

THE RNAL 'BYOR CHEN PO BSGOM PA'I DON MANUSCRIPT  
OF THE 'GONDHLA KANJUR'

HELMUT TAUSCHER (VIENNA)

Nowadays Gondhla is an inconspicuous little village in Lahaul, Himachal Pradesh, some ten km east of the confluence of the rivers Chandra and Bhaga. In the old days, however, its importance as the centre of the principality of Ti nan must have been much greater; the partly ruined, but still impressive tower of the Thakur's castle is now the only obvious remainder of those better days. Another such remainder—but not as easily seen—is the manuscript collection in the possession of the Thakur, a set of 35 partly illuminated volumes. An additional volume, containing works such as the *Lalitavistara* and the *mahāsūtra Māyājāla*,<sup>1</sup> was viewed and partly photographed by D. Klimburg-Salter and Ch. Luczanits in 1991, but it cannot be traced anymore.

Although no Tibetan Buddhist would hesitate to call this collection a Kanjur, technically speaking it is not, in the sense of an homogenous body with, e.g. running volume-numbering; such numbering is found only within the sets of the *Ratnakūṭa* (six vols.), the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (originally four vols., one missing) and the *Mahā-parinirvāṇasūtra* (two vols.). The Gondhla collection also seems to pre-date the compilation of the Tibetan canon at Narthang/Zhalu at the beginning of 14<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, although it was not necessarily produced as one set in its totality, it appears to form a unit, with all the volumes being very much alike with regard to size (67–69 x 19–21 cm, 10–11 lines), palaeography, orthography, and the style of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Skilling 1997a: 198f.

<sup>2</sup> Without any inclination to contribute to the ongoing discussion about whether and to what extent or in which context it might or might not be justified to speak of a Tibetan 'canon', I use the term in the general sense of "a 'normative collection of texts' which should not be subject to alteration" (Eimer 2002: 7) and refer it to both Kanjur and Tanjur.

The discussion mentioned above and the present state of Kanjur research is reflected, e.g., in the papers collected in Eimer 1997 (s. in particular Skilling 1997b) and Eimer and Germano 2002.

the miniatures. 34 of these 35 volumes contain in *mdo mangs*-style units the greater part of all texts commonly recorded in the *mdo* sections of the various Tibetan Kanjur editions, a few texts that are included in the *rgyud* section of Peking and Derge, four texts (*Loka-prajñapti*, *Kāraṇaprajñapti*, *Kuṇālāvadāna*, *Li'i yul lung bstan pa*) that occur in the Tanjurs of Peking and Derge as well as in some editions of the Kanjur (e.g. Stok Palace and Ulan Bator), and one non-canonical text (*Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don*), with ten texts still to be identified: 277 titles in total, 24 of them duplicated or even triplicated. One volume contains 101 *dhāraṇīs*. All the texts are complete or almost complete; quite a number of folios, however, were replaced in later times, probably the 19<sup>th</sup> or even the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There is, however, not a single *sher phyin* text. Local rumours have it that the extant collection at Gondhla is only half of the original one, and that the other part, probably containing *sher phyin* and *rgyud* texts, is kept in Phukthar monastery in Zanskar.<sup>3</sup>

If this local information is based on fact, this collection could quite appropriately be called a 'Proto-Kanjur', representing a pre-canonical attempt to gather all of the words of the Buddha, that is, a rather extensive form of the smaller collections of texts which all Kanjurs ultimately go back to.<sup>4</sup> As such, it could be either the copy of a similar 'Proto-Kanjur' or an original attempt towards such a compilation, which made use of existing *mdo mangs* volumes. Corruptions within some of the volumes make clear that the arrangement of the texts within them was taken over from older models: some of the texts have been separated into several parts, interrupted by passages from other texts that merge into each other without any indication; in some cases the beginning of the text appears more than 100 folios after its end. The only plausible explanation for this is that the volume was copied with its folios in disorder. Some of these mix-ups were detected by some later reader, and indicated as 'error in the texts' (or similar) in *dbu med* script; unfortunately but naturally without any reference to the correct text.

<sup>3</sup> Personal communication of Tshering Dorje, Keylong.

<sup>4</sup> See Eimer 2002: 4. For such attempts at pre-canonical collections of manuscripts see, e.g., Tucci 1988: 69f., and the short statement in Rin chen bzang po's biography, reporting that he equipped even his smaller foundations with three volumes/copies (?) each of *mdo mang(s)* and seven volumes/copies (?) of '*Bum*' (Tucci 1988: 115, fol. 13a7–b1).

The question of dating the manuscripts poses some problems. On the basis of the stylistic evidence of the illuminations they have been dated to the 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>5</sup> From palaeographic and orthographic features one could tentatively date them to the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> or early 14<sup>th</sup> century. Of course, it is highly problematic to restrict the dating of any Tibetan manuscript to a period of some fifty years on this basis alone. In the case of West-Tibetan manuscripts it is virtually impossible; too little material has been investigated as yet to justify any dating other than tentative and within a wider margin. The Gondhla manuscripts do present archaic elements that could—according to the classification established by Scherrer-Schaub<sup>6</sup>—allow for an earlier date, but they do not occur consistently, and the ‘classical’ forms are to be found as well; even the negation *med* occurs without a *ya btags*, and the spelling *myed* is probably the most long-lived of all archaic forms. The particular mixture of old and new orthographic and palaeographic features seems to speak against an earlier dating; it cannot, however, be completely ruled out.

These archaic features will not be discussed at this point; they have been dealt with sufficiently elsewhere,<sup>7</sup> and some of them will be mentioned later in this paper. The pagination system, however, deserves special mention. In general, the system typical for the time and the area is used: the letters *na*, *ma*, *nga* subscribed to the letter of the volume signature and followed by the numerals 1–100 indicate hundreds from fol. 101 onwards. This system is used even if the ‘set’ consists of only one volume; in general these one-set volumes bear the signatures Ka (1–100), Ka-Na ([10]1–200), Ka-Ma ([20]1–300), Ka-Nga ([30]1–400). There are, however, a few exceptions. In one case the hundreds are indicated by the letters *ka*, *kha*, *ga* plus numerals; once *ka-ma* does not appear, and *ka-nga* is used instead to denote fols. 201+; once *ka-nga* is replaced by *ka-wa*, however on folios replaced much later.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Klimburg-Salter 1994: 59, and personal communication of Ch. Luczanits.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Scherrer-Schaub 1999.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., Steinkellner 1994, De Rossi Filibeck 1994, Tauscher 1994, Scherrer-Schaub 1999.

<sup>8</sup> This usage seems to be very rare, but it is not unique. One such instance is to be found also among the Tabo manuscripts (see Steinkellner 1994: 125).

A precise answer to the question of date could be given by historians if they knew the dates of Rdo rje pa la, the second chief of Ti nan according to the “Chronicles” and the genealogical tree of Ti nan published in Francke’s *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*.<sup>9</sup> He is mentioned in dedication poems in two texts. The 12<sup>th</sup> chief, Ha ri ya, a contemporary of the Kullu king Bahādur Singh, has been dated to the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century by Francke.<sup>10</sup> Francke’s estimate and an allowance of an average reign of 25 years for each chief places Rdo rje pa la in the last quarter of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. If, on the other hand, the manuscripts—and thus Rdo rje pa la—are not later than the 12<sup>th</sup> century, an average reign of at least 35 years would follow, which seems unlikely. Or one has to assume that the genealogical lists are incomplete, and at least three or four chiefs are missing from them; but there is not particular evidence for this.

The dedications offer additional information that might turn out to be valuable in one respect or other; they mention the chief’s palace as Sa de’u chung nal ze sku mkhar,<sup>11</sup> and they give the names of donors and the scribe (Rdo rje rtse). In addition, they make clear that ‘Gondhla’ was originally the name of a sacred mountain, a mountain to the north of the village Gondhla, also known as Dril bu ri. The spellings “Ghan dha la” and “Gan da la” reflect the recent local pronunciation of the name when it is referred to the monastery that is commonly known as Guru Ghantal;<sup>12</sup> when referred to the village, the pronunciation follows the modern Indian spelling. As a place-name the dedications give only Ti nan; it is, however, not clear whether this refers to the village or to the principality as a whole.

The non-canonical text mentioned earlier, the *Rnal ’byor chen po bsgom pa’i don*, is an anthology of *sūtra* quotations, very much in the style of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, in answer to 88 questions that were obviously considered to be relevant for the “practice of *mahāyoga*” (*rnal ’byor chen po bsgom pa*) and occur subsequent to the initial and

<sup>9</sup> Francke 1926: 211ff.; there, the name appears in the forms Rdo rje pha la and Rdo rje pāl (= Rdo rje dpal?).

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*: 214 (notes). Francke follows “Dr. Vogel’s investigations” in a work which he quotes as “Vogel, Jean Phillippe, *Triloknāth etc*”. It is not accessible to me.

<sup>11</sup> sku mkhar Nal rtse in the *Chronicle of Ti nan*, Francke 1926: 212f.

<sup>12</sup> Francke 1926: 215 derives ‘Gondhla’ as the name for the principality “from the important and ancient monastery of *Gandhola*, which is situated within its boundaries” (my emphasis).



crucial question: “How is the perfection of insight, which is homogeneous by nature and unitary, differentiated?” (*shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa rang bzhin gyis mnyam zhing tshul gcig pa las so sor gyes pa ci lta bu zhe na*).

A Dunhuang MS (PT 996) names the author: Spug Ye shes dbyangs.<sup>13</sup> This text also sets the context with regard to religious history. It starts with Nam ka'i snying po,<sup>14</sup> his spiritual lineage (A rtan hywer - Be'u sing Hwa shang - Man Hwa shang - Nam ka'i snying po), his virtues, and a hymn composed by him in praise of the path of yoga. The following section, entitled *Theg pa chen po rnam par myi rtog par bsgom pa'i lam*,<sup>15</sup> contains a biographical sketch of Spug Ye shes dbyangs and names him as the author of the *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don*. Although the actual relation between the two masters is not stated—Spug Ye shes dbyangs is only said to have died in the hermitage of Nam ka'i snying po—the structure of the text suggests a rather close one. Accordingly, his work can safely be associated more generally with the *dhyāna - gcig car pa* tradition commonly connected with Hwa shang Mahāyāna. Bu ston even attributes the *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don* to Hwa shang Mahāyāna in his *Chos 'byung*;<sup>16</sup> considering the evidence of the much older manuscript from Dunhuang, this seems highly questionable. However, the catalogue of the 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai lama's library at 'Bras spungs, too, lists the manuscript of a “*Mdo sde brgyad cu'i khungs* composed by Hwa shang mahā ya na”.<sup>17</sup> In the Gondhla collection it is preceded by the *Kuśalamūlaparidharasūtra* (Q 769) and followed

<sup>13</sup> 771–850 acc. Okimoto 1993 (s. Otokawa 1999: n. 1). In view of *Bka' thang sde lnga* Nga 66b5–67a1 (quoted in Okimoto 1993: 18), however, this date appears problematic and possibly too late. This passage—following a report of the foundation of Bsam yas, and placed between the lists of 76 primarily Indian scholars and of the *sad mi mi bdun*—tells about a text which strikingly resembles our *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don*: it is called a (?) *Rnal 'byor chen po sgom pa'i lung* which consists of 88 chapters of questions in four *bam po* and contains quotations from 80 *sūtras*; as its additional title *Rin chen phreng ba* is given. The author of the text is not mentioned, but the 88 questions are closely and directly attributed to King Khri Srong lde btsan.

<sup>14</sup> Possibly identical with the Nam mkha'i snying po mentioned in *Bka' thang sde lnga* (Nga 67a1) among the *sad mi mi bdun*; cf. Tucci 1958: 13.

<sup>15</sup> 3b5ff. (Lalou 1939: 520–522).

<sup>16</sup> Szerb 1990: 35f.

<sup>17</sup> 'Bras spungs dpe rnying dkar chag: 1655, No 018810. On this alternative title of the *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don* see below.

by the *Paramārthadharmavijaya* (Q 912) and *Dānapāramitāsūtra* (Q 849).

Until now this text was extant only in fragments from Dunhuang (PT 818 and ST 705)<sup>18</sup> and Tabo (provisional numbers 36 and 89).<sup>19</sup> The Dunhuang material, together with other texts of this tradition, has been studied by Lalou 1939 (including a facsimile edition of PT 996, referred to by its provisional number 202), Imaeda 1975 and Okimoto 1993; the Tabo fragments were recently presented in Otokawa 1999.

The present paper does not intend to touch upon the content or the religious significance of the *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don*, but concentrates on technical and structural aspects relevant for the editing of the text, which is in progress.

The full title of the text is given four times at the beginning of the *bam pos*: *Rnal 'byor chen po/por/pos bsgom pa'i don (l) theg pa chen po'i mdo' (sde [zab mo]) las btus pa*. At the beginning and the end of the MS it is referred to as *Mdo sde brgyad bcu khungs* and *Brgyad bcu khungs*, respectively; this title is also given in PT 996 (4a5: *Mdo sde brgyad bcu'i khungs*) and by Bu ston (see above). As the expression *mdo (sde'i) khungs ni brgyad bcu zhig bzugs* ("the *sūtra*-testimony comprises 80 [texts quoted]") appears in the text itself, Otokawa argues that this cannot be taken as the title of a work;<sup>20</sup> he nevertheless accepts PT 996 as evidence for Spug Ye shes dbyangs being the author of the *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don*. In addition, what is given as the title in PT 996 and by Bu ston and affirmed by the Gondhla manuscript is not *Mdo sde'i khungs brgyad bcu*, but (*Mdo sde*) *brgyad bcu('i) khungs* ("[having] 80 *sūtras* [as its] source", or similar), and thus the Gondhla manuscript makes it fairly clear that this is the alternative title of the *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don*. For the sake of convenience it will henceforth be referred to by the short title *Brgyad bcu khungs*.

The text commences with a verse section, and the opening lines read:

<sup>18</sup> Thanks to Burkhard Quessel for making all the Dunhuang material mentioned available to me.

<sup>19</sup> Fragments of a third manuscript of this text have been identified among the Tabo materials (provisional number 149) after the completion of the present paper; its variant readings could not be taken account of.

<sup>20</sup> Otokawa 1999: 102f.

“The purpose of practising yoga is, in short, [to find out] how the homogeneous and unitary [perfection of] insight is differentiated. In order to explain this unity, there are 88 chapters of questions. The *sūtra*-testimony comprises 80 [texts quoted]”.

(*rnal 'byor bsgom don mdor bsdus na || shes rab mnyam nyid tshul gcig las || so sor gyes pa ci lta bu || tshul gcig de'i don bstand phyir || zhus pa'i le'u brgyad bcu brgyad || mdo'i don ni brgyad bcur bsdus ||*)

Then follow, also in verse, the 88 questions that will be dealt with. This “[list of] 88 chapters of questions” (*zhus pa'i le'u brgyad bcu rtsa brgyad{pa}*, see Appendix A) is followed by a list of the *sūtras* that will be quoted (see Appendix B). It comprises 82 titles; three of them, Nos. 66 (duplication of 30), 72 and 76 (duplication of 25) on the list, are added as corrections in the margin.

Some of these titles, however, are duplications, either through the Tibetan and the Sanskrit titles of the same text being given (*Dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po'i mdo'* and *Pun dha ri ka'i mdo'*, Nos. 6 and 26; *Da sha bu myi'i mdo'* and *Sa bcu'i mdo'*, Nos. 78 and 79), through simple repetition (*'Byung ba m(y)ed pa'i mdo'*, Nos. 30 and 66), or through superficially diverging names being given (*De bzhin gshegs pa'i gsang ba'i mdo'* and *Gsang ba'i mdo'*, Nos. 13 and 48; *Glang po dang mtshungs pa'i mdo'* and *'Phags pa glang dang mtshungs pa'i mdo'*, Nos. 25 and 76; *Dkon mchog brtsegs pa'i mdo'* and *Dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i mdo'*, Nos. 33 and 57). In one case actually alternative titles of the same text are cited (*Ting nge 'dzind rgyal po'i mdo'*/*Samādhirājasūtra* and *Zla ba sgron ma'i mdo'*/*Candrapradīpasūtra*, Nos. 55 and 64);<sup>21</sup> *Zla ba mar mye'i mdo'* (No. 65) is most probably an alternative translation of the same title. In the same way *Tshangs pa kun 'dris kyi mdo'* and (*'Phags pa*) *Tshangs pas zhus pa'i mdo'* (Nos. 22 and 82) also seem to be different translations of the same title (*Brahmapariprcchāsūtra*).

In the *Brgyad bcu khungs* proper, too, all these alternative forms appear, together with some additional ones (e.g. *Zla ba'i le'u* for *Zla ba'i snying po'i mdo'* [No. 7] or *Sdong po(s) bkod pa'i mdo'* for *Gsdong [= Sdong] pos brgyand pa'i mdo'* [No. 43]<sup>22</sup>) which are not listed separately. Three titles cited but not appearing on the list, how-

<sup>21</sup> On these alternative titles see, e.g., Dutt 1941: I-X; Tropper 2005: 51f.

<sup>22</sup> See Steinkellner 1995: 16ff.; Tropper 2005: 45.

ever, seem to be additional texts rather than alternative titles or translations, namely, *Tshangs pa khyad par sems kyis zhus pa'i mdo'*, *Ki sin lon gyi mdo'*, and *Theg chen sa chen gyi mdo'*.

Together with the 82 titles of the list this amounts to 85 titles referring to some 76 texts (see Appendix B). However, the duplications of titles and texts reflect the rather mechanical way in which the author took the quotations over from various sources, and due to this some uncertainty remains as to how many texts are actually referred to as *Prajñāpāramitā* (*Shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i mdo'*), *Ratnakūṭa* (*Dkon mchog brtsegs pa [chen po]'i mdo'*), and *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (*Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo'*). At the present stage this question cannot be decided, as the identification of the greater part of the quotations remains to be done. Under the title *Shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i mdo'* we find quotations from the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* and the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*, and citations from other *Prajñāpāramitā* texts cannot be excluded. *Dkon mchog brtsegs pa'i mdo'* refers to the *Kāśyapaparivarta* in most of the identified quotations, but also to the *Maitreyamahāsimṣhanāda* in one case; in the remaining quotations additional texts from the *Ratnakūṭa* collection might be referred to, but also *sūtras* already listed individually. The *Gaṇḍavyūha* is quoted in both ways, under its individual title (*Gsdong pos brgyand pa'i mdo' / Sdong pos bkod pa'i mdo'*) and as *Buddhāvataṃsaka* (*Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo'*), which might also refer to other texts of this collection.

As many quotations are still to be identified, the sources for the quotations are also not yet clear in most of the instances; however, Spug Ye shes dbyangs seems to have made extensive use of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*. In some cases his quotations are much closer to the *Sūtrasamuccaya* version than to the canonical versions of the respective texts; others, however, deviate from both. The *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Brgyad bcu khungs* have corresponding sections and occasionally even quotations in the same order. Apart from the *Sūtrasamuccaya* the *Brgyad bcu khungs* also seems to depend on what Otokawa refers to as “some Chinese apocryphal text(s)”.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Otokawa 1999: 103 and 112–117. In particular he mentions a Chinese anthology provisionally called *Zhujing yao chao*, which exists only as a fragment. Cf. PT 996: 4a3–5 (Lalou 1939: 521), where it is stated that the text was composed making use of the precepts and instructions of skilled Indian, Chinese and Tibetan experts on *samādhi* as well as of Mahāyāna *sūtras* of explicit meaning (... *rgya gar*



The *Brgyad bcu khungs* proper commences with the initial question already mentioned. In accordance with the verse text, the following 88 chapters of questions generally consist of one question each. As an exception, Question No. 21 is split into two. The verse-text reads: “As direct, intuitive knowledge is the object consisting in the meaning, what is it like to be attached to words, not knowing the meaning of direct, intuitive knowledge?” (*rang rig dond kyi spyod yul phyir || rang rig don ni ma rig nas || sgra la chags pa ci lta bu*), and this is represented with: “What is it that a yogi has to follow for the sake of direct, intuitive knowledge?” ([*de la*] *rnal 'byord pa rang gis rig pa'i don kyi phyir 'brang bar bya ba gang [zhe na]*) and: “Of what kind is the fault of adhering to words?” (*sgra ci bzhin du song ba'i nyes pa ci lta bu [zhe na]*). Four of the chapters (29, 30, 58, 81) seem to be sub-divided by additional questions that are formally identical with the 88 main questions, but are not represented in verse. They are taken over from the respective source-text, where they function as introductions to the immediately following quotations only. In three of the cases this source-text is the *Sūtrasamuccaya*; in one case it could not be identified, but an analogous situation can be assumed with some certainty.

In a quite unique manner these 88 chapters are presented in groups of—theoretically—11, with the chapter numbers mentioned at the end of each group: 11, 22, 33, etc. This, of course, is helpful with regard to checking and—when necessary—establishing the correct flow of the text (see Appendix A, questions No. 44–49), but the actual, inconsistent execution of this system also poses a problem. The indication “chapter 11” appears after the tenth question, and this sequence is confirmed by the Tabo fragments. This could mean that the initial question is counted by mistake, although it clearly should not be (see Appendix A). As a consequence, one of the following groups should contain 12 questions. In fact, the group ending with the indication “chapter 66” after question 64, again, contains only 10, and the following two groups contain 12 questions each. As this grouping, too, seems to be confirmed by the Tabo manuscripts, it could be a rather old corruption; however, there is no obvious break to indicate

---

*dang | rgya dang | bod kyi bsam gtan mkhan nyams can rnams kyi lung dang | man [MS nam] ngag dang | de dag gi don dang | theg pa chen po'i mdo sde nges pa'i don du gsungs pa rnams kyi khungs dang yang gtugs nas | ...).*

disorder in the flow of the text. Probably the easiest solution is to assume that it is a slip of the author himself.

The Gondhla manuscript comprises 40 folios (plus two lines), from Ka-Na 99a10 to Ka-Ma 40a10, with one folio bearing a double number (Ka-Ma 15/16). Although no folio is missing, the text is not complete. The equivalent of slightly less than one folio (probably one folio of the recension copied) is missing; it could also not be detected mixed into one of the other texts of this volume, in the manner mentioned above. Fortunately this missing passage is totally covered by the Tabo fragments. However, this is not the only corruption in the Gondhla manuscript. At least in one case the sequence of the text is in severe disorder, but it could be re-established.<sup>24</sup>

Until now, the investigation of almost all the manuscripts from western Tibet has revealed considerable independence, and we tend to speak of a "West Tibetan manuscript tradition". This, of course, implies not only independence from other traditions, but also some relation between the manuscripts of the area. The present text seems to be suitable for an enquiry into the question of such an interdependence, and the Gondhla manuscript [G] has been compared with the available fragments for this purpose.

PT 818 and ST 705 comprise 12 folios of a manuscript which must originally have consisted of some 70–72 folios. Although these fragments are kept in distinct collections, they clearly belong to the same manuscript [D].<sup>25</sup>

The following folios are extant:

D	=	G	D	=	G
Ka 4 (PT 818)		Ka-Ma1a5–b4	19 (PT 818)		9b7–10a4
5 (PT 818)		1b5–2a6	22 (ST 705)		11a6–b6
9 (PT 818)		4a2–b4	25 (PT 818)		12b9–13a10
11 (PT 818)		5a6–b9	27 (PT 818)		14a2–b4
13 (ST 705)		6b1–7a2	33 (ST 705)		17b2–18a4
15 (ST 705)		7b3–8a	36 (ST 705)		19a9–20a1

<sup>24</sup> Ka-Na 99a10–Ka-Ma 21a7; 22b3–24a6; 21a10–22b3; 21a7–10[!]; 24a6ff. Essentially, this corruption can be explained by the exemplar copied having had its folios in disorder; the reason for the misplacement of less than three lines (21a7–10), however, is unclear.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Otokawa 1999: n. 2. According to the Gondhla manuscript the two folios of PT 818 that are partly broken and without pagination can be identified as fol. 4 and 11.

Tabo 36 [T(A)] consists of 9 out of approximately 35–36 folios for the entire manuscript. Of Tabo 89 [T(B)] we have only three folios. Their paginations, Ka 3, 16 and 22, are clearly legible, but they cannot be correct, unless the equivalent of at least ten folios was already missing from its model when the manuscript was produced; 3, 26 and 32 would suit much better, as “folio 22” contains the end of the text, with only two to three lines left to follow. As each of the three folios contains only slightly more text than the Gondhla folios do, it simply is not possible that the entire text can be covered by 22 folios + 2–3 lines.

T(A)	=	G	T(B)	=	G
Ka 3		1a6–2a10	Ka 3		1b5–2b8
10–11		9b7–12a1	16		32b3–33b8
15 (a1–8)		15/16b2–10	22		39a5–40a7
18		19a5–20a9			
25		27a8–b10			
27–29		29b3–33a4			

In the two passages extant in both fragments (equivalent to G 1b5–2a10 and 32b3–33a4), T(A) and T(B) show only some insignificant variants; they can therefore be assumed to represent the same tradition, and for the present purpose they are treated as one manuscript [T].

The following sections of G are represented in both the other manuscripts, T and D: 1a6–2a6; 9b7–10a3; 11a6–b6; 19a9–20a1—the equivalent of about three folios altogether.

With regard to palaeography, all three manuscripts are similar, with very few exceptions: the *gi gu log*, for example, is quite frequent in D, but appears only two to three times in T and only once in G; in G the ligature *sp* occurs in its ‘classic’ form as well as in the horizontal type, in the most extreme form in the combination *spy(o)*; *st* takes, in the majority of cases, its ‘classic’ form.

Still, there are some general orthographic differences: in T the *da drag* appears slightly more frequently than in G and particularly D,<sup>26</sup> and the spelling *ji* is used where G and D generally have *ci*. The su-

<sup>26</sup> D consistently spells *pha rol du phyin pa* instead of *pha rold tu phyind pa*, the usual form in T and G.

perabundant 'a rjes 'jug is much more frequent in G than it is in T and D, particularly in the word *mdo*('); D, on the other hand, uses it more often with the particles *pa*(') and *na*('). However, none of the manuscripts is really consistent in any of these respects, and these features are certainly not relevant for establishing or rejecting any relation between the manuscripts; in the present comparison they are disregarded.

Taking into account *all* the other variants, regardless of how insignificant they might be (i.e. including all sorts of orthographic variants, the placing of the *shad*, etc.), G appears to be closer to T than to D: in the—admittedly very short—passages covered by all three manuscripts, G agrees with T against D in some 44% of all the variant readings, in some 38% T and D agree against G, and only 12% show an agreement of G and D against T; in the remaining 6% all three disagree.

In the majority of the more substantial variants, however, T and D agree against G. A few examples will suffice:

Ka-Ma 1b1: 'thun mthun tu gsungs pa (G) : 'thun 'thun du bsdu ba (DT),

1b2: phyir (G) : slad du (DT),

1b8: rdzogs pa'i byang chub par (G) : rdzogs par (DT[A and B]),

2a5: nang nas (G) : steng du (DT[A and B]),

11b4: bkri ba'i mdo sde'i don (G) : bkri ba'i don kyi mdo sde (DT),

19b2: las dang po bya'i byang chub sems dpa' (G) : las byed pa'i byang chub sems dpa' (DT).

Occasionally G is closer to T than D:

1b9: stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams (G), stong gsum gyi 'jig rten gyi khams (T[A and B]) : stong gi khams (D),

or it represents a mixture of the two:

1b10: yi ge tshig tsam thos pa (G), yi ge 'di tshig gcig tsam thos pa (T[A and B]), yi ge 'di tsig [sic] gcig thos pa'i tsam (D).

At least in one instance G and D largely agree against T:

11b2: nye bar zhi ba mthong la | (D ba) rang bzhin gyis snyoms par mthong ba (DG) : nye bar zhi ba mthong ba (T); T corresponds to the canonical versions (Peking and Derge) of the text quoted (*Bodhi-sattvapīṭaka*), as well as to the version of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (Peking and Derge).

It has, however, to be noted that variants consisting of omissions of words and phrases do not necessarily indicate a different textual



tradition if they appear in only one manuscript—and quite a number of variants within these three manuscripts are of this kind; occasionally they *might* even point to a common model. In the list of *sūtras* to be quoted, D does not list the—duplicated—'*Phags po glang dang mtshungs pa'i mdo*', and in G it was inserted later by a second hand. This might be sheer coincidence, but it could also mean that neither of the manuscripts copied for G and D respectively had it, and that the addition in G reflects an editorial effort.

In a similar way, something that at first glance appears to be a variant reading might point to a relation between G and D. Instead of *myi gnas par* (G 7b6), D reads *myi dmyigs par*, however with an *n* subsequently inserted between the *g* and *s*, so that we have the rather strange combination of *dmyigs* and (*d*)*myi gnas* in one word. This could be a—not very successful—attempt to correct *myi dmigs par* to *myi gnas par*.

Strong evidence for any manuscripts belonging to the same tradition is provided by the occurrence of common obvious mistakes that are not likely to happen twice independently:

In one case G gives the title of the present text as *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgoms pa'i mdo' las btus pa*, instead of *Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don | theg pa chen po'i mdo' (sde) las btus pa* (10a4). Essentially the same reading with only insignificant variants (*chen por : chen po, bsgom : bsgoms, mdo sde : mdo'*) is found in T; unfortunately this passage is not extant in D.

To sum up the preliminary results of this investigation, which are still very hypothetical, remaining to be proved or disproved by future studies:

- The independence of the 'Gondhla Kanjur' from the mainstream Kanjur tradition(s) is, in the present case, shown by the mere existence of the *Brgyad bcu khungs* within a *mdo mangs* collection.
- All three manuscripts of the *Brgyad bcu khungs*, D, T and G, depend on a common archetype. Given the scarcity of the material, it cannot be decided whether this archetype might be the autograph or a derivate thereof.
- At least T and G represent distinct branches of the same tradition.

APPENDIX A: *ZHUS PA'I LE'U BRGYAD BCU RTSA BRGYAD*

With regard to orthography, the versions of Gondhla are retained; variant readings of any other sort have been tacitly incorporated where it seemed appropriate. In the case of unsupported corrections the respective versions of the manuscript are added in round brackets; unsupported amendments are in square brackets.

## Question

No.

Verse

Prose text

*rnal 'byor chen po (MS pos/por)*  
*bsgom pa'i don | theg pa chen po'i*  
*mdo' sde zab mo las btus pa | ||*  
*le'u brgyad bcu' rtsa brgyad pa ||*  
*bam po dang po 'o ||*

*rnal 'byor bsgom don mdor bdus*  
*na ||*

0. *shes rab mnyam nyid tshul gcig*  
*las ||*  
*so sor gyes pa ci lta bu ||*

*shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa*  
*rang bzhin gyis*  
*mnyam zhing tshul gcig pa las so sor*  
*gyes pa ci lta bu (1a8)*

- *tshul gcig de'i don bstand phyir ||*

*... bstand te | mdo sde'i khungs ni*  
*brgyad bcu zhig*

*zhus pa'i le'u brgyad bcu brgyad ||*

*bzhugs || the tsom zhus pa'i le'u ni*  
*brgyad bcu rtsa brgyad do || (1a10)*

*mdo'i don ni brgyad bcur bsdu ||*

1. *mdo btus bstond gnang ci lta bu ||*

*mdo' sde'i don kyi mdo' btu zhing*  
*sems can la stond tu gnang ba'i gtan*  
*tshigs ci lta bu (1b4)*

2. *'jig rten spruld gshegs ci lta bka' ||*

*sangs rgyas spruld pa'i sku 'jig rten*  
*du gshegs shing chos bstond par dka'*  
*ba ci lta bu (1b10f.)*

3. *myi lus khom ldan ci lta bu ||*

*myi lus thob cing chos spyod pa*  
*dang ldan pa'i dus dka' ba ci lta bu*  
*(2a4)*

4. *myi lus myi rtag ci lta gyur ||*

*myi lus thob pa myi rtag pa ci lta bu*  
*(2a6f.)*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 5. myi lus thob nas ci ltar dad ll   | myi lus thob nas sangs rgyas kyi<br>chos la dad pa ci lta bu (2b1)  |
| 6. dad nas byung ba'i yon tan ci ll  | dad nas rab tu byung ba'i yon tan<br>dang legs pa ci lta bu (2b7)   |
| 7. sangs rgyas rang bzhin de bzhin<br>nyid ll<br>bdag gnyis la ni ci ltar yod ll | rab tu byung nas sangs rgyas kyi<br>rang bzhin bdag la yod par ci ltar yod<br>(3a5)   |
| 8. de las 'khruld te ci ltar khyams ll   | sems can la sangs rgyas kyi rang<br>bzhin de ltar yod pa las ci ltar khruld<br>(3a10)   |
| 9. ci byas pas ni rig par 'gyur ll   | sangs rgyas kyi ngo bo nyid de ltar<br>'khruld pa de da ci byas rig (3b8)   |
| 10. dang por sems bskyed sems can<br>gyis ll<br>[ ..... ]                        | sangs rgyas kyi ngo bo nyid dang po<br>sems bskyed pa'i sems can gyis<br>mthong du rung ngam myi rung(4a3)<br><i>le'u bcu gcig pa'o</i> (4a9) |
| 11. cig car rig pa ci lta bu ll  | cig car rig pa'i phyi mo'i tshor ba ci<br>lta bu (4a9)  |
| 12. rig nas gcig car ci ltar 'dag (MS<br>bdag) ll                                | rigs pa'i byin kyis bag chags cig car<br>'dag pa ci lta bu (4b5f.)  |
| 13. rim gyis 'dag (MS bdag) la ci lta<br>bu ll                                   | dngos po ni cig car 'dag pa ma yin te l<br>rims kyis dag par 'gyur ba ci lta bu<br>(5a9)  |
| 14. shes bya'i sgrib pa 'ang gang<br>zhig lags ll                                | de la shes bya'i sgrib pa ci lta bu<br>(6a6)  |
| 15. zag pa myed pa'i ye shes la ll<br>skad cig nyon mongs yod dam<br>myed ll     | zag pa myed pa'i ye shes la ye shes<br>skad cig ma dang l nyon mongs pa<br>yod dam myed (6a9f.)   |
| 16. zab la 'bad pas ci ltar spyad ll   | mdo' sde zab mo la dad pa dang l<br>mos pas sdig pa byang ba ci lta bu<br>(6b7)   |
| 17. bla myed sems bskyed ci lta bu ll  | zab mo la dad pas bla na myed pa'i<br>byang chub tu sems bskyed pa ci ltar<br>(7a4)   |
| 18. de'i yon tan gang zhig lags ll   | dang po'i sems bskyed pas chos rig<br>pa de'i yon tan dang sems can gyi<br>don byed pa'i mthu' ci lta bu (7b6f.)                              |
| 19. sems bskyed de la rnam pa tu ll  | dang po byang chub tu sems bskyed<br>pa la rnam pa tu (8b3)   |

20. zab la dad par gang phyir 'brang ||      zab mo la dad pa'i byang chub sems  
dpa' gang gi phyir 'brang bar bya  
(8b9)
21. rang rig dond kyi spyod yul phyir ||      a) rnal 'byord pa rang rig pa'i don  
rang rig don ni ma rig nas ||      kyi phyir 'brang bar bya ba gang  
(9a2f.)  
sgra la chags pa ci lta bu ||      b) sgra ci bzhin du song ba'i nyes pa  
ci lta bu (9a9)  
*le'u nyi shu rtsa gnyis pa'o* (10a4)
- 
- rnal 'byor chen po bsgoms pa'i [don l  
theg pa chen po'i] mdo' las btus pa l ||  
bam po gnyis pa'o || ||*
22. ye shes phyir 'brang gang zhig      ye shes kyi phyir 'brang ba gang  
lags ||      (10a5)
23. ye shes de nyid ci lta bu ||      ye shes de nyid ci lta bu (10b2)
24. rnam shes phyir 'brang gang zhig      rnam par shes pa'i phyir myi 'brang  
lags ||      ba ci lta bu (10b7)
25. ci bzhin sgra phyir ma song bar ||      sgra ci bzhin du ma song bar nges  
nges don mdo phyir ci lta 'brang ||      pa'i don kyi mdo' sde'i phyir 'brang  
bar bya ba gang (11a6f.)
26. bkri phyir 'brang ba yang gang      bkri ba'i don kyi mdo sde'i phyir  
zhig lags ||      myi 'brang bar bya ba gang (11b4)
27. stong ba'i 'du shes ci lta bu ||      stong ba'i 'du shes can ci lta bu  
(12a9)
28. chos nyid phyir 'brang gang zhig      chos nyid kyi phyir 'brang gi l gang  
lags ||      zag gi phyir mi 'brang (MS 'brang  
mi) bar bya ba gang (12b7)
29. dkon mchog gsum ni tshul gcig      dkon mchog gsum tshul gcig cing l  
pa ||      dmyigs su myed pa la mchod pa rim  
mchod pa rim 'gro ci lta bgyi ||      'gro' ci lta bya (13a7)
30. dam chos 'dzind pa 'ang gang      dam pa'i chos 'dzind pa gang (13b3)  
zhig lags ||
31. de'i snying rje ci lta bu ||      tshul gcig pa'i snying rje chen po  
gang (13b8)
32. bshags pa de yang ci lta bu ||      tshul gcig pa'i bshags pa ci lta bu  
(14a4)  
*le'u gsum bcu rtsa gsum pa'o || ||*  
(14a8)
- 
33. bsod nams de yang ci lta bsngo' ||      tshul gcig pa'i sngo ba ci lta bu (14a9)



34. de ltar tshul cig lam bsgoms pas ll  
nyan thos kyi ni sdom par dang ll  
dbyangs la brten pa dgongs myi  
dgongs ll  
theg pa chen po dmyigs su myed par  
tshul gcig pa'i lam bsgoms pas l nyan  
thos kyi phyi'i sdom pa dang l gnyed  
pa sbyangs pa'i yon tan la brtend  
dgos sam myi dgos (14b9f.)
35. sbyangs pa nyid ni ci lta bu ll  
sbyangs ba'i yon tan ji lta bu (T[A]  
15b9, missing in G)
36. dge ba'i bshes gnyen ci ltar brten ll  
tshul gcig par dang po sems bskyed  
pas dge ba'i bshes nyen la brtend na l  
dgos sam myi dgos (17a3f.)
37. ci lta bu la brtend par bgyi' ll  
dge ba'i bshes gnyen la brten dgos  
na l ci lta bu la rtend (17b5)
38. myi dge bshes gnyen gang zhig  
lags ll  
myi dge ba'i bshes gnyen ci lta bu  
(17b10)
39. sdig pa'i grogs po ci ltar spang ll  
sdig pa'i grogs po spang ba gang  
(18b3)
40. dge ba'i grogs po ci ltar brtend ll  
'di ltar sdig pa'i grogs po spangs nas l  
dge ba'i grogs po dang gnas pa ci lta  
bu (18b9f.)
41. bstand pa yang ni ci ltar 'jig ll  
sdig pa'i dge slong gis l de bzhin  
gshegs pa'i bstand pa 'jig pa ci lta bu  
(19a5f.)
42. chos la rma'byind gang zhig lags ll  
tshul gcig pa'i don ma rig nas dge  
ba'i bar chad byed cing rma 'byind  
pa ci lta bu (19b4)
43. byang chub sems bskyed de dag  
la ll  
legs bya bsod nams ci lta bu ll  
byang chub sems dpa' de dag la legs  
par byas pa'i bsod nams che ba ci lta  
bu (20b7f.)  
*le'u bzhi bcu rtsa bzhi pa'o ll ll*  
(22b5 !)

---

*rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don  
theg pa chen po'i mdo las btus pa l ll  
bam po [gsum pa'o] ll*

44. tshul khrims dang ni lta nyams  
pas ll  
yon gnas myi 'gyur gang zhig  
lags l  
tshul khrims nyams pas yon gnas su  
myi 'gyur ba ci lta bu (22b7 !)
45. ci tsam gyis na yon gnas 'gyur ll  
ci tsam gyis na l yon gnas su 'gyur  
(23a1 !)

46. rang gis rig pa'i don mthong nas ||  
chos stond gnang ba ci lta bu || yang dag pa'i don rang gis rig nas |  
gzhan la chos bstond tu gnang ba ci  
lta bu (23a8f. !)
47. thos pa'i shes rab gang zhig lags || thos pa'i shes rab ci lta bu (21a10 !)
48. bsam pa'i shes rab ci lta bu || bsam pa'i shes rab ci lta bu (21b10 !)
49. sgom pa'i shes rab de'ang gang || bsgoms pa'i shes rab ci lta bu (22a6f. !)
50. theg gsum de yang ci lta bu || tshul gcig pa'i theg pa gsum gyi  
khyad par dang | myi dmyigs par ro  
gcig pa ci lta bu (22b2)
51. theg pa gcig tu ci ltar 'du || theg pa gcig ces bya ba de nyid ci lta  
bu (24a6)
52. theg pa gcig la bslabs pa yis || theg pa gcig la bslabs shing bsgoms  
te | chos thams cad grol bar bshad ci  
ltar 'gyur (24b2f.)
53. theg pa gcig la zhugs pa'i || byang chub sems theg pa gcig la  
sgyu ma lta bu'i ting 'dzind gang || zhugs pa'i sgyu ma lta bu'i ting nge  
'dzind gang (24b7f.)
54. chos rnam tshul cig ci lta bu || chos thams cad tshul gcig ro gcig ces  
bya ba de nyid ci lta bu (25a4)  
*le'u lnga bcu rtsa lnga pa'o* || ||  
(26a2)
- 
55. tshul gcig don ni ma gtogs par || myi dmyigs pa'i tshul gcig pa'i don  
chos spong nyes pa 'ang gang 'di ma rtogs nas | chos spong ba'i  
zhig lags || nyes pa ci lta bu (26a2)
56. tshul gcig zab la dad pa'i || de lta bu'i tshul gcig pa'i zab mo la  
bsod nams khyad par ci lta bu || dad pa'i bsod nams kyi khyad par ci  
lta bu (26b5)
57. byang chub sems ni gang zhig de lta bu'i tshul gcig pa'i byang chub  
lags || kyi sems ci lta bu (27a3)
58. thams cad mkhyend pa 'ang ci lta bu || rnam pa thams cad mkhyend pa nyid  
du sems bskyed pa ci lta bu (27b8)
59. myi dmyigs par ni tshul gcig pa'i || myi dmyigs par tshul gcig pa'i tshul  
tshul khrims dang ni ting 'dzind khrims ting nge 'dzind shes rab phun  
dang || sum (MS gsum) tshogs pa gang  
shes rab ci ltar phun sum (MS (28b1)
60. ting 'dzind nyid ni gang zhig lags || ting nge 'dzind gang (28b5)
61. de'i shes rab ci lta bu || shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa la  
spyod pa ci lta bu (29a2f.)
62. rnam' thard gsum gyi sgo ni gang || shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa  
myi dmyigs par tshul gcig pa'i rnam

63. rang bzhin gyis ni ci ltar stong || par thard pa'i sgo gsum ci lta bu (30a4f.)  
shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i tshul gcig pa'i don de ci ltar rang bzhin gyis stong (31a1)
64. stong nyid dag pas myi 'gyur ba || stong pa nyid ci ltar rang bzhin gyis rnam par dag pas myi 'gyur ba yin (31b1)  
[ ..... ] (?)  
*le'u drug bcu rtsa drug pa'o ||* (31b8)
- 

*rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don |  
theg pa chen po'i mdo sde las btus  
pa |  
bam po bzhi pa || ||*

65. ci lta bu'i stong nyid la || de lta bu'i chos kyi dbyings stong pa nyid la dang po sems bskyed pa'i dang po nyid nas brtend bsgoms na | byang chub sems dpas brten te | thams cad lhund kyis ci ltar 'grub || bsgoms na chos thams cad rdzogs shing lhund kyis grub par 'gyur bar ci mngon (31b9f.)
66. de ltar zab mo bsgoms pa'i || dang po sems bskyed pas shes rab bdud kyi las kyang gang zhig kyi pha rold tu phyind pa zab mo la lags || tshul gcig pa la bsgom pa'i bdud kyi las ci lta bu (32a6f.)
67. mu stegs lta ba ci lta bu || mu stegs kyi lta ba rgyang phan pa ji lta bu (32b2)
68. tshul gcig pha rold phyind drug de myi dmyigs par tshul gcig pa'i gang || pha rold tu phyind pa drug ci lta bu (32b5)
69. pha rold phyind drug rnam par de ltar pha rold tu phyind pa drug dag || shes rab kyis ma zind te | 'khor gsum shes rab kyis ni ma zind nas || ma dag pa'i nyes pa ji lta bu (33a3f.)  
'khor gsum ma dag nyes pa ci ||
70. 'dus byas kyi ni bsod nams kyis || de ltar shes rab kyis ma zind pa'i brgyud pa'i rgyud yang ci ltar 'gyur || 'dus byas dmyigs pa'i bsod nams kyis mya ngan las 'das ba'i mngon sum gyi rgyur myi 'gyur na | rgyud pa'i rgyu tsam du yang myi 'gyur ram (33b4f.)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 71. dbu ma'i lam ni ci lta bu   | theg pa chen po myi dmyigs par<br>tshul gcig pa'i dbu ma'i lam 'di ci lta<br>bu (34a6 )                           |
| 72. chos dang gang zag bdag myed<br>cing  | theg pa chen po'i chos dang gang<br>zag la bdag myed pa ci lta bu (34b3)  |
| 73. myi skye bzod pa gang zhig lags   | myi skye ba'i bzod pa ci lta bu<br>(34b6)   |
| 74. dang po pas ni sems bskyed nas   <br>myi dmyigs tshul du bsgom pa la        | dang po sems bskyed pa nas myi<br>dmyigs pa bsgom pa las sar ci ltar<br>'phar (34b8)                              |
| 75. brten cing 'breld par gang 'byung<br>ba   <br>rang bzhin ma skyes ci lta bu | rtend cing 'brel bar 'byung ba rang<br>bzhin gyis ma skyes pa ci lta bu<br>(34b5f.)                               |
| 76. kun rdzob don dam bden (MS<br>dben) pa gang                                 | kun rdzob dang l don dam pa'i bden<br>pa ci lta bu (35b1)<br><i>le'u bdun bcu rtsa bdun pa'o      </i><br>(35b10) |
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 77. phyi nang gi ni chos rnam kun   <br>sams las ci ltar spruld te 'byung   | ci nang gi chos thams cad sems<br>'khruld pa las ci ltar 'byung (35b10)  |
| 78. myi dmyigs tshul gcig bsgoms pa<br>yin   <br>'phags pa'i bden pa bzhi las<br>rtsogs   <br>chos rnam kun ni ci ltar rdzogs | tshul gcig tu myi dmyigs pas 'phags<br>pa'i bden pa bzhi las stsogs pa chos<br>thams cad rdzogs par 'gyur ba ci lta<br>bu (36a5f.) |
| 79. mtshan nyid gsum yang ci lta bu   | chos lnga dang mtshan nyid gsum<br>tshul gcig pa ji lta bu (36b4)  |
| 80. gnyis su myed pa 'ang gang zhig<br>lags   | dmyigs pa'i tshul gcig par gnyis su<br>myed pa ci lta bu (36b8)  |
| 81. thabs dang shes rab ci ltar 'breld  | myi dmyigs pa'i tshul gcig pa'i thabs<br>dang shes rab zung du 'breld pa ci lta<br>bu (37a4)                                       |
| 82. zhi gnas lhag mthong ci lta bur   | zhi gnas dang lhag mthong gang<br>(38a1)   |
| 83. mya ngan 'das lam gang zhig<br>lags   | theg pa chen po'i myi dmyigs pa'i<br>tshul gcig pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa<br>ci lta bu (38a4f.)                                    |
| 84. mya ngan 'das las stsogs pa'i   <br>chos rnam thams cad ci snyed pa   | mya ngan las 'das pa las stsogs pa'i<br>chos thams cad rmyi lam lta bu ci<br>ltar yin (38b5)                                       |
| 85. 'bras bu sku gsum ci lta bu   | mya ngan las 'das pa'i 'bras bu'i sku<br>gsum ci lta bu (39a2)   |



86. shes rab spyān gyis ci ltar gzigs ll de bzhin gshegs pa rnam kyī dmyigs  
pa myed pa'i shes rab kyī spyān ji lta  
bu (39a10)
87. de bzhin gshegs pa rnam dang ni ll de bzhin gshegs pa rnam dang l  
byang chub sems dpa' thams cad byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'  
kyī ll chen po de dag gi dgongs pa mi  
dgongs pa rnam ni myi mnga' mnga' bar sems can gyi don mdzad  
bar ll pa'i che ba'i yon tan ci lta bu  
sems can gyi ni don mdzad pa'i ll (39b3f.)
88. sangs rgyas zhing ni ci ltar dag ll byang chub sems dpa' dang l sangs  
rgyas rnam kyis sems can gyi don  
yongs su mdzad pa'i yid yongs su  
dag pa ci lta bu (40a3f.)

# APPENDIX B: TEXTS QUOTED

Titles in round brackets indicate alternative forms, as they appear in the *Brgyad bcu khungs*.

No.	in the list	in the text
1	Shes rab kyī pha rold tu phyind pa'i mdo'	28
2	Sangs rgyas kyī mdzod kyī mdo'	1
3	'Dul ba bzhung pa'i mdo'	2
4	Gser 'od dam pa'i mdo'	3
5	Phyogs su rgyas pa'i mdo'	4
6	Dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po'i mdo' = 26	5 (Pad ma dkar po'i mdo')
7	Zla ba'i snying po'i mdo'	6 (Zla ba'i le'u)
8	Bskald ba bzang po'i mdo'	7
9	Yang dag par ldan pa'i mdo'	8
10	Gcig las 'phros pa'i mdo'	9
11	Dri ma myed par grags pa'i mdo'	10 (Dri ma myed pa/pa'i/par/pas bstand pa'i mdo')
12	Mtshan ma bzang po'i mdo'	11
13	De bzhin gshegs pa'i gsang ba'i mdo' = 48	12
14	Yid gnyis yang dag par 'joms pa'i mdo'	13
15	Dad pa stobs bskyed pa'i mdo'	14
16	'Jam dpal gnas pa'i mdo'	15
17	Rdo rje ting nge 'dzind kyī mdo'	16
18	De bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po'i mdo'	17

19 Lang kar gshegs pa'i mdo'		18 (Lang ka'i mdo')
20 Gtsug tor chen po'i mdo'		19 (Gtsug tor gyi mdo')
21 Rdo rje gcod pa'i mdo'		20
missing		21 Tshangs pa khyad par sems kyis zhus pa'i mdo'
missing		22 Ki sin lon gyi mdo'
22 Tshangs pa kun 'dris kyi mdo'	= 82 ?	24
23 Chos kyi rgyal po'i mdo'		25
24 Shing then wang pa zha'i mdo'		26
25 Glang po dang mtshungs pa'i mdo'	= 76	27 (Gleng po mtshungs pa'i mdo')
26 Pun dha ri ka'i mdo'	= 6	—
27 Par ne rwan gyi mdo'		23 (P/Bar ner pan/r gyi mdo')
28 Rta skad dbyang byub sems dpa'is dris pa'i mdo'		29
29 Bsam gtan gyi bsgo'i mdo'		30
30 'Byung ba myed pa'i mdo'	= 66	31
31 Byang chub kyi sde snod kyi mdo'		32
32 Sa de'i mdo'		33
33 Dkon mchog rtsegs pa'i mdo'	= 57	34
34 Shes rab bdun brgya' ba'i mdo'		35
35 Rnam par myi rtog pa'i mdo'		36
36 De bzhin gshegs pa mdzod kyi mdo'		37
37 Rgyal po ma skyes sgra'i mdo'		38 (Ma skyes sgra'i mdo')
38 Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo'		39
39 Rab kyi rtsald kyis rnam par gnond pa'i mdo'		40
40 Rin po che'i phung po'i mdo'		41
41 Dkon mchog sprin gyi mdo'		42
42 Lhag pa'i bsam pas bskul ba'i mdo'		43
missing		44 Theg chen sa chen gyi mdo'
43 Gsdong pos brgyand pa'i mdo'		45 (Sdong po[s] bkod pa'i mdo')
44 Se'u ta la'i mdo'		46
45 Byams pa seng ge sgra'i mdo'		47 (... sgra'i le'u)
46 Blo gros rgya mtshos zhus pa'i mdo'		48
47 Tshul brgya lnga bcu ba'i mdo'		49
48 Gsang ba'i mdo'	= 13	—

49 Dpal gyi 'phreng ba'i seng ge'i sgra'i mdo'	50
50 Chos yang dag par bsdud pa'i mdo'	51
51 Khyim bdag dpal sbyin gyis zhus pa'i mdo'	52
52 Sgo drug pa'i gzungs kyi mdo'	53 (Sgo drug pa'i mdo'/gzungs)
53 Byang chub kyi [tshul] khrims kyi mdo'	54
54 Dge ba'i lam gyi mdo'	55
55 Ting nge 'dzind rgyal po'i mdo' = 64 = 65 ?	56
56 Dpal 'byung ba'i mdo'	57
57 Dkon mchog rtsegs pa chen po'i mdo' = 33	—
58 Rnam par rold pa'i mdo'	58
59 Rnam par 'thag (MS dag/dag theg) pa'i mdo'	59
60 Nges pa dang ma nges pa 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo'	60
61 Mtshan ma myed pa'i le'u yi mdo'	61
62 Bden pa [po]'i le'u yi mdo'	62
63 'Dus pa chen po'i le'u yi mdo'	63
64 Zla ba sgron ma'i mdo' = 55 = 65 ?	—
65 Zla ba mar mye'i mdo' = 64 ?	—
66 'Byung ba med pa'i mdo' = 30	—
67 Khye'u rin po ches byin pa'i mdo'	64
68 Blo gros myi bzad pa'i mdo'	65
69 Ma dros pa'i mdo'	66
70 Chos kyi tshig gi mdo'	67
71 Gdon myi za ba'i 'dul ba'i mdo'	68
72 Rin po che rtsegs pa'i mdo'	69
73 Dkon mchog mtha'i mdo'	70
74 Nam mkha' mdzod kyi mdo'	71
75 Bstand pa brjod pa'i mdo'	72
76 'Phags pa glang dang mtshungs pa'i mdo' = 25	—
77 Sems kyi rgyal po'i mdo'	73
78 Da sha bu myi'i mdo' = 79	74
79 Sa bcu pa'i mdo' = 78	—
80 Bdud 'dul ba'i mdo'	75
81 De bzhin gshegs pa'i skye ba srid pa'i mdo'	76 (... skye ba sdig pa'i mdo')
82 'Phags pa tshangs pas zhus pa'i mdo' = 22 ?	—

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bka' thang sde lnga*      *Bkaḥ-thaṅ-sde-lṅa*. Zhö edition, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the collection of Prof. Raghuvira. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1982.
- '*Bras spungs dpe rnying dkar chag*      '*Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*. Ed. Dpal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang, 2 vols. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004.
- De Rossi Filibeck, E. 1994. A study of a fragmentary manuscript of the *Pañcaviṃśatikā* in the Ta pho library. *East and West* 44(1), 137–60.
- Dutt, N. 1941. *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Vol. 2. Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press.
- Eimer, H. (ed.) 1997. *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon*. PIATS 1995: Proceedings of the Seventh Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995, vol. 3. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- 2002. Kanjur and Tanjur studies: present state and future tasks. Introductory remarks. In H. Eimer and D. Germano (eds) *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*. PIATS 2000: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000, vol. 10. Leiden: Brill, 1–12.
- Eimer, H. and Germano, D. (eds) 2002. *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*. PIATS 2000: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000, vol. 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Francke, A.H. 1926. *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*. Part II: *The Chronicles of Ladakh and Minor Chronicles*. Texts and Translations, with Notes and Maps. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing.
- Imaeda, Y. 1975. Documents tibétains de Touen-houang concernant le concile du Tibet. *Journal Asiatique* 263, 125–46.
- Klimburg-Salter, D. 1994. Tucci Himalayan archives report, 2: the 1991 expedition to Himachal Pradesh. *East and West* 44(1), 13–82.
- Lalou, M. 1939. Document tibétain sur l'expansion du Dhyāna chinois. *Journal Asiatique* 231, 505–23.
- Okimoto, K. 1993. Daijō mufunbetsu shūjūgi jobun (Pelliot 996) ni tsuite. *Hanazono Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 25, 1–23.
- Otokawa, B. 1999. New fragments of the *rNal 'byor chen por bsgom pa'i don* from Tabo. In C.A. Scherrer-Schaub and E. Steinkellner (eds) *Tabo Studies II: Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions, and the Arts*. Serie Orientale Roma LXXXVII. Rome: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 99–161.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. 1999. Towards a methodology for the study of Old Tibetan manuscripts: Dunhuang and Tabo. In C.A. Scherrer-Schaub and E. Steinkellner (eds) *Tabo Studies II: Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions, and the Arts*. Serie Orientale Roma LXXXVII. Rome: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 3–36.
- Skilling, P. 1997a. *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- 1997b. From bKa' bstan bcos to bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur. In H. Eimer (ed.) *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon*. PIATS 1995: Proceedings of the Seventh Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995, vol. 3. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 87–111.
- Steinkellner, E. 1994. A report on the 'Kanjur' of Ta pho. *East and West* 44(1), 115–36.
- 1995. *Sudhana's Miraculous Journey in the Temple of Ta pho: the Inscriptional Text of the Tibetan Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra Edited with Introductory Remarks*. Serie

- Orientale Roma LXXXVI. Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Szerb, J. 1990. *Bu ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Tauscher, H. 1994. Tanjur fragments from the manuscript collection at Ta pho monastery: *Sambandhaparīkṣā* with its commentaries *vr̥tti* and *ṭīkā*. *East and West* 44(1), 173–84.
- Tropper, K. 2005. *Die Jātaka-Inschriften im skor lam chen mo des Klosters Zha lu. Einführung, textkritische Studie, diplomatische Edition der Paneele 1-8 mit Sanskritparallelen und deutscher Übersetzung*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- Tucci, G. 1958. *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part II. Serie Orientale Roma IX. Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- 1988. *Rin-chen-bzañ-po and the Renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet Around the Millenium*, edited by Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka series, 348. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan. [English translation of *Rin c'en bzañ po e la rinascita del buddhismo nel Tibet intorno al mille*. Indo-Tibetica II, Rome: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1932].



# TEXT, IMAGE AND SONG IN TRANSDISCIPLINARY DIALOGUE

PIATS 2003: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar  
of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Oxford, 2003.  
Managing Editor: Charles Ramble.

EDITED BY

DEBORAH KLIMBURG-SALTER, KURT TROPPER AND  
CHRISTIAN JAHODA



BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON  
2007

# *Text, Image and Song in Transdisciplinary Dialogue*



EDITED BY

DEBORAH KLIMBURG-SALTER,  
KURT TROPPER  
AND CHRISTIAN JAHODA