Introduction to the Critical Editions of TrBh$_s$ and TrBh$_t$

Presuppositions for the present edition of TrBh$_s$

1.   As Sylvain Lévi relates in the introduction to his *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, visiting Nepal for the second time in 1922, he had been able to spent four months (24 March - 24 July) in that Himalayan kingdom. Thanks to his friendly rapport with the royal family and Rāj-Guru Hemrāj Śarman, he was allowed to consult their Sanskrit manuscript treasures under particularly favourable conditions. Lévi had already been familiar with the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda tradition for more than two decades. His first visit to Nepal in 1898 had led to the important discovery of the manuscript of MSA (edited by him in 1907).[1] It is therefore easy to imagine his elatedness when this time, on one of the very first sessions of investigating manuscripts, he read the colophon:[2]

trimśikāvijñaptibhāṣyaṃ samāptam || *kṛtir ācāryasthiramateḥ* ||.

However, soon he recognized that the newly discovered palmleaf manuscript contained a rather large lacuna. Yet, intent on editing this fragment and thinking of restoring the lacking portion from the Tibetan, he started on this work after returning to Paris. In the meanwhile, Hemrāj Śarman[3] discovered those palm-leaves of the *Trimśikāvijñaptibhāṣyam* that fitted exactly into the lacuna and shared his discovery with Lévi. As a result, Lévi was able to publish in 1925 the whole text (together with the *Vimśatikā*) in the form of an edition that was based upon a complete original Sanskrit manuscript.[4] Since

---

[1] Already in 1890, Lévi had been engaged in a discussion with Bühler concerning the date of Vasubandhu. — Louis RENOU's bibliographical sketch of the scientific life of Sylvain Lévi (1863-1935) has been included in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (1937, reprinted Delhi 1996: XI-LI): "Sylvain Lévi et son oeuvre scientifique". The same volume contains his bibliography (pp. 445-477).

[2] Cf. LÉVI 1925 (= *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*): XIII.

[3] About Rāj-Guru Hemrāj Śarman LÉVI (*op. cit.*: XII) said: "Issu d'une famille originaire du Kangra, formé aux écoles de Bénarès, il possède une maîtrise éblouissante du sanscrit; versé par profession dans théologie, familier avec toutes les finesses et les subtilités de la science grammaticale, il joint à l'érudition d'un pandit le sens aigu des réalités et des affaires publiques. [...] C'est à lui que je dois la découverte de mes deux textes."

[4] To be more precise, although he initially saw a major part of the original palm-leaves of TrBh, practically speaking, Lévi's basis consisted in photographic reproductions of that MS, together with modern hand-written copies prepared for him.

then his edition has served as the standard basis for general reference and for translations.[5]

2.   In his *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, M. WEST (1973: 61) has rightly emphasized that the first duty of a scholar, before starting upon a new edition of a text, is to determine whether there is a factual need at all for such a task. Thus called upon to justify my present undertaking of reediting TrBh, I have been confronted with such questions as: Why would it not suffice simply to reprint Lévi's edition? Is there any real advantage in editing TrBh anew?

Constituting a lucid and the most concisely formulated summary of the basic tenets of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda, Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā* enjoyed an outstanding position first in classical India and subsequently wherever Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda (Y.-V.) ideas went to elicit intellectual responses (including those of modern scholarship). The only commentary on Tr that has survived in its entirety in Sanskrit is Sthiramati's TrBh. These facts seem to underline the principal need to have a reliable text of Tr/TrBh at hand.

As I will demonstrate, in view of both the general editorial standards and the material evidence that has become available since 1925, Lévi's TrBh edition does indeed no longer satisfy the contemporary philological requirements for a text to be considered reliable.

3.   Independent of the specifically chosen mode of technically presenting a given text, one of the fundamental demands related to editorial standards is a reasonable philological transparency. An edition must not lose sight of the manuscript sources it relies upon. That is, the presented philological materials must be transparent to the reader in view of both the original evidence encountered by the editor and the particular mode in which he has handled it in the editorial process.

If these principles were applied to Lévi's edition, the existence of only a very few notes added to his text would have to be taken as indicating that — unless he says so either generally in the introduction or specifically in a pertinent note — his text exactly reflects the only manuscript he occasionally refers to. As we will see, Lévi's editorial standards have been different.

Yet, it is true that LÉVI (1932: 175-179) himself has also been the first to provide emendations to his TrBh edition in an appendix to his French translation of TrBh (most of these were simply correcting misprints). The notes to JACOBI's German translation, published posthumously in the same year as Lévi's, likewise contained a number of conjectures. In the course of

---

[5] For bibliographical references, cf. the introduction to the Derge reprint of the Tibetan translation of TrBh in: *sDe dge Tibetan Tripitaka, bsTan 'gyur*, preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo, ed. J. TAKASAKI/Z. YAMAGUCHI/Y. EJIMA, Tokyo 1977ff., *Sems tsam* 14.; H. NAKAMURA 1980: 269f.; *Mahāyāna Texts translated into Western Languages: A Bibliographical Guide*, compiled by P. PFANDT, Köln 1986: #236; A. PEZZALI 1987: 284ff.; J. POWERS 1991: 64ff.

reviewing Lévi's translation, L. de LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1935: 395) has adduced another list of suggested emendations. The longest of such lists followed twenty-seven years after the publication of TrBh and has been provided by H. UI (1952: 54-62), who repeated previous suggestions and added his own. Other emendations occurred *en passant* in publications by various scholars. For example, É. LAMOTTE (1936 [KSi_L]: 247n. 108; 1938 [MSgr_L]: 14) further emends L. de La Vallée Poussin's conjecture of TrBh's quotation of Saṃdh V.7 (cf. *Siddhi* 173). Needless to say, those variously suggested emendations, where they are not merely correcting misprints in Lévi's edition, are themselves often open to discussion.

The first variant readings in the proper sense (not necessarily emendations) were provided by V. V. GOKHALE 1968, who had discovered an independent fragment of TrBh among the photographs of MSS made by R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana on his travels to Tibet (cf. STEINKELLNER 2004: 14ff., 18f.). Another fragment of TrBh in the SĀṄKṚTYĀYANA-Collection has been discovered by L. SCHMITHAUSEN, who in 1987 reported a very important emendation on basis of this fragment (cf. *Ālayav.*: n. 419). The whole fragment has been edited and discussed by K. KANO 2005.

4.   While Lévi had already made use of the Tibetan translation of TrBh to corroborate his Sanskrit edition, he could not yet avail himself of several important Sanskrit texts which were first published much later. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (AS_G and AS_P) and its *Bhāṣya* (ASBh) are most pertinent for TrBh_S. Similarly indispensible is the *Triṃśikāṭīkā* (TrṬ) of which unfortunately only a fragmentary Sanskrit text (with substantial portions missing) has been found and published by P. S. JAINI as late as 1985.

Though not indispensible for the edition of TrBh_S, other post-Lévi publications of Sanskrit texts — either related to the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda context (such as MAV/MAVBh and texts belonging to the *Yogācārabhūmi*-corpus) or to the authorship of Vasubandhu (particularly AKBh/AKVy) — have likewise contributed to developing a greater familiarity with the broader terminological horizon in which TrBh is located. And this familiarity, that is, any contemporary editor's possibility of acquainting himself with a prestructure of understanding a Y.-V. text, has furthermore been expanded and differentiated by significant Y.(-V.) studies in the course of the last decades.

The philological circumstances with regard to the external textual witnesses (*testimonia*) have thus been remarkably improved since the times of Sylvain Lévi, not least since ASBh and important original portions of AS, that is, the two textual sources most frequently quoted in TrBh, have become available in Sanskrit.

In 1989, an excellent Japanese facsimile edition of the Nepalese palmleaf manuscript of TrBh, which had already been used by Lévi for his edition, was published by K. MIMAKI, M. TACHIKAWA and A. YUYAMA in the volume *Three Works of Vasubandhu in Sanskrit Manuscript* (henceforth:

3WVSM). While to my knowledge no other complete Sanskrit MS of TrBh is accessible at present, there exist several partial copies. Photographs of five of these copies, including those Lévi himself had employed, were incorporated in the facsimile volume along with the photographs of the complete palm-leaf MS.

On inquiry it was found that no additional MSS beyond those presented in 3WVSM had been filmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP).

On the basis of these materials it has become possible to estimate how Lévi's edition actually relates to his presumed single textual basis, the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript, which is nowadays stored in the National Archives, Kathmandu.[6] As will be shown, there is a rather inadequate correlation between these two.

Four documents of Tr/TrBh have become accessible that do not depend on the complete palm-leaf version of TrBh: one complete Nepalese MS containing TSN, Vś and Tr (included in 3WVSM); one complete MS of Tr (belonging to the Cultural Palace of the Nationalities, Beijing; likewise included in 3WVSM) and two fragments of TrBh (both pertaining to the SĀNKRTYĀYANA Collection; for a description, see below).

Evaluation of S. Lévi's edition of TrBh$_s$

5.   Together with his edition of Vasubandhu's *Vimśatikā*(Vś), Lévi's edition of TrBh has appeared in a book under the title *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*. Unfortunately, Lévi is not as clear as would have been desirable regarding his indications of the sources he actually used while preparing his edition of TrBh (henceforth designated as L e). As referred to earlier, a fairly large middle portion of the Nepalese palm-leaf MS of TrBh had been separated, perhaps centuries ago, from the remaining leaves and was accidentally displaced. Lévi informs us in the introduction to his *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* (1925: XV) that, upon his request, he had received a copy of the *Vimśatikā* in August 1924. This copy had been made available to him by Hemrāj Śarman, who had discovered the Vś palm-leaf MS at the beginning of 1924 and informed Lévi about it.[7] As Lévi (*op. cit.*: XIVf.) recounts, he himself then

---

[6] Cf. 3WVSM: xiii.

[7] Lévi 1925: XIIIf.: "Le Rāj-Guru qui n'avait pas cessé depuis mon départ de poursuivre la recherche des anciens manuscrits et de me signaler les trouvailles de valeur, par une lettre datée du février 1924, m'annonçait entre autres la découverte" of the *Vimśatikābhāsyam*, the MS of which however exhibited a lacuna. After having communicated his very first impression ("Le Rāj-Guru n'en promettait, il est vrai, qu'un texte fragmentaire") of the contents of these newly found Vijñānavāda materials, the Rāj-Guru, complying with Lévi's request, had the occasion to take a more thorough look at them. As Lévi (*loc. cit.*) says: "Je

rediscovered that middle portion of TrBh among the folios of the copy of Vś sent to him by the Rāj-Guru.[8] In 3WVSM those two portions of TrBh have still been kept separate and have received the siglas C and D (= middle portion) respectively.

When Lévi speaks about those Viṃśatikā materials he had received (including, as it turned out, the portion D of TrBh), he explicitly mentions only a copy carefully prepared under the supervision of the Rāj-Guru. But a few lines after mentioning this copy, he suddenly starts discussing a pagination issue related to the original MS of D while referring to a p h o t o g r a p h i c reproduction. That is, as is also evident from the photographic reproductions of palm-leaf folios preceding his edition of Vś/TrBh in the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, Lévi must have had access to both photographs as well as handwritten copies of the original folios.

6.   It is in fact possible to identify those copies of C/D that were at his disposal, as they all were reproduced in 3WVSM. Adopting the siglas relating to TrBh in 3WVSM, there is sufficient evidence to support the view that Lévi used two copies of the palm-leaf portion C and one copy of portion D.

MS E was the first copy of C at Lévi's disposal: E carries the stamp imprint "Bibliothèque Sylvain Lévi" on folio 12 and belongs today to the Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Paris.[9]

---

me hâtai de solliciter une copie de l'original: la copie exécutée avec soin sous la contrôle du Rāj-Guru me parvint aux premiers jours d'août."

[8] Continuing the text quoted in the previous footnote: "Je la parcourus aussitôt avec une sorte de fièvre. Ici le travail de collation était plus facile encore: M. de La Vallée Poussin avait dès 1912 publié dans la revue belge *Muséon* (p. 53-90) la traduction tibétaine de la Viṃśatikā accompagnée d'une version en français. La comparaison mettait en évidence ce que la lecture avait déjà indiqué au Rāj-Guru: le texte ne se développait pas en ligne continue;" — yet Lévi now adds — "mais ce qui avait semblé une lacune n'était que le résultat d'une interpolation". There follows his statement concerning the restitution of the *Viṃśatikā*, after which he continues (p. XV): "Restait alors un bloc de 12 feuillets, tracés de la même écriture que les 7 feuillets de la Viṃśatikā, taillés au même format, et paginés en série continue de 7 à 19. Il suffisait de les parcourir pour y reconnaître exactement les feuillets qui manquaient dans l'exemplaire retrouvé de la Triṃśikā; mis en place, ils comblaient la lacune tout entière".

[9] MS E contains numerous marginal remarks both in French and Devanāgarī as well as interlinear clarifications and corrections of single akṣaras and ligatures found in this copy. Probably this was Lévi's first copy of C; it contains attempted emendations by Lévi himself. Yet he had likewise access to MS H, another copy of C, prepared under the supervision of the Rāj-Guru.

MS H was Lévi's second copy of C and he often shares the readings of H against those of C/E.[10]

There seems to exist only one copy of portion D, the one appearing as MS I in the facsimile volume. As it can be shown that this is the one to which Lévi had access,[11] it has to be identified with the copy prepared under the

---

[10] By consulting the apparatus to the present edition of TrBh₅ it will be easily noticed that very often C/E/F share a variant reading against G/H/Lé Instances of this kind of variants may be the result of a correction of C by G/H, which has been followed by Lé (whereas E/F merely copied C). But attempted emendations have also resulted in introducing new mistakes.

Instances of both cases do sometimes quickly follow upon each other: cf., e.g., TrBh *41ns.8, 18 and 20. As TrBh *41n.20 elaborates — to presently demonstrate dependencies by shared mistakes — Lé reads with G/H: *kleśādhipatyatvāt* ignoring the correct reading *kleśādhipatyāt* found in C/E/F.

While such a choice might have been based on a conscious decision, the same can hardly be said about the following example, a case in which Lé seems to have blindly followed H (which probably had copied G): TrBh *43,9 quotes the kārikā Tr 20b: *yad yad vastu vikalpyate* and has been correctly reproduced as such in C/E/F. But G/H/Lé suddenly read *prakalpyate* instead of *vikalpyate*. It is difficult to imagine that Lévi would have adopted this reading had he looked into his photographs of C at this point. — Though G/H/Lé often share particular readings, there are instances which demonstrate that Lé had H at his disposal, not G (cf., e.g., TrBh *6ns.10, 14; *7n.1; *8n.7; *40n.19; * 47n.7 etc.)

On the other hand, there are clear cases where Lévi cannot simply have relied upon H, as when he (Lé15n.4) notes a lacuna in C which had not at all been indicated as such in G/H (cf. TrBh *2n.1).

The reading *paramānor apy* (TrBh *4,19) is found in G/H without any indication of the fact that C has omitted the second akṣara °*ra*°, thus providing the faulty reading *paramānopy*. This faulty reading has, however, been copied by E (6,5) and attracted the attention of Lévi, which he indicated by explicitly marking this reading with a *sic* in E. Thus, either while checking E against C, or when faced with the contradiction between E and H, Lévi must have consulted C in order to write his footnote (Lé17n.1) indicating the reading of C.

As TrBh *42n.4 documents, Lévi's note Lé38n.2 could also not have been written without direct access to C (that is, in form of photographs).

---

[11] While it can be documented that Lévi had access to D, for the most time he seems to have relied on I.

As noted by him (Lé27n.4), there is a problematic reading in D (12a6) looking rather like °*ādivā* than the proper °*ādivat* (cf. TrBh *22n.16): this observation could not stem from I (21,18), where it simply reads °*ādinā*.

On the other hand, just two lines before this reading, I miscopies °*pramādena vartata*, which Lé (27,22) reproduces without being aware, we have to assume, that D (12a5) contains the correct reading °*pramādena pravartata* (cf. TrBh *22n.15).

Similarly, Lé (22,25) reads *cittān māno*° along with I (14,10) without noting the reading of D (8a6): *cittāt* | *māno*°.

Or, against D (9b4): *utsahe*, Lé(24,21) reads *utsahe(ta)*, that is, an additional syllable *ta* is placed in parentheses, exactly as I (17,1) had done.

Again, the reading *kliṣṭā ta* found in D (17b5) is provisionally emended in I (31,11): *kliṣṭā(ḥ) ta* — to become *kliṣṭāḥ ta* in Lévi's edition (33,4): still fixated on I, it seems, he forgets the sandhi.

supervision of Hemrāj Śarman according to Lévi's report. However, keeping only E for himself, Lévi seems to have returned H and I to the Nepalese Rāj-Guru after his edition of Vś/TrBh had been completed, because, unlike E, they are nowadays kept in the National Archives in Kathmandu.

While Lévi (op. cit.: XIVf.) profusely thanked Hemrāj Śarman for assisting in the process of regaining both Vś and TrBh, he wished to reserve the actual discovery of the middle portion (= D) of TrBh among the leaves of the *Vimśatikā* for himself. But now, with MS I at our disposal, it is not difficult to see that the Rāj-Guru in Kathmandu was the one who actually discovered that significant portion of palm leaves.[12]

These few examples provided here may suffice to demonstrate that I has not just been the copy of D that has been used by Lévi, but that Lévi's readings heavily depend on I despite the fact that D has been accessible to him.

Cf. also TrBh *19n.12, *26n.16, *29n.20, *30 n.2, *35n.16 etc.

[12] As related above, Lévi mentioned (and actually quoted from) a letter of the Rāj-Guru in which the latter had announced his find of an incomplete version of the *Vimśatikā*, but not yet spoken of having found the remaining portion of TrBh as well. Upon requesting handwritten copies of those newly found palmleaves, Lévi obtained what we can identify as MS I. Lévi recounts how he then discovered — as he says (p. XIVf.), on the basis of photographs of those palmleaves (which he must have received at the same time) — that folios 7-19 of the TrBh manuscript had crept into the *Vimśatikā* manuscript after its folio 6. And, reassembling TrBh, he concludes (p. XV): "Ainsi, après des siècles de dislocation, les portions de la Trimśikā(bhāsya, H.B.) qu'un hasard fâcheux avait isolées se rejoignent pour former de nouveau un ensemble intégral."

The MS I, however, tells a different story: it relates how this discovery took place already in Kathmandu in the course of copying the *Vimśatikā* under the eyes of Hemrāj Śarman (it is not clear whether he has prepared the copy himself). To reconstruct the event: having just started to copy folio 7a (cf. I 9,19), it was realized that a semantic gap in relation to folio 6b had occurred which could not be explained in terms of a few lacking akṣaras. The whole semantic context had changed: folio 7a belonged to a different text. Hemrāj Śarman knew very well that the TrBh, of which he had earlier arranged a copy for Lévi, was written on the same palmleaf materials, in the same script, and that it contained a big lacuna. Now it was a child's game for him to fetch the fragmentary TrBh manuscript and to understand that its folio 6b was in the process of defining the notions provided in a kārikā on folio 6a and that the folio 7a, he held in his hands, simply continued this part of the commentary. Going through the leaves of the newly found MS, he discovered another hiatus after folio 19: here another folio 7 followed.

But folio 19b of the presently found palm-leaves ended in the middle of a word (*ananta-*), while folio 20a of the previously already known portion of TrBh started with the syllable -*ram*. The transition could not have been smoother — even symbolically it was sealed: what had been a *Trimśikāvijñaptibhāsya* MS with a big lacuna (*antaram*) now became a text that was unbroken, without any gap, but with parts immediately adjoining (*anantaram*).

The other folio 7 constituted the end of the *Vimśatikā*.

On realizing these circumstances, the first words of TrBh 7a, which had already been written on the copy I — as can still be seen on I 9,19 —, were crossed out and the copying was continued with the remaining lines of the *Vimśatikā*. Thereafter the scribe started copying what had been recognized as the middle portion of TrBh (= D), explicitly indicating this discovery at the head of I, p. 12:

7.   In connection with demonstrating that the manuscripts H and I included in 3WVSM were copies that had been prepared for Lévi, I have referred to the fact (cf. notes 7 and 8) that the readings adopted in L é have the strong tendency to be those of H against C/E/F and those of I against D. And while H/I — not C/D — thus largely come to form the a c t u a l basis of L é, those adoptions of readings in L é often occurred without Lévi noting the differences between the readings in the original palm-leaves C/D and their copies H/I.[13]

In those cases where C/D contained lacunae, Lévi chose between various options: he might indicate the given lacuna in a footnote and emend it, either along with H/I or on the basis of reconstructions from the Tibetan. But, often, he simply filled a lacuna without providing any information at all about the existence of it in the MS (whereas even H/I tended to indicate the existence of lacunae by placing the reconstructed akṣaras in parentheses).[14]

---

eṣa trimśikāgranthaḥ

Thus, beyond the copies H and I, on which Lévi — as demonstrated — so heavily relied for his edition of TrBh, the French savant has also received the very reassemblage of this text from Hemrāj Śarman (who had brought C to the attention of Lévi, in the first place). Perhaps, defocusing from the phonetic and attending to the semantic, we can now also understand what may have been the deeper significance of the initial words of Lévi's dedication of his *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* to the Rāj-Guru: *He mām rakṣa* ! — The Guru did so and kept silent.

[13] To add a few further, more or less randomly selected, cases in which Lévi reads with the copy H against C:

> TrBh *5n.2: C/E/F read correctly: *tṛṣu satsu bhavati;* but L é copies H: *tṛṣu bhavati;*
>
> TrBh *6n.7: against the correct reading *prabheda* (= C/E/F), L é adopts H: *bhedạ*
>
> TrBh *6n.10: while C has the correct reading *yatrātmādyupacāro,* L é resorts to the incorrect one of H: *yatrātma hy upacāro;*
>
> TrBh *43n.14: C reads properly: *atra ca,* whereas *ca* is omitted by H and by L é ;
>
> TrBh *45n.14: L é follows H in reading *°samatayāyām* against C's (almost) correct reading *°samatayā tāṃ* (= *tān*);
>
> TrBh *47n.1: C has correctly: *na svayambhāva,* but L é prefers to read with H: *nanvayaṃ bhāva;*
>
> TrBh *47n.17: C's originally correct reading *tathatāvat* becomes the faulty reading *tathatā tat* in H/L é ;
>
> TrBh *51n.4: the correct reading in C is *avasthitaṃ,* which H/L é turn into *eva sthitaṃ.*
>
> Cf. also TrBh *42n.21, *43n.9, *44n.12, *47n.15, *50n.23, etc.

[14] Cf., e.g., TrBh *21n.11: D12a1 leaves a lacuna: *°pariniʃ   ʃkarma-kam* — L é accepts the conjecture of I: *°parini(śraya)karmakam* without indicating the lacuna or his conjecture as such. The proper reading *°parinispādanakarmakam,* however, is found in the Abhi-dharmasamuccaya; AS had been quoted by TrBh and the reading is confirmed by TrTj.
For a few other examples, cf. TrBh *4n.1, *26n.14, *23n.21, *48n.18, etc.

Lévi often went his own way, differing from the readings of **C/D** and other copies without informing his readers. Despite this editorial incorrectness, his options sometimes resulted in textual improvements.[15]

Not infrequently, however, he introduced mistakes, while ignoring the correct readings found in the palm-leaves (i.e. **C/D**).[16]

Occasionally it happens that Lévi, in the one or the other of his very few footnotes, ascribes a variant reading to "Ms." (i.e. to C or D), while the reading does not actually occur in C/D at all, but only in one or more copies.[17]

Moreover, this procedure has led to instances where Lévi, assuming that he had corrected a faulty reading in the original MS, corrected only a copy and arrived at the reading actually found in C/D without being aware of this fact.[18]

---

[15] To specify a few examples where **Lé** fails to document his procedure, though in principle he is right to emend C and its copies as well as D/I:

   TrBh *19,11 (+ n.13): *samyan mithyā* -: **Lé** emends D/I (: *samyag mithyā;*
   TrBh *19,12f. (+ n.16): *yuktir yogah* -: **Lé** emends D/I (: *yuktiyogah;*
   TrBh *27,16 (+ n.15): °*visayo* -: **Lé** emends D/I (: °*visayah* |;
   TrBh *31,20 (+ n.18): *cetasor yathā°* -: **Lé** emends D/I (: *cetasoh* | *yathā;*
   TrBh *50,15 (+ n.22): *grāhako* -: **Lé** emends C etc. (: *grāhakam;*
Cf. also TrBh *35n.15, *50n.21, *51n.14, etc.

[16] To provide a few examples:

   TrBh *12n.11: against a nearly correct *nairantaryapravandhena* (only:°*vandh°* —>
   °*bandh°* !) of D/I, we find a contraction in Lé: *nairantaryena;*
   TrBh *15n.2: D/I: *hy ātmā°* is replaced by Lé: *hi ātmā;*
   TrBh *18n.7: against the correct *cāvisesena* of D/I, **Lé** reads: *ca visesena;*
   TrBh *31n.3: correct is D/I/AS: °*paripantha°;* incorrect is Lé: °*paripanyi°*
                                               (LÉse: °*thi°);*
   TrBh *34n.8: D/I/TrT read correctly: *virūdhyate;* yet Lé: *nirūdhyate;*
   TrBh *39n.1: C to H is almost correct: °*vāsanās,* but Lé changes it into: °*vāsanāyās.*
Cf. also TrBh *19n.23, *21n.6, *42n.10, *50n.6, *53n.18, etc.

[17] A few instances demonstrating cases in which Lévi relegates a variant to "Ms.", i.e., to C/D, while it is actually not found there:

   TrBh *7n.5 (ad *7, 9: *antarena na tat):* here Lé(18n.4) reports *na* to be lacking in
        "Ms." —: not true for C/E/F, but only for G and H (while H secondarily
        adds *na* above the line).

   TrBh *30n.19 (ad *30,16: *kāyavāṅmanahkarmani):* here Lé (32 n. 1) states:
   "Ms. °*vāṅmanasaka°*" — but D: °*manakarmani,* while I: °*mana(sa)karmani.*

   TrBh *45n.4 (ad *45,5: *pradhvamsābhāva°):* here H: *prastamsābhāva°* ; Lé (40,17):
   pranastasvabhāva° , while identifying in a footnote the wrong reading of H
        as that of "Ms." and rejecting it; yet, C/F do actually contain the correct
        reading.
Cf. also, e.g., TrBh *46n.23, *52n.4, *49n.14 etc.

[18] To refer to a few instances at this place:

Lévi could go so far as to adopt a wrong reading from H, while explicitly indicating in a footnote that the Tibetan version corresponded to a Sanskrit variant he had discarded, without recognizing that this discarded variant constituted the proper reading likewise to be found in C.[19]

8. On the whole, although he had C/D/E/H/I and the Tibetan translation of TrBh at his disposal, the quality of Lévi's edition of TrBh$_S$ is very uneven. Its unreliability becomes extreme when the notes — invariably ascribing readings to "Ms." — refer to different documents, changing the locus of reference from footnote to footnote. For example, first to denote a reading found only in C, but not in H (cf. L é 38n.2), then to denote a reading actually found in H, but not at all in C (cf. L é 38n.3). The same ambivalence of jumping within lines from a palm-leaf reading to a reading adopted from a copy — each time unshared by the other document — is encountered in his handling of D/I (cf., e.g., TrBh *22ns.15 & 16). Probably nobody would be fond of discovering an actual method of intentional deception behind Lévi's editorial procedures, but the least we have to assume is a rather too superficial consultation of his sources and an unawareness of the differences displayed in the materials he had at his disposal.

Notwithstanding its problems, Lévi's edition of TrBh has obviously been of great importance and has also assisted the preparation of the present edition in various ways, not least in the initial process of reading the MSS. Considering Lévi's text as a sort of *vulgate* of TrBh, the present critical edition does not try to obliterate its memory. Qualified page/line references to Levi's contribution are found on each page in the critical apparatus to the new TrBh$_S$. Thereby any previous references to TrBh in the buddhological history of research will remain easy to locate.

As pointed out above, Hemrāj Śarman's factual role in the history of rediscovering the Sanskrit MS of Sthiramati's *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* will likewise remain recognized.

TrBh *6n.16/ad *6,19: *pravṛttivijñān*° — against the correct reading in C, Lé says in a footnote that Ms. reads *pravṛttir* - a reading found only in G/H - and then emends to the correct reading (the one already found in C).

TrBh *16n.12/ad *16,16: *lokottare na* — thus D; but I, misunderstanding the context and trying to "emend" D in parentheses, reads: °*ttarena (na)*. Unaware of D, Lé (24n.2) ascribes the reading °*ttarena* to Ms. and "establishes" his: *lokottare na*.
Cf. also TrBh *1n.9, *6n.2, *42n.9, *49n.11 etc.

[19] Thus, as TrBh *53n.17 documents, the correct reading *saṃsāraparityāgāt* occurs in C/E/F. Unaware of this fact, Lé (44n.7) refers to that reading as one occurring in the Tibetan translation of this passage ('*khor ba yoṅs su mi gtoṅ źiṅ*), but decides himself against it and adopts the faulty reading of G/H: *saṃsāra parityāgāt*.

For another interesting misemendation of Lévi on basis of the Tibetan, cf., e.g., TrBh *48n.1.

The Present Edition of TrBh_s

9.   The present edition of TrBh_s, the first critical edition, is based on
textual materials included in 3WVSM and on two fragments of TrBh from the
SĀNKṚTYĀYANA Collection, assisted by the published Sanskrit fragments of
TrṬ, as well as by the passages defining the *caitasikā   dharmāḥ* in AS and
ASBh. The Tibetan translation of TrBh, offering a continuous check of the
Sanskrit text, has likewise been indispensible.

Nine among 3WVSM's photographic reproductions of MSS were
pertinent and have been employed (A, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J). However, the
palm-leaf MSS A and J contain the *Triṃśikākārikā*. And, being modern copies
of C/D, the MSS E, F, G, H, I have no independent status. Written on paper
(H/I in notebook format), all of these, except the Newari MS F, are
Devanāgarī transcriptions of C/D. They have nevertheless been consulted
and found very useful for confirming correct and incorrect readings of C and
D (apart from contextualizing Lévi's achievement). *Three Works of Vasubandhu
in Sanskrit Manuscript* (pp. XIII-XVIII) contains a general description of these
documents and two concordances relating them to Lévi's editions in his
Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi.

10.   Adding the two available fragments (K, L) from the SĀNKṚTYĀYANA
Collection to those three independent texts (A, J, C/D) reproduced in
3WVSM, we obtain the following list of old palm-leaf materials employed —
on the basis of phototechnical reproductions — for the present edition:

A: MS No. 5-6462 (Bauddhadarśana 44) of the National Archives,
      Kathmandu.
      Five rather well-preserved folios, ca. 28.5 x 5 cm, one string hole
      within a surrounding square space, 6-7 lines. Early hooked
      Nepalese script [similar to that of K].[20]
      Contains the texts of TSN, Vś and Tr (repro. in 3WVSM: 1-8).
      The *Triṃśikākārikā* covers A4a5-5b2.

---

[20] The script of A is similar to the script of the MS Add. 1686 (Plate II. 3) in BENDALL 1883.
Bendall has described it as the first dated (i.e. 1167 CE) "example of hooked Nepalese
hand". BÜHLER 1896: 59, while referring to BENDALL, calls it the "nepalesische Hakentypus".
Filliozat (in L. RENOU/J. FILLIOZAT, et al., *L'Inde Classique*, Paris 1953/II: 679 [and plates
693ff.]) names it "*vartula*". BANDURKSKI (1994: 19ff.), discussing the scripts occurring in the
Sāṅkṛtyāyana Collection, refers (p. 21) to other names, such as "Kuṭilā", Early Śārada",
"Bhujimol", etc., given to the script, which I shall provisionally designate as "Early hooked
Nepalese".

Four of the documents (A, J, K, L) use this hooked type of script, but each hand is
different. In contrast to A and K, the hands of J and L are "slanted", that is, the script used
in these two MSS is slightly cursive.

While BÜHLER (*op. cit.*: 58) explains the development of the early hooked Nepalese
from Proto-Bengali, BENDALL (*op. cit.*: xxiii) places its origin into the 12th century and
considers the 13th century as the peak phase of its employment.

J: Cultural Palace of the Nationalities, Beijing, China (according to
       3WVSM).
       One well-preserved folio, ca. 31 x 4.5 cm, one string hole within a
       surrounding square space, recto: 9 lines, verso : 7 lines,
       "slanted" early hooked Nepalese script [similar to that of L].
       Containing the complete Trimśikākārikā (repro. in 3WVSM: 159).

K: Cat.-No. 54, signature: Xc 14/57   (cf. BANDURSKI 1994: 93)
       This fragment of TrBh was first described in GOKHALE 1968;
       as part of the SĀNKRTYĀYANA Collection in Göttingen it has
       later been catalogued by BANDURSKI 1994 (see here for details).
       Two long and slim palm-leaves (the size provided by Bandurski
       [27.5 x 2.5 cm] seems to correspond to that of a photographic
       reproduction, but not to that of the original MS), 6 lines of text
       divided into three horizontal blocks separated by two vertical
       intermediate spaces with string holes; implicitly agreeing with
       BÜHLER 1896: 58 (cf. note 20), GOKHALE (op. cit.: 176) recognizes the
       script of C/D as a Bengali precursor of K and identifies that of K as
       a 12th-13th century Nepalese script ("from the use of the 'Nepalese
       hooks' seen on the tops of the letters in our fragments"), i.e., as the
       early hooked Nepalese.[21]

       First folio: only recto (K1a); second folio: recto and verso (K2a and
       K2b):

       K1a: top folio on plate Ñ darśana I A: corresponds to TrBh *16,2-17,17
       K2a: second from top folio on same plate: corresponds to TrBh *22,17-
            24,15

       K2b: top folio on plate Ñ darśana I B: corresponds to TrBh *24,15-
       26,10.

L: Cat.-No. 1, signature: Xc 14/1
       The discovery of these fragments of TrBh among those of RGV was
       made by Prof. SCHMITHAUSEN (personal communication).

---

[21] In the introduction preceding his catalogue, BANDURSKI (1994: 19) has rightfully
emphasized the desideratum of a comprehensive palaeographical study of the MSS
pertaining to the Sāṅkṛtyāyana Collection similar in kind to L. SANDER's Paläographisches zu
den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung, Wiesbaden 1968. Referring to a
number of publications containing discussions of the scripts partly as related to, and based
upon, R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana's photographs of Indian Buddhist texts discovered in Tibetan
monasteries, Bandurski demonstates the relative vagueness of the identifications of scripts
often encountered. Bandurski himself adopts the problematic — since BÜHLER 1896: 50; cf.
also SALOMON 1998: 39n. 112 — name "Kuṭilā" for the early hooked Nepalese script
employed in K.

Still unknown to Bandurski, the TrBh fragment L is mixed up with the folios of a MS described by BANDURSKI 1994: 31 (a2).[22]
K. KANO 2005 provides diplomatic and critical editions of this fragment of TrBh.[23]
Recto sides of two long and slim palm-leaves (size: see under K); clear photographs; yet, due to some technical inadvertance, the right margins of the leaves are "cut off" on the photographs (entailing some loss of text: 2-3 akṣaras per line); 1st folio: 7 lines, 2nd folio: 6 lines; text is divided into three horizontal blocks separated by two vertical spaces with string holes; "slanted" early hooked Nepalese script.

L1a: 2nd leaf from the bottom on plate Ṅ Mahāyānott 2A:
        corresponding to TrBh *34,10-36,14
L2a: bottom leaf on same plate: corresponding to TrBh *38,14-40,13.

C/D: Although forming a single MS of TrBh, the portions C and D are still handled as separate MSS in the National Archives, Kathmandu, and hence in 3WVSM (here even the photographic reproductions of respectively C [pp. 16-29] and D [pp. 30-49] are different in appearence).

     C: MS No. 5-136 vi (Bauddhadarśana 40ka)
            14 folios corresponding to TrBh *1-10,28 and *36,6-53;

     D: MS No. 1-1697 vi (Bauddhadarśana 38)
            13 folios corresponding to TrBh *11,11-36,6.

     C/D: ca. 30 x 5,5 cm (cf. already LÉVI 1925: XV), 6-8 (mostly 7) lines of text, one string hole within a square space;
     script: Proto-Bengali-cum-Maithili.[24]

---

[22] Although Bandurski's description can be understood in the sense that his a2 (= only *recto* sides) represents half a reduplication of a1, there seems to be no second version of the folios corresponding to L*recto*, not to speak of any L*verso*.

[23] Kano also includes a photographic reproduction of L; and, naturally, he retains the siglum Xc14/1 (an impractical solution in the present context of a critical edition of TrBh₅).

[24] Providing me with this identification of the script of C/D, Dr. Lore SANDER has essentially confirmed G. ROTH's (1970: XXIV) identification of the script of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* with that of the TrBh MS (= C/D) and explicitly referred to Roth's detailed study of his script (*op. cit.*: XXI-XXVII). So does BANDURSKI (1994: 20), who could also personally draw on Roth's expertise when preparing the catalogue of the Sāṅkṛtyāyana Collection.

   In the introduction to his edition of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, ROTH (*op. cit.*: XXIV) still preferred the designation "Proto-Bengali-cum-Proto-Maithili". But in a later paper he dropped the second "proto" (cf. his "Notes on the Patna Dharmapada" [p. 95], a supplement to his article "Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition", in: H. BECHERT [ed.], *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung/The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen 1980: 78-135).

Eight folios are damaged with some loss of text on both *recto* and *verso* (fols. 2, 6, 12, 13, 14, 25, 26, 27); in most cases, just a corner of the right edge has broken off; in one case (12), the folio's whole right edge.

11.   Though none of these five MSS is dated, an approximate date of C/D is gained on the basis of ROTH's (1970) dating of the Proto-Bengali-cum-(Proto)-Maithili script. In the course of describing the palaeographical features of the *Bhiksuṇī-Vinaya* in comparison with datable epigraphic materials and dated manuscripts of the Pāla-Sena age (*op. cit.*: XXI-XXIV), he suggested "the 11th (latest 12th) century A.D." as the time when his MS was written. Employing the same script, approximately the same dating should be valid for C/D.[25]

Supplementing Roth's description of Proto-Bengali-cum-Maithili, É. NOLOT (1997) has provided a drawn table of *aksaras* of this script. Another pertinent, and even more elaborate, table of akṣaras and ligatures is to be found in Part I: *Introduction to Vimalakīrtinirdeśa and Jñānālokālamkāra* (here: pp.91-122: "The Script of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and the *Jñānālokālamkāra* Palm-leaf Manuscripts") of the volumes *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa and the Jñānālokālamkāra: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations* (Tokyo 2004, Parts I - III) as prepared by the Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University.

[25] Although Lévi did not support his assumption with arguments, he too (1925: XV) tentatively placed C/D in the 12th century.

While it cannot be determined with sufficient certainty, whether C/D has been written in an Indian monastery or in Nepal (whereto the script had been imported), we would gain a rather definite *terminus ante quem* for an Indian production by the fact that Śākyaśrībhadra, the last abbot of Vikramaśīla and Odantapūri, had to abandon his residences before their destruction by the Muslims at the end of the 12th century. Soon he left India for Nepal and, in 1203 (or in 1204; Cf. NAUDOU 1980: 244ff. and STEINKELLNER 2004: 10), he went to Tibet together with some of his disciples, among them Vibhūticandra and Danaśīla, to whose hands some of the MSS in the Sāṅkṛtyāyana Collection owe their existence (cf. BANDURSKI 1994: 24). Comparative palaeographical studies including those precisely datable MSS written by these two monks will probably contribute to greater precision concerning the historical allocation of scripts more or less closely related to the script(s) used in these autographs (cf. STEINKELLNER, *loc.cit.*, for providing an impression of Vibhūticandra's hand in the form of a partial photographic reproduction of his autograph).

In the case of one manuscript — one in which Vibhūticandra has identified himself as scribe — BANDURSKI (cf. Cat.-No. 70a) has identified the script as Kuṭilā (i.e., as the script here called Early hooked Nepalese). In contrast to my insufficient basis (slightly blurred photocopies of K and Steinkellner's partial reproduction of Vibhūticandra's hand) for precise palaeographical assertions, Bandursky had extensive access to the collection in Göttingen; and, given we may trust Bandurski's sense of consistency, then in this autograph — produced around 1205 — the same script seems to have been used as in our MS K (cf. above). The approximate date of the MS written by Vibhūticandra would correspond to Bendall's dating of the early hooked Nepalese script (cf. above note 20).

12. ROTH (*loc. cit.*) has also drawn attention to certain orthographic pecularities in his MS; the same occur in the *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya* MSS C/D, K, L. In fact, this palaeographical evidence is fairly typical and also characteristic for epigraphic Sanskrit records (cf., e.g., R. SALOMON 1998: 96).

To refer to a few of these features:

— *anusvāra* frequently occurs also *in pausa* instead of -*ṃ*;

— class nasals and *anusvāra* are interchangeably used with little systematic consistency;

— optional (cf. ROTH, *op. cit.*: XXVI) gemination of consonants joined to a preceding *r* (graphically as superscript) occurs as a frequent but inconstant phenomenon
   (in C/D, *dharmma, karmman, pravarttate*, etc. are frequent; likewise found are *vitarkka* [17a3], *varjjayitvā* [19a3], *nirddiṣṭāḥ* [19b6], *pūrvvā°* [20b5], *utsargga* [19a3] etc., but also *prajñaptir ddharmma°* [2a3], *utpatter ggatiṣu* [18a6] etc.);

— notation of due doubled consonants may be irregular
   (in C/D, we find several times *arhatva* instead of *arhattva, satva* instead of *sattva, guṇavatva* instead of *guṇavattva*, etc.);

— there is an interchange of sibilants such as that of dental *s* and palatal *ś*
   (in C/D, e.g.: *aśakti* instead of *āsakti* [11b4]; *prasrabdhi* instead of *praśrab-dhi*[11a5]; *saṃsaya* [10b3], *vipraṇāsa* [10b3], *sāsvato* [14a3], *samatha* [16a7] instead of *saṃśaya, vipraṇāśa, śāśvato, śamatha*, etc.)

— vowel sandhi in *ā* may be inconsistently interferred with by means of an *avagraha*
   (in C/D, e.g.: *yā'layavijñāne* [4b3, reproduced in Lé18,6]; C5a3 reads first: *vā'līyate*, but right afterwards: *vālīyate*; C4b5: *cā'dhatte* [= *ca-ādhatte*]; etc.)

— prescribed use of *avagraha* is inconsistently followed
   (in C/D, the elison of an initial *a* has often not been indicated with the help of an *avagraha*).

In the present edition, these various inconsistencies have been silently homogenized: no *anusvāra* will occur *in pausa*, no gemination of consonants after *r*, no *avagraha* to interfere with *ā*-sandhi; but *avagrahas* and doubled consonants will be found, where they should be placed, and sibilants will be emended according to common standards (while the cases in which BSHD indicated a widespread optional employment of sibilants in certain technical terms will be noted).

13. Concerning the general methodical principles applied, depending on the state of the manuscript materials at hand and on the reader addressed, the particular mode of presenting textual materials may differ.[26] My principles

---

[26] Extremely fragmentary materials such as those pertaining to the Turfan finds require different modes of presenting the state of textual remains than manuscripts which, apart from occasional lacunae due to damages (especially at the edges) constitute running texts,

have been to let the editorial transparency of evidencing textual problems interfere as little as possible with the clarity of textual presentation. That is, to afford a smooth reading, the body of the text itself has been kept quite free from complicating editorial interferences. Even in the case of lacunae only the footnote numbers referring to pertinent discussions in the *apparatus criticus* are found in the text. Addressing the editorial necessity of indicating the exact places of line shifts in the MSS A, J, C, D, K, L, recourse has been taken to small dots inserted into TrBh$_S$ with correlated sigla on the left margin.

On the other hand, the critical apparatus attempts to address every perceived textual problem in an informative way. As referred to above, a series of suggested emendations by past and present scholars had to be integrated. In particular, Lévi's efforts have been taken as a serious attempt to provide a restored and normalized text (*vulgate*) to the best of his abilities: hence the complicated relationship of his edition to C/D, as well as his accomplishments of going beyond what C/D (and H/I) could offer, have been documented in the notes.

But, being irrelevant from the text-critical point of view (hence in this respect subjected to a general *eliminatio codicum descriptorum*), it has of course not been the present aim to document each single variant in the copies E, F, G, H and I. Nevertheless, sufficient information for obtaining an adequate picture of the general relationship of the copies E, F, G, H, I to C/D, and that of L é to these copies, has been provided on the way (mainly for the sake of gaining a better understanding of L é in relation to C/D). Yet, the focus has necessarily been on establishing a critical recension of TrBh$_S$ by means of reflecting it on the basis of only the text-critically pertinent materials — the palm-leaf MSS and the *testimonia* referred to above — available for any given passage. Particularly problematic passages (e.g., when lost Sanskrit passages had to be reconstructed due to lacunae in C/D) have been discussed in the apparatus, so as to allow any reader to evaluate these emendations on the basis of qualified reflections that have led to them.

14.   Another problem that had to be addressed in connection with editing TrBh is the logical structure of the text. Although Tr prestructures the broad thematic framework of TrBh, there is a need for a finer grid to serve as an appropriate means of orientation. Therefore, a Structural Analysis of T r B h has been prepared, which refers to the structure of TrBh in two ways:

(1)   as a table of contents which is locating the topics of TrBh by means of page/line references;

(2)   as a topical analysis which is contextualizing the themes discussed in TrBh within a numerical grid of structural coordination and sub-coordination. The numbers of the topical analysis reappear on the left margin of TrBh (likewise coordinating the Sanskrit text

such as those belonging to the Sāṅkṛtyāyana Collection. The present material basis corresponds to the latter case.

and its translations), thus providing an optimal orientation with regard to its logical structure.

My annotated English translation of TrBh, supplemented with a translation of this Structural Analysis, is about to follow in a second volume.

The Tibetan Translation of TrBh (TrBh$_t$)

15.   TrBh$_t$ has been drawn upon as a running check on TrBh$_S$. In view of the fact that there exists only a single complete Sanskrit MS of TrBh, TrBh$_t$ has been indispensible for the constitution of TrBh$_S$.

Unfortunately, E. TERAMOTO's (1933) edition of TrBh$_t$ is seriously flawed.[27] Hence to obtain a reliable referential basis for my critical apparatus to TrBh$_S$, the preparation of a new edition of TrBh$_t$ was imperative.

---

[27] A few examples illustrating Teramoto's editorial technique may serve to support my evaluation. As the notes to his edition indicate, Teramoto has been able to consult the Peking, Narthang and Derge versions of TrBh$_t$. Thus he has actually been provided with an excellent basis as a starting point. However, he hardly used this basis to critically indicate the variant readings in his apparatus (as a comparative glance at the apparatus to the present edition of TrBh$_t$ will confirm). The references to folio paginations inserted into his text refer to the Peking edition, apparently his basic text. Yet, he often fails to adequately reproduce even this edition:

> Cf., e.g. the following readings provided by Teramoto [T = Teramoto's ed.]
> against the actual readings found in P (without that he noted the differences):
>
> T 7,17 me: P172b4 med; T 8,5 mthun mon : P172b6 thun mon ;
> T 27,4 stan : P179b2 bstan ; T 23,2 sems las : P178a3 sems gan las ;
> T 25,14 yid de rtag tu : P179a2 yid de de rtag

Sometimes, however, Teramoto does not reproduce P (and N, for that matter), but silently prefers the readings of the Derge edition:

> e.g. Tr 3ab reads in P/N:
>   de'i len pa dag dan gnas II rnam pa rigs pa mi rigs te II
>
> while T reads correctly (but without note) with D:
>   de ni len pa dag dan gnas II rnam par rig pa mi rig te II

At other places he reproduces the mistakes of the Peking edition:

> these may be quite simple mistakes such as reading dnos yan (9,8) with P instead
> of D dnos kyan,
>
> but may also be more complicated cases:
>
> T 21,9f. reproduces a long dittography of P(/N), where P 177b2 repeats half of the
> previous line: yan reg pa dan yid la byed pa la sogs pa bsdus nas ji srid 'khor gi bar —
> while the proper text found in D (ze na gan dan ldan na 'di dgra bcom pa zes bya'o II
> ci) has simply been omitted.
>
> T 25,12 reproduces P 179a2 kun gzi non mons instead of correcting it into kun nas
> non mons (= Skt. samklista).

There are other advantages of this edition of TrBh$_t$ beyond its function as a text-critical instrument with regard to TrBh$_S$. Having a reliable parallel Sanskrit-Tibetan edition at hand can be of general benefit for the task of reconstructing technical Sanskrit terminology and syntactic phrases with the help of TrBh$_t$-TrBh$_S$ when working with Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda materials on the basis of Tibetan texts. An easy access of TrBh$_t$ is naturally also of great advantage for the use of the *Triṃśikāṭīkā* (which for the larger part is available only in Tibetan translation), as well as for the search and identification of parallel passages and quotations (as may be found both in more or less closely related texts — such as Y$_t$, VinSg, MSgr[Bh], PSk, ASVy, etc. — and in the extensive philosophical literature produced subsequently by Tibetan authors.

16.   The Tibetan translation of TrBh goes back to the very early period of promoting Buddhism (*sṅa dar*) in Tibet. To be more precise, according to its Tibetan colophon, TrBh$_t$ was translated by two Indian paṇḍits, Jinamitra and Śīlendrabodhi, together with their Tibetan collaborator Ye śes sde; that is, it was accomplished at the beginning of the 9th century.

Jinamitra and Ye śes sde are well known as the two most important early translators with an enormous productivity of a fairly high standard. With shifting partners they collaborated in numerous translation projects. They were likewise largely responsible for the compilation of the great

---

But N (like P) reads: *chos rnam med par rtog pa*, while only D has the correct reading: *chos rnams med par rnam par rtog pa* (forming part of the phrase *yaṅ phyi rol gyi bdag daṅ I chos rnams med par* = Skt. *vināpi bāhyenātmanā dharmaiś ca*);

T 24,7 completely fails to understand the TrBh$_t$ version of Tr 6d:
    bdag rgyal bdag chags źes bya ba ste II

Teramoto thinks that *źes bya ba ste* forms part of the commentary and simply fills up the ensuing gap in Tr 6d with syllables of his own fantasy;

Tr 7ab has been messed up in a similar way. The Tibetan translation (in TrBh$_t$) of each of these pādas consists in 7 syllables; yet in conformity with TrBh$_S$ they have been divided into three parts with intervening commentary:

    1. (5 syllables): *gaṅ du skyes pa de'i'o -*
    2. (4 syllables). *gźan reg sogs kyaṅ -*
    3. (5 syllables): *de la dgra bcom med.*

But Teramoto simply fills up the Tibetan text so as to obtain 7 syllables each time (that is, he actually adds a whole pāda) — and repeats this procedure in the *Bhāsya* as well.

Unable to identify the correct pāda Tr 8a, Teramoto (28,11) considers a part of the commentary as kārikā, while letting the proper Tr 8a become a part of the commentary;

Without the slightest basis in any of the Tanjur versions, and without informing the reader in any way, Teramoto invents *tshor daṅ 'du śes* to replace the proper *rig daṅ 'du śes* in Tr 3d.

These instances may suffice to exemplify the general character of Teramoto's work.

16. The Tibetan translation of TrBh goes back to the very early period of promoting Buddhism (sna dar) in Tibet. To be more precise, according to its Tibetan colophon, TrBh$_t$ was translated by two Indian paṇḍits, Jinamitra and Śīlendrabodhi, together with their Tibetan collaborator Ye śes sde; that is, it was accomplished at the beginning of the 9th century.

Jinamitra and Ye śes sde are well known as the two most important early translators with an enormous productivity of a fairly high standard. With shifting partners they collaborated in numerous translation projects. They were likewise largely responsible for the compilation of the great Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicographical work *Mahāvyutpatti* as well as for formulating the valid new standards of translation as expressed in the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa*.[28]

No complete Dunhuang version of TrBh is known to exist. Apart from a fragment consisting in a single folio, only canonical Tanjur versions of TrBh$_t$ are at our disposal. The only Dunhuang fragment of TrBh is found in the Stein Collection and has been described as No. 604 in L. de LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library*, Oxford 1962. No. 603 in the same catalogue refers to an early Tibetan version of the *Triṃśikākārikā* (Tr$_t$). M. LALOU's *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliotèque Nationale* (3 volumes, Paris 1939-1960) does not contain any TrBh$_t$. But a Dunhuang version of Tr$_t$ is found here (PT 125).

---

[28] P. SKILLING, in his *Mahāsūtra: Great Discourses of the Buddha* (volume II, 1997: 111-176), has devoted a long section to the early translators and their translations, thereby focusing in particular upon Jinamitra, yet also on Ye śes sde. The latter's role may indeed have been even more significant than that of Jinamitra. There was probably no Indian translator with whom Ye śes sde did not collaborate. As the most versatile Tibetan Buddhist scholar of his time, he seems to have been involved in almost every translation project; cf. SKILLING's (*op. cit.*: 148ff.) tables listing the various translator teams for those early translations.

With his *lTa ba'i khyad par*, the earliest Tibetan work on differentiating the various Indian Buddhist schools of thought, Ye śes sde has also initiated the indigenous doxographical tradition of *Grub mtha'* literature; cf. D. SEYFORT RUEGG 1981 ("Autour du lTa ba'i Khyad par de Ye śes sde"); on the development of *Grub mtha'* literature in general (particularly as leading up to dBus pa blo gsal, fl. 14th cent.), see K. MIMAKI 1982.

On the *sna dar* translators, see also J. NAUDOU 1980: 96-106 and for further references, cf. SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1991: 313 n. 706.

At the beginning of the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, the name of Jinamitra is heading the group of Indian scholars; that of Ye śes sde (under its sanskritized form Jñānasena) the group of Tibetan translators (cf. SIMONSSON 1957: 241). Constituting the basis for revising earlier translations and for homogenizing the terminology of future ones, while specifying the basic hermeneutic methods to be applied, the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* has been completed in 814/15 under Khri lde sroṅ btsan (= Sad na legs, ca. 800-815) as a project that had already been initiated under the rule of his father Khri sroṅ lde btsan (cf. PANGLUNG 1994). The actual revision was carried out under the rule of Khri gtsug lde btsan (= Ral pa can, ca. 815-835); see hereto URAI 1989; cf. also VERHAGEN 1994: 15ff. and the introductory portion in HU-VON HINÜBER 1997.

17.   The transmission of the Tanjur (bsTan 'gyur) collections is much less complicated than that of the Kanjur (bKa' 'gyur) collections.[29] Its basic features may be recalled at this point.

It has been generally recognized that the first decisive steps toward establishing a classical Tanjur have been taken in the first half of the 14th century. Drawing upon the Old sNar than manuscript collections that had been gathered under the direction of dBus pa blo gsal Byan chub ye śes in the previous decades, it was Bu ston Rin chen grub, who, around 1320-1334, had a complete copy of that collection made and brought to Źa lu, to his own monastery. There he produced a thoroughly revised and orthographically standardized collection of texts, from which duplicates and apocrypha had been removed, to which many new texts were added, and which was systematically rearranged and catalogued.[30]

This Źa lu Tanjur now became the basis of numerous copies and subcopies, thereby spreading in all directions throughout the following centuries. Some of these copies were subjected to additional revisions, hence incorporated readings, which influenced subsequent copies based on them. This resulted in the stemmatic bifurcation that is still reflected in the variant readings a modern editor of a Tanjur text, based on all the available Tanjur versions, obtains: essentially these readings exhibit the dominant feature of o n l y t w o lines of transmission.[31]

One of these lines of transmission is reflected by the Peking Tanjur (1724) and the New Narthang Tanjur (1741-42), both being available as xylograph editions. To these we may add the Pho lha nas/Ganden Golden Tanjur MS (earlier half of the 18th cent.). These three Tanjur versions are based on a subarchetype designated as the 'Phyin ba rTag rtse manuscript Tanjur.

The other branch is represented by the Derge Tanjur (1737-1744) and its virtual reprint, the Cone edition (1753-1773), whose blocks were engraved "from the proof-sheets of the sDe dge bsTan 'gyur" (RATIA unpubl.: 22 [cf.

---

[29] For pertinent contributions on the Tanjur transmission (with further bibliographical references), it may be referred to A. I. VOSTRIKOV, Tibetan Historical Literature, Calcutta 1970, chpt. 4 ("Historico-Biographical Surveys of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon"); C. VOGEL 1965 ("Introduction"); Y. IMAEDA, "Mise au point concernant les éditions chinoises du Kanjur et du Tanjur tibétains", in: A. MacDonald & Y. Imaeda (eds.) Essais sur l'Art du Tibet, Paris 1977: 23-52; J. D. SCHOENING 1995: 132ff., 175ff. K.-D. MATHES 1996: 37ff (§ 2.4: "Das Verhältnis der kanonischen Textzeugen zueinander"). A useful overview of the Tanjur tradition by A. RATIA ("Contributions on the Tibetan Buddhist Canon: Editions of the bsTan 'Gyur Division", [unpublished]) has likewise been at my disposal.

[30] Completed in 1335, Bu ston's catalogue of that collection is still available; cf., e.g., Cat. No. 1794 in: H. BUESCHER/T. TULKU, Catalogue of Tibetan Manuscripts and Xylographs, Copenhagen 2000 (= Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc. in Danish Collections, vol. 6, 1-2): 894.

[31] Cf. also the stemmata in SCHOENING 1995: 133 and MATHES 1996: 39.

note 29]).[32] The Derge edition is a compilation of Tanjur MSS probably all going directly or indirectly back to the Źa lu Tanjur.

18.   Since the very idea of preparing critical editions of Tibetan canonical texts has recently been challenged by J. D. SCHOENING (1995) in connection with his edition of several texts related to the Śālistambasūtra, it is necessary to shortly address this issue.

SCHOENING (1995: 179ff.) advocates a "reorientation of the textual critic's concern" (183). In his view, the proper format for editions of Tibetan canonical texts is that of a diplomatic edition, not that of a critical edition. SCHOENING (op. cit.: 179) quotes Paul Maas, a well-known authority on textual criticism, who in § 1 of his Textual Criticism states that the "business of criticism is to produce a text as close as possible to the original (constitutio textus)." However, when editing a text belonging to the Tibetan corpus of canonical translations it may be questionable whether this fundamental aim is achievable at all. As formulated for Kanjur texts, but also valid for Schoening in the case of Tanjur texts, he (op. cit.: 183) draws the following conclusion:

> "[I]t would be pointless to attempt to establish an original text; our goal must
> remain to make a historical study of the editions, a study that would include the
> relationship between the texts, the history of the Kanjur transmission in Tibet, and
> the changes in the Tibetan languages."

According to Schoening, this goal is to be achieved with the help of a diplomatic edition. Hereby, "the editior transcribes a known historical document" (op. cit.: 180), which "is reproduced without normalizing the orthography" (ibid). And he thinks that such a diplomatic edition "accompanied with supplemental variant readings will help to reveal the relationship between different Kanjur editions of a given work in the Kanjur as well as between the Dunhuang manuscripts, should they be extant" (op. cit.: 183). In addition, SCHOENING (ibid.) appeals to the "sacred" Tibetan Buddhist text tradition in which "each witness is important as a historical document".

---

[32] Cf. already VOGEL 1965: 28. However, there may be occasional exceptions to that rule as especially editors of texts stemming from the Stotra-section have noticed (e.g., J.-U. HARTMANN, Das Varṇārhavastotra des Mātṛceta, Göttingen 1987; J. SCHNEIDER, Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha, Bonn 1993). Cf. also MATHES 1996: 38, and likewise EIMER 2002: 74 confirms:

> "In most cases we have common readings of the Cone and Derge Tanjurs on the
> one side and the Narthang, Beijing (Peking) and Golden Manuscript Tanjurs on
> the other. This does not, however hold good for the bstod tshogs section, i.e. for
> the first volume, in which the Cone Tanjur is not directly traceable to the Derge
> edition."

Apart from the contaminating influence of the other branch of transmission, the fact that the Derge edition itself has been revised (emended and expanded) — while the Cone Tanjur is based on the first Derge edition — may have contributed to occasional variants between Derge and Cone.

An appreciation of this "sacred" text tradition is supposed to be supported by the diplomatic edition but underminied by a critical one.[33]

---

[33] As SCHOENING (op. cit.: 183) says:

> "After all, within the Tibetan Buddhist tradition, each of these witnesses is a sacred piece of writing, a physical representation of the Word of Lord Buddha. As such, none is more sacred than another and, more importantly for the textual critic, each has its own unique place in the Tibetan Buddhist tradition. Thus, each witness is important as a historical document that was produced by particular people at a particular time and place, and which played its own role in history. The construction of a stemma, however, tends to undermine an appreciation of this religious and historical importance."

I do not think that such popularistic sentiments of "sacredness" etc. should have any place in an enlightened discussion about textual criticism, independent of whether one favours a critical or a diplomatic edition. It is certainly not to be denied that the dominant cultural attitude of Tibetans toward texts has been (and is) one of deep respect (assuming greater degrees of irrationality the less educated the people are), but one should neither lose sight of the critical capacities of the Tibetan intellectuals. However, Schoening's uncritical appreciation of popular attitudes toward "sacred" texts has even guided him in his choice of the Derge version as the basic Tanjur text diplomatically edited in those cases where he could not avail himself of a Dunhuang version as the historically earliest document. He states (p. 185):

> "The most compelling reason for its selection was the high regard with which it is held in the Tibetan community."

Schoening shows no awareness of the reason why the Derge edition is so highly appreciated by the Tibetans. — It is the very fact that the Derge edition has been "critically" prepared by Tibetan scholars on the basis of collating various manuscript versions. For modern text-critical studies this characteristic of the Derge edition is a disadvantageous feature. Particularly for Kanjur studies. Therefore, diametrically opposed to Schoening's preference, Harrison goes so far as to dismiss the Derge edition in the context of critically editing Kanjur texts:

> "Second, one must collate the right witnesses. For practical purposes one can forget about later conflated and derivative editions, such as the Berlin MS, Cone, Derge, Lhasa and Urga." (HARRISON 1992: xlix).

However, for the Tibetans it naturally constituted a significant achievement in the history of the transmission of canonical texts. As we recall, Si-tu Paṇ chen, one of the greatest Tibetan scholars in the field of linguistics (including grammar, lexicography, prosody, poetics), was significantly involved in editorial projects at the printing house of Derge and directly supervised the production of the Derge Kanjur. For a recent introduction to the critical acumen of this 18th-century polymath, see P. VERHAGEN, "Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (1): Issues of Interpretation and Translation in the Minor Works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas (1699?-1774)", in JIABS 24 (2001): 61-88.

Continuing his reasoning about the Tanjur versions, SCHOENING (ibid.) argues:

> "Because the five Tanjurs are practically synchronous, any of them, except the Co-ne, which is a copy of the Derge, can be used for the diplomatic edition."

This is however far from true. When Schoening chose the Derge edition (which certainly is not free from mistakes) to constitute the text presented in diplomatic fashion (i.e., as a mere transcription with all its mistakes left in the text), the variants of the other Tanjur versions — consisting de facto in the variants of the other branch of transmission — are listed in the

19.   While this introduction to my edition of TrBh$_t$ cannot be the place for a detailed investigation and critique of Schoening's philological handling of his materials, some reflections on text-critical principles, also serving to contribute to the theoretical foundation for my own procedure, may be due. Concluding his review[34] of Schoening's work, DE JONG asserted:

> "Schoening's work is an important contribution to the study of the Śalistamba Sūtra and its commentaries. This is the first time that so many manuscripts and xylographs have been used for the editing of Tibetan texts. His work will certainly be a model for future editions."

If even such an erudite and influential scholar as the late J. W. de Jong, seemingly impressed by mere quantity, not only suspenses his critical reflections on the methodological principles adopted by Schoening but endorses these principles, it can be rationally anticipated that further products of the same kind are apt to follow. Schoening has indeed incorporated a very large amount of materials, which deserves to be carefully studied, and he has largely reconfirmed the stemmatic observations of other scholars. But the validity of essential parts of his editorial methodology is highly questionable. There is a difference between necessity due to the nature of the materials at hand and deliberate choice. Schoening has not produced any serious arguments demonstrating the necessity, or at least the advantage, of applying the method of d i p l o m a t i c a l l y editing canonical texts, nor does he disprove the validity of the recent advancement of the Kanjur and Tanjur research performed on the basis of critical editions. In my view, Schoening's deliberate choices of methodological principles contain seriously problematic and self-contradictory features, which should better not become the model for future editions of Tibetan canonical texts.

The preparation of a diplomatic edition of canonical texts entails for Schoening to take a given Dunhuang text as the textual basis to be diplomatically edited whenever one or more of these earliest documents exist. In SCHOENING 1995 this method has been applied to the Tibetan versions of the Śalistambasūtra and Kamalaśila's commentary upon it. That is, apart from all the mistakes, all the early Tibetan orthographic peculiarities, which had been abandoned by classical Tibetan scholars, have been revived

---

apparatus. Any other choice would have considerably complicated both the text and the apparatus. That is, while Schoening's choice of the Derge edition as the basic text has not been based on rational reflections, it has been, recensionally seen, a lucky one. As the Derge edition has been prepared on basis of the consciously critical standards developed by Tibetan scholars, the "classically correct" readings among the variants are indeed mostly found in Schoening's text.

But there are many cases where the reader cannot be immediately sure, whether the (text-critically) correct reading is found in the text or in the apparatus. Being stemmatically limited to two options in the apparatus to his editions, Schoening himself does only occasionally indicate mistakes as either scribal or printing errors (usually in the case of some of the more obvious mistakes).

[34] IIJ 40,2 (1997): 187-192.

by Schoening to form a dominant feature of his edited texts. SCHOENING (*op. cit*.: 179) says:

"The essential reasons are that the diplomatic edition is more scientific, has
historical validity, and can be used by scholars from a wider range of disciplines."

To demonstrate the questionability of these postulates, let me just quote a single instance — one to which, incidentally, Schoening himself (*op. cit*.: 188) refers — of his assumed superior editorial science, so as to comprehend the "historical validity" it retains as reflected in his translation. On p. 435,2 we read:

las chu ngu byas pa las 'bras bu chen po'e rnam par smyind pa myong ste |

The underlined syllables have variants listed in the apparatus and only by studying these variants it becomes possible to understand the text.

Before showing what Schoening does in his "translation" of this line, it has to be referred to the fact that there are frequent instances where Schoening indicates that a given translation is not at all based on the edited text but assumes certain corrections of the text. Usually he adopts the correct readings from among the variants.

That is, it is rather unclear what sort of "historical validity" Schoening wished to emphasize (beyond the trivial fact that faulty texts obviously are historical products), when he himself cannot even use his own edition as a reliable basis for his translation.

But, while Schoening's "diplomatic" mode of editing could already dispense with consistently indicating which of the variants he assumes to be the correct ones, those instances, where Schoening does at least indicate that his translation is not based on the edited text, are fortunate occasions for the reader. The translation of the line quoted above does not contain such an indication. Implicitly he simply translates the classical version of this passage which the reader has to reconstruct for himself from the variants in the apparatus. Thus his so-called "translation" (i.e.: "[Because] one experiences the ripening of a great result from performing a small karma" [p. 325]) would correspond to (i.e., be based upon) the following reconstruction:

las chun nu byas pa las 'bras bu chen po'i rnam par smin pa myon ba ste.

A note appended to the section in which also his translation occurs refers to the whole paragraph of the Sanskrit text (produced in an appendix far apart from the Tibetan text) in which the corresponding Sanskrit passage may be detected: *parīttaṃ karma kriyate, vipulaḥ phalavipāko 'nubhūyate.* Slightly adopted, this passage almost fits as a commentary to the present discussion:

If a negligible [text-critical] work is performed,
the resultant consequence is experienced as vast [by the reader].

Schoening's translations contain references to Tibetan and Sanskrit technical terms in parentheses. Thereby, the Tibetan orthography shifts between Dunhuang and classical modes of spelling. By providing also the Sanskrit terminology Schoening seems to admit the indispensability of going back to the Sanskrit text as the original basis of the Tibetan. And although he

has likewise included the large portion of available Sanskrit passages of the *Śālistambasūtra*,[35] he does not at all text-critically relate the Tibetan translation to the Sanskrit texts. He does not even correlate the Sanskrit passages to the Tibetan text. Quite to the contrary, he even obstructs a convenient mode of correlation by employing different modes of organizing the Tibetan text and the Sanskrit passages into sections.

On the whole, Schoening has indeed done much to deliberately complicate the use of his edition.

While appealing to an anonymous, if not fictitious, body of "scholars from a wider range of disciplines" (*op. cit.*: 179) as the benefactor of his work, the philologically really pertinent problem of settling the correct readings of the text has often been left open, that is, left to the most probable reader, the buddhologist, to decide.

20.   There are certainly instances in the various branches of Tibetan literature where a diplomatic edition may be preferable, or even the only possible choice. But as long as a Tibetan text, to restrict myself to canonical literature, is not an extremely bad translation, which has only become further defective in the course of its subsequent transmission, that is, unless there is no gain at all to be derived from collating the different branches of transmission, it is in my view ill-advised to produce other than critical editions of c a n o n i c a l texts, given one's aim is to prepare a valid basis for a translation into a modern language. In a text-critical sense, a valid textual basis is one that reflects the original as closely as possible. Yet, the canonical Tibetan texts are translations, and, as translations of (mostly) original Sanskrit texts, they are apt to contain mistakes — i.e., misrepresentations of their Sanskrit basis (not to speak of the condition of this basis itself) — from the outset.

Hence the aim of a c r i t i c a l   e d i t i o n of a canonical text may, in principle, n o t   be restricted to the c o n s t i t u t i o n   o f   t h e   o r i g i n a l v e r s i o n   o f   t h e   T i b e t a n   t r a n s l a t i o n. Though often it may not be possible to recognize the original Tibetan version of considerable portions of a text, even when Dunhuang versions are available, there are differences, not only from text to text, but, more essentially, between (a) the anonymous Kanjur texts and (b) Tanjur texts, mostly ascribed to particular authors.

Still, what P. HARRISON (1992: xlvi) has expressed with regard to the Kanjur tradition is valid for Tanjur texts as well:

> "[W]e must, it seems, forsake the quest for the "original text",
> the "archetype", the "autograph"."

---

[35] Which had been collected, in various ways, already by L. de La Vallée Poussin, N. Aiyaswamy Sastri, V. V. Gokhale and N. Ross Reat. Reassembled from the scattered quotations found in a number of texts, the material still available in Sanskrit amounts to approximately 90% of this *sūtra* (cf. ROSS REAT 1993: xii).

The aim of a critical edition is not to find the "original" Kanjur version, or the "original" Tanjur version, of a text, but rather to transcend the historical stages that have occurred in the course of the Tibetan textual transmission, while making these stages as transparent as possible. Naturally, the editor has to be cautious with regard to the extent he may directly emend a Tibetan text against all transmitted versions, rather than merely indicating and discussing the problematic passages in the notes, or resorting to other means of editorial technique (such as parallel editions, etc.). But, in principle, since a Tibetan translation is never the original version of a text, the task of a critical edition as conceived here for canonical texts is in agreement with the spirit of Maas.[36]

And had it not been the case that the contrary practice was adopted in SCHOENING 1995, then recommended as a model by the late J. W. de Jong, it would probably have been superfluous to emphasize that, when a Sanskrit version is partially or completely available, the Tibetan text has to be compared with the Sanskrit portions in order to serve as a methodical orientation for evaluating the Tibetan translation(s) and especially the extant variant readings. Independent of how one designates one's editorial undertaking, merely to list the bare fact of variant readings occurring in the different versions of a given text, without generating (and applying) an awareness with regard to their text-critical implications for the proper constitution of this text, falls short, I think, of acceptable academic standards. In this respect the differences between Schoening's assumptions and mine seem to be unbridgeable. In general support of my view with regard to philosophical Tanjur literature, I may refer to F. ERB's (1997) exemplary work on the *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti* consisting in a skilful combination of a "semi-diplomatic" edition of an extremely problematic canonical text and a radically text-critical discussion of the same in connection with its translation.[37]

---

[36] The implicit conception of the original Tibetan translation as the *original version* of a given text within the context of text-critical work related to Tibetan canonical texts may have formed a basis for Schoening's discrediting the preparation of critical editions in accordance with the standards of Paul Maas.

[37] In methodological respects, Schoening's standards cannot compare with the very high standards of Erb's penetration of extremely difficult textual materials. F. ERB (1997: 207) himself refers to the problematic situation he had to face: there was often no choice of best readings from any of the transmitted Tanjur versions so as to fulfil the basic text-critical criteria. Given these circumstances he changed the text as little as possible, as he says, but suggested extensive corrections (for the sake of obtaining a meaningful text at all) in the notes to his translation. In this way, passages that had to be more or less diplomatically edited did nevertheless receive a thoroughly text-critical reflection, while Erb is constantly attempting to reconstruct the original Sanskrit of the problematic passages in question. Actually, his text-critical reflection also pervades the edited Tibetan text on the level of the less complicated orthographic details — on this level Erb has constantly chosen the best readings. And various text-critical signs inserted into the text function to inform about the constituted text on a meta-textual level.

21.   In consideration of the fact, as outlined above (in § 17), that the general stemmatic constellation we obtain when collating Tanjur texts is a bifurcation into two lines of transmission, the present critical edition of $TrBh_t$ has been constituted by means of collating three Tanjur versions (serving as witnesses of both branches of transmission):[38]

Peking Tanjur (5565):	P 170a - 201b
Narthang Tanjur (3557):	N 161a - 192a
Derge Tanjur (4064):	D 146b - 171b
Dunhuang fragment (IOL 604)	M_{bh} (corresponding to $TrBh_t$ **50,6-51,19)

The separate Tibetan translation of the *Triṃśikākārikā*(Tr_t) has been additionally collated:

Peking Tanjur (5556)	P_k 1b - 3b
Derge Tanjur (4055)	D_k 1b - 3a
Narthang Tanjur (3547)	N_k 1b-4a
Dunhuang Ms (IOL 603)[39]	M_k 1a - 4b

22.   The present critical edition of $TrBh_t$ evaluates the Tibetan text and its variant readings with constant reference to $TrBh_S$.

On the whole, the variant readings fall in line with the stemmatic evidence obtained from previous editions of Tanjur texts.[40] As the critical

---

[38] No stemmatically valid new variants are to be expected by including the Cone xylograph (largely directly dependent on the Derge version) and the "Golden" Ganden MS (going along with Peking and Narthang; cf., e.g., MATHES 1996: 39; SCHOENING 1995: 176f., 182) in a collation of a given Tanjur text. For the present purpose it has been sufficient to collate P, N and D in order to obtain the range of alternative readings stemming from the two basic branches of the available Tanjur transmission, the Źa lu and 'Phyiṅ ba sTag rtse branches (cf. SCHOENING 1995: 132ff.). The editor's task of choosing the correct readings from among usually only two options will not in any way change by adding further sigla on either side of such pairs of alternative readings (with an occasional third variant without stemmatic implications).

The well-known and regular modes of abbreviating Tibetan words as found in N have of course not been considered as variant readings (for a list of typical instances, cf. MUROJI 1993: 41; for similar lists, see MATHES 1996: 68, 97f., 11).

[39] Both IOL 603 and 604 have been available to me in the form of digitized versions prepared by the British Library, thanks to Mr. Burkhard Quessel, curator of the Tibetan collection.

[40] ERB 1997: 30f. has provided a useful categorization of the various kinds of mistakes he found in his text. The three basic categories enumerated by Erb will be encountered by any editor of a canonical Tibetan text:

(1) mistakes that may be traced back to a faulty Skt. manuscript basis
(2) mistranslations
(3) mistakes that entered the text in the course of its canonical transmission.

Erb analyses each class of these mistakes into subcategories (with references to suitable exemples), thus providing an insightful grid that can be further elaborated by other

apparatus to TrBh$_t$ shows, **P** and **N** often share gross mistakes due to omissions, additions and alterations of words and phrases.[41] These instances are stemmatically significant variants.

---

researchers in future. Regarding the recensional and transmissional variants pertaining to the third category (i.e., stemmatically significant variants and variants without stemmatic implications; cf. hereto also HARRISON 1992: xxv & xxxi and BRAARVIG 1993/I: V n. 2) one might partially prefer other, and list further, subcategories, such as:

— orthographical mistakes due to scribal/printing errors (e.g., the frequent
    exchange of genitive and instrumental particles, that of *la/las*, loss of
    vowel signs, etc.),
— dittographies,
— omissions of words and passages (including haplographies),
— alterations of passages by Tibetan editors at various points of the textual
    transmission (e.g. Bu ston, Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas [Derge], etc.).

To Erb's three basic categories of mistakes and variants, a fourth category might be added: that of i n c o m p a t i b i l i t i e s .

This latter category concerns, in the first place, editors of canonical Tibetan texts, which can be compared with partial or complete extant Sanskrit versions. The extant Sanskrit version usually differs from the Sanskrit text that has served as the basis for the Tibetan translation. Consequently, a lack of congruence between extant Sanskrit passages and their Tibetan versions (as shared by all transmissional representants) may be due to stemmatic differences in the transmission of the original Sanskrit text. The Tibetan translation may be a correct translation of its Sanskrit basis, and yet be incompatible with the extant Sanskrit text. To evaluate a given instance as constituting either an original mistranslation or an incompatibility (in relation to the Sanskrit text at hand) may be difficult, but in principle there is a significant difference. Incompatibilities virtually enable the editor to text-critically enter the field of stemmatic relationships pertaining to the original Sanskrit text predating its Tibetan translation.

[41] The references provided in this and the following notes are to the apparatus of TrBh$_t$. Simple omissions in PN are readings like

    med pa instead of *med par śes pa* (**1n.5),
    rnam par śes pa la sogs instead of *rnam par śes pa las bdag la sogs* (**2n.15),
    rnam par gnas instead of *rnam par śes pa gnas* (**13n.4),
    'jig instead of *'jig rten* (**52n.1),
    the partial omission of Kā. 11c: *rnam mi 'tshe dge* (**20n.3), etc.

Haplographies are instances like:

    **2n.7: PNomit the words in square brackets from the passage:
    chos su ñe bar ['dogs pa'o || *ñe bar] 'dogs pa 'di*
    **23n.5: PN omit the words in square brackets from the passage:
    rtsol ba mi byed pas <u>lhun gyis [grub pa</u>'i dus na sems <u>lhun gyis] grub pa</u> ñid do
    **23n.13: PN omit the words in square brackets from the passage:
    [<u>bsod ñams</u> sel bas sñiṅ rje ba'o ||*] <u>bsod ñams</u> źes bya ba ni bde ba ste*
    **10n.10: PN omit the words in square brackets from the passage:
    sdug bsṅal <u>ba yaṅ ma yin</u> [bde <u>ba yaṅ ma yin</u>] pa'o ||, etc.

Simple additions found in PN are, e.g.,

    phuṅ po lṅa rnams instead of *phuṅ po rnams* (**24n.1);
    'jig rten las 'das pa'i instead of the metrically correct *'jig rten 'das pa'i* (**52n.4), etc.

Typical dittographies are readings like

    ñes par spyod par spyod pa'i instead of *ñes par spyod pa'i* (**24n.14);

Representing the other branch of transmission, D contains faulty readings of a similar character, not found in P and N.[42] These are likewise counted as stemmatically significant. But this does not mean that all the mistakes in D are of deeper stemmatical significance.[43]

In contrast to D's stemmatically significant readings, all the mistakes in the other branch of transmission occurring only in P (but not in N), or only in N (but not in P), can be explained as spontaneous scribal or printing errors.[44] When due to mistakes of this kind in P (or in N) an agreement between N (or P) and D comes about, this has no stemmatic significance.[45]

Since it is known that both P and N have been copied from the 'Phyiṅ ba rTag rtse manuscript Tanjur (itself prepared on the basis of the Źa lu collection), the mistakes shared by P and N may, in fact, be assumed to go back to their common predecessor. Omissions of words and phrases occur

---

ni goṅ ma goṅ ma'i instead of *ni goṅ ma'i* (**26n.2), etc.
At one place (**12ns.15-16), PN share a long dittography (scribe has slipped into the previous line) followed by the omission of long passage (due to a sort of haplography related to *ci*).

[42] Simple omissions in D are readings like:
    rtog pa instead of *rnam par rtog pa* (**8n.10),
    smra ba dag gi instead of *smra ba gźan dag gi* (**9n.4);
    mi 'grub pas instead of *mṅon par mi 'grub pas* (**8n.18);
    de med kyaṅ phyi rol gyi instead of *de med kyaṅ 'byuṅ bas phyi rol gyi* (**37n.2),
    etc.
While the reading *rnam par mi rig pa'o* instead of *rnam par rig pa mi rig pa'o* (**8n.6) is a haplography, the reading *de la źes bya ba ni gźan gyi dbaṅ ṅo* instead of *de la źes bya ba ni gźan gyi dbaṅ ṅo la'o* (**44n.11) fails to properly provide the meaning of the gloss of *de la* (*tatra*) by omitting the locative particle *la*.

[43] D has its share in s i m p l e scribal/printing errors (cf. subcategories listed in n. 40), just like P and N.

[44] Thus the scribe of N omits *rnams la* (**34n.2), writes *pa'i* instead of *pa'am* (**28n.14),
    med instead of *miṅ* (**41n.2), *der* instead of *de'i* (**43n.11),
    omits a negation particle (**44n.21), a genitive particle (**44n.16),
    reads *rig par ma* instead of *rig pa tsam* (**49n.8), etc.
    — In those cases P agrees with D.
P omits and exchanges particles, has dittographies (reading, e.g., *raṅ raṅ* instead of *raṅ*
    [**6n.3] or repeating kā 23b [**46n.6]); further, P contains readings like *smos* instead
    of *smon* (**18n.15), *lam* instead of *lan* (**27n.19), *btan* instead of *gtan* (**35n.1), etc.
    — In those cases N agrees with D.

[45] Sometimes one may wish to ascribe a deeper significance to a variant, especially if taken out of the context. E.g., the variant *brtags* DN : *rtag* P (**43n.1) might seem complicated enough to be interpreted as more than merely a spontaneous scribal mistake. But the general stemmatic constellation and the fact that *kun tu brtags pa* is the proper translation of *parikalpita* (also usually in P) leaves no room but to consider it as nothing more than that.

more frequently in **PN** (hence in the 'Phyiṅ ba rTag rtse manuscript version) than in **D**. And such occurrences in **PN** do usually effect rather strong semantic and syntactic distortions of the context, whereas similarly effected distortions in **D** are not quite as grave.[46]

Slightly more frequent than omissions are occurrences of altered formulations in **D**.[47] The phenomenon of transmitting altered formulations is, however, not less frequent in **PN**.[48]

23.   Unless future Tanjur research can prove that any of those two branches of transmission has made collational use of manuscripts that have not descended from the Źa lu collection, the following interpretations may be offered.

When a given stemmatically valid variant reading occurs in only one branch of transmission it has to be considered as originating due to the influences of some sort of redactional process p o s t - d a t i n g Bu ston's Źa lu recension.

In contrast to those faulty readings that have entered only one branch of transmission, there are other variants, which have already been transmitted by the Źa lu version. Some, if not most, of these may even go back to the original Tibetan translation of TrBh. Such "variants" can be identified when they are shared by **PND**, but are at variance with TrBh$_S$.

---

[46] Supposedly due to reasons related to the original generation of the Derge Tanjur (cf. above § 17), the syntactic distortions in D resulting from omissions of syllables and words (as exemplified above in note 42) are relatively mild if compared with those of PN (exemplified above in note 41).

[47] For example, in D
>   the phrase *de'i rnam par skyes pa'i phyir* has been turned
>   into *de'i rnam par śes pa'i phyir* (**5n.2);
>   the expression *rnam par brtags pa* into *rnam par rtog pa* (**37n.10);
>   the word *gźan* of kā. 19c has become *kyaṅ* (**38n.4);
>   while *btab pa* (= *ākṣipta*) changed into *brtags pa* (**38n.10),
>   the reading .... *dmigs pa daṅ | bde ba daṅ |* has become
>   .... *dmigs pa'i bde ba daṅ |* (**53n.3);
>   the change of *'bras bu daṅ | bden pa daṅ* into the reading
>   *'bras bu daṅ ldan pa daṅ* (**20n.4) is probably an instance of what ERB (*op. cit.*: 31)
>   called "Hörfehler" (graphic mistake on the basis of hearing a phonetic articulation
>   with various semantic semantic options); etc.

[48] For example, in PN
>   a change of *rnam par smin pa* into *rnam par śes pa* (**7n.17) has been effected;
>   *de ni len pa* of Kā. 3a has become *de'i len pa* (**8n.1);
>   *sems mi dga' ba* has turned into *sems ni ma dga' ba* (**31n.7);
>   *'phaṅs pa'i tshe ni 'gags* changed into *'phaṅs pa de'i tshe 'gags* (**42n.9);
>   *źes bya ba* has become *gźan źig* (**48n.1);
>   *rnam par 'tshe ba* (= *vihiṃsā*) turned into *sems can rnams la 'tshe ba* (**29n.16), etc.

Incompatibilities between TrBh$_S$ and TrBh$_t$ may either be due to correct translations from a manuscript deviating from the only available complete Sanskrit MS, or they may be due to factual mistranslations (cf. also note 40).

In the present edition of TrBh$_t$ such deviations from the Sanskrit have been noted in the apparatus. Especially in the case of problematic syntactic deviations these have only been indicated in the notes, while the text itself has been left as it has been transmitted.[49] But in the case of simple terminological mistranslations or incompatibilities these have been emended. The apparatus will then provide the transmitted readings, while the editorial emendations, being underlined in the text, are indicated with the sigla **Ed**.[50]

24. An interesting and important range of variant readings has been obtained by collating the *separate* translation of the *Trimśikākārikā* (Tr$_t$) with the version of Tr$_t$ as *included* in TrBh$_t$.

Significant syntactic differences between these two versions affect one third of the 30 kārikās. The readings transmitted in the separate Tr$_t$ version are often preferable to those of the version included in TrBh$_t$.[51] As has also

---

[49] Cf., e.g., the following notes in the apparatus to the Tibetan text: **8ns.12, 13, **10n.11, **11n.3, **13n.9, **16n.4, **18n.12, **26n.14, **27n.21, **28n.6, **30n.10, **33n.28, **34ns.4, 6, **37ns.20, 23, **40n.7, **41n.1, **44ns.10, 14, 15, **46n.16, **47ns.6, 7, 10, **48n.11, **53n.4.

[50] Cf., e.g., the following notes in the apparatus to the Tibetan text: **8n.15, **11n.14, **12n.4, **15ns.3, 8, **20n.9, **21ns.4,9 **25n.15, **29n.9, **30ns.1, 7, **31n.14, **36n.14, **37n.21, **42n.8, **45ns.3, 13, **48n.14, **53ns.5, 6.

[51] Affected by syntactic differences are Tr$_t$ 6d — 7a+b — 19b — 20d — 22b — 23a+c — 25c — 26cd — 27b — 30b+d.

Although both TrBh$_t$ and the separate Tr$_t$ have been translated by the same translator team, at least some of the syntactic differences we encounter do nevertheless seem to go back to the original translations. While some changes in the texts may have been introduced in the course of the subsequent transmission, it is known that, at some point, the translators themselves became actively involved in methodological reflections about translation techniques and in revising earlier translations falling short of these new standards (cf. above note 28). Some of the differences between the separate version of Tr$_t$ and the version of Tr$_t$ as included in TrBh$_t$ may be due to an unequal work of revising the texts. On the other hand, it is impossible to generally differentiate between those two versions of Tr$_t$ in terms of a sharp qualitative distinguishment. Even the wording of TrBh$_t$ alternates between supporting the wording of its own Tr$_t$ version and that of the separate version.

For example, the phrase *de srid du 'dzin pa gñis kyi bag la ñal mi ldog ste* in TrBh$_t$ (**49,10) clearly supports its own Tr$_t$ 26cd (*de srid 'dzin pa rnam gñis kyi || bag la ñal ba mi ldog go ||*), not the reading of the separate version (*'dzin pa gñis kyi bag la ñal || de srid rnam par mi ldog go ||*).

However, the readings of the separate versions of Tr$_t$ 27b and 30b+d are supported by respective quotations in TrBh$_t$ (**49,24 and **53,6 + **52,20).

been observed by Schoening, Dunhuang text have usually little value with regard to stemmatic evaluations of the classical branches of transmission.[52] Although the Dunhuang MSS consulted for the present edition have their orthographic peculiarities, some of which are typical and well known,[53] the

about translation techniques and in revising earlier translations falling short of these new standards (cf. above note 28). Some of the differences between the separate version of Tr_t and the version of Tr_t as included in $TrBh_t$ may be due to an unequal work of revising the texts. On the other hand, it is impossible to generally differentiate between those two versions of Tr_t in terms of a sharp qualitative distinguishment. Even the wording of $TrBh_t$ alternates between supporting the wording of its own Tr_t version and that of the separate version.

For example, the phrase *de srid du 'dzin pa gñis kyi bag la ñal mi ldog ste* in $TrBh_t$ (**49,10) clearly supports its own Tr_t 26cd (*de srid 'dzin pa rnam gñis kyi* || *bag la ñal ba mi ldog go* ||), not the reading of the separate version (*'dzin pa gñis kyi bag la ñal* || *de srid rnam par mi ldog go* ||).

However, the readings of the separate versions of Tr_t 27b and 30b+d are supported by respective quotations in $TrBh_t$ (**49,24 and **53,6 + **52,20).

[52] As noted by SCHOENING (1995: 150), "[t]he Dunhuang manuscripts have very few readings that are not shared with the Classical editions", that is, not shared as transmissional variants. That remark has been made with regard to the Kanjur transmission. According to HARRISON's (1992: xxxii) preface to his critical edition of the Tibetan translation of the *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra*, "the Dunhuang and the Tshal pa texts carry the same recension of the *DKP*". On the other hand, for the Tibetan version of the *Akṣayamati-nirdeśasūtra* it is, according to BRAARVIG (1993/I: vi n. 1), the Them spaṅs ma branch of the Kanjur, whose "readings are closest to the Dh [= Dunhuang] readings".

Concerning the Tanjur tradition, SCHOENING (1995: 178) has likewise indicated that, according to his experience, due to "stemmatically insignificant variants [...] there is no dramatic stemma to be discovered. The Dunhuang manuscripts share an equal number of variants with each of the two Tanjur traditions".

That is, generally speaking, the classical readings of no Tanjur branch of transmission are more conservative with regard to Dunhuang readings than those of the other.

[53] The manuscripts M_k and M_{bh} do a l w a y s add a *ya-btags* to the consonant *-m-* when it is provided with a *gi gu* or *'breṅ bu* (e.g., *myi* [3b], *myed* [7cd], *smyin* [2], *dmyigs* [5c]).

Having mentioned this well-known phenomenon here, it will not be specifically indicated in the apparatus to $TrBh_t$.

M_k does not show any reversed *gi-gu*, whereas a l l the *gi-gus* are reversed in M_{bh} (except in two cases, where the *gi-gu* on *phyir* of the expression *de'i phyir* assumes the classical shape). It should likewise suffice to generally refer to this peculiarity at this point. The single variants occuring in M_{bh} are conveniently listed in the notes to $TrBh_t$ **50-51. Peculiar orthographic variants found in M_k are, e.g.,

> *sa 'on* instead of the classical *sa bon* (Tr_t 2d, 18a),
> *las stsogs* instead of *la sogs* (4c, 11a, 22c),
> *sum* instead of *gsum* (11a),
> *khoṅ bkhro* instead of *khoṅ khro* (11d),
> *mkhon du 'dzin* instead of *khon du 'dzin* (12b),
> *ci bźin* instead of *ji bźin* (15d),
> *de ltar de ltar* instead of *de lta de ltar* (18c), etc.

25. There are two instances where the original Tibetan translations of TrBh deviates from the Sanskrit MS C, but corresponds to readings found in the Sanskrit manuscript fragment L (photographed by R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana in Tibet).[55] Yet, because L contains particular mistakes (such as omissions of words; cf. TrBh$_s$ *34 ns. 21, 24) not shared by TrBh$_t$, the fragment L cannot have belonged to the Sanskrit manuscript upon which the original Tibetan translation of TrBh is based. But the congruence of readings in L and TrBh$_t$ against the Sanskrit MS C evidences that L belonged to a stemmatic branch of a Sanskrit manuscript transmission of TrBh, which already in the 8th century has been distinct from that of C. That is, we may assume that the Skt. fragment L formed part of a manuscript belonging to the same branch of transmission as the (apparently lost) Sanskrit manuscript upon which the Tibetan translation is based. However, as we likewise recognize, this Sanskrit manuscript basis of TrBh$_t$ has hardly been faultless. A few of the peculiar readings of TrBh$_t$ which significantly deviate from the corresponding passages in TrBh$_s$ are probably due to corruptions in the 8th century Sanskrit text available to the Indo-Tibetan translator team.[56]

26. To summarize the results of my critical editions of TrBh$_s$ and TrBh$_t$:

As regards the Sanskrit text of TrBh, it has been possible, with the help of the available *testimonia*, to transform a faulty manuscript with a few lacunae into a philosophical document corresponding to an *archetype* that seems to come considerably close to the original text as it was composed by Sthiramati in the 6th century CE.

Some mistakes in TrBh$_t$ indicate that its Sanskrit basis was a text, which already in the 8th century contained omissions and additional materials, thus belonged to a stemmatic branch that was different from the one, which later (i.e. probably in the 12th century) produced our Sanskrit MS C/D. In other words, we can indirectly perceive that already in the 8th century (and, given the 6th century was the time of Sthiramati's floruit, supposedly much earlier)

---

[55] Cf. the two notes **34n.4 and **40n.6 in the apparatus to the Tibetan text.

[56] Apart from those two cases referred to above (in note 55), the notes in the critical apparatus to TrBh$_t$ referred to below are related to instances where the Tibetan translation may have correctly translated its Skt. manuscript basis, which, however, differed from the extant Sanskrit version with the result of generating incompatibilities between TrBh$_s$ and TrBh$_t$. Among the various types of incompatibilities between TrBh$_s$ and TrBh$_t$ are instances where TrBh$_t$ lacks textual material in relation to TrBh$_s$ (as in the case of **40n.6) and instances where TrBh$_t$ contains textual material lacking in TrBh$_s$ (as in the case of **34n.4):

(1) Omissions: cf. **18n.12 (it is possible that the omission of the phrase *abhiprete vastuny abhilāsa* has already happened in the underlying Skt. manuscript text due to haplography), and further **26n.14, **30n.10, **33n.28, **34n.6, **37n.20.

(2) For additional materials in TrBh$_t$ possibly originating in the underlying Skt. manuscript, cf. **25n.15, **27n.21, **37n.23 (the term *ālaya* may once have formed a marginal remark, which at one point has slipped into the Skt. text pertaining to a stemmatic line different from that of our available Skt. MS).

the transmission of TrBh$_s$ had split into various branches transmitting mistakes found in some MSS, but not in others. To the extent that the *testimonia* allow us to be aware of differences in the transmission at this stage, it has been possible to establish a text representing a version of TrBh$_s$ prior to the 8th century stage by simply eliminating the mistakes constituting it.

The present preparation of a critical edition of TrBh$_t$ does not intend to establish the original version of the Tibetan translation, but rather to transcend, though carefully, the historical versions of TrBh$_t$ altogether.

Although it has become evident that the 8th century Sanskrit manuscript upon which TrBh$_t$ is based, and the single complete Sanskrit manuscript at our disposal, belonged to different stemmatic branches, this fact does not, on the whole, all too seriously affect the generally fairly close congruence between TrBh$_S$ and TrBh$_t$.

Sigla, Signs, graphic devices, abbreviations, etc. used in TrBh$_s$

	used in TrBh$_s$ (and in the notes) to indicate a shift of the line in C, D, K, L (the beginning of the new line being designated on the margin)
xxxx[ ]xxx	lacuna in C/D (the cases in which akṣaras are partially damaged, yet partially still legible, have been reported)
=	corresponds to
{X}	superfluous akṣara
{X?}	superfluous illegible (or partially illegible) akṣara

Sigla designating the MSS of Tr$_s$ and TrBh$_s$ consulted on the basis of facsimile reproductions or photocopies of photographs (as described above §§ 9-10):

A	Tr	\
J	Tr	|
C	TrBh (archetype)	|
D	TrBh (archetype)	|
E	TrBh (copy of C)	} as found in 3WVSM
F	TrBh (copy of C)	|
G	TrBh (copy of C)	|
H	TrBh (copy of C)	|
I	TrBh (copy of D)	/
K	TrBh: 2 fols. [1 recto; 1 recto & verso sides] (Sāṅkṛtyāyana)	
L	TrBh: 2 fols. [2 recto sides] (Sāṅkṛtyāyana)	

Sigla, editorial conventions, etc. employed in the critical apparatus
(i.e., beyond the more general sigla, etc. listed in the select bibliography):

Lé	LÉVI's (1925) edition of TrBh$_s$
LÉse	LÉVI's (1932) own suggested emendations (= corrections of misprints, conjectures, etc.) to TrBh$_s$
JACse	JACOBI's (1932) suggested emendations to TrBh$_s$
LVPse	LA VALLÉE POUSSIN's (1935) suggested emendations to TrBh$_s$
UIse	UI's (1952) suggested emendations to TrBh$_s$
GOvl	*Variæ lectiones* related to MS K as provided in GOKHALE 1968. (Ed. had read K already before actually receiving GOvl and had discovered more variant readings than indicated in GOvl, though some of those GOvl provides had previously been overlooked. The siglum GOvl will be appended to all those variants Gokhale referred to, also when Ed.'s readings of K were only confirmed)
KANO	Edition of L in KANO 2005.
Ed.	refers to the editor of the present edition(s)
C/etc.	C and at least two copies of C (but not Lé)
C/Lé	C up to Lé (= C, at least two, though usually all, copies of C, as well as Lé)
+K1a1	Beginning of the indicated line (here: a1) of K1 (i.e. 1st fol. of K)
K1a1+	End of the indicated line (here: a1) of K1

For the sigla related to the critical edition of TrBh$_t$, see above: Introduction § 21