Mātrceṭa ranks among the most famous Buddhist poets of India, and this renown he mainly won as an author of hymns, Stotras. His two main works are the Varnāravarnāstotra, "The Praise of the Praiseworthy", and the Satapaścaśatka, the "(Praise in) 150 Verses". The Chinese Indian-pilgrim Yi-jing, for instance, writes about these two hymns in his travel record: "... in India all who compose hymns imitate his style, considering him the father of literature. Even men like the Bodhisattvas Asaṅga and Vasubandhu admired him greatly. Throughout India every one who becomes a monk is taught Mātrceṭa’s two hymns as soon as he can recite the five and ten precepts (Sīla). This course is adopted by both the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna schools."

Little is known about Mātrceṭa’s date. The fact that the Mahārajakaniśkalekha, "The Letter to the King Kaniśka", is ascribed to him, has led various scholars to differing attempts at dating him. These attempts have in common they are all built up on several hypotheses. The problem is a difficult one, and I cannot offer a convincing date either, but at least a new terminus ante quem. While preparing a new edition of the Varnāravarnāstotra I came across two lengthy quotations from this stotra in the "Mahāprajñāpāramitā-upadeśa". This work was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva between 402 and 406, and as Kumārajīva came to China in 384, this would give the first half of the fourth century as the latest possible date for the composition of the hymn.

Mātrceṭa’s fame has also spread into Tibet. Both Bu ston and Tāranātha deal with him, Bu ston briefly fearing the stories to be too many, but Tāranātha at length. Apart from their Tibetan translations, both these Stotras are also not unknown to the living Tibetan tradition, at least that of the dGe lugs pa school, as Con kha pa several times quotes from them in his Lam rim ēben mo and his sNags rim ēben mo.0

0 Shortly after reading my paper, Professor Katsumi Mimaki, at present in Hamburg, kindly drew my attention to an article by Noriaki Hakamaya (cf. bibliography) about Ye sles sde’s commentary. While Hakamaya had started from Ye sles sde’s work, the Chinese translation of which was published in BSOAS 13 (1950), pp. 701–709, I had come across Ye sles sde’s commentary in his studies on the Varnāravarnāstotra. Hakamaya’s studies lead me to a new terminus ante quem. While preparing a new edition of the Varnāravarnāstotra I came across two lengthy quotations from this stotra in the "Mahāprajñāpāramitā-upadeśa". This work was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva, and his Chinese translator, the Chinese Indian-pilgrim Yi-jing, for instance, writes about these two hymns in his travel record: "... in India all who compose hymns imitate his style, considering him the father of literature. Even men like the Bodhisattvas Asaṅga and Vasubandhu admired him greatly. Throughout India every one who becomes a monk is taught Mātrceṭa’s two hymns as soon as he can recite the five and ten precepts (Sīla). This course is adopted by both the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna schools."


4 Taishō No. 1509; the first (p. 66b10ff.) corresponds to Varṣāravāravāstotra VII.17–22, the second (pp. 222c22ff.) to V.3–VI.7; cf. Étienne Lamotte, Le traité de la grand vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra), Vol. I, Louvain 1949, pp. 83f., and Vol. III, Louvain 1970, pp. 1378ff.


6 E.g. Lam rim ēben mo (Peking edition, no. 6601, vol. 9a), fol. 59v6, 238v1, 241v1, 245v1, 303r5; sNags rim ēben mo (Peking edition, no. 6210, vol. 8a), fol. 3r6.
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Besides these two famous hymns there are about 18 works connected with Mātrceta’s name in one way or another. The bulk of them are preserved only in Tibetan translation, and most of them are Stotras.7 Obviously Mātrceta was famous as the writer of Stotras par excellence, and therefore all those ascriptions should be accepted with caution, until they can be confirmed by independent sources and by means of internal criteria.

One of these works ascribed to Mātrceta is the Triratnastotra (dKon mchog gsum la b standoff), a very short text consisting of four verses only. It is presumably lost in Sanskrit, but preserved in a Tibetan translation. Despite its brevity it must already in India have been of some importance as it was considered worthy of commentary. In the Tanjur the text of the Stotra itself is immediately followed by a comparatively extensive commentary, a Vṛtti, of about six leaves in the Peking edition. At the end of the Stotra there is only an author’s colophon, but as the quoted lines in the commentary agree verbatim with the Stotra itself, the translators’ colophon of the commentary most probably holds true for both works. Accordingly the translation was carried out by Jñānaśānti and dPal gyi lhun po‘i sde, hence in the beginning of the 9th century as dPal gyi lhun po was a contemporary of the great translator dPal brcegs rakṣita.8 The translation is, however, not listed in the old catalogue of Lhan dkar.

According to its colophon the commentary was written by rGyal ba‘i sras, a name to which would correspond a Sanskrit Jinaratna. Little is known about this author; the works connected with his name all belong to the Yogācāra tradition.9 As the Stotra commentary is written from the viewpoint of the same school,10 the ascription of the colophon may be correct or is at least a possibility to be reckoned with.

To return to the Stotra itself, mention must be made of a second indication of its importance at an earlier time, namely the existence of three Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang which preserve its text. Two of them belong to the Pelliot collection in Paris; they are numbered 135 and 136 in the inventory of Lalou.11 Both comprise only a single leaf; No. 135, a rather well written folio of about 7 by 52 cm, is complete, but without a colophon. The other, No. 136, is a smaller folio of about 7 by 21 cm and written less carefully. The text continued on a second leaf, which, however, appears to be lost. The third manuscript, also consisting of one leaf, belongs to the Stein collection in the India Office Library; it is numbered 281 in L. de La Vallée Poussin’s catalogue,12 measures about 8 by 44 cm and contains an interlinear gloss written in very small dBu-med characters. Apart from a certain number of variants the text of all three manuscripts agrees with the canonical translation.

There is even a third indication of the importance of this short Stotra and especially of its early popularity among the Tibetans, namely a second commentary preserved in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka. As it was written by a Tibetan himself, it did not come to be included in the Stotra section but was incorporated among the few works of Tibetan authors in quite another part of the Tanjur. This second commentary was composed by the famous Ye sses sde, one of the most important translators at the beginning of the 9th century. Its title runs Saṅs rgyas geo bo‘i rgya cher ’gyel pa, which instead of the original title Triratnastotra takes up the first line of the hymn, i.e. saṅs rgyas geo la phyag ’chal lo.13

12 Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts in the India Office Library, Oxford 1962, p. 94f. Dr. Helmut Eimer, Bonn, kindly provided me with a copy. – The manuscript was independently identified by Hakamaya, cf. p. 21 of his article.
13 Cf. Hakamaya, p. 3; for an analysis of the structure of this commentary see ibidem, pp. 9–11, for a Japanese translation pp. 11–21.
Despite its classification as rGya 'cher 'grel pa it is shorter than Jinaputra's work, comprising about four leaves in the Peking edition, which however can partly be explained by the fact that it does not comment on the first verse of the Stotra, which it merely quotes.

Compared to Jinaputra's work Ye 'səs sde's commentary is more clearly structured, stating for each verse a number of phun sun chogs pa — between four and five — which are to be expressed by the verse and on the basis of which the verse is explained. While Jinaputra's commentary contains at least seven quotations from the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* (No. 2036, fol. 124v2; all references are to the Peking edition), the *Prajñāpāramitā* (128r5), from Vasubandhu a long and rather poetical verse (126v6) which, however, I was not able to identify, and from unnamed sources (fols. 126r3, r5, 127r4, 128r3) — Ye 'səs sde does not quote a single time from the scriptures. There is no indication that he has used or even known Jinaputra's work, but as his commentary is also based on the canonical translation of the Stotra this seems to be rather likely; moreover, it is also written from the Yogācāra point of view. Apart from an allusion to a comparison in the *Vāññāravarnastotra* there is no reference at all to Mātṛceta. Finally, the commentary does not conclude with the usual transferring of merit which, incidentally, also holds true for the two other works of Ye 'səs sde which came to be included in the Tanjur.

The interlinear gloss in the Stein manuscript No. 281 seems to be mainly based on Ye 'səs sde's commentary. First it mentions the occasions when to recite the Stotra; then it presents the same number and follows with one exception the same order of phun sun chogs pa as does Ye 'səs sde. On the other hand, the wording is not exclusively derived from Ye 'səs sde's commentary; it contains, for instance, a short quotation from the *Buddhabhiimitkā* which is neither referred to by Jinaputra nor by Ye 'səs sde. However, in the *Ita ba'i khyad par*, another of his works, Ye 'səs sde uses the same quotation in the same context, and therefore this interlinear gloss is at least directly connected with his exegetical tradition.

Before turning to a critical edition of the Stotra — which abounds with an amazing number of variants, as will be seen — a word should be said regarding the authorship of this small work. It can hardly be called into doubt that the Tibetan transcription ma ti ci 'tal tra in the colophon is meant to stand for Mātṛceta, as it is well in accordance with the transcriptions found in the colophons of the other works transmitted under his name. The colophon itself is most probably based on a statement in Jinaputra's commentary, where Mātṛceta is named as the author of the last three verses (cf. p. 181). Jinaputra seems to be mentioned by Xuan Zang, which would place him not later than the 6th century. As long as Jinaputra can be regarded as the author of the Vṛtti, his reference would serve as one of the earliest mentions of Mātṛceta's name, the still earlier quotations in T 1509 being anonymous, and therefore carries some weight regarding the authorship of the Stotra. On the other hand the contents of all the remaining works ascribed to Mātṛceta offer no connexion whatsoever with a Yogācāra background except for the fact that Dignāga composed an enlargement of the *Satapāñciśat-ka*. Therefore further corroboration would seem to be called for, before the ascription can be accepted wholeheartedly; nevertheless it is a possibility to be kept in mind.

16 Cf. Hakamaya, p. 8f.
17 Peking edition no. 5848, fol. 270v7, ad *Vāññāravarna* III.10cd.
18 For an edition see the appendix; Hakamaya was unable to utilize this gloss as he could not obtain a sufficiently enlarged photograph (cf. p. 21 of his article).
20 Cf. Takasaki 1972, p. 38, and Hakamaya, p. 22; both refrain from a discussion of this problem, but Hakamaya points to the possible consequences for the chronology of the development of Yogācāra terminology.
Text and Translation of the *Triratnasotra*

1. *Triratnasotra*

C  Cone edition, vol. ka (209), fol. 121r2–7
D  Derge edition, no. 1144, vol. ka, fol. 104v4–105r1
P  Peking edition, no. 2035, vol. ka, fol. 122v4–123r1
135  Pelliot tibétain 135
136  Pelliot tibétain 136
281  Stein Collection no. 281

2. Commentary I: *Triratnasotra-vrta* of Jinaputra (rgyis pa'i gser pa)


3. Commentary II: Saiks rgyas gco bo'i rgya cher 'grel pa of Ye 'sde sde

Com. II P  Peking edition, no. 5848, vol. cho, fol. 269v7–274r1

I 1) dakon mchog gsum la bstod pa
rgya gar skad du / tri ratna sto tra / bod skad du / dakon mchog gsum la phyaq 'chal lo

[1] saiks rgyas gco la'phyag 'chal lo //
skyob pa'chos la'phyag 'chal lo //
dge 'dun che la'phyag 'chal lo //
gsum la rtag tu phyaq 'chal lo

[2] chogs 'chen ga'i tjogs mkhyen bzi sku gsum grub //
nam rtog mi'ensa'chi'ya'n sa ler mkhyen //
chos sku mkha' 'dra gzugs sku mjes skur ldan //
saiks rgyas dpag bsam 'dra la'phyag 'chal lo //

[3] chos dbyi'ns rgyu mthun gsum rab bcu ga'i da'n //
chos ni'd skyi 'gag med chi spros las dben //
de la'rdzigs te yon tan kun grub pa //
legs rgyu dam pa'chos la'phyag 'chal lo //

1) minute scriptum in P, deest in D
2) tranp D
3) gzi D
4) The homage is missing in CP.
5) 281 inserts gus par.
6) pa'i D, 135, 136, 281, Com. I D, Com. II
7) 281 inserts gus par.
8) 281 inserts gus par.
10) chos 136
11) gnis ga 135
12) myi 135, 136, 281
13) cir 135
14) le CPD, Com. I, Com. II P
15) mkhra' 281; nam mkha' Com. II P
16) gzug bsku P
17) sku D; digur 135, 136, 281
18) ldan 281
19) // deest in 136
20) bsams 281
21) 135, 281 insert gus par
22) chos dbyi'ns 281, Com. II : chos kyi dbyi'ns 136 : chos ni'd CDP, 135, Com. I
23) 'shun 281, Com. II P
24) gnis 136
25) gsum rab: yan lag 281
26) chos ni'd 136, 281, Com. II : chos la CDP, 135, Com. I
27) myod 135, 136, 281
28) la CP, Com. I P
29) las 135, 136
30) dmyigs 135, 136, 281
31) na 136, 281
32) sgrub Com. I P
33) rgyud C; gzi 135, 136, 281
34) dam pa'i deest in 136, 281
35) 135, 136, 281 insert gus par
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[4] ŋon moi Msgrīb36 dan37 šes bya‘i38 Msgrīb pa dag /39
gnën pos rim40 par41 bsal42 te43 sar bzung44 pa45 //
sems ḷon mjad saṅs rgyas žiṅ sbyoṅ46 ba47 //
‘phags pa’ai dge ‘dun čhe48 la49 phyang ’chal lo //50

dkon mchod gsum la51 bstod pa52 sloṅ dpun čhen po ma ti ci tas53 mjad pa rjogs so //

36) Msgrīb C, 135
37) dan / 136
39) End of 136
41) pas 135
42) bsal 281
43) nas CDP, Com. I; CP insert saṅs rgyas (probably influenced by the next line)
44) gnas 135, 281 : žugs Com. I, Com. II P
45) žiṅ D, 281, Com. I D
46) skyoṅ P
47) ba’i CP
48) ‘phags pa’ai dge ‘dun čhe: dge ‘dun bcon 281
49) 135, 281 insert gus par
50) End of 281; 135 continues with another two verses of unknown origin:

bcom ldan sku mchod gser gi ri bo ’dra //
spyan myig dag yans pad ma leh rgyan ’dra //
chems dkar gtams pas dper na duṅ dan ’dra //
bcom ldan ri rgyal sku la gus par phyang ’chal lo //
gdan btiṅ lags khyis bcom ldan bzung so ’chal //
srid gsum phan mjad bcom ldan go bo mchod //
’kham gsum sdeṅ sgal ma las žir mjad pa //
’gro bi don phyir bcom ldan ḷhos kyi gdan la bzung //

End of 135; the rest of the line is empty.
51) grī D
52) pa // CP
53) tras CP

1. Homage to the Buddha, the Guru!
   Homage to the Dharma, the Protector!
   Homage to the great Saṅgha!
   Constantly homage to the three!

Apart from the manuscripts no. 136 and no. 281 and Com. II all other versions read bdag phyang ’chal, “I pay homage”, in the last line. As the original surely must have been a Śloka, it is difficult to imagine how an equivalent to bdag could have been fitted into the line. For a possible Sanskrit original cf. Sylvain Lévi, Sanskrit Text from Bali, Baroda 1933, p. 79:

nmaṇo buddhāya gurave nmaṇo dharmāya tāyeṇa /
nmaṇah saṅgḥāya mābate triḥḥyo ’pi satatam namah //;

cf. also the first verse of the Śaṅkūpaniṣatārāṃśatstotra, also ascribed to Mātrce~a and preserved only in a Tibetan translation,23 and the introduction to the Chinese transcription of the Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya-sūtra.24

The first verse is obviously common Buddhist property. Ye šes sde merely quotes it; Jinaputra defines it as bstod pa mdor gsuṅs pa, “concise Stotra”, and explains that the following has been written by the Ācārya Mātrce~a as an enlargement (fol. 124r6f.).

2. To him who has finished the two great accumulations and accomplished the four wisdoms and the three bodies, who is free of deceiving conceptions and knows everything clearly, to the sky-like Dharmakāya and the well-shaped Rūpakāya, homage to the Buddha who is like something wishfulfilling!

Jinaputra quotes from the Sanskrit: if i quote, please let me know.

Against the mss. 136 (unmetrically: "chos kyi dbyiṅs") and 281 and Ye šes sde's commentary, the canonical versions (Stotra and commentary) and ms. no. 135 all read "chos nīd (dharmaṭā)" in the first line. This shows that the Dunhuang mss. do not stem from a common source; moreover it raises the question which reading has to be regarded as the original one. Jinaputra briefly explains dharmaṭā as the emptiness of the two kinds of ego. Ye šes sde's explanation, however, is much more detailed; he says: "If one takes the Indian word for dbyiṅs, it is dbāṭu, and if dbāṭu is translated into Tibetan, then it is dbyiṅs. The meaning of dbyiṅs is 'cause'. What is to be understood by the meaning 'cause' for dbyiṅs? This is the empty and egoless dharmaṭa, which is teaching, that is to say the dharma, because emptiness is the cause of the holy dharmas, for the holy dharmas emerge from it as the object.

The matter becomes still clearer if the rest of the line is taken into consideration. In his Tikā at Madhyāntavibhāga II.14 Sthiramati explains: "The dharma which is teaching, that is to say the sūtras etc., this dharma is an outflow of the dharmaṭā, because it has emerged on account of the dharmaṭā which is pure in every respect and known as dharmaṭakāya."

In Sanskrit the first part of this explanation reads: prabhāvito dharmaṭāmānyandah sūtrādikā desanādharmaṭah. The Tibetan correspondence, also translated by Ye šes sde, reads: "chos kyi dbyiṅs kyi rgyu mthun pa mdo la sog pa bstan pa'i 'chos rab tu byun ba'i phyir ro" (Peking edition, no. 5534, vol. chi, col. 78v7). This parallel appears to be so striking that it leads to two possible conclusions, which are, however, rather contradictory: either the original Sanskrit of the Stotra had dharmaṭā and Ye šes sde, knowing the original, corrected an inaccurate translation, or alternatively the Sanskrit had dharmaṭa, the correct translation of which was changed by Ye šes sde on account of explanations like the one from the Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā.

The problem continues into the next line. As a variant reading of "chos nīd at the beginning of the second Pāda we find "chos la", again in ms. no. 135 and in the canonical versions, another indication of their relationship. Ye šes sde explains: "The dharmaṭa of all dharmas is from the beginning unorigi­nated, unborn and free from all pluralistic appearances." (fol. 272r). Jinaputra has characterized the first
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The understanding of the reading ēhos la, however, appears to be difficult, as every line should depend on the namas-formula at the end of the verse. Taking Ye šes sde's version as the correct one, the other two readings are difficult to explain. There is no significant gap in time which could be held responsible for manuscript corruptions, and it is not easy to believe that terms like dharmadhatu and dharmata could have been translated in such an unusual fashion. In any case it is remarkable that Ye šes sde explains dhātu in such detail. Dhātu is the only Sanskrit word which he refers to; conceivably he knew of the other reading ēhos niid and thereby tried to reject it.

4. To him who gradually removes the klesāvaraṇa and the ātāvaraṇa by antidotes and dwells on the bhūmis, who brings about benefits for the beings and purifies the Buddha-fields, homage to the noble and great Saṅgha!

Appendix

Text of the interlinear gloss in the Stein manuscript No. 281; the number of the corresponding line of the Stotra is given in square brackets. — Thanks are due to the India Office Library for providing a microfilm without which the reading of the very small dbu med would have been impossible.

[Verse 1a–d] // lha gaṅ ga (? Reading unsure) mchod rten las scogs ste gaṅ du phyin kyaṅ / dkon mchod gsum gyi yon tan 'di bzin rjes su dran žiṅ / chiṅ tu slas (? Reading unsure, ms. partly worn off; for zlas?) nas / lus btud de phyag 'chal bar bya'o // de la dkon mchod gsum gyi yon tan bsam gyis myi khyab / brjod par myi nus mod kyi chigs bcad 'di 'don čiṅ phyag 'chal ba'i che / rtag tu yid la bya žiṅ phyogs cam žig mdor bsdu na / chiṅ bcad daṅ po'i rkaṅ pa gsum gis dkon mchod gsum re re la phyag 'chal ba daṅ / rkaṅ pa tha mas de gsum spyir bsdu te phyag 'chal bar bstan to // de nas chiṅ bcad rkaṅ bžis / re res yon tan brjod čiṅ phyag 'chal bar bstan pa ste /

deyā saṁs rgyas la ni rgyu phun sum chogs pa daṅ / 'bras bu phun sum chogs pa daṅ / raṅ bžin phun sum chogs pa daṅ / bdag gi don phun sum chogs pa daṅ / gžan gi don phun sum chogs pa daṅ / rnam pa līas bstan to //

čhos la ni rgyu phun sum chogs pa daṅ / raṅ bžin phun sum chogs pa daṅ / 'bras bu phun sum chogs pa daṅ / gžan gi don phun sum chogs pa daṅ / rnam pa bžis bstan to //

dge 'dun la ni rgyu phun sum chogs pa daṅ / 'bras bu phun sum chogs pa daṅ / gžan gi don phun sum chogs pa daṅ / bdag gi don phun sum chogs pa daṅ / raṅ bžin phun sum chogs pa daṅ / rnam pa līas bstan te / mdo cam žig so so'i mchen tu bris pa yin no //

[2a] rgyu phun sum chogs pa yin ste bsod nams daṅ ye šes kyi chogs so / 'bras bu phun sum chogs pa ste / ye šes bži daṅ sku gsum niṅ do / de la sku gsum yaṅ ye šes kyi raṅ bžin du zad de saṁs rgyas sa 'i ti ka las /anye loṅ lta bu'i ye šes / ni čhos kyi sku'o / mnam pa niṅ / so sor rtag pa'i ye šes ni / lobs spyod rjogs pa'i sku / bya ba bsgrub pa'i ye šes ni sprul pa'i sku žes 'byuṅ ste / saṁs rgyas kyi sion gyi smon lam gyi mthu daṅ / sems čan snod dag pa'i rgyu rkyen las de lta snaṅ no //

[2b] raṅ bžin phun sum chogs pa ste / gžun dag las mchan niṅ ma 'dres pa yān mkhyen la / rnam pa yān myi rtag go že 'byuṅ ba lta bu yin bas / saṁs rgyas kyi raṅ bžin ni / rnam par yān myi rtag la / dus

28 The readings, however, differ: ēhos la don dam pā'i čhos so (Peking, fol. 126rv–127r1): čhos ni dam pa'i čhos so (Derge, fol. 108r5); cf. Hakamaya, p. 7, note 26.
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yin no

pa thams
yonsu byan

nas bsgom bas

byad chad myed pas brygan te / dban phyug chen po'i gnas / bya'hn chub sems dpa'i dkyir khor 'og myin

dan / lha dan myi las scogs te / 'khor sna chogs ma po'i dkyil khor 'jam bu glii na / bzung shin chos kyi

lohs spyod chen po grub pa la bya'o /

[2c] bdag gi don phun sum chogs pa ste / sains rgyas ntid thog ma bya'hn chub du thugs bskyed pa nas

bskal pa grai's myed pa gsum du dka' ba spyad pa'i don / chos kyi sku nam ka dan 'dra ba ci la yam ma

chags ma thogs pa (pa is cancelled) shin thams cd du khyab pa'dan / gzugs kyi sku gnis mchan dan dpe

byad chad myed pas brygan te / dban phyug chen po'i gnas / bya'hn chub sems dpa'i dkyir khor 'og myin

dan / lha dan myi las scogs te / 'khor sna chogs ma po'i dkyil khor 'jam bu glii na / bzung shin chos kyi

lohs spyod chen po grub pa la bya'o /

[2d] gzan gi don phun sum chogs pa ste / dpag bsams ni rtog pa myed kyi sems cdn pho'ns pa nrams

kyi te ba skor ba ltar / rtog pa myi mi'a ya'n snoon chogs da'n smon lam mion bar 'dus byas pa'i rgyu

da'n rkyen kyi mthus / sku da'n gsum da'n thugs kyiis 'gro seb (se cancelled? Read 'gro ba?) ma po'i don

mjad cin sgrol bar ya'n sna'n no / de bas na de la phyag 'chal lo /

[3a] rgyu phun sum chogs pa ste / mdo sde lascogs pa gsum rab thams cd chos kyi dbyi'ns rtogs pa'i

rgyu las / byuin bas na rgyu chos kyi dbyi'ns da'n / 'bras bu gsum rab bceu gnis don 'thun pa'i phyir rgyu

da'n 'thun ba'o /

[3b] rai bzin phun sum chogs pa ste cdos thams cd ni de bzin ntid du na skye 'gag myed cin mchan ma

thams cd da'n bral ba'i phyir spros las dben /

[3c] 'bras bu phun sum chogs pa ste // rgyu go'n ma lta bu'i gsum rab bceu gnis la spyod cin dbyi'ns skye

'gag myed pa rtogs na / che ba'i yon tan thams cd 'thob pa'o /

[3d] gzan gi don phun sum chogs pa ste / legs pa thams cd kyi gzi yin bas na / thams cd la legs par

byed pa'i phyir de la phyag 'chal bar bya'o

[4a-4b bsal te] rgyu phun sum chogs pa ste khams (about four syllables worn off) ba'i rgyu nnon moins

pa da'n / chos thams cd mi'se par byed pa'i rgyu se bya'i sgrub pa gnis 'phags pa'i lam da'n / ya'n

dag pa'i se'rs rab lascogs te / gnen po'i chos go'n yin na thams kyiis spa'ns pa na / spa'ns pa de ntid rgyu

yin no /

[4b end] 'bras bu phun sum chogs pa ste / rgyu mthong ba spa'n bar bya' spa'ns pas sa da'n po la gnas / de

nas bsgom bas spa'n bar bya' ba rims kyiis spa'ns pas / sa bceu go'n go'n (the second go'n is cancelled) nas

go'n du gnas te de bzin gshes pa'i sa yai 'thob bo /

[4c] gzan gi don phun sum chogs pa ste / bya'n chub sems dpas jii bya'o' cho kyi sems cin giy don

bya bar zad do /

[4c end] bdag gi don phun sum chogs pa ste / phyi rol giy snot rin po bye du rya lascogs par bsgyur ba

ya'n gi ci byo'n ba yin mod kyi gco chen ra'n gi sems yoonsu dag pa'i gi ci byo'n las sa'ns rgyas skye

bas na sems

yo'nsu ba la bya'o /

[4d] rai bzin phun sum chogs pa ste / dge 'dun se bya'b'i rai bzin ni nes pa thams cd spa'ns shin legs

pa thams cd la 'jag ste / skyon myed pas na dge la / lta ba 'thun gi ci bgs pa'i gpros pos miy'i phyed pa

'thun ba la bya'o /
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