

HELMUT EIMER

THREE LEAVES FROM A TIBETAN *DHĀRAṆĪ* COLLECTION

The two Tibetan Buddhist canonical collections, viz. *bKa' 'gyur* (Kanjur) and *bsTan 'gyur* (Tanjur), comprise far more than four thousand individual texts of different length, printed on well over one hundred thousand leaves. The Kanjur was, as far as we know, promulgated in blockprinted editions issued from eight, the Tanjur from four places. The number of manuscript copies cannot be estimated at present.

It took about six hundred years, i.e. the time between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, for the main portion of this huge literary corpus to develop. The Tibetans translated Buddhist texts from the Sanskrit and other Indian languages, as well as from Chinese or Uighur versions of texts originally stemming from India. Monasteries and feudal lords brought together the translations at different places. Thereby collections of sacred texts grew consisting of a limited number of items; the earliest catalogue still preserved, viz. the *lHan dkar ma*,<sup>1</sup> lists 730 odd items. In the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century the attempts to form a comprehensive collection reportedly led to the compilation of the first handwritten canon prepared in Narthang Monastery. But this has not come down to our times. The earliest

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. LALOU, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan". JA 241 (1953), p. 313-353.

witnesses of the Kanjur and Tanjur accessible at present date back to the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries respectively<sup>2</sup>.

So far research has drawn a picture of general Kanjur history which shows the lines of the *Vulgata*<sup>3</sup> transmission going back to two "hyparchetypes"<sup>4</sup>, viz. the *Tshal pa* prepared in the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and the *Them spans ma* produced in 1431. At present two central questions concerning the first Narthang Kanjur are open. The first one pertains to the textual relation between the earliest Kanjur on the one side and the *Tshal pa* and *Them spans ma* editions on the other. The second focuses on the first Kanjur manuscript itself, especially on its origin and on its specific nature<sup>5</sup>.

Recently, handwritten Kanjurs, to name here the *Phug brag* and *Tawang*<sup>6</sup> manuscripts only, turned up which hitherto, due to several reasons, cannot be directly connected with the *Vulgata* tradition stemming from the two "hyparchetypes". The problem of how they can be related to the Old Narthang manuscript is still unsolved, it is possible that the Kanjurs not cognate to the *Vulgata* rely at least to some extent on those collections utilized for compiling the first Narthang Kanjur. The relation of the Kanjurs accessible at present to those old manuscripts and manuscript fragments found in the extreme West of Tibet, viz. in the former kingdom of Guge<sup>7</sup>, has not yet been investigated successfully. It might well be that some of

---

<sup>2</sup> The earliest printed Kanjur accessible to scholars is the Lithang / 'Jan Sa tham edition prepared 1609-1614, cf. J. SAMTEN, J. RUSSELL, "Notes on the Lithang Edition of the Tibetan *bKa'-'gyur*", in *The Tibet Journal* 12 (1987), p. 17-18.

<sup>3</sup> H. EIMER, "Preliminary Notes on *Nor chen's* Kanjur Catalogue", in PER KVAERNE, *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the IATS, Fagernes 1992*, (The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, Occasional Papers. 1.), Oslo, 1994, p. 230-236.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. P. HARRISON, "In Search of the Source of the Tibetan *Bka'-'gyur*: A Reconnaissance Report", in PER KVAERNE, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. P. HARRISON, *op. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. SAMTEN, "Notes on the *bKa'-'gyur* of O-rgyan-gling, the family temple of the Sixth Dalai Lama (1683-1706)", in: PER KVAERNE, *op. cit.*, p. 393-402.

<sup>7</sup> H. EIMER, "Einige Bemerkungen zu Handschriftenfunden aus Guge / Westtibet", in *Zentralasiatische Studien* 22 (1989/91), p. 244-255 and E. STEINKELLNER, "A Report on the 'Kanjur' of Ta pho", in *East and West* 44 (1994), p. 115-136.

these old manuscripts are closely related to the first handwritten Narthang canon or to some sources thereof. Thus, old manuscripts or manuscript remains deserve our special interest, as they are witnesses for an early stage of canonical transmission in Tibet.

The leaves described in this communication survived enclosed in an old Central Asian Śākyamuni bronze related to the *Sa skya pa* school of Tibetan Buddhism. A short time ago Mr. Namgyal Gonpo Ronge (rNam rgyal mGon po Rañ dge), a Tibetan artisan living near Bonn, discovered them together with other materials and some smaller-sized leaves decked with *dbu med* written text<sup>8</sup>. An early date of these materials is suggested, so I was informed, by a reference to Grags pa rgyal mtshan found on a slip of paper - most probably the second of the five Great *Sa skya pa* Masters.

The present communication is a first attempt to understand the relation between the said three leaves and the known canonical tradition: The following investigation applies different hermeneutical methods for reaching this goal. After a description of the fragment, we will consider some peculiar variant readings and regard the position of the three *dhāraṇīs* in the extant Kanjurs and in collateral collections of canonical texts. For the reader's convenience a full diplomatic transliteration<sup>9</sup> of the three leaves is added.

The leaves measure c. 15, 9 / 16, 2 to 60 / 60, 8 cm. For placing them into the bronze they were folded into 16 vertical strips of about 3,5 to 4,5 cm in breadth; the folding left clearly visible breaks in the paper. On each leaf two binding holes are pierced at about 21 cm from the left-hand and at about 21 cm from the right-hand margin respectively; they are surrounded by circles, lined in red<sup>10</sup>, with a

---

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Ronge discussed the contents and the dating of these handwritten materials with Geshey Pema Tsering (dGe bśes Padma Tshe riñ), Seminar für Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft Zentralasiens, Bonn. As the three leaves in question comprise texts found in the Kanjur, they were shown to me. I thank Mr. Ronge very much for his kind permission to study the leaves in detail.

<sup>9</sup> The 'a *chui* written under a consonant with the *o* or the *ai* as vowel is indicated by a macron above the *o* and the *a*.

<sup>10</sup> The vertical margins of the text face are given in red lines as well.

diameter of c. 3,4 cm. At the left-hand margin of each *recto* the letter numeral *ka* (for 1) is written. Then follow four small crosses (indicating the number 400) and the numerals *don gñis* (i.e. 72), *don gsum* (i.e. 73), and *don bži* (i.e. 74). Six lines of text are written upon each side in a clear *dbu can* handwriting. There are many instances of the old orthography, e.g., the *ya btags* is applied in all cases where the Tibetan words *me/mye*<sup>11</sup>, *med/myed*<sup>12</sup>, *mi/myi*<sup>13</sup>, or *miñ/myiñ*<sup>14</sup> occur, whereas fol. 474b6 the syllable *me* appears in a portion of transliterated Sanskrit. The *da drag* is given at 20-odd places, we find the forms *gyur/gyurd*<sup>15</sup>, *stsal/stsald*<sup>16</sup>, *gsol/gsold*<sup>17</sup> etc.<sup>18</sup>

Blank portions in line 2 of fol. 472b and in line 3 of fol. 474a indicate the end of the text and the start of the following one. The first text, of which only the final portion is extant, is styled by the brief colophon as:

(1.) *'Phags pa dkyil 'khor brgyad pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po 'i mdo.*

According to the initial entry on fol. 472b3 and the colophon on fol. 474a2/3 the Tibetan title of the following complete text runs like this:

(2.) *'Phags pa 'od (g)zer*<sup>19</sup> *can źes bya ba 'i gzuñs.*

The initial Tibetan title at fol. 474a3/4 reads as follows:

(3.) *'Phags pa gźaṅ 'brum rab tu źi bar (4) byed pa 'i mdo.*

<sup>11</sup> "Fire", fol. 473b2.

<sup>12</sup> "To be not", fol. 472a1, 472a6, 472b4, 472b5 (5 times), 472b6 (5 times), 473a1 (10 times), 473a2 (3 times), 473a3 (5 times), 473a4 (2 times).

<sup>13</sup> "Not" or "man", fol. 472b2, 472b6, 473a2, 473a4, 474a2, 474b3, 475b6.

<sup>14</sup> "Name", fol. 472b6, 473a2, 475b5.

<sup>15</sup> Preceding the *slar bsdu ba* fol. 472a4 and 474b1, preceding the imperative particle fol. 473a2 (3 times), 473a3 (4 times), and 473a4 (4 times), at fol. 474b3 at the very end of a clause.

<sup>16</sup> Fol. 472b1, 472b5, and 474a1 *bka' stsald nas*, fol. 474b4 *bka' stsald to*.

<sup>17</sup> Fol. 474b2 and 474b4.

<sup>18</sup> *Myurd tu* fol. 472a6, *'jig rtend* fol. 474a2, *sbyard* fol. 474b2, and *seld* fol. 474b5; cf. fol. 472a2 *mchod to* as well.

<sup>19</sup> The prefixed *g* is missing in the colophon title, elsewhere in the manuscript the form *gzer* is preferred.

Texts bearing these three titles are found in the Kanjur as well. In all catalogues to the different blockprint and manuscript editions they are listed at least once in the general Tantra section (*rgyud*, *rgyud sde*, or *rgyud 'bum*)<sup>20</sup>. In the printed editions belonging to the *Tshal pa* line of transmission<sup>21</sup> a second copy of the texts is preserved<sup>22</sup>. This is due to the fact that during the *Tshal pa* revision about 260 *dhāraṇīs* were added to the general Tantra section to form a specific subsection, which in the Derge blockprint edition bears the marginal section title *gzuis 'dus* ("collection of spells")<sup>23</sup>.

The two brief colophons indicate the end of the preceding texts by mentioning their titles with *rdzogs sho*, "is finished", added; the names of the translators are not given. The catalogues of the Kanjur record that the *dKyil 'khor brgyad pa* and the *gZaṅ 'brum rab tu ži bar byed pa* were translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, and Ye šes sde, whereas the *'Od zer can gyi gzuis* was rendered into Tibetan by Amoghavajra and Rin chen grags. The translations preserved on the three leaves were prepared by the same monk-scholars during the "early propagation" (*sna dar*) of the Buddhist Doctrine in Tibet. This is evident, because in all the texts in question the wording is identical in general, except for several variant readings<sup>24</sup>.

The most conspicuous differences found in the wording of the three leaves as against the Peking and Phug brag Kanjur versions are the following. In the *'Od zer can žes bya ba'i gzuis* the initial formula depicting the situation in which the Buddha addressed his monks has the following form on fol. 472b3-5:

---

<sup>20</sup> Viz. *dKyil 'khor brgyad pa* D 644, F 537, N 474, Q 158, and S 601; *'Od zer can žes bya ba'i gzuis* D 564, F 643, N 497, Q 182, and S 524; *gZaṅ 'brum rab tu ži bar byed pa'i mdo* D 621, F 676, Q 213, and S 580.

<sup>21</sup> Viz. the Kanjurs printed in Cone, Derge, Lithang, Peking, and Urga,

<sup>22</sup> Viz. *dKyil 'khor brgyad pa* D 882 and Q 507; *'Od zer can žes bya ba'i gzuis* D 988 and Q 613; *gZaṅ 'brum rab tu ži bar byed pa'i mdo* D 1020 and Q 645.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. H. EIMMER, *Der Tantra-Katalog des Bu ston im Vergleich mit der Abteilung Tantra des tibetischen Kanjur*. Studie, Textausgabe, Konkordanzen und Indices, Bonn 1989 (Indica et Tibetica. 17), p. 40, note 7.

<sup>24</sup> This is the result of some test collations with the two versions in the Peking Kanjur and the version in the Phug brag manuscript.

*'di skad bdag gis thos pa'i dus gcig na / (4) bcom ldan 'das mñan yod na / rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon myed zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba bžugs te / / de nas bcom ldan 'das kyiis dge sloñ rnam la bka' (5) stsald pa /*

In the Kanjur transmission this passage comprises about thirty more syllables<sup>25</sup>; and between *kun dga' ra ba* and *bžugs te* the following passage is found:

*na / dge sloñ gi dge 'dun chen po brgya phrag phyed dañ bcu gsum dañ / byañ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po mañ po dag dañ thabs gcig tu*

It is obvious that in the fragment this passage has been omitted, because the stereotyped form in which the beginning of a sermon by the Buddha is given generally names the number of monks assembled.

Another example to be discussed here pertains to the prayer for protection from several fears directed to the goddess Marīcī (Tibetan: *'Od zer can*). The order of the individual requests given in the fragment is indicated by preceding numbers set in brackets, the arrangement in the Peking and Phug brag Kanjurs is marked by numbers set in double brackets following the single sentences. The passage in question runs like as under:<sup>26</sup>

- [1.] bdag skye bo (bo'i 'jigs pa FQ) las skyobs [[Q 1., F 1.]]  
 śig |
- [2.] bdag rgyal po'i 'jigs (473b) pa las skyobs [[Q 2., F 2.]]  
 śig |
- [3.] bdag chom rkun gyi 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 4., F 4.]]
- [4.] bdag klu'i 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 5., F ./.]]
- [5.] bdag glañ po'i (po che'i FQ) 'jigs pa las [[Q 3., F 3.]]  
 skyobs śig |
- [6.] bdag señ ge'i (ges F) 'jigs pa (2) las skyobs [[Q 6., F 5.]]  
 śig |

<sup>25</sup> Q *rgyud, pha* (14), 160a6-7, Q *rgyud, ya* (24), 149a5-6, and F *rgyud sde, dza* (19), 264a2-4.

<sup>26</sup> To the passage fol. 473a6-b3 correspond Q *rgyud, pha* (14), 160b5-8, and F *rgyud sde, dza* (19), 264a6-b1.

- [7.] bdag stag gi 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 7., F 6.]  
 bdag chu'i 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 9., F 8.]
- [8.] bdag sbrul gyis (gyi FQ) 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 10., F 9.]
- [9.] bdag mye si (*recte*: i' FQ) 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 8., F 7.]  
 bdag dug gi (gis F) 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | [[Q 11., F 10.]
- [10.] bdag phyir rgol ba dañ dgra (dgra'i F)  
 thams (3) cad las skyobs śig | [[Q 12., F 11.]

The differences in the order of the individual requests start after the second one already. The requests for protection against water and poison are given by the Kanjur versions only. The absence from the *Phug brag* manuscript of the fourth request, which is given in the fifth place in the Peking canon, can be interpreted as an individual mistake of that edition. These major variants allow two interpretations; either the fragment represents a different line of transmission besides the Kanjur, or the variants are individual mistakes occurring on the three leaves only. Which of them is correct cannot be found out with the help of the accessible texts.

The three texts appearing one after another in the fragment are found scattered over different volumes in the Kanjur editions. Some of the *Mdo mañ / gZuñs bsdus* collections, which substitute the canons in private houses, do contain the 'Od zer can ma'i gzuñs and the gZaiñ 'brum rab tu zi bar byed pa'i mdo but separated from each other. In the 1729 Yongzheng edition, e.g., the two texts are given on fol. 49a1-b10 (in the margin: *ta*) and fol. 133a9-134a6 (in the margin: *kho*) respectively<sup>27</sup>.

The para- or precanonical *dkar chags* stemming from the time of the "later propagation" (*phyi dar*), as far as they have been edited, list the three *Dhāraṇīs* in question at different places: The catalogue

---

<sup>27</sup> M. TAUBE, *Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke*. 1-4. Wiesbaden 1966. (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. 11,1-4), nos. 280 and 433; in the two examples discussed above the readings of this *mDo mañ / gZuñs bsdus* collection resemble the Kanjur transmission.

section of Bu ston Rin chen grub's "History of the Buddhist Church" (*Chos 'byun*) dated 1322 or 1323 contains the *dKyiil 'khor brgyad pa* in the untitled paragraph preceding the "various small *Dhāraṇīs*" (*gzuis phra mo sna tshogs*), the '*Od zer can gyi gzuis* in the paragraph devoted to the texts of the "cycle of Uṣṇīṣa[vijayā]" (*gtsug tor gyi skor*) and the *gZaṅ 'brum rab tu zi bar byed pa* in the paragraph covering the "various small *Dhāraṇīs*"<sup>28</sup>.

The *rGyud 'bum gyi dkar chag* written by Bu ston about 16 years later lists the three *Dhāraṇīs* in the chapter on the Tathāgata Family of the *bya ba'i rgyud* (Kriyāntātra), too, but at different places: The *dKyiil 'khor brgyad pa* is placed into the category *de bzin gsegs pa'i rigs su bsdu ba'i byaṅ sems*, the '*Od zer can gyi gzuis* appears under *rigs kyi yum* and the *gZaṅ 'brum rab tu zi bar byed pa* under *rigs kyi pho ṅa pho mo*.<sup>29</sup> The *dkar chag* to the Derge Kanjur adopts these categories<sup>30</sup> which were also used in the Kanjurs of the Tshal pa line of transmission<sup>31</sup>.

Two closely related early *Sa skya pa* catalogues of the Tantras which are reported to have been utilized in compiling the first Kanjur manuscript have come down to our times. The earlier of these *dkar chags* was written by Sa skya Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1147-1216), the later one by 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan (1235-1280). Therein the '*Od zer can gyi gzuis* and the *gZaṅ 'brum rab tu zi bar byed pa* are classified as forming a part of the second

<sup>28</sup> S. NISHIOKA, "'Putun bukkyōshi' Mokurokubusakuin", I.II.III. [i.e. "Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu-ston's 'History of Buddhism'"], in *Tōkyō-daigakubungakubu Bunkakōryūkenkyūshisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 4 (1980), pp. 61-92, 5 (1981), pp. 43-94, 6 (1983), p. 47-201, nos. 1271, 1228, and 1322, resp.

<sup>29</sup> H. EIMER, *Der Tantra-Katalog des Bu ston im Vergleich mit der Abteilung Tantra des tibetischen Kanjur*... nos. 270, 192, and 248, resp.

<sup>30</sup> D Dkar names fol. 151b2 (... *de bzin gsegs pa'i rigs su bsdu ba'i byaṅ sems* ...) the category for D 644, fol. 151a1 (... *gsegs kyi pho ṅa mo'i rgyud* ...) for D 621 and fol. 148a7 (... *gsegs rigs kyi yum*...) for D 564.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. R. O. MEISEZAHN, "Zur Klassifizierung der kanonischen Übersetzungsliteratur des tibetischen Vajrayāna-Buddhismus im Peking- und Derge-Kanjur", in *Oriens* 29-30 (1986), p. 346 (items IV.1.1.3, IV.1.1.6, and IV.1.1.7).



section of the Kriyāyogatantra, entitled "the *Dhāraṇīs* of the *Vidyādevīs*" (*rig pa'i lha mo rnam kyī gzuñs*), whereas the *dKyiil 'khor brgyad pa* is placed into the third section of the *bya ba'i rgyud*, viz. "the common Tantras"<sup>32</sup>.

The above-mentioned catalogue of the Indian Buddhist texts translated during the 8/9<sup>th</sup> centuries and collected in the palace of lHan dkar, the *lHan dkar ma*, lists the three *Dhāraṇīs* one after another in the chapter "Various long and small *Dhāraṇīs*" (*gzuñs che phra sna tsogs*)<sup>33</sup>, but in reverse order. This shows that in that early time the three *Dhāraṇīs* were transmitted together in spite of the fact that they were translated into Tibetan by different hands.

There is only one catalogue in which the three *Dhāraṇīs* under discussion are listed in the order of our three leaves: In the *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum*, the *Collected Works of Nor chen Kun dga' bzañ po* (1382-1456), a hitherto unpublished Kanjur catalogue is extant<sup>34</sup>. This catalogue, entitled *Bka' 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag bstan pa gsal ba'i sgron me*, is incomplete, as it describes the texts of Esoteric Buddhism, i.e. of the Vajrayāna, only. It covers twenty volumes *rgyud 'bum*, three volumes *gzuñs 'dus* and six volumes *gzuñs 'bum*, i.e. 29 volumes in all. The three *Dhāraṇīs* are recorded one after another as the 24<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> out of 130<sup>35</sup> texts in the second volume

---

<sup>32</sup> The texts in question bear the following numbers in the edition of the two *Sa skya pa dkar chags*: [Grag pa rgyal mtshan] 111 / ['Phags pa] 113 ('*Od zer can gyi gzuñs*, but with the divergent title: '*Od zer can gyi rtsa ba'i rgyud/sñags*), 146/118 *gZaiñ 'brum rab tu ži bar byed pa*, 163 / 168 *dKyiil 'khor brgyad pa*, cf. H. EIMER, "A Source for the First Narthang Kanjur: Two Early *Sa skya pa* Catalogues of the Tantras", in H. EIMER (ed.), *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon. Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7<sup>th</sup> Seminar of the IATS, Graz 1995*. Wien 1997. (Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> Seminar of the IATS, Graz 1995. 3). (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens. 22). (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften. 257. Bd.), p. 11-78.

<sup>33</sup> M. LALOU, op. cit., nos. 399 (*gZaiñ 'brum ži bar byed pa*), 400 ('*Od zer can [gyi gzuñs]*), and 401 (*dKyiil 'khor brgyad pa*).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. H. EIMER, "Preliminary Notes on Nor chen's Kanjur Catalogue".

<sup>35</sup> Thus runs the colophon to volume *kha* (2), whereas that to volume *ka* (1) counts 37 and that to volume *ga* (3) speaks of 13 texts only.

(*kha*) of the *gzuis 'dus*<sup>36</sup> section. It is most probable that this *gzuis 'dus* originally was a separate collection of *Dhāraṇīs*.

So we come to the conclusion that that collection of magic spells to which our three leaves belonged contained not only the three texts discussed above, but the same texts as the three volumes *gzuis 'dus* of Nor chen's Kanjur. The high-foliation numbers found on the three leaves indicate that the collection was organized in two volumes only; some texts given by Nor chen in the second volume appeared in the first already. The present consideration has shown that the only tradition which kept the three *Dhāraṇīs* together belongs to the Nor subschool of the Sa skya school of Tibetan Buddhism. Up to the present day the three leaves are the only accessible specimen of an early Sa skya pa *Dhāraṇī* collection, which eventually was incorporated by Nor chen Kun dga' bzañ po into his Kanjur.

### Transliteration

(472a) bu de'i phyir sñiñ po gañ brjod pa tsam gyis mtshams myed pa lña 'byuñ žiñ | dños grub thams cad kyañ thob par 'gyur ba | byañ chub sems dpa' brygad kyi sñiñ po ñon cig || ōṃ hu 'um ma

(2) hā bī rī sva hā || sñiñ po'[i<sup>37</sup>] 'dis dbus kyi bcom ldan 'das mchod to || ōṃ hri hu ma pad ma pri ya sva hā || 'phags pa spyān ras gzigs dbañ phyug gi sñiñ po'o || ōṃ mē hā rā na sva hā ||

(3) byams pa'i sñiñ po'o || ōṃ ā ga rbhra ya sva hā || nam □ mkha'i sñiñ po'i<sup>38</sup> sñiñ po'o || ōṃ sva hri dza ya sva hā || □ kun tu bzañ po'i sñiñ po'o || ōṃ ku ru pan ra hā sva hā ||

---

<sup>36</sup> In the edition of that catalogue already prepared the titles have the nos. 181 (*dKyil 'khor brygad pa'i gzuis*), 182 (*lHa mo 'od zer can gyi gzuis*), and 183 (*gZaṅ 'brum rab tu ži ba'i gzuis*), cf. H. EIMER, *The Early Mustang Kanjur Catalogue* (dkar chag), under press.

<sup>37</sup> The *gi gu* is missing.

<sup>38</sup> Erased passage, rest of the deleted text is the final *gi gu Q*.

(4) lag na rdo rje'i sñiñ po'o || ōṃ śrī aṅ rañ gha sva hā || □  
'jam dpal g'zon nur gyurd pa'i sñiñ po'o || ōṃ ni □ sva ram ba sva  
hā || sgrib pa thams cad rnam par sel

(5) ba'i sñiñ po'o || ōṃ kśrī ti ha<sup>39</sup> rā dzā sva hā || sa'i sñiñ po'i  
sñiñ po'o || byañ chub sems dpa'i brgyad kyi sñiñ po de b'zin g'segs  
pa dañ ldan pa 'di | rigs kyi bu 'am rigs kyi bu mo gañ

(6) la la žig gyis dkyil 'khor kyi mdun du | lan cig brjod na | de'i  
don thams cad grub par 'gyur te | myurd tu bla na myed pa yañ dag  
par rdzogs pa'i byañ chub mñon par rdzogs par 'chañ

(472b) rgya bar 'gyur ro || bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka'  
stsald nas | byañ chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po de dag yid rañs  
te | bcom ldan 'das kyis gsuñs pa la mñon bar

(2) stod do || 'phags pa dkyil 'khor brgyad pa žes bya ba theg pa  
chen po'i mdo | rdzogs sho || . . . || rgya gar skad du | ā rya mā ri tsī  
nā mā dha ra ṇī || bod skad du ||

(3) 'phags pa 'od gzer can žes bya ba'i gzuñs | sañs □ rgyas dañ  
byañ chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tsha□ lo || 'di skad bdag  
gis thos pa'i dus gcig na |

(4) bcom ldan 'das mñan yod na | rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal  
□ mgon myed zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba b'zugs te || □ de nas  
bcom ldan 'das kyis dge sloñ rñams la bka'

(5) stsald pa | dge sloñ dag lha mo 'od gzer can žes bya ba žig  
yod de | de ñid ma dañ zla ba'i mdun nas 'gro yañ bltar myed | gzuñ  
du myed | bciñ du myed | bgag du myed | brgal du myed |

(6) rmoñs par byar myed | chad pas gcad du myed | mgo brag du  
myed | g'zur myed | tshig par byar myed | dgra'i dbañ du myi 'gro'o |  
| dge sloñ dag gañ gis lha mo 'od gzer can de'i myiñ šes pa de

(473a) yañ | bltar myed | gzuñ du myed | bciñ du myed | bgag tu  
myed | brgal du myed | rmoñs par byar myed | chad pas gcad du  
myed | mgo phrag tu myed | g'zur myed | tshig par byar myed de |<sup>40</sup>  
dgra'i

<sup>39</sup> The attribution of the *i*-vowels is not certain.

<sup>40</sup> Most probably the syllable *de* (with following *tsheg*), which in the other text witnesses is given directly in front of the syllable *dgra'i*, was written over the first of the two *šads*.

(2) dbaṅ du 'gro bar myi 'gyur ro || de ltar bdag gis kyaṅ lha'i mo 'od gzer can gyi myiṅ śes kyis | bdag kyaṅ bltar myed par gyurd cig | gzuṅ du myed par gyurd cig | bciṅ du myed par gyurd

(3) cig | bgag tu myed par gyurd cig | brgal du myed par □ gyurd cig | rmoṅs par byer myed par gyurd cig | chad □ pas gcad du myed par gyurd cig | mgo brag tu myed par

(4) gyurd cig | gźur myed par gyurd cig | tshig par byar mye□d par gyurd cig | dgra'i dbaṅ du myi 'gro bar gyurd ci□g | de la gsaṅ sṅags gźi ni 'di rnamṅs yin no ||

(5) tad ya thā | pa da mā gra ma si | pa rā kra ma si | a pa rā krā ma si | u da ma si | na da ma si | nāi rā ma si | a rka ma si | pa rka ma si | o rma si | pa na ma si | gul ma ma si | tsī ba rā ma si | ma ha

(6) tsi ba ra ma si | an ta ra dha na ma svi sva hā || lha mo 'od gzer can bdag lam du skyobs śig | bdag lam log pa las skyabs śig | bdag sbye bo las skyobs śig | bdag rgyal po'i 'jigs

(473b) pa las skyobs śig | bdag chom rkun gyi 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | bdag klu'i 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | bdag glaṅ po'i 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | bdag seṅ ge'i 'jigs pa

(2) las skyobs śig | bdag stag gi 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | bdag sbrul gyis 'jigs pa las skyobs<sup>41</sup> śig | bdag mye si 'jigs pa las skyobs śig | bdag phyir rgol ba daṅ dgra thams

(3) cad las skyobs śig | 'khrugs pa daṅ ma 'khrugs pa □ daṅ ṅams pa daṅ ma ṅams pa daṅ | thams cad du yaṅ □ bdag la sruṅs śig | bdag 'jigs pa thams cad dag<sup>42</sup>

(4) gnod pa daṅ | nad 'go ba daṅ | 'khrug pa thams cad la□s sruṅs śig sruṅs śig || tad ya thā | e le | tā □ le | go le | i li | ko li | ad tsig te | tad tshid de |

(5) bdag 'tshe ba daṅ | 'jigs pa daṅ | nad thams cad las sruṅs śig sruṅs śig | sva hā | dkon mchog gsum la phyag 'tshal lo || lha mo 'od gzer can gyi sṅiṅ po brjod par bya'o ||

(6) tad ya thā | oṃ bud ta li ba rā li | ba rā hā mu khi | sa rba du ṣta na ni | ba ra ya | ban dha ban dha ban dha mu khi | dzam ba ya |

<sup>41</sup> Final letter partly rubbed off.

<sup>42</sup> The final letter is nearly lost, because the leaf is damaged.

stam ba ya | mo ha ya sva hā | ōṃ mā ri tsye sva hā | o ba ra le | ba de  
le |

(474a) ba rā hā mu khi | sa rba du ṣṭa na | ban dha ban dha sva  
hā | | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsald nas | | dge sloṅ de dag dañ |  
byañ chub sems dpa' de dag dañ | thams cad dañ ldan pa'i 'khor de

(2) dañ | lha dañ | myi dañ | lha ma yin dañ | dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig  
rtend yid rañs te | bcom ldan 'das kyis gsuñs pa la mñon par stod do |  
| 'phags pa 'od zer can žes bya ba'i gzuñs |

(3) rdzogs sho | | . . . □ | | rgya gar skad du | e rya ar śa pa śa  
ma ni su tra | | □ bod skad du | | 'phags pa gžañ 'brum rab tu ži bar

(4) byed pa'i mdo | | sañs rgyas dañ byañ chub sems dpa' □  
thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo | | 'di skad bdag gi□s thos pa'i dus gcig  
na | bcom ldan 'das rgyal po'<sup>43</sup>

(5) khab na | 'od ma'i tshal bya ka lan da kan gnas<sup>44</sup> pa na | dge  
sloṅ lña brgya tsam gyi dge sloṅ gyi dge 'dun chen po dañ | thabs  
gcig tu bžugs te | de nas bcom ldan 'das bco lña'i gso sbyoñ

(6) zla ba ña de ñid kyis tshe | dge 'dun gyi mdun du gdan bsams  
pa la bžugs so | | de'i tshe tshe dañ ldan pa kun dga' bo | | bcom ldan  
'das kyis snam logs na rña yab thogs te | bcom

(474b) ldan 'das la g.yob ciñ 'dug par gyurd to | | de nas tshe  
dañ ldan pa kun dga' bo bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar te | pus mo  
g.yas pa'i lha ña sa la btsugs te | bcom ldan 'das ga la ba

(2) de logs su thal mo sbyard pa btud te | bcom ldan 'das la 'di  
skad ces gsold to | | bcom ldan 'das kyis rgyal po'i khab 'di na | dge  
sloṅ gžañ 'brum can mañ po dag gžañ 'brum gyi

(3) bro nad kyis<sup>45</sup> gzer te | sdug bsñal myi bzañ ba drag po myi  
□ bde ba yid du myi 'oñ ba'i tshor ba myoñ bar gyurd | btsun □ pa  
bcom ldan 'das de dag la bdag gis ji ltar bsgrub

(4) par bgyi | de skad ces gsold pa dañ | bcom ldan '□das kyis  
tshe dañ ldan pa kun dga' bo la 'di skad ces b□ka' stsald to | | kun  
dga' bo khyod kyis gzañ 'brum

<sup>43</sup> The 'a *chui* was subscribed for saving space at the end of the line.

<sup>44</sup> The sequence of the letters *k*, *n*, *g*, *n*, and *s* is not divided into syllables with the help of *tsheg(s)*.

<sup>45</sup> Final letters are partly rubbed off.

(5) seld pa'i mdo 'di loñ śig || kun dga' bo gañ la la źig gyis |  
gźaň 'brum seld pa'i mdo'i myiň daň | tshig daň | yi ge śes na | de  
ci'i srid 'tsho 'i bar du gźaň 'brum gyi nad kyis

(6) btab par myi 'gyur ro || tshe —<sup>46</sup> s bdun gyi bar du tshe rabs  
dran bar 'gyur ro || tad ya thā | a la ba te | a la me śā | li tse ni ku śa  
mas bha be sva hā || kun dga' bo 'di lta ste | byaň phyogs (end)

### *Signs, Sigla, Abbreviations and Catalogues*

□	(in the transliterated text only) binding hole
D, F, N, Q, S	the standard Kanjurs, viz. the Derge, Phug brag, Narthang, Peking (1717/20 edition), and sTog Palace editions – followed by a number, refers to the catalogues to the said editions.
DDkar	Si tu Gtsug lag Chos kyi snañ ba, <i>Bde bar gśegs pa 'i bka' gais can gyi brdas drañs pa 'i phyi mo 'i tshogs ji śñed pa par du bsgrubs pa 'i tshul las ñe bar brtsams pa 'i gtam bzañ po blo ldan mos pa 'i kunda yoñs su kha bye ba 'i zla 'od gźon nu 'i 'khri śiñ</i> . Tibetan catalogue to the Derge Kanjur.
IATS	International Association for Tibetan Studies.

J. SAMTEN (1992), *A Catalogue of the Phug-brag Manuscript Kanjur*. Dharamsala, LTWA.

T. SKORUPSKI, *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*. Tokyo, IIBS 1985 (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica. Series Maior. IV).

J. TAKASAKI, *Tōkyō Daigaku Shozō Rasa-ban Chibetto Daizōkyō Mokuroku / A Catalogue of the Lhasa Edition of the Tibetan Tripitaka in comparison with other editions*. Tokyo 1965.

---

<sup>46</sup> Two or three letters are erased, it seems possible that originally *tshe rabs* was written at this spot.

*The Tibetan Tripiṭaka. Peking edition. Reprinted under the supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto.* Edited by D. T. SUZUKI. Vol. 1-45 Bkaḥ-ḥgyur. Vol. 46-150 Bstan-ḥgyur. Vol. 151 Dkar-chag. Vol. 152-164 Extra (Btsoñ Kha Pa/Lcañ Skya). Vol. 165-168 Catalogue. Tokyo, Kyoto, Suzuki Research Foundation 1955-1961.

HAKUJU UI et al., *Chibetto Daizōkyō Sōmokuroku / A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur). Edited by H. UI, M. SUZUKI, Y. KANAKURA, T. TADA. With an index volume. Sendai, Tōhoku Imperial University 1934 [reprinted in I vol. Tōkyō 1970].