

EAST AND WEST

Founded by Giuseppe Tucci

QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE
ISTITUTO ITALIANO PER IL MEDIO ED ESTREMO ORIENTE
WITH A GRANT FROM THE
CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE

INDZ: 16/44₁

20. Sep. 1994



I s M E O

Vol. 44 - No. 1 (March 1994)

**Tanjur Fragments from the Manuscript Collection
at Ta pho Monastery
Sambandhaparīkṣā with Its Commentaries *Vṛtti* and *Ṭikā***

by HELMUT TAUSCHER

The history of the Tibetan Kanjur has been extensively studied during the past years, in particular by H. Eimer ⁽¹⁾, and the existence of an independent West Tibetan text tradition was shown by M. Hahn's study on the Phudrag-Kanjur ⁽²⁾, but no comparable studies of the Tanjur are available. It could, however, be expected that the situation of the Tanjur and its individual texts is similar to that of the Kanjur. Taking into consideration the extensive activities of the translators Rin chen bzañ po, Legs pa'i śes rab and their pupils, and the religious and cultural importance of the West Tibetan monastic centers, we can by no means exclude the possibility that there existed various writing and copying offices that handed down texts from the Kanjur as well as from the Tanjur for a considerable period of time independently from the Central Tibetan centers. Previously the necessary materials were not available for raising the question of a West Tibetan Tanjur text tradition with any hope of an answer. It is, however, to be hoped that the Ta pho manuscripts, photographed within the framework of the joint research program of IsMEO, Rome, and the Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna, during a field expedition in 1991 ⁽³⁾ can provide us with the textual basis for studies in the West Tibetan tradition of Tanjur texts.

⁽¹⁾ H. Eimer, *Ein Jahrzehnt Studien zur Überlieferung des Tibetischen Kanjur*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 28, Wien 1992; Id., 'Einige Bemerkungen zu Handschriftenfunden aus Guge/Westtibet', *ZAS*, 22, 1989-1991, pp. 244-55. See also P. Harrison, *Druma-kinnara-Rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra*, Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series, 7, Tokyo 1992.

⁽²⁾ M. Hahn, 'Bemerkungen zu zwei Texten aus dem Phudrag-Kanjur', *Indology and Indo-Tibetology*, ed. H. Eimer, Bonn 1988, pp. 53-80.

⁽³⁾ For a report on this field expedition and a general description of the manuscript remains kept at the 'Du khañ of Ta pho monastery, see E. Steinkellner, 'A Report on the "Kanjur" of Ta pho', this volume.

As the relevant material to be found is comparatively scanty, and the fragments are obviously not part of a canonical collection, but rather represent individual texts that may or may not have been taken from such a collection, nothing can be concluded with regard to the history and development of the Tanjur as a whole; for the present, this particular question will have to be left hanging.

The aim of the present, more modest study will therefore be twofold:

- a) to investigate whether new insights can be gained as to an 'original' Tibetan translation of a particular text;
- b) to contribute, on a more general level, to the evaluation of the Ta pho manuscripts as a whole.

For this purpose I have chosen at random a fragment of Dharmakīrti's *Sambandhaparīkṣā* [SP] together with the autocommentary *Sambandhaparīkṣāvṛtti* [SPV or V] and Vinitadeva's *Sambandhaparīkṣāṭīkā* [SPT or T]. It is a small fragment consisting of only 3 leaves. Unfortunately we failed to take its measurements on the spot; from the photographs I calculate a total size of 58.5 × 12.5 cm, and 53.5 × 10 cm writing area, with 10 lines (9 on fol. 3r) per page. Each leaf displays two holes for binding, surrounded by two or three red and blue circles. The latter is a unique feature among the Ta pho manuscripts. Like the majority of the Ta pho manuscripts, this one too is written in beautiful *dbu can* script with the *pratīkas* in red ink. The general condition is fairly good; only small portions are missing along the edges or illegible due to ageing or external influences.

One folio, bearing the pagination 3, contains the text of the SPV on k. 16-23. The other two, being fols. 15 and 16, were found next to each other, but in a different bundle to the first one. They contain the end of the SPT, beginning with the last sentences on k. 22 (fols. 15 and 16r1-9) and SP k. 1-23a. They do not display a volume signature, so they have to be taken as a separate text and not as part of any bigger collection. Despite some slight paleographic differences which I will discuss later, I take these three folios as belonging to one set. On the basis of the space they cover in the editions of Peking and Derge, the missing portions of the texts could very well fit within the missing folios. Moreover, it is the resemblance in their striking outward appearance that suggests this assumption. There is, however, no possibility for a full 'title-page'; the equivalent of at least six ordinary lines must have been written on fol. 1r. From this we can assume the following arrangement with a rather unusual sequence of texts: SPV 1-4r5, SPT 4r6-16r9, SP 16r10-17r2; whether any other text followed we cannot know.

This material was approached with two different questions in mind:

- a) What can be said about the age of the actual manuscript? Lacking the possibility of paper and ink analysis no absolute dating is possible. So paleographic and orthographic peculiarities are the only means for establishing a relative chronology among the Ta pho manuscripts.
- b) What state of textual development does it represent? In order to answer this question the Ta pho manuscript [T] was compared with the canonical editions

of Narthang [N] (for which Frauwallner's edition [F] ⁽⁴⁾ was used as well as his handwritten copy kept among his estate at the Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna), Peking [P], Derge [D] and Cone [C]. In the case of SP, in addition to its canonical editions the *pratīkas* in SPV and SPT were also used, the latter two, however, only in the editions of N, P and D. Śāṅkaranandana's *Sambandhaparīkṣānusāra* [A], as it contains a completely different Tibetan translation of Dharmakīrti's text, was used only in Frauwallner's edition, and only in cases where it supports the reading of Ta pho against the four canonical versions.

Paleography and Orthography

Many of the Ta pho manuscripts show a number of paleographic and orthographic peculiarities that can be taken as indicating old age, shared to various degrees also by the long inscriptions on the temple walls:

- frequent use of the inverted *gi gu*,
- horizontal ligatures *s-pa*, *s-ta*, *s-tsa*, with *ta* and *tsa* sometimes taking its *dbu med* form,
- superscribed *ra* occasionally in *dbu med* style,
- ra* subscribed to *da* occasionally in *dbu med* style,
- pa* and *ba* often not to be distinguished,
- palatalisation of *ma* before e and i by using a subscribed *ya*,
- genitive 'i and final 'o after vowels written as a distinct syllable,
- haplography in the case of the same end and beginning consonants,
- occurrence of the *da drag* ⁽⁵⁾,

⁽⁴⁾ 'Dharmakīrti's *Sambandhaparīkṣā*. Text und Übersetzung', *WZKM*, 41, 1934, pp. 261-300 (= E. Frauwallner, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Oberhammer & E. Steinkellner, Wiesbaden 1982, pp. 490-529).

⁽⁵⁾ The *da drag* is used in the following cases in this manuscript:

<i>gyurd</i>	SPV 3r7, 3r9; SPT 15v1, 16r8, 16r10
<i>bsgyurd</i>	SPT 16r9
<i>(-c)end</i>	SPT Glosses
<i>bstand</i>	SPV 3r4; SPT 15r6
<i>dond</i>	SPV 3r1; SPT 15v2, 15v4
<i>pha rold po</i>	SPT 15r2, 15r5, 15r8, Glosses
<i>'breld</i>	SPV 3r3-3v1, 3v4, 3v5; SPT 15r3, 15r7, 15r9, 15v2, 15v3, 15v8-16r1, 16r5, 16r7-9, Glosses; SP 16r10-16v5, 16v8-16v10
<i>zind</i>	SPV 3v8
<i>'ond</i>	SPT Glosses
<i>yind</i>	SPT 15v5
<i>land</i>	SPV 3v5
<i>śind tu</i>	SPV 3v4
<i>stend</i>	SPT Glosses
<i>stond</i>	SPV 3r3; SPT 15v5, 16v6, 16v8

pleonastic use of 'a,
las stsogs instead of *la sogs*,
ji ste instead of *ci ste*,
 putting a *tsheg* before the *śad*, etc.

These features may occur all together or in various combinations. Hypothetically it could be assumed that the occurrence of all or the majority of them reflects the greatest antiquity, and that step by step one feature after the other fell out of use during the course of time. Of course the possibility of a faithful copy of an older manuscript has to be taken into consideration and of later deliberate imitation of the older writing style. The first case is probably of no great significance in terms of textual history. In the latter case, the occasional occurrence of 'mistakes' can be expected, e.g. the writer's falling back into his 'usual' writing style or even an overemphasizing of the archaic features.

In the manuscript under consideration most of the peculiarities mentioned above are to be found. There is, however, no case of haplography, and the pleonastic 'a occurs only once (SP 16r10). While the ligatures *s-ta* and *s-tsa* are of the horizontal type, *s-pa* is not; the *sa mgo* is, just as in the ligature *s-ma*, only moved slightly to the left. (In the same way it is also to be seen in canonical blockprints). SPT contains a number of interlinear glosses that are generally in *dbu med*. Some *akṣaras*, however, are written in *dbu can* style, viz. *i*, *bra*, *ma*, *śa* and sometimes *ra*. Otherwise they show the same peculiarities as the rest of the fragment. This peculiarity is shared by some other manuscripts at Ta pho ⁽⁶⁾.

A few inconsistencies also occur that perhaps represent instances of what I have called 'mistakes' in imitating an archaic writing style. Most significant is the combination *s-ta* written in a vertical ligature. This occurs only once (SP 16v6, k. 13d), but in this case one instance is certainly enough to show that this manuscript was written at a time when the new style was already in use or at least known. Besides, the subscribed *ya* in the word *min* is omitted once (SP 16v8, k. 18b), and the *da drag* in words that usually have it, is omitted twice in SP ⁽⁷⁾ and perhaps once in SPT ⁽⁸⁾.

On the other hand, the *da drag* is sometimes used in quite unusual places, e.g. with the word *don*, *lan* and *yin*, a usage which I did not see among the other manuscripts or wall inscriptions at Ta pho that I inspected. This is not a significant argument, as the majority of the Ta pho manuscripts have not yet been investigated. The form *yind* does occur several times in a Tun-huang manuscript of the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* (Pelliot Tibétain 845) ⁽⁹⁾, *dond* and *land* I have not seen elsewhere. Despite

⁽⁶⁾ E.g. photos 219/24, 28.

⁽⁷⁾ 16v1 (k. 2a) and 16v9 (k. 18c): 'brel instead of the usual 'brel.

⁽⁸⁾ 16r4. The illegible spot after *gyur* seemingly leaves place only for the required *pa*; in the case of compact writing, however, *gyurd pa* could be possible.

⁽⁹⁾ I owe this information to Cristina Scherrer-Schaub. See C.A. Scherrer-Schaub & P.C. Verhagen, *The Lexicological Treatise in two volumes (sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa) being a commentary on the Great Comprehensive Treatise of Learning (Mahāvvyutpatti)*, Part III: Glossaries. [Work in progress]

of the occurrence of *yind* in PT 845, this particular usage of the *da drag* might be an indication of a manneristic use of an archaic feature without being quite familiar with its correct application.

As already mentioned, fol. 3 shows slight differences from the other two: The inverted *gi gu*, which is used in more than half of the cases in fols. 15 and 16, occurs only four times in fol. 3. Genitive 'i or final 'o as separate syllables are used only three times. The ligature *dr-* with *ra* written in *dbu med* style, which is used consistently (with one exception in SP) in fols. 15 and 16, appears only once (however, out of a total of only three occurrences of the ligature *dr-*). The 'correct' form *ci ste* appears twice instead of the usual *ji ste. la stsogs*, which represents something like an intermediate form between the usual *las stsogs* and the classical *la sogs*, occurs very rarely on fols. 15 and 16, but it is used in more than half of the cases in fol. 3.

From all this it can be concluded that this particular manuscript does not belong to the oldest period, which might date back to the 11th or 12th century⁽¹⁰⁾, but obviously dates from a period when the old writing style was already more or less out of use.

I would not dare to give more precise specification of these features at the present stage. Additional criteria and a closer study of a larger body of material will certainly be necessary if a more reliable chronology of these texts is to be established.

Textual History

Comparing the three old texts with only the four major canonical editions mentioned above may not be sufficient to reconstruct the history of the text in detail. Nevertheless it can be of some significance, in particular if a sufficient number of variant readings can be found that are different from all four canonical editions. And this SP-manuscript does actually provide us with a considerable number of such instances, most of them even offering a better reading than the canonical version.

As no common history of the three texts can be assumed prior to the actual execution of this particular manuscript, they have to be treated separately.

SPV (fol. 3): On a formal level this text, just as SPṬ does, shows a striking divergency in the usage of the *śad*. In this one folio, which corresponds to about two folios in P, there are 72 such cases, 48 (= $\frac{2}{3}$) of which are at variance with all four editions. From the remaining $\frac{1}{3}$ again $\frac{2}{3}$ correspond to N, and the fewest cases of agreement are to be found with P.

⁽¹⁰⁾ It could be assumed that the wall inscriptions actually represent the writing style of the time of the renovation of the monastery in 1042 or 1054, and that the manuscripts corresponding to the inscriptions thus date from about the same period. Unfortunately, however, the inscriptions contain inconsistencies within themselves. The inscription of the *Kṣitigarbhasūtra*, e.g., does not show a single inverted *gi gu*, and, unlike most of the older texts, it consistently gives the word *rol* without *da drag*.

Among the other variants, I disregarded those due to the peculiarities of the manuscript as well as merely orthographic variants. There remain 68 divergences, 31 of which are at variance with all editions, another 22 against N and P. From the remaining 37 that correspond to any edition, the majority agree with C (31) and D (30).

SPT (fol. 15, 16r1-9) contains 70 variants regarding the usage of the *śad*, the version of Ta pho being unique in 52 cases (= almost $\frac{3}{4}$). Among the few cases of correspondence, those with N and P dominate.

Regarding other variant readings, there are 95; 50 of them against all editions, another 22 against N and P, and still another 11 against N alone, most cases of correspondence thus being with D and C.

SP (fol. 16r10, 16v), being a verse text, naturally does not show any divergences in the usage of the *śad*. It contains 42 cases of variant readings. 30 (= more than 71%) of them are not shared by any of the canonical editions; 10 of the remaining 12 agree with N, only four with P.

To summarize: the predominant majority of all the variant readings differ from all four canonical editions. Among the remaining minority most cases of correspondence are to D and C in SPV and SPT, and to N in SP. With regard to the usage of the *śad*, however, it is to N in SPV and to N and P in SPT. But, as these cases of correspondence are generally very few, they may not have any real statistical significance.

Discussing these variant readings in detail, I shall mainly restrict myself to some of the more essential instances in the verse text of SP. This text is almost complete in the Ta pho manuscript: only three verses are missing. It contains a number of rather significant variants, and there is a Sanskrit version⁽¹¹⁾ available that provides us with a significant criteria for evaluating the variants. SPT I shall not discuss at all, and from SPV only two significant cases.

Title: Unlike the canonical editions that give it as *Sambandhaparīkṣāprakarāṇa*, T has *Sambandhaparīkṣākārikā*.

k. 4c: *thug pa 'añ* (T), *thug pa* (NPDC). The reading of T must be preferred, as the Skt. reads: *anavastā ca*. In fact this pāda has eight syllables in T; some instances in various verse texts from Ta pho of apparently the same age, however, show that the writing of one or two syllables in such cases is not strictly distinguished. The reading of T is approved by V_{NP} *pa 'añ*, V_D has *pa 'am*.

A similar case is to be seen in k. 14c (below) and, with the preference to be given to the canonical version, in **k. 22d:** *gnas par byed pa* (T), ... *pa 'añ* (NPDCVṬ) - *sthitīś ca*.

k. 6: pādas a and b appear in reversed order. With regard to the meaning, it

⁽¹¹⁾ *Vādanyāyaprakarāṇa ... and Sambandhaparīkṣā with the commentary of Acharya Prabhachandra*, ed. Dwarikada Shastri, Varanasi 1972. See also F (fn. 4).

does not make any difference; formally the version of T may be closer to the Skt.:

tām eva cānurundhānaiḥ kriyākārahāvācinaiḥ /
 bhāvabhedapratītyartham saṃyojante 'bhidhāyakāḥ //
 [de yi] rjes su 'brel pa yis // dños po tha dad rtogs bya phyir //
 bya dañ byed pa pa'i tshig // smra ba po dag 'god par byed // (T)
 dños po tha dad rtogs bya'i phyir // de yi rjes su 'brañ ba yis //
 bya dañ byed pa po yi tshig // smra ba po dag 'god par byed // (NPDC)

k. 7a: *rgyu dañ 'bras bu'i dños po yañ* (T), ... *'brel ba ...* (NPDC). T is supported by Skt. *kāryakāraṇabhāva 'pi*. As V reads ... *rgyu dañ 'bras bu'i dños po'i brel pa yañ ...*, it can be suspected that in establishing the text that formed the basis for the canonical editions, V was used but misunderstood. T makes it clear again: ... *rgyu dañ 'bras bu'i dños po yañ zes bya ba 'di'i bśad pa ni 'brel pa ji ltar grub ces bya ba'o*.

k. 14cd: *'di la 'bras bu sgra las stsogs sgra 'añ* // *sla bar bya phyir rnam par bkod* (T), *'di la 'bras bu la sogs sgra* // *tha sñad sla ba'i phyir bkod do* (NPDC). Being a translation of *kāryādiśrutir api atra*, pāda c does not, in its T version, make any sense. However, I do not think that we have — apart from the *'añ* at the end of the pāda, which is testified by the Skt. *api* — a real variant reading, but rather the case of a severe scribal error. *'di la* at the beginning, being inserted later, has obviously been forgotten. Instead the word *sgra* might have been duplicated and not erased later on. With pāda d the situation is quite different. Here, again, the canonical version seems to be influenced by a gloss from V, taken as *pratīka*. The version of T, on the other hand, is a faithful translation of Skt. *lāghavārtham niveśitā*.

k. 20d: *śin tu thal phyir de la(-)* = (T), ... *de gñis min* (NPDC). Frauwallner in his edition has corrected the end of this pāda in accordance with V and T to *de las min*, which is a correct translation of Skt. *na tato 'tiprasaṅgataḥ*. In T *la* is the last *akṣara* in the line; there is room enough for an additional *sa*, but no traces of it are to be seen. The beginning of the following line is missing. In any case, a reading *de la/las min* is possible, which is certainly to be preferred to the canonical version.

k. 22a gives a good example of how mistakes can be generated within the tradition of a text. In T it starts with *las stsogs*, in the canonical editions with *la sogs*. Frauwallner in his edition has corrected this to *las sogs*, as it is a translation of *karmādi* and V and T gloss it by *las la sogs pa*. The canonical editions give evidence for a somewhat automatic 'correcting' of the text when changing from the old orthography to the new. A similar case can be observed twice in T.

The most tricky verse is **k. 17cd** ⁽¹²⁾: *rnam par rtog pas stond pa ni* // **don log 'brel**

(12) *rnam par rtog pas stond pa ni* // *don log 'brel pa'i bzin stond* (T)
rnam par rtog pas ston pa ni // *don log pa yi don bzin ston* (NPDC)
rnam par rtog pas ston pa ni // *don 'brel pa yi don bzin ston* (F)
 vikalpā darśayanty arthān mithyārthā ghaṭitān iva

pa'i bzin ston, pāda d consisting of only six syllables in T. The canonical editions read ... || **don log pa yi don bzin ston**, F has, perhaps according to V, ... || *don 'brel pa yi don bzin ston*. He does, however — just as V_T does — seemingly take *log pa'i don* in V as a *pratīka*. According to the Skt. none of these versions is correct. 17cd read: *vikalpā darśayanty arthān mithyārthā ghaṭitān iva* ('imagination, which have [per se] wrong objects, show things as if related'). If we add *don* as a seventh syllable to T, we get a hypothetical *don log 'brel pa'i don bzin ston*, which would certainly be the best of these versions, as it contains an equivalent for *mithyā* as well as for *ghaṭita*. Still it would not be a correct translation of the Skt., as it actually translates ... *arthān mithyārthaghaṭitān* (as compound) *iva* ('... show things as if related to wrong things.') Besides, *ston pa ni* from the end of pāda c is without equivalent in the Skt., and *don log* at the beginning of pāda d must be taken as meaning the same as *log don*, the form that would actually be expected.

Now, the dropping of *don* in T would raise no problem if the same did not also appear in V_{PN} . It is, however, not to be found in V_{DCT} or in T. Assuming that it is very unlikely for a mistake of that kind to appear twice independently, we have to assume that the T version is influenced by some V_X that is somehow connected with N and P. The variant readings that I have discussed above certainly show that the T manuscript of SP represents a pre-canonical version (which in this case means predating the common source of these four canonical editions). Thus this particular V_X must also be pre-canonical. It is, however, not the same version that forms the basis for V_T , which must also be considered as pre-canonical, as the examples given below will show. For the time being I shall have to leave a question mark next to this problem.

Just as above, V_T does not support any of the substantial variants in the *kārikās*. Nevertheless, it contains a number of variants that testify to its independence from the canonical versions. Two cases may suffice to illustrate this, for which the Skt. equivalents are extant in passages of the Jaina authors Prabhācandra (980-1065) and (Vādi)devasūri (~ 1080-1170) ⁽¹³⁾, identified as quotations by Frauwallner.

3r7 (commenting on k. 19b [underlined]) reads: *bśad ma thag pa spyir 'brel pa 'gog pa'i gzuñ des kyañ thams cad dpyad pa yin te*. NPDC have: *bśad ma thag pa'i phyir* ... Frauwallner states in a note (p. 295, fn. 1) that *pa'i phyir* ('because of') of the Tibetan tradition is wrong and should be *spyir* ('general') according to Prabhācandra (147,10): *sarvam etenānantaroktena sāmānyasambandhapraṭiṣedhena cintitam*. ('All this has been discussed herewith, i.e. by the general refutation of relationship just explained').

— T proves Frauwallner right.

3v2 (on k. 20ab): *des na phan pa myi byed pa'i phyir 'brel pa myed pa ni ma yin no ze na*. In the canonical editions the negation of *byed pa* is missing. Of course,

⁽¹³⁾ *Syādvādaratnākara* by Vādideva Sūri, 2 vols., Dillī 1988; for Prabhācandra see fn. 11. Dates according to Frauwallner's estimate.

it makes good sense without: 'Opponent: Therefore, as they induce influence, it is not correct that they are without relationship'. T's reading, however, is in total agreement with Devasūri's (p. 817, f. 25) quotation: *ato nānupakārād sambandhiteti / tan na* ('Opponent: Therefore it is not correct that, because of not inducing influence, they are without relationship'). In the given context, this version is certainly to be preferred ⁽¹⁴⁾.

In conclusion, I would like to revert to the two questions with which I approached this manuscript, and to the twofold aim of this study that I formulated at the beginning. As to the age of the actual manuscript no precise answer can be given. Obviously it does not belong to Ta pho's oldest manuscripts, which might date back to the 11th or early 12th century. As a *terminus ante quem* for the particular archaic writing style in the Tabo area, De Rossi Filibeck suggests the annexation of mNa' ris by Tibet at the end of the 17th century ⁽¹⁵⁾. This sounds reasonable, but beyond that nothing can be said at the moment.

With regard to the state of textual development represented by the Ta pho manuscript, however, it can be shown that it is independent of the four major canonical editions and thus reflects a version of the texts prior to the oldest common source of these editions. This might very well mean that it is prior to the compilation of the canon in the early 14th century. Moreover, in many cases the T readings are better than the canonical ones, and from this I conclude that they are also closer to the original Tibetan translation.

Finally, with regard to evaluating the manuscripts of Ta pho as a whole, a few observations in connection with a single manuscript are certainly not very significant. Provided that I did not, by chance, pick the only manuscript of interest from among the roughly 40,000 leaves, it can nevertheless serve as evidence for the fact that much more can be expected. The Ta pho manuscripts, together with similar collections possibly surviving in other monasteries of Western Tibet, might give access to a new, hitherto unknown text tradition. However, this remains for further studies to show.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. Frauwallner, *op. cit.*, p. 296, fn. 1.

⁽¹⁵⁾ 'A Study of a Fragmentary Manuscript of the *Pañcaviṃśatikā* in the Ta pho Library', this volume.

SAMBANDHAPARĪKṢĀ

fol. 16r10/16v (k. 1-23a)

(P 5713, 357r3-358r4; D 4214, 255r2-v6)

(C Ce 252r1-v5; N Ce 375v6-377r2)

< >	empty space	$\overset{\underset{\cdot}{i}}{\underset{\cdot}{i}}$	inverted <i>gi gu</i>
{ }	deleted in the manuscript	$\overset{\underset{\cdot}{i}}{\underset{\cdot}{i}}$	inverted <i>gi gu</i> + subscribed 'a <i>chuñ</i>
()	uncertain reading	=	illegible <i>akṣara</i> with or without vowel sign, including the <i>śad</i>
[]	illegible, restored		
○	circles surrounding the hole for binding	<u> </u>	underlined: horizontal ligature, <i>dr: ra</i> in <i>dbu med</i> style
*	beginning of the line	bold:	passages that show variant readings
		xxx	amendments below the line ^{xxx}

rgya gar skad du | **sam ban dha pa ri̇ kśa kā ri̇ ka** | < > bod skad du | 'brel̇d pa brtag ba'i̇
rab tu byed **pa'o** | '**phags pa**' 'jam dpal g'zon nur gyurd pa la phyag 'tshal lo ||

- 16v1 g'zan dbaṅ kho **na** 'brel̇d **par ni̇** || grub na g'zan dbaṅ ci̇ žig **yin** ||
de phyir dños = = = = = | 'brel̇ = * yaṅ dag ṅi̇d du myed || [1]
- ño bo 'dres pa 'brel̇ yin = [] gñ[i]s ṅi̇d **yin na** ji̇ ltar 'gyur ||
de **bas** raṅ b'zin tha dad pa || 'brel̇d pa yaṅ dag ṅi̇d du myed || [2]
- g'zan **ltos** pa ni̇ 'brel̇d par yaṅ || myed na de **ni̇** ji̇ ltar (**l**)**tos** ||
yod **na 'aṅ** kun la rag ma las || dños po ji̇ ltar **ltos** = = [3]
- 16v2 (gñis) ni̇ 'brel̇d = * gcig **pu** yis || ji̇ **ste** 'brel̇d na de daṅ gñis ||
'brel̇d pa gaṅ yin thug **pa 'aṅ** myed || de b'zin '**brel̇d** myed śes par bya || [4]
- dños po de gñis de las g'zan || de dag thams cad bdag ṅi̇d gnas ||
de **bas** raṅ dños ma 'dres la || de dag **rtog** pas (')**dres** par [b]y[ed] || [5]
- 16v3 (= =) (rjes su '**brel̇d**) * **pa** yis || dños po tha dad rtogs **bya** phyir ||
bya daṅ byed **pa pa'i̇** tshig || smra ba po dag '**god par** byed || [6]
- rgyu daṅ 'bras bu'i̇ **dños po** yaṅ || de gñis lhan cig myi̇ gnas pas ||
gñis la gnas pa ji̇ ltar '**grub** || gñis la myi̇ gnas ji̇ ltar 'brel̇d || [7]
- 16v4 rim las dños po gci(g) = (=) gnas || g'zan la re * ba myed pa yin ||
de myed par yaṅ yod pa'i̇ phyir || gcig la '**dug** pa 'brel̇d pa myed || [8]
- <○> '**di̇ ni̇ g'zan du** 'dug pa **na** || ji̇ **ste** de **gñis** gcig la ltos ||
ltos pa phaṅ ba byed par 'gyur || myed na ji̇ ltar phaṅ **pa** byed || [9]
- ji̇ **ste** don gcig 'brel̇d pa'i̇ phyir || de gñis rgyu = = s {=} ṅi̇d yin (na) ||
16v5 gñis * ṅi̇d las **stsogs** 'brel̇d pa'i̇ phyir || g.yas **g.yos** rwa yaṅ de **gñis 'thob** || [10]

- 'ga' žig <○> gñis gnas 'breld pa yin || de mtshan de las gžan du myin ||
yod dañ myed **pa'i** <○> bye brag can || sbyor ba ji **ste** rgyu 'bras na || [11]
- 16v6 sbyor ba'i bye brag = = de ñid || 'dir ni rgyu 'bras * ci ph[y]ir myin ||
tha dad ces **byar** sgra 'di ni || smra **byed rten pa** ma yin nam || [12]
- 'ga' žig mthoñ <○> na ma mthoñ mthoñ || de ma mthoñ na ma mthoñ ba ||
'bras bu yin ba ñid du ni || stond pa'i⁽¹⁶⁾ <○> skye bo myed par šes || [13]
- 16v7 mthoñ dañ ma mthoñ ma g[t]o(gs) = = = | 'bras bu'i (bl)o ni myi sri(d) * = = =
'di la (')bras bu **sgra las stsogs sgra 'añ** || **sla bar bya phyir rnam par bkod** || [14]
- de yod yod phyir <○> de 'bras rtogs || gañ yañ rjes su smra **ba'i** ||
brda'i yul du de brjod de || **kog** šal las <○> **stsogs** glañ rtogs bžin || [15]
- 16v8 yod 'gyur yo(d na) = = = ci[ñ] || yo[d] pa (ñ)i(d) **na 'añ** * = = = [']gyur ba ||
mñon sum myi dmigs pa dag las || rgyu **dañ 'bras bur** rab tu grub || [16]
- re šig de tsam yañ dag don || rgyu dañ 'bras bu'i spyod yul rnames ||
rnam par rtog pas **stond** pa ni || **don log 'breld pa'i** bžin **stond** || [17]
- tha dad yin na ci žg 'breld | = = = = min na rgyu 'bras gañ ||
16v9 gžan * = = = d (na) ma 'brel gñis || de gñis 'breld **par** ji ltar byed || [18]
- sbyor dañ 'du ba las **stsogs** pa || thams cad des kyañ dpyad pa yin ||
phan tshun phan pa myi byed phyir || de 'dra ba la 'breld pa myed || [19]
- 'du ba can ni 'ga' žig gis || 'bras bu skyed par byed **na yañ** ||
16v10 **de'i** tshe = = = can 'di my(ed) || š[i]n tu thal phyir de **la(=?)** * = = = = [20]
- = = = is dañ ni 'du ba **'am** || gžan yañ phan pa myi byed _{par} ||
ji **ste** 'breld na mtha' dag kyañ || phan tshun 'breld pa can du 'gyur || [21]
- las stsogs** sbyor ba can {du} grub phy(i)r || **sbyor (s)kye(d) kyañ de gñis des** ||
sbyor ba can du myi 'dod de || gnas par **byed pa** rab (d)u br(j)od || [22]
- sbyor ba las **stsogs pa'i** gnas | = = = (?)

(16) 'a chuñ subscribed to pa.

VARIANT READINGS

V and T without specification (NPDC_T) indicate that all versions agree.

- Title:** sam ban dha pa ri kśa kā ri ka : sam bam dha pa rī kṣa pra ka ra ṇa (NP), sam bandha pa rī kṣa (C: ra kṣi ?) pra ka ra ṇa (DC);
pa'o || 'phags pa' : pa | (NPDC)
- 1a:** na (T_A) : nar (NPDCV); par : pa (NPDC) **1b:** yin : yod (NPDCV_T)
2b: yin na : la de'añ (NP) **2c:** bas : phyir (NPDCV_T)
3a: ltos : bltos (NP) **3b:** ni (V_T) : ñid (NP); ltos : blta'o (P), bltos (N)
3c: na 'añ : na'añ (NPDC) **3d:** ltos : bltos (NP)
4a: gcig pu : gcig du (P)
4c: pa 'añ : pa (NPDC), pa'añ (V_{NP}), pa'am (V_D) **4d:** 'breld : 'bres (C)
5c: bas : las (P); **5d:** rtog (V_{NP}T_{NP}) : rtogs (NPDCV_DT_D); 'dres (V_T) : 'brel (NP)
6ab: 6ba (NPDCV), T = A
6a: 'breld pa : 'brañ ba (NPDCV_{NP}T), 'bral (V_D?)
6b: bya : bya'i (PDCV_{PD}T_{PD}), pa'i (NV_NT_N)
6c: pa pa'i : pa po yi (NPDCV), pa'i (T); **6d:** 'god par : 'gog bar (P)
7a: dños po (A) : 'brel ba (NPDC); **7c:** 'grub (V) : grub (NPDC)
8d: 'dug : gnas (NPDCV_T)
9a: 'di ni gźan du : gźan du 'di ni (NPDC); na (V_T) : dañ (NP)
9b: gñis (V_T) : ni (DC) **9d:** pa (V_T_D) : par (NPDC_T_{NP})
10d: g.yos : g.yon (NPDCV_T); gñis : ñid (DC); 'thob (V_{ND}) : thob (NV_PT)
11c: pa 'i : pa'i (NPDC)
12c: byar : bya'i (NPDC) **12d:** byed rten pa : byed la brten (NPDC);
13a: 'ga' žig : gañ žig (NPDC), 'ba' žig (V)
14c: sgra las stsogs sgra 'añ : la sogs sgra (NPDCV), la sogs sgra 'añ (P sgra'añ) (T)
14d: sla bar bya phyir rnam par bkod : tha sñad sla ba'i phyir bkod do (NPDCV),
15b: ba'i : ba yi (NPDC) **15c:** brda'i : brda yi (NPDC)
15d: kog : lkog (NPDCV_T)
16b: na 'añ : na'añ (NPDC) **16d:** dañ 'bras bur : 'bras kho nar (NPDC), ... na (V)
17d: don log 'breld pa'i : don log pa yi don (NPDC), don 'brel pa yi don (F)
V_T: rgyu dañ 'bras bu'i spyod yul rnams [T + ...] ston pa de yañ 'brel pa'i
(V_{DCT}T + don) bźin ston te | ... || de ltar byed pas (T + na) log pa'i don yin no
18d: par : pa (DC)
20b: na yañ : pa na (NPDC) **20c:** de'i (V_T) : de (NPDC)
20d: la(=)/la[s] (FV_T las) : gñis (NPDC)
21a: 'am : dañ (NPDCV_T)
22a: las stsogs : la sogs (NPDC), las sogs (F), V_T: las la sogs pa
22b: sbyor skyed kyañ de gñis des : sbyor ba bskyed (DCV_DT_{PD} skyed, T_N skyes) kyañ des
de gñis (NPDCV_T)
22d: byed pa : byed pa'añ (NPDCV_T)
23a: pa'i : pa yi (NPDC)