Several years ago, Klu sdings mkhan chen Rin po che, the head of the Sa skya – Ngor lineage, detected some 50 mchod rten on an alluvial plateau at the edge of the village of Matho (Mang spro) in Ladakh as the origin of some malign influence on the wellbeing of the community and decided that they should be destructed. One of these mchod rten used to be referred to popularly as the “King’s stupa” (rgyal po’i mchod rten), and another one as the “Queen’s stupa” (rgyal mo’i mchod rten). This local usage has obviously preserved the memory of historical facts, but it apparently mixes up names and persons and periods of time.

Although probably not all of these mchod rten were contemporary, they are generally said to have been erected “at the time of the Mongol war”. “Normally”, this expression would refer to the Tibet/Mongol-Ladakh-Mughal war around 1680, and the local tradition does, in fact, associate these mchod rten in some way with dGa’ ldan Tshe dbang (1644–1697), the commander of the Tibetan-Mongol army that invaded Ladakh at that time. Born a Mongol prince from the family of Guśrí Khan, he became a devote Buddhist monk. It is reported that, due to his aversion to bloodshed, he hesitated to accept the command when he was appointed leader of this military campaign by the 5th Dalai Lama. Nevertheless, his troops raided Ladakh for some four years before they could be driven back with the help of Mughal forces. Accordingly, dGa’ ldan Tshe dbang is not remembered sympathetically by Ladakhis other than dGe lugs pa followers, and it seems to be easy to ascribe some sinister influence to places connected with his name. The connection with dGa’ ldan Tshe dbang might be a good excuse for destructing the mchod rten. Historically, however, it is not possible, as the mchod rten were much older.

* My sincere thanks are due to Daniel Berounsky, John Bray, Quentin Devers, Brandon Dotson, Amy Heller, Bruno Lainé, Christian Luczanits, Nawang Jinpa, Nyima Woser, Jampa L. Panglung, Tibor Porcio, Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, Roberto Vitali and Bettina Zeisler for various information, suggestion, advice, assistance, and inspiration, and to Sarah Teetor for correcting the English.

1 The “story” surrounding the destruction of the mchod rten is based on personal communications from Nelly Rieuf, manager of the “Matho Museum Project”, and on local gossip.
2 On these events, see, e.g., Petech 1947; Petech 1977: 71ff.; Emmer 2007; Nawang Jinpa 2015.
Possibly, the memories of this 17th century war mix with those of some military campaign by the sTod Hor (Chagatai Mongols) in mNga’ ris skor gsum in mid-13th century, but this is mere speculation.

Alternatively, the mchod rten are locally said to originate from “the times of the kings”, i.e. from the times when there were kings at Matho, before Mar yul was turned into “Ladakh” under the rNam rgyal rulers.

Be this as it may – historians and archaeologists may bring more light to this matter –, the villagers apparently did not consider the threat by the mchod rten very serious or urgent, as about a decade was allowed to pass before they eventually took action and destroyed these mchod rten in spring 2014. Once they had started, however, they did their job thoroughly. They tore down the mchod rten and began shovelling the rubble together with all the grave goods into the river, even making use of a bulldozer. Much archaeological material was lost in this way: skeletons, a mummy, ritual objects, manuscripts, etc.

By lucky coincidence and the intervention of locals who were concerned about the fate of these relics this action was stopped, and the remaining grave goods were saved and collected at Matho Monastery by the Matho Museum Project, among them a thangka, long human hair, tsa tsa and various ritual items, and manuscript fragments. The majority of these items – though not the skeletons and the mummy – and practically all the manuscripts are from the “King’s stupa”.

The recovered thangka has been dated by the art-historians of the Matho Museum Project to the 12th century, but the early 13th century could also be considered possible. Assuming that it was painted for the funeral ceremony, it could provide a date for the erection of the mchod rten, and the terminus ante quem for all the items found inside. The manuscript fragments, too, suggest this early dating. Apparently, not all of them were produced at exactly the same period, and it is not possible – at least not at the present stage – to date any of them within the narrow frame of half a century. In general, however, their formal characteristics such as mgo yig (fig. 1a), ornamentation (fig. 1b), the foliation systems, orthography, and palaeography indicate an early phase from the 10th to 12th century, or the early 13th century at the latest, according to the criteria presented by Scherrer-Schaub (1999: 25). On the other hand, there are very few leaves or later additions on apparently older leaves that create the impression of more “modern” writing (fig. 7c). These cases must be investigated in detail.

In addition, the only two illuminated folios discovered so far (fig. 2a) show iconographic and stylistic characteristics found in works from 11th-12th century mNga’ ris, and a third fragmentary miniature, which was found inside a tsa tsa in a stupa at Matho village (fig. 2b), could tentatively be dated to the late 11th or early 12th century.

---

4 Discussed in Vitali 2005: 100 ff.
5 Christian Luczanits, in an e-mail communication of 3 August 2015.
6 Amy Heller, in e-mail communications of 22 July and 7 October 2015.
With regard to content, these manuscript findings contain fragments from a great variety of literary genres: ritual texts, puja, practice manuals (khrid yig), pith instructions (man ngag), eulogies (bstod), etc., but also “Kanjur” and “Tanjur” texts (i.e. texts that were later included in the various Kanjurs or Tanjurs), as well as philosophical commentaries that could be of Tibetan or even local origin, frequently with interlinear glosses.

From these few superficial observations we can conclude two things:

a) The “King’s stupa” must have been the burial place of an important person. Nothing is known – to my knowledge – about the particular history of Matho in the 12th century or about the Matho “kings” in general. In pre-rNam rgyal times, many of the villages were “kingdoms” of their own. Some of them gained wider influence, but Matho, presumably, did not, as it had access neither to mining nor to major trade routes. Nevertheless, as an agricultural area with no competitors for pastoral land some distance up the Indus, Matho might have acquired some importance and also wealth as a supplier of food and an ally (or vassal?) of the kings of Shel (or She ye, i.e. modern-day Shey).\(^7\) Again, I leave it to historians and archaeologists to clarify these matters, but I am afraid that the identity of the king who found his rest in the “King’s stupa” – at least for some 800 years – will remain a mystery.

b) The nature and the variety of texts represented among the manuscript fragments presuppose the existence of a monastic centre of high educational standards. Some of them, like the ritual and prayer texts, may originate from Matho, but the greater part is not from “village manuscripts”. Which villager of 12th century Matho would have been interested in, e.g., Dharmottara’s Nyāyabinduṭīkā? The remains of two manuscripts of this text could be identified. With their philosophical and commentarial texts, their interlinear glosses and their “writing exercises”, whereby novice monks practiced writing in the margins of old manuscripts, etc., these fragments very much reflect scholastic monastic life. In this respect, there are not too many alternatives, and one would immediately think of the nearby Nyar ma (now in ruins), the only monastery in Ladakh that can be identified with certainty as a foundation of Rin chen bzang po;\(^8\) as the crow flies, it is only some 6 km from Matho on

---

\(^7\) Quentin Devers in a personal communication of 12 September 2015. On Shel, see Vitali 1996: 245ff. (in particular, n. 352 on the different versions of the name) and 495ff. (in particular, n. 834 for a clear statement of the Deb ther dmar po gsar ma on the distribution of power in present-day Ladakh, though the situation might not have been all that clear and easy as bSod nams grags pa makes us believe).

\(^8\) On this site, see Panglung 1983; Snellgrove & Skorupski 1977: 19. Snellgrove & Skorupski 1980: 84 mentions a description of Nyar ma Monastery as it once was, included in a biography of Rin chen bzang po composed in 1976 by Blo bzang bzod pa from Tiksey Monastery and published by rDo rje the brtan in Historical Materials Concerning the bKra-sis-lhun-po and Rin-chen bzang-po Traditions from the Monastery of Kyi in Lahoul-Spiti (Himachal Pradesh), Delhi 1978.
the opposite bank of the river. Nowadays, there are bridges at Choglamsar, Tiksey, and Stakna, and if the assumption is correct that Matho delivered agricultural products to Shey, a safe and easy crossing of the Indus must have existed in the area also in the 12th century. The petroglyphs that once could be seen near the Stakna bridge – they have since given way to modern developments – indicate that this was an ancient crossing of the Indus, but others might have existed as well.

Did Nyar ma monks performing or attending the funeral ceremonies of the Matho king bring their waste manuscripts to deposit them in the stupa, and are the “Matho manuscripts” – at least parts of them – actually “Nyar ma manuscripts”? This scenario seems very likely.

However, it is much too early to speak publicly about these findings. The study of the manuscripts cannot even be called “work in progress”; it is merely in the very beginning phases. Everything contained in this paper represents the state of investigation from September 2015; it is full of question marks, and a good deal reflects on and speculates about possibilities rather than discussing facts in well-founded argumentation. With certainty much of it will have to be revised at a later stage: the documentation of the material has not even been completed, and so far only the “canonical” texts could be identified to some extent; all the others are still more or less mysterious, and many detailed investigations in various aspects still have to be conducted.

Nevertheless, as these fragments appear to be the oldest manuscripts hitherto known in Ladakh, and some insight into the history of textual transmission can be expected from their examination, or at least hoped for, a short preliminary report might be justified.

With regard to writing media, there are two kinds of manuscripts: birch bark and paper. The manuscripts were certainly incomplete and damaged already when they were deposited in the mchod rten, yet due to the treatment suffered during the destruction of the stupa they were additionally torn to pieces and scattered. Those recovered were found in total disorder, which makes it difficult to identify texts and compile units of related leaves and fragments.

This applies in particular to the birch bark manuscripts. Of these, only very few reasonably substantial units are extant; the majority consists only of small pieces (fig. 3). This material has not yet been investigated at all. Special preparation was necessary before it could even been touched without risking damage to the birch bark. It is thanks to the efforts and the achievements of Irene Martinez-Maeso that the more essential parts of this material could be documented photographically.

Birch bark has been in use in Ladakh for ritual purposes to the present day. Some scrolls inside the mani wheels along the walls of temples and monasteries, e.g., are written on this medium. Ladakhi birch bark manuscripts, however, have not been identified so far. They might (!) be of Kashmiri origin and lead us right back to the days
Radio-carbon dating the birch bark could clarify this question, yet some bureaucratic hurdles must still be overcome before testing can occur.

The paper manuscripts were found to be in unexpectedly good condition after cleaning and flattening by the team of the Matho Museum Project. Only a few leaves are affected by fungi or other impairments, and the greater part of them is reasonably legible. Of course, many leaves are torn, and many of the “units” established so far consist only of a single folio; related folios might simply not have been discovered or their relation to others might not be recognized yet. However, there are also bigger units with up to some 100 folios, and 36 of them in succession.

Both with regard to style and format and to content they display a great variety, and not all details can be presented in this paper. Very provisionally one can distinguish three groups: a) “various”, b) “non-canonical”, and c) “canonical” texts, i.e., texts that where included into the Kanjurs or Tanjurs some 100–150 (?) years later. None of these groups is homogeneous or clearly defined. In particular, the difference between groups a) and b) is blurred, but also b) and c) can be clearly distinguished only if all the texts could be properly identified. Further investigation will be necessary to draw clearer lines between them, or to find better ways of classification.

### a) Various ritual and religious texts

Since no attempt has yet been made to investigate or identify any of these texts, this group shall not be taken into account in this paper or described in any detail. Many of the texts have a very small format, the smallest folios measuring 7 × 8 cm; some are in the form of “booklets” with the folios folded and stitched together (fig. 4), and there are a few drawings and paintings, mainly tantric in nature (fig. 5). The majority of these texts are written in *dbu med* script.

### b) “Non-canonical” religious and philosophical texts and commentaries

Apparently most of the manuscripts in this group were not part of any larger collection, but only individual texts, or smaller collections of Śādhanā and the like. A considerable number of them do not exhibit any foliation at all, and high page numbers occur primarily in longer canonical texts. Therefore, a description of the various systems of foliation will be included below in the discussion of this group of texts, taking account of the non-canonical texts, too.

Paper seems to have been scarce when these manuscripts were written: the margins range from narrow to non-existent and the script is tiny, with up to 23 lines on 11 cm. This group encompasses manuscripts of various formats, from 32–35 ×
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9 This theory was expressed by ‘Jam dbyangs rgyal mtshan from the Central Institute of Buddhist Studies at Choglamsar during a conversation in August 2014.
5–6 cm with 9–12 lines or 22 × 8 cm with 7 lines to 58 × 5 cm with 8 lines or 62–65 × 9.5–12 cm with 10–14 lines. The last seems to be some sort of a “standard”; there are quite a number of manuscripts in this format. Occasionally, however, these folios were obviously considered too large for everyday usage; they were divided into two columns and folded in the middle (fig. 6).

A peculiarity of the Matho fragments are a few folios used for two texts simultaneously, with the folio turned upside down and the second text written between the lines of the first one (the bottom right examples of fig. 7a and 7b). It is unclear whether this was done due to the shortage of paper or for some other reason, and at the present stage it is also not known whether these texts are in any way related.

Most of the “standard-size” manuscripts of this group appear to be commentaries of some sort, and some of them use numerical figures in their sa bcad, abbreviations (skung yig) and contractions (bsdu yig) of syllables (see Eimer 1992: 53ff.), just as they can be found in early manuscripts in the bKa’ gdamgs gsung ’bum, frequently with interlinear glosses. Occasionally pith instructions (man ngag), eulogies (bsed), etc. are also in this format. The script is exclusively an archaic dbu med. There are, of course, various types of script and handwriting represented among the Matho fragments (fig. 7b), but in general they resemble some of the Dunhuang manuscripts as well as the dbu med inscriptions at Alchi10 (fig. 8).

Not a single text of this group could be identified so far. As is to be expected from the particular overall situation of the fragments, beginnings and endings of texts are rare. Even if they are extant, they pose questions rather than provide answers at the present stage, as they seem to indicate texts unknown to western academia and to local scholars, both laymen and monks. Not all these cases can be listed in this paper, and not all of them have been discovered yet. Two examples will suffice:

A *Caityapūjāpradāna (or similar) is not included among the works ascribed to Nāgārjuna, the author of the Madhyamakakārikā, and at least I do not know about such a text ascribed to any Nāgārjuna.

Regarding the author, Byang chub ye shes, one might think of the 11th century bKa’ gdamgs pa scholar Ar Byang chub ye shes, author of the sDud pa tshigs su bcad pa’i ’grel ba (bKa’ gdamgs gsung ’bum, vol. 3: 137–277). However, no ... dka’ ’grel kyi ti ka is known from either Ar Byang chub ye shes or any other author. Be this as it may, the text seems to consist of “notes” on the sDud pa tshigs su bcad pa’i dka’ ’grel by

Buddhaśrīrjñāṇa, apparently composed by a bKa’ gdamgs pa scholar. The text originally consisted of 54 folios, 30 of which are extant.

c) “Canonical” texts

These manuscripts also appear in various formats, the smallest measuring 28 × 10 cm. There is, however, a clear tendency towards larger formats and script. The majority of these manuscripts have the size 56–60 × 9–12 cm, with 6–9 lines per page. Obviously, large format leaves of some 60–65 × 18–20 cm (thus coming close to the standard “Kanjur size” of ca. 70 × 20 cm of later days) did already exist at that time, and they were prepared for the scribes with wide margins and “symbolic” string holes surrounded by red circles. However – and this seems to be a peculiarity of this collection – they were not used in this form, but cut in half before the manuscripts were written (fig. 10).

String holes, with or without surrounding circles, can be found in roughly 25 % of these manuscripts. The scripts are dbu med as well as dbu can (fig. 7a), showing to a varying degree all features of old orthography and palaeography. While the ma-ya btags (e.g., myed, myi, smyin, etc.) is used consistently, the inverted vowel i (gi gu log) is relatively rare.

Like the previous group, many of the canonical texts were individual texts rather than part of bigger sets. There is, however, also evidence of such units at Matho/Nyarma, like mdo mangs volumes or possibly even proto-canonical collections: one manuscript of the Tathāgatoṣṇīṣita-tapatre-aparājitāmahāpratyāmga-prama-siddhi, e.g., shows the foliations 7 and 12, i.e., 207 and 212 of a volume 1 (Ka), but this text covers only 6.5 folios in the Derge Kanjur (vol. rGyud Pha 212b7–219a7). Two leaves of a Prajñāpāramitā-saṃcayagāthā manuscript bear the foliation 187 and 188; in the Derge Kanjur this short text is included in the volume of “various (sna tshogs) Prajñāpāramitā texts”, fol. 189a2–215a4. Strong evidence for the existence of larger manuscript units is also provided by a manuscript of the Vinayasūtraṭīkā (below).

Systems of Foliation

1. Numerals or numerical figures

The vast majority of the Matho fragments use only numerals without any indication of a volume. For folios from 101 onwards, the units of hundred are marked by crosses. In three cases numerical figures are used instead of numerals.

Two manuscripts denote numbers from twenty-one to twenty-nine with the syllable rtsa plus a numeral (e.g., rtsa gnyis = 22). The following decade is indicated by the commonly used so plus numeral. No folios between ten and twenty or above forty are extant of these manuscripts.

11 J. L. Panglung, in an e-mail communication of 14 January 2015.
2. Letters used as numerals (type I of Scherrer-Schaub 1999: 22)
\(\text{ཀ}, \text{ཁ}, \text{ག},\) etc.
Apparent this system was used only in shorter texts; no folios with combined
letters or other additions were discovered.

3. Letters indicating the hundreds, followed by numerals (type II of Scherrer-
Schaub)
\(\text{ཀ} 1–100, \text{ཁ} (10)1–200, \text{ག} (20)1–300,\) etc.

4. Letters indicating the volume, and subscribed letters denoting the units of
hundreds from 101 onwards (type III of Scherrer-Schaub)
\(\text{ཀ} 1–100, \text{ཀྣ} (10)1–200, \text{ཀྨ} (20)1–300.\) No folios with higher numbers were
discovered at Matho.

5. A combination of the systems 3) and 4) is used in manuscripts of the
\(Daśasāhasrikā\) and of Dharmamitra’s \(Vinayasūtraṭīkā.\) Here, letters apparently
indicate units of hundred, and letters with subscribed \(ན\) the same units of a second
series. The folios or fragmentary folios that are extant, in both cases from the units \(ན\)
and \(ཉ\) exclusively, suggest a sequence \(\text{ཀ} - \text{ཁ} - \text{ག} - \text{ང}\) and \(\text{ཀྣ} - \text{ཁྣ} - \text{གྣ} - \text{ངྣ},\) each time
followed by the numerals 1–100.\(^{12}\) In this case, the \(Vinayasūtraṭīkā\) would not have
been the first text in its set; just like in the Tanjurs, it might have been preceded by
the \(Vinayasūtraṛtyabhidhānasvavyākhyāna.\) However, the foliation \(ཉ 400\) does not
fit into this assumed system.\(^{13}\)

6. Letters indicating the volume, and crosses the units of hundred from 101
onwards (type IIIb of Scherrer-Schaub)
Of this type, two examples were discovered at Matho.

The greater part of these canonical texts could be identified with a high degree of
certainty, though not all of them. Given the fact that some of the fragments are rather
small, and quite a number of passages within canonical literature appear with more or
less identical phrasing in several texts, occasionally there are a number of possibilities
when attributing a fragment to a specific text.

In addition, the Matho material apparently preserves versions that divert
considerably from the editions in the various Kanjurs and Tanjurs, some even
representing distinct translations from the Sanskrit. Due to this fact a number of
fragments are supposed to be from “canonical” texts, but they cannot (yet?) be related
to any one in particular. Till now, two instances of a Tibetan translation differing
from that contained in the canons could be singled out; one of them will be presented
below. There are most likely some more of them.

Almost all the major canonical sections (according to the arrangement of the
Kanjur and Tanjur of Derge) are represented among the texts hitherto identified.
From the Kanjur sections only Avatāmsaka (Phal ches) and Ratnakūta (dKon brtsegs)
are missing, and from the Tanjur no texts in the sections “Hymns” (bsTod tshogs),

\(^{12}\) Cristina Scherrer-Schaub in an e-mail communication of 3 November 2015.
\(^{13}\) For other ancient systems of foliation, see Dotson 2015.
“Sutra commentary” (mDo ’grel), Abhidharma (mNgon pa), Jātaka (sKyes rabs), and of the sections on the general fields of knowledge, “Grammar” (sGra mdo), etc., have been found. On the other hand, the sections Vinaya (‘Dul ba) and Tantra (rGyud) from both Kanjur and Tanjur are particularly well represented.

Both the absence of Avatāṃsaka and, in particular, Ratnakūṭa texts and the strong presence of Tantra are striking. Ratnakūṭa is prominently represented among the western Tibetan proto-canonical collections from late 13th to early 15th century (Tholing, Tabo, Gondhla, Phukthar), and it can also be found among the approximately 900 folios from roughly the same period at Basgo. Its absence from Matho might, of course, be sheer coincidence, and it does not necessarily mean that no fragments of these texts were initially contained in the mchod rten; their remains might simply be drifting in the Arabian Sea by now. However, it would be a strange coincidence, if this was the fate of all the remains of this group of texts without exception. Likewise, the absence of these texts does not necessarily imply that Avatāṃsaka and Ratnakūṭa were not studied at Nyar ma (or wherever the manuscripts originated), but it might indicate that they did not exist in great number, so that at a particular time there were no waste copies around to be deposited in the mchod rten. In any case, it is rather unfortunate that no Ratnakūṭa texts are extant. Their arrangement in most of the proto-canonical collections and the Kanjurs of Shel dkar/London, Shey, Hemis, and Basgo is evidence for a particular western Tibetan line of transmission,14 and it would have been interesting to discover whether this arrangement already existed in the 12th century.

The strong presence of Tantra texts as such is not at all surprising, considering the strong tantric inclination of Atiśa, Rin chen bzung po, Zhi ba ’od, and others who were active in these western parts of Tibet during the early days of phyi dar, and the time of production of these manuscripts, which is presumably only slightly later and still to be considered as early phyi dar. Nevertheless, it is striking in the context of the general situation of tantric literature in the area:

1) The proto-canonical collections mentioned above contain nothing that could be counted as “tantra” apart from gZung ’dus (*Dhārānīsaṅgraha) texts. gZung (’dus), however, was occasionally considered a category distinct from rGyud, and it appears as a separate section, e.g., in the Early Mustang Kanjur (see Eimer 1999) and in the Kanjur of Derge.

2) In the Kanjur of Basgo (around 1635) the rGyud section is fully represented, but it is not (yet?) known according to which tradition. It contains a considerable number of rnying ma tantra, in a separate section as well as intermingled with gsar ma tantra, as well as texts not included in any other known Kanjur. The same was probably also true for the contemporary Kanjurs of Hemis, but only

---

14 See Tauscher & Lainé 2008. The Kanjurs of Hemis and Basgo were not known to us at that time.
very few rGyud volumes are extant, among them, however, one volume of *rnying ma* tantra (see Tauscher & Lainé 2015).15

3) The Kanjurs of Stog and Shey (around 1730), in turn, did not continue this (Ladakhi?) tradition, but presumably took over their rGyud sections from a Kanjur of the ’Phyin ba stag rtse sub-division16 of the Tshal pa group.

Like in Hemis and Basgo, in Matho we have *rnying rgyud*, which actually does not correspond to the early bKa’ gams pa position.17 One text, the *rDzogs pa chen po ’khor ba rtsa[rd] nas gcod pa chos sku skye myed rig pa ’i rgyud* (gTb 142), could clearly be identified, others could be either *rnying rgyud* or *gsar rgyud* texts with considerable divergences from their canonical versions, possibly even representing different translations from the Sanskrit.

The Śrī Hevajrapaṇīṭā nāma Muktiṅvalī (*dPal dgyes pa’i rdo rje’i dka’ ’grel mu tig phreng ba*) by Ratnakāraśānti (D 1189) appears to be an example of such a different translation. Only one folio exists in Matho, but it contains the end of chapter two, and the title mentioned there (Matho: *Mu tig gi ’phreng ba’ zhes pa dgyes pa’i rdo rje’i dka’ ’grel* vs. Derge: *dGyes pa’i rdo rje’i dka’ ’grel mu tig phreng ba*) leaves no doubt that it is actually the same text. However, the Matho folio contains several passages missing in Derge, and it omits a few others. Either Matho represents a different translation, or the canonical version is severely corrupt.

Among the fragments there are also texts that are not preserved in any generally known Kanjur or *rNying ma rgyud ’bum*, such as the *Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtags pa’i rgyud* (*Sarvadharmacaryopadesābhisaṁyā tantra*); only a commentary on apparently the same text, the *Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtags pa’i rgyud kyi rnam par bshad pa gzi brjid snang ba*, is contained exclusively in the Tanjur of Narthang (N 3536). One folio of this text has been discovered at Matho. This text is, however, contained in volume Ja of the Kanjur of Basgo, though incomplete and with its leaves presently scattered over several volumes. The work of analyzing this Kanjur and correctly ordering its folios is still progressing, though only slowly.

Another example is the (*rGyud thams cad kyi gleng gzhi dang gsang chen*) *dPal Kuntukhasbyorlasbyung ba[zhespa’i(b)rgyalpa’i rgyalpo]* (*[Sarvatantrasyanidānā- mahāguhyya] Śrī Sampuṭa [tantrarāja]*)). Its commentary is contained in all Tanjurs (e.g., D 1199), but the root text is not preserved in generally known Kanjurs. However, nine folios were discovered at Matho, and the complete text is contained in the
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15 The “Golden” Kanjur of Chemdey, which might originate from the same period of Seng ge rnam rgyal, s’Tag tshang ras pa, and Nam mkha’ dpal mgon (on those, see Tauscher & Lainé 2015) and belong to the same group as the Kanjurs of Hemis and Basgo, still has to be investigated.
16 For this group of Kanjurs see Eimer 1992: xvii.
17 Cf., e.g., the open letter (*bka’ shog*) of Zhi ba ’od (see Karmay 1980).
Manuscript Fragments from Matho

The *Abhidhānottaratantra*, which is contained in the main-stream Kanjurs as *mNgon par brjod pa’i rgyud bla ma* (D 369) is represented by at least four manuscripts among the Matho fragments. Three contain various chapter endings and two even include the beginning of the text, so that we have the title mentioned several times: *Nges par brjod pa’i rgyud bla ma’i bla ma*, in one case with the specification *rdzogs pa’i rim pa bshad pa*. This form of the title (without the specification) appears in Derge exclusively at the end of chapter 9, and the colophons of the mainstream Kanjurs record a mixture of these two forms of the title: *mNgon par brjod pa’i rgyud bla ma’i bla ma*. Meanwhile in Basgo (vol. rGyud Ka, 49a1–216b7), this text is transmitted as *Nges par brjod pa’i rgyud bla ma’i bla ma zhes bya ba’i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po*.

Of course, these various forms represent nothing other than different translations of *Abhidhānottaratantra*, but even if this was the sole divergence it would be a very strong indication of the respective line of transmission, in this particular case, pointing to a common tradition of Basgo and Matho (or Nyar ma), in the same way that the two texts mentioned above do. Yet it is not only an issue of an alternative translation of the title. Apparently, Basgo and Matho preserve a different translation, or a different version of the translation transmitted in the mainstream Kanjurs. The very few, short passages of the Matho fragments that have been compared so far do not contain any major and essential deviations from the mainstream Kanjurs; a detailed investigation of the texts is necessary.

The colophon, however, suggests distinct versions. While that from Matho is not extant, the Basgo colophon does not give the names of the translators, but it does mention two steps of revision: by Kumāra (= Kumārakalāśa?) and Byang chub shes rab, and by Jñānaśrī, Blo gros snying po, and Rab bzhi. This seems to be the same translation by Dipaṃkara and Rin chen bzang po that is mentioned in the colophon of Phug brag (No. 446) as “another translation” (*’gyur gzhan*).

These two translators also appear in the majority of Kanjurs (Stog and Shey mention Padmākaraśrījñāna instead of Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna); however, the revisers vary: Jñānaśrī and Khyung po Chos kyi brtson ’grus in a first step, and Ānanda and the “junior translator” (*lo chung*) (= Legs pa’i shes rab)19 in a second. The Kanjur of Phug brag preserves yet a different version of this text as *Nges par brjod pa’i rgyud bla ma* – the title appears also in the *dkar chag* of O rgyan gling in this form – or *Nges par brjod pa’i rgyud bla ma’i bla ma* (in the colophon), translated by Jñānākara and Rig pa gzhon nu, and revised by Prabhākara and Shākya ye shes. In addition, its

---

18 Unfortunately this Kanjur was not accessible, and only the handwritten *dkar chag* in the possession of the Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies at Sarnath could be compared.

colophon mentions two more translations, one by Chos kyi brtson ’grus, the other by Dharmaśrībhadra and Rig pa gzhon nu. This would mean that Rig pa gzhon nu translated this text twice, each time in collaboration with a different Indian master, and Chos kyi brtson ’grus not only revised Rin chen bzang po’s translation, but also made one of his own.

Even without closer study of the fragments mentioned, these three examples are sufficient at least to suspect a distinct line of transmitting tantric literature from early phyi dar times as represented in Matho (Nyar ma) and Basgo. It might also be reflected in the Kanjur of O rgyan gling (around 1700), which contains – just like Basgo – a number of rnying ma tantra within its general Tantra section (see Mayer 2011) and corresponds with Matho and Basgo in some details (above). In Ladakh, this tradition was still known or revived in early 17th century, but forgotten or neglected before and after the period of Seng ge rnam rgyal and sTag tshang ras pa. What happened? This paper will make no attempt at answering this question and also the matter of the rGyud sections in Ladakhi Kanjurs shall not be pursued any further.

The following two examples which illustrate rare (or unique?) text versions found among the Matho (Ma) fragments are both verse texts from the Madhyamaka section of the Tanjur. Although only small portions of them will be discussed, the full texts of the fragments are given in the appendices, both times in comparison with the respective verses of the Derge (D) Tanjur as a representative of the canonical version(s).

Bodhi(sattva)caryāvatāra (བོད་སིལ་བཟྡ་ཅེས་བཀའ་པ།) (BCA) by Śāntideva (D 3871).

Only a very small fragment of this text (fig. 9) is extant, consisting of about half a folio with the reverse blank, as it contains the very end of the text. It is a lucky coincidence that this small fragment preserves parts of two pāda that are not extant in the canonical versions of BCA. Being from chapter 10, which contains only benedictions, these two pāda are, of course, in no way of philosophical or doctrinal relevance. They might, however, contribute one small piece to the huge puzzle of the transmission of Buddhist texts.

Did these two pāda disappear in the course of the Tibetan transmission of the text, or were they already missing in the Sanskrit version that was translated by Sarvajñādeva and dPal brtsegs in the 9th century? The textual situation does not permit an answer to this question. IF the latter were the case, the Matho fragment

22 The Derge texts are as provided by ACIP, taken over without systematic verification. Only in cases of doubt the blockprint edition provided by TBRC was consulted, and one or two typos in the ACIP version were tacitly corrected.
would not merely represent a more complete version, but a different translation than that contained in the Tanjur, produced from a different Sanskrit manuscript. However, the rest of the fragment contains only four variants, and none of these would convincingly support any hypothesis for a different translation from the Sanskrit:

v. 54b: don rnams : kun don
v. 55d: thard par : sel bar
v. 56d: -ig : shog
v. 58d: la phyag 'tshal lo : la'ang bdag phyag 'tshal.

In any case, the Matho fragment shows that a complete translation of BCA did exist and was available in Western Tibet in the 12th century. This version might not have been present in Central Tibet when the Tanjur was compiled in the early 14th century, or it was simply neglected for some reason or other.

In Sanskrit, chapter 10, verse 50 reads:

| प्रत्येककुंद्रोऽसुः सविनो भवतुः सत्यकारः |
| देवाः सुगरिन्द्रे सुप्रयमानः: सर्वारः: |

"Equally, may the Pratyekabuddhas be happy, and also the Śrāvakas, constantly worshiped by respectful gods, demigods and humans."

The canonical versions of the Tibetan translation preserve only pāda a and b:

In Matho, however, a part of pāda c and the whole pāda d are extant:

The missing beginning of pāda c is easy to reconstruct, translating devāsuraṇarāiṁ as lha dang lha min mi rnams kyis, but the equivalent for pūjyamānāḥ, xx bar (facsimile left) shog, poses a problem and at the same time allows room to speculation. At first sight, one would read lkyang bar, but such a word does not exist in Tibetan. A closer investigation of the handwriting of this page, however, suggests reading sa-mgo instead of la-mgo, and “the other ya-btags are generally larger than what we see here. It could be that the scribe did not mean to write a ya-btags and stopped it short, and perhaps made a desultory attempt at striking it through.”23 In that case we would arrive at the reading skang bar (“satisfying”, etc.). However, this is not attested as a translation of any derivate of pūj-. In this particular case, the term to be expected is bskur bar,24 but this reading seems to be highly unlikely here. Could

---

23 Brandon Dotson, in an e-mail communication of 19 December 2014.
24 J. L. Panglung, in an e-mail communication of 14 January 2015 and Tshe dbang rig ’dzin from Hemis Monastery in a personal communication of 28 September 2015.
this be older terminology, to use skang ba as an equivalent for pūj-? As the canonical translation of BCA is already an “old”, a snga dar translation, we should probably rather assume a (severe) scribal error, until more evidence for pūj- being translated as skang ba is found.

The second example is clearly a different translation from the canonical one, and it is certainly not the only one among the Matho fragments.

Ālokamālpākaraṇa (སྣང་མ་ལེ་བར་ཏུ་བྱེད་པ།) by Kampala/Kambala(pāda) (D 3895).

Kambalapāda (Kampala in the colophon of Derge), an approximate contemporary of Jñānagarbha (8th century) is regarded as Yogācāra-Svātantrika-Mādhyamika and a representative of the Madhyamaka-Vajrayāna synthesis.25 His Ālokamālpākaraṇa consists of 281 verses plus one introductory verse of veneration, paying homage to “the munīndra, who taught the mind-only (doctrine)” (... gang gis sms ths mgs pa’i thub dbang de la phyag ’tsal lo).

The fragment consists of four folios (1, 2, 10 and 11, numbered ka, kha, tha and da) of probably twelve. They contain the introductory verse and 77½ of the 281 verses of the complete text.

From the different terminology, word order, and arrangement of pāda, occasionally even across the limits of a śloka, etc., it is evident that this fragment represents a translation different from and apparently older than the one by Kumārkalaśa and Shākya ‘od, which is preserved in the Tanjur. Unfortunately, the last folio is not extant; the colophon might have mentioned the name(s) of the translator(s). One variant, of which there might be others, could hint at the regional origin of the translator of the Matho version, perhaps hailing from Western Tibet or maybe even Ladakh. In verse 224d the idea of “falling” (lhung bzhin) is expressed by lhung bas khyer bas in Ma. Local informants tell me – and in this respect I simply have to rely on them – that formulations with ... khyer bas are still used in contemporary Ladakhi to express the gerund idea of “being in the process of doing or experiencing something” just like ... bzhin in Classical Tibetan. Alternatively, it could be an “intensifying verbal compound” (“when thoroughly fallen”, or similar) as used in contemporary Ladakhi. In this case it could provide evidence for a translator of Western Tibetan, Ladakhi, or even Dard origin.26 Alternately, it might simply be the case of an old Tibetan verbal usage that was preserved in Ladakhi, but not in Classical Tibetan. Here, I leave it to linguists to find an answer.

Some variances even suggest that the Matho translation was made from a – slightly – different Sanskrit version than the canonical one. In some cases it is hard to comprehend how alternative translations could be based on one and the same Sanskrit model. More importantly, two of the 315 pāda in this fragment (216a and 241c) are found exclusively in Ma, whereas D 256a is not represented there. In the latter case,

26 Bettina Zeisler, in an e-mail communication of 9 October 2015.
the idea of yul rnams 'ga' yang sems pa med is not expressed in the Matho version; apparently, this pāda has simply been omitted due to a scribal error. In verses 216 and 241, however, five-pāda śloka in Ma are replaced – without any loss to the message – by formally correct śloka in the ideal form of metric units of four pāda, expressing logically and contextually coherent ideas: for example, in verse 216 rang bzhin legs bslab de nas ni || rnal 'byord goms byas de phan 'chad (Ma) is shortened to de nas sbyor ba byas pa yis. A similar procedure is to be observed in verse 241 (discussed below).

As one would not expect a lotsāba to add or omit a pāda to his liking, these differences must have existed already in Sanskrit. So, the Matho translation of these verses is either dilettante, or it is based on a different, less refined Sanskrit version. At the same time, other verses are very similar, apart from terminological differences and minor variants.

It is not possible to discuss all the verses in this paper; three of them have to suffice as examples of the differences between an old and a new translation of the same text. No attempt shall be made at reconstructing one common Sanskrit “original”. The provisional, tentative and occasionally clumsy translation of the two Tibetan versions aims at being faithful to the respective version and retaining its peculiarities, while still conveying a common general message despite all deviations.

```
Matho

240
འོག་མངོན་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་བཤད་པ་
བར་ཐམས་ཅད་མ་ི་མ་སེམས་པ་
སེམས་པ་འི་འཚོལ་
ཐམས་ཅད་མ་ི་མ་སེམས་པ་
དེ་རང་གིས་མི་བཤད་པས་
དེ་པར་འི་འཚོལ་
“Everything without exception is,
due to being (las), by (the force of)
the residues, like a painting
and straying like a wheel,
obscured by afflictions,”
```

```
Derge

| རང་སྤྲིི་མ་འི་འཚོལ་
| ཆོས་འཇིག་མེད་པ་བཤད་པ་
| ཆོས་འཇིག་མེད་པ་བཤད་པ་
| སྤྲན་པར་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་
| སྤྲགས་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་
| སྤྲན་པར་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་
| སྤྲགས་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་
| སྤྲན་པར་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་
| སྤྲགས་ལ་བོ་མེད་པ་

“Through (being) a painting by the
remaining traces, everything
appears like painted,
permeated by afflictions,
spinning like a wheel,”
```

Here, the sequence of causal dependencies appears slightly different. In Ma, the residues (vāsana) are the reason for everything to be like a painting or like a wheel, and due to this fact everything IS obscured by afflictions (kleśa) (240d) and without characteristics (alakṣana) (241b). In D, on the other hand, the fact that everything is a painting of/by the residues is the cause for everything to APPEAR like painted (bris pa lta bu ru, 240b), etc., up to “without characteristics” (mtshan nyid med par snang, 241b).

The terms bag chags (Ma) and bag chags lhag ma (D), translated here as “residues” and “remaining traces” respectively, appear equally to represent vāsana, unless ma lus (Ma), lhag ma (D) and thams cad (both versions) reflect a slightly redundant
formulation like “everything without exception – everything” (lhag ma ma lus – thams cad) that was resolved differently in the two translations. Although g.yogs pa (“to obscure, cover”) (Ma) and khyab pa (“to permeate, cover, pervade”) (D) are not attested elsewhere as translations of the same Sanskrit term, their meanings are similar enough that we can take them as the equivalents for the same Sanskrit expression.

Similarly, the verbs 'khrul pa (“to deceive” etc., here in its “perfect tense” form 'khruld pa “being/having deceived” etc.) (Ma) and 'khor ba (“to revolve” etc.) (D) apparently stand for the same Sanskrit expression, or at least for the same idea. These two terms frequently appear in combination, as sansāra ('khor ba) is delusive or deceiving by nature. Apart from that, they are “normally” not lexically related. However, they are both attested (according to Lokesh Chandra 1961) as translating Skt. (vi)bhrama, a term that combines the meanings of “roaming around” and “illusion, confusion, error”.27 Probably the idea of sansāra-like revolving could – in a particular context and time – be expressed by the verb 'khrul ba. There is no evidence in this fragment that it also works the other way, and the idea of “deceiving” etc. could be expressed by 'khor ba. Possibly, the Matho version 'khrul(d) pa is an example of an old convention in translating; the details require much closer investigation.

“To stray”28 is not a verb that would usually be used in connection with a wheel. Here, it is an attempt at covering the double meaning of 'khrul ba and 'khor ba (as in Skt. (vi)bhrama), taking into consideration that the “wheel” alluded to is sansāra.

“And, [like] a vivid dream in a wakeful cognition, it is without the basis of characteristics and characteristics. In the seeing of those who see emptiness as emptiness, it is like destroyed/faded. What is it that is seen?“(Like) the wakeful cognition of a clear dream, and without sign and characteristic. When one sees (this), it is like not appearing; so, like what does it appear?”

27 J. L. Panglung (in an e-mail communication of 5 August 2015) points to the fact that in colloquial Tibetan the idea of “to err, to be deceived” can be expressed by mgo 'khor ba as well as by mgo 'khrul ba.
28 This term was suggested by Daniel Berounsky in an e-mail communication of 29 July 2015.
In Ma, dang at the end of verse 240, in the translation represented by “And” at the beginning of this verse, seems to be understandable only if 241a is taken as a comparison – just as in D – exemplifying a second predicate to “everything”: “it is without the basis of characteristics and characteristics”. In D, on the other hand, dang of 240d clearly continues the list of how everything appears. However, the statement “(everything appears like) the wakeful cognition of a clear dream” (241a) is not easily comprehensible, and dang might have to be replaced by some other expression.

The alternative formulations brten pa'i rmyi lam (Ma) vs. rmi lam gsal (D) and shes la (Ma) vs. shes pa dang (D) (241a) need no further discussion; the implications of myed ldan pa (Ma) vs. med par snang (D) (241b) are clear from what has been said above.

The equivalents “like destroyed/faded” (’jig pa lta bu nyid, Ma 241d) and “like not appearing” (mi snang dang mshungs par, D 241c) might, just like the variants in 241a, reflect different conventions of translating, either of the respective times or simply of the respective translator. Unless more evidence for these variations can be found in other texts, it is probably not justified to speak of “old” and “new terminology”.

The same is also true for the alternative renderings of the last pāda, in particular the variant “is seen” (mthong ba yin) (Ma) vs. “does appear” (snang ba yin) (D). Both terms probably translate some form of dṛṣ-, and the use of mthong ba in these cases is apparently a characteristic feature of the “old”, i.e., the Matho terminology: in six more cases Matho reads mthong ba instead of snang ba as found in Derge. However, it is reversed twice, and Ma reads snang ba vs. mthong ba in D.

In verse 238d, on the other hand, Ma reads bdag gi nang du vs. D bdag gis snang du. The commentary of Asvabhāva (102b5) confirms the version of Ma. The main issue in this verse is the additional pāda found in the Matho version, without an equivalent in Derge. It offers an elaborate specification of the lapidary “when one sees (this)” (mthong nas) of D (241c). As discussed above, this editorial intervention obviously represents the attempt to render the idea expressed in the Matho version in five pāda in a formally correct śloka of four pāda, and it does not seem likely that this happened in the course of the translation into Tibetan. Rather, we should assume the efforts of a Sanskrit editor who formally “straightened” an older version through a contextually minor alteration without effect on the general message of the verse.

These reflections lead to the question of which of the two Tibetan translations is actually the older one. The fact that the Matho manuscript was apparently written prior to the first compilation of a Tanjur suggests, though not conclusively, that it also preserves the older version. Yet this is relevant only if we assume the same Sanskrit model for both translations. Otherwise the question of age is pushed back in the line of transmission: which of the Sanskrit versions is the older one, regardless their translation into Tibetan? In this respect, the formally “correct” translation of D seems to represent the younger version.
The expression stong nyid stong nyid mthong rnams begs for interpretation, as one would not expect that the dogmatic concept of “emptiness of emptiness” (stong nyid stong nyid, śūnyatāśūnyatā)\textsuperscript{29} to find reference in this context. The present translation is based on the same formulation in verse 250a (Ma), which appears as stong nyid stong par mthong ba in D (251a).

The following verse is an example of practically identical translations in both versions.

\begin{verbatim}
242

“\begin{quote}
When one cognizes the absolute, 
nothing everything has the nature of being 
without differentiation, 
without beginning and end, 
without aspects and not apprehensible.”
\end{quote}
\end{verbatim}

The variant shes na (Ma): shes pa (D) in verse 242a is taken into account in the translation, but in fact it could be neglected in the present context, just as the variants bdag nyid ca (Ma): bdag nyid de (D) (242b), rnam dbyes myed (Ma): cha shas med (D) (242c), and 'dzin pa myed (Ma): gzungs du med (D) (242d) can be neglected.

Verses like this one call into question the hypothesis of distinct Sanskrit manuscripts translated into Tibetan. Even if this hypothesis turns out to be correct, for the greater part the difference between the two Sanskrit versions could certainly not have been substantial, apart from rendering 5-pāda stanzas into 4-pāda śloka.

When the people of Matho followed the advice of their Rinpoche and destroyed these mchod rten, they revealed a fraction of the oldest layer of Buddhist literature known in Ladakh. Much material was destroyed by the heedless actions of the villagers, the manuscript findings consist exclusively of fragments, the majority of them rather small ones, and the study of the material has only just begun. The full extent of information that it might provide cannot even be estimated. Nevertheless, even at this early stage of research it is possible hypothetically to assume that a part of the manuscripts found at Matho were initially in use at the monastery of Nyar ma.

It is obvious that hitherto unknown texts or versions of texts are among the fragments, and one can expect information about the development and transmission of Buddhist canonical literature.

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. MAv 6.186ab: | stong nyid ces bya'i stong nyid gang | | stong nyid stong nyid du 'lod de | “The emptiness of what is called emptiness is asserted as emptiness of emptiness.”
Communalities between some versions of Matho and the Kanjur of Basgo suggest a common origin of their tantric literature. While the Sūtra sections in the Kanjurs of Hemis and Basgo are closely related to the Early Mustang Kanjur (see Tauscher & Lainé 2015: 472ff.), their Tantra sections apparently represent a tradition distinct from Mustang as well as from all better known Kanjurs. However, traces of it might have survived in the Kanjur of O rgyan gling.

All this is merely hypothesis; for the time being, nothing else can be offered, and much more detailed and comprehensive analysis of the material is required to evaluate all the information provided by the recently discovered Matho manuscript fragments.
## APPENDIX 1
*Bodhi(sattva)*cāryāvatāra 10.50c-58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verse</th>
<th>Matho</th>
<th>Derge 3871, 39b6–40a7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50c</td>
<td>[སྒྲ་མ་བིན་བོར་བཞི།]</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50d</td>
<td>[ཏི་][ཏི་][ཏི་][ཏི་][ཏི་][ཏི་][ཏི་][ཏི་]</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>[བདག་པར་བཞི་པ་བཞི།]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>[ཨོ་ཞིོ་ཨོ་ཞིོ་]</td>
<td>[ཨོ་ཞིོ་ཨོ་ཞིོ་]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>[ཨོ་ཞིོ་]</td>
<td>[ཨོ་ཞིོ་]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>[ཨོ་ཞིོ་]</td>
<td>[ཨོ་ཞིོ་]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Ālokamālāprakaraṇa

verse         Matho fol. ka-kha                          Derge 3895, 51a1-52b2

(acc. D)

0  གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།               གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   [ka b2 གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།]    གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།      གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།      གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།

1  གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།               གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   [ka b3 གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།]    གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།      གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།      གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།

2  གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།               གཉིས་ཕྲུག་ལྡན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
   གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།      གྲོལ་བཞི་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྟ་རོ།
བཟང་ན་ས་འབད་པ་།

ཁམས་པས་མན་པར་མ་དག་།

མཁས་པ་མན་པར་མ་དག་གནས་།

དོ་བ་འམ་ཡང་ན་བདག་ལ་།

མཁས་པས་མན་པར་མ་དག་།

ཕྲག་ན་པར་མདོ་བ་ལ་བེན་པ་།

ཐར་ཛན་འབར་བ་འཐོས་ལ་ཡང་།

ཙན་དུན་འབེར་བ་འཐོས་ལ་ཡང༌།

གང་ཐ་དན་ལས་ཐ་དན་དོད་།

བོན་ཐ་དཀོན་དེ་ཐ་དཀོན་དོད་།

ཕྲག་ན་པར་མདོ་བ་ལ་བེན་པ་།

ཐེག་གི་གུས་སི་གོང་དག་།
25 བེན་རི་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དོན་གཅིག་གུ་།

26 རྣམ་པའི་སྒྲོན་པ་བཤད་པ།

27 གླུ་ཅན་གཞན་ལ་འཁོད་པ་བཤད།

28 བློ་བོ་མི་ཐོག་པ་བཤད་པ།

29 དབྱུགས་པོ་ཐོག་པ་བཤད་པ།

30 ཁྱི་བོད་གྱི་སྒྲོན་པར་བཅས་ནས་སྒྲོན་པ།

verse Matho fol. tha-da Derge 3895, 59a3-61a1
HELMUT TAUSCHER

253 བཐོད་པར་བདེ་ནས་མ་གནས།

254 བཐོད་པར་བདེ་ནས་འགའ་ཡང་མ་གནས།

255 བཐོད་པར་བདེ་ནས་‘

256 ———

[na a1] ...
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