

Catalogue of the Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur

Introductory Study

A Catalogue of the Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur

by

Kojun Saito

&

Jonathan Silk

Preface

The following study is a completely revised version of a study published some twenty years ago by Prof. Kojun Saito. In 1958 Prof. Taishun Mibu urged Prof. Saito to undertake a study of the MS Kanjur (herein abbreviated **M**) kept in the Library of the Tōyō Bunko in Tokyo, Japan. As explained below, this Kanjur was received in Tibet from the Dalai Lama himself by the great Japanese pioneer of Tibetan Buddhist studies, Ekai Kawaguchi. Since some work had already been done on the Kanjur, and note cards were available in the Tōyō Bunko, Prof. Saito accomplished his work rather quickly. A provisional presentation of the results was made at the eighth meeting of the Nihon Chibetto Gakkai (Japan Tibetan Studies Association) at Otani University, Kyoto, on October 4, 1960. Seventeen years passed before the study appeared in print as "Kawaguchi Ekai-shi Shorai Tōyō Bunko Shozo Shanon Chibetto Daizokyo Chosa Bibo" in the *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō*, 63 (1977), pp. 406- 345. I translated this into English in 1985, and in the summer of 1986 Prof. Saito corrected my draft. Due to other obligations I could not return to the work until the summer of 1987, but by

this time I realized that the progress made in studies on Kanjur history made a simple translation impossible. Therefore, with the resources available to me in Ann Arbor, Michigan -- for primary materials limited to catalogues and the Derge and Lhasa editions -- I revised and expanded the introductory study. It stands now more than double the length of the original, although I must confess, far less than double the quality.

At the time Prof. Saito made his investigations almost nothing was known about the history of the Kanjurs of Western Tibet, and information about Kanjur history in general was scarce. Certainly some excellent work had been done, especially on the Derge and Peking editions, not to mention Csoma de Körös's ground-breaking work on the Narthang edition, which is of course a western Tibetan edition. Of the three other manuscripts now associated with **M**, the London Manuscript Kanjur (**L**), the Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur (**R**), and the Rgyal rtse Them spangs ma Kanjur (**G**), only **L** was known and had been studied. Even then, only an index of the mdo section had been published.

Because of the amount of information now available in the works of Helmut Eimer, Géza Bethlenfalvy, Tadeusz Skorupski and others, it has been possible for me to attempt to draw some picture of the ways in which **M** fits in with the other Kanjurs in the grouping Eimer calls the "Western." This is only a small beginning. The critical reader should remember, moreover, that only in close contact with the original editions can firm statements be made about contents and the like.

It remains to thank those who have generously assisted in this project. Prof. Eimer critically read a copy of the first English draft, and made many valuable comments. Prof. Bruce Cameron Hall did the same. Both of these

scholars have also been most generous in providing copies of materials, including their own researches. Above all, my gratitude is due those scholars who have gone before me, making this work possible.,

Jonathan A. Silk,

Ann Arbor,

Michigan,

June, 1987

1.0 Introduction

On September 29, 1914, the Rev. Ekai Kawaguchi, who had left for his second trip to Tibet on December 20, 1913, had an audience with the Dalai Lama at the Norbu Glinka detached palace in Lhasa. At that audience he requested the gift of an old Tibetan Tripiṭaka. After ordering his ministers to search among the old Tripiṭakas of the great monasteries, the Dalai Lama decided to grant to Kawaguchi a Tripiṭaka from Rgyal rtse (Gyantse). On January 3, 1915, the Rev. Kawaguchi visited the Dalai Lama for a second time and offered his thanks for the gift of the Tripiṭaka. He left Lhasa on January 19 of the same year, and on January 28 received the 111 volumes of the Tripiṭaka at the Dpal 'khor chos sde monastery of Rgyal rtse. Kawaguchi arrived in Darjeeling on May 4, and was back in Kobe, Japan, on September 4, 1915.

The old Tripiṭaka which was received by Kawaguchi is the manuscript Kanjur now kept in the Tōyō Bunko Library, in Tokyo, Japan. Herein it is abbreviated **M**. The study that follows is an attempt to present the most important details about **M** to a specialist audience. Some familiarity with the

Tibetan Kanjur, and its history, has been assumed.

2.0 The Date of the Manuscript Kanjur (**M**)

According to Ryōtai Kaneko, legend has it that **M** was either a pre-Old Narthang Kanjur text, or that it was taken as a basis for the Old Narthang itself. The so-called Old Narthang Kanjur is believed to be the original version of the Kanjur from which all other Kanjurs ultimately descend. It was almost certainly a manuscript. It is natural that partisan traditions should ascribe hoary antiquity to a sacred text, but unfortunately an examination of the evidence proves **M** to be of much more recent origin. Below we will try to show the place of **M** in relation to other known Kanjurs, but a first step in determining the filiation of **M** is to determine its date.

2.1

On the recto of the first folio of each bundle or volume in **M** (that is, on folio 1a) there are "vow-offering" texts. These texts contain important accounts of the formation of this manuscript Kanjur, and are of three types, labeled A, B, and C. The type B text is found on two volumes, the *ga* of the *mdo*, and the *ga* of the 'dul ba. The type C text is found on only one volume, the *cha* of the *dkon brtsegs*. All other volumes are prefaced with a type A composition.

2.2

In this type A composition, which is comparatively easy to read, we find the following: The spiritual heir of the Twelfth Dalai Lama 'Phrin las rgya mtsho, the master De mo, composed the expression of vows. Rta mgrin tse dbang phun tshogs was the supervisor, Re kha surya badzra wrote it on paper radiant with lapis lazuli, and Ratna-dharma and Ratna-dharma-pāla corrected it. It was

undertaken in the *lcags bya* [Iron-bird] year.

The Twelfth Dalai Lama, 'Phrin las rgya mtsho, lived 1856-1875. He was followed by two regents, the second of whom was De mo Qutuqtu (in Tibetan *hu thog thu*) of the Bstan rgyal gling, called Ga dbang blo bzang 'phrin las rab rgyas. He did not come to power until after May, 1886, and resigned from power in 1895.

2.3

The texts of types B and C are difficult to understand in places, but we find the following in B: On the advice of the master De mo, the patriarch of the Dga' bzhi grangs khang pa clan, Lde 'chang mkhyen rab rnam rgyal, composed the expression of vows, and between the *gnam byung* and the *'bru mangs* years [the copying] was completed.

The Dga' bzhi estate lies to the north of Rgyal rtse, according to Luciano Petech. Note the peculiar spellings of the dates, *gnam byung* for *rnam 'byung* [= Sanskrit *vibhava*], and *'bru mangs* for *'bru mang po* [= Sanskrit *bahudhānya*].

2.4[

In the text of type C appear the name of the Eighth Dalai Lama 'Jam dpal rgya mtsho's disciple, the head priest (*dpal chos khri*) of the Dpal 'khor chos sde, the incarnation of De mo (*de mo hu thog thu*) Blo bzang thub bstan 'jig med rgya mtsho, the names of the revisors (*zhus mkhan*) Bsod nams mkhas grub and Piṣu ratna maiṭe, and the Earth horse [*sa rta*] year.

2.5

Since the Twelfth Dalai Lama lived from 1856-1875, we must look for the

Iron-bird [*lcags bya*] year around this time, and the only possibility is 1861. So probably the volumes with the type A preface were written in 1861. The *gnam byung* year mentioned in the type B text would correspond to 1868, and the '*bru mangs* year to 1878. The Earth horse [*sa rta*] year in the type C text would then be 1858. We conclude therefore that the Kanjur **M** was written between approximately 1858 and 1878. Probably **M** existed originally in three "sets", as represented by the vow-offering texts A, B and C. These sets were copied at different times. It is difficult to say if they were copied in the same place, but we can probably locate the Kanjur as a whole in Rgyal rtse not only because it was kept there, but because the patronage of a local clan helped to get it copied.

The Vow-Offering Texts: Type A: *mdo, na*.

Om¹ swa sti/

*ston pa mnyam med zas gtsang sras po'i gsung/
 bsil ldan zhing dir dri med 'gyuro cog²/
 dpal gyi chos grwar mdzad³ med bskun srol mkhan/
 byams mgon 'khor bsgyur gar rol thugs bskyed dpal/
 slar yang srid mthar spel mdzad bsil ljong mkhon/
 phyag na padmo 'phrin las rgya mtsho che/
 sku phreng rim pa'i sras kyi mthu bo byon/
 de mo rje de'i rmad byung 'phrin las bzhin/
 gnam lo lcags bya nas brtsaṃs rnam byung bar/
 gser lcog⁴ las 'dzin mkhar⁵kha ka shod pa'i/
 mingo rta mgrin tshe dbang phun tshogs kyis/
 rnam dkar lhag bsam stobs kyi gsung rab brten/
 legs bskrun glegs bam yongs kyī⁶ dbu shog zung/
 bkar chag dang bcas bai dū rya mdangs ngos/*

*sa zla'i re kha su rya badzras bris/
 bi kṣu ra tna dha rma wa ta pa/
 ra tna dha rma pā⁷ las dag ther bsgrubs/
 gang 'di gzhan du bskal brgyar thos brnyes dka'
 'di na legs byas stobs kyis lhun gyis grub/
 'dis mtshon skyes 'phags dus gsuṃ rnam dkar mthus/
 bstan dar de 'dzin rgyal dbang yab sras dbus/
 skyes chen mtha' dag zhabs brtan 'phrin las dpal/
 nor 'dzin yongs khyab gsung rab rten bzhengs⁸ kyi/
 dge 'dun sde rnams thugs mthun khrimś gtsang zhing/
 chos sbyin gaṅgā'i chul 'gran⁹ pa dang/
 lung rtog mdzad pa phyogs bcur 'phel zhing rgyas/
 'jig rten khams kun rdzogs ldan skal¹⁰ bzang la/
 spyod cing kun mkhyen¹¹ go 'phang¹² thob gyur cig//*

(a. shows variants from 'bum, ma; b. shows variants from mdo, la.)

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| 1) a., b., lack orñ. | 2) a., lcog. | 3) a., b., 'dzad. |
| 4) a., b., lcogs. | 5) a., khar. | 6) a., b., gyi. |
| 7) a., pa. | 8) a., b., gzheng. | 9) a., b., mgran. |
| 10) a., b., bskal. | 11) a., b., khyen. (The versions at mdo, ja, and 'dul ba, ka & kha, all read mkhyen.) | |
| | 12) b., phang. | |

Vow-Offering Text: Type B: *mdo, ga*

*swa sti/
 dag pa gnyis ldan gdod ma'i stong dbyings las/
 yan lag bdun ldan rab 'byams longs spyod rdzogs//
 thugs rje'i 'dod¹ gar 'jig rten mi mjed khams/*

*mtha' yas sku gsum rgyu 'phru² rgyal rgyur cig/
 'phags mchog phyag na padmo'i gdugs dkar gyis/
 'khor mo'i phrin³ las sras kyi tha⁴ bo ba/
 de mo'i 'dzin⁵ dbang kun dga' ra ba'i khams/
 mchod sbyin mdzad med ke ra ka yi nor/
 bsod nams gnyis skyes rgyal pos⁶ bskul ba las/
 gser lcog⁷ las 'dzin dga' bzhi grangs⁸ khang pa'i/
 mingo lde 'chang mkhyen rab rnam rgyal gyi/
 gnam lo gnam byung nas bzung 'bru mangs bar
 zung gi grangs ldan dbu shog mig gi brgyan⁹ /
 mthing shog mig sman mdangs phrog¹⁰ rab mdzes ngos/
 rin chen sū war sna yi leges [???] drangs pa'i/
 bdag/ sogs 'grel¹¹ thogs yongs la smin 'gyur shog/
 dge 'dis rgyal bstan yongs 'du'i khri shing rgyas/
 skyes chen zhabs brtan 'gro khams rdzogs ldan gyis/
 'bras smin rlabs chen tshogs gnyis yongs rdzogs te/
 gnyis 'dzin lha min g.yul las rgyal gyur cig//*

(Variants from 'dul ba, ga)

- 1) dod 2) sgyur 3) 'phrin 4) mthu 5) dzin
 6) rgyalo'i 7) lcog 8) brang 9) rgyan 10) 'phrog
 11) 'brel

Vow-Offering Text: Type C: *dkon brtsegs, cha*

om̄ swa sti/

*byang phyogs gangs ri'i phreng ldan bod yul 'dir/
 rgyal ba'i gsung rabs dri med 'gyuro lcog/*

nyang gzhung dpal 'khor bde chen chos grwa cher//
dus gsum bskrun pa'i shing rta'i srol byed mkhan
byams mgon mi yis srid bzung chos kyī rgyal//
rab brtan kun bzang thugs bskyed smon lam mthu//
chos 'phags rnam s dkar brlabs chen dal 'gro'i brgyun//
chad med 'dren pa'i bdag po 'gro ba'i mgon//
phyag na padmo 'jam dpal rgya mtsho yis//
thugs kyī sras mchog de mo hu thog thu//
blo bzang thub bstan 'dzig [sic??] med rgya mtsho ches//
dpal chos khri skongs spyi gnyer zhal 'dzin bskyangs//
gangs can bstan 'gro'i legs tshogs kun gyi gzhi//
zas gtsang sras kyī gsung rab glegs bam rnam//
cha tshang so bzhi'i bar du tshar dngar bar//
gnam lo sa rta la nang spyi gnyer gyi//
'khur byed lde chung kun dga' mi 'gyur nas//
rgyu tshogs ci che'i mdun bskyed legs bskrun pa'i//
dbu shog dang gnyis dkar chags dang bcas pa//
bai du rya'i mdangs ldan mthing shog ngos//
rin chen su wa rṇa yi yig gzugs rnam//
ma nyams lugs par yig sa ba yis bris//
zhus mkhan rin chen bsod nams mkhas grub dang//
pi ṣu ra tna mai ṭe zung gis bgyis//
gsung rabs rin chen 'di yi srid shu'i rgyun//
gaṅgā'i chu rgyun bzhin du chad med shog/
'dis mtshon dus gsum dge tshogs la brten nas//
bstan nang de 'dzin rgyal ba yab sras sogs//
srid mthar zhabs pad bstan cing rnam dkar gyi

mdzad pa'i 'phrin las phyogs bcur rgyas pa yis//
mkha' khyab 'gro ba ma lus gnas skabsu//
nad mtshon nyer 'tshe ma lus pa zhi ba dang//
dpal 'byor legs tshogs dbyar mtsho ltar rgyas shing//
bde zhing skyid pa'i dga' ston legs spyod nas//
mthar thug mkhyen go 'phang mchog thog shog// //
shu bharñ

2.6

The so-called Old Narthang Kanjur is probably to be assigned to a date sometime early in the fourteenth century. The first firmly datable Kanjur is also the first printed Kanjur, the Yongle edition printed in Peking in 1410. **M** clearly dates from the nineteenth century, and therefore cannot be the source for the Old Narthang Kanjur. On the other hand, while **M** itself is relatively new, it might well be a copy, or a copy of a copy and so on, of a very old Kanjur manuscript. This indeed is the scenario which Helmut Eimer suggests for a closely related text, the London Manuscript Kanjur, **L**. This is not to imply that the prototype of **M** was the source for the Old Narthang. Eimer suggests that the prototype of **L** was the original Shel dkar rdzong Kanjur. This leads us to our next topic, that of the filiation of **M** with other Kanjurs, and this in turn necessitates a brief survey of Kanjur history.

3.0 Filiation

3.1 Brief Survey of Kanjur History

The earliest Kanjur was a manuscript version kept at Narthang (*snar thang*). Various copies were made of this original, including the so-called Tshal

pa and the Them spangs ma Kanjurs. The Them spangs ma Kanjur is associated with Rgyal rtse where it was kept. H. Eimer has divided the known Kanjurs into two rough groups, the Western and the Eastern. **M** is a member of the Western group, the other members of which are **R**, **G**, **L**, **N** and perhaps **H**. In deciding the filiation of Kanjurs there are three classes of evidence: variant readings, arrangement of sections and texts, and testimony (literary references and the like). None of these types of evidence have been fully utilized to date due to the difficulty of getting access to the Kanjurs, to the lack of *dkar chags*, and to general lack of familiarity with the mass of Tibetan literature. Kanjur studies remain in their infancy.

3.2

Nevertheless, some facts are known, or can be reasonably supposed. In Eimer's opinion **L** and **N** are closely related, and **H** is based mainly on **N**. Both **L** and **N** seem to be based on a manuscript from the Shel dkar rdzong. **M** seems to be based on the so-called Them spangs ma manuscript, also the source of **G**. Both these old manuscripts seem to be directly related to the Old Narthang Kanjur. **R** should be grouped with **M** and **G**. In Eimer's opinion even the order of the texts in the manuscripts of the Western group preserve the tradition established in the Old Narthang. The arrangement of **N**, however, differs. **H**, being very late, does preserve many features of the Western tradition, but is also affected heavily by other Kanjurs, perhaps especially the Derge.

3.3

A hand-list of the Rgyal rtse Kanjur called the Them spangs ma, currently kept in the State Library, Ulan Bator, Mongolia, has been given by G. Bethlenfalvy. Here it is abbreviated **G**. The ordering of the texts, and what texts

are found, lead us to the conclusion that **G** is very closely related to **M**. The hand-list prepared by Bethlenfalvy is based not only on a rather recent handwritten table of contents (*dkar chag*), but also on a description by Zaya paṇḍita Blo bzang 'phrin las (1642 - 1715). But there is no assurance that this ordering is "original." There is in fact a conflict. Zaya paṇḍita, according to Bethlenfalvy, says that he lists the ordering of the Rgyal rtse Them spangs ma. This ordering is in virtually complete agreement with the present ordering of **M**, that is the ordering on the shelves of the Tōyō Bunko and that followed by this catalogue, except that **M** is missing some texts found in **G** (see below). Eimer's suggestion that **M** should be brought into the ordering of **L** is therefore cast in doubt.

3.4

L is the Kanjur kept in the British Library, London. It agrees in content very closely with the other Western group manuscripts. But it is incomplete, missing several volumes, and has yet to be adequately catalogued. As mentioned above, Eimer has suggested that **M** should be brought into line with **L** in terms of the ordering of the sections.

3.5

R is the Tog (or Stog) Palace manuscript Kanjur, recently made available in a photo-reprint edition, and catalogued by T. Skorupski. On the whole its contents and arrangement of texts agrees with the other MS Kanjurs, but with some differences. The *dkar chag* to **R** justifies some of the scheme by reference to doctrinal considerations. Although the historical relation between **M** and **R** is established without doubt, some differences remain to be explained.

We turn now to examine in detail the physical description of **M**, and then we will examine the ordering of its texts and sections.

4.0 Physical Description of **M**

4.1 The Number of Volumes

In its present state the MS Kanjur is arranged in 114 "bundles" or volumes. However, in the *shes khri* section of the *sher phyin*, volumes *ka* and *kha* are placed together. (They together constitute one sūtra, the *Daśasahāsrikā-prajñāpāramitā*.) If we consider these as two volumes, we then get a total of 115. On the other hand, volumes *ga* and *cha* of the *'dul ba*, and *ta* and *da* of the *sher phyin 'bum* are divided into *gong* and *'og*, or "upper and lower." These two sections *gong* and *'og* have consecutive, not independent, page numberings, and moreover the first two leaves of the *'og* ("lower") volumes are written in black ink on normal paper; the first two leaves of every other volume are written in gold ink on blue paper (on which, see below). If we place these *gong* and *'og* volumes together, counting the pair as one volume, we subtract four from 115, and get 111 volumes. The total number of volumes should be correctly considered as 111. But it should be remembered that the current system of arrangement of the Kanjur on the shelves of the Tōyō Bunko Library is according to the 114 volume calculation. The ordering of the 111 or 114 volumes will be considered below.

4.2 The Number of Texts

There are several different ways to enumerate the number of texts in **M**. If we consider all the texts in the *dkon brtsegs* [Ratnakūṭa] section to be separate, and count sūtras which are divided into parts as themselves individual sūtras, then we get a total of 815 texts. This division of sūtras into parts is often denoted

by the terms *phyi ma* and *phyi ma'i phyi ma* attached to the title(s) of the text(s). Some Kanjur catalogues consider these texts to be single units, others consider them to be multiple. This catalogue considers them as unitary, and denotes them with the addition to the text number of (1) or (2) -- and in one case also (3). If we consider the *dkon brtsegs* section to be a single text, and the texts divided into *phyi ma*, etc., as unitary, then the total number of texts is 761.

4.21

In the following table, alternate tabulations are given in brackets. The total for the number of volumes is figured to be 111, since the *gong* and *'og* divisions are not counted separately, but *ka* and *kha* of the *shes khri* are divided. Six texts are divided into *phyi ma* and *phyi ma'i phyi ma*, one in the *mdo* and five in the *rgyud*. Text #413 is divided into three parts, the others into two. This accounts for the alternate tabulations for the number of texts in the *mdo sde* and *rgyud* sections. The tabulation of the *dkon brtsegs* section is mentioned above. The ordering of the sections in the table is discussed below.

<SET UP TABLE HERE.>

Table One

Section	Number of Volumes	No. of Texts		
I.[rgyud	18[434 [440],	II.[mdo sde	37[293 [294],	
III.[myang 'das	3[1,	IV.	[sher phyin 'bum	16 [18][1,
V.[nyi khri	4[1,	VI.[khri brgyad	3[1,	
VII.[shes khri	2[1,	VIII.[brgyad stong	1[1,	
IX.[khri sna tshogs	1[18,	X.[phal chen	6[1,	
XI.[dkon brtsegs	6[1 [48/49*],	XII.['dul ba	14 [16][8,+	

TOTAL:[111 [114][761 [815],[* On the missing text in the *dkon brtsegs*, see below.]

4.3 Summary of Individual Volumes

4.31 Number of Pages

A single volume of **M** usually contains about 300 leaves. There is one volume with about 500 leaves, ten with about 400, and six with about 200. The volume with about 500 leaves, the *rgyud, na*, is the biggest, and is numbered from page 1 to page 510. The smallest is the *ka* volume of the *sher phyin khri sna tshogs*, which is numbered from 1 to 244. If, however, we split up the single volumes divided into *gong* and *'og*, as discussed above, these would then be even smaller volumes. For instance, the *gong* of volume *da* in the *sher phyin 'bum* is numbered from 1 to 118, and the *'og* from 119 to 350.

4.32 Pagination

One complication is that the pagination written on the borders of the folios is not always consistent. There may be two, or in extreme cases as many as five (5!), page numbers entered on one leaf. The reason this is so is that someone, perhaps the original scribe or perhaps a later reader, wanted to indicate that although the pages may for some reason not have been numbered consecutively, the text was in fact continuous; the addition of subsequent page numbers to a leaf indicates that no actual text is missing, although the numbers may skip in sequence. On the other hand, one sometimes comes across the case of *gong* and *'og* attached to one page number, giving two leaves with the same number -- as it were, page 8 and 8-bis. (These of course both have recto and verso, which should not be confused with *gong* and *'og*, although these Tibetan terms can sometimes have this sense.) It is important to note, therefore, that the page number found on the last page of each volume does not always necessarily conform exactly to the actual number of pages in the volume. The

page numbers given in this study and catalogue are based on the written pagination of the Kanjur itself, unless otherwise specified.

4.33 Size of Folios

Throughout the volumes, the largest paper is approximately 64.8 cm x 28.9 cm, and the smallest is 58 cm x 19 cm. The usual size, however, is 58.4 - 60.9 cm x 19 - 21.6 cm. In each volume, as mentioned above, the first two leaves are of blue paper, written on with gold ink, and from the third leaf onwards regular Tibetan paper is used, the writing being in black ink. As anyone who has seen such a manuscript knows, the color combination of blue and gold together with the beauty of the writing conspire to make quite a lovely impression.

4.34 Number of Lines per Page

The number of lines per page gradually increases at the beginning of each volume. Folio 1b has three lines, 2a four lines, 2b five, 3a six, 3b seven, and 4a eight lines. The remaining folios also usually have eight lines each. Sometimes, however, there are folios with less than eight lines per side, and there are even cases in which there are as many as eleven lines of writing per side.

5.0 Missing Sections

The present MS Kanjur has several sections or portions of text which are missing in the original. Of the three major cases considered below, in two the text has been replaced by either a copy or another text, and in one the lacuna is almost certainly of recent origin.

5.1

In the *'dul ba, ka*, only the first two leaves, that is the folios written on blue

paper in gold ink, are from the original **M**. The rest of the volume, from folio three onwards, was filled in by a Tibetan scribe and Rev. Kawaguchi in 1925. At the end of the last folio of the volume, that is 369b4-6, there is a post-script clarifying the origin of the volume:

The text above was completed from the Narthang *'dul ba ca pa* [*ca* section of the *'dul ba*] from *rgya gar skad du* on the verso of folio 30 line 2, to the recto of folio 430, line 3. From July 1925 until the middle of November it was copied by the Karmapa monk from Derge in the Tibetan province of Khams, Tse dbang rin chen (*khams sde dge pa tse dbang rin chen pas bris*). From November 20 until December 11, together with the same person, I finished correcting it. In the Bodhi-tree Studio, written by Ekai.

Incidentally this tells us that one person could copy one volume of the Kanjur in the space of about five months, and with the addition of one month's time for corrections, the process of completing one volume consumed about six months.

5.2

Again in volume *ma* of the *sher phyin 'bum*, only the first two folios of the original are found. The leaves from folio three onwards to folio 338 are in fact identical with folios 3 to 338 of the *pha* volume of the same *'bum*. Those folios, 3 to 338 of the *'bum, pha*, are therefore duplicated.

5.3

The *ka* volume of the *dkon brtsegs* section ends with folio 294b. Leaving aside those *gong* volumes of volumes which are split into *gong* and *'og*, all other volumes usually end at an appropriate place on the recto of the last leaf. (*Gong*

volumes are copied completely to the end of the verso.) It is unusual, therefore, for this volume to end on the verso. Furthermore, when we compare it with other editions of the Kanjur, we find that there is always one more sūtra found between the last sūtra presently found in volume *ka* and the first of volume *kha*. Although at present the section ends at 294b8 with the colophon of the *'Phags pa rmi lam bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*, previously the volume contained several more pages.

5.4

We may conjecture that the missing folios contained the *'Phags pa 'od dpag med kyi bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* (Toh. 49, Otani 760-5), the *Amitābhavyūha* or *Sukhāvatīvyūha*. In the edition of the Tibetan text of this sūtra published in December, 1931, *Bonzōkanei Gappeki Jōdo Sanbukyō: Zōwa Taiyaku Muryōjukyō*, readings of this Kanjur (**M**) are cited in the critical notes. There is therefore no doubt that the Kanjur did contain this section, until 1931. Any speculation that the *dkon brtsegs* section of **M** should contain only 48 instead of the normal 49 texts, speculation that might be prompted by the catalogue's omission of the text, is unfounded. Like most other Kanjurs, **M** originally had 49 texts in the *dkon brtsegs*. Some Kanjurs, however, seem to have only 48 texts (e.g., the Berlin manuscript), or even 47 (e.g., perhaps the first Qing dynasty Kanjur) in the section. **M**, nevertheless, is not one of these

6.0 Duplicated Portions

As mentioned above, in addition to missing portions of **M**, some portions are duplicated. We will consider a few cases here.

6.1

Volume *ka* of the *phal chen*, from the third folio to folio 331 (the last) is found twice. If we compare these two copies, we find that the same leaf contains virtually the identical text, although the respective leaves may, at the beginning or the end, be a few words off. The same is true with the duplicated texts that follow.

6.2

As we mentioned above, volume *pha* of the *sher phyin 'bum* is duplicated from the third leaf to leaf 338, the duplication being found in the *ma* volume of the same section. **[[NB: why does the catalogue list *ma* as going only up to folio 322 ?????]]**

6.3

In the *mdo* section, volume *ma* is duplicated from folio 33 to 58. This portion of the text, which is the *Dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po* or *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, extends from just before fascicule three chapter three (*bam po gsum pa, le'u gsum pa*) to just after the end of fascicule four chapter four (*bam po bzhi pa, le'u bzhi pa*).

6.4

Folio 380 of volume *cha* of the *'dul ba* is found twice.

6.5

The last leaf of volume *na* of the *mdo* section, folio 363, is backed by the 109th folio of volume *nga* of the *dkon brtsegs* section. Of course, in the relevant place in the *dkon brtsegs* section a leaf containing exactly the same text is found. The leaf in the *mdo* is too lovely to think it a mis-writing.

6.6

With the exception of the first two folios each of the volumes discussed under 6.1 and 6.2 -- those written in gold on blue -- the duplications (that is, the two copies of the text) are so similar one to the other that it is hard to distinguish them. But in cases 6.3 and 6.4, while the whole volumes are, from the point of view of size of paper, color, thickness, handwriting, and so on, quite similar to those volumes preceding and following, the duplications are rather different. These duplications should be distinguished from the original Kanjur text. We can only assume that they are "contaminations" from some other source.

7.0 Fascicules and Chapters

Between the different editions of the Kanjur, there are some differences in the divisions into fascicule (*bam po*) and chapter (*le'u*). We will look at two cases.

7.1

In the *sher phyin 'bum*, both **M** and **P** have 300 fascicules. **M**'s fascicule 228 corresponds to **P**'s 229, **N**'s 229, and **D** tha, fascicule 2. Yet **M**'s fascicule 283 (*ma*, 1a1) corresponds to **N** and **P** fascicule 283. The corresponding fascicule in **D** is unclear. We see, therefore, that within the 300 fascicules, there are differences in the places at which the fascicules are divided. In regard to the chapters, the last chapter of the *sher phyin 'bum* is 73 in **M**, but 72 in **R**, **N**, **D**, & **P**, so **M** has one more chapter than the other editions.

7.2

In the case of the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra*, **M** 327 and **P** 787, both editions **M** and **P**

have 15 chapters, but **M** has 43 fascicules, and **P** 56. The content is the same, but the locations of the fascicule breaks are different. **R** seems to have 43 fascicules in 14 chapters, while **L** has 43 fascicules in 15 chapters.

8.0 Ordering of Texts

8.01

We will discuss below the difficult question of the ordering of the sections in **M**. With the exception of the Peking Kanjurs (plural because there are several printings, and probably two complete re-cuttings of the blocks), none of the Kanjurs available today are consecutively numbered in a way which would permit us to determine the overall ordering. Within each section, however, the volumes are numbered (with letters, *ka*, *kha*, *ga*, *nga*, and so on), and of course the volumes themselves are paginated. This allows us to know with certainty the ordering of the individual texts within each section.

8.02

We will detail below in a separate section the differences in content between the various Kanjurs. Here we will discuss only the ordering of the texts. It is easiest to compare **M** with **G**, since Bethlenfalvy has provided a convenient chart of correspondences. **M**'s agreement with **G** is so close that there seems to be only one instance of real disagreement in ordering. In the *rgyud, cha*, one text (**M** 426) seems to not follow the order of **G**. The only other possible case involves **M** 611-612, which seem to be reversed in **G**. However, both of these are texts called *Gza' rnam kyī yum zhes bya ba'i gzungs*, and since Bethlenfalvy had no opportunity to examine **G** in detail, there is a possibility that he confused the texts. Of course, as we will show below, **G** contains texts missing in **M**, and

vice versa. This makes for breaks in the series of texts, but no change in the correspondence between editions of the texts which are found. In the *rgyud*, *cha*, **L** agrees with the ordering of **M**, not **G**. **R** again agrees with **M** here. If we understand Bethlenfalvy's catalogue correctly, it seems that Zaya paṇḍita's list differs from both the **M**, **L**, **R** ordering and the actual ordering of **G**. Perhaps only a close examination of **G** can decide the matter.

8.03

In general the degree of agreement between the MS Kanjurs of the Western group is striking. In the *rgyud* section there is sporadic correspondence with the ordering of most of the other editions, but no coherent correspondences. In the *mdo* there seems to be no close correlation with any of the printed editions, including **N** and **H**.

8.1 Arrangement of Each Section

We discussed above, in Table 1, the number of volumes and texts in **M**, and then the ordering of the individual sūtras. Below is a comparison of the arrangement or ordering of sections in **M** with the arrangement in other Kanjur editions.

8.10

As the Kanjur is now arranged on the shelves of the Tōyō Bunko Library, the sections are arranged in the following order:

<INSERT TABLE HERE>

Table 2,1 ['dul ba,2[sher phyin 'bum,3[nyi khri ,4[khri brgyad,5[khri sna tshogs,6[shes khri,7[brgyad stong,8[phal chen,9[dkon brtsegs,10[mdo

sde,11[myang 'das,12[rgyud

8.11

The origin of this ordering, however, is not quite clear, since there is no *dkar chag* accompanying the Kanjur. Recently, however, Dr. Helmut Eimer has suggested that the Tōyō Bunko Kanjur **M** should be arranged in accord with a *dkar chag* that belongs to the London manuscript Kanjur, the *Dkar chag dam chos gsal gsrön*. Dr. Eimer's suggestion is based on two kinds of similarities between the two Kanjurs. First, the two have an identical number of texts in each section, and in total, and the sequence of these texts within a given section is also identical. Second is the similarity of variant readings. Eimer based his comments about the readings on his detailed examination of the *Pravrajyāvastu*, that is the *Rab tu 'byung ba'i gzhi* of the *'dul ba*. We are now able to corroborate these findings based on readings collected in a critical edition of the *Prajñapāramitāhṛdaya* in Tibetan.

8.12

As we mentioned above, however, a problem for Dr. Eimer's theory is the close relation between **M** and **G**. The current ordering of **M** agrees almost entirely with **G** (two sections of the *sher phyin* group are out of order), and **G** has been found to follow almost exactly the ordering mentioned by Zaya paṇḍita Blo bzang 'phrin las. This proves if nothing else that the current ordering of **M** is not a fluke due to those who shelved the Kanjur in the Tōyō Bunko Library. The ordering of **L** which Eimer suggests based on the *dkar chag* might well stand, of course, unaffected by this. Why this ordering is given for **L** and a rather different ordering for the other related Kanjurs should be a subject of future enquiry.

8.13

Table 3 shows the ordering of sections in several available Kanjur editions. We see quickly that the Western group Kanjurs, **G**, **R**, **N** and **H** agree with each other to a far greater extent than they agree with **L**. The only edition to which **L** shows any affinity in terms of ordering is **C**, an edition to which, on other grounds, it can be shown to be unrelated.

<INSERT TABLE HERE> Table 3, Section [G[N[D[R[H[P[L[C,-----'dul
ba[1[1[1[1[1[11[12[11,sher phyin[2[2[2[2[2[2[4[3,nyi khri[3[3[3[5[3[3[5[4,khri
brgyad[4[4[4[6[5[4[6[7,sher khri[5[5[5[7[6[5[7[8,brgyad stong[6[6[6[8[4[6[8[5,khri
sna[7[7[7[9[7[7[9[6,phal chen[8[8[8[3[9[9[10[10,dkon
brtsegs[9[9[9[4[8[8[11[9,mdo sde[10[10[10[10[10[10[2[2,mang 'das[11[11[-[11[11[-
[3[-rgyud 'bum[13*[12[11[12[12[10[1[1[* Section 12 is the Rnying rgyud, Old
Tantras.]-

8.2 Detailed Comparison with Different Editions

8.21

Of the 815 texts found in **M**, only one seems to be unique to this Kanjur.

M 670 (*rgyud, ma*, 81a4 - 84a2)

Yid bzhin gyi nor bu'i rtog pa

This text has no Sanskrit title or colophon. In neither the *Ldan dkar ma* nor the Dunhuang manuscript collections do we find reference to a text with such a title.

8.22

There seems to be one text which is found only in **M** and **R.**, **M** 242.
(*mdo, ya, 338b8-339a7*)

De bzhin gshegs pa lnga'i bkra shis tshigs su bcad pa

Pañcatathāgatamaṅgala-gāthā

The first half, up to 339a4, corresponds to **D** 822, up to 261b4. This is the same as **P** 445, **N** 737, etc. But after that it does not correspond. The end title is simply *Bkra shis tshigs su bcad pa*. Nothing corresponding to the latter half can be found. Note that **D** 822 etc. are found in the *rgyud*. There is no colophon.

Correspondence: **R** 242. (*mdo, ya, 360a7-361a5*)

8.3

M contains 16 texts which are unique to the Western group of MS Kanjurs. These are not found even in **N** or **H**. In many of these cases the relevant volume in **L** is actually missing, but the evidence of the rest of **L** strongly suggests that the contents closely parallel that of **M**, **G**, and **R**.

(1) **M** 38 (*mdo, ga, 28b4-132a2*)

'Phags pa sa bcu pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

Ārya-daśabhūmika-nāma-mahāyānasūtra

No colophon. Seven fascicules (*bam po*). This corresponds to the Chinese *Shidi jing*, T. 287.

Correspondences in other MS Kanjurs:

R 38 (*mdo sde, ga, 31b2-131b2*)

G 85 (*mdo-mang, ga*; on the basis of a *dkar chag* only -- actual volume missing);

L (*mdo, ga, 30b2-138b4*)

(2) **M** 131 (*mdo, pha, 224a6-363b6*)

Sangs rgyas rjesu dran pa'i ting nge 'dzin gyi rgya mtsho zhes bya [ba theg pa chen po'i mdo]

Buddhānusmṛtisamādhisamudra-nāma-mahāyānasūtra

The text is divided into seven fascicules and seven chapters, but the seventh chapter seems to end in the middle. No colophon or end title.

Correspondences:

R 130 (*mdo sde, pha, 247b1-402b7*). Colophon: *mdo 'di sngon rgya las 'gyur ba'i 'jug me rdzogs pa sgyur 'phro lus par snang ste mkhas pas legs par gzigs 'tshal.*

G 180 (*mdo, pha, 225a7-367b8*)

L (*mdo, pha, 238a1-368a6*),

(3) **M** 149 (*mdo, ma, 249b4-251a6*)

Lha'i mdo

Deva-sūtra

This has the same title as **D** 329, **P** 995, **N** 314, etc. The first half resembles these somewhat, but the latter half, and especially the end, does not correspond. It is probably best to view this as a different text. There is no colophon or end title. ,

Correspondences:

R 148 (*mdo, ma*, 291b4-293b2). The catalogue of Skorupski identifies this with **D** 329, etc.,

G 198 (*mdo, ma*, 248b6-250a7). Bethlenfalvy likewise connects this with **D** 329, etc. ,

L is missing this volume.

Both **M** 149 and **D** 329 are of roughly the same extent. It will be necessary to examine the texts in detail to determine if they are variants, different translations, or wholly different texts. Adelheid Mette has studied two texts from the Gilgit collection, the *Devatāsūtra* and the *Alpadevatāsūtra*, and compared them with their Tibetan versions, **P** 995 and 996. A footnote (p.139, n. 2) mentions several texts in the Dunhuang Tibetan collections in London and Paris, in London 370 (2), according to La Vallée Poussin's catalogue. This is called the *'Phags pa lha mo'i mdo*, the *Āryadevatāsūtra*, in the text itself. But Mette does not mention # 370(3), the title of which is *Lhas gsold pa'i mdo*, the *Devasūtra*. Reference is also made to the texts in Paris, numbered by Lalou #103 (1) and (5) , *Lha'i mdo*, #731, *Lha'i mdo*, and #732, the title of which is the same as La Vallée Poussin's 370(3). See also the *Ldan dkar ma*, 296, the *Lha'i mdo*, 37 ślokas.

(4) **M** 173 (*mdo, dza*, 354b1-356a4)

Sa'i mdo

Bhūmi-sūtra

Translated by Padmakaravarma and Rin chen bzang po.

Correspondences: ,

R 172 (*mdo, dza, 399a5-401a5*). Colophon: *rgya gar gyi mkhan po Padmākaravarma dang zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba dge slong Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa.*

G 222 (*mdo, dza, 356a2-357b2*),

L is missing this volume.

(5) **M** 248 (*mdo, la, 137b3 - 165/66a6*)

Mdo sde snyan gyi gong rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo,

No Sanskrit title.

Colophon: *lo tsa ba Ce ba tsan* [read: *btsan*] *skyes kyis bgyur* [read: *bsgyur*]. At 149b7-8, there is the sentence: *'jig rten gyi khams kyi rnam par gzhag pa'i sgra ma lus pa zhes bya ba bsgyur pa dgu po rdzogs so.* Then, at the end, 165/66a4-5, we read: *sangs rgyas kyi snyan gyi gong rgyan las shin tu rgya che ba'i theg pa chen po bshad ba rnam par snang mdzad kyi le'u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i rgyud rdzogs s.ho.* The "Colophon" given above follows here.

Correspondences: ,

R 248 (*mdo, la, 137a6 - 166b5*). The colophon of **R** is the same as the end colophon of **M** (folio 165/66, above), from *sangs rgyas* to *lo tsa ba Ce btsan skyes kyis bsgyur*. Then follows: *yi ge pa ning shing mul tol bris.*

G 296 (*mdo, la, 127b3 - 154a4*). The title is given as *sangs rgyas kyi snyan gyi gong rgyan zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.*

L (*mdo, la, 138a5 - 165b4*). *sangs rgyas kyi* preceding the title is found in the colophon, but not at the head of the text. The translator is given as Tse

btsan skyes, not Ce btsan skyes. [Mis-reading?]

The form of the translator's name given in the Derge Kanjur (**D** 829), Otani catalogue (452), and the colophon translated by Bischoff (from the Mongolian version; there the text is numbered 461), is Che btsan skyes. **U** 829 calls the translator simply Che btsan. It seems that this text **M** 248 is only the second known translation of this translator. The catalogues indicate the text to be translated from the “*bru zha*” language, the only text in any of the collections to be so specified. It is found in the *rnying rgyud* section, a section not found in **M**, **R** or **L**, but found in **G** where the text is **G** 380; unfortunately Bethlenfalvy's catalogue gives no colophons. ,

(6) **M** 264 (*mdo, sa, 238b8 - 240a6*)

'Phags pa tshul khrim nyams pa'i rnam par smin pa'i lce [read *lci* ?] *yang bstan pa'i mdo*, No Sanskrit title, or colophon.

Correspondences:,

R 264 (*mdo, sa, 254b7 - 256b1*). The catalogue spells . . . *lci*.

G 312 (*mdo, sa, 239b3 - 241a2*). Also here . . . *lci* . . . ,

L is missing the volume.,

(7) **M** 265 (*mdo, sa, 240a6 - 241b6*)

Byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po sa'i snying pos bcom ldan 'das la zhus pa'i mdo. No Sanskrit title or end title., Colophon: *kha che'i pan qi ta Shā kya shrī las brgyud te byung zhes grag go*.

Correspondences:,

R 265 (*mdo, sa, 256b1 - 258a2*). Title begins *Byang chub sems dpa' chen po'i sa'i snying*. . . . The colophon is the same.,

G 313 (*mdo, sa, 241a2 - 242b2*), **L** is missing the volume.

See La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue, # 62. The Tibetan title is identical. La Vallée Poussin gives the Sanskrit title as *Kṣitigarbha-mahāsattvabodhisattva-bhagavat-paripṛccha-sūtra*, but this seems to be his own "reconstruction." The manuscript does not mention any Sanskrit title. Is there any relation to Taisho 412?,

(8) **M** 266 (*mdo, sa, 241b6 - 244a1*)

'Phags pa yongs su skyob pa'i snod ces bya ba'i mdo

Ārya-pariśaraṇibhañja-nāma-sūtra [sic]

Colophon: *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba dge slong 'gos Chos grub kyis/ rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o.*

Correspondences:;

R 266 (*mdo, sa, 258a3 - 260b3*). The Sanskrit title and the colophon are exactly the same, although Skorupski "normalizes" the spelling of both.,

G 314 (*mdo, sa, 242b2 - 244b8*). The title is given as *yongs su skyo ba pa'i snod ces bya ba'i mdo*. Probably a copiest (or the cataloguer, Bethlenfalvy) has mistaken *skyob pa* for *skyo ba pa*. *Yongs su skyo ba pa* would not be possible in the context.,

L is missing the volume.,

(9) **M** 268 (*mdo, sa, 263b7 - 266b8*)

'Phags pa rgyal bu kun tu dge zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

No Sanskrit title or colophon.,

Correspondences:,

R 268 (*mdo, sa, 282a3 - 285b1*),

G 316 (*mdo, sa, 264b6 - 267b7*). Title is given as: *Rgyal bu kun tu dge ba'i rtogs brjod*

L is missing the volume.,

The *Ldan dkar ma* lists as text 269 the *Rgyal bu kun tu dge ba'i mdo* in 40 ślokas, in the section *theg pa chen po'i mdo sde rgya las bsgyur la*. If these two texts are in fact the same text, and if the text was in fact translated from Chinese, we might expect to find copies among the Dunhuang MSS. But we do not -- at least under this title, according to the catalogues of the London and Paris collections.,

(10) **M** 272 (*mdo, sa, 328b1 - 340a8*)

Zla ba'i khyim brtsi ba dang/ rgyu skar ba rtsi [read: *brtsi*] *ba'i mdo sde las 'byung ba*

No Sanskrit title, end title, or colophon.,

Correspondences:,

R 273 (*mdo, sa, 352a7 - 365a7*). **R** adds *zla ba'i bam brtsi ba* at the end of the title.,

G 320 (*mdo, sa, [missing, no pagination]*). Title: *Zla khyim dang rgyu skar rtsi ba'i mdo sde 'byung ba 'jig rten ston pa'i le'u*. Is this an abbreviation of the title? ,

L is missing the volume.,

(11) **M** 312 (*mdo, ji*, 186a3 - 199b1)

Mdzod dang 'jig rten brjod pa'i mdo

Kośalokiprajñaptikancaśba [sic!],

No colophon.[??? the discussion of colophons says this text reads *brda rnying du snang ngo*.

Correspondences:,

R 315 (*mdo, ji*, 190b6 - 204a6). Title given as : *Kośalokaprajñaptikanacakṣeba*, but perhaps this has been "standardized" by Skorupski.

Colophon: *lokaprajña rdzogs so/ brda rnying du snang ngo*.

G 361 (*mdo, ji*, 184.n.3 - 197a8)

L (*mdo, ji*, 192b8 - 206b2). *Kośalokaprajñapti*. Barnett seems to consider this to be part of the preceding *'Jig rten bzhag pa (Lokaprajñapti)*, but the handlist recognizes it as a separate text.

If we understand it correctly, the colophon to **R** seems to support the notion that this text must be taken as a part of the *Lokaprajñ(āpti)*. Apparently this text has been studied by Dr. Siglinde Dietz (Göttingen), but no results have yet been published.

(12) **M** 318 (*mdo, ji*, 348b4 - 353a6)

Byang chub dam pa'i rjes su mos pa'i smon lam,

No Sanskrit title or colophon.,

Correspondences:,

R 323 (*mdo, ji, 371b6 - 376a7*),

G 369 (*mdo, ji, 358b2 - 363a5*),

L (*mdo, ji, 366b1 - 370b8*),

The *Ldan dkar ma* lists the same title as # 475. At 10 ślokas, however, it may be too short to correspond (?). We should not, however, make too much of the lengths of texts as quoted in the *Ldan dkar ma.*,

(13) **M** 322 (*mdo, ji, 362a6 - 363a8*)

Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi yongs su bsngo ba,

No Sanskrit title or colophon.,

Correspondences:,

R 327 (*mdo, ji, 384a3 - 385a5*),

G 373 (*mdo, ji, 371a2 - 373b4*),

L (*mdo, ji, 378a1 - 378b8*)

The same title is found for chapter 30 of the *Sangs rgyas phal po che* or *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, namely *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan gyi yongs su bsngo ba*. But, the extent of the present text (**M** 322) makes it impossible to identify the two. See, however, La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue, # 179, the '*Phags pa rdo rje rgyal mtshan zhes bya ba yongs su bsngo ba'o*', which La Vallée Poussin says is "Complete in 15 stanzas. Colophon, title only; a blank space has been left for the Sanskrit title." See also Lalou, Inventaire, # 740: "Titre et six premières lignes mutilées du *Vajradhvarajanāmapariṇamāna* . . . *Rdo rje rgyal mtshan zhes bya ba yongsu bsngo'o*." The identity of this text is unclear.

The *Ldan dkar ma* has a text, # 468, called the '*Phags pa rdo rje rgyal*

mtshan gyi bsngo ba. At 18 ślokas, this might be our text rather than the chapter from the *Sangs rgyas phal po che*. But note that according to Yoshimura's edition of the *Ldan dkar ma*, the Derge edition gives for this text not 18 but 180 ślokas.,

(14) **M** 323 (*mdo, ji, 363b1 - 364a4*)

Bde legs su 'gyur ba'i tshigs su bcad pa

Svastiyana-gāthā,

In the Colophon the translation is attributed to Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, and Ye-shes-sde. The texts with the same title in the printed editions, **D** 818 = 1102 = 4400A, **P** 441 = 723 = 1047 = 5945, etc., do not correspond. None of these are given translators in the catalogues. This text should not be confused with **M** 324, the *Bde legs kyi tshigs su bcad pa* or *Svastigāthā*. This does correspond to **D** 817 = 1101, **P** 440 = 722 = 1046 = 5944, etc.,

Correspondences:

R 328 (*mdo, ji, 385a5 - 386a1*). Title given as *Svastayana-gāthā*. The colophon reads: *rgya gar gyi mkhan po Jinamitra dang Surendrabodhi dang zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba bande Ye-shes-sdes bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa*.

G 374 (*mdo, ji, 372b4 - 373b1*),

L (*mdo, ji, 379a1 - 379b3*). *Svastayana-gāthā*. Translators same.,

The same title is found in the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue # 482, its length 9 ślokas.,

(15) **M** 326 (*mdo, ji, 368b8 - 369a8*)

Dkon mchog gsum gyi bkra shis kyi tshigs su bcad pa

Ratnatrayasvasti-gāthā,

No colophon. The title is the same as **D** 824 & 827 (=1108), but the texts do not correspond. **D** 824 is called *Ratnatrayamaṅgalagāthā*, but 827 is *Ratnatrayasvastigāthā*.

Correspondences:

R 332 (*mdo, ji*, 391a2 - 391a7). The title is given as *Dkon mchog gsum gyi bde legs kyi tshigs su bcad pa*. What if any is the connection of this with **R** 331-b (390b4 - 391a1), given the title from the *dkar chag* of *Bkra shis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*? Does **M** have an equivalent text?

G 377 (*mdo, ji*, 377b3 - 378). Same title as that given in **R**.

L seems to lack the text, although since it would fall at the end of the last volume in the section, it is not impossible that it has merely been lost.

(16) **M** 676 (*rgyud, ma*, 114b5 - 115b2)

Rje btsun sgröl ma'i mtshan brgya rtsa brgyad pa ces bya ba

Bhaṭṭatārā-aṣṭaśataka-nāma

The colophon reads: *kha che'i paṇḍi ta Bud dha ā ka ra dang/ bod kyi lo tstsha ba ga rub Chos kyi shes rab kyis/ kha che'i dpa la [sic? read las] bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o.*

Correspondences:

R 679 (*rgyud, ma*, 126a7 - 127a4),

G 749 (*rgyud, ma*, 114a8 - 115a6),

L The "handlist" has only "?" at the appropriate place, but the surrounding texts show that this should equal **M** 676, etc.

A text with a very similar title is **M** 674 = **D** 727 [= 745 & 1000], **P** 391 [= 625], **N** 639, **C** 396 [= 630], etc. According to the Tohoku catalogue the title is *Rje btsun ma 'phags ma sgrol ma'i mtshan brgya rtsa brgyad pa shes bya ba*, in Sanskrit the *Ārya-Tārābhaṭṭarikānāmāṣṭaśataka*. **D** 728 is titled *Lha mo sgrol ma'i mtshan brgya rtsa brgyad pa shes bya ba*, in Sanskrit the *Tārādevīnāmāṣṭaśataka*. What is the relation of this text to the others? A Sanskrit text with the title *Āryatārābhaṭṭarikāyānāmāṣṭottaraśataka* was edited and translated into French as long ago as 1895, and rendered into English by E. Conze in 1954. This is usually identified with **D** 727, etc., but Yamada identifies with **D** 728 also. Judging by the number of manuscripts of this text in the various collections of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts, the text must have been rather popular.

8.4 Texts Unique to the Western Group

Four texts are found in all the Kanjurs of the Western group, printed as well as manuscript. It is of great interest to note that the four texts are found in **N** in the *kha skong* "supplemental" section, not in the so-called original bulk of the Kanjur **N**. Exactly what this means for the history of the Western group, and for the history of **N**, is not quite clear at the moment. One text included here is found in other editions in the Tanjur.

(1) **M** 143 (*mdo, ma, 230a7 - 232a5*)

De bzhin gshegs pa'i mtshan brgya rtsa brgyad pa,

No Sanskrit title or colophon.

Correspondences:

R 142 (*mdo, ma, 269b6 - 271b5*),

G 192 (*mdo, ma, 229b7 - 231b3*),

H 101 (*mdo, kha, 520a2 - 523a3*),

N 785 (*kha skong # 25: 225b7 - 227b7*),

L seems to lack the volume in which the text would be found.,

(2) **M** 276 (*mdo, a, 297a5 - 297b7*)

'Du shes bcu bstan ba'i mdo

Daśasaṃjñadeśa-sūtra,

No colophon. ,

Correspondences: ,

R 277 (*mdo, a, 311a2 - 311b2*). *Daśasaṃjñanirdeśa-sūtra.*

G 324 (*mdo, a, 287b4 - 287b4* [sic. Bethlenfalvy's catalogue; something is obviously wrong here.]),

L (*mdo, ā, 287b2 - 288a3*). *Daśasaṃjñadeśasūtra.,*

H 314 (*mdo, la, 241a3 - 241b4*). *Daśasaṃjñadeśasūtra.,*

N 787 (*kha skong # 27: 313b7 - 314b2*).

(3) **M** 283 (*mdo, ci, 225a1 - 300a8*)

Las gdags pa

Karmaprajñapti,

No colophon.,

R 286 (*mdo, ci, 272a5 - 358a4*) ,

G 332 (*mdo, ci, 240.?.? - 314b8*),

L (*mdo, ci, 225b5 - 300a7*),

H 290 (*mdo, ra, 356a1 - 444b7*) ,

N 786 (*kha skong # 26: 228a1 - 313b7*)

In the other editions this text is found in the Tanjur. **D** 4088; **P** 5589; **N** 3580; [No catalogue of Cone available]. Here there is a colophon to the Tanjur's version which lists the translators as Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Prajñāvarman and Ye shes sde. Cordier (vol. 3, p. 393) has a note saying that the Tibetan *dkar chag* to the Peking Tanjur, and the colophons, consider this text and the two preceding it in **P**, that is, **P** 5587, 5588, and 5589, equivalent to **M** 283 and **M** 310 & 313, as sections of one text, the *Gdags pa'i bstan bcos* or in Sanskrit the *Prajñaptiśāstra*. The *dkar chag* (folio 125b8) "fait connaitre en outre que, si les Vaibhāṣikas (Bye brag tu smra ba rnam) les considèrent comme des āgamas (Bkaḥ), les Sautrāntikas (Mdo sde pa rnam) les tiennent pour des śāstras (Bstan bcos)."

The *Prajñaptiśāstra*, then, comprises three texts, the *Lokaprajñapti*, the *Kāruṇāprajñapti*, and the *Karmaprajñapti*. In his *Chos 'byung* or 'History of Buddhism,' Bu ston discusses these three works. Unfortunately the Tibetan text is not available at present, but according to Takakusu's rendering, Bu ston says: "Those three works are translated by Prajñasena [understand Prajñavarman]. The Vaibhāṣikas maintain that they belong to the scriptures. And although they appear to be mentioned as such in the *Dkar chag chen po* still there is no doubt that they, conformably to the meaning of the Sautrāntikas and the remaining schools, must be reckoned as śāstras."

The texts taken as a whole, that is as the *Prajñaptiśāstra*, are said by

Yaśomitra in his commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* to be the work of Maudgalyāyana, and apparently Bu ston repeats this claim. These texts have been summarized by Takakusu, and studied in depth by L. de La Vallée Poussin. The first two are given in slightly abbreviated French translation, and the last summarized. According to Bruce Cameron Hall, these three "seem to be the only pre-Vasubandhu Abhidharma texts in Tibetan, and the only Abhidharma texts ever found in Kanjurs." He goes on to speculate that "If the MSS preserve a tradition predating the printed Kanjurs, this shows an earlier stage in the process of classifying texts into the "Buddhas Word" and the śāstras of his Indian successors." Note that the *Ldan dkar ma* records what seem to be these three texts under the heading *theg pa chung ngu'i sde la* as 275, 276 and 277. It is curious to note that Mkhas grub rje (1385 - 1438) seems to know only two of the three texts. He says:, "Of the Seven Sections of the Abhidharma, only a part of the *Prajñaptiśāstra*, namely the two [texts] *Lokaprajñapti* and *Karmaprajñapti* have been translated into Tibetan; no others have been translated.,

(4) **M** 284 (*mdo, ci, 300a8 - 324/25b8*)

Las rnam par 'byed pa

Karmavibhaṅga,

Translators: Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Munivarman, & Ye shes sde.,

Correspondences:

R 287 (*mdo, ci, 358a5 - 385a3*),

G 333 (*mdo, ci, 314b8 - 367a1*),

L (*mdo, ci, 300a7 - 324b8*).,

H 343 (*mdo, la, 425b6 - 455a7*),

N 783 (*kha skong* # 23: 130a1 - 157b7)

The texts at **D** 338, **N** 323, **P** 1005, (**H** 344, **S** 337) lack a colophon, and the text differs slightly from that of **M**. But note **U** 338, the colophon of which is in complete agreement with the colophons of **M**, **R**, **L**, and **H**. (**N** is not available.)
[Toh. lists the same translators!],,

8.5 Texts in **M** Lacking in Other Editions

Above we discussed the texts unique to the Western group, including those found only in the MS Kanjurs and those found in **N** and **H** as well. Some texts found in **M** are contained in only some of the printed editions, and conversely, some Kanjurs have certain texts which are missing in **M**. We pass without notice the many texts which are missing only from **N**, and found in virtually all the other editions. Texts which are missing in any of the other Western group editions, or found in them and missing in **M**, are considered separately below. This list does not include the texts considered above, with the exception of **M** 283.

Table 4

M[**D**[**N**[**P**[**H**[**C**

195[119[-[-[200[-

372[412[-[-[-

430[475[-[-[441[-

440[484[-[-[452[119

625[-[-[359[-[364

634[683[-[-[-

637[689[-[-[659[-

640[690[-[-[653[373 (?)

716[767[668 (?)][-[706 (?)][-,

8.51

All of the texts in the table above are found in **R**, **G** and **L**, except 716, which is missing in **R** and **L**. This text is the *Gnod sbyin gar mkhan mchog gi rgyud*. The identifications with **N** and **H** need to be verified.

,8.6 Correspondences in the Tanjur

Some texts found in **M** are found in other editions only in the Tanjur. (In the case of **M** 283, in both the Kanjur and the Tanjur.) All these texts are found in **R**, **G** and **L**. (It was not possible to verify the existence of **M** 269 and 271 in **L** since the relevant volume is missing.) (Numbers below for **N** are serial numbers for the Tanjur, following Mibu's catalogue.),

Table 5

M[D[N[P

44[1161[50[2050

269[4199[3688[5697

271(1)[[3807[- 4321 5815*3[271(2)[[3808[

283[4088[3580*2[5589

307[4144[3636[5645

308[4145[3637[5646

309[4196[3686[5695

310[4086[3578[5587

313[4087[3579[5588],[314[4201[3689[5698

315[4202[3690[1041 (Kanjur)

,[*3 See Cordier, CXXIII (16)] ,[*2 Also in **N** kha skong, 786, and **H** 290.

See section 0000]

Note that of the above texts, a little more than half are not ascribed to authors in the catalogues of Derge and Peking. These are **M** 44, 271 (1) and (2), 307, 308, 309, 315. (Cordier notes for **P** 5646, "In fine, mention de Gnas brtan Grags pa.")

8.7 Multiple Correspondences

Some texts found in **M** are found in both the Kanjur and the Tanjur in other editions. This list is by no means exhaustive; a study of such correspondences remains a desideratum of future Kanjur research.

Table 6, M[D[N[P, 316[44 (4) = 1095 = 4377[3916[716 = 761 [= 1038] = 5924, 317[1096[3917[717 = 1039 = 5925, 319[1097[3931[718 = 1040 = 5939, 8.8
Western Group Texts Lacking in **M**

Some of the other Kanjurs in the Western group contain texts which are not found in **M**. (Because of the fragmentary state of **L**, and the absence of any

detailed catalogue for it, it is not possible at this time to identify what may or may not be contained in it.) **M** lacks the whole *rnying rgyud* or Old Tantras section, found in **G** as texts 379 through 397. Most of these texts are found in the xylographic editions, although not necessarily in a special *rnying rgyud* section.

,Table 7

G[R[L[D[N[P[H[C

103[-[125[112[793[127[766

326[279[-[788[-[-

364[318[mdo,ji,352[4202[-[5699[-[-

365[-[4146[-[5647[-[-

497[-[472[782[-[438[-

614[-[587[717[582[758[287

-[174[-*2[335[320[1001[339[974

-[331[-[-[-[-[-

-[565[-[-[-[-[-,*2 Volume missing]

8.9 Other Problems

As mentioned above, it seems that **M** contains only one text, **M** 670, which is unknown to all other Kanjurs. **G** seems to lack the *'Dul ba gzhung dam pa*, or the *Vinaya-uttaragrantha*, which is however found at **M** 8, and in **R** 8, L ('dul ba, pa, 79), **P** 1037, **N** 8, **C** 1038, **H** 8. This could be a fault of the *dkar chag*,

however, since the actual Kanjur could not be examined by Bethlenfalvy. But as Eimer points out in a review of Bethlenfalvy's catalogue of **G**, the catalogues of **D** and **U** (which is usually identical with **D**) also lack the text. Some catalogues, however, refer to a second text number 7 in **D**. Probably we have to do with a difference of opinion as to whether the *'Dul ba gzhung dam pa* is to be distinguished from the *'Dul ba gzhung bla ma* which precedes it, not whether the former exists or not. No such title is found in the *Ldan dkar ma*. Note, by the way, that according to Eimer, Claus Vogel suggests the Sanskrit title should be *Vinayottamagrantha*.

9.0 Contents

9.1 Titles

There are several cases in which, although the contents are identical, the title found in **M** differs from that in some other editions. Although the evidence is limited, there does not seem to be as much cohesion among the members of the Western group as we saw when we considered texts and their ordering, above. The catalogue for **G** unfortunately contains no Sanskrit titles, and the listings in the hand-list for **L** should be used with caution; they look to have been "standardized.",

9.11

[**M** 389 = **N** 394 = **R** 390 = **G** 459 = **H** 405:

Sngags kyi cha'i rgyud kyi rgyal po zhes by ba

Mantra-am̐sa-tantrarāja-nāma,

D 429 = **P** 68 = **U** 430 = **S** 425 = **C** 68;

L (*rgyud, nga, 150a4*): *dpal gdan bzhi pa'i bshad pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po sngags kyi cha zhes bya ba*

Śrī-caturpīthakhyāta-tantrarājo-mantra-aṁsa-nāma

There are slight variances in the Sanskrit title: omitting *śrī*, short for long vowels, dental for palatal, *catuḥ* for *catur*. There are also differences in the translators listed:

D: Gayadhara, Shā kya ye shes

P: Gāyadhara, 'Gos klug pa lhas btsas [sic]

U: Gayadhara, Shā kya ye shes; Colophon has 'Gos khug pa lhas bcas [instead of Shā kya ye shes.

R: Gayadhara, 'Gos lhas btsas [sic catalogue]

S: Gayadhara, 'Gos khug pa lhas btsas,9.12[**M** 71 = **R** 71:

'Dus pa chen po las 'phags pa byang chub sems dpa' sa'i snying po 'khor lo bcu pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

Ārya-badhisattvakṣitigarbha-cakradaśa-nāma-mahāyānasūtra [sic : *badhi-*],

D 239 = **N** 224 = **P** 905 = **U** 239 = **S** 239 = **G** 119 = **C** 878 = **H** 240 = **L**
(*mdo, nya, 1a1*):

'Dus pa chen po las sa'i snying po'i 'khor lo bcu pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

Daśacakraṣitigarbha-nāma-mahāyānasūtra

[standardized; variant transcriptions in the different editions.],

J 181:

Sa'i snying po 'khor lo bcu pa zhes bya ba'i mdo

Is this the *dkar chag's* abbreviation? *Ldan dkar ma* 82 is titled '*Phags pa sa'i snying po 'khor lo bcu ba*, and is 3,900 ślokaś, 13 *bam po* long.

According to the catalogues of Tohoku and **R**, this sūtra is translated from the Chinese. Tohoku gives the translators as Hwa shang zab mo and Rnam par mi rtog pa. But the colophon in **R** reads simply: *bande Rnam par mi rtog pas rgya las bsgyur ba'o/ mdo 'dir skad gsar bcad kyis gtan la ma phab pa'i 'gyur snying pa 'ga' zhig gda'o*.

9.13

[**M** 230 = **N** 221 = **R** 230 = **H** 237:

Bhagavanoṣṇiṣamahā,

D 236 = **P** 902 = **U** 236 = **S** 236 = **L** (*mdo, 'a, 108a5*):

No Sanskrit title

For the editions not cited, the catalogues never record the Sanskrit title, so they cannot provide evidence. The catalogue for **R** gives *Bhagavaduṣṇiṣamahā*, but the note indicates this to be Skorupski's "correction"; the edition reads *Bhagavanoṣṇiṣamahā*. The reading in **H** is actually *Bhagawāna-uṣṇiṣamahā*. Both Tohoku and **R** indicate that the text is translated from Chinese, but **U** does not mention it. The colophons in **R** and **U** differ. The Sanskrit title seems to be an abbreviation of the Tibetan title (or, the Tibetan is a distended version of the

Sanskrit): *Bcom ldan 'das kyi gtsug tor chen po de dzhin gshegs pa'i gsang ba sgrub pa'i don mngon par thob pa'i rgyu byang chub sems dpa' thams cad kyi spyod pa dpa' bar 'gro ba'i mdo.*

9.14

M: 690;

H 685: *Ārya-mahāsrīyāh-sūtra,*

D: 740;

U 740;

S 736: *Ārya-mahālakṣmiṇi-sūtra,*

N: 647: *Ārya-mahāsrīyāh-sūtra,*

P: 399: *Ārya-mahāsrīya-sūtra,*

R: 693: *Ārya-mahāsrīyāh-sūtra* [addenda: *-mahāsrī-*],

L: (*rgyud, tsha, 79a1*) *Mahāsrīya-sūtra*

,9.15

Cases of variations such as that seen in the last example can be found in abundance. The Kanjur editions not only show a vast range of transcriptions of Sanskrit titles, names, and words, but some revisions certainly took place. Some of these were executed no doubt by competent Sanskrit scholars, but others were not. By carefully comparing "disfigured" Sanskrit titles and words, we can gain an insight into the filiation of editions one to the other. It is therefore essential to accurately record all readings, especially when they seem to be corrupt.

,9.2 Differences in Content

Any evaluation of texts with similar or identical titles but differences in

content can be attempted only after gaining a thorough familiarity with a corpus of texts, and often only upon minute comparative examination. We have, nevertheless, been able to offer several examples of this type. A very interesting case is that of scriptures with two or more variant, but obviously related, versions.

,9.21

In our discussion above we mentioned the difficulties involving text number **M** 276, the *'Du shes bcu bstan pa'i mdo*, in Sanskrit the *Daśasamjñā-deśasūtra* [sic]. Most other Kanjurs have a text which deals not with the ten *samjñā*, but with the eleven. The other text is **M** 47, the *'Du shes bcu gcig bstan pa'i mdo*, in Sanskrit the (*Ārya-*) *Samjñāna-ekadaśanirdeśa-sūtra*. Only in the manuscript Kanjurs from the Western group, and the Narthang and Lhasa Kanjurs, do we find the ten *samjñā* version.

Table 8, M[G[R[L [N[H[D[P[C][J[U, 47[94[47 *mdo, nga,*
307b4[296[315[311[977[950[251[311, 44276[324[277 *mdo, ā,* 287b2[787[314[-[-[-
[-[-]

The difference is highlighted in the following passages: **M** 276 (297b1):
*'tshal pa'i tshul khirms thams cad bshags shing tshul khirms thams cad yang dag
blang ba'i 'du shes dang,* (**H** 314 (*mdo, la,* 241a6-7) reads for the passage: *tshul
khirms 'chal cing nyams pa thams cad bshags shing/ tshul khirms thams cad
yang dag par blang ba'i 'du shes dang.*

D 311 (157b1); **H** 315 (242a1-2): *'tshal pa'i tshul khirms thams cad bshags
pa'i 'du shes dang/ tshul khirms thams cad yang dag par blang ba'i 'du shes
dang.*

The confusion is seen very clearly in the Urga edition. The title is given as

'Phags pa 'du shes bcu gcig bstan pa'i mdo, but the colophon reads: *'Du shes bcu bstan pa śloka brgyad pa/ bcom ldan 'das kyi zhal chems 'du shes bcu gcig bstan pa'i mdo śloka bcu gcig pa*. In the case of the Dunhuang MSS, La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue, lists one MS, # 89, with the title *'Du shes bcu bstan pa'i mdo*. He remarks, however, that "There are really eleven notions (*saṃjñā*, *saṃjñāna*) described in the present text." In fact, the reading he reports corresponds exactly with that quoted for Derge, above. Text # 311 (4) has only the ten *saṃjñā*. Both of these texts have strange Sanskrit titles. For 89 La Vallée Poussin gives *Daśa-saṃjñāna-sūtra*, but the Tibetan writes Da 45sha sa nga ng4]d nyi n4]r de sha su dra. For 311 (4) La Vallée Poussin gives the same Sanskrit, the manuscript reading Da sha sang ng4]d nyā n4] ra de sha su + 46tra. In the Paris collection, the text catalogued by Lalou, Inventaire, as # 45 (12) has again only the ten.

,9.3 Conflation of Texts

There are four cases in which texts found in **M** as single units are found in other Kanjurs as two texts. We should keep in mind that there may be other examples which do not necessarily reveal themselves by variant head and end titles, for instance. Only a comprehensive survey of multiple Kanjurs can effectively reveal instances of conflation.

,9.31

M 81 (*mdo, nya, 379a8 - 380a8*), Head title: *'Phags pa'i bud med 'gyur ba lung bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. End title: *Sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa*, Sanskrit title: *Ārya-strīvivartavyākaraṇa-nāma-mahāyānasūtra*, The first half, found separately, is the following sūtras: **M** 235, **D** 190, **P** 857, **N** 176, **U** 190, **R** 235, **G** 129, **L** (*mdo, nya, 383a3 - 414a6*):

'Phags pa bud med 'gyur ba lung bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i
mdo

Ārya-strīvivartavyākaraṇa-nāma-mahāyānasūtra,

The latter half is **M** 233, **D** 279, **P** 945, **N** 264, **U** 279, **R** 233, **G** 130, **L**
(*mdo, nya*, 414a6 - 415):

'Phags pa sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa

Ārya-buddhānusmṛti

Let us compare in detail the section in which the joint appears. (The **bold**
type indicates the first half, underline type the second.

M 81 (379b7-380a2),. . . byams pa la sogs pa bskal pa bzang po'i byang
chub sems dpa' chen po thams cad kyang 'khor de nyid du 'dus par gyur te 'khor
ro// de nas bcom ldan 'das rgyal po'i khab (b.8) kyi grong khyer chen po na rten
cing bzhugs te/ **ryal po dang/ rgyal po'i bu rnams dang/ tshong dpon**
rnams dang/ 'phags pa'i gang zag rnams kyi rgyal po/ (380.a7.1) mya ngan las
'das pa'i grong khyer du 'gro ba rnams kyi ded dpon/ ye shes dpag tu me pa/
spobs pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa/ gsung rnam par dag pa/ 7(a7.2) dbyangs
snyan pa/ . . . ,D 190 (201b4-5),. . . **rgyal po dang/ rgyal po'i bu rnams dang/**
tshang dpon rnams dang/ khyim bdang rnams dang/ (b.5) blon po rnams
dang/ 'khor rnams dang/ grong rdal pa dang/ yul gyi mi rnams kyis bkur sti
byas/ bla mar byas ri mo byas/ mchod pa byas so// . . . ,D 279 (55a3),shes rab
zil gyis mi non pa/ stobs rnams la brdzib med pa/ sems can thams cad kyi ston
pa/ byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi yab/ 'phags pa'i gang zag rnams kyi rgyal
po/ mya ngan las 'das pa'i

For the sake of reference, we will quote the end of the latter half.,

M 81 (380a65-8),. . . 'di dag ni de bzhin gzhegs pa'i yang (a.7) dag pa'i che ba'i yon tan yin no// sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa rdzogs s.ho// // **de bzhin gshegs (a.8) pa'i ye shes bden mtshan glegs bam dum la gtugs nas zhus dag ci nus bgyis/ bstan brgyas par shog/ gcig zhus/ kra bshegs// //,D 279 (55a7),. . . 'di dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i **ye shes** yang dag pa'i che ba'i yon tan yin no// **'phags pa** sangs rgyas rjes su dran pa rdzogs so//**

The correspondences can be given in tabular form as follows:,Chart 1,M 81:[379a8--[379b8[--[--[--[--(First half),M 235:[172a8--[172b8--[203b9,N 176:[324a6--[325a1--[363a6,D 190:[201a6--[201b4--[224b5,P 857:[211a5--[211b3--[235a8,M 81(Second Half) [--[--[--[379b8[--[--[380a7,M 233[134 (gong)b2--[134 (gong)b7--[134 ('og)a5,N 264[79a7[--[--[79b5[--[--[80a4,D 279[54b6[--[--[55a3[--[--[55a7,P 945[58b4[--[--[58b8[--[--[59a5,9.32[M 315 (mdo, ji, 314b6 - 342b4),End title: Rgyal po gser gyi lag pa'i mar me'i smon lam gyi mdo,No head title or Sanskrit title.

This text comprises the so-called Prophecy of the Li Country, and the Annals of the Li Country. These texts, concerning the history of Khotan, were studied long ago by F.W. Thomas in *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*. A recent study is that of R.E. Emmerick, *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*. The text translated by Thomas, which is actually made up of two texts, was taken by him from the Narthang Tanjur # 3690 (*mdo, nge* (94) 420b3 - 444a4). The second of the two texts begins at 424b1. It is actually only this second text which Prof. Emmerick edits and translates. The first text is called the *Li'i yul (gyi) lung bstan pa*, and the second the *Li yul gyi lo rgyus*. Prof. Emmerick gives the title of the first only, although he is studying the

second. According to Cordier, in the Peking edition the second title appears only in the colophon.

,Correspondences:

,First half:[Li'i yul lung bstan pa,**N** 3690 (mdo 'grel, nge, 420b3 - 444a2),**D** 4202 (spring yig, nge, 168b2 - 188a7),**P** 5699 (spring yig, 444a2 - 468a8),? **R** 318 (mdo, ji, 329a6 - 357b2),? **G** 364 (mdo, ji, 313b4 - 343b?). Li'i yul du sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa [dar tshul

The same basic beginning seems to be found in three manuscripts from the London Dunhuang collection, 597, 598, and 601(2).

,Second half: *Mar me'i lo rgyus dang smon lam gyi mdo,*

C 1042 (*'dul ba, pa, 358b8 - 361a6*),

P 1041 (*'dul ba, pe, 301a6 - 303a1*),

R 320 (*mdo, ji, 363b3 - 366a3*). *Rājakājabāhudripasyaprakīyupraṇidha* [[sic.],

G 366 (*mdo, ji, 349b7 - 352b1*). *Rgyal po gser gyi lag pa'i mar me'i lo rgyus dang smon lam gyi mdo,*

L (*mdo, ji, 358a2 - 360b5*). Barnett and the hand-list disagree about the Sanskrit and exact Tibetan titles.

Two texts in **L** are related. The text at *mdo, ji, 320b7 - 329a8* is called the *Li'i yul lung bstan pa*, and the following text (329a8 - 352a4) is the *Li yul gyi lo rgyus*. The colophon to **R** 320 reads: *Rgyal po gser gyi lag pa'i mar me'i smon la* [sic. catalogue] *gyi mdo rdzogs so*. In this regard we should mention the title of **D**

4380, *Rgyal po gser gyi lag smon lam*.

The passages of correspondences can be given as follows., Beginning:

M 315 (314b6), // *li yul byung nas li'i rgyal po rabs drug ni 'di 'das/ rabs bdun ni rgyal po bi dza ya ki rti zhes bya ba'i tshe nal . . .*,

N 3690 (420b3) *li yul lung bstan pa bzhugs so// li'i yul lung bstan pa/ dkon mchog gsum la phyag 'tshal lo// li yul byung nas li'i rgyal po rabs drug ni 'das/ rabs bdun gyi rgyal po bi dza ya ki rti zhes bya ba'i tshe nal . . .*,

Conflation:

M 315 (340b8), **bdag dgung bdun zhig khyim thab kyi mdun bgyid cing/ slad rol du mi mchi bar ci gnang zhes gsol pa dang/** (341a1) bsam gtan la sogs pa snyoms par 'jug pa'i skal pa dang ldan [v]]_ par gyur cig/ . . .,

P 5699 (465b3) = **N 3690** (441a7), **bdag dgung bdun zhig khyim thab kyi bdun bgyi cing/ slad rol du mi mchi bar ci gnang zhes gsol pa dang/** rgyal pos kyang de bzhin du (441b1) gnang nas dam/ . . .

C 1042 (359b4) = **P 1041** (301b6-7), de ltar gsal ba'i mdo la gzugs med pa'i lha rnam mar me'i 'od kyis bskul ma thag tu mtshan dang dpe byed du ldan nas snyoms par 'jug pa'i skye (b.5) mched bzhi las grol te/ de bzhin gshegs pa'i bsam gtan la sogs pa snyoms par 'jug pa'i. . .

End:

M 315 (342b4), . . . gyur cig/ rgyal po gsel [sic??] gyi lag pa'i mar me'i smon lam gyi mdo rdzogs s.ho//,

C 1042 (361a6), . . . gyur cig/ rgyal po gsel [sic??] gyi lag pas mdzad pa'i

mar me'i smon lam gyi mdo rdzogs so/

We can chart the correspondences as follows:,

Chart 2,

M 315[314b6--[340b8[---[First half,N 3690[420b3--[420b3--[441a7[---
[444a2,P 5699[444a2--[444a2--[465b2--[468a8,M 315[Second half[---[---
[341a1--[342b4,C 1042[358b8--[359b5--[361a6,P 1041[301a6--[301b7[---
[303a1,9.33[

M 340 (rgyud, kha, 385b2 - 393a9) = **N** 382 = **R** 342 = **G** 411.;

Head title:

Rdo rje phag mo mngon par 'byung ba,

Sanskrit title: *Vajravārihi-abhidani* [sic],

End title: Rig pa 'dzin ma'i rdo rje rnal 'byor ma'i sgrub thabs

The first half of this text corresponds to **D** 377, **P** 22, **U** 379, and the second half to **D** 380, **P** 25, **U** 382. The titles of these are as follows:;**D** 377:

Phag mo mngon par brjod pa bshad pa'i rgyud phyi ma las/ phag mo mngon par byang chub pa zhes bya ba/,

D 380:

Rig pa 'dzin pa rdo rje rnal 'byor ma'i sgrub thabs zhes bya ba/,

The joint in the text occurs in the following passage in **M**, and corresponds to the passages in **D** cited below it.,

M 340 (393a1), shes rab pha rol phyin sbyor ba// de bzhin rnal 'byor ma/ dmar mo zhal steng du phyogs shing gyen du gzigs pa/,

D 377 (59b2-3),. . . // shes rab pha rol phyin sbyor pa// de bzhin rnal 'byor pa gnas bya// snang ba med pa'i gnas la gnas// . . . ,

D 380 (73a2),. . . 'dir de'i steng du ma nid gi sa bon blta ste/ sa bon de yongs su gyur pa las/ dmar mo zhal steng du phyongs shing gyen du gzigs pa/ . . .

If we chart these correspondences, we get the following:,

Chart 3, M 340:[385b2[--[393a1[--[--[(First half), N 382:[236b6[--[246a6[--[--[["", D 377:[52b5[--[59b3[--[60a7, P 22:[215b6[--[222b7[--[223b6, M 340:[(Second half)[--[[(393a1)[--[393a9, N 382:[["[--[[(246a6)[--[246b7, D 380:[72b7)[--[--[73a2[--[73a7, P 25:[243a7)[--[--[243b1[--[244a2,

9.34

M 242 (mdo, ya, 338b8 - 339a7),

Title:

De bzhin gshegs pa Inga'i bkra shis tshigs su bcad pa,

End title:

Bkra shis tshigs su bcad pa

Various Kanjurs have texts with titles corresponding to the head title of M 242, a text we mentioned above. These are **D 822 [= 1105]; P 445; N 737; U 822 [= 1107].**,

Correspondence for the first half;

M 242 (339a3), . . . // dge mnyam bsam sems ldan ba'i bkra shis gang yin pa// mi yis rab tu bsgrims te gdon// . . . ,

D 822 (261b3), . . . // dge mnyam bsam ldan pa'i bkra shis (b.4) gang yin pa/ bkra shis des ni ske dgu rnams la zhi byed shog/ . . . ,

The correspondence can be tabulated as follows;

M 242:[338b8--[339a3--[339a7,N 737:[238b5--[239a1[--[. . . [--[239a6,D 822:[261b1--[261b3[--[. . . [--[261b7,P 445:[320a5--[320a7[--[. . . [--[320b2

Things are relatively complicated in the context of identifying this text. It has the same title as **M 325** and **760**, which are equivalent. These apparently correspond to **G 376 = 833**; **R 330 = 762**; **L** (*mdo, ji*, 381a6 - 385) = (rgyud, tsha, 441a6 - 442) -- [the preceding are all in identical locations within the Kanjurs] -- **D 822 = 1105 = 3782**; **P 445 = 726 = 4600**; etc. Neither **G** nor **L** has a text with this title in the *mdo, ya*, but **R** does, **R # 242**. The end title of **M 242**, curiously, is the same as the title of text which comes close after **R's 330, 331-b**. According to the *dkar chag* the title of this so-called 331-bis *Bkra shis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*. The text itself has no title. Note also that according to Cordier, the *dkar chag* gives **P 4600** the title *Rigs lna'i bkra shis kyi*. It will be necessary to examine the texts in detail to shed light on the problem

.,10.0 Colophons

There are some cases in which exactly the same text has differences in the colophon, or differences in the translators who are listed, between one edition and another. We have mentioned some such cases above, but now we will give

some detailed examples

.,10.1

M 9 (*sher phyin 'bum, ma, 322a5-8*) = **R** 9 (*sher phyin, ma, 365a5-7*).

(Variants from **R** are quoted in the notes.),

'di ni bsam yas dang/ lha sa'i **reg** zing **rnam gnyis dang/ lha sa'i reg zing** mtshams mi 'da' la sogs pa la gtugs nas/ zhus dag lan bcu drug byas pa'i/ rgyan gong gi 'bum **nags** mtshams mi 'da' la phyi mo byas nas/ dag par gtud [= gtugs] pa'i (a.7) 'bum sdig ma 'dres **shes** bya ba'i gser 'bum bcu gnyis **dam/lo** tstsha ba chen po thams cad [] mkhyen pa Bu ston rin **chen** grub kyi thugs darñ la phyi mo bgyis nas mkhan chen rin chen rgyal mtshan pas 7 8bzhengs pa la ma **phyis** pa'o// 'di dge bas sems can [] rnam s/ khor ba'i rgung pa kun dang bral gyur nas/ lan gnyis lhun gyis grub par shog//,

+_____1) rig[2) omitted[3) nag[4)

zhes,5) dum[6) omitted[7) phyi bgyis[8) 'di'i,9) rgud [correctly!][10) don,[[[is rgung the reading of M????]],N 9 (536a5); H 9 (521a6-7);,rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dzi na mi tra dang/ Su re ndra bo de dang/ zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba bande Ye shes sde la sogs pas bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o// ,D 8; P 730; U 8; S 8: No colophon,10.2[M 33 (-39) = R 11 (-40) = N 72 = H 84;:,lo tstsha ba 'gos Chos grub kyis rgya nag gi dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa/ ,D 84 = P 760 (-40) = C 1029 (-40) = S 84 = U 84 = B (dkon brtsegs # 39);:,No colophon. (The old Otani catalogue says: "Perhaps a re-translation from Chinese.) 10.3[M 455 [= 696] = D 948 [= 748] = P 132 [= 573] = S 921 [= 743] = U 950 [= 748] =B (rgyud, da, # 3);:,rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dī parñ ka ra shrī dznyā na dang/ bod kyi lo tstsha ba Rgya brtson 'grus seng ges dpal na len dra'i sgo 'gram du bsgyur//

(Not all the editions repeat the colophon verbatim, but the content is [the same.], N 775 = R 699 = H 468:; rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dznyā na garbha dang/ lo tsā ba bandhe Klu'i dbang pos bsgyur//, 10.4 [M 458 = D 504 = R 464 = P 136 = S 497 = B (rgyud, da, # 7) = H 472:; rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dzi na mi tra dang/ Dā na shī la dang/ zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba ban dhe Ye shes sde la sogs pas zhus shing bsgyur te/ skad gsar chad kyis kyang bcos shing gtan la phab pa'o//

The Tohoku catalogue (= dkar chag?) lists the translators as Jinamitra, 6Silendrabodhi, and Ye shes sde. U 503 has no colophon. The Kanjurs of the Western group have two versions of this text. M 458 [= 190] = R 464 [= 190] = G 239 [= 531] = L (mdo, zha, 232b6 - 244b6) -- volume tha of the rgyud is missing, but the text was probably in that volume. The colophons of all of these versions of the text should be examined to determine if the names of the translators differ., 10.5 [M 57 = N 313 = R 57 = L (mdo, cha, 125a3 - 128a4):; No colophon., D 328 = P 994 = S 326 = U 328 = B (mdo, sa, # 28) = H 332:; rtsangs De ben dra ra kṣi tas zhu chen bgyis pa//, 11.0 Technical Terms: Spelling & Prefixes

The whole field of studies on Tibetan orthography is still very under-developed. The following comments are intended only as materials for consideration; they neither express nor imply any final judgment on the issues they attempt to raise. If these questions draw the attention of specialists in Tibetan language history and linguistics, they will have served their purpose.,

11.1 The Term "Mendicant's Staff"

M 174 is a text called the *Mkhar gsil 'chang ba'i kun tu spyod pa'i cho ga*, or "The Method of the Practice of Holding the Mendicant's Staff." In the Chinese Tripiṭaka it is T. 785, the *Yu ch'ih hsi chang fa* []. It should not be confused with the text which precedes it (D 335, etc.), the *'Khar gsil gyi mdo*, which is

apparently equivalent to the first part of T. 785, the *Te tao t'i ch'eng hsi chang ching* [[]]. This short text in the *mdo, dza*, covers folios 356a4 - 357a7. Including the head and end titles, the term for "mendicant's staff" appears twenty times. Usually the term is spelt '*khar gsil*', although some dictionaries prefer *mkhar gsil*. Here follow some tabulations of usage, and citations from catalogues. N 321, D 336, P 1002, C 975, H 340:;

In the sūtra:;

M: mkhar gsil. 16 times

P: khar sil. [19 times, khar sil. 4 times

C: 'khar sil. [20 times,

N: 'khar gsil. 19 times

D: 'khar gsil. [20 times, mkhar gsil. 1 time[

Tun.: khar s4]l. [20 times,- (reversed gi-gu)

H: 'khar gsil. 20 times,

In the catalogues:;

Peking dkar chag (old Otani catalogue note):['khar bsil,

P (1002):. . . khar sil[G (223):. ['khar gsil,

U (335):. . . 'khar sil[

H (340):. ['khar gsil,

S (334):. . . 'khar gsil

B (mdo 28, # 36):. [khar sil,

C (975):. . . 'khar sil[J (275):. [khar sil,

R (174):. . . 'khar gsil,

11.11

Of these versions, the only that is particularly old is the Dunhuang version. It could be suggested, therefore, that the spelling of *khar* without the use of any prefixed letters is an archaic feature. This form appears four times in M. If one makes this argument, however, it would follow that the spelling *sil*, likewise without a prefix, is also archaic. However, the Cone edition, which dates from the 18th century, and the Urga edition, which dates from the first years of the 20th century, both show the form *sil*. It is not necessary, therefore, that the lack of prefixed letters indicate any particular archaism. ,

11.12[

Another problem is the alternation of the prefix between the *m* and the '*a-chung*. These two prefixes have much in common. We may note that in modern colloquial Lhasa Tibetan these are the only two prefixes which cause an initial voiced stop to be pronounced as a voiced stop with nasal ingress, instead of as an unvoiced aspirated stop. It must be left to specialists in the linguistics and phonology of Tibetan to discuss this issue in detail. Our provisional conclusion is that these alternate forms, both the presence or lack of prefixes, and the alternation of prefixes, are due to regional or dialectal differences, and not archaism, especially since the time between the publications of the various

xylographic editions themselves is not as great as the time which separates the Dunhuang documents from the xylographs.,

11.2[

In spelling in Tibetan the name of the famous translator from Dunhuang, whose name in Chinese is Wu Fa-ch'eng [[]], M and N usually write mgos Chos grub, and D and P usually spell 'gos. Sometimes M and N also write 'gos. The spelling 'go is also not uncommon. Furthermore, the Dunhuang documents and P standardize the spelling of the name as Chos grub, but M, D, and N mix Chos grub with Chos 'grub. The Derge catalogue (based on the *dkar chag?*) spells Chos 'grub for D 691 & 692, but the texts themselves read Chos grub.,

11.3[

In the Tibetan title of M 607 and N 590, we find the word *'thun*. In all other editions (catalogues) consulted, the spelling in *mthun*. It is possible that some of the catalogues have standardized their spelling.,

11.4[

In the Tibetan title of M 279, J 281, L (*mdo, ja 1a1*), P 1008, N 326, we read *'dzangs*, while D 341, R 281, U 341, S 339, G 328, H 347, C 980, have *mdzangs*.,

11.5 New and Old Word forms

We mentioned above the dangers inherent in making arguments about the relative age or degree of archaism of different Kanjurs on the basis of some differences in spelling. There may be partial standardization of spelling within individual sūtras, but certainly the editions as a whole show no such

standardization. We saw above that **M** and **P** show forms which, it could be suggested, are "archaic" from the point of view of spelling. We argued, however, that such forms are no certain sign of the archaism of the editions. But while it may be that the absence of prefixed letters is not a necessarily archaic feature, some peculiarities of spelling are unquestionably "archaic." That the presence of these archaic feature -- the *da drag* and the use of *yi* for classical *i* -- is not an indication of the age of the edition as a whole can be shown by the following examples.,

11.51,

M 9 (sher phyin 'bum, pa, 2a4 - 2b3),

D 8 (shes phyin, tha, vol. 23, 17a5 - 17a7),

P 730 (sher phyin 'bum, ngi, 182b3 - 182b5),

M 2a4):,+ 1mi gzung ba'i phyir ma yin/ 'du byed gzung ba'i phyir bstan pa
 ma yin 1(2b1) mi gzung ba'i phyir ma yin/ rnam par shes pa gzung ba'i phyir
 bstan 1 2pa ma yin/ mi (2b2) gzung ba'i phyir ma yin/ mig gzung ba'i phyir
 bstan 3pa ma yin/ ma gzung ba'i phyir ma
 yin/_____,1)[D:[myi(2)]D:[myig,3]D:[myi; [P:
 [mi[(M's ma is an error),11.52,M 9 (sher phyin 'bum, ma, 322a4 - 322a5),D 8
 (shes phyin, a, vol. 25, 395a5),N 9 ('bum, na, vol. 25, 484a3),(M 322a4), 1 2
 3 2 3rab 'byor 'di la dngo po yod pa yang med/ dngos po med pa yang med/
 ngo 3 2 3bo nyid kyang med/ gzhan gyi dngos po yang med na/ de la
 gang yongs su 4shes par bya ba'i ngo bo nyid stong (322a5) pa nyid ces bya ba
 lta yod par 5 6'gyur re skan/ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag brgya
 pa las/7 8chos nyid mi 'gyur ba bstan pa'i le'u ste bdun cu don gsum mo// [What

follows is the colophon, given below 00000] 'di ni bsam yas dang/ lha sa'i reg zing., _____, 1)[D:['byord[2][N: ['ang[3][D:['myed,4)[P:['nyid yod ces[5][D:['rold[6][D:['phyind,7)[N:['omits[8][D,P,N: [bdun cu rtsa gnyis so// D & P lack what follows; N continues past bam po 301. See the old Otani catalogue footnote.,

11.53[

We see from the variant readings of just these two passages that D, which is generally well-known for the rigor of its revision -- the standard- ization of its spelling and of its grammatical usage -- shows such "archaic" forms as *myi*, *rold*, and *phyind*, that is, it shows the use of *yi* for *i*, and employs the *da drag*. These features are generally considered to be character- istic of an older stage of the language, and are common in Dunhuang texts. The fact that they occur in the Derge edition emphasizes our statement, that it is not possible to connect the age of forms which are found in a text directly to the age of the edition, or perhaps even the text.,

11.6

Orthography

In the beginning of M we find the special character , an 'a-chung with a "flag" on the right shoulder. There is no such character in use in the present day, but it is very frequent in old writings such as the Dunhuang manuscripts. It seems to occur in some cases in the Derge and Cone at least, but the exact references are not at hand. Since this character has been little studied, even little noted, it may be excusable to offer some comments. It is noticed without comment by La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue, p. xvi, and by L.D. Barnett in M.A.

Stein, *Ancient Khotan*. In response to an inquiry by the late Mr. Ryotai Kaneko, Prof. H.E. Richardson made the following observations:; You mentioned the different ways of writing the Tibetan letter in ancient documents. I have had a quick look at my material and find that it is written in the Zhol inscription, also in those at Bsam-yas (Khri Srong Lde brstan), the Gtsug-lag-khang Treaty inscription of 821-822 and also in the inscription at Mtshur-phu (Lcang-bu) (Khri Gtsug Lde brstan, Ralpacen). In the Tunhuang Mss. there is a good deal of variation. It appears as only rarely in the Annals, but more often in the Chronicles. There the word 'ung nas seems to have it regularly and also a final without a vowel sign. The pillar at Khri Lde Srong brstan's tomb at 'Phyong-rgyas; the inscriptions of his reign at Zhva-li Lha-kha²g, and the Skar-cung inscription, also of the same reign, have. I cannot find what may be the form used on bells at Bsam-yas, Khra-'brug and Yer-pa. Also much more careful examination is necessary to discover whether the use in the Tunhuang Mss. and elsewhere can provide ground for any theory. I cannot claim to have checked every appearance of the letter in the various inscriptions but have only taken a quick look at them. . . .,[Exerpt from a letter dated 21 May, 1960],

11.61[

On the general question of orthography, we can only mention, besides the considerations offered in the course of the studies above, the fact that some texts, for example M 312 (199b1) mention in the colophons "*brda rnying du snang ngo*." Usually this is interpreted to mean "[as] in the old orthography," but Ruegg has suggested that *brda rnying* as opposed to *brda gsar* refers to old as opposed to new terminology, that is, the terminology employed before the reform of terminology instituted by the Tibetan scholastics. R 315 has the same statement in its colophon. It would be most interesting to compare the spelling

and terminology of texts which possess such colophons in M with that of the same texts in other editions of the Kanjur, or even just to note whether such notice in the colophons is consistent between editions.,