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1. Si tu Paṇ chen Chos kyi 'byung gnas

The appreciation of the brilliance of Si tu Chos kyi ‘byung gnas (henceforth: Si tu) in the areas of scholarly achievements is demonstrated by the brief designation most commonly used for him, namely: Si tu Paṇ chen, i.e. ‘Great Scholar of the Si tu lineage’. His genius as a scholar is attested in every aspect of his impressive career spanning the first three quarters of the eighteenth century, an era of extraordinary cultural flowering in Tibet. Gene Smith and others have stressed the paramount place that Si tu occupied in this heyday of Tibetan culture, which was in its turn closely associated with the development of the Ris med movement in the nineteenth century. In both of these the major areas of eastern Tibet, in particular Khams, Si tu’s native land, played a significant role.

The scholar in question is of course the eighth incumbent in the (Ta’i) Si tu lineage of reincarnations within the Karma Bka’ brgyud pa tradition, the famous polymath Chos kyi ‘byung gnas who lived from 1699/1700 to 1774. He is widely regarded as one of the major scholars in eighteenth century Tibet and the wide array of his areas of expertise is truly impressive.

Without doubt he was one of the key figures in the cultural life of eighteenth-century Eastern Tibet, a region of particular efflorescence at the time. Being one of the most brilliant minds of his period, his

---

1 I gratefully acknowledge that this research has in part been made possible by a grant from the “Stichting Jan Gonda Fonds” foundation (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, KNAW), The Netherlands.


claims to fame lay in many areas of expertise and excellence. In addition to being a religious hierarch of the highest spiritual attainments, he had powerful political connections, he was a gifted artist and connoisseur of the arts, a widely famed physician, and — last but not least — a master-grammarian and translator — arguably the most important Tibetan linguist of the eighteenth century.3

1.1. Si tu’s range of expertise

In order to give an impression of the wide range of Si tu’s talents and interests, I list the major ranges of expertise he displays in his literary oeuvre:

(1) He wrote a lengthy commentary on a pivotal text in Buddhist Abhidharma metaphysics, namely Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa.4

(2) He wrote extensively on the theory and praxis of Tantric Buddhism as it was cultivated within the Bka’ brgyud pa tradition. His writings in this field ranged from liturgical and meditational manuals5 to hymns and prayers,6 from commentaries7 to mantra collections.8

(3) He had a keen interest in history. In his published works this is most evident in his compilation of biographies of Karma pa hierarchs,9 but it comes out in many of his other writings as well.10

(4) And, of course, he was the main editor responsible for the famous Derge blockprint edition of the Buddhist canon Bka’ ‘gyur, which was finalized in the year 1733.11 Analyzing the contents and overseeing

3 His versatility and brilliance is eminently brought to light in the thematic issue ‘Si tu pan chen: Creation and Cultural Engagement in Eighteenth-Century Tibet’ of the Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, 2013. For a brief biographical sketch of Si tu, see e.g. Smith introd. Chandra (1968: 5-12, 15-17) = Smith (2001: 87-95), and Verhagen (2001B: 61-63).
4 Verhagen (2001B: 64 note 18).
5 Verhagen (2001B: 64 note 11).
6 Verhagen (2001B: 64 note 13).
7 Verhagen (2001B: 64 note 12).
8 Verhagen (2001B: 64 note 14).
9 Karma kāṃ tshang brgyud pa rin po che’i rnam thar rab ‘byams nor bu’i chu shel gyi ’phreng ba, occupying volumes 11 and 12 of Si tu’s Collected Works.
10 E.g. in his Dkar chag to the Derge Bka’ ‘gyur (Si tu Collected Works, volume 9, title no. 1) and in his autobiography (Si tu Collected Works, volume 14).
the compilation of such a tremendous mass of scriptural materials was certainly a major feat for a man in his early thirties. For this task he was particularly well-equipped as by that time he was a skilled expert in Sanskrit linguistics and paleography.

This brings us to the ‘non-religious’ or—perhaps better—‘para-religious’ of Si tu’s fields of excellence:

(5) He was beyond a shadow of a doubt one of the major language experts in pre-modern Tibet. His elaborate and highly involved commentary on Sum cu pa and Rtags kyi ‘jug pa, the two seminal treatises of Tibetan indigenous grammar, which he completed in 1744, was so influential that it justifies the distinction between a pre-Si tu and post-Si tu era of grammatical studies in Tibet. Si tu was also renowned for his expertise on Sanskrit grammar. No less than six of the fourteen volumes of his Collected Works are devoted to this topic, containing translations of Sanskrit treatises as well as original writings. The culmination of his oeuvre on Sanskrit grammar no doubt is his extensive commentary on Cāṇḍra-Vyākaraṇa.

Ultimately Si tu’s cultivation of grammatical studies served the aim of honing his translating skills to perfection. He was always on the look-out for important scriptural materials, in particular Sanskrit manuscripts, in his profound aspiration to go back to the original sources for Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna Buddhist literature. Oftentimes he laments the questionable quality of translations made by earlier generations and at times he severely criticizes specific translations and translators. He regarded it as one of his callings to correct and to revise existing—by that time often canonized—translations that he deemed inferior, or to contribute translations of texts that had not been translated before. He realized this calling in particular in the area of Sanskrit linguistics, as shown by the nine translations of works on Sanskrit grammar preserved in his Collected Works, five of which are revisions of canonical translations. One can catch a truly fascinating glimpse of the actual process of translating at the hands of Si tu Paṇchen in one particular brief text in his Bka’ ’bum. We will consider this text in detail in the present essay.

(6) A second secular area of expertise was medicine. Si tu’s medical skills were renowned throughout his native region. His medical

---

advice was often sought by the Eastern Tibetan elite. His autobiography reports on his avid searching for *materia medica* during his travels, and the numerous patients he treated. Although he did not write a monograph on medicine, we do find, for instance, discussions on medical topics in his collections of *Dris lan*, that is ‘Answers to Queries’ which were put to Si tu by various masters and which have been preserved in his Collected Works.

(7) Last but not least, I should mention his intensive involvement in art, particularly the art of painting. From a tender age he loved to make drawings, first without any formal training, and very quickly he showed great talent. Deeply interested in the styles of earlier artists he became a connoisseur and a major patron of the arts. He played a pivotal role in the revival of the sixteenth century *Karma Sgar bris* (or ‘Karma pa Encampment’) style of painting, which so elegantly merges the landscape setting inspired by Chinese art with the prototypically Indian depiction of the central human or deity figures.

Being a gifted artist himself, he made numerous scroll-paintings of splendid quality and he commissioned sets of paintings — under his own exact instructions— that were actually still copied by artists as late as the twentieth century. Particularly significant among the latter were the sets depicting the 108 stories of the *Avadāna-kalpalatā* collection, the eight *Mahāsiddhas*, and the eighty-four *Mahā-siddhas.*

Illustration (2) shows one of several later copies of the final painting in the twenty-five *thang ka* set depicting scenes from Kṣemendra’s collection of the Buddha’s previous-life stories entitled *Avadāna-kalpalatā*, which portrays Si tu as the patron and artistic supervisor of this prestigious undertaking, with artists and craftsmen involved in this project depicted in the lower register, and in the background on the left a scroll-mounted inscription which outlines and eulogizes the collection.

---

18 On Si tu’s involvement in the field of medicine, see e.g. Ehrhard (2000).
19 On Si tu’s importance for pictorial arts, see Jackson (1996: 259-287) and Jackson (2009).
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His artistic talents came to good stead early in his career — in 1726 to be precise — when his gift of an exquisite set of thang kas depicting the eight Mahāsiddhas, which was work of his own hand, swayed the
king of Derge, Bstan pa Tshe ring (1678-1738), to endorse the foundation of Dpal spungs as a new home monastery for the Si tu lineage. Moreover, the splendid exhibition held in the Rubin Museum of Art in New York in 2009 celebrating “Situ Panchen and the Revival of the Encampment Style” speaks volumes of his tremendous importance for the flowering of pictorial art in eighteenth-century Khams.

1.2. Si tu the linguist

In this essay I will focus primarily on Si tu’s work as a linguist and a translator. The wide range of Si tu’s skills in linguistics is nicely attested in one of the Dris lan collections in his Gsung ’bum, namely the ‘Answers to queries, delighting the venerable supreme incarnation(s), entitled “Jewel-mirror”’. In this collection dated 1749 he answers questions from a number of high-ranking Lamas, almost half of which pertain to linguistics and related fields. In the former of the two sections in this compilation he addresses these queries, labeling them as ‘common’ or ‘general’ (thun mong [gi tshan], f. 1v2-13v5) as opposed to the ‘non-general’ i.e. specifically Buddhist matters dealt with in the latter section (f. 13v5-29v1). In this first section he discusses topics as diverse as:

— A number of prominent Sanskrit grammarians, such as: Anubhūti Svarūpācārya, author of Sārasvata-vyākaraṇa (question 1.3, f. 2r3-6), Pāṇini (question 1.5, f. 2v2-4), and Candragomin (question 1.6, f. 2v4-5).

— Sanskrit phonology (question 1.15 on the long vowels ṛ and ṭ, f. 6r6-v5; question 1.16. on the phonological systematics of Sanskrit vowels with the distinction of the features of length, accent and nasality, f. 6v5-7v3; question 1.21 on the distinction between Sanskrit b and v, f. 9r2-6).

— Technical terminology in Sanskrit indigenous grammar (question 1.17 on metalanguage terms such as kU etc, and TI , f. 7v3-5; question 1.20 on technical terms such as liṅga, śabda, and prātipadika, f. 8r4-9r2;
question 1.22 *inter alia* on the dichotomy of *loka* (‘common usage’) and *śāstra* (‘technical usage’), f. 9r6-v5).

— Philosophical aspects of language (question 1.11 on the *Abhidharma* categories of *yi ge*, *ming* and *ṭshig*, f. 5r2-6; question 1.19 on the criterion of general usage as the authority for grammar, f. 8r1-4).

— Some basic concepts from Indic culture in general (question 1.7 on the four stages (*āśrama*) of the Brahmin’s life, f. 2v5-3r2; question 1.27 on terms from theatre (*zlos gar*), f. 11v5-12r4; question 1.28. on the eighteen fields of knowledge (*vidyāsthāna*), f. 12r4-13r1).

— Vedic language and literature (question 1.13 *inter alia* on the phonetics of *upadhmāntyā* and *jihvāmūlyā*, two allophones of the *visarga* phoneme which are typical for Vedic Sanskrit,28 f. 5v2-6r1; question 1.18 on the orthography of the Vedic allophone technically termed *anunāsika*,29 f. 7v5-8r1; question 1.22 *inter alia* on the designation of the Vedic literature as *chandas*, f. 9r6-v5; question 1.29 on the nature of the four *Vedas*,30 f. 13r1-13v1).

— Linguistic aspects of *mantras* (question 1.13 *inter alia* on the pronunciation of unusual consonant clusters, f. 5v2-6r1; question 1.14 on the pronunciation of *mantras* containing terms and phrases from various languages,31 f. 6r1-6r6).

— Etymologies of topographical names (question 1.9 on terms such as *Rgya gar*, ‘India’; *Rgya nag*, ‘China’; *Bhoṭa*, ‘Tibet’;32 Magadha,33 and Oḍiyana, f. 3r3-4r2).

— The nomenclature of the Indian goddess Sarasvatī (question 1.1, f. 1v2-2r1) and the identification of the musical instrument which is the standard iconographical attribute of this deity34 (question 1.2, f. 2r1-2r3).

34 Verhagen (1997: 600-603).
Sanskrit-Tibetan translating techniques, explaining certain principles laid down in the ninth-century manual for translators *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*35 (question 1.26, f. 10v6-11v5).

He also put his extensive knowledge of grammar and related fields such as lexicography and prosody to practical use in his work as editor and translator. I have argued earlier that the sophisticated approach to such tasks that we see in Si tu’s oeuvre can with good right be termed philology.36

The overall most prestigious of Si tu’s editorial projects of course was his supervision of the xylograph edition of the *Bka’ ’gyur* canon at the Sde dge Printing House in the years 1731 to 1733. His editorial policies as set forth in a section of the *Dkar chag* (‘catalogue’)37 which he appended to this edition are a fascinating source of information for the formal criteria and theoretical principles which Si tu brought to bear upon the complicated process of establishing a reliable text on the basis of a wide variety of heterogeneous sources.38

For instance, he describes the scrupulous attention that should be paid to the transliteration of *mantras* in the Tibetan translations of Tantric materials, either by basing the orthography on auxiliary treatises found within the tradition proper which specify the spelling of such formulas, or basing it on the norms of Sanskrit grammar as far as possible. In the remaining cases of unanalysable or otherwise incomprehensible Sanskrit terms and of non-Sanskrit terms (for instance Prakrit, or Tamil) occurring in these *mantras* he urges the editors to adhere strictly to the spelling as found in the original manuscripts.39

---

38 Sherab Gyaltsen (ed.) (1990 vol. 9: 412.3-413.6, f. 205v3-206r6); see Verhagen (2010: 469-471). On the notices of the editorial practice of both Si tu and Zhu chen Tshul khrims rin chen (1697-1774), editor of the Sde dge *Bstan ’gyur* xylograph (1744), in their respective *Dkar chags*, see Schaeffer (2009: 94-103).
39 Sherab Gyaltsen (ed.) (1990 vol. 9: 412.5-412.6, f. 205v5-6): *gsang sngags rnams kyang sngags btu yod pa’i rigs la de nyid dang bstun / med pa rnams la’ang mtha’ gcig tu sam skr ta’i skad du ngos gzung byar mi btub pa ’gro lding ba’i skad dang / pi shâ tsâ’i skad dang / zur chag dang / gsang ba’i brda’i skad la sogs pa can rnams ni dhe mthun shas che ba gtsos bor bzung / legs sbyar dngos yin pa rnams la’ang sgra’i gzhung rnams dang bstun par rang nyid kyis blos dpog pa rnams de bzhin du bgyis / blos mi
Such philological considerations are of course fundamental to the act of interpretation underlying the editing and translating of a text. To gain insight into the actual application of these techniques on the part of Si tu, obviously we need to turn to the results of this praxis, namely the editions and translations that he produced. It would far exceed the limitations of the present essay to attempt a comprehensive investigation and evaluation of the philological techniques which Si tu employed in his enormous output as editor and translator. Fortunately we need not make bold as to attempt such an exhaustive investigation in order to gain a clear impression of his philological practice. Since the facsimile reprint of Si tu’s collected works in the early 1990s the wealth of Si tu’s literary oeuvre has been accessible to the academic world. In this fourteen-volume collection we find texts ranging in size from several volumes (notably his commentary on the Cāndra Sanskrit grammar occupying some two and a half volumes, and a collection of biographies of Karma Bka’ brgyud masters filling two volumes) to works of only one or a few folios. Among these smaller documents there is one of singular relevance to the topic at hand which I want to highlight in the present article.

1.3. The Eight-Stanza Hymn to Vajra-Mahākāla

We are in the fortunate circumstances that we can gain a close-up perspective of Si tu’s outstanding translating skills through one particular document. In the seventh volume of his Collected Works, in a mixed collection of liturgical and related materials, a hymn to the Tantric deity Mahākāla has been preserved entitled Vajra-Mahākāla-Aṣṭaka-Stotra, ‘The Eight-Stanza Hymn to Vajra-Mahākāla’. Although only slightly less than four folios long, this text is a veritable gold mine for our understanding of Si tu’s translation practice. It consists of the Sanskrit text (in Tibetan transliteration) as established by Si tu on the basis of a considerable number of manuscripts, and his Tibetan translation of the hymn. The
most fascinating aspect of this edition, however, is Si tu’s abundant intralinear annotation to both the Sanskrit original and the Tibetan version. In this extensive annotation Si tu goes to great length to justify the choices he made in the establishing as well as the interpretation of this text. There he compares variant readings from Sanskrit manuscripts he had traced in Tibet and Nepal, and he explores the various Tibetan translations that were already in circulation. Here we are privileged to witness at first hand his weighing of arguments and considerations in the process of editing and translating a Sanskrit scripture.

The colophon to this brief text informs us that Si tu made this translation, at the behest of a ‘Brug pa Bka’ brgyud pa hierarch, probably in the year 1747 in the vicinity of the hall of worship (Gandhola) of the ‘Phrul snang temple in Lhasa. As for his sources, according to the colophon, he based his edition on Indian manuscripts that had reached Tibet in earlier times, some bilingual copies, and numerous corrupt manuscripts from Kathmandu and Patan [in] Nepal’. If I have interpreted the dating correctly (1747) this means that the Nepalese manuscripts he worked with were most probably ones he had found during his first visit to Nepal (1723-1724), to which manuscripts may have been added that found their way to Si tu otherwise, for instance through the mercantile and pilgrimage contacts between Nepal and Tibet. Si tu’s annotation to this hymn will show that he consulted a considerable number of older and more recent Sanskrit manuscripts. The colophon mentions only one earlier Tibetan translation explicitly, namely one by Zha lu Lo tsā ba Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1528), but it will become clear from the annotation that Si tu looked at several other existing translations as well.

On account of its unique value for our insight into Si tu’s translation techniques — and by extension those of the more sophisticated Tibetan translators in general — I present here an integral edition and translation of his annotated version of this hymn (in section 2) followed by a brief investigation of some conclusions that may be drawn from this (in sections 3, 4 and 5).

---

43 The full text of the colophon is given infra, section 2.11.
44 I.e. ‘Brug chen VII Dkar brgyud ’phrin las shing rta (1718-1766)?
45 My interpretation of the dating in the colophon is tentative, see my translation of the colophon infra.
46 A tentative translation for nyis bid can (a term which I have not been able to trace elsewhere) assuming a connection with the numeral gnyis, ‘two’.
The ‘Eight-Stanza Hymn to Mahākāla’

The Mahākāla-Aṣṭaka-Stotra per se, as its title suggests, consists of eight stanzas, which are followed by a ninth concluding verse which specifies the benefits gained from the liturgy of this hymn. In the following section 2, I will deal with the text stanza by stanza according to this scheme:

— SS (in references: + verse + line number) = Sanskrit text based on Si tu’s transliteration (with occasional reconstruction and emendation by the present author).

— PS (in references: + verse + line number) = Sanskrit text according to the edition Pandey (1994: 206-207). (The passages in PS which are variant from SS are underlined.)

— ST (in references: + verse + line number) = Tibetan translation by Si tu. To this my English translation of Si tu’s Tibetan translation is added. (Please note: My English translation is not based on the Sanskrit text. I will indicate the main instances where Si tu’s translation does not correspond to a literal interpretation of the Sanskrit.)

The text of Si tu’s annotation will be given for each stanza, along with an English translation.

Finally, for the sake of comparison I have included the Tibetan translations of this same hymn available in the Bstan 'gyur canon (Peking edition) in section 6:

6.1: Peking 2639 (Bstan 'gyur, Rgyud 'grel, vol. la (26) f. 293v2-294v3)
6.2: Peking 2644 (Bstan 'gyur, Rgyud 'grel, vol. la (26) f. 298r4-299r6)
6.3: Peking 2645 (Bstan 'gyur, Rgyud 'grel, vol. la (26) f. 299r6-300v1)
6.4: Peking 2646 (Bstan 'gyur, Rgyud 'grel, vol. la (26) f. 300v2-301v4)

2. Si tu’s Edition and Translation of the Hymn

Title

SS:
Vajra-Mahākālāṣṭaka-stotra (1v1)
Śrī-Vajra-Mahākālāṣṭaka-stotra (4v1)

---

47 The original Sanskrit was composed in the twenty-one syllable Sragdharā metre, the traditional scheme of which is ma-ra-bha-na-ya-ya-i.e.: --- / "- - / "- - / "- - / "- - / "- - / "- - / "- - / "- - / "- - /"- - / "- - /"- - /"- - / "- - /"- - /."
PS:
[Śrī-] Vajra-Mahākāla-stotra
inoda

ST:
Rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa brgyad pa (1v2)
Dpal rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa brgyad pa (4v2)

Variants of the title in Bstan ‘gyur versions:

(1) Peking 2639:
Sanskrit: Śrī-Mahākālaśyā Aṣṭa-mantra-stotra (293v3)
Tibetan: Dpal nag po’i [sic] bstod pa (293v2),
Dpal nag po’i [sic] stod pa rkang pa brgyad pa (293v3)
Dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa (294v3)

(2) Peking 2644:
Sanskrit: Śrī-Mahākāla-padaśṭaka-stotra (298r5)
Tibetan: Dpal nag po chen po’i bstod pa (298r4)
Dpal nag po chen po’i bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa (298r5)
Dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa sngags rkang pa brgyad pa (299r6)

(3) Peking 2645:
Sanskrit: Śrī-Mahākālaśyā Aṣṭa-mantra-stotra (299r7)
Tibetan: Dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa (299r7, 300r8)

(4) Peking 2646:
Sanskrit: Vajra-Mahākāla-aṣṭaka-stotra (300v2)
Tibetan: Rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa (300v2)
Rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa brgyad pa (300v2, 301v3-301v4)

2.1. Stanza 1

SS:
[a] ḡa-ḥa-ḥaṃ-kāra-nādaiḥ kilī-kili-taravaiḥ bhūta-vetāla-vṛṇdaiḥ/
[b] ḡaṃ-ḥaṃ-kāraḥ samantān nara-piśita-mukhair antra-mālākulaṅgaiḥ /
[c] khatvāṅga-saktā-pāṇīr nara-karaka-dharaṃ kāma-rūpī virūpī /
[d] pīṅgākṣaḥ pīṅga-keśaḥ śava-gamaṇa-raṭaḥ kṣetra-pālo ’vatād vah //

PS:
[b] hāṃ-hāṃ-kāraḥ samantān nara-piśita-mukhai rakta-mālākulaṅgaiḥ /
[c] khatvāṅga-skanna-pāṇīr nara-karaka-dharaḥ kāma-rūpī virūpī /
[d] pīṅgākṣaḥ pīṅga-keśaḥ śava-ganaṇalakaḥ kṣetra-pālo ’vatād vah //
The 'Eight-Stanza Hymn to Mahākāla'

ST:
[a] ḡā ḡā ḡāṁ dang ki li li zhes pa’i sgra sgrogs ’byung po ro langs rnams kyi tshogs dang bca’s /
[b] ḡāṁ ḡāṁ zhes sgrogs zhal du mi yi sha dang sku la rgyu ma’i phreng bas kun nas kun du dkrigs /
[c] kha twāṃga dang bca’s pa’i phyag gis mi yi thod pa ’dzin cing ’dod pa’i gzugs can mi sdu ggzugs /
[d] spyan ser dbu skra ser zhing ro yi gdan la dgyes pa’i zhing rnams skyong ba khyod kyi bsrun’g bar mdzod /

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘Making ḡā-ḡā-ḡāṁ and kili-kili noises, accompanied by groups of demons and living dead (vetāla),
[b] Making ḡāṁ-ḡāṁ sounds, everywhere decked with human flesh on [your] head and garlands of entrails on [your] body,
[c] With a Khatvāṅga sword in [your] hand, holding the skull of a man, with a form of desire, with an ugly form,
[d] Yellow-eyed, yellow-haired, delighting in cemeteries, Protector of the Fields, may you protect [us]!'

Si tu’s gloss ad 1b:
S 1v3-1v6: rgya dpe’i bzhugs tshul gyis ’di bzhin bsgyur ba ’thad gyi [?] gdong gis brgyan zhes pa ni brgyan pa’i skad dod med par ma zad mi ’brel lo / rgya dpe kha cig na wak tra’i rma’ la’ m zhes snang bas mgo bo’i phreng bar bsgyur kyang tshig rkang snga ma dang ’brel [infralinear: mgul du ] che bas dkyus bzhin legs

‘[My] translation thus [i.e. as above], in accordance with the way [the phrase] occurs in the Indian manuscripts, is acceptable, but as regards [the translation] ’adorned with faces [or: heads]',48 not only is the word ’adorned' missing [in the Sanskrit] but also it lacks [syntactical] connection.
In some Indian manuscripts [the passage] vaktra’ir māḷaṃ occurs [here], therefore one could translate as ‘a garland of heads' (mgo bo’i phreng ba), and it has a strong [semantical/syntactical] connection with the preceding verse-line (tshig rkang = *pāda), so, in accord with the customary [reading], it is in order [to translate thus].'

Si tu’s gloss ad 1d ro yi gdan la dgyes pa:

---

48 I have not found exact attestations of this translation in the canonical versions. Cf. Peking 2639 f. 293v8: mgo bo rnams kyi phreng bas (…), Peking 2644 f. 298r8: mgo yi rnams [sic] kyi mgo’i phreng byas (…), Peking 2645 f. 299v4: mgo bo rnams kyi phreng ba’s, Peking 2645 f. 299v6: rgyu ma sbral ba’i phreng bas, and Peking 2646 f. 300v3: rgyu ma’i phreng ba.
S 1v6: ro la gshegs par dgyes pa’i zhes bsgyur na rgya dpe dang mthun yang dkyus bzhin don ‘gyur yin ‘dug pas rang sor bzhag

‘If one would translate śava-gamana-rataḥ as ‘delighting in going to corpses’, this is in accordance with the Sanskrit manuscripts, however, as this translation ro yi gdan la dgyes pa is an intention-based [or reference-based] translation, in accord with the customary [reading] I have left it unchanged [and have translated it as ‘delighting in cemeteries’].

2.2. Stanza 2

SS:
[a] phem-phem-phem-kāra-nādaiḥ pratijanita-brhad-vahni-garbhāgagra-vaktraḥ /
[b] mālā-kāṇṭhi vidhāya prakāṭa-bhaya-vapur-bhūṣitāṅgopāśobhah /
[c] pīṭṭā ṛaktā-śravō ṛghaṃ nṛka-śakala-dhṛto mārinām ugra-pāṇīḥ /
[d] krīḍāṃ-krīdo vinodair nara-dahana-bhuvi kṣetrapaḥ pātu yuṣmān //

PS:
[a] phem-phem-phem-kāra-nādaiḥ pratijanita-brhad-vahni-garbhāṅga-vaktre /
[b] mālāṃ kāṇṭhe nidhāya prakāṭa-bhaya-vapur-bhūṣitāṅgopāśobhah /
[c] ṛṣad-ṛaktā-dhāroṣṭho ‘ṛgḥaṃ nṛka-śakala-ṛtā-mālinā mukta-pāṇīḥ /
[d] klīṃ-ḍāṃ-klīṃ-ḍāṃ-ninādaīr vara-dahana-bhuvi kṣetrapaḥ pātu yuṣmān //

ST:
[a] phem phem phem zhes grogs shing so sor skyes pa’i me dpung chen po’i dbus su gdong gi rtse mo yis /

49 As given in SS; however, note also the (obscure) reading in PS: śava-gaṇamalakah.
On this typography of translation, see section (5) infra.
50 Alternative translation, somewhat less likely: ‘(…) [I] have not changed my own [translation].’ Both translations are tentative: the usual meaning of the phrase sor bzhag / sor gzhag is ‘has been / should be left untranslated’, indicating the use of a loanword. This is clearly not the case here. Does Si tu intend here that he has adopted his rendering of this phrase from a previous translation, or previous translations, perhaps including the translation by Zha lu?
51 The canonical translations here have, Peking 2639, f. 293v6 and Peking 2645 f. 299v2: ro yi gdan la dgyes pa; Peking 2644 f. 298r7: ro yi gdan la skyes pa [?]; Peking 2646 f. 300v4: dur khrod la dgyes. The former two and perhaps the third (with emendation) correspond to Si tu’s rendering in ST. In a personal communication, November 2009, Kurtis Schaeffer translated this passage: ‘If [one] translates [this] as “ro la gshegs par dgyes pa” this is a translation of the sense that is typically in accord with the Indic manuscript, so [I] have left it as it is.’
52 Note that PS 2cd varies significantly from SS 2cd.
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[b] mgul du phreng ba mdzad de rab tu gsal zhing 'jigs pa'i sku brgyan yan lag rnams ni nye bar mdzes /  
[c] drag shul phyag gis bsad pa'i mi mgo'i dum bu bzung nas khrag 'dzag pa yi mchod yon gsol mdzad cing /  
[d] mi rnams bsreg pa'i sa la rtse zhing brtse bas rnam par rol pa zhing skyong khyod kyis skyong bar mdzod //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘Making pheṃ-pheṃ-pheṃ sounds, with the top of [your] head in the centre of a great mass of fire that spreads54 in all directions,  
[b] Having placed the garlands around [your] neck, truly magnificent due to [your] shining and terrifying bodily form and [your] decorated limbs,  
[c] Holding parts of heads of humans who were killed by a violent hand, partaking55 of an offering of dripping blood,  
[d] Playfully frolicking on a human cremation ground, Protector of the Field, may you protect [us]!’

Si tu’s gloss ad 2a:
S 1v6-2r3: a gra baktraḥ zhes pa zha lus mchog gi zhal nas zhes bsgyur kyang lha las phul byung [?] gi bstod par thod pa’i skad dod şi ro gra zhes ‘byung ba bzhin thod dum gyi don du ’dug pas ‘di bzhin bsgyur  
‘Although [the Sanskrit] agra-vaktraḥ was translated by Zha lu [lo tsā ba] as ‘from the highest head’ (mchog gi zhal nas),56 in order to [make] a perfect praise to [?] the god, the word for ‘skull’ [should] occur thus: śiro’gra, and accordingly this [should] function in the meaning of ‘part of the skull’; [therefore] I have translated it thus [namely as ‘the top of [your] head’].’

Si tu’s gloss ad 2c -śravo ’rgham:
S 2r3: rgya dpe kha cig na shra bā nyaiḥ zhes yod kyang dkyus bzhin don bzang bas bkod  
‘Although in some Indian manuscripts [the reading] śravānyaiḥ occurs [instead of -śravo ’rgham], in accord with the customary57 [reading] I have established [the reading -śravo ’rgham] as it is [gives] the best meaning.’58

54 Lit.: ‘has arisen’.  
55 As supported by SS pitvā; an alternative translation of ST would be: ‘making an offering (…)’.
56 This translation is not attested in any of the four canonical versions.
57 Note that in Verhagen 2010 (475) I interpreted dkyus in this and the following quoted passage as ‘inferior [reading]’. I have now opted to translate it as ‘customary [reading]’, i.e. the usual, common reading.
58 This gloss is also translated in Verhagen (2010: 475) and Verhagen (2013: 326).
Si tu’s gloss ad 2d vinodair:
S 2r3: bi no da rnam sel yin yang don du rtsed mo'i 'khyog tshig la 'jug pas rnam rol du bsgyur
‘Although vinoda [usually] means ‘cleaning completely’, it actually occurs [here] as a word for the playing of a game,\textsuperscript{59} therefore I have translated it as ‘frolicking’ (rnam [par] rol [pa]).\textsuperscript{60}

Si tu’s gloss ad 2d:
S 2r3-2r6: rgya dpe kha cig la na ra gña [or: ga ŋa] na zhes yod pas mi yis gang ba zhes bsgyur kyang don du pi τ्र ba na zhes pa’i nags te dur khrod la ‘dug [or: ‘jug?] pa bzhin ‘dir yang mi’i nags te dur khrod kyi don song [?] / ‘on kyang rgya dpe ‘ga’ la ‘di bzhin snang ba ltar bsgyur
‘In some Indian manuscripts [the reading] nara-gñana\textsuperscript{61} [?] occurs, therefore this has been translated as ‘filled with men’ (mi yis gang ba),\textsuperscript{62} and it is actually (don du) similar [i.e. synonymous?] to [the term] pītr-vana [lit. ‘forest of the forefathers’], occurring in [the meaning of] a forest which is a cemetery, so [some translators?]\textsuperscript{63} here came to the interpretation ‘a forest of humans’ i.e. ‘a cemetery’. However, I have translated it as above [i.e. in my translation]\textsuperscript{64} in accordance with [the phrasing of] this [passage] in some Indian manuscripts.’

2.3. Stanza 3

SS:
[b] krāntyā krāntyāika-viśvāṇi kaha-kaha-kāṭhanair nīla-jīmūta-varṇam /
[c] hṛm-kṛm-śrīm-mantra-dehāḥ \textsuperscript{65} paca-paca-dahanair jāti-mantraih samantāḥ /
[d] vighanā prosāryamāṇaḥ samayatu niyataṁ sādhakāṁ kṣetra-pālah //

\textsuperscript{59} An alternative translation here: ‘as a playful word for “to play”’; Schaeffer (2013: 307) translates: ‘it may be construed as an indirect term for ‘tsemo’ [‘play’].
\textsuperscript{60} See also Schaeffer (2013: 307).
\textsuperscript{61} Or nara-gañana? It is unclear which Sanskrit form Si tu intends here. The orthography here is evidently corrupt in the blockprint. One might wonder if the intended form was *nara-vana, ‘forest of humans’ (cf. infra in the gloss)?
\textsuperscript{62} As in Peking 2639 f. 294r3, Peking 2644 f. 298v1 and Peking 2645 f. 299v8. Peking 2646 f. 300v7 has dmyal bar bsreg pa here.
\textsuperscript{63} This translation is not attested in any of the four canonical versions.
\textsuperscript{64} I.e. as ‘human cremation ground’, mi rnams bsreg pa’i sa for Sanskrit nara-dahana-bhuvī.
\textsuperscript{65} One would expect (...)-dehā (singular nominative masculine) here, as in PS.
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PS:
[a] kṣam-kṣam-kṣam-kṣanti-mūrtih kala-kala-kala-kṛt kṣanti-vṛddhim prakurvan /
[b] krāntā krāntaika-ovīsah kaha-kaha-kāṭhanao nīla-jīmūta-varṇah /
[c] hṛīṃ-śrīṃ-kliṃ-mantra-dehah paca-paca-dahanin jāṭa-mantraḥ samantād /
[d] vīgnān uṭsāryāmāṇāḥ śamayatu niyataṁ śātravān kṣetra-pālāḥ //

ST:
[a] kṣem kṣem kṣem zhes bzod pa’i sku can ca co sgros par mdzad cing bzod pas gdug pa rnams bsdad de /
[b] gcig pus sna tshogs mnan cing mnan nas ka ha ka ha brjod par mdzad pa char sprin sn gon po’i mdog /
[c] hṛīṃ kliṃ śrīṃ zhes sngags kyi sku can sngags kyi rigs rnams pa tsa pa tsas kun nas bsdreg par mdzad
[d] zhing skyong gis ni sgrub po rnams kyi bgegs rnams rab tu skrod cing nges par zhi bar mdzad du gsol //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘With kṣem-kṣem-kṣem bodily form of forbearance, uttering exclamations\(^{66}\) and having killed the noxious with forbearance,
[b] Alone subduing all kinds [of negative factors?] and after subduing [these]\(^{67}\) uttering kaha-kaha, having the hue of a dark-blue cloud,
[c] Having a hṛīṃ-kliṃ-śrīṃ mantra-body, [with various] classes of mantras\(^{68}\) burning [negative factors?] everywhere with paca-paca [sounds],
[d] May the Protector of the Field, expelling the obstacles of the adepts, surely bring [us] to tranquility.’

Si tu’s gloss ad 3a (...)-baddha-(...):
S 2r4: bcings zhes bsgyur ba’ang ‘dug ‘One could also translate [baddha] as ‘bound’ [instead of ‘noxious’ (gdug pa) as in my translation].’\(^{69}\)

Si tu’s gloss ad 3c hṛīṃ-kliṃ-śrīṃ:
S 2r3: kṛīṃ kṣīṃ śrīṃ zhes ‘gar snang

\(^{66}\) See SS: kala-kala-rava-kṛt, ‘making kala-kala noises’.
\(^{67}\) An alternative translation for line (b) would be: ‘Alone subduing again and again all kinds [of negative factors?], uttering (...)’.
\(^{68}\) See SS: jāṭi-mantraḥ, ‘with mantras of nobility’ i.e. excellent mantras(?); cf. PS: jāṭa-mantraḥ.
\(^{69}\) All canonical versions translate similarly to Si tu: gdug pa rnams (Peking 2639 f. 294r1; Peking 2644 f. 298v2; Peking 2645 f. 299v5; Peking 2646 f. 301r6).
'In some [manuscripts (or translations?) the form] krīṃ-kṣīṃ-śrīṃ occurs [instead of hrīṃ-kliṃ-śrīṃ].'

2.4. Stanza 4

SS:
[a] hā-hā-haṭṭa-hāsair atiśaya-bhaya-kṛt sarvadā yaḥ paśūnām /
[b] pāpāṇāṃ vighna-hantā pratidivasām alam-prāpta-sambodhi-lābhah /
[c] hūṃ-phat-phat-tīrora-nādais tri-bhūvana-kuhaṛāṃ pūrayan pūrṇa-saktih /
[d] pāyād vah kṣetra-pālah kapilam urur jaṭā-śmaṣru-keśopahārah //

PS:
[a] hā-hā-haṭṭa-hāsair atiśaya-bhaya-kṛt sarvadā 'sat- paśūnām /
[b] pāpāṇāṃ vighna-hantā pratidivasām asau prāpta-sambodhi-lābhah /
[c] hūṃ-phat-hūṃ-phat-nīnādais tri-bhūvana-kuhaṛāṃ pūrayan pūrṇa-saktih /
[d] pāyāc chṛi-kṣetra-pālah kapilatara-jaṭā-jāṭa-klesāṅga-bhārah //

ST:
[a] hā hā haṭṭa zhes bzhad pa gang gis dus kun du ni phyugs rnams shin tu 'jigs par byed /
[b] nyin re bzhin du bgegs dang sdiṅ pa thams cad bcom pas nges par rdzogs byang du ni gshegs pa brnyes /
[c] hūṃ phat phat ces mi bzod sgra yis srid pa gsum gyi khongs ni kun du gang bar 'gengs nus pa /
[d] ral pa sma ra skra yi nyer spyod dmar ser rgyas pa'i zhing rnams skyong ba khyod kyis brung bar ndzod //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘[You] who with laughter [sounding] hā-hā-haṭṭa-haṭṭa constantly make the cattle panic,
[b] As [you] conquered the obstacles and sins each and every day [you] have surely gained arrival at perfect Awakening.

---

70 Note that all canonical sources have readings variant from both of Si ṭu’s readings (the one in SS and the alternative one he suggests in this gloss), namely, Peking 2639 f. 294r3: hrīṃ kṣīṃ śrīṃ; Peking 2644 f. 298v2: hrīṃ kṣīṃ śrīṃ; Peking 2645 f. 299v7: hrīṃ kṣīṃ śrīṃ; Peking 2646 f. 301r7: hrīṃ glīṃ śrīṃ. PS has yet another variant: hrīṃ śrīṃ kliṃ.

71 Si ṭu’s rendering ‘and’ does not tally with his own Sanskrit reading (SS) pāpāṇāṃ vighna-(…), ‘obstacles of the sins’.

72 gshegs pa brnyes, see SS (…) -lābhah. Note also that Sanskrit alam(-…) is not reflected in Si ṭu’s translation.
[c] Able to fill the hollow of the three worlds\textsuperscript{73} entirely with the unbearable\textsuperscript{74} sound \textit{ḥūṃ-phaṭ-phaṭ},

[d] May you, Protector of the Fields, with a red-yellow widely extending hairdress of long beard and locks, protect [us]!

Si tu’s gloss ad 4a shin tu ’jigs par mdzad (for atiśaya-bhaya-kṛt):

\textit{S 2r6: `dir rnam dbye’i ’bros [or: ’gros?] kyis phul byung ’jigs pa dang ’brel gyi gad rgyangs dang mi ’brel bas ’di bzhin byas

‘On account of the [syntactical] structure [’gros, lit. ‘course’]\textsuperscript{75} of the cases in this [passage] there is a [semantical/syntactical] connection for [the translation] ‘panic’, but not for [the translation] ‘laughter’, therefore I have translated it accordingly.’

Si tu’s gloss ad 4b sdig pa (for pāpānāṃ):

\textit{S 2r6-2v3: ‘dir rgya dpe kha cig na lo kā nām zhes snang yang dkyus ltar rgya dpe gzhan mang po mthun zhing ’gyur rnying la yang snang bas ’di ltar bsgyur

‘In some Indian manuscripts [the form] lokānāṃ occurs here [instead of pāpānāṃ], yet as [the reading pāpānāṇ] as a customary reading accords with many other Indian manuscripts and also occurs in the old[er Tibetan] translation[s], I have translated it accordingly [i.e. as ‘sins’, sdig pa].\textsuperscript{76}

Si tu’s gloss ad 4b nges par:

\textit{S 2v3: dri med kyi skad dod med pas ’di bzhin bsgyur ba legs

‘The word ‘stainless’ (dri med) does not occur [here], therefore it is in order to translate thus [i.e. as in my translation].\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{73} This, the upper and the nether world.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{mi bzod pa}, see SS (…)-ṭīva-(…), ’deep’.

\textsuperscript{75} My translation ‘structure’, based on the reading ‘gros, is tentative. If we read ‘bros instead of ‘gros, an alternative translation could be: ‘In this [passage] where elision (?) [’bros, lit. ‘fleeing’] of the case-ending [scil. of atiśaya in the compound?] occurs, there is [in this verse] a [semantical/syntactical] connection for [the translation] ‘extreme fear’ (…)’. This would make sense also, as the elision of the case ending after atiśaya- indeed indicates it forms a compound with the following -bhaya-krīt precluding an attribute construction with the preceding terms (as the alternative translation presupposes). However, this analysis of ‘bros must be tentative as well, as by far the most common terms for ‘elision’ in Indo-Tibetan grammatical literature are forms of the verb ‘byi ba, in particular phyis and dbyi. Note that the phrase \textit{rnam dbye’i ’gros / ’bros occurs also in Si tu’s gloss on verse 6c.

\textsuperscript{76} See also Verhagen (2010: 476), Schaeffer (2013: 307) and Verhagen (2013: 326).

\textsuperscript{77} The point is that earlier Tibetan translations have the element \textit{dri med}, ‘stainless’, in their rendering of this verse, whereas Si tu did not find this term attested in the Sanskrit manuscripts. Indeed Peking 2639 f. 294r5 has: bgegs dang sdig ’joms dri med bsnyems [?] pa chu nyi bzhin; Peking 2644 f. 298v4: nyi ma re re dri med mnyes pa
Si tu’s gloss ad 4c hūṃ-phat-phaṭ:
S 2v3: ‘ga’ zhiṅ tu hūṃ hūṃ phat zhes snang
‘In some [manuscripts/translations (?) the form] hūṃ-hūṃ-phat occurs [here instead of hūṃ-phat-phaṭ].’

Si tu’s gloss ad 4d (…)-keśopahāraḥ:
S 2v3: rgya dpe ‘gar ke ≤a gra bhāra zhes ‘byung ba ltar na skra yi khur mchog ces bsgyur dgos kyang dkyus ltar bzhag pa
‘In some Indian manuscripts [the form] keśāgra-bhāra occurs [here instead of keśopahāraḥ] and accordingly one should translate this as ‘the highest burden of hair’ (skra yi khur mchog), but in accord with the customary [reading] [I] have established [this (i.e. keśopahāraḥ) as the reading].’

Si tu’s gloss ad 4d dmar ser (for kapilam):
S 2v6: ‘dir rgya dpe kha cig la ka pi la ta ra zhes ‘byung bas [?] shin tu dmar ser bsgyur byār dkyus bzhin legs
‘Here in some Indian manuscripts [the form] kapilatara occurs, which one could translate as ‘very red-yellow’ (shin tu dmar ser), [but] in accord with the customary [reading, scil. kapilam urur] it is in order [to translate as I have, namely ‘yellow-red widely extending’].’

2.5. Stanza 5

SS:
[a] kham-kham-kham-khadga-pañir lala-lala-lalito lampako rakta-pānāt /
[b] ram-ram-ram-rakta-netram ru-ru-rudhira-karaiś carccita canda-vegah /
[d] ḍaṃ-ḍaṃ-ḍaṃ-ḍāmaro vo ḍamaruka-sahito rakṣatāṃ kṣetra-pālaḥ //
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PS:
[a] khaṃ-khaṃ-khaṃ-khadga-pânîr lala-lala-lalito rûpato rakta-pâniḥ /  
[b] raṃ-ram-ram-ruktâ-ru-ru-rudhira-karaś caritaś caṇḍa-vegâḥ /  
[c] kruṃ-kruṃ-kruṃ-krodha-dŗṣṭiḥ kuha-kuha-kuṭilah kuñcitâsaśa-duṣṭâḥ /  
[d] daṃ-daṃ-daṃ-dâmarâṅgo dâmaru-sahiho rakṣatât kṣetapâlah //

ST:
[a] khaṃ khaṃ khaṃ zhes ral gri‘i phyag gis khrag gsol mdzad nas rgyan  
    gyis rtse zhiṅg ‘jo sgeg dag gis rol /  
[b] raṃ raṃ raṃ zhes dmâr ba‘i spyan dang ru ru zhes khrag gi lag pas  
    gtum po‘i shugs kyiś sdiśs par mdzad /  
[c] kruṃ kruṃ kruṃ zhes khros pa‘i lta bas mtshar zhiṅg mtshar bar bûd  
    rnams ma lus gya gyur kun nas ‘khums /  
[d] daṃ daṃ daṃ zhes ‘dul mdzad dâ ma ru dang ldan pa‘i zhiṅg rnams  
    skyong ba khyod kyiś bsrung bar mdzod //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘With a khaṃ-khaṃ-khaṃ sword in [your] hand, after partaking of  
    [the offering of] blood, playing with [your] ornaments and frolicking  
    in a playful posture,  
[b] With raṃ-ram-ram red eyes, with furious force pointing [your  
    finger] menacingly with ru-ru-ru blood[-red] hands,  
[c] With kruṃ-kruṃ-kruṃ angry look most wondrously slaying the  
    demons, all of these deceitful [beings],  
[d] Subduing [them] with daṃ-daṃ-daṃ [tumult], carrying a dâmaru[-  
    drum], may you, Protector of the Fields, safeguard [us]!’

Si tu’s gloss ad 5a lala-lala:
S 2v3: rgya dpe kha cig tu la li la li zhes yod  
‘In some Indian manuscripts [the form] lali-lali occurs [here instead of  
    lala-lala].’

Si tu’s gloss ad 5a rgyan:
S 2v6: laṃ ba ka zhes pa laṃ ba gar ‘khrul nas gsus ‘phyang du bsgyur  
    kyang rgya dpe thams cad mthun par ‘di bzhin yod pas rgyan du bsgyur  
    dgos  
‘Although [the Sanskrit term] lâmbaka, on the basis of an erroneous  
    [reading] lâmbaga, has been translated as ‘hanging-belly’ (gsus

82 Taking ‘khums as erroneous for ‘gum(s), ‘to kill’. An alternative translation,  
    without amending the form ‘khums, would be: ‘Due to [his] kruṃ-kruṃ-kruṃ  
    angry look most wondrously the demons, all of these deceitful [beings], shrink’.  
73 Note that SS actually has the reading lampaka.
'phyang')

Si tu’s gloss ad 5b:

S 2v6-3r3: bod dpe 'gar 'dir ku ru ru ru zhes 'dug pas / ma lus mdzod cig mdzod ces bsgyur 'dug pa yi ge la 'khrul gzhi byung ba yin tshig phyi ma'i 'gros dang mi 'brel zhing / 'dir khrag gsol gtum po'i shugs kyis spyod ces zha lus bsgyur kyang gsol ba'i skad dod med tsa rtsi [?] ta dpyad pa la 'jug kyang spyod ces pa 'gal bas dkyus bzhin don dang mthun khul lags

In some Tibetan manuscripts [i.e. Sanskrit manuscripts kept in Tibet] [the form] kuru-kuru occurs here [instead of ruru-ru]; this could be translated as ‘do and do [this] completely’. It appears that the source of confusion lay in the [ortho-]graphical form [of phonemes k and r] and [it would result] in a lack of [semantical/syntactical] connection with the following term.

Zha lu translated here: ‘performing the offering of blood with furious force’, however, the word ‘offering’ (gsol ba) does not occur [in the Sanskrit], [and] although [the term] carcita may occur in [the meaning] ‘to investigate’ (dpyad pa) it does not accord with [the translation] ‘to perform’ (spyod).

Therefore, [my translation ‘with furious force pointing [your finger] menacingly with (...) blood[red] hands’], in accord with the customary [reading], seems to correspond [better] to the [intended] meaning.

Si tu’s gloss ad 5c (or 5 in general?):

---

84 As in Peking 2646 f. 301r1: gsus pa 'phyang bab. Cf. also Jäschke (1881: 589): gsus 'phyang po, ‘a deity’. Is there a connection with terms such as Sanskrit lambodara, ‘pot-bellied’, Monier-Williams (1899: 897)?

85 The precise purport of this gloss has remained obscure to me: I fail to see how any of the variant readings for the Sanskrit term (lampaka, lambaka, or lambaga, i.e. lampaka, lambaka, or lambaga) connects meaningfully to Si tu’s translation ‘ornament’ (unless lamba-ka would mean something like ‘having pendent [ornaments]?). Cf. e.g. Monier-Williams (1899: 897): lampaka = ‘name of a Jain sect’, and lambaka = ‘a perpendicular’ etc., Edgerton (1953: 461): lampaka = ‘some sort of garment’, and lambaka, (only at the end of a compound) = ‘excellent, fine’.

86 This exact translation is not attested in the canonical versions, but there is some similarity with Peking 2644 f. 298v6 and Peking 2646 f. 301r2 which have: mdzod cig.

87 Up to this point this gloss was translated in Verhagen (2010: 475) and Verhagen (2013: 326).

88 This translation is not attested in the canonical versions. An alternative English translation could be: ‘acting with the furious force of a blood-offering’.
S 3r3-3r6: kho bos mthong ba’i rgya dpe rnams su dkyus bzhin byung ba de
ga ‘thad pa’i lugs su byas / de dang bdag gis mthong ba’i bod dpe nyis bid
can rnams la krim kriṃ krim sogś ’og gi klog gcig ‘dir snang
‘I have made [my translation] in according with precisely that
[reading] which occurs, as the customary [reading], in the Indian
manuscripts which I have seen.
In these [Indian manuscripts] and the bilingual [copies] housed in
Tibet which I have seen, once the reading of the bottom [half of the
stanza as] kriṃ-kriṃ-kriṃś99 etc. occurs here [instead of
kruṃ-kruṃ-kruṃ etc.].’

Si tu’s gloss ad 5d:
S 3r3: rgya dpe kha cig la ‘dir sau zhes dang pā la’i tshab tu so baḥ zhes ‘dug
pas ‘di yis ‘dul mdzad ces bsgyur bar snang
‘In some Indian manuscripts here [the form] sau [= ‘sau = asau]
[occurs instead of vo?] and instead of pāla (‘protector’) [the form]
sovah [= ?] occurs, therefore [this passage] occurs in translation(s) as
‘this one subdues’ (‘di yis ‘dul mdzad’).100

2.6. Stanza 6

SS:
[a] yaṃ-yaṃ-yaṃ-ṛati viśvāṃ yanam iva niyataṃ yāmino yāmano vā /
[b] vaṃ-vaṃ-vaṃ-ṛata-vega jhaṭ-iti taṭid iva prāpta-loka-pracārah /
[c] bhrūṃ-bhrūṃ-bhrūṃ-bhīṣāṅgo bhṛkuṭi-kṛta-bhayo muktidāḥ
sādhakānām /
[d] kṣaṃ-kṣaṃ-kṣema-kāri kṣapayatu duritāṃ rakṣatāṃ kṣetra-pālaḥ //

PS:
[a] yaṃ-yaṃ-yaṃ-ṛati viśvāṃ yama-niyama-yuto yāmino ‘yāmino vā /
[b] vaṃ-vaṃ-vaṃ-ṛata-vego jhaṭ-iti karaṇa-dhṛt prāpta-lokapacāraḥ /
[c] bhrūṃ-bhrūṃ-bhrūṃ-bhīṣāṅgo bhṛkuṭi-kṛta-bhayo mukti-vān
sādhakānām /
[d] kṣaṃ-kṣaṃ-kṣema-kāri kṣapayatu duritāṃ rakṣatāḥ kṣetra-pālaḥ //

ST:
[a] yaṃ yaṃ yaṃ zhes gshin rje lta bur nges par kun du gshegs shing yang
na mtshon cha can rnams ‘gog /

99 This reading is not attested in any of the four canonical translations.
100 Peking 2639 f. 293v8, Peking 2644 f. 298v6, and Peking 2645 f. 299v4 have this
precise translation. The translation in Peking 2646 f. 301r2 (‘dul bar mdzad pa) is
more similar to that of Si tu (‘dul mdzad).
Translation of ST:
[a] ‘Surely yaṃ-yaṃ-yaṃ going everywhere, just like Yama [i.e. the deity of the dead], yet eradicating [his, i.e. Yama’s?] armoured [demons],
[b] With vaṃ-vaṃ-vaṃ force of the wind instantly travelling through the world like a flash of lightning,
[c] With bhrūṃ-bhrūṃ-bhrūṃ fearsome body, with a terrifying grimace, granting liberation to the adepts,
[d] [I] pray that, creating ḷaṃ-ḥaṃ-ḥaṃ bliss, the Protector of the Fields clear away the harmful and safeguard [us]!’

Si tu’s gloss ad 6a:
S 3r6-3r7: ‘dir bod dpe nyis bid can ‘gar ya ma lo pā ma lo tā zhes ‘dug pa snga ‘gyur dang zha lus dri ma med pa’i chu bzhin gzigs zhes bsgyur kyang yah dang a ma la mtshams sbyar ba yin pa rnam bcad phyi zhi gning mtshams sbyor ba mi ’thad / a pāṃ. chur ’jig kyang a lo tā sā dang mtshams sbyar bas chu ma mthong zhes par ’gyur bas ’brel med cing bzhin sgra ’ang ma byung bas yig nor ram gang yin chu ma ’tshal da lan bal po’i dpe mang po dang bod dpe rnying pa gnyis rnam mthun par byung ba bzhin dkyus ltar bsgyur ba lags

‘Here in some Tibetan bilingual manuscripts [the passage] yāmalō’[pāṃ alocā]91 occurs. In the earlier translation(s) and [in the translation] by Zha lu this is translated as ‘seeing as [through] clear water’.92 However, if yaḥ and amala are juxtaposed, the visarga [= h] would be elided and [further] sandhi would not apply [and therefore the resulting form could not be yāmalō]. Apāṃ could occur in the meaning ‘water’, and in combination with alocā it could be translated as ‘not seeing the water’, yet [this reading] lacks [proper] [semantical/syntactical] connection. Also the word [translated as] bzhin (‘as’) does not occur [in the Sanskrit], so there [appears] to be some kind of scribal error here, [and, finally] [the word] ‘water’ (chu)

91 I.e., in all probability: yaḥ + amalaḥ + apāṃ + alocā.
92 Precisely this rendering is attested in Peking 2644 (269v8-269v1). Similar translations can be found in the other three canonical versions; Peking 2639 f. 294r7 and Peking 2645 f. 300r3 have dri ma med pa’i sna tshogs chu bzhin gzigs and Peking 2646 f. 301r4 has dri med chu bzhin gzigs.
is not appropriate [lit. desirable] [here]. [Therefore] at present [I] have translated [it as ‘eradicating [his] armoured [demons]’], as the customary [reading], corresponding to [the reading] which concurs with many Nepalese manuscripts and two old [Sanskrit] manuscripts [housed in] Tibet.

Si tu’s gloss ad 6b:
S 3r4: mkhyen pa’i skad dod med pas ‘di bzhin byas
‘As [in the Sanskrit] there is no term for ‘to know’ (mkhyen pa) [as found in other translations],93 I have translated it thus [i.e. as in my translation, ‘moving through’].

Si tu’s gloss ad 6c:
S 3r7: yi ge ‘gar bhi ša na gro zhes ‘dug pas mchog tu ‘jigs rung zhes bsgyur kyang dkyus bzhin legs shing ‘jigs pa dang grol snyer zhes pa’ang mi ‘thad pa don thob dang rnam dbye’i ‘gros kyis shes so
‘In some texts [the reading] bhīṣanāgro [instead of bhīṣanāṅgo] occurs, and therefore [earlier translators] have translated this as ‘able to scare in the highest degree’,94 which is in order [as it is] in accord with the customary [reading].

And [the translation] ‘fear and liberation-grimace’95 [instead of ‘jigs pa’i khro gnyer ‘terrifying grimace’, for Sanskrit bhṛkṣi-kṛta-bhaya] is not applicable; [we] know [this] on account of the appropriate meaning and the [syntactical] structure96 of the cases.’

Si tu’s gloss ad 6d:
S 3v3: ‘dir rgya dpe ‘gar bha ksa nāt. zhes ‘dug pa de lta na zha lus ‘gyur bzhin zhi ng skyon khyod kyis gnod pa skad cig gis ni bsal du gsol zhes pa’ang legs
‘Here in some Indian manuscripts [the passage] vaḥ kṣañāt occurs,97 and in accordance with Zha lu’s translation based on that [reading], it

93 Attested in Peking 2639 f. 294r7 and Peking 2645 f. 300r4: ’jig rten gnod byed mkhyen.
94 A comparable though not identical translation appears to be attested in Peking 2644 f. 299r1: mchog gi ‘jigs mdzad nus pa, however compare also Peking 2639 f. 293v5 and Peking 2645 f. 299v1: mchog gi khro gnyer ‘jigs mdzad.
95 Tentative translation. I have not been able to trace the term grol snyer. I assume snyer (‘to frown’, see Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo s.v. snyer ba) = gnyer (as in khro gnyer). The phrasing ‘jigs pa dang grol snyer is not attested in any of the Bstan ‘gyur versions. See Peking 2639 f. 293v5 and Peking 2645 f. 299v1: mchog gi khro gnyer ‘jigs mdzad, Peking 2644 f. 299r1: khro gnyer mchog gi ‘jigs mdzad nus pa, and Peking 2646 f. 301v5: khro gnyer bshnyer bas ‘jigs par mdzad.
96 On the phrase rnam dbye’i ‘gros (or ‘bros), see supra my notes ad gloss 4a. The interpretation ‘elision of the case-ending[s]’ is even less plausible in the present gloss.
97 Instead of rakṣatām.
is also in order to translate ‘Protector of the Field, may you clear away the harmful instantly!’.

2.7. Stanza 7

SS:
[a] klāṃ-klāṃ-klāṃ-klaina-mārtis tri-bhuvana-namitaṃ kledayet sarvadā yah /
[b] paṃ-paṃ-paṃ-pāsa-hastal paśu-dhṛta-kavalan [?] pālayan pāḷantyān /
[c] mantrātmā mantra-mārtis tv abhimata-phala-dāṃ mantriṇāṃ mantra-tulyaṃ /
[d] kṣetraṇāṃ pālako ‘sau sakala-jana-tanuḥ pātu yuśmāṁś ciraṃ yah //

PS:
[a] klāṃ-klāṃ-klāṃ-krānti-mārtis tri-bhuvana-maniśaṃ kledayan sarvadā yah /
[b] paṃ-paṃ-paṃ-pāsa-hastaḥ parasu-dhṛta-karaḥ pālayan pāḷantyān /
[c] mudrānāṃ mantra-mārtis tvam abhimata-phala-dāma mantriṇāṃ mantra-
tulyaḥ /
[d] kṣetraṇāṃ pālako ‘sau sakala-jīta-tanuḥ pātu yuśmāṁś cirāyuh //

ST:
[a] klāṃ klāṃ klāṃ zhes rul ba’i lus can srid pa gsum gyis btud cing gang
gis kun nas nyams par mdzad /
[b] paṃ paṃ paṃ zhes phyag gi zhags pas phyugs rnams bsung nas gsol
tzing brung bya rnams ni skyong mdzad pa /
[c] sngags bdag sngags kyi sku can sngags pa rnams la sngags dang
mtshangs par mgon par ‘dod pa’i ‘bras ster ba /
[d] gang zhiṅg zhing rnams skyong bar mdzad pa khyod kyis mtha’ dag skye
bo’i lus ‘di yun ring skyong bar mdzod //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘[You] who have a klāṃ-klāṃ-klāṃ putrid body, for whom [the
inhabitants of] the three worlds98 bow down and who in all respects99
make [the evil factors?] perish,100
[b] With a paṃ-paṃ-paṃ noose in [your] hand, after catching the
cattle,101 feeding [them],102 and protecting those who are to be
safeguarded,

---

98 I.e. this, the upper and nether world.
99 Kun nas for Sanskrit sarvadā, ‘always’.
100 ‘Make (…) perish’ (nyams par mdzad) for Sanskrit kledayet, ‘may cause to putrefy’. 
[c] With a mantra-self, with a mantra-bodily form, granting to the mantra-practitioners the result of what they wish for in accordance with the mantra, [d] [You] who protect the Fields, may you protect this body [i.e. life] of a limitless number of living beings for a long time!’

Si tu’s gloss ad 7a tri-bhuvana-namitam / srīd pa gsum gyis btud:
S 3v3: ‘dir ga ma naiḥ zhes dpe ’gar byung bas srīd gsum ’gro ba zhes sngar bsgyur
‘Here [the Sanskrit form] gamanaihu occurs in some manuscripts, and therefore it has previously been translated as ‘moving in the three worlds’103.’

Si tu’s gloss ad 7b:
S 3v3: ‘dir la lar bi dhṛta ka raḥ zhes yod pas nrāṃ ’dzin phyag gis zhes bsgyur kyang dkyus bzhin gzhan du byung ba legs
‘Here in some [manuscripts] [the form] vidhṛta-karaḥ occurs [instead of (-)pāśā-hastaḥ], and therefore it has been translated as ‘with widely wielding hand’ (nrāṃ ’dzin phyag gis),104 but it is better [to translate] in accord with the customary [reading] and [to follow the reading] occurring in other [manuscripts].’

Si tu’s gloss (1) ad 7c mantrātmā mantrā-mūrtis / sngags bdag sngags kyi sku can:
S 3v3: bal po’i dpe mang por mu drā nāṃ mantra mu kti zhes ’dug pa de ltar na sngags dang phyag rgyas grol ba zhes ’gyur
‘In many Nepalese manuscripts [the passage] mudrāṇāṃ mantrā-mukti occurs, and accordingly this [could] be translated as ‘liberation by mantra and mudrā’105.’

101 Cf. stanza 4a. Metaphor for the ‘flock’ of adepts, or the ‘herd’ of ignorant beings? The former interpretation seems more apt in the present stanza, the latter in stanza 4a.
102 Gsöl, ‘to offer a meal’ (Jäschke 1881: 591-592) for Sanskrit kavala, ‘a mouthful, a morsel’ (Monier-Williams 1899: 264)?
103 Specifically in Peking 2646 f. 301r8: srīd gsum ’gro ba’i (…); the other canonical translations read: srīd gsum nyin mtshan dus kun (…) (Peking 2639 f. 294r8; Peking 2644 f. 299r2; Peking 2645 f. 300r4).
104 Three canonical translations appear to be based on this reading, namely Peking 2639 f. 294r8, Peking 2644 f. 299r3, and Peking 2645 f. 300r5: nrāṃs ’dzin phyag gis (in all three cases emend nrāṃs to nram?). Peking 2646 f. 301r8 has phyag gi zhags pas, corresponding to Si tu’s translation.
105 Note that Si tu disregards the genitive plural of Sanskrit mudrāṇāṃ in this rendering. None of the canonical translations reflect this variant reading, in fact they all correspond to Si tu’s reading, with only a minor variant in Peking 2646 f. 301r8-301v1: sngags kyi bdag nyid sngags kyi sku can. SP does offer yet another
Si tu’s gloss (2) ad 7c sngags dang mthun par / (mantriṇāṃ) mantra-tulyāṃ:
S 3v6: rgya dpe ‘gar ‘dir sa ma su kha zhes ‘dug pas zhi bder bsgyur ‘dra yang ‘di bzhi legs
‘In some Indian manuscripts here [the form] sama-sukha occurs, and therefore it has been translated as ‘bliss [of/and] tranquility’ (zhi bde),¹⁰⁶ [yet] it is in order [to translate] as above [scil. in my translation].'

Si tu’s gloss ad 7d:
S 3v6: ‘dir tsi rā yuh zhes dang tsi rā yāṃ zhes pa’ang dpe ‘ga’ la snang yang dkyus bzhi legs par rtogs
‘Here [the forms] cirāyuḥ [‘long-lived’] and cirāyāṃ [‘for a long time’] occur in some manuscripts [instead of ciraṃ yaḥ]. But [I] considered it best [to translate] in accord with the customary [reading].’¹⁰⁷

2.8. Stanza 8

SS:
[a] kriṃ-kriṃ-kriṃ-krīṭi-vāsāḥ kṛta-ripu-niyamāṃ kleśikanāśanesāḥ /
[b] kam-kam-kāpāla-mālī kali-kaluṣa-haraṃ tāla-vṛndhābha-kāyāḥ /
[c] cam-cam-cam-canda-vegāḥ pracalita-samayāḥ kāra-bhūtaikālokāḥ /

PS:
[a] klīṃ-klīṃ-klīṃ-krīṭi-vāsā kṛta-ripu-niyamaḥ kleśitanāṃ sadeśāḥ /
[b] kam-kam-kam-kāpāla-mālī kali-kaluṣa-haraḥ kāla-vṛndhābha-kāyāḥ /
[c] cam-cam-cam-canda-vegāḥ pracarita-samayāḥ kāla-bhūtaikālokāḥ /
[d] saṃ-sam-sam-samyaṭātmā samaya-śubha-phalaṃ lakṣyatā pātu yuṣmān //

variant which is similar –though not identical- to the alternative reading that Si tu signals here: mudrāṇāṃ mantra-mūrti.

¹⁰⁶ Si tu’s gloss has Sanskrit sama-sukha here, probably an editorial (?) error for *śama-sukha which would correspond precisely to Tibetan zhi bde, ‘tranquility [and] bliss’ or ‘bliss [of] tranquility’. This reading is reflected in only one canonical translation, Peking Peking 2646 f. 301v1: zhi ba’i bde ster; the others are evidently based on a different Sanskrit passage, Peking 2639 f. 294v1: ‘bras bu blo gros mthongs med ster, Peking 2644 f. 299r3 and Peking 2645 f. 300r6: blo gros ‘bras bu mthungs med ster.

¹⁰⁷ Indeed PS has the reading cirāyuḥ. I have not found Sanskrit cirāyuḥ reflected in the canonical translations; Peking 2644 f. 299r4 seems to represent cirāṃ or cirāyāṃ: yun ring.
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ST:
[a] kṛim kṛim kṛim zhes pags pa'i gos can nyon mongs can gyi dgra rnams nges par 'joms mdzad dbang phyug ste /
[b] kam kam zhes ni thod pa'i phreng ldan rtsod pa'i rnyog ma 'phrog cing tā la'i tshogs dang mtshungs pa'i sku /
[c] tsam tsam zhes dam tshiṅ gtum po'i shugs kyis rab tu g'yas nas 'byung po gsd byed 'jig rten gtsos /
[d] sam sam sam zhes gshegs par mdzad cing mtshungs med bde ba'i 'bras ster zhiṅ skyoṅ khyoḍ kyis brsung bar mdzod //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘Dressed in a kṛim-kṛim-kṛim antelope skin, truly vanquishing the enemies of those afflicted by impurities [Sanskrit: kleśas], the mighty one,
[b] Wearing a kaṃ-kaṃ garland of skulls, taking away the obscuration108 of the evil enemies, with a body as [impressive as] a group of Tāla trees,
[c] With caṃ-caṃ-caṃ fierce force setting the solemn vows in motion,109 killer of demons, the highest of the world,
[d] Coming sam-sam-saṃ near, granting the result of unequalled bliss, Protector of the Field, may you safeguard [us]!’

Si tu’s gloss ad 8a kṛim-kṛim-kṛim:
S 3v4: dpe ‘gar kram kram kram zhes snang
‘In some manuscripts [the form] kram-kram-kram occurs [here].’110

Si tu’s gloss ad 8a nyon mongs can gyi dgra rnams nges par ‘joms mdzad [:]
S 3v6-3v7: ‘dir sngon gyi bod dpe ‘gar kle śi tā śe sa mā raḥ zhes yod pas bdud dang dgra bo nyon mongs gyur rnams ma lus nges par ‘joms mdzad pa / zhes bṣgyur kyang ‘joms pa’i skad dod med cing mi ‘grigs dkyus ltar don dang ‘byor / ‘gyur gsar rnying thams cad la kā la ‘dir lha chen po’i mtshan nag po chen po la sbyar ba te ‘chi med mdzod du gzig gos can zhes bṣgyur kyang dkyus bzhin legs gshegs pas zhes bṣgyur zhing bshad pa byed pa ni ya m [?] tshan pa’i gnas so
‘Here in some old(er) [Sanskrit] manuscripts [housed] in Tibet [the passage] kleśitāśeśa-māraḥ occurs (instead of kleśikāṇāśaneśaḥ),111 which

108 Lit. ‘turbid(ness)’.
109 Or: ‘With caṃ-caṃ-caṃ solemn vow, setting in motion with fierce force (...).’
110 Peking 2645 f. 300r2 has this variant. Other variants, different from both mentioned by Si tu are found in PS: kliṃ-kliṃ-kliṃ, Peking 2639 f. 294r6: kriṃ-kriṃ-kriṃ, Peking 2644 f. 298v7: kriṃ-kriṃ-kriṃ, and Peking 2646 f. 300v8-301r1: hrim-hrim-hrim.
111 I.e. kleśika + ānāśana + Ṭṣah?
could be translated as ‘truly totally vanquishing the demons and the enemies that the impurities [Sanskrit: kleśas] have become’, 112 but the word ‘vanquish’ does not occur [here] 113 and is incorrect, [and therefore I have translated] in accordance with the customary [reading and] in accord with the meaning [of the context?].

In all translations, old[er] and [more] recent, [the form] kāla is applied [?] here [as] in the name of the great deity ‘The Great Black’ [Tibetan Nag po chen po, i.e. Sanskrit Mahākāla], whereas in the Amarakoṣa (Chi med mdzod) [Sanskrit lexicon] it is translated as ‘wearing a leopard[-skin]-garment’ (gzig gos can), but in accord with the customary [reading] it could be translated and explained as ‘by the well gone’ [Sanskrit sugata?], which is an instance of an honorary [epithet].114

Si tu’s gloss ad 8b:
S 4r3: tuṇḍa nag po ‘i mchu zhes snang yang bal po ‘i dpe thams cad la ‘di bzhin snang ba legs snyam nas bkod

‘Although [the form] tuṇḍa,115 [i.e.] ‘black lips’ [or: ‘black-lipped’?] occurs [here in certain manuscripts],116 [I] deemed [the form] as above

---

112 Cf. Peking 2639 f. 294r6 and Peking 2645 f. 300r2: dgra bo nyon mongs pa rnams nges par nyon mongs ‘joms mdzad cing, Peking 2644 f. 298v7: dgra bo nyon mongs pa rnams nges par nyon mongs par mdzod cig, and Peking 2646 f. 301r2: nges par gnod [?] pa’i bdud dang nyon mongs bag chags gcod byed.

113 A curious statement as this term does occur in SS (- (ā)nāśana-) –which is reflected in ST (‘joms mdzad)—as well as in the variant reading Si tu discusses here (-māra).

114 My interpretation of the second part of this gloss is entirely tentative. The form kāla is not attested in the Sanskrit sources or reflected in the available Tibetan translations of this verse-line. Had Si tu seen a manuscript reading *kāla-vāśa here instead of his own reading kṛtti-vāśa? Or is Si tu perhaps speaking of the translation of the Sanskrit name of the deity Mahākāla in general? The actual term “Mahākāla” does not occur in this verse, or in any other verse of this hymn. The deity is consistently addressed as “Protector of the Field(s)” (Sanskrit kṣetrapāla) in this hymn. The name of the deity of course does appear in the title of the text. Moreover, I have not been able to trace a locus in Amarakoṣa that glosses kāla as ‘wearing a leopard[-skin]-garment’. A secondary meaning of the Sanskrit terms kāla and kālaka is ‘black spot [on a garment]’, Edgerton (1953-2: 179). Is this the rationale for the reference to the spotted ‘leopard[-skin]-garment’, perhaps based on a(n unattested) reading *kāla-vāśa? Finally, the rendering legs gshegs pas is not attested in any of the canonical versions. However, at this point Peking 2639 f. 294r6 and Peking 2645 f. 300r2 have: zhes gshegs pas. Is there a confusion between zhes gshegs and legs gshegs here? Cf. also Peking 2644 f. 298v7 which here has: zhes mnan pas.

115 Monier-Williams (1899: 450) tuṇḍa = “a beak, snout (of a hog etc.), trunk (of an elephant); the mouth (used contemptuously) (…)”; Edgerton (1953-2: 255) “(in Sanskrit ‘beak, snout’, of birds and animals, only contemptuously of men (…) 1. ‘face’ (?) of men, as a part shaven (…)”.

116 Or: ‘(…) [the rendering] tuṇḍa ‘black lips’ [or: ‘tuṇḍa-black-lipped’?] occurs [here in certain translations] (…)’. Note that the translation nag po ‘i mchu (‘black lips’ or ‘black-lipped’) is found in Peking 2639 f. 293v4 and Peking 2646 f. 301r2.
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[i.e. in my edition/translation], which occurs in all Nepalese manuscripts, as in order and consequently [I] have established [the text thus].\(^{117}\)

Si tu’s gloss ad 8c kāra-bhūtaikalokah = ‘byung po gsod byed ‘jig rten gtso:
S 4r1: kā ra gsod pa dang e ka gtso bo la ‘jug
‘[The Sanskrit term] kāra functions in [the meaning] ‘to kill’ (gsod pa) and [the Sanskrit term] eka in [the meaning] ‘the highest’ (gtso bo).\(^{118}\)

Si tu’s gloss ad 8c:
S 4r3: ‘dir dpe ‘gar pra tsa la ta ra tsa ma kṣā [?] kr llo ka lo ka zhes dang ‘gar kṣā ra bhū rlo ka lo kah zhes snang yang sngar gyur pa’i rmad byung gi skad død ma nges shing ma bde bas bāl dpe mnams mthun par ‘byung bas ‘di bzhin bkod pa yin
‘Although here in some [Sanskrit] manuscripts [the passage] pracalatara ca makṣā-kṛl loka-loka [?] [occurs] and in other [Sanskrit] manuscripts [the passage] kṣāra-bhūr loka-lokah occurs, and as the word ‘miraculous’ (rmad byung) [found] in earlier translations\(^{119}\) is dubious and infelicitous, [I] have established [the text] thus [i.e. as above] as it is in accordance with the Nepalese [Sanskrit] manuscripts.’

Si tu’s gloss ad 8d:
S 4r3-4r6: saṃ gha tā rya [?] dang saṃ dza [?] tā rya [?] zer ba ‘ga’ zhig snang zhing sa ma yaṃ su ta dha ra zhes dang sa ma ya śu bha tsa ra zhes mi ‘dra tsam ‘dug pas de dag dzh lag bsnyur kyang rung mod kyi ‘dir bal po’i dpe ltar byas
‘[In] some [manuscripts] the forms sanghatārya\(^{120}\) [?] and sanja-tārya [?] occur [instead of sansāryamāno]\(^{121}\) and [the forms] samayam-suštā-

---

\(^{117}\) Also translated in Verhagen (2013: 327).

\(^{118}\) A quite opaque gloss. Sanskrit kāra can indeed mean ‘killing’, a nominal derivation from the root kṛ, ‘to hurt, to kill’, see Monier-Williams (1899: 274, s.v. 4. kāra, 308, s.v. 2. kṛ). However, I fail to see how bhūta, which follows in the compound, can be construed as the direct object to kāra, as Si tu does in his translation of this verse-line. Moreover, the Sanskrit term eka, ‘one’, can indeed denote ‘singular, pre-eminent’, see Monier-Williams (1899: 227), but again the order of terms within the compound is problematic. Si tu’s translation ‘the highest of the world’ seems to be more in keeping with Sanskrit loka + eka (instead of eka + loka, as in SS).

\(^{119}\) All canonical translations (Peking 2639 f. 294r3; Peking 2644 f. 298v8; Peking 2645 f. 300r2 and Peking 2646 f. 301r3) have the term rmad ‘byung here.

\(^{120}\) Perhaps reflected in Peking 2639 f. 294r6 and Peking 2645 f. 300r3: tshogs pa’i bdag nying?  

\(^{121}\) PS has samyatātmā.
dhara\textsuperscript{122} and samaya-śubha-cara\textsuperscript{123} occur [instead of (a)sama-sukha-phala-
dan] therefore [these passages] have been translated in accordance with these [readings], \textsuperscript{124} but I have established [the text] in accordance with the Nepalese manuscripts.’

2.9. Stanza 9 (Declaration of Merit)

SS:
[a] mantrāṇām aṣṭako niyata-patū-matir yat paṭhet sa trisandhyāṃ /
[b] ācāryaḥ sādhako vā samaya-śubha-carāḥ punyavān jāyate ‘sau /
[c] āyuḥ-śri-kīrti-lakṣmī-ḥṛti-balām atulaṃ kānti-puṣṭi-prabhāvāḥ /
[d] śarvajñāṇaḥ tasya nityaṃ dina-niśi matulaṃ\textsuperscript{125} nāṣayaṃ vighaṇa-jālam //

PS:
[a] mantrāṇāṃ mantra-kāyo niyata-yama-dyutiḥ sat-pathe ūcchha-tīrṣa /
[b] ācāryaḥ sādhako vā japati ca niyataṃ punyavān jāyate ‘sau /
[c] āyuḥ śrī kīrti-lakṣmī-ḥṛti-balām atulaṃ sānti-puṣṭi prabhā ca /
[d] śarvajñātvaṃ ca nityaṃ dina-niśaṃ atulaṃ naṣyate vighaṇa-jātam //

ST:
[a] sgrub pa po ‘am slob dpon gang zhig dam tshig bzang po spyod byed nges par sgrin zhiṅ blo ldan gang /
[b] thun gsum du ni sngags rnam brgyad po klog par byed pa de ni nyin dang mtshan mor rtag tu ni /
[c] bsod nams ldan zhiṅ the dang dpal dang grags dang ‘byor pa blo gros mtshungs med stobs dang mdzes pa dang /
[d] de’i nus mthu rgyas shing mtshungs med thams cad mkhyen par ‘gyur te bgegs kyi tshogs rnam nyams pa ‘gyur //

Translation of ST:
[a] ‘When some adept (sādhaka) or preceptor (ācārya), performing an excellent solemn vow, with a truly acute mind,
[b] Recites this octad of mantras during the three divisions of the natural day, during day and night, permanently
[c] Virtuous, [for this person] there will be [long] life, glory, fame, wealth, intelligence, unequalled strength and beauty,

\textsuperscript{122} Perhaps reflected –based on a reading of samayam-suta-dhara as samayam-śruta-
dhara?-- in Peking 2639 f. 294r6 and Peking 2645 f. 300r3: dam tshig thos ’dzin?

\textsuperscript{123} Cf. PS 8d: samaya-śubha-phalaṃ; cf. also samaya-śubha-carāḥ in SS 9b.

\textsuperscript{124} Peking 2646 f. 301r3-4 lha mchog dam tshig ldan pa may reflect samaya-(śubha?)-cara.

\textsuperscript{125} Judging by his translation ‘unequalled’ (mtshungs med) it seems that Si tu read this passage as (…)-niśaṃ atulaṃ, which makes better sense than the reading in SS and is attested by SP. Is there a corruption in the blockprint of SS here?
[d] And after his powers have increased he will arrive at unequalled omniscience, whereas the groups\textsuperscript{126} of obstacles will perish."

Si tu’s gloss ad 9d:
S 4r6-4v1: bstod pa bklag pa’i phan yon bstan pa’i tshigs bead ‘di rnam dbye dang tshig gi ‘gros dang don thob la legs par brtags nas ‘di ltar bsgyur ba yin gyi / gsar ‘gyur zha lu’i de ni don shin tu mi ‘brel bar snang / ‘gyur rnying la brtags nas sarba dzñam ta snya zhes pa’i thad ‘dir gzhan zhig yod ‘dra yang dpe ma rnyed / gzhan bal dpe ‘gar tshig zur ‘dra min phran bu snang yang / bod dpe ltar byas pa legs par rtag pas de bzhin byas pa lags\textsuperscript{127}

‘After carefully considering the structure and the appropriate meaning of the words and cases in this stanza, which expounds the benefits of the recitation of the hymn, I have translated it thus. However, [the translation of] that [stanza] in the [more] recent translation, namely the [one by] Zha lu,\textsuperscript{128} seems to deviate to a great extent from the meaning [of the stanza]. Upon examination of [some] old[er] translation[s], it appeared that [in the manuscript(s) on which these translations were based] there was a different [reading] instead of the passage sarvajñam tasya, but I have not found [this reading in] a [Sanskrit] manuscript.\textsuperscript{129} Elsewhere [in the text], in some Nepalese manuscripts there appear to be minor variations in parts of words, but as the reading according to the Tibetan manuscripts [i.e. the manuscripts kept in Tibet] makes good sense, I have established [the text] accordingly.’

\textbf{2.10. Concluding phrase / Sanskrit manuscript’s colophon}

\textbf{SS}: iti śrī- mahākālāśṭakaṃ stotraṃ samāptaṃ /
\textit{kṛṭir ayam acārya-nāgārjuna-pādānā m iti} //

\textbf{PS}: śrī- vajra- mahākāla-stotraṃ samāptam /

\textbf{ST}: dpal rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa bṛgyad pa zhes bya ba rdzogs so / ‘di ni slob dpon klu sgrub zhabs kyi mzdad pa’o //

\textsuperscript{126} Note that SS has vighna-jālam, i.e. ‘web of obstacles’.

\textsuperscript{127} For earlier slightly different translations of this gloss, see Verhagen (2001B: 81-82) and Verhagen (2010: 476).

\textsuperscript{128} An alternative, yet in my opinion less plausible translation could be: ‘(…) the [more] recent translation(s) and the [one by] Zha lu seem to (…)’.

\textsuperscript{129} The variant reading which Si tu may have had in mind here is the one reflected in all four canonical versions as \textit{sa steng(s) dang ni mtho ris su}, ‘on earth and in the heaven(s)’ (Peking 2639, f. 294v2-294v3; Peking 2644, f. 299r5; Peking 2645, f. 300r8; and Peking 2645, f. 300r8) for which no equivalents can be found in SS (or in SP for that matter, which reads sarvajñatvam ca).
Translation of ST:
‘The *Śrī-Vajra-Mahākālāstotra [‘The Eight-stanza Hymn to the noble Vajra-Mahakāla’] has now been completed. This [hymn] was composed by Acārya Nāgārjuna(-pāda).’

The concluding phrase as recorded in the four canonical versions:

Peking 2639 f. 294v3:
dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /
slob dpon ‘phags pa sgrub [sic; = klu sgrub?] kyi mdzad pa rdzogs so //

Peking 2644 f. 299r6
dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa sngags rkang pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /
slob dpon ‘phags pa klu sgrub kyi mdzad pa’o //

Peking 2645 f. 300r8-300v1:
dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /
slob dpon chen po ‘phags pa klu sgrub kyi zhal snga nas mdzad pa’o //

Peking 2646 f. 301v3-301v4:
rdor je nag po chen po’i bstod pa brgyad pa slob dpon chen po klu sgrub kyi zhal snga nas mdzad pa’o //

2.11. Si tu’s translator’s colophon

S 4v2-4v4: zhes sgrub brgyud mchog gi gtsug rgyan dpal ‘brug pa rin po che’i bkas bskul bar brten / bod du snigar byung ba’i rgya dpe dangs dang zhal bshus nyis bid can ‘ga’ re / bal yul yam bu dang ye rang gi dpe dag min mang po bcas go bsdur nas / zha lu lo tsas ‘gyur bcos pa de’i steng du ci nus kyi zhu dag byed pa po ni snyoms las pa / bstan pa nyin byed de rab byung bcu gsum pa’i mgo zla’i dbang phyogs tshes bcu’i nyin par gangs can sa’i thig le ‘phrul snang gandho la’i nye ’dabs su grub pa dza yantu //’

‘Following the exhortation by the noble ’Brug pa Rin po che, the crown-ornament of the highest traditions of realization, after comparing actual Indian manuscripts that had reached Tibet in earlier times, some bilingual [?] copies and many corrupt

---

130 On this colophon, see also Verhagen (2001B: 78-79, 81).
131 Probably to be identified as ’Brug chen VII Dkar brgyud ‘phrin las shing rta (1718-1766); see Smith introd. Chandra (1968: 19).
manuscripts from Kathmandu and Patan [in] Nepal,\textsuperscript{132} the person who made the revision to the best of his abilities after correcting the translation by Zha lu Lo tsā [ba Chos skyong bzang po]\textsuperscript{133} was [I], the indolent Bstan pa nyin byed,\textsuperscript{134} [and I have] completed [this work] during the daytime of the tenth day of the latter half\textsuperscript{135} of the eleventh month\textsuperscript{136} [in the first (?) year] of the thirteenth Rab byung [cycle]\textsuperscript{137} in the vicinity of the hall of worship (Gandhola) of the 'Phrul snang [temple],\textsuperscript{138} the centre of the Land of Snows. Jayantu! (‘May [the good forces] be victorious!’)

### 3. Si tu’s sources and editorial techniques: Sanskrit sources

It is quite evident that Si tu was working with a true wealth of sources. Just to give an impression: in one single gloss (ad 6a) we find references to ‘some Tibetan bilingual manuscripts’, ‘many Nepalese manuscripts’ and ‘two old manuscripts [housed in] Tibet’. When referring to the Sanskrit manuscript sources in his glosses, in most instances Si tu speaks of ‘Indian manuscripts’ (rgya dpe)\textsuperscript{139} in general, or occasionally less specifically of ‘manuscripts’ (dpe).\textsuperscript{140} But, in six

\textsuperscript{132} See Verhagen (2001B: 78); please correct there my erroneous translation of Yam bu as “Svayambhū” to “Kathmandu”.

\textsuperscript{133} An alternative translation: ‘(…) the person who made the corrections to the best of his abilities on the basis of the revised translation [i.e. the revision of the earlier translation(s)] by Zha lu Lo tsā[ba Chos skyong bzang po] was [I], the indolent (…)’.

\textsuperscript{134} One of the commonly used detachable parts of Si tu’s two major ordination names, viz. Chos kyi ‘byung gnas ‘Phrin las kun khyab Ye shes dpal bzang po and Karma Bstan pa’i nyin byed Gtsug lag chos kyi snang ba, see Smith introd. Chandra (1968: 9), Verhagen (2001B: 61).

\textsuperscript{135} Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo: Dbang phyogs = Mar ngo.

\textsuperscript{136} Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo: Mgo zla ba = (1) Hor zla bcu gcig pa (2) ‘Dul ba lung las hor zla bcu pa’i bcu drug nas bcu gcig pa’i bco lnga’i bar mgo zla ba zer.

\textsuperscript{137} If the dating here –‘the eleventh month of the thirteenth Rab byung [cycle]’-- is taken literally this would imply it refers to the eleventh month of the first year of that cycle, i.e. the ‘Fire-female-hare’ year, corresponding to the year 1747 CE. However, as the year is not specified it could theoretically refer to any year in that cycle, so between 1747 and 1774 when Si tu passed away.

\textsuperscript{138} I.e. the famous Lha sa (or Lha ldan) Gtsug lag khang, more commonly designated as Jo khang, in Lha sa.

\textsuperscript{139} Sixteen times: in gloss 1b (1v3, twice), 1d (1v6), 2c (2r3), 2d (2r3-6, twice), 4b (2r6-v3, twice), 4d (2v6), 5a (2v3), 5a (2v6), 5c (3r3-6), 5d (3r3), 6d (3v3), 7c (3v6); also in Si tu’s translator’s colophon (4v2). Of these in seven instances followed by kha cig (‘some, several’), four times by ‘ga’ (‘some, several’), once by thams cad (‘all, every’) and once by gzhan mang po (‘many other’).

\textsuperscript{140} Three times, in all instances followed by ‘ga’ (‘some, several’): in gloss 7d (3v6), 8a (3v4), 8c (4r3).
instances he explicitly distinguishes manuscripts kept in Tibet (bod dpe)\textsuperscript{141} and in six other cases he refers to manuscripts acquired in or stemming from Nepal (bal po’i dpe or bal dpe).\textsuperscript{142} He appears to have been well aware that the Sanskrit manuscripts housed in Tibet which he had consulted were older than the ones found in Nepal, as he speaks of ‘two old manuscripts in Tibet’ (gloss 6a) and ‘old(er?) manuscripts in Tibet’ (gloss 8a). His Nepalese manuscript sources seem to have been more numerous, though. Twice he refers to ‘many’ Nepalese manuscripts (gloss 6a, 7c) and in his colophon he states that he compared ‘many corrupt manuscripts from Kathmandu and Patan [in] Nepal’ (bal yul yam bu dang ye rang gi dpe dag min mang po bcas go bsdur). For the manuscripts located in Tibet we find that ‘some’ (gloss 5b, 6a) and ‘two’ (gloss 6a) are the highest quantifications he gives, which suggests that he had at least two and possibly more of such manuscripts at his disposal.

In addition to that, Si tu used sources that he characterizes —with a quite puzzling term, elsewhere unknown— as nyis bid can, which I tentatively interpret as meaning ‘bilingual’.\textsuperscript{143} The colophon suggests that these ‘bilingual’ [?] versions were in fact ‘copies’ (zhal bshus). Perhaps we should think of —probably handwritten— versions similar to the one in Si tu’s collected works which we are currently investigating, where the Sanskrit text (presumably in transliteration in Tibetan script) and a Tibetan translation were juxtaposed. Si tu categorizes these nyis bid can versions also as bod dpe, that is ‘manuscript [of the Sanskrit text] [housed] in Tibet’ (gloss 5c and 6a) and clearly he had a few of them at this disposal (gloss 6a: ‘ga’; colophon: ‘ga’ re).

4. Si tu’s sources: Tibetan translations

Si tu not only drew on bilingual copies of the hymn —if my conjecture supra is correct— but he also consulted a considerable number of Tibetan translations that were made before his time. In his glosses he refers to ‘(an) old translation(s)’\textsuperscript{144} as well as to ‘(a) new [i.e. more recent] translation(s)’.\textsuperscript{145} From his gloss on 8a we can gather that he had several previous (including both ‘old(er)’ and ‘new(er)’)

\textsuperscript{141} In gloss 5b (2v6-3r3), 5c (3r3-6), 6a (3r6-7, twice), 8a (3v6-7), 9d (4r6-v1).
\textsuperscript{142} In gloss 6a (3r6-7), 7c (3v3), 8b (4r3), 8c (4r3), 8d (4r3-6), 9d (4r6-v1).
\textsuperscript{143} In gloss 5c (3r3-6), 6a (3r6-7); also in Si tu’s translator’s colophon (4v2).
\textsuperscript{144} ‘gyur […] rnying: gloss 4b (f. 2r6-2v3), gloss 8a (f. 3v6), gloss 9d (f. 4r6-4v1); snga ‘gyur: gloss 6a (f. 3r6); snga gnyur pa: gloss 8c (f. 4r3); snga bgsyur: gloss 7a.
\textsuperscript{145} gnyur gsar: gloss 8a (f. 3v6); gsa ‘gyur: gloss 9d (f. 4r6).
translations at his disposal as he speaks of ‘all translations, old[er] and [more] recent’ (’gyur gsar rnying thams cad).

So, clearly Si tu worked with quite a few translations of this hymn that were made by his predecessors. The ones that were entered into the Sde dge Bstan ‘gyur blockprint edition were almost certainly available to him, taking into account that the production of this xylograph collection had been completed in 1744 and its redaction had taken place in his immediate vicinity a few years before he authored his version of the Mahākāla hymn (1747). Therefore it seems he must have known the ‘canonical’ translations (four in total). He may also have had access to other renderings that did not reach the Bstan ‘gyur canon. It is very likely that this was indeed the case. Regrettably I have not been able to trace any such extra-canonical translation.

I have come across several indications that Si tu probably had access to one (or more) translation(s) that have not been transmitted in the Bstan ‘gyur xylographs. Specifically, in his glosses he discusses a number of renderings that are not found in the canonical versions and are therefore very likely to stem from (an) unknown extra-canonical Tibetan version(s) of this hymn:

(1) gdong gis brgyan, ‘adorned with faces [or: heads]’ (in gloss ad 1b)
(2) mchod gi zhal nas, ‘from the highest head’ (in gloss ad 2a)
(3) mi’i nags, ‘forest of humans’ (in gloss ad 2d)
(4) krīṃ kṭīṃ śṛīṃ (in gloss ad 3c)146
(5) skra yi khur mchod ‘the highest burden of hair’ (in gloss ad 4d)
(6) mchod tu ‘jigs rung ‘able to scare in the highest degree’ (in gloss ad 6c)
(7) ‘jigs pa dang grol snyer ‘fear and liberation-grimace’ (in gloss ad 6c)

It is not evident which of the translations that antedated him Si tu termed ‘old’ and which ‘new / recent’. Unfortunately he did not give any specifics here. Moreover, we have no criteria for establishing the relative chronology for the presently available translations, namely those preserved in Bstan ‘gyur. On account of general ordering principles for groups of texts observed in this canon,147 one might surmise that the versions of this hymn have been arranged in chronological order. This assumption would make Peking 2639 the earliest and Peking 2646 the most recent translation. However, as only one of the four canonical versions contains a translator’s

---

146 Si tu’s gloss here is very laconic, so it is not clear whether this variant reading is based on Sanskrit manuscripts or on a Tibetan translation.
colophon, the Bstan ‘gyur editors may not have been able to establish their dates and therefore may have followed a different principle of ordering, or may even have arranged them at random.

Si tu does specify one particular earlier translation, namely the one by ‘Zha lu’, i.e. assuredly the renowned translator Zha lu lo tsā ba Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1528). Si tu definitely did not regard Zha lu’s as one of the ‘old(er)’ translations, for he distinguishes the former from the latter in his gloss on 6a.148 Therefore the translation by Zha lu lo tsā ba which, according to the colophon, Si tu is revising in his present version must have belonged to the category which he dubbed ‘new(er)’.149 As there is no marking of a plural for the designation ‘new translation(s)’ anywhere in the annotation it is even conceivable that Zha lu’s translation is the new translation [singular] referred to by Si tu, but, for the time being, let us assume Si tu was comparing several ‘new(er) translations’ one of which was the one by Zha lu.

Si tu refers explicitly to the version by Zha lu at a number of occasions throughout his annotation:

(1) In the gloss on 2a Si tu speaks of Zha lu’s rendering mchog gi zhal nas, ‘from the highest head’, for Sanskrit (...)-agra-vaktraiḥ (where Si tu translates gdong gi rtse mo yis, ‘with the top of [your] head’).

(2) And in his gloss on 5b he quotes Zha lu’s translation khrag gsol gtum po’i shugs kyis spyod, ‘performing the offering of blood with furious force’ (where Si tu has khrag gi lag pas gtum po’i shugs kyis sdigs, ‘with furious force pointing [your finger] menacingly with (...) blood[-red] hands’).

Neither of these phrases is attested in any of the four canonical versions.

(3) In a gloss on 6a Si tu attributes the translation dri ma med pa’i chu bzhin gzigs, ‘seeing as [through] clear water’, to Zha lu and earlier translator(s). This rendering is attested in Peking 2644 (269v8-269v1). The other three canonical versions have very similar translations here: dri ma med pa’i sna tshogs chu bzhin gzigs (Peking 2639 f. 294r7 and Peking 2645 f. 300r3) and dri med chu bzhin gzigs (Peking 2646 f. 301r4). However, as Si tu ascribes this translation also to another earlier translator (or translators), we cannot definitely identify Peking 2644 as the work of Zha lu Lo tsā ba.

---

148 Note also that the one canonical translation for which we have the names of the translators (Peking 2645) predated Zha lu, see Verhagen (2001B: 79-80).
(4) In the gloss for 6d Si tu attributes the translation zhing skyong khyod kyis gnod pa skad cig gis ni bsal du gsol, ‘Protector of the Field, may you clear away the harmful instantly!’ to Zha lu, which was based on a reading of the Sanskrit in this line with vah kṣanāt, ‘for/of you instantly’, probably instead of SS rakṣatām, ‘[he] must safeguard’. Two of the four canonical translations seem to be based on a Sanskrit reading kṣanāt (Tib. skad cig gis; not reflecting vah) here but none of them correspond to the precise phrase from Zha lu’s translation that Si tu gives: Peking 2644 f. 299r2: snod pa skad gis [sic; = skad cig gis?] sel zhing skyong khyod kyis skyongs; Peking 2645 f. 300r4-300r5: gnod pa skad cig gis sel’ zhing skyong khyod kyis skyongs; the corresponding phrase in Peking 2639 is missing; and Peking 2646 f. 301r5-301r6 has gnod pa’i sgo rnams brung ba’i zhing skyong which does not reflect the form kṣanāt in any way.

(5) In his observations on the translation by Zha lu in his gloss on verse 9, Si tu does not quote Zha lu’s translation, but merely remarks that it is quite ‘off the mark’ in its rendering of that verse. All four canonical translations deviate from Si tu’s at a number of points—for instance, all four have the reading ‘on earth and in the heaven(s)’ which Si tu appears to be condemning further on in this gloss—yet we have no means to establish which—if any—of them is the one by Zha lu on the basis of this remark.

(6) Finally, in the colophon to his translation, Si tu again refers to Zha lu’s translation in the most general terms, and he appears to suggest that his own present work is in fact a revision of the translation by Zha lu Lo tsā ba.

In sum, we cannot at this point identify any specific one(s) of the canonical translations as made by Zha lu. On the basis of gloss 6a one might surmise that Peking 2644 is a possible candidate to be the work of Zha lu, but this is highly improbable. The reading discussed in gloss 6a is also attributed to (an)other previous translation(s), and, more importantly, the other readings that Si tu specifies for Zha lu cannot be traced to Peking 2644. It seems therefore that the translation by Zha lu is not among the four that were collected in the Bstan ‘gyur canon, but belongs to Si tu’s category of extra-canonical ‘more recent’ translations.

Generally Si tu’s judgment on Zha lu’s translation of this hymn is quite critical. This is no wonder taking into consideration the fact that Si tu offers his version as a revision of Zha lu’s translation. And, elsewhere also, Si tu has expressed severe critique of the translation
work by Zha lu Lo tsā ba, in particular some of his translations of treatises on Sanskrit grammar.\footnote{See e.g. Verhagen (2001A: 177-178).}

5. Si tu’s Translation Technique

Generally speaking, Si tu’s translation of this Mahākāla hymn is quite precise, and faithful to the Sanskrit original as supplied in his own Bka’ ‘bum edition (SS). By far the most remarkable anomaly —if we can call it that— in his translation must be his syntactical analysis of the final lines of no less than six of the eight stanzas (namely 1d, 2d, 4d, 5d, 7d and 8d). In all these instances the Sanskrit original as offered in SS has a main verb in an (either imperative or optative) third-person singular form and a personal pronoun of the second person plural as the direct object in the sentence. However, in his translation (ST) Si tu consistently renders these phrases with a second-person (presumably singular) pronoun as the agent for the verb\footnote{In fact one could argue that in SS 1d rakṣatāt can be a second as well as a third person singular imperative (see Pāṇini 7.1.35), but this does not take away the fact that the form vah, ‘you’ [accusative, dative or genitive plural] is not reflected in Si tu’s translation. Actually the form rakṣatāt is quite rare in later Sanskrit (see Whitney (1888: 213-214 par. 570-571) so one might wonder whether the form actually should be read as rakṣatāṃ, ‘he must/may he safeguard’ (imperative 3rd person singular medium). Note however also the similar forms avatāt in SS 1d (attested in PS 1d) and rakṣatāt in PS 5d and 6d (where SS has rakṣatāṃ).} and does not represent the direct object. For example, SS 2d has: ‘may the Protector of the Field protect you [plural]’ (kṣetrapāḥ pāṭu yuṣmān), but Si tu translates: ‘Protector of the Field, may you protect [us]’ (zhing skyong khyod kyis skyong bar mdzod), and SS 4d has pāyād vah kṣetrapālāḥ (‘may the Protector of the Field protect you [plural]’) which is translated by Si tu as: ‘may you, Protector of the Fields, (…) safeguard [us]’ (zhing rnams skyong ba khyod kyis bsrung bar mdzod). We find the same discrepancy in Si tu’s rendering of the final lines of stanza 1, 5, 7 and 8!\footnote{The main verbs in these stanzas in SS, 1d: avatāt (imperative 2nd [see infra] or 3rd person singular active from root av, ‘to help’), 5d: rakṣatāṃ (imperative 3rd person singular medium from root rakṣ, ‘to safeguard’), 6d: kṣapayatu (imperative 3rd person singular from causative of root kṣi, ‘to destroy’), 7d and 8d: pāṭu (imperative 3rd person singular active from root pā, ‘to protect’). Compare this to Si tu’s translations where he consistently chooses a second person subject for the main verb.} It is striking that the very same construction is found throughout all canonical translations of the hymn, yet is not attested in Si tu’s (SS) or Pandey’s (PS) edition of the Sanskrit in any of the six instances.
Moreover, we encounter the same problematic analysis in Si tu’s gloss on line 6d where he signals a variant reading vah kṣanātī (‘for/of you instantly’) in all probability instead of raktātī (‘he must/may he safeguard’), which would result in a reading of that line as: kṣam-kṣam-kṣema-kārī kṣapayatu duritāṃ vah kṣanāt kṣetra-pālaḥ. Again, in the alternative translation which Si tu sanctions here he seems to overlook or fail to interpret correctly the term vah (unaccented personal pronoun 2nd person plural, accusative, dative or genitive case).

In the light of this it is all the more striking that, on the other hand, Si tu did construe the other two stanzas (3d and 6d) with a third person subject for the main verb in exact accord with the Sanskrit original! This clearly shows that he must have been well aware of the syntactical structure of the final phrases in the verses of this hymn.

How, then, can we explain this awkward apparently erroneous yet remarkably persistent rendering? Did Si tu follow a customary practice, or succumb to some form of peer group pressure? For instance, did he conform to some prevalent convention or common usage in such liturgical practices involving incantations? Or did he yield to the ‘weight’ of each and every previously canonized translation of this hymn that he laid eyes on which indeed addressed the deity in the second person in the final line of each stanza? And this he did—we must assume, Si tu being a master-grammian—knowing full well that the rendering was not grammatically sound. I do not dare to venture a definite answer to any of these questions. We can only simply conclude that Si tu’s translations for these passages do not match the syntax of the Sanskrit as contained in Si tu’s own edition.

There is of course also the possibility that the Sanskrit transliteration was garbled by the editors of the xylograph of Si tu’s Collected Works, who may have been less knowledgeable about the intricacies of Sanskrit grammar. After all, this edition was compiled posthumously so Si tu could not supervise this redaction himself. Therefore this scenario cannot be ruled out, but it seems highly improbable that the responsible editor(s) or craftsmen would err in exactly the same fashion no less than six times in a text of merely eight stanzas (or nine, including the additional stanza).

153 SS 3d: śamayatu (imperative 3rd person singular from causative of root śam, ‘to appease’), ST: zhing skyong gis (…) nges par zhi bar mdzad du gsol, ‘May the Protector of the Field (…) surely bring (…) to tranquility’, and SS 6d: kṣapayatu (imperative 3rd person singular from causative of root kṣi, ‘to destroy’), ST: zhing rnams skyong bas (…) sel bar mdzad (…) du gsol, ‘[I] pray that (…) the Protector of the Fields clear away (…)’.
I may mention one other instance in the translations by Si tu that is in a way reminiscent of the case under consideration. In Volume six of his Collected Works we find a short commentary by Si tu on the well-known ‘Hundred-Syllable’ (Tibetan Yi ge brgya pa) mantra of Vajrasattva.\(^\text{154}\) In this work he discusses various aspects of the exegesis as well as the pronunciation and grammar of this mantra. At five points in his explanation of the terms in the mantra Si tu translates Sanskrit bhava (imperative second person singular active from the root bhū, ‘to be’, so it would translate as: ‘be!’; ‘you must be’, ‘please be!’) as mdzod cig, ‘make!’; ‘you must make’, ‘please make!’.

Granted, in Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit, we know of the phenomenon of non-causative verb forms occurring in causative meaning\(^\text{155}\) and this might justify the rendering ‘(please) cause to be!’; ‘(please) produce!’; ‘(please) make!’.

But the syntactical construction of the five phrases actually rules out the reading of the main verb as a causative.\(^\text{156}\) Here, again, Si tu persists in a somewhat puzzling interpretation that cannot fully be justified by the Sanskrit text that he himself provides and the reading of which is attested in numerous other sources as well.

Other minor observations on Si tu’s translation technique attested in this document:

— In stanza 4b Si tu’s translation ‘the obstacles and sins’ is in fact not in accord with the reading of the Sanskrit in his own edition, which has ‘the obstacles of sins’ (pāpānāṃ vighna-…).

— In the same stanza (4b), Si tu does not translate the term alam in the compound alam-prāpta-saṃbodhi-lābhāḥ.

— In stanza 6a I must admit I fail to see the rationale for Si tu’s translation of part of this line on the basis of the Sanskrit text (SS) which he himself provides: mtshan cha can rnams ‘gog, ‘eradicating [his] armoured [demons]’, for Sanskrit yāmino yāmano (or is it yāmino yāmano for yāminas + ayāmanas ?; cf. PS yāmino ‘yāmino?’).

— In stanza 8c, even with his explanation (in the second gloss ad 8c: kāra = ‘to kill’ and eka = ‘the highest’) it is unclear to me how Si tu has

\(^{154}\) Sherab Gyaltsen (ed.) (1990 vol. 6: 619.3-627.6, f. 1-5r5); see Verhagen (2001A: 163-165).

\(^{155}\) Edgerton (1953-1: 189-190 paragraph 38.24-38.33); note Edgerton gives no attestation for such a formation for the verb bhū.

\(^{156}\) The Sanskrit passages are: dṛḍho me bhava / sutoṣyo me bhava / supoṣyo me bhava / anurakto me bhava / and, near the end of the mantra: vajrī bhava /, so: ‘(Please) be steadfast for me!’; ‘(Please) be well-appeasable for me!’; etc.
arrived at his translation (‘killer of demons, the highest of the world’, ‘byung po gsod byed ’jig rtse gtsa) on the basis of his Sanskrit for this passage, viz. kāra-bhūtaikalokah.

— In the translation of stanza 9 Si tu abandons the principle he maintained thus far in this hymn, namely of rendering each verse-line of the original stanza in one verse-line of his translation. It may be noted that in fact this freedom of changing the ordering of words and phrases within a single verse is allowed to the Tibetan translators as early as the ninth century, specifically in the imperial edict forming the introductory part of Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa.157

— Si tu’s reference to a don ‘gyur type of translation is also interesting (gloss 1d). The fundamental dichotomy of sgra ‘gyur and don ‘gyur, that is between —broadly speaking—a ‘literal translation’ and a ‘free translation’, or —more precisely—between a ‘convention/ sense-based translation’ and an ‘intention/reference-based translation’,158 is also specified early in the history of Tibetan translation activities in —again— the imperial edict section of Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa.159 At issue in Si tu’s gloss 1d is his translation of the Sanskrit compound śava-gamana-rata as ‘delighting in cemeteries’ (i.e. literally ‘delighting in the places where corpses go’). Si tu argues that prima facie the rendering ‘delighting in going to corpses’ could be correct —indeed, grammatically speaking within this compound the relation between the terms śava ‘corpse’ and gamana ‘the going’ could very well be thus—but he opts for the don ‘gyur, the intention-based translation. This gloss clearly shows the extreme density of argumentation that Si tu applies in this annotation. Indeed, as Si tu states, the Sanskrit compound śava-gamana-rata could mean ‘delighting in going to corpses’ as the middle term gamana can in fact designate ‘[the act of] going’ as well as ‘[the place] where one goes’. Si tu opts for the latter interpretation, reading the combination śava-gamana as ‘[the place] where corpses go’ i.e. ‘a cemetery’. Si tu admits that the translation ‘delighting in going to corpses’ is conceivable as an —in Si tu’s eyes rather too—literal rendering on the basis of the form śava-gamana-rata which occurs in his Sanskrit sources. Nonetheless, here he prefers a different type of translation, i.e. an intention-based (or reference-based) translation (don ‘gyur) which more emphatically reflects the semantics of the term rather than its morphology. What rendering,

158 Verhagen (forthcoming).
then, was it that Si tu “left unchanged”\textsuperscript{160} (sor bzhag)? And in what sense was that “the customary [reading]” (dkyus)? I think both apply to the earlier Tibetan translations of this work. Three of the four versions of this hymn canonized in Bstan ‘gyur translate this passage as ‘delighting in cemeteries’.\textsuperscript{161} Obviously Si tu followed the rendering chosen by his predecessors here, but not without thorough examination of the matter, justifying his choice for a don ‘gyur type of translation.

6. Canonical translations

In general, the order of the stanzas and —in some cases— of the verse-lines in S is different from the four available canonical versions (Peking 2639, 2644, 2645 and 2646). Peking 2639 and 2645 appear to be based on a similar Sanskrit text, perhaps even the same manuscript, which however differed considerably from the manuscript(s) on which Peking 2644, 2646 and Si tu’s edition and translation (SS and ST) were based. On the other hand, Peking 2644 and 2646 seem more closely related to S as they display basically only variance in the order of the stanzas. In Peking 2639 and 2645 the arrangement and division of the individual lines of the stanzas is entirely different from S and Peking 2644 and 2646. The ninth, additional stanza is the only one where S and all four canonical versions correspond closely. The structure of the eight stanzas of the hymn proper in Peking 2639 and 2645 is in fact quite opaque: as these versions do not seem to divide the hymn into eight four-line verses, but into an irregular pattern of two-, three-, four- and even five-line stanzas, I have consecutively numbered the lines of these two versions for more convenient reference.

Concordance of stanzas in S, Peking 2644 and Peking 2646:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S:</th>
<th>Peking 2644:</th>
<th>Peking 2646:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{160} Note that commonly the phrase sor bzhag means ‘has been left untranslated’, but as we do not have a rendering by means of a loanword here, this is definitely not intended.

\textsuperscript{161} Peking 2639, f. 293v6, and Peking 2645, f. 299v2: ro yi gdan la dgyes pa; Peking 2646, f. 300v4: dur khrod la dgyes; cf. Peking 2644, f. 298r7: ro yi gdan la skyes pa.
Concordance of verse-lines in Peking 2639, Peking 2645, and S:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peking 2639</th>
<th>Peking 2645</th>
<th>S:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>cf. 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cf. 5b / 5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cf. 1a / 1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>cf. 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>cf. 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>cf. 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>cf. 2c / 1c / 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>cf. 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[20]</td>
<td>cf. 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>cf. 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>cf. 8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>cf. 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>cf. 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[26]</td>
<td>cf. 6b / 6a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.1. Peking 2639
(Bstan ’gyur Rgyud ’grel vol. lb (26), f. 293v2-294v3)

Reconstruction Sanskrit title: Śrī-Mahākālaśya Aṣṭa-mantra-stotra.
Author: Nāgārjuna (slob dpon ’phags pa sgrub [= klu sgrub?], 294v3).
Translator: not mentioned.

[minusc.: Dpal nag po’i [sic] bstod pa bzhugs sho //]
// rgya gar skad du / [293v3:] śrī ma hā kā la sya aṣṭa mantra stotra nā ma /
bod skad du / dpal nag po’i [sic] bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /

dpal nag po chen po la phyag ’tshal lo /
om grub par gyur cig /

[1] hūṃ hūṃ phat ces drag po’i sgra yi srid pa [293v4:] gsum gyi khongs ni ma lus ’gengs nus pa’i /
[2] ha ha ta ta zhes brjod pa gang zhig dus kun du ni shin tu ’jigs mdzad cing /
[3] kam kam zhes pod [?] pa’i phreng bas dbul spras shing nag po’i mchu dang mtshungs pa’i sku /
[4] [293v5:] hūṃ [?] hūṃ [?] hūṃ [?] zhes bros [?] pa’i mchog gi khro gnyer ’jigs mdzad ’jigs pa kha g dangs [?] sha za zhing /
[5] dbus sgra [sic; = dbu’i skra?] dang ni sma ra ches ser nye bar spyod pa’i zhing skyod kyis bsrung bar mdzod /

[6] ram ram ram zhes spyan dmar ’khyug cing sgyur [293v6:] mdzad krum krum krum zhes rab sgros spyan gyis gzigs /
[7] smin ma ser zhing mche gtsigs ro yi gdan la dgyes pa’i zhing skyigs khyod kyis zhing skyong mdzod /
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[8] ha ha hūṃ dang kī la kī la zhes sgrogs phyag g'yon [293v7:] khatwaṃ gar bcas thod pa bs näms /  
[9] ru ru ru zhes khrag gi rgyun 'bab phyag gis bs näms shing gsol ba 'thung ba la dgyes shing /  
[10] kham kham kham zhes gtum po'i phyag g'yas gri gug ral gri bgegs rnäms la [293v8:] ni rol mdzad pas /  
[11] dām dām dām zhes da ma ru can 'di yis 'dul mdzad 'khor bcas zhing skyong khyod kyis brüns /  

[12] rab tu rngam zhing mgo bo rnäms kyi phreng bas gshin rje dang mtshungs 'jigs pa'i sku brgyan [294r1:] cing /  
[13] kṣam kṣam kṣam zhes gzugs can ca co sgrogs par byed pa'i gdug pa rnäms bzung ste /  
[14] geig pus sna tshogs mnän nas ka ha ka ha brjod mdzad char sprin sngon po'i mdog /  
[15] sku la mi yi [294r2:] sha dang rgyu mas 'brel bas kun nas bgyan cing zhal du [?] gsol /  

[16] drag shul phyag gis 'dod pa'i gzugs dang mi gdug gzugs can gyi ni 'byung po ro langs tshogs /  
[17] ma lus gzung nas myur du bsäd pa [294r3:] rnäms kyi mgo bo'i khrag rgyun 'bab pa rab tu gsol /  

[18] hrīṃ kṣīṃ śrīṃ zhes sngags kyi gsung can pa tsa pa tsa'i sngags kyis bgegs rnäms rab tu bsreg /  
[19] rol pas rol pa sel cing mi yis gang ba'i mtsho [294r4:] la zhing skyong khyod kyis brüns bar mdzod /  

[20] phem phem phaṭ ces sgrogs pa so sor bskyed pa'i me dpung chen po'i dbus su bzhugs nas su /  
[21] rigs kyi lus can skrod par mdzad cing bsgrub pa rnäms kyi zhing rnäms [294r5:] nges par zhing skyong mdzod /  

[22] phyugs rnäms kyi ni nyin re bzhin du bgegs dang sdig 'joms dri med bsnäms [?] pa chu nyi bzhin /  
[23] tsam tsam tsam zhes gtum pa'i shugs kyis rab dbye rmad byung 'od kyi 'jig rten snang [294r6:] mdzad pa /  
[24] krīṃ krīṃ krīṃ zhes gshegs pas dgra bo nyon mongs pa rnäms nges par nyon mongs 'joms mdzad cing /  
[25] sam sam sam zhes tshogs pa'i bdag nyid dam tshig thos 'dzin zhing skyong gang yin khyod kyis skyongs /  

[26] [294r7:] baṃ baṃ baṃ zhes gshin rje ltar 'gro dri ma med pa'i sna tshogs chu bzhin gzigs mdzad cing /
6.2. Peking 2644

(Bstan 'gyur Rgyud 'grel vol. la (26), f. 298r4-299r6)

Reconstruction Sanskrit title: Śrī-Mahākāla-padāṭaka-stotra.
Author: Nāgārjuna (slob dpon 'phags pa klu sgrub, 299r6).
Translator: not mentioned.

[298r4, minusc.: Dpal nag po chen po'i bstod pa bzhugs so /]
[298r5:] rgya gar skad du / śrī ma hā kā la pa da aṣṭa ka sto tra nā ma /
   bod skad du / dpal nag po chen po'i bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /
   
   dpal nag po chen po la phyag 'tshal lo /
[298r6:] oṃ grub par gyur cig /

Stanza 1:
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Stanza 2:
[a] 'byung po ro langs tshogs rnam ha ha hūṃ dang ki li ki [sic] zhes myur bar ni /
[b] sku la rgyu ma'i phreng bas kun nas klubs shing zhal du mi yi sha ni gsol mdzad cing /
[c] 'dod pa'i [298r7:] gzugs dang mi sdu ggzugs can kha ṭwał gav bcas phyag bcas phyag g'yon mi yi thod pa bsnams /
[d] smin ma ser zhing mcbe gtsigs ro yi gdan la skyes pa'i zhing skyong khyod kyis zhing skyong mdzod /

Stanza 3:
[a] phem phem phem zhes sgrogs par byed cing [298r8:] so sor skyes pa me dpung chen po'i dbus na ni /
[b] mgo yi rnams [sic] kyis mgo'i phreng byas rab gsol 'jigs pa'i sku brgyan gshin rje dang mtshungs shing /
[c] drag shul phyag gis bsad pa rnam kyi mi [298v1:] mgo'i ma lus 'dzin cing khrag [?] ...gs [?] 'bab pa gsol /
[d] rol pas rol pa sel cing mi yis gang gis la zhing skyong khyod kyis srung bar mdzod //

Stanza 4:
[a] gang zhig dus kun du ni ha ha ṭa ṭa zhes bzhad shing tu 'jigs mdzad cing /
[b] phyag rnam kyi s [298v4:] sdig dang dgeg 'jig nyi ma re re dri med mnyes pa chu 'dzin mdog /
[c] hūṃ hūṃ phat ces drag po'i sgra yis srid pa gnyis po'i khong ni ma lus 'gengs nus shing /
[d] dbu skra dang ni rma ra cher ser nye bar spyod pa'i [298v5:] zhing skyong khyod kyis bsrun gra bar mdzod /

Stanza 5:
[a] khāṃ khāṃ khāṃ zhes phyag g'yas gri gug ral gris bgegs rnam rol khrag 'thung pa la dgyes /
[b] ram ram ram zhes spyan nam du ru ru zhes phyag ni khrag gis brgyan cing stu [?, sdu?] pa'i [298v6:] shugs /
Stanza 6:
[a] [298v7:] krim krim krum zhes mnan pas dgra bo nyon mongs pa rnams nges par nyon mongs par mdzod cig /
[b] kāṃ kāṃ kāṃ zhes thod phreng sku la spras shing nag po'i mchu dang 'dra ba'i sku /
[c] tsam tsam tsam stuṃ [?; sdum?] pi [?] shug kyis [sic] rab [298v8:] g'yo rmad byung ba'i 'jig rten snang mdzad cing /
[d] saṃ sa[m?] sa[m?] zhes tshogs pa'i bdag gi dgra bros [?; thos?] dzin zhin skyong gang yin khyod kyis skyongs /

Stanza 7:
[a] yaṃ yaṃ yaṃ zhes snod gshin rje ltar 'gro dri ma med pa'i chu [299r1:] bzhin gzigs mdzad cing /
[b] bāṃ bāṃ bāṃ zhes rlung gi shugs kyis myur du rgyu zhin nyon mongs 'jig rten skyong ba mnyes /
[c] bāṃ bāṃ bāṃ zhes 'jigs pa'i khro gnyer mchog gi 'jigs mdzad nus pa'i khra [?] sha [299r2:] za zhin /
[d] kṣa [ ni?] kṣaṃ kṣaṃ zhes [...?]n par mdzad snod pa skad gis [sic; = skad cig gis?] sel zhin skyong khyod kyis skyongs /

Stanza 8:
[a] klaṃ klaṃ klaṃ zhes gdug pa'i gzugs kyi srid gsum nyin mtshan dus kun nyon mongs par mdzad pa gang /
[b] paṃ paṃ paṃ [299r3:] zhes thye'i [?; = bya'i?] zhags pas byol [?] song [?] rnams 'dzin phyag gis 'dul ba rnams skyong ba /
[c] sngags bdag sngags kyi sku can blo yis sngags pa rnams la blo gros 'bras bu mtshungs med ster /
[d] zhin rnams skyong [299r4:] bar mdzad pa khyod kyis 'gro ba'i lus rnams ma lus yun ring bskyang du gsol /

Stanza 9:
[a] bsgrub pa po'i slob dpon blo ldan bdag gis thos 'dzin gzhi gus dang ldan pas /
[b] thun gsum du ni sngags rnams [299r5:] brgyad po klog byed de ni bsod nams ldan par 'gyur ba dang /
[c] sa stengs dang ni mtho ris su ni de yi rtag tu bgegs rnams nyams 'gyur zhin /
[d] tshes dang dpal dang grags dang 'byor 'dzin stobs dang [299r6:] mthu dang gzi brjid rgyas par mtshungs med 'gyur /
The 'Eight-Stanza Hymn to Mahākāla'

Colophon:
dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa sngags rkang pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /
slob dpon 'phags pa klu sgrub kyi mdzad pa'o //

[No translator's colophon]

6.3. Peking 2645
(Bstan 'gyur Rgyud 'grel vol. la (26), f. 299r6-300v1)

Reconstruction Sanskrit title: Śrī-Mahākālasya Aṣṭa-mantra-stotra.
Author: Nāgārjuna (slob dpon 'phags pa klu sgrub, 300r8 300v1).
Translator: ‘the Indian scholar, yōgin from Kośala, Śrī Vairocanavajra
and the Tibetan translator, the venerable Ding ri Chos grags’ (300v1:
rgya gar gyi mkhan po go [?] sa la’ī rnal ‘byor pa shri bai ro tsa na badzra
dang / bod kyi lo tsa ba bande ding ri chos grags).

[299r6:] rgya gar skad du / [299r7:] śrī ma hā kā la syāṣṭa mantra sto tra nā
ma /
bod skad du / dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa zhes bya
ba /

dpal nag po chen po la phyag ’tshal lo /
[298r6:] om grub par gyur cig /

[1] hūṃ hūṃ phat [299r8:] ces drag po’i sgra yis srid pa gsum gyi khong ni
ma lus ‘gengs nus pa’i /
[2] hā hā ū tē zhes bzhad gang zhig dus kun du ni shin tu ‘jigs mdzad pa /
[3] kam kanm kanm zhes thod pa’i phreng bas dbu la spras [299v1:] shing nag
po’i mechu dang mtshungs pa’i sku /
[4] bhrum bhrum bhrum zhes khros pa’i mchog gi khro gnyer ‘jigs mdzad
‘jigs pa’i gdangs sha za zhing /
[5] dbu skra dang ni rma ra cher ser nye bar spyod pa’ zhing skyong khyod
khyis srung bar [299v2:] mdzod /

[6] ram ram ram zhes spyan dmar ‘khrug cing sgyur mdzad krum krum
krun zhes rab sgrogs spyan gyis gzigs /
[7] smin ma ser zhing mche gtsigs ro yi gdan la dgyes pa’i zhing skyong
khyod khyis zhing skyong mdzod /

[8] ha ha [299v3:] hūṃ dang ki li ki li zhes sgrogs phyag g’yon kha ‘twān
gar bcas thod pa bsnams /
ru ru ru zhes khrag rgyun 'bab pa phyag gis bsnams shing gsol de thun ba la dgyes shing /
kham kham kham zhes gtum pa'i phyag [299v4:] g'yas gri bug ral gri bgegs rnams la ni rol mzdad pa /
dam dam dam zhes da ma ru can 'di yis 'dul mzdad 'khor bcas zding skyong khyod kyis srgungs /

rab tu rngam zding mgo bo rnams kyi phreng bas gshin rje dang mtshungs [299v5:] 'jigs pa'i sku brgyan cing /
kṣīṃ kṣīṃ kṣīṃ zhes bzod pa'i gzugs ca co sgrogs par byed pa'i gduq pa rnams gzung ste /
gcig pus snot [?; = sna tshogs?] bsnan cing bsnan nas ka ha ka ha brjod mzdad char sprin sgon [299v6:] po'i mdog /
sku la mi yi sha dang rgyu ma sbrel ba'i phreng bas kun nas brgyan cing zhal du gsol /

drag shul phyag gis 'dod pa'i gzugs dang mi sdug gzugs can gyi ni 'byung po ro langs chags /

hrim kṣīṃ śrīṃ gi sngags kyi gsungs can pa tsa pa tsa'i sngags kyis bgegs rnams rab tu bsreg /
rol pas rol [299v8:] pa sel zding mi yis gang ba'i sa la zding skyong khyod kyis bsrgun bar mzdod /

phem phem phat ces sgrogs pas so sor bskyod pa'i me dpung chen po'i dbus su gzhugs nas su /
rigs kyi lus can spyod [?] [300r1:] par mzdod cig sgrub po rnams kyi zding rnams nges par zding skyong mzdod /

phyugs rnams kyi ni nyin re bzhin du bgegs dang sdig 'joms dri med mnyes pa chu langs bzhin /
tsam tsam tsam [300r2:] zhes gtum po'i shugs kyis rab g'jos rmad byung 'od kyis 'jig rten snang mzdad pa /
krāṃ krāṃ krāṃ zhes gshogs pas dgra bo nyon mongs pa rnams nges par nyon mongs 'joms mzdad cing /
štām śtām stām [300r3:] zhes tshogs pa'i bdag nyid dam tshig thos 'dzin zding skyong gang yin khyod kyis skyongs /

bhāṃ bhāṃ bhāṃ zhes gshin rje ltar khrd dri ma med pa'i sna tshogs chu bzhin gzhigs mzdad cing /

yam yam yam zhes rlung gi shugs [300r4:] kyis myur du rgyu zding nyon mongs 'jig rten gnod byed mkhyen /
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[28] klāṃ klāṃ klāṃ zhes gdug pa’i gzugs kyis srid gsum nyin mtshan dus kun nyon mongs gyur pa gang /
[29] kṣāṃ kṣāṃ kṣāṃ zhes phan par mdzad cing gnod pa [300r5:] skad cig gis sel zhiṅg skyong khyod kyis skyongs /

[30] pāṃ pāṃ pāṃ zhes thugs rje’i zhags pas byol song rnams ‘dzin phyag gis gdul bya rnams skyong ba /
[31] sngags bdag sngags kyis lus can thugs kyis [300r6:] sngags pa rnams la blo gros ‘bras bu mtshungs med ster /
[32] zhiṅg rnams skyong bar mdzad pa khyod kyis ‘gro ba’i lus rnams ma lus yun ring bskyang du gsol /

[33] sgrub pa po’i slob dpon gang zhig dam tshig thos [300r7:] ‘dzin gang zhig blo ldan gyur pa dag /
[34] thun gsum du ni sngags rnams brgyad po klog byed de ni bsod nams ldan par gyur ba dang (/)
[35] tshe dang dpal dang grags dang mthu stobs ‘byor pa ‘dzin dang gzi brjid rgyas pa [300r8:] mtshungs med ster /
[36] sa steng dang ni mtho ris su yang de yi bgegs kyi tshogs rnams rtag tu nyams par ‘gyur /

Colophon (300r8 300v1):
dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa rkang pa brgyad pa zhes bya ba /
slob dpon chen po ‘phags [300v1:] pa klu sgrub kyi zhal snga nas mdzad pa’o //

Translator’s colophon (300v1):
rgya gar gyi mkhan po go [?] sa la’i rnal ‘byor pa shri bai ro tsa na badzra dang / bod kyi lo tsa ba bande ding richos grags kyis bṣgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa’o //

6.4. Peking 2646
(Bstan ‘gyur Rgyud ‘grel vol. la (26), f. 300v2-301v4)

Reconstruction Sanskrit title: Vajra-Mahākāla-aṣṭaka-stotra.
Author: Nāgārjuna (slob dpon chen po klu sgrub, 301v4).
Translator: not mentioned.

[300v2:] [minusc.: rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa bzhugs so /]
// rgya gar skad du / badzra ma hā kā la aṣṭa ka sto tra /
bod skad du / rdo rje nag po chen po’i bstod pa brgyad pa /

om nag po chen po [300v3:] la phyag ‘tshal lo /
Stanza 1:
[a] ḍā ḍāḥ mṭad ki li ki li sgrugs pa’i dgra yis ‘byung po’i tshogs pa
rnam par ‘thag /
[b] ḍāḥ ḍāḥ sgrugs pa’i zhal rnams kyis ni mi yi sha za rgyu ma’i phreng
ba ‘khrug [300v4:] pa’i sku /
[c] phyag na kha twāṃ ga dang gdung thung mi yi lag pa’i mtshan pa ‘dzin
cing mdzes pa’i gzugs /
[d] mi sdug gzugs can spyan dang dbu skra dmar ser dur khrod la dgyes
zing skyong kun [300v5:] nas sbrungs /

Stanza 2:
[a] zhal dang zhal nas pham pham bet ces sgrugs pas so sor bskyed pa’i me
dpung chen po yi /
[b] phreng ba rab tu ‘bar ba’i dbus na bzhugs shing sku la brgyan pas yan
lag nye bar [300v6:] mdzes /
[c] gsod byed drag po’i phyag gis mi yi khrag ‘dzag rgyun tu btung zhin
sprul gyi phreng bas brgyan /
[d] dmyal bar bsreg pa sel zhin sa steng zhin rnams skyong ba khyod ni
rol zhin rol par [300v7:] mdzod /

Stanza 3:
[a] dri med rdzogs pa’i byang chub brnyes kyang srid pa gsum po khed [sic]
par ‘gengs nus ‘od ‘dod kyis /
[b] ṭā ṭāḥ phat ces ma rungs dgra yis nyin bzhin ‘jig rten phyugs rnams
tyi ni bgegs ‘joms [300v8:] shing /
[c] ḍā ḍā aṭṭā [sic] rgod pa yi ni dus rnams kun tu shin tu rab tu ‘jigs par
byed /
[d] mgo skye ral pa sla ra shin tu dmar ser nye bar ‘phro ba’i zhin skyong
sbrung bar mdzod /

Stanza 4:
[a] sゲ sゲ cing rol pa’i ‘jo sゲ dang ldan [301r1:] gsus pa ‘phyang bab [?] phyag
na ral gri kḥam kḥam kḥam /
[b] rakta ‘thungs pa’i spyan dang phyag ni khrag ltar dmar [?] ba ram raṅ
ram dang ru ru ru /
[c] ngo mtshar snang mṭad gtum po’i shugs cad [= can?] khro bo’i lta bas
kḥro [301r2:] gnyer mdzod cīg kṛṃ kṛṃ kṛṃ kṛṃ /
[d] ‘khor bcas skyong pa’i zhin skyong ma lus bdud dang ro langs ‘dul bar
mdzad pa ḍaṃ ḍaṃ ḍaṃ /

Stanza 5:
[a] nges par gnod [?] pa’i bdud dang nyon mongs bag chags gcod byed gri
gug ‘dzin pa hṛṃi [301r3:] hṛṃ hṛṃi /
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[b] nag po'i mchu dang 'dra ba'i sku ni rtso dang nyes 'phrog thod pa'i phreng can kham kham kham /  
[c] rmad byung 'od kyi 'jig rten g'yo zhing [?] snang bar mdzad pa gtum po'i shugs can tsam tsam tsam /  
[d] lha mchog dam tshig [301r4:] ldan pa khyod kyi tshogs kyi mchog dang zhing rnams skyongs shig sam sam sam /  

Stanza 6:  
[a] 'gro ba sna tshogs dri med chu bzhi gnigs nas nges par gshi [?] ... [?] 'gog byed yam yam yam /  
[b] rlungs gi shugs bzhi myur du rgyu [301r5:] bas nyon mongs 'jig rten snang bar mdzad pa b'am b'am b'am /  
[c] smin ma gya gyu'i khro gnyer bsnyer bas 'jigs par mdzad kyung 'jigs las thad [?] byed bhrum bhrum bhrum /  
[d] sgrub po rnams la phan dang bde mdzad gnod pa'i [301r6:] sgo rnams bsrung ba'i zhing skyong ksam ksam ksam /  

Stanza 7:  
[a] bzod pa'i lus can kshin kshin kshin zhes gdug pa rnams kyis bzod par dka' ba'i ca co sgrug /  
[b] ka ha ka ha'i gsung gi rgyun dang char sprin sngon po'i lus can [301r7:] gcig pus thams cad gnon /  
[c] hriṃ ghīṃ śīṃ gis sngags dang pa tsa pa tsa'i sngags rnams kyis ni lus can thal bar byed /  
[d] sgrub po rnams la kun tu gnod pa'i bgegs rnams nye bar zhi bar mdzod cig zhing skyong che /  

Stanza 8:  
[a] [301r8:] klas klam klam zhes rtag tu nyon mongs gyur pa'i lus can srid gsum 'gro ba'i nyon mongs rnams /  
[b] rnam par gsal nas phyag gi zhags pas skyong zhing srong ba la phan phyugs bdag paṃ paṃ paṃ paṃ /  
[c] sngags kyi [301v1:] bdag nyid sngags kyi sku can sngags myos sngags kyis zhi ba'i bde ster 'bras bu'i phyag /  
[d] mtha' dag rgyal ba'i sku bzhi mdzes pa zhing rnams skyong bar mdzad pa khyod kyis de rnams sroings /  

Stanza 9:  
[a] sgrub pa po 'am [301v2:] slob dpon gang zhig dam tshig bde mchog mkhas pa'i blo can thun gsum du /  
[b] sngags kyi bstod pa brgyad po klog byed de rnams bsod nams ldan zhing rgyal bar 'gyur ba dang /  
[c] tshe dang dpal dang grags [301v3:] dang 'byor ldan mnyam med stobs kyis rnam par gnin [?] pa'i gzi brjed rgyas /
7. Concluding Observations

This bilingual annotated edition of the ‘Eight-Stanza’ hymn to Mahākāla shows clearly that extensive and wide-ranging considerations underly the act of translating in the hands of a master scholar such as Si tu Paṇ chen Chos kyi ‘byung gnas (1699?-1774). We see that Si tu consulted a multitude of sources for his rendition of the hymn, ranging from older Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in specialized monastic libraries in Tibet to more recent ones stemming from Nepal. He weighed the intrinsic and contextual aptness of the variant readings he encountered in them. He also involved earlier translations in his deliberations (distinguishing ‘old[er]’ and ‘new[er]’ ones) — four of which have been preserved in the Bstan ‘gyur canon—and gave particular attention to that by Zha lu Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1528), which Si tu regarded his own translation to be a revision of and which is distinct from the extant canonical renditions.

Si tu’s version of the Mahākāla hymn has proved to be an important document for our comprehension of the exact procedure followed by a Tibetan translator. Only very rarely do we get such a close view of the actual processes of deliberation of the translator at work. Precisely how did these los ba las go about their task? What arguments did they base their choices on? Where did they struggle with the fundamental linguistic differences between their source language (Sanskrit) and their target language (Tibetan)? And how did they overcome these discrepancies and incompatibilities? These and many such questions remain to be answered in full. This essay merely offers some working materials for those interested in such matters. I will not claim that I have taken account of every conclusion that can be drawn from this document, far from it. My article constitutes merely another small step in the academic exploration of the technical and practical aspects of the Tibetan translating activities, hopefully contributing to our understanding and appreciation of the genesis of the vast corpus of Tibetan translations of Buddhist scripture.
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**Abbreviations**


PS = Sanskrit text of this hymn according to the edition Pandey (1994: 206-207).

S = Si tu’s bilingual version of this hymn (SS and ST).

SS = Sanskrit text of this hymn based on Si tu's transliteration

ST = Si tu’s Tibetan translation of this hymn
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