

NATALIA YAMPOLSKAYA

(Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS, St. Petersburg, Russia)

A Rare Tibetan Version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in Mongolia*

Abstract

This paper addresses the questions that were left unanswered in my previously published works on the Mongolian translations of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. It shows that the five earliest Mongolian translations of the sutra were based on the Tibetan version known as *gzo sbyangs*, suggesting that in the first half of the 17th century the *gzo sbyangs* version, which is a rarity today, dominated the transmission of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* in Mongolia and was later replaced by the widely spread *phreng ba can* version. Two of the early Mongolian translations have preserved a rare Tibetan colophon. Currently this colophon is known to have survived in a unique Tibetan manuscript kept at the Otani University, Japan. The colophon declares that the sutra was edited by several figures of the *snga dar* period, whose identities are under question.

Keywords: *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, *brgyad stong pa*, *gzo sbyangs*, *phreng ba can*, Samdan Sengge, mChims Śākyaprabha, sPa gor Vairocana, Mongolia, Tibetan Buddhism

Introduction

The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* is believed to date back to the 1st century CE. For a long time its earliest specimens were preserved only in the oldest of the seven Chinese translations, primarily the one by Lokakṣema (179 CE).¹ In 1999 fragments of a Gāndhāri

* The article was prepared within the frames of the academic project supported by RFBR (Russian Foundation for Basic Research, No. 18-012-00376): “Golden” manuscript fragments from Dzungar monasteries – a unique source of information on the history of the Buddhist canon in Mongolia: a comprehensive historical-philological study.

¹ On the Chinese translations of the sutra see: Huifeng Shi, *An Annotated English Translation of Kumārajīva’s Xiaōpīn Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, “Asian Literature and Translation” 4, no. 1 (2017), pp. 188–189.

version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, dated to the period between 47 and 147 CE, were found in Northern Pakistan. Based on the study of these fragments Seishi Karashima proposed a hypothesis according to which the text of the sutra took shape in Northern India, and its original language was possibly Gāndhārī.² In the 8th (or early 9th) century the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* was translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan, and the earliest Mongolian translations we know today appeared at the turn of the 17th century.

In the years 2010–2013 I conducted a study of eight Mongolian translations of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the results of which were published in 2018.³ The comparative study of the eight texts showed that they fall into two groups which I call the “earlier” and “later” translations. The five “earlier” ones include: (1) the joint work of Diduyba gabču lam-a, Durqar Omboo Sñagbo bayši and Brasi bayši (the “Three Translators”, 1599–1603), the translations by (2) Āryadeva (1608), (3) Samdan Sengge (the 1620s), (4) Paṇḍita Darqan Blam-a (undated), and (5) Altan Gerel ubasi (mid 17th century). The three “later” ones were created by (6) the Oirat Ĵay-a paṇḍita (1638–1662),⁴ (7) the Darba paṇḍita Blo bzang bZod pa rGya mtsho (1678–1702), and (8) an anonymous translator, possibly – a member of the editing committee of the Mongolian Kanjur block-printed in Beijing (*terminus ante quem* – 1720).⁵

Not all of the translations have been accurately dated, and it is possible that two of the “earlier” ones (by Altan Gerel ubasi and Paṇḍita Darqan Blam-a) were created at the same time as the work of Ĵay-a paṇḍita which falls into the “later” group. However, the division into two groups was not imposed on the eight translations based on the time of their origin: they naturally fell into two groups based on the differences in text structure that were revealed by the comparative analysis of two chapters of the sutra. The fact that their textological characteristics are supported by chronology, if not in the most precise

² Seishi Karashima, *Was the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?*, in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2012 XVI* (2013), pp. 171–188.

³ Natalia Yampolskaya, *Jadamba. Eight Mongolian Translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā sūtra*, Asiatische Forschungen 158, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2018.

⁴ There is one more translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* by Ĵay-a paṇḍita written in *todo bičiq*, i.e. the ‘Clear Script’ – an alphabet created in 1648 and used by the Oirats, but this translation was not included into my original research. A fragmentary (unpublished) analysis conducted afterwards has shown that his Oirat translation is based on the same Tibetan version as the Mongolian one. The Oirat translation has come down to us in a xylographic edition and at least one manuscript. Two copies of the blockprint are preserved at the Institute of Language and Literature, Ulaanbaatar. See: G. Gerelmaa, *Brief Catalogue of Oirat Manuscripts Kept by Institute of Language and Literature*. Vol. III, Ulaanbaatar, 2005, NN 455, 592[1]. One copy was published in Inner Mongolia in 2016. See: Erdemtü Minggad ed., *Ili-yin ʒool-un urusqal dayau oron-du qatayalaydaju bayiy-a todo üsüg-ün surbulji bičig-ün čiyulyan 5*, Öbör mongyol-un keblel-ün bölügöl, Öbör mongyol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2016. The manuscript was published earlier in the same series. See: Erdemtü Minggad ed., *Ili-yin ʒool-un urusqal dayau oron-du qatayalaydaju bayiy-a todo üsüg-ün surbulji bičig-ün čiyulyan 1*, Öbör mongyol-un keblel-ün bölügöl, Öbör mongyol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2015.

⁵ For detailed information about the eight translations see: *Chapter I. Eight Mongolian Translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* in: Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, pp. 25–73.

way possible, is an important detail in the bigger picture which allows to speak of the two groups as the “earlier” and “later”.

The Mongolian translations cannot be studied without a constant reference to the Tibetan sources, but the genuine Tibetan texts that were used by the Mongolian translators of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* are not known. In the course of my research I managed to access only one Tibetan version of the sutra. This version is widely spread and has a well-known colophon, according to which the text was translated by the Indian scholars Śakyasena and Jñānasiddhi and the Tibetan translator Dharmatāśīla in the late 8th – early 9th century, and later, in the 10th – 11th centuries, edited by the Indian master Atīśa, his disciple ’Brom ston pa, the Tibetan scholars Rin chen bZang po, Blo ldan Shes rab and others.⁶ A comparison of several Kanjur editions (Yongle, Lithang or ’Jang sa tham, Derge, Urga, Cone, Lhasa, Narthang and the Stog Palace manuscript) revealed no significant differences between them, and in the absence of relevant sources the Peking Kanjur edition of 1700 was chosen to be used as a conventional model for comparative analysis.

The fragments chosen for comparison were chapters 30 and 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*.⁷ The analysis showed a recurring pattern of concordance between the Mongolian translations and the Tibetan text: in 17 instances one or several sentences are missing in the five “earlier” works, but are present in the “later” ones and the Tibetan text, or vice versa. The tables containing the comparative textual material have been published in full and can be consulted for detailed information.⁸

The comparison allows to state that the “earlier” and “later” Mongolian translations are based on two different groups of Tibetan source texts: while the “later” ones coincide with the widely known Tibetan version, the “earlier” translations are based on a different one. It has to be added that in smaller details the “earlier” translations are not identical

⁶ The full text of the colophon in the Derge Kanjur (vol. 33): [286r] *rgya gar gyi mkhan po shAkya se na dang dz+nyA na si d+d+hi dang zhu chen gyi lo tsA ba ban+de d+harmā tA shI la la sogs pas bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab/ slad kyis dbang phyug dam pa’i mnga’ bdag bod kyi dpal ldan bisan po bkra shis lha sde bisan gyi bkas/ rgya gar gyi mkhan po sub+hA Shi ta dang/ sgra bsgyur gyi lo tsA ba dge slong rin chen bzang pos ’grel pa dang mthun par bsgyur/ slad kyis rgya gar gyi mkhan po paN+Di ta chen po dI paM ka ra shrI dz+nyA na dang/ zhu chen gyi lo tsA ba dge slong rin chen bzang pos yul dbus kyi ’grel pa dang gtugs nas bcos shing zhus te gtan la phab/ yang slad kyis kyi smad gnyes nga mo cher/ paN+Di ta chen po dI paM ka ra shrI dz+nyA na dang/ lo tsA ba ’brom rgyal ba’i ’byung gnas gnyis kyis brgyud stong pa’i bshad pa’i dus su che long zhig gtan la phab/ phyi sar sgreng gtsug lag khang du lo tsA ba ’brom rgyal ba’i ’byung gnas kyis rgya gar gyi mdo gsum dang gtugs nas lan gnyis gtan la phab/ slad kyis yang lo tsA ba de nyid kyis bshad pa mdzad cing phran tshogs kyang gtan la phab/ dus physis lo tsA ba chen po shAkya’i dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis kha che’i dpe dang yul dbus kyi dpe du ma bsags nas gtan la phab/.*

⁷ Only the last chapter (32) was available in all the eight Mongolian translations (the work of Darba paṇḍita is a very rare manuscript preserved in a private collection and was only partly accessible for study).

⁸ The text of Chapter 32 was published in: Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, Appendix 2. The differences between the “earlier” and “later” groups can be seen in lines 11–12, 14–17 and 23 of the table. A detailed analysis of this table is published in: Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, pp. 87–95. The text of Chapter 30 is available online at: http://www.orientalstudies.ru/rus/images/pdf/add1/b_yampolskaya_2018_appendix_4.pdf. The differences between the “earlier” and “later” groups can be seen in lines 137, 142, 151, 164, 185, 253, 275–282, 367–368, 407, 410, 468, 485, 508–510 and 524–526 of the table.

to each other, but the differences (the 17 instances mentioned above) reveal a consistent picture suggesting that another Tibetan version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* was so widely spread in Mongolia in the first half of the 17th century that five different translators chose it to render in the Mongolian language. Up to 2018 I did not succeed in finding a Tibetan version to match the “earlier” translations, and the results of my research were published with this lacuna waiting to be filled.

The Lesser Known Tibetan Versions and the Mongolian Tradition

In 2018 I finally located the Tibetan text to match the “earlier” Mongolian translations among the volumes of the Phug brag Kanjur – an independent manuscript edition created in Western Tibet between 1696 and 1706 and preserved in the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharamsala.⁹ One of its multiple peculiarities is that it contains not one, but three volumes of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (vols. 39, 40, 41). The cover of each of the three volumes is additionally marked with a Tibetan phrase: vol. 39 – *phreng ba can*, vol. 40 – *'phreng ba can*, and vol. 41 – *gzo sbyangs*. These are two different ways of rendering the name of Śreṇika Vatsagotra – a character mentioned by the Buddha in the first chapter of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. This very name, easy to find on the very first pages of the sutra, serves as a “tag” to quickly determine which version one is dealing with. Textual comparison has shown that the text marked as the *gzo sbyangs* volume (41) perfectly corresponds to the five “earlier” Mongolian translations (based on the analysis of chapters 30 and 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*).

For the sake of convenience one of the comparative tables (Chapter 32 – the last and shortest chapter of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*) is partly reproduced in the end of this article. The first column contains the text in the Tibetan Peking Kanjur edition, the second column – the same chapter from the *gzo sbyangs* volume of the Phug brag Kanjur. The whole comparative body of text being too large to be published here, two Mongolian translations were chosen to represent the “earlier” and “later” groups – the works of

⁹ The catalogue of the *Phug brag* Kanjur was published by Jampa Samten in 1992. See: Jampa Samten, *A Catalogue of the Phug-Brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, Dharamsala 1992. All the basic information on the origin, history and unusual features of the *Phug brag* Kanjur is given in the preface to the catalogue. In 1993 Helmut Eimer produced a location list that allowed to use this catalogue with the microfiche edition that was created in 1990 to make this unique Kanjur manuscript accessible to readers outside Dharamsala. See: Helmut Eimer, *Location List for the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Phug Brag Kanjur: Compiled from the Microfiche Edition and Jampa Samten's Descriptive Catalogue*, Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1993. Select issues were discussed in a number of publications including: Jens-Uwe Hartmann, *Notes on Two Texts in the Phug Brag Kanjur*, in: Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann und Roland Steiner (eds), *Suhrlekkhāh. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, Indica et Tibetica Bd. 28, 1996, pp. 69–78. Helmut Eimer, *Einige Notizen zur Struktur der Kanjurhandschrift aus Phug brag*, in: Helmut Eimer, Michael Hahn, Maria Schetelich et Peter Wyzlic (eds), *Redigenda curaverunt. Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*, Indica et Tibetica Bd 34, Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indo-tibetischen Kulturraumes, Swisttal-Odendorf 1999, pp. 101–116.

Altan Gerel ubasi and the Anonymous translator respectively (columns three and four of the table). The lines of the table are numbered in the leftmost column; the differences between the Tibetan versions and their Mongolian counterparts can be seen in lines 11–12, 14–17 and 23.

As much as finding the long searched for Tibetan version has become a new step in the study of the Mongolian translations of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, it is not a discovery in itself: accounts of it had been published by two Tibetologists whose works were overlooked in my previous research, and I hasten to bridge this unfortunate gap.

As early as 1999 the Italian scholar Fabrizio Torricelli published two articles describing the threefold tradition of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* in Tibet.¹⁰ As is recorded in the collected works (Tib. *tham phud*) of the 5th Dalai Lama (1617–1682), there are three Tibetan versions of the sutra, traditionally referred to as *phreng ba can*, *gzo sbyangs* (variant – *bzo sbyang*) and *sde can* (variant – *bde chen*) based on the three ways that the name of Śreṇika was translated by Zha lu lo tsā ba Rin chen chos skyong bzang po (1441–1527).¹¹ Of the three versions *phreng ba can* is absolutely predominant: it is included in the most widely known Kanjur editions,¹² and spread in multiple single volumes of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*.¹³ The other two versions, on the contrary, are comparatively rare. Fabrizio Torricelli described five copies of *gzo sbyangs* (four manuscripts, including volume 41 of the Phug brag Kanjur, are preserved in the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives (LTWA), Dharamsala, and one in the National Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology, Florence), and only one specimen of *sde can*, also preserved in the LTWA.¹⁴ In the 2010s a comprehensive study of the Tibetan versions was carried out by the Japanese scholar Fumio Shoji¹⁵ who located another two copies of *gzo sbyangs* (in two manuscript Kanjurs of the Them spangs ma group – the London, or Shel dkar monastery manuscript and the Tokyo manuscript) and one more copy of *sde can* (a manuscript from the Toyo

¹⁰ Fabrizio Torricelli, *Un Libro Sacro Tibetano Nella Collezione De Filippi al Museo Nazionale d'Antropologia e Etnologia Di Firenze*, “Archivio per l'Antropologia e La Etnologia” CXXIX (1999), pp. 273–285; Fabrizio Torricelli and Nikolai N. Dudka, *Manuscript LTWA No. 23476. A “SDe Can” Sample of the BrGyad Stong Pa*, “Tibet Journal”, no. 24 (2) (1999), pp. 29–44.

¹¹ Torricelli and Dudka, *Manuscript LTWA*, pp. 31–35.

¹² Based on the editions that I consulted, the *phreng ba can* version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* is included in the following Tibetan Kanjurs: of the Tshal pa group: Peking, Cone, Derge, Urga, Lithang, Ragya, Dodedrak, Phajoding Ogmin Lhakhang and Phajoding Khangzang Lhakhang; of the Them spangs ma group: Shey and Stog; of the mixed editions: Lhasa, Narthang and Dongkarla.

¹³ Its colophon refers to the sutra being translated by Śakyasena, Jñānasiddhi and Dharmatāśīla and edited by Aṭīśa, 'Brom ston pa, Rin chen bZang po, Blo ldan Shes rab and others. See note 7.

¹⁴ Torricelli and Dudka, *Manuscript LTWA*, p. 32.

¹⁵ His publications on the topic include: 史生 (Fumio) 庄司 (Shoji), チベットに伝えられる三種の『八千頌般若』について (*On the Threefold Textual Tradition of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā in Tibet*), 印度學佛學研究 (“Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies”) 63, no. 1 (2014), pp. 460 (93) – 455 (98); 史生 (Fumio) 庄司 (Shoji), ‘現存梵本『八千頌般若』はいかに形成されたか (*A Study on the Compilation Process of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*)’, 中央學術研究所紀要 (“Bulletin of Chuo Academic Research Institute”), no. 44 (2015), pp. 57–78.

Bunko collection).¹⁶ Recently I have located another two specimens of *gzo sbyangs* in the Chizhi and Neyphug manuscript Kanjurs.¹⁷

Given the rarity of these versions today, one can assume that in the first half of the 17th century they already represented marginal lines of text transmission. It is all the more remarkable that one of them – *gzo sbyangs* – was prevalent in Mongolia in that period. What caused the change of source for the later translators? Two of the three translators of the “later” group – Ĵay-a paᅇᅇita and Darba paᅇᅇita – had similar biographies. Both of them were sent to Tibet as young men and completed their education there: Ĵay-a paᅇᅇita resided in Tibet from 1617 until 1638, Darba paᅇᅇita – from 1655 until 1678. After returning from the Land of Snows they brought back the Tibetan tradition of the period to pass on and spread in Mongolia, in particular – through literary activity. When translating the *Aᅇᅇasāhasrikā* they both relied on *phreng ba can* (possibly, because this version of the sutra was among the books they brought from Tibet). The identity of the third member of the “later” group – the Anonymous Translator – remains unknown, but if he was indeed a member of the editorial board of the Beijing Kanjur (1720), it is only natural that he, too, chose *phreng ba can*, considering its domination in the Kanjur editions of the Tshal pa group that the committee could use as models to follow. This reflects the centripetal tendency in text production that transformed the Mongolian Buddhist literary landscape throughout the 17th century, from heterogeneity to uniformity built along the lines of the Tibetan model.

The Lost Colophon

At least one of the extant *gzo sbyangs* manuscripts has a colophon, identical to the first sentence of that of the *phreng ba can* version: it names Śakyasena, Ĵñānasiddhi and Dharmatāśīla as the translators of the sutra and ends at that, not proceeding to describe any further editing.¹⁸

The colophon of the *sde can* version gives a different account. According to it, the *Aᅇᅇasāhasrikā* was translated in the 8th century by the Indian scholar Kamalaśīla and the Tibetan translator dPal brtsegs (one of the compilers of the *IHan kar ma* catalogue),

¹⁶ Fumio, *On the Threefold Textual Tradition*, p. 459 (94). Notably, the original catalogue (Tib. *dkar chag*) of the Phug brag Kanjur lists the three volumes of the *Aᅇᅇasāhasrikā* as '*phreng ba can*, *bzo sbyangs* and *sde can*, which means that the intention of the compilers was to include all the three versions. See: Jampa Samten, *Catalogue*, p. ix. However, today the *sde can* volume is replaced with *phreng ba can*.

¹⁷ Both Kanjurs come from monasteries located in Bhutan and can be attributed to the Them spangs ma group (Neyphug – possibly, mixed). Digital copies of the *Aᅇᅇasāhasrikā* volumes can be accessed at the Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies database of the Vienna University. The Chizhi volume: <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/digit/affiche0.php?vol=brgyad%20stong%20pa%20ka&beg=2&coll=chizhi&rkts=12>; the Neyphu volume: <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/digit/affiche0.php?vol=brgyad%20stong&beg=2&coll=neyphug&rkts=12>.

¹⁸ Based on this Torricelli suggested that *gzo sbyangs* and *phreng ba can* represented the same translation, the latter being the edited version of the former. See: Torricelli, *Un Libro Sacro Tibetano*, p. 282.

and later edited by paṇḍita Dharma Śrībhadrā and the translator Rin chen bzang po (958–1055).¹⁹

Mongolian translations often include Tibetan colophons as well: as a rule, they are translated as part of the source text and followed by the Mongolian colophon, if one exists. The three translations of the “later” group (as well as the Oirat translation by Ĵay-a paṇḍita) include the Tibetan colophon of the *phreng ba can* version that they are based on.²⁰ Of the five “earlier” ones only two have a Tibetan colophon – one short sentence that can be found in the colophons of the translation by Samdan Sengge, the most widely spread of the eight Mongolian translations of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, and the work of Āryadeva – one of the earliest and rarest (today only one copy is known to be preserved in the Museum of Ts. Damdinsüren, Ulaanbaatar).²¹ To this day the colophon has presented both a sensation and a puzzle: on the one hand – its Tibetan equivalent had not been found, on the other hand – the two Mongolian sources do not render the sentence identically. Previously I have attempted to interpret the discrepancies between them,²² resulting in just one positive statement: there was one more Tibetan colophon of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (presumably, quite rare and related to the *gzo sbyangs* version) which mentioned several figures of the *snga dar* period (Early Spread of Dharma, the 8th – early 9th century). Presently the clue to this puzzle has been found: a Tibetan manuscript with the same colophon is known to be preserved in the collection of Otani University, Japan. I have not worked with this manuscript and rely on the description in the catalogue of the Otani collection and the information published by Fumio Shoji and Tsutomu Kawai.²³ In the scheme below the Tibetan colophon and two of its Mongolian “relatives” are presented against each other line by line (the lines are numbered from 0 to 4):

¹⁹ Ibidem, p. 280. Fumio has published an elaborate account of the relations between the Indian and Tibetan versions, suggesting that *gzo sbyangs* is the earliest version, not influenced by the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, *phreng ba can* – a later version, edited under the influence of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* and closest to the extant Sanskrit manuscripts, and *sde can* – a mixed version that possesses features of both *gzo sbyangs* and *phreng ba can*. For details see: 史生 (Fumio) 庄司 (Shoji), チベット語訳『八千頌般若』の改訳過程とその背景—近代日本の入蔵者らによる将来本を手がかりとして— (*On Retranslation Process of the Tibetan Version of the Astasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā and Its Background*), 法華文化研究 43 (2017), pp. 2–7.

²⁰ Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, pp. 49–51, 62–66.

²¹ Manuscript XT-7 from the collection of the Museum of Ts. Damdinsuren, Ulaanbaatar. See: G. Bilgüdeii, R. Otgonbaatar and A. Tsendina, *Damdinsürengiyn ger müzein mongol nom sudryn burtgel*, Ulaanbaatr, 2018, N 55.

²² For a detailed account of the differences in the rendering of this sentence in the two Mongolian translations see: Yampolskaya, *Jadamba*, pp. 38–41.

²³ The manuscript consists of two volumes: *ka* (ff. 1–204, incomplete at the end) and *kha* (ff. 1–200, ff. 118, 147 missing), size 19 × 58 cm, written in gold on blue paper. See: *Catalogue of Tibetan Works Kept in Otani University Library*, Otani University Library, Kyoto 1973, p. 441, No. 12750 (1, 2); Fumio, *On Retranslation Process*, pp. 10–11 and note 13; 川合 (Kawai), 務 (Tsutomu). 「写本チベット訳『八千頌般若経』の翻訳年代について」 (*On the Time of Creation of the Tibetan Manuscript Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*), 『印度學佛敎學研究』 (“Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies”) 29 (1), pp. 388–386.

	Tib., Otani No. 12750 Vol. 2, f. 200		Mong. Āryadeva (1608) ¹		Mong. Samdan Sengge (the 1620s) ²
0		0		0	endkeg-ün kelen-eče
1	rgya gar gyi mkhan po dharma shi la dang	1	hindkeg-ün ubadini darm-a tala-a kiged:	1	endkeg-ün ubadiy-a dharmata-la kiged:
2	lo tsa ba ban dhe bai ro tsa na ra kshi ta dang/	2	bandida virōjan-a kelemürči <šanta>ragsida kiged	2	lōjjau-a bandhi biirōčan-a raksita kiged:
3	zhang shag kya pra ba la stsogs pas	3	šaky-a brabha-a sang terigüten	3	sang suriy-a prabha terigüten:
4	zhus nas gtan la phabs pa//	4	öčigleged debter-tür orosiyulbai:	4	töbed-eče nayirayuluyad orosiyulbai:

¹ Quoted from the manuscript XT-7, f. 283v. Additional signs in transcription: ô = ཨ; j = ར.

² Quoted from the Beijing blockprint edition of 1707, ff. 327r-v. See: Walther Heissig, *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1954, N 11. Additional signs in transcription: š = ཤ.

The Tibetan sentence can be translated in the following way: “(1) The Indian master (*upādhyāya*) Dharmatāśīla, (2) translator monk Vairocanarakṣita, (3) Zhang Śakyaprabha and others (4) revised and put down.”²⁴ The Mongolian translations differ in several details, although there can be no doubt that they represent the same colophon. The differences will be commented on below.

The identity of *upādhyāya* Dharmatāśīla is unclear. In both Mongolian translations this name is rendered as Dharmatala. Both the Tibetan and Mongolian variants can be interpreted as erroneous spellings of the names of Dharmatāśīla, the Tibetan translator of the *phreng ba can* version or Dharmapāla, an Indian translator of that period, mentioned in one colophon of the *Brahmaviśeṣacintiparipṛcchā* (Tib. *'phags pa tshangs pa khyad par sems kyis zhus pa*) together with Śakyaprabha and Dharmatāśīla.²⁵

The name Vairocanarakṣita most probably belongs to the great translator and editor: Vairocana of sPa gor (although he is mostly known under the name Vairocana, some sources refer to him as Vairocanarakṣita as well).²⁶

In the Mongolian version of Samdan Sengge line 2 is identical to Tibetan, while in that of Āryadeva it is structured in a different way: the word order is changed, the name

²⁴ “Put down” is a literal translation of the Tibetan expression *gtan la phab* – a cliché used in the colophons of texts translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan to say that the translating and editing process was finished. This expression is sometimes translated as “settled”, “revised” or “finalised”.

²⁵ Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, *Die lHan kar ma. Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte. Kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 59, Wien 2008, N 97.

²⁶ Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism (Chos-Ḥbyung)*. II. Part. *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, (trans.) E. Obermiller, Heidelberg 1931, p. 190. Sarat Chandra Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, Calcutta 1902, p. 1266.

Vairocanarakṣita is separated into two, *śanta* is written in (as a correction) before *ragsida*, and the word *paṇḍita* is used instead of *ban dhe* (‘monk’). As a result, the line seems to mention not one, but two persons – paṇḍita Vairocana the translator and Śāntarakṣita (or paṇḍita Vairocana and translator Śāntarakṣita). Before the Tibetan original was located, I contemplated the possibility of this colophon referring to ācārya Śāntarakṣita (725–788), one of the earliest propagators of Buddhism in Tibet, two of the other figures being his disciples – sPa gor Vairocana and mChims Śākyaprabha. Presently, however, it appears more probable that the changes in the colophon of Āryadeva are misleading and come from a misunderstanding that occurred in the course of the transmission (or translation) of the text. However, given the scarcity of information about this colophon and its origins, even this confusion deserves attention.

The third name mentioned in the colophon – Zhang Śākyaprabha – must refer to mChims Śākyaprabha. The title *zhang* (“maternal uncle”) was given to several families whose members were once related to a king of Tibet as maternal uncles, and the mChims clan was one of them.²⁷

Finally, in the colophon of Samdan Sengge the sentence is expanded: it starts with the phrase “From the Indian language” (line 0), but does not end with the words “translated into Tibetan” (the only possible ending). Instead, it ends with the innately erroneous phrase “from Tibetan revised and put down” (line 4).²⁸ As unclear in meaning as it is, this sentence passed from edition to edition without being corrected, which means that the source it was taken from was rare and could not be accessed to check against. Moreover, only two of the five “earlier” Mongolian translations contain this Tibetan colophon, which highlights its rarity.

Conclusions

These observations give ground to conclude that the five earliest Mongolian translations of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* were based on the Tibetan version known as *gzo sbyangs*. These five translations date back to the first half of the 17th century, which means that at that period the *gzo sbyangs* version dominated the transmission of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* in Mongolia. Later in the 17th century it was replaced by *phreng ba can* – the most widely spread of the Tibetan versions of the sutra.

²⁷ H. E. Richardson, *Names and Titles in Early Tibetan Records*, “Bulletin of Tibetology” IV, no. 1 (1967), pp. 9–10.



²⁸ This phrase is reproduced in the Beijing blockprints of 1707, 1723, 1727, 1731, the 19th century Buriat blockprint. See: A.G. Sazykin, *Katalog mongol'skikh rukopisei i ksilografov Instituta vostokovedeniya Rossijskoi Akademii nauk*, vol. 2, Vostochnaya literatura RAN, Moskva 2001, NN 2631–2634, 2636. I have found only one edition of the translation by Samdan Sengge where this phrase is corrected, and *töbed-eče* is replaced with *töbed-ün*, which allows to translate it as “revised and put down in the Tibetan language” – an undated Beijing blockprint Q405 preserved at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, St. Petersburg. See: Sazykin, *Katalog*, N 2635.

Two of the “earlier” Mongolian translations have preserved an exceptionally rare Tibetan colophon. Currently the only described Tibetan source in which it has survived is a manuscript kept at Otani University, Japan. Both Mongolian translations have distorted this colophon in several ways, which suggests that even in the early 17th century the Tibetan source it came from was not easy to access. The colophon declares that the sutra was edited by several figures of the *snga dar* period: Dharmatāśīla (possibly, Dharmatāśīla or Dharmapāla), Vairocanarakṣita (possibly, sPa gor Vairocana) and Zhang Śākyaprabha (possibly, mChims Śākyaprabha).

The next important step in the study of the transmission of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in Mongolia would be to compare the translations by Āryadeva and Samdan Senge to the Otani University manuscript.

Table 1. Chapter 32 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*²⁹

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
1	[310r] rab 'byor byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rtag tu ngus [310v] ting nge 'dzin gyi sgo brgya stong phrag drug cu thob ma thag tu/	[370r] rab 'byor byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rtag [370v] tu ngus/ ting nge 'dzin gyi sgo stong phrag bcu thob ma thag tu/	[206v] subuti-a nasuda uyilayči bodisung maqasung jīran jāyun mingyan diyan-u qayalyasi oluyad sača	[394r] subuti-a bōdhi satuva ma-ha-a satuva nasuda uyilayči jīran jāyun mingyan toyatan samadi-yi oluyad sača
2	shar phyogs dang lho phyogs dang nub phyogs dang byang phyogs dang mtshams dang 'og dang steng gi phyogs dang	shar phyogs dang/ lho phyogs dang/ nub phyogs dang/ byang phyogs dang/ phyogs 'tshams dang/ 'og dang/ steng gi phyogs dang/	dorona jüg emüne jüg ürüne jüg umara jüg kiged: jobkis deger-e door-a jüg ba:	dorona jüg kiged: emüne jüg: ürüne jüg: umar-a jüg ba: jüg jobkis ba: door-a kiged: degereki jüg-lüge
3	phyogs bcu'i 'jig rten stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams gang gA'i klung gi bye ma snyed dag na/	phyogs bcu'i 'jig rten gyi khams gang ga'i klung gi bye ma snyed na/	arban jüg-ün gangga mören-ü qumaki-yin toyatan yirtinčü ulus-daki	arban jüg-ün yirtinčü ba yurban mingyan yeke mingyan yirtinčü-yin oron gangga mören-ü qumaki-yin toyatan orod-tur:
4	sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das gang gA'i klung gi bye ma snyed dag dge slong gi dge 'dun gyis yongs su bskor cing byang chub sems dpa'i	sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das gang ga'i klung gi bye ma snyed dag dge slong gi dge 'dun gyis yongs su bskor cing/ byang chub sems	gangga mören-ü qumaki-yin toyatan ilaju tegüs nögčigsen burqan-nuyud ayay-qa tegimlig-ün quvaray-ud-iyar sayitur	gangga mören-ü qumaki-yin toyatan ilaju tegüs nögčigsen burqad ayay-q-a tegimlig-ün quvaray-ud-iyar oγoyata

²⁹ Additional signs in Mongolian transcription: ô = ; ġ = . Angle brackets < > are used to mark the text that is written in as a correction in the manuscript.

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
	tshogs kyis mdun du byas te tshul 'di lta bu nyid dang ming 'di nyid dang yi ge 'di nyid kyis shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di 'chad pa mthong ngo//	dpa'i tshogs kyis mdun gyis bltas te tshul 'di lta bu nyid dang/ ming nyid dang/ yi ge 'di nyid kyis shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di 'chad pa mthong ngo//	küriyelegüljü: [207r] bodisung-narun čiyulyan-i esergüben qayduyulju: enekü yosun kiged: enekü nere ba: enekü üsüg-iyer ene bilig baramid nomlaqu-yi üjebei::	küriyelegülged: bôdhi satuva-nar-un čiyulyan-iyar emüne-ben bolıaju ene metü yosun kiged ene kü ner-e ba ene kü üsüg-üd-iyer ene bilig baramid-i nomlaqui-yi üjebei::
5	'di lta ste dper na da ltar nga stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams 'di na chos ston pa dge slong gi dge 'dun gyis yongs su bskor cing	'di lta ste dper na/ da ltar stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams 'di na/ chos ston pa dge 'dun gyis yongs su bskor cing/	<eyin uqaydaqui> adalidqabası: edüge bi ene ıurban mingyan yeke mingyan yirtinču ulus-dur nom nomlarun: ayay-qa tegimlig-üd quvaray-ud-iyar sayitur küriyelegüljü:	eyin uqaydaqui üligerlibesü edüge ıurban mingyan yeke [394v] mingyan yirtinču-yin ene oron-dur nom üjügülügči ba ayay-q-a tegimlig-ün quvaray-ud-iyar oıoyata küriyelegül-ün
6	byang chub sems dpa'i tshogs kyis mdun du byas te tshul 'di nyid dang ming 'di nyid dang yi ge 'di nyid kyis shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di 'chad pa bzhin no//	byang chub sems dpa'i tshogs kyis mdun gyis ltas te/ tshul 'di nyid dang/ ming 'di nyid dang/ yi ge 'di nyid kyis shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di 'chad bzhin no/	bodisung-narun čiyulyan-i esergüben qayduyulju: ene kü yosun kiged: enekü nereba: enekü üsüg-iyer ene bilig baramid-i nomlaqui metü buyu:	bôdhi satuva-nar-un čiyulyan-iyar emüne-ben bolıaju: ene kü yosun kiged ene kü ner-e ba ene kü üsüg-üd-iyer ene bilig baramid-i nomlaysan metü bolai:
7	de mang du thos pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa dang thos pa rgya mtsho dang ldan par gyur te/	de mang du thos pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa dang/ thos pa rgya mtsho lta bu dang ldan par gyur te/	tere sedkijü ülü baraydaqı olan-i sonosuysan kiged: dalai metü sonosuysan büküi-tü bolju:	tere sedkisi ügei olan-ta sonosqui kiged: dalai metü sonosqui-luy-a tegülder bolju:
8	gar skyes pa thams cad du yang nam yang sangs rgyas dang bral bar ma gyur to//	gar skyes pa thad du yang sangs rgyas dang mi 'bral bar 'gyur//	qab qamiy-a qamuy töröl tutum-dur <ber> burqan-luy-a ülü anggijiraqu boluyu:	qamiy-a törögsen bügüde-dür ber: kejiy-e ber burqan-ača ese qayacıbai:
9	skye ba thams cad du yang gang dang gang du sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das nmams mngon sum du 'gyur ba de dang de dag tu skyes te tha na rmi lam na yang sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das dag dang mi 'bral bar 'gyur ro//	skyes pa thams cad du yang gang dang gang du/ sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das nmams mngon sum du gyur pa de dang de dag tu bskyed de/ mtha' ni rmi lam na yang sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das dag 'di dang mi 'bral bar 'gyur ro//	qamuy töröl dotor-dur ber qab qamiy-a ilaju tegüs nöğcigsen burqan-nuyud-luy-a <ülü> anggijiraqui boluyu:	ab ali qamuy töröl-dür ber: ilaju tegüs nöğcigsen burqan-nuyud ilede boluysan tede teden-dür töröged yadabasu jөгүдүн-dür ber ilaju tegüs nöğcigsen burqad-ača ülü qayacıqu boluyu:

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
10	des mi khom pa thams cad ni spangs dal ba phun sum tshogs pa ni bsgrubs so//	des mi khoms pa thams cad ni spangs/ dal ba phun sum tshogs pa ni bsgrubs so//	tere qamuy čola ügei-yi tarqayaju: tegüs sayin čola-tu-yi bütügebei:	tere ber qamuy čöle ügei-yi tebčiged qotala tegüsügsen čöle-tü-yi bütügegsen bolai:.
11		rab 'byor nmam grangs 'di kyang/ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di/ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' [371r] chen po rnams kyi/ thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes bsgrub pa yin par rig par bya'o//	subuti-a ene yosu-bar ene bilig baramid: bodisung maqasung- narun: qamuy-i medegčiyin belge bilig-i bütügegči buyu:	
12		rab 'byor de lta bas na/ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes thob par 'dod pa dag gis/ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di la spyad par bya'o//	subuti-a tegüber qamuy-i medegčiyin belge bilig-i olsuyai kemen küsegči bodisung maqasung- nar: ene bilig baramid- tur yabuydaqui:.	
13	de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la bka' stsal pa/	de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la bka' stsal pa/	tendeče ilaju tegüs nögčigsen amin qabiy- a-tu ananda-tur jarliy bolbai:	tendeče ilaju tegüs nögčigsen amin qabiy- a-tu ananda-dur jarliy bolur-un:
14	kun dga' bo nmam grangs 'dis kyang shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnams kyi thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes sgrub pa yin par rig par bya'o//			ananda-a ene jüil-iyer ber ene bilig baramid bödhi satuva ma-ha-a satuva-nar-un qamuy-i medegči-yin belge bilig-i bütügegči mön kemen uqaydaqui:
15	kun dga' bo de lta bas na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes [311r] thob par 'dod pa dag gis shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di la spyad par bya'o//			ananda-a teyimü-yin tula qamuy-i medegči- yin belge bilig-i olsuyai kemen küsegči bödhi satuva ma-ha-a satuva- nar bilig baramid-iyar yabuydaqui:

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
16		kun dga' bo shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di byang chub sems dpa' mams yang dag par yongs su bzung ba'i phyir	ananda-a ene bilig baramid-i bodisung maqasung-nar-a ünen-iyer sayitur bariyulquyin tulada:	
17		zungs shig/ chongs shig/ lhogs shig/ kun chub par gyis shig/ gzhan dag la yang rgya cher rab tu ston cing/	baridqun jëgüdkün uridqun: qotala-yi dotorayan oroşuludqun: busud-ta ber aŗui-da delgerenggüy-e sayitur üjëgülüdkün:	
18	shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di mnyan par bya gzung bar bya bcang par bya klag par bya kun chub par bya rab tu 'don par bya bstan par bya nye bar bstan par bya	kun dga' bo shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di/ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po dag gis mnyan par bya/ gzung bar bya/ bcang bar bya/ klag par bya/ kun chub par bya/ mngon par bya/ lung nod par bya/ bstan par bya/	ananda-a ene bilig baramid-i: bodisung maqasung- nar sonosdaqui bariydaqui jëgüdekküi uriydaqui: qotala-yi dotorayan oroşuldaqui: ungsiydaqui	ene bilig baramid-i sonosuŗydaqui: toytaŗaydaqui: bariydaqui: uriydaqui: [395r] qotala-yi dotoraban orosiyuluydaqui: sayitur ungsiydaqui: üjëgülüdekküi: sayitur üjëgülüdekküi:
19	lung 'bogs par bya kha ton tu bya bri bar bya de bzhin gshegs pa'i byin gyi rlabs kyis glegs bam chen po la yi ge gsal zhing rab tu gsal ba legs par bris te	kha ton tu bya/ de bzhin gshegs pa'i byin gyis brlabs kyis/ glegs bam chen po la yi ge gsal zhing rab tu gsal ba legs par bris nas/	uduriyulsun abuydaqui: üjëgüldekküi: amayar ügülegdekküi: tegünçilen iregsen-ü adistid-iyar yeke gelmeli-dür asuru todarqay-a sayitur biçijü:	uduriyulsun öggüdekküi: ürgüljide ungsiydaqui: biçigdekküi. tegünçilen iregsed-ün adistid-iyar yeke gelmeli-dür üsüg-i todorayul-un masi todorqai-y-a sayitur biçijü:
20	me tog dang bdug pa dang dri dang phreng ba dang byug pa dang phye ma dang na bza' dang gdugs dang rgyal mtshan dang dril bu dang ba dan dang kho ra khor yug tu mar me'i phreng ba dang mchod pa nram pa mang pos	me tog dang/ bdug pa dang/ dri dang/ byug pa dang/ phye ma dang/ na bza' dang/ gdugs dang/ rgyal mtshan dang/ ba dan dang/ khor yug tu mar me'i phreng ba dang/ mchod pa nram pa mang po dag gis	çeçeg ünür küji erike: sürçiküd narin çimeg degel sükkür tuy <qongqu> vançid: orçin bükü jula-nuyud kiged: olan <jüil> takil-nuyud- iyar	çeçeg ba küji. ünür. erike. sürçig. jambuljayui ba. kög dayun. qubçad ba sikkür. tuy kiged qongqu banjid ba orçin toyorin julas-un erike kiged. olan jüil takil-nuyud- iyar

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
21	bkur stir bya bla mar bya rjed par bya mchod par bya ri mor bya bsnyen bkur bya ste kun dga' bo 'di na nga'i rjes su bstan pa'o//	bkur stir bya/ bla mar bya/ mchod par bya/ brjod par bya/ gsol bar bya ste kun dga' bo 'di ni nga'i gdam ngag go//	kündülegdeküi: degejilegdeküi dabsiydaqui takiydaqui maytaйдаqui ergügdeküi: ananda-a ene kemebesü minu ubadis buyu:	kündülegdeküi degejilegdeküi dabsiydaqui. takiydaqui tabiylaydaqui. ergün kündülegdeküi buyu: ananda-a ene kemebesü minu dayan üjügülügsen bolai::
22	de ci'i phyir zhe na/	de ci'i phyir zhe na/	tere yayun-u tulada kemebesü:	tere yayun-u tulada kemebesü:
23	shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa 'di las thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes yongs su rdzogs par 'gyur ro/			ene bilig baramid-ača qamuy-i medegci-yin belge bilig oγoyata tegüskü boluyu:
24	kun dga' bo 'di ji snyam du sems de bzhin gshegs pa khyod kyi ston pa yin nam/	kun dga' bo 'di ji snyam du sems/ de bzhin gshegs pa khyod kyi ston pa yin nam/	ananda-a egüni ker sedkimüi: tegünčilen iregsen činu baysi buyukü:	ananda-a egün-i ker sedkimüi: tegünčilen iregsen činu baysi mön buyu uu:
25	kun dga' bos gsol pa/ bcom ldan 'das bdag gi ston pa lags so bde bar gshegs pa bdag gi ston pa lags so//	kun dga' bos gsol pa/ bcom ldan 'das bdag gis ston pa lags so// bde bar gshegs pa bdag gis ston pa lags so//	ananda öčirün: ilaju tegüs nöğčigsen-e minu baysi bui: sayibar oduysan-a minu baysi bui:	ananda öčir-ün: ilaju tegüs nöğčigsen-e minu baysi bolai: sayibar oduysan-a minu baysi bolai:
26	de skad ces gsol pa dang bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to//	de skad ces gsol pa dang/ bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to//	teyin kemen öčigsen- dür: ilaju tegüs nöğčigsen amin qabiy-a ananda-dur eyin kemen jarliy bolbai:	teyin kemen öčigsen- dür: ilaju tegüs nöğčigsen amin qabiy- a-tu ananda-dur eyin kemen jarliy bolur-un:
27	kun dga' bo khyod kyi ston pa de bzhin gshegs pa la kun dga' bo khyod kyis lus kyi las byams pa yid du 'ong ba dang ngag gi las byams pa yid du 'ong ba dang yid kyi las byams pa yid du 'ong bas rim gror byas te	kun dga' bo khyod kyis lus kyi las byams pa yid [371v] du 'ong ba dang/ ngag gi las byams pa yid du 'ong ba dang/ yid kyi las byams pa yid du 'ong bas rim gro byas te/	ananda-a činu baysi tegünčilen [207v] iregsen-dür ananda-a č bey-e-yin üile sedkil- dür jökistu asaraqui: kelen-ü üile sedkil- dür jökistu asaraqui: sedkil-ün üile sedkil-tür jökistu asaraqui-bar kündülegdeküi:	ananda-a činu baysi tegünčilen iregsen-dür anand-a č ber bey-e- yin üilen sedkil-dür jokis-tu asaraqui kiged: kelen-ü jarliy sedkil-dür jokis-tu asaraqui ba: [395v] sedkil-ün üiles sedkil-iyer jökis-tu asaraqui-bar tabiylal-i üiledbei:

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
28	de lta bas na kun dga’ bo da ltar nga bzhugs te ’tsho zhing gzhes pa’i sku ’di la ci ltar khyod kysis dga’ ba dang dad pa dang dad pa dang ri mor byas pa kun dga’ bo de ltar nga ’das nas shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa ’di la yang byos shig/	de lta bas na kun dga’ bo da ltar nga bzhugs te/ mtsho zhing bzhes pa’i sku ’di nyid khyod kysis dga’ ba dang/ dad pa dang/ ri mor byas pa de bzhin du nga ’das nas/ shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’di la’ang byos shing/	ananda-a tegüber edüge nirvan ülü bolun sayuqui minu ene bey-e-dür či bayasqui süsülküi kündülel takil üiledküi<-dür> adali: namayi nögčibesü ele ene bilig baramid- tur ber tegünčilen üiledtügei:	teyimü-yin tula ananda-a edüge amui esen tügel aysan ene bey-e-dür či ber ker metü bayasqui kiged bisireküi tabiylan üiledügsen tere metü ananda-a namayi nögčigsen-ü qoyina ene bilig baramid-tur ber teyin kü üiledüged:
29	kun dga’ bo ci nas shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa ’di nub par mi ’gyur zhing ci nas khyod [311b] skyes bu tha mar mi ’gyur bar kun dga’ bo khyod la lan gnyis lan gsum du yongs su gtad do rjes su yongs su gtad do/	kun dga’ bo ci nas shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’di nub par mi ’gyur zhing/ ci nas khyod skyes bu tha mar mi ’gyur bar khyed la lan gnyis gsum du yongs su gtad do// rjes su gtad do// rjes su yongs su gtad do//	ananda-a kerken-ber ene bilig baramid-i ülü ečülgerün: kerken-ber namayi tangqai aran ülü bolıyarun čimada qoyar-ta ıurban-da oıoyata ögbei: dayan ögbei:	ananda-a kerken kijü ene bilig baramid-i ülü ečülgen ananda-a kerken kijü čimayi degeji törölki-tü ülü bolıyar-un čimadur qoyar-a ıurban-ta oıoyata qatangıudqabai: dayan oıoyata qatangıudqabai:
30	kun dga’ bo shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa ’di ’jig rten na ci srid du rab tu spyod pa de srid du de bzhin gshegs pa bzhugs par rig par bya’o//	kun dga’ bo shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’jig rten na ji srid du spyod pa de srid du/ de bzhin gshegs pa bzhugs par rig par bya’o/	ananda-a ene bilig baramid yirtinčü-tür kejiy-e aqu bügesü tejiyede tegünčilen iregsen esen sayubai kemen uqaydaqı:	ananda-a ene bilig baramid-i yirtinčü- dür kejiy-e-de sayitur yabuqui tejiy-e-de tegünčilen iregsen orosıysan kemen uqaydaqı:
31	kun dga’ bo de srid du de bzhin gshegs pa chos ston par rig par bya’o/	kun dga’ bo de srid du de bzhin gshegs pa chos ston par rig par bya’o//	ananda-a tejiyede tegünčilen iregsen nom nomlaqui kemen uqaydaqı:	ananda-a tejiy-e-de tegünčilen iregsen nom üjügülümüi kemen uqaydaqı:
32	kun dga’ bo gang shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa ’di nyan pa dang ’dzin pa dang ’chang ba dang klog pa dang kun chub par byed pa dang/ rab tu ’don pa dang ston pa dang nye bar ston pa dang lung ’bogs pa dang kha ston byed pa dang yi ger ’dri ba dang/	kun dga’ bo gang shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa ’di nyid nyan pa dang/ ’dzin pa dang/ ’chang ba dang/ klog pa dang/ kun chub par byed pa dang/ rab tu ’don par bya ba dang/ lung nod pa dang/ ston pa dang/ kha ton byed pa dang/ yi ger ’bri ba dang/	ananda-a kedber ene bilig baramid-i sonosuyči bariyči jegügči uriyči qotala-yi dotorayan orıyulun üiledügči: sayitur ungsiyči: uduriıulsun abuyči: üjegülügči amayar ügülegči bičigči kiged:	ananda-a ken bilig baramid-i sonosun. barin toıytayan. urin. qotala-yi dotoraban oroıul-un. üjügül-ün. sayitur üjügül-ün. uduriıulsun-i öggün. ürgüljide ungsiyčin ba. debter-tür bičiged.

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
33	me tog dang bdug pa dang dri dang phreng ba dang byug pa dang phye ma dang na bza' dang gdugs dang rgyal mtshan dang dril bu dang ba dan dag dang khor yug du mar me'i phreng ba dang mchod pa nam pa mang po dag gis/	me tog dang/ bdug pa dang/ spos dang/ phreng ba dang/ byug pa dang/ phye ma dang/ na bza' dang/ gdugs dang/ rgyal mtshan dang/ ba dan dag dang/ kho ra yug tu mar me'i phreng ba dang dang/ mchod pa nam pa mang po dag gis/	čečeg ünür küji erike: sürčiküd narin čimeg degel sükür tuy <qongqu> vančid orčin bükü jula kiged: olan jüil takil-nuyud-iyar	čečeg ba küji. ünür. erike. sürčig. jambuljayui. qubčad. sikür. tuy. qongqu. banjid kiged. orčin toyorin-a julas-un erike ba. olan jüil takil-nuyud-iyar
34	bkur stir byed bla mar byed rjed par byed mchod par byed ri mor byed bsnyen bkur byed pa'i sems can de dag ni sangs rgyas mthong ba dang dam pa'i chos nyan pa dang dge 'dun la rim gro byed pa dang ma bral bar rig par bya'o//	bkur stir byed/ bla mar byed/ ri mor byed/ mchod par byed/ gsol bar byed pa'i sems can de dag ni sangs rgyas mthong ba dang/ mi 'bral ba dang/ dam pa'i chos nyan pa dang mi 'bral ba dang/ dge 'dun la bsnyen bkur byed pa dang mi 'bral bar rig par bya'o//	kündülügči degejilegči dabsiyči takiyči maytayči ergügči tedeger amitan kemebesü burqan-i üjeküiy-e-eče ese anggijiraysan: degedü nom-i sonosqui-ača ese anggijiraysan: bursang quvaray-ud-tur takil üiledküi-eče ese anggijiraysan kemen uqaydaqui:	kündülen. degejilen. dabsin. takin. tabiylan. ergün kündülen [396r] üiledügči tedeger amitan kemebesü burqan-i üjeküi kiged: degedü nom-i sonosqui ba: burqan quvaray-i tabiylan üiledküi-eče ese qayačaysan kemen uqaydaqui::
35	kun dga' bo sems can de dag ni de bzhin gshags pa'i drung na spyod par rig par bya'o//	kun dga' bo sems can de dag ni de bzhin gshags pa'i drung na tshangs par spyod par rig par bya'o//	ananda-a tedeger amitan-i tegünčilen iregsen-u dergede yabuyči kemen uqaydaqui::	ananda-a tedeger amitan kemebesü: tegünčilen iregsen-ü dergede yabuyči kemen uqaydaqui::
36	bcom ldan 'das dgyes shing de skad ces bka' stsal pa dang/	bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka' [372r] stsal pa dang/	ilažu tegüs nögčigsen teyin kemen jarliḡ boluysan-dur:	ilažu tegüs nögčigsen bayasuyad teyin kemen jarliḡ boluysan-dur:
37	byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po byams pa la sogs pa dang tshe dang ldan pa rab 'byor dang tshe dang ldan pa sha ri'i bu dang tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo dang	byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po byams pa la sogs pa dang/ tshe dang ldan pa rab 'byor dang/ tshe dang ldan pa sha ri'i bu dang/ tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo dang/	mayidari terigüten bodisung maqasung-nar kiged: amin qabiy-a-tu subuti: amin qabiy-a-tu saribudari: amin qabiy-a-tu ananda:	bödhi satuva ma-ha-a satuva mayidari terigüten ba amin qabiy-a-tu subuti kiged: amin qabiy-a-tu šaribudari ba: amin qabiy-a-tu ananda-luy-a:

	Peking Kanjur Tib. phreng ba can	Phug brag Kanjur Tib. gzo sbyangs	Altan Gerel ubasi Mong. “earlier” group	Anonymous (Kangxi) Mong. “later” group
38	lha nrams kyi dbang po brgya byin dang lha dang mi dang lha ma yin dang dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi rangs te/ bcom ldan 'das kyi gsungs pa la mngon par bstod do//	lha dang/ mi dang/ lha ma yin dang/ dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yid rangs te/ bcom ldan 'das kyi gsungs pa la mngon par bstod do//	tngri kümün asuri gandari-luy-a yirtinčü- dekin bayasču bisirejü: ilažu tegüs nögčigsen-ü jarliy-i ilede maytabai::	tngri-ner-ün erketü qormusta kiged: tngri. kümün. asuri. gandari-luy-a nigen-e yirtinčü-dekin bayasulčažu bür-ün. ilažu tegüs nögčigsen-ü nomlaysan-i ilede maytabai::
39	'phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol du phyin pa brgyad stong pa las yongs su gtad pa'i le'u zhes bya ste sum cu rtsa gnyis pa'o//	shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa brgyad stong pa las yongs su gtad pa'i le'u ste sum bcu rtsa gnyis pa'o//	qutuy-tu naiman mingyan neretü bilig baramid-ača: oyoyata öggügsen neretü yučin qoyaduyar bölöğ: : ::	qutuy-tu bilig-ün činadi kürügsen naiman mingγ-a-tu-ača oyoyata qatangyadqaysan-u bölöğ kemegdekü yučin qoyaduyar bolai: ::

Bibliography

- Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism (Chos-Ḥbyung). II. Part. The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, E. Obermiller (trans.), Harrassowitz, Heidelberg 1931.
- Catalogue of Tibetan Works Kept in Otani University Library*, Otani University Library, Kyoto 1973.
- Das, Sarat Chandra, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, Calcutta 1902.
- Eimer, Helmut, *Einige Notizen zur Struktur der Kanjurhandschrift aus Phug brag*, in: Helmut Eimer, Michael Hahn, Maria Schetelich et Peter Wyzlic (eds), *Redigenda curaverunt. Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*, Indica et Tibetica Bd 34, Monographien zu den Sprachen und Literaturen des indo-tibetischen Kulturraumes, Swisttal-Odendorf 1999, pp. 101–116.
- Erdemtü Minggad ed., *Ili-yin γool-un urusqal dayau oron-du qatayalaydaju bayiy-a todo üsüg-ün surbulji bičig-ün čiyulγan 1*. Öbör mongγol-un keblel-ün bölüglel, Öbör mongγol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2015.
- Erdemtü Minggad ed., *Ili-yin γool-un urusqal dayau oron-du qatayalaydaju bayiy-a todo üsüg-ün surbulji bičig-ün čiyulγan 5*. Öbör mongγol-un keblel-ün bölüglel, Öbör mongγol-un soyol-un keblel-ün quriy-a, 2016.
- *Location List for the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Phug Brag Kanjur: Compiled from the Microfiche Edition and Jampa Samten's Descriptive Catalogue*, Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1993.
- Gerelmaa, G., *Brief Catalogue of Oirat Manuscripts Kept by Institute of Language and Literature*, Vol. III, Ulaanbaatar 2005.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, *Notes on Two Texts in the Phug Brag Kanjur*, in: Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann und Roland Steiner (eds), *Suhrllekhāh. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, Indica et Tibetica Bd. 28, 1996, pp. 69–78.
- Heissig, Walther, *Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1954.

- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid, *Die lHan kar ma. Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte. Kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 59, Wien 2008.
- Jampa Samten, *A Catalogue of the Phug-Brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, Dharamsala 1992.
- Karashima, Seishi, *Was the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?* in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2012 XVI* (2013), pp. 171–188.
- Richardson, H. E., *Names and Titles in Early Tibetan Records*, “Bulletin of Tibetology” IV, no. 1 (1967), pp. 5–20.
- Shi, Hui Feng, *An Annotated English Translation of Kumārajīva’s Xiaōpīn Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, “Asian Literature and Translation” 4, no. 1 (2017), pp. 187–238.
- Torricelli, Fabrizio, *Un Libro Sacro Tibetano Nella Collezione De Filippi al Museo Nazionale d’Antropologia e Etnologia Di Firenze*, “Archivio per l’Antropologia e La Etnologia” CXXIX (1999), pp. 273–285.
- Torricelli, Fabrizio, and Nikolai N. Dudka, *Manuscript LTWA No. 23476. A “SDe Can” Sample of the BrGyad Stong Pa*, “Tibet Journal”, no. 24 (2) (1999), pp. 29–44.
- Yampolskaya, Natalia, *Jadamba. Eight Mongolian Translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā sutra*, Asiatische Forschungen 158, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2018.
- Bilgüdeci, G., Otgoonbaatar R., and A. Tsendina, *Damdinsürengiyn ger müzein mongol nom sudryn bürtgel*, Ulaanbaatar 2018.
- Sazykin, A.G., *Katalog mongol’skikh rukopisei i ksilografov Instituta vostokovedeniya Rossiyskoi akademii nauk*, vol. 2, Vostochnaya literatura RAN, Moskva 2001.
- 務 (Tsumoto), 川合 (Kawai), 「写本チベット訳『八千頌般若經』の翻訳年代について」 (*On the Time of Creation of the Tibetan Manuscript Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*). 『印度學佛教學研究』 (“Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies”) 29 (1), pp. 388–386.
- 史生 (Fumio), 庄司 (Shoji), チベットに伝えられる三種の『八千頌般若』について (*On the Threefold Textual Tradition of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā in Tibet*), 印度學佛教學研究 (“Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies”) 63, no. 1 (2014), pp. 460 (93)–455 (98).
- チベット語訳『八千頌般若』の改訳過程とその背景—近代日本の入蔵者らによる将来本を手がかりとして— (*On Retranslation Process of the Tibetan Version of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā and its Background*), 法華文化研究 43 (2017), pp. 1–24.
- 現存梵本『八千頌般若』はいかに形成されたか (*A Study on the Compilation Process of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*), 中央学術研究所紀要 (“Bulletin of Chuo Academic Research Institute”), no. 44 (2015), pp. 57–78.