Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge’s synoptic table of the Pramāṇaviniścaya

Pascale Hugon, Vienna

1. Introduction

At the time of the Later Diffusion (phyi dar) of Buddhism in Tibet, which started in the second half of the 10th century, translation of the Indian Buddhist corpus was undertaken anew. Tibetan scholars, working together with Indian paṇḍits, continued the process that had been begun at the time of the First Diffusion (snga dar); in addition to taking up texts that had not yet been translated into Tibetan, they also revised and replaced older translations with new ones, aiming at faithfully retrieving and transmitting the meaning of the sūtras, tantras, and treatises of various kinds. These scholars faced a massive and complex corpus of Indian material, and their translations displayed an inclination in favor of literalness that did not contribute to readability: regardless of the preciseness with which they render the original, these translations use language that can be understood only with difficulty unless the reader has special training. Scholars active at the start of the Later Diffusion were thus also concerned with providing exegetical tools that would enable their coreligionists to access the impressive amount of Indian material. Their pioneering work was instrumental in the development of the Tibetan Buddhist

* Work on this paper has been generously supported by the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) in the context of the FWF-Projekt P19862 “Philosophische und religiöse Literatur des Buddhismus.” My thanks to Cynthia Peck-Kubaczek for correcting my English.

tradition: On the one hand, their translations became source texts by proxy for their successors, who had, for the most part, no knowledge of Sanskrit and thus no direct access to the Indian corpus. On the other hand, their exegesis was the foundation stone for the rise of an autochthonous scholarly tradition, still active today.

A large quantity of important new material has recently surfaced, material that helps us understand how the Tibetan tradition evolved in the early years of the Later Diffusion. I am thinking here in particular of the publication in 2006 and 2007 of sixty volumes of pre-15th century texts of the bKa’ gdamgs pa school that were preserved for the most part in the library of ’Bras spungs monastery.1 This newly available collection contains a number of “treasures” – fundamental texts by influential authors that until now had been known only through citations or secondary references. This is the case, among others, for the two major authors that will be discussed in this paper: rNgog Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109), one of the greatest contributors to the establishment of Buddhist scholasticism in Tibet, and another famous scholar, famous in particular for his contribution to epistemology, Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (1109–1169).

This paper will not address the views of these thinkers, but will rather dwell on the question of the form their writings took. I would like to examine, through their example, how the compositions of early Tibetan scholasticism (i.e., 11th–12th centuries) reflect the concerns of the time regarding the transposition and diffusion of the Indian Buddhist corpus. The newly available texts of rNgog Blo ldan shes rab and of Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge (hereafter: Phya pa) give us an opportunity to examine a sample of compositions that are, in my opinion, typical of this endeavor. They illustrate how Tibetan scholars dealt with the Indian corpus, first by way of translation, then by analyzing, structuring and summarizing, as well as by explaining and discussing. I will focus here on the “structuring” part of the process, examining a particular type of composition called “bsdus don,”

1 See bKa’ gdamgs gsung ’bum in the bibliography.
which I translate as “synoptic table,” through an analysis of one such work authored by Phya pa.

2. Phya pa’s epistemological works

Phya pa counts as the main contributor to the domain of epistemology (tshad ma) in the early period. Active a generation after rNgoṅ Blo ldan shes rab at the monastery of gSang phu Ne’u thog, he gained a long-standing reputation for his innovative views and (sometimes questionable) interpretations, both of which influenced the later tradition significantly. Among the “treasures” of the bKā’ gdams gsung ’bum, three works on epistemology authored by Phya pa recently became available. They provide a relevant sample of distinct yet complementary compositional styles:

1. A text in 97 folios entitled Tshad ma yid kyi mun sel, which the later tradition refers to as a “Summary of epistemology” (tshad ma’i bsdus pa).

2. An extensive commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya in 197 folios, entitled Tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i ‘grel bshad yi ge dang rigs pa’i gnad la ’jug pa’i shes rab kyi ’od zer (hereafter: ‘Od zer).

3. A short text in 13 folios entitled Tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i bsdus don, that is, a bsdus don on the Pramāṇaviniścaya (see below).

The Pramāṇaviniścaya, a foundational work of Buddhist epistemology composed by Dharmakīrti (7th c.), was at the center of Tibetan developments in this area of Buddhist learning following its twofold and nearly simultaneous introduction into Tibet in the 11th century by Jñānaśrībhadra, who translated this text with Khyung po Chos

---

2 For a pioneering study of Phya pa’s life and works, see van der Kuijp 1978 and 1983, chapter 2.

3 Cf. bKā’ gdam gsung ’bum vol. 8. The first two works have been presented in van der Kuijp 2003. See also Hugon 2008: 39–53 for a discussion of these three texts.
kyi brtson 'grus, and by rNgoṅ Blo Idan shes rab, who translated, with Parahitabhadra, both the Pramāṇaviniścaya’s root-text and Dharmottara’s commentary theron. Its predominance continued until the 13th century, when, following the efforts of Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1182–1251), another work of Dharmakīrti, the Pramāṇavārttika, started to take precedence. Even though the Pramāṇaviniścaya can be identified as being Phya pa’s main basis for his three compositions on epistemology, a difference must be noted: while Phya pa’s extensive commentary (’grel bshad) and his bsdus don explicitly relate to the Pramāṇaviniścaya and refer to it, this is not the case of the Yid kyi mun sel, which stands as a (relatively) independent composition on tshad ma. That is, the Yid kyi mun sel was not conceived as a commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya; it does not follow the order of topics of this work, nor does it cite it. The Yid kyi mun sel is certainly Phya pa’s most famous composition, and the proponents of Phya pa’s system are accordingly referred to as “those who follow the summary(ies)” (bsdus pa smra ba rnams). The presentation of Phya pa’s personal views is however not restricted to this work: ’Od zer, Phya pa’s extensive commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya, combines a linear explanation of the source text with independent presentations of certain topics that bear many parallels to related discussions in the Yid kyi mun sel. I thus describe it as a “hybrid commentary.” That summaries and commentaries (hybrid or not) were viewed as complementary types of compositions would be supported by the frequent occurrence of such pairs in the subsequent literature.

4 For a periodicization of early Tibetan epistemology and the role of the Pramāṇaviniścaya therein, see van der Kuijp 1989, in particular pp. 19–22 on the introduction of the Pramāṇaviniścaya into Tibet.

5 See for instance in Glo bo mkhan chen’s commentary on the Tshad ma rigs pa’i gter, Rigs gter nyi ma 118,9. The expression “bsdus pa smra ba” is already found in Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal’s rNam rgyal (13th c.).

6 For instance Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal (13th c.) authored both an epistemological summary (rNam rgyal) and an extensive commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya. One also finds such pairs outside the gSang phu tradition, as for instance among the works of Dar ma rgyal mtshan, alias bCom...
3. Phya pa’s rNam nges bsdus don

The title Tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i bsdus don (hereafter: rNam nges bsdus don) is given for the third text in the colophon of the 13-folio manuscript – the only one presently available – that is reproduced in the bKa’ gdams gsung ’bum, vol. 8, pp. 3–28. The colophon also establishes Phya pa’s authorship of the text. In view of the parallels between rNam nges bsdus don and ‘Od zer (about which more will be said below), I see no reason to doubt this attribution. It is not possible to ascertain when the text was written or copied. The manuscript contains only traces of the orthographical specificities that are typical to the early period of the Later Diffusion, namely, a few inverted “i”-s (gi gu log) (mostly at the end of lines) and some cases of palatalisation (these almost systematic in the available manuscripts of ‘Od zer and Mun sel); one can also note occasional alternation of prefixes (e.g. rngos for dngos or ’thun for mthun). The manuscript abounds in marginal and interlinear notes by several different hands, which will prompt some hypotheses as to the use of bsdus don texts in the context of monastic education.

As the list of Phya pa’s works by Śākya mchog Idan mentions the existence of three epistemological summaries of graduated size (the Yid kyi mun sel identified as the “summary of medium size”) in ad-
dition to a commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya, I initially thought that the 13-folio text published in the bKa’ gdamgs gsung ’bum might be a sort of abbreviated Yid kyi mun sel. This however turned out not to be the case. Phya pa’s bsdus don of the Pramāṇaviniścaya constitutes a synoptic table of this source text. Namely, it consists of an enumeration of topical outlines, which superimpose a hierarchical stratification onto the Indian text, itself devoid of such an explicit division of its topics. Not surprisingly, few of Phya pa’s famous innovative ideas find their way into this text.

3.1 Structure of a bsdus don – the “sa bcad technique”

Those of us working with Tibetan material are inevitably familiar with the so-called sa bcad technique, which consists in presenting topics by means of successive divisions and sub-divisions, each of these being given a title. The hierarchical structure that ensues can be described (using the vocabulary adopted for such structures in mathematics and computer science) as a “tree” composed of “branches” and “sub-branches.” The points of connection of the “branches” are the “forks,” the final segments are the “tree leaves.” When reading a text thus organized, one “walks the tree” according to a pre-order traversal method, i.e., one goes from branch to sub-branch (always starting with the first sub-branch of the fork) until reaching a leaf, after which one walks the next sub-branch of the last visited fork. Once all the sub-branches of a fork have been walked, the process is
repeated for the preceding fork, until all the branches of the initial fork have been walked. For instance, in the tree on the preceding page, the order of walking would be: A, A1, A11, A12, A121, A122, A123, A2, A21, A22, A221, A222, A3, A31, A32.

In Tibetan works, the number and/or title of the sub-branches attached to a given fork is often given before one starts walking the first sub-branch of that fork. Subsequent sub-branches are usually introduced by stating their rank within the sub-branches of the same fork (second, third, etc.), but their title, if listed earlier, is not always repeated. Conversely, sub-branches are sometimes introduced only with their title, without reference to their rank. This technique, for which, as discussed by Steinkellner, antecedents can be found in Chinese commentaries,10 was developed into “a state of the art” by

10 Steinkellner (1989: 235) pointed out a 9th-century translation of a commentary on the Sandhinirmocanasūtra composed in Chinese by Yuance (613–696), a Korean disciple of Xuanzang (599–664), which applies this method of division. The translation of Yuance’s Sandhigambhīranirmocanasūtraṭīkā by ’Gos Chos grub (=Wu Facheng), a renowned translator based in Dunhuang, is preserved in Tibetan in P5517 and D4016. A consultation of the Chinese text published online by the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (Ref: Xuzangjing Vol. 21, No. 369) confirmed the presence of a sa bcad structure: this commentary constitutes a clear case of successive subdivisions being applied to analyze a root text. (My thanks to Dr. Toshikazu Watanabe for locating the Chinese version and to Dr. Toru Tomabechi for his help in deciphering the text.) This would confirm that the Tibetan translation faithfully reflects a structure already present in the Chinese. A remark found in Yisun Zhang’s dictionary in the entry on the Sandhigambhīranirmocanasūtraṭīkā (the source of which I could not ascertain) could cast doubt on this assumption: there it is argued that, as the Chinese original had become incomplete, the missing parts were translated back into Chinese from the Tibetan version, which had preserved the complete work (see Martin and Cherniak 2008: 1827). We can probably grant that the overall structure of the text itself was not likely to have been influenced by a possible retranslation of missing parts. More research into Chinese commentaries would nevertheless be necessary to ascertain whether this is an isolated case or an instance of a widely-used technique. In another commentary mentioned by Steinkellner in this regard – the Saddharmapundarikāsūtraṛitti of Kuji (632–682) (T1723,
Tibetan authors in their own compositions; it was also used to analyze Indian texts, in which such stratification was originally absent. It provides an extremely refined analysis of the source text, dividing it into portions that are generally the length of a paragraph (1 to 2 lines of a folio), but sometimes the length of a single sentence, or even parts of sentence. In the *rNam nges bsdus don*, the synoptic table divides the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* into more than 1,200 portions, and these carry more than 1,800 *sa bcad* titles that go to a depth of eighteen (i.e., eighteen successive subdivisions from the first fork to the leaf). Their correspondence to the source text is provided by interlinear notes that mention, for each “leaf,” the first word of the corresponding passage in the Tibetan translation; I will refer to them as “pratikas.” To imagine what this represents, consider a 200-page book with a 70-page-long table of contents. Whereas tables of contents as we know them adopt a graphic form or a numbering system that indicates the hierarchy of the titles and subtitles, a *bsdus don* conveys this information through a linear presentation. In some works of this type, this is done by listing the *sa bcad* titles in an order that amounts to simply “walking the tree,” no content being given in this case for the “leaves.” Applied to the example considered above, one would have a linear presentation such as the following:

Tibetan translation in P5518), another disciple of Xuanzang – as well as in other works by Kuiji and Xuanzang that I consulted, subdivisions are frequently used to classify and organize the topics dealt with in the text being commented upon, but, unlike the previous case, they do not provide an overall hierarchical structuring of the source text itself.

11 In the manuscript of *rNam nges bsdus don*, if the *sa bcad* title includes the words of the *pratika*, the *pratika* is not noted below the title’s line. Instead, a vertical dotted line is inserted to indicate which words of the title correspond to the *pratika*. In some manuscripts, the *pratikas* are written in a different color ink.

For *rNam nges bsdus don*, the translation used for reference was most probably that by rNgog Blo Idan shes rab, which is the translation preserved in the Tibetan canon. Only minor differences can be noted (such as *de’di*, or homophonic variants); occasionally, the *pratika* of the *bsdus don* allows erroneous readings in the canon to be corrected.

In Phya pa’s synoptic table of the Pramāṇaviniścaya, however, a more “economical” technique is used. Namely, if a branch has few sub-branches and subsequent ramifications, one enumerates the sub-branches with their ramifications when listing the sa bcad titles of the fork’s sub-branches. In doing so, instead of listing i) the title of a branch, ii) the number of sub-branches, iii) the titles of the sub-branches, one lists, recursively, i) the titles of the sub-branches, ii) the number of sub-branches, iii) the title of the branch they belong to. The result, for the same example, would be as follows:

A_{(3)}: A11 | A121 | A122, A123 3 kyiś A12 2 kyiś A1, A21, A221, A222 2 kyiś A22 2 kyiś A2, A31, A32 2 kyiś A3

Here, the expression “A121, A122, A123 3 kyiś A12” indicates that A121, A122, and A123 are the three sub-branches of A12, and respectively, the expression “A11, A12 2 kyiś A1” means that A11 and A12 are the two sub-branches of A1. Although this arrangement is quite clear when using letters and numbers, the actual formulation in Tibetan is not as obvious and somewhat ambiguous. For instance, before one reaches “3 kyiś A12,” one may think that A11, A121, A122 and A123 are sub-branches of the same fork. To avoid this, the scribe has used a graphic device and a special punctuation that plays a role similar to parentheses. Namely, the expressions indicating the number of sub-branches (2 kyiś, etc.) are written in bold letters, and the sa bcad titles of different levels of subdivision are separated by a distinct means: broken shad (‘) full shad (|), or double shad (‖). For the above example, one would thus find:

A_{(3)}: A11 | A121; A122; A123 3 kyiś A12 2 kyiś A1 | A21 | A221; A222 2 kyiś A22 2 kyiś A2 | A31 | A32 2 kyiś A3

Suppose now that A11 had many ramifications. These would be listed only after presenting A1, A2 and A3 in the abovementioned way. As a consequence, the order of occurrence of the pratikas attached to the sa bcad titles does not always respect the linearity of
the source text, as would be the case if one walked the tree in the usual way (i.e., according to the pre-order traversal method). For instance here, the pratīka for the leaf A31 would be given before the pratīka for A111 (or any leaf stemming from A11), although in the Pramāṇaviniścaya, the passage corresponding to A111 occurs before the one corresponding to A31. To solve this difficulty, numbers, letters and reference signs were added to the manuscript of rNam nges bsdus don (by the scribe himself or more probably by a reader using the manuscript). They allow a linear order to be retraced and sub-branches whose ramification is dealt with much later in the bsdus don to be located.

3.2 Tibetan and Indian antecedents of bsdus don

bsDus don compositions did not start with Phya pa. They find in particular an antecedent in the multifaceted contribution of the great scholar rNgog Blo ldan shes rab (hereafter referred to as rNgog Lo).12 In addition to contributing to an impressive number of translations – which earned him the title “Lo tsā ba” – rNgog Lo authored more than forty commentarial compositions, often bearing on works that he himself translated. The bibliographers mention among these a number of works they describe as “bsdus don”/“don bsdus,” works that are often paired with a second commentarial composition described as “rnam bshad.”13 If this lets us presume the existence of pairs of shorter and longer commentaries, it actually turns out to be problematic to match these titles to the available extant texts (only ten at present). Works entitled bsdus don do figure among the available compositions of rNgog Lo, but it is to be noted that rNgog Lo uses this title for two quite distinct types of texts:

i. “bsdus don” used in the sense of “synoptic table.” This sense

---

12 See Kano (2008) for an analysis of rNgog Blo ldan shes rab’s bsdus don on the Ratnagotrabhāga, as well as a general discussion about bsdus don.

13 See Kano 2006: 125–128 for a compilation of the bibliographical lists of rNgog Lo’s works by Gro lung pa, Bu ston and Śākya mchog ldan.
of *bsdus don* is illustrated by a single case, a two-folio text discovered in Kharakhoto that has been studied by Dr. Kazuo Kano. This *bsdus don*, like *rNam nges bsdus don*, consists in an enumeration of topical outlines (i.e., *sa bcad* subdivisions), which express a hierarchical stratification superimposed onto an Indian treatise, in this case the *Ratnagotravibhāga*.

ii. a second type of composition entitled “*bsdus don*” or “*don bsdus pa*,” of which those by rNgog Lo published in the *bKa’ gdams gsung ’bum* are representative. These works also reveal the process of structuring a source text, either locally or globally. However, here the source text is not presented merely by means of *sa bcad* titles. Rather, the author, following the source text linearly, takes it up portion by portion, summarizing and/or explaining the contents; each portion is referred to by the beginning and ending words. I translate *bsdus don* in this sense as “concise guide.”

Lexically, the term *bsdus don* corresponds to the Sanskrit *piṇḍārtha*, which on one hand is a hermeneutical category in Vasubandhu’s *Vyākhyāyukti*, and on the other, a type of composition. As a herme-

---


15 See his *mDo sde rgyan gyi don bsdus* (vol. 1, no. 15) and *dBus dang mtha’ rnam par’ byed pa’i don bsdus pa* (vol. 1, no. 17). He also authored a *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i man ngag gi don bsdus pa*, published in Dharamsala in 1993. Another work by rNgog Lo published in the *bKa’ gdams gsung ’bum* (vol. 1, no. 20) is falsely identified as *Tshad ma rnam nges kyi bsdus don* in the *dkar chag*. This work is a concise guide to Dharmottara’s *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*. It might be the *bsdus don* mentioned by Gro lung pa as one of the two works by rNgog Lo on the *Nyāyabindu cum ṭīkā* (*Rigs thigs ’grel pa dang bcas pa’i bsdus don* and *rnam bshad*). Note that in the absence of a pair of works on the same treatise (apart from the two *bsdus don* works on the *Ratnagotravibhāga*), and since the extant works entitled “*bsdus don*” are sometimes of considerable length, it is unclear whether they might correspond to the works that the bibliographers refer to as “*rnam bshad*” in the *bsdus don/rnam bshad* pairs, or if the existence of a still longer work must be presupposed.

16 *Don bsdus pa* would for its part correspond to *arthasamuccaya*.
neutical category that is part of the technique for the exposition and
exegesis of Buddhist texts, the term “pindārtha” refers to a state-
ment to be included at the beginning of a commentary, which sum-
marizes the treatise and is easy to understand and memorize.17 Such
bsdus don statements are found at the beginning of Tibetan com-
mentaries.

As a type of composition, several of which are preserved in Ti-
betan in the bsTan ’gyur,18 pindārthas possibly influenced rNgog
Lo’s composition of “concise guides.” Indeed, as Kano (2008) dis-
cusses in more detail, rNgog Lo was responsible for the translation
of a number of Indian pindārthas, and it was moreover a type of
composition used by his master Sajjana. One could also argue that
pindārthas prefigure, to a limited extent, the type of analysis found
in synoptic tables in terms of the arrangement of the topics and sys-
tematic classifications. One is, however, still far from finding an
Indian model: whereas Indian pindārthas are meant to convey the
essence of a treatise, they do not provide, as do Tibetan bsdus don
(either qua synoptic table or concise guide), a tool for a guided sys-
tematic reading of the original text.

3.3 Nature of the subdivisions

The subdivisions applied to the source treatise (and, by extension,
subdivisions applied in autochthonous works) cover a wide range of

17 See Verhagen 2005a, and in particular pp. 580–581 on “pindārtha”
in the Vyākhyaṅvuki. For a discussion of this hermeneutical category by Sa
skya Paṇḍita, see Jackson 1987: 127 and 147 n. 4, and Verhagen 2005b.
18 See for instance the Nyāyabindupiṇḍārtha by Jinamitra (ca. 800), a
versified work summarizing the Nyāyabindu. Jackson 1993: 23 mentions,
among works found in the canon, an Abhisamayālāṅkāra-vṛtti-piṇḍārtha
(P5193) and a Prajñāpāramitā-piṇḍārtha (P5195). Kano (2008) notes the
existence in the Tucci collection of a Sūrālāṅkāra-piṇḍārtha by Sajjana.
These works are not of a single type. Kano classifies them into three main
types: versified summaries of source texts, concise summaries listing the
essential topics of source texts, and systematic summaries with concise
explanations.
functions. Considering the nature of the subdivisions and their origin will enable us to determine the role of bsdus don compositions more precisely.

Without attempting an exhaustive typology, one can identify two main functions of these subdivisions: they aim at providing a systematized organization of the topics presented in the treatise and also reflect the nature of the presentation. The latter type of subdivision expresses the structure of the discourse by identifying the nature of the corresponding passages in the source text: for instance, the division between a brief introduction and a detailed presentation (mdor bstan pa/rgyas par bshad pa), the statement of a controversy and the answer to it (rgol ba//lan), the presentation of the opponent’s view and its refutation (gzhan lugs/sun 'byung pa), etc. As for the former, they are not only concerned with conveying what the topics are and how they are organized, but also address what is said about them in the source text. As such, the titles of these subdivisions provide summaries of portions of the source treatise. Further, although these sa bcad titles are essentially descriptive, insofar as these descriptions reflect the author’s understanding of the source text, they also express an element of interpretation. So does, as a matter of fact, the choice of where the source text is divided and the relationships ascribed to the passages thus delimited. Thus, the function of such a synoptic table brings us beyond a mere “table of contents.”

3.4 Possible sources for the sa bcad titles and their stratification

We will see below that the organization and formulation of the sa bcad titles in rNam nges bsdus don reflects Phya pa’s indebtedness to his Tibetan predecessors. This does not solve the question how the hierarchical structure applied to the source text is built in the first place; indeed, it is worth recalling that the sa bcad hierarchy is something that is superimposed onto a source text that, in itself, is often devoid of such explicit stratification. And if there is one, it does not necessarily provide a basis for the sa bcad hierarchy. In a text such as the Pramāṇaviniścaya, the only explicit division is its three
chapters (pariccheda): perception, inference for oneself, inference for others. And yet, Phya pa’s bsdus don does not adopt a three-branched division for analyzing this treatise. Instead, Phya pa makes a two-branched initial division between “means to ascertain an object of knowledge by oneself” and “means to generate understanding for others”; the first is divided further into two sections, “means of understanding what is perceptible, namely, perception” and “means of understanding what is not perceptible, namely, inference.”

The author of a bsdus don (and by extension, of a longer commentary) carries out a threefold task: dividing the source text into sections, attributing a title to each section, and organizing these sections hierarchically. Divisions that reflect the structure of the presentation (e.g. the statement of the opponent’s view and its refutation) and list categories stand out as obvious choices for analyzing and organizing the source text. Other divisions rely on syntax: statements starting with the word “therefore” occurring at the end of a discussion are regularly distinguished as constituting the summary or recapitulation (don bsdu ba) for the given section.

But such divisions represent only a portion of the analysis. Part of the work accomplished by the author of a bsdus don is common to any commentary on a source text, and Indian commentaries thus provide a starting point for the analysis. Regarding the Pramāṇaviniścaya, Dharmottara’s commentary appears to have played a major role in Phya pa’s stratification. This is not to say that Dharmottara himself resorted to the sa bcad technique. He does however provide both broader and finer demarcation of the source text. Indeed, Dharmottara occasionally marks the transition between two topics, or two discussions, in the form of statements such as “having explained X, now [Dharmakīrti] said in order to explained Y...” (... bshad nas / ... bshad pa’i phyir ... zhes gsungs), or he introduces a new discussion.

19 In Phya pa’s longer commentary, two structures co-exist: a division into three chapters that corresponds to the three chapters of the Pramāṇaviniścaya, and a hierarchical organization in sa bcad that applies the same initial division as that found in rNam nges bsdus don.
by stating a question or an objection to be answered. Further, a number of \textit{sa bcad} titles in \textit{rNam nges bsdus don} are found to correspond to glosses, remarks, summarizing statements, etc., that can be found in Dharmottara’s commentary.\textsuperscript{20}

With the exception of the format of presentation and its brevity, the composition of \textit{bsdus don} does not appear to be a process essentially different from that of a commentary. Its \textit{sa bcad} titles play the role of glosses on the corresponding \textit{pratika}. The specificity of \textit{bsdus don} qua commentary, which also applies to the related extended commentary, is the overall and exhaustive stratification of the subdivisions, regarding which full credit is to be given to the author.

3.5 The \textit{bsdus don} as a commentary – \textit{rNam nges bsdus don} and \textit{'Od zer}

The commentarial nature of \textit{rNam nges bsdus don} becomes more evident when comparing it with \textit{'Od zer}, Phya pa’s extensive commentary on the same source text. \textit{'Od zer} itself is composed using the \textit{sa bcad} technique. Every one of its parts is ordered within an exhaustive hierarchical structure. As mentioned earlier, \textit{'Od zer} is a “hybrid commentary,” in which independent presentations of topics and analysis of the source text co-exist. It is in the portions of \textit{'Od zer} devoted to the latter that one finds the most obvious parallels to \textit{rNam nges bsdus don}. In many cases, the same subdivisions occur in both \textit{rNam nges bsdus don} and \textit{'Od zer}, with similar \textit{sa bcad} titles and references to the same corresponding \textit{pratikas}. In \textit{'Od zer}, the \textit{sa

\textsuperscript{20} For instance, in a passage that will be discussed below in the section on alternative analyses, one finds as the first subdivision of the section “\textit{tshad ma'i yul dngos po yin pa}” (“the object of valid cognition is an entity”) the title “\textit{mngon sum rjes dpag dngos po'i yul can du mtshungs par sgrub pa}” (“proof that perception and inference are similar in terms of having an entity as their object”). Dharmottara’s commentary on the corresponding passage of the \textit{Pramāṇaviniścaya} reads here: \textit{de nyid kyi phyir 'di dag ni tshad ma dngos po'i yul can gyi rgyu mtshan can du mtshungs par bstan pa'i phyir gnyi ga zhes gsungs so //} (PV\text{in}\text{\textgamma} D178a7).
bcad titles do not stand on their own, but introduce a more detailed explanation, namely, the contents of the respective “leaves” of the “tree.” In other cases, a parallel to the sa bcad titles of rNam nges bdus don appears in 'Od zer in the gloss that follows the mention of the pratika.

One should mention right away that the correspondence between the two texts, albeit significant, is far from absolute; the number and formulation of the subdivisions vary, and for a given passage the two texts frequently offer quite different structural analyses. This leads me to the conclusion that it is most likely that these two texts were not composed simultaneously and that rNam nges bs dus don was also not “extracted” from the longer commentary. I would rather suggest that the bs dus don was composed first. While offering a both ultra-detailed and ultra-succinct analysis of the Pramāṇaviniścaya, it likely provided a preparatory step for an extensive commentary. And an extensive commentary is actually needed, in either written or oral form, to compensate for the conciseness of the bs dus don; if read on its own, the latter remains to some extent unclear, and it is definitely cryptic if one is not familiar with the source text.

One actually finds places in 'Od zer that appear to be traces of such a composition process. For instance, one finds a title preceded by the mention of “bzhi pa” (fourth point), although in the section where it occurs, there is neither an explicit subdivision into four subsections, nor are any other titles preceded with a numeral; Phya pa’s explanations in this passage are given without stratification. Turning to the rNam nges bs dus don, one sees that for this passage of the Pramāṇaviniścaya, a four-fold subdivision is introduced, in which the fourth and last sa b cad title corresponds to the title given as “fourth” in 'Od zer. Thus, the ordinal number given in 'Od zer to this sub-section makes sense only in view of the corresponding passage in rNam nges bs dus don.

21 'Od zer 181b1: 'gal ba g zhan du bzhag pa'i dgos pa'i rgol ba.
22 rNam nges bs dus don 11a1: 'gal ba g zhan du bshad pa'i dgos pa.
How are the differences between the two texts to be understood? A more detailed analysis of both texts would be needed to see whether the differences amount merely to minor modifications in formulation, as are often found in different commentaries by a single author on the same treatise, or if they reflect a significant change in the interpretation of the source text. One reason for these differences could be that Phya pa, when composing rNam nges bsdus don, followed or drew his inspiration from earlier commentaries and/or bsdus don on this treatise, and later developed a personal interpretation that was different for some portions of the text, which is reflected in 'Od zer. Indeed, it is obvious that Phya pa did not start from scratch when composing his works on the Pramāṇaviścaya. We know from bibliographical sources that works on the Pramāṇaviścaya were composed by Phya pa’s predecessors (and among them his teachers), in particular by rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, Gro lung pa and rGya dmar pa. Unfortunately, none of the epistemological works by the latter two have been recovered so far.23 We do have, however, a work on the Pramāṇaviścaya by rNgog Lo, a “commentary on the difficult points” of this treatise (dKa’ gnas rnam bshad).24 This work – or more likely rNgog Lo’s as yet unavailable commentary on the Pramāṇaviścaya25 – which uses the sa bcad technique locally, can be identified as a source of influence for Phya pa, both with regard to the way of dividing the source text into sections and sub-sections,

23 A khu ching’s list of “rare works” ascribes commentaries on the Pramāṇaviścaya (Tho yig 11802 and 11809) to both and to the second, some epistemological summaries (Tho yig 11810).

24 Some bibliographers mention two works by rNgog Lo on the Pramāṇaviścaya (cum ŏkā), a “bsdus don” and a “rnam bshad.” Śākya mchog ldan also identifies some quotes as coming from a “commentary” (ôkā) or “extensive commentary” (ôk chen). The dKa’ gnas is the only work on the Pramāṇaviścaya by rNgog Lo that is currently available. See n. 15 above regarding the work falsely listed as a bsdus don on the Pramāṇaviścaya in the dkar chag of the bKa’ gdamgs gsung ’bum.

25 See the preceding note. According to the citations collected, rNgog Lo’s commentary would bear many parallels with his explanation of the difficult points. See Krasser 2003: 168 and Hugon 2008: 21–22.
but also with regard to the titles standing for those sections. But as rNgog Lo’s available work is itself neither a synoptic table nor a systematic commentary, as it only deals with the “difficult points,” it is not possible to ascertain whether the analyses of rNam nges bsdu don that differ from those of ’Od zer consistently go back to rNgog Lo.

One must mention here the numerous marginal notes found in the manuscript of rNam nges bsdu don, which offer additional or alternative analyses for certain passages. I could establish that in the majority of such cases, the marginal notes repeated (or at least were inspired by) the analysis found in ’Od zer. The possibility was suggested to me that such notes might represent Phya pa’s own revision of his earlier composition while composing ’Od zer or afterwards. However, as one also finds notes proposing alternatives differing from both rNam nges bsdu don and ’Od zer where these two correspond, I think it more likely that the notes are those of a

26 In addition to numerous parallel passages, one also finds sections of ’Od zer that are, other than a few details, literally identical with dKa’ gnas. Compare for instance ’Od zer 181a3–b1 and dKa’ gnas 470–473. Note also that rNam nges bsdu don mentions on two occasions an alternative analysis that corresponds to what is found in dKa’ gnas (see the next section).

27 For instance, in the case of the analysis of a passage in the anupalabdhi section of PVin II, a marginal note gives an alternative analysis that corresponds to ’Od zer 111b1ff. The analysis of rNam nges bsdu don for this section (don gzhan sgrub pa mi dmigs pa go byed du sgrub pa) presents a fourfold division into 1. mi ’gal bas ’gog mi nus pa, 2. lhan cig mi gnas pa, 3. phan tshun spangs ’gal, 4. ’gal ba grub pa mi dmigs par ’du ba. This formulation is similar to what one finds in dKa’ gnas 277–278, where a threefold division is presented for the corresponding section (presented in terms of ’gal ba bsgrub pa mi dmigs pas khyab bar bsgrub pa): 1. lhan cig mi gnas pa’i ’gal ba’i don gan la ’bebs pa’i tshad ma, 2. phan tshun spangs pa’i ’gal pa’i don gan la ’bebs pa’i tshad ma, 3. ’gal bar ’grub pa rtags su sbyar ba mi dmigs par grub pa nyid.

28 This is the case, for instance, for the first note in the manuscript. Both rNam nges bsdu don and ’Od zer concord in presenting an initial fourfold initial division of the Pramāṇaviniścaya (1. bstan bcos rtson pa’i rgyu, 2. rang gi bstan bcos kyi ’bras bu dgos ’brel, 3. bstan bcos kyi rang bzhin, 4.
reader who was familiar with 'Od zer, and probably also one or more other commentaries or synoptic tables on the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*.

*rNam nges bsdus don* and 'Od zer offer two distinct, but complementary types of composition. Similar pairs involving a *bsdus don* and a commentary were also composed by Phya pa on the *Satyadvayavibhaṅga* and the *Ratnagotravibhāga*. It is attested also for other authors whose works are published in the *bKa’ gdamgs gsung ‘bum*.

3.6 Alternative stratifications as divergent interpretations

We have seen that different analyses for a particular passage are given by Phya pa in his synoptic table and his longer commentary respectively, and that one finds in the manuscript of *rNam nges bsdus don* alternative analyses occurring in marginal notes. One can also note that on four occasions alternative analyses are also mentioned by Phya pa in the synoptic table itself.31 These cases allow us to better grasp how alternative stratifications proposed for a passage (i.e., alternative ways of dividing, alternative hierarchy and/or *sa bcad* titles) actually stand for distinct interpretations of it.

One such case concerns a passage occurring at the beginning of the second chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, where Dharmakīrti

*bstan bcos kyi don nges pa mdo mdzad pa’i dgongs pa rdzogs pa la bspro ba*, whereas the note suggests grouping the first two divisions under one heading, so as to have a threefold initial division (1. *bstan bcos rtsom pa la ‘jug pa*, 1.1 *bstan bcos rtsom pa’i rgyu*, 1.2. *rang gi bstan bcos kyi ‘bras bu dgos ‘brel*, 2. *bstan bcos kyi rang bzhin*, 3. *bstan bcos kyi don nges pa mdo mdzad pa’i dgongs pa rdzogs pa la bspro ba*).

30 The *dkar chag* of the *bKa’ gdamgs gsung ‘bum* fails to differentiate between the two texts, and lists only a “*dbu ma bden gnyis kyi ‘brel ba*.”

31 For instance, one finds an anonymous *don gsal ba’i ti ka* and a *bsdus don* on the *rGya ba’i yum yon tan rin po che sdu pa* (vol. 23), and a *’grel bshad* and a *don bsdus pa* by Byang chub skyabs on the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (vol. 25).

31 See *rNam nges bsdus don* 2a4/2a6, 4b1/4b2, 7a4/7a7, 9b1/9b3.
explains that valid cognitions have as their object a real entity.\textsuperscript{32} Phya pa gives two successive analyses in \textit{rNam nges bsdus don}. The first analysis is based on the idea that Dharmakīrti’s arguments all concern the proof that perception has a real entity as its object, except for the last sentence, which applies specifically to inference. The second analysis suggests, for its part, that the passage be divided into two according to the two logical reasons presented by Dharmakīrti. While it amounts to the same division of the source text, the second analysis does not suggest that the logical reasons given in each of the two sections address the cases of perception and inference separately.\textsuperscript{33}

These two analyses correspond to two different interpretations of the passage whose proponents can actually be identified: the first

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{rNam nges bsdus don} 4b1/4b2, on PVin II 48,1–8 (Tib. 3\textsuperscript{a}10–24).

\textsuperscript{33} The first alternative suggests a bipartition of the passage as follows: i) PVin II 48,1–8 (Tib. 3\textsuperscript{a}10–23) is presented as “the proof that perception and inference are similar in having a real entity as their object” (\textit{mngon sum rjes dpag dngos po’i yul can du mtshungs par sgrub pa}), and ii) the last sentence, PVin II 48,8 (Tib. 3\textsuperscript{a}23–24), which reads “and because it depends on a logical reason for the entity which is linked with the latter” is explained as “the proof, in particular, that inference has for an object a real entity” (\textit{rjes su dpag pa dngos po’i yul can du bye brag du sgrub pa}). An interlinear note suggests that in the first division, the proof has two parts: the initial “therefore” refers to a logical reason involving a necessary connection (\textit{avinābhāva}), while the rest of the argument is explained as a logical reason of causal efficiency (\textit{arthakriyā}).

The second analysis is introduced in the \textit{bsdus don} by the words “yang na.” It suggests that the first part of the passage is an argument for proving that valid cognition has a real object relying on the logical reason “evaluating [an object] capable of causal efficiency” (\textit{don byed nus pa ‘jal ba’i rtags}), and that the second part (the last sentence) does the same, but by relying on the logical reason “relation with the entity” (\textit{dngos po dang ‘brel pa’i rtags la ltos pa’i rtags}). The first part is further divided into five (presentation of the logical reason, establishment of its \textit{pakṣadharma}, rejecting objection, establishing the negative concomitance, summary), without distinguishing the first “therefore” as expressing another argument.
analysis is inspired by Dharmottara’s commentary;\textsuperscript{34} the alternative turns out to correspond to the one provided by rNgog Lo in his commentary on the difficult points of the \textit{Pramāṇaviniścaya}.\textsuperscript{35} If this confirms our assumption that Phya pa was influenced by earlier commentaries, both Indian and Tibetan, it is not clear why Phya pa would have thought it important to mention rNgog Lo’s alternative interpretation here and not in other places. One must note that in ‘\textit{Od zer}, where the passage is analyzed in a manner corresponding to the first alternative given in \textit{rNam} nges bsdus don, Phya pa makes no mention of rNgog Lo’s interpretation.\textsuperscript{36}

We find an inverse case for another alternative occurring with regard to the detailed explanation of the criterion “not opposed by what is commonly recognized” in the definition of the thesis.\textsuperscript{37} In ‘\textit{Od zer}, Phya pa follows the first alternative given in \textit{rNam} nges bsdus don, whose source appears to be rNgog Lo’s interpretation, but does not repeat the second analysis of \textit{rNam} nges bsdus don (whose source I could not identify and which is also not mentioned in \textit{dKa’ gnas}).\textsuperscript{38}

In the two other cases where \textit{rNam} nges bsdus don states alternative analyses for a passage, interlinear notes by an unknown hand specify the name (or names) of an Indian or Tibetan commentator to be associated with each analysis. In the first case, which concerns

\textsuperscript{34} See PVin\textsuperscript{T} D178aff.

\textsuperscript{35} See \textit{dKa’ gnas} 199,7–201,11. There are several differences in formulation, and rNgog Lo does not apply the \textit{sa bcad} technique systematically in this portion. Still, the general outline of the analysis and the division of the source text correspond. Note that rNgog Lo considers both logical reasons to apply specifically to inference.

\textsuperscript{36} ‘\textit{Od zer} 80b9–81b1.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{rNam} nges bsdus don 9b1/9b3, on PVin III P171b8ff. More precisely, this passage is said to address the necessity, for Dignāga, to include this criterion.

\textsuperscript{38} See ‘\textit{Od zer} 171b7ff. The interlinear note found in this context in \textit{rNam} nges bsdus don, which states “\textit{phyis mi gsung}” (“not told afterwards”) could refer to the absence of the second analysis in ‘\textit{Od zer}. For rNgog Lo’s analysis, see \textit{dKa’ gnas} 439–441.
the definition of sense perception and the proof that sense perception is devoid of conceptualization, the first analysis is attributed to Vinițadeva, Ratnākaraśānti and rNgog Lo tsā ba, and the second to Dharmottara.39 In the second passage mentioning two alternative analyses, which concerns the establishment of relations, the first analysis is attributed to Śākyabuddhi (with a supplementary note that adds: “and the Lo tsā ba who follows”), the second again to Dharmottara.40 Here, the two alternative interpretations are also dealt with in the longer presentation of ‘Od zer and are to some extent already discussed by rNgog Lo in dKa’ gnas.41 A detailed examination of these alternative analyses would go beyond the framework of the present paper. Let us just note that if one only considers the sa bcad titles in rNam nges bs dus don, it is not clear at first glance what the difference in the respective interpretations actually amounts to. It would thus be difficult (unless one were familiar with every detail of the above-mentioned commentators’ thought) to make sense of

39 rNam nges bs dus don 2a4/2a6 on PVin I 7,8–8,7 (Tib. 40,9–42,6). See the last page of the appendix 2.
40 rNam nges bs dus don 7a4/7a7 on PVin II 97,8–99,4 (Tib. 44,18–45,23).

41 Regarding the first topic, Phya pa presents his own analysis in ‘Od zer 47a6–49a1 and a second interpretation, which he attributes to Dharmottara, in ‘Od zer 49a1–49b3 (see PVinṬ D43a–48a). For rNgog Lo’s presentation, see dKa’ gnas 100,5–103,16. rNgog Lo presents Dharmottara’s interpretation in dKa’ gnas 103,16–105,14 and criticizes it in dKa’ gnas 105,15–107,6. The presentation in dKa’ gnas confirms to some degree the attribution of the first analysis to rNgog Lo, but I was not able to find a source for the attribution to Vinițadeva and Ratnākaraśānti.

Regarding the second topic, Phya pa presents the first analysis in ‘Od zer 139a2–140a6, the second in ‘Od zer 140a6–141a1. rNgog Lo’s discussion runs from dKa’ gnas 358,20 to 368,15, including the views of Dharmottara and Śaṅkaranandana; the latter discusses this topic when commenting on the parallel passage occurring in PVSV 15,8–16,7 (see PVṬŚaṅk D90bff). No mention is made of Śākyabuddhi in either ‘Od zer or dKa’ gnas. This nominal reference in rNam nges bs dus don’s notes could be a mistake for Śaṅkaranandana, or an allusion to Śākyabuddhi’s commentary on PVSV (see PVṬŚaṅk D35a4–37b4).
Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge’s synoptic table of the Pramânavinîścaya

rNam nges bsdus don on this score without referring to Phya pa’s extensive commentary.

3.7 Annotations on the manuscript

The role of synoptic tables within the Tibetan corpus appears quite clear: maximizing the analysis of a source while keeping the explanations to the briefest. How were these texts actually used?

The colophon of rNam nges bsdus don indicates that this text was taught, and it even gives us the name of the designated instructor, the learned monk rDo rje dbang grags. Whether or not in connection with the latter’s teaching, it is apparent from the numerous annotations found in the manuscript that one or more likely several readers indeed used this work as a learning tool. The various notes appear to have been made by different persons: there are differences in the script used (some notes are in capital letters, some in cursive). Also, fifteen notes are preceded by a similar sign – they most likely must all be attributed to a single reader. Further, the occurrence of notes where the words “gsung” or “zer” (“he said that”) have been added to already existing notes would confirm that successive readers worked with the manuscript.

---

42 rNam nges bsdus don 13b4: mang du thos pa’i dge slong rdo rje dbang grags kyis sbyin par bya ba’i chos s.hyo //. Note the existence of an analogous indication in the colophon of rNgog Lo’s dKa’ gnas: shag kya’i dge slong ’dra rin chen ’byar gyis sbyin par bya ba’i chos so.

43 These notes include identifications of the proponents, alternative and additional subdivisions, and modifications of the sa bcad. I counted twelve of them on folio 1b, one on folio 4a8 and two on folio 10a7. In the majority of cases, the information supplied in the note can be traced back to ’Od zer. See the appendix.

44 gSung or zer are added, for instance, after a note, a remark, or when an alternative analysis is offered for a passage in a note. I was however unable to ascertain whether the use of one or the other expression was significant as a means of expressing agreement or disagreement. In particular, both gsung and zer are found in cases where the information comes from ’Od zer. See the appendix for more details.
Many of these notes testify to the difficulties students or readers had to deal with when studying this text. The way in which the hierarchical structure is presented is one: a number of annotations consist of reference signs that, by indicating distant branches related to the same fork, allow a clearer orientation in the hierarchical structure. Another issue is that of brevity. In the case of the *rNam nges bsdus don*, the use of this synoptic table for understanding the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* requires the reader to be familiar with the source text in its Tibetan version (most probably through earlier memorization). Indeed, the nature of the *pratikas* – these only state the first words of the passages, e.g., “therefore” (*de’i phyir*) or “in this regard” (*de la*) – would not otherwise allow the corresponding passages to be identified. As I have already mentioned, a consequence of the conciseness of the synoptic tables is that they are of little use on their own. Some additional information has to be supplied. Numerous notes made on the manuscript in question indicate that the reading/teaching of this text was done in tandem with that of Phya pa’s longer commentary, *’Od zer*, and possibly with other commentaries or *bsdus don* that provided alternative analyses. We have seen above that the majority of marginal notes providing alternative or additional subdivisions had their origin in *’Od zer.* This is the case as well for most of the notes providing additional information such as definitions, or notes that identify the origin of an analy-

45 In one case (*rNam nges bsdus don* 6a4), the annotation merely hints at a more detailed fivefold division for the section “*de 2 kyi gtan tshigs tha dad pa’i rgyu*” and gives only one of the titles (*dbye ba’i rgyu la stso pa lngas*). One can find a corresponding fivefold division in *’Od zer* 122b7: *gsum pa de gnyis kyi sbyor ba tha dad pa’i rgyu ni sbyor ba’i dbang gis* (PVin II 25,18) *zhes pa ste / dbye ba’i gzhi dang / dbye ba’i rgyu mtshan dang / gsal ba’i dbye ba dang / bstan bya tha dad dgag pa dang skabs su ma bab pa’i brisad pa spang pa lngas nges par bya’o /.*

46 For example, definitions have been added in capital letters when listing the division *sgrub pa/sun* *byin pa* (proof/refutation). They correspond to the definitions given under the corresponding section in *’Od zer.* *rNam nges bsdus don* 7b5: *<rgol ba’i rten can gyi ngag>* *sgrub pa dang / <phyir rgol ba’i rten can gyi ngag>* *sun ‘byin pa;* cf. *’Od zer* 142b1: *rgol ba’i rten
sis (one finds the names Dharmottara, Vinītadeva, Ratnākaraśānti, Śaṅkaranandana, Jñānaśrībhadra, and on the Tibetan side “lo tsa ba,” i.e., rNgog Blo ldan shes rab) or the proponents in a discussion (Īśvarasena, the Śāṅkhyā, the Cirāntana-vaiśeṣika, “heretics,” etc.). As not all of the notes have a parallel in ’Od zer, reference to other works and oral transmission must also be taken into account.

Incidentally, while these notes abound in the first part of rNam nges bsdus don, they become extremely rare towards the end. This leaves us to wonder whether the reader or readers dropped out of rDo rje dbang grags’s class, lost their enthusiasm for methodical reference to ’Od zer, or just found it unnecessary, in the long run, to consistently note down variants and other information.

4. Conclusion

This short text thus turns out to be quite informative: First, it throws light onto the techniques of composition characteristic of the first centuries of the Later Diffusion. In this regard, synoptic tables offer a twofold advantage in dealing with a huge corpus of complex new texts: they simultaneously allow an in-depth analysis and provide a general outline for each treatise by organizing the contents according to a hierarchical structure, which in itself also constitutes a summary and a commentary, even occasionally contrasting different interpretations.

can gyi ngag bsgrub pa dang / phyi rgyo ba’i rten can gyi ngag sun ’byin pa rgyis so /

Other additions change the reading of the bsdus don, adding or jumping over words to make it identical to the reading of ’Od zer. This is the case for instance in rNam nges bsdus don 2a5: ming ’dzin <ming snang pa tsam gyi sphyi rigs> pa la don dang ’brel <par snang> pas khyab pa<s rang gi mtshan nyid kyi ming snang yang>. Cf. ’Od zer 39b9: ming snang pa tsam gyi sphyi rigs la don dang ’brel par snang pas khyab pas rang gi mtshan nyid kyi ming snang pa yang...

47 See the appendix for a complete list.
The examination of Phya pa’s *bsdus don* also gives us a glimpse of the “life” of such a text in the scholarly context: whereas for someone familiar with the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* it was a tool for making sense of its contents in a systematized way, for students of epistemology it provided a basis for approaching this source text. References to extra material found in longer commentaries or provided orally allowed the limited information of the *bsdus don* to be supplemented with an identification of the context and/or proponents, as well as more detailed explanations on each topic.

When comparing this composition with the other types of works by rNgog Lo and Phya pa that were mentioned in the course of this paper, I would qualify “synoptic tables” as works representative of “first-generation” compositions, with commentaries and concise guides also in this group, in contrast to “summaries” (and to some extent, hybrid commentaries), which I consider representative of “second-generation” compositions. The distinguishing characteristic I see between the two is that the first group is primarily directed towards an understanding of the Indian material, or more precisely, towards the reading, understanding and interpretation of this material, whereas the second builds on the understanding of its contents, which results in a more independent type of presentation, both formally and regarding the views adopted.

In this regard, there is also, in my opinion, a difference between rNgog Lo’s undertaking and that of Phya pa: rNgog Lo tsā ba’s scholarly work encompasses translation and exegesis. He had direct access to the Sanskrit source texts and all his compositions relate directly to the Indian corpus, aiming at providing a facilitated access to it; his translations provide direct access to the source texts for those who do not know Sanskrit, while his own compositions – most of them addressing Indian treatises that he himself translated – provide tools to work with these source texts: “synoptic tables” give the reader an overview of a work’s contents; “concise guides” offer a more detailed presentation, while “commentaries” carry out an extensive exegesis. They are clearly meant to solve problems related to
the volume and complexity of the Indian material that was imported to Tibet in this period.

On the other hand, Phya pa had, as far as we know, no knowledge of Sanskrit. He did not work as a translator, nor did he study in India or Kaśmir, or with Indian masters. He can be regarded a pure product of the Tibetan monastic and scholastic education. Part of his contribution stands as a continuation of rNgog Lo’s endeavors, that is, the composition of exegetical works that relate closely to source texts, as illustrated by his synoptic table and his commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya. His Yid kyi mun sel, on the other hand, is an independent presentation that differs from the previous commentarial compositions in both its form and purpose, insofar as it does not comment on a specific treatise, but addresses a general topic – epistemology – dealing with it in accordance with his own understanding and philosophical project. The same can be said, with regard to Madhyamaka, of Phya pa’s dBu ma shar gsum gyi stong thun – known as his “summary of Madhyamaka” (dbu ma’i bsad pa) – in contrast to his commentaries on the individual works of the three

48 ’Gos Lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal specifically points out this fact in the Blue Annals when he mentions Dus gsum mkhyen pa’s studies with rGya dmar pa in sTod lung. Trans. Roerich 1996: 475: “At the age of 20, he [i.e., Dus gsum mkhyen pa] visited sTod lungs sa thang. He heard from sTod lungs rGya dmar pa and his disciple the teacher and scholar Phya pa, who was learned in the Tibetan language only, the “Doctrine of Maitreya” (byams chos) and the dbu ma sher gsum.” (Deb sngon 413–414: stod lungs rgya dmar ba dang / de’i slob ma bod skad rigs gcig pa la mkhas pa slob dpon phywa pa gnyis la byams chos dang dbu ma sher gsum gsan zhi’ing mkhas par bslabs /; emphasis mine.) As Dus gsum mkhyen pa was born in 1110, Phya must have been 21 years old at that time. No conclusive evidence can be drawn from Phya pa’s works, which were presumably written later. In ’Od zer 120b8ff., commenting upon PVin II.37=PV I.318, Phya pa mentions the Sanskrit equivalents for the words of the Vedic injunction “who desires heaven should offer an oblation in the fire” (Tib. mtho ris ’dod pas mye la sbyin sreg sbyin, Skt. agnihotram juhuyāt svargakāmāh). He does the same when discussing Dignāga’s definition of the thesis. Nevertheless, this cannot in itself be taken as a proof that he had, by the time he composed his commentary, acquired mastery of the Sanskrit language.
scholars from the East. Thus, one could say that Phya pa is taking two steps away from the Indian material: there is first a linguistic separation, as he relied on the Tibetan versions of the source texts, then a formal one, insofar as the “summaries” he composed do not follow the structure of specific Indian texts or cite from them as is done in standard commentaries; such works opened the way for the composition of autochthonous manuals that, in the long run, were to replace the Indian material, at least in the introductory course of monastic study. To this one must add a philosophical distancing, as it appears that for Phya pa, Indian treatises did not stand as the ultimate authority, but as contributions that could be criticized. It was, I would suggest, as much due to this “iconoclast” attitude towards the Indian sources as to the actual contents of his innovations that Phya pa was so harshly criticized a half century later by Sa skya Panḍita and his followers, whose program favored a more “conservative” attitude towards the Indian sources.49
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Appendix 1: Manuscript description

Note: The diplomatic edition of rNam nges bsdus don and the synopsis of the Pramāṇaviniścaya reconstructed from the bsdus don are, due to their length, not included here. The latter is available online (http://ikga.oeaw.ac.at/Mat.html).

1. Manuscript

13 folios. Size of the original unknown.

The folios are numbered on the recto in the left margin (except for folio 1).

Number of lines per folio: 1b–2a: 7 lines; 2b–13a: 8 lines; 13b: 4 lines.

Recto folios start with the single opening crook (mgo yig) followed by a shad (a triple opening crook on 13a); folio 1b starts with a triple opening crook followed by a double shad.

2. Title page

The title on folio 1a reads:

\[\text{ye dha rmā he tu pra bha bā he tun te sān ta thā ga to // hya ba daṭ <te> sāṃ tsa yo ni ro dha e bām bha ti ma hā śrā ma nāḥ}^{50}\]

This mantra is repeated with a few variants on the last page of the text (13b4):

\[\text{ye dha rmā he du pra bha bā he tun te sān ta thā ga to / hya bā daṭ te sāṃ tsa yo ni ro dha e bām bha ti ma hā śrā ma nāḥ}\]

Lined up vertically in the middle of the title page, one finds the three syllables Īṭ, A, hūṃ.

---

50 This is the well-known mantra summarizing the pratītyasamutpāda, in Skt.: ye dharmā hetuprabhavā hetum teṣāṃ tathāgato hy avadat teṣāṃ ca yo nirdha evam vadi mahāśramanah.
3. Introduction and colophon

The text starts on folio 1b with an invocation to Mañjuśrī and to the author’s Lamas:

(1b1) ’phags pa ’jam dpal la phyag ’tshal lo / bla ma rnams la phyag ’tshal lo //

The colophon states the title of the text and identifies its author as “the monk-logician Chos kyi seng ge”:

(13b3) tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i bsdus don / rigs pa smra ba’i dge slong chos kyi seng ges sbyar pa rdzogs s.hyo //

It also states the name of another monk, rDo rje dbang grags, who is to give instruction:

(13b4) mang du thos pa’i dge slong rdo rje dbang grags kyis sbyin par bya ba’i chos s.hyo //

It concludes on the propitiatory “dag go // dge’o ||” followed by the mantra found on the title page (see above).

4. Script and orthography

The text is written in cursive Tibetan script. The following characteristics can be noted:

- Use of numerals to write the numbers 1 to 4, principally when indicating the number of subdivisions:
  
  2 te or 2 ste, 3 ste, 4 ste (with and without tsheg between the numeral and the following “ste”). Also 4i for bzhi.

  The numeral 1 also stands for “gcig/cig” in expressions such as “phyogs l” (for phyogs gcig). Numerals are not otherwise used for their phonetic value.

- Use of the letter ṇa (ཋ) for med.

- Use of the bindu (’ that I transcribe as m) for the post-vowel m. I.e., rnams for rnams, dam for dam, sens for sens, mngon sum for mngon sum, etc.
• Occasional use of reversed-i (gi gu log), in most cases at the end of a line.

• Rare use of abbreviations, such as:
  - tham for thams cad
  - mtshid for mtshan nyid
  - mitshungs for mi mishungs
  - mithun for mi mthun
  - yton for yan ton
  - lastso (or laswo) for la sogs

• Final particle sometimes linked with the preceding word, as in:
  - tshulo for tshul lo
  - lano for lan no
  - phyogso for phyogs so
  - rjesu for rjes su

• Rare cases of palatalisation by ya btags, e.g. khyegs (6a7, 7a6, 8b3, 9b2, 9b7, 13a5), myi (13b1), myed (4b6, pratika).

• Alternation of certain prefixes: both rngos/dngos for dngos, both ’thun /mthun for mthun.

5. Annotations

5.1 Reference signs for internal references

When the sub-branches of a fork are presented in distant parts of the text, a reference mark is introduced where their title is first enumerated and then repeated where the sub-branch is developed (on some occasions the marks differ).

   Numbers (1, 2...) and letters in dbu can (Ka, Kha, Ga, Nga) are used to indicate the linear order of the subdivisions (either to remove ambiguity in the actual analysis, or, conjointly with other annotations, in order to indicate an alternative reading).
Marking with capital letters (meaning unknown)

Twenty references, found between folios 1b and 8a, have the form of a redoubled consonant, sometimes with a vowel (once i, thrice u). The alphabetical series is incomplete, and sometimes unordered. I was unable to ascertain what its purpose is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KKa</td>
<td>1b9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KhKha</td>
<td>2a6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChCha</td>
<td>3b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJa</td>
<td>4a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHa?</td>
<td>4a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su?</td>
<td>4a8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NyNya</td>
<td>4b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTa</td>
<td>4b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThTha</td>
<td>5a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPa</td>
<td>5a6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDi</td>
<td>5a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBa</td>
<td>6a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMa</td>
<td>6a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TsTsa</td>
<td>6b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TshTsha</td>
<td>6b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DzDza</td>
<td>6b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRa</td>
<td>6b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TshTshu</td>
<td>7a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DzDzu</td>
<td>7b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZhZha</td>
<td>8b5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Interlinear and marginal notes – Reference signs

Interlinear (sometimes marginal) notes are generally linked to their point of insertion with a dotted line. Dotted lines are also used to indicate the order of reading (i.e., which words to read or not to read) in the case of modifications.

Marginal notes providing supplementary subdivisions are referred to by the presence of the same sign at the point of insertion and at the beginning of the note.

In the case of marginal notes providing an alternative analysis, two distinct signs are used, one at the beginning and one at the end of the insertion; they are repeated at the beginning and end of the marginal note respectively.

5.3 Notes preceded by a hooked sign

Fifteen notes are marked by a similar sign resembling an opening crook. They include identification of the proponents, alternative or additional subdivisions, and modifications in the reading of the
sa bcad title. For most of them, the origin of the information can be traced in 'Od zer (I give references when available). The notes marked by the hooked sign are transcribed below in bold, in pointed brackets. The pratikas are written in subscript.

The words crossed out in my transcription are not actually crossed out in the manuscript; instead, a dotted line indicates the order in which the words should be read, jumping over the words not linked by the dotted line. The asterix * stands for an illegible character.

1b3 <grangs gzhan grub pa'i> gnod pa spong pa
1b5 <mu stegs grangs can pa'i> sgra las byung pa '<i tshad ma gzhan 'dod pa> la lkog gyur gzial bya dang ldan pa dgag pa

➤ See 'Od zer 39a2

1b5 <3 kyis lan te 2 kyi> bzhis <mu stegs rtsi ran ta ba dag> rjes dpag du ma 'dus pa'i don gyi go byed <BA> '<dod pa dgag> med pa

➤ See 'Od zer 39a2–3

1b5 <phyi'i(?) gsung>
1b5 rgol ba <phogs snga ma> dang <de'i lano | de la 2 te |> <{note on top of the folio} > <<dod pa> yul can gzhan dang mtshungs pa 2 kyis c'di al* brjod kyi lan yino> '<brel pa khas blangs kyang phyogschos med pas 'jug yul nges pa sgrub mi nus pa dang> ghang sgar sgar nges pa dran pa bcad pa yiul can gzhan dang mtshungs pa 2 kyis c'di al* brjod kyi lan yino> '<brel pa khas blangs kyang phyogschos med pas 'jug yul nges pa sgrub mi nus pa dang> ghang sgar sgar nges pa dran pa bcad pa yiul can gzhan dang mtshungs pa 2 kyis c'di al* brjod kyi lan yino>

➤ See 'Od zer 41b8–9

1b7 <rtags 3 khas blangs pas rjes dpag tsam la tshad ma ma yin pas khyad par 'dod pa rang tshig dang 'gal bar> spyir bstan pa la brten pa'i rjes dpag khas blangs pa
1b7 <spyi bzhag dang po mgon sum la tshad mas khyab pa la rnam gzhag> <spyi bzhag 2 pa rjes dpag la tshad ma ma yin pas khyab pa la * rnam gzhag> rang bzhin gyi rtags la brten pa'i rjes dpag khas blangs pa

➤ See 'Od zer 41b8–9
4b1 <gal te 2 rgol ba dang | bshad pa rtsa bas bstan pa dang | dgos pa rtags kyis spyi ldog dpags pa dang; 1 shos mgonsum gysis so sor nges pa ‘jal ba dang; yan lag rtags kyis so sor nges pa sgrub mi nus pa dang; don la mi sla spyi ldog ‘jal yang dngos po'i yul can du grub pa bzhin (read: bzhis) de'i rnam 'grel gysis bshad pa 2 kyis lan te 2 kyis>

➢ See 'Od zer 81b5–7

4b3 <di tsh[e] shri'i bshad pa yin> rnam gcad tha dad pa

10a7 <'bras bu'i rtags kyis> ma nges pa spang pa

➢ See 'Od zer 176b6

10a7 don <'i> bsdus ba

5.4 Identifications

The following table lists the notes containing identifications of opponents, etc. with their Sanskrit equivalent.

| 1b5   | mu stegs grangs can pa | Sāmkhya           |
| 1b5   | mu stegs rtsi ran ta ba dag | Cirāntana-vaiśeṣika |
| 2a4   | dul lha dang | shan ti pa dang | lo tsa ba ltar na | Vinūtadeva, Ratnākaraśānti, rNgog Blo ldan shes rab |
| 2a6   | chos mchog ltar         | Dharmottara       |
| 2a7   | lo tsa bas ... gsung ste ... 'di chos mchog ltar | rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, Dharmottara |
| 3b4   | lo tsa pa'i bag? can? gyi bshad pa | ? |
| 3b6   | chos mchog na re         | Dharmottara       |
| 4b3   | 'di tsh[e] shri'i bshad pa yin | ? |
| 4b7   | 'di tshe yees dpal gyi bshad pa yin | Jñānaśrībhadra |
| 6b8   | dbang phyug sde           | Īśvarasena        |
| 6b8   | mu stegs pa                | “heretics”        |
| 7a4   | shag kya blo <'i rjesu lo tsa ba> | Śākyabuddhi, rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, etc. |
| 7a5   | braṃ ze                    | Śaṅkaranandana     |
| 7a7   | chos mchog ltar na         | Dharmottara       |
9a6 klang po'i slob ma gzhan Dignāga’s student(s)
lugs dgag pa

5.5 Notes with mention “gsung” and “zer”

The notes “gsung” and “zer” appear to have been added to pre-existing statements. They are listed here with the source of the statement where I could identify it. As above, the words crossed out in my transcription are not actually crossed out in the manuscript.

gsung

1b5 <phyi’i(?)> <gsung>
2b2 <rgyu gsung> khyab byed mi dmigs pa’i khyab pa
2b2 <rgyu gsung> khyab byed mi dmigs pa’i phyogs chos sgrub pa
2b8 rtags dgod pa <bshad pa la gang la nas ’dzin de yig ltar yin snyaṃ gsung>
➢ See below “Remarks and comments”
3a4 nang sens pa can du sgrub pa<DANG / de’i phyi DON BSDU BA’o <gsung>
➢ Maybe ref. to ’Od zer 64b5
5b4 sgra kun rang gi don la tshad mas dgag <DANG | de’i phyir lung DON BSDU ><gsung>
➢ Cf. ’Od zer 121b2–3
8a5 <’di ngag gang las nges pa skye ba’i blun po la sgrub byed yin gsung>
<’di ngag las [the tshom] skye ba’i mkhas pa la yin gsung>
➢ Cf. ’Od zer 151a7
10b7 rgol ba dang | < lan no || de la 2ste || gsung>
11a1 glan ka spang pa <la 2 te KA | GA lano || de> <gsung > la
➢ Cf. ’Od zer 181b5
11a5 <[LA]N NO /> <de la 3 ste > <gsung>
12a3 de’i bye brag phyogs su ma bzung pa las ldog pa ma nges pa
<phyogs su bzung pas phyogs kha 3 du ’dod pa’i gsung | >
5.6 Remarks and comments

"(He said that) he thinks that the explanation starting from “gang la” is in concordance with the text.”

This note is attached to the title “presentation of the logical reason” (rtags dgod pa). The pratika given is “dbang po” (PVin I 56,12). The same is given in the parallel passage in ‘Od zer 56a6–7. In Tibetan, this sentence in the PVin starts however with the words “gang las.” This is what this note (with “gang la” instead of “gang las”) could be referring to.
“The explanation mixes the order of the treatise’s passages.”

Both in *rNam nges bsdus don* and in the parallel passage of *Od zer* 140b6ff., the sentences of PVin II Tib. 45,17–23 are not analyzed linearly.

Seems to hint to the absence in *Od zer* of the parallel alternative analysis introduced by yang na in the *bsdus don*. See n. 38.

### Appendix 2: Example of alternative subdivision

This passage of *rNam nges bsdus don* (2a4/2a6) offers two distinct analyses for PVin I Tib. 40,9–42,6. The respective proponents are identified in interlinear notes. The *pratikas* are given in the central column, and are indicated in bold in the text of PVin cited below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sgra rang gi mtshan nyid kyi ming snang pa dgag pa</th>
<th>rang gi mtshan nyid kyi ming snang pa dgag pa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 'gal bas khyab pa dmigs pa'i rtags dgod pa</td>
<td>1. 'gal khyab dmigs pa rtsta ba'i rtags su dgod pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. mying don ma 'brel bas don las skye bas ming</td>
<td>2. de'i khyab pa sgrub byed kyi phyogs chos dang khyab pa sgrub pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.i don las don dang 'dra ba skye ba</td>
<td>2.i de'i khyab pa sgrub pa khyab byed mi dmigs pa'i khyab pa bstan pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.ii don yang ming 'brel pa med pa</td>
<td>2.ii phyogs chos sgrub pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.iii ming 'dzin pa la don dang 'brel pas khyab pa</td>
<td>2.iii khyab pa sgrub pa'i tshad ma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
88 Pascale Hugon

Tibetan text of *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (PVin I Tib. 40.9-42.6):

**dbang po’i** shes pa la ni de srid pa ma yin te

*don gyi mthu yis ni | yang dag skye ba yin phyir ro* | (Pvin 1.4’cd )

**gang gi** phyir de don gyi nus pa la skyes pa na de’i rang bzhin kho na’i rjes su byed pa’i phyir ro | **gang gis de** snang ba na de yang snang bar ‘gyur ba don la sgra yod pa’i am | de’i bdag nyid ni ma yin no | **rig pa’i chos** ’di ni don la reg pa dang mi ldan pa yang ma yin te | de don rtag tu sbyor ba’i phyir dang | de las kyang don rnam mi rtogs par thal ba’i phyir ro | **de’i stobs** kyis skyes pa’i rnam par shes pa yang don gzhann gyi rjes su ’brang ba ma yin te | ro la sog pa phan tshun bzhin no | **de’i bdag nyid** yin du chug kyang dbang po gzhann gyi shes pa bsksed par mi nus pa’i phyir dang | ha cang thal bar ‘gyur ba’i yang phyir ro | **rnam par** rtog pa can ni yid kyi rnam par shes pa ste | don gyi nus pa nye ba la ltos pa med par rnam par rtog pa’i bag chags kyis kun nas bslangs pa las dbang po’i don ma nges par ’dzin pa can nyams su myong ba ‘ga’ zhig dang ’brel pa las lhan cig so so sor ’dzin par byed do ||
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