Dreaming the path: diagnosing Bodhisattva progress in early Mahāyāna

Jiang, Y.

Appendix I
Attribution, Title, Witnesses, and Impact of the *Jingju tianzi hui*

1. Attribution and Title

Following Zhisheng's 智昇 catalog of 730 CE, the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (T. 2154), almost all the extant Chinese witnesses ascribe the Chinese translation of the *SvN*—the *Jingju tianzi hui* 淨居天子會 (*JJTZH*, hereafter)—to *Dharmarakṣa 竺法護. However, this attribution is highly problematic. An investigation into this issue is necessary to understand the textual history of both this Chinese translation and the *SvN* as a work.

External Evidence

Being "the standard catalog according to which later editions organized their content" (Wu 2016, 19), the attribution of the *JJTZH* found in Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* was later adopted by almost all the Chinese canons.[1] Zhisheng's full account of this translation reads as follows:

> 第四，淨居天子會，二卷，西晉三藏竺法護譯。右舊譯單本，本名菩薩說夢經，新改名淨居天子會。當第十五及十六卷。[T. 2154, 584b2–6]
> Fourth, *Jingju tianzi hui*, two *juan*, translated by the Tripiṭaka Master *Dharmarakṣa of the Western Jin. The above is a unique text (單本)[2] which was translated in a former time (舊譯).[3] The original title was *Pusa shuo meng jing* (菩薩說夢經; "Sūtra of [*the Buddha's] teaching on dreams [*intended for]

[1] The only exception is the witness now preserved in the Imperial Palace, which belongs to the Chongning 崇寧 edition (see my introduction to witnesses below). The colophon of this edition follows Fei Changfang's catalog (see below) and records the *JJTZH* as "translator lost." The colophon in question reads, "according to the catalog of Changfang and others, (the identity of) the translator (of this text) has been lost" (大譯出長房等錄; I translate based on the conclusion that "大譯" is a corruption of "失譯"; for photos of this witness, see https://db2.sido.keio.ac.jp/kanseki/bib_frame?id=007075-778).

[2] "單本," literally, a "lone book," means that the text is not paralleled by other translations, i.e., not a retranslation (for similar usages of the term "單本" in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu*, see Silk 2008, 377–379). Zacchetti (2016a, 82) renders this term as "single version" since they refer to "scriptures reflecting one single original that was translated only once."

[3] Note that "舊譯" in this catalog is used to denote "old translations" that were translated before the Tang Dynasty or in the early Tang, in contrast to "new translations" (新譯) that were made recently. This term should be differentiate from "古譯," which mostly refers to "old translation style" (for example, in this catalog, T. 2154, 611a7–8), although the two terms are occasionally used interchangeably (ibid., 584a19).

bodhisattvas")[4] but recently changed to *Jingju tianzi hui* ("Section on Deities of the Pure Abode"). It corresponds to the 15th and 16th *juan* (of the *Baoji* 寶積 Collection).

Nevertheless, besides the above statement, Zhisheng voiced his suspicion as a side note:

> 細詳文句，與竺法護經稍不相類。長房等錄皆云失譯，法上錄中云竺護出。今者且依法上錄定。[T. 2154, 584b5−6]
> Having carefully examined the language [style], [I think] it is somewhat different from that of the sūtras [translated] by Dharmarakṣa. The catalogs of [Fei] Changfang [費]長房 and others all assess it as "translator lost."[5] According to Fashang's 法上 catalog, this translation was made by Dharmarakṣa. For now, (regarding the issue of the attribution) I follow Fashang's catalog.

Additionally, Zhisheng notes that the text (i.e., the *Pusa shuo meng jing*) that Fashang refers to is the same as the *JJTZH* since Bodhiruci had examined the old translation before including it in the *Baoji* collection.[6] Also, although Zhisheng records the "original title" as *Pusa shuo meng jing* under this entry, a slightly different form of this title, *Pusa meng jing* 菩薩夢經 ("Sūtra on Dreams of Bodhisattvas"), is approved as an alternative title of *JJTZH* when Zhisheng cites previous catalogs (T. 2154, 665b7−8, 698a4). As we will see below, *Pusa meng jing* is in fact the most common form of the title of this translation in all extant catalogs preceding Zhisheng's time.

---

[4] The meaning of this title—*Pusa shuo meng jing*—is perplexing. It can be interpreted in many ways. One possible interpretation, "Sūtra on a/the Bodhisattva's Teaching about Dreams," cannot describe the content of the text well: in the sūtra, it is the Buddha who expounds the teaching instead of any bodhisattva or the Bodhisattva. To solve this problem, I propose to add "佛為" to the title. The emended title, 佛為菩薩說夢經, i.e., "Sūtra of the Buddha's Teaching on Dreams to Bodhisattvas," makes more sense semantically and syntactically. First, it accurately describes the content of the text. Secondly, as can be exemplified by many titles included in the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (e.g., T. 2154, 482a2−5), titles including the character "說" typically follow the pattern of "佛為…說…經" (Sūtra on the Buddha's teaching on something to somebody). Therefore, the title—菩薩說夢經—may either be a corruption of 佛為菩薩說夢經 or 菩薩夢經. It is also possible that this title implies a "佛為" at the beginning of the title without explicitly including it.

[5] The term "失譯" is rendered literally as "translator lost" here to highlight that a known translator was assumed. However, I believe that, as Nattier (2008, 9−16) has argued, this term in fact means the translator's identity was unknown.

[6] Under the entry of this sūtra, it is only stated vaguely that "[the information on this translation is] from Fashang's catalog. [This so-called *Pusa shuo meng jing*] is examined and found to be the same [as the Sanskrit text that Bodhiruci had in hand] and was included [in the *Baoji* collection as the *JJTZH*]" (出法上錄。勘同編入。T. 2154, 584b03). Regarding this, Zhisheng makes a much more clear and detailed explanation under the main entry of the *Baoji* Collection: "Concerning the ancient translations as well as the old Tang translations (i.e., Tang translations made prior to Bodhiruci's time), Bodhiruci has checked them against the Sanskrit manuscripts and included them [only if they were confirmed to be] the same [as the Sanskrit texts]" (古譯及唐舊譯菩提流志勘梵本同編入, T. 2154, 584a17−19).

To examine the reliability of this attribution, we certainly want to consult its source, namely, Fashang's catalog. Unfortunately, Fashang's catalog no longer exists, and the details of his conclusion are also lost. We only know that this lost catalog, *Qishi zhongjing mulu* 齊世眾經目錄 by name, was compiled before 576.[7] If we trust Zhisheng's citation, then this means that the *JJTZH* already existed and was ascribed to Dharmarakṣa before this date. This catalog is our earliest evidence of the *JJTZH*.

Another source that Zhisheng mentioned, Fei Changfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (T. 2034; 598), has been passed down to us. This catalog lists, without any additional information, the *Pusa meng jing* as a two-*juan* Mahāyāna sūtra whose translator('s name) is lost (T. 2034, 112b19). Finally, although Zhisheng commented that "Fei Changfang and the others all assess this translation as 'translator lost,'" he was vague about who "the others" are. We need to find them out by ourselves.

The catalogs Zhisheng had in hand must be quite different from what we have now. Nevertheless, the extant catalogs can still supply us with some clues about this issue: in fact, almost all the extant catalogs preceding Zhisheng's time imply that the translator of the *Pusa meng jing* is anonymous. The *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 by Fajing 法經 and others (T. 2146, 120c3; 594) categorizes it as translator lost. The *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 compiled by Yancong 彥琮 and others (T. 2147, 152c12; 602) does not specify its translator, nor do the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 by Jingtai 靜泰 (T. 2148, 183b1; 668) and the *Da tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 by 道宣 Daoxuan (T. 2149, 316a24; 664). As these three catalogs generally name the translators if they are known, the absence of the information of the translator of the *Pusa meng jing* suggests that this translation was also considered as attributable by the compilers to a translator whose name was lost. The only exception is the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄 (T. 2153; 695), which attributes the *Pusa meng jing* to Dharmarakṣa, and dates it to the Da'an 大安 era (302−303). This attribution, however, just as that adopted by Zhisheng, is claimed to be based on Fashang's catalog.[8] To sum up: according to the extant catalogs, the *JJTZH* is either recorded as "translator lost" or attributed to Dharmarakṣa. The earliest known evidence for the latter attribution was presumably given by Fashang.

In addition, as stated above, an issue closely related to the translator of the *JJTZH* is the varied forms of its title. Examining the above catalogs with this question, we find out that *Pusa meng jing* is the title seen in virtually all the catalogs before Zhisheng's

[7] For Fashang's life and his works, see *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳, T. 2060, 485a1−486a6. The place where the catalog was produced is likely to be Xiangzhou 相州 (modern Linzhang 臨漳, China). The geographical information in this historical context is important for there were significant difficulties in transmission and circulation of texts between the Northern and Southern Dynasties.

[8] More precisely, the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* clarifies that this attribution follows the catalog of Damoyuduoluo 達摩鞞多羅, which is obviously the Chinese transliteration of Sanskrit "*Dharmottara," i.e., Fashang 法上. The passage in question reads, "The above [sūtra] was translated by Dharmarakṣa in the Da'an era. This attribution is from *Dharmottara's catalog" (右西晉大安年竺法護譯。出達摩鞞多羅錄。T. 2153, 374b5−6).

time,[9] whereas *Jingju tianzi hui* never once appears. Zhisheng himself has already clarified that the title of the sūtra "was recently changed to *Jingju tianzi hui*," although he did not specify how "recently" the change took place. Judging from the current evidence, the change in the title of this translation is most likely consequential upon its inclusion in the *Baoji* collection. Evidently, in Zhisheng's catalog, *Jingju tianzi hui* only appears as the title of the sūtra in question under the *Baoji* section; elsewhere, the title remains *Pusa meng jing* or its slightly varied form. In addition, all extant catalogs that refer to this translation as *Pusa meng jing* also precede Bodhiruci's compilation of the *Baoji* collection.[10] Finally, out of the twenty-three old translations included in the *Baoji* collection, fourteen of them changed their titles (Okamoto 1991, 20). We can thus assume that this change in the title is related to the text's inclusion in the *Baoji* collection. Yet, no reason or source for the new name is recorded anywhere that I can discover.

As illustrated above, the extant Chinese Buddhist catalogs provide us with varied accounts concerning the translator, title, and dating of the *JJTZH*. It is hard to settle these disagreements solely by relying on the catalogs themselves. Next, we will look into additional external evidence that provides us with further information on the textual history of the *JJTZH*.[11]

[9] T. 2148 records one more alternative title for the *Pusa meng jing*, "Sūtra on Auspicious Omens" (*Ruiying jing* 瑞應經; T. 2148, 183b1). Although this title seems to describe the content of the text well, it is the only piece of evidence that suggests the *Pusa meng jing* was alternatively referred to as *Ruiying jing*. More importantly, judging from the extant materials such as commentaries (e.g., T. 1721, 460c27−28; T. 1735, 905c25−27), catalogs (e.g., T. 2034, 23b7−8), and biographies (e.g., T. 2059, 402b8−10), the name "*Ruiying jing*" seems to generally refer to a sūtra on the Buddha's life story which is now known as *Taizi ruiying benqi jing* (太子瑞應本起經; T. 185). Therefore, although the *Pusa meng jing* may have been also known as *Ruiying jing* among some communities, the latter is not frequently seen as an alternative title of the *Pusa meng jing* in the broad context of Chinese Buddhist literature.

[10] According to Bodhiruci's biography in the *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (T. 2061, 720b4−c9), the translation and compilation work of the *Da baoji jing* collection began in 707 and was accomplished—in the sense of being presented to the Court—in 713. For more information on the translation and compilation of the *Da baoji jing* collection, see Forte 2002, 94−104. Note that, although throughout this dissertation we conveniently refer to the compiler of the MRK collection as Bodhiruci, it is for certain that the compilation and translation was carried out by a team of Buddhist monks led by Bodhiruci. Some of his collaborators are named in Chinese Buddhist historiography (ibid., 100−102).

[11] In addition to the catalogs, the title *Pusa meng jing* also appears in the *Foming jing* 佛名經 (T. 441, 197b18−c14). While this text has been controversial from an early period and its textual history remains unclear, nevertheless, it could serve as a side note to the catalogs. As Zacchetti (2016a, 94) has observed, "there is little doubt that the compilers of this *Sutra on the Names of the Buddhas* [i.e., T. 441] based these portions of the text on a catalogue very close, from the point of view of general structure, content, and sequence of listed scriptures, to the two *Catalogs of All Canonical Scriptures* (T#2147 and T#2148) [眾經目錄] by Yancong and Jingtai (though there are a number of minor differences between these three sources). More research is needed to work out the precise relationship of the *Sutra on the Names of the Buddhas* lists of scriptures with the two Catalogs of *All Canonical Scriptures*. My impression is that they are generally closer to Yancong's Catalog (T#2147). However, in at least one case the *Sutra on the Names of the Buddhas* comes closer to Jingtai's Catalog (T#2148) in the sequence of texts." Indeed, in the third *juan*, the list containing the *Pusa meng jing* appears identical to that of the T. 2147. In addition, the Taishō edition also appends to T. 441 a Dunhuang manuscript of the *Foming jing* from Nakamura Fusetsu's 中村不折 collection. In this manuscript, the *Pusa meng jing* appears in a totally different position (T. 441, 304b4−6), but the implication of this is unknown.

First, as a translation made from a (most possibly) Indic text, the issue of the "original title" (本名) of the *JJTZH* is closely related to the issue of its Sanskrit title. Although there is no available Indic material remaining of this work known, according to the colophons of its Tibetan translation, the Sanskrit title of this sūtra is "*(Ārya-)svapna-nirdeśa nāma Mahāyāna Sūtra*" (Noble "Teaching on Dreams," a Mahāyāna Sūtra").[12] This title seems close to what Zhisheng claims to be the "original" title—*Pusa shuo meng jing*[13] as both indicate that the text centers on dreams. The slightly varied but more frequent form of this title, *Pusa meng jing*, conveys the content of the text more adequately and also highlights the key element—dreams.[14] Thus, it is likely that *Pusa meng jing* was the title of this work when it was originally transmitted from India to China. However, a Yuan-Dynasty catalog records an alternative Sanskrit title for this work. The title, which can be reconstructed as "*(*Ārya-*)śodhana-nirdeśa*,"[15] has nothing to do with dreams but agrees with the later Chinese title—*Jingju tianzi hui*. Then, does this mean that the title *Jingju tianzi hui* is also based on some Indic source? So far, we do not have sufficient evidence to assign an authentic "original" Sanskrit name(s) to the work. Nevertheless, the reliability of the Yuan catalog is questionable,[16] and this catalog is chronologically late. Therefore, I am inclined to believe that the earliest attested title of this work, *Pusa meng jing*, more faithfully reflects a form of its most widely accepted Indic title (i.e., "*svapna-nirdeśa*"), and the source of the title *Jingju tianzi hui* remains obscure.

Second, although we have exhausted the direct external evidence about the issue of the attribution of the *JJTZH*, some general features of the abovementioned catalogs and the *Baoji* collection could assist us in understanding the origin of this dispute. As Zhisheng's catalog plays a decisive role in leading all later catalogs and printed canons to ascribe the *JJTZH* to Dharmarakṣa, we seek to understand Zhisheng's reasoning behind his judgment. The larger picture of Zhisheng's catalog suggests that Zhisheng

---

[12] For my survey on the colophons of the Tibetan translation, see Appendix II.

[13] Shi Jikun (1998, 68−69; 95) argues that Zhisheng changed the title from *Pusa meng jing* to *Pusa shuo meng jing* because he was aware of the Sanskrit title (i.e., *Svapna-nirdeśa*, literally, "a Discourse on Dreams"). She further claims that the "correct" name should be *Pusa mengshuo jing* 菩薩夢說經 ("Sūtra of a Discourse on the Dreams of Bodhisattvas"). Although I agree that "*Pusa shuo meng jing*" does not seem to be the "correct" title of the translation because it only appears in Zhisheng's catalog and its meaning is obscure, Shi Jikun's claim is not supported by any historical evidence.

[14] As I have noted above (n. 4), *Pusa shuo meng jing* does not accurately describe the content of the text in question, and it may be a corruption of either *Fowei pusa shuo meng jing* or *Pusa meng jing*.

[15] "阿唎二合 亜稅怛拏儞哩二合 底沙二合 拏麻," in the *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zonglu* 至元法宝勘同總錄, which is included in the *Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku* 昭和法寶總目錄 [1929] 1983, Tokyo: Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai, II: 184. I tentatively reconstruct 稅怛拏 as *śodhana* as the Sanskrit title of the second section of the MRK collection, which is *Ārya-Anantamukha-**pariśodhana**-nirdeśa-parivarta nāma Mahāyāna Sūtra* according to the Tibetan references (e.g., D46, *dkon brtsegs, ka,* 45b1), is recorded as be "阿難怛 穆迦空架切 **尾稅怛拏**儞哩二合底瑟二合答 巴哩二合哇囉二合答 麻訶衍拏 拏麻" in the *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zonglu* (*Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku*, II: 184). About the historical background and authorship of this catalog, see Huang 2003, 5−8; for the compilation and compilers of the catalog, see Franke 1994.

[16] There are cases in which the claims in this Yuan catalog are proved problematic; for examples of such cases, see Hamar 2007, 234 and van der Kuijp 2006, 172−173. For an (unfortunately very brief) summary of the deficiency of this catalog, see Huang 2003, 9−10.

was possibly suspicious of Fei Changfang's judgment in general.[17] Otherwise, it is also possible that Zhisheng's judgment is not based on his opinion of the previous catalogs, but on the generic preference for known translators. In other words, Zhisheng may have followed the trend of attributing texts to famous translators (here, Dharmarakṣa),[18] which seems to be a common practice seen in the later Chinese Buddhist catalogs.[19] Lastly, the text's attribution to Dharmarakṣa is not necessarily related to Zhisheng's view with regard to this issue. Rather, it may reflect the *Baoji* compilers' obvious preference for works that were once translated by Dharmarakṣa.[20] That means, although we do not have any hard evidence, that it is possible that it was the compilers of the *Baoji* collection who ascribed the *JJTZH* to Dharmarakṣa, and Zhisheng, despite his own doubt, accepted this attribution.

Last but not least, the absence of some key information about the *JJTZH* should also be taken into account. As elaborated above, according to our current knowledge, the first catalog that records the *Pusa meng jing* is Fashang's catalog. However, in the catalog compiled approximately 60 years prior to the Fashang's catalog—the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 (compiled by Sengyou 僧祐; ca. 515; see Nattier 2008, 11−13)—no title resembling *Pusa meng jing* can be found. In addition, there seems to be no cross-reference to the *Pusa meng jing* in the lost catalogs before Fashang's time either. This could suggest that by Sengyou's era, the text had not been translated or circulated in his region.[21] In any case, based on the extant materials, there is a two-

[17] According to Radich (2019a, 820), Fei Changfang's catalog "was already subject to criticism by medieval Chinese bibliographers—especially by Zhisheng." He has supplied this conclusion with adequate evidence (ibid., 820, n. 5).

[18] It worth mentioning that in Fei Changfang's catalog, "Dharmarakṣa's [corpus increased] from sixty-four to 210" (Nattier 2008, 14), compared to Sengyou 僧祐's *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集. Radich (2019a, 822; 826) has also noted that Fei Changfang gave 129 new ascriptions to works that Sengyou lists as anonymous texts. It is thus interesting that even Fei Changfang, given his strong inclination to attribute translations to Dharmarakṣa and other known translators, considers the *Pusa meng jing* as belonging to the category of "translator lost."

[19] More specifically, "scholars have noticed for some time the growing tendency, in medieval China, to bring the number of anonymous translations to a minimum by inflating spurious attributions to well-reputed translators such as An Shigao, Zhu Fahu, or Kumārajīva, although the trend is really only attested since the Liang Dynasty (502−557) and the systematic interference of its rulers in matters of Buddhist orthodoxy" (Palumbo 2017). Regarding the reason behind these new ascriptions, Storch (2014, 34) asserts that they were added to promote the authenticity of the corresponding texts, because there was a general "doubt on the authenticity of the anonymous translations as a whole." And according to her (ibid., 125), Zhisheng himself strongly emphasized the authority of well-known translators. However, as Palumbo (2017) has pointed out in his review of Storch's book, Storch's assertion about the correlation between known translators and the authenticity of translations is highly problematic, since "nowhere in the catalogues are anonymous translations excluded or set aside as inauthentic on this ground only." Therefore, in the case considered here, it is possible that Zhisheng also based his decision on the conventional preference for attributing earlier translations to known translators—in addition to his conclusion that the language style of the *JJTZH* is only "somewhat different" (i.e., not too different) from other translations ascribed to Dharmarakṣa—but this does not necessarily mean that, as Storch claimed, Zhisheng strongly correlated a text's authenticity with its translator.

[20] Though the *Baoji* collection only includes three translations that are credited to Dharmarakṣa, another thirteen sūtras are paralleled with alternative translations ascribed to him. Therefore, out of the forty-nine works that were selected for the *Baoji* collection, sixteen are directly or indirectly related to Dharmarakṣa. The three translations in the *Baoji* collection that are attributed to Dharmarakṣa are the third, the fourth (i.e., the *JJTZH*), and the 47th. The thirteen sūtras that have parallel translations ascribed to Dharmarakṣa are the 10th, 13th, 15th, 19th, 21st, 29th, 30th, 32nd, 33rd, 36th, 37th, 38th, and the 42nd texts of the *Baoji* collection (T. 2154, 584a14−588a04).

[21] Considering that Sengyou was active in the Liang Dynasty (in the South) whereas Fashang lived in the North, it is also possible that the text was translated before Sengyou's time but was not available to him due to some social-political circumstances.

hundred-year gap between the lifetime of Dharmarakṣa (who was active during the late third century to the early fourth century) and the first attestation of this translation. This strongly suggests that the *JJTZH* is not an authentic translation of Dharmarakṣa, and it was perhaps produced during the mid or late sixth century.

The issue of the ascription of the *JJTZH* has also drawn some attention from modern scholarship.[22] Among them, Mei Naiwen (1996, 53) has convincingly argued that the attribution of the *Pusa meng jing* to Dharmarakṣa might stem from a confusion between this text and a text with a very similar title—the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing* 佛為菩薩五夢經 ("Sūtra on the Five Dreams of the Buddha When He Was a Bodhisattva").[23] The latter, which appears to have been lost at least since the Sui Dynasty,[24] was attested as an authentic translation of Dharmarakṣa in several early catalogs (e.g., the *Chu sanzang ji ji*).[25] In fact, as early as 1938, Tokiwa Daijō (1938, 33, 656) has already noted the possible confusion between these two sūtras, but he was too cautious to draw any conclusion.[26] Moreover, as Mei Naiwen has pointed out, it is very unlikely that these two titles in fact designate the same text, because the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing* is said to have one *juan* while the *JJTZH* has two. Also, in the *JJTZH*, the number of dreams is one hundred and eight instead of five.

Following Mei Naiwen's hypothesis, we would like to further examine the available information concerning this *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing*. According to Sengyou, the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing* was translated by Dharmarakṣa in the second year of Tai'an 泰安 era (alias Da'an 大安; i.e., the year 303; for more details of the date, see Boucher 1996, 281). Zhisheng (T. 2154, 641b13−17) reports it as having multiple alternative titles and an alternative translation by An Shigao 安世高, which further increases the complexity of the problem. Considering the lost status of this sūtra, its content can only be learned from catalogs and commentaries that cite this sūtra. According to the available information, the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing* appears to center on the Buddha's life story—we may guess it has something to do with the Five Great Dreams of the Bodhisattva which we have discussed extensively in Chapter 3.[27] Based on the above

[22] For a summary of the scholarship on the authorship of the *JJTZH*, see https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/4380/.

[23] The title can be either interpreted as "Sūtra on the Five Dreams of the Buddha When He Was a Bodhisattva," or "Sūtra of the Buddha's (Teaching) on Five Dreams for Bodhisattvas." Considering the popularity of the story about the Five Great Dreams of the then-Bodhisattva before his awakening (on which I elaborate in Chapter 3), I incline to adopt the first interpretation, which can be corroborated by its alternative titles recorded in the *Lidai sanbao ji* (e.g., "Five Dreams of the Buddha" [佛五夢]; "Five Dreams of the Prince" [太子五夢]; "Five Dreams of the Sage" [仙人五夢]; T. 2034, 63a18−19).

[24] See T. 2147, 180b14. Zhisheng's catalog also confirms the text's lost state in T. 2154, 641b15−17.

[25] Sengyou (T. 2145, 8b7) states that both Nie Daozhen's 聶道真 catalog and (an) "old catalog(s)" (舊錄; it is not clear to which catalog[s] Sengyou refers by this term; on this issue, see Nattier 2008, 12, n. 21) list the text as a work of Dharmarakṣa. This attribution is adopted by all the later catalogs, as we will see below.

[26] In addition, Boucher (2006, 25) has also questioned whether the two titles refer to the same text, but he did not go into detail.

[27] The sūtra is categorized as a "Hīnayāna sūtra" by Fei Changfang (T. 2034, 116a28). However, it appears under both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna categories in the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* (T. 2153, 410a18−19; 442c10). For

evidence, the contents of this so-called *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing* and the *JJTZH* indeed appear to be quite dissimilar. Therefore, it is highly possible these two distinct works were confused due to the similarity of their titles at some point, which led to the *Pusa meng jing*'s attribution to Dharmarakṣa and the Tai'an era.

Besides the above hypothesis, Kanakura (1972, 453−454) proposes that the *JJTZH*'s attribution to Dharmarakṣa may have originated from the confusion between it and the *Mulian shang jingjutian jing* 目連上淨居天經 ("Sūtra on *Maudgalyāyana Ascending to the Pure Abode"), as both titles contain the keyword *jingjutian* ("Pure Abode"). The latter, a long-lost "Hīnayāna" sūtra, is also credited to Dharmarakṣa in Sengyou's catalog and the later ones.[28] However, in my opinion, this hypothesis is less plausible than the one we examined above (i.e., the false attribution is caused by confusion between the *Pusa meng jing* and the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing*). First, the title of the translation in question most likely only changed to *Jingju tianzi hui* during the early eighth century, whereas its attribution to Dharmarakṣa was likely first attested during the Northern and Southern dynasties. Then, the false attribution should have more to do with the title under which the work was circulated when the confusion took place (i.e., *Pusa meng jing*). Second, since the date of the translation of the *Pusa meng jing* in the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* coincides with the date of the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing* recorded in Sengyou's catalog, at least regarding this very catalog, the confusion should surround the two sūtras on dreams.

In sum, having examined the available primary sources and scholarly discussion on the textual history of the *JJTZH*, on the one hand, its attribution to Dharmarakṣa proves to be highly doubtful; on the other hand, the exact circumstances of the production of this translation and its inclusion in the *Baoji* collection remain mysterious.

Internal Evidence

Although the external evidence has revealed some information about the textual history of the *JJTZH*, considering the limitation of the historical evidence such as the

the citations of this text, see the *San mile jing shu* 三彌勒經疏 (T. 1774, 322a11−21; 321c14−22) by Kyŏnghŭng 憬興 (fl. 681−691; see Choe 2015, 28), the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 (T. 2122, 356c17−357a23), and the *Fanyi mingyi ji* 翻譯名義集 (T. 2131, 1095b6−14, which is basically copied from the *Fayuan zhulin*). However, all these works were composed after the time that the sūtra in question was supposed to have become lost (i.e., Sui Dynasty), and we do not know how reliable these citations are. Moreover, the latter two works obviously mistook another text called *Shi'er you jing* 十二遊經 (T. 195) for the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing*, since what they claim to be a citation from the *Wumeng jing* can be found in the extant version of the *Shi'er you jing* (see T. 195, 146c19−29). Therefore, these two citations can hardly provide us with any useful information about the content of the *Fo wei pusa wumeng jing*. That said, as all the citations suggest the sūtra is about the Buddha's life story, and considering that its title and alternative titles clearly refer to the Five Great Dreams of the Bodhisattva, the lost text was most likely about the Bodhisattva's life story.

[28] It had been lost before Sengyou's time, see T. 2145, 9a7. For Fei Changfang's record of this text, see T. 2034, 64a6.

unreliability of some catalogs,[29] I would like to turn to the internal evidence for a better understanding of the textual history of the *JJTZH*.

Just as Zhisheng noted, another problem of ascribing the *JJTZH* to Dharmarakṣa is the text's vocabulary and style. Upon reading the first few lines of the *JJTZH*, anyone who is familiar with Dharmarakṣa's translations must also feel suspicious of this attribution: for example, instead of Dharmarakṣa's trademark beginning "*wen rushi*" (聞如是),[30] the *JJTZH* reads "*rushi wo wen*" (如是我聞), which in fact suggests a relatively late translation date[31]; the term "*Gṛdhrakūṭaparvata*" is transliterated as "*Qishejue*" (耆闍崛) in the *JJTZH* instead of "*Lingjiu shan*" (靈鷲山)—a literal translation found in many works attributed to Dharmarakṣa. Throughout this translation, the terminology differs significantly from that typical of Dharmarakṣa.[32] Furthermore, phrases like "*rushi wo wen*" (如是我聞) and "*niepan*" (涅槃) strongly indicate that this translation was made after the late fourth century, as the universal shift in terminology took place around the year 400 (Zürcher 1996, 2−3). That said, however, since a variety of vocabulary and style does co-exist among the translations that are most likely to be genuine works of Dharmarakṣa (Mei 1996, 61−63),[33] the current evidence is not sufficient to *completely* reject the *JJTZH*'s ascription to Dharmarakṣa. Just as Zhisheng pointed out more than one thousand years ago, the language style of the text is "somewhat different from that of the sūtras [translated] by Dharmarakṣa," yet considering the complex translation and revision process that the text may have gone through, both Zhisheng and I cannot fully rule out the possibility of it being a translation of Dharmarakṣa solely on this internal evidence either.

Apart from their terminology, another feature of Dharmarakṣa's translations, as hypothesized by some modern scholars (Salomon 2018, 73−76), is that (at least some of) the source texts of most of his translations were written in Kharoṣṭhī script and Gāndhārī language. This hypothesis can be proved by the "apparent errors in the early Chinese texts [that] can only be explained by reference to features of an underlying

[29] On the unreliability of some Chinese Buddhist catalogs, especially of that compiled by Fei Changfang, see Nattier 2008, 14−16.

[30] Kanakura (1972, 452) has examined all the sūtras attributed to Dharmarakṣa in Sengyou's catalog and confirmed that they all open with the term "聞如是," and none uses "如是我聞." This fact compels him to believe that the *JJTZH*'s attribution to Dharmarakṣa is a mistake (ibid., 454).

[31] Both "聞如是" and "如是我聞" are supposedly a translation of Sanskrit "*evaṃ mayā śrutam*." Except for very limited examples, most of the translations before Kumārajīva's time use the opening formula "聞如是" (Nattier 2014, 53−56) whereas "如是我聞" became predominant in Chine translations after Kumārajīva's years of activity (Funayama 2007, 243−244; for the problems of interpreting this phrase, see ibid.).

[32] However, even by taking such diversity into account, if we accept the claim of the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* that *JJTZH* was translated during the Tai'an era and assume that there was no major change of the members of Dharmarakṣa's translation team or his translation style during the three years of Tai'an, it is still obvious that the style of other surviving translations that Sengyou claimed to be translated by Dharmarakṣa during the Tai'an era differs hugely from that of the *JJTZH*. These translations include the *Baotai jing* (胞胎經; T. 317), the *Shanquan fangbian jing* (順權方便經; T. 565), and the *Ruhuan sanmei jing* (如幻三昧經; T. 342); for a full list, see Boucher 2006, 25−26.

[33] For example, see the beginning of Dharmarakṣa's translation of the *Lotus Sūtra*, i.e., *Zheng fahua jing* 正法華經 (T. 263, 63a7). See also Karashima's dictionary of this translation in Karashima 1998, 272.

Gāndhārī archetype" and "copying errors indicating that the Indian archetype texts were written in Kharoṣṭhī script" (ibid., 74), which can be amply found in Dharmarakṣa's translations such as the *Lotus Sūtra* (Karashima 1992, 263−275). I would like to apply a similar approach to the *JJTZH* and see whether we can ascertain that this Chinese translation was made from an Indian archetype text written in Kharoṣṭhī script and Gāndhārī language. Although there is no extant Indic text of the *SvN*, in theory, the discrepancies between the Tibetan translation and the Chinese one can offer us some insights about the source text(s) of the *JJTZH*. However, practically speaking, among the many differences between the two translations, only in a few cases can we propose plausible explanations and, in even fewer cases, the differences between the two translations can be interpreted as resulting from confusions that are commonly seen under the influence of Prakrit, instead of from problems such as corruptions or contaminations that took place during the transmission of the *SvN*. Further, although we can discern an influence of Prakrit in some cases, these examples do not strongly suggest the source language/script being Gāndhārī language/Kharoṣṭhī script. For example, in one case, the Chinese reads "彼以姦詐心盜法" whereas the Tibetan reads "*gnod pa dang rtsub pa'i sems kyis chos gnas par bya ba'i phyir*." This discrepancy may suggest a confusion between Sanskrit "*steya*" (Chn. 盜) and "*stheya*" (Tib. *gnas par bya ba*; see also my footnote 12 in Chapter 2). Such confusion between an aspirated, voiced dental consonant and an unaspirated, unvoiced one is relatively rare in Gāndhārī.[34] In conclusion, from the perspective of the possible source language of the Chinese translation, we find no evidence supporting the hypothesis that the *JJTZH* was translated from an archetype text written in Kharoṣṭhī script and Gāndhārī language, while having such archetype texts is considered as a feature of Dharmarakṣa's translations. However, given the practical problems of determining a translation's source language(s), the above discussion remains rather inconclusive.

Now, with the help of advanced digital tools, the vocabulary and language style of early Chinese translators can be systematically analyzed and compared. Such methodological development is already applied in many scholarly works devoted to the issue of authorship of Chinese Buddhist translations.[35] However, as such an investigation requires considerable time and work, and since the authorship of the *JJTZH* is not the focus of this dissertation, this method has not been applied to our study

[34] For the features of Gāndhārī and possible confusions caused by them, see Fussman 1989; for a comprehensive study of the features of Kharoṣṭhī script, see Glass 2000. For more examples of the discrepancies between the two translations, see my annotated English translation.

[35] Thanks to the new development of digital humanities, many attempts have been made to carry out quantitative analyses of the attribution of early Chinese Buddhist translations. See for example Jen-Jou Hung, Marcus Bingenheimer, and Simon Wiles's study (2010) on the attribution of the Madhyama Āgama. More recently, with the assistance of the software TACL, developed by Radich and his team, Radich (2019b) re-examines the attribution of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* 大般涅槃經 (T. 7) by comparing the style of the texts ascribed to Guṇabhadra and that of translations attributed to Faxian.

here. It is our hope that future studies can better understand the authorship of the *JJTZH* using the abovementioned new methods and the new findings accompanying this methodological innovation.

Conclusion

In sum, aside from a catalog that was compiled nearly three hundred years after Dharmarakṣa's death, the attribution of the *JJTZH* to Dharmarakṣa is not backed by any substantial evidence. Rather, the text should be considered as having been translated by an anonymous translator(s) before the year 576. Then, what does this conclusion mean for the study of the *JJTZH* as a translation and the *SvN* as a work?

First of all, we should give up the hope of precisely dating and locating the production of the *JJTZH* simply by assuming one known translator. As argued by Nattier (2008, 10), "the use of the character 失 (meaning 'lost') might seem to suggest that the identity of these translators had once been known but was lost in the course of transmission, but it is more likely that they were never recorded at all." The translator(s) of the *JJTZH* may also have been "lost" since the moment it was produced. However, just as Nattier (ibid., 11) stated, "this does not mean that we are unable to say anything at all about the time and the place where they were likely produced." Although the historical evidence provides little information on the background of the *JJTZH*, we can base our quest for its date more on textual evidence, as our previous discussion on the internal evidence has shown.

From the perspective of the textual history of the *SvN* as an Indian Mahāyāna sūtra, as the *JJTZH* was possibly produced between the turn of the fifth century and the early sixth century, the compilation and transmission of the *SvN* seem to also belong to a slightly later stage. However, this is not necessarily the case, since the date of Chinese translations does not always correlate with the date of the Indic text (Boucher 2009, 35−36). The textual history of the *SvN* should therefore also mainly be examined from its textual evidence instead of relying on external clues. As is elaborated in Chapter 2, the content of the *SvN* shows that the text was most possibly based on materials that belong to a relatively early development phase of Mahāyāna, and the late translation date of the *JJTZH* rather reveals the long fossilization process of the text.

Finally, this conclusion also urges us to rethink the relationship between the *JJTZH* and the *Baoji* collection, and the textual history of the *Baoji* collection. The inclusion of the *JJTZH* in the *Baoji* collection has largely distorted the picture of its textual history. Although the anonymity of the translation may not initially be a problem,[36] it was

[36] As we do not know the exact date and background of the *JJTZH*, we cannot say for sure that anonymity was not considered an issue when it was produced. However, according to Palumbo (2017), "Seeing the absence of a named translator as a problem seems to have started from [the Liang Dynasty (502–557)] rather than with Dao'an." Moreover, as Nattier (2022, 135) has pointed out, regarding the anonymous works recorded in Dao'an's catalog,

probably seen as a problem by the compilers of the *Baoji* collection. The *Baoji* collection's clear preference for works that were once translated by Dharmarakṣa suggests that the compilers may have correlated the translators' identity with the status or classification of their works. Given the working hypothesis that the translator of *JJTZH* is not Dharmarakṣa, does the inclusion of the *JJTZH* in the *Baoji* collection suggest that the *JJTZH* was seen as suitable for this collection because of its false attribution? Or, on the contrary, did the compilers of the *Baoji* collection deem the *JJTZH* important for certain reasons and use the attribution to Dharmarakṣa (or, simply to a known translator) to reinforce its authenticity? Also, a closely related question is why, since Bodhiruci retranslated the majority of the works that were once translated by Dharmarakṣa which were selected for this collection, he did not retranslate the *JJTZH*.[37] Considering the gaps in historical records, these questions may not be easily answered. But no matter why and how the *JJTZH* was included in the *Baoji* collection, the fortunes of the *JJTZH* permanently changed after this inclusion.

As illustrated above, there still remain many questions regarding the textual history of the *JJTZH*, and even if we pursue definite answers to the above questions, we may never get solid historical evidence to provide such answers: some records are long lost, and some decisions perhaps were amenable to no logical explanation in the first place. However, I believe that the above survey is sufficient for us to conclude that the *JJTZH* was translated by a team of unknown translators before the second half of the sixth century, and the compilation of the *Baoji* collection profoundly shaped the final form of the *JJTZH*. These conclusions form the basis for my study of the *JJTZH* in this dissertation.

2. Extant Witnesses of the Chinese Translation

The *JJTZH* is witnessed by all surviving Chinese canons (*Dazang jing* 大藏經) and several early manuscripts. Below is my introduction to the important witnesses. As the thesis does not focus on a textual study of this particular translation, this summary will be very brief. Also, a stemmatic analysis based on the readings of the available

"Respected compilers of treatises, commentaries, and anthologies drew freely on these works, showing no hesitation in treating them as authentic and authoritative scriptures;" many of the treatises, commentaries, and anthologies that she refers to belong to a period slightly later than the Liang Dynasty (e.g., ibid., 119). Thus, it seems that anonymous translations were not deemed as inauthentic until some time later than the Liang Dynasty. Therefore, since the *JJTZH*, per our analysis, may be produced during the first half of the sixth century or slightly earlier, the anonymity of the translation should not be seen as a sign of inauthenticity at that time.

[37] Zhisheng's comment on the *Baoji* section suggests that Bodhiruci had checked the Chinese translations made prior to the compilation of this collection with the Sanskrit manuscripts Xuanzang brought from India. If Zhisheng's account about the Indic materials of the MRK collection is reliable (which it is probably not; see Silk and Nagao 2022, 689−690), then, the inclusion of the *JJTZH* indicates the similarity between it and the Indic version of *SvN* that Bodhiruci had in hand. This may be the reason that Bodhiruci did not retranslate the work. However, as there are too many guesses involved here, we should admit that the compilation and retranslation work of the *Baoji* collection remains a mystery to us.

witnesses is not intended here. In this summary, besides the sources I refer to in my notes, I mainly consulted Zacchetti's study of the Chinese witnesses of the *Guangzan jing* (2005, 79−140), and the comprehensive study of Chinese canons provided by Li Fuhua and He Mei (2003).

Manuscripts

1. Dunhuang Manuscript

A fragmentary manuscript of the first *juan* of the *JJTZH* is now held in the Anding Museum 安定博物館 (cataloged as Dingbo001 [定博〇〇一]), an ancillary museum of the Dingxi Museum 定西博物馆. This fragment was photographed and published along with other Dunhuang manuscripts kept in Gansu Province in 1999.[38] It is believed to be the only Dunhuang manuscript of this translation.[39]

Judging from the photos, the content on this incomplete scroll corresponds to T. 310, 83b15−84a22. Unfortunately, due to the carelessness of the editors of the *Gansu cang dunhuang wenxian*, six lines of the scroll were left out when it was photographed. To compensate for this mistake, the editors gave a transcription of the missing lines (Duan 1999, 369). The bottom of the manuscript was slightly damaged; nevertheless, the characters are overall legible.[40]

As the colophon of this manuscript has not survived, its date or scribe(s) are also not known; also, we cannot determine whether this manuscript was written down as a part of the *Baoji* collection. Considering its script style (Kaiti 楷體) and the number of characters on each page (28 lines per page, 17 characters per line), although we do not know for certain, this manuscript was most possibly produced during the Tang Dynasty (cf. Zhang 2013, 614−643). This manuscript, together with other Dunhuang manuscripts kept in the Dingxi Museum, was donated by Guo Jieshan 郭傑山 and Kang Xijin 康錫晉 (Zheng 2011, 24; Duan 1999, 3). However, no further information about the circumstances of its discovery is known. The manuscript is collated for my Chinese edition; we find no significant variants within the few surviving lines.[41]

2. Shōgozō Manuscripts 聖語藏

[38] For the pictures of this manuscript, see Duan Wenjie, ed., *Gansu cang dunhuang wenxian* 甘肅藏敦煌文獻 VI, Lanzhou: Gansu renmin chubanshe, 1999, 287−288. For the description of the manuscript, see ibid., 369.

[39] See Zheng 2011, 23. For a catalog of Dunhuang manuscripts of works included in the *Baoji* collection, see the catalog compiled by the Dunhuang yanjiuyuan 敦煌研究院 (2000); for the text in question, see p. 29. In addition, a reference to this text (together with other works of the *Baoji* collection) is found in Pelliot 3017, see Campany 2023, 226, n. 16.

[40] According to Duan (1999, 369), the damage was caused by a slight burn, whereas Qiu (2014, 13) claims that the bottom was stained with ink.

[41] One quite significant variant is found in the transcription of the lines that are missing in the photograph, recorded by the editors of the *Gansu cang dunhuang wenxian*: what reads 若見數座經行 (T. 310, 83c10−5) in most witnesses reads 若菩薩數座經行 in this manuscript. However, since we do not possess the photos of these lines, we cannot verify this reading.

The manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth *juan* of the *Baoji* section are included in the so-called "May First" canon ("Gogatsu tsuitachi kyō" 五月一日経) of the Shōgozō 聖語藏, now kept in the Shōsō-in 正倉院 of the Tōdai-ji 東大寺 in Nara. The manuscripts are also known by the time period during which they were produced: Tenpyō-shakyō 天平寫經 (i.e., Tenpyō manuscripts). More precisely, the manuscripts can be dated to the first day of the fifth month (hence, "May First" canon) in the twelfth year of the Tenpyō period (740).[42] As the exact date of the Dunhuang manuscripts cannot be ascertained, these manuscripts of the Shōgozō may be the earliest witness of the *JJTZH*. The photos of the manuscripts in question are now available in the form of CD-ROM.[43]

This edition was manually collated for my edition. Though the Taishō editors also collated variants from these manuscripts, their collation is not exhaustive. The manuscripts of the *JJTZH* included in this canon seem to have an extremely close relationship with the Imperial Palace edition: out of the 31 instances in which the Shōgozō reads differently from the Korean edition, 19 times it agrees with the Imperial Palace edition; in addition, it has unique readings that can be interpreted as corruptions or graphic variants.

In addition, according to Yamashita (2000, 49−50), there is a two-*juan* manuscript titled *Pusa meng jing* preserved as a part of the scriptures "not included in the canon" (*buruzang* 不入藏; ibid., 46) of the *Gogatsu tsuitachi kyō*, which was written before the year 741. Unfortunately, this manuscript is currently inaccessible to us. For more information about the surviving manuscripts of the *Pusa meng jing* as a scripture that is "not included in the canon" preserved in Japan, see my discussion of the Nanatsu-dera manuscripts below.

3. Other Old Buddhist Manuscripts in Japanese Collections

According to *A Concordance of Eight Buddhist Manuscript Canons Extant in Japan*[44] and its corresponding database, besides the Shōgozō, there are at least seven other old manuscripts of the *JJTZH* as a part of the *Baoji* Collection that have survived in Japan. Although none of them is accessible to us, we can preview the head of the two *juan* in question in Kongō-ji 金剛寺 (copied in the early Kamakura period)[45] and that of the

[42] For a catalog of the *Gogatsu tsuitachi kyō*, see *Tenpyō jūninen gogatsu tsuitachi gogankyō* 天平十二年五月一日御願經, edited by Nara teishitsu hakubutsukan 奈良帝室博物館 in 1930. For the *Baoji* collection (No. 182), see p. 25. For an overview of this collection, see Iida Takehiko 2011, 77−116, esp. 89−111.

[43] See *Tenpyō jūninen gogankyō 2: Dai hōshaku kyō* 天平十二年御願經二:大宝積経 (CD no. 58−62; vols. 638−682), in: Kunaichō shōsōin jimusho 宮内庁正倉院事務所 (ed.), *Kunaichō shōsōin jimusho shozō shōgozō kyōkan* 宮内庁正倉院事務所所蔵聖語蔵経巻, Tokyo: Maruzen, 2001. The *JJTZH* is located in CD no. 59.

[44] http://www.icabs.ac.jp/frontia/Hachishu.pdf.

[45] For the photos of the fifteenth and sixteenth *juan*, see https://koshakyo-database.icabs.ac.jp/resources/viewer/958; https://koshakyo-database.icabs.ac.jp/resources/viewer/959; for their description and date, see https://koshakyo-database.icabs.ac.jp/collations/show/5488; https://koshakyo-database.icabs.ac.jp/collations/show/5489.

sixteenth *juan* in Nanatsu-dera 七寺[46] (copied between 1175 and 1180).[47] From the few lines available to us, we can spot a few variants.[48] But needless to say, it is impossible to draw any substantial conclusion from them. There is nothing worth noting concerning the colophons of both manuscripts either (the Nanatsu-dera one left out the character "護" in 竺法護).

In addition to the manuscripts of the *JJTZH* as a part of the *Baoji* collection, Nanatsu-dera preserves a two-*juan* manuscript under the title *Pusa meng jing*—the "original" title of the text (No. 1245-01, 1245-02). Although the photos of this manuscript are not accessible to us, according to Ochiai's transcription (1994, 461), its colophon reads "the manuscripts were checked against the scripture preserved at the Hosshōji 法勝本 at Kiyomizu-dera 清水寺 by Enkei 圓慶" (於清水寺以法勝本一交了 圓慶), which allows us to date these to around the third year in Jishō's 治承 reign (1179), based on relevant manuscripts checked by Enkei (ibid, 460−462).

This witness, judging by its title *Pusa meng jing*, is supposedly based on a version before the text's change in the title. The *Pusa meng jing*—if we consider it as a separate version from the *JJTZH*—is listed under the "catalog of scriptures not included in the canon" (*buruzang mulu* 不入藏目錄) in the *Da Tang zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 大唐貞元新定釋教目錄 and catalogs following it (T. 2157, 1046b4; Ochiai 1999, 758). It is excluded from the canon as the *Pusa meng jing* is considered a repetition of the *JJTZH*, which is included in the *Baoji* collection.[49] Similarly, all the other old translations that were later incorporated into the *Baoji* collection are listed under the "catalog of scriptures not included in the canon" in the *Zhenyuan lu*, and most of the scriptures that belong to this category had been considered lost. Fortunately, the *Pusa meng jing* is witnessed by the manuscripts preserved as a part of the Nanatsu-dera canon, as well as the abovementioned "May First" canon. However, none of these manuscripts of the *Pusa meng jing* is currently accessible to us.[50] Although we cannot examine the

[46] For the preview, see https://koshakyo-database.icabs.ac.jp/resources/viewer/4506.

[47] For the dating of the Nanatsu-dera manuscripts, see Ochiai 1991, 22. Some manuscripts preserved in Nanatsu-dera are based on early manuscripts that were brought from China before the year 734 (ibid., 14), and thus contain valuable texts and readings that are "no longer transmitted after the composition of the standard-setting *Kaiyuan Shijiao Lu* 開元釋教録 and the printed Song canon" (Hubbard 1991, 403). However, the exact amount of such manuscripts is unclear.

[48] For example, in terms of the readings of the beginning lines of the sixteenth *juan*, in one case, the Kongō-ji and Nanatsu-dera manuscripts read "若夢被繫在死尸中," agreeing with the readings of the Taishō, Jin and Fangshan editions, but different from the Sixi, Qisha, Shōgozō, and Chongning; in another case, the Kongō-ji and Nanatsu-dera manuscripts read "親理," same as the Sixi, Shōgozō, and Chongning, different from the other versions in examination.

[49] Evidently, the *Pusa meng jing* is not included in any surviving printed canons. Also, although the Nanatsu-dera *issaikyō* appears to be arranged in a pattern similar to the Tōji *issaikyō* 東寺一切経 catalog (Ochiai 1991, 15), the Tōji *issaikyō* catalog makes it clear that the sūtras that are considered as repetitions of those included in the *Baoji* collection are excluded (Ochiai 1994, 442−443). It is not known why the Nanatsu-dera *issaikyō* had included them. Although there are some records of writing and preserving activities of the sūtras that fall into the category of "scriptures not included in the canon" in Japan (Ochiai 1999, 763−771), few manuscripts are available to us today.

[50] According to Ikuma's study (2020) on the two Nanatsu-dera manuscripts of the *Miji jin'gang lishi jing* (密迹金剛力士經; T. 310 [3]; *Tathāgatācintyaguhya-nirdeśa*) that belong to the category of "scriptures not included in the canon," there are some significant variants in comparison with the version included in the printed canons.

manuscripts of the *Pusa meng jing*, the existence of this version in old Buddhist manuscripts in Japanese collections confirms that the *Pusa meng jing* continued to circulate in Japan until the twelfth century or later.

Stone Canon

Fangshan Stone Scriptures 房山石經

The *JJTZH* is included in the Fangshan stone scriptures as the fourth sūtra of the *Baoji* collection. According to its colophon, the Fangshan inscription of the *JJTZH* was carved in the sixth month of the year 11 of the Chongxi 重熙 era, Liao Dynasty (1042), under the supervision of Liu Xiang 劉湘.[51] Due to weathering and erosion, some characters, especially those near the verges of each stone panel, are illegible.

Evidenced by the catalog of the Fangshan Stones Scriptures carved in the Liao Dynasty, this witness of the *JJTZH* is representative of the Khitan canon—a distinct lineage of the printed Chinese canons (Li and He 2003, 146−151; see below). This edition is collated in the *Zhonghua dazang jing* edition 中華大藏經 (hereafter, Zhonghua edition; see below), but not exhaustively. I collate the variants manually for my edition.

Woodblock Printed Editions

Below I present the premodern woodblock printed editions in four systems on the basis of their content, structure, and format following Wu Jiang's summary of previous studies (2016, 22−24).[52] In addition, I will add a few comments on two important modern editions.

Kaibao 開寶 Lineage

This lineage is based on the earliest printed edition of the complete Chinese canon—a project that began during the Kaibao era of the Northern Song (968−975) and is hence known as the Kaibao edition. Few editions of this lineage have survived today.

1. Zhaocheng Jin Edition 趙城金藏

One of the earliest surviving woodblock printed canons is the Zhaocheng Jin edition, found in Guangsheng Temple 廣勝寺, Shanxi Province. Based on the Kaibao edition,

Considering this, studies of similar witnesses of "scriptures not included in the canon" such as the *Pusa meng jing* should also be promising.

[51] The rubbings of the Fangshan Stone Scriptures are published in *Fangshan shijing* 房山石經, Beijing: Zhongguo fojiao xiehui, 2000. The *JJTZH* is found in vol. XIII, pp. 85−96; its colophon is at the end of the text (ibid., 96).

[52] Previously, most scholars follow the three-systems classification of Chinese printed canons, in which the Ming and Qing editions are considered to belong to a subcategory under the Southern tradition (Zacchetti 2005, 93−95). However, as the Yongle Southern edition made some significant structural change, which was followed by later canons, a fourth lineage—Ming and Qing editions—was proposed (Wu 2016, 23).

this editing project was accomplished in 1173 (Li and He 2003, 97). The *JJTZH* of this edition was reproduced in the abovementioned Zhonghua edition, along with collation notes from eight other editions added by the modern editors (for the details, see below). These two *juan* are also available online on the website of the National Library of China.[53]

2. Second Edition of the Korean (Koryŏ) Canon 再雕高麗藏

Unfortunately, the complete *Baoji* collection of the first edition of the Korean canon preserved in Nanzen-ji 南禪寺 has not survived. The two *juan* of the *JJTZH* are among the lost texts.[54]

The second edition of the Korean Canon was printed in the thirteenth century. The whole *Baoji* collection (catalogued as K. 22) was carved between 1239 to 1241.[55] This edition is made available by modern reprintings[56] and by the Tripitaka Koreana Database.[57] It serves as the base text of the Taishō edition (Zacchetti 2016b, 86), and is collated in the Zhonghua edition.

The Northern Tradition (Based on the Khitan Edition)

The complete Liao edition 遼藏, or Khitan edition 契丹藏, is no longer extant, and the volumes that survived in Yingxian 應縣, Shanxi Province do not include any texts of the *Baoji* collection. However, since the texts in the Fangshan Stone Scriptures carved during the Liao and Jin Dynasties are essentially based on the Liao edition (Li and He 2003, 127−160), to which the *JJTZH* belongs, we will use the Fangshan edition to represent this lineage.

The Southern Tradition (Based on the Chongning 崇寧 Edition)

1. Imperial Palace Edition 宮內藏

The *Baoji* collection included in a canon now preserved in the Imperial Palace of Japan, according to its catalog,[58] is representative of the Chongning edition, alias Dongchan-si 東禪寺 edition. The woodblocks of this edition were carved from 1080 to 1112 (ibid., 179). This edition is collated in the Taishō edition. I also collate variants

[53] http://read.nlc.cn/OutOpenBook/OpenObjectBook?aid=892&bid=196916.0; http://read.nlc.cn/OutOpenBook/OpenObjectBook?aid=892&bid=196960.0; The current online *Zhaocheng jin zang* also includes some fragmentary Ming Dynasty manuscripts of the *Baoji* collection found in Shanxi along with the Jin canon, but they are of minor importance. These two *juan* of *JJTZH* are only preserved as woodblock edition.

[54] See the Tripitaka Koreana Database; unfortunately, the website (http://kb.sutra.re.kr/ritk/) is not accessible at the moment.

[55] See the catalog of the Korean canon compiled by Lancaster and Park (2004): http://www.acmuller.net/descriptive_catalogue/files/k0022.html.

[56] For the text in question, see *Gaoli dazang jing* 高麗大藏經, Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2004, X: 255−270.

[57] http://www.sutra.re.kr/. However, as stated above, the website is currently down.

[58] We know the *Baoji* collection preserved here is representative of the Chongning edition for it bears the seal of the Dongchan dazang 東禪大藏, see the catalog in *Zushoryō Kanseki zenpon shomoku* 圖書寮漢籍善本書目 1930, IX: 4.

manually for my edition. The photos of this edition are now made available online by the Keio Institute of Oriental Classics.[59]

2. Sixi Edition 思溪藏

The Sixi edition, alias Zifu edition 資福藏, was produced starting from the year 1126 of the Northern Song and finished during the Southern Song (ibid., 223−236). This edition was consulted by both the Zhonghua and Taishō editions. The photos of a set of this edition preserved in the National Library of China are now available online.[60] However, the *JJTZH* in the available copy is incomplete: some lines were handwritten instead of printed; some lines are missing (for details, see my edition). I manually collate the readings of this edition.

3. Qisha Edition 磧砂藏

The exact dating of this edition remains unsettled; the project started in 1216 and finished around 1322, that is, from the late Song to Yuan (Chia 2016, 181−182). Two modern reproductions (published in Beijing [2004] and Taipei [1987]) are available, both based on one set of this edition discovered in Shaanxi province in 1931.[61]

This edition is collated in the Zhonghua edition but not in the Taishō since the compilation of the Taishō took place prior to its discovery. Because this edition "played a transitional role in continuing this southern tradition from the Song and Yuan to the Ming and Qing" (Wu 2016, 46), I also collate readings from this edition.

4. Puning Edition 普寧藏

The Puning edition was carved within fourteen years during the Yuan Dynasty (1277−1290) and is known for its improved collation notes and phonetic explanations (Li and He 2003, 319−329). However, as there is no complete set available to us, we can only rely on the collation notes in the Taishō and Zhonghua editions.

5. Chuke Southern Edition 初刻南藏

This edition was previously referred to as Hongwu Southern edition 洪武南藏 as it was incorrectly assumed to have been completed in the Hongwu era. This project in fact started in 1399 and finished in 1402, and it is basically a reprint of the Qisha edition with some new editorial notes (ibid., 375−390). The complete set, preserved in Chongzhou 崇州, Sichuan, was only discovered in 1934, and reprinted in 1999.[62] Due to its late discovery, this edition is rarely consulted by the modern editions. As it is essentially based on the Qisha edition, I do not collate its readings for my edition.

---

[59] https://db2.sido.keio.ac.jp/kanseki/T_bib_frame.php?id=007075.

[60] http://mylib.nlc.cn/web/guest/search/shanbenjiaojuan/medaDataObjectDisplay?metaData.id=6480362&metaData.lId=3717723&IdLib=402834c3409540be0141aa7d72035310; http://mylib.nlc.cn/web/guest/search/shanbenjiaojuan/medaDataObjectDisplay?metaData.id=6480363&metaData.lId=3717724&IdLib=402834c3409540be0141aa7d72035310.

[61] For the *JJTZH*, see *Yingyin Songyuanban qisha dazang jing* 影印宋元版磧砂大藏經, Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2004, XV: 501−525.

[62] For the *JJTZH*, see *Hongwu nan zang* 洪武南藏, Chengdu: Sichuan fojiao xiehui, 1999, XXVII: 1−39.

Ming and Qing Editions

Although this lineage of editions is innovative in terms of its structure, as they do not provide any valuable variant readings,[63] I do not consult any of the following for my edition.

1. Yongle Southern Edition 永樂南藏

This canon, carved from 1413 to 1420, is known for its structural change. Its content, however, basically follows the previous editions (Li and He 2003, 406−429). A complete set preserved in the Shandong Province Library is now available online.[64] This edition is consulted in the Zhonghua edition.

2. Yongle Northern Edition 永樂北藏

This edition follows the Southern one closely, especially in terms of its time. The main part of it was carved from 1419 to 1440. Since the emperor himself was very concerned with the carving of this canon, it is said to have an excellent quality. Besides the modification of its catalog, the content was edited a total of seven times (ibid., 434−43; 449−57). This edition was reprinted in 2000 and 2008 in Beijing.[65]

3. Jiaxing Edition 嘉興藏

The Jiaxing edition, alias Jingshan edition 徑山藏, or Wanli edition 萬曆藏, or simply the Ming edition as in Taishō, is based on the Yongle Northern edition. Its carving started in 1589 and was only completed in 1711 (ibid., 478−508). Both the Zhonghua and Taishō consult this edition. This edition is now available in many forms: two reproductions were published in Taipei (1987) and Beijing (2008), and the Library of Tokyo University has released an online version of the set preserved there.[66]

4. Qing Dragon Edition 清龍藏

This edition is also known as the Qianlong edition 乾隆藏 for it was accomplished in the third year of the reign of Emperor Qianlong (1738). Its catalog and content essentially follow the Yongle Northern edition (ibid., 509−527) and it was reprinted many times.[67] This edition is collated in the Zhonghua edition.

Modern Editions

1. Taishō Edition 大正新修大藏經

[63] For an illustration of the fact that these witnesses hardly provide any helpful readings for a critical edition regarding the *Guangzan jing*, see Zacchetti 2005, 129−132.

[64] http://124.133.52.158:8056/jpath/reader/reader.shtml?channel=100&code=8c587632d08ed6d2a29fb22bf7e53e77&cpage=1&epage=26&ipinside=1&netuser=1&spage=1&ssno=11184711; http://124.133.52.158:8056/jpath/reader/reader.shtml?channel=100&code=a850c868cd7f50263bbe82e06d576a34&cpage=1&epage=28&ipinside=1&netuser=1&spage=1&ssno=11184811.

[65] For the *JJTZH*, see *Yongle bei zang* 永樂北藏, Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2000, IXX: 345−389.

[66] For the text in question, see https://dzkimgs.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/utlib_kakouzou/024_5/0081?bxbk=024_5&pg=0081; https://dzkimgs.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/utlib_kakouzou/025_1/0002?bxbk=025_1&pg=0002.

[67] For the *JJTZH*, see *Qianlong dazang jing* 乾隆大藏经, Beijing: Zhongguo shudian, 2010, XVII: 231−261.

This Japanese edition, compiled from 1924 to 1932 by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭, and others, is revolutionary in terms of its structure, format, collation, index, and punctuation. This edition is indirectly based on the second Korean edition, and subsequently became the standard version to refer to in terms of Chinese Buddhist texts for scholarly research around the world (ibid., 612−626; Wilkinson 2016, 295−296). In my research, I also follow this convention while being cautious about the imperfections of this canon.

The digitalized Taishō is available in several databases, most prominently, in the database developed by the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Texts Association (CBETA) project in Taiwan[68] and the SAT Daizōkyō Text Database in Japan.[69]

2. Zhonghua Dazang Jing 中華大藏經

There is more than one modern edition called *Zhonghua dazang jing*. The Taipei edition (mid-1950s to late 1970s), uses the sources mainly from the Qisha, Jiaxing, and Japanese Manji editions (Li and He 2003, 576−584). The Beijing edition, as discussed above, provides the original images from the Zhaocheng Jin edition (when available) and collation notes based on eight other editions, namely, the second Korean, Fangshan, Sixi, Qisha, Puning, Yongle Southern, Jiaxing, and Qing Dragon editions.[70] The editor-in-chief, Ren Jiyu (2005), has briefly remarked on their general editorial principle. Accordingly, the above eight canons are chosen because they are "representative," but Ren does not go into details. Ren also clarifies that the aim of their collation is not to make a "critical edition" but to present readers with an overview of the variations and leave the decision to the readers. Based on a comparison with my own direct examination of some sources, their collation notes are not exhaustive.

[68] The Chinese Buddhist Electronic Texts Association (CBETA), based in Taiwan, has been working on digitalizing the complete Taishō canon and other supplementary materials for several decades. Besides the digitalized texts, this database also provides readers with functions including advanced search, etc. Also, this database allows readers to view the glyph of rare Chinese characters by using both the picture of the character in question in the Taishō edition and its closest variant encoded in Unicode. For a detailed introduction to this project, see Tu (2015, 321−335). Since the goal of CBETA is to provide modern readers an accessible digitalized Buddhist canon, this project has modified many readings and added modern punctuation to the original text of the Taishō canon, which, in fact, created many new readings and new problems. For their online version of the *JJTZH*, see https://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T11n0310_015, https://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T11n0310_016.

[69] The SAT Daizōkyo Text Database, based in Japan, provides a digitalized version of the Taishō canon in terms of both its texts and photos. In addition, it also supplies readers with various useful tools such as search, cite, digital dictionaries, word frequency analysis, parallel texts finder, links to the other databases, etc. The input of SAT is "cleaner" than the CBETA one; without too many editing traces, it presents readers the original content of the Taishō in a digitalized way. However, some research tools developed by this database, including the citing function, do not work well. For the *Baoji* collection, see https://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT2018/master30.php.

[70] For the *JJTZH* and the collation notes, see *Zhonghua dazing jing* (*hanwen bufen*) 中華大藏經 (漢文部分), Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985, XIII: 524−542.

3. Early Citations and Indirect Impact on Chinese Buddhist Literature

The *JJTZH* does not seem to be influential in the context of Chinese Buddhism. Aside from the historical records that I have examined, other external evidence of the *JJTZH* such as its citation or discussion is close to non-existent in surviving Chinese materials. Further, there appears to be no evidence of any indirect impact that the *JJTZH* may have made on later Chinese translations, apocrypha, or, anthologies.[71] Therefore, although we cannot say for certain, this, together with the fact that only one Dunhuang manuscript of the *JJTZH* has been passed down to us, seems to suggest that the *JJTZH* was of marginal importance in the Buddhist tradition in China.[72] In addition, almost all the later quotations present the text as a part of the *Baoji* collection; in other words, there is scarce interest in the sūtra itself.

One outline of the text can be found under the *Baoji* section in the *Yuezang zhijin* 閱藏知津, a comprehensive summary of canonical texts composed by Ouyi Zhixu (藕益智旭; 1599−1655) in the late Ming Dynasty.[73] The outline reads as follows:

> When the Buddha was residing on the Vulture Peak along with sixty thousand great bodhisattvas and monks, after mealtime, he entered concentration, which shook the [great three thousand times] many thousands [of world-realms], and assembled all the deities. After the deity Vajrapramardin made a request for a teaching in verses, the Buddha taught him 108 dream signs of bodhisattvas. [The signs are taught in a way that,] first, by the designation [of the dreams]; then, by the explanations [of each dream]. The verses at the end clarify that the aspiration for awakening is irreversible and the behavior of beings is inconceivable. [After the Buddha preached this teaching,] all sixty thousand deities and humans attained irreversibility; deities and humans of eighteen *nayuta*s aspired for awakening; ten thousand bodhisattvas who were about to regress abandoned their faults and directly ascended to being bound to only one more life, and they would achieve buddhahood simultaneously with Maitreya.[74]

[71] As proposed by Nattier (2022, 17−18), besides direct citations or discussion, "[y]et another indicator of the popularity of a scripture is when parts of it are adopted without acknowledgement—in other words, plagiarized—in apocryphal texts composed in China."

[72] As put by Zacchetti (2005, 67), "the study of the indirect tradition of a text (i.e., of its quotation in other texts) is generally a good barometer of its circulation and influence, and the same holds true, to a certain extent, for the extent of its available manuscript tradition."

[73] For the date and purpose of this work, see the autobiography of Ouyi Zhixu in the *Lingfeng Ouyi dashi zizhuan* 靈峰藕益大師自傳 (J. B348). For the life, works, and influence of Ouyi Zhixu, see McGuire 2019.

[74] 佛住耆闍崛山與大菩薩比丘眾六萬人俱，佛於食後入三昧，震動大千，諸天來集。金剛摧天子說偈問法，佛為說菩薩百八夢相。先標，次釋。後偈明菩提心無有退轉，眾生行不可思議。六萬天人，得不退轉；十八那由他天人，發菩提心；十千欲退菩薩，捨除罪過，徑登補處，與彌勒同時成佛。(J. B271, 800b18−24)

In this outline, on the one hand, Ouyi Zhixu only briefly touches upon the topic of this sūtra—dreams; on the other hand, he seems to attach much importance to the ending of this text, in which the benefit of hearing this sūtra is highlighted. In addition, Ouyi Zhixu mistakenly takes Vajrapramardin as a deity instead of a bodhisattva, which may be due to the infrequent appearance of this Vajrapramardin (金剛摧) in Chinese Buddhist materials (see Chapter 1, n. 16).

Another early Chinese source directly referring to the *JJTZH* is the glossary *Yiqie jing yinyi* 一切經音義 (T. 2128, 377a22–b7) compiled by Huilin 慧琳 (737–820). Although the work is of great importance for linguistic studies of Chinese Buddhist literature, for the purpose of this study, there is not much to be noted here.

Finally, there appear to be no Chinese apocryphal scriptures or anthologies that directly borrowed from the *JJTZH* (cf., in the way that Chinese apocryphal scriptures such as the *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 borrowed from the *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經; see Nattier 2007, 135–137). Although we do see several fifth-century Chinese apocryphal works sharing similar ideas on visions as confirmations for spiritual achievement (for instance, the "Contemplation Scriptures" that we have reviewed in Chapter 4), no direct parallel of the *JJTZH*—for example, identical dream and corresponding achievement—can be found. However, it is still possible that there are a few works that had consulted the *JJTZH*. For example, one Chinese apocryphal scripture that was produced no later than the second half of the sixth century and was translated into Tibetan and subsequently entered the Tibetan canon, the *Datong fangguang chanhui miezui zhuangyan chengfo jing* 大通方廣懺悔滅罪莊嚴成佛經 (T. 2871; Tib. [*'phags pa*] *Thar pa chen po phyogs su rgyas pa 'gyod tshangs kyis sdig sbyangs te sangs rgyas su grub par rnam par bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*; D264),[75] shows slightly more similarities with the *JJTZH*. The text claims that "ordinary people" (凡夫)[76] could learn about the elimination of their five sins of immediate retribution (*ānantarya*) through five kinds of dreams. Among the five dreams, the dream of entering a monastery and seeing the image of the Buddha reminds

[75] The Chinese version of this text had been lost for a long time before it was recovered from two early manuscripts. For the textual history of the Chinese version and a summary of its content, see Kuo 1994, 138–141; 1995, 238–239. For the information about its Tibetan version, see Silk 2019, 236–237; Stein 2010, 226, n. 56. See also my note n. 5 in Chapter 5.

[76] The text claims that bodhisattvas know that their sins are being purified through the direct confirmation of the Buddha (T. 2871, 1352c22–1353a15), whereas ordinary people learn about the elimination of the five sins of immediate retribution through dreams. Through this, the text draws a line between bodhisattvas and ordinary people. It seems that, according to the understanding of the compilers of this work, first, bodhisattvas also have lingering bad karma; second, the rituals of eliminating sins for both bodhisattvas and ordinary people seem to be the same, but ordinary people cannot receive a confirmation from the Buddha himself, but only through dreams. It is not certain why it is specified that the sins are "five sins of immediate retribution" when it comes to ordinary people; it perhaps suggests that bodhisattvas are beyond these grave sins.

us of several dreams with similar themes in the *JJTZH* (e.g., Dreams 6, 14, 15, 16).[77] However, as these dream themes are clichéd in Buddhist literature, the coincidences here may not indicate the *JJTZH*'s (at least direct) influence on this popular apocryphal work.

In sum, direct references to and (explicit or implicit) quotations of the *JJTZH* are very few. These few references and quotations, together with the abundant historical records and available witnesses of the *JJTZH*, present us with the whole picture of the textual history of the Chinese translation of the *SvN*.

[77] 凡夫之人，未合真諦，當取夢相。若見一夢，即滅一逆；見此五夢，即滅五逆。是人其夜，夢見自身，欲渡大河，上大橋行，當知是人，定得度脫。其人或時，夢見自身，人與洗浴，天雨其身，當知是人，定得清淨。其人或時，夢見自身，入沙門大會之中，入次而坐，當知是人，真佛弟子。其人或時，夢見自身，入塔寺中，見好大像，及見菩薩，當知是人，得正門已。其人或時，夢見自身，自得菓食而食，當知是人，還得果報 (T. 2871, 1353a15−24). For the corresponding passage in the Tibetan, see D264, *mdo sde, 'a*, 257a1−5.

Appendix II
Textual History and Witnesses of the *rMi lam bstan pa* and Notes on the Edition

1. Historical Background

The historical background of the Tibetan translation of the *SvN*—the *'phags pa rMi lam bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* (abbreviated as *rMi lam bstan pa*, same below)—is obscure. Not much information about it is available to us in the first place.

Below, I will gather all the known facts about the *rMi lam bstan pa* by reviewing the references to it in early catalogs and the colophons of its available witnesses. Next, I will give some additional comments on the compilation of the Tibetan version of the MRK, that is, the *dKon mchog brtsegs pa chen po* collection (abbreviated as *dKon brtsegs* below).

Early Catalogs

All three important early Tibetan catalogs—the lHan kar ma catalog, the 'Phang thang ma catalog, and the catalog of Bu ston—include the *rMi lam bstan pa.*

The oldest known catalog of Tibetan Buddhist texts—the *lHan kar ma*, compiled in the early ninth century[1]—registers the *rMi lam bstan pa* as the fourth text of the *dKon brtsegs* collection. In addition, the only information of the text in question this catalog provides is its length, which is 3 *bam po* and (additionally) 100 *śloka*-units, in total 1000 *śloka*-units (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, 19 §28).[2]

[1] There are many problems of giving an exact date of the compilation of this catalog (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, xvii−xxii). According to Herrmann-Pfandt's view (ibid., xxii), the catalog was finished in the year 812, but remained unfixed approximately before the year 838. In other words, at least one entry was added into this catalog between 812 and 838. Therefore, it is more accurate to date the text to the early ninth century rather than precisely the year 812.

[2] Tib. *ślo ka stong ste / bam po gsum dang / ślo ka brgya* (ibid., 19 §28; see also Lalou 1953, 320). For the term "*śloka*" and its synonym "*sho log*" that appear frequently in catalogs and colophons, see van der Kuijp's discussion (2009) on the length of *bam po* and *śloka*. In the lHan kar ma catalog, one *bam po* consists of roughly 300 *śloka*s. This number concurs with Dung dkar Blo bzang 'phrin las's explanation of these terms, "one *shlo ka*-unit consists of textual matter that is demarcated by eight intermediate dots that separate individual words or, at times, syllables (*bar tsheg*), and that three hundred such units make up one *bam po*" (ibid., 118).

The slightly later catalog,[3] the 'Phang thang ma, also only includes information about its length—3 *bam po*. Curiously, the 'Phang thang ma puts the *rMi lam bstan pa* in the category of Mahāyāna sūtras (*mDo chen po'i tshar la*) instead of the category of the *dKon brtsegs* collection (Kawagoe 2005, 11 [107]). This catalog only includes nine sūtras within the category of the *dKon brtsegs* (ibid., 8, n. 29).

Another early Tibetan catalog, though much later than the above two, is the catalog that Bu ston completed in 1322 as a part of his account of the history of Buddhism (*Bu ston chos 'byung*).[4] The translation in question is included as the fourth text of the *dKon brtsegs*, and its length is 1000 *śloka*-units (Nishioka 1980, 70 [131]).

While the catalogs inform us of the length of the *rMi lam bstan pa* and its position in the *dKon brtsegs* collection, crucial information such as its translators is absent. We will subsequently consult the colophons of its witnesses in the hope of learning more about this Tibetan translation.

Colophons

Before diving into the colophons, it is necessary to briefly introduce the sources and sigla of the witnesses of the *rMi lam bstan pa* in this survey. The details of the witnesses used for my edition will be elaborated below. My study of the Kanjurs and other canonical collections is primarily based on the digitized materials provided by the Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies (rKTs),[5] which is compiled and maintained by the members of the Tibetan Manuscripts Project Vienna (TMPV).[6] I also follow the conventions established by the rKTs in terms of sigla and numbering.

The *rMi lam bstan pa* is witnessed by a large number of Kanjurs and canonical collections.[7] Besides canonical witnesses, according to my knowledge, this text has not survived (or at least has not been identified) in any Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript.[8] Among them, twenty-four versions are (completely or partially) available in scans.[9]

[3] On the dating of this catalogue, see Halkias 2004. While it can be confirmed that the catalogue was compiled in the ninth century and later than the lHan kar ma catalog, the exact time is unknown. It is also noteworthy that the manuscript, "from which our present catalogue was copied, is a post-ninth-century reproduction" (ibid., 78), which means it contains emendations and revisions made after the ninth century.

[4] For a brief introduction to this catalog, see Nishioka 1980, 61.

[5] Visit their website on http://www.rkts.org. Several other projects are also involved, e.g., the BDRC (Buddhist Digital Resource Center; https://www.tbrc.org), the ACIP (Asian Classics Input Project; https://asianclassics.org/preserve/tibetan), the EAP (Endangered Archives Programme) of the British Library (https://eap.bl.uk), and Adarsha of the Dharma Treasure (https://adarsha.dharma-treasure.org).

[6] See their website on https://tmpv.univie.ac.at/.

[7] See the list on the rKTs website: http://www.rkts.org/cat.php?id=48&typ=1; accessed 5 February, 2024.

[8] Although some manuscripts that were clearly written as a part of the *dKon brtsegs* collection have survived, for example, Pelliot tibétain 89 and 90 (see Lalou 1939−1961, I: 29−30), Tibetan documents in the Indian Office collection of the British Library No. 152−153 (La Vallée Poussin 1962, 57−58) none of them contains the *rMi lam bstan pa.* In addition, as far I am aware, no manuscript wuth a title resembling the *rMi lam bstan pa* is found in Dunhuang.

[9] Several witnesses are incomplete; for example, all three versions from the Tabo collection are fragmentary, and the Basgo collection includes three sets of incomplete versions. See my discussion of these witnesses below.

Here, I will examine the witnesses only in terms of their colophons; an elaboration on their typology and characteristics will follow in the next section. The colophons of the *rMi lam bstan pa* vary considerably in terms of format and contents, but there is no conflicting information. In the following part, I will separate them into three groups and translate the representative colophons. As the provisional classifications of Kanjurs (see my introduction to the typology of Kanjurs in the next section) do not always apply to individual texts, for the convenience of discussion, below I will categorize the witnesses of the *rMi lam bstan pa* according to the contents of their colophons.

The colophon of the Derge edition provides relatively little information: "Here ends the fourth chapter from the hundred thousand expositions of the teaching of the Noble Collection of Jewels, 'Teaching on Dreams.'"[10] More detailed is the reference at the beginning of the text:

> *'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i chos kyi rnam grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa las le'u bzhi pa ste / rmi lam bstan pa / bam po dang po / rgya gar skad du / Ar+ya swab+na nir de sha nA ma ma hA yA na sU tra / bod skad du / 'phags pa rmi lam bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo/ /sangs rgyas dang byang chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo/ /* [D 48, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 203b1−2]
>
> The Teaching on Dreams, Chapter 4 of the Noble Dharma Discourse (**dharmaparyāya*) Collection of Jewels in hundred thousand chapters, *bam po* 1st. In Sanskrit, '*Āryasvapnanirdeśa nāma mahāyānasūtra.*' In Tibetan, 'The Noble Teaching on Dreams,' a sūtra of Great Vehicle. Homage to all buddhas and bodhisattvas.

Similar formulae of references and colophons are seen in other Kanjurs of the Tshal pa group with only minor variations (mostly in the transliteration of the Sanskrit title)[11] such as the Lithang (J303, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 235b6−8; 276a2) and the Cone (C1029[4], *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 234a7−234b2; 271b5−6). In addition, the references and colophons in the Phugbrag (F35, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 296a6−296b1; 346b2−3), the Shey (Z36, *dkon brtsegs*, *ka*, 281b8−282a3; 330b6−7), and the London Kanjur (L643[04], *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 239b3−5; 279b4−5) are also closer to those of the Tshal pa group in this respect. Note that the latter two are generally considered as Kanjurs of the Them spangs ma

[10] Tib. *'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i chos kyi rnam grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa las rmi lam bstan pa'i le'u zhes bya ba ste bzhi pa rdzogs so*/ / D48, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 237a7. The Derge is inconsistent in terms of whether its colophons include information on translators; for example, the translator information is given in the colophon of the *De bzhin gshegs pa'i gsang ba bsam gyis mi khyab bstan pa* (see D47, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 203a7)—the third sūtra of the *dKon brtsegs*.

[11] The references and colophons of the two Kanjurs that are primarily based on the Derge edition (Han 2020, 103−104)—the Ragya (R48, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 203b1−2; 237a7) and the Urga (U48, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 203b1−2; 237a7)—are almost identical to that of the Derge, besides the obvious corruptions or errors.

group but they were evidently influenced by a particular Western Tibetan tradition (Tauscher and Lainé 2008, 355)—which showcases the prevalent contamination of Kanjurs. These colophons inform us of the Sanskrit and Tibetan titles of the *rMi lam bstan pa*, and its position in the *dKon brtsegs*. However, as in the case of the early catalogs, one crucial piece of information—translators of this text—is absent.

More detailed information about the *rMi lam bstan pa*, including its translators and length, can be found in the colophons in the Ulaanbaatar and Stog Kanjurs (S11.04, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 363a5−7) of the Them spangs ma group, the Narthang Kanjur (N35, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 394a5−7), and the canonical collection from Gondhla (Go04, 04, *Ka-Na*, 24a6−7). According to the Ulaanbaatar:

> *'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i chos kyi rnam grangs stong phrag brgya pa las rmi lam bstan pa'i le'u zhes bya ste / 'dus pa bzhi pa rdzogs so / sho log dgu brgya / bam po gsum pa / rgya gar gyi mkhan po prad nyA bar ma dang / zhu chen gyi lo ts+tsha ba ban d+he ye shes sde la sogs pas bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa/* [V35, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 318b3−5]
>
> Here ends the chapter called 'Teaching on Dreams' as the fourth section (*'dus pa*)[12] of the hundred thousand (expositions of) the teaching of the Noble Collection of Jewels. (This chapter has) 900 *śloka*-units, (which is) three *bam po*s. It was translated, revised, and edited by the Indian master Prajñāvarman and the great reviser and translator Venerable Ye shes sde.

In addition to this information, the Stog Kanjur adds that "it was also edited in conformity with the decision relative to the new terminology."[13] Note that the length of the *rMi lam bstan pa* in terms of *śloka*-units according to these colophons disagrees with the catalogs that we have reviewed above; according to the lHan kar ma catalog and the catalog of Bu ston, it has 1000 *śloka*-units instead of 900.[14]

---

[12] The "*'dus pa*" here is a direct translation of Chinese *hui* (會), indicating that the *dKon brtsegs* collection is modeled after the Chinese *Da baoji jing*, in which each sūtra is considered a "section" (會); see Silk and Nagao 2022, 677, as well as Apple 2017, 209. This colophon also interchangeably refers to each sūtra as a "*le'u*," which is generally a rendition of Sanskrit "*parivarta*" (Silk and Nagao 2022, 679). To differentiate the two terms, I translate "*'dus pa*" as "section" and "*le'u*" as "chapter."

[13] Tib. *slar skad gsar bcad kyis bcos nas gtan la phab pa'o /* S11(04), *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 363a7. Here, I follow Hill's translation of this stock sentence (2015, 918). For more information about the so-called "new terminology" (*skad gsar bcad*), see ibid., 918−919.

[14] It is hard to conclude which number of *śloka*-units of the *rMi lam bstan pa* is "correct" as the numerical value of a *śloka*-unit—unlike the Indic use of this term which generally refers to *anuṣṭubh* verse consists of 32 *akṣara* or syllables—does not seem to be fixed (van der Kuijp 2009, 118). Herrmann-Pfandt has calculated the number of *śloka*s per folio for each text using the numbers of *śloka* provided by the lHan kar ma catalog and the folio numbers of corresponding texts in the Derge edition. According to her, the number of *śloka*s per Derge folio is usually between 20 to 30 (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, lxv). Using this method, the *śloka*/folio ratio of the *rMi lam bstan pa* is 29.85 (ibid, 19) when the length is of 1000 *śloka*-units, as per the lHan kar ma catalog. If we calculate the *śloka*/folio ratio according to the colophon and folios of the Ulaanbaatar edition, the number will be 19.6. It is unknown what is implied by this conflicting information. We may suspect that the difference in the claimed *śloka*-units between the

The last group of colophons is briefer. The colophon of the Lhasa Kanjur (H48, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 367a2−4) and one surviving in the Tabo collection (Ta1.3.3.4 [RN250] *Ka-Na*, 66b5−6) include information about its translators but no mention of the length.

In sum, all the available colophons of the *rMi lam bstan pa* agree about the text's Sanskrit and Tibetan names, and its position in the *dKon brtsegs*. When information on translators is included, the colophons invariably attribute the text to Prajñāvarman and Ye shes sde. Its length is said to be three *bam po*s or 900 *śloka*-units.

The above colophons, while providing us with consistent information about this translation, as a matter of fact barely help us with the understanding of the textual history of the *rMi lam bstan pa* since we do not know much about the translators in question and their translation process. It is even questionable how reliable the attributions are, as the corpus credited to Ye shes sde is enormous (in total 347 works ascribed to him, see Rhaldi 2002, 21−34).[15] In terms of the textual history of the *rMi lam bstan pa*, what can be ascertained from the above record is only one fact: the translation should have been made at the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth based on the fact that it predates the lHan kar ma catalog, and—if we accept such attribution—the dating of the translators (ibid., 20−21).

Moreover, regarding the work's position in the *dKon brtsegs* collection, judging from the current evidence, all the colophons and two out of the three important early catalogs consider the *rMi lam bstan pa* a "chapter" (*le'u*) integral to the *dKon brtsegs*, and the earliest evidence, i.e., lHan kar ma catalog, already registers it as one of the forty-nine titles under the *dKon brtsegs* (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, 19).[16] However, since the 'Phang thang ma catalog arranges this translation under the category of Mahāyāna sūtras instead of the *dKon brtsegs*, Herrmann-Pfandt (ibid., xl) suspects that the *lHan kar ma*, despite its supposedly earlier compilation date, represents a rather later development in terms of the arrangement of the *dKon brtsegs*—a change that was possibly made in the later revision of this catalog.[17] In other words, it is also possible

catalogs and the Kanjurs originated in the change of the content of the actual text. However, first of all, besides this minor variation in the length of the text, there is no evidence that would lead us to believe any substantial change (such as deletions of passages, as the number of *śloka*s is smaller in the colophons) in terms of the content of the *rMi lam bstan pa* had taken place after the compilation of the early catalogs. Moreover, according to van der Kuijp's survey (2009, 121−122), it is not uncommon to find differences in the *bam po* and *śloka* numbers registered in the early catalogs and the printed canons of a certain text as "the *bam po* unit primarily involves the number of *shlo ka* occupied by a portion of a text and [its] length can be variable" (ibid., 124). Per the accounts of Tibetan authors, a *bam po* is either made up of one third of a thousand *śloka*s or three hundred *śloka*s (ibid., 122−125). In our case, the length of a *bam po* according to the Kanjur colophons is three hundred *śloka*-units whereas that of the catalogs is one third of a thousand *śloka*-units—both are within the normal range. It is therefore more likely that the different accounts of the length of *rMi lam bstan pa* indicate different definitions of these units due to complex socio-historical context such as economic factors (ibid., 132).

[15] On this question, see also n. 13 in Chapter 1.

[16] It is noteworthy here that, although the lHan kar ma catalog claims that there are forty-nine chapters in the *dKon brtsegs* (Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, 18), it in fact omits one title, that is, the forty-sixth text of the "standard" *dKon brtsegs* collection (D90), which makes its total number forty-eight.

[17] For more discussion on the lHan kar ma catalog in relationship with the *dKon brtsegs* collection, see Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, xxxix−xl; Pagel 1995, 154; Alekseev 2021, 124; Li 2024 (forthcoming).

that the *rMi lam bstan pa* was not translated, or treated, as a part of the *dKon brtsegs* collection in the early stage.

In relation to the issue of the compilation of the *dKon brtsegs* collection, it is worth noting that although the lHan kar ma catalog is likely modeled on the MRK collection after its Chinese version, and all the extant witnesses of the Kanjurs invariably provide each text with a section number in conformity with that of the *Da baoji jing*, many scholars have noticed some irregularities in the witnesses of the *dKon brtsegs* in terms of its arrangement (Tauscher 2008, xxiv). Such peculiarities are not infrequent. Lalou noted the non-standard sequences of its chapters in the Peking printed Kanjur and the Berlin manuscript Kanjur already in 1927.[18] More recently, Lainé (2009, 10−12) noted that the positions of the standard 12th and 15th texts of the collection switch in the Zhey and London Kanjurs of the Them spangs ma lineage, and the Tholing, Gondhla, and Phukthar collections.[19] In addition, the surviving fragments of the *dKon brtsegs* included in the Tabo collection also show some "recurrent peculiarities, chiefly that whole texts are often omitted from the collection, and that texts are not always copied in their standard sequence" (Harrison 2009, xxxiii). There is even a text (i.e., the **Dārikāvimalaśraddhā-paripṛcchā*) that had not been translated during the time when some of the Tabo manuscripts were copied (ibid, xxxiv). Although all those irregularities have no direct relationship with the *rMi lam bstan pa,* I bring them into the discussion since first, we should note that while the *dKon brtsegs* does not remain unchanged within all the witnesses, the *rMi lam bstan pa* is a relatively stable block of this collection; secondly, the particularities of the *dKon brtsegs* give us a glimpse of the possible transmission lineages of the *dKon brtsegs,* that is to say, the differences in its arrangement imply that the canonical collections from Western Tibet may share the same source with some Kanjurs of the Them spangs ma group. We will come back to this issue later.

One final issue to examine related to the *dKon brtsegs* collection is the source languages of the translations included in this collection. Even though the lHan kar ma catalog indicates that none of its chapters was translated from Chinese (i.e., they were all translated from Indic sources; Pagel 1995, 73), the current *dKon brtsegs* collection in fact includes ten texts that were translated from Chinese sources (Silk 2019, 230−231) and as many as 23 texts that may have consulted the old Tibetan translations found in Dunhuang which were based on Chinese sources (Li 2024 [forthcoming]). This may

[18] Lalou (1927, 237−244) has given a detailed survey of the irregularities of the chapter sequences and titles within various witnesses of the *dKon brtsegs*. But due to the limitation of accessible materials at that time, her survey is only restricted to a few Kanjurs and catalogs. Relevant to our discussion here is that Chapters 17, 18, 44 and 45 in the Peking Kanjur and the Berlin manuscript Kanjur are not in their "standard" positions (ibid, 237ss−239).

[19] See also Tauscher (2008, xxiv−xxv), who provides the reason behind this arrangement: "The reason for this re-arrangement is obvious: R[atna]K[ūṭa] 12 (*Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, *Byaṅ chub sems dpa'i sde snod*) is a rather long text, and in order to avoid splitting it over two volumes (as is the case in D[erge] and Q [i.e., Peking]), the shorter R[atna]K[ūṭa] 15 was moved forward, and vol. Ga started with R[atna]K[ūṭa] 12" (ibid, xxiv).

suggest that, as proposed by Pagel (1995, 73), the "Chinese-based *Ratnakūṭa* translations of the *dKon-Brtsegs* we possess today were composed at a later date" (i.e., later than the lHan kar ma catalog) since the previous translations vanished or were not in good shape. But it is also possible that the lHan kar ma catalog somehow did not assign all the Chinese-based translations to the category of translations from Chinese, which is a somewhat common occurrence in this catalog.[20] That being said, per my analysis in Chapter 2, the surviving version of the Tibetan translation of the *SvN* is highly likely to be a translation made from Indic sources, and as far as I am aware, there is no evidence that supports the suspicion that the surviving *rMi lam bstan pa* is different from that attested in the early catalogs.

In sum, judging from the available external evidence and relevant modern scholarship, the *rMi lam bstan pa* was most possibly produced at the beginning of the ninth century or slightly before that date; the length of the text is three *bam po*s; no matter whether it was initially translated as a part of the *dKon brtsegs* collection, in extant witnesses, it invariably occupies the position of its fourth chapter. Due to the absence of translator information in some important sources (the early catalogs and several colophons) and the lack of historical records of the translators to whom the *rMi lam bstan pa* is credited, we cannot ascertain whether its attribution to Prajñāvarman and Ye she sde is authentic and what is implied by this attribution.

2. Witnesses: Transmission Lineages and Observations

As mentioned above, the *rMi lam bstan pa* is witnessed by a large number of Kanjurs and canonical collections and contains three *bam po*s. Considering this, to produce a critical edition of this text, a careful evaluation of the extant witnesses is necessary. In the following, I will first introduce the principle upon which I based my choices of witnesses. Subsequently, I will briefly outline the history and features of the witnesses I consult within the framework of the current understanding of the lineages of Tibetan Kanjurs and canonical collections.

Even though much previous scholarship was dedicated to tracing back the transmission of Tibetan canonical collections, and now the collections are provisionally separated into a few groups, the current classification cannot always truthfully reflect their transmission and relationship. As Tauscher summarizes:

[20] Besides the ten texts from the *dKon brtsegs*, other texts, such as the *'Dus pa chen po las sa'i snying po'i 'khor lo bcu pa*, despite being classified into the category of Mahāyāna sūtras in the lHan kar ma, were actually translated from Chinese sources (Silk 2019, 234). In addition, there are texts that, despite being considered as translated from Chinese in the lHan kar ma catalog, may not be actually translated from Chinese sources (ibid., 240). Therefore, the extant version of the lHan kar ma is not always authoritative on the source language of a certain translation.

> At present, however, it is widely accepted that different lines of canonical transmission are only conceptually indebted to the Old Narthang Kanjur but independent in their actual execution (Skilling, 1997b, 100); no one archetype of the Kanjur ever existed. None of these lines is pure; they show various degrees of interrelation and conflation. […] Each group has its distinctive features in terms of structure, arrangement, and the texts or versions of texts contained. They are, moreover, not homogeneous units. In particular, among the local Kanjurs, some sections might be more closely related to a particular tradition and others to another; that is, some collections may be traced back to diverse sources, as a result of which filiations are complex and not unilinear. (Tauscher 2015, 108)

Indeed, as we have seen when reviewing the colophons of the *rMi lam bstan pa*, the general affiliation and features of each provisional transmissional group do not necessarily apply to individual texts. Considering the prevalence of internal inconsistencies or contamination within the Kanjur traditions (which prevents us from establishing a general stemma of Kanjurs) and that we have not yet reached a full understanding of some newly discovered collections (e.g., Kanjurs of the Mustang/Ladakhi group), we cannot simply base our choices of versions to consult for a critical version on the provisional transmission lineages. Moreover, as the amount of extant Tibetan canonical collection are great, and some versions are notorious for their frequent scribal errors, it is not practical to collate the readings of every extant witness. Therefore, to maximize the chance of including the most original and characteristic readings in the edition and reduce the burden of collating some highly corrupted or contaminated witnesses, we need to determine the key witnesses for this critical edition (Harrison 2024 [forthcoming]).

Fortunately, this crucial work has been carried out by Gregory Forgues under our project "Open Philology," the result of which will be published in "From the Network to the Text: Selecting Key Witnesses across Tibetan Collections of Canonical Texts" (Forgues 2024 [forthcoming]). My choice of witnesses to consult is primarily based on this study. This study combines traditional stemmatic analysis with new advances in digital tools by conducting case studies on the 35th and the 37th texts of the *dKon brtsegs*, i.e., the *Acintyabuddhaviṣaya-nirdeśa* ([*'phags pa*] *Sangs rgyas kyi yul bsam gyis mi khyab pa bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*; D79) and the *Siṃha-paripṛcchā* ([*'phags pa*] *Seng ges zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*; D81), respectively. This study first samples several key passages from these two texts such as the verses, then compares the variant readings and analyzes the variants through digital means. Next, by splitting the variants into two groups—variants that indicate the transmission lineages and accidental variants that do not provide genealogical

information—and examining the correlations between the transmissional variants[21] of each witness, this study determines the key witnesses that best represent each transmission line. As far as these two texts of the *dKon brtsegs* are concerned, the key witnesses can be categorized into five groups, each represents a transmission line; these groups and the key witnesses of each group are as follows:

1) Tshal pa group: Lithang/Peking 1737 (Qianlong Kanjur)
2) Them spangs ma group: Ulaanbaatar/Stog
3) Mustang/Ladakhi group: Basgo/Hemis I
4) Canonical collections from Western Tibet: Tabo/Gondhla/Phuktar
5) Namgyal: Namgyal

For an edition based on this methodology, collating the readings from one witness of each group should allow us to bring the most original or characteristic readings into account. In case it is difficult to determine whether a variant reading is of a transmissional or accidental nature, we can extend the collation to the co-team (i.e., another witness from the same group).

In light of this study, considering that the *dKon brtsegs* collection is generally transmitted as a whole, I also base my critical edition of the *rMi lam bstan pa* on the above key witnesses in principle. Yet as the *rMi lam bstan pa* of the Namgyal collection has not survived, the three versions included in the Tabo collections are fragmentary, and the version in Hemis I is largely damaged, my edition consults nine versions from four groups, which are, the Derge (for my reason for using this witness, see the next section), Lithang, Ulaanbaatar, Tabo (including three fragmentary manuscripts), Gondhla, Hemis I, and Basgo 2 (for the reason for consulting this fragmentary witness, see my discussion on the Basgo collection).

As I stated in my introduction to the Chinese witnesses, this dissertation does not aim to provide a textual study of any particular translation of the *SvN* or contribute to the stemmatic analysis of Chinese or Tibetan Buddhist canons in general terms. Therefore, I will only provide a cursory summary of the transmissional lines of Kanjurs and Tibetan canonical collections according to current studies. Under each lineage, I will briefly introduce the history of the witnesses that I consult and share my observations of them. Compared to the study of the Chinese canons, our knowledge of the Tibetan canonical collections is still insufficient, especially of those that were discovered or utilized for philological studies only recently. I will spend more time on these relatively new findings.

[21] Note that here I use the "transmissional variants" to refer to variants that are indicative of the transmissional process, in a sense different from what Harrison (1992a, xxv) designates as "transmissional variants," which are "errors resulting from scribal lapses or casual attempts to improve or modernize the text," in contrast to "recensional variants."

The following summary of the historical background and general characteristics of each transmissional lineage is primarily gathered from Harrison (1992c; 1996), Skilling (1997a), Eimer (2002), Tauscher (2015), and the rKTs Website. For philological observations of the features of each Kanjur or canonical collection, I consult the following editions: the *Pravrajyā-vastu* by Eimer (1983), the *Drumakinnararājaparipṛcchā-sūtra* by Harrison (1992a), the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa-sūtra* by Braarvig (1993), the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya* by Silk (1994), the *Mahā-sūtra* by Skilling (1997b), the *Tathāgatagarbha-sūtra* by Zimmermann (2002), the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* by Habata (2013), the *Garbhāvakrānti-sūtra* by Kritzer (2014), the *Nandimitrāvadāna* by Chen (2018a), the *Bhikṣuṇī-vinayavibhaṅga* from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya by Clarke (2018), and the *Gaganagañja-paripṛcchā* by Han (2020). Each Kanjur or canonical collection is supplemented with its production date (if can be confirmed) and its siglum proposed by the rKTs Project.

Mainstream lineages:

The Tshal pa group and the Them spangs ma group are commonly known as two mainstream lineages, both to some extent indebted to the Old Narthang Kanjur (sNar thang; compiled at the Zhalu [Zhwa lu] monastery; early 14th century)—this is known as the first Kanjur, though it is not extant. Another group of Kanjurs, referred to as "mixed editions," is essentially based on the above two groups. Research on the formation and transmission history of these groups started from an early date. To date, the mainstream Kanjurs have been relatively sufficiently studied; many versions from these groups are considered essential for critical editions of Tibetan scriptures and thus aptly used for philological studies.

Tshal pa group

Kanjurs of the Tshal pa group descend from a manuscript Kanjur produced at Tshal Gung thang Monastery in the mid-14th century (consecrated in 1351), which is claimed to be largely based on the Old Narthang Kanjur. A majority of Kanjurs from this group now exist in block-print editions. The Tshal pa Kanjurs can be divided into two subgroups.

The so-called Peking subgroup is mainly formed by a series of xylograph Kanjurs produced in Imperial China. This subgroup consists of the earliest one, the Yongle Kanjur (Y; 1410), and several reprints or revisions based on it. Besides the xylograph Kanjurs, this subgroup also includes two manuscript Kanjurs—the Berlin Kanjur (B; 1680) and the Dragon Kanjur (Dr; 17th century). Available to us from this subgroup are

an edition based on the Yongle Kanjur under Qianlong's reign (Q; 1737), an edition currently held in the National Library of Mongolia (Q_u), as well as one edited by D.T. Suzuki (1955–1961) primarily based on the 1717−1720 reprint. The available editions from this subgroup are reported to mostly agree with another subgroup of the Tshal pa Kanjurs (see below), especially the Lithang Kanjur (Han 2020, 101), perhaps as a result of consulting the Lithang for corrections (Harrison 1992c, 81).

Another subgroup of the Tshal pa group consists of five xylograph Kanjurs, which are, the Lithang (J; 1609−1621), Derge (D; 1733), Cone (C; 1721−1731), Urga (U; 1908−1910), and Ragya Kanjur (R; 1820). All versions of this subgroup are available for this research. Cone appears to be a rather faithful copy of the Lithang (Han 2020, 102),[22] while Urga and Ragya are largely based on the Derge edition (Harrison 1996, 82; Han 2020, 103−105). For this reason, I do not consult the Cone, Urga, and Ragya editions.[23]

Lithang Kanjur

The Lithang ('Jang sa tham) edition is based on a copy of the abovementioned Tshal Gung thang manuscript Kanjur. Accessible for us are scans of a microfiche edition from Orissa provided by BDRC.

Derge Kanjur

The Derge (sDe dge) edition closely follows the Lithang but also consults readings from a descendant of the Them spangs ma group and "thus represents a conflation of the two main branches of the tradition" (Harrison 1996, 82). In addition, as observed by Chen (2018a, 105), "Another significant characteristic of the Derge is that it has undergone a process of scrupulous revision by the redactors and thus shows more often than not standardized grammatical and orthographical forms." The edition is therefore popular and often serves as the base text for modern editions. Although we use the Lithang Kanjur to represent the Tshal pa group due to the conflated nature of the Derge, considering the scholarly convention to follow the Derge in terms of orthographical issues (especially verbal forms; I will discuss these issues below), I consult the Karmapa reprint (scans provided by BDRC) of the Derge for my edition.

[22] Han (2020, 102) also notes that there are cases in which Cone emends scribal errors of the Lithang.

[23] In addition, a modern edition, referred to as the "Pedurma" (dPe bsdur ma) or "comparative edition" (BDRC MW1PD96682), is based on the Derge with editorial notes collated from seven editions (*bsdur mchan*). The seven editions that the editors consult are the Yongle, Lithang, Peking (Kangxi), Cone, Narthang, Khu re (Urga), and Zhol (Lhasa) editions (listed in its references, i.e., *bsdur 'bras re'u mig*). In fact, this edition was undertaken under the *Zhonghua dazang jing* 中華大藏經 project with which I introduce in my discussion of the Chinese witnesses; the editorial principles seem similar to those of the Chinese part of the project. Since there is no public access to some of the Kanjurs that the Pedurma has used, for example, the Yongle edition, its collation notes are worth attention—but certainly with much caution. For the collation notes of the *rMi lam bstan pa* and the references to other editions, see pp. 699−714 in Volume 39 (https://www.tbrc.org/" \l "library_work_ViewByOutline-O1PD1123714CZ87801%7CW1PD96682").

Them spangs ma group

Another mainstream group of Kanjurs is the Them spangs ma group, which descends from a manuscript Kanjur compiled in rGyal rtse shortly after 1431 that "may have been closer to the Old sNar thang than its Tshal pa counterpart, at least in terms of organization" (Harrison 1996, 79).

This group of Kanjurs can also be divided into several subgroups. Among them, the London (L; 1712), and Shey (Z; 18th century) represent a subgroup showing influences of a particular western tradition" (Tauscher 2015, 108). However, Clarke's recent study (2018, 277) has shown that, as far as the Vinaya section is concerned, the Shey Kanjur seems related to the Stog Kanjur (S; 1694−1729)—which is a copy of a certain Bhutanese manuscript Kanjur (ibid., 218−225)—whereas the London Kanjur presents similar recensional features as the Toyo Bunko and Ulaanbaatar Kanjurs. Yet Han's survey based on the *Gaganagañja-paripṛcchā* (2021, 106) finds that the Stog and Shey Kanjurs "[show] a close affinity with L[ondon] in terms not only of its terminology, but also of the placement of *śad.*" As far as the *dKon brtsegs* is considered, evidenced by its colophons and arrangement, the Stog seems to be distinct from the Shey and London Kanjurs but closer to the Ulaanbaatar (V; before 1671). Besides the abovementioned Ulaanbaatar and Stog, another Kanjur from the Them spangs ma group is the Toyo Bunko Kanjur (T; a.k.a. Tokyo Kanjur; 1858−1878). All Kanjurs of this group are accessible to us.

Ulaanbaatar Kanjur

For this study, we prioritize the Ulaanbaatar Kanjur since it is considered to be a direct copy of the rGyal rtse manuscript Kanjur (Tauscher 2015, 108). For the Ulaanbaatar edition, I consult the scans of the manuscript kept in the National Library of Mongolia, published in 2010 and catalogued by Jampa Samten and others in 2012. This manuscript was brought to Mongolia around 1671 as a gift from the fifth Dalai Lama (Jampa Samten, Niisaku, and Tahuwa 2012, I)

Mixed Editions

The mixed Kanjurs used Kanjurs of both mainstream lineages for their compilation. The most important one is the Narthang (N; 1730−1732), which is primarily based on a Kanjur of the Tshal pa group but also consulted Kanjurs from the Them spang ma group to a great extent. The Lhasa (H; 1934) is in turn based on the Narthang. This group of Kanjurs is not very interesting from a philological view as they do not provide further readings beyond the mainstream group. Therefore, although these two Kanjurs are available, neither is consulted for this study.

Local Kanjurs

Besides the mainstream lineages, there exist several manuscript Kanjurs "that were produced not at large monastic centers but at rather remote places and compiled from locally available material" (Tauscher 2015, 109). The local Kanjurs represent transmission lineages that are independent of the two mainstream ones, and they often differ from the mainstream Kanjurs in arrangement and readings. The local Kanjurs are important as "their sources might predate the archetypes of the two main groups" (ibid.). This category of Kanjurs consists of several groups that share similar characteristics or descend from one common source.

Mustang/Ladakhi Group

The Mustang/Ladakhi group of Kanjurs presents some distinct features that appear to be transmitted separately from the two mainstream groups. This transmission lineage was first hypothesized by Tauscher and Lainé (2015) in light of the discovery of two 17th-century manuscript Kanjurs from Ladakh—Hemis I (He) and Hemis II (Hi)—in 2007. Another group of Kanjur collections from the same region—the Basgo collections (including one complete Kanjur [X] and a few fragments [Ba])—is contemporary with the Hemis collections and shares some similar features. Comparing the Hemis and the Basgo collections with the Early Mustang Kanjur (of which only a catalog survived, 1436−1447), Tauscher and Lainé (ibid., 465) suggest that the connection between these three is undeniable. This hypothesis has been further developed by the scholarly examination of the Namgyal (Ng) and the Lang (Lg; a.k.a. Glang dgon pa; which is a part of the Dolpo manuscript collections) collections that also belong to the Southwestern Tibet region (Viehbeck 2020; Luczanitz and Viehbeck 2021, 353−360). Based on these findings, Viehbeck concludes that these canonical collections from the Southwestern Tibet region clearly represent "another important line of transmission next to the mainstream lineages of Tshal pa and Them spangs ma" (Viehbeck 2020, 256) although "so far we lack a clear understanding of the detailed relations between these collections and the historical possibilities underlying their connections" (ibid, 266). Note that the lineage of the Dolpo manuscripts is disputed; for example, according to Han's stemmatic analysis based on some passages from the *Gaganagañja-paripṛcchā*, the Lang and Nesar seem to form a transmissional lineage separate from the Mustang/Ladakhi group and other Western Tibetan canonical collections (2020, 130−132; 148).

As most manuscripts of this group were discovered and cataloged only recently, few studies have sufficiently utilized them for critical editions. Below is a list of editions

that have consulted more than one collection from this group: 1) The complete Basgo Kanjur and Hemis I manuscripts are used in Apple's study on the *Mañjuśrīvihāra-sūtra* (Apple, 2014a) and the *Avaivartikacakra-sūtra* (Apple 2021). According to Apple's observation, the readings of the *Mañjuśrīvihāra-sūtra* in the Hemis and Basgo suggest that they share a common source that predates the ancestor of the Tshal pa group (Apple 2014a, 300). Based on the *Avaivartikacakra-sūtra*, Apple (2021, 27) further concludes that this line of Kanjurs "contains the oldest vulgate textual witnesses."[24] 2) Kritzer has also collated readings from the complete Basgo Kanjur and Hemis I for his edition of the *Garbhāvakrānti-sūtra* (Kritzer 2014, 205), but he does not include them in his stemma (ibid, 212). 3) The Lang and Nesar manuscripts from Dolpo and the complete Basgo Kanjur are used for Chen's critical edition of the *Nandimitrāvadāna* (2018a). In addition to his introduction to the history and features of these manuscripts (ibid., 108−110), Chen also notes "a special affinity" that the Mustang group shares with the Them spangs ma group, and proposes that they may share "a common hyparchetype (α), which may well predate the Narthang" (ibid, 116). 4) By sampling a few paragraphs from the *Gaganagañja-paripṛcchā*, Han (2020) has examined the complete Basgo Kanjur, the two Hemis manuscripts, the Lang and Nesar manuscripts found in Dolpo, and the Namgyal collection (Han 2020, 118−126). In the stemma Han proposes (ibid, 148), he notes that the two Hemis collections, the Basgo manuscripts, and the Namgyal manuscript perhaps share one common source; the two Dolpo manuscripts appear to have a closer connection with each other, and the Lang collection further "presents unique readings against all other witnesses" (ibid, 124).[25]

Except for the Basgo Kanjur (X), all the extant collections from this group are incomplete. The *rMi lam bstan pa* is not present in the Namgyal and Lang collections[26] but is extant in the Nesar collection (which is unfortunately inaccessible to us at the moment),[27] the two Hemis collections (He33.7, *dkon brtsegs, ka,* 263b[?]−305b; Hi34.04, *dkon brtsegs, ka,* 282a7−328b2), the Basgo Kanjur (X31.4, *dkon brtsegs, ka,* 317b8−369a3), and the three Basgo fragments (Ba1, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 296[?]−342b6; Ba2, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 236b−275b; Ba3, *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 314a5−364a3). However, the photographs of the first pages of the Hemis I are blurred, and all three versions in Basgo fragments are incomplete (see below).

[24] In his study on the very short text of the *Avalokiteśvaraparipṛcchā-sapta-dharmaka*, Apple (2019) only consulted the Hemis but not the Basgo. In this study, Apple (ibid., 221) notes the close connection between the Hemis and the Gondhla manuscripts through his stemmatic analysis. Note that Apple's studies of the Tibetan canonical collections use both and stemmatic and phylogenetic analysis (for an explanation on his methodology, see Apple 2021, 25−28).
[25] In addition, Harrison's edition of the *Vajradhvajapariṇāmanā* (2018b) also made use of two versions from the Basgo collection and the two Hemis Kanjurs, but he did not include much discussion on them.
[26] For a handlist of the Lang collection, see Heller 2009, 225−226. Regarding the Namgyal manuscripts, according to Luczanits and Viehbeck (2021, 346) "among the Ratnakūṭa section (here rk) again only two texts are contained in Namgyal, that is, the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchāsūtra* (rKTs 62, Ng 14.12) and the *Acintyabuddhaviṣayanirdeśasūtra* (rKTs 79, Ng 14.11)."
[27] According to Heller (2009, 227), the volume *ka* of the *dKon brtsegs* of the Nesar manuscripts has survived (cataloged as N83), which is likely to include the text in question. However, this volume is not accessible to us.

Hemis Collections

Two incomplete manuscript Kanjurs were found in Hemis, Ladakh in 2007, and subsequently cataloged and studied in recent years. One of the two Kanjurs can be dated to 1635 (for their detailed historical background, see Tauscher and Lainé 2015, 468−470). As has been pointed out by previous scholars, the Hemis manuscripts are closely related to the Basgo ones in terms of structure, readings, and other features (ibid., 472−477; Han 2020, 118−121).

For my edition, I use the manuscripts of Hemis I. The *rMi lam bstan pa* in this collection is, although complete, not entirely legible due to the quality of the photographs (pp. *ka*, 263b−265b are blurred, which should include the beginning of the text). In addition, quite a few folios are heavily damaged, leaving several syllables missing on each folio. Despite the condition of the manuscript and the poor quality of the photographs of it, we can still make some general observations of the Hemis. This set of manuscripts shares many unique readings with the Basgo collections, which are not found in any other witnesses that I have examined. More specifically, the Hemis and Basgo versions often have readings that are synonymous but alternative to their counterpart in witnesses of the mainstream lineages (e.g., "*gal te*" in the Hemis and Basgo versus "*ji ste*" in the Derge and Ulaanbaatar); we also frequently see reversed sequences of phrases or sentences in the Hemis/Basgo manuscripts, especially in verses. In addition, traces of frequent emendations characterize the Hemis/Basgo collections—signs of deletion and insertion prevail in these manuscripts.[28] Besides the shared features between the Hemis and the Basgo, compared to the Basgo, the Hemis is extremely inconsistent in terms of verb forms. For example, the Hemis version of the *rMi lam bstan pa* constantly alternates between "*lta*" and "*blta*" whereas other witnesses in the examination mostly stick to one form.

Basgo Collections

There are in total four versions of the *rMi lam bstan pa* in the Basgo collections. The Basgo Kanjur (X31.4, *dkon brtsegs, ka,* 317b8−369a3) provides us with a complete version of the text in question, while each of the three Basgo fragments misses several folios. The missing folios were taken away in a seemingly completely random pattern—similar to the case of the Tabo fragments that we will come to in the next section. Below are the details of the missing folios in the three fragments:

Ba 1 misses the first folio which is supposed to include the title and several lines at the beginning. The available text runs from *ka*, 297a to *ka*, 342b6. Folios 310 and 316 in between are also missing. In total, three folios are missing.

[28] The scribes of the Hemis manuscripts use a horizontal slash (or slashes) to mark deletions of phrases, or three dots on top of a character to denote the deletion of the syllable, and add syllables by simply putting them in between the lines. The signs for emendation are consistent with other collections from this region such as the Namgyals collection (see examples presented by Luczanits and Viehbeck 2021, 37).

Ba 2 starts from *ka*, 236b2 and ends at *ka*, 275b5. In total, seven folios are missing, which are 243, 248, 249, 251, 254, 265, 271.

Ba 3 starts from *ka*, 314a5 and ends at *ka*, 364a3. Two folios are missing, which are folios 319 and 336.

According to my preliminary observation, the three Basgo fragments vary in scribal features and formats (for example, the number of lines per page is seven, nine, and eight in Ba1, 2, and 3, respectively). Although, according to Tauscher and Lainé (2015, 472), some of the manuscripts kept in Basgo "appear to have been part of proto canonical collections of the 14th or early 15th century, showing ancient orthography and paleography and all the peculiarities of the respective manuscripts from Tabo, Gondhla, Tholing, or Phkthar," no version of the *rMi lam bstan pa* in the Basgo collection has those features. Instead, all the versions of the *rMi lam bstan pa* show strong similarities with the Hemis manuscripts and may belong to the early 17th century (ibid.), like the majority of the Basgo manuscripts.

Considering that, as far as I am aware, only Harrison (2018b) has utilized the Basgo fragments for philological studies, I collate the Basgo 2 in my edition, which shows an overall similarity with the readings of the Hemis I. The single readings of the Basgo 2 do not display any distinctive features; most of them seem to be scribal errors in nature.

Canonical Collections from Western Tibet

Aside from the Mustang/Ladakhi group, although the Kanjur collections from Bhutan also form a unique group, they are less important for this study (Forgues, 2024 [forthcoming]).[29] In addition, the Phugbrag collection, although it also includes unique readings that are independent from the two mainstream lineages, because of its highly corrupted nature (Han 2020, 109−113), is not considered in this study.[30]

The last important group of witnesses for my edition is the canonical collections found in Western Tibet, including the Gondhla, Tholing, Tabo, and Phukthar collections. This group of canonical collections presents features that belong to a tradition that may predate the fully developed form of Kanjurs, and they lack the systematic classification and completeness of Kanjurs (Tauscher 2008, xi−xii). Most collections of this group have not been sufficiently studied; for a relatively detailed introduction to the Gondhla, Tabo, and Phukthar collections, see Lainé (2009).

[29] According to Clarke (2018, 199), the Bhutanese witnesses and the closely related Shey and Stog Kanjurs present a separate recension of the section on the nuns' conduct in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which is distinct from the witnesses of other Kanjurs of the mainstream groups "in terms of the presence and absence of certain rules, frame stories, and legal analyses for nuns." For more information of Bhutanese Kanjurs, see ibid., 280−281. See also Harrison's comments (2018b, 163, n. 33) for the Bhutanese Kanjurs.

[30] For the *rMi lam bstan pa*, see F35, *dkon btsegs, ka*, 296a6−346b3.

The Gondhla (13th to 14th century) and Tabo collections (for the problem of the dating of the Tabo manuscripts, see below) show many similarities, including typical archaic paleographical and orthographical features such as *da drag*, *'a rjes 'jug*, etc. From a stemmatic perspective, the two collections often share distinct readings and characteristics with each other, and with manuscripts discovered in Dunhuang (Han 2020, 114). However, considering that these collections are not internally consistent, these shared features cannot be generalized.

The *rMi lam bstan pa* survives in the Gondhla collection and the Tabo collection, and the latter includes three fragmentary versions of the text. Another important witness from Western Tibet, the Phukthar collection (Ph), unfortunately, only includes less than half of the *rMi lam bstan pa*. The available photographs extend from *ka*, 93.7 to folio *ka*, 214, i.e., from the beginning of the text to somewhere in the second *bam po*. Considering its incompleteness, this witness is not consulted in this edition. In addition, according to my examination, this translation is not found (or not yet identified) in the very fragmentary *dKon brtsegs* of the surviving Tholing collection (for the catalog of the *dKon brtsegs* in the Tholing canonical collection, see De Rossi Filibeck 2003, 439 §1332).

Gondhla Collection

The Gondhla collection is argued by Tauscher (2007, 80) to be a "Proto-Kanjur" for "representing a pre-canonical attempt to gather all of the words of the Buddha," which "seems to pre-date the compilation of the Tibetan canon at Narthang/Zhalu at the beginning of 14th century" (ibid., 79). The manuscripts from this collection are preserved in a small village in Himachal Pradesh and they only caught academic attention about two decades ago.

The Gondhla collection has been cataloged by Tauscher (2008). The contents and readings of the Gondhla collection display an affinity with other Western Tibetan canonical collections (i.e., Tabo and Phugthar; ibid., xvii−xxxiii) but "no single homogeneous line of transmission can be expected for either proto canonical or canonical collections of texts" (ibid., xviii). For example, by examining the manuscripts of the *mDo sde brgyad bcu khungs*, Tauscher concludes that, on the one hand, "A very superficial observation suggests an agreement of Tabo and Dunhuang against Gondhla in the majority of the more substantial variants (Tauscher 2007: 90). However, [on the other hand,] errors that would not easily occur twice independently are shared by Gondhla and Tabo, and thus provide strong evidence of a close relation between these two" (Tauscher 2021, 38). According to Han's study of the *Gaganagañja-paripṛcchā* in the Gondhla and the Tabo 2 (2021, 134), "Common variants shared among GoTa2 are mostly minor."

This collection includes a complete version of the *rMi lam bstan pa* (Go. *Ka-Ma*, 92b3−*Ka-Na*, 24a7; for the details of the manuscript and its colophon, see Tauscher

2008, 7 §4.4), which contains many single readings. As I do not intend to provide a stemmatic analysis of the Tibetan canonical collections, I cannot reach any conclusion based on my preliminary observations of these single readings.

Tabo Collection

This manuscript collection was found at the Tabo monastery, also in Himachal Pradesh, India, although "some of the Tabo collection may have come from other monasteries and temples in the area, or even from the private collections which people keep in their houses" (Harrison 2009, xvii). This collection is known to scholars from the early 20th century (ibid., xi), but has only been systematically studied recently. The results of scientific research on it are mostly presented in the Tabo Studies series (Gnoli ed. 1994; Scherrer-Schaub and Steinkellner eds. 1999; Harrison 2009).

This collection is extremely fragmentary and heterogeneous, and therefore should not be conceived as a "proto-Kanjur" (ibid., xxv). Due to its heterogeneous nature, it is very hard to assign definite dates to individual manuscripts preserved in this collection—"the older core of the collection dates from the 10th and 11th centuries, to which have been added manuscripts produced later, perhaps even up to the mid-19th century" (ibid., xviii). Moreover, due to the poor state of this collection, its arrangement is obscure; for example, see the arrangement of the *dKon brtsegs* collections included in this collection (ibid., xxxiii−xxxvi). For a full account of its historical background and the difficulties in cataloging it, see Harrison (ibid., xi−xl). Despite the significant problems this collection poses to scholars, since "Tabo versions often carry readings (in some cases better ones) which are not found in the later canonical edition" (ibid., xxxvii), this collection should be considered essential for any critical edition.

Although—according to Harrison's estimation—only less than twenty percent of the Tabo collection survives (ibid., xv), "*Ratnakūṭa* (dKon brtsegs) manuscripts seem to have made up a significant proportion of the Tabo collection" (ibid., xxxiii). Three versions of the *rMi lam bstan pa* have survived in this collection, but each of them only provides a small fraction of the text. Harrison has provided detailed information on these three versions, which only consist of nine, ten, and seven folios respectively (ibid., 91−92 [Rn250] §1.3.3.4; 109 [Rn265] §1.3.11.4;[31] 122 [Rn242] §1.3.14.4). Further, those surviving folios are not consecutive; many folios in between were taken away in a totally random manner.[32]

The three Tabo witnesses display similar archaic paleographical and orthographical features in a way that is more consistent than the Gondhla witness of the *rMi lam bstan pa*. The readings of each version—when their contents overlap—seem to differ a lot.

[31] According to my examination, the surviving page numbers of the *rMi lam bstan pa* in the Rn265 should be as follows: *Ka-Na* 81, 83–84, 86–87, 91−92, 94, 96, 96 (*'og ma*), whereas the catalog compiled by Harrison (2009, 109) records the pages as "Ka-Na 81, 83–84, 86–87, 91, 93−94, 96, 96 (*'og ma*)."

[32] For hypotheses about the poor state of the Tabo collection, see ibid., xv−xvi.

The relationship between these three Tabo witnesses, as well as between each Tabo version and other canonical collections, is a problem that is too complicated to be fully examined here.

3. Notes on the Edition

This edition mostly follows scholarly conventions established by previous critical editions of Tibetan translations of Buddhist scriptures (as listed in the previous section). However, since this edition is based on the new methodology proposed by Forgues (2024 [forthcoming]), and as the main aim of this edition is not to contribute to the genealogical analysis of the Tibetan canonical collections, I would like to note a few specific editorial principles of my edition.

First of all, most of the previous critical editions of Tibetan translations of Buddhist texts categorize the variants into two groups—single/shared readings (cf. Harrison 1992a, li−lii),[33] or, monogenetic/polygenetic errors (Chen 2018a, 100)[34]—and present them separately in the apparatus. However, since we have already minimalized the witnesses to consult from each transmissional lineage according to the new methodology for Tibetan critical editions proposed by Forgues, it is not necessary to separate the variants into two groups according to whether they are single readings or shared.

In addition, since the main purpose of this edition is to serve as a basis for understanding the content of the text, this edition does not intend to reproduce certain orthographic and paleographical features on the apparatus. More specifically, the archaic orthographical and paleographical readings found in the Tabo and Gondhla

[33] Other critical editions of Tibetan scriptures such as Skilling (1994) and Zimmermann (2002) all primarily follow Eimer (1983) and Harrison (1992a), and divide the variants into two categories, namely, shared variants and single variants. But all of these editions have made it clear that such categorization cannot be taken at face value. For example, according to Zimmermann (2002, 216), "some few cases of variants shared by two manuscripts or xylographic editions are given in the critical apparatus at the end because of their very trivial and coincidental nature […] On the other hand, some significant single variants which imply a different understanding of the text have been adopted in the main apparatus." A similar strategy is also explained in Skilling (1994, lxi−lxii). Concerning this problem, Silk (1994, 66) separate the variants into "true" variants and single variants, the former category includes "both recensional and transmissional" variants while the latter category mainly compromises "scribal errors or various orthographical peculiarities."

[34] Chen (2018a, 100−101) argues that the binary categorization of "transmissional/recensional" errors is problematic (see also previous note 20). Therefore, he distinguishes "'monogenetic' errors from 'polygenetic' ones, in order to steer clear of potential risks of mistaking coincidental commonalities for family resemblance" (ibid., 110). He subsequently defines polygenetic variants as "orthographical variants, grammatical variants (e.g., verb forms), casual alternations (e.g., of *pa*/*ba*, *nga*/*da* etc.)" as well as punctuation (ibid.).

manuscripts,[35] and the alteration between "*ba*" and "*pa*" that prevails in all witnesses,[36] are less important to us. Moreover, as I have noted above, traces of amendments are frequently found in the Hemis/Basgo manuscripts, although they may be interesting for studies on manuscript culture, for the purpose of this edition, I only record the end result after such emendations. For the same reason, I also ignore punctuation variants since in the case of the *rMi lam bstan pa*, the punctuation generally makes only a minor difference in the understanding of its content, or rather, makes no difference at all.[37] In addition, punctuation variants generally cannot be seen as indicative of transmission lineages (Chen 2018a, 110−111). Therefore, I only record a few variants in punctuation when necessary.

Finally, with regard to orthographical and grammatical issues, as this edition does not aim to contribute to the historical linguistic studies concerning Tibetan spellings, although I record all such variants, I tentatively observe the scholarly convention and follow the *Mahāvyutpatti* for Buddhist terminology[38] and the Derge edition when facing currently irresolvable problems concerning verb forms.[39] I look forward to future studies in Tibetan orthography in a larger framework that will contribute to our further understanding of these issues.

[35] Some of the most notable paleographical features in the two collections include the *da drag*, subscribed *ya* (i.e., *ya btags*; mostly after *ma* and before *i/e* in our manuscripts), and pleonastic *'a* suffix after vowels (*'a rjes 'jug*; especially after final vowels). Horizontal ligatures for *s-ta* appear frequently in two out of three Tabo versions (Running No. 250 and 265). It is also worth mentioning that some archaic features such as the reversed *gi gu* (*gi gu log*), which are found in some manuscripts of the Tabo collection and "exceptionally" in the Gondhla (Tauscher 2008, xxxvii), do not occur in any version of *rMi lam bstan pa* preserved in these two collections according to my observation. For the archaic features of the Gondhla collection, see Tauscher (ibid., xxxvi−xxxvii). For the archaic paleographic and orthographic features of the Tabo manuscripts, see Steinkellner (1994, 124−125), Tauscher (1994, 175−177), Eimer (1999, 166−167), Pagel (1999, 166), etc. For (a periodization of) shared archaic features between Tabo manuscripts and Dunhuang documents, see Scherrer-Schaub and Bonani (2002, 203ff). Also comparable in terms of codicology, orthography, and paleography are the manuscripts kept at Namgyal, of which Luczanits and Viehbeck (2021, 27−43) have provided a detailed and illustrated summary.

[36] Due to the high similarity between *ba* and *pa* in Uchen, I do not record the variants between the suffix *ba* and *pa.* However, I have to admit my inconsistency; for example, although the suffixes *ji* and *ci* (cf., Tauscher 2008, xxxvi) are also considered as similar orthographical variants, I note them in my edition as they appear very different in Uchen script.

[37] For example, Hemis I frequently adds a *shad* after "in a dream" (*rmi lam na*), which does not affect the understanding of the text.

[38] For example, the spellings of the Tibetan translation of Sanskrit term *satyādhiṣṭhāna* vary greatly among the version in examination (in §1a, the Derge and Lithang read *bden pa'i byin gyis brlabs*, the Ulaanbaatar reads *bden pa'i byin gyi brlabs*, the Gondhla reads *bden pa'i byin gyi rlabs*, whereas the Basgo 2 reads *bden pa'i byin gyis rlabs*). I tentatively follow the *Mahāvyutpatti* (Ishihama and Fukuda 1989, 87 §1585) and choose the reading *bden pa'i byin gyis brlabs pa* for the main text.

[39] For a study of Tibetan verb forms according to the traditional grammar books, see Hill (2010). However, considering the problems of this index as pointed out by Białek (2013), I do not follow the verb forms reported in this book, but as a rule I follow the Derge.