

On the Authorship of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*

Jonathan Stoltz
(University of St. Thomas, Minnesota)

Twenty years have passed since the publication in China of the book, *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* ("The Compilation of the Essential Nature of Epistemology," henceforth, *Tshad bsdus*), by Sichuan People's Press. This important work on Buddhist Epistemology is purported to be authored by the great, fourteenth century Nyingma scholar Klong chen Rab 'byams. Thanks to the careful scholarship carried out by Leonard van der Kuijp soon after the book's publication, it has long been agreed by contemporary scholars of Tibetan epistemology that the *Tshad bsdus* was *not* in fact authored by Klong chen pa.¹ Yet, identification of the real author of the *Tshad bsdus* has eluded researchers' grasps. Thankfully, there is now enough evidence to put forward a highly credible thesis regarding the authorship of this text, and to clarify the author's connection to the tradition of epistemological theorizing that was centered on gSang phu Monastery in central Tibet. The evidentiary support for this thesis, as well as an indication of the process by which this thesis was generated, will be presented in the following pages. To put the cards on the table straight away, however, the claim is this: the author of the *Tshad bsdus* is a Tibetan scholar named 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub (c. 1150–1210), a person whose main teacher—Byang chub skyabs—was a direct student of the critically important Tibetan thinker Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169).²

1. Background

Before delving into the evidence of the *Tshad bsdus*'s authorship, it is important to provide readers with a brief synopsis of some of the most relevant information concerning this text, including the information that was used by Leonard van der Kuijp in support of his

¹ See van der Kuijp (2003).

² The tentative dating for gZhon nu byang chub—*circa* 1150–1210—comes from van der Kuijp (2014), p. 123.

determination that the text was not in fact composed by Klong chen pa in the fourteenth century. To begin, a book-form version of the *Tshad bsdus* was published in China in the year 2000. In the introduction to the text, we are told that the book's editor, Padma tshul khriṃs, produced the typeset version of the *Tshad bsdus* from two existing manuscripts, one written in cursive (*dbu med*) and one written in block script (*dbu can*). Unfortunately, little else is said about the editorial practices that were used, and Western scholars have not been provided with access to (even copies of) the existing manuscripts.³

The last line of the text attributes authorship to "*klong chen rab 'byams*"—that is, to Klong chen pa. Be that as it may, there are a number of clues contained within the text itself that made it possible for van der Kuijp to reach his contrary conclusion that "the cumulative evidence strongly argues for holding that the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* was written not by the great Klong chen pa, but by another, as yet unidentified scholar who most likely flourished before Sa skyā Paṇḍita."⁴ Among the evidence cited by van der Kuijp, the most important bits of information are the frequent references that the author makes to the views and definitions held by other Tibetan epistemologists. The two most-cited figures in the text are "*phyā*"—that is, Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge—and "*rgya*"—who is rGya dmar ba Byang chub grags.⁵ Also cited prominently are "*lo tsa ba*"—i.e. rNgog lo tsā ba Blo Idan shes rab—"*jo btsun*"—who we can now identify as Khyung Rin chen grags—and "*byang chub skyabs*"—about whom much more will be said below.⁶ There are, to be sure, more Tibetan scholars cited in the book than those listed above. But what is remarkable about the full list of people referenced in the *Tshad bsdus* is that all of them appear to be either contemporaneous to or earlier than Phya pa (1109–1169). In

³ It would be incredibly helpful for scholars to have access to the manuscripts of the *Tshad bsdus*, which, at the very least, could lead the creation of a critical edition of the text. The publication contains, for example, numerous typos, and it would be important to know whether these are editorial errors or mistakes inherent to the manuscripts themselves. In addition, there is at least one case (p. 39) where the topic shifts unexpectedly and where it appears that an entire folio has been skipped in the publication.

⁴ Van der Kuijp (2003), p. 419.

⁵ A more detailed discussion of these references will take place in §2. In the introduction of the 2000 publication of the *Tshad bsdus*, it is incorrectly implied that the "*rgya*" referenced frequently in the text is rGya Grags (pa) bsod (nams). This mistaken attribution is repeated in van der Kuijp's (2003) article on the text. There is indeed a single reference to "*rgya grags bsod*" (p. 166), but the evidence is clear from other texts of the same general period that the marker "*rgya*" in the *Tshad bsdus* refers to Phya pa's teacher rGya dmar ba. For more on this, see Hugon & Stoltz (2019), especially ch. I.2.

⁶ For more on the identity of "*jo btsun*" as Khyung Rin chen grags, see Hugon (forthcoming).

particular, Phya pa's two most important students, gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge and Dan 'bag pa sMra ba'i seng ge, are neither directly mentioned by name in the *Tshad bsdus*, nor are their most distinctive epistemological positions even indirectly referenced.⁷ Moreover, the *Tshad bsdus* displays no familiarity with the epistemological views and criticisms (of earlier Tibetan epistemologists) that are associated with Sa skya Pañdita (1182–1251). This absence of figures from generations after Phya pa, who himself flourished in the middle of the twelfth century, lends powerful credence to the view that the text was unlikely to have been written in the fourteenth century.

A second relevant bit of information that van der Kuijp relied on to reach his conclusion was the fact that the *Tshad bsdus* contains a large number of Sanskrit expressions written phonetically in Tibetan script, both for technical terms and for names of historical figures. For example, while there are multiple places where the name “*chos kyi grags pa*” appears, in many other places within the text one finds the Sanskrit wording “*dar ma kir ti*” (i.e., Dharmakīrti). Similarly, the text contains the expression “*bu ta*” (i.e., Buddha) in many places instead of the standard Tibetan term “*sangs rgyas*.⁸ With respect to technical terminology, one also finds prominent use of the Sanskrit term “*he du*” (i.e., *hetu*) instead of the Tibetan terms “*gtan tshigs*” or “*rtags*.⁹ This frequent use of transliterated Sanskrit does not provide definitive insight, but given the general absence of such expressions in Tibetan epistemology texts from later periods their inclusion in the *Tshad bsdus* provides some indication of the text's early composition date.

Beyond the evidence provided by van der Kuijp, additionally relevant to dating the composition of the *Tshad bsdus* are the precise Tibetan technical terms that the author uses. For example, the objects of non-conceptual erroneous cognition are denoted, in the *Tshad bsdus*, with the expression “*rtog med 'khrul pa'i dmigs pa*.¹⁰ This is the same term that is used by Phya pa in his *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* and by mTshur ston gzhon nu seng ge (c. 1150–1210) in his *Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma*—both of which were composed in the twelfth century.¹¹ Yet, by the early thirteenth century, this particular expression for the objects of non-conceptual erroneous cognition is abandoned and replaced with other (admittedly simpler) expressions. For example, these same items are called “*med pa gsal ba*” by Sa skya pañdita (1182–

⁷ That is, the specific, idiosyncratic positions that are ascribed to gTsang nag pa and Dan 'bag pa within later Tibetan epistemological compilation texts are absent from the *Tshad bsdus*.

⁸ See Hugon (2004) and (2016) for documentation indicating that mTshur ston's epistemology compilation text was composed prior to his being the teacher of Sa skya pañdita in 1201.

1251) and are called “*dngos med gsal snang*” by Chu mig pa (c. 1200–1270).⁹

In much the same way, among the five principal types of cognition that are not instances of knowledge (*tshad min lnga*), the author of the *Tshad bsdus* calls one of these “*bcad pa'i yul can*,” which is the same term used by Phya pa.¹⁰ In some places in the *sGron ma*, mTshur ston also uses the term “*bcad pa'i yul can*.” In other places in his text, however, he uses the term “*bcad shes*” to denote this same class of cognitions. Yet, by the early part of the thirteenth century, it is this latter term, “*bcad shes*,” that is systematically found within Tibetan epistemology texts and the earlier expression “*bcad pa'i yul can*” is abandoned. Linguistic clues of this sort—including the author’s use of the terms “*rtog med 'khrul pa'i dmigs pa*” and “*bcad pa'i yul can*”—provide us with promising evidence for thinking that the *Tshad bsdus* was composed sometime in the second half of the twelfth century, and hence that it was not composed by Klong chen pa in the fourteenth century.

2. References in the *Tshad bsdus*

Even though the cumulative evidence is overwhelming that the *Tshad bsdus* was not composed in the fourteenth century but was likely written sometime in the second half of the twelfth century, the evidence thus far provided is merely helpful in relation to *dating* the composition of the *Tshad bsdus*, and does nothing to help us positively identify the actual author of the text. There are, however, some additional clues within the text that allow us to make some headway toward identifying the author. These clues come from information concerning the other Tibetan epistemologists who are referenced throughout the text—but less from *who* those thinkers are and more from *how* their views are presented.

As was mentioned in the preceding section, the *Tshad bsdus* contains a plethora of references to the views held by earlier Tibetan epistemologists. That rNgog lo tsā ba is referenced fifty-two times and that Phya pa is referenced ninety-nine times is not entirely surprising.¹¹ These two figures were, after all, incredibly important players in the development of the Tibetan epistemological tradition. Likewise, the

⁹ In addition to these two texts by Sa skyā pāṇḍita and Chu mig pa, these same two expressions are found in other epistemology treatises as well. For example, the epistemology text composed by gTsang drug pa rDo rje 'od zer (the *gSal byed*) uses the term “*dngos med gsal snang*,” and the text written by Dharmaratna (the *sNyīng po*) uses the term “*med pa gsal ba*.” Both of these texts likely date to the very end of the twelfth century or first quarter of the thirteenth century.

¹⁰ This term could be translated into English as “post-knowledge cognition.” For more on this see Hugon & Stoltz (2019), ch. IV,2.

¹¹ See Appendix for a more detailed enumeration of references in the *Tshad bsdus*.

fact that rGya dmar ba is referenced seventy-nine times is a testament to his importance to later scholars—not just as the direct teacher of Phya pa, but also as a scholar who was purportedly the author of an epistemological compilation text (*Tshad ma bsdus pa*) himself.¹² What stands out as unique, however, are the fifty-three references to a figure named Byang chub skyabs. Little is otherwise known about the epistemological views of this scholar, as that particular name is not mentioned within any other presently available Tibetan epistemological treatise. It is, therefore, rather peculiar, and potentially informative, to find so many references to Byang chub skyabs in this text.

As van der Kuijp has pointed out in his (2003) article, the internal evidence within the *Tshad bsdus* would seem to indicate that Byang chub skyabs was a junior contemporary of Phya pa. The reasoning for this is two-fold. First of all, many of the positions attributed to Byang chub skyabs in the *Tshad bsdus* appear to be in response to claims made by Phya pa. This suggests that Byang chub skyabs was writing—or at least developing his positions—after Phya pa wrote his *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*. Second, in a few cases it also appears that Phya pa has replies to Byang chub skyabs’ objections—which serves to strengthen the hypothesis that the two thinkers were contemporaries.¹³ The author of the *Tshad bsdus* was clearly intimately familiar with the views of both Phya pa and Byang chub skyabs. But again, this familiarity with the views of Phya pa is not so surprising given his outsized role in the development of Tibetan Buddhist epistemology.

The key significance of these references to the positions of Byang chub skyabs can only be seen by taking note of the *precise ways* in which his views are presented by the author of the *Tshad bsdus*. On this, there are two critical observations that must be made. First, while *all* of the other Tibetan authors cited within the text are systematically quoted/cited in conjunction with non-honorific verbs, most frequently with the word “*zer*”—either with the expression “[name] *na re...zhes zer*” or with “...*zhes [name] zer*”—this is almost *never* the way that Byang chub skyabs’ positions are expressed. In fact, of the fifty-three times in which Byang chub skyabs is referenced in the *Tshad bsdus*, there are only two occurrences where the verb “*zer*” is used when mentioning his views. Instead, the author systematically uses the

¹² For more on the claim that rGya dmar ba authored a *Tshad ma bsdus pa* see van der Kuijp (1983), p. 60.

¹³ One example of a possible back-and-forth exchange (on p. 314 of the *Tshad bsdus*) between Phya pa and Byang chub skyabs is cited in van der Kuijp (2003). Other back-and-forth exchanges occur on p. 175 and on p. 264. One additional potential back-and-forth takes place on pp. 72-73, where there is an unnamed view (quite possibly from Byang chub skyabs, as it is expressed with the honorific verb “*gsung*”) asserted between two pronouncements by Phya pa.

honorific verb “*gsung*” when mentioning Byang chub skyabs’ positions. (Moreover, in nearly all of these cases, it is the present tense verb “*gsung*” that is used, whereas quotes from Indian scriptures make use of the past tense form “*gsungs*.”) Likewise, only infrequently (eleven times) does the author refer to Byang chub skyabs in conjunction with the expression “[name] *na re....*” Instead, in the vast majority of cases, some version of the name Byang chub skyabs appears at the end of a quotation and right before the word “*gsung*,” but without any preceding use of the expression “*na re.*” And again, this is in contrast to every single other Tibetan philosopher mentioned in the text, all of whom are typically referenced or quoted by way of the non-honorific verb “*zer*” and who much more frequently are introduced with the expression “[name] *na re....*” This is true for Khyung Rin chen grags, rGya dmar ba, and Phya pa, as well as other lesser-known figures in the Tibetan tradition of epistemology. (Please see the Appendix for details on these attributions.)

The second critical observation with respect to the author’s references to Byang chub skyabs has to do with *where* within a given discussion Byang chub skyabs’ positions are discussed. Within his presentations on many topics, the author of the *Tshad bsdus* references the views of multiple Tibetan thinkers and, in a fair number of cases, offer critiques of those earlier Tibetans’ views. (Sometimes those criticisms are from the author himself, but in many cases they are criticisms coming from other Tibetan scholars that he cites.) What it is important to recognize, however, is that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* never disagrees with or responds to the claims that are put forward by Byang chub skyabs. Instead, the views of Byang chub skyabs nearly always appear at the very end of his discussion of a given topic and serve as (literally) the final statement on the issue under question.¹⁴

Putting these above two points together, it is clear from the style of presentation that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* held Byang chub skyabs in very high esteem and that the author took Byang chub skyabs’ assertions to be definitive. This thus gives us some reason to suspect that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* could have been a devoted student of Byang chub skyabs, and that he wrote his epistemological compilation under the influence of Byang chub skyabs, either during or shortly after the lifetime of Phya pa.

¹⁴ It is only in the back-and-forth discussions between Phya pa and Byang chub skyabs that we find responses to any of the claims made by Byang chub skyabs.

3. Teacher-Student Lineages in Tibet

It is remarkable that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* quotes from or otherwise references the views of Byang chub skyabs fifty-three times, and yet this person's epistemological views seem not to have been remarked upon in any other extant epistemological texts.¹⁵ It is likewise remarkable that the *Tshad bsdus*, even without putting forward any groundbreaking epistemological contributions of its own, seems to have gone entirely unnoticed by later generations of Tibetan scholars. As van der Kuijp modestly announces in his (2003) article on the *Tshad bsdus*, his "...limited reading in the literature strongly suggests that it fell dead from the author's pen, since [he has] yet to come across one single reference to it, explicit or otherwise."¹⁶ But these two facts—viz., the relative anonymity of Byang chub skyabs and of the *Tshad bsdus* itself—would actually fit together quite well if the author of the *Tshad bsdus* was indeed a direct student of Byang chub skyabs.

3.1. Byang chub skyabs

So who was Byang chub skyabs? Thankfully, there is enough information available from a variety of sources to clarify who Byang chub skyabs was and to ascertain the identities of (at least some of) his principal students. Versions of Byang chub skyabs' name can be found within multiple historical texts in relation to transmission lineages for the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and the *Abhidharmakośa*.¹⁷ We know that he received teachings on Abhidharma from Tho ston Kun dga' rdo rje, who was himself a student of 'Ban dKon mchog rdo rje. Both of those figures are known to have flourished in the first half of the twelfth century.¹⁸ Byang chub skyabs, in turn, was the Abhidharma teacher of

¹⁵ There is one possible reference to Byang chub skyabs in mTshur ston's *sGron ma* (28b7). This identification is only tentative, however, as the reference is simply to "byang" and the view—relating to yogic perception—held by this figure in the *sGron ma* does not match up with any views attributed to Byang chub skyabs in the *Tshad bsdus*.

¹⁶ Van der Kuijp (2003), p. 389.

¹⁷ See, for example, *Deb sngon*, p. 420, *rGya 'grel*, p. 743, and *Thob yig*, p. 409.

¹⁸ While no exact dating of these two individuals could be made, there is at least some reason to think that 'Ban dKon mchog rdo rje was roughly contemporaneous with rGya dmar ba and sTag pa kha che—two important students of Khyung Rin chen grags. This would suggest that he flourished in the first half of the twelfth century. Among the evidence for this is the fact that, within the rNam thar of Rwa lo tsā ba (*rNga sgra*, p. 19), it is remarked that sTag pa kha che and 'Ban dKon mchog rdo rje traveled together to gSang phu so that they could see rNog lo tsā ba just before his death (in 1109). In addition, it is known that one of 'Ban's teachers, Brang ti Dar ma snying po, was also a teacher of Sa chen Kun dga' snying po (1092-1158).

gZhon nu byang chub (c. 1150–1210). Later figures in the same transmission lineage of the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* include Bo dong Rin chen rtse mo and dPang lo tsā ba Blo gros brten pa (1276–1342), both of whom were affiliated with Bo dong E Monastery in gTsang. Both Byang chub skyabs and his student gZhon nu byang chub frequently find their names prefaced with the modifier “‘jad pa” which indicates that they hailed from the area called ‘Jad in present-day Shigatse Prefecture.

In addition to teaching the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and the *Abhidharma-makośa* to gZhon nu byang chub, at least a few other students can be linked to Byang chub skyabs. One such person is Mus srad pa chen po, who is said to have received teachings on the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* from Byang chub skyabs. A second figure is sPrul sku Yang dben pa who is known to have lived from 1160 to 1217. It appears that Yang dben pa received his full ordination vows, as well as various teachings, from Byang chub skyabs when he was approximately seventeen years old.¹⁹ This would thus imply that Byang chub skyabs lived until at least 1177.

This connection to transmission lineages of the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and *Abhidharma-makośa* is informative, but it doesn’t fully explain why Byang chub skyabs’ name would appear in an epistemology text, nor does it explain why it would appear in connection to other scholars from gSang phu Monastery. The key insight comes from recognizing that ‘Jad pa Byang chub skyabs is the same person as ‘Jad pa sTon skyabs. In listings of the relevant Abhidharma transmission lineages, some historical sources list his name as “‘jad pa ston skyabs” and others as “‘jad pa byang (chub) skyabs.”²⁰ This is an important detail because ‘Jad pa sTon skyabs is also listed in the *Blue Annals* as being a student of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. When exactly Byang chub skyabs (a.k.a. ‘Jad pa sTon skyabs) studied with Phya pa is not specified. It could have been during the time that Phya pa was the head teacher of epistemology at gSang phu Monastery, or it could have been earlier when Phya pa was still in residence with his own

¹⁹ This information comes from *Ming mdzod*, p. 1043.

²⁰ In the *Blue Annals* (*Deb sngon*, p. 419–420) the lineage reads: *brang ti la ko bo ye shes 'byung gnas / ... 'ban / tho gar ba gcam lde / 'jad pa byang skyabs / 'jad pa gzhon byang / 'bring mtshams zhang*. In the commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* written by dPang lo tsā ba (*rGya 'grel*, p. 743) we find: *brang ti dar ma snying po / 'ban dkon mchog rdo rje / tho kun dga' rdo rje / byang chub skyabs / gzhon byang / 'bring 'tshams zhang*. By contrast, in the collected works of the Sakyapas (*gSan yig*, p. 785) we find the following: *ngur smrig pa dar ma snying po / ko bo ye 'byung / de gnyis ka'i slob ma 'ban dkon mchog rdo rje / de nas tho ston kun dga' rdo rje / 'jad pa ston skyabs / gzhon byang*. Finally, in the collected works of the fifth Dalai Lama (*gSung 'bum*, vol. 1, p. 31), the lineage reads: *brang ti dar ma snying po / ko ye 'byung / 'ban dkon cog rdo rje / tho kun dga' rdo rje / 'jad pa ston skyabs / 'jad pa gzhon byang / zhang 'bring mtshams pa*.

teacher rGya dmar ba in sTod lungs. What is clear is that, while Byang chub skyabs is primarily known for his contributions to Abhidharma, he received teachings on epistemology, as well as on the *Bodhicaryāvataṭāra*, from Phya pa.²¹

Two texts within *The Collected Works of the Kadampas* (vol. 25) are attributed to a person named “*byang chub skyabs*.” Whether those two texts were indeed written by the same person who is referenced repeatedly in the *Tshad bsdus* is not something that can be affirmed with certainty at this time, but there is at least some reason to suspect that those two texts were composed by the same Byang chub skyabs who studied under both Tho ston Kun dga’ rdo rje and Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. The longer of those two texts (see *rNam bshad*) contains a fair number of interlinear notes, a few of which mention the Tibetan figures that are associated with certain views. Though there are not many such references, the labels used include multiple occurrences of “*lo ts+tsa ba*,” “*jo btsun*,” “*rgya*,” “*phyā*,” and “*tho*.” This suggests that the Tibetans being cited are rNgog lo tsā ba, Khung Rin chen grags, rGya dmar ba, Phya pa, and Tho ston Kun dga’ rdo rje, respectively.²² In fact, on one occasion (*rNam bshad*, 43a7) these latter four persons are all referenced together with respect to the same position. Given that both Phya pa and Tho are cited in this text, and insofar as there are no references to any figures from later generations, this would lend some credence to the conclusion that the author was indeed ’Jad pa Byang chub skyabs.

Having already established that Byang chub skyabs was a direct student of Phya pa, and given the reverence that the *Tshad bsdus* shows toward Byang chub skyabs, it is then important to look more closely at who that scholar’s primary students were. As mentioned above, there are three people who I have been able to identify as disciples of Byang chub skyabs, and who should thus be under consideration as possible authors of the *Tshad bsdus*. These three known disciples are the aforementioned gZhon nu byang chub, Mus srad pa chen po, and sPrul sku Yang dben pa.

²¹ With respect to Phya pa transmitting teachings of the *Bodhicaryāvataṭāra* to Byang chub skyabs, see *Thob yig*, p. 262, where the transmission lineage reads: *rngog lo tsā+tsa ba / khyung rin chen grags / stod lung rgya dmar / slob dpon phya pa / Jad pa ston skyabs / mus srad pa chen po.*

²² There are other references as well. For example, one finds a few tags of “*zhang chos*” and “*zhang tshes*,” both of which I take to be references to rNgog lo tsā ba’s student, and the third throne-holder of gSang phu Monastery, Zhang tshe spong Chos kyi bla ma. There are also several tags for “*chos ye*,” which would seem to refer to Zhang tshe spong’s student Nyang bran pa Chos kyi ye shes, who is claimed to have written a commentary on the *bSlab pa kun las btus pa* (see *Deb sngon*, p. 405).

3.2. *gZhon nu byang chub*

With that said, the fact that one of Byang chub skyabs' students went by the name *gZhon nu byang chub* (at least to writers in later generations) may be taken as *prima facie* evidence for thinking that this student bore a very close connection to, and may even have been a blood relative of, Byang chub skyabs. It is thus worth exploring the possibility that the *Tshad bsdus* could have been authored by *gZhon nu byang chub*. Specific evidence linking *gZhon nu byang chub* to the composition of the *Tshad bsdus* will be presented in the next section. Before providing that evidence, I will spend the next few paragraphs saying a bit more about what is known of *gZhon nu byang chub*.

Two texts written by *gZhon nu byang chub* have been published within *The Collected Works of the Kadampas*. One text, a short Prajñāpāramitā commentary called the *mNgon rtogs rgyan yum bar ma nyi khri dang sbyar ba'i rgyan 'grel* (henceforth, *rGyan 'grel*), is contained in volume 10 of the *Collected Works of the Kadampas*, and a second text, a much longer Abhidharma commentary called the *Chos mingon pa kun las btus pa'i TIkka Shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me* (henceforth, *sGron me*), is found in volume 40. (Stylistically, these two texts are quite different from one another, but a discussion of those differences is beyond the scope of this article.)

We have already seen above that *gZhon nu byang chub* was a student of Byang chub skyabs—receiving teachings from him on both the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and the *Abhidharmakośa*. This comports well with the references contained within *gZhon nu byang chub's sGron me*, which includes, aside from forty-nine explicit references to Byang chub skyabs, an additional 221 references to Byang chub skyabs' teacher Tho ston Kun dga' rdo rje and 187 references to Tho's teacher 'Ban dKon mchog rdo rje.

The editors of *The Collected Works of the Kadampas* assert that *gZhon nu byang chub* was a direct student of one “*dkar chung ba gzhon nu tshul khrims*,” who was himself a student of Ar Byang chub ye shes. Though not noted as such, this information would appear to come from claims made in the collected works of Shākyā mchog ldan (1428–1507). In his short text on the spread of *rNgog lo tsā ba*'s teachings, Shākyā mchog ldan provides information on each of the four main disciples of *rNgog lo tsā ba*. *gZhon nu byang chub's* name is indeed found within the brief discussion of the followers of *rNgog*'s

student 'Bre Shes rab 'bar.²³ 'Bre's principal student was Ar Byang chub ye shes. Shākyā mchog ldan tells us that Ar was the teacher of one "gzhon nu tshul khrims"—who I believe is the same person as 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo—and this latter figure was the teacher of 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub.²⁴ Interestingly, Shākyā mchog ldan reports that it was gZhon nu byang chub who was responsible for bringing Prajñāpāramitā teachings to Bo dong—that is, to Bo dong E Monastery in gTsang.²⁵

In this same text by Shākyā mchog ldan, he mentions that 'Bre Shes rab 'bar received Prajñāpāramitā teachings from rNgog lo tsā ba and Abhidharma teachings, in Bo dong, from dGe bshes Mu tra chen po, the person who is proclaimed to have founded Bo dong E Monastery in the year 1049. This very much fits with the pattern of names appearing within the Abhidharma commentary written by gZhon nu byang chub, as his *sGron me* contains references to all these individuals. In addition to seven references to rNgog lo tsā ba, there are fifty-four references to Mu tra chen po and fifteen references to 'Bre Shes rab 'bar. (See Appendix for a more comprehensive listing). The stylistically different *rGyan 'grel* contains many fewer references to Tibetan scholars—and the references that it does contain are found only within interlinear/sublinear notes. That said, there are references in the *rGyan 'grel* to "lo tsa ba" (i.e., rNgog lo tsā ba), "bre" (i.e., 'Bre Shes rab 'bar), and "Ar" (i.e., Ar Byang chub ye shes).

Finally, it was mentioned above that gZhon nu byang chub was a student of 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo. This latter name figures in various transmission lineages associated with followers of 'Bre, but he is also

²³ Within many typeset versions of this text, gZhon nu byang chub's name is rendered "'jam dpal gzhon nu byang chub." In an existing *dbu med* version of the text (*Rol mo*, p. 509), however, his name is correctly rendered as "'jad pa gzhon nu byang chub."

²⁴ Though Shākyā mchog ldan's *Rol mo* speaks just of "gzhon nu tshul khrims," the editors of *The Collected Works of the Kadampas* claim that the Prajñāpāramitā teacher of gZhon nu byang chub was "dkar chung ba gzhon nu tshul khrims"—that is, 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo's student dKar chung ring mo. I believe this to be incorrect. First of all, in another text within his collected works, Shākyā mchog ldan refers to this same student of Ar with the more extensive name "'dul 'dzin gzhon nu tshul khrims." Second, within the collected works of the Sakya master Tshul khrims rin chen (1697–1774) we are provided with a comprehensive listing of these same figures, and that text proclaims that 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo had the 'real name' (*mtshan dngos*) of "gzhon nu tshul khrims" and that his student dKar chung ring mo had the name "shes rab 'bum." (See *Chu gter*, p. 128.) As such, I believe that this teacher of gZhon nu byang chub was 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo.

²⁵ The transmission lineages that include gZhon nu byang chub do indeed feature a number of scholars known to be associated with Bo dong E Monastery. Among them are Bo dong Rin chen rtse mo (c. 12th to 13th centuries) and dPang lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa (1276–1342).

found within transmission lineages for the *Chos nyid rnam 'byed* and *rGyud bla ma*. Most importantly, he is said to have had those texts transmitted by Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge.²⁶ This means that gZhon nu byang chub was indirectly connected to Phya pa in two different ways. gZhon nu byang chub was a student both of Byang chub skyabs and of 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo, each of whom had studied under Phya pa. Recall that the *Blue Annals* tells us that Byang chub skyabs (a.k.a. 'Jad pa sTon skyabs) was a student of Phya pa, and information within the *Tshad bsdus* makes it clear that Byang chub skyabs had interactions with Phya pa on various epistemological topics. As such, it is important to seek out evidence that could support the hypothesis that Byang chub skyabs' student gZhon nu byang chub could have authored the *Tshad bsdus*.

4. Comparing Texts

The corroborating evidence for concluding that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* is in fact gZhon nu byang chub comes from an examination of the strong similarities between the *Tshad bsdus* and the commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* that is known to have been written by gZhon nu byang chub—the *sGron me*. In what follows, I will focus on four points of similarity between the *Tshad bsdus* and gZhon nu byang chub's *sGron me*. These similarities are so striking that, when used in concert, and when combined with the evidence provided above of Byang chub skyabs' role as student of Phya pa and teacher of gZhon nu byang chub, we are in the position to assert with high credibility that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* is in fact gZhon nu byang chub.

4.1. Invocation

The first compositional similarity between the *Tshad bsdus* and gZhon nu byang chub's *sGron me* to be mentioned here relates to the opening verses of the two works. The opening lines of the two texts are so similar in structure that one has good reason to suspect that the authorship is the same. As documented in the 2000 publication of the *Tshad bsdus*, that text opens with the verse:

*byang chub sems dang blo gros thogs pa med mnga' bas//
 'gro ba rnams kyi skyabs gyur de la phyag 'tshal te//
 mdo' dang rnam 'grel mdzad pa'i dri med gzhung rnams las//
 tshad ma'i de nyid rab tu bsdus pa'i brjed byang bri//*

²⁶ See *gSung 'bum*, vol. 2, p. 202.

There are at least two items to note about this opening verse. First, the lines contain hidden within them the name “*byang chub skyabs*.” Second, this opening verse ends with a proclamation that the author is *writing a memorandum* (*brjed byang bri*) of epistemological matters. This description as a memorandum is rather peculiar in relation to texts of this sort, and the peculiarity of this wording is discussed at some length in van der Kuijp (2003).

Due to apparent damage to the original manuscript that is reproduced in *The Collected Works of the Kadampas*, the opening verses of gZhon nu byang chub’s *sGron me* are not fully readable. Nevertheless, enough of the first verse can be identified to note the clear similarities between the two texts. Here is the opening of gZhon nu byang chub’s Abhidharma commentary:

‘phags pa ‘jam dpal gzhon nur gyurd pa la phyag ‘tshal lo//
gang dag sgrib gnyis mtha’ dag byang gyur cing//
yang dag [unclear] mngon du chub gyur tel/
[unclear]
skyabs gyur de la btud nas brjed byang bri//

As one can plainly see, this text likewise contains a hidden invocation of his teacher Byang chub skyabs. Perhaps more importantly, we see the exact same language of writing a memorandum (*brjed byang bri*) at the close of the verse. It must be remarked again that this specific way of expressing things appears to be unique within texts from these genres in this time period.²⁷ The isolated fact that the exact same expression is used in these two texts, in the exact same situational context, does not decisively prove that the texts were written by the same author, but it does serve to increase the credence for that hypothesis.

4.2. Citations of Predecessors

It was emphasized in §2 above that the *Tshad bsdus* contains fifty-three references to Byang chub skyabs, and that in nearly all of these cases, the honorific verb “*gsung*” is used when mentioning Byang chub skyabs’ views. Yet, when all other Tibetan epistemologists are mentioned, the honorific verb “*gsung*” is not used. We find, instead, the verb “*zer*” generally used for these other thinkers. Given this systematic difference in how Tibetan thinkers’ views are presented in the *Tshad bsdus* and given the live hypothesis that gZhon nu byang chub might have been the author of the *Tshad bsdus*, it is important to

²⁷ This language of a memorandum (*brjed byang*) is found within dPang lo tsā ba’s *rGya ‘grel*, but he uses this language precisely in reference to gZhon nu byang chub’s *sGron me*, which he calls “*gu ru gzhon byang gi brjed byang*.”

examine the names referenced in gZhon nu byang chub's *Abhidharma-samuccaya* commentary. Indeed, though I have likely missed at least some occurrences within the text, my initial inspection of the Tibetan names cited within gZhon nu byang chub's *sGron me* makes it quite clear that the pattern of citation found in the *Tshad bsdus* is also exhibited within the *sGron me*.

I have identified forty-nine explicit references to the views of Byang chub skyabs in gZhon nu byang chub's *sGron me*, and in forty-eight of those cases the author has used the honorific verb "gsung."²⁸ Yet, of the more than 600 references to other Tibetan scholars, in only two instances is the verb "gsung" used when referencing these other Tibetan scholars.²⁹ The text contains, for example 221 references to "tho"—i.e., Byang chub skyabs' teacher Tho ston Kun dga' rdo rje—and 187 references to "bhan" or "ban"—i.e., Tho's teacher 'Ban dKon mchog rdo rje. Yet, in none of these cases is the honorific verb "gsung" used when mentioning these two thinkers' views. Instead, in nearly all these cases it is the non-honorific verb "zer" that is used.³⁰ In short, the reference style employed in gZhon nu byang chub's *sGron me* is exactly the same as what is found in the *Tshad bsdus*. (See Appendix for further details.)

²⁸ To be clear, all of these references in the *sGron me* are within the main text itself—not within interlinear notes. (Having said that, it is possible, or perhaps likely, that some/most/all of these references originally took the form of interlinear notes that were subsequently inserted into the body of the text by a scribe copying the text.) With respect to Byang chub skyabs, in seventeen cases, reference is made with the full attribution "byang chub skyabs," but in thirty-five cases it is just with the abbreviated form "skyabs." In one additional case the label "'jad pa'" is used. In thirty-nine occurrences, the references to Byang chub skyabs come at the end of a quote: either "[quote] zhes byang chub skyabs gsung ngo" or "[quote] zhes skyabs gsung ngo." In three cases one finds the form "byang chub skyabs ni [quote] zhes gsung ngo" and in seven cases it is of the form "byang chub skyabs na re [quote] zhes gsung ngo."

²⁹ As for these two occasions where the honorific verb "gsung" is used for a Tibetan other than Byang chub skyabs, one occurrence (*sGron me*, 155b9) involves Gangs pa she'u, and in a second occurrence (*sGron me*, 183a4) it is in reference to the view of Khyung Rin chen grags—mentioned with the label "jo btsun."

³⁰ Two points of clarification are in order here. First, the claim here is only about cases where the present tense, honorific verb "gsung" is used in conjunction with an explicit speaker/author attribution. The text does additionally contain numerous (at least sixty-eight) occurrences of the present tense, honorific verb "gsung" for which no explicit speaker/author attribution is made. It is possible that many (or all) of these are also references to the views of Byang chub skyabs—for in most places it is clear that these are views that are in response to Byang chub skyabs' teacher Tho ston Kun dga' rdo rje. Nevertheless, these cases are separate from the explicit attributions to Byang chub skyabs and have played no role in supporting the central conclusion of this article. The second point of clarification is that the past tense, honorific verb "gsungs" is frequently used when quoting from Indian sutras. There are dozens of expressions of the form "[sometimes name of sutra] mdo las [quote] zhes gsungs so."

4.3. Sanskrit and Spellings

It was additionally mentioned in the first section of this paper that the *Tshad bsdus* contains a fair number of Sanskrit terms in transliteration, and that this could be taken as evidence that the text was composed sometime earlier than the fourteenth century. In particular, it was noted that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* frequently used the spelling “*dar ma kir ti*” instead of the expected Tibetan rendering “*chos kyi grags pa*” when mentioning the views of the Indian epistemologist Dharmakīrti. Now, because gZhon nu byang chub’s *sGron me* is a text on Abhidharma and not epistemology, Dharmakīrti’s name does not show up very often. Yet, in each of the two places I have identified within the *sGron me* where his name does appear, gZhon nu byang chub does indeed use the Sanskrit spelling “*dar ma kir ti*.”

Relatedly, within the introduction to Chinese publication of the *Tshad bsdus*, it is remarked that the manuscripts of the text contained a non-standard spelling of Dignāga’s name. Though now standardly spelled “*phyogs kyi glang po*,” it is mentioned in the introduction of the *Tshad bsdus* that the manuscripts contained the spelling “*klang*” instead of “*glang*.³¹ Matters are identical in the *gGron me*. In the places where Dignāga’s name appears in gZhon nu byang chub’s *gGron me*, his name is systematically spelled “*phyogs kyi clang po*.” (Moreover, there are various places in the text—when providing examples and analogies—that a reference is made to elephants, and in each of these cases, the Tibetan term for an elephant is spelled “*clang po che*.”) In short, the peculiarities of spelling for both Dignāga’s name and Dharmakīrti’s name in the *Tshad bsdus* match up with those in the *gGron me*.

4.4. Text Re-use

While the above three similarities are suggestive of common authorship between the *Tshad bsdus* and the *sGron me*, there is still the possibility, however faint, that the *Tshad bsdus* could have been written by some other student of Byang chub skyabs—one who just happens to exhibit a writing style remarkably similar to that found in the *sGron me*. What would be ideal, therefore, would be to identify some sort of independent textual evidence that directly links the *Tshad bsdus* to gZhon nu byang chub. This could involve, for example, a later writer attributing some view to gZhon nu byang chub that comes from the *Tshad bsdus*. Evidence of any such attributions have yet to surface,

³¹ It appears that the editor of the *Tshad bsdus* systematically “corrected” the spelling of Dignāga’s name in the version of the text published in 2000, as the spelling “*klang*” is found only once in the text, with the spelling “*glang*” used in all other occurrences.

however. In the absence of such an attribution, another option would be to look for passages in the *Tshad bsdus* that are identical to claims found within either of the two texts known to be authored by gZhon nu byang chub, the *sGron me* and *rGyan 'grel*.

Unfortunately, I have been thus far unable to identify enough cases of text re-use that allow us to definitively establish identical authorship. There may very well be instances of text re-use between the *Tshad bsdus* and the other two texts known to be composed by gZhon nu byang chub—and one example will be described below—but a more comprehensive identification of such re-use would likely require the latter texts to be digitally input into a searchable computer format. I say this because there is at least some reason to think that both the *sGron me* and the *rGyan 'grel* were written prior to the *Tshad bsdus*. My own manual inspection of the *sGron me* and *rGyan 'grel* for passages on epistemological themes—for which there are many—has not revealed any passages with language identical with what is written in the *Tshad bsdus*. The *sGron me*, for example, displays a clear acquaintance with themes coming from the Buddhist tradition of epistemology, but the wording on epistemological matters is actually more similar to what is found in Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge's *Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel* and his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary than it is to the wording in the *Tshad bsdus*.

To give but one example of this, gZhon nu byang chub's *sGron me* contains, on its first page, a brief discussion of the difference between concepts (*don spyi*) and particular things (*don rang gi mtshan nyid*). While he describes concepts as being "mixed ('*dres pa*) with respect to place, time, and aspect," particular things are spoken of as "unmixed with respect to place, time, and nature."³² This language is very much in accord with the way that these objects are described by Phya pa in his *Mun sel*.³³ Yet, this wording in the *sGron me* is slightly different from how concepts and particular things are described within the opening pages of the *Tshad bsdus*, where the language of being "mixed" or "unmixed" is not used. Instead, the *Tshad bsdus* speaks of concepts as having their "place...time...and nature or aspect indeterminate (*nges pa med pa*)."³⁴

To be clear, I take this *not* as evidence that the *Tshad bsdus* was not written by the same person as the *sGron me*, but instead as evidence that the *sGron me* was likely composed prior to the *Tshad bsdus*. If that's right, it suggests that text re-use in the *Tshad bsdus* would most likely occur when a topic related to Abhidharma (or Prajñāpāramitā in the

³² *sGron me*, 1b3-4.

³³ See *Mun sel*, 1b6-7 and 4a7.

³⁴ *Tshad bsdus*, p. 4. The passage reads: *de'ang mi gsal ba ni yul nges pa med pa dang / dus nges pa med pa dang / rang bzhin nam rnam pa nges pa med pa*.

case of the *rGyan 'grel*) is taken up within the *Tshad bsdus*. Indeed, I have been able to thus far find a single example illustrative of possible text re-use. Early in the *Tshad bsdus* there is a brief discussion of the Three Natures (Skt. *trisvabhāva*). That text describes 'the perfected' (*yongs grub*) in the following way:³⁵

yongs grub ni chos can gzhan dbang rnam rig tsam de'i steng du dgag bya gang zag gi bdag dang chos kyi bdag gnyis khegs tsam gyi med dgag go //

Within the *sGron me*, that same term is described thusly:³⁶

yongs grub ni chos can gzhan dbang rnam rig tsam de'i steng du dgag bya gang zag gi bdag dang chos gyi bdag med tsam gyi med dgag ste...

As one can see, the language in these two passages is identical except for a single term. This may therefore be evidence that gZhon nu byang chub simply copied his earlier characterization of 'the perfected' (*yongs grub*) when writing about the topic within the *Tshad bsdus*.

I do not think, of course, that this proves definitively that these two texts must have been authored by the same person. (For example, it is possible that this specific language could originate in an earlier source, which was then reproduced both by gZhon nu byang chub in his *sGron me* and also, independently, by the author of the *Tshad bsdus*.) It would be helpful to have additional instances of identical language shared by the two texts. As I have said earlier, however, because these instances of text re-use are likely to involve Abhidharma themes being reproduced within the *Tshad bsdus*, their identification would be aided by having a searchable, digital version of the *sGron me*, which to my knowledge does not currently exist. Nevertheless, the example of identical language provided above does, when combined with all the other evidence presented in this paper, lend additional support to the conclusion that the author of the *Tshad bsdus* was the same as the author of the *sGron me*.

³⁵ *Tshad bsdus*, p. 7.

³⁶ *sGron me*, 4b7.

5. Conclusion

Given the fragmentary nature of the documentary record, I do not believe we can ever establish with *absolute certainty* who the author of the *Tshad bsdus* was. Yet, I do believe that the evidence provided above, when taken altogether, allows us to conclude with high credibility that the author of that epistemology text was 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub (c. 1150–1210), a disciple of 'Jad pa Byang chub skyabs, who was himself a direct student of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169). Just to summarize the central strands of evidence:

1. Linguistic clues within the *Tshad bsdus* strongly suggest that the author of the text was a devoted disciple of Byang chub skyabs.
2. Byang chub skyabs was a direct student of Phya pa—the student identified in the *Blue Annals* as 'Jad pa sTon skyabs—and had as one of his disciples a person named gZhon nu byang chub.
3. A comparison of the *Tshad bsdus* with a separate text known to have been authored by gZhon nu byang chub, the *sGron me*, shows these two texts to share a large number of linguistic and stylistic peculiarities in common—which suggests that they were composed by the same person.

As a result, I believe it is warranted to conclude that the author of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa* was 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub, and that this text was, therefore, composed sometime in the last thirty or so years of the twelfth century. The lack of references to figures like gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge and Dan 'bag pa sMra ba'i seng ge—the two students of Phya pa known to have composed their own epistemology texts—may be viewed as a reason to think that the *Tshad bsdus* was composed prior to the epistemological works of those two figures. But it might just as likely be the case that the views presented by gZhon nu byang chub in the *Tshad bsdus* were simply limited to the range of views that were known by Byang chub skyabs at the time that he taught epistemology to gZhon nu byang chub.

What is left unanswered is how and why Klong chen pa's name came to be attached to this text. While I do have some ideas about how that false attribution may have happened, those ideas do not at this time come anywhere close to having the level of epistemic security necessary to be considered highly credible. As such, the puzzle of why an epistemology text composed by gZhon nu byang chub in the second half of the twelfth century came to be attributed to the fourteenth

century Nyingma scholar Klong chen Rab 'byams will need to be solved at a later point in time.

Appendix – References to Tibetan scholars in the *Tshad bsdus* and *sGron me*

Below is a list of all the Tibetan scholars who are either (a) referenced in both the *Tshad bsdus* and *sGron me* or (b) referenced at least ten times in one or the other of those texts.

Name	Standard reference tag	# of references in <i>Tshad bsdus</i>	# of occurrences in <i>Tshad bsdus</i> w/ " [name] ni"	# of occurrences in <i>Tshad bsdus</i> w/ " [name] na re"	# of occurrences in <i>Tshad bsdus</i> with " <i>gsung</i> "	# of references in <i>sGron me</i>	# of occurrences in <i>sGron me</i> w/ " [name] ni"	# of occurrences in <i>sGron me</i> w/ " [name] na re"	# of occurrences in <i>sGron me</i> with " <i>gsung</i> "
Byang chub skyabs ³⁷	"byang chub skyabs"	53	8	11	46	49	3	7	48
Phya pa	"phya"	99	4	62	1 ³⁸	0	0	0	0
rGya dmar ba	"rgya"	79	0	54	1 ³⁹	0	0	0	0
rNgog lo tsā ba	"lo tsa ba"	52	0 ⁴⁰	21	0	7	0	6	0
Khyung Rin chen grags	"jo btsun"	34	0	25	0	11	0	6	1

³⁷ Of the 53 references in the *Tshad bsdus*, in 33 occurrences the full name "byang chub skyabs" is given. In 19 additional occurrences one finds the abbreviated form "byang skyabs." In one final case the form "skyabs" is used. Within the *sGron me* one finds "byang chub skyabs" 17 times, "skyabs" 31 times, and "jad pa" one time.

³⁸ There is but a single occurrence, on p. 193 of the *Tshad bsdus*, in which the verb "gsung" is used for a person other than Byang chub skyabs, and in that one case the pair of names "rgya" and "phya" are referenced together.

³⁹ See fn. 38 above.

⁴⁰ There are no references to rNgog lo tsā ba with the marker "ni," but there are ten occurrences with the third case marker "-s"—e.g., "lo tsa bas [quote] zer."

Gangs pa She'u	"gangs pa"	19	0 ⁴¹	15	0	6	0	3	1
Me dig pa	"me dig"	6	0	5	0	1	0	1	0
gNyags ⁴²	"gnyags"	3	1 ⁴³	2	1 ⁴⁴	31	2	19	0
Tho Kun dga' rdo rje	"tho"	0	0	0	0	221	1	77	0
'Ban dkon mchog rdo rje	"bhan"	0	0	0	0	187	1	97	0
Mu tra chen po	"mu tra"	0	0	0	0	54	1	45	0
Brang ti Dar ma snying po ⁴⁵	"ngur smrig pa"	0	0	0	0	33	4	16	0
mChims brT-son 'grus seng ge	"mchims"	0	0	0	0	30	0	25	0
'Bre Shes rab 'bar	"bre"	0	0	0	0	15	0	10	0
Unat-tributed		15	0	0	15	63	0	0	63

⁴¹ There are no references to Gangs pa She'u with the marker "ni," but there are two occurrences with the third case marker "-s"—e.g., "gangs pas [quote] zer."

⁴² The total of thirty-one occurrences of the name "gnyags" in the *sGron me* does not include three additional places in the text where one finds the names "gnyags seng ge grags," "gnyags tshul," and "gnyags tshul brtson." It is assumed (perhaps incorrectly) that these latter names refer to two individuals different from the referent of the term "gnyags."

⁴³ This single occurrence (p. 245) is one in which gNyags is cited together with Byang chub skyabs. The wording is "gnyags dang byang chub skyabs ni...gsung"

⁴⁴ See fn. 43 above.

⁴⁵ There is good reason to believe that both "ngur smrig pa" and "brang ti" are ascriptions for the same person, Brang ti Dar ma snying po. Of the 33 references to him in the text, 24 occurrences have the label "ngur (s)m(r)ig pa" and 9 places use the label "brang ti." In each and every case in which "brang ti" is used, the form is "[quote] zhes brang ti zer (ro)." In most of the places where "ngur smrig pa" is used, we find instead "ngur smrig pa na re [quote]." The four places where one finds "ngur smrig pa ni [quote]" are all on the same page: folio 126a.

"zhes gsung"									
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Bibliography

Tibetan Sources

- rGya 'grel – dPang lo Blo gros brtan pa. Chos mngon pa kun las btus kyi rgya cher 'grel pa shes bya gsal byed.* (TBRC resource W23638)
- rGyan 'grel – gZhon nu byang chub.* (2006). *mNgon rtogs rgyan yum bar ma nyi khri dang sbyar ba'i rgyan 'grel.* In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 10. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- sGron ma – Hugon, P. (Ed.).* (2004) *mTshur ston gZhon nu seng ge, Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma.* Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
- sGron me – 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub.* (2007). *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i tīkka shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me.* In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 40. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- rNga sgra – Ye shes seng ge.* (1989). *Rwa lo tsā ba'i rnam thar kun khyab snyan pa'i rnya sgra.* Xining: Qinghai People's Press.
- Chu gter – Tshul khriims rin chen.* (2005). *Zhu chen tshul khriims rin chen gyi gsan yig gdengs can rol pa'i chu gter*, vol. 1. Kathmandu: Sachen International. (TBRC resource W00EGS1016703)
- sNying po – Dha rma rad na.* *rTog ge rigs pa'i brgyan gyi snying po.* (TBRC resource W26453)
- Thob yig – Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po.* *Thob yig rgya mtsho.* In *Ngor chen kun dga' bzang po'i bka' bum.* (TBRC resource W11577)
- Deb sngon – 'Gos lo gZhon nu dpal.* (1985). *Deb ther sngon po.* Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- rNam bshad – Byang chub skyabs.* (2006). *bSlab pa kun btus kyi rnam bshad.* In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 25. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Ming mdzod -- Grags pa 'byung gnas and Blo bzang mkhas grub.* (1992). *Gangs can mkhas grub rim byon ming mdzod.* Lanzhou: Gansu People's Press.
- Mun sel – Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge.* (2006). *Tshad ma yid kyi mun pa sel pa.* In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 8. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Tshad bsdus – Klong chen Rab 'byams (attributed).* (2000). *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa.* Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.

- Rol mo* – Shākyā mchog ldan. (2010). *rNgog lo tsa+tsha ba chen pos bstan pa ji ltar bskyangs pa'i tshul mdo tsam du by aba ngo mtshar gtam gyi rol mo*. In *Bod kyi lo rgyus rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 11 (pp. 497-511). Xining: Qinghai People's Press. (TBRC resource W1KG10687)
- gSan yig* – Blo gros rgyal mtshan. (2006). *Lung dang brgyud pa sna tshogs thob pa'i gsan yig*. In *Sa skya bka' 'bum*, vol. 15. Kathmandu: Sa-chén International. (TBRC resource W00EGS1017151)
- gSal byed* – gTsang drug pa rDo rje 'od zer. (2007). *Yang dag rigs pa'i gsal byed sgron ma*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 47. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- gSung 'bum* – Ngag dbang Blo bzang rgya mtsho. (2009). *rGyal dbang lnga pa ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i gsung 'bum*, vols. 1 & 2. Beijing: Chinese Tibetology Press.

Western Sources

- Hugon, P. (2016). Enclaves of learning, religious and intellectual communities in Tibet: The monastery of gSang phu Ne'u thog in the early centuries of the later diffusion of Buddhism. In E. Hovden, C. Lutter, and W. Pohl (Eds.) *Meanings of community across medieval Eurasia: Comparative approaches* (pp. 289-308). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Hugon, P. (forthcoming). Wonders in margin – Mapping the Madhyamaka network of Gyamarwa Jangchupdrak. *Journal of South Asian Intellectual History*.
- Hugon, P., and Stoltz, J. (2019). *The roar of a Tibetan lion: Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge's theory of mind in philosophical and historical perspective*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- van der Kuijp, L. (1983). *Contributions to the development of Tibetan Buddhist epistemology*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- van der Kuijp, L. (2003). 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, 381-437.
- van der Kuijp, L. (2014). Studies in Btsun pa Ston gzhon's *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary of ?1297 — Part one: Preliminary observations and the import of its title. *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines*, 30, 111-198.

