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The book under review is a study and annotated translation of the *Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs*, a monastic textbook on Buddhist logic, authored by the notable Tibetan scholar Phur bu lcog blo bzang byams pa rgya mtsho (1825–1901, hereafter referred to as “Phur lcog pa”), one of the official preceptors (*yongs ’dzin*) of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama Thub bstan rgya mtsho (1876–1933). The *Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs* constitutes a part of the *Rigs lam che ba* (“Great Path of Reasoning”), which again constitutes one part of the work entitled *Rigs lam ‘phrul gyi lde’u mig* (“Magic Key to the Path of Reasoning”). The *Rigs lam ’phrul gyi lde’u mig*, which includes *bsdus grwa* (“collected topics”), *blo rig* (“mind and consciousness”), and *rtags rigs* (“typology of inferential signs” or “inferential signs and reasoning”), was originally dedicated to Thub bstan rgya mtsho, and up to the present day has been used as a teaching manual at monastic universities (*gdan*

---


2 The full title of the *Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs* is: *Tshad ma’i gzung don ’byed pa’i bsdus grwa’i rnam par bshad pa rigs lam ’phrul gyi lde’u mig las rigs lam che ba rtags rigs kyi skor* (“The Section on Typology of Inferential Signs [or Inferential Signs and Reasoning] from the ‘Great Path of Reasoning’ of the ‘Magic Key to the Path of Reasoning’—Explanation of the Collected Topics Analyzing the Meaning of the Texts on Valid Cognition”).

3 Phur lcog pa seems to construe the term *blo rig* to mean *blo dang rig pa* (“mind and consciousness”); see *Rigs lam ’phrul lde 318.6 f.: mtha’ yas shes dang shes bya’i gnas | gsal byed blo dang rig pa yi | rmam bshad tshig nyung ’d Richardson | rgya chen rigs lam rgyas rgyur cig |*. The etymology of the term, together with the orthography, is briefly discussed by van der Kuijp (1985: 36 f.), who suggests that *blo rigs* is the correct spelling and that it can be translated by “typology of cognition,” or simply by “epistemology.”

4 Rogers translates *rtags rigs* by “signs and reasoning.” It seems that she takes *rigs* to mean *rigs pa* (“reasoning”), and *rtags rigs* to mean *rtags dang rigs pa*. It is of course true that such an interpretation is possible, but there is another possible interpretation of the term, according to which *rtags rigs* means “typology of inferential signs” (cf. van der Kuijp ibid.; Hugon 2002: 9). Interestingly enough, Dung dkar blo bzang ’phrin las (1927–1997) does not speak of “reasoning,” or *rigs pa*, when he defines the term. Instead, he explains that *rtags rigs* means the section on inferential signs or logical reasons (*rtags sam gtan tshigs skor*) in the works on epistemology, and that the term is also used to refer to an individual work on inferential signs. See *Dung dkar tshig mdzod chen mo* 988: *tshad ma rig pa’i gzung gi nang don gyi rtags sam gtan tshigs skor la rtags rigs zer ba dang gzung gi ming | |.
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sa/grwa sa) of the Dge lugs pa/Dga’ ldan pa order of Tibetan Buddhism, such as Je College of Sera Monastery (se ra byes) and Jangtse College of Ganden Monastery (dga’ ldan byang rtse) in southern India.

The Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs is a treatise on a variety of inferential signs (rtags), or logical reasons, which serve as causes for generating inference. It encompasses the investigation of three modes (tshul gsum) of a proper sign (rtags yang dag)—or three characteristics of a valid logical reason—, the classification of proper signs, and that of improper quasi-signs (rtags ltar snang). Onoda (1981) prepared a critical edition of the Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs on the basis of four available editions, and gave a brief sketch of its contents (cf. Onoda 1992: 168 ff.). A large number of its details are now fleshed out in the study under review.

The book is divided into two parts: the first (“Essentials of Reasoning”) is a detailed analysis of the Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs; the second (“Annotated Translation”) is a translation. In addition, the book contains an English-Tibetan-Sanskrit glossary of terms (pp. 479–485), a list of abbreviations (p. 499), a bibliography (pp. 501–503), and an index of technical terms, personal names, and texts cited (pp. 517–524). Readers can survey the structure of the book by looking at the “Detailed Outline” (pp. 487–495).

In Part One, Rogers set herself the formidable task of offering a general presentation of the Dge lugs pa’s system of logic, and of showing how the Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs is studied and practiced in Dge lugs pa monastic universities. Rogers provides a detailed explanation of each topic on the basis of oral commentaries by contemporary Dge lugs pa scholars,5 thereby illustrating how this manual is studied within the monastic curriculum. The book under review thus represents an important contribution to our understanding of the Yongs ’dzin rtags rigs, which is usually studied under the guidance of a teacher, written in an elliptical style, and hence not easily understandable outside the tradition.

However, this challenging task could have benefited from more detailed information concerning the Indian and early Tibetan sources for Phur lcog pa’s presentations since, as Rogers puts it, “many aspects of the Ge-luk-pa system of logic are not innovations but part of an even older tradition” (p. 15). And we should notice that the Dge lugs pa logicians have up to the present day offered “a fascinating nexus of opinions and counteropinions, of complications and contradictions” so that “there is no monolithic Ge-luk-pa presentation of logic” (p. 13).6 Thus, it is highly regrettable that Rogers had to refrain from making a

---

5 The names of the scholars with whom the author worked are listed in pp. 14–15.
6 We must be very careful when we use such generalized expressions as “Dge lugs pa presen-