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 Dipagupa, could not retain her glory in this field from the 13th century onwards 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 forever. But Tibet, being one of the neighbouring countries which received Indian thoughts, 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 the contribution of that country to the storehouse of world knowledge. Scholars like Dr. S.C. Vidyabhusana, Rahula Sankhysana, Dr. M.K. Ganguli (the teacher and guide of the present writer), A. Voitkof, J. Tuwā, B. Baradi, B. Vassili, E.E. Obermiller, Prof. Oberhammer, Prof. F. Franswiller, E.Tch. Stechkis 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, get 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. Anantadul 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. Bhatia M.A., B.Ed., M.Phil. Phd., and Assistant Director Mr. Bhupgobinda 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.
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- Dr. Sanjit Kumar Sadhukhan

1. 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 Dharmakirti. The original treatises and the huge commentaries on 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, Vaisesika 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 Buddhists 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 scil 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 then 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-srong lde'u-btsan (740-c. 798) became the king of Tibet in 754 A.D. 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, Tattvasamgraha 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. Śāntarāṣṭrīya was also accompanied by his disciple Kamaśīla 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. This incident worked to directly influence Tibetans to follow of Buddhist logic in favour of Buddhist 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.

Śāntarāṣṭrīya is seen not only for the doctrine in Tibet, but also to have left mark from which we may call Śāntarāṣṭrīya 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 Hetucakrādamaru (Gtan-tshigs-kyi ’khor-lo gtan-la dbab-pa, Tg. mdo xcv 9. 189a7-190a4) of Diṅṅa (Phyogs-kyi gleṅ-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 Atiśa, 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-tsā-ba (1392-1481), the eleventh century was the beginning of the spread of the teaching of logic, which were established in the region of Dbus and Gtsan of Tibet, with the activities of the famous Tibetan interpreter named Rma lo-tsā-ba Dge-ba’i blo-gros (1044-1089).09

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 pāṇḍita Kun-dga’ rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251) who maintained that logic was an utterly profane science, containing nothing Buddhist 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.60 But Dge-lugs-pa or Yellow sect that was founded by the celebrated reformer of Tibet, Tsön-kha-pa (1357-1419)
and is predominant now, rejected these views and acknowledged Buddhist logic (of Dharmakirti) as a foundation of Buddhism as a religion. From the very time of Tsön-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 Indis 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 inestimable 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 these 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-glaṅ), Dharmakīrti (Chos-grags), Devendrabuddhi (Lha-dban-blo), Sākyabuddhi (Sākya-blo), Subhagupta (Dge-sruṅs), Vinitadeva (Dul-ba'liḥa), Jinendrabuddhi (Rgyal-dbaṅ blo-gros), Sāntarakṣita (Zhi-ba-tsho). Kamalasila, Dharmottara (Chos-mchog), Muktākālaśa (Mutig bum-pa), Arcaṭa alias Dharmakaradatta (Chos-'byun-byin), Prajñakaragupta (Ses-tab 'byun-gnas sbas-pa), Jitūrī (Dgra-las rgyal-
1. Bhikṣu Dharmāśoka (8th cen.): This scholar has translated the Hetucakradamāra (Gtan-tshigs-kyi ’khor-lo gstan-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 Zhuochen 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 Dharmakīrti. 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 cxv 5. 128b8-223b6) of Vinītadeva. Translated with the assistance of the above Indian pandita. It is a commentary on the above work.

(c) Santānāṃśara-siddhi (Rgyud-grhan grub-pa, Tg mdo xcv 17. 401b7-404b3) of Dharmakīrti. Translated with the assistance of the Indian pandita Viśuddhasūtra. It is a treatise on the reality of other minds, directed against solipsism.
4. Vande Nam-mkha'-skyon (9th cen.) translated Sambandha-parikṣā ("Bre-lha brtag-pa, Tg mdo xcv 14. 357a3-358a7) of Dharmakīrti, and Sambandha-parikṣā-tikā ("Bre-lha brtag-pa'i rgya-cher bsad-pa, Tg mdo xci 1.1-26b8) of Vinitadeva, into Tibetan, with the assistance of the Indian pandita janagarbha. 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 ssaṅ-ba (9th cen.) translated Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā20 (Rigs-pa'i thigs-pa'i 'grel, Tg mdo xii 2. 43b3-113a1) of Dharmottara, with
the assistance of the Indian pandita Jñānagarbha. It is a commentary on Nyāyāntika of Dharmakīrti.

6. Rna lo-tsa-ba dge-ba'i blo-gros (1044-1089): He was the celebrated interpreter (lo-tsa-ba) of Rna. Among the logical works translated by him, was the Pramāṇa-vārttika (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. His translations of the logical texts including Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇa-vārttika, its auto-commentary and two voluminous commentaries, one by Devendrabuddhi and the other by Sākyabuddhi, show the sign of a perseverant and talented scholar. He was murdered by poison in 1089.

He translated the following works:

(a) Pramāṇa-vārttika-kārikā (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 Subhūtisrī-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 (Raṅ-don rjes-dpag), Pramāṇasiddhi (Tshad-ma grub-pa), Pratyakṣa (Mon-sum) and Parārthānumāna (Gzhon-don rjes-dpag). First chapter contains the scrutiny of logical reason (hetu, gtan-tshigs), fallacy (hetvābhāsa, gtan-tshigs ltar-snaṅ), negation (anupalabdhi, mi-dmigs-pa), concomitance (avinābhāva, med-na mi-byuṅ-ba), verbal testimony (sahda, tshig), scripture (aṅgā pa gzuṅs-lugs), relation (sambandha, ‘brel-pa), etc. Second chapter contains scrutiny of source of valid knowledge (pramaṇa, tshad-ma), god (śivara, lha), Buddhahood, four truths (catuḥ āryasatyas, ‘phags-pa bden bzhi), etc. Third chapter contains scrutiny of perception (pratyakṣa, mion-sum), inference (anumāna, rjes-su dpag-pa), negation (anupalabdhi, mi-dmigs-pa), universal (sāmīnya, 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 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 Subhutiśri-sānti.

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

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

(d) Pramāṇa-vārtika-parājikā(16) (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi dka'-'grel, Tg mdo xcv 18 & xcvi. 40b3-53a4 and 1-390a8) of Deveshrabuddhi. Translated with the help of Subhutiśri-sānti. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇa-vārtika and the commentator was the personal disciple of Dharmakīrti.

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

7. Zhu-chen Tin-je-'dzin bzaṅ-po (11th cen.) translated Yuktī-prayoga (Rigs-pa'i sbyor-ba, Tg mdo cxii 27. 360b8-361a8) of Ratnavajja, with the help of the Indian pandita Sūryaśūtisānti same with Subhutiśri-sānti. It
8. Khyun-po chos-kyi btsun-'grus (11th cen.): He seems to be a little senior to Riog lo-tsa-ba as Riog 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 Jñānaśrībhadra (c.1020-c.1080), into Tibetan with the assistance of the author himself who also visited Tibet. The work is a commentary on Dharmakirti’s Pramāṇa-viniścaya.

9. Pa-tshab ni-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 ses-rab (11th cen.): He translated Tattvasamgraha-pañjikā (De-kho-na-nid bsdus-pa'i dka'-'grel, Tg mdo cxii 2 & cxiv. 159b2-431a8 and 1-405a7) of Kamalśila, with the help of the Indian pandita Devendrabhadra (1040). It is a beautiful commentary on Sāntarakṣita’s Tattvasamgraha-kārikā.

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

11. Riog lo-tsa-ba blo-ldan ses-rab (1059-1109): According to the famous Tibetan historian Gos lo-tsa-ba (1392-1481) Riog lo-tsa-ba was the celebrated founder of the lineage known as the ‘New Nyāya’ (Tshad-ma gsar-ma) in Tibet. Up to now Khyun-po grags-se's (early 11th century) works were popular there and those were on ‘Old Nyāya’ (Tshad-ma min-ma). The works translated by Riog lo-tsa-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.

Riog lo-tsa-ba was the son of Chos-skyabs. He was the follower of the
Bka’-gdam-pa school and became the abbot of the Gsai-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-tsa-ba (b. 1016), Gnam lo-tsa-ba, Khyu-nil po chos-kyi brtson-grus, Rdo-ston and Btsan kha-bo-che (b. 1011/1020). When King RTse-Ide had invited most of the Tripitaka-dhara of Dbus, Gtsan and Khams, and held the religious council of 1076 A.D., he also attended it. RTse-Ide’s son Dbañ-phug-Ide decided to become a supporter of Rnog lo-tsa-ba. Rnog then proceeded to Kashmir where he attended on six teachers, including Sajana and Parahitabhadrā (c. 1010–1090). His provisions having come to an end he sent a letter to Mā’ris. Dbañ-phug-Ide sent him again much gold and requested him to translate Pramāṇa-vārtikā-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 Shirapsāla and Sumatkirti. He visited Nepal for a short while and heard the Tantra from Atulyavajra, Varendrauci and others. Then he again returned to Tibet and made numerous correct translations. He preached at Lhasa, Bsam-yas, Myu-gu-sna, Gniil-sgam-thogs. Gtsan-ngyan-mkhar and other places. Among his assistant preachers were 55 preachers of Alamkāra (Pramāṇa-vārtika-alamkāra of Prajñakaraṇa) and Pramāṇa-viniscaya-tīka (of Dharmottara) 280 expounders of Pramāṇa-viniscaya. He taught extensive logic, five treatises of Maitreya, the Madhyamika doctrine and other texts. He passed away at the age of 51 in 1109 on the road in the neighborhood of Bsam-yas.

Following are the works translated into Tibetan by Rnog lo-tsa-ba:

(a) Nyāyabindu (Rigs-pa’i thigs-pa, Tg mdo xcv. 12. 329b 1-337a 8) of Dharmanikirti. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Parahitabhadrā and others.

It is divided into three chapters, (1) Perception (Pratyakṣa, Māna-sūna), (2) Inference for one’s own sake (Śvārthānumāna, Ran-gi don-gyi rjes-su
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(3) Inference for one's sake (Pararthānūmanā, Gzhan-gyi don-gyi rjes-su dpag-pa). Nyṣyābindu 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 (bhūnti, 'khrul-pa), identity (svabhāva, ran-bzhin), effect (kārya, 'bras-bu), negation (anupalabdhi, midmigs-pa) and its different varieties, fallacies (hetvābhāṣa, gtan-tshig, litargstan), analogues for futilities (žāti, itag-chod), etc.

(b) Pramāṇa-viniscaya (Tshad-ma rnam-par rjes-pa, Tg mdo xcix 11. 250b6-329b1) of Dhammakīrti. 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 Dhammakīrti, covering all the necessary matters of Buddhist logic.

c) Pramāṇa-viniscaya-lika (Tshad-ma rnam-ñes-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 Dhammakīrti's Pramāṇa-viniscaya.

d) Pramāṇa-vārtika-alankāra (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi rgyan, Tg mdo cix & c. 1-382a7 and 1-34a6) of Prajñākaragupta. Translated with the help of the pandita Dhavyarāja (Skal-ldan rgyal-po) of Kashmir. Later the translation was checked by Rñog lo-tsa-ba with the help of another Indian pandita Sumatiikīrti. It is a commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika of Dhammakīrti.

e) Pramāṇa-vārtika-alankāra-lika (Tshad-ma rnam-'grel rgyan-gyi 'grel-bsad, Tg mdo cix 2, cv, cvi & cvii. 208a7-345a8, 1-290a7, 1-43a6a8 and 1-321a5) of Yamār. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Sumatiikīrti in the Sth-than monastery near Lhasa. It is a voluminous commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika-alankāra of Prajñākaragupta, which is a commentary on
Dharmakirti’s Pramāṇavārttika.

(f) Pramāṇa-parikṣā (Tshad-ma brtags-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) Kṣaṇe-bhaṅga-siddhi (Skad-cig-ma ’jigs-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 Saṅkarāṇanda. Translated with the help of the Kashmirian pandita Manoratha (? Manorathanandin who composed an excellent Vṛtti on Pramāṇa-vārttika) 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 Saṅkarāṇanda. Translated with the help of the Kashmirian pandita Bhavyarāja. It is a treatise on the establishment of the causal relation.

12. Zha-ma Seṅ-ge rgyal-po (/ Zha-ma seṅ-ge/Seṅ-ge rgyal-mdshan) (11th cen.): This famous interpreter learned the work of a translator under Rma lo-tsā-ba (1044-1089), Rūg 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 btsus-pa, Tg mdo xcv 1. 1-13a5) of Dignāga. Translated with the help of his collaborators, Dad-pa’i
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, Mūkon-suni), (2) Inference for one’s own sake (Sravītānuṣṭāna, Raṇ-den-gyi rjes-dpag), (3) Inference for other’s sake (Parāśāramūṣṭāna, Gzhan-gyi don-gyi rjes-dpag), (4) Reason and example (Hetu-dṛṣṭānta, Glar-tshigs dar Dpe), (5) Determination of a thing by exclusion of its opposites (Apoloh, Gzhan sel-ba), and (6) Analogue (jāti, Liang-gcod).

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

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

14. Dga' (? Dge)-ba'i rdo-rje (11th cen.) translated Sambandha-parīkṣāṇaṇara ("Brel-pa btsug-pa'i rjes-su 'bras-ba, Tg mdo cxxxii 2. 27a6-44a3) of Saṃkarāṇanda, with the assistance of the Indian pandita Prahítabhadrā (c.1010-c.1090). It is a commentary on Dharmakirti's Sambandha-parikṣāṇa.

15. Dpal-ṅchog dan-po'i rdo-rje of Sum-pa (in Amdo) (11th cen.) translated Bāhyavatara-tarka (Byis-pa 'jug-pa'i rog-ge, Tg mdo cxxxii 25. 348a1-360b8) of Jñātari, 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 Guṇḍakaraśrī-bhadra, Tattvasaṅgrahā-kārikā (De-kho-na-nid bdus-pa'i tshig-le'ur byas-pa, Tg mdo cxii 1. 1-159b2) of Sāntarakṣīṭa, in Phun-tshogs-gliṅ 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-niscaya) (Lhan-cig dmigs-pa ņes-pa, Tg mdo cxii 19. 29b7-302b3) of Prajñākaragupta. Translated with the help of the Nepalese pandita Sāṁtiḥadra. It is a treatise on the ascertainment of the existence of the objects simultaneously with their knowledge.

(b) Vijnaptimātratā-siddhi (Rnam-par ríg-pa tsam-nid 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) Hetuttatvopadesa (Gtan-tshigs-kyi de-kho-na-nid bstan-pa, Tg mdo cxii 24. 335a4-343b1) of Jītārī. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Kumārakalaśa. It is a treatise on the real nature of the reasons in a syllogism.

(d) Kāryakāraṇabhāva-siddhi (Rgyu daṅ 'bras-bu'i 'ño-bo grub-pa, Tg mdo cxii 29. 399a3-403a4) of Jñānaśrī-mitra. Translated with the help of the Indian pandita Kumārakalaśa. The translation was checked by Sākya-'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 Kumārakalaśa. It is a treatise on internal inseparable connection.

(f) Vādanyāya-vṛtti vipaścitārtha nama (Rtsol-pa'i rigs-pa'i 'grel-pa don rnam-par 'byed-pa zhes-bya-ba, Tg mdo cviii 2. 21b2-137a8) of
Sántarakṣita. Translated with the collaborator "Pāṇḍita-śes-rab and with the help of the Indian pandita Kumārasūkta-bhadra, in the Bsam-yas monastery. It is an elaborate commentary on Dharmakīrti’s Vādanyāya.


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

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

21. Dö-ba'i-los-known bstan-pa (1276-1342) translated a magnificent commentary named Visalāmalavatī (Yans-pa dan dri-ma med-pa ldan-pa, Tg mdo xcv 1-358a8) of Jinendrabuddhi. The name of the Indian pandita is not found. However, Dö-ba'i-los-known 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 Dignaga’s famous work Pramāṇa-samuccaya.

Tarkabhaṣa (Rto-gi skad, Tg mdo xcv 28. 361a8-399a3) of Moksākaragupta 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:

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

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

Sambandha-parikṣā-yrtti ('Brel-pa brtag-pa 'grel-ba, Tg mdo xcv 15. 356a7-364b8) of Dharmakīrti. It is an auto-commentary on Sambandha-parikṣā.

Sarvajñāsiddhi-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.

Śrutī-parikṣā-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.

Anyāpohavīcāra-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 (Dban'-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-īkā (Rtscd-pa'i riggs-pa'i 'grel-ba, Tg mdo cxii 3. 44a3-71a5) of Vinitadeva. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Vādanyāya.

Hetubindu-vivaraṇa(2) (Gtan-tshigs thigs-pa'i 'grel-ba, Tg mdc cxii 6. 223b7-302a8) of Arcaṭa. It is a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Hetubindu.

Pramāṇa-vārtika-yrtti ('Ishad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi 'grel-ba, Tg mdc cxii 3. 137a8-266a6) of Ravigupta. It is an annotation on the Pramāṇa-vārtika of Dharmakīrti.

Pramāṇa-vārtika-īkā ('Ishad-ma rnam-'grel-gyi 'grel-bsad, Tg mdo
Dharma-dharmi-viśīcaya (Chos dan chos-can gtan-la dbab-pa, Tg mdo cci 25. 343b2-347b8) of Jitāri. It is a treatise on the determination of the quality and qualificand.

One Pramāṇa-vidhvaṃsana-tīppitaka-vṛtti¹⁰ (Tshad-ma rnam-par 'joms-pa mdo-bsad-pa'i 'grel, Tg mdo xci 11. 398b4-401b8) is seen to have been translated into Tibetan. But names of the translators are not found. The work is attributed to Nagarjuna. It reproduced Nagarjuna’s definition of the sixteen categories, Pratāpana (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-tshaṅ). Thus the schools had their own set of manuals and their own learned tradition.

In a big monastery, there are five general subjects¹¹ taught, among which Buddhist logic or rather specifically Raaṃ-'grel (Pramāṇa-vārtika)¹² was one.

The monastic history started with the foundation of Bsam-yes. Though it became sacred with the touch of an eminent Buddhist logician Sāntarakṣīta who visited Tibet in c. 779 at the invitation of the Tibetan king Khris-soṅ Iđe'u-bstan (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 Brug-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-skya-pa, which takes its name from the monastery of Sa-skya, founded in 1073 by Dkon-mchog rgyal-po of the 'Khun family, who was a disciple of 'Bro-mi. A great scholar of this sect, who increased the fame of this school rapidly was Sa-skya-pa-pa Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182-1251). Sa-skya 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-skya-pa-pa 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-bza'i 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-spuis, Se-na and Bka'-sís lhun-po.

Dga'-ldan or rather fully Dga'-ldan rnam-par dge-ba'i glin was founded in 1409, by Tson-kha-pa. It is about twenty-five miles east of Lhasa. It had three school, namely Byan-rtses, Sar-rtses and Mna'-ris. Byan-rtses school followed the logical texts of Rje-btsun Chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan (1469-1544) and Sar-rtses school followed the texts of Pan-chen Bod-nams grags-pa (1478-1554).\(^4\) In 1541, the second Dalai Lama Dge-'dun rgya-mtsho (1475-1542) founded the Mna'-ris school of the Dga'-ldan monastery. This school followed the text-books written by Bstan-pa dar-bza'i and Blo-gros sbas-pa, with some additional reading materials on this matter; such as some writings on Rnam'-grel, by Gsain-bdag sprul-skü 'Ol-kha rje-druñ Blo-bzañ phrin-
One of the greatest monasteries of Tibet is 'Bras-spaṅs. It was founded in 1414, by Rgyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen (1364-1432), one of the disciples of Tsoṅ-kha-pa. It is situated about three miles west of Lhasa. This monastery has three schools, namely, Blo-gsal-glin, Bkra-sis sgo-maṅ and Bde-yasṅ. Blo-gsal-glin school follows the logical texts of Pan-chen Bsdod-rams grags-pa. Bkra-sis sgo-maṅ school was founded by Kun-mkhyen 'Jan-dbyan's bzhad-pa Nag-dbaṅ bṛtson-grus (1648-1722) and follows the logical texts of the founder himself. Apart from those, the school also teaches Nag-dbaṅ bṅra-siṅ's Bsbun-grvaṅ i.e. a compendium on logic. All Mongolia follows the tradition of the Bkra-sis sgo-maṅ or rather simply sgo-maṅ school. Bde-yasṅ is a small school and follows the syllabus of Sne-than Kva-ba-stod monastery.

Another great monastery of Tibet is Se-ra or rather Se-ra theg-chen-glin. It was founded in 1417, by Mkhas-grub Dge-legs dpal-bzaṅ-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 and Se-ra-smad. Se-ra-byes school follows the commentary on all the four chapters of Rnam-'gel, written by Rje-btsan-pa Chos-kyi nyal-mtshan (1469-1544). Se-ra-smad follows the texts of Mkhas-grub Bstan-dar.

Another great monastery and the seat of the Pan-chen Lamas is Bkra-sis lhun-po. It was founded in 1447, by the first Dalai Lama Dge-'dun-grub (1351-1474), near the south bank of the Gtsan-po near Gzhiṅ-kar-rtse. This monastery has three different schools, namely, Thos-bsaṅ-glin, Dkyil-khaṅ and Sar-rtse. Thos-bsaṅ-glin school follows the text-books written by the following scholars: Pan-chen Bsdod-rams rnam-nyal, Byan-sion Blo-gros nyal-mtsho Kun-mkhyen Chos-byon dpal-bzaṅ, Saṅs-rgyas nyal-po dpal-btan rin-chen, Dri-med bses-gnen, Blo-bzaṅ bses-gnen, Dge-'dun-bsam-grub and Dge-'dun blo-bzaṅ. Dkyil-khaṅ school follows the texts of Bstan-pa dar-bzaṅ and Blo-gros sbas-pa (1400-1475). Sar-rtse school follows the
texts of Kun-mkhyen Legs-pa don-grub.\(^{(36)}\)

Extensive study on logic is carried on in the Siye-thang Ra-va-stod monastery.\(^{(7)}\) Here the texts of Sans-pa kun-mkhyen Mchog-lha 'od-zer (1429-1500), Dkon-mchog chos-'phel\(^{(16)}\) (1573-1646). Gra-chung-pa Yon-tan rgya-mtsho, Rie Šes-rab ser-ge, Glin-smad Nag-dbaṅ dpal-'byor and Drun-chen Legs-pa bzan-po are followed.\(^{(9)}\)

\'Jam-dbyangs bzhad-pa was a native of Amdo in eastern Tibet. He studied in the Blo-gsal-glin school of the 'Bras-spurṅs monastery. He founded the Šgo-maṅ 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-braṅ Bka-ra-sis-'khyil. It became celebrated as a seat of profound learning and as the spiritual metropolis of all Mongola. 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 bzhad-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, Prajñāparamiṅta, etc. were given equal importance to be and discussed in a public debate. Hence all those meet 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-spu, Sê-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 expressively "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-plyin, 4) Mdzod, 5) 'Dul-ba, 6) Dbu-ma and 7) Bslab-ptsus. At these disputations there are tree-trunks, called the Sal-tree trunk (Sug-sdoin), Lcãn-ma sden-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 (Mdzan-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 brslob-htus 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 ‘bras-spuns congregate there. And all the learned students of the four schools who belong to the grade of brslob-htus 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 skyi-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-gtags scarf and money as present.  
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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 spr-xd of the teaching of logic, which became thus established in the region of Dbus and Gtsaṅ.

At this time there was a famous scholar named Khyun-po grags-se who composed numerous treatises on logic. They are called the "Old Nyāya" (Tshad-ma miṅ-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-idan sê-rab who is reportedly to have written a short commentary on Pramāṇa-vārtika, named Ses-rab 'grel-chuṅ.

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-ро and other monasteries. He composed an original Tibetan commentary on Pramāṇa-viniścaya (Tshad-ma rnam-ṅes) of Dharmakirti (Chos-kyi grags-pa). He had many disciples The great logician Cha-ba Chos-kyi sen-ge was one of them.

At this time another Tibetan scholar named Smön-lam tshul-khrims (11-12 th cen.) of Zhaṅ-gye is known to have written a commentary on
Pramāṇa-viniscaya. He was the disciple of Khu Ser-brtson (1075-1124).

Cha-ba (/Phya-pa) Chos-kyi sen-ge (1109-1169) studied under Byan-chub-grags the systems of Madhyamika and Nyāya (logic). Later, he became the abbot of the Gsas-phu ne-thog monastery for 18 years. Among his numerous commentaries on different treatises, there was a commentary on Pramāṇa-viniscaya. 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 or “Abridgement of logic — disperser of darkness of mind”, and an auto-commentary thereon. "Gos lo-tsa-ba (1392-1481), a renowned Tibetan historian writes He (Gos lo-tsa-ba) heard about a Phyin-na-md gi grub-mthra’ bsdus-pa or “Summary on the theories of non-Buddhist and Buddhist” and about a Ses-by a gzhi-nya’i bsad-pa or “exposition of the five bases of the knowable” by him.

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

A large commentary on Pramāṇa-viniscaya was composed by Gtsan-nag-pa Brtson-’gus sen-ge (12th cen.). The commentator also composed a number of text-books on Nyāya, Madhyamika and other subjects. His numerous large and abridged commentaries on the Madhyamika follow the method of Candrakirti. His exposition of logic was very popular in the monastery of Rot-wo/Reb-koni, Amdo.

Dan-bag-pa Smra-ba’i sen-ge (12th cen.) composed an independent treatise on logic. Bu-stor (1290-1365) mentions in his Tshad-ma rnam-par nes-pa’i mthhan-don (The meaning of the term pramāṇa-viniscaya), one Dan-bag-pa Dar-mabgra-sis in the lineage of Pramāṇa-viniscaya, and most probably Dar-ma bkra-sis is same and identical with Smra-ba’i sen-ge. Anyway, ‘Gos lo-tsa-ba says that he had seen other works composed by Dan-bag-pa except an “Abridgement of logic” (Tshad-ma’i bsdus-pa) by
hin and a commentary on Asuttaratantra. ‘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 pandita 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 I’shad-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 sen-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 [Ssod-nams sen-ge], the disciple of ‘Jan-ba ston-skyabs headed (the exposition) of Pramāṇa-vartika from Sa-skya pan-chen at Sa-skya. Thanks to his teaching, there appeared numerous disciples, including the great scholar Zhan 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 Gsāṅ-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-dbyang gsar-ma\(^{(22)}\) appears to have composed a commentary on Pramāṇa-viniscaya.\(^{(23)}\)

An extensive commentary on Pramāṇa-viniscaya was composed by the famous historian and writer Bu-ston Rün-chen-grub (1290-1365). Its title is I’shad-ma rnam-pa’i rift tshig-don rab-gsal\(^{(24)}\). Bu-ston also composed a small tract\(^{(25)}\) on the meaning of the term pramāṇa-viniscaya.

Mahāpandita Bisun-pa Jam-dbyangs\(^{(26)}\) (‘Jam-pa’i dbyangs), a disciple of the famous scholar Scom-idan rigs-pa’i ral’ign\(^{(27)}\), became the court chaplain (mchod-ngaś) of Buyantu-pan (1311-1320), a Mongol prince. There
he wrote a short commentary on the Pramana-viniścaya.58

The last writer of this old period was Red-mda’-pe Gzhon-nu blo-gros (1349-1412). He was the teacher of Tson-kha-pa and the author of an independent work on the general tendency of Dignāga’s system.59

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 Tson-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 of Dhammakirti. The title of that work is Sde-ba-dun-la ‘jug-pa’i sgo don-gner yid kyi mun-se51.

Tson-kha-pa’s three disciples Rgyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen (1364-1432), Mchugs-grub Dge-legs dpal-bzab-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 Dharmakirti.


Other important work of Rgyal-tshab is a commentary50 on the treatise Tshad-ma rigs-pa’i gter of Sūrya pandita. Its title is Tshad-ma rigs-rges-rgyis rnam-bsad legs-par bsad-pa’i stin-po but generally known by its short title Rigs-gter dar-tik. One summary50 of Pramāṇa-vārttika and other small related works50 were also composed by him. Original treatises of Rgyal-tshab includes Tshad-ma’i lam-khrig50 on Introduction to logic, ‘Gal-brel-gyi rnam-gzhag50 on Separation and relation which are the important topics of discussion in Buddhist logic, and Phyogs-sgra ‘jug-tshul nmn-su50 on
the use of propositional word.

Mkhas-grub wrote a very detailed commentary on Pramâna-vartika, with the sub-title Rig-pa i rgya-rab-sho. An annotative work on the Seven Treatises of Dharmakirti was another treatise composed by him. Its title is Tshad-ma sde-btun-rgyi rgyan yid-kyi mun-sel. His one independent work, Tshad-bras-kyi rram-bad chen-mo 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 on Pramâna-vartika in 1432. Tshad-ma rigs-gyan was an independent work written by him in 1437.

Thân bla-ma thor-god Jam-dbyangs sras-rab skyin-pa wrote two small works, one summary of Pramâna-vartika and a commentary on inference for one’s own sake.

Spyan-sna Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan, a close disciple of Mkhas-grub wrote a treatise named Tshad-ma rnam-grel-la brtea-pa’i lla-khrig.

Pan-chen Bsod-rams grags-pa (1478-1554) wrote a commentary on Pramâna-vartika.

Pâdana dkar-po (1527-1592), a giant figure of the Tibetan academic world wrote two works, one detailed and the other brief, on the contention of Pramâna-samuccaya of Dignâga and Seven Treatises of Dharmakirti. The titles of those two works are Tshad-ma mdo dañ sde-btun-rgyi don gtan-la phab-pa’i bstan-bsos ’jag-btsun ‘jam-pa’i dbya’is-kyi dgoñs-rgyan and Tshad-ma’i mdo sde-btun dañ bcas-pa’i spyi-don rigs-pa’i sriu-po ches-bya-bu.

The celebrated grand lama ‘Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa Nag-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-vārttika.

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

Klon-rdo bla-ma Nag-dbaṅ blo-bzaṅ (b. 1719) was an erudite scholar and writer of a number of important texts on different subjects. He wrote Tshad-ma rnam-'grel-sogs gstan-'tshigs rig-pa-las byun-bzì mìn-gi graṅs containing explanation of important technical terms in Pramāṇa-vārttika and other treatises on logic.

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


Unabating culture of Buddhist logic or rather specifically the culture of Rnam-'grel (Pramāṇa-vārttika) 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, "Saṃkhyā" - 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 Nagarjuna and others follow Mādhyamika school.
the works of Dārāga, Dharmakīrti and others follow Yogacāra school: the works of Sāntarakṣita, Kamalasila and others follow Saṃvatīkā school and the works of Subhagupta and others follow Vaibhāṣīka 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 Tibet, the subsequent Tibetan scholars followed only two systems among them, "Mādhyamika" and "Yogacāra". Mādhyamika system in Tibet, as in India, flourished in a separate line of study. And yogacāra system is kept up in Tibet through the study of Pramāṇa-viniscaya (Rnam-'grel) 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. Rgyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen belonged to the "Critical school" of Kashmir, to which belonged the Indian commentator Śaṅkarānanda. No continuation of "Religious school" of Bengal, to which belonged the Indian commentator Prajinakara-gupta and sub-commentators Ravigupta, Jina and Yanari, is seen in Tibet.

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-viniscaya) 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 Scherbatsky writes: "Substantially logic has hardly made any great progress in Tibet. Dharmakīrti had given it its final form".

Despite his statement like that Scherbatsky did not fully deny the credit of the Tibetan scholars in creation of some new ideas in logic.
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 subtility 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."(1)

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.(2)

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)

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 Abso-
   lute 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 Frauwaller).
   Dharmakirti : c. 650 (according to Nakamura), 600-660
   (according to Frauwaller).
   Devendrabuddhi : 630-690 (according to Frauwaller).
   Śākyabuddhi : 660-720 (according to Frauwaller).
   Subhagupta : 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

38
because he was reportedly present in the great debate held at Bsam-yas monastery of Tibet about 792 A.D.

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

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

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

Arcaś alias Dharmakaradatta : 730-790 (according to Frauwaller).

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

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

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

Ruvígupta : After 950.

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

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

Jñānasīrbhadra : c. 925 (according to Nakamura).

Ratnākarasānti : 1040 (according to Nakamura).

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

Sāmkarananda : 1059 (according to Satish C. Vidyabhusan).

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

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

3. BA, p. 70.
4. This was subsequently twice translated, first by Bhavyarāja and Blo-Ildan sles-rab (1059-1109), and finally by Śākyāri bhadra (1127-1225) and Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dga’ rgyal-mtshan (1181-1250).

5. Colophon of the Tibetan text shows that Dipaṅkara (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-tsa’ ba did not even cross the age of 10 years.

6. According to Tāraṇāthā (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 sles-rab with the help of Kumārāṇaṇi of Kashmir.

   Before the translation of Rṇog-lo-tsa’-ba, one famous Zans-dkar lo-tsā’-ba translated Pramāṇa-vārtika-alamkāra. [See BA, p. 70]

10. Sanskrit manuscripts of 12 works of Jñānaśrīmitra have been discovered by Rahul Sankrityayan from Tibet. Apart from Kāryakaranasiddhi, the rest are: Kṣanakhambadhyaya, Vyāptiṣaiva, Bhedābheda-prakarāṇa, Anupalabdhi-hahasya, Sarvasabdābha-cacra, Apanaparakaṇa, Īsāvāvada, Yoginirpaṇaparakaṇa, Advaitabindu prakaraṇa, Sākāra-siddhisāstra and Sākāra-saṅgrahasūtra.
11. There was one Dīpaṃkararaḵṣita in the 11th century. He was well-known by the names Bṣal-po thugs-rje chen-po or Paṇ-chen ne-tsa liṅ-pa. Going to Tibet he bestowed Yoga to Zaṅs-dkar los-tsi-ba. Then that Lo-tsi-ba translated the commentary of Anuttarayoga (Yo-ga-smad). Dīpaṃkararaḵṣita was also the teacher of Rva los-tsa-ba.

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

12. The Kashmirian pandita Śākyānirvāṇa (1127-1225) went to madhyadeśa and received upasampadā from Śāntyākaraṇagupta in 1156. [KLT, p. 174]

13. The translators are not found in Ĥanjuṛ. But Rahulji mentions Dpal-brtsegs as one of the translators in his Pramāṇa-vārtika-bhāṣya (p. 67).[BL-I, pp. 28, 559]

(Part Three)

1. Dbu-ma (Mḍhyamika philosophy), Phar-phyin (Thon-kha-pi’s commentary on Ser phyin i.e. Prajñāpāramitā), (Dul-ba’ Vinaya), Mnön-mdan (Abhidharmakosa of Vasubandhu) and Rnam-'grel (Pramāṇa-vārtika of Dharmakirti).

2. Buddhist logic in Tibet, in one way, means nothing but the study of a logical text of Dharmakirti, named Pramāṇavārtika which, in Tibetan, is called Tahad-ma rnam-'grel or more briefly Rnam-'grel.

3. BL-I, p. 56.

4. MHTL-III, p. 671. See the syllabus of Dkhyil-kha’n school of Bka’-sīs tshun-po.

5. Same as that were taught in Bgol-gsti-glön school of ’Bras-spu’ monastery.

We see that Dga’-ldan nag-ros sar-rtsé school published one exposition of all
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the four chapters of Bstan-'grel, having 117 fols., 50 fols., 113 fols., and 52 fols. consecutively. See MHTL - III, p. 671.

6. Bsdod-gangs's exposition of Bstan-'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 Blov-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-dbyangs bzhad-pa’s Exposition of Bstan-'grel contains 268 fols. for the first chapter and 107 fols. for the second chapter. Blov-rig (25 fols.) and Rtags-rig (45 fols.) also were included in the syllabus. See MHTL - III, p. 669-70.

8. This Bsdus-grva contains 135 fols. See MHTL - III, p. 669.

9. See later, for the syllabus of Sné-thaṅ Iva-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 ner-bu glin.


13. This information is supplied by my Venerable teacher Ṣārya Padma brtson-grus, now the Tibetan teacher of Calcutta University.


Thos-glin bya-thon blo-gros rgya-mtsho'i rnam-'grel lta-ba'i me-loṅ dais le'u dabh-po'i mtha'-dpoyd legs-bsdad 'phreö-ba.

Thos-glin kun-mkhyen chos-byur dpal-bzāṅ-gi rnam-'grel mkhas-pa'i mgul-
Thos-glin dri-med bses-gnën-gyi rnam-’grel yid-bzhin nor-bu.
Thos-glin blo-bzan bses-gnën-gyi rig-nyan.
Thos-glin dge-’dun bsam-’grub-kyi blo-gros kha-byañ.
Thos-glin dge-’dun blo-bzaṅ-gis le ’u-bzhi’i mtha’-’geod.”
[MHTL - II, p. 664]

Bstan-pa dar-bzan-gi rnam-’grel luṅ-rig gter mdzod. ‘Dul-’dzin blo-gros sbsas-pas mdzad-pa’i le’u daṅ-po’i mtha’-’geod klag-pas don-’grub.
Blo-gros sbsas-pa’i rnam-’grel le’u bzhis-k‘a’i spyi-don.”
[MHTL - III, p. 664]

16. “Sat-rtsa kun-mkhyen legé-pa don-grub-kyi rnam-’grel.”
[MHTL - III, p. 665]

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

18. He received upasampadi under Dpal-byuṭ tgya-mtsho in 1593, became the judge of philosophical debate (‘chad-dan-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 Gsas-phu in 1619, became Head of the Rdzin-phyi in 1620, became Mkhen-po of Blo-gsal-glin in 1623, became Head (35th) of the Dgi’-ldan in 1626 and became the preceptor of the Dalai Lama in 1627.
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(33 fols.) Lugs-ldog legs-bsad ba'-mûzod. (23 fols.) Le'u gsun-pa lu-n-rig sgo-brgya. (113 fols.) Le'u bzhis-pa thar-lam gsal-ba'i dgo'-nyan. (76 fols.) 'Đkon-mchog chos-'grel mam-'grel le'u so-so'i zur-bkol no-mtshar gyes bs dus. Le'u da'-po'i thbyor-'tik.

Gra-chu-ni ba von-kan rgya-mthos mdzad-pa'i rmm-'grel gi-ma'i 'od-zer le'u bzhis tshân-ma.

Rje skes-rab ser-ge'i gsun-bzhin zin-bris mdzad-pa'i rnam-'grel thar-lam gsal-byed ni-ma'i 'od-zer le'u bzhis tshân-ma.

Glin-smad phug-dba' dpal-'byor-gyi rtags-rig gsal-ba'i mt-loi.

(24 fols.)

Dru'n-chen legs-pa bza'-po'i blo-rig. (30 fols.)

The above complete set of logical texts is called Rva-ba-stod bs dus-grva. One such set is being preserved in Bkra-sis sgo-ma's school of the 'Bras-spu monastery.

[MiTL. - III, p. 665]

20. No sects appear to have existed prior to Gia-r-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 Atiśa 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 Tson-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 Atisa'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 demesnolatry.

The residue who remained wholly unreformed and weakened by the loss of their best members, were now called the Rni-nyi-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 Khyun-po grags-pa. See BA, p. 93.

"Though there exists an account that Khyun-po grags-se had studied the 'Old Nyaya', and had left behind numerous disciples, it is not sure whether the 'Old Nyaya', which had been studied by him, had not originated from Khams and Mha'-ris, from a translation of Devendrabuddhi's commentary by Rma lo-tsâ-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-ma, Skyil-mkhar lha-khaṅ-pa, Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa.

[BA, p. 332]

6. BA, p. 331.

7. Most of the Pitjakadhara-s of that time had been his disciples. Gtsan-nag-pa Betson-grus sen-ge, Dan-bag-pa Smra-ba’i sen-ge (Dan-bag, near ‘Bras-spu’s), Bru-sa Bsod-nams sen-ge (Bru-sa, Gilgit), Rma-bya Rtsod-pa’i sen-ge (Rma-bya, near Sa-skya), Rtsags Dbaṅ-phug sen-ge, Myan-bran Chos-kyi sen-ge, Ldan-ma Dken-mchog sen-ge and Gstal-pa Yon-tan sen-ge — the “Eight mighty lions” (Sen-chen brgyad). Some include (among them) Gtsan-pa ‘Jam-dpal sen-ge. ’Khon Jo-sras Rtsi-mo, Rinog Jo-sras Ra-mo, Khu Jo-sras Ne-tso, Gnos Jo-sras Dpal-le — these four were called “The Four Jo-sras”. ‘Gar Dbaṅ-grub, Koṅ-po Jag-chuṅ, Lho-pa Sgog-zan and Shar-pu-pa — these four were called “The Four Wise Ones” (Ses-rab-can bzhi). Further ‘Jai-pa Ston-skyabs, Rdo-rje ’od-zer and others. Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa, Zhaṅ Tshal-pa, as well as many others.

[BA, p. 333]

8. Commentaries on the Five Treatises of Maitreya, Satyadvaya-vibhāṅgakārikā, Madhyamakālaṃkārākārikā, 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 ţaçařya Čandrakirti the celebrated commentator on Mūlamadhyamakakārikā of Nāgārjuna.

12. BL, p. 55.

13. BA, p. 349.

14. BA, p. 334.

15. Here Roerick 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 bṛpta-pa, 2b-1-3a4 (Vīśaya-pariṣkāra), 2) Bāo-bṛpta-pa, 5a-1-1b (Buddhi-pariṣkāra), 3) Spho dai bya-brag bṛpta-pa, 7b-1-9a1 (Sāmanya-viṣeṣa-pariṣkāra), 4) Sgrub-pa dai gzhan-sel bṛpta-pa, 9a1-13b1 (Ādhanā-anvaya-pariṣkāra), 5) Brjod-byā dai rjod-byed bṛpta-pa, 13b1-15b6 (Vācya-vacaka-pariṣkāra), 6) 'Brel-pa bṛpta-pa, 15b6-21a3 (Sāṃbandha-pariṣkāra), 7) Gsho-ba bṛpta-pa, 21a3-23b1 (Virodha-pariṣkāra), 8) Mšan-rig bṛpta-pa, 23b1-29a2 (Laṅkāna-pariṣkāra), 9) Mnhen-sum bṛpta-pa, 29a2-32b3 (Pratyakṣa-pariṣkāra), 10) Ra-ba jres-dpa bṛpta-pa, 32b4-40b5 (Svārthānamāna-pariṣkāra), and 11) Gzhon-don jres-su dpag-pa bṛpta-pa, 40b5-45b2 (Parārthānamāna-pariṣkāra).

18. A xylograph copy of it is in the possession of the writer of the present article. Its title is Tshad-ma rig-pa'i gter-kyi legs-bshad bzan-po gsum ldan ces-byas-ba (Pramāṇa-yuktī-nidhi-subhaṣīta-bhadra-tṛতayīnāya) and contains 161 fols. of medium format.


20. Though the name of the scholar U-yug-pa Rigs-pa'i sér-ge is clearly mentioned by Scherbatsky 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 Bstd-nams sen-ge.

21. BA, p. 335.

22. One of his disciples was Kun-mkhyen Cho-skü 'od-zer. 'Jam-dbyangs 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 'nes-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-mdä-'pa. See BA, pp. 336-9.

28. BA, pp. 335-6.

29. BL, p. 56.

30. Pramana-vartika (Tshad-ma rnam-'gle), Pramāṇa-viniscaya (Tshad-ma rnam-ī), Nysyabindu (Rigs-thigs), Sambandha-parikṣā ('Brel-pa rtags-pa), Vādanyāya (Rtsod-pa rigs-pa), Santanāntara-siddhi (Rgyad-gzhan grub-pa) and Hetubindu (Gtan-thigs thigs-pa).

31. It contains 25 fols. and is included in the 18th (Tsha) volume of the Collected Works of Tsoṅ-kha-pa (Bkra-sis lhon-po edition.).

32. It contains 408 fols. and is included in the 6th (Cha) volume of the Collected Works of his preceptor Tsoṅ-kha-pa. Short title of the work is
Rnam-'grel thar-lam gsal-byed. Author composed it at the request of Gnas-rin-chos-pa Rin-chen rgyal-mishan. (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 'Bro-pa lha-btsun. Short title of the work is Rnam-rje Dgongs-pa rab-gsal.

34. It contains 63 fols. and is included in the 8th (Na) volume of the Collected Works of Tsong-kha-pa. It was written at the inspiration of 'Bro-pa lha-btsun. Klo-'dol bla-ma mentions the text with a different sub-title Rin-chen gter-mdzod. For the last information see MHTL-III, p. 618.


36. See BL - II, P. 325.

'Bre-pa rtag-pa'i rnam-bshad 'zin-ma'i sphi-po (14 fols.): A text on Sambandha-pariṇāma of Dhanakirti. See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/8.

37. Rnam-'grel-gyi bsdus-don thar-lam-gyi de-thid gsal-byed (92 fols.). See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/5. (?) Same with the text Lha-dba'-blo'i rjes-su 'brai-pa'i rnam-'grel-gyi sa-bcad chen-mo, as mentioned by Klo-'dol bla-ma. See MHTL-III, p. 618.\(1\)

38. Tshad-ma'i brjed-byan chen-mo (47 fols.), Tshad-ma mion-sum le'di brjed-byan chen-po (55 fols.), Tshad-ma mion-sum le'u'i tjiaka (102 fols.), as mentioned by Klo-'dol. See MHTL-III, p. 617. For the first text mentioned above (containing 43 fols.) see NL Tib. ms. No. 59/4.


40. It contains 10 fols. See NL Tib. ms. No. 25/10.

41. Mentioned by Klo-'dol. See MHTL-III, p. 618.

(One bundle. Bkra-śis 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. 460/1-4).

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. 519.

45. (Ka: 1st chapter) Tshad-ma rnam-'grel legs-par bsad-pa zhes-byba-ba thams-cad mkhyen-pa dge-'dun-grub-kyis mdzad-pa las raṅ-don rjes-su dpag-pa'i le'u'i rnam-bsad. 42 fols. (Kha: 2nd chapter) Tshad-ma ... las tshad-ma grub-pa'ile'u'i ... 36 fols. (Ga: 3rd chapter) Tshad-ma ... las miön-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 Klong-rdo slo 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 Klong-rdo slo. See MHTL-III, p. 622. A copy of the text is preserved in the CU. S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 327).


49. See MHTL-III, p. 641.


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 (Phie) volume of the Collected Works of the author.


57. It contains 6 fols. See CU. S. C. Das Collection (TM No. 332/7).

58. From the autobiography called Dkhyil-zur dka'-chen blo-bzain sbyin-pa'i spyod-thub dran-po'i gtim-gyis gsal-bar brjod-pa rin-chen dbang-gi 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 dain-po'i tikka (Ka, 1st chapter, 116 fols.); Le'u gnis-pa'i tikka (Kha, 2nd chapter, 68 fols.); Le'u gsun-pa'i tikka (Ga, 3rd chapter, 124 fols.) and Le'u bzhis-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 loophole 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 tsho-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 nam-'grel-gyi 'grel-ba rigs-pa'i ba-mdzod gces-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 Mongol 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 sumbnum 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-pa mdzad-pa'i rgyud-gzhvan grub-pa zhes-byas-ba'i bstan-bcos-kyi 'grel-pa mkhas-pa'i yid-'phrog (21 fols.) [Exposition of Santanantarasiddhi of Dharmakriti]

(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]
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3. [Blo-bzan] 'jigs-med bstan-pa'i rgyal-mtshan (19th cen.) was the nombun qan of Cin sujugtu 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 dbar-po slob-dpon Bsdod-nams rgya-mtshan came from the Sayin noyan qan qosirun. He was famous for his grammatical erudition. Seven volumes of his sumber 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.
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