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### Table of Abbreviations

The following sigla are employed in the present work. Details of the editions and exemplars consulted are given in Part II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Berlin Manuscript Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cone Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Derge Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Taipei Manuscript Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lhasa Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>'Jang sa-tham / Lithang Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Peking (1692) Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>London Manuscript Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Narthang Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Peking (1737) Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Phu brag Manuscript Kanjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Urga Kanjur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers 1 and 2 in addition to the letter sigla are employed to differentiate between the versions in the *Prajñāpāramitā* and in the *Tantra* sections of the Kanjur for those editions, D, H, L, M, N, R and U, which have the text twice. 1 indicates the text in the *Prajñāpāramitā* section; 2 the text in the *Tantra* section. Thus D1 means the Derge Prajñāpāramitā text, and so on.
Part I

Introduction
The following presents a critical edition of the Tibetan texts of Recensions A and B of the *Bcom ldan 'das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i snying po* as found in the presently available editions of the Tibetan Kanjur. Best known by its Sanskrit title, *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya*, or by relevant translations of its short title, “The Heart Sūtra” is one of the most widely used texts of Mahāyāna Buddhism.¹ I say “used” since the text is not only read (in whatever sense one chooses to apply to that difficult term), but also set up as an object of veneration, and employed in various other contexts. Although it is usual to refer to whatever text one has at hand as the Heart Sūtra, there are in fact many versions of this small text, not only in different languages, but even within a single language. It will become clear in what follows why I have introduced the novel distinction between Recension A and Recension B of the Tibetan Kanjur text of the Heart Sūtra.

The present introduction has little claim to contribute to the study of the doctrine of emptiness or the philosophy of the Perfection of Wisdom. The results of this study belong rather to the domains of philology, text criticism, and history. It should be obvious, however, that without a firm grounding in the philological, text-critical and historical facts of a given text, philosophical judgements about that text are prone to error.² Philosophical appraisals of a given passage have a chance of success only if the

---

¹ For the sake of convenience, throughout this introduction I use the appellation “Heart Sūtra” to refer to the text. In Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese, as well as in modern languages, this or the title “Heart of Wisdom” is used — *Prajñāhrdaya; Shes rab ’snying po; (Boruo) Xingjing, (Hanwya) Shengwu* (般若)
心経. Except in bibliographic citations, all Tibetan is romanized according to the so-called Wylie system, and quotations using other systems are modified without further note. Chinese is romanized according to the Pinyin system.

² I use the term “philosophy” here rather loosely, including ideological and doctrinal concerns under the general rubric.
passage, on a very basic level, says in fact what the investigator thinks it says; remarks based on readings which arise from a faulty textual transmission, and do not in fact represent an authentic tradition, lead only to groundless speculations and false conclusions. It is difficult enough to carry out the study of ancient texts such as the present one in any case, but it becomes impossible if the text at hand is unreliable from a philological point of view. I belabor this point because it seems so far to have been little appreciated by many modern scholars. It is a sad fact that many, perhaps most, of the editions of Buddhist texts available to us today are incomplete or unreliable even for the editions the readings of which they claim to represent. In the case of Tibetan translations of Indian Buddhist literature (perhaps more so in the case of those in the Kanjur than of those in the Tanjur), a transcription of a single xylograph or manuscript edition is a completely inadequate source for statements about "the Tibetan text." Such a transcription will much more likely serve as a source for information about the erratic habits of Tibetan scribes and even editors, although without comparison with other editions the degree to which one is, in any given instance, erratic will of course remain unknown. Even consulting more than one Kanjur guarantees nothing about coverage of the tradition in its entirety if the editions chosen are selected without an awareness of their interrelations. Translations of such unreliable editions are, needless to say, consequently prone to being equally unreliable.

The purpose of the present edition and introduction is two-fold. First, it seeks to contribute to the study of Kanjur history by registering in detail internal evidence of Kanjur filiations. This evidence consists primarily of readings shared by different editions. In the sketching of the relations between one Kanjur edition and another, the evidence from variant readings must be combined with other types of evidence, primarily evidence from documentary sources but also that gleaned from the internal arrangements of the editions. Eventually, the sum of this evidence will contribute to the writing of a comprehensive history of the Kanjur. The second purpose of the present edition is to contribute more generally to the study of Indian Mahāyāna sūtra literature. One striking result of the present study is that even in the case of such a well-known and seemingly
much-studied text of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism as the Heart Sūtra, the text is far from settled. It is possible that in some measure it was the very popularity of this text which contributed to the appearance of variations in the canonical Kanjur text serious enough to motivate me to refer to them as different recensions. But I suspect rather that a different process has been at work, and although an obscure text might conceivably have a relatively simpler textual history, and encounter fewer circumstances in which it might undergo transformations, a look at other Tibetan translations in the Kanjur in as careful a way would probably reveal recensional variations there too.¹ I will return to this problem below.

The “hermeneutic circle” is in reality more of a hermeneutic spiral — we do make progress. Therefore, although the theoretical problems inherent in the process of establishing a critical text are many and complex, this fact does not imply the pointlessness of the project. It may not be possible at first to decide among different variant readings which is the “best,” but over time as readings are collected from many texts we will gain a better picture of the literature as a whole, its general characteristics and tolerances. It is not practical to establish a critical edition for each and every text from which we wish to cite a passage or two, but slowly and piece by piece the task of building a corpus of critical editions must be undertaken. An understanding of the relationships of one Tibetan edition to another will enable us to make a start at choosing which editions to take into account. Once we know which texts we must use, the editor who fails to consult one or more of the requisite editions can clearly be said to have failed to establish a critical, and therefore reliable, edition. Furthermore, this study illustrates through the variant readings it quotes the possibilities which exist for contemporary exegetical misunderstanding when a text is not comprehensively studied from the philological point of view.

A word is necessary on the limitations of this study. I can claim no special expertise in Tibetan studies per se, Tibetan history, philology and

¹ Peter Skilling, in a letter of 22 July, 1992, tells me that the textual history of the relatively “obscure” Mahā-sūtras is indeed as complex as that of the Heart Sūtra. I am finding similar complexity in my present studies of the Mahāramakūṭa sūtra collection.
the like. My main interests lie rather in the area of Indian Buddhism. If some of the present comments spur specialists in Tibetan language, history, and Buddhism to point out mistakes and offer corrections, I will be more than delighted. Within the limits of my knowledge, and within the restrictions of a short introduction, I have tried to touch upon the most important points raised by the text presented in the present edition. It should not be a surprise that some problems remain untreated, and others ill-treated. I hope, again, that others will offer improvements.

General Considerations

It may not be out of place to quote and emphasize some observations offered more than forty years ago by a largely unappreciated scholar, Arnold Kunst. In a paper with the forbidding title “Kamalaśīla’s Commentary on Śāntarakṣita’s Anumānaparīkṣā of the Tattvaśaṅgraha” [Kunst 1947], Kunst offered what amounts to a history and appraisal of Western studies of the Kanjur and, to a lesser extent, the Tanjur. While understandably the information presented therein is, in many details, not completely accurate, for its time this summary was probably the most comprehensive and correct available. Moreover, many of the methodological observations offered by Kunst at that time are as valid today as ever. In discussing which Kanjur editions need be consulted in compiling a critical edition, for instance, Kunst [1947: 127-28] raised the question of “local” editions of the Kanjur:

The religious and sectarian propensities of the Tibetans must have made it a point of ambition for every province or center of intellectual life to have its Kanjur recension. But it is also obvious that many of them remained merely “local” editions without ever gaining a recognized position in the literature. May be, it will mean waste of time [sic] to occupy oneself in the future with all these unimportant and secondary editions. So far, however, we are seldom quite sure, which are to be considered secondary, and thus the luxury of selection must be postponed until we obtain absolute clarity on the mat-
ter. To us all editions are equally important at present, the more so as the “local” ones were certainly not without influence on the editions available to us, and as, in turn, they themselves reflect upon the influence of earlier editions no longer extant. This is especially important with regard to the handwritten copies which were mostly rewritten, usually with “corrections,” in several lamaseries.

That this careful, meticulous and critical admonition has been but rarely heeded is obvious from the fact that few indeed are the editions of canonical texts in Tibetan which provide readings from more than, at most, the more popular xylograph editions, those of Derge, Peking, Narthang and Lhasa (and occasionally Cone). Usually not even all of these have been consulted by the editors.

Kunst also expressed his concern with the detail with which readings are reported. The very idea of “significant” variants, he suggested, presupposes more knowledge than is yet available. Kunst [1947: 138] wrote:

A Sanskrit scholar and a linguist will be mainly interested in the fidelity with which the right sense of the Sanskrit text (if such is available) has been conveyed; but if in addition to that he is a student of culture, seemingly insignificant differences in terminology or grammatical forms will be of value to him in that they are apt to disclose, if only in fragments, the historical circumstances accompanying the origin of various editions.

And he also said [1947: 148]:

[W]hat may seem to one type of student insignificant may occur as a phenomenon of greater importance to another.

Since the truth of these remarks seems self evident, the present edition seeks to record all differences which could, in any conceivable way, turn out to be significant. This issue is discussed in detail below.
Kunst also addressed himself to an issue not directly taken up in the present study, namely the comparison of different editions on the basis of their internal organization and contents. He demonstrated [1947: 149-50] quite clearly that "general comparisons of single editions on the basis of distribution of material, order of chapters and volumes etc., although not without importance, are conclusive only if supported by investigation of single works."

What is it that we seek to establish through a critical edition? In the broadest sense, we can cite approvingly from the remarks of Martin West [1973:7-8], whose comments on classical text criticism can be applied, mutatis mutandis, to our case. West wrote:

Textual criticism is not the be-all and end-all of classical scholarship, which is the study of a civilization. But it is an indispensable part of it. By far the greater part of our knowledge of that civilization comes to us from what the ancients wrote. In almost all cases those writings have survived, if they have survived at all, only in copies many stages removed from the originals, copies of which not a single one is free from error.... It follows that anyone who wants to make serious use of ancient texts must pay attention to the uncertainties of the transmission.... But the practice of textual criticism is more than a prophylactic against deception. It brings benefits which go beyond its immediate aims of ascertaining as exactly as possible what the authors wrote and defining the areas of uncertainty.

When it comes to actually thinking about organizing a critical edition, in general, most scholars who consider the issue tend to follow the model of classical (Greek and Latin) studies — a model subject to some criticism in recent years — and seek to establish a stemma codicum, that is, they hope to ultimately trace the readings of their various exemplars back to one Ur-text. In the case of Indian literature this technique has many flaws, not the least of which is due to the fact that much of the literature was originally oral and therefore strictly speaking no unique Ur-text ever existed. This is unquestionably the case for works such as the Mahā-
bhārata and the Purāṇa literature,¹ and probably for at least some Buddhist sūtras — I am inclined to think that this holds true for most Indian Buddhist sūtra literature until at least the medieval period, but must hold off from discussing that problem here. To the complexities of oral composition and transmission, which brings into question the whole notion of a single text, are added in India the problems introduced by the use of more than one script to transcribe the copied manuscripts. Scribes unfamiliar with a script may easily misread the manuscript which they are copying, and for this reason, especially with subsequent hypercorrections, recensions tend often to follow lines delimited by the scripts employed [Katre 1954: 29; von Hinüber 1980: 34]. At first blush one might suppose the situation with Buddhist literature translated into Tibetan to be quite different. But before we discuss this, it will be helpful to briefly summarize some of what we know about textual criticism in general.

Classical textual criticism divides the text critical task into four projects: 1) Heuristics, 2) Recensio, 3) Emendatio, 4) Higher Criticism. 1) comprises the task of collecting materials and establishing the stemma codicum. 2) consists in restoring the text of the collected material. 3) consists in restoring the wording of the author. 4) consists in the separation of the sources utilized by the author [Katre 1945: 31]. For the present we may ignore step 4 as irrelevant to the basic text-critical task; this challenge may be taken up by a subsequent translator of a well-edited text, for instance. The whole question we really want to ask here is whether step 3 is or is not possible. For of course with anonymous literature there is no author per se. And is there even “a” text? Oskar von Hinüber [1980: 31] puts it this way:

The business of textual criticism is to produce a text as close as possible to the original (constitutio textus). ... Our first task is to establish what must or may be regarded as transmitted — to make the recension (recensio); our next is to examine this tradition and

¹ See the important comments of Biardeau [1968].
discover whether it may be considered as giving the original (*examination*); if it proves not to give the original, we must try to reconstruct the original by conjecture (*divination*) or at least isolate the corruption.

But as von Hinüber [1980] demonstrates, this is not possible for Indian Buddhist scriptural texts in Sanskrit. The nature of the variants proves that we are not dealing with a single text which can be reconstituted. We are rather dealing with a "text tradition," and the best we can do is quite carefully record all the variegations within this tradition. This implies, or can imply, that we are interested not only in the "original" text but in all texts of the tradition. (More strictly, in all good texts; there is little to be gained — except for the specialist in the Siddham script — from interest in horribly corrupt medieval Japanese copies of the Sanskrit Heart Sūtra, for example.) For it seems to me that there is no intrinsic reason why we should be interested only or even mainly in the earliest stratum of a multi-valent tradition which, like the famous Buddhist banana tree, has no core. For textual traditions of authored works (which would mean in the context of Indian works translated into Tibetan, to simplify a bit, those found in the Tanjur) the situation *may* be — but is not necessarily — different, and we *may* assume a potentially recoverable core. In other words, we *may* face different text-critical problems in trying to establish a text authored by Nāgārjuna than in trying to edit a sūtra. Let us set this scenario aside for the present, however, and limit ourselves to scriptural materials, those of anonymous (and probably group or communal) authorship. Von Hinüber's concluding suggestions [1980: 40] are ones to which we will return below:

[The only good course for an editor] is to print one MS, for practical reasons the oldest one, exactly as it is, if it is fairly complete, and to give all variants of the rest of the MSS. ... In following this procedure, the idea of a text-critical apparatus as prepared for Greek or Latin texts is renounced. The aim of this critical apparatus is to show why and how the editor has reconstructed the printed text
from his MSS. The apparatus of an anonymous S[anskrit] text, ... on the other hand, shows the different stages and layers of the development of a text. ... The apparatus therefore is not critical, but historical, or ... it is a veritable thesaurus of the tradition. ... Thus the work of an editor of an anonymous S[anskrit] text resembles that of an archaeologist: he has to make visible the different layers of his text.

Given that this is the case for Indian Buddhist works in Indic languages (for von Hinüber's use of the term "Sanskrit" here is strictly speaking not precise), how can we apply these guidelines to Indian Buddhist works in the guise of their Tibetan translations? The first question we must address is what we hope to accomplish by editing and studying a Tibetan translation. Do we wish to study it in its own right? But what might this mean? As linguists we may be interested, for instance, in different verbal forms found in this or that edition, but by the mere fact of establishing an edition which collects various Tibetan editions we are probably producing something which has never existed before, in Tibet or elsewhere. If we seek the "original" version of the Tibetan translation, we may possibly obtain some form of Ur-text, but it is highly unlikely that it would reflect a text known to many Tibetans at any time. Recording all variants, not just the true, recensational variants, however, should give us the kind of access to the layers of the text to which von Hinüber referred in the passage quoted above. Clarifying which of our variants are recensational variants, as distinct from transmissional variants, those introduced by the vagaries of a scribal tradition, or simple errors, guarantees a full picture of the textual tradition. Ultimately the apparatus to a full, true critical edition not of the Kanjur version of a given text but of the whole Tibetan tradition of that text should provide not only readings from all independent versions of the text (Kanjurs, Dunhuang manuscripts, vulgata, and so forth), but also testimonia from native Tibetan works which show how the work was quoted and referred to within the native literature. The arrangement of the critical apparatus of the present edition is one step toward the future establishment of such a full apparatus.
If this is one aspect of the study of a text that can be undertaken from the point of view of Tibetan studies, the goal of the Indologist who studies these translations is different, for he or she seeks to read beneath, as it were, the Tibetan "guise" of the translation to the "encoded" Indic language original which lies behind it.¹ It is common sense to think that for such a purpose it is of course vital to obtain the version of the Tibetan translation closest to that which the translators originally produced, since later variants in the tradition, whatever doctrinal or historical value they may have within the context of the study of Tibetan religion and culture, inevitably move us farther away from the Indian text upon which the translation was based. But is this common sense view the right one?

In the case of Tibetan Kanjur (and Tanjur) texts, it is not wholly unreasonable to assume that some Ur-text did exist. The reasons for this assumption may be stated simply. When we suppose that an Indian sūtra was translated into Tibetan and subsequently established within the Kanjur, we assume the existence of some unique text, the historically singular product of a translator or rather more likely team of translators. This assumes nothing about the textual tradition from which the translators' "archetype" came, and does not of course imply that the Indic text tradition, of which the translators' manuscript or recited text was an exemplar, was in itself in any way unitary. But assuming that there was only one translator or group of translators, and assuming that he or they did not produce multiple versions of one text, we are left with a unique Tibetan version of any given scripture. This unique product may have incorporated choices between variant readings and so on, but the result nevertheless preserves only the final decisions of the translator(s), and so is in itself unitary. If it is this unique version which lies behind the translation which comes to be copied in our Kanjurs, then we have to deal with a textual history which, for its greater or lesser complexity, can be analyzed in terms of the classical stemma codicum. In this model we assume that texts were translated once and only once. There should not be variants at the point of the "original" copy of the translation. Therefore we can, in the context of this mod-

¹ See the observations in Harrison [1990]: xxv-xxxvi.
el, presume the existence of a unique Ur-text. Of course, some sūtras and śāstras were translated more than once. We know this from examples found at Dunhuang.¹ But I doubt that these occasional variant translations can account for all of the textual variants we encounter. So then how are we to account for the sometimes radical variants in the Tibetan textual tradition of the Kanjurs?

A hypothetical but possible scenario may be the following. A Sanskrit or Indic text was obtained by a team of Tibetan translators, written or delivered orally. Let us call this Text \( S^1 \). The team of Tibetan translators produces what is more or less a calque of \( S^1 \) into Tibetan; let us call this \( T^1 \). This \( T^1 \) circulates within Tibet, being copied and recopied. This of course may introduce a few variations, but probably nothing major. However, some reader who obtains a copy of \( T^1 \) may also have access to another copy of the Indic original, his \( S^{ii} \). His version of \( S^{ii} \) may be the same as \( S^1 \), or may very well be a different version. Our reader may compare \( S^{ii} \) against \( T^1 \), and even assuming that \( S^{ii} \) is the same as \( S^1 \), he may still differ with some renderings of the original translators, and rewrite the translation in portions. If his \( S^{ii} \) is different it goes without saying that his comparison would produce differences in a Tibetan rendition. When his newly emended \( T^{ii} \) begins to circulate, we have the beginning of two recensions of one and the same text. There is no telling how many times such a process could have been carried out on any given text. A revision might be revised, or the first translation revised by more than one reader or group of readers. No matter how good our stemma and our understanding of text-critical theory and the practice of text criticism, we cannot reconstruct an archetype of S from such a situation. As West [1973: 36] has said, “If contamination is present in more than a slight degree, it will be found that no stemmatic hypothesis is satisfactory.” If all our data does not lead back to the establishment of one archetype, we may be dealing

---

¹ For example, we might cite the Dunhuang versions of the \( Vimalakirtinirdeśa \) and the \( Yuktisāṣṭikā \), to select respectively a Kanjur and a Tanjur text. See, for the first, de Jong [1955], and for the second, Mimaki [1982]: note 458. (Paul Harrison tells me that the \( Vimalakirtinirdeśa \) case may not, after all, be a case of an alternate translation, but stem rather from recensional differences. I have not yet had a chance to examine the matter myself.)
with an open recension, from which the most we can hope to establish is a "serviceable" stemmatic relationship. It may be possible to establish several hyparchetypes, but no single archetype. And I believe this is the actual situation for many or most texts in the Tibetan Kanjur.

If the scenario presented above, for many of the ideas leading to which I am indebted to conversations with Paul Harrison, is true, it is still far from being the whole background of Kanjur textual variations. We know that the canonical collections (Kanjur and Tanjur) both underwent revisions, for example standardizations in the light of the Mahāvyutpatti and Sgra shyor bam po gnyis pa, although details of what these processes were, entailed and meant are still hazy. The story of the very establishment of the great canonical collections is still a history waiting to be written. This process of compilation and revision is one likely source of additional variant readings. After a text was revised it is, again, likely that pre-revision versions still circulated. And we know that in at least some cases whole alternate translations were made.

The types of alterations carried out on translations in the processes sketched above produce what I have referred to as recensional variants. Another type of variant, aside from simple errors, is of the transmissional type. There are a variety of sources for transmissional variants. The transmission of the Kanjur was perhaps not purely a written transmission; maybe sometimes texts were read aloud and written down. This could account for certain variant spellings and misspellings, but these might occur in a written transmission as well. Martin West [1973: 20] reminds us that "When one is writing (whether one is copying or not, but especially if one is), one tends to say the words over to oneself. One may then find oneself writing down a word that sounds the same as the one intended." This, by the way, speaks against the classical stricture that a textual change which ignores paleographical probability is a violent change in the only proper application of the term. We might modify this to say that emendations which cannot be explained on paleographical or phonetic grounds must be judged to be violent changes.

The replacement of a term by a synonym, or differences such as grammatical inversions, on the other hand, are perhaps more difficult to
explain by oral transmission, dictation or homophonic confusion. Nevertheless, both are possible, as West [1973: 21] has pointed out in discussing the substitution of one word for another through mental association and the transposition of phrases, since the scribe “carries a block of text in his head, at least a whole phrase or half a line, [and] he may unwittingly alter the order of the words.” Now, variants which do not make sense are relatively easy to dismiss as mere corruption, although the source of the corruption may not be so easily located. But variants which do make sense should probably be attributed to conscious, aware agents, somewhere along the line. How could a transmissional variant come to make sense? There are two possibilities. First, the scribe does what West refers to, and mentally replaces one word or spelling with another, or even inverts a phrase grammatically. This might be termed an instantaneous and unconscious variation which produces sense directly. For the second possibility, we might speak of a two stage process of change. First, there occurs a corruption yielding a nonsense, followed by a correction (we may say hypercorrection) which yields sense, but a sense different from the original. Depending on how radical the corruption was, and how far back toward the root of the stemma of texts available to us it was hypercorrected, it may be very difficult, or even impossible, to determine if a given variant is a recensional or transmissional variant. Theoretically speaking, in the end, then, either we are faced with an originally multiple textual transmission, in which case no matter how far back we trace the variants they do not converge, or we are dealing with some type of corruption which, ideally, is explainable, and once explained the variants reconciled. I think that a careful examination of the texts presented in the present edition will convince the reader that both processes of the generation of variants have probably been at work here.

Besides their inherent philological value, an additional benefit of compiling complete editions of Kanjur texts comes from the utility of such editions in the compilation of other editions of the same text. I would go so far as to suggest that complete critical editions (in other words, utilizing all materials necessary to establish a reliable critical edition) of the Tibetan translations of a given sūtra should be compiled before any attempt is made
to edit the Sanskrit or Indic version(s) of that sūtra. The reason is not that the Tibetan texts should be given priority, or that the Sanskrit or Indic should be emended or edited to correspond to the Tibetan translations. On the contrary, while it is generally accepted that when Tibetan translations of a given Indic text are available an editor must consult those translations in the process of critically establishing his or her Indic text, the editor must, of course, exercise great caution in the uses to which the Tibetan translations are put. As a rule of thumb, if the goal is an edition of the Indic text for which we have Indic evidence, and not a new conflated version of some “super sūtra” created from Indic, Tibetan and Chinese materials of varying date and provenance, a monster which has never before existed in reality, the readings of the Indic text should be given priority at all times. It is now widely, although not widely enough, recognized that the original Indic versions lying behind the available Tibetan versions of Buddhist texts are often palpably different from the Indic versions of those texts which are preserved for us today in manuscripts from Nepal or other locations. However, given the fact that “the Tibetan text” will be consulted at all by editors of Indic language Buddhist texts — and to not consult such a translation when it is available is sheer folly — it is necessary that the fullest possible account of the Tibetan textual tradition be available. Generally editors content themselves with consulting one or two xylographic exemplars of a Kanjur translation (for practical purposes Peking, Derge and Narthang; often only the Peking edition is consulted), and on this basis those editors seek sanction for the emendation of their Indic texts. But we can see very clearly from the present edition, and from the information made available by the researches of Helmut Eimer and Paul Harrison, that a good Tibetan text and well-attested rather than random variants become available when a wide variety of exemplars is consulted. It is not, I think, the case that consulting a large number of Tibetan witnesses and assembling their variant readings will broaden the scope for emendation of a corresponding Indic text. My suspicion is rather that consulting the requisite Kanjur editions, based on their historical relation to one another, as will be discussed below, will produce a reliable picture of, if not “the Tibetan translation,” rather “the Tibetan translation traditions.”
Introduction

It is not enough, of course, to just consult many Kanjurs; they must be well chosen. As Katre [1954: 47], repeating an old commonplace, has pointed out, “One of the cardinal rules of textual criticism is that codices are to be weighed and not counted.” While emotionally the appeal to numbers has its seductive and reassuring qualities, the majority should not necessarily rule.\(^1\) If one does not understand the relations between the witnesses it is tempting to fall back on the argument that “most editions read ....” On the other hand, as West [1973: 49] remarks, “‘Weight’ is not determined solely by stemmatic considerations.” An editor, then, by carefully gathering the requisite materials and analyzing them well should be able to obtain a good, reliable edition of the Tibetan text tradition or perhaps traditions corresponding to his or her Indic text. It is another question what weight the editor wishes to grant that Tibetan evidence in editing the Indic text, but in any case, editorial decisions which appeal for support to “the Tibetan” must be made based on criteria other than a simple resort to the readings of whichever Kanjurs happen to be at hand.

Interrelations of Kanjurs

Many studies have recently been carried out on the relationships of the various Kanjurs one with another. The leader in this field is certainly Dr. Helmut Eimer, and he has summarized his views several times in recent years.\(^2\) Recently Paul Harrison has been working on some new material which has contributed to a refinement of the picture presented by Eimer. For the textual stemma which follow, and for much of the logic of the discussion, I am particularly indebted to several recent conversations with Harrison, but it should be noted that the most recent research carried out after the completion of the present study seems to be producing a picture different in some details from that presented below. By the time the

---


present study is published the picture will almost certainly have changed again, and so the reader is asked to read the following with constant reference to the continuing studies of Eimer, Harrison and recently also Peter Skilling.

Since the Heart Sūtra is a very short text, one would expect it to provide a statistically hardly significant sample. Nevertheless, the internal evidence of filiations between Kanjurs given by the readings presented in the present edition fully confirms the relations suggested by the work of Eimer and Harrison. In particular, one general theme of recent work, namely that there are two clearly distinguishable branches of the Kanjur text tradition, a so-called Western or Them spangs ma line and a so-called Eastern or Tshal pa line, is here fully confirmed. The case of the two recensions presented here, however, A and B, is more complicated. There is a clear split between the Them spangs ma and Tshal pa lines. But, the Heart Sūtra is found twice in some editions of the Kanjur. It is found in the Tantra (Rgyud) section in all but one Kanjur (the exception is in every way exceptional, and will be discussed in detail below), and in the Prajñā-pāramitā (Shes rab or Sher phyin) in only some. The Kanjurs which have the text twice all (with essentially one exception) belong to the Them spangs ma line. We have, then, not only the distinction between Western and Eastern, but between sections within one and the same edition. Therefore, somewhat surprisingly perhaps, the Western Them spangs ma Kanjurs, which contain the Heart Sūtra twice, contain two different recensions of the same text; Recension B is constituted by only the Them spangs ma Shes rab Heart Sūtra. The one exception mentioned above to the rule that only the Them spangs ma texts have the Heart Sūtra twice is the Derge edition (and Urga, its virtual copy). But there the text in the Prajñā-pāramitā section is copied from the Tantra section, virtually exactly. So both D1 and D2 (and U1 and U2) are Recension A texts. In most cases, however, for texts which appear only once in the Kanjur, we would expect recensional differences to follow the Them spangs ma — Tshal pa split.

In the past it has generally been thought by scholars that the readings of the Derge edition provide the “best” text. So Paul Harrison, before carrying out his recent studies, wrote [1978: xii-xiii] that, in comparison
with H, N, and P, Derge “frequently preserves the correct reading,” without, however, defining “correct.” Harrison further stated that compared to N, “Derge is by far the better of the two.” The term “better” was likewise not defined. These remarks may be taken as typical of widely held views about the value of the Kanjurs commonly consulted. Now there is no question that the Derge edition has, in general, been carefully revised. One very rarely finds flatly impossible forms, and the morphology and grammar of D by and large agree with the scholastic prescriptions. This, however, need not mean that other editions contain “incorrect” forms or syntax. Grammar can be both prescriptive and descriptive. It is well known that the spelling of the Tibetan language remained unstandardized for a very long time. The great revision of the Kanjur and Tanjur, including standardization of spelling and grammar, is a process as yet not well understood. And our knowledge of the historical grammar of Tibetan is not yet sufficient to say in many cases whether a given form or construction is possible or simply wrong. Given this state of affairs, I originally thought that the best that could be accomplished was to accept, in a more or less ad hoc way, the readings of the Derge text as the “root” text and to provide in the notes a comprehensive listing of all other readings, creating in effect a variorum edition. I was encouraged in this by the fact that in only a very few places the readings of D2 are flatly impossible.¹ I will show below

¹ In Paragraph W, D2 writes bcom ldan for the bcom ldan ’das of all other editions. This reading occurs at the end of a folio, that is, the ’das would have occurred as the first word on the next folio. One would naturally think that this is simply a scribal error, and in fact I do believe this to be the case. Nevertheless, the form bcom ldan is found in Tibetan, and not altogether rarely. In merely glancing briefly through texts and indices I have noticed the following examples: Suvarna(pra)bhāsottama XVIII.1, and passim; Mahāyānasūrālāṅkāra I.15; Sūnyatāsaññati 40; Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā XV.7, XXV.17, XXV.18; Bodhicaryāvatāra IV.20, VII.37; Mahāvairocana-sūtra (Derge Kanjur rgyud, tha, 154b3). These examples all share one common factor, however; they are all found in verses. Since the occurrence in the present text is not in verse, does not make good sense here, and is a reading found nowhere else in the Kanjurs now available, it seems unlikely that the reading of D2 can be accepted as a revision by the Derge editors. The term bcom ldan does occur in Tibetan dictionaries. It is defined as “victorious, blessed, triumphant” [Das 1902: 395; Jäschke 1881: 147], “vainqueur,” [Desgodins 1899: 305] “sangs rgyas dang ldan phyug la’ang,” [Dge bshes chos kyi grags pas brtsams pa’i brda dag ming tshig gsal ba bzhus so (Peking: Minzu Chubanshe, 1981): 239. Originally published, Lhasa, 1949, then Peking, 1957. The Chinese definitions, added in the 1957 edition, define the term as Buddha or Maheśvara, with the extended sense of victorious or fortunate] and “bdud bzhi bcom zhi legs pa’i yab tan drug dang ldan pa ste sangs rgyas” [Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo (Peking: Minzu Chuban-
why I now know this approach to have been a serious mistake.

Although, as mentioned above, the very short length of the Heart Sūtra means that, taken alone, its sample of variant readings is statistically virtually insignificant, it is possible, in comparison with other data assembl-
ed by Eimer and Harrison, who have heretofore studied more substantial texts, to suggest the way in which the information the Heart Sūtra edition does provide can be fitted into the stemma suggested by their work. In the stemma given on the following pages, the pointed lines indicate filiation, although there may be intermediary editions not specified, and the dotted lines indicate contamination. Thus, for example, P is ultimately dependent on K, but there were intermediary versions (which, however, were not utilized for the present edition). On the other hand, U is a direct copy of D, with contamination from P. Not all the information given by the variant readings of the present edition could be recorded in this stemma, of course. Especially the interaction between some readings of the two recensions could not be illustrated. This feature is discussed below.

Let us start with Recension A. This is comprised by the Heart Sūtra from the Tantra section of the following Kanjurs: B[erlin], C[one], D[erge], F [Taipei Manuscript], H [Lhasa], J[’Jang sa tham / Lithang], K [1692 Peking], L[ondon Manuscript], M [Tōyo Bunko Manuscript], N[arthaṅ], Peking [1737], R [Tog Manuscript] and U[rga]. In addition, the Derge and Urga editions also contain the Recension A text in their Prajñāpāramitā sections. We will see below that both of these cases are due to editorial conflation. The stemma for Recension A shows clearly that the Heart Sūtra’s evidence confirms the theories of Eimer and Harrison concerning the Them spangs ma and Tshal pa lines, with the

...
latter subsequently split into the 'Phying ba stag rtse and Peking lines.¹ The 'Phying ba stag rtse Kanjur gives us J, of which C is a virtual copy. D also copies J, but with some contamination from the Them spangs ma line. To those who have examined only the heretofore more readily available editions of the Kanjur, it seemed that C was closely related to D, although in some cases C agreed not with D but with P, another widely available edition. This correspondence led Claus Vogel [1970: 9] to suggest that “C is not exclusively dependent on D but seems to have been collated with P.” However, the true state of affairs is that both D and C are based on J. The Peking line shares the same origin as J, in the Tshal pa Kanjur, and the predecessor to P, a 1717/20 Kanjur not available for the present text but generally reproduced in the Japanese reprint edition, also was emended (or technically speaking contaminated) on the basis of J.

J, the 'Jang-sa tham or Li-thang Kanjur, has just recently been made available,² and is the earliest datable Kanjur exemplar to which we presently have access. de Jong’s comment that “The oldest Kanjur presently preserved is the manuscript version of Berlin … which was finished in 1680” can therefore now be revised.³ The exact date of J, however, still presents problems. Imaeda had suggested 1608 to 1621 (see Part II, J.7 of the present edition), but a recent study of this Kanjur [Samten 1987: 17-18] assigns it to between 1609 and 1614.⁴ It is to be hoped that when

¹ On the compilation of the Tshal pa, see Samten [1987b]. This article also contains much information on the compilation of other editions, and the general history of the Kanjur. Paul Harrison has recently been hard at work correcting and augmenting this picture, and his results are eagerly awaited. See for example Harrison [1992a, and 1992b].

² This was catalogued by Yoshiro Imaeda, who transcribed the dkar chag. At the time Imaeda undertook this task, only this dkar chag was accessible. Subsequently the Kanjur itself became accessible, and it was microfilmed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, and also, according to the recent report of Jampa Samten Shastri, by the Naritasan Shinshōji 成田山新勝寺 Temple in Japan. A new catalogue is in preparation by Leonard W.J. van der Kuijpf, and the Kanjur itself should be published in microform in the future. See Part Two J.7 for details.

³ de Jong [1978]: 160. de Jong was correct according to the information available to him when he wrote his remarks. The Taipei manuscript Kanjur is probably also to be dated earlier than Berlin. See the discussion below.

⁴ Eimer [1988a: 70] followed Imaeda in dating the edition, but unfortunately a misprint made it seem otherwise (1608 - 1623), as Dr. Eimer informed me by letter.
Dr. L. van der Kuijp brings out his catalogue of the Li-thang Kanjur this issue will be clarified. Even a very early date for J does not mean that it is the most authentic or even archaic Kanjur, however. It had been Eimer’s opinion [1988a: 68], for instance, that the text of the London manuscript Kanjur is the most archaic of those currently available, but recently Samten and Skilling [Forthcoming] have clarified that this manuscript was completed in 1712. We may expect continued clarification of these problems in the future.

As for the Peking line Kanjurs, a little bit more is known, though much remains to be learned. According to the only available listing of the Taipei Manuscript Kanjur F (see Part II, F.7), the manuscript dates to the Qianlong 乾隆 reign period (1736-95). However, Helmut Eimer refers to the testimony of Dieter Schuh who read in the colophon of F a much earlier date, namely 1670. As Eimer [1983b: 1.42] puts it, Schuh read the date as “bde skyid, 8. Jahr, 10. Monat.” This corresponds to the eighth year of Bde skyid rgyal po, none other than the Kangxi 康熙 emperor. The reign of the Kangxi emperor started in 1662, and the Kanjur is assigned to the eighth year of his reign, therefore 1670. If Schuh’s information is correct, then the Kanjur dates from 1670, and not from 65 to 125 years later. That its colophon dates the edition in a Chinese reign cycle only reinforces all the other evidence that the Kanjur is of Chinese origin. I am indebted to Dr. Bruce Cameron Hall for making available to me his careful hand-copy of K, an exemplar of the Peking edition which dates from 1692. This is a very interesting exemplar in that it contains a number of corrections written in by hand. It was described briefly by Alexander von Staël-Holstein in a paper that was printed but unfortunately never published.²

---

¹ The indication in Eimer [1983a]: 8, n. 3, is therefore to be corrected.

² Staël-Holstein [1934]. The only copy I know of resides in the Harvard-Yenching Library at Harvard University. It is inscribed on the title page by Staël-Holstein to Dean G. H. Chase. Although apparently it was to have been published in volume three of the Harvard Sino-Indian Series, a note in Staël-Holstein’s hand on the first page says: “If the editors (?) almost illegible) approve of my suggestion these pages will be published as the 1rst (rst) twenty pages of vol IV of the Harvard Sino-Ind (sian Series). Compare my letter (of) February 27th 1 (date obscured).” In the present context, see note 16 of that paper.
It is virtually certain that the copy of K in Harvard was Staël-Holstein’s own copy. More research on this exemplar is needed.

It is generally accepted that U is a virtual re-print of D. Bethlenfalvy [1980:4] says, for example, that “the Urga Kanjur ... is based on the Derge Kanjur. In most cases it follows that edition page by page, line by line. In modern terminology we may say that it is a revised and corrected reprint of the Derge Kanjur.” The dkar chag to the edition itself states that the text was established by a collation of the Derge and Peking editions. After listing the main revisors of the edition, the colophon says: “Many hundreds of other dka’ bcu-s and dge-bshes-s also compared the Derge and Chinese editions. After three whole years of great exertion, they corrected it properly.”1 The present edition records several variants between U and D. Looking at the bare readings, without reference to the stemma, we see that those readings that U shares with other editions in opposition to D are in fact grouped around agreement with texts in the Peking group (BFKP), with some overlap with J and C. When U shares readings with J and C these are always found also in the Peking group. Therefore, U which is virtually a copy of D was emended on the basis of P, and the readings C shares with D and P it shares by virtue of a common origin in J. When D differs from the J-P axis, which is to say, when it does not follow the Tshal pa line, it is due to the careful editing of the Derge redactors, who borrowed Them spangs ma readings.

The internal organization of the Them spangs ma line is still not clear. The graphic representation in the stemma is one possible representation of the data available. Both Eimer and Harrison, on the basis of different data for their respective cases, and owing to continually growing knowledge of the documentary evidence, have offered various suggestions for the internal relations of the Them spangs ma line. For the present I print the stemma following Eimer [1992: xviii-xix], with the notation that there does seem to be some evidence that L, M, and N sometimes disagree.

---

1 The text [folio 9a6-7] reads: gzhon yang dka’ bcu dge bshes brgya phrag mang pos sde dge par mar rgya par ma gnyis dang bstun te lo ngo gsum gyi ring la ‘bad pa chen pos legs par zhus dag mdzad pa dang/. The text and a translation, which I have modified, are found in Lokesh Chandra [1959], reprinted in Bethlenfalvy [1980]: 291-319.
with R. I cannot adequately explain this at present, but there is a possibility of a further breakdown in the lines of descent at the head of the *Them spangs ma* line. It is possible also that L should be attached to the stemma in a slightly different way. The placing of the “Old Narthang” at the head of Recension A is problematic, and I refer to Harrison [1992a, 1992b] for further information on this stratum of the tradition. I have tried to indicate some of the ambiguity with a “cloud” in the stemma. Anyway, whatever the name of the hyparchetype, it is clear that Recension A, for all its variations, does represent a single recension, in opposition to Recension B.

Recension B is found only in the *Them spangs ma* texts of the Prajñāpāramitā section. Not rarely H1 shows considerable contamination with Recension A, no doubt through H2. There are occasional instances in which R1 and R2 share innovations not found in any other Kanjurs I have seen, but otherwise R1 and R2 preserve separate recensions. This leads to the suggestion that the editors of R probably knew that they had two recensions, but made no effort to level them, or synthesize one into the other.

The position of the Narthang edition is interesting. According to Paul Harrison, the Narthang edition, which was completed in two separate periods of activity, contains, depending on the section in which a text is found, recensions from both the *Them spangs ma* and Tshal pa lines. In the case of the Heart Sūtra, both the Prajñāpāramitā section and the Tantra section contain a *Them spangs ma* text. Sometimes, however, N will fall in the Tshal pa line, in which case it would be attached to the ’Phying ba stag rtse Kanjur in the stemma. This is the case, for example, often in the Sūtra (mdo) section. Harrison will discuss this issue in the near future.

S, the Phu brag (or Phug brag, Phug drag, or Spu sbrag?), is somewhat difficult to place. On the whole it preserves a Recension A text, but with some significant variations, and it is clear that from the evidence available to me that it cannot yet be attached to the stemma at any given place. I have tried to express this ambivalence by placing it in an oval floating near Recension A, but not within it. Another peculiarity of S is that it is the only Kanjur available in which the Heart Sūtra is apparently found only in the Prajñāpāramitā section. As Dr. Ugen Gombo kindly
informed me by letter, it appears that the Tantra section of the yet unpublished Phu brag Kanjur does not contain the text. There are many peculiar and interesting features of S, which must be considered, from the point of view of text criticism, one of the most important Kanjurs presently available. The only other editions of Recension A to contain the Heart Sūtra in the Prajñāpāramitā are, as mentioned above, the Derge and Urga. Urga obviously merely copies Derge, and we need bother no more with it. It seems clear that the Derge editors, under the influence of the Them spangs ma Kanjurs, the opinion of Bu ston or others (on which see below), or on their own initiative, added a copy of the Heart Sūtra to the Prajñāpāramitā, but merely a copy of their Tantra text. Lhasa, which is a more or less direct copy of Nārthang, but which has been influenced by Derge as indicated in the stemma by the lines of contamination, contains basically a Recension B text in its Prajñāpāramitā, but one conflated with the Recension A text. At the same time, its Tantra contains a basically unconfled Recension A text. Let us turn now to a consideration of the assignment of the Heart Sūtra to different sections of the Kanjur.

Assignment of the Heart Sūtra to Prajñāpāramitā and Tantra

The question of how and why Kanjurs were organized the way they were has not yet been adequately studied. Recently Paul Harrison has been working on this question, especially with regard to the role of Bu ston, and we may expect interesting results from him soon. But we can give some indications concerning the placement of the Heart Sūtra within the Kanjur tradition. The text occurs both in the Shes rab (Prajñāpāramitā) and the Rgyud (Tantra) sections. It seems that as a Prajñāpāramitā text the Heart Sūtra was felt to belong in the Shes rab, but since it

---

1 On this problem, see recently Eimer [1989].

2 Lopez [1990b]: note 3 seems to be mistaken when he says that the Heart Sūtra is classified also as a miscellaneous sūtra (mdo sna tshogs). It is often classified as a miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā text (shes rab sna tshogs, sher phyin sna tshogs, khri sna tshogs, sras sna tshogs, or simply sna tshogs), but never as far as I know as a sūtra, mdo.
contains a mantra, and since sādhana-s have been written based on it, it should also be grouped with the Tantric texts.

In the catalogue section of his History of Buddhism (Chos 'byung), Bu ston discusses the assignment of the Heart Sūtra to the mantra (that is, Tantra) class:

As for the Prajñāhṛdaya and the [Prajñāpāramitā-] Nayaśata-pañcāsati, because of the existence of the sādhana on the Prajñā-hṛdaya written by Nāgārjuna, and because of the existence of commentaries explaining the Nayaśata-pañcā-śatikā as a mantra, it is not a mistake [to place these texts] in the mantra section too.\(^1\)

In his Catalogue of the Tantra section, Rgyud 'bum gyi dkar chag [Eimer 1989: 89], in the entry on the Heart Sūtra [160], Bu ston says:

Although certainly it was proper that this was also placed in the Prajñāpāramitā (yum) cycle, because Ācārya Nāgārjuna wrote a sādhana on the five member assembly headed by the Sage [Śākyamuni, Prajñāpāramitā, Vajrapāṇi, Śāriputra, and Avalokiteśvara], on that basis [this sūtra] was made acceptable as [a Tantra of] the Sage.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Nishioka [1983]: 65. The passage reads: sher snying dang tshul brgya lnga bcu pa 'ang yin mod kyi sher snying la sgrub thabs klu sgrub mdzad pa snang ba'i phyir dang / tshul brgya lnga bcu pa sngags su 'chad pa'i 'grel pa yod pas sngags su 'ang mi 'gal lo //

\(^2\) Eimer [1989]: 89: The passage reads: ... 'di 'ang yum gyi skor du byas kyang rigs mod kyi slob dpon klu sgrub kyis thub pa giso 'khor lnga pa'i sgrubs thabs mdzad pas / de la brient nas thub par byas so // The reference is to the sādhana of Nāgārjunagarbha, Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasādhana (Ōtani 3464; Tōhoku 2640), in which there is a mandala with Śākyamuni as the center, surrounded by the other four named in brackets, thus constituting the five-fold assembly. See Ochi [1991]: 99. A look at the preceeding entries in Bu ston's Rgyud 'bum gyi dkar chag [Eimer 1989] shows that the puzzling phrase thub par byas so probably means the same as thub pa'i gzungs su bshad cing in entry 159, for example. I thank Tshultrim Kelsang for this observation, and his help in reading Bu ston’s comment.
Tsong kha pa’s disciple Mkhas grub rje wrote in the same context:\(^1\)

Again, some say the *Prajñāhṛdaya* belongs to the mantra [class]. [However], all [of the following] are simply forgeries: The commentary claimed to have been written by Ārya Nāgārjuna, in which a maṇḍala is formed with the Victor Śākyamuni as the principal part; and the commentary claimed to have been written by the Master Dhari [=Dārikapāda], in which a maṇḍala is formed by the buddhas of the ten directions surrounding the Great Mother [Prajñāpāramitā]; and that claimed to have been written by the Master Padmasambhava which again explains in the same way; and that with the initiations of the eight abhisamaya, and so on. Even the methods for expelling demons, the *'Od gsal ma*, the *Gleng gzhi ma* and so on, are fabrications.\(^2\)

It is not clear from the passage whether or not, in the end, Mkhas grub thinks that the Heart Sūtra does not in fact belong in the Tantra section. What is clear is only that the texts which some adduce to support its inclusion are not, for him, authentic. A later Tibetan commentary written by Bstan dar lha ram pa discusses the matter as follows:

Although some scholars say that this mantra does not belong to the Tantras, thinking that it is assigned to the basic sūtra class, since the

---

\(^1\) Lopez [1990a]: 225 refers to a comment attributed to Tsong kha pa himself in which the latter, in reference to an unidentified commentary on the Heart Sūtra, criticizes those who confuse sūtra and mantra.

\(^2\) From Mkhas grub rje’s *Rgyud sde spyi’i rnam par gzhag pa rgyas par brjod*. For the text, see the edition of Lessing and Wayman [1968]: 108. The translation given there on page 109 seems to me to be not entirely accurate. The text reads: *yang kha cig sher snying sngags su gungs zer te* / *'phags pa klu sgrub kyi mdzad zer ba’i* *'grel par rgyal ba shā kya thub pas gtsos bo mdzad pa’i dkyil* *'khor dang* / *slob dpon dha ri s mdzad zer ba’i* *'grel par yun chen mo la phyogs bcu’i sangs rgyas kyis bskor ba’i dkyil* *'khor dang* / *slob dpon pad ma* *'byung gnas kyis mdzad zer bar yang de ltar bshad pa dang / mgon rtogs brgyud kyi dang bskur sogs thams cad rdzun ma *’ba’ zhig go / bdud bzlog byed tshul* yang *’od gsal ma dang gleng gzhi ma sogs yod de rtog bzo’o’ /*. The last two texts mentioned are ritual texts which employ the mantra from the Heart Sūtra. Cf. the *Sher snying gi bzlog bsgyur* of Blo bzang ’phrin las; See Kolmaš [1969]: 45 (#28).
sādhanas of Nāgārjuna and Dārikapa are clearly in the mantra class, therefore there must be grounds for this mantra to belong to the Tantras. Nevertheless, Mkhas grub rje said that the sādhanas of Nāgārjuna and Dārikapa are forgeries, and a few scholars accept that. Again, since there are explanations such as that of the so-called Śrisimha that the Prajñāahrdaya is part of the mantra class, [the problem] shows itself to be difficult to decide.¹

Another, even later, Tibetan commentary goes into considerable technical detail on the exact status of the text. The interested reader should consult Donald Lopez’s translation of the commentary of Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me [1988: 176ff]. It is plain that the proper classification of texts was of great import to the Tibetans, and certainly the Heart Sūtra was not alone in having its status debated. The situation becomes complex, and the discussion heated, in the context of the Tantras,² but an investigation of these issues is beyond the scope of the current study. In any case, future investigators will have to distinguish two issues. First is the question of the establishment and organization of the Kanjur editions, by Bu ston and others. Second is the question of how other writers not involved in the process of the compilation of the great collections responded to the choices of the editors. Both of these issues no doubt strike right to the nerves of some deep-seated issues in Tibetan Buddhist doctrinal history, and are best treated by specialists in that field.

¹ Bstan dar lha ram [1971] 320 = folio 15b2-4: mkhhas pa kha gcig gis / sngags ‘di rgyud sder gtogs pa ma yin gsungs pa mdo lugs gzhir bzhag la dgongs pa yin gyi / klu sgrubs dang dà ri ka pa’i sgrub thabs sngags lugs su gsal bas des na sngags ‘di rgyud sder gtogs pa’i skabs yod agos so // ‘on kyang mkhhas grub rjes klu sgrub dang dà ri ka pa’i sgrub thabs brdzus ma yin par gsungs pa dang / mkhhas pa la las de ‘thad ldan du mdzad cing / yang shi [sic] sim ha zhes bya bas shes rab snying po sngags lugs su bkral ba’ang yod pas dpyad dka’ bar snang ro //. Compare Lopez [1988]: 157.

² See Ruegg [1964], especially page 79, and note 3.
The Two Recensions

Whatever the ultimate reasons, the fact is that we have two recensions of the Heart Sūtra in the Kanjurs available to us now, one of which constitutes basically speaking (with the exceptions mentioned above) the Tantra text, Recension A, and the other the Prajñāpāramitā text, Recension B. On the question of why and how this breakdown occurred, one recension in one section of the Kanjur and the other in another, I cannot speculate. It is not enough to say that the Them spangs ma editors just decided that the Heart Sūtra belonged both in the Tantra and the Prajñāpāramitā. For if this was the case, we would assume that they had a Heart Sūtra which they would then place into two divisions of their collection. But the textual tradition is crystal clear in having a sharp distinction between the recensions found in either section. I think it is possible, as I discussed above, to offer some hypotheses on how two recensions could have developed. A text was translated, circulated, and revised. In this scenario, it is difficult to say whether one or the other tradition, Recension A or B, represents "the original." And in fact, I think we can go so far as to say that neither tradition can be known to present an "original text." We have, at best, two hyparchetypes — if not more than two. An examination of recensional variants, variants within one recension, and the evidence of S, will show us why. In addition, I will refer occasionally, relying on Shiraiishi [1939a], to some Sanskrit materials on the Heart Sūtra which illustrate how conflicting variants can point to attestable Sanskrit recensional differences. I will occasionally refer also to the Polyglot texts which are, despite some inconsistencies, Recension A texts; the variants from the polyglots are listed in Appendix I, and for details the reader is referred to that Appendix. It goes without saying that an examination of other materials not utilized in this edition, such as the Tibetan vulgata and Dunhuang texts, might help clarify some of these issues, but these materials would in their turn introduce new problems. We have to take things one step at a time.

It may be necessary to clarify one point here. I believe there to be two basic causes of recensional variations in the Tibetan text of the Heart Sūtra. The first is transmissional, in which variants are introduced without
reference to other texts; they are thus due to what we may loosely term "corruption." The other cause is the introduction of materials extraneous to the main Tibetan text itself, either other Tibetan materials (such as commentaries) or Indic materials. In the evaluation of textual evolution, if a variant or set of variants can be explained as due to transmissional causes, this solution should be preferred to an explanation which relies, for example, on Sanskrit materials. Therefore, the reference to corresponding Sanskrit materials in the following discussion does not preclude the possibility that any given variant or set of variants is to be traced to a corruption within the Tibetan textual tradition, rather than by reference to Indic materials. This said, I may suggest that the correspondence between Tibetan and Sanskrit variants in some cases is so clear as to strongly suggest that recensional differences in the Tibetan text are in fact to be traced to alternate Indic sources.

Let us go through the text paragraph by paragraph, examining some of the variants exposed there. For a full account of all differences, the reader is referred to the edition itself. The principles according to which I have accepted or rejected readings are discussed below in this Introduction, under the heading "The Established Texts and the Critical Apparatus." I may just note here that I have labeled the paragraphs with upper case roman letters for convenience, and to avoid any confusion with the partial numbering of the text in the chaotic edition of Conze [1948 = 1967: 148-67].

A: Recension B has the word ārya in the title while Recension A does not, and places a shad after bha ga ba ti, absent in A. Recension A has two significant variants. For bha ga ba ti the 'Phying ba stag rtse texts (CDJU) read bha ga ba ti. Polyglots 1, 3, and 4 do too. For ħrī da ya the 'Phying ba stag rtse texts except U1 (conflated from P or by error?), along with H2 (conflated from D?) read ħrī da ya. It is important to note that L1 and M1 of Recension B share this latter reading. All of the polyglots have this reading.

B: Recension B has the word 'phags pa in the title, corresponding to Paragraph A’s ārya, while Recension A does not. In Recension A the
Phying ba stag rtse texts (with the conflated H2) have *bam po gcig go* appended to the title. So do polyglots 2 and 4. Note that P has been revised on the block into this reading. The earlier Peking line texts do not have this expression, and P has had to cut out a section of the block to add the revised material. H1 of the Recension A texts is conflated, containing the expression. Note that S inserts this expression after the Invocation in Paragraph C, marking its difference from both Recensions A and B.

C: Recension A has the Invocation *bcom ldan 'das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la phyag 'tsal lo//'*. Recension B has *sangs rgyas dang / byang chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tsal lo//'*. A’s reading is the expression found in the Nepalese Sanskrit material of Shiraishi [1939a], text 6, *nāma bhagavatye* [sic] *āryaprajñāpāramitāye*, while B’s reading is that of the Japanese edition dating back at least to 1231 (Shiraishi [1939a]: text 4 = Hariba [1932]: Section 3: 82-88), *nāmas sarvva-buddhabodhisatvabhyaḥ* [sic].

D: To begin with, Recension B has the reading *thos pa'i dus gcig na*, rather than *thos pa dus gcig na*, which is usually considered standard. However, given the fact, mentioned above, that most editions of Tibetan Kanjur texts now available are not comprehensive, it is impossible to tell what is truly standard. Note that S, nominally a Recension A text, shares this Recension B reading. In the expression *rgyal po'i khab na/*, the Recension B reading, Recension A’s 'Phying ba stag rtse texts C, D1, J and U1 also have *na*, but not the *shad*; the *shad* is also omitted by the Recension B texts H1 and R1. Perhaps the removal of *na* is an innovation of D2, followed by U2. That the insertion of *na* is not an innovation of D1 is proved by its existence in J, the source of D. Since the Peking line and the *Them spangs ma* have no *na*, I have not accepted it into the text, but it remains to explain how the 'Phying ba stag rtse texts share a Recension B reading against *Them spangs ma*, Peking, and S. After *phung po'i ri la* Recension A’s *Them spangs ma* and Peking lines omit the *shad*, which I have thus rejected despite the agreement between 'Phying ba stag rtse and S. H1 also omits the *shad* by conflation. All the polyglots omit the *shad*. In the expression for the *samādhi* into which the Blessed One enters, Recension A reads: *zab mo snang ba zhes bya ba chos kyi rnam*
grangs kyi ting nge 'dzin. Recension B (except for the conflated H1) has: zab mo'i chos kyi rnam grangs snang ba zhes bya ba'i ting nge 'dzin. A’s reading agrees very well with Shiraishi’s Nepalese text 6: gambhirāvabhāsan nāma dharmaparyāyam samādhiṃ. B seems to refer rather, if I may venture a retranslation, to something like *gambhirā-dharmaparyāyam avabhāsam nāma samādhiṃ. For the final verb Recension A has bzhugs so, while B has zhugs so. The Recension A Them spangs ma texts and D (with U) share the B reading. Polyglot 4 also has the Recension B reading.

E: Here in the expression of observing the emptiness of the five aggregates Recension A has: phung po lnga po de dag la yang rang bzhin gyis stong par rnam par lta'o. Recension B (again, except for the conflated H1) states this as: phung po lnga po dag la de dag ngo bo ntyp kyis stong par rnam par blta'o. Note that as in the preceding clause, rnam par (b)lta zhing or ste, here B writes blta against A’s lta. This may seem very trivial, but we will note later that at least one Tibetan commentator has picked up on this difference. Shiraishi’s text 3 reads vyavalokayati, while text 4 reads paśyati sma and text 6 vyavalokayati sma. Although grammars (for example, Inaba [1986]: 137) state that lta is a present and blta a future, if there is any correspondence with the Sanskrit we might expect blta (rather than the stipulated bltas) to be a past. All polyglots share S’s reading of zab mo’i spyod pa, against mo of all other Kanjurs.

F: For Recension A’s shā ri’i bus B has shā ra dwa ti’i bus /. The shad found in A in the Them spangs ma texts and in S is also read in Recension B.

G: While Recension A as printed agrees with Recension B in beginning this paragraph with rigs kyi bu gang la la, the Them spangs ma texts in Recension A have rigs kyi bu ’am rigs kyi bu mo gang la la. Not only that, but the ’Phying ba stag rtse texts as now available also have the latter reading. However, J has the whole passage written in a cramped way such as to clearly indicate that the blocks were corrected; this correction almost certainly took place before C or D were made, since they have the expression. I have accepted what I believe to have been the original Tshal pa reading. The Sanskrit texts from Nepal, and Max Müller’s Chinese text,
Shiraishi’s 5 and 6, have kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā, of which the vā kuladuhitā vā is not found in the other Sanskrit texts. It is probably too much to claim that this variation indicates some sort of attempt at gender inclusivity on the part of the editors of the Recension A Them spangs ma texts and later correctors of J. More likely is that they had a different Sanskrit text, or knew the cliché and adjusted their text accordingly. All the polyglots follow the reading as printed in both recensions. In the translation of carvām cartukāma-, Recension A has sphyod pa sphyad par ‘dod pa while B has sphyad pa sphyod par ‘dod pa. S and (perhaps by happenstance?) N2 share the B reading, as do polyglots 1, 2 and 3. I will discuss below the Tibetan commentator Bstan dar lha ram pa’s remarks on this phrase. Again, all polyglots agree with S in reading zab mo ’i sphyod pa.

H: It seems that the original reading of the Tshal pa texts was shā ra dwa ti ’i bu, and I have accepted this into the text. The Peking xylographs have clearly been altered, thus proving that their present reading, shā ri ’i bu, is an innovation. Recension B has this reading, as do the Recension A Them spangs ma texts, but these seem unlikely sources for the Peking “correction.” More likely it is an editorial correction based on the editors’ knowledge. I cannot say how M1 in Recension B got the Recension A reading, but H1’s reading is almost certainly another conflation from D or H2. Polyglot 2 has the Recension B reading.

I: After the phrase shā ri ’i bu rigs kyi bu ’am, Recension B has a shad found in Recension A’s Them spangs ma texts, and in D (and U), which obviously borrowed it from the Them spangs ma. L1’s omission of the shad is probably an error rather than showing any connection with Recension A. Again here in I we have the distinction between A’s sphyod pa sphyad par ‘dod pa and B’s sphyad pa sphyod par ‘dod pa. Polyglots 1, 2 and 3 have the B reading. The following phrase, before which the Recension A Them spangs ma texts together with S — in agreement with Recension B (again, except the conflated H1) — insert a shad, reads in Recension A: ‘di ltar rnam par blta bar bya ste / phung po lnga po de dag kyang rang bzhin gyis stong par rnam par yang dag par rjes su blta’o //. The Them spangs ma texts and S omit the second rnam par. Recension B
(except for the conflated H1) has for the same passage: phung po lnga po de dag ngo bo nyid khyi stong par yang dag par rjes su mthong ba de ltar blta bar bya ste/. Recension A’s rendering is close to the word order of Shiraishi’s Sanskrit text 3: tenaivām vyavaloṣṭavyām paṁca skandhās tāṃś ca svabhāvaśūnyaṃ samanupaśyati sma. B inverts the word order of the extant Sanskrit version. Again in this paragraph S and all the polyglots read zab mo ’i spyod pa.

J: In the expression gzugs las stong pa nyid gzung ma yin no //, I have accepted the agreement of the Recension A Them spangs ma texts (except H2) with the Peking texts against the ’Phying ba stag rtse texts with S. Thus Recensions A and B agree. In the next sentence, Recension A has stong pa nyid las kyang gzugs gzung ma yin, but the emphatic kyang is not found in Recension B, or in polyglots 1, 3 and 4. Shiraishi’s Sanskrit text 5 has nāpi śūnyātā prthag rūpāt, which might provide one possible explanation for the kyang. In the expression which Recension A reads as: de bzhin du tshor ba dang / ’du shes dang / ’du byed dang / rnam par shes pa rnams stong pa ’o, B has instead de bzhin du tshor ba dang / ’du shes dang / ’du byed rnams dang / rnam par shes pa rnams stong pa ’o. Shiraishi’s Sanskrit text 3 reads: evam vedanā-samjñāsaṃskāra-vijñānāni ca śūnyatā. Text 4, however, reads: evam vedanā-samjñā-saṃskāra-vijñānāni ca śūnyāni. (Shiraishi prints vedanā-samjñāsaṃskāra in text 4 as three words.) It looks like Recension A corresponds better to the reading of text 3, and Recension B to that of text 4.

K: Recension A reads mtshan nyid med pa, which B has as mtshan nyid med pa nyid dang. The corresponding extant Sanskrit reads (sarvadharma) śūnyatālakṣaṇa, but B seems to presuppose something like *śūnyatālakṣaṇatā. Note that both Tibetan versions understand the Sanskrit as śūnyatā + alaksanā. An interesting case appears several phrases later. Recension A has dri ma dang bral ba med pa, while B has dri ma dang bral ba dang. The latter is the reading of polyglot 4. Recension A has obviously understood the analysis amalā + avimala, while B has understood amalā + vimala. Commentators have discussed this phrase, which will be referred to further below.
L: The first clause of the paragraph presents an instance of the Recension A _Them spangs ma_ texts along with S agreeing against the Tshal pa line, here in the insertion of a _shad_. Note that throughout this paragraph Recension B has split into separate sentences what are clauses in Recension A. As usual, H1 is highly conflated, carrying here the Recension A readings. In this famous list of what does not exist in emptiness, although Recension A reads 'du byed rnams med, the Peking texts, C and S omit rnams. (So do polyglots 1, 2 and 3.) Compare the similar pattern in paragraph J, above.

M: Where Recension A has only: mig gi khams med pa nas, B has: mig gi khams med cing / mig gi rnam par shes pa’i khams med pa nas /. Recension A texts of the _Them spangs ma_ line, and S, also have a _shad_ after nas.

N: Here we have another instance of the Recension A _Them spangs ma_ texts along with S agreeing against the Tshal pa line in the insertion of a _shad_.

O: The Sanskrit corresponding to this section is: _na duhkha-samudaya-nirodha-mārgā na jñānam na prāptir nāprāptih_. Recension A has the list as one sentence, ending with _ma thob pa yang med do //_. B has four sentences, and clarifies the plural of the first compound with _lam rnams med do //_. A has only _lam med /_. The expression _na jñānam_ is rendered in A as _ye shes med /_, while B has _shes pa med do //_. All polyglots agree with S in inserting _de bzhin du_ at the head of the paragraph.

P: Within Recension A, the _Them spangs ma_ texts read _shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab mo la brten cing gnas te /_, while the Tshal pa texts omit _zab mo_. Instead S has here not _zab mo_ but ‘di, not found in any other version. In the equivalent of the Sanskrit _viparyāsa-atikrānta_, Recension B has _phyin ci log las ‘das te_, while A has _phyin ci log las shin tu ‘das nas_. It looks like B does not explicitly render _ati-. _ In note (i), S’s omission of the _shad_ is shared by polyglots 1, 3 and 4.

R: The first words of this paragraph in Recension B, _shā ri‘i bu_, are not found in A, but correspond to the Sanskrit reading in Shiraishi’s Nepalese text, 6. The phrase corresponding to _asamasamamantra_ is
rendered *mi mynam pa dang mynam pa'i sngags* in both A and B. S, however, renders *mi mynam pa dang mynam par byed pa'i phan sngags* (*phan* may not be original). The latter half of the paragraph differs greatly in the two recensions. Recension A has: *sdug bsngal thams cad rab tu zhi bar byed pa'i sngags / mi brdzun pas na bden par shes par bya ste / shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i sngags smras pa/*. Recension B reads: *sdug bsngal thams cad rab tu zhi bar byed pa'i sngags te / ma log pa'i phyir shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ni / gsang sngags bden zhir / rigs pa yin par shes par bya'o/* //. There are variants in the corresponding Sanskrit texts, but text 3 reads: *tasmāj jñātavyah praśīpāramitā mahā- mantrō mahāvidyāmantrō 'nuttaramantrō 'samasamamantrō sarvadukkhapraśamanamantrō satyam amithyatvāt praśīpāramitāyām ukto mamtrāh*. Texts 5 and 6, the Chinese and Nepalese texts respectively, have some transmissional variants, but a crucial point is that both end not with *praśīpāramitāyām ukto mamtrāh* but with *praśīpāramitāyukto mamtrāh*. Recension A has understood *jñātavyah* to cover the clause up to *amithyatvāt*, and *smras pa* seems to correspond to *uktā*. We can render Recension A from the beginning of the paragraph as: "Therefore, you should know that the mantra of the Perfection of Wisdom, the mantra ... the mantra which assuages all sufferings, since it is not spurious, is true, and the mantra of the Perfection of Wisdom says: " Recension B’s *rigs pa yin pa* seems to correspond, though it is not exactly clear how, to -yukta. We might very tentatively, with no confidence in the last clause, render Recension B as follows: "Śāriputra! Therefore, you should know that being the mantra of the Perfection of Wisdom, it is the mantra ... being the mantra which assuages all sufferings, because it is not erroneous the Perfection of Wisdom, being a true mantra, is appropriate." It seems to me at this point that neither recension understands the Sanskrit in the way I do, namely: "... this is a mantra appropriate (or proper) to the Perfection of Wisdom, namely (*tadyathā*): ....." Note that polyglot 2 has inserted *bden bar shes par byas te / after de lta bas na*, thus corresponding exactly to the word order of the Sanskrit *tasmāj jñātavyah.*

S: Here in the mantra itself, the *Them slangs ma* and Peking texts, with S, of Recension A agree against the 'Phying ba stag rtse texts in
having *om* in the mantra: *tadya thā / om gate gate*. Of the Sanskrit texts reported by Shiraishi, only his text B has *om*. The discussion of the Tibetan commentators on this phrase is examined below.

**U/V**: Corresponding to the Sanskrit (with variants eased over for the sake of convenience) *sādhukāram adāt, sādhu sādhu kulaputra evam etat / kulaputra evam etad gambhirāyām prajñāpāramitāyām caryām carta-vyāṁ yathā tvayā nirdiṣṭam anumodyam tathāgatabhyaḥ* [*?!!*], Recension A has: *legs so zhes bya ba byin nas / legs so legs so // rigs kyi bu de de bzhin no // rigs kyi bu de de bzhin te / ji ltar khyod kysis bstan pa de bzhin du shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab mo la spyad par bya ste / de bzhin gshegs pa rnams kyang rjes su yi rang ngo //*. Recension B has: *rigs kyi bu legs so legs so // rigs kyi bude de bzhin no // de de bzhin te / khyod kysis ji skad bstan pa bzhin du / shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab mo la spyad par bya ste / de bzhin gshegs pa rnams kyang rjes su yi rang ngo zhes legs so bya ba byin no //*. In Recension A, the second *rigs kyi bu*, which is omitted by the Peking texts (except for P, which has obviously been corrected on the block), and S, corresponds well with the Sanskrit. The *Them spangs ma* texts and S insert a *shad* after *de bzhin du*. The word order of this recension seems to more or less agree with that of the Sanskrit. Recension B has placed the equivalent of *sādhukāram adāt* at the end of paragraph **V**.

**W**: Again in this paragraph we have an example of the Recension A *'Phying ba stag rste* texts and S reading *shā ra dwa ti’i bu* for the *shā ri’i bu* of the rest. Recension B also reads *shā ri’i bu*. In the following clause Recension A reads: *byang chub sms dpa’ sms dpa’ chen po ’phags pa spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug*, while Recension B has *byang chub sms dpa’ phags pa spyan ras gzigs kyi dbang phyug*. Of the Sanskrit texts, only 5 and 6 add *mahāsattva*. In the phrase *thams cad dang ldan pa’i ’khor de dang*, of the Recension A texts the Peking line, R2 and S, and of the Recension B texts H1 and N1, have *’khor de dag dang*. N1 was corrected on the block, or before it was carved. Polyglots 1, 2 and 3 also add *dag*. In the expression *yi rangs te* in Recension A, the Peking line shares with S the reading *yid*. Polyglots 1, 2 and 3 also have this reading.
X: Recension B appends to the head of the End Title 'phags pa, while omitting zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo. The Recension A Them spangs ma texts read ... zhes bya ba'i mdo. So polyglots 1 and 3. Polyglots 1, 3 and 4 also add 'phags pa, and 4 reads the whole paragraph with B.

Y: The colophon is found only in Recension A (except for the conflated H1), and omitted by the Recension A Them spangs ma texts. All the polyglots omit it. It is discussed in detail below in this Introduction.

The above should have made it abundantly clear that the textual tradition of the Heart Sūtra in its Kanjur versions is anything but monolithic. The tradition splits into at the very least two clear groups, and if we look deeper, toward the recensitional variants within the two larger recensions, we find the tradition even further divided. Given our present imperfect knowledge of the Sanskrit texts of the Heart Sūtra, due to the lack of anything approaching a complete and reliable edition, nothing can be said about the possible affiliations of any of our Tibetan recensions or sub-recensions with any given Sanskrit tradition.

Although there are not many editions of Tibetan translations which have provided enough information to draw any comparisons, a recent paper by Takamichi Fukita [1991] on the Karmavibhāṅga shows that Tibetan recensional variations can sometimes correspond spectacularly to Sanskrit variations. Fukita’s paper shows that the Sanskrit fragments of the Karmavibhāṅga he studied correspond much more closely to the Tibetan and Chinese translations than do those of the Sanskrit text studied years ago by Sylvain Lévi. So far this has little to do with Kanjur text criticism, although of course it reinforces the claim offered above that the Tibetan translations we now have sometimes clearly go back to Indic originals quite different from those extant today.¹ What is interesting for us is that the Tog Palace Kanjur quoted by Fukita contains a recension of

¹ This point was, in fact, made for this very text on the basis of the readings in L, the London Manuscript Kanjur, long ago by Walter Simon [1970]. At that time, however, the actually corresponding Sanskrit text was not available.
the Karmavibhaṅga clearly different from that contained in the only other two Kanjurs mentioned by Fukita, Derge and Peking. One might expect to find a nice Them spangs ma — Tshal pa division here, and a complete edition of the Karmavibhaṅga would no doubt yield interesting results.

I mentioned several times in the preceding discussion of variants in the Heart Sūtra that Tibetan commentators have remarked on one point or another. These scholars have noticed and mentioned variations in the texts of the Heart Sūtra available to them, and this in itself is interesting in showing that they took the trouble to consult written copies of a text most of them must have memorized. A look at some so-called Indian commentaries may also be of interest, so let us turn now to a consideration of the commentaries.

The Commentaries

As mentioned above, the present study is restricted to the Kanjur text of the Heart Sūtra itself. I have made no special study of the commentaries, either Indian or Tibetan. This is a task for the future, and one already begun by Donald Lopez. In his recent book, The Heart Sūtra Explained: Indian and Tibetan Commentaries, Lopez has included translations of two quite late (18th-19th century) Tibetan commentaries. Besides much of doctrinal interest, both of these contain interesting information on textual variants known to the authors of these commentaries. The two commentaries treated by Lopez are Bstan dar lha ram pa’s Shes rab snying po ’i ’grel ba don gsal nor bu ’i ’od,1 and Gung thang Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me’s Shes rab snying po ’i sngags kyi rnam bsad spas [correctly sbas] don gsal ba.2 The text of the first commentary was very generously made available to me by Tszultrim Kelsang, but the second was available only in a virtually illegible microfiche reproduction. I would like to point

1 Lokesh Chandra 1963. Serial number 7078; Published in Bstan dar lha ram (1971): 291-322.
2 Lokesh Chandra [1963]. Serial number 3430. Published in Gung thang bstan pa’i sgron me’i gsung ’bum. Vol. 1. (New Delhi, 1972).
out below some of these scholars’ comments relevant to the text-critical issues raised by the present edition.

The commentary of Bstan dar lha ram pa is, from the point of view of variant readings at least, the more informative of the two, and the reader who consults the critical apparatus of the present edition will find most of the variants listed in the following well attested in the editions I have studied. In regard to our Paragraphs B and C, it tells us:¹ “‘One fascicle’ and ‘Homage to the Blessed One, the Perfection of Wisdom’ are words written by the translators.” Both of the cited readings come from Recension A, the first limited to the Tshal pa line. It is interesting to note that the second phrase cited by Bstan dar lha ram pa, “Homage to the Blessed One, the Perfection of Wisdom,” was perhaps not in fact added by the translators, or at least not added without a basis in an Indic text; as noted above, at least one Nepalese Sanskrit manuscript has this phrase. A second comment illustrates the relevance to some of seeming minutiae. “The ba prefix on blsa ’o was added by the scribe and is not correct,” the commentator writes in reference to Paragraph E.² The reading rejected is a Recension B reading. A perhaps more substantive issue is raised with regard to Paragraph G.³ “The occurrence of the phrase spyod pa spyad par ’dod pa in the majority of texts these days is incorrect; it should say spyad pa spyod par ’dod because spyad pa and spyod pa refer to the object of achievement and the means of achievement or to the object of practice and the practitioner.” The reading approved of by Bstan dar lha ram pa is the Recension B reading. Therefore, “the majority of texts these days” means Recension A texts.

---

¹ Bstan dar lha ram [1971] 8a4: bstan pa gcig go zhes pa dang bcom ldan ’das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la phyag ’tshal lo zhes pa lo tsā bas byas pa’i tshig go //. Translation from Lopez [1988]: 148, slightly modified.

² Bstan dar lha ram [1971] 10a6: ...stong par lta ba’i don te ’di la blta’o zhes pa yig gis phul ba ni ma dag go //. Translation from Lopez [1988]: 151.

³ Bstan dar lha ram [1971] 11a1-2: deng sang gi dpe phal che ba las spyod pa spyad par ’dod ces byang ba ni ma dag pa yin pas spyad pa spyod pa ’dod ces don dgos te / spyad pa dang spyod pa ni bsgrub bya dang sgrub byed ces pa’i nyams su blang bya dang nyams su len pa po la byed pa’i phyir /. Translation from Lopez [1988]: 151.
With regard to Paragraph K, the commentary says:

Some editions say, “Therefore, all elements are emptiness,” and “without stain and free from stain” and there are scholars who comment on it in that way, but in many Indian and Tibetan commentaries it says, “Thus, all elements,” and “without freedom from stain.” It is clear that it is more meaningful if it is explained in accordance with the two negative terms appearing in succession.¹

If we did not know that Bstan dar lha ram pa was long dead by the time the Lhasa edition H1 was published, we might think that he had H1 in mind when he referred to editions which have “Therefore, all elements are emptiness,” and “without stain and free from stain.” For of the editions studied here only H1 has both of these readings. Otherwise, the Recension A texts have “therefore” instead of the Recension B “thus,” while the Recension A texts read “without stain, without freedom from stain,” and the Recension B texts have “without stain and free from stain.” It is therefore not exactly clear what Bstan dar lha ram pa means here. A final remark of Bstan dar lha ram pa concerns the famous mantra of the sūtra. As noted above for Paragraph S, only the Recension A Peking and Them spangs ma lines, and S, contain the word om. But the commentary warns:² “Om and svāhā bless the mantra with power. The absence of om here is incorrect because it says in the Prajñāpāramitāhrdayasādhana written by Nāgārjuna: ‘If you are tired, recite the mantra of truth / Adding tadyathā and om.’”³ As noticed above, the issue of whether the Heart

---

¹ Bstan dar lha ram [1971] 13a1-2: dpe kha cig las / de lta bas na chos thams cad stong pa nyid ces dang / dri ma med pa dri ma dang bral ba zhes byung ba ltar ’gre gmkhan yo’ na’ang rgya bod kyi ’gre pa mang por de ltar chos thams cad dri ma dnag bral ba med pa zhes dgag tshig nyis brtsegs byung ba ltar ’gre na don che bar mgon no //. Translation from Lopez [1988]: 154, slightly modified.


³ Lopez [1990a]: 212 translates *Nāgārjuna’s comment: “If you are tired, recite the mantra of
Sūtra is to be assigned to the Prajñāpāramitā section or to the Tantra section of the Kanjur is related to the issue of the existence of tantric texts associated with the sūtra. A discussion of this issue, in fact, immediately follows the just quoted observations. For our purposes it is enough to note that the presence or absence of the word om was evidently of some gravity to the Tibetan commentators. The other commentary translated by Lopez contains an almost identical comment. Dkon mchog bstan pa’i sgron me says: “Although there are two traditions of the text, one in which the mantra has om and one in which it does not, the one which has om should be taken as correct, because it says in the sādhana written by Nāgārjuna, ‘adding tadyathā and om....’”

The other observation in the latter commentary relevant to our concerns does not correspond to any reading recorded in the present edition. With regard to Paragraph O, the commentary says: “Some Indian texts at the point of ‘no wisdom’ add ‘no non-wisdom,’ but if the meaning is analyzed, I wonder whether it is necessary.” At this place I was able to read the microfiche of the xylograph: rgya dpe ’ga’ zhig tu ye shes med ces pa’i ’phror / mi shes pa med ces pa zhig yod par bshad kyang don la brtag na mi dgos sam snyam /2 The reading shes pa med is the reading of Recension B, while Recension A has ye shes med. I do not know the source of the reading mi shes pa med.

It will undoubtedly prove very interesting to study in detail the traditions concerning variant readings preserved in Tibetan commentaries and other works. I may just mention here an interesting work, to my knowledge so far unstudied, called the Snar thang dang khu re dpar ma’i bka’ ’gyur tshig brjod zhib bsdur gsal byed me long bzhugs [Nyima 1982]. This text, apparently dating from 1918, is not alone in its class. Ts. Damdinsuren [1983] lists several similar works, products of nineteenth and twentieth century Mongolian scholarship. These include the Bka’

---

1 Lopez [1988]: 175. Although I was unable to read the microfiche clearly, I located the passage. It occurs at ka, 10.b.6 (= folio 701 of the reprint edition).

2 Translation Lopez [1988]: 181, modified. In the xylograph ka 15.a.4-5 (= reprint folio 710).
'gyur rin po che 'i dogs slong gsal byed of Chahar dge bshes chos rje Blo bzang bkra shis, the Rgyal ba 'i bka' 'gyur ro cog gi lung rgyud snar thang dpar ma' i steng nas spel skabs su nye bar mkho ba'i ... brjed tho mdo tsam of Gser tog ho thog thu Blo bzang tshul khrims rgya mtsho, the Bka' 'gyur rin po che 'i bklags lung gnang skabs su nye bar mkho ba'i kha skong chad pa bsngo pa lhag pa bri ba sogs kyi sog grang of Bka' becu Rta mgrin srung, and the Rgyal ba 'i bka' 'gyur rin po che zhes yongs su grags pa 'i klag lung mnos pa' i thob yig of Bka becu Lcam srin skyabs. The works of Daminsuren's main subject, Bstan dar sngags rams pa (Sngags rams pa Bshad sgrub bstan dar), were already noticed by Bethlenfalvy [1980: 14] as Mdo mang gi zhus dag, Sher phyin gyi zhus dag, Phal chen gyi zhus dag, Dkon brtsegs kyi zhus dag, and 'Dul ba' i zhus dag.¹ We cannot but strongly agree with the general outlines of the following conclusion offered by Damdinsuren [1983: 54]:

It will be a great contribution to the study of the Kanjur — a significant monumental literary work of Buddhism — and to the establishment of the correct, initial text of Kanjur, if these corrections of misprints and errors of Kanjur made by Mongolian scholars of the earlier and later period, with introductions and commentaries were to be introduced to the scientific world and were to be published.

It is possible that in at least some of the works of this class we will find what amount to the working notes of the teams of redactors who carefully studied the texts available to them in the process of establishing new Kanjur editions. Some of these texts seem to represent the fruits of the labors of scholars who translated the Kanjur into Mongolian. Whether or not we can ever be certain of the historical circumstances in which these texts were compiled, such notes are of great interest since they present to us not isolated variants but variants which were felt by educated readers to be in some way significant, and worthy of mention. The great task of

¹ These works, with the exception of the 'Dul ba' i zhus dag, can be found in the Works of Bstan-dar Sngags-rams-pa, Lokesh Chandra [1982].
studying these texts (in some instances, of first finding a copy of the text) awaits the future. In this regard it would be well to draw attention to the Kanjur called K in the present edition, languishing now unused in the Harvard-Yenching Library at Harvard. It is just possible that the handwritten notations on this copy represent, or are even the original, actual working notes of the revisors of the Peking Kanjur, or maybe they are notes made by later reader(s) in comparison with the revised Kanjur. In either case, K certainly should be scrutinized in the future.

The Indian commentaries present another source of evidence, but until critical editions of these, based minimally on all the available Tanjur editions (namely, those of Derge, Peking, Narthang and Cone and perhaps the newly published Golden Manuscript Tanjur), are produced, any comments must be purely preliminary. Several problems will present themselves as we study these texts, unfortunately preserved only in Tibetan, and not available in Sanskrit. Were the quotations of the sūtra text found in the commentaries translated independently of the Tibetan translation of the Heart Sūtra itself, or did the translators copy or consult the translation of the sūtra available to them? Do variants in the sūtra quotations represent Indian variants or Tibetan variants? The latter question, in the first place, cannot be answered without careful editions of the commentaries, which would then be studied along with careful editions of the sūtra in question. Without such philological tools no progress can be made on such questions. Despite these problems, we can tentatively offer some very brief remarks based on published studies.

The most recent and perhaps most relevant study to which I might draw attention is Watanabe Shōgo’s study and translation of Praśāstrasena’s commentary [1992]. With access to an earlier version of the present study, Watanabe determined that the text quoted in the commentary is a

---

1 Hariba [1938] published photographs of the Derge Tanjur texts of the extant so-called Indian commentaries, those attributed to Vimalamitra, Jñānamitra, Phyag na rdo rje, Praśāstrasena, Śrīmahājana, Atiśa and Śrīśrīnīha. This list does not include Tantric sādhanas and so forth based on the Heart Sūtra. We may mention here that an additional Indian commentary to the Heart Sūtra is attributed to Jetārī in the biography of Atiśa. See Eimer [1979]: I.288 (sec. 240), 443; II.179. Eimer remarks (I.443) that “The commentary of Jetārī [shes rab snying po ’i ’grel pa] has not been traced.” And indeed, even traditional lists of the works of Jetārī do not know such a title; see Shirasaki [1981].
Recension A text which was, as we saw above, the more popular recension in Tibet. Donald Lopez [1988: 206, n. 61] comments on Vimalamitra’s commentary (ad Paragraph K) as follows: “The Tibetan reads ‘dri ma dang bral ba,’ but it is clear from Vimalamitra’s discussion that it should be ‘dri ma med pa dang bral ba.’ ” It is not quite clear exactly what Lopez means here, but as we noted above the reading dri ma dang bral ba belongs to Recension B. Recension A reads rather dri ma dang bral ba med pa, the inversion of Lopez’s dri ma med pa dang bral pa. The latter is, as far as I know, unattested. P.O. Skjærvø [1988] transcribed the portions of the sūtra quoted in Jñānamitra’s commentary (from the Derge Tanjur) which differ from the sūtra text in the Narthang Kanjur (our N1 [iii]). Without a more complete study it is difficult to say, but I have the impression that Jñānamitra’s text is on the whole very close to that presented in the present edition, with however quite a few variants, many not attested in any Kanjur I have seen. These sources, as mentioned, remain as yet virtually unstudied, at least from the philological point of view.

The Colophon

When I discussed the two recensions of the Heart Sūtra above, I postponed consideration of the colophon. I would like now to examine it in detail here. The colophon, which appears only in the Tshal pa texts of Recension A, is short, relatively simple, and seems at first to present few problems. It has been translated before, by F.A. Bischoff in his Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone [1968: 101]. Bischoff’s translation reads:

---

1 In his study of Praśāstrasena’s commentary, Edward Conze remarked that “The Sūtra text which is commented upon here differs at times from that of the Kanjur,” and he noted five place in which this is true [1974: 51; see his notes 25, 26, 33, 34, 41]. But in light of Watanabe’s results, Conze’s remarks may need to be reconsidered.

2 Actually the transcription covers only the portion corresponding to the fragmentary Khotanese text, up to our Paragraph L.
Der indische Lehrer Bimala mitra (Vimalamitra) und der Übersetzer dge slong Rinchen sdes (Rin chen sde) haben [dieses] übersetzt, und der grosse Korrektor-Übersetzer dge slong Nam mkha’ (Nam mkha’) und andere haben es korrigiert und ediert. An der Wand der “Tugendverdienst erblühten Sandinsel” (Buyan delgeregshen qumagi dvib = Dge rgyas bye ma gling) des glanzvollen, von selbst enstandenen Kloster Samini (Bsam yas) haben sie die Niederschrift und die Korrektur trefflich vollendet.

Although a note says “Nach der tib. Version übersetzt,” this may not be entirely the case, since Bischoff has provided the Mongolian renderings in several places. I would like to offer the following English rendering of the text printed in the present edition, which reads as follows:

rgya gar gyi mkhan po bi ma la mi tra dang / lo tstsha ba dge slong rin chen sdes bsgyur cing / zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba dge slong nam mkha’ la sogd pas zhun te gtan la phab pa’o // apal bsam yas lhun gyis grub pa ’i gtsug lag gi dge rgyas bye ma gling gi rtsig ngos la bris pa dang zhu dag legs par bgyis so //

Translated by the Indian scholar Vimalamitra and the Lotsāwa Dge slong Rin chen sde, it was revised and put in order by the chief revisor Lotsāwa Dge slong Nam mkha’ and others. It was corrected [comparing it] with that written on the wall of the Dge rgyas bye ma gling of the Lhun gyis grub pa (= spontaneously produced) monastery Śrī Bsam yas.

There are some issues which merit discussion here. In the first place, although a relatively trivial matter, note that the texts of the Peking line add khang to the term gtsug lag in the final phrase. In any case, whether we accept this reading or not, the sense is that of gtsug lag khang, monastery (lit. scripture house). According to Bu ston, the Queen ’Bro za
byang chub sman built the Dge rgyas bye ma gling at Bsam yas.\(^1\) The same information is given in the *Rgyal rabs gsal ba'i me long*.\(^2\) The expression that the scripture was “written on the wall” is probably to be taken quite literally. In conversation the Tibetologist David Jackson told me that it was not uncommon in later times for certain brief scriptural passages to be written or inscribed on walls of monasteries in connection with or in addition to murals.\(^3\) In this way the survival of early readings was assured to a much higher degree than it would have been had the text merely been committed to fragile paper. Jackson adds that the important point is that the colophon emphasizes that the text was compared with a version surviving on the walls of Tibet’s earliest monastery, Bsam yas. For the Tibetans this would have been a strong argument for an early and authoritative reading. It is interesting to note that Xuanzang’s translation of the Heart Sūtra seems to have been inscribed on a stone wall of the *Da Xingshan-si* 大興善寺 monastery in the capital of Luoyang, perhaps by Xuanzang himself.\(^4\)

Before we begin to investigate the colophon in detail, we should briefly notice the listings of the translation in the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue, and in the catalogues of Bu ston. The former lists the translation in its first section, titled *Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i phyogs su gtogs pa*, “[Texts] included within the Mahāyāna Sūtras Prajñāpāramitā section.” It is numbered 14, and designated as 28 ślokas in length. No indication is given of its translator(s) [Lalou 1953: 319; Yoshimura 1974: 120]. Bu ston, on the other hand, lists the text in his *Chos 'byung*, number 118, together with other Prajñāpāramitā texts as follows

---

1. Obermiller [1932]: 189. The queen’s name is variously spelt; ‘Bro bza’ byang chub sman and ‘Bro(ng) bza’ byang chub (s)gron seem to be common. A list of over ten variant names or spellings is given by Erik Haarb [1969]: 57.

2. Kuznetsov [1966]: 174, l. 23-24. Here the name of the queen is written ‘Bro za byang chub sgron, with the variant bza’.

3. Jackson adds that such customs probably existed in earlier times too, and points to the long inscriptions on the walls of Tabo monastery in Spiti (ca. 11th century), a Rin chen bzang po establishment.

[Nishioka 1980: 69]: Shes rab snying po 25 śloka Rin chen sde dang / bandhe Nam mkha’ la sogs pa'i 'gyur / 'di la 28 śloka zer yang rgya dper 25 bshad do //. We can translate this: “Prajñāḥṛdaya, 25 ślokas. A translation of Rin chen sde, Bandhe Nam mkha’, and others. Although it is said to have 28 ślokas, it is stated that there are 25 [ślokas] in the Indian manuscript.” We saw above (page 29) that Bu ston accepts in the same Chos 'byung the assignment of the Heart Sūtra to the Tantra section as well. In his later Tantra Catalogue, Rgyud 'bum gyi dkar chag [Eimer 1989: 89], Bu ston lists the text, number 160, this way: Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i snying po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo / paṇḍi ta Bi ma la mi tra dang / lo tsā ba dgro Rin chen sde'i 'gyur / .... We may render this: “Prajñāpāramitāḥṛdaya nāma mahāyānasūtra. A translation of Paṇḍit Vimalamitra and the Lotsawa Dgro Rin chen sde.” I cannot explain the reason for the two different attributions given by Bu ston.

All three names mentioned in the colophon are found mentioned together in Bu ston’s History of Buddhism (Chos 'byung). After a discussion of the first seven monks ordained in Tibet (the sad mi mi bdun), we read the following sentence: “Furthermore, the Indian teachers Vimalamitra, Sangs rgyas gsang ba, Śāntirigarbha [sic], Viśuddhasīna and others, with the Tibetan translators, the seven selected ones and Chos kyi snang ba, Bande Nam mkha’, Sgro Rin chen sde, Rnam par mi rtog pa, Śākya ’od and others, interpreted and translated many texts.”

The question of the identity of the translator Vimalamitra is a little more complicated than it might at first seem. It was long thought that there were (at least) two Vimalamitras. One was the famous Vimalamitra, the influential tantric scholar considered to be a founder of the Rdzogs chen

---

1 The Tibetan text is found in the Chos 'byung of Bu ston, vol. pa of the gsung 'bum, folio 127b1-2. In the reprint edition it is folio 886 of volume 24. See Lokesh Chandra [1971]. The passage reads: gzhan yang rgya gar gyi slob dpon bi ma la mi tra dang / sangs rgyas gsang ba dang / šā nīm garbha dang / bi su dāha singha .. [sic!] la sogs pa dang / bod kyi lo tsā ba sad mi mi bdun dang / chos kyi snang ba dang / bandhe nam mkha’ dang / sgro rin chen sde dang / rnam par mi rtog pa dang / sākya ’od la sogs pa lo tsā byas te chos mang po bsgyur to //. The translation by Obermiller [1932]: 190-91 seems to me potentially misleading. Prof. Ruegg suggests that the last expression means “... acting as translators (lo tsa ba) they rendered ....”
tradition, and another a later Vinaya specialist. This is the position of the Deb ther sngon po or Blue Annals, from which Roerich translates the crucial passage as follows:

Now, it is stated in ancient records about the ācārya Vimalamitra that there had been two Vimalamitras, the “Earlier” and the “Later,” during the reigns of the religious kings Khri srong lde btsan and Mnga’ bdag Ral pa can. The “Earlier” lived during the reign of the religious king Khri srong lde btsan. He did not dress in monastic robes but went about attired as a yogin. The king and his ministers expressed doubt as to whether he was a heretic, or a Buddhist. Doubts were also expressed, because, while making obeisance, he had broken an image of Vairocana. In order to remove the doubts of the ministers he composed the Šadāṅga-śaraṇa (Skyabs ’gro yan lag drug pa), in which he said: “the king and ministers did not trust me, so I composed the rite of the ‘Six branches of the Refuge taking ceremony.’” He also composed the extensive commentary on the Prajñāhṛdaya (Shes rab snying po), [the Rim gyis ’jug pa’i sgom don] and the Cig char ’jug pa’i sgom don. To judge from the method (employed in the books) he must have lived after the ācārya Kamalaśīla. The “Later” Vimalamitra is the author of an extensive commentary on the Pratimokṣa-sūtra in fifty chapters. He should be regarded as a monk.

---

1 See for a recent example Davidson [1981]: 9, n. 23.

2 Roerich [1949]: 191-92. The Tibetan text is found in ‘Gos gzhon nu dpal [1985]: 1.238-39. The passage reads: de la slob dpon bi ma la mi tra yang/ chos rgyal khri srong lde btsan nas mnga’ bdag ral pa can gyi bar du/ bi ma la mi tra snga phyi gnyis byung ba srong gyi yi ge dag la snang ste/ snga ma ni chos rgyal khri srong lde btsan gyi dus su byung ba/ rab tu byung ba’i cha byad du med par rnal ’byor pa’i cha byad du yod pas/ rgyal blon rnam gnyis pa dang nang pa gang yin the tshom za zhing rnam snang gi lder tsho la phyag byas gus pas kyang the tshom zos pa’i gtam snang zhi/ the tshom bzlog pa’i phyir skyabs ’gro yan lag drug pa mdzad las/ rgyal blon yid ches ma gyur pas/ skyabs ’gro yan lag drug pa byas/ zhes kyang ‘byung ngo// dis shes rab snying po’i rgya cher ’grel pa dang/ rim gyis ’jug pa’i sgom don dang/ cig char ’jug pa’i sgom don gnyis kyang mdzad de/ de dag gi tshul la blatas na slob dpon ka ma la shi la’i rjes tsam la byon pa ‘dra’o// bi ma la mi tra phyi ma ni so sor thar pa’i rgya cher ’grel pa bjam po lnga bcu pa mdzad pa po ste/ rien yang dge slong du ‘thag do//. The words in brackets are missing from Roerich’s translation.
Recently, however, Flemming Faber has taken up the problem, and concluded [1989: 26] that “if there were two [Vimalamitras], the so-called ‘later’ one is of no consequence whatsoever, as all available information on Vimalamitra appears to refer to the ‘earlier’ Vimalamitra.” King Khri srong lde btsan apparently died in 797. ¹ Now, since we have this reference to Vimalamitra, and since the Heart Sūtra is listed in the Ldan dkar ma catalogue of Tibetan texts, a catalogue which dates from the time of King Khri srong lde btsan, this should give us a chronological starting point.

Colophons to other texts also know the name of Vimalamitra, some mentioning it along with several of the other names mentioned in the colophon to the Heart Sūtra. The colophon to the commentary on the Heart Sūtra attributed to Vimalamitra [Tōh. 3818, Ōtani 5217] credits Vimalamitra, Nam mkha’ and Ye shes snying po [= Jñānagarbha] with the translation. It seems possible, or even probable, that this Nam mkha’ is to be identified with Nam mkha’ skyong. Note that this commentary is also listed in the Ldan dkar ma catalogue.² Vimalamitra, Surendrākaraprabha and Nam mkha’ skyong translated Kamalaśīla’s Saptaśatikāprajñāpāramitāṭīkā [Tōh. 3815, Ōtani 5215]. The names of the translators of Vimalamitra’s own commentary of the same name seem to be lost [Tōh. 3814, Ōtani 5214]. The same Surendrākaraprabha and Nam mkha’ translated Vasubhandu’s Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā [Tōh. 3995, Ōtani 5496] and Nam mkha’ along with Surendraprabha (the same as Surendrākaraprabha?) rendered Gunamati’s Pratītyasamutpādādīvibhāṅgardeśatīkā into Tibetan [Tōh. 3996, Ōtani 5497]. It seems to be the same Nam mkha’ who, along with Jñānagarbha, is responsible for the Sambandhaparikṣāprakarana of Dharmakirti [Tōh. 4214, Ōtani 5713] and Vinitadeva’s commentary, the Sambandhaparikṣāṭīkā [Tōh. 4236, Ōtani 5735]. The

¹ On the question of the relative priority of Vimalamitra and Kamalaśīla, see Faber [1989]: 21.
² Entry 529. ’phags pa shes rab snying po ’i rgyal cher ’grel pa / slob dpon bi ma la mi tras mzdad pa / 300 ślokā.
³ According to Marek Mejor, the Sanskrit manuscript reads the title in this way (or vyākhyāna). The Tanjurs generally read ādīvibhāṅgayaḥ nirdeśa.
first of these (perhaps integrating the second?) is also mentioned in the
*Ldan dkar ma.*1 If this Jñānagarbha is the same as the Ye shes snying po
with whom Vimalamitra and Nam mkha’ translated Vimalamitra’s com-
mentary to the Heart Sūtra, it may be that the evidence for the identity of
the translators is mounting. One problem here is the identity of Jñāna-
three, scholars of this name. We will see below that this multiplicity can
potentially create some confusion.

The name Dge slong Nam mkha’ presents us with a problem. D1,
D2, H1, H2 and U2 read here *lo tsts ha ba dge blo dang nam mkha’.*
Probably H1 and H2, and of course U2, derive their readings from Derge.
There would perhaps be little need to take such a variant very seriously if it
were not generally felt that the Derge editors, as I have had occasion to
mention above, generally knew very well what they were doing.2 If they
printed a text different from any others we have, there are at least reason-
able grounds for suspecting that we have to do with more than a simple
error, until we can show otherwise. What if the Derge editors are right?
This would mean that we have to do with another person, a Dge blo. What
of Dge blo? Does it make sense to say Dge blo and Nam mkha’? If we
think it does, we must locate a candidate for the role of Dge blo.3 The
name does occur in various catalogues, virtually always as an abbreviation.
One name for which it stands is Dge ba’i blo gros, easily and normally
abbreviated into Dge blo. It seems that at least in Bu ston’s *Chos ’byung*
catalogue Dge blo always refers to Dge ba’i blo gros. This figure is

1 Number 704. See Frauwallner [1957]: 96ff. Regarding the identification of several texts,
Frauwallner [96] says: “Only the great extent specified for the Sambandhaparīkṣā affords a difficulty.
However, this difficulty disappears as soon as we assume that the commentary of Vinitideva, his
Sambandhaparīkṣātikā, was included in it.”

2 As David Jackson pointed out to me, the Kanjur team was headed by Situ Pañ-chen Chos kyi
’byung gnas (1699-1774).

3 In his “Notes à propos des colophons du Kanjur,” J.W. de Jong has accepted the reading of the
Peking edition, which is the edition followed by the Mongol translation and by Bischoff (whose work de
Jong was reviewing). Therefore de Jong considers the translation team to consist of Vimalamitra, Rin
chen sde and Nam mkha’ (skyong). He places them at the end of the eighth century. de Jong [1972]:
528-29.
identified, however, as a student of Rin chen bzang po (958-1055), and he seems to have been closely associated with Atiśa. We have already determined that Vimalamitra is to be assigned to the time of Khri srong lde btsan. Now, the revisors need not date from the same time as the translators, but we would expect Dge blo and Nam mkha’ to be contemporaries. It is also possible that we can explain the confusion orthographically, suggesting that the sa of slong (in dge slong) was miswritten or misread as ba. The nga was then seen as erroneously attached to a correct dge blo (as *dge blo), and hypercorrected to dang, yielding dge blo dang for an original dge slong. (Or, Paul Harrison suggests, was written which was then misread as . It amounts to the same thing.) We are left with two possibilities. Dge blo may refer to some other as yet unidentified figure, and this possibility cannot be totally ruled out. On the other hand, if we accept the reading Dge slong Nam mkha’ (or probably we are to take dge slong as a title), then the problem is essentially solved. Since we have already shown Nam mkha’ and Vimalamitra to be contemporaries, this is certainly the favorite solution at the moment. It remains to explain why the revisors of the Derge edition admitted this reading into their text.

What of the Lo tsā ba Dge slong Rin chen sde? This name is somewhat of a problem. Besides the references by Bu ston mentioned above, and one additional reference in his catalogue which also mentions Vimalamitra and Rin chen sde together, I have been able to locate this name in only one place, and there it seems impossible for the holder of the name to be the same as the scholar mentioned in the present colophon. In the biography of Atiśa, as studied by Helmut Eimer, the name Rin cen sde is found. Eimer [1979: 1.454] renders this as Ratnasena, and identifies this

---

1 Entry 521. Slob dpon dri med bshes gnyen gyis mdzad pa’i sdbus pa’i don bsdus slob dpon de nyan dang dgra bcom rin chen sde’i ‘gyur / ‘di bstan ‘gyur du ma chud /. See Nishioka [1981]: 50. The entry can be rendered: “The *Sam [u]ccayapindārtha (??) composed by Ācārya Vimalamitra is a translation of the Ācārya himself and the Arhat Rin chen sde. It is not included in the Tanjur.”

2 Eimer [1979]: 1.161 and n. 6; II.20. The passage is 6a6. A variant reading is Rin cen mdo, seemingly equally unknown. Could this reading be due to some confusion based on the composite term mdo sde’?
individual as follows: “Indian scholar, teacher of Suvarṇadvīpa Dharmakīrti.” This Ratnasena, then, evidently lived sometime around the year 1000 [Ruegg 1981: 109-10].

To consider another possibility, in her index to Cordier’s catalogue of the Narthang Tanjur, Marcelle Lalou distinguishes two men named Rin chen bzang po, the first of whom she claims [1933: 211] to be “contemporain] du roi Khri-srong lde’u btsan, 755-797 A.D.” Could this figure be Rin chen sde? The texts Lalou cites under this heading were almost all translated in collaboration with the Indian Janādana, perhaps the most famous being the medical work called Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā.¹ One text was translated with Daṇḍibhiṣṇu Śākyamati. Claus Vogel [1965: 19-21] seems to accept without comment, and apparently in contradiction to Lalou, that the Rin chen bzang po with whom Janādana (or Jārandhara, as Vogel prefers) worked is the very famous tenth-eleventh century translator of that name. If we turn to consider Daṇḍibhiṣṇu Śākyamati, we learn that he is credited, under the name of I gu Śākya blo gros, with the translation of Vāgbhaṭa’s auto-commentary to the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya. The co-translator was Dharmaśrīvarman, and the text was revised by Blo, according to Cordier equal to Chos kyi blo gros.² This Chos kyi blo gros, also known as Mar pa Chos kyi blo gros, collaborated with Ye shes snying po [= Jñānagarbha] on a translation listed as Tōhoku 453.³ These figures evidently belong to the eleventh century. It is important to note here that this Jñānagarbha is necessarily different from the one with whom Vimalamitra and Nam mkha’ worked. It seems therefore that Lalou’s attribution of a Rin chen bzang po to the time of Khri srong lde btsan is in error, and

¹ The name is spelled many other ways as well: Jārandana, Jarandana, Janadhana, Jinardhana, Jārandhara, Jārandhana, Jarandha, Jālandhara, and Jenardāna.
² The Ōtani catalogue (5799) does not list this name, nor does Tōhoku (4311).
³ The reference in the Tōhoku catalogue to Mar pa chos kyi grags pa is evidently in error. See Roerich [1949]: 417, n. 4. The Ōtani catalogue of the Peking (no. 88) lists it correctly. As David Jackson pointed out to me, Mar pa Chos kyi blo gros is the famous guru of Milarepa and founder of the Bka’ brgyud pa order; his dates are given as 1012-97.
we cannot identify our otherwise almost unknown Rin chen sde with this figure.¹

Bibliographic Remarks

The present edition is not, of course, the first non-indigenous edition of the Tibetan text of the Heart Sūtra. The following editions, listed in chronological order, have come to my attention.


¹ Another possibility to keep in mind is that suggested by Frauwallner [1957]: 96, albeit in the context of the Ldan dkar ma. “Then, one must, in cases in which the translator belongs to a later time, keep in mind the possibility that older translations got lost and were replaced or supplanted by younger ones.”

² See Appendix II.

tion, and a Chinese version. The Chinese text is omitted in the reprint.¹


Hariba Yoshio (Gensui).² 1932. *Hannya Shingyō Taisei*. Tokyo: Yoyogi Shoin. Reprinted Tokyo: Kaimei Shoin, 1977. Contains photo reproductions of the following: The Taishō University Derge and Narthang xylographs (for both editions the texts from the Sher phyin and the Rgyud are both reproduced), and the texts from Teramoto 1929. Kawaguchi Ekai’s hand copy of both texts from Narthang, along with his interlinear translation, is also reproduced. A diglot in Tibetan

---

¹ See Appendix III. Some read the author’s name as Kan or even Yutaka, but the title page of his *Posthumous Papers* has his name in Tibetan script as Hiroshi.

² Gensui 元水 is the author’s “Dharma name,” that is, the name he took upon becoming officially a Buddhist layman. He is referred to both as Hariba Yoshio 榊葉良男 and as Hariba Gensui, and in addition sometimes as Gensui Koji 元水居士, the Householder Gensui. A brief entry is given this book by Wada Kenju 和田謙寿 in Ono [1932-35]: 13.264b-c. Hariba attributes the texts reproduced from Teramoto [1929] to the “Red Peking” Kanjur. The text has similar, but not identical, readings to those reported for Peking in the present edition.
and Manchu is reproduced from a (xylographic?) text dating from January, 1784.


Sonam Gyamtsho and Arai Keiyo. 1983. *Chibettogo-yaku Hannya Shingyō / The Heart Sutra*. Jutokuji Bunko 7. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai. Contains a careful edition (in Tibetan script) of the text based on D1, with a (romanized) list of variants from C, D2, H1, H2, N1, N2, and P. In addition, facing the edition a phonemic transcription, in the notation devised by Kitamura Hajime, is provided. Both an English and a Japanese translation are appended. This is the second edition; a note mentions that the first edition was published in 1973.


A. A. Terent’ev. 1989. “‘Sutra serdca pradžnjaparamity’ i ee mesto v istorii buddijskoj filosofii” [“Prajñāpāramitā Heart Sūtra” and its place in the history of Buddhist Philosophy]. In
Introduction

Buddizm: istorija i kul’tura (Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Vostokovedenija): 4-21. This contains an edition of the Tibetan text of the St. Petersburg Derge, with variants from a Buriai xylograph (9 folios, 19th-20th century), the praise of Seng ge’i gdon can mkha’ ’gro ma contained in the xylograph, and a translation of the latter.

Many modern Tibetan editions of the text are available, both in xylographic and in modern printed versions. I list below the few I have seen. Prof. Roger Jackson kindly sent me copies of several of them. There must be very, very many more.


’Phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i snying po bzhugs so. (Dharamsala: 1968). Printed. Small pothi format.

The Heart Sūtra has been a favorite subject for translators of Buddhist texts. Most translations are based on the Sanskrit or Chinese versions. Some translations, however, have been made from Tibetan; I list below only those translations I am certain are rendered from Tibetan, even if not the Kanjur version.

1 I owe my knowledge of this work to the kindness of Dr. Marek Mejor.


Several of the editions listed above also contain translations, these being Nōmi 1918, Teramoto 1929, Teramoto 1938, Kusunoki 1960 and

¹ I thank Dr. Josef Kolmaš for kindly sending me a copy of this article.
Gyamtsho and Arai 1983. Several of the texts printed in Hariba 1932 contain an interlinear or facing translation.

As far as I know, virtually no philological studies have been carried out on the Kanjur text of the Heart Sūtra. Research on the text in its Sanskrit and Chinese versions, however, has been active in recent years. I list here only a few recent studies on text-critical issues. Philosophical and historical research has also been active, but such studies are in principle not mentioned in the following.

Although not recent, the works of Shiraishi Shindō deserve to be mentioned first. Since most studies on the Heart Sūtra refer for the Sanskrit text to the editions of Conze [1948 = 1967: 148-67] or Max Müller [1884], either directly or through the medium of another’s edition which in turn is based on these, it may be helpful to point out that Shiraishi Shindō has made important contributions to our knowledge of the Sanskrit text through his careful transcriptions of Japanese editions of both the long [Shiraishi 1939a, 1940] and short [Shiraishi 1939b] versions of the Sanskrit text. In addition he has studied various aspects of the sūtra, especially its mantra [Shiraishi 1974, 1979, 1984]. A study by Tsukinowa [1931] on Japanese copies of the Sanskrit Heart Sūtra should also be noted here. Chūjō Hiroyasu [1985] and Donald Lopez [1990b] have also offered some remarks on the text’s mantra. The studies of Kaie Mochizuki [1991a, 1991b] on several so-called Indian commentaries may also be mentioned, as may also Ochi’s [1991] study of Tantric commentaries, especially those of Nāgārjunagarbha and Dārika pa. Watanabe Shōgo recently published an annotated translation of Praśāstrasena’s commentary [1992].

In 1984 the Chinese scholar Wu Chi-yu published a discussion of some Chinese transcriptions of the Sanskrit text [Wu 1984], and in that paper Wu referred to the study of Chen Yinke on the Chinese phonetic transcription of the Sanskrit from Dunhuang [Chen 1980].

---

I find it a little difficult, however, to follow the repeated suggestion of Shiraishi that we should see in the mantra a trisūbhī, a suggestion which moreover requires a fair amount of fiddling with the text. Much more likely, it seems to me, is that the rhythms Shiraishi has noticed (for example the opening *) are indicative of the natural rhythm of Indian prose, rather than pointing to a specific metre.
Fukui Fumimasa published a survey of the Chinese manuscripts of the Heart Sūtra from Dunhuang [Fukui 1984], and the same scholar subsequently published a detailed analysis of Amoghavajra’s translation of the text, a translation newly discovered among the Dunhuang manuscripts [Fukui 1985]. Finally, in 1987 Fukui published a detailed and comprehensive book-length study of the Chinese texts of the Heart Sūtra from Dunhuang, in China generally, and in Japanese Tendai [Fukui 1987]. Watanabe Shōgo’s recent paper [1991] on the relationships between various Chinese translations of the Heart Sūtra and Sanskrit texts, in particular the Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, should throw new light on some old problems of the origins of the text.¹

A revised edition of a Khotanese version of the sūtra, along with portions of a Khotanese commentary, was published by Prods Oktor Skjærvø [Skjærvø 1988], whose edition was mentioned above for its inclusion of the Tibetan text. We should also note here that an old Turkish (Uigur) version of the Heart Sūtra has been discovered in the Berlin Turfan Collection. This seems to have been signaled first by Takao Moriyasu [1982: 6, n. 19], and it is to be published by Peter Zieme.²

The Dunhuang manuscripts of the Tibetan text of the Heart Sūtra will require an extensive study to themselves. We can mention here only that there exist a rather large number of these manuscripts, over ninety according to my count. This includes only those manuscripts in the collections of the India Office³ and the Bibliothèque Nationale.⁴ Other collec-

---

¹ I have also, thanks to the kindness of the author, been able to read a draft of Jan Nattier’s forthcoming article on the origins of the Heart Sūtra, but as it remains unpublished I will not comment on it here.

² Dr. Zieme writes, in a letter of 3 September, 1985: “It is correct that there is a Uigur manuscript (not complete) being a translation of the Prajñāpāramitāḥṛdayasūtra, obviously from Chinese, but possibly also from Tibetan. This is not sure. My study of that text has not yet reached the stage to publish it . . . . Other works have hindered me so far, but, anyhow, it remains my intention to do it (or perhaps my pupil, Simone Raschmann).”

³ See Yamaguchi [1977-86]. Manuscripts of the Heart Sūtra are the following: 117; 118.II; 119.II; 120.I-XVI (inclusive); 121.I-II; 122; 751.II; 1027; 1048; 1219, 1453, 1460. Cf. also 1121. This list follows the same numbering as that of La Vallée Poussin [1962], but is more complete.

⁴ Lalou [1939, 1950, 1961]. The Heart Sūtra manuscripts are: 22; 87; 101; 449-494 (inclusive);
tions, for example in Japan, may yet yield more manuscripts. Only one manuscript of the Heart Sūtra from Dunhuang has been edited as far as I know, that listed above with the editions of the Kanjur text as Ueyama [1965]. Note that at least two photographs of Dunhuang manuscripts of the Heart Sūtra have been published. ¹

Aside from secondary materials, I would like to refer to some recent editions of the Tibetan Kanjur. Less than ten years ago a new edition of the Derge Kanjur and Tanjur was published by Dharma Publishing in Oakland, California. The publishers of this so-called Nyingma edition have stated (in a letter to me) that the source of the Kanjur and Tanjur used as the basis of this new “edition” is their own copy of a Derge. It is also known (although the publishers do not mention it) that some leaves damaged or illegible in the source edition were substituted with photographs taken of leaves from the sets of Derge held by Harvard University in the Harvard-Yenching Library and by the United States Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.² I can now prove, however, that at least in some places the source edition taken as the base of this “Nyingma edition” is none other than the recently reprinted “Karmapa edition,” itself a reproduction of an edition of the Derge Kanjur and Tanjur kept in Rumtek monastery, Sikkim. This is provable because in places in which the Rumtek Derge was illegible it was overwritten with pencil before reprinting. These over-writings are visible on the Nyingma Derge. Because they show evidence of such overwritings, there is no question that the two texts of the Heart Sūtra printed in the “Nyingma edition” are from leaves of the so-called Karmapa Kanjur. This presents a problem for the scholar who would use the so-called Nyingma edition, since it is actually a massive conflation of distinct Derge editions or printings. It has already been

¹264-1282 (inclusive). Some manuscripts in the Paris collection were not catalogued by Lalou; Heart Sūtra manuscripts may also be among these.

² See Diringer [1953]: plate VIII-14a. Another plate is published in Zwalf [1985]: plate 69. It is Or. 8212/77, Ch. 00183. Jan Nattier and John McRae have promised a study of the manuscripts of the short version of the Heart Sūtra in Tibetan from Dunhuang.

² Still, many pages — or even whole sections — of the edition are hardly legible. I can refer to the Bodhivasrāvāna-lakṣāpalatā (Tōh. 4155) as a particularly egregious example.
shown [Imaeda 1981] that the Derge of Rumtek and that catalogued in the famous “Tōhoku Catalogue” differ in some respects.¹ Despite the convenience of the edition, and the fact that some institutions have already invested the high amount of money demanded by the publishers, I regret to say that I believe the “Nyingma edition,” while adequate for casual reference, cannot be relied upon in the establishment of critical text editions.²

It is only fair to note at this point that the widely available Peking reprint edition has also conflated, to a certain extent, two distinct editions of the so-called Peking edition. These two are the 1720 edition, held in the Library of Ōtani University and the main edition upon which the reprint is based, and the 1737 edition of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The latter was used to supplement the former in the case of missing or damaged leaves. In the case of the text studied in the present edition, the whole volume containing the Heart Sūtra being lost from the 1720 edition, we have only the text from the 1737 edition in our hands. We should also note that the editors of the Peking reprint have not hesitated to “clean up” the print in some places. In our text, in Paragraph B note 2, the photographs of the Paris and Harvard exemplars of Peking clearly show that a slice of the printing block was removed and a new, compacted, text inserted, a gap being left in the border around the text area. When we look at the reprint edition, based on the very same photographs from Paris kindly made available to me by Prof. N. Odani of Ōtani University, we observe that this gap has been filled in by the Japanese reprint editors, obscuring this additional evidence of correction.

¹ See also Ochi [1982].

² The new reprint edition of the Karmapa edition recently published in Taiwan became available just as I was finishing the present study, and I have not consulted it. My impression, however, is that it is merely a photographically reproduced copy of the Karmapa edition. If this is correct, it would be preferable to consult this edition, rather than the “Nyingma edition.”
The Established Texts and the Critical Apparatus

Above I explained for the most part how I have arrived at the texts which constitute Recensions A and B, through the analysis of the *stemma* and rejection of readings which are obviously mistakes or single readings. I have tried to establish the oldest form of the respective recensions that it is at present possible to know. For Recension B this has been easy, almost trivial. But the same is not always true for Recension A. As one can see from a look at the critical apparatus, S, more or less a Recension A text, seems nevertheless in some important ways to be independent of the whole *stemma*. Its occasional identity with readings of the polyglot texts does not clarify the situation. Now, when the Recension A *Them spangs ma* line does not agree with the Tshal pa line, there is no objective principle by which to decide the matter of which reading to accept. I decided, therefore, that when the Tshal pa disagrees with the *Them spangs ma* branch, I will follow the Tshal pa, even when S agrees with the *Them spangs ma*. When the Tshal pa and S agree there is no conflict, since I have established this as what we may call a Tshal pa Recension A. Even if S agrees with the 'Phying ba stag rtse texts, if Peking and *Them spangs ma* are against them (as in Paragraph D note 4), I do not accept the reading, and I follow rather Peking and *Them spangs ma*. This may seem like a sort of arbitrary decision, but as I can see no objective criteria by which to decide the question, I have had to set up arbitrary, but consistent, criteria. In the case, in Paragraph B note 2, in which it seems like I have followed the coordination of *Them spangs ma* and S against the Tshal pa, this is because I believe Peking to have been "corrected." I believe that the reading I have adopted is originally a reading shared by *Them spangs ma* and Peking. The adoptions in Paragraph G of *rigs kyi bu gang la la* and in Paragraph H of *shā ra dwa ti'i bu* are likewise based on my belief that J and Peking, respectively, have been corrected, and thus the original Tshal pa reading was as I print it. In some cases, not all may agree with my choices, but the evidence is there in the notes for the reader to make a different choice. What else is in the notes?
The critical apparatus to the present edition is intended to reproduce all features of the text which could be in some way significant. The apparatus itself, however, is split into two sections. The section above the double line (====) records “true” variants, both recensional and transmissional, and these notes are marked in the text with arabic numerals. Those variants listed below the line are in almost all cases single variants, mostly comprising scribal errors or various orthographic peculiarities, and these are marked in the text with lower case roman letters. In a few cases I have recorded in this lower apparatus shared variants which I think are due to pure chance, for example, abbreviations shared by two editions which the stemma indicates could not have know each other. Their coincidence I consider to be totally adventitious. In other cases I have given single readings in the top apparatus, especially readings from S, due to the importance of this Kanjur. In the future, to understand the place of newly discovered texts, it may be necessary to consult also the single readings apparatus, but at present almost all readers may neglect it.

Irregularities in such things as punctuation, spacing, the formation of conjuncts and the use of abbreviations are all noted. One form of evidence for filiation between editions is often overlooked; indeed most editors do not even report this evidence in their notes — the use and placement of the shad, primarily the chig or rkyang (single) shad and the gnyis (double) shad. The use of the tshec or mark of inter-syllabic punctuation is also rarely or never reported. However, since variants of the latter type are almost always due to simple error or coincidence of convention, and in any case it is often impossible to detect this sort of variant from the copies one is able to obtain, the omission of this type of evidence is of lesser importance, and in future I would not bother to report it.1 The placement of the shad, however, is important not only for what it can tell us about the relationship of one edition of a text to another. Punctuation can tell us much about how texts were read, pronounced, even understood.2 Some-

---

1 For the usage of the tshec before the shad, which may be of some interest for the study of the history of the Tibetan language, see the summaries of Exemplars Consulted in Part II under entry 6.

2 For a suggestive discussion of the ways in which even gaps in a written text — in this case
thing I would probably note in the future is the cases in which the _sbrul shad_ is used other than when a _shad_ is to be placed after the first syllable of a line. Future studies will have to take into account the many questions raised by Tibetan punctuation practices.

When the placement of letters, usually the subjoined _sa_, is irregular, this too is noted. This type of graphic variant is found here and there, particularly at the end of a line when no room remains for the full form of the final letter. It is transcribed with an _s_ written below the line. Usually the _sa_ is subjoined to _ga_, occasionally to _ma_, once to _sha_. We find only a few cases of the reversed _ta_ graph standing for _gs_ (this graph is transcribed, according to its value in transliterated Sanskrit, as _t_). This abbreviation is, however, very common in editions of non-canonical Tibetan texts. Other examples of less common abbreviations, and their transcriptions (in which I follow the practices of Eimer) are: N1: _rnamr_ for _rnam par_; J and L2: _thamd_ for _thams cad_ (L2 consistently writes this with the _candrabindu_ rather than a simple _anusvāra_); L1: _semda_’ for _sems dpa_’. Examples of rather common abbreviations abound: _’tshalo_; _bdagis_; _tinge_; (_b)_zhuso; _smraso_; _rjesu_; _yino_; _nyide_; _medo_; _legso_; _bzhino_; _namkha_’, and so on. Any variants which occur at the end of a line are noted as such. If enough space is left blank at the end of a line for the next word to have been written normally in that space, the space is noted. If any otherwise blank space is filled with _tshegs_, this is noted. Blank space within a line, except after (rarely before) a _shad_, is noted. Often the double _shad_ is split such that the first _shad_ follows the last letter of one word and the second directly precedes the first letter of the next word. The intervening space is not noted. Irregular spacing that could conceivably indicate deletion is noted. It is my impression that the use of subscribed letters can rarely lead to the creation of transmissional variants. However, the evidence of the _Them spangs ma_ texts tends to suggest that abbreviated spellings are sometimes a shared phenomenon, and as such should be carefully noted by an editor. The reason to carefully note spaces in one’s exemplars, even when at the

_lithic_ — can help us to appreciate the context, transmission, and understanding of the text, see Janert [1972].
time one cannot see what such a space might mean, has been amply 
illustrated above in our comments on corrections introduced into xylo-
graphs and manuscripts. Until one has a full picture of the Tibetan tradi-
tion for any given text — and let us remember Kunst’s admonition, still 
applicable, that much of this tradition remains yet unknown to us — it is 
not possible to know what will become crucial evidence in the light of 
tomorrow’s new materials, or even in the light of materials sitting on one’s 
desk waiting to be collated.

I have mentioned several times that even small variants, consistently 
shared between editions, can point to a genetic connection. In this regard I 
would like to mention what may look to some like a trivial point. Two 
uses of the so-called reversed gi-gu (transcribed here with i) are well 
known in Tibetan writing and present no controversial features. First is 
the use of i with subjoined r to represent Sanskrit vocalic r. Second is the 
use forced by space constraints in the xylographs or manuscripts; the i is 
used when a normally written gi-gu would collide with another letter. 
These are the only two uses attested in the present edition.¹ Note that 
even in the first usage the xylographs and manuscripts considered in the 
present edition are not in concord; the ’Phying ba stag rtse texts in Recen-
sion A and L1 and M1 in Recension B write not a hri in the title’s hrdaya, 
but rather hari, that is there is a variation in the use of the normal or revers-
ed gi-gu. When modern editors “regularize” the spelling of transcribed 
terms, writing r for our ri and prajña for graphs we transcribe as 
pradznyā, and so on, as they almost always do, it becomes impossible to 
offer good evidence for textual affiliation, or for that matter for Tibetan 
transcription practices in general. In addition to providing evidence of 
filiation, this type of variant is important in that is shows clearly how 
carefully some editors revised their texts. It is sometimes felt that the care 
with which Sanskrit words are transcribed in the Derge edition is an 
indicator of the general care applied to its editing, and the knowledge of

¹ The reversed gi-gu is common in Dunhuang materials. For two contributions to the debate over 
the meaning of the graph, with extensive references, see Ulving [1972] and Miller [1982]. The debate is 
certainly not over. Jan Nattier points out to me that transcribing the graph with i could imply some view 
with regard to its phonetic value. I have no such view, and use the transcription only for convenience.
Sanskrit possessed by its editors, chief among whom was Situ Pañ-chen. But, at least based on the admittedly statistically small evidence of the present edition, it seems that the Derge edition inherited its Sanskritic spellings from the 'Phying ba stag rste. This is a question which deserves to be looked into further. Future editors should report all readings as accurately as possible to enable others to investigate these and other such issues.

The use of the terms "insert" and "omit" in the notes is relative. At this point I am unable to resolve, from a chronological point of view, the recensional differences within recensions A and B. Furthermore, there are not a few places in the notes in which I have remarked that some Recension A texts share a Recension B reading. I do not know what this means at present. In almost all cases in which Recension B texts share a Recension A reading, this is due to conflation. Almost all, but not all. And this remainder too I cannot as yet adequately explain.

The present edition reports the readings of all Kanjur exemplars available to me. In the case of xylographic editions I tried to consult multiple exemplars of the same edition in order to determine whether any differences exist between exemplars. I found none in the exemplars I consulted. One should remember, however, that my sample was of course very, very small — about three folio sides of text. It has been pointed out that some editions of the Kanjur were revised between one printing and the next, as is obvious when we compare K and P. For practical purposes it seems not to make sense to consult more than one exemplar of a given edition, but it should be kept in mind that the possibility for internal revision (within different printings of the same xylographic edition) cannot be completely ruled out.

I have tried, in so far as it was practical, to line up the texts in Recensions A and B line by line, to facilitate comparison. Bold note numbers indicate that the note is discussed in this Introduction.
Summation

The present study does, I think, succeed in shedding some light on problems of the history of the Tibetan Kanjur, on the process of the editing of Buddhist texts, and on the Heart Sūtra itself, its history and even its meaning. It is fitting to now focus some of that light, and conclude with a set of suggestions for further research.

The present edition and introduction emphasize the need for editions of texts which are as comprehensive as possible. The reasons for this are several-fold. First, I mentioned my belief that without a firm philological basis further "higher" studies are doomed to stand on shaky foundations. Whether editions such as the present one are taken by themselves as the basis for translations or studies (as they must be when we have only a canonical Tibetan translation with no Dunhuang or other materials, Indic text and/or Chinese translation at hand), or whether editors of other versions of the same text, for example in Indic language versions, use the edition of the text's Tibetan Kanjur version for comparison, the fullest possible account of the latter text tradition is necessary to allow the scholar who uses this account to obtain a fair picture of that tradition. There are several practical suggestions which can be offered in this regard.

An editor of a Tibetan Kanjur text should be very careful to record all variants that he or she encounters, including variants in punctuation. There are two reasons for this. The first is that differences in punctuation are as valuable as any other variant reading in determining connections between editions of a text and thus establishing the stemma of the text. The second is that through their punctuation practices the Tibetan editors and scribes give us hints about their understanding of their text. If we re-write the punctuation and fail to record that of our sources, we completely lose this important evidence. In addition, an editor should, at this stage in our knowledge of the Tibetan tradition, and given ideal resources, consult all the available versions of a text. This includes, most especially includes, those within the same edition of a given Kanjur recorded by the catalogues as "duplicates." In almost all cases the catalogues have been compiled without the compilers actually carefully reading through all the
texts they catalogue — how could it be otherwise? Therefore, even if a
cataloguer reads past the title and skims through the text, a text which is
“more or less” the same will tend to be recorded as a duplicate, despite the
possible existence of valuable variant readings, for example those indica-
tive of recensional variations. The Ôtani catalogue of the Peking edition
for example often refers to “duplicate” versions of texts; the careful study
of these “duplicates” is an important task for the future. It is a different
question if every available Kanjur must be consulted. Actually, if we are
primarily interested in the earliest possible text, then it should not be neces-
sary to look at clearly derivative exemplars, in our case Cone, Urga, and
Lhasa at least. But, and this is a big but, we do not really know enough yet
about the Tibetan Kanjur traditions to have the confidence required to say
“this edition is irrelevant.” Moreover, and again here we recall the words
of Kunst, there are things of interest and value to be learned from editions
which, otherwise, may provide us little or no information about the earlier
strata of the text. How spelling conventions changed over time, for in-
stance, cannot be determined if we reject all late evidence. But there are
practical questions too. I spent a not inconsiderable sum of money gather-
ing the copies required to make the present edition, despite the great gener-
osity of some scholars and librarians who kindly and freely sent me cop-
ies. While I think, again from a perfectionist’s point of view, that the
reprint edition of the Peking Kanjur has some problematic points, and
represents a rather late stage of the Peking tradition, conflated as the stem-
ma clearly shows, it is still the case that copies of K are unavailable unless
one goes to Harvard oneself (or has a generous friend), and copies of B
and F are not cheap, and the latter not so easy to get. (It is easy, but very
expensive, to get copies of B.) The Yongle and Wanli Kanjurs, although
copies exist, are inaccessible. J is also yet unpublished, but is expected
to be made available in the future. This will also, it is hoped, be the case
for S. N is widely available, but copies of L and M are sometimes very
hard to get. All of this creates severe practical headaches for an editor, but

---

1 I am at present preparing an article on the Yongle edition, which will report all that is presently
known about it.
still one should not be tempted to resort only to the editions to which one can most easily get access. In this regard, Erasmus set a very bad example. Stemmatics considerations should be foremost, if one wishes one's edition to be worthwhile. A good edition should utilize D, J, L, M, N, P, R and S. And "utilize" means careful recording all the relevant variants.

An editor who regularizes the readings of the exemplars consulted fails in his or her editorial duty. This even, or especially, extends to the transcription of Sanskrit or Indic words in Tibetan script. Of course hrī da ya "is" hrdaya, but to transcribe a Tibetan transcription in the latter fashion prevents us from distinguishing between hrī da ya and hrī daya, for example. Here it is not a question of misunderstanding which Indic term is intended but, again, of losing valuable evidence of textual affiliation.

It is dangerous to speak of things like the "best edition," especially in the absence of any definition of terms. For example, we may recall the discussion above of the colophon to the Heart Sūtra. It is fairly clear in light of our discussions that the reading in the Derge edition, the edition heretofore most widely considered to be the "best," is erroneous. How many errors in previous studies have been committed because of a non-rigorous use of textual evidence it is hard to say. We can try to avoid such problems by carefully gathering and considering as much evidence as possible. Evidence gathered from Kanjur texts colophons, for example, must be placed into correspondence with other evidence by specialists in Tibetan history. This is a task that Buddhist scholars not specializing in Tibetology can and must leave to their colleagues, but we can make an effort to present the Tibetologists with the best possible basis from which to make their researches.

Despite the extensive attention which has been given to the Heart Sūtra, some results of which are listed in the bibliographical sketch included in the present study, much remains to be done. A full account of the Tibetan materials from Dunhuang must be given. The polyglot texts, and the Tibetan vulgate versions, must be studied in renewed detail. The Mongolian translation(s?), based probably on the Tibetan Kanjur text, must be studied in detail, as must the notes of the Mongolian scholars who studied variants in different Kanjurs accessible to them. The commentaries
(Indian and Tibetan, at the least) and the quotations contained in them must
be carefully edited and studied. The relation between the Heart Sūtra and
other Prajñāpāramitā texts must be re-examined. And finally (at least from
the point of view of the scholar of Indian Buddhism interested in philologi-
cal concerns), the Sanskrit text of the Heart Sūtra must be given a new,
reliable edition, based on all the available evidence, including Nepalese and
Japanese manuscripts, inscriptions, Chinese transcriptions, the Tibetan and
Chinese translations, and whatever other evidence is available. With such
materials at hand it may be possible to reconsider some vexing problems of
the history and meaning of this most popular of Buddhist sūtras.

I am well aware that the recommendations made here are basically
counsels of perfection. Even with such a very short text as the Heart
Sūtra, the present study extends over a rather large number of pages, and
the critical apparatus to the edition may seem daunting. It is hard to imag-
ine carrying out a study of the same intensity on a large text, and only
barely imaginable for a medium sized text. Yet, with certain modifications
such as the removal from consideration of B, C, F, H, K and U, and the
acknowledgment that one need examine only one exemplar per edition
(while carefully looking at instances of the same text “duplicated” within
one edition), the task becomes manageable, if still great. Yet without
ditions of this type, as I think must now be clear, we cannot be said to be
presenting an honest picture of the Tibetan textual tradition. A bad edition
will be the basis of an unnecessarily bad translation, which will mislead,
and on and on. There are, as far as I can see, no good reasons for making
an edition which is not as good or complete as it could be.

For reasons that may be clear only to a given individual, and per-
haps not even then, the Heart Sūtra has become one of the most venerated
religious texts in the world. This very important and moving fact is lost
from view among piles of variant readings and discussions of historical or
textual minutiae. But whenever I become overly caught up in this sort of
thing I remember, with deep emotion, the story of a dear friend of mine
who at the age of 33, in the prime of her life, lay dying of lung cancer. She
took great comfort, her husband told me, in reading again and again the
Chinese text of the very sūtra you now hold in your hands. If we forget
this, there is no difference between the production of such textual studies as the present one and the compilation of a telephone directory. But if we remember ....
Part II

The Exemplars Consulted for the Present Edition

Bibliographic Details

Sigla
The following sigla are employed in the present edition. Details of the editions and exemplars consulted are given in the section which follows.

B  Berlin Manuscript Kanjur
C  Cone
D  Derge
F  Taipei Manuscript Kanjur
H  Lhasa
J  'Jang sa-tham / Lithang
K  Peking (1692)
L  London Manuscript Kanjur
M  Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur
N  Narthang
P  Peking (1737)
R  Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur
S  Phu brag Manuscript Kanjur
U  Urga

The numbers 1 and 2 in addition to the letter sigla are employed to differentiate between the versions in the Prajñāpāramitā and in the Tantra for those editions, D, H, L, M, N, R and U, which have the text twice. 1 indicates the text in the Prajñāpāramitā section; 2 the text in the Tantra section. Thus D1 means the Derge Prajñāpāramitā text.
Variants which are to be considered significant, and not single errors, are indicated with a superscripted Arabic numeral, thus.¹ Single readings, that is variants which can be ignored by all readers save those especially interested in the vagaries of the Tibetan scribal traditions, are indicated with superscripted lower case roman letters, thus.² The apparatus below the double line, =====, may be ignored by most readers. The system of transcribing abbreviated spellings follows that of Helmut Eimer. The rest of the transcription, except for the use of i to indicate the reversed gi-gu and s.ha for sa with ha beneath, follows the so-called Wylie system. I have tried to line up Recension A and Recension B line by line, in so far as this was possible.

Recension A represents the Tantra texts (including the Prajñāpāramitā texts from D, U and S as well). When this tradition is not unitary, the printed text represents the Tshal pa line, and the Them spangs ma readings are placed in the notes. When Them spangs ma and Peking agree against the ’Phying ba stag rtse texts, even when S reads with the latter, the printed text follows Them spangs ma and Peking, with the variants in the notes. Recension B represents the Prajñāpāramitā texts from the Them spangs ma line.

Note numbers in bold indicate that the reading is discussed in the Introduction.
For each edition utilized for the present study, the following information is listed.

1) Name of the edition.
2) Location of the text within the edition.
3) Serial Number (according to the catalogues listed in number 7).
4) Date.
5) Sources — For most xylographs, more than one exemplar has been consulted. Therefore this section may include several entries. Under each source the following are listed:
   a) Location of exemplar.
   b) Form of copy consulted (i.e., photocopy, microfilm, etc.).
   c) Physical quality of exemplar and legibility (poor; good; very good, excellent).
   d) Acknowledgments and remarks.
6) Remarks on orthography, etc.
7) References (e.g., catalogues).

I have not noted the occasional misprints of the catalogues with regard to pagination and so forth. The information in the following is based on the xylographs and manuscripts themselves, and not on the catalogues.
B 1) Berlin Manuscript Kanjur.
   2) rgyud, na, 49.a.1-50.b.3.
   3) Band 96, #22.
   4) 1680.
   5) a) Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Berlin.
      b) Photocopy.
      c) Excellent.
      d) I am grateful to Dr Hartmut-Ortwin Feistel of the 
         Staatsbibliothek for his help in obtaining a copy of the 
         text. It is my pleasure to acknowledge the Staatsbibliothek’s 
         permission to publish the text.
   6) An exquisitely written manuscript, with eight lines of writing 
      per folio side. The text shows several graphic variants and a 
      few obvious mistakes, but on the whole agrees quite well 
      with the other texts in the Peking text group. Even after the 
      letter nga, B shows no tsheg before a shad.
   7) The Berlin Manuscript was catalogued many years ago by 
      Hermann Beckh [1914]. Two reviews of this catalogue 
      comprise independently valuable studies: Pelliot [1914] and 
      Laufer [1914]. See also Haarh [1954].

C 1) Cone xylograph.
   2) rgyud, na, 43.b.6-45.a.7.
   3) 165.
   4) 1721-31.
   5) (i)
      a) Library of Congress, Washington D.C.
      b) Photocopy.
      c) Excellent.
d) My sincere thanks to Ms. Susan Meinheit and Mr. Robert Dunn of the Library of Congress, Asian Division, for their kindness in providing me with very clear photocopies of this and their Derge [see under D1.5.i.].

(ii)

a) The Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo.

b) Microfilm.

c) Very good.

d) My thanks to the Tōyō Bunko for their excellent film, and their kindness in providing it.

6) The *tshég* occurs before a *shad* only after *nga*.

7) A catalogue of the Cone edition, based on the Tōyō Bunko exemplar, was compiled by Mibu Taishun [1959]. It is sometimes reported that another exemplar of the Cone is held in the Library of Ōtani University, Kyoto. This is an error. The Library of Congress and Tōyō Bunko exemplars are the only known exemplars.

D 1

1) Derge xylograph (*sde-dge*).

2) *shes rab sna tshogs*, *ka*, 144.b.6-146.a.3.

3) 21

4) 1733.

5)

(i)

a) Library of Congress.

b) Photocopy.

c) Good.

d) My thanks to Ms. Susan Meinheit and Mr. Robert Dunn of the Library of Congress for their kindness in providing photocopies.

(ii)

a) Kōyasan University / Ōtani University, Japan.

b) Microfiche.
c) Good [very reduced]
d) My gratitude is due Professor Odani Nobuchiyo 小谷信千代 for sending me a copy of the microfiche, and a print from that copy, of the Kōyasan University Derge from the complete set of microfiche held in the Library of Ôtani University, Kyoto.

(iii)
a) Prague, The Library of the Oriental Section of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
b) Photographic negatives
c) Very good / excellent.
d) My sincerest thanks to Dr. Josef Kolmaš, through whose kind help I received the photos from Prague. I must also acknowledge my debt to my mother, Ellen Silk, who generously printed for me the negatives sent by Dr. Kolmaš.

(iv)
a) Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo.
b) Microfilm.
c) Good / very good.
d) My thanks to the Copy Section of the Tōyō Bunko for their fine microfilm.

(v)
a) Stanford University.
b) Photocopy.
c) Good.
d) My thanks to Prof. Anne Klein for generously making copies from the Stanford exemplar.

(vi)
b) Printed reproduction of xylographs in book form.

c) Excellent

d) There is absolutely no doubt that here the so-called Nyingma edition is a photo reprint of the so-called Karmapa edition, D.5.vii. See next.

(vii)


b) Printed edition reproduction of xylographs in folio format.

c) Excellent.

d) Thanks to Gregory Schopen for sending me copies of this edition from the set held at Indiana University.

6) See the Bibliographic Remarks in the Introduction for a discussion of the problems of the so-called Nyingma edition. The *tsheg* precedes the *shad* only after *nga*.

7) The famous “Tōhoku Catalogue” records the Derge edition, Ui et al. [1934]. There is a significant secondary literature on this edition, which it would be redundant to list here.

D2 1) Derge xyograph (*sde-dge*).

2) *rgyud 'bum, na*, 94.b.1-95.b.3. [NB: See below D2.5.vii.d].

3) 531.

4) See D1.4

5)  

(i)  

a) Library of Congress.
b) Photocopy.
c) Good.
d) See D1.5.i.d.

(ii)
a) Kōyasan University / Ōtani University.
b) Microfiche.
c) Good / poor.
d) See D1.5.ii.d.

(iii)
a) Prague, The Library of the Oriental Section of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
b) Photographic negatives.
c) Very good / excellent.
d) See D1.5.iii.d.

(iv)
a) Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo.
b) Microfilm.
c) Good / very good.
d) See D1.5.iv.d.

(v)
a) Stanford University.
b) Photocopy.
c) Good.
d) See D1.5.v.d.

(vi)
a) Nyingma reprint. [Vol. 31, pp. 363-64.].
b) Printed reproduction of xylographs in book form.
c) Excellent.
d) Again (see D1.5.vi.d) there is no question but that this is a reprint of the so-called Karmapa edition. See next

(vii)
a) Karmapa reprint. [See D1.5.vii.a.].
b) Printed edition reproduction of xylographs in folio format.
c) Excellent.
d) See D1.5.vii.d. **NOTA BENE:** The location of the text in this edition is *rgyud, na*, 77.b.1-78.b.3. See Imaeda [1981], Ochi [1982] and also Eimer [1980].

6) See D1.6.
7) See D1.7.

**F**
1) Taipei Manuscript Kanjur.
2) *rgyud, na*, 58.b.8-60.b.8.
3) [No catalogue].
4) 1670 (?)
5) 
   a) National Palace Museum, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China.
   b) Photographic enlargements (Black & white, 8” x 10”).
   c) Excellent.
   d) My sincere gratitude is due Dr. Peter Chang [Ch’ang Pi-te 陳彼得], the Deputy Director of the National Palace Museum, for his very kind help. In addition, Dr. Chou Feng-sen, Head of the Publications Division of the Museum, provided me with the information on the pagination of the text in the Kanjur. The pagination, in Tibetan, occurs outside of the border of each page, on the left, according to the catalogue (see F.7). This is not reproduced in the photographs I received, in which the frames are filled by the ornate border. I should also mention here the kindness of my friend Dr. Jason Kuo [Kuo Chi-sheng 郭繼生], who put me in touch with Dr. Chang.
6) This exquisite manuscript is written in gold ink on blue paper. Before the shad the tsheg appears only after nga. On the dating of this manuscript, see the Introduction.

7) As far as I know, the only listing for this Kanjur is Select Chinese Rare Books and Historical Documents in the National Palace Museum. (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1971). #24 (Longzangjing 龍藏經). Description: p. 70 (Chinese), p. 89 (Japanese), p. 108 (English). The descriptions in the three languages differ slightly. Illustrated with one plate.

H1 1) Lhasa xylograph.
2) sher phyin sna tshogs, ka, 259.a.6-261.a.3.
3) 26.
4) 1934.
5) (i)

   a) IASWR microfiche / Rashi Gempil Ling, First Kalmuck Buddhist Temple, Howell, New Jersey. [Microfiche reference: LM pj 022, 034 14/23. vol. 34 (ka) ff 258b-278a].

   b) Microfiche.

   c) Very good.

   d) Microfiche was kindly sent by the IASWR [Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions], Stony Brook, New York. I must thank Ms. Jane Abritis, Microform Resources Manager, who kindly responded to my inquiry regarding the source of the IASWR Lhasa edition by sending me a copy of the letter she had sent to the Kalmuck temple in New Jersey, asking them the source of their exemplar. As far as I know, there has still been no response to her enquiries.
(ii)

b) Photocopy.
c) Very good.
d) My thanks are due to Dr. Gudren Hegardt, Curator of the Tibetan section of the Etnografiska Museet for providing photocopies. [By inadvertence, leaf 260b is missing from the photocopy sent me.]

(iii)

a) Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin. [From a copy held in the Indologischen Seminar, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn. See below, H1.5.iii.d.]
b) Photocopy.
c) Very good / excellent.
d) My thanks to Dr. Helmut Eimer for kindly sending me a copy of the Xerox copy of the Lhasa Kanjur held in his seminar in Bonn. My appreciation is also due the Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, the repository of the original.

6) The *tsheg* appears before the *shad* only after *nga*.

7) The Xerox copy reproduction of the Lhasa edition (iii, above) has been described by Eimer [1979]. The Lhasa edition has been catalogued from an exemplar in Tokyo University by Takasaki Jikidō [1965]. The catalogue seems to be based on the *dkar-chag*, and not on the exemplar itself. See also Tada and Takasaki [1960]. The exemplar in Stockholm (ii above) has been listed by Eimer [1972]. The Lhasa Kanjur is listed as H.5900 to H.5999 on pp. 677-81. Our H1 is found in H.5933, and H2 in H.5987
H2 1) Lhasa Xylograph.
2) *rgyud*, *tha*, 45.a.1-47.a.2.
3) 499.
4) 1934.
5) [Undoubtedly the following were all printed from the same blocks.]
(i) 
   a) IASWR microfiche [reference: LM pj 022, 088 3/24. vol. 88 (tha) ff 40b - 60a.].
   b) Microfiche.
   c) Excellent.
   d) See H1.5.i.d.
(ii) 
   a) Etnografiska Museet, Stockholm.
   b) Photocopy.
   c) Excellent.
   d) See H1.5.ii.d.
(iii) 
   a) Staatsbibliothek, Berlin / Indologisches Seminar, Bonn.
   b) Photocopy.
   c) Very good.
   d) See H1.5.iii.d.
6) See H1.6.
7) See H1.7.

J 1) 'Jang sa-tham / Li-thang xylograph.
3) 498.
4) 1608-21
5) 
   a) Orissa, India / Frei Universität, Institut für Indische Philologie und Kunstgeschichte, Berlin. From micro-
film owned by the Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

b) Photocopy from microfilm.

c) Poor / good.

d) I am indebted to Dr. Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp for a copy of the Heart Sūtra from the 'Jang sa-tham / Li-thang Kanjur. Dr. van der Kuijp has microfilmed the complete Kanjur in situ in Orissa, and is now completing a catalogue which will supersede that compiled by Yoshiro Imaeda, who had access only to the dkar-chag. My thanks are also due the Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, the owners of the microfilm obtained by Dr. van der Kuijp. See J.6.

6) The legibility of the copy available to me was very poor. It is virtually impossible to distinguish pa from ba, and da from nga. The text shows the tsheg before the shad only after nga. On the date of this edition, see the Introduction.

7) Imaeda [1982, 1984]. The introduction is a re-print of Imaeda [1982]. The catalogue was reviewed by Eimer [1986]. See now also Samten [1987].

K

1) Peking edition, 1692.

2) rgyud, na, 39.b.7-41.a.5.

3) [No catalogue].

4) 1692.

5)

a) Harvard University, Harvard-Yenching Institute. [Tib. 1803.7/14].

b) Hand copy, prepared by Dr. Bruce Cameron Hall

c) [Original not seen].

d) I was able to include the readings of this exemplar thanks to the kindness of Dr. Bruce Cameron Hall,
who provided me with his careful hand copy of the only known exemplar, that at Harvard.

6) See the remarks in the introduction.
7) There is no catalogue of this edition, known to exist only in the incomplete copy at Harvard. It has been briefly described by Hall [1979].

L1 1) London Manuscript Kanjur.
2) *khri sna tshogs, ka*, 248.a.6-249.b.6.
3) [No catalogue].
4) 1712.
5) a) The British Library, Or. 6724.
b) Microfilm.
c) Excellent.
d) My deepest thanks are due to Lama Chime Radha, Rinpoche, Curator for the Tibetan section of the British Library, whose personal attention and concern made it possible for me to obtain a microfilm copy of the text after some misunderstandings.

6) This beautifully written manuscript shows the *tsheg* before the *shad* only after *nga*.
7) There is a complete hand-list of the contents of the London MS Kanjur, but it remains unpublished. One must refer to Grinstead [1967] and to Barnett [1931]. See also Eimer [1981]. The date has been determined in a yet unpublished paper by Samten and Skillling [Forthcoming].

L2 1) London Manuscript Kanjur.
2) *rgyud, da*, 85.a.2-86.b.1.
3) [No catalogue].
4) 1712.
5) See L1.5.
6) See L1.6.
The Exemplars

7) See L1.7.

M1 1) Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur.
2) *khri sogs, ka*, 236.b.8-238.b.1.
3) 24.
4) 1858-78.
5) 
   a) Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo.
   b) Microfilm.
   c) Excellent.
   d) My thanks to the Tōyō Bunko for kindly providing microfilm of this Kanjur.

6) The *tsheg* is found rarely before the *shad*. When it does appear in this position, it seems to follow any letter.

7) A catalogue (or better, hand-list) of this Kanjur was published by Saitō Kōjun [1977]. A revised and expanded English version has been prepared by the present author, and a full scale catalogue is now in preparation.

M2 1) Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur.
2) *rgyud, da*, 84.a.7-85.b.4.
3) 484.
4) 1858-78.
5) 
   a) Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo.
   b) Microfilm
   c) Good. It seems the paper used was too absorbent, and so the writing looks rather sloppy; there is quite a bit of show-through from the other side of each page. This is certainly the worst of the manuscripts I have examined. (M1, however, is excellent.)
   d) See M1.5.d.

6) This exemplar occasionally uses an *dbu med* style *ra* superscript. The *tsheg* appears before the *shad* only after *nga*. 
7) See M1.7.

N1 1) Narthang xylograph (*snar-thang*).
2) *sna tshogs, ka*, 262.b.1-264.a.4.
3) 26.
4) 1731.
5) (i)
   a) Indologisches Seminar, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn.
   b) Photocopy.
   c) Good / poor [Essentially, the only legible copy of N1 available to me].
   d) Dr. Helmut Eimer very kindly provided me with a photocopy of this exemplar. My thanks also to Dr. Richard Othon Meisezahl, the owner of the Narthang kept in Bonn.

(ii) a) Ōtani University, Kyoto.
   b) Photocopy.
   c) Poor [perhaps the worst copy of a Kanjur xylograph I have ever seen].
   d) My great thanks are due Professor Odani Nobuchiyo for preparing these copies for me

(iii) a) The Royal University Library, Oslo.
   b) Microfilm.
   c) Poor.
   d) My thanks for his kindness to the Librarian of the Royal University Library, University of Oslo, Dr. Per K. Riis. My thanks also to Dr. Per Kvaerne, who put me in touch with Dr. Riis.
a) IASWR microfiche / Tashi Lhunpo, Howell, New Jersey. [Ref. LMpj 026, 034 14/14, vol. 34, ff 260b -270.].
b) Microfiche.
c) Poor.
d) See H1.5.i.d.

(v)
a) Taishō University, Tokyo.
b) Plates reproduced in Hariba [1932]: 390-91.
c) Poor.
d) My thanks to G. Schopen for the loan of Hariba’s book.

6) All exemplars are very difficult to read. The *tsheg* before the *shad* occurs only after *nga*.

7) The Narthang Kanjur has been catalogued by Nagashima Shōdō [1975]. The numbering he gives for the texts differs slightly from the numbering given to the Narthang texts by Takasaki Jikidō in his catalogue of the Lhasa edition (see H1.7). See also Eimer [1984].

N2 1) Narthang xylograph.
2) *rgyud*, *da*, 92.a.4-94.a.2.
3) 475 (Takasaki 476).
4) 1731.
5) [On the basis of certain physical features (broken letters) it is possible to state with certainty that all versions listed below were printed from the same blocks.]
   (i)
   a) Indologisches Seminar, Bonn.
   b) Photocopy.
   c) Good / very good.
   d) See N1.5.i.d.
   (ii)
   a) Ōtani University, Kyoto.
b) Photocopy.
c) Good / poor.
d) See N1.5.ii.d.

(iii) a) Royal University Library, Oslo.
b) Microfilm.
c) Poor.
d) See N1.5.iii.d.

(iv) a) IASWR microfiche. [LMpj 026,089 5/26, vol. 89, ff 79b-99a].
b) Microfiche.
c) Good / very good.
d) See N1.5.iv.d.

(v) a) Taishō University, Tokyo.
b) Hariba [1932]: 392-393.
c) Good.
d) See N1.5.v.d.

(vi) a) Ryūkoku University, Kyoto.
b) Photocopy.
c) Good / very good.
d) My thanks to the Librarian of Ryūkoku University for kindly providing a photocopy

6) See N1.6.
7) See N1.7.

P 1) Peking xylograph, 1737.
2) rgyud, na, 39.b.7-41.a.5.
3) 160.
4) 1737.
5)
a) Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris / Tokyo re-print edition of Peking. [Vol. 6, 166-1-7 to 4-5.].

b) Photocopy of photograph.

c) Very good.

d) My thanks are due Odani Nobuchiyo for kindly sending me photocopies of the photographs of the Paris exemplar. These photographs are held in the Ōtani University Library and are the basis of the text printed in the Peking reprint edition.

(ii)

a) Harvard-Yenching Institute.

b) Photographs.

c) Very good.

d) Dr. Bruce Cameron Hall kindly photographed this exemplar for me at Harvard. Folio 40 is missing, so in fact the available text covers only a fraction of the whole. My gratitude is due my mother, Ellen Silk, who graciously printed the negatives given me by Dr. Hall.

6) Since the Ōtani set of the Peking lacks this volume, the text reproduced in the photo re-print edition of the Peking published in Japan is in fact the text from Paris. The text upon which the bulk of the re-print is based is the 1720 edition (called Q by Eimer). The Paris edition is the 1737 print. This 1737 edition of the present text is therefore accessible in the re-print edition, but the photocopies sent me by Prof. Odani are very much clearer. It seems that no exemplar of the Heart Sūtra from the edition of 1720 is available. The editors of the Ōtani re-print, by the way, have made some “corrections” on the re-produced photos, or “cleaned up” the xylograph’s appearance. As is well known, on the whole ba and pa, and da and nga, are indistinguishable in Peking prints. Before a shad sometimes a tsheg follows a letter other than nga.
7) The Peking edition is served by the catalogue originally prepared many years ago in Kyoto, Sakurabe [1930-32]. The re-print edition (Kanjur and Tanjur) was catalogued in Suzuki [1961].

R1 1) Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur (*stog*).
2) *sras sna tshogs, ka*, 277.a.2-278.b.5.
3) 28.
4) (Unknown).
5)
   a) Tog Palace, Ladakh.
   c) Excellent.
   d) G. Schopen kindly sent me photocopies from the re-print held in the library of Indiana University, Bloomington.
6) The *tsheg* before the *shad* is found only after *nga*.
7) See the catalogue by Skorupski [1985]. See also Eimer [1982, and 1987].

R2 1) Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur.
2) *rgyud, da*, 94.a.5-95.b.7.
3) 490.
4) (Unknown).
5)
   a) Tog Palace, Ladakh.
   b) Re-print edition. vol. 102, #22.
   c) Excellent.
   d) See R1.5.d.
6) See R1.6.
7) See R1.7.

S 1) Phu(g)-brag Manuscript.
2) *shes phyin sna tshogs*, 35a2-36b7.
3) None available.
4) 1696-1706.
5) 
   a) Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharmsala.
   b) Microfiche (from IASWR).
   c) Very poor.
   d) My greatest thanks to Ugen Gombo of the IASWR for providing microfiche to me while the microfiche edition is still unpublished.
6) The manuscript seems very well written, but unfortunately the fiche available to me is overexposed and the center portion of each leaf is almost too faint to make out. The *tsheg* seems to be able to appear after any letter before the *shad*.
7) See Samten [1989].

U 1 1) Urga xylograph.
2) *shes rab, ka*, 144.b.6-146.a.2
3) 21.
4) 1908-10.
5) 
   a) International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi.
   b) Photocopy.
   c) Good.
   d) I am grateful to Dr. Lokesh Chandra, M.P., who sent me a photo-copy of the text from the Urga edition kept in New Delhi.
6) The paper was probably too wet when this exemplar was printed, or too absorbent; the letters are often blurred and indistinct. Moreover, the blocks were not well carved. The *tshegs* are, on the whole, not visible anywhere. They seem to occur sometimes before a *shad* after *da* or *ta*. The spacing and size of the letters in this edition is totally erratic.
7) The Urga edition was catalogued by Bethlenfalvy [1980]. This volume also contains re-prints of two articles by Lokesh Chandra [1959]. These articles were commented upon by Kaneko Ryōtai [1959]. See also Eimer [1985].

U2

1) Urga xylograph.
2) rgyud, na, 94.b.1-95.b.3.
3) 531.
4) 1908-10.
5) See U1.5.
6) The ba and pa are often indistinguishable. The tsheg occurs before the shad after nga.
7) See U1.7.
Part III

The Edition
Paragraph A: Sanskrit Title

rgya gar\textsuperscript{a} skad du / bha ga ba\textsuperscript{b} ti\textsuperscript{1} pradzny\textsuperscript{c} pā\textsuperscript{d} ra\textsuperscript{e} mi tā\textsuperscript{f} hri\textsuperscript{2}
dā\textsuperscript{3} ya /

1) C, D1, D2, J, U1, U2: \textit{ti}.
2) C, D1, D2, H2, J, U2: \textit{hri}.
3) B, F, K, P: \textit{ta}.

\begin{itemize}
    \item a) U1: \textit{skar}.
    \item b) H2: \textit{wa}.
    \item c) F: \textit{pra dznya}.
    \item U1: \textit{pra dznyā}.
    \item J: \textit{padznyā}.
    \item K: \textit{tsheg} between \textit{pra} and \textit{dznyā} added by hand.
    \item d) B, S: \textit{pa}.
    \item B: Inserts \textit{la} after \textit{pa}, but has a triangle of dots above it indicating deletion.
    \item e) U1: \textit{pār} for \textit{pā ra} (? \textit{tsheg} broken?).
    \item f) H2, S: \textit{ta}.
\end{itemize}
Paragraph A: Sanskrit Title

1) rgya gar skad du / ārya bha ga ba ti / pradznyā₂ pā₁ ra mi tā hri
2) da ya² /

1) L1, M1: hṛī. Agrees with variants in Recension A, note 2.
2) M1, R1: yā.
L1: 'a-chung under ya erased?

pra dznyā.
All exemplars virtually illegible, but probably no tsheg.

pa.
Paragraph B: Tibetan title

1  bod skad du / bcom ldan 'das a ma b shes rab kyi pha rol tu
2  phyin pa'i c sning po 1 // 2

1)  B, K, P:  po'o.
    F:  po'i.
    J:  Space of one letter after po.
    L2:  pa'o.
    U1:  o vowel is placed over preceding nga.
2)  D1, D2, F, H2, R2, U2:  Single shad.
    C, D1, D2, H2, J, P, U1, U2:  Insert bam po gcig go //.
    [C, H2, J, P, U2:  Single shad.]
    [J:  bam.]
    P:  From bam to shes (which falls at the end of a line and is marked
        by b in paragraph C) is squeezed into a space of approximately
        eleven letters. In other words, without bam po gcig go /
        everything would fit. The Paris and Harvard photos clearly
        show that the border at the end of this line is broken, illustrating
        that something was cut out of the block and re-inserted. The
        Tokyo re-print editors have “fixed” the border, obscuring the
        evidence.
    U1:  From here and extending down to the next line (bottom of the
        page) there is a large blot —either there was a knot in the board
        from which the edition was printed, or some problem with the
        paper on which the text was written before carving, since the text
        is written around the blot. See Paragraph D, note j.

a)  J:  bcomdas.
b)  S:  Omits ma, but an extra tsheg is written.
c)  U1:  ba'i.
Paragraph B: Tibetan title

1  bod skad du / 'phags a pa b bcom ldan 'das ma c shes rab kyi
2  pha rol tu phyin pa'i snying po / ¹

1)  H1: Inserts *bam po gcig go l*. Conflation with Recension A; see its note 2.

a)  H1:  *pha* broken — looks like *pa*.
b)  M1:  *pha*.
c)  R1:  Omits *bcom ldan 'das ma*.
Recension A

Paragraph C: Invocation

1 bcom ldan ’das a ma shes b rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la c
2 phyag ’tshal lo 1 // 2

1) J, L2 [end of line], M2, N2: ’tshalo.
2) J: Double shad cramped.
   S: Inserts bam po gcig go //. See Paragraph B, note 2.

a) J: bcom das.
b) See Paragraph B note 2.
c) L2: Two tshegs follow la; perhaps the pha of phyag is corrected?
Paragraph C: Invocation

1) sangs rgyas dang / byang chub sems dpa’ thams cad la
2) phyag ’tshal lo //

---

1) L1, R1: Omit the *shad*.
2) L1, N1: ’tshalo.
Paragraph D

1) 'di skad a bdag b gis c thos d pa 1 dus gcig na / e bcom ldan f 'das g
2) rgyal po’i khab 2 bya rgod 3 phung po’i ri h la 4 dge slong
3) gi i dge j ’dun chen po dang / k byang chub sms l dpa’i m dge
4) ’dun chen po dang 5 thabs gcig 6 tu bzhugs te / n de’i tshe bcom
5) ldan ’das 0 zab mo snang ba p zhes bya ba 7 chos kyi rnam q grangs
   kyi r ting nge 8 ’dzin la snyoms par s bzhugs 9 so 10 //

1) S: pa’i, in agreement with Recension B.
2) C, D1, J, U1: Insert na. Agrees with Recension B.
   [B: Does not have kyi!]
4) C, D1, D2, J, R2, S, U1, U2: Insert shad.
5) S: Inserts shad, in agreement with Recension B.
6) D1, D2, R2, U1, U2: cig.
7) D1, D2, H2, L2, M2, N2, R2, S, U2: ba’i.
   U1: pa’i.
8) L2, M2, N2, S: tinge.
10) J: bzhugso.
    L2, M2, N2: zhugso. See note 9.

---------------------------------------------------------------

a) L2: dag [i.e., 'di dag bdag gis ...].
b) U1: gi sa. [For bdag. Now, without access to my photocopy of the xylograph,
   I wonder whether I made a slip in recording the variant; does gi sa belong to
   the next word?]
c) J: bdagis.
d) P (ii): thes (evidently broken).
C: Left half of o vowel broken.
e) J [end of line]: Space of 2 letters before shad.
U1: No shad (and no tsheg after na), and a space of approx. 5 letters (an
   uneven line runs across the top of the space — from the photocopy it is not
   possible to tell whether it is on the block or not).
S: Double *shad*.
f) U1: Omits *ldan*.
g) J: *bcom* *mdas*.
h) M2: *rigs*.
i) J: Originally *gtis*, with *sa* erased but slightly visible.
j) U1: See note 2 to Paragraph B (Tibetan Title) above.
k) U1: One and one half *shad*. (Broken?)
l) P(ii): Missing from here to Paragraph V, note e.
m) S [end of line]: *sem* *s*.
n) J: *dpa*.
o) S: Double *shad*.
p) J: *bcom* *mdas*.
q) S: Inserts *shad*.
r) U1: Superscript *ra* broken off.
s) U2: *gyi*.
s) U1: *bar*. 
Paragraph D

1) R1:  
   
2) H1, R1:  
   Omit shad. Agrees with Recension A.

3) H1:  

4) H1, R1:  
   Omit shad. Agrees with Recension A.

5) H1, R1:  

6) H1:  
   mo snang ba zhes bya ba'i chos kyi rnam grangs kyi, conflated from Recension A.

7) L1, N1:  
   tinge.

8) L1, N1:  
   zhugso.

   [L1: Hard to tell, but probably zhu is corrected from bzhu  
   — anyway, there is some erasure.]

===============================

a) N1 [end of line]: bdagi

b) N1:  pa [?].

c) N1:  Vowel broken (so looks like snyems).
(This page intentionally left blank)
Paragraph E

yang de'i tshe byang chub sans dpa' sans dpa' chen po
'phags a pa b spyan ras gzigs dbang c phyug 1 shes rab kyi d pha
rol tu phyin pa zab mo 2 spyod pa nyid la rnam par lta zhing /
phung po lnga po de dag e la yang f rang bzhin gyis g stong
par h rnam par i lta'o //

1) L2, M2, N2, R2: Insert shad.
2) S: mo 'i.

-----------------------------
a) M2 [end of a line]: 'phag s.
b) U1: Almost invisible.
c) J: dbyang.
d) M2: kyis.
e) J: Gap of one letter.
f) S: kyang for la yang.
R2: 'ang (therefore, la'ang, without tsheg ).
g) U1: kyis.
h) M2, U2: bar.
C, J: pa.
i) S: Omits rnam par.
Paragraph E

1) H1, R1: Omit shad. Agrees with Recension A.
2) H1: zhing. Conflation from Recension A.
3) H1: de dag la yang. Conflation from Recension A. See also Paragraph I, note 5.
4) L1, N1: Omit la. [N1 has four tshegs in this place.]

---

a) N1: ra directly below pa.
b) N1: rnamr for rnam par.
c) L1: pa.
Recension A

Paragraph F

1  de¹ nas sangs rgyas kyi mthus /¹ tshe² dang ldan pa³ shā⁴ ri’i
2  bus² byang chub sems⁵ dpa’ sems⁶ dpa’ chen⁷ po ’phags pa
3  spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug la ’di skad ces smras so³ //⁸

1)  R2: Omits shad. Compare Recension B.
    F [end of line]: Double shad.
2)  H2, L2, M2, N2, R2, S: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.
3)  L2, N2: smraso.

==============================================

a)  B: des.
b)  P: che (Probably broken; K: tshe).
    S: Inserts ba after tshe, canceled by dots above.
c)  U1: ba.
d)  S: sha.
e)  J: sems.
f)  C [end of line]: Five tshegs filling space.
g)  U1: Almost invisible.
h)  J, U1 (?): Single shad. See Paragraph G, note 1.1

    [U1: If double shad, first is almost completely broken.]
Paragraph F

1) de nas sangs rgyas kyi\(^a\) mthus tshe dang ldan pa shā\(^b\) ra dwa\(^1\) ti’i
2) bus /\(^2\) byang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po ’phags pa
3) spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug la ’di skad ces smras so\(^c\) //

---

1) H1, L1: radwa for ra dwa.
N1: dwā.
2) H1: Omits shad, with Recension A.

---

a) R1: kyis.
b) N1: sha.
c) L1: smraso.
Paragraph G

1) C, D1, D2, H2, J, L2, M2, N2, R2, S, U1, U2: Insert 'am rigs kyi bu mo.

J: From rigs kyi bu until gang la is very cramped and almost impossible to read, but the text has been jammed into a space normally meant for about nine letters — which means that if 'am rigs kyi bu mo were omitted, things would fit perfectly.

D1, H2, R2, U1: Insert shad after 'am.

S: 'am added below line.

D1, M2 [end of line], U2: bu'am (no tsheg).

2) S: mo'i.

3) N2, S: spyod pa spyod. Agrees with Recension B.

[S seems to have had par for pa, but the ra is mostly erased leaving a space.]

4) L2, M2, N2, S: Insert shad.

----------------------------------------

a) J: bslab very cramped; almost certainly 'corrected.'

S: brlab.

b) J: half-shad, or broken?
Paragraph G

1) rigs kyi bu\(^1\) gang la la shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab mo\(^2\)
2) la\(^3\) spyad pa spyod\(^4\) par ’dod pa des ji ltar bslab par bya /

1) H1: Inserts ’am / rigs kyi bu mo (without tsheg after preceding bu).
    Conflation with Recension A, note 1.
2) H1: mo’i. Agrees with S in Recension A.
3) H1: Omits la. Conflation with Recension A.
4) H1: spyod pa spyad. Conflation with Recension A.
   N1: Vowel over spyod broken.
de skad ces smras pa dang / byang chub sems dpa’ \(^{a}\) sems
dpa’ chen \(^{b}\) po ’phags \(^{c}\) pa spyan ras gzigs \(^{d}\) dbang phyug gis \(^{e}\)
tshe’ \(^{f}\) dang ldan pa shā \(^{1}\) ra dwa’ \(^{g}\) ti’i \(^{2}\) bu la ’di skad ces smras
so \(^{3}\) // \(^{h}\)

---

1) D1, D2, H2, U1: *sha.*
2) B, F, K, L2, M2, N2, P, R2: *shā ri’i.*
   K, P: There is a gap of about two letters between ri and ’i.
   [H2: *sha radwa ti’i* seems to be a ‘correction.’ The letters
   are smaller and closer together than is normal.
   Probably a normal size *shā ri’i* would fit perfectly.]
2) L2, M2, N2: *smraso.*

---

a) U1: Gap of about 3 letters. The ’a of dpa’ is slightly away from the pa —
   perhaps something was deleted on the block here.
   S: Inserts *shad*, but cramped (or elongated *tsheg*?).

b) L2: *tshan.*

c) M2 [end of line]: ’phags’.
   N2 [end of line]: ’phat.

d) B [end of line]: *gzig’.

e) R2: Inserts *shad*. Equals R1’s reading

f) H2: *che.*

g) U1: *dwa* almost impossible to make out as such (broken?).
   H2: *radwa.*

h) U1: Single *shad.*
Paragraph H

1  de skad ces smras pa dang / byang chub sems\textsuperscript{a} dpa' sems
2  dpa' chen po 'phags pa spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug gis\textsuperscript{b}
3  tshe dang ldan pa\textsuperscript{c} shā ri'\textsuperscript{1} bu la 'di skad ces smras so\textsuperscript{2} //

    M1:  shā ra dwa ti'i.
2)  L1, N1:  smraso.

---------------------

a)  N1:  Vowel broken.
b)  R1:  Inserts shad. Equals R2's reading.
c)  M1:  ba (?).
sha\textsuperscript{a} ri'i bu\textsuperscript{1} rig kyi bu 'am\textsuperscript{2} rig kyi bu\textsuperscript{b} mo gang la\textsuperscript{c} la\textsuperscript{d} shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab\textsuperscript{e} mo\textsuperscript{f} spyod pa spyad par\textsuperscript{g} 'dod pa des\textsuperscript{h} 'di ltar rnam\textsuperscript{i} par blta\textsuperscript{j} bar bya ste / phung po\textsuperscript{k} lnga po de dag kyang rang bzhin\textsuperscript{l} gyis stong par\textsuperscript{m} rnam par\textsuperscript{n} yang\textsuperscript{o} dag par rjes su\textsuperscript{p} blta'o\textsuperscript{q} // i

1) H2, L2, M2, N2: Insert shad.
2) D1, H2, L2, M2, N2, R2, U1: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B. J: 'am (no tsheg).
3) S: mo'i.
4) L2, M2, N2, R2, S: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.
6) L2, M2, N2, R2, S: Omit rnam par.
7) J, L2 [end of line], N2: rjesu. See Recension B, note d.

\begin{flushleft}
a) S: \textit{sha}.
b) S: \textit{bu} added below line.
c) J: First \textit{la} written in margin at beginning of line; solid border broken to allow room. Perhaps a correction made on the block.
d) P: \textit{pa zab} partially obscured by blot. See Paragraph J, note e.
e) J: rnam.
f) P: bzhin, for space.
g) S: par added below line.
h) S: lta'\textit{o}.
i) U1: Single half-shad (broken?).
\end{flushleft}
Paragraph I

1 shā ri'i bu¹ rigs kyi bu² 'am³ /² rigs kyi bu mo⁴ gang la la
2 shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab mo³ spyad pa spyod⁴ par
3 'dod pa des /⁵ phung po lnga po de dag ngo bo nyid kyis stong
4 par yang dag par rjes su⁶ mthong ba de ltar blta bar bya ste /⁵)

1) H1: Insert shad; see Recension A, note 1.
2) L1: Omits shad. Agrees with Recension A.
3) H1: mo'i. Note agreement with S in Recension A, note 3.
4) H1: spyod pa spyad. Conflation with Recension A.
   R1: spyad pa very cramped.
5) H1: Omits preceding shad and reads with Recension A: 'di ltar
    rnam par blta bar bya ste / phung po lnga po de dag kyang ngo
    bo nyid kyis stong par rnam par rjes su blta'o. Note the further
    conflation of reading ngo bo nyid for Recension A's rang bzhin.
    [The sa of kyis is added below kyi on the block.] See also
    Paragraph E, note 3.

a) M1: bu inserted below the line in small writing, in the same hand.
b) H1: bu'am (no tsheg).
c) N1: Omits mo.
Recension A

Paragraph J

1) gzugs\(^{a}\) stong\(^{b}\) pa’o\(^{c}\) // 1 stong pa\(^{d}\) nyid gzugs so\(^{e}\) // f gzugs
2) las\(^{2}\) stong pa nyid gzhan ma yin no\(^{3}\) // 4 stong pa nyid las
3) kyang \(^{5}\) gzugs gzhan ma yin no\(^{6}\) // de bzhin du tshor ba\(^{g}\) dang /
4) ’du shes\(^{h}\) dang / ’du byed \(^{7}\) dang / mam par shes pa rnams
5) stong pa’o //

1) J [end of line], P: Single shad.
   F: shad omitted altogether.
   U1: Single half-shad (broken?).
2) K, N2, S: Insert kyang. In K the kyang is inserted by hand below the line.
3) C, D1, D2, H2, J, S, U1, U2: Omit no. See note 4, below.
   L2, N2: yino.
4) C, D1, D2, H2, J, S, U1, U2: Single shad. See note 3, above.
   K: The second shad is added by hand.
5) M2: Omits kyang. Agrees with Recension B.
6) L2, N2, J: yino.
7) H2, L2, M2, N2, R2, S: Insert rnams. Agrees with Recension B.

---

a) J: gzugs\(^{s}\).
b) U1: ia almost completely absent.
c) J [end of line]: ’a-chung written directly below po.
d) B: par written, and ra canceled.
e) J, N2: gzugsso.
M2: gzungsso.
f) K: shad effaced.
P: so and shad effaced by blot. See Paragraph I, note d.
U1: Single half-shad (broken?).
g) N2: pa.
C: ba half height, but full width.
h) L2: she\(^{s}\).
Paragraph J

1) gzugs stong pa'o // 1 stong pa nyid gzugs so^2 // 3 gzugs
2) las stong pa nyid gzhan ma yin no^4 // 5 stong pa nyid las
3) gzugs gzhan ma yin no^a // de bzhin du tshor ba dang /
4) 'du shes dang / 'du byed rnams dang / rnam par shes pa rnams^b
5) stong pa'o //

---

1) M1: Single shad.
   N1: Double shad cramped, and beginning and end of next clause cramped.
2) L1, N1: gzugso.
   [N1: so quite cramped. See note 3, below.]
3) N1: Single shad. See note 2, above.
   L1: yino.

---

a) L1: yino.
b) H1 [end of line]: rnams.
Paragraph K

1) shā\textsuperscript{a} ri'i bu\textsuperscript{b} de lta\textsuperscript{1} bas\textsuperscript{2} na\textsuperscript{3} chos thams cad\textsuperscript{c} stong pa nyid
2) de\textsuperscript{d} / mtshan nyid\textsuperscript{e} med pa / ma skyes pa\textsuperscript{f} / ma 'gags\textsuperscript{g} pa\textsuperscript{h} /
3) dri ma med pa / i dri ma dang bral ba\textsuperscript{i} med pa / bri ba med
4) pa / gang ba med pa'o //\textsuperscript{k}

1) S: Itar. See note 2. Corresponds with Recension B.
   U1: Space of about 2 letters.
2) S: Omits bas. See note 1.
3) H2, L2, M2, N2: Insert shad.

a) M2: shu.
   S: sha.
b) H2: Inserts shad. Equals H1's reading.
c) J, L2: thamd for thams cad.
   U2: Apparently has nad (?) for cad.
d) N2: nyide.
e) M2: nyled.
f) B: dpa (or dap, i.e. 5\textsuperscript{i}).
g) M2, S: 'gag.
h) K, P: Gap of about 5 letters before shad.
i) S: ma written and cancelled.
j) U1: pa.
k) B [end of line], M2: Single shad. See Recension B, note d.
Paragraph K

1) shā ri’i bu a de ltar b chos thams cad ni c stong d pa nyid dang e f
2) mtshan nyid med pa nyid dang g / ma skyes pa dang h / ma
3) 'gags c pa dang i / dri ma med pa dang j / dri ma dang bral k ba
4) dang l / bri ba med pa dang m / gang ba med pa’o n / d

1) H1: Ita bas na / for ltar. Conflation with Recension A.
2) H1: Omit ni. Conflation with Recension A.
3) H1, N1: de. Agrees with Recension A.
4) H1: Omits nyid dang. Conflation with Recension A.
5) H1: Omits dang. Conflation with Recension A.
6) M1: med added above the line in a different (sloppy; non-Tibetan?) hand, indicated as belonging here with an x-cross below the line. Conflation with Recension A? Probably rather added by a later reader (once brought to Japan?).
7) H1: Reads med pa for dang. Conflation with Recension A.

a) H1: Insert shad. Equals H2’s reading.
b) N1: nga badly damaged in Ótani & Bonn; clear in IASWR; Hanba illegible. Following strong there is a space of 2 letters at the beginning of a line.
c) N1: ‘gag .
Paragraph L

1. shā a ri’i bu de lta bas na 1 stong pa b nyid la.gzugs c med /
2. tshor ba med / ’du shes d med / ’du byed mams 2 med /
3. rnam e par shes pa med / mig f med / rna ba med / g sna med / lce med / h lus med / yid med / gzugs med / i
4. sgra med / j dri k med / ro med / reg bya med /
5. chos l med do 3 // 4

1) L2, M2, N2, H2, S: Insert shad.
   S: na.
3) M2, N2: medo.
4) F, P: Single shad.
   K: Second shad added by hand.

-----------------------------

a) S: sha.
   U1: ba.

b) F: Writes gzugs, since the word runs into the ‘binding’ circle.

   J: Very difficult to read, but something odd; perhaps reads gchugs [gtshugs?].

c) U1: Space of one letter, undecipherable letter, another space, then med/. This is

   the bottom left corner of the folio, and it appears that the paper was too wet
   when printed, and so it blurred severely.

d) U1: Superscript ra broken.

   f) U1: meg.

   g) B: Inserts sna ba med /

   h) B [end of line]: shad very cramped, almost nonexistent.

   N2 [end of line]: Omits shad.

   j) R2 [end of line]: Omits shad.

   N2 [end of line]: Omits shad.

   k) U1: di.

   l) B: mehos.
Paragraph L

1) shă ri’i bu / ¹ de lta bas na stong pa nyid la gzugs med do² // ³
tshor ba med do⁴ // ⁵ ’du shes med do² // ³ ’du byed nams med
do² // ³ rnam par shes pa med do² // ³ mig med do² // ⁶ ma ba
med do⁷ // ⁸ sna med do² // ⁹ lce med do¹⁰ // ³ lus med do² // ³
yid med do¹¹ // ³ gzugs med do² // ³ sgra med do² // ³ dri med
do² // ¹² ro medᵃ do² // ³ reg bya med do² // ³ chos nams¹³
med do //ᵇ

1) RI: Omits shad. Agrees with Recension A.
2) H1: Omits do. Conflation with Recension A. [And so for the
   following.]
   L1: medo.
3) H1: Single shad. Conflation with Recension A. [And so for the
   following.]
4) H1: Omits do.
5) H1: Single shad.
   N1: Double shad cramped.
6) H1: Single shad.
   N1: Half + full-shad (first shad broken?).
7) H1: Omits do.
   L1: medo.
   M1: Omits rna ba med do.
8) H1: Single shad.
   M1: Omits shads.
9) H1: Single shad.
   R1 [end of line]: Second shad not clear.
10) H1: Omits do.
    T1 [end of line]: medo.
11) H1: Omits do, but with larger than normal space before and after the
    preceding two words.
    L1: medo.
12) H1: Single shad.
    N1: Double shad cramped.
13) H1: Omits rnams. Conflation with Recension A.

ᵃ) N1: Vowel broken?
ᵇ) N1: Double shad cramped.
Paragraph M

1. mig gi¹ khams² med³ pa⁴ nas⁵ yid kyi kham⁶ med⁷ /³ yid
2. kyi mam⁸ par shes pa'⁴i kham⁹ g kyi bar du yang¹⁰ med do¹¹ //

---

1: L2, M2, N2: gis.
   U1: gi, but seems to have been 'corrected' on the block; ga is a little small, slightly below the line, and off-level, but the gi-gu is in the correct place. There is a space of one letter after gi.
2) H2, L2, M2, N2, R2, S: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.
3) D1, F, P [end of line], U1: Omit shad.
   J: shad cramped. See note e, below.
   S: Double shad.

---

a) J: khams.
   U1: kha off-balance.

b) U1 [end of line]: Space of one letter, with two tshegs.

c) M2: Inserts rnas, but deletes it with three dots in a triangle above both letters.

d) H2 [end of line], L2 [end of line]: kham.

e) J: sa of kham, and med, cramped. See note 3, above.

f) J: One blank space; probably rnam written and sa erased.

g) J: kham.

h) R2: 'ang (therefore, du'ang, without tsheg.)
Paragraph M

1 mig gi kham's med cing / mig gi rnam par shes pa'i kham's med pa
2 nas /¹ yid kyi kham's med cing / yid kyi rnam par shes pa'i
3 kham's kyi bar du² med do³ //

1) H1: Omits shad. Conflation with Recension A.
2) H1: Inserts yang. Conflation with Recension A.

Paragraph N

1) ma rig pa med / ma rig\textsuperscript{a} pa zad\textsuperscript{b} pa med pa\textsuperscript{c} nas\textsuperscript{1} rga shi med /\textsuperscript{d} rga shi zad pa\textsuperscript{i} bar du\textsuperscript{e} yang\textsuperscript{f} med do\textsuperscript{g} //\textsuperscript{h}

---

1) L2, M2, N2: Omit pa nas.
H2, L2, M2, N2, R2, S: Insert shad.

---

a) M2: \textit{rigs}.
b) S: Space two letters wide filled with tshegs.
c) S: Omits \textit{pa}.
d) F: Omits \textit{shad}.
e) B: Omits \textit{du}.
f) R2: \textit{\textquotesingle}ang (therefore, \textit{du\textquotesingle}ang, without tshegs)
g) S: \textit{medo}.
h) C: Double half-\textit{shads}; broken?
U1: Full + half-\textit{shad}; broken?
Paragraph N

1) ma rig pa med cing  ma rig pa zad pa med pa nas  rga shi
2) med cing  rga shi zad pa’i bar du  med do  //

---

1) H1, R1: Insert shad. Conflation with Recension A.
2) R1 [end of line]: Inserts shad. Agrees with Recension A, note 1.
3) H1, R1: Insert shad. Conflation with Recension A.
4) H1: Inserts yang. Conflation with Recension A.

---

b) L1: medo.

c) N1 [end of line]: Single shad.
Paragraph O

1  sdug bsngal ba\(^a\) dang / kun 'byung\(^b\) ba dang / 'gog pa dang / 
2  lam med / ye shes med\(^c\) / thob pa med / ma thob pa\(^d\) yang\(^e\)
3  med do\(^2\) // f

1) S: Inserts de bzhin du.
2) L2, N2, S: medo.

-----

\(a\): U1: \(pa\).
\(b\): U1: Looks like bbyung. (Broken 'a-chung?).
\(c\): P: mad (vowel broken; K: med).
\(d\): J: One or 2 letter gap.
\(e\): R: 'ang.
\(f\): F, U1: Single shad.
Paragraph O

1) L1, N1: Omit shad.
   M1: 'a-chung (of 'gog) written over shad in same hand. See note a, below.

2) L1, N1: Omit shad.

3) H1: Omits rnams. Conflation with Recension A.
   L1: rnam.

4) H1: Omit do. Conflation with Recension A

5) H1: Single shad. Conflation with Recension A

6) H1: ye shes med for shes pa med do. Conflation with Recesnion A.

7) H1, M1: Single shad.

a) M1: 'grog. See note 1, above.

b) N1: Cramped double shad:
Paragraph P

1) sha\(^a\) ri\(^i\) bu\(^c\) de lta\(^d\) bas\(^e\) na\(^1\) byang chub sems dpa’ nams\(^f\) thob
2) pa\(^g\) med pa’i\(^h\) phyir / i shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa\(^2\) la brten\(^3\)
3) cing gnas te / sems la sgrig pa\(^j\) med pas\(^k\) skrag\(^l\) pa med de\(^m\) / \(^n\)
4) phyin\(^o\) ci log\(^p\) las shin tu\(^4\) ’das nas\(^5\) mya ngan las ’das pa’i\(^q\)
5) mthar phyin to // r

1) H2, N2: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.
2) H2, L2, M2, N2, R2: Insert zab mo.
    S: Inserts ‘di.
    M2: ‘greng bu above and zhabs kyu below rta. (Quite clear.)
5) S: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.

---

a) S: sha.
b) K, P: ri'i (for spacing?).
c) H2: Insert shad. Equals H1’s reading.
d) S: ltar.
e) C: ba.
f) J [end of line]: rnam\(^s\).
    S: rnam\(^s\), with la written after it and cancelled by what looks something like a
    ulde above ~.
g) U1: ba.
h) U1: ba’i.
i) S: Omits shad, with 2 tshegs in that place.
j) S: Omits pa.
k) S: Inserts shad.
l) U2: sgag? sgrag? (Preceding sgrig very clear.)
m) B: do.
n) B: Double shad.
o) D1: phyi.
p) B: logs.
q) D2 [end of line]: After pa’i three tshegs and a little space.
    J: ‘i cramped, probably enough to be a late insertion.
r) C: Double shad cramped.
Paragraph P

1) shā ri’i buᵃ de lta basᵇ na /¹ byang chub sems dpa’ rnam thob
2) pa med pa’i phyir /ᶜ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la brtenᵈ
3) nas gnasᶜ te /ᶠ sems kyi² sgrib pa med pas ’jigs pa med cing³ /
4) phyin ci log las⁴ ’das⁸ te⁵ /⁶ mya ngan las ’das pa’i
5) mthar phyin to //

---

1) R¹: Omits shad. Agrees with Recension A.
2) H¹: la. Conflation with Recension A.
3) H¹: de. Conflation with Recension A.
4) H¹: Inserts shin tu after las. Conflation with Recension A.
   M¹: lam.
5) H¹: nas. Conflation with Recension A.
6) H¹: Omits shad. Conflation with Recension A.

---

a) H¹: Inserts shad. Equals H²’s reading.

b) M¹: Blot, but hand-written below line in a different hand: bas. As far as I can
tell, the original reading was also bas.

c) H¹: Omits shad.

d) N¹: rten.

e) R¹: Omits gnas.

f) H¹: Omits shad.

g) M¹: ldas [⁼⁷⁵⁸⁷⁶]. Influenced by preceding las?
Paragraph Q

1) dus⁵ gsum² du³ nam par bzhugs⁵ pa’i sangs rgyas thams cad⁴
2) kyang¹ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’f la brten⁸ nas / bla na
3) med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub⁶ tu² mngon par⁵
4) rdzogs par³ sangs rgyas so⁴ //⁵

1) C, D1, J, U1: Insert shad.
2) C, J, Omit tu, with Recension B.
3) L2, N2: Omit rdzogs par.
   H2: pa for par.
4) L2, N2: rgyaso.
5) H2, M2: Double shad a bit cramped.
   U1: Single shad.

=b--------------------------=

a) B: dug.
b) M2: sum.
   J [end of line]: gsum.
c) K, P: Gap about 3 letters wide.
d) J: bzhug.
e) J, L2: tham for thams cad.
f) S: Inserts 'di.
g) N2: rten.
   S: sten.
h) J: chu.
i) D1: bar.
Paragraph Q

1. dus gsum\(^a\) du rnam par bzhugs\(^b\) pa'i sangs rgyas thams\(^c\) cad
dkyang shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la brten te /\(^d\) bla na
med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par
rdzogs par sangs rgyas so //

_________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N1:</th>
<th>gsum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>R1:</td>
<td>zhugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>M1:</td>
<td>thabs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>H1:</td>
<td>Omits shad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1:</td>
<td>Space of one letter before shad, perhaps indicating revision of Recension A's nas for te.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paragraph R

1) L2, M2, N2: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.
2) S: mnyam par byed pa'i phan sngags; phan is written in a different hand sloppily and cramped at the end of the line and folio.
3) D1, S, U1: rdzun.

---

a) H2: itar.
b) S: Omits kyi.
   U1: Gap of one letter after kyi.
c) S: Omits tu.
d) U1 [end of line]: sngag\_s .
e) S: sngag\_s .
   M2: Space of about two letters before shad .
f) D2: ba'i (?).
g) S: sngag\_s .
   M2: Space of about two letters before shad .
h) C: The space of one letter this edition usually leaves after the single shad is not found here.
   S: Omits shad .
i) L2: Three tshegs; MS obviously corrected.
j) H2: Inserts shad .
k) S: than\_s .
l) J, L2: tham\_d for thams cad .
m) S: sngag\_s .
n) R2: pa .
o) S: kyi added below line.
p) F: Double shad .
Paragraph R

shā ri’i bu¹ de lta bas na / a shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i
2 sngags te² / b rig³ pa chen po’i sngags dang⁴ / bla na med pa’i
3 sngags⁵ dang / mi⁶ mnyam pa dang mnyam pa’i sngags / e sdug
bsnal thams cad rab tu zhi bar byed pa’i ⁶ sngags (⁷ te / ma log
5 pa’i phyir⁵ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ni / gsang sngags bden
6 zhing / g rigs⁹ pa yin par shes par bya’o // ⁷)

1) H1: Omits shā ri’i bu. Conflation with Recension A.
2) H1: Omits te. Conflation with Recension A.
3) L1, N1: rigs.
4) H1: Omits dang. Conflation with Recension A.
5) H1: Omits dang. Conflation with Recension A.
6) M1, R1: Insert gsang.
7) H1: / mi rdzun pas na / bden par shes par bya ste / shes rab kyi
pha rol tu phyin pa’i sngags smras pa / . Conflation with
Recension A.

-------------------------

a) R1: Omits shad.

b) M1: shad erased into tsegg (? or MS worn here?).
c) N1: Effaced on Bonn only (inking error?).
d) R1: The phrases from rig pa to here are rather cramped.
e) L1 [end of line]: shad added on border.
f) R1: Omits phyir.
g) M1: Space of about three letters.
h) R1: Writes rig for rigs.
Paragraph S

1) tadya thā / orṁ¹ ga te ga te pā² ra ga te / a pā³ ra sarn⁴ ga te /
2) boᵇ dhi swā hā⁵ / c

1) C, D1, D2, H2, J, U1, U2: Omit orṁ, agreeing with Recension B.
2) S: pa. Agrees with Recension B.
3) S: pa. Agrees with Recension B.
4) S: sah.
   B, F, J, L2, P (?): sarn written with candrabindu.
5) B, F, H2, L2, M2, N2, S, U2: swāhā.
   [U2 is unclear; reading only probable.]

a) B: Omits shad.
b) R2, S: bho.
Paragraph S

1) H1, R1: tadya.
2) H1, M1: thā.
3) R1: pā. Agrees with Recension A.
4) H1: sam. Conflation with Recension A.
5) H1: swāhā. Conflation with Recension A.
   R1: swahā.
6) L1, N1: Double shad. Both are cramped. See Recension A, note c.

a) N1: Double shad.
b) R1: Omits shad.
Paragraph T

1) shā<sup>a</sup> ri'i bu<sup>1</sup> byang chub sems<sup>b</sup> dpa' sems dpa' chen pos<sup>2</sup> de ltar
2) shes rab<sup>c</sup> kyi pha rol<sup>d</sup> tu phyin pa zab<sup>e</sup> mo la bs lab<sup>3</sup> par<sup>f</sup> bya'o // g

1) J:  Space of one letter [trace of erased sa?]
               H2, M2, N2, R2: Insert de lta bas na /.
               [R2: Omits shad.]
               L2: Inserts de lta bas /.

2) H2, L2, M2, N2: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.

3) B, F, K, P:  pos,
                slab.

a) S:  shā.

b) L2 [end of line]:  sems, and inserts single shad on border.

c) U1:  Looks like rang, but probably was rab. Followed by a space of about 5 or 6 letters.

d) L2:  ro written on one side of the 'binding' circle, la on the other.

e) F:  zad.

f) U1:  bar.

g) U1:  Single shad.
Paragraph T

1) R1: Omits shad. Agrees with Recension A.
2) H1, R1: Omit shad. Agrees with Recension A.
Paragraph U

1 de nas bcom ldan 'das a ting b nge l 'dzin de c las bzhengs te d
2 byang chub sms dpa e sms f dpa g chen po h 'phags i pa j spyan
3 ras gzigs dbang phyug la legs so 2 zhes bya ba byin nas k / legs
4 so l legs so // 4 rigs m kyi bu n de de bzhin no 5 // 6

1) L2, N2, S: tinge.
2) L2, N2, S: legso.
3) L2, M2, N2, S: legso legso.
4) F, P, U1: Single shad.
   K: First shad added by hand.
5) L2, N2: bzhino.
   [L2: ba a bit cramped.]
   K: Second shad added by hand.
   B: Omits shad altogether, but two tsheg-s added vertically beneath
      normal tsheg.

====================================

a) J: Writes without abbreviation [compare passim].
b) U1: tang (vowel broken?).
c) J: de added below the line on the block, with the e vowel above the line,
   directly above the tsheg between 'dzin and las.
d) M2: Omits shad.
e) U1: Space of 2 letters.
f) S: sem s.
g) D1: dba ? (?).
h) F: po i.
i) N2 [end of line]: 'phat.
   F [end of line]: 'phag s.
j) P: ba.
k) S: te.
l) H2: Inserts double shad.
m) U1: rig.
   S: rig.
Recension B

Paragraph U

1  de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis¹ /² ting³ nge⁴ 'dzin de las bzhengs
2  nas⁵ /⁶ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po /⁷ 'phags pa
3  spyan⁸ ras gzigs dbang phyug la (⁶ rigs kyi bu⁶) legs so⁹ legs
4  so¹ //² f  rigs kyi bu³ de de bzhin no //

---

1) H1: Omits kyis. Conflation with Recension A.
2) H1, M1, R1: Omit shad. Agrees with Recension A.
3) H1: te. Conflation with Recension A.
4) H1: Omits shad.
5) H1, R1: Omit shad. Agrees with Recension A.
6) H1: legs so // zhes bya ba byin nas. Conflation with Recension A.
   See Paragraph V, note 6.

---

a) M1: kying.
b) L1: tinge.
c) M1: sbyan.
d) H1: Inserts double shad.
   L1 [end of line]: legs so.
   [so written on and outside of the borderline.]
e) L1: legso.
f) L1: Second shad cramped.
g) H1: Inserts shad. Equals H2's reading.
Paragraph V

1) a. rigs kyi bu\(^1\) de de\(^b\) bzhin te / c. ji\(^2\) ltar khyod kyis bstan
2) pa de bzhin du\(^3\) shes rab kyi pha rol\(^d\) tu phyin pa zab mo la
3) spyad par\(^e\) bya ste / de bzhin gshegs pa rnams\(^f\) kyang rjes su\(^4\)
4) yi\(^5\) rang ngo\(^g\) // h

1) B, F, K, S: Omit rigs kyi bu. See note 2, below. Agrees with Recension B.
   H2: Inserts shad.
2) P: Very cramped from the beginning of this paragraph to here. If written normally the phrase without rigs kyi bu would fit perfectly. Note that K omits rigs kyi bu; evidently P has been 'corrected.' See note 1, above.
3) H2, L2, M2, N2, S: Insert shad. Agrees with Recension B.
   U1: Looks like shad was erased; two tshegs follow du.
4) J, L2, M2, N2, S: rjesu.

a) L2: Perhaps one letter (\(\text{da}\)) erased between preceding double shad and ra of rigs.
b) S: d\(\text{a}\)i [i.e., two 'greng bu-s above da] for de de.
   U1: Vowel over second de unclear, but seems to be di or perhaps dam.
c) L2 [end of line]: Double shad.
d) J: One letter space at end of line.
e) P: bar.
P(ii): Resumes. See Paragraph D, note m.
f) U1: Superscript ra broken off.
   J: rnams.
   S: rnams.
g) S: rango.
h) U1: Single shad.
Paragraph V

1) de de\textsuperscript{a} bzhin te / \textsuperscript{1} khyod kyis ji skad\textsuperscript{2} bstan pa\textsuperscript{3} bzhin du / \textsuperscript{4}
2) shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa zab mo la spyad par bya ste /
3) de bzhin gshegs pa rnams kyang rjes su\textsuperscript{b} yi\textsuperscript{5} rang ngo\textsuperscript{c} zhes
4) legs so\textsuperscript{d} bya ba byin no\textsuperscript{6} //

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1) & H1: Inserts \textit{ji ltar}. Conflation with Recension A. \\
2) & H1: Omits \textit{ji skad}. Conflation with Recension A. \\
3) & H1: Inserts \textit{de}. Conflation with Recension A. \\
4) & H1: Omits \textit{shad}. Conflation with Recension A. \\
5) & L1, N1: \textit{yid}. \\
6) & H1: Omits \textit{zhes legs so bya ba byin no}. Conflation with Recension A. See Paragraph U, note 6. \\
   & M1: Reads after \textit{rang ngo}: \textit{bzhin no// de de bya ba byin no}. \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{itemize}
\item[a)] L1: \textit{dai} [i.e., two \textit{greng bu-s above da}] for \textit{de de},
\item[b)] L1 [end of line]: \textit{rjesu}.
\item[c)] L1: \textit{rango}.
\item[d)] L1: \textit{legso}.
\end{itemize}
Paragraph W

1) Bcom Ildan 'das\(^a\) kyis de skad ces bka' stsal\(^b\) nas\(^c\) / tshe dang
2) Ildan pa shā ri'i\(^1\) bu dang /\(^d\) byang chub sems dpa'\(^e\) sems
3) dpa' chen po 'phags pa\(^2\) spyan ras gzigs\(^3\) dbang phyug dang /
4) thams\(^f\) cad\(^g\) dang Ildan pa'i 'khor de\(^4\) dang\(^h\) / lha dang / i\(^i\) mi\(^j\)
5) dang /\(^k\) lha ma yin dang / dri zar\(^l\) bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi\(^5\) rangs\(^m\)
6) te /\(^n\) bcom Ildan 'das\(^o\) kyis\(^6\) gsungs pa la mgon par bstod do\(^p\) //\(^q\)

---

1) C, J: shā ra dwa ti'i.
   D1, D2, H2, S, U2: shā ra dwa ti'i.
   U1: sha ri dwa ti'i.

2) L2, M2, N2, R2: Omit sems dpa' chen po 'phags pa.
   U1: Omits pa.

3) F [end of line], J, U1: gzigs.


6) L2: kyi.
   N2: Small sa inserted below kyi on the block.

---

a) J, L2: bcom\(\text{das}\).
   D2: Omits 'das. This is at a folio break, and probably the scribe just lost his
   place while taking a new piece of paper. See the note in the Introduction.

b) D2: scal? (Probably broken.)
   S: bstsal.

c) S: pa dang for nas.

d) S: Double shad.

e) U1: dpa [i.e., no 'a-chung], and a gap of 3 or 4 letters following.

f) S: thams\(\_\).

g) J, L2: thanid.

h) N2: Space of one letter before shad.

i) B: Omits shad.

j) J: ming (? mid ?).

k) B: Omits shad.

l) S: Inserts dang.

m) S: rang.

n) M2: Omits shad.

o) J: bcom\(\text{das}\).

p) N2: bstado.
   S: bstodo.

q) F: Single shad.
Paragraph W

1 bcom ldan ’das kyis de skad ces bka’ stsal nas /\tshe dang
2 ldan pa shā ri’i b bu dang / byang chub sems dpa’c ’phags pa
3 spyan ras gzigs kyi dbang phyug dang / d thams cad dang
4 ldan pa’i ’khor de dang\¹ lha dang / e mi dang / f lha ma yin
dang / dri zar bcas pa’i ’jig rten yi rangs te g / h bcom ldan ’das
5 kyis gsungs pa la mngon par i bstod do //

1) R1: Inserts shad. Agrees with Recension A.
L1: shad may have been erased into tsheg.
N1: dang inserted on the block in small letters below the line after
dag and before lha. The copyist probably made the correction
on paper before the block was carved.

a) H1: Omits shad.
b) N1: ri’ or ra’i; i.e., only one gi-gu.
c) L1: semda’.
d) N1 [end of line]: Omits shad.
e) L1: Omits shad.
f) L1: Omits shad.
g) H1: rang ste.
h) H1: Omits shad.
i) M1: bar.
Paragraph X: End Title

1 a bcom ldan 'das b ma shes rab kyi c pha d rol tu phyin pa'i e
2 snying po zhes bya ba 1 theg pa chen po'i 2 mdo f rdzogs s.ho 3 //

1) H2, L2, M2, N2, R2: ba'i.
2) H2, L2, M2, N2, R2: Omit theg pa chen po'i.
3) L2, M2, N2: rdzogso.
S: rdzogs.ho.
C, D1, D2, H2, R2, U1, U2: so.
P: Looks like sto, but is probably a broken s.ho.

-------------------------
a) U: Inserts double shad.
b) J: bcomdas.
c) F: gyi.
d) N2: pa (broken?)
e) C: ba'i.
f) P: Left half of ovowel broken off.
Paragraph X: End Title

1  'phags pa¹ bcom ldan 'das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa’i
2  snying po² rdzogs so³ //

1) H₁: Omits 'phags pa. Conflation with Recension A.
2) H₁: Inserts zhes bya ba theg pa chen po 'i mdo. Conflation with Recension A.
3) L₁: rdzogs.ho. See Recension A.
   N₁: s.ho.
Paragraph Y: Colophon*

1) rgya gar gyi mkhanā po bi b ma la mi tra dang/ lo tstsha c ba
2) dge slong rin chen sdes bsgyur cing/ zhu d chen gyi lo tstsha e ba dge slong 3) nam mkha' f la sogs pas zhus te gtan la phab 4) pa'o 5) // 6) dpal bsam yas g lhun h gyis grub pa'i gtsug i lag 7) gi dge rgyas byema gling gi rtsig j ngos la bris pa k dang zhu l dag legs par m bgyis n so o //

Recension B omits the Colophon — except for the conflated H 1. In addition the Recension A texts L2, M2, N2, R2 also omit the colophon.
S: b'kriso / mangga lam /.
See the discussion of the colophon in the introduction.

1) D1, D2, H2, U1, U2: Insert double shad.
2) B [end of line], F, K, P: Omit shad.
3) D1, D2, H1, H2, U2: blo dang for slong.
H1, H2: Insert shad.
5) D1, D2, H2, U1, U2: pa.
6) D1, D2, U1, U2: Insert second double shad.
H1: Ends here.
H2: Single shad only.
F: Half-letter space before gi.

--------------------------

a) P: Top of kha broken, so looks like la.
b) P: bi, probably for spacing.
c) H1: tsā.
K: tscha.
P(ii): Looks like ccha, but almost certainly just broken.
d) H2: zhus.
e) H1: \( \text{tsā}. \)  
Space of one letter.

g) U1: \( \text{las}. \)

h) P: \( \text{dlhan} \) (vowel broken; K: \( \text{ldun}. \))

j) B: \( \text{gtsugs}. \)

j) B: \( \text{rtsigs} \) (\( \text{rtsig sa}. \)) [There looks to be a \( \text{tshig} \) through the upper left-hand corner of the \( \text{sa}. \)]

k) U1: \( \text{ba}. \)

l) U1: \( \text{dang zhu} \) added below \( \text{bris ba} \) [sic; see note k], between lines, evidently on the block.

m) F: \( \text{ra} \) re-written. See next note.

n) C: \( \text{bar}. \)

P: \( \text{gyis}. \)

P: \( \text{ba} \) of \( \text{bgyis} \) corrected?

o) P: Cramped, since the beginning of the next text has been “corrected” in the titles and invocation (half the total length of the line 41a5.).
Part IV
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Appendix I

Notes on the Polyglot Editions of the Heart Sūtra

In addition to the versions of the Heart Sūtra in Tibetan discussed or studied in the introduction, the Kanjur versions, versions from Dunhuang, and the vulgata, there also exist various copies of the text in polyglot editions. Several polyglot editions of the Heart Sūtra were available to me. Two are xylographs reproduced and studied by Walter Fuchs [1970]. Another is a manuscript tetraglot reproduced by Lokesh Chandra [1979: 44-49 (preface), 50-61 (text)]. A final text is a diglot in Tibetan and Manchu, dated January 1, 1784, reproduced by Hariba Yoshio [1932: III.161-68 = 451-58]. The two texts in Fuchs’s work were later romanized and studied by Leon Hurvitz [1975]. While I cannot speak of Prof. Hurvitz’s reproduction of the texts in Mongol and Manchu, his transcription of the Tibetan text is not completely accurate, and cannot be taken as the basis for a critical study. The readings of the edition published by Lokesh Chandra are nearly identical with those of Fuchs’s tetraglot. The Imperial Preface (written in Manchu, Tibetan, Mongolian and Chinese) which accompanies the Lokesh Chandra tetraglot is identical (at least in Chinese and Tibetan) with the second, undated, preface published by Fuchs. The Tibetan in this preface, transcribed accurately by Hurvitz, agrees, with only a few trivial differences, with Lokesh Chandra’s text, except that Xuanzang’s 玄奘 name is transliterated ywan cwang in the latter, rather than the ywan cung of Hurvitz’s text.¹ Hurvitz also includes an English translation of the

¹ The wa-zur plus -a- seems to occur in free variation with -u-. See Uray [1955]: 106-07. The wa-zur has been discussed in detail by Laufer [1898-99]. The transliteration ywan is to be accounted for because Xuanzang’s name could not be written with its usual characters. The character xuan 玄, as the personal name of the Kangxi Emperor Xuanzong 太宗, was taboo, and the character was therefore replaced by yuan 元. On another point, Hurvitz does not note that the mark in the Tibetan text which he transcribes with a “2” indicates the omission of honorific titles. Note that the mark precedes the following words: yab (three times), nang (signifying the Imperial precincts), and gong ma yab. [The “2”
preface, already translated into German by Fuchs.\footnote{See Lokesh Chandra [1963: 49, n. 6]. It is not clear to me whether this mark, which in fact is the Tibetan numeral 2, \$, is to be connected with the \textit{mangala} symbol which, according to Gustav Roth [1986], represents \textit{siddham}. Cp. particularly the signs numbered 2 and 3 in Roth's chart.}

It is clear that all the polyglots are, on the whole, Recension A texts. But there is some fluctuation between recensions, and none of the polyglots can be said to correspond very closely to any one Kanjur edition or lineage. It is of interest that in several instances all the polyglots share a reading with S not attested in any other Kanjur. All of this raises more problems than it solves, but these are problems for the future.

Below is a listing of variant readings of the polyglot texts, keyed to the paragraphs (in bold), footnote numbers or letters (in parentheses), and, when necessary, line and word numbers, of Recension A of the present edition. Despite variations, the polyglots are Recension A texts. For additional words or \textit{shad}-s which are not found in the Critical Edition, reference by line and word number or footnote numbers or letters points to the position following the indicated word. Thus “5.5 adds \textit{shad}” means that the \textit{shad} falls after the fifth word on the fifth line. Trivial variants or possible variants (\textit{ba / pa}, for example) and broken vowel signs are, in general, not recorded. Those variants that have significant and important correlation with readings reported in the Critical Edition are marked in bold.

\footnote{Note the interesting reference in the Imperial Preface to the quadrilingual \textit{Śūramitāra-sūtra}, written by the Emperor Qianlong 乾隆 in 1763 (Staël-Holstein [1936]: 144): “During the reign of my imperial grandfather (the Emperor K’ang-hsi [Kangxi 康熙]) the \textit{Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra} was translated into four languages. It was engraved on printing blocks and published by my imperial father (the Emperor Yung-chêng [Yongzheng 雍正]).” \textit{yab bsam pa la 2 mes rgyal po’i ring la shes rab snying po skad rigs bzhis bsgyur zhi g 2 yab rgyal pos par brkos te kun la bkram par mdzad pa yin /}.}
The following sigla are used:

1: Fuchs tetraglot.  
2: Fuchs pentaglot. 
3: Lokesh Chandra tetraglot.  
4: Hariba diglot. 
All: Unanimity of 1, 2, 3, and 4.

A:  
2: Missing whole paragraph. 
(b): 1, 3, 4: \(\text{wa}\).  
(c): 1, 3: \(\text{pra dzny\=a}\). 
(2): 1, 3, 4: \(\text{hri}\).

B:  
2: Missing whole paragraph. 
(2): 4: Single \(\text{shad}\), and insert \(\text{bam po gcig go II}\).

C:  
1, 3, 4: Omit the whole paragraph.

D:  
(e): 4: Omits \(\text{shad}\).  
(k): 4: Omits \(\text{shad}\). 
(m): 2: \(\text{dpai}\).  
(8): 2: \(\text{tinge}\). 
(9): 4: \(\text{zhugs}\).

E:  
2.3: 1: \(\text{sbyan}\).  
All: \(\text{mo'\i}\). 
3.14: All: Omit \(\text{shad}\).  
5.4: 2: \(\text{bIla'\o}\).

F:  
(1): All: Omit \(\text{shad}\).  
(2): 2: Inserts \(\text{shad}\).

G:  
(1): 1, 3, 4 add \(\text{shad}\).  
(2): All: \(\text{mo'\i}\). 
(3): 1, 2, 3: \(\text{spyad pa spyod}\).  
\([2: \text{a vowel canceled over spyad}]\) 
2.4: 2: \(\text{pas}\).  
2.8: 2: \(\text{ci}\).
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(g): 4: Single shad.

2.6: 2: chu (3): All: mo'i.
2.11-13: 1, 2, 3: spyad pa spyod. 3.2: 1: ba.
(4): 2: Inserts shad. 3.4: 2: de.
(5): 2: lta.

J: (1): 2: Omits shad. Between 1.6-7: 1, 2, 3: Insert kyang.
(2): 1, 2, 3: Insert kyang. (3): 1, 3, 4: Omit no.
3.10: 1: chir. 4.6: 4: Omits shad.
5.2: 4: Single shad.

(d): 2: Omits shad. 2.5: 2: Omits shad.
(i): 2: Omits shad. 3.8: 2: ra almost invisible.
(j): 2: bas. 3.10-11: 4: Omits med pa.
4.1: 2: Omits shad.

L: 1.3: 1, 3, 4: Insert shad. 1.13: 2, 4: Omits shad.
2.3: 2, 4: Omits shad. 2.6: 2, 4: Omits shad.
(2): 1, 2, 3: Omit rnams. 2.10: 2: Omits shad.
3.5: 2: Omits shad. 3.7: 2: Omits shad.
(g): 2: Omits shad. 4.1: 2: Omits shad.
(h): 2: Omits shad. 4.5: 2: Omits shad.
(j): 2: Omits shad. 5.4: 2: Omits shad.
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M: (3): 2: Omits shad. 2.5: 2: pa.
(h): 1, 3: 'ang. 2, 4: Omit yang.

(f): 1, 3, 4: 'ang.

O: (1): All: Insert de bzhin du.
2.8: 2: Omit shad.

P: (c): 2: Omit bu. 1, 3, 4: Insert shad.
(i): 1, 3, 4: Omit shad. 3.3: 1, 3, 4: Omit shad.
3.6: 2: 'jigs. 3.9: 2: cing.
(n): 2: Omit shad 4.4: 2: la.
(q): 1, 2, 3: pa. 4: par.
1, 3: Insert chen po'i. 2: Inserts chen po.
5.1: 4: Omit shad.

Q: 1.7: 1: ba'i. 2: pa.
(1): 1, 2, 3: Insert shad. 2.7: 2: du.
2.10-12: 2: Omit shad. 2.12: All: Omit shad.
(2): 4: Omit tu.

(c): 2: du. 2.3: 2: po.
4.8: 2: ba.
4.9: 2: dang. 1: Inserts shad
5.1-2: 1, 2, 3: byas te. 5.8: 2: du.
(4): 2, 3: Insert shad.
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S:
1.7: 1, 2, 3: Insert shad.
110: 2: ngga (nga superscripted over ga).
(a): 4: Omits shad.
(c): 2: Double shad.

T:
2.6: 2: du.

U:
(d): 4: Omits shad. (h): 1, 2: po'i.
(2): 4: Insert double shad. (k) 2: no //.
(n): 4: Inserts shad.
(6): 1, 2, 3: Omit shad's. 4: Single shad.

V:
(1): 1, 2: Omit rigs kyi bu. 4: Inserts shad.
(c): 1, 2, 3: Omit shad.
1.11: 2, 4: kyi. 1: Inserts shad.
2.2: 4: Omits. de. (3): 2, 3: Insert shad.
2.10: 2: du. 3.3-4: 1, 2: byas te.
3.8: 4: ba. (5): 1, 2, 3: yid..

W:
5.5: 2: Omits shad. (5): 1, 2, 3: yid.

X:
(a): 1, 3, 4: Insert 'phags pa.
2.2: 2: po'o, and ends here.
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(1) 1, 3: ba'ī.
(2) 1, 3: Omit theg pa chen po'i.
(3) 4: Omits zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.

Y: All: Omit the colophon.
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The First European Printing of the Tibetan Heart Sūtra

The first edition of the Heart Sūtra in Tibetan published outside of Tibet and surrounding areas (e.g., China), dating to 1835, is titled *Btschom-lidan-adas-ma-sches-rab-kyi -pha-rol-tu-phyin-pai-sňing-po: Das Herz (die Quintessenz) der zum jenseitigen Ufer des Wissens gelangten Allerherrlichkeit-Vollendenten: Eine tibetische [sic] Religionsschrift*. The editor is not known. Copies seem to be rather rare, and I have traced only two. One is listed in the *Katalog der Bibliothek der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Erster Band (Drucke), Zweite Auflage. R. Pischel, A. Fischer, G. Jacob, eds. (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1900): 460, listed as Ff 1418. The disposition of this library after the war is not known to me. The other copy is in America, at Yale University in the Beinecke Rare Book Library, where its call number is Fvr 90.B85. Thanks to the kindness of Prof. Stanley Weinstein of Yale, and of his student Mr. Morten Schlütter, I was able to obtain a copy of this book. Of modern scholars, only S. Ju. Lepechov [1986] seems to have known of it, but my ignorance of Russian prevents me from determining whether he discusses this work in his paper, or merely lists it in his bibliography.

This book is actually a reproduction of a native Tibetan edition of the text, in small pothi format. In the xerox copy I have the pages are 24 x 11 cm., and the printed text covers an area of about 16 x 5.5 cm., but probably the actual dimensions are slightly less since a standard xerox machine copies at approximately 103 percent. Including the Tibetan title page the book covers 14 pages. Only the front and back covers contain writing in Roman script. On the back we read: "Von ächt tibetischen Holtztafeln stereotypirt," (Stereotyped from eight Tibetan woodblocks). Apparently stereotype is a kind of offset printing. The text proper is followed, as is not uncommon in Tibetan vulgate versions of the Heart
Sūtra, with a series of homages. These homages take up five folio sides while the text takes up eight. We have no indication of what editor is responsible for the publication. Only the publisher’s name, Karl Tauchnitz, is given. Although certainly not the first, this seems to be one of the first books published in Europe in Tibetan, and is perhaps the first Prajñāpāramitā text; I. J. Schmidt’s edition of the *Vajracchedikā* was published only in 1837. As such this edition of the Heart Sūtra is of great antiquarian interest, and of value for the study of the evolution of Tibetology in the West.
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Appendix III

Nōmi Hiroshi

The first edition of the Tibetan Heart Sūtra published in Japan seems to be that of Nōmi Hiroshi (or Kan) 能海寛 (1868-1901). The publisher of Nōmi's book is unclear, but it was published seventeen years after his death by a memorial committee (tsuiokukai 追憶会) represented by Teramoto Enga 吳本婉雅. Nōmi was a pioneer of Japanese Tibetologists, in the sense that he was one of the first Buddhists in Japan to recognize the value of the Tibetan Buddhist scriptures. Having recognized their value, he set off to obtain copies of these scriptures, but despite repeated attempts was unable to gain access to Tibet itself.

The following brief information may be given about him (based mostly on Sumita [1989], below): Nōmi was born May 18, 1868 in the Shinshū Ōtani-ha Jōrenji Temple 淨蓮寺 in Nakagun 那賀郡, Hazamura 波佐村 in Iwami-no-kuni 石見国 (modern Shimane 島根 prefecture). In 1886 he entered the Normal High School of the Honganji-ha, and it was then, at the age of 19, that he first got the idea to go to Tibet, inspired by Nanjō Bun’yū 南条文雄. In 1892 he graduated from the Tetsugakkan 哲學館, now Tōyō University in Tōkyō, and in the following year published a book with the title Sekai ni okeru Bukkyōto 世界に於ける佛教徒 [Buddhists of the World] (Tōkyō: Tetsugaku Shoin 哲學書院, 1893). In 1896 he came to Kyōto, lived in the house of Nanjō Bun’yū and studied Sanskrit as his student. In the evenings he learned Chinese from Miyazaki Daihachi 宮澤大八. He married in 1898, but left almost immediately to try to enter Tibet. He left Kōbe November 11th, and arrived in Shanghai on the 16th. In April, 1899, he planned to leave from Dajianlu 打箭炉, about 200 km. SW of Chengdu 成都, in Sichuan 四川 province and enter Tibet, and in fact left together with Teramoto Enga’s party. But he was forced to turn back from Batang 巴塘, 300 km. west of Dajianlu and the Tibetan border at that time. In March 1900 he made his edition of the
Heart Sūtra, and in May began his second attempt to enter Tibet. He took the Qinghai 青海 province road from Xining 西寧 in Gansu 甘肅 province, 200 km. NW of Lanzhou 蘭州, but was able to reach only as far as Dongkeer 冬科爾, which again marked the Tibetan border. In 1901 he took the Yunnan 雲南 province road, and in April he sent a collection of Buddhist texts and other materials to Nanjō Bun'yū from Dali 大理, about 280 km. WNW of Kunming 昆明. After that nothing certain is known.

In 1918 on the seventeenth anniversary of his death a Memorial Committee published the Nōmi Hiroshi Posthumous Papers [Nōmi Hiroshi Ikō 能海寛遺稿], including the “Hannya Shingyō Chibetto Choku-yakai” (Shingyō Zōbon Nichikan Shitai Gappeki) 般若心經西藏直譯．心經藏梵日漢四體合壁, [The Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya translated literally from Tibetan, with a comparative edition of the Tibetan, Sanskrit, Japanese and Chinese texts], his collected correspondence, and so on.

Recently a fair amount of attention has been given Nōmi, and it seems appropriate to append here at least a preliminary bibliography of the works I have seen which deal with this figure. Mr. Watanabe Shōgo very kindly provided me with information and photocopies, and Mr. Sumita Shōzō, curator of the Nōmi Hiroshi Shiryō Kankōkai also extended his kindness in providing me materials. A work which would introduce this tragic yet romantic figure to non-Japanese readers would no doubt be most welcome.
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———. 1918. Nōmi Hiroshi Ikō 能海寛遺稿 (Nōmi Hiroshi Posthumous Papers) (Kyōto: no publisher [Ôtani University?]).

Sumita Shōzō 隅田正三. 1989. Chibetto tanken no senkusha: kyūdō no shi Nōmi Hiroshi チベット探検の先駆者・求道の師 能海寛 [A pioneer of Tibetan explorers: the Truth seeker Nōmi Hiroshi] (Nakagun, Shimane 那賀群島根: Haza bunka kyōkai 波佐文化協会). Written and compiled by the man responsible for the Memorial Association for Nōmi, this volume contains a wealth of information on the man and his life. It also contains the complete text of his Sekai ni okeru Bukkyōto, a re-print of his Heart Sūtra edition, detailed information on other Tibetan textual and anthropological materials sent back to Japan by Nōmi, and photocopies of newspaper stories about him and about the Memorial Association. To these add a reference to Chūgai Nippō 中外日報 March 9, 1983, pages 1 (by Nakamura Hajime 中村元), and 8-9.
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Appendix IV

The Opening Verse

Teramoto’s editions of the Heart Sūtra, and some modern Tibetan editions, carry a verse before the opening of the text. This reads as follows:

\[
\text{smras bsam brjod med shes rab pa rol phyin//}
\text{ma skyes ma 'gags nam mkha'i ngo bo nyid//}
\text{so sor rang rig ye shes spyod yul ba//}
\text{dus gsum rgyal pa'i yum la phyag 'tshal lo//}
\]

This might be rendered in English:

To the inexpressible, inconceivable, ineffable Perfection of Wisdom, The unproduced, undestroyed, whose nature is [like] the sky, The realm of self-illuminated knowledge,¹ The Mother of the Victors of the three times, Homage!

The connection of this stanza with the Kanjur version is tenuous; it seems to belong only to the vulgate text, and this was probably also Teramoto’s source. It is possible that this verse reflects some verse of homage of the sort which is appended to Sanskrit manuscripts, but I have not been able to identify a Sanskrit verse to which it corresponds. A set of verses, more or less fluid in composition, with similar content is found at the beginning of most editions of the larger Prajñāpāramitā texts in Sanskrit,

¹ The third line may represent something like "pratyāmajñānagati-gocara; similar technical terms are found often in the Lankāvatāra-sūtra. I do not mean, however, to imply that the stanza was necessarily ever written in Sanskrit; it may well be a Tibetan composition."
these verses called the Prajñāpāramitāstotra, but even here I have not found any verse which fully corresponds. The present verse is, however, mentioned in Bstan dar lha ram pa’s commentary to the Heart Sūtra. Donald Lopez [1988: 147] quotes this commentary as follows: “[I]n great monasteries such as Se-ra and ’Bras spung (Drepung), before reciting the sūtra, it is customary [to recite] these verses of praise and obeisance.” The verse in question is then quoted, and the commentary briefly discusses the verse. It is possible that Bstan dar lha ram pa is pointing at the Prajñāpāramitāstotra when he says, after citing the verse: “It is claimed that this verse is words of praise directed by the son Rāhula to his own mother.” Is there some confusion here between Rāhula(bhadra), the son of the Buddha, and Rāhulabhadra, the putative author of the Prajñāpāramitāstotra? A further discussion of this verse, its interpretation, and its historical importance should be taken up by scholars of Tibetan Buddhism.

---

1 For a convenient text and translation of one version of these verses, see Lamotte [1949]: 1060-65, in the notes.

2 Actually the Tibetan text [Bstan dar lha ram 1971: 7a6] quotes only the first line of the verse.

3 Bstan dar lha ram [1971]: 7a6-b1: tshigs bcad de ni sras sgra gcen ’dzin gyis rang gi yum la bstod pa’i tshig yin zer. Translation modified from Lopez [1988]: 147.

4 On the latter figure, see Ruegg [1981]: 54ff.
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The Text in Tibetan Script, and an English Translation

To provide to students and teachers a reliable text of the Tibetan Heart Sūtra in Tibetan script, I have included here both recensions established in the present edition, printed side by side. No account is taken here of the variant readings reported in the edition, and the materials below are intended solely as reading texts. All other things being equal, it is no doubt better to read Tibetan in Tibetan script. But with computers and their word processors and searching capabilities, it is often easier to romanize Tibetan than to computerize it in Tibetan script. For pedagogical purposes, however, we should try to return to the native script, and that should be considered the justification of this presentation.

I have thought long about the advisability of offering yet another translation of the Heart Sūtra, and have been very reluctant to add to the glut. But in the end I decided to provide what might serve as a guide to the differences between the two recensions for those who do not know the Tibetan language. The two recensions of this text are different in important ways, and while I am far from being certain of many of my renderings, I hope that they give some idea of the vital divergences between the recensions. The translation is sometimes rough as English, but I have preferred this in an attempt to highlight the distinctions between recensions.
Recension A

In Sanskrit: Bhagavati Prajñā-
pāramitā Hṛdaya

In Tibetan: Bcom ldan 'das ma
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin
pa'i snying po

Homage to the Blessed One, the
Perfection of Wisdom!

Thus I heard at one time: The
Blessed One was staying on the
Vulture Peak in Rājagrha, to-
gether with a great assembly of
monks, and a great assembly of
bodhisattvas, and at that time the
Blessed One was entered into the
concentration of the Preaching of
the Dharma called “Profound
Illumination.”
Recension B

In Sanskrit: Ārya Bhagavati Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya

In Tibetan: 'Phags pa bcom ldan 'das ma shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i snying po

Homage to all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas!

Thus it was at the one time when I heard this that the Blessed One was dwelling at Rājagṛha, on the Vulture Peak, together with a great assembly of monks, and a great assembly of bodhisattvas, and at that time the Blessed One was entered in the concentration called “Illumination of the Profound Preaching of the Dharma.”
Recension A

Now, at that time the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara, observing the practice itself of the profound Perfection of Wisdom, observed that even those five aggregates are intrinsically empty.

Then, through the empowerment of the Buddha, the elder Śāriputra spoke thus to the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara.

“How should whichever gentle son who desires to practice the practice of the profound Perfection of Wisdom learn it?”

He spoke thus, and the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara spoke thus to the elder Śārdvātiputra.
Recension B

Now, at that time the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara observed the practice of the profound Perfection of Wisdom, and with respect to the five aggregates observed that they are inherently empty.

Then, through the empowerment of the Buddha the elder Śāravatīputra spoke thus to the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara.

“How should whichever gentle son who desires to practice his practice in the profound Perfection of Wisdom learn it?”

He spoke thus, and the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara spoke thus to the elder Śāriputra
Recension A

“Śāriputra! Whichever gentle son or gentle daughter desires to practice the practice of the profound Perfection of Wisdom should observe thus, and he will behold that even those five aggregates are intrinsically empty.

Matter is empty. Emptiness is matter. Emptiness is not other than matter. Matter is also not other than emptiness. In such a way feeling, concept, disposition and cognition are empty.

Śāriputra! Therefore all elements areemptiness and without characteristic marks, non-arising, non-ceasing, without stain, without freedom from stain, without decrease, without increase.
Recension B

“Śāriputra! Whichever gentle son, or gentle daughter, desires to practice the practice of the profound Perfection of Wisdom, he remarks that those five aggregates are inherently empty, and should observe thus:

Matter is empty. Emptiness is matter. Emptiness is not other than matter. Matter is not other than emptiness. In such a way feeling, concept and the disposition, and cognition, are empty.

Śāriputra! Thus, all elements are emptiness, and in the state of being without characteristic marks, and non-arising, and non-ceasing, and without stain, and free from stain, and without decrease, and without increase.
Recension A

Śāriputra! Therefore emptiness is without matter, without feeling, without concept, without disposition, without cognition, without eye, without ear, without nose, without tongue, without body, without mind, without physical form, without voice, without odor, without taste, without tactile object, without mental object.

And from: without the sense realm of the eye, even as far as: without the sense realm of the mind, without the sense realm of the mental cognition.

And from: Without ignorance, without the destruction of ignorance, even as far as: without old age and death, without the destruction of old age and death.
Śāriputra! Therefore emptiness is without matter. It is without feeling. It is without concept. It is without disposition. It is without cognition. It is without eye. It is without ear. It is without nose. It is without tongue. It is without body. It is without mind. It is without physical form. It is without voice. It is without odor. It is without taste. It is without tactile object. It is without mental objects.

And from: lacking the sense realm of the eye, it is without the sense realm of the eye cognition, as far as: lacking the sense realm of the mind, it is without the sense realm of the mental cognition.

And from: lacking ignorance, it is without the destruction of ignorance, as far as: lacking old age and death, and it without the destruction of old age and death.
Recension A

Without suffering, and its arisal, and its cessation, and the path, without wisdom, without attainment, and also without non-attainment.

Śāriputra! Therefore because bodhisattvas are without attainment, they dwell relying on the Perfection of Wisdom, and since they are without obstruction in their minds they are without fear, and completely transcending perversity they reach the finale which is nirvāṇa.

All the buddhas resident throughout the three times too, having relied on the Perfection of Wisdom, fully awakened to unexcelled, perfect Awakening.
Recension B

It is without suffering, and its arisal, and its cessation, and the path. It is without knowledge. It is without attainment. It is also without non-attainment.

Śāriputra! Therefore, because bodhisattvas are without attainment, they dwell reliant on the Perfection of Wisdom, and lacking dread since they are without obstruction of mind, they transcend perversity, and reach the finale, which is nirvāṇa.

All the buddhas resident throughout the three times too relied on the Perfection of Wisdom, and fully awakened to unexcelled, perfect Awakening
Recension A

Therefore you should know that the mantra of the Perfection of Wisdom, the mantra of great knowledge, the unexcelled mantra, the mantra equal to the unequalled, the mantra which assuages all sufferings, since it is not spurious, is true, and the mantra of the Perfection of Wisdom says:

\[
\text{tadyathā om gate gate pāragate pārasaṁgate bodhi svāhā.}
\]

Śāriputa! Thus should the bodhisattva, mahāsattva learn the profound Perfection of Wisdom.”

Then, the Blessed One rose from that concentration and offering commendation to the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara [said]: “Well done! Well done! Gentle son, it is just so.
Sāriputra! Therefore, you should know that being the mantra of the Perfection of Wisdom, it is the mantra of great knowledge, and the unexcelled mantra, and the mantra equal to the unequalled; being the mantra which assuages all sufferings, because it is not erroneous the Perfection of Wisdom, being a true mantra, is appropriate.

*tadyathā gate gate paragate parasaṅgate bodhi svāhā*

Sāriputra! The bodhisattva, mahāsattva should thus learn the profound Perfection of Wisdom.”

Then, the Blessed One, rising from that concentration, offered commendation to the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Ārya Avalokiteśvara: “Gentle son! Well done! Well done! Gentle son, it is just so.
Recension A

“Gentle son, it is just so, and just as you have stated so should one practice the profound Perfection of Wisdom, and even the Sugatas will be delighted.”

The Blessed One having spoken thus, the elder Śāriputra, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva Árya Avalokiteśvara, the world encompassing that entire audience, and gods, and men, and asuras, and gandharvas rejoiced, and acclaimed what the Blessed One had said.

The Mahāyāna sūtra called the Blessed Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom is concluded.
Recension B

“It is just so, and just as you have declared, so should one practice the profound Perfection of Wisdom, and even the Sugatas will be delighted.”

The Blessed One having spoken thus, the elder Śāriputra, and the bodhisattva, Ārya Avalokiteśvara, and the world encompassing that entire audience, and gods, and men, and asuras, and gandharvas rejoiced, and acclaimed what the Blessed One had said.

The Noble Blessed Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom is concluded.
Recension A

Translated by the Indian scholar Vimalmitra and the Lotsāwa Dge slong Rin chen sde, it was revised and put in order by the chief revisor Lotsāwa Dge slong Nam mkha’ and others. It was corrected [comparing it] with that written on the wall of the Dge rgyas bye ma gling of the Lhun gyis grub pa monastery Śrī Bsam yas.
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