

Orna Almogi

Authenticity and Authentication

Glimpses behind the Scenes of the
Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 9

Hamburg • 2020

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Authenticity and Authentication

Glimpses behind the Scenes of the
Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES

Edited by Harunaga Isaacson and Dorji Wangchuk

Volume 9

Hamburg • 2020

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Authenticity and Authentication

Glimpses behind the Scenes of the
Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon

Orna Almogi



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 9

Hamburg • 2020

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Published by the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies,
Asien-Afrika- Institut, Universität Hamburg, Alsterterrasse 1,
D-20354 Hamburg, Germany
Email: indologie@uni-hamburg.de

© Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2020

ISBN: 978-3-945151-08-2

Almogi, Orna: Authenticity and Authentication: Glimpses behind the
Scenes of the Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon

First published 2020

All rights reserved.

*Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism
or review, no part of the book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by
print, photoprint, microform or any other means without written permission.*

Enquiry should be made to the publishers.

Printing and distribution:

Aditya Prakashan, 2/18 Ansari Road, New Delhi, 110 002, India.

Email: contact@bibliainpex.com

Website: www.bibliainpex.com

Printed and bound in India by Replika Press Pvt. Ltd.

This publication has been supported by the Khyentse Center for Tibetan
Buddhist Textual Scholarship (KC-TBTS), Universität Hamburg.

All that is well-expounded, O Maitreya, is Buddha-expounded.
yat kiñcin maitreya subhāṣitaṃ sarvaṃ tad buddhabhāṣitaṃ |

~ *Adhyāśayaśaṃcodanasūtra*
(as cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*; Bendall 1897–1902: 15.19)

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----------|
| Preface | 5 |
| Technical Note | 7 |
| Part One | 9 |
| <i>On Strategies for Authenticating Scriptures and Treatises: The Tibetan Buddhist Case</i> | |
| 1 Introductory Remarks | 11 |
| 2 Criteria of Authentication and Canonization within the Tibetic Cultural Sphere | 16 |
| 2.1 Provenance | 19 |
| 2.1.1 The Existence of a Sanskrit Manuscript | 19 |
| 2.1.2 The Existence of a Sanskrit Title | 21 |
| 2.1.3 The Existence of an Author/Authorship Colophon | 28 |
| 2.1.4 The Existence of a Translator/Translation Colophon | 29 |
| 2.1.5 Reliance on Written Authority | 33 |
| 2.1.6 Reliance on Oral Authority | 43 |
| 2.1.7 Syntax and Vocabulary | 48 |
| 2.2 Verifiably Valid Traditions | 59 |
| 2.3 Authentication Based on Content | 61 |
| 2.3.1 Authentication Based on Soteriological Benefit | 61 |
| 2.3.2 Authentication Based on the Quality of Translation | 68 |
| 2.4 Authentication Based on the Scripture's Structure | 70 |
| 3 Polemical and Apologetic Strategies | 73 |
| 3.1 The <i>Argumentum ad Hominem</i> | 75 |
| 3.2 The Ridicule Argumentative Device | 77 |
| 3.3 The Historical-Philological Approach | 80 |
| 3.4 The "Other-Religions" Argument | 89 |
| 3.5 Self-Critique | 91 |

Authenticity and Authentication

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 3.6 | The Development of Complex, Multifaceted Narratives regarding the Appearance of Scriptures | 92 |
| 4 | When Polemics End | 93 |
| 4.1 | Beyond Discourse: Banning, Censorship, and Destruction | 94 |
| 4.2 | The Non-Sectarian Approach: Inclusivism or Harmonization/Reconciliation | 95 |
| 5 | Concluding Remarks | 96 |
| | Appendix | 97 |

Part Two 99

What's in a Name? Once Again on the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 1 | Introductory Remarks | 101 |
| 2 | Canonical and Paracanonical Colophons: Some General Observations | 102 |
| 3 | Author/Authorship Colophons | 103 |
| 4 | Translator/Translation Colophons | 106 |
| 5 | Case Studies | 111 |
| 5.1 | An Overview of the Traditional Catalogues Consulted | 112 |
| 5.2 | The Colophons of the <i>Prajñāpāramitāstotra</i> aka <i>Niroikalpastava</i> in Tibetan Translation | 121 |
| 5.2.1 | Extant Versions and Their Colophons | 121 |
| 5.2.2 | Further Bibliographical Evidence | 130 |
| 5.2.3 | Examination of Selected Verses | 134 |
| 5.2.4 | Assessment of the Evidence | 153 |
| 5.3 | The Colophons of the <i>Prasādapratibhodbhava</i> aka <i>Śatapañcāśatkastotra</i> in Tibetan Translation | 158 |
| 5.3.1 | Extant Versions and Their Colophons | 159 |
| 5.3.2 | Further Bibliographical Evidence | 165 |
| 5.3.3 | Examination of Selected Verses | 169 |
| 5.3.4 | Assessment of the Evidence | 174 |
| 5.4 | The Colophons of the <i>Buddhākṣeṇasūtra</i> in Tibetan Translation | 178 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 5.4.1 | Extant Versions and Their Colophons | 178 |
| 5.4.2 | Further Bibliographical Evidence | 180 |
| 5.4.3 | Assessment of the Evidence | 181 |
| 5.5 | The Colophons of the <i>Guhyasamājatantra</i> in Tibetan Translation | 182 |
| 5.5.1 | Extant Versions and Their Colophons | 182 |
| 5.5.2 | Further Bibliographical Evidence | 205 |
| 5.5.3 | Assessment of the Evidence | 210 |
| 6 | Concluding Remarks | 219 |
| | Abbreviations & Bibliography | 223 |
| 1 | Sigla: Tibetan Canonical and Paracanoncal Collections & Their Catalogues | 223 |
| 2 | Tibetic Sources | 226 |
| 3 | Indic Sources | 234 |
| 4 | Sources in Western Languages | 237 |
| 5 | Digital Sources | 252 |
| | Index | 253 |

Preface

In the past decade, I have devoted most of my research to the study of the formation of Buddhist textual corpora, both canonical and paracanonical, within the Tibetan cultural sphere. One of the aspects I have focused upon is the combined issue of authenticity and authentication in connection with the formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, and the present publication presents some of these findings. Part One, titled “On Strategies for Authenticating Scriptures and Treatises: The Tibetan Buddhist Case,” is devoted to a general discussion of the issue of authenticity and authentication as viewed and dealt with by various Tibetan masters, some of whom were responsible for the formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon as we know it today. Part Two, titled “What’s in a Name? Once Again on the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons,” discusses the question of the authenticity of canonical colophons—a topic that I have touched upon on an earlier occasion—by first deliberating on the issue in broader terms and then presenting and examining a few case studies.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to several of my friends and colleagues from Universität Hamburg for their support in various ways. First and foremost I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to Prof. Dorji Wangchuk, for helping clarify textual problems of various kinds, and Prof. Harunaga Isaacson, for his unfailing readiness to assist me in matters concerning doubtful Sanskrit names and terms. I also thank both of them for accepting the book for publication in the Indian and Tibetan Studies Series and for their comments on the final version. Thanks are also due to Nicola Bajetta, who read (portions of) the manuscript on two occasions, for his comments and feedback, and likewise to Tashi Wangdi, Sonam Choden, and Sonam Jamtsho, for their assistance over the years in digitizing various Tibetan materials, some of which facilitated the present study. I am also grateful to Sebastian Nehrlich for the collaborative work on the BuddhaNexus project, which aided the research that went into two

Authenticity and Authentication

of the case studies presented in Part Two (which in turn enabled me to do repeated testing of the database before its publication). I was also fortunate to have had the opportunity to present the findings of the present study, shortly before it went to the press, to the members of the Academic Research Program Initiative (ARPI) project, which enabled me to improve it in several respects despite the time constraint, for which I am likewise very grateful. Last but not least, I would like to take this opportunity to also thank Mr. Philip Pierce, Kathmandu, for proofreading my English and for his, as always, very helpful and useful comments, which made me improve the study in various ways. Needless to say, whatever errors might be found in the present study are solely mine.

The findings exhibited in the present study are the result of research conducted within the framework of the project “A Canon in the Making: The History of the Formation, Production, and Transmission of the *bsTan 'gyur*, the Corpus of Treatises in Tibetan Translation,” generously funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), for which I am highly grateful.

Orna Almogi

Hamburg, September, 2020

Technical Note

Attempts have been made to offer critical editions for all Tibetan texts cited in the present monograph. For this purpose, at least two versions, whenever possible, have been taken into consideration. In the case of Tibetan works for which modern (critical) editions exist, preference was given to these editions, while occasionally other witnesses were considered as well. When citing works found in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, the Peking and sDe dge editions have generally been used. For the recording of the colophons of the case studies found in Part Two (§5), numerous canonical, para-, and extracanonical versions have been used as deemed necessary.

Apart from a few exceptions, no attempt has been made to emend the Tibetan text in cases of transliteration of Sanskrit names or terms. When several variant readings have been recorded, the one closest to the correct Sanskrit word was opted for. The correct or reconstructed Sanskrit names or terms are offered in the respective English translation or summary. Moreover, apart from a few exceptions, the Sanskrit titles of Indic works in Tibetan translation are given in accordance with the modern catalogues of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon. Only in some obviously doubtful cases they have been marked as reconstructions by way of an asterisk. Sanskrit and Tibetan short titles are employed without an asterisk.

Glosses found in the cited manuscripts and block prints, including those found in dBus pa blo gsal's catalogue of the Old sNar thang edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*—which, as a rule, offer reconstructions of the Indic authors' Sanskrit names or the Tibetan rendering of these Sanskrit names (in both cases often wrong ones)—were recorded only when found relevant. Orthographic abbreviations (*skung yig*) have been silently expanded.

The sigla used for the various versions of the Tibetan Buddhist canonical and paracanonical collections—including the *bKa' 'gyur*, *bsTan 'gyur*, and *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*—and those used for the

Authenticity and Authentication

catalogue numbers are listed and elucidated in the Bibliography, §1. The sigla used for non-canonical Tibetic works are elucidated in the respective bibliographical entries found in the bibliography, §2.

Part One

On Strategies for Authenticating Scriptures and Treatises The Tibetan Buddhist Case

1. Introductory Remarks

Much has already been written and said about the processes of scripturalization, authentication, and canonization in general, and in the Buddhist context in particular.¹ In this part of the present study I would like to primarily focus on the various policies and strategies regarding authentication processes within the Tibetic cultural sphere, with special reference to the formation of what is referred to by modern scholars as the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, which consists of the *bKa' 'gyur* (*The Word [of the Buddha] in [Tibetan] Translation*) and the *bsTan 'gyur* (*The Treatises in [Tibetan] Translation*). At a first glance it may seem that the processes of scripturalization, authentication, and canonization are in a way universal, involving the same, or similar, issues surrounding the identity of a given work and the policies for authenticating it. Nonetheless, it appears that Buddhism is unique in this regard in several aspects: (1) the relatively long duration of the formation of its scriptural corpus within the Indic cultural sphere, the birthplace of Buddhism, (2) the unparalleled amount of material considered canonical (both by each Buddhist tradition separately and by all of them together), (3) the likewise unparalleled undertakings—particularly in terms of scope—of translating Buddhist scriptures and treatises into Chinese and Tibetan, (4) the existence of several canons, which differ, in some cases greatly, in terms of content and size, and (5) perhaps the most relevant to our discussion, the continued surfacing of new scriptures in non-Indic languages in different locations outside the Indic cultural sphere.

¹ For a recent brief discussion of these issues, see Almogi 2019, where further references to previous studies are provided.

Authenticity and Authentication

Generally speaking, issues related to the processes of scripturalization, authentication, and canonization are always complex and often highly polemical, and Buddhism is no exception in this regard. Tibetans were well aware of the fact that these processes also occurred within the Indic cultural sphere for centuries before (and during) the adoption (and to a certain extent adaptation) of Buddhism in Tibet, and thus they inherited the Indic intra-Buddhist dissent concerning these matters (behind which often stood issues concerning ontological and soteriological matters), including such between the early form of Buddhism (pre/non-Mahāyāna, or Nikāya Buddhism, as it is increasingly being referred to as) and the later form known as Mahāyāna (including Tantric Buddhism), and also among their individual sub-schools or sub-strands. Along with this they naturally likewise inherited authentication policies and the related polemical strategies. Thus with the increasing activities toward the formation of various corpora of Buddhist literature in Tibetan translation—activities that reached their culmination in the compilation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon in the early fourteenth century—the Tibetans were confronted with issues regarding authentication and canonization that were unique to the reality they faced on the ground, and accordingly they had to develop revised or wholly different criteria for determining authenticity, which naturally also led to new authentication strategies.

As is well known, the Tibetans, despite being aware of authenticity-related debates and polemics in India, generally speaking admitted into their Canon all those Buddhist scriptures and non-scriptural works they believed to have originated in the Indic cultural sphere and that were later translated into Tibetan. Moreover, texts whose Indic origin was largely doubted were, with some exceptions, excluded from the Canon, and thus either found their way into various extracanonical corpora, if lucky, or in the worst case fell into oblivion. These authentication and canonization policies added several new factors to the mix that had been thus far by and large irrelevant to the same processes within the Indic cultural sphere. Now authenticity is (1) conditioned by the work's provenance, that is, its geographical

origin, and (2) not anymore confined to scriptures, that is, to whether a given work contained the actual Word of the Buddha (*buddhavacana: sangs rgyas kyi bka'/'gsung*), but also extended to treatises (*śāstra: bstan bcos*) and other non-scriptural doctrinal works, whose Indic origin, and not only their conformity with the Word of the Buddha, became a precondition for their authentication and thus canonization. Moreover, only a small number of indigenous compositions penned by Tibetans active during what is referred to as the Early Translation Period have been included in the Canon, in a separate section called either Miscellanea (*sNa tshogs*), as in the sDe dge edition, or Curiosa (*Ngo mtshar*), as in the Peking edition, as a tribute to their pioneering work in laying a foundation and paving the way for the following generations. It should be perhaps also briefly mentioned in this context that in the first centuries of dissemination of Buddhism in Tibet there was, as odd as it may appear from today's perspective, a general scepticism towards the ability of Tibetans to compose treatises and other works on Buddhism. The primary task reserved for Tibetan scholars was translation, and that too, almost always in collaboration with Indian masters. One of the famous examples in this regard is perhaps the scepticism shown towards the eleventh-century Tibetan translator-cum-author Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, who was probably the first prolific Tibetan writer, and about whom it is stated that some of his contemporaries, questioning his abilities, asked the following question: "How could it be that a native of Tibet composed so many more treatises than Indian scholars?"² It was only with the gradual decrease in the translation activities that the art of composition became the main intellectual undertaking for Tibetan scholars. As we shall see, this early general denial of Tibetans' intellectual ability to be scholars in their own right and the delegitimization of their doctrinal works by refusing to accord them equal status with their Indian counterparts seem to have something to do with the fact that a number of autochthonous non-scriptural compositions—

² See Almogi 2002: 69, and Almogi 1997: 88.

including treatises, commentaries, and manuals of various kinds—were presented as Indic. While many of these alleged Indic compositions were indeed denied access to the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, some of them were granted entry into it, though often not without reservations.

The policy of conditioning authenticity, and thus canonicity, upon a proven Indic origin was thus, in my view, clearly an attempt to bring to a halt both the formation of new scriptures on Tibetan soil and the composition of autochthonous Tibetan doctrinal works. We would all agree, I believe, that this attempt has been only partly successful in both regards. The main success of this policy, however, was and still remains the exclusion from the Canon of most works whose Indic origin is questioned. Over the centuries, Tibetan scholars and adepts have developed various policies and strategies to deal with issues relating to authentication and canonization. These include criticism, polemics, and apologetic responses, alongside attempts at reconciliation or inclusion (in various ways and to varying degrees).³

³ To be noted here is that Wedemeyer, in the context of discussing the authenticity of the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā* attributed to Śākyamitra (D1834/P2703), has suggested a different possible motive for presenting a Tibetic composition as Indic (Wedemeyer 2009). Regardless of whether Wedemeyer is right in his conclusion that the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā* is “an indigenous Tibetan work masquerading as an Indic commentary” (ibid.: 11)—a matter that is not the concern of the present study—his suggested motive clearly needs to be briefly addressed here. Wedemeyer speculates that the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā* is a composition commissioned by some political body in order to advance conservative views concerning certain Tantric practices. He further speculates that the author of the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā* was none other than Ba ri lo tsā ba Rin chen grags (1040–1112; BDRC: P3731; Ba ri’s dates are stated by him as 1040–1111). Wedemeyer speculates that the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā* “represents one salvo in the late-eleventh/early-twelfth-century Tibetan Buddhist ‘culture wars,’ seeking to advance a more moderate take on the Tantric system of Nāgārjuna than represented in Indic *śāstras* such as the [**Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*].” He further hypothesizes that “the author was a court-sponsored translator/teacher,

charged with creating a commentarial digest of the authoritative Tantric teachings of Āryadeva, freed of its antinomian strains,” and that “[o]ne could well imagine that an emergent Tibetan Buddhist court—intrigued by the potentialities offered by the ritual system of the Mahāyoga Tantras, yet concerned that its antinomian rhetorics not sow ethical confusion in the public square—would be grateful for an entirely scholastic presentation attributable to a renowned Indic authority” (ibid.: 14). Wedemeyer appears to have based his hypothesis on several circumstantial pieces of evidence: (a) Ba ri’s dates correlate with Wedemeyer’s tentative dating of the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭikā* to 1050–1150 (ibid.: 12, 14); (b) Ba ri was a junior contemporary of Zhi ba ’od (1016–1111), who, as is well known, advanced a rather conservative policy towards esoteric Buddhism in general and some specific Mahāyoga practices in particular; and (c) Bu ston’s attribution of the translation of the work to Ba ri (ibid.: 14). The first two points are extremely incidental, and I would like therefore to merely briefly address the third point, which appears most crucial to the hypothesis put forward by Wedemeyer. The attribution of the translation to Ba ri is found, according to Wedemeyer, in Bu ston’s catalogue to his Zhwa lu edition of the *bsTan ’gyur*. Wedemeyer, however, has undoubtedly misinterpreted the text. Bu ston in fact does not mention any translator(s) whatsoever for the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭikā*. The translation attribution to Ba ri claimed by Wedemeyer does not concern the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭikā* but rather the work that follows it. See the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (467.6–7): [=D1834] *sPyod bsdus sgron ma’i bshad pa slob dpon Shākya bshes gnyen gyis mdzad pa* | [=D1835] *slob dpon Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa’i rDo rje sems dpa’i sgrub thabs kyi ’grel pa Ta thā ga ta rakṣi tas mdzad pa* | *Dī paṃ ka ra rakṣi ta dang* | **Khams** [Ms: *khams*, Xy: *lams*]^[*] **pa Ba ri lo tsā’i ’gyur** |. (* The reading *khams* suggested by Dan Martin and adopted by Wedemeyer is confirmed by the reading of the MS (659.2).) For some reason, Wedemeyer in his citation of the above passage (ibid.: 15 n. 57) has chosen to skip (indicated by ...) the part concerning D1835 that provides the title and author, “a commentary on Candrakīrti’s *Vajrasattvasādhana* (D1814) composed by Tathāgatarakṣita,” thus creating the impression that Bu ston is attributing the translation of the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭikā* to Ba ri. Moreover, the speculation that a Tibetan ruler, and that too, a very conservative one such as Zhi ba ’od, would commission a forgery of this kind seems to be extremely far-fetched, particularly as no concrete evidence for this hypothesis has been put forward by Wedemeyer. Such a scenario appears particularly

2. Criteria of Authentication and Canonization within the Tibetic Cultural Sphere

I have suggested elsewhere that the Ancient Tantras (*rnying rgyud*) form, more or less, three distinct categories—Indic, hybrid Indic-Tibetic, and Tibetic. The category Indic would include those

improbable if we remind ourselves that Zhi ba 'od vehemently rejected the authenticity of works regarded by him as Tibetic compositions in Indic disguise, as made explicit in his open letter. (See Karmay 1998: 31–40, for an English translation and the Tibetan text of Zhi ba 'od's open letter, where numerous works are rejected with the argument that they were Tibetic compositions.) Moreover, it is likewise hard to believe that a prominent figure such as Ba ri lo tsā ba—who himself came from a rather orthodox tradition, in which he held a rather high position as the Second Sa skya Khri chen (r. 1103–1110)—would have entered into such a plot, there being likewise no evidence whatsoever to support this hypothesis. In addition, Wedemeyer argues that the author took pains to make the work look like an Indic work in Tibetan translation, though not always successfully (ibid.: 6). I am unfamiliar with Ba ri's translations and compositions, but he is no doubt considered a prominent figure—to which Wedemeyer seems to subscribe (see ibid.: 14, where he is referred to as “eminent translator”)—and it is again hard to believe that he would come up with, from the point of view of a Tibetan reader, completely useless glosses—such as *dngos po med pa ni dngos po med pa ste* or *chos thams cad ni chos thams cad do*—which, according to Wedemeyer, intended to “make his work read as if it were in fact a translation of a Sanskrit commentary,” by “simulat[ing] the (exhilarating) experience of reading a Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit commentary.” In this way, Wedemeyer maintains, “the author demonstrates his knowledge of the fact that Tibetan translators were not infrequently unable to render effectively-synonymous Sanskrit glosses” (ibid.: 6–7). (To be noted in passing is that such glosses in Tibetan translation could be a result of glosses in Sanskrit that dissolve compounds, which are indeed hard to effectively render into Tibetan, and not necessarily ones presenting synonyms.) Wedemeyer may be right, but I personally find it hard to believe that anyone would seriously author such nonsensical glosses in order to convince his potential readership of the work's authenticity in the sense of it being of Indic origin. I would prefer, therefore, to disregard such a conspirative motive, at least until convincing evidence is put forward.

works that clearly emerged within the Indic cultural sphere and were later translated into Tibetan; the category hybrid Indic-Tibetic would include works that seem to have been unknown within the Indic cultural sphere but consist of translated Indic material blended together with what is autochthonously Tibetan; while the category Tibetan would include works that likewise seem to have been unknown within the Indic cultural sphere but rather such that largely present Tibetan material.⁴ Many (if not most) works of the Indic-Tibetic and Tibetan categories for which a canonical status was claimed—both scriptural and non-scriptural—emerged due to the activities of masters known as Treasure Revealers (*gter ston*), mainly but not solely within the rNying ma tradition. While many of these newly emerging works were openly accepted as Revealed Treasures (*gter ma*) associated with particular Treasure Revealers, many others were not presented as such and thus remained completely anonymous, which is particularly crucial in the case of works for which scripturality is claimed. Still other non-scriptural works for which a canonical status was claimed were ascribed to Indic scholars, often well-known masters but occasionally also some lesser-known ones. This latter phenomenon was clearly more widespread in the centuries during which Tibetan compositions were generally considered inferior to their Indic counterparts.

⁴ For more on these categories, and for the employment of the term “Tibetic” (rather than “Tibetan”), see Almogi 2019. Although this typology is particularly relevant to those works for which a canonical status has been claimed, the categories hybrid Indic-Tibetic and Tibetan may also be applied to classify works composed within the Tibetan cultural sphere that are commonly considered autochthonously Tibetan. An example of an autochthonous work that well illustrates this complex state of affairs is A ro Ye shes 'byung gnas's *Theg pa chen po'i rnal 'byor la 'jug pa'i thabs bye brag tu 'byed pa*, which, as has been demonstrated by Katja Thiesen in her master's thesis, heavily draws upon two scriptures, both titled *Rājadeśasūtra* (D214/P880 and D215/P881), alongside other scriptures, and which could certainly be regarded as Indic-Tibetic. See Thiesen 2009.

Authenticity and Authentication

While the authenticity and canonicity of Revealed Treasures, along with the authentication policies and strategies related to them, have been discussed by sundry modern scholars on numerous occasions, less attention has been paid to these issues in relation to works that belong to other literary genres or doxographical categories, concerning whose formation, including time, place, and intellectual and religious milieu, we know very little. Moreover, there has been thus far no attempt to record and analyze in a systematic manner the policies and strategies of authentication and canonization practiced within the Tibetic cultural sphere. In the following, I shall thus attempt to present, to the extent possible, a systematic overview of these policies and strategies, while mainly (but not only) paying attention to works that were not identified as Treasures.

Generally speaking, the most decisive conditions for authenticity and canonicity of Buddhist scriptures and treatises within the Tibetic cultural sphere have been, perhaps in this order, (1) the work's provenance, that is, a solid proof of its Indic origin, (2) the existence of a verifiably valid tradition, and (3) the work's content, that is, its being the actual Word of the Buddha in the case of a scripture, or its being in accord with the Word of the Buddha in the case of a non-scriptural work. Accordingly, the main question that Tibetan scholars, and particularly editors of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, were confronted with was what the criteria are by which these conditions could reliably be confirmed. Needless to say that often more than one criterion or one strategy is simultaneously employed for authenticating or delegitimizing a work, so that the distinct criteria and strategies suggested here should be understood as being part of a complex conceptual and operational framework. Moreover, I would like to emphasize that the lists of criteria and strategies for authentication presented below have, to the best of my knowledge, not been formulated in a systematic manner by the tradition, and they were put together as a result of my own observation.⁵

⁵ Cf. Wedemeyer 2009: 3, where an "ad hoc nature, deference to precedent, drive to comprehensiveness, and marked tendency toward

2.1. Provenance

As regards the Indic origin, one can observe several such criteria, which I attempt to arrange here, as objectively as possible, in a descending order of their potential reliability and strength.

2.1.1. The Existence of a Sanskrit Manuscript

The existence of a Sanskrit manuscript containing the work in question has no doubt been the most straightforward criterion, and it is in fact the most decisive and powerful one. Tibetan literature contains numerous accounts of doubts regarding the Indian origin of a certain scriptural or non-scriptural work being removed after the surfacing of a Sanskrit manuscript containing it. One of the best-known cases is perhaps that of the **Guhyagarbhatantra*, a central rNying ma Tantric scripture of the Mahāyoga class; the surfacing of a manuscript containing its Sanskrit original in bSam yas seems to have ended all controversy surrounding its provenance.⁶ Here I would like to provide one less-known example of very popular cycles of works related to Sūryagupta's tradition of the twenty-one forms of Tārā, narrated by Tāranātha (1575–1634; BDR: P1428) in his *sGrol ma nyer gcig nyi ma sbas pa'i lugs*, as follows:⁷

inclusivity" are said to be "important features" of the *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*. It is hoped that the discussion below will demonstrate that the reality on the ground is somewhat different, and in fact much more complex. See also *ibid.*: 15–18, where Wedemeyer offers a brief discussion of these "features" in general and as they concern pseudepigraphs in particular. His discussion, however, will not be deliberated on here further. Some of the issues will be addressed in Almogi (forthcoming-b).

⁶ For more on the controversy surrounding the **Guhyagarbhatantra*, see Wangchuk 2002, particularly p. 285 n. 70, where references to the finding of the Sanskrit manuscript are provided. See also van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 46–50.

⁷ *sGrol ma nyer gcig nyi ma sbas pa'i lugs* (A, 535.4–6; B, 621.5–622.1; C, 187.12–19): **Nyi ma sbas pa'i** [AC: *pa'i*, B: *ba'i*] *lugs srol ma nyer gcig gi chos skor 'di rnams bla med du bkral ba shin tu zab cing byin rlabs che ba yin* |

These cycles of doctrinal works on the twenty-one [forms] of Tārā [within] Sūryagupta's tradition, which are expounded according to the [Yoga]niruttara [Tantric system], are very profound and of great beneficial power. In earlier times, these [cycles] were very widespread in Tibet, and during the time of the three venerable lay (lit. "white") Sa skya [masters],⁸ practice related to these doctrinal cycles was very popular. Although [they] had no doubt that the subsidiary ritual works contained special instructions, [they] had a slight doubt as to whether the treatises were Indian compositions. At this point, a Sanskrit manuscript [containing] these [treatises] surfaced through a Kashmiri śramaṇera who came to the religious seminary of the great rJe btsun (i.e., Gags pa rgyal mtshan). Later two or three Sanskrit manuscripts associated with different regions materialized, whence it became indisputable that [these works] were Indian treatises, and the sublime beings [of Tibet] had great confidence [in them].

The main problem connected with this criterion is that manuscripts containing the Sanskrit originals of translated works seem to have never been systematically collected and stored in Tibet, so that the absence of such an original at a certain point in time and place would not necessarily mean that it never existed. Testimony to this state of affairs may be found not only in reports narrating the surfacing of Sanskrit originals of controversial

sngon dus bod du 'di dar rgyas che zhing | sa skya pa'i [A: pa'i, BC: ba'i] rje [A: rje, BC: rjes] btsun dkar po rnam gsum gyi ring la chos skor 'di'i phyag len shin tu dar | las tshogs rnam man ngag khyad par can du thugs yid ches kyang | gzhung gi rtsom rgya gar ma yin min cung zad dpyad [AC: dpyad, B: dkyad] gzhi yod pa'i skabs | rje btsun chen po'i chos grwar kha che'i dge tshul zhig byung ba'i lag nas 'di'i rgya dpe byung | phyis yul tha dad kyi rgya dpe gnyis gsum 'dzoms pas | rgya gzhung [AB: gzhung, C: gzhu] rtsod med du gyur te | skyes mchog dam pa rnam shin tu thugs yid ches par [AC: par, B: bar] mdzad do | |.

⁸ This is a collective designation of Sa chen Kun dga' snying po (1092–1158; BDRC: P1615), bSod nams rtse mo (1142–1182; BDRC: P1618), and rJe btsun Gags pa rgyal mtshan (1147–1216; BDRC: P1614).

works but also in reports narrating corrections of existing translations undertaken by Tibetan scholars after coming across manuscripts containing the Sanskrit originals of the works in question.⁹

2.1.2. The Existence of a Sanskrit Title

The existence of a Sanskrit title of the work in question was perhaps the second most important type of evidence for the authenticity of both scriptures and non-scriptures in terms of their Indic origin.¹⁰ The main problem in this regard is that such titles could easily be fabricated. Moreover, we know that some of the Sanskrit titles offered for canonical works in their headings, for many of which there are no grounds for doubt, are later (and not seldom wrong) reconstructions. What makes the situation even more complex is that apparently not all titles of translated works were systematically recorded at the time of their translation in one register, so that for a compendium of complete titles one had to rely on various sources. Moreover, obviously the titles recorded were not always identical. This state of affairs regarding the inconsistency of the titles has been described in the introduction to the imperial catalogue *'Phang thang ma*, which states the following:¹¹

⁹ Accounts of Tibetan scholars making corrections to existing translations after coming across the Sanskrit original are found abundantly in various sources—including translation colophons of the works in question, catalogues to the various editions of the canonical collections, and historical and bibliographical works—and thus will not be referred to here in detail.

¹⁰ Concerning the authenticity of Sanskrit titles in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, see Almogi 2008: 87–88, particularly n. 3. On the significance of the existence of Sanskrit titles for not only translated works but occasionally also autochthonous ones, see Almogi 2005: 51–54.

¹¹ *'Phang thang ma* (A: 3.1–14; B: 6.10–22): *bod khams su dha rma theg pa che chung gi mdo sde dang* | *gzungs che phra dang* | *mdo sde'i ti ka dang* | *'dul ba dang* | *bstan bcos che phra dang* | *bstan bcos kyi ti ka la sogs pa snga slad du bsgyur zhing zhu chen gtan la dbab pa'i mtshan dang* | *bam po dang* | *shu log gi grangs sgra sgyur pa na byang bu zhig mchis pa gtan la ma phab nas* | *slad kyis*

The titles [of works] and the numbers of *bam pos* and *ślokas* [in works] previously translated within the Tibetan domain and finalized [by] the great editors—including *sūtras* of the Lesser and Greater Vehicles, long and short *dhāraṇīs*, *sūtra* commentaries, *vinaya* [works], major and minor *śāstras*, and commentaries on *śāstras*—were not determined [and recorded] during the time of translation in one existing register (*byang bu*). Later, in the Dog year, teachers residing at the 'Phang thang palace¹²—having taken an existing old title register (*mtshan byang*)¹³ of the doctrinal works that had

*khyi lo la {btsan po Khri Ral ba [= pa] can Yar lungs shar phyogs kyi pho
brang 'Phang thang ka med na bzhugs pa'i ston ces pa'ang snang} pho brang
'Phang thang na bzhugs pa'i ston| sgra sgyur gyi bla ban dhe dPal brtsegs
dang| ban dhe Chos kyi snying po dang| lo tsa ba ban dhe De ben tra
dang| ban dhe lHun po la sogs pa'i g.yar sngar dha rma bsgyur zhing zhu
chen bgyis pa'i mtshan byang rnying zhig mchis pas gzhi bzung ste| sgo sgo na
mtshan byang mchis pa dang yang gtugs| dha rmar yang bstun nas| dha rma
sde gcig la mtshan nyis rim du gyur pa yang phyung| sngar ma chud pa ci
mchis pa bsnan nas| Bod khams su dha rma bsgyur zhing zhu chen bgyis pa'i
mtshan dang| bam po dang| shu log gi grangs gtan la phab ste dkar chag bla
dper bris pa| l.*

¹² A gloss inserted at this spot reads: “The reading ‘teachers residing in the 'Phang thang ka med palace [of] the ruler Khri Ral pa can, [which is located in] the eastern part of Yar lung’ is also found.”

¹³ It has been suggested that this old register upon which the *'Phang thang ma* was based is probably the *lDan dkar ma*. This assumption could have been initially provoked by lCom 'das rig pa'i ral gri, who provides a somewhat altered version of the first part of this passage (for which see below, § 2.1.5.), in which it is explicitly stated that the *lDan dkar ma* predates the *'Phang thang ma*. Moreover, this assumption seems to have been substantiated by the similarity of the two catalogues on the one hand and by the fact that the *'Phang thang ma* is more detailed. For a comparison of the *lDan dkar ma* (LL/YS) and *'Phang thang ma* (KP), see Kawagoe 2005: 78–82. Note, however, that Halkias's claim for “internal evidence” proving that the *'Phang thang ma* was based on the *lDan dkar ma* is problematic, since this so-called “internal evidence” consists in the mention of the *lDan dkar ma* in two glosses. There is no proof whatsoever, though, that these glosses were authored by the compilers

been translated and had undergone a final proofreading under the oversight of the translation master–cum–Buddhist monk dPal brtsegs, the Buddhist monk Chos kyi snying po, the translator-cum–Buddhist monk Devendra (= lHa'i dbang po), the Buddhist monk lHun po (= dPal gyi lhun po'i sde), and others as a basis—in each and every case (*sgo sgo na*) consulted (*gtugs*) [the title] found in the existing title register, compared [it with the title found] in the doctrinal work [itself], and then alleviated [cases of] a single doctrinal work [being listed] twice (*nyis rim du gyur*) (i.e., under two different titles). [Then], having added whatever [titles that] were not included earlier, [they] compiled the catalogue (*dkar chag*) into [the form of] an imperial copy (*bla dpe*),¹⁴

of the *'Phang thang ma*. In fact, the gloss found in the passage cited here (see above, notes 11 and 12 for the Tibetan text and English translation, respectively), whose content makes it clear that it is a later (editorial/scrival) addition, supports the likelihood that the glosses are a later addition. See also Halkias 2004: 77–79, where the *'Phang thang ma*'s dates are discussed, and Dotson 2007, where further deliberations on the issue are found. See also van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 53–56, where the possible chronology and dating of the three imperial catalogues (i.e., the above-mentioned two and the *mChims phu ma*) are reflected upon.

¹⁴ The term *bla dpe* (lit. “superior [i.e., original] copy”) is to be understood in contrast to *'og dpe* (lit. “inferior [i.e., duplicate] copy”). For an occurrence of these two terms in the lCang bu inscription, see Richardson 1985: 100 (Tibetan text) and 101 (English translation). Richardson renders the terms “principal copy” and “secondary copy,” respectively. The same inscription is also provided in Tucci 1950: 89 (Tibetan text). Tucci, in his discussion of this inscription, freely renders the terms “original chart” and “second copy,” respectively (ibid.: 17). My rather paraphrastic-dynamic translation of the term *bla dpe* as “imperial copy” (as opposed to *'og dpe* “public copy”) better reflects, I believe, the state of affairs in the context of the passage cited above, for in addition to its being a superior copy in terms of quality, it was obviously meant to be kept at the royal palace, and thus was rather inaccessible to readers, while the other, ordinary, copies were distributed to other institutions and were thus certainly more accessible (at least to a small circle of readers). The relevance of the place of deposit is also clear from the

establishing the titles of, and the number of *bam pos* and *ślokas* in, the doctrinal works that have been translated and have undergone final proofreading within the Tibetan domain.

Of relevance in this regard are also the heading and sub-headings of one section in the *'Phang thang ma*.¹⁵ From the section heading (or rather opening explanation) we first learn that three versions of a register of *sūtra* titles were used, and then that the majority principle was applied in cases where there were slight variations regarding the titles found in these three versions. As for what the three versions used were, the *'Phang thang ma* is not explicit, but it appears that they consist of two older versions and one newer one. In addition, a register belonging to the monk gZhon nu snying po was also used, along with some other unspecified registers.¹⁶

ICang bu inscription, which explicitly specifies the respective places of deposit of both the *bla dpe* and *'og dpe*.

¹⁵ This section has been assigned the number XXIX in Halkias 2004 and number 27 in Kawagoe 2005.

¹⁶ Halkias's understanding of these headings differs from mine in various ways, mainly due to his misunderstanding of some of the key terms and phrases found there, as clearly reflected in both his discussion of this section and his translation of its headings. See Halkias 2004: 75–76, 81. (i) First, Halkias reads the term *mtshan byang*, which simply means “title register” or “title list,” in two different ways, namely, as “titles” (or possibly as “the editorial process of comparing titles” or merely “comparing titles”?) (ibid.: 75) and as “register” (ibid.: 81). (ii) Second, he understands the phrase *mtshan byang dpe gsum* as referring to “three [different] registers,” while it seems, both from the phraseology and the context, that it means “three versions of [one and the same] register,” namely, two older ones and obviously one newer one. This misunderstanding led him to conclude that the “three registers” referred to are the *IDan dkar ma* and *mChims phu ma*—the “older registers” (*dpe rnying*)—the second of which he takes as the “source” (*yum*) for the *'Phang thang ma*, the third, and thus newer, register (for what he means by “source,” see below). This interpretation of Halkias's is based on a misunderstanding of another phrase, namely, *sras yum bcu bdun no*,

which concludes the first section of the *'Phang thang ma*. The phrase *sras yum bcu bdun* is undoubtedly to be understood as “the seventeen Mother and Offspring [Prajñāpāramitā sūtras],” referring to a cluster of Prajñāpāramitā sūtras considered by the tradition to consist of seventeen works, some of which count as “mothers” and some as “offspring.” (A study of this cluster is currently being conducted by four members of the Ngagyur Nyingma Research Centre (NNRC), Mysore, within the framework of the Academic Research Program Initiative (ARPI) project led by Prof. Dorji Wangchuk and myself.) Halkias’s argument for his understanding of the terms and phrases in question is so far-fetched that I feel it would be best to cite him here verbatim. See Halkias 2004: 75: “This division and its subdivisions meant to explain the editorial process of comparing titles (*mtshan byang*) across the two older registers (*dpe rnying*), namely the *IDan dkar ma* and *mChims phu ma* catalogues—the latter serving as the source (*yum*”); and the pertinent note (ibid.: 75 n. 66): “PT [i.e., *'Phang thang ma*] division (§ 1.) closes with the phrase, *sras yum bcu bdun no*, referring to the seventeen titles listed within. Since the corresponding *IDan dkar ma* division (§ 1.) lists sixteen titles and is mentioned elsewhere in the same division (see *Textual Archaeology*), we can assume that the PT compilers had access to yet another register which included fifteen DK [i.e., *IDan dkar ma*] texts (listed in the division) and two additional texts, contributing to a total of seventeen in all texts contained within what is likely the other *dpe rnying*, the *dkar chag mChims phu ma*.” (iii) Third, Halkias understands the term *'gyur byang* to mean “translators’ colophons.” While there is no doubt that *'gyur byang* can have this meaning, here it undoubtedly means “register of translated [works].” This is clear not only from the context but also from the phraseology, particularly the word *gzhan* in the phrase *'gyur byang gzhan las smos pa*, which means “mentioned in other registers,” but is rendered by Halkias as “acquired in other colophons” (ibid.: 81) in the sense of “colophons of other texts” (ibid.: 76). That *'gyur byang* means here “register of translated [works]” rather than “translators’ colophons” is further confirmed by the concluding sentence of the *'Phang thang ma*, which is also the concluding sentence of its Tantra section, which reads *sngags nang pa'i 'gyur byang gzhan na bzhugs||*. See the *'Phang thang ma* (A: 65.2; B: 45). The sentence may be rendered (somewhat freely, due to the compound building by way of a genitive particle, which makes the sentence elliptical) as follows: “[The titles of works belonging to] the Inner Tantra [system] are found in another (i.e., a separate) register of translated [works] (i.e., seemingly due to their esoteric nature).” Any

The section heading reads as follows:¹⁷

Three versions of a title register of sacred writings [consisting in] *sūtras* having been consulted, and [in cases where the titles] slightly differ, the [title] that occurs in two versions [of the register] in the same form has been provided in the main [list above] (*dkyus*), following the majority principle.

The titles that were not found in at least two versions of the register used and thus not included in the main list were listed under four categories. The description of these four categories in terms of the criteria underlying them (i.e., the registers consulted) is indeed at times slightly ambiguous. After considering all possible interpretations, I have opted for the translation offered

attempt to make sense of Halkias's translation of this sentence—which reads “Thus, the inner (higher) Tantras are in other colophons.”—is futile. See Halkias 2004: 71.

¹⁷ *'Phang thang ma* (A: 49.19–50.1; B: 34, no. 27-1[a]): *gsung rab mdo sde rnams kyī mtshan byang dpe gsum la gtugs nas nyung shas mi mthun pa dpe gnyis las mthun par 'byung ba rnams ni mang brtsan du byas nas dkyus su stsal*. Cf. Halkias 2004: 81, where the section opening statement has been rendered as followed: “A few titles of scriptures are listed in three registers. Many titles, which are not available in three, are generally accepted if they are listed in two registers.” See also *ibid.*: 75–76: “Generally, those texts whose titles were represented in at least two registers were selected. It is clear that works listed in division (§ XXIX) are demarcated from the works in the rest of the catalogue which, by deduction, should have met the original criteria for cataloguing set by the editors, that are listed in at least two indexes.” Compare also the translation of this passage in Dotson 2007: 4–5: “*Sūtras* and teachings whose titles do not quite correspond after comparison with three sources, but correspond in two sources, are mostly added to the ad hoc (*dkyus*) [catalogue]. Those that appear in one source, but not in two, are recorded elsewhere.” See particularly *ibid.*: 5 n. 17, where Dotson explains his choice of translating the term *skyus* as “ad hoc.” For another passage supporting my understanding of the word *dkyus* as “the main [text],” see below § 2.1.7., where *dkyus* is found in a citation from Tāranātha's *Dam tshig gsum bkod dkyil chog* with the phrase *dkyus su shor ba*, meaning “having been conflated with the main text.”

below, which seems the only one yielding a coherent scheme.¹⁸ The four categories are thus the following:

- (i) [Titles] that appear in one version but not in the other two are recorded [here] separately.¹⁹
- (ii) [Titles] that appear in neither of the two older versions [but] do appear in the version of the Buddhist monk gZhon nu snying po.²⁰
- (iii) Of the titles of sacred writings that are mentioned in other registers of translated works (*'gyur byang*), [titles] that are mentioned in [one of the] older version[s], [but] not in the [other] two versions.²¹
- (iv) [Titles] that are not mentioned in [any of the other] registers of translated works (*'gyur byang*).²²

¹⁸ See the appendix for a table that helps to better picture the usage of the various registers in each of the four categories.

¹⁹ *'Phang thang ma* (A: 50.1–2; B: 34, no. 27-1[b]): *dpe gcig las 'byung ste gnyis las ma byung ba rnams gud du bris pa* |. Cf. Halkias 2004: 81: “Titles acquired from one register— not listed in both registers.”

²⁰ *'Phang thang ma* (A: 50.8; B: 34, no. 27-2): *dpe rnying rnam gnyis las ni ma byung | ban dhe gZhon nu snying po'i dpe las byung ba* |. Cf. Halkias 2004: 81: “Titles acquired from Bande gZhon nu snying po’s register— not listed in the two older registers.” For the identity of this gZhon nu snying po, apparently the 8th abbot of bSam yas, see Karmay 1988: 78–80, where the Dunhuang document IOL 689/2, which contains lineages of teachers of four religious centers, is presented (including an annotated translation and a transliteration of the text), and Dotson 2007: 5–6, where a brief discussion is offered.

²¹ *'Phang thang ma* (A: 50.13–14; B: 35, no. 27-3): *'gyur byang gzhan las smos pa'i gsung rab kyi mtshan la | dpe rnying las 'byung | dpe gnyis las ma byung ba* |. Cf. Halkias 2004: 81: “Titles of scriptures acquired in other colophons and in one old register— not listed in both older registers.”

²² *'Phang thang ma* (A: 51.1; B: 35, no. 27-5): *'gyur byang las mi 'byung ba'i bzhugs pa'i mtshan*. Cf. Halkias 2004: 81: “Titles not listed in the colophons.” See also *ibid.*: 76: “The selection process seems to be yet more complex, for in addition to the registers, the editors availed themselves of the translators’ colophons (*'gyur byang*) in the texts themselves, or as mentioned in the colophons of other texts.”

It is also unclear whether in fact all works received a title during the time of their translation. Possibly a title was not always provided in the Sanskrit manuscript that served as the basis for the translation. Moreover, it is not to be ruled out either that in the process of translation, paratexts—which are sometimes the only texts to contain the title—were occasionally left out. This complex state of affairs regarding the titles clearly made things more difficult for the compilers of the early registers and catalogues, and for the compilers of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon as well. It certainly raises further doubts regarding the credibility of the (reconstructed) Sanskrit titles offered in the works' headings found in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon. bCom ldan Rig(s) pa'i ral gri (1227–1305; BDRC: P1217; henceforth Rig ral), in his catalogue—which apparently records titles of translated works on the basis of earlier catalogues rather than on the basis of the holdings of a specific library (e.g., that of sNar thang or his own)²³—has well formulated the complexity of the issue of work titles and pointed out their limitations when it comes to serving as evidence for authenticity (for this passage, see below § 2.1.4.).

2.1.3. The Existence of an Author/Authorship Colophon

The presence or absence of an author/authorship colophon (*mdzad byang* and similar terms), too, has been considered a criterion for the authenticity or inauthenticity, respectively, of the work in question. In this case, the main problem is that such colophons can easily be fabricated or, at best, be wildly inaccurate, especially when written long after the date of composition.²⁴ Of particular relevance in this regard is the fact that editors of the Canon took pains to record, in their respective catalogues, the fact that a

²³ See van der Kuip & Schaeffer 2009: 60.

²⁴ For a previous discussion of the authenticity of authorship and translation colophons in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, see Almogi 2008. The topic has also been touched upon in Almogi 2016a: 3–5.

certain work lacks an author/authorship colophon.²⁵ Moreover, they also reserved a separate section for anonymous works that were apparently regarded by them as particularly doubtful.²⁶ (They likewise noted cases suspected of being pseudepigraphs, which will be discussed on another occasion.) The difficulties connected with determining (in)authenticity on the basis of the presence (or absence) of colophons has likewise been pointed out by Rig ral (in a passage in which the same problem in connection with titles is discussed, for which see the following paragraph).

2.1.4. The Existence of a Translator/Translation Colophon

The presence or absence of a translator/translation colophon ('gyur byang) as a criterion for the (in)authenticity of works presents similar difficulties to those regarding the presence or absence of an author/authorship colophon. Here, too, the main

²⁵ See, to give one example, the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (445.5): [=D1289] *phyag mtshan gyi phan yon rnams la mdzad byang 'gyur byang mi snang zhing the tshom gyi gzhi'o* | |.

²⁶ Rig ral, for example, in his *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, lists anonymous works together with autochthonous works as follow: The first section lists "treatises by Tibetans" (ibid.: 263f.: *bod kyis byas pa'i bstan bcos*), the second "anonymous [works]" (ibid.: 264ff.: *rtsom pa po'i mtshan ma smos pa*), and the third "[works whose] authors are named" (ibid.: 267ff.: *brtsom pa po'i mtshan smos pa*). That the anonymous works are not necessarily Tibetan is clear in several instances, including (ibid.: 264, Rr30.36): *brjed byang rnying 'gyur gcig*; (ibid.: 265, Rr30.54): *So so thar pa'i brjed byang bam po bcu pa dang rnying [em.: rnying, NR: snying] 'gyur la sogs pa sna lnga* |; and (ibid.: 265, Rr30.59): *dGe slong ma'i so so thar pa'i brjed byang rnying 'gyur* |.²⁷

Bu ston, too, in his catalogue to the *Zhwa lu bsTan 'gyur* tends to list anonymous works separately, be it within the main body of the catalogue listing translated works or within the special section listing autochthonous works. See the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (445.5): *mdzad pa po'i mtshan ma smos pa la...*; ibid. (633.1): *da ni bod kyi mkhas pa chen po rnams gyis mdzad pa'i dpe dkon pa ci rigs pa dang* | *mdzad pa po'i mtshan ma smos pa'i chos kyi rnam grangs la* | ..., and ibid. (634.4, referring to the same subsection): *Ngo pa la* | *mdzad pa po'i mtshan ma smos pa la* |

problem with which one is faced is the possibility of fabrication. The fact that many of the existent *'gyur byangs* are translation colophons—that is, such that were inserted later by editors of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon on the basis of early written sources (such as catalogues or histories of various kinds) or oral traditions, and may thus contain errors—makes the issue even more complex. There are of course special questions that arise surrounding the issue of colophons of (real or alleged) retranslations and revised translations (on this issue see Part Two of the present study).

However, while Tibetan scholars have tended to question the authenticity of works lacking a title, an author/authorship colophon, and/or a translator/translation colophon, they have also been aware of the limitations of this approach. Rig ral, in the context of discussing the distinction between authentic and inauthentic Tantric works (both scriptures and non-scriptures) points out several issues on the textual level (historical and/or philological) on the basis of which such a distinction could be made, including the presence or absence of titles and colophons (and likewise the presence or absence of doubtful passages, as will be briefly alluded to below). He explicitly states that while there are authentic works that have neither a title nor a translator/translation colophon nor an author/authorship colophon, there are numerous inauthentic works that have titles and/or both types of colophons. He states:²⁷

[*] Note that although the page numbers given to these and other passages from the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* cited in the present study refer to van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009, the critical edition offered here and elsewhere is mine, made on the basis of the text provided there. The text provided by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer, referred to by them as “semi-diplomatic edition,” is a collation rather than an edition. See *ibid.* (73): “This semi-diplomatic edition takes N as its principal text and provides variants from R in the footnotes. It retains many non-standard spellings throughout with the exceptions that are noted below. The experienced reader will no doubt be able to auto-correct these.” The apparatus provided by them is occasionally ambiguous. I was, however, unable to re-examine their witnesses for the present publication.

[Inauthentic Tantric scriptures] such as [those just recorded] have been cited in very many works (*gzhung*). Therefore [those works that] do not contain these cited phrases and that are not compositions [that bear] with deceitful intent titles [merely] imitating [those of authentic scriptures] are authentic *tantras*. [One] will come to understand [this state of affairs] by observing the anonymous works—[both] the Tantric commentaries and ritual [manuals]—mentioned earlier. For example, the [two] bathing ritual [manuals] associated with] the [*Vajra*]*vidāraṇā*[*dhāraṇī*] and the commentary on [the *Vajra*]*vidāraṇā*[*dhāraṇī*] composed by Kumārasena (D2925/P3750)—who attained the [capabilities of] a *vidyādhara* of the Brahmanic [tradition]—and by his disciple Buddhaguhya (D2926/P3751; D260/P3508), [all of

²⁷ *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (261–262): ... *la sogs pa* [em.: *pa*, NR: *pa'i*] *gzhung shin tu* [R: *shin tu*, N: *om.*] *mang por drangs* [R: *drangs*, N: *grangs*] *pas* | [em.: |, NR: ||] *drangs* [R: *drangs*, N: *grangs*] *pa'i tshig* [N: *tshig*, R: *tshig gi*] *de dag yod* [N: *yod*, R: *mod*] *pa bslu* [N: *bslu*, R: *klu*] *ba'i bsam pas* | *ming mthun du* [R: *mthun du*, N: *'thun par*] *sbyar ba ma yin pa rnams ni rgyud yang dag yin no* | [*] *sngar bshad pa'i rgyud 'grel dang* | [em.: |, NR: ||] *cho ga mdzad pa po* [R: *po*, N: *dpe'i*] *ming ma smos pa rnams kyang gzhung mthong bas shes par 'gyur tel dper na rNam 'joms kyi khros chog dang* | *bshad pa bram ze'i rigs sngags 'chang grub pa Ku ma ra se na dang* | [em.: |, NR: ||] *de'i slob ma Sangs rgyas gsang bas mdzad pa dBa'* [N: *dba'*, R: *rba*] *Manydzu shri war mas bsgyur ba bzhin no* | | *chos bzang po rnams la ni* [R: *ni*, N: *om.*] *mdzad pa po'i ming dang 'gyur byang ma bris pa* [em.: *ma bris pa*, R: *ma dris pa*, N: *med pa*] *shin tu* [R: *shin tu*, N: *om.*] *mang po yod la* | [em.: |, NR: ||] *bslu ba'i bsam pas kha 'phangs byas pa rnams la ni* | *de* [N: *de*, R: *om.*] *gnyis dang* | *slu ba'i rdzun gyi gtam* [em.: *gtam*, N: *rtam*, R: *brtam*] *rgyud mang po 'ong ba* [N: *'ong ba*, R: *'ang ma*] *yin no* | | *des na rgya gar ba bstan* [N: *bstan*, R: *stan*] *bcos rtsom* | [em.: |, NR: ||] *rgya nag pa mdo rtsom* | | *bod rgyud rtsom bzer ba de* [R: *de*, N: *om.*] *bden nges* [N: *nges*, R: *om.*] *par snang* [em.: *snang*, NR: *gnang*] *bas* | *mkhas pa bsten la blang dor phyin ci ma log par bya'o* | | *bod kyis* [N: *kyis*, R: *gyis*] *byas pa'i rgyud kyi* [N: *kyi*, R: *gyi*] *dbye ba ni khos bos byas par blta'o* | |. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine. [*] The understanding of this passage, and hence the choices regarding the critical edition offered here, is based on the first paragraph of this chapter in the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (i.e., chap. 29; *ibid.*: 255).

which] were translated by dBa' Mañjuśrīvarman (fl. 8th cent.), [have no titles but are authentic].²⁸ There are very many authentic doctrinal works that are anonymous and for which no translator/translation colophon was written, while in contrast there are numerous [work]s that, with deceitful intent, have been falsely ascribed [to Indic authors but] have both [author/authorship and translator/translation colophons], and [also] many deceitful narrative accounts [associated with them]. Therefore, the cliché that Indians compose *śāstras*, the Chinese *sūtras*, and the Tibetans *tantras* is probably true. [One] should thus engage in proper “adopting” and “rejecting” by relying on learned persons. In regard to distinguishing *tantras* composed by Tibetans, look into [other] works composed by me.

Interestingly, both examples given by Rig ral as works that lack a title do bear Tibetan as well as Sanskrit titles in their headings

²⁸ The three works by Kumārasena and Buddhaguhya referred to here by Rig ral are listed by him under Rr18.99, R18.100, and R18.101: *rNam* [em.: *rNam*, NR: *rNams*] 'joms khrus [em.: khrus, N: khru, R: 'khrus] *chog sna gnyis dang bShad pa*||. Van der Kuijp and Schaeffer have failed to identify these three works despite the interlinear gloss found in MS R, which is recorded by them in the apparatus. See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 185 n. 42: *sangs rgyas gsang ba dang| bram ze grub thob? Ku ma ras mdzad| Man dzu'i shri war mas bsgyur*||.) Rig ral also refers to Buddhaguhya's commentary while discussing *tantras* that were extracted from a bigger ur-*tantra*, stating that the fact that “the first” (*dang po*) work listed by him—that is, the *Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇī*—is an extract was already observed by Buddhaguhya in his commentary on it. See the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (256–257): *rDo rje rnam 'joms| rDo rje lhun po| Ri rab zom* [N: *zom*, R: *bzom*] *gyi rgyud le'u brgya rtsa brgyad yod pa'i dang po phyung bar slob dpon Sangs rgyas gsang bas gzigs par rNam 'joms* [N: 'joms, R: 'jom] 'grel par bshad pa bzhin [R: *bzhin*, N: *yin*] no||. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine. Rig ral is referring in this passage to the following statement in Buddhaguhya's **Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇīṭikā* (D, 186a6; P, 193a3–4): *rdzogs pa ni yang dag par* [D: *yang dag par*, P: *om.*] *thob pa ste rgyud chen po nas phyung zhes pa'o*||.

(i.e., the versions found in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon).²⁹ Thus Rig ral, with his examples of works lacking titles, unintentionally also provides us with examples of works that obtained their titles, both Tibetan and Sanskrit, during the compilation of the Canon at the latest, although the way in which they acquired them remains unclear. The issue of (in)authenticity in regard to both author/authorship and translator/translation colophons is discussed in more detail in Part Two of the present study and therefore will not be discussed here further.

2.1.5. Reliance on Written Authority

Tibetan scholars—particularly editors of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon and authors of catalogues to its different editions, but also polemicists concerned with issues of authenticity—have made much use of earlier written records considered authoritative in their eyes to determine the (in)authenticity of scriptural and non-scriptural works. One of the main criteria employed to prove the authenticity of a given work claimed to have been translated during the Early Period of Propagation of Buddhism in Tibet has been its mention in one of the ninth-century imperial catalogues (*dkar chag*). While such a mention would serve as solid proof of the work's Indic provenance, its absence from the record would be a cause for some doubt, to say the least. In the course of time further catalogues along with other works of a religio-historical nature—such as histories of religion or biographies of Tibetan masters and translators—were composed. These later sources likewise occasionally served as verification sources. In particular, they often included narratives or statements that could be

²⁹ Kumārasena's manual (D2925/P3750) is titled in the heading '*Phags pa rdo rje rnam par 'joms pa zhes bya ba'i gzungs kyi sgrub thabs cho ga zhib mo dang bcas pa / Āryavajravidāraṇānāmādhāraṇīsakalpasādhana*, Buddhaguhya's manual (D2926/P3751) *rDo rje rnam par 'joms pa zhes bya ba'i gzungs kyi sgrub thabs dpa' bo gcig tu sgrub pa / Vajravidāraṇānāmādhāraṇīsādhana ekavīrasādhana* (D: °dhāraṇyekavīrasādhana), and his commentary (D2680/P3508) *rDo rje rnam par 'joms pa zhes bya ba'i gzungs kyi rgya cher 'grel pa rin po che gsal ba / Vajravidāraṇānāmādhāraṇītikā-ratnābhāsvārā*.

employed to support or discard claims of the Indic provenance of certain works. This has particularly been the case in regard to works claimed to have been translated during the Later Period of dissemination of Buddhism in Tibet.

Rig ral, for example, explicitly states that one should rely on earlier, authoritative catalogues for determining a work's authenticity. For works translated during the Early Period, he mentions two of the three known imperial catalogues, namely, the *lDan/lHan dkar ma* and *'Phang thang ma*. The latter, he says, contains the correct titles of the works and their size in terms of *ślokas* or *bam pos*. As for works translated during the Later Period, he relies on the individual catalogues of a number of renowned gSar ma translators—including Lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po (958–1055; BDRC: P753), Nag tsho/'tsho lo tsā ba Tshul khriims rgyal mtshan (1011–1064; BDRC: P3456), and rNgog lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109; BDRC: P2551)—which contain lists of works translated by them and perhaps also ones translated by their fellow translators. In this context he also explains the measurement units *śloka* and *bam po*, problems connected with *bam po* as a unit, and his own efforts at determining the size of works when this was not previously established. One wonders whether the fact that of the three imperial catalogues only the *lDan dkar ma* and *'Phang thang ma* are mentioned by Rig ral—while there is no mention of the *mChims phu ma*, which was composed at bSam yas—is of some significance. The question as to whether Rig ral's failure to mention the *mChims phu ma* was because he considered it less reliable (perhaps due to its containing titles of controversial works?) or whether it was simply the result of him not having access to it can unfortunately only be answered if the *mChims phu ma* surfaces in the future. In any case, it is noteworthy that Bu ston did avail himself of the *mChims phu ma* for his religious history.³⁰ Rig ral states:³¹

³⁰ See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (314.9; Nishioka 1983: 119.15–16), where the *mChims phu ma* is listed as one of the sources used by Bu ston for compiling the index contained in his religious history.

An explanation regarding the enumeration of doctrinal [works] that appeared there [in Tibet]: There are [two early] catalogues: (i) [the *lDan/lHan dkar ma*], which was compiled at the lHan kar palace in the Dragon year by the Buddhist monk dPal brtsegs and others,³² and (ii) [the *'Phang thang*

³¹ *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (115–116): *de na* [R: *de na*, N: *da ni*] *byung ba'i chos kyi grangs bshad de* | *de'ang 'brug gi lo la pho brang lHan kar du ban dhe dPal brtsegs* [N: *brtsegs*, R: *rtsegs*] *la sogs pas byas pa dang* | *slad kyis khyi lo la yar lungs kyi pho brang 'Phang thang ka med du ston kha cig* [em.: *cig*, NR: *gcig*] *ban dhe dPal brtsegs* [N: *brtsegs*, R: *rtsegs*] *dang* | *ban dhe Chos kyi snying po dang* | *lo tsha ba ban dhe De ben* [em.: *de ben*,^[*] NR: *bin*] *dra dang* | *ban dhe lHun po la sogs pa'i phyag na* [N: *na*, R: *nas*] *'gyur byang rnying pa yod pa la gzhi* [N: *pa la gzhi*, R: *pas bzhi*] *byas te ma dag pa dang* | *bzlos pa dang* | *mtshan gyi rnam grangs du ma smos pa la sogs par phyung ste* | *btsan po Khri Ral pa can yan chad du bod du chos bsgyur ba'i mtshan dang* | *bam po dang* | *shu log ka'i grangs gtan* [N: *gtan*, R: *stan*] *la phab te* | *dkar chag du bris pa yod la* | *lo tsha ba Rin chen bzang po dang* | *Nag tsho lo tstsha ba dang* | *rNgog Blo ldan la sogs pa rnams la'ang rang rang gi dkar chag yod do* | | *don 'di la ni lo tsha chen po de dag nyid tshad ma yin pas* | *bod kyis byas nas rgya gar nas 'byung bar* [N: *'byung bar*, R: *pa*] *rdzu zhing* | *mi slu ba'i rdzun gyi phreng ba rnams 'dis spang bar bya'o* | | ^[*] Testimonia: *'Phang thang ma*, for which passage see the citation above in section § 2.1.2.

de la tsheg bar [N: *tsheg bar*, R: *rtseg par*] *bdun pa'i tshig rkang pa bzhi la shu log gcig dang* | *de sum brgya ni bam po gcig ni tshad yin la* | ^[*] *bam po la che chung byung pa rnams ni tsheg bar gyi yi ge mang nyung ngam* | *yang 'ga' zhis tsheg bar bgrang ba* [em.: *bgrang bar*, NR: *grang ba*] *dka' nas shog grangs kyi steng nas bam po* [N: *po*, R: *tshad*] *tshad rtsis pas cung zad 'chugs par gsal lo* | | *'di 'dra ba'i tshad kyis theg pa che chung gi mdo'* [N: *mdo'*, R: *mdo dang*] *rgyud bstan bcos* [em.: *bcos*, NR: *chos*] | **rGya gar dang** | [R: *rgya gar dang* |, N: *om.*] **rGya nag dang** | **Li dang** | **Kha che dang** | **Bal po nas bsgyur ba rnams dkar chag rnams dang** | *des gtan* [N: *gtan*, R: *btan*] | *la ma phab* [em.: *phab*, N: *phebs*, R: *'phebs*] *pa rnams kho bos dpe* [R: *dpe*, N: *dpe'*] *nyid bltas* [N: *bltas*, R: *ltas*] *te bri bar bya'o* | | ^[*] Here there is a rather lengthy gloss in MS R in which the length of some Prajñāpāramitā sūtras is specified. As this has no relevance to the current discussion, it is not cited here. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

³² Cf. Skilling 1997: 92, where—following a study by P. T. Denwood on the usage of the term *pho brang*, which points out the early usage of the term as an element in a dating system—the following translation of the

ma, which was compiled] later, in the Dog year, [by] a number of teachers [residing] at the Yar lungs palace 'Phang thang ka med, who—by relying on old registers of translated works (*'gyur byang*) that were at the disposal of the Buddhist monk dPal brtsegs, the Buddhist monk Chos kyi snying po, the translator-cum-Buddhist monk Devendra (= lHa'i dbang po), the Buddhist monk lHun po (= dPal gyi lhun po'i sde), and others—removed errors (*ma dag pa*), duplications (*bzlos pa*) (i.e., probably different titles of the same work), numerous recurrences of [the same] title, and the like, and established the titles of doctrinal works translated in Tibet up to [the time of] King Khri Ral pa can along with the number of their *bam pos* and *ślokas*. Moreover, Lo tsha ba Rin chen bzang po, Nag tsho lo tstsha ba, rNgog Blo ldan, and others have their own catalogues (i.e., catalogues listing the works translated by them and perhaps also ones translated by their fellow translators). Since these great translators are an authority in these matters, one should [rely on their catalogues and so] eliminate the string of lies that deceive human beings (? *mi slu ba rdzun*) by giving the wrong impression [that works] composed by Tibetans had their origin in India.

Moreover, four seven-syllable *pādas* are counted as one *śloka*, and three hundred of these are counted as one *bam po*. In regard to [inconsistencies regarding] the size of a *bam po*, a *bam po* is calculated based on either the number of syllables or, according to some—given that the number of syllables is difficult [to determine]—the number of folios, whence [the indications of length of texts in terms of *bam po*] appear to be slightly confusing.³³ [As for the sizes of] *sūtras*, *tantras*, and

catalogue's title, which would effect by implication the translation of this and the following sentences, is suggested: "*Catalogue of Translations of Buddha-word and Commentaries done in the realm of Tibet, commissioned in the autumn of the dragon year when the court was staying at sTong thang lDan dkar.*" (Emphasis in mine.)

³³ For more on the term *bam po*, see van der Kuijp 2009.

śāstras of the Lesser and Greater Vehicles—translated from [the languages of] India, China, Khotan, Kashmir, and Nepal—that have been determined in terms of such units by neither [the above-mentioned] catalogues nor the [texts themselves?], I shall record [them] by looking at the manuscripts.

More specifically, Rig ral points out the problem of the numerous works falsely ascribed to *Adhīśa (or *Atiśa) Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (982–1054) that surfaced after his death, and refers to the catalogue by Nag tsho lo tsā ba—the former’s disciple and the main translator of his works—as a reliable source for determining their authenticity. He states:³⁴

Although there are many in Tibet who are devoted to Lord [Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna], there appear to be, on account of lack of familiarity with the Lord’s doctrinal [works], [some] who abandon those [works] that are [by him] and engage with ones that are not [by him], while fabricating many false transmission lineages and narrative accounts. The works of Lord [Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna] are those [listed above]. In the catalogue compiled after the Lord passed away by Nag tsho—who relied on the Lord for nineteen years in the three [countries] India, Tibet, and Nepal from the age of twenty-five on—there are no [works other] than those [I listed], but later many [works] falsely ascribed [to him] appeared.

³⁴ rGyan gyi nyi 'od (218–219): **Bod na Jo bo la dad pa mang yang jo bo'i chos** [N: chos, R: chos kyis] rgyus med pas | [N: pas |, R: par] yin pa rnams 'dor | min pa rnams la ni [R: la ni, N: om.] rdzun gyi brgyud [em.: brgyud, NR: rgyud] pa dang | gtam rgyud mang po byas nas [R: mang po byas nas, N: dang bcas ste] spyod par snang ste [R: ste, N: om.] | jo bo'i chos ni de dag go | | [N: jo bo'i chos ni de dag go | |, R: jo bo las byung ba'i chos ni de rnam yin no | |] **Nag tshos lo nyer lnga nas** [N: nag tshos lo nyer lnga nas, R: nag tsho tshul khriims rgyal bas lo nyi shu rtsa lnga lon pa | |] **rGya Bod Bal** gsum du **Jo bo bcu dgu' brten nas Jo bo 'das nas byas pa'i dkar chag la chos** [R: chos, N: om.] de las med la [R: la, N: om.] | phyis ni kha 'phangs mang po [R: po, N: du] byung ngo [R: ngo, N: om.] | |. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

Moreover, the written sources relied upon were not only catalogues recording translated works—with the help of which the authenticity of a given work could be positively determined if it was included in the list, and at least questioned if it was absent from it—but also works containing lists (or reports) of works considered inauthentic (at least from the point of view of the list compiler). The earliest such “black list” is perhaps that compiled by the ruler lHa bla ma Zhi ba ’od (1016–1111),³⁵ and there is no doubt that Rig ral relied upon such aids as well. Other early such sources that Rig ral relied upon are the polemical works by Rin chen bzang po, Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal (1197–1263/64; BDRC: P1025), who was also his teacher!, and ’Gos Khug pa lhas btsas (b. 11th cent; BDRC: P3458),³⁶ all three bearing the title *sNgags log sun ’byin*. Rig ral states:³⁷

Very many [alleged] new and ancient *tantras* of the Mantra[naya] were composed by Tibetans. For an elaborative distinction of them [from the authentic ones],

³⁵ The dates of Zhi ba ’od provided here are based on Laurent 2013: 203–204; the same dates are found in other publications as well. A translation of the “open letter” of Zhi ba ’od, including a discussion and the Tibetan text, is found in Karmay 1998, chap. 2. See also Wangchuk 2002: 273–275 for a brief discussion of the text with particular reference to the **Guhyagarbhatantra*. Another early work is that by Rin chen bzang po. For references to mentions of it and a brief discussion of it, see Wangchuk 2002: 273. See also Cabezón 2007: 257 n. 90, where references to such mentions are likewise provided. The work has recently surfaced in Tibet and is currently being studied by Sherab Yoenten (Universität Hamburg) for his MA thesis.

³⁶ For a brief discussion of ’Gos Khug pa lhas btsas’s *sNgags log sun ’byin*, with particular reference to the **Guhyagarbhatantra*, see Wangchuk 2002: 275–277.

³⁷ *rGyan gyi nyi ’od* (257): *sngags gsar rnying gi rgyud shin tu mang po ni bod kyis byas stel | de dag gi dbye ba rgyas par* [N: *par*, R: *pa*] *ni lo tsha ba Rin chen bzang po dang | de’i slob ma* [N: *slob ma*, R: *slob ma lo tshwa ba*] **lHa bla ma Zhi ba ’od** *dang | ’Gos lHas* [*em.: lhas*, NR: *lha*] **btsas kyis** [*em.: kyis*, NR: *kyi*] *byas pa dang | kho bos byas pa’i yi ge la* [N: *la*, R: *las*] *lta bar bya’o |*. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

you should look at works compiled by Lo tsha ba Rin chen bzang po, his disciple lHa bla ma Zhi ba 'od, and 'Gos lHas btsas, [as well as the ones] compiled by me.

Later compilers of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon and producers of catalogues to their various editions followed suit. Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364; BDRC: P155), for example, in his catalogue to the Zhwa lu edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, justifies in numerous cases his inclusion of, in his eyes, doubtful works by referring to persons of authority, in all likelihood on the basis of catalogues (or other works) produced by them, though oral sources are not to be excluded. Zhu chen Tshul khrim rin chen (1697–1774; BDRC: P801), in his catalogue to the sDe dge edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, seems (to give another example) to have adopted most of Bu ston's statements of this kind, and in addition to have inserted several statements of his own along the same lines. One thus often finds in these two catalogues statements such as “although these [works] are doubtful, I have included them since they have been regarded [by others] as Indic,”³⁸ “there appear to be grounds for doubt, but since it seems that masters (*bla ma*) maintained that it is genuine, I have included it,”³⁹ “since masters of the past recorded it, [I] recorded [it as well],”⁴⁰ or “it has been stated by scholars

³⁸ See, for example, the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (487.1–2): *'di dag la the tshom za ba snang yang rgya gar mar byed kyi 'dug pas bris so ||*. See also the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 382b4), where Zhu chen reproduces Bu ston's statement: *'di dag la the tshom za ba snang yang rgya gar mar byed kyin 'dug pas bris so zhes gsungs |*.

³⁹ See, for example, the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (509.5): *... che ba 'di the tshom gyi gzhi gcig snang ste bla ma rnams yang dag tu bzhed kyi snang bas bris so ||*. See also the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 396b4), where Bu ston's statement is likewise reproduced: *... che ba 'di the tshom gyi gzhi cig snang ste bla ma rnams yang dag tu bzhed kyin snang bas bris so ||*.

⁴⁰ See, for example, the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (445.7): *... sngar gyi rnams kyis bris 'dug pas bris so ||*. See also Bu ston's statement regarding D1833 in *ibid.* (467.5–6): **Rim lnga'i 'grel pa don gsal bar byed pa zhes bya ba Klu'i byang chub** *kyis mdzad zer ba 'di rdzun ma yin par 'dug na'ang sngar gyi rnams kyis kyang bris 'dug pas bris so ||*; and the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 371b5), where Zhu chen reproduces Bu ston's statement almost

(*mkhas pa*) of the past that there are grounds for doubting this treatise, too.”⁴¹ Interesting in this regard is also the fact that Zhu chen, while on the whole following Bu ston as the authority in his catalogue, has occasionally availed himself of another authority, namely, Ngor chen Kun dga’ bzang po (1382–1456; BDRC: P1132), a prominent master from his own tradition, referred to by him as *rDo rje ’chang*.⁴²

verbatim: *Rim pa lnga’i don gsal bar byed pa zhes bya ba slob dpon Klu’i byang chub kyis mdzad pa zhes zer ba ’di rdzun ma yin par ’dug na’ang sngar gyi rnam kyis bris ’dug pa ltar bris so* | | . Cf., however, van der Kuijp 2007: 1013: where Bu ston’s statement has been misunderstood to be saying “it was composed by ‘earlier [Tibetans]’ (*sngar gyi rnam*).” In this regard van der Kuijp comments (*ibid.*): “In spite of this, he included the pseudepigraphs of both in the manuscript of his [open] Tanjur-canon, most likely on the precedent that quite early and rare texts written by Tibetans can be so incorporated as well - the question of what might in this connection constitute a rare manuscript that is in need of preservation requires further scrutiny.” I thank Nicola Bajetta for bringing the passage in van der Kuijp 2007 to my attention. See also Bajetta 2019: 14–15.

⁴¹ See, for example, the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 398a2): *gzhung ’di la’ang the tshom gyi gzhi can du snang ngo zhes sngon gyi mkhas pa dag gsung ngo* | | . With “masters of the past” Zhu chen is clearly alluding to Bu ston (among others?), who, in his *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (511.5) states in the same context the following: *’di’ang the tshom gyi gzhi gcig snang* | | .

⁴² There are several references by Zhu chen to *rDo rje ’chang* in general or to his catalogue (*rdo rje ’chang gi dkar chag*) in particular. In at least two cases Zhu chen relies on Ngor chen aka *rDo rje ’chang* in matters concerning authenticity. In the first case, concerning the *Tattoāloka* (D1293/P2416), he repeats Bu ston’s statement and backs it up with Ngor chen’s. See the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 346b4): *De kho na nyid kyi snang ba zhes bya ba Byang chub sems dpas mdzad pa\ kha che’i paṇḍi ta So ma nā thas bsgyur zer ba ’di rdzun mar ’dug ste paṇḍi tar bshad ’dug pas bzhugs su bcug pa yin\ rDo rje ’chang gis kyang the tshom du bzhed ’dug* | | . For Bu ston’s statement, see the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (445.6–7). Ngor chen likewise expresses his doubt by merely using the verb *zer ba*. See the *Glo bo rdo rje theg pa’i bstan dkar* (A, 272b6; B, 245.12–13): *Kye rdo rje’i sgrub thabs de kho na nyid snang ba rDo rje snying pos mdzad zer ba* | | . Note that the *Tattoāloka* has no author/authorship colophon (it does have a

translator/translation colophon though) so that the authorship ascription to Vajragarbha is merely found in the catalogues (the appellation 'Jig rten mgon po (Lokanātha), an epithet of Avalokiteśvara, is found in the concluding verse and is given in some catalogues as the author). Also note that Bodhisattva (Byang chub sems dpa', as in Zhu chen's catalogue) is an epithet of Vajragarbha (rDo rje snying po, as in Ngor chen's catalogue). See, for example, the colophon of the *Hevajrapañdarthaṭikā* (D1180/P2310), where both are recorded. This equation is also reflected in the Tibetan collective term "the three [bodhi]sattva commentaries" (*sems 'grel skor gsum*). See, for example, A kyā yongs 'dzin's *'Grel bzhi'i bshad lung zin bris* (vol. 2: 33.20–21): *'Grel chen dri med 'od dang | Phyag rdor stod 'grel | rDo rje snying 'grel te sems 'grel skor gsum...*; Mi pham's *sKad gnyis shan sbyar* (395.1–4) ... *sngags kyi phyogs la byang chub sems dpa'i 'grel pa skor gsum zhes pa | 'Grel chen dri med 'od dang | rDo rje snying 'grel | bDe mchog stod 'grel gsum dang |...* As pointed out by Isaacson and Sferra, this is commonly a reference to three commentaries by three Indic masters of the Kālacakra tradition active in the early eleventh century, namely, Vajrapāṇi's on the *Laghūsaṃvaratantra*, Vajragarbha's on the *Hevajratāntra*, and Puṇḍarīka's on the *Laghukālacakratāntra*. See Isaacson & Sferra 2015: 477. The "three Bodhisattva commentaries" are accordingly identified as (a) Vajrapāṇi's *Laghutantrapañdarthavivaraṇa* (D1402/P2117); (b) Vajragarbha's *Hevajrapañdarthaṭikā* (D1180/P2310); and (c) Puṇḍarīka's *Vimalaprabhā* (D1347/P2064). The designation "three Bodhisattva commentaries" was apparently given since each of the three authors bears a name of, or is associated with, a certain *bodhisattva*, namely, Vajrapāṇi, Vajragarbha, and Puṇḍarīka who is considered an emanation of Avalokiteśvara. See, however, also Avalokiteśvara's *Kālacakratāntra[hṛdaya]ṛttivimalaprabhā* (DØ/P4608). Cf., however, Jackson 2015: 635 n. 28, where the following is stated: "I was told that the 'three bodhisattva tantric commentators' (known also by its abbreviated name *sems 'grel skor gsum*) are a Kālacakra commentary by Sucandra, a Hevajra commentary by Vajragarbha (*Hevajrapañdarthaṭikā*, [D1180]), and a Cakrasaṃvara commentary by Vajrapāṇi (b. 1017)." On the influence of this trilogy on Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan's (1292–1361; BDRC: P139) controversial views, see Stearns 1999: 45–46, and elsewhere.

In the second case, concerning D2627, Zhu chen cites the opinion of Ngor chen (and the latter's disciple (*sras*), apparently referring to dKon mchog rgyal mtshan (1388–1496; BDRC: P1034)), that this work is spurious, which somewhat stands in opposition to the statement of Bu

Interestingly, the catalogue to the Ngam ring edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, which is likewise based on Bu ston's catalogue (apparently particularly in terms of the order of sections and works), remarks in its concluding section that Bu ston, despite knowing that some early treatises were autochthonous Tibetan, he nonetheless included them, simply because they were recorded in earlier catalogues. Unfortunately, the text is disrupted due to missing folio(s), and thus it is unclear what the policy in this regard of the editor of the Ngam ring edition (probably dated mid-fourteenth century or slightly later) was. This question can only be answered by thoroughly examining the catalogue itself.⁴³

ston, who found the expositive mode of this work to be "superior" (*drag pa*). See the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 401a1–2): ... 'di la kun mkhyen **Bus sByong rgyud** kyi bshad pa byed lugs cung 'di nyid legs par gsungs pa dang | **Ngor pa rDo rje 'chang yab sras kyis 'Khyin lo tsā ba dGe tshul khyung grags kyis byas nas Kun dga' snying po** la kha 'phangs pa'i bod mar bzhed do ||. For Bu ston's statement, see the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (516.5): ... **sByong rgyud** kyi bshad pa byed lugs cung 'di drag pa 'dra'o ||. Ngor chen's *Glo bo rdo rje theg pa'i bstan dkar* appears not to include this title at all. Ngor chen's and dKon mchog rgyal mtshan's statements in this regard are yet to be located. On 'Khyin lo tsā ba and the accusation of him being a forger, see Bajetta 2019: 17–23.

In two other cases, Zhu chen refers to Ngor chen's catalogue for works listed there but unavailable to him. See the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 346a3–4): **rDo rje 'chang gi dKar chag tu Phyang rgya bzhi'i sgrub thabs zer ba cig 'dug pa 'dir ma byung |**, and *ibid.* (vol. 2: 346b3–4): yang **Ro bsreg gi cho ga Na ro pas mdzad zer ba rDo rje 'chang gi dKar chag tu snang yang 'dir ma byung |**. For the first instance, see the *Glo bo rdo rje theg pa'i bstan dkar* (A, 272b1–2; B, 244.22–245.2): **Phyang rgya bzhi'i sgrub pa'i thabs dang | [...] rnams dGra las rnam par rgyal bas mdzad pa |**. For the second instance, see *ibid.* (A, 272b5; B, 245.12): **Ro sreg gi cho ga Nā ro pas mdzad pa |**.

⁴³ See the *Ngam ring bstan dkar* (177.12–15): *dkar chag gi rim pa yang | Inga rig pa'i mkhas pa chen po mkhan chen lo tsā ba Bu ston gyis brtag dpyad legs par mdzad pa'i dKar chag gzhir byas tel sngar bstan bcos bod ma yin par mkhyen bzhin du yang | dkar chag snga ma dag na yod pa'i dbang du mdzad nas re shig bzhugs su gsol | [...?]*. For more on this edition, see Part Two of the present study, pp. 117–118.

2.1.6. Reliance on Oral Authority

Tibetan scholars seem to have also relied on oral authorities when authenticating works, particularly on information obtained from masters from the Indic cultural sphere. One of the earliest examples of inquiring within the Indic cultural sphere about the provenance of questionable works is no doubt the narrative telling of IHa bla ma Ye shes 'od (ca. 947–ca. 1024; BDRC: P8344) becoming suspicious of certain Tantric doctrines and practices, and sending Rin chen bzang po to Kashmir to inquire about their authenticity.⁴⁴ A further example of an oral report by a Tibetan translator is the narrative surrounding the authenticity of the controversial **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* (*Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud*), as related in two biographies of *Adhīsa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna. According to this narrative, Nag tsho lo tsā ba, following his visit to the monastic seminary of Vikramaśīla, reported that the *paṇḍitas* residing there were studying and teaching the *tantra* in question.⁴⁵ Yet another example is found in 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas's aforementioned polemical work aimed at refuting what he calls false Tantric works (*sngags log*). There, having expressed his doubts about the Indic origin of many of the Yoganiruttaratantra-s in general, and the *Thabs kyi zhags pa* being a translated work in particular, he tells of having made inquiries among Indian *paṇḍitas* (obviously considered by him to be authorities), who, needless to say, replied that it is not true that numerous new scriptures emerged in India after the Buddha has passed into *nirvāṇa* and, more specifically, that the *Thabs kyi zhags pa* did not exist in India.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ See Karmay 1998: 6.

⁴⁵ See Bajetta 2019: 1 n. 1, 13, and Wangchuk 2016: 100.

⁴⁶ 'Gos lhas btsas *sngags log sun 'byin* (20.1–6): *mya ngan las 'das nas lo brgya dang bcu gnyis song nas rNal 'byor bla med gsungs| de nas rGya gar gyi yul du mdo sngags kyi chos rgyas par gyur pa yin zer te| rgya gar gyi paṇḍi ta kun la dris pas mi bden zer ro|| de nas bod kyi rgyal blon gyi sku drin las paṇḍi ta mkhas pa kun spyang drangs nas lo tstsha ba rnam kyis sDe snod gsum bsgyur zhing gtan la phabs pa yin no|| de nas phyi rabs gcig na lo tstsha ba dPal [em.: dpal, Ms: legs]^[*] rtsegs bKra shis dpal^[*] gyis sngags kyi chos la*

However, the fact that the Indic cultural sphere covers an extremely vast area and that the numerous scriptural and non-scriptural Buddhist works emerged there over a long period of time in different centres obviously calls the accuracy of such testimony by any one (or even several) Indic master(s) into question. This is of course in addition to the fact that there existed numerous traditions within the Indic cultural sphere, and that possible conflicts of interest and rivalries among the Indic masters representing them could have influenced their testimony. Moreover, the natural decay of manuscripts in the Indian subcontinent's climate, on the one hand, and the gradual disappearance of (institutional) Buddhism from most of it, on the other, must also be kept in mind. These and similar arguments were also put forward by traditional scholars in various apologetic works, which, however, deserve a separate study.⁴⁷

dpal gSang ba 'dus pa | Zla gsang thig le | Sangs rgyas mnyam sbyor sGyu 'phrul dra ba rnams bsgyur | Thabs kyi zhags pa bsgyur zer te the tshom za'o | | paṇḍi ta la dri bas rGya gar na med zer ro | | [†] There seems to have been a confusion concerning the syllables *legs* and *dpal*; they could have possibly been correction/additions in the master copy in the form of glosses that have been integrated into the text in a wrong way: *dpal* should have possibly been inserted before *rtsegs*, and *legs*, which is apparently a wrong reading for *lce*, before *bKra shis*. Cf. the parallel passage in *Sog bzlog pa Blo gros rGyal mtshan's* (1552–1624; BDR: P645) *Nges don 'brug sgra* (219.11–220.7). On 'Gos's inquiring Indian *paṇḍitas*, see also the phrase in the concluding paragraph in the 'Gos *lhas btsas sngags log sun 'byin* (25.2): ... *rgya gar gyi mkhas pa rnams la 'dri nas 'di byas pa yin gyis* | For a discussion on 'Gos's views regarding the *Yoganiruttaratantra-s* in general and controversial practices associated with them, see Wedemeyer 2014.

⁴⁷ *Zhe chen rgyal tshab 'Gyur med padma nam rgyal* (1871–1926; BDR: P235), for example, has argued that, in addition to the vastness of the Indic cultural sphere, there existed there no catalogues of the entire Buddhist (*Mahāyāna*) literature and no complete canonical collection was found in one single place. See the *Zhe chen chos 'byung* (78.16–79.8): ... *de la rGya gar du med ces pa | bod lo thag ring rkang thang zhis gis rGya gar sa rgya thams cad ji ltar chum [= 'chur] ste | Bod sa rgya chung ngu'i yul thams cad kyang rkang thang re zung gis e chod som | Na lendra sogs chos*

sde che ba rnams su rgyal bka' mtha' dag phyogs gcig yod pa'i nges pa med de | spyir sangs rgyas kyi bka' mdo rgyud la tshad med | bye brag **Phal chen dKon brtsegs** sogs kyi ma dpe mngon pa la dgra lan gsum byung ba na nub tshul dang | **'Bum rgyas pa Klu sgrub** kyis klu yul nas gdan drangs pa yin na | bod lo sleb pa'i gtsug lag khang gcig na med na sangs rgyas kyi bka' min nges 'di blo rgya shin tu chung ba byis pa'i ca co stel **rGya gar** na yod pa 'di tsam zhes | **Bod** kyi bka' bstan ltar dkar chag ni yod par ma bshad | par 'khod de phyogs gcig bsdus pa'ang yod par ma grags | gar te ci rigs bsdus kyang mtha' dag bsdus ga la nus te | O rgyan pa Rin chen dpal (1229/30–1309; BDRC: P1448) is also reported to have argued in a similar fashion in response to gSar ma lo tsā ba-s, including Chag lo, who rejected the Ancient Tantras, claiming that they were not to be found in India. In addition to the argument of the vastness of the Indic cultural sphere, he also mentions the hot climate there, which causes books to decay, and adds that many of these books, including ones containing Ancient Tantras, were in fact preserved in Nepal. For this report, see the *bDud 'joms chos 'byung* (728.1–729.3): *dngos grub brnyes pa O rgyan pa Rin chen dpal gyis | bod kyi lo tsā ba kha cig rGya gar na rnying ma bsgyur rgyu med zer | de la Chag lo tsā ba nyid bdag rang gi dbang zhus kyi bla ma yin yang rGya gar na rnying ma'i rgyud bsgyur rgyu mi 'dug zer | de 'dra khong rang blo chung gi gtam yin | lo tsā ba rGya gar shar phyogs su yug re las ma phyin pas rGya gar na gang yod cha ci chod | de las Bod na gar yod kyi cha yang mi tshod | spyir yang rGya gar tshad khungs che bas dpe rnams rul ba mang | sangs rgyas kyi bka' la tshad bzung med pa la | bod kyi lo tsā ba rnams kyis de'i khungs ci tshod | ngas nub phyogs O rgyan gyi yul la phyin pa yang mu dang mtha' ma chod | de yang dang po'i rgya dpe rnams dus phyis Bal po na mang ba yin | de bas Bal po bhi ha ra'i gtsug lag khang gcig na rnying ma'i rgyud rnams kyi rnam grangs rang yang bsam gyis mi khyab par bzhugs 'dus | ngas bod kyi rnying ma rnams la ngas rnying ma'i rgya dpe dang | pañdi ta tshur dgug | khyed rang rnams kyang yul sKyid grong du 'dong | ngas lo tsā ba byas bsgyur zer ba byas de ma grub | rnying ma'i 'gyur da rung bya rgyu yod pa la | yang bod kyi shes par 'dod pa 'ga' zhig na re | rnying ma'i dGongs pa 'dus pa bod kyi sngags rgan tshos bcos pa yin pas mi dag zer | de 'dra yang 'os su mi 'gro ba'i gtam yin | shes na de 'dra ba'i chos rang re tsho yang 'tshos dang de legs rgyu ni sangs rgyas kyi bka' la'ang med | ces pa dang....* For an English translation, see Gyurme Dorje & Kapstein 1991: 891. A much shorter version of this report is found in O rgyan pa's biography. See the *O rgyan pa'i rnam thar* (213.19–214.4): *chos rje Chag lo tsā ba de | nga yi dbang zhus pa'i bla ma yin yang | chos rnying ma dang gter ma dang zhi byed la sogs pa | chos log yin zhes gsungs zer te | rgyal ba'i gsung rab la tshad bzung ga la yod | Bal yul thang bhi*

Here I would like to merely cite several verses from 'Jigs med gling pa mKhyen brtse 'od zer's (1729/30–1785; BDRC: P314) collection of discourses (*gtam tshogs*), which are found in chapter sixty-eight devoted to rebuffing partiality regarding Tantric scriptures (*tantra'i phyogs 'dzin bzlogs pa'i gtam*). There, in addition to arguing along these same lines, 'Jigs med gling pa also, notably, speaks in favour of Tibetan compositions, a matter to which we shall come back below. He states:⁴⁸

ha ra'i gtsug lag khang na gsar rnying gi dpe bzhugs pa'i ming sgyur na yang |
'bum tsam zhig yod par 'dug mthong rgya chung ba yin |. Of much relevance is also the *Lung rigs skya rengs dang po*—a short work by rDzogs chen mkhan po Padma badzra (1807/08–1884; BDRC: P6744), who was also a teacher of Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho—where Padma badzra reasons along these lines and in fact addresses several of the criteria discussed in the present study, including the (non)existence of a Sanskrit manuscript, of a translator/translation colophon, and of Indic commentaries, the reliance on oral or written sources, the style of composition and syntax featured in the work in question, and the work's content.

⁴⁸ 'Jigs med gling pa'i gtam tshogs (633.14–634.16):

snga 'gyur phal dang gsar ma yang | |
mang dag bod kyis byas so zhes | |
smras pas rmongs pas rmongs chen kyang | |
chos spong dam tshig bzhin du bsrung | | (1)
de la bod mar sgro btags pa | |
phal cher rgya gzhung lung dang ni | |
rgya dpes kha tshon bcad pa'i tshul | |
gzu bor gnas la yongs su grags | | (2)
lar ni khyod kyis 'dod pa'i lugs | |
rgya nas byung tshad ngo mtshar la | |
bod du byung tshad ngan ngon na | |
deng sang bshad sgrub byed pa kun | |
rgya gzhung khungs su 'dren pa las | |
bod kyi bstan bcos 'ba' zhig yin | | (3)
rang gis ma mthong ma thos pa | |
tsam zhig tshad ma'i dbang yin na | |
lung gi dam chos thams cad ni | |
'dus byas nyid phyir rim pas nub | |
da ni kla klo 'ba' zhig gis | |

Part One: On Strategies for Authenticating Scriptures and Treatises

Most [*tantras* of] the Early Translation and many New ones,
too,
Are claimed to have been composed by Tibetans,
Thereby [giving rise to] confusion. Despite [such] great
confusion,
[One] is to abide by [one's] commitment concerning the
abandonment of the Dharma. (1)
The upright ones know how [the authenticity of]
[Those *tantras* that] were falsely asserted to be
autochthonous Tibetan
Has in most cases been determined by [relying on] Indic
authoritative works
And [the existence of] a Sanskrit manuscript. (2)
In addition, if your attitude is such that
Whatever originated in India is wonderful
And whatever originated in Tibet is inferior,
[Is it not so that] all [those works on the basis of which one]
nowadays carries out [the activities of] exposition and
practice
Are nothing but treatises [composed by] Tibetans
By relying on Indic works? (3)
If the mere [fact that one] personally did not see or hear
Is considered valid cognition, [the following would ensue]:
Since all authoritative sublime scriptures

bkab pas rgya gar yul kun na ||
rgyal bstan grags pa med pa'i phyir || (4)
sde snod gsum dang rgyud sde kun ||
sgyur byed lo tsā de dag gis ||
brtsams zhes rgol na ci zhig smra || (5)
khyad par rdor sems sgyu drwa dang ||
phur pa ye shes rtse mo sogs ||
rgyud kyi dngos po bcu tshang zhing ||
tshig don phun sum tshogs pa rnams ||
sgyur byed lo tsās byas zer na ||
byas pa de kas chos go chod || (6)
spang rtogs thugs rje rdzu 'phrul kun ||
sangs rgyas nyid kyi phrin las phyir || (7) ...

Are conditioned phenomena, [they are bound to] gradually disappear.

Nowadays, [India] is pervaded by barbarians,
And therefore, the Teaching of the Victorious One
Is not known everywhere in the Land of India. (4)

Thus, what would you say if I object by saying [the following]:

“The Tripiṭaka and all Tantric scriptures
Were composed by the translators, the Eyes of the World”?
(5)

In particular, if you claim that the *rDor sems sgyu drwa*
(D833/P456),

Ye shes rtse mo (Tb.658) of the *Phur pa* [cycle], etc. —

Which [are Tantric scriptures containing] all ten Tantric
topics

And are excellent [in terms of both] words and meaning —

Were composed by the translators, the Eyes of the World,
Then these very compositions would qualify as scriptures.

(6)

[Considering] all [the translators’ qualities]—abandonment,
realization, compassion, [and] magical power —

[Their activities are nothing but] the salvific activities of the
Buddha himself. (7) [...]

2.1.7. Syntax and Vocabulary

Very soon Tibetans realized that the syntax and vocabulary of translated literature differ from those of autochthonous compositions. It appears that, at least in some circles, translated texts were expected to have more complex syntax (which at times was equated with being less smooth) and to often contain less familiar vocabulary and more complex wording (taken as mirroring the underlying Sanskrit terminology) and thus to be more difficult to comprehend. Tibetan autochthonous texts, in turn, were expected to have rather simple syntax and not to contain complex vocabulary or phrases (and often in fact to contain vocabulary typical of autochthonous literature and believed to have no Sanskrit equivalents), and thus considered

easier to read and comprehend. It was therefore only a matter of time until syntax and vocabulary began to play a role in determining the provenance of works, and thus in their authentication and canonization. However, using syntax and vocabulary as evidence of a work's provenance turned out to be a complex issue. The main difficulty with this criterion was undoubtedly that it is much less formal and thus difficult to define. On a previous occasion I have pointed out that this criterion was also used by opponents of the rNying ma school, who claimed that some rNying ma scriptures and related treatises are not of Indic origin but rather Tibetan, because, among other things, they feature syntax that is simple and easy to comprehend. The rNying ma followers, for their part, used this very same feature to argue the opposite, namely, that simple, and thus smooth, syntax is nothing if not proof of a high-quality translation and of the fact that the rNying ma *lo tsā bas* understood their texts correctly, while what are considered complex syntax and vocabulary or phrases are simply testimony to the poor skills of some of the gSar ma *lo tsā bas*, and thus to the poor quality of the translation.⁴⁹

In general, the fact that the translations of the Early Period were prepared under strict state control is seen by adherents of the rNying ma school as being conducive to ensuring the authenticity of the works and to achieving high-quality translation as well. This is in contrast to the translations of the Later Period, which were prepared in a decentralized manner, with no state control, and thus both their authenticity and quality of translation could not always be guaranteed. This viewpoint is reflected, to give one example, in Mi pham 'Jam dbyangs rNam rgyal rgya mtsho's (1846–1912; BDRC: P252) *sKad gnyis shan sbyar*, where he discusses the different ways of translating Sanskrit into Tibetan:⁵⁰

⁴⁹ On this issue, see Almogi 2016b.

⁵⁰ *sKad gnyis shan sbyar* (564.4–9): ... *de dus chos rgyal bka' khriims btsan shing sa la gnas pa'i lo paṅ zhal 'dzoms kyis bsgyur ba'i chos la chos rnam dag yin min the tshom skye ba'i gnas med la\ sgra don nor ba [= bar] dogs pa yang*

Authenticity and Authentication

At that time (i.e., the Imperial Period), the law of the Dharma Kings was strict, and there was no place for doubts to arise as to whether the doctrinal works jointly translated by translators and *paṇḍitas* abiding on [one of the *bodhisattoa*]*bhūmi*[s] were genuine or not, let alone doubts regarding mistakes in words and meaning. However, this is not necessarily the case with later translations etc. (i.e., revisions) made by not particularly learned translators after consulting Sanskrit manuscripts.

Of relevance to our discussion is Mi pham's reference to correct translation in terms of both "words" (*sgra*) and "meaning" (*don*), which reflects the permanent innate tension in any translation undertaking between translation *ad verbum* and translation *ad sensum*, or literal translation and dynamic/creative/humanistic translation. It appears that, in general, Tibetan translators attempted to combine these two approaches in their translation. Moreover, it seems that during the Early Period some translators specialized in translating *ad verbum*, while others specialized in translating *ad sensum*, and yet others specialized in proofreading/revision, where achieving the right balance between the two was probably attempted. This is evident from the designations "the great *ad sensum* translator" (*don sgyur gyi lo tsha ba chen po*) referring to Cog ku (= ro) Klu'i rgyal mtshan, "the great *ad verbum* translator" (*sgra sgyur gyi lo tsha ba chen po*) referring to sKa ba dPal brtsegs, and "the great translator-cum-chief editor" (*zhu chen gyi lo tsha ba chen po*) referring to Ban dhe Ye shes sde, which are found in the concluding passage of the '*Phang thang ma*.⁵¹

Here, I would like to cite three passages from Tāranātha's writings, which provide further insight into the issue of style, this time wholly from a gSar ma perspective. The first is a passage taken from his *gShin rje chos 'byung*, found in the context of his discussion of various matters concerning the **Śrīkṛṣṇayamāri-*

ga la yod | phyis su lo tsā cher mi mkhas pa dag gis rgya dpe la bltas nas bsgyur ba sogs la de ltar ma nges te | ...

⁵¹ See the '*Phang thang ma* (A: 66.17–20; B: 46.13–16).

tantrarājatrikalpa (D469/P107), known in Tibet simply as *rTog pa gsum pa*, including its authenticity in terms of its Indic provenance. There, Tāranātha categorically rejects the claim that the *rTog pa gsum pa* must be a Tibetan composition because its wording is too clear to be a translated text. Moreover, he takes this occasion to point out how it is in general wrong to judge whether a text is a translated or autochthonous one on the basis of style, including syntax and wording. One interesting argument by him is that persons who made such allegations were often not experienced enough to have a learned opinion in this regard, apparently hinting at the fact that most of these critics had never worked on any translation project themselves (and probably had no knowledge of Sanskrit either). A second interesting argument of his is that if one follows such logic, one risks the authenticity of the scriptures and related treatises one is devoted to being questioned as well. A third point raised by him is that such accusations are (often) motivated by bias and sectarianism. Of special interest is also his reference to Virūpa's *rDo rje'i tshig rkang* of the Lam 'bras tradition as a work accepted as authoritative by the unnamed critics he is alluding to. He states:⁵²

⁵² *gShin rje chos 'byung* (A, 36.5–37.5; B, 38.4–39.3; C, 33.13–34.10): *tshig shin tu kha gsal bas bod ma yin snyam na| mdo sde rnams dang| grub thob rnams kyi gzhung klogs* [AC: *klogs*, B: *glogs*] *shig| zhal shin tu gsal ba mtha' yas te| khyod kyi log rtog sel bar 'gyur rol| tshig la* [BC: *la*, A: *kha*] *brjid bag med pa'i phyir| bod ma'o snyam na rTog gsum ni tshig brjid bag dang ldan pa kho na yin pas skyon de med la| spyir ni tshig rngam brjid che chung lo tsā ba'i 'gyur khyad* [AB: *khyad*, C: *khyad pa*] *yin pas| de tsam gang gi yang rgyu mtshan du* [BC: *du*, A *om. (a.c.)*] *mi rung zhing| khyed kyis ni tshig brjid bag che chung yang nyams kyis mi chod cing ngo ma shes par snang ngo|| yang khyed kyi ngor thal ba 'di* [AB: *ba 'di*, C: *ba'i*] *skad 'phang ste| Lam 'bras rDo rje'i tshig rkang yang bod rtsom yin par thal te| dga' la g.yang za| ngo tsha la* [AB: *tsha la*, C: *tshal*] *skyug* [AB: *skyug*, C: *skrun*] *bro ces* [AB: *ces*, C: *zhes*] *dang| 'dod yon sna tshogs mthong bas dgod* [*em.: dgod*, ABC: *rgod*] *bro| ces* [AB: *ces*, C: *zhes*] *sogs tshig brjid bag chung zhing mi mdzes pa du ma 'dug pa'i phyir rol| des na rgya gzhung bstan bcos rnam dag dang| rgyud tshig gnyis la mi 'dra ba'i khyad par ji ltar yod| de gnyis dang| bod rtsom la mi 'dra ba'i khyad par gang 'dra yod| bod rtsom bstan bcos rnam dag dang| rnam dag ma yin pa gnyis la| tshig sbyor gyi khyad par ji lta bu yod| ces* [AB: *ces*, C:

[Objection]: [The *rTog pa gsum pa*] is a Tibetan [work] because [its] wording is very clear. [Response]: [You] should read *sūtras* and works [composed by] *siddhas* [in Tibetan translation]! [Then you would realize that] many of them are very clear [in their wording], and thus your misconception [about the *rTog pa gsum pa*] will be eliminated. [Objection]: Given that the wording [of the *rTog pa gsum pa*] is not elevated (*brjid bag*), [it] is Tibetan. [Response]: Inasmuch as the *rTog gsum* is indeed elevated in its wording, this fault does not apply to it. Moreover, the degree of dignity (*rngam brjid*) of expression is in general a distinctive trait of the lo tsā bas' translations, and therefore that [feature] alone cannot prove anything. And as far as the degree of elevated speech is concerned, it appears that you do not have sufficient experience [in this matter] and [thus] are not familiar [with it].⁵³ In addition, I will [now] throw [at you] statements that from your perspective would lead to undesired consequences (*thal ba*): [If one accepts your reasoning], it would illogically follow that [Virūpa's] *rDo rje'i tshig rkang* of the Lam 'bras [tradition] is a Tibetan composition, since [it] contains numerous [cases in which] the wording is less elevated and not elegant, such as *dga' la g.yang za | ngo tsha la skyug bro* and *'dod yon sna tshogs mthong bas dgod bro*.⁵⁴ Therefore, if [one] posed [the following] questions, [this would become] clear [to you]: What is the

zhes | dris na gsal te | rdzun dang tshod dpogs 'ba' zhig gis phyugs kyi skye bo'i tshogs pa rnams dang | mtshan nyid mkhas por rlom pa'i nyams med ko long dam po rnams mgo bskor ba lhur len pa las | dkar po'i chos gcig kyang ma 'dres pa'i spyod pa'o | | spros pas chog go | |

⁵³ For an earlier discussion of the authenticity of the *rTog pa gsum pa*, including further citations from Tāranātha's works, see Almogi 2008: 89–106.

⁵⁴ The phrases *dga' la g.yang za | ngo tsha la skyug bro* and *'dod yon sna tshogs mthong bas dgod bro* are found in the **Mārgaphalānvitāvavādaka* ascribed to Virūpa, which is widely known in Tibet as the *rDo rje'i tshig rkang*. See the **Mārgaphalānvitāvavādaka* (D, 141a7 and 141b1; P, 154b1 and 154b1–2, respectively).

difference between authentic Indian śāstric works and the wording of *tantras*? What kind of differences are there between these two (i.e., Indian śāstras and *tantras*) and Tibetan compositions? What is the difference in terms of phrasing (*tshig sbyor*) between Tibetan compositions that are [considered] authentic śāstras and those that are not [considered] authentic? Narrow-minded quarrels based on no experience—[led by] groups of “cattle-[like]” persons [motivated] by nothing but lies and speculations (*tshod dpogs*), and [by persons] pretending to be learned in reasoning—are [all nothing but] attempts to deceive [people]. Hence it is conduct with not even one single positive quality mixed in. Enough of elaboration!

The second is a passage taken from Tāranātha’s *Dam tshig gsum bkod dkyil chog* wherein he discusses the authenticity of the **Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇīṭikā* (D2680/P3504) in the context of the controversy as to whether the scheme of six [modes of] the deity is taught in the Kriyā Tantric system. He puts forward several arguments in regard to this controversy, which can be subsumed under two main points: (a) the authenticity, and thus authority, of the source relied upon, and (b) the identity of the scriptural citation itself. (a) In regard to the Indian origin of the **Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇīṭikā*, commonly ascribed to Buddhaguhya,⁵⁵ Tāranātha raises several points concerning its style of composition: (i) the flow of words (*tshig gi ’babs*), (ii) the expectation, in the case of a versified text, of a plausible correlation between the original Sanskrit verses and their Tibetan translation in terms of the number of words/syllables per verse in general and per line in particular, whereas, as he points out, there are complex cases of translation in which an obvious correlation

⁵⁵ It is notable that neither Bu ston nor Zhu chen in their *bsTan ’gyur* catalogues expresses doubts as to the authenticity of the **Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇīṭikā*. See the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (521.4–5) and *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 404a1–2). They obviously follow in this regard Rig ral’s opinion. For Rig ral’s brief discussion of the authenticity of this work as found in his *rGyan gyi nyi ’od*, see above § 2.1.4.

cannot be determined, and (iii) the phraseology (*tshig lam*), with special reference to the style of Tibetan summarizing formulations (*bod ma'i sdoms*) or words (*sdoms tshig*). (b) In regard to the scriptural citation itself, he mainly discusses three issues, which can be considered as historical and/or philological in nature: (i) on a purely textual level, whether the scriptural citation in question is found in a *kriyātantra* in the first place, (ii) on a textual-doxographical level, whether the sources relied upon can indeed be identified as *kriyātantras*, and (iii) on a purely philological level, whether citations found therein have all along been an integral part of the text or are possibly later interpolations. The employment of the historical-philological approach by the tradition in matters of authenticity will be separately discussed below, but this passage by Tāranātha nicely shows that, as pointed out earlier, more than one criterion, or one strategy, was often simultaneously employed for authenticating a work or rejecting its authenticity. Two points in this passage are of particular interest, the first being that this time Tāranātha does resort to matters of style to argue that the work in question is of Tibetan origin, and the second being that he gives us unique insight into issues concerning translation, particularly of metrical text. He states:⁵⁶

⁵⁶ *Dam tshig gsum bkod dkyil chog* (A, 697.1–698.2; B, 506.2–507.3; C, 84.4–85.2): *skabs 'dir 'di snyam du Bya ba'i rgyud la bdag bskyed kyang med la | mdun bskyed la yang sngags sogs sa bon las dam tshig pa* [A: *pa*, BC: *gis*] *bskyed pa dang | ye shes pa spyang drangs te bsre ba med na | lha drug gi dbye ba bshad pa dang 'gal bar 'gyur* [AB: *'gyur*, C: *gyur*] *snyam na | 'dir dang por khru* [AB: *khru*, C: *'khru*] *byas rnal 'byor pas ces* [AB: *ces*, C: *zhes*] *sogs | lha drug ston byed kyi gzhung tshig de bod du 'gyur ba'i rgyud na ni med la | rNam 'joms kyi 'grel pa Sangs rgyas gsang bas* [AC: *bas*, B: *pas*] *mdzad par grags pa na | lung 'dren gyi tshul du yod pa las de rNam 'joms rgyas pa'i lung yin par grags mod kyi | rNam 'joms kyi rgyud yin du chug kyang rNam 'joms kyi rgyud yin tshad Bya rgyud* [AB: *rgyud*, C: *rgyu*] *yin par ma nges pa'i phyir dang | 'grel pa de yang tshig don bzang mod tshig gi babs la dpags na snga 'gyur dus kyi zin bris bod ma shin* [AC: *shin*, B: *zhig*] *tu gsal ba'i phyir dang | mchod dang gsol ba lha drug bsgom | | stong dang yi ge sgra gzugs dang | | ces* [AB: *ces*, C: *zhes*] *pa lta bu rgya skad tshig ring po thung ngur bsdu pa'am | rgya skad rkang pa gsum bod skad rkang pa gnyis la bsdu*

[Objection]: In this context the following [points] may be raised: If in the Kriyā Tantric scriptures there is no generation of oneself [as a deity] (*bdag bskyed*), and if with regard to the generation [of a deity] in front of [oneself] (*mdun bskyed*) there is no fusion of the *samaya*[*sattva*] (*dam tshig* [*sems dpa'*]), who has been generated by means of seed syllables (*bija*) such as *mantras*, with the *jñāna*[*sattva*] (*ye shes* [*sems dpa'*]), who has been “invited,” this would contradict the distinction [made] among the six [modes of] the deity explained [in the context of the Kriyā Tantric system]. [Response]: In this regard, [the above arguments do not hold] for [several reasons, as follows]: The text teaching the six [modes of] the deity—[namely], *dang por 'khrus byas rnal 'byor pas* etc.⁵⁷—is not found in the Tibetan translation of the *tantra*(s).⁵⁸ Moreover, this [passage] can [indeed] be found in the commentary on the *Vajravidāraṇā* known to have been composed by Buddhaguhya, in the form of a citation from

pa'am | *rgya skad tshig lhug pa tshigs* [AC: *tshigs*, B: *tshig*] *bcad yi ge shin tu nyung ngur bsdus pa lta bu'am* | *tshigs bcad la Rig byed kyi gsang ba'i gab* [AC: *gab*, C: *kab*] *tshig skad dod* [AB: *dod*, C: *'dod*] *bsgrigs pa lta bu yod na ma gtogs* | *rjes bsngags* [*em.*: *bsngags*, ABC: *sngags*] *dang* | *kha sgo la sogs pa tshigs bcad yig 'bru brgyad pa'i sdeb sbyor gyi tshig rkang gnyis la 'grig dka' bar snang zhing* | *tshig lam yang bod ma'i sdoms 'dra rung ba snang ba* | *des na tshig 'di ni bod kyi sdoms tshig rnying* [A: *rnying*, BC: *snying*] *pa yin yang dag cing* | *ches snga ba'i yig rnying las dpe gsar du spel ba rnams la mchan bu dkyus su shor ba'i nor ba* [BC: *ba*, A: *pa*] *yang mang bas lung khungs smos pa* [BC: *pa*, A: *pa pa*] *yang rtsom pa pos byas par ma nges pa'i phyir dang* | **Bya rgyud** *rang rkang* [BC: *rang rkang*, A: *rang rang*] *la ni* | *lha drug gi rnam gzhas* [AC: *gzhas*, B: *bzhas*] *nges* [AB: *nges*, C: *nged*] *par 'chad dgos pa mi snang bas* | *de 'dra'i rnam gzhas* [AC: *gzhas*, B: *bzhas*] *nges par dgos pa min la* | *ci ste byed na Sangs rgyas gsang bas bshad pa rnams ni sPyod rgyud kyi lugs yin pas 'dir de ltar mi bya'o* | |

⁵⁷ For this citation, see below, note 59.

⁵⁸ It is unclear whether Tāranātha is generally referring here to the Tantric scriptures translated into Tibetan or to a specific scripture, such as the *Vajravidāraṇā* mentioned by him in the following sentence (see also below, note 60).

an authoritative scripture,⁵⁹ and is thus known to be an authoritative citation from the extensive *Vajravidāraṇā*.⁶⁰ However, even if one were to concede that [it] is [from] the [extensive] *Vajravidāraṇā*, it is not certain that all *tantras* [associated with] the *Vajravidāraṇā* are *kriyātantras*. Moreover, although that commentary is fine in terms of [both] wording and content, if one examines the flow of words, it becomes clear that it is a Tibetan work [consisting of] notes [that were made] during the Early Period of Translation. In addition, as is the case with [the Tibetan translation of the lines of verse] *mchod dang gsol ba lha drug bsgom|| stong dang yi ge sgra gzugs dang||*,⁶¹ it seems implausible that a [Sanskrit] verse of an eight-syllable metre, such as *anuṣṭubh* (*rjes bsngags*) and/or *vaktra* (*kha sgo*),⁶² would correlate with two [seven-syllable] verse lines [in Tibetan]—unless [of course, one is dealing with complex cases in which, for example,] long Sanskrit phrases have been contracted into short ones, three Sanskrit lines of verse compressed into two Tibetan ones, a Sanskrit prose text condensed [in Tibetan] into verses in very few words, or

⁵⁹ The citation in question is found in Buddhaguhya's **Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇītikā*. It consists of eight verse lines and reads as follows: (D, 179b6–7; P, 185b6–8): *de yang rgyud las| dang po khruś byas rnal 'byor pas|| rdo rje gdan la gnas nas ni|| mchod dang gsol bas lha drug bsgom|| stong dang yi ge sgra gzugs dang|| phyag rgya mtshan ma drug yin te|| bum* [B: *bum*, P: *khum*] *par bskyed sogs rdzogs byas la|| nor bu spyod lam sngags bzlas te|| sha la sogs pa bdun spong* [D: *spong*, P: *spad*] *ngo|| zhes gsungs so|| ||*.

⁶⁰ Two versions of the *Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇī* are found in the *bKa' 'gyur*, namely, D750/P406 and D949/P574, obviously both short (i.e., an “abbreviated” form rather than an “extensive” one).

⁶¹ These are the third and fourth lines cited by Buddhaguhya provided above, note 59.

⁶² The word *kha sgo* most likely is the Tibetan for *vaktra*. Moreover, *vaktra* and *anuṣṭubh* are regarded by most metricians as synonymous, though some do differentiate between them. I am thankful to Harunaga Isaacson for this information.

hidden, enigmatic Vedic words encoded with [Tibetan] translation equivalents in [the form of] verses. It seems that the phraseology [of the above cited lines of verse], too, is akin to Tibetan summarizing formulation (*bod ma'i sdoms*), and thus these phrases are old Tibetan summarizing words (*sdoms tshig*). Nonetheless, [generally speaking] there are many mistakes in new manuscripts produced from correct and very early old texts—[namely, mistakes resulting from] annotations having been conflated with the main text (*dkyus su shor ba*)—and thus it is also uncertain whether citations of authoritative sources are [necessarily] by the author [himself]. As for the Kriyā Tantric [system] as such, it does not seem that it needs to expound the system of six [modes of] the deity. Thus such [a system] is not indispensable [for the *kriyātantras*]. But if [one still wishes to] engage in [this practice], the statements by Buddhaguhya refer to the Caryā Tantric tradition, and therefore [the practice] should not be engaged in here [in the context of the *kriyātantras*].

The third passage of interest is found in Tāranātha's *rDo rje'i rnal 'byor gyi khrid yig*. There Tāranātha, after narrating the background to Vibhūticandra's connections with the Sa skya tradition, goes on to discuss the controversy regarding the authenticity of the content of the **Trisaṃvaraprabhāmālā* (D3727/P4549) ascribed to Vibhūticandra (who is also said to have translated the work by himself, that is, without the help of a Tibetan *lo tsā ba*). In this regard, Tāranātha merely states that the work betrays several signs of being a Tibetan composition, but unfortunately he does not specify what these signs are. In addition, he seems to indirectly hint at some sectarian issues (and perhaps also motives?) connected with the composition of the work.⁶³ He states:⁶⁴

⁶³ See Sobisch 2002: 23–24 and 35–36, where the authorship of the **Trisaṃvaraprabhāmālā* is briefly discussed, including a reference to Tāranātha's claims that the text is an autochthonous Tibetan work, which Sobisch rejects, suggesting that Vibhūticandra indeed composed the work but modelled it after a Tibetan composition. Note that the work is listed in all traditional catalogues with no particular note regarding its

Vibhūticandra had already previously had connections with 'Bri khung pa-s (i.e., during his first visit to Tibet). During [his] second visit, too, [his] salvific activities in 'Bri khung gling were enormous. Afterwards there was [a certain person] said to be either a *dge bshes* from Srin po ri or a zealot adherent of 'Bri khung. He composed a minor text

authenticity. See the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (under the section of translation by Vibhūticandra): [Rr.28.87]: *sDom gsum 'od phreng dang* | |; *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*: (A, 51a1; B, 41a4–5): [Njs 1100] **Bi**^[1] **bhu ti tsan dras**^[2] *mdzad pa'i sDom gsum 'od kyi phreng ba*^[3] *de nyid kyis bsgyur ba...* ([^[1] bi] A, bhi B; [^[2] tsan dras] A, tsandras B; [^[3] ba] A, pa B); and *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc764] **Bi bhu ti tsandras mdzad pa'i sDom gsum 'od kyi phreng ba de'i rang 'gyur** |. A similar statement is found in *Bu ston's Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (566.1), followed by the *INga pa chen po bstan dkar* (87b4–5), *gSer bris bstan dkar* (111b6–112a1), and *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 428a4–5), and in the *Tshal pa bstan dkar* (T2221; Tms: 76b5), followed by the *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1* (562.2–3).

⁶⁴ *rDo rje'i rnal 'byor gyi khrid yig* (A, 485.2–486.1; B, 153.5–154.3; C, 143.5–20): **Bi bhu ti ni de sngon nas 'Bri khung pa dang 'brel chags yod | lan bar pa** [AC: *bar pa*, B: *par ba*] **phebs skabs kyang 'Bri khung gling du 'phrin las cher byung | de rjes Srin po ri pa'i** [AB: *pa'i*, C: *ba'i*] **dge bshes** [BC: *dge bshes*, A: *dge ba shes*] **cig** [AB: *cig*, C: *zhig*] **yin nam yang zer | 'Bri khung pa'i** [A: *pa'i*, BC: *ba'i*] **phyogs 'dzin cig** [AB: *cig*, C: *zhig*] **yin nam yang zer te | rJe btsun chen po'i rTsa ltung 'khrul spong gi grub mtha' la dgag pa yod pa'i sDom gsum 'od 'phreng zer ba'i gzhung chung de brtsams nas | Bi bhu ti tsandras** [BC: *tsandras*, A: *tsa ndras*] **mdzad do zhes kha 'phangs byas 'dug | grub mtha' Bi bhu ti'i** [A: *ti'i*, BC: *ta'i*] **bzhed pa ni yin yod par yang gda' | phyis kyi Sa skya pa** [A: *pa*, BC: *ba*] **rnams bod rtsom dang rgya rtsom gyi nyams ni med | dgag pa de mthong bas snying na ba** [BC: *ba*, A: *pa*] **yin te | 'Od 'phreng gi gzhung de bod rtsom sang sang mngon** [em.: *mngon*, ABC: *sngon*] **rtags can yin pas | Bi bhu tis ma mdzad par nges | khong la tshig pa de tsam za mi dgos | dper na rgyud brdzus ma gcig gi nang na | lta spyod log pa 'dug kyang | de rDo rje 'chang la khag med pa dang 'dra | lar sDom gsum 'od 'phreng gi lugs de la'ang lung rigs gis** [B: *rigs gis*, AC: *rig kyi*] **gnod byed yod na khyogs shog | rJe btsun Grags rgyal la phyag ma phul ba dang | dgag pa byas pa tsam la snying kham** [em.: *kham*, AC: *'kham*, B: *'khang*]^[*] **pa ni gu dog tsam yin gyi | mkhas pa'i bya ba ma yin no | | des** [AB: *des*, C: *de*] **na mkhas pa yin du re na mkhas pa la 'os pa zhig byas na dga' 'o | |**. [^[*] Cf. the *brDa dkrol gser gyi me long*, s.v. *zhe kham pa* (also s.v. *kham shis*).

called *sDom gsum 'od 'phreng* (**Trisaṃvaraprabhāmālā*), which contains criticism of the doctrinal positions [found in] the *rTsa ltung 'khrul spong* of rJe btsun chen po [Grag pa rgyal mtshan] (1147–1216; BDRC: P1614)]⁶⁵ and then falsely ascribed it to Vibhūticandra. [These] doctrinal positions were held by Vibhūti [and] are indeed contained [in the *sDom gsum 'od 'phreng*]. Later Sa skya pa-s had no clue as to whether these were Tibetan or Indian compositions. Having seen that contradiction, they became upset. But this work *'Od 'phreng* contains a number of signs that [it] is a Tibetan composition. It is certain that it was not composed by Vibhūti, and thus [you] need not bear any animus toward him. It is, for example, just like the presence of false views and conduct in a spurious *tantra* not being the fault of Vajradhara. Still, if [you find] contradictions regarding authoritative scriptures and reasoning in the tradition of the *sDom gsum 'od 'phreng*, repel them! Being angry (*snying kham*) at [the critics for] not prostrating before rJe btsun Grags rgyal and at mere contradictions is simply inadequate, and thus not the behaviour of a learned person (*mkhas pa*). Therefore, if one hopes to be learned, it would be best if one respected learned persons.⁶⁶

2.2. Verifiably Valid Traditions

In addition to any of the above-mentioned criteria, which are considered to be indicative of an Indic origin, the existence of a verifiably valid tradition—mainly in the form of an authoritative and unbroken transmission that begins within the Indic cultural sphere—was a very important, and in fact central, criterion. The Tibetans made from relatively early on efforts to keep records of their transmission lineages. Their efforts were not confined to lineages within the Tibetic cultural sphere; rather, and more

⁶⁵ This is a reference to Grags pa rgyal mtshan's *rTsa ba'i ltung ba bcu bzhi pa'i 'grel pa gsal byed 'khrul spong*, in *Sa skya bka' 'bum*, vol. 7: 275–410, [Kathmandu]: Sachen International, 2006 [BDRC: W00EGS1017151].

⁶⁶ Compare the translation in Stearns 1996: 151.

importantly, they also attempted to trace, or (re)construct, the lineages back to masters within the Indic cultural sphere, and in the case of scriptures, all the way back to the historical Buddha (or a celestial *buddha*). The absence of such an authoritative and unbroken transmission tremendously reduced the chances of the work in question (and also the teachings associated with it) being authenticated. As is well known, in the case of Revealed Treasures, the concept of a “short transmission” (*nye brgyud*) was brought forward in order to solve the problem that arose due to temporal gaps, at times huge, in the transmission; gaps that would commonly be considered long enough to undermine the validity of a lineage. This concept of a “short lineage” allows a tradition to connect seemingly intermittent dots, so to speak, namely, events that at first seem dissociated from each other—the initial teaching, the following concealment, and finally its revelation—so as to form an uninterrupted line of transmission, and thus a valid lineage. The concept of a “short transmission,” although perhaps not successful in convincing the critics,⁶⁷ did allow its adherents to present, at least from their point of view, a valid transmission lineage. Regardless of its employment in the case of Revealed Treasures, however, this concept did not (and in fact could not) serve as an adequate solution in the case of works that were not presented as Treasures, and at the same time appeared not to fulfil any of the conditions required for the determination of an Indic origin listed earlier.

⁶⁷ For an example of an implicit rejection of the notion of “short transmission” by critics, and the emphasis on the importance of a valid transmission lineage, see Martin 1997a: 268 (English translation) and 293 n. 28 (Tibetan text), where one of the “Vajra Statements” from the anti-Bon polemical work titled *Dam chos dgongs pa gcig pa* composed by dBon Shes rab 'byung gnas (1187–1241; BDRC: P131) is provided: 'ga' zhig ni chos rgyud pa med par 'byung ba dang | sa chos | gnam chos | gter ma la sogs pa zab cing ngo mtshar bar 'dod pa yin mod kyi | 'dir ni rgyud pa las brgyud pa'i chos zab cing ngo mtshar bar bzhed do ||. For a brief discussion of the phenomenon of “short transmission” in the context of the gSar ma schools, see Davidson 2002: 218–220.

2.3. Authentication Based on Content

Authentication based on a work's content mainly encompasses two major criteria, namely, (a) whether its content is of soteriological benefit, and (b) whether the Tibetan translation correctly conveys the content contained in the original.

2.3.1. Authentication Based on Soteriological Benefit

As already pointed out on an earlier occasion, the fundamental question as to “what the Word of the Buddha is” has been approached within the Tibetan cultural sphere by way of employing either of two criteria, recently termed by Dorji Wangchuk (i) the “genetic–diachronic” criterion, that is, the work's “genetic” link to an Indic origin or a Sanskrit text/manuscript, and (ii) the “generic–synchronic” criterion, that is, the work's “generic” conformity with the scriptures for which there is already general consensus (mainly due to their fulfilling the first criterion), in line with the notion that whatever is “well-expounded (or: taught)” is “Buddha-expounded (or: taught).”⁶⁸ The “genetic–diachronic” criterion is motivated by the wish to have ready at hand historical evidence for the authenticity and

⁶⁸ The twofold scheme of “genetic–diachronic” and “generic–synchronic” criteria has been presented by Wangchuk on several occasions and will be readdressed in Wangchuk (forthcoming-a). See also Almogi 2019: 6–7. On the notion that whatever is “well-expounded/taught” is “Buddha-expounded/taught, see Wangchuk 2007: 120–121, where the *Adhyāśaya-saṃcodanasūtra* (as cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*) and Rong zom pa's *dKon cog 'grel* are cited and where further references are provided. For a recent discussion, see Schmithausen 2020: vol. 2: 426 n. 2822, where three possible interpretations of a statement in the same spirit found in the *Aṅgulimāliyasūtra* are offered: (a) All that is in conformity with the Teaching of the Buddha is to be regarded as *de facto* the Buddha's Teaching. (b) All that is in conformity with the Teaching of the Buddha is inspired by the Buddha. (c) All that is in conformity with the Teaching of the Buddha is extracted from Buddhism. For a German translation of the pertinent statement from the *Aṅgulimāliyasūtra*, see *ibid.*: vol. 1: 360 (§ 4a[2]), for an edition of the Tibetan and Chinese texts, see *ibid.*: vol. 3: 39 (§ 4a[2]).

identity of the work in question, whereas the “generic-synchronic” criterion is motivated by the presumed soteriological benefit gained by it. The compilers of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon largely sought to meet the former criterion, though apparently not always to the same degree. As has been argued on several occasions, this policy was in contradiction to the general attitude prevailing within the Indic cultural sphere, which generally offered fertile ground for the continued emergence of new scriptures and philosophical traditions, despite similar reservations there as well. In the Tibetan context, it was often followers of the rNying ma school and their sympathizers (mostly, but not only, from within the bKa’ brgyud school) who embraced the “generic-synchronic” criterion, while most adherents of the gSar ma schools stuck with the “genetic-diachronic” criterion.⁶⁹ Here I would like to cite two more passages by Tāranātha in which he argues in favour of Tibetan compositions when these are of great benefit in terms of their soteriological impact. The first passage is taken from his autobiography and occurs in the context of discussing a dispute surrounding the origin of the Śākyamuni statue known as the Jo bo Phyogs las rnam rgyal,⁷⁰ namely, the question as to whether it

⁶⁹ The two authentication approaches, that is, the one based on claims of historical validity, and the other based on claims of soteriological benefit, both in the Indic and Tibetic contexts, have been previously discussed on several occasions. For a recent example, see Doctor 2005: 38–40, 205 nn. 101 and 102, where some references to earlier studies are provided.

⁷⁰ According to the Jo nang tradition, the Jo bo Phyogs las rnam rgyal is one of several statues made in India after the demise of the Śākyamuni Buddha. It later found its way to Tibet, where at first it served as a personal religious object (*thugs dam*) of King Srong btsan sgam po; then, during the time of Khri Srong lde btsan, it was moved to the Bad rngam temple of bSam yas, and later to the sNe gdong palace; and finally it was presented by the gTsang ruler to rTag brtan Phun tshogs gling, the seat of Tāranātha. Interestingly, despite generally holding the view that Tibetan religious artefacts and commentarial works are not necessarily of less value than Indian ones, Tāranātha took pains to propagate the Indian origin of the statue, which served the goal of promoting his Jo nang tradition in general and Phun tshogs gling monastery in particular.

is of Indian or Tibetan origin. There Tāranātha alludes to the general tendency to automatically give preference to both religious objects and works that have their origin in the Indic cultural sphere over those that have originated in the Tibetic one. Interestingly, he simultaneously insists on the Indic origin of the Jo bo statue and argues that Tibetic artefacts and commentarial works (which obviously excludes scriptural works that first made their appearance on Tibetan soil) are to be judged first and foremost on the basis of their quality and hence their soteriological benefit. Good Tibetic commentaries and statues are, according to him, by far preferable to mediocre (let alone inferior) Indic ones. In this way Tāranātha clearly gives scholars (and artists and craftsmen) from the Tibetic cultural sphere the legitimacy they had lacked since the time Buddhism was introduced on Tibetan soil from India and neighbouring areas, and for which they had been longing for centuries. He states:⁷¹

In regard to this [statue of] Lord [Śākya]muni—[originally] at the Bad rnam [temple, and now] installed in sNe gdong rtse—some great masters without sufficient experience [in such matters] considered [it] to be a Tibetan bronze [statue], and therefore did not accept [it as authentic]. Yet just because [a statue] is Tibetan, it is not necessarily bad. With regard to doctrinal works, too, it has been obviously proven that the best Tibetan commentaries are better than Indian commentaries that are mediocre or worse. [In regard to statues, too], those from the time of the Tibetan Dharma

For a discussion of this statue and the role it played in Tāranātha's propagation of his tradition, see Quintman 2017.

⁷¹ *Tā ra nā tha'i rang rnam* (A, 488.1–3; B, 476.7–477.3; C, vol. 2: 89.15–20): **Bad** [B: *bad*, A: *gad*, C: *dab*] *rnam pa'i Jo bo Thub pa 'di sNe gdong rtse na bzhugs pa la' bla chen 'ga' zhig gis kyang nyams kyis ma chod* [A: *kyis ma chod*, BC: *kyi mchod*] *par bod li* [A: *li*, BC: *mi*] *yin pa'i lugs su byas nas ma 'dod par 'dug' lar bod ma yin pa tsam gyis ngan par lta* [em.: *lta*, ABC: *ta*] *mi 'gro' chos kyang rgya 'grel 'bring man chad las bod 'grel bzang shos rnam bzang bar mngon sum* [A: *sum*, BC: *gsum*] *gyis grub' rgya lha 'bring man chad las bod chos rgyal gyi dus kyi rnam bzo sgros dang byin rlabs gnyis kar bzang'.*

Authenticity and Authentication

Kings are superior, [in terms of] both artistic style and beneficial power, to Indian statues that are mediocre or worse.

The second passage is taken from Tāranātha's *'Khor lo chen po'i sgrub thabs*, in a context discussing the authenticity of the nine main cycles of Vajrapāṇi of the gSar ma traditions,⁷² whose Indic origin has been doubted by some. Tāranātha makes it clear that there is strong evidence that these nine cycles are of great soteriological benefit and that they are undoubtedly of Indic origin. He then argues that there is no harm in admitting into these cycles Tibetan compositions consisting of oral instructions as part of the miscellaneous minor ancillary works. He finally explicitly reiterates the idea that Tibetic works that are soteriologically beneficial are at least as good as Indic ones and at times even better. He states:⁷³

⁷² These nine main cycles are specified by Tāranātha in the previous paragraph in the *'Khor lo chen po'i sgrub thabs* (C, 65: 1–4) as follows: (1) *'bro mar lugs kyi skor sgon can du grags pa*, (2) *'byung po 'dul byed kyi skor*, (3) *gtum po khyung sham can gyi skor*, (4) *u tsa'i chos skor*, (5) *'khor lo chen po'i skor*, (6) *mdo lugs su grags pa'i skor*, (7) *rdo rje be con gyi skor*, (8) *rdo rje bde khrod kyi skor*, and (9) *rdo rje me lce'i skor*. Tāranātha points out that in addition to these nine main cycles, there also exist other minor works, which spread during the Early Period, such as those composed by Buddhaguhya and others, and also some from the Later Period of Propagation.

⁷³ *'Khor lo chen po'i sgrub thabs* (A, 912.2–913.3; B, 87.5–88.5; C, 65.6–66.3): *che ba dgu po rnams* [AC: *rnams*, B: *om.*] *ci rigs pa la mkhas pa mang pos dpyad gzhir mdzad pa* | *spyir rgya gzhung yin min the tshom can yang 'ga' re snang mod kyi* | *chos skor 'di rnams bod yul du shin tu grags che zhing* | *thams cad la nus mthu mngon gyur du thob pa'i gsang sngags pa mang du byung ba kho na yin pas* | *byin rlabs kyi gzi byin ches 'bar ba sha stag tu 'dug pas* | *skur ba nam du yang mi btab cing* | *gus pa bskyed par bya'o* | | *der ma zad che ba* [BC: *che ba*, A: *tshab*] *dgu po rnams la'ang 'ga' zhig la rgyud gzhung gnyis ka dang* | *kha cig la sgrub thabs la sogs pa'i gzhung 'ga' zung re* [AB: *re*, C: *de*] *rgya dpe las bsgyur ba rtsod med du yod pa kho na yin pas* | *cha lag gi gzhung phran thor bu pa* [BC: *pa*, A: *ba*] *rnams la* [AC: *la*, B: *pa*] *bod rtsom yod du chug* [AC: *chug*, B: *bcug*] *kyang zhal gdams yin pa'i phyir 'gal ba* [AC: *ba*, B: *pa*] *med de* [BC: *de*, A: *do*] | *chos skyong mgon po so so'i gdams ngag* [BC:

With regard to some [texts of] (*ci rigs pa*) the nine [main cycles of Vajrapāṇi of the gSar ma traditions], many scholars have considered them dubious (*dpyad gzhi*). In general, there appear to be some doubtful [cases among them] as to whether [they] are Indian compositions or not. And yet these doctrinal cycles are extremely popular in Tibet, and in all [these traditions] have arisen nothing if not many *mantrikas* who evidently have achieved ability and powers, so that they are all blazing with the great splendour of beneficial power. Therefore, [one] should never disparage [these cycles] but generate faith [in them]. Further, these nine great [cycles] are simply [and] undisputedly translations from Sanskrit manuscripts, in some [cases] both *tantras* and [related] works, in some [other cases] merely some [related] works, such as *sādhanas*. Therefore there is no contradiction even if [one] admits Tibetan compositions into the [collections of] miscellaneous minor ancillary works, inasmuch as [they] consist of oral instructions. It is similar to collections (*dpe bum*)⁷⁴ of instructions regarding the different

*ngag, A: dag] gi dpe bum bzhin no || yang byin rlabs med pa'i rgya gzhung las byin rlabs yod pa'i bod gzhung ngo mtshar chung rgyu [A: rgyu, BC: ngu] med pa'ang mkhyen par mdzod || khyad par du 'khor lo chen po'i chos skor 'di rnams mchog tu byin rlabs che zhing | rgyud gzhung rtsa ba [AC: ba, B: pa] rnams rtsod med yid ches can yin pas | sngon gyi mkhas pa 'ga' zhig gis zur za tsam gsungs zer yang snying po med | **bCom ldan Rig ral dang | Kun mkhyen chen po Jo nang pa dang | Bu ston rin po che dang | Chos rje bla ma bSod nams rgyal mtshan dang | rJe btsun Tsong kha pa [AB: pa, C: ba] chen po dang | Bo dong pa [A: pa, BC: ba] chen po sogs Bod [AC: bod, B: pod] yul rang gi shing rta chen po phyogs re tsam ma yin [AB: ma yin, C: yin] pa gzhung lugs thams cad la chos kyi spyang dang ldan pa rnams kyis chos 'di la rtsis su mdzad pas rtsod pa dang bral bar gyur to ||***

⁷⁴ This term for “collection” can be found in various spellings, including most commonly *be'u bum*, the first member of this compound being also spelt *be*, *pe*, or *dpe*, and the second *'bum*, with different possible combinations. For a recent discussion of this term and its range of referents, including an overview of previous discussions, see Cuevas 2010: 165–167.

protector *dharmapālas* [of each tradition, which includes Tibetan oral instructions alongside Indic works]. Moreover, you should know that Tibetan works that are endowed with beneficial power are not less amazing than Indian works that have no beneficial power. In particular, these cycles of the *'Khor lo chen po* are great [in terms of their] supreme beneficial power, and the basic (*rtsa ba: mūla*) Tantric scriptures and [related] works are undisputed and trustworthy. Therefore, although some indirect denunciation (*zur za*) was expressed by several early [Tibetan] scholars, [this criticism] has no substance. Some of our great pioneers in Tibet—including bCom ldan Rig ral (1227–1305; BDRC: P1217), Kun mkhyen chen po Jo nang pa [Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan] (1292–1361; BDRC: P139), Bu ston rin po che, Chos rje Bla ma (=? Bla ma dam pa) bSod nams rgyal mtshan (? 1312–1375; BDRC: P1226), rJe btsun Tsong kha pa chen po (1357–1419; BDRC: P64), and Bo dong ba chen po (1376–1451; BDRC: P2627)—who, endowed with the Dharma-Eye in regard to all textual traditions, are not in the least bit biased (*phyogs re tsam ma yin pa*), cherished these doctrinal [cycles], and thus they are undisputably [authentic].

Moreover, Tāranātha not only argues in favour of the soteriological benefits of autochthonous Tibetan compositions, but even encourages Tibetans to compose commentarial works in the future in order to fill in the gaps he sees in the available Indic literature. In his *Rim lnga'i 'grel chen*, in the context of discussing commentarial literature related to the *Pañcakrama*, he states:⁷⁵

⁷⁵ *Rim lnga'i 'grel chen* (A, 937.7–938.4; B, 870.7–871.4; C, 611.8–16): *khyad par gzhung 'di la Nag po dam tshig rdo rje dang | brTson 'grus bzang po dang | Kha che La kṣmi dang | A bha yā ka ra dang | Thub pa dpal bzang po dang | sKal ldan grags pa'i 'grel chung dang | Klu byang la kha 'phangs pa'i 'grel chen Nor bu'i phreng ba sogs rgya 'grel du grags pa mang po yod kyang | rgyud don dpyis phyin pa rang dkon par snang zhing | bod rnying pa rnams kyi yig sna mang du snang ba'ang de dag dang 'dra la | Bod du phyis Rim lnga'i 'khrīd yig dang | spyi don mtha' chod kyi bshad pa mang du byung yang | gzhung 'di la 'bru ṭik [AC: ṭik, B: ṭi ka] gsal po byed mkhan ma byung*

In particular, there are numerous [works] known to be Indian commentaries on this work (i.e., the *Pañcakrama*), including [those] by Kṛṣṇasamayavajra (D1841/P2698), Vīryabhadra (D1830/P2699), the Kashmiri Lakṣmī (D1842/P2705), Abhayākara[gupta] (D1831/P2700), and Muniśrībhadrā (D1813/P2691), the small commentary by Bhavyakīrti (D1838/P2696), and the large commentary titled *Mañimālā* ascribed to Nāgabodhi (D1840/P2697). Nonetheless, [those among them that] thoroughly fathomed the meaning of the *tantra* seem to be rare. [The situation] with the various old Tibetan works that appeared in great numbers is similar. And although later on instruction manuals and exegetical literature consisting in general outlines and analyses relating to the *Pañcakrama* appeared in Tibet in great numbers, no one elucidating this scripture by way of a word-commentary has [thus far] appeared. Therefore, it would be enormously beneficial if at a later point in time some upholders of this [*Pañcakrama*] tradition were to appear here [in Tibet]!

To be noted, however, is that Tāranātha, in the same work and context, also makes it very clear that Tibetan compositions, no matter how good they may be, cannot be regarded as authentic (i.e., as being of an Indic origin). He states:⁷⁶

In general, in this region [of Tibet] there are indeed around fifty [works] known as Indian treatises that are based on this doctrinal work [i.e., *Pañcakrama*]. However, [while among

bas [BC: ba, A: pas] | lugs 'di'i srol ka 'dzin pa dag cig phyi ma'i dus 'dir 'byung srid na shin tu phan par yod do | |.

⁷⁶ Rim lnga'i 'grel chen (A, 7.7–8.2; B, 209.5–7; C, 7.18–8.4): spyir phyogs 'di na chos 'di la brten pa'i rgya gzhung du grags pa lnga bcu tsam yod mod | **rDo rje sems dpa'i sgrub thabs** la sogs pa **Zla grags** la kha 'phangs te brtsams pa dang | **'Phags pa lha dang Klu byang** la kha 'phangs pa'i gzhung 'grel yang mang du yod pa dang | rgyud phyi ma'i 'grel pa **Na ro pas** mdzad zer ba bod kyi mkhas pa zhig gis brtsams pa sogs gzhung 'grel gzhan rnams ni legs bshad kyang mang du yod mod | tshad ldan kho nar khas blang du btub pa yang ma yin no | |.

them] there are [indeed] compositions ascribed to Candrakīrti, such as the *Vajrasattvasādhana* (D1814/P2678), and many commentarial treatises ascribed to Āryadeva (D1803/P2668–D1808/P2673) and Nāgabodhi (D1809/P2674–D1812/P2677), there are also many other commentarial treatises—such as the commentary claimed to have been composed by Nāropa on the *uttaratantra* (D443/P82) but which was [actually] composed by a Tibetan scholar—that cannot be accepted as actually being authentic [in terms of an Indic provenance], even though they are coherent expositions.

One should perhaps add here that while both the “genetic–diachronic” and “generic–synchronic” criteria are legitimate, and were in fact already employed in one way or another within the Indic cultural sphere, the main question to be asked is whether the advocates of the “genetic–diachronic” criterion also applied it as consistently and with similar rigor in the case of works central to their own tradition. The answer is probably “no.” It should be also added that it was not pure doctrinal issues alone that played a role in this regard, but that social and political concerns, too, were important factors behind polemics surrounding various religious issues, including authenticity of scriptural and non-scriptural works;⁷⁷ as José Cabezón has put it, “[a] desire for reputation, patronage, power, and followers is in some cases more evident as the driving force than a desire for the truth.”⁷⁸

2.3.2. Authentication Based on the Quality of Translation

Given that the Tibetan Buddhist Canon consists of Indic works in Tibetan translation, the quality of translation has occasionally

⁷⁷ See Vitali 2020, for a recent discussion of the tension during the early years of the Later Period of Propagation of Buddhism in Tibet (ca. 975–1160) between the lay Tantra practitioners (*sngags pa*) dwelling in lHa sa, who adopted particularly controversial practices, and the members of the ordained community, who sought to revive the monastic tradition in central Tibet after having returned from mDo Kham.

⁷⁸ See Cabezón 2007: 9–10.

been linked to the question of authenticity, in this case, however, in terms of a correct transmission of the work's content. As I have discussed this issue on a previous occasion,⁷⁹ it need not be elaborated upon here in detail. Like attempts to determine authenticity in terms of an Indic provenance on the basis of style, ones to measure authenticity and validity of content as reflected in the quality of translation are not without their problems and limitations. The absence, on the one hand, of a Sanskrit original of the work in question (let alone the specific Sanskrit manuscript upon which the translation in question was based), and very often also the lack of (sufficient) knowledge of the source language (i.e., commonly Sanskrit) on the part of the naysayers, on the other, made these "quality controls" very questionable, and in fact such claims are altogether unverifiable. Moreover, much prestige was at stake when undertaking translations, and indeed multiple factors—including personal, sectarian, political, and financial—were in play. Due to the policy, furthermore, of not including in the Canon what is referred to as "duplicates," that is, most commonly various translations of the same work, editors—first and foremost Bu ston (who apparently was among the first to systematically carry out this practice) and his successors—were bound to choose which translation was the "best." I am not aware of any discussion by Tibetan masters and scholars as to what the criteria were according to which one was to select the "best" translation. However, to judge from the reality on the ground, it seems that, as a rule, the (alleged) retranslations or revised translations were more or less automatically preferred over the original, older translations. This policy in itself gives the impression that sectarian bias or, at best, leanings toward one's own circle were at work.⁸⁰ This issue, in any case, should be taken

⁷⁹ See Almogi 2016b.

⁸⁰ The issue of editorial policies regarding duplicates will be discussed in detail in Almogi (forthcoming-a).

into consideration in view of the fact that the truthfulness of claims regarding retranslations and revisions is often doubtful.⁸¹

2.4. Authentication Based on the Scripture's Structure

Last but not least is the authentication criterion based on the structure of the work. This mainly applies to scriptures—written text containing a discourse believed to be by the Buddha (or a *buddha*)—but also upon occasion to treatises. Commonly, a scripture, be it a *sūtra* or a *tantra*, is expected by the Buddhist tradition at large to contain certain structural textual elements, particularly a preamble (*nidāna*: *gleng gzhi*) at its beginning and verses of gratification (*anumodanā*: *rjes su yi rang/s*) or applaud-cum-gratification (*mthun 'gyur rjes su yi rang/s*: *abhy anumodanā*) at its end. The preamble commonly starts with the phrase “Thus have I heard” (*evaṃ mayā śrutam*: *'di skad bdag gis thos pa*), which is followed by a description of the setting, including a specification of the time and place in which the teaching was given, the names of the persons involved, and so forth. In the course of time, the existence of these structural textual elements, particularly the preamble, came to be considered by the various Indic Buddhist traditions one sign of a work's authenticity. It is not the concern of the present study to discuss the numerous statements and deliberations found in Indic sources that attempt to justify this stance but it is perhaps worth mentioning here in passing, as already pointed out by Schopen, that the historicity of the

⁸¹ Part Two of the present study is solely devoted to the topic of the authenticity of colophons in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, including translator/translation colophons. For my earlier discussions concerning the authenticity of translator/translation colophons in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, see Almogi 2008. The topic has also been touched upon in Almogi 2016b and Almogi 2016a. For an overview of the phenomenon of Tibetan colophons in general, see Wangchuk (forthcoming-b), where references to previous studies on the topic are likewise provided.

information provided in these preambles is questionable. This problem is, however, irrelevant to the present discussion.⁸²

Having inherited this stance, Tibetan scholars, when attempting to determine the authenticity of scriptures, made the above-mentioned structural elements one of the things they looked for. Bu ston in his religious history, for example, alludes to this issue briefly on two occasions. The first instance is found in the context of discussing the characteristics of the Word of the Buddha (*bka' la mtshan nyid*)—in the explanation of “that which has been granted/permitted” (being the third sub-subpoint of the sixth subpoint “dominant condition” (*bdag rkyen*))—where he states the following:⁸³

The third (i.e., “that which has been granted/permitted”): These are the preamble (*gleng gzhi: nidāna*), the [actual] composition (*mtshams sbyor: bandha*),⁸⁴ and the [concluding verses of] applaud-cum-gratification (*mthun 'gyur [rjes su] yi rangs: abhy anumodanā*). This is because the following has been granted/permitted in the *Dharmasaṃgītiśūtra* (D238/P904): “Monks, one should [first] declare ‘Thus have I heard’ and [then] compile/codify the Teachings,” and “One should present [them] coherently and in proper order.”

⁸² See Schopen 1997, where a passage from the *Kṣudrakavastu* is discussed, in which the problem is addressed of what to do when some of the necessary details, such as place and persons' names, are lost, and where it is suggested that names no longer known be replaced with other names.

⁸³ *Bu ston chos 'byung* (22.25–23.2): ... *gleng gzhi dang mtshams sbyor dang mthun 'gyur [em.: 'gyur, Text: sbyor] yi rangs rnam te | Chos yang dag par sdud pa las | dge slong dag 'di skad bdag gis thos pa zhes gyis la chos bsdu bar bya'o zhes dang | 'brel ba dang go rims yang bstan par bya'o zhes rjes su guang ba'i phyir ro |*

⁸⁴ This middle part is also referred to by Bu ston as “the actual discourse” (*mdo dngos*) and “the doctrine to be communicated” (*bshad bya'i chos*). For the former, see the following cited passage; for the latter, see the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (13.15).

The sentences “Monks, one should [first] declare ‘Thus have I heard’ and [then] compile/codify the Teachings,” and “One should present [them] coherently and in proper order” do not seem to be exact citations from the *Dharmasaṃgītisūtra*, but rather ones that simply reflect its spirit. Similar passages are found in several Indian commentaries, including, for example, Ratnākaraśānti’s *Hevajratāntra* commentary, the *Muktāvalī*.⁸⁵ It could therefore well be that Bu ston is echoing here one of these Indian commentators rather than directly citing the *Dharmasaṃgītisūtra*.

The second instance is found in the context of discussing the statement that “the Sublime Dharma is wholesome in the beginning, wholesome in the middle, and wholesome in the end” (*dam pa’i chos ni thog mar dge ba | bar du dge ba | mtha mar dge ba |*). Bu ston puts forward two interpretations of it, one in the context of scriptures (or more specifically: *sūtras*) and another in the context of treatises:⁸⁶

Some explain [in the context of scriptures (or: *sūtras*)] that [this statement refers to the following] three: the preamble at the beginning of the discourse (or: *sūtra*), the actual discourse (or: *sūtra*) in the middle, and the [verses of] applaud-cum-gratification at its end. Ācārya Kalyāṇadeva explains [in the context of treatises] that [it refers to the following] three: the expression of reverence at the

⁸⁵ See the *Muktāvalī* (2.12–13) *tasmād ihāpi nidānavākyam evedam, uktaṃ ca bhagavatā—“evaṃ mayā śrutam iti bhikṣavo mama dharmāḥ saṅgātavyaḥ,” ity atah saṅgītikāra āha—evaṃ mayā śrutam iti |*; Tib. (D, 221b1; P, 262b4–5): *de bas na dang po’i gleng gzhi’i tshig ‘di yang bcom ldan ‘das kyis gsungs pa nyid de | dge slong dag nga’i chos rnams ni ‘di skad bdag gis thos pa zhes bsdu bar bya’o zhes gsungs so | | de bas na sdud par byed pas smras pa | ‘di skad bdag gis thos pa zhes so | |*.

⁸⁶ *Bu ston chos ‘byung* (33.16–18): *kha cig mdo’i mgor gleng gzhi | bar du mdo dngos | mthar mthun ‘gyur yi rang ste gsum la ‘chad | slob dpon dGe ba’i lhas bstan bcos kyī thog mar mchod brjod | bar du bstan bcos kyī lus | mtha’ mar bsngo ba gsum la bshad do | |*.

beginning of a treatise, the body of the treatise in the middle, and the dedication at [its] end.

This having been said, it should be added that the tradition took pains to explain why certain scriptures, particularly *tantras*, are authentic despite the fact that they lack, for example, a preamble (on this, see below, § 3.3.). It seems, in fact, that Tibetan literature contains more cases in which attempts are made to prove a scripture's authenticity despite its lacking a preamble, for example, than cases in which the authenticity of a scripture is disputed because it lacks one. A curious case worth mentioning here briefly is the transformation of Mañjuśrīmitra's *Bodhicittabhāvanā* (D2578/P3405) into a *tantra*, where at the final stage of the process the work was enlarged with additional passages, including a preamble, in order to lend it the look of a scripture.⁸⁷

3. Polemical and Apologetic Strategies

Polemics and apologetics have always been a part of discussions surrounding authenticity—be it of doctrines, practices, or works—from the very beginning of the history of Buddhism within the Tibetan cultural sphere. Much has already been written on this topic, but what I wish to do in the following is to merely focus on strategies (and perhaps tactics) used by scholars of the Tibetan tradition in their polemical and apologetic discussions surrounding the issues concerning authenticity of works in terms of their Indic provenance (and thus also their canonicity), while refraining from discussing polemics that are purely concerned with doctrines and practices.⁸⁸ In my employment of the word

⁸⁷ See Almogi 2019: 14–15.

⁸⁸ To be noted, however, is that while one could indeed identify works, doctrines, and practices as the three major foci of Tibetan religious polemics, inasmuch as these three themes represent the main points of polemical disputes concerning authenticity (as suggested, for example, in Cabezón 2007: 16 and elsewhere), such a distinction is, strictly speaking, rather impractical, since these three topics often overlap

“polemics” in the religious context, I follow, by and large, the (*de facto*) definition offered by Ernestine van der Wall in her article on ways of polemicizing within the Christian traditions:⁸⁹

In brief, religious polemics is about maintaining the truth, whatever that truth may be. From a functionalist perspective we may say that people are concerned about preserving their religious, ecclesiastical and theological identity or the identity of the group (church, denomination) to which they belong. So we may regard polemics as a dynamic way of demarcating identities and boundaries.

As regards the word “apologetics” in the following discussion, despite some attempts to differentiate between polemics and apologetics—for example, the proposal by Friedrich Schleiermacher to consider apologetics as battling with external foes and polemics as concerning internal criticism—I completely agree with van der Wall that in the context of discussing “tactics and tools of religious polemics” such a distinction seems to be irrelevant.⁹⁰ While the strategies used by scholars of the Tibetan tradition in their polemical and apologetic discussions surrounding the authenticity of works are no doubt multifarious, I shall focus in the following on six such strategies that are in my view the major ones, namely, (1) the *argumentum ad hominem*, (2) the ridicule argumentative device, (3) the historical–philological approach, (4) the “other-religions” argument, (5) self-critique, and (6) the development of complex, multifaceted narratives regarding the appearance of scriptures, particularly Tantric ones.⁹¹

within a single instance of religious dissent, so that a clear separation is impossible.

⁸⁹ See van der Wall 2004: 402.

⁹⁰ See van der Wall 2004: 406, 413.

⁹¹ For a very informative overview on Tibetan polemical literature, including polemics on authenticity of doctrinal works, see Cabezón 2007: 2–33, which contains a brief discussion on polemics in general, and overviews of polemics in Tibet and of Tibetan polemical literature in particular, including references to some previous studies on the topic, which thus need not be repeated here. For a brief discussion of

3.1. The *Argumentum ad Hominem*

The *argumentum ad hominem*—a form of criticism consisting in personal attacks of an opponent (i.e., his character or qualities) rather than addressing the issue itself—has been very popular in religious (as in other forms of) polemic,⁹² and Tibetan Buddhism is no exception in this regard.⁹³ The *argumentum ad hominem*, being a clear case of an informal fallacy,⁹⁴ should be in fact regarded as a rhetorical device rather than an argumentative one. The most straightforward form of it is perhaps the version referred to as “abusive *ad hominem*” in which terms of abuse are extensively employed. Within the Tibetic cultural sphere, the use of this rhetorical device is very well known in the context of polemics surrounding the authenticity of Revealed Treasures, where the Treasure Revealers are personally attacked with pejorative terms and derogatory expressions of various kinds. One of the most famous, or rather infamous, Tibetan scholars in this regard is

apologetic literature by rNying ma authors and their sympathizers, see Smith 2001: 16–17. See also *ibid.*: 237–247, where the development of sectarian division within the Tibetic cultural sphere—which, among other things, also led to sectarian-based polemics surrounding the authenticity of works—is discussed as the background to the arising of the Ris med tradition.

⁹² For a brief discussion of the employment of *ad hominem* in the Christian tradition, see van der Wall 2004: 406–407.

⁹³ Cabezón’s claim that “there are probably few cultures that have mastered the art of the polemical insult to the extent that Tibetans have” needs to be corroborated through an in-depth comparative study. See Cabezón 2007: 17.

⁹⁴ For an overview of formal and informal fallacies in general, and the three versions of the *ad hominem* fallacy—abusive, circumstantial, and *tu quoque*—see Hansen 2018. On informal fallacies, including the various types of *ad hominem*, see also Walton 1999. While the first two versions—abusive and circumstantial—will be briefly discussed in the following with some examples in the Tibetan context, the third version—*tu quoque*—which consists in rejecting a view because its espouser does not consistently adhere to it, seems to be less relevant to the current discussion.

Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal (1197–1263/64; BDRC: P1025). In his aforementioned *sNgags log sun 'byin*, a work devoted to refuting what he calls “false Mantric [works]” (*sngags log*), he refers, for example, to the Treasure Revealer Gu ru Chos dbang as being possessed by a *māra* (*bdud*), and as suffering from leprosy (*mdze*) and psychotic fits (*smyo 'bogs*).⁹⁵ However, the *ad hominem* rhetoric was not confined only to Treasure Revealers, but was also employed in the case of other doubtful works for which canonical status has been claimed, or of compositions based on such works. The (alleged) authors of such works were often referred to as “old Tibetan men” (*bod rgan*), an expression which in this context is clearly pejorative.⁹⁶ Chag lo tsā ba, for example, refers to the authors of some such works as old Tibetan men who have had evil spirits enter their mind/heart (*snying du 'dre zhugs*) and who are motivated by greed for food and drink (*zas skom*), and other material goods (*zang zing*); as Tibetans with few beneficial resources (*bsod nams chung ba*); and as persons under the influence of a *māra*, who finds delight in evil (*nag phyogs la dga' ba'i bdud*). In an attempt to substantiate (and/or justify) his harsh and abusive words, he refers his readers to the chapter in the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* which contains an analysis of the “deeds of a *māra*.”⁹⁷ In a

⁹⁵ See Doctor 2005: 32 and 202–203 n. 77, for, respectively, an English translation and the Tibetan text of the pertinent passage from Chag lo tsā ba's *sNgags log sun 'byin*, where even a Nepalese/Newari, one Ka ka ru 'dzin, is also described as being possessed by unfavourable beings. See also *ibid.*: 33 and 202–203 n. 80, where, respectively, an English translation and the Tibetan text of a passage from the *Chos log sun 'byin* ascribed to Bu ston (26.4–5) is provided, in which Gu ru Chos dbang is likewise described as being under the influence of a *māra*.

⁹⁶ For the usage of the pejorative term *bod rgan* in the context of anti-Bon polemics, see Martin 1997a: 285 (English translation), 301 n. 97 (Tibetan text). See also Wangchuk 2016: 99–100 and Bajetta 2019: 14, where a reference to the usage of the term by Sa paṅ in regard to the author of the **Sarovadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* is provided.

⁹⁷ *Chag lo sngags log sun 'byin* (11.4–6): 'di rnams bod rgan rnams kyi snying du 'dre zhugs nas | 'jig rten 'dir zas skom dang | zang zing 'dod pa dang | bod

similar manner, the same author describes sPa gor Vairocana as having composed rDzogs chen works while possessed by Devaputramāra (*lha'i bu'i bdud*).⁹⁸ To be noted is that although adherents of the Treasure tradition were most often the objects of such words of abuse, mostly from outside (but occasionally also from within) their own tradition, gSar ma scholars have also received vilifying treatment from their opponents (frequently, but not solely, in regard to doctrinal matters) from both inside and outside their own school.⁹⁹

Naturally, the adherents of the Treasure tradition did not remain silent. However, they seem to have often resorted to the rather more subtle, so-called “circumstantial ad hominem,” often accusing critics of being motivated by sectarianism, so that any evaluation of their criticism had to take into consideration the possibility that they—as adherents of opposing, and in fact competing, traditions—may well have been biased, or even motivated by jealousy.¹⁰⁰

3.2. The Ridicule Argumentative Device

Ridicule has been another popular device in polemics. Van der Wall has described it as “one of the most influential polemical devices of all ages,” and added that “[i]t was ridicule, not reason, which was the most harmful weapon advanced against

rnams bsod nams chung ba dang nag phyogs la dga' ba'i bdud kyi mthu yin | phar phyin gyi bdud brtags pa'i le'u las shes par bya'o | |.

⁹⁸ *Chag lo sngags log sun 'byin* (10.1): *yang sPa gor Bāi ro tsa na bya ba lha'i bu'i bdud zhugs bas rdzogs chen lta ba'i mdo lnga bya ba brtsams...*

⁹⁹ See, for example, Cabezón 2007: 17, where an example of similar vilifying words directed toward Tsong kha pa by the First Paṅ chen bla ma mKhas grub dGe legs dpal bzang (1385–1438; BDRC: P55) is given.

¹⁰⁰ See, for example, Doctor 2005: 34 and 203 n. 83, for, respectively, an English translation and the Tibetan text of a passage from Ratna gling pa's apology titled *gTer 'byung chen mo gsal ba'i sgron me*, in which Ratna gling pa refers to critics of the Treasure tradition as haughty (*dregs pa can*) and sectarian (*phyogs zhen can*).

religion.”¹⁰¹ In the Tibetan context, the use of ridicule was widespread among the critics of Revealed Treasures, Ancient Tantras, and other controversial works, doctrines, or practices. Revealed Treasures, for example, appear to have been ridiculed by some as being teachings that originated in the outer five elements—earth, wind, and so forth—rather than with the Buddha, and hence have been pejoratively called “earth teachings” (*sa chos*), “water teachings” (*chu chos*), “wind teachings” (*lung chos*), or “space/sky teachings” (*gnam chos*), and along the same lines “stone teachings” (*rdo chos*) or “wood/tree teachings” (*shing chos*), all alluding to the places of their claimed concealment-cum-revelation, and also obviously with an ironic nod to such existing expressions as “earth treasure” (*sa gter*), “sky teachings” (*gnam chos*), or “mind treasure” (*dgongs gter*).¹⁰² Another expression of ridicule often used by critics to refer to Revealed Treasures is *rdol chos*. The term has been often translated literally as, for example, “outbreak teachings,” “eruptive [teachings],” “teachings that burst forth,” or, in a play on words, “Pop[ular] Buddhism,”¹⁰³ but these literal translations clearly do

¹⁰¹ For a discussion of the use of ridicule in the Christian tradition, see van der Wall 2004: 410–411.

¹⁰² References to passages containing these expressions of ridicule (including English translations, Tibetan texts, and/or references to earlier publications) are provided, for example, in Doctor 2005: 34, 36, 203 n. 83, 205 n. 104; Martin 2001: 157; Kapstein 2000: 132–133.

¹⁰³ For the rendering “outbreak teachings,” see Martin 1996a: 41 and Martin 1996b: 172; for “eruptive [teachings],” see Martin 1996b: 190; for “teachings that burst forth,” see Doctor 2005: 34 and *passim*; and for “Pop[ular] Buddhism,” see Martin 1996b: 172, 179, 175, 188. The last of these is clearly a play on words attempting to reflect both the literal meaning of the component *rdol* (“pop”) and Martin’s understanding of the term as a whole to be referring to popular religious movements, or as he himself formulates it (Martin 1996b: 172) “in keeping with the etymological and the practical usage of the term.” See also the rendering “popular religious movements” in Davidson 2005: 330, which is clearly influenced by Martin 1996b. To be noted in this connection is also the term *rdol bon*, which is likewise used pejoratively in polemical discussion targeting the Bon religion. For a note on the usage of the terms *rdol chos*

not (sufficiently) convey the derisive nuances of this expression. The term undoubtedly suggests the absence of a valid transmission lineage that can be traced back all the way to the historical Buddha. I therefore tentatively suggest rendering it rather figuratively with the expression “out-of-the-blue teachings,” which I hope better conveys the way in which such teachings have been conceived by their critics in terms of their origin and at the same time the ridicule this expression harbours. To be noted, however, that the term (in a paraphrased form) has also been used in a positive sense.¹⁰⁴ Expressions of ridicule were

and *rdol bon* in Tibetan polemical literature, including some other common (mis)spellings, see Martin 1996b: 172 n. 3. Worth citing here is the following passage wherein Martin relates his understanding of the terms *rdol chos* and *rdol bon* as referring to popular religious movements (Martin 1996b: 190): “I think that *Rdol-chos*, as well as *Rdol-bon* are referring to religious movements that ‘break out’ (*rdol*) among lay people (which may then go on to attract monks to their movements), hence popular religious phenomena as contrasted and in a state of dialectical tension with the mainstream ‘official’ religion, with its strong concerns for its own undisturbed continuity. At one level, labelling these teachings of Bon and Chos ‘eruptive’ (*rdol*) is also a way of denying them any (legitimate) historical background.”

¹⁰⁴ As has already been pointed out in Almogi 1997: 8 n. 6, a paraphrased form of the term *rdol chos* is found in two citations contained in bDud ‘joms ‘jigs bral ye shes rdo rje’s religious history (*chos ‘byung*) where it is employed positively, describing the natural outflow of doctrinal Treasures: “Accordingly, it has been stated that Doctrinal Treasures will flow out from the sphere of the minds of sublime individuals.” See the bDud ‘joms chos ‘byung (522.1): *rjes su mthun par ‘phags pa’i gang zag rnam la dgongs pa’i klong nas chos kyi gter kha brdol du yod par gsungs te*|. Cf. the English translation in Gyurme Dorje & Kapstein 1991: 748. And in another instance: “In the *sūtra* it is stated:

If [one] achieves the confidence of certainty regarding the meaning,

One hundred thousand doctrinal Treasures will [spontaneously] burst forth from [one’s] mind.

See *ibid.* (522.3): ... *mdo las| don la nges pa’i gding rnyed na|| sems las chos gter ‘bum phrag brdol||*. Cf. the English translation in Gyurme Dorje &

also employed by Sa skya paṇḍi ta Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182–1251; BDR: P1056) in his *sDom gsum rab dbye*, to name another example, in regard to scriptural or doctrinal traditions considered by him inauthentic. These include phrases like “books that have sprung out of treasuries” (*gter nas byung ba'i glegs bam*), “doctrinal traditions stolen from elsewhere” / “plagiarized doctrinal traditions” (*gzhan nas brkus pa'i chos lugs*), the oxymoron “composed scriptures” (*brtsams chos*)—we have encountered similar terms above on several occasions, all used in contrast to what are believed to be true teachings/scriptures, considered divine revelations as opposed to compositions, which are by definition human-made products—“dream teachings/scriptures” / “teachings/scriptures [originating in] dreams” (*rmi lam chos*), and “memorized [fabricated] doctrinal traditions” (*blo bzung ma yi chos lugs*).¹⁰⁵ Also Bu ston, who appears to have tried hard to remain unbiased and refrain from words of abuse in his function as an editor of the edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon compiled at Zhwa lu (or at least parts of it), has not always succeeded in doing so, as demonstrated by his use of another oxymoron, namely, “genuinely fake” / “an authentic forgery” (*rdzun ma yang dag pa zhig*) in regard to the aforementioned controversial **Sarva-dharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* and its likewise controversial commentary.¹⁰⁶

3.3. The Historical–Philological Approach

Historical and philological argumentative approaches, as well as scientific ones, have frequently been used in polemics between believers and non-believers, particularly in the context of theist religions, in order to prove or disprove the validity of various

Kapstein 1991: 748. It is very well possible that the pejorative term *rdol chos* has its root in such statements.

¹⁰⁵ For the pertinent verse lines from the *sDom gsum rab dbye* (vv. 507–509), see Rhoton 2002: 162 and 321 for an English translation and the Tibetan text, respectively. These verses have been cited and translated in Martin 1997a: 268, Martin 2001: 156, and Doctor 2005: 33.

¹⁰⁶ See Wangchuk 2016: 100, and Bajetta 2019: 14.

religious scriptures or claims.¹⁰⁷ In this particular context, arguments brought forth by non-believers have been by and large presented as logical, substantiated by historical and scientific evidence, while those brought forward by believers have often been presented as ahistorical and unscientific, and thus unfounded, being, from the non-believers' perspective, permeated by superstition, mythology, and blind faith. However, the fact that faith is one of the predominant aspects of any religion clearly indicates the limitations faced by any calls for, or else claims made on the basis of, reason corroborated by historical and scientific evidence. This of course raises the fundamental question as to how a non-believer scholar of any given religion is to approach and address various religious phenomena within the framework of his or her research. This complex and fascinating question, however, will have to be reserved for a separate occasion. Here we are primarily concerned with the issue of scholarship operating between faith and reason, that is, with that of the employment of reason substantiated by historical, philological, and (when applicable) even scientific evidence from the point of view of a believer-scholar, or in other words, within the religious tradition itself. (It remains to be seen to what extent our discussion is also relevant to interfaith dialogue.)

Needless to say, within religions, despite the fact that they are *Weltanschauungen* involving faith, there are adherents who have availed themselves—alongside the above-mentioned *ad hominem* and the ridicule polemical devices—of more valid types of arguments, thereby resorting to historical, philological, and even what may be regarded as scientific evidence; and Buddhism, once again, is no exception in this regard. Tibetan Buddhist masters, like their counterparts in other religious traditions, have often employed history in their polemical and apologetic discourses, and the number of works belonging to the history-cum-apology genre that have been written within the Tibetic cultural sphere

¹⁰⁷ For the application of history in polemics between Christians and atheists, and within the different Christian confessions as well, see van der Wall 2004: 411–412.

clearly testifies to this fact. History has been employed in religious polemics as, to once again use van der Wall's words, a "weapon of scholars, fighting one another with the 'sword of scholarship'."¹⁰⁸ How much the historical, philological, and scientific arguments employed in such religious polemics, in general, and in apologetic histories, in particular, could be considered objective and reliable from the point of view of a modern scholar is a legitimate, and in fact an important, question. However, this question can probably be only selectively answered, on the basis of a close inquiry of each case.¹⁰⁹

In the context of polemics surrounding the authenticity and canonicity of Buddhist scriptures and treatises within the Tibetic cultural sphere, one finds ample examples of the historical-philological approach being employed. It has already been demonstrated in various ways that the main prerequisite for authenticity (and thus canonicity) has been the Indic origin of the work or doctrine in question, and the manifold evidence required for a determination has likewise been discussed. It was indeed these requirements that most shaped the employment of historical and philological arguments. The historical-philological argumentative device was the one most often employed by the editors of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon; generally, it seems, they refrained from using harsh and abusive terms in their catalogues when formulating arguments for excluding certain works from the Canon or when expressing doubts regarding others (unlike in their other works, where they felt freer to deliver their judgments in harsher words). The role of these editors as canon-makers will be dealt with in detail in a separate paper.¹¹⁰ Here I wish to merely provide some examples of the most common arguments

¹⁰⁸ See van der Wall 2004: 412.

¹⁰⁹ See Merriam-Webster, s.v. scientific method: "principles and procedures for the systematic pursuit of knowledge involving the recognition and formulation of a problem, the collection of data through observation and experiment, and the formulation and testing of hypotheses."

¹¹⁰ See Almogi (forthcoming-a).

employed by them that could be regarded as historical–philological. We know that already with the first compilation of the Canon in sNar thang monastery, the tendency has been to generally follow the aforementioned “genetic–diachronic” criterion, a policy that was followed by Bu ston, who seems to have even tightened its prerequisites. In the following, I shall therefore provide some examples from Rig ral’s catalogue, which represents the phase prior to the compilation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon in sNar thang, and to Bu ston’s catalogue to his Zhwa lu edition of the *bsTan ’gyur*, which became the basis for practically all five *bsTan ’gyur* editions accessible to date and their respective catalogues.

As pointed out above, one of the things that Tibetan scholars looked into when attempting to determine the authenticity of scriptures in terms of their origin was the structure of the work, which was expected to contain certain features considered standard for authentic scriptures (i.e., ones that originated within the Indic cultural sphere). Aware at the same time, however, that not all scriptures whose Indic origin was certain met these standards, they were obliged to provide an explanation for this state of affairs. A nice example is the explanation provided by Rig ral, who states in regard to *sūtras* the following:¹¹¹

Those [*sūtras*] that have neither a preamble (*gleng gzhi: nidāna*)—[consisting of] a dedication (*bsngo ba: pariṇāmana*), an aspirational wish (*smon lam: praṇidhāna*), auspicious [opening verses] (*bkra shis: maṅgala*), and so on—nor [concluding verses of] gratification (*rjes su yi rang: anumodanā*) are extracts from other large *sūtras*.

A similar explanation in regard to *tantras* is provided by him as follows:¹¹²

¹¹¹ *rGyan gyi nyi ’od* (256): *bsngo ba dang smon lam dang | bkra shis la sogs pa gleng* [R: *gleng*, N: *kleng*] *gzhi dang | rjes su yi* [*em.*: *yi*, RN: *yid*] *rang med pa rnams ni mdo chen po gzhan nas phyung ba yin no | |*. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

¹¹² *rGyan gyi nyi ’od* (256): *gleng* [R: *gleng*, N: *kleng*] *gzhi dang | rjes su yi* [*em.*: *yi*, RN: *yid*] *rang med pa rnams* [*em.*: *rnams*, NR: *rnam*] *ni | de dag gi*

Authenticity and Authentication

Those [*tantras*] that do not have a preamble and [concluding verses of] gratification either have been extracted from other [*tantras*, namely, from] their respective large [ur]-*tantras* or are explanatory *tantras*. Those that do have a preamble but not [verses of] gratification were in turn extracted from the upper [portion of their respective ur-*tantra*].

One concrete example in this regard is Tāranātha's remark in his commentary on the *Mahāmāyātāntra* concerning the question as to why this *tantra* lacks a preamble and his references to Indic sources that discuss it. He states:¹¹³

Kṛṣṇa-pa explains that this *tantra* has no preamble and that, according to the tradition of the Supreme Vehicle (i.e., Mahāyāna), the *nirmāṇakāya* of a *buddha* does not [entirely] pass into *nirvāṇa* (i.e., complete extinction), and this, then, is reflected in the lack of a need for codifiers/compiler to proclaim “[Thus have I] heard.” Better, however, is the explanation by [other] masters of the past that [in general] one observes that a number of [other] *tantras* also lack a preamble and that in particular this *tantra* was taught immediately after the 16,000-[verse] extensive *tantra*, and therefore, just like the *niruttaratantras*, [it] has no preamble.

rgyud chen po gzhan nas phyung pa 'am | bshad rgyud yin la | [N: la |, R: no | |] gleng [R: gleng, N: kleng] gzhi yod kyang rjes su yi [em.: yi, RN: yid] rang med pa rnam kyang stod phyung ba yin te |. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

¹¹³ *sGyu 'phrul chen po rgya cher bshad pa* (A, 573.5–7; B, 508.6–509.2; C, 93.5–11): ... *nag po pas ni | rgyud 'di la gleng gzhi med de | theg pa mchog gi lugs la sangs rgyas sprul pa'i sku yang mya ngan las 'da' ba med pas | bsdud pa po rnam kyi thos pa sgrog pa mi dgos pa mtshon par bshad mod | rgyud sde 'ga' zhig la gleng gzhi med pa'ang snang la | [A: |, om.: BC] khyad par rgyud rgyas pa stong phrag bcu drug pa gsungs pa'i rjes thogs su | bar ma chad par rgyud 'di nyid gsungs pa'i phyir | rgyud phyi ma rnam ltar gleng gzhi med pa yin no zhes bla ma gong ma rnam gsung pa ltar legs [AC: legs, B: lags] so | | [A: | |, om. BC]....*

The first explanation Tāranātha is referring to is the one offered by Kṛṣṇavajra in his commentary on the *Mahāmāyātantra*, which states the following:¹¹⁴

Regarding the reflection as to why the phrase “Thus [have] I [heard]” has not been stated: The Bhagavat has passed into non-fixed *nirvāṇa*. Therefore the word “perpetually” has been stated [in the *Mahāmāyātantra* on several occasions],¹¹⁵ and thus it is by no means a complete passing into *nirvāṇa* (i.e., complete extinction).

The second explanation referred to by Tāranātha is found, for example, in Ratnākaraśānti’s commentary on the *Mahāmāyātantra*, the *Guṇavatī*, where the following is stated:¹¹⁶

This (i.e., the *Mahāmāyātantra*) is not an independent *tantra*. What is it then? It is [a *tantra*] that is connected with other *tantras*. Therefore, the function of the word “then”¹¹⁷ is to

¹¹⁴ *Mahāmāyātantra*vṛtti (D, 202a4–5; P, 250b1–2): ‘di skad bdag gis bya ba ci’i phyir ma smos snyam du sems pa la | bcom ldan ‘das ni mi gnas pa’i mya ngan las ‘das pa’o | | de nyid kyis na rtag tu zhes bya ba la sogs pa gsungs pas | rnam pa thams cad du yongs su mya ngan las ‘das pa ni ma yin no | |.

¹¹⁵ This appears to be a reference to several instances in the *Mahāmāyātantra* where the word “perpetually” (*sadā/satatam*: *rtag tu*) is employed in connection with the Buddha (or a *buddha*). See *Mahāmāyātantra* 1.18 (Skt., p. 13.4; Tib., p. 99.3), 1.29 (Skt., p. 22.6; Tib., p. 119.4), 2.2 (Skt., p. 25.5; Tib., p. 125.4), and 2.6 (Skt., p. 27.5; Tib., p. 129.2).

¹¹⁶ *Guṇavatī* (2.5–8): ... *naitat tantram muktakam, kiṃ tarhi tantrāntaraiḥ samprayuktam | tasmād ayam athaśabdaḥ pūrvatantrāpekṣayānantaryam asya tantrasya dyotayati | ata eva nāsyādaḥ nidānavākyaḥ evaṃ mayetyādikaṃ prayuktam, prāg eva prayuktatvāt | tadyathā śrīvajraśekhara |*; Tib. (77.7–12): ... rgyud ‘di ni rang gi rgyud ma yin no | | ‘o na ci zhe na | rgyud gzhan dang ‘brel ba ste | de bas na de nas zhes bya ba’i don rgyud ‘di rgyud snga ma la ltos pa’i rjes thogs yin par gsal bar byed do | | de nyid kyi phyir ‘di’i dang por ‘di skad bdag gis thos pa la sogs gleng gzhi’i tshig phrad sbyar bar ma mdzad de | snga ma nyid la sbyar ba’i phyir | dper na **dPal rdo rje rtse mo** la sogs pa’i rgyud bzhin no | |.

¹¹⁷ This is a reference to the word *atha*: *de nas*, which is, after the homage, the first word of the *tantra*. See *Mahāmāyātantra* 3 (Skt., p. 2.3; Tib., p. 77.1).

make clear that this *tantra* is a later one with regard to the previous *tantra*. For just this reason, the preamble sentence “Thus [have] I [heard]” etc. is not found at the beginning of it because it is found in the previous [*tantra*], as it is, for example, in the *Śrīvajraśekhara*.

Tibetan scholars have also looked into works in an attempt to locate passages consisting in textual matches—be they the result of extracting, “borrowing,” or acknowledged citing—in order to verify their actual origin, and thus determine the (in)authenticity of both the cited and citing works. A very nice example is the passage by Rig ral provided above (§ 2.1.4.), who, in the context of discussing the distinction between authentic and inauthentic Tantric works, points out the fact that one finds in treatises citations (or “borrowed” passages) even from counterfeit works that present themselves as scriptures, and makes it clear that the presence or absence of such doubtful passages could serve as a hint as to the (in)authenticity of both scriptures and treatises.¹¹⁸ However, as has already been pointed out, Rig ral at the same time clearly admits that the historical–philological approach, particularly in terms of the existence or absence of titles and colophons, has its limitations. In this connection one may once again mention the controversy surrounding the authenticity of the **Guhyagarbhatantra*, which was alleged to have “four defects [in the form] of falsities” (*log pa'i skyon bzhi*)—including the just mentioned criteria concerning the work’s structure and references to other works—as follows: (i) “a falsity regarding the preamble” (*gleng gzhi log pa*), for it does not have the standard formulaic opening sentence, (ii) “a falsity concerning the times” (*dus log pa*), for it refers to four times instead of the common three, (iii) “a

¹¹⁸ Indeed, controversies regarding the authenticity of certain works did not prevent scholars who obviously considered them authentic from citing them in their own works. For examples of scholars citing the controversial **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* mentioned above, see Bajetta 2019: 16–17, 237–254 (Appendix 2). For an earlier discussion of citations from this scripture, see Wangchuk 2016: 95, 96, 102–103 particularly n. 24.

falsity concerning the *maṇḍala*” (*dkyil 'khor log pa*), for it has Vajrasattva as the central figure of the *maṇḍala* although its Lord (*bdag po*, i.e., propagator) is Samantabhadra, and (iv) “a falsity concerning a Tantric scripture” (*rgyud log pa*), for it refers to another Tantric scripture.¹¹⁹

Bu ston, as is evident from his catalogue, has on the whole relied solely on the historical–philological device, though it must be stated that he does not always offer sufficient evidence, and in fact it appears that in borderline cases he opts for inclusion rather than exclusion. What his criteria for determining the “degree of doubt” were remains unclear. He often uses very general expressions, such as, “it is doubtful whether it is of an Indic origin,”¹²⁰ or “it/these seem(s) to be grounds for doubt.”¹²¹ While generally he does not provide sufficient reasons for his doubts, at times he does mention some of the reasons for his decision (for example, as has been demonstrated above, he occasionally relies on earlier sources, written or oral, considered by him authorities), although there appears to be some lack of consistency. One finds, for example, expressions such as “there seems to be neither a translator/translation nor an author/authorship colophon, and thus this is grounds for doubt,”¹²² or “although it has neither an author/authorship colophon nor a translator/translation colophon and the like, I have included it.”¹²³

¹¹⁹ See Wangchuk 2002: 277 n. 54 for the pertinent passage from the *rGyud don gsal byed me long* by g.Yung ston rDo rje dpal (1284–1365; BDRC: P1454).

¹²⁰ See, for example, the remark concerning D1278 and D1279 in the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (445.2): *'di gnyis rgya gar ma yin min the tshom za'o* ||.

¹²¹ See, for example, the remark concerning D1598–D1601 in the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (438.1): *... the tshom gyi gzhir snang ngo* ||.

¹²² See, for example, the remark concerning D1283–D1289 in the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (445.5): *... rnam la mdzad byang 'gyur byang mi snang zhing the tshom gyi gzhi'o* ||.

¹²³ See, for example, the remark concerning D4365 in the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (634.4): *... mdzad byang 'gyur byang la sogs mi 'dug pas 'dir bzhugs su bcug* ||.

Chag lo tsā ba, too, attempts to avail himself of historical–philological arguments in addition to his aforementioned excessive employment of the *ad hominem* and the ridicule polemical devices. In arguing against Ancient Tantras, he contends that they neither accord with the Word of the Buddha nor originated within the Indic cultural sphere, for (a) there is no evidence for such doctrines in other scriptures, (b) there is no evidence for their existence either in commentarial works or in works of other literary genres by Indic masters, and (c) there is ample evidence that they are not translated works. He states:¹²⁴

Regarding those [works] that are designated Ancient Scriptures (*bka' rnying ma*; i.e., [Tantric] scriptures merely associated with the Early Period or the rNying ma school), such as these [just mentioned]: Firstly, they were not taught by the Teacher, and [authentic] *sūtras*, *tantras*, *sādhanas*, and *śāstras* bear witness [to this]. Further (*bar du*), [they] have not been commented upon by commentators, and [this] is known from [authentic] “meaning commentaries” (*don 'grel*), instructions, [and works on] prosody, poetry, and metrics. [They] have not been translated by *lo [tsā bas]* and *paṅ[ditas]*, and [this] is known from [instances of] false imputations and from the length, stress/accent, and density of words.

The validity of Chag lo tsā ba’s arguments cannot be discussed here. Moreover, he unfortunately does not go into detail and does not provide concrete examples. We have, nonetheless, already encountered similar arguments in the passages from Tāranātha’s works cited above, some of which certainly offer a better insight into these matters. There is no doubt, in any case, that the

¹²⁴ *Chag lo sngags log sun 'byin* (11.1–4): *de la sogs pa'i bka' rnying mar btags pa rnams | dang por ston pa sangs rgyas kyis [em.: kyis, Ms: kyi] ma gsungs te | mdo rgyud sgrub thabs bstan bcos rnams kyis dpang por byed pa yin | bar du dgongs 'grel mkhan rnams kyis ma 'grel te | don 'grel man ngag sdebs sbyor snyan ngag tshig(s) rkang [conj.: tshig(s) rkang, Ms: tshogs kyang] rnams kyis shes pa yin | Bod du lo paṅ rnams kyis ma bsgyur [em.: bsgyur, Ms: 'gyur] te | sgro 'dogs tshig ring thung lci yang srab 'thug rnams kyis shes pa yin |.*

presence of commentaries by Indian scholars on the “basic texts” (*mūla: rtsa ba*) is clearly seen by Tibetan polemics—including ‘Gos Khug pa lhas btsas, to give another example—as proof of the authenticity of the Tantric scripture in question, and thus also of works related to it, such as ritual or practice manuals,¹²⁵ while the absence of such Indic works is regarded, implicitly or explicitly, as a sign of inauthenticity.

As mentioned earlier, the adherents of the works in question embraced the generic–synchronic criterion in addition to the genetic–diachronic one. Nonetheless, this did not prevent them from making attempts to argue along historical–philological lines as well. It goes without saying, however, that such endeavours were far less successful in terms of their influence on the outcome (that is, in convincing the critics). In this context, the “three witnesses” (*dpang po gsum*) employed by Rong zom pa in his defence of the **Guhyagarbhatantra* could be mentioned, namely, the witness of prophecies (*lung bstan pa’i dpang po*), the witness of persons (*gang zag gi dpang po*), and the witness of scriptural coherency (*lung ’brel ba’i dpang po*). It seems, though, that with the “three witnesses” scheme, Rong zom pa combines both the genetic–diachronic and generic–synchronic approaches.¹²⁶

3.4. The “Other-Religions” Argument

Another device often employed in religious polemics is the “other-religions” argument, including opposing sects within the

¹²⁵ ‘Gos lhas btsas sngags log sun ’byin (24.5–6): ... *de la rGya gar mkhas pas byas pa’i ’grel pa mang ngo|| sgrubs thabs mang po| dkyil ’khor gyi cho ga mang po| de thams cad ma nor ba dri ma med pa sha stag yin no||*.

¹²⁶ See Wangchuk 2002. Cf. Martin 1997a: 269, where the *tshad ma bzhi* scheme (translated by Martin as “Four Truth-tests”) is referred to. This scheme, which has been used by scholars of the bKa’ brgyud school for authentication purposes (apparently for both scriptures and doctrines), also appears to combine both the genetic–diachronic and generic–synchronic approaches. See also *ibid.*: 293 n. 30 for similar schemes in the Bon tradition. A closer examination of these schemes is yet to be undertaken.

same religion, to discredit opposing views within one's own tradition.¹²⁷ In this regard, Tibetans have been no exception. Since the motives underlying such a strategy, and the consequences it has for the tradition or person in question, are rather clear, I shall not overly dwell on it, but simply briefly mention the most common usages, including (a) associating opposing views with non-Buddhist traditions (*tīrthika: mu stegs*), in general, and with the Bon religion and the doctrines of Hwa shang Mahāyāna, in particular, (b) equating them with views unacceptable from a Buddhist point of view, such as the extremes of annihilationism (*ucchedānta: chad pa'i mtha'*) and nihilism (*nāstika: med par lta ba*), and so forth.¹²⁸ The earliest written example of the “other-religions” argument being used to declare both scriptural and non-scriptural works as inauthentic is perhaps the above-mentioned “open letter” by IHa bla ma Zhi ba 'od, which, in addition to labelling most of the works he lists as being Tibetan compositions and thus inauthentic, explicitly refers to some Mahāmudrā works and to rDzogs chen doctrines in general as being influenced by non-Buddhist traditions, and thus being an obstacle to attaining awakening.¹²⁹ Rig ral, too, lists several works

¹²⁷ See van der Wall 2004: 409–410 for a discussion of this phenomenon within the Christian context, where, for example, the accusation of dreaming “Jewish dreams” or of believing “Jewish fables” was used to denounce Christian millenarianism, or where accusations of a similar nature were put forward in polemical disputes within the different Christian confessions—for example, by Protestants seeking to discredit fellow-Protestants by accusing them of having Roman Catholic views.

¹²⁸ *Chag lo sngags log sun 'byin* (10.3–5): ... 'di rnam mu stegs chad lta ba dang | mchod 'os pa dang nang pa 'i dus 'khor gyi sbyor drug bsres | bon po 'i lta ba bal nag bsres par dug 'dis lam log par 'gro nges te | dam pa dang po 'i rgyud dpang por yod |.

¹²⁹ IHa bla ma Zhi ba 'od lists seven such Mahāmudrā works, while in addition to labelling numerous rDzogs chen works as Tibetan compositions, he considers rDzogs chen itself to contain non-Buddhist elements. For an English translation and the Tibetan text, see Karmay 1998, particularly pp. 36 (entries nos. 60–67), 37 (entry no. 69) (English) and 39, 40 (Tibetan).

which he declares to be in agreement with non-Buddhist traditions, and refers in this regard to lHa bla ma Zhi ba 'od's open letter, which, as we have already seen, Rig ral regards as authoritative.¹³⁰

3.5. Self-Critique

Self-critique is a very powerful polemical device, and it has both internal and external functions, for, on the one hand, it is a genuine means of addressing issues within the tradition itself upon which there is no consensus, while on the other it also serves as a means of taking the wind out of an opponent's sails. A good example of a self-critical work in our context is Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho's *Chu dwangs nor bu*. Although Mi pham's main readership would have been others within his own tradition, it cannot be ruled out that another of his motives was to avert or at least reduce some of the criticism directed toward the phenomenon of Treasures from outside the rNying ma tradition. Unlike critics from other traditions, Mi pham fundamentally accepts the authenticity of Treasures of those Revealers he considers credible, and opposes only those he regards as ungenue. It is perhaps interesting to note that Mi pham has a general tendency to accept the authenticity of old Treasures and reject new ones, as most of his criticism is directed towards contemporary religious figures claiming to be Treasure Revealers.¹³¹ This naturally raises the question as to the role that "historical distance" plays in the authentication and canonization process. This certainly deserves a thorough discussion, one beyond the framework of the present study.

¹³⁰ See the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (257): ... *la sogs pa'i mu stegs dang mthun* [R: *mthun*, N: 'thun] *par lHa bla ma Zhi* [*em. zhi*, NR: *bzhi*] *ba 'od kyis* [N: *kyis*, R: *kyi*] *bshad pa bzhin no* | |. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

¹³¹ For more on Mi pham's stance on this issue as expressed in his *Chu dwangs nor bu*, see Doctor 2005: 52–71, where an English translation of the work, along with the Tibetan text, is provided.

3.6. The Development of Complex, Multifaceted Narratives regarding the Appearance of Scriptures

One further important strategy seems to be the development of complex, multifaceted narratives regarding the appearance of scriptures, particularly Tantric ones, within the human realm or, alternatively, their disappearance from it. Such narratives aim at addressing questions related to incongruity with historical facts or with innate historical common sense, as raised by adversaries of the scriptures in question. Such questions have to do with unaccountable temporal gaps, absence of Sanskrit originals, the lack of mention in earlier sources (such as the early imperial catalogues), and the like. This phenomenon, which has its roots in India, likewise deserves a separate, in-depth study, and thus can merely be mentioned here in brief. These, at times complex and multifaceted, narratives include accounts of such scriptures being taken by *ḍākinīs* to other realms for safeguarding or of being hidden, mainly on account of their abstruse esoteric teachings, only to surface later when the time for their revelation has ripened.¹³² Within the Tibetic cultural sphere such narratives often served as the underlying argument in the defence of the Treasure literature, which, according to tradition, consists of works hidden during the Early Period of Propagation of Buddhism due to controversial contents and lack of suitable disciples, with the expectation that they would be revealed in a later, more suitable time.¹³³ They also often played a role in the defence of Ancient Tantras, in that they were used to justify the absence of their Sanskrit originals during the Later Period,¹³⁴ and also their not

¹³² On the notion of secrecy in Buddhism in general, see Wangchuk 2020.

¹³³ It has been argued by Andreas Doctor that historical accounts regarding Revealed Treasures were not meant to serve as defensive devices; rather, they have had an internal function within the rNying ma tradition. See Doctor 2005: 40. It is beyond the scope of the present study, however, to address this claim.

¹³⁴ An early source that presents the rNying ma view on the chronicles regarding the appearance of Tantric scriptures in general and the

being mentioned in the older imperial catalogues. To be noted, however, is that works belonging to the class referred to as “Inner Tantras” were anyway not included in these early catalogues due to their highly esoteric contents, but in separate lists or registers of translated texts (*gyur byang*).¹³⁵ Such narratives, to be sure, were particularly developed in Tibet during the later translation period, in regard not only to Treasure literature and the Ancient Tantras, but also to New Tantras, some of which faced similar criticism.¹³⁶

4. When Polemics End

Before concluding this part of the present study, I wish to refer, albeit very briefly, to two more related phenomena that present the two poles on the spectrum of religious (and perhaps any) polemical discourse, namely, that of banning, censorship, and destruction, on the one hand, and that of inclusivism or harmonization/reconciliation, on the other. These two phenomena could in fact rightly be seen as situated outside the sphere of

Ancient Tantras in particular is Rog bandhe Shes rab 'od's doxographical work (*grub mtha'*). For an English translation of the pertinent passage, see Cabezón 2013: 87–92. See also Davidson 2005: 232–233, where an English translation of selected portions of this passage has been provided.

¹³⁵ This is, for example, explicitly stated in the *'Phang thang ma*. See the *'Phang thang ma* (A: 65.2; B: 45.34): *sngags nang pa'i 'gyur byang gzhan na bzhugs* | | | |. For the term *'gyur byang* as meaning “register of translated texts,” see above note 16.

¹³⁶ Note, for example, Rig ral's statement in his catalogue—made in the context of his distinction between authentic and inauthentic scriptures and non-scriptures (chap. 29)—that most *tantras* were taken to safety by *dākinīs* to such other realms as Śambhala, Kamboja, and Oḍḍiyāna, and therefore are not available in the human realm. See the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (256): *sngags kyi rgyud rnams ni phal cher gzhan* [N: *gzhan*, R: *zhag*] *na mkha' 'gro la sogs pa rnams kyis* [R: *rnams kyis*, N: *pas*] *bzung nas bzhugs pa te | gSang 'dus chen po dang | Dus 'khor chen po dang | dGyes rdor 'bum lnga la sogs pa Sham* [R: *sham*, N: *sha*] *bha la dang rKam po rtse'i gling dang | U rgyan la sogs pa na bzhugs par bshad do* [N: *do*, R: *pa yin no*] | | |. Note that the critical edition offered here is mine.

(polemical) discourse, and strictly speaking are also not truly measures of authentication. I nonetheless wish to fleetingly mention them here, since they cannot, I believe, be completely ignored when wishing to provide an overview of the strategies of authentication employed within the Tibetic cultural sphere.

4.1. Beyond Discourse: Banning, Censorship, and Destruction

The one pole is the extreme case in which discourse—even in its harshest polemical forms—practically ceases, and violent measures such as banning, censorship,¹³⁷ and destruction take its place. Generally speaking, instances of such violent measures toward works, and the books transmitting them (be they in the form of manuscripts or xylographs), have occurred within the Tibetic cultural sphere when their content was believed by their adversaries to represent heterodoxy and/or heteropraxy. Such measures were thus taken not only in connection with works claiming canonicity while being suspected by their opponents of being inauthentic, but also with works of autochthonous origin containing controversial doctrines. Moreover, these measures could hardly be employed without the support of some sort of political power. Their employment, needless to say, was an extreme case of exercising a combined form of religio-political power that targeted not only authors and their literary products but also the school they were affiliated with. These measures include the physical sealing of books (or woodblocks) containing the works in question, preventing the preparation of new copies of them (particularly xylographic ones, as these would have markedly accelerated the works' dissemination), and in extreme cases even the actual destruction of those books.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ The term “censorship” is used here in the sense of “(violent) suppression” rather than mere “exclusion (from the canon).” Cf. Assmann & Assmann 1987, where the term is used in the context of discussing “Kanon und Zensur” more loosely in the latter sense.

¹³⁸ On banned books within the Tibetic cultural sphere, see Smith 2004. On the phenomenon of book destruction, particularly biblioclasm, within the Tibetan domain due to religio-political motives, see

4.2. The Non-Sectarian Approach: Inclusivism or Harmonization/Reconciliation

The other pole clearly consists in attempts at inclusivism or harmonization/reconciliation, which within the Tibetan cultural sphere reached their peak in the form of the Non-Sectarian (*ris med*) movement that flourished in the late eighth and throughout the nineteenth century in East Tibet.¹³⁹ This topic, too, is clearly beyond the scope of the present study, but it should perhaps at least be stated that while leaders of the Non-Sectarian movement made efforts to reduce the conflicts surrounding the question of authenticity and canonicity of certain doctrines and works, both scriptural and non-scriptural, they were at the same time a target of criticism for their non-sectarian approach, which some considered as threatening to blur the distinction between what they saw as genuine and false doctrines, and equally important, between the different Tibetan schools and traditions and their distinct lineages. Tolerance was regarded in their eyes as a danger to the identity of their respective schools and traditions, for, to

Wangchuk 2015, in general, and pp. 532–535, in particular. See also Cabezón 2007: 31–33, where several cases of the suppression of books, particularly those of Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge (1429–1489; BDRC: P1042), are briefly discussed. To be noted, however, is that occasionally some reports of such measures taken by opposing religious and/or political powers contain legendary elements, so that their historicity needs further verification.

¹³⁹ The Non-Sectarian movement in East Tibet has been discussed in the past on sundry occasions, and cannot be dealt with here systematically. On the “origin of the *Ris med* tradition,” see Smith 2001: 237–247, where Smith particularly focusses on the development of distinct schools within the Tibetan cultural sphere and the sectarianism-cum-polemics that (naturally) followed, and which in turn gave rise to non-sectarian approaches and finally to the Non-Sectarian movement. For a more recent discussion on the *Ris med* tradition, particularly in view of *rDzogs chen*, see Deroche 2018, where the notion of being non-sectarian (or “impartial”) in Buddhism in general is also discussed.

once again use Cabezón's words, "[p]olemics is both the parent and the child of sectarian identity-formation."¹⁴⁰

5. Concluding Remarks

In Part One of the present study, I have attempted to analyze the policies of authentication and canonization employed within the Tibetan cultural sphere and to lay down, as far as possible, a systematized presentation of the polemical devices employed by the tradition in this specific context. I have done so above all since I believe that a better understanding of these matters would offer new perspectives and facilitate research on the formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon in general and better our understanding regarding the history of the transmission of individual works in particular. The present study, however, clearly does not exhaust the topic; certainly there have been other criteria for authenticity or inauthenticity along with strategies to determine them that could be discussed and likewise substantiated by way of specific examples. It is hoped that Part Two—which discusses the issue of authenticity in the context of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon from yet another perspective, namely, the (in)authenticity of canonical author/authorship and translator/translation colophons—will fill some of these gaps.

¹⁴⁰ See Cabezón 2007: 6. See also van der Wall 2004: 404, where it is pointed out that the concept of toleration itself, including its limits, at some point also became an issue of debate within the Christian tradition in the Age of Enlightenment.

Appendix

The usage of various registers in the four categories of the *Phang thang ma* section discussed in § 2.1.2. (i.e., section number XXIX in Halkias 2004 and number 27 in Kawagoe 2005) are as follows:

| Category | Register Older Version 1 | Register Older Version 2 | Register [Newer] Version | gZhon nu snying po's Register | Other Registers |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| i | ✓ | X | X | – | – |
| | X | ✓ | X | – | – |
| | X | X | ✓ | – | – |
| ii | X | X | ? | ✓ | – |
| iii | ✓ | X | X | – | ✓ |
| | X | ✓ | X | – | ✓ |
| iv | X | X | X | X | X |

Part Two

What's in a Name?

Once Again on the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

1. Introductory Remarks

I have touched upon the issue of authenticity of colophons in the Tibetan Buddhist Canon (*bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*) and the paracanonical Collection of Ancient Tantras (*rNying ma rgyud 'bum*) in previous publications. On those occasions, I argued that particularly in the case of Tantric works—both scriptures and non-scriptures—colophons are at times inauthentic and thus unreliable.¹ This observation concerned colophons consisting in either authorship or translation statements. In this context, I have also suggested differentiating between an author and an authorship colophon and, along the same lines, between a translator/s and a translation colophon—the former in each of these two pairs being composed by the author or translator/s himself/themselves, and the latter ones being inserted later by persons responsible for the production of the manuscripts or xylographs transmitting the work in question, including editors, proofreaders, and scribes/copyists. It should be noted, however, that the Tibetan language does not distinguish between the two (author/authorship colophon is commonly termed *mdzad/rtsoṃ byang*, and translator/translation colophon *'gyur byang*). Although it is true that what I refer to as authorship and translation colophons are more likely to contain inaccurate information, or information that is wholly false, they often do include information drawn from reliable historical sources or oral traditions, and thus should not be categorically dismissed as untrustworthy. In any

¹ See particularly Almogi 2008, and 2016a: 3–5. As demonstrated in Skilling 1994, the state of affairs in this regard with Sūtric works is much better (for a summary, see Almogi 2008: 87–88 n. 3). However, as will be shown in the following, it is perhaps not as good as assumed thus far.

case, colophons, particularly of canonical and paracanonical works, should be carefully examined with regard to the reliability of the information contained therein.

In the present study, I wish to touch once again upon the topic of authenticity of colophons, this time, however, in terms of their broader importance, and in fact their role as shapers of certain realities on the ground regarding the status and/or history of the transmission of certain works, and their impact on the transmitted history regarding the scope of certain Tibetan translators' activities.

2. Canonical and Paracanonical Colophons: Some General Observations

I believe that it would be correct to argue that many of the canonical and paracanonical colophons are authorship and translation colophons rather than author and translator/s colophons. While it is not always possible to determine whether a colophon was written by the author or translator(/s) himself(/themselves) or whether it was a later addition, several factors can assist in reaching some conclusion. Generally speaking, the more formulaic the colophon is, the smaller the chance that it was written by the author or translator(/s), which, as already pointed out, does not mean that the information contained therein is necessarily false. A brief look at canonical colophons shows that many of them resemble each other in phraseology and syntax, the main difference being the names of the persons involved. The less formulaic a colophon is and the more details it contains—that is, details regarding the place and dates of composition or translation, names of secondary persons involved (such as the petitioner, commissioner, or donor), or a detailed description of the course of events leading to the undertaking (i.e., composition or translation)—the greater is the likelihood that it was composed by the author/translator(/s) himself(/themselves) rather than having been added later at some stage of the work's transmission. Furthermore, colophons written in first person are, generally speaking, most likely to have been written by the author or translator(/s) himself(/themselves)—one

obvious exception being intentional falsification. When examining a colophon for signs of authenticity, one should, however, take several additional factors into consideration. A special case is perhaps colophons of what are called Revealed Treasures (*gter ma*). The authors of colophons of works belonging to this literary genre (if one may call it so), whoever they were, often took great pains to supply many details in what are referred to as revealer/revelation colophons (*gter byang*)—that is, details regarding the origination of the work/teaching, its translation into Tibetan, the events leading to its concealment, and those surrounding its revelation—in order to lend the work the flair of an Indic work in Tibetan translation, and thus the authenticity needed, so as to facilitate its admission into a canonical (or at least a paracanonical) collection. As the phenomenon of literary Revealed Treasures is a unique case, the colophons transmitted along with them have peculiarities of their own, and thus will not be discussed in the present study.²

3. Author/Authorship Colophons

In the case of an author/authorship colophon of a translated Indic work, the colophon could obviously be compared with the pertinent colophon found in its Sanskrit original. However, in many cases no Sanskrit original is available (or accessible). Moreover, even if such an original is available, there is no guarantee that it bears a colophon that is identical with the one borne by the copy used for the translation. The truthfulness of an authorship ascription as such could, however, be also verified through other Indic sources, if, for example, references (such as mention of the work along with its author in another Indic work) exist.

² For a discussion of the role both author/authorship and translator/translation colophons had in the authentication of works as being of an Indic origin, and thus in their admission into the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, see Part One of the present study, particularly §§ 2.1.3. and 2.1.4.

Moreover, one peculiarity of the Tibetan language is the employment of honorific forms when these refer to revered persons. As a rule, honorific language is not used in reference to oneself, and thus its occurrence in a colophon could be a hint that it was written by someone else. In other words, one possible way of determining the source of the authorial statement is to consider whether the verb “compose,” for example, is used in its common form (*rtsom pa / bris pa / byed pa*) or the honorific one (*mdzad pa*). However, while this criterion might work rather well for autochthonous literature, the issue is more complex when dealing with translated works, since Tibetan translators had obviously no problem in translating author colophons using honorific language. This criterion is thus rather weak when it comes to canonical works.

The phenomenon of intentional false authorship ascription to well-known and highly revered masters in order to guarantee a work’s reception and status is widely known within both the Indic and the Tibetic cultural spheres. Within the latter, it also meant increasing the chance of the work’s admission into the Tibetan Buddhist Canon. Such pseudepigraphs obviously contained inauthentic author/authorship colophons. Editors of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon were well aware of the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy, and did their best to either exclude such works from the Canon altogether or at least express their doubts regarding them. Such editors’ treatment of pseudepigraphs deserves, however, a separate discussion and will not be considered here further.³ It should be, however, noted briefly that, generally speaking, in cases where the false authorship ascription occurred, so to speak, within the Indic cultural sphere—that is, when the actual author is believed to be Indic but it is merely his exact identity that is disputed—the work was still considered authentic and was thus admitted into the Canon, for the Indic provenance was the most crucial criterion for a work’s

³ A discussion of how editors of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon treated the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy will be further discussed in Almogi (forthcoming-a).

authentication. Therefore, pseudepigraphs were, as a rule, only then considered inauthentic when an Indic origin was claimed but the actual author was suspected to come from within the Tibetic cultural sphere.⁴

It should be perhaps mentioned here in passing that falsification of author/authorship colophons occur also in the case of autochthonous works, though clearly to a lesser extent. Just as with Indic works, here, too, the motive would be to ascribe works composed by less known (or less respected) persons to highly revered masters, often to serve some doctrinal-cum-sectarian agenda. One famous example is the falsified colophon to a critique of the Ancient Tantras (*rnying rgyud*), which ascribes the work to the Eighth Karma pa Mi bskyod rdo rje (1507–1554; BDRC: P385). In this regard dPa' bo gTsug lag 'phreng ba (1504–1564/66; BDRC: P319) in his history titled *mKhas pa'i dga' ston* reports the following:⁵

There is an author colophon to [a work] disparaging the Ancient Tantras. [Therein the work] is falsely ascribed to the master (i.e., the Eighth Karma pa), [whereas] it was composed by someone else. As all rNying ma [pa-s] have [as a result] lost faith [in the Karma pa, he] composed [a work titled] *Drang po'i sa bon* (*A Seed of Honesty*), in which [he] responded to [the criticism expressed in that work] and [also] analyzed the style of composition, [in order to raise more] doubt [regarding its authorship ascription].

Doubts have been also expressed notably regarding the authenticity of the authorship ascription of the rebuttal *Drang po'i*

⁴ Cf. Wedemeyer 2009: 5, where, in the context of discussing the authenticity of the **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā* and the identity of its author Śākyamitra, the work—of which the Indic origin is undisputed by the tradition but the exact identity of whose author was nonetheless debated—is referred to as “at least semi-authentic by Tibetan criteria.”

⁵ *mKhas pa'i dga' ston*, vol. 2: 1297.13–16: *sngags rnying ma la skur pa btab pa'i rtsom byang rje'i drung gi mtshan la g.yar ba zhig gzhan zhig gis byas pa byung ste rnying ma mtha' dag ma mos pa nas de'i lan dang rtsom tshul la dogs pa dpyad pa drang po'i sa bon zhes bya ba mdzad l.*

sa bon, suggesting that it may be a falsification as well.⁶ While this case of falsification of author/authorship colophons undoubtedly had pure doctrinal-cum-sectarian motives, in the case of such falsifications in the context of canonical works, or works claiming such a status, the main motive was authentication of scriptural and non-scriptural works in terms of their Indic origin, and thus the facilitation of their admission into the Canon (which surely played into sectarian rivalries as well).

4. Translator/Translation Colophons

In the case of a translator/translation colophon, we are obviously solely dependent on Tibetan sources. As pointed out earlier, the formulaic nature of most of these colophons suggests that they are later additions (or at least the outcome of later reworking and standardizing). There is ample evidence that prior to the compilation of the canon, numerous manuscripts containing translated works circulated without a translator/translation colophon. While it is not to be ruled out that such colophons were added and/or augmented during the usual transmission of works by various individuals on occasions such as copying or revising, one can name two events in which the insertion of new colophons or the reworking and standardizing of existing ones certainly occurred on a large scale. The first was what is referred to as the Great Revision, an undertaking that took place during several decades at the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries, where mainly (but not solely) the translation of technical terms was made uniform and a standardized orthography was introduced. This naturally affected what is known as the Ancient/Early Translations (*rnying/snga 'gyur*). On that occasion, colophons were added when these were missing, or else reworked and standardized. Often a phrase stating that the translation had been proofread and finalized by a group of translators and/or by a certain chief editor (*zhus chen*) was also added (i.e., if a major proofreading-cum-revision took place). The second major occasion was the compilation of the Canon in the

⁶ See Gentry 2016: 181–182.

early fourteenth century, first in sNar thang and then in Zhwa lu (and other places as well). At that time many of the colophons of the Ancient Translations seem to have been reworked once again, and what is known as the New/Later Translations (*gsar/phyi 'gyur*) underwent a similar process of having missing colophons inserted or existing ones reworked. This reworking included, among other things, the addition of names of (alleged) revisers, but possibly also the removal of existing colophons and their replacement by new ones.

In regard to the reworking of the colophons of the Ancient Translations during the Great Revision, bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri (1227–1305; BDRC: P1217; henceforth Rig ral), in his *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, states the following:⁷

It seems that until the earlier part of King Khri Srong lde btsan's life no translator/translation colophons were inserted into most translated [work]s, while it appears that such colophons were inserted starting from the later part of [his] life (apparently the time of the Great Revision). Regarding phrases such as “translated by the Buddhist

⁷ *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (113–114): *de la btsan po Khri Srong de btsan gyi sku tshe'i stod* [N: *stod*, R: *bstod*] *la bsgyur ba rnams phal che ba la 'gyur* [N: *'gyur*, R: *sgyur*] *byang ma btab par snang la| sku tshe'i smad nas ni 'gyur byang btab nas* [N: *nas*, R: *om.*] *snang ngo|| de la ban dhe Ye shes sde la sogs pas bsgyur zhes pa la sogs pa'i sgra smos pa rnams ni lo tsha ba mang pos mthud nas bsgyur te| lo tsha ba zhu chen gtso bo de'i ming smos pa yin no|| sogs pa'i sgra med pa rnams ni de nyid kyi yin no|| zhu chen gyi lo tsha ba zhes bya ba de ni| de'i tshe mkhas pa mthar phyin pa des| zhu dag byas nas yid ches pa'i gnas [em.: *gnas*, NR: *gnas pa*] yin pa [em.: *pa*, NR: *pa'i*] yang rgya dpe las bod skad du bton [N: *bton*, R: *bston*] nam| bod dpe las rgya skad du bton [N: *bton*, R: *ston*] na bsdeb sbyor sgra dang mthun par 'ong ba te| 'di ni srid pa'ang shin tu dka'o [em.: *dka'o*, N: *bka'o*, R: *bkas so*]||. The variant readings (versions N & R) provided here (and in the other passages from the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* cited below) are as recorded in van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009; the critical edition offered here is mine (for more details, see Part One of the present study, p. 30 n. 26, remark ⁽¹⁾). See also Almogi 2008: 117–118, where this Tibetan passage has been cited (on the basis of yet another witness) and paraphrased (in English).*

monk Ye shes sde, etc.,” [the word “etc.” means that the work in question] was jointly translated by numerous translators and it is [only] the name of the translator-cum-chief editor that is [explicitly] mentioned. [Those translation]s [whose colophon] lacks the word “etc.” are the translation of the [named translator(s) alone]. Regarding the term “translator-cum-chief editor,” [its presence implies that the translation], having been proofread by an excellent scholar of the time, is an object of reverence. If the Sanskrit were to be reconstructed (lit. “drawn”) from the Tibetan manuscript, or the Tibetan from the Sanskrit manuscript, it would turn out that the syntax-cum-wording [of the two texts] would [perfectly] correspond. However, although this is possible, [such convergence] is extremely difficult [to achieve].⁸

This practice of reworking and complementing colophons was continued during the compilation of the *bsTan ’gyur* edition prepared by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364; BDRC: P155) at Zhwa lu. Bu ston, in his catalogue to this edition, explicitly states that he adopted translator/translation colophons from other manuscripts that contained a similar translation and inserted

⁸ In connection with Rig ral’s last statement concerning “reconstruction” of the source text on the basis of its translation and *vice versa*, it seems fitting to remind one of Michael Hahn’s remark made in the context of his discussion of the three independent Tibetan translations of Carpaṭi’s *Avalokiteśvarastotra* (aka *Lokanāthastotra*): “A close comparison of such multiple translations reveals that there is neither a one-way road from Sanskrit to Tibetan nor from Tibetan back to the hypothetical Sanskrit original. There are pitfalls in both directions, but thorough case studies of multiple translations might help us to avoid at least some of them.” See Hahn 2016: 94. This and related issues have also been discussed by Seyfort Ruegg extensively on several occasions. See Seyfort Ruegg 1992: 385–388, and Seyfort Ruegg 2016: *passim*, where he differentiates among reconstruction, retrotranslation (back-translation), and restoration.

them into the corresponding texts available to him that lacked such colophons:⁹

In the case of those [works] that lacked translator/translation colophons, the translator/translation colophons of master copies (*phyi mo*) that were obtained from elsewhere and contained similar translations were inserted.

The catalogue of the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* likewise addresses the issue, clearly confirming that in unclear cases there has been some intervention on the part of the editors regarding the colophons—that is, mainly the identification of the respective authors, translators, and *paṇḍitas*—and also regarding the determination of the doxographical classification of the individual works:¹⁰

⁹ *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (639.2): 'gyur byang mi bzhugs pa rnams la'ang 'gyur mthun pa'i phyi mo gzhan nas rnyed pa rnams kyi 'gyur byang bzhugs su bcug cing|. See also the translation in Seyfort Ruegg 1966: 34, and Almogi 2008: 116. Note that Bu ston, in his “letter to editors,” does not give any instructions regarding author/authorship colophons or translator/translation colophons. He does so only in regard to “production colophons” (*bris byang*)—which contain the background of the production of the manuscript in question—clearly to ensure that they credit the right donor. He states: “There are instructions by the donors not to copy existing old production colophons but to write new ones. Therefore, oversee [the copyists] and instruct [them accordingly].” See the *bsTan bcos bzhengs pa'i chos gnyer pa la gsol ba* (Xy: 346.2, Ms: 500.3): *sbyin bdag gis bris byang* [Ms: *byang*, Xy: *kyang*] *rnying pa 'dug pa rnams ma 'bri| bris byang so ma 'bri ba zhal ta'i gsung bdog pas|* [Ms: |, Xy: *om.*] *gzigs nas zhal bkod mdzod|*. Cf. the translation of this passage in Schaeffer 2009: 150: “Please instruct [them] to write new writer’s colophons and not rewrite the old [colophons], even if they were written by patrons.” The term *bris byang* is clearly to be understood in this context in the sense of “production colophon” (lit. “writing/copying colophon”) rather than “writer/scribe/copyist colophon.” Moreover, the reading *bris byang* (as in the Ms) is clearly preferable to *bris kyang* (as in the Xy, and as read by Schaeffer).

¹⁰ *Tshal pa bstan dkar* (T_{JS}, 228.20–229.29; T_{MS}, 6a6–b2): 'di'i sde tshan gyi rnam dbye dang mdzad pa po dang lo paṇ gyi mtshan kha gsal du yod pa rnams ni dngos su smos la| med pa rnams go bar zad de| mdor na mtshan dang 'gyur byang gi smos tshul la sogs| bkod pa dang grangs mang ba la sogs che ba du

Authenticity and Authentication

[In the case of works] for which the section division and the names of the authors, translators, and *paṇḍitas* were needed to be clarified, explicit statements were made, [and in the case of those works for which] there was no [such need, these] are easily understood. In short, since [this edition] is supreme in numerous [ways]—the manner in which the names and the translation colophons are formulated, etc., and the arrangement, the large number [of works], etc.—it is superior to other [editions]. Regarding [works] other than those [already included], new translation from Sanskrit or rare master copies obtained later are yet to be copied [and] should be written in their respective division.

We do not know to what extent this reworking of existing and insertion of missing colophons was practised, but it seems to have been quite extensive. It appears, however, that the editor of the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* was more reserved in this regard than Bu ston was, but this matter requires further investigation. While information found in colophons was generally integrated into catalogues (*dkar chag*), it is obvious that the other way around was also a common practice, that is, new colophons were inserted into manuscripts lacking ones or existing colophons were complemented on the basis of information found in earlier catalogues (or other sources of historical and/or bibliographical nature). Such practices were certainly engaged in the case of authorship colophons as well. Unlike brief catalogues, which commonly consist of short title lists, extensive catalogues often contain, in addition to titles (occasionally even in full form), also the names of the works' authors and translators, their length, and occasionally some editorial remarks concerning various matters including authenticity. Such procedures of inserting new colophons or complementing existing ones occasionally led to colophons containing information that was false, whether intentionally or inadvertently so. This state of affairs certainly

*mas gzhan las khyad par du 'phags so || 'di las gzhan pa | rgya gar nas gсар
du 'gyur ba'am | dpe phyi dkon nas phyis brnyed pa 'bri dgos da dung so so'i
sde tshan du bri bar bya'o ||.*

contributed to repeated complaints of plagiarism from adherents of the rNying ma school against translators associated with the New Schools for misleadingly taking credit for Ancient Translations.¹¹

One can only speculate about how many translation colophons contain false information, since in most cases only the versions admitted into the Canon have survived (and/or are accessible). This is true also of alleged revisions, since the Canon's editors often admitted versions that claimed to be "revisions," and thus the original, "non-revised" versions have rarely survived. Luckily, however, in a few cases the original translations have survived, either as extracanonical versions, or within what is called "local" canonical editions (*bKa' 'gyur* or *bsTan 'gyur*). The Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur*, for example, written sometime between 1696 and 1706 in Phug brag monastery located in West Tibet, provides several such examples that could give us some idea of the state of affairs in this regard and perhaps also some clues of what could have occasionally happened in the course of transmission.¹² Another collection that could give us further glimpses into the matter is no doubt the paracanonical collection known as *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*. Admittedly, it is often hard to tell whether the discrepancies are the result of an intended falsification or of an innocent transmissional error (or even a combination of the two).

5. Case Studies

In the following I would like to present four instances for which several translations have survived as case studies. For this purpose I shall consult, in addition to the available colophons, also several traditional catalogues (*dkar chag*), with preference given to earlier ones, and whenever applicable also other sources of historical or bibliographical nature. I would like therefore to first present an overview of the traditional catalogues consulted

¹¹ For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Almogi 2016b.

¹² See Jampa Samten 1992: iv, xi–xxx.

(in as chronological an order as possible) in order to enable a better historical perspective.

5.1. An Overview of the Traditional Catalogues Consulted

A. *bKa' bstan* Catalogues

- (1) *lDan/lHan dkar ma*, the earliest imperial catalogue of the holdings of translated literature kept at the lDan/lHan dkar palace; compiled by various translators in the early ninth century. Catalogue numbers are provided according to Lalou 1953, indicated by the siglum L.
- (2) *'Phang thang ma*, an imperial catalogue of the holdings of translated literature kept at the 'Phang thang palace; compiled by various translators in the early ninth century (most probably after the *lDan dkar ma*). Catalogue numbers are provided according to Kawagoe 2005, indicated by the siglum K.
- (3) *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, the catalogue compiled by Rig ral on the basis of earlier catalogues, which could be regarded in a way as reflecting a preliminary stage of the activities in sNar thang towards the compilation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon there in the early fourteenth century (1310s). Based on internal evidence it has been suggested by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer that it was composed no later than the early 1270s.¹³ Catalogue numbers are provided according to van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009, indicated with the siglum Rr. (The variant readings recorded in van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009 (versions N & R) are provided and the text is critically edited by myself.)
- (4) *Bu ston chos 'byung*, the catalogue of translated literature appended to the religious history compiled by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364; BDRC: P155) between the years 1322–1326. Catalogue numbers are provided

¹³ See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 59.

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

according to Nishioka 1980/1981/1983, indicated by the siglum Bc.

B. *bKa' 'gyur* Catalogues

- (1) *Glo bo bka' dkar*, the catalogue to the Mustang (Glo bo) manuscript edition of the *bKa' 'gyur* compiled by Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po (1382–1456; BDRC: P1132) in 1447. Catalogue numbers are provided according to Eimer 1999, indicated by the siglum Mk.
- (2) *Phug brag bka' dkar*, the catalogue to the Phug brag manuscript edition of the *bKa' 'gyur*, which was produced ca. 1696–1706. The compiler is unknown. The catalogue has not been edited, and the corresponding catalogue numbers are provided according to Jampa Samten 1992, indicated by the siglum F.
- (3) *sDe dge bka' dkar*, the catalogue to the sDe dge xylographic edition of the *bKa' 'gyur* compiled by Si tu Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1699/1700–1774; BDRC: P956) and completed in 1733. The catalogue has not been edited. Catalogue numbers are given according to the Tōhoku catalogue (Ui 1934), indicated by the siglum D.¹⁴

C. *bsTan 'gyur* Catalogues

- (1) *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, the catalogue compiled by dBus pa blo gsal (ca. 1270–ca. 1355;¹⁵ BDRC: P3090) to the first *bsTan 'gyur* edition prepared at sNar thang in the early fourteenth century (1310s), and thus the earliest

¹⁴ Other *bKa' 'gyur* catalogues—such as those to the sNar thang (completed 1732), lHa sa (completed 1934), and 'Jang sa tham aka Li thang (completed 1621) xylographic editions, and the sTog manuscript edition (produced in the first half of the eighteenth century)—merely consist of title lists and thus are not much of a help. Whenever necessary, references will be given to Members of Staff 1988 (sNar thang and lHa sa), Imaeda 1984 ('Jang sa tham), and Skorupski 1985 (sTog).

¹⁵ The dates provided here are according to van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 10, but cf. van der Kuijp 2011: 79, where it is argued that if dBus pa blo gsal indeed wrote his *bstan rtsis* in 1280 as suggested by several sources, he was most probably born before 1260.

such catalogue. Two versions of the catalogue are available, one shorter, which presents an earlier version (MS B), and one longer, which presents a later (final?) version (MS A). Catalogue numbers are provided according to Jampa Samten 2015, which merely consults manuscript B, with the siglum N_{js}.

- (2) *Tshal pa bstan dkar*, the catalogue (completed 1323?) to the Tshal pa edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, which was sponsored by the ruler of Tshal gung thang, Tshal pa drung che sMon lam rdo rje (1284–1346/7; BDRC: P9825) and prepared in the years 1317–1323 under the supervision of one Bla ma Kun dga' don grub,¹⁶ mostly based on manuscripts from various places in dBus and neighbouring areas, whereas still missing works were supplemented from sNar thang. The catalogue was compiled by one dGe ba'i bshes gnyen dGe 'dun rin chen.¹⁷ Catalogue numbers are provided according to

¹⁶ This Bla ma Kun dga' don grub might well be sNye mdo Kun dga' don grub (b. 1268; BDRC: P1452), who was one of the Third Karma pa's teachers. In the short biography of the Third Karma pa found in Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje's *Red Annals* (composed 1346–1363; Martin 1997b: no. 77), the Third Karma pa is reported to have studied under him the entire doctrinal cycles of rJe dam pa (?) and Grub chen O rgyan pa (1229/30–1309; BDRC: P1448). See the *Deb dmar* (98.8–9): **sNye mdo pa chen po Kun dga' don grub la | rJe dam pa dang Grub chen O rgyan pa'i chos skor kun [gsan]** |. Dung dkar Blo bzang 'phrin las (ibid.: 416, note 474), gives sNye mdo Kun dga' don grub's dates as 1268–1316! (note that the birth year is erroneously given there as 1286, but the Tibetan year is correctly given as Earth Dragon, which is indeed 1268). Dung dkar does not name his source for 1316 being sNye mdo Kun dga' don grub's year of death. If this year is, however, correct, he could not possibly be our Bla ma Kun dga' don grub, since the Tshal pa edition was prepared during the years 1317–1323. See also the following note.

¹⁷ dGe ba'i bshes gnyen dGe 'dun rin chen, too, might be one of the Third Karma pa's teachers. In the *Red Annals* it is stated that at the age of eighteen, after his ordination, he studied the Vinaya under one dGe 'dun rin chen, who is referred to there as the officiating master (*las kyi slob dpon*). See the *Deb dmar* (98.4–7): *dgung lo bco brgyad | mngal dang shol zla*

Jampa Samten 2016, indicated by the siglum T. (Readings found in Jampa Samten 2016 are recorded as T_{JS} and those in the the manuscript as T_{MS}.)

- (3) *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*, the catalogue to the Zhwa lu edition of the *bsTan 'gyur* compiled by Bu ston and completed in 1335. The edition was based on the sNar thang edition, but is entirely different in terms of its structure and in some respects also in terms of its content. The catalogue has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the sDe dge edition are given according to the Tōhoku catalogue Tōhoku (Ui 1934), indicated by the siglum =D.
- (4) *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*, the catalogue to the *bsTan 'gyur* commissioned and sponsored by the Third Karma pa Rang byung rdo rje (1284–1339; BDRC: P66) and prepared by Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje (1309–1364; BDRC: P4525) sometime between September 1335 and January 1336. The catalogue must have been therefore completed at the beginning of 1336 at the earliest. This edition bears a resemblance to the Tshal pa one, and so does its catalogue. The identity of the compiler of its catalogue is unclear (possibly Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje or dGe ba'i bshes gnyen dGe 'dun rin chen, the compiler of the *Tshal pa bstan dkar?*). (The version available is apparently based on a damaged master copy and thus possibly incomplete.) The catalogue has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the Peking edition are given according to the Ōtani catalogue (Suzuki 1961), indicated by the siglum =P.
- (5) *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2*, another catalogue to a *bsTan 'gyur* edition associated with Rang byung rdo rje. The

rtsis pa'i nyi shu la mkhan po **Byang chub sems dpa'i gzhon nu byang chub pa dang las kyi slob dpon dGe 'dun rin chen gyi spyang sngar bsnyen par rdzogs nas 'dul ba'i skor gsan** |.

compiler's identity is similarly unknown.¹⁸ The relationship between the two catalogues is unclear. There is, however, some evidence that this catalogue may have been compiled much later than the former, perhaps three quarters of a century later or more. That the content of the two catalogues differs greatly could mean that either two editions were prepared at the behest of Rang byung rdo rje or that the original set was revised at some point. This matter needs, however, to be more closely studied.¹⁹ The catalogue has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the Peking edition are given

¹⁸ Although the title on the title page merely reads *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag*, the fact that this is a catalogue to a *bsTan 'gyur* edition that served as a reverential object (*thugs dam*) of the Third Karma pa is made clear in the concluding sentence of the introduction to the catalogue. See the *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2* (598.5–6): ... *lha dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten pa thams cad kyis 'dren pa dam pa mtshungs pa med pa'i chos kyis rje rin po che'i karma pa'i zhal nga nas kyis bstan bcos bod du 'gyur ro 'tshal thugs [em.: thugs, Text: thug] dam du bzhengs pa'i bstan bcos rnam kyis mtshan gyi rnam grangs tsam ni 'dir gang brjod par bya ba'i chos sol |*.

¹⁹ See, for example, below, note 288, for a record cited from *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2* that reports on a revision of the Tibetan translation of the *Pradīpodyotana*, Candrakīrti's commentary on the *Guhyasamājantra*, made by [Tsong kha pa] Blo bzang grags pa. (This could theoretically be a later interpolation, but there is no evidence to support this.) It is to assume that Tsong kha pa made this revision together with his revision of the translation of the *Guhyasamājantra* itself, which survived as an extracanonical blockprint. According to the colophon of this version, the revision was made in dGa' ldan, and thus is to be dated 1409 at the earliest (see below, p. 191). The fact that this edition is referred to as a reverential object of the (Third) Karma pa implies that it was prepared during his lifetime. This, however, does not accord with the fact that it includes a text revised by Tsong kha pa. This contradiction could be perhaps resolved if one assumes that the edition reflected in this second catalogue was based on the first edition (as reflected in the first catalogue), which then underwent a major revision, including reorganization of the existing works and supplementation of additional ones.

according to the Ōtani catalogue, indicated by the siglum =P.

- (6) *Ngam ring bstan dkar*,²⁰ the catalogue to the Sa skya-cum-Jo nang monastery *Ngam ring chos sde/grwa bsTan 'gyur* edition prepared at the behest of the governor dPon chen Ta'i si tu Nam mkha' brtan pa'i rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po aka Kun spangs chen po Grags pa rgyal mtshan (b. 1316²¹). The catalogue was compiled by Jo nang Phyogs las nam rgyal (1306–1386; BDRC: P152). The exact dates of neither the edition nor its catalogue are known (the master copy used for the modern print was missing the first and last folio(s), which could have contained information regarding the dates).²² Nonetheless, as stated in the catalogue, the edition was mainly based on the sNar thang edition, while the Zhwa lu edition was relied upon for the additional works contained therein, and more works were searched for and added (totaling 3116 works altogether).²³ In terms of the order of works, the catalogue is stated to have followed Bu ston's *Zhwa lu*

²⁰ I would like to take this opportunity to thank the mKhan po-s of 'Dzam thang monastery for presenting me a copy of this catalogue during a visit there in 2015.

²¹ The birth year of Nam mkha' brtan pa provided here is according to Stearns 1999: 203 n. 44.

²² For the publishers' remark, see the *Ngam ring bstan dkar* (177): 'di'i ma phyi ni rje **Ngag dbang tshogs gnyis rgya mtshos Chos thang dgon du phul bas** | da lan dgon pa'i las sne nas nga tshor g.yar byung bas bka' drin che zhu | dbu ldeb shog mtha' skyon shor yod pas tshog yod pa rnams kha gsab thabs bral | mjug yang mi tshang bas par thengs gnyis pa'i skabs spus legs shig yong thub pa'i re ba yod |.

²³ Note that although the *Ngam ring* edition is said to have included additional works found in neither the sNar thang nor the Zhwa lu editions, it contains 276 works less than the Zhwa lu edition, which is said to contain 3392 works in total. It is yet to be seen whether the lower number of works in the *Ngam ring* edition is a result of a different policy concerning works whose authenticity was disputed.

bstan dkar.²⁴ Considering this information and the dates of the persons involved, the edition was most probably prepared sometime around mid-fourteenth century or slightly later. The catalogue has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the sDe dge edition are given according to the Tōhoku catalogue, indicated by the siglum =D.

- (7) *Glo bo rdo rje theg pa'i bstan dkar*, the catalogue to the Tantra section of the Mustang (Glo bo) manuscript edition of the *bsTan 'gyur* compiled by Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po and completed in 1447. The catalogue has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the sDe dge edition are given according to the Tōhoku catalogue, indicated by the siglum =D.
- (8) *Glo bo bstan dkar*, the catalogue to the Sūtra section of the Mustang (Glo bo) manuscript edition of the *bsTan 'gyur* compiled by Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po and completed in 1447. The catalogue has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the sDe dge edition are given according to the Tōhoku catalogue, indicated by the siglum =D.

²⁴ See the *Ngam ring bstan dkar* (177.6–15): ... *khyad par du 'phags pa'i bstan bcos stong phrag gsum dang brgya phrag gcig dang bcu drug bzhugs so* | | *'di'i phyi mo chos gra chen po sNar thang na bzhugs pa'i bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal la zhus shing* | *der ma 'dus pa'i dpe phyi dkon pa dang* | *gsar du 'gyur ba chos gra chen po Zhal lu'i bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi nang na bzhugs pa rnam la zhus te* | *der yang ma 'dus pa'i bstan bcos gsar du 'gyur ba ci rigs pa zhig gi phyi mo yang 'bad pa chen pos btsal te legs par zhus so* | | *dkar chag gi rim pa yang* | *lnga rig pa'i mkhas pa chen po mkhan chen lo tsā ba Bu ston gyis brtag dpyad legs par mdzad pa'i dKar chag gzhir byas te* | *sngar bstan bcos bod ma yin par mkhyen bzhin du yang* | *dkar chag snga ma dag na yod pa'i dbang du mdzad nas re shig bzhugs su gsol* | [...?]. As stated above, the master copy of the only available publication of this catalogue was missing the last folio(s).

(9) *INga pa chen po bstan dkar*, the catalogue to what I would like to refer to as the Fifth Dalai Lama edition,²⁵ was prepared in the years 1687–1688 in 'Phyong rgyas (/Phying ba stag rtse) as part of various activities undertaken to conceal the Fifth Dalai Lama's (1617–1682; BDRC: P37) death. The authorship colophon disingenuously ascribes the catalogue to the Fifth Dalai Lama for the same reason. (It has been speculated that the actual compiler of the catalogue was sDe srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho (1653–1705, r. 1679–1702; BDRC: P421), but there is no concrete evidence for it.) Being the catalogue of its master copy, this catalogue was appended to the Peking edition as it is occasionally done in such cases (and thus erroneously believed by some to be its actual catalogue).²⁶ The *INga pa chen po bstan dkar* has not been edited; equivalent catalogue numbers of works in the Peking edition are given according to the Ōtani catalogue, indicated by the siglum =P.

(10) *sDe dge bstan dkar*, the catalogue to the sDe dge xylographic edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, compiled by Zhu chen Tshul khri ms rin chen (1697–1774; BDRC: P801) in the years 1737–1744. The catalogue was prepared in 1744

²⁵ The edition is sometimes also referred to as the 'Phyong rgyas or the 'Phying ba stag rtse edition, a designation that I prefer not to use since it appears that it is not the only edition prepared there.

²⁶ A complementary catalogue to the Peking edition itself is reported to have been compiled by the Second Thu'u bkwan Ngag dbang chos kyi rgya mtsho (1680–1736; BDRC: P1896) and to bear the title *bsTan 'gyur rin po che'i dkar chag blo gsal mgul rgyan tsinta ma ni'i phreng mdzes*. This catalogue seems to have been printed separately from the Peking edition and is unfortunately not available to me. Thu'u bkwan's *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue is listed in the *Shes bya'i gter mdzod*, vol. 2: 334–335 (no. 22), where it is reported to consist of 35 folios. A reference to it has already been made in Jampa Samten 1987: 775. A thorough study of the *INga pa chen po bstan dkar* and a comparison of its content with the Peking *bsTan 'gyur* edition is necessary in order to determine whether there is a complete agreement between the two.

and had Bu ston's catalogue as its basis. The catalogue has not been edited. Catalogue numbers of works in the sDe dge edition are given according to the Tōhoku catalogue, indicated by the siglum D.

- (11) *gSer bris bstan dkar*, the catalogue to the Golden edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, also known as the dGa' ldan edition. The edition was prepared at the behest of Pho lha nas/ba bSod nams stobs rgyas (1689–1747, r. 1728–1747; BDRC: P346) sometime between 1734 and 1741. Its master copy was the Fifth Dalai Lama edition and its catalogue was compiled by 'Jam dbyangs bde ba'i rdo rje (1682–1741; BDRC: P345) on the basis of the former's catalogue and is in fact almost identical to it. The catalogue has not been edited; catalogue numbers of works in the Golden edition are given according to Miyake 2000, indicated by the siglum G.

D. *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* Catalogues

- (1) *Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag*, the catalogue of the now lost Pad ma 'od gling edition of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*, prepared between 1771 and 1772 at the behest of 'Jigs med gling pa (1729/30–1798; BDRC: P3), who also compiled its catalogue. Catalogue numbers are given according to the *rNying rgyud dkar chag gsal ba'i me long* (Thub bstan chos dar 2000, with additional reference to Achard 2002), indicated by the siglum Pw.
- (2) *sDe dge rnying rgyud dkar chag*, the catalogue to the sDe dge edition of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* prepared in the years 1794–1798. The catalogue was compiled by Kaḥ thog dge rtse 'Gyur med tshe dbang mchog grub (1761–1829; BDRC: P2943). Catalogue numbers are given according to The Tibetan & Himalayan Library (THL) online catalogue (with additional reference to Achard 2003), indicated by the siglum Dg.
- (3) *Nub ri (Brag dkar rta so) rnying rgyud dkar chag*, the catalogue to the Brag dkar rta so edition prepared at the behest of Brag dkar rta so sprul sku Chos kyi dbang

phyug (1775–1837; BDRC: P5630) between 1813 and 1814, and now kept in Nubri (Samagaon, Nepal). The catalogue was compiled by Brag dkar rta so sprul sku himself. Catalogue numbers are given according to Almogi (forthcoming-b), indicated by the siglum Nu.

5.2. The Colophons of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* aka *Nirvikalpastava* in Tibetan Translation

As has already been pointed out by Jampa Samten, in several cases the Phug brag manuscript edition of the *bKa' 'gyur* contains versions that are virtually identical with the versions found in the “mainstream” (i.e., as opposed to “local”) canonical editions but bear a different translator/translation colophon with a different ascription of the translation.²⁷ In the following I shall present and discuss three of these cases, starting with the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* (*Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i/ma'i bstod pa*) aka *Nirvikalpastava* (*rNam par mi rtog pa'i bstod pa*).

5.2.1. Extant Versions and Their Colophons

In the instance of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* aka *Nirvikalpastava* we are concerned with questions regarding both the authorship and translators' statements, and the title as well. This work and the identity of its author and translators has been discussed on several occasions in the past;²⁸ thus here I shall merely focus on the authenticity of its colophons and the information contained therein. As already pointed out by Michael Hahn and Jampa Samten, the work is available both in the *bsTan 'gyur* and in the

²⁷ For Jampa Samten's discussion of cases in the Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur* in which the translations and/or the translation ascriptions found in the colophons differ from those found in the mainstream canonical versions, see Jampa Samten 1992: xi–xxiii.

²⁸ The studies dealing in one way or another with this work are too numerous to be listed here. In the following I shall merely refer to the ones most relevant to our discussion, in which references to other studies can be found.

Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur*, where it is found twice.²⁹ While the authorship ascription in all witnesses is identical, the ascription of the translation in the mainstream canonical versions differs from that in the two Phug brag versions.

(a) Mainstream *bsTan 'gyur* editions

In the colophons of the mainstream canonical versions (D1127/G18/N18/P2018), the work—titled there *Prajñāpāramitā-stotra*—is ascribed to Nāgārjuna and is stated as having been translated by [rNgog] Blo ldan shes rab (1059–1109; BDRC: P2551) in collaboration with Tilakakalaśa (Thig le bum pa). The authorship and translation colophons of the mainstream canonical versions (*bsTan 'gyur*) read as follows (D, 76b6–7; G, 109b2; N, 84b5; P, 88b2–3):

Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma'i bstod pa slob dpon 'phags pa Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa rdzogs so || kha che'i paṇḍi ta Thig le bum pa dang | lo tsā ba Blo ldan shes rab kyis bsgyur ba'o ||

(b) Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur* edition

In the colophons of both versions contained in the Phug brag collection (F240, F390), which are titled there *Nirvikalpastava*, the authorship is likewise ascribed to Nāgārjuna but the translation to [Nag tsho] Tshul khriims rgyal ba (1011–1064; BDRC: P3456) in collaboration with Śāntibhadra. The colophons of both versions found in the Phug brag collection read as follows (F240, 379b8–380a2, F390, 339b5–6; cf. Jampa Samten 1992: 91, 140):

rNam par mi rtog pa'i bstod³⁰ pa 'phags pa Klu sgrub³¹ kyis mdzad pa rdzogs s.ho || rgya gar gyi mkhan po Shan ti³² bha tra

²⁹ See Hahn 1988. This information was brought to Hahn's attention by Jampa Samten, who was at the time working on his catalogue of the Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur*. See Jampa Samten 1992: xxii, § (c)2.

³⁰ bstod] F₂₄₀, stod F₃₉₀

³¹ sgrub] *em.*, grub F₂₄₀, grubs F₃₉₀

³² shan ti] *em.*, shin ti F₂₄₀, shan ta F₃₉₀

*dang | lo tsha*³³ *ba Tshul khrim s rgyal bas bsgyur cing zhus te*
*gtan la phab pa'o*³⁴ | |

(c) **Tshal pa bsTan 'gyur edition**

Fortunately, I was able to obtain images of the bsTod pa volume (Ka) of the Tshal pa bsTan 'gyur, which gives us the opportunity to examine the colophon of yet another witness. The colophon of this version (T55)³⁵—which is, like the mainstream canonical versions, titled *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* (*Shes rab pha rol phyin ma'i bstod pa*)—ascribes the authorship to Rāhulabhadra and the translation to yet another translator, Khe'u brgad³⁶ Yon tan dpal (fl. possibly late eleventh and first half of the twelfth centuries; according to some suggestions, however, the range of his possible floruit could be sometime between the eleventh and early fourteenth century³⁷) in

³³ tsha] F₃₉₀, tsa F₂₄₀

³⁴ pa'o] F₃₉₀, pa F₂₄₀

³⁵ The work is found in the bsTod pa section, vol. Ka, 312a3–313b1.

³⁶ The first component of the name appears in three spellings in various combinations with the second: Khe'u brgad or else Kher or Khyer for the first syllable and (b)rgad, (b)gad, or gang for the second. In the following I shall consistently use the spelling Khe'u brgad.

³⁷ The dates of Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal are unfortunately unknown. He was, however, with certainty active during the Later Period. Firstly, he is listed by Rig ral as a translator of the Later Period and credited there with the translation of three *stotras*, none of which is, however, the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*. See the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (247): **Khyer gang Yon tan dpal** *gyis* | [Rr28.28] **Nam langs pa'i bstod pa dang** | | [Rr28.29] **Ha ri sha'i gNas chen brgyad kyi bstod pa dang** | | [Rr28.30] **sGrol ma'i bstod** [N: *bstod*, R: *stod*] **pa me tog 'phreng ba bsgyur ro** [N: *ro*, R: *om.*] | |. The three works are to be identified as Harṣadeva's *Suprabhātastotra* (D1167/P2056) and *Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavandanāstava* (D1168/P2057), and Sarvajñamitra's *Āryatārāsrāgharāstotra* (D1692/P2565), respectively. While the translation of the first two is also ascribed to Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal in collaboration with Rājaśrī Jñānamitra (D1167 and D1168/P2057 in their respective colophons; P2056 lacks a colophon), that of D1692/P2565 is termed a solo-translation (*rang 'gyur*) by Candrakumāra. See Tibskrit, s.v. *Suprabhātastotra*, where Martin suggests

collaboration with Rājaśrī Jñānamitra. The colophon reads as follows (T, 313a5–b1):

Shes rab pha rol phyin ma'i bstod pa || 'phags pa sGra
gcan 'dzin bzang pos mdzad pa || rdzogs s.ho || || rgya gar gyi
mkhan po paṇḍi ta ra dzā shrī **Dznya na mi tra dang** | lo tsha ba
Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal gyis bsgyur pa'o ||

(d) Extracanonical Version

Interestingly, there exists another set of authorship and translation colophons of the *stotra*, this time transmitted in a commentary on it composed by Rong ston Shes bya kun rig (1367–1449; BDRC: P431). Based on the commentary's authorship colophon, the commentary is to be dated 1447.³⁸ There the *stotra* is

that this Yon tan dpal might be a disciple of Sa skya paṇḍi ta (1182–1251; BDRC: P1056), who lived from 1237 to 1323—which would place his floruit in the second half of the thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth centuries—but adds that this requires verification. Martin also points out the modern Tibetan publication *mKhas grub rim byon*, where no bibliographical information is offered but it is nonetheless speculated that he might have been born in the mid eleventh century. Note that Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal is dated by the BDRC (P4CZ10522) ca. eighth century, but considering the bibliographical records in the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (and some later/modern Tibetan sources, all of which list him under the Later Period), this dating is clearly unlikely. The identity of his collaborator, Rājaśrī Jñānamitra, is unfortunately uncertain, and thus also his dates. At any rate, the fact that he is listed in Rig ral's catalogue, which according to van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 59 was written in the early 1270s at the latest, confirms that Khe'u brgad has by that time already produced several translations. Moreover, the fact that Rig ral lists him together with Pa tshab Nyi ma grags (b. 1055; BDRC: P5651) and other translators active during the second half of the eleventh century and the twelfth century, where he occurs at the beginning of the list, speaks for a floruit in the later part of the second half of the eleventh and first half of the twelfth centuries. See the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* 247 (section begins in *ibid.*: 245).

³⁸ *Sher phyin bstod pa'i 'grel pa* (A, 6536–654.1; B: 109.3–4): ... *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la bstod pa 'phags pa sGra gcan 'dzin gyis mdzad pa'i 'grel pa byin rlabs rnam par rol pa'i gter zhes* [B: *zhes*, A: *om.*] *bya*

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

referred to as *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, authorship is ascribed to Rāhulabhadra, and the translation to Mar pa [do ba] Chos kyi dbang phyug (1042–1136; BDRC: P3814) in collaboration with the Kashmiri Mahājana. The colophons as cited in Rong ston’s *Sher phyin bstod pa’i ’grel pa* (A, 653.4–5; B: 109.1–2) read as follows:

Shes rab kyi pha rol tu³⁹ phyin pa’i bstod pa | *’phags pa sGra gcan ’dzin bzang pos mdzad pa rdzogs so* || *kha che’i paṇḍi ta Ma hā⁴⁰ dza na⁴¹ dang* | *bod kyi lo tsā ba Mar pa Chos kyi dbang phyug gis bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa’o* |

To recap, the colophons of the five *bsTan ’gyur* editions (DGNPT) and the one transmitted in Rong ston’s commentary refer to the work as *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, while those of the Phug brag versions refer to it as *Nirvikalpastava*; the colophons of the four mainstream *bsTan ’gyur* versions (DGNP) and those of the Phug brag *bKa’ ’gyur* versions ascribe the authorship to Nāgārjuna, while that of the Tshal pa *bsTan ’gyur* and the one transmitted in Rong ston’s commentary ascribe it to Rāhulabhadra. Regarding the translation ascription they all differ: the colophons of the four mainstream *bsTan ’gyur* versions (DGNP) ascribe it to Tilakakalaśa and rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, that of the Tshal pa

ba ’di ni | **Rong ston chen po Shes bya kun rig gis dPal Nā lendra’i dgon par rab byung gi lor sbyar ba’o** || ||. The year of composition is merely specified as Rab byung, which is the first year of the sexagenary cycle, also known as the Fire Rabbit (Me yos) Year. Within the span of Rong ston’s dates, the two possible years are 1387, when he was twenty years old, or 1447, when he was eighty. Since the place of composition is specified as Nāendra Monastery, which was founded by Rong ston himself in 1436, the year of composition can only be 1447. Note that my reference to this colophon as “authorship colophon” rather than “author colophon” is due to the attributive adjective “great” (*chen po*) attached to the name Rong ston. It is, however, not to be ruled out that the colophon was originally written by Rong ston and was later slightly reworked by the editors of his Collected Works.

³⁹ tu] A, du B

⁴⁰ ma hā] A, mahā B

⁴¹ na] *em.*, ma AB

version to Rājaśrī Jñānamitra and Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal, those of the two Phug brag versions to Śāntibhadra and Nag tsho Tshul khirms rgyal ba, and the one transmitted in Rong ston's commentary to the Kashmiri Mahājana and Mar pa do ba Chos kyi dbang phyug. Now, to take the dates of the Tibetan translators, which luckily are known in at least three cases, the translation ascribed to Nag tsho (1011–1064) is most likely the oldest of the four, and is to be dated ca. mid-eleventh century. Determining the relative chronology of the translations ascribed to rNgog (1059–1109) and Mar do (1042–1136) merely on the basis of the two translators' dates seems impossible for their lifetimes considerably overlap. All one could say is that the two translations are to be generally dated to ca. late 11th to early 12th century. And finally, in the case of Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal, the range of dates in which his translation saw the light of day is unfortunately rather large—eleventh to early fourteenth century (though, as argued above, late eleventh to first half of the twelfth centuries seems more probable for his floruit, which would date his translation to the same period as the ones by rNgog and Mar do). In the following, for practical reasons, I shall present and discuss the different versions in the following order: Nag tsho, rNgog, Mar do, and Khe'u brgad, but it should be borne in mind that the relative chronology of the last three is not at all certain, although the discussion might at times give this impression.

Regarding the translation ascribed to Nag tsho and that to rNgog, Michael Hahn, who compared the two, concluded that they differ greatly, and considered rNgog's to be a "retranslation."⁴² However, given that many of the phrases (occasionally entire verse lines) are virtually identical in both versions, one cannot

⁴² For the critical edition and a "philological commentary" on the differences between the two translations, see Hahn 1988. See also Hahn 2016: 85, where he classifies this case under his rubric of "retranslations of older translations with the sole intention of improving an older version and producing a correct Tibetan text." See also Seyfort Ruegg 1992: 383–384, where the differences between the two translations are likewise discussed, and Seyfort Ruegg 2016: 216–217 as well.

help wondering whether rNgog's use of the earlier translation by Nag tsho (provided this was indeed the case) could be justifiably passed over in the colophon. I would therefore suggest reconsidering the matter and asking ourselves whether rNgog's version can indeed be considered a "retranslation" or whether it should perhaps be regarded as a "revision." Regarding the translation attributed to Mar do, Rong ston fortunately embeds great portions of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* in his commentary, so that a comparison of the translation used by him with the above two is possible. Moreover, now that the translation attributed to Khe'u brgad has become available, an examination of this version is also possible.

Nearly the entire *stotra*, notably, seems to be embedded in Ānandarāgarbha's *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* (D2644/P3468).⁴³ The work has no translation colophon but its translation—together with Ratnakīrti's *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalavidhi* (D2645/P3469), which follows it in the mainstream *bsTan 'gyur* editions, and for which there is a very short colophon⁴⁴—is considered in several of the traditional catalogues to be a solo-translation by the Nepalese/Newari *Mahāpaṇa (or perhaps *Mahāpatha?⁴⁵).⁴⁶ This

⁴³ What appears to be another translation of verses 1–20 is found in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* (D, 258a3–b7; P, 276b7–277b4). (It seems, however, that three lines of verse are missing altogether; naturally, verse 21, which contains the dedication, is also missing, the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* having its own dedication verse at the end.) Whether the Sanskrit text underlying this Tibetan translation of the verses was completely identical with the Sanskrit text of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* is hard to say, but an in-depth study of the Tibetan translation of the relevant section of the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* could certainly shed more light on this matter (which is, however, not the main concern of the present study).

⁴⁴ The translation colophon of the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalavidhi* reads (D, 270a2; P, 290b1): *bal po Ma hā pā ṇas bsgyur pa'o* [D: *pa'o*, P: *ba'o*] | |.

⁴⁵ The name is found in Tibetan transliteration in several variants, including Mahāpaṇa/°pāṇa/°pana/°pāna. Nonetheless, the name is glossed in MS A of the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* with what seems to be (the reading is somewhat unclear) the Tibetan rendering Lam chen,

which would suggest Mahāpatha, which in turn appears to be a plausible reading. If this is indeed the case, the reading Mahāpaṇa/°pāṇa/°pana/°pāna may be a corruption resulting from a confusion between the syllables *tha* and *ṇa/na* (in dBu med script). See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 32a2). It must, however, be added that the quality of the glosses found in MS A that contain reconstructions of the authors' Sanskrit names or *vice versa*, that is, the Tibetan rendering of the Sanskrit names (as in the present case), is rather poor in terms of their correctness, and thus the reconstruction Lam chen should be taken with caution.

⁴⁶ See the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (518.4–5): [=D2644] *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga zhes bya ba | slob dpon Kun dga' snying pos mdzad pa dang |* [=D2645] *de la brten nas slob dpon Ratna kirtis mdzad pa'i Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga | bal po Ma hā pā na'i rang 'gyur |*. The interpretation that the translation ascription to *Mahāpaṇa applies to both works is based on the usage of the particle *dang* (“and”) connecting the two bibliographical items, and corroborated by observations regarding the general practice, in this and later catalogues, of presenting such information. However, such interpretation/conclusions should be drawn with caution, for, as to be expected, the syntax and usage of particles is not, and in fact cannot be, absolutely consistent. (One may indeed argue that the particle *dang* here is due to the following *de la brten nas*, but this seems unlikely if we take into consideration two other cases where, although the records are connected by the phrase *de la brten nas* but the translators are different, the particle *dang* has not been used. See the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (518.2–3), referring to works =D2640 and =D2641, found only a couple of records previous to those under discussion, and *ibid.* (492.6–493.1), referring to works =D2217+D2218 and =D2219). Later *bsTan 'gyur* catalogues that are based on the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* contain almost identical statements. See the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 402a2–3); *INga pa chen po bstan dkar* (63b5–6); *gSer bris bstan dkar* (80a4–5). The listing of the two works together with an ascription of the translation of both to *Mahāpaṇa can be traced back to Bu ston's *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*. Unlike in his *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*, in his religious history Bu ston does not, notably, list the two works together: The reference to what seems to be Ānandagarbha's *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* is with neither an authorship nor a translation ascription. The reference to the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalavidhi* comes with an explicit authorship ascription to Ratnakīrti and a translation ascription to *Mahāpaṇa. See the *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc1827;

translation displays significant differences with the four discussed

=D2644?] *dPal mchog shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyil chog*; and *ibid.*: [Bc1863; =D2645] *slob dpon Ratna kirtis mdzad pa'i Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga bal po Ma hā pa na'i rang 'gyur* |. *dBus pa blo gsal* also lists the two texts separately (but in proximity), first the one by Ratnakīrti and two items later the one by Ānandagarbha, with *Mahāpaṇa indicated as the translator of the former one alone. See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 66b4–5; B, 53b6–7): [N_{js}1435; =D2645] *slob dpon Rad na kīrtis*^[1] *mdzad pa Shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga bal po Ma hā*^[2] *pa na'i rang 'gyur* | (^[1] kīrtis] A, kīrtis B; ^[2] hā] A, ha B); and *ibid.* (A, 66b5–6; B, 54a1): [N_{js}1437; =D2644] *slob dpon Kun dga' snying pos mdzad pa Shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa'i*^[1] *dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga* | (^[1] shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa'i] B, sher phyin gyi A). Moreover, Ratnakīrti's work is listed there a second time in a different chapter, likewise with an ascription of the translation to *Mahāpaṇa. See *ibid.* (A, 31b6–32a1; B, 25b1–2): [N_{js}670; =D2645] *slob dpon Rad na kīrtis*^[1] *mdzad pa'i Shes rab pha rol phyin pa'i dkyil*^[2] *chog* [...] *bal po Ma hā pa nas bsgyur ba...* (^[1] kīrtis] A, kir tis B, ^[2] dkyil] B, gtor A). (Note that a cluster of five works [A, 31b6–32a2; B, 25b1–5; N_{js}670–N_{js}674] should be understood here as all composed by Ratnakīrti and translated by *Mahāpaṇa; also note that Jampa Samten erroneously reads here Ma ta sa na). Rig ral, in his *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, seems not to list either of the two (cf., however, Rr18.1). The *Tshal pa bstan dkar* likewise lists the two works separately (and not in proximity) with a translation ascription to *Mahāpaṇa only in the case of Ratnakīrti's work (33a7–b1): [T745] *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga Kun dga' snying pos mdzad pa* |; and *ibid.* (48b6): [T1242] *Shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga Rad na kir tis mdzad pa Mahā pa na'i 'gyur* |. The catalogue of Rang byung rdo rje's edition, as expected, shows an affinity with that of the Tshal pa edition. See the *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1* (475.1–2): [=P3468] *Shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga* | *Kun dga' snying pos mdzad pa* |; and *ibid.* (503.6): [=P3469] *Shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga* | *Rad na kirtis mdzad pa Ma ha pa na'i 'gyur* |. This discussion of the identity of the translator of the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*, while a small excursion away from the topic at hand, is certainly not completely irrelevant. Among other things, it may serve as another example of the complexity of canonical compilations and the cataloguing involved, and of the transmission of bibliographical data.

above, particularly in the order of words/phrases and their placement within verse lines. Nonetheless, given the obvious similarity, not only of the words/phrases but occasionally of entire lines, with the above four versions, it appears that *Mahāpaṇa (or whoever the translator was) knew of (and in fact made use of) an existing translation.⁴⁷ A comparison of this translation with the four translations of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* appears, therefore, to be called for as well. In addition, several verses of the *stotra* (or verses identical with or similar to them) are found in other canonical works, either as “borrowings” or as an explicit citation (with or without specification of the source), which allows a still different angle to look at the evidence from.

5.2.2. Further Bibliographical Evidence

Before turning to comparing and examining the text of the various versions, we should first look at some bibliographical records. As has been pointed out above, records found in traditional catalogues (*dkar chag*) and other historical works of bibliographical value are of high relevance to our discussion. There is a symbiotic relationship between colophons and catalogues, so that it is not only colophons that serve as a source for catalogue records, but catalogues are often a source that feeds the colophons. This state of affairs is particularly complex in the case of canonical colophons and bibliographical records relating to them. In order to shed more light on the question of the authenticity of the various colophons of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* presented above, I shall in the following present the bibliographical records concerning it that could be traced thus far. The catalogue entries in question can be classified into three groups, and are presented (to the extent possible) in chronological order within each group as follows:

⁴⁷ Numerous (rather large) passages in Ratnakīrti's *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalavidhi* are shared, notably, with other Indic works. This is very well reflected in the Tibetan translations of the shared passages, and it appears that *Mahāpaṇa made use of existing Tibetan translations of these works as well.

Group I

- (i) *lDan dkar ma*: [L452] *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la bstod pa'i tshig gi sde ba sbyor slob dpon sGra gcan 'dzin bzang pos mdzad pa*, 40 śloka.⁴⁸
- (ii) *'Phang thang ma*: [K663] *'phags pa Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la bstod pa slob dpon sGra gcan 'dzin bzang pos mdzad pa*, 40 śloka.

Group II

- (i) *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*
 - (a) under the section Early Period: [Rr17.7] *sGra gcan 'dzin bzang pos mdzad pa Sher phyin la bstod pa*, 40 śloka.
 - (b) under the section Later Period, translations by Mar do: [Rr27.114] *dGra can 'dzin bzang po'i Sher phyin kyi [phyin kyi R, phyin N] bstod pa dang | |*
- (ii) *Tshal pa bstan dkar*
 - (a) under the *bsTod pa* section (6b6–7): [T55] *Shes rab pha rol phyin ma'i bstod pa 'phags pa sGra gcan 'dzin bzang pos bstod pa | Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal gyi 'gyur |*
 - (b) under the *dBu ma bstod tshogs* section (72b2–4): [T2100] *rNam par mi rtog pa'i bstod pa | [...] rnam slob dpon Klu sgrub*⁴⁹ *kyis mdzad pa |*
- (iii) *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*
 - (a) under the *bsTod pa* section (419.6–420.1): *Shes rab pha rol phyin pa'i bstod pa 'phags pa sGra gcan 'dzin bzang pos bstod pa | Khe'u rgad Yon tan dpal gyi 'gyur |*
 - (b) under the *dBu ma bstod pa'i tshogs* section (554.3–4): *rNam par mi rtog pa'i bstod pa | [...] rnam slob dpon Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa |*

⁴⁸ See also Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 260.

⁴⁹ *sgrub] em., grub T_{Ms}T_{Js}.*

(iv) *Bu ston chos 'byung*

(a) under the rubric of “to be searched” (... *de rnams btsal lo*) *stotras*: [Bc974] *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la bstod pa slob dpon sGra gcan 'dzin bzang pos mdzad pa*, 40 *śloka* |

(b) under *bsTod pa sna tshogs kyi skor*: **Klu sgrub** *kyis mdzad pa'i bstod pa la* | [...] [Bc932] *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma'i rnam par mi rtog par bstod pa rNgog 'gyur* |

Group III

(i) *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 4a5 [...] 4b1–2; B, 3b3 [...] 3b6): *slob dpon chen po 'phags pa Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa* [...] [Njs26] *Shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin ma'i rnam par mi rtog par bstod pa Blo ldan shes rab kyi 'gyur* |

(ii) *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2*: (600.5–601.1): *Sher phyin la bstod pa rNgog 'gyur* | [...] *rnams mgon po Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa* |

(iii) *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (411.3): [=D1127] *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma'i bstod pa slob dpon Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa paṇḍi ta Thig le bum pa dang* | *Blo ldan shes rab kyi 'gyur* |⁵⁰

(iv) *Glo bo bstan dkar* (A, 287b3–4; B, 273.1–5): ... *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma la bstod pa* | [...] *mDzad pa bcu gnyis nas* | *'di'i bar rnams 'phags pa Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa* |

To recap, Group I—consisting of the two imperial catalogues—records the *stotra* under the title *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la bstod pa* and ascribes it to Rāhulabhadra, with no specification of the translator(s). (The two, notably, indicate the number of *ślokas* as 40, but the available Sanskrit and Tibetan versions consist of only 21 *ślokas*!) Group II—consisting of Rig ral's *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, which, for the Early Period section, is based on the imperial catalogues, the catalogue to the Tshal pa edition, one of the

⁵⁰ Later *bsTan 'gyur* catalogues followed suit. See the *Ngam ring bstan dkar* (6.16–18, reference to authorship 6.11–12); *lNga pa chen po bstan dkar* (14b8, reference to authorship 14b6); *gSer bris bstan dkar* (11b2–3, reference to authorship 11a6); *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 339a7–b1).

catalogues associated with the Third Karma pa edition (*Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*), and Bu ston's religious history—records the work in two ways: (a) The title and authorship ascription are, firstly, as in Group I, but in Rig ral's catalogue once under the Early Period section and a second time under the Later Period section with a translation ascription to Mar do, and in the catalogues of the Tshal pa and Third Karma pa sets with Khe'u brgad Yon tan dpal as the translator. Bu ston for his part had obviously not seen the work, for he lists it under “*stotras* to be searched for,” so that this record must have been based on older catalogues (first and foremost those presented under group I and Rig ral's). (b) The other way the work is recorded is with the title *rNam par mi rtog pa'i bstod pa* (Bu ston, however, combines both titles!), with an authorship ascription to Nāgārjuna and in Bu ston's case an identification of the translator as rNgog lo tsā ba. This record of Bu ston resembles that by dBus pa blo gsal (cited under Group III) and is very probably based on it. Group III—consisting of the catalogue compiled by dBus pa blo gsal, the other catalogue associated with the Third Karma pa edition (*Rang rdor bstan dkar-2*), Bu ston's catalogue to the Zhwa lu edition (followed by the later *bsTan 'gyur* catalogues, which are based on it), and Ngor chen's catalogue to the Mustang edition—records the work with the title *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin ma'i bstod pa* (dBus pa blo gsal combines both titles), and names Nāgārjuna as the author. All but Ngor chen, who does not mention the names of the translators of any of the 15 *stotras* ascribed to Nāgārjuna listed under this paragraph, name rNgog lo tsā ba as the translator (Bu ston adding Tilakakalaśa). It may be that both dBus pa blo gsal and Bu ston (the latter during the compilation of the *bsTan 'gyur* in Zhwa lu at the latest) recognized that the two works were one and the same. It remains unclear why they opted for the version whose authorship is ascribed to Nāgārjuna and translation to rNgog. Was it possibly the only one available to them? We do not know. What is certain is that the fact that their editions included the version attributed to Nāgārjuna with a translation ascription to rNgog influenced all accessible mainstream *bsTan 'gyur* editions (and their respective catalogues). None of these records, notably, ascribes the

translation to Nag tsho (in collaboration with Śāntibhadra), as in the colophon of the Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur*. The *Phug brag bka' dkar* itself mentions none of the versions by name.⁵¹ The most interesting records for our discussion are perhaps those in group I, which attest the existence of an Ancient Translation, no trace of which is to be found in the available colophons.

5.2.3. Examination of Selected Verses

In the following I shall present, compare, and point out the similarities and differences in the Tibetan translation of several verses as found in (i) the four translations of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* (in more or less chronological order), (ii) other canonical works as far as these could be determined,⁵² and (iii) the translation of the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*. A few examples, I

⁵¹ Regarding F240, the record found in the *Phug brag bka' dkar* for volume La (mDo sde section) states that the volume represents a continuation of F230 (named there with its short title *IDan bzhags*). F230 actually covers volumes 77, 78, 79, and 81 (Ya, Ra1, Ra2, and Sha), and as already noted in Jampa Samten 1992: 88 n. 2, there is no correlation between the content of volume 80 (La), which comprises works F231–F253, and the catalogue, according to which F230 covers volumes Ya, Ra, La, and Sha. See the *Phug brag bka' dkar* (11a5–6): La *par* [F230] *IDan bzhags bam po zhe drug 'thab bral nas lha rnams kyis las stag du bde ba'i sa ste brgyad pa yan bzhugs* |. Given that the volume number Ra is given twice, and in view of the disruption of the text, with volume 80 (La) containing other works, and of the discrepancy between the actual contents of the volume and the catalogue record, it appears that there has been some reshuffling of the volumes at some later point in time. Regarding F390, the catalogue avoids listing all the *stotras* in the volume (Ngi) and simply states that it contains numerous such works. See the *Phug brag bka' dkar* (17b3–4): *sangs rgyas bcos ldan 'das la bstod pa la cha cha tshan^(a) mang po* |. ^(a) The reading *cha cha tshan* is unusual. One would expect *chos tshan* (or, less common, *cha tshan*).

⁵² Many of the textual matches found in other canonical works that are presented and discussed in the context of the first two case studies were detected with the help of the BuddhaNexus database.

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

believe, should suffice to demonstrate the state of affairs regarding the authenticity of the colophons in question.⁵³

⁵³ The verses of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* discussed below are cited as follows: Those from the versions found in the sDe dge and Peking *bsTan 'gyur* (rNgog) are based on the critical edition published in Hahn 1988 (note, however, that the emendations offered by Hahn were not taken over, as this proved to be counterproductive for the comparison). Those from the two versions found in the Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur* (Nag tsho) are ones I here critically edit myself. Hahn has merely used F240 in his comparison, and the critical edition offered here presents a slightly different picture. While at times it renders Hahn's emendations obsolete, at other times it raises new questions. Those from Rong ston's commentary (Mar do) are provided with two versions taken into consideration, the embedded verses being marked in **bold**. And finally, those from the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* version (Khe'u brgad) are provided here with no alterations. The verses are numbered as in Hahn 1988. The respective passages from the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* and those found in other canonical works are based on two canonical versions (D and P). Due to the greater differences in the translation (or the underlying Sanskrit text?), the numbers of the verses cited from the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* are preceded by a double tilde (≈) in order to stress the rather approximate similarity. Those cited from other canonical works, most of which show greater similarity to the formulations found in one or the other of the versions of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* presented in the present study, are preceded by an equals sign (=). Moreover, similarities and/or differences in the four versions of the *stotra* are marked as follows: In rNgog, words/phrases that are *similar* to Nag tsho's are marked double underlined. A continuous underlining implies that both the syllables and their order within the phrase/line are identical, whereas a separate underlining implies that the syllables are identical but that the string of syllables is different. In Mar do and Khe'u brgad, words/phrases that are *different* from rNgog's are single underlined, whereas those same *different* words/phrases that *correspond* to Nag tsho's are double underlined. Certain variants such as those involving orthography or conjugated verb forms, those resulting from *sandhi* rules, and those regarding segmentation marks, grammatical particles, or the like will be ignored, as they are of little significance for our discussion. The similarities and/or differences in the passages found in other canonical works and

(1) Verses 2–3:

Nag tsho (F240, 378b6–8; F390, 338b5–7):

nam mkha' bzhin du gos pa med ||
spros pa med pa mi 'gyur ba'i ||
ngo bor gang gis mthong gyur pa ||
de yis de bzhin gshegs pa mthong || (2)
'phags ma yon tan rdzogs khyod dang ||
'gro ba'i bla ma sangs rgyas la ||
zla ba dang ni 'od zer bzhin ||
dam pa rnams kyis dbye ma mthong || (3)

rNgog:

nam mkha' bzhin du gos med cing ||
spros pa med cing yi ge med ||
*bsam yas*⁵⁴ *khyod mthong gang yin pa* ||
des ni de bzhin gshegs pa mthong || (2)
'phags ma yon tan phyug khyod dang ||
sangs rgyas 'gro ba'i bla ma rnams ||
khyad par yod par ma 'khums te ||
zla ba dang ni zla 'od bzhin || (3)

Mar do (A, 649.6–650.2; B, 104.3–5):

*yid la bsam pa'i*⁵⁵ *khyod mthong ba gang yin pa de ni de*
bzhin gshegs pa mthong ngo || *bsam bya'i sher phyin spros bral*
du bstan pa ni nam mkha' bzhin du gos med cing || *spros pa*
med pa'i yi ge med || *ces so* || (2) *sher phyin gyi yon tan gzhan*
yang brjod pa ni 'phags ma yon tan dpag tu med pas phyug pa
*khyod nyams*⁵⁶ *su blangs pas* | *'phags pa rnams 'byung bas ma*

the corresponding verses found in Ānandagarbha's *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* will be marked as follows: words/phrases that are *similar* to both Nag tsho and rNgog will be marked **bold**. Those that are *similar* to Nag tsho's will be double underlined, while those similar to rNgog will be single underlined.

⁵⁴ Note that Hahn emended *yas* to *pas*. See Hahn 1988: 63 n. 8, which, however, erroneously records "*pas* DP," instead of "*yas* DP."

⁵⁵ pa'i] A, pa B

⁵⁶ nyams] A, snyoms B

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

*zhes brjod do|| sangs rgyas 'gro ba'i bla ma rnams dang
khyad par yod par⁵⁷ ma 'khums te| dper na zla ba dang ni
zla 'od bzhin| (3)*

Khe'u brgad (312a4–5):

*nam mkha' bzhin du gos med cing||
spros pa med cing yi ge med||
bsam yas khyod mthong gang yin pa||
de yis de bzhin gshegs pa mthong|| (2)
'phags ma yon tan phyug khyod dang||
sangs rgyas 'gro ba'i bla ma rnams||
khyad par yod par ma khums te||
zla ba dang ni 'od zer bzhin|| (3)*

It is obvious that the versions ascribed to rNgog, Mar do, and Khe'u brgad are very similar to each other, with merely minor differences. Moreover, while greatly differing from the version ascribed to Nag tsho, the three do share with it common passages, which suggests that they, in one way or another, have some affinity with it, through either direct or indirect reliance on it, or else because all four have an earlier common source. Also, notably, the version attributed to Khe'u brgad, in the merely two instances of readings that are different from rNgog, reads similarly to Nag tsho's, an indication that the latter was consulted or a hint of an earlier common source.

Dīpaṃkarajñāna's *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa* (D3930/P5325)—translated by rGya brTson 'grus seng ge (b. 10th cent.; BDRC: P4104) and Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba in collaboration with the author—contains these two verses in the form of a citation attributed to “Ācārya himself” (obviously referring to Nāgārjuna).⁵⁸ The verses there read as follows (D, 110a5–6; P, 123a3–6):

*slob dpon nyid kyi zhal snga nas kyang|
nam mkha' bzhin du gos pa med||
spros pa med cing mi 'gyur ba'i||*

⁵⁷ par] A, pa B

⁵⁸ The *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa* often refers to Nāgārjuna by the title Ācārya (*slob dpon*) alone (in the Tibetan translation, either with or without *nyid*).

Authenticity and Authentication

ngo bo gang yin mthong ba ni | |
de yis de bzhin gshegs pa mthong | | (=2)
'phags pa yon tan rdzogs khyod dang | |
'gro ba'i bla ma sangs rgyas la | |
zla ba dang ni 'od zer bzhin | |
mkhas pa rnam kyis dbye ma mthong | |⁵⁹ (=3)
zhes pa dang |

This Tibetan translation is clearly similar to the translation of the verses as found in the version attributed to Nag tsho. This is of course not surprising given the fact that Nag tsho was involved in both translations. The differences are indeed minor, but the question that comes to mind is why Nag tsho did not bring the two translations into alignment with each other.

Verse 3 is found in Ratnākaraśānti's *Ratnapradīpa* (D1919/P2782)—which was translated by [Go rub] Chos kyi shes rab (b. 11th cent.; BDRC: P3890) in collaboration with Vinayacandra. The verse, which appears there as a citation with no indication of the source, reads as follows (D, 130b6; P, 156b1–2):

'phags ma yon tan phyug khyod dang | |
sangs rgyas 'gro ba'i bla ma dag | |
khyad par yod par ma mthong ste | |
zla ba dang ni zla ldan bzhin | |⁶⁰ (3)
zhes bstan pas so | |

Go rub's translation of this verse clearly shows similarity with the one attributed to rNgog, and it seems that he relied on and extensively made use of it (or of Mar do's or Khe'u brgad's). But as we shall see below through the analysis of other verses, another possibility is that he used yet another version which served as the basis for rNgog's (or Mar do's or Khe'u brgad's) translation.

The two verses as embedded in Ānandagarbha's *Prajñāpāramitā-maṇḍalopāyikā* (D2644/P3468), which is possibly a solo-translation by *Mahāpaṇa, read as follows (D, 258a4–5; P, 276b8–277a1):

⁵⁹ | | D, om. P

⁶⁰ | | D, om. P

gang gis⁶¹ yang dag nyid du khyod | |
 nam mkha' bzhin du gos pa med | |
spros med yi ge med mthong na | |
 des ni de bzhin gshegs pa mthong | | (≈2)
 'phags pa dam pa rnam dang ni | |
 yon tan phyug mo khyod dang ni | |
sangs rgyas 'gro ba'i bla ma dang | |
 khyad par ma mthong zla 'od bzhin | | (≈3)

Although the line order and some of the formulations differ from the translations of verses 2–3 of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* presented above, this translation undoubtedly demonstrates that, apart from the common passages (**bold**), there is a measure of similarity to both Nag tsho's (double underlined) and rNgog's (single underlined) translations, which leaves the impression either that *Mahāpaṇa consulted these two translations (or those by Mar do or Khe'u brgad instead of that by rNgog), combining them in one way or another, or, perhaps more likely, that he based himself on a yet different version which had common features with both.

(2) Verse 6

Nag tsho (F240, 379a2–3; F390, 338a8–b1):

gzhan don mngon⁶² dga'i⁶³ bdag nyid can | |
 dpa' bo⁶⁴ dag ni thams cad kyang | |
 gso dang bskyed⁶⁵ par byed pa'i ma | |
 brtse ba'i bdag nyid khyod lags te⁶⁶ | | (6)

⁶¹ gis] P, gi D

⁶² mngon] *em.*, sngon F₃₉₀, mthon F₂₄₀. As it seems that *mngon* was the original reading in Nag tsho's translation and the readings *sngon* and *mthon* are mere scribal errors, I have opted here for an emended reading, which is also suggested in Hahn 1988: 65 n. 5, where, however, only F240 was consulted.

⁶³ dga'i] F₂₄₀, dgi'i F₃₉₀

⁶⁴ bo] F₂₄₀, *om.* F₃₉₀

⁶⁵ bskyed] F₂₄₀, skyes F₃₉₀

⁶⁶ khyod lags te] F₂₄₀, can khyod lags F₃₉₀

rNgog:

gzhan don mngon dga'i bdag nyid can ||
dpa' bo dag ni thams cad kyi ||
gso mdzad bskyed par mdzad pa ste ||
khyod ni byams ma'i yum lags so || (6)

Mar do (A, 650.5–6; B, 105.3–4):

'phags pa thams cad kyi yum du bstod pa ni | **gzhan don la**
mngon par dga' ba'i **bdag nyid can** gyi **dpa' bo** ste | byang chub
sems dpa' **thams cad** kyi zag med kyi phung po **gso** ba ste |
bskyed par mdzad pas byams pa'i yum zhes bstod par mdzad
do || (6)

Khe'u brgad (312b1):

gzhan don mngon dga'i bdag nyid can ||
dpa' bo dag ni thams cad kyi ||
gso mdzad bskyed par mdzad pa ste ||
khyod ni byams ma'i yum lags so || (6)

The differences observed in this verse show a similar pattern to verses 2–3. In fact, here we see an even smaller difference between rNgog's and Nag tsho's versions, and Khe'u brgad's version is completely identical with rNgog's.

This verse is found twice in Ratnākaraśānti's *Ratnapradīpa* (D1919/P2782), which was translated by Go rub Chos kyi shes rab. In both cases it is explicitly presented as a citation, but, as was the case with verse 3, without specifying the source. In the first occurrence the text reads as follows (D, 130b4; P, 156a7):

gzhan don la dga'i bdag nyid can ||
dpa' bo dang⁶⁷ **ni kun gyi yang** ||
gso mdzad skyed par mdzad ma ste ||
byams pa yi ni yum lags so || (6)
zhes bstan pas so ||

The second occurrence reads, with merely two variants, almost identically (D, 161b6–7; P, 194a5–6):

⁶⁷ DP both read *dang* instead of *dag* as in Nag tsho and rNgog. Cf. the second occurrence in the *Ratnapradīpa*, which correctly reads *dag*.

ji skad du |

*gzhan don la dga'*⁶⁸ *bdag nyid can* | |

dpa' bo dag ni kun gyi yang | |

gso mdzad skyed par mdzad ma ste | |

byams pa yi ni yum lags so | | (6)

zhes gsungs pa dang sbyar ro | |

Go rub's translation of this verse, too, clearly shows similarity with the one attributed to rNgog, and further supports the assumption that he relied on and extensively made use of it (or of Mar do's or Khe'u brgad's).

The verse as embedded in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*, representing possibly a solo-translation ascribed to *Mahāpaṇa, reads as follows (D, 258a6–7; P, 277a3–4):

khyod ni dpa' mo gzhan don la | |

*dga' ba'i bdag nyid thams cad kyis*⁶⁹ | |

gso mdzad skyed par mdzad pa ste | |

byams shing gcugs pa'i yum lags so | | (≈6)

This verse's similarity to rNgog's version is obvious, particularly in the choice of words/phrases, *Mahāpaṇa's version mainly differing in their placement within the lines.

(3) Verse 9

Nag tsho (F240, 379a5–6; F390, 339a3⁷⁰):

*'dul ba'i 'gro ba la brten*⁷¹ *nas* | |

de bzhin gshegs pas de dang der | |

*khyod nyid gcig*⁷² *pu dngos mang por*⁷³ | |

du ma'i ming gis bstod par mdzad | | (9)

⁶⁸ DP both read *dga'* instead of *dga'i* as in the above translations, including the first occurrence in the *Ratnapradīpa*.

⁶⁹ kyis] P, ni D

⁷⁰ The end of the verse is supplemented in the top margin in F390.

⁷¹ brten] F₂₄₀, bstan F₃₉₀

⁷² gcig] F₂₄₀, cig F₃₉₀

⁷³ por] F₂₄₀, po F₃₉₀

rNgog:

gdul bya'i 'gro ba la brten nas | |
*de dang*⁷⁴ *de bzhin gshegs rnams kyis* | |
khyod nyid gcig pu tshul mang du | |
sna tshogs mtshan gyis bsngags pa mdzad | | (9)

Mar do (A, 652.2–3; B, 106.1–2):

*gdul bya'i*⁷⁵ *'gro ba la phan btags pa la brten nas* | *gdul bya*
gnas pa'i gnas de dang der de bzhin gshegs pa rnams kyis sher
phyin khyod gcig po la tshul mang du sna tshogs mtshan
gyis bsngags par mdzad do | |

Khe'u brgad (T, 312b3):

gdul bya'i 'gro ba la brten nas | |
de dang de bzhin gshegs rnams kyis | |
khyod nyid gcig pu tshul mang du | |
sna tshogs mtshan gyis bsngags par mdzad | | (9)

Here, too, one observes a rather great similarity between Nag tsho's and rNgog's translations, while those by rNgog, Mar do, and Khe'u brgad are nearly identical.

The verse is found in Dharmamitra's *Prasphuṭapadā* (D3796/P5194)—which was translated by [Go rub] Chos kyi shes rab in collaboration with Tāraśrīmitra. Here too the verse is cited with no specification of the source. The text reads as follows (D, 7a6–7; P, 8a7–8):

de'i phyir |
gdul bya'i skye bo la brten nas | |
de bzhin gshegs pas de dang der | |
khyod nyid gcig pu gzugs mang dang | |
sna tshogs mtshan du mngon par brjod | | (=9)
ces bstod cing |

⁷⁴ Note that *dang* is emended in Hahn 1988: 67 n. 2 to *der*. As the reading *dang* is found in both Mar do's and Khe'u brgad's versions, keeping the original reading better serves our purpose.

⁷⁵ bya'i] B, bya A

While the Tibetan translation of verse 6 found in Ratnākaraśānti's *Ratnapradīpa*, which is also attributed to Go rub, merely shows its affinity with rNgog's translation, that of verse 9 as found in Dharmamitra's *Prasphuṭapadā* shows some affinity with both Nag tsho's and rNgog's translations, which would mean that Go rub had either consulted both of them or, perhaps more likely, some third version.

The verse as embedded in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* reads as follows (D, 258b1–2; P, 277a5–6):

khyod ni nyag ma gcig lags kyang | |
*de bzhin gshegs pas de dang*⁷⁶ *der* | |
skye bo 'dul ba'i rten mdzad nas | |
*sna tshogs mtshan gyis rnam mang*⁷⁷ *bstod* | | (=9)

Here again we see evidence that *Mahāpaṇa's translation shows affinity with both Nag tsho's and rNgog's translations.

(4) Verse 15

Nag tsho (F240, 339b7–8; F390, 339a7–8):

*khyod*⁷⁸ *mt hong bas kyang bcing bar*⁷⁹ *'gyur* | |
ma mthong na yang bcings par 'gyur | |⁸⁰
khyod mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur | |
ma mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur | |⁸¹ (15)

rNgog:

khyod nyid mthong na 'ching 'gyur zhing | |
ma mthong na yang 'ching bar 'gyur | |
khyod nyid mthong na grol 'gyur zhing | |
ma mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur | | (15)

⁷⁶ dang] D, de P

⁷⁷ mang] P, snang D

⁷⁸ khyod] F₃₉₀, khyed F₂₄₀

⁷⁹ bcing bar] F₃₉₀, bcings par F₂₄₀

⁸⁰ Line 15b is missing in F₃₉₀.

⁸¹ Line 15d is missing in F₂₄₀.

Mar do (A, 652.2; B, 107.3):

'ching grol la bden par bzung ba skyon du bstan pa ni |
[...lacuna?...] (15) yum khyod nyid bden par mthong ba'i tshul
gyis bstod pa ni | ... (16)

Khe'u brgad (313a1):

khyod nyid mthong na 'ching 'gyur zhing | |
ma mthong na yang 'ching bar 'gyur | |
khyod nyid mthong na grol 'gyur zhing | |
ma mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur | | (15)

The same pattern as in the previously presented verses is also observed in the case of verse 15. rNgog's translation is very similar to Nag tsho's, this time manifesting only very minor differences. Khe'u brgad's version is completely identical with rNgog's. Unfortunately, Rong ston's commentary on verse 15 seems to have been lost in the course of textual transmission (the introductory phrase to verse 15 is immediately followed by the introductory phrase to verse 16).

The verse appears as a citation in *Asvabhāva's *Mahāyāna-saṃgrahopaniṣandhāna* (D4051/P5552)—whose translation is attributed to Ye shes sde in collaboration with Jinamitra and Śilendrabodhi—without, however, specifying the source. The text reads as follows (D, 272a1–2; P, 329a5–6):

ji skad du | |
***khyod nyid mthong** ba 'ching ba ste | |*
***ma mthong** ba yang 'ching bar 'gyur | |*
***khyod nyid mthong** ba grol ba ste | |*
***ma mthong** ba yang grol bar 'gyur | |⁸² (15)*
zhes bshad pa lta bu'o | |

Unlike the canonical works containing shared passages with the *stotra* presented previously, here we are dealing with an Ancient Translation. This is in fact the first instance that allows us to compare the available versions—all New Translations—with an Ancient Translation. We see that verse 15 as found here is very similar to both Nag tsho's and rNgog's versions, with slightly

⁸² | | D, *om.* P

more affinity with rNgog's. This strongly suggests that the New Translations are nothing but revisions—in varying degrees—of the, now lost, Ancient Translation of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*.

Moreover, the verse is also cited in Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* (D3842/P5242)—which is likewise an Ancient Translation, made by Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan in collaboration with Jñānagarbha. This time the source is clearly indicated as the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, which is ascribed to Rāhulabhadra, as to be expected from an Ancient Translation. The text reads as follows (D, 243b6–7; P, 275b3–5):

*slob dpon sGra gcan zin bzang pos Shes rab kyi pha rol tu
 phyin pa la bstod pa las kyang |
 khyod nyid mthong na 'ching 'gyur te ||
 ma mthong na yang 'ching bar 'gyur ||
 khyod nyid mthong na grol 'gyur te ||
 ma mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur || (=15)
 zhes gsungs so ||*

This instance provides us with another opportunity to compare the New Translations with an Ancient Translation, this time by Klu'i rgyal mtshan. Here the similarity—to the point of near identity—to rNgog's is again obvious. This would suggest not only that rNgog (or Mar do or Khe'u brgad) used for his (alleged) translation the Ancient Translation rather than Nag tsho's version, but also that his, probably, revision (rather than translation) may have been minor and featured fewer changes than Nag tsho's.

The verse is likewise cited in Bhavya's *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (D3854/P5254)—which was translated by Nag tsho Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba and rGya brTson 'grus seng ge in collaboration with Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (i.e., the same team that translated Dīpaṃkarajñāna's *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa*, whose two verses cited above are equivalent to verses 2–3)—where it is again ascribed to Ācārya, apparently referring to Nāgārjuna, with no further specification. The text reads as follows (D, 266A6–7; P, 335A4–6):

Authenticity and Authentication

slob dpon gyi zhal snga nas |⁸³
*khyod mthong na yang bcing bar*⁸⁴ *'gyur* | |⁸⁵
ma mthong na yang bcing bar 'gyur | |
khyod mthong na yang grol bar *'gyur* | |
*ma mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur*⁸⁶ | | (=15)
 [...] ⁸⁷
zhes gsungs so | |

As one can clearly see, this translation by Nag tsho Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba and rGya brTson 'grus seng ge is virtually identical with Nag tsho's own. As we have here another case where Nag tsho was involved in both translations, this is again not at all surprising. Also the apparent ascription to Nāgārjuna fits well.

The verse as embedded in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*, with a possibly solo-translation by *Mahāpaṇa, reads as follows (D, 258b4; P, 277b1):

*khyod mthong na ni bcings*⁸⁸ *'gyur te* | |
*ma mthong na yang 'ching*⁸⁹ *bar 'gyur* | |
khyod mthong na ni grol *'gyur te* | |
ma mthong na yang grol bar 'gyur | | (≈15)

⁸³ | | D, om. P

⁸⁴ bcing bar] P, bcings par D; also in verse line 15b

⁸⁵ | | D, | P; also in verse line 15b–d

⁸⁶ 'gyur] D, gyur P (due to damage to the block? or *ante corr.*?)

⁸⁷ The citation continues with what appears in P as a prose passage containing a comment on the cited verse, but is presented in D as another verse. The text, however, differs from *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* 16, and it seems in fact that the reading of the passage as a verse in D presents a faulty interpretation of the text (followed by what seems to be a faulty emendation of it in order to yield the desired seven-syllable verse line). See the *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (D, 266a7; P, 335a5–6): *gang gis khyod nyid yang dag tu* [P: tu, D: tu | |] *mthong ba med kyang sgrub par byed* [em.: |, DP: | |] *bsgrubs* [D: bsgrubs, P: bsgrub] *pas rnam par grol bar 'gyur* | [P: |, D: | |] *de ltar* [P: de ltar, D: de lta bu 'di] *ngo mtshar che* [P: che, D: che | |].

⁸⁸ bcings] P, mchi D

⁸⁹ 'ching] P, mchi D

Although the translations of this verse found in Nag tsho's and rNgog's versions are anyway very similar, one could nonetheless see that our translation here features elements common to both Nag tsho's and rNgog's.

(5) Verses 16–17:

Nag tsho (F240, 379b3–5; F390, 339a8–b2):

*e ma*⁹⁰ *ngo mtshar gyur pa'i rgyu* ||
grags ldan ma khyod zab mor gyur ||
*sgyu ma bzhin du rtogs dkar*⁹¹ *gyur* ||
mthong ba de mthong ma yin pa || (16)
sangs rgyas rang sangs rgyas rnams dang ||
*nyan thos rnams kyis nges*⁹² *bsten pa* ||
thar pa'i lam ni gcig nyid khyod ||
gzhan dag med ces bya bar nges || (17)

rNgog:

e ma ya mtshan cher 'ong ma ||
*grags ldan ma khyod bzang*⁹³ *mo lags* ||
shin tu rtogs dka' sgyu ma bzhin ||
snang zhing mi snang ba yang lags || (16)
sangs rgyas rang sangs rgyas rnams dang ||
nyan thos rnams kyis nges bstent ma ||
khyod nyid gcig pu thar pa'i lam ||
de ltar gzhan dag med par nges || (17)

Mar do (A, 652.2–6; B, 107.3–108.1):

yum khyod nyid bden par mthong ba'i tshul gyis bstod pa ni | *e*
ma ya mtshan ches cher bstod par 'os ma zhes pa dang | 'jig

⁹⁰ ma] F₂₄₀, ma'o F₃₉₀

⁹¹ dkar] F₂₄₀, kar F₃₉₀

⁹² nges] F₃₉₀, ngos F₂₄₀

⁹³ Note that Hahn emends *bzang* to *zab* in agreement with the Sanskrit text (which is also reflected in Nag tsho's translation). Since, however, the reading *bzang* is also reflected in the translations ascribed to Mar do and Khe'u brgad, it better serves our purpose to keep the original reading.

*rten gsum du grags pa dang ldan pas grags ldan ma khyod
bzang mo*⁹⁴ *lags zhes so* || *rtogs par dka' bar bstan pa ni*⁹⁵ *sgyu
ma rang bzhin du rang bzhin med par shin tu rtogs par dka'
ste*⁹⁶ *bden 'dzin gyi bag chags brtan pa'i phyir ro* || *yang rtogs
par dka' ste* | *ma dpyad pa'i ngo na snang zhing dpyad na snang
ba'ang brlag pas rtog*⁹⁷ *ge'i blos dpag tu med pa'i phyir* | (16)
rigs can gsum gyi yum du bstan pa ni | *sangs rgyas dang rang
sangs rgyas rnams dang* | *nyan thos rnams kyis*⁹⁸ *nges par
bsten par bya ba yin pas ste* | *yon tan thams cad 'byung ba'i rgyu
yin pas ma zhes brjod do* || *khyod ni thar pa'i lam gcig pu ba
de* | *de ltar sangs rgyas thob pa'i lam gzhan dag med par nges
so* || (17)

Khe'u brgad (313a1–3):

e ma ya mtshan cher 'ong ma ||
grags ldan ma khyod bzang mo lags ||
shin tu rtogs dka' sgyu ma bzhin ||
snang zhing mi snang ba yang lags || (16)
sangs rgyas rang sangs rgyas rnams dang ||
nyan thos rnams kyid nges bsten ma ||
khyod nyid cig pu thar pa'i lam ||
de ltar gzhan dag med par nges || (17)

Verses 16–17 display an overall similarity between the translations ascribed to Nag tsho and rNgog, the differences featured in some of the lines mainly consisting in the order of words/phrases rather than in the renderings of individual ones. Mar do's wording features very minor differences with rNgog's, with mainly a different order of words/phrases in one instance, while Khe'u brgad's is, as in the above presented verses, practically identical with rNgog's.

⁹⁴ mo] B, lo A

⁹⁵ |] B, || A

⁹⁶ |] A, om. B

⁹⁷ rtog] B, rtogs A

⁹⁸ kyis] A, kyi B

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

Verse 17 is cited in Vairocanarakṣita's (fl. 11th cent.) *Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā* (D3875b/P5277), for which, unfortunately, there is no translation colophon, but given the author's dates the translation was certainly made during the Later Period. The citation is provided without specifying the source. The text reads as follows (D, 144b2; P, 169b7–8):

de yang 'di skad du |⁹⁹
sangs rgyas rang sangs rgyas dang ni | |
nyan thos rnam la nges bstan pa'i | |
thar pa'i lam ni khyod gcig pu | |
gzhan yod min zhes nges pa yin | |¹⁰⁰ (=17)
zhes 'byung ngo | |

In this case, in the first two lines there are merely minor differences from the versions ascribed to Nag tsho and rNgog, while line 3 seems to be a combination of both with altered word order, and line 4 to be different from both, but a closer look rather suggests some influence from Nag tsho. The state of affairs in line 3 may again hint at the existence of a yet different version that had common features with both Nag tsho's and rNgog's versions, but the evidence here is unfortunately too meagre, particularly as this verse consists of many phrases that have a standard Tibetan rendering. As has already been pointed out, the possible existence of such a version—which could be either an earlier version that served both Nag tsho and rNgog (e.g., the Ancient Translation) or a later one which based itself on both of them—should be, however, borne in mind. It is not completely impossible, in any case, that the translator of the *Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā* took the liberty to change the existing translation(s) he had used. Regarding the reading *nges bstan pa'i* (v. 17b) instead of *nges bsten pa*, see the translation of the verse as found in the *Prajñāpāramitā-maṇḍalopāyikā* presented below.

⁹⁹ |] D, om. P

¹⁰⁰ |] D, om. P

Authenticity and Authentication

The same verse is also found in Prajñākaramati's *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (D3872/ P5273)—which was translated by gNyan Darma grags (b. 11th cent.; BDRC: P2614) in collaboration with Sumatikīrti, and revised by a certain Yon tan rgya mtsho. It likewise appears there as a citation with no indication of the source. The text reads as follows (D, 218a6–7; P, 245a6–7):

sangs rgyas rnams dang rang sangs rgyas ||
nyan thos rnams kyis nges bsten pa'i ||
thar lam gcig pu khyod lags te ||
gzhan du nges pa ma mchis so || (=17)
zhes gsungs so ||

While the overall similarity to both Nag tsho's and rNgog's versions is evident, it is hard to say in this case whether it was either of them that served as the basis of this translation or some other version. As already pointed out, the fact that this verse contains several expressions with standard Tibetan renderings complicates any assessment.

Verse 17 is further found in Lakṣmī Bhaṭṭārikā's *Sahajāsiddhipaddhati* (D2261/P3108)—which was translated by ['Bro] Shes rab grags (Prajñākīrti) (b. 12th cent.; BDRC: P2553) in collaboration with *Manāviharala(?)/*Manābhihalala(?). It is likewise cited there from an unspecified source. The text reads as follows (D, 16b4–5; P, 19b5–6):

yang na |
sangs rgyas rang sangs rgyas rnams dang ||
nyan thos rnams kyis khyod bsten na ||
thar pa'i lam ni gcig nyid khyod ||
gzhan dag med ces bya bar nges || (=17)
zhes bya ba'i don to ||

In this case the affinity with Nag tsho's translation is very obvious. In fact, apart from two syllables they are practically identical.

The verse is likewise found in Dharmamitra's *Prasphuṭapadā* (D3796/P5194) which was translated by Go rub Chos kyi shes rab in collaboration with Tārasrīmitra. The verse—presented as a

citation, but, as in the case of verse 9, with no indication of the source—reads as follows (D, 14a2–3, P, 16a3–4):

tshig 'di smos te |
sangs rgyas rnams dang rang sangs rgyas | |
nyan thos rnams kyis nges bsten pa'i | |
thar lam khyed nyid gcig pu ste | |
gzhan zhes bgyi ba ma mchis nges | |¹⁰¹ (=17)
zhes¹⁰² bstod pa dang |

Like in the case of verse 9 Go rub's translation of verse 17 shows no clear affinity to either Nag tsho's or rNgog's translation. As suggested above this could mean that he had either consulted both of them or, more likely, yet another version. Indeed, one witnesses some similarity to the translation of the verse as found in Prajñākaramati's *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* (D3872/P5273) cited above whose translation is attributed to gNyan Darma grags with a revision by a certain Yon tan rgya mtsho.

Verses 16–17 as embedded in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*, with possibly a solo-translation by *Mahāpaṇa, read as follows (D, 258b4–5; P, 277b2–3):

kye ma ngo mtshar skyed mdzad ma | |
zab mo lags so grags ldan ma | |
snang yang snang ba ma lags ma | |
shin tu rtogs dka' sgyu ma bzhin | | (≈16)
sangs rgyas rnams dang rang rgyal dang | |
nyan thos rnams la nges bstan pa'i | |
thar lam gcig tu khyod lags te | |
gzhan ma mchis par nges par lags | | (≈17)

Here, too, one observes similarities to both Nag tsho's and rNgog's versions, though with no decisive affinity with either of them (or perhaps with slightly greater affinity with rNgog's?). Interestingly, this translation of the verse resembles the translation found in Prajñākaramati's *Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā* attributed to gNyan Darma grags (with a revision by a certain

¹⁰¹ | |] D, om. P

¹⁰² zhes] D, shes P

Yon tan rgya mtsho). Of some interest is the reading *nges bstan pa'i* (v. 17b) instead of *nges bsten pa*, which is also found in the Tibetan translation of Vairocanarakṣita's *Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā* (see above).

(6) Verse 21:

Nag tsho (F240, 379b7–8; F390, 339b4–5):

shes rab pha rol phyin bstod pas ||
*bdag gis dge ba gang bsags*¹⁰³ *pa* ||
des ni 'gro ba ma lus pa ||
shes rab pha rol phyin mchog gyur || (21)

rNgog:

shes rab pha rol phyin bstod las ||
bdag gis dge ba gang bsags pa ||
de yis 'jig rten ma lus pa ||
shes rab pha rol phyin gzhol shog || (21)

Mar do (A, 653.3–4; B, 108.6–109.1):

bstod pa brtsams pa'i dge ba bsngo ba ni dge ba'i rtsa ba bdag
gis gang bsags pa des 'jig rten ma lus pa shes rab kyi pha rol
tu phyin pa la blo gzhol shing don rtogs par shog | ces pa'o ||
 (21)

Khe'u brgad (313a5):

shes rab pha rol phyin bstod na ||
bdag gis dge ba bsags pa gang ||
de yis 'jig rten ma lus pa ||
shes rab pha rol phyin gzhol shog || (21)

The relationship among the four translations for this verse remains similar to the cases presented thus far, namely, a certain similarity between Nag tsho and rNgog, and near identity between rNgog, Mar do, and Khe'u brgad. It must be, however, added that this verse, too, contains numerous standard phrases, allowing less room for creativity (or individuality) on the part of the translator. Since verse 21 is the dedication verse ending the

¹⁰³ bsags] F₃₉₀, brtsags F₂₄₀

stotra, the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* has understandably not included it, having a similar verse (i.e., similar in terms of content, but different in terms of wording) at its own end. The lines 21bc, be it noted, appear as a part of other dedication verses in several works (commonly at the end of the works, but also at the end of chapters), with slight variations. The earlier witnesses I was able to trace stem from translations by Rin chen bzang po and some of his disciples and other contemporaries. Noteworthy are the readings *bsod nams* instead of *dge ba* in several instances and *thob pa* instead of *brtsags/bsags pa* in one instance. These lines should therefore be regarded as formulaic and thus will not be presented here individually.¹⁰⁴

5.2.4. Assessment of the Evidence

Given the diverse information found in both the translation colophons and catalogue records, on the one hand, and the

¹⁰⁴ Lines 21bc are found (i) in Ānandagarbha's *Vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalopāyikāsarvavajrodaya* (*rDo rje dbyings kyi dkyil 'khor chen po'i cho ga rdo rje thams cad 'byung ba*) (D2516/P3339), translated by Rin chen bzang po in collaboration with Buddhaśrīśānti (D, 50a2); (ii) five times in Ānandagarbha's *Sarvātathāgatattvasaṃgrahamahāyānābhisamayānāmatantravyākhyātattvālokaḥ* (*De bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi de kho na nyid bsodud pa theg pa chen po mngon par rtogs pa zhes bya ba'i rgyud kyi bshad pa de kho na nyid snang bar byed pa*) (D2510/P3333), translated by Rin chen bzang po (first section), and 'Phags pa shes rab in collaboration with Mahākaruṇa (remaining sections) ((a) D, vol. Li, 324b2; (b) D, vol. Shi, 12a4; (c) D, vol. Shi, 90b1; (d) D, vol. Shi, 164a4–5; and (e) D, vol. Shi, 317a5 (with an additional line in between)); (iii) in Ānandagarbha's *Śrīparamādīṭikā* (*dPal mchog dang po'i rgya cher bshad pa*) (D2512/P3335), translated by Rin chen bzang po in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman (first section), and lHa bla ma zhi ba'i 'od in collaboration with Mantrakalaśa (remaining sections) (D, vol. I, 184b5); (iv) in Viravajra's *Samantaḡuṇaśālinīnāmaṭikā* (*Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa*) (D1408/P2124), translated by Rin chen grags pa in collaboration with Dharmapāla (D, 207a2); and (v) in Kumāra's *Pradīpadīpaṭippanīhrdayādarśa* (*sGron ma gsal ba mdor bshad pa'i sa bcad snying gi me long*) (D1791/P2656), translated by Shākya blo gros in collaboration with Kumārakalaśa (D, 201b1).

obvious similarity (to varying degrees) of the available translations, on the other, with none of these sources giving credit to an earlier translation, the authenticity of the colophons must be called into question. Moreover, one witnesses discrepancies regarding both title and authorship ascriptions. All these discrepancies make one wonder whether there is a connection between the different names of the work, its author, and the translators. The following questions might be asked: Are these discrepancies the result of mere transmissional errors introduced by editors or cataloguers? Are we possibly dealing here with cases of premeditated falsification/plagiarism on the part of some of the translators? Or are we faced here perhaps with examples of intervention on the part of editors and cataloguers motivated by bias towards translators affiliated with their own tradition?

Concerning the discrepancy in the work's title, it could be explained rather easily, for while the title *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* is a straightforward descriptive title, the title *Nirvikalpastava* reflects the custom to name works—particularly prayers and eulogies—according to the opening words.¹⁰⁵ In fact, some bibliographical records (i.e., the one in the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* and one of the records in the *Bu ston chos 'byung*) combine the two titles. Still, the question whether a different title could have served to mask a possible falsification on the part of the writer of the colophons is legitimate and should be kept in mind. Regarding the discrepancy in the authorship ascription, it has been previously proposed by modern scholars that the ascription of the work to Nāgārjuna (Klu sgrub) is faulty. In addition to the existence of several Sanskrit originals that ascribe the hymn to Rāhulabhadra, the Chinese translation by Kumārajīva also names Rāhulabhadra as the author.¹⁰⁶ As we have already seen, earlier Tibetan catalogues, like

¹⁰⁵ This explanation has already been pointed out in Hahn 1988: 58. This custom of creating (popular) titles by making use of the work's opening words was adopted by Tibetans. See Almogi 2005: 50.

¹⁰⁶ See Hahn 1988: 58, 59 n. 2, for further references. See also Sferra 2009: 274 (text no. 27) for a record of a Sanskrit manuscript containing the work, there titled *Nirvikalpastuti*, with an ascription to Rāhulabhadra

some later sources, likewise ascribe the work to Rāhulabhadra (sGra gcan 'dzin bzang po).¹⁰⁷ However, we now know that there also exists an incomplete Sanskrit manuscript in the Potala (originally eight folios with two folios missing), the first four folios of which contain our hymn, titled *Nirvikalpastotra* (the remaining four folios contain commentarial remarks on it). Interestingly, the colophon of the hymn found there ascribes it to Nāgārjuna. This manuscript may have been the source for the later authorship ascription to Nāgārjuna and/or its title *Nirvikalpastotra*, as found in later Tibetan sources.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, as we have seen above, both Bhavya's *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* and *Adhīśa Dīpaṃkarajñāna's *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa*, while citing the hymn, attribute it to Nāgārjuna (referred to by them simply as Ācārya). It is therefore very possible that Nag tsho was influenced by *Adhīśa regarding the authorship ascription of the *stotra*.

Regarding the discrepancies in the translation ascription, it has become clear that the versions attributed to rNgog, Mar do, and Khe'u brgad are virtually identical, so that at least two of the translation colophons must be inauthentic, that is, contain a faulty attribution of the translation. Since a determination of the chronological order of these three "versions" has not been possible, it is practically impossible to know which of these three colophons is the authentic one. Moreover, of some interest is the fact that, in addition to listing the work under the section Early Period, the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* records a translation by Mar do, while mentioning no translation (or revision) by any of the other three gSar ma translators credited with the work's translation (Nag tsho, rNgog, and Khe'u brgad). This is particularly significant since Rig ral explicitly states that for works translated

found in the Tucci Collection and photographed in Kathmandu in 1954. The same manuscript was microfilmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP, reel no. C21/7).

¹⁰⁷ To be noted also is that there is a Tibetan tradition of identifying Rāhulabhadra, the author of the *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, with Saraha. See Schaeffer 2005: 49–56, and elsewhere.

¹⁰⁸ For some more details on this manuscript, see Ye 2009: 315–316.

during the Later Period he relied on the individual catalogues of a number of renowned gSar ma translators (i.e., ones that contain lists of works translated by them), including those of Nag tsho and rNgog.¹⁰⁹ Nonetheless, as we have seen above, the authenticity of the colophon ascribing the translation to Nag tsho can be validated through the reading of several verses of the hymn found in other works in whose translation Nag tsho collaborated. The relationship between Nag tsho's version and those of the other three (represented in the discussion by rNgog's version) is more complex. While there are clear differences between them, the numerous identical words/phrases, and at times entire verse lines, leave no doubt that they are interconnected. As one can be certain that Nag tsho's version is earlier than rNgog's (and Mar do's and Khe'u brgad's), two scenarios are possible: (i) rNgog's is a revision of Nag tsho's, or (ii) Nag tsho's and rNgog's are two independent revisions of the Ancient Translation (whose translator remains anonymous). We have also seen that *Mahāpaṇa's translation of an apparently (nearly) identical Sanskrit text (verses 1–20) shows an affinity with both Nag tsho's and rNgog's versions, which suggests three scenarios: (i) *Mahāpaṇa (or whoever the translator was) used both of them, (ii) he used another version which in turn was already a combination of both, or (iii) he used the Ancient Translation on which the two were based. Moreover, looking at several individual verses found in other works, we witness either (i) a comparable pattern of similarity with both, or (ii) greater affinity with one of them. This state of affairs is also reflected in the similarities and/or difference between some of these verses and the translation found in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*. Of most interest are the occurrences of verse 15 in two works translated during the Early Period which show slightly more similarity with rNgog's. This might suggest that the two are independent revisions of the Ancient Translation rather than that rNgog's is a revision and improvement of Nag tsho's, as suggested by Hahn. This might also suggest that rNgog's revision

¹⁰⁹ See Part One of the present study, pp. 34–36.

may possibly have included fewer changes than that of Nag tsho's, though the evidence (i.e., verse 15, and the slightly greater affinity of rNgog's with the reading of the *stotra* as embedded in the translation of the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* ascribed to *Mahāpaṇa) is not sufficient to come to a decisive conclusion in this regard. To be kept in mind, however, is that Nag tsho and rNgog were partly active in the same Western Tibetan circles (though with a time difference of several decades), and it seems rather unlikely that rNgog did not have access to Nag tsho's translation, provided, of course, he was the one responsible for this version and not Mar do or Khe'u brgad. Hahn, who finds rNgog's version more elegant and sophisticated than Nag tsho's, also suggests that this was the reason that it was rNgog's version that was admitted into the Canon.¹¹⁰ If rNgog's version is indeed closer to the Ancient Translation, this would mean that Nag tsho's was rather a disimprovement of it. This might seem surprising, but it would certainly not be the only case of disimprovement of an Ancient Translation by gSar ma translators.¹¹¹ As have already been alluded to, the other possibility is that the translation embedded in the *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* is the Ancient Translation, but also here the evidence is too scanty.

What is most relevant for our discussion is the fact that the colophons of all four available versions give the impression that

¹¹⁰ See Hahn 1988: 58.

¹¹¹ Meisezahl, to merely give one example, in his study of the *Amoghapāśahṛdayadhāraṇī* has compared the *bKa' 'gyur* and the Dunhuang versions of the text and came to the following conclusion: "After a careful consideration of the two Tibetan versions, the Tunhuang text is more destined to reveal the full scope of the original Sanskrit text. The translator has attempted to satisfy himself first as to the Sanskrit's exact meaning, and then to express it (1) precisely, (2) with lucidity, (3) worthily, (4) with a close adherence to the vocabulary and syntax of the original as Tibetan language allows. It may be helpful for the beginner, and of interest to the more advanced student, to take the early Tunhuang version as a help to the understanding of the later Kanjur version, whose language is not so clear and accurate." See Meisezahl 1962: 275–276.

they are entirely independent translations, neither mentioning the existence of earlier version(s) nor employing the terms “retranslation” or “revision.” When considering the possibility of plagiarism, one must bear in mind that both Nag tsho and rNgog (and to a lesser extent Mar do) were well-known translators, and one wonders what their motive would have been to practise it.¹¹² This state of affairs should certainly raise anew the question regarding the practice of plagiarism on the part of gSar ma translators in a broader context. Whether the acknowledgement of reliance on earlier version(s) was purposely omitted and whether such omissions were made by the translators themselves or by later editors or cataloguers (for whatever reasons) remains unclear. As all available colophons in this case are quite formulaic (those of the Phug brag versions in particular), with few personal features, later insertions of faulty colophons, or alteration of existing colophons, by copyists or editors is one plausible scenario.

5.3. The Colophons of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* aka *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* in Tibetan Translation

The second case concerns the Tibetan translation of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* (*Dad pa las spobs pa bskyed pa*) aka *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* (*brGya lnga bcu pa'i bstod pa*), of which there are, in addition to the versions found in the mainstream canonical editions of the *bsTan 'gyur*, two versions that survived in the Phug

¹¹² It is perhaps worth noting in this context that the team of Tilakakalaśa and rNgog translated two other canonical works—the *Prajñāpāramitā-saṃgrahakārikā* (P5207/D3809) and *Bhadracaryamahāprañidhānarājanibandhana* (P5512/D4011)—and revised the translation of another—the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (P5336/D3940); the team of Śāntibhadra and Nag tsho translated merely one work together, one only included in the larger *bsTan 'gyur* editions—the *Kṛṣṇayamāryabhisamayakrama* (P4796)—while Nag tsho is known to have translated numerous works in collaboration with *Adhīśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna; and the two duos Mahājana and Mar do and Rājaśrī Jñānamitra and Khe'u brgad each likewise translated one work—the *Putralekha* (D4187/P5687) and *Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavandanāstava* (D1168/P2057), respectively.

brag edition of the *bKa' 'gyur*, which latter preserve colophons different from the others. In addition, the work is also contained in the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* edition, with colophons similar to those found in the Phug brag versions.

5.3.1. Extant Versions and Their Colophons

(a) Mainstream *bsTan 'gyur* editions

The colophons of the mainstream canonical versions (D1147/G38/N38/P2038) ascribe the work, which is titled there *Śatapañcāśātkastotra*, to Aśvaghōṣa (rTa dbyangs), and the translation to Shākya blo gros (fl. 11th cent.; BDRC: P8216) in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman. The authorship and translation colophons read as follows (D, 116a4–5; G, 167a6–b1; N, 128b4; P, 136a8–b1):

*brGya lnga bcu pa'i bstod pa slob dpon mkhas pa chen po bram
ze rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa rdzogs so || rgya gar gyi mkhan
po shrī Shraddhā¹¹³ ka ra warmma¹¹⁴ dang | lo tsā ba Shākya
blo gros kyis¹¹⁵ bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o || ||*

(b) Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur* and Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* editions

As already pointed out by Jampa Samten and Hahn, the two versions found in the Phug brag collection (F250 and F400) contain the same Tibetan translation as the one found in the *bsTan 'gyur* (apart from negligible variations of an orthographical or grammatical nature).¹¹⁶ But, once again, the Phug brag versions are transmitted with colophons containing different bibliographical information: There the work goes under the title **Prasādapratibhodbhavo bhagavato buddhasya stotram* (*Sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la bstod pa dad pa las spobs pa bskyed pa*), or for short *Prasādapratibhodbhava*, while the colophons ascribe the authorship

¹¹³ shraddhā GN, shra ddhā DP

¹¹⁴ warmma] N, wa rmma DGP

¹¹⁵ kyis] DGP, kyi N

¹¹⁶ Hahn 1988: 55, and Jampa Samten 1992: 95 n. 1.

to Mātṛceṭa (Ma khol) and the translation to rMa Rin chen mchog (fl. 8th cent.; BDRC: P2JM5) in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva, with a proofreading and finalization by dPal brtsegs (fl. 8th/9th cent.; BDRC: P8182). The colophons of the two versions found in the Phug brag collection read virtually identically (with merely minor variation). The colophons of the version found in the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* (T15) provide the same information. The colophons of these three versions read as follows (F250, 433a4–5; F400, 385b6–7, cf. Jampa Samten 1992: 95–96, 143; T, 115a2–3):

*Sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la bstod*¹¹⁷ *pa*¹¹⁸ *dad pa*¹¹⁹ *las spobs pa skyed pa zhes bya ba*¹²⁰ *slob dpon Ma khol*¹²¹ *gyis*¹²² *mdzad pa rdzogs s.ho* || *rgya gar gyi mkhan po Sarba dznya*¹²³ **de ba dang** | *lo tstsha*¹²⁴ *ba ban de*¹²⁵ **Rin chen mchog gis bsgyur¹²⁶ *cing*¹²⁷ *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha*¹²⁸ *ba ban de*¹²⁹ **dPal brtsegs**¹³⁰ *kyis zhus te gtan la phab pa'o* || ||¹³¹**

¹¹⁷ bstod] F250T, stod F400

¹¹⁸ |] T, *om.* F250F400

¹¹⁹ dad pa] F250T, *om.* F400

¹²⁰ |] F250T, *om.* F400. Note that Jampa Samten, apparently erroneously, fails in his recording of the colophon to reproduce the title. The colophon (as found in F250) is entirely reproduced in Hahn 1998: 54 (though with negligible variation in the orthography and segmentation marks).

¹²¹ khol] T, gol F250F400

¹²² gyis] F250T, gis F400

¹²³ sarba dznya] F400T, sa rbad nya F250

¹²⁴ tstsha] F400T, tsha F250

¹²⁵ ban de] F250F400, *om.* T

¹²⁶ bsgyur] F250T, bgyur F400

¹²⁷ |] F250T, *om.* F400

¹²⁸ tstsha] F400T, tsha F250

¹²⁹ ban de] F250F400, *om.* T

¹³⁰ brtsegs] F250F400, rtsegs T

¹³¹ pa'o || ||] T, pa || F250F400

As in the previous case, the versions found in the Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur*, and here also the one contained in the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur*, appear to be earlier ones, this time containing an Ancient Translation, while those found in the mainstream canonical editions contain a later New Translation. As for the differences in the title, also here the discrepancy can be easily explained, for the title of the mainstream canonical version simply reflects the number of verses in the hymn (i.e., 150)—again a very common practice. Moreover, as has already been shown in previous studies, the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* is the original title of the work, which was first known among modern scholars under the titles *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* and *Adhyardhaśatakastotra* (which latter likewise reflects the number of verses).¹³²

As for the discrepancy in the author's identity, this is a matter that has been discussed extensively in several previous studies and clearly goes beyond our discussion of the authenticity of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava's* colophons. As has been shown by Jens-Uwe Hartmann (and others before him), discussions regarding the identity of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava's* author were already taking place within the Indic cultural sphere, and were continued by the Tibetan tradition. One finds both persons, Māṛceta and Aśvaghōṣa, as the author in both traditions. It should be perhaps noted here that this Aśvaghōṣa is very unlikely to be the famed Aśvaghōṣa who composed the *Buddhacarita*. It seems rather that Aśvaghōṣa is a byname (one of several others) of Māṛceta (or, alternatively, of yet another person altogether). What is perhaps most relevant to our discussion is that *Adhīśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna assigns the names Māṛceta and Aśvaghōṣa to a single bearer. Since Shākya blo gros collaborated with him on several translations (though not ours), it might well be that the shift in the author's name in the colophons (and in catalogue records, on

¹³² For a detailed description of the work (along with its commentary, *Nandipriya's *Śatapañcāśatkanāmastotraṭīkā*), including its titles, available manuscripts, and bibliographical details of previous studies (particularly those by D. R. Shackleton Bailey), see Hartmann 1987: 23–25, § 2.1.2. See also Hahn 1988: 54.

which see below) we witness here is an influence of *Adhīśa (who, according to Hartmann is probably the earliest source for this equation).¹³³

Concerning the discrepancy regarding the translators, as stated above, a comparison between the mainstream canonical versions and the Phug brag versions (and now also the Tshal pa one) has shown that they contain virtually the same translation. This leads to the conclusion that the colophons of the mainstream canonical versions ascribing the translation to Shākya blo gros in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman must be falsified, while those of the Phug brag and Tshal pa versions ascribing the translation to rMa Rin chen mchog in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva and with a proofreading and finalization by dPal brtsegs must be authentic. Jampa Samten also notably points to at least one more case in which an Ancient Translation was later claimed to be by Shākya blo gros, namely, that of the *Āryasūryagarbhanāmavaipulyasūtra* (*'Phags pa shin tu rgyas pa chen po'i sde nyi ma'i snying po zhes bya ba'i mdo*) (P923/D257). The work is presented in the mainstream canonical collections as an Ancient Translation ascribed to bZang skyong (b. 9th cent.; BDRC: P4256) in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva, Vidyākaraprabha, and Dharmākara, with a revision by dPal brtsegs, while the colophon of the Phug brag version (F220) ascribes the translation to Sarvajñadeva, Vidyākaraprabha, and Dharmākara (omitting the names of any Tibetan translators of the Early Period altogether), with a twofold revision by Shākya blos gros and Tshul khirms 'byung gnas.¹³⁴ Jampa Samten, pointing out that both translations are also in this case virtually identical, concludes that

¹³³ See Hartmann 1987: 21, 34. For a detailed treatment of Mātrceta, including a discussion of his identity, name(s), and other biographic and bibliographic details, see *ibid.*: 15–36.

¹³⁴ The identity of this Tshul khirms 'byung gnas is uncertain. A brief search in the BDRC suggests Lo tsā ba Ga rod Tshul khirms 'byung gnas (fl. ca. 11th cent.; P4CZ15613) and Rab zhi lo tsā ba aka Rag shi Tshul khirms 'byung gnas (b. 10th cent.; P4275) as possible candidates.

the insertion of the names of the two gSar ma translators must likewise be a falsification.¹³⁵

To get back to the *Prasādapratibhodbhava*, apart from the evidence provided by the colophons and the comparison of the two versions, Hahn argued that the translation ascription to Rin chen mchog and dPal brtsegs, in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva, must be correct, if only for stylistic reasons. Having compared the vocabulary and style of the Tibetan translation of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* with that of the Tibetan translation of another hymn by Mātṛceṭa, the *Varṇārhavarnāstotra* (D1138/P2029), which is likewise an Ancient Translation ascribed to dPal brtsegs in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva (except chapter 13, whose translation is

¹³⁵ See Jampa Samten 1992: 95 n. 1. Note, however, that since not only the names of Tibetan translators of the Early Period are missing but also the verb “translated” (*bsgyur ba*), or the verbal noun “translation” (*’gyur ba*), is wholly missing, it might well be that the colophon is lacking a portion of its text. See the colophon (378a4–6; cf. Jampa Samten 1992: 84 no. 220): *rgya gar gyi mkhan po Sa rbad nya de ba dang | Byi dya ka ra pra bha dang | Dar ma ka ra dang lo tsa ba dge slong Shag kya blo gros dang | dge slong Tshul khirms ’byung gnas gnyis kyis | mdo sde glegs bam gnyis brgyad lan gnyis zhus so* |. This would mean that we witness here either an undeliberate omission of a phrase and that Shākya blos gros and Tshul khirms ’byung gnas were originally merely credited with a revision, or a deliberate omission, admittedly clumsily made, which aimed at crediting the two with both the translation and a revision. Jampa Samten has noted (*ibid.*: 84 n. 2) that the respective traditional catalogue entry names the translation team of the Early Period and not Shākya blos gros and Tshul khirms ’byung gnas as in the colophon. However, to be more precise, it names Sarvajñadeva, Vidyākaraṇa, Śākyadharmā (instead of Dharmākara), and bZang skyong, with a revision by dPal brtsegs. For the catalogue entry, see the *Phug brag bka’ dkar* (13b6–7): *’Phags pa shin tu rgyas pa chen po’i mdo sde nyi ma’i snying po bam po bcu gsum dang le’u bcu gnyis Sarba dznya de ba dang | Byi dyā ka ra pra bha Shākya Dar mā | bZang skyong rnams kyis ’gyur la dPal rtsegs kyis zhu pa....* As we shall see below, this is not the only instance in which an entry in the catalogue of the *Phug brag* edition differs from the respective colophon regarding translators’ names. For more details, see the third and fourth case studies (§§ 5.4. and 5.5., respectively).

ascribed to Rin chen bzang po in collaboration with Padmākara),¹³⁶ Hahn showed that there is a very clear correspondence between the two translations, which contain words and expressions that are either not or only seldom found elsewhere. Such correspondence between two translations, Hahn convincingly argues, could be easily explained only if the same person/s was/were involved in them (in our case dPal brtsegs). However, this is not the only argument brought forward by Hahn to prove that the mainstream canonical version is in fact the Ancient Translation by Sarvajñadeva, Rin chen mchog, and dPal brtsegs and not a New Translation by Śraddhākaravarman and Shākya blo gros, as its colophon wants us to believe. Hahn argues further that the team translating the commentary on it by *Nandipriya—the *Śatapañcāśatkanāmastotraṭīkā* (D1148/P2039), which according to whose colophon was likewise translated by Shākya blo gros in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman—could not be the same team as the one that did the basic text (*mūla / rtsa ba*). This is clear, he says, from the different translation of the same vocabulary in the basic text and in the commentary. (He unfortunately does not discuss these discrepancies in detail for want of space.) Hahn thus concludes that the colophon of the basic text found in the Phug brag collection is authentic, while that found in the *bsTan 'gyur* contains a false translation ascription. He does conclude, though, that the colophon of its commentary, ascribing the translation to Shākya blo gros in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman, is authentic. Hahn notes, in addition, that the commentary contains the basic text as translated by Rin chen mchog and dPal brtsegs in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva (a matter to which I shall return below). Before coming to a final conclusion regarding the authenticity of the translation colophons, however, I would first like to explore some more bibliographical sources and investigate and compare the translation of several verses.

¹³⁶ For an extensive study of Mātrceṭa's *Varṇārḥavarṇastotra*, see Hartmann 1987.

5.3.2. Further Bibliographical Evidence

In order to shed more light on the question of authenticity with regard to the various colophons of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* presented above, I shall in the following present whatever bibliographical records concerning it have been traced thus far. As records concerning its commentary, the *Śatapañcāśatkanāmastotra-tīkā*, proved to be relevant to our discussion, they shall likewise be presented. The catalogue entries in question, which could be classified into three groups in terms of their information regarding the translators, are presented (to the extent possible) in chronological order within each group as follows:

Group I

- (i) *lDan dkar ma: slob dpon Mā ti tsi ʒas mdzad pa* [L455 ...] [L457] *Sangs rgyas bcom ldan ʼdas la bstod pa | dad pa la spobs pa skyes pa | 150 śloka || [...]* [L684] *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu paʼi bshad pa | slob dpon dGaʼ byed snyan pas mdzad pa | 900 śloka | 3 bam po |*¹³⁷
- (ii) *ʼPhang thang ma: slob dpon Ma ti tsi tras mdzad pa la |* [K657 ...] [K658] *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa | 150 śloka ste | de rnams so |* [K659] *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu paʼi bshad pa | 10 bam po |*

Group II

- (i) *rGyan gyi nyi ʼod*
- (a) under Ancient Translations: [Rr17.8] *slob dpon Ma ti tse tras*¹³⁸ [...] [Rr17.10] *Dad pa la spobs pa bskyed*¹³⁹ *pa brgya lnga bcu pa || leʼu bcu gsum la*¹⁴⁰ [...]

¹³⁷ See also Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 262–263.

¹³⁸ tse tras], tsitras N

¹³⁹ bskyed] N, skyed R

¹⁴⁰ As noted in van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 177 n. 5, the following thirteen entries Rr17.11–23 (in *ibid.* erroneously 17.11–13) correspond to the individual chapters (*leʼu*; in *ibid.* “works”) contained in Rr17.10.

[Rr17.39] *brGya lnga bcu pa'i 'grel*¹⁴¹ *pa slob dpon dGa' byed snyan pas byas pa bam po lnga*¹⁴² | |

(b) under New Translations, section of translations by Shākya blo gros: [Rr23.4] *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa'i le'u dang po 'grel pa dang* | |

(ii) *Tshal pa bstan dkar* (5b5–6): [T15] *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa las*(!)¹⁴³ | *dad pa la spobs pa bskyed pa la sogs pa le'u bcu gsum tshang ba*¹⁴⁴ *slob dpon rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa Rin chen mchog dang dPal rtsegs kyi 'gyur* | [T16] *de'i 'Grel pa dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa Shakya blo gros kyi 'gyur* |

(iii) *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1* (417.3–4): [=P2038] *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa las*(!)| *dad pa las spobs pa bskyed pa la sogs pa'i*¹⁴⁵ *le'u bcu gsum tshang ba slob dpon rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa dang Rin chen mchog dang dPal brtsegs kyi 'gyur* | [=P2039] *de'i 'Grel pa dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur* |

Group III

(i) *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*

(a) reading as in the earlier version (B, 3a6–7): [N_{js}10] *slob dpon rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa'i bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa dad pa las spobs pa skyes pa bstod pa gleng bslang pa la sogs pa le'u bcu gsum tshang pa Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur* | [N_{js}11] *de'i 'Grel pa slob dpon dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa* |

¹⁴¹ 'grel] *em.*, grel NR. It is very likely, however, that *grel* is an erroneous reading/recording by van der Kuijp & Schaeffer.

¹⁴² lnga] N, lnga bcu R

¹⁴³ The reading containing the addition of the particle *las* found in several of the catalogues—including the later version of the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (MS A), *Tshal pa bstan dkar*, and *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*—is clearly less felicitous. It appears to be a result of failing to recognize that *bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa* and *Dad pa las spobs pa skyes pa* are two alternative, complementing titles.

¹⁴⁴ ba] T_{ms}, pa T_{js}

¹⁴⁵ la sogs pa'i] *em.*, lags pa'i Xy

- (b) reading as in the later version (A, 3b2–3): [≈N_{js}10] *slob dpon rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa'i bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa las(!) dad pa las spobs pa skyed pa bstod pa gleng bslang ba la sogs pa le'u bcu gsum tshang ba dang* | [≈N_{js}11] *de'i 'Grel pa slob dpon dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa gnyis Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur* |
- (ii) *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc906] *slob dpon rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa'i Dad pa la spobs pa skyes pa*¹⁴⁶ *bstod pa gleng bslang ba la sogs pa 13 le'u 150 śloka dang* | [Bc907] *de'i 'Grel pa slob dpon dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa 12 bam po* | **Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur** |
- (iii) *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (417.3–4): [=D1147] *brGya lnga bcu pa'i bstod pa slob dpon rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa paṇḍita Shraddhā ka ra warma dang* | *lo tstsha ba Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur* | [=D1148] *de'i 'grel pa slob dpon dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa* | *paṇḍita Shraddhā ka ra warma dang* | *lo tstsha ba*¹⁴⁷ **Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur** |¹⁴⁸
- (iv) *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2* (600.3–4): [=P2038] *brGya lnga bcu pa zhes bya ba'i bstod pa rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa* | *Shra dha dang* | **Shākya blos gros kyi 'gyur** |; (601.5) [=P2039] *brGya lnga bcu pa zhes bya ba'i bstod pa'i 'grel pa dGa' byed snyan pas mdzad pa* | *Shra dha dang* | **Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur** |
- (v) *Glo bo bstan dkar* (A, 287a3–4; B, 272.4–6): *Sangs rgyas la bstod pa brgya lnga bcu pa rTa dbyangs kyis mdzad pa Shākya blo gros kyi 'gyur* | *brGya lnga bcu pa'i bstod*

¹⁴⁶ The reading *pa*, reported by Nishioka to be found in his versions DTS, is preferable to *pa'i* found in the version he follows (Lhasa).

¹⁴⁷ *ba*] *em.*, *pa Xy*

¹⁴⁸ Later *bsTan 'gyur* catalogues followed suit. See the *Ngam ring bstan dkar* (5.15–17; = D1147); *lNga pa chen po bstan dkar* (15a7–8; =P2038) and *gSer bris bstan dkar* (12a3–4; G38) (note that both erroneously read *dGa' byed snyem pa* instead of *dGa' byed snyan pa*); and the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 339b7–340a2; D1147).

*pa'i 'grel pa dGa' byed snyems pas mdzad pa Shākya blo
gros kyi 'gyur* |

To recap, Group I consists of the two imperial catalogues of the Ancient Translations—the *IDan dkar ma* and *'Phang thang ma*—both of which ascribe the work to Mātṛceṭa, but they differ in their recording of the title of the hymn, which in the former is given as *Prasādapratibhodbhava* and in the latter as *Śatapañcāśatkastotra*, while in the title of its commentary it is referred to as *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* in both catalogues (I shall come back to this issue below). As is common in these two catalogues, the translators are not individually named. Both catalogues indicate the length of the hymn as 150 verses, but differ in their recording of the commentary's length (3 and 10 *bam pos*, respectively). As we have seen, the inconsistency regarding the length of the commentary in terms of *bam pos* persists in some of the later catalogues as well (the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* indicates the number to be 5 and the *Bu ston chos 'byung* to be 12). This, however, is of not much relevance to our discussion and thus will not be discussed further.¹⁴⁹ Group II—consisting of Rig ral's *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, the *Tshal pa bstan dkar*, and the *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*—represents a transitional phase. The *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, in addition to recording both the hymn and its commentary under the section Early Period (with titles and authorship ascription as in the *IDan dkar ma*), also records a translation by Shākya blo gros of a commentary on the first chapter of the hymn (a matter to which I shall return below) with no authorship ascription. The *Tshal pa bstan dkar* and *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*, in which, as in all later catalogues, there is no separation between Ancient and New Translations, the bibliographical records appear to be a conflation of various sources, with a record of Aśvaghōṣa as the hymn's author, with Rin chen mchog and dPal brtsegs as its translators, and with Shākya blo gros as the translator of the commentary. Group III—consisting of the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, *Bu ston chos 'byung*, *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (and all later catalogues based on it), *Rang rdor*

¹⁴⁹ Concerning Rig ral's remark on the problem connected with the measurement unit *bam po*, see Part One of the present study, § 2.1.5.

bstan dkar-2, and *Glo bo bstan dkar*—consistently names Aśvaghōṣa as the hymn’s author and Śraddhākaravarman and Shākya blo gros as the translators of both the hymn and its commentary. (Of some interest is perhaps the discrepancy between the earlier version of the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* and its later version.)

5.3.3. Examination of Selected Verses

Various verses from the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* are found in other works, either as explicit citations or in the form of silent “borrowings.” Most of them, however, are found in works translated in the Later Period and exhibit no substantial differences from the above presented versions, and are thus of little interest to our discussion. In the following I shall, therefore, only present, compare, and point out the similarities and differences in the Tibetan translation of several such verses that are found in works translated during the Early Period, which would allow us to better judge the state of affairs.¹⁵⁰

(1) Verse 10

The first case concerns *Prasādapratibhodbhava* 10 (D, 110b1–2; P, 129b3; F250, 424a7; F400, 378b2–3):¹⁵¹

spyod dam mi spyod snyam pa yi | |¹⁵²
*rnam par rtog*¹⁵³ *pa rnam*¹⁵⁴ *spangs nas* | |¹⁵⁵
'gro ba 'di ni nyam thag ces | |¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁰ The divergent readings found in Ancient Translations are single underlined. Differences in orthography and conjugated verb forms, differences resulting from *sandhi* rules, and the like are ignored, as they are of little significance to our discussion.

¹⁵¹ See also Bailey 1951: 40–41, for the Sanskrit, Tibetan (based on the sNar thang version), and Chinese texts, and for the commentary (in Tibetan translation).

¹⁵² | |] DPF₂₅₀, om. F₄₀₀

¹⁵³ rtog] DPF₂₅₀, rtogs F₄₀₀

¹⁵⁴ a.c. rnams F₄₀₀

¹⁵⁵ | |] DPF₂₅₀, | F₄₀₀

khyod bdag nyid kyis zhal gyis bzhes | |¹⁵⁷ (10)

This verse is found in Kamalaśīla’s *Vajracchedikāṭīkā* (D3817/P5216)—translated by Ye shes sde in collaboration with Mañjuśrī and Jinamitra—where it reads virtually identically, the only difference being the reading *dka’* instead of *spyod* (apparently both for *viśahya*). The verse here reads as follows (D, 211b2–3; P, 218b4–5):

ji skad du |¹⁵⁸
*dka’ ’am mi dka’ snyam pa yi*¹⁵⁹ | |
*rnam par rtog pa rnam*¹⁶⁰ *spangs nas* | |¹⁶¹
*’gro ba ’di ni nyam*¹⁶² *thag ces* | |¹⁶³
khyod bdag nyid kyis zhal gyis bzhes | |¹⁶⁴ (=10)
zhes bshad pa lta bu’o zhe na | ...

The same verse is also found in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśaṭīkā*, which is ascribed by later traditional cataloguers to Vasubandhu. The identity of its translator is unknown, but it is listed in both imperial catalogues and thus is undoubtedly an Ancient Translation (or, alternatively, a Tibetan composition of the Early Period).¹⁶⁵ The translation of the verse here also reads similarly,

¹⁵⁶ | |] DPF₂₅₀, | F₄₀₀

¹⁵⁷ | |] DPF₂₅₀, | F₄₀₀

¹⁵⁸ |] D, om. P

¹⁵⁹ yi] D, yin P

¹⁶⁰ rnam] D, mams P

¹⁶¹ | |] D, om. P

¹⁶² nyam] D, nyams P

¹⁶³ | |] D, | P

¹⁶⁴ | |] D, om. P

¹⁶⁵ The *IDan dkar ma* (L536), which lists the work under the section “Mahāyānasūtra Commentaries” (§ XX, p. 331: *Theg pa chen po’i mdo sde’i ṭika*), does not name any author. In the *’Phang thang ma* (K769) the work is listed under the section “Commentaries on sūtras and treatises composed by King Khri Srong lde btsan (§ 27-8., p. 38: *mDo sde dang bstan bcos kyī ti kal btsan po Khri Srong lde btsan gyis mdzad pa*). The *rGyan gyi nyi ’od* (Rr10.39), obviously following the *IDan dkar ma*, does

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

with merely negligible differences. Notable is the reading *dka'*, as in Ye shes sde's translation presented above, instead of *spyod* in the first instance (in the second instance we read *sla* instead of *mi dka'*, which amounts to the same thing). The verse here reads as follows (D, 57b2–3; P, 70b4–5):

de bas na |¹⁶⁶
dka' 'am sla 'am snyam pa yi | |
*rnam par rtog pa spangs*¹⁶⁷ *nas ni* | |
'gro ba 'di dag nyam thag ces | |¹⁶⁸
khyod bdag nyid kyi zhal gyis bzhes | |¹⁶⁹ (=10)
zhes gsungs pa lta bu'o | |

not provide an author's name either. It appears that the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* is the earliest catalogue with an authorship ascription to Vasubandhu, followed by Bu ston and later cataloguers. See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 41a4–5; B, 32b4–5): [Njs881] '*phags pa Blo gros mi zad*^[1] *pas bstan pa'i mdo'i 'grel pa slob dpon dByig gnyen gyis mdzad pa dang* | (^[1] *zad*) A, bzad B); *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc644] *Blo gros mi zad pas bstan pa'i mdo'i 'grel pa slob dpon dByig gnyen gyis mdzad pa 20 bam po* |; *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (597.7–598.1): '*phags pa Blo gros mi zad pas bstan pa'i mdo'i rgya cher 'grel pa* | *slob dpon dByig gnyen gyis mdzad pa bzhugs so* | |. The work itself, notably, lacks both authorship and translation colophons! Worth consideration is perhaps the fact that the next catalogue entry in the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* (Rr10.40) is a work by Vasubandhu, and one wonders whether this caused confusion on dBus pa blo gsal's part, leading to a faulty authorship ascription to Vasubandhu in the case of our work as well; an error that was then transmitted in later catalogues. Note that Jens Braarvig, who likewise doubted the authorship ascription to Vasubandhu, hypothesized that the author (or more precisely, the compiler) could have well been Sthiramati and Vasubandhu may have been the person to whom the work was dedicated. See Braarvig 1993, vol. 2: cxxviii–cxxix.

¹⁶⁶ |] D, om. P

¹⁶⁷ spangs] D, spang P

¹⁶⁸ | |] D, | P

¹⁶⁹ | |] D, om. P

(2) Verse 12ab

The second case concerns *Prasādapratibhodbhava* 12ab (D, 110b2; P, 129b4; F250, 424a8–b1; F400, 378b4):¹⁷⁰

*nyid kyi sha yang stsol mdzad na ||*¹⁷¹
*dngos po gzhan lta smos ci 'tshal ||*¹⁷² (12ab)

These lines are found in *Asvabhāva's *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāraṭīkā* (D4029/P5530)—translated by dPal brtsegs in collaboration with Śākyasiṃha—where they read almost identically, the only different reading being *btang gyur* instead of *stsol mdzad*, which amounts to the same meaning (D, 123b1; P, 138b7–8):

nyid kyi sha yang btang gyur na ||
dngos po gzhan lta smos ci 'tshal || (=12ab)

(3) Verses 94–95

The third case concerns *Prasādapratibhodbhava* 94–95 (D, 113b5; P, 133b1–3; F250, 429a8–b2¹⁷³):¹⁷⁴

bsgrags pas sdig pa 'phrog par mdzad ||
khyod dran pas ni rangs par 'gyur ||
*btsal bas*¹⁷⁵ *blo gros skye 'gyur te ||*
*yongs su shes pas rnam par 'dag*¹⁷⁶ || (94)
*khyod la bsu*¹⁷⁷ *bas dpal du*¹⁷⁸ *byed ||*

¹⁷⁰ See also Bailey 1951: 42, for the Sanskrit, Tibetan (based on the sNar thang version), and Chinese texts, and for the commentary (in Tibetan translation).

¹⁷¹ ||] DPF₂₅₀, om. F₄₀₀

¹⁷² ||] DPF₂₅₀, om. F₄₀₀

¹⁷³ It appears that a text passage approximately two folios long (the later part of chap. 8, the whole of chap. 9, and the first part of chap. 10) was lost in F400 in the course of transmission (the foliation is consecutive), including our two verses.

¹⁷⁴ See also Bailey 1951: 104–106, for the Sanskrit, Tibetan (based on the sNar thang version), and Chinese texts, and for the commentary (in Tibetan translation).

¹⁷⁵ bas] DP, pas F₂₅₀

¹⁷⁶ 'dag] DP, dag F₂₅₀

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

bsten pas blo gros mchog tu 'gyur | |
bsten na 'jigs pa med par mdzad | |
*bsnyen bkur bgyis pas*¹⁷⁹ *bde bar 'gyur* | | (95)

The two verses are found in Vimalamitra's *Vinayasamuccaya* (D4106/P5607)—translated by Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan in collaboration with Jinamitra and Sarvajñadeva—where one observes a comparably large number of instances in which the reading differs. However, in this case, too, there is no doubt that the alleged New Translation is nothing but the Ancient Translation, with some (partly minor) changes. The verses read here as follows (vol. Pu, 6a4–5; P, vol. Bu, 6b7–7a1):

de nyid kyi phyir |
brjod na sdig pa 'byang bar 'gyur | |
khyod nyid dran na mchog tu dga' | |
btsal na blo gros byed 'gyur te | |
yongs su shes na rnam par dag | |
khyod la bsu na dpal du byed | |
bsten na blo mchog byed par 'gyur | |
'grog na 'jigs pa med par byed | |
bsnyen bkur byas na bde byed 'gyur | |
zhes gsungs so | |

The above presented cases demonstrate beyond doubt that the (alleged) New Translation is indeed nothing but the Ancient Translation, with merely some (slight) differences. While these differences could indeed be the result of some revision on the part of Shākya blo gros, one should bear in mind that the verses taken from the Ancient Translations presented above do not necessarily faithfully reflect the translation of the verses as found in the Ancient Translation of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava*, for they are found embedded in other works. In other words, it is very well possible that despite the great efforts generally made by translators and editors to bring into alignment the translations of

¹⁷⁷ la bsu] DP, lab bcus F₂₅₀

¹⁷⁸ du] DP, tu F₂₅₀

¹⁷⁹ pas] DP, pa F₂₅₀

identical passages found in different works (i.e., identical passages that are subject to citation or borrowing), they have not been always entirely successful in doing so. The fact that the readings of the Phug brag versions (ascribed to translators active in the Early Period) are nearly identical with the readings of the *bsTan 'gyur* versions (ascribed to translators active in the Later Period) strengthens the possibility that the above presented passages were not aligned so much as rather revised by the gSar ma translators.

5.3.4. Assessment of the Evidence

The evidence presented above clearly reveals, once again, the complexity of the issue of authenticity of colophons in general, and of our case in particular. As in the first example, we witness here discrepancies regarding the authorship and translation ascriptions, and also regarding the title. As for the inconsistency regarding the author's identity, we have seen that the Tibetans inherited this discussion from India. We also suggested that the shift in Tibet from Mātr̥ceta to Aśvagoṣa as the putative author of the work in question is likely due to *Adhīsa, who is known to have equated the two, and with whom Shākya blo gros collaborated on several translations. What should be perhaps added here in conclusion is the fact that the switch from one name to the other seems to have merely concerned the *Prasādapratibhodbhava*, while the authorship ascription of other works said to be by Mātr̥ceta remained unchanged. This might suggest that the later editors of the different editions of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon and the compilers of their respective catalogues did not necessarily understand Aśvagoṣa to be a byname of Mātr̥ceta, and indeed probably considered them to be different persons. This can already be observed in the first *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue, the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, and later catalogues followed suit.¹⁸⁰

¹⁸⁰ See, for example, the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 3b2–3, 3b4–6, 4a1; B, 3a6, 3a7–b2, 3a5, 3b3; Njs10,13–16,9,17), and equivalent records in catalogues to later *bsTan 'gyur* editions. However, the exact state of affairs should be looked at more closely in at least one case, namely, that

As for the discrepancy regarding the titles, we have seen that the two titles were already being used indiscriminately in India. Here I would merely like to comment on Hartmann's conclusion that since the mainstream canonical version goes under the title *Śatapañcāśatkastotra*, the New Translation team must have relied on another manuscript than the Ancient Translation team, since the latter's, according to the *IDan dkar ma*, went under the title *Prasādapratibhodbhava*.¹⁸¹ Hartmann, who at the time was not aware of the Phug brag version, assumed on the basis of the colophon that the version included in the *bsTan 'gyur* is a New Translation by Shākya blo gros in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman. However, since we know today that the *'Phang thang ma* (which was likewise not accessible to Hartmann at the time) records the work under the title *Śatapañcāśatkastotra*, the conclusion on the basis of the title alone that the two translator teams used different Sanskrit originals does not hold.¹⁸² One should perhaps also note that, as we have seen above, the work is recorded in the *IDan dkar ma* as *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* in the title of its commentary! As it is clear that Śraddhākaravarman and Shākya blo gros did not translate the work, but at best merely made slight changes regarding

of the *Khadiravaṇītārāstotra*. Both dBus pa blo gsal, in his *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue, and Bu ston, in his religious history, do not name the author of this work. In his *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue, however, Bu ston indicates the author as Mātṛceṭa. Moreover, while the work has not been included in the sDe dge *bsTan 'gyur* edition, it is found in the three larger editions (G2880/N2872/P4881) with an authorship attribution to Nāgārjuna. See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 8a3; B, 5b4): [Nj579] *Seng ldeng nags kyi sgrol ma'i bstod pa tshigs bcad bcu drug pa*; *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc1731] *Seng ldeng nags kyi sgrol ma'i bstod pa tshigs bcad bcu drug pa*; *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (413.7): [=DØ] *Seng ldeng nags sgrol gyi bstod pa tshigs su bcad pa bcu drug pa Ma ti tsi tras mdzad pa*; *INga pa chen po'i bstan dkar* (99b3–4): *Seng ldeng nags sgrol gyi bstod pa tshigs bcad bcu drug pa Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa*.

¹⁸¹ See Hartmann 1987: 23–24.

¹⁸² Cf., however, Hartmann 1996: 72, where Hartmann summarises the relevant findings in Hahn 1988.

orthography and grammar, and occasionally replaced words with their synonyms, it is not entirely impossible that the Tibetan Ancient Translation they had at their disposal already bore the title *Śatapañcāśatkastotra*. It is also possible that the title was changed by cataloguers and/or editors, in order to match it with the commentary's title (as was probably the case in the record found in the *'Phang thang ma*).

Concerning the translation colophons, on the basis of the above presented evidence, it appears that one can say with certainty that all available versions of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* aka *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* represent the Ancient Translation made by rMa Rin chen mchog in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva as revised by dPal brtsegs. This leads us to the inexorable conclusion that the translation colophons of the Phug brag versions are authentic, while those of the *bsTan 'gyur* version, ascribing it to Śraddhākaravarman and Shākya blo gros, are false. Whether this was a premeditated falsification or rather a transmissional error could again in this case not be answered with certainty. However, even if we assume that this latter team engaged in introducing some changes into the Ancient Translation, the question whether minor changes consisting in standardization of orthography and grammar and substitutions of synonyms (both of which can surely be done without consulting the Sanskrit original) could be considered translation activity at all is certainly legitimate. And yet, when claims of revision (justifiable or not) end up as claims of independent translation, we are certainly faced with questions of (in)authenticity concerning the translator/translation colophons. Such deliberations are applicable not only to this particular case but are universally valid. Now, while the identity of the translators of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* (i.e., the basic text) seems rather certain, the situation with the identity of the translators of its commentary is more complex. This is simply because, unlike in the case of the basic text, here we merely have at our disposal the mainstream canonical version—whose colophon likewise ascribes the translation to Śraddhākaravarman and Shākya blo gros—with no version bearing a colophon claiming it to be the Ancient Translation to compare with. As has already been noted above,

Hahn pointed out that the commentary contains the basic text as translated by Rin chen mchog and dPal brtsegs in collaboration with Sarvajñadeva. The *Prasādapratibhodbhava* is also notably embedded in Dinnāga's *Miśrakastotra* (D1150/P2041), which was translated by yet another team, Kumārakalaśa and bSod nams bzang po (11th cent.; BDRC: P4213). A brief examination of the Tibetan translation of the verses of the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* found there shows that also in this case it is virtually identical to the Ancient Translation. This is as such not unusual, for we know from other cases that when translating a commentary for whose basic text a translation already exists, the translators made use of it for the passages of the basic text embedded in the text they were translating.¹⁸³ Regarding the text containing the actual commentary (i.e., excluding the embedded basic text), Hahn argued, as pointed out above, that its Tibetan translation contains vocabulary that is different from that of the basic text, and thus the two translations must be by different teams, so that the translation ascription of the commentary to Śraddhākaravarman and Shākya blo gros must be correct. Hahn did not bring forward examples of such vocabulary for want of space. This will not be attempted here either since such an attempt would require a thorough examination of the vocabulary (and perhaps also the syntax, grammar, and style) of the entire commentary and a comparison of it with that of the basic text, an undertaking which is clearly beyond both the scope and objectives of the present study. One detail, however, should in my opinion be brought to our attention in this regard, namely, the fact that Rig ral in his *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* mentions in addition to the Ancient Translations of both the hymn and its commentary also a translation by Shākya blo gros of a commentary on the first chapter of our hymn (*bsTod pa brgya lnga bcu pa'i le'u dang po 'grel pa*). Now, since Rig ral does not mention the author of this commentary, it could theoretically be a reference to another commentary that focuses on the first

¹⁸³ For a brief discussion of this phenomenon, see Almogi 2016b: 15. This method was also notably practised when citing works for which a translation already existed.

chapter alone. However, since there seems to be no other evidence for such a commentary, it would appear more likely that this record refers to the same commentary—that is, *Nandipriya's *Śatapañcāsatkanāmastotraṭīkā*—and that Shākya blo gros merely translated anew (or, again, just revised?) its first chapter, and that the later ascription of the translation of the entire work to Shākya blo gros was a transmissional error on the part of the editors of the *bsTan 'gyur* and/or compilers of its catalogues. This assumption could only be corroborated by closely examining and comparing the translation of the first chapter with that of the remaining chapters in terms of vocabulary, syntax, and style, which undertaking is likewise beyond the scope and objectives of the present study. In this regard, since Hahn did not provide details concerning the scope of his investigation, we do not know whether it concerned the entire text or merely focused on a small portion of it (e.g., the first chapter?).

5.4. The Colophons of the *Buddhākṣeṇasūtra* in Tibetan Translation

Another example that was made possible through the unique versions found in the Phug brag collection concerns the translation of the *Buddhākṣeṇasūtra* (*Sangs rgyas mi spang ba zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*).

5.4.1. Extant Versions and Their Colophons

In this case, too, the various versions consulted by me could be classified into more than one group, this time two.

(a) Various *bKa' 'gyur* editions

The first group consists of ten *bKa' 'gyur* collections—including those of sDe dge (D276), Peking (P942), 'Jang sa tham (J217), Urga (U276), sTog (S97), Ulaanbaatar (V147), sNar thang (N261), lHa sa (H278), Shey (Z128), and the Gondhla Proto *bKa' 'gyur* collection (Go13.30)—which belong to various transmission groups. The colophons of this group, which ascribe the translation to

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, Ye shes sde, etc.,¹⁸⁴ read as follows (D, 49b5–6; Go, 65a7; H, 122b7; J, 49b6; N, 72a1; P, 53a1–2; S, 352a2–3; U, 49b6–7; V, 298a8; Z, 378b4–5):

*rgya gar gyi mkhan po D¹⁸⁵zi na mi¹⁸⁶ tra dang | Pra dznyā¹⁸⁷
barma¹⁸⁸ dang | zhu chen¹⁸⁹ gyi¹⁹⁰ lo tstsha¹⁹¹ ba ban dhe¹⁹² Ye
shes sde la sogs pas¹⁹³ bsgyur cing zhus te¹⁹⁴ gtan la phab pa¹⁹⁵ | |*

(b) Phug brag bKa' 'gyur edition

The second group consists of merely the Phug brag version (F332). Its colophon, which ascribes the translation to Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs, reads as follows (F, 12b5–6):

*ban de Shes rab bsam gtan dang | ban de Sangs rgyas skyabs
gnyis kyis bsgyur pa'o | |*

Jampa Samten, who compared the Phug brag version with other canonical versions and found them to be virtually identical, concludes that the translation ascription to Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs is a case of plagiarism.¹⁹⁶ In contrast to the previous two examples, this case seems rather straightforward. I shall nonetheless attempt to corroborate Jampa Samten's

¹⁸⁴ The word "etc." is apparently a reference to some collaborative work done during the Great Revision. For Rig ral's explanation of the word "etc." in such contexts, see above § 4.

¹⁸⁵ dzi] DHJNSUVZ, 'dzi GoP

¹⁸⁶ mi] DHJNPSUVZ, myi Go

¹⁸⁷ pra dznyā] DHPV, pradznyā JNSUZ, prad nya Go

¹⁸⁸ barma] DHJN, warma U, bar ma GoPV, war ma SZ

¹⁸⁹ chen] DHJNPSUVZ, can Go

¹⁹⁰ gyi] DHJNPSUVZ, gi Go

¹⁹¹ tstsha] DJPU, tsā HN, tsa GoSVZ

¹⁹² ban dhe] PSVZ, ban de DGoJU, bande HN

¹⁹³ la sogs pas] DHJNPSUVZ, las stsogs pas Go

¹⁹⁴ te] DHJNPSUZ, te | GoV

¹⁹⁵ gtan la phab pa] DHJNPSUVZ, bstan la 'phab pa 'o Go

¹⁹⁶ See Jampa Samten 1992: xxii no. c.1, and 123 n. 2.

conclusion with some additional information followed by a brief discussion.

5.4.2. Further Bibliographical Evidence

Altogether six bibliographical records could be located, as follows:

- (i+ii) *lDan dkar ma* and *'Phang thang ma*: [L198/F195] **Sangs rgyas mi spang ba** | 120 śloka | |¹⁹⁷
- (iii) *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*: [Rr6.144] **Sangs rgyas mi spang ba**¹⁹⁸ *brgya nyi shu* | |
- (iv) *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc356] **Sangs rgyas mi spong ba** 120 śloka dang | [357 ...] *gnyis Ye shes sde'i 'gyur* |
- (v) *Phug brag bka' dkar* (16a6–7): **Sangs rgyas mi spongs ba zhes bya ba'i mdo sho lo ka brgya nyi shu pa Dzi na mi tra Pradznyā warma Ye shes sde** *gsum gyi 'gyur* |
- (vi) *sDe dge bka' dkar* (133a1–2): *'phags pa Sangs rgyas mi spong ba zhes bya ba'i mdo shlo ka brgya nyi shu pa* | *rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dzi na mi tra dang* | **Pradznyā warma dang** | *lo tsā ba Bande Ye shes sde la sogs pas bsgyur cing zhus pa* |¹⁹⁹

As both imperial catalogues—the *lDan dkar ma* and *'Phang thang ma*—contain an entry for the *Buddhākṣepaṇasūtra*, there is no doubt that there existed an Ancient Translation of the *sūtra*. The *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, apart from listing the *sūtra* under the section Early

¹⁹⁷ See also Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 105–106.

¹⁹⁸ spang ba] N, spangs pa R

¹⁹⁹ The catalogue of the lHa sa *bka' 'gyur* edition reproduces the colophon in a similar manner. See Members of Staff 1988: 61–62 no. 261 (record for H278). As noted earlier, other *bKa' 'gyur* catalogues, such as those to the sNar thang, Mustang, 'Jang sa tham, and sTog editions, merely consist of title lists and thus are not much of a help here. See Members of Staff 1988: 61–62 no. 261; Eimer 1999: 106 no. 594; Imaeda 1984, vol. 2: 44 no. 217; and Skorupski 1985: 101 no. 97, respectively. It appears that, except for the Phug brag version, none of the other *bKa' 'gyur* versions, notably, bears a colophon that identifies the translators as Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs.

Period, does not record any New Translation (or revision) of it. The *Bu ston chos 'byung* mentions Ye shes sde as the translator, and the *sDe dge bka' dkar* (along with the catalogue to the lHa sa bKa' 'gyur edition) provides the same information as found in the translation colophon, including, that is, the names of the Indian *paṇḍitas* Jinamitra and Prajñāvarman. While these records are all in line with their respective colophons presented above, the record found in the *Phug brag bka' dkar* is most perplexing, since it likewise ascribes the translation to Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye shes sde. This stands in clear contrast with its respective colophon, which ascribes the translation to Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs.

5.4.3. Assessment of the Evidence

From the above evidence several points seem of particular relevance for determining the (in)authenticity of the colophons: (i) It appears that the colophon of the Phug brag version is the only bibliographical source that names Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs as the translators of the *sūtra*. (ii) While the persons named in the translation colophons of ten of the consulted versions—Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye shes sde—are well-known translators who lived during the Early Period, the identity of the translators named in the colophon of the Phug brag version—Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs—is uncertain, though it seems that they were active during the Later Period. In fact, it appears to be the only work stated as having been translated by this team (the colophons of the Phug brag edition must be, however, looked at more closely in this regard for Jampa Samten unfortunately provides no name index). (iii) Although none of the colophons have a personal or individual tone, the ones that name Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye shes sde resemble the formulaic translation colophons commonly found in the canon, while the colophon of the Phug brag version is very simple, merely mentioning the names of the translators Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs. (iv) The Phug brag colophon has no reference to an Indian *paṇḍita*, which is rather unusual. (v) The names of translators of the *sūtra* provided by the

catalogue of the Phug brag edition are different from those found in the colophon, and in fact are identical with those provided in all other colophons and catalogues, a discrepancy that cannot be easily explained. We know from other cases that discrepancies between the edition itself and its respective catalogue can be explained by the fact that catalogues of new editions were often based on—and occasionally almost a verbatim copy of—an earlier catalogue, often the one of the set the new edition was based on. As a result, changes introduced into the new edition were occasionally overlooked and thus not recorded in the new catalogue. Since the Phug brag *bKa' 'gyur* and its catalogue are rather unique, it is hard to explain this discrepancy in a similar manner, particularly as this is not the only instance. Several scenarios could be suggested, but these will have to remain in the domain of our imagination. All the points just raised support Jampa Samten's suggestion that the Phug brag colophon is inauthentic, and thus that the translation ascription to Shes rab bsam gtan and Sangs rgyas skyabs is incorrect. This would of course be true even if the two, in the best-case scenario, introduced some minor "corrections" to the Ancient Translation.

5.5. The Colophons of the *Guhyasamājatantra* in Tibetan Translation

As noted earlier, another collection that can provide us good examples in regard to the issue of colophon authenticity is the paracanonical Tantric collection known as the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*. In the present study I would like to merely focus on one such case, that of the *Guhyasamājatantra* (*gSang ba 'dus pa'i rgyud*).

5.5.1. Extant Versions and Their Colophons

The *Guhyasamājatantra* consists of 17 chapters (referred to collectively in the following as the *mūlatantra*) and an additional chapter 18 (referred to in the following as the *uttaratantra*). Various versions of the *tantra* in Tibetan translation are available, including those of the mainstream and local editions of the *bKa' 'gyur*, those of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*, and two incomplete

Dunhuang versions. The Dunhuang versions, which merely contain the *mūlatantra*, bear no translation colophons. As for the remaining versions, while the *mūlatantra* and the *uttaratantra* of most of them each bear an independent translation colophon, in some editions there is only one shared colophon at the end. Kenneth Eastman, in his pioneering study from 1979/(1980), compared the Tibetan translations of the verse portion of chapter 3 as found in five versions available to him at the time. These included (i) one Dunhuang version, which lacks a translation colophon but is obviously an Ancient Translation, (ii) the version found in the gTing skyes edition of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*, whose translation is attributed to sKa ba dPal brtsegs, (iii) the version found in the sNar thang edition of the *bKa' 'gyur*, stated to be a revision by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas of a translation by Rin chen bzang po, and (iv+v) the versions found in the sDe dge and Peking editions, claimed to be another revision of Rin chen bzang po's translation, one made by Chag lo tsā ba. Having compared the reading variants of these five (alleged) translations/revisions, followed by an attempt to reconstruct Rin chen bzang po's (alleged) translation with the help of these variants, Eastman came to the conclusion that all five versions have a common origin: The translation claimed to be by Rin chen bzang po, as reconstructed on the basis of the two revised versions of it, and the one contained in the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* both represent slightly revised or modified versions of the Ancient Translation as preserved in the Dunhuang version. The topic was later briefly discussed in passing by Dan Martin (1987), and recently also by van der Kuijp (2018), neither of whom, however, had (direct) access to Eastman's study. Given the big number of versions in Tibetan translation of both the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra* accessible to date and the traditional catalogues and other bibliographical material that have come to light in recent years, I shall in the following readdress the issue and present the available colophons and bibliographical records in order to allow a broader overview and a more systematic investigation of it, with a focus on the question of the colophons' authenticity. I shall start by presenting and discussing the translation colophons of various versions in

five clusters. Since, however, the number of available *bKa' 'gyur* and *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* editions is rather large, I shall not consider all of them, but instead select several representatives from each of the known groups of transmission of each of these collections, as deemed suitable (or possible).²⁰⁰

²⁰⁰ For the groups of transmission of the *bKa' 'gyur*, I follow the scheme suggested by the rKTs. For the groups of transmission of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*, I have followed the scheme offered in Almogi 2016c: 37–49, where details concerning the production of the individual sets are provided as well. I would like to take this opportunity to slightly correct the dates of the plain sGang steng set to 1643–1644. At the time I suggested, by relying on the autobiography of the Third Pad gling gsung sprul Phan pa bzang po (1598–1669; BDRC: P1692), that the set was produced in 1642 by Pad gling gsung sprul himself as a commemoration set (*dgongs rdzogs*) for his teacher, the First sGang steng sprul sku rGyal sras Padma 'phrin las (1564–1642; BDRC: P2659) right after his death. See Almogi 2016c: 39–40. (The birth year of the First sGang steng sprul sku must also be corrected from 1565 to 1564.) Pad gling gsung sprul's autobiography does not explicitly mention the production year, and 1642 was suggested based on the death year of the First sGang steng sprul sku, which is stated in the preceding paragraph to be 1642 (the exact date of his death is specified there as the tenth of the ninth month of the Horse Year). See the *Tshul rdor rnam thar* (18a2–3). Fortunately, the biography of the First sGang steng sprul sku—which was likewise authored by the Third Pad gling gsung sprul—provides the exact dates and some more details regarding the production of the set (some of which I have already reported on the basis of the *rGyud 'bum dkar chag* by Karma bde legs, who apparently had access to this biography). According to the biography, the production of the 46-volume set started in the Sheep Year (1643), on the first death anniversary (*sku mchod*) of the First sGang steng sprul sku, was executed with the help of forty famed experts (the chief scribe being one lTo dkar ba rTa mgrin from sNye mo in Tibet, a village famed for his scribes and calligraphers), and took four months to complete. The master copy appears to have been a set from Gu ru lha khang in lHo brag, the seat of the Pad gling gsung sprul incarnations. The offering and consecration ceremonies took place on the third month (*nag pa zla ba*) of the Ape Year (1644). See the *sGang steng sprul sku dang po'i rnam thar* (32a6–b4): **Gu ru lha khang na bzugs pa'i rGyud 'bum ljags thog nas tshar gcig sgrogs par mdzad pa sogs| thugs mos**

(a) Cluster One

Two copies of the *Guhyasamājatantra* in Tibetan translation are found among the Dunhuang manuscripts: IOL Tib J 438 and IOL Tib J 481, which together make up an almost complete text of the *mūlatantra* in 17 chapters, and Pelliot tibétain 5, which is likewise an incomplete copy of it. Although these Dunhuang versions unfortunately lack translation colophons, they are not only clear evidence for the existence of an Ancient Translation, but they also allow us to compare the Ancient Translation with the (alleged) New Translations in an effort to determine the authenticity of the translation colophons transmitted in other versions, as was done by Eastman, who, however, only used the one version available to him at the time (IOL Tib J 438).²⁰¹

(b) Cluster Two

The second cluster consists of the translation colophons contained in the sDe dge (D442), Peking (P81.1), 'Jang sa tham (J422), Co ne (CØ²⁰²), and Urga (U443) editions of the *bKa' 'gyur*—all belong to the Tshal pa group—and, from among the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*

*lhag par che ba'i dgongs 'thangs lon pas | spyi gzims thun mong nas brtsol ba bskyed | rGyud 'bum po ti bzhi bcu rtsa drug | Lug lo sku mchod steng du dbu gtsugs sNye mo'i yig mkhan lTo dkar ba rTa mgrin | mkhas pa mtshan ldan pa sogs mkhas skrabs [=? bkrabs] bzhi bcu bskor gyis | zla ba bzhi'i khongs su rdzogs par grub cing | de dag la rgyun gyi za ma dus gyi ston mo | rjes kyi yon 'debs sogs dang | rab gnas dga' ston gyi bya ba dang bcas pa sPrel lo nag pa zla ba'i nang du legs par grub bo | |. See also ibid. (30b2), where the exact date of the First sGang steng sprul sku's death is provided in conformity with the one provided in the *Tshul rdor rnam thar*. I thank Slob dpon dKon mchog bstan 'dzin (NNRC, Namdroling, a member of the ARPI project) for bringing the existence of this biography and the relevant details contained therein to my attention, and Élie Roux (BDRC) for making the biography available online, thus enabling me to consult it before the present study went to the print.*

²⁰¹ See Dalton & van Schaik 2006: 184–185 for a description of IOL Tib J 438, and ibid.: 221 for a description of IOL Tib J 481.

²⁰² The Co ne edition is yet to be catalogued. The work is found there in the rGyud section, vol. 5 (Ca), 101b2–168a3.

versions, the colophons of the versions found in the mTshams brag edition (Tb.409.1)—belonging to the Central Bhutanese group—and the gDong dkar la edition (Dk.Ø²⁰³)—which is thus far the only edition representing the Western Bhutanese group. These colophons name Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po (958–1055; BDRC: P753) as the translators, and Ravindra[prabha] (Nyi ma'i dbang po['i 'od zer]) and Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal (1197–1263/4; BDRC: P1025) as the revisers. The colophons of the *mūlatantra* read as follows (C, 168a1–3; D, 148a5–6; J, 165b5–7; P, 157b4–5; U, 148a5–6; Dk, 93a4–5; Tb, 938.3–5):

*rgya gar gyi mkhan po Shrad dhā²⁰⁴ ka ra²⁰⁵ warma dang| zhu
chen gyi lo tstsha²⁰⁶ ba dge slong Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur
cing zhus te gtan la phab pa| slad kyis paṇḍi²⁰⁷ ta bla ma rdo
rje 'dzin²⁰⁸ pa chen po rje btsun Nyi ma'i dbang po'i²⁰⁹ zhal
snga nas Chag lo tstsha²¹⁰ ba dge slong Chos rje dpal gyis gus
pas²¹¹ zhus shing dag par bcos te gtan la phab pa²¹² |*

Interestingly, the colophon of the 'Jang sa tham version contains two additional sentences, one before and one after the above cited colophon. According to them, the 'Jang sa tham version is a further revised version, which was made by one Thang chen pa and one rGyal mtshan ring mo—thus far unidentified—who, having consulted a version from the *sTag lung rgyud 'bum* (*sTag lung Collection of Tantras*), accordingly proofread and corrected the text. The colophon of the version found in the Co ne edition,

²⁰³ The gDong dkar la edition is yet to be catalogued. The *mūlatantra* is found there in vol. 11 (Da), fols. 1–93a5 (separate foliation).

²⁰⁴ shrad dhā] CDJU, shrid dhā P, shradha Tb, shra dha Dk

²⁰⁵ ka ra] CDJUDkTb, kara P

²⁰⁶ lo tstsha] CDJU, lo tsha P, lo tsa Tb, lotstsha Dk

²⁰⁷ paṇḍi] DUDkTb, paṇ ḍi CJP

²⁰⁸ 'dzin] CDJPDkTb, dzin U

²⁰⁹ po'i] DJPUDkTb; po 'di C

²¹⁰ lo tstsha] CDJU, lo tsha P, lo tsa Tb, lotstsha Dk

²¹¹ gus pa] CDJPU, *om.* DkTb

²¹² pa] CDJPU, pa'o DkTb

which is based on the 'Jang sa tham edition, follows suit. These additional sentences read as follows (C, 168a1 [...] a3; J, 165b5 [...] b7):

sTag lung rgyud 'bum dang bstun pa'i ma la zhus dag | [...] **Thang chen pa dang rGyal mtshan ring mos zhus chen bgyi'o** | |²¹³

The translation colophons of the versions of the *uttaratantra* found in the above five canonical collections (CØ²¹⁴/D443/P81.2/J423/U444) and those of the mTshams brag and gDong dkar la versions (Tb.409.2/Dk.Ø²¹⁵) likewise ascribe the translation to the team Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, with, however, no reference to a revision. The colophons read as follows (C, 179a8; D, 157b7; J, 177a3–4; P, 167a8–b1; U, 157b6; Dk, 105b5–6; Tb, 969.7):

²¹³ It appears that several *tantras* in the 'Jang sa tham edition were compared with versions from *sTag lung* and accordingly proofread and corrected by Thang chen pa and rGyal mtshan ring mo. See, for example, the additional statement in the colophon of the *Vajramālābhīdhānamahāyogatantra* (*rNal 'byor chen po'i rgyud dpal rdo rje phreng ba mngon par brjod pa*) (J424=D445/P82), which reads (J, 252a6): *sTag lung rgyud 'bum dang bstun pa'i zhus dag grub* | |; and the one in the colophon of the *Sandhivvyākaraṇanāmatantra* (*dGongs pa lung bstan pa zhes bya ba'i rgyud*) (J425=D444/P83), which reads (J, 306a6): **Thang chen po dang rGyal mtshan ring mo yis** | | 'di yi zhus chen legs par bgyis pa'o | | *sTag lung brgyud(!) 'bum dang bstun pa'i zhus dag grub* | |. In all of these cases the nature of these corrections can only be determined by closely examining the text and comparing it with the other available versions. The Co ne edition, which is based on the 'Jang sa tham, has similar additions (but apparently not always, as in the case of the *uttaratantra* of the *Guhyasamājatantra*).

²¹⁴ The work is found in the Co ne edition in the rGyud section, vol. 5 (Ca), 168a3–179a8.

²¹⁵ The *uttaratantra* is found in the gDong dkar la edition in vol. Da, fols. 93a5–105b7 (the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra* together have a separate foliation).

*rgya gar gyi mkhan po ā*²¹⁶ *tsārya*²¹⁷ **Shrad dhā**²¹⁸ **ka ra**²¹⁹ **war ma**²²⁰ *dang| zhu chen gyi lo tstsha*²²¹ *ba dge slong Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur*²²² *te gtan la phab pa| |*²²³

Here, too, the colophon of the 'Jang sa tham version has an additional sentence at its end, reporting a revision by Thang chen pa and rGyal mtshan ring mo, likewise on the basis of a version from the *sTag lung rgyud 'bum*. For reasons yet to be clarified, the colophon of the Co ne version omits this addition in the case of the *uttaratantra*.²²⁴ The additional text reads as follows (J, 177a4):

sTag lung rgyud 'bum la bstun pa'i Thang chen pa dang rGyal mtshan ring mos zhus dag grub| | |

The gDong dkar la edition inserts a gloss (*mchan*), which is of importance for those of us who are interested in history of transmission in general and editorial processes in particular. According to the gloss, which obviously refers to both the *mūla*- and *uttaratantra*, the text was proofread once (i.e., after being copied). It also states that the quality of the master copy was not very good but the copyist—one gTsang pa Karma yang dag, who is described as a holy madman—wrote everything that was in the master copy. It also adds that he wrote down the text in haste / with poor quality (*shar ma shur mar*)²²⁵ at mDa' sdong monastery,

²¹⁶ ā] DUDkTb, a CJP

²¹⁷ tsārya] CDPDkTb, tsā rya JU

²¹⁸ Shrad dhā] CDJPU, shra dha DkTb

²¹⁹ ka ra] DJDkTb, kara PU

²²⁰ war ma] DkTb, warmma DJPU

²²¹ tstsha] PDk, tsā DU, tsta J, tsa Tb

²²² bsgyur] JPDkTb, bsgyur cing bcos DU

²²³ pa| |] DJPUTb, pa'o| | Dk

²²⁴ To start with, one could examine whether the Co ne version contains the corrections/changes introduced by Thang chen pa and rGyal mtshan ring mo, that is, whether that version matches what is in the 'Jang sa tham edition. If so, the omission would have been unintended.

²²⁵ I understand the phrase *shar ma shur ma* in the sense of *shar shur* (= *sha ri shu ri*), “in a haste,” “with poor quality,” but note that *shur ma* is also

the seat of Mon Ko re lung bla ma (both remain unidentified). In regard to the work in question, such a remark could again assist those who wish to compare versions containing (alleged) different translations/revisions in assessing their findings. The gloss reads as follows (Dk, 105b6–7):

*cig zhus dag go || 'di'i dpe yang dag po rang mi 'dug cing ma la
gang yod bu la bris s.ho | yi ge pa ni gTsang pa Karma yang
dag zhes smyon pa byar med mkhan gyis Mon Ko re lung bla
ma'i gdan sa mDa' sdong dgon par shar ma shur mar bgyis sol
ma rgan 'gro ba rnams kyi don du bsngo | bkra shis |*

The mTshams brag edition, too, adds after the colophon of the *uttaratantra* (Tb, 969.7), in the form of a short gloss, confirmation that the text (i.e., of both the *mūla*- and *uttaratantra*) was proofread twice (*nyis zhus*) after being copied.

(c) Cluster Three

The third cluster to be presented here consists of four versions, including those found in the sTog (S408.1) and Ulaanbaatar (V472.1) editions of the *bKa' 'gyur*—both of which belong to the Them spangs ma transmission group—and those found in the sNar thang (N404) and lHa sa (H416.1) editions of the *bKa' 'gyur*—both of which belong to the Independent/Mixed group. Here, too, one finds two separate colophons for the *mūla*- and *uttaratantra*, and again the *mūlatantra* is presented as a revision of a translation made by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, but this time by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas in collaboration with Jñānakara.²²⁶ The colophons of the *mūlatantra* found in the versions of this cluster read as follows (H, 521a7–b2; N, 152b6–153a2; S, 82a5–b1; V, 73a7–b1):

reported to be a name of a Tibetan script, “half way between printed and written script.” See the Glossary for Rangjung Yeshe Books at <http://www.rangjung.com/glossary/>.

²²⁶ Cf. Wedemeyer 2006, where Wedemeyer wrongly assumes that the version revised by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsa has not been transmitted in the *bKa' 'gyur*. This assumption is repeated in Wedemeyer 2014: 241–242.

rgya gar gyi mkhan po **Shradhā**²²⁷ **ka ra warma dang** | *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha*²²⁸ *ba dge slong* **Rin chen bzang pos** *bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa* | *rgya gar gyi mkhan po shrī* **Dznyā na ka ra bas** *bshad nas* | *zhu chen gyi lo tstsha*²²⁹ *ba* **'Gos lHas btsas** *kyis zhus gtugs*²³⁰ *g.yar khral du 'tshal ba'o* | | **'Dus pa'i rtsa rgyud**²³¹ *la* **Lo chen** *gyis bsgyur ba mang du snang na'ang*²³² | **'Gos** *kyis 'gyur bcos mdzad pa nyung bar snang la* | *'grel pa'i*²³³ *bshad pa* **'Gos** *'gyur gyi steng nas byed pa la rgyud kyī* **'Gos**²³⁴ *'gyur gal che bar mthong nas bris pa'o* | |

Interestingly, as already noted by Eastman, the colophon also contains a justification of why the editor preferred 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas's revision over the actual translation by the famed translator Rin chen bzang po although the latter was more widely circulated and thus apparently more popular, stating the following: "Although there are many [copies of] the Great Translator's (i.e., Rin chen bzang po's) translation of the *mūlatantra* of the [*Guhya*]*samāja*, [I] have copied [here] 'Gos's translation (i.e., revision) of the *tantra* after having seen that there are fewer [copies of] 'Gos's revision and that it is very important to rely upon 'Gos's translation for commenting purposes."²³⁵

²²⁷ shradhā] HNV, shrad dhā J, shradha S

²²⁸ tstsha] HNV, tsa S

²²⁹ tstsha] HNV, tsa S

²³⁰ gtugs] HSV, btugs N

²³¹ rgyud] HNV, brgyud S

²³² na'ang HNS, na 'ang V

²³³ pa'i] HS, ba'i NV

²³⁴ 'gos] HNV, 'gog S

²³⁵ Note that my understanding of this passage differs greatly from that of Eastman, who has translated it as follows: "Although this may seem to diminish [the value of] the *mūlatantra* translated by the great translator [Rin chen bzang po], copies of 'Gos's work are rare, and seeing the importance of 'Gos's translation since commentaries have been written on the basis of it, it is copied here." See Eastman 1979: 3.

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

Moreover, as likewise noted by Eastman,²³⁶ Manfred Taube has recorded an extracanonial Peking blockprint of the *tantra* which was edited by ICang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–1786; BDRC: P182)²³⁷ and which bears the above cited colophon with an additional passage. According to this addition, the version contained therein is a revision of 'Gos's revision made by Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357–1419; BDRC: P64) at 'Brogr ri bo che dGe ldan nram par rgyal ba'i gling (i.e., dGa' ldan monastery).²³⁸ It also states that he corrected the text after consulting numerous old translations of the *tantra* and by relying on commentaries. Here again, the extent of these corrections can only be determined by a careful examination of the text, which cannot be undertaken here.²³⁹ The additional passage reads as follows (as cited in Taube 1966: 75 no. 227):

The identity of the author of this editorial addition to the translation colophon is unknown. If one accepts Paul Harrison's hypothesis that the *Them spangs ma* is a descendant of what he calls *Zhwa lu ma*, namely, the presumed Bu ston's edition of the Old sNar thang *bKa' 'gyur*, then the author of our editorial statement could well be Bu ston himself. For the *Zhwa lu ma* hypothesis, see Harrison 1994. Note, however, that in his religious history and in his *rGyud 'bum gyi dkar chag*, Bu ston records the version revised by Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal, for which see below.

²³⁶ See Eastman 1979: 19 n. 13.

²³⁷ See the colophon of the editorial epilogue (as cited in Taube 1966: 75 no. 227): ... *ces pa 'di yang mang du thos pa'i rgyal khams pa ICang skya Rol pa'i rdo rjes smras pa'ol* |.

²³⁸ See the BDRC: G337. Since dGa' ldan was founded by Tsong kha pa in 1409, the revision must have been made no earlier than this year.

²³⁹ Unfortunately, Wedemeyer, who, as already pointed out above, was unaware of the existence of 'Gos's revised version transmitted in several *bKa' 'gyur* editions, was also unaware of the existence of Tsong kha pa's revised version of 'Gos's revision. Considering these two versions might have certainly shed different light on Wedemeyer's examination of "alternative translations of the root text" found in Tsong kha pa's commentaries and other works related to the *Guhyasamājantra*. See Wedemeyer 2006.

...²⁴⁰ *'gyur rnying gi rgyud mang po la gtugs shing| 'grel pa la brten nas dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i rnal 'byor pa| Shar Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa'i dpal gyis| 'Brog ri bo che dge ldan nam par rgyal ba'i gling du dag ter byas pa yin no||*

As in the first cluster, the colophons of the *uttaratantra* of these four versions (S408.2, V472.2, N405, H416.2) ascribe the translation to Rin chen bzang po in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman, with no reference to a revision. The colophons read as follows (H, 536a5–6; N, 167b2–3, 536a5–6; S, 95b4; V, 85a1–2):

rgya gar gyi mkhan po ā tsarya Shraddha ka ra barma dang| zhu chen gyi lo tstsha²⁴¹ ba dge slong Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur cing bcos te gtan la phab pa'o|||

(d) Cluster Four

The fourth cluster consists of three versions, namely, the version found in the Shey edition (Z418) of the *bKa' 'gyur*—which belongs to the Them spans ma group—the version found in the Charang (Cx06.1+Cx06.2) edition—which belongs to the Ladakhi/Mustang group—and the one found in the Phug brag edition (F415+F416)—which belongs to the Independent/Mixed group. The common characteristic of these three versions is that they all have only one translation colophon for both the *mūla*- and the *uttaratantra* at the end, one ascribing the translation to Rin chen bzang po in collaboration with Śraddhākaravarman. The colophons read as follows (Cx, 86a7–8; F, 98b3–4; Z, 95a6):

rgya gar gyi mkhan po ā²⁴² tsarya²⁴³ Shraddha²⁴⁴ ka ra²⁴⁵ warma²⁴⁶ dang| zhu chen gyi lo tstsha²⁴⁷ ba²⁴⁸ dge slong Rin chen²⁴⁹ bzang pos bsgyur cing bcos²⁵⁰ te gtan la phab pa'o||

²⁴⁰ The colophon of this extracanonical version omits the last two syllables of the colophon found in the canonical versions just cited (i.e., *bris pa'o||*) and continues with the following passage.

²⁴¹ *tstsha*] HNV, tsa S

²⁴² *ā*] Z, a CxF

²⁴³ *tsarya*] FZ, tsa rya Cx

(e) Cluster Five

The fifth cluster consists of six versions from six *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* editions, including the gTing skyes (Tk) and Rig 'dzin Tshe dbang nor bu (Tn) editions—which together make up the South-Western Tibetan group—the Nubri (Nu) and National Archives Kathmandu (Na) sets—which together make up the Tibetan–Nepalese Borderlands group—the Khams (Kh) edition—which is thus far the only available representative of the (Central Bhutanese)–Eastern Tibetan group—and the sDe dge (Dg) edition—which is likewise the only available representative of the (Central)–Eastern Tibetan group. The colophons of the *mūlatantra* found in these versions (Dg.211.1, Kh.Ø,²⁵¹ Na.Ø, Nu.237,²⁵² Tk.242.1, Tn.tsa.1) ascribe the translation to sKa ba dPal brtsegs in collaboration with Vimalamitra. The colophons are very laconic and read as follows (Dg, 147a5; Kh, 109a5–6; Na, 87b4; Nu, 294a3; Tk, 152.6; Tn, 82a6–7):

*paṅṭi ta*²⁵³ **Bi ma la**²⁵⁴ *dang lo tsā*²⁵⁵ *ba sKa wa*²⁵⁶ **dPal
brtsegs**²⁵⁷ *kyis*²⁵⁸ *bsgyur pa'o* | ²⁵⁹

²⁴⁴ Shraddha] Z, shrā dha Cx, srad dha F

²⁴⁵ ra] ZCx, rā F

²⁴⁶ warma] Cx, war ma F, barma Z

²⁴⁷ tstsha] F, tsa Z, tshtsha Cx

²⁴⁸ ba] FZ, wa Cx

²⁴⁹ chen] CxF, om. Z

²⁵⁰ bsgyur cing bcos] CxZ, bcos shing bsgyur F

²⁵¹ No catalogue of the Khams edition is known to exist. The *mūlatantra* is found in vol. 15, 1a–109a (separate foliation). As I have pointed out elsewhere (Almogi 2020: 6–7) the Khams edition was reorganized and digitally published by the BDRC as the gZhi chen dgon edition. (The text is found there in vol. 5, at the same location.)

²⁵² Catalogues for the Nubri and the National Archives sets are currently under preparation. See Almogi (forthcoming-b). The *mūlatantra* is found in the Nubri set in vol. Pha, 212a–294a3, and in the National Archives set in vol. Ba, 1a–87b4.

²⁵³ paṅṭi ta] NaNuTkTn, rgya gar gyi mkhan po DgKh

The Khams version adds a sentence to the above colophon, according to which Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po later translated the *tantra*. The formulation gives the impression that this later translation was made independently from the earlier translation. The additional text reads as follows (Kh, 109a6):

slar yang **Shrādha ka ra warma dang lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang pos** *bsgyur cing gtan la phab pa'o ||*

Interestingly, the sDe dge version, too, adds a passage after the above cited colophon. This passage points out, in the view of its author, the shortcomings of the Later Translation(s) and at the same time praises the Ancient Translation for its high quality. Unfortunately, the passage is somewhat vague, and it is unclear who the reviser referred to there is and what exactly the commentary in the Jñānapāda tradition and the *vivaraṇa* (as conjectured by me) mentioned in it are. I shall, however, return to this questions below. Given the importance of the passage, an English translation is offered following the Tibetan text, which reads as follows (Dg, 147a5–6):

slar yang slob dpon **Ye shes zhabs dang Bi shwa mi tra'i 'grel pa gnyis bibaraṇa²⁶⁰ gcig phyi 'gyur bcas la gtug nas zhus dag bgyis par 'grel pa gnyis²⁶¹ dang bibaraṇa²⁶² bcas snga 'gyur dang khyad spu tsam mi 'dug cing | phyi 'gyur la 'gyur mi bde ba dang**

²⁵⁴ bi ma la] NaTk, bī ma la KhNu, bi mā la Tn, bi ma la mi tra Dg

²⁵⁵ tsā DgKh, tsa NaNuTkTn

²⁵⁶ ska wa] Tn, ka wa NaNuTk, *om.* DgKh

²⁵⁷ brtsegs] DgKhNaTk, rtsegs NuTn

²⁵⁸ kyis] Dg, kyi KhNaNuTkTn

²⁵⁹ pa'o||] TkTn, ba'o|| DgNaNu, cing Kh. For an additional passage in Kh see the following.

²⁶⁰ bibaraṇa] *conj.*, bibarta Xy

²⁶¹ gnyis] *em.*, gnyas Xy (vowel *i* missing apparently due to damage to the block)

²⁶² bibaraṇa] *conj.*, babarta Xy (vowel *i* missing apparently due to damage to the block)

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

*don mi legs pa dang don go dka' ba dang | tshig zlos pa sogs don
ltar ma bsgyur pa ches mang po mchis so | |*

Later, with two commentaries—[one in the tradition of] the master Jñānapāda and [one] by Viśvāmītra (/Viśvamitra) (D1844/P2707)—one *vivaraṇa*, and Later Translation(s) [of the *tantra*] having been consulted, corrections were made. Yet [the translations of the *tantra* in] the two commentaries and the *vivaraṇa* do not display even the slightest difference from the Ancient Translation [of it]. Moreover, the Later Translation(s)—being infelicitous, making no good sense, being hard to comprehend, repetitive, and so on—contain(s) very many incorrect renderings.

The colophons of the *uttaratantra* versions found in these same editions (i.e., Dg.211.2, Kh.Ø,²⁶³ Na.Ø, Nu.238,²⁶⁴ Tk.242.2, Tn.tsa.2) ascribe the translation to yet another team, Buddhaguhya (Sangs rgyas gsang ba) and 'Broḡ mi dPal gyi ye shes (BDRC: P8402), both of whom were active around the late eighth and/or early ninth century,²⁶⁵ and then note a later translation by Rin chen bzang po in collaboration with

²⁶³ The *uttaratantra* is found in vol. 15, 109a6–126b (continuous separate foliation). (The text is found in the BDRC's gZhi chen dgon set in vol. 5, at the same location.)

²⁶⁴ The *uttaratantra* is found in the Nubri set in vol. Pha, 294a3–307b4, and in the National Archives set in vol. Ba, 87b5–102a4.

²⁶⁵ Regardless of whether this colophon is authentic, note that Eastman appears to have doubted the information contained therein on the basis of his wrong identification of 'Broḡ mi dPal gyi ye shes with the gSar ma translator 'Broḡ mi lo tsā ba Shākya ye shes (992/993–1043?/1072?; BDRC: P3285), for he notes that “[t]here is obviously some confusion concerning the translators of the eighteenth chapter since two hundred years separate the life-time of Buddhaguhya and 'Broḡ mi [...]” See Eastman 1979: 3, and also *ibid.*: 19 n. 11, where Buddhaguhya is rightly referred to as a contemporary of Khri Srong lde brtsan, but our 'Broḡ mi dPal gyi ye shes is wrongly referred to as a younger contemporary of Rin chen bzang po. This confusion is also found in the *sDe dge rnying rgyud dkar chag* and the *rGyud 'bum thob yig*, for which see below.

Śraddhākaravarman. The colophons read as follows (Tk., 177.3–4; Dg, 156b7; Nu, 307b3–4; Na, 102a3–4; Kh, 126b1–2; Tn, 95b4–6):

*rgyud phyi ma 'di*²⁶⁶ *rgya gar gyi mkhan po Sangs rgyas gsang ba*²⁶⁷ *dang| bod kyi lo tsā ba*²⁶⁸ **'Broḡ mi dPal gyi**²⁶⁹ **ye shes kyis**²⁷⁰ *bsgyur*²⁷¹ *pa'o||*²⁷² *slad kyi*²⁷³ *mkhan po*²⁷⁴ *ā tsārya*²⁷⁵ **Shrad dhā**²⁷⁶ **ka ra warma**²⁷⁷ *dang| zhu chen gyi lo tsā*²⁷⁸ *ba dge slong Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur*²⁷⁹ *te gtan la phab pa'o|||*²⁸⁰

Interestingly, the colophon of the version found in the Khams edition, which appears to contain more archaic readings (as does in fact the entire collection), includes an additional sentence at the end of the colophon cited above, according to which the translator [‘Gos lo tsā ba] gZhon nu dpal (1392–1481; BDRC: P318) revised Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po’s translation of the *uttaratantra* at the behest of the Dharma king Grags pa ‘byung gnas (1414–1446, r. 1432–1446; BDRC: P3584), who was the sixth throne holder of the Phag mo gru pa. He reportedly did so by consulting a Sanskrit manuscript of the *uttaratantra* and by

²⁶⁶ rgyud phyi ma ‘di] Dg, *om.* KhNaNuTkTn

²⁶⁷ Sangs rgyas gsang ba] DgNaNuTkTn, slob dpon Buddha gu he Kh

²⁶⁸ bod kyi lo tsā ba] Tk, bod kyi lo tsa ba NaNu, bod kyi lotstsha ba Tn, *om.* DgKh

²⁶⁹ gyi] DgKh, *om.* NaNuTkTn

²⁷⁰ kyis] *em.*, kyi DgKh, *om.* NaNuTkTn

²⁷¹ bsgyur] DgKhNaTkTn, brgyud Nu

²⁷² pa’o||] DgTk, ba’o|| NaNuTn, cing Kh

²⁷³ slad kyi] NaNuTkTn, slar yang DgKh

²⁷⁴ mkhan po] NaNuTkTn, rgya gar gyi mkhan po Dg, *om.* Kh

²⁷⁵ tsārya] DgTn, tsarya KhNaNuTk

²⁷⁶ shrad dhā] Dg, shraddha NaNuTkTn, shra dhā Kh

²⁷⁷ warma] NaNuTk, warmma Dg, war ma KhTn

²⁷⁸ tsā] Dg, tstsha NaNuTkTn, tsa Kh

²⁷⁹ bsgyur] NaNuTkTn, bsgyur cing bcos DgKh

²⁸⁰ phab pa’o|| ||] NaNuTkTn, pa| Dg, phab pa las Kh. For additional passages in Kh and Dg, see the following citations.

comparing it with Smṛti[jñāna]'s translation. The text reads as follows (Kh, 126b2–3):

*slar yang| chos kyi rgyal po Gags pa 'byung gnas kyi bka'
rtsal pa la brten nas| bod kyi lo tsa ba gZhon nu dpal gyis
rgyud phyi'i rgya dpe bltas shing Jo bo Smri ti'i 'gyur dang
bstun te dag par bcos pa'o|*

The colophon is followed by words of auspiciousness and a dedication verse, which in turn are followed by a gloss confirming that the text was proofread twice (*lan gnyis zhus| zhus so|*). The Nubri version likewise adds at the end of the colophon words of auspiciousness and a confirmation that the text was proofread (*dge'o|| zhu dag|| dge'o||*).

Here, too, the sDe dge version adds a passage after the above cited colophon, which is very similar to the passage added to the colophon of the *mūlatantra* and for which an English translation is likewise offered below. It is, however, unclear why Viśvāmītra's commentary is omitted this time (particularly since it is a commentary on the *uttaratantra*). The passage reads as follows (Dg, 156b7–157a2):

*slar yang slob dpon Ye shes zhabs kyi 'grel pa dang bibaraṇa²⁸¹
phyi 'gyur bcas gsum la gtugs nas zhu dag bgyis pa yin kyang
phyi 'gyur la 'gyur mi bde ba dang| don go dka' ba dang| tshig
zlos pa sogs don ltar ma bsgyur pa yang mang po mchis shing
'grel pa dang bibaraṇa²⁸² gnyis snga 'gyur kho na dang| khyad
spu tsam mi 'dug pa yid ches pa'i gnas so||*

Later, with the three—a commentary [in the tradition of] the master Jñānapāda, a *vivaraṇa*, and Later Translation(s) [of the *tantra*—having been consulted, corrections were made. Nonetheless, the Later Translation(s)—having infelicitous renderings, being hard to comprehend, being repetitive, and so on—contain(s) numerous incorrect renderings. Moreover, the two—the commentary and the *vivaraṇa*—do not display even the slightest difference from the Ancient

²⁸¹ bibaraṇa] *conj.*, bibarta Xy

²⁸² bibaraṇa] *conj.*, birta Xy

Authenticity and Authentication

Translation itself (i.e., concerning the passages cited from the *mūlatantra*). [This makes the Ancient Translation] an object of trustworthiness.

To recap, the first cluster consists of two incomplete Dunhuang versions of the *mūlatantra*, with no colophons. The colophons presented in the second cluster, namely, five *bKa' 'gyur* versions (CDJPU)—all belonging to the Tshal pa group—and two *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* versions (TbDk)—belonging to the Central Bhutanese and Western Bhutanese groups, respectively—name Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po as the translators of the *mūlatantra* and Ravīndraprabha and Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal as its revisers, with no allusion to an Ancient Translation. The 'Jang sa tham version, adhered to by Co ne, is called a revision of Chag lo tsā ba's revision made on the basis of a sTag lung manuscript. The colophons of the *uttaratantra* ascribe the translation to the team of Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, with no reference to a revision. The 'Jang sa tham version is likewise called a revision made on the basis of a sTag lung manuscript. For reasons yet to be clarified this additional statement is missing from the Co ne version.

The colophons of the third cluster, consisting of four *bKa' 'gyur* versions—two of the Them spangs ma group (SV) and two of the Independent/Mixed group (HN)—name Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po as the translators of the *mūlatantra*, and Jñānakara and 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas as its revisers, while there exists an extracanonial version containing a revision of 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas's revision made by Tsong kha pa.²⁸³ The

²⁸³ Note that there also exists a one-folio fragment from Tabo monastery, which was examined by Toru Tomabechi (1999). According to Tomabechi this version belongs to what he calls “group b,” that is, the canonical versions containing 'Gos's revision. Having compared the fragment with four canonical versions of “group b” (HNLS), Tomabechi reached the conclusion that the textual transmission represented by the Tabo fragment is independent of that of the canonical versions of “group b” considered by him. Nonetheless, it has been hypothesized that some Tabo manuscripts are in one way or another connected with the activity

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

colophons of the *uttaratantra* ascribe the translation to Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, with no reference to a revision.

The colophons of the fourth cluster, consisting of three *bKa' 'gyur* versions—one of the Them spangs ma group (Z), one of the Ladakhi/Mustang group (Cx), and one of the Independent/Mixed group (F)—all of which have only one translation colophon for both the *mūla-* and the *uttaratantra*, ascribe the translation to Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, with no mention of any revision.

Finally, the colophons of the fifth cluster, consisting of six *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* versions—including two of the South-Western Tibetan group (TkTn), two of the Tibetan–Nepalese Borderlands group (NaNu), one of the (Central Bhutanese)–Eastern Tibetan group (Kh), and one of the (Central)–Eastern Tibetan group (Dg)—ascribe the translation of the *mūlatantra* to Vimalamitra and sKa ba dPal brtsegs. The colophon of the Khams version adds that later the *mūlatantra* was translated by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, while giving the impression that this was done independently of the Ancient Translation and also being rather ambiguous as to whether this is a mere additional piece of information or whether the Khams version itself is this later translation. The former option seems more plausible though. While a close examination of this version and its comparison with other versions might offer an answer, such an undertaking is peripheral to the present study. Interestingly, the colophon of the sDe dge version adds that the Ancient Translation surpasses in quality the (alleged) New Translation(s), referring, as proof, to some revisions of related commentarial literature—an unnamed commentary in the tradition of Jñānapāda, the commentary by

of Rin chen bzang po. See, for example, Scherrer-Schaub & Bonani 2002: 208–209. It is therefore not impossible that this fragment contains the unrevised version of Rin chen bzang po. Since we do have now access to versions whose colophons ascribe the translation to Rin chen bzang po without noting any revision (CxFZ), it would be worth comparing the fragment with these versions as well.

Viśvāmitra (D1844/P2707), and (probably) an unspecified *vivarāṇa*—which were made while consulting Later Translation(s) of the *mūlatantra*. The person behind these revisions of the commentarial literature is, however, unnamed. Now, I would like to suggest that this person might be ‘Gos lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal and the two unidentified works might be Candrakīrti’s (fl. 10th cent.?) *Pradīpoddyotana* (D1785/P2650) and Āryadeva’s *Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda* (D1805/P2670). My suggestion relies on a passage recently pointed out by van der Kuijp from a biography of gZhon nu dpal written by the Fourth Zhwa dmar pa Chos grags ye shes (1453–1524; BDRC: P317). I do so, however, despite the fact that the passage differs from the sDe dge colophon in several points. The passage in question reads as follows (‘Gos lo gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam thar, A, 45b4–6; B, 107.18–108.4):

*chu mo phag gi lo’i dbyar sKyam mchad pa stengs su sku mtshams bsdams nas | gSang ‘dus kyi rgyud kyi rgya dpe*²⁸⁴
*gcig | ‘grel pa sGron gsal gyi rgya dpe gsum | Lo chen ‘Gos Pa tshab Chag gi ‘gyur bzhi la nam langs sa sros kyi bar gzigs shing tshig don la dpyad pa dpyis phyin pa’i zhu chen mdzad pas | rgyun ring ba’i stobs kyi bzhugs stan*²⁸⁵ *‘og tu rlan ‘khyil ba’ang*²⁸⁶ *byung ste | mdor na ‘grel pa sGron gsal la ‘gyur bcos rnam par dag pa dang | bDag byin gyis brlab pa’i rab tu dbye ba slob dpon ‘Phags pa lhas mdzad pa Nag tshos bsgyur pa’i*²⁸⁷ *‘gyur bcos gnang |*

Having bound himself to a retreat at sKyam mchad pa (?) in the summer of the Water Pig Year (1443), [‘Gos lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal] examined, from dawn to dusk, one Sanskrit manuscript of the *Guhyasamājatantra*, three Sanskrit manuscripts of the commentary *Pradīpoddyotana*, and four

²⁸⁴ dpe] A, dper B

²⁸⁵ stan] *em.*, ston AB

²⁸⁶ ba’ang] B, pa’ang A

²⁸⁷ pa’i] A, ba’i B

Tibetan translations [of the *mūlatantra*]²⁸⁸—[namely, those] by Lo chen [Rin chen bzang po], 'Gos [Khug pa lhas btsas],

²⁸⁸ The reason for my understanding that the four Tibetan translations are of the *Guhyasamājatantra* and not of the *Pradīpoddyotana* is twofold: (i) First, we have no evidence for four translations/revisions of the *Pradīpoddyotana* by the four named translators. The *Blue Annals*, for example, merely records a translation of it by Rin chen bzang po and a revision by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas, whereas it indeed reports on translations/revisions of the *Guhyasamājatantra* by all four translators. For the pertinent passages in the *Blue Annals*, see below. (ii) Second, the colophon of the sDe dge edition of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* cited above, which employs the expression Later Translation (*phyi 'gyur*), supports this understanding, and this also makes better sense in terms of the content (i.e., as opposed to the Early Translation (*snga 'gyur*) of the *tantra*). Moreover, most *bsTan 'gyur* catalogues report that there was only one translation of the *Pradīpoddyotana*, namely, the one by Rin chen bzang po, which was revised by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas. Interestingly, one catalogue, the *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2*, also reports on a revision by Tsong kha pa of 'Gos's revision of the *Pradīpoddyotana*, which recalls the extracanonical version of the *mūlatantra* reported above likewise said to be a revision of 'Gos's revision made by Tsong kha pa. Moreover, on that occasion Tsong kha pa has reportedly employed all the above-mentioned versions of the *tantra*'s Tibetan translation—namely, those by Rin chen bzang po, 'Gos, Pa tsha, and Chag—on which see Wedemeyer 2006. See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 18a2; B, 13b4): [Njs297] *slob dpon Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa'i gSang 'dus kyi 'grel pa sgron ma gsal ba Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur* |; *Tshal pa bstan dkar* (10b6–7): [T138] *sGron ma gsal ba zhes bya ba'i rgya cher bshad pa dpal Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur* |; *Rang rdor bstan dkar-1* (430.2): [=P2650] *sGron ma gsal ba zhes bya ba'i rgya cher bshad pa dpal Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa le'u bcu bzhi'i bstod pa yan chad* | **Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur ba...**; *Rang rdor bstan dkar-2* (639.4): *rtsa rgyud kyi 'grel pa sGron gsal Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa 'Gos 'gyur la slar yang thams cad mkhyen pa Blo bzang grags pas 'Gos 'gyur gyi rgyud 'grel mang po la gtug nas dag par byas pa dang* |; *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (462.6): [=D1785] *dpal gSang ba 'dus pa'i 'grel pa sGrol ma gsal ba zhes bya ba'i rgya cher bshad pa slob dpon Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa paṇḍi ta Shraddhā ka ra warma dang lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur la* | 'Gos kyi g.yar khral cung zad 'tshal ba dang | (It appears that a passage is missing here. The manuscript version (652.3–4), however, reads identically. Cf. the record in the *lNga pa chen po bstan dkar*

Pa tshab [Nyi ma grags], and Chag [Chos rje dpal]—and thoroughly analyzed [the texts in regard to both their] words and meaning, on the basis of which [he] made corrections [of the *tantra's* translation]. Consequently, a circle of moisture was formed under his seat due to [him sitting] for a long time. In short, he [likewise] accurately revised the translation of the *Pradīpoddyotana* and [also] revised Nag tsho's translation of Āryadeva's *Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda*.

As already pointed out, there are several important differences between the two sources: (i) The colophon refers to an unspecified commentary in the Jñānapāda tradition, while the biography names Candrakīrti's *Pradīpoddyotana*, which is a commentary in the Ārya tradition. (ii) The colophon also refers to Viśvāmītra's commentary, while the biography does not. (iii) The colophon refers to an unspecified *vivarāṇa* (as conjectured by me), while the biography names Āryadeva's *Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda*. Nonetheless, I believe that the overall similarity of events reported in these two passages hints that they both deal with the same revision activity. The rather vague formulation and the lack of details in the colophon may suggest that the source used by Kaḥ thog dge rtse, the editor of the sDe dge edition of the *rNying ma*

provided below.); *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 369a4–6): [D1785] **sGron ma gsal bar byed pa zhes bya ba'i rgya cher bshad pa slob dpon chen po Nā gārdzu na'i man ngag la brten te slob dpon Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa | rgya gar gyi mkhan po Shradhā ka ra warma dang | zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur la | rgya gar gyi mkhan po Shri dznyā nā ka ra bas bshad nas | bod kyi zhu chen gyi lo tsā ba 'Gos lHas btsas kyis bsgyur pa la | yang slad kyis rgya gar gyi paṇḍi ta Nag po'i zhal snga nas bshad cing | bod kyi lo tsā ba 'Gos lHas btsas kyis yul dbus kyi dpe dang gtugs te bcos pa |**; *lNga pa chen po bstan dkar* (37a1–2): [=P2650] **dpal gSang ba 'dus pa'i 'grel pa sGron ma gsal ba zhes bya ba'i rgya cher bshad pa slob dpon Zla ba grags pas mdzad pa | paṇḍi ta Shradhā ka ra warma dang | lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur la | 'Gos kyi g.yar khral cung zad 'tshal ba las slar yang zhus chen bgyis pa'i 'gyur gsum pa...**; the record in the *gSer bris bstan dkar* (42a5–b1; G653) reads virtually the same as the one in the *lNga pa chen po bstan dkar*.

rgyud 'bum, was rather vague, and perhaps no more than an oral one. After all, the colophon was written sometime between 1794 and 1798, and thus more than three hundred years after gZhon nu dpal's death (1481), although it may have been taken from an earlier edition of the collection as well (such as Padma 'od gling's). Moreover, gZhon nu dpal's biography, which was composed in 1517, thirty-six years after his death, could itself possibly contain inaccuracies. The reason for the discrepancy regarding the terms *prabheda* and *vivarāṇa* (or whatever the latter term may be) can be explained by the fact that the Sanskrit terms for the various commentarial genres were not systematically rendered into Tibetan, so that there is often an overlap between the various Tibetan renderings and the Sanskrit terms.²⁸⁹ Moreover, as we shall see in the following section, the *Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag*—which (together with the edition itself) served as the main basis for the sDe dge edition of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*—explicitly connects gZhon nu dpal to a revision of the *uttaratantra* (as does the colophon of the Khams edition), a remark that Kaḥ thog dge rtse took no notice of in his own catalogue.²⁹⁰ One also wonders whether the omission of gZhon nu dpal's name was a result of Kaḥ thog dge rtse's wish to avoid any explicit criticism of the former. However, it is not to be ruled out that the revision mentioned by Kaḥ thog dge rtse refers to the one made by Tsong kha pa, who, as we have seen, is reported to have corrected the text after consulting numerous old translations of the *tantra* and by relying on commentaries as well. The colophons of the *uttaratantra* version of this fifth cluster ascribe the translation to Buddhaguhya and 'Broḡ mi dPal gyi ye shes, and note a later translation by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po. This is the only instance, notably, when translations of the *uttaratantra* are ascribed both to translators

²⁸⁹ Cf. van der Kuijp 2018: 113–114, where this passage from gZhon nu dpal is also referred to.

²⁹⁰ As already noted by van der Kuijp, the versions revised by gZhon nu dpal have, however, not found their way into the available *bsTan 'gyur* editions. See van der Kuijp 2018: 113–114.

active in the Early Period and ones active in the Later Period. Interestingly, the colophon of the Khams version notes that 'Gos lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal revised Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po's translation of the *uttaratantra* by consulting a Sanskrit manuscript and by comparing it with *Smṛtijñānakīrti's translation (to which we shall return). The colophon of the sDe dge edition adds here words of praise to the quality of the Ancient Translation and points out the shortcomings of the New Translation. The above cited biography of gZhon nu dpal makes no explicit mention of the *uttaratantra*. The *Guhyasamājantra* Sanskrit manuscript referred to there may have included the *uttaratantra*, but it appears that these two reported revision activities by gZhon nu dpal were undertaken on two different occasions.

In any case, all *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* versions—except those of the Central Bhutanese group, represented in the present study by the mTshams brag edition, and that of the gDong dkar la edition, thus far the only one representing the Western Bhutanese group—ascibe the translation of both the *mūla-* and the *uttaratantra* to translators active in the Early Period (with or without mention of a later revision). The same ascriptions are also notably reported in other *rNying ma* sources.²⁹¹ Although this is not the concern of the present study, it may be added here in passing that the above

²⁹¹ See, for example, the *rGyud 'bum thob yig* (174.5–6): *thugs kyi rgyud gSang ba 'dus pa le'u bcu bdun pa Bi ma la dang | sKa ba dPal brtsegs kyis bsgyur ba | de'i rGyud phyi ma le'u bco brgyad pa Bhuddha gu hya dang | 'Brogs mi Shākya(!) ye shes kyi bsgyur ba* |. This is a Record of Teachings Received of a 30-volume *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* edition, with transmission lineages going down through various *rNying ma* masters active in East Tibet. This and several other Records of Teachings Received, all lacking a compiler colophon (or any other authorship statement for that matter), have been scanned and published in one volume by the BDRC. From the recorded transmission lineages it is, however, obvious that the compiler belonged to Kaḥ thog circles. The identity of the compiler could fortunately be determined with the help of Karma bde legs (communication from May 18, 2020) as Kaḥ thog mkhan po Tshe ring rdo rje.

presented colophons can assist one in further studying the formation and history of transmission of the various groups of *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* collections (the same applies to the various *bKa' 'gyur* editions).

5.5.2. Further Bibliographical Evidence

In addition to the colophons, several traditional catalogues contain information regarding the facts surrounding the translation of the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra*. This can be presented in four groups, as follows:

Group I

(i) *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*:

(a) under the section Early Period: [Rr18.20] *gSang 'dus* | [... Rr18.21–23 ...] *bzhi Ka*²⁹² *ba dPal brtsegs*²⁹³ *dang* | *ICe bKra shis kyis bsgyur zhes 'Gos lo tstsha ba*²⁹⁴ *zer rol* |

(b) under the section Later Period, Activities of **Smṛtijñānakīrti*, before the time of Rin chen bzang po: [Rr21.8] *gSang 'dus Ye shes zhabs lugs dang* | [Rr21.9] *de'i rGyud dang* | ...

(c) under the section Later Period, Translations by Rin chen bzang po: [Rr22.5] *gSang ba 'dus pa dang* | | [Rr22.6: D443] *de'i rGyud phyi ma dang* |

Group II

(i) *Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc1447] [*gSang ba 'dus pa'i*] *rtsa ba'i rgyud 17 le'u Rin chen bzang po dang Chos rje dpal*

²⁹² Ka] R, dka' N

²⁹³ brtsegs] N, rtsegs R

²⁹⁴ 'gos lo tstsha ba] R; mgos {lo tsa ba} N

- gyi 'gyur* | [Bc1448] *rGyud phyi ma 18 pa*²⁹⁵ *le'u Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur* |²⁹⁶
- (ii) *Glo bo bka' dkar*: [Mk069] *dpal gSang ba 'dus pa rtsa ba'i rgyud le'u bcu bdun pa dang* | [Mk070] *rGyud phyi ma Shra ddha ka ra wa rma dang* | *lo tstsha ba Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur* |
- (iii) *sDe dge bka' dkar* (142a5–6): [D442+D443] *De bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi sku gsung thugs kyi gsang chen gsang ba 'dus pa zhes bya ba'i brtag pa'i rgyal po la le'u bcu bdun dang* | *de'i rGyud phyi ma le'u gcig pa* | *rgya gar gyi mkhan po ā tsārya Shraddha ka ra warma dang lo tsā ba Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur* |
- (iv) *Phug brag bka' dkar* (19a3): [F415] *dpal gSang ba 'dus pa'i rtsa rgyud le'u bcu bdun pa Rin chen bzang po dang Chos rje dpal gyi 'gyur* | [F416] *gSang 'dus kyi rgyud phyi ma le'u bco brgyad pa Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur* |

Group III

- (i) *Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag* (288–289):²⁹⁷ [Pw.Pha.9] *dpal gSang ba 'dus pa'i le'u bcu bdun* | *Bi ma la dang dPal brtsegs kyi 'gyur* | *slar yang Shraddhā*²⁹⁸ *ka ra warma [dang] Rin chen bzang pos bsgyur cing gtan la phab pa* | [Pw.Pha.10] *yang rGyud phyi ma le'u bco brgyad* | *Dad byed go cha dang* | *Rin bzang gi 'gyur* | *phyis 'Gos lo gZhon nu dpal gyis rgya dpe la gzigs nas dag bcos mdzad pa* |

²⁹⁵ pa] Text, *om.* Ed. (Nishioka)

²⁹⁶ Bu ston, in his *rGyud 'bum gyi dkar chag* (*Catalogue to the Tantra Collection*) provides the same information regarding the translators of both the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra*. See Eimer 1989: 73 nos. 78 and 79.

²⁹⁷ See also Achard 2002: 79 nos. 221 and 222.

²⁹⁸ shraddhā] *em.*, shriddha Text

Group IV

- (i) *sDe dge rnying rgyud dkar chag* (301b6):²⁹⁹ [Dg.211.1] **Thugs kyi rgyud gsang ba 'dus pa** le'u bcu bdun pa | **Bi ma la dang lo tsā ba sKa ba dPal brtsegs kyi** bsgyur pa | [Dg.211.2] *de'i rGyud phyi ma* le'u bco brgyad pa slobs dpon **Buddha gu hya dang 'Brog mi Shākya(!)**³⁰⁰ **ye shes** kyi bsgyur pa |
- (ii) *Nub ri (Brag dkar rta so) rnying rgyud dkar chag* (11a6–b1): [Nu.237] **Thugs rgyud gsang ba 'dus pa** le'u bcu bdun pa | **Bi ma dang dPal brtsegs kyi** 'gyur | [Nu.238] **gSang 'dus kyi rgyud phyi ma** le'u bco brgyad pa rdzogs so'i mtha' can | 'di gong 'og gi le'u mtshan sdom pas le'u bco brgyad pa yin 'dra | **Sangs rgyas gsang ba dang | 'Brog mi dPal ye shes** 'gyur |

To recap, the two imperial catalogues, the *lDan dkar ma* and *'Phang thang ma*, contain unfortunately no record of the *Guhya-samājatantra*, despite the fact that there obviously existed an Ancient Translation of it. The reason that the *tantra* has not been mentioned in the early catalogues is, however, that works belonging to the class referred to as Inner Tantras were not included in these catalogues in the first place, but were rather recorded in a separate list of translated texts (*'gyur byang*), which unfortunately does not seem to have survived. This fact as such is interesting for various reasons, but for our discussion it means that since the Dunhuang versions lack a translation colophon, we lack an early record to rely upon in this regard (though it must be added that these early catalogues do not commonly record the names of the translators anyway).³⁰¹

²⁹⁹ See also Achard 2003: 69 nos. 222 and 223 and *rNying rgyud dkar chag gsal ba'i me long* (81–82) nos. Pw.Na.3 and Pw.Na.4.

³⁰⁰ The text erroneously reads *shākya* instead of *dpal gyi* (as in the colophon!). This error was obviously due to confusion regarding the two 'Brog mi lo tsā ba-s, dPal gyi ye shes, who was active during the Early Period, and Shākya ye shes, who was active during the Later Period. As we have seen above, this error crept into several sources.

³⁰¹ See the *'Phang thang ma* (A: 65.2; B: 45.34): *sngags nang pa'i 'gyur byang gzhan na bzhus* | | |. Cf. Halkias 2004: 71, where this passage has been

The first group consists of Rig ral's *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, which appears to be the earliest available catalogue that records the translation of the *Guhyasamājatantra* and its *uttaratantra*. It seems to list three translations of the *mūlatantra*, and at least one of the *uttaratantra*: (a) First it records an Ancient Translation, noting that 'Gos lo tsā ba (i.e., 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas) reports (*zer*) that the translators are sKa ba dPal brtsegs and lCe bKra shis (fl. 8th/9th cent.; BDRC: P4CZ16804).³⁰² Rig ral's employment of the verb *zer ba* may express some scepticism regarding the reliability

wrongly understood. On this issue, see Part One of the present study, pp. 24–26 n. 16. See also Dorji Wangchuk (forthcoming-b: § 2(b)).

³⁰² Rig ral's source for this information was probably the 'Gos lhas btsas *sngags log sun 'byin*. For the pertinent passage, see Part One of the present study, pp. 43–44 n. 46. Note that the entry for Lo tsā ba lCe bKra shis in the BDRC (P4CZ16804) wrongly gives his dates as ca. 11th cent. lCe bKra shis is a rather unknown translator. The Tibetan Buddhist Canon merely contains one work translated by him (done in collaboration with Muncandra), namely, the *Sūtrālamkāraṅvṛttibhāṣya* ascribed to Sthiramati (D4034/P5531). He is also listed by Rig ral in chapter 30—which records “Works Composed up to the Era of Emperor Khri Ral pa can”—under the section “[Works for which] the author's name is stated (*brtsom pa po'i mtshan smos pa*) as the author of two works: [Rr30.112] *dBu ma brgyan gyi rjed byang dang* [N: *dang*, R: *om*.] | | [Rr30.113] *sDom pa gsum pa'i 'grel pa* | lCe bKra shis *kyis mdzad pa* | |; cf. the 'Phang thang ma: [K785] *dBu ma rgyan gyi brjed byang slob dpon bKra shis kyis mdzad pa* | 10 bam po |, and [K801] *Byang chub sems dpa'i sdom pa nyi shu pa'i 'grel pa* | slob dpon bKra shis *kyis mdzad pa* |; and *Bu ston chos 'byung* (which relies on the former): [Bc2928] *dBu ma rgyan gyi brjed byang slob dpon bKra shis kyis mdzad pa* | 10 bam po |, and [Bc2930] *sDom pa nyi shu pa'i 'grel pa slob dpon bKra shis kyis mdzad pa* |. None of the two works are found in the *bsTan 'gyur*. He is also recorded as the translator, in collaboration with Śāntigarbha, of two other Ancient Tantras contained in the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*. See, for example, the *Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag* (301): [Pw.'A.10] *Las kyi mkha' 'gro ma de kho na nyid gsum du 'dus pa zhes bya'i rgyud gleng gzhi'i le'u dang* | [Pw.'A.11] *Las kyi mkha' 'gro ma'i rgyud chen rdzogs so'i mtha' can rgya gar pa Shīntam(!) garbha dang* | lo tsā ba lCe bkra shis *kyis bsgyur pa* |.

of this information. An interesting point is that Rig ral seems to mention only the *mūla-* and not the *uttaratantra* under works translated during the Early Period. (b) Next it mentions the *tantra* in connection with *Smṛtijñānakīrti, listing it together with several other works which stood at the centre of his activities in Khams. Unfortunately, the catalogue is ambiguous in regard to what exactly these activities were in relation to the individual works listed. The only verb employed is “composed” (*brtsams*), which could clearly merely refer to some of them but not all. The other works seems to have either been translated or taught by him (or both). The relevant entry could be thus understood as “[He translated/taught works associated with] the Jñānapāda tradition of the Guhyasamāja and its *tantra*.” Here, too, it remains unclear whether the *uttaratantra* is included. (c) Next it mentions a translation by Rin chen bzang po of both the *mūla-* and the *uttaratantra*. Most importantly, Rig ral does not hint at any connection between these translations, and they appear to be represented as having been done independently.

The second group—consisting of the *Bu ston chos 'byung*, *Glo bo bka' dkar*, *sDe dge bka' dkar*, and *Phug brag bka' dkar*—merely records the translation by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of both the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra*. Both the *Bu ston chos 'byung* and the *Phug brag bka' dkar* add [Chag lo tsā ba] Chos rje dpal, as the reviser of the *mūlatantra*. This information notably is not found in the respective colophon of the Phug brag version. We have already seen two cases of discrepancy between an entry in the Phug brag catalogue and its respective colophon—in the case of F332 (third case study) and F220 (mentioned briefly in the second case study)—and this third case strengthens the impression that the catalogue might have been influenced by the catalogue of some other edition. Moreover, given the fact that it lacks clear structure, including that there is no continuous foliation throughout, the Phug brag catalogue might have been a patchwork of several sources (such as various catalogues to smaller collections, put together) that has never undergone thorough proofreading and finalization.

The third group, merely consisting of one *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* catalogue—namely, that of 'Jigs med gling pa's Padma 'od gling edition—names translators of both the Early and Later Periods. It first names Vimalamitra and sKa ba dPal brtsegs as the early cotranslators of the *mūlatantra*, and Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po as the later ones. The formulation leads one to believe that these are two independent translations. In fact, the mention of the New Translation seems to be a mere report rather than to mean that this is the version contained in the collection. Interestingly, in the case the *uttaratantra* the catalogue records only a New Translation, likewise by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po, which, it then reports, was revised by 'Gos lo gZhon nu dpal on the basis of a Sanskrit manuscript. It is, however, not to be ruled out that the revision by gZhon nu dpal reported here refers to both the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra*.

The fourth group consists of two *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* catalogues, namely, those of the sDe dge edition and the Nubri set, both of which only name translator teams active during the Early Period: Vimalamitra and dPal brtsegs as the translators of the *mūlatantra* and Buddhaguhya and 'Brog mi dPal gyi ye shes (the sDe dge catalogue erroneously reads Shākya instead of dPal gyi) as those of the *uttaratantra*.

5.5.3. Assessment of the Evidence

The information contained in the colophons and the bibliographic material presented above could be summarized as follows: Alongside the two Dunhuang versions of the *mūlatantra*, which lack translation colophons, there exist various canonical (*bKa' 'gyur*) and paracanonical (*rNying ma rgyud 'bum*) versions with colophons that present the text as a New Translation, with or without revisions, while some other paracanonical versions contain colophons that present it as an Ancient Translation, with or without (a report concerning) revision. The New Translation is in all cases said to be by Rin chen bzang po, whereas some versions are called a revision—either by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas or Chag lo tsā ba—or a revision of a revision—a revision of 'Gos's revision by one Thang chen pa and one rGyal mtshan ring mo,

alongside an extracanonical version containing a revision of 'Gos's revision by Tsong kha pa. The Ancient Translation is ascribed in all colophons to sKa ba dPal brtsegs, occasionally with mention of a revision or another translation by Rin chen bzang po. Unlike in the case of the *mūlatantra*, there is no strong evidence that the *uttaratantra* was translated during the Early Period. The colophons of the canonical and some paracanonical versions present it as a New Translation by Rin chen bzang po, with no reference to a revision, though there exists a report of an extracanonical version containing a revision of it by gZhon nu dpal with the help of a translation prepared by *Smṛtijñānakīrti. The colophons of the remaining paracanonical versions present the text as an Ancient Translation by 'Brog mi dPal gyi ye shes, with note taken of a New Translation of it by Rin chen bzang po. Of perhaps some relevance are the verbs employed while attributing the translation of both the *mūla*- and *uttaratantra* to Rin chen bzang po. In some cases recorded in clusters 2–4 one finds, alongside the common phrase *bsgyur cing zhus te* ("translated and edited/proofread"), or simply *bsgyur te* ("translated"), also the rather unusual *bsgyur cing bcos* ("translated and corrected"), which could be interpreted as meaning that Rin chen bzang po later revised his translation, and in one case (F) also the phrase *bcos shing bsgyur* ("corrected and translated"), which may signify that he revised an earlier version so as merely to produce a revised version of it rather than an entirely new translation. In cluster 5, Rin chen bzang po's translation is mentioned in such a manner that one could interpret it as an independent translation of which the colophon merely reports. Whether these different formulations are of some significance or are merely a result of random changes to formulations made by previous editors without any particular significance is hard to say. The information gained through the bibliographical material more or less coincides with the overall information found in the colophons. The most valuable bibliographical source in this regard has clearly been Rig ral's *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, which first reports that the early translators of the *mūlatantra* were sKa ba dPal brtsegs and lCe bKra shis, noting that he has based himself on 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas in

this regard, then ambiguously hints at a later solo translation of it by *Smṛtijñānakīrti, and finally names Rin chen bzang po as the translator of both the *mūla-* and *uttaratantra*.

The *Blue Annals*, composed by gZhon nu dpal between 1476–1478 (Martin 1997b: no. 141), likewise reports on several translations of the *Guhyasamājatantra* (with no separate reference to the *uttaratantra*), thereby all in all supporting the colophons and bibliographical records presented above: (i) An Ancient Translation by lCe bKra shis, who, together with sKa ba dPal brtsegs, is also named as the translator by Rig ral, but is omitted in all consulted colophons. (ii) A New Translation by Rin chen bzang po. (iii) A twofold revision by 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas of Rin chen bzang po's translation. (iv) A New Translation by Pa tshab (in collaboration with Tilakakalaśa), regarding which gZhon nu dpal adds that he could not find a trace of this lineage (i.e., when composing his history in 1476–1478),³⁰³ and indeed no version of it seems to have survived. (v) A revision by Chag lo tsā ba of 'Gos's revision of Rin chen bzang po's translation. This record is of particular relevance to those of us who wish to compare and study the different versions in Tibetan translation, since it seems to be the only source to state that Chag's revision is not a direct revision of Rin chen bzang po's translation but rather a revision of 'Gos's revision. (vi) And finally, a report that *Smṛtijñānakīrti taught the Jñānapāda tradition in Khams, which could imply that he also translated the *tantra*. This is supported by the report that gZhon nu dpal revised Rin chen bzang po's translation of the *uttaratantra*, during which he consulted a Sanskrit manuscript and compared it with *Smṛtijñānakīrti's

³⁰³ As we have seen, gZhon nu dpal did nonetheless possess a copy of Pa tshab's translation, which he reportedly used for his own revision of the text. We have also seen that Tsong kha pa used it for his revision of the *Pradīpoddyotana's* translation (and probably also his revision of the translation of the *mūlatantra*) and for his *Guhyasamāja* related works as well, activities that appears to have taken place sometime at the beginning of the fourteenth century.

translation.³⁰⁴ The earliest report regarding the identity of the translators of the *Guhyasamājantra* I have been able to locate thus far is found in Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer's (1124–1192; BDRC: P364) religious history dated late 1100's (Martin 1997b: no. 18). There, Nyang ral names yet another team, Padmasambhava and Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan, as the translator of the *tantras* belonging to the Inner Tantra class, including the *Guhyasamājantra*.³⁰⁵

Regarding the authenticity of the various translation colophons, the only way to come to a more conclusive judgement would be to study and compare all available versions (or at least representatives of each group)—ideally by preparing a new critical edition of the Tibetan text, or at least a partial one in a manner similar to the one done by Eastman. Of particular interest in this regard are those versions found in some local *bKa'* 'gyur editions whose translation is merely ascribed to Rin chen bzang

³⁰⁴ See the *Deb sngon* (437.3–9): 'di ni bstan pa snga dar gyi dus su lo tsā ba **lCe bKra shis zhes bya bas bsgyur nas** | [...] *phyi ni lo tsā ba chen po Rin chen bzang pos* 'di'i rgyud dang | [...] 'grel pa dang | [...] *phra mo yang mang du bsgyur zhing bshad pa yang mdzad par snang ngo* |; *ibid.* (441.18–442.2): ... rgyud thams cad kyi spyi bor gyur pa '**Dus pa'i rgyud** 'grel pa **sGron ma gsal ba** dang bcas pa la ni | rje '**Gos kyis** 'gyur bcos kyang lan gnyis su byas | *phan pa yang shin tu che bar byung zhing* | ...; *ibid.* (445.3–7): ... **sPa tshab gSang 'dus** la mos [em.: mos, Text: mon] nas **Shung ke** la gsan pas 'gyur la ma mnyes nas | *pañdi ta Ti la ka ka la shas mdzad nas sPa tshab lo tsā bas* 'gyur yang rgyud 'grel phran dang bcas pa la mdzad cing legs par bsgyur | *bshad pa yang mdzad do | ding sang gi bar du brgyud pa bzhugs pa ni ma mthong ngo* |; *ibid.* (445.8–12): **Chag Chos rje dpal gyis kyang** [...] **gSang 'dus 'Gos** lugs bslabs | *de nas bal po'i* [em.: po'i, Text: lo'i] *pañdi ta Nyi ma'i dbang po'i* 'od zer la legs par mnyan nas | rgyud 'grel dang **mDor byas Rim lnga** sogs kyi 'gyur yang bcos | ...; *ibid.* (451.19–452.1): *pañdi ta Smṛ tis kyang Khams su Ye shes zhabs lugs rnam mang du bshad* |. For an English translation, see Roerich 1949: 359, 363, 366, 372.

³⁰⁵ See the *Nyang ral chos 'byung* (308.13–15): *de rnam ni gsang sngags Nang gi rgyud sde'o* | | *slob dpon Padma 'byung gnas dang Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan gyis bsgyur rol* |; see also *ibid.* (308.6) for the explicit mention of the *Guhyasamājantra* as belonging to this category.

po, with no revision. Such a version was not available to Eastman, who therefore attempted to reconstruct Rin chen bzang po's translation with the help of the versions available to him at the time. Also to be noted here is that while Eastman concluded that Rin chen bzang po merely revised the Ancient Translation of the *mūlatantra* rather than prepared a new translation, Martin—who had no access to the Dunhuang version (IOL TIB J 439)—observed that the two versions compared by him (only “random parts of the text”)—namely, the gTing skye and the Peking versions—“showed many variant readings in both wording and syntax,”³⁰⁶ which led van der Kuijp to state that “Eastman's conclusion stands in singular opposition to that of Martin.”³⁰⁷ This might indeed appear to sow doubts about Eastman's conclusion that all available versions are either direct or indirect revisions of the Dunhuang text, while suggesting that the gTing skye version is a rather direct descendant of the Dunhuang version, with some interpolation from or collation with the revision made by 'Gos.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁶ See Martin 1987: 184. Note that Martin (ibid.: 183) remarks that the title given in the terminating colophons of both the Dunhuang and the gTing skye versions, unlike the Peking version, do not contain the element *guhyaśamāja* (*gsang ba 'dus pa*), which he finds to be significant for the investigation of the relation among these witnesses. This observation-cum-conclusion, however, is misleading, since the element *guhyaśamāja* (*gsang ba 'dus pa*) is contained in the titles found in its chapters' terminating colophons, of both the Dunhuang and gTing skye versions, and, as we know, colophons of all kinds are in the course of text transmissions often subjected to changes made by editors and even copyists.

³⁰⁷ See van der Kuijp 2018: 112.

³⁰⁸ It is not the occasion to delve into Eastman's methodology and conclusion. However, I would like to remark here that it seems that he might have not sufficiently considered the possibility of 'Gos's consulting the Ancient Translation while revising Rin chen bzang po's revision, which could be a (perhaps more likely?) explanation of the common readings of the gTing skye version and 'Gos's revision. As we have seen above, it was 'Gos who reported Lo tsā ba lCe bKra shis to be the one responsible for the Ancient Translation, which could suggest that he had a copy of it.

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

However, since Martin did not avail himself of Eastman's study from 1979/(1980), and since he, unlike Eastman, does not provide any examples for the "many variant readings in both wording and syntax," it is very hard to make any decisive judgement regarding these apparently contradicting observations or conclusions. It seems, however, that Eastman convincingly showed that (at least for the passages he compared) the similarity of words and syntax is too great to present two different independent translations. One should also keep in mind that the Peking version presents a twofold revision—a revision by Chag of a revision by Rin chen bzang po, or (to take the *Blue Annals'* report into consideration) a threefold revision—a revision by Chag of a revision by 'Gos (who is said to have revised it twice) of a revision by Rin chen bzang po—which could of course explain the differences. Perhaps also worth mentioning in this context is that Francesca Fremantle—who prepared a critical edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the *mūlatantra*, for which she used three Tibetan versions, all containing 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas's revision³⁰⁹—notes that the sDe dge version containing Chag Chos rje dpal's revision—which she obtained only towards the completion of her study and thus did not employ for her critical edition but merely referred to occasionally—"differs considerably" from 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas's revision, and "is very often closer to the Sanskrit as well as being clearer grammatically."³¹⁰

Regarding the *uttaratantra*, such an undertaking would unfortunately be of limited use for determining the colophons' authenticity, since there exists no Dunhuang version of it to compare with. In fact, van der Kuip has compared the translation

³⁰⁹ Note that Fremantle reports that among the three Tibetan versions containing 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas's revision used by her was, alongside the sNar thang and lHa sa versions, also the Peking version (kept in the School of Oriental and African Studies Library)! See Fremantle 1971: 7, 9.

³¹⁰ Fremantle 1971: 10. Chag's revision (D) was also the one consulted by Matsunaga (1978) for his critical edition, probably for the same reasons.

of two verses from the *uttaratantra* as found in the Peking edition—whose translation is attributed to Rin chen bzang po—with the one found in the gTing skyes edition—whose colophon names 'Brog mi lo tsā ba dPal gyi ye shes as the earlier translator and Rin chen bzang po as the later one (whereas the formulation leaves it unclear which translation it contains!)—and found them to be identical. This led him to suggest that either Rin chen bzang po merely revised the Ancient Translation or that there is “a problem with the colophon[s].”³¹¹ Van der Kuijp has notably pointed out that the above-mentioned commentary on the *uttaratantra* by Viśvāmitra—the **Guhyasamājopadeśasamudrabindu* in Tibetan translation (D1844/P2707)—preserves some very different readings of the two verses studied by him.³¹² However, Yukei Matsunaga, who also consulted Viśvāmitra’s commentary (in Tibetan translation) for his edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Guhyasamājatantra*, including its *uttaratantra*, has suggested that these discrepancies are probably due to different Sanskrit texts underlying the two translations, rather than to simply different Tibetan translations of the same text.³¹³

For now it seems safe to say that the colophons of the *mūlatantra* ascribing the translation to Rin chen bzang po are inauthentic, since, as has already been shown by Eastman, he must have merely revised the Ancient Translation, and that too rather minimally. The fact that Rig ral explicitly states that he relied on the individual catalogues of a number of renowned gSar ma translators, which appear to contain lists of works translated by them, including the catalogue of Rin chen bzang po,³¹⁴ suggests that the attribution of the translation (and not just a revision) to Rin chen bzang po is not a mere transmissional error but most probably goes back to Rin chen bzang po himself! But how about

³¹¹ See van der Kuijp 2018: 111–112.

³¹² See van der Kuijp 2018: 114–115.

³¹³ See Matsunaga 1978: xxix. According to Matsunaga, the text as preserved in Viśvāmitra’s commentary may represent an earlier stage in the evolution of the *uttaratantra* as we know it today.

³¹⁴ See Part One of the present study, pp. 34–36.

the authenticity of the colophons found in the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* versions that ascribe the translation to Vimalamitra and sKa ba dPal brtsegs? Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, relying on Eastman's study, concludes that these *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* colophons must be the authentic ones.³¹⁵ Nonetheless, even though there is no doubt that the *mūlatantra* was translated during the Early Period, the authenticity of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* colophons that ascribe the translation to that specific team from the Early Period (sKa ba dPal brtsegs in collaboration with Vimalamitra) could not be confirmed with certainty either, for thus far no reliable early source confirming this attribution could be located. On the contrary, the three reports found thus far ascribe the Ancient Translation to either Lo tsā ba lCe bKra shis and sKa ba dPal brtsegs, or lCe bKra shis alone (which would suggest that sKa ba dPal brtsegs was probably the proofreader responsible for the finalization of the translation), or to Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan in collaboration with Padmasambhava. I thus believe that Herrmann-Pfandt's conclusion was perhaps somewhat premature and needs further corroboration.

As regards the translation colophons of the *uttaratantra*, the situation is somewhat different, since not only do we not have a Dunhuang version of it, we also have no evidence that it was translated during the Early Period in the first place, although it is generally assumed that the *uttaratantra* was completed by the latter half of the eighth century.³¹⁶ The only evidence we have is Viśvāmitra's commentary on it, which is commonly considered an Ancient Translation. However, the identity of the translator(s) of Viśvāmitra's commentary is unknown, and doubts regarding its authenticity in terms of an Indic origin have likewise been expressed.³¹⁷ Indeed the work is listed neither in any of the

³¹⁵ See Herrmann-Pfandt 2002: 140–142.

³¹⁶ See Matsunaga 1978: xxvi.

³¹⁷ The *Blue Annals'* reassurance that it is a work associated with the rNying ma [School] (or: being an Ancient [Translation]?)—together with a remark that it was also included by Bu ston in his [Zhwa lu] *bsTan 'gyur* edition—appears to hint at certain reservations on the part of

available imperial catalogues (which, as pointed out earlier, is not particularly significant) nor in Rig ral's *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*. The first catalogue record seems to be dBus pa blo gsal's catalogue followed by Bu ston's religious history.³¹⁸ Nonetheless, none of the known catalogues express any reservations regarding its Indic origin. Interestingly, however, it appears not to have been included in the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur*, for there is no record of it in its catalogue. Nonetheless, even if it is possibly an early Tibetan composition, it would still mean that the *uttaratantra* was known to Tibetans already during the Early Period. This is strengthened by Matsunaga's suggestion that Viśvāmitra's commentary seems to reflect an earlier evolutionary stage of the *uttaratantra*. In any case, it seems unlikely that a commentary on the *uttaratantra* was either translated into Tibetan or composed by a Tibetan scholar without the *uttaratantra* being translated into Tibetan first (or simultaneously). Nonetheless, given these uncertainties, one should not entirely dismiss the possibility that it was translated for the first time during the Later Period. More likely, however, is that it was translated anew based on a different Sanskrit version and that the earlier translation has not been preserved. Moreover, the (reported) similarity of the versions of the *uttaratantra* available to date, alongside the rather different text cited in Viśvāmitra's commentary, would suggest that the colophons presenting the available Tibetan text of the *uttaratantra* as a New

some adherents of the New Schools. See the *Deb sngon* (135.13–14): ... *'Dus pa phyi ma'i 'grel pa Bi shwa mi tras mdzad pa Bu'i bsTan 'gyur na bzhugs pa yang rnying ma kho nar snang la*.... For an English translation, see Roerich 1949: 103. Moreover, according to Dorji Wangchuk (Universität Hamburg; oral communication), the text indeed features terminology and phraseology typical to the rNying ma tradition. See also van der Kuijp 2018: 115, where reservations regarding the authenticity of the commentary (or at least parts of it) in terms of an Indic origin are likewise expressed.

³¹⁸ See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 19b1; B, 14b7): [Njs333] *slob dpon Bi shwa mi tras mdzad pa'i Le'u bcwa brgyad pa'i 'grel pa; Bu ston chos 'byung*: [Bc2053] *slob dpon Bi shwa mi tras mdzad pa'i Le'u bco brgyad pa'i 'grel pa* |.

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

Translations are probably the authentic ones, while those presenting it as an Ancient Translation are likely to be inauthentic. As pointed out earlier, though, it is only through a closer study of the various versions of the Tibetan translation, including the passages cited in Viśvāmitra's commentary, that one could shed more light on the matter and hopefully come to a more decisive conclusion.

6. Concluding Remarks

Part Two of the present study, devoted to the issue of authenticity of colophons, particularly those found in Tibetan Buddhist canonical and paracanonical collections, first offers a discussion on the phenomenon of colophons of translated literature in general, and on author/authorship colophons and translator/translation colophons in particular. This is followed by a presentation of four case studies of works from the *bKa' 'gyur*, *bsTan 'gyur*, and *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* collections. Each of these case studies sheds light on the issue of authenticity of canonical colophons from different angles, and together they demonstrate the complexity of the matter. The four case studies clearly confirm, each in its own way, the assumption that canonical colophons must be treated with some healthy suspicion. They also demonstrate that by various means of conducting a closer examination—including a comparison of colophons of various versions, investigation of various traditional catalogues, and identification and dating of the persons involved, and admittedly occasionally also with a bit of luck—the information contained in the sources could, at least in some cases, be either dismissed or corroborated with a high degree of certainty, and in other cases discrepancies and problems could be pointed out and some hypotheses posited. It has also become clear that determining authenticity of colophons with great certainty almost always requires close philological examination of the various versions in question, an undertaking which is time-consuming and challenging, and thus clearly cannot be undertaken within the framework of a broad and general study such as the present one.

Authenticity and Authentication

The recurring problems inevitably lead to some general questions, including: What can legitimately be called an independent translation? What is a retranslation? Can a translation be regarded as independent despite having been influenced by earlier translations? What can justifiably be called a revision? Where is the borderline between retranslation and revision? Can mere standardization of orthography, grammar, and the like be considered a retranslation or even merely a revision? Or does such an undertaking more closely resemble what is nowadays called copy-editing? Does such an undertaking require knowledge of Sanskrit and/or the consulting of a Sanskrit manuscript in order to justifiably be regarded a revision? Admittedly, agreement regarding the usage of terms such as translation, retranslation, independent/new translation, revision, and proofreading should first be reached in order to determine the (in)authenticity of translation colophons. Should one apply a different meaning to these terms when used in the Tibetan context? Are these terms to be understood identically in the context of the Early Period, when these undertakings were conducted in a centralized and controlled manner, and in the context of the Later Period, when they were decentralized and with no state control? To what extent can one justifiably regard dubious colophons as representing cases of plagiarism in the modern sense of the term, and when should they be judged according to local cultural standards?

These questions require further examination and evaluation and must be thus left for other occasions. However, while we are indeed faced here with phenomena that occurred in a different time and place and within the context of an entirely different culture, one can, I believe, say with a high degree of certainty that even though the answers to some of these questions are not straightforward but rather complex, and that these phenomena must be at least partly understood within the given cultural context, some of the cases can, without hesitation, be regarded as plagiarism. We already know in terms of composition that the practice of silently “borrowing” was—both in the Indic and Tibetic contexts—a very widespread and legitimate practice.

Part Two: On the Authenticity of Tibetan Canonical Colophons

Along the same lines, Tibetan translators, when translating a certain work, “borrowed” from existing translations whatever shared passages they could find. These shared passages could be, for example, either explicit citations or silently borrowed passages from other scriptures, commentaries, and other non-scriptural works. They could also be the basic text embedded in a commentary on it. Thus when the work to be translated contained passages that are shared with other works for which a translation already existed, it was not only allowed but perhaps expected of the translator that he make use of these earlier translations. This practice made of course very much sense, and was indeed desirable. Thus, when the text to be translated contained numerous such shared passages, the main task of the translator would be to locate them and take them over into his own translation. While this procedure was fully appropriate, it would nonetheless still be legitimate to ask how much of the translation must be original in order to be justifiably regarded as a translation done by the translator in question. For all that this state of affairs is acknowledged, the case studies presented above demonstrate that the problem of authenticity of translation colophons goes way beyond this issue, and one cannot help but suspect that the Tibetan Buddhist Canon contains numerous dubious translator/translation colophons, including reports on revisions, representing cases of faulty transmission in the best-case scenario and sheer plagiarism in the worst.

Abbreviations & Bibliography

1. Sigla: Tibetan Canonical and Paracanonical Collections & Their Catalogues

(a) *bKa' 'gyur* (including Catalogues)

C = Co ne Xylograph Edition. 107+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W1PD96685].

Cx = Charang Manuscript Edition. 97 vols. [scans: rKTs]. Catalogue nos. according to rKTs.

D = sDe dge Xylograph Edition 102+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W22084]. Catalogue nos. according to Ui et al. 1934.

F = Phug brag Manuscript Edition. 119+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W1KG13607]. Catalogue nos. according to Jampa Samten 1992.

Go = Gondhla Proto *bKa' 'gyur* Manuscript Collection. 37 MSS. [scans: rKTs]. Catalogue nos. according to rKTs.

H = IHa sa Xylograph Edition. 99+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W26071]. Catalogue nos. according to Members of Staff 1998.

J = 'Jang sa tham (Li thang) Xylograph Edition. 108+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W4CZ7445]. Catalogue nos. according to Imaeda 1984.

N = sNar thang Xylograph Edition. 101+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W22703]. Catalogue nos. according to Members of Staff 1998.

P = Peking (Qianlong) Xylograph Edition. 107+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W1KG26108]. Catalogue nos. according to Suzuki 1961.

S = sTog Manuscript Edition. 108+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W22083]. Catalogue nos. according to Skorupski 1985.

Authenticity and Authentication

U = Urga Xylograph Edition. 105 vols. [scans: BDRC: W29468]. Catalogue nos. according to rKTs.

V = Ulaanbaatar Manuscript Edition (*bKa' 'gyur rgyal rtse'i them spang ma*). 114+1 vols. [scans: Digital Preservation Society, Tokyo]. Catalogue nos. according to rKTs.

Z = Shey Manuscript edition. Originally 105 vols., only 100 were available at the time of scanning. [scans: rKTs]. Catalogue nos. according to rKTs.

(b) *bsTan 'gyur* (including Catalogues)

D = sDe dge Xylograph Edition. 212+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W23703]. Catalogue nos. according to Ui et al. 1934.

G = Golden (dGa' ldan) Manuscript Edition. 224+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W23702]. Catalogue nos. according to Miyake 2000.

N = sNar thang Xylograph Edition. 224+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W22704]. Catalogue nos. according to Mibu 1967.

P = Peking Xylograph Edition. 224+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W1KG13126]. Catalogue nos. according to Suzuki 1961.

T = Tshal pa Manuscript Edition. 240 vols. [scans: only partly available]. Catalogue nos. according to Jampa Samten 2016.

(c) *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* (including Catalogues)

Dg = sDe dge Xylograph Edition. 25+1 vols. [scans: BDRC: W21939]. Catalogue nos. according to www.thlib.org.

Dk = gDong dkar la Manuscript Edition. 28 vols. Stored at gDong dkar la monastery, Paro district, Bhutan. [scans: CSMC, Universität Hamburg & Preservation of Bhutan's Written Heritage, Bhutan, 2012].

Kh = Khams Manuscript Edition. 33 vols. [scans: mKhan po 'Chi med rig 'dzin, Bla rung sgar]; partially identical

Bibliography

with gZhi chen dgon Collection, 39 vols. [scans: BDRC: W2PD17382].

Na = National Archives Kathmandu Illuminated Manuscript Edition. 37? vols. (incomplete, 35 vols. available). Stored at the National Archives Kathmandu, Nepal (MS no. 5). [microfilms: NGMPP: Reel Nos. AT1/1–AT25].

Nu = Nubri (Brag dkar rta so) Manuscript Edition. 37 vols. [microfilms: NGMPP: Reel Nos. L426/4–L448/1]. Catalogue nos. according to Almogi (forthcoming-b).

Tb = mTshams brag Manuscript Edition. 46 vols. Offset Edition: Thimphu: The National Library of Bhutan, 1982. [scans: BDRC: W21521]. Catalogue nos. according to www.thlib.org.

Tk = gTing skyes Manuscript Edition. 33 vols. Offset Edition: Thimphu: Dingo Khyentse Rimpoche, 1973–1975. 33+3 vols. [scans: BDRC: W21598]. Catalogue nos. according to www.thlib.org.

Tn = Rig 'dzin Tshe dbang nor bu (=Waddell) Manuscript Edition. 33? vols. (incomplete). Stored at various places, including The British Library, London; Bodleian Library, Oxford University; Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Catalogue nos. according to <http://www.tbrc.org/ngb/>.

(d) Other Catalogues

Bc = See *Bu ston chos 'byung*; Nishioka 1980–1983.

K = See *'Phang thang ma*; Kawagoe 2005.

L = See *lDan//lHan dkar ma*; Lalou 1953.

N_{JS} = See *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*; Jampa Samten 2015.

Pw = See *Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag*.

Rr = See *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*; van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009.

M_K = See *Glo bo bka' dkar*; Eimer 1999.

* For other sigla, see the bibliographical entries of the respective works.

2. Tibetic Sources

bDud 'joms chos 'byung = *bDud 'joms 'Jigs bral ye shes rdo rje, Gangs ljongs rgyal bstan yongs rdzogs kyi phyi mo snga 'gyur rdo rje theg pa'i bstan pa rin po che ji ltar byung ba'i tshul dag cing gsal bar brjod pa lha dbang g.yul las rgyal ba'i rnga bo che'i sgra dbyangs*. In *The Collected Writings and Revelations of His Holiness bDud-'joms Rin-po-che 'Jigs-bral-ye-ses-rdo-rje*. 25 vols. Kalimpong: Dupjung Lama, 1978–1985. Second reprint: New Delhi: Yashodhara Publications, 1999, vol. 1. [scans: BDRC: W20869].

brDa dkrol gser gyi me long = *bTsan lha ngag dbang tshul khirms, brDa dkrol gser gyi me long*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997.

bsTan bcos bzhengs pa'i chos gnyer pa la gsol ba = *Bu ston Rin chen grub, bsTan bcos chen po bzhengs pa'i chos gnyer pa dge ba'i bshes gnyen rnams dang yon tan mkhan rnams kyi snyan du gsol ba*. In *Bu ston gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 26 (La): 344.5–346 (Xy); B: vol. 26 (La): 498–500 (MS).

Bu ston chos 'byung = *Bu ston Rin chen grub, bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod*. (On the cover: *Bu ston chos 'byung*). Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1991 (second edition); Index part as edited in Nishioka 1980–1983 (=Bc).

Bu ston gsung 'bum = *Bu ston Rin chen grub, A: The Collected Works of Bu-ston (zhol par ma)*. Edited by Lokesh Chandra from the collections of Raghu Vira. 28 vols. Śata-piṭaka Series Indo Asian Literatures 41–68. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965–1971. [scans: BDRC: W22106]; B: *Bu ston Rin chen grub kyi gsung 'bum (bris ma)*. Brought to publication by dPal brtsegs bod yig dpe mnying zhib 'jug khang. 28 vols. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2008. [scans: BDRC: W1PD45496].

Bibliography

- Chag lo sngags log sun 'byin* = Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal, *sNgags log sun 'byin*. In *sNgags log sun 'byin gyi skor*, 1–18.2.
- Dam tshig gsum bkod dkyil chog* = Tāranātha, *Dam tshig gsum bkod pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga bya ba'i rgyud mtha' dag la 'jug pa*. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 11: 661–781; B: vol. 13: 467–598; C: vol. 26: 54–154.
- dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* = dBus pa blo gsal, *bsTan bcos kyi dkar chag*. A: MS, dBu med, 81 fols. [scans: BDRC: W2CZ7507]; B: MS, dBu med, 58 fols., in *dBus pa blo gsal gyi gsung phyogs bsdus*, 2 vols., s.l., s.n., n.d., vol. 1, separate foliation (PDF, 107–222). [scans: BDRC: W2PD17520] (= N_{JS}, see also Jampa Samten 2015: 1–118).
- Deb dmar* = Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje, *Deb ther dmar po*, pp. 1–151; Dung dkar Blo bzang 'phrin las, *Deb ther dmar po'i nang gi gal che'i tshig 'grel gnad bsdus*, pp. 152–462.
- Deb sngon* = 'Gos lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal, *Deb ther sngon po*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984.
- Glo bo bka' dkar* = Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, *bKa' 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag bstan pa gsal ba'i sgron me*. In Eimer 1999: 25–130 (=M_K).
- Glo bo bstan dkar* = Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag thub bstan rgyas pa'i nyi 'od*. A: In *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum. The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa skya Sect of the Tibetan Buddhism*. Compiled by bSod nams rgya mtsho. Bibliotheca Tibetica I, 1–15. 15 vols. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968–1969, vol. 10, 286a3 (357-4-3)–304a4 (366-4-4); B: In *E waṃ bka' 'bum*. 20 vols. Mes po'i shul bzhag 132–151. Brought to publication by dPal brtsegs bod yig dpe mying zhib 'jug khang. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2009–2010, vol. 7: 270–304. [scans: BDRC: W1KG8320].
- Glo bo rdo rje theg pa'i bstan dkar* = Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, *rDo rje theg pa'i bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag*. A: In *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum. The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa skya Sect of the Tibetan Buddhism*. Compiled by bSod nams

Authenticity and Authentication

rgya mtsho. Bibliotheca Tibetica I, 1–15. 15 vols. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968–1969, vol. 10, 270b1 (350-1-1)–286a3 (357-4-3); B: In *E waṃ bka' 'bum = E waṃ bka' 'bum*. 20 vols. Mes po'i shul bzhag 132–151. Compiled by dPal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2009–2010, vol. 7: 241–269. [scans: BDRC: W1KG8320].

'Gos lhas btsas sngags log sun 'byin = 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas, sNgags log sun 'byin. In *sNgags log sun 'byin gyi skor*, 18.2–25.5.

'Gos lo gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam thar = Fourth Zhwa dmar pa Chos grags ye shes, dPal ldan bla ma dam pa mkhan chen thams cad mkhyen pa don gyi slad du mtshan nas smos te gzhon nu dpal gyi rnam par thar pa yon tan rin po che mchog tu rgyas pa'i ljon pa. A: MS, 72 fols. [scans: BDRC: W1PD90154]; B: Ed. Ngag dbang nor bu. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004. [scans: BDRC: W28960].

'Grel bzhi'i bshad lung zin bris = A kyā yongs 'dzin Blo bzang don grub aka dByangs can dga' ba'i blo gros, 'Grel pa bzhi sbrag gi bshad lung skabs kyi gsung bshad 'ga' zhig zin bris su bkod pa. In *A kyā yongs 'dzin gyi bka' 'bum*. 2 vols. Lanzhou (Lan kru'u): Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2011, vol. 2: 29–45. [scans: BDRC: W1KG13760].

gSer bris bstan dkar = 'Jam dbyangs bde ba'i rdo rje, bsTan 'gyur rin po che srid zhi'i rgyan gcig gi dkar chag rin chen mdzes pa'i phra tshoms. Golden bsTan 'gyur Manuscript Edition, vol. 225 (Tso).

gShin rje chos 'byung = Tāranātha, rGyud rgyal gshin rje gshed skor gyi chos 'byung rgyas pa yid ches ngo mtshar. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 10: 1–147; B: vol. 6: 5–141; C: vol. 11: 1–138.

'Khor lo chen po'i sgrub thabs = Tāranātha, dPal 'khor lo chen po'i sgrub thabs srid gsum 'dul byed. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 8: 885–913; B: vol. 13: 59–88; C: vol. 25: 44–66.

'Jigs med gling pa'i gtam tshogs = 'Jigs med gling pa mKhyen brtse 'od zer, gTam gyi tshogs theg pa'i rgya mtsho. (On the cover: 'Jigs

Bibliography

- med gling pa'i gtam tshogs*). Gangs can rig mdzod 18. Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1991. [scans: BDRC: W20599].
- lDan/lHan dkar ma* = Various, *Pho brang stod thang ldan dkar gyi bka' dang bstan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag*. As edited in Lalou 1953: 319–337 (=L). See also Herrmann-Pfandt 2008.
- lNga pa chen po bstan dkar* = Dalai Lama V Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho (disingenuously ascribed), *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag 'jig rten gsum gyi bde skyid pad tshal bzhad pa'i nyin byed*. In *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition*. Ōtani University, Tokyo–Kyoto, 1955–1961, vol. 151, 61-4–119-1 (fols. 1–144).
- mKhas pa'i dga' ston* = dPa' bo gTsug lag 'phreng ba, *Dam pa'i chos kyi 'khor los bsgyur ba rnams kyi byung ba gsal bar byed pa mkhas pa'i dga' ston ces bya ba'i legs par bshad pa*. (On the cover: *Chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*). 2 vols. Ed. rDo rje rgyal po. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986. [scans: BDRC: W7499].
- Lung rigs skya rengs dang po* = rDzogs chen mkhan po Padma badzra, *sNga 'gyur rnying ma'i gzhung la brgal ba'i lan lung dang rigs pa'i skya rengs dang po*. In *rDzogs chen mkhan po padma badzra'i gsung thor bu*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2001: 141–165.
- Ngam ring bstan dkar* = Jo nang Phyogs las rnam rgyal, *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag dri med 'od kyi phreng ba*. In *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag dang dus 'khor sgrub thabs sogs*. (On the cover: *bsTan 'gyur dkar chag*). Jo nang dpe tshogs 23. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1–177.
- Nges don 'brug sgra* = Sog bzlog pa Blo gros rGyal mtshan, *gSang sngags snga 'gyur la bod du rtsod pa snga phyir byung ba rnams kyi lan du brjod pa nges pa don gyi 'brug sgra*. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1997.
- Nub ri (Brag dkar rta so) rnying rgyud dkar chag* = Brag dkar rta so sprul sku Chos kyi dbang phyug, *rNying ma rgyud 'bum gyi glegs bam nang gi chos tshan bzhugs byang dkar chag dpe rdzi*

Authenticity and Authentication

bsam 'phel nor bu'i 'phreng ba. [microfilms: NGMPP Reel No. L426/4, 26 fols.] (=Nu). See also Almogi (forthcoming-b).

Nyang ral chos 'byung = *Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer, Chos 'byung me tog snying po sbrang rtsi'i bcud*. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmang dpe skrun khang, 1988.

O rgyan pa'i rnam thar = *bSod nams 'od zer, dPal ldan bla ma dam pa grub chen u rgyan pa'i rnam par thar pa byin rlabs kyi chu rgyun*. (On the cover: *Grub chen u rgyan pa'i rnam thar*). Ed. by rTa mgrin tshe dbang. Lhasa: Bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1997.

Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag = *'Jigs med gling pa, sNga 'gyur rgyud 'bum rin po che'i rtogs pa brjod pa'i 'dzam gling tha gru khyab pa'i rgyan*. Edited in *rNying rgyud dkar chag gsal ba'i me long*, 270–305 (=Pw).

'Phang thang ma = Various, *dKar chag 'phang thang ma*. A: In *dKar chag 'phang thang ma | sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa |*. Ed. by rTa rdo. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2003, 1–67; B: In Kawagoe 2005: 5–46 (catalogue nos. =K).

Phug brag bka' dkar = Unknown, *bKa' 'gyur gyi dkar chag rin po che'i 'phreng ba*. In *Phug brag bka' 'gyur*, vol. 120. (separate foliation). [scans: W1KG13607].

Rang rdor bstan dkar-1 = Unknown [=? Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje or dGe ba'i bshes gnyen dGe 'dun rin chen], *Thugs dam bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag*. In *Karma pa rang byung rdo rje's gsung 'bum*. 16 vols. [Xining (Zi ling): mTshur phu mkhan po Lo yag bKra shis, 2006], vol. 4: 415–594. [scans: BDRC: W30541].

Rang rdor bstan dkar-2 = Unknown, *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag*. In *Karma pa rang byung rdo rje's gsung 'bum*. 16 vols. [Xining (Zi ling): mTshur phu mkhan po Lo yag bKra shis, 2006], vol. 4: 595–717. [scans: BDRC: W30541].

rDo rje'i rnal 'byor gyi khrid yig = *Tāranātha, rDo rje'i rnal 'byor gyi khrid yig mthong ba don ldan gyi lhan thabs 'od brgya 'bar ba*. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 3: 457–815; B: vol. 4: 123–381; C: vol. 7: 111–388.

Bibliography

- rGyan gyi nyi 'od* = *bCom ldan rig pa'i ral gri, bsTan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od*. In van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 101–277 (=Rr).
- rGyud 'bum thob yig* = [Kaḥ thog mkhan po Tshe ring rdo rje], *sNga 'gyur rgyud 'bum thob yig theg mchog bla na med pa'i mdzod khang*. In *bKa' ma dang rnying ma rgyud 'bum dang bstan 'gyur sogs kyi thob yig sna tshogs*. s.l., s.n., n.d., 149–244. [scans: BDRC: W1KG12178].
- Rim lnga'i 'grel chen* = Tāranātha, *Rim lnga'i 'grel chen rdo rje 'chang chen po'i dgongs pa*. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 5: 281–939; B: vol. 5: 201–875; C: vol. 10: 1–614.
- rNying rgyud dkar chag gsal ba'i me long* = Mi nyag Thub bstan chos dar, *rNying ma rgyud 'bum gyi dkar chag gsal ba'i me long*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2000.
- sDe dge bka' dkar* = Si tu Chos kyi 'byung gnas aka Karma bstan pa'i nyin byed gtsug lag chos kyi snang ba, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bka' gangs can gyi brdas drangs ba'i phyi mo'i tshogs ji snyed pa par du bsgrubs pa'i tshul las nye bar brtsams pa'i gtam bzang po blo ldan mos pa'i kunda yongs su kha bye ba'i zla 'od gzhon nu'i 'khri shing*. D4568. [scans: BDRC: W30532].
- sDe dge bstan dkar* = Zhu chen Tshul khriims rin chen, *Thams cad mkhyen pa chen po nyi ma'i gnyen gyi bka' lung spyi dang bye brag gi dgongs don rnam par 'grel pa'i bstan bcos gangs can pa'i skad du 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi chos sbyin rgyun mi 'chad pa'i ngo mtshar 'phrul gyi phyi mo rdzogs ldan bskal pa'i bsod nams kyi sprin phung rgyas par dkrigs pa'i tshul las brtsams pa'i gtam ngo mtshar chu gter 'phel ba'i zla ba gsar ba*. 2 vols. D4569. [scans: BDRC: W1KG10093].
- sDe dge rnying rgyud dkar chag* = Kaḥ thog dge rtse 'Gyur med tshe dbang mchog grub, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa thams cad kyi snying po rig pa 'dzin pa'i sde snod rdo rje theg pa snga 'gyur rgyud 'bum rin po che'i rtogs pa brjod pa lha'i rnga bo che lta bu'i gtam*. In *sDe dge rnying ma rgyud 'bum*. 26 vols., vol. 26. [scans: BDRC: W21939].

Authenticity and Authentication

- sGang steng sprul sku dang po'i rnam thar* = Pad gling gsung sprul III
Phan pa bzang po aka Kun mkhyen Tshul khirms rdo rje,
rNam thar byang chub sems kyi me tog bstan pa mdzes byed pa'i
rgyan gcig. MS. [scans: BDRC: W8LS15807].
- sGrol ma nyer gcig nyi ma sbas pa'i lugs* = Tāranātha, *sGrol ma nyer*
gcig gi sgrub thabs nyi ma sbas pa'i lugs dang rjes su 'brel ba 'dus
gsal go bde ba. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, within the collection
Yi dam rgya mtsho'i sgrub thabs rin chen 'byung gnas (A: vol. 15:
9–640; B: vol. 15: 5–746; C: vol. 29: 1–322, vol. 30: 1–277, vol.
31: 1–312), A: 533–543; B: 518–532; C: vol. 30: 185–195.
- sGyu 'phrul chen po rgya cher bshad pa* = Tāranātha, *dPal rgyud kyi*
rgyal po sgyu 'phrul chen mo ma hā mā ya'i rgya cher bshad pa de
kho na nyid kyi sgron ma. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 9:
537–683; B: vol. 11: 463–655; C: vol. 22: 57–207.
- sKad gnyis shan sbyar* = Mi pham 'Jam dbyangs rNam rgyal rgya
mtsho, *sKad gnyis shan sbyar rab gsal nor bu'i me long*. In *'Ju mi*
pham bka' 'bum. 32 vols. Ed. by Kaḥ thog rgyud sde bshad
sgrub Nor bu'i lhun po. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun
khang, 2012, vol. 4.1 (Nga stod cha): 79–vol. 4.2 (Nga smad
cha): 918.
- Sher phyin bstod pa'i 'grel pa* = Rong ston Shes bya kun rig, *Shes rab*
kyi pha rol tu phyin pa la bstod pa 'phags pa sgra gcan 'dzin bzang
pos mdzad pa'i 'grel pa byin rlabs rnam par g.yo ba'i gter (in the
colophon: ... *rol pa'i gter*). A: In *Rong ston shākya rgyal mtshan*
gyi gsung skor. 3 vols. Kathmandu: Sa skya rgyal yongs gsung
rab slob gnyer khang, 1999, vol. 2: 648.6–654.1. [scans: BDRC:
W23637]; B: In *Kun mkhyen rong ston chen po'i bka' 'bum*. 10
vols. Jyekundo (sKye dgu mdo): Gangs ljongs rig rgyan
gsung rab par khang, 2004, vol. 1: 103.1–109.4. [scans: BDRC:
W8942].
- Shes bya'i gter mdzod* = Mi rigs dpe mdzod khang (ed.), *Bod gangs*
can gyi grub mtha' ris med kyi mkhas dbang brgya dang brgyad cu
lhag gi gsung 'bum so so'i dkar chag phyogs gcig tu bsgrigs pa shes
bya'i gter mdzod. 3 vols. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun
khang.

Bibliography

- sNgags log sun 'byin gyi skor* = Various, *sNgags log sun 'byin gyi skor*. Thimphu: Kunsang Tobgyel & Mani Dorji, 1979. [scans: BDRC: W23954].
- Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum* = Tāranātha, A: *The Collected Works of Jonang rJe-btsun Tāranātha*. Reproduced from a set of prints from the rTag-brtan Phun-tshogs-glin blocks preserved in the library of the sTog Palace in Ladak. 17 vols. Smanrtsis Shesrig Dpemzod. Leh: C. Namgyal & Tsewang Taru, 1984. [scans: BDRC: W22277]; B: *rJe btsun tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*. 23 vols. [Sichuan: 'Dzam thang dgon, 2000?]. [scans: BDRC: W22276]; C: *Jo nang rje btsun tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum dpe bsdur ma*. 45 vols. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2008. [scans: BDRC: W1PD45495].
- Tā ra nā tha'i rang rnam* = Tāranātha, *rGyal khams pa tā ra nā thas bdag nyid kyi rnam thar nges par brjod pa'i deb gter shin tu zhib mo ma bcos lhug pa'i rtogs brjod*. In *Tā ra nā tha'i gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 1: 1–654; B: vol. 1: 7–675; C: vol. 1: 1–366, vol. 2: 1–248.
- Tshal pa bstan dkar* = dGe ba'i bshes gnyen dGe 'dun rin chen, *bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag sna tshogs nor bu'i phung po*. T_{JS} = As in Jampa Samten 2016; T_{MS} = As in MS, dBu med, 99 fols. [scans].
- Tshul rdor rnam thar* = Pad gling gsung sprul III Phan pa bzang po aka Kun mkhyen Tshul khriims rdo rje, *sPrul sku tshul rdor gyi rnam par thar pa'i tshul sgrib med ston pa'i me long*. MS. [scans: BDRC: W8LS15799].
- Zhe chen chos 'byung* = Zhe chen rgyal tshab 'Gyur med padma rnam rgyal, *sNga 'gyur rdo rje theg pa gtso bor gyur pa'i sgrub brgyud shing rta brgyad kyi byung ba brjod pa'i gtam mdor bsdus legs bshad padma dkar po'i dzing bu*. (On the cover: *Zhe chen rgyal tshab chos 'byung*). Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1994.
- Zhwa lu bstan dkar* = Bu ston Rin chen grub, *bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*. In *Bu ston gsung 'bum*, A: vol. 26 (La): 401–643 (Xy); B: vol. 26 (La): 569–896 (MS, consulted occasionally).

3. Indic Sources

Adhyardhaśatakastotra = See *Prasādapratibhodbhava*.

Akṣayamatīnirdeśatikā = Vasubandhu (ascribed), *Akṣayamatīnirdeśatikā*. Tib. *Blo gros mi zad pas bstan pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa*. D3994/P5495. Tr. unknown.

Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā = Prajñākaramati, *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*. Tib. *Byang chub kyi spyod pa la 'jug pa'i dka' 'grel*. D3872/P5273. Tr. gNyan Darma grags, Sumatikirti, Rev. Yon tan rgya mtsho.

Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā = Vairocanarakṣita, *Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā*. Tib. *Byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa'i dka' 'grel*. D3875b/P5277. Tr. unknown.

Buddhākṣepaṇasūtra = *Buddhākṣepaṇasūtra*. Tib. *Sangs rgyas mi spang ba (zhes bya ba theg pa chen po)'i mdo*. D276/Go13.30/H278/J217/N261/P942/S97/U276/V147/Z128. Tr. Ye shes sde, Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman; F332. Tr. Shes rab bsam gtan, Sangs rgyas skyabs.

Guhyasamājatantra = *Guhyasamājatantra*. Tib. *gSang ba 'dus pa'i rgyud*.

(a) *Mūlatantra*. IOL Tib J 438 & IOL Tib J 481 / Pelliot tibétain 5 (both incomplete). Tr. unknown; CØ (vol. 5 (Ca), 101b2–168a3)/D442/Dk.Ø (vol. 11 (Da), fols. 1–93a5 (separate foliation))/J422/ P81.1/Tb.409.1/U443. Tr. Rin chen bzang po, Śraddhākaravarman, Rev. Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dPal, Ravindra[prabha], Rev. (only CJ) Thang chen pa, rGyal mtshan ring mo; H416.1/N404/S408.1/V472.1. Tr. Rin chen bzang po, Śraddhākaravarman, Re. 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas, Jñānakara; Z418a/Cx06.1/F415. Tr. Rin chen bzang po, Śraddhākaravarman; Dg.211.1/Kh.Ø (vol. 15, 1a–109a (separate foliation)/Na.Ø (Ba, 1a–87b4)/Nu.237 (vol. Pha, 212a–294a3)/Tk.242.1/Tn.tsa.1. Tr. sKa ba dPal brtsegs, Vimalamitra.

(b) *Uttaratantra* : CØ (vol. 5 (Ca), 101b2–168a3)/D442/Dk.Ø (vol. 11 (Da), fols. 1–93a5 (separate foliation))/J422/

Bibliography

- P81.1/Tb.409.1/U443. Tr. Rin chen bzang po, Śraddhākaravarman, Rev. (only J) Thang chen pa, rGyal mtshan ring mo; H416.1/N404/S408.1/V472.1. Tr. Rin chen bzang po, Śraddhākaravarman; Z418b/Cx06.2/F416. Tr. Rin chen bzang po, Śraddhākaravarman; Dg.211.2/Kh.Ø (vol. 15, 109a6–126b (continuous separate foliation))/Na.Ø (Ba, 87b5–102a4)/Nu.238 (Pha, 294a3–307b4)/Tk.242.2, Tn.tsa.2. Tr. 'Brog mi dPal gyi ye shes, Buddhaguhya.
- Guṇavatī* = Ratnākaraśānti, *Guṇavatī*. In *Mahāmāyātantram with Guṇavatī by Ratnākaraśāntī(!)*. Ed. by Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajavallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text 10. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992. [Sanskrit & Tibetan].
- Niroikalpastava* = See *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*.
- Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* = Bhavya, *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*. Tib. *dBu ma rin po che'i sgron ma*. D3854/P5254. Tr. Nag tsho Tshul khrim rgyal ba, rGya brTson 'grus seng ge, Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna.
- Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana* = *Asvabhāva, *Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana*. Tib. *Theg pa chen po bsdus pa'i bshad sbyar*. D4051/P5552. Tr. Ye shes sde, Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi.
- Mahāmāyātantra* = In *Mahāmāyātantram with Guṇavatī by Ratnākaraśāntī(!)*. Ed. by Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajavallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text 10. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992. [Sanskrit & Tibetan].
- Mahāmāyātantravṛtti* = Kṛṣṇavajra, *Mahāmāyātantrasya vṛttismṛiti*. Tib. *sGyu 'phrul chen mo'i rgyud kyi 'grel pa dran pa*. D1624/P2496. Tr. 'Gos [Khug pa] lhas btsas, Jinavara.
- Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāraṭīkā* = *Asvabhāva, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāraṭīkā*. Tib. *Theg pa chen po'i mdo sde'i rgyan gyi rgya cher bshad pa*. D4029/P5530. Tr. dPal brtsegs, Śākyasiṃha.

Authenticity and Authentication

- Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* = Buddhapālita, *Buddhapālitamūlamadhyamakavṛtti*. Tib. *dBu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa buddha pāli ta*. D3842/P5242. Tr. Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan, Jñānagarbha.
- Mārgaphalānvitāvavādaka* = Virūpa (ascribed), **Mārgaphalānvitāvavādaka*. Tib. *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i gdams ngag aka rDo rje'i tshig rkang*. D2284/P3131. Tr. unknown.
- Muktāvalī* = Ratnākaraśānti, *Muktāvalī*. In *Hevajatantram with Muktāvalī Panjikā of Mahāpaṇḍitācārya Ratnākaraśānti*. Ed. by R. S. Tripathi & T. S. Negi. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica 48. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2001. Tib. *dPal dgyes pa'i rdo rje'i dka' 'grel mu tig phreng ba*. D1189/P2319. Tr. 'Gos [Khug pa] lha btsas, Śāntibhadra.
- Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā* = Ānandagarbha, *Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*. Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga*. D2644/P3468. Tr. *Mahāpaṇa (ascribed).
- Prajñāpāramitāstotra* = Rāhulabhadra or Nāgārjuna (ascribed). *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* aka *Nirvikalpastava*. Skt. see Hahn 1988. Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i/ma'i bstod pa* aka *rNam par mi rtog pa'i bstod pa*. D1127/G18/N18/P2018. Tr. rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, Tilakakalaśa; F240/F390. Tr. Nag tsho Tshul khirms rgyal ba, Śāntibhadra; T55. Tr. Khe'u brgad Yon tan, Rājasrī Jñānamitra; embedded in *Sher phyin bstod pa'i 'grel pa*. Tr. Mar pa do ba Chos kyi dbang phyug, Mahājana.
- Prasādapratibhodbhava* = Mātr̥ceṭa aka Aśvagoṣa, *Prasādapratibhodbhava* aka *Śatapañcāśatkastotra* and *Adhyardhaśatakastotra*. Skt. see Bailey 1951. Tib. (*Sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la bstod pa*) *Dad pa las spobs pa bskyed pa* aka *brGya lnga bcu pa'i bstod pa*. D1147/G38/N38/P2038. Tr. Shākya blo gros, Śraddhākaravarman; F250/F400. Tr. rMa Rin chen mchog, Sarvajñadeva, Re. dPal brtsegs.
- Prasphuṭapadā* = Dharmamitra, *Abhisamayālamkārikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstratikā Prasphuṭapadā*. Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan gyi tshig le'ur byas pa'i 'grel bshad tshig rab tu gsal ba*. D3796/P5194. Tr. [Go rub] Chos kyi shes rab, Tāraśrīmitra.

Bibliography

- Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭa* = *Adhṣa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭanāmamadhyamakopadeśa*. Tib. *dBu ma'i man ngag rin po che'i za ma tog kha phye ba*. D3930/P5325. Tr. rGya brTson 'grus seng ge, [Ng tsho] Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba, Dīpaṃkarajāna.
- Ratnapradīpa* = Ratnākaraśānti, *Śrīkṛṣṇayamārimahātantrarāja-pañjikāratnapradīpa*. Tib. *dPal gshin rje'i dgra nag po'i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po'i dka' 'grel rin po che'i sgron ma*. D1919/P2782. Tr. [Go rub] Chos kyi shes rab, Vinayacandra.
- Sahajasiddhipaddhati* = Lakṣmī Bhaṭṭārikā, *Sahajasiddhipaddhati*. Tib. *lHan cig skyes grub kyi gzhung 'grel*. D2261/P3108. Tr. ['Bro] Shes rab grags (Prajñākīrti), *Manāviharala(?)/ *Manābhihalala(?).
- Śatapañcāśatkastotra* = See *Prasādapratibhodbhava*.
- Vajracchedikāṭikā* = Kamalaśīla, *Prajñāpāramitāvajracchedikāṭikā*. Tib. *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa rdo rje gcod pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa*. D3817/P5216. Tr. Ye shes sde, Mañjuśrī, Jinamitra.
- Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇīṭikā* = Buddhaguhya, *Āryavajravidāraṇānāmadhāraṇīṭikāratnābhāsvārā. Tib. *'Phags pa rdo rje rnam par 'joms pa zhes bya ba'i gzungs kyi rgya cher 'grel pa rim po che gsal ba*. P3504/D2680. Tr. dBa' (/dBas) Mañjuśrīvarman, Buddhaguhya, Rev. 'Og bSod nams mos pa, Dznyo na te ha du la / 'Jon te ta'u la (?).
- Vinayasamuccaya* = Vimalamitra, *Pratimokṣasūtraṭikā Vinayasamuccaya*. Tib. *So sor thar pa'i mdo'i rgya cher 'grel pa 'dul ba kun las btus pa*. D4106/P5607. Tr. Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan, Jinamitra, Sarvajñadeva.

4. Sources in Western Languages

- Achard, Jean-Luc. 2002. "La liste des Tantras du *rNying ma'i rgyud 'bum* selon l'édition établie par kun mKhyen 'Jigs med gling pa." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 1: 62–89.
- —. 2003. "Rig 'dzin Tshe dbang mchog grub (1761–1829) et la constitution du *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* de sDe dge." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 3: 43–89.

- Almogi, Orna. 1997. "The Life and Works of Rong-zom Paṇḍita." Magister thesis. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.
- —. 2002. "Sources on the Life and Works of the Eleventh-Century Tibetan Scholar Rong-zom Chos-kyi-bzang-po: A Brief Survey." In Henk Blezer (ed.), *Tibet, Past and Present*. PIATS 2000: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000. Tibetan Studies 1. Leiden: Brill, 67–80.
- —. 2005. "Analysing Tibetan Titles: Towards a Genre-based Classification of Tibetan Literature." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 15: Fabienne Jagou (ed.), *Conception et Circulation des Textes Tibétains*: 27–58.
- —. 2008. "How Authentic Are Titles and Colophons of Tantric Works in the Tibetan Canon? The Case of Three Works and Their Authors and Translators." In Orna Almogi (ed.), *Contributions to Tibetan Buddhist Literature. Proceedings of the Eleventh Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Königswinter 2006*. Beiträge zur Zentralasienforschung 14. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies: 87–124.
- —. 2016a. "Tantric Scriptures in the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* Believed to Have Been Transmitted to Tibet by Kashmiris: A Preliminary Survey." In Eli Franco & Isabelle Ratié (eds.), *Around Abhinavagupta: Aspects of the Intellectual History of Kashmir from the Ninth to the Eleventh Century*. Leipziger Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte Süd- und Zentralasiens 6. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 1–31.
- —. 2016b. "Translation as Proofs and Polemics of Authentication: *rNying ma* versus *gSar ma* Translation Practices." In Dorji Wangchuk (ed.) 2016: 1–21.
- —. 2016c. "The *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* at the National Archives Kathmandu: The History of Its Production and Transmission." In Orna Almogi (ed.), *Tibetan Manuscript and Xylograph Traditions: The Written Word and Its Media within the Tibetan Cultural Sphere*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 4.

Bibliography

- Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 31–65.
- —. 2019. “The Human behind the Divine: An Investigation into the Evolution of Scriptures with Special Reference to the Ancient Tantras of Tibetan Buddhism.” In Volker Caumanns, Marta Sernesi, Nikolai Solmsdorf (eds.), *Unearthing Himalayan Treasures: Festschrift for Franz-Karl Ehrhard*. Indica et Tibetica 59. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1–26.
- —. 2020. “Spiritual Masters and Master Copies on the Move: On a Recently Discovered Manuscript Edition of the *rNying ma rgyud ’bum* from East Tibet and Its Origin.” In Jeannine Bischoff, Petra Maurer, Charles Ramble (eds.), *On a Day of a Month of the Fire Bird Year. Festschrift for Peter Schwieger on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 5–25.
- —. forthcoming-a. “Editors as Canon-Makers: The Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon in the Light of Its Editors’ Predilections and Agendas.” In Orna Almogi & Chizuko Yoshimizu (eds.), *Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons*. Indian and Tibetan Studies Series. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- —. forthcoming-b. *Two rNying ma rgyud ’bum Editions from the Tibetan-Nepalese Borderlands: A Comparative Catalogue of the Sets Stored at the National Archives (Kathmandu) and in Nubri (Samagaon)*.
- Assmann, Aleida & Jan Assmann. 1987. “Kanon und Zensur als Kultursoziologische Kategorien.” In Aleida Assmann & Jan Assmann (eds.), *Kanon und Zensur*. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation 2. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 7–27.
- Bailey, D. R. Shackleton (ed.). 1951. *The Śatapañcāśatka of Mātrceta: Sanskrit Text, Tibetan Translation and Commentary, and Chinese Translation. With an Introduction, English Translation and Notes*. Cambridge: The University Press.

- Bajetta, Nicola. 2019. *The Clear Realisation of the Quintessential Instructions on All Dharma Practices: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the *Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* (Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud). *Indian and Tibetan Studies* 6. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- Bendall, Cecil (ed.). 1897–1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.
- Braarvig, Jens. 1993. *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*. Vol. 1: Editions of Extant Manuscripts with an Index; Vol. 2: The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought. Oslo: Solum Forlag.
- Cabezón, José Ignacio. 2007. "Introduction." In José Ignacio Cabezón & Geshe Lobsang Dargay (trs.), *Freedom from Extremes: Gorampa's "Distinguishing the Views" and the Polemics of Emptiness*. *Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1–57 & 243–275 (endnotes).
- (tr.). 2013. *The Buddha's Doctrine and the Nine Vehicles: Rog Bande Sherab's Lamp of the Teachings*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cuevas, Bryan J. 2010. "The 'Calf's Nipple' (Be'u bum) of Ju Mipam ('Ju Mi pham). In José Ignacio Cabezón (ed.), *A Handbook of Tibetan Ritual Magic in Tibetan Ritual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 165–186.
- Dalton, Jacob & Sam van Schaik. 2006. *Tibetan Tantric Manuscripts from Dunhuang: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Stein Collection at the British Library*. Leiden: Brill.
- Davidson, Ronald. 2002. "gSar ma Apocrypha: The Creation of Orthodoxy, Gray Texts, and the New Revelation." In Helmut Eimer & David Germano (eds.), *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*. PIATS 2000: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of

Bibliography

- the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden
2000. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 203–224.
- —. 2005. *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deroche, Marc-Henri. 2018. “On Being ‘Impartial’ (*ris med*): From Non-Sectarianism to the Great Perfection.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 44: 129–158.
- Doctor, Andreas. 2005. *Tibetan Treasure Literature: Revelation, Tradition, and Accomplishment in Visionary Buddhism*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion Publications.
- Dotson, Brandon. 2007. “‘Emperor’ Mu rug btsan and the ‘Phang thang ma Catalogue.’” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 3, 25 pp. (separate pagination).
- Eastman, Kenneth W. 1979(/1980). “The Dun-huang Tibetan Manuscript of the Guhyasamājantra.” Presented to the twenty-seventh convention of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies, November 17th, 1979, Kyoto, Japan. (A version in Japanese was published in 1980, *Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies* 26: 8–12.)
- Eimer, Helmut (ed.). 1989. *Der Tantra-Katalog des Bu ston im Vergleich mit der Abteilung Tantra des tibetischen Kanjur: Studie, Textausgabe, Konkordanzen und Indices*. Indica et Tibetica 17. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- — (ed.). 1999. *The Early Mustang Kanjur Catalogue. A Structured Edition of the mDo sngags bka’ ’gyur dkar chag and of Nor chen Kun dga’ bzañ po’s bKa’ ’gyur ro cog gi dkar chag bstan pa gsal ba’i sgron me*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 45. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Fremantle, Francesca (ed.). 1971. *A Critical Study of the Guhyasamāja Tantra*. PhD thesis. London: University of London Library.

- Gentry, James Duncan. 2016. *Power Objects in Tibetan Buddhism: The Life, Writings, and Legacy of Sokdokpa Lodrö Gyeltsen*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 40. Brill: Leiden.
- Gyurme Dorje & Matthew Kapstein (trs.). 1991. *The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism: Its Fundamentals and History*. Dudjom Rinpoche Jigdrel Yeshe Dorje. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Hahn, Michael. 1988. "Zwei Texte aus dem Phudrag-Kanjur." In Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Indology and Tibetology*. Indica et Tibetica 13. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 53–80.
- —. 2016. "Multiple Translations from Sanskrit into Tibetan." In Dorji Wangchuk (ed.) 2016: 81–98.
- Halkias, Georgios T. 2004. "Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang thang." *The Eastern Buddhist* 36/1&2: 46–105.
- Hansen, Hans. 2018. "Fallacies," In Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, at <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/fallacie>. Summer 2018 edition.
- Harrison, Paul. 1994. "In Search of the Source of the Tibetan bKa' 'gyur: A Reconnaissance Report." In Per Kvaerne (ed.), *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies Fagernes 1992*. Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, vol. 1: 295–317.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 1987. *Das Varṇārḥavarṇastotra des Mātrceta*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 160. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- —. 1996. "Notes on Two Texts in the Phug brag Kanjur." In Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Roland Steiner (eds.), *Suhrllekhāḥ: Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*. Indica et Tibetica 28. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Bibliography

- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2002. "The *Lhan dkar ma* as a Source for the History of Tantric Buddhism." In Helmut Eimer & David Germano (eds.), *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*. PIATS 2000. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 2/10. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, pp. 129–149.
- (ed.). 2008. *Die lHan kar ma: Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Imaeda, Yoshiro (ed.). 1984. *Catalogue du Kanjur Tibetain de l'Édition de 'Jang Sa-tham*. 2 vols. Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior 2. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Isaacson, Harunaga & Francesco Sferra. 2015. "Tantric Commentaries: South Asia." In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. 1: 467–482.
- Jampa Samten. 1987. "Origins of the Tibetan Canon with Special Reference to the Tshal-pa Kanjur (1347~1349)." Translated with Jeremy Russell. In *Buddhism and Science*. Seoul: Dongguk University, 763–781.
- (ed.). 1992. *Phug brag bka' 'gyur bris ma'i dkar chag. A Catalogue of the Phug brag Manuscript Kanjur*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives.
- (ed.). 2015. *Catalogue of the Narthang Manuscript Tangyur. Compiled by dBus pa blo gsal rtsod pa'i seng ge*. Lo rgyus deb phreng 19. Dharamshala: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives.
- (ed.). 2016. *bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag sna tshogs nor bu'i phung po. Tshal pa drung chen smon lam rdo rjes bzhengs pa'i tshal pa bstan 'gyur dkar chag. Catalogue of the Tshalpa Manuscript Tanjur*. Compiled by dGe 'dun rin chen. Miscellaneous Series 32. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central University of Tibetan Studies.
- Jackson, David P. (tr.). 2015. "Clarifying the Sage's Intent. Sakya Paṇḍita Kunga Gyaltsen (1182–1251)." In Dölpa, Gampopa, Sakya Paṇḍita. *Stages of the Buddha's Teachings: Three Key*

Authenticity and Authentication

- Texts*. Trans. Ulrike Roesler, Ken Holmes, David P. Jackson. The Library of Tibetan Classics 10. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 385–665 (Part III).
- Kapstein, Matthew T. 2000. *A Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestation, and Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Karmay, Samten Gyaltzen. 1988. *The Great Perfection: A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching of Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.
- —. 1998. *The Arrow and the Spindle: Studies in History, Myths, Rituals and Beliefs in Tibet*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.
- Kawagoe, Eishin. 2005. *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*. Monograph Series 3. Sendai: Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W.J. 2007. “*Nāgabodhi/Nāgabuddhi: Notes on the *Guhyasamāja* Literature.” In B. Kellner, H. Krasser, H. Lasic, M. T. Much, H. Tauscher (eds.), *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ: Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Part 2. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 70.2. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische and Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1001–1022.
- —. 2009. “Some Remarks on the Meaning and Use of the Tibetan Word *bam po*.” *Journal of Tibetology* 5: 114–132.
- —. 2011. “A Hitherto Unknown Tibetan Religious Chronicle from Probably the Early Fourteenth Century.” *藏学学刊 Journal of Tibetology* 7: 21–50.
- —. 2018. „The Bird-faced Monk and the Beginnings of the New Tantric Tradition: Part Two.” *Journal of Tibetology* 19: 86–127.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. & Kurtis R. Schaeffer. 2009. *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The *bsTan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of bCom ldan ral gri**. Harvard Oriental Series 64. Cambridge, MA: The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.

Bibliography

- Lalou, Marcelle. 1953. "Contribution à la bibliographie du Kanjur et du Tanjur: Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan." *Journal Asiatique* 241/3: 313–353.
- Laurent, Lobsang Nyima. 2013. "lHa bla ma Zhi ba 'od's Eighth Century Bronze from Gilgit." *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 26: 195–214.
- Martin, Dan. 1987. "Illusion Web—Locating the Guhyagarbha Tantra in Buddhist Intellectual History." In Christopher Beckwith (ed.), *Silver on Lapis. Tibetan Literary Culture and History*. Bloomington: Tibet Society, 175–220.
- —. 1996a. "Lay Religious Movements in the 11th- and 12th-Century Tibet: A Survey of Sources." *Kailash* 18: 23–55.
- —. 1996b. "The Star King and the Four Children of Pehar: Popular Religious Movements in 11th- to 12th-Century Tibet." *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 46: 171–195.
- —. 1997a. "Beyond Acceptance and Rejection? The Anti-Bon Polemic Included in the Thirteenth-Century Single Intention (Dgongs-gcig Yig-cha) and Its Background in Tibetan Religious History." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25/3: 263–305
- —. 1997b. *Tibetan Histories: A Bibliography of Tibetan-Language Historical Works*. In collaboration with Yael Bentor. London: Serindia Publications.
- —. 2001. *Unearthing Bon Treasures: Life and Contested Legacy of a Tibetan Scripture Revealer, with a General Bibliography of Bon*. Brill's Tibetan Studies Library 1. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Matsunaga, Yukei (ed.). 1978. *The Guhyasamāja Tantra: A New Critical Edition*. Osaka: Toho Shuppan.
- Meisezahl, R. O. 1962. "The Amoghapāśahṛdaya-dhāraṇī. The Early Sanskrit Manuscript of the Reiuñji Critically Edited and Translated." *Monumenta Nipponica* 17.1–4: 265–328.
- Members of Staff (eds.). 1998. *The Brief Catalogues to the Narthang and the Lhasa Kanjurs: A Synoptic Edition of the bKa' 'gyur rin po che'i mtshan tho and the rGyal ba'i bka' 'gyur rin po che'i chos*

Authenticity and Authentication

tshan so so'i mtshan byang dkar chag bsdus pa. Compiled by the members of staff, Indo-Tibetan Section of the Indologisches Seminar, Universität Bonn. Issued on the occasion of Professor Dr. Claus Vogel's sixty-fifth birthday, July 6, 1998. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 40. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

Mibu, Taishun. 1967. *A Comparative List of the Tibetan Tripitaka of Narthang Edition (bsTan-ḥgyur Division) with the sDe-dge Edition*. Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku.

Miyake, Shin'ichiro. 2000. "Comparative Table of the Golden Manuscript Tenjur in dGa'-ldan Monastery with the Peking Edition of Tenjur." *Annual Memoirs of the Ōtani University Shin Buddhist Comprehensive Research Institute* 17. Kyoto: Ōtani University, 1–65.

Nishioka, Soshū 1980–1983. "Putun bukkyōshi' Mokurokubusakuin" ["Index to the Catalogue Section of Busto's 'History of Buddhism'"] (I-III). [*Tōkyō Daigaku Bungaku-bu*] *Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū-shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 4 (1980): 61–92, 5 (1981): 43–93, 6 (1983): 47–201.

Quintman, Andrew. 2017. "Putting the Buddha to Work: Śākyamuni in the Service of Tibetan Monastic Identity." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 40: 111–156.

Rhoton, Jared† (tr.). 2002. *A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes: Essential Distinctions among the Individual Liberation, Great Vehicle, and Tantric Systems. The sDom gsum rab dbye and Six Letters*. Sakya Pandita Kunga Gyaltsen. Ed. by Victoria R. M. Scott. Albany: SUNY Press.

Richardson, H. E. 1985. *A Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions*. James G. Forlong Series 24. [London]: Royal Asiatic Society.

Roerich, George N. (tr.). 1949. *The Blue Annals*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1988.

Bibliography

- Schaeffer, Kurtis R. 2005. *Dreaming the Great Brahmin: Tibetan Traditions of the Buddhist Poet-Saint Saraha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- —. 2009. *The Culture of the Book in Tibet*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Christina & George Bonani. 2002. "Establishing a typology of the Old Tibetan Manuscripts: A Multidisciplinary Approach." In Susan Whitfield (ed.), *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*. The British Library Studies in Conservation Science. London: The British Library, 184–215.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 2020. *Fleischverzehr und Vegetarismus im indischen Buddhismus. Bis ca. zur Mitte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* 3 vols. Numata Center for Buddhist Studies. Hamburg Buddhist Studies 12. Bochum/Freiburg: Projectverlag.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1997. "If You Can't Remember, How to Make It Up: Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts." In Petra Kiefer-Pülz & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Baudhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Indica et Tibetica 30. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 571–582.
- Seyfort Ruegg, David. 1966. *The Life of Bu ston Rin po che. With the Tibetan Text of the Bu ston rNam thar*. Serie Orientale Roma 34. Rome: Is.M.E.O.
- —. 1992. "Some Reflections on Translating Buddhist Philosophical Texts from Sanskrit and Tibetan." *Asiatische Studien / Études asiatiques* 46: 367–91.
- —. 2016. "On Translating Buddhist Texts: A Survey and Some Reflections." In Dorji Wangchuk (ed.) 2016: 193–266.
- Sferra, Francesco. 2009. "The Manuscripts Buddhica Project – Alphabetical List of Sanskrit Manuscripts and Photographs of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Giuseppe Tucci's Collection." In Ernst Steinkellner in cooperation with Duan Qing and Helmut Krasser (eds.), *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China*. Proceedings of a Panel at the 2008 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan

Authenticity and Authentication

Studies, October 13 to 17. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 259–278.

- Skilling, Peter. 1994. "Kanjur Titles and Colophons." In Per Kwærne (ed.), *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies Fagernes 1992*. Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, vol. 2: 768–780.
- —. 1997. "From bKa' bstan bcos to bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur." In Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon. Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*. PIATS 3. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 22. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 257. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 87–111.
- Skorupski, Tadeusz. 1985. *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*. Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior 4. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Smith, Gene. 2001. *Among Tibetan Texts: History and Literature of the Himalayan Plateau*. Ed. by Kurtis R. Schaefer. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- —. 2004. "Banned Books in the Tibetan-Speaking Lands." In *21st Century Tibet Issue: Symposium on Contemporary Tibetan Studies*. Collected Papers. Taipei: Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission, 368–381.
- Sobisch, Jan-Ulrich. 2002. *Three-Vow Theories in Tibetan Buddhism: A Comparative Study of Major Traditions from the Twelfth through Nineteenth Centuries*. Contributions to Tibetan Studies 1. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Stearns, Cyrus. 1996. "The Life and Tibetan Legacy of the Indian Mahāpaṇḍita Vibhūticandra." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19/1: 127–171.

Bibliography

- —. 1999. *The Buddha from Dolpon: A Study of the Life and Thought of the Tibetan Master Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen*. SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Suzuki, Daisetz T. 1961. *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto. Catalogue & Index*. Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Taube, Manfred. 1966. *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*. Vol. 11/1: *Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Thiesen, Katja. 2009. "A-ro Ye-shes-'byung-gnas: Leben, Werk und Tradition eines tibetischen Gelehrten – Mit einer Übersetzung seines *Theg pa chen po'i rnal 'byor la 'jug pa'i thabs bye brag tu 'byed pa*" („Eine detaillierte Analyse [der] Methode für den Eintritt in den Yoga [entsprechend] der Mahāyāna-Tradition“). Magister thesis. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.
- Tomabechi, Toru. 1999. "Selected Tantra Fragments from Tabo Monastery." In C. A. Scherrer-Schaub & E. Steinkellner (eds.), *Tabo Studies II. Manuscripts, Texts, Inscriptions, and the Arts*. Serie Orientale Roma 87. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente, 55–98.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. 1950. *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*. Serie Orientale Roma 1. Roma: Is.M.E.O.
- Ui, Hakuju et al. (eds.). 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.
- Vitali, Roberto. 2020. "Lha sa's Hectic Years ca. 975–1160." In Jeannine Bischoff, Petra Maurer, Charles Ramble (eds.), *On a Day of a Month of the Fire Bird Year. Festschrift for Peter Schwieger on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 849–867.
- van der Wall, Ernestine. 2004. "Ways of Polemicizing: The Power of Tradition in Christian Polemics." In T. L. Hettema & A. van

- der Kooij (eds.), *Religious Polemics in Context*. Papers presented to the Second International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religion (LISOR) held at Leiden, 27–28 April 2000. With an annotated bibliography compiled by J.A.M. Snoek. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 401–414.
- Walton, Douglas. 1999. In Robert Audi (general ed.), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*. Second edition. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 431–435.
- Wangchuk, Dorji. 2002. “An Eleventh-Century Defence of the *Guhyagarbhatantra*.” In Helmut Eimer & David Germano (eds.), *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*. PIATS 2000: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill: 265–291.
- —. 2007. *The Resolve to Become a Buddha: A Study of the Bodhicitta Concept in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- —. 2015. “Biblioclasm/Libricide in the History of Tibetan Buddhism.” In Olaf Czaja & Guntram Hazod (eds.), *The Illuminating Mirror: Tibetan Studies in Honour of Per K. Sørensen on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 527–540.
- —. 2016. “On the Identity and Authenticity of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*: A Tantric Scripture Associated with the Vikramaśīla Tradition.” In Norihisa Baba (ed.), *Relationship between Tantric and Non-Tantric Doctrines in Late Indian Buddhism*. Oriental Culture 96. Tokyo: Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, The University of Tokyo, 95–106.
- — (ed.). 2016. *Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 5. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.

Bibliography

- —. forthcoming-a. “Three Two-Fold Criteria of Scriptural Authenticity in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism.” In Orna Almogi & Chizuko Yoshimizu (eds.), *Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons*. Indian and Tibetan Studies Series. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- —. forthcoming-b. “The Syntax of Tibetan Colophons: An Overview.” In Martin Delhey, Giovanni Ciotti, Nalini Balbir (eds.), *The Syntax of Colophons in Indic Poṭhi Manuscripts*. Studies in Manuscript Cultures. Berlin: de Gruyter.
2020. “Secrecy in Buddhism.” In Orna Almogi (ed.), *Birds as Ornithologists: Scholarship between Faith and Reason*. Intra- and Inter-disciplinary Perspectives. Indian and Tibetan Studies Series 8. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 7–177.
- Wedemeyer, Christian K. 2006. “Tantalising Traces of the Labours of the Lotsawas: Alternative Translations of Sanskrit Sources in the Writings of rJe Tsong kha pa.” In Ronald M. Davidson & Christian K. Wedemeyer (eds.), *Tibetan Buddhist Literature and Praxis: Studies in its Formative Period, 900–1400*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 149–182.
- —. 2009. “Pseudepigrapha in the Tibetan Buddhist ‘Canonical Collections’: The Case of the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* Commentary Attributed to Śākyamitra.” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 5: 1–31.
- —. 2014. “Sex, Death, and ‘Reform’ in Eleventh-century Tibetan Buddhist Esoterism: ‘Gos Khug pa Lhas btsas, spyod pa (caryā), and mngon par spyod pa (abhicāra). In Todd Lewis & Bruce McCoy Owens (eds.), *Sucāruvādadeśika. A Festschrift Honoring Professor Theodore Riccardi*. Kathmandu: Himal Books, 240–260.
- Ye, Shaoyong. 2009. “A Preliminary Survey of Sanskrit Manuscripts of Madhyamaka Texts in the Tibet Autonomous Region.” In Ernst Steinkellner in cooperation with Duan Qing and Helmut Krasser (eds.), *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China*.

Authenticity and Authentication

Proceedings of a Panel at the 2008 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies, October 13 to 17. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 307–335.

5. Digital Sources

BDRC = Digital Buddhist Resource Center, at <http://www.tbrc.org>; and <http://www.tbrc.org/ngb/> for the catalogue of the Rig 'dzin Tshe dbang nor bu *rNying ma rgyud 'bum* edition by Cathy Cantwell, Robert Mayer & Michael Fisher.

BuddhaNexus = BuddhaNexus at buddhanexus.net.

Merriam-Webster = Merriam-Webster Dictionary, at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>.

rKTs = Resources for Kanjur Tanjur Studies, at <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/>.

THL = The Tibetan & Himalayan Library at www.thlib.org for the catalogues of the sDe dge, mTshams brag, and gTing skyes editions of the *rNying ma rgyud 'bum*.

Tibskrit = Dan Martin, *Tibskrit Philology. A Bio-bibliographical Resource Work*. Ed. Alexander Cherniak. Version from 2016.

Index

- A kyā yongs 'dzin Blo bzang don grub aka dByangs can dga' ba'i blo gros, see 'Grel bzhi'i bshad lung zin bris.
- A ro Ye shes 'byung gnas, 17 n. 4.
- Abhayākaragupta, 67.
- abhy anumodanā* (*mtshun 'gyur rjes su yi rang/s*; applaud-cum-gratification), see *anumodanā*.
- ad sensum vs. ad verbum* (translation), 50.
- *Adhīśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (/Dīpaṃkarajñāna), 37, 43, 137, 145, 155, 158 n. 112, 161–162, 174.
- Adhyardhaśatakastotra*, see *Prasādapratibhodbhava*
- Adhyāśayasamcodanasūtra*, 61 n. 68.
- Akṣayamatīnirdeśatikā*, 170–171.
- Amoghapāśahṛdayadhāraṇī*, 157 n. 111.
- Ānandagarbha, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Aṅgulimālīyasūtra*, 61 n. 68.
- annihilationism (*ucchedānta: chad pa'i mtha'*), 90.
- anumodanā* (*rjes su yi rang/s*; verses of gratification), 70–72, 83–84.
- anuṣṭubh* (*rjes bsngags*), 56.
- Āryadeva, 15 n. 3, 68, 200, 202.
- Āryasūryagarbhanāmavaipulya-sūtra*, 162.
- Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityavandanā-stava*, 123 n. 37.
- Asvabhāva, 144, 172.
- Aśvaghoṣa, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- *Atiśa, see *Adhīśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna.
- Avalokiteśvara, 41 n. 42.
- Avalokiteśvarastotra*, 108 n. 8.
- Ba ri lo tsā ba Rin chen grags, 14–16 n. 3, 34, 105 n. 4.
- bam po*, 36.
- bandha* (*mtshams sbyor*; composition), 71.
- bCom ldan Rig pa'i ral gri (Rig ral), 28, 29, 65 n. 73, 66; see also *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*.
- bDud 'joms chos 'byung*, 45 n. 47, 79 n. 104.
- Bhavya, 145, 155.
- Bhavyakīrti, 67.

Authenticity and Authentication

- bKa' brgyud, 62, 89 n. 126.
- bla dpe, 23–24 n. 14.
- Blue Annals, see *Deb sngon*.
- Bo dong ba chen po, 65 n. 73, 66.
- bod rgan, 76.
- Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā, 150–151.
- Bodhicittabhāvanā, 73.
- Bodhisattva, see Vajragarbha.
- Bodhisattvacaryāvatārapañjikā, 149, 151–152.
- Bon (religion), 60 n. 67, 76 n. 96, 78–79 n. 103, 90.
- brDa dkrol gser gyi me long, 58 n. 64.
- 'Bri khung, 58.
- 'Bro Shes rab grags, 150.
- 'Brog mi dPal gyi ye shes, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- 'Brog mi lo tsā ba Shākya ye shes, 195 n. 265, 204 n. 291, 207 n. 300.
- bSod nams bzang po, 177.
- bSod nams rtse mo, 20.
- bsTan bcos bzhengs pa'i chos gnyer pa la gsol ba, 109 n. 9.
- Bu ston chos 'byung, 34 n. 30, 58 n. 63, 71 nn. 83 & 84, 72 n. 86, 112–113, 128–129 n. 46, 132, 154, 167, 168, 171 n. 165, 175 n. 180, 180–181, 205–206, 208 n. 302, 209, 218 n. 318.
- Bu ston Rin chen grub, 15 n. 3, 29 n. 26, 34, 39–42, 53 n. 55, 65 n. 73, 66, 69, 71–72, 76 n. 95, 80, 83, 87, 108, 109 n. 9, 110, 112, 115, 117–118, 120, Part Two §5.2.–§5.5. passim; see also *Bu ston chos 'byung*, *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*, *bsTan bcos bzhengs pa'i chos gnyer pa la gsol ba*.
- Buddhaguhya, 31, 32 n. 28, 53, 55, 56 nn. 59 & 61, 57, 64 n. 72, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- Buddhākṣeṇasūtra, Part Two, §5.4. (178–182) passim.
- Buddhapālita, 145.
- Buddhasamāyogatantra (*Sangas rgyas mnyam sbyor*), 44 n. 46.
- Buddhaśrīśānti, 153 n. 104.
- bZang skyong, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Cakrasaṃvara, 41 n. 42.
- Candrakīrti, 15 n. 3, 68, 116 n. 19, 200, 202.
- Candrakumāra, 123 n. 37.
- Carpaṭi, 108 n. 8.

Index

- **Caryāmelāpakapradīpaṭīkā*, 14–15 n. 3, 105 n. 4.
- Chag lo sngags log sun 'byin*, 76–77 n. 97, 77 n. 98, 88 n. 124, 90 n. 128.
- Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal*, 38, 45 n. 47, 76–77, 88, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- Chos grags ye shes*, Fourth Zhwa dmar pa, 200.
- Chos kyi snying po*, 22 n. 11, 23, 35 n. 31, 36.
- Chos rje Bla ma* (= ? *Bla ma dam pa*) *bSod nams rgyal mtshan* 65 n. 73, 66.
- Chu dhwangs nor bu*, 91.
- Cog ro Klu'i rgyal mtshan*, 50, 145, 173, 213 n. 305, 217.
- dākinī*, 92, 93 n. 136.
- Dam chos dgongs pa gcig pa*, 60 n. 67.
- Dam tshig gsum bkod dkyil chog*, 26 n. 17, 53–57.
- dBa'* (/dBas) *Mañjuśrī-varman*, 31 n. 27, 32.
- dBon Shes rab 'byung gnas*, 60 n. 67.
- dBu pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, 58 n. 63, 113–114, 127 n. 45, 128 n. 46, 132, 154, 166, 168, 170 n. 165, 174, 201 n. 288, 217 n. 318.
- dByangs can dga' ba'i blo gros*, see *A kyā yongs 'dzin Blo bzang don grub*.
- De kho na nyid kyi snang ba*, see *Tattvāloka*.
- Deb dmar*, 114 n. 16.
- Deb sngon (Blue Annals)*, 200–201 n. 228, 211–212, 214, 217 n. 317.
- Devaputramāra (lha'i bu'i bdud)*, 77.
- Devendra*, see *lHa'i dbang po*.
- dGa' ldan*, 116 n. 19, 191.
- dGe 'dun rin chen*, *dGe ba'i bshes gnyen*, 114.
- Dharmākara*, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Dharmamitra*, 142–143, 150–151.
- Dharmapāla*, 153 n. 104.
- Dharmasaṃgītisūtra*, 71–72.
- Diñnāga*, 177.
- Dīpaṃkarajñāna*, see **Adhīśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna*.
- dKon mchog rgyal mtshan*, 41–42 n. 42.
- dkyus*, 26, 55 n. 56, 57.

Authenticity and Authentication

- Dol po pa Shes rab rgyal mtshan, 41 n. 42, 65 n. 73, 66.
- dPal gyi lhun po'i sde, see lHun po.
- Drang po'i sa bon, 105–106.
- evaṃ mayā śrutam* ('di skad bdag gis thos pa; Thus have I heard), 70–72.
- Fifth Dalai Lama, 119, 120.
- Glo bo bka' dkar, 113, 205, 209.
- Glo bo bstan dkar, 118, 132, 167, 168.
- Glo bo rdo rje theg pa'i bstan dkar, 40–42 n. 42, 118.
- gNyan Darma grags, 150, 151.
- Go rams pa bSod nams seng ge, 95 n. 138.
- Go rub Chos kyi shes rab, 138, 140, 142, 150.
- 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas, 38–39, 43, 44 n. 46, 89, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- 'Gos lhas btsas sngags log sun 'byin, 43–44 n. 46, 89 n. 125, 208 n. 302.
- 'Gos lo dpal gyi rnam thar, 200–201.
- Grags pa rgyal mtshan, rje btsun, 20, 59.
- 'Grel bzhi'i bshad lung zin bris, 41 n. 41.
- gSar ma, 34, 45 n. 47, 49, 50, 60 n. 67, 62, 64, 65, 77, 155, 156, 157, 158, 163, 174, 195, 216.
- gSer bris bstan dkar, 58 n. 63, 119–120, 128 n. 46, 132 n. 50, 167 n. 148, 202 n. 288.
- gShin rje chos 'byung, 50–53.
- gTer 'byung chen mo gsal ba'i sgron me, 77 n. 100.
- gTsang pa Karma yang dag (yi ge pa), 188–189.
- Gu ru Chos dbang, 76.
- Gu ru lha khang, 184 n. 200.
- **Guhyagarbhatantra*, 19, 38 nn. 35 & 36, 86, 89.
- Guhyasamājatantra* (gSang ba 'dus pa; mūla- & uttarantra), 44 n. 46, 116 n. 19, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- **Guhyasamājopadeśasamudra-bindu*, 216; see also Viśvāmitra.
- Guhyendutilakatantra* (Zla gsang thig le), 44 n. 46.
- Guṇavatī, 85–86.
- 'gyur byang, 25 n. 16, 27, 29–33.

Index

- gZhon nu snying po, 24, 27, 97.
- Harṣadeva, 123 n. 37.
- Hevajrapañḍārthaṭīkā*, 41 n. 42.
- Hevajratantra*, 41 n. 42, 72.
- Hwa shang Mahāyāna, 90.
- 'Jigs med gling pa'i gtam tshogs*, 46–48.
- Jinamitra, 144, 170, 173, Part Two, §5.4. (178–182) passim.
- Jñānagarbha, 145.
- Jñānakara, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- Jñānamitra, see Rājaśrī Jñānamitra.
- Jo nang, 62 n. 70, 117.
- Ka ka ru 'dzin, 76 n. 95.
- Kaḥ thog dge rtse 'Gyur med tshe dbang mchog grub, 120, 202, 203.
- Kālacakra, 41 n. 42.
- Kālacakratantra[hṛdaya]vṛttivimālaprabhā*, 41 n. 42.
- Kalyāṇadeva (Ācārya), 72.
- Kamalaśīla, 170.
- Kamboja, 93.
- Khadiravaṇītārāstotra*, 175 n. 180.
- Khe'u brgad Yon tan, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- 'Khor lo chen po'i sgrub thabs*, 64–66.
- Khri Ral pa can, 22 n. 12, 35 n. 31, 36, 208 n. 302.
- Khri Srong lde btsan, 62 n. 70, 107, 170 n. 165.
- 'Khyin lo tsā ba dGe tshul khyung grags, 42 n. 42.
- Kṛṣṇasamayavajra, 67.
- Kṛṣṇavajra, 85.
- Kumāra, 153 n. 104.
- Kumārajīva, 154.
- Kumārakalaśa, 153 n. 104, 177.
- Kumārasena, 31, 32 n. 28, 33 n. 29.
- Kun dga' don grub, Bla ma / sNye mdo, 114.
- Kun dga' snying po, Sa chen, 20.
- Kun mkhyen Tshul khriims rdo rje, see Phan pa bzang po.
- Kun spangs chen po Grags pa rgyal mtshan, see Nam mkha' brtan pa'i rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po.

Authenticity and Authentication

- Kye rdo rje'i sgrub thabs de kho na nyid snang ba*, see *Tattoāloka*.
- Laghukālacakratāntra*, 41 n. 42.
- Laghuśaṃvaratantra*, 41 n. 42.
- Laghutantrapiṇḍārthavivaraṇa*, 41 n. 42.
- Lakṣmī (Kashmiri), 67.
- Lakṣmī Bhaṭṭārikā, 150.
- Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i gdams ngag*, see *rDo rje'i tshig rkang*.
- Lam 'bras, 51, 52.
- lCang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje, 191.
- lCe bKra shis, 43–44 n. 46, 205, 208, 211–214, 217.
- lDan/lHan dkar ma*, 22 n. 13, 24–25 n. 16, 34, 35, 112, 130, 165, 167, 168, 170 n. 165, 175, 180, 207.
- lHa bla ma Ye shes 'od, 43.
- lHa bla ma Zhi ba 'od, 15–16 n. 3, 38–39, 90–91.
- lHa'i dbang po (= Devendra), 22 n. 11, 23, 35 n. 31, 36.
- lHun po (= dPal gyi lhun po'i sde), 22 n. 11, 23, 35 n. 31, 36.
- lNga pa chen po bstan dkar*, 58 n. 63, 118–119, 132 n. 50, 167 n. 148, 201–202 n. 288.
- Lokanāthastotra*, see *Avalokiteśvarastotra*.
- lTo dkar ba rTa mgrin (*yig mkhan*), 184–185 n. 200.
- Lung rigs skya rengs dang po*, 46 n. 47.
- Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*, 145–146, 155.
- Mahājāna, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Mahākaruṇa, 153 n. 104.
- Mahāmāyātāntra*, 84–86.
- Mahāmāyātāntravṛtti*, 85.
- Mahāmudrā, 90.
- *Mahāpaṇa, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- *Mahāpatha, 127, see *Mahāpaṇa.
- *Manāviharala(?)/*Manābhihalala(?), 150.
- Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana*, 144.
- Mahāyānasūtrālamkāraṭīkā*, 172.
- maṅgala* (*bkra shis*; auspicious opening verses), 83.
- Maṇimālā*, 67.

Index

- Mañjuśrī (*paṇḍita*), 170.
- Mañjuśrīmitra, 73.
- Mañjuśrīvarman, see dBa' (/dBas) Mañjuśrīvarman.
- Mantrakalaśa, 153 n. 104.
- Mar pa do ba Chos kyi dbang phyug, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- māra* (*bdud*), 76.
- Mārgaphalānvitāvādaka*, see *rDo rje'i tshig rkang*.
- Mātṛceta, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Māyājālatantra* (*sGyu 'phrul dra ba*), 44 n. 46.
- mChims phu ma*, 23 n. 13, 24–25 n. 16, 34.
- mDa' sdong dgon pa, 189.
- Mi bskyod rdo rje, Eighth Karma pa, 105.
- Mi pham rNam rgyal rgya mtsho, 41 n. 42, 46 n. 47, 49–50, 91.
- Miśrakastotra*, 177.
- mKhas grub dGe legs dpal bzang, First Paṇ chen bla ma, 77 n. 99.
- mKhas pa'i dga' ston*, 105.
- Mon Ko re lung bla ma, 189.
- mtshan byang*, 22, 24–25 n. 16, 26 n. 17.
- Muktāvalī*, 72.
- Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti*, 145.
- Municandra, 208 n. 302.
- Muniśrībhadrā, 67.
- Nā lendra, dPal, 125 n. 38.
- Nag tsho Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba, 34–37, 43, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim, 200, 202.
- Nāgabodhi, 67, 68.
- Nāgārjuna, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Nam mkha' brtan pa'i rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po, dPon chen Ta'i si tu, 117.
- *Nandipriya, 161 n. 132, 164, 178.
- Nāropa, 68.
- Ngam ring bstan dkar*, 42 n. 43, 116–118, 132 n. 50, 167 n. 148.
- Ngam ring chos sde/grwa*, 42, 117–118.
- Nges don 'brug sgra*, 44 n. 46.
- Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, 40–42, 113, 118, 133; see also *Glo bo bka' dkar*, *Glo bo bstan dkar*, *Glo bo rdo rje theg pa'i bstan dkar*.

Authenticity and Authentication

- nidāna* (*gleng gzhi*; preamble), 70–73, 83–86.
- nihilism (*nāstika: med par lta ba*), 90.
- Nirvikalpastava*, see *Prajñāpāramitāstotra*.
- non-Buddhist traditions (*tīrthika: mu stegs*), 90.
- Nub ri* (*Brag dkar rta so*) *rnying rgyud dkar chag*, 120–121, 207.
- Nyang ral chos 'byung*, 213 n. 305.
- O rgyan pa'i rnam thar*, 45–46 n. 47.
- Odḍiyāna, 93.
- 'og dpe*, 23–24 n. 14.
- Pa tshab Nyi ma grags, 124 n. 37, 200, 202, 212, 213 n. 304.
- Padma 'od gling rnying rgyud dkar chag*, 120, 203, 208 n. 302.
- Padma badzra, mkhan po, 46 n. 47.
- Padmākara, 164.
- Padmasambhava, 213, 217.
- Pañcakrama*, 66–68.
- pariṇāmana* (*bsngo ba*, dedication), 73, 83, 127 n. 43, 152–153, 197.
- 'Phags pa shes rab, 153 n. 104.
- Phan pa bzang po, Third Pad gling gsung sprul, 184–185 n. 200.
- 'Phang thang ma*, 21–27, 34, 35 n. 31, 50, 93 n. 135, 97, 112, 130, 165, 167, 170 n. 165, 175, 180, 207, 208 n. 302.
- Pho lha nas/ba bSod nams stobs rgyas, 120.
- Phug brag bka' dkar*, 113, 133–134, 163 n. 135, 180–181, 206, 209.
- Phyogs las rnam rgyal, Jo bo (Śākyamuni statue), 62–64.
- Phyogs las rnam rgyal, Jo nang, 117.
- Pradīpoddyotana*, 116 n. 19, 200–202, 212 n. 303.
- Prajñākīrti, see 'Bro Shes rab grags.
- Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalavidhi*, 127, 128–129 n. 46, 130 n. 47.
- Prajñāpāramitāmaṇḍalopāyikā*, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Prajñāpāramitāstotra*, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Prajñāvarman, Part Two, §5.4. (178–182) passim.

Index

- praṇidhāna* (*smon lam*; aspirational wish), 83.
- Prasādapratibhodbhava*, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Prasphuṭapadā*, 142–143, 150–151.
- Puṇḍarīka, 41 n. 42.
- Rāhulabhadra, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Rājadeśasūtra*, 17 n. 4.
- Rājaśrī Jñānamitra, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Rang byung rdo rje, Third Karma pa, 115–116, 129 n. 46.
- Rang rdor bstan dkar-1*, 58 n. 63, 115, 129 n. 46, 131, 132, 166, 168, 201 n. 288.
- Rang rdor bstan dkar-2*, 115–116, 132, 133, 167, 168, 201 n. 288.
- Ratna gling pa, 77 n. 100.
- Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta*, 137–138, 145–146, 155.
- Ratnākaraśānti, 72, 85–86, 138, 140, 143.
- Ratnakīrti, 127, 128–129 n. 46, 130 n. 47.
- Ratnapradīpa*, 138, 140–141, 143.
- Ravīndraprabha, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- rDo rje 'chang, see Ngor chen.
- rDo rje'i rnal 'byor gyi khrid yig*, 57–59.
- rDo rje'i tshig rkang*, 51–52.
- rdol chos*, 78–80.
- rDzogs chen, 77, 90, 95 n. 139.
- rGya brTson 'grus seng ge, 137, 145, 146.
- rGyal mtshan ring mo, 186–188, 210.
- rGyal sras Padma 'phrin las, First sGang steng sprul sku, 184–185 n. 200.
- rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, 29 n. 26, 30–33, 34–39, 53 n. 55, 58 n. 63, 83 nn. 111 & 112, 91 n. 130, 93 n. 136, 107–108, 112, 123–124, n. 37, 129 n. 46, 131, 132, 155, 165, 168, 170–171 n. 165, 177, 180, 205, 207, 211, 217.
- rGyud 'bum thob yig*, 195 n. 265, 204 n. 291.
- Rim lnga'i 'grel chen*, 66–68.
- Rim lnga'i 'grel pa don gsal bar byed pa*, 39–40 n. 40.
- Rin chen bzang po, 34–36, 38–39, 43, 153, 164, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.

Authenticity and Authentication

- Ris med, 75 n. 91, 95.
- rMa Rin chen mchog, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- rNgog Blo ldan shes rab, 34–36, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- rNying ma rgyud 'bum, 101, 111, 120–121, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- rNying ma, 17, 19, 49, 62, 75 n. 91, 88, 91, 92 nn. 133 & 134, 105, 111, 204, 217 n. 317, 218 n. 317.
- rNying rgyud dkar chag gsal ba'i me long, 120, 206 n. 299.
- Rog bandhe Shes rab 'od, 93 n. 134.
- Rong ston Shes bya kun rig, see *Sher phyin bstod pa'i 'grel pa*.
- Rong zom Chos kyi bzang po, 13, 61 n. 68, 89.
- rTog pa gsum pa (*Śrīkṛṣṇa-yamāritantrarājatrikalpa), 50–53.
- rTsa ltung 'khrul spong, 58 n. 64, 59.
- Sa skya paṇḍi ta (Sa paṇ) Kun dga' rgyal mtshan, 76 n. 96, 80, 124 n. 37.
- Sa skya, 20, 57, 58 n. 64, 59, 117.
- Sahajasiddhipaddhati*, 150.
- Śākyadharmā, 163 n. 135.
- Śākyamitra, 14 n. 3, 105 n. 4.
- Śākyasiṃha, 172.
- Samantabhadra, 87.
- Śambhala, 93.
- Sandhivoyākaraṇanāmatantra*, 187 n. 213.
- Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho, sDe srid, 119.
- Sangs rgyas skyabs, Part Two, §5.4. (178–182) passim.
- Śāntibhadra, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- Śāntigarbha, 208 n. 302.
- **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*, 43, 76 n. 96, 86 n. 118.
- Sarvajñadeva, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Śatapañcāśatkanāmastotraṭīkā, 161 n. 132, 164, 178.
- Śatapañcāśatkastotra, see *Prasādapratibhodbhava*.
- sDe dge bka' dkar, 113, 180, 206, 209.

Index

- sDe dge bstan dkar*, 39–42 nn.
38–42, 53 n. 55, 58 n. 63,
119, 128 n. 46, 132 n. 50, 167
n. 148, 201 n. 288.
- sDe dge rnying rgyud dkar chag*,
120, 195 n. 265, 206.
- sDom gsum 'od 'phreng*, see
**Trisaṃvaraprabhāmālā*.
- sDom gsum rab dbye*, 80.
- sems 'grel skor gsum*, 41 n. 42.
- sGang steng sprul sku dang po'i
rnam thar*, 184 n. 200.
- sGrol ma nyer gcig nyi ma sbas
pa'i lugs*, 19–20.
- sGyu 'phrul chen po rgya cher
bshad pa*, 84–85.
- Shākya blo gros, Part Two,
§5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Sher phyin bstod pa'i 'grel pa*,
124–125.
- Shes bya'i gter mdzod*, 119 n. 26.
- Shes rab bsam gtan, Part Two,
§5.4. (178–182) passim.
- Śilendrabodhi, 144.
- sKa ba dPal brtsegs, 22 n. 11,
23, 35–36, 43–44 n. 46, 50,
Part Two, §5.3. (158–178)
passim, §5.5. (182–219)
passim.
- sKad gnyis shan sbyar*, 41 n. 42,
49–50.
- sKyam mchad pa, 200.
- sMon lam rdo rje, Tshal pa
drung che, 114.
- **Smṛtijñānakīrti* (*Smṛti* /
Smṛtijñāna), 197, 204–205,
207, 211–212.
- sNye mo, 184 n. 200.
- Śraddhākaravarman, 153 n.
104, Part Two, §5.3. (158–
178) passim, §5.5. (182–
219) passim.
- sras yum bcu bdun*, 24–25 n. 16.
- **Śrīkṛṣṇayamāritantrarājatri-
kalpa*, see *rTog pa gsum pa*.
- Srin po ri, 58.
- Śrīvājraśekhara, 86.
- sTag lung rgyud 'bum*, 186–
188.
- sTag lung, 186–188, 198.
- Sthiramati, 171 n. 165, 208 n.
302.
- Sucandra, 41 n. 42.
- Sumatikīrti, 150.
- Suprabhāstotra*, 123 n. 37.
- Sūryagupta, 19–20.
- Sūtrālamkāravṛttibhāṣya*, 208 n.
302.
- Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda*,
200, 202.

Authenticity and Authentication

- Tā ra nā tha'i rang rnam*, 63 n. 71.
- Tabo, 198 n. 283.
- Tāranātha, see *Dam tshig gsum bkod dkyil chog*, *gShin rje chos 'byung*, *rDo rje'i rnal 'byor gyi khrid yig*, *Rim lnga'i 'grel chen*, *sGrol ma nyer gcig nyi ma sbas pa'i lugs*, *sGyu 'phrul chen po rgya cher bshad pa*, *Tā ra nā tha'i rang rnam*.
- Tāraśrīmitra, 142, 150.
- Tattvāloka, 40–41 n. 42.
- Thabs kyī zhags pa* (**Upāyapāśatantra*), 43–44.
- Thang chen pa, 186–188, 210.
- Theg pa chen po'i rnal 'byor la 'jug pa'i thabs bye brag tu 'byed pa*, 17 n. 4.
- Tilakakalaśa, Part Two, §5.2. (121–158) passim.
- **Trisaṃvaraprabhāmālā* (*sDom gsum 'od 'phreng*), 57–59.
- Tshal pa bstan dkar*, 58 n. 63, 109 n. 10, 114–115, 129 n. 46, 131, 166, 168, 201 n. 288.
- Tshe ring rdo rje, Kaḥ thog mkhan po, 204 n. 291.
- Tshul khriṃs 'byung gnas, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Tshul rdor rnam thar*, 184–185 n. 200.
- Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa, 65 n. 73, 66, 77 n. 99, 116 n. 19, 191–192, 198, 201 n. 288, 203, 211, 212 n. 303.
- Vairocana, sPa gor, 78.
- Vairocanarakṣita, 149, 152.
- Vajracchedikāṭīkā*, 170.
- Vajragarbha (rDo rje snying po; *paṇḍita*) aka Bodhisattva, 40–41 n. 42.
- Vajramālābhīdhānamahāyogatantra*, 187 n. 213.
- Vajrapāṇi (*paṇḍita*), 41 n. 42.
- Vajrapāṇi, cycles of, 64–65.
- Vajrasattvasādhana*, 15 n. 3, 68.
- Vajravidāraṇādhāraṇīṭīkā*, 32 n. 28, 53, 56 n. 59.
- vaktra* (*kha sgo*), 56.
- Varṇārhavarnastotra*, 163–164.
- Vasubandhu, 170–171.
- Vibhūticandra, 57–59.
- Vidyākaraṇaprabha, Part Two, §5.3. (158–178) passim.
- Vimalamitra, 173, Part Two, §5.5. (182–219) passim.
- Vimalaprabhā*, 41 n. 42.
- Vinayacandra, 138.

Index

- Vinayasamuccaya*, 173.
- Vīravajra, 153 n. 104.
- Virūpa, 51–52.
- Vīryabhadra, 67.
- Viśvāmitra (/Viśvāmitra),
195, 197, 200, 202, 216–219.
- Ye shes sde, 50, 107 n. 7, 108,
144, 170, 171, Part Two,
§5.4. (178–182) *passim*.
- Yon tan rgya mtsho, 150, 151,
152.
- Zhe chen chos 'byung*, 44 n. 47.
- Zhu chen Tshul khriṃs rin
chen, see *sDe dge bstan
dkar*.
- Zhwa lu bstan dkar*, 15 n. 3, 29
nn. 25 & 26, 39–40 nn. 38–
42, 42 n. 42, 53 n. 55, 58 n.
63, 87 nn. 120–123, 109 n. 9,
115, 128 n. 46, 132, 167, 168,
171 n. 165, 175 n. 180, 201
n. 288.
- Zhwa lu ma*, 191 n. 235.



Indian and Tibetan Studies Series

(Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität
Hamburg)

Orders can be made from Biblia Impex: contact@bibliaimpex.com.

1. Kengo Harimoto, *God, Reason, and Yoga: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Commentary Ascribed to Śaṅkara on Pātañjalayogaśāstra 1.23–28*. 2014. ISBN: 978-3-945151-00-6.
2. Alexander Schiller, *Die "Vier Yoga"-Stufen der Mahāmudrā-Meditationstradition: Eine Anthologie aus den Gesammelten Schriften des Mönchsgelehrten und Yogin Phag mo gru pa rDo rje rgyal po (Kritischer Text und Übersetzung, eingeleitet und erläutert)*. 2014. ISBN: 978-3-945151-01-3.
3. Ayako Nakamura, *Das Wesen des Buddha-Erwachens in der frühen Yogācāra-Schule*. 2016. ISBN: 978-3-945151-02-0.
4. Orna Almogi (ed.), *Tibetan Manuscript and Xylograph Traditions: The Written Word and Its Media within the Tibetan Cultural Sphere*. 2016. ISBN: 978-3-945151-03-7.
5. Dorji Wangchuk (ed.), *Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation*. 2016. ISBN: 978-3-945151-04-4.
6. Nicola Bajetta, *The Clear Realisation of the Quintessential Instructions on All Dharma Practices: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the *Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra (Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud) Based on Two Unpublished Manuscripts from the 'Bras-spungs-gnas-bcu-lha-khang*. 2019. ISBN: 978-3-945151-05-1.

7. Torsten Gerloff, *Saroruhavajra's Hevajra-Lineage: A Close Study of the Surviving Sanskrit and Tibetan Works. Part I: Saroruhavajra's Works & Part II: Commentarial Works*. 2 vols. 2020. ISBN: 978-3-945151-06-8 (set).
8. Orna Almogi (ed.), *Birds as Ornithologists: Scholarship between Faith and Reason. Intra- and Inter-disciplinary Perspectives*. 2020. ISBN: 978-3-945151-07-5.
9. Orna Almogi, *Authenticity and Authentication: Glimpses behind the Scenes of the Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon*. 2020. ISBN: 978-3-945151-08-2.