

INDICA ET TIBETICA

Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen
des indo-tibetischen Kulturraumes

Herausgegeben von Michael Hahn
unter Mitwirkung von
Jens-Uwe Hartmann und Konrad Klaus

Band 28

Suḥṛllekhāḥ

Festgabe für Helmut Eimer

Herausgegeben von
Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann
und Roland Steiner

A VI
67.1

96/74
177950

Suḥrillekhāḥ

Festgabe für Helmut Eimer

Herausgegeben von
Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann
und Roland Steiner



SWISTTAL-ODENDORF • 1996

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Roland STEINER

Helmut EIMER. <i>Curriculum vitae</i>	IX
Verzeichnis der bis zum 1. März 1996 erschienenen und einge- reichten Schriften von Helmut EIMER	XIII

Tilak Raj CHOPRA

Bemerkungen zum Metrumsnamen Dohā	1
--	---

Siglinde DIETZ

Remarks on the textual transmission of four stanzas from the <i>Loka- prajñaptiśāstra</i>	7
--	---

Karl-Heinz GOLZIO

Buddhas eigenes Land? Die auserwählten Länder des Theravāda- Buddhismus	17
--	----

Michael HAHN

Das <i>Vanaratnastotra</i> des Āditya	29
--	----

Jürgen HANNEDER

<i>Kumārasambhava</i> 3.15. Kālidāsa's Sources for Śaiva Theology	43
--	----

Paul HARRISON

Preliminary Notes on a <i>gZungs 'dus</i> Manuscript from Tabo	49
---	----

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN

Notes on Two Texts in the Phug brag Kanjur	69
---	----

Adelheid HERRMANN-PFANDT

Verdienstübertragung im Hīnayāna und Mahāyāna	79
--	----

Rudolf KASCHEWSKY

Mongolistische Bemerkungen zum Lobhymnus auf Atiśa in achtzig Strophen	99
---	----

Hans-Joachim KLIMKEIT

Zum Inhalt der alttürkischen <i>Maitrisimūt</i>	111
--	-----

Jens Peter LAUT	
Höllische Fehler	121
Jürgen Paul SCHWINDT	
Der vergessene Schlegel. August Wilhelm von Schlegels KLASSISCHE	
Sanskrit-PHILOLOGIE	137
Jonathan A. SILK	
Notes on the History of the Yongle Kanjur	153
Peter SKILLING	
Verses associated with the *<i>Rāhula-sūtra</i>	<u>201</u>
Roland STEINER	
Die Lehre der Anuṣṭubh bei den indischen Metrikern	<u>227</u>
Claus VOGEL	
Indische Hauptstädte im Spiegel alter Reiseberichte	249
Akira YUYAMA	
A Critical Survey of Philological Studies of the <i>Daśabhūmikasūtra</i> .	263
Anschriften der Autoren	283

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.

² HARRISON 1992, p. xxxv. For the *Them spangs ma*—sometimes still called “Western”—and the *Tshal pa* (“Eastern”) lines of Kanjur transmission, cf. also EIMER 1992, esp. pp. xiii ff., EIMER 1994, pp. 307f., SKILLING 1994, pp. 768f., and SKILLING n.d. (I wish to thank my friend and colleague for a manuscript copy of his [as yet unpublished] paper).

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.³ 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-dharmaparyāya*, to give its full title, a text consisting mainly of listings of groups of technical terms of Nikāya Buddhist doctrine.⁴ Originally, or, to be more cautious, at one point in its history, it formed part of the *Ādīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sārvāstivādins.

This sūtra is listed in the *IDan dkar ma* (or, rather, *Lhan kar ma*)⁵ catalogue, and therefore it must have been translated in the first half of the 9th century, at the latest.⁶ 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 tshan ba*, “incomplete at the end”, to the title of the *Arthavistara-sūtra* in his Kanjur catalogue.⁷ Even the sTog Palace Manuscript, as a representative of

³ SILK 1994, pp. 21 and 26-27; SCHOENING 1995, pp. 129-131; SKILLING n.d.

⁴ For a summary of its contents cf. HARTMANN 1994, p. 330.

⁵ For the spelling *lhan kar ma*, cf. Ernst STEINKELLNER, *Nachweis der Wiedergeburt. Prajñāśāstas 'Jig rten pha rol sgrub pa*, Teil II, Wien 1988 (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Denkschriften, 197), p. 15, note 31.

⁶ For the various datings of the *Lhan kar ma* catalogue, cf. Akira YUYAMA, *Prajñā-pāramitā-ramaṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*, Cambridge, 1976, p. xxxiii.

⁷ Cf. SOSHIŪ Nishioka, “‘Putun-bukkyō-shi’ Mokuroku-bu sakuin I, *Tōkyō daigaku bungaku-bu Bunka-kōryū kenkyū shisetsu kenkyū kiyō* 4 (1980), p. 67, no. 52.

the Them spañs ma line of Kanjur transmission, does not contain the missing part,⁸ 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 Kanjur⁹ 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 spañs 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 źes bya ba chos kyi rnam grañs / rdzogs so / ʎ*), 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 źes sde are given as translators,¹⁰ 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 *Varṇārhaveśvara* 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,¹¹ 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

⁸ The same holds true for the Kanjur manuscript in the Tōyō Bunko; the corresponding volume of the London manuscript is lost.

⁹ No. 137, vol. 65 = *mdo sde na*, fol. 330b3-338b6.

¹⁰ *bKa'* 'gyur rin po che'i dkar chag gsal ba'i me loñ, fol. 11a6-7: *Don rgyas pa'i chos kyi rnam grañs so lo ka brgya Dźi na mi ʎra / Su rendra Ye źes sde gsum gyi 'gyur*; cf. SAMTEN 1992, p. 57.

¹¹ SAMTEN 1992, p. vi. For the early tradition of including *stotra* texts in the Kanjur, cf. also HARRISON 1994, p. 301.

Kanjur, and they appear once more in the same order in vol. 96: *Nirvikalpastava* (nos. 240 and 390), *Paramārhastava* (241/391), *Nirupamastava* (242/392), *Lokāṭīstava* (243/393), *Dharmadhātustava* (244/394), *Acintyastava* (245/395), all attributed to Nāgārjuna, *Guṇāparyantastotra* (246/396) by Triratnadāsa, *Mañjuśrībhaṭṭārakakarūṇāstotra* (247/397) allegedly by Nāgārjuna, *Lokeśvarasya Bhuvanatrāyastava* (248/398) by a certain Bhikṣuṇī,¹² *Varṇārhavarṇa* (249/399) and *Prasādapratibhodbhava* (250/400) by Mātṛceṭa, and finally the *Viśeṣastava* (251/401) by Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin.

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 *Prasādapratibhodbhava*, one of the two famous Buddhastotras of Mātṛceṭa. In all the Tanjur editions this hymn is ascribed to Aśvaghoṣa and its title is given as *Śatapañcāśatka*, although the translation is the same in both versions. Furthermore HAHN could show that this translation was not a work of Śraddhākaravarman and Śākya blo gros from the 11th century, as claimed in the colophon of the Tanjur text, but was carried out by Sarvajñadeva 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 Mātṛceṭa's other well-known Buddhastotra, the *Varṇārhavarṇa* ("Praise of the Praiseworthy") or *Catuḥśataka* ("[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 par 'os pa bsṅags pa las bstod par mi nus par bstod źes bya ba*, which is sanskritized as

¹² This is another translation of the *Avalokiteśvarastotra* by the Bhikṣuṇī Lakṣmī (dGe sloṅ ma dPal mo), 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. 56f.

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.

varṇārhavarṇe bhagavato buddhastotre 'śakyastavo 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 dan po'o*, “first chapter”. The final colophon at the end of the whole work, however, gives only the correct main title *saṅs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la bstod pa bsṅags par 'os pa bsṅags pa*, “The Buddha Hymn ‘Praise of the Praiseworthy’”.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸

[1. *Aśakyastava*, missing in Phug brag]

2. *Mūrdhābhiṣeka*

a) *bar ṇar ha par ṇe bha ga ba te buddha stud te / mur dha a bi śe ko na ma*
(la 401a3-4)

b) *bar ṇar ha bar ṇa bha ga ba to bud dha stud te / mur dha a ba śe ko nas ma*
(ñi 358b4)

3. (*Sarvajñatāsiddhi*)

a) *bar ṇar ha bar ne bha ga ba to buddha stud te / sar rbad ṇa ta sid dhir nā ma*
(la 405b2)

b) *bar ṇar ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to bhud dha stud te / sar bad ṇa ta sid dhir na ma*
(ñi 362b4)

4. (*Balavaiśā*)*radya**stava*

a) *bar ṇā ra ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to buddha stud tre pa la pai śa rad dya sta pa nā ma*
(la 406b8-407a1)

¹⁶ Cf. HARTMANN 1987, pp. 65, 87, 325.

¹⁷ Even the *Prasādapratibhodbhava*, the other hymn by Mātṛceṭa 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 ṇa ra ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tre ba lbai śa rad dya sta bo na ma*
(ñi 363b7-8)
5. *Vāgviśuddhi*
a) *bar ṇar ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to buddha stod tre pa ga bi śu ddhi sto pa nā ma*
(la 408b4)
b) *bar ṇar ha bar ṇe bha ga to bud dha stod tre ba ga bi śud sta bo nā ma* (ñi 365a6)
6. *Avivādaśtava*
a) *bar ṇā ra ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to buddha stod tre a pī ba da sta bo nā ma*
(la 410a8-b1)
b) *bar ṇā ha ba re ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tre a ba'i sta bo na ma* (ñi 366b6-7)
7. *Brahmānuvāda*
a) *bar ṇar ha bar ṇe bha ga ba te / buddha stod tre pra mhā nu ba dā sta bo nā ma*
(la 412b7-8)
b) *bar ṇa ra ha bar ṇi bha ga ba te bud stod tra bra mhā nu bā da sto ba nam*
(ñi 368b8)
8. *Upakāras(tava)*
a) *bar ṇar ha par ṇe bha ga ba to buddha stod tre u pa kla¹⁹ ra sta bo nā ma*
(la 414a7-8)
b) *bar ṇar ha ba re ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tre u pa klar sta bo na ma*
(ñi 370a4-5)
9. *Apratikāraśtava*
a) *bar ṇār ha bar ṇe bha ga bato buddha stod tre a pra ti kā rya sta bo nā ma*
(la 416b3)
b) *bar ṇār ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tre a pra ti kā rya sta bo na ma*
(ñi 372a1)
10. *Śarīraikadeśaśtava*
a) *bar ṇār ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to buddha stod tre ru pai ka de śa sta bo nā ma*
(la 417 'og a7-8)
b) *bar ṇār ṇe bha ga ba to pud dha stod tra rū pe ka de śa sta bo nā ma*
(ñi 373a8-b1)
11. *Prabhūtaśtava*
a) *bar ṇar ha bar na bha ga ba to buddha stod tre bra bhu ta sta bo nā ma* (la 419b2)
b) *bar ṇār ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tra pra bha ta sta bo nā ma* (ñi 375a5)
12. *Bhavodvejaka*
a) *bar ṇar ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to buddha stod bha ba ud be dza no nā ma*
(la 421/422b3)
b) *bar ṇār ha bar ṇe bha ga ba to bud dha stod tra bha ba ud be dza no nā ma*
(ñi 376b8-377a1)

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

¹⁹ A scribal error evidently due to the graphic similarity between *kla* and *kā*.

*bstod pa*²⁰ *žes bya ba / slob dpon ma (ma' b) tri (ti a) rtse ʒas (tas a) mdzad pa rdzogs te / rgya gar gyi mkhan po sa rbad ña de ba (pa b) dañ / ʒu chen gyi lo tsha ba ban de dpal brtsegs (rtsegs b) rag śi (śiñ b) tas bsgyur ciñ ʒus te (de nas added by b) gtan la phab pa / / (la 423b2-4; ñi 377b6-8).*

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, *varṇārhavarṇe 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. *jñ* by *dñ*, as in the title of chapter three, *sar bad ña ta* for *sarvajñatā*, or in the translator’s name *Sa rbad ña 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 *Vāgviśuddhi* and *Brahmānuvāda*, which is corroborated by the translations *gSuñ rnam par dag pa la bstod pa* and *Tshañs pa dañ mthun par gsuñ bar bstod pa* in all the Tibetan versions.²¹ In chapter nine, both of the Phug brag versions agree on *Apratikāryastava* against *Apratikārastava* 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 *śarīra* 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 *Varṇārḥavarṇa* 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 *daṇḍa*, which results in a partial loss of metre as a regulating device against the omission of single syllables.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 *Varṇārḥavarṇa*, 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.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 rñi* (*rñe* b) *ba* (a 402a3; b 359b3) against *mi riñ(s)* ba CDNP for *amlāyin*; Phug brag obviously is to be corrected to either *mi rñiñ ba* or *mi rñid pa*;
- [2.18a: *rab shyāṅs pa* (a 402a4; b 359b3) with CDNP for *praśrabdhi*. Guided by SAKAKI's edition of the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, I changed *shyāṅs* to *spyāṅs* (HARTMANN 1987, p. 99), but both forms evidently exist side by side, the more frequently used one being *shyāṅs*;]
- [2.43d: *gtsaṅ sbra* (a 403b2; b 360b8) with CDNP; as in the previous case, on account of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* 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)²⁴ against *don* CDNP for *samākhyāna*;
- 5.10d: *bsriñ ba'i* (a 409a6) against *srid pa'i* (b 365b6 and CDNP) for *naiṣṭhurya*;
- 5.12c: *phyuñ* (a 409a7; b 365b8) with CDNP for *phyug, ādhya*;

²² The same holds true for the two copies of the *Guṇāparyantastotra* 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.

²³ Cf. HARTMANN 1987, p. 46, note 123.

²⁴ In the second version this line contains a dittography; it runs *chos kyis (!) de ñid ma mchis so* instead of *chos kyī de ñid ston slad du*, clearly under the influence of the foregoing line *phan tshun 'gal ba 'añ ma mchis so*.

- 8.11c: *gañ dañ* (a 415a3) with CDNP against unmetrical *gañ dag dañ* (b 370b6) for *gañ dag, yāh*;
- 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 371a6²⁵ and CDNP) for *tr̥ṣṇā*;
- 8.30a: *dpyod* (b 371b4) against *spyod* (a 416a5 and CDNP) *pa med dañ sbyar* for *amī-māmsaka*;
- 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 *āsraya*;
- [10.19c: *'phral bas* (a 418b2) with CDNP and *'phrens bas* (b 374a8) against reconstructed *dpral bas* for *lalāṭena*; however, this reconstruction in HARTMANN 1987, p. 280, was unnecessary, since *'phral ba* is an old form for *dpral ba*;]²⁶
- 10.19c: *'khyims pa* (a 418b2; b 374a8) against *'khyil pas* CDNP (*bas D*) for *pariveṣin*;
- 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 pos mig gi* (a 419a2; b 374b6-7) against *thugs rje chen po'i mig gis* CDNP for *yac cakṣurbuddhiviṣayaṃ mahākaruṇayā kṛtam*;
- 11.21b: *skyo mi mña'* (a 420b6; b 376a5) against *skyon mi mña'* CDNP for *akilāsin*;
- 11.25d: *kyis* (a 421/422a2; b 376b1) against *kyi* CDNP;
- 12.6d: *re ñan* (a 423a2; b 377a6) against *reñ na* CDNP for *dhik*;
- 12.15a: *mña'* (*mña' po b*) *dbañ sgyur* (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 *pāda* is corrupt: *srid pa'i phrin ni 'chī mañ ba* for *sred pa'i bran ni 'tshē mañ ba* (with *zan* for *bran*, an obvious scribal error, in version a of Phug brag).

²⁶ Cf. David Seyfort RUEGG, "On Translating the Buddhist Canon", *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture*, Vol. 3, ed. P. RATNAM, Delhi 1974 (Śata-piṭaka Series, 209), p. 256.

References

EIMER, Helmut

- 1992 "Zum Stand der Kanjurforschung", *Ein Jahrzehnt Studien zur Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur*, Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 28), pp. ix-xi.
- 1993 *Location List for the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Phug brag Kanjur*. Compiled from the Microfiche Edition and Jampa Samten's Descriptive Catalogue. Tokyo (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior, 5).
- 1994 "Zur Problematik der Stellung des Narthang-Druckes in der Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur", *XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Vorträge*, ed. Cornelia Wunsch, Stuttgart (ZDMG, Suppl., 10), pp. 307-312.

HAHN, Michael

- 1988 "Bemerkungen zu zwei Texten aus dem Phudrag-Kanjur", *Indology and Indo-Tibetology. Thirty Years of Indian and Indo-Tibetan Studies in Bonn*, Bonn (Indica et Tibetica, 13), pp. 53-80.

HARRISON, Paul

- 1992 *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra. A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment*, Tokyo (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series, 7).
- 1994 "In Search of the Source of the Tibetan Bka' 'gyur: A Reconnaissance Report", *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes 1992*, ed. P. Kvaerne, vol. 1, Oslo, pp. 295-317.

HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe

- 1987 *Das Varṇārḥavarṇastotra des Mātṛceṭa*, Göttingen (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, 12; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 160).
- 1994 "Der Śaṣṭraka-Abschnitt des in Ostturkistan überlieferten Dīrghāgama", *XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Vorträge*, ed. Cornelia Wunsch, Stuttgart (ZDMG, Suppl., 10), pp. 324-334.

SAMTEN, Jampa

- 1992 *Phug brag bka' 'gyur bris ma'i dkar chag: A Catalogue of the Phug-brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Dharamsala.

SCHOENING, Jeffrey D.

- 1995 *The Śālistamba Sūtra and Its Indian Commentaries*, 2 vols., Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 35.1-2).

SILK, Jonathan A.

- 1994 *The Heart Sūtra in Tibetan. A Critical Edition of the Two Recensions Contained in the Kanjur*, Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 34).

SKILLING, Peter

- 1994 "Kanjur Titles and Colophons", *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes 1992*, ed. Per Kvaerne, vol. 2, Oslo, pp. 768-780.

- n.d. "From Bka' bstan bcos to Bka' 'gyur and Bstan 'gyur", forthcoming in the Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies at Seggau, Austria, 1995.