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The history of printing in Central Tibet has received the attention of several scholars in recent years. David P. Jackson, who has written the most about early Tibetan prints, has pointed out that Tibetan authors are generally of the opinion that the printing of books by way of xylographs started in this area sometime during the beginning of the fifteenth century.1 In addition, he has made significant contributions to our know-

ledge of the corpus of texts that were committed to the printing block during that time. Heather Karmay was, to my knowledge, the first to provide evidence that Tibetan texts were being printed as early as sometime around the year 1306, although not in the Tibetan cultural area, but rather in China proper. Elsewhere, we have examined various notices of Mongol-sponsored printing projects anent the Kalacakra literature and the dissemination of its esoteric doctrines, first in China and then in Mongolia. The earliest evidence for the preparation of a xylograph of its main tantra, most likely in China, dates from either the last decade of the thirteenth or the first decade of the fourteenth century. The present paper has to do in part with an even earlier xylograph of a Tibetan text that was to all appearances prepared in China as well.

Among the writings for which Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtsshan (1182-1251), the fourth patriarch of the Sa skya school and one of the finest scholars of his (or any other) era, is justly famous by any standards, his most widely studied work, was the Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter and autocommentary, which he completed sometime in the 1220s. This study of Buddhist logic and epistemology (tshad ma) soon became a classic and went into numerous printings, in addition to eliciting an enormous commentarial literature. The Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing contains two different xylographs of this work, one of which dates from the beginning, the other from the middle of the Yuan dynasty. The first of these is the earliest known blockprint of this work in particular and, perhaps, also constitutes the earliest Tibetan blockprint as such. An essential description of these and a reproduction of their print-colophons (par byang) can be found in Appendix One.

The first of these two xylographs was initially sponsored by empress Čabi (?-1284), or Ča[m]bui, the dpon mo chen mo, "Grand Lady," dpe skrun khang, 1990) 294. The allegation in the Life and Teachings of Tsong kha pa, ed. R. Thurman (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1982) 11, that Snar thang housed the printing blocks for the canon during Tsong kha pa's stay there is of course unacceptable.

2. See her Early Sino-Tibetan Art (Warminster: Aris and Phillips Ltd., 1975) 44.
3. See my "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History II: The Mongol Imperial Family and Tibetan Kalacakra Texts" which is forthcoming in Asia Major.
5. For the literature on her and the previous problems of dating her passing,
senior wife of Qubilai and mother of prince Zhenjin (1243-5 January 1286), the heir apparent who passed away before his father. The cutting of the blocks apparently commenced under her patronage at the instigation of a “Chos kyi rgyal po bzang po,” whom I am unable to identify. The work was evidently left unfinished, presumably due to Cam’s passing, and the project was brought to completion by order of her daughter-in-law Go go cin (Kököčin, ?-1300), “the wife of [her] supreme son” (sras mchog gi bitsun mo) Zhenjin, and like her husband a major sponsor of ’Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan (1235-1280), Sa skya Paṇḍita’s nephew. The date given for this in the colophon is the eighth day of the rgyal ba (*pause) lunar month of the wood-male-monkey year. This would therefore be the oldest known xylograph of a Tibetan text. Unfortunately, no place name is given for where the blocks were originally carved. Towards the very end of the colophon we read that a certain Dpal mo ’Bog gan, presumably a lady, realized two hundred [copies?] of the text (for purposes of acquiring good karma). Of further interest is the fact that its pagination, like that of the second blockprint, is given in Tibetan and Chinese on the left of the “a” side, and only in Chinese on the “b” side of the folio. The only reason for having a Chinese pagination that I can think of is that it was added lest the Chinese block-carvers would be confused about the woodblock-order. Of equal interest is the fact that it has a marginal notation of “KA” (= Vol. 1) which could very well indicate that it was the first volume of a projected printed edition of Sa skya Paṇḍita’s collected oeuvre, one that presumably never materialized. The various catalogues of his writings known so far do not list the Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter autocommentary as comprising or being part of a first volume.6

The colophon of the second xylograph is not altogether unproblematic. It basically begins with stating that the view of Vasubandhu and the author of the ‘Bum tik (= Satasahasrikāprajñāpaññarathtika), Gdang ta se na (sic), that is, Damśī[r]āsena, is that the Buddhist doctrine will remain for five thousand years. This then lays the foundation for dating this print to the earth-female-hare (sa mo yos) year, 1339, which, it is alleged, completes three thousand four hundred and forty-nine years see note two of my aforementioned paper.

6. For these, see Jackson 1987, 507-523. It may be that the “Mongol block-print” of Sa skya Pandita’s Sdom gsum rab tu dbye ba, alluded to in Jackson 1983, 6 and 22, note 17, belongs to this same period. If so, then we could assume that the Mongol court was involved in having, if not his entire corpus, then at least some of his major writings published in print.
since the passing of the historical Buddha. However, the Sa skya school
dates the passing of the Buddha to the year 2133 B. C. E. so that the
year 1339 does not come close to this chronology. The fact that imme­
diately thereafter the colophon continues by stating that: "Henceforth, we
claim that the Buddha’s Teaching will remain for one thousand five hun­
dred and fifty-one years," and that the earth-female-hare year is men­
tioned once again below, leads us to suspect that the colophon’s author
either fell victim to an error in arithmetic, or that, more drastically, we
may have to correct sa mo yos to shing mo yos, "wood-female-hare,"
which would be the year 1315. The plausibility of this correction is
strengthened by the next reference to emperor Buyantu (Renrong, r. 7
April 1311 to 1 March 1320); note the use of the present stem of the
verb skyong! This, in turn, is followed by the mention of a Grand
Empress-Dowager (tha’i hu, Ch. taihou). If we allow for an error in the
year of the colophon, then she must be identified as Hong-gu-la-shi-da­
ji/gu, and not as Mai-lai-di, the mother of emperor Toyon Temür
(Shundi, r. in China 19 July 1333 to 14 September 1368; r. in Mongolia
to 23 May 1370). The colophon then notes two other individuals,
namely a cleric by the uninformative name of "Kun dga’" who had pro­
posed the project to a Sha-zin a-kho-che who then made the formal
request (zhus) to have the print "established."7 The editor-in-chief of the
text was the elderly(?) ‘Jam snyeg,8 who was assisted by Zla ba and

7. The last line of this passage is not easy to interpret. It reads rnam 'grel
rigs gter stong phrag par du bsgrubs //, which means “Established a thou­
sand [copies of?] the rnam 'grel rigs gter as a print,” where the phrase rnam
'grel rigs gter can be interpreted a dvandva compound meaning rnam 'grel
and rigs gter, that is, a print of the Tibetan translation of Dharmakirti’s
[Pramāṇavarttika] and the Tshad ma rigs gter. Alternatively, we can also
take it in the more likely sense of rnam 'grel gyi rigs gter, that is to say, a
“treasury of tshad ma anent the Varttika,” bearing in mind the meaning of
“tshad ma rigs pa’i gter.” Thus far, a Yuan, “Mongol print” of
Dharmakirti’s work is not referred to in the known Tibetan literature.

8. A “‘Jam nyeg”—nyeg and snyeg are homophones—is mentioned as one of
the scribes of ‘Phags pa’s Kyai rdo rje’i bdag ’jug gi cho ga dbang la ’jug
pa, Sa skya pa’i bka’ ’bum, Vol. 6, comp. Bsod nams rgya mtsho (Tokyo:
The Toyo Bunko, 1968), no.47, 118.4.3. There this man is styled “won­
drous scribe” (phrul gyi yig mkhan) and it is also said that he was among
those who petitioned ‘Phags pa to write it. The work in question is dated to
the year 1266. Seng ge bzang po’s biography of his master Dka’ bzhi pa
Rig[gs] pa’i seng ge (1287-1375) of 1418 notes a Slob dpon ‘Jam nyag in
Khro phu monastery who taught him the Pramāṇavinīścaya and a Summary
[of logic and epistemology?] sometime early in 1322; see SENG 22 [SENG
58].
Thog dpon. The ones who were actually responsible for the printing process were the official (mi chen) Sar du, Ta'i hyo and Peb ha du. The preparation of the printing blocks was begun on the fourth day of the eighth month and completed on the fifteenth day of the eleventh month of the wood-female-hare year, that is, again if the correction is in order, they were cut and edited from 2 August to 14 November of 1315 (or from 9 August to 14 November 1339). Lastly, the place where the blocks were prepared is stated to be the monastery of "Ka'u lang ho." 9 It is of course tempting to hold that this print is simply a clone of the first one due to the good possibility that the original blocks of 1284 had worn out. This does not appear to be case, however. The differences between these two prints in terms of pagination are substantial enough to warrant the view that this second print derives from newly carved blocks.

The first indication that all was not well with the transmission of the Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter's verse-text and autocommentary in which the verses are also reproduced is found in a passage of Glo bo Mkhan chen Bsod nams lhun grub's (1456-1532) exegesis of Sa skya Pandita's autocommentary of 1482, where he quotes from the mid-fourteenth century commentator Gnas drug pa Blo gros mtshungs med to the effect that there were conflicting readings in at least two manuscripts of the text's tenth chapter. 10 Other important notices of conflicting readings in the eleventh and last chapter are alluded to expressis verbis in Bo dong Pañ chen 'Jigs med grags pa's (1375-1451) biography of 1453 by his disciple and patron 'Jigs med 'bangs, that is, the Sna dkar rtse scion Nam mkha' bzang po of Yar 'brog. 11 The issue at hand was Sa skya

9. This could refer to a monastery at Gaolang river, (at the time) south of Dadu. My thanks to my colleague A. Yue-Hashimoto for drawing my attention to this possibility. This may be confirmed by a passage in one of the Wang Guowei writings to which F. W. Cleaves has drawn attention in his "The Bodistw-a čari-a awatar-un tayilbur of 1312 by Čosgi Odsir," Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 17 (1954): 15, 33, note 18. The "monastery at Gaoliang" river is none other than the well-known monastery of Da Renwang huguo, built by Qubilai, which was located on a site that is right behind the Beijing National Library. One wonders if this be an alternate name for what the Yuanshi refers to as the Southern Monastery (nansi) in YS 2, [20] 434 and 8, [90] 2284. This was the locale where Rong po Rdo rje rgyal mtshan (1283-1325) had the Kalacakramulatana printed sometime between 1310 and 1325.

10. GLO 352 [GLO1 358, GLO2 223].

11. See the Dpal ldan bla ma thams cad mkhyen pa phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba'i zhabs kyi rnam par thar pa ngo mtshar gyi dga' ston,
Pandita’s numerical determination of two kinds of a refutation by way of a reductio ad absurdum (thāl ’gyur, *prasāṅga), one which in its contraposed form implies a proof of a similar logical type and structure (bzlog/ldog pa rang rigs ’phen pa) and one which implies a dissimilar one (gzhan rigs ’phen pa). Apart from the intellectual satisfaction of establishing the correct reading, the textual problems raised by these divergent manuscript (and blockprint) traditions were not exclusively a scholastic exercise in philology. On the contrary, it was something that had obvious practical significance when we bear in mind that the art of disputation was one that was very well developed in the Tibetan monastic environment.

It is also precisely at this juncture that the Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter commentaries of Go rams pa Bsod nams seng ge (1429-1489) of 1471 and Gser mdog Pan chen Shakya mchog ldan (1428-1507) of 1474 refer to the readings of a Mongol print (hor sp/par ma) which had a classification of these two in, respectively, four and fourteen types. The reading they assert of this print is confirmed by both blockprints, so that we may conclude that the hor par ma (singular!) to which they refer indicates one or both of these. Whereas Go rams pa accepts the hor par ma’s reading, Gser mdog Pan chen does not with some vehemence and argues instead for accepting a four by sixteen classification, for which,


13. Onoda 1992, 80; blockprint no.1 reads on fol. 187a: bzlog pa rang rigs ’phen pa bzhi // . . . gzhan rigs ’phen pa bcu bzhi yod //, and blockprint no.2 has on fol. 187a-b: bzlog pa rang rigs ’phen pa bzhi // . . . gzhan rigs ’phen pa bcu bzhi yod //.
as indicated by Glo bo Mkhan chen, there is already a thirteenth century precedent by way of the *Sde bdun gsal ba'i rgyan* of Lho pa Kun mkhyen Rin chen dpal, a disciple and biographer of Sa skya Panḍita.\(^{14}\)

It is of course likely that, when earlier fourteenth century exegeses of the text come to light—I am thinking here particularly of the works by Byams mgon dpal, alias Phyogs glang gsar ma, and his student Dka' bzhi pa Rigs pa'i seng ge\(^{15}\)—we shall have further evidence that these early xylographs of the *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* autocommentary were put to use in other interpretations of Sa skya Panḍita's work. Aside from the fact that these blockprints are of undoubted historical significance, they also underscore the methodological imperative that textual criticism should precede translation (and interpretation), something that is all too often and easily forgotten these days in the study of Tibet's vast literary heritage.\(^{16}\)

Indeed, at least three different xylograph-editions of the autocommentary were prepared during the fifteenth century. We now have located the Glang ri thang monastery blockprint, as ordered by Kun dga' rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po, that was completed on the fourteenth day of the third month of the wood-female-ox year, which can only refer to 22 March 1445.\(^{17}\) Other prints that have yet to come to light are the one prepared in Thub chen mngon par dgal yes pa temple in Glo bo Smon thang in 1474, for which Gser mdog Paṇ chen wrote a notice,\(^ {18}\) and the one of Dpal rdo rje gdan mi 'gyur bde ba chen po

---

14. GLO 404 [GLO1 412, GLO2 256]:

sgrub byed 'phen pa nyi shu la // rang rigs 'phen pa rnams bzhi // gzhan rigs 'phen pa bcu drug ste // tsha reg gsum gyis grang reg gsum // 'gog pa'i spyod pa rnam dgu las // rang rigs 'phen pa rnam gsum bri // thag ma drug dag rang bzhi dang // 'bras bu'i thal ba rnam gnyis te // brgyad las phyre ba'i bcu drug nyid //

Glo bo Mkhan chen concurs with this numerical determination.

15. SENG 20-21, 25, 36 [SENG 1 56, 60, 71]. Some of their views are cited severally in Glo bo Mkhan chen's exegesis. To be sure, Seng ge bzang po does not state that Phyogs glang gsar ma wrote a *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* commentary. Although he does mention that he enjoyed special renown in Sa skya for his expert knowledge of this difficult work.

16. This holds already for the serious inconsistencies in the most widespread available texts of both by way of the Sde dge print of 1736, for which see the useful tabulation of variant readings in the verse texts in the *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Pe cin: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1989) 395-401. For the particulars of this print, see Jackson 1987, 232-236.

17. This blockprint is housed in the Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities where it is catalogued under no. 004783(2). It consists of one hundred and fifteen folios and bears the marginal notation "Ka" (= Vol. 1).

18. See the *Rigs gter gyi gzhung par du bsgrubs pa'i dkar chag* in GSER
monastery that was effected through the financial patronage of Gong dkar Rdo rje gdan pa Kun dga' rnam rgyal (1432-1496). It may be that the Sa skya xylograph of the verse-text of the *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* as such also belongs to this century.

In his discussion of these arguments, S. Onoda points out that the four by sixteen scenario is also met with in the later Dga' ldan pa and Dge lugs pa bsdus grwa texts, the earliest of which he signalled is the work by Mchog lha 'od zer (1429-1500). He tentatively suggests that its origin might be sought in Rgyal tshab Dar ma rin chen's (1364-1432) *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* commentary. This is perhaps unlikely given the fact that it was consistently suppressed by later editors of his collected oeuvre, and is so far only extant by way of a Bla brang Bkra shis 'khyil blockprint. Like their master Tsong kha pa, Mkhas grub Dge legs dpal bzang po (1385-1438) is but content with giving a very general description of both types, adding that one should look elsewhere for a detailed subdivision of their typology. Lastly, their disciple Dge 'dun grub pa (1391-1474) is so far the earliest known Dga' ldan pa scholar to have argued for a four by sixteen scenario, one which we encounter in his survey of Buddhist logic and epistemology of 1437.

In addition to the dossier provided by S. Onoda, we may also refer to the discussion in the anonymous, undated, and hitherto unknown work on Buddhist logic and epistemology entitled the *Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma*, a beautifully calligraphied handwritten *dbu med* manuscript of which we located in the Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities, which also accepts the four by sixteen classification with-

---


21. 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 (Pe cin: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984) 372.

Moreover, the recently published survey of Indo-Tibetan Buddhist epistemology and logic by Bcom Idan Rigs pa’i ral gri (ca. 1235-1314) makes it clear that this great controversialist accepted a total of seventeen different types of prasāngas which he classified by means of a four by thirteen division. Lastly, Bo dong Pan chen’s monumental Tshad ma rigs pa’i snang ba refers rather critically to three different positions which are not attributed to any one specifically. These are a five by sixteen, a four by fourteen and a three by ten classification, the first two of which are attested in different Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter manuscripts (and other xylographs?). He himself argues for a three by eleven scenario. These issues deserve further exploration.

We may take this opportunity to furnish some additional remarks on the Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma. Its colophon does not shed any light on its authorship, the title does somewhat resemble the so-called Gzhal bya shes rab sgron ma’i phreng ba—the phreng ba is somewhat peculiar in this title—of unknown authorship which, according to Zhang Rgyal ba dpal, yet another biographer and disciple of Sa skya Pandita, the latter had studied under Mishur Gzhon nu seng ge around the years 1200 to 1201. This work has not been located so far. However, we can unequivocally say that the intellectual environment of the Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma is clearly the exegetical traditions that had their inception in Gsang phu ne’u thog monastery. With some modifications, it accepts its rather distinctive five-fold typology of the so-called non-valid means of cognition (tshad min) against which Sa skya Pandita reacted so critically. For example, its discussion of the notion of
reflection (yid dpyod), an epistemological type which Sa skya Pandita is loathe to accept, begins with a negative reference to an earlier definition in which it was maintained that it is a type of cognition that ascertains an object independent of either a direct experience of it, or a logical justification on which basis the object could be deduced. We find something very similar to this in Gtsang nag pa’s Pramāṇa-viniścaya commentary which belongs to the second half of the twelfth century, not to mention the fact that such a standpoint is also more or less attributed to Phya pa. The author’s own position is that reflection consists of an ascertainment of an imperceptible object, on par with an [actual] object, that has not been previously cognized and which is, however, independent of a logical indicator (rtags) or justification. The text is polemical and argumentative, but none of its references to other opinions are identified by their owners—an exception is made in its citation of Indian Buddhist philosophers—the author being content with prefixing these opinions by the somewhat exasperating kha cig na re, “some say.” However, several glosses in an unknown hand do identify—future research will have to show whether rightly or wrongly—several such kha cigs. Among the first of these is a sublinear “Rgya” anent a definition of a cognition which does not ascertain what is present [to it] (snang la ma nges pa) with which the author disagreed. It is quite probable that “Rgya” refers here not to an Indian (rgya[-gar]) scholar, but rather to Rgya dmar pa Byang chub grags, a disciple of Gangs pa She’u Blo gros byang chub and Khyung Rin chen grags and one of Phya pa’s masters, for an epistemological type of the snang la ma nges pa variety never seems to have been conceptualised in India.


29. AN fol. 6a.
30. GTSANG fol. 23a.
31. AN fol. 5b.
32. For him, see van der Kuijp 1983, 60, 293, notes 213-215. The remain-
Other *kha cig na res* are glossed by "Lo," "Gangs pa," and "Khyung," which would refer to possibly Rngog Lo tsa ba Bio Idan shes rab (1059-1109) and his disciples Gangs pa She'u and Khyung.\(^{33}\) On the strength of the glosses of "Rtsang nag pa," that is, "Gtsang nag pa," we can argue that it postdates Gtsang nag pa's logical oeuvre.\(^ {34}\) Moreover, we may have to place the author at sometime between Gtsang nag pa and the *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*, although we can only adduce negative evidence for this inasmuch as, for instance, he does not take issue with Sa skya Panḍita's criticism of the earlier five-fold classification of the *tshad min*. Only a detailed study of our text will reveal whether or not there is evidence for the author having known Sa skya Panḍita's work. A potential snag in a pre-*Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* dating of this work may be the two glosses that attribute a position to a "S[R?]tag pa" or "S[R?]tag."\(^ {35}\) The only individual who might be identified by "Stag" is Stag lung Lo tsa ba Shaky a bzang po (1322-1404). The chronicle of the Stag lung Bka' brgyud sect written by Stag lung pa Ngag dbang rnam rgyal (1571-1626) in 1609 states that he had written a *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary which carried the subtitle of *Rig[s?] tshul snang chen*.\(^ {36}\) However, it seems unlikely that the *Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma* is to be placed sometime in the latter part of fourteenth century, or even beyond.

**Excursus: The Rtes thang Print of Dignaga's Pramāṇasamuccaya**

Aside from the numerous printing projects that were undertaken anent Tibet's indigenous literature, the fifteenth century also knows of various xylograph editions of canonical texts, including those of the Tibetan renditions of the writings of Dignāga and Dharmakirti. One such xylograph is the Rtes thang print of the Tibetan rendition of Dignāga's

---

33. For instance, AN fols. 21a, 23a, 31a.
34. See, for instance, AN fol. 22a.
35. See, for instance, AN fols. 5b, 15b.
36. See the *Chos 'byung ngo mtshar rgya mtsho*, Vol. 1 (Tashijong, 1972) 484.
Pramāṇasamuccaya—the blockprint specifies that it is the translation of Vasudhararaksita and Seng ge rgyal mtshan—which is housed in the Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities where it is catalogued under no. 004806(2). It consists of ten folios with seven lines per folio side and measures 9 x 61 cm. The upper center of the title page has a marking in red ink phyi, zha, 18. Phyi, “external” would suggest that it was accessible to the “public,” whereas nang in other manuscripts would mean that it was for “internal” circulation only. There is a miniature on either side of fol. 1b; on the left Mañjuśrī and on the right Dignāga. The printer’s colophon states that it was prepared by Bsod nams bkra shis in Rtses thang monastery for the fulfillment of [his] preceptor’s final wishes and the longevity of the Phag mo gru/Sne’u gdong ruler Grags pa ’byung gnas (1414-1445). The person who may have been in charge of the actual printing, or who had particular expertise in this text—I have difficulty in interpreting the phrase chos ’di mkhas pa—was a Lama Rin chen dga’.

Text of the Printer’s Colophon
bstan bcos kun gyi mi gcig thos pa’i mchod // thub pa’i bstan pa dngos stobs legs sgrubs pa’i // rigs lam dri ma med pa’i gzhung lugs ’di // dpal ldan bla ma’i thugs dgongs rdzogs pa’i phyir dang / [here the text has a rin spungs shad] rgyal ba’i sras grags pa ’byung gnas kyi // sku tshe brtsan cing chab srid brgyas bya’i phyir // chos gra chen po dpal gyi rtses thang du // bsod nams bkra shis bdag gis par du sgrubs // de’ang ’byung pa’i bde ba gang thob pas // rgyal ba’i dkyil ’khor bzang zhing dga’ ba der // padmo dam pa shin du mdzes las skyes // snang ba mtha’ yas rgyal bas mgon sum du // lung bstan pa yang bdag sogs der thob shog // chos ’di mkhas pa bla ma rin chen dga’?o /

Lastly, Gser mdog Pan chen signals the existence of a xylograph of the Tibetan version of the Pramāṇavārttika in Thub chen mgon par dgyes pa monastery in his notice of this “publication” dated 1474. Like that of the Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter autocommentary, it too was sponsored by Bkra shis mgon. The scribe who prepared the manuscript was Shes rab grags and the carver/printer was Dge legs seng ge.

37. See his Rnam ‘grel gyi gzung par du bsgrubs pa’i dkar chag in GSER 216-220.
APPENDIX ONE

Note: “No.” refers to the catalogue number of the Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities, Beijing.

1. No title page

No. 004817.
Folios: 2a-190a; six lines per folio side.
Dimension: 12.5 x 64 cm.
Incomplete: fols. 1 and 66 are missing.
Marginal notation: KA.

Tibetan/Chinese pagination.

Incipit: [2a] . . . pa rnams kyang log par rtog pa du ma mthong pas de sun dbyung pa dang yang dag pa'i don gtan la dbab pa'i phyir 'di brtsems mo //

Printer’s Colophon: [189b-190a] tshad mar gyur ba [read: pa] rgyal ba'i gsung rab kun // tshad ma nyid du nges byed gzhung kun gyi // tshad mas grub pa'i rigs mchog kun bsdu pa'i // tshad ma'i bstan bcos 'di ni rigs pa'i gter // 'di ni shes bya'i gnas la mkhyen pa rab gsal zhing // 'gro ba kun la kun nas brtse ba'i thugs mnga' ba //chos kyi rgyal bo [read: po] bzang bo'i [read: po'i] zhab kyi zhal snga nas // bstan pa dri med rnam par spel phyir rab tu mdzad // gzhung lugs [190a] [gzhung lugs; reduplication] 'di yi dri med 'thad pa mthong gyur zhing // gzhung rtsom de yi ngo mtshar dpag yas shes gyur nas // gzhung mchog 'di ni blo gsal rnams la rgyas pa'i phyir // gzhung 'di'i par gi gter chen legs par phyed ba yin // 'di ni rigs gzugs dge mtshan ldan zhing // dad dang brtse dang dpal 'byor phun sum tshogs // sna tshogs bkod pa'i tshul la rab mkhas pa // dpon mo chen mo cha bus mgo btsugs nas // de sras mchog gi btsun mo dpal ldan pa // bstan pa'i rtsa lag skye rgu'i ma lta bu // rigs gzugs yon tan phun sum tshogs pa yi // go go cin gi lung gis rdzogs par bsgrubs // rgyal ba rnams la dam chos mi zad ltar // par 'di las kyang chos tshul zad mi shes // de 'dra sgrub par gang zhig bka' sgo ba // de'i bsod nams tshul yang zad mi shes // de las byung ba'i dge ba rgya mtsho dang // rgyal sras rgya mtsho'i spyod pa 'dres gyur nas // sems can rgya mtsho'i tshogs rnams smin byed cing // rgyal ba'i ye shes rgya mtshor 'jug par shog // gnas skabs su yang rgyal po yab sras dang // btsun mo sras dang brgyud par bcas pa rnams // sku khams bzang zhing
sku tshe ring ba dang // chos dang zang zing dpal 'byor phun tshogs shog // 'di 'dra gang gis dran bskul byas pa dang // yi ger 'bri dang par du rko pa dang // yo byad sgrub pa'i gnyer pa la stogs kun // gnas skabs mthar thug don rnams lhun grub shog // phyogs dus thams cad du bkra shis par gyur cig // shing pho spre'u lo / rgyal gyi zla ba yi / yar ngo'i tshis [read: tshes] brgyad la / legs par grub pa yin / // [figure comprising a circle plus two semicircles underneath it] btsun mo dam pa mtho ris kyi // yon tan kun kyi brgyan pa can // dpal mo 'bol gan zhes bya bas // rigs gter brgya phrag gnyis bsgrubs te // bshad nyan spel phyr phul ba yis // rgyal po sku tshe legs brtan zhing // kun gyi sangs rgyas thob par shog // bkra shis par gyur cig /

2. No title page.

No.
004796.
Folios: 1-190b; six lines per folio side.
Dimension: 12.5 x 65.2 cm.
Tibetan/Chinese pagination.

Fol. 1b has two miniatures in black and white: "'Jam dpal [Manjusri]'" on the left and "Chos rje Sa skya Pañ di ta" on the right side.
Fol. 190a has seven lines.

Printer's colophon: [190a-b] tshogs gnyis rgyas pa'i kling [read: gling] las legs 'khrungs shing // legs spyad lhun mdzes phan bde'i lo 'dab can // sku gsum 'bras ldan phrin las bsil grib kyi // nyon mongs gdung sel dkon mchog gsum la 'dud // me tog u dum stong gi Inga ltas las // gnas gtsang lha yis bzang po zhes bsgrags pa'i // bskal bzang 'di la bde gshogs stong 'byon pa'i // 'khor ba 'jig dang gser thub 'od brung 'das // brgya pa'i dus 'dir shakya'i [read: shākya'i] rgyal po byon // rgyal ba'i bstan 'di Inga stong gnas so zhes // sangs rgyas gnyis pa lta bu'i dbyig gnyen dang // 'bum tig mkhan po gdang Ma se na bzhed // de la thub bstan lo ni sum stong dang // bzhi brgya zhe dgu sa mo yos los rdzogs // da phyis rgyal ba'i bstan pa lo stong dang // Inga brgya Inga bcu nga gcig gnas par 'dod // de lta'i thub pa'i bstan pa'i rtsa lag mchog // Inga brgya bdun par 'dzam kling [read: gling] byang phyogs su // stobs kyi 'khor lo bsgyur ba brgyad par ni // sngon bsags bsod nams mtho chen 'khyil pa la // dam 'byor chu skyes yon tan ge sar 'khrigs // sa chen 'di na sa la mnga' mdzad pa // bu yan du gan rgyal srid skyong pa [read: ba] na // bsod nams stobs kyi sa la mnga' bsgyur zhing // dad pa'i stobs kyi dBu sde rnams gnyis mchod // snying rje'i stobs kyi mnga' ris chos
APPENDIX TWO

The Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities houses a large number of other early treatises on tshad ma. Among these there are the following three manuscripts which I was able to inspect only very briefly due to exigencies of time:

1. Title: Bod snga rabs pa'i tshad ma'i spyi don
   No. 004783(1)
   Folios 1-97a.
Upper center of the title page has *Phyi, Zha, 17*, for which see the remarks in the excursus.

Incipit: [1b] 'phags pa ’jam dpal la phyag 'tshal lo // dag gsal mthu’ ldan byams pa’i dkyil ’hor can // gsung gi ’d zer ’gro ba’i lam ston pas // ma rig mun sel kun gyi sgron mer gyur // rdzogs sangs nyi ma’i sku la phyag 'tshal lo //


Despite the title page, the actual title of this work by the monk Dharma rad[read: t]na was *Rtog ge rigs pa’i [b]rgyan gyi snying po*. It was carefully written out by a certain Zhang. Who was Dharmaratna, that is, Chos kyi rin chen/dkon mchog or Dar ma rin chen/ dkon mchog? If my suspicion is correct, then he may be identified as the late twelfth and early thirteenth century scholar signalled by Tshal pa Kun dga’ rdo rje (1309-1364) as “Dar dkon.”38 This is no doubt an abbreviation of “Dar ma dkon mchog.” The bearer of this name, either a native of Phu thang, or one who was associated with this place on a professional basis, had been one of the disciples of the very influential Gnyal zhig ’Jam pa’i rdo rje,39 himself a student of ’Dan bag pa Smra ba’i seng ge who in turn had studied with Phya pa. Dar ma dkon mchog is said to have been active in Yar lung and Mtsho smad temples. ’U yug pa Bsod nams seng ge, alias Rigs pa’i seng ge, the author of the first Tibetan commentary on

38. TSHAL 69-70 [TSHAL fol. 29a-b, Inaba-Satô 1963, 150, Chen-Zhou 1988, 62].
the *Pramāṇavārttika*, had been one of Gnyal zhig's disciples prior to joining Sa skya Pandita in Sa skya. It now appears that he wrote two other texts on *tshad ma*. The first would be the *Bsdus pa* text on *tshad ma*—it is entitled *Rigs pa [s]grub pa*—which might have been written when he was still with Gnyal zhig; he refers to it towards the end of his *Pramāṇavārttika* exegesis. The other text would be his short *Tshad ma rnam 'grel gyi bsdus don rigs pa'i sdom*. I was able to inspect a late nineteenth century Sde dge print of the latter through the kind offices of Mr. Rgya rong Blo bzang of the department of nationalities' literature of the Beijing National Library where it is catalogued under no. 3154-1. This little text is nothing but a topical outline of his *Pramāṇavārttika* exegesis which he possibly wrote while at Sa skya, so that it must be assigned to a later period of his life.

2. No title page

No. 004827(4)
Fols. 1-152a.

Incipit: [1b] thugs rje chen po la phyag 'tshal lo // sangs rgyas gzhon phan dgongs pa can // kun bzang rab zhi gnyis myed cing // thams cad khyab pa'i sku ldan pa // skyob pa mchog la phyag 'tshal lo //

Colophon: [152a] // rgya shes rab dbang phyug dang 'jang shag kya dpal dang s/ryel grags pa seng ge la sogs pa chen po rnams kyi zhab kyi rdl spyi bos blangs te mang du thos pa rgya mtsho'i pha rol du phyin pa'i don / slob dpon chos mchog gis mzdad pa'i ti ka 'thad ldan dang / kha che dznya na shri'i ti ka la sogs pa mthong ba'i don / bsams pa las byung ba'i shes rab kyis legs par gtan la phab pa'i don ston par byed pa / blo la zin pa tsam gyis mkhas pa'i mchog tu 'gyur zhing mkhas pa rtag tu mi nyams par byed pa'i ti ka chen po 'di / shag kya'i dge slong gtsang chu mig pa seng ge dpal gyis gshang phu ne'u thog gi gtsug lag khang du bsams te yar lung kha 'brug gi gtsug lag khang du yi ger bkod pa'o //.

This is a *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary which, as is to be expected, takes to some extent the Indian exegeses of Dharmottara and Jñānaśrī as its point of departure, was begun by Gtsang Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal in the monastery of Gsang phu ne'u thog, and committed to writing in

---

41. For later references to him, see van der Kuijp 1983, 117, 314, note 356.
the temple of Kha 'brug in the Yar lung river valley. His masters were evidently Rgya Shes rab dbang phyug, 'Jang Shakya dpal and Skyel Grags pa seng ge. Tshal pa writes that Skyel nag Grags [pa] seng [ge] had been a student of Gnyal zhig and Dānāśīla, a member of Śākyasrīhadra's party, that he was responsible for setting up a tradition of tshad ma study in Snar thang monastery and that this attracted such men as Skyo ston Grags [pa] 'bum and Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal. It seems therefore rather likely that this Skyel nag is none other than the colophon's “Skyel Grags pa seng ge.” Most sources have it that Chu mig pa succeeded Rgya M/’chims ru ba as abbot of Gsang phu ne’u thog’s Gling stod college, a post which he allegedly occupied for eighteen years.

3. No title page.

No. 004827(1)
Folios 1-68a.

Upper center of the first page has phyi, zha, 9.

Incipit: [lb] tshad ma bde bdun gyi phyogs cig du bsdus pa gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba /. Colophon: [68a] // gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba zhes bya ba / rigs par smra ba'i dge slong sing ha shris gsang phu ne'u thog gi gtsug lag khang du logs par brtsams te / dpal rtse dkar gyi gtsug lag khang du yi ger bkod pa'o // rdzogs sho //

42. TSHAL 63, 71, 73 [TSHAL 1 fols. 26b, 30a-31a, Inaba-Sato 1963, 142, 152, 154, Chen-Zhou 1988 57, 64-65]. Dpa’ bo Gtsug lag phreng ba (1504-1566) relates that although Chu mig pa was a scholar at Snar thang, he had come to Rgya M/’ching ru ba [in the Gling stod college of Gsang phu ne’u thog] to debate with him. Unable to defeat him, he became his disciple; see his Chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston, Vol. 1 (New Delhi: Delhi Karmapa chodey gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1981) 749 [Ibid., Stod-cha, ed. Rdo rje rgyal po (Pe cin: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986) 734].

This work was evidently entitled the *Gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba*, which is described a summary of the purport of Dharmakirti's *tshad ma* writings. The colophon gives the author's name in Sanskrit as "Sing ha shri" which in Tibetan would read "Seng ge dpal." He may therefore have to be identified as Chu mig pa as well. The text was begun in Gsang phu ne'u thog, and completely committed to writing in the monastery of Dpal rtse dkar.
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