



**Pascale Hugon (2023). ‘Thunderbolt Blaze’ or ‘Armless Hero’? – On the Authorship of the *Essence of Debate*. In: Kurtis R. Schaeffer, Jue Liang, and William A. McGrath, (eds.), *Histories of Tibet: Essays in Honor of Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp*, New York, NY: Wisdom Publications, 339–354.**

**Publication date:** 25.07.2023

**DOI:** [https://doi.org/10.1553/TibSchol\\_ERC\\_Cog\\_101001002\\_Hugon\\_Thunderbolt](https://doi.org/10.1553/TibSchol_ERC_Cog_101001002_Hugon_Thunderbolt)

**Abstract:**

This article puts to the test the ascription of the authorship of the *brTsod pa'i de nyid* – a short versified Tibetan treatise on debate – to gTsang nag pa brTson 'grus seng ge (?–after 1195). It addresses the issue of its dating and authorship by comparing the central section with the excursus on debate in gTsang nag pa's commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and by exploring specific nicknames mentioned in the *brTsod pa'i de nyid* for arguments by consequence (*thal 'gyur*).

**Project:**

**[TibSchol – The Dawn of Tibetan Buddhist Scholasticism \(11th-13th c.\)](#)**

TibSchol aims at painting an integrative picture of the contextual and conceptual aspects of the formative phase of the Tibetan Buddhist scholastic tradition. Its ground-breaking study of an exceptionally active period of Tibetan scholarly creativity will integrate Tibetan thinkers into world intellectual history and the global history of philosophy.

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 101001002). It is hosted at the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

The results published are solely within the author's responsibility and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Research Council or the European Commission who must not be held responsible for either contents or their further use.

STUDIES IN INDIAN AND TIBETAN BUDDHISM

# HISTORIES OF TIBET

*Essays in Honor of Leonard W. J. van der Kuip*

Edited by Kurtis R. Schaeffer, Jue Liang,  
and William A. McGrath



Wisdom Publications  
132 Perry Street  
New York, NY 10014 USA  
wisdomexperience.org

© 2023 William McGrath, Jue Liang, and Kurtis Schaeffer  
All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photography, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system or technologies now known or later developed, without permission in writing from the publisher.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Names: Schaeffer, Kurtis R., editor. | Liang, Jue, editor. | McGrath, William A., editor. | Kuijp, Leonard W. J. van der, honoree.  
Title: Histories of Tibet: essays in honor of Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp / edited by Kurtis R. Schaeffer, Jue Liang, and William A. McGrath.  
Description: First edition. | Somerville: Wisdom Publications, 2023. | Series: Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism | Includes bibliographical references and index.  
Identifiers: LCCN 2022036154 (print) | LCCN 2022036155 (ebook) | ISBN 9781614297840 (hardcover) | ISBN 9781614298083 (ebook)  
Subjects: LCSH: Tibet Region—Civilization. | Tibet Region—History. | Buddhism—Tibet Region—History. | Tibetans—Intellectual life.  
Classification: LCC DS786 .H57 2023 (print) | LCC DS786 (ebook) | DDC 951/.5--dc23/eng/20220729  
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022036154>  
LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022036155>

ISBN 978-1-61429-784-0 ebook ISBN 978-1-61429-808-3

27 26 25 24 23

5 4 3 2 1

Cover image: Detail of Sakya Paṇḍita from a mural in Zhidé Lhadé monastery (Gzhi sde lha sde; BDRG: G2249) in Purang, China. Photo provided by Suwen Lu 卢素文, Sichuan University.

## Contents

Preface and Bibliography of Leonard van der Kuijp's Published Work <i>Kurtis R. Schaeffer</i>	xi
A Note on Transcription, Transliteration, and Bibliography	xxix
CULTURAL HISTORY	
On <i>Gtsug-lag khang</i> , “Monastery, <i>Vihāra</i> ” <i>Christopher I. Beckwith</i>	3
Andrade’s Mission to Tsaparang, Western Tibet, and the Mystery of the Aftermath <i>Hubert Decler</i>	17
The Fourth Khamtrül Tendzin Chökyi Nyima (1730–79) and Excerpts from His Diaries <i>Franz-Karl Ehrhard</i>	33
Portraying the Lineage Masters of the Path with Its Fruit: Lowo Khenchen’s Description of Ngorchen’s Commission <i>Jörg Heimbrel and David P. Jackson</i>	55
Lost—and Added—in Translation between India and Tibet: Theories about Drama in Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology <i>Isabelle Henrion-Dourcy</i>	95
Origin of the <i>r</i> - Allomorph of the Tibetan Causative <i>s</i> - <i>Nathan W. Hill</i>	109
Refractions of Lotus Light: The Early Elaboration and Delimitation of Padmasambhava’s Eight Names <i>Daniel A. Hirshberg</i>	115

The Earliest Example of Printing in the Tibetan Script: Remarks on a <i>Dhāraṇī</i> Amulet from Dunhuang <i>Matthew T. Kapstein</i>	133
Pakpa's Epistolary Manual <i>Christina Kilby</i>	155
Nature and Emotion in Nineteenth-Century Tibetan Lyric Poetry <i>Kurtis R. Schaeffer</i>	167
The Jonangpa Scholar Künga Drölchok's Oeuvre, Its Xylography Project, and the <i>Analects of Zhentong</i> <i>Michael R. Sheehy</i>	193
Insects Give Advice to the Scholar and Siddha Kalden Gyatso (1607–77) <i>Victoria Sujata</i>	213
No Stone Unturned: Un-Disciplining Tibetan Buddhist Studies <i>Ivette Vargas-O'Bryan</i>	235
The Great One: On the Life and Oeuvre of Tibet's Last Great Statue-Maker, Penba Dorjé <i>Cameron David Warner</i>	253
Tibet Viewed from Kashmir: Some Notes on the Relationship of Kashmir with Ladakh and Other Parts of Tibet <i>Michael Witzel</i>	267
INTELLECTUAL HISTORY	
Chomden Reldri on Dharmakīrti's <i>Examination of Relations</i> <i>Allison Aitken</i>	283
Maintaining Identification with a Buddha: Divine Identity or Simply False? <i>Yael Bentor</i>	307
Rumblings of <i>Thunder</i> : Notes on the Identity and Intellectual Milieu of the Nyingma School Critic Peldzin <i>James Gentry</i>	323
"Thunderbolt Blaze" or "Armless Hero"? On the Authorship of the <i>Essence of Debate</i> <i>Pascale Hugon</i>	339

Eclipsing the Great Paṇḍita: Śākyaśrībhadra in the Later Biographies of Jetsün Drakpa Gyeltsen <i>Rory Lindsay</i>	355
<i>Flower Garland</i> : The Transmission of the <i>Vinayakārikā Mālākāra</i> in Tibet <i>Cuilan Liu</i>	367
Subhāṣākīrti's <i>Sarvabhāṣāpravartana</i> and Its Relevance to the <i>Smra sgo</i> <i>Zhouyang Ma</i>	387
Some Interesting Passages from the <i>Noble Noose of Methods, the Lotus Garland Synopsis</i> and Its <i>Commentary</i> <i>Robert Mayer and Cathy Cantwell</i>	403
Notes on the Tibetan Lexeme <i>lo rgyus</i> : Other Than "History" <i>Sun Penghao</i>	421
Tibetan Expertise on Sanskrit Grammar (6): Dar Lotsāwa Ngawang Püntsoḱ Lhündrup on Pāṇini <i>Pieter C. Verhagen</i>	435
 INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY	
All in the Dudjom Family: Overlapping Modes of Authority and Transmission in the Golok Treasure Scene <i>Holly Gayley</i>	453
Conflicting Views on Kingship between the Tibetan Buddhist World and the Qing Dynasty: The Fifth Dalai Lama's Visit to Beijing <i>Ishihama Yumiko</i>	473
Newar Merchants in Tibet: Observations on Frontiers of Trade and Buddhist Culture <i>Todd Lewis</i>	491
A Discourse on Kingship from the Eighth Karmapa <i>Ian MacCormack</i>	513
Tibetan Medicine under the Mongols: The Emergence of Medical Houses and Official Physicians in Tibet <i>William A. McGrath</i>	529

Some Remarks on the <i>Genealogy of the Sakya</i> (Sa skya gdung rabs) by Taktsang Lotsāwa (Stag tshang lo tsā ba, 1405–77) <i>Shoko Mekata</i>	543
Who Owned the Land in Tibet? <i>Peter Schwieger</i>	555
The Institution of the Qinghai Amban <i>Gray Tuttle</i>	567
Poppy Cultivation, the Opium Trade, and Its Social Harm in Tibetan Regions of Sichuan Province during the Early Twentieth Century <i>Yudru Tsomu</i>	585
About the Contributors	607
Tabula Gratulatoria	617

# “Thunderbolt Blaze” or “Armless Hero”? On the Authorship of the *Essence of Debate*

Pascale Hugon

## Introduction

LIKE A MAGICIAN, Leonard van der Kuijp always surprised me by pulling out of his hat the rarest Tibetan works. Recently he entrusted me with an early work on debate of an unusual style. In anticipation of my forthcoming critical edition and translation of this text, the present essay is a small token of gratitude to Leonard’s immense kindness and generosity in sharing both fascinating texts and his expertise and enthusiasm.

Leonard van der Kuijp located a copy of *The Essence of Debate* (*Brtson pa'i de nyid*, hereafter *Rtsod*) at the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing in 1993. Based on the colophon of *Rtsod* that names “the monk-logician Tsöndrü Senggé (Brtson ’grus seng ge)” as the author,<sup>1</sup> he ascribed the work to Tsangnakpa Tsöndrü Senggé (Gtsang nag pa Brtson ’grus seng ge, ?–after 1195), the foremost of the Eight Great Lions—the group of Chapa Chökyi Senggé’s (Phya pa Chos kyi seng ge, 1109–69) leading students in epistemology (*tshad ma*).<sup>2</sup> This paper puts the proposed authorship of *Rtsod* to the test through a comparison with the excursus on debate in Tsangnakpa’s extensive commentary on Dharmakīrti’s *Ascertainment of Valid Cognition* (*Pramānaviniścaya*; hereafter *Bsdus*).<sup>3</sup> The issue of its dating and authorship

This paper was written under the auspices of the research project “The Dawn of Tibetan Buddhist Scholasticism (11th–13th centuries)” (TibSchol). This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement no. 101001002).

1. *Rtsod* 3a8: *rigs par smra ba'i dge slong brtson 'grus seng ges sbyar ba'o*. The colophon is followed by a topical outline of *Rtsod* (fols. 3a7–3b1) ascribed to “the monk Tsöndrü Senggé.” The cover page reports the latter ascription.

2. See van der Kuijp 1994, 7, and 2016, 240n124. On Chapa’s contribution and that of his successors, see van der Kuijp 1978 and 1983.

3. See van der Kuijp 1989 for an introduction to the publication of the facsimile of *Bsdus* preserved at the Tōyō Bunko. Ten other works have appeared so far. Nine were published



is further addressed by exploring specific nicknames for arguments by consequence (*thal gyur*) mentioned in *Rtsod*.

### *Rtsod and Bsdus on Debate*

*Rtsod* is a short treatise in verses available in a unique three-folio manuscript (nine lines per folio) in cursive 'bru tsha script bearing a few interlinear glosses. This work on debate stands apart from discussions on the topic typical of early epistemological summaries and commentaries. Indeed, the greatest part of *Rtsod* is devoted to exposing the cause and result of vulgar and superior debate, providing compelling motives for rejecting bad debate (such as to avoid being reborn in hell) and giving a general exposition of the path to enlightenment. The central portion of the work (fols. 1b7–2b5) more specifically addresses topics constituting the “essence of debate” (*brtsod pa'i de nyid*), an expression that gives the work its name.<sup>4</sup> The programmatic verse of this section announces nineteen topics but actually lists twenty-seven notions, which are subsequently explained in thirty verses (notions 15, 16, and 17 being divided into two verses each). It is not obvious how these notions should be grouped to arrive at the number nineteen.<sup>5</sup>

---

in 2006 in vol. 13 of the *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum* collection (hereafter KDSB), in which the *Bsdus* facsimile was also reprinted. One more appeared in 2010 in the collection *Bod kyi lo rgyus rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs* (BDRC W1KG10687; van der Kuijp 2016, 251). Nine of these ten works name Tsöndrü Senggé as author in their colophons, with the addition of various specifications—e.g., *shag kya'i dge slong*, *dbu ma smra ba'i dge slong*, *mang du thos pa'i dge slong*. The commentary on the difficult points of the *Bodhisattva's Way of Life* (*Bodhicaryāvatāra*) in KDSB, vol. 13, 647–742, names instead “the learned Tsangnakpa” (*mkhas pa rtsang [=gtsang] nag pa*). The colophon of *Bsdus* (fol. 201a4), like that of *Rtsod*, ascribes the work to “the monk-logician Tsöndrü Senggé.” The authorship of *Bsdus* is confirmed by external evidence.

4. According to the topical outline, this is the third subsection of the section on the determination of the nature of debate (*brtsod pa'i rang bzhin nges par bya ba*). The preceding two subsections deal respectively with the cause and effect of vulgar and superior debate. The title of the third subsection, *spyi'i de nyid*, can be understood to mean “the essence of [debate] in general” (i.e., without the specification “vulgar” or “superior”).

5. A reader—maybe the same person who wrote a few interlinear glosses on fol. 1—unsuccessfully attempted to make sense of this, writing numbers next to the verses in the explanatory section. The reader used “9” twice, regrouped several notions under “16,” and gave up after “17,” leaving the explanation of the last notions unnumbered.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. participants in the debate                             | 13. causes [of expertise in disputation]         |
| 2. occasions that are improper for debating               | 14. the ornaments [embellishing the disputation] |
| 3. occasions in which one engages in debate               | 15. the motivations (inferior and superior)      |
| 4. points of defeat when questioning                      | 16. the result (pure and impure)                 |
| 5. points of defeat when pointing out faults              | 17. similes [of good and bad debate]             |
| 6. points of defeat when setting forth a state of affairs | 18. philosophical positions                      |
| 7. points of defeat when presenting a proof               | 19. property possessors                          |
| 8. points of defeat of the referee                        | 20. characteristics of the logical reason        |
| 9. status of the object [about which one debates]         | 21. the divisions of logical reasons             |
| 10. way to argue  | 22. fallacious reasons                           |
| 11. questions   | 23. modes of expression                          |
| 12. answers   | 24. autonomous arguments                         |
|   | 25. arguments by consequence                     |
|   | 26. fallacious consequences                      |
|   | 27. elimination [of the conclusion]              |

In *Bsdus*, Tsangnakpa's excursus on debate (fols. 155b8–164b8) prefaces the word explanation of the third chapter of the *Ascertainment of Valid Cognition* on “inference for others.” The author distinguishes three points: the determination of the participants in debate, the statements associated with each, and the division of these statements.<sup>6</sup> The last division is done according to the speaker (this includes a discussion of points of defeat), to what the statements achieve (proof or refutation), and to the mode of presentation (autonomous argument or consequence).

Many of the twenty-seven points presented in *Rtsod* simply do not appear in *Bsdus*—for instance, the ornaments, the causes for being an expert, or the similes for good and bad debate. These points are not discussed in Dharmakīrti's treatment of debate in the context of inference for others in the *Ascertainment of Valid Cognition* and the *Commentary on Valid Cognition* (*Pramāṇavārttika*), nor in the *Science of Debate* (*Vādanyāya*). Their nature recalls, rather, the kind of

6. These points are different from the three points the author identifies to be the main items in the *Ascertainment of Valid Cognition*: the way of proving a thesis to an opponent, stating the faults in the proof, and points of defeat (*Bsdus* fol. 156a4).

topics addressed in the sections on debate in Asaṅga's *Stages of Spiritual Practice* (*Yogācārabhūmi*) and *Compendium of Abhidharma* (*Abhidharmasamuccaya*).<sup>7</sup> However, the terminology in the Tibetan translation of the section of the *Stages of Spiritual Practice* devoted to the science of reasoning differs, and there is no specific match regarding the contents, details that would suggest a direct source of influence.<sup>8</sup> Mention of such “non-technical” elements of debate are not commonly found in early Tibetan epistemological works. Parallels may be located in Sakya Paṇḍita's (Sa skya Paṇḍita, 1182–1251) *Entrance Gate for the Wise* (*Mkhas pa 'jug pa'i sgo*), where the author highlights the features of “debate in accordance with the Dharma” and of a “noble debater” (building on Dharmakīrti's remark to this effect in the *Science of Debate*) and also points out that improper debating practices cause rebirth in evil realms.<sup>9</sup>

Regarding the more “technical” elements of disputation, the comparison between *Rtsod* and *Bsdus* is challenged by the format and style of *Rtsod*. Not only is *Rtsod* composed in verses, but it explains each notion (or subdivision in the case of nos. 15–17) in the form of a triad. A triad is actually expected in several cases, such as the three kinds of logical reasons (no. 21) or the three characteristics of the logical reason (no. 20). In other cases, the triad is artificial. For instance, for number 23, the modes of expression of arguments, the author adds to the standard pair (homogeneous and heterogeneous) the “fallacious statements with a residue” to arrive at three.

While the two texts agree on standard issues of Dharmakīrtian logic, there are notable differences regarding some notions, in particular *Rtsod*'s nos. 1, 4–8, and 25–26.

### The Debate Participants (No. 1)

Both texts posit three participants—proponent (*rgol ba*), respondent (*phyir rgol*), and referee (*dpang po*)—but define the first two differently. The proponent is “he who takes up the defense of a thesis” in *Rtsod*, but “he who takes

7. See Wayman 1958 and the more recent study in Todeschini 2011.

8. See *Stages of Spiritual Practice*, Dergé Tengyur 187a7–199b2. Compare notably: *Rtsod* no. 13 *brtsod pa mkhas pa'i rgyu* ≈ *smra ba la ges spras byed pa'i chos rnam*s (Skt. *vāde bahukarā dharmāḥ*); no. 14 *brtsod pa mdzes pa'i rgyan* ≈ *smra ba'i rgyan* (Skt. *vādālamkāra*); no. 15 *brtsod pa'i bsam pa* ≈ *smra ba las nges par 'byung ba* (Skt. *vādānihsaraṇa*).

9. See *Mkhas 'jug* 3.12–13 and 3.69, translated in Jackson 1987, 329, 364. One may also note that *Mkhas 'jug* 3.72 uses the same image as *Rtsod* in its introductory verse of homage—namely, the Buddha's speech defeating bad views is compared to the lion's roar scaring wild beasts.

up<sup>10</sup> the proof of his own position” in *Bsdus*. The respondent is “he who takes up the refutation of the thesis” in *Rtsod*, but “he who takes up pointing out the faults of the proponent” in *Bsdus*.<sup>11</sup>

### The Points of Defeat (Nos. 4–8)

Tibetan scholars differ in their count of the points of defeat, as well as on the number of contexts associated with each participant.<sup>12</sup> *Rtsod* and *Bsdus* uphold two different models:

- *Rtsod* counts *fifteen* points of defeat, organized into five triads (nos. 4–8) that correspond to five contexts in which the participants are individually involved. The first two triads are associated with two contexts of the debate in which the respondent is involved (asking questions and stating faults), and the next two with contexts in which the proponent is involved (setting forth a state of affairs and presenting a proof). The last triad concerns the referee.
- *Bsdus* counts instead *nine* points of defeat distributed over three contexts: two contexts involving the respondent (asking question and refuting), but only one involving the proponent (setting forth a state of affairs);<sup>13</sup> it does not include points of defeat pertaining to the referee. One point of defeat linked with both the proponent and respondent is mentioned but not counted when the total number of points of defeat is stated.

Important differences of phrasing are found for the points of defeat common to the two works. For instance, regarding the faults for the proponent stating the object of debate:

10. *Bsdus* (fol. 156b1) makes clear that the mention of “accepting” or “taking up” (*khas len*) is part of each definition. It guarantees that the persons agree on the role they are to fulfill and are therefore liable to incur defeat if they do not fulfill it.

11. *Rtsod* (fol. 1b8): *brtsod pa'i skabs kyi gang zag gsum yin te / dam bca' skyong par khas len rgol ba dang // dam bca' sun 'byin khas len phyir rgol dang // brtsod pa'i shags 'byed khas len dpang po'o //*. *Bsdus* (fol. 156a7–8): *gang zag gsum gyi mtshan nyid ni rang gi 'dod pa bsgrub pa dang rgol ba'i skyon brjod pa dang de dag gi gshag 'byed [156a8] par khas blangs pa nyid yin te khas ma blangs kyang de dag du 'gyur na ha cang thal ba'i phyir ro //*

12. See Hugon 2011, 125.

13. A second context involving the proponent, “rejecting faults,” is mentioned in *Bsdus* fol. 156b2, but no point of defeat is associated with it.

<i>Rtsod</i> no. 6	<i>Bsdus</i> fol. 156b3
- <i>gzhan gyis dris dang lan la mi 'bad</i> - <i>dam bcar mi 'os chos rnams sgrub pa</i> - <i>skabs las 'das pa sgrub byar byed pa</i>	- <i>pha rol gyis dris pa'i don mi brjod pa</i> - <i>skyon can brjod pa</i> - <i>ma dris pa'i don brjod pa</i>

### Arguments by Consequence (Nos. 25–26)

*Rtsod*'s discussion of consequences (*thal 'gyur*) is limited to the distinction between correct and fallacious consequences, while *Bsdus* (fols. 158b6–159a4) further distinguishes between correct consequences that prove a thesis and correct consequences that only refute the opponent.

*Rtsod* and *Bsdus* agree on a threefold division of fallacious arguments by consequence that corresponds to three possible retorts by the respondent—namely, “logical reason not established,” “entailment not established,” and “I accept (what follows from the premises)!”<sup>14</sup> Their phrasing of the first two cases differs:

<i>Rtsod</i> no. 26	<i>Bsdus</i> fol. 158b1 and 158b5–6
- <i>phyogs chos med pa</i> - <i>khyab pa med pa</i> - <i>bsal pa med pa</i>	- <i>rtan (=gtan) tshigs ma grub</i> - <i>khyab pa ma grub</i> - <i>bsal ba med pa</i>

A difference in genre (one work being an independent composition, the other a commentary) cannot be invoked to explain the above discrepancies, since the passage considered in *Bsdus* is an excursus in which Tsangnakpa presents his own model. One could invoke instead a difference of scope: *Rtsod*'s emphasis being on “moral” criteria for distinguishing proper and improper debate, *Bsdus*'s focus being on logical criteria. But this distinction does not warrant discrepancies pertaining to technical notions explained in both works.<sup>15</sup>

14. This model, shared by a number of early epistemological works and which found its way into Gelukpa textbooks, was criticized by Sakya Paṇḍita, who argued in favor of four possible answers. See Jackson 1987, 457n216 and 459n220.

15. Sakya Paṇḍita's discussions of debate in the third chapter of the *Entrance Gate for the Wise*

### *Nicknames for Consequences*

A feature of *Rtsod's* verses on arguments by consequence (that does not find an equivalent in *Bsdus*) deserving additional attention are nicknames given to correct consequences and to the three types of fallacious consequences:

a.	Correct consequence	<i>Thunderbolt blaze</i>	<i>rnam [=gnam] lcags 'bar ba</i>
b.	Fallacious consequence lacking qualification of the subject	<i>Catapult weapon</i> <sup>16</sup>	<i>mtshon cha kbri sgyogs</i>
c.	Fallacious consequence lacking pervasion	<i>Armless hero</i>	<i>dpa'o lag rdum</i>
d.	Fallacious consequence lacking elimination	<i>Poison-destroying peacock</i>	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>

“Poison-destroying peacock” and “catapult weapon” are reminiscent of the titles of two works on mind training (*blo sbyong*) attributed to Dharmarakṣita, the teacher of Atiśa who translated the works into Tibetan with Drom-tön ('Brom ston, 1008–64). The first work has this very title, *Poison-Destroying Peacock*, and the second is entitled the *Wheel Weapon* (*mtshon cha 'khor lo*, an expression not so different from *Rtsod's* *mtshon cha kbri sgyogs*).<sup>17</sup> It is likely that the inventor of these nicknames was acquainted with these works.

Searching Tibetan epistemological works for other occurrences of these terms, I discovered several concurring models. The three main ones are represented in the following table:

---

and in the eleventh chapter of the *Treasure of Reasoning* (*Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter*) illustrate a distinction of scope in this sense, but no divergence on technical points can be observed.

16. The term is also used for cannon, but it may refer here to a type of stone-slinger rather than a firearm.

17. These two works are translated in Geshe Lhundub Sopa 2001. The first verse of the *Wheel Weapon* and the *Poison-Destroying Peacock* refer to the peacocks that prefer the jungles' poisonous plants to the medicine gardens (bodhisattvas are later compared to them). See 59: “When the peacocks roam the jungle of virulent poison, the flocks take no delight in gardens of medicinal plants, no matter how beautiful they may be, for peacocks thrive on the essence of virulent poison.” Peacocks supposedly are able to kill poisonous snakes and to eat poisonous plants without being affected by their toxins.

	A	B	C	A	B/C	A	B'
	<i>Rtsod</i>	<i>Rnam rgyal</i>  <i>Chu mig pa</i>	<i>Me tog</i>  <i>Ral gri</i>	<i>Mtshon cha</i>  <i>Ral gri</i> “ <i>kha cig</i> ”	<i>Tshad don bsdus</i>  <i>Blo gros mtshungs med</i> “ <i>bod rnams</i> ”	<i>Rigs rgyan</i>  <i>Dge 'dun grub</i>	<i>Rol mtsbo</i>  <i>Śākya mchog ldan</i> “ <i>Rtsang nag pa</i> ”
a.	<i>rnam lcags 'bar ba</i>	<i>gnam/ rnam lcags 'bar ba</i>	<i>gnam lcags 'bar ba</i>		<i>gnam lcags 'bar ba</i>	<i>gnam lcags 'bar ba</i>	<i>gnam lcags thog</i>
b.	<i>mtshon cha khri sgyogs</i>	<i>dpa' bo lag rdum</i>	<i>dpa' bo lag rdum</i>	<i>mtshon cha khri sgyogs</i>	<i>dpa' bo lag rdum</i>	<i>mtshon cha khri sgyogs</i>	<i>dpa' bo lag rdum</i>
c.	<i>dpa'o lag rdum</i>	<i>mtshon cha khri sgyogs</i>	<i>gzhu mo rgyud chad</i>	<i>dpa' bo lag rdum</i>	<i>mtshon cha khri sgyogs</i>  <i>gzhu mo rgyud chad</i>	<i>dpa' bo lag rdum</i>	<i>mtshon bya'i khri sgyogs</i>
d.	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>	<i>rma byas (em. to bya) dug 'joms</i>	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>	<i>rma bya dug 'joms</i>

**Model A**, the version found in *Rtsod*, is identical with the one reported by Chomden Reldri (Bcom ldan ral gri, 1227–1305) in *Mtshon cha* (fol. 152a3–4), where it is ascribed to “some people” (*kha cig*). It is found as well in *Rigs rgyan* (pp. 327 and 333) of Gendün Drup (Dge 'dun grub, 1391–1475), on which more will be said in the section “Gendün Drup’s *Rigs rgyan*” below.

**Model B** is found in *Rnam rgyal* (A 67b8–68a2; B 77a1–2), an epistemological summary by Chumikpa Senggé Pel (Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal, ca. 1200–1270), which is also the earliest datable evidence for these nicknames.<sup>18</sup> In *Rnam rgyal*, the focus is on the expression, “thunderbolt blaze,” that illustrates the function of “defeating others” (*gzhan tshar gcod pa*) common both to consequences that induce a proof and to those that do not. The four nicknames and corresponding specification appear after the statement on proof-inducing consequences; it may originally have been an insert. Model B is also found, for instance, in Séra Jétsün Chökyi Gyeltsen’s (Se ra rje btsun Chos kyi rgyal mtshan, 1469–1544/46) commentary on the difficult points of the *Commentary on Valid Cognition*.<sup>19</sup>

**Model B’**: Model B, with a slightly different phrasing for *a* (*gnam lcags thog* instead of *gnam lcags ’bar*) and a phonetic variant for *c* (*mtshon bya* for *mtshon cha*), is reported in *Rol mtsho* (fol. 127a7) by Serdok Panchen Śākya Chokden (Gser mdog Pañ chen Śākya mchog ldan, 1428–1507), who names the “Learned Tsangnakpa” (Mkhas pa rtsang [=gtsang] nag pa) as the inventor of the four nicknames.<sup>20</sup> This passage (with the reference to Tsangnakpa) is repeated by Namgyel Drakpa (Rnam rgyal grags pa, b. sixteenth century), a student of the ninth Karmapa.<sup>21</sup>

**Model C** is attested in Chomden Reldri’s *Me tog* (126). It gives to *c* the name “cut-off bow” (*gzhu mo rgyud chad*) instead of, as in B, “catapult weapon.”

The other occurrences of this terminology I could trace are repetitions of, or variations on, one of these models. For instance, Lodrö Tsungmé (Blo gros mtshungs med, active between 1330 and 1371)<sup>22</sup> was aware of both models B and C, which he ascribes to unidentified “Tibetans” in *Tshad don bsdus* (fol. 58a4–5, *bod rnams*). As he frequently mentions the views of Chumikpa and Chomden Reldri in this epistemological summary, one can suppose that he learned these models from their works. Identifications of the source of this terminology in later works do not go beyond the vague mention of “previous scholars” (*mkhas pa snga ma rnams*).

A variant (maybe involving some confusion of terms from different models) is found in an early Kadampa work ascribed to “Nyak” (Gnyag), as yet

18. The two manuscripts of *Rnam rgyal* have different spelling. For *a*: A 67b8 *gnas lcags* [sic], 67b9, and 68a1 *gnam lcags*; B 77a1 and 77a2 *rnām lcags*. For *c*: A 67b8 *khri sgyogs*; B 77a2 *khri rgyogs*.

19. *Gsung ’bum* (BDRC W1AC364), vol. 2, 337.

20. This was noted in Jackson 1987, 456n216.

21. *Rtags rig rigs lam gsal byed* (BDRC W22314).

22. Hugon 2018, 867n36.



undated.<sup>23</sup> The author reports two terms for *a*, “peacock catapult” (*rma bya kbri sgyogs*) and “lightning on the head” (*spyi bor thog bcas*), follows model C for *b* and *c*, and terms *d* “big castle with an escort of ants” (? *'khar che grog skyel*). Another alternative version is found in the work of a fourteenth-century Bön scholar, Nyammé Shérap Gyeltsen (Mnyam med Shes rab rgyal mtshan, 1356–1415), who uses the terms “cut-off bow” for *b*, and a terminological variant of “catapult weapon” (*mtshon cha 'phrul 'khor*) for *c*.<sup>24</sup>

### *Gendün Drup's Rigs rgyan*

The plot thickens when taking a closer look at Gendün Drup's *Rigs rgyan*. First, the passage mentioning the “thunderbolt blaze” (327) is a quasi-literal repeat of Chumikpa's *Rnam rgyal*, but without the sentence mentioning the four nicknames together. As for the passage in which the nicknames of the three fallacious consequences occur, it is part of a section entitled “Presentation of the Three, Proponent, Respondent, and Referee” (329–35), which includes a short section providing definitions and divisions and a longer discussion of their respective role in debate.<sup>25</sup> This second subsection (*rtsod pa byed pa'i rnam gzshag*, 330–35) amounts to a prose version of the discussion of the twenty-seven notions addressed in *Rtsod!* The items appear in a different order and are arranged in a nested hierarchical structure. The only notable differences in contents between the two texts is that *Rtsod!*'s nos. 3 and 24 are omitted in *Rigs rgyan* and that *Rigs rgyan* counts an additional point of defeat for the proponent in the first context (no. 6 in *Rtsod!*), bringing the total number of points of defeat to sixteen. The following examples will suffice to demonstrate the extent of the terminological match (differences are marked in bold):

23. *Tshad ma'i spyi skad cung zad bsdus pa*, in KDSB, vol. 44, fols. 7b6–8a8.

24. See *Tshad ma'i rnam 'byed 'phrul gyi sgron me'i rang 'grel*, in *Bon po'i yig cha las tshad ma'i skor* (BDRC W23427), 220–21 and 374–75. This passage is cited in *Mu stegs kyi grub mtha' tshar gcod gian tshigs thigs pa'i rigs pa smva ba'i mdo 'grel*, in *Gsung 'bum* of Shérapgyeltsen (BDRC W8LS16918), vol. 1, 273.

25. One can note that the shorter and the longer account offer different definitions of proponent and respondent, and that three types of referee are distinguished in the shorter section (as in *Rnam rgyal*) but not in the longer section. Note, in the first section, the division between correct and incorrect proponent and respondent (330), for which no details are provided. This part is reused by Purbuchok (see Nemoto 2013, 159n14).

<i>Rtsod</i> no. 1	<i>Rigs rgyan</i> , 330–31
<i>brtsod pa'i skabs kyi gang zag gsum</i> <i>yin te /</i> <i>dam bca' skyong par khas len rgol ba</i> <i>dang //</i> <i>dam bca' sun 'byin khas len phyir rgol</i> <i>dang //</i> <i>brtsod pa'i shags 'byed khas len dpang</i> <i>po'o //</i>	<i>rtsod pa'i dus kyi gang zag la gsum</i> <i>yod de /</i> <i>dam bca' skyong bar khas len pa'i snga</i> <i>rgol dang /</i> <i>dam bca' sun 'byin par khas len pa'i</i> <i>phyi rgol dang /</i> <i>rtsod pa'i shan 'byed par khas len pa'i</i> <i>dpang po gsum yod pa'i phyir /</i>
<i>Rtsod</i> no. 15a	<i>Rigs rgyan</i> , 334'
<i>brtsod pa'i bsam pa tha shal gsum yin</i> <i>te //</i> <i>pha rol smad par 'dod pa'i zhe sdang</i> <i>dang //</i> <i>bdag nyid che bar 'dod pa'i chags pa</i> <i>dang //</i> <i>rigs lam 'dor bar 'dod pa'i gyo sgyu'o //</i>	<i>pha rol po dma' bar 'dod pa'i zhe sdang</i> <i>dang /</i> <i>rang nyid mtho bar 'dod pa'i 'dod</i> <i>chags dang /</i> <i>rigs lam 'dor bar 'dod pa'i gyo sgyu</i> <i>rnams ni rtsod pa'i bsam pa tha shal</i> <i>yin la /</i>

A prose presentation similar to that of Gendün Drup—and likely borrowed from him—is found in a number of monastic manuals, including the well-known *Magic Key of the Path of Reasoning* (*Rigs lam 'phrul gyi lde mig*) of Purbuchok Lozang Jampa Gyatso (Phur bu lcog Blo bzang byams pa rgya mtsho, 1825–1901).<sup>26</sup> Yet complicating the matter, some of them additionally cite verse for the notions corresponding to *Rtsod*'s nos. 13 to 17 (without mentioning a source), verses that, however, differ from the versified version of *Rtsod*, as illustrated on the next page in the third column:<sup>27</sup>

26. BDRC WA1KG22610. Other instances include: *Gangs ljongs dgon sde'i slob dep dpe tshogs* (BDRC WA1KG16581) and *Dga' ldan shar rtse'i chos spyod mdzad rim ngo mtshar bstan pa'i mdzes rgyan nyin byed snang ba'i yang gsal* (BDRC WA1KG24220).

27. These verses are found, for instance, in *Dga' ldan shar rtse'i chos spyod mdzad rim ngo mtshar bstan pa'i mdzes rgyan nyin byed snang ba'i yang gsal* (BDRC WA1KG24220), *Bsdus grwar thog mar 'jug byed skyabs khrid dang 'brel ba'i man ngag gser gyi lde mig* of Dzötsang Lozang Tsöndrü (Mdzod tshang Blo bzang brtson 'grus, twentieth century) (BDRC WA20471), and in a text reproduced in several volumes of the compilation *Gangs ljongs rig bcu'i snying bcud chen mo* (BDRC WA1PD95727).

<i>Rtsod</i> no. 17b	<i>Rigs rgyan</i>	
<i>rnam dag brtsod pa'i dpe ni gsum yin te // gti mug gcod pas 'khor lo 'dra ba dang // sun 'byin rlung gis mi gyo lhun po 'dra // don la ma rmongs thub dbang 'dra ba'o //</i>	<i>rang dang gzhan gyis gti mug gcod pa 'khor lo lta bu dang / sun 'byin pa'i rlung gis mi gyo ba lhun po lta bu dang / tshig dang don la ma rmongs pa thub pa'i dbang po'i sras lta bu ni rnam par dag pa'i rtsod pa'i dpe yin no //</i>	<i>ji skad du/ rang gzhan gti mug gcod pa 'khor lo bzhin // sun 'byin rlung gis mi gyo lhun po bzhin // tshig dang don la ma rmongs thub pa'i sras // 'di rnam rnam dag rtsod pa'i dpe ru bshad // ces pa'o //</i>

These five verses corresponding to *Rtsod*'s nos. 13–17 all appear together, in an order reflecting Gendün Drup's presentation, in a text by Kirti Lozang Tendzin (Kirti blo bzang bstan 'dzin, b. 1942) entitled *Precepts on Debate* (*Rtsod pa byed tshul gyi bslab bya*).<sup>28</sup> This is, however, not an original composition, as some of the verses are quoted by earlier scholars (the earliest I could find being a work by Yongdzin Paṇḍita Lozang Penden [Yongs 'dzin Paṇḍita Blo bzang dpal ldan, 1880–1944]). These verses are likely to be based on Gendün Drup's prose presentation or a later reuse and are as such not directly related to *Rtsod*.

The direction of the relationship between the versified version attested in *Rtsod* and the prose version attested in *Rigs rgyan*—assuming they would be directly related—is difficult to ascertain. It seems slightly more likely that the verses would be based on the prose, but it is also possible that the prose represents the unfolding of a versified text. Given Gendün Drup's reuse of previous material in other parts of *Rigs rgyan* (see above on the passage common to Chumikpa's *Rnam rgyal*), one can suspect that his presentation of debate is also not original. As no precedent could be traced so far, the dating of the prose version itself can at best be established with the first half of the fifteenth century as *terminus ante quem*.

28. It is published as part of *Legs bshad dpe tshogs nor bu'i phreng ba* (BDRC WA1GS54156).

### Conclusion

The above considerations left unresolved the questions of the origin of the nicknames used for consequences. The main clues are the earliest datable occurrence in Chumikpa's *Rnam rgyal* (model B), followed by Chomden Reldri's secondary reference to model A and mention of model C, and the ascription by Serdok Panchen (and scholars reusing his presentation) of model B' to Tsangnakpa.

Chumikpa and Reldri have in common that they both studied under Kyelnak Drakpa Senggé (Skyel nag Grags pa seng ge), a student of the Sangpu (Gsang phu) abbot Nyelzhik Jampé Dorjé (Gnyal zhid 'Jam pa'i rdo rje)<sup>29</sup> and a disciple of Dānaśīla, who had founded a seminary of philosophical study in Nartang (Snar thang). Nyelzhik himself was a student of Denbakpa Mawé Senggé (Dan bag pa Smra ba'i seng ge)—another of Chapa's Eight Great Lions. Reldri studied with Chumikpa, but not in the field of epistemology. For this, his teachers were notably Kyelnak, Kytön Drakbum (Kyi ston grags 'bum), Dānaśīla, and Uyukpa ('U yug pa). Uyukpa (d. 1253) mentions the “thunderbolt blaze” as the name for *a*, but not the other three terms, in his epistemological summary.<sup>30</sup> No epistemological work by Nyelzhik or Kyelnak is available. Extant epistemological summaries by two students of Nyelzhik—Tsangdruk Dorjé (Gtsang drug rdo rje), whose works bears many similarities with *Rnam rgyal*, and Dharmaratna—do not mention this terminology. The terms are also absent from the epistemological summary of Tsangnakpa's student Tsurtön Zhönnu Senggé (Mtshur ston Gzhon nu seng ge) and do not appear in Chapa's epistemological works or, earlier, in the extant ones by Ngok Loden Sherap (Rngog Blo ldan shes rab, 1059–1109).

The argument “from silence” would hint to the terminology emerging shortly before Chumikpa but not before nor with Nyelzhik. Such type of argument has some weight in a context of composition where extensive reuse of previous material is common practice. It cannot, however, be taken as conclusive: in addition to the limited range of extant sources, nothing speaks against the possibility that scholars knew this terminology but did not mention it in all their own compositions or did not mention it in *all* of their compositions (indeed, for instance, Chumikpa mentions the four nicknames in *Rnam rgyal* but not in his commentary on the *Ascertainment of Valid Cognition*).<sup>31</sup>

What does this say about the authorship of *Rtsod*? If the colophon of *Rtsod*

29. See Sparham 1996.

30. See *Rigs grub*, 352.

31. The absence of these nicknames in *Bsdus* whereas they are present in *Rtsod* is thus not a strong argument against identical authorship of *Bsdus* and *Rtsod*.

is genuine and “Tsöndrü Senggé” refers to Tsangnakpa Tsöndrü Senggé,<sup>32</sup> there would be, against the argument “from silence,” an instance of the use of the four nicknames predating Chumikpa. We would, however, have to conclude that Serdok Panchen is mistaken with regard to the model he ascribes to Tsangnakpa (since *Rtsod* exemplifies model A, and not model B’), or is mistaken about the nominal reference to the inventor of model B’ (which would not be a unique case).<sup>33</sup> Should Serdok Panchen’s claim be correct, it would be an argument against Tsangnakpa being the author of *Rtsod*, as it is unlikely that the same author would adopt different models in different works.<sup>34</sup>

I could not find compelling arguments for dating *Rtsod* in relation to other works, in particular other works by Tsangnakpa, the future study of which might still reveal pertinent similarities of phrasing or stylistic features comparable to *Rtsod*.

The colophon is, at this point, the only argument in favor of Tsangnakpa’s authorship of *Rtsod*, whereas the divergences in *Rtsod* and *Bsdus* pointed out here—although one may argue whether it constitutes a genuine “thunderbolt blaze”—point to the authors of the respective works being different.

## References

### Primary Sources

BDRC, Buddhist Digital Resource Center (<https://library.bdrc.io/>). See this resource for full bibliographical references to the works mentioned only once, for which the BDRC work ID number is provided.

*Bka’ gdams gsung ’bum* (KDSB). *Bka’ gdams gsung ’bum phyogs sgrig thengs dang po/ gnyis pa/ gsum pa/ bzhi pa*. 120 vols. Edited by Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe nying zhib ’jug khang. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2006 (vols. 1–30), 2007 (31–60), 2009 (61–90), and 2015 (91–120).

*Bsdus*. Gtsang nag pa Brtson ’grus seng ge. *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i ti ka legs bshad bsdus pa*. Otani University Tibetan Works Series 2. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co, 1989.

32. Although there are several other scholars named Tsöndrü Senggé, I am not aware of another candidate as “the monk-logician Tsöndrü Senggé” besides Tsangnakpa.

33. See van der Kuijp 1989, 22, on Serdok Panchen’s misidentification of an opponent in the *Treasure of Reasoning* as Tsangnakpa, whereas it was actually Tsurton (who held a different position than Tsangnakpa on this point).

34. The case of Chomden Reldri is unlike, as *Me tog* presents the model adopted by the author, while *Mtshon cha* is reporting someone else’s model.

- Me tog*. Bcom ldan rigs pa'i ral gri. *Tshad ma'i bstan bcos sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*. In *Tshad ma sde bdun rgyan gyi me tog*. Edited by Rdo rje rgyal po. Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1991.
- Mtshon cha*. Bcom ldan rigs pa'i ral gri. *Tshad ma bsdus pa rigs pa'i mtshon cha*. Sa skya'i dpe rnying bsdus sgrig khang, BDRC W3CN4042.
- Rigs grub*. 'U yug pa Rigs pa'i seng ge. *Bstan bcos tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rgyan rigs pa grub pa*. In *'U yug pa rigs pa'i seng ge'i gsung 'bum*, vol. 1. Beijing, 2007. BDRC W2DB25060.
- Rigs rgyan*. Dge 'dun grub. *Tshad ma'i bstan bcos chen po rigs pa'i rgyan*. In *Rgyal dbang dang po dge 'dun grub kyi gsung 'bum*, vol. 7. Lha sa: Ser gtsug nang bstan dpe rnying 'tshol bsdus phyogs sgrig khang, 2011.
- Rnam rgyal*. Chu mig pa Seng ge dpal. *Gzhan gyi phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba*. A = In *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum*, edited by Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, vol. 87, 315–448. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2009; B = In *Bka' gdams gsung 'bum*, edited by Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, vol. 45, 11–163. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2007.
- Rol mtsho*. Gser mdog Pañ chen Śākya mchog ldan, *Tshad ma rigs pa'i gter gyi rnam par bshad pa sde bdun ngag gi rol mtsho*. In *The Complete Works (Gsung 'bum) of Gser mdog pañ chen Śākya mchog ldan*, vol. 19 (*dza*). Edited by Kunzang Tobgey. Timphu, 1975. Reprint, Delhi: Nagwang Topgyal, 1988.
- Rtsod*. Rigs par smra ba Brtson 'grus seng ge. *Brtsoḍ pa'i de nyid*. Photocopy of a three-*folio dbu med* manuscript preserved at the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing, no. 004900(7).
- Stages of Spiritual Practice*. Asaṅga. *Rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa* (Skt. *Yogācārabhūmi*). In *Bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*, vol. 127, 4–567 (=Tohoku No. 4035, tshi 1b1–283a7). Edited by Zhu chen tshul khriṃs rin chen. Reproduced by Delhi Karmapae Choedhey. Sde dge: Sde dge par khang, 1982–1985. BDRC W23703\_4035.

## Works in European Languages

- Geshe Lhundub Sopa, with Leonard Zwilling and Michael J. Sweet. 2001. *Peacock in the Poison Grove: Two Buddhist Texts on Training the Mind*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Hugon, Pascale. 2011. "Argumentation Theory in the Early Tibetan Epistemological Tradition." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 34.1–2: 97–148.
- . 2018. "Sa skya Pañḍita's Classification of Arguments by Consequence Based on the Type of the Logical Reason: Editorial Conundrum and Mathematics for Commentators." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 46.5: 845–87.
- Jackson, David. 1987. *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III): Sa-skya Pañḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions of Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 17.1 and 17.2. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. 1978. "Phya-pa Chos-kyi Seng-ge's Impact on Tibetan Epistemological Theory." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 5: 355–69.

- . 1983. *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- . 1989. “An Introduction to Gtsang-nag-pa’s *Tshad-ma rnam-par nges-pa’i ti-ka legs-bshad bsdus-pa*: An Ancient Commentary on Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, Otani University Collection No. 13971.” In Gtsang nag pa Brtson ’grus seng ge, *Tshad ma rnam par nges pa’i ti ka legs bshad bsdus pa*, 1–39. Otani University Tibetan Works Series 2. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co.
- . 1994. “On Some Early Tibetan *Pramāṇavāda* Texts of the China Nationalities Library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing.” *Journal of Buddhist and Tibetan Studies* 1: 1–30.
- . 2016. “The Lives of Bu ston Rin chen grub and the Date and Sources of His *Chos ’byung*, a Chronicle of Buddhism in India and Tibet.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 35: 203–308.
- Nemoto, Hiroshi. 2013. “Who Is a Proper Opponent? The Tibetan Buddhist Concept of *phyi rgol yang dag*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 41: 151–65.
- Sparham, Gareth. 1996. “A Note on Gnyal zhig ’Jam pa’i rdo rje, the Author of a Handwritten *Sher phyin* Commentary from about 1200.” *The Tibet Journal* 21: 19–29.
- Todeschini, Alberto. 2011. “On the Ideal Debater: *Yogācārabhūmi*, *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya*.” *Journal of Indian and Tibetan Studies* 15: 244–72.
- Wayman, Alex. 1958. “The Rules of Debate according to Asaṅga.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 78.1: 29–40.