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ENACTING WORDS

A DIPLOMATIC ANALYSIS OF THE IMPERIAL DECREES
(BKAS BCAD) AND THEIR APPLICATION IN THE
SGRA SBYOR BAM PO GÑIS PA TRADITION

CRISTINA SCHERRER-SCHAUB

Dedicated to the memory of a very dear friend, Graham E. Clarke

1. Chancery. Phraseology and practice

The manifold aspects of the transmission of Indian Buddhism to Tibet during the VIIth-IXth century are some of the most interesting cultural phenomena in the study of the Indo-Tibetan tradition. The fact that several secular documents and religious manuscripts of the same period have been found in hiding places or in sacred deposits of Central Asia, in particular Dunhuang, reveals (and at once complicates) the picture of the interwoven relations occurring at this time between Indian, Tibetan and Chinese societies, to speak of them only. If, as we said on another occasion, the quest for pristine sources may be seen as a vérito-machie\(^2\), the

\(^1\) Presented at the VIIIth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, July 25-31 1998, Indiana University, Bloomington. I am grateful to Peter Skilling and Tom Tillemans for having carefully corrected (žüs) and revised (žu chen) the English. Errors left are of course only mine.

\(^2\) That is, the result of a prolonged and tortuous effort to authenticate the “original” (text, document, etc.). Indeed, as we have had occasion to say earlier (Harvard Manuscripts Workshop 1999), in the study of a manuscript, be it a philosophical text written on birch-bark or paper, or an ostracon transmitting a “decodifiable” fragmentary text — something which makes sense —, one of the motivations if not the motivation is a kind of “vérito-machie” [“truth-o-machy”], as we are overtly engaging in a search of “authenticity” and attempting, consciously or not, to establish a hierarchy of truths, if not facts of truth. Take for instance the case of constructing stemmae to establish the genesis of a document (diplomatic analysis) or to study text-stratigraphy (philology).

Notwithstanding the fact that diplomatic (Lat. diplomatica see infra n. 28) and philology are essential instruments for a rigorous approach to texts and documents, the search
study of textual genesis and stratigraphy is a plunge into the field of interpretation. The sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa, partially surviving in four old incomplete manuscripts (the fourth discovered only recently) and in a canonical version, attests to the fact that the Buddhist institution, as an integral part of the Tibetan Empire, “emerges in this period as a textualized artifact”. Indeed, the first epigraphical records, such as the inscriptions of bSam yas or Žwa’i lha khañ, and some of their contemporary extant documents, bear witness to the existence of chancery and archival practices where originals or copies of the public acts, which were also kept on stone were stored. It is clear that the vérito-machie, besides its obvious authoritative value, aimed to prevent forgeries and hand public acts down to future generations, as expressed by the well-known formula inherited from ancient Indian epigraphy and appended to public acts “… and may this order/edict/decree/grant/charter endure as long as sun and moon [endure]…”.

A genuine example of chancery phraseology and practice is embedded in the last paragraphs of the inscription at Žwa’i lha khañ. Two pillars for pristine sources should never obscure the search of meaning, nor end in a striving for “truth” … For the unconscious historical motives behind the search of “truth”, see Paul Veyne (1983: 17-27) “Quand la vérité historique était tradition et vulgate”, ib. 23: “Le grand mot est lâché: l’habitude de citer ses autorités, l’annotation savante, n’a pas été une invention des historiens, mais vient des controverses théologiques et de la pratique juridique, où l’on alléguait l’Écriture, les Pandectes ou les pièces du procès: dans la Summa contra Gentiles, saint Thomas ne renvoie pas aux passages d’Aristote, car il prend la responsabilité de les réinterpréter et il les tient pour la vérité même, qui est anonyme; en revanche il cite l’Écriture, qui est Révélation et non pas vérité de l’anonyme raison. … Bref, l’annotation savante a une origine chicanière et polémique: on s’est envoyé les preuves à la tête, avant de les donner à partager aux autres membres de la “communauté scientifique”. La grande raison en est la montée de l’Université, avec son monopole de plus en plus exclusif sur l’activité intellectuelle”.

3 The fourth, is a short passage so far unidentified and preserved in the India Office manuscript collection of the British Library (IO Tib J 76) and may now be added to the three extant incomplete manuscripts, see Appendix II.


5 See for instance Pelliot tib. 134 (Scherrer-Schaub 1999-2000: 226 and 237) and compare with the formulae “ā-candrāditya kāliya” attested in a Vākātaka’s copper plate, dated ca. Vth c. (Burgess 1975: 118, 120-121 and 123-124), and “ā-candrārka-kṣiitī samakālam” (Sircar 1996: 140 and nn. 1-2, 392 and 397). Alternative formulae, such as nam du or g-yuṅ druṅ du, are used in Old Tibetan to express perpetuity.

flanking the entrance of the *lha khai* record the privileges granted by Khri lde sron btsan (r. 800-815)\(^7\) to Ban de\(^8\) Myaṅ Tiṅ ne ’dzin to whom the King owed affection, respect and probably also his sovereignty\(^9\). Without entering into a detailed analysis of the charter, we will mention some interesting elements of chancery procedure.

First of all, if we compare the inscriptions from the time of Khri lde sroṅ btsan with those of the preceding reign of Khri sroṅ lde btsan (755-794?), we note (without surprise) that with time the chancery becomes more complicated (in phraseology) and bureaucratized (in praxis). For instance, the text appearing on the Western pillar at Žwa’i lha khai distinguishes between the original document or *exemplar* and copies, lists the officials in charge of the chancery court, and attests to the existence of a deposit\(^10\), constructed (*brtsigs*) to contain and preserve the *exemplar* of the document. The text carved on the pillar (*rdo riṅ*) by the lapicide, following a common and universal procedure, recapitulates the act in order to ensure its publicity, that is, “to make the text known by everybody” (*kun gyis ūs par bya ba’i phyir*)\(^11\). Moreover, the procedure of consulting (reading, readjusting, renewing or reconfirming?) the charter is precisely established and phrased, including the gesture of taking in hand the


\(^8\) It may be worth noting that if we admit that the Tabo document genuinely dates to 783/795, that is, the date of the second and middle *bkas bcad*, then the title “Ban de” (equivalent of “Bhadanta”) as designation for a high ecclesiastic office must have been already in use at the time of Khri sroṅ lde btsan. The title, apparently, appears in “public” for the first time in the inscription of Žwa’i lha khai.


\(^10\) *gtsigs kyi mkhar bu*, lit. a small fortress, that is a deposit having the form of a casket or a coffer for storing a public act. See Li and Coblin 1987: 265, ll. 26-27 and Richardson 1985: 48, ll.26-27. In fact, the act was probably deposited in the socle of the stone pillar or the “coffered recess” bearing a seal: see Richardson 1985: 45 and Plate 6.

\(^11\) Žwa’i lha khai, West Inscription, ll. 25-26, Richardson 1985: 48-49. Compare the injunctive clause of the 814 Edict of Khri lde sroṅ btsan or the “third and last authoritative decision concerning the *chos kyi skad*” appearing in the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa, *infra*, p. 317.

There is no doubt that the chancery has, as other disciplines, some underlying universal principles. Public acts were and are read on special occasions, although the evidence is rather scarce. In this respect the Dhauli edict of King Aśoka is remarkable in that it attests that the edict had to be read or listened to at a precise time: *ekatho iyaṅ ca lipi tissanakkhattena sotaviyā aṅtalā pi ca tissena* … See Bloch 1950: 139-140.
Gesture, exchange of objects, as well as formal declaration and oath, the use of which is confirmed from the time of the first epigraphical records, for instance the inscription of Zol, r. of Khri sro n lde btsan, where the charter is granted by oath, Richardson 1985: 16-17, and 16, ll. 5-7: || btsan po Khri sro n lde btsan gyi ža sra nas dbu sñu gnai ste ||, corroborate the written act. As said on another occasion, there is much to learn in waste paper, in spite of its being less attractive than art or living/contemporary societies. Texts are not inert matter: they are memories of past societies which are alive as soon as we handle them. See Scherrer-Schaub forthcomingc.

Richardson 1985: 52, ll. 58-62. Properly speaking this is the announcement of the validation sign (gtsigs kyi mdo \ rdo la mñoṃ bar bris te mthā’ phyag rgyas btāb nas) here the seal, which appears at the end of the public act carved on stone. It is worth noting that in this particular case, the affixed seal (rare in epigraphical records) appears on stone probably because, as seen, a copy of the edict was kept in the socle of the pillar itself.

In fact, ever since the discovery of the Old Tibetan Chronicle and other important administrative documents, kept in the collection of Dunhuang, certain aspects of chancery terminology and practice of the Old Tibetan period became partially known. Marcelle Lalou’s “Revendications des fonctionnaires du Grand Tibet au VIIIe siècle” remains a fine and inspiring piece of scholarship, as are the current researches of Helga Uebach and Tsuguhito Takeuchi.

In analysing the traditions preserved in the mKhas pa’i dga’ ston of dPa’bo gtsug lag ’phren ba (1504-1566) and “concerning Sroṅ brcan sgam po as first legislator and organizer of Tibet”, Géza Uray reached the conclusion that “there was no codification and deliberate administrative organization

12 Gesture, exchange of objects, as well as formal declaration and oath, the use of which is confirmed from the time of the first epigraphical records, for instance the inscription of Zol, r. of Khri sro n lde btsan, where the charter is granted by oath, Richardson 1985: 16-17, and 16, ll. 5-7: || btsan po Khri sro n lde btsan gyi ža sra nas dbu sñu gnai ste ll, corroborate the written act. As said on another occasion, there is much to learn in waste paper, in spite of its being less attractive than art or living/contemporary societies. Texts are not inert matter: they are memories of past societies which are alive as soon as we handle them. See Scherrer-Schaub forthcomingc.

13 Richardson 1985: 48, ll. 27-28. Properly speaking this is the announcement of the corroboration or the legal confirmation of the edict.

14 The documents have been studied by several scholars beginning with Bacot, Thomas and Toussaint (1940-46) and Macdonald-Spanien (1971). Géza Uray, in one of the last mise au point concerning these historical texts to appear so far, adopted the appellation “Old Tibetan Chronicle”, and further distinguished between “Chronicle manuscripts” and “Genealogy manuscripts”: see Uray 1992.

15 The documents have been studied by several scholars beginning with Bacot, Thomas and Toussaint (1940-46) and Macdonald-Spanien (1971). Géza Uray, in one of the last mise au point concerning these historical texts to appear so far, adopted the appellation “Old Tibetan Chronicle”, and further distinguished between “Chronicle manuscripts” and “Genealogy manuscripts”: see Uray 1992.


17 Dates according to the masterpiece of an unconventional scholar: see Martin 1997 s.v.
under Sroṅ-btsan sgam-po, alias Khri Sroṅ-btsan”; rather “this took place only under Khri Maṅ-slon Maṅ-rtsan in 654-655”. However “in spite of the deliberate forgeries and errors, the traditions are not far off the historical truth, as the administrative organization and codification executed shortly after Sroṅ-btsan sgam-po’s death and later attributed to him, are but the last stages on the development during his reign”18.

The Tibetan scholar dGe ’dun Chos’phel, and other scholars after him19 noted that epigraphical records and probably some old documents were known to later historiographers, in particular dPa’bo gtsug lag’phreñ ba who reproduces the edict (bka’ gtsigs)20 of Khri sroṅ IDe btsan, which, as Tucci says “can be considered as the foundation-chart of the Tibetan Buddhism”. It appears that when Buddhism became the official religion of the Empire, the administrative machinery permeated the ecclesiastic state21. In this respect, the “sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa” is one of the oldest documents of ecclesiastic chancery. There is no doubt that, in spite of the fact that it is functionally a manual of translation techniques, this complex document is, at the same time, a charter, a public act, corroborated

20 Karmay 1988: 1, dates the bka’ gtsigs to 779 and the bka’ mchid to ca. 761, when at the age of twenty the Sovereign “began to contemplate the idea of taking up again the religion which had been subjected to a ban since the assassination of his father Khri IDe-gtsug-btsan in 755 A. D.”. Richardson (1985: 27) argues convincingly a precise dating of the bSam yas inscription, which, as it is known succintly recapitulates the bka’ gtsigs in question: “It is largerly due to the brief inscription at Bsam-yas that we can accept as authentic the valuable light thrown on the history of Buddhism in Tibet by these two documents [that is the bka’ gtsigs and the bka’ mchid] in PT [i.e. dPa’o gTug]. The first of them, moreover, makes it possible to date the inscription to within a few years. The principal witness to the detailed edict was the Chief Minister Zhang Rgyal-zigs shu-theng who, according to the T’ang Annals, demitted office in 782 A. D. Accepting that the great temple at Bsam-yas was completed in the sheep year 779 A. D. the inscription and the other documents [our emphasis] can be placed between those two years and therefore earlier than the culmination of rivalry between the Indian teaching of gradual and the Chinese of immediate enlightenment in a great debate, probably in 792 A. D.” Sørensen (1994: 383, n. 1171) dates these documents of 780, thus agreeing with Richardson.

This dating sheds light on the genesis of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa tradition. The “Tabo version” might well have been issued in the wake of these documents, which would speak in favour of 783 for the second and middle bkas bcad, see infra p. 290, n. 84.
by validation and presumably circulated in several copies throughout the Empire, as the use was in vogue at the time and precisely attested in the *bka’* *gtsigs* of Khri sroṅ lde btsan, statuting that

Also, the text of an authoritative account [*bka’* *mchid*] of how the religion of the Buddha came to Tibet both in earlier and later times has been deposited together with the edict [*bka’* *gtsigs*]. Such an original was made in thirteen copies. One has been placed in the archives. Two have been sealed and one each deposited with the religious communities of the ‘Phrul snaṅ temple in Ra-sa and the Bsam-yas Lhun-gyis-’grub temple of Brag dmar. Ten copies have been sealed at the end and one each has been given to the ‘Phrul snaṅ temple of Ra-sa, the temple of Bsam-yas Lhun-gyis-’grub, the temple of Bkra-shis-lha-yul of Khra-’brug, the religious community of the palace, to the Rgya-btags Ra-mo-che of Ra-sa, Kham-sum Myi-lgrol-sgrol of Brag-dmar, to the country of Bru-ža, the country of Zhang-zhung, to Mdo-smad and to the jurisdiction of sde-blon [*sde blon ris*], to be held by the religious community of their temples.

We may note that the itemized copies assigned to various religious sites are treated differently. The first of the thirteen copies was placed in the archives.
repository (phyag sbal)\textsuperscript{25}. The remaining twelve are authenticated: two of them bear a seal and are assigned to the main sites, while the others bear a “seal at the end” (mthar phyag rgya). The expression is attested in the inscription at Žwa’i lha khān (Richardson 1985: 48, l. 28), where indeed at the end of the east inscription one may see “a coffered recess which once held the king’s seal” (ib., Plate 6, see \textit{supra} n. 10). Other examples could be the so called “sceaux carrés tibétains” affixed to the end of some Dunhuang manuscripts\textsuperscript{26}. It might be that the seal [a great seal?] stamped on the two copies assigned to the main sites, bore evidence to the ratification and authenticity or attestation of authority by the btsan po. The seal stamped at the end attests to the authenticity of the ratified document, and seems to have also functioned as the document’s closure, granting security and avoiding alteration. This is confirmed by the Dunhuang documents alluded to above (another example is Pelliot tib. 1089), in which the seal is affixed to the right part of the bottom page, preceded by hatching lines. Moreover, the different degrees of validation, so to speak, seem to reflect the hierarchy of importance of the places where the \textit{vidimus} copies of the edict were placed.

\textit{The Study of public acts}

To reconstruct and interpret textual history, that is, the history of a text’s formation or “stratification”\textsuperscript{27}, in particular when dealing with public acts emanating from a political, social or religious institution, the well-established discipline, known as “diplomatic”\textsuperscript{28} may and, as we will see, has been advantageously applied. As this word has sometimes been used in a rather metaphorical or metonymic acceptation, it is useful to recall

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Pelliot tib. 1083, 1085, Spanien & Imaeda 1979: 16-17; Macdonald-Spanien 1971: 324-325.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Cf. Ueyama Daishun à propos Ch’an texts of Dunhuang – “Tonkō ni okeru zen no shosō”, Ryūkoku Daigaku Ronshū 421, 1982, pp. 114-115.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Although its use is rare the term is consecrated by the \textit{New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary}, s. v. “Sing. & plur. The paleographic and critical study of old documents”. The term is coined on Lat. \textit{diplomatica}, cf. French \textit{diplomatique}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
its basic meaning. Although the expression “diplomatic edition” of antique manuscripts has been consecrated as a term for a specific editorial procedure, the discipline known as “diplomatic” refers more specifically to the study of written documents, be they the result of a juridical or institutional act or the record of a juridical or institutional fact, having been redacted according to a specific form and formulary and provided with a criterion of validation, for instance a seal, the names of the persons involved in the act or a formula, functioning respectively as validator (the person) and validation (the formula).

Diplomatic, the art and features of which were well-known in classical India, was born in the European Middle Ages, with the intent to discriminate between authentic documents and forgeries. It can count illustrious representatives, such as Lorenzo Valla or Nicolas Cusanus, the famous Humanist who collected ancient Latin manuscripts. Successfully applied, as early as 1950, to the collection of charters and records of the Kamakura period by the French scholar Joüon des Longrais\(^{29}\), diplomatic was applied to the study of Old Tibetan documents by the late Géza Uray and his followers. One of the most important contributors to the field is Jampa L. Panglung (1994), who collated the extant canonical version of the introductory part of the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* (Fig. A§1) together with the corresponding manuscript fragments from Tabo, which were identified by Panglung Rinpoche himself in 1991 among the confused mass of folii of the Tabo collection. His conclusions may be summarized as follows:

1. The edict opening the canonical version of the *sGra sbyor* and dated, according to annalistic style, to 814 “must be taken as a confirmation by Khri lDe sroñ btsan of the earlier edict of his father as transmitted in the Tabo version”\(^{30}\).


\(^{30}\) Panglung 1994: 171-172. A consequence noted by Panglung is that the “annalistic entry including the names of the great councillors of the earlier edict had to be replaced by an actual one. However, the names of the great monks Yon tan and Tiṅ he ’dzin who were still in office had been kept” and “it is noteworthy that the canonical version shows a promotion in rank of the great monk Yon tan whose name is preceded by the honorific dPal”.
2. The earlier edict attested by the Tabo fragment may be dated to 795 or 783, although “the reference to the residence Žuñ-kar which in historiographical literature traditionally is the place where Khri-sroṅ lde-btsan lived in his old days (or had retired to) and where he died would be in favour of the year 795” (1994: 167)\textsuperscript{31}.

3. The \textit{narrative} and the \textit{dispositive} (1994: 168-171), as transmitted in the two versions, differ. In particular, the canonical version is “more elaborate than the Ta pho version” (ib.: 171) and contains an “enlargement of the guidelines” for the translators which “doubtless are a consequence of increasing experience in translating” (\textit{loc. cit.}).

It is noteworthy that the Tabo version almost certainly descends from a copy transmitted to Western Tibet at the end of the VIII\textsuperscript{th} century following the procedure for public acts at that epoch alluded to above. If this is the case, given that the Tabo version begins with the edict of Khri sroṅ lde btsan\textsuperscript{32} dated, according to annalistic style, to 783 or 795, one can surmise that a copy of the “

\textit{bkas bcad}” edict of Khri sroṅ lde btsan reached the Western regions of Žaṅ žuñ in the period between the end of the VIII\textsuperscript{th} century and the first decade of the IX\textsuperscript{th}. This raises the vexing question of Buddhism in Western Tibet during the first propagation (\textit{sña dar}) of Buddhism in Tibet. According to the account of Huichao, in the regions situated to the north-east of Kashmir, visited by the Chinese pilgrim on his way back from India to his homeland in 727\textsuperscript{33}, lie “the kingdoms of P’o-lū, Yang-t’ung (= Žaṅ-žuñ?) and So-po-tz’u (?). Those three kingdoms are under suzerainty of the Tibetans. The clothing, language and customs are completely different … The country is narrow and small, and the mountains and valleys very rugged. There are monasteries and monks and the people venerate faithfully the Three Jewels. As to the kingdom of Tibet to the East, there are no monasteries at all and Buddha’s teaching

\textsuperscript{31} Compare however \textit{infra} pp. 290-291 and 314.

\textsuperscript{32} The Tabo manuscript begins on the recto side of the first folio, which according to the old system of pagination making use of letter-numerals, is indicated with the letter “ka”. For the pagination of Old Tibetan manuscripts see Scherrer-Schaub 1999: 20-22.

\textsuperscript{33} For the date of Huichao journey, see Kuwayama 1994.

\textsuperscript{34} Petech 1977: 10 and n. 2; cf. Demiéville 1952: 185 and n. 3. Following Pulleyblank, Petech (ibidem) thinks that “Hu” “for Hui-ch’ao (…) it applied to the Iranian populations, which would fit perfectly well with the Dards of Ladakh (but not with the people
is unknown; but in the [three above mentioned] countries the population consists of Hu, therefore they are believers.”34. Petech, astonishingly enough ignored by Jettmar (1993), clearly and rigourously summarizes the political situation of these regions where already in 727 “Ladakh, if and as far as included in Great P’o-lü [Baltistan], was under Tibetan suzerainty”, from where “the Tibetans in 737 launched an attack against the King of Bru-ža (Gilgit, Little P’o-lü)’’.

The Royal Annals of Tibet witness the fact that “in the summer of 721 many envoys from the Upper Region paid their respect “to the Tibetan King’’”. And “In 737/738 “(a military expedition) was led by the councilors Skyes-bzañ to the Bru-ža land; in winter the residence (of the
Tibetan King) was in Brag-mar, and the Bru-za king, defeated, paid (there) his respect.”35 The same year “The Chinese envoy Waʾn ’Do ści having paid homage, the Chinese abolished [their administration] [of Little Balûr?]…”36 These facts are well-known. Tibet started to raid these regions quite early and royal alliances with Žaṅ ņuṅ, Bru Ža (Gilgit), Gog/Kog (Wakhan) and Baltistan eventually assured the victory of the Tibetan army37. It is difficult to identify the name of the defeated [petty?] king (rgyal po) of Bru Ža, mentioned in the Tibetan Annals who “paid (his) respect” to the Tibetan btsan po in 737/738, although Christopher Beckwith (1987: 123) identifies him with the Bru Ža rJe38, that is the “Lord of Little Balûr” [Gilgit], to whom “in the fall of 740” the Tibetan princess Khri ma lod — possibly “to her deep sorrow… as the literary cliché in vogue had it”39 — was given “as bride”.

The fact that Khri sroṅ lde btsan, some decades later, stipulated by authoritative decision in his edict (bka’ gtsigs) proclaiming Buddhism the state religion40, that copies of his edificatory discourse (bka’ mchid), nar-

---

37 See Macdonald-Spanien 1971, Bogoslovskij 1972, Petech 1977, Uray 1979, Beckwith 1987, Jettmar 1993. The Old Tibetan Chronicles mention the conquest of Žaṅ ņuṅ and of the borderlands at the time of King ’Dus sroṅ (676-704) when “also many kings from the Upper Region [sTod], viz. from [Bru-za and] Kog, etc. and from the Southern Region (Himalayan countries) were included among the subjects” (Uray 1979: 286). Cf. Macdonald-Spanien 1971: 253 and 255 and Beckwith 1987: 30. Later accounts, such as the Royal Genealogy of Ladakh and Ngari, confirm these facts. We read in the mÑa’ris rgyal rabs and the La dwags rgyal rabs that ’Dus sroṅ maṅ po rje “conquered the regions of Glo bo gad riṅ and sBal yul naṅ gon / sBal ti rnaṅ gi naṅ gon”. Some decades later, according to the mÑa’ris rgyal rabs, Khri sroṅ lde btsan “took over sBal ti and ’Bru sha”, that is Baltistan and Gilgit. See Vitali 1996: 104-105. However, Géza Uray (1968: 292-297) analysed the historical tradition of the annexation and concluded “that the quarrel between Lig Myi-rhya and the Tibetan King and the annexation of Žaṅ ņuṅ must be put to the time of Khri Sroṅ-brcan, that is, Sroṅ-brcan sgam-po” This is also the opinion of Beckwith, following Satō: see op. cit. 25 and n. 67.

The (re-)writing of history in Tibet is particularly rich. Furthermore, a later Bon po tradition “attribue à partir du XIVe s. environ la conquête du Žaṅ ņuṅ et l’assassinat de Lig-mi rgya à l’époque de Khri sroṅ lde btsan”: see Macdonald-Spanien 1971: 260-261.
40 On the date, see supra n. 20.
It seems plausible that given the proximity of Western Tibet to Kashmir and Northern India, Buddhism could well have been present there, even if sporadically, before the annexation of these regions to Tibet. This has been suggested with reference to Gilgit by Richardson 1985: 27: “Bru-zha, the Gilgit area, had been raided by the Tibetans as early as 719 A.D. and was dominated by them from 737 until the early part of the 9th century. Buddhism had been established there long before the Tibetan connection” [our emphasis].

On the kings of Gilgit in the VIIth-VIIIth centuries, v. Hinüber 1985, 1987 and forthcoming. G. Fussman (1993: 16-17) refers to the Pa†ola kings and notes: “les noms et les titres n’ont rien de bouddhique, mais rien de spécifiquement hindou non plus. Ils dénotent un désir de lier la dynastie au souvenir de Vikramāditya (…) donc aux Guptas. De la même façon ces rois Patola, malgré leur nom non-indien, prétendent se rattacher à la lignée kṣatriya de Bhagadatta, fils de Naraka, donc petit-fils de Viṣṇu et de la Terre (…) Il s’agit donc d’une dynastie locale, mais tout à fait indienisée, comme la dynastie contemporaine d’Assam, qui se proclamait également descendante de Bhagadatta. Que la dynastie des Pa†ola Sāhi fût bouddhiste ne l’empêchait pas d’employer un personnel, vraisemblablement brahmane, capable de lui fournir des horoscopes, une généalogie prestigieuse, des noms et des titres hindous, et de rédiger des inscriptions qui, malgré quelques fautes de langue (…) sont aussi indiennes et sanskrités que celle de la vallée du Gange”. The Buddhist bronzes bearing inscriptions describing themselves as “religious gift” of the Patola sovereigns (Fussman 1993), attest abundantly to the presence of Buddhism, in these regions prior to the Tibetan invasion.

In this respect it would be interesting to investigate the epoch and circumstances under which the “Jayamaṅgalavikramādityyanandi of the Indianized Buddhist [Patola Sāhi Dynasty]…” bronze reached the Jokhang of lHasa. Equally interesting is to note the coincidence, that the Pa†ola Sāhi “controlled the area of Baltistan [Great Bālur] and Gilgit [Little Bālur] in present-day northeastern Pakistan and whose territory was even occupied for a certain time around 722 by the Tibetans” O. v. Hinüber in Henss 1996: 61. Cf. infra p. 313.

On the political side, after 783, the Tibetans were active in the Western regions and in Central Asia “involved in a protacted war with the Arabs”, and “had been able to expand unassisted into the area of the Hindu Kush via the Pamirs”. See Beckwith 1987:

41 It seems plausible that given the proximity of Western Tibet to Kashmir and Northern India, Buddhism could well have been present there, even if sporadically, before the annexation of these regions to Tibet. This has been suggested with reference to Gilgit by Richardson 1985: 27: “Bru-zha, the Gilgit area, had been raided by the Tibetans as early as 719 A.D. and was dominated by them from 737 until the early part of the 9th century. Buddhism had been established there long before the Tibetan connection” [our emphasis].
the work of translation into Tibetan was, to some extent, flourishing there.  

Leaving aside the early and uncertain mission of Thon mi sam bhoṭa, who went to the Western regions, Kāśmīr or Magadhā as the case may be, in search of models for the Tibetan script, the fact that bilingual Buddhist scholars were present in these regions at this epoch might be inferred from the historiographical tradition that the Kashmiri scholar, translator, and brahmin, Ananta, functioned as personal translator of the great Bengali Ācārya Śaṅtarakṣita, on his first trip to Tibet, about 763. On the other hand, if we relate this tradition to the equally well-known one that at precisely this epoch translations were made from the language of Żān ūn, Uḍḍiyāna (or according to some sources, Khotan) and Bengal (Za hor)44, we may legitimately assume that at least some of the translated texts were brought to Tibet by scholars from regions bordering Western Tibet (e.g. the brahmin, Ananta, just mentioned) and those from Eastern regions (e.g. Śaṅtarakṣita, the learned Maestro from Bengal). The result is that the picture of the transmission of Buddhism to Tibet takes, so to speak, a some-

157, cf. 149-163. Concerning Buddhism, Vitali (1996: 166, n. 223) notes that isolated facts attest to the presence of [rDzogs chen] masters in Puraṅ-Guge, at the end of the VIIIth c. according to a passage from Ñaṅral (p. 313.14-18):  

“sNubs Nam mkha’i sṉin po received the teaching of the Yaṅ dag sgrub pa rtsa rgyud (lta bu la ‘grel chen sgron me lta bu mdzad nas bṉad) composed by Huµka ras | yaṅ dag lus kyi khog po daṅ ’dra ba la de’i sṉin daṅ ’dra ba’i me geig ma gnaṅ nas | lo geig gser gyi brag bya (skyibs) can du bṣgrubs pas ... “sNubs Nam mkha’i sṉin po received the Yaṅ dag sgrub pa rtsa rgyud (lta bu la ‘grel chen sgron me lta bu mdzad nas bṉad) composed by Hüm kā ra [himself] and further was meditating during one year at gSer gyi brag bya skyibs can”, on the northern shore of Ma pham gyi mtsho, cf. Vitali op. cit. n. 646. On gNubs Nam mkha’i sṉin po, cf. Karmay 1988: 98.

“A” Bal po pa ∞∂ita Hµkµka ras is credited with having been chaplain of Khri lde sroṅ btsan, Sad na legs, according to Śrībhūtibhadra’s Yig mkhan Šaṅ kya’i dge bsñen, see Sørensen 1994: 408 and n. 1407.

how more solid shape. Buddhism entered Tibet in successive stages, from different regions, each of which, in one way or another, laid claim to Indian Buddhism. Buddhist scholars, monks and thaumaturges coming from regions as distant as the Pamir and the Bay of Bengal (regions where during its Secolo d’oro Tibet excercised degrees of power, if not sovereignty), were entering a country to which Buddhism was nothing new, not only because translations from Chinese were possibly already in use, but also because the Tibetan ruling class had had occasion to meet Buddhism in China, where some of their scions had been educated.

The suggestion that to impose Buddhism as state religion was a natural consequence of the “internationalisation” of the Tibetan Empire seems quite plausible and that valiant, if not cruel, generals were in prominent positions in state affairs closely related to the ecclesiastical institution, as we will see with Stag sgra and rGyal zigs, is perfectly in the nature of things. As Samten G. Karmay noted, “The adoption of [Buddhism] as state religion took place in a period when the Tibetan Empire was at its

---

46 Including China of course. One cannot but quote, once again, the fine and pioneering work of Jean Naudou, who mentions the “Annals of Ladakh” according to which, the Kashmiri Ananta preceded the Bengali Master in Tibet, working there as translator and teaching scholastic philosophy. Naudou (1968: 84) adds: “Il semble donc se confirmer que les relations entre le Tibet et l’Inde s’établissaient, comme il est normal, par l’intermédiaire des provinces himalayennes, Kāsmīr et Népal, et que le Kāsmīr a joué un rôle dans l’évangélisation du Tibet à ses débuts, en raison de sa situation géographique, mais aussi du cosmopolitisme qui obligeait les commerçants à comprendre le vernaculaire utilisé au marché de Śrīnagar et dans les caravansérails de la Vallée et permettait sans doute à qui le désirait de s’initier au tibétain”. On aspects of Buddhism claiming an Indian pedigree in the regions of Kāsmīr, Gilgit and Khotan, as illustrated in the narrative of the Vimalaprabhāpariprechā, see Scherrer-Schaub [1998] forthcoming a.

47 See Hoffman 1990: 383 “The Tibeto-Chinese peace treaty of 783 confirmed Tibetan dominion over east Turkestan, Kansu, and a large part of Szechwan. During this period Tibetan influence also extended to the south and the Buddhist king of Magadha and Bengal, Dharmapāla (circa 760-815) acknowledged Tibetan overlordsdom - the reason why the Muslim writers refer to the Bay of Bengal as the “Tibetan Sea”.” An interesting and beautiful literary record of the extension of the Tibetan Empire is preserved in a letter from Dunhuang [Pelliot Ch. 2555, sub finem] dated 763, where in few lines the author paints a political picture of the military and economic power of Tibet at this epoch: see Demiéville 1952: 297-299.

48 Demiéville 1952: 188 (footnote) “Entre 705 et 710 un décret impérial prescrivait encore d’“agréger à l’École des fils de l’État (kouo tseu hiue), pour y faire leurs études, les fils et petits-fils des Rois du Tibet ou des qaghan, désireux d’étudier les Classiques (confucianistes...””
apogee. Its political and military power reached the four corners of Asia: in the east, Ch’ang-an (now Xi’an), the capital of the T’ang Dynasty was captured in 762 and the Chinese who had previously discontinued paying tributes to the Tibetans were again obliged to give 50’000 silk rolls each year; in the west, Gilgit was made a vassal state; in the north, Turkestan became virtually a part of the empire; in the south, the Pāla kings of Bengal were made to pay tributes”49.

On the other hand, we have already alluded to the fact that when commenting upon the period we are dealing with and up on the narrative of the motives which inspired the Imperial authoritative decision (bkas bcad) regarding the “Dharma-language” (chos kyi skad), later historiographers speak of former translations into Tibetan made from Chinese, Khotanese and the languages of U rgyan (Uḍḍīyāṇa) and Za hor (Bengale)50. It turns

49 Karmay 1988: 1. Demiéville 1952: 189, cites a passage from the Tibetan Chronicles where it is stated that Khri lde gtsug btsan (r. 712-755) “a confédéré tous les princes par la grande couronne de la bonne loi” (chos bzaṅ ni gtsug che bas || rgyal pran ni kun kyah ’dum ||): see Bacot, Thomas et Toussaint 1940-1946: 113. The same passage, summarised by Macdonald-Spanien (1971: 343), apparently refers to the renewed allegiance of the petty king of Nanzhao to the Tibetan bTsan po. As Ariane Macdonald-Spanien has correctly observed, in the song addressed to the Ambassador of Nanzhao, Khri lde gtsug btsan “se définit à travers le premier ancêtre, et pose les principes qui rendaient en quelque sorte inéluctable la relation de vassal à suzerain qui s’est établie entre le roi du Nan-tchao et lui…” Stein (1986: 177) refers to the same passage and translates “… il a soumis les roitelets par sa “bonne religion”. Stein (against Macdonald-Spanien), basing his argument on contemporary evidence, thinks that the narrative alludes here to Buddhism. Whether this is so, or open to discussion, the fact remains that Khri lde gtsug btsan, credited with having instituted religious sites, might well have appropriated the maxim religione obstrictos habere multitudinis animos… cf. supra p. 274.

50 mNa’ bdag Nañ ral Ñi ma ’od zer. Chos ’byuṅ me tog sīṅī po sbraṅ rtsi’i bcud. Lhassa 1988, p. 420.

51 Baron Schilling von Constadt, in the first part of the XIXth century, collected Mongolian and Tibetan texts with great acumen probably, as surmised by Jacques Bacot, following the advice of Buddhist scholars. The collection was given by Schilling von Constadt to the Library of the “Institut” in 1836. Jacques Bacot attempts to retrace the figure of S. v. C., the history of the Tibetan collection and its content: “Pour le tibétain seul, sans parler du mongol, la collection comprend 79 numéros ou volumes pour 48 ouvrages. Sur ces 48 ouvrages, 25 sont purement canoniques et traduits du sanscrit, formant un lot de 54 volumes. 18 œuvres, également religieuses, n’ont pas de titres sanscrits. Quelques-uns parmi eux sont des œuvres originales tibétaines, comme le Mani kam boum, œuvre historique et religieuse attribuée à Šrong tsan gam po, premier roi bouddhiste au Tibet, qui régnait au VIIe siècle. Restent 5 ouvrages profanes, dont un sur l’astrologie, un sur la
out that this fact seems indeed to be reflected in practice. Among the _mdo maṅ_ kept in the Collection of Schilling von Constandt, some texts — whether authentic or forgeries — bear unusual _incipits_, mentioning titles in Žaṅ žuṅ, Sum pa, and other languages; although written in Tibetan script, some languages are unknown. Similar _incipits_, attested in the Gondhla (Lahul, HP, India) collection, have been brought to my knowledge by my colleague Helmut Tauscher. As far as the Schilling von Constandt collection is concerned, one item strongly inclines us to suspect forgeries or later remakes of history. The _dPaṅ skoṅ phyag_ (b)rgya pa[l'i mdo] bears a colophon, that reflects later narrative (_Bod du dam_ pa[l'i_ chos 'byuṅ ba'i sīa lta su lHa tho tho ri sīan šal gyi sku riṅ la pho braṅ Yum bu bla mkhar du nam mkha' las babs mi rab sha nas 'di'i don šes pa 'oṅ ŋes rmi lam du luṅ bstan te chos kyi dbu brñes so ||) and, moreover, it is kept together with a copy of _Chos skyoṅ ba'i_ rgyal po _Sroṅ btsan_ sGam po[l'i_ bka[l'i 'bum, better known as _Maṇi bka' 'bum._ The legend relating the introduction ( _dbu brñes_) of Buddhism to Tibet and the motive of the “rain of books” or “ _dar ma_ fallen down from heaven”, is attested relatively early (Richardson 1977, Stein 1986). But, in the words of Per Sørensen, it “either was formulated in the late dynastic period (…) and then went unaltered through the hands of Atiśa, dNörs grub and Naṅ ral, the Indian master and the _gter-ston-s_ independently responsible for the _Vita_ -compilation of Srong-btsan sgam-po and its initial dissemination. Or are we to assume that the latter here introduced the element with this fabulous king in order to tinge their own rDzogs-chen tradition with the luster of authenticity and importance?”.

---


52 See Francke 1927: 129.
53 Same title as in Tōhoku N° 267, sDe dge vol. Ya, fol. 1a1-5b2 and I.O. 211. Cf. Stein 1986: 191 and n. 54.
2. Reading the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa as being a public act

The sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa, this complex text being at once a vademecum destined for translators, a public act, and a richly argued lexicographical commentary, displays a strong normative character as it deals at once with “language” which, by definition, is a code and with “authoritative prescriptions” regulating the procedure of translating and ratifying the usages of a term, and thus stating functions of legislation.

It might be unusual, although not incorrect, to say, as stated above, that the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa, handed down through the canonical version, may be seen as a complex charter. When analysed the document may be seen as consisting of three main parts (Fig. A).

1. The first part (Fig. A §1), usually referred to as the “Introductory part of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa”, may also be considered as the protocol of the act. It mentions three “authoritative decisions” issued by Imperial command, related to the procedure of translating Buddhist texts, as well as principles and rules for the art of translating and coining new words.

2. The main part (Fig. A §2), the text of the sGra sbyor properly speaking, may be seen as the main body of the act. It consists of a detailed commentary on some difficult or hitherto unsettled lexical items. This part is introduced by the last sentence of the introductory part or protocol (Fig. A §2, I), which states

55 It is worth noting that the term “bkas bcad” appears in the second or middle decree of 783/795 and, again, immediately after the reconfirmation of the first and early authoritative decision, promulgated at the occasion of the translation of the Ratnamegha and Laṅkāvatārāsūtra. The reconfirmation occurred at the occasion of the second and third decrees. In this passage the expression [skad kyi lugs ‘di ltar] bkas bcad pa applies to the three (or two) previous events. See infra p. 322.

56 Omitted in the Dunhuang version.

57 The version of Tabo has “bam po dañ po”, but the canonical version seems preferable. Unless, as evidenced by some Tibetan canonical texts (the Ratnamegha for instance), “bam po dañ po” is announced at the beginning and not at the end of the corresponding portion of text. Cf. infra n. 131.

58 The main body ends with a colophon giving the title of the three “vyutpatti” treatises that is preserved in the canonical version only. It is difficult to decide whether or not it was added later, as suggested for instance by Yamaguchi 1979: 15-16.
Given that previously [some] lexical entries (skad kyi min) have not been [formally] decided (gtan la ma phab pa) nor fixed as terms (miṅ du ma thogs pa), [our text gives] at first …(dañ po’o)\(^{57}\)… an explanation [of these lexical entries] in conformity with [the meaning and derivation] elicited from the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna treatises and from the grammatical treatises [of the Indian tradition]\(^{58}\).

3. The final part of the “virtual” document or eschatocol (Fig. A §3), extant only in the canonical version and closing the sGra sbyor, restates the authoritative decision of 814 (Fig. A§3, I) issued at the ‘Oh can rdo Imperial Court\(^{59}\). It confirms the validation of the authoritative decision (bkas bcad) on the part of Emperor Khri lDe sroñ btsan (Fig. A§3, II) and authenticates the document (Fig. A§3, III).

Recurrent terminology confirming the normative character of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa occurs throughout the whole text. Principles and rules expressed in the protocol (Fig. A§1) are echoed and applied in the main body of the act (Fig. A§2). Again, validation formulae found in the eschatocol (Fig. A§3) reflect the former authoritative decisions, mentioned in the protocol (Fig. A§1). Moreover, in reading the protocol (Fig. A§1) we may note that the chancery formulary and procedure related to the third and last authoritative decision, issued in 814, must be read together with the eschatocol (Fig. A§3), thus consistently showing that the entire text of the sGra sbyor, as transmitted in the canonical version, presents itself as a coherent public act. Whether or not a similar and complex document existed at the time of the last redaction of this public act, that is in 814, the canonical version of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa shows that, at the time of its collation, it was still considered a formally and duly authenticated document.

The year 814 is generally assumed to be the date of the edict concerning the codification (bkas bcad) of the rules and principles of trans-

\(^{59}\) However it is worth noting that apart from the mention of the Imperial Residence where the event took place, the phraseology corresponds word-to-word with the phraseology of the authoritative decision of 783/795, as we have it in the Tabo version, and could well represent the vestige of at least part of the act of the second or middle bkas bcad. Cf. infra p. 324.

As noted by Uray and Panglung, the date follows the formulary used in the Old Tibetan Annals in various degrees of complexity.

Cf. infra p. 313.

lating buddhist texts, issued by Khri lDe sroñ btsan (r. 800-815), alias Sad na legs and, as it is known, Géza Uray (1979) has retraced the “deviating” tradition, according to which the edict was wrongly attributed to Khri gTsug lde btsan (r. 815-836), alias Ral pa can. The horse year 814 is also commonly assumed to be the “date” of the so called “vyutpatti” treatises60, often associated with the “skad gsar bcad”, literally “the new lexical entries/new language (skad gsar) [sanctioned by Imperial (bkas)] decision (bcad)”, sometimes referred to as the “revision of the former translations” and variously interpreted in the light of later accounts. Indeed, later historiographers mention the authoritative decision(s) (bkas bcad) or Imperial decree(s). Some of them speak of “three” bkas bcad, again with various attributions and significance, the result of recastings of the tradition. With time, the bkas bcad gsum have even been assimilated to the three vyutpatti treatises. How far is that correct? In other words, what does our document really say?

3. Focussing upon the three authoritative decisions

As said before, the protocol (Fig. A§1 ⇒⇒ Fig. B and Appendix I) mentions three events or circumstances which occasioned a specific authoritative decision related to the procedure of translating Buddhist texts. Two of them are now dated quite precisely, but the first and earliest event can only be dated relatively.

1. The third and last event occurred “In the horse year [that is 814, when] the bTsan po was staying at the ‘Oñ can rdo Imperial Court”61.

2. The second and middle event, now openly revealed thanks to the collation of the Tabo fragment, took place “In the pig-year [that is 795 or rather 78362, when the bTsan po] was staying at the Zuñ kar Imperial Court”.

3. The first and earliest event is more opaque. It occurred, according to the canonical version, “at the time of the Father (Yab)” or, according

---

61 As noted by Uray and Panglung, the date follows the formulary used in the Old Tibetan Annals in various degrees of complexity.

62 Cf. infra p. 313.
to the Tabo version, “at the time of father and forefathers (Yab myes)”. In this case, the formulary is minimal.

These three events may in turn be analysed according to

1. the **narrative** of the motives which occasioned the authoritative decision,
2. the **dispositive/content/text** of the authoritative decision, stipulating the prescriptions and conditions of application, and
3. the **authors** (and **actors**) who issued the authoritative decision and the persons intervening in the complex procedure of deliberating, ratifying and enacting the decision.

Focussing on Fig. B and Appendix I, the three events will now be delineated according to the preceding headings.

1. The edict (**bkas bcad**)\(^{63}\) of 814 (Fig. B III and Appendix I p. 317-318), in the reign of Khri lDe sroṅ btsan (800-815), alias Sad na legs.

   1.1. **Narrative or the motives** which occasioned the present authoritative decision. Part of the **terminology** [formerly] **established** (**miṅ du btags pa**), at the time of the Father (Yab) by Bodhisattva [i.e. Śāntarakṣita], Ye śes dbaṅ po and others, having not been established according to the rules expressed in the present decree and being the result of former translations, made at the time when the Dharma-language (**chos kyi skad**) was not yet widely known in Tibet (**Bod la ma grags pa las**)\(^{64}\), shall be [now, correctly] “**formed**” (**bcos**).

---

\(^{63}\) The expression is attested in the *eschatocol*, see Fig. A §3.

\(^{64}\) See *supra* p. 275.

\(^{65}\) Śāntarakṣita “went from Nepal to Tibet for the first time in about 763, and (...) he again resided there from about 775 to the time of his death in about 788”; Seyfort Ruegg 1981, p. 88-89 and 89, n. 284. Apparently then he is no more of this world at the epoch of the second and middle **bkas bcad**, recorded in the Tabo manuscript, dated of 783/795. Hence, the event referring to him in the narrative of the 814 **bkas bcad** must be prior to the 795/783 **bkas bcad**. Unless we accept, with Samten G. Karmay, that the Great Teacher passed away in 783 and, at the same time, the date 783 for the second **bkas bcad**. If we follow Sørensen (1994: 400, n. 1362), the Bengali Ācārya passed away in 797! See *infra* p. 313-314.
The alleged motives deserve closer examination. We gather not only that the process of translating existed before 814, a well-known fact, but also that ever since the beginning of the more or less organized, although seemingly not yet institutionalized, process of translating Buddhist texts, that is ever since the first translations, performed by the team of Šāntaraksita\textsuperscript{65} and Ye šes dbaṅ po, some sort of procedure for establishing a terminology was already in force, notwithstanding the fact that over time, it had showed its weaknesses and limits. Interestingly enough, the narrative here must refer to a period prior to the middle authoritative decision of Khri srṅ lde btsan (Fig. B II)\textsuperscript{66}, a period when although methods for translating were settled, the procedure of approving and eventually registering a term with a deliberative body was not yet in use. This seems to confirm the existence of a previous, less formal, authoritative decision, attested in the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa itself but passed over unnoticed so far.

1.2. **Dispositive**: the text of the authoritative decision (bka’ stsāl) of 814 states that

The expressions translated from the Indian language as they are found in the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna [treatises], once established as terms (miṅ du btags pa rnams), must be entered in the register of words (dkar chag).

The dispositive is followed by two clauses\textsuperscript{67},

1.2.1. **a prohibitive clause** stipulating

Never must [the translators] deviate from the established text (gzung lugs)! (nam du yaṅ guṅ lugs de las mi bsgyur ziṅ)

1.2.2. **and an injunctive clause** stating

The [disposition] must be learnt by everybody! (kun gyis bslab tu ruṅ bar gyis ŝig)

---

\textsuperscript{66} Cf. *infra* p. 313.

\textsuperscript{67} These two clauses are contemplated by Kauṭīlya in his *Arthaśāstra* where we find a concise chancery manual, together with an epitome on edicts (śāsana). See Scherrer-Schaub forthcoming\textsuperscript{c}.

The ordinance of 814 adds complementary principles and rules for translating, attesting to, as noted before, a highly refined knowledge of both Tibetan and Sanskrit.

1.3. If we turn now to the authors [or “actors”] involved in this event and functioning as deliberative body of the act, we find first of all Emperor Khri IDe sroṅ btsan who, as stated in the concluding part of the canonical version (Fig. A§3), issued the authoritative decision, along with the councillors and the Western and Tibetan mkhan po and lo tsā ba who translated and fixed the terms. Moreover, a detailed chancery procedure appears where we gather that

1.3.1. The Indian and Tibetan mkhan po all together established and ratified the [rules and prescriptions of the] Dharma language and after deliberation by the Ruler and Councillor (rje blon mol nas), a minute [of the document] has been redacted (reg zeg du mdzad pa) and in the presence of a convention of the learned (mkhas pa rnams 'tshogs te), the new terms (skad gsar miṅ), not previously established and ratified/fixed (sṅon ma thogs pa daṅ gتان la ma phab pa) were established as terms and ratified/fixed (miṅ du btags śiṅ gتان la phab ste).”

1.3.2. The text indicates twice (Fig. A§1,3) the place where the Buddhist terminology was ratified, that is the ’On caṅ rdo Imperial Court.

1.3.3. Finally the validator and validation formula confirm formally the authenticity of the public act (Fig. A§3).

1.3.3.1. The Divine Emperor Khri IDe sroṅ btsan confirmed by order (btsan gyis bskul nas) and authenticated the authoritative decision (bkas bcad) [lit. and [the bTsan po] established the bkas bcad as not falsified (bkas bcad de mi bcos par bʒag pa)].

1.3.3.2. [This] has been written in conformity with the exemplar [that is the original act] of the bkas bcad and shall not be corrupted/not be deviating (zur ma bcos so) [from the original] by other (gʒan gyis) [redactions/redactors].

Then, following a procedure known also in other public acts kept in epigraphical records (in the rKoṅ po Inscription for instance), a procedure well attested in Indian epigraphy, the dispositive of the edict of 814 ends with a clause (Appendix I, p. 317, l. 24-318, l. 1) (re)confirming and thereby introducing the authoritative decision and prescriptions issued previously.
2. The second or middle edict (*bkas bcad*) of 783 or 795 (Fig. B§2, Appendix p. 321), in the reign of Khri sroṅ lde btsan.

The textual stratum related to this decision is, at least partially, common to the three extant versions of the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, the canonical (“*bstan ’gyur*”), the manuscript of Tabo and the manuscripts of Dunhuang (see infra Annex I, p. 319).

Jampa L. Panglung (1994) has shown quite clearly that “the *bsTan-*’gyur version of the first *bam-po* must be taken as a confirmation by Khri lDe-sroṅ-bcan of the earlier edict of his father as transmitted in the Ta pho version. (…) As a consequence [of the fact that the canonical version records the events in 814, and not in 783/795 as the Tabo version, apparently, does] also the annalistic entry including the names of the Great Councillors of the earlier edict has to be replaced by an actual one. However, the names of the Great monks Yon-tan and Tiṁ-ñe-'jin who were still in office had been kept. But it is noteworthy that the *bsTan-*’gyur version shows a promotion in rank of the Great monk Yon-tan whose name is preceded by the honorific dPal. It is worth pointing out, that the Ta pho version does not include the title zu-chen but simply reads lochaba.”

The collation of the extant versions may even lead a step further. Indeed, if one carefully confronts the canonical, the Tabo and the Dunhuang versions (see herewith §2.2.4 and 2.2.5.) which unfortunately have, so to speak, disappeared in the critical apparatus of Ishikawa’s edition (1990), the collation of chancery formulae of similar pattern, as we will see, shows small, although significant, differences.

2.1. Narrative or the motives having occasioned the second or middle authoritative decision

The motives behind the authoritative decision (*bkas bcad*) are not explicitly expressed. One may surmise, however, after consideration of the dispositions stipulated in the present decision, that a certain anarchy prevailed among the translators and, as the last paragraph explicitly admits (see hereafter), one cause of the situation was personal initiative on the part of the colleges of translation and teaching69, both with regard to the content and the form.

---

69 See infra Appendix I, p. 323: bsgyur ba daṅ ’chad pa’i grwa. This may refer to the colleges installed in bSam yas, where “Im mKhyen-rab ’jam-dpal gliṅ wurde der Dharma gelehrt [chos ’chad]. (…) Im sGra-bsgyur rgya-gar gliṅ wurde übersetz [sgra bsgyur]” (Uebach 1987: 98-99). On the twelve colleges of which the foundation is traditionally attributed to Khri lDe sroṅ btsan, see Uebach op. cit. 106-107 and Uebach 1990.
Moreover, the narrative related to the second or middle authoritative decision shows genuine concern for the spirit of language (le génie de la langue) in the light of which the motives alleged in the bkas bcad of 814, claiming that the authoritative decision is a response to the problems of improper translations, made “at the time when the Dharma-language (chos kyi skad) was not yet widely known in Tibet (Bod la ma grags pa las)” (Appendix I, p. 318), may be seen as complementing and clarifying the implicit motives alluded to here. In fact the present authoritative decision seems to take for granted that the translations into Tibetan must be done from the Indian language (rgya gar gyi skad la bod kyi skad du); it attests to the existence of “normative principles for translating the Saddharma (dam pa’i chos bsgyur lugs)”, clearly implies the existence of colleges of translation and exegesis before the date of issue of the present authoritative decision, that is before 795/783, and thereby agrees with the evidence given above for an earlier, albeit less standardized institutionalized procedure for translating Buddhist texts and terminology.

2.2. Dispositive.

As just said, the middle or second authoritative decision provides normative principles (lugs) regulating the translation of Saddharma. In particular the dispositive provides the restrictions regarding literal and non-literal translation, as the case may be, and the rule applying to the use of honorific / respectful expressions according to the rank\(^\text{70}\) of “sanctity” of the persons appearing in Buddhist narrative\(^\text{71}\) closely connected (te I, gzan ni Tabo) to the early and first authoritative decision which both versions reconfirm.

Then follow two clauses restricting the executive power of the colleges appointed to the office of translating, here the bstan ’gyur and Dunhuang version (Appendix I, p. 322-323a; cf. Tabo, p. 323b and infra p. 288).

\(^{70}\) I sans rgyas daň byaň chub sms dpa’ daň ñan thos la sogs pa že sa daň sko loň gi tshig gi rim pa ni saňs rgyas la že sa’i tshig tu bsgyur l, Tabo sans rgyas daň byaň chub sms dpa’ daň l ñan thos mams la rje…daň…rk (o) daň rim pa ni rje sa’i tshig tu bsgyur ro l l On the verb sko, see Uray 1972: 19.

\(^{71}\) An example being the prastāvāna of the Ratnamegha. This disposition, despite its location in the text, could refer to the previous authoritative decision which is immediately introduced.
2.2.1. Prohibitive clause

In consequence of the fact that (las) the normative principles (lugs) of the [dharma] language have been stipulated (bcad pa) by [imperial] decree (bkas), it is not allowed for any one, on their own initiative (so so nas), to create/invent (chos) and, after that (’og tu), to fix a new term (mĭn gsar du ’dogs su).

2.2.2. Restrictive clause, related to the revision and formation of a new term

However, when a college of translation and exegesis (bsgyur ba dañ ’chad pa’i grva), on its own part (so so nas) is compelled to fix a term in the new language / a new lexical entry, one must examine (dpyad de) [the term] as it is designated / known or understood (ji skad du gdags pa) in the Dharma and, [the term in case, will be explained through] the arguments as they come out of / emerge from / appear in (ji skad du ’byuñ ba) the dharma treatises and from the grammatical method, and one must not definitively fix the term (mĭn chad par ma gdags par) at [the initiative of] a particular college.

2.2.3. The dispositive then records the procedure of approval of a new term, to be eventually entered in the register, which again bears testimony to changes in chancery, in the interval between the issue of the second and third authoritative decisions, since the canonical and Dunhuang versions show a more complex hierarchy in chancery practice and titulature (see hereafter §2.3) than the version attested by the Tabo fragment.

---

72 The Tabo version does not include this ordinance (infra Appendix I). Instead of the prohibitive clause of the canonical version, somewhat looser and more “positive” disposition provides that “permission must be requested; after it has been granted by order…” (sňand tu žus te | bka’š gnañ nas…); see the following note.

73 This is even more explicit if we read the Tabo version: “As to the Tantras, the texts themselves state that they are to be kept secret. Therefore it is not allowed to teach and explain them to unfit people, because it causes harm if encoded terms are misunderstood. Therefore permission must be requested and after it has been granted by order, the translation of the Tantras must be done by an excellent scholar not falsifying the meaning and not falsifying the text but just as the tantra had been known formerly! Concerning the translation of Tantra… codified… not allowed.”. See Panglung 1994: 165 and infra Appendix I, p. 323.

74 See Panglung 1994: 166.
2.2.4. Finally, the text presents a special ordinance promulgated (Bla nas bka’ stsal (d) IDh)\textsuperscript{72} in order to restrict the translation of the tantras to the texts currently under translation (IDh) and adding

2.2.5. a prohibitive clause related to tantra and mantra terminology, attesting that translations of this class of Buddhist texts had been made before 783/795\textsuperscript{73}.

2.3. The authors or actors who issued the authoritative decision and were appointed as a legislative and executive body comprise the bTsan po (rJe, that is Khri sroṅ lde btsan\textsuperscript{74}) and the Council of Ministers (blon mol) who issued the decree or ordinance (bkas bcad) relative to the terminology and the normative principles.

Without entering into a detailed analysis of this section, this having been thoroughly undertaken by Jampa L. Panglung, it may be useful to focus upon the procedure of approval of a new term, which as we have seen could be, in case of necessity, coined by the college of translation and explanation of Buddhist texts (see supra 2.2.2). Again, the two sGra sbyor bam po gños pa traditions differ. The canonical version states:

2.3.1. [After that, the new term] must be submitted to the convention/committee (mdun sa)\textsuperscript{75} of the Bhagavat’s representative (riṅ lugs) and to the college for proposal for great revision of Buddhist treatises (dha rmna žu chen ’tshal ba’i grvar phul la) at the Imperial palace (pho braṅ). Then [once the petition has been accepted and] sanctioned by authoritative decision (bkas bcad) [i. e. officially homologated/approved], the term must be entered in the register of words (skad kyi dkar chag).

The Tabo version, translated by J. Panglung\textsuperscript{76}, has:

2.3.2. [However, though such terms of translation had been created (’di dag bsgyur ba’i myiṅ smraṅ yaṅ)] they must be submitted to the Commissioners of Bhagavat (bcom ldan ’das riṅ lugs) in the residence and the Board of

\textsuperscript{75} The term ’dun sa, according to Helga Uebach, designates a “holy place” in the sGra ’grel of Dran pa nam mkha’, and “strongly reminds of an institution of the Tibetan empire, the “assembly of the state”, ’dun ma”: Uebach 1999: 271 and 265.

\textsuperscript{76} See Panglung 1994: 165 and infra Appendix I.

\textsuperscript{77} On the meaning of the Tibetan term “dar ma/dhar mma”, see Stein 1983: 177 and n. 54.
Lochabas who translate the Dharma (dar ma bsgyur ba’i lo tsha ba’i grar) and permission [of the bcan-po] must be asked for. After [the assent] is given by order, include the term into the general register.

This interesting passage shows that in 783/795 the ecclesiastic chancery already followed an established hierarchical procedure: the colleges of translating and explaining Buddhist texts\textsuperscript{77} had to refer proposed terminology for approval to the high ecclesiastic representative and the college of translators attached to the palace; a repertory of homologated terms already existed. The canonical and Dunhuang versions, possibly reflecting the 814 situation, bear evidence to a flourishing ecclesiastic bureaucracy. The Bhagavat’s representative is flanked by a convention/committee (mdun sa) and the college of translators, [in charge of] translating Buddhist texts (dar ma bsgyur ba’i lo tsā ba’i grar), is replaced by and/or hierarchically submissioned to the college for proposals of great revision of Buddhist treatises (dha rmma žu chen ’tshal ba’i grvar phul la)\textsuperscript{78}.

\section*{Dating the second or middle bkas bcad}

As we have seen, the Tabo document begins with the edict of Khri sroṅ lde btsan and represents an independent act; it bears a date and gives the names of the persons acting as deliberative body. We gather thus that besides the great monks (ban de chen po) Yon tan and Tiṅ ne ’dzin, the great councillors (blon chen po) rGyal gzigs and Stag ra appear at the head of the deliberative body (blon chen po rGyal gzigs dañ l blon chen po sTag ra la stosgs pa). We have also seen that with good reason Jampa L. Panglung favours 795, noting that “the reference to the residence Zuñ-kar which in historiographical literature traditionally is the place where Khri-sroṅ lde-bcan lived in his old days (or had retired to) and where he died would be in favour of the year 795”. However and interestingly enough, Blon chen po Žaṅ rGyal gzigs Šu then and Blon sTag sgra Klu goṅ are listed in first place, following the Lord of ’A ža (!) (dPon ’A ža rJe), among the civil and military offi-

\textsuperscript{77} Cf. Panglung 1994: 179. See infra p. 315 § 3.5.
\textsuperscript{78} See Tucci 1950: 97.13-14 and 46; Richardson 1985: 2; Karmay 1988: 1; Panglung 1994: 167.
cials having sworn to (*bro stsal pa*) the *bka’ gtsigs*, the charter proclaiming Buddhism as state religion which, as have seen, was distributed by Imperial command to the borderland regions of Tibet (*supra* p. 268).

If sTag sgra Klu goñ, known as a valiant general, is the recipient of the privileges granted by Khri sroñ Ile btsan, as recorded in the *Zol* inscription, and promoting him great inner minister (*nañ blon chen po*) and “great conciliator” (?) (*Yo gal ’chos pa chen po*), and if he was possibly the diplomat who in 781 took part in the pourparlers for the Sino-Tibetan treaty of 783 (Richardson 1985: 2), on his part, rGyal gzigs Šu theñ is known for his cruelty and his hostility towards the Chinese which probably resulted in his dismissal in 782/3 when he was replaced by rGyal mtshan lHa snañ as chief minister in the aforementioned pourparlers. sTag sgra Klu goñ and rGyal gzigs Šu theñ are mentioned in the *Zol* inscription (of 763), which relates their military exploits against Emperor Tai Tsung who, unlike his father, “did not deem it proper to pay tribute to Tibet. When the *btsan-po* was aggrieved at that, Klu-khong took the lead in advising that an army should be sent against the palace of the Chinese king at Keng-shi, the very centre of China. Zhang Mchims-rgyal Rgyal-zigs shu-theng and the minister Stag-sgra klu-khong were appointed chief generals for the

---

80 Demiéville 1952: 184 (footnote) “Le grand ministre tibétain (…), qui était violemment anti-chinois, fut remplacé par son second (…) Chang Kie-tsan (Žañ rGyal bcan?) politique avisé, partisan d’une attitude modérée et pacifique aux frontières chinoises (…) et en 783 un traité de paix fut juré à Ts’ing-chouei”. Cf. Demiéville op. cit. p. 291 (footnote). On mChims Žañ rGyal zigs and Šan lam sTag sgra klu goñ, see Panglung 1994: 166-167 and notes.

Richardson loc. cit. dates the *Zol* inscription of “around 764 A. D. or only a little later”.


83 Per Sørensen (1994: n. 1181) in commenting upon the fact that Stag sgra is “recorded as active during the erection of the black stupa in bSam-yas and (more surprisingly) recorded as sworn-in minister in the Buddhist *bKa’ gtsigs* of Khri sroñ lde-btsan (issued ca. 780 A. D.)” notes that this facts “may indicate that he turned Buddhist towards the end of his life”.

84 In 783 several important events took place: the Sino-Tibetan Treaty of Ch’ing Shui (Beckwith 1987: 149; Imaeda 2000: 93), the Bon-Buddhist dispute (according to S.G. Karmay 1972: 88-94) and possibly the “middle” *bkas bcad* of Khri sroñ lde btsan.
campaign against Keng-shi. They attacked Keng-shi and a great battle was fought with the Chinese on the banks of the ford at Ci’u-cir."

Richardson, commenting upon sTag sgra, notes the difficulty of reconciling the reports of later historiographers to the effect that sTag sgra was considered “as a leading opponent of Buddhism at the time of the death of Khri Lde-gtsug-brtsan. In one version he was banished before the building of Bsam-yas (…) but another part of tradition names him as the builder of the black mchod-rten there” (…) “In view of his survival in power until about 783 A.D. the story needs further examination”82. The fact that Stag sgra is mentioned in the bkas bcad of 795/783, preserved

85 The complex figure of sTag sgra, a leading protagonist of the anti-Buddhist faction, who might, as we have seen before (n. 83) “turned Buddhist towards the end of his life”, is credited with having been banished, at an unsettled date, to the northern regions (Byaṅ thaṅ), the vital centre of Zaṅ żuṅ. In the dBa bṭed he is clearly listed among the Bon po adherents who participated in the Bon/Buddhist controversy (Wangdu & Diemberger 2000: 61 and n. 194), a controversy which Sørensen (against Karmay, supra n. 84) places in the year 759, op. cit. 605 and 366-367.


87 The dates of the treatises do indeed almost in all cases coincide with remarkable religious events such as the De ga g-yu tshal prayers (Pelliot tib 16 and I. O. 751) for the foundation of the vihāra of dByar mo thaṅ, on the occasion of the 821/822 treaty. Rolf Stein (1983: 215-216) has a short albeit rich note, which seems to have passed unnoticed and may deserve to be quoted: “Le lieu est De-ga g.yu-chal, situé dans le dByar-mo thang qualifié de “plaine du traité” (mjal-dum thaṅ). On y mentionne des hauts fonctionnaires du Tibet, du mDo-gams, du Kam-bcu (Kan-tcheou), de Go-cu, et les militaires de mKhar-can, de Kva-cu (Koua-tcheou), de Phyug-cams, de ’Brom-khoṅ. Selon l’étude de Yamaguchi, le mKhar-chan de l’époque se situe dans la région de Ling-tcheou, alias Ling-wou [93], c.-à-d. loin à l’Est, dans l’Ordos. C’est là que fut fixée la frontière entre Chine et Tibet (Alasan), selon le Traité de 821-2. Il y avait là une sous-préfecture de Mingcha [94], nom qu’on retrouve à Touen-houang (Cha-tcheou). Un autre nom de lieu est proche des deux régions. C’est Yu-lin [95] (*iu liam) “forêt des ormes”: 1) nom des célèbres grottes de Wan-fo hia [96] (ca. 30 km à l’Est de Touen-houang), et 2) deux fois dans l’Ordos, a) =Souei-yuan, rive nord du Fl. jaune; b) =Hia-tcheou (plus tard occupé par le Si-hia). Un 3e Yu-lin, poste militaire, a existé entre Ngan-si (Turfan) et Yen-k’i (Karasar) au VIIIe siècle. Un temple de Yu-lim (= Yu-lin) est mentionné ensemble avec Kva-cu et Phyug-mchams dans le ms. P. tib. 997 et, avec des vœux pour le roi tibétain (lha-sras kyi sku-yon), dans P. 2122. Dans ces conditions on peut se demander si le nom de g.Yu-chal “forêt de turquoise” n’est pas moitié traduction (“forêt”), moitié transcription (g. yu = yu?) de Yu-lin.” Surprisingly enough, this passage escaped the attention of Kapstein, see IDP News N° 17 2000/2001, p. 3. Helga Uebach (1991) provides a detailed and careful study of the location of dByar mo than in the light of the Tibetan historiography.
in the Tabo version, might confirm that he was then, in a way or another, active in the political scene if not the Buddhist milieu\textsuperscript{83}. But at the same time it argues for rejecting 795 in favour of 783\textsuperscript{84}, since sTag sgra and rGyal gzigs had supposedly been dismissed by the latter date and disappear from the public records after 783\textsuperscript{85}. We must still face the problem of where the bTsan po was staying when the edict was issued. Zuñ khar residence must have been particularly dear to Khri sroñ lde btsan, since it was there that he received his regnal name and his sovereign power in 756\textsuperscript{86}. After all, the edict of Khri sroñ lde btsan, dated in a pig-year, might (like religious foundations or public and solemn prayers) have complemented the “\textit{Te Deum} practices” usually performed in the wake of the Sino-Tibetan treaties\textsuperscript{87}, in this case the treaty of 783. This is, of course, highly speculative since we may wonder why Šántarakṣita supposedly alive in Tibet and active in translating, is not mentioned in the text of the \textit{bkas bcad}, preserved in the Tabo version, a fact that induces us to prefer 795...

Coming back to our document, the end of the present paragraph (Appendix I, p. 321), as in the case of the 814 Edict (Appendix I, p. 319a), records, thereby re-\textbf{confirming} and introducing, a \textbf{previous} authoritative decision.

3. The [\textit{earliest}] and \textbf{first} authoritative decision

Although the formulary is here reduced to its essentials, this passage undoubtedly implies the existence of a \textit{previous authoritative decision} promulgated, according to the canonical version, “at the time of the preceding Divine Son, the Father” (\textit{s}ñon \textit{lha} \textit{sras} \textit{Yab}), that is Khri lde sroñ btsan, or according to the Tabo version “at the time of the forefathers (\textit{Yab Myes kyi sku riñ la})”\textsuperscript{88}.

3.1. The alleged \textit{motive} or \textit{occasion} is the translation of the \textit{Ratnamegha}\textsuperscript{89} and the \textit{Laṅkāvātara} (\textit{dha rmma/ dar ma dkon mchog sprin dañ lañ kar gṣegs pa bsgyur te}).

\textsuperscript{88} Cf. IO 370.5, Stein 1986: 173-174.

\textsuperscript{89} A Sanskrit fragment of the \textit{Ratnameghasūtra} is attested in SHT III 945, see \textit{Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden}, E. Waldschmidt, Wiesbaden, 1971, Teil 3, Verz. der orient. Handschrift. in Deutschland Bd X,3, p. 206-207 [= T. 659.246a28 f., T 600, 660.288a14 f.].
3.2. As to the dispositive the text, reduced to a minimum, speaks of “normative principles” (lugs) of [translating] and fixing [terms] (gtan la phab pa’i lugs).

3.3. Besides the supreme authority who issued the act, this earliest bkas bcad mentions anonymous author(s) or actor(s). Here again, the canonical and the Tabo versions differ. The canonical version, like the second bkas bcad (see supra §2), actualizes the titulature: where the Tabo version has only “lo tsā bas”, the canonical version supplies “lo tsā ba mkhas pa [´tshogs pa]s”, consistently following the titulature of the third or 814-bkas bcad (see infra Annex I, pp. 317a lo tsā ba mkhas pa, I 1.22-23 and mkhas pa rnams ´tshogs I 127.16) which, as we will see in the following paragraph, attests to a change in the chancery practice.

3.3.1. The chancery procedure, according to the canonical version, is relatively precise. The present authoritative decision has been issued

In the presence (spyan sňar) of the Divine Son Yab, when the preceptors and translators had assembled (´tshogs pas), the normative principles… were ratified/fixed (gtan la phab pa).

3.3.2. Once again, the Tabo chancery is, briefer, stating:

At the time of the Ancestors, the Teacher (mkhan po) and the Translator90 having translated (bsgyur te) the Ratnamegha and the Laṅkāvatāra [sūtra], normative principles [were] fixed (gtan la phab pa’i lugs)91.

90 Although “mkhan po” is a common religious title, “Mkhan po” may designate Śantaraksita, see for instance, dBa bţed fol. 5b et passim, Wangdu & Diemberger 2000: 40 and n. 83. And Ananta is described as “lo tsā ba” and sometimes “learned lo tsā ba” (lo tsā ba mkhas pa), Sorensen 1994: 366 and n. 1186, 398 and n. 1352; Wangdu & Diemberger op. cit. 45 and n. 103. On the other hand Demiéville (1952) notes that the expression “Hwa śan” (Chinese Heshang) is a “transcription (à travers une déformation sérindienne) du skr. upādhyāya, devenu en chinois vulgaire la désignation la plus usuelle des moines bouddhistes” (op. cit. p. 10, n. 1).

91 Our translation takes some liberty with the syntax, lit. “according to the normative principles that have been fixed…”

92 From now on the text is also preserved in three fragmentary Dunhuang manuscripts Pelliot tib. 845 and 843, I. O. Tib. J. 76, see Appendix I, pp. 323 et sq., Appendix II, p. 325.
At this point, what follows (in all versions), shows that these unspecified “normative principles” (lugs), were eventually considered as having been promulgated by the supreme power and hence were authoritative, which confirms the official character of this vague first authoritative decision.

Indeed, the passage introduces here a restrictive clause (3.3.3) based on the [three] previous authoritative decisions:

In consequence of the fact that (las) the normative principles of the [dharma] language (skad kyi lugs) have been stipulated by [imperial] decree (bkas bcad pa),

3.3.3. the following restrictive clause related to the revision and formation of a new term, states\(^{92}\)

It is not permitted for anybody, on their own initiative to create (chos) and, after that (og tu), to fix a new term (miṅ gsar du ’dogs su).

In his detailed analysis of the paragraph Nils Simonsson noted that it was difficult to decide which version of the translation of the two sūtras was being alluded to by the sGra sbyor\(^{93}\). However, the Tabo version of this paragraph was not available to Simonsson and his analysis was mainly restricted to textual history. The study of the history of the translation of the Ratnamegha and the Laṅkāvatārasūtra leads, as we shall see, to interesting and hitherto unnoted data; the fact that the extant versions of the sGra sbyor attribute the translation to two different periods of Tibetan imperial history confirms the ideological nature of historical and epigraphical sources, already at a relatively early epoch in Tibet. This complex situation has been studied with different approaches by several scholars;

\(^{93}\) Simonsson 1957: 257-259 and 258 where Simonsson mentions that both the Ratnamegha and the Laṅkāvatāra are listed in the IHan dkar ma as having been translated from the Indian language, when it is common knowledge that the canonical translation of the Laṅkāvatāra made by Chos grub, the learned bilingual scholar who worked mainly in Dunhuang during the first part of the IXth century, is based on the Chinese version of the sūtra. However, as noted by Jikido Takasaki (1978), a Dunhuang version translated “from the Indian language” is kept in the Paris Pelliot collection.

\(^{94}\) Richardson 1985: 74: ||’phrul gyi lha btsan po ‖ myes ‖ Khri sroṅ brtsan gyi riṅ la ‖ sans rgyas gyi chos mdzad de ‖ ra sa’i gtsug lag khaṅ las stsogs pa brisigs śiṅ ‖ dkon mchog gsun gyi rten btsugs pa daṅ ... Stein 1986: 169. Similar context in the bKā’mchid of Khri sroṅ Iđe btsan.
particularly relevant here are the studies of Géza Uray (1972), Rolf A. Stein (1986) and Jampa L. Panglung (1994). In his *Tibetica Antiqua IV. La tradition relative au début du bouddhisme au Tibet*, Stein quotes the testimony of the sKar chuṅ inscription, dating to the reign of Khri lde sroṅ btsan, which as he says is “un édit à la gloire du bouddhisme. On y lit au début ‘À l’époque de (mon) ancêtre Khri Sroṅ-bcan (*alias* Sroṅ-bcan sgam-po), roi saint et divin, (il) a pratiqué la religion du Bouddha et il a construit les temples de Ra-sa (Lhasa) et autres. Il a (ainsi) fondé les supports des Trois Joyaux’”94. A parallel case is mentioned by Géza Uray in *The Narrative of Legislation and Organization of the Mkhas-pa’i dga’ston. The Origin of the Traditions concerning Sroṅ-brcan Sgam-po as First Legislator and Organizer of Tibet*. Uray (1972: 46) stresses the political motive for recasting history and quotes Bogoslovskij “While concentrating all his attention on the reign of the ‘strong’ bcan-pos, at the same time the author of the chronicle conceals the activity of other ‘weak’ bcan-pos, as e.g., Maṅ-sroṅ Maṅ-bcan during whose reign all the power in the country was held by the aristocratic Mgār clan.” To this he adds, “The same tendency can be observed in Khri Lde-sroṅ-brcan’s inscription made on the occasion of the foundation of Skar-cuṅ chapel at the beginning of the 9th century.”

Since Sroṅ btsan sgam po is credited with having instituted religious sites and state administration, it is only normal that the tradition adds to the sovereign’s edificatory tale the fact that translation of Buddhist texts was initiated in his reign95. Following the *Deb ther*96 the translator of the *Ratnameghasūṭra* was Thon mi sāmbhoṭa, the Tibetan lettré reputed to have introduced writing to Tibet. Commenting upon the passage in point, Jampa L. Panglung (1994: 165, n. 13), says “Concerning the date of the translation of both texts, the bsTan-’gyur version of the sGra-sbyor instead of yab-myes reads lha-sras-yab = Khri-sroṅ lde-

---

95 On Sroṅ btsan sgam po’s Vitae as Dharmarāja, see the narrative of the *rGyal rabs*, translated and annotated by Per Sørensen 1994: 159-186. On the *sūtras* translated in his reign, op. cit. 173 and notes.

96 *Deb ther shon po*, English translation, p. 40. The dBa bzad, Wangdui & Diemberger 2000: 27, says that on his return to Tibet, Thon mi “took with him some [texts of the doctrine] such as Chos dkon mchog sprin (*Ratnameghasūṭra*), Pad ma dkar po, Rin po che tog, gZugs grwa Inga and dGe ba bcu”.
bcan. However it is worth noting that traditionally Tibetan historiographers like mKhas-pa lDe’-u, Bu-ston and others mention that the translation of the Ratnameghasūtra had been made during the reign of Sroñ-bcan sgam po.”

Géza Uray (1972: 48-49) assumed that the “elaboration of an all-embracing picture of Tibetan history in the Buddhist principles was begun only by lDan-ma-rce-man and his fellow-monks during Khri Lde-sroñ-brcan’s reign, at the beginning of the 9th century (our emphasis), and their work accomplished by the historiographers of the Buddhist restoration, after 1000 A. D.” In the case in point here, since the Tabo version attributes the second authoritative decision to the reign of Khri sroñ lde btsan and the previous authoritative decision to the epoch of the Ancestors (yab myes), we must decide whether this statement has any factual basis or has been interpolated in the wake of later tradition, if not an ideological rewrite of history.

In the rdo riṅ inscription “near the bridge” of ’Phyoṅ rgyas, dating to the reign of Khri sroñ lde btsan (755-794?), the expression yab myes refers to ruling sovereigns, namely the first bTsan po “who came [on earth] to rule over gods and men” (lha btsan po yab myes lha dañ myi’i rjer gšegs te ||) and the Ancestors of Khri Sroñ lde btsan, that is his predecessors, who continued to govern according to inherited custom. A similar use of the expression yab myes is attested in the sKar chuṅ inscription dated to the reign of Khri lde sroñ btsan (ca. 800-815): ’di ltar || yab myes | gduṅ rabs rgyud kyis || dkon mchog gsum gyi rten btsugs šin || saṅs rgyas kyi chos mdzad pa ’di || “And so … this practice of the religion of the Buddha by establishing shrines of the Three Jewels by the father and ancestors in successive generation (our emphasis)…”

Again, in his bka’ mchod Khri sroñ lde btsan says “When my father went

---

97 Richardson 1985: 38-39 and 76-77. The title lha sras Yab is applied to Khri sroñ lde btsan in the rKOn po inscription, the latter being dated to the reign of Khri lde sroñ btsan (ca. 800-815).

98 Our emphasis. See Tucci 1950: 47 and 98. This passage may be confronted with IO 370.5, ll. 14-16 rgyal po yab noṅ sras chuṅs pas || chos bzaṅ gtsug lag rniṅ nub mod || bden pa’i lam mchog dge ba’i chos || ’dul ba beu srūṅ ba dañ || myi mgon rgyal po’i rgyal khrims dañ || pha myes ’jaṅs pa’i stan hag gzuṅ || Cf. Stein 1986: 174.

to heaven, some ministers became hostile and the Buddhist Law practised from the time of grandfather and father was destroyed.” (btsan po yab dguñ du gség kyi ‘og tu Žañ bloñ kha cig gyis ‘ur ’dums kylo žig byun ste \ yab mes kyi riñ tshund chad \ sañs rgyas gyi chos mdzad mdzad pa yañ gšig go \) Since the inscription from the time of Khri sroñ lde btsan attests to the existence (legendary or not) of the Buddhist religion in the age of the Ancestors, one can reasonably assume that a text close to the Tabo version was circulating in Tibet at the turn of the century, i.e. the approximate period to which we assign the transmission of the sGra sbyor to the Western regions (see supra p. 271). The canonical version of the sGra sbyor which emphasizes Khri sroñ lde btsan, seems to be in line with later tradition, as attested for instance in the story of King Tsa (Ptib 840) studied by Samten G. Karmay (1981), where we find an eulogy which states: “… The Divine Son, Khri-sroñ lde-btsan, He introduced holy Buddhism and invited masters from India,…”

---


101 Demiéville op. cit. p. 185 and n. 1, where he sum up a very long passage of Bu ston, cf. Chos ’byun fol. 881.8-890.6.


According to Takasaki (1978) the Tibetan translation of the Laṅkāvatārasūtra of Chos grub was made from the Chinese so-called “Sung” version of 443. One may wonder why Chos grub didn’t translate the text from the version made by Śīksānanda, the khotanese monk working in Lo yang et Tch’ang ngan from 695 to 704 and in Tch’ang ngan at his return from Khotan in 707/708, where he resided until his death in 710. See Hōbōgiron Fascicule Annexe 141a s.v. Jisshananda. On Śīksānanda and the nine Bhadanta, see Forte 1976. The question is interesting, all the more when one knows that apparently the version used in the “Chinese records” in the Debate of bSam yas was the translation of Śīksānanda. The Liṅ ka’i mkhan po dañ slob ma’i mdo, mentions Gunabhadrā as the first [abusive, according to some] Patriarch of the “Laṅkāvatāra” school and Faure (1989: 75) quotes Ueyama who thinks that “le Mémoire [i. e. the Liṅ ka’i mkhan po...] original avait pour principal but de relier la tradition du Laṅkāvatāra et celle de l’école du Tung-shan”.

---


104 Demiéville op. cit. p. 185 and n. 1, where he sum up a very long passage of Bu ston, cf. Chos ’byun fol. 881.8-890.6.
Another parallel may be found in an equally well-known alternative tradition, according to which Buddhism was first introduced to Tibet from China at the time of the Ancestors or during the infancy of Khri sroṅ lde btsan. While this is not the place to go into the question in detail, it is useful to recall the testimony of Bu ston, as noted by Paul Demiéville (1951: 195 and n. 1) “…, dans le récit que donne Bu-ston de l’introduction du bouddhisme à l’époque de Khri-sroṅ-lde-bcan, c’est l’arrivée de maîtres chinois qui est mentionnée en premier lieu, avant celle des maîtres indiens”. Rolf Stein, for his part, concludes a long analysis of this question by saying that “le rôle éminent de la Chine vers 730-750 réside dans la transmission du bouddhisme chinois (en partie par l’intermédiaire du Tch’an), parallèlement et concurremment avec le bouddhisme indien”.

As seen before, the central or pivotal assumed fact which occasioned the earliest authoritative decision is the translation of the Ratnamegha and the Laṅkāvatārasūtra. That the earliest authoritative decision stresses this point has not received the attention it merits. These sūtras appear to have been instrumental in transmitting a political ideology and were especially influential at the time of the Zhou Empress Wu Zetian (685-704). Their presence is attested during the VIIth and VIIIth century in China and as far as Turfan, Khotan and North West India, the idea...
they might have been translated into Tibetan at an early date should not be hastily rejected. The “Prophecy of the Arhat Samghavardhana”\textsuperscript{105} demonstrates that by the IX\textsuperscript{th} century the “idéologème” of the Bodhisattva-king/queen was accepted as, so to speak, performative during the reign of Khri Iide gtsug btsan (712-755) and the Chinese Koñ jo Kim šeñ. One may surmise that some decades earlier the Dowager Empress Khri ma lod (regency? 705-712), mother of Khri ’Dus sroñ (r. 677-704), renowned to have been influential if not formally in power, could also have had the same wish to see her power consolidated by the \textit{Ratnameghasūtra} pretense\textsuperscript{106}.

There are further arguments to support the idea that these \textit{sūtras}, already widely disseminated in the far-flung Buddhist milieu of the epoch, could have been translated into Tibetan at an early date and that the same texts played an important role in the Debate of bSam yas. Reference to both works is found in the Chinese records of Dunhuang\textsuperscript{107} and in the first \textit{Bhāvanākrama} of Kamalaśīla, sometimes referred to as “Indian records”. As far as the \textit{Laṅkāvatārasūtra} is concerned, the most commonly transmitted version is the translation of ’Gos (Chinese “Wu” according to Ueyama and Imaeda) Chos grub, the famous Chinese \textit{Bhadanta} who worked in Dunhuang during the second period of the Tibetan occupation\textsuperscript{108}. Although to our knowledge there is no precise date for this translation, thanks to the detailed study of Ueyama Daishun\textsuperscript{109} we know

\textsuperscript{105} Pelliot tib 609 is a bilingual commentary to the \textit{Laṅkāvatāra}, see \textit{Catalogue des manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang VI} 45-46, with some emendations, see Scherrer-Schaub forthcoming\textsuperscript{g}.  
\textsuperscript{106} “DaiBan-koku daitoku sanzō hōshi shamon Hōjō no kenkyū”, see Demiéville 1970: 47-62.  
\textsuperscript{107} Pelliot tib 608 possibly belongs to the first type of Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript, making use of ancient system of pagination (Scherrer-Schaub 1999:\textsuperscript{h} 20-22) to which a new system of pagination has been subsequently added, see Lalou 1939, N° 608. It might be interesting to note that the persons having corrected and copied this manuscript bear patronyms well attested in the region of Khotan. Moreover, fragments of Tibetan version of the \textit{Laṅkāvatara} have been found in Mīrān, see Takeuchi 1998, vol. II: N° 609-611.  
\textsuperscript{108} Whether there were one or two dPal dbyanś, see Karmay 1988: 66-69. sBa dPal dbyanś (and sBa Sañ śi) took an active part in the Debate of bSam yas, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 60, 69-70, 1992: 239. Stein 1983: 219 “Yamaguchi (1975) a pensé qu’il pouvait s’agir du célèbre Sañ-çi qui a joué un grand rôle vers 750 A. D. dans la quête de livres chinois. Mais il y a eu d’autres dPal-dbyanś. Celui du colophon n’était peut-être pas l’auteur de la liste mais un simple copiste”.

\textsuperscript{109} Whether there were one or two dPal dbyanś, see Karmay 1988: 66-69. sBa dPal dbyanś (and sBa Sañ śi) took an active part in the Debate of bSam yas, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 60, 69-70, 1992: 239. Stein 1983: 219 “Yamaguchi (1975) a pensé qu’il pouvait s’agir du célèbre Sañ-çi qui a joué un grand rôle vers 750 A. D. dans la quête de livres chinois. Mais il y a eu d’autres dPal-dbyanś. Celui du colophon n’était peut-être pas l’auteur de la liste mais un simple copiste”.  

\textsuperscript{106} “DaiBan-koku daitoku sanzō hōshi shamon Hōjō no kenkyū”, see Demiéville 1970: 47-62.  
\textsuperscript{107} Pelliot tib 608 possibly belongs to the first type of Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript, making use of ancient system of pagination (Scherrer-Schaub 1999:\textsuperscript{h} 20-22) to which a new system of pagination has been subsequently added, see Lalou 1939, N° 608. It might be interesting to note that the persons having corrected and copied this manuscript bear patronyms well attested in the region of Khotan. Moreover, fragments of Tibetan version of the \textit{Laṅkāvatara} have been found in Mīrān, see Takeuchi 1998, vol. II: N° 609-611.  
\textsuperscript{108} Whether there were one or two dPal dbyanś, see Karmay 1988: 66-69. sBa dPal dbyanś (and sBa Sañ śi) took an active part in the Debate of bSam yas, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 60, 69-70, 1992: 239. Stein 1983: 219 “Yamaguchi (1975) a pensé qu’il pouvait s’agir du célèbre Sañ-çi qui a joué un grand rôle vers 750 A. D. dans la quête de livres chinois. Mais il y a eu d’autres dPal-dbyanś. Celui du colophon n’était peut-être pas l’auteur de la liste mais un simple copiste”.  
\textsuperscript{109} Whether there were one or two dPal dbyanś, see Karmay 1988: 66-69. sBa dPal dbyanś (and sBa Sañ śi) took an active part in the Debate of bSam yas, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 60, 69-70, 1992: 239. Stein 1983: 219 “Yamaguchi (1975) a pensé qu’il pouvait s’agir du célèbre Sañ-çi qui a joué un grand rôle vers 750 A. D. dans la quête de livres chinois. Mais il y a eu d’autres dPal-dbyanś. Celui du colophon n’était peut-être pas l’auteur de la liste mais un simple copiste”.

\textsuperscript{105} Pelliot tib 609 is a bilingual commentary to the \textit{Laṅkāvatāra}, see \textit{Catalogue des manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang VI} 45-46, with some emendations, see Scherrer-Schaub forthcoming\textsuperscript{g}.  
\textsuperscript{106} “DaiBan-koku daitoku sanzō hōshi shamon Hōjō no kenkyū”, see Demiéville 1970: 47-62.  
\textsuperscript{107} Pelliot tib 608 possibly belongs to the first type of Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript, making use of ancient system of pagination (Scherrer-Schaub 1999:\textsuperscript{h} 20-22) to which a new system of pagination has been subsequently added, see Lalou 1939, N° 608. It might be interesting to note that the persons having corrected and copied this manuscript bear patronyms well attested in the region of Khotan. Moreover, fragments of Tibetan version of the \textit{Laṅkāvatara} have been found in Mīrān, see Takeuchi 1998, vol. II: N° 609-611.  
\textsuperscript{108} Whether there were one or two dPal dbyanś, see Karmay 1988: 66-69. sBa dPal dbyanś (and sBa Sañ śi) took an active part in the Debate of bSam yas, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 60, 69-70, 1992: 239. Stein 1983: 219 “Yamaguchi (1975) a pensé qu’il pouvait s’agir du célèbre Sañ-çi qui a joué un grand rôle vers 750 A. D. dans la quête de livres chinois. Mais il y a eu d’autres dPal-dbyanś. Celui du colophon n’était peut-être pas l’auteur de la liste mais un simple copiste”.
that Facheng / Chos grub was active at the time of Emperor Khri gtsug lde btsan (r. 817-838?), Ral pa can. The first authoritative decision of the sGra sbyor is therefore assumed to refer to a putative previous translation from the Indian or some other neighbouring language. Indeed, a second translation is transmitted in the bKa ’gyur and a manuscript of Dunhuang (Pelliot tib. 608) seems to attest to a translation from the Sanskrit, although as far as we know no systematic philological analysis has been carried out so far110.

Focussing on the Ratnamegha and the Laṅkāvatāra as terminological sources

An interesting bilingual inventory of texts and terms was drawn up by a certain dPal dbyaṅs111, supposedly at one of the Dayun Monasteries (established throughout the Empire in the wake of the edict of 690 issued by the Empress Wu Zetian112). The Sino-Tibetan terminology113 uses Indian transcription mixed with vernacular translation; for the “Ratnamegha” it gives the Chinese title Baoyun jing and the correct Tibetan translation “dKon mchog sprin” (Ptib 1257, l. 6-7)114, the same title as that recorded in the lHan dkar catalogue (Lalou 1953 no 89). If we compare the Tibetan titles of works translated from the Chinese (or the reverse?), as recorded in

112 See Forte 1976: 6-7, 8-11. At the same occasion the nine Bhadantas (ib. 6-7) were “granted with the investiture as dukes of a subprefecture and were given the purple kaṣāya and a “silver bag for the tortoise””. On the role assumed by the nine Bhadanta in making Buddhism the religion of the Empire, see op. cit. 111-115. This prefigures an analogous case when, a century later, Buddhism became the state religion in Tibet and ecclesiastics of high rank were at the same time ministers (blon po).

113 Stein ’s “Tibetica Antiqua I. Les deux vocabulaires des traductions Indo-tibétaine et Sino-tibétaine dans les manuscrits de Touen-houang” a work of reference in this matter has not seen the fruit of its legacy. Underlining the difficulties inherent to the study of the “mixed” terminology used by Tibetan translators, Stein says “Les données relatives aux traductions tibétaines de textes chinois sont en vérité très complexes. Pour le moment on doit se garder de conclusions hâtives et de raisonnements simplistes”, Stein 1983: 154.

114 On Ptib 1257 see Lalou 1950, N° 1257, Fujieda 1961 cited in Spanien & Imaeda 1979: 20, Catalogue des manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang T. 1, N° 2046, pp. 34-35. The page setting of Ptib 1257 shows how careful and precise the redaction of bilingual terminological lists was.

115 Tucci provides important material that has not received the attention it deserves. For an example of “mapping” Buddhist texts, see Scherrer-Schaub [1998] forthcoming.
Analogous case with iconographical programs, a paradigmatic illustration being the Temple of bSam yas. On the rich ideological program of bSam yas, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 134-135. As recorded by Tibetan historiographers, various and specific texts were illustrated in the temples of bSam yas, among them the *Ratnamegha*, see sBa bZed, ed. Stein 1961: 36.1.

116 sKa ba dPal brtsegs, Cog ro Klu’i rgyal mtshan and Vairocana are considered by rNgol lo tsā ba Blo ldan šes rab (1059-1109) the Great Translators, *par excellence*, of the *sha dar*, see Karmay 1988: 17.

117 See Tucci 1978: 139.

118 See MvyS §§1337, 1338.

119 See Lalou 1953: 321, n° 84 and 85.
miscellaneous mahāyānasūtras (theg pa chen po’i mdo sna tshogs) from 26 to 11 bam po in length (bam po nī šu rtsa drug man chad nas \ bam po bcu gcig pa yan chad ), while the Ratnamegha follows shortly in the next section (starting with Mahāmeghasūtra), which comprises mahāyānasūtras of 10 bam po and less in length (bam po bcu man chad)\textsuperscript{119}.

The Ratnamegha and the Mahāvyutpatti

Other considerations aside, the descriptions of the impressive assembly gathered to listen to the exposition of the Ratnameghasūtra furnish an ideal repository of terminology; in fact there is evidence that these descriptions have actually been used for this purpose. In an interesting article published in 1997, Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber drew attention to parallels between the arrangement of the chapter titles of the Vinayavastu preserved in the Vinayasūtravrītti of Guṇaprabha and the entries in the section “gzhi bcu bdun la \ bzhis bcu bdun lai” of the Mahāvyutpatti. Following her approach and collating the list of the Ratnamegha together with parallel lists of the Mahāvyutpatti, it appears quite clearly (Fig. D) that the Ratnamegha has served as a model in the complex distribution of terms into lexical and semantic fields\textsuperscript{120}.

The colophon of the sDe dge version of the Ratnamegha names Venerable Rin chen ’tsho (Ratnarakṣita) and Chos ŋid tshul khrims (Dharmatāśīla) as the scholars who translated, revised and established the definitive text (lo tsa ba Ban de Rin chen ’tsho dañ \ Chos ŋid tshul khrims kyis bsgyur cīn žus te gtan la phab pa, Tōh. N° 231, vol. Lwa, fol. 112b7)\textsuperscript{121}. Both appear with the title “Bod kyi mkhan po” and reconstructed Indian names (Ratnarakṣita and Dharmatāśīla) as having been

\textsuperscript{120} Cf. Scherrer-Schaub 1992.

\textsuperscript{121} An alternative Western Kanjur tradition attests change in the title of Dharmatāśīla and possibly represents the revision of the text kept in the sDe dge collection. See the colophon of sTog, Skorupski 1985, N° 157. Žu chen gyi lo tsa ba Ban de Vairocanarakṣita dañ Dharmatāśīlas žus te gtan la phab pa \ skad gsar bcad kyis kyañ bcos lags so || Parallel with the change in titulature attested in the 795/783 bkas bcad, see supra §2, preliminary note, p. 284-285.

\textsuperscript{122} On the way “that Tibetan and Buddhists received and reacted to two important and distinct traditions within Buddhism and to the Chinese and Indian Masters who were the transmitters of these traditions”, see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 59 et sq.
prominent in the redaction of the *Mahāvyutpatti* at the time of the *third bkas bcad* of 814 (Appendix I, p. 317). If it is this translation of the *Ratnamegha* which occasioned the earliest and *first authoritative decision* in the *sGra sbyor* (Appendix I, p. 321), why are the names of the translators not expressly mentioned in the canonical version of the earliest authoritative decision, since, as we saw, this version consistently updates the preceding acts and titles? Our opinion, which is admittedly speculative, is that the earliest *authoritative decision* refers to translations made from the Chinese or from Indian texts (brought from China or borderlands) that might have been used, emended and absorbed into successive stages of translations. And there is more. These translations, despite the fact that they needed to be heavily revised, were not completely discarded. It is also by no means clear how the revision was actually performed. Most probably the text was not translated anew, from scratch; and probably the revision was the result of learned discussion among translators and teachers who consulted and collated all available extant translations. This could explain why some texts have a “blending” of Indo-Tibetan and Sino-Tibetan terminology. In short, the situation is more complicated than imagined and many problems remain unsolved. The extraordinary philological skilfulness showed by Tibetan and Indian scholars of the time paid due tribute to textual tradition and could not and would not *a priori* discard sources.

When speaking of Chinese Buddhism it is wise not to forge a monolithic entity, but rather to distinguish, as far as possible, between the regions of China in close contact with Tibet and the Buddhist schools flourishing in China at the time or, rather, the Buddhist temples that could transmit a certain kind of religious filiation to Tibet. When our texts speak of translations made from different languages, they indirectly recall the cosmo-

---

123 Illuminating in this respect are the records of later colophons. In that of the “brGyad ston' pa” for example, the various stages of textual transmission are faithfully recorded, attesting to the philological process of correcting revising and collating Tibetan translations, further comparing them with Indian commentaries and source documents, and again considering newly discovered *exemplar* of the Tibetan translation, etc. See Lalou 1929. This fact had been noted by Simonsson (1957) in his careful study of various versions of manuscript fragments of Central Asia: see op. cit. pp. 212-233, in particular p. 217.

124 See Forte loc. cit. Note that a fragmentary Sanskrit manuscript of the *Ratnamegha* from Šorčuq is found in the Turfan collection: see supra p. 292, n. 89.
politican influences throughout the far-flung Buddhist milieu at the end of the VIIth century and in the first half of the VIIIth, when “on 7th October 693” the Ratnameghasūtra was translated into Chinese and, as we gather from the colophon translated by Antonino Forte (1976: 71): “The śramaṇa Fan-mo [Dharmaruci], envoy of the king of Central India, also enounced the Sanskrit original: the śramaṇa Chan-t’o and the lay Brahman Li Wu-ch’an translated [their] words: the śramaṇa Hui-chih checked the translation: the śramaṇa Ch’u-i and others received [the translation] in writing: the śramaṇa Ssu-hsüan and others bound the composition: the śramaṇas Yüan-ts’e, Shen-ying and others checked the meaning Sun [Ch’eng-] p’i, Assistant of the Court of Diplomatic Reception, was the supervisor.” Four decades later more or less, when the Tibetans were in Gilgit, the Chinese translation of the Ratnamegha with its colophon was copied in Japan.

Indian texts could well have reached Tibet at this epoch in the wake of the comings and goings of religious figures and diplomats, from China, Khotan, or other regions. Out of these “close and/or mediate transmissions” a certain disorder may have resulted that intellectuals (mkhas pa) and ecclesiastics (mkhan po) decided to rectify.

4. Enacting rules, enacting words

One may wonder whether the three events or facts which occasioned the three authoritative decisions are echoed in practice, especially in the main part of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa (Fig. A§2). This part consists of a lexicographic commentary analysing the derivation and formation of Indian words according to the principles and rules of the Indian vyākaraṇa tradition (vya ka ra ṇa’i lugs) and relying on the Buddhist hermeneutic tradition. On close examination, it appears that this part must have been compiled (and the eschatocol partially confirms it; see supra p. 284) at the two colleges mentioned in the last paragraphs of the protocol, where we gather:

However, when a college of translation and exegesis (bsgyur ba daṅ ’chod pa’i grva), on its own part (so so nas) must / is compelled to fix a term in the new language / a new lexical entry, one must examine (dpyad de) [the

---

As we have seen, once settled the term should be submitted to the authorities for approval. In a way the main part of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa can be seen as the text of the official document presented and/or redacted by the team working on translating, correcting and commenting upon Buddhist texts, the document that was eventually submitted to the authorities in charge of ratifying or definitively fixing (gtan la phab pa) the term that would subsequently be in the register of words. The text at hand shows quite clearly that the procedure of forming and deriving a term existed before 795/783 and that the authors of the sGra sbyor assumed that this particular procedure would continue after 814 (Fig. C).

The formulary appearing in the commentary on lexicographical entries is extremely rigorous and reflects a refined and well-established administrative organisation. Although it is common to regard this text as a lexicographical index, it also records steps relative to the procedure of ratifying a term and, as such, reveals unexpected features pertaining to the translation process. Interesting details may be inferred from the use of a particular technical phraseology or normative formulary.

The pattern samples of lexicographical entries (Fig. C) show quite clearly that each lexicographic entry may be considered as an application of the principles and rules stipulated in the protocol (Fig. A§1), thereby revealing that the text, as we have it here, representing the texts or pseudo-texts of 814 and 783/795, constitutes evidence of a previous and later stage of the complex translating and revising procedure.

V. Conclusions

Three repertories (vyutpatti) and three authoritative decisions (bkas bcad)

At the end of the analysis one may plausibly argue that the sGra sbyor preserves a complex public act, which in turn contains three distinct do-
cuments. The fact of having at hand various versions (Dunhuang, Tabo and the canonical or “bstan ’gyur”) shed light on text stratigraphy. It appears that the documents were successively integrated (partially or in toto, at this stage we cannot decide) at the occasion of issuing the public act when, following a procedure in common use, the preceding edict or authoritative decision (bkas bcad) was reconfirmed.

The three authoritative decisions (bkas bcad) relative to the codification of Tibetan language for use of ecclesiastic and religious matters (chos kyi skad) were ratifying the terminology (miṅ du btags rnams) and method / normative principles for translating Buddhist texts (dha rmma bsgyur ba’i thabs/dam pa’i chos bsgyur ba’i lugs) in successive stages and in various degrees of complexity. Out of this process, three systematic collections were published, known by later tradition as Mahāvyutpattī/Bye brag tu rtogs byed chen po, Madhyavyutpattī/Bye brag tu rtogs byed ’briṅ po or sGra sbyor bam po gniś pa and Svalpavyutpattī/ Bye brag tu rtogs byed chuṅ ņu (Appendix I, p. 324). While the first two are well known, the “Small Repertory” (Svalpavyutpattī), although mentioned in Tibetan literature, has so far been a subject of conjecture; its long history far exceeds the scope of the present article. Zuihō Yamaguchi (1979) suggested that this “short list” of words could possibly have been merged into the great repertory, the Mahāvyutpattī, and that this could have been the reason that induced later authors to consider this text as lost126.

126 Simonsson shared this opinion, see 1957: 277 estimating “Was die *Kṣudravyutt-patti enthalten haben mag, wissen wir allerdings nicht”, op. cit. 233, n. 1. On “Kṣudravyutt-patti” see Simonsson, op. cit. 263 and Uray 1989: 3, n. 3. We adopt the reading “svalpa” of Ishikawa 1990: 127 n. 6, based on the equivalent of MvyS.

127 It is worth noting that (s)Ka ba dPal brtsegs, the learned lo tsā ba credited with having played a central role “as compiler of the Mahāvyuttattī” (Sørensen 1994: 399 and nn. 1357 and 1360), is not mentioned in the sGra sbyor bam po gniś pa. Instead dPal brtsegs appears in the introductory part of the IHan dkar catalogue, see Lalou 1953: 316 “Index des traductions des āgama et des sāstra du palais de Ldan kar, au Stod-thani, fait par Dpal-brcegs et Nam-mkha’i-sniṅ-po....” Cf. Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 209, n. 9.
The small/concise repertory (Svalpavyutpatti)

Now, we have seen that the diplomatic analysis of the sGra sbyor has revealed the existence of an earlier and first authoritative decision concerning principles fixed at the occasion of the translation of the Ratnamegha. Also we have seen that upon close examination (supra p. 301 and Fig. D p. 331-332), the Ratnamegha (and the Laṅkāvatāra) possibly functioned as source of inspiration for the Mahāvyutpatti. From this we can surmise that the list of words excerpted from the Ratnamegha together with their Tibetan equivalents might have been the writing/text drawn in application of the first authoritative decision, eventually known as the “small/concise repertory” or “repertory consisting in short sections” (Svalpavyutpatti).

It appears evident that the lists of terms and section on terminology were required as preliminary material that was further on collated and merged into larger repertories or manuals. Such lists, some of which are bilingual, are kept in the Dunhuang collection and among the collection of Buddhist manuscripts of Central Asia. This material was primarily used or destined to be used by teachers. Evidence of this fact is attested in the Chos kyi rnam graṅs kyi brjed byaṅ of dPal brtsegs, a commentary on his Chos kyi rnam graṅs. dPal brtsegs states that the terms collected are excerpted from different sūtra and śāstra, such as the Śatasahasrikāprajñāpāramitā and the Yogācāra [bhumi of Aśaṅga?], and explained for the purpose that those persons who have difficulties in the various teachings will be able to understand easily the meaning of [Buddha] Scripture or Word. ICaṅ skya Rol pa’i rdo rje (1717-1786), in his Dag yig mkhas pa’i ’byun gnas advocating authoritative principles for translating Buddhist texts from Tibetan into Mongolian, recapitulates the main lines fixed in the sGra sbyor bam po gniś pa and lists the works having inspired his treatise. Among them he mentions “the large and small Vyūtpattis (Bye brag rtogs

128 See Tōhoku N° 4263, Vol. Jo, fol. 289a5-294b6 and Tōhoku 4362, vol. Jo, fol. 231b7-232a1: de la chos kyi rnam par graṅs kyi brjed byaṅ žes bya ba ni mdo sde daṅ bstan bcos daṅ l sès rab ’bum daṅ l yo ga cā rya la sogs pa gzǔṅ tha dad pa maṅ po’i naṅ nas don ’dus pa’i tshig ’jeks ’jeks mdo tsam btus te l chos maṅ po ŋan mi nus pa’i gaṅ zag rnams kyis tshogs chuṅ ŋus gsuṅ rab kyi don rtogs par bya ba daṅ ’raṅ gi lus gLONG pa’i mshun 郩l la mkhas par bya ba’i phyir bstan pa’o l l

129 See Seyfort Ruegg 1973: 251 and n. 32, 259: ka cog sogs lo tstsʰa ba du mas mdo las ’byuṅ ba’i mīṅ gi rnam bzung du ma bs dus pa bye brag rtogs byed che cheṅu l
The term *dkar chag* may also designate an “inventory” (Latin *inventorium*), especially in case of shrines, temples, but also profane registers and inventories, as recorded in several Dunhuang manuscripts. Interesting enough, the Tabo version has “dkar gnag” (MvyS kרגs་sugs), “virtuous and evil [groups]” or “black and white”), possibly metonymic of Yama, register recalling good and evil actions to the dead. Cf. Pelliot tib 126, Macdonald-Spanien 1971: 372 “Lorsque Yama fera comparaître les morts (dkar-chag)…”

Yama, the “judge of all souls” in the *Mahābhārata*, is known as such by Vasubandhu: see Abhidharmakoṣa ed. Pradhan p. 123.12. On the “register of good and evil” in the Chinese context, see KUO 1994: 91-92.

The large/great repertory (*Mahāvyutpatti*)

If the Sanskrit title “*Mahāvyutpatti*” seems to be attested for the first time in the Chos ’byuñ of Ṇān Ral Ni ma ’od zer (1136-1204), the term *bye brag tu rtogs pa*, the Tibetan equivalent of *vyutpatti*, is recorded ad MvyS 7496, a passage which however cannot be dated, since we do not know if the lexical entry at hand today represents the text redacted *sine varietur*. There is no doubt that the sGra sbyor refers to the *Mahāvyutpatti* and calls it simply a “register” (*dkar chag*, Appendix I, pp. 317a) at the time of the third and last authoritative decision of 814. On the other hand, at the time of the second or middle bkas bcd of 795/783, the [Mahā]vyutpatti

130 The term *dkar chag* may also designate an “inventory” (Latin *inventorium*), especially in case of shrines, temples, but also profane registers and inventories, as recorded in several Dunhuang manuscripts. Interesting enough, the Tabo version has “dkar gnag” (MvyS kṛṣṇa-śukla, “virtuous and evil [groups]” or “black and white”), possibly metonymic of Yama, register recalling good and evil actions to the dead. Cf. Pelliot tib 126, Macdonald-Spanien 1971: 372 “Lorsque Yama fera comparaître les morts devant lui, ils auront beau s’excuser et se repentir, Yama lira son registre (*dkar-chag*)…”

Yama, the “judge of all souls” in the *Mahābhārata*, is known as such by Vasubandhu: see Abhidharmakoṣa ed. Pradhan p. 123.12. On the “register of good and evil” in the Chinese context, see KUO 1994: 91-92.

131 Cf. Panglung 1994: 165 and 171 “This is the first *bam-po* of the so-called sGra-sbyor in which the terms for translating the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna texts formerly had been fixed and codified”. When the canonical version reads “Given that previously [some] lexical entries (*skad kyi miṅ*) have not been [formally] decided/ratified (*sḥon gtan la ma phab pa*) nor fixed as terms (*miṅ du ma thog pa*), [the treatise gives here] at first (*daṅ po*) the explanation/exegesis (*bsdad pa*) [in conformity with the meaning and derivation as] found in the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna treatises and used/applied in the grammatical treatises (… *las theg pa che chuṅ gi gzǔn daṅ sgra’i gzǔn las ’byuñ ba daṅ sbyar te…*). Or with minor changes, as in Simonsson 1957: 262 “[Hier beginnt] das erste [Kapitel des Sgra sbyor], in dem die Wörter der Sprache — während sie früher kodifiziert und als Termini festgelegt worden waren — [jetzt] in Übereinstimmung (*sbyar te*) mit dem, was in den Schriften des Mahāyāna und des Hinayāna und in den Sprachbüchern vorzufinden ist, erklärt werden”.

Cf. supra p. 279.
ENACTING WORDS 309

is referred to as the “register of words” (skad kyi dkar chag, bstan ’gyur and Dh, Appendix I, p. 323a) or “register” (dkar gnag, Tabo Appendix I, pp. 323b), where the terminology translated and fixed according to rules and principles prescribed by order was entered. The term dkar chag could have been translating the Sanskrit sūci-pattra, ⁰lipti? meaning “index, table of contents”. In the sGra sbyor we translate the term as “register” (Latin registrum), a term which connotes the underlying legal procedure.¹³⁰

The middle repertory (Madhyavyutpatti) or “On the use of words” (sGra sbyor)

If we agree with the fact that the Tabo manuscript of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa is a copy of the text dated 795/783, then this copy bears the first evidence of the text’s title as it was subsequently formulated by the compilers of the Tibetan canon. The passage in question presents some variant readings (Appendix I, p. 323).¹³¹ Instead of “gţuṅ dañ sgra’i gţuṅ las ’byuṅ ba dañ sbyar te bṣad pa” (bstan ’gyur version, see loc. cit.) the Tabo version has “gţuṅ gi dañ sgra sbyord du bṣad pa”. It is difficult at this stage to decide whether or not the bstan ’gyur reading represents an enlargement of the reading as attested in the Tabo fragment or if, on the contrary, the Tabo reading represents a contraction of a previous reading as attested in the bstan ’gyur version. Interesting enough, this passage is not kept in the Dunhuang manuscript, a fact which tends to indicate that the Tabo passage could show later interpolation (?) or an alternative textual stage. Further analysis shows that reference to the work of emending previous terminology according to formally established principles (lugs), appears in the dispositive of the third authoritative decision, or the 814 “bkas bcad” (Annex I, p. 318a). Again, the middle or 795/783 bkas bcad speaks of “methods or principles for translating Buddhist texts” (dha rmma bsgyur ba’i thabs, dam pa’i chos bsgyur ba’i lugs, Annex I, p. 323), obviously alluding to the normative principles and methods destined for translators, that is the sGra sbyor. Particularly striking is the fact that even the first authoritative decision refers to formally established methods (gtan la phab pa’i lugs, Annex I, p. 321) for translating.
TEXTS (REGISTER/VYUTPATI) AND AUTHORITATIVE DECISIONS (DECREES/EDICT/BKAS BCAD)

It appears quite normal that lists of words and dispositions, if not manuals regulating the translations, existed already from the time of the first vague codification — that is, the beginning of the institution of Buddhism in Tibet — as texts made in application of high authority’s decision. Although the register of words (dkar chag) and the manual regulating the use of words (sgra sbyor) were produced in stages corresponding to the respective authoritative decisions, and although three different texts were compiled in application of the three authoritative decisions or edicts (bkas bcad), it should be stressed that the texts/repertories (vyutpatti) are collections of writing while the bkas bcad are edicts, or decrees, having force of law. The written document, or charter, stipulating the three decrees has survived until today in archives or collections and is physically kept together with three repertories (vyutpatti) of which the first and “Small Repertory” (Sval-

132 Ňa nh ral, Chos 'byuṅ p. 421.7-10 ... sīnar gyi bsgyur ba rnams ni mi Ňams par bya ba daṅ \ phyis 'gyur slob pa rnams la phan pa'i yan lag tu \ rta che chuṅ daṅ \ bka' bcad daṅ \ dkar chag gi yi ge gsum yah mţad do \ II Cf. Uray 1989: 7. The parallel passage in Bu ston has been translated by Sørensen 1994: 412, cf. Petech 1996: 151 “The revised languages were made in three codices”. The translation is correct, but needs some explanation. This passage seems to be drawn from CHBY, 145a [Chos 'byuṅ of Bu ston]. It refers to the two volumes (ban po) of the Sgra sbyor gnyis pa, plus the no longer extant “Lesser Mahāvyutpatti” (Bye brag tu rtogs byed chung ngu)...” However this does not correspond to Bu ston (Chos 'byuṅ fol. 891.6-892.1 sīnar bsgyur ba rnams skad gsar bcad kyis kyaṅ gtan la phab ciṅ \ bkas bcad rnam pa gsum mţad de \ sde pa bye brag tu gţi thams cad yod smra las gţan daṅ gsaṅ bshṅags rnams ma ggyur cig ces bkas bcad do \ than bre daṅ sraṅ daṅ žo la sos pa’aṅ rgya gar daṅ mţun pa rgyor bcos so II), nor to Simonsson, loc. cit. q.v.

133 See supra p. 303 and n. 123. For instance, the colophon appended to the Lalitavistara and quoted by Simonsson (1957: 224 footnote) attests the phraseology in question here. \ rgya gar gyi mkhan po ji na mi tra daṅ \ dā na śi la daṅ \ mu ne bar ma daṅ \ žu chen gyi lo tsā ba ban de ye sès sdes bsgyur ciṅ žus te \ skad gsar bcad kyis kyaṅ bcos nas gtan la phab pa II “The Indian Masters (mkhan po, upadhyāya) Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Munivarman and the Translator (lo tsā ba) [in charge of] Great Revision (žu chen) Venerable (ban de) Ye sès sde translated, corrected and fixed/ratified [the ne varietur version] after having made [the Tibetan translation] in conformity with the decision relative to the new language”.

pavyutpatti) for various reasons disappeared and merged into successive textual stages. A passage in the Chos ’byuṅ me tog siṅṅ po of Naṅral seems to be a faint echo of this fact: “With the scope of perfecting (mi ṅams par) the translations [performed] earlier and as a section/supplement (yan lag) to assist teachers (slob pa rnams) in future time, the large and small [registers? vyutpatti?] and the decrees (bkas bcad) [relative to the codification of language in religious matter were produced and promulgated] and three texts of [these?] register(s) (dkar chag gi yi ge gsum) were made”132.

The decision relative to the new language (skad gsar bcad)

That former translations were corrected and revised according to terminology and principles fixed and established for the new language (skad gsar) is a fact known also through the record of texts’ colophons133. The expression skad gsar bcad134 refers here to the new language, that is the terminology and normative principles followed in the revision of former translations. This expression, discussed at length by authors and attested in colophons of Dunhuang manuscripts, was certainly taken from a passage of the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa kept in all versions and apparently unnoticed up until now. Variant readings show again that the Tabo manuscript represents an earlier and/or alternative tradition. The expression occurs in two clauses, restricting the executive power of the colleges appointed to the office of translating, seen before (supra p. 288). The Tabo version, although referring to the work of forming expressions for translating a process currently in use at the time, does not speak of fixing “new terms” (miṅ/miyn gsar du ’dogs), nor of terms in the “new language” (skad gsar du miṅ/miyn gdags), as the Dunhuang and canonical versions do (Appendix I, p. 322, ll. 3-8 and p. 323, ll. 4-8). This fact nicely fits with the change in titulature and ecclesiastic chancery procedure occured in the 814 bkas bcad.

We can thus confidently sum up as follows. The institution of translating Buddhist texts was rigourously organized right from the beginning, i.e. from the time it was founded under the ægis of Śāntarakṣita, the Bengali teacher, philosopher and high rank ecclesiastic, assisted by Ananta,

the Kashmiri bilingual or polyglot Brahman and other scholars (possibly Sañ śi, no matter who was concealed under this name). As Tibetan historiography attests, Buddhist texts in Tibetan were extant and circulating in Tibet already before the arrival of Śāntarakṣita. These texts possibly included the Ratnamegha and the Laṅkāvatāra, even if historiographical tradition did not count these among the five mahāyānasūtra supposedly circulating at the time of Khri lDe gtsug btsan (r. 704–755?). This material served as the point of departure for Śāntarakṣita’s efforts and was soon revised as a consequence of the intellectual and scholarly discussions of the time.

Probably the first and earliest authoritative decision, the “small list” (Svalpavyutpatti) of terms, and the unspecified methods (lugs) of translating date to this epoch, as the Dunhuang and canonical version claim (and possibly even the first list of texts). As we have seen the Tabo sGra sbyor version attributes this event to the epoch of the Ancestors (yab mes). Whether recasting history or not, this could have been determined by the fact that the earliest unspecified and vague authoritative decision may have had two stages or phases. During the first decades of the VIIIth century when Buddhism flourished under the reign of Khri lDe gtsug btsan and religious sites were instituted by the King in the wake of military success (Kwa cu in Brag dmar, after the fall of the Chinese eponym town, for instance), monks from bordering countries, Khotan, Gilgit and China (lHo bal?) were reaching Tibet, certainly carrying with them Buddhist texts and possibly religious implements. This much is perfectly in line with the widespread and perennial Buddhist narrative cliché. Bogoslovskij resumes this period gleaning passages from various Tibetan historiographers:

Sous le règne de Khri-lde-gcug-brtan déjà, s’était manifestée une violente recrudescence bouddhique [political incorrectness from the part of the author or translator?] dans le pays. La tradition attribue à ce bcan-po l’édification de nombreux temples, l’invitation de prédicateurs bouddhistes et la protec-

---

135 lho bal that is “non-Tibetan barbarians, including Sogdians. Azha, Mthong-khyab, Chinese, etc.”: see Takeuchi 1992, n. 5 with reference to Richardson 1983 and Takeuchi 1984.

136 Bogoslovskij (1972: 52-53 and notes) represents a good and useful résumé — things of course are much more complicated when collating Tibetan historiography.


If monks left Khotan between 730 and 740138 (at the same epoch Tibetans were in Gilgit), some decades earlier when the ideology propagated by the Ratnamegha (and the Mahāmegha) was possibly circulating in Tibet (supra p. 301), texts and implements from Bru Ńa/Gilgit could have reached Tibet in the wake of the first Tibetan raid in these regions, dated 719/720 (supra n. 41). Sheer coincidence or not, the Buddhist bronze of Jayamangalavikramadityanandi I of the Paśolva Śāhi dynasty (v. Hinüber 1996 and forthcoming), kept in the Jokhang of lHasa, is dated 706/707. It represents “Lokeśvara in his mountain home Potalaka”, a figure who could have concurred to form the mythical paradigm of the Bodhisattva-king.139.

---

137 Cf. supra p. 274, n. 41.
138 On the institution of Dharma Colleges, see Uebach 1990; Cf. Sørensen 1994: 412-413 and notes.
Proposing dates

Later on, at the time of Śāntarakṣita, the texts that had been previously circulating when Buddhism was not yet institutionalised in Tibet, were collected and exhibited to the Great Bengali Teacher who, assisted by Ananta and Sañśī (?), reviewed the extant Tibetan material and compared it with the “Indian” and other “originals” near at hand. This first informal revision may have been the occasion for the first authoritative decision, approximatively dating it at 763 →, i.e. the year of Śāntarakṣita’s arrival in Tibet or a little later.

If we turn now to the second or middle bkas bcad, we observe that this decision must have occurred after the foundation of bSam yas and the colleges (gra, grva)\(^{140}\), since these are mentioned in the Tabo version representing the text or pseudo-text of 795/783 (Appendix I, p. 321 and 323), Hower, this decision must have been taken prior to the bSam yas debate (792-794?) since the principle of authority appealing to Nāgārjuna\(^{141}\) and Vasubandhu and issued after the bSam yas debate is not mentioned in the Tabo version. Hence, despite objections raised earlier (supra pp. 289-292), the date 783 for the issuing of the second and middle bkas bcad of Khri sroṅ lDe btsan would conform to the results of diplomatic analysis.

Institution of translation of Buddhist texts: a work in progress

Tradition maintains, that the institution was initiated under the ægis of Śāntarakṣita, the intellectual (mkhas pa) and high ecclesiast (mkhan po) who presided over intellectual and liturgical matters. The methods and tools for translating and collecting Buddhist texts were developed in stages. From the start there were prototypes of what we know nowadays as Mahāvyutpatti and Madhyavyutpatti or sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa existing as registers of words, methodological guidelines and critical lists of lexical entries. Unauthorized, personal and unbridled initiative, as well as lack of source material, compelled the high authorities to take specific decisions. A chancery procedure, flanked with an increasingly important bureaucracy and deliberative body, was instituted. The sGra sbyor’s text
The Tabo fragment preserves fol. 3a (corresponding to fol. 27 of numeral pagination and to the entry <śatrumahārājakāyikā>, Tabo fol. 3a verso 1. 6 = bstan ‘gyur fol. 157b1), showing that the size of the lexicographic commentary must have been nearly the same. If we look at the introductory part of the sGra bshoṅ, the situation changes. On a rough estimate (counting syllabes), the Tabo version is a third less than the corresponding bstan ‘gyur part. In comparison if we calculate the proportion between the Dunhuang manuscript and the bstan ‘gyur version, we arrive at the conclusion that Dunhuang is minimally shorter in size; the difference is roughly that of three lines of text or so. If the Tabo manuscript represents a copy of the text of the second authoritative decision, then we may plausibly admit that later additions mainly concerned the introductory part.

142
3. The third and last authoritative decision.

3.1. Date. 814, reign of Khri lDe sroñ btsan, alias Sad na legs.

3.2. The register of terms translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan is homologated and established as an official document. It may be inferred that before this several (non-homologated) registers were circulating.

3.3. The procedure for creating and fixing a new term is subject to specific principles of scriptural authority, appealing to Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu and other Indian authors, as far as the exegesis is concerned, and to the Indian grammatical tradition, as far as syntax and grammar is concerned.

3.4. Enlargement of the methodological guidelines fixed by the second or middle authoritative decision of 783.

3.5. The chancery procedure is more refined and the offices and officers are subject to various changes. The Bhagavat’s representative is flanked by a committee (mdun sa) and assisted by the college for proposals of great revision (zu chen) of Buddhist texts (dha rmma zu chen ’tshal ba’i grvar), that has its seat at the Imperial palace.

3.6. The fact that the text of the bkas bcad of 814 speaks of “great revision” (zu chen) means that emendation and revision (zus) existed before, this being confirmed by colophons (cf. supra n. 133).

To sum up. In 763 the “small repertory” (Svalpavyutpatti) was composed on the basis of a previous prototype. This “small list” subsequently merged into the “large repertory” (Mahāvyutpatti) and disappeared into successive text-layers. In 783 the sGra sbyor was written down. It was further enlarged upon and affixed to the document of the third bkas bcad of 814.

Finally in 814 the terminology, i.e. those entries so far included in the register of terms, was fixed ne varietur. The register of terms itself, however, remained open to additions and modifications. The register was officially homologated, and the text of the sGra sbyor reconfirming the previous authoritative decision of 783 was established as authentic. The work of translating Buddhist texts and entering new terminology continued after 814 until the fall of the Imperial dynasty, with which this unique intellectual enterprise had been so closely affiliated.
APPENDIX I

*bstan 'gyur* Tōh. № 4347, vol. Co, fol. 131b1-160a7

 Invocation symbol and Devotion formula

Dating formula ⇒ 814

Narrative

Dated event⇒ historical lan la³

Ordinance

Prohibitive clause

Injunctive clause

---

2 *ba laṅ*, P: *laṅ* I.
3 Uray 1975: 159.
Event and motives having occasioned the authoritative decision

Prescription relative to revision of improperly formed terms

Principles of authority

---

Narrative

Event and motives having occasioned the authoritative decision

Prescription relative to revision of improperly formed terms

Principles of authority

---

4 Ananta ego: Ānanta Ferrari, Ānanda I.
Reconfirmation of previous authoritative decision

Authoritative decision concerning the principles of translating and establishing the terminology. Legislative and deliberative body

nas / bTs'an po'i spyan s'nar Bande chen po dPal gyi Yon tan da'n / Bande chen po Ti'n ne 'dzin la sog's pa ya'n 'tshogs te / rJe Blon gdan 'dzom pa la 'zus nas dha rmma bsgyur ba'i thabs da'n / rGya gar gyi skad la Bod kyi skad du mi'n btags pa rams gtan la phab ste / bkas bcad pa /

dam pa'i chos bsgyur ba'i lugs ni don da'n ya'n mi 'gal la Bod skad ya'n gar bde bar gyis 'sig / dha rmma bsgyur ba la rGya gar gyi skad kyi go rims las mi bnor bar Bod kyi skad du bsgyur na don da'n tshig tu 'brel zi'n bde na ma bnor bar sgyur cig /

bTs'an po'i spyan ñar / Ban de chen po Yon tan da'n / Ban de chen po Ti'n ne 'dzind da'n / Blon chen po rGyal gzigs da'n / Blon chen po s'Tag ra las ststogs pa la / rJe Blon mol ba'i spyar / rGya gar skad las Bod skad du … … …5 (2) rams/ gtan la phab ste bkas bcad pa' / /

dam pa'i chos bsgyur ba'i lugs ni don da'n / myi 'gal la Bod skad la bde bar bya ba da'n / rGya gar skad go rims las myi bsnor bar / don da'n tshig tu 'brel par byos la sgyurd cig / /

5 Lacuna.
Supplementary principles and rules for translating ⇒ bstan 'gyur fol. 132a2-132b3, Tabo and Dunhuang: omit.

bsnor na bde žin go ba bskyed pa žig yod na / tshigs bcad la ni rtsa ba bzi pa' am / drug pa'a'n ru 'n ste / tshigs su bcad pa gcig gi na'n na ga'n bde ba bsnor žin sgyur cig /

rkyan pa la ni don ga'n sñegs pa yan chad kyi tshig da'n don gnis ka la gar bde bar bsnor žin sgyur cig /

skad gcig la mi'n du mar 'dren pa ni itag 'og da'n bstun la gar sñegs pa bzin du mi'n thogs šig /

pari da'n / sam da'n / upa lta bu la sogs te / tshig gi phrad da'n rgyan lta bur 'byu'n ba rnam bsgyur na don da'n mthun žin 'byor ba' i thabs ni / yo'ns su 'ze'am / ya'n dag pa 'ze'am ņe ba žes sgra bzin du sgyur cig / don lha'g par sñegs pa med pa rnam ni tshig gi lhad kyi bsan mi dgos kyi don bzin du thogs šig /

rnam gra'ns su gtogs pa'i tshig rnam ni ma 'dom na mi'n ga'n Bod skad du spyir grags šin tshig tu gar bde bar gdags so' 'dom na so sor btags pa bzin du thogs šig /

gar ya'n dra'n du ru'n ba'i tshig cig byu'n na / phyogs gcig tu chad par mi bsgyur bar spyir sñegs su ru'n bar gyis šig /

yul da'n / sems can da'n / me tog da'n / rtsi šin la sogs pa'i mi'n bsgyur na yid gol žin tshig mi bde ba da'n / 'ol spyir bsgyur du ru'n ya'n don du de ltar yin nam ma yin gol med pa rnam la / mgo la yul 'ze'am / me tog ces pas la sogs pa ga'n la bya ba'i mi'n gcig bla thabs su snon la rGya gar skad so na žog cig /

gra'ns la rGya gar skad bzin du bsgyur ba dge slo'n brgya phrag phyed da'n bcu gsum żes 'byu'n ba la sogs pa ni sto'n ņis brgya lha bcu žes tha mal par Bod skad du kyi lugs bzin bsgyur na don da'n ya'n mi 'gal la Bod kyì skad la ya'n bde bas / gra'ns bsdom du ru'n ba rnam Bod skad kyi lugs du thogs šig /

6 gau ta mya Simonsson: gau ta ma I.
7 / DC: om. I.
8 ba Simonsson: pa I.
Reconfirmation of previous authoritative decision ⇒ 763 →

Saṅs rgyas daṅ Byaṅ chub sems dpa’ daṅ Ñan thos la sogs pa že sa9 daṅ sko loṅ gi tshig gi rim pa ni Saṅs rgyas la že sa’i tshig tu bsgyur / gžan la tshig ’briṅ po man chad tsam du byas te /

Reconfirmation of previous authoritative decision ⇒ Khri lDe gtsug btsan (r. 712-755)?

Sṇon lha sras Yab kyi spyan sṇar mkhan po daṅ lo tsā ba mkhas pa ’tshogs pas / dha rmma dKon mchog sprin daṅ / Laṅ kar gsēgs pa bsgyur te / gtan la phab pa’i lugs bzin du sgyur cig /

gžan ni Yab myes kyi sku riṅ la / mkhan po daṅ lo tsa baš dar ma dKon mchog sprin daṅ / Laṅ kar gsēgs pa bsgyur te gtan la phab pa’i lugs bzin du sgyur cig /

9 Že sa Simonsson: Žes I.
skad kyi lugs 'di ltar bkas bcad pa las so so nas su yañ 'chos šiñ 'og tu miñ gsar du 'dogs su mi gnañ gis / bsgyr ba\textsuperscript{10} dañ 'chad pa’i grva so so nas skad gsar du miñ gdags dgos pa žig yod na yañ / so so’i grva grvar miñ chad par ma gdags parchos kyi gźuñ dañ sgra’i lugs las ji skad du 'byuñ ba’i gtan tshigs dañ / chos las ji skad du gdags pa dpyad de /

Prohibitive clause

Restrictive clause related to revision and formation of new terms

pho brañ du bCom ldan 'das kyi riñ lugs kyi mdun sa dañ / dha rmma žu chen 'thal ba’i grvar phul la / sñañ du žus te bkas bcad nas skad kyi dkar chag gi dkyus su bsnan no //

Procedure and instances of approval of a new term eventually entered in the register

Ordinance

Restrictions, motives and prescriptions relative to the Tantra

gsán sñałs kyi rgyud mams gźuñ gis gusable bar bya ba yin te / snod du ma gyur pa mams la bśad ciñ bstan du yañ mi ruñ la / bar du bsgyr žiñ spyod du gnañ gis kyañ / ldem po dag tu bśad pa ma khrol nas sgra’i ji bźin du ’dzin ciñ log par spyod pa dag kyañ byuñ / sñałs kyi rgyud nañ nas thu žiñ Bod skad du sgyur\textsuperscript{11} ba dag kyañ byuñ žes gdags kyi / phyin chad gźuñs sñałs dañ rgyud Bla nas bka’ stsal te / sgyur du bcug pa ma gtogs pa / sñałs kyi rgyud dañ / sñałs kyi tshig thu žiñ bsgyr du mi gnañ ŋo //

\textsuperscript{10} ba Simonsson: pa I.
\textsuperscript{11} sgyur Dh: bsgyr I.
Dunhuang fol. kha recto l. 1-5

Restrictive clause relative to revision and formation of new term

// de. las. so. so. nas. su. yañ. 'chos. šiñ. 'og. du. myiñ. gsrar. du. 'dogs . su. miy. gnäñ. gis // sgyur. ba. dañ. 'chad. pa'i. sgra. so. so. nas. skad. gsrar. du. myiñ. gdags. dgos. pa. ŋiñ. yod. na. yañ // so'i. so'i. gra. grar. myiñ. chad. par. ma. gdags. par // chos. kyi. gžun. dañ. sgra'i. lugs (2) las. ji. skad. du. 'byuñ. ba'i. gtan. tsigs. dañ. chos. la /// ji. skad. du. gdags. pa. dpyod. de //

Procedure and instances for approval of new term

pho. brañ. du. / bcom. ldan. 'das. kyi. riñ. lugs. kyi. 'dun. sa. dañ /// dar. ma. žu. chen. 'tsal. ba'i. grar. phul. la /// sñan. du. žus. te. bka's. bcad. nas /// skad. kyi. dkar. cag. gi. dkyus. su (3) bsnd. to //

Ordinance

Restrictions, motives and prescriptions relative to the Tantra


bsタン 'gyur fol. 132b7-133a1, Dunhuang: omits.

skad kyi miñ sñon gtan la ma phab pa dañ miñ du ma thogs pa las theg pa che chuñ gi gžun dañ sgra'i gžun la's byuñ ba dañ sbyar te bṣad pa'i dañ po'ø //

Tabo fol. ka recto l. 4-verso l. 1

Restrictive clause relative to formation of term

skad gyi lugs 'di ltar bkas bcad (4) pa las / so so nas su yañ 'chos su myi gnañ bar sgyur 'chad gra so sor yañ skad gdags dgos pa pa13 ŋiñ yod na / so so'i gra grar myiñ ma 'chad par gdags par chos kyi gžun dañ / sgra'i lugs las ji skad 'byuñ ba gtan tshigs dañ / chos la gdags par byos ŋiñ /// 'di dag bsgyur ba'i (5) myiñ smrañ yañ /

Procedure and instances for approval of term

pho brañ du bcom ldan 'das kyi riñ lugs dañ / dar ma bsgyur ba'i lo tsha ba 'i grar gtugs la /

sñaND tu žus te bkas bcad nas dkar gnag gi skyus su yañ bsnd. no ///

Ordinance

Restrictions, motives and prescriptions relative to the Tantra

sñaqs kyi rgyud rnam ni gžun gis kyañ / gsañ bar bya ba yin te /// snod du ma gyurd (6) pa la bṣad ciñ bstan tu yañ / miy run bas / idem po [d / ŋ]ag las log par go na skyon yod pas / sñaND tu žUS te / bka's gnañ nas sñaqs bsgyur ba yañ mkhas pa rab kyi don ma nor par sgyur la / sñaqs sñon grags pa bžin gžun ma nor14 par gysig /// sñaqs bsgyur ba / yañ (ka,v,1) gtan la … … … (my[i]i gnañ / no

12 Lacuna?

13 Ditto?
14 -d subscript.
Mahāvyutpatti Bye brag tu rtogs byed chen po / Madhyavyutpatti Bye brag tu rtogs byed ’ briṅ po / Śvalpavyutpatti Bye brag tu rtogs byed chuṅ nu / Vacavyutpatti sKad bye brag tu bṣad pa ’dī ni ’ briṅ po’o // chen po’i dka’ ba’i gnas [chos]¹⁵ daṅ sgra’i gzuṅ daṅ sbyar te bṣad pa’i Pañjikā Madhyavyutpatti yin no //

pho braṅ ’On caṅ rdor Bod daṅ rGya gar mkhan po thams cad kyis chos skad gtan la phab ste / rJe Blon mol nas reg zeg¹⁶ du mdzad pa skad gsar gyi mín snoon ma thogs pa daṅ / gtan la ma phab pa la mkhas pa rnams ’tshogs te mín du btags sīṅ gtan la phab ste /

lHa bTsan po Khri lDe sroṅ btsan gysis bskul nas bkas bcad de mi bcos par bzung pa rdzogs so //

bkas bcad pa bla dpe bzin bris pa gźan gysis kyaṅ de bzin du zur ma bcos so //

sGra sbyor bam po gnis pa’o // Explicit

Colophon
bstan ’gyur fol. 160a4-7, Tabo, Dunhuang: omit.

Eschatocol
Ratification of new terminology
Authoritative confirmation and authentication of the Imperial decree
Document authentication or validation

¹⁵ Cf. Simonsson 263, n. 5.
¹⁶ reg zeg ego: reg ḥid I.
APPENDIX II

India Office fragment, I. O. tib J 76, part V, fol. 63a-63b
Book form, 21.9 c. × 15.3 c., ll. 8, see La Vallée Poussin 1962: 31a-32a.
Pelliot tib. 845, 9 folii, pagination by letter-numerals, well-formed highly refined small squared script, red rubrics. gi gu log, ya btags, da drag, intersyl-labic tsheg.

poṭhi form, binding holes with circles, 13.2 x 65.8, ll. 8,
Cf. Lalou 1939, N° 845 ⇒ fol. ‘a, recto, l. 1-2
Tabo RN° 129: deest
bsTan ’gyur, sDe dge, Tōhoku N° 4347, vol. Co, fol. 154a4-5
Ishikawa 1990: 98


……………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………>l. 7  indispensable © sans. rgyas. dañ l byañ. chub. sms. dpa’t. thams. cad. la. phyag. ’tshal. lo l l

1 Recte: dhā ra ni.
3 The gi gu is traced. Recte: maṇ da la žes bya ba ll sniñ po ’am dbyiñs sam dkyil la bya l là ni à dā ne (see Verhagen 1994: 42).
Reading the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa as a charter

Decree(s) and ratification
Prescriptions and rules

Na mo Buddhāya ll rta'i lo la btsan po Khri lDe sron btsan Pho braṅ sKyī'i 'On caṅ rdo na bzung ll
→ continues
← ends with
ll sṅags kyi rgyud dāṅ sṅags kyi tshig thu žiṅ bsgyur du mī gnaṅ no ll

§2 Main Body [bstan 'gyur fol. 133a1-160a4. Tabo and Dunhuang are fragmentary]

I Application: Derivation of words according to normative prescriptions

skad kyi mīṅ sṅon gtan la ma phab pa dāṅ mīṅ du ma thogs pa las theg pa che chuṅ gi gzung dāṅ sgra'i gzung las 'byuṅ ba dāṅ sbyar te bṣad pa'i dāṅ po'oll

saṅs rgyas kyi mtshan dāṅ yon tan gyi mīṅ la sogs pa ll skad dka' ba mams thog thog bṣad pa ll saṅs rgyas kyi mtshan gyi rnam grāṅs la l

buddhaḥ žes bya ba sgra las draṅs na gcig tu na l mohanidrā-pramatta-buddha-puruṣavat ces bya ste l gti mug gi gṅid saṅs pas na mī gṅīl dāṅ saṅs pa bžin te l saṅs pa la sṅegs pa l yaṅ rnam pa gcig tu na l buddher vikāsanād buddha-vibuddha-padma-vat ces bya ste l blos byi žiṅ rgyas pas na pa dma kha byi žiṅ rgyas pa dāṅ 'dra bar yān bṣad de saṅs rgyas žes bya'o ll
tshig gi don spyiṅ na chos thams cad thugs su chud čiṅ ma lus par byaṅ chub pa la bya ll

→ continues
← ends with

II Colophon [passage extant in the bstan 'gyur version only]

Mahāvyutpattī Bye brag tu rtogs byed chen po / Madhyavyutpattī Bye brag tu rtogs byed 'briṅ po / Svalpavyutpattī Bye brag tu rtogs byed chuṅ nu / Vacavyutpattī sKad bye brag tu bṣad pa 'di ni 'briṅ po'o // chen po'i dka' ba'i gnas [chos] dāṅ sgra'i gzung dāṅ sbyar te bṣad pa'i Pañjikā Madhyavyutpattī yin no //

§3 Eschatocol [extant in the bstan 'gyur version only, fol. 160a4-7]

I Authoritative decision

pho braṅ 'On caṅ r dor Bod dāṅ rGya gar mkhan po thams cad kyis chos skad gtan la phab ste / rJe Blon mol nas reg zeg du mūdzad pa skad gsar gyi mīṅ sṅon ma thogs pa dāṅ / gtan la ma phab pa la mkhas pa mams 'tshogs te mīṅ du btags śin gtan la phab ste /

II Confirmation / Validation by the King

lHa b'Tsan po Khri lDe sron btsan gyis bskul nas bkas bcad de mi bcos par bzung pa rdzogs so //

III Document Authentication

bkas bcad pa bla dpe bzung bris pa gzung gyis kyaṅ de bzung du zur ma bcos so //

Explicit

sGra sbyor bam po gños pa'o //

Fig. A
Three authoritative decisions

III
814
imperial decree

II
795/783?
Post bSam yas foundation and pre- bSam yas debate?
imperial decree

I
— At the time of the Father (Yab)
Šāntarakṣita first arrives in Tibet?
763 ⇒

— At the time of the Forefathers (yab myes)

• Sroṅ btsan sgam po
  Edificatory narrative?

• Khri lDe gtsug btsan? (r. 712-755)
  'Dus sroṅ? (r. 676-704)
Ratnamegha and Lankāvatāra possibly circulated in Tibet

unspecified authoritative decision

Fig. B
Samples of patterns for lexicographical entries

**Pattern I:** The term is analysed for the first time.

1. [Sanskrit term] žes bya ba
2. [According to the literal twofold interpretation] sgra las draňs na
3. [First literal interpretation] gcig tu na
4. [Sanskrit exegesis/derivation] žes bya ba ste
5. [Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit derivation] (s)te
6. [Tibetan meaning] sňegs (pa)
7. [Second literal interpretation] yaň rnam pa gcig tu na
8. [Sanskrit exegesis/derivation] žes bya ba ste
9. [Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit derivation] (s)te
10. [Tibetan equivalent term] žes bya’o

**Option**

11. [Common meaning of the word] tshig gi don spyir na
12. [Meaning of the word as it is generally known in Buddhist hermeneutics] la bya.

\[\Rightarrow MvyS 8 <buddha> žes bya ba sgra las draňs na gcig tu na <mohanidră-pramatta-prabuddha-puruașvat> ces bya ste l gti mug gi gńid sans rgyas pas na mi gńid sans pa bźin te l sans pa la sňegs pa l yaň rnam pa gcig tu na l <buddher vikăšanăđ buddha-vibuddha-padmavat> ces bya ste l blo bye ziň rgyas pas na pa dma kha bye ziň rgyas pa daň ’dra bar yaň bśad de <sans rgyas> žes bya’o l

tshig gi don spyir na <chos thams cad thugs su chud ciň ma lus par byaň chub pa> la bya l\]

**Pattern II:** The term must be translated taking its context into account

1-6. [Word derivation ⇒ Pattern I §1-6]

7. [The expression in common use in previous translations must now be [subject to being] strictly enforced / confirmed / ratified, on the basis of word derivation out of which two distinct translations are proposed]

---

1 Ishikawa 5-6, Simonsson 1957: 265-266 and 266 (ref.).
— las snar bsgyur ba’i tshig grags pa btsan par bya ste

[New word derivation ⇒ following the usual pattern]

10. [Tibetan established terms to be submitted for approval]
— žes btags
— žes gdags

⇒MvyS 2<bhagavat> žes bya ba gcig tu na l <bhagavat> žes bya ste l bdud bzi bcom pas na bcom pa la bya l yan rnam pa gcig tu na l <bhaga> ni legs pa rnam pa drug gi min ste l gzugs dañ l grags pa dañ l dbañ phyug dañ l dpal gi spyi la bya l <vân> žes byañ ba ni <bhago’syästiti bhagavâni> žes ldan par bsad de l rnam grañs ’di skad du bya ba las snar bsgyur ba’i tshig grags pa btsan par bya ste l <bcom ldan ’das> žes bya ba ni mdo sde dag las sañs rgyas kyi yon tan la mthshan ’jig rten las ’das pa’o žes kyañ ’byuñ bas na l ’jig rten pa’i lha bhagavat las khyad par du <’das> sesión bha thabs su bsan te l <bcom ldan ’das> žes btags l ’jig rten pa’i bhagavat žes bya ba ni ’jig rten pa’i gžun ñid las kyan bcom par mi ’chad de l legs pa dañ ldan pa žes ’chad pas ’jig rten pa’i bhagavat ni <legs ldan> žes gdags2

Pattern III: The term has been previously settled but not ratified. It is now submitted, and established ne varietur on the basis of the previously known term, §340, after having been newly analysed.

[Word derivation ⇒ Pattern I §1-6]

7. [Although the twofold word derivation is possible / correct]
— tshig ’di gñis kar yañ drañ du ruñ gis kyañ

8. [The Tibetan term has been fixed as “…” after having been established in conformity with the term known previously]
— sìan chad miñ du btags te grags pa bžin du bžag nas …žes btags l

⇒MvyS <pudgala> ni <punah punar gatiṣu liyate iti> žes bya ste l yañ dañ yañ lha dañ mi la soñs pa’i rgyud du skye žiñ sbyor bas na yañ sbyor ba žes kyañ bya l <pûryate galate caiva pudgalah> žes kyañ bya ste l skyes nas dar gyi bar du ni gañ l dar yol nas sì ba’i bar du ni zag pa la yañ bya ste l tshig ’di gñis kar yañ drañ du ruñ gis kyañ sìan cad miñ du btags te grags pa bžin du bžag nas <gañ zag> ces btags

Pattern IV: The term is unsettled and not yet decidable. For the time being it cannot be submitted for approval for lack of arguments. The term is polysemic and several different translations exist.
[Word derivation ⇒ Pattern I §1-6]

7. [Since according to the written sources there is no strong argument (in favour of any of the derivations) (the term) has not been enforced / decided]
— yi ge gzuñ dañ sbyar na gtan tshigs mi che bar 'gyur te mi btsan par byas so

⇒ MvyS <yama> [yama and yama] žes bya ba <asuravivāda-bhayād apayāthā> žes bya ba ste
| sum cu rtsa gsum pa’i ris man chad ni lha ma yin gyis ‘thab pa’i ’jigs pa dañ ma bral la l ’di yan chad ni lha ma yin dañ ’thab pa’i ’jigs pa las ’das te bral bas <’thab bral>MvyS3080 žes btags te | bsod nams kyis phyin pa dañ l mel tshe thun re re la skoms śīṇ skul ba’i skad ’byuṇ ba dañ l sbon <mtshe ma>MvyS.3911 dañ <zuṇ ma>MvyS.798 žes btags pa ni yi ge gzuñ dañ sbyar na gtan tshigs mi che bar ’gyur te mi btsan par byas so

Fig. C
Ratnameghasūtra and Mahāvyutpatti
A terminological comparison

Ratnameghasūtra, sDe dge ed., vol. lwa, fol. 1b et sq. Dh I. O. Tib 161 fol. 1a1 et sq. MvyS, Mahāvyutpatti, Sasaki ed., reference to the entry number

Ratnameghasūtra, v. lwa, fol. 1b et sq., Dh I. O. Tib. 161 fol. 1a et sq.

MvyS, v. lwa, fol. 1a1 et sq.

**Ratnameghasūtra**

- ** Fol. 1b1**
  - dkon mezho sprin
  - MvyS 1337

- ** Fol. 1b3**
  - zag pa zad pa
  - MvyS 1075
  - ṅon moṁ pa med pa
  - MvyS 1076
  - dban du (fol. 1b4) gyur pa
  - MvyS 1077 dban [daṅ ldan par]

- ** Fol. 1b4**
  - sems śīn tu rnam par grol ba
  - MvyS 1078
  - śes rab śīn tu rnam par grol ba
  - MvyS 1079
  - caṅ śes pa
  - MvyS 1080
  - głaṅ po chen po
  - MvyS 1081
  - bya ba byas pa
  - MvyS 1082
  - byes pa byas pa
  - MvyS 1083
  - khur bor ba
  - MvyS 1084

- ** Fol. 1b5**
  - bdag gi don rjes su thob pa³
  - MvyS 1086 raṅ gi ~
  - srid par kun tu sbyor ba yoṅs su zad pa
  - MvyS 1085 srid pa ~
  - bka²¹ yaṅ dag pas sems śīn tu rnam par
grol ba
  - MvyS 1087 yaṅ dag pa’i śes
  - pas sems ~
  - sems kyi dban thams cad kyi dam pa’i pha
  - MvyS 1088 ~ son pa thob pa (fol. 2a1)

- ** Fol. 2a1**
  - chos kyi dbyin la mkhas pa
  - MvyS 1089
  - chos kyi rgyal po’i sras
  - MvyS 1090
  - sems rṇed pa daṅ l bkur sti thams cad daṅ bral ba
  - MvyS 1091
  - legs par rab tu byuṅ ba
  - MvyS 1092
  - legs par brjhen par rdzogs pa
  - MvyS 1093
  - brnag pa yoṅs su rdzogs pa
  - MvyS 1094

- ** Fol. 2a2**
  - mya nyam las ’da’pa’i lam la gnas pa
  - MvyS 1095

- ** Fol. 2a3**
  - skye ba gcig gis thogs pa
  - MvyS 806
  - thams cad mkhyen pa niṅ la mṅon du phyogs pa
  - MvyS 807

³ Dh fol. 1a4 bdag gi rab tu rṇed pa


⁵ Dh fol. 1a4 phyin pa.
thams cad mkhyen pa ŋid la gţol ba
thams cad mkhyen pa ŋid la ’bab pa
thams cad mkhyen pa ŋid la bab pa
chags pa med pa’i (fol. 2a4) gzuṁs dañ tìn ne ’dzin thob pa

fol. 2a4
dpa’ bar ’gro ba’i tìn ne ’dzin la šiṁ tu gnas pa
mṇon par šes pa chen pos nmam par rol pa
lam gyi rgyun ma bcad pa
sgrib pa dañ l chod pa dañ l kun nas ldañ ba thams cad dañ bral ba

fol. 2a5
byams pa chen po dañ l sñaṁ rje chen pos phyogs bcu’i ’jig rten
gyi khams su khyab pa
saiṅs rgyas kyi ŋin mtha’ yas par ’gro ba la mkhas pa
stoṅ pa ŋid spyod yul ba
mṭshan ma med pa la gnas pa
smön lam la gnas pa (fol. 2a6) thams cad dañ bral ba

fol. 2a6
sems can thams cad la phan par brtson pa
saiṅs rgyas kyi yul thams cad la mkhas pa
ye šes mtha’ yas pa
sems can mkha’ dañ mṭshuns pa
sems rgya mṭsho ltar zab pa
sems ri’i rgyal po ri rab (fol. 2b1) ltar mi sgul ba

fol. 2b1
sems pa dma ltar ma gos pa
sems rin po che ltar šin tu yonis su dag pa
sems gser ltar šin tu yonis su byaṅ ba

fol. 2b2
lag na rdo rje rin po che
lag na phyag rgya rin po che
rin po che’i cod pa na
gtsug na rin po che
rin po che brtsegs pa
rin po che ’byuṅ gnas
rin po cha’i rts mo
rin po che’i rgyal mṭshan
rdo rje’i sñaṁ po

fol. 2b3
spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ po
mṭhu chen thob
kun tu bzaṅ po
kun nas mig

Fig. D
Cited manuscripts (MSS)
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