

The Place of Dan 'bag pa sMra ba'i seng ge in the Tibetan Epistemological Tradition

Jonathan Stoltz
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota)

The corpus of texts collected together and published as part of the *Collected Works of the Kadampas* (*bKa' gdams gsung 'bum*) beginning in 2006 has provided Buddhologists with a wealth of information and has made it possible to piece together an increasingly clearer picture of how Tibetan philosophy developed from the eleventh to fourteenth centuries. Even before the publication of the texts in the *Collected Works of the Kadampas*, scholars were keenly aware of the critical importance of figures like rNgog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059-1109) and Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109-1169). Access to multiple texts composed by these two Tibetan thinkers has allowed scholars to form a more complete picture of those two philosophers' roles in shaping Tibetan intellectual history.

The texts written by rNgog Lo tsā ba and Phya pa cannot tell the whole story, however. Also crucially important are the works composed by, and views held by, the direct and indirect teachers and disciples of these two figures. With respect to Phya pa's impact on the field of epistemology, for example, it would be incredibly helpful to have access to more of his teachers' and students' works. Of Phya pa's eight principal disciples—referred to as his “Eight Mighty Lions” (*seng (ge) chen brgyad*)—we currently possess just a single epistemology treatise: a commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* composed by gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge. Yet, multiple sources attest to the fact that at least one of Phya pa's other students, Dan 'bag pa sMra ba'i seng ge, composed an “epistemology summary” text, i.e., a *Tshad ma'i bsdus pa*.

Though no copies of this epistemology summary have yet come to light, a considerable number of the epistemological views held by Dan 'bag pa—views almost certainly espoused in his now lost epistemology summary—can be found referenced in two other epistemology treatises that have been recovered in the past thirty years, namely:¹

¹ For full references for these two works, see *gSal byed* and *sNying po* in the Bibliography. In addition to the references to Dan 'bag pa in these two texts, there are also eleven references to him in Śākya mchog ldan's *Pham byed*, a text which dates to the second half of the fifteenth century. (Ten of those eleven references are

- i. *The Clarifying Lamp of Pure Reasoning* (*Yang dag rigs pa'i gsal byed sgron ma*; henceforth, *Clarifying Lamp*) authored by gTsang pa drug po rDo rje 'od zer (henceforth, gTsang drug pa), and
- ii. *The Ornamental Essence of Logical Reasoning* (*rTog ge rigs pa'i brgyan gyi snying po*; henceforth, *Ornamental Essence*) written by Dharmaratna, a.k.a. Dharma dkon mchog.

These two texts contain a total of fifty-one interlinear citations referencing the views of Dan 'bag pa, thus making it possible to cobble together a clearer picture of the range of epistemological contributions that were made by this important student of Phya pa.

A full accounting of those epistemological contributions cannot be carried out in this brief article. Instead, the principal task of this article is to lay bare the connection between Dan 'bag pa and the authors of the two extant epistemology summaries that reference his views—Dharmaratna and gTsang drug pa. I shall investigate why Dan 'bag pa's views are featured so prominently in the treatises of Dharmaratna and gTsang drug pa and what that might tell us about the development of Buddhist epistemology in twelfth and thirteenth century Tibet.

I shall begin by summarizing what is currently known about the life of Dan 'bag pa. After doing so, I will proceed to lay out in some detail where Dan 'bag pa's epistemology summary text fits within the broader tradition of epistemological theorizing that took hold in central Tibet in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Once I have sketched a rough timeline of early Tibetan epistemology summary texts, we will then be in the position to examine more carefully the texts by Dharmaratna and gTsang drug pa and to determine with more precision where those two works fit within the Tibetan epistemological tradition. I will then proceed to examine the authorship of those two texts and to clarify the connections that the two authors bear to both Dan 'bag pa himself and the broader tradition of epistemological theorizing connected with gSang phu Monastery in central Tibet.

1. A Short Summary of Dan 'bag pa's Place in Tibetan Intellectual History

Relatively few details are known about the life of Dan 'bag pa sMra ba'i seng ge. Much of what is currently known about him stems from

identified in van der Kuijp (1983), p. 96.) Those references within Śākya mchog ldan's work will not be addressed here, as the focus of this article is on references dating to the much earlier period of the late-twelfth to early-thirteenth century.

his connections to two other important Tibetan scholars in the twelfth to thirteenth century: his teacher Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge and his student gNyal zhig 'Jam pa'i rdo rje. We know that Dan 'bag pa was one of the most important students of Phya pa—one of his 'Eight Mighty Lions'—where he is frequently listed second in that group of eight students, immediately after gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge. What precise topics and what texts he studied directly under Phya pa is not entirely clear from existing historical records. There is, in fact, some reason to believe that, aside from studying under Phya pa, Dan 'bag pa additionally received various teachings from (Phya pa's student) gTsang nag pa. Multiple text lineages suggest that the transmission line went from Phya pa to gTsang nag pa to Dan 'bag pa.² Later in life, Dan 'bag pa went on to become one of the two primary teachers of gNyal zhig 'Jam pa'i rdo rje, a figure who played a key role in promoting scholarly learning in early thirteenth century Tibet.³

Both Phya pa and gNyal zhig were abbots of gSang phu ne'u thog Monastery in central Tibet—Phya pa from approximately 1151 until his death in 1169, and gNyal zhig from, it is believed, 1199 to 1207.⁴ This makes it safe to infer that Dan 'bag pa flourished sometime from the middle to late twelfth century. Given his status as a student of Phya pa and teacher of gNyal zhig, Dan 'bag pa falls squarely within a web of Tibetan scholasticism that goes all the way back to rNgog Legs pa'i shes rab (11th cent.), the founder (and first abbot) of gSang phu Monastery and the uncle of that monastery's second abbot, rNgog Lo tsā ba.

Just as we find with other Tibetan scholars from that time period, Dan 'bag pa's name is likely an indicator of his birthplace and suggests that he hailed from the area of central Tibet called Dan bag/'bag—i.e., the grasslands located just south of present-day 'Bres spungs Monastery. If this is right, this would put his birthplace only about 25 kilometers from the site of gSang phu Monastery. Though Dan 'bag pa was

² To give but two examples, see *mTshan don* 5a5, which traces a lineage of epistemology teachings, and *gSung 'bum*, vol. 4, p. 103, which traces a lineage for the *Gang blo ma*. Both these lineages have the sequence: rGya dmar ba, Cha pa (i.e., Phya pa), gTsang nag pa, and then Dan 'bag pa.

³ Aside from Dan 'bag pa, gNyal zhig's other main teacher was Zhang ye ba sMon lam tshul khriims, who, incidentally, was purported to have authored a commentary on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (see *Tho yig* 23a3).

⁴ The dates of Phya pa's abbotship are fairly well established, given that his precise death is recorded. There is less certainty regarding the timeline of gNyal zhig's time as abbot of (the Upper College of) gSang phu Monastery. This uncertainty is, in part, due to conflicting information about how long gNyal zhig was abbot (somewhere between eight and twenty-eight years), but also due to a lack of certainty about the dates of some of the earlier abbots of the Upper College of gSang phu. For more on this, see van der Kuijp (1987).

given the name “*smra ba'i seng ge*” in connection with his status as a student of Phya pa, multiple documents attribute various other names to him. He is in some texts referred to as “*dar ma bkra shis*” and in others as “*dar ma seng ge*.”⁵ There is some reason to believe that Dan 'bag pa sMra ba'i seng ge is in fact the same person as the Dar ma bkra shis who composed a Two Truths text called the *bDen pa gnyis rnam par 'byed kyi bshad pa*, which, as scholarship by Ritsu Akahane has revealed, bears close resemblance to the Two Truths texts composed by Phya pa (viz., the *dBu ma bDen gnyis kyi 'grel ba*) and by (Phya pa's teacher) rGya dmar ba (viz., the *bDen gnyis rnam bshad*).⁶

Dan 'bag pa's (indirect) influence appears to have extended beyond gSang phu Monastery, thanks in large part to his having been a teacher of gNyal zhig. Within the *Blue Annals* and other history chronicles, gNyal zhig is credited with encouraging his own students to found philosophical study centers outside of central Tibet, including within sNar thang, Zhwa lu, and Sa skya Monasteries in gTsang.⁷ In this way, these satellite study centers could very well have provided a mechanism for the views—and, perhaps also, texts—of scholars like rNgog Lo tsā ba, Phya pa, and even Dan 'bag pa, to become accessible within these more Western regions of Tibet and within monasteries having sectarian affiliations different from gSang phu.

As mentioned earlier, Dan 'bag pa is credited in the *Blue Annals* with composing, among other works, an epistemology text called the *Tshad ma'i bsdus pa*. It is unlikely that this is the precise or full name of his text. Rather, it is more likely a general term for any “epistemology summary” of the sort that became fairly common among gSang phu

⁵ For example, the colophon of Bu ston's epistemology text *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i mtshan don* (see *mTshan don* 5a5) contains a lineage of *pramāṇa* scholars, wherein Dan 'bag pa is identified as “*dar ma bkra shis*.” Within the Collected Works of Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, one text lineage contains the name “*dan phag pa dar ma seng ge*” (see *Ngor gsung*, p. 428). This is clearly a reference to Dan 'bag pa, as the name appears immediately after the names rGya dmar pa, Phya pa, and gTsang nag pa (and immediately before gNyal zhig). Likewise, the name “*dan 'bag pa dar seng*” appears within the same sequence of scholars in the transmission lineage for the *Gang blo ma*, as presented in the Collected Works of Taranatha (*Jo gsung*, vol. 31, p. 281). The Collected Works of the Fifth Dalai Lama, Ngag dbang bLo bzang rgya mtsho, contains various lists of transmission lineages involving these same gSang phu scholars, including (a) one lineage with a reference to “*dan 'bag pa dar ma seng ge*” and (b) another lineage referencing “*dan 'bag pa dar ma bkra shis*” (see *gSung 'bum*, vol. 4, p. 103 and p. 137, respectively).

⁶ These three texts are the *rGya bden*, the *dBu bden*, and the *bDen bshad*. For more on these texts, see Akahane (2013).

⁷ See, for example, *Deb sngon*, pp. 407-8.

scholars in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁸ The most famous epistemology summary in Tibet is the one composed by Phya pa—his, *Epistemology: The Dispeller of the Mind's Darkness* (*Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel*; henceforth *Dispeller*). But the tradition of writing epistemology summaries likely did not begin with Phya pa, for there is some evidence that Phya pa's teacher rGya dmar ba also wrote a *Tshad ma'i bsdus pa*.⁹ Neither this epistemology summary composed by rGya dmar ba nor the one written by Dan 'bag pa are known to be extant. It is highly probable that the references to the positions held by Dan 'bag pa within Dharmaratna's *Ornamental Essence* and gTsang drug pa's *Clarifying Lamp* are derived from the epistemology summary that was produced by Dan 'bag pa. Before examining the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp*, however, let us first take a step back and examine the historical context for the composition of epistemology summaries in Tibet so that readers can see more clearly where Dan 'bag pa fell within this tradition of writing.

2. Epistemology Summaries from Phya pa to Sa skya Paṇḍita

Scholars now have access to more than a handful of texts falling under the genre of “epistemology summaries” (*tshad ma'i bsdus pa*) that were likely written sometime between the middle of the twelfth and the first quarter of the thirteenth centuries—i.e., within the first (roughly) 75 years following the composition of Phya pa's *Dispeller*. The earliest, presently available, epistemology summary that post-dates Phya pa's *Dispeller* is probably the *Summary of the Essential Nature of Epistemology* (*Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*; henceforth *Essential Nature*).¹⁰ That text's colophon attributes authorship to Klong chen Rab 'byams (1308-1363), but as has been carefully documented by Leonard van der Kuijp, the *Essential Nature* assuredly dates to a period much earlier than the fourteenth century.¹¹ Enough evidence has been compiled to support the conclusion that the *Essential Nature* was actually written by a person named 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub (c. 1150-1210)—a scholar whose primary teacher, Byang chub skyabs, was himself a direct

⁸ There is no straightforward English correlate for the Tibetan term “*bsdus pa*”; at least none that adequately captures its application to epistemology texts of the sort that developed in Tibet starting in the eleventh or twelfth century. The most common rendering of the term “*bsdus pa*” is probably “summary.” In reality, however, the epistemology texts falling in this genre are rarely summaries at all. For more on how to render the term “*bsdus pa*” in English, see Hugon & Stoltz (2019), ch. I.2, pp. 48-50.

⁹ See *Tho yig* 23b4 as well as van der Kuijp (1983), pp. 60-1.

¹⁰ See *Tshad bsdus*, as well as Stoltz (2020).

¹¹ See van der Kuijp (2003).

student of Phya pa.¹²

There is, within the *Essential Nature*, a large amount of evidence to support the conclusion that the text was written sometime around the last thirty years of the twelfth century. This evidence includes: (1) facts about the organizational structure of the text, which bears extremely close resemblance to Phya pa's *Dispeller*; (2) various peculiarities of technical nomenclature; and (3) information about the identities of the scholars who are referenced in the text.¹³ In particular, while the *Essential Nature* references Phya pa's views and the views of earlier Tibetan philosophers, it contains (aside from repeated references to the views of the author's teacher Byang chub skyabs) no other references to Tibetans from generations subsequent to Phya pa. For example, it contains no references to the views of Phya pa's prized students g'Tsang nag pa and Dan 'bag pa.

Two other known epistemology summaries likely date to a period roughly contemporaneous to that of the *Essential Nature*. One of these is the summary composed by Dan 'bag pa and the other is a text called *The Wisdom Lamp of Epistemology* (*Tshad ma Shes rab sgron ma*; henceforth, *Wisdom Lamp*), which was composed by mTshur ston gZhon nu seng ge. As mentioned above, Dan 'bag pa studied directly under Phya pa, but he also seems to have received teachings on epistemology from g'Tsang nag pa. mTshur ston was likewise a student of g'Tsang nag pa, and he went on to become one of the teachers of Sa skya Paṇḍita (henceforth, Sa-pan; 1182-1251) in the early years of the thirteenth century (c. 1201-1204). It is believed that mTshur ston's epistemology summary was among the texts that Sa-pan studied, thus implying that the *Wisdom Lamp* dates to no later than the end of the twelfth century.

Neither the *Essential Nature* nor the *Wisdom Lamp* make any explicit references to the views of Dan 'bag pa. Nor does gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature* make any reference to the epistemological views of mTshur ston (or vice versa). This makes it difficult to determine with any precision the order in which these texts were composed. There are a few pieces of evidence that, when put together, could indicate that Dan 'bag pa and gZhon nu byang chub would have been roughly contemporaneous thinkers, though Dan 'bag pa was probably somewhat senior to gZhon nu byang chub. Consider first that Phya pa was a direct teacher of (among others) both Dan 'bag pa and Byang chub skyabs; and, as mentioned above, Byang chub skyabs was the main teacher of gZhon nu byang chub. This may lead one to suspect that gZhon nu byang chub was about one generation later than

¹² See Stoltz (2020). The approximate dates for gZhon nu byang chub's life come from van der Kuijp (2014), p. 123.

¹³ See Stoltz (2020), section 1, for a more detailed discussion of these various pieces of information.

Dan 'bag pa. On the other hand, we must note that within Śākya mchog ldan's short history on the spread of rNgog Lo tsā ba's teachings, it is reported that gZhon nu byang chub was a teacher of Zhang ye ba sMon lam tshul khirms; and Zhang ye ba, along with Dan 'bag pa, was one of the two principal teachers of gNyal zhig.¹⁴ If Śākya mchog ldan's account is right, that could suggest that gZhon nu byang chub may have been somewhat senior to Dan 'bag pa. For our purposes, however, it will suffice to remark that (i) gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature*, (ii) Dan 'bag pa's epistemology summary, and (iii) mTshur ston's *Wisdom Lamp* all were composed after Phya pa's *Dispeller* but before the beginning of the thirteenth century.

Each of the above-mentioned works clearly predate two additional epistemology texts that could be categorized as epistemological summaries. The first of these is the *Treasury of Epistemology* (*Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter* (*gyi rang 'grel*); henceforth *Treasury*), which was finished by Sa-pan in or around the year 1219.¹⁵ A second epistemology summary that dates to the first half of the thirteenth century is *The Conqueror of all other Viewpoints* (*gZhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba*; henceforth, *Conqueror*), which was composed by Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal (c. 1200-1270). Chu mig pa was the abbot of (the Upper College of) gSang phu Monastery for eighteen years, sometime during the middle of the thirteenth century. He is reported to have been a student of (among others) sKyel nag Grags pa seng ge, who was himself one of the nine principal students of gNyal zhig. Moreover, Chu mig pa's time as abbot of gSang phu came immediately after the abbotship of rGya 'ching ru ba, who was also one of the nine principal students of gNyal zhig. This thus places Chu mig pa three generations after Dan 'bag pa.

I will now proceed to argue that the two texts containing references to Dan 'bag pa's views—Dharmaratna's *Ornamental Essence* and gTsang drug pa's *Clarifying Lamp*—both date to a period *after* the *Essential Nature*, *Wisdom Lamp* and Dan 'bag pa's epistemology summary but *before* Sa-pan's *Treasury*. In other words, it will be argued that these two texts were authored sometime roughly between the end of the twelfth century and the second decade of the thirteenth century.

¹⁴ See *Rol mo*, p. 509. Note that Śākya mchog ldan refers to Zhang ye ba via his title "byang chub 'bum." It should also be pointed out that it is quite possible Śākya mchog ldan has, in this text, simply confused gZhon nu byang chub with a different person, gZhon nu tshul khirms (a.k.a. dKar chung ring mo, a.k.a. "shes rab 'bum") for whom there is much clearer evidence that he was a teacher of Zhang ye ba.

¹⁵ For more on the dating of the *Rigs gter*, see van der Kuijp (1983), p. 101, and van der Kuijp (2014), p. 114.

3. Dating the *Clarifying Lamp* and *Ornamental Essence*

3.a. Evidence 1: Citations

The first form of evidence relevant to dating the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* relates to the interlinear notes that are provided in the existing manuscripts of the two texts. These interlinear notes mention the persons associated with various philosophical positions—figures who, within the body of the text, are only marked as “someone” (*kha cig*). Starting first with the *Clarifying Lamp*, the three most-cited figures are gTsang nag pa (19 times), Dan 'bag pa (16 times) and Phya pa (16 times). Also referenced prominently are rNgog Lo tsā ba (13 times) and Dharmottara (6 times). Each of the four most-cited figures are scholars affiliated with the tradition of scholasticism coming from gSang phu Monastery and there are no explicit citations to any figures from generations after the time of gTsang nag pa and Dan 'bag pa. Given this information, it lends initial credence to the hypothesis that the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* was someone whose epistemological training was tied (either directly or indirectly) to the gSang phu tradition and that the author thrived somewhat soon after the time of Phya pa's direct students.

Turning to the existing manuscript of the *Ornamental Essence*, the pattern of citations is quite similar to what is observed in the *Clarifying Lamp*—with the main difference being that there are about twice as many explicit references to earlier Tibetan scholars within the interlinear notes. The two most frequently cited figures are Phya pa (36 times) and Dan 'bag pa (36 times). In fact, several of the references to Dan 'bag pa are considerably long (roughly the length of a long English-language paragraph) and reflect a deep acquaintance with the nuances of Dan 'bag pa's arguments. The third most frequently referenced scholar is gTsang nag pa, who is mentioned 21 times. In addition, the *Ornamental Essence* contains five references to a figure called “myal pa,” which may be a gloss for gNyal zhig 'Jam pa'i rdo rje. Yet, aside from these possible references to gNyal zhig, there are no other explicit references to figures from any generation after that of gTsang nag pa and Dan 'bag pa. This again suggests that the composition of the *Ornamental Essence* dates to a period one or two generations after the time of Dan 'bag pa's epistemology summary.

3.b. Evidence 2: Technical Nomenclature

A second form of evidence internal to the texts that can prove helpful to dating the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* is the precise terminology that is used within the texts. Given the terminological nomenclature found in the two texts, there is good reason to believe that

the texts date to a time period later than that of the *Essential Nature* and the *Wisdom Lamp*. There are various pieces of evidence to support this assertion, but here I shall just point to two observations concerning the technical vocabulary deployed in these texts.¹⁶ First, the term that is used to capture the form of cognition that apprehends an object that is already known—which we could term in English a “post-knowledge cognition”—is systematically rendered as “*bcad pa'i yul can*” within Phya pa's *Dispeller* and gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature* (not to mention earlier texts like rNgog Lo tsā ba's *dKa' gnas*).¹⁷ Yet, both the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* use the term “*bcad shes*” for the same form of cognition. In mTshur ston's *Wisdom Lamp* we find both of these terms used essentially interchangeably. In later texts from the time of Sa-paṅ's *Treasury* onward, it is this latter term, “*bcad shes*,” that becomes standard within Tibetan epistemology treatises. Thus, the fact that we uniformly find the term “*bcad shes*” in both the *Clarifying Lamp* and *Ornamental Essence* strongly argues for the conclusion that these texts date to a period later than gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature*—and likely also later than mTshur ston's *Wisdom Lamp*.

As a second example, the standard term used by Phya pa, mTshur ston, and gZhon nu byang chub to mark an object of non-conceptual erroneous cognition is “*rtog med 'khrul pa'i dmigs pa*.” This term is quite long-winded and is abandoned in later epistemology texts. Sa-paṅ's *Treasury*, for example, systematically uses the term “*med pa gsal ba*” to denote these objects of non-conceptual erroneous cognition. Within Chu mig pa's *Conqueror* we find yet a different term. He uses the expression “*dnagos med gsal snang*” to denote these objects. Importantly, neither the *Ornamental Essence* nor *Clarifying Lamp* uses the expression “*rtog med 'khrul pa'i dmigs pa*.” Instead, within Dharmaratna's *Ornamental Essence*, we find the systematic use of the expression “*med pa gsal ba*,” and within gTsang drug pa's *Clarifying Lamp* we find the term “*dnagos med gsal snang*.” Once again, this supports the conjecture that the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* both date to a period after the composition of the *Essential Nature* and *Wisdom Lamp* (and after Dan 'bag pa's epistemology summary as well).

¹⁶ Various additional pieces of linguistic evidence, beyond the two given in the main body of this article, could be put forward to show that the *Clarifying Lamp* and *Ornamental Essence* date to a period after gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature* and mTshur ston's *Wisdom Lamp*. For example, the *Clarifying Lamp* and *Ornamental Essence* regularly make use of the term “*rang mtshan*” in their texts, and also make use of the distinction between “*don rang mtshan*” and “*sgra rang mtshan*.” The term “*rang mtshan*” is, in fact, incredibly common in epistemological treatises from the thirteenth century onward. Yet, the term “*rang mtshan*” is entirely absent from Phya pa's writings, nor is it found in the *Essential Nature*.

¹⁷ For more on the translation of “*bcad pa'i yul can*,” please see Hugon & Stoltz (2019), ch. IV,2,(c).

3.c. Evidence 3: Presentational Similarities

In addition to these terminological peculiarities, there are yet more reasons for thinking that Dharmaratna's *Ornamental Essence* and gTsang drug pa's *Clarifying Lamp* date from roughly the same time period and that their authors share similar philosophical pedigrees. The two texts display, for example, topical structures that are more similar to each other than they are to other (earlier and later) extant epistemology summaries. Likewise, there are several places within the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* where the specific arguments presented are nearly identical, but where those arguments are crucially different from what is attested in earlier extant epistemology summaries. The presence of these similarities lends credence to the conclusion that the authors of the two texts shared similar philosophical influences and were composing their works at roughly the same point in time.

Here is one key example of a structural similarity between the two texts. Both the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* contain prolonged discussions of various sub-divisions of conceptual cognition (*rtog pa*) within their respective presentations of the three-fold typology of cognitions (*gzung yul gsum*). In particular, both texts describe multiple different ways in which conceptual cognition can be divided (*dbye ba*), including: sub-dividing conceptual cognition by way of its essence (*ngo bo*), by way of its operations (*byed ba*), and by way of its being or not being erroneous (*'khrul ba/ma 'khrul ba*). Moreover, both these texts contain additional detail concerning even more-finely-grained sub-divisions pertaining to those conceptual cognitions that are erroneous because they "conflate items that are distinct" (*tha dad gcig tu bsre*).¹⁸

Importantly, no such delineation of sub-divisions of conceptual cognition is found within earlier extant epistemology summaries. There is no comparable accounting within the *Dispeller* (by Phya pa), the *Essential Nature* (by gZhon nu byang chub), or the *Wisdom Lamp* (by mTshur ston). On the other hand, there is a discussion of these sub-divisions of conceptual cognition in Chu mig pa's *Conqueror*, though the presentation by Chu mig pa is far less detailed than what is found in the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp*. (This lack of detail regarding these sub-divisions of conceptual cognition in Chu mig pa's epistemology summary fits a pattern where newly introduced topics are initially discussed at length, only to gradually wane in detail within later generations of texts.) This thereby supports the conjecture that the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* were composed in

¹⁸ The relevant discussions of these sub-divisions are found in *sNying po* 5a5-5b2 and *gSal byed* 7a4-9.

roughly the same time period—a time period later than the *Dispeller*, *Essential Nature*, and *Wisdom Lamp*, but earlier than the composition of Chu mig pa's *Conqueror*—and that these texts were composed by figures who shared similar epistemological influences. Once again, this example is but one of several that could have been provided.

A second form of similarity between the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* that points toward those texts having been composed at roughly the same point in time and under similar philosophical influences involves not structural similarities but argumentative similarities. There are places in the two texts where the arguments provided are (i) incredibly similar to each other but (ii) substantially different from what is attested in earlier extant epistemological works. Once again, I shall provide just a single example of this sort of phenomenon.

After defining the form of cognition known as *doubt* (*the tshom*) within his *Dispeller*, Phya pa addresses the question of whether doubting cognitions have the operation of *excluding what is other* (*gshan sel*). Within the *Essential Nature*, the position that doubt *lacks* the operation of excluding others is attributed to Phya pa's teacher rGya dmar ba. Phya pa disagrees, however, and affirms in his *Dispeller* that episodes of doubt *do* have the operation of excluding others. In particular, he argues that the doubting cognition "Is sound permanent or impermanent?" excludes *the impossibility* of sound being permanent. More generally, the idea is that episodes of doubt have the operation of excluding others insofar as they exclude certain impossibilities. Within gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature* we find an even more detailed discussion of the same issue, with the same line of reasoning provided on behalf of Phya pa.

This issue of whether episodes of doubt contain the operation of excluding others is taken up in both the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp*, with the issue addressed in somewhat more detail within the former text. What both texts share in common, however, is an identical line of argumentation against a position that is attributed to Dan 'bag pa. Both texts begin their discussion of the issue by announcing that some thinkers have held that episodes of doubt do not possess the operation of excluding others; and in both texts there is an interlinear note indicating that it is Dan 'bag pa who held this view. Both the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* then go on to argue in favor of the opposite thesis—that episodes of doubt do have the operation of excluding what is other—and they utilize nearly identical arguments to reach that conclusion. Notably, however, the reasoning deployed in both these texts is quite different from what is attested in Phya pa's *Dispeller*. Phya pa's claim, as noted above, was that episodes of doubt have the operation of exclusion by virtue of the fact that they exclude certain impossibilities. The *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp*, by

contrast, each argue that episodes of doubt must have the operation of exclusion simply because a single cognizer could not have two conceptual cognitions at the same time. For example, when a person has the doubting cognition "Is sound impermanent?" she could not simultaneously form the determinate cognition "Sound is permanent," for no person can simultaneously have two conceptual cognitions. But this then shows that the doubting cognition "Is sound impermanent?" *excludes* the determinate cognition "Sound is permanent."

The point here is not that the authors of the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* both support the conclusion that episodes of doubt have the activity of excluding what is other. Rather, the crucial point is that the lines of reasoning that the two authors provide for their positions are essentially identical and yet fundamentally different from the reasoning for that position that is attested in both Phya pa's *Dispeller* and gZhon nu byang chub's *Essential Nature*. And, once again, this suggests that the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* shared similar philosophical influences. It may be that both texts were influenced by a common source/teacher from which this line of reasoning originated, or it could be the case that one of the authors was influenced by the other.

3.d. Evidence 4: Presentational Differences

While there is a preponderance of evidence that the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp* date to a period after the *Dispeller*, *Essential Nature*, and *Wisdom Lamp* but before Sa-paṅ's *Treasury*, I now want to examine possible evidence that might help us determine the order in which these two texts were composed. It needs to be acknowledged at the outset that the evidence on this issue is comparatively thin. While there is strong evidence that the *Clarifying Lamp* and *Ornamental Essence* were written in roughly the same time period, I can (at this time) only make tentative pronouncements about the temporal relationship between these two texts.

There is no evidence that either of these texts explicitly references the other. But there may be other, admittedly more tenuous, ways by which one might sequence the two texts. One can look for particular views (e.g., claims, arguments, or definitions) that are (i) without precedent in earlier extant epistemology texts, but which are (ii) defended in one of the two texts and (iii) argued against within the other text. In other words, one author's knowledge of a novel definition or argument contained within the other text could suggest that the one author's text postdated the other's. Here is one example of this phenomenon.

When we turn to these two texts' definitions and discussions of the

three kinds of apprehended objects (*gsung yul gsum*)—i.e., (1) *don rang gi mtshan nyid*, (2) *don spyi*, and (3) *dngos med gsal snang*—we find something interesting with respect to the definitions that are entertained in the two texts. First, the definitions of each of these three terms in gTsang drug pa's *Clarifying Lamp* are the same as those found in Chu mig pa's *Conqueror* (except for differences in the presentational order of the definitional criteria). In both the *Clarifying Lamp* and the *Conqueror* these different types of apprehended objects are distinguished by two factors:

- (a) whether they appear distinctly or not (*thun mong par snang ba* or *thun mong ma yin pa'i rnam par snang ba*) and
- (b) whether they are causally efficient (*don byed nus pa* or *mi nus pa*).

Dharmaratna's *Ornamental Essence*, by contrast, appeals to a subtly different set of criteria. Specifically, Dharmaratna's text makes an appeal to the above factor (a) as well as a new factor:

- (c) whether they involve an erroneous or non-erroneous apprehension (*'dzin pa 'khrul pa* or *ma 'khrul pa*).

This last criterion is not found in any of the earlier epistemology summaries composed by Phya pa, mTshur ston, or gZhon nu byang chub. It is also clear that the appeal to erroneous/non-erroneous apprehensions (in these definitions) does not come from Dan 'bag pa, for his definitions are quoted in Dharmaratna's text and are merely slight modifications of Phya pa's definitions for the three types of apprehended objects.

Yet, within gTsang drug pa's discussion of the definitions of the three types of apprehended objects, he presents (and briefly argues against) another scholar's views—someone who is labeled as "*bla ma kha cig*" and as "*blo gros chen po kha cig*"—where this opponent does in fact make use of criterion (c)—viz., the contrast between "*'dzin pa 'khrul ba*" and "*'dzin pa ma 'khrul ba*"—in his definitions. In short, it appears that gTsang drug pa argues against definitions essentially identical to those that are put forward by Dharmaratna in the *Ornamental Essence* but which appear in no earlier (extant) epistemology summaries. This certainly does not guarantee, or even render probable, the conclusion that the "lama" referred to by gTsang drug pa was Dharmaratna. It is just as likely the case that gTsang drug pa is referring to some other, earlier teacher—one who may have had an influence on Dharmaratna (such as, perhaps, gNyal zhig). What is of utmost importance about all this, however, is that Dharmaratna appears to be ignorant of the line of criticism that gTsang drug pa employs against his definitions. As

such, this could indicate that Dharmaratna's *Ornamental Essence* was composed somewhat earlier than gTsang drug pa's *Clarifying Lamp*.

4. The Authorship of the Clarifying Lamp and Ornamental Essence

Let us now turn to examining what is known about the identities of the two men who authored the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp*. This will serve to further support the hypothesis that the texts were likely composed, approximately, in the first twenty years of the thirteenth century, and that they were composed by persons who would have been quite familiar with the views of Dan 'bag pa.

4.a. The Authorship of the Ornamental Essence

According to the *Ornamental Essence's* colophon, the text was composed by one "shag kya'i dge' slong rda rma rad na"—in other words, the monk Dharmaratna. About thirty years ago, shortly after the manuscript surfaced, Leonard van der Kuijp proposed that the name Dharmaratna likely refers to one of the nine principal students of gNyal zhig, a student who, in the *Blue Annals*, is referred to as "phu thang dar dkon."¹⁹ The expression "dar dkon" is very likely an abbreviation of the longer name "dar ma dkon mchog." Given that "dar ma dkon mchog" is a plausible Tibetan rendering of the name Dharmaratna, and given that the *Ornamental Essence* contains apparent references to gNyal zhig—as well as a multitude of references to gNyal zhig's teacher Dan 'bag pa—it was plausible to think that the author of this text, Dharmaratna, is in fact the student of gNyal zhig named "phu thang dar dkon."

This conjecture is bolstered by the fact that there is an extant *Pramāṇaviniścaya* commentary written by Dar ma bkon mchog. This text, called *The Commentary on the Ascertainment of Knowledge: The Ornamental Essence of Reasoning* (*Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i Tikka rigs pa'i rgyan gyi snying po*; henceforth *Ascertainment Ornament*), is attributed in its colophon to "shag kya'i dge' sbyong dar ma dkon mchog." In fact, attached to this attribution is an interlinear note saying "dhar ma rad nas"—i.e., "by Dharmaratna." Moreover, it is undeniably the case that the *Ornamental Essence* and *Ascertainment Ornament* are composed by the same person. Those two works share many parallel passages in common; in some cases whole pages of the two texts are identical.²⁰ This gives us solid grounds to conclude that the name Dharmaratna in

¹⁹ *Deb sngon*, p. 407 and van der Kuijp (1993), p. 294.

²⁰ See, for example, *sNying po* 5a1-5b2 and *rGyan snying po* 17a6-17b9, where the two texts are (for large stretches) identical.

the *Ornamental Essence* does indeed refer to Dar ma bkon mchog and strongly suggests that this person is indeed the student of gNyal zhig who, in the *Blue Annals*, is referred to as “*phu thang dar dkon*.”

4.b. *The Authorship of the Clarifying Lamp*

Determining the authorship of the *Clarifying Lamp* is a more challenging task. According to the text's colophon, the *Clarifying Lamp* is authored by one “*gtsang pa drug po*,” who is also called “*rdo rje 'od zer*.” The title page of the text names the author as “*gtsang drug pa rdo rje 'od zer*.” With respect to the author's identity, little can be said with absolute certainty about this person named gTsang drug pa rDo rje 'od zer. It is more helpful, in my opinion, to approach the question of authorship in terms of how much credence can be attached to various hypotheses about the identity of the author. Here, then, are three hypotheses about who this author may be:

Hypothesis A: The author is a student of the fifth abbot of sNar thang Monastery

Hypothesis B: The author is a direct student of Phya pa (a student named “*rdo rje 'od zer*”)

Hypothesis C: The author is a student of gNyal zhig (a student named “*gtsang pa gru gu*” or “*gtsang drug*”)

I shall briefly walk through these hypotheses and speak to the merits of each possibility.

The first hypothesis, *Hypothesis A*, is put forward by the editors of the *Collected Works of the Kadampas*. Recognizing that the authorship of the *Clarifying Lamp* is far from certain, they ponder whether the author of the text may be a student of the fifth abbot of sNar thang Monastery, Zhang ston Chos kyi bla ma. Unfortunately, this particular suggestion has little merit. First of all, the fifth abbot of sNar thang was not born until 1184 and is believed to have served as abbot from 1232 to 1241. If the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* was this abbot's student, that would put the composition of the text well into the middle portion of the thirteenth century, which is highly unlikely to be the case given a variety of pieces of information, including the list of authors referenced in the text. Moreover, this link to the fifth abbot of sNar thang appears to be grounded in the erroneous belief that the colophon of the *Clarifying Lamp* contains a reference to a teacher named “*zhang chos*”—whom the editors of the *Collected Works of the Kadampas* take to be Zhang ston Chos kyi bla ma. This is simply a misreading, however. The colophon of the *Clarifying Lamp* speaks not of “*zhang chos*” but of a person named “*zhang tshes*” (about whom there will be a discussion below). In short,

there is no good reason to believe that the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* is a student of the fifth abbot of sNar thang.²¹

The second main hypothesis, *Hypothesis B*, derives from the claim within the *Blue Annals* that among Phya pa's students was a person named "rdo rje 'od zer." In the *Blue Annals* a large number of people are listed as students of Phya pa, most of whom fall into different groups such as the Eight Mighty Lions, the Four Noble Sons, and the Four Wise Ones.²² rDo rje 'od zer is not listed among any of these groups but is instead mentioned as being among "other" students of Phya pa. If the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* was a direct student of Phya pa, that would cohere quite well with the list of scholars referenced within the text. That is, it would put the author within roughly the same generation as Phya pa's students gTsang nag pa and Dan 'bag pa, and thus could explain why the views of those two students are referenced prominently within the *Clarifying Lamp* whereas no epistemologists from later generations are mentioned at all. Other than this one particular reference to rDo rje 'od zer, however, nothing else is said in the *Blue Annals* that would help to substantiate the hypothesis that he authored the *Clarifying Lamp* or any other epistemology summary. In fact, it is not clear that this same rDo rje 'od zer is mentioned elsewhere within the *Blue Annals*.²³

In contrast to the first two hypotheses, *Hypothesis C* focuses not on the name "rdo rje 'od zer" but on the other name for the author found in the colophon: "gtsang pa drug po." Versions of this name can be found among the list of the nine principal students of gNyal zhig. In the *Blue Annals*, for example, this particular student of gNyal zhig is referred to as "gtsang pa gru gu." In the *Red Annals* that same list of nine students is provided, and in that text this student of gNyal zhig is called "gtsang drug." This student of gNyal zhig is said to have established a study center at Zhwa lu Monastery in gTsang. It is further claimed that this study center propagated gNyal zhig's commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. *Hypotheses C* thus

²¹ Having somewhat more merit is a modified theory, which we could call *Hypothesis A**, that is grounded in the observation that someone with the name "rdo rje 'od zer" served as the *third* abbot of sNar thang Monastery. This person, Zhang btsun rDo rje 'od zer (1122-1194) was the abbot of sNar thang from 1185 to 1193. This hypothesis would, however, likely put the composition of the *Clarifying Lamp* at an earlier date than that of the *Essential Nature*, which is highly unlikely. Moreover, there is no evidence to support the idea that this abbot of sNar thang had any connection to gSang phu Monastery or its scholarly tradition of epistemology.

²² For more on Phya pa's students, please see Hugon (2015-2020).

²³ The *Blue Annals* does contain at least one reference to Zhang btsun rDo rje 'od zer, who was the third abbot of sNar thang Monastery, but there is otherwise no evidence to suggest that this person is the same student of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge named "rdo rje 'od zer."

holds that the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* is this student of gNyal zhig. Given that gNyal zhig was himself a student of Dan 'bag pa, this hypothesis would help to explain the clear familiarity that the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* had with the epistemological views of Dan 'bag pa.

It is tempting to endorse *Hypothesis C*, since that would suggest a connection between the *Clarifying Lamp* to the *Ornamental essence*, inferring that both were written by students of gNyal zhig. This would match up with the evidence provided in §3 where it was emphasized that the similarities between the two texts point toward the conclusion that the texts were written in roughly the same time period and that the authors shared similar epistemological pedigrees. Indeed, I believe that the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* is in fact gNyal zhig's student. Yet, before we accept that conclusion, it would be helpful to examine additional clues from the colophon of the *Clarifying Lamp* that have not yet been taken into account, but which may help us strengthen the plausibility of *Hypothesis C*.

The colophon of the *Clarifying Lamp* mentions two figures to whom the author pays his respects. One of these figures is "dpal ldan rtsang pa 'bre," and the other is "bla ma dge ba'i bshes gnyen gnyal pa zhang tshes." It can be said with high confidence that this latter reference is to Zhang tshes spong pa Chos kyi bla ma.²⁴ According to some texts, Zhang tshes spong pa originally hailed from the region of gNyal in southern Tibet.²⁵ Zhang tshes spong pa was the third abbot of gSang phu Monastery, a position that he reportedly held for 32 years, from the time of rNgog Lo tsā ba's death in 1109 until his own death in 1141. Given these dates, it would be very unlikely for the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* to have had Zhang tshes spong pa as one of his teachers. Instead, this reference to Zhang tshes spong pa should be viewed as an expression of endearment—one associated with Zhang tshes spong pa's significance in leading gSang phu Monastery for so many years.²⁶

The identity of the other person referenced in the colophon, "rtsang pa 'bre," is more difficult to establish. The most plausible candidate would seem to be gTsang pa 'bre sgur, a figure falling within the scholarly lineage extending from rNgog Lo tsā ba's student 'Bre shes rab 'bar. gTsang pa 'bre sgur was purportedly a student of 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo, who had himself studied under both Ar Byang chub ye shes and Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. (And Ar Byang chub ye shes was the

²⁴ Note: In some historical documents we find the spelling "zhang tshes" and in other documents the spelling "zhang tshé."

²⁵ See *Thob tshul* 57a5.

²⁶ It is theoretically possible, though unlikely, that the expression "gnyal pa zhang tshes" could be a scribe's misreading of (or, miscopying of) the name "gnyal pa zhig po"—i.e., gTsang drug pa's teacher gNyal zhig.

most prominent student of 'Bre shes rab 'bar.) This would indicate that gTsang pa 'bre sgur was roughly contemporaneous with gZhon nu byang chub, the author of the *Essential Nature*, who is estimated to have lived from around 1150 to 1210. Thus, if the author of the *Clarifying Lamp* had some connection to gTsang pa 'bre sgur (such as being his student), that would fit well with the hypothesis that the text dates to the turn of the thirteenth century and is about one generation later than the *Essential Nature*.

Aside from this reference in the colophon of the *Clarifying Lamp*, I have been unable to find any other direct evidence to link gTsang drug pa with gTsang pa 'bre sgur. There is, however, a small amount of evidence that links gTsang pa 'bre sgur to at least one other student of gNyal zhiḡ. To wit, there is at least one text transmission lineage—one proceeding through gNyan Lo tsā ba (c. late 11th to early 12th cent.)—wherein gTsang pa 'bre sgur transmitted a text to 'Jam dbyangs gsar ma.²⁷ We know that 'Jam dbyangs gsar ma was—like Dharmaratna and probably also gTsang drug pa—one of the nine main students of gNyal zhiḡ. Moreover, within an extant manuscript of a commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* written by 'Jam dbyangs gsar ma, one finds various interlinear notes marking the names of the figures associated with views expressed within the text.²⁸ While these interlinear notes mention a host of scholars who were followers for rNgog Lo tsā ba, among the most frequently inserted 'name tags' are "bre" and "rtsang 'bre." There is little question that these two labels refer to different persons (since, in several places, we find them affirming somewhat different views on the same subject). It is assuredly the case that "bre" refers to rNgog Lo tsā ba's disciple 'Bre shes rab 'bar.

There is, I believe, some reason to think that "rtsang 'bre" could be a reference to gTsang pa 'bre sgur. For example, in several places within the text, one finds views by "rtsang 'bre" presented immediately after the views held by "'dul" or "'dul dkar," both of which are likely references to 'Dul 'dzin dkar mo, who, as mentioned above, was the teacher of gTsang pa 'bre sgur. Moreover, within this manuscript of 'Jam dbyangs gsar ma's *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* commentary, while in the vast majority of cases the name tags are attached to views that in the text itself are merely attributed to "someone" (viz., "kha cig"), there are two places where the name tags are linked to views attributed in the text to (quite possibly) the author's lama. In one place (43a3), for a view ascribed to "bla ma dag" we find the (interlinear) tag "gnyal." This is very likely a reference to ('Jam dbyangs gsar ma's teacher) gNyal zhiḡ. In the second instance (25b4), below the agentive clause "bla mas"

²⁷ gSung 'bum, vol. 1, p. 78.

²⁸ See 'Od 'bar.

we find the (interlinear) tag “*rtsang 'bre*.” This could be viewed as supporting the hypothesis that the tag “*rtsang 'bre*” refers to (‘Jam dbyangs gsar ma’s teacher) gTsang pa ‘bre sgrur. More generally, this provides some support for the hypothesis that gTsang pa ‘bre sgrur was a known figure to (at least some of) the nine principal students of gNyal zhig. With all this in mind, and returning now to gTsang drug pa’s *Clarifying Lamp*, this makes it plausible to think that the reference in the colophon to “*gtsang pa 'bre*” could very well refer to gTsang pa ‘bre sgrur.

In light of all the foregoing evidence, the most reasonable conclusion to draw is that the author of the *Clarifying Lamp*, gTsang drug pa, is in fact gNyal zhig’s student. If that is correct, it means that Dharmaratna’s *Ornamental Essence* and gTsang drug pa’s *Clarifying Lamp* were both composed by students of gNyal zhig, who was himself a student of Dan ‘bag pa. This, in turn, serves to explain the frequent references to Dan ‘bag pa’s views in the *Ornamental Essence* and *Clarifying Lamp*.

There is no evidence to suggest that Dharmaratna or gTsang drug pa ever studied directly under Dan ‘bag pa. And while we do know that Dharmaratna and gTsang drug pa both studied under gNyal zhig, we do not know for sure whether Buddhist epistemology was among the topics on which they received teachings from gNyal zhig. Nevertheless, what Dharmaratna’s and gTsang drug pa’s epistemological summary texts do show us is that Dan ‘bag pa was viewed by them as an important figure in the Tibetan epistemological tradition.

5. Reprise: Epistemology Summaries from Phya pa to Sa skya Paṇḍita

With all the above information in hand, we can put forward the following tentative chronological ordering for the compositions of all the above-mentioned epistemology summary (*Tshad ma’i bsdus pa*) texts:

Period 1: c. pre-1150

- A) rGya dmar ba: [*Tshad ma’i bsdus pa*]
- B) Phya pa: *Dispeller*

Period 2: c. 1150 to 1200

- C) gZhon nu byang chub: *Essential Nature*
- D) Dan ‘bag pa: [*Tshad ma’i bsdus pa*]
- E) mTshur ston: *Wisdom Lamp*

Period 3: c. 1200-1220

- F) Dharmaratna: *Ornamental Essence*
- G) gTsang drug pa: *Clarifying Lamp*

Period 4: c. 1219

- H) Sa-paṅ: *Treasury*

This list does not include, it must be emphasized, any of the epistemological *commentaries*—principally on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavinīścaya*—that were written during this time period. Nor does it include any of the epistemological summaries that were written in the decades after Sa-pan's *Treasury*. For example, it does not include Chu mig pa's *Conqueror* (see *rNam rgyal*) or Chos kyi bzhad pa's *Absolutely Essential Nature* (see *Tshad nye bsdus*), both of which appear to date to a period after Sa-pan's *Treasury*. Nor does it include any of the commentaries on Sa-pan's *Treasury*, nor other epistemology treatises thematically similar to the *Treasury*—such as Rig pa'i ral gri's *Ornamental Flower* (see *Me tog*).²⁹

Tibetan history chronicles have not viewed Dharmaratna and gTsang drug pa as particularly important or influential figures in Buddhist philosophy. Yet, their respective epistemology summary texts do provide twenty-first century scholars with helpful portrayals of how Tibetan epistemology developed in the twelfth century. They bear evidence not only of the significance of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge, but also of the important role played by Dan 'bag pa in the maturation of Tibetan epistemology in the generations following Phya pa's death.

Bibliography

Tibetan Epistemology Summaries

- sGron ma (Wisdom Lamp)* – Hugon, P. (Ed.). 2004. *mTshur ston gZhon nu seng ge, Tshad ma shes rab sgron ma*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
- sNying po (Ornamental Essence)* – Dha rma rad na. *rTog ge rigs pa'i brgyan gyi snying po*. (BDRC resource W26453)
- rNam rgyal (Conqueror)* – Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal. 2007. *gZhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 45. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- sPyi skad (Common Terminologies)* — gNyags. 2007. *Tshad ma'i spyi skad cung zad bsdus pa*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 44. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Me tog (Ornamental Flower)* – bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri. 1991. *Tshad*

²⁹ Also not included in the list here is the *Common Terminologies* (see *sPyi skad*), a short text that deserves more attention, and for which its dating still needs to be ascertained.

- ma'i bstan bcos sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog* (pp. 1-138). Beijing: Chinese Tibetology Press.
- Mun sel (Dispeller)* – Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. 2006. *Tshad ma yid kyi mun pa sel pa*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 8. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Tshad nye bsdus (Absolutely Essential Nature)* — Chos kyi bzhad pa. 2009. *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa'i nye bar bsdus pa*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 88, Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Tshad bsdus (Essential Nature)* – Klong chen Rab 'byams (attributed). 2000. *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdus pa*. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Rigs gter (Treasury)* – Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan. 1989. *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter and Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rang gi 'grel pa*. Ed. Nor brang o rgyan. Lhasa: Tibetan People's Press.
- gSal byed (Clarifying Lamp)* – gTsang drug pa rDo rje 'od zer. 2007. *Yang dag rigs pa'i gsal byed sgron ma*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 47. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.

Other Tibetan Sources

- dKa' gnas* — rNgog Lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab. 1994. *Tshad ma rnam nges kyi dka' ba'i gnas rnam par bshad pa*. Xining, Qinghai: Chinese Tibetology Press.
- rGya bden* – rGya dmar ba Byang chub grags. 2006. *bDen gnyis rnam bshad*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 19. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- rGyan 'grel* – gZhon nu byang chub. 2006. *mNgon rtogs rgyan yum bar ma nyi khri dang sbyar ba'i rgyan 'grel*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 10. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- rGyan snying po* – Dar ma dkon mchog. *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i ti ka rigs pa'i rgyan gyi snying po*. (BDRC W00KG03840)
- sGron me* – 'Jad pa gZhon nu byang chub. 2007. *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa'i fikka shes bya thams cad gsal bar byed pa'i sgron me*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 40. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Ngor gsung* – Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po. *Ngor chen kun dga' bzang po'i bka' 'bum*, vols. 1-4. (BDRC W11577)
- Jo gsung* – Tā ra nā tha. 2008. *Jo nang rje btsun tA ra nA tha'i gsung 'bum dpe bsdur ma*, vol. 31. Beijing: Chinese Tibetology Press.
- Tho yig* – A khu Shes rab rgya mtsho. *dPe rgyun dkon pa 'ga' zhig gi tho*

- yig. (BDRC W3CN1923)
- Thob tshul* – Ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams. 2000. *Chos kyi rje dpal ldan bla ma dam pa rnams las dam pa'i chos ji ltar thob pa'i tshul legs par bshad pa zab rgyas chos kun gsal ba'i nyin byed ces bya ba las sprul pa'i sku spyan snga chos kyi spyan ldan gyis rjes su bzung ba'i tshul gyi sarga*. In *dPal sa skya pa chen po sngags 'chang thams cad mkhyen pa ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams kyi gsung 'bum*, vol. 4 (nga).
- Deb sngon* – 'Gos lo gZhon nu dpal. 1985. *Deb ther sngon po*. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- bsDus pa* — gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge. 1989. *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i ti ka legs bshad bsdus pa*. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co (Otani University Tibetan Works Series 2).
- bDen bshad* – Dar ma bkra shis. (Unpublished). *bDen pa gnyis rnam par 'byed kyi bshad pa*.
- Pham byed* – gSer mdog pañ chen Śākya mchog ldan. 2006. *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter dgongs rgyan lung dang rigs pa'i 'khor los lugs ngan pham byed*. In *gSer mdog gsung 'bum*, vol. 9 (ta) and 10 (tha). Kathmandu: Sachen International.
- dBu bden* – Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. 2006. *dBu ma bden pa gnyis rnam par bshad pa yi ge rung dus gzhung gsal bar byed pa*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 6. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- 'Byung tshul* – gSer mdog pañ chen Śākya mchog ldan. 1995. *Tshad ma'i mdo dang bstan bcos kyi shing rta'i srol rnams ji ltar 'byung ba'i tshul gtam du bya ba nyin mor byed pa'i snang bas dpyod ldan mtha' dag dga' bar byed pa*. In *The Complete Works (gsun 'bum) of gser-mdog pan-chen sakyamchog-ldan*, vol. 19. New Delhi: Nagawang Topgyel.
- mTshan don* – Bu ston Rin chen sgrub. *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa'i mtshan don*. In Lokesh Chandra (Ed.), *Bu ston rin chen grub dang sgra tshad pa rin chen rnam rgyal gyi gsung 'bum*, vol. 24.
- 'Od 'bar* – 'Jam gsar ba Shes rab 'od zer. 2006. *mNgon rtogs rgyan gyi 'grel ba 'thad pa'i 'od 'bar*. In Karma bde legs et al. (Eds.), *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 14. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.
- Rol mo* – Śākya mchog ldan. 2010. *rNgog lo tsa+tsha ba chen pos bstan pa ji ltar bskyangs pa'i tshul mdo tsam du bya ba ngo mtshar gtam gyi rol mo*. In *Bod kyi lo rgyus rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs*, vol. 11 (pp. 497-511). Xining: Qinghai People's Press. (BDRC resource W1KG10687)
- gSung 'bum* – Ngag dbang Blo bzang rgya mtsho. 2009. *rGyal dbang lnga pa ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i gsung 'bum*. Beijing: Chinese Tibetology Press.

Contemporary Sources

- Akahane, R. 2013. The Influence of rGya dmar ba Byang chub grags on Early Tibetan Buddhism in the Period of the Second Diffusion. *Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies*, 59, 89-104.
- Hugon, P. 2015–2020. Compiled Information on the Life and Works of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge. (Version date: 2020-06-02). https://www.oeaw.ac.at/fileadmin/Institute/IKGA/PDF/forschung/tibetologie/Information_about_the_life_and_works_of_Phya_pa_Chos_kyi_seng_ge_20200206.pdf.
- Hugon, P., and Stoltz, J. 2019. *The roar of a Tibetan lion: Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge's theory of mind in philosophical and historical perspective*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- van der Kuijp, L. 1983. *Contributions to the development of Tibetan Buddhist epistemology*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- van der Kuijp, L. 1987. The Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog and its Abbatial Succession from ca. 1073 to 1250. *Berliner Indologische Studien*, 3, 103–127.
- van der Kuijp, L. 1993. Two Mongol xylographs (*Hor Par Ma*) of the Tibetan text of Sa skya Paṇḍita's work on Buddhist logic and epistemology. *Journal of the international association of Buddhist studies*, 16(2), 279-298.
- van der Kuijp, L. 2003. A treatise on Buddhist epistemology and logic attributed to Klong chen Rab 'byams pa (1309-1364) and its place in Indo-Tibetan intellectual history. *Journal of Indian philosophy*, 31, 381-437.
- van der Kuijp, L. 2014. Studies in Btsun pa Ston gzhon's *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary of ?1297 — Part one: Preliminary observations and the import of its title. *Revue d'Études Tibétaines*, 30, 111-198.
- Stoltz, J. 2020. On the Authorship of the *Tshad ma'i de kho na nyid bsdu pa*. *Revue d'Études Tibétaines*, 56, 48-69.

