

Preface


Perhaps it is no exaggeration that Tibet occupies a distinct place in the academic world regarding the practice and culture of the Buddhist logic. India where it first originated in the 5th century A.D. practically with the advent of Dignaga, could not retain her glory in this field from the 13th century onward i.e; immediately after the fall of the Vikramasila Mahavihara. Culture took a back seat and unfortunately a large portion of logical literature in its original form appears to have been lost for ever. But Tibet, being one of the neighbouring countries which received Indian thought, preserved the lost literature in translation. The study on the subject was carried on more or less continuously in different monasteries of the country for centuries, and even now Buddhist logic is extensively practised among the Tibetans. As a result of continuity of rich culture in this field, a good number of original treatises and commentaries were also composed in Tibet.

So, on the one hand these translations of the Indian logical works are the treasure house with the help of which the gap in the history of philosophical movement in ancient India can be filled and as the excellence of Indian understanding on the subject can be properly assessed; and on the other hand, the original Tibetan treatises and commentaries are of immense value as they record of the contribution of that country to the storehouse of world knowledge. Scholars like Dr. S.C. Vidyabhusana, Rahula Sankrityayana, Dr. M.K. Ganguli (the teacher and guide of the present writer), A.Vostrikov, J. Tucci, B. Baradiin, B. Vassiliev, E.E. Obermiller, Prof. Oberhammer, Prof. E.Franwallner, F.Th. Stcherbatsky, E.Steikellner and a number of excellent Japanese scholars and some others realised the importance of Tibetan commentaries and their study and research works sufficiently enriched the subject matter in many ways.

The present writer, while preparing a detailed catalogue of the Tibetan xylographs and manuscripts in the S.C. Das Collection preserved in the Calcutta University, got the opportunity of having a first-hand knowledge of a good number of Tibetan texts of Buddhist logic, which aroused in the writer the long suppressed wish to write an informative account on the subject. The present paper is a result of that.

The writer now takes the opportunity to remember those persons from whom he benefited in some way or the other. He is grateful to his Tibetan teacher Ven.A.P.Lama from whom he received many valuable information about Tibet. The eminent scholar Prof. Anantalal Thakur always inspired the writer in this field and the writer will never forget the help received from him in this regard.

Last of all, the writer is glad to know that a complete issue of the Bulletin of Tibetology is dedicated to his paper. He gives credit to Director Dr. Lama. T.D. Bhutia M.A. B.Ed. M.Phil. Phd. and Assistant Director Mr. Bhajagobinda Ghosh of the SRIT for their deep interest in this matter. The writer expresses his gratitude also to the Authority of the Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology without whose help the whole thing could not have been completed in such a nice way.



A SHORT HISTORY OF BUDDHIST LOGIC IN TIBET

- Dr. Sanjit Kumar Sadhukhan

I. Rise of Buddhist logic in Tibet

By Buddhist logic we understand a system of logic and epistemology created in India in the VI-VII-th century A.D. by two great luminaries of Buddhist science, the Masters Dignaga and Dharmakriti. The original treatises and the huge commentaries in the line are part of the Buddhist logical literature. Buddhist logic obviously contains the forms and nature of syllogism, the essence of judgement, etc. for which it deserves the name of logic. But that logic is not only logic it also establishes the doctrines of the Buddhists. Thus the philosophical tenets were the fulcrum and the logic developed as tools to establish those. That is why, when a theory of sense-perception or, more precisely, a theory on the part of pure sensation in the whole content of our knowledge, a theory on the reliability of our knowledge and on the reality of the external world as cognized by us in sensation and images, a theory on the art of conducting philosophic disputations in public, and so on are discussed, at the same time those keep faithful to the ideas with which Buddhism started with apprehension that entities whose existence is not sufficiently warranted by the laws of logic can mercilessly be repudiated. So having been led by this thought, Buddhist logic denied a God, it denied the Soul, it denied Eternity. It admitted nothing but the transient flow of

evanescent events and their final eternal quiescence in nirvana. Reality according to Buddhists is kinetic, not static, but logic, on the other hand, imagines a reality stabilized in concepts and names. The ultimate aim of Buddhist logic is to explain the relation between a moving reality and the static constructions of thought. It is opposed to the logic of the Realists, the logic of the schools of Nyaya, Vaisheshika and Mimamsa for whom reality is static and adequate to the concepts of our knowledge. ⁽¹⁾

Anyway, it is evident that the simple revelations of Buddhism and the reasonings in support of those, gave birth to a new subject 'Buddhist logic'. In the literature of about seven centuries from 5th to 11th century, Buddhist logic showed examples of erudition of its scholars in the field of ideological conflict. But there was no such background of ideological conflict behind its rise in Tibet, although it had to establish its superiority on the soil of Tibet in competition with its Chinese counterpart.

Tibet, a neighbouring country of India was steeped in ignorance before the seventh century, without even an alphabetic system of their language. Sron-btsan sgam-po (7th cen.), the first Tibetan king, united different warring nomad groups and made Tibet a powerful kingdom with territorial sovereignty. This king keenly felt the deficiency of learning of the Tibetan people in contrast with the Indian and Chinese people, and promised them a good number of studying arrangements and materials. He established relations with India and China and sent scholars to India to innovate Tibetan script, collect manuscripts and translate them. He also encouraged more and more people in this connection. As a result of that the work began and the migration of Indian literature caused Buddhist logic to step in in the Land of Snow by the middle of the eighth century.

Khri-sron lde'u-btsan (740-c. 798) became the king of Tibet in 754 AD. He invited many Indian panditas to his own country to spread the doctrine. At his invitation, Santaraksita, known in Tibet as the "Bodhisattva Abbot" reached there. He was a great Buddhist logician and had already composed

his great work on Buddhist logic, *Tattvasaṃgraha* before he reached Tibet. At his inspiration the king *Khri-sron lde'u-btsan* in c. 779 A.D. built the famous *Bsam-yas* monastery, the first one of its kind in Tibet. *Sāntarakṣita* was also accompanied by his disciple *Kamalaśīla* who was no less erudite than his preceptor in Buddhist logic.

Now there followed a surge of activity in the translation of Indian and Chinese Buddhist texts into Tibetan. A keen interest in doctrine began to develop, and this culminated in the great debate held at *Bsam-yas* about 792 A.D. as to whether Indian or Chinese Teachings should be followed. The Indian side, represented in this debate, argued the conventional *Mahāyāna* teachings connected with the theory of the gradual course of a 'would-be buddha' (*bodhisattva*) towards buddhahood. The basis of these teachings was the assumption that it was unnecessary to accumulate vast quantities of knowledge and merit through innumerable ages, if one wished to progress towards the final goal of buddhahood. The Chinese case concentrated upon the absolute nature of buddhahood, which could be realised by any practitioner who established himself in the state of complete repose. According to this, conventional morality and intellectual endeavour are irrelevant, and in some cases even directly harmful, if they obstruct the pure contemplation of the emptiness of all concepts whatsoever.

The verdict in the present case went to the Indian school, and contemporary dossiers show that it was a victory for a moralistic view skillfully defended by the Indian scholar *Kamalaśīla* who had been specially invited for the occasion.⁽²⁾ This incident worked to directly influence Tibetans to follow of Buddhist logic in favour of Buddhistic path. Apart from this, it is natural that when at the moment the Tibetans adopted Buddhism Buddhist logic sneaked into the intellectual world since logic is already wound up with the life of the Buddhists in their homeland.

Sāntarakṣita is seen not only for the doctrine in Tibet, but also to have left mark from which we may call *Santaraksita* the introducer of Buddhist

logic by virtue of his active assistance with a Tibetan interpreter named Bhikṣu Dharmāśoka in translation work of an Indian logical text Hetucakraḍamaru (Gtan-tshigs-kyi 'khor-lo gtan-la dbab-pa, Tg. mdo xcv 9. 189a7-190a4) of Dignga (Phyogs-kyi glaṅ-po).

The surge of activities of the Indian panditas and the Tibetan interpreters, which started from the 7th century, was not always unhindered. In the 9th century an unfortunate disaster came to the life of the Tibetan nation when Glaṅ-dar-ma (b. c. 803) succeeded to the throne of Tibet in c. 836 and tried to expunge the Buddhist culture from Tibet. As a result, monasteries were destroyed, a large number of Buddhist manuscripts burnt, many monks killed and many fled in fear of life etc. Buddhist Study was completely stopped. But after the assassination (in 842 A.D.) of this tyrant king, the situation returned to normal.

It was the revivalism of Buddhist Tibet in all spheres of life, with the arrival of Atīsa, the great Buddhist scholar from Bengal, in 1042. The work on the translation of the Buddhist texts and study thereon started in a fresh. At this time the Tibetan scholars came into close contact with the Kashmiri logicians. According to a famous Tibetan historian 'Gos lo-tśā-ba (1392-1481), the eleventh century was the beginning of the spread of the teaching of logic, which became established in the region of Dbus and Gtsan of Tibet, with the activities of the famous Tibetan interpreter named Rma lo-tśā-ba Dge-ba'i blo-gros (1044-1089).⁽³⁾

In this way, Buddhist logic went on to be studied in different monasteries. But a new dimension in the overall idea about the subject was given by Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251) who maintained that logic was an utterly profane science, containing nothing Buddhistic at all, just like medicine or mathematics like. He established Buddhist logic in that way. The celebrated historian Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub (1290-1365) shared the same opinion.⁽⁴⁾ But Dge-lugs-pa or Yellow sect that was founded by the celebrated reformer of Tibet, Tsoṅ-kha-pa (1357-1419)

and is predominant now, rejected these views and acknowledged Buddhist logic (of Dharmakīrti) as a foundation of Buddhism as a religion.⁽⁵⁾ From the very time of Tson-kha-pa, Buddhist logic rose in Tibet as a constituent part of the religious practice of the people.

II. Indian works on Buddhist logic translated into Tibetan

It is well-known that the basic literature of Tibet is the translation of the Indian texts. In the 8th century and later in the 11th and the 12th centuries, a great number of works on Buddhist logic, written by Indian logicians were translated into Tibetan. In the work of translating, the enthusiastic Tibetan scholar-interpreters of different corners of Tibet engaged themselves at work year after year with the help of the Indian panditas in India and Tibet. In this way, so vast amount of literature on this subject was gradually built up and this, in fact, stands heavier and richer than Indian Literature at present, because a good number of the invaluable texts have not come down to us in original.

Within the 11th century almost all the excellent and ordinary treatises were composed in India and from time to time the manuscripts of those works reached Tibet through the hands of the Tibetan scholars who came to India from Tibet and returned, and also through the hands of the Indian panditas who visited Tibet at the invitation of the Tibetan kings. Sometimes, the Tibetan scholars came to India, translated the text and carried only the translated version with them. Kashmir, an Indian state adjacent to Tibet was an ideal place of work for the Tibetans for a much longer period than other places of India.

The Buddhist logicians whose works were translated into Tibetan are the following: Dignāga (Phyogs-glañ), Dharmakīrti (Chos-grags), Devendrabuddhi (Lha-dbañ-blo), Śākyabuddhi (Śākya-blo), Śubhagupta (Dge-sruñs), Vinitadeva ('Dul-ba'i lha), Jinendrabuddhi (Rgyal-dbañ blo-gros), Śāntarakṣita (Zhi-ba-'tsho), Kamalasila, Dharmottara (Chos-mchog), Muktākalasa (Mutig bum-pa), Arcaṭa alias Dharmakaradatta (Chos-'byun-byin), Prajnakaragupta (Ses-rab 'byuñ-gnas sbas-pa), Jitāri (Dgra-las rgyal-

ba), Jina (Rgyal-ba-can), Ravigupta (Ñi-ma sbas-pa), Ratnavajra (Rin-chen rdo-rje), Jñānaśrimitra, Jñānaśrībhadrā (Ye-ses-dpal bzañ-po), Ratnākaraśānti (Śānti-pa), Yamāri, Saṃkarānanda (Bde-byed dga'-ba), and Mokṣākaragupta (Thar-pa'i 'byuñ-gnas sbas-pa). ⁽¹⁾ With the translation of numerous texts of the above logicians the Tibetan literature stored each and every topic of logical discussion which took several centuries to come up in India. Following are the names of the interpreters and their translated works:

1. Bhikṣu Dharmāśoka (8th cen.) : This scholar has translated the Hetucakradamaru (Gtan-tshigs-kyi 'khor-lo gtan-la dbab-pa, Tg mdo xcv 9. 189a7-190a4) of Dignāga, with the help of the Indian logician Śāntarakṣita, widely known by the name "Bodhisattva Abbot" in Tibet.

The work deals with all nine possible relations between the reason and what is to be proved and has founded that there are among them two relations which conform to the three characteristics of the reason and the remaining seven relations are at variance with those characteristics.

2. Zhu-chen dpal-brtsegs-rakṣita (9th cen.): He was a native of Zhu-chen and was a Tibetan official interpreter. Following are the names of the works translated by him:

(a) Hetubindu (Gtan-tshigs-kyi thigs-pa, Tg mdo xcv 13. 337a8-357a3) of Dharmakṛiti. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Prajñāvarman. It is a treatise on logical reasons.

(b) Hetubindu-tikā (Gtan-tshigs-kyi thigs-pa rgya-cher 'grel-ba, Tg mdo cxi 5. 123b8-223b6) of Vinītadeva. Translated with the assistance of the above Indian pandita. It is a commentary on the above work.

(c) Santānāntara-siddhi (Rgyud-gzhan grub-pa, Tg mdo xcv 17. 400a7-404b3) of Dharmakīrti. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Viśuddhasiṃha. It is a treatise on the reality of other minds, directed against solipsism.

(d) Santānāntarasiddhi-tīkā (Rgyud-gzhan grub-pa'i 'grel-bsad, Tg mdo cviii 1. 1-21b2) of Vinitadeva. Translated with the assistance of Visuddhasiṃha. It is a commentary on the above work.

(e) Nyāyabindu-pūrvapakṣa-saṃkṣipti (Rigs-pa'i thigs-pa'i phyogs sna-ma mdor-bsdus-pa, Tg mdo cxi 3. 113a1-122b6) of Kamalaśīla. Translated with the assistance of Visuddhasiṃha. It is a treatise on the prima facie arguments against the Buddhist logic.

(f) Ālambana-parīkṣā-tīkā (Dmigs-pa brtag-pa'i 'grel-bśad, Tg mdo cxii 5. 183a7-197b7) of Vinitadeva. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Sākyasiṃha. It is a commentary on Dignāga's Ālambanaparīkṣa.

(g) Bāhyārthasiddhi-kārikā (Phyi-rol-gyi don-grub-pa ces-bya-ba'i tshigs-le'ur-byas-pa . Tg mdo cxii 8. 199b8-207b7) of the Vaibhāṣika scholar Śubhagupta. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Jinamitra. It is a Vaibhāṣika treatise containing memorial verses on the reality of external objects.

3. Zhu-chen ye-ses-sde (9th cen.): He translated numerous texts of Sanskrit literature into Tibetan. Among those, Nyāyabindu-tīkā (Rigs-pa'i thigs-pa rgya-cher 'grel-ba, Tg mdo cxi 1. 1-43b3) of Vinitadeva is a remarkable text on logic, which was translated by him with the help of the Indian pandita Jinamitra. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Nyāyabindu.

4. Vande Nam-mkha'-skyon (9th cen.) translated Sambandha-parīkṣā ('Brel-pa brtag-pa, Tg mdo xcv 14. 357a3-358a7) of Dharmakīrti, and Sambandha-parīkṣā-tīkā ('Brel-pa brtag-pa'i rgya-cher bsad-pa, Tg mdo cxii 1. 1-26b8) of Vinitadeva, into Tibetan with the assistance of the Indian pandita Jnanagarbha. The first text is a metrical composition on the problem of relation and the second is a commentary on it.

5. Zhu-chen chos-kyi snan-ba (9th cen.) translated Nyāyabindu-tīkā⁽²⁾ (Rigs-pa'i thigs-pa'i 'grel, Tg mdo cxi 2. 43b3-113a1) of Dharmottara, with

the assistance of the Indian pandita Jñānagarbha. It is a commentary on Nyāyabindu of Dharmakīrti.

6. Rma lo-tsa-ba dge-ba'i blo-gros (1044-1089): He was the celebrated interpreter (lo-tsa-ba) of Rma. Among the logical works translated by him, was the Pramāṇa-vārtika (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel) which got the honour of being a fundamental text in the monasteries throughout Tibet. According to 'Gos lo-tsa-ba (1392-1481), a famous Tibetan historian, the beginning of the spread of the study of logic was associated with Dge-ba'i blo-gros⁽³⁾. His translations of the logical texts including Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇava-vārtika, its auto-commentary, and two voluminous commentaries, one by Devendrabuddhi and the other by Śākyabuddhi, show the sign of a perseverant and talented scholar. He was murdered by poison in 1089.

He translated the following works:

(a) Pramāṇa-vārtika-kārikā⁽⁴⁾ (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel tshigs-le'ur byas pa, Tg mdo xcv 10. 190a4-250b6) of Dharmakīrti. Translated into Tibetan with the help of the Indian pandita Śubhūtiśrī-sānti.

It is a metrical composition regarded as a classical text on Buddhist logic. It advocates the philosophy of idealism. It has four chapters: Svārthānumāna (Rañ-don rjes-dpag), Pramāṇasiddhi (Tshad-ma grub-pa), Pratyakṣa (Mñon-sum) and Parārthānumāna (Gzhan-don rjes-dpag). First chapter contains the scrutiny of logical reason (hetu, gtan-tshigs), fallacy (hetvābhāsa, gtan-tshigs ltar-snañ), negation (anupalabdhi, mi-dmigs-pa), concomitance (avinābhāva, med-na mi-'byuñ-ba), verbal testimony (śabda, tshig), scripture (āgama gzuñs-lugs), relation (sambandha, 'brel-pa), etc. Second chapter contains scrutiny of source of valid knowledge (pramāṇa, tshad-ma), god (īśvara, lha), Buddhahood, four truths (catuḥ āryasatyas, 'phags-pa bden bzhi), etc. Third chapter contains scrutiny of perception (pratyakṣa, mñon-sum), inference (anumāna, rjes-su dpag-pa), negation (anupalabdhi, mi-dmigs-pa), universal (sāmānya, spyi), determination of a thing by the exclusion of its opposites (apoha, sel-ba), etc. Fourth chapter

contains scrutiny of inference for other's sake, constituent parts of syllogism, etc.

The arrangement of the chapter in *Pramāṇa-vārtika* is a bit peculiar i.e. not a traditional one. It begins with inference, goes over to the validity of knowledge, then comes back to sense-perception which is followed by syllogism at the close. The natural order would have been to begin with the chapter upon the validity of knowledge and then to go over to perception, inference and syllogism.

(b) *Pramāṇa-vārtika-vṛtti* (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi 'grel-ba, Sde-dge Tg Tshad-ma No. 4216): It is the auto-commentary of *Pramāṇa-vārtika*. Translated with the help of Śubhūtiśrī-śānti.

The commentary is only on the first chapter of *Pramāṇa-vārtika* and Dharmakīrti could not comment more than this in his life-time.

(c) *Vādanyāya*⁽⁵⁾ (Rtsod-pa'i rigs-pa, Tg mdo xcv 16. 364b8-400a7) of Dharmakīrti. Translated with the help of Jñānaśrī-bhadra, a Kashmirian scholar of Buddhist logic. It is a text on the art of debate.

(d) *Pramāṇa-vārtika-pañjikā*⁽⁶⁾ (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi dka'-'grel, Tg mdo xcv 18 & xcvi. 404b3-535a4 and 1-390a8) of Devendrabuddhi. Translated with the help of Śubhūtiśrī-śānti. It is a commentay on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇa-vārtika* and the commentator was the personal disciple of Dharmakīrti.

(e) *Pramāṇa-vārtika* (-pañjikā)-tikā (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi 'grel-bśad, Tg mdo xcvi & xcvi. 1-402a8 and 1-348a8) of Śākyabuddhi, the disciple of Devendrabuddhi. The name of the Indian pandita is not found. It is a commentary on Devendrabuddhi's *Pramāṇa-vārtika-pañjikā*.

7. Zhu-chen Tin-ne-'dzin bzañ-po (11th cen.) translated *Yukti-prayoga* (Rigs-pa'i sbyor-ba, Tg mdo cxii 27. 360b8-361a8) of Ratnavajra, with the help of the Indian pandita Śrī-subhūtiśānti same with Subhūtiśrī-śānti). It

is a small tract on application of reasoning.

8. Khyuñ-po chos-kyi brtson-'grus (11th cen.): He seems to be a little senior to Rñog lo-tsā-ba as Rñog went to Kashmir with this interpreter and some others. He translated *Pramāṇa-viniścaya-tikā* (Tshad-ma rnam-par nes-pa'i 'grel-bsad, Tg mdo cx 2. 209b8-355a6) of Jñānaśrībhadrā (c.1020-c.1080), into Tibetan with the assistance of the author himself who also visited Tibet. The work is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇa-viniścaya*.

9. Pa-tshab ñi-ma-grags (b.1055) translated *Paraloka-siddhi* ('Jig-ten pha-rol grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 15. 264a8-267b7) of Dharmottara, with the assistance of the Kashmiri pandita Bhavyarāja (1070). It is a treatise on the proof of the world beyond.

10. Grags-'byor śes-rab (11th cen.): He translated *Tattvasaṃgraha-pañjikā* (De-kho-na-ñid bsdus-pa'i dka'-'grel, Tg mdo cxiii 2 & cxiv. 159b2-431a8 and 1-405a7) of Kamalaśīla, with the help of the Indian pandita Devendrabhadra (1040). It is a beautiful commentary on Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṃgraha-kārikā*.

Another work, translated by him with the help of the Indian pandita Vināyaka, is *Kṣaṇabhaṅga-siddhi-vivarana* (Skad-cig-ma 'jig grub-pa'i rnam-'grel, Tg mdo xcii 18. 278b2-295b7) of Muktākalāśa (1000). It is a commentary on Dharmottara's *Kṣaṇabhaṅga-siddhi*.

11. Rñog lo-tsā-ba blo-ldan śes-rab (1059-1109): According to the famous Tibetan historian 'Gos lo-tsā-ba (1392-1481) Rñog lo-tsā-ba was the celebrated founder of the lineage known as the 'New Nyāya' (Tshad-ma gsar-ma) in Tibet. Up to now Khyuñ-po grags-se's (early 11th century) works were popular there and those were on 'Old Nyāya' (Tshad-ma rnin-ma).⁷⁾ The works translated by Rñog lo-tsā-ba were of Dharmottara and Prajñākara-gupta who brought a new wave in the study of Buddhist logic, and the Tibetan scholastic world sincerely felt the existence of this new stream of thought.

Rñog lo-tsā-ba was the son of Chos-skyabs. He was the follower of the

Bka'-gdams-pa school and became the abbot of the Gsañ-phu ne'u-thog monastery. In childhood he went to live with his uncle and studied much under him and Spo-chun-ba tshul-khrims ses-rab and others. When he was 17 (in 1076), he was sent to Kashmir for study. He went there in the company of Rva lo-tsā-ba (b. 1016), Gñan lo-tsā-ba, Khyun-po chos-kyi brtson-'grus, Rdo-ston and Btsan kha-bo-che (b. 1011/1020). When king Rtse-lde had invited most of the Tripitaka-dhara-s of Dbus, Gtsaṅ and Khams, and held the religious council of 1076 A.D., he also attended it. Rtse-lde's son Dbañ-phyug-lde decided to become a supporter of Rñog lo-tsa-ba. Pñog then proceeded to Kashmir where he attended on six teachers, including Sajjana and Parahitabhadra (c. 1010- c. 1090). His provisions having come to an end he sent a letter to Mña'-ris. Dbañ-phyug-lde sent him again much gold and requested him to translate Pramāṇa-vārtika-alamkāra. He made a good translation of it.

He studied for 17 years in Kashmir and then returned to Tibet in 1092, aged 35. In Tibet he studied the Doctrine with the panditas Trikalasa Sthirapāla and Sumatikīrti. He visited Nepal for a short while and heard the Tantra from Atulyavajra, Varendraruci and others. Then he again returned to Tibet and made numerous correct translations. He preached at Lhasa, Bsam-yas, Myu-gu-sna, Gñal-sgañ-thogs, Gtsaṅ-rgyan-mkhar and other places. Among his assistant preachers were 55 preachers of Alamkāra (Pramāṇa-vārtika-alamkāra of Prajñākaragupta) and Pramāṇa-viniścaya-tika (of Dharmottara), 280 expounders of Pramāṇa-viniścaya. He taught extensive logic, five treatises of Maitreya, the Mādhyamika doctrine and other texts.⁽⁸⁾ He passed away at the age of 51 in 1109 on the road in the neighbourhood of Bsam-yas.

Following are the works translated into Tibetan by Rñog lo-tsā-ba:

(a) Nyāyabindu (Rigs-pa'i thigs-pa, Tg mdo xcv 12. 329b1-337a8) of Dharmakīrti. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Parahitabhadra and others.

It is divided into three chapters, (1) Perception (Pratyakṣa, Mñon-sum), (2) Inference for one's own sake (Svārthanumāna, Ran-gi don-gyi rjes-su

dpag-pa), and (3) Inference for other's sake (Parārthānumāna, Gzhan-gyi don-gyi rjes-su dpag-pa). Nyāyabindu is an ideal text narrating all the important things and ideas of Buddhist logic in a simple way. It contains, apart from the definitions of perception and inference, the related theories of mental-conception (kalpanā, rtog-pa), error (bhrānti, 'khrul-pa), identity (svabhāva, ran-bzhin), effect (kārya, 'bras-bu), negation (anupalabdhi, mi-dmigs-pa) and its different varieties, fallacies (hetvābhāsa, gtan-tshigs ltar-snan), analogues for futilities (jāti, ltag-chod), etc.

(b) Pramāṇa-viniścaya (Tshad-ma rnam-par nes-pa, Tg mdo xcv 11. 250b6-329b1) of Dharmakīrti. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Parahitabhadra and others, in Anupamapura of Kashmir.

It is divided into three chapters, (1) Perception, (2) Inference for one's own sake, and (3) Inference for other's sake. It is a beautiful explanatory treatise of Dharmakīrti, covering all the necessary matters of Buddhist logic.

(c) Pramāṇa-viniścaya-tīkā (Tshad-ma rnam-nes-kyi tika, Tg mdo cix & cx 1. 1-347a8 and 1-209b8) of Dharmottara. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Parahitabhadra (1080) and others, in Anupamapura of Kashmir. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇa-viniścaya.

(d) Pramāṇa-vārtika-ālamkāra⁽⁹⁾ (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi rgyan, Tg mdo xcix & c. 1-382a7 and 1-344a6) of Prajñākaragupta. Translated with the help of the pandita Bhavyarāja (Skal-ldan rgyal-po) of Kashmir. Later the translation was checked by Rñog lo-tsa-ba with the help of another Indian pandita Sumatikīrti. The text is a commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika of Dharmakīrti.

(e) Pramāṇa-vārtika-ālamkāra-tīkā (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel rgyan-gyi 'grel-bsad, Tg mdo civ 2, cv, cvi & cvii. 208a7-345a8, 1-290a7, 1-436a8 and 1-321a5) of Yamāri. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Sumatikīrti in the Sñe-than monastery near Lhasa. It is a voluminous commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika-ālamkāra of Prajñākaragupta, which is a commentary on

Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārtika.

(f) Pramāṇa-parīkṣā (Tshad-ma brtag-pa, Tg mdo cxii 12. 213a4-236b1) of Dharmottara. Name of the Indian pandita is not found. It is a treatise on the examination of the source of valid knowledge (pramāṇa, tshad-ma).

(g) Apoha-nāma-prakaraṇa (Gzhan-sel-ba rab-tu byed-pa, Tg mdo cxii 14. 252b4-264a8) of Dharmottara. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Bhavyarāja (1070), in Anupamapura of Kashmir. It is a treatise on the determination of a thing by the exclusion of its opposites.

(h) Kṣaṇa-bhaṅga-siddhi (Skad-cig-ma 'jig-pa grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 17. 268a2-278b2) of Dharmottara. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Bhavyarāja. It is a treatise on the momentariness of everything.

(i) Apohasiddhi (Sel-ba grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 20. 302b3-325a7) of Saṃkarānanda. Translated with the help of the Kashmirian pandita Manoratha (? Manorathanandin who composed an excellent Vrtti on Pramāṇa-vārtika) in Anupamapura of Kashmir. It is a treatise on the determination of a thing by the exclusion of its opposites.

(j) Pratibandha-siddhi ('Brel-pa grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 21. 325a7-326b1) of Saṃkarānanda. Translated with the help of the Kashmirian pandita Bhavyarāja. It is a treatise on the establishment of the causal relation.

12. Zha-ma Señ-ge rgyal-po (/Zha-ma señ-ge/Señ-ge rgyal-mtshan) (11th cen.): This famous interpreter learned the work of a translator under Rma lo-tsā-ba (1044-1089), Rñog lo-tsā-ba (1059-1109), and others. He translated some very important texts on Buddhist logic among which one that shook the entire world of Indian logic is the Pramāṇa-samuccaya of Dignāga. Following are the works translated by him into Tibetan:

(a) Pramāṇa-samuccaya (Tshad-ma kun-las btus-pa, Tg mdo xcv 1. 1-13a5) of Dignāga. Translated with the help of his collaborators, Dad-pa'i

ses-rab and Indian pandita Kanakavarman.

It is a revolutionary text in the field of Buddhist logic. By virtue of it, the Buddhists in India got the strength to fight against the Naiyāyikas, their main opponents, in the duel ground. It is a metrical composition and is divided into six chapters, (1) Perception (Pratyakṣa, Mñon-sum), (2) Inference for one's own sake (Svārthānumāna, Rañ-don-gyi rjes-dpag), (3) Inference for other's sake (Parārthānumāna, Gzhan-gyi don-gyi rjes-dpag), (4) Reason and example (Hetu-drṣṭānta, Gtan-tshigs dañ Dpe), (5) Determination of a thing by exclusion of its opposites (Apoha, Gzhan sel-ba), and (6) Analogue (Jāti, Ltag-gcod).

(b) Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti (Tshad-ma kun-las btus-pa'i 'grel-ba, Tg mdo xcv 2. 13a6-93b4). Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Vasudhararakṣita. It is the auto-commentary of Pramāṇa-samuccaya.

13. Dad-pa'i ses-rab (11th cen.): He was the collaborator of Zha-ma Señ-ge rgyal-po in the work of translating Pramāṇa-samuccaya. He separately translated the auto-commentary (Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti, Tshad-ma kun-las btus-pa'i 'grel-ba) of Pramāṇa-samuccaya with the help of the Indian pandita Kanakavarman. Luckily it has got the place in Tanjur Collection and bears the No. Tg mdo xcv 3. 93b4-177a7.

14. Dga' (? Dge)-ba'i rdo-rje (11th cen.) translated Sambandha-parīkṣānusara ('Brel-pa brtag-pa'i rjes-su 'brañ-ba, Tg mdo cxii 2. 27a6-44a3) of Saṃkarānanda, with the assistance of the Indian pandita Parahitabhadrā (c.1010-c.1090). It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Sambandha-parīkṣa.

15. Dpal-mchog daṅ-po'i rdo-rje of Sum-pa (in Amdo) (11th cen.) translated Bālāvatāra-tarka (Byis-pa 'jug-pa'i rtog-ge. Tg mdo xcii 26. 348a1-360b8) of Jitari, with the help of the Indian pandita Nāgarakṣita. It is an introductory treatise on logic for the children.

16. Sakya bla-ma Zhi-ba-'od (11th cen.): He lived in Gu-ge in western

Tibet. He translated, with the help of the Kashmirian pandita Guṇākaraśrī-bhadra, *Tattvasaṃgraha-kārikā* (De-kho-na-nid bsdus-pa'i tshig-le'ur byas-pa, Tg mdo cxiii 1. 1-159b2) of Śāntaraksita, in Phun-tshogs-glin monastery in Gu-ge. The text is a metrical composition and is considered a *magnum opus* of the Buddhist logical literature.

17. 'Bro Sakya-'od (11th cen.) : He was a native of the village of Seṅdkar in the province of "Bro. Following are the works he translated into Tibetan:

(a) *Sahāvalamba-nīścaya* (? *Sahopalambha-nīścaya*) (Lhan-cig dmigs-pa nes-pa, Tg mdo cxii 19. 295b7-302b3) of Prajñākaragupta. Translated with the help of the Nepalese pandita Śāntibhadra. It is a treatise on the ascertainment of the existence of the objects simultaneously with their knowledge.

(b) *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* (Rnam-par rig-pa tsam-ñid grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 22. 326b1-329b6) of Ratnākaraśānti. Translated with the help of the above Nepalese pandita. It is a treatise on the existence of knowledge alone.

(c) *Hetutattvopadeśa* (Gtan-tshigs-kyi de-kho-na-ñid bstan-pa, Tg mdo cxii 24. 335a4-343b1) of Jitāri. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Kumārakalāśa. It is a treatise on the real nature of the reasons in a syllogism.

(d) *Kāryakāraṇabhāva-siddhi* (Rgyu dan 'bras-bu'i ño-bo grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 29. 399a3-403a4) of Jñānaśrī-mitra.⁽¹⁰⁾ Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Kumārakalāśa. The translation was checked by Śākya-'od with the assistance of the Nepalese pandita Anantasrī. It is a treatise on the relation between cause and effect.

(e) *Antarvyāpti* (Nan-gi khyab-pa, Tg mdo cxii 23. 329b6-335a4) of Ratnākaraśānti. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Kumārakalāśa. It is a treatise on internal inseparable connection.

(f) *Vādanyāya-vṛtti vipaṇcītārtha nāma* (Rtsod-pa'i rigs-pa'i 'grel-pa don rnam-par 'byed-pa zhes-bya-ba, Tg mdo cviii 2. 21b2-137a8) of

Śāntarakṣita. Translated with the collaborator "Phags-pa śes-rab and with the help of the Indian pandita Kumārasī-bhadra, in the Bsam-yas monastery. It is an elaborate commentary on Dharmakīrti's Vādanyāya.

18. Zhañ-zhuñ Byañ-chub śes-rab (11th cen.) translated Pramāṇa-vārtika-alaṃkāra-tikā (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi rgyan-gyi 'grel-bsad, Tg mdo ci & cii. 1-434a8 and 1-375a8) of Jina with the help of the great pandita Dīpaṃkararakṣita⁽¹¹⁾ of Vikramaśīla in Anupamanirābhoga vihāra of Tholin. It is a voluminous commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika-alaṃkāra of Prajñākaragupta.

19. Pa-tshab Tshul-khrims rgyal-mtshan (12th cen.) translated Trikāla-parīkṣā (Dus-gsum brtag-pa, Tg mdo xcv 6. 179a4-180b1) of Dignāga, with the help of the Indian pandita Śāntiyākaragupta (b. c. 1117).⁽¹²⁾ It is a treatise on the examination of three times.

20. Sa-skyā Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan (1147-1216) was the fifth hierarch of the Sa-skyā monastery of western Tibet. He translated Nyāya-praveśa (Tshad-ma rigs-par 'jug-pa'i sgo, Tg mdo xcv 7. 180b2-184b6) of Dignāga, with the help of the Indian pandita Sarvajñaśrīrakṣita, in the Sa-skyā monastery.

21. Dpañ lo-tsā-ba Blo-gros brtan-pa (1276-1342) translated a magnificent commentary named Visālamalavati (Yans-pa dan dri-ma med-pa ldan-pa, Tg mdo cxv. 1-355a8) of Jinendrabuddhi. The name of the Indian pandita is not found. However, Dpañ lo-tsā-ba was assisted by another Tibetan scholar named Rdo-rje rgyal-mtshan (1283-1325), the teacher of the famous Tibetan historian Bu-ston (1290-1364). The commentary is on Dignāga's famous work Pramāṇa-samuccaya.

Tarkabhāṣā (Rtog-ge'i skad, Tg mdo cxii 28. 361a8-399a3) of Moksakaragupta was another work which was translated by him. Here also no name of the Indian pandita is mentioned. It is a treatise on the technicalities of logic.

Apart from the above works, there are a number of very important

works on Buddhist logic which were translated into Tibetan, but we do not find the names either of the Indian panditas or of the Tibetan interpreters. Those are the following:

Ālambana-parīkṣā (Dmigs-pa brtag-pa, Tg mdo xcv 4. 177a7-177b5) of Dignāga. It is a metrical treatise on the objects of thought.

Ālambana-parīkṣā-ṽrtti (Dmigs-pa brtag-pa'i 'grel-pa, Tg mdo xcv 5. 177b5-179a4) of Dignāga. It is an auto commentary on Ālambana-parīkṣā.

Sambandha-parīkṣā-ṽrtti ('Brel-pa brtag-pa 'grel-ba, Tg mdo xcv 15. 358a7-364b8) of Dharmakīrti. It is an auto-commentary on Sambandha-parīkṣā.

Sarvajñasiddhi-kārikā (Thamsa-cad mkhyen-pa grub-pa'i tshigs-le'ur byas-pa, Tg mdo cxii 7. 198b6-199b7) of Śubhagupta. It is a metrical composition on the existence of an Omniscient being.

Śruti-parīkṣā-kārikā (Thos-pa brtag-pa'i tshig le'ur byas-pa, Tg mdo cxii 9. 207b7-208b5) of Śubhagupta. It is a metrical composition on verbal testimony.

Anyāpohavicāra-kārikā (Gzhan sel-ba-la brtag-pa'i tshigle'ur byas-pa, Tg mdo cxii 10. 208b5-212a1) of Śubhagupta. It is a metrical composition on the determination of a thing by the exclusion of its opposites.

Īśvarabhāṅga-kārikā (Dbañ-phyug 'jig-pa'i tshig-le'ur byas-pa, Tg mdo cxii 11. 212a2-213a3) of Śubhagupta. It is a metrical composition on the refutation of God.

Vādanyāya-ṭikā (Rtsod-pa'i rigs-pa'i 'grel-ba, Tg mdo cxii 3. 44a3-71a5) of Vinitadeva. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Vādanyāya.

Hetubindu-vivarana⁽¹³⁾ (Gtan-tshigs thigs-pa'i 'grel-ba, Tg mdo cxi 6. 223b7-302a8) of Arcāṭa. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Hetubindu.

Pramāṇa-vārtika-ṽrtti (Tshad-ma rnam'grel-gyi'grel-pa, Tg mdo cviii 3. 137a8-266a6) of Ravigupta. It is an annotation on the Pramāṇa-vārtika of Dharmakīrti.

Pramāṇa-vārtika-ṭikā (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi 'grel-bśad, Tg mdo

ciii.1-338a8) of Saṃkarānanda. It is an incomplete commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇa-vārtika*.

Dharma-dharmi-viniscaya (Chos dan chos-can gtan-la dbab-pa, Tg mdo cxii 25. 343b2-347b8) of Jitāri. It is a treatise on the determination of the quality and qualificand.

One *Pramāṇa-vidhvaṃsana-tippitaka-vṛtti*⁽¹⁴⁾ (Tshad-ma rnam-par 'joms-pa mdor-bsad-pa'i 'grel, Tg mdo xxi 11. 398b4-401b8) is seen to have been translated into Tibetan. But names of the translators are not found. The work is attributed to Nāgārjuna. It reproduced Nāgārjuna's definition of the sixteen categories, *Pramāṇa* (tshad-ma), *Gzhal-bya* (prameya), etc.

III. Buddhist logic: Its study in different big monasteries

Monasteries regulated the educational world of Tibet. The Grand lamas set the system of education, and curriculum in their respective monasteries. Even a single monastery is seen to follow different syllabus for its different schools (*grva-tshan*). Thus the schools had their own set of manuals and their own learned tradition.

In a big monastery, there are five general subjects⁽¹⁾ taught, among which Buddhist logic or rather specifically *Rnam-'grel* (*Pramāṇa-vārtika*)⁽²⁾ was one.

The monastic history started with the foundation of Bsam-yes. Though it became sacred with the touch of an eminent Buddhist logician Śāntarakṣita who visited Tibet in c. 779 at the invitation of the Tibetan king Khri-sron lde'u-btsan (8th cen.), no detail of the study in it is known to us. However, it continued still, enjoying wealthy patronage and regarded with respect by new generations of teachers, who nonetheless developed rather different lines of thought, derived from their contacts with Indian masters and such Tibetan scholars as 'Brog-mi (993-1074) and Mar-pa (1012-97), who returned

from study in India and Nepal. Groups of disciples gathered around these new masters, and it was in their centres of teaching that the various subsequent 'orders' of Tibetan Buddhism had their origin.

The first of the great new schools or 'orders' was the Sa-skyapa, which takes its name from the monastery of Sa-skyapa, founded in 1073 by Dkon-mchog rgyal-po of the 'Khon family, who was a disciple of 'Brog-mi. A great scholar of this sect, who increased the fame of this school rapidly was Sa-skyapaṇḍita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251). Sa-skyapa maintained a rich cultural tradition and prosperity in Tibet. Though an eccentric mystical type of education was preferred, yet study of logic was also given much importance. So far it is known that there is a set of manuals following the ancient tradition of the Sa-skyapaṇḍita monastery.⁽³⁾

Within a few centuries, a great change in the sectarian history of Tibet came about. In the 14th century Dge-lugs-pa or Yellow sect emerged, and spread all over Tibet. Gradually it became powerful with the relentless activities of the great reformist Tson-kha-pa Blo-bzañ grags-pa (1357-1419) Sectarian. This scholar himself wrote treatise on logic and extensive study is seen in the monasteries of the Yellow sect.

There are four great monasteries of the Yellow sect, namely, Dga'-ldan, 'Bras-spuñs, Se-ra and Bkra-sis lhun-po.

Dga'-ldan or rather fully Dga'-ldan rnam-par dge-ba'i gliñ was founded in 1409, by Tson-kha-pa. It is about twenty-five miles east of Lhasa. It had three schools, namely, Byañ-rtse, śar-rtse and mña'-ris. Byañ-rtse school followed the logical texts of Rje-btsun Chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan (1469-1544) and Sar-rtse school followed the texts of Pañ-chen Bsod-nams grags-pa (1478-1554).⁽⁴⁾ In 1541, the second Dalai Lama Dge-'dun rgya-mtsho (1475-1542) founded the Mña'-ris school of the Dga'-ldan monastery. This school followed the text-books written by Bstan-pa dar-bzañ and Blo-gros sbas-pa, with some additional reading materials on this matter, such as some writings on Rnam'-grel, by Gsañ-bdag sprul-sku 'Ol-kha rje-druñ Blo-bzañ phrin-

One of the greatest monasteries of Tibet is 'Bras-spuñs. It was founded in 1414, by Rgyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen (1364-1432), one of the disciples of Tsoñ-kha-pa. It is situated about three miles west of Lhasa. This monastery has three schools, namely, Blo-gsal-gliñ, Bkra-sis sgo-mañ and Bde-yañs. Blo-gsal-gliñ school follows the logical texts⁽⁶⁾ of Pañ-chen Bsod-nams grags-pa. Bra-sis sgo-mañ school was founded by Kun-mkhyen 'Jam-dbyañs bzhad-pa Ñag-dbañ brtson-'grus (1648-1722) and follows the logical texts⁽⁷⁾ of the founder himself. Apart from those, the school also teaches Ñag-dbañ bkra-sis's Bsdus-grva⁽⁸⁾ i.e. a compendium on logic. All Mongolia follows the tradition of the Bkra-sis sgo-mañ or rather simply sgo-mañ school. Bde-yañs is a small school and follows the syllabus⁽⁹⁾ of Sñe-than Rva-ba-stod monastery.

Another great monastery of Tibet is Se-ra or rather Se-ra theg-chen-gliñ. It was founded in 1417, by Mkhas-grub Dge-legs dpal-bzañ-po (1385-1438). It is situated about a mile and a half to the north of Lhasa. Se-ra has two schools, namely, Se-ra-byes⁽¹⁰⁾ and Se-ra-smad⁽¹¹⁾. Se-ra-byes school follows the commentary on all the four chapters of Rnam-'grel, written by Rje-btsun-pa Chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan⁽¹²⁾ (1469-1544). Se-ra-smad follows the texts of Mkhas-grub Bstan-dar.⁽¹³⁾

Another great monastery and the seat of the Panchen Lamas is Bkra-sis lhun-po. It was founded in 1447, by the first Dalai Lama Dge-'dun-grub (1391-1474), near the south bank of the Gtsañ-po near Gzhis-ka-rtse. This monastery has three different schools, namely, Thos-bsam-gliñ, Dkyil-khañ and sar-rtse. Thos-bsam-gliñ school follows the text-books written by the following scholars: Pañ-chen Bsod-nams rnam-rgyal, Byan-ston Blo-gros rgyal-mtsho Kun-mkhyen Chos-'byor dpal-bzañ, Sañs-rgyas rgyal-po dpal-ldan rin-chen, Dri-med bsēs-gnen, Blo-bzañ bsēs-gnen, Dge-'dunbsam-grub and Dge-'dun blo-bzañ.⁽¹⁴⁾ Dkyil-khañ school follows the texts of Bstan-pa dar-bzañ and Blo-gros sbas-pa (1400-1475).⁽¹⁵⁾ Sar-rtse schoool follows the

texts of Kun-mkhyen Legs-pa don-grub.⁽¹⁶⁾

Extensive study on logic is carried on in the Sñe-thañ Ra-va-stod monastery.⁽¹⁷⁾ Here the texts of Sañs-pa kun-mkhyen Mchog-lha 'od-zer (1429-1500), Dkon-mchog chos-'phel⁽¹⁸⁾ (1573-1646). Gra-chuñ-pa Yon-tan rgya-mtsho, Rje Śes-rab señ-ge, Gliñ-smad Nāg-dbañ dpal-'byor and Drun-chen Legs-pa bzan-po are followed.⁽¹⁹⁾

'Jam-dbyans bzhad-pa was a native of Amdo in eastern Tibet. He studied in the Blo-gsal-gliñ school of the 'Bras-spunś monastery. He founded the Sgo-mañ school of the same monastery. But he dissented with his teachers, and retired to his native country. He then founded a new monastery in Amdo, named Bla-brañ Bkra-śis-'khyil. It became celebrated as a seat of profound learning and as the spiritual metropolis of all Mongolia. An extensive culture of Buddhist logic is reported to have been maintained in this monastery.

Buddhist logic was sincerely taught and studied also in Dag-po bsad-sgrub-glin in south Tibet.

Whatever that is publicly interesting factor about logic lies in the practical side of this subject. Public debate over different subjects was very interesting in Tibet. Though the contents of Buddhist logic alone might have been open to discussion, Vinaya, Madhyamika philosophy, *Prajñāpāramitā*, etc. were given equal importance to be and discussed in a public debate. Hence all those met with a common characteristic of being discussed publicly.

To study logic and participate in a discussion was a part of the daily routine of a monk in the great monasteries. We see that in the fourth assembly held about 3 p.m. in the Grand Lama's private monastery of Chapel-royal of Rnam-rgyal, or mount Potala, the junior or middle-grade monks occasionally meet for a public wrangling on set themes to stimulate theological proficiency. In unreformed monasteries⁽²⁰⁾ or small monasteries,

importance is given to sermons and sacrifice for the monks.⁽²¹⁾

There is little doubt that public disputations made the subject much more attractive than any other exercise regarding that for the students. Indeed, the academic feature of the monastic universities of Tibet is perhaps seen at its best in the prominence given to dialectics and disputations, thus following the speculative traditions of the earlier Indian Buddhists. That is why in the great monastic universities of Dga'-ldan, 'Bras-spuñs, Se-ra and Bkra-sis lhun-po, each with a teeming population of monks ranging from about 4,000 to 8,000, public disputations are regularly held, and form a recognized institution, in which every divinity student or embryo lama must take part. This exercise is called expressing "the true and innermost essence (of the doctrine)" (mtshan-nid), in which an endeavour is made to ascertain both the literal sense and the spirit of the doctrine, and it is held within a barred court.

Within the court Chos-ra the disputations are held in seven grades ('dzin-grva) namely, 1) Kha-dog dkar-dmar, 2) Tshad-ma, 3) Phar-phyin, 4) Mdzod, 5) 'Dul-ba, 6) Dbu-ma and 7) Bslab-btus. At these disputations there are tree-trunks, called the Sal-tree trunk (Sug-sdon), Lcañ-ma sdon-po and yu-ba; and bounded by a wall, and inside the court is covered by pebbles (rde'u). In the middle there is a great high stone seat for the lord protector (Skyabs-mgon), and a smaller seat for the abbot (Mkhan-po of the school, and one still smaller for the chief celebrant.

On reaching the enclosure, the auditors take their respective seats in the seven grades in each of which discussions are held. One of the most learned candidates volunteers for examination, or as it is called to be vow-keeper (Dam-bca') takes his seat in the middle, and the others sit round him. Then the students stand up one by one, and dispute with him.

The scholar who stands up wears the yellow hat, and, clapping his hands together says, Ka-ye! and then puts his questions to the vow-keeper, who is questioned by every student who so desires; and if he succeeds in

any case, one is transferred to another grade after every three years.

After twenty-one years of age the rank of Dge-ses is obtained, though some clever students may get it even at eleven. The abbot of the college comes into the enclosure seven days every month, and supervises the disputations of the seven grades. When a candidate has reached the bslab-btus grade, he is certain soon to become a Dge-ses.

The great disputation, however, is held four times a year, in spring, summer, autumn, and in winter, in a great paved courtyard, and lasts for five to seven days. On these occasions, all the scholars and abbots of the four schools of the colleges of 'Bras-spuns congregate there. And all the learned students of the four schools who belong to the grade of bslab-btus volunteer for examination, and each is questioned by the students who ply their questions, saying My Lama, "just like flies on meat". When the voluntary examinee has successfully replied to all the questions he goes to the abbot of his own school, and, presenting a silver coin and a scarf, he requests permission to be examined on the Lhasa mass-day. If the abbot receives the coin and scarf, then the application is approved, and if not, the student is referred to his studies. In the great Lhasa mass-day all the monks of Dga'-ldan, 'Bras-spuns, and Se-ra congregate, and examinations are held every seventh day, and the Dge-ses of the three monasteries act as examiners. If the volunteer can answer them all, then the Lord Protector throws a scarf round his neck, and he thus receives the title of Dge-ses — somewhat equivalent to our Bachelor of Divinity.

The newly-fledged Dge-ses is now known as a Skya-ser-med-pa dge-ses. Then he must give soup (called Dge-ses thug-pa) to all the students of his school and club, each student getting a cupful. The soup is made of rice, mixed with meat and butter, and different kinds of fruits. Then the abbot of the school and the Spyi-so of his club, and all his friends and relatives, each gives him a Kha-gdags scarf and money as present.⁽²²⁾

IV. Original Tibetan commentaries and independent treatises

When Buddhism in India proper had become extinct, an indigenous independent production of works on logic by Tibetan monks gradually developed and continued the Indian tradition. The original Tibetan literature on logic begins in the 11th century A.D. just a little before when Buddhism becomes extinct in northern India. Its history can be divided into two periods, the old one, up to the time of Tson-kha-pa (1357-1419), and the new one, after Tson-kha-pa.

The history of logic in Tibet is marked with the appearance of a famous Tibetan interpreter Rma lo-tsa-ba Dge-ba'i blo-gros (1044-1089). He made the logic into a system through teaching and study. This was the beginning of the spread of the teaching of logic, which became thus established in the region of Dbus and Gtsaṅ.⁽¹⁾ At this time there was a famous scholar named Khyun-po grags-se⁽²⁾ who composed numerous treatises on logic. They are called the "Old Nyāya" (Tshad-ma rñin-ma). Apart from this, we do not get any further information about the works of this great scholar. Khyun-po seems to have been a contemporary of Po-to-pa Rin-chen-gsal (1031-1105).

Next comes the name of the great scholar-translator Blo-ldan ses-rab who is reportedly to have written a short commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika, named Ses-rab 'grel-chuṅ.⁽³⁾

Rgya-dmar-pa Byaṅ-chub-grags (11-12th cen.) was a learned scholar in logic as well as a possessor of numerous Tantric secret precepts. He lived in Stod-luns and taught at Myaṅ-ro and other monasteries.⁽⁴⁾ He composed an original Tibetan commentary on Pramāṇa-viniścaya (Tshad-ma rnam-ñes) of Dharmakīrti (Chos-kyi grags-pa). He had many disciples⁽⁵⁾ The great logician Cha-ba Chos-kyi seṅ-ge was one of them.

At this time another Tibetan scholar named Smon-lam tshul-khrims (11-12 th cen.) of Zhaṅ-gye is known to have written a commentary on

Pramāṇa-viniścaya.⁽⁶⁾ He was the disciple of Khu Ser-brtson (1075-1124).

Cha-ba (/Phya-pa) Chos-kyi seṅ-ge⁽⁷⁾ (1109-1169) studied under Byan-chub-grags the systems of Mādhyamika and Nyāya (logic). Later, he became the abbot of the Gsañ-phu ne'u-thog monastery for 18 years. Among his numerous commentaries on different treatises⁽⁸⁾, there was a commentary on Pramāṇa-viniścaya. Cha-ba composed its abridgement also. He composed an independent work on logic in mnemonic verse, named Tshad-ma'i bsdus-pa yid-kyi mun-sel⁽⁹⁾ or "Abridgement of logic — disperser of darkness of mind", and an auto-commentary thereon. 'Gos lo-tsā-ba (1392-1481), a renowned Tibetan historian writes⁽¹⁰⁾: He (Gos lo-tsā-ba) heard about a Phyi-nañ-gi grub-mtha' bsdus-pa or "Summary on the theories of non-Buddhist and Buddhist" and about a Śes-bya gzhi-lña'i bsad-pa or "exposition of the five bases of the knowable" by him.⁽¹¹⁾

Cha-ba is the creator of a special Tibetan logical style on which some remarks will be made in the sequel.⁽¹²⁾ He asserted that the absolute negation of the reality of external objects represented the paramārtha-satya which, according to him, was the object of an approximate judgement determined by words and thought-constructions.⁽¹³⁾

A large commentary on Pramāṇa-viniścaya was composed by Gtsaṅ-nag-pa Brtson-'grus seṅ-ge (12th cen.). The commentator also composed a number of text-books on Nyāya, Mādhyamika and other subjects. His numerous large and abridged commentaries on the Mādhyamika follow the method of Candrakīrti.⁽¹⁴⁾ His exposition of logic was very popular in the monastery of Roñ-wo/Reb-koñ, Amdo.⁽¹⁵⁾

Dan-'bag-pa Smra-ba'i seṅ-ge (12th cen.) composed an independent treatise on logic. Bu-ston (1290-1365) mentions in his Tshad-ma rnam-par ñes-pa'i mtshan-don (The meaning of the term pramāṇa-viniścaya), one Dan-'bag-pa Dar-ma bkra-śis in the lineage of Pramāṇa-viniścaya and most probably Dar-ma bkra-śis is same and identical with Smra-ba'i seṅ-ge. Anyway, 'Gos lo-tsā-ba says that he had seen other works composed by Dan-'bag-pa except an "Abridgement of logic" (Tshad-ma'i bsdus-pa) by

him and a commentary on Anuttaratantra. 'Gos lo-tsa-ba is sure that Dan-bag-pa had composed many refutations of acarya Cha-ba's theory about the endlessness of Time and the infinity of atoms.⁽¹⁶⁾

The Classical Tibetan work of the 13th century has been produced by the fifth grand lama of the Sa-skya monastery, the celebrated Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251). It is a short treatise⁽¹⁷⁾ in mnemonic verse with the author's own commentary.⁽¹⁸⁾ Its title is Tshad-ma rigs-pa'i gter (Pramāṇa-yukti-nidhi). It was strongly criticised by the late logicians of the Yellow School.⁽¹⁹⁾

His pupil U-yug-pa Rigs-pa'i seṅ-ge⁽²⁰⁾ (13th cen.) composed a detailed commentary on the whole of Pramāṇa-vartika. This work is held in very high esteem by the Tibetans. 'Gos lo-tsa-ba writes⁽²¹⁾: U-yug-pa [Bsod-nams seṅ-ge], the disciple of 'Jañ-ba ston-skyabs heard (the exposition) of Pramāṇa-vartika from Sa-skya paṇ-chen at Sa-skya. Thanks to his teaching, there appeared numerous disciples, including the great scholar Zhañ Mdo-sde-dpal and others. The spread of Pramāṇa-vartika up to the present time [i.e. 'Gos lo-tsa-ba's year of completion of his history book, 1478] is due to Pan-chen and him. In my younger days [i.e. around first decade of the 15th century] the inmates of Gsañ-phu used to study Pramāṇa-viniscaya, but now-a-days they have changed over to Pramāṇa-vartika.

At the very time of U-yug-pa, another Tibetan scholar named 'Jam-dbyaṅs gsar-ma⁽²²⁾ appears to have composed a commentary on Pramāṇa-viniscaya.⁽²³⁾

An extensive commentary on Pramāṇa-viniścaya was composed by the famous historian and writer Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub (1290-1365). Its title is Tshad-ma mnam-par ñes-pa'i tik tshig-don rab-gsal⁽²⁴⁾. Bu-ston also composed a small tract⁽²⁵⁾ on the meaning of the term pramāṇa-viniscaya.

Mahapandita Btsun-pa 'Jam-dbyaṅs⁽²⁶⁾ ('Jam-pa'i dbyaṅs), a disciple of the famous scholar Bcom-ldan rigs-pa'i ral-'gri⁽²⁷⁾, became the court chaplain (mchod-gnas) of Buyantu-qan (1311-1320), a Mongol prince. There

he wrote a short commentary on the *Pramāṇa-viniscaya*.⁽²⁸⁾

The last writer of this old period was Red-mda'-pa Gzhon-nu blo-gros (1349-1412). He was the teacher of Tsoñ-kha-pa and the author of an independent work on the general tendency of Dignāga's system.⁽²⁹⁾

The literature of the new period can be divided into systematical works and school manuals. We here shall try to concentrate in systematical works only.

The first writer of this period was Tsoñ-kha-pa (1357-1419). He was the greatest reformer of Tibet though himself wrote only a short introduction to the study of the Seven Treatises⁽³⁰⁾ of Dharmakīrti. The title of that work is Sde-bdun-la 'jug-pa'i sgo don-gñer yid-kyi mun-sel⁽³¹⁾.

Tsoñ-kha-pa's three disciples Rgyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen (1364-1432), Mkhas-grub Dge-legs dpal-bzañ-po (1385-1438) and Dge-'dun-grub (1391-1474) surpassed their preceptor in writing on logic, since they composed commentaries almost on every work of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti.

Rgyal-tshab composed detailed commentaries on *Pramāṇa-vārtika*, *Pramāṇa-viniscaya*, and *Nyāyabindu*, all of Dharmakīrti and *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* of Dignāga. Those bear the titles *Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi tshig-le'ur byas-pa'i rnam-bsad thar-lam phyin-ci ma-log-par gsal-bar byed-pa*⁽³²⁾, *Bstan-bcos tshad-ma rnam-nes-kyi tik-chen dgons-pa rab-gsal*,⁽³³⁾ *Tshad-ma rigs-thigs-kyi 'grel-pa legs-bsad shñi-po'i gter*⁽³⁴⁾ and *Tshad-ma mdo'i rnam-bsad*⁽³⁵⁾ respectively.

Other important work of Rgyal-tshab is a commentary⁽³⁶⁾ on the treatise *Tshad-ma rigs-pa'i gter* of Sa-skya paṇḍita. Its title is *Tshad-ma rigs-gter-gyi rnam-bsad legs-par bsad-pa'i shñi-po* but generally known by its short title *Rigs-gter dar-tik*. One summary⁽³⁷⁾ of *Pramāṇa-vārtika* and other small related works⁽³⁸⁾ were also composed by him. Original treatises of Rgyal-tshab includes *Tshad-ma'i lam-khrid*⁽³⁹⁾ on Introduction to logic, *'Gal-'brel-gyi rnam-gzhag*⁽⁴⁰⁾ on Separation and relation which are the important topics of discussion in Buddhist logic, and *Phyogs-sgra 'jug-tshul nuñ-ñu*⁽⁴¹⁾ on

the use of propositional word.

Mkhas-grub wrote a very detailed commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika, with the sub-title Rig-pa'i rgya-mtsho⁽⁴²⁾. An annotative work on the Seven Treatises of Dharmakīrti was another treatise composed by him. Its title is Tshad-ma sde-bdun-gyi rgyan yid-kyi mun-sel⁽⁴³⁾. His one independent work, Tshad-'bras-kyi rnam-bad chen-mo⁽⁴⁴⁾ deals with the source of valid knowledge and its effect.

Dge-'dun-grub was the first who acquired the post of religio-political supremacy in Tibet, i.e. he was the first Dalai Lama. He composed a commentary⁽⁴⁵⁾ on Pramāṇa-vārtika in 1432. Tshad-ma rigs-rgyan⁽⁴⁶⁾ was an independent work written by him in 1437.

Thaṅ bla-ma thor-god 'Jam-dbyaṅs ses-rab sbyin-pa wrote two small works, one summary⁽⁴⁷⁾ of Pramāṇa-vārtika and a commentary on inference for one's own sake⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Spyan-sṅa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan, a close disciple of Mkhas-grub wrote a treatise named Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-la brten-pa'i lta-khrid⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Paṅ-chen Bsod-nams grags-pa (1478-1554) wrote a commentary⁽⁵⁰⁾ on Pramāṇa-vārtika.

Padma dkar-po⁽⁵¹⁾ (1527-1592), a giant figure of the Tibetan academic world wrote two works, one detailed and the other brief, on the contention of Pramāṇa-samuccaya of Dignāga and Seven Treatises of Dharmakīrti. The titles of those two works are Tshad-ma mdo daṅ sde-bdun-gyi don gtan-la phab-pa'i bstan-bcos rje-btsun 'jam-pa'i dbyaṅs-kyi dgoṅs-rgyan⁽⁵²⁾ and Tshad-ma'i mdo sde-bdun daṅ bcas-pa'i spyi-don rigs-pa'i sñiṅ-po zhes-bya-ba⁽⁵³⁾.

The celebrated grand lama 'Jam-dbyans-bzhad-pa Ṅag-dban brtson-'grus (1648-1722) was an extraordinary man to write a whole library of works on every department of Buddhist learning. He was a native of Amdo in

Eastern Tibet. He composed a commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika.

Sum-pa mkhan-po Ye-ses dpal-'byor (1709-1786), a great historian, also touched the subject with his Tshad-ma sde-bdun-gyi sñiñ-nor dan grub-mtha'i rnam-bzhag huñ-'dus⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Klon-rdol bla-ma Ņag-dbañ blo-bzañ (b. 1719) was an erudite scholar and writer of a number of important texts on different subjects. He wrote Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-sogs gtan-tshigs rig-pa-las byuñ-ba'i miñ-gi grañs⁽⁵⁵⁾ containing explanation of important technical terms in Pramāṇa-vārtika and other treatises on logic.

The third Panchen Lama Blo-bzañ dpal-ldan ye-ses (1737-1780) was a renowned scholar who wrote a commentary⁽⁵⁶⁾ on Tshad-ma rigs-rgyan of Dge-'dun-grub. He also wrote a small tract⁽⁵⁷⁾ on Pramāṇa-vārtika.

Rje smon-lam dpal-ba [Blo-bzan sbyin-pa, b. 1820]⁽⁵⁸⁾ composed a detailed commentary⁽⁵⁹⁾ on Pramāṇa-vārtika.

Unabating culture of Buddhist logic or rather specifically the culture of Rnam-'grel (Pramāṇa-vārtika) is observed in Tibet. Stcherbatsky also did not have the different experience and that is why wrote "The literary production in this field has never stopped and is going on up to the present time. The quantity of works printed in all the monastic printing offices of Tibet (and also Mongolia) is enormous."

V. Schools followed in Tibetan logical literature

Buddhist philosophy in India is broadly divided into four schools, namely, "Mādhyamika" - advocating the philosophy of voidness of everything, "Yogācāra" - advocating the philosophy of voidness of only external things, "Sautrāntika" - advocating the philosophy of inferable existence of external things, and "Vaibhāṣika" - advocating the philosophy of perceivable existence of external things. The Indian logicians composed treatises following their respective philosophical lines they belonged to. Thus, we see the works of Nāgārjuna and others follow Mādhyamika school;

the works of Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and others follow Yogācāra school: the works of Sāntarakṣita, Kamalaśīla and others follow Sautrāntika school and the works of Śubhagupta and others follow Vaibhāṣika school.

The picture of the world of Tibetan logical literature is different. Though translations of the Indian logical works of all the four schools are available in Tibetan, the subsequent Tibetan scholars followed only two systems among them, "Mādhyamika" and "Yogācāra". Mādhyamika system in Tibet, as in India, flourished in a separate line of study. And yogācāra system is kept up in Tibet through the study of Pramāṇa-viniścaya (Rnam-ñes) and Pramāṇa-vārtika (Rnam-'grel). Rnam-'grel⁽¹⁾ was later reckoned as sole text under the subject called Buddhist logic or rather logic (tshad-ma) in specific sense.

In the exposition of Rnam-'grel, there are different schools seen to have been followed by the Tibetan logicians. Mkhas-grub Dge-legs dpal-bzang-po belonged to the "Philological school" to which belonged the Indian commentators Devendrabuddhi and Śākyabuddhi.⁽²⁾ Rgyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen belonged to the "Critical school" of Kashmir, to which belonged the Indian commentator Śaṅkarānanda.⁽³⁾ No continuation of "Religious school" of Bengal, to which belonged the Indian commentator Prajñakara-gupta and sub-commentators Ravigupta, Jina and Yamāri, is seen in Tibet.⁽⁴⁾

VI. Importance of the Tibetan logical literature

Tibetan logical literature is as it comprises the translations of Indian works on logic on the one hand, and numerous original Tibetan commentaries mainly on Rnam-'grel (Pramāṇa-vārtika) on the other, with also a very few independent treatises on the subject. Among these Rnam-'grel was so popular and pervading in Tibet that the majority of scholastic brains were engaged in writing only lengthy commentaries on it. Hence Stcherbatsky writes: "Substantially logic has hardly made any great progress in Tibet. Dharmakīrti had given it its final form".⁽¹⁾

Despite his statement like that Stcherbatsky did not fully deny the credit of the Tibetan scholars in creation of some new ideas in logic.

Following is an instance:

Dharmakirti's "position in Tibet can be compared with the position of Aristotle in European logic. The Tibetan logical literature will then be compared to the European mediaeval scholastic literature. Its chief preoccupation consisted in an extreme precision and scholastical subtlety of all definitions and in reducing every scientific thought to the three terms of a regular syllogism. The form of the propositions in which the syllogism can be expressed is irrelevant, important are only the three terms."

Adoption of a new method in syllogism may claim importance for the Tibetan logic. "The concatenation of thoughts in a discourse consists in supporting every syllogism by a further syllogism. The reason of the first syllogism becomes then the major term of the second one and so on, until the first principles are reached. The concatenation then receives the following form: If there is S there is P, because there is M; this is really so (i.e. there is really M), because there is N; this again is really so because there is O, and so on. Every one of these reasons can be rejected by the opponent either as wrong or as uncertain. A special literary style has been created for the brief formulation of such a chain of reasoning, it is called the method of "sequence and reason" and its establishment is ascribed to the lama Cha-ba Chos-kyi sen-ge."⁽²⁾

Moreover, Tibetan logical literature highlights many philosophical problems in Tibet, which are no less interesting in the Indian context. For example: 'Jam-dbyans bzhad-pa's Blo-rigs contains a vivid picture of the controversies that raged in Tibet on the interesting problem of a gap between a simple reflex and a constructed mental image.⁽³⁾

Anyway, immense importance is given to the Tibetan logical literature for the very translation works where the best achievements of Indian philosophy in the golden age of Indian civilisation are faithfully preserved. Those translations are considered much more important for India than for Tibet. Study on those has revealed many things of the hidden treasure of Indian philosophy in many ways. In fact, we would have been in complete darkness for a glorious period of Buddhist scholasticism, if we would not get those translation works, the original treatises of which were lost due to various causes.

NOTES (Part One)

1. BL - I, pp. 1-13.
2. A Cultural History of Tibet, pp. 78-9.
3. BA, p. 70.
4. HB - I, pp. 44-46.

"The sciences of logic and of grammar (and literature) are studied in order to vanquish one's adversaries in controversy....

"A Logician is to be recognized

by his disposition to argue, by analysis and discussion of matters,
by practice, obtained in former births, by non-perception of the Absolute Truth, and by having no recourse to scripture.

5. BL - I, p. 46.

(Part Two)

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 1. Dignāga | : 400-480 (according to Nakamura), 480-540
(according to Frauwallner). |
| Dharmakīrti | : c. 650 (according to Nakamura), 600-660
(according to Frauwallner). |
| Devendrabuddhi | : 630-690 (according to Frauwallner). |
| Śākyabuddhi | : 660-720 (according to Frauwallner). |
| Śubhagupta | : 640-700 (according to Embar Krishna -
macharya), c. 650-750 (according to Nakamura). |
| Vinītadeva | : 8th century. |
| Jinendrabuddhi | : 8th century. 800-850 (according to Dinesh
Bhattacharya). |
| Śāntarakṣita | : c. 680-740 (according to Nakamura), 705-762
(according to Embar Krishnamacharya). But
Śāntarakṣita's death appears to be still later |

because he was reportedly present in the great debate held at Bsam-yas monastery of Tibet about 792 A.D.

Kamalaśīla : c. 700-750 (according to Nakamura), 713-763 onwards (according to EmbarKrishnamacharya). But his death appears to be still later, because he skillfully defended the moralistic view expressed by his preceptor Sāntarakṣita in the great debate in Tibet.

Dharmottara : 730-800 (according to Nakamura), 750-810 (according to Frauwallner).

Muktākalaśa : After 900 (according to Satish C. Vidyabhusan).

Arcata alias

Dharmākaradatta : 730-790 (according to Frauwallner).

Prajñākara Gupta : early 10th century (according to Dinesh Bhattacharya).

Jitāri : c. 940-980 (according to Nakamura).

Jina : 940 (according to Satish C. Vidyabhusan).

Ravigupta : After 950.

Ratnavajra : 983 (according to Satish C. Vidyabhusan).

Jñānasrimitra : Between 975-1000 (according to Nakamura), 982-1055 (according to Dinesh Bhattacharya).

Jñānasribhadra : c. 925 (according to Nakamura).

Ratnākaraśānti : 1040 (according to Nakamura).

Yamāri : 1050 (according to Satish C. Vidyabhusan).

Samkarananda : 1050 (according to Satish C. Vidyabhusan).

Mokṣākaragupta : Between 1050-1202 (according to Nakamura).

2. Later translation was done by Rñog lo-tṣā-ba with the help of the Indian pandita Sumatikirti.

3. BA, p. 70.

4. This was subsequently twice translated, first by Bhavyarāja and Blo-ldan śes-rab (1059-1109), and finally by Śākyaśrībhadra (1127-1225) and Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1181-1250).
5. Colophon of the Tibetan text shows that Dīpaṅkara (982-1054) and the Tibetan interpreter Dar-ma-grags corrected the translation. By this, it is supposed that by 1054, the translation of this difficult text was already completed when Rma lo-tśā-ba did not even cross the age of 10 years.
6. According to Tāranātha (HOB, p.239), the story goes regarding the composition of Pramāṇa-vārtika-pañjikā: Dharmakīrti chose Devendrabuddhi to write a commentary on his Pramāṇa-vārtika. After Devendrabuddhi had finished the commentary for the first time and had shown it to Dharmakīrti, the latter erased it with water. After he had compiled it a second time, Dharmakīrti burnt it in fire. He then compiled it a third time and gave it to Dharmakīrti with the observation "Since the majority of the people are incompetent and time is fleeting, I have written this commentary for the people of lighter understanding." This time Dharmakīrti allowed the work to exist.
7. BA, p. 70.
8. BA, p. 326.
9. Later, the work was retranslated by 'Phags-pa śes-rab with the help of Kumārasrī of Kashmir.

Before the translation of Rñog-lo-tśā-ba, one famous Zans-dkar lo-tśā-ba translated Pramāṇa-vārtika-alamkāra. [See BA, p. 70]

10. Sanskrit manuscripts of 12 works of Jñānaśrimitra have been discovered by Rahul Samkrityayan from Tibet. Apart from Karyakaraṇasiddhi, the rest are: Kṣaṇabhaṅgadhyaḥ, Vyāptīcarcā, Bhedaḥbheda-parīkṣa, Anupalabdhirahasya, Sarvasābdābhāva-carcā, Apohaprakaraṇa, Īśvaravāda, Yoginirṇayaprakaraṇa, Advaitabindu prakaraṇa, Sākārasiddhisāstra and Sākārasaṃgrahasūtra.

11. There was one Dīpaṃkararakṣita in the 11th century. He was well-known by the names Bal-po thugs-rje chen-po or Paṅ-chen me-tsa liñ-pa. Going to Tibet he bestowed Yoga to Zaṅs-dkar lo-tsa-ba. Then that Lo-tsa-ba translated the commentary of Anuttarayoga (Yo-ga-smad). Dīpaṃkararakṣita was also the teacher of Rva lo-tsa-ba.

[Indian and Tibetan Scholars who visited Tibet and India from the 7th to the 17th century A.D.]

12. The Kashmirian pandita Śākyaśrībhadra (1127-1225) went to madhyadeśa and received upasampadā from Śāntyaṅkaragupta in 1156. [KLT, p. 174]
13. The translators are not found in Tanjur. But Rahulji mentions Dpal-brtsegs and Prajñāvarman as its translators in his Pramāṇa-vārtika-bhāṣya (p. ṇa).
14. It is same with Vaidalya-sūtra and Prakaraṇa. The Vaidalya-prakaraṇa is evidently spurious. [BL - I, pp. 28, 559]

(Part Three)

1. Dbu-ma (Mdhyaṃika philosophy), Phar-phyin (Tson-kha-pa's commentary on Ser-phyin i.e. Prajñāpāramitā), (Dul-ba' Vinaya), Mñon-mdzod (Abhidharmakośa of Vasubandhu) and Rnam-'grel (Pramāṇa-vārtika of Dharmakīrti).
2. Buddhist logic in Tibet, in one way, means nothing but the study of a logical text of Dharmakīrti, named Pramāṇavārtika which, in Tibetan, is called Tshad-ma rnam-'grel or more briefly Rnam-'grel.
3. BL - I, p. 56.
4. MHTL-III, p. 671. See the syllabus of Dkyil-khañ school of Bkra-sis lhun-po.
5. Same as that were taught in Blo-gsal-glin school of 'Bras-spun's monastery.

We see that Dga'-ldan 'nag-roñ sār-rtse school published one exposition of all

the four chapters of Rnam-'grel, having 117 fols., 50 fols., 113 fols., and 52 fols. consecutively. See MHTL - III, p. 671.

6. Bsod-grags's exposition of Rnam-'grel contains 117 fols., 115 fols., 42 fols., and 84 fols. for the four consecutive chapters. Besides, two other texts of the same author, one Blo-rig (for the exercise of intellect) and one Rtags-rig (for the proper understanding of inferential signs) were also taught. See MHTL - III, p. 668.
7. 'Jam-dbyaṅs bzhad-pa's Exposition of Rnam-'grel contains 268 fols. for the first chapter and 107 fols. for the second chapter. Blo-rig (25 fols.) and Rtags-rig (45 fols.) also were included in the syllabus. See MHTL - III, p. 669-70.
8. This Bsdus-grava contains 135 fols. See MHTL - III, p. 669.
9. See later, for the syllabus of Snē-thaṅ Rva-ba-stod monastery.
10. Byes means 'abroad, foreign country'. Many of the monks in the Se-ra-byes school were from Mongolia or territories of Greater Tibet like Khams and Amdo. [MHTL - III, p. 13]
11. Full name of this school is Se-ra smad thos-bsam nor-bu glin.
12. Rje-btsun-pa Chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan became head of the Se-ra-byes school in 1511. In 1537 he became Mkhan-po of Se-ra.
13. This information is supplied by my Venerable teacher Ācārya Padma brtson-'grus, now the Tibetan teacher of Calcutta University.
14. "Thos-bsam-glin paṅ-chen bsod-nams nam-rgyal-gyi nam-'grel le'u bzhi'i spyi-don daṅ mtha'-gcod.
Thos-glin byaṅ-ston blo-gros rgya-mtsho'i nam-'grel lta-ba'i me-loṅ daṅ le'u daṅ-po'i mtha'-dpyod legs-bśad 'phreṅ-ba.
Thos-glin kun-mkhyen chos-'byor dpal-bzaṅ-gi nam-'grel mkhas-pa'i mgul-

rgyan dan mtha'-gcod. Thos-glin sañs-rgyal dpal-rin-gyi nam-'grel rin-chen gter-mdzod.

Thos-glin dri-med bśes-gñen-gyi nam-'grel yid-bzhin nor-bu.

Thos-glin blo-bzan bśes-gñen-gyi rig-rgyan.

Thos-glin dge-'dun bsam-'grub-kyi blo-gros kha-byañ.

Thos-glin dge-'dun blo-bzañ-gis le'u-bzhi'i mtha'-gcod."

[MHTL - III, p. 664]

15. "Rnam-'grel smon-ñik.

Bstan-pa dar-bzañ-gi nam-'grel luñ-rig gter mdzod. 'Dul-'dzin blo-gros sbas-pas mdzad-pa'i le'u dan-poi'mtha'-gcod klag-pas don-'grub.

Le'u gñis-pa'i mtha'-gcod nor-bu'i 'phreñ-ba yin. Des mdzad-pa'i spyir yig-cha mañ.

Blo-gros sbas-pa'i nam-'grel le'u bzhi-ka'i spyi-don."

[MHTL - III, p. 664]

16. "Sar-rtse kun-mkhyen legs-pa don-grub-kyi nam-'grel."

[MHTL - III, p. 665]

17. It is situated in Sné-than, near Lhasa. This monastery is also called Stag-tshañ Rva-ba-stod.

18. He recieved upasampadā under Dpal-'byor rgya-mtsho in 1593, became the judge of philosophical debate ('chad-ñan-pa) in the Rva-ba-stod monastery in 1602, became Head of the Rgyud-stod monastery in 1612, became Head of the Rin-chen-glin in 1613, became Head of the Gsañ-phu in 1619, became Head of the Rdziñ-phyi in 1620, became Mkhan-po of Blo-gsal-glin in 1623, became Head (35th) of the Dga'-ldan in 1626 and became the preceptor of the Dalai Lama in 1627.

19. "Sañs-pa kun-mkhyen mchog-lha 'od-zer-gyis mdzad-pa'i nam-'grel le'u dan-poi'i nor-bu'i phreñ-ba. (100 fols.) Le'u gñis-pa'i lugs-'byuñ rin-chen bañ-mdzod.

(33 fols.) Lugs-ldog legs-bsad bañ-mdzod. (23 fols.) Le'u gsum-pa lun-rig sgo-brgya. (113 fols.) Le'u bzhi-pa thar-lam gsal-ba'i dgoñs-rgyan. (76 fols.) Dkon-mchog chos-'phel nam-'grel le'u so-so'i zur-bkol ño-mtshar gces bsdus. Le'u dan-po'i sbyor-tik.

Gra-chuñ-ba yon-tan rgya-mtshos mdzad-pa'i nam-'grel ñi-ma'i 'od-zer le'u bzhi tshañ-ma.

Rje śes-rab señ-ge'i gsuñ-bzhin zin-bris mdzad-pa'i nam-'grel thar-lam gsal-byed ñi-ma'i 'od-zer le'u bzhi tshañ-ma.

Glin-smad ñag-dbañ dpal-'byor-gyi rtags-rig gsal-ba'i me-lon. (24 fols.)

Druñ-chen legs-pa bzañ-po'i blo-rig. (30 fols.)"

— The above complete set of logical texts is called Rva-ba-stod bsdus-grva. One such set is being preserved in Bkra-sis sgo-man school of the 'Bras-spuñ monastery.

[MHTL - III, p. 665]

20. No sects appear to have existed prior to Glan-dar-ma's persecution, nor till more than a century and a half later. The sectarian movement seems to date from the Reformation started by the Indian Buddhist monk Atiśa, who, as we have seen, visited Tibet in 1042 A.D.

Atiśa while clinging to Yoga and Tantrism, at once began a reformation on the lines of the purer Mahāyāna system, by enforcing celibacy and high morality, and by deprecating the general practice of the diabolic arts. Perhaps the time was now ripe for the reform, as the Lamas had become a large and influential body, and possessed a fairly full and scholarly translation of the bulky Mahāyāna Canon and its commentaries, which taught a doctrine different from that then practised in Tibet.

The first of the reformed sects and the one with which Atisa most intimately identified himself was called the Bka'-gdams-pa, or "those

bound by the orders (Commandments)"; and it ultimately, three and a half centuries later, in Tsoñ-kha-pa's hands, became less ascetic and more highly ritualistic under the title of "The Virtuous Style", Dge-lugs-pa, now the dominant sect in Tibet, and the Established Church of Lamaism.

The rise of the Bka'-gdams-pa (Dge-lugs-pa) sect was soon followed by the semi-reformed movements of Bka'-brgyud-pa and Sa-skya-pa, which were directly based in great measure on Atiśa's teaching. The founders of these two sects had been his pupils, and their new sects may be regarded as semi-reformations adapted for those individuals who found his high standard too irksome, and too free from their familiar demonolatry.

The residue who remained wholly unreformed and weakened by the loss of their best members, were now called the Rñin-ma-pa or "the Old one", or "Unreformed", as they adhered to the old practices.

[BLT, pp. 54-56]

21. BLT, pp. 212-221.

22. BLT, pp. 184-5.

(Part Four)

1. BA, p. 70.

2. Perhaps he has been called also by the name of Khyuñ-po grags-pa. See BA, p. 93.

"Though there exists an account that Khyuñ-po grags-se had studied the 'Old Nyaya', and had left behind numerous disciples, it is not sure whether the 'Old Nyāya', which had been studied by him, had not originated from Khams and Mña'-ris, from a translation of Devendrabuddhi's commentary by Rma lo-tsä-ba."

[BA, p. 71]

3. BA, p. 698.
4. BA, p. 332.
5. Other disciples were the great pandita Cog-ro Chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan, Dpal Phag-mo gru-pa, 'Bal Tshad-ma-pa, Skyil-mkhar lha-khañ-pa, Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa.

[BA, p. 332]

6. BA, p. 331.
7. Most of the Piṭakadhara-s of that time had been his disciples. Gtsaṅ-nag-pa Brtson-'grus seṅ-ge, Dan'bag-pa Smra-ba'i seṅ-ge (Dan'bag, near 'Bras-spun), Bru-sa Bsod-nams seṅ-ge (Bru-sa, Gilgit), Rma-bya Rtsod-pa'i seṅ-ge (Rma-bya, near Sa-skya), Rtsags Dbañ-phyug seṅ-ge, Myan-bran Chos-kyi seṅ-ge, Ldan-ma Dkon-mchog seṅ-ge and Gñal-pa Yon-tan seṅ-ge — the "Eight mighty lions" (Seṅ-chen brgyad). Some include (among them) Gtsaṅ-pa 'Jam-dpal seṅ-ge. 'Khon Jo-sras Rtse-mo, Rñog Jo-sras Ra-mo, Khu Jo-sras Ne-tso, Gños Jo-sras Dpal-le — these four were called "The Four Jo-sras". 'Gar Dbañ-grub, Koñ-po 'Jag-chuñ, Lho-pa Sgog-zan and Bar-pu-pa — these four were called "The Four Wise Ones" (Ses-rab-can bzhi). Further 'Jañ-pa Ston-skyabs, Rdo-rje 'od-zer and others. Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa, Zhañ 'Tshal-pa, as well as many others.

[BA, p. 333]

8. Commentaries on the Five Treatises of Maitreya, Satyadvaya-vibhaṅgakārikā, Mādhyamakālaṃkārikā, Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra and other texts, as well as respective abridgements of them were composed by Cha-ba.

[BA, p. 332]

9. Roerich informs: There exist several well-known texts of the same title written by various authors, but the text by Cha-ba is not extant at present.

[See BA, p. 333]

10. BA, p. 333.
11. BA, p. 334. He wrote many refutations of the works of ācārya Candrakīrti the celebrated commentator on Mūlamadhyamakakārikā of Nāgārjuna.
12. BL, p. 55.
13. BA, p. 349.
14. BA, p. 334.
15. Here Roerich informs: There exists a printed edition of his work Roñ-wo. See BA, p. 334.
16. BA, p. 334.
17. A xylograph copy of it is in the possession of the writer of the present article. It contains 47 fols. of small format. It is divided into 11 chapters. Those are the following: 1) Yul brtag-pa, 2b1-5a4 (Viśaya-parīkṣā), 2) Blo-brtag-pa, 5a4-7b1 (Buddhi-parīkṣā), 3) Spyī dan bye-brag brtag-pa, 7b1-9a1 (Sāmānya-viśeṣa-parīkṣā), 4) Sgrub-pa dan gzhan-sel brtag-pa, 9a1-13b1 (Sādhana-anyāpoha-parīkṣā), 5) Brjod-bya dan rjod-byed brtag-pa, 13b1-15b6 (Vācya-vācaka-parīkṣā), 6) 'Brel-pa brtag-pa, 15b6-21a3 (Sambandha-parīkṣā), 7) 'Gal-ba brtag-pa, 21a3-23b1 (Virodha-parīkṣā), 8) Mtshan-nid brtag-pa, 23b1-29a2 (Lakṣaṇa-parīkṣā), 9) Mn̄on-sum brtag-pa, 29a2-32b3 (Pratyakṣa-parīkṣā), 10) Rañ-don rjes-dpag brtag-pa, 32b4-40b5 (Svārthanūmāna-parīkṣā), and 11) Gzhan-don rjes-su dpag-pa brtag-pa, 40b5-45b2 (Parārthanūmāna-parīkṣā).
18. A xylograph copy of it is in the possession of the writer of the present article. Its title is Tshad-ma rigs-pa'i gter-kyi legs-bsad bzañ-po gsumldan ces-bya-ba (Pramāṇa-yukti-nidhi-subhāṣita-bhadraka-tritayī-nāma) and contains 161 fols. of medium format.
19. BA, pp. 808-9.
20. Though the name of the scholar U-yug-pa Rigs-pa'i seṅ-ge is clearly mentioned by Stcherbatsky in his Buddhist Logic (Vol. I, p. 56), the

verification of the Blue Annals (p. 335) confirms the name of the scholar as U-yug-pa Bsod-nams sen-ge.

21. BA, p. 335.
22. One of his disciples was Kun-mkhyen Chos-sku 'od-zer. 'Jam-dbyaṅs gsar-ma founded a school at Skyaṅ-'dur which had many monks. He in his later life founded a philosophical school. See BA, p. 335.
23. BA, p. 336.
24. The work consists of 301 folios and is included in the 24th (Ya) volume of the Collected Works of Bu-ston (Dalai Lama XIII's edition).
25. Tshad-ma rnam-par ṅes-pa'i tshan-don (5 fols.). It is included in the 24th (Ya) volume of the Collected Works of Bu-ston (Dalai Lama XIII's edition).
26. He was the first scholar who felt the necessity of collecting the translations of the Indian texts and worked successfully. See BA, p. 338.
27. Rig-ral, a native of Pu-than became a monk in the monastery of Mchod-rten dkar-mo of Bsam-yas. He was an opponent of the Kālacakra system which he considered to be a non-Buddhist system. Another famous opponent was Red-mda'-pa. See BA, pp. 336-9.
28. BA, pp. 335-6.
29. BL, p. 56.
30. Pramāṇa-vārtika (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel), Pramāṇa-viniścaya (Tshad-ma rnam-ṅes), Nyāyabindu (Rigs-thigs), Sambandha-parīkṣā ('Brel-pa rtags-pa), Vādanyāya (Rtsod-pa rigs-pa), Santānāntara-siddhi (Rgyud-gzhan grub-pa) and Hetubindu (Gtan-tshigs thigs-pa).
31. It contains 25 fols. and is included in the 18th (Tsha) volume of the Collected Works of Tson-kha-pa (Bkra-śis lhun-po edition.).
32. It contains 408 fols. and is included in the 6th (Cha) volume of the Collected Works of his preceptor Tson-kha-pa. Short title of the work is

Rnam-'grel thar-lam gsal-byed. Author composed it at the request of Gnas-rñin-pa Rin-chen rgyal-mtshan. (See NL Tib. ms. No. 74)

33. It has two volumes, upper and lower. Upper vol. (307 fols.) is included in the 7th (Ja) volume of the Collected Works of the author. Lower vol. (260 fols.) is included in the next volume of the Collected Works. (Bkra-sis lhun-po edition). This was written at the inspiration of 'Broñ-rtse lha-btsun. Short title of the work is Rnam-ñes Dgons-pa rab-gsal.
34. It contains 63 fols. and is included in the 8th (Na) volume of the Collected Works of Tson-kha-pa. It was written at the inspiration of 'Broñ-rtse lha-btsun. Kloñ-rdol bla-ma mentions the text with a different subtitle Rin-chen gter-mdzod. For the last information see MHTL-III, p. 618.
35. See NL Tib. ms. No. 59/3. Kloñ-rdol mentions the text with the subtitle Mthar-'dzin gduñ-sel. See MHTL-III, p. 618.
36. See BL - II, P. 325.

'Brel-pa rtag-pa'i rnam-bsad 'ni-ma'i sñin-po (14 fols.): A text on Sambandha-parikṣā of Dharmakīrti. See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/8.
37. Rnam-'grel-gyi bsdus-don thar-lam-gyi de-ñid gsal-byed (92 fols.). See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/5. (?) Same with the text Lha-dbañ-blo'i rjes-su 'brañ-pa'i rnam-'grel-gyi sa-bcad chen-mo, as mentioned by Kloñ-rdol bla-ma. See MHTL-III, p. 618.⁽³⁸⁾
38. Tshad-ma'i brjed-byañ chen-mo (47 fols.), Tshad-ma mñon-sum le'ui brjed-byañ chen-po (55 fols.), Tshad -ma mñon-sum le'u'i tikka (102 fols.), as mentioned by Kloñ-rdol. See MHTL-III, p. 617. For the first text mentioned above (containing 43 fols.) see NL Tib. ms. No. 59/4.
39. It contains 22 fols. See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/9. Tshad-ma lam-sgrig is mentioned by Kloñ-rdol. See MHTL-III, p. 618.
40. It contains 10 fols. See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/10.
41. Mentioned by Kloñ-rdol. See MHTL-III, p. 618.

42. Ka (1st chapter: Rañ-don) Rgyas-pa'i bstan-bcos tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi rgya-cher bsad-pa rig-pa'i rgya-mtsho las rañ-don le'u'i rnam-bsad. 177 fols. Kha (2nd chapter: Tshad-ma grub-pa) Le'u gn̄is-pa rgya-cher bsad-pa rig-pa'i rgya-mtsho. 94 fols. Ga (3rd chapter: Mn̄on-sum) Rgya-pa'i ... las mn̄on-sum le'u'i rnam-bsad. 195 fols. Na (4th chapter: Gzhan-don) Rgyas-pa'i ... las gzhan-don le'u'i rnam-bsad. 119 fols.

(One bundle. Bkra-sis lhun-po edition) See NL Tib. ms. No. 52. Another edition of this Tshad-ma rig-pa'i rgya-mtsho is also available in CU. S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 460/2-4).

43. It contains 192 fols. See NL Tib. ms. No. 27/3. Another edition of it also is available in 238 fols.
44. See MHTL-III, p. 619.
45. (Ka: 1st chapter) Tshad-ma rnam-'grel legs-par bsad-pa zhes-bya-ba thams-cad mkhyen-pa dge-'dun-grub-kyis mdzad-pa las rañ-don rjes-su dpag-pa'i le'u'i rnam-bsad. 42 fols., (Kha: 2nd chapter) Tshad-ma ... las tshad-ma grub-pa'i le'u'i ... 36 fols., (Ga: 3rd chapter) Tshad-ma ... las mn̄on-sum le'u'i ... 64 fols. and (Na: 4th chapter) Tshad-ma ... las gzhan-don rjes-dpag-gi rnam-bsad. 46 fols. See NL Tib. ms. No. 48.

Perhaps another edition of the above text is also available since Klon-rdol shows the text as containing 230 fols. and being in the 4th (Na) volume of the Collected Works of the author. See MHTL-III, p. 622.

46. It contains 170 fols. and is included in the 4th volume of the Collected Works of the author, according to Klon-rdol. See MHTL-III, p. 622. A copy of the text is preserved in the CU. S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 327).
47. Tshad-ma rnam-'grel mdor-bsdus (25 fols.). See MHTL-III, p. 637.
48. Tshad-ma gzhan-med-kyi rnam-gzhag (23 fols.). See MHTL-III, p. 638.
49. See MHTL-III, p. 641.

50. It contains 360 fols. See MHTL-III, p. 629.
51. Year of birth is well-known. Year of death is taken from an article "The Buddhist Paintings and Iconography" - J. K. Rechung, published in Bulletin of Tibetology, New Series, 1990, Nos. 1-3.
52. It contains 94 fols. and comprises the 5th book of the 4th volume of the Collected Works of the author. See CU. S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 266/5).
53. It contains 39 fols. and comprises the 6th book of the 4th volume of the Collected Works of the author; See CU. S.C. Das Collection (TM No. 266/6).
54. It contains 29 fols. and is included in the 2nd (Kha) volume of the Collected Works of the author.
55. It contains 27 fols. and comprises the 14th (Pha) volume of the Collected Works of the author.
56. Rnam-'grel rig-rgyan mchod-brjod tikka (107 fols.). See MHTL-III, p. 657.
57. It contains 6 fols. See CU. S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 332/7).
58. From the autobiography called Dkyil-zur dka'-chen blo-bzan sbyin-pa'i spyod-tshul dran-po'i gtam-gyis gsal-bar brjod-pa rin-chen dba'ngi rgyal-po'i do-sal (NL Tib. ms. No. 100/8), it is known that the author wrote it in 1891 at the age of 71. The year of birth of the author, then, can easily be calculated to be 1820. He wrote the biography of the fourth Panchen Lama in 1883. See Tibetan Historical Literature, p. 197.
59. Rje smon-lam dpal-bas mdzad-pa'i le'u dan-po'i tikka (Ka, 1st chapter, 116 fols.); Le'u gn̄is-pa'i tikka (Kha, 2nd chapter, 68 fols.); Le'u gsum-pa'i tikka (Ga, 3rd chapter, 124 fols.) and Le'u bzhi-pa'i tikka (Na, 4th chapter, 103 fols.). See CU S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 340/1-4).

(Part Five)

1. The extraordinary predominance given to this work, is noteworthy. It is alone studied by everybody. Dharmakirti's other works, as well as the works of Dignaga, Dharmottara and other celebrated authors, are given much less attention and are even half forgotten by the majority of the learned lamas. The reason for that, according to Mr. Vostrikov, is the second chapter, in the traditional order of the chapters of Pramana-vartika, the chapter containing the vindication of Buddhism as a religion. The interest of the Tibetans in logic is, indeed, chiefly religious; logic is for them *ancilla religionis*. Dharmakirti's logic is an excellent weapon for a critical and dialectical destruction of all beliefs unwarranted by experience, but the second chapter of the Pramana-vartika leaves a loop-hole for the establishment of a critically purified belief in the existence of an Absolute and Omniscient Being. All other works of Dharmakirti, as well as the works of Vasubandhu, Dignaga and Dharmottara incline to a critically agnostic view in regard of an Omniscient Being identified with Buddha. BL-I, pp. 57-8.
2. BL-I, p. 46.
3. BL-I, p. 46.
4. BL-I, p. 47.

(Part Six)

1. BL-I, p. 58.
2. BL-I, p. 58.
3. BL-II, p. 313.

APPENDIX

(Original Tibetan commentaries produced in Mongolia)

1. Bicigeci chos-rje Nag-dban tshe-rin of Urga (1) wrote his works in fourteen volumes (Ka-Pha). The 400 folios of the 13th (Pa) volume are solely dedicated to the exposition on the three chapters of Pramana-vartika. Its title is Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi 'grel-ba rigs-pa'i bar mdzod ces-pa las le'u dan-po ran-don le'u'i rnam-bsad (202 fols.), ... Le'u'i gnis-pa'i rnam-bsad (148 fols.) and ... Le'u'i gsum-pa'i rnam-bsad rtsom-'phro (incomplete) (50 fols.).
 2. Bstan-dar lha-rams-pa (b. 1758) of the Alashan (2) -Olots is variously referred to as Smon-lam rab-'byams-pa Nag-dban bstan-dar, Smon-lam bla-ma, Alasa lha-rams-pa Nag-dban bstan-dar, A-lag-sa Bstan-dar lha-rams-pa and Nag-dban bstan-dar lha-rams-pa. He was eighty years of age when he published his Tibetan Mongolian Dictionary (139 fols.) in 1838 A.D. So his date of birth can be reckoned to 1758 A.D. In 1839 A.D. at the age of 81 he wrote a work on Blo-sbyon which confirms this date. His sumbum was xylographed at Kumbum. Each of the 3 works is indicated by a letter of the alphabet (Ka-chi).
(Ja) Dmigs-pa brtag-pa'i 'grel-ba mu-tig 'phren-mdzad (21 fols.) [Exposition of Alambana-pariksa of Dignaga]
(Na) Chos-kyi grags-pas mdzad-pa'i rgyud-gzhan grub-pa zhes-bya-ba'i bstan-bcos-kyi 'grel-pa mkhas-pa'i yid-'phrog (21 fols.) [Exposition of Santanantarasiddhi of Dharmakirti]
(Ki) Rnam-'grel rtsom-'phro (24 fols.) [An incomplete commentary on Pramana-vartika]
-
1. Urga had three famous schools, each specialising in a particular curriculum or yig-cha and each situated in a different direction
North Bkra-sis chos-'phel Sgo-man yig-cha
South Kun-dga' chos-glin Blo-gsal-glin yig-cha
West Yig-dga chos-'dzin Ser-byas yig-cha
 2. South-Mongolian dialect: Alarsan (Heissig, Blockdrucke, p. 164 n 4).
[MHTL-II, p. 21-2]

3. [Blo-bzan] 'jigs-med bstan-pa'i rgyal-mtshan (19th cen.) was the nom-un qan of Cin sujugu in Sayin noyan qan. His eight-volume sumbum (Collected Works) was xylographed in the Urga qosirun. The sixth volume contains the [Exposition of] Nyayabindu (31 fols.) with other philosophical works.
4. Mkhas-pa'i dban-po slob-dpon Bsod-nams rgya-mtsho came from the Sayin noyan qan qosirun. He was famous for his grammatical erudition. Seven volumes of his sumbum were xylographed in his qosirun and the eighth volume was handwritten.
Unxylographed last volume (Na) contains an exposition of Pramana-vartika

Abbreviations

- BA : (The) Blue Annals.
BL : Buddhist Logic
BLT : Buddhism and Lamaism of Tibet.
CU : Calcutta University
HB : History of Buddhism.
HOB : Taranatha's History of Buddhism in India.
KLT : Bstan-rtsis kun-las btus-pa
MHTL: Materials for the History of Tibetan Literature
NL : National Library, Calcutta.

Bibliography

(The) Blue Annals. G.N. Roerich. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1988.

Bstan-rtsis kun-las btus-pa. Tshe-brtan zhabs-drun. Mtsho-snon mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khan. China.

Buddhism and Lamaism of Tibet. L. A. Waddell. Asian Publishers.

Buddhist Logic. Vols. I & II. Th. Stcherbatsky. Dover Publications.

(A) Cultural History of Tibet. David Snellgrove and Hugh Richardson. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1968.

(A) History of Indian Logic. S.C. Vidyabhusana. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1978.

History of Buddhism. Bu-ston. 2 vols. Tr. from Tibetan by D. E. Obermiller. Heidelberg, 1931-32.

Indian and Tibetan Scholars who visited Tibet and India from the 7th to the 17th century A.D. Tibetan Educational Printing Press, Kashmir House, Dharmasala, Kangra (H.P.), 1968.

Materials for the History of Tibetan Literature. 3 vols. L. Chandra. Delhi. (Satapitaka Series Vol. Nos. 28-30).

Tanjur. Ed. A. Chattopadhyaya. Eastern Books, Calcutta, 1983.

Taranatha's History of Buddhism in India. Tr. from Tibetan by Lama Chimpa & Alaka Chattopadhyaya. Ed. by D.P. Chattopadhyaya. K.P. Bagchi & Company, Calcutta, 1980.

Tibetan Historical Literature. A. I. Vostrikov. Tr. from Russian by H.C. Gupta. Indian Studies, Calcutta, 1970.

Journal: Bulletin of Tibetology. New Series, 1990, Nos: 1-3. SRIIT, Gangtok, India.