** regarding all that is knowable,  
Beautified with the ornament of many hundreds of qualities that  
**delight** the learned,  
Protecting the stability of the **victory banner** of the stainless  
Teaching, the **lustre** of heaven and the world,  
Reverential homage to the stainless lotus feet of the **good**, reli-  
gious lord, the religious king!*

And finally, line 3 may also cloak "Dri med dpal [\*Vimalaśrī]", the name of his Kashmirian teacher, on whom see below.

Now a Ston gzhon figures at least twice in 'Phags pa's oeuvre. In the fall of 1277, 'Phags pa lectured in Sa skya on a number of canonical sūtra-texts, including the *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, and the summary of this sūtra contained in his collected writings is owed to the notes a Ston gzhon had taken down while he was in attendance.<sup>82</sup> He may also be the same as the addressee of a very short "letter" 'Phags pa wrote to a Ston gzhon at an unknown time in the form of two quatrains; the text of this little ephemeral document reads as follows:<sup>83</sup>

<sup>81</sup> To be sure, the epithet *chos kyi rje* in STON, 233, ad PV, III: 54c-d, refers to Sa skya Paṇḍita and not to 'Phags pa, for Ston gzhon alludes here to a passage in the *Rigster* autocommentary, which virtually begins with a quote of the same *Pramāṇavārttika* half-verse, for which see RGRG, 168/4 ff. [=RGRG[1], 49 ff.].

<sup>82</sup> *Byang chub sems dpa'i sa'i* (sic) *sdom*, SSBB, vol. 7, no. 238, 225/1. It will be noted that the title suggests that this is a summary of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*!

<sup>83</sup> See *Ston gzhon la spring ba*, SSBB, vol. 7, no. 278, 242/3; it is also cited in *Tsom mdo gdan rabs kun btus, Smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar phyogs sgrig*, ed. Padma tshul khriims, 120. A Ston gzhon is briefly mentioned by 'Chad kha ba Nam mkha' 'bum (1207-after 1267) in his narrative of a second episode in 'Phags pa's life for late 1267, which A mes zhabs cites in his *Sa skya'i gdung rabs ngo mtshar bang mdzod*, 184.

*blo che rlom che spobs pa che //  
 gzugs chung 'khos chung longs spyod chung //  
 chen po gsum dang chung ngu gsum //  
 gcig la 'dzom[s] pa de la spring //*

*tshul khrims dag pa'i rtsa ba rab brtan zhing //  
 mang du thos pa'i lo 'dab kyis phyug pa'i //<sup>a</sup>  
 ting 'dzin zhi ba'i 'bras bus sbud gyur pa'i //  
 ston gzhon dpag bsam ljon pa rgyas gyur cig //*

<sup>a</sup> ...*kyis phyug pa'i //* is not an example of very fine Tibetan prosody.

*Great in intelligence, great in boast, great in courage,  
 Small in size, small in office, small in possessions,  
 Three greats and three smalls,  
 A message to him [in whom these] are fused into one.*

*A firm root of pure, proper behavior and,  
 Resplendent with the foliage of much-learning,  
 Adorned with the fruit of calm meditative integration,  
 May Ston gzhon, the wishfulfilling tree, flourish!*

Reading these verses, it becomes readily apparent that apart from their mere existence, they are otherwise almost devoid of any historical content. The phrase "the root of pure behavior" could be a nod at the *pratimokṣa* vow, meaning that he may have been a monk and not a layman. What we are able to conclude without any ambiguity from the last verse is that Ston gzhon was already respected for his learning when it was written, that is, he was either no longer young, or he was a prodigious youth. These very same two quatrains are also cited in Tshul khrims rin chen's sketch of the life of Ston pa Tshul khrims gzhon nu (1197-1277), the second abbot of Tsom mdo gnas gsar, where it is further related that 'Phags pa left the area sometime during the intermediate autumn-month of 1275.<sup>84</sup> Although he is referred

<sup>84</sup> Byang chub 'od zer, *Tsom mdo gdan rabs kun btus*, 120. On p. 122, we learn that he had written commentaries on the *Sum cu pa* and *Rtags kyi 'jug pa*, the little Tibetan "grammatical" treatises whose textual history is still beset with so much mystery, a work on tantric practice (*sngags kyi thabs lam*) and songs of liberating gnosis (*rtogs pa'i nyams mgar*), and what appears to be a commentary on Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvalī* (*Rin 'phreng 'grel pa*). 'Phags pa was recognized as the one who was in control of Central Tibet on behalf of the Mongol imperial court. It is perhaps no accident that he would write a study of the *Ratnāvalī*, since this work is fundamental to Buddhist notions of kingship and its ethical dimensions; see C. Scher-

to as "Ston tshul" and "Ston gzhon" in this biography, this man's dates preclude him from being our Ston gzhon and it is he who is no doubt the very same person who was the focus of a short article by L. Petech.<sup>85</sup> Tshul krims rin chen states that he passed away on the fifth day of the seventh month, that is, on July 7, 1277. The summary of *Daśabhūmikasūtra* that is contained in 'Phags pa's writings is dated September of the same year and this renders the identity of these two men, both of whom happen to be called Ston gzhon, an impossibility.

Ston gzhon refers once in the body of his text to a *kham s gsum gyi chos kyī rgyal po*, "Religious King of the Three Realms," a phrase that in those passages where he takes pains to identify his teachers — he identifies him as "our teacher" (*kho bo'i bla ma*) — can here only indicate 'Phags pa. The context in which the latter is mentioned is at the end of his interpretation of twelve verses of the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s third chapter on perception, in which, in PV, III: 208-19, Dharmakīrti essayed to come to terms with the irreconcilable difficulties a philosopher encounters when he is committed to a realistic ontology and a mentalistic epistemology, that is, when he argues from being or from being-aware.<sup>86</sup> There, Ston gzhon makes the following observation that is perhaps not altogether free from hyperbole.<sup>87</sup>

...tshigs su bcad pa bcu gnyis pa'i bshad pa ni mdzod mdzad pa dang / ṭi ka byed pa gzhan gyis gzhan dang gzhan du bshad na'ang / kho bos ni / kho bo'i bla ma kham s gsum chos kyī rgyal po gsung rab thams cad rnam par 'byed pa'i mkhyen rab yangs pa can gyi gsung ngag rin po ches gzhung gzhan du bshad pa la brten nas rnam par bshad pa 'di kho na gzhung gi dgongs pa yin no //

---

rer-Schaub, "Immortality extolled with reason: Philosophy and politics in Nāgārjuna," *Pramāṇakīrti. Papers Dedicated to E. Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, ed. B. Kellner et al., Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 70.2 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2007), 757-93.

<sup>85</sup> See L. Petech, "Ston-tshul: The Rise of Sa-skyā Paramouncy in Khams," *Tibetan History and Language. Studies dedicated to Uray Géza on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. E. Steinkellner Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 26 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1991), 416-22.

<sup>86</sup> For these verses, see their translation and analysis in T. Vetter, *Erkenntnisprobleme bei Dharmakīrti* (Wien: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1964), 69-70, and now also J.D. Dunne, *Foundations of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2004), 401-10.

<sup>87</sup> STON, 280.

...even if the explanation of these twelve quatrains were explained in various different ways by the author of the Treasury (*mdzod*) [= 'U yug pa]<sup>88</sup> and other commentators, according to me, only the explanation conceived by me on the basis of what was explained in another text by the precious statement (*gsung ngag rin po che*) of my teacher, the religious king of the three realms, who has an expansive Buddha-like intuitive understanding for analyzing all the pronouncements of the Buddha and his followers, is the intent of the text of the *Pramāṇavārttika*.

His use of the highly charged phrase "precious statement" can only be intentional. It is a reflex of, if it does not directly refer to, the esoteric Path-and-Result (*lam 'bras*) teachings of the Sa skya pa tradition, which takes its point of departure from Virūpa's *Rdo rje'i tshig rkang, The Adamantine Lines*.<sup>89</sup> Davidson tentatively suggests that Virūpa flourished in the final quarter of the eleventh century, and this fits well with the very persuasive arguments in A. Sanderson's recent forceful restatement of the priority of the Śaivite over the Buddhist tantras in which he observes that the *terminus a quo* of the *Hevajra-tantra* and its related literature is the tenth century.<sup>90</sup> One of the most dearly held doctrinal entities, and hence called *gsung ngag rin po che*, Ston gzhon's alignment of a work by 'Phags pa with this expression is no accident. *The Adamantine Lines* itself is considered to be a crystallization of especially the *Hevajratantra*, and its two explanatory tantras, the specific *Ḍakiniṅvajrapañjaratantra* and shared *Samputatantra* [or: *Samputodbhavatantra*], and their cognate oral instructions and written literature. Gayadhara and his disciple 'Brog mi Lo tsā ba Shākya ye shes (?993-?1074/87) rendered this small work into Tibetan in the se-

<sup>88</sup> It is rather remarkable that Ston gzhon never mentions 'U yug pa by name. In his numerous critical references, he either writes "the author of the *Mdzod*" (*mdzod mdzad pa*) or simply refers to the *Mdzod*; see STON, 21-2, 39, 64-6, 69, 71, 76, 95, 124-5, 141-2, 152, 157, 170-1, 183, 186, 188, 193-7, 199, 203, 206, 232, 251-2, 273, 280, 292, 294, 314, 317-8, 323, 336-7, 342-3, 346, 352, 354-5, 360, 389, 405, 409, 410, 412, 420, 423, 426, 433, 437, 454, 456, 484. He obviously did not like what he was reading! For 'U yug pa's comments on PV, III: 208-19, see RM, vol. 2, 60-6 [=RM, vol. Ga, 133-40].

<sup>89</sup> For a translation, notes, and an edition of this extraordinarily cryptic little text, see R.M. Davidson, *Tibetan Renaissance. Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 477-88, 493-517; for another, at times strikingly different translation, see *Taking the Result as the Path. Core Teachings of the Sakya Lamdré Tradition*, tr. C.S. Stearns (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2006), 13-21.

<sup>90</sup> Davidson, *Tibetan Renaissance. Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*, 53, and Sanderson, "The Śaiva Age — The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period," *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Sh. Einoo (Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, 2009), 163-5.

cond half of the eleventh century, after which a large number of commentaries were composed on it. Originally handed down in a wide variety of circles, the only ones that seem to have survived intact to the present day are those of the Sa skya pa traditions.<sup>91</sup> No doubt this was due in part to the fact that this school's first patriarch Sa chen Kun dga' snying po (1092-1158) is recorded to have written no less than eleven studies of this work and thus figures among this little text's most consummate and foundational interpreters. Ngor chen never completed his history of these highly esoteric instructions, which he had begun at some unspecified time. This task was shouldered, perhaps independently, by his two disciples Gung ru Shes rab bzang po (1411-75) and Go rams pa, and it is the former who attributes to 'Phags pa a study of the *Precious Statement*, which he calls the *Gzhung bshad 'phags mdzad ma*.<sup>92</sup> If this work were not the one hundred and eight-folio commentary on *The Adamantine Lines* the catalog of 'Bras spungs monastery attributes to 'Phags pa,<sup>93</sup> then I am not sure if it is extant. And I am equally uncertain if Ston gzhon's remark can really be construed as an allusion to it. Neither is it entirely obvious to me where, if he did allude to it, 'Phags pa would have inserted a discussion of, or related to, the one found in PV, III: 208-19, in his commentary. And insofar as his other, minor works belonging to this tradition as enumerated by Gung ru, the *Rnal 'byor dbang phyug gi bsrung ba'i yi ge*, *Tshogs sbyor kyi mngon rtogs* and the *Bdud rtsi ril bu sgrub pa'i zhal shes*, are manuals that have to do with practice-related issues, they would not come into consideration. To be sure, the term *tshad ma* occurs almost at the very outset of *The Adamantine Lines*, in which connection Davidson has briefly pointed out that the result of the path is "defined or structured by the 'four-fold episteme' (*tshad ma bzhis 'bras bu gtan la phab*)."<sup>94</sup> It appears that Sa chen, 'Phags pa's

<sup>91</sup> For the early history of the Sa skya pa lam 'bras, see C.R. Stearns, *Luminous Lives. The Story of the Early Masters of the Lam 'bras Tradition in Tibet* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2001) as well as his *Taking the Result as the Path. Core Teachings of the Sakya Lamdré Tradition*, 129-251, 253-84.

<sup>92</sup> See his *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i man ngag gi byung tshul gsung ngag rin po che'i bstan pa rgyas pa'i nyi 'od*, SSBB vol. 9, no. 37, 121/1.

<sup>93</sup> 'Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag, Stod cha, ed. Bstan 'dzin phun tshogs (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004), 373, no. 3798.

<sup>94</sup> See his "Masquerading as *pramāṇa*: Esoteric Buddhism and Epistemological Nomenclature," *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy* [Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997], ed. Sh. Katsura (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999), 33-4. We may quibble with his use, in this context, of "episteme," a precious word coined by M. Foucault who uses it in different contexts and with different meanings attached to it. On the instrumentalist view or on any other interpretation of Dharmakīrti, a *pramāṇa*/ *tshad ma* is precisely a means by which what is true/real can be distinguished from what is deviant/unreal.



great-grandfather argued in his large *Sras don ma* exegesis, allegedly written for his own sons, that these four "epistemes" constitute, and here I paraphrase or quote Davidson:

- [1] the infallible speech of the Buddha
- [2] the validity of the tantric master's, the *vajrācārya*'s instructions
- [3] the authority of the practitioner's own experience
- [4] the reliability of interdependence in the relationship between master and student

The tradition usually cites a verse from the second section of the fifth chapter of the *Saṃpuṭatantra* as an authority for these four, but the meaning of the verse is rather obscure. It reads in the 1744 Sde dge xylograph of the eleventh century translation by the same team that was responsible for the Tibetan version of *The Adamantine Lines*, but which was later revised by Bu ston in the early 1330s, that:<sup>95</sup>

*bstan bcos tshad ma slob dpon dang //*  
*lung gi rjes 'brangs de nyid shes<sup>a</sup> //*  
*gsang don de nyid dngos po yang //*  
*de nyid las ni gcig las gcig //*

<sup>a</sup> We sometimes find *rig* instead of its synonym *shes*.

Other quotations of this verse by Slob dpon Bsod nams rtse mo (1142-82), Sa chen's eldest son, Ngor chen, and Go rams pa suggest a different reading for the last line:<sup>96</sup>

*gcig nas gcig brgyud shes par bya //*

<sup>95</sup> SDE, vol. 16, no. 381, 225/4 [Ga, 104a]; see also the *Bka' 'gyur dpe sdur ma*, vol. 79, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 2008), no. 0405, 286. It is strange that in his catalog of this edition Si tu Paṅ chen Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1700-74) attributes the translation only to the eleventh century team, without mentioning Bu ston's later revision; see his *Sde dge'i bka' 'gyur dkar chag* (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 393-4. However, he does add that Bu ston had claimed that this work is an explanatory tantra of several tantras besides the *Hevajratantra*, a position with which he agrees.

<sup>96</sup> See, respectively, the Slob dpon's *Rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par bzhag pa*, SSBB, vol. 2, no. 1, 30/1, Ngor chen's *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i bshad thabs kyi man ngag*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 38, 127/1, and Go rams pa's *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i man ngag gi byung tshul gsung ngag bstan pa rgyas pa'i nyi 'od kha skong dang bcas pa*, SSBB, vol. 14, no. 87, 168/3-4. The latter's pp. 168/3-9/4, contains a lengthy account of these four *tshad ma*-s.

And this variant reading is found, for example, in the handwritten *dbu can* text of the Stog Palace edition of the Kanjur, which contains the text of the tantra that had not been revised by Bu ston. Be that as it may, its precise meaning remains resistant to interpretation and, in the absence of an edition of the Sanskrit manuscripts and the Tibetan translation[s], Davidson rightly hesitates to pronounce a judgment on it, although he does hold that it fails to articulate four *pramāṇa*-s. And he is in good company. In his 1175 exegesis of the tantra, the Slob dpon for one isolated only three and not four such "authorities" (*tshad ma*) in this verse, namely:

- [1] scripture (*lung*) involves the authoritative tantras (*lung ni rgyud sde tshad ma*),
- [2] its uncontaminated transmitter is the authoritative commentarial treatise (*de ma nyams pa'i brgyud pa ni bstan bcos tshad ma*)
- [3] the one who unerringly teaching its essence is the authoritative master (*de'i gnad ma 'krul par ston pa ni slob dpon tshad ma*).<sup>97</sup>

The Slob dpon firmly places his work historically on both exegetical and text-critical levels by alluding to earlier studies of this tantra — it is as yet not entirely clear whether these were oral or written, though he frequently suggests his readership to consult their own masters for practice-based instructions — and by an occasional remark about variant readings in its Tibetan transmission. It also stands to reason, though this still needs to be looked into, that his tour de force was not written independently of the Tibetan recensions of the corpus of *Saṃpuṭatantra*-related texts such as Indrabhūti's (?-?) *Smṛti-saṃdarśanāloka* (early 11<sup>th</sup>c.), the old \*Kāyastha's (?-?) *Suviniśada* (late 11<sup>th</sup>c.), the *Ratnamālā* by Dpa' bo rdo rje [\*Vīravajra] (late 11<sup>th</sup>c.) — \*Vīravajra was a disciple of a certain Jñānaśrī — and, of course, Ab-

<sup>97</sup> See the *Saṃpuṭa'i tī ka gnas kyi gsal byed*, SSBB, vol. 2, no. 15, 250/1: ...*bstan bcos zhes bya ba la sog pa shlo ka gcig ste lung ni rgyud sde tshad ma'o // de ma nyams pa'i brgyud pa ni bstan bcos tshad ma'o // de'i gnad ma 'khrul par ston pa ni slob dpon tshad ma ste gsum gyis shes par 'gyur zhes bya ba'i don to //*. He quotes PVN, I: 29 [= PV, III: 282], on p. 200/2: 'dod 'jigs mya ngan gyis brlams dang // chom rkun rmi sog kyiis bsal pa // yang dag min yang mdun na ni // gnas pa bzhin du gsal bar snang //, albeit with several variant readings from the received text. For the text, see *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniśaya*, Chapters 1 and 2, ed. E. Steinkellner, *Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region*, no. 2 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2007), 27-28 [= T. Vetter, *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniśaya*. 1. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam (Wien: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1966), 74-5.

hayākaragupta's marvellous *Amnayamañjarī*. According to the latter's colophon,<sup>98</sup> it was first translated in Nālanda by the author himself and Tsa mi Lo tsā ba Sangs rgyas grags. Later, Śākyaśrībhadra and Dpyal Lo tsā ba Chos kyi bzang po (1162-1229)<sup>99</sup> edited this translation with the aid of a Sanskrit manuscript from Magadha (*dbus kyi dpe*) and it was again revised when Dpang Lo tsā ba compared the text with two Indian/Sanskrit manuscripts (*rgya gar gyi dpe*) of unspecified provenance. It is quite probable that he had acquired these not in the Indian subcontinent, for he never journeyed that far south, but rather in the Kathmandu Valley. The sketch of his life by Bla ma dam pa relates that during his first visit there, in 1296, his teacher was a certain Ra ma mā da (=?) ācārya.<sup>100</sup> Dngos grub rgya mtsho, on the other hand, names two teachers, namely, Ra ma [= Rāma] ācārya and Ma tha na [= ?] ācārya — it is not unthinkable that both go back to Bla ma dam pa's ra ma mā da — in addition to a scholar from East India by the name of Cuḍa Paṇḍita. Dngos grub rgya mtsho states in connection with the *Munimatālaṃkāra* and the *Amnayamañjarī* that Dpang Lo tsā ba had requested most of the local Nepalese scholars for instructions in both.<sup>101</sup> In any event, his revision of the *Amnaya-*

<sup>98</sup> SDE, vol. 21, no. 1201 [#1198], 595/1 [Cha, 316a]. The ?1737 Beijing xylograph of this work is probably based on a different manuscript of Dpang Lo tsā ba's translation. Contrary to the Sde dge xylograph, it concludes with a number of verses from ?his pen that occur after the usual translators' credits; see *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition*, ed. D.T. Suzuki, vol. 55 (Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripiṭaka Research Institute, 1955-61), no. 2358, 248/5-9/1. For further information, see the text with text-critical annotations in the *Bka' 'gyur dpe sdur ma*, vol. 4, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1996), no. 0093, 766-777. See also T. Tomabechi and K. Kano, "A Critical Edition and Translation of a Text Fragment from Abhayākaragupta's *Amnayamañjarī*: Göttingen, Cod.ms.sanscr. 259b," *Tantric Studies* 1 (2008), 22-44.

<sup>99</sup> A useful sketch of Dpyal Lo tsā ba's life may be found in Bya btang pa Padma rdo rje, *Dpyal gyi gdung rabs za ra tshags dang gang gā'i chu rgyun gnyis gcig tu bris pa kun gsal me long*, 46-64.

<sup>100</sup> *Lo tsa* (sic) *ba blo brtan la mādza pa*, *Collected Works*, vol. Na, *dbu can* manuscript in folios, C.P.N. catalog no. 003877, 5a. Volume Na of Bla ma dam pa's collected writings is analyzed in my forthcoming "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History III: The Oeuvre of Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312-1375), Part Two."

<sup>101</sup> *Tha snyad rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gsal bar byed pa blo gsal mgrin rgyan legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba*, 300-1: *bal po'i paṇḍita phal che bas* [read: *las*] *man snye dang dgongs rgyan sogs zhus /*. Sanskrit manuscripts of both the *Munimatālaṃkāra* and the *Amnaya-mañjarī* are extant in, respectively, 202 and 170 (?sic) folios; see *Zhongguo zangxue yanjiu zhongxin shouzangde fanwen beiye jing* (*Sunwei jiaojuan*) *mulu /* Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas su nyar ba'i ta la'i lo ma'i bstan bcos (*sbyin shog 'dril ma'i par*) *gyi dkar chag mdor gsal* (np, nd), nos. 86 and 139 [pp. 66, 123]. My thanks go out to V.A. Wallace for so generously giving me a copy of this valuable catalog.

*mañjarī* translation must be dated before the mid-1320s, as Bu ston already registers it in his catalog of translated scripture, which he appended to his ecclesiastic history of 1323-6.<sup>102</sup> Dbus pa Blo gsal Byang chub ye shes (ca.1270-1350) but lists the translation by Dpyal Lo tsā ba [and Śākyaśrībhadra] in his undated but no doubt earlier catalog of a Tanjur collection in Snar thang monastery.<sup>103</sup> To be sure, the only thing that can be legitimately inferred from this is that he was unaware of its existence, and not, though this would be in my opinion improbable, that Dpang Lo tsā ba had yet to complete it. The two catalogs for two different Tanjur manuscripts that may have been authored by Karma pa III Rang byung rdo rje (1284-1339) only register the translation by Tsa mi Lo tsā ba!<sup>104</sup> This goes to show once again that the dissemination of revised or new translations of canonical texts in the Tibetan cultural area was for all intents and purposes a very haphazard affair. And it is safe to say that their inclusion in larger collections was as much happenstance as it was determined by the economic circumstances that prevailed in some institutions as it was by their location, traditions of learning and their consequent resistance to change. Thus it should not be surprising that Ngor chen's catalog of the tantric scriptures of the library of monastery of Brag dkar in Glo bo Smon thang, present-day Mustang, Nepal, which he completed before 1447, only registers Dpyal Lo tsā ba's version.<sup>105</sup> Comparing the comments of the Slob dpon with those of Abhayākara-gupta, it is remarkable to what degree they are at a distance from one another. Further research into this arcane area may establish that this was due to an unexpected heterodoxy of Abhayākara-gupta's views and the relative orthodoxy of those of the Slob dpon. It may also prove to be an unequivocal testimony to the rapidity with which the Tibetan tradition felt itself able to dissociate itself from the Indic heritage and to establish a hermeneutic of this and other tantras independent of it. On the other hand, we must also not discount the possibility that at least some of the differences were simply due to the

<sup>102</sup> *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod, Collected Works, Part 24* (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 1017.

<sup>103</sup> *Bstan bcos gyi dkar chag [dbu med manuscript in 81 folios]*, C.P.N. catalog no. 002376(1), 12b.

<sup>104</sup> See, respectively, *Rje rang byung rdo rje'i thugs dam bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag and Bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag, Karma pa rang byung rdo rje gsung 'bum dkar chag, Collected Works, vol. Nga* (Lhasa, 2006), 459, 631. For these two catalogs, see briefly K.R. Schaeffer and L.W.J. van der Kuijp, *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri*, 46-7, and also D. Martin's blog in [tbrc.org](http://tbrc.org).

<sup>105</sup> See his *Rdo rje theg pa'i bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag, SSBB, vol. 10, no. 156, 350/2.*

various transmissions of the relevant Sanskrit manuscripts and the ensuing different Tibetan translations, provided that the latter were more or less accurate reflections of these. Indeed, a case can be made for holding that the manuscript[s] of the *Samputatantra* used by the Indian master had a considerable body of different readings from the one[s] employed for the Tibetan translation. In fact, contrary to the Slob dpon, Abhayākara Gupta does not correlate \**pramāṇa* of this verse with scripture or the authoritative master, the *vajrācārya* — the term does not even occur in his comment —, and only predicates validity (*yang dag*, \**samyak*) of the commentarial treatise.<sup>106</sup>

Now according to the colophon of the Sde dge xylograph of the *Samputatantra*, Bu ston revised Gayadhara's and 'Broq mi Lo tsā ba's translation and filled in what he must have called the lacunae (*hor kong*) of the earlier translation by translating the relevant passages from the Sanskrit manuscript[?]s (*rgya dpe*) of the text and its commentary (*rtsa 'grel*). Bu ston's own long commentary of this work, which he completed on March 14, 1336,<sup>107</sup> makes it quite transparent

<sup>106</sup> SDE, vol. 21, no. 1201 [#1198], 549/7 [Cha, 158a]: *de ltar gang gi phyir rdo rje sems dpa' rang gi don phun sum tshogs pa dang ldan pa zhes pa de'i phyir de kho na las yang dag bstan bcos te phyin ci ma log pa'i chos bstan pa rnams su 'gyur gyi gzhan las ni ma yin te / thabs byung de rgyu lkog gyur bas // de 'chad pa ni dka' ba yin // de nyid kyi phyir gsungs pa de nyid shes pa'i slob dpon zhes dor bar bya ba dang rgyu dang bcas pa'i rang gi ngo bo mngon sum du byed pa las gzhan rnams la de dag spang ba dang len pa kun tu spyod pa bskul pa la legs pa ni mkhas par 'gyur gyi / gzhan du na ma yin no // de nyid kyi phyir 'di rgyu'i gnas skabs su lung gi rjes su 'brang zhing / de kho na nyid las nges pa'i don gyis / gsang chen te bde byed la sogs pa'i spyod yul ma yin pa'i brjod par bya ba'i ngo bo 'byung ba ste thos pa dang bsam pa dang bsgom pa'i rim pas 'bras bu gnas skabs su gsal bar gyur pa ni / mchog tu ste rab kyi mthar thug pa la gnas par yongs su mngon du byed do // de ltar na rang dang gzhan gyi don phun sum tshogs pa dang ldan pa'i rdo rje 'dzin par 'gyur ro //.*

<sup>107</sup> *Sampu ta'i 'grel pa snying po'i de kho na nyid gsal bar byed pa*, Collected Works, Part 8 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1967), 946: 'dzin byed kyi lo [gloss: *me lo* (read: *mo*) *byi ba*] *sangs rgyas kyis dbang bskur zhing byin gyis brlabs pa'i nag pa can gyi zla ba'i dkar po'i tshes gcig*. The date of Bu ston's work that was calculated with the aid of the invaluable *Tabellen* in D. Schuh, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Kalenderrechnung* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1973), \*80, and much else besides vitiates the argumentation in M. Nihom, "Bu ston, Politics and Religion," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement VI, XII. Deutscher Orientalistentag*, ed. W. Röhlig (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985), 315-24, where we read on p. 323: "Therefore, despite that it is mentioned in the passage [of Sgra tshad pa's biography (*sic*), vdk] on 1332, the *Samputa* commentary may also have been written in 1353." The passage in question refers to Sgra tshad pa Rin chen nam rgyal's (1318-88) biography of Bu ston, for which see D. Seyfort Rugg, *The Life of Bu ston Rin po che*, Serie Orientale Roma XXIV (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1966), 111, 113. But Sgra tshad pa, who is notoriously bad when it comes to providing accurate dates for his master's major writings, does not date this work to 1332. Nihom's article is by and large a précis of the second chapter of his

that the Sanskrit manuscript of the "commentary" in question was the one of Indrabhūti's *Smṛtisaṃdarśanāloka*. In this work, Bu ston distinguishes on one hand between *rgya dpe*, *rgya dpe gnyis*, and *rgya dpe dag* and just *dpe* or *dpe kha cig* etc., as well as *bod dpe*, on the other. The first grouping points of course to one or more Sanskrit and the second to one or more Tibetan manuscripts. Bla ma dam pa, Sa skya's Grand Abbot from 1344 to 1348 and a scion of Sa skya's ruling family that occupied the Rin chen sgang Residence, was responsible for commissioning Bu ston's treatise. In the colophon, Bu ston styles him as a wondrous emanation of Mañjuḥṣa. Further, Bu ston acknowledges that he took the *Amnayamañjarī* as the basis of his work, and this is indicated by his comment on the above verse. Interesting is that he cites there part of the last line of the *Samputatantra*'s quatrain as *gcig nas gcig brgyud*, which at least is *not* the canonical reading of the Sde dge xylograph of the text.<sup>108</sup> The indigenous Tibetan dossier that he used for his exegesis included the explanations of the Sa skya pa patriarchs, that is, the Slob dpon's and his brother Rje btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan's (1147-1216) commentaries, as well as the oral instructions that issued from Rwa pa, which in turn were written down as a commentary by a certain Rngog.<sup>109</sup> Finally, he writes apropos of the *Ratnamālā* that it was allegedly (*zer*) written by \*Vīravajra and that it is in some respects similar to a Tibetan work (*bod ma*). These misgivings about the integrity of this work are, however, absent from the relevant entries in his catalog he appended to his ecclesiastic history as well as from his 1335 catalog of the Zhwa lu Tanjur.<sup>110</sup>

It is a commonplace in Tibetan Buddhism that the oral traditions that grow up around corpora of texts play as much a crucial role in

---

*Studies in the Buddhist Tantra* (Proefschrift, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1982), 96-151, which is richly annotated. Further, its dating to March 1, 1336 in E. De Rossi Filibeck, *Catalog of the Tucci Tibetan Fund in the Library of IsMEO*, vol. 1 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1994), 23, is thus also not acceptable.

<sup>108</sup> *Sampu ta'i 'grel pa snying po'i de kho na nyid gsal bar byed pa*, 540.

<sup>109</sup> A short gloss on the tantra written by Rngog Zhe sdang rdo rje (1030-1106) with the subtitle of *gzhung gsal ba'i sgron ma* was published as *Sam bhu ta'i rnam bshad*, Rngog chos skor phyogs bsgrigs, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, vol. 2 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007), 171-245 [= *Rngog slob brgyud dang bcas pa'i gsung 'bum*, vol. 5/34, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, Mes po'i shul bzhag, vol. 226 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2011), 88-253]. This author makes no mention of any intellectual debt therein to a member of the Rwa clan, but he is reputed to have studied with Rwa Lo tsā ba Rdo rje grags (?1016-?1128).

<sup>110</sup> See *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod*, 1017, and the *Bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po*, *Collected Works*, Part 26 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 440.

the practice of the commentator as do his own textual learning and the consequences of his own spiritual practice. Hence, notwithstanding the notices of Rje btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan that his father Sa chen had studied *tshad ma* with Khyung Rin chen grags and Dpal mi/me dig pa<sup>111</sup> in Nyang stod and the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* plus Dharmottara's commentary on the *Nyāyabindu* with a certain Me'i lhang tshe in G.yu rtse 'byid phu in Grom pa,<sup>112</sup> Sa chen's interpretation of *The Adamantine Lines'* *tshad ma* can also be located in a direct trajectory with what he had learned from his Tibetan, Indian and Nepalese teachers about this verse of the *Samputatantra*. Whatever the case may have been, the influence from his Path-and-Result teachings is unmistakably present in the Slob dpon's analysis of the verse. But we have to reckon with considerable variations. Writing in Sa skya in 1304, the fairly controversial Cha gan Dbang phyug rgyal mtshan has initially only a very slightly different take on Virūpa's work and first gives this list of the four *tshad ma*-s<sup>113</sup>:

- [1] the authoritative annals, explications of the biographies of the teachers (*bla ma rnam kyī rnam thar 'chad pa lo rgyus tshad ma*)
- [2] the authoritative scripture-statements of the Sugata [= Buddha] (*bde bar gshegs pa'i bka' lung tshad ma*),
- [3] the authority of the spiritual experience of the *vajrācārya*'s instructions (*rdo rje slob dpon gyi man ngag nyams pa' [i] tshad ma*)
- [4] the authority of [his] disciple who recalls the spiritual experience (*slob ma nyams myong rjes su dran pa'i tshad ma*).

It is clear that this analysis is substantially identical to Sa chen's. But he immediately follows this quartet by an alternative (*yang na*, "or") listing; here the four are:

<sup>111</sup> For concrete references to this man's views, see my "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," 416, n. 9. He is also severally cited in Dar ma dkon mchog (ca. 1170-1230), alias Dharmaratna, *Rtog ge rigs pa'i rgyan gyi snying po* [*dbu med* manuscript in 91+1 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004783(1), 8b, 10b, 18a, 20b, and 77a.

<sup>112</sup> *Bla ma sa skya pa chen po'i rnam thar*, SSBB vol. 3, no. 5, 85/1.

<sup>113</sup> *Rdo rje tshig rkang gi 'grel pa cha gan gyis bsdebs pa* [*dbu med* manuscript in 46 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 006617(14), 3a. A few details about Cha gan can be found in my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History 1: Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan as a Man of Religion," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 37 (1994), 142-3.

- [1a] the evidential authority of what was experienced by the teacher who has the nectar [of the teaching] (*bla ma bcud ldan gyis nyams su myong ba mngon sum tshad ma*)
- [2a] the inferential authority that has arisen from experience, because the student with the vessel [for the nectar] has practised in accordance with the teacher's words (*slob ma snod ldan gyis gsung bzhin bsgrub pas nyams myong skyes pa'i rjes dpag tshad ma*)
- [3a] the hidden authority for one who has not cut through the conceptual web by means of listening and thinking about what was heard saying that the *Adamantine Lines* is an exposition of the corpus of the one hundred thousand tantras<sup>114</sup> (*rdo rje tshig rkang rgyud 'bum pa'i lus rnam bzhag yin zhes thos bsam gyis spros pa ma chod pa la lkog gyur tshad ma*)
- [4a] the very hidden authority for those without presence saying that the successions of teachers involves an unbroken acquisition of spiritual realization (*bla ma brgyud pa rnam[?s] grub pa thob pa rgyun ma chad zhes mngon* [proof reader's insert: *shes*] *dang mi ldan pa rnams la shin du lkog gyur tshad ma*)

The latter interpretation in particular would be wholly unthinkable in an historical setting where the study of *tshad ma* had not reached a definite level of sophistication and intensity. But then, to be sure, such a level had already been reached in Tibet by the second half of the eleventh century! At this point we have to admit that the foregoing discussion may be a red herring after all. 'Phags pa's commentary on *The Adamantine Lines* could have included a series of remarks on these *Pramāṇavārttika* verses in an attempt to establish the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of the Path-and-Result system. The more likely place where he might have done so would not be in the context of the passage of the *tshad ma*-s, but rather in the one that has to do with the so-called "three visions" (*snang ba gsum*) which immediately follows after it. The second of these is usually called "the vision of spiritual experience" (*nyams kyi snang ba*), and it is there that these philosophical concerns can come to matter a great deal.<sup>115</sup> So far, I have found no testimony, express or otherwise, that these were controversial in his time. But this does not mean that they were not. Indeed, they certainly had the potential to become so, and they did

<sup>114</sup> I am not altogether sure of what exactly is intended by this phrase and the one that follows it.

<sup>115</sup> An expository rather than a polemical account of this vision can be found in Ngor chen Dkon mchog lhun grub's (1497-1557) *The Beautiful Ornament of The Three Visions*, tr. Lobsang dagpa and J. Goldberg (Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, 1991), 112-200.



around the turn of the fifteenth century. Residing in Sa skya around the middle of 1406, the young Ngor chen wrote a scathing critique titled *Rgyud gsum gnod 'joms, Defeating a Vitiating of the Three Tantras*, in verse, which he accompanied with an autocommentary in prose.<sup>116</sup> Of course, the three tantras in question are the aforementioned *Hevajratantra* and its two explanatory tantras, to which he also added the oral instructions that were based on these, namely, the *Precious Statement*. He pointedly says that some scholar in the perfection of insight (*pha rol tu phyin pa'i tshul la mkhas pa kha cig*) [and not in tantric literature!] had asserted that these espoused not a Centrist-Madhyamaka point of view, as was virtually enshrined in the tradition, but rather a Mentalist-Vijñānavāda (*rnam rig smra ba*) one. Among other things, this would go counter to the implication of the famous verse of *Hevajratantra*, II: viii, 10, where Centrist-Madhyamaka is unquestionably privileged as the highest form of philosophical discourse and spiritual insight, being preceded, in this order, by the Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, and Yogācāra [= Mentalist-Vijñānavāda] points of view. This reversal, if it were one, seems to have been inspired by a re-reading of Ratnākaraśānti's (11<sup>th</sup>c.) *Muk-tikāvali Hevajratantra*-exegesis. Ngor chen does not name the Tibetan scholar who had initially raised this issue, but we will presently see that he must have been Red mda' ba. By the time of Ngor chen's writing, Red mda' ba was already marginalized in Sa skya as a virtual *persona non grata*, not least because of the series of public statements he issued in the late 1380s in which he had questioned the canonical integrity of the *Kālacakratantra* and its associated literature.<sup>117</sup> The latter had enjoyed a special place of authority within Sa skya pa traditions for several centuries. Judging from the remarks of his biographer Sangs rgyas rtse mo of Mnga' ris, Red mda' ba's remarks had crossed the line separating forbearance from intolerance, and called for a swift response.<sup>118</sup> He did not have to wait long for a reaction. Ta dben (< Ch. Dayuan [guoshi]) Kun dga' rin chen (1339-99) of Sa skya's Bzhi thog Residence, the monastery's seventeenth Grand-

<sup>116</sup> His collected oeuvre contains two different recensions of this work with two different titles, for which see *Dpal kye'i rdo rje'i lus kyi dkyil 'khor la rtsod pa spong ba smra ba ngan 'joms*, SSBB vol. 9, no. 49, 135/4-44/3 and *Dpal kye'i rdo rje'i lus kyi dkyil 'khor la rtsod pa spong ba lta ba ngan sel*, SSBB vol. 9, no. 50, 144/3-55/4.

<sup>117</sup> Found in the various editions of his still unpublished miscellaneous writings, these were published in the *Bod kyi rtsis rig kun 'dus chen mo*, vol. 1, Skar nag rtsis kyi lo rgyus skor, ed. Byams pa 'phrin las et al. (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1998), 283-93, 294-97, 383-428.

<sup>118</sup> *Dpal ldan red mda' pa chen po'i rnam thar ngo mtshar rmad byung* [dbu med manuscript, folios 44-82], C.P.N. catalog no. 002802(5), 53a-b; see now see C. Roloff, *Red mda' ba. Buddhist Yogi-Scholar of the Fourteenth Century*, Contributions to Tibetan Studies, vol. 7 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichelt Verlag, 2009), 103-13, 216-20.

Abbot from around 1358 to his passing, felt compelled to call a meeting where he was grilled for his unorthodox views. And this would explain his probable relegation to the fringes of Sa skya's scholarly society, which ultimately resulted in his departure from Sa skya in 1390, as well as the fact that his most famous disciple Tsong kha pa was forced to leave his teacher for Zhwa lu when he decided it was time to begin the study of the *Kālacakratantra*. In spite of this, their relations remained close until Red mda' ba's passing. Ngor chen himself was the illegitimate son of Kun dga' rin chen. Drawing out the implications of this position, he notes at one point in his autocommentary that it would involve an internal contradiction in this scholar's own commentary of the *Madhyamakāvātāra* — he does not indicate by way of a direct quotation where this contradiction would occur —, but further down he actually cites from another work of his, which he calls the *Bden pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa rigs tshogs gnad kyi zla zer*.<sup>119</sup> Now a volume of an edition of Red mda' ba's miscellaneous writings, prepared by 'Jam dbyangs grags pa, contains a substantial piece, written in an unspecified year, in the form of a reply to a question on Centrist-Madhyamaka philosophy posed to him by Bka' bzhi pa Nam mkha' 'od zer. Since he spent well over a decade in meditative retreat in the vicinity of Skyid grong, it is likely that it dates to before the year 1400. The beginning of the text titles it *Bla ma bka' 4 pa nam mkha' 'od zer gyi gsung gi dris lan*, but in the colophon it is titled *Bden gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i rigs pa'i tshogs kyi zla zer*.<sup>120</sup>

But let us now return to Ston gzhon. Neither 'Phags pa's own writings, nor the available biographical literature on his life, go any way in demonstrating that he had taken a particular interest in the field of *tshad ma* or single him out as being especially renowned for his brilliant competence in this area. In fact, none of the *gsan yig* or *thob yig* that are presently available recount his studies even indicate that he had enjoyed a formal education in the subject,<sup>121</sup> and he consequently does not figure in any of the *tshad ma* lineages of transmission of the Sa skya pa. Be this as it may, we can fearlessly assume that he had in fact studied both the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the *Rigs gter* with his uncle,

<sup>119</sup> SSBB, vol. 9, no. 52, 162/2, 163/4.

<sup>120</sup> See *Rje btsun red mda' pa'i mdzad pa'i bka' 'bum thor bu* [incomplete *dbu med* manuscript in 335 folios], ed. 'Jam dbyangs grags pa, C.P.N. catalog no. 004546, 228b-55a. Other manuscripts of both works in, respectively, 21 and 2 folios, are cataloged in the *Shes bya'i gter mdzod*, ed. Sun Wenjing and Mi nyag Mgon po, vol. 3 (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997), 312, nos. 30 and 25. Of relevance would also be his open letter to the historical Buddha, the *Ston pa la sprin du gsol ba*, which we find on fols. 210a-1a of this collection; Roloff, *Red mda' ba. Buddhist Yogi-Scholar of the Fourteenth Century*, 307-13, gives the text and a translation.

<sup>121</sup> See my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History VI: The Transmission of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda* According to the Early Tibetan *Gsan yig-s*," 921-3.

particularly when we recall that he spent his entire early career under his care and scholarly tutelage. One of the very few places in his oeuvre where he may have alluded to both is found in two passages of his versified *Rgyal po la gdams pa'i rab tu byed pa*, *Treatise which Instructs the Emperor*, which he wrote for Emperor Qubilai in 1271 while residing in Shing kun, present-day Lintao.<sup>122</sup> Four years later, in 1275, his disciple Shes rab gzhon nu wrote a commentary on this little work when both he and 'Phags pa were staying in the monastery of Tsom mdo gnas sar in East Tibet. If we are to place some trust in what he himself states in his colophon, namely that he wrote it in accordance with 'Phags pa's own words (*bla ma dam pa nyid kyi gsung dang mthun*), and there is no cogent reason to doubt what he says, then the quotation of PV, II: 202c-3b, in support of the first<sup>123</sup> and the one allegedly from the *Rigs gter* in support of the second passage suggest that these issued from him, or at least had his imprimatur. Shes rab gzhon nu cites the *Rigs gter* in the following terms:<sup>124</sup>

*phyi ltar don rig du ma yang // nang ltar rang rig nyid du gcig //*

*Though, externally, [there are] many [types] of cognitions of [external] objects, internally, [there is only] one in terms of self-awareness.*

These two lines of verse are of limited text-historical interest in that, as far as I have been able to determine, they are absent from both the 1284 Dadu xylograph of the *Rigs gter* autocommentary and the 1733 Sde dge xylograph of both the *Rigs gter* and the autocommentary.<sup>125</sup> This absence demonstrates once again that the manuscript transmission of the *Rigs gter* is far from as monolithic as is sometimes assumed.

<sup>122</sup> SSBB, vol. 7, no. 210, 182/1: *kun rdzob rgyu 'bras rten 'byung mi slu bas // ji ltar spyad pa'i rnam smin myong ba'i slad // las 'bras tshul la khyad du gsad mi bya //*, and 182/2: *rnam pa du mar snang ba'i gzung 'dzin dang // gcig na sems de'ang du ma nyid dang ni // brdzun par 'gyur zhing...*

<sup>123</sup> SSBB, vol. 7, no. 154, 103/1. It reads for PV, II: 202c-d: *sdug bsngal skye ba'i rgyu 'di nyid // 'ching yino...*, "Cognitive-emotive bondage is this very cause for the onset of suffering," rather than *sdug bsngal skye ba'i rgyu nyid ni // 'ching yin* (= *duḥkhotpādasya hetuṭvaṃ bandho*), "Cognitive-emotive bondage is the very cause for the onset of suffering."

<sup>124</sup> SSBB, vol. 7, no. 154, 104/1.

<sup>125</sup> The verse text of the *Rigs gter* of this xylograph belongs to a different filiation of the text than the one contained in the Sde dge xylograph of the *Rigs gter* autocommentary, for which see the handy comparative charts in the *Rigs gter*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1989), 395-401.

Ston gzhon relates the circumstances under which he composed his work in his very informative colophon which, written in verse and prose, states in part the following:<sup>126</sup>

*thub pa'i bstan pa lnga brgya bdun pa la //  
 bstan pa'i mnga' bdag sa skya pa yi mthus //  
 bstan pa'i rtsa lag sa chen yongs skyong ba //  
 mi dbang go pe la<sup>a</sup> sras kyi sras //  
 'dzam gling byang phyogs phal cher skyong ba yi //  
 mi bdag de mur zhes bya'i sku ring la //  
 sa skyong de yi gtsug gi nor bu mchog /  
 mkhas mchog grags pa'i mtshan can bka' drin las //  
 'phags pa'i mtshan can kun mkhyen gnyis pa yi //  
 zhabs rdul dri med yun ring bsten pa dang //*

...  
*btsun pa ston gzhon zhes byar grags pa yis //  
 thub pa'i bstan pa gsal phyir 'di bshad do //*

<sup>a</sup> STONm and Suo's edition wrongly have *la'i*.

Thus, he wrote this work for the purpose of illuminating the Buddha's teaching in dependence on his long-time studies with 'Phags pa ('*phags pa'i mtshan can*), during the reign of De mur, the Lord of Man in most of the northern regions, who was the grandson of Go pe la. De mur is of course none other than Qubilai's grandson Temür, that is, Emperor Öljeitü. He waxes more explicit about his debt to his teachers in the prose text, where he writes:

*...bla ma dam pa chos kyi rgyal po rin po che dang / gangs can  
 gyi khrod kyi rigs pa smra ba rnam kyi gtsug gi nor bu lta bur  
 gyur pa mkhas pa chen po zhang mdo sde dpal dang / kha che'i  
 pañdi ta chen po bi ma la shri dang / skad gnyis smra ba chen po  
 shong ston sku mched la sogs pa mkhas pa'i skyes bu du ma'i  
 zhabs kyi pad mo yun ring du bsten...*

The fact that he does not mention a Dpal ldan pa casts some doubt on Mkhan chen Rgyal mtshan bzang po's assertion, as reported by 'Gos Lo tsā ba, that he had been one of his teachers of the *Pramāṇavārttika*. But this does not impeach its veracity completely. It is not impossible that "Dpal ldan pa" refers indeed to Zhang btsun. Again, the Bla ma dam pa chos kyi rgyal po rin po che is of course 'Phags pa. The other scholars with whom he had studied were Zhang btsun, the Shong

<sup>126</sup> STON, 495.

ston brothers, that is, Shong ston Lo tsā ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan and Shong ston Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa, and a Kashmirian scholar by the name of Vimalaśrī. As for the last individual, he can in all likelihood be identified as the Indian-*xitian* monk and expert in the traditional five domains of knowledge (*wuming*, \**pañcavidyā*) Weimaluoshili [= Vimalaśrī], who, together with twenty-eight other scholars, aided Qingfu or Qing Jixiang in compiling the comparative catalog of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist translated scriptures, the *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zhonglu*, in the Yuan capital of Dadu during the years 1285 to 1287.<sup>127</sup> The Tibetan canon, too, knows of an all-round (*gzhung lugs rgya mtsho'i mthar son pa*) Kashmirian scholar named Vimalaśrī or Vimalaśrībhadrā — the *bhadra* affix is often optional —, who was active at Sa skya during the middle of the second half of the thirteenth century. Thus, for one, Zhu chen Tshul khrim rin chen's (1700-62) catalog of the Sde dge xylograph of the Tanjur canon states that he co-translated Ṭaṅkadāsa's *Hevajratantra* commentary, the *Śrīhevajratantrarājatīkāsuviśuddhasamputa*, in this institution with none other than Shong ston Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa.<sup>128</sup> The colophon of this work states that they had translated it at the behest of 'Phags pa himself, here styled *paṇḍi ta mchog dpal ldan chos kyi rgyal po*, who also ordered the official (*dpon*) Zhang btsun to be the financial underwriter (*yon bdag*) of the project. Zhang btsun might refer to either Zhang Dkon mchog dpal (1250-1316) or, what is more likely, to Zhang Mdo sde dpal. A certain Bsod nams dbang phyug functioned as the scribe. Dbus pa Blo gsal's catalog lists Ṭaṅkadāsa's work, but credits the translation only to Blo gros brtan pa.<sup>129</sup> And while Bu ston mentions but Blo gros brtan pa in the catalog appended to his ecclesiastic history, his catalog of the Zhwa lu Tanjur notes both Vimalaśrī and Blo

<sup>127</sup> See Qingfu, *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zhonglu*, *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, ed. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, comp. G. Ono Genmyō (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924-32), vol. 99, no. 25, 180a5, 180b10-1; see also H. Franke, *Chinesischer und Tibetischer Buddhismus im China der Yüanzeit*, *Studia Tibetica. Quellen und Studien zur tibetischen Lexikographie*, Band III (München: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien / Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 116, no. 27, 94. This catalog was studied in detail in Huang Mingxin, *Hanzang dazangjin mulu yitong yanjiu* (Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe, 2003). Working in Beijing in the first half of the eighteenth century, the Mongol scholar Mgon po skyabs used this catalog as one of his fundamental sources for his ecclesiastic history of Buddhism in China, and Vimalaśrī is mentioned in his *Rgya nag chos 'byung* [based on the Sde dge xylograph] (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1983), 168, 174, 179; see also the bilingual Tibetan-Chinese edition in Luosang danzeng [= Blo bzang bstan 'dzin], *Handi fojiao yuanliuji* (Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe, 2005).

<sup>128</sup> *Bstan 'gyur dkar chag*, ed. Blo bzang bstan 'dzin et al. (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1985), 612.

<sup>129</sup> *Bstan bcos gyi dkar chag*, 10a.

gros brtan pa as the translators.<sup>130</sup> Furthermore, Zhu chen writes that a Vimalaśrī might have also co-translated one of his own three minor works on the tantric deity Avalokiteśvara Kulalokanātha with Blo gros brtan pa, and that Dri med dpal bzang po [= Vimalaśrībhadra] co-translated his own *Pañcasikātippanī* with Yar klungs pa Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1242-1346), who was one of Sa skya Paṇḍita's disciples and biographers.<sup>131</sup> The colophon of the latter text reads *inter alia*: *dpal sa skya'i gtsug lag khang du mi chen lha rje ma ga ling gis zhus shing...*<sup>132</sup> This means that the translation was requested by a official-cum-physician with the name Ma ga ling in Sa skya. I am unable to identify the latter, but it seems safe simply to assert that he was a Chinese rather than a Mongol or a Uyghur.

The presence in Central Tibet of Vimalaśrī seems to be yet another indicator of the remarkably open lines of communication that existed among the Tibetan cultural area and her neighbors, as well as the connections between individual families from different regions that could sometimes last over several generations. Namely, Vimalaśrī was a relative of none other than Śākyaśrībhadra. And according to a note in Ngor chen's *Thob yig*, he was the son of Bhūmiśrī, who in turn was Śākyaśrībhadra's nephew.<sup>133</sup> It is therefore quite possible that the much later Sumanaśrī, too, belonged to this very same family. Although he makes only one brief cameo appearance in an entry for the year 1357 in Bu ston's biography, Bu ston's *Gsan yig* makes it clear that Sumanaśrī had studied with a Vi bha ba bhi ma la shrī [= ?], himself a disciple of Vimalaśrī, and a Pha la śrī (?\*Phalaśrī/Pālaśrī).<sup>134</sup>

It now appears that our Ston gzhon gained some international experience by having traveled to the Mongol court in China in the early 1280s. The very same *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zhonglu* catalog registers a Tibetan — his name is there transcribed as *sutuanren* — who was part of the team that carried out the compilation of the canon.<sup>135</sup> Even

<sup>130</sup> *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod*, 1016, and the *Bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*, 438.

<sup>131</sup> *Bstan 'gyur dkar chag*, 688-9. I have been unable to locate these in Dbus pa Blo gsal's *Bstan bcos gyi dkar chag*. Though the *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod*, 1015-6, has slightly different entries, Zhu chen's agree with those in *Bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*, 488.

<sup>132</sup> SDE, vol. 27, no. 2137 [# 2134], 575/3 [Tshi, 194b].

<sup>133</sup> SSBB, vol. 9, no. 36, 77/2; see also 80/1 and 82/2.

<sup>134</sup> See, respectively, Seyfort Ruegg, *The Life of Bu ston Rin po che*, 149-50, and the *Bla ma dam pa rnam kyis rjes su bzung ba'i tshul bka' drin rjes su dran par byed pa*, *Collected Works*, Part 26 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 141.

<sup>135</sup> *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zhonglu*, 180a5, 180b8-9.

though Mgon po skyabs simply transcribed his name by “*Su tñan bzhan*” — a parenthetical remark in his work states that it is a corrupt Tibetan form (*bod skad zur chag*) — and thus failed to identify him, I think H. Franke was absolutely correct in reading Tibetan *ston* for the transcription *situan*.<sup>136</sup> Chinese *ren* would therefore be a transcription of Tibetan *gzhon*, which is pronounced *zhön*. In fact, he may have also been versed in Chinese, for another one of his known accomplishments was his Tibetan translation of Xuanzang's (ca. 602-64) Chinese version of Śāṅkarasvāmin's *Nyāyapraveśa*, which he did jointly with a certain Sing gyang ju (< Ch. *jiangzhu*), a “chief reciter [of scripture],” who must have been Chinese.<sup>137</sup> It was then edited by Lha btsun Chos kyi rin chen (1271-1323), the Tibetan name in religion of the deposed emperor of the Southern Song dynasty, who spent a great deal of his adult life in exile in Sa skya before he was summarily and ignominiously executed at the order of the Mongol court for reasons that are not altogether transparent. The Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit text of the *Nyāyapraveśa* that is also included in the Tibetan Buddhist canon postdates Ston gzhon's version.

Lastly, the colophon of Ston gzhon's commentary closes with such particulars as his place of birth, the names of those at whose behest he had composed his work, and its place and the time:

*rtsang nyang stod rgya gar gyi yul gnyis pa byung ba btsun pa  
ston gzhon zhes bya ba la / ... mi nyag gi rigs su byung ba sangs  
rgyas rin chen zhes bya ba dang / ... chos kyi brtson 'grus la sogs  
pa'i blo gsal rnams kyis yang dang yang bsklu ba'i ngor / bya lo  
zla ba bcu gcig pa'i tshes bcu gcig la / gza' bkra shis dang / skar  
ma tha skar grub pa'i sbyor ba la bab pa'i tshe / tshes spongs  
gnyan phu'i chos grwar yongs su rdzogs par sbyar ba'o //*

In other words, Ston gzhon hailed from Nyang stod in Gtsang, which he likens to a second India. We must take this in the sense that he felt it to be an important, if not the most important, source for Buddhist learning in Central Tibet. He also relates that he had written his work in response to requests by a certain Sangs rgyas rin chen of Mi nyag [here: Xixia] origins and a Chos kyi brtson 'grus, and that he completed it on the eleventh day of the eleventh month of a hen-year at the monastery of Gnyan phu in Tshes spongs. The precise whereabouts of his monastery is unknown for now. Suffice it to say, that it

<sup>136</sup> See, respectively, *Rgya nag chos 'byung*, 179, and *Chinesischer und Tibetischer Buddhismus im China der Yüanzeit*, 115, n. 24.

<sup>137</sup> In *Yinming luoji shi ziliao xuan*, ed. Lu Yu, et al., 5, his name is reconstructed as “Sheng Zangzhu.” For several other chief-reciters, see my *The Kālacakra and the Patronage of Tibetan Buddhism by the Mongol Imperial Family*, 44-5, n. 131, 57.

was located at the lower point of the Gnyan Valley in Tshes spungs, a locale in Dbus. Its date of completion most probably corresponds to November 26, 1297. This year would make it all but certain that he wrote it after the *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary of Rin chen rgyal mtshan, but at present no such claim can be made for its relative chronology vis à vis the one by 'Jam dbyangs skya bo. As we saw above, one of the three Ston gzhon-s, all of whom who belong to the thirteenth century, hailed from Cog ro in Nyang. Adding this circumstance to the names of the two men that figure in Ngor chen's *Thob yig* record, then I believe that the evidence strongly supports his identification with Ngor chen's Cog ro Ston gzhon.

We have already seen that this was not the only work to have come from his pen. The large catalog of [most of] the library holdings of 'Bras spungs monastery registers at least two manuscripts that are attributed to one or the other Ston gzhon, one of whom may be our Ston gzhon, and I list them here for the sake of convenience:<sup>138</sup>

- [1] *Lam 'bras gyi bshad pa gsung ngag nyi ma'i 'od zer* [230 folios]
- [2] *Kun gyi sna lam du ma grags pa'i rin po che'i gsung 'ga'* [*gnyan ston tshul rgyal dang ston gzhon gnyis kyis*] *zin bris su mdzad pa rnam* [38 folios]

Most probably a commentary on *The Adamantine Lines*, the author of the first work is styled in full as Dge ba'i bshes gnyen 'Phun 'dzu Ston gzhon, that is to say, he is associated with 'Phun 'dzu. A Ston gzhon was the co-author of the second, whereby his counterpart was Gnyan ston Tshul khriims rgyal [mtshan/po]. This work seems to have been a series of lecture notes that may have been based on lectures given by Rje btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan, the third patriarch of the Sa skya pa school.

The above discussion still offers too little that is concrete and beyond further inquiry to enable us to draw any airtight conclusions on the identity of our Btsun pa Ston gzhon, but it is likely that he needs to be identified as the one who hailed from Cog ro and who is therefore also referred to as Cog ro Ston gzhon. To be sure, this somewhat unsatisfactory state of affairs is only exacerbated by the fact that there is not much that can be done about it at the present time.

<sup>138</sup> See *'Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*, Stod cha, 214, 329, nos. 2025, 3290. Housed in 'Phan po Nalendra monastery, what is the possibly the very same another(?) manuscript as the first with the same 230 folios is registered in *Bod khul gyi chos sde grags can khag gi dpe rnying dkar chag*, ed. Ska ba Shes rab bzang po et al., 132, no. 2823.



5. The Title of Ston gzhon's *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary

Titles without embedded subtitles, titles with embedded subtitles of every conceivable length, and titles with subtitles in which further subtitles may lie embedded, from the terse to the floridly elaborate, gradually became standard fare in Tibetan letters from a diachronic perspective. However, it is fair to say that, allowing for exceptions, in general the shorter the title, and the older the work. One might claim, and I think this is fully borne out by the evidence, that the increase in the floridity of subtitles, and thus a change in the use of a certain type of diction, has everything to do with the interest in poetry and poetic theory that was the result of the first translation into Tibetan of Daṇḍins *Kāvyaḍarśa* and the ensuing study of poetic theory on its basis. Indeed, G. Tucci made this perceptive and no doubt quite correct observation some sixty years ago, pointing out that it had its inception in the second half of the thirteenth century.<sup>139</sup> To be sure, titles are inherently ambiguous entities, for their origins are often murky. It is sometimes unclear whether the authors themselves had given these to their writings or whether they were affixed in the course of their *Tradierung*. Further, a work may gradually come to be known not by its original title, but by its nickname in which its author had neither a hand nor a stake, or by an abbreviation of its title. O. Almogi has published the only article, a truly pioneering essay, on titles of Tibetan writings.<sup>140</sup> Other than this fine piece, no "titological" work of any kind has been done on the titles we meet in the Indian or Tibetan texts.<sup>141</sup> We do now have a volume that is dedicated to another "paratext" [Genette], namely, the preamble (*arambha*) of a traditional scholarly/scholastic work (*śāstra*) in Sanskrit,<sup>142</sup> but not yet a single one that is devoted to the study of titles in Sanskrit letters, let alone one for Tibetan. The field is therefore wide open, and there is indeed much to be done. Speaking in general terms and restricting ourselves to the titles of Buddhist *pramāṇa*/*tshad ma*-specific texts, we find in India only a haphazard, slow but steady evolution in titles from the simple to the slightly more complex. Much of this was no doubt the result of the rise of the scholastic method and, simultaneously, the onset and development of a vast commentarial literature, its pendant.

<sup>139</sup> See *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, vol. I (Rome: la Libreria Dello Stata, 1949), 104.

<sup>140</sup> "Analysing Tibetan Titles: Towards a Genre-based Classification of Tibetan Literature," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 15 (2005), 27-58.

<sup>141</sup> For a survey of "cette petite discipline," see G. Genette, *Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation*, tr. J.E. Lewin, Literature, Culture, Theory, vol. 20 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 55-103.

<sup>142</sup> See *The Śāstrārambha: Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit*, ed. W. Slaje, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (2008).

There are as yet no comprehensive studies of these in any form, and individual or comparative investigations of the literature have hardly begun. This stands in sharp contrast to certain achievements in the domain of Western medieval book culture. The developments in both must ultimately be viewed against the background of shifts in the local economies of certain regions in the subcontinent and relations of patronage, the types of education that were available, and the curricula that might be offered in a given place.

Judging from the available Indian and Tibetan corpora of manuscripts, titles generally appear on a separate cover-folio, and are often recapitulated in a concluding colophon in which the author identifies himself by name and sometimes also by family or caste-affiliation [in India and sometimes even in Tibet!]. On occasion, this is also the place where he might relate the place where and the time during which he composed his work, or completed it. The titles of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* and *Pramāṇaviniścaya* are succinct and to the point, and we can hardly doubt that they were not given to the texts by their authors. The evidence for this is to be found in the writings of their commentators and their non-Buddhist critics. And already Dharmakīrti refers to the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* as the *sūtra* (*mḍo*)<sup>143</sup> — later, we also encounter the denomination *Pramāṇasūtra* (*Tshad ma[ 'i ] mḍo*). Similarly, the *Pramāṇavārttika* is often simply cited in the later Indic literature as *Vārttika*, and the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* as the *Viniścaya*. In Tibet, the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* is cited as *Kun las btus pa* or *Kun btus* as well as *Tshad ma[ 'i ] mḍo* or simply *Mḍo*. The term *pramāṇa*, "correct knowledge, authority," indicates that these treatises have to do with a kind of authoritativeness, embodied in a logic and epistemology that in their author's opinion is "correct." In the case of Dignāga, *samuccaya* means that his work is a summary account, a compendium of sorts. Only at the beginning of his work, does he relate of what it is a summary or compendium, namely, his earlier writings on these themes whose titles, however, did *not* contain the term *pramāṇa*. The *Pramāṇasamuccaya* sought to establish the foundations of knowledge as the deeply regretted H. Krasser and D. Arnold, have so eloquently pointed out and, while written by a Buddhist, Dignāga did not write it as a Buddhist with an explicit Buddhist doctrinal bias. If, as at least some in the tradition have maintained, the *Pramāṇavārttika* is in fact a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, the question needs to be

<sup>143</sup> See Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, Chapter 3, ed. P. Hugon and T. Tomabechei, *Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region*, no. 8 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2011), 19.5 [= PVIN, 436/ [Ce, 193a]].

raised why Dharmakīrti did not title his work something along the order of *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā* or *Pramāṇasamuccayabhāṣya* and opted instead for the somewhat ambiguous title *Pramāṇavārttika*? To be sure, Kātyāyana (?2<sup>nd</sup>c. BC) famously used the term *vārttika* for his study of Pāṇini's grammar and it was then used much later by the philosophers Uddyotakara (6<sup>th</sup>c.) for his *Nyāyavārttika* and Kumāriḷa (7<sup>th</sup>c.) for his *Ślokaivārttika* and *Tantravārttika*. Bronkhorst states that a *vārttika* "is characterized by aphoristic sentences followed by explanations in less dense prose."<sup>144</sup> This would hold only for Kātyāyana; the *vārttika*-texts of Uddyotakara, Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa, on the other hand, do not appear to fit this description at all. Indeed, the *Nyāyavārttika* is a study of the *Nyāyasūtra* and Vatsyāyana's *bhāṣya*-commentary on the *sūtra*-text, whereas Kumāriḷa's treatises are distinctly commentaries on the *Mimāṇṣasūtra* and Śābara's (?5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup>c.) *bhāṣya* thereon. There is really no evidence that the *Pramāṇavārttika* is a commentary on some *sūtra*-text and some unknown *bhāṣya* thereon. Ganeri's explanation of *vārttika* is therefore more apropos:<sup>145</sup>

- sūtra*: An aggregation of short formula-like assertions.  
*bhāṣya*: A commentary on a *sūtra* whose function is to unpack and weave together its contents.  
*vārttika*: A subcommentary on a *bhāṣya*, defending its particular construction of the *sūtra* over alternatives, making revisions and adjustments as necessary.

Hence, apart from its title containing the technical term *vārttika*, the *Pramāṇavārttika* has nothing in common, structurally speaking, with these other treatises and thus stands anomalously alone and does not conform to the definitions given by Bronkhorst and Ganeri. This notwithstanding, the question whether or not it was in fact a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* was raised several times among Indian exponents of the so-called Buddhist *pramāṇa*-tradition. This was of course closely tied to the fact that Dharmakīrti obviously radically departed from Dignāga's sequence of chapters in his *Pramāṇavārttika* and *Pramāṇaviniścaya*. Ignoring the latter — that they did so is of interest in itself —, Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi both suggest that the former was more or less a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, even if it was not one in the strict sense of the

<sup>144</sup> See his *Language and Reality. On an Episode in Indian Thought*, tr. M.S. Allen and R. Raghunathan (Brill: Leiden, 2011), 54.

<sup>145</sup> See his "Sanskrit Philosophical Commentary," *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 27 (2010), 188, and its expansion on p. 191; another version of this article was apparently published earlier in the *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 25 (2008), 107-127.

word, that is, one in which Dharmakīrti had consequently followed its sequence of chapters and, thus, the sequence of the topics that Dignāga had discussed therein. The Kashmirian intellectual Dharmottara (ca.740-ca.800) does not add much in his large study of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and but also acknowledges, as he must, that the text does comment on certain portions of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, which means that he, too, has a less specific notion of the relationship between the latter two.<sup>146</sup> Indeed, Dharmakīrti himself said as much when he wrote its opening verses that he will clarify his, that is, Dignāga's position (*tannīti*) because many did not understand his "difficult words" (*garīyaḥ padam*).<sup>147</sup>

A brief aside: Now already some years ago, Steinkellner queried the intent of the last verse of the Tibetan translation of Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭkā*, one that is not found in the Sanskrit, and was no doubt added by the Tibetan translator.<sup>148</sup> The cryptic verse reads:

*stong phrag bzhi dang gsum dang bzhi //*  
*brgya phrag lnga dang drug dang gsum //*  
*nyi shu gnyis dang sum cu ste //*  
*de ni gnyis drug gsum bcas so //*

I may be wrong on this but I believe that this verse accounts for the total number of *śloka*-units of the translated text. The first and second chapter ends with the statement that these consisted of, respectively, four thousand five hundred and twenty-two *śloka*-s — *stong phrag bzhi ... brgya phrag lnga ... nyi shu gnyis* — and twelve *bam po*-units and thirty-two *śloka*-units. We know that a *bam po*-unit — this unit is not of Indic origin — can consist of three hundred or three hundred and thirty-three *śloka*-units.<sup>149</sup> Thus the second chapter contained three thousand six hundred and thirty-two — [*stong phrag*] ... *gsum ... [brgya phrag] ... drug ... sum cu ... gnyis*. And this means that the

<sup>146</sup> SDE, vol. 48, no. 4234 [# 4229], 523/4 f. [Dze, 2bf.].

<sup>147</sup> See Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, Chapters 1 and 2, ed. E. Steinkellner, Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region, no. 2 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House/Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2011), 1 [= T. Vetter, *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ*, 1. Kapitel: *Pratyakṣam* (Wien: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1966), 30-1].

<sup>148</sup> See his "Miscellen zur erkenntnistheoretisch-logischen Schule des Buddhismus IX: The Colophon of Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭkā*," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 50 (2007), 203-4, ad SDE, vol. 48, no. 4233 [# 4228], 488/6 [Tshe, 178b]; the same verse is also found at 570/6 [Dze, 168a]. For what now follows, see SDE, vol. 48, no. 4234 [# 4229], 570/6, 605/3; Dze, 168a, 289a]

<sup>149</sup> See my "Some Remarks on the Meaning and Use of the Tibetan Word *bam po*," *Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology* 5 (2009), 123 ff.

third chapter contained four thousand three hundred and sixty-three *śloka*-units — [*stong phrag*] ... *bzhi* ... [*brgya phrag*] ... *gsum* ... *drug* ... *gsum*. In all, then, Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* consisted of twelve thousand five hundred and seventeen *śloka*-units.

Much later, Dharmottara's fellow Kashmirian Jñānaśrībhadrā (ca. 1050) wrote in his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary<sup>150</sup> that the reason the *Pramāṇavārttika* is a *vārttika* kind of commentary is because it "mainly renders understood aspects of the meaning of the terminology" (*tshig gi don gyi cha gtsor rtogs par byed*) that Dignāga used in his work. By contrast, his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* does not qualify to be a *vārttika* because it deals primarily with aspects of rational argumentation (*rigs pa'i cha gtsor*) *per se*, so that, because of that fact, this work is not *vārttika* of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. On the other hand, his junior contemporary Jayanta (early 11<sup>th</sup>c.) criticizes Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi by stating that Dharmakīrti did not explicitly explicate Dignāga's ideas and suggests that his, that is, Dharmakīrti's work should be understood in terms of its very title, namely, as an analytical study of the valid means of cognition *per se*, albeit with the quite distinctive soteriological emphasis on Buddha/*buddha* as the embodiment or matrix of three types of authoritative knowledge, a notion that he had inherited from the text on which he comments, namely, from Prajñākaragupta's (ca. 800) large *Pramāṇavārttikālaṃkāra*.<sup>151</sup> On the other hand, commenting on Prajñākaragupta's work as well, Yamāri (mid 11<sup>th</sup>c.) delved into this problem in a much more systematic way and severely takes Jayanta to task for his views on the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s chapter-sequence and thus attempts to rehabilitate Devendrabuddhi and the position he had taken on the matter.<sup>152</sup>

Titled *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā* and subtitled *Viśālāmalavati* or "The Vast and Stainless One," Jinendrabuddhi's (8<sup>th</sup>c.) *Pramāṇasamuccaya*

<sup>150</sup> SDE, vol. 48, no. 4233 [# 4228], 488/5-6 [Tshe, 178a-b].

<sup>151</sup> SDE, vol. 47, no. 4227 [#4222], 345/5-346/1 [De, 3a-4b]; see also Ono Motoi, "A Reconsideration of the Controversy about the Order of the Chapters of the *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Tibetan Studies*, vol. II, ed. H. Krasser et al. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 701-716, and B. Kellner, "First logic, then the Buddha? Remarks on the chapter sequence of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Hörin* 11 (2004), 147-167.

<sup>152</sup> SDE, vol. 48, no. 4311 [#4226], 1 66/1-169/3[Phe, 179b-191a], where he explicitly cites Jayanta by naming him several times. In the course of his discussion, Yamāri appears to mention a work titled *Tshad ma rnam nges kyi rgyan* (*\*Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*) of unknown authorship. Th. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, vol. 1 (New York: Dover Publications, 1962), 44-45, briefly speaks of Jayanta — he calls him Jina — and Yamāri, and then only in very general terms. But the articles by Ono and Kellner (see supra n. 151) were the first to further tackle Jayanta's discussion, Ono also mentions Yamāri in passing, in a more systematic way. However, a detailed study and analysis of the positions of these two men is still a desideratum.

exegesis is but one of an unknown number of commentaries that were written on Dignāga's main work in the subcontinent.<sup>153</sup> It is extant in two complementary but different Sanskrit manuscripts<sup>154</sup> as well as in a complete Tibetan translation by the great Dpang Lo tsā ba. The Sanskrit manuscript Dpang Lo tsā ba used for his translation appears to have been differently filiated from the two incomplete Sanskrit witnesses of Jinendrabuddhi's work. His disciple Bla ma dam pa was no doubt among the very first to cite his master's translation when he did so on a number of occasions in his critical survey of Dharmakīrti's thought that he completed in 1342.<sup>155</sup> However, there is evidence that Dpang Lo tsā ba was not the first to introduce Jinendrabuddhi to the Tibetan scholarly world and that portions of his treatise, or at least some of his ideas, were known to earlier Tibetan commentators.<sup>156</sup>

The full title of Ston gzhon's work is *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi rnam par bshad pa gnas gsum gsal ba ganggs can gyi rgyan*. It occurs on the title page and is recapitulated several times in the text. The first of such iterations is already found immediately at the very beginning of the work where Ston gzhon gives the putative Sanskrit equivalent of his Tibetan title and then the Tibetan title itself. These are respectively prefaced by the phrases "In the language of India" (*rgya gar gyi skad du*) and "In the language of Tibet" (*bod kyi skad du*). This is obviously a reflex of what we find in the Tibetan canonical texts and its use had already become quite precious if not specious in the thirteenth century. A notable precursor is of course Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* all the available editions of which begin with the phrase: "In Sanskrit, *Pramāṇayuktinidhi*."<sup>157</sup> What can therefore only be called Ston gzhon's work's pseudo-Sanskrit title reads: *Pra mā ṇa bār ti kā bhya kṣa nam tri sthā na pra kā śa ke la śā lang kā ra nā ma — bhya kṣa nam*

<sup>153</sup> Matsuda Kazunobo, "Sanskrit Manuscript of Sthiramati's Commentary to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*," *China Tibetology* 1 (2013), 51-2, provides some evidence that suggests that Sthiramati may have authored one as well.

<sup>154</sup> So far editions of the first two chapters have been published by the China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of the Sciences Press in, respectively, 2005 and 2013.

<sup>155</sup> See Bla ma dam pa, *Sde bdun gyi snying po rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rab tu gsal ba, Collected Works*, vol. Da, 938, 947, 985, 995, 1038, 1041.

<sup>156</sup> This is signaled in my "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," 414.

<sup>157</sup> The text was of course not originally written in Sanskrit, but some later sources did spread the rumor that its introductory verses had been translated into that language, with more recent sources stating that the entire work had been rendered into Sanskrit; see P. Hugon, "Clapping Hands in Skyid grong? Logical and contextual aspects of a famous debate narrative," *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 23 (2012), 62, n. 51.

should be corrected, if at all, to read *bhā śya nam*, the nominative singular form of *bhāśya*. This is followed by the nominal phrase *gnas gsum gsal ba* and *gangs can gyi rgyan*, a noun phrase in which we have a head (*rgyan*) and an objective modifier (*gangs can gyi*). The first informs the reader that it is a commentary (*rnam par bshad pa*) of (*gyi*) the *Pramāṇavārttika*; the term *rnam par bshad pa* is one of several Tibetan equivalents of Sanskrit *bhāśya* and *ṭīkā*.<sup>158</sup> The subtitle, *gnas gsum gsal ba gangs can gyi rgyan*, consists of two parts *gnas gsum gsal ba* and *gangs can gyi rgyan*. Let us first take a look at *gnas gsum gsal ba*.

In Ston gzhon's analysis, Dharmakīrti comments on PS, III: 2b: *svayam* in PV, IV: 42-68. This is unproblematic and has precedents. Defining what conditions a valid thesis or probandum (*sādhya*, *bsgrub bya*) of a debate between two opponents should be fulfilled, Dignāga stated in PS, III: 2, that:

*svarūpeṇaiva nirdeśyaḥ svayam iṣṭo 'nirākṛtaḥ /  
pratyakṣyārthānumāptaprasiddhena svadharmini //*

A somewhat modified text of Tillemans' fine translation of this verse *sans* brackets would be:<sup>159</sup>

*A valid thesis is what the proponent himself claims in its proper  
form alone,  
And in terms of the proponent's own point of departure, it is not  
eliminated by perceptible objects, inference, a credible authority,  
and common sense.*

The Tibetan text as cited by Ston gzhon reads:<sup>160</sup>

*/ngo bo kho na bstan bya ba /  
/rang nyid 'dod dang ma bsal ba/  
/mngon sum don dang rjes dpag dang /  
/yid ches grags pas rang rten la'o /*

This reading is not unproblematic, but it is close albeit not identical to the one found in Vasudhararakṣita's and Zha ma Lo tsā ba Seng ge

<sup>158</sup> For a study of the "Tibetan commentary" (*bod 'grel*) see now Shar ba Thogs med and Blo ris, "Bod 'grel dang de'i thad kyi bsam tshul 'ga' gleng ba," *Mdo smad zhib 'jug*, vol. 1, ed. Kan su'u bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2005), 44-62.

<sup>159</sup> See his *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. An annotated translation of the fourth chapter (parārthānumāna)*, Volume 1 (k. 1-148) (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000), 47.

<sup>160</sup> STON, 391, 414, 417.

rgyal mtshan's translation.<sup>161</sup> Sensitivity to philological problems is a special feature of Mkhas grub's commentarial practice, and it is thus not surprising that he isolated several different Tibetan translations of this verse in his undated *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary.<sup>162</sup> Interesting and important as they are, their discussion should be a matter for another occasion. But we cannot help but note that *rang rten la* for *svadharmiṇi* is philologically not unproblematic, and *rang gi chos can la* definitely seems preferable.

Ston gzhon's topical analysis (*sa bcad*) divides the first portion of Dharmakīrti's detailed exegesis of *rang nyid/ svayam* along the following lines<sup>163</sup>:

- [1] Explaining *rang nyid* [or: *bdag*] (*svayam*) in detail  
STON, 397-416 *ad* PV, IV: 42-90
- [1a] Dharmakīrti's own position  
STON, 397-409 *ad* PV, IV: 42-72b
- [1a1] Briefly demonstrate the necessity  
STON, 397-398 *ad* PV, IV: 42
- [1a2] Stating in detail the rejection of the claim that the subject-matter of scripture (*lung don*) is a probandum  
STON, 398-409 *ad* PV, IV: 43-72b
- [1a2a] Rejecting the non-Buddhist claim that the subject-matter of scripture is a probandum  
STON, 398-408 *ad* PV, IV: 43-68
- [1a2a1] Stating the claim  
STON, 398 *ad* PV, IV: 43
- [1a2a2] Its rejection  
STON, 398-400 *ad* PV, IV: 44-47
- [1a2a3] Rejecting its response  
STON, 400-408 *ad* PV, IV: 48-68
- [1a2a3a] Inquiry into a situation where there is and there is no invalidation (*gnod byed, bādhana*) of scripture  
STON, 400-402 *ad* PV, IV: 48-52
- [1a2a3b] Inquiry into the subject matter in which there is and there is no validation (*sgrub byed, sādhana*) of scripture  
STON, 402-404 *ad* PV, IV: 53-59

<sup>161</sup> PS, 383/4 [Ce, 6a].

<sup>162</sup> See MKHAS, vol. Da, 682 [= MKHAS[1], 943]. Without identifying its origin, Tillemans, *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. An annotated translation of the fourth chapter (parārthānumāna), Volume 1 (k. 1-148)*, 47, n. 166, has *rang gi ngo bo kho nar bstan // bdag 'dod rang gi chos can la // mngon sum don dang rjes dpag dang // yid ches grags pas ma bsal ba'o //* for PS, III: 2. This is the reading of the translation of the PS by Kanakavarman and Lo tsā ba Dad pa'i shes rab.

<sup>163</sup> STON, 397-409.



- [1a2a3c] Demonstrating that a contradiction with the authoritative means of cognition is an error in scripture  
STON, 404-407 *ad* PV, IV: 60-65
- [1a2a3d] Farreaching consequences if [a logical reason were] invalidated due to being invalidated by the absence of a connection [between a property and a probandum]  
STON, 407-408 *ad* PV, IV: 66-68
- [1a2b] Rejecting the claim of [a] *Pramāṇasamuccaya* commentator[s] that the subject-matter of scripture is a probandum  
STON, 408-409 *ad* PV, IV: 69-72b
- [1b] Rejection of others' positions  
STON, 409-416 *ad* PV, IV: 72c-90<sup>164</sup>

Ston gzhon's use of "clarification (*gsal ba*) of *gnas gsum* [*po*] (*\*tristhāna[ni]*)" in his title is of course quite purposive and obviously echoes its occurrence in his comments on PV, IV: 51-53<sup>165</sup>, even if the term *trītyasthāna* only occurs once in the *Pramāṇavārttika*, namely in PV, IV: 51, and has its counterpart in the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, namely in PVIN, III: 12.<sup>166</sup> The verse in question reads:

*tadvirodhena cintāyās tatsiddhārtheṣv ayogataḥ /*  
*trītyasthānasamkrāntau nyāy[y]aḥ śāstrapariḡrahaḥ //*

[/ *des grub don la de dang ni /*  
/ *'gal bar sems pa mi rung phyir /*  
/ *gnas gsum par ni 'pho ba na //*  
/ *bstan bcos len par rigs ldan yin //*]

Tillemans translated this verse as follows:<sup>167</sup>

<sup>164</sup> To be noted is that Tillemans, *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. An annotated translation of the fourth chapter (parārthānumāna), Volume 1 (k. 1-148)*, 103, begins a new topic with PV, IV: 72. Notwithstanding some important internal differences, the six Tibetan *Pramāṇavārttika* commentaries analysed in Fukuda Yoichi and Ishihama Yumiko, *A Comparative Table of sa-bcad of the Pramāṇavārttika Found in Tibetan Commentaries of the Pramāṇavārttika*, *Studia Tibetica* No. 12 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1986), 65, all suggest that Dharmakīrti begins a new topic with PV, IV: 72c.

<sup>165</sup> STON, 401-402.

<sup>166</sup> PVIN, 437/1 [Tse, 193a]; see now also *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapter 3*, ed. P. Hugon and T. Tomabechei, *Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region*, no. 8 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2011), 21.

<sup>167</sup> *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. An annotated translation of the fourth chapter (parārthānumāna), Volume 1 (k. 1-148)*, 80-82

[This is] because one should not think that things established by means of that [treatise] are in contradiction with that [treatise]. When one proceeds to the third type of existent [i.e. *atyantaparokṣa*], it is correct to adopt a treatise.

Sa skya Paṇḍita partly cites and discusses Dharmakīrti's verse in the third and last chapter of his *Mkhas pa rnam s la 'jug pa'i sgo*, whereby Jackson's "accept[ing]" for [*khas*] *len par* (*parigrahaḥ*) already at first blush seems a bit more sensible than Tillemans' "adopt."<sup>168</sup> Stongzhon interprets this verse as follows [what is in bold letters reflects the imbedded PV, IV: 51]:

*chos can lung kho nas grub pa'i don la dpyod pa na lung de  
dang 'gal bar sems pa mi rung ba'i phyir / gzhäl bya gnas  
gsum par 'pho ba'i tshé na /*

*'brel ba dang ni rjes mthun thabs //  
skyes bu'i don ni rjod byed dag //  
yongs brtags dbang du byas yin gyi // [PV, I: 214a-c]<sup>169</sup>*

[*sambaddhānuṅopāyaṃ puruṣārthābhīdhāyakam /  
parikṣādhikṛtam...//*]

*zhes pa ltar **bstan bcos** khyad par can **len pa** ni rigs pa dang  
**ldan pa yin** no //*

*Because of the consideration that, if one were to examine an object that is established solely on the basis of scripture, the thesis (chos can, dharmin), contradicts scripture, is not appropriate,*

<sup>168</sup> SSBB, vol. 5, no. 6, 103/4-104/1; see also D.P. Jackson, *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III). Sa skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*, vol. 2, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 17,2 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1987), 332-6.

<sup>169</sup> See J.D. Dunne, *Foundations of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2004), 361-2, Eltschinger, *Penser l'autorité des Écritures. La polémique de Dharmakīrti contre la notion brahmanique orthodoxe d'un Veda sans auteur. Autour de Pramāṇavārttika 1.213-268 et Svavṛtti*, 102-104, 220-1, and H. Krasser in V. Eltschinger, H. Krasser and J. Taber, *Can the Veda Speak? Dharmakīrti against Mīmāṃsā exegetics and Vedic authority. An annotated translation of PVSV 164,24-176,16* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2012), 70-71, n. 145, 86 ff.

when one moves to the epistemic object qua third existent, the acceptance of a specific treatise is reasonable, as it is stated:<sup>170</sup>

*A statement that is a worthy subject of examination is one that is coherent, offers a suitable method for liberation, and cites some human aim.*

I refrain from delving into a full analysis of this verse and its context; for this, I refer the reader to the recent studies of Dunne, Eltschinger, and especially Krasser. Suffice it to say that the so-called *trtyasthāna* is "the radically inaccessible" (*atyantaparokṣa*) object, as opposed to the "visible" (*parokṣa*, *mngon 'gyur*) one of perception and the "invisible" (*aparokṣa*, *lkog 'gyur*) one, which is the proper domain of an inference that is based on "hard facts" (*vastubalapravṛtti*). The status of arguments that are based on "the radically inaccessible," that is, inferences based on scripture (*āgamopekṣa*) that can be logically persuasive, was a hotly debated topic among Tibetan intellectuals of the fifteenth century.<sup>171</sup> Needless to say, Dharmakīrti uses the term *śāstra* in the sense of *āgama*, which itself is a difficult term that also covers the oral teachings of the Buddha.

Finally, and returning to the title, the expression *ke la śā lang kā ra* is of course a non-translation. True *ri bo gangs can* is a Tibetan name for Kailāśa, and so is the equally common *ti se*, which is actually a

<sup>170</sup> These lines are translated according to Ston gzhon's interpretation in STON, 80-81, namely, that Dharmakīrti explains there what was intended with Dignāga's phrase "believable statement" (*yiid ches tshig, aptavāda*) [or: "statement of a believable person"] of PS, II: 5a-b. Ston gzhon does not overtly cite these two lines, but Sun Wenjing reproduced them in bold as if they belonged to the *Pramāṇavārttika*. To be sure, Dharmakīrti incorporated them a little later in PV, I: 216, but see H. Krasser's penetrating analysis in V. Eltschinger, H. Krasser and J. Taber, *Can the Veda Speak? Dharmakīrti against Mīmāṃsā exegetics and Vedic authority. An annotated translation of PVSV 164,24-176,16, 87-102.*

<sup>171</sup> See especially Gser mdog Paṅ chen, *Tshad ma'i mdo dang bstan bcos kyi shing rta'i srol rnams ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gnam bya ba nyin more byed pa'i snang bas dpyod ldan mtha' dag dga' bar byed pa*, *Collected Works*, vol. 19 (Thimphu, 1975), 73 ff. [= *Gsung 'bum*, Rdzong sar khamtsar bye Inga rig thub bstan slob gling, vol. Dza [19] (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2013), 56 ff.], which severely takes Rgyal tshab Dar ma rin chen (1364-1432) to task for his analysis of the *Pramāṇavārttika*'s *Pramāṇasiddhi* chapter in the context of the strength of the arguments used therein. For the registers of *aparokṣa*, *parokṣa*, and *atyantaparokṣa*, see V. Eltschinger, *Penser l'autorité des Écritures. La polémique de Dharmakīrti contre la notion brahmanique orthodoxe d'un Veda sans auteur. Autour de Pramāṇavārttika 1.213-268 et Svavṛtti*, *Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens*, no. 56 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 67 ff.

loan word that is adapted from the Zhang zhung language.<sup>172</sup> By itself, the modifier *gangs can* simply renders *himavat* and **not** *kailāśa* and it indicates here the Tibetan area as a whole. The head *rgyan* suggests that this work is an "ornament" for or of the entire Tibetan region. Ston gzhon thus makes a universal appeal to the Tibetan intellectual elite at large.

The titular identification is followed by a one-line invocation to Mañjuśrī. This procedure is once again transparently a reflex of the way in which translated texts were originally entered into the Tibetan Buddhist canons. The indigenous Tibetan literature offers countless examples of this, and one of the reasons why an author would want to begin his work in such a fashion is that it lends a no uncertain measure of authority to it. The single-line invocation to Mañjuśrī is followed by four verses, the first of which is an invocation to the Buddha, the "Protector" (*skyob mdzad*) — note here the allusion to benedictory verse with which Dignāga opens his *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. In the second, he petitions Mañjuśrī, symbol of intelligence and wisdom, for inspiration. The third is dedicated to commending Dignāga and Dharmakīrti for their prowess in putting into place the criteria for valid reasoning that ultimately places one on the path to full liberation from *samsāra*. In the fourth verse, as we have already seen above, he pays homage to several of his teachers in an oblique fashion. And verses five and six comprise what may be called his *rtsom pa dam bca' ba*, that is, a statement of his purpose or intent with his work, whereby he in part recapitulates its title by embedding a segment of it in the last verse; the two verses read:

*de dag rigs tshul nyin mor byed des lta ngan mun pa rnam bsal  
kyang //  
gangs ri'i khrod 'dir log lam goms pa'i rgan po rnam ni 'byung  
po'i bya ltar mdongs //  
dri med rigs tshul 'di nyid yin zhes mkhas rnam 'o dod brgyar  
yod kyang //  
blo ngan bya rog sgrogs dang g.yul sprod tsam gyis lhag par  
snyems pa ci byar yod //*

*'on kyang yang dag rigs pa'i snang ba rgya chen tshul bzhin  
bzod nus shing //  
dri med rigs gzhung rgya mtsho skyes tshal la mngon par dga'  
ba'i blo gsal 'gas //*

<sup>172</sup> See Dagkar Namgyal Nyima, *Zhang-zhung-Tibetan-English Contextual Dictionary* (Bonn: Selbstverlag, 2003), 183, and also D. Martin, "Zhangzhung Dictionary," *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 18 (2010), 94.

legs bshad sbrang rtsi'i dga' ston yid 'ong kun nas myong ba'i  
 phyir //  
**gnas gsum gsal byed rnam 'grel rnam bshad 'od stong ldan**  
 'di rnam par spro //

*Although the one that brings the day [= sun] to the modality of  
 their [Pramāṇasamuccaya's and Pramāṇavārttika's] reason-  
 ing has lifted the darkness of the bad points of view,  
 In this multitude of icy mountains, habituated on the wrong  
 path, the elders<sup>173</sup> are as blind as demonic birds [= owls].  
 Although there were a hundred outcries of the learned saying:  
 "This work is truly a spotless mode of reasoning!",  
 What is the point of boasting by merely having done battle with  
 the raven shrieks of bad ideas?<sup>174</sup>*

*Nonetheless, in order that some clear-minded ones who, able to  
 endure something like the large light of truthful reasoning  
 and,  
 Find delight in the lake-born [= lotus] garden of an immaculate  
 treatise of logic,  
 Experience in every way the pleasing feast of the honey of what is  
 well said,  
 This thousand-ray'd explanation of the Rnam 'grel that clarifies  
 the three objective situations shines forth.*

Following these introductory verses, Ston gzhon divides his commentary into three parts along the lines of the well-known phrase *thog mtha' bar 3 du dge ba*, "wholesome at the beginning, the end, and the middle," which is of course a probable allusion to *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*, 11:d. The "beginning" is his comment on Dharmakīrti's invocation and statement of intent; the "middle" consists of his comment on the main body of the *Pramāṇavārttika*; and the "end" involves his comment on Dharmakīrti's concluding verses. He himself ends his work first with a series of verses in which he demonstrates his knowledge of Daṇḍin's Indo-Tibetan poetics and then with a con-

<sup>173</sup> Sa skya Paṇḍita also mentions "the elders" in a similar context in RGRG, 264/2 [= RGRG[1], 429].

<sup>174</sup> It is well known that no love is lost between an owl and a raven or crow, or a murder of them. Crows and ravens are known to attack owls relentlessly and owls eat them when they get a chance; they are natural enemies. An indication of this is also found in Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Legs bshad rin po che'i gter*, ed. and tr. J.E. Bosson (Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1969), 105, no. 340, and elsewhere.

cluding colophon in prose wherein he comes to speak of his main teachers and where and when he composed his treatise.

Aside from quoting certain individuals or books in the affirmative in the main body of his work, there are many other, less or more obvious ways in which a writer can pay homage to one of his teachers or to an earlier or contemporaneous scholar towards whom he harbors feelings of respect or, in the case of some disagreement, to whom he can direct a measure of sarcasm. One of these is no doubt his choice of a title. As I indicated, he often refers to the *Pramāṇavārttika* study of 'U yug pa by its abbreviated subtitle *Rigs pa'i mdzod, Treasury of Logic*, and the similarity of this title with his teacher, Sa skya Paṇḍita's [*Tshad ma*] *Rigs pa'i gter, Treasure of Logic*, is by no means an accident. By the same token, it is also simply not a coincidence that whereas Phya pa's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary is subtitled *Shes rab kyi 'od zer, Light of Discriminative Insight*, Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge's (ca. 1150-1220) commentary of the same bears the subtitle *Shes rab sgron ma, Lamp of Discriminative Insight*.<sup>175</sup> Mtshur ston was a disciple of both Phya pa and his student Gtsang nag pa Brtson 'grus seng ge (?-ca. 1195). These similarities can be interpreted as forms of homage or as an initial pointer to the way in which the author places his work in a specific inter-textual context. For example, Rje btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1147-1216), Sa skya Paṇḍita's uncle and the third patriarch of the Sa skya pa school, wrote three separate, undated studies on aspects of the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*. These are subtitled *Gzhan phan spyi chings, Gzhan phan 'od zer* and *Gzhan phan nyer mkho*. The phrase *gzhan phan* means "benefiting others." Ngor chen's 1442 work on rituals associated with this tantra is subtitled *Gzhan phan mtha' yas*. Bo dong Paṇ chen 'Jigs med grags pa (1375-1451), alias Phyogs las rnam rgyal, composed two treatises in which he took Rje btsun to task, none of which echoe Rje btsun's subtitle. These critical studies in turn provoked several defensive reactions from Sa skya pa scholars and Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge's (1429-89) study and rebuttal of 1466 and 1469 are respectively subtitled *Gzhan phan gnod 'joms* and *Gzhan phan kun khyab*. As a last example, on occasion referred to as *Ngor lan, Reply to Ngor*, Mkhas grub gave his polemic treatise *contra* some Ngor chen's positions on the highest (*niruttara*) yoga-tantras the title *Phyin ci log gi gtam gyi sbyor ba la zhugs pa'i smra ba ngan pa rnam par 'thag pa'i bstan bcos gnam*

<sup>175</sup> The first two lines of the concluding verses of Mtshur ston's work would appear to allude to Phya pa's *Tshad ma yid ky mun sel* treatise or is at least a nod in Phya pa's direction; see Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge. *Tshad ma Shes rab sgron ma*, ed. P. Hugon, 320: *yid kyi mun pa ma lus sel byed pa // rigs tshul dri med she srab sgron ma 'di //*.

*lcags 'khor lo*.<sup>176</sup> And it is certainly no accident that 'Jam dbyangs Dga' ba'i blo gros (1429-1503), alias Legs pa chos 'byor, titled his main polemical tract that he directed against Go rams pa's *Lta ba'i shan 'byed theg mchog gnad kyi zla zer* [of 1469], *Lta ba ngan pa thams cad tshar gcod pa'i bstan bcos gnam lcags kyi 'khor lo*!<sup>177</sup> Lest we forget, Go rams pa was one of Ngor chen's principal disciples. And lastly, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, we do not know to what degree, if any, Ston gzhon's title is a reflex of or a reaction to an earlier title of a cognate work.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

- C.P.N. Nationalities Library, Cultural Palace of Nationalities, Beijing.
- MKHAŠ Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po, *Rgyas pa'i bstan bcos tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi rgya cher bshad pa rigs pa'i rgya mtsho* [Lhasa Zhol xylograph], vol. Tha (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 619-1001, and *Rgyas pa'i bstan bcos tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi rgya cher bshad pa rigs pa'i rgya mtsho* [Lhasa Zhol xylograph], vol. Da (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981).
- MKHAŠ[1] *Ibid.*, *Rgyas pa'i bstan bcos tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi rgya cher bshad pa rigs pa'i rgya mtsho*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1990).
- NYI Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod nams lhun grub, *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rnam par bshad pa rigs pa ma lus pa la 'jug pa'i sgo* (Gangtok, 1970).
- NYI[1] *Ibid.*, *Sde bdun mdo dang bcas pa'i dgongs 'grel tshad ma rig[s] pa'i gter gyi 'grel pa'i rnam bshad rig[s] lam gsal ba'i nyi ma* [Sde dge xylograph], *Thub pa'i dgongs pa rab gsal dang tshad ma rig[s] gter skor*, vol. 1 (Dehra Dun: Pal Evam Chodan Ngorpa Centre, 1985).
- NYI[2] *Ibid.*, *Tshad ma rigs gter gyi 'grel pa*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Xining: Krung gsho'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988), 1-262.

<sup>176</sup> *Collected Works* [Lhasa Zhol xylograph], vol. Kha (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 1-95.

<sup>177</sup> This work is reproduced in the *Dgag lan phyogs bsgrigs* (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997), 519-605, and in his *Gsung 'bum*, vol. 2, Ser gtsug nang bstan dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu phyogs sgrig khang (Lhasa: Se ra monastery, 2009), 218-323. In this work, which he completed in 1477, he uses "the crazy Go bo" (*go bo smyon pa*) as one of his choice terms of endearment for Go rams pa. For Go rams pa's work that he criticizes at great length, see *Freedom from Extremes. Gorampa's "Distinguishing the Views" and the Polemics of Emptiness*, tr. J.I. Cabezón and Geshe Lobsang Dargyay (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2007).

- PS Dignāga, *Pramāṇasamuccaya*[*vytti*], SDE, vol. 46, no. 4208 [#4203], 382/1-385/4 [Ce, 1a-13a].
- PV Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārttikakārikā*, ed. Y. Miyasaka, *Acta Indologica* II (1971/1972); with the usual provisions about the sequence of the chapters.
- PVIN Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, SDE, vol. 46, no. 4216 [#4211], 425/3-447/4 [Ce, 152a-230a].
- RGR 'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge, *Bstan bcos tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rgyan rigs pa grub pa*, 'U yug pa rigs pa'i seng ge'i gsung 'bum, vol. Ka, Mes po'i shul bzhag 40, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007).
- RGRG Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan, *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rang gi 'grel pa* [Sde dge xylograph], SSBB, vol. 5, ed. Bsod nams rgya mtsho (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968), no. 19, 155-264.
- RGRG[1] *Ibid.*, *Rigs gter rtsa 'grel dpe bsdur ma*, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, Shes bya'i gter bum, 1 (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa/Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2005).
- RM 'U yug pa rigs pa'i seng ge, *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi 'grel pa rigs pa'i mdzod* [Sde dge xylograph], 2 vols. (New Delhi, 1982).
- RM[1] *Ibid.*, *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi 'grel pa rigs pa'i mdzod*, 'U yug pa rigs pa'i seng ge'i gsung 'bum vol. Kha, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007), 106-454, and 'U yug pa rigs pa'i seng ge'i gsung 'bum, vol. Ga, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007).
- SDE *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition* [Sde dge xylograph], ed. A.W. Barber (Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc., 1991), 72 vols.
- SSBB *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum* [Sde dge xylograph], ed. Bsod nams rgya mtsho (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968-1969), 15 vols.
- STON Btsun pa Ston gzhon, *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi rnam par bshad pa gnas gsum gsal ba gangs can gyi rgyan*, ed. Sun Wenjing (Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1993).
- STONm *Ibid. dbu med* manuscript in 191 fols., China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities, Beijing, catalog no.005148(4) [= tbrc.org W26440].

### Bibliography of References Cited

#### Tibetan References

- A mes zhabs Ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams, *Sa skya'i gdung rabs ngo mtshar bang mdzod*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986).



Bdud 'joms dpa' bo, *Rgyal ba'i bka' dang dgongs 'grel gyi gzhung lugs brgya phrag dag las legs bshad kyi gtam du bya ba rgya bod kyi grub mtha' rnam par 'byed pa lung rigs rgya mtsho'i snying po mkhas pa dga' byed rin po che'i rgyan* [dbu med manuscript in 51 folios].

*Bka' 'gyur dpe sdur ma*, vol. 4, ed. Krung go'i bod rig pa zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi bka' bstan dpe sdur khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1996), no. 0093.

Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan, *Bsdus pa che ba rigs pa'i de nyid rnam par nges pa* [or: *Tshad ma mdo sde bdun 'grel bshad dang bcas pa'i snying po rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rnam par nges pa*], *Collected Writings*, vol. Da (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 673-930.

— *Sde bdun gyi snying po rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rab tu gsal ba* [or: *Sde bdun mdo 'grel pa 'grel bshad dang bcas pa'i snying por gyur pa rigs pa'i de kho na nyid rab tu gsal ba*], *Collected Writings*, vol. Da (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999), 931-1378.

— *Lo tsa (sic) ba blo brtan la mdzad pa*, *Collected Works*, vol. Na, dbu can manuscript in two folios, C.P.N. catalog no. 003877.

*'Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*, Stod cha, ed. Bstan 'dzin phun tshogs (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004).

Bsam gtan bzang po. *Bcom ldan rig ral pa'i rnam thar*, *Collected Works*, vol. Ka (Kathmandu: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung rab slob gnyer khang, 2007), 1-30.

Bu ston Rin chen grub, *Sampu ta'i 'grel pa snying po'i de kho na nyid gsal bar byed pa*, *Collected Works*, Part 8, ed. L. Chandra (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1967), 217-947.

— *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod*, *Collected Works*, Part 24, ed. L. Chandra (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 633-1055.

— *Bla ma dam pa rnam kyis rjes su bzung ba'i tshul bka' drin rjes su dran par byed pa*, *Collected Works*, Part 26, ed. L. Chandra (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 1-142.

— *Bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po*, *Collected Works*, Part 26, ed. L. Chandra (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971), 401-603.

Bya btang pa Padma gar dbang, *Zab chos sbas pa mig 'byed kyi chos bskor las pañ chen sha wa dbang phyug gi snyan rgyud rdo rje sum gyi bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar dad pa'i rnga chen*, Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project Reel no. L 451/6.

Bya btang pa Padma rdo rje, *Dpyal gyi gdung rabs za ra tshags dang gang gā'i chu rgyun gnyis gcig tu bris pa kun gsal me long*, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig

dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2008).

Byang chub 'od zer, *Tsom mdo gdan rabs kun btus, Smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar phyogs sgrig*, ed. Padma tshul khirms (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006), 68-154.

Cha gan Dbang phyug rgyal mtshan, *Rdo rje tshig rkang gi 'grel pa cha gan gyis bsdebs pa* [dbu med manuscript in 46 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 006617(14).

Chos nyid ye shes, *Gnyags ston pa'i gdung rabs dang gdan rabs*, ed. Rta mgrin tshe dbang, Gangs can rig mdzod 31 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1997).

Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal, *\*Tshad ma rnam nges kyi tika* [dbu med manuscript in 152 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004827(4).

— Ibid, *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 87, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 12-307.

— *Tshad ma sde bdun gyi phyogs gcig du bsdus pa gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba* [dbu med manuscript in 68 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004827(1).

— Ibid, *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 87, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 314-449.

Dar ma dkon mchog, *Rtog ge rigs pa'i rgyan gyi snying po* [dbu med manuscript in 91+1 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004783(1).

Dar ma rgyal mtshan, *Tshad ma kun las btus pa'i rgya cher bshad pa rgyan gyi me tog, Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 53, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 445-528.

— *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog* [dbu med manuscript in 95-folios], C.P.N. no. 002468(2).

— Ibid., ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi she rig dpe skrun khang, 1991), 1-138.

— Ibid., *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 54, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007), 329-515.

Dbus pa Blo gsal Rtsod pa'i seng ge, *Bstan bcos gyi dkar chag* [incomplete dbu med manuscript in 81 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002376(1).

Dngos grub rgya mtsho, *Tha snyad rig gnas lnga ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gsal bar byed pa blo gsal mgrin rgyan legs bshad nor bu'i phreng ba*, ed. Nor brang O

rgyan, Gangs can rig mdzod 4 (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 253-322.

*Dpal ldan smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar su khar rṇa'i phreng ba, Smar pa bka' brgyud kyi rnam thar phyogs sgrig*, ed. Padma tshul khirms (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006), 155-241.

Dpang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa, *Chos mngon pa kun las btus kyi rgya cher 'grel pa shes bya gsal byed* (Dehra Dun: Sakya College, 1999).

Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod nams lhun grub, *Sde bdun mdo dang bcas pa'i dgongs 'grel thad ma rigs gter la nye bar mkho ba mtha' gnyis gsal byed, Thub pa'i dgongs pa rab gsal dang tshad ma rig[s] gter skor*, vol. 2 (Dehra Dun: Pal Evam Chodan Ngorpa Centre, 1985), 60-65.

— Ibid., *Tshad ma rigs gter gyi 'grel pa*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988), 297-299.

Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge, *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i man ngag gi byung tshul gsung ngag bstan pa rgyas pa'i nyi 'od kha skong dang bcas pa*, SSBB, vol. 14, no. 87.

'Gos Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal, *Deb gter sngon po*, ed. L. Chandra (Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1976).

Gser mdog Paṇ chen Shākya mchog ldan, *Tshad ma'i mdo dang bstan bcos kyi shing rta'i srol rnam ji ltar byung ba'i tshul gtam bya ba nyin more byed pa'i snang bas dpyod ldan mtha' dag dga' bar byed pa*, *Collected Works*, vol. 19 (Thimphu, 1975), 1-137.

— Ibid., *Gsung 'bum*, Rdzong sar khams bye lnga rig thub bstan slob gling, vol. Dza [19] (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2013), 1-106.

Gtsang Byams pa Rdo rje rgyal mtshan, *Sa skya mkhon (sic) gyi gdungs rab (sic) rin po che'i 'phreng ba* [incomplete dbu can manuscript in 90 folios], Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Reel L 591/4.

'Jad pa Gzhon nu byang chub, *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i ṭikka shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me, Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 40, ed. Karma bde legs et al. (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007).

'Jam dbyangs Chos kyi dpal 'byor, *Gtsang stag tshang lo tsā ba shes rab rin chen rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po'i rnam par thar pa'i kha skong yid ches gser gyi ljon pa*, *Collected Works* [of Stag tshang Lo tsā ba], vol. 2, *Mes po'i shul bzhaq*, vol. 30, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007), 53-63.

- 'Jam dbyangs Dga' ba'i blo gros, *Lta ba ngan pa thams cad tshar gcod pa'i bstan bcos gnam lcags kyi 'khor lo* [zhes bya ba go bo bsod nams seng ge zhes bya ba'i dge ba'i bshes gnyen la gdams pa], *Dgag lan phyogs bsgrigs*, ed. (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997), 519-605.
- Ibid., *Gsung 'bum*, vol. 2, *Ser gtsug nang bstan dpe rnying 'tshol bsdu phyogs sgrig khang* (Lhasa: Se ra monastery, 2009), 218-323.
- Karma pa III Rang byung rdo rje, *Rje rang byung rdo rje'i thugs dam bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag*, *Collected Works*, vol. Nga (Lhasa, 2006), 415-594.
- *Bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag*, *Karma pa rang byung rdo rje gsung 'bum dkar chag*, *Collected Works*, vol. Nga (Lhasa, 2006), 595-717.
- Khams phyogs dkar mdzes khul gyi dgon sde so so'i lo rgyus gsal bar bshad pa thub bstan gsal ba'i me long*, comp. Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas kyi chos lugs lo rgyus zhib 'jug so'o et al., ed. 'Jigs med bsam grub, vols. 1-3 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1995).
- Kun bzang tshe 'phel, *Dpal chen rgwa lo'i rnam thar rags bsdus lus can dad pa'i gsol sman ngo mtshar lung gi nyi ma* (np, nd).
- Lam rim pa Ngag dbang phun tshogs, *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi tikka* [gzur gnas dgyes pa'i mchod sprin], 2 vols. (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1997).
- Mgon po skyabs *Rgya nag chos 'byung* [based on the Sde dge xylograph] (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1983).
- Mi nyag 'Jam dbyangs grags pa, *Mi nyag 'jam dbyangs grags pa'i rang rnam*, ed. Mi nyag Thub bstan chos dar (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2005).
- Mnyam nyid rin chen, *Skyes bu dam pa rnam kyi rnam par thar pa rin po che'i gter mdzod* [undated xylograph in 88 folios].
- Mkhan chen Ngag dbang chos grags, *Pod chen drug gi 'bel gtam*, ed. Slob dpon Padma lags (Thimphu, 1979).
- *Bod kyi mkhas pa snga phyi dag gi grub mtha'i shan 'byed mtha' dpyod dang bcas pa'i 'bel ba'i gtam skyes dpyod ldan mkhas pa'i lus rgyan rin chen mdzes pa'i phra rtsom bkod pa. The Collection (sic) Works of Mkhyen (sic) chen Ngag dwang (sic) chos grags*, vol. IV (Darjeeling: Sakya Choepheling Monastery, 2000), 1-182.
- Mkhan po Appey et al., *Dkar chag mthong bas yid 'phrog chos mdzod bye ba'i lde mig* (New Delhi, 1987).
- Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po, *Rje btsun bla ma tsong kha pa chen po'i ngo mtshar rmad du byung ba'i rnam par thar pa dad pa'i 'jug ngogs*, *Collect-*

- ed Works* [of Tsong kha pa, Zhol edition], vol. Ka (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 5-146.
- Ibid., Sku 'bum edition, ed. Grags pa rgya mtsho (Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1982).
- *Phyin ci log gi gtam gyi sbyor ba la zhugs pa'i smra ba ngan pa rnam par 'thag pa'i bstan bcos gnam lcags 'khor lo*, *Collected Works* [Lhasa Zhol xylograph], vol. Kha (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1981), 1-95.
- Mnga' ris Chos kyi rgyal po Phyogs las rnam rgyal, *Chos kyi rje byang chub sems dpa' chen po'i rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che'i gter mdzod kun las btus pa* [slightly incomplete (fol. 1 is missing) *dbu med* manuscript in 32 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002780.
- Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge, *Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge. Tshad ma Shes rab sgron ma*, ed. P. Hugon, *Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Heft 60 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2004).
- Nag phug pa Shes rab 'od zer, *Rje btsun nag phug[s] pa'i rnam thar* [*dbu med* manuscript in 19 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004381(7).
- Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, *Thob yig rgya mtsho*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 36.
- *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i man ngag gi byung tshul gsung ngag rin po che'i bstan pa rgyas pa'i nyi 'od*, SSBB vol. 9, no. 37.
- *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i bshad thabs kyi man ngag*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 38.
- *Dpal kye'i rdo rje'i lus kyi dkyil 'khor la rtsod pa spong ba smra ba ngan 'joms*, SSBB vol. 9, no. 49.
- *Dpal kye'i rdo rje'i lus kyi dkyil 'khor la rtsod pa spong ba lta ba ngan sel*, SSBB vol. 9, no. 50.
- *Rgyud gsum gnod 'joms kyi 'grel pa*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 52.
- *Kyai rdo rje'i 'grel pa'i dkar chag*, SSBB, vol. 9, no. 58.
- *Rdo rje theg pa'i bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag*, SSBB, vol. 10, no. 156.
- Nyang ral Nyi ma'i 'od zer, *Chos 'byung me tog snying po sbrang rtsi'i bcud*, ed. Nyan shul Mkhyen rab 'od gsal, *Gangs can rig mdzod 5* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988).
- 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan, *Rgyal po la gdams pa'i rab tu byed pa*, SSBB, vol. 7, no. 210.
- *Byang chub sems dpa'i sa'i (sic) sdom*, SSBB, vol. 7, no. 238.
- *Ston gzhon la spring ba*, SSBB, vol. 7, no. 278.
- Red mda' ba Gzhon nu blo gros, *Dus kyi 'khor lo dpyad pa las brtsams te bstan 'dzin rnams la 'phrin du gsol ba nor bu'i phreng ba*, *Bod kyi rtsis rig kun 'dus chen mo*, vol. 1, *Skar nag rtsis kyi lo rgyus skor*, ed. Byams pa 'phrin las et al. (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1998), 283-293.

- *'Phrin yig nor bu'i phreng ba'i rang lan, Bod kyi rtsis rig kun 'dus chen mo*, vol. 1, *Skar nag rtsis kyi lo rgyus skor*, ed. Byams pa 'phrin las et al. (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1998), 294-297.
- *Dpal dus kyi 'khor lo'i nges don gsal bar byed pa rin po che'i sgron ma, Bod kyi rtsis rig kun 'dus chen mo*, vol. 1, *Skar nag rtsis kyi lo rgyus skor*, ed. Byams pa 'phrin las et al. (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1998), 383-428.
- Dpal ldan red mda' pa chen po'i rnam thar ngo mtshar rmad byung* [dbu med manuscript, folios 44-82], C.P.N. catalog no. 002802(5).
- Rje btsun red mda' pa'i mdzad pa'i bka' 'bum thor bu* [incomplete dbu med manuscript in 335 folios], ed. 'Jam dbyangs grags pa, C.P.N. catalog no. 004546.
- Rta tshag Tshe dbang rgyal, *Lho rong chos 'byung*, ed. Gling dpon Pad ma skal bzang and Ma grong Mi 'gyur rdo rje, *Gangs can rig mdzod 26* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1994).
- *Bka' brgyud rin po che'i lo rgyus phyogs gcig tu bsgrigs pa'i gsol 'debs rgyas pa* [dbu med manuscript in 541 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002448(6).
- Rgyal ba ye shes, *Chos rje 'jam dbyangs chen po'i rnam thar yon tan rgya mtsho* [dbu med manuscript in 24 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 004381(10).
- *Kun spangs chen po chos rje'i rnam thar yon tan rab gsal* [dbu med manuscript in 40 folios], C.P.N. catalog no. 002815(5).
- *Ibid.*, *Dpal ldan dus kyi 'khor lo jo nang pa'i lugs kyi bla ma brgyud pa'i rnam thar*, ed. Karma bde legs (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004), 66-141.
- Rje btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan, *Bla ma sa skya pa chen po'i rnam thar*, SSBB vol. 3, no. 5.
- 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).
- *Ibid.*, *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 1, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Chengdu: Si khron dpe skrun tshogs pa / Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006), 419-705.
- *Ibid.*, *Rngog Lo tsā ba blo ldan shes rab kyi gsung chos skor*, *Bka' gdams dpe dkon gces btus*, vol. 3, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2009), 53-359.
- Rngog Zhe sdang rdo rje, *Sam bhu ta'i rnam bshad*, Rngog chos skor phyogs bsgrigs, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, vol. 2 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007), 171-245.
- *Ibid.*, *Rngog slob brgyud dang bcas pa'i gsung 'bum*, vol. 5/34, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, *Mes po'i shul bzhag*, vol. 226 (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2011), 88-253.

- Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan, *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter rang gi 'grel pa*, SSBB, vol. 5, no. 6.  
*Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1989).
- Seng ge bzang po, *Mkhan chen bka' bzhi pa chen po rig[s] pa'i seng ge'i rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che'i rgya mtsho*, *Mi nyag mkhas dbang lnga'i rnam thar*, ed. Thub bstan nyi ma (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986), 37-115.
- Shangs Rin chen seng ge, *Shangs kyi bla ma chos rje rin seng pa'i rnam thar*, *Sa skya lam 'bras Literature Series*, vol. 1 (Dehra Dun: Sakya Centre, 1983), 345-362.
- Shar ba Thogs med and Blo ris, "Bod 'grel dang de'i thad kyi bsam tshul 'ga' gleng ba," *Mdo smad zhib 'jug*, vol. 1, ed. Kan su'u bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug khang (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2005), 44-62.
- Shes bya'i gter mdzod*, ed. Sun Wenjing and Mi nyag Mgon po, vol. 3 (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997).
- Shes rab gzhon nu, *Rgyal po la gdams pa'i rab tu byed pa'i rnam par bshad pa gsung rab gsal ba'i rgyan*, SSBB, vol. 7, no. 154.
- Ska ba Shes rab bzang po et al., *Bod khul gyi chos sde grags can khag gi dpe rnying dkar chag* (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2010).
- Skyed legs sprul sku Nam mkha' rgyal mtshan, *Mkhas shing grub pa'i skyes chen mi lnga'i rnam thar ngo mtshar snang ba*, *Mi nyag 'jam dbyangs grags pa'i rang rnam*, ed. Mi nyag Thub bstan chos dar (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2005), 312-8.
- Slob dpon Bsod nams rtse mo, *Rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par bzhag pa*, SSBB, vol. 2, no. 1.  
 — *Samputa'i ti ka gnas kyi gsal byed*, SSBB, vol. 2, no. 15.
- Stag tshang Lo tsā ba Shes rab rin chen, *Dpal ldan sa skya pa'i 'khon gyi gdung rabs 'dod dgu'i rgya mtsho [dbu med manuscript in 34 folios]*, C.P.N. catalog no. 002537.
- Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan, *Bka' chems mthong ba don ldan, Rlangs kyi po ti bse ru rgyas pa*, ed. Chab spel Tshe brtan phun tshogs and Nor brang O rgyan, *Gangs can rig mdzod 1* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1986), 103-373.
- Tāranātha, *Myang yul stod smad bar gsum gyi ngo mtshar gtam gyi legs bshad mkhas pa'i jug ngogs*, ed. Lhag pa tshe ring (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1983),

- ed. *Don grub phun tshogs* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 2002).
- *Myang chos 'byung, Jo nang rje btsun tā ra nātha'i gsung 'bum dpe bsdur ma*, vol. 44, *Mes po'i shul bzhaq*, vol. 86, ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib jug khang (Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2008).
- The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, ed. D.T. Suzuki, vol. 55 (Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1955-61), no. 2358.
- Zhwa dmar IV Chos grags ye shes, *Dpal ldan bla ma dam pa mkhan chen thams cad mkhyen pa don gyi slad du mtshan can nas smos te gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che mchog tu rgyas pa'i ljon pa [dbu can manuscript in 74 folios]*, C.P.N. catalog no. 003259(11).
- *'Gos lo gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam thar*, ed. Ngag dbang nor bu (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004).
- Yar lung Jo bo Shākya rin chen sde, *Chos 'byung*, ed. Dbyangs can (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1988).
- Zhang btsun Mdo sde dpal, *Thub pa'i dgongs gsal rgyal sras 'phags pa'i lam gyi sgrung 'grel zla ba'i 'od zer, Dpal sa skya pa'i gsung rab*, vol. 11, *Lam rim*, comp. Mkhas dbang Tshul khriims rgyal mtshan and Mkhas dbang Padma dam chos (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang / Xining: Mtsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004), 340-605.
- *Thub pa'i dgongs pa gsal ba'i bstan bcos kyi mdo rnam par bshad pa rin po che'i gter, Selected Works of Glo bo Mkhan chen*, vol. 2 (Dehra Dun, 1985), 253-539.
- Zhang G.yu 'brug Brtson 'grus grags pa, *Dpal gyi rnam thar, Writings (bka' thor bu)* (Tashijong: The Sungrab Nyamso Gyunpel Parkhang, 1972), 360-392.
- *Dpal rgwa lo'i rnam thar, Collected Works*, vol. Ka (Beijing: Huangsi, ?), 541-544.
- Zhongguo zangxue yanjiu zhongxin shouzangde fanwen beiye jing (Suowei jiaojuan) mulu / Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas su nyar ba'i ta la'i lo ma'i bstan bcos (sbyin shog 'dril ma'i par) gyi dkar chag mdor gsal* (np, nd).
- Zhu chen Tshul khriims rin chen, *Bka' 'gyur dkar chag*, ed. Blo bzang bstan 'dzin et al. (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1985).

### Chinese References

- Huang Mingxin, *Hanzang dazangjin mulu yitong yanjiu* (Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe, 2003).



- Luo Zhao, tr., *Liangli baozang lun*, ed. Huang Mingxin, *Zhongguo luoji shi ziliao xuan*, ed. Lu Yu, et al. (Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe, 1991), 267-420.
- Luosang danzeng [= Blo bzang bstan 'dzin], *Handi fojiao yuanliuji* (Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe, 2005).
- Mingshing Fashi, tr. *Liangli baozang lun* (Taipei: Dongchu chubanshe, 1994).
- Ska ba Shes rab bzang po, "Zangwen <Yuanban> kao [Investigating Tibetan Language 'Yuan Blockprints'," *Zhongguo zangxue* 1 (2009), 41-50.
- Sun Wenjing and Huang Mingxin, "Guonei bufen dushuguan(shi)so zangwen yinming shumu," *Yinming xintan*, ed. Liu Peiyu et al. (Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe, 1989), 329-383.
- Xiong Wenbin, "Yuandai huangshi chengyuan shikande zangwen fojing [Tibetan Buddhist Scriptures Published with the Financial Aid of Members of the Yuan Dynasty's Imperial Family], *Zhongguo zangxue* 3 (2009), 91-103.
- Qingfu, *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zhonglu*, *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, ed. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, comp. G. Ono Genmyō (Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, 1924-32), vol. 99, no. 25.
- Xiong Wenbin, *Yuandai huangshi chengyuan shikande zangwen fojing* [Tibetan Buddhist Scriptures Published with the Financial Aid of Members of the Yuan Dynasty's Imperial Family], *Zhongguo zangxue* 3 (2009), 91-103.

### Sanskrit References

- Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*, ed. N. Tatia, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series no. 17 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute 1976).
- Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapters 1 and 2*, ed. E. Steinkellner, Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region, no. 2 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House/Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2011).
- Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapter 3*, ed. P. Hugon and T. Tomabechi, *Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region*, no. 8 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2011).

**Other References**

- Almogi, O. "Analysing Tibetan Titles: Towards a Genre-based Classification of Tibetan Literature," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 15 (2005), 27-58.
- Bosson, J.E. tr. and ed. *Legs bshad rin po che'i gter* (Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1969).
- Bronkhorst, J. *Language and Reality. On an Episode in Indian Thought*, tr. M.S. Allen and R. Raghunathan (Brill: Leiden, 2011).
- Cabezón, J.I. and Geshe Lobsang Dargyay, tr. *Freedom from Extremes. Gorampa's "Distinguishing the Views" and the Polemics of Emptiness* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2007).
- Clemente, M. "Colophons as Sources: Historical Information from Some Brag dkar rta so Xylographies (sic)," *Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici* II (2007), 121-58.
- Dagkar Namgyal Nyima. *Zhang-zhung-Tibetan-English Contextual Dictionary* (Bonn: Selbstverlag, 2003).
- Davidson, R.M. "Masquerading as *pramāṇa*: Esoteric Buddhism and Epistemological Nomenclature," *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy [Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997]*, ed. Sh. Katsura (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999), 33-4.
- *Tibetan Renaissance. Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).
- De Rossi Filibeck, E. *Catalog of the Tucci Tibetan Fund in the Library of IsMEO*, vol. 1 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1994).
- Dreyfus, G.B.J. *Recognizing Reality. Dharmakīrti's Philosophy and Its Tibetan Interpretations* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).
- Dunne, J.D. *Foundations of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2004).
- Eltschinger, V. *Penser l'autorité des Écritures. La polémique de Dharmakīrti contre la notion brahmanique orthodoxe d'un Veda sans auteur. Autour de Pramāṇavārttika 1.213-268 et Svavṛtti*, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, no. 56 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007).
- Eltschinger, V., H. Krasser and J. Taber. *Can the Veda Speak? Dharmakīrti against Mīmāṃsā exegetics and Vedic authority. An annotated translation of*

PVSV 164,24-176,16 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2012).

- Franco, E. "The Tibetan Translations of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the Development of Translation Methods from Sanskrit to Tibetan," *Tibetan Studies*, vol. 1, ed. H. Krasser et al. (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 277-288.
- Franke, H. *Chinesischer und Tibetischer Buddhismus im China der Yüanzeit, Studia Tibetica. Quellen und Studien zur tibetischen Lexikographie*, Band III (München: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien / Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996).
- "The Consecration of the 'White Stupa' in 1279," *Asia Major* 7 (1994), 155-184.
- Fukuda, Y. and Y. Ishihama, tr. *A Study of the Grub mthaḥ of Tibetan Buddhism* [in Japanese], vol. 4, *Studia Tibetica*, no. 11 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1986).
- *A Comparative Table of sa-bcad of the Pramāṇavārttika Found in Tibetan Commentaries of the Pramāṇavārttika*, *Studia Tibetica* No. 12 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1986).
- Ganeri, J. "Sanskrit Philosophical Commentary," *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 27 (2010), 187-207.
- Genette, G. *Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation*, tr. J.E. Lewin, Literature, Culture, Theory, vol. 20 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Hambis, L. *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan che [avec des notes supplémentaires par Paul Pelliot]* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1945).
- *Le chapitre CVIII du Yuan che, Tome I* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954).
- Hugon, P. *Trésors du raisonnement. Sa skya Paṇḍita et ses prédécesseurs tibétains sur les modes de fonctionnement de la pensée et le fondement de l'inférence. Édition et traduction annotée du quatrième chapitre et d'une section du dixième chapitre du Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, 2 vols., Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 69, 1-2 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2008).
- "Clapping Hands in Skyid grong? Logical and contextual aspects of a famous debate narrative," *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 23 (2012), 51-102.
- Iwata, T. *Prasaṅga und Prasaṅgaviparyaya bei Dharmakīrti und seinen Kommentatoren*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 31 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1993).

- Jackson, D.P. *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III). Sa skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*, vol. I, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 17,1-2 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1987).
- "Sources for the Study of Tibetan *Pramāṇa* Traditions Preserved at the Bihar Research Society, Patna," *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition*, ed. E. Steinkellner (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 97-106.
- Kellner, B. "First logic, then the Buddha? Remarks on the chapter sequence of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Hōrin* 11 (2004), 147-167.
- "Towards a Critical Edition of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 52-3 (2009-10), 161-211.
- Kramer, J. *A Noble Abbot from Mustang. Life and Works of Glo bo Mkhan chen (1456-1532)*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 68 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2008).
- Krasser, H. "Bhāviveka, Dharmakīrti and Kumāri," *Devadattiyam. Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*, ed. F. Voegeli et al. (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 535-594.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J. "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.
- "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), 279-298.
- "On Some Early Tibetan *Pramāṇavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing," *Journal of Tibetan and Buddhist Studies* 1 (1994), 1-30.
- "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History IV: The *Tshad ma'i 'byung tshul 'chad nyan gyi rgyan*: A Tibetan History of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda*," *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*, ed. N. Balbir and J.K. Bautze (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, 1994), 375-93.
- "Apropos of Some Recently Recovered Texts Belonging to the *Lam 'bras* Teachings of the Sa skya pa and Ko brag pa," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17 (1994), 175-201.
- "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History 1: Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan as a Man of Religion," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 37 (1994), 139-149.
- "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History VI: The Transmission of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda* According to the Early Tibetan *Gsan yig-s*," *Asiatische Studien / Études asiatiques* XLIX (1995), 919-941.

- "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 (1999), 646-672.
- "On the Fifteenth Century *Lho rong chos 'byung* by Rta tshag Tshe dbang rgyal and Its Importance for Tibetan Political and Religious History," *Lungta* 14 [*Aspects of Tibetan History*, ed. R. Vitali and T. Tsering] (2000), 57-76.
- "A Treatise on Buddhist Epistemology and Logic Attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and Its Place in Indo-Tibetan Intellectual History," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 31 (2003), 381-437.
- *The Kālacakra and the Patronage of Tibetan Buddhism by the Mongol Imperial Family*, The Central Eurasian Studies Lectures, 4, ed. F. Venturi (Bloomington: Department of Central Eurasian Studies, Indiana University, 2004).
- "Some Remarks on the Meaning and Use of the Tibetan Word *bam po*," *Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology* 5 (2009), 114-132.
- "Notes on Jñānamitra's Commentary on the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*," *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners. The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*, ed. U.T. Kragh, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 75 (Cambridge: Department of South Asian Studies, 2013), 1388-1429.
- "The *hor par ma*-Mongol Xylograph of the Tibetan Translation of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* (*Tshad ma rnam 'grel*)," *Zangxue xuekan / Journal of Tibetology* 9 forthcoming in 2014.
- "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History III: The Oeuvre of Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312-1375), Part Two," forthcoming.
- van der Kuijp, L.W.J and A.P. McKeown. *Bcom ldan ral gri (1227-1305) on Indian Buddhist Logic and Epistemology: His Commentary on Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 80 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2013).
- Lobsang dagpa and J. Goldberg, tr. *The Beautiful Ornament of The Three Visions* (Ithaca: Snow Lion Publications, 1991).
- Martin, D. "Zhangzhung Dictionary," *Revue d'Études Tibétaines* 18 (2010).
- Matsuda Kazunobo. "Sanskrit Manuscript of Sthiramati's Commentary to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*," *China Tibetology* 1 (2013), 48-52.
- Nihom, M. *Studies in the Buddhist Tantra* (Proefschrift, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1982).
- "Bu ston, Politics and Religion," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement VI, XII. Deutscher Orientalistentag*, ed. W. Röllig (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985), 315-24.

- Ono Motoi. "A Reconsideration of the Controversy about the Order of the Chapters of the *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Tibetan Studies*, vol. II, ed. H. Krasser et al. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 701-716.
- Petech, L. "Ston-tshul: The Rise of Sa-skya Paramountcy in Kham," *Tibetan History and Language. Studies dedicated to Uray Géza on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. E. Steinkellner Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 26 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 1991), 416-22.
- *Central Tibet and the Mongols. The Yüan-Sa skya Period of Tibetan History*, Serie Orientale Roma, vol. LXV (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1990).
- Roerich, G.N., tr. *The Blue Annals* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979).
- Roloff, C. *Red mda' ba. Buddhist Yogi-Scholar of the Fourteenth Century*, Contributions to Tibetan Studies, vol. 7 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichelt Verlag, 2009).
- Sanderson, A. "The Śaiva Age – The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period -," *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Sh. Einoo (Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, 2009), 41-349.
- Schaeffer, K.R. and L.W.J. van der Kuijp. *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The Bstan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of Bcom ldan ral gri*, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 64 (Cambridge: The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, 2009).
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. "Towards a Methodology for the Study of Old Tibetan Manuscripts: Dunhuang and Tabo," *Tabo Studies II. Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions and the Arts*, ed. C.A. Scherrer-Schaub and E. Steinkellner, Serie Orientale Roma LXXXVII (Rome: Istituto Italiana per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 1999), 3-36.
- "Immortality extolled with reason: Philosophy and politics in Nāgārjuna," *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ. Papers Dedicated to E. Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, ed. B. Kellner et al., Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 70.2 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2007), 757-93.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. and G. Bonani. "Establishing a typology of the old Tibetan manuscripts: a multidisciplinary approach," *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*, ed. S. Whitfield (London: The British Library, 2002), 184-215.
- *Ibid. The Cultural History of Western Tibet. Recent Research from the China Tibetology Center and the University of Vienna*, ed. D. Klimburg-Salter,

- Liang Junyan et al. (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 2008), 299-337.
- Schuh, D. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Kalenderrechnung* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1973).
- Seyfort Ruegg, D., tr. *The Life of Bu ston Rin po che*, Serie Orientale Roma XXIV (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1966).
- Slaje, W., ed. *The Śāstrārambha: Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62 (2008).
- Sperling, E. "Rtṣa mi Lo tsā ba Sangs rgyas grags pa and the Tangut Background to Early Mongol-Tibetan Relations," *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. Fagernes 1992*, ed. P. Kvaerne, vol. 2 (Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, 1994), 801-824.
- Stcherbatsky, Th. *Buddhist Logic*, vol. 1 (New York: Dover Publications, 1962).
- Stearns, C.R., tr. *Luminous Lives. The Story of the Early Masters of the Lam 'bras Tradition in Tibet* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2001).
- *Taking the Result as the Path. Core Teachings of the Sakya Lamdré Tradition* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2006).
- Steinkellner, E. "Miscellen zur erkenntnistheoretisch-logischen Schule des Buddhismus IX: The Colophon of Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 50 (2007), 199-205.
- Steinkellner E. and M.T. Much. *Texte der erkenntnistheoretischen Schule des Buddhismus*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 214 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).
- Tillemans, T.J.F. *Scripture, Logic, Language. Essays on Dharmakīrti and His Tibetan Successors* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1999).
- *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. An annotated translation of the fourth chapter (parārthānumāna), Volume 1 (k. 1-148)* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000).
- Tomabechi, T. and K. Kano. "A Critical Edition and Translation of a Text Fragment from Abhayākaragupta's *Amnayamañjarī*," Göttingen, Cod.ms.sanscr. 259b," *Tantric Studies* 1 (2008), 22-44.
- Tucci, G. *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, vol. II (Kyoto: Rinsen Book, Co. Ltd., 1980).
- Vetter, T. *Erkenntnisprobleme bei Dharmakīrti* (Wien: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1964).

———, tr. and ed. *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, 1. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam* (Wien: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1966).

Vitali, R. "The History of the Lineages of Gnas rnying Summarised as its 'Ten Greatnesses'," *Tibet, Past and Present: Tibetan Studies 1*, ed. H. Blezer (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 81-107.

