The rich epigraphic legacy of Alchi’s chos ’khor was brought to the attention of the scholarly community mainly by Denwood’s pioneering study (1980). Altogether he published twelve inscriptions, which are located in the gSum brtsogs (5), the ’Du khang (5), the Lo tsa ba lha khang (1), and on a piece of stone forming part of a wall to the south of the ’Du khang (1). Denwood also mentions traces of several other unspecified inscriptions, but regrettably they were already in such a bad state of preservation when he came to

1 Some of the compound’s inscriptions were already referred to in earlier publications (see, e.g., Francke 1914: 89-92 and Snellgrove & Skorupski 1977: 30ff., 45 and 48ff.), but Denwood provided the first editions and translations of most of these invaluable sources.

2 For a sketch plan of the compound showing the approximate positions of the inscriptions, see Denwood 1980: 118.
A fragmentary inscription that has gone largely unnoticed so far is to be found in the southern niche of the mchod rtens opposite the entrance of the gSum brtsegs (Fig. 1). Located immediately beneath two bands of painted mchod rtens and Buddhas in the upper parts of the niche’s east, south and west walls (Fig. 2), the epigraph renders a passage from the Caityapradakṣinagatā inscription beneath painted bands of mchod rtens and Buddhas.

The inscription is written in regular letters and contains two dbu can as well as four (partly uncertain) instances of palatalised m before e and i. There are no cases of superabundant ’a rjes ’jug, gi gu log or horizontal ligatures. Although the preserved passage is relatively short and thus provides only limited evidence, by and large these orthographic and palaeographic features tally well with the 13th century dating that LUCZANITS (2003: 28-37) proposed for a painted figure in the upper parts of the mchod rtens. The same dating is also postulated for the structure itself by KOZICZ and it thus seems that the inscription was executed not long after the mchod rtens had been erected.

Whether all of these painted bands were originally combined with inscriptional panels cannot be decided with certainty, but it seems rather likely.

Such unfinished restorations are not uncommon and in the course of my work on Tibetan inscriptions I have come across several cases where a panel was, wholly or partly, provided with a new ground coat without ever being inscribed again. For a more extensive discussion of epigraphic palimpsests and the resulting problems in dating Tibetan inscriptions, see TROPPER & SCHERRER-SCHAUB (forthcoming).

The limitations in dating Tibetan witnesses solely on the basis of their orthographic and palaeographic features have been pointed out often enough and do not need to be repeated in detail here; see, e.g., TROPPER 2007: 109f. and the sources cited there. For a rough chronological classification scheme, see SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1999 and SCHERRER-SCHAUB & BONANI 2002.

Ibid.: 118.

Cf. the plan provided in SNELLGROVE & SKORUPSKI 1977: 24f., where the mchod rtens is marked “J2” (the north arrow in this plan is wrong and should be rotated roughly 80 degrees anti-clockwise). The structure itself and some of its art work have already been discussed in SNELLGROVE & SKORUPSKI 1977: 77f. and LUCZANITS 2003: 28-37. The configuration of the complicated mchod rtens is presently being analysed by KOZICZ, whose forthcoming publication will provide elaborate plans and drawings (see also http://stupa.arch-research.at).

Tib. mChod rtens bskor ba’i tshigs su bcad pa. The Sanskrit title is given, with some minor variants, at the beginning of the text. Note that its third to last syllable does not have an ’a chung in any of the collated Tibetan witnesses (for which, see below). I thus prefer the spelling Caityapradakṣinagatā, although, as a single word, the feminine form pradakṣinā is perhaps more common. The masculine/neuter form in the title is also corroborated by the various collated Sanskrit sources (cf. Appendix B).
In any case, the above-mentioned peculiarities strongly suggest that the fragmentary epigraph predates what Eimer (1997: viii) has called the Kanjur “Vulgate” (all dating from the 15th century or later), therefore making it a valuable witness for what has come to be known as Kanjur Studies. The inscription seems of particular interest in view of the potentially independent Kanjur tradition in Western Tibet that was first presumed by Eimer (1991: 245ff.) and has subsequently been corroborated by text-critical research on the manuscript Kanjur from Phug brag. For the stemmatic analysis provided below, I have thus collated the following Tibetan witnesses of the Caityapradaksinagathā:

E Manuscript Kanjur kept at the Newark Museum (Newark, New Jersey): mdo bsde, va, 249r2-251r2.17

14 See, e.g., HARRISON 1992: xxxii-xxxvi, SCHOENING 1995: 136, TROOPER 1996: 71, ZIMMERMANN 2002a: 173-177 and 193-206. The Phug brag versions of the respective texts that formed the objects of these studies could be shown to be independent of the two main lines of transmission formed by the descendants of the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma Kanjurs.
15 The folio and page numbers refer to the complete text. Specifications for the passage rendered in the inscription are given in the edition provided below. Only after I had already collated most of the witnesses did I become aware of Warner BELANGER’s unpublished MA thesis “Caityapradaksinagathā: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text based on Six Editions of the Kanjur”, which was submitted to the University of Texas at Austin in 2000. Because all but two of the witnesses that I have collated were available in Vienna, gaining access to BELANGER’s thesis only during the later stages of my own work did not turn out to be a serious disadvantage, however. The programme of the XVth congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (Atlanta, June 2008) contained the announcement of the following paper by BELANGER: “Redaction and the Ritual Efficacy of the Stūpa Cult in the Prakṛṣṭa Textual Tradition”. His article “The Role of Devotion in the Caityapradaksinagatha and the Efficacy of the Stupa Cult” was announced to be published in “The Stupa, ed. Lokesh Chandra” (http://www.gcsu.edu/history/warner_antony_belanger_iii.htm; last visited May 19, 2010). By the time the present article was submitted for publication, this study had not appeared.
16 Text No. 321 according to the catalogue by Ut et al. (1934: 60).
17 Text No. 8 of vol. vi according to the preliminary catalogue provided by DIETZ (2002: 26). I used photographic prints made from a microfilm in the private possession of Dr. Dietz.
JLNQS were chosen in accordance with the recommendations by Harrison (1992: xlviif.), and GoZ seemed especially relevant with regard to the above-mentioned assumption of an independent Kanjur tradition in Western Tibet. The value of the Newark Kanjur was first pointed out by Skilling (1994: xxv-xxx, 1997a: 190-193) and has been confirmed by more recent studies.25 The Derge Kanjur is probably the most widely available, and its collation thus seemed to be apposite, even though it has been repeatedly shown to be text-critically not particularly relevant.26

The Caityapradakṣināgāthā is not extant among the Tabo manuscript collection,27 and it is also not listed in Samten’s catalogue of the Phug brag Kanjur (1992). Herrmann-Pfandt (2008: 160) states that there are no witnesses for it among the Dunhuang manuscript collections kept in Paris and London.

None of the collated versions has a colophon and thus the names of the translators are unknown. Yet as the text is listed in both the lhān kar ma28 and the ’Phang thang ma29 catalogues, the Tibetan translation can be attributed with some degree of certainty to the beginning of the 9th century or earlier.30


27 The first volume of the Tabo manuscript catalogue has recently been published (Herrmann-Pfandt 2009) and the second volume (by Cristina Scherrer-Schaub) is due to appear soon. I am grateful to Helmut Tauscher, who had access to pre-print versions of both volumes and informed me that the text was not found in the Tabo collection (oral communication).

28 See Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 159ff.


30 On the dates of the two catalogues (late 8th or early 9th century), see Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: xviii-xxi and xxv-xxvi. Of course, it cannot be definitely proven that the versions at the disposal of the compilers of these catalogues and the collated Kanjur witnesses derive from the same translation and were essentially identical. But as long as we do not have any concrete evidence for two (or even more) translations and/or Tibetan recensions of the text, one should probably act on the assumption that there was only one. Both catalogues list the text with 70 slokas, and according to Herrmann-Pfandt (2008: 160) and Eimer (1998: 67) the same specification is found in the 20th century Kanjur from Lhasa (which is known to be a conflation of the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma lines). Herrmann-Pfandt (2008: lxxi) also notes that such sloka specifications in the various Kanjur versions or in their dkar chags frequently just follow the information provided by the lhān kar ma and often appear to be rounded or estimated rather than exact figures (ibid.: xxx). Moreover, the mean value of 25.5 that she ascertained for the ratio of slokas as stated in the lhān kar ma per folio of the corresponding texts in the Derge Kanjur (ibid.: xxxf.) is quite close to the figure of 26.9 (i.e., 70/2.6) that the analogous calculation yields for the Caityapradakṣināgāthā. Thus I do not see any reason to assume that the text versions available to the compilers of the lhān kar ma and the ’Phang thang ma were essentially different from the collated Kanjur witnesses.

28 See Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 159ff.


30 On the dates of the two catalogues (late 8th or early 9th century), see Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: xviii-xxi and xxv-xxvi. Of course, it cannot be definitely proven that the versions at the disposal of the compilers of these catalogues and the collated Kanjur witnesses derive from the same translation and were essentially identical. But as long as we do not have any concrete evidence for two (or even more) translations and/or Tibetan recensions of the text, one should probably act on the assumption that there was only one. Both catalogues list the text with 70 slokas, and according to Herrmann-Pfandt (2008: 160) and Eimer (1998: 67) the same specification is found in the 20th century Kanjur from Lhasa (which is known to be a conflation of the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma lines). Herrmann-Pfandt (2008: lxxi) also notes that such sloka specifications in the various Kanjur versions or in their dkar chags frequently just follow the information provided by the lhān kar ma and often appear to be rounded or estimated rather than exact figures (ibid.: xxx). Moreover, the mean value of 25.5 that she ascertained for the ratio of slokas as stated in the lhān kar ma per folio of the corresponding texts in the Derge Kanjur (ibid.: xxxf.) is quite close to the figure of 26.9 (i.e., 70/2.6) that the analogous calculation yields for the Caityapradakṣināgāthā. Thus I do not see any reason to assume that the text versions available to the compilers of the lhān kar ma and the ’Phang thang ma were essentially different from the collated Kanjur witnesses.

31 See Appendix B.

32 As Belanger (2000: 3 and 9) points out, the Tibetan Caityapradakṣināgāthā is basically an expanded version of the Pradakṣināgāthā, the former being longer by thirteen verses. For the textual parallels, see Belanger 2000: 8-14. The redaction of the text will probably be treated in some more detail in the published version of Belanger’s paper mentioned in note 15 above.

33 See Nanho 1883: 110. A brief biographical sketch of Śikṣānanda (652-710) with primary sources is provided in Lamotte 2005: 298, n. 175.

34 The complete text of the passage that corresponds to the inscriptive text is rendered (in Chinese characters) in Appendix A.

35 Cf. the short discussion and summary of the Khotanese manuscript by Emmerick (1990: 645-646 and 1992: 27). According to him, the Caityapradakṣināgāthā as it is extant in the various Kanjur collections is a “similar text on the same subject”.
has not been taken into account here. The same holds for the comparatively late translation in the Mongolian Kanjur.\textsuperscript{36}

**EDITORIAL SYSTEM AND SIGNS**

The edition is based on video-documentation that I prepared in August 2002 and it renders the text of the inscription as it appeared at that time.\textsuperscript{37} The critical apparatus contains the divergent evidence of the Kanjur versions\textsuperscript{38} as well as an evaluation of all significant variants.\textsuperscript{39} In order to keep the apparatus from becoming even bulkier, the Sanskrit sources and the You rao fo ta gong de jing were adduced for this evaluation only when their testimony was of possible relevance.

\textsuperscript{36} Text No. 1081 according to the catalogue of LIGETI (1942: 292). For a preliminary report on the genesis and transmission of the Mongolian Kanjur, see KOLLMAR-PAULENZ 2002.

\textsuperscript{37} From the video-sequences some 200 single exposures were extracted; they can now be viewed at http://www.univie.ac.at/Tibetan-inscriptions (links: Ladakh → Alchi → Small stūpa (I) → Inscription 01).

\textsuperscript{38} Variants of the type “ba : pa” have usually not been recorded. On the reasons for ignoring such differences, see TROPPER 2005: 142, n. 7.

\textsuperscript{39} While the boundary between significant and insignificant variants is not always easy to draw, I have generally refrained from discussing morphological differences like “thob : thub”. It is well known that such forms were used very indiscriminately in early sources, and even in modern texts one encounters such alternative stems for many verbs. A decision about which form was extant in the original translation of a Kanjur text thus is usually impossible. Moreover, in cases like “skor ba : bskor ba” the semantic difference between the verbal noun (lit. ‘the circumambulating’) and the nomen actionis (lit. ‘the circumambulation’) – respectively formed with what is now generally given as present (skor) and future (bskor) stem – is quite marginal, and even where we do have an extant Skt. text, it usually does not allow for a decision to be made (cf. TROPPER 2005: 279). Similarly, variants like “ser : gser” occur too frequently in early sources for a discussion about which reading was original to be meaningful. Single readings in the descendants of the Tshal pa and of the Them spangs ma Kanjurs (i.e., DJQLSN) have not been discussed either, because they obviously result from scribal error or damaged printing blocks. They have nevertheless been recorded because they sometimes provide valuable evidence for the ascertainment of the stemmatic situation. E also contains a large number of single readings, many of which have to be clearly rejected or are inferior to those found in the other witnesses. Its single readings are only discussed if there seemed to be some possibility that they constitute the original text and if there is any significant evidence supporting or contradicting one of the variants. Lastly, readings which result in metrically incorrect verses or verse-lines are generally not submitted to any further analysis.

\textsuperscript{40} Cf. the introduction.

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. STEINKELLNER & LUCZANITZ 1999: 15, n. 12, where ‘letter’ is defined as “any combination of letters in the Tibetan alphabet that occupy in vertical arrangement of the letter sequence the space of a single grapheme”, whereas letter “refers to the single signs for consonants or vowel modification only”.

\textsuperscript{42} Cf. DIETZ 2002: 14. For further examples of this particular sign, albeit used somewhat differently, see DOTSON 2007: 19, and TROPPER 2005: 88, n. 52.

\textsuperscript{43} Note that the empty space that is found more or less regularly before and after a shad or double shad has not been recorded.

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. S TEINKELLNER & L UCZANITZ 1999: 16, where ‘‘letter’’ is defined as “any combination of letters in the Tibetan alphabet that occupy in vertical arrangement of the letter sequence the space of a single grapheme”, whereas letter “refers to the single signs for consonants or vowel modification only”.

\textsuperscript{45} Note that the empty space that is found more or less regularly before and after a shad or double shad has not been recorded.

\textsuperscript{46} Cf. S TEINKELLNER & L UCZANITZ 1999: 16, where ‘‘letter’’ is defined as “any combination of letters in the Tibetan alphabet that occupy in vertical arrangement of the letter sequence the space of a single grapheme”, whereas letter “refers to the single signs for consonants or vowel modification only”.\textsuperscript{47}
third verse-line ends in med pa bzhi po (with the stress on pa and po), which is metrically highly unusual (cf. HAHN 1996: 222f.), and dang in DGoJLNQSZ has an equivalent (ca) in MS(s). For the other variants, cf. note 39.

45 phręs-lag': phrul rkang DGoJLNQSZ, 'phrul kyi rkang E.

46 pa : pa'i DJLNQSZ, pa bzhi' E.

Stylistically, the genitive construction with pa'i is perhaps to be preferred, but as a "referential accusative" (cf. HAHN 1996: 55f.) rdzu 'phrul rkang pa can also be justified. MS(s) (rddhipāda)vasiṇāprāptaḥ and G3 (riddhipādāvasiṇāprāptaḥ) allow for both pa and pa'ı, whereas E's pa bzhi is not supported by the Skt. sources (and results in a metrically incorrect verse-line).

47 thob : 'thob DJLNQSZ, thob po E.

48 == : / DJLNQSZ, / Go (at the end of the line).

In the inscription a double shad was probably followed by an empty space amounting to the size of one or two 'letters' (i.e., //<1> or //<2>), which separated the two columns of the panel from each other (cf. the introduction).

49 ]=== dang : mchod rten bskor byas (byas : bce E) pas ni \ / / \ / E 'phugs pa'i bden pa (bden pa : bstan pa N, bden pa // in Go) bzhi po dang \ / / \ / E dbang (dbang N) po rnams dang stobs (stobs : stob, L) rnams (rnams : : dan Go) dang DEGoJLNQSZ.

For E's bce, cf. note 44. In Go, the scribe may have accidentally omitted rnams and then, realising his mistake, preferred to insert dan because it takes up less space.

50 \ / \ / \ / EL.

51 lag : logs E.

52 bu : bur N.

53 thob : 'thob DJLNQSZ.

54 s-or : bskor DEGoJLNQSZ.

55 par== : pas ni \ / DJLNQSZ, pas na E, pa, ning \ / Go (it seems that the scribe first wrote pas dang and then corrected his mistake).

The lacuna seems too small to allow for the reading(s) of D(E)(Go)JLNQSZ followed by an empty space (i.e., pas ni //<1>) (cf. the corresponding footnote at the end of line 1; for E's na, cf. note 44). Thus the inscription may have read pas ni //<1> (i.e., omitting the double shad [like at the end of line 1 in the right column of the panel]), or "ni //" could have been placed at the beginning of the next line in that part of the inscription which is beginning together missing now (cf. the following footnote).

56 ]=== phrul : (ni //) mngon shes drug ldan zag po med (zag po med : zag po myed Go, zab med po E, zag med po LSZ) \ / / \ / E nyon mong shes cad (thams cad : tham d)
rteng skor⁷⁵ =-y-⁷⁶ pas⁷⁷ ni //⁷⁸ =-rteng⁷⁹ da⁸⁰ du⁸¹ de bzhin gshegs⁸²

\{2\} mtshan⁸³ =-g⁸⁴ kyis ni rgyand⁸⁵ pa dang //⁸⁶ gser 'dra'i⁸⁷ -ku⁸⁸ mdog

---

Skt. (and Chin.) witnesses (cf. note 67) neither pa dang nor pa'i / pa yi can be ruled out as the original reading.

71 // : / E, Go om. // (at the end of the line), / L.

72 -gyal : rgyal DEGoJLNQSZ.

73 -uh : chub DEGoJLNQSZ.

74 thob : 'thob DEJNQ.

75 skor : bskor DEGoJLNQSZ.

76 =-y= : ba byas DEGoJLNQSZ.

77 pas : pa E (cf. note 44).

78 // : / E.

79 ==-rteng : 'jig rten DEGoJLNQSZ.

80 ga : dag DEGoJLNQSZ.

81 du : tu DEGoJLNQSZ.

82 gshegs : gshegs // DGoJLNQSZ, gshegs // N (at the end of the line; the sign below the sh looks more like a ya btags, but it is probably just a slightly botched d, i.e., the usual abbreviation for gs), gshegs E.

83 mtshan : mthar E.

84 ==g : rnams DGoJLNQSZ, rnams E.

85 rgyand : bgryan DEJLNQSZ, bgryan Go.

86 // : / E.

87 'dra'i : gyi DEJLNQSZ.

For angrirasena / anisrāsena[na] in G1 and G3, see note 34 in Appendix B. MW notes that according to the lexicographers rasa can have the meaning ‘gold’, but the Skt. sources do not allow for a decision in regard to the Tibetan variants 'dra'i and gyi. In the Chinese version what corresponds to the second half of the quatrain in the Tibetan text reads de miao zi jin se, xiang hao zhuang yan shen. While zj jin se is attested for Skt. suvāraṃśa (see Hirakawa 1997: 928), miao ‘wonderful’, ‘exquisite’, ‘fine’, just seems to have been added metri causa. Moreover, de and shen obviously correspond to ‘thob and sku, while xiang hao and zhuang yan tally with mtshan rnams and bgryan(d) pu (see, again, Hirakawa 1997: 871 and 1015, where the terms are listed as equivalents of Skt. laksana and alamkīta, respectively). In any case, like the Sanskrit sources, the Chinese version does not have a direct equivalent for 'dra'i or gyi. This could be interpreted as supporting the semantically weaker gyi, but the variant in GoI certainly cannot be ruled out as original reading.

88 -ku : sku DEGoJLNQSZ.

---

\[\text{The Caityapradaksinagāthā} \] Inscription in Alchi ...

\{3\} ==-yang⁹² -ko⁹³ ba yin // -'i³⁰³ ni skor¹⁰⁴ ba¹⁰⁵

---

89 thob : 'thob DJNQ.

90 =-yur : 'gyur DEGoJLNQSZ.

91 == : / DGoJLNQSZ, / E.

92 ==-yang : las kyang DEGoJLNQSZ.

93 -kor : bskor DEGoJLNQSZ.

94 ==-g : / ngag DGoJLNQSZ (if the inscription had the same text as DGoJLNQSZ, there must have been a fairly large empty space on both sides of the double shad); in E, yin is followed by a double tshag (=) and the next two verse-lines are missing. The easiest explanation for the omission in E would be that the scribe accidentally skipped the passage due to the repetitive structure at the end of the verse-lines (= bskor ba yin). G1 (manahy), G3 (kāyakarma, vākakarma, [m]ajapak karma) and the Chin. version (shen ye, ya ye [zan tan]) also support DGoJLNQSZ. MS and BL2 appear to have had a somewhat different text, but the decisive passages (i.e., those that may have contained a form of vāc and/or manas) are unfortunately lamentable.

95 gi=g : gi las DGoJLNQSZ, gis las Q.

96 ==: =-yur DEGoJLNQSZ.

97 kyis s : kyi las DGoJLNQSZ.

98 skor : bskor DGoJLNQSZ.

99 == : yin // DGoJLNQSZ.

100 s-o=lam : smon lam DGoJLNQSZ, smon lam E.

101 pa yang : pa'ang DJNQSZ, pa' ang L.

102 skor : bskor DGoJLNQSZ.

103 ‘i : 'dir DGoJLNQSZ, 'dir J, 'di E.

The damaged space seems too small to allow for the conjecture 'dir. Perhaps the inscription read as in E, but the remaining traces rather suggest 'ri, i.e., the scribe inadvertently may have skipped the letter d. Neither the Skt. sources nor the Chinese version have an equivalent for 'dir or 'di.

104 skor : bskor DGoJLNQSZ.

105 ba : bar E.
bSa-ba yi\(^{106}\)= byas pa yis DJLNQSZ, byas yin E, byas pas ni Go.

107 // : E.

108 = sprod: bsgrod DJNQ, sprod E, sprod GoLSZ. Judging from the remaining traces, the inscription may have read "\(=w\)grod, bsgrod or "\(=s\)prod, the latter being most likely. Instead of the six verse-lines starting from las the Skt. and Chinese versions have only four and they do not provide any evidence in regard to the Tibetan readings at hand.

109 = yang: dka’ DJNQ, kha ELSZ, ka ‘ang Go.

The remaining traces of the damaged ‘letter’ suggest that the inscription read ka yang rather than kha yang, but in either case yang has to be emended to (or at least read as) ‘ang in order to get a metrically correct verse-line. Irrespective of this, it is difficult to decide which of the readings in the various witnesses should be preferred. The apparently similar text in Go and in the inscription (i.e., the oldest witnesses) does not make much sense and kha seems even less plausible. Thus it perhaps stands to reason to take ka (yang’ ‘ang) as an irregular spelling of dka’ (yang’ ‘ang). Again, the Skt. and the Chinese versions do not provide any evidence.

110 bde grub-e-g=-ved: bde dguq don rna\(s\) (rnam: rnam, L) ‘grub DJLNQSZ, bde dguq don rnam ‘gug E, bde grub the tson myed Go. The inscription most likely read as in Go.

While arthasid[\(dh\)]i\(^{118}\) in BL2 (also cf. the partly damaged text in MS and G1) corresponds to don rna\(s\) ‘grub in DQj(L)SNZ, bde dguq does not have an equivalent in the Skt. sources or in the Chinese version, and neither do Go(\(i\))’s bde grub and the tson myed. Moreover, in combination with don, E’s (rnam\(s\))’ ‘gug would be highly unusual, but semantically it does not seem altogether impossible. The Chinese huo ci da li yi (huo: cheng in the Old Sung, Sung, Yuan and Ming editions) (i.e., “one obtains / accomplishes these great benefits”) constitutes only a loose equivalent to the concluding verse-line in the Tibetan translation, but (huo\(u\))\(o\) li\(u\) rather speaks in favour of don rna\(s\) (‘grub) (cf. HIRAKAWA 1997: 191, s.v. li\(y\)). In any case, here the Skt., Chin. and Tibetan versions are at variance to such a degree that the significance of the Skt. and Chinese witnesses is rather limited in regard to a decision about the original Tibetan text.

111 = : // DGoJLNQSZ, ‘E.

112 The prescript now looks like a, but the erstwhile loop at its lower left tip simply seems to have flaked off.

113 po= mchod: po’i mchod DGoJLNQSZ, po= mchod E.

114 rt=-: rten DEGoJLNQSZ.

115 skor: bskor DGoJLNQSZ, bskar E.

116 byas pa’i: byed pas E.

Of the collated Skt. sources, MS, G1 and G3 correspond most closely to the Tibetan version, and the preserved absolutive (\(k\)rtv\(u\)) in G3 rather supports the reading byas (pa’i).

117 =sprod: // DGoJLNQSZ, ‘E.

The inscription most likely read as in Go.

While arthasid[\(dh\)]i\(^{118}\) in BL2 (also cf. the partly damaged text in MS and G1) corresponds to don rna\(s\) ‘grub in DQj(L)SNZ, bde dguq does not have an equivalent in the Skt. sources or in the Chinese version, and neither do Go(\(i\))’s bde grub and the tson myed. Moreover, in combination with don, E’s (rnam\(s\))’ ‘gug would be highly unusual, but semantically it does not seem altogether impossible. The Chinese huo ci da li yi (huo: cheng in the Old Sung, Sung, Yuan and Ming editions) (i.e., “one obtains / accomplishes these great benefits”) constitutes only a loose equivalent to the concluding verse-line in the Tibetan translation, but (huo\(u\))\(o\) li\(u\) rather speaks in favour of don rna\(s\) (‘grub) (cf. HIRAKAWA 1997: 191, s.v. li\(y\)). In any case, here the Skt., Chin. and Tibetan versions are at variance to such a degree that the significance of the Skt. and Chinese witnesses is rather limited in regard to a decision about the original Tibetan text.

118 tse: tsho DJLNQSZ, tse om. E (see the following note).

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

119 lue shuo ju neng jin)

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

120 // : E.

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

121 // : E.

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

122 // : E.

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

123 // : E.

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

124 // : E.

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-

125 // : E.

In the Chinese version the actual ged shi shu zhu cun ci ji yi. she li fo deng yi qie zhong hui. jie da huan xi xin lue shuo ju neng jin (roughly cor-
The Caityapradaksinagāthā Inscription in Alchi ...

tsa'i\textsuperscript{145} bu mo rgya\textsuperscript{146} //\textsuperscript{147} nor bu\textsuperscript{148} rna\textsuperscript{149} cha\textsuperscript{150}

Right column (D 200v4, E 250v2, Go 56v2, J 215r1, L 350v3, N 314v6, Q 209v8, S 404v2, Z 437v4)

\{1\} gdu\textsuperscript{151} = khor\textsuperscript{152} \textsuperscript{153} tho\textsuperscript{154} = ser\textsuperscript{155} dpung\textsuperscript{156} = rgya\textsuperscript{157} = chang\textsuperscript{158} pa\textsuperscript{159} = \textsuperscript{160} gya\textsuperscript{161} = brgyand\textsuperscript{162} pa\textsuperscript{163} = skor\textsuperscript{164} ba'i go\textsuperscript{165} = phod\textsuperscript{166} \textsuperscript{167} // (XI) = \textsuperscript{168}

145 tsa'i: 'de ya DSZ, 'dzm E, tsi'i Go, dz'i yi N, dza'i L, ji yi Q. Various spellings are attested in the dictionaries, but E’s ‘(gam bu) ‘dzam almost certainly has to be ruled out as original reading and Q’s ‘ji (yi) just seems to result from a damaged printing block.

146 rgya: brgya DEGoJLNQS. Cf. v. IX.

147 // : E.

148 bu: bu'i Go. The Skt. sources (āmuktamarikā-vyākaraṇa) allow for both readings.

149 rna: rnam E.

150 cha: ca L.

151 gdu:\textsuperscript{151} = khor : gdub 'khor DGoJN, gdu 'kor E, gdub kor LSZ, gdur 'kor Q. Both gdub 'khor and gdub kor are attested, but not E and Q’s readings, which most likely just result from scribal error.

152 tho:\textsuperscript{152} = thogs DEGoJLNQS.

153 // : E.

154 ser:\textsuperscript{154} = gser DEGoJLNQS. Cf. v. XI.

155 = = gyi DEGoJLNQS.

156 dpung:\textsuperscript{156} = chung Q.

157 -gya\textsuperscript{157} = rgyan DGoJLNQS, brgyan E.

158 'chang: chad E. The Skt. sources (dharā) clearly support the reading 'chang.

159 == : dang DEJLNQS, yang Go. Neither dang nor yang has a direct equivalent in the Skt. sources. 160 // : E.

161 ======== = l-gs: mgrin (mgrin: ' brin E, 'grind Go) pa gser gyis (gyis: gyi E) legs DEGoJLNQS.

162 brgyand: brgyan DEJLNQS, ‘1’ brgyan N.

163 // : E.

164 skor: bskor DEGoJLNQS.

165 ge:\textsuperscript{165} = phod de : gom pa gcig (gcig: cig Go) bor (bor: por Q) ba'i // bcu drug char DEGoJLNQS, gom pa cig = por 'i // bcu drug chad E.
The Skt. sources’ -eka- corresponds to the cardinal number gcig. The variant in EGo is probably just an irregular spelling (the correct “sandhi-form” of the indefinite pronoun would be zhiig).

166 ======== = gangs (gangs: grangs\textsuperscript{3} E) kyi 'gang chen DEGoJLNQS.

If the inscription had the same text as DEGoJLNQS, the letters must have been very compact. The Skt. sources (haimavatā) clearly support the reading gangs.
The Caityapradaksinagāthā Inscription in Alchi ...

[18] 168 a gang gis 191 sangs rgyas mchod 192 r-n 193 la // 194 dag 195 ba'i sems kyis 196 gom= 197 =m bu'i 198 -u-u=se 199rang == grangs 200 snyed // 201 de-i 202 de 203 dang

189 myi : mi DEJLNQSZ.
190 phod de : phod do DEGoJLNQSZ, phodo L, yod do E. Cf. note 143.
191 gis 192 gi E.
The Skt. sources (yo buddhacaityeṣu … [vidvān] and ye buddhacaityeṣu …) clearly militate against E’s reading.
192 mchod : mo4chod E.
193 r-n : rten DEGoJLNQSZ.
194 // : E.
195 kyis : kyi E.
The Skt. sources (yo … prasannacittāḥ and ye … prasannacittāḥ) rather support the reading of DEGoJLNQSZ.
196 gom== 197 =m : gom pa gcig (gcig = cig E) bor (bor = por EQ) ba (ba = ba’i Go) DEGJLNQSZ.
The extent of the damaged passages and the remaining traces do not allow for the readings of DEGoJLNQSZ. The inscription may have featured the Tibetan numeral for 1 instead of gcig. Go’s ba’i does not make much sense and is also contradicted by the nominatives in all Skt. sources (cf. notes 191 and 195).
197 // : E.
198 ==b== : dum pa geig (geig = cig E) bor (bor = por EQ) ba (ba = ba’i Go) DEGJLNQSZ.
The inscription probably read chu klung ser. The Skt. sources allow for both chu klung (g)ser and chu bo’i gser (cf. the previous note and see L.Ch.: s.v. ‘dצam bu chu klung and ‘dצam bu chu bo’i gser), while chu bo klung gser is unmetrical. See also note 208.
200 ==grangs : ‘bum grangs DEGoJLNQSZ.
201 // : E.
202 -i : ni DEGoJLNQSZ, nyid E.
Neither ni nor nyid has a direct equivalent in the Skt. sources. Thus the semantically weaker ni is perhaps slightly to be preferred.
203 de : de om. E. The Skt. sources (nāsyam samā … yo/ye) clearly support the reading of DEGoJLNQSZ. See also note 205.

The Skt. sources do not have an equivalent for either variant. In combination with the preceding (b)gya, however, snyed (for which see BEYER 1992: 230) clearly has to be preferred.

90 phod de : phod do DEGoJLNQSZ, phodo L, yod do E. Cf. note 143.
91 gis 192 gi E.
The Skt. sources (yo buddhacaityeṣu … [vidvān] and ye buddhacaityeṣu …) clearly militate against E’s reading.
92 mchod : mo4chod E.
93 r-n : rten DEGoJLNQSZ.
94 // : E.
95 kyis : kyi E.
The Skt. sources (yo … prasannacittāḥ and ye … prasannacittāḥ) rather support the reading of DEGoJLNQSZ.
96 gom== 197 =m =: gom pa geig (gcig = cig E) bor (bor = por EQ) ba (ba = ba’i Go) DEGJLNQSZ.
The extent of the damaged passages and the remaining traces do not allow for the readings of DEGoJLNQSZ. The inscription may have featured the Tibetan numeral for 1 instead of gcig. Go’s ba’i does not make much sense and is also contradicted by the nominatives in all Skt. sources (cf. notes 191 and 195).
97 // : E.
98 ==b== : dum pa geig (geig = cig E) bor (bor = por EQ) ba (ba = ba’i Go) DEGJLNQSZ.
The inscription probably read chu klung ser. The Skt. sources allow for both chu klung (g)ser and chu bo’i gser (cf. the previous note and see L.Ch.: s.v. ‘dצam bu chu klung and ‘dצam bu chu bo’i gser), while chu bo klung gser is unmetrical. See also note 208.
200 ==grangs : ‘bum grangs DEGoJLNQSZ.
201 // : E.
202 -i : ni DEGoJLNQSZ, nyid E.
Neither ni nor nyid has a direct equivalent in the Skt. sources. Thus the semantically weaker ni is perhaps slightly to be preferred.
203 de : de om. E. The Skt. sources (nāsyam samā … yo/ye) clearly support the reading of DEGoJLNQSZ. See also note 205.
West wall  
(D 200v6, E 250v5, Go 56v4, J 215r3, L 350v6, Z 438r1)
{1} ==ngg\textsuperscript{204} pa yod\textsuperscript{205} ma yi==\textsuperscript{206} 207 (XIII) mkhas pa \textsuperscript{208}  
{2} [  
{3} [  

**Translation**\textsuperscript{209}

(I) [Through having made a circumambulation of a stūpa\textsuperscript{210}] one attains [the four applications of awareness (catvāri smṛtyupasthānāni),] all the four

\[204 ==ngg : mtshungs DEGoNQSZ, mtshung, L.\]

\[205 yod : yod om. E, yong L. In E, the whole verse-line (de n Reid dang mtshungs pa ma yin) has only seven syllables and a metrically poor structure. After the preceding erroneous omission of de (cf. note 203), the omission of yod may well have been a makeshift correction to achieve an uneven number of syllables again.\]

\[206 yi== : yin // DGJLNQSZ, yin ‘E.\]

\[207 Go ins. mkhas pa gang gis sangs rygas mchod rten la // dga’ ba’i sens kyis gom pa gcig bor ba // ‘djam bu’i chu klang gser srang ‘bum grangs snyed // de ni de dang mtshungs par yod ma yin // -- an obvious case of ditypography.\]

\[208 In DJLNQSZ the verse ends: gang gis sangs rygas (rygas : rgya, L) mchod rten la // dga’ ba’i sens kyis ‘jim gong gcig (bor : por Q) ba // ‘djam bu’i (‘djam bu’i : ‘djam bu LSZ, dzambu’i N) chu klang gser gyi pho brang (pho brang : pha bong LSZ) ‘bhum // de ni de dang mtshungs pa yod ma yin // E reads: gang gis sangs rygas mchod rten la ‘dga’ ba’i sens kyis ‘jig gcig bor ba // ‘djam bu’i chu klang gser gyi pha bong ‘bhum // de ni de dang mtshungs pa yod ma yin (no shad or double shad following [at the end of the line]). Go has: gang gis sangs rygas mchod rten la ‘dga’ ba’i // sens kyis gom pa gcig bor dag // ‘djam bu’i chu klang gser gyi pha bong ‘bhum // de ni de dang mtshungs pa yod ma yin //]

On the variant ‘djam bu’i : ‘djam bu see notes 198 and 199. Moreover, the Skt. sources clearly support the readings pha bong (here corresponding to pīṇḍa) and ‘jim gong gcig (the direct equivalent of mitikāpīṇḍa eka). E’s gyis is obviously just a scribal error, and the same applies to Go’s placement of the double shad after dga’ ba’i (resulting in a lopsided metrical structure). Finally, Go’s bor dag is grammatically irregular and also not supported by the Skt. sources, all of which have singular forms.\]

\[209 Text in square brackets is not preserved in the inscription and has been translated in accordance with the foregoing discussion of the readings in DEGoJLNQSZ.\]

\[210 In keeping with the Skt. sources, here and in the following seven verses mchod rten is rendered by stūpa, although the Tibetan witnesses give the Skt. equivalent of the text’s title as Caityapradakṣinagāthā. As EDGERTON (1953: 233) points out, especially in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Caitya can denote “any object of veneration” and thus has a somewhat broader meaning than stūpa. Not infrequently, however, the two terms are used synonymously.\]
(VII) [The merit] of having made\(^{217}\) a circumambulation at a \([\text{stūpa} \text{ of}]\) the protector of the world \([\text{cannot be truly taught because of}]\) the limitations \([\text{of mere words.}]\)

(VIII) Out of \([\text{compassion for sentient beings,}]\) \([\text{and}]\) Śāriputra \([\text{having}]\) asked[, the protector of the world has taught the merit of homage paid to a \text{stūpa}.]

(IX) \([\text{A hundred horses,}]\) a hundred \([\text{nīkas of gold,}]\) \([\text{a hundred(s of)}\text{ mares,}]\) \([\text{she-mule chariots,}]\) \([\text{chariots of}]\) \([\text{a hundred thousand}]\) \([\text{jewels,}]\) \([\text{are no match [for even the sixteenth part of}}\text{ having taken one step of a circumambulation.}]\)

(X) A hundred girls of Kåmboja,\(^{219}\) \([\text{wearing}]\) precious stones (and) earrings,\(^{220}\) sporting armlets of gold \([\text{and}]\) adorned with [gold and] precious stones,\(^{221}\) \([\text{are no match [for even the sixteenth part of having taken one step] of a circumambulation.}]\)

(XI) No less than a hundred [elephants (the colour of) snow],\(^{222}\) \([\text{bulls [of big bodies,] broad [upper chest bones,] [also with noses (i.e., trunks) like [plough-poles,] [adorned with [gold and] precious stones,] are no match [for even the sixteenth part of having taken one step] of a circumambulation.}]\)

(XII) The wise one who \([\text{has taken one step] with a joyful mind at a \text{caitya of the Buddha – no less than [a count of a hundred thousand] nīkas of gold from the Jāmbū river}:\(^{223}\) there is no [match of] that (one) and that.]

\(^{217}\) E: “on account of making”.

\(^{218}\) Again, \text{dag} was probably just used as an expletive here (cf. note 213; also cf. the preceding \text{rta brgya} and \text{gsar srong (b)rgya}, as well as the following \text{rgod ma brgya, bu mo (b)rgya} and \text{glang chen (b)rgya}.)

\(^{219}\) Located in northwestern India, the country of Kåmboja (also spelt Kamboja) was especially famous for its excellent horses and beautiful women. For a brief discussion and further literature, see \text{WALKER 1995: 520}.

\(^{220}\) Or: “earrings of precious stones” (as in \text{Go}).

\(^{221}\) \text{Go}: “gold, also having ...”.

\(^{222}\) The particular value attributed to the rare albino elephant in India is largely connected with śakra’s \text{vāhana} Airāvata (aka Airāvata) as well as with the legend of Māyā’s conception. For further details see \text{ZIMMER 1929: 22-24 and 1962: 105, 107-108}.

\(^{223}\) Cf. Mvy 5974.
mentioned studies of other Kanjur texts the bifurcated configuration of both JQ (ultimately going back to the Kanjur produced in Tshal Gung thang between 1347 and 1349) and LS (L probably and S certainly deriving from the Them spangs ma Kanjur completed in 1431)228 has been sufficiently established,229 and thus one may assume that this also holds true for the Caityapradakṣināgāthā.

Regarding D and N, the evidence gleaned from the collation of the various witnesses again provides a picture that is consistent with the results known from other studies. In all of the twelve instances given above, N has the same reading as JQ,230 while D agrees three times with LS231 and matches JQ in the other nine cases. Thus the repeatedly demonstrated status of the Derge Kanjur as a conflation of the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma branches232 can also to conclude from the absence of such single readings that in both groups one of the two witnesses must derive from the other.

228 On the problems in determining the ancestry of the London Manuscript Kanjur, see, e.g., EIMER 1992a: xv and xxvii, 1992b (passim), HARRISON 1992: xxvfi. and xxxvii., HARRISON 1994: 295 and 310, TROPPER 1996: 67f. and 70, PAGEL & GAFNEY 1996: xi, SKILLING 1994: xiv-xvi, SKILLING 1997a: 183f., SKILLING 1997b: 107, ZIMMERMANN 2002a:186-191 and 206f. The most important argument in this connection is, of course, the following remark in the brGyad stong pa colophon of the London MS Kanjur (text and translation quoted from HARRISON 1994: 295 and 310): “rgyal rtse them spang ma’i bu dpe [inserted below line: 15 pa] shel chos su bzhugs pa’i ma dpe bzhin gcig zhus // [smaller hand] ‘di shel dpe’i bu dpe bzhin pa yin //”, “Proofread once against the master copy kept at Shel [dkar] chos [sde], the 15th copy of the Rgyal rtse Them spangs ma. This is the 4th copy of the Shel [dkar] MS”. As HARRISON (ibid.) indicates, this remark probably does not refer just to the brGyad stong pa, but to the London MS Kanjur as a whole. Most recently, however, TAUSCHER & LAINÉ (2008: 355f.) (who do not mention the brGyad stong pa colophon) have come up with a different picture on the basis of their study on the arrangement of the Ratanakīṭa texts in the various Kanjur collections. According to them, the London Manuscript Kanjur (or at least its Ratanakīṭa section) is independent of the Them spangs ma.

229 I.e. and.

(Note that J [1609-1614] is roughly a century older than Q, L, S [and N] [all first half of the 18th century].)

230 In verse X it reads dz1 yi.

231 (X) dza yi, (XI) snyed, (XI) yang.

232 This was first shown by SAMTEN (1987: 18f.) and later confirmed by the studies of, e.g., HARRISON (1992: xxviii), SCHOPEN (1995: 174f.), and ZIMMERMANN 2002a: be seen in the Caityapradakṣināgāthā, while the Narthang version of this particular text belongs to the Tshal pa group.233 Again, the exact relationship between N and JQ cannot be determined on the basis of the short passage studied for the present paper,234 but the collated readings do not contradict the stemmata that were (tentatively) offered as a result of text-critical research on the Drumakinnarājaparipṛcchāsūtra, the Śālistambasūtra and the Tathāgatagarbhāsūtra.235 There, N and J were shown to share a common exemplar,236 which (like Q) ultimately derives from the Tshal pa Kanjur.237 Further evidence pending, we thus have some reason to believe that this situation also applies to the Caityapradakṣināgāthā.238

Turning to E, the most striking feature is its large number of single readings. The majority of these can be ruled out as obvious transmissional mistakes; not one of them is superior to (all of) the respective variant(s) preserved in the other witnesses. With regard to the stemmatic situation, the most telling case is the absence of two entire verse-lines in E (verse VI), 183 and 205f. Specifically, the Derge Kanjur conflated readings from the Kanjurs of 'Jang sa tham and lHo rdzong.

233 As was first pointed out by HARRISON (1992: xix), the Narthang Kanjur took over entire texts from different Kanjur collections and belongs to the Them spangs ma group in regard to some texts and to the Tshal pa group in regard to others (for a very useful overview of the stemmatic affiliation of particular texts in the Narthang Kanjur, see ZIMMERMANN 2002a: 178). There is, however, some evidence suggesting that in the latter case it may occasionally have been conflated with individual readings from the Them spangs ma group (see ZIMMERMANN 2002a: 181f. and the sources cited there).

234 Cf. note 227.


236 Most likely the respective text version in the Kanjur from 'Phying ba sTag rtse.

237 I.e.:
which alone already strongly militates against J, Q, L, S, N or any of their ancestors being a descendant of E.\textsuperscript{239} Furthermore, the Newark Kanjur has been (somewhat tentatively) dated to the 15\textsuperscript{th}/16\textsuperscript{th} century,\textsuperscript{240} and if it has preserved the original text of the Tibetan translation here,\textsuperscript{241} the two verse-lines would most probably have had to have been interpolated in a common ancestor of J, Q, L, S and N,\textsuperscript{242} that is, before the split occurred which ultimately lead to the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma branches. Obviously, the latest possible date for this split is when the Tshal pa Kanjur was produced (1347-1349), and provided that the 15\textsuperscript{th}/16\textsuperscript{th} century dating of E is correct, its status as an ancestor of J, Q, L, S and N thus also has to be ruled out from a chronological point of view.\textsuperscript{243}

In the attempt, in turn, to determine whether or not E derives from the Tshal pa Kanjur or a common hyparchetype of LS, one has to look again at the twelve instances, where JQ read against LS. In six of them, E agrees with LS,\textsuperscript{244} three times it is decidedly closer to LS than to JQ,\textsuperscript{245} twice it sides with JQ,\textsuperscript{246} and in one case it cannot reasonably be attributed to either group.\textsuperscript{247} The conclusions one can draw from these figures are for the most part in agreement with the results of S

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure3.png}
\caption{Five possible positions of E in regard to J, L, N, Q and S}
\end{figure}

It remains to be determined how the inscription (I) and the text versions of the largely unstudied Kanjur collections from Gondhla (Go) and Shel (Z) relate to this situation.

Turning first to Z, it is to be noted that it always sides with LS in the twelve above-mentioned cases. Moreover, SKILLING (1994: xxv,f. and 2001: 74f., as well as the sources cited there).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{248} Also cf. the stemma provided in SKILLING 1997b: 107.
\item \textsuperscript{249} a, of course, represents the archetype, and \(\beta - \eta\) stand for possible and actual hyparchetypes. The Tshal pa corresponds to \(\zeta\), while the Them spangs ma may or may not equate to \(\eta\), whose chronologic (as opposed to mere stemmatic) position is thus uncertain (cf. note 228). Obviously, the same is true for \(\beta, \gamma, \delta,\) and \(\varepsilon\). On the question of whether \(\gamma\) may represent the “Old Narthang” MS Kanjur (early 14\textsuperscript{th} c.), from which both the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma have been claimed to derive, see below.
\item \textsuperscript{250} In all these cases, L’s reading is not shared by any of the other witnesses, whereas \textit{dza yi} is also found in D (’\textit{dzam E, tsi’i Go, gsar’i L, dza yi JN, ji yi Q), cho in DGoJNQ, and \textit{phod do} consistently in DGoJNQ (’\textit{phod de [IX], =phod de [X], phod de [XI]} I; \textit{phod do}}
of themselves, their combined evidence indicates that Z is closer to S than to L. In view of the fact that the precise date of Z still has to be determined, the following three constellations are possible:

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 4 Three possible constellations for L, S and Z**

In contrast, it may be expected that due to their old age Go and I are independent of both the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma. This is clearly confirmed for Go by its agreement with JNQ in some places and with LSZ in others.

For I, the evidence is unfortunately more scant. Only in three of our twelve cases is its text completely intact, and in all three it agrees with JNQ. In another four cases, its reading is more or less uncertain but appears to side twice with LSZ, once with JNQ, and once with neither group.

251 Cf. note 24. S has been dated to the first half of the 18th century (SKORUPSKI 1985: xii). 252 (III) zag pa med JNQ: zag pa med JNQ, (IV) pa’i (pa yi JNQ), (X) ‘khor, (XII) ba’i, (XIII) ba’i. 253 (VI) sprod, (VI) kha (XI) snyed, (XIII) pha bong. Also cf. (IV) mkhon (khon LSZ).

254 Again, it is not relevant for this argument whether L derives from the Them spangs ma; for where GNQ read against LSZ, the fact that the shared reading of the latter three witnesses is found in S is already sufficient proof that it was also extant in the Them spangs ma.

255 (IV) ‘khor, (IV) pa’i, (XII) ba’i.

256 (VI) = sprod (following a somewhat uncertain double shad, i.e., probably “/ s1/ sprod”) 1: bgrod JNQ, sprod LSZ, (XI) snyed 1: rten JNQ : snyed LSZ.

257 (X) rnas I: sprod JNQ, rnas LSZ.

258 (X) sprod I: dza yi JNQ, ji yi Q, dza’i L, dza yi LSZ.

259 (III) zag pa med JNQ: zag pa med JNQ, (VI) dka’ JNQ: kha LSZ, (X) dang JNQ: yang LSZ, (XIII) bu’i JNQ: bu LSZ, (XIII) pha brang JNQ: pha bong LSZ.

260 As TAUSCHER & LAINÉ (2008: 350) aptly point out, in order to speak of an independent tradition “it is necessary to show not only independence from other traditions, but also internal mutual interdependence”.

261 (II) dka’ Go: rnas JLNQSZ (I damaged), (IV) sprod shing zhe sprod Go: sprod shing zhe sprod LSZ, (VI) sprod na’i JNQ: sprod na’i JNQ, (XI) byas pas ni Go: byas pa’i yi’I, byas pa’i yi’I JNQ, (VIII) pa’i phyur Go: nas kyung JLNQSZ (I damaged).

262 Cf. TROPPER 1996: 23f.

263 In those cases where Go read against JLNQSZ the discussion of the variants on the basis of the Chinese and Sanskrit witnesses did not allow for a decision about the original reading in a. If it could have been shown that one or more of the variants in Go were already extant in a, one could have concluded that the branch-off(s) leading to Go and I have to be located at a or between a and γ. Moreover, in one of the twelve places where JNQ read against LSZ ([IV] ‘khor: khon), I agrees with JNQ, while Go (mkhon) has a variant spelling of the reading in LSZ – a constellation that is not easy to reconcile with all of the 15 scenarios described below. Yet the semantic context of the passage does not make it seem impossible that I and a common ancestors of JNQ deriving from γ independently changed (mkhon) to ‘khor (the former being slightly preferable according to the Chinese version); for the term in question is the last element in a tripartite enumeration that starts with ‘dod chags and
zhe sdang (i.e., two of the “three poisons”), and thus (m)khon – instead of an expected gti mug – could have caused a scribe to think that something was wrong here. Because ‘khor rnams thams cad spangs pa (‘one who has given up all attendants’) is certainly an apposite attribute for a Pratyekabuddha, the emendation from (m)khon to ‘khor rnams then may have come naturally.

264 (II) rnams, (VI) zhe sdang spangs pa dang.
265 (VI) byas yin, (VIII) nas nas kyang. The latter is obviously just a case of dittography; E’s exemplar almost certainly read nas kyang (like JLNQSZ).

Looking at those three cases again where GoI share significant variants against JLNQSZ, E turns out to have a single reading in the first one,266 while it agrees with JLNQSZ in the second267 and largely agrees with JLNQSZ in the third.268 Therefore E also cannot derive from a common hyparchetype of GoI.

Moreover, in three places ELSZ read against Go(I)JNQ,269 which indicates that at least one of the two branch-offs leading to E and to the common hyparchetype of GoI must be located below Ё. There are also two instances where EGo(I)LSZ read against JNQ and the respective variant in the former witnesses is clearly preferable,270 which strongly suggests that these two readings of EGo(I)LSZ were also extant in α, γ, and η.

Thus of the 15 above-mentioned alternatives for the positions of Go and I, only those described under 9), 10) and 11) remain possible, with the following restrictions:

— in 9) and 11) E can only be located in position 5 (E₅).
— in 11) the branch-off which leads to Go and I must be located between γ and ε.
— in 10) E can be located in any of the five positions (E₁ – E₅), but for E₄ the branch-off which leads to GoI must be located between δ and ζ.

As a result, we are left with 7 possible scenarios, which can be illustrated as follows:271

---

266 (I) pa bzhi’i.
267 (II) gyi.
268 (VI) bde dgur don rnam 'gug.
269 (III) zag pa med GoJNQ : zag (zag E) med pa ELSZ (I damaged), (IV) pa dang ELSZ : pa'i GoI, pa yi JNQ, (X) 'khor GoJNQ = 'khor I : kor ELSZ.
270 (XI) snyed EGoLSZ, snyed I : rten JNQ, (XIII) pho bong EGoLSZ : pho brang JNQ (I damaged).
271 A and B each depict one possible stemma, while E₁ – E₅ in C represent five alternative positions for E. On the chronological indeterminacy of Ё, γ, δ, ε, and η, cf. note 249.
As pointed out above, the fact that E shares decidedly more readings with the witnesses deriving from \( \eta \) (LSZ) than with those going back to \( \zeta \) (JNQ) perhaps also makes E5 in C a little more likely than E1\(-\)E4. In regard to GoI, the situation is more balanced. If their slight leaning towards the readings of GNQ is anything to go by, one would have to prefer the constellation shown in C (i.e., a branch-off between \( \gamma \) and \( \zeta \) which leads to GoI). Yet the evidence is really too scant here and thus this cannot be considered to be much more than an educated guess.

Lastly, the results of this analysis are significant in regard to the following issue. Both the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma had originally been claimed to derive from the “Old Narthang” MS Kanjur (early 14th c.), but this view was strongly called into question by SKILLING (1994: xlf. and 1997b: 100ff.). His doubts were subsequently corroborated by ZIMMERMANN (2002a: 204ff.) and TAUSCHER & LAINÉ (2008: 355f.). The present study now also confirms SKILLING’s position, because the common hyparchetype of GoI\(^{272}\) is very likely to predate the “Old Narthang”, and thus the latter can hardly equate to \( \gamma \) in any of the seven possible constellations that are illustrated above.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

It goes without saying that there is a certain element of tentativeness in all such stemmatic studies of Kanjur and Tanjur texts, especially as one always has to reckon with the possibility that conflations already took place in the early stages of their transmission.\(^{273}\) The brevity of the passage that could be used for the present enquiry set additional limitations and therefore both the evidence and the results gleaned have a comparatively narrow scope. In the not unlikely event that other early Western Tibetan Kanjur collections will eventually become accessible,\(^{274}\) the picture provided above may have to be refined and/or extended. This study can thus also be seen as a touchstone for the stemmatic attribution of other witnesses of the *Caityapradaksinagathā*, especially with a view to further corroboration of the independent transmission of Kanjur texts in Western Tibet.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


\(^{272}\) On their dating, see the introduction.  
\(^{273}\) Cf., e.g., ZIMMERMANN 2002a: 204ff. and TROPPER 2005: 130ff.  
\(^{274}\) Like those in Tholing, Khorchag (both Ngari) or Charang (Kinnaur), which at present are still largely out of reach for scholars from the west.


APPENDIX A

Verses in the You rao fo ta gong de jing 右繞佛塔功德經 (Taisho No. 700) that correspond to the Caityapradakṣinagāthā inscription in Alchi1

I 常在四念處 及以四正勤
四如意足 斯由右繞塔

II 了達四真諦 根力七覺分 (真: 真 T)
正道及聖果 斯由右繞塔

III 滅一切煩惱 具足大威德
無漏六神通 斯由右繞塔

IV 永離貪恚癡 及以一切障礙
證獨覺菩提 斯由右繞塔

V 得妙紫金色 相好莊嚴身
現作人天師 斯由右繞塔

VI 皆由以身業 及語業讚歎 (讚: 歡 T)
右繞於佛塔 獲此大利益 (益: 益 T)

VII 右繞諸佛塔 所得諸功德b
我今隨所聞c 略説鉅能盡

爾時世尊說此偈已。舍利弗等一切眾會。 (尊: 歡 T, 獨: 衆 T)
皆大歡喜信受奉行

右繞佛塔功德經

a 獲 : 成 OS,S,Y,M b 諸功德 : 勝功德聚 OS,S,Y,M c 聞 : 問 OS,S,Y,M

1 Quoted from the CBETA version (http://www.cbeta.org/result/normal/T16/0700_001.htm), which I checked against the original Taisho print (T) (Vol. 16, pp. 802b [col. 14] – 802c [col. 1]) and augmented with the variant readings of the Old Sung (OS), Sung (S), Yuan (Y) and Ming (M) editions (as given in T).
APPENDIX B

Sanskrit sources corresponding to the Caityapradakṣinagāthā

inscription in Alchi

Gudrun Melzer*

The Caityapradakṣinagāthā as it has been transmitted in the various Kanjur
collections combines three stylistically different sections that derive from
different sources and are loosely strung together. Most Sanskrit witnesses of
its constituent parts are not accessible in the form of an edition or translation.
This appendix aims to fill this gap with regard to the verses found in the
Alchi inscription.

1. In the first part of the Tibetan text (verses 1-45), the Buddha relates the
benefits of circumambulating a stūpa to one of his chief disciples, Śāriputra.
For this section one complete Sanskrit version and eight fragments, altogether
from five different manuscripts, have been preserved, dating from around the
sixth to the eighth centuries. They originated from areas far apart from each
other, namely from Gilgit in today’s northern Pakistan (G1, G2, G3), perhaps
from the vicinity of Bamiyan in Afghanistan (MS), and from Northern Turki-
stan along the northern branch of the Silk Road in the Xinjiang Uyghur Auto-
nomous Region of China (BL1+2). The text is relatively short and was there-
fore usually included in a “Sammelhandschrift”. Where the colophon is still
extant, the text is labelled Pradakṣinagāthā. Several verses have parallels in
the second Avalokitasūtra of the Mahāvastu and in Śāntideva’s Śikṣāsamuccaya.1 The following table indicates the number and sequence (differences
marked in grey) of the verses in the preserved Sanskrit sources that corre-
spond to the Alchi inscription.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alchi</th>
<th>Tib.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>BL1+2</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Chin.</th>
<th>Śikṣa</th>
<th>Mvu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>(37?)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42+prose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the Pradakṣinagāthā manuscripts

BL1+2 Four fragments written in North Turkistani Brāhmī, type a,2 from an
eight-lined paper manuscript are contained in the India Office Library
collection of the British Library, London. They belonged to the
Hoernle collection (H.), but the place of origin is not exactly known.
They may perhaps come from the greater vicinity of Kučā.3 The first
line on recto and the last line on verso are hardly legible.

The fragments Or.15009/354 (H.149 unnumbered) and Or.15008/6
fit together and belong to one folio (BL1). Fragments Or.15009/380
(H.149 unnumbered) and Or.15009/646 (H.149/Add.159) also fit
together and belong to the following folio (BL2), but the pagination
is not preserved. The fragments were first identified by Hartmann
and Wille.4 The verses contain the numerals 24-40 and correspond
roughly to verses 25-39, 43 and 45 of the Tibetan translation. After
the colophon, an unknown text in Anuṣṭubh verses starts on recto,
line 5 of the second folio.

Since the beginning and end of each line is broken, the number of
missing aksaras at the right and left side of the page can only be

* I would like to thank Patrick Mc Allister who kindly corrected my English.
1 Most of these parallels were already identified by Belanger 2000 (see especially pp. 8-14).

4 Hartmann & Wille 1992: 36, photo 169, fragment no. d; 37, photo 171, fragment d;
47, photo 188, no. H.149/Add.159. Klaus Wille recently informed me of fragment
Or.15008/6 in an e-mail. I am grateful to Seishi Karashima for sending digital images,
and to Tatsushi Tamai for providing his provisional transliterations of fragments Or.
15009/354 and 380.
guessed, while the total number of missing akṣaras can be easily gleaned with the help of the metre.

All facsimiles are now available on the web page of the International Dunhuang project. The complete edition of the fragments as well as the facsimiles will appear in the next issue of BLSF.

G1 One isolated folio with the pagination number 196 is part of Ser. No. 60 (National Archives of India, New Delhi). It has been read from scans of the microfilm Xb 150 of the Seminar für Indologie und Tibetologie in Göttingen. The details in the published facsimiles in GBM 3356-3357 are often not clearly discernible. The folio represents the earliest version of the three Gilgit manuscripts. Like the manuscript of the Schøyen Collection (see below) it is written in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Most likely, the manuscript had seven lines, of which the first one is not preserved anymore. The right half of the folio is lost. The text corresponds to verses 34-45 of the Tibetan translation, and it ends immediately before the colophon. It was identified by von Hinüber 1981: *10*, *11*.

G2 The text of G2 in Ser. No. 59 (National Archives of India, New Delhi) corresponds to the beginning of the Caityapradakṣinagāthā with verses 1-11 of the Tibetan translation and is therefore irrelevant for the Alchi inscription.

G3 The only complete Sanskrit version of the text is preserved as Ser. No. 13 in the collection of the National Archives of India, New Delhi. It is written in eight lines per page in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II or ProtoŚrāvānī. In contrast to G2, where only the old tripartite form of the ya (굽) can be found, the scribe(s) used the old ya as well as the modern form (ं) in this manuscript. The facsimiles have been published in GBM 7.1585 = Folio (2)[8]3, 7.1524-1528.3 = Folios 284-286, and they are occasionally difficult to read. After the colophon, the manuscript includes an appendix of well-known canonical verses that have also been included in the Tibetan Caityapradakṣinagāthā. The leaves were identified by von Hinüber 1979: 344; 1981: *9*-*10*, and Frentz 1987: 100 succeeded in the correct reading of the pagination numbers. A very short discussion and an English translation of the verses corresponding to no. 11, 13, 23 and 31 of the Tibetan translation can be found in Matsumura 1985: 137-138.

MS Two fragments from Afghanistan, now in The Martin Schøyen Collection, numbered 2382/40b and 2382/245/1, belong to one folio with five lines on each side and with the pagination number 24 on the left margin of the recto. Both have been identified by Klaus Wille, who also provided the first transliterations. The sole string-hole was placed between the two fragments, and several akṣaras are now missing. Since only a few akṣaras are broken away at the end of the line it is possible to estimate the approximate size of the folio at ca. 33.5 cm in length and 5.5 cm in width. The script is Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I as in G1. The fragment covers the verses 36-45 of the Tibetan translation and contains the colophon on verso, line 3. For a complete edition, further details as well as facsimiles of the fragment see the BMSC IV (forthcoming).

---

5 See http://idp.bl.uk/, s.v. the respective inventory number.
6 For the palaeography of the numerals see Frentz 1987: 152.
7 I am grateful to Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille for providing the scans.
8 The script is roughly datable to the 6th to the first half of the 7th century. See Sander 1968: 123, 129, 134, table IV. From the middle of the 7th century onwards, the script was replaced in this region by ProtoŚrāvānī or Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II.
9 Belanger 2000 has referred to the three texts from Gilgit differently, namely as manuscript A (= G3), B (= G2), and C (= G1). He has not edited them in his thesis, which focuses on general remarks on the text and the Tibetan Caityapradakṣinagāthā.
10 It consists of one isolated folio written in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II or ProtoŚrāvānī. The hardly legible facsimiles are published in GBM 3249-3250. The folio was first identified by von Hinüber 1981: *10*, *11*.
11 For the script see Sander 1968: 141-148, 154-161, tables 21-26, alphabet m and Huvon Hinüber 1994: 42 (note 1), 37-40. This script was in use in Northwest India, Pakistan and Afghanistan from the 7th to at least the 10th century.
12 Additionally, scans from the microfilm at Göttingen were used for the reading.
13 The publication on G3 announced by Matsumura (1985: 148-149, note to Ser. No. 13; 1986-87: 146, note 5) has never been published.
14 Perhaps from the vicinity of Bamiyan. Cf. Sander 2000: 87-88 and “Photographs of the possible place of origin of the Buddhist manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection”, pls. I-II in BMSC III.
Parallels in the Mahavastu and in the Śīkṣāsamuccaya

Mvu  Verses from the second Avalokitāśutra in the Mahāvastu; see especially II.362.17-365.10.\(^{15}\)

Śīkṣ  Quotation from the Āryāvalokanāśutra in Chapter 17 named vandanaṁsāṁsāh, of Śāntideva’s Śīkṣāsamuccaya. See Śīkṣ 297.10-309.5. The version is very similar to that of Mvu.

2. The following three verses (46-48) after section 1 of the Tibetan Caityapradakṣinagāthā are quotations from the Saṅghabhedavastu- or Śayanāsanavastu of the Vinayaavastvāgama. The context of the verses is the same in both texts: When Anāthapiṇḍada was staying in Rājagṛha in the house of a house-holder who had invited the Buddha for the next morning, he heard the words buddha and saṅgha for the first time. On the way to the Buddha during the night he is seized by fear. However, the deity of the city gate lights his way and encourages him to continue on his way by speaking these verses. The verses in this context do not refer directly to the circumambulation of stūpas or caityas, but rather to the steps towards the Buddha.

Saṅgh  Saṅghabhedavastu of the Vinayaavastvāgama, read from the scans of the original photographs used by GNOLI for his edition, folio 411r9, 411r10, 411v1);\(^{16}\) cf. also the edition by GNOLI 1977-78, I 168.10-12, 15-17, 20-22.

Śay  Śayanāsanavastu of the Vinayaavastvāgama, read from GBM 949.9, 949.10 (folio 318v9-10); cf. also GNOLI 1978: 16.1-3, 6-7, 11-13.

3. The last ten verses (49-58 of the Tibetan translation) of section 3 can be found in several Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda texts. The context of the verses is as follows: King Prasenajit and others have learned that the Buddha has made the relics (sarīrasaṅgha) of Kāśyapa, the predecessor of Śākyamuni, (supernaturally) visible. When an upāsaka circumambulated the place thinking of how much benefit (puṇya) would arise, the Buddha speaks these verses, mixed with prose passages. So far it is not possible to determine which source(s) the verses were taken over from into the Pradakṣinagāthā.

Bhai  Bhaiṣajyavastu of the Vinayaavastvāgama, quoted from GBM 991.4-992.6 (Folio 161v4-162r6). Cf. also the edition by DUTT in GM 1939-59/III/I: 76.3-78.13.

Interestingly, these three verses are also included in G3, following its colophon. Probably due to the repetition of the same pāda at the end of each verse, the scribe of G3 originally omitted the second verse (no. 46 in G3), and after becoming aware of his mistake, he later added its first three words (only!) beneath the line. Perhaps for the same reason, the scribe of Śay omitted verse no. 1, but he did not correct it. The different order of some of the verses in the various witnesses may have been caused by similar reasons.

Regardless of some minor variants originating in the transmission of the text, the Tibetan translation of both occurrences of the verses in the Vinaya is the same. By contrast, their translation in the Tibetan Caityapradakṣinagāthā is completely independent from the version in the Vinaya with hardly any agreeing expressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alchi</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Saṅgh</th>
<th>Śay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) There is also a Tibetan translation of the text (Phags pa spyan ras gzigs zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo, Āryāvalokanāṁśaṁsāṁśa), e.g., Q no. 862, mdo nsa tshogs, mu 261a6-275b6 (vol. 34: 232-238). For the verses parallel to Mvu see in particular Q 262a8-163b7.

\(^{16}\) I am grateful to Prof. Kazunobu Matsuda for allowing me to see them.

SHT no. 498, see SHT I: 217-218.

Divy 1+2 Two almost identical passages in chapter 6 (Indrānīmabrāhmaṇ-āvadāna) and chapter 31 (Sudhanakumārāvadāna) of the Divy-āvadāna. See Divy 77.23-80.9, 466.19-469.18.

MPS MPS 25.13-23: Sondertext I of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, ed. WALDSCHMIDT 1961. The relevant fragment comes from Śor-čuq. A new fragment of the passage parallel to our text has been studied by HARTMANN 1992: 175, fragment no. 83 (Pelliot Sanskrit Numéro bleu 162 + Pelliot Koutchéen Nouvelle Série 914). The use of brackets has been adjusted accordingly.

Quotation, apparently from the MPS, in a donation formula from a manuscript found at Kizil. It is full of mistakes. The relevant part on folio F has been added later to the manuscript, and it is dated by LÜDERS to the end of the 6th or the beginning of the 7th century. See LÜDERS 1940: 596, 607-608, 612-613. The parallels are cited from Lüders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alchi</th>
<th>Tib.</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Bhai</th>
<th>Divy 1</th>
<th>Divy 2</th>
<th>MPS</th>
<th>formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conventions for the presentation of the text of the manuscripts are based on the wide-spread system used in BLSF, BMSC and SHT. Because the verses serve the purpose of comparison it did not seem practicable to divide strictly between a transliteration and an edition with the restoration of gaps. Such a combined presentation, even though it is a compromise, is also applied in BLSF and SHT, which means in practice that, e.g., round and square brackets are used side by side.

The manuscripts offer a wide range of orthographic peculiarities that have not been corrected to standard Sanskrit as far as they are easily understandable, e.g., different conventions for writing nasals, assimilated visargas, or

\[ ri \] instead of \( r \) and vice versa. Unwritten visargas before \( ka, pa \) and sibilants have been added in brackets for the reader’s convenience. In the manuscripts written in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II (Proto-śāradā) as well as in other north Indian local scripts the consonants \( va \) and \( ba \) are not differentiated as it is still the case in modern Bengali. Even in Devanāgarī a secondary stroke had to be invented in order to differentiate between both letters. In the presentation of the text, \( b \) - has been written wherever necessary.

Symbols

- ( ) restorations in a gap
- [ ] damaged aksara(s)
- › › omission of (a part of) an aksara without gap in the manuscript
- « » interlinear insertion
- { } superfluous (part of an) aksara
+ small cross inserted by the scribe for marking the place of an interlinear insertion
+ one destroyed aksara
.. one illegible aksara
· illegible part of an aksara
/// beginning or end of a fragment when broken
○ string hole
- stroke in the MS indicating that the place on the material was not enough or good for writing upon
◊ space between two aksaras (without gap of the text)

Punctuation

* virāma
- one dot used as punctuation mark
⊙ double circle marking the end of a text (passage)
| danda

18 Regarding the relevant verses, WALDSCHMIDT (1961: 378) writes: „Die wahrscheinlich jüngeren, aber sehr beliebten Strophen über den Wert der Reliquienverehrung sind offenbar in den Sanskrittext des MPS eingeschoben worden.“
19 SHT no. 498, see SHT I: 217-218.
Alchi inscription I (Tibetan, verse 38)

The inscription in Alchi ...

Alchi inscription III (Tibetan, verse 40)

Alchi inscription IV (Tibetan, verse 41)
Alchi inscription V (Tibetan, verse 42)

MS (v1) bhavet tathāgato [33] lok(e) + + + + + + + + + + + + (k)[r][t][v][ā stūpaṃ pradakṣ[ha][s][i][n][a][m][am] || 〈w〉

G1 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + s[34] laksānais samalakṣrītaṃ 

G3 bhavet tathāgato loke (r5) laksānais samal[a][n][k][a][h]  

amgīrasena kāyena stū[pa][m] kṛtvā pradakṣiṇāṃ || 〈w〉

Alchi inscription VI (Tibetan, verse 43)

MS + + + + + + [k][y][a]ya [ya] karmam + + + + pradakṣiṇām  

stūpaṃ pradakṣiṇāṃ kṛtvā artha[s][i][m][a][m] || 〈y〉

BL2 pradakṣiṇāṃ kāya(k)a[ma](a) + + + + + + (r3) + + 

[s]tūpaṃ prā[ōDa][kṣiṇāṃ] [k][r][t][v][ā arhasid][dh][i] pradakṣiṇāṃ 39

G1 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (v4) pradakṣiṇāṃ ||

manahpradakṣiṇāṃ O kṛtvā artha + + + + + (||) 〈x〉

G3 pradakṣiṇāṃ kāyakarmma vākkarmmā prāda[kṣiṇāṃ] pradakṣiṇāṃ (r6) [m][a][n][k][a][m][a] pradakṣiṇāṃ[na][m] 〈 43〉36

Alchi inscription VII (Tibetan, verse 44)

MS na śa[kya]ṃ vācayā sarvamā nihilena [p]r[akṣiṇātu]ṃ + (v2) guṇā lokanāthānāṃ[m] + + + + + + + + + + 〈x〉

G1 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + kāṣitaṃ[ma] ||

ye guṇā - - - lokanāthasya s[1][ū]paṃ kṛtvā pradakṣiṇāṃ || 〈y〉

33 Ms. bhaves tathāgatto.
34 Ms. aṁśīra[sa][e][na]. The aṅkṣaras śa and ga resemble each other. It is not clear what exactly the Sanskrit term amṛgārasena kāyena means and how it came into the Tibetan translation gyi sku mdog that also agrees with the Chinese version.
35 The scribe did not differentiate between tha and rtha.
36 None of the Sanskrit versions nor the Chinese translation corresponds exactly with the Tibetan translation that is based on six pādas.
37 Ms. hy e[r]e.
38 There are many similar verses. Cf., e.g., Mvu 2.232.7: na śa[kya]ṃ ca pari[kṛt]ayi[ti]ṃ sarvavādcya bhāṣātaḥ 〈44〉;
40 The remains of something like an akṣara are too damaged to be read. At this place no additional syllable is needed.
41 Illegible.
42 Classical Sanskrit would be pṛṣṭavaṃ.
43 Restore to (hi)ṭāya?
44 It is often not clear if text titles ending in -gāthā should generally be understood as plural (-gāthāḥ), or if both possibilities, singular and plural, are equally acceptable, since the visarga is only occasionally written in the manuscripts.

---

The Caityapradakṣiṇāgāthā Inscription in Alchi ...
Alchi inscription IX (Tibetan, verse 46)

G3 śatam aśvāḥ- śatam niskāḥ- śatam aśvatarathāḥ- nānāvittasya sampūrṇāḥ- śatam ca vaḍavārathāḥ- padāvīhaḥ- rasyaikasaya kalāṃ nāṛghanti śoḍaśīm* ||

Saṅgh śatam aśvāḥ- śatam niskāḥ- śatam aśvatarathāḥ
411r9 nānāvittasya sampūrṇāḥ- śatam ca vaḍavārathāḥ padāvīhaḥrasyaikasya kalāṃ nāṛghanti śoḍaśīm* ||

Śay Gnoli has quoted the verse from his edition of Saṅgh. It is present (ed. 16.1-3) in the Tibetan translation of the Śay, however, the scribe of the Gilgit manuscript has omitted it as well as the relevant prose passage, which GNOLI did not mention.

Alchi inscription X (Tibetan, verse 47)

G3 śatam kāmbhojikāḥ- kanyāḥ- āmuktamanikundalāḥ suvarṇakeyūradharā niśkagrīvāḥ svalamkṛtāḥ padāvīhārasyaikasaya kalāṃ nāṛghanti śoḍaśīm* ||

Saṅgh śatam kāmbhojikāḥ- kanyā āmuktamanikundalāḥ
411v1 suvarṇakeyūradharā[ḥ] niśk[ṛ] agrīvāḥ svalamkṛtāḥ padāvīhārasyaikasaya kalāṃ nāṛghanti śoḍaśīm* ||

Śay śatam kāmbhojikāḥ- kanyā āmuktamanikundalāḥ •
318[949]v10 suvarṇakeyūradharā niśkagrīvāḥ svalamkṛtāḥ padāvīhārasyaikasaya kalāṃ nāṛghanti śoḍaśīm* •

Alchi inscription XI (Tibetan, verse 48)

G3 śatam haimavatā nāgāḥ- suvarṇamanikalpitāḥ- īśādantā mahākāyā vyūḥavansto matāṅgajāḥ
(185[1527]v1) padāvīhārasyaikasaya kalāṃ nāṛghanti śoḍaśīm* • ||

45 G3 has no equivalent for the last verse.
46 Since argh- can be found in all instances in the Gilgit manuscripts, the form has to be accepted. There is no need to correct it to arh- as GNOLI does.
47 Ms. “danto.
Bhai šatam sahasrani suvarnapidä jambunadad nasya samā bhavanti | 161[991]v5-6(6) yo buddhacaityesu prasannacitta āropayen mṛttikapiṇḍam ekam i'Oti | 2

Divy šatam sahasrani suvarnapidä jambunadad nasya samā bhavanti | yo buddhacaityesu prasannacitta āropayen mṛttikapiṇḍam ekam || Divy 1 78.15-16 suvarnapidä; Divy 2 467.13-16 ekam || iti | 2

MPS (šatam sahasrani suvarnapidä jambunadad nasya samā bhavani)ti | 25.14 (ST.I) yo (buddhacaityesu p)r(asa)nn(acitta) ā(ropa)y(e)n mṛttikapiṇḍam ekam* || 2

formula šatam sahasrani suvarnapidä jambunadad nāsya samāv bhavanti F V7-8 yo buddha(8)cia)jyesu prasannacitta āropayenš2 mṛttikapiṇḍam e(ekam* 2

ABBREVIATIONS and BIBLIOGRAPHY


Bhai Bhaisajyavastu of the Vinayavastvāgama. See GBM and GM.

BHS Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit


52 Ms. prasannacitta āropayen.
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