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Notes on Two Texts in the Phug brag Kanjur*

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN

From 1990 onwards, thanks to the joint efforts of the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives in Dharamsala and the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions in New York, a handwritten Kanjur from Western Tibet was made accessible in the form of a microfiche edition. Only then did it become possible to study this Kanjur on a wider scale, although scholars had already recognized its unique features before this. A catalogue was prepared by Jampa SAMTEN in 1992, and in 1993 Helmut EIMER drew up a location list of the texts in the microfiche edition for the benefit of its users.

The importance of the Phug brag Kanjur had already been stressed by SAMTEN, and in the location list EIMER justly remarks that the “manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur written some time between A.D. 1696 and 1706 in the West Tibetan monastery of Phug brag is one of the most valuable treasures housed in the Library of Tibetan Works & Archives (LTWA), Dharamsala”;¹ in a note EIMER refers to three studies by Michael HAHN, Paul HARRISON and Jeffrey SCHOENING which demonstrate, each in its own way, the value of this particular Kanjur.

Since then, the position of the Phug brag Kanjur within the Kanjur tradition has been examined in a growing number of studies. Paul HARRISON reached the conclusion that “despite its frequent corruptions, it is truly independent of the standard Kanjur editions, a valuable third witness which enables us to isolate some of the peculiar variants in their hyparchetypes, i.e. in the Them spangs ma and Tshal pa MSS.,”;² and he illustrated the relationship with a stemma codicum. Recently, modified stemmata were proposed by Jonathan SILK, Jeffrey SCHOENING and Peter SKILLING, each derived from

---

* I wish to thank Richard WILSON for his help in correcting my English.

¹ EIMER 1993, p. v.


their respective study of a single text or a group of connected works, in which they assign a slightly different position to the Phug brag Kanjur. A survey of its peculiarities and unique features was given by Samten in the preface to his catalogue, listing the inclusion of variant translations, of two different translations of the same text, of texts not found in other Kanjur editions etc. In the following, a few modest observations on two texts from the Phug brag Kanjur will be made; they deal with features not found in their parallel versions in any of the other Kanjur or Tanjur editions accessible so far.

1. The Arthavistarasūtra

As is well known, the Kanjur contains translations of a number of sūtras belonging to Nikāya Buddhism which were, for various reasons, found worth including in the otherwise Mahāyāna-oriented sūtra section of the Tibetan canon. One of these is the Arthavistara-nāma-dharmaparāyāya, to give its full title, a text consisting mainly of listings of groups of technical terms of Nikāya Buddhist doctrine. Originally, or, to be more cautious, at one point in its history, it formed part of the Dirghāgama of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins.

This sūtra is listed in the Dan dkar ma (or, rather, Lhan kar ma) catalogue, and therefore it must have been translated in the first half of the 9th century, at the latest. At some point during its transmission, the last page of one of the manuscript copies was either lost, misplaced or irretrievably damaged, and a loss of text occurred. This defective copy then became the prototype for later editorial work, from which all of the printed and evidently most of the known handwritten Kanjurs derive their version of the Arthavistarasūtra. In all these editions the text breaks off at the same place in the middle of a sentence. This state of affairs was already observed by Bu ston, who adds the remark mjug ma tshaṅ ba, “incomplete at the end”, to the title of the Arthavistarasūtra in his Kanjur catalogue. Even the sTog Palace Manuscript, as a representative of

---

the Them spaṅs ma line of Kanjur transmission, does not contain the missing part, although in several instances it offers readings superior to those found in the editions of the Tshal pa line.

Surprisingly, then, the text of the sūtra as contained in the Phug brag Kanjur is complete, and a comparison with the corresponding Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia and with the two Chinese translations (T 97-98) reveals that the final sentences are preserved intact and in full agreement with the Sanskrit and Chinese versions. Although they comprise only about seven lines (338a7-b6) in the Phug brag manuscript, the possibility of a reconstruction of the missing ending is excluded, since the text breaks off in the other Kanjur versions at a point where neither the exact length nor the contents of the missing part can (as yet) be guessed at. Thus it is certain that the Phug brag version of the Arthavistarasūtra cannot go back to either the Tshal pa or the Them spaṅs ma lines of transmission; it is derived from an independent source, which confirms the findings of SILK and SKILLING. The only slight disappointment, if any, lies in the circumstance that the Phug brag version ends with a colophon containing the usual conclusion of a text ('phags pa don rgyas pa žes bya ba chos kyi rnam graṅs / rdzogs so /'), but without mentioning the name(s) of the translator(s) or reviser(s) of the text. However, in the dKar chag, the names Jinamitra, Sūrendra(bodhi) and Ye sès sde are given as translators, which would agree exactly with the listing of the translation in the Lhan kar ma catalogue, but the source of this statement and its reliability remain of course unknown.

2. The Varnārhatvarṇa of Mātrceṭa

One of the outstanding features of the Phug brag Kanjur is the inclusion of a number of hymns which are normally found in the Tanjur, since they do not belong to the sayings of the Buddha; instead they are from the pen of several famous Indian scholars or poets. Whether these ascriptions are correct in every case, is of no consequence here. With the exception of the hymn on Avalokiteśvara, which is included in the rGyud 'grel, they all form part of a special section of hymns in the Tanjur, the bsTod tshogs. Altogether twelve such hymns are included in volume 80 of the Phug brag

---


10 bKa’ 'gyur rin po che’i dkar chag gsal ba’i me loṅ, fol. 11a6-7: Don rgyas pa’i chos kyi rnam graṅs so lo ka brya DZi na mi : ru / Su rendra Ye sès sde gsun gyi ’gyur; cf. SAMTEN 1992, p. 57.


Already in 1988, Michael HAHN was able to demonstrate that the *Nirvikalpastava*, according to its colophon composed by Nāgārjuna, was nothing other than a second translation of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, usually attributed to Rāhulabhadra.13 In the same article, HAHN drew attention to the fact that the Phug brag Kanjur preserved the original title and the correct author of the *Prasādāpratibhodhavha*, one of the two famous Buddhastotras of Mātrīceta. In all the Tanjur editions this hymn is ascribed to Asvaghoṣa and its title is given as *Śatapāñčāśatka*, although the translation is the same in both versions. Furthermore HAHN could show that this translation was not a work of Śraddhākaravarman and Śākyā blo gros from the 11th century, as claimed in the colophon of the Tanjur text, but was carried out by Sarvajñādeva and Rin chen mchog and revised by dPal brtsegs in the 9th century, as stated in the colophon of the Phug brag version.14

Although title, author and translators are undisputed in the case of Mātrīceta’s other well-known Buddhastotra, the *Varnāḥharavāra* (“Praise of the Praiseworthy”) or *Catuh-śataka* (“[Hymn in] Four Hundred [Verses]”), the text preserved in the Phug brag Kanjur differs significantly from the one in the Tanjur in several respects.15

2.1. The chapter titles

The stotra consists of twelve chapters of varying length. In the Tanjur version each chapter concludes with a chapter colophon containing its Tibetan title. Strangely enough, in the four printed Tanjur editions the stotra begins with the title of its first chapter appearing as the main title: *saṅs rgyas bcom ldan ’das la bstod pa bsṅags pa r ‘os pa bsṅags pa las bstod par mi nus par bstod žes bya ba*, which is sanskritized as

---

12 This is another translation of the *Avalokiteśvarastotra* by the Bhikṣuṇī Lakṣmī (dGe slon ma dPal mno), no. 3560 in the Peking Tanjur, cf. SAMTEN 1992, pp. xi and 94, note 2, and EIMER 1993, nos. 248 (read gi sa gsum) and 398.
13 HAHN 1988, pp. 57ff.
14 HAHN 1988, pp. 56ff.
15 In Phug brag it is found twice: no. 249, vol. 80 = *mdo sde la*, 401a3-423b4, and no. 399, vol. 96 = *mdo sde ni*, 358b4-377b8; for the Tanjur version, cf. HARTMANN 1987, p. 45.
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varṇārhavarṇe bhagavatō buddhastotre 'śakyaṃstavo nāma, “Celebration of What Cannot be Celebrated in the Praise of the Praiseworthy, a Buddha Hymn on the Lord”. The Tibetan translation appears again at the end of the first chapter, this time with the addition le'u dañ po’o, “first chapter”. The final colophon at the end of the whole work, however, gives only the correct main title saṇis rgyas bcom ldan ’das la bstdod pa bsniags par ’os pa bsniags pa, “The Buddha Hymn 'Praise of the Praiseworthy'”.

The version included in the Phug brag Kanjur demonstrates several peculiarities. First of all, it does not contain the first chapter of the stotra. Instead, it begins with the second chapter, but in exactly the same fashion as the Tanjur version does with the first, i.e. the chapter title is put at the beginning of the chapter. Second, the chapter titles continue to be placed at the head of each chapter, and not only in Tibetan translation, but also with the Tibetan transcription of that chapter’s Sanskrit title, each time introduced by the formula rgya gar skad du, “in Indian language”. This is, to my knowledge, an absolutely unique feature distinguishing this text of the Phug brag Kanjur from any other text in all the known Kanjur or Tanjur editions. Third, these Sanskrit titles can hardly be derived from a reconstruction based on their Tibetan translation, as will become evident from the following; they must go back to a Sanskrit original. The following list contains the transliteration of the Sanskrit chapter titles along with the correct Sanskrit form as found in the fragmentary Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia.

1. Asākyastava, missing in Phug bragl
2. Mūrdhābhiseka
   a) bar nār ha par ne bha ga ha te buddha stud te / mur dha a bi še ko na ma
      (la 401a3-4)
   b) bar nār ha bar ṇa bha ga ha to bud dha stud te / mur dha a ba še ko nas ma
      (ni 358b4)
3. (Śārvājaññatāsiddhi)
   a) bar nār ha bar ne bha ga ha to buddha stud te / sar ṛbad ŋa ta sid dhir nā ma
      (la 405b2)
   b) bar nār ha bar ne bha ga ha to bhud dha stud te / sar ṛa ta sid dhir na ma
      (ni 362b4)
4. (Balavaiśā)radyaṃstava
   a) bar nā ra ha bar ne bha ga ha to buddha stud tre pa la pai ša rad dya sta pa nā ma
      (la 406b8-407a1)

16 Cf. HARTMANN 1987, pp. 65, 87, 325.
17 Even the Prasādapraṇīṭhodbhava, the other hymn by Mātręṣṭa which directly follows in the Phug brag Kanjur, contains chapter titles only at the end of each chapter and only in Tibetan translation.
18 Parentheses ( ) in the Sanskrit titles denote reconstructions due to textual gaps in the fragments. Cf. HARTMANN 1987 for the Sanskrit manuscripts.
b) bar na ra ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to bud dha stud tre ba lba'i śa rad dya sta bo na ma
  (ni 363b7-8)

5. Vāgviśuddhi
a) bar nar ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to buddha stod tre pa ga bi śu ddhi sto pa nā ma
   (la 408b4)
b) bar nar ha bar ṇe bha ga to bud dha stod tre ba ga bi śud sta bo nā ma (ni 365a6)

6. Avivādastava
a) bar nā ra ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to buddha stod tre a pī ba da sta bo nā ma
   (la 410a8-b1)
b) bar nā ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tre a ba'i sta bo na ma (ni 366b6-7)

7. Brahmānūvāda
a) bar nā ra ha bar ṇe bha ga ha te / buddha stod tre pra mahā nu ba dā sta bo nā ma
   (la 412b7-8)
b) bar nā ra ha bar ṇi bha ga ha te bud stod tra bra mahā nu bā da sto ba nam
   (ni 368b8)

8. Upakāras(tava)
a) bar nar ha par ṇe bha ga ha to buddha stod tre u pa kla' ra sta bo nā ma
   (la 414a7-8)
b) bar nar ha ha re ṇe bha ga ha to bud dha stod tre u pa klar sta bo na ma
   (ni 370a4-5)

9. Apratikārastava
a) bar nār ha bar ṇe bha ga bato buddha stod tre a pra ti kā rya sta bo nā ma
   (la 416b3)
b) bar nār ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to bud dha stod tre a pra ti kā rya sta bo na ma
   (ni 372a1)

10. Śāriraikadesastava
a) bar nār ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to buddha stod tre ru pai ka de śa sta bo nā ma
    (la 417 'og a7-8)
b) har nār ne bha ga ha to pud dha stod tra rā pe ka de śa sta bo nā ma
    (ni 373a8-b1)

11. Prabhūtastava
a) bar nar ha bar ṇa bha ga ha to buddha stod tre bra bhu ta sta bo nā ma (la 419b2)
b) har nār ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to bud dha stod tra pra bha ta sta bo nā ma (ni 375a5)

12. Bhavodvejaka
a) bar nar ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to buddha stod bha ba ud be dza no nā ma
   (la 421/422b3)
b) har nār ha bar ṇe bha ga ha to bud dha stod tra bha ba ud be dza no nā ma
   (ni 376b8-377a1)

The final colophon refers only to the last chapter: saṁs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la bstod (stod b) pa / (/ deest b) bsṅags par 'os pa bsṅags pa las / srid pa la skyo bar

19 A scribal error evidently due to the graphic similarity between kla and kā.
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After comparing them with the titles transmitted in the Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia, it becomes clear that the Tibetan transliterations are based upon a Sanskrit original. They have suffered considerably, however, from the process of transmission, although most of the mistakes and scribal errors are easily explainable and it is always possible to reconstruct the underlying Sanskrit original, all the more remarkably since the two versions within the Phu brag hardly ever agree. Even the recurring part of every title, *varṇārharvarṇe bhagavato buddhastotre*, abounds in omissions, variants and outright errors.

There are several peculiarities in the way of transcription; one of them is the Sanskrit word *stotra*, which is, with amazing consistency, transcribed with a final *d* in its first syllable as *stod* (*stud*) *tra* (alluding, perhaps, to the Tibetan verb *stod*, “to praise”, from which the translation *bstod pa*, “praise, hymn”, is derived?). Another peculiarity is the older manner of transcribing Skt. *jit* by *dīṇ* as in the title of chapter three, *sar bad ŋa ta* for *sarvajñatā*, or in the translator’s name *Sa rbad ŋa de ba* for *Sarvajñādeva*, usually transliterated as *Sarba dzñā de ba*. Worthy of note is perhaps the form *bramha* for *brahma* in the title of chapter five, *Brahmānuvāda*, which reminds one of the Middle Indian metathesis *mh* for *hm*, although it is not possible to draw any conclusions from this.

Differences between the titles preserved in the Sanskrit manuscripts and their Tibetan transliterations are few and without great significance for the meaning: in chapters five and seven, the Tibetan contains an additional *stava* in the titles *Vāgvisuddhi* and *Brahmānuvāda*, which is corroborated by the translations *gSuṅ rnam par dag pa la bstod pa* and *Tshaṅs pa daṅ mthun par gsuṅ bar bstod pa* in all the Tibetan versions.21 In chapter nine, both of the Phug brag versions agree on Apratikāryastava against Apratikārástava of the Sanskrit manuscripts, which presents a possible alternative. The title of chapter twelve, *Bhavodvejaka*, is given as *Bhavodvejana*, which is, as in the foregoing case, a possible and perhaps even better variant, if the ending is corrected to *udvejanam*. Contrary to the titles in chapters five and seven, the expected addition *stava* presupposed by the Tibetan translation does not occur in chapter twelve. The only real difference is found in the title of chapter ten, where the word *rūpa* offers a variant reading for the synonym *sarira* preserved in the Central Asian manuscripts. At present,

---

20 According to the Tanjur version, the chapter title is *srid pa las skyo ba* (*b*)*skyed par bstod pa*.

21 Cf. HARTMANN 1987, p. 52.
however, it appears impossible to decide which of the two readings is to be preferred.

### 2.2. Variant readings

Both texts of the *Varnāravarna* in the Phug brag Kanjur were either rather carelessly written or based upon an original already containing a large number of mistakes. Although both abound in scribal errors and omissions, the situation is even worse with the second text. It differs from the first in its irregular use of the śad, or danḍa, which results in a partial loss of metre as a regulating device against the omission of single syllables.\(^\text{22}\) Notwithstanding such textual problems, the Phug brag version preserves a number of readings which are, in the light of the Sanskrit original, definitely superior to those found in the Tanjur version. In the edition of the *Varnāravarna*, altogether 29 cases were listed where the Sanskrit text seemed to require a correction of the Tibetan translation as preserved in all four block prints of CDNP.\(^\text{23}\) Since chapter one is missing in Phug brag, only 26 of these corrections could be checked against this version. The result is as follows:

2.7b: the haplography thugs rje instead of thugs rjes (stobs . . .) is also found in Phug brag (a 401b2; b 359a2);  
2.17b: *mi ruḥ (riṅ b) ba* (a 402a3; b 359b3) against *mi rin(s) ba* CDNP for uṇāyin; Phug brag obviously is to be corrected to either *mi ruḥ ba* or *mi ruḥ pa*;  
[2.18a: *rab sbyaṅs pa* (a 402a4; b 359b3) with CDNP for praśrabdhī. Guided by SAKAKI’S edition of the *Mahāvyutpatti*, I changed *sbyaṅs* to *spyāṅs* (HARTMANN 1987, p. 99), but both forms evidently exist side by side, the more frequently used one being *sbyaṅs*;]  
[2.43d: *gtsan sbra* (a 403b2; b 360b8) with CDNP; as in the previous case, on account of the *Mahāvyutpatti* I changed *sbra* to *spra* against all sources;]  
2.51d: *rig pa* (a 404a1; b 361a7) against *rigs pa* CDNP for vidyā;  
3.9a: *rgya chen* (a 406a2; b 363a4) against *rgyal chen* CDNP for viśāla;  
5.8a: *ston* (a 409a3)\(^\text{24}\) against *don* CDNP for samākhyāna;  
5.10d: *bsrīn ba’i* (a 409a6) against *srid pa’i* (b 365b6 and CDNP) for naisthūrya;  
5.12c: *phyuṅ* (a 409a7; b 365b8) with CDNP for *phyug, āḍhya*;

---

\(^\text{22}\) The same holds true for the two copies of the *Gunāparyantastotra* in the Phug brag. The translation is the same, but in the second copy many śad are missing, and this leads to a particularly large number of mistakes, since the metre is rather long: it contains fifteen syllables per quarter and easily becomes confused.

\(^\text{23}\) Cf. HARTMANN 1987, p. 46, note 123.

\(^\text{24}\) In the second version this line contains a ditography: it runs chos kyi (!) de ŋid ma mehis so instead of chos kyi de ŋid ston slad du, clearly under the influence of the foregoing line phan tshun ’gal ba ’aṅ ma mehis so.
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8.11c: gañ dañ (a 415a3) with CDNP against unmetrical gañ dag dañ (b 370b6) for gañ dag, yäh;

8.16a: 'tshal (a 415a7; b 371a2) with CDNP against 'chal, asamañjas or asamañjasa;

8.22a: sred pa'i (a 415b5) against srid pa'i (b 371a62 and CDNP) for trṣṇā;

8.30a: dpyod (b 371b4) against spyod (a 416a5 and CDNP) pa med dañ sbyar for amī- mãṃsaka;

10.7c: kyi (a 417 'og b6; omitted in b 373b6) with CDNP against kyis (Skt. not available);

10.9b: ku mu da (a 418a1; b 373b8) against ku mu ta CDNP for kumuda;

10.11a: khyod kyi (a 418a2; b 374a1) against khyod kyis CDNP for te;

10.13b: bži po (a 418a4; b 374a3) with CDNP (bo C, pa D) against reconstructed gži bo for āśraya;

[10.19c: 'phral bas (a 418b2) with CDNP and 'phrel bas (b 374a8) against reconstructed dpral bas for Lalātena; however, this reconstruction in Hartmann 1987, p. 280, was unnecessary, since 'phral ba is an old form for dpral ba.]

10.19c: khyims pa (a 418b2; b 374a8) against khyil pas CDNP (bas D) for parivesin;

10.25a: mdzes pa yis (a 418b7; b 374b4) against mdzes pa yi CDNP (Sanskrit not preserved);

10.26c: khyod kyi (b 374b5) against khyod kyis (a 418b8 and CDNP) for te;

10.28c: thugs rje chen po mig gi (a 419a2; b 374b6-7) against thugs rje chen po'i mig gis CDNP for yac caksurbuddhiṣayam mahākarmaṇa kṛtaṃ;

11.21b: skyo mi mña' (a 420b6; b 376a5) against skyon mi mña' CDNP for akilāsin;

11.25d: kyi (a 421/422a2; b 376b1) against kyi CDNP;

12.6d: re 'nan (a 423a2; b 377a6) against re 'na CDNP for dhik;

12.15a: mña' (mña' po b) dbaṅ sgyar (a 423b2; b 377b5) against mña' dbaṅ bskur CDNP for vaśavartin.

Thus, out of 26 cases, three cannot be counted, and in six cases neither version contains a reading in agreement with the Sanskrit original. However, in 17 or two-thirds of all cases either both or at least one of the two texts in the Phug brag manuscript preserve the correct reading. Finally, in 2.13a the line missing in CDNP is found in Phug brag as phyag 'tshal rin chen sku (skun b) khyod la (a 401b7; b 359a7).

25 In this version the whole päda is corrupt: srid pa'i phrin ni 'chi mañ ha for sred pa'i bran ni 'ishe mañ ha (with zan for bran, an obvious scribal error, in version a of Phug brag).
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