

BEYOND ACCEPTANCE AND REJECTION?

*The Anti-Bon Polemic Included in the Thirteenth-Century Single Intention (Dgong-gcig Yig-cha) and Its Background in Tibetan Religious History**

I hope that no one will look forward to finding in this paper a number of closely linked arguments leading in a single logical chain swiftly and directly to one inescapable conclusion. I fear this will resemble more a rambling talk, with a number of paths opening out on the map without being travelled down very far (even with an occasional backward step), but we may at least hope that this will reveal more of the countryside and its landscapes than do those researchers who travel non-stop the limited-access tollroads directly from point A to point B. The conclusion to which the following remarks should lead is simply a better understanding of the circumstances behind the production of a particular literary passage. If everything works out better than I expect it to, that literary passage, the anti-Bon polemic of the *Single Intention*, will be enough of a conclusion. Still, the historical patterns that will be uncovered might lead us to challenge some long-held assumptions, particularly as they concern the Tibetan polemical tradition and its continuing hold on our consciousness.

When dealing with a polemic all the usual problematics of scholarly objectivity and impartiality rise to the surface. Partisanship does make us bad judges. We should carefully hear and weigh the statements and arguments from all parties of course, while recognizing that polemic is extreme testimony often produced under a state of duress and usually put forward in order to induce a state of duress. Polemic does its best to undo the background and authority of a tradition as it understands itself, and in various ways remake that background into something disreputable and unworthy of further interest. Seeing this delegitimizing motive behind polemics, we may yet at times find truths in them, but they should hardly ever be our primary sources of truths. At best they can only occasionally, and that despite their designs, supply some useful points of secondary verification. In any case, we will keep polemics filed

away in a folder clearly marked with the words ‘hostile testimony’.¹ I do not agree with the position that polemic should be left entirely out of account; in the first place and at the very least because, historically speaking, polemics have had their own impact on the very sectarian formations we might wish to understand. I would like to suggest, even though there may be many who will disagree with me on this point, that polemicists are worthy of our compassionate interest if we are ever to be able to gain some insight into their thoughts or at least begin to understand their intentions. Angrily snapping back at polemics might only serve to gratify the hearts of the polemicists, and as historians, we want very much to avoid the general tendency to inject aspects of the current sectarian situation into the past as if they were there all along. Still, I think it is as legitimate to ask as it is difficult to answer, ‘What was it that made them say such things?’

Many are familiar with the anti-Bon polemic contained in one of a number of works which together make up the *Textbook of the Buddha’s Single Intention* (*Dgongs-gcig Yig-cha*),² which I will call the *Single Intention*, and the exponents of its views Single Intentionists (corresponding to the Tibetan *Dgongs-gcig-pa*), for brevity’s sake. The contents of this early thirteenth-century polemic have been known for a long time, at second hand, thanks to Sarat Chandra Das’s 1881 translation³ of the 1801 polemic compiled by Thu’u-bkwan Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-nyi-ma and included in his *Glass Mirror of Doctrinal Systems*.⁴ A good English translation of the original *Single Intention* passage recently appeared in Namkhai Norbu’s book *Drung, Deu & Bon*, and I also translated it as a part of my dissertation.⁵ I do not intend to discuss very much the contents of this polemic, but rather to concentrate on what was behind it, historically speaking, and then in particular try to identify the proponent of the rather liberal views about Bon with which the *Single Intention* polemic begged to differ. Some of the background materials have already appeared in my dissertation (Martin 1991), although I will add a number of new ideas and sources and correct some of the mistakes. The identity of the unnamed liberal was an issue I did not attempt to address in my dissertation, and I am presenting it for the first time in this paper.

One warning in advance: The following treatments of the Bon, Sa-skyapa and particularly the ’Bri-gung Bka’-brgyud-pa schools are issue oriented. In other words, I do not pretend to represent adequately those schools in all their various aspects here. Sects do not necessarily show their most positive aspects at the rough edges where they encounter

other sects. But this paper takes those very rough edges as its central research concern. It is important to keep this in mind.

A set of 200 (a round number) Vajra Statements, which are supposed to epitomize the views of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po (1143–1217), were written down by Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas (1187–1241) at Mkhar-chu in the area of Lho-brag in 1226. These were later reduced to the round number of 190 to avoid repetition,⁶ and they were listed in no particular order. Later on, at the same place, they were reduced to the round number 150. These 150 are always called the 'root text', while the remaining round number of 40 were relegated to a text called a 'supplement' (*Ihan-thabs*).⁷

An anonymous⁸ historical work included among the main texts of the *Single Intention*, with the title *Khog-dbub*, has the statement that the 150 Vajra Statements were singled out as having no contradiction to the words of The Presence ('Jig-rten-mgon-po) himself.⁹ This implies that there might have been some lack of consensus about just how characteristic or just how pivotal the other 40 statements were for accurately representing the thought of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po. According to the same source, these leftover statements were 'pressed down' (*mnan-pa*) and made into a supplement (*Ihan-thabs*).¹⁰ There is some conflict in the sources about whether the supplement contains the round numbers of 50 or 40 statements. As we have the text today, there are 47 (the '40' and '50' might just be different ways of rounding out the same number). It does seem significant that subsequent commentaries on the *Single Intention* usually concentrate on the 152 root Vajra Statements, without commenting on the 47 statements of the supplement in any orderly or detailed way, and this is true even though a few later commentaries on the 47 statements do exist.¹¹

The 150 (or 152) Vajra Statements of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po were divided, according to one source in the year 1235, into seven 'clusters'.¹² Each cluster would be given its own separately titled commentary, and each commentary is immediately followed by a separately titled collection of stories used to illuminate the commentary. These commentaries together with the story collections are, in works like the 'Record of Teachings Heard' (*gsan-yig*) of Padma-dkar-po,¹³ attributed to a person quite obscure in 'Bri-gung histories by the name of Rdo-rje-shes-rab. We may say that he was active during the early to mid-thirteenth century, although we have no precise dates for him.¹⁴ His commentaries were probably all composed in about the year 1267.¹⁵ It is my present impression that, in any case, this person being a student of Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas, his 'authorship' primarily consisted in passing on the

substance of the very lengthy oral commentaries by Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas, which we know from his biographies to have stretched out in several three- and four-month-long teaching sessions in the later years of his life.¹⁶ Another very early commentary called the *Rin-byang-ma* was made by another disciple of Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas, by the name of Rin-chen-byang-chub. The *Rdor-sher-ma* and *Rin-byang-ma* were both cited and compared in an early sixteenth-century commentary, but the *Rin-byang-ma* has not yet been published in modern times.¹⁷

The seven clusters are, following the order of the *Rdor-sher-ma*:

1. *Chos-kyi 'khor-lo spyi'i gnad' dus*. 'Summary of the vital points of the Wheels of Dharma in general'. Contains basic criteria for distinguishing among the various Buddhist doctrinal entities. 30 statements.
2. *Rten-'brel kun-la phan-pa*. 'Interdependent origination and the common good'. On interdependent origination, karma, law, and the 'common good'. 15 statements.
3. *'Dul-ba so-so thar-pa'i gnad bsdus*. 'Summary of the vital points of the Vinaya Pratimokṣa'. On lay and monastic vows. 20 (19?) statements.
4. *Bslab-pa byang-chub-sems-dpa'i gnad bsdus*. 'Summary of the vital points of Bodhisattva education'. On Bodhisattva vows. 24 statements.
5. *Gsang-sngags rig-'dzin sdom-pa'i gnad bsdus*. 'Vital points of the Secret Mantra Vidyadhāra vows'. On tantric vows and tantra in general. 28 statements.
6. *Khyad-par lta spyod sgom-pa'i gnad bsdus*. 'Vital points of the special teachings about view, conduct and meditation'. 20 statements.
7. *'Bras-bu Sangs-rgyas sa'i gnad bsdus*. 'Vital points of the Goal, the level of Buddhahood'. 15 statements.

These seven subjects fairly cover the field of Buddhist teachings. Each statement is preceded by a contrasting idea not attributed to anyone in particular ("some say," "it is said"). Even the commentaries never seem to specify clearly the proponents. At most they will say "some Tibetan meditators," "many Tibetan scholars of the past," "some teachers of the old and new translations," and quite frequently "the majority."¹⁸ It is interesting that so many of the statements with which the *Single Intention* differs are identified as majority views, since the *Single Intention* proudly refers to itself as *khyad-chos*, 'special or exceptional teachings' or 'teachings that set us apart from the rest'.¹⁹ This particular idea of *khyad-chos* was not employed by Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta. He uses the word occasionally on his own account, but only to point out the

special characteristics of standard doctrinal entities like Mahāyoga, not to characterize any sectarian position.²⁰

Now I believe it is surely not by chance that the compilation of the Vajra Statements coincided very closely in time with the composition of the *Distinguishing the Three Vows of Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta*. The two works are quite similar in a number of respects. It is interesting to note that, in 1225, before either work had been written, Shes-rab-'byung-gnas and Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta had a meeting of a few days' duration at Bsam-yas Monastery. I know of no record of their conversations. The *Blue Annals* account²¹ says only that they "conversed on the Doctrine." Among the things I see in common are the following:

1] Both works directly counter ideas and practices that had been held by other, primarily New Translations, teachers without naming names.

2] Both works represent a significant effort to tighten the riggings of the ship of Buddhist doctrine in a comprehensive way.

3] One way to do this is to produce consensus on a way to combine the three vows into a single system.²² Clusters 3 through 5 at the heart of the 150 Statements of the *Single Intention* concern the three vows – Vinaya, Bodhisattva and Tantra vows – which correspond exactly to the three parts of Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta's work. Both the *Single Intention* and the *Distinguishing the Three Vows* were probably written with one motive, among others, to counter the position taken by Vibhūticandra just a decade or so before on the relationships between the three vows. Vibhūticandra, if we follow his work on the subject preserved in the *Sa-skya Collection*,²³ believed that the highest set of vows, the Tantra vows, outshines the lower sets of vows, just as the sun outshines the moon and stars; when the higher vows are taken, the lower ones recede into the background. The *Single Intention* insists on a 'unity of vital points' (*gnad gcig*) of the three Vehicles in that each provides its own methods for overcoming the three poisons, in every case requiring avoidance of the ten nonvirtues.²⁴ The unity of vital points means that injury to any one of the sets of vows would entail injury to the lower ones. Evidently Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta shared with Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan the idea that the lower vows are necessarily taken along with one into the higher vows (this is called *gnas-'gyur* an adjustment to the changed 'environments') and become 'one substance' (*ngo-bo-gcig*) with them. As Karma-phrin-las would later point out, "although they have different ways of explaining it, the Sa-skya-pa and 'Bri-gung-pa are agreed that the three vows share a single essence."²⁵

There had been interesting discussions about differing views on the interrelationships of the three vows already in the last half of the twelfth century, although I will not go further into this since it could become quite complicated, and I am not sure I understand enough of the significance of these views or that I have thought enough about their implications. Others such as Cyrus Stearns (Seattle) and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch (Hamburg) are doing fine doctrinal-historical research in this area, and if we pursue this much more we won't be able to get to the other main points.

4] Both works are opposed (although in slightly differing degrees) to further revelations, and in particular to *gter-ma*. To illustrate this point quickly with some quotations, since it is rather germane to our subject.²⁶

To start with Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta, he says

Volumes that came from mines (*gter*),
religious traditions stolen from others,
composed teachings and dream teachings –
teachings that possess the mind,
even if they trace their lineage to Vajradhara,
when they give these teachings to others
they not only violate the Dharma
but violate even their own words.

and later on he says

If teachings that have not existed from the beginning
suddenly make an appearance,
whether they be held by Buddhist or Tīrthika,
they must be rejected,
so that everyone will know they are fabrications.²⁷

For comparison and contrast the *Single Intention*, in the first Vajra Statement of the sixth cluster, says

There are some who would have it that teachings (*chos*) without lineages and earth teachings (*sa chos*), sky teachings (*gnam chos*), *gter-ma* and so on are profound and miraculous. But we hold that the teaching transmitted through a lineage is [truly] profound and miraculous.²⁸

The commentary to this Vajra Statement is very interesting, but I have studied it in other contexts, and so will pass over it here. As a matter of emphasis, the *Single Intention* is not *as* negative about *gter-mas* as *Distinguishing the Three Vows* is. For the *Single Intention*, revelations received outside a lineage might be of some worldly benefit, but without the spiritual value of teachings transmitted through a lineage. The born-Sanskritist Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta rejects *gter-ma* out of concern for the authentic Indian origins of scripture. The *Single Intention* rejects

them in favor of teachings with a clear lineage. The two early 12th-century texts agree, for different reasons, that *gter-ma* revelations are of little or no use.

5] On a bit more subtle and arguable level, both works are quite concerned to locate, to identify, the true and authoritative sources of Buddhist teaching, but in this area there is a clear difference of emphasis. *Distinguishing the Three Vows*, in accord with other works by Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta, underscores the importance of true Buddhist scriptures textually transmitted from India and translated from Indian languages, and then rightly interpreted in the light of comprehensive study and systematic reasoning.²⁹ The *Single Intention*, for its part, identifies four main sources of authoritative guidance which might at the same time also be understood as four avenues for truth-testing. These are the *tshad-ma bzhi*, which I will call for reasons that will soon become plain the Four Truth-tests, a formulation that was often used by 'Jig-rten-mgon-po. If we limit ourselves to the Bka'-brgyud-pa evidence, it would seem that Phag-mo-gru-pa was its author, although the origin of a formulation shouldn't be confused with the origin of the ideas contained in it. The Four Truth-tests also provide the most general conscious framework for the early commentaries on the *Single Intention*.

1. The truth-test of scriptural authorities – the authentic Word of the Sugatas.
2. The truth-test of the experience of the Vajra Master.
3. The truth-test of history – interdependent origination.
4. The truth-test of the yogin's own experiences.³⁰

It should be noticed immediately that this set of four *tshad-ma*, a word some still want to take to mean in every case 'logic', contains nothing about logic, reasoning or logical inference. This leads us into an intriguing issue which has been central to a great deal of recent scholarship by philosophically-oriented Buddhologists, and that is the question of the degree of soteriological effectiveness commanded by logic in Buddhism.³¹ It might seem that the 16th Vajra Statement of the 1st of the 7 clusters of the *Single Intention*, is unequivocally proclaiming the power of logic to convey us all the way to Buddhahood. It says,

Although there are those who hold that *tshad-ma*, being held in common with the Vedic sciences of the Tirthika, does not qualify as the teaching of the Buddha, we propose that *tshad-ma* is the Total Knowledge (Ye-shes) known by Buddha.³²

As 'Jig-rten-mgon-po understands the word, *tshad-ma* means a 'non-misleading' (*mi-slu-ba*) and 'reliable' source of guidance. The *Rdor-*

sher-ma commentary gives some examples, saying that if there is a person in the world who doesn't tell lies, and is honest, that person is *tshad-ma*. Or, if we take an inert substance for an example, then the standard weight against which it is weighed is *tshad-ma*. This commentary also explains that the strictly logical texts written by Indian Buddhists are not 'Buddhist' insofar as they could not refute the Tīrthikas on the basis of Buddhist scripture, since this was precluded by the debating rules, and so had to use reasoning alone. It is clear that the commentator does distinguish the meaning of the word *tshad-ma* as used by some others (set standards of logical procedure), from the meaning used by 'Jig-rten-mgon-po (the Buddha as the ultimate standard for Buddhists). What he seems to be saying overall is, 'If it is true that *tshad-ma* is a secular science, there are ways in which it may prove useful or instrumental for us as Buddhists as well as to us as Single Intentionists.'

Since the Rdor-*sher-ma* commentary has already been translated and paraphrased (Jackson 1994: 89–99), and to avoid devoting too much time to what may seem for the moment like a side route to our main discussions, we would like to supply a translation of the so-far unavailable *Rin-byang-ma*'s interpretation of the two Vajra Statements on *tshad-ma*.³³

[Vajra Statement no. 14]

The Presence said,

"*Tshad-ma*" is all-knowing Total Knowledge."

[He also said]

"In order to clear away all faults of these three – non-understanding, wrong understanding and doubts – from the teachings pronounced by the perfectly enlightened Buddha, the greater and lesser Vehicles and so forth, the Six Ornaments of Jambu Island and others have written a vast number of treatises. In particular one of them, Dignāga, composed the *Tshad-ma Kun-la[s] Btus-pa* (*Pramāṇa-samuccaya*). His student was Dbang-phyug-sde (Īśvarasena), and his student was the teacher Dharmakīrti. This latter composed great treatises on *tshad-ma* including the *Seven Tshad-ma Texts*."³⁴

To comment on this, *tshad-ma* is in common with Tīrthikas because in the past in India they needed to argue philosophical ideas with the Tīrthikas, and it was for that purpose [the *tshad-ma* texts] were composed. Once the Lama Rngog Lo-tṣā-ba, who had studied with the Tīrthika Bhavyarāja (Skal-ldan-rgyal-po), called it the "savage quarrels of the Tīrthikas," and did not consider it to be a teaching of the Insiders.

Now the thinking of the Lord is this, "[We say that] *tshad-ma* is all-knowing Total Knowledge."

The Teacher Dignāga also speaks in that language when he says,

The Blessed one, the Buddha has become Total Knowledge,
has become the eye, has become the witness (or 'mediator'),
has become the standard (*tshad-ma*). He looks with knowledge.³⁵

He is saying that *tshad-ma* is part and parcel of the Tathagata. He is all-knowing, he is non-misleading, he is certainty. Further [he is saying] that this codification of *tshad-ma* is correct knowledge. According with different moments [in spiritual development], starting from the smallest purposeful thought up until the ultimate, the Total Knowledge of the Bhagavan Buddha who has purified all faults and thoroughly completed all qualities, these are all accomplished by relying on correct knowledge.

In the opening of glorious Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavinīścaya*, he says, "Even prior to [knowing] what is beneficial and what is not beneficial, what is to be taken up and what to be renounced, comes correct knowledge. For the sake of beings who do not know this, I have written this work."

At the time of entering the Path, it is through correct knowledge that the things that need to be renounced are renounced, and the things that need to be accomplished are accomplished. Learning what to stop and what to accomplish, one engages in perfect moral discipline (*tshul-khrims*), on that basis the full potential of moral discipline is brought to completion, and on that basis the other five [*pāramitās*] are brought to their full potential.

Or, to further this discussion, the Total Knowledge of the Buddha – the Sugata who has the two knowledges and has completed each of the limitless qualities just as they are – depends on prior correct knowledge, proceeds out of it and is the full actualization of the same. The full actualization of correct knowledge is the Total Knowledge known by the Bhagavan. Similarly, when something is established through *tshad-ma*, the result depends on correct knowledge in that one gives up all faults (fallacies) and accomplishes all qualities. Finally, everyone from animals up knows it is beneficial to eat when you are hungry. This kind of knowledge comes as a part of the omniscience which is [itself] correct knowledge. The ultimately actualized two knowledges,³⁶ also, are identical to the thorough completion of all correct knowledges. Correct knowledge and renouncing wrong knowledge are applied in renouncing faults and accomplishing the qualities both in the moments [of the Path] and in its full actualization. That is why he can say that *tshad-ma* is the real Total Knowledge of all-knowing. After one has allowed oneself to think along these lines, one will have faith and confidence in all the teachings of *tshad-ma*.

[Vajra Statement no. 15]

The Presence said,

"The fruit of *tshad-ma* is teaching Dharma Proper Emptiness."

Some say that since this *tshad-ma* is in common with the Vedic schools of the Tīrthikas, it has no fruit and so cannot realize Dharma Proper. In the past, when the Pundit Jayānanda³⁷ was composing his treatise entitled *Tarkamudgara Kārikā*, he said,

Being followers of Dharmakīrti,
the logicians are made to say,
'Through *tshad-ma* Thusness is realized.'

and he included [in his work] much about how the Thusness of *tshad-ma* is not empty and how the Dharma Proper of Madhyamaka is understood.

While there are those who would have it that there is no fruit in *tshad-ma*, here, if we follow the thinking of the Lord, he says that the intention of *tshad-ma* is the Great Seal Dharma Proper.

Now *tshad-ma* employs two things – inference and direct perception. In inference *tshad-ma* there are three 'marks' – [1] The mark of not imagining, making what is nonexistent nonexistent. [2] The mark of nature, making what exists exist. [3] The mark of result, inferring results from their causes. Direct perception *tshad-ma* involves

four things – [1] Sensory direct perception and [2] mental direct perception together make the five sense spheres evident. [3] Own awareness direct perception and [4] yogic direct perception together are the way one accomplishes the contemplative concentrations of peaceful abiding and further vision, and everyone agrees that these latter two are the way to realize Dharma Proper.³⁸

Hence, showing it is certain to realize the Dharma Proper of *tshad-ma*, Glorious Dharmakīrti said, in the preface to his *Pramāṇārtika*:

Completely clearing away the traps of understanding,
having a body of profundity and vastness,
the light rays of the universal good
shining on all, to you I prostrate.

[The Presence] said, “This is a characterization of the qualities of the Great Seal and its purpose.”

[The same work says:]

If we thoroughly ponder its meaning,
in its meaning there is no thing/substance.
For this reason there is in them
no nature of singularity and plurality.

Here there is not the slightest difference in intent from that of Madhyamaka.

If we were to hold that in *tshad-ma* there is no result, then why would the Blessed One make prophecies about the authors of the *tshad-ma* treatises like the teacher Dignāga and glorious Dharmakīrti included among the Six Ornaments of Jambu Island? Therefore, without following such counterproductive thoughts and conversations, we ought to have limitless belief and veneration for those treatises which clarify the Victor’s Teachings composed by the teacher Dignāga and his sons who were prophesied by the Teacher Tathagata.³⁹

It is entirely possible to read this, as well as the commentary in the *Rdor-sher-ma* as a vindication of logic’s necessary place in, or even equivalence to, the Buddhist Path, but I believe this would be a misreading, and for a number of reasons. If read carefully, they are precisely the third and fourth types of ‘direct perception *tshad-ma*’, those of own awareness and yogic direct perception, that lead to the realization of Dharma Proper, not the relatively mundane first and second, sensory and mental direct perceptions, accepted as *The Two Tshad-ma* especially beloved by the logicians. It seems that the Single Intentionists’ readings of the works of the prime Buddhist logicians, Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, barely got past the opening invocations. Their actual intention was to lead the argument in a rather unexpected direction, which should be of particular interest to those who would tend to make them into Buddhists of the logical constructionist kind.

Quite close, even in wording, to the statement “*Tshad-ma* is the Total Knowledge known to the Buddha” (*tshad-ma sangs-rgyas-kyi mkhyen-pa’i ye-shes-su bzhed-do*) is the 3rd Vajra Statement of the 3rd cluster. “Precious moral discipline⁴⁰ is precisely the all-knowing Total

Knowledge” (*tshul-khrims rin-po-che thams-cad mkhyen-pa'i ye-shes kho-nar bzhed-do*). The idea with which it disagrees is the idea that the moral discipline of stopping and accomplishing [non-virtues and virtues, faults and qualities, respectively] is a teaching of the Hearers (*dgag sgrub-kyi bslab-pa'i tshul-khrims ni nyan-thos-kyi chos-su 'dod-pa*). The arguments in the two commentaries (which are quite close to each other in content) will be summarized here. Basically, there are two types of knowledge pertaining to the Enlightened One. First, the Buddha's realization of the actuality of all *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa* defines ‘the knowledge of how [they are]’ (*ji-lta-ba mkhyen-pa*). While continuing in that ultimate knowledge, the Buddha at the same time knows individually and without mixture, all the interconnections of cause and result, but without really separating them anymore than one would really separate the sun from its rays. This is called the ‘knowledge of whatever [there is]’ (*ji-snyed-pa mkhyen-pa*). The first is the knowledge of the Buddha *qua* Buddha, while the second is the knowledge of the Buddha needed for guiding others to Buddhahood. These two knowledges (equivalent to the *mkhyen-pa'i ye-shes* of the Vajra Statement, which then ought to be interpreted, ‘the Total Knowledge of [the two] knowledge[s]’) are then made to correspond to Ten Strengths of the Tathāgata. Of these ten, only the tenth, the ‘strength of knowing the cessation of defilements’ (*zag-pa zad-pa mkhyen-pa'i-stobs*),⁴¹ is equivalent to the knowledge of the Buddha *qua* Buddha, while the first through ninth are equated to the ‘knowledge of whatever [there is]’. These nine are, as given in the text of the commentary, [1] the strength of knowing what are and are not the [right] conditions, [2] the strength of knowing the ripening of karma/deeds, [3] knowing the elemental potentialities in their singularity and plurality, [4] knowing the superior and not superior faculties, [5] knowing the various [degrees and types] of faith, [6] knowing what is thoroughly afflicted and what completely pure, [7] knowing death, transference and birth, [8] knowing clairvoyantly the prior conditions, and [9] knowing the paths that lead to all [destinies].⁴² The Enlightened One looks upon sentient beings with the Total Knowledge look, and in response to the fact that they do not know the difference between the causes and results that keep them in *samsāra*, that they do not recognize virtue and sin, He makes His teachings about what to stop and what to accomplish, saying, “This is to be renounced, this should be worked on.” The Buddha does this knowing that eventually, by abandoning faults and perfecting good qualities, they will themselves realize the Ten Strengths of the Total Knowledge known to a Buddha.

Then both commentaries cite an unspecified scripture as saying,

If they dwell in moral discipline, they obtain the contemplative concentrations.
 If they dwell in contemplative concentrations, Insight will be highly developed in meditation.

Through Insight they obtain perfect Total Knowledge.

If they have immaculate Total Knowledge, their moral discipline will be perfect.⁴³

Hence, if they have immaculate discipline, they will obtain the Ten Powers which are the Total Knowledge known to the Buddha.

The necessary link between these two arguments, [1] that *tshad-ma* is the Total Knowledge known to the Buddha and [2] that moral discipline is the Total Knowledge known to the Buddha, is found in the very story of the origins of the Single Intention system. For this we turn to a work composed in 1240 or 1241 by Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas called *Snang-mdzad Ye-shes-kyi Sgron-me* ('Lamp of Total Knowledge the Illuminator').⁴⁴ It begins with a brief biographical sketch about 'Jig-rten-mgon-po. This tells, among other things, how he remained a layman until his 35th year, yet never experienced the touch of a woman besides that of his own mother. He never permitted women to cross his threshold, and ate only food brought to him by men. He didn't drink barley beer, and neither did he eat meat. The women among his patrons would say, "Does your Lama have a mother or not?" 'Jig-rten-mgon-po realized the 'intention of single nature' (*rang-bzhin gcig-pa'i dgongs-pa*) in the context of his monastic discipline. The author tells us how the Buddha didn't preach Vinaya rules for the first twelve years of His teaching career because no faults surfaced. In those days the monks would chant a set of verses,

Do not commit any sin.
 Practice perfect virtue.
 Thoroughly tame your own mind.
 This is the Teaching of the Buddha[s].
 The vows of body are fine,
 the vows of speech are fine,
 the vows of mind are fine.
 In every way the vows are fine.
 Thoroughly controlled *bhikṣus*
 are completely free from any sin.
 Their speech acts are guarded
 their minds completely under control,
 and they never commit any non-virtues with their bodies.
 One who has completely guarded these three avenues of karma
 will obtain the Path of which spoke the Sage.⁴⁵

These verses the past masters⁴⁶ said summarize all the Three Baskets of scriptures. But 'Jig-rten-mgon-po had an idea even broader than theirs. He believed that while the Buddha continued to teach in the world, there was no distinction between greater and lesser Vehicles,

none between mantra and Prajñāpāramitā, but all were included in this set of verses.

This story about the founding insight of the Single Intention explains to us how it is that moral discipline came to be the main unifying thread that runs through the entire text and its commentaries.⁴⁷ The question of *tshad-ma* enters into it simply because the invocational prefaces to the *tshad-ma* texts by Dignāga and Dharmakīrti so clearly make the omniscient Buddha the true standard and authority, and because Dharmakīrti, in the first verses of his famous work on logic, the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, makes ‘correct knowledge’, which he explicitly links to the omniscience of the Buddha, the very basis for understanding what to do (what to accept) and not to (what to reject) at the beginning of the Buddhist Path. Syllogistic logic and reasoning are not at the forefront of their minds, moral discipline is.

As clarified in the commentary to the final cluster of the root text of the Vajra Statements,⁴⁸ when ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po says Total Knowledge, he means the first moment of the Buddha’s actual Enlightenment⁴⁹ when the universe of knowable objects was displayed before Him in its true form clearly and without obscurations, and it is this that is the *tshad-ma*, the ultimate ‘standard’ for the whole of Buddhist teachings. There is much more to this discussion, which could lead us off into quite subtle and perplexing philosophical problems, but my point here is that when ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po uses the term *tshad-ma* on his own account, he means an unfailing source of guidance – ultimately the Total Knowledge of the Buddha’s Enlightenment experience, while the Four Truth-tests are considered the main ways for us to validate and gain access to that experience (in a sense they are ‘conduits’ for the authoritative experience of Enlightenment, and therefore in significant measure share in its power). Or, to put it still another way, as I read the texts of the *Single Intention* at the moment, the Single Intention of the Buddha is to guide us to that experience of Enlightenment, and it is to the four ways of truth-testing that we must turn for true guidance.⁵⁰ ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po has certainly not “strongly asserted that the ‘fruit’ of *pramāṇa* (*tshad-ma*) is the highest insight into ultimate reality,”⁵¹ or even if he has, he hasn’t confused this ‘highest insight’ with the actual realization that can come only through engaging in moral conduct and meditation (*these* are his necessary preconditions to Insight), not through the application of logic or reasoning of any special kind.

We must add here, as an important aside, taking a step backward, that even though this seems never to have been acknowledged by the Bka’-brgyud-pa tradition, Phag-mo-gru-pa in fact got the idea of the Four

Truth-tests as part of the esoteric Lam-'bras transmission he received from Sa-chen Kun-dga'-snying-po, the famous Sa-skya-pa patriarch, *before* he joined the Bka'-brgyud-pa lineage. The basic statement on the Four Truth-tests goes back to the 'root' verses on Lam-'bras by the Indian master Virūpa, verses first put in writing by Sa-chen, prior to whom it was a very elite and entirely oral tradition. These same Lam-'bras teachings, it must be pointed out, were also received and practised by Sa-chen's grandson Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta. Further clarification on this point is promised in future studies of the Lam-'bras system and its history by Dr. Cyrus Stearns (Seattle), who kindly pointed this out to me. Knowing this is significant in that it threatens the solidity of the contrasts we are attempting to draw between Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta and the Single Intentionists. But regardless of its origins, the use of the Four Truth-tests as an overarching structuring element for the whole constellation of Buddhist teaching is unique to the *Single Intention*.

The *Single Intention*, in the 7th Vajra Statement of the 6th cluster, cites with approval a work by Phag-mo-gru-pa entitled *Rin-chen Them-skas* ('Jewelled Ladder'),

The persons who rely [on those Buddhist and non-Buddhist philosophical schools] may have achieved certainty through their own intellects in their various diverse views but since they have neither understood nor realized this through meditation practice, these are views devoid of realization (*lta-ba rtogs-pa dang bral-ba*).⁵²

The original work by Phag-mo-gru-pa immediately continues:

Not just for three limitless aeons,
but for a million they may follow their procedures
but there is no squeezing oil from husks.
They may plow and hoe the winter ground
but come spring there will be no result.
Those who want to go east
waste their steps going west.
People suffering from the heat
desire shade, but if they go again and again
to bask themselves by the bonfire
they will just go on suffering from the heat.

Phag-mo-gru-pa also says, "Those who hold views without realization may strive for many aeons. But while desiring the goal they haven't hit its cover (its 'shield'),"⁵³ and "If ones views have become accompanied by realization, one will attain the result in a single lifetime, a single body." One could multiply such examples from his works, but what is essential here is to acknowledge that for him meditation is imperative. For him, the most subtle arguments of the Mādhyamika dialecticians only enmesh them more and more inextricably in increasingly subtle

forms of the obscurations due to knowables, in particular subject-object dichotomies, which can only be overcome through engaging directly in meditation⁵⁴ *with or without engaging in some type of philosophical discourse*.⁵⁵

But what about Phag-mo-gru-pa's views in particular about *tshad-ma*? Is *tshad-ma* necessary? In his own answer to this question he quotes liberally from Atiśa's *Satyadvayāvatāra*,⁵⁶

Atiśa said, "The student of Nagarjuna is Candrakīrti. Through the oral precepts of their lineage, the truth of Dharma Proper will be attained."

Well now, through perceptual *tshad-ma*, perceptions are established. Through inferential *tshad-ma* the 'hidden' aspects are established. If you think it is necessary to establish the external appearances through analytical insight, while establishing an external appearance, realization cannot arise. This is because appearances are the mistaken [perceptions] of your own mind.

Well then, what is necessary?

If one realizes [the nature of] the mind, it is Total Knowledge. For this realization, what is necessary is a Lama holding the lineage, and correctly performing the practices according to the his or her precepts.

Well then, one might think, 'Isn't there some necessity for *tshad-ma*? In taking up the practices on the Path it isn't necessary. [As Atiśa says] "the perceptual and inferential [. . .], this is deluded talk by those who see only this side [the concerns of the present life]."⁵⁷

Well then, one might think, 'For what is it necessary?' [As Atiśa says] "For countering the arguments of the Tīrthikas, it was made by scholars."⁵⁸

In short, 'Jig-rten-mgon-po (as well as the subsequent Single Intentionists, one might presume) would agree with his teacher Phag-mo-gru-pa, whom he quotes with complete approval as saying, "If you want to search for the actual meaning, do not rely on logical inference. Gain experience by meditating well."⁵⁹ I think, if they have to be placed in some philosophical pigeon-hole, it would be accurate enough to call this early Bka'-brgyud-pa emphasis a kind of meditation-based empiricism (as long as 'empiricism' doesn't imply a naive trust in the senses, a problem to which Buddhists in general, let alone Bka'-brgyud-pas, have never been especially prone). To put it differently, they are primarily concerned about the 'Mind Proper' (Sems-nyid), or what thought finally amounts to, and only secondarily 'Dharma Proper' (Chos-nyid), which is what phenomenal things finally amount to. Just to drive this point in, I produce one of my favorite quotes from Phag-mo-gru-pa. He says,

The learned scholars cut away of the veils of words with words and establish the objects of knowing . . . Make forests into pens, oceans into ink, land into paper, and still there would be no end to their writing. Yogis don't establish external objectivities. They establish the mind. The mind established, its objects establish themselves.

Sgam-po-pa also says in several places and in several different ways that when Mind Proper is realized Dharma Proper realization takes care of

itself.⁶⁰ He seems never even to suggest the approach of some modern physicists, that the opposite might be true, that the understanding of Dharma Proper might lead to the understanding of Mind Proper.⁶¹ It remains to be seen if this meditation-based orientation of the earlier Bka'-brgyud-pas was being modified, as indeed it seems, by the increasing emphasis of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po and the Single Intentionists on moral discipline, which led them so far as to appeal even to the authority of the logicians.

Now in the text of the 150 statements there is not a single use of the word Bon. But, among the 47 statements in the supplement, there are two statements that mention Bon. These are numbers 9 and 10. Number 9 is the basis for the commentary (evidently composed by Rdo-rje-shes-rab) that is identical to the well-known anti-Bon polemic.

9. There are those who claim that those who enter into Tīrthika and Bon teachings see the truth. However, we say that those who enter into Tīrthika and Bon teachings have no chance to see the truth.⁶²

10. There are those who claim that in Tīrthika and Bon there are no factors that accord with liberation. However, we say that there is no contradiction [to the preceding statement] in our saying that they have some factors that accord with liberation.⁶³

The statement no. 10 has a mitigating effect – and statement 11 goes on to stay that Tīrthikas do possess some inherent virtue, regardless of their wrong views – since it allows, as an afterthought, that some positive factors might be found in the teachings and practices of Tīrthikas and Bonpos, at the same time reasserting (in the accompanying text) that they have no way to realize the truth without entering the door of Chos [or Dharma].⁶⁴

One question that we might very reasonably ask, and which could illumine our question considerably, is “How much contact did Bka'-brgyud-pa teachers prior to the compilation of the *Single Intention* have with Bonpos?” Early biographical literature is the place to turn for answers, but I must stress the word *early*, since much of the biographical material on Milarepa, for example, is quite late, and therefore not strictly admissible as evidence. There is a biography with some claims to age (it is based on biographies written by his 4 chief disciples) about Khyung-po Rnal-'byor.⁶⁵ Born as a Bonpo in the Khyung clan, he even served as a Bon leader with several hundred disciples when he was a young man. There are many brief references to Bon in early Bka'-brgyud-pa biographies. One is in the biography of Rgwa Lo-tsa-ba composed in the late twelfth century, where it is told in a very matter-of-fact tone free of polemical elements, that he was presented by a Bonpo with a

gift of a *Khams-chen* (which should have 16 volumes).⁶⁶ This at least provides us with a piece of ‘outside verification’ for the existence in those times of this important Bon scripture revealed by Gshen-chen Klu-dga’.⁶⁷ It might be noted, perhaps contrary to expectations, that Bon is not mentioned in available polemical literature dating to the late 10th through 12th centuries.

One of the most interesting early Chos biographical sources for our purposes is the biography of ’Jig-rten-mgon-po composed by Dbon Shes-rab-’byung-gnas. The most significant fact that emerges from reading Sher-’byung’s biography of ’Jig-rten-mgon-po, the only one of its length and detail available to us, is that ’Jig-rten-mgon-po’s mother had a preference for Bon. His father’s elder brother, named Mkhan-po Dar-ma, had studied with a pupil of ’Gos Lha[s]-btsas⁶⁸ named Lho Rdo-rje-snying-po. This Mkhan-po Dar-ma then perfected his abilities in the practice of Phur-pa and defeated, through its power, a powerful Bonpo named Ba-ring-bal-sgom. When ’Jig-rten-mgon-po was born in 1143, his mother quickly called a Bonpo named Dbal’ Gshen-blon⁶⁹ who, at the baby’s first feeding, named him Dbal-bar-thar, although this Bon name was later changed to Btsun-pa-skyabs, and then Rdo-rje-dpal. Little more is said about his mother. His father, a practitioner of Bhairava, died during a famine after being forced to pawn even his Bhairava scriptures of sixteen *bre* of barley.⁷⁰ Soon after this his mother also died, during ’Jig-rten-mgon-po’s sixteenth year. After age eighteen, ’Jig-rten-mgon-po, who had already taken up the profession of ‘paid reader’ at six years of age, wandered about reading scriptures for various patrons. In one incident, he went begging at the house of a wealthy man named Mgo-li-bya-rgyal, but was turned away because they were Bonpo.⁷¹ Thus it seems that his mother’s side was pro-, while his father’s side was anti-Bonpo, and he himself had one bad experience with a Bonpo that *could* have created resentment, although there is really no hint of this, and no further supporting evidence seems to be forthcoming.

The works of ’Jig-rten-mgon-po which we have in a five-volume reprint edition, are difficult to find ones way through,⁷² but I did skim them carefully looking for any reference to Bon. His works, which in great part were written down by his followers on the basis of his spoken words, show that he was not opposed to Rdzogs-chen, Zhi-byed, and the other teachings that had been singled out for criticism by others.⁷³ Some of his references to Bon do appear in a rather negative light, but not excessively so, and we have to wonder in some cases just what he is referring to under the name. When he speaks of Mo Bon, he seems

to mean divination techniques,⁷⁴ not *Bon per se*. He is aware that Bon was a literary phenomenon, since he sometimes vaguely mentions ‘Bon Collections.’

Although it is commonly said that one Teaching does not have two Teachers at the same time, the source for this is in the Bon Collections, and is not seen elsewhere. Scholars should look into this.⁷⁵

and,

He [’Jig-rten-mgon-po] also said, ‘This saying that one Teaching does not have two Teachers is in the Bon Collection, and not in the scripture of the Tathāgata. The *’Dus-pa Rin-po-che Tog* tells how there are many Buddhas in lower and higher worlds.’⁷⁶

Making reference to the same saying in yet another place, he implies that it does not have a very great source, since it is understood to show envy toward the teachings of the Tathāgata.⁷⁷

Besides these there are quite a few references to people who believe that Phya or Dbang-phyug (Īśvara) created the world,⁷⁸ and this same statement is cited in the *Single Intention* polemic. This statement is against creationism of both its Tibetan and its Indian varieties. The reference to Phya is not necessarily about *Bon per se*, although of course the first of the nine Vehicles of Bon is called the Phya Gshen Vehicle. Phya is associated with ‘luck’ or ‘fate’ and especially with the throwing of ‘lots’, or divination, and thus belongs to a very this-worldly and fate-focused ethos which is undoubtedly ancient and still persisting in Tibet, just as it arguably does in some form in every culture. Bon myths of origin, although they are many and often differ remarkably from Chos myths of origin, are – like the Chos myths – about the origins of the aeon (*kalpa*), not about the *original* origins of the universe. Bon thinkers have been just as firmly opposed to creationisms as have Chos thinkers. Following is an example from the Bon intellectual ’A-zha Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan’s (1198–1263) great commentary on the *Gsang-ba Bsen-thub*, a *gter-ma* of Gshen-chen Klu-dga’ (as well as of Dpon-gsas Khyung-rgod-rtsal). He is speaking about suitable objects for prostration.

If one asks exactly what constitutes a suitable object of prostration, it is not, as the outsiders say, Phya, Īśvara or Brahma. They are themselves wandering in *samsāra*, so that they are unable to assist others. Hence the true object of Refuge is the completely perfected Sangs-rgyas [Buddha].⁷⁹

A Bon text excavated in the eleventh century says,

Some have said [things are] made by Phya and *deities*. Phya and *deities* do not create [anything]; this is [due to] the power of virtuous and non-virtuous [deeds/*karma*].⁸⁰

Evidently, some Tibetans at some time did say that the world was created by Phya, and it is possible that some of these Tibetans at one time or another had the label Bon attached to them. This is, however, quite a different matter from saying, 'Bonpos believe that an entity named Phya was responsible for giving the universe its original origins.' This last statement is certainly false.

Taken as a whole, most of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po's references to Bon are of an incidental nature. Bon is a part of his experience and that of his listeners, but he does not attach great importance to it, and so he did not write any sustained polemic against it. He generally had a somewhat liberal attitude, albeit together with a lifestyle that was quite puritanical about beer, meat and sex (as we have seen above). He simply considered Bon unworthy of receiving very much attention:

I am drunk on Great Bliss beer.
Do not criticize my foolish drunk talk,
please, with your partial perspectives.
I understand as utter simplicity all *dharmas*.
Toward nihilistic and eternalistic systems of thought
this man has no preference, no sense of good or bad.
Even the Tirthikas agree with me.
When they chant on the pure nature, Bonpos are wise.⁸¹

This was said under the intoxication of meditation-generated bliss. Generally, he thought Bon was a waste of time; as in this passage where he is emphasizing the necessity of study and spiritual cultivation:

Otherwise one will not get even the flavor of impermanence. One will get extremely attached to the affairs of the present life, and if one then passes the time in Bon and farming, life will pass by to no purpose. . . .⁸²

Perhaps for 'Jig-rten-mgon-po here also, Bon means just divination, and thus his statement is equivalent to a Christian theologian saying 'astrology is a waste of time.' Otherwise, he would only be displaying his ignorance of what Bonpos long before his time were really saying about transcendence, about 'passing beyond suffering'.

In the whole of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po's collected work we find extremely little that corresponds to anything in the *Single Intention* polemical passage against Bon. I can just point out that both criticize the idea that things were created by Phya or Ísvara. Also, there is a single reference to *rdol Bon* in 'Jig-rten-mgon-po's works,⁸³ but from the context we can understand from this only that he sees this type of Bon as an 'outbreak' without any background in the form of a lineage, and therefore not worthy of following. The terms '*khyar Bon* and *bsgyur Bon*, so important in the polemic, do not appear at all in 'Jig-rten-mgon-po's works.⁸⁴

Knowing this lack of correspondences between the polemic and the works of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po, one may very well ask how well the *Single Intention* polemic really reflects the ideas of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po. Perhaps it better reflects the views of Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas, or of the commentator Rdo-rje-shes-rab. Even the words of the Vajra Statement no. 9, which ought to be the words of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po (*mu-stegs dang bon-gyi sgor zhugs-pas bden-pa mthong-ba'i gnas med-pa*) have no even nearly equivalent statement in his collected works.

Finally, I think we will have to turn away from our search for any specific 'Bri-gung-pa background for the polemic. Can we then be precise about who it was who had the contrary views that the Vajra Statement and its commentary sought to counter? Let us look first at the text of the polemic. This first part represents to us the position that will be refuted in the main part that follows it:

Adamantine Statement [of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po. We say,]:

"Those who have joined the Tīrthikas and Bon have no opportunity to see the Truth."

[The idea with which we differ]:

"Even though they have joined the Bon and Tīrthikas, they see the Truth," it is said.

There are generally two ways of [religious] teaching, firstly the teaching of the Buddha[s], which is best; secondly, the teachings of the Tīrthikas, which is inferior. As it was said in the *Sarvadurgati-pariśodhana*,

There are two different ways of teaching.

The best is Buddha's teaching.

The Tīrthika teaching is inferior.

Do not look down upon the Tīrthikas.

Looking down on Tīrthikas

creates distance from 'Shining Everywhere' (Vairocana),

for even Tīrthikas join in seeking the Path [to Enlightenment].⁸⁵

[The scripture is] saying that, apart from this distinction of superior and inferior, they are both the same in that they have different teachings for [different] individuals. They are similar in that they seek for a way to pass beyond suffering [to find *nirvāṇa*] and leave behind the *samsāra* of the Three Realms [Desire, Form and Non-form Realms]. Therefore, they are similar in that they join in the search for the Path which leads to the attainment of Liberation and the Path which leads to the abandonment of *samsāra*. Since they are looking for the Path, they are also similar in practising diligence. Therefore, even though the ultimate Buddhahood of the Great Sage cannot be attained by outsiders, still, when they do enter that Path, they are able to see the Truth of Dharma Proper, [these people] say.

It is a similar case with Bon. The Buddha Great Sage and Teacher Gshen-rab-mi-bo are in any case similar in being Teachers. Their teachings are likewise similar. [Bon] is a particular part, or an equivalent, of the teachings of the Sage. Since this is so, after entering the Path of their particular means, they take up the practices as taught in their scriptures, and just like insiders, they see the ultimate Truth of Dharma Proper, [people] say.⁸⁶

You, the reader, might be surprised to learn, as I was, that the polemic was neither provoked by the arguments of a Bonpo, nor does it stem from some unfortunate incident involving a Bonpo buried in the 'Bri-gung-pa past. I now believe that I can say with some confidence that it was in fact provoked by some liberal sentiments expressed by a fellow Bka'-brgyud-pa who founded the Tshal-pa Bka'-brgyud-pa lineage, the teacher by the name of Zhang G.yu-brag-pa Brtson-'grus-grags-pa.⁸⁷ The following is from a lengthy record of advice he gave to the minor 'emperor' of a Yar-lung side-valley called 'Phrang-po, in a Hen year following his initiation of the emperor into the mandala of Cakrasamvara. It probably dates to the 1180's:

All the shapes of frozen lakes and ponds – square, round, half-circles, triangles ... sharp, blunt, thin, thick ..., every single possible distinct shape – through no power of their own gradually and simultaneously melt into the lake or river.

All the shapes and colors of salt, when it sinks into water are entirely subsumed in the water.

In a similar way, the Sage in order to help the aspirants, with the form bodies comes variously to each doing whatever is needed to train all those who have an aptitude for this training. They are guided on and on by the Buddha and are sure to be placed in comfort.

The constitutions and thoughts of aspirants are beyond comprehension. The forms and Full Knowledges of the Sage are beyond comprehension. The compassionate verbal actions, the Vehicles [of the Sage], are inexhaustible.

The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* says,

As long as there is no end to conceptualizations
there will be no end of Vehicles

We do not make criticisms and draw divisions like 'What is and is not Dharma', but knowing all to be styles of the Sage and His Sons, we will honor them without avoiding them. Look, just look at all those 'virtuous friends'⁸⁸ with all their great achievements in the realm of knowledge. See how they and many of the good meditators and high realizers have not seen that the great sin of their contempt for [the followers of] Bon is a sin and so avoided them. Their not seeing might make them plunge into vast chasms (*g.yang-sa*). We will not belittle [the followers of] Bon. The Sage and Sons have enlightened activities that cannot be placed within limits.

The *Vairocana Abhisambodhi Tantra* says,

Do not look down upon Tīrthikas.
Those who look down on Tīrthikas
create distance from Shining Everywhere (Vairocana).

All the textual sources of the Tīrthikas teach how the perfectly and completely enlightened Blessed One took birth as a son of the king *Aṣṭapada (Rkang-pa-brgyad-pa) and pronounced all the textual sources of the Tīrthikas. They intone the greatness of the Enlightened One, and say, "These are His reincarnations." Beyond comprehension are the fundamental thoughts (intentions) of the All Knowing One. It is inappropriate to cut out parts and then look down on them.

In order to help sentient beings, the aspects of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas partly appear as Bon-po, partly as Gsas-po, Gsas-mo, etc., as Mo-ma, as Cha-ba, as

Mu-steps-pa (Tīrthikas), as householders, as monastics, as mantrists, as yoga practitioners, as Vinaya followers, as Hearers, as Self Buddhas, as Bodhisattvas, as Path cultivators, as [Path cultivators] on the level of acting in faith, . . .⁸⁹

The words that follow have Zhang going into a long discussion that shows, among other things, that he was familiar with the polemic of Khug-pa Lhas-btsas,⁹⁰ using some of the same words, such as *rgya gar-ma* and *bod-ma* for texts made in India and Tibet, and the words *chos dri-ma-can*, ‘impure teachings’.

For those who are converted through Indian texts, we have Indian texts. For those who are converted through Tibetan texts, we have Tibetan texts. Don’t say, ‘Tibetan teachings are impure.’⁹¹

Then he mentions how certain Bka’-gdams-pas were composing texts calling them, ‘circulars on what is and is not Dharma’, and he advises the emperor not to pay heed to them, but to govern everyone equally.

These general sorts of liberal statements of opposition to the polemical tradition are of course not enough to establish that Zhang Rin-po-che is the unnamed proponent of the liberal views countered in the anti-Bon polemic. We have seen above that he does cite the same scriptural passage.⁹² While it is true that this passage was cited by Atiśa and Phag-mo-gru-pa, they did so without making any explicit reference to Bon. We might still be left somewhat in doubt about the identity of our liberal if it were not for other words in still other works of Zhang Rinpoche. In the first text in the section of his works devoted to philosophical positions (*grub-mtha’*, *siddhānta*), we find the quote,

Even Sgrung [‘narratives’] and Mde’u [i.e., Lde’u, ‘riddling’ and other aspects of oral artistry] and Mo [‘lots’] and Bon, etc., have emerged as significant Vehicles which convey them by degrees, so what need is there to mention [the] other Vehicles. That is why one shouldn’t look down on any of the outer and inner Vehicles such as Bon, and so forth.⁹³

and later on in the same work, after discussions about how everyone is capable of Enlightenment, he quotes again the scriptural passage, “Don’t look down on Tīrthikas,” and “Outsiders also join in seeking the Path.”⁹⁴

We may also find in one *Single Intention* text, the *Khog-dbub*, a passage clearly echoing the words of Zhang Rinpoche about the ‘chasms’ (*g.yang sa*) into which those who look down on Bon might fall, a passage which could well have been consciously written as a defense against Zhang’s relatively open views. It reads:

We have not looked down on the teachings of others, we just do not follow the teachings of others. The Chos-rje⁹⁵ said, “[We are] not looking down on anyone’s teachings, and not renouncing anything, so there is no chasm for those who rely

on the Dharma. Since we will not follow [just] anyone's teachings, and have not followed [just] anything, the fault of entering wrong paths does not arise. We follow after the teachings of the Buddha. We practice them without any contradictions, and without leaving anything out. That is the Dharma of our fathers (*pha chos*). If internal contradictions were to lead us to accept some and reject others, then that is what [we] call the Dharma of the old Tibetans in general (*bod rgan spyi'i chos*).⁹⁶ Here we teach a single Dharma that has no contradiction with the Word of the Sage. There are not many different types of Dharma, no different styles of Dharma, no various meanings of the [Dharmic] expressions. So the Presence spoke of the Holy Dharma which is *single* in its *intention* ...⁹⁷

My impression, which isn't exactly a conclusion since it is still in the process of formation, is that the *Single Intention*, like the near-contemporaneous *Distinguishing the Three Vows*, represents a particular point in Tibetan Buddhist history in which there was a strongly emerging concern for sectarian self-identification. In part this involved pointing out what was 'different' about one's own tradition against the others, while reserving the claim to possess the total picture. The earlier diversity of views about how the three vows fit together had to be self-consciously resolved, and generally in favor of an interpretation that insisted on the maintenance of the basic social virtues even in the course of *bodhisattva* and tantric Vehicles (involving a rejection of interpretations that emphasize the creative stratagems of the Bodhisattva, and the 'activities' of tantra). The Single Intentionists go further than Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta in this respect, in making moral discipline the point on which they develop their complex Buddhist system and to which they keep returning. It seems that the Sa-skya-pa and 'Bri-gung-pa in those times were beginning to achieve numerical parity, or perhaps even superiority, to the Bka'-gdams-pa school. The large numbers of monasteries built in the last half of the twelfth century now, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, entered into a phase that required consolidation and maintenance to a degree not even considered in the relatively free-floating doctrinal situation at the beginning of the twelfth. This need for maintenance is reflected in their relatively similar views about the non-validity of new revelations, in their depreciation of the scriptural text excavations called *gter-ma*. It also is reflected in the tendencies for scripture-based, meditation-based, compassion-based and morality-based Buddhisms⁹⁸ to take logical rationality on board as a defense against the rationales put forward by others.⁹⁹ I think these factors are among those that will help us one day to define in a general way the historical context within which we might better understand how the *Single Intention* authors could feel themselves justified in their rejection of Bon. Perhaps valid as a partial explanation, they would reflect the tendency of institutions to cede to moral discipline (*tshul-*

khirms) some of the territory of Insight (*shes-rab*), even to exalt moral discipline over Insight.¹⁰⁰ As Bon became more an object of ‘cleansing’, it became less an object or vehicle for compassion and insights. The Bon religion was only one of the casualties in this strengthening of institutional control. Another casualty was openness to plurality and difference. Still another was peace. By the end of the thirteenth century the ‘Bri-gung-pa and Sa-skyapa were at war with each other.’¹⁰¹

A few further conclusions remain to be stated. Firstly, thinkers within Buddhist traditions, as well as within Buddhological traditions, have demonstrated a tendency to reduce the totality of Buddhism, at one extreme, to a complex logical construction, or, what is in some people’s mouths the same thing, a ‘philosophy’. At still other extremes, there have been tendencies to reduce it to a ‘way of life’ to be simply lived or an ethical code demanding strict compliance. Even the ‘religious’ or ‘popular religious’ construction of Buddhism may be a pitfall in an attempt to grant it something approximating adequate representation, if we were, for example, to define these exclusively in terms of the devotional or cultic, thereby ignoring those meditators for whom the real nature of the human mind experienced in meditation is the main thing, or, with the Bka’-gdams-pa adherents of Mind Training (Blo-sbyong) in mind, those meditators for whom the transformation of the mind equivalent to the development of compassion is the main objective. Real-life Buddhists, like Buddhism’s real-life interpreters in their non-Buddhist institutions, need to foster an appreciation for the rich possibilities inherent in Buddhism while avoiding simplistic reductions, however much these might suit their individual interests, not to mention the intellectual fashions of the moment.

Finally, seeing at least part of the motivation for the production of the anti-Bon polemic within the context of the *Dgongs-gcig Yig-cha*, we no longer have to make obeisance to it as some kind of generally acceptable statement fairly representing the views of Chos adherents, since we have seen that Zhang Rinpoche, for one, would not have accepted it. Some later Chos thinkers have had still other ‘liberal’ or at least relatively accommodating views about Bon, as I have noted elsewhere.¹⁰² We may now proceed with confidence to study and talk about Bon without making the customary tip of the hat to those polemical statements, rooted in the *Single Intention*, about the ‘three phases of Bon history’. We may feel free to go directly into the Bon historical tradition, scriptural literature, ritual practices, and the like and appreciate them in their own right, if not on their own terms. Largely due to the hold of the polemic on our minds, we haven’t yet imagined

what doing so might mean for future developments in Buddhist and Tibetan studies.

APPENDIX A:

[Rin-chen-byang-chub n.d.: 229–232; note that the abbreviations in this cursive manuscript have been tacitly resolved here, but misspellings are left unchanged] yang rje rin po che'i zhal snga nas / tshad ma thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes yin gsungs / de la yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas kyis gsungs pa'i chos thams cad theg pa che chung la sogs pa rnams / ma rtogs log rtogs the tshom gsum gyis skyon bsal ba'i phyir 'dzam bu gling gi rgyan drug la sogs pa rnams kyis bstan bcos dpag tu med pa rnams brtsams pa las / bye brag tu slob dpon phyogs kyi glang pos tshad ma kun la btus pa rtsam / de'i slob ma dbang phyug sde zhes bya ba byung / de'i slob ma slob dpon chos kyi grags pa yin te / des tshad ma sde bdun [230] la sogs pas tshad ma'i bstan chos chen mo rnams brtsams pa yin gsungs / de la tshad ma ni sngon rgya gar du mu stegs pa dang grub mtha'rtsod pas phyir brtsam pss mu stigs pa dang thun mongs yin la / sngon bla ma rngog [lo] tsa ba des mu stegs skal ldan rgyal po la tshad ma gsan pa yin pas / mu stegs kyi shag rgod zer ste / nang pa'i chos su mi 'dod pa yin pa la / 'dir rje'i dgongs pa ni / tshad ma thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes yin par bzhed do / de'i rgyun mtshan gang yin na / tshad ma zhes bya ba ni mi bslu ba yin te / lha dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten na tshad mar gyur pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das yin / de skad du yang slob dpon phyogs kyi glang pos / tshad ma gyur pa'i 'gro la phan bzhed pa / ston pa bder gshegs skyob la phyag 'tshal te / bdag gi gzhung lugs cung zad 'thor ba dag / bsdu bar bya phyir kun las btus pa brtsams / ces pas / tshad ma de bzhin gshegs pa nyag cig yin / de thams cad mkhyen pa yin / de mi bslu ba yin / de nges pa yin / de la 'dir tshad ma gtan la phabs pa de ni yang dag shes pa bya ba yin te / gnas skabs su don dang ldan pa'i blo cung zad nas bzung ste / mthar thug skyon thams cad dag cing yon tan yongs su rdzogs pas sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das kyi ye shes man chad yang dag pa'i shes pa la brten nas 'grubs ste / dpal chos kyi grags pas tshad ma rnams nges kyi dbur / phan pa dang mi phan ba thob pa dang spong ba'i sngon du yang dag gi shes pa 'gro ba can yin pa'i phyir / de mi shes pa'i sems can rnams kyis don du bdag gis 'di brtsams bor / zhes gsungs pas / lam la 'jug pa'i dus su yang dag gi shes pas spang bar bya ba rnams spang shing / bsgrub par bya ba rnams bsgrub ste / dgag bsgrub kyi bslab pa tshul khrims rnam par dag pa la zhugs pas / de la rten nas tshul khrims kyi

*phung po yongs su rdzogs par 'gyur / de la brten nas ting nge 'dzin la
sogs pa zag pa med pa'i phung po lnga'am / gzhan yang sangs rgyas
kyi ye shes sam yon tan mtha' yas pa rnams ci lta ba bzhin du rdzogs
shing mkhyen pa'i gnyis dang ldan pa'i bde bar gshegs pa [231] de
ni yang dag pa'i shes pa dang rjes su 'brel ba / de las byung ba de
nyid mthar thug pa yin la / yang dag pa'i shes pa mthar thug pa ni
bcom ldan 'das kyis mkhyen pa'i ye shes yin la / de ltar na tshad mas
gtan la phebs pas 'bras bu yang dag gi shes pa la brten nas skyon
ma lus pa spang ba dang yon tan mtha' dag bsgrub pa yin te / tha na
ltog pa zas zos pas / phan par shes pa dud 'gro yan chad la yod pas
/ de lta bu'i shes pa ni yang dag gi shes pa'i thams cad mkhyen pa'i
cha shas su 'gro la / mthar thug mkhyen pa rnam pa gnyis kyang yang
dag pa'i shes pa mtha' dag gi yongs su rdzogs pa'i bdag nyid yin pas
/ log shes spang la yang dag gi shes pas gnas skabs dang mthar thug
gi skyon spong ba dang yon tan bsgrub pa la 'jug pa'i phyir tshad
ma thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes dngos yin gsungs / de ltar thugs la
bzhag nas / tshad ma'i chos tha' dag la dad cing yid ches par bya'o
gsungs / + yang rje rin po che'i zhal snga nas / tshad ma'i 'bras bu
chos nyid stong pa nyid ston pa yin gsungs / de yang tshad ma 'di mu
stegs kyi rigs byed dang mthun mong yin pa'i phyir / de la 'bras med
pas chos nyid mi rtogs zer zhing / sngon pan tri ta dza ya a nan ta bya
bas rtog gi rig pas tho ba zhes pa'i bstan chos brtsams pa las / tshad
mas de nyid rtogs so zhes / chos kyi grags pa'i rjes 'brang bas / rtog
ge pa rnams smra bar byed / ces pa la sog pa tshad ma'i de nyid mi
stong pa'i tshul dbu ma'i chos nyid rtogs pa'i tshul mang po bkod pa
yod de / tshad ma la 'bras bu med par 'dod pa yod mod kyis / 'dir
rje'i dgongs pa ltar na / tshad ma'i dgongs pa chos nyid phyag rgya
chen por bzhed do // de yang tshad ma la rjes dpag dang / mngon sum
gnyis las / rjes dpag tshad ma la rtag gsum yin te / med pa med par
bsgrub pa ma dmigs pa'i rtags dang / yod pa yod par bsgrub pa rang
bzhin gyi rtags dang / rgyus 'bras bu dpag pa 'bras bu'i rtags zhes
zer ro // mngon sum tshad ma la bzhi te / dbang po mngon sum [232]
dang yid kyi mngon sum gnyis kyis yul lnga mngon sum du byed la /
rang rig mngon sum dang rnal 'byor mngom sum gnyis kyis zhu gnas
dang lhag mthong gi ting nge 'dzin bsgrub pa'i tshul dang / ting nge
'dzin gnyis po des chos nyid rtogs pa thams cad mthun / de'i phyir
yang tshad ma'i chos nyid rtogs par nges la / dpal chos kyi grags pas
/ rnam 'grel gyi mchod brjod las / rtogs pa'i dra ba rnam gsal zhing
/ zab cing rgya che'i sku mnga' ba / kun tu bzang po'o 'od zer dag /
kun nas 'phro la phyag 'tshal lo / zhes gsungs pa de ni / phyag rgya
chen po yon tan gyi bdag nyid yin pa de'i don yin gsungs / yang /*

gang gi don du rnam brtags nas / de yi don du de dngos med / gang
 gi phyir na de dag la / cig dang du ma'i rang bzhin med / ces gsungs
 te / 'di yi don dang dbu ma'i don la bye brag cung zad kyang med
 / gal te tshad ma la 'bras bu med du zin na / tshad ma'i bstan chos
 rtsom mkhan slob dpon phyogs kyi glang pos / dpal chos kyi grags pa
 la sogs pa 'dzam bu gling gi brgyan drug gi nang du bcom ldan 'das
 kyis cis phyir lung ston / des na 'di lta bu'i blo dang ngag phyin ci
 log gi rjes su mi 'brang bar / ston pa de bzhin gshegs pas lung bstan
 pas rgyal ba'i bstan pa gsal bar byed pa slob dpon phyogs glang yab
 sras dang de dag gis brtsams pa'i bstan chos de dag la mos gus rgya
 chen po bya'o gsungs /.

APPENDIX B:

mtsho dang mtsho phran khyab rom dbyings kyi tshogs // gru bzhi'i
 zlung po zla gam zur gsum sogs // rno dang brtul dang srab dang mthug
 sogs pa'i // [199v] dbyibs kyi khyad par sna tshogs srid tshad rnams //
 rang dbang med par mtsho chen chu klung du // dus cig phyams kyis
 zhu ba de bzhin no // lan tshwa'i kha dog dbyibs sogs ji snyed rnams
 // chu la thim te ma lus chu ru rdzogs // de nyid gdul bya'i don du
 thub pa yi // gzugs skur gdul bya gang dang gang 'dul la // s[o] s[o]r
 sna tshogs byon te sangs rgyas ras // drangs shing drangs shing bde
 la 'god par nges // gdul bya'i khams dang bsam pa bsam mi khyab //
 thub pa'i sku dang ye shes bsam mi khyab // gsung gi 'phrin las theg
 mtha' zad pa med // 'phags pa lang kar bshegs pa'i mdo las kyang // ji
 srid 'du shes ma zad bar // theg pa'i mtha' la zad pa med // ces gsungs
 pas / 'o skol rang cag chos dang chos min zhes / khyad du mi bsad ris
 su mi bcad cing // thams cad thub dbang sras bcas rnam 'gyur du //
 shes par gyis shing mi spang khur bgyi'o // [200r] gzigs dang dge ba'i
 bshes gnyen ji tsam du // mkhyen pa che ba'i mtha' thug thams cad
 dang // sgom chen bzang dgu rtogs pa mtho dgu sogs // thams cad ma
 lus kun gyis bon la ni // ras chod mdzad pa'i sdig kham chen po la //
 sdig du ma mthong spong ba rnams la gzigs // ma mthong g. yang sa
 chen por phyong phod pa // 'o skol bon la 'ang ras chod mi bgyi'o //
 thub dbang sras bcas 'phrin las zad pa med / rnam par snang mdzad
 mngon byang rgyud las kyang // mu stegs can la smad mi bya // mu
 stegs can la smad gyur na // rnam par snang mdzad ring ba'ri rgyu //
 zhes gsungs so // mu stegs kyi gzhung lugs thams cad kyang yang dag
 par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das nyid rgyal po rkang pa
 brgyad pa'i sras su sku skye ba bzhes pa'i tshul bstan nas / mu stegs
 kyi gzhung lugs thams cad gsungs pa yin te / sangs rgyas pa'i che ba

*gdon pa dang // [200v] 'di lta bu yang srid do // zhes bya ba thams
cad mkhyen pa'i dgongs gzhi bsam gyis mi khyab pa yin // ris su bcad
nas smad du mi rung pa lags so // sangs rgyas dang byang chub sems
dpa'i rnam 'gyur sems can la phan gdags pa'i ched du la la bon por
snang / la la gsas po dang gsas mo la sogs par snang mo mar snang /
cha bar snang / mu stegs par snang / khyim par snang / rab tu byung
bar snang / sngags par snang / rnal 'byor gyi cha byad du snang /
'dul bar 'dzin par snang / nyan thos su snang / rang sangs rgyas su
snang / byang chub sems dpar snang / lam la slob par snang / mos pa
spyod pa'i sa par snang ...*

NOTES

* Dedicated to a friend, Dagkar Geshe Namgyal Nyima, with best wishes for a happy and productive future. Thanks are due to the *Senter for høyere studier* in Oslo for providing the necessary leisure in a stimulating environment. This paper was first written for presentation at the Bonpo Kanjur Seminar held in Atnsjøen, Norway, on June 1, 1996.

¹ Compare the discussion of polemic in Cabezón 1995: 646–648, with which I substantially agree, although it will be important to be aware that when I use the term ‘polemical tradition’ in what follows I am referring primarily to a corpus of Tibetan literature dealing with disputed issues of history, textual authenticity and religious ideas that go together with practices, and not the corpus of Tibetan literature, as discussed by Cabezón, concerned with disputed philosophical or ‘Buddhalogical’ points, and this remains true despite the fact that we might find something to say about matters that could be deemed ‘philosophical’ along the way.

² It is probable that the immediate source of inspiration for the term ‘Single Intention’ (Dgongs-gcig) was Phag-mo-gru-pa, since he frequently uses this or very similar terms in his works (without, however, forming a system of thought around it), and in his collection of *sūtra* citations called the *Mdo Lung Rin-chen Dpungs-pa*, he cites scriptures in support of the Buddha’s singularity of intention (Phag-mo-gru-pa 1507: III 217r).

³ Das 1881 includes Tibetan-script text and translation of Thu’u-bkwan’s polemic. Das gives the mistaken dates 1674 to 1740 for Thu’u-bkwan, and his translation is often problematic. Most disturbingly, the final passage about Bonpo monks being lovers of wine and women has crept into the body of the translation without finding any place in the Tibetan text (he also neglected to translate the difficult closing verses). A German translation and a transcription of the Tibetan text appeared in Hoffmann 1950: 328–338, 415–419; these are in many ways preferable to those of Das.

⁴ Thu’u-bkwan 1984: 378–390. Thu’u-bkwan Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-nyi-ma (1737–1802) was an important religious leader of the Dge-lugs-pa school with close links to the Manchu court. In Martin 1991: 170–173, I have demonstrated that, aside from severely condensed paraphrases of the single Bon text he had in hand, his polemic does little more than reproduce the words of previous anti-Bon polemicists. Thu’u-bkwan had no privileged or personal knowledge about the subject on which he was writing, but rather like any good scholar, he based himself primarily on a selected group of old ‘authorities’.

⁵ See Norbu 1995: 39–42, and for the Tibetan text behind the translation, see

Norbu 1989: 113–116, or see Martin 1991: 204–223, with Tibetan script edition on pp. 319–335.

⁶ Thus, the *Khog-dbub* (Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 211) suggests that two, and occasionally even three, statements were combined together into a single statement.

⁷ Roerich 1976: 598, 596–602, and especially pp. 606–607.

⁸ In a work composed in 1516 (Zhwa-dmar 1992:6), the *Khog-dbub* appears to be attributed to Rdo-rje-shes-rab. The exact nature of his ‘authorship’ is not so easily ascertained. The exact words used by Zhwa-dmar are *gzhung-du byas*, ‘made into text[s].’ Rdo-rje-shes-rab, a disciple of both ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po and Dbon Shes-rab-’byung-gnas, was clearly the compiler of the huge mass of textual materials included in the single generally-available version of the two (or even possibly three) original versions of the *Single Intention* (Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990 and several other modern reprint editions of the *Rdor-she-ma*. For the sake of those who may have at hand other versions of the *Dgongs-gcig Yig-cha* than Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990, I have generally made reference to the numbers of the clusters and Vajra Statements so that they can locate them in their own editions).

⁹ ‘The Presence’ (*zhal-snga* or *spyang-snga*) is a respectful way to refer to one’s teacher in early ‘Bri-gung-pa tradition. The identity of the person has to be inferred from the identity of the speaker. Hence, when Dbon Shes-rab-’byung-gnas is speaking, ‘The Presence’ means ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po. When his own disciples (including the compilers of the *Single Intention* collections) are speaking, it means Dbon Shes-rab-’byung-gnas. Nevertheless, the epithet *Spyan-snga* has come to form a permanent part of some proper names. For further explanation on this point, see Padma’i-rgyal-mtshan 1989: 87, where we also find discussion of the following confusing facts of early ‘Bri-gung-pa nomenclature. When ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po Rin-chen-dpal went into the presence of his teacher Phag-mo-gru-pa, he would address the latter as Lord of the Triple Universe (‘Jig-rten-gsum-gyi-mgon-po) and Precious Protection (Skyob-pa Rin-po-che), and this is why later on the disciples of ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po would apply these names to ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po. Also, some Tibetans mistook the name *Spyan-snga* ‘Bri-gung-gling-pa for one of the names of ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po, when in fact it is a name of Dbon Shes-rab-’byung-gnas.

¹⁰ Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 205. The passage reads as follows: *de la brgya Inga bcu pa tshan pa bzhi po de gung bsgrigs pa’i khog nas spyang snga nyid kyi gsung dang ‘gal ba med par rtsa ba’i tshig brgya Inga bcu byas pa la / lhag ma Inga bcu po de mnan nas lhan thabs su byas nas tshig tha dad du bstan pa de bshad pas ...*

¹¹ One of these is Zhwa-dmar 1992: 8–46, although it is not especially detailed.

¹² ‘Cluster’ translated *tshoms*. See the *Khog-dbub* text contained in Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 219. The sources also often speak of an eighth cluster, the *zhal-gdams* cluster. As suggested by the name, this refers to ‘oral precepts’ (*zhal-gdams*) that never formed part of the written text.

¹³ See Padma-dkar-po 1973: IV 457–459. We have to read for Padma-dkar-po’s *Rong-shes-ma* rather *Rdor-shes-ma* (or *Rdor-she-ma* or *Rdo-she-ma*, since these forms also occur). Padma-dkar-po also mentions the *Rin-byang-ma* (see the following notes).

¹⁴ There is a brief biographical note about him contained in Padma’i-rgyal-mtshan 1989: 105, which basically says that he was disciple of both Rje Skyob-pa Rin-po-che (i.e., ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po) and *Spyan-snga* Shes-’byung (i.e., Shes-rab-’byung-gnas), and that he composed the *Single Intention* commentary called *Rdo-she-ma*. The same source says that the *Rin-byang-ma* was composed by a younger brother of *Spyan-snga* Sher-’byung, who is there called Thub-pa Bsod-snyoms-pa and Rin-chen-byang-chub.

¹⁵ This may be known from the text of the commentary to the second cluster, which bears the title *Kun-la Phan-pa Rten-’brel-gyi Gnad* as found in Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 506, where we find the date Fire Female Hare (*me mo yos*, corresponding to a date 1812 years after the Buddha’s death according to the Paṇ-chen system. Since the

chronology of Kha-che Paṅ-chen Shākya-shīrī is the one referred to, and according to this system the death of the Buddha took place in 544 B.C., the calculations work out perfectly to the year 1267. Of course, the commentaries to the other clusters could have been written in other years, but for the moment at least, I think we may date the entire text of the collection of Rdo-rje-shes-rab's commentaries to the year 1267. At the end of the commentary on the final cluster, we do find a colophon that mentions Rdo-rje-shes-rab's authorship (it says that he 'compiled and wrote it down', *bsdus nas bris*), and this does seem to be the colophon for the whole seven-part collection of commentaries. The accompanying story collections do not seem to contain any statement of authorship. The opening verses of the story collection for the first cluster pay homage to Rgyal-sras Rdor-she (i.e., Rdo-rje-shes-rab; see Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 460), from which it would appear that the story collections were put together by a follower of Rdo-rje-shes-rab, and might therefore be a generation or so later. I would nevertheless suggest that the story collections largely go back to the public lectures on the *Single Intention* given by Shes-rab-'byung-gnas in the later years of his life (although many of the stories themselves are of course much more deeply rooted in Buddhist history).

¹⁶ See Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 128 *et passim*. This is in the context of the 1535 biography by 'Bri-gung Rin-chen-phun-tshogs.

¹⁷ Both versions of the *Single Intention* are compared in Zhwa-dmar 1992. I recently obtained from a private source in Lhasa a photographic copy of a cursive manuscript of the *Rin-byang-ma* (see the bibliography under Rin-chen-byang-chub, n.d.). The final colophon says (at 290v.5) that the author is Bo-dhi'i mtshan-can ldom-bu-pa ('mendicant having the name Bodhi'; evidently Bodhi is for the *byang-chub* in the name Rin-chen-byang-chub). It is interesting that Zhwa-dmar 1992: 7, supplies for the *Rin-byang-ma* the title: *Zab-chos Dgongs-pa Gcig-pa'i Zin-bris Bstan-bcos Nor-bu Rin-po-che'i Rigs Mtha'-dag Ma-tshang-ba Med-pa'i Gter-mdzod Bsam-gyis-mi-khyab-pa*.

¹⁸ These examples taken from Zhwa-dmar 1992.

¹⁹ But see *Rdor-she-ma* cluster 5, Vajra Statement no. 16, where the term *khyad-chos* is used in a negative sense.

²⁰ Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta 1987: 71.

²¹ Roerich 1976: 606. See also Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 122–123.

²² It is not often thought to question how it is that Tibetans were able to integrate these three realms of Buddhist ideas and practices within *each one* of their sects. In China, sects formed around particular *sūtras* and *śāstras*, or groups of the same, and *tantra* formed a school of its own. I suggest that Tibetan discussions about the three vows, which are always about *how* they go together, never about *if* they go together, may provide clues that would help us explain the very different evolutions of sect formations in Tibet and China. (But it is also possible that what really requires explanation is the Tibetan tendency to put together into one comprehensive system a broad array of practices that would have been kept separate, or performed individually, in India. See Bentor 1995, who finds an example of this tendency in the Tibetan practice of depositing relics, etc., in *mchod-rtens*.)

²³ The title is *Three Vows, Garland of Light* (*Sdom Gsum 'Od-kyi Phreng-ba*). It is embedded in Go-ram-pa Bsod-nams-seng-ge's *Sdom Gsum Rab-dbye'i Spyī Don Yid-bzhin-nor-bu* as contained in: *Sa-skya-pa'i Bka'-'bum* 1968: XIV 199.4.1–240.3.4, at 228.1.1–229.3.4. Vibhūticandra's work was also published separately in India under the title *Sdom Gsum 'Od-kyi Phreng-ba*, by Mkhan-po Ngag-dbang-chos-grags & Ye-shes-chos-dar (Varanasi 1968), in 6 folios. For a study of this work, see Stearns 1996. Many Tibetans have questioned whether or not Vibhūticandra should in fact be regarded as the author.

²⁴ See the first cluster, number 24: *sdom pa gsum po dge ba dang mi dge ba so*

sor nyams su len par 'dod pa mang mod kyi / 'dir ni sdom pa gsum spang bya mi dge ba'i phyogs spong bar gnad gcig tu bzhed do (Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 158). "There are many who would have it that the moralities (lit., 'virtues and nonvirtues') pertaining to the three sets of vows are undertaken separately. Here we say that the things to be renounced in the three vows are identical in their vital points, that one needs to renounce what pertains to nonvirtue." The word *gnad*, like the Sanskrit word *marman* it is used to translate, is from medical vocabulary, even if it is used analogically in non-medical contexts. It means a weak or otherwise vulnerable point within the general structure of the organism, injury to which is bound to debilitate the whole. *Gnad* seems to be etymologically rooted in the verb *gnod*, 'injure'. That the virtues do not change in any way when the higher vows have been taken is stressed in several later Vajra Statements (references given below).

²⁵ Karma-'phrin-las-pa 1975: 125, *skabs 'dir'chad tshul tha dad kyang // sdom gsum ngo bo gcig par sa 'bri mthun*.

²⁶ Bon is almost entirely based on scriptures received through *gter-ma* revelations, and scriptures believed to have remained in an unbroken transmission from Tazik or Zhangzhung form only a very small part of the hundreds of volumes of the Bon canon. The stories told in the anti-Bon polemic in the *Single Intention* particularly intend for us to draw conclusions in favor of the inauthenticity of Bon texts found in the ground.

²⁷ These quotes are from Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta 1987: 139–140 – *gter nas byung ba'i glegs bam dang // gzhan nas brkus pa'i chos lugs dang // brtsams chos dang ni rmi lam chos // blo bzung ma yi chos lugs la // rdo rje 'chang la brgyud pa snyeg // de la'ang gzhan dag lung len pa // chos dang 'gal ba smos ci dgos // rang tshig dang yang 'gal ba yin ... gal te gdod nas med pa'i chos // glo bur byas pa yin na ni // kun gyis rang bzor go ba'i phyir // sangs rgyas pa'am mu stegs byed // su la 'dug kyang dor bya yin*.

²⁸ This is the first Vajra Statement of the sixth cluster. Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 170 – *'ga'zhig ni chos rgyud pa med par 'byung ba dang / sa chos /gnam chos / gter ma la sogs pa zab cing ngo mtshar bar 'dod pa yin mod kyi / 'dir ni rgyud pa las brgyud pa'i chos zab cing ngo mtshar bar bzhed do*.

²⁹ See Jackson 1994a: 102–107 *et passim*. Tibetan texts call this dual system of 'authority' in short form *lung rtogs gnyis*.

³⁰ See 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1967: IV 408. Other discussions in II 21, 102. Here the idea is clearly credited to Phag-mo-gru-pa. For an explanation of how the Four Truth Tests provide a basic framework for the discussion of each of the Vajra Statements in the *Single Intention*, see the *Khog-dhub* as contained in Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 238. See also the end of the commentary on the seventh and final cluster (pp. 1101–1102). For a fairly similar set of Three Truth-tests ("authenticators of method," *tshad-ma rnam-pa gsum*) in a Bon text, the *Gal Mdo*, see Klein & Wangyal 1995: 779: These are "scripture (*lung*), direct speech (*man-ngag*) and one's own innate awareness (*rang-gi rig-pa*)." Here 'direct speech' means the meditative precepts of one's teacher, and therefore closely corresponds to no. 2, the truth-test of the experience of the Vajra Master. A quite similar, but not identical, formulation is found in another quite early Bon scripture (apparently revealed in the 11th century) on the life of Lord Shenrab, the *Mdo 'Dus* 1985: 140: "Not being misleading, the Word of the Gshen is *tshad-ma*. For certain attainment, the scriptures [scriptural authorizations?] of the Well Gone Ones are *tshad-ma*. For certain realization, the self-dawning awareness is *tshad-ma*. Hear the scriptural Word of truth of the Three *Tshad-ma*." *bslu ba med pa gshen bka' tshad ma yin / nges par rnyed pa bder gshegs lung tshad ma yin / nges par rtogs pa rang shar rigs pa tshad ma yin / tshad ma gsum 'i bden pa'i bka' lung nyon* (cf. pp. 146, 230).

³¹ Or logical reasoning or 'logic' under the cloak of (the philosophical enterprise of) epistemology employing logic. The most general, but also the most provocative

and entertaining, survey of the history of academic views on the place of logic in Buddhism is written by someone who gives logic a very big place indeed; see the introductory chapters of Hayes 1988. The current flurry of scholarly publications was apparently initiated by Steinkellner 1983, which cites a number of earlier studies on the problems associated with integrating (or not integrating) Indian logic with Buddhism, and discusses the term *tshad-mar gyur-pa* as an epithet of Buddha (compare Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 1067). For a brief but lucid historical survey of the Indian *pramāṇa* tradition, see Steinkellner 1993. Lipman 1992 has an interesting discussion of *tshad-ma*, although by far the most relevant discussions for our purposes are Jackson 1994, which includes a bibliography of works that have addressed the role of logic in Buddhism, and Jackson 1993, pp. 175–219. There is also quite an important discussion of *tshad-ma* (including the question of the ‘authority’ [*tshad-ma*] of scriptures and treatises), together with a historical sketch of the literature, in Ye-shes-dbang-phyug 1989. In a gross way we might draw out three possible positions: 1) The Buddhist goal of Enlightenment is not aided in any way by logic, and is likely to be impeded by it. 2) Logical thinking helps out on the Path to Enlightenment to a greater or lesser degree at one stage or another. 3) The philosophical enterprise employing strict logic defines Buddhism and constitutes its only allowable method for attaining Enlightenment. The history of Tibetan sectarian discussions and their modern interpretations takes place within the second gross position, with very few arguable exceptions (the primary exception being those modern interpreters who want very much to portray the Buddha as a pure philosopher who sat under the Bodhi Tree and thought very hard employing standard logical procedures, these same interpreters being most quick to object whenever anyone ventures to apply the word ‘religion’ to Buddhism in their eagerness to excommunicate at a stroke the vast majority of the Buddhists of all times).

³² In Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 157, as follows: *tshad ma ni mu stegs kyi rigs byed dang thun mong du gyur pas sangs rgyas kyi chos su mi 'gyur bar 'dod pa yod mod kyi / 'dir ni tshad ma sangs rgyas kyi mkhyen pa'i ye shes su bzhed do*. See Kuijp 1987, which contains a translation of this Vajra Statement. Note that the word *Tīrthika* itself, no matter how hallowed by long Buddhist usage, was originally a polemical appellation along the lines of ‘Quakers’ and ‘Shakers’; it means someone who goes to bathe in sacred places (the Tibetan translation *mu-stegs-pa* must mean ‘steps’, *stegs*, at the ‘edge’ *mu*, referring to the bathing *ghāts* at Varanasi and other sacred places, which are generally provided with broad steps leading down to the water level), thus calling the whole after one remarkable religious practice highly visible to even the most distant or casual observer.

³³ These are located in Rin-chen-byang-chub n.d.: fols. 229–232. These are numbers 14 and 15 of the fifth cluster. It is important to note that the *Rin-byang-ma* arranges the seven clusters in a different order, and the internal order of the Vajra Statements in each cluster also differs from that of the *Rdor-sher-ma*.

³⁴ A glossary of numeric categories (Dkon-mchog-'jigs-med-dbang-po 1992: 94) says that, of these seven treatises, three are considered to be body-like. These three are the ‘extensive’ *Tshad-ma Rnam-'grel* (*Pramāṇavārtika*), the ‘intermediate-length’ *Tshad-ma Rnam-nges* (*Pramāṇaviniścaya*), and the ‘abbreviated’ *Tshad-ma'i Rigs Thigs* (*Nyāyabindu*). The remaining four are said to be limb-like: the *Gtan-tshigs Thigs-pa* (*Hetubindu*), the '*Brel-ba Brtag-pa* (*Sambandhaparikṣa*), the *Rgyud Gzhan Sgrub-pa* (*Samtānāntarasiddhi*) and the *Rtsod-pa'i Rigs-pa* (*Vādanyāya*). For a long list of references to these works, including studies and translations, see Jackson 1993: 110.

³⁵ Compare also the opening verse of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* as translated in Taranātha 1990: 183, where we find the translation ‘personified Logic’ for the epithet *tshad-mar gyur-pa*. Ye-shes-dbang-phyug 1989: 58 tells us that this epithet signifies

the Buddha's 'personal authority' (*skyes-bu tshad-ma*) as an impartial and truth-telling mediator (*gzhan-gyi dpang-por 'os-pa-ste blo gzu-bor gnas-pa'i mi-zhig-la zer*).

³⁶ *Mkhyen-pa gnyis* means knowing things in all their multiplicity (*ji-snyed-pa mkhyen-pa*) and knowing how things actually are (*ji-lta-ba mkhyen-pa*), the first means that the Buddha continues to comprehend conventional ways of knowing, the second means ultimate truth. These terms will prove their significance shortly.

³⁷ On this Kashmiri philosopher, who spent some time as National Preceptor of the land of the Tanguts, and on the work to be cited presently, see Kuijp 1993 and Dash 1993.

³⁸ On these four kinds of direct perception *tshad-ma*, see Jackson 1993: 123; for all practical purposes, the Pramāṇa School limited itself to the first two.

³⁹ For the text, see Appendix A.

⁴⁰ Elsewhere in the text, 'precious moral discipline' would appear to specify the morality of the post-Enlightenment phase, to be distinguished for that reason and only that reason from the morality that leads up to Enlightenment.

⁴¹ Both commentaries are careful to advise us that this doesn't mean a cessation that is a result of renouncing or abandoning things, but a realization that from primordial times it has never undergone any defilement.

⁴² For other sources on the Ten Strengths, with minor variations on the wording and order, see Dkon-mchog-'jigs-med-dbang-po 1992: 150; Mvy. nos. 119–129 (including the Sanskrit forms); Rigzin 1993: 134. There is also an enlightening discussion in Thrangu 1988: 106–109. The Ten Strengths are known in the *Eight Thousand Prajñāpāramitā*, although they are not individually listed there, and the terms for the two Knowledges are absent. A listing of the Ten Strengths is found, for example, in the *Lalitavistara Sūtra*, chapter 26.

⁴³ This series of [1] moral discipline, [2] contemplative concentrations and [3] Insight, is quite an old one in Buddhism. It may be located in the *Eight Thousand Prajñāpāramitā*, and seems to be the older formulation on which the Six Pāramitās are themselves based (see Hallisey 1987). However, the text of the *Eight Thousand* never gives priority to moral discipline, which is always preceded by something else, almost invariably generosity. In the Prajñāpāramitā texts in general, Insight reigns supreme, while the five other Pāramitās are sometimes said to be 'preliminaries' for it. Moral discipline is never singled out as being more basic than the other four, neither is it placed 'beyond' Insight as it is here. It would certainly help if we could identify the source of the citation.

⁴⁴ The colophon, although not composed by the author himself, gives the name of the author as 'Bri-gung-gling-pa, which is one of the names of Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas. The text is located in Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 133–151. Note that this same title is used in the colophon to the commentary on the seven clusters by Rdo-rje-shes-rab.

⁴⁵ The full set of verses is found at Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 139, which reads: *sdig pa ci yang mi bya ste // dge ba phun sum tshogs par spyad // rang gi sems ni yongs su gdul // 'di ni sangs rgyas bstan pa yin // lus kyi sdom pa legs pa ste // ngag gi sdom pa legs pa yin // yid kyi sdom pa legs pa ste // thams cad du ni sdom pa legs // kun tu bsdams pa'i dge slong ni // sdig pa kun las yongs su grol // ngag rnam bsrung zhing yid kyi rab bsdams te // lus kyi mi dge ba ngag [dag] mi byed cing // las lam gsum po 'di dag rab skyangs na // drang srong gsungs pa'i lam ni thob par 'gyur*. Prebish 1980: 241–242, gives a set of verses as constituting the original core of the Vinaya code. The content of Prebish's verses and 'Jig-rten-mgon-po' verses overlap (the part italicized in the following quote corresponds very closely). Prebish's translation reads: "Enduring patience is the highest austerity;/ nirvāṇa is the highest say the Buddhas;/ for he who injures others is not a monk;/ he who violates others is not a śrāmaṇa;/ Not to do any evil, to attain good;/ to purify one's own mind; this is

the Teaching of the Buddhas./ Not speaking against others, not harming others,/ and restraint according to the Prātimokṣa,/ moderation in eating, secluded dwelling,/ and the practice of *adhicitta*; this is the Teaching of the Buddhas.” This is a rare example of modern Buddhology agreeing with pre-modern Buddhists, although Prebish sees his verses as the historical origins and core of the Vinaya. ’Jig-rten-mgon-po saw his very similar verses as historical origin and continuing core of the whole realm of Buddha’s message, excluding nothing.

⁴⁶ ‘Past masters’ translates *bla-ma gong-ma*, which in this context probably refers specifically to the past Bka’-brgyud-pa teachers (most likely Sgam-po-pa and Phag-mo-gru-pa, both of whom were monks).

⁴⁷ In the *Rdor-sher-ma* commentaries, cluster 2, Vajra Statement no. 11 argues for the single identity of the ‘divine customs’ (*lha-chos*) of Buddhist discipline with the ‘human customs’ (*mi-chos*) of the sixteen laws. Cluster 2, no. 13 argues, perhaps rather unexpectedly, that there are those who train in Insight before training in moral discipline (but note in this connection that ’Jig-rten-mgon-po became a monk only in his later years, after a long period of Buddhist studies). Almost all of the 20 Vajra Statements of cluster 3 are about moral discipline. In cluster 4, Vajra Statement no. 7 argues that there is no possibility for Bodhisattvas to engage in non-virtue, even as a stratagem, a ‘skilful means’, an idea continued in nos. 9 and 10. In cluster 5, Vajra Statements nos. 21–24 insist on upholding moral discipline in the conduct of the Vajrayāna. Cluster 5, Vajra Statement no. 11, says that action divorced from acceptance and rejection is ‘precious moral discipline’ (*tshul-khrimsd rin-po-che*). No. 12 argues that Mahāmudrā and moral discipline are identical. Nos. 19–20 insist that upholding moral precepts takes precedence over the tantric ‘activities’ (which might include drinking, consuming disgusting substances, sexual libertinism, etc.), and that nothing about Vajrayāna makes it possible to turn a non-virtue into a virtue. Moral discipline also surfaces in the commentarial arguments of other Vajra Statements that would not seem on the face of things to have much to do with it.

⁴⁸ See Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 1062, which says that the Buddha’s Total Knowledge is outside the purview of thinking (*sangs-rgyas-kyi ye-shes ni blo’i yul-las ’das-pa yin*), which clearly makes it an inappropriate ‘objective’ of thinking, whether of the logical or any other kind, and notice also the discussion of Total Knowledge that opens on p. 1054, and of *tshad-ma* on p. 1066 ff.

⁴⁹ At dawn, when all the obstructions to omniscience and all the *kleśas* were incinerated by the fire of Total Knowledge of His Vajra-like Samādhi. See Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 1059.

⁵⁰ To belabour the obvious, without the Enlightenment experience, both as past event and future possibility, there is nothing to which the Four Truth-tests might guide us. Making the necessary adjustments to account for other differences, I would still see a certain similarity in the dynamic of medieval Christianity, as portrayed in Russell 1992: 10, “Underneath the struggle between dissent and order lay the question of authority. Christian belief has always rested on four main pillars: tradition, the Bible, personal experience, and reason. All authority ultimately comes from God, but who legitimately mediates that authority to the people?” See also p. 36, “The sources of Christian authority are the Bible, tradition, experience, and reason.” The first three authorities in this last quote correspond quite closely in content to the four authorities of Phag-mo-gru-pa. In making this perilous cross-cultural comparison, the absence of ‘reasoning’ in the latter becomes all the more striking. It is interesting to read the chapter ‘The Authority of Scripture’ in Cabezón 1994: 89–112, in light of Single Intentionists’ primary emphasis on scripture as source of true guidance, as a *pramāṇa*. Cabezón notes that “The Buddhist Prāmāṇika have ... rejected the understanding of scriptural testimony (*śabda*) as a third *pramāṇa*” (p. 98). See also Cabezón 1981: 8. Nevertheless, one does find “the three *pramāṇa*” (*tshad-ma gsum*), of which the third is that of scripture (*lung-gi tshad-ma*), in the *Sandhinirmocana*

Sūtra, the tenth and final chapter. For the Single Intentionists, scripture is first in the list.

⁵¹ Jackson 1994: 99.

⁵² The text of the citation in Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 956–957: *rje phang mo gru pas rin chen them skas las // rten gyi gang zag de rnams las* [i.e., *la*] *// lta ba tha dad sna tshogs su // rang gi rig pas nges gyur kyang // bsgoms pas go rtogs mi 'byung bas // lta ba rtogs pa dang bral ba yin / ces gsungs pas ...* This agrees with the reading in Phag-mo-gru-pa 1507: II 159v (or for a more accessible text, compare Phag-mo-gru-pa 1976: 184–185). In the context of the *Single Intention*, as well as in the work of Phag-mo-gru-pa which it cites, there is a brief summary of a number of non-Buddhist and Buddhist philosophical schools, very much like a *siddhanta*, ending with three type of Mādhyamika schools.

⁵³ Phag-mo-gru-pa 1507: II 158r; the immediately following quote is at 160r. It is true that Dharmakīrti probably would not have insisted that logical method in itself can result in any high religious goal. On this point, see Jackson 1993: 106. He was, nonetheless, confident that the validity of these goals can be demonstrated (*not realized*) through rational arguments. Although Dharmakīrti could not, evidently, serve as a valid target of his remarks, in general Phag-mo-gru-pa loved the poetry and inspiration of the scriptures, and especially of the sūtras, while in equal degree he disdained the dry pontificating and hairsplitting of the treatises (*śāstra*); see Phag-mo-gru-pa 1976: 172–173. Phag-mo-gru-pa saw that rational argumentation, if bolstered by an idea that it is effective for achieving spiritual goals, becomes an all-consuming profession that takes away the energy and time for the meditation that can lead to a direct experience of the truth, not just a weak or strong rationalization for the same. He, and Sgam-po-pa before him, believed that the pride felt by philosophers in their rational formulations could form a serious block to spiritual growth (although we might add, in a spirit of cynicism, that pride is a failing to which meditators themselves are evidently quite prone).

⁵⁴ The meditation imperative is strongly expressed, for example, in the context of a public Dharma session in Phag-mo-gru-pa 1507: III 159r: “One may practice learning and reflection for aeons, but without meditating one will not obtain Buddhahood. Hence meditation is necessary.” Phag-mo-gru-pa goes on to cite scriptural similes of the raftsmen who perishes in the lake even though he could take many other people across, of the deaf musician who pleases others with his music without ever hearing it, and the blind painter.

⁵⁵ This latter point is made most clearly in Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 995, “Generally, if we divide up sentient beings, there are those who do not have and those who do have views. Of those who do not have views, there are two further kinds, the lower and the higher. The lower includes those who have no view downward to the ordinary persons who have not recognized any of the characteristics of the things to be given up and taken up. The higher includes those who have no views all the way up to those who have realized the way things are.” – *spyir sems can gyi ris na lta ba med pa dang yod pa gnyis / med pa la yang gnyis te / 'og ma dang gong ma gnyis so / 'og ma ni spang blang gi mtshan nyid mi shes pas tha mal pa man chad rnams la lta ba med / gong ma ni gnas lugs kyi don rtogs pa yan chad rnams la lta ba med do//*.

⁵⁶ This work by Atiśa is transcribed and translated in Lindtner 1981. For the specific verses cited here, see verse nos. 10, 13, and 14–15 on p. 191.

⁵⁷ Here Phag-mo-gru-pa (or perhaps there is a fault in the manuscript) has dropped two lines essential to understanding the verse by Atiśa. What Atiśa really says is, “Perceptual and inferential logic/ these two are held by Buddhists./ But if you say, ‘These two realize Voidness’/ this is deluded talk of those who see only this side [the concerns of the present life].”

⁵⁸ Phag-mo-gru-pa 1507: III 85v: jo bo'i zhal nas / klu grub slob ma zla ba grags yin / de las brgyud pa'i man ngag gis / chos nyid bden pa thob par 'gyur / zhes so // 'o na mngon sum tshad mas mngon sum gtan 'bebs / rjes su dpag pa'i tshad mas lkog gyur gtan la 'bebs / phyi'i snang ba rigs pa'i shes rab kyis gtan la 'bebs dgos snyam na phyi snang ba gtan la 'bebs pas rtogs mi srid de / snang ba rang sems 'khrul pa yin pa'i phyir ro / 'o na gang dgos na / sems rtogs na ye shes yin pas zhes so // de rtogs pa la rgyud ldan gyi bla ma dang / des gsungs pa'i gdams ngag la / bsgrub pa tshul bzhin byed dgos pa'o // 'o na tshad ma la dgos pa mi 'dug gam snyam na / lam nyams su len pa la dgos pa med de / mngon sum dang ni rjes su dpag // tshu rol mthong ba'i rmongs pas smra / zhes so / 'o na gang la dgos pa yin snyam na / mu stegs rgol bzlog pa'i phyir / mkhas pa rnams kyis byas pa yin zhes so //.

⁵⁹ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: IV 409.4: de nyid don ni tshol 'dod pas// rjes dpag gtan tshigs rten mi bya// legs par bsgoms pas myong 'gyur gyis.

⁶⁰ See Martin 1992: 249. The source of the quote from Phag-mo-gru-pa is 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: IV 408.

⁶¹ In a lecture I recently attended, the speaker, a physicist, suggested that physics would soon supply an explanation for the mystery of human consciousness. A biologist in the audience immediately suggested that while biologists might be in a better position to explain consciousness, it is perhaps overly optimistic to expect this any time soon. Psychology was not even mentioned in this context, and perhaps needless to say, neither was meditation.

⁶² mu stegs dang bon gyi sgor zhugs pas bden pa mthong ba 'dod pa yod mod kyi / 'dir ni mu stegs dang bon gyi sgor zhugs pas bden pa mthong ba'i gnas med par bzhed do.

⁶³ mu stegs dang bon la thar pa cha mthun tsam yang med par 'dod pa yin mod kyi / 'dir ni thar pa'i cha dang mthun pa 'ga' zhig ni yod pa mi 'gal bar bzhed do.

⁶⁴ I use the word Chos later on in this paper (but also the Indian word Dharma, when this seems more appropriate), rather than 'Tibetan Buddhism', since this is the word Tibetans use when they require a word to describe everything in their culture (leaving Muslim and Christian minorities and the occasional Indian *sādhu* aside for the moment, and ignoring the now-common usage of the words *chos* and *chos-lugs* to mean in a broader sense 'religion' or 'religious tradition/sect/school'; in this last sense of the word, Bon is often referred to as a *chos-lugs*) that isn't ascribed to Bon. The internal Tibetan dialectic between Bon and Chos (attested in a Dunhuang text; see Karmay 1983) is obscured by calling only one side 'Buddhist', since the other side thereby automatically attains the status of 'non-Buddhist' (See the strong arguments made in Kvaerne 1972, although in his later articles he returns to the earlier Bon/Buddhist dichotomy). This begs a number of issues that should rather be left open.

⁶⁵ It has been published in *Shangs-pa Gser-'phreng* 1970: 59–143. A different manuscript version is kept on microfilm at the Nepalese National Archives, Kathmandu.

⁶⁶ Zhang 1972: 385.2. The longer and more correct version of the name of this Bon scripture is *Khams-brgyad Stong-phrag-brgya-pa*. It has been published once in India, as well as in the (two, but soon to be three) reprintings of the Bon canon recently published in Chengdu.

⁶⁷ Biographical sources on Gshen-chen Klu-dga' are translated in Martin 1991.

⁶⁸ This Lhas-btsas is author of a late eleventh-century polemic included in Chag Lo-tsa-ba et al. 1979: 18–25.

⁶⁹ In the other long biography by Sher-'byung, the name of the Bonpo appears to be Sbas Bshen-blon (although the reading of the first syllable is not certain). Dpa-'bo 1980: II 514, gives the Bonpo name of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po as Dbal-ba-thar. The name seems to be a slight misspelling of Dbal-'bar-thar. The Dbal-'bar occurs

in some Bonpo names, and has the meaning of 'blazing point', a way of referring to the Phur-pa teachings. The *thar* means 'freedom'. Chos authors and scribes didn't recognize the Bon associations, and this would be sufficient explanation for the degenerate forms.

⁷⁰ As a dry volume measure (it may also serve as a weight measure for gold and silver), one *bre* is equivalent to one twentieth of the standard yak-load. Therefore we could say that his father received somewhat less than a 'standard yak-load' (*khal*) for his scriptures. Actually, both *bre* and *khal* are standardized measurements using square boxes, and I do not know of any studies that would indicate their exact values.

⁷¹ See the biography by Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas as contained in 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: I 53.5 (and note other references to Bonpos on pp. 60.5, 98.7).

⁷² There are numerous small texts, most of them provided with poetic titles that do not supply any clue as to their contents. This is true, although not quite as true, of the works of Phag-mo-gru-pa. By way of contrast, most titles in the collected works of their contemporary Zhang G. yu-brag-pa do explicitly indicate the subject matter. In terms of genre, one may detect a fast progression (not a uniform evolution, however) taking place in the twelfth-century Bka'-brgyud-pa literature, increasingly moving from the relative predominance of the more orally-determined genres of the *tshogs-chos*, *gsung-sgras*, and *zhu-lan* at the earlier half of the century toward more formally structured literary genres such as the *lam-rim* and *grub-mtha'* toward the end.

⁷³ See 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: I 231 (and also pp. 277.5, 295.4).

⁷⁴ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: I 342.2, 475.1; III 19.3; V 279.5. *Mo* is the usual word for divination techniques in Tibetan (on which, see Goldberg 1994 and Tseten 1994). Tibetan laypeople today frequently resort to high incarnate Lamas to have these divinations performed for them.

⁷⁵ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: I 464.5. A twelfth-century Bon treatise does contain this statement about one Teaching not having two Teachers. See Shes-rab-'od-zer 1973: 33.

⁷⁶ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: V 378.5. It is interesting that the short collections of words of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po by his disciples are here prefaced by the words '*di skad bdag-gis thos-pa'i dus gcig na*, which generally appear at the beginning of a scripture, as a mark of its authenticity. The scriptural reference here is to the *Mahāsannipātaratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra* which was, incidentally, among the manuscripts excavated in Gilgit. The argument here would seem to be linked to the idea that two Buddhas cannot exist in one world simultaneously (Pesala 1991: 66, for example).

⁷⁷ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: II 278.6.

⁷⁸ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: II 90.5, 245.4, 300.1, 522.7; IV 328.5. Compare Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990:201.

⁷⁹ From the commentary on the *Gsang-ba Bsen-thub* by 'A-zha entitled *Rtsa-rgyud Chen-po Gsang-ba Bsen-thub-kyi 'Grel-pa Rin-po-che Yid-bzhin Rnam-par Bkod-pa'i Rgyan* as contained in a collection published under the title *Rtsa-rgyud Chen-po Gsang-ba Bsen-thub*, vol. 2, p. 102.6 ff. See the same work, p. 139.6 ff, where it tells how things came into being with the help of the karma (*las*) of beings and the compassion of the Buddha (this part corresponding to chapter 2 of the root tantra).

⁸⁰ *Mdo-'dus*, p. 137.4: *kha cig phyas dang lha'i byas zhes smras / phyas dang lha'i bya med dge sdig dbang*. See also the statements against eternalist and nihilist positions on the preceding page of this same work.

⁸¹ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: II 122.6.

⁸² 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: IV 375.6. One may think it remarkable that a person who suffered through a famine or two said these words about farming. Not all religious scholars shared his sentiments on this subject. The eleventh-century Nying-ma

intellectual Rong-zom-pa, as noted elsewhere (Martin 1991a: 332), composed works on agriculture and animal husbandry, unfortunately no longer extant.

⁸³ 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: II 380.

⁸⁴ We do find in an earlier text a passage about *gnam-gyi rdol bon*, 'outbreak Bon of the sky' in the history by Nyang-ral Nyi-ma-'od-zer and this might well explain part of the literary background for the polemic, but with the basic observation that the story Nyang-ral uses about this 'outbreak Bon' does not correspond at all with the story told about 'outbreak Bon' in the polemic, but rather corresponds more to the story about 'erring Bon', '*kyhar Bon*', but we will not go off into this sidetrack now.

⁸⁵ For similar sorts of liberal attitudes expressed by Karma Pakshi, see Kapstein 1985: 367. Compare also Sog-bzlog-pa 1975: I 426.1. Perhaps of even more significance are the comments of Atiśa on the subject, making reference to this same passage supposedly found in the *Sarvadurgati*, for which see Don-grub-rgyal-mtshan 1985: 98. The text of the *Sarvadurgati* says simply, *mu-stegs-can-la[ang] smad mi bya*, 'Do not look down upon the Tirthikas' (see Skorupski 1983: 78, and texts on pp. 239 and 317). It seems likely that Sher-'byung is actually citing a commentary rather than the tantra itself, although this is a mystery I have not yet been able to solve. It is interesting that in the *Bka'-'bum* of Phag-mo-gru-pa (1507: I 262), in the context of a work on the tantric vows, he quotes a rather different version of this same passage without naming the source: *de skad du yang rnam par snang mdzad ring ba'i rgyu / mu stegs can la 'ang smad mi bya / zhes pa dang / grub pa'i mtha' yis blo bskyed phyir / phyi rol pa yang lam tshol zhugs / de phyir de la smad mi bya / lam zhugs nyan thos smos ci dgos zhes gsungs so*.

⁸⁶ For the text on which this translation is based, see Martin 1991: 320–321. The main body of the polemic, which follows, is not given here.

⁸⁷ On this poet-contemplative founder of a Bka'-brgyud-pa sub-sect called the Tshal-pa, and political leader of much of Central Tibet (Dbus) during the late 12th century, see Jackson 1994a: 57–66, Martin 1992.

⁸⁸ Here Zhang Rinpoche is probably alluding to certain 'virtuous friends' (*dge-bshes*) of the Bka'-gdams-pa school, whom he will mention later on as responsible for circulating polemical tracts.

⁸⁹ The text is entitled: '*Phrang-po Btsad-po'i Don-du Gsungs-pa'i Gdams-pa Dgos-pa Kun Tshang*'. See the manuscript of the works (*bka'-'bum*) of Zhang G. yu-brag-pa Brtson-'grus-grags-pa which I call "Samdo A" (see the biography), volume 3, folio 199r and following. The transcription of the Tibetan text is found below in Appendix B. It is noteworthy that in this passage the fundamental intentions (*dgongs-gzhi*) of the Buddha are said to be unfathomable, and perhaps even variegated (according to the differences in the target audiences), which might have seemed like a direct challenge to the Single Intentionists, who would of course find unacceptable even the slightest hint of any such variegation of intention (see the quote from the *Khog-dbub* translated below), and would also claim to be able to gauge what that single intention is (a position that would clearly negate its unfathomability). It is quite difficult to explain some of the religio-social categories used here, the *Gsas-mo* and so forth, since these terms have most likely not survived with identical meaning in later literature. My best guess at the moment is that *Gsas-po* and *Gsas-mo* are male and female spirit-mediums (*gsas* may be interchangeable with Zhang-zhung language *sad*, equivalent to Tibetan *lha*, 'deity'), while *Mo-ma* and *Cha-ba* (=Phy[w]a-pa) would be distinct types of diviners.

⁹⁰ Contained in: Chag Lo-tsa-be, et al. 1979: 18–25.

⁹¹ Samdo A, vol. 3, folio 202r: *rgya gar mas 'dul ba la rgya gar ma / bod mas 'dul ba la bod ma / bod chos dri ma can ma gsung mdzod cig*.

⁹² It is noteworthy that he ascribes the quote to a different scripture.

⁹³ Samdo A, vol. 2, fol. 78v: *sgrung dang mde'u dang mo dang bon la sogs pa rnams kyang rims kyis drangs pa'i don gyi theg par byung ba yin la theg pa gzhan lta smos kyang ci dgos / de'i phyir na bon la sogs pa phyi nang gi theg pa gang la yang smad par mi bya'o*. The triad *sgrung*, *lde'u*, and *bon* forms the subject of Norbu 1989 and Norbu 1995.

⁹⁴ Samdo A, vol. 2, fol. 96v: *phyi rol pa'ang lam tshol ba la zhugs pa'o*.

⁹⁵ Here *Chos-rje'i zhal snga* evidently means *Dbon Shes-rab-'byung-gnas*.

⁹⁶ It is important to hear the polemical tone of these words *bod rgan* ('old Tibetans'), frequently used in the polemic by Chag Lo-tsa-ba, probably datable to the 1250's (see Chag Lo-tsa-ba et al. 1979: 6, 11, 13, 14, 16, etc.). We find these same words used elsewhere in the texts of the *Single Intention*.

⁹⁷ Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: 236–237. The text reads as follows: *des na gzhan gyi chos la yang smod pa ma yin / gzhan gyi chos kyi rjes su mi 'brang ste / chos rje'i zhal snga nas / su'i chos la yang mi smod / gang la yang ma spang pas chos la brten pa'i g.yang sa med / su'i chos kyi rjes su mi 'brang / gang gi rjes su yang ma 'brangs pas / log par zhugs pa'i nyes pa mi 'byung / sangs rgyas kyi chos gang gi rjes su yang 'brang / gcig kyang bzahag tu med par mi 'gal bar nyams su len na pha chos yin / nang 'gal spong len gnyis su song na bod rgan spyi'i chos zhes gsungs pas 'dir thub pa'i bka' dang mi 'gal ba'i chos cig ston pa yin / de yang chos rigs mi gcig pa mang po'am / chos tshul tha dad pa'am / brjod bya'i don sna tshogs pa ma yin te // zhal snga nas / dgongs pa gcig pa'i dam chos la //*. Very similar words may be found in two places in the *Rin-byang-ma* (Rin-chen-byang-chub, n.d.). First, in the text of the *Khog-dbud*, fol. 5r: *su'i chos la yang mi smad / gang la yang ma smad pas chos la brten pa'i g.yang sa med / su'i chos kyi rjes su yang mi 'brangs / gang gi rjes su yang ma 'brang pas / log par zhugs pa'i nyes pa mi 'byung / sangs rgyas kyi chos gang gis yang rjes su 'brangs / gcig kyang bzahag tu med par mi [5v] 'gal bar nyams su myong na pha chos yin / nang 'gal spong len gnyis su song na bod rgan spyi pa'i chos yin ces pa dang ...* In the main text (the *Rnam-bshad*), fol. 4r: *su'i chos la yang mi smad / gang la yang ma smad pas chos la brten pa'i g.yang sa med / su'i chos kyis rjes su yang mi 'brang / gang gi rjes su yang ma 'brang pas log par zhugs pa'i nyes pa mi 'byung / sangs rgyas kyi chos gang gi yang rjes su 'brang [4v] cig kyang bzahag tu med par mi 'gal bar nyams su myong na pha chos yin / nang spong len gnyis su song na bod rgan spyi pa'i chos yin gsungs pas / 'dir thugs dgongs kyi tshul de lta bu cig yin la ...*

⁹⁸ By these terms I mean different ways of 'constellating' (finding an intellectual cosmology for) the realm of Buddhist teachings and practices. Different ways of constellating may be found at different times (even at times within a single work) by the same author. Still, Tibetan Buddhist authors have to be approached from what they in particular see as the area of main concern.

⁹⁹ In a brief history of the spread of logic (*tshad-ma*) among the Tibetan sects, Ye-shes-dbang-phyug 1989: 62 says that the study of the logical treatises was never greatly spread among the Bka'-brgyud-pa, but that it started among the Karma-pa sect with the Karma-pa VII Chos-grags-rgya-mtsho (1454–1506). Other than this he mentions a few titles composed by the 'Brug-pa Bka'-brgyud-pa master 'Brug-chen Padma-dkar-po (1527–1592). From now on, any account of the Bka'-brgyud-pa use of Indian logic should include discussion of the earlier *Single Intention*. Two important early sketches of the history of Indian Buddhist logical literature are to be found in a religious history dating to approximately 1261 with distinct Rnying-ma-pa leanings; see Lde'u 1987: 98, 172–173.

¹⁰⁰ If better known, the *Single Intention* in particular would probably find clear resonances in some contemporary preoccupations with the social and ethical structures underlying categories of thought as held by some of our post-modernist (or sociology-of-knowledge) thinkers, as well as with the need to inculcate moral values

felt by some of our educationalists. Needless to say, it will also be of interest to students of ethics and political philosophy.

¹⁰¹ This war, called the 'Bri-gung Gling-log seems to have had, like most armed conflicts in human history, quite a complicated background. Here it is merely suggested that the sectarian doctrinal codifications of the 'Bri-gung-pa and Sa-skyapa in the earlier part of the century played some part. See Sperling 1987: 35–36 and Martin 1992a.

¹⁰² Martin 1991: 170–178, especially the comments on Rdo-rje-gling-pa AKA G.yung-drung-gling-pa (1346–1405?), Sde-srid Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, and the leaders of the Ris-med movement at the end of the nineteenth century.

REFERENCES

- Bentor 1995: Yael Bentor, 'On the Indian Origins of the Tibetan Practice of Depositing Relics and Dhāraṇīs in Stūpas and Images', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 115, no. 2, pp. 248–261.
- Cabezón 1981: José Cabezón, 'The Concepts of Truth and Meaning in the Buddhist Scriptures', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 7–23.
- Cabezón 1994: José Cabezón, *Buddhism and Language: A Study of Indo-Tibetan Scholasticism*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Cabezón 1995: José Cabezón, 'On the *Sgra pa Shes rab rin chen pa'i Rtsod Lan* of Pan chen Blo bzang chos rgyan', *Asiatische Studien*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 643–669.
- Chag Lo-tsa-ba et al. 1979: Chag Lo-tsa-ba et al., *Sngags-log Sun-'byin-gyi Skor*, Kunsang Topgyel and Mani Dorji, Thimphu.
- Chang 1986: Krang Dbyi-sun (=Chang I-sun), et al., ed., *Bod Rgya Tshig-mdzod Chen-mo*, Mi-rigs Dpe-skrun-khang, Beijing.
- Das 1881: Sarat Chandra Das, 'The Bon (Pon) Religion', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, pp. 187–205.
- Dash 1993: Narendra Kumar Dash, 'A Critical Edition of Jayananda's *Rtog-ge'i Tho-ba'i Tshig-le'ur Byas-pa*', *The Tibet Journal* (Dharamsala), vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 23–47.
- Dkon-mchog-'jigs-med-dbang-po 1992: 'Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa II Dkon-mchog-'jigs-med-dbang-po (1728–1817), *Chos-kyi Rnam-grangs* (=Mdo Rgyud Bstan-bcos du-ma-nas 'Byung-ba'i Chos-kyi Rnam-grangs Shes-ldan Yid-kyi Dga'-ston), Mtsho-sngon Mi-rigs Dpe-skrun-khang, Xining.
- Don-grub-rgyal-mtshan 1985: Don-grub-rgyal-mtshan, *Legs-par Bshad-pa Bka'-gdams Rin-po-che'i Gsung Gces-btus Nor-bu'i Bang-mdzod*, D. Tsondu Senghe, Bir Tibetan Society, Bir.
- Dpa'-bo 1980: Dpa'-bo II Gtsug-lag-phreng-ba, *Chos-'byung Mkhas-pa'i Dga'-ston: A Detailed History of the Development of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, Delhi Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, Delhi, 2 volumes.
- Goldberg 1994: Jay L. Goldberg, 'Mirrors in the Sky: Tibetan Methods of Divination', contained in: John Matthews, ed., *The World Atlas of Divination*, Headline, London, pp. 161–170.
- Hallisey 1987: 'Paramitās', contained in: Mircea Eliade, ed., *Encyclopedia of Religion*, New York, vol. 11, pp. 196–198.
- Hayes 1988: Richard P. Hayes, *Dignaga on the Interpretation of Signs*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Hoffmann 1950: 'Helmut H. Hoffmann, *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden.

- Jackson 1993: Roger Jackson, *Is Enlightenment Possible? Dharmakīrti and Rgyal tshab rje on Knowledge, Rebirth, No-Self and Liberation*, Snow Lion Publications, Ithaca.
- Jackson 1994: David Jackson, 'The Status of Pramāṇa Doctrine according to Sa-skya Paṇḍita and Other Tibetan Masters: Theoretical Discipline or Doctrine of Liberation?', contained in: T. Skorupski & U. Pagel, eds., *The Buddhist Forum*, School of Oriental & African Studies, London, vol. 3, pp. 85–129.
- Jackson 1994a: David Jackson, *Enlightenment by a Single Means*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.
- 'Jig-rten-mgon-po 1969: 'Bri-gung Chos-rje 'Jig-rten-mgon-po Rin-chen-dpal, *The Collected Writings (Gsung-'bum) of 'Bri-gung Chos-rje 'Jig-rten-mgon-po Rin-chen-dpal*, Khangsar Tulku, New Delhi; 5 volumes, with English prefaces by E. Gene Smith.
- Kapstein 1985: Matthew Kapstein, 'Religious Syncretism in 13th Century Tibet: The Limitless Ocean Cycle', contained in: Barbara N. Aziz & Matthew Kapstein, eds., *Soundings in Tibetan Civilization*, Manohar Publications, New Delhi, pp. 358–371.
- Karma-'phrin-las-pa 1975: Karma-'phrin-las-pa, *The Songs of Esoteric Practice (Mgur) and Replies to Doctrinal Questions (Dris-lan)*, Ngawang Topgay, New Delhi.
- Karmay 1983: Samten G. Karmay, 'Un témoignage sur le Bon face au Bouddhisme à l'époque des rois tibétains', contained in: E. Steinkellner & H. Tauscher, eds., *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy*, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, Vienna, vol. 2, pp. 89–106.
- Klein & Wangyal 1995: Anne Klein & Geshe Tenzin Wangyal, 'Bön and the Logic of the Non-conceptual: Preliminary Reflections on *The Authenticity of Innate Awareness (Gtan tshigs gal mdo rig pa'i tshad ma)*,' *Asiatische Studien*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 769–792.
- Kuijp 1987: Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, 'An Early Tibetan View of the Soteriology of Buddhist Epistemology: The Case of 'Bri-gung 'Jig-rten-mgon-po', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 15, pp. 57–70.
- Kuijp 1993: Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, 'Jāyānanda: A Twelfth Century Guoshi from Kashmir among the Tangut', *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 37, no. 3–4, pp. 188–197.
- Kvaerne 1972: Per Kvaerne, 'Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet', *Numen*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 22–40.
- Lde'u 1987: Mkhas-pa Lde'u, *Rgya Bod-kyi Chos-'byung Rgyas-pa*, Bod-ljongs Mi-rigs Dpe-skrun-khang, Lhasa.
- Lindtner 1981: Christian Lindtner, 'Atiśa's Introduction to the Two Truths and Its Sources', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 9, pp. 161–214.
- Lipman 1992: Kennard Lipman, 'What is Buddhist Logic? Some Tibetan Developments of Pramāṇa Theory', contained in: S. Goodman & R. Davidson, eds., *Tibetan Buddhism: Reason and Revelation*, State University of New York Press, Albany, pp. 25–44.
- Martin 1991: Dan Martin, *The Emergence of Bon and the Tibetan Polemical Tradition*, doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington (University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan).
- Martin 1991a: Dan Martin, 'A Brief Political History of Tibet by Gu-ru Bkra-shis', contained in: Ernst Steinkellner, ed., *Tibetan History and Language*, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, Vienna, pp. 329–351.
- Martin 1992: Dan Martin, 'A Twelfth-Century Tibetan Classic of Mahamudra: *The Path of Ultimate Profundity: The Great Seal Instructions of Zhang*', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 243–319.
- Martin 1992a: Dan Martin, 'Crystals and Images from Bodies, Hearts and Tongues from Fire: Points of Relic Controversy from Tibetan History', contained in: S. Ihara & Z. Yamaguchi, eds., *Tibetan Studies*, Naritasan Shinshoji, Narita, vol. 1, pp. 183–191.

- Mdo-'dus: Mdo-'dus Rin-po-che'i Rgyud Thams-cad Mkhyen-pa' Bka' Tshad-ma, Khedup Gyatsho, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Dolanji, 1985.
- Mvy: Bon-zo-kan-wa yon 'yaku taiko Mahabuyuttopatti (Mahāvīyutpatti), ed. Sakaki Ryojaburo, Tokyo, 1965, reprint of 1916 edition.
- Norbu 1989: Namkhai Norbu (Nam-mkha'i-nor-bu), *Sgrung Lde'u Bon Gsum-gyi Gtam E-ma-ho*, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharamsala.
- Norbu 1995: Namkhai Norbu, *Drung, De'u and Bön: Narrations, Symbolic Languages and the Bön Tradition in Ancient Tibet*, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharamsala. This is a translation by Adriano Clemente and Andrew Lukianowicz of Norbu 1989.
- Padma-dkar-po 1973: 'Brug-chen IV Padma-dkar-po, *Collected Works (Gsung-'bum) of Kun-mkhyen Padma-dkar-po*, Kargyud Sungrab Nyamso Khang, Darjeeling.
- Padma'i-rgyal-mtshan 1989: Che-tshang Sprul-sku IV Bstan-'dzin-padma'i-rgyal-mtshan (b. 1770), aka Padma'i-rgyal-mtshan), *'Bri-gung Gdan-rabs Gser-phreng (=Nges-don Bstan-pa'i Snying-po Mgon-po 'Bri-gung-pa Chen-po'i Gdan-rabs Chos-kyi Byung-tshul Gser-gyi Phreng-ba)*, Bod-ljongs Bod-yig Dpe-rnying Dpe-skrun-khang, Lhasa; composed in 1800–1803.
- Pesala 1991: Bhikku Pesala, *The Debate of King Milinda*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- Phag-mo-gru-pa 1507: Phag-mo-gru-pa Rdo-rje-rgyal-po, *Bka'-'bum* ('Collected Works'), a photocopied version of a 'golden manuscript' (written in gold ink) in four volumes, privately acquired in Lhasa. This ms. was constructed under the patronage of 'Bri-gung-pa Kun-dga'-rin-chen (1475–1527).
- Phag-mo-gru-pa 1976: *The Collected Works (Gsung-'bum) of Phag-mo-gru-pa Rdo-rje-rgyal-po*, Gangtok. Vol. 1 only (no subsequent volumes have been published).
- Prebish 1980: Charles S. Prebish, 'Vinaya and Pratimoksa: The Foundation of Buddhist Ethics', contained in: A. K. Narain, ed., *Studies in [the] History of Buddhism*, B. R. Publishing, Delhi, pp. 223–264.
- Rdo-rje-shes-rab 1990: Rdo-rje-shes-rab, *Dam-chos Dgongs-pa Gcig-pa'i 'Grel-chen Snang-mdzad Ye-shes Sgron-me*, Drikung Kagyu Institute, Dehradun.
- Rigzin 1993: Tsepa Rigzin, *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, Dharamsala. Revised and enlarged version of the 1986 edition.
- Rin-chen-byang-chub n.d.: Unpublished photocopy of a cursive manuscript in two parts: [1] *Dam-chos Dgongs-pa Gcig-pa'i Khog-dhub Don-bsdus*, in 13 folios. [2] *Khyad-par-gyi Chos Dgongs-pa Gcig-pa'i Rnam-bshad* in 292 folios. Privately acquired in Lhasa.
- Roerich 1976: George N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, Motilal Barnarsidass, Delhi.
- Rtsa-rgyud Chen-po Gsang-ba Bsen-thub: *Rtsa-rgyud Chen-po Gsang-ba Bsen-thub dang De'i 'Grel-pa Rin-po-che Yid-bzhin Rnam-par Bkod-pa'i Rgyan*, Tashi Dorji, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Dolanji, 1985. In 2 volumes.
- Russell 1992: Jeffrey B. Russell, *Dissent and Order in the Middle Ages: The Search for Legitimate Authority*, Twayne Publishers, New York.
- Sa-skya-pa'i Bka'-'bum 1968: Sa-skya-pa'i Bka'-'bum, Toyo Bunko, Tokyo.
- Sa-skya Pañḍi-ta 1987: Sa-skya Pañḍi-ta Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan, *Sdom-pa Gsum-gyi Rab-tu Dbye-ba'i Bstan-bcos (=Sdom Gsum Rang Mchan 'Khrul-med)*, Ngawang Topgyal, New Delhi.
- Samdo A: Zhang G. yu-brag-pa Brtson-'grus-grags-pa, *Bka'-'bum* ('Collected Works'). Microfilm of a six-volume manuscript kept at Samdo Monastery in Nepal. This nearly complete set is found in the Nepalese National Archives microfilm collection from running number L4686 through L4697, which is equivalent to the reel numbers L448/2 through L450/4.
- Shangs-pa Gser-'phreng 1970: *Shangs-pa Gser-'phreng: A Golden Rosary of Lives of Masters of the Shangs-pa Dkar-rgyud-pa Schools*, T. Y. Tashigangpa, Leh, 1970.

- Shes-rab-'od-zer 1973: Me-ston Shes-rab-'od-zer, et al., *Bka'-rten Sum-brgya-pa dang Lam-rim Chung-ba bcas-kyi Rnam-'grel Lhan-cig Bsdus-pa'i Gsung Pod*, Khedup Gyatso, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Dolanji.
- Skorupski 1983: Tadeusz Skorupski, *The Sarvadurgatipariśodhana Tantra: Elimination of All Evil Destinies*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- Sog-bzlog-pa 1975: Sog-bzlog-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, *Collected Writings of Sog-bzlog-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan*, Sanje Dorji, New Delhi; in 2 volumes.
- Sperling 1987: Elliot Sperling, 'Some Notes on the Early 'Bri-gung-pa Sgom-pa', contained in: C.I. Beckwith, ed., *Silver on Lapis: Tibetan Literary Culture and History*, The Tibet Society, Bloomington, pp. 33–53.
- Stearns 1996: Cyrus Stearns, 'The Life and Tibetan Legacy of the Indian Mahāpāṇḍita Vibhūticandra', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 127–171.
- Steinkellner 1983: Ernst Steinkellner, 'Tshad ma'i skyes bu: Meaning and Historical Significance of the Term', contained in: E. Steinkellner & H. Tauscher, eds., *Contributions on Tibetan Buddhist Religion and Philosophy*, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, Vienna, pp. 275–284.
- Steinkellner 1993: Ernst Steinkellner, 'Buddhist Logic: The Search for Certainty', contained in: Takeuchi Yoshinori, et al., eds., *Buddhist Spirituality: Indian, Southeast Asian, Tibetan, Early Chinese*, Crossroad, New York, pp. 213–218.
- Tāranātha 1990: *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*, tr. by Lama Chimpa & A. Chattopadhyaya, ed. by Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi. Reprint of the original 1970 edition. Tāranātha composed this work in 1608.
- Thrangu 1988: Thrangu Rinpoche, *Buddha Nature: Ten Teachings on the Uttara Tantra Shastra*, tr. by Erik Pema Kunsang, Rangjung Yeshe Publications, Kathmandu.
- Thu'u-bkwan 1984: Thu'u-bkwan Blo-bzang-chos-kyi-nyi-ma, *Thu'u-bkwan Grub-mtha' (=Grub-mtha' Thams-cad-kyi Khungs dang 'Dod-tshul Ston-pa Legs-bshad Shel-gyi Me-long)*, Kan-su'u Mi-rigs Dpe-skrun-khang, Lanchou.
- Tseten 1994: Dorje Tseten, 'Looking into the Future', *Chö Yang* (Dharamsala), vol. 6, pp. 111–118.
- Ye-shes-dbang-phyug 1989: Ye-shes-dbang-phyug, 'Rig-gnas Chen-po Lnga'i Nang-tshan Tshad-ma Rig-pa Rags-tsam Brjod-pa,' *Bod-ljongs Nang Bstan*, issue 1 of 1989 (issue no. 5 in the general series), pp. 58–76.
- Zhang 1972: Zhang G. yu-brag-pa Brtson-'grus-grags-pa (1123–1193), *Writings (Bka' 'Thor-bu)*, Sungrab Nyamso Gyunpel Parkhang, Tashijong.
- Zhwa-dmar 1992: Zhwa-dmar IV Chos-grags-ye-shes (1453–1524), *Dam-chos Dgongs-pa Gcig-pa'i Gsal-byed*, D. Tsondu Senghe, Bir.

Radak Street 19,
Jerusalem 92187 Israel