THE RNAL 'BYOR CHEN PO BSGOM PA'I DON MANUSCRIPT
OF THE 'GONDHLA KANJUR'

HELMUT TAUSCHER (VIENNA)

Nowadays Gondhla is an inconspicuous little village in Lahaul, Himachal Pradesh, some ten km east of the confluence of the rivers Chandra and Bhaga. In the old days, however, its importance as the centre of the principality of Ti nan must have been much greater; the partly ruined, but still impressive tower of the Thakur’s castle is now the only obvious remainder of those better days. Another such remainder—but not as easily seen—is the manuscript collection in the possession of the Thakur, a set of 35 partly illuminated volumes. An additional volume, containing works such as the Lalitavistara and the mahāsūtra Māyājāla,\(^1\) was viewed and partly photographed by D. Klimburg-Salter and Ch. Luczanits in 1991, but it cannot be traced anymore.

Although no Tibetan Buddhist would hesitate to call this collection a Kanjur, technically speaking it is not, in the sense of an homogenous body with, e.g. running volume-numbering; such numbering is found only within the sets of the Ratnakūṭa (six vols.), the Buddhāvatamsaka (originally four vols., one missing) and the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra (two vols.). The Gondhla collection also seems to pre-date the compilation of the Tibetan canon at Narthang/Zhalu at the beginning of 14\(^{\text{th}}\) century.\(^2\) Nevertheless, although it was not necessarily produced as one set in its totality, it appears to form a unit, with all the volumes being very much alike with regard to size (67–69 x 19–21 cm, 10–11 lines), palaeography, orthography, and the style of

---

\(^1\) See Skilling 1997a: 198f.

\(^2\) Without any inclination to contribute to the ongoing discussion about whether and to what extent or in which context it might or might not be justified to speak of a Tibetan ‘canon’, I use the term in the general sense of “a ‘normative collection of texts’ which should not be subject to alteration” (Eimer 2002: 7) and refer it to both Kanjur and Tanjur.

The discussion mentioned above and the present state of Kanjur research is reflected, e.g., in the papers collected in Eimer 1997 (s. in particular Skilling 1997b) and Eimer and Germano 2002.
the miniatures. 34 of these 35 volumes contain in mdo mangs-style units the greater part of all texts commonly recorded in the mdo sections of the various Tibetan Kanjur editions, a few texts that are included in the rgyud section of Peking and Derge, four texts (Lokaprajñaapti, Kāraṇaprajñaapti, Kūnlāvadāna, Li’i yul lung bstan pa) that occur in the Tanjurs of Peking and Derge as well as in some editions of the Kanjur (e.g. Stok Palace and Ulan Bator), and one non-canonical text (Rnal ’byor chen po bsgom pa’i don), with ten texts still to be identified: 277 titles in total, 24 of them duplicated or even triplicated. One volume contains 101 dhāranis. All the texts are complete or almost complete; quite a number of folios, however, were replaced in later times, probably the 19th or even the 20th century. There is, however, not a single sher phyin text. Local rumours have it that the extant collection at Gondhla is only half of the original one, and that the other part, probably containing sher phyin and rgyud texts, is kept in Phukhar monastery in Zanskar.3

If this local information is based on fact, this collection could quite appropriately be called a ‘Proto-Kanjur’, representing a pre-canonical attempt to gather all of the words of the Buddha, that is, a rather extensive form of the smaller collections of texts which all Kanjurs ultimately go back to.4 As such, it could be either the copy of a similar ‘Proto-Kanjur’ or an original attempt towards such a compilation, which made use of existing mdo mangs volumes. Corruptions within some of the volumes make clear that the arrangement of the texts within them was taken over from older models: some of the texts have been separated into several parts, interrupted by passages from other texts that merge into each other without any indication; in some cases the beginning of the text appears more than 100 folios after its end. The only plausible explanation for this is that the volume was copied with its folios in disorder. Some of these mix-ups were detected by some later reader, and indicated as ‘error in the texts’ (or similar) in dbu med script; unfortunately but naturally without any reference to the correct text.

---
3 Personal communication of Tshering Dorje, Keylong.
4 See Eimer 2002: 4. For such attempts at pre-canonical collections of manuscripts see, e.g., Tucci 1988: 69f., and the short statement in Rin chen bzang po’s biography, reporting that he equipped even his smaller foundations with three volumes/copies (?) each of mdo mang(s) and seven volumes/copies (?) of ’Bum (Tucci 1988: 115, fol. 13a7–b1).
The question of dating the manuscripts poses some problems. On the basis of the stylistic evidence of the illuminations they have been dated to the 11th-12th centuries. From palaeographic and orthographic features one could tentatively date them to the second half of the 13th or early 14th century. Of course, it is highly problematic to restrict the dating of any Tibetan manuscript to a period of some fifty years on this basis alone. In the case of West-Tibetan manuscripts it is virtually impossible; too little material has been investigated as yet to justify any dating other than tentative and within a wider margin. The Gondhla manuscripts do present archaic elements that could—according to the classification established by Scherrer-Schaub—allow for an earlier date, but they do not occur consistently, and the ‘classical’ forms are to be found as well; even the negation med occurs without a ya btags, and the spelling myed is probably the most long-lived of all archaic forms. The particular mixture of old and new orthographic and palaeographic features seems to speak against an earlier dating; it cannot, however, be completely ruled out.

These archaic features will not be discussed at this point; they have been dealt with sufficiently elsewhere, and some of them will be mentioned later in this paper. The pagination system, however, deserves special mention. In general, the system typical for the time and the area is used: the letters na, ma, nga subscribed to the letter of the volume signature and followed by the numerals 1-100 indicate hundreds from fol. 101 onwards. This system is used even if the ‘set’ consists of only one volume; in general these one-set volumes bear the signatures Ka (1-100), Ka-Na ([10]1-200), Ka-Ma ([20]1-300), Ka-Nga ([30]1-400). There are, however, a few exceptions. In one case the hundreds are indicated by the letters ka, kha, ga plus numerals; once ka-ma does not appear, and ka-nga is used instead to denote fols. 201+; once ka-nga is replaced by ka-wa, however on folios replaced much later.

5 Klimburg-Salter 1994: 59, and personal communication of Ch. Luczanits.
8 This usage seems to be very rare, but it is not unique. One such instance is to be found also among the Tabo manuscripts (see Steinkellner 1994: 125).
A precise answer to the question of date could be given by historians if they knew the dates of Rdo rje pa la, the second chief of Ti nan according to the “Chronicles” and the genealogical tree of Ti nan published in Francke’s Antiquities of Indian Tibet. He is mentioned in dedication poems in two texts. The 12th chief, Ha ring ya, a contemporary of the Kullu king Bahādur Singh, has been dated to the middle of the 16th century by Francke. Francke’s estimate and an allowance of an average reign of 25 years for each chief places Rdo rje pa la in the last quarter of the 13th century. If, on the other hand, the manuscripts—and thus Rdo rje pa la—are not later than the 12th century, an average reign of at least 35 years would follow, which seems unlikely. Or one has to assume that the genealogical lists are incomplete, and at least three or four chiefs are missing from them; but there is not particular evidence for this.

The dedications offer additional information that might turn out to be valuable in one respect or other; they mention the chief’s palace as Sa de’u chung nal ze sku mkhar, and they give the names of donors and the scribe (Rdo rje rtse). In addition, they make clear that ‘Gondhla’ was originally the name of a sacred mountain, a mountain to the north of the village Gondhla, also known as Dril bu ri. The spellings “Ghan dha la” and “Gan da la” reflect the recent local pronunciation of the name when it is referred to the monastery that is commonly known as Guru Ghantal; when referred to the village, the pronunciation follows the modern Indian spelling. As a place-name the dedications give only Ti nan; it is, however, not clear whether this refers to the village or to the principality as a whole.

The non-canonical text mentioned earlier, the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don, is an anthology of sūtra quotations, very much in the style of the Sūtrasamuccaya, in answer to 88 questions that were obviously considered to be relevant for the “practice of mahāyoga” (rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa) and occur subsequent to the initial and

---

9 Francke 1926: 211ff.; there, the name appears in the forms Rdo rje pha la and Rdo rje pāl (= Rdo rje dpal?).
10 Ibid.: 214 (notes). Francke follows “Dr. Vogel’s investigations” in a work which he quotes as “Vogel, Jean Phillippe, Triloknāth etc”. It is not accessible to me.
11 sku mkhar Nal rtse in the Chronicle of Ti nan, Francke 1926: 212f.
12 Francke 1926: 215 derives ‘Gondhla’ as the name for the principality “from the important and ancient monastery of Gandhola, which is situated within its boundaries” (my emphasis).
crucial question: "How is the perfection of insight, which is homogeneous by nature and unitary, differentiated?" (shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa rang bzhin gyis mnyam zhung tshul gcig pa las so sor gyes pa ci lta bu zhe na).

A Dunhuang MS (PT 996) names the author: Spug Ye shes dbyangs. This text also sets the context with regard to religious history. It starts with Nam ka'i snying po, his spiritual lineage (Artan hywer - Be'u sing Hwa shang - Man Hwa shang - Nam ka'i snying po), his virtues, and a hymn composed by him in praise of the path of yoga. The following section, entitled Theg pa chen po rnam par myi rtog par bsgom pa'i lam, contains a biographical sketch of Spug Ye shes dbyangs and names him as the author of the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don. Although the actual relation between the two masters is not stated—Spug Ye shes dbyangs is only said to have died in the hermitage of Nam ka'i snying po—the structure of the text suggests a rather close one. Accordingly, his work can safely be associated more generally with the dhyāna - gcig car pa tradition commonly connected with Hwa shang Mahāyāna. Bu ston even attributes the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don to Hwa shang Mahāyāna in his Chos 'byung; considering the evidence of the much older manuscript from Dunhuang, this seems highly questionable. However, the catalogue of the 5th Dalai Lama's library at 'Bras spungs, too, lists the manuscript of a "Mdo sde brgyad cu'i khungs composed by Hwa shang mahā ya na". In the Gondhla collection it is preceded by the Kuśalamūlaparidharasūtra (Q 769) and followed

---

13 771–850 acc. Okimoto 1993 (s. Otokawa 1999: n. 1). In view of Bka' thang sde lnga Nga 66b5–67a1 (quoted in Okimoto 1993: 18), however, this date appears problematic and possibly too late. This passage—following a report of the foundation of Bsam yas, and placed between the lists of 76 primarily Indian scholars and of the sad mi mi bdun—tells about a text which strikingly resembles our Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don: it is called a (?) Rnal 'byor chen po sgom pa'i lung which consists of 88 chapters of questions in four bam po and contains quotations from 80 sūtras; as its additional title Rin chen phreng ba is given. The author of the text is not mentioned, but the 88 questions are closely and directly attributed to King Khri Srong lde btsan.

14 Possibly identical with the Nam mkha'i snying po mentioned in Bka' thang sde lnga (Nga 67a1) among the sad mi mi bdun; cf. Tucci 1958: 13.


16 Szerb 1990: 35f.

17 'Bras spungs dpe rnying dkar chag: 1655, No 018810. On this alternative title of the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don see below.
by the Paramārthadharmavijaya (Q 912) and Dānapāramitāsūtra (Q 849).

Until now this text was extant only in fragments from Dunhuang (PT 818 and ST 705)\(^{18}\) and Tabo (provisional numbers 36 and 89).\(^{19}\) The Dunhuang material, together with other texts of this tradition, has been studied by Lalou 1939 (including a facsimile edition of PT 996, referred to by its provisional number 202), Imaeda 1975 and Okimoto 1993; the Tabo fragments were recently presented in Otokawa 1999.

The present paper does not intend to touch upon the content or the religious significance of the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don, but concentrates on technical and structural aspects relevant for the editing of the text, which is in progress.

The full title of the text is given four times at the beginning of the bam pos: Rnal 'byor chen po/por/pos bsgom pa'i don (1) theg pa chen po'i mdo’ (sde [zar mo]) las btus pa. At the beginning and the end of the MS it is referred to as Mdo sde brgyad bcu khungs and Brgyad bcu khungs, respectively; this title is also given in PT 996 (4a5: Mdo sde brgyad bcu'i khungs) and by Bu ston (see above). As the expression mdo (sde'i) khungs ni brgyad bcu zhig bzhugs (“the sūtra-testimony comprises 80 [texts quoted]”) appears in the text itself, Otokawa argues that this cannot be taken as the title of a work;\(^{20}\) he nevertheless accepts PT 996 as evidence for Spug Ye shes dbyangs being the author of the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don. In addition, what is given as the title in PT 996 and by Bu ston and affirmed by the Gondhla manuscript is not Mdo sde'i khungs brgyad bcu, but (Mdo sde) brgyad bcu(’)i khungs (“[having] 80 sūtras [as its] source”, or similar), and thus the Gondhla manuscript makes it fairly clear that this is the alternative title of the Rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don. For the sake of convenience it will henceforth be referred to by the short title Brgyad bcu khungs.

The text commences with a verse section, and the opening lines read:

\(^{18}\) Thanks to Burkhard Quessel for making all the Dunhuang material mentioned available to me.

\(^{19}\) Fragments of a third manuscript of this text have been identified among the Tabo materials (provisional number 149) after the completion of the present paper; its variant readings could not be taken account of.

\(^{20}\) Otokawa 1999: 102f.
"The purpose of practising yoga is, in short, [to find out] how the homogeneous and unitary [perfection of] insight is differentiated. In order to explain this unity, there are 88 chapters of questions. The sūtra-testimony comprises 80 [texts quoted]."

(rnal 'byor bsgom don mdo r bs dus na || shes rab mnyam nyid tshul gcig las || so sor gyes pa ci lta bu || tshul gcig de'i don bstand phyir || zhus pa'i le'u brgyad bcu brgyad || mdo'i don ni brgyad bceur bs dus ||)

Then follow, also in verse, the 88 questions that will be dealt with. This "[list of] 88 chapters of questions" (zhus pa'i le'u brgyad bcu rtsa brgyad{pa}, see Appendix A) is followed by a list of the sūtras that will be quoted (see Appendix B). It comprises 82 titles; three of them, Nos. 66 (duplication of 30), 72 and 76 (duplication of 25) on the list, are added as corrections in the margin.

Some of these titles, however, are duplications, either through the Tibetan and the Sanskrit titles of the same text being given (Dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po'i mdo' and Pun dha ri ka'i mdo', Nos. 6 and 26; Da sha bu myi'i mdo' and Sa bcu'i mdo', Nos. 78 and 79), through simple repetition ('Byung ba m(y)ed pa'i mdo', Nos. 30 and 66), or through superficially diverging names being given (De bzhin gshegs pa'i gsang ba'i mdo' and Gsang ba'i mdo', Nos. 13 and 48; Glang po dang mtshungs pa'i mdo' and 'Phags pa glang dang mtshungs pa'i mdo', Nos. 25 and 76; Dkon mchog brtsegs pa'i mdo' and Dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i mdo', Nos. 33 and 57). In one case actually alternative titles of the same text are cited (Ting nge 'dzin rd byal po'i mdo'/Samādhīrājasūtra and Zla ba sgron ma'i mdo'/Candrapradīpasūtra, Nos. 55 and 64);\(^{21}\) Zla ba mar mye'i mdo' (No. 65) is most probably an alternative translation of the same title. In the same way Tshangs pa kun 'dris kyi mdo' and ('Phags pa) Tshangs pas zhus pa'i mdo' (Nos. 22 and 82) also seem to be different translations of the same title (Brahmaparipṛcchāsūtra).

In the Brgyad bceu khungs proper, too, all these alternative forms appear, together with some additional ones (e.g. Zla ba'i le'u for Zla ba'i snying po'i mdo' [No. 7] or Sdong po{s} bkod pa'i mdo' for Gsdong [= Sdong] pos brgyand pa'i mdo' [No. 43])\(^{22}\) which are not listed separately. Three titles cited but not appearing on the list, how-

\(^{21}\) On these alternative titles see, e.g., Dutt 1941: I-X; Tropper 2005: 51f.

ever, seem to be additional texts rather than alternative titles or translations, namely, *Tshangs pa khyad par sms kyis zhus pa'i mdo’*, *Ki sin lon gyi mdo’*, and *Teg chen sa chen gyi mdo’*.

Together with the 82 titles of the list this amounts to 85 titles referring to some 76 texts (see Appendix B). However, the duplications of titles and texts reflect the rather mechanical way in which the author took the quotations over from various sources, and due to this some uncertainty remains as to how many texts are actually referred to as Prajñāpāramitā (*Shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i mdo’*), Ratnakūta (*Dkon mchog brtsegs pa [chen po]'i mdo’*), and Buddhāvatsaṅsaka (*Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo’*). At the present stage this question cannot be decided, as the identification of the greater part of the quotations remains to be done. Under the title *Shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i mdo’* we find quotations from the Pañcavimśati-sāhasrikā and the Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya, and citations from other Prajñāpāramitā texts cannot be excluded. *Dkon mchog brtsegs pa'i mdo’* refers to the Kāśyapaparivarta in most of the identified quotations, but also to the Maitreyamahāsīmyānā in one case; in the remaining quotations additional texts from the Ratnakūta collection might be referred to, but also sūtras already listed individually. The Gaṇḍavyūha is quoted in both ways, under its individual title (*Gsdong pos brgyand pa'i mdo'i Sdong pos bkod pa'i mdo’*) and as Buddhāvatsaṅsaka (*Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo’*), which might also refer to other texts of this collection.

As many quotations are still to be identified, the sources for the quotations are also not yet clear in most of the instances; however, Spug Ye shes dbyangs seems to have made extensive use of the Sūtrasamuccaya. In some cases his quotations are much closer to the Sūtrasamuccaya version than to the canonical versions of the respective texts; others, however, deviate from both. The Sūtrasamuccaya and the Brgyad bceu khungs have corresponding sections and occasionally even quotations in the same order. Apart from the Sūtrasamuccaya the Brgyad bceu khungs also seems to depend on what Otokawa refers to as “some Chinese apocryphal text(s)”.

---

23 Otokawa 1999: 103 and 112–117. In particular he mentions a Chinese anthology provisionally called *Zhujing yao chao*, which exists only as a fragment. Cf. PT 996: 4a3–5 (Lalou 1939: 521), where it is stated that the text was composed making use of the precepts and instructions of skilled Indian, Chinese and Tibetan experts on samādhi as well as of Mahāyāna sūtras of explicit meaning (... rgya gar
The Brgyad bcu khungs proper commences with the initial question already mentioned. In accordance with the verse text, the following 88 chapters of questions generally consist of one question each. As an exception, Question No. 21 is split into two. The verse-text reads: “As direct, intuitive knowledge is the object consisting in the meaning, what is it like to be attached to words, not knowing the meaning of direct, intuitive knowledge?” (rang rig dond kyi spyod yul phyir || rang rig don ni ma rig nas || sgra la chags pa ci lta bu), and this is represented with: “What is it that a yogi has to follow for the sake of direct, intuitive knowledge?” ([de la] rnal 'byord pa rang gis rig pa'i don kyi phyir 'brang bar bya ba gang [zhe na]) and: “Of what kind is the fault of adhering to words?” (sgra ci bzhin du song ba'i nyes pa ci lta bu [zhe na]). Four of the chapters (29, 30, 58, 81) seem to be sub-divided by additional questions that are formally identical with the 88 main questions, but are not represented in verse. They are taken over from the respective source-text, where they function as introductions to the immediately following quotations only. In three of the cases this source-text is the Sūtrasamuccaya; in one case it could not be identified, but an analogous situation can be assumed with some certainty.

In a quite unique manner these 88 chapters are presented in groups of—theoretically—11, with the chapter numbers mentioned at the end of each group: 11, 22, 33, etc. This, of course, is helpful with regard to checking and—when necessary—establishing the correct flow of the text (see Appendix A, questions No. 44–49), but the actual, inconsistent execution of this system also poses a problem. The indication “chapter 11” appears after the tenth question, and this sequence is confirmed by the Tabo fragments. This could mean that the initial question is counted by mistake, although it clearly should not be (see Appendix A). As a consequence, one of the following groups should contain 12 questions. In fact, the group ending with the indication “chapter 66” after question 64, again, contains only 10, and the following two groups contain 12 questions each. As this grouping, too, seems to be confirmed by the Tabo manuscripts, it could be a rather old corruption; however, there is no obvious break to indicate

dang 

[MS nam] ngag dang | de dag gi don dang | theg pa chen po'i mdo sde nges pa'i don du gsungs pa rnams kyi khungs dang yang gtugs nas |...).
disorder in the flow of the text. Probably the easiest solution is to assume that it is a slip of the author himself.

The Gondhla manuscript comprises 40 folios (plus two lines), from Ka-Na 99a10 to Ka-Ma 40a10, with one folio bearing a double number (Ka-Ma 15/16). Although no folio is missing, the text is not complete. The equivalent of slightly less than one folio (probably one folio of the recension copied) is missing; it could also not be detected mixed into one of the other texts of this volume, in the manner mentioned above. Fortunately this missing passage is totally covered by the Tabo fragments. However, this is not the only corruption in the Gondhla manuscript. At least in one case the sequence of the text is in severe disorder, but it could be re-established.  

Until now, the investigation of almost all the manuscripts from western Tibet has revealed considerable independence, and we tend to speak of a "West Tibetan manuscript tradition". This, of course, implies not only independence from other traditions, but also some relation between the manuscripts of the area. The present text seems to be suitable for an enquiry into the question of such an interdependence, and the Gondhla manuscript [G] has been compared with the available fragments for this purpose.

PT 818 and ST 705 comprise 12 folios of a manuscript which must originally have consisted of some 70–72 folios. Although these fragments are kept in distinct collections, they clearly belong to the same manuscript [D].

The following folios are extant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka 4 (PT 818)</td>
<td>Ka-Ma1a5–b4</td>
<td>19 (PT 818)</td>
<td>9b7–10a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (PT 818)</td>
<td>1b5–2a6</td>
<td>22 (ST 705)</td>
<td>11a6–b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (PT 818)</td>
<td>4a2–b4</td>
<td>25 (PT 818)</td>
<td>12b9–13a10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (PT 818)</td>
<td>5a6–b9</td>
<td>27 (PT 818)</td>
<td>14a2–b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (ST 705)</td>
<td>6b1–7a2</td>
<td>33 (ST 705)</td>
<td>17b2–18a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (ST 705)</td>
<td>7b3–8a</td>
<td>36 (ST 705)</td>
<td>19a9–20a1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 Ka-Na 99a10–Ka-Ma 21a7; 22b3–24a6; 21a10–22b3; 21a7–10[!]; 24a6ff. Essentially, this corruption can be explained by the exemplar copied having had its folios in disorder; the reason for the misplacement of less than three lines (21a7–10), however, is unclear.

25 Cf. Otokawa 1999: n. 2. According to the Gondhla manuscript the two folios of PT 818 that are partly broken and without pagination can be identified as fol. 4 and 11.
Tabo 36 [T(A)] consists of 9 out of approximately 35–36 folios for the entire manuscript. Of Tabo 89 [T(B)] we have only three folios. Their paginations, Ka 3, 16 and 22, are clearly legible, but they cannot be correct, unless the equivalent of at least ten folios was already missing from its model when the manuscript was produced; 3, 26 and 32 would suit much better, as “folio 22” contains the end of the text, with only two to three lines left to follow. As each of the three folios contains only slightly more text than the Gondhla folios do, it simply is not possible that the entire text can be covered by 22 folios + 2–3 lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T(A)</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka 3</td>
<td>1a6–2a10</td>
<td>Ka 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>9b7–12a1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (a1–8)</td>
<td>15/16b2–10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19a5–20a9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27a8–b10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27–29</td>
<td>29b3–33a4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two passages extant in both fragments (equivalent to G 1b5–2a10 and 32b3–33a4), T(A) and T(B) show only some insignificant variants; they can therefore be assumed to represent the same tradition, and for the present purpose they are treated as one manuscript [T].

The following sections of G are represented in both the other manuscripts, T and D: 1a6–2a6; 9b7–10a3; 11a6–b6; 19a9–20a1—the equivalent of about three folios altogether.

With regard to palaeography, all three manuscripts are similar, with very few exceptions: the *gi gu log*, for example, is quite frequent in D, but appears only two to three times in T and only once in G; in G the ligature *sp* occurs in its ‘classic’ form as well as in the horizontal type, in the most extreme form in the combination *spy(o)*; *st* takes, in the majority of cases, its ‘classic’ form.

Still, there are some general orthographic differences: in T the *da drag* appears slightly more frequently than in G and particularly D, and the spelling *ji* is used where G and D generally have *ci*. The su-

---

26 D consistently spells *pha rol du phyin pa* instead of *pha rold tu phyind pa*, the usual form in T and G.
perabundant 'a rjes 'jug is much more frequent in G than it is in T and D, particularly in the word mdo('); D, on the other hand, uses it more often with the particles pa(') and na('). However, none of the manuscripts is really consistent in any of these respects, and these features are certainly not relevant for establishing or rejecting any relation between the manuscripts; in the present comparison they are disregarded.

Taking into account all the other variants, regardless of how insignificant they might be (i.e. including all sorts of orthographic variants, the placing of the shad, etc.), G appears to be closer to T than to D: in the—admittedly very short—passages covered by all three manuscripts, G agrees with T against D in some 44% of all the variant readings, in some 38% T and D agree against G, and only 12% show an agreement of G and D against T; in the remaining 6% all three disagree.

In the majority of the more substantial variants, however, T and D agree against G. A few examples will suffice:
Ka-Ma 1b1: 'thun mthun tu gsungs pa (G) : 'thun 'thun du bsdu ba (DT),
1b2: phyir (G) : slad du (DT),
1b8: rdzogs pa'i byang chub par (G) : rdzogs par (DT[A and B]),
2a5: nang nas (G) : steng du (DT[A and B]),
11b4: bkri ba'i mdo sde'i don (G) : bkri ba'i don kyi mdo sde (DT),
19b2: las dang po bya'i byang chub sens dpa' (G) : las byed pa'i byang chub sens dpa' (DT).

Occasionally G is closer to T than D:
1b9: stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams (G), stong gsum gyi 'jig rten gyi khams (T[A and B]) : stong gi khams (D),
or it represents a mixture of the two:
1b10: yi ge tshig tsam thos pa (G), yi ge 'di tshig gcig tshig thos pa (T[A and B]), yi ge 'di tshig [sic] gcig thos pa'i tsam (D).

At least in one instance G and D largely agree against T:
11b2: nye bar zhi ba mthong la l (D ba) rang bzhi gyis snyoms par mthong ba (DG) : nye bar zhi ba mthong ba (T); T corresponds to the canonical versions (Peking and Derge) of the text quoted (Bodhisattvapitaka), as well as to the version of the Sūtrasamuccaya (Peking and Derge).

It has, however, to be noted that variants consisting of omissions of words and phrases do not necessarily indicate a different textual
tradition if they appear in only one manuscript—and quite a number of variants within these three manuscripts are of this kind; occasionally they might even point to a common model. In the list of śūtras to be quoted, D does not list the—duplicated—’Phags po glang dang mtshungs pa’i mdo, and in G it was inserted later by a second hand. This might be sheer coincidence, but it could also mean that neither of the manuscripts copied for G and D respectively had it, and that the addition in G reflects an editorial effort.

In a similar way, something that at first glance appears to be a variant reading might point to a relation between G and D. Instead of myi gnas par (G 7b6), D reads myi dmyigs par, however with an n subsequently inserted between the g and s, so that we have the rather strange combination of dmyigs and (d)myi gnas in one word. This could be a—not very successful—attempt to correct myi dmyigs par to myi gnas par.

Strong evidence for any manuscripts belonging to the same tradition is provided by the occurrence of common obvious mistakes that are not likely to happen twice independently:

In one case G gives the title of the present text as Rnal ’byor chen po bsgoms pa’i mdo’ las btus pa, instead of Rnal ’byor chen po bsgom pa’i don | theg pa chen po’i mdo’ (sde) las btus pa (10a4). Essentially the same reading with only insignificant variants (chen po : chen po, bsgom : bsgoms, mdo sde : mdo’) is found in T; unfortunately this passage is not extant in D.

To sum up the preliminary results of this investigation, which are still very hypothetical, remaining to be proved or disproved by future studies:

- The independence of the ‘Gondhla Kanjur’ from the mainstream Kanjur tradition(s) is, in the present case, shown by the mere existence of the Brgyad bcu khungs within a mdo mangs collection.
- All three manuscripts of the Brgyad bcu khungs, D, T and G, depend on a common archetype. Given the scarcity of the material, it cannot be decided whether this archetype might be the autograph or a derivate thereof.
- At least T and G represent distinct branches of the same tradition.
APPENDIX A: ZHU5 PA’I LE’U BRGYAD BCU RTS5 BRGYAD

With regard to orthography, the versions of Gondhla are retained; variant readings of any other sort have been tacitly incorporated where it seemed appropriate. In the case of unsupported corrections the respective versions of the manuscript are added in round brackets; unsupported amendments are in square brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Prose text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rnal 'byor chen po (MS pos/por) bsgom pa’i don \ theg pa chen po’i mdo’ sde zab mo las btus pa \ le’u brgyad bcu’ rtsa brgyad pa \ bam po dang po ’o \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.</td>
<td>shes rab mnyam nyid tshul gcig</td>
<td>shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa rang bzhin gyis mnyam zhung tshul gcig pa las so sor gyes pa ci lta bu (1a8) bstand te l mdo sde’i khungs ni brgyad bcu zhig bzhus \ thesom zhus pa’i le’u ni brgyad bcu rtsa brgyad do (1a10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>las \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so sor gyes pa ci lta bu \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tshul gcig de’i don bstand phyir \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zhus pa’i le’u brgyad bcu brgyad \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mdo’i don ni brgyad bcur bsdus \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>mdo btus bstand gnang ci lta bu \</td>
<td>mdo’ sde’i don kyi mdo’ btu zhing sems can la stond tu gnang ba’i gtan tshigs ci lta bu (1b4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>’jig rten sprul gshegs ci ltar bka’ \</td>
<td>sangs rgyas sprul pa’i sku ’jig rten du gshegs shing chos bstand par dka’ ba ci lta bu (1b10f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>myi lus khom ldan ci lta bu \</td>
<td>myi lus thob cing chos spyod pa dang ldan pa’i dus dka’ ba ci lta bu (2a4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>myi lus myi rtag ci ltar gyur \</td>
<td>myi lus thob pa myi rtag pa ci lta bu (2a6f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>myi lus thob nas ci ltar dad  [myi lus thob nas sangs rgyas kyi chos la dad pa ci lta bu (2b1)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>dad nas byung ba'i yon tan ci  [dad nas rab tu byung ba'i yon tan dang legs pa ci lta bu (2b7)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>sangs rgyas rang bzhin de bzhin nyid  [rab tu byung nas sangs rgyas kyi rang bzhin bdag la yod par ci ltar yod (3a5)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bdag gnyis la ni ci ltar yod  [sems can la sangs rgyas kyi rang bzhin de ltar yod pa las ci ltar khruld (3a10)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>de las 'khruld te ci ltar khyams  [sangs rgyas kyi ngo bo nyid de ltar 'khruld pa de da ci byas rig (3b8)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.................................]  [sangs rgyas kyi ngo bo nyid dang po sems bskyed pa'i sems can gnyis mthong du rung ngam myi rung(4a3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ci byas pas ni rig par 'gyur  [le'u becu gcig pa'o (4a9)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>dang por sems bskyed sems can gnyis  [cig car rig pa'i phyi mo'i tshor ba ci lta bu (4a9)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.................................]  [rigs pa'i byin kyis bag chags cig car 'dag pa ci lta bu (4b5f.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>cig car rig pa ci lta bu  [dngos po ni cig car 'dag pa ma yin te l rims kyis dag par 'gyur ba ci lta bu (5a9)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>rig nas gcig car ci ltar 'dag (MS bdag)  [de la shes bya'i sgrub pa ci lta bu (6a6)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>rim gys 'dag (MS bdag) la ci lta bu  [zag pa myed pa'i ye shes la ye shes skad cig nyon mongs yod dam myed (6a9f.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.................................]  [mdo' sde zab mo la dad pa dang l mos pas sdig pa byang ba ci lta bu (6b7)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>shes bya'i sgrub pa 'ang gang zhib lags  [zab mo la dad pas bla na myed pa'i byang chub tu sems bskyed pa ci ltar (7a4)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>zag pa myed pa'i ye shes la skad cig nyon mongs yod dam myed  [dang po'i sems bskyed pas chos rig pa de'i yon tan dang sems can gnyi don byed pa'i mthu' ci lta bu (7b6f.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>zhab la 'bad pas ci ltar spyad  [dang po byang chub tu sems bskyed pa la rnam pa tu (8b3)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>bla myed sems bskyed ci lta bu  [cig car rig pa ci lta bu (8a9)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>de'i yon tan gang zhib lags  [rigs pa'i byin kyis bag chags cig car 'dag pa ci lta bu (8b5f.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>sems bskyed de la rnam pa tu  [dngos po ni cig car 'dag pa ma yin te l rims kyis dag par 'gyur ba ci lta bu (9a9)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>zab la dad par gang phyir 'brang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>rang rig don kyi spyod yul phyir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rang rig don ni ma rig nas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sgra la chags pa ci lta bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ye shes phyir 'brang gang zhig lags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ye shes de nyid ci lta bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>rnam shes phyir 'brang gang zhig lags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ci bzhin sgra phyir ma song bar lges don mdo phyir ci ltar 'brang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>bkri phyir 'brang ba yang gang zhig lags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>stong ba'i 'du shes ci lta bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>chos nyid phyir 'brang gang zhig lags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>dkon mchog gsum ni tshul gcig pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mchod pa rim 'gro ci ltar bgyi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>dam chos 'dzind pa 'ang gang zhig lags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>de'i snyig rje ci lta bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>bshags pa de yang ci lta bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>bsod nams de yang ci lta bsngo'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. de ltar tshul cig lam bsgoms pas ||
    nyan thos kyi ni sdom par dang ||
    dbyangs la brten pa dgongs myi
    dgongs ||
    theg pa chen po dmyigs su myed par
    tshul gcig pa'i lam bsgoms pas l
    nyan thos kyi phy'i'i sdom pa dang l gnyed
    pa sbyangs pa'i yon tan la brtend
dgos sam myi dgos (14b9f.)
sbyangs ba'i yon tan ji lta bu (T[A]
15b9, missing in G)
35. sbyangs pa nyid ni ci lta bu ||
    tshul gcig par dang po sems bskyed
    pas dge ba'i bshes nyen la brtend na l
dgos sam myi dgos (17a3f.)
dge ba'i bshes gnyen la brtend dgos
na l ci lta bu la rten (17b5)
myi dge ba'i bshes gnyen ci lta bu
(17b10)
36. dge ba'i bshes gnyen ci ltar brten ||
    sdig pa'i grogs po spang ba gang
(18b3)
37. ci lta bu la brtend par bgyi' ||
    'di ltar sdig pa'i grogs po spangs nas l
dge ba'i grogs po dang gnas pa ci lta
bu (18b9f.)
38. myi dge bshes gnyen gang zhig
    lags ||
    sdig pa'i dge slong gis l de bzhin
gshegs pa'i bstand pa 'jig pa ci lta bu
(19a5f.)
39. sdig pa'i grogs po ci ltar spang ||
    tshul gcig pa'i don ma rig nas dge
    ba'i bar chad byed cing rma 'byind
    pa ci lta bu (19b4)
40. dge ba'i grogs po ci ltar brtend ||
    byang chub sems bskyed de dag
    la ||
    le'u bzh'i bcu rtsa bzh'i pa'o ||
    legs bya bsod nams ci lta bu ||
    (22b5 !)
41. bstand pa yang ni ci ltar 'jig ||
    rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don
    theg pa chen po'i mdo las btus pa ||
    bam po [gsum pa'o] ||
42.chos la rma'byind gang zhig lags ||
    tshul gcig pa'i don ma rig nas dge
    ba'i bar chad byed cing rma 'byind
    pa ci lta bu (19b4)
43. byang chub sems bskyed de dag
    la ||
    le'u bzh'i bcu rtsa bzh'i pa'o ||
    legs bya bsod nams ci lta bu ||
    (22b7 !)
44. tshul khrims dang ni lta nyams
    pas ||
    ci tsam gyis na yon gnas 'gyur ||
    yon gnas myi 'gyur gang zhig
    lags l
    tshul khrims nyams pas yon gnas su
    ci tsam gyis na l yon gnas su 'gyur
    myi 'gyur ba ci lta bu (22b7 !)
45. ci tsam gyis na yon gnas 'gyur ||
    (23a1 !)
46. rang gis rig pa'i don mthong nas / 
chos stond gnang ba ci lta bu / 
yang dag pa'i don rang gis rig nas / 
gzhan la chos bstond tu gnang ba ci lta bu (23a8f. !)

47. thos pa'i shes rab gang zhig lags / 
48. bsam pa'i shes rab ci lta bu / 
49. sgom pa'i shes rab de'ang gang / 
50. theg gsum de yang ci lta bu / 
ths pa'i shes rab ci lta bu (21a10 !) 
bsam pa'i shes rab ci lta bu (21b10 !) 
bsgoms pa'i shes rab ci lta bu (22a6f. !)
tshul gcig pa'i theg pa gsum gyi 
khya par dang l myi dmyigs par ro gcig pa ci lta bu (22b2)

thep pa gcig ces bya ba de nyid ci lta bu (24a6)

51. theg pa gcig tu ci ltar 'du / 
chos rnam kun las ci ltar grol / 
byang chub sems theg pa gcig la 
zhugs pa'i sgyu ma lta bu'i ting nge 
dzind gang (24b7f.)

52. theg pa gcig la bslabs pa yis / 
chos rnam kun las ci ltar grol / 
chos thams cad grol bar bshad ci 
ltar gyur (24b2f.)

53. theg pa gcig la zhugs pa'i / 
sgyu ma lta bu'i ting 'dzind gang / 
chos thams cad tshul gcig ro gcig ces 
bya ba de nyid ci lta bu (25a4)
le'u lnga bcu rtsa lnga pa'o / 
(26a2)

54. chos rnam tshul cig ci lta bu / 
myi dmyigs pa'i tshul gcig pa'i don 
'di ma rtogs nas l chos spong ba'i 
nyes pa ci lta bu (26a2)
de lta bu'i tshul gcig pa'i zab mo la 
dad pa'i bsod nams kyi khya par ci 
lta bu (26b5)

de lta bu'i tshul gcig pa'i byang chub 
kyi sems ci lta bu (27a3)

55. tshul gcig don ni ma gtogs par / 
chos spong nyes pa 'ang gang 
zhig lags / 
myi dmyigs pa'i tshul gcig pa'i don 
'di ma rtogs nas l chos spong ba'i 
nyes pa ci lta bu (26a2)
de lta bu'i tshul gcig pa'i zab mo la 
dad pa'i bsod nams kyi khya par ci 
lta bu (26b5)

56. tshul gcig zab la dad pa'i / 
bsod nams khyad par ci lta bu / 
de lta bu'i tshul gcig pa'i zab mo la 
dad pa'i bsod nams kyi khya par ci 
lta bu (26b5)

57. byang chub sems ni gang zhig 
lags / 
chos thams cad mkhyend pa 'ang ci lta 
byang chub 
bsod nams khyad par ci lta bu (27a3)

58. tshul gcig zab la dad pa'i / 
bsod nams khyad par ci lta bu / 
mmam pa thams cad mkhyend pa nyid 
bsod bskyed pa ci lta bu (27b8)

59. myi dmyigs par ni tshul gcig pa'i / 
tshul khrims dang ni ting 'dzind 
dang / 
mmmyi dmyigs par ni tshul gcig pa'i / 
tshul khrims dang ni ting 'dzind 
shtshing phun gsum (MS 
gsum) tshogs / 
shes rab ci lta bu phun sum (MS 
gsum) tshogs / 
ting nge 'dzind gang (28b5)

60. ting'dzind nyid ni gang zhig lags / 
61. de'i shes rab ci lta bu / 
shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa la 
spyod pa ci lta bu (29a2f.)

62. rnam'hard gsum gyi sgo ni gang / 
shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa 
myi dmyigs par tshul gcig pa'i rnam
63. rang bzhin gyis ni ci ltar stong  //
par thard pa'i sgo gsum ci lta bu
(30a4f.)
shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i
tshul gcig pa'i don de ci ltar rang
bzhin gyis stong (31a1)
stong pa nyid ci ltar rang bzhin gyis
rnam par dag pas myi 'gyur ba yin
(31b1)
le'u drug bceu rtsa drug pa'o  //
(31b8)

rnal 'byor chen po bsgom pa'i don  //
theq pa chen po'i mdo sde las btus
pa  //
bam po bzhi pa  //

65. ci lta bu'i stong nyid la  //
dang po nyid nas bbrten bsgoms
na  //
thams cad lhund kyis ci ltar 'grub  //
de lta bu'i chos kyi dbyings stong pa
nyid la dang po sems bskyed pa'i
byang chub sems dpas brten te l
bsgom na chos thams cad rdzogs
shing lhund kyis grub par 'gyur bar
ci mgon (31b9f.)
dang po sems bskyed pas shes rab
kyi pha rold tu phyind pa zab mo la
tshul gcig pa la bsgom pa'i bdud kyi
las ci lta bu (32a6f.)
mu stegs kyi lta ba rgyang phan pa ji
lta bu (32b2)
deo myi dmyigs par tshul gcig pa'i
pha rold tu phyind pa drug ci lta bu
(32b5)
deo ltar pha rold tu phyind pa drug
shes rab kyis ma zind te l 'khor gsum
ma dag pa'i nyes pa ji lta bu (33a3f.)
deo ltar shes rab kyis ma zind pa'i
'dus byas dmyigs pa'i bsod nams
kyis mya ngan las 'das ba'i mgon
sum gyi rgyur myi 'gyur na l rgyud
pa'i rgyu tsam du yang myi 'gyur
ram (33b4f.)
71. dbu ma’i lam ni ci lta bu  || theg pa chen po myi dmyigs par
    tshul gcig pa’i dbu ma’i lam ’di ci lta
    bu (34a6)
72. chos dang gang zag bdag myed
    cing  || theg pa chen po’i chos dang gang
    lag la bdag myed pa ci lta bu (34b3)
34 myi skye bzod pa gang zhig lags  || myi skye ba’i bzod pa ci lta bu
(34b6)
74. dang po pas ni sems bskyed nas ||
    myi dmyigs tshul du bsgom pa la  ||
    dang po sems bskyed pa nas myi
    dmyigs pa bsgom pa las sar ci ltar
    ’phar (34b8)
75. brten cing ’brel d par gang ’byung
    ba  || rtend cing ’brel bar ’byung ba rang
    bzhin gyis ma skyes ci lta bu  ||
    rang bzhin ma skyes ci lta bu (34b5f.)
76. kun rdzob don dam bden (MS dben) pa gang  ||
    kun rdzob dang l don dam pa’i bden
    pa ci lta bu (35b1)
    le’u bdun bcu rtsa bdun pa’o  ||
    (35b10)
77. phyi nang gi ni chos rnam kun  ||
    sems las ci ltar sprul’d te ’byung  ||
    ci nang gi chos thams cad sems
    ’khrul’d pa las ci ltar ’byung (35b10)
78. myi dmyigs tshul gcig bsgoms pa
    yin  || tshul gcig tu myi dmyigs pas ’phags
    pa’i bden pa bzhiz las stsogs  ||
    pa’i bden pa bzhisi las stsogs pa chos
    thams cad rdzogs par ’gyur ba ci lta
    bu (36a5f.)
79. mtshan nyid gsum yang ci lta bu  ||
    chos lnga dang mtshan nyid gsum
    tshul gcig pa ji lta bu (36b4)
80. gnyis su myed pa ’ang gang zhig
    lags  || dmyigs pa’i tshul gcig par gnyis su
    myed pa ci lta bu (36b8)
81. thabs dang shes rab ci ltar ’breld  ||
    myi dmyigs pa’i tshul gcig pa’i thabs
    dang shes rab zung du ’breld pa ci lta
    bu (37a4)
82. zhi gnas lhag mthong ci lta bur  ||
    zhi gnas dang lhag mthong gang
    (38a1)
83. mya ngan ’das lam gang zhig
    lags  ||
    theg pa chen po’i myi dmyigs pa’i
    tshul gcig pa’i mya ngan las ’das pa
    ci lta bu (38a4f.)
84. mya ngan ’das las stsogs pa’i  ||
    mya ngan las ’das pa las stsogs pa’i
    chos thams cad rmyi lam lta bu ci
    ltar yin (38b5)
85. ’bras bu sku gsum ci lta bu  ||
    mya ngan las ’das pa’i ’bras bu’i sku
    gsum ci lta bu (39a2)
APPENDIX B: TEXTS QUOTED

Titles in round brackets indicate alternative forms, as they appear in the *Brgyad bcu khungs*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>in the list</th>
<th>in the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shes rab kyi pha rold tu phyind pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sangs rgyas kyi mdzod kyi mdo'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'Dul ba bzhung pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gser 'od dam pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Phyogs su rgyas pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po'i mdo' = 26</td>
<td>5 (Pad ma dkar po'i mdo')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zla ba'i sning po'i mdo'</td>
<td>6 (Zla ba'i le'u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bskald ba bzang po'i mdo'</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yang dag par ldan pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gcig las 'phros pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dri ma myed par grags pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>10 (Dri ma myed pa/pa'i/par/pas bstand pa'i mdo')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mtshan ma bzang po'i mdo'</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>De bzhin gshegs pa'i gsang ba'i mdo' = 48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yid gnyis yang dag par 'joms pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dad pa stobs bskyed pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>'Jam dpal gnas pa'i mdo'</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rdo rje ting nge 'dzind kyi mdo'</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>De bzhin gshegs pa'i sning po'i mdo'</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 Lang kar gshegs pa'i mdo'
20 Gtsug tor chen po'i mdo'
21 Rdo rje gcod pa'i mdo'

missing

22 Tshangs pa kun 'dris kyi mdo' = 82 ?
23 Chos kyi rgyal po'i mdo'
24 Shing then wang pa zha'i mdo'
25 Glang po dang mtshungs pa'i mdo' = 76

26 Pun dha ri ka'i mdo' = 6
27 Par ne rwan gyi mdo'

28 Rta skad dbyang byub sems dpai'is dris pa'i mdo'
29 Bsam gtan gyi bsgo'i mdo'
30 'Byung ba myed pa'i mdo' = 66
31 Byang chub kyi sde snod kyi mdo'
32 Sa de'i mdo'
33 Dkon mchog rtsegs pa'i mdo' = 57
34 Shes rab bdun brgya' ba'i mdo'
35 Rnam par myi rtog pa'i mdo'
36 De bzhin gshegs pa mdzod kyi mdo'
37 Rgyal po ma skyes sgra'i mdo'

38 Sangs rgyas phal po che'i mdo'
39 Rab kyi rtsald kyis rnam par gnond pa'i mdo'
40 Rin po che'i phung po'i mdo'
41 Dkon mchog sprin gyi mdo'
42 Lhag pa'i bsam pas bskul ba'i mdo'
missing
43 Gsdong pos brgyand pa'i mdo'
44 Theg chen sa chen gyi mdo'
45 Sdng po[s] bkod pa'i mdo'
46 Se'u ta la'i mdo'
47 Byams pa seng ge sgra'i mdo'
48 Blo gros rgya mtshos zhus pa'i mdo'
49 Tshul brgya lnga bcu ba'i mdo'
48 Gsang ba'i mdo' = 13
49 Dpal gyi 'phreng ba'i seng ge'i sgrai mdo'
50 Chos yang dag par bsdu pa'i mdo'
51 Khyim bdag dpa sbyin gyis zhus pa'i mdo'
52 Sgo drug pa'i gzungs kyi mdo'

53 Byang chub kyi [tshul] khrims kyi mdo'
54 Dge ba'i lam gyi mdo'
55 Ting nge 'dzind rgyal po'i mdo' = 64 = 65 ?
56 Dpal 'byung ba'i mdo'
57 Dkon mchog rtsegs pa chen po'i mdo' = 33
58 Rnam par rold pa'i mdo'
59 Rnam par 'thag (MS dag/dag theg) pa'i mdo'
60 Nges pa dang ma nges pa 'jug pa'i phyag rgya'i mdo'
61 Mtshan ma myed pa'i le'u yi mdo'
62 Bden pa [pol]i le'u yi mdo'
63 'Dus pa chen po'i le'u yi mdo'
64 Zla ba sgron ma'i mdo' = 55 = 65 ?
65 Zla ba mar mye'i mdo' = 64 ?
66 'Byung ba med pa'i mdo' = 30
67 Khye'u rin po ches byin pa'i mdo'
68 Blo gros myi bzad pa'i mdo'
69 Ma dros pa'i mdo'
70 Chos kyi tshig gi mdo'
71 Gdon myi za ba'i 'dul ba'i mdo'
72 Rin po che rtsegs pa'i mdo'
73 Dkon mchog mtha'i mdo'
74 Nam mkha' mdzod kyi mdo'
75 Bstand pa brjod pa'i mdo'
76 'Phags pa glang dang mtshungs pa'i mdo' = 25
77 Sems kyi rgyal po'i mdo'
78 Da sha bu myi'i mdo' = 79
79 Sa bcu pa'i mdo' = 78
80 Bdud 'dul ba'i mdo'
81 De bzhin gshegs pa'i skye ba srid pa'i mdo' = 76 (...) skye ba sdig pa'i mdo')
82 'Phags pa tshangs pas zhus pa'i mdo' = 22 ?
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