

Fourteenth century Tibetan cultural history VI : the transmission of Indian Buddhist pramnavda according to early Tibetan gsan yig-s

Autor(en): **Kujip, Leonard W.J. van der**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **49 (1995)**

Heft 4

PDF erstellt am: **22.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147204>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

FOURTEENTH CENTURY TIBETAN CULTURAL HISTORY VI:
THE TRANSMISSION OF INDIAN BUDDHIST *PRAMĀNAVĀDA*
ACCORDING TO EARLY TIBETAN *GSAN YIG-S**

Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, Cambridge MA

One of the principal features of Tibetan Buddhism from the eleventh century onward is that it was very much concerned with determining the authenticity, and therefore the canonicity, of the enormous corpus of Buddhist texts with their various doctrinal entities. One of the main reasons for this concern must have been the fact that these texts were by and large introduced into Tibet in a fairly erratic and higgledy-piggledy fashion, without the support of any central authority, whether doctrinal or institutional. As such, we can observe that concerted attempts were, and indeed had to be, made to trace these back to one or other ultimate, trustworthy source, namely the historical Buddha or another representative of the experience of buddhahood such as Vajrapāṇi, Vajradhāra, Vajrayoginī etc. It is for this reason that we can discern already quite early on in its history a serious effort at establishing the lineages of transmission of Indic texts or text-clusters, one that culminated in a specific genre of Tibetan literature variously called “record [of texts] heard” (*gsan yig*) or “record [of texts] obtained” (*thob yig*). The designations *gsan yig* and *thob yig* may have superseded the earlier, rather bland *mtho' byang* (= *tho byang*), roughly translatable by “register” or “list”, which appears in the heading of a work belonging to this genre that is included in the first volume of an edition of the writings of Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson 'grus grags pa (1123-1193), or

* This is the second of three papers that deal with some general features of the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of Indian Buddhist logic and epistemology (*pramāna*, *tshad ma*) in Tibet; for the first, see VAN DER KUIJP (1994). Like the first, it, too, was made possible in part by my stay in Beijing from July to September of 1993 that was facilitated by a generous grant that I received from the Committee on Scholarly Communication with China, Washington, D.C. My thanks are owed to Messrs. Li Jiuqi, Chief Librarian and Shao Guoxian, ex-Deputy Librarian, and particularly to Ngag dbang nor bu, Assistant Researcher, of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities (hereafter CPN) for the warm cooperation I received.

Lama Zhang.¹ To my knowledge, this is the earliest text of this genre published to date. On the other hand, the term *gsan yig* seems to have made its appearance in the thirteenth century. Although these records have yet to receive the attention they deserve from historians of Indian and especially Tibetan Buddhism – a notable exception is D.P. JACKSON –, they do, of course along with other sources, constitute potentially primary historiographic source material for the reconstruction of its development and, above all, how it was perceived to have developed from the Indian subcontinent. The insertion of the restrictive adverb “potentially” is here quite necessary since, as will become clear below, these records are not always reliable, a circumstance that also did not go unrecognized by several authors of such *gsan yig*-s, for, in fact, some of the later ones can often be seen to have been actively engaged in comparative “*gsan yig*-ology.” Aside from the work by Lama Zhang, a number of important precursors to these records are now

1 See ZHANG 426–445. In ZHANG 429, we learn that he received Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇa-viniścaya* and the *Nyāyabindu* from a “Bsam bu Lo tshtsha ba.” The latter is mentioned, albeit as Sam bu Lo tsha ba and without the *Nyāyabindu*, in his biography in an entry placed between approximately his ninth and seventeenth year; see his untitled autobiography written for a Dge bshes Sha mi and others in the *Writings (bka’ thor bu) of Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson ’grus grags pa* (Tashijong, 1972), 13. For some reason, he is not noted in the corresponding passage of his longer autobiography; see the *Rnam thar rgyal blo ma, Writings (bka’ thor bu) of Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson ’grus grags pa* (Tashijong, 1972), 219 ff. In Lama Zhang’s biography in a version of the *Deb ther dmar po* chronicle of Tshal pa Kun dga’ rdo rje (1309–64), his name is written “Sam byung Lo tsā ba”; see TSHAL 127 – the translation in CHEN-ZHOU (1988: 111) reads that his studies took place from the age of “twelve *sui*” instead of the correct “ten *sui*” onward. Tshal pa also states that he studied grammar (*sgra*) under him, something about which both the “register” and autobiographies are silent. A “Sam bu” Lo tsā ba, or any of the possible variants of “Sam bu”, is not found in the standard listings of Tibetan translators. He is, however, also mentioned (along with Klu mes Dbang phyug grags) by Dbus pa Blo gsal Byang chub ye shes (ca.1270–1350) in his commentary on the grammatical treatise of the *Sum cu pa*; see his *Tri sha ka ṭī ka (sic)*, CPN catalogue no.006594(1), 3b. Both are noted in connection with the text’s exposition of ligatures that have a prescribed *b*, which *Sum cu pa* specifies, can only occur with the ten radicals *ka, ga, ca, ta, da, tsa, zha, za, sha* and *sa*. Sum ba Lo tsā ba was of the opinion that “a *ja* is [also] prescribed with a *b*” (*bas ja ’phul*) and Klu mes held the same anent *nya*. Dbus pa Blo gsal comments that these claims “are different from the tradition of early scholars.” This goes to show that the orthotactics of written Tibetan has undergone various changes, and I intend to return to this subject on another occasion.

available. For example, something quite similar to what we see in the *gsan yig-s* is found in the chronicle of the great Rnying ma pa scholar Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer (1124-1192) in which we come across descriptions of such lineages of, for instance, the *vinaya* and the *Abhidharmakośa*, and various textual cycles of the Rnying ma pa school.² To be sure, a corpus of twelfth and early thirteenth century exegetical treatises also include lineages of the transmission of the text or text-clusters on which the authors have commented, which undoubtedly served the purpose of authenticating and legitimizing their hermeneutic efforts. Cases in point would be several of the writings of Sa chen Kun dga' snying po (1092-1158)³ and a good number by his son Rje btsun Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1147-1216), the first and third patriarchs of the Sa skya pa school.

Apart from some tentative tracings of the Indian origins of tantric teachings in the last section of Lama Zhang's *mtho' byang*⁴, another relatively early specimen of the *gsan yig* genre which, rather than being merely conceived as either a bare listing of the works and textual cycles or a textual genre studied by a given individual under one or more teachers⁵, attempts on a greater scale to trace their transmissive history in India and Tibet, is the *Lung dang brgyud pa sna tshogs thob pa'i gsan yig* that was authored by 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan (1235-1280), the fifth Sa skya pa patriarch. In spite of its unity in the Sde dge print, this work actually consists of two separate but cognate texts, whereby the first one may be tentatively entitled **Thos pa'i chos dang bla ma brgyud pa'i dkar chag*. According to its colophon, 'Phags pa completed it in 1259 while residing in China in Cu sham hu, a place-name that I am unable to identify.⁶ Though not mentioned in the

2 See NYANG 453-456, 472-473, 482 ff.

3 See, for instance, the *Slob dpon mtsho skyes kyi lo rgyus*, SSBB 1 no.52, 381/4/2-4.

4 ZHANG 433 ff.

5 We often meet with rather extensive lists in early biographies. Examples would be the convolute of the lives of the abbots of Snar thang monastery by Mchims Nam mkha' grags (1210-1285) in a manuscript catalogued under CPN catalogue no. 002806(8-12) and the biographies of the fourth Sa skya pa patriarch Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182-1251), by Zhang Rgyal ba dpal and Lho pa Thams cad mkhyen pa Rin chen dpal, for which see, respectively, the *Dpal ldan sa skya paṇḍita chen po'i rnam par thar pa*, SSBB 5 no.111, 434/2/3 ff., and the *Dpal ldan sa skya paṇḍita'i rnam thar*, LBSB, 85 ff.

6 SSBB 7 no. 315, 294/3/4. No other work from 'Phags pa's pen was written in a locale with this place-name. The text was incorporated almost in its entirety in 'Phags pa's

table of contents of the Sde dge print of his œuvre published in Tokyo, it is the second section that bears the title of *Lung dang brgyud pa sna tshogs* – strictly speaking, *Lung dang brgyud pa sna tshogs thob pa'i gsan yig* is therefore a title that was given to both texts by an unknown editor. 'Phags pa compiled it at a much later date while in Gtsang; its last entry is dated to the year 1278 during which time he received the transmission of several texts on the means of evoking/realising deities (*sādhana*, *sgrub thabs*) from Rg[w]a Lo tsā ba Rnam rgyal rdo rje (1203-1282).⁷ Sandwiched between these two chronologically is the *Lam 'bras lam skor sogs kyi gsan yig* by A tsa ra *pak shi* (Mongol *baysi*), that is, Master A tsa ra, an undated work that is included in 'Phags pa's œuvre as well.⁸ It focuses on the various transmissions of tantric teachings A tsa ra had received from his teacher 'Phags pa whom he invariably styles as “Chos kyi rgyal po”. The colophon of this undated work appears to be slightly ambiguous. We read there that a certain Bkra shis rgyal mtshan had petitioned 'Phags pa for this work and that A tsa ra was the scribe who compiled it in Mtshal mdo. From the contents, however, it is clear that A tsa ra was both the author and its scribe. We know from the colophons of his other writings that 'Phags pa sojourned in the monastery of Tsam mdo in Smar khams in 1253, and in Tsom mdo gnas sa in Mdo khams in the year 1275.⁹ Since A tsa ra appears relatively late on the scene of 'Phags pa's life, it follows that, if “Mtshal mdo” is a scribal

biographies by his disciples 'Shar pa Ye shes rgyal mtshan (?1222-?1287) and Byang chub gzhon nu; see, respectively, *Bla ma dam pa chos kyi rgyal po rin po che'i rnam par thar pa rin chen phreng ba*, LBSB, 307-327, and the *Bla ma dam pa'i rnam par thar pa la bstod pa tshigs su bcad pa lnga bcu pa grub pa'i rgyan/Rnam par thar pa ngag gi dbang phyug grub pa*, CPN catalogue no.002635(3), fols.15b-28b.

- 7 SSBB 7 no. *315, 297/3/3-4. The text has no colophon. Another contemporaneous, but as yet unretrieved *gsan yig*, a “large” one of Mchims Nam mkha' grags, is referred to in his biography by Skyo ston Smon lam tshul khriims (1219-1299); see fol. 17a of the *Mchims nam mkha' grags kyi rnam thar*, CPN catalogue no. 002806(13).
- 8 SSBB 6 no. 31, 32/4-35/1.
- 9 See, respectively, SSBB 7 no. 129, 62/4/6, and nos. 119, 36/2/3-4 and 298, 262/2/6-3/1. The scribe's name for the text under no. 119 was Zi ston Gzhon nu dpal and not A tsa ra. The commentary on 'Phags pa's *Rgyal po la gdams pa'i rab tu byed pa* entitled the *Gsung rab gsal ba'i rgyan* was written by Shes rab gzhon nu, another one of his disciples, in Tsom mgo gnas sa temple in 1275; see SSBB 7 no. 154, 90/4-108/4.

corruption of “Tsom mdo”, or *vice versa*, this work may have been written in Mtshal mdo in 1275 when ’Phags pa and his party were en route to Central Tibet. That it may very well be such a corruption is indicated by the fact that a Bkra shis rgyal mtshan (and a Thang ngo ta) is mentioned in one of ’Phags pa’s works written in Tsom mdo!¹⁰ In any event, by the early fourteenth century, Gtso mdo in Mdo khams became one of the more important monasteries of the Sa skya pa. Neither of these three texts has anything to say about the lineages of transmission of Buddhist epistemology and logic in India or Tibet.

The first available *gsan yig* to include the transmission of *tshad ma* texts is the one authored by Bu ston Rin chen grub pa (1290-1364).¹¹ Though undated, its last entry indicates that it doubtlessly belongs to the very last years of his life, insofar as it is concerned with the Kashmirian *paṇḍita* Sumanaśrī with whom he studied sometime in 1357.¹² From this work as well as from his main biographies – the latter are clearly indebted to the former – we learn that, in all, Bu ston had five teachers of *tshad ma*, namely:

1. Bsod nams mgon po
2. Spyl bu pa Stag ston Shes rab ’od zer
3. Brag ston Bsod nams rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po
4. ’Jam dbyangs skya bo Nam mkha’ dpal bzang po
5. Ti shri Kun dga’ blo gros rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po

10 SSB 7 no. 298, 262/2/5.

11 BU26 1-142. For an analysis of this work, see Appendix One of my “Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History VII: On the Textual History of Bu ston Rin chen grub’s History of Buddhism (*Chos ’byung*),” which is forthcoming in *Acta Orientalia*. Other fourteenth century representatives of this genre would be, for instance, the ones of Dka’ bzhi pa Rig[s] pa’i seng ge (1287-1375) and Byams pa dpal; see the references in their biographies in, respectively, Seng ge bzang po, *Mkhan chen bka’ bzhi pa chen po rig 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), 63, and Blo gros thogs med pa’i dpal bzang po, *Jag chung ba’i bla ma byams pa dpal gyi rnam thar*, *Shangs pa Bka’ brgyud pa Texts*, Vol.1 (Sumra, 1977), 506. Neither of these have been retrieved so far.

12 BU26 141-142. He is mentioned in Bu ston’s biography by his disciple Sgra tshad pa Rin chen rnam rgyal (1318-1388) in RUEGG (1966: 149, note 1).

As far as the unfortunately rather vague chronologies of his biographies are concerned, the first of these was Bsod nams mgon po, alias Tshad ma'i skyes bu¹³ and Rigs thigs pa, “the one of [Dharmakīrti's] *Nyāyabindu*”, a nickname that suggests that he was primarily associated with this text, under whom he studied at Khro phu monastery from 1307 until well into the second decade.¹⁴ We do not have this master's dates, but Sgra tshad pa observes that he had taught until his eighty-third year, so that we may tentatively date him from ca. 1235 to 1315.¹⁵ If there ever existed one, no biography of him has come down to us so far, and but a mere fragment on his life is preserved by Tshal pa and thence in the history of 1376 by Yar lung Jo bo Shākya rin chen.¹⁶ There we read that a certain Bzad rings, one of the “nine sons” of Gnyal zhid 'Jam pa'i rdo rje (?-?1207/1217/1227), an erstwhile abbot of Gsang phu [s]ne'u thog monastery's Upper/Western College¹⁷, had founded a seminary at Khro phu monastery where his primary students were 'Ga' pa – his name is also written “Mgas pa” and “Gab pa” – and Stag ston Spyil bu pa [= Shes rab 'od zer]. After a certain Ldong [Grags pa dpal] had become its abbot, the main disciple of the two

13 For this expression, meaning “an individual of absolute authority” and most likely a contraction of *tshad mar gyur pa'i skyes bu* which would go back to the Sanskrit **pramāṇabhūtapuruṣa*, see T. TILLEMANS, *Persons of Authority. The sTon pa tshad ma'i skyes bur sgrub pa'i gtam of A lag sha Ngag dbang bstan dar. A Tibetan Work on the Central Religious Questions in Buddhist Epistemology, Tibetan and Indo-Tibetan Studies 5* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990), D.S. RUEGG, “*Pramāṇabhūta*, **Pramāṇa-(bhūta)-puruṣa*, *Pratyakṣadharman* and *Sākṣātkṛtadharman* as Epithets of the Rṣi, Ācārya and Tathāgata in Grammatical, Epistemological and Madhyamaka Texts,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* LVII,2 (1994), 303-304, and also VAN DER KUIJP (1994: 376-377, note 2).

14 RUEGG (1966: 70 ff.).

15 RUEGG (1966: 146).

16 TSHAL 72 [TSHAL1 30b-31a, INABA-SATŌ 1964: 153-54, CHEN-ZHOU 1988: 64-65] and YAR 133 [YAR1 131, TANG 1989: 78]. The texts refer to him here as “Rigs thigs pa”. Further, “Rigs thigs pa, the scholar of Khro phu” as noted in an entry that may postdate the year 1313 in Lha'i rgyal mtshan's (1319-1401) biography of Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan (1292-1361) obviously refers to him; see fol.7a of the *Chos rje jo nang pa kun mkhyen chen po'i rnam thar*, handwritten *dbu med* manuscript, CPN catalogue no.002815(1).

17 For this, see my “The Monastery of Gsang phu ne'u thog and Its Abbatial Succession from ca. 1073 to 1250,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 3 (1987), 114.

former men was Lho pa Grub pa seng ge, and Bsod nams mgon po was in turn one of his students. According to the entries in Bu ston's *gsan yig*¹⁸, his own masters included Lho pa [Grub pa seng ge], Dar ma 'od zer of Brag ram monastery, Rin po che ba [= Khro phu Bsod nams seng ge dpal bzang po (1237-?)], Grand Master Spyil bu pa Shes rab 'od zer, Bla ma Bsod nams rgyal ba, Mkhan po Na rong pa Gzhon nu rdo rje, Mkhan po Seng ge zil gnon, Dar ma rgyal mtshan, Mchims Nam mkha' grags of Snar thang monastery, Bla ma Chos rgyal [= 'Phags pa], Dgon pa Rdor she [= Rdo rje shes rab], Stod 'dul ba Gzhon nu rgyal mtshan, the *madhyamaka* Master Zhang *dbon*, and Khang ston 'Od zer rgyal mtshan.

The *gsan yig*'s scenario of the *tshad ma* transmissions that issued from Bsod nams mgon po¹⁹ suggests that the introduction of the Indian texts into Tibet proceeded apparently by way of two routes, one through Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059-1109), the other by way of the Kashmirian Śākyaśrībhadrā (?-?1225), whose most famous, if not his principal, student of *tshad ma* had of course been Sa skya Paṇḍita (1182-1251). These are representative of what has been called, respectively, the Rngog (*rngog lugs*) and the Sa skya pa systems of interpretation (*sa lugs*) of Dharmakīrti's thought. In any event, both issued from Kashmir, for that was where Rngog Lo tsā ba had studied most, if not all the relevant texts.²⁰ Of these two, the

18 The names of these individuals are taken from the sixth section of Bu ston's text, namely BU26 32-54, which deals with the texts he studied with Bsod nams mgon po.

19 BU26 38-39.

20 A blockprint of his biography, together with its listing of his considerable œuvre, has been described most recently in D.P. JACKSON, "An Early Biography of Rngog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab," *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies Fagernes 1992*, Vol.1, ed. P. Kvaerne (Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, 1994), 372-392. This work is also found under CPN catalogue no.002853(1). An interesting account of Rngog Lo tsā ba's studies in Kashmir and elsewhere is given by Nyang ral in NYANG 470-471, and cited in M. MEJOR, "On the Date of the Tibetan Translations of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and the *Pramāṇavārttika*," *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition*, ed. E. Steinkellner (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 184-185, note 77:

*kha cher brtol tsa na | rgyal po dang mi kun na re | paṇ ḍi ta mkhas pa kun bod
yul du bzhud | khyed ci byed zer nas | paṇ ḍi ta gzhan med dam dris pas | 'bring
po 'dra yod yod zer bas | skal ldan rgyal po la tshad ma rgyan bslabs | des kyang
ma chog ste |...'bum phrag gsum pa las rnam nges la sogs pa'i tshad ma rnam
bslabs |...*

first [= I] is textually a composite affair, involving the *Pramānaviniścaya*

Upon his arrival in Kashmir, the ruler and all the people told him: “All the pundits and scholars have left for Tibet. What will you do?” Since, because he [then] asked whether there was no other pundit, they replied that there was one who seems to be average, [he] studied the **Pramānālamkāra* [of Prajñākara-gupta] under Skal Idan rgyal po (*Bhavyarāja). He, however, could not satisfy him ... He studied the [*Pramāna*]viniścaya with 'Bum phrag gsum pa (*Trilakṣa = Sthirapāla) ...

The *Mkhan po gdan sa pa la snyan skul gyi yi ge*, Bu ston's undated admonition to Sgra tshad pa as abbot of Zhwa lu (*mkhan po gdan sa pa*) states, in BU26 313-314, that Trilakṣa and Rngog Lo tsā ba had founded a seminary of textual studies (*bshad grwa*) at Zhwa lu. According to Ri phug Blo gsal bstan skyong's (1804-?) study of the history of this monastery, this institution was especially designed for the study of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*; see ZHWA 359. Zhwa lu was also the place where his ritual conch shell was preserved. He is also associated with the monasteries of Bodong E and Gnas rnying/snying. The history of the Myang/Nyang river valley, stretching roughly from Rgyal mkhar rtse to Gzhis ka rtse – the only published edition attributes this work to Tāranātha (1575-1635) – states that he was the “Indian abbot of Gnas snying;” see the *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 rigs dpe skrun khang, 1983), 88. Sde srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho (1653-1705) gives a brief synopsis of the abbatial succession of this monastery and its affiliated colleges in his survey of Dge lugs pa monasteries of 1698, but fails to mention him in this connection; see the *Dga' ldan chos 'byung baiḍūrya ser po*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1989), 247-249. Evidence of his association with the transmission of the *Abhisamayālamkāra* is found in Bu ston's own lineage of transmission in BU26 32, and he appears to have authored a commentary on this work. As far as I have been able to determine, he is not quoted by Bu ston in his *Lung gi snye ma* exegesis of the *Abhisamayālamkāra*, but other authors do, a case in point being, for example, Gser mdog Pañ chen Shākya mchog ldan's (1428-1507) *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan 'grel pa dang bcas pa'i dka' ba'i gnas rnam par bshad nas rang gzhan gyi grub pa'i mtha' rnam par dbye ba lung rigs kyi rol mtsho*, *Collected Works*, Vol.1 (Thimphu, 1975), 18.

The first of three Tibetans with the same nickname of “'Bum phrag gsum pa” was Byams pa chos grub (1433-1504), who apparently came to be styled in this way owing to the fact that he had committed to memory the entire *Śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāśūtra* within the space of one month – see Mang thos Klu sgrub rgya mtsho (1523-1596), *Bstan rtsis gsal ba'i nyin byed lhag bsam rab dkar*, ed. Nor brang O rgyan, *Gangs can rig mdzod 4* (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988), 233-236, and Ichijō Ogawa's introduction to his *Legs par bshad pa nyi ma'i 'od zer*, *Ōtani University Collection No.13971, Ōtani University Tibetan Works Series*, Volume VI (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1991), 3. The second one was Pañ

together with the oral transmission (*lung*) of the *Pramāṇavārttika* that had its origin in the tradition established by Rngog Lo tsā ba. Bu ston writes that, in addition, it also comprised the writings of Dharmakīrti in general, Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* plus autocommentary, Dharmottara's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and *Nyāyabindu* exegeses, and Kamalaśīla's *Nyāyabindupūrvapakṣasamkṣipta*, an indispensable work for an understanding of the Indian schools of thought against which Dharmakīrti argued in his *Nyāyabindu*. He also indicates that he had studied Vinītadeva's *Hetubindu* exegesis with both Bsod nams mgon po and a Spyil bu pa; the context demands that the latter must be identified as Stag ston Shes rab 'od zer. The second line of transmission [= II] only concerns the *Pramāṇavārttika* as it passed through Śākyaśrībhadra. The two look as follows:

I.	II.
Śākyamuni	Śākyamuni
Mañjuśrī	Mañjuśrī
Arhat Dharmatrāta ²¹	Arhat Dharmatrāta
	Btsun pa Me vam gha
Vasubandhu	Vasubandhu
Dignāga	Dignāga
Īśvarasena	Īśvarasena
Dharmakīrti	Dharmakīrti
Devendrabuddhi	Devendrabuddhi
Śākyabuddhi	Śākyabuddhi

chen 'Bum phrag gsum pa Rin chen chos kyi dbang po (?16th cent.) who is recorded in ZHWA 241. And the third was 'Bum phrag gsum pa Dge 'dun rgya mtsho, the "confessor" during the ordination of 'Jam mgon Bstan 'dzin dbang po (1639-1690) of Sa skya's Rtse gdong Residence in 1659, for which see Sngags 'chang Kun dga' blo gros' (1729-1783) *Sa skya'i gdung rabs ngo mtshar bang mdzod kyi kha skong*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1991), 123, 129, 131, 136.

21 So far, the earliest mention of him as an "ancestor" of the Buddhist *pramāṇavāda* tradition occurs in the *Chos la 'jug pa'i sgo*, SSBB 2 no. 17, 342/4/1, which Master Bsod nams rtse mo (1142-1182), the second patriarch of the Sa skya pa school, wrote at the end of 1167 or the beginning of 1168. The other exponents of *pramāṇavāda* mentioned therein are, respectively, the *Sthavira Vasubandhu – the epithet would distinguish him from his namesake who was Asaṅga's younger brother –, *Badhanta Dignāga and Master Dharmakīrti.

'Od kyi blo (*Prabhābuddhi)	Prajñākaragupta
Chos 'byung byin (*Dharmākaradatta) ²²	
Śubhagupta	
Dharmottara	Dharmottara
	Yamāri/Jamāri
Vinītadeva	Vinītadeva
Prajñākaragupta	Śāṅkaranandana
Parahitabhadra	Wa gi Paṇḍita
Rngog Lo tsā ba	
Khyung Rin chen grags	
Rgya dmar Byang chub grags	
Phya pa [Chos kyi seng ge (1109-1169)]	
Gtsang nag pa	
Dar ma bkra shis	
Gnyal pa	Paṇ chen Śākyaśrī[bhadra]
Bo dong ba	
Ldong Grags pa dpal	Chos rje Sa skya pa
Lho pa Grub seng	'U yug pa Bsod nams seng ge
	Khang sten(sic) 'Od zer rgyal
	mtshan ²³
Tshad ma'i skyes bu	Tshad ma'i skyes bu

Bu ston's third teacher of *tshad ma* was his own father Brag ston Bsod nams rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po under whom he had studied the *Pramāṇa-viniścaya* and a *Bsdus pa* "authored by Tshad ma['i skyes bu]".²⁴ The latter must be identified as Bsod nams mgon po and not as Don grub dpal, another one of Bu ston's teachers to whose name some sources also prefix the

22 He is also known as Arcaṭa. Both Śubhagupta and Dharmākaradatta were teachers of Dharmottara; see now also KRASSER (1991: 5, note 1).

23 For "sten" we must of course read "ston". A Khang ston is mentioned in the colophon of 'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge's *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi 'grel pa rigs pa'i mdzod* (Sde dge print), Vol.2 (New Delhi, 1982), 400: *khang gi ston pa zhes bya bas / thog mar shog gu dang snag tsha sul nas gsol ba btab /*. It is rather possible that he is identical with 'Od zer rgyal mtshan and, less likely, with his younger brother Rdo rje rgyal mtshan.

24 See BU26 54 and also RUEGG (1966: 75).

epithet *tshad ma'i skyes bu*.²⁵ Brag ston had studied *tshad ma* with Bsod nams mgon po as well, so that their lines of transmission are identical. His fourth master was 'Jam dbyangs skya bo Nam mkha' dpal bzang po²⁶ of Sa skya monastery from whom he received the authoritative explanation (*bshad bka'*) of the *sa lugs*, one that was given to him with the *Rigs mdzod* exegesis of the *Pramānavārttika* by 'U yug pa Bsod nams seng ge – the latter is also known as 'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge, where of course *rigs pa'i seng ge*, “lion of reasoning”, points to his expertise in *tshad ma*²⁷ –, in conjunction with the parallel passages from the *Pramānaviniścaya*. Up to and including the mention of 'U yug pa, the latter's lineage of transmission is identical to scheme II, only “Wa gi” is written “Wa gī”, after which it continues with:

III.

Zhang Mdo sde dpal

Bla ma 'Jam dpal [= dbyangs] [skya bo]

His fifth and last teacher of *tshad ma* was the Imperial Preceptor (*ti shri*, Ch. *dishi*) Kun dga' blo gros rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po (1299-1327) of Sa skya who, in addition to the Sa skya pa transmissions of the *Pramānavārttika*, also gave him the one for Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* in two sessions each.²⁸ It is not altogether clear when exactly this might have taken place, although Sgra tshad pa does state that, prior to the future *dishi*'s departure for the Mongol court in 1309 – he was appointed

25 TSHAL 70 [TSHAL1 29b, INABA-SATŌ 1964: 151, CHEN-ZHOU 1988: 63]. Bu ston had, however, also been his student and the teachings he received from him are registered in BU26 54 in connection with the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* plus commentary, where Tshad ma'i skyes bu, that is, Bsod nams mgon po, is said to have been one of his masters. Yar lung Jo bo but signals Don grub dpal as “Tshad ma'i skyes bu”; see YAR 134-135 [YAR1 132, TANG 1989: 78].

26 BU26 56.

27 For some notes on this erstwhile disciple of Gnyal zhig 'Jam pa'i rdo rje at Gsang phu and his shift of allegiance to Sa skya Paṇḍita in Sa skya, see my “A Hitherto Unknown Oral Text of Sa skya Paṇḍita”, which is forthcoming in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.

28 See BU26 56: *rnam 'grel chos thun gnyis / rigs gter chos thun gnyis /*.

dishi on 27 March 1315²⁹ –, Bu ston received from him the *madhyamaka* version of the bodhisattva vow as well as other unspecified instructions.³⁰ As Bu ston was very well aware, the *dishi* returned to Tibet in 1322 to receive his ordination as a monk, to complete his studies and, possibly, to ensure a smooth transition of power given that his father Bzang po dpal (1262-1322/24) had either passed away, or, at this time well advanced in years, may have become more interested in religious practice than looking after the daily affairs of the see. In fact, Bzang po dpal had become a fully ordained monk in 1313, whereby his name in religion became, in spite of orthographic turbulence in our sources, Amoghadvajasaṁbhadrā (= Don yod rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po). In any event, before the *dishi*'s return to the Mongol court in the summer of 1324, he effected some far-reaching changes in the administrative structure of Sa skya by splitting it into four different Residences (*bla brang*) and appointing his younger brothers to look after their interests.³¹ It is probable that Bu ston studied under him between the years 1322 and 1324.

Bu ston's œuvre also contains an Indo-Tibetan lineage of transmission of but the *Pramāṇavināyaka* in which all the names of the protagonists, whether they be Indic or Tibetan, are given in Sanskrit in Tibetan script; this lineage reads (with a few tacit corrections)³²:

29 PETECH (1990: 77). For his biographical sketch, see A mes zhabs Ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams (1597-1659) Ap 302-307 [A 250-254, Ac 180-183].

30 RUEGG (1966: 76).

31 PETECH (1990: 82).

32 BU16 22-23. This lineage is identical to the first text of the first volume of an incomplete, six-volume handwritten *dbu can* manuscript of the collected writings of Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312-1375), one of Bu ston's disciples, which I located among the Tibetan holdings under CPN catalogue no.003872; see his *Bla [ma] brgyud pa'i mtshan 'bum*, fol.12a-b. For this collection, see my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History III: The Œuvre of Bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan, Part One," *Berliner Indologische Studien* 7 (1993), 109-147, and "Part Two", which is forthcoming in *Berliner Indologische Studien* 8 (1994). A similar and prototypical treatise would be 'Phags pa's *Bla ma brgyud pa'i mtshan 'bum sngags can*, SSBB 6 no.6, 22/4/5-23/3/4, which, however, only consists of listings of the Sanskrit names of masters belonging to lineages of tantric transmissions that are not explicitly identified.

IV.

Śākyamuni
 Mañjuḥṣa
 Dharmatrāta
 Vasubandhu
 Dignāga
 Īśvarasena
 Dharmakīrti
 Devendrabuddhi
 Prajñākaragupta
 Śākyabuddhi
 Aṃśubuddha
 Dharmottara
 Vinītadeva
 Parahitabhadrā
 Blo ldan shes rab
 Rin chen grags pa
 Chos kyi seng ge
 Brtson 'grus seng ge
 Chos kyi grags pa
 'Jam pa'i rdo rje
 Brtson 'grus rdo rje
 Rin chen dpal
 Don grub seng ge
 Bsod nams mgon po

It is clear that schemes I and IV are intended to reflect *rngog lugs* lines of transmission, and that II and III purportedly reflect the one of the *sa lugs*. However, when we compare I and IV, we notice a number of significant differences, the most important of which being a change in the relative positions of Prajñākaragupta and Dharmottara. Scheme I may be interpreted as having inserted one generation between Dharmottara and Prajñākaragupta with Vinītadeva having been, respectively, the student and teacher of these two. Further, since Rngog Lo tsā ba is known to have studied with Parahitabhadrā, we may assume that his dates are, very roughly, 1025 to 1100. Thus, depending on which scheme one would wish to place some reliance, both Vinītadeva and Prajñākaragupta would then have flourished from roughly 1000 to 1075. This, of course, goes against all the evidence. Translations of

Vinītadeva's writings and some of Dharmottara's are already found listed in the Lhan dkar ma register of the beginning of the ninth century. Scheme IV is altogether different, for it indicates not only that Śākyabuddhi was a disciple of Prajñākaragupta, but also that there was perhaps an interval of as many as two generations between the latter and Dharmottara. Recent studies have shown that Prajñākaragupta knew Dharmottara, specifically his *Pramānaviniścayaṭīkā* which is now considered to have been his last and final work, so that Dharmottara's chronological precedence over the former (or his senior contemporaneity) is beyond any doubt.³³ Scheme II (and III) has Jamāri as a student of Dharmottara, which goes against all the evidence as well – Jamāri must be placed in the first half of the eleventh century –, and no one even remotely named “Wa gi Paṇḍita” is found mentioned in the available biographies of Śākyaśrībhadrā.³⁴ We are therefore forced to conclude that we can lend very little credence to any of the three scenarios of how Buddhist *pramānavāda* was transmitted in post-Dharmakīrti India. To date, the first Tibetan scholar to come to precisely the same conclusion was Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po (1385-1438) who, in his *gsan yig*, criticized the integrity of both the *rngog lugs* and *sa lugs* lines of transmission.³⁵ But here there is also a problem, for he writes in his evaluation of the *rngog lugs* transmission:

..*rngog lo nas brgyud pa'i yi ge yin zer ba mang po zhig las rgyan mkhan po shākya blo'i slob mar byas pa sogs yid brtan mi rung ba mang bar 'dug pas ma bris so //*

..since there are many unreliable [notions such as] having made the scholar of the ornament [= Prajñākaragupta] a disciple of Śākyabuddhi etc. [as stated] by a good number [of sources that] are alleged to be records of the line [that issued] from Rngog Lo [tsā ba, we], have not written [these here].

Of the above schemes, this remark can only refer to II and III, and these undoubtedly belong to that of the *sa lugs*. Thus, if he did not simply make this up, the only other possible explanation for Mkhas grub rje's statement

33 KRASSER (1991: 14).

34 For the available biographical corpus on his life, see my “On the *Lives* of Śākyaśrībhadrā (?-?1225),” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994): 599-616.

35 See the *Mkhas grub thams cad mkhyen pa dge legs dpal bzang po'i gsan yig*, *Mkhas grub rje'i gsung 'bum* (Lhasa Zhol print), Vol.KA (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1979), 41.

would have to be that such a succession was found in those *gsan yig* texts of scholars of the *rngog lugs* transmission that have not come down to us (so far).

Bu ston's own point of view may be gleaned from a brief passage in his chronicle of Buddhism, where he commits himself only to the position that Devendrabuddhi was Dharmakīrti's disciple and Śākyabuddhi's master, something that most certainly did not originate with him.³⁶ Nothing further can be gathered from his own writings on *tshad ma* about how he understood the chronology of post-Dharmakīrti Indian *pramānavāda*.

Aside from the one by Mkhas grub rje, the other early *gsan yig*-s that are available to us are those of Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357-1419) and Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po (1382-1456). Ngor chen's large *thob yig* makes no mention of *tshad ma*³⁷ and Tsong kha pa's is curiously incomplete and it only provides us with the lineage for the *Pramānavārttika* that is identical to Scheme II, although, strangely, it ends with 'U yug pa.³⁸ The only differences are that it has "Me van ga" instead of "Me vaṃ ga", and that it has "Va gu Śākyaśrī", thereby perhaps conflating "Wa gi Paṇḍita" and "Śākyaśrī".

A crucial source for Indo-Tibetan lines of transmission of an enormous number of texts is of course the enormous *gsan yig* of Dalai Lama V Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho (1617-1682) which itself, especially in the numerous interlinear notes, very often refers to earlier *gsan yig*-s that have yet to come down to us. It refers in its discussion of the transmission of *tshad ma* in India to the records of Bu ston, Tsong kha pa, Jo nang Kun dga' grol mchog (1507-1566) and Mkhan chen Ngag dbang chos grags (1572-1641). Thus, we read that for "Me va ga", the putative disciple of Dharmatrāta in scheme II of Bu ston's *gsan yig* – he follows II very closely –, Tsong kha pa's *gsan yig* had "Me wa ga".³⁹ A passage from the text of Dalai Lama V is quoted by Dbal mang II Dkon mchog rgyal mtshan (1764-

36 BU24 852 [= E. OBERMILLER, *History of Buddhism (chos 'byung)* by Bu ston, Part Two (Heidelberg, 1932), 155].

37 For Ngor chen's work, see his large *Thob yig rgya mtsho*, SSBB 9 no.36, 44/4-108/2.

38 See the *Rje rin po che blo bzang grags pa'i dpal gyi gsan yig* (Bkra shis lhun po print), Vol.1 (New Delhi, 1979), 286; an editorial note at the end of this work observes and bemoans its patent incompleteness.

39 See the interlinear note in his *Zab pa dang rgya che ba'i dam pa'i chos kyi thob yig gangā'i chu rgyun* [*The Gsan yig of the Fifth Dalai Lama*], Vol.1 (New Delhi, 1970), 37.

1853) in his chronicle of the monastery of Bkra shis 'khyil of 1800, where he makes the following observation⁴⁰:

gsan yig gangā'i chu rgyun las / bu ston dang rje rin po che'i gsan yig na dza ma ri chos mchog gi slob mar byas pa dpyod dgos gsungs nas / rang lugs chos mchog dza ma ri'i slob mar byas snang / 'brug pa pad dkar pa'i chos 'byung du /

dul ba'i lha sngar byung zhing rgyan phyis byon pa ste / gang las shes na / dul lhas mdzad pa'i rigs thigs 'grel pa bstan pa snga dar gyi dus su dpal brtsegs kyi bsgyur ba mngon sum du snang zhing / rgyan gyi mtshan dngos shes rab 'byung gnas sbas pa ste / bod kyi bstan pa phyi dar dus kyi thog ma tsam na bi kra ma la shī la'i sgo skyong du bzhugs pa'o // des na rgyan gyi dngos slob kha che nyi ma sbas pa / de'i dngos slob dza ma ri'am ya ma ri yin te / rgyan gyi 'grel pa nyi ma sbas pa / de la dza ma ri'i 'grel pa dngos su snang ba'i phyr ro // zhes gsungs kyang

'dir rje rin po che'i gsan yig gzhir bzhag gis bris pa'o //

The [Dalai Lama V's] *Gsan yig gangā'i chu rgyun*, saying that one should investigate [the assertion] in the *gsan yig*-s of Bu ston [see scheme II] and Rje Rin po che [Tsong kha pa] that made Jamāri a disciple of Dharmottara, appears to have made Dharmottara a disciple of Jamāri [as its] own position. Although the *Chos 'byung* of 'Brug pa IV Padma dkar ba (1519-1592) has stated that⁴¹:

“Vinitadeva was born earlier and Rgyan [= Prajñākaragupta] came later. Whence is this known? It appears evident that the *Hetubindu* exegesis written by Vinitadeva was translated by Dpal brtsegs during the Teaching's early propagation; Rgyan's actual name was Prajñākaragupta [and] sometime around the beginning of the later propagation of [the Buddhist] Teaching, [he] lived as a gate-guardian of Vikramaśīla [monastery]. Thus the direct disciple of Rgyan was the Kashmirian Ravigupta; his direct disciple was Jamāri or Yamāri, because Jamāri's commentary appears explicitly in the commentary on [Prajñākaragupta's] *Alaṃkāra* of Ravigupta.”⁴²,

40 See his *Mdo smad bstan pa'i 'byung gnas dpal ldan bkra shis 'khyil gyi gdan rabs rang bzhin dbyangs su brjod pa'i lha'i rnga bo che*, *Collected Works*, Vol.1 (New Delhi, 1974), 207-208 [*Ibid.*, ed. Smon lam rgya mtsho (Lanzhou: Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1987), 177].

41 This passage is found in the *Chos 'byung bstan pa'i padma rgyas pa'i nyin byed* (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1968), 109 [*Ibid.*, ed. Rta mgrin tshe dbang (Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1992), 84].

42 Padma dkar po confused Prajñākaragupta with Prajñākaramati, the well-known author of the *Bodhicāryāvātārapañjikā*. As Tāranātha suggested, he was not alone in Tibet to have done so; see *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*, trs. Lama

in this [work of ours the lineage of transmission] is written by having taken the *gsan yig* of Rje Rin po che [Tsong kha pa] as [our] point of departure.

None of the later Indian or Nepalese Buddhists who made their way to Tibet during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, or their Tibetan counterparts who travelled south, had any recognizable impact on *tshad ma* studies – an exception would perhaps be Dpang Lo tsā ba Blo gros brtan pa (1276-1342) –, or on the earlier Tibetan evaluations of the relative chronologies of the Indian commentators. It is difficult to say with any precision when the formal study of texts belonging to the Buddhist *pramānavāda* tradition came to an end in the Indian subcontinent. There is evidence that it persisted to at least the middle of the fifteenth century after which it may have become closed. For example, the biographies of Vanaratna (1384-1468) by his Tibetan disciples 'Gos Lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392-1481) and Khriṃs khang Lo tsā ba (or: Khruṣ khang Lo tsā ba) Bsod nams rgya mtsho'i sde (1424-1482) observe that he taught Kaluka's '*grel bshad* (*tīkā*) on the first chapter of the *Pramānavārttika* while in Rtsed thang monastery in 1433-36 as the guest of *gong ma* Grags pa 'byung gnas (1414-1445).⁴³ Here, the “Ka lu ka” in both texts should refer to Kaṇakagomin and the text in question to his *Pramānavārttikasvavṛttiṭīkā*. Further, the biography of Ngag gi dbang phyug grags pa dpal bzang po (1418-1496), the twelfth abbot of Stag lung monastery, and especially the ones of Gser mdog Paṅ chen Shākya mchog ldan (1428-1507) by Jo nang Kun dga' grol mchog (1507-1566) and Shākya rin chen (1710-1759) contain interesting information about the Indian Buddhist monk Lokottara and how he fared in Central Tibet during the mid 1460s.⁴⁴ They also relate that he carried with him a portable library of Sanskrit manuscripts of Buddhist *pramāṇa* and other texts. He most likely passed away in the late 1460s, and we do not know where this valuable material was ultimately deposited.

Chimpa and A. Chattopadhyaya (Calcutta: KP Bagchi & Company, 1980), 296. Further, I have not found any evidence that Ravigupta cites Jamāri.

43 See *Mkhas pa chen po dpal nags kyi rin chen gyi rnam par thar pa*, (Thimphu: National Library of Bhutan, 1985), 40, and the *Chos kyi rje Paṅ chen nags kyi rin po che'i zhal snga nas kyi rnam par thar pa*, CPN catalogue no.002775(2), 17b.

44 The reports on him are discussed in my “Some Sri Lankan and Indian Peregrinators in Central Tibet and Glo bo Smon thang During the Fifteenth Century”, which is under preparation.

EXCURSUS

Bu ston's Writings on *tshad ma*

Bu ston's own results of his *tshad ma* studies are found in three texts of his collected oeuvre, two of which were written anent the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*. Foremost among these is of course his lengthy commentary on this work itself which its colophon dates it to 1 October 1323 (*khrag skyug gi lo smin drug gu zla ba'i tshes gcig*)⁴⁵, indicating that it was written in chronological proximity to his chronicle of Buddhism in India and Tibet and his commentary on the *Abhisamayālamkāra*. The colophon also explicitly underscores his debt to Tshad ma'i skyes bu, that is, Bsod nams mgon po – in fact, he is the only one of his teachers who is mentioned – for his understanding of the Indian *pramāṇa* texts. The first to have made elaborate use of this work was E. Steinkellner in his well-known critical edition and translation of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*'s second chapter on inference, where his footnotes abound in references to Bu ston's text, specifically in connection with philological and text-historical issues. In fact, this meshes very well with the generally sedate and unpolemical tenor of the commentary, for here at least Bu ston shows himself as a relatively uncommitted expositor of the text, that is, as a philologist, and not as a philosopher. For one, he is often content simply to juxtapose various opinions expressed by Indian interpreters of Dharmakīrti, without making a judgement in favor of one over the other(s). This is of course not the place to embark on an analysis of the specific philosophical features of his argumentation and ideas, or the philosophical contributions he made, if any, to the on-going interpretation of Dharmakīrti in Tibet. To do something like this would require not only a full understanding of the various "schools of thought" of post-Dharmakīrti Indian Buddhist *pramāṇavāda*, but also, and perhaps especially, of the specific developments in Tibet, about which we are only very recently, and only in very broad outlines becoming aware.⁴⁶ However, as far as explicit references

45 BU26 646.

46 For some of the pre-Bu ston texts on *tshad ma* that have recently become available or whose existence has been signaled, see P. Schwabland's unpublished *A General Exposition of Valid Cognition. The Initial Chapter of Bcom ldan Ral gri's Introduction to Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology* (Seattle, University of Washington M.A. Thesis, 1994), and my "Two Mongol Xylographs (*hor par ma*) of

to Tibetan scholarship on Dharmakīrti are concerned, Bu ston is not very helpful. While he takes pains to indicate at length the opinions of the Indian commentators whenever he thought these to be useful, Bu ston also frequently simply uses the vexatiously laconic phrase *kha cig / kha cig na re*, “some say.” He names Tibetans on but few occasions. Thus, he refers severally to “my tutor” (*bdag gi yongs ’dzin*), that is, Bsod nams mgon po.⁴⁷ Rngog Lo tsā ba seems to be referred to by simply “Lo tsā ba” and “Rngog chen po,”⁴⁸ and he also mentions a certain Ri khrod rje, whom I cannot identify.⁴⁹

The second work is found in the compilation of his miscellaneous writings in the last volume of his collected œuvre.⁵⁰ It consists of a series of interesting replies he drafted to several questions on *tshad ma* raised by a Chos kyi rgyal mtshan sometime in 1357. The latter must of course be identified as the Chos kyi rgyal mtshan who was a scion of Sa skya monastery’s Lha khang Residence, and who flourished from 1332 to 1359.⁵¹ The eldest of the two sons fathered by *Ti shrī* Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1310-1358) before the latter had taken his monk’s vows and a major, if somewhat questionable, player in the bloody politics of Central Tibet in the 1350s, a late biographical sketch of his life singles him out for his expertise in *tshad ma*, and observes that he often lectured on the *Pramānavārttika* and the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter* to a large audience. In fact, his scholarship was such that

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, Apropos of Some Recently Recovered Manuscripts anent Sa skya Paṇḍita’s *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter* and Autocommentary,” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 7 (1993), 149-162, and “On Some Early Tibetan *Pramānavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing,” *Journal of Buddhist and Tibetan Studies* 1 (1994): 1-30.

47 BU24 29, 158, 160.

48 See, respectively, BU24 22, 71, 302 and BU24 36.

49 BU24 33.

50 BU26 265-274. Being omitted in *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism*, eds. Y. Kanakura et al. (Sendai, 1953), 75, it is also not listed in the table of contents in the preface to this volume. The reply to Dge legs dpal bzang is found in BU26 274-275 and the one to Mnga’ ris *dbon po* Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan in BU26 275-278; the latter is dated to 29 July 1360.

51 Ap 402-403 [A 331, Ac 229-230]; see also RUEGG (1966: 149-150), where “Bla ma Lha khang pa” also refers to him.

his at least some of his contemporaries sometimes referred to him as “the second Sa skya Paṇḍita”. Bu ston’s text consists of some sixteen questions (Q) – some of these have more than one part – that are indicated in the form “Q *gsung ba ni*”. Though not made explicit, Chos kyi rgyal mtshan’s fifteenth conundrum and Bu ston’s reply give away that the last part of this question had to do with Sa skya Paṇḍita’s discussion of immediate mental perception (*yid kyi mngon sum*), the relevant passage of which occurs in the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter* and autocommentary in the course of his analysis of the three different conceptualizations of its genesis (*skye tshul*), namely those by Prajñākaragupta, Dharmottara and Śāṅkaranandana.⁵² The problems at hand were: “How to identify *yid kyi mngon sum* and its principal cause; is the third alternative [conceptualization] (*’gros gsum pa*) correct; if [it be] correct, what is its textual source?” Bu ston replies that he himself follows Dharmottara’s interpretation and that: “The third alternative is said to have been stated on the basis of the scriptural authority of the Great Brahmin (Śāṅkaranandana), but [a statement to this effect in his writings] has not been seen by me (*gros gsum pa bram ze chen po’i lung nas bshad zer te / bdag cag gis ma mthong ngo /*). Indeed, at this juncture, Sa skya Paṇḍita had not quoted from one of Śāṅkaranandana’s writings, but referred rather to oral teachings to this effect which he had received from Śākyaśrībhadrā. To be sure, not only Bu ston had a problem with this, for Mkhas grub makes a similar remark as well.⁵³ We might add that this is the only occasion in the entire text where Sa skya Paṇḍita explicitly refers to the Kashmirian scholar, although Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod nams lhun grub (1456-1532) does make the observation that an “old gloss” (*mchan rnying*) to a passage in the second chapter of the *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter* autocommentary identified “some scholars” by Jñānaśrī and Śākyaśrībhadrā.⁵⁴

52 BU26 273-274 anent TMRGRG 221/1/4-222/1/2.

53 See his *Tshad ma sde bdun gyi rgyan yid kyi mun sel* [based on the Bkra shis lhun po print], ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984), 184.

54 See his *Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter gyi ’grel pa’i rnam bshad rigs lam gsal ba’i nyi ma* [Sde dge print] *Selected Writings*, Vol.2 (Dehra Dun: Ludhing Ladrang, Pal Evam Chodan Ngorpa Centre, 1985), 79 [*Ibid.*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Xining: Krung go’i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1988), 52] anent TMRGRG 172/3/1: “I also heard some scholar[s] allege that since [the varieties of non-valid cognitions] are infinite, no classification [can] exist.” (*paṇ ḍi ta ’ga’ zhiḡ mtha’ yas pas dbye ba med do zhes zer ba’ang thos /*).

Bu ston's third and, chronologically, last work on *tshad ma* is an undated little treatise of far more modest proportions, one that is devoted to a gloss on the title of the *Pramānaviniścaya*, the first work, namely *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i 'grel bshad tshig don rab gsal*.⁵⁵ Though not given in this work, his own catalogue of his œuvre has it that it was written as a reply to a query by a certain 'Phags rin [= 'Phags pa rin chen].⁵⁶ Since his name is prefixed by the epithet *sde snod 'dzin pa*, it seems unlikely that he should be identified as the scion of the Shar ka/kha ba family which ruled over Rgyal mkhar rtse and other estates in Dbus and Gtsang, whose dates are 1320 to 1376, even though Bu ston is recorded to have met him in ca. 1360.⁵⁷ Rather, he must have been Rkeg Gnas rnying pa 'Phags pa rin [chen] to whom he taught the text in the late 1350s, but before 1357.⁵⁸ Another *Pramānaviniścaya* line of transmission is found in what amounts to a closing note – it may have been written by Sgra tshad pa or by one of his students – and from Dharmakīrti onwards differs substantially from Schemes I and IV: Dharmakīrti - Devendrabuddhi - Śākyabuddhi - Mchog gi rgyal po (*Uttararāja) - 'Od kyi blo (*Prabhābuddhi) - Chos 'byung byin (*Dharmākaradatta) - Dge srung (*Kalyāṇarakṣita) - Dharmottara - Vinīta-deva - Mchog gi go cha (*Uttarasena) - Gzi brjid ldan (*Ojin/Tejin) - Gzhan phan bzang po (*Parahitabhadra) - Rngog Lo tsā ba - Khyung Rin chen grags - Rgya dmar - Cha (= Phya) pa - Gtsang nag pa - Dan 'bag pa - Gnyal zhis - Bo dong Rin chen - Ldong[s] Grags pa dpal [gloss: Lho pa] - Grub pa seng ge - Tshad ma'i skyes bu - Bu ston - Thugs sras Lo tsā ba.

55 BU24 1-9.

56 BU26 646.

57 RUEGG (1966: 156).

58 RUEGG (1966: 151); the index in RUEGG (1966: 189) suggests his identity with the *Nang chen*, but this is not the case. It is possible that he is the same as Gnas rnying pa Rin chen tog to whom Bu ston wrote a letter in 1354, for which see BU26 246-247.

Bibliographic Abbreviations

- A 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).
- AC Chen Qingying - Gao Hefu - Zhou Runnian (1989), trs., *Sajia shixi shi* (Lhasa: Xizang renmin chubanshe); translation of A.
- AP *Ibid.*, [Sde dge print] (New Delhi: Bonpo Monastic Centre, 1975).
- BU Bu ston Rin chen grub, *The Collected Works of Bu ston* (and Sgra tshad pa) [Lhasa print], 28 Parts (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971).
- CHEN Qingying & ZHOU Runnian (1988), trs., *Hongshi* (Lhasa: Xizang renmin chubanshe); translation of TSHAL.
- INABA Shōju and SATŌ Hisashi, trs., *Hu lan deb ther. Ancient Chronicle of Tibet* [in Japanese] (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1964); translation of TSHAL.
- KRASSER, H. (1991), *Dharmottara's kurze Untersuchung der Gültigkeit einer Erkenntnis. Laghuprāmānyaparikṣā* (Wien: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- VAN DER KUIJP, L.W.J. (1994), "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History IV: The *Tshad ma'i byung tshul 'chad nyan gyi [b]rgyan*: A Fourteenth Century Tibetan History of Indian Buddhist *Pramāṇavāda*," in *Festschrift for Klaus Bruhn*, eds. J. Bautze and N. Balbir (Reinbeck): 375-401.
- LBSB Gsung ngag slob bshad chen mo/The Slob bshad Tradition of the Sa skya Lam 'bras, Sa skya Lam 'bras Literature series, Vol.1 (Dehra Dun: Sakya centre, 1983).
- NYANG Nyang ral Nyi ma '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).
- PETECH, L. (1990), Central Tibet and the Mongols. The Yüan - Sa skya Period of Tibetan History, Serie Orientale Roma, Volume LXV (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- RUEGG, D.S. (1966), *The Life of Bu ston Rin po che with the Tibetan Text of the Bu ston rNam thar*. Serie Orientale Roma, Volume XXXIV (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- SSBB *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum* [Sde sde print], comp. Bsod nams rgya mtsho, Vols. 1-13 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1967-1968).
- TANG Chi'an, tr. *Yalong zunzhe jiaofa shi* (Lhasa: Xizang renmin chubanshe, 1989); translation of YAR.

- TRMRRG Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan, *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rang 'grel*, SSBB 5 no.20, 167/2-264/2.
- TSHAL Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje, *Deb ther dmar po*, ed. Dung dkar Blo bzang phrin las (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1981).
- TSHAL1 *Ibid.* (Gangtok: Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, 1961).
- YAR Yar lung Jo bo Shākya rin chen, *Yar lung jo bo'i chos 'byung*, ed. Dbyangs can lha mo (Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1988).
- YAR1 *Ibid.*, ed. Ngag dbang (Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988).
- ZHANG Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson 'grus grags pa, *Bla ma sna tshogs kyis* (sic) *miho'* (sic) *byang*, *Writings (bka' thor bu) of Zhang G.yu brag pa Brtson 'grus grags pa* (Tashijong, 1972), 426-445.
- ZHWA Ri phug Blo gsal bstan skyong, *Dpal ldan zhwa lu pa'i bstan pa la bka' drin che ba'i skyes bu dam pa rnams kyi rnam thar lo rgyus ngo mtshar dad pa'i 'jug ngogs* [History of Zhwa lu] (Leh, 1971), 1-471.

