

# The Old sNar thang Tibetan Buddhist Canon Revisited, with Special Reference to dBus pa blo gsal's *bsTan 'gyur* Catalogue

Orna Almogi  
(Hamburg)\*

## 1. Introductory Remarks

**T**he compilation of Buddhist literature in Tibetan translation in small units is documented from as early as the so-called Grey Period, namely, the period between what are known as the Early and Later Disseminations of Buddhism in Tibet. Such compilatory units consisted mainly, but not exclusively, of scriptural works of varying scope and kinds, in one or more volumes—including Prajñāpāramitā (Sher phyin) collections, the Buddhāvataṃsaka (Sangs rgyas phal po che) and Ratnakūṭa (dKon mchog brtsegs) anthologies, Tantra collections (rGyud 'bum), collections of miscellaneous Sūtras (mDo mang), and Vinaya ('Dul ba), Stotra (bsTod pa), and Dhāraṇī (gZungs) collections. As has been demonstrated in several previous studies, such small collections later served as building blocks for various *bKa' 'gyur* editions.<sup>1</sup> Information regarding comparable units of non-scriptural works, which later served as building blocks for the *bsTan 'gyur*, is available only to a much lesser degree, but there is no doubt that these existed as well. Needless to say that mixed compilations containing scriptural works along with commentarial and other material directly related to them have also existed. Moreover, in what appears to be unique for the Later Period, collections were compiled

---

\* The findings presented in the present paper have been gained during the project "A Canon in the Making: The History of the Formation, Production, and Transmission of the *bsTan 'gyur*, the Corpus of Treatises in Tibetan Translation," generously funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), for which I am highly grateful. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Philip Pierce for proofreading my English.

Technical Note: For the cited Tibetan texts, efforts have been made to cite at least two versions whenever possible. Note, however, that accidental/insignificant variants, such as those concerning segmentation marks, *pa/ba* variants and the like, have not been recorded unless they have some significance. Orthographic abbreviations (*skung yig*) have been silently expanded.

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Jampa Samten 1987a, 1987b, Harrison 1994, 1996, and Skilling 1997.

containing translations of a specific translator.<sup>2</sup> As a result of the Mongols' occupation in the twelfth century and their ensuing cultural influence, combined with their considerable financial support, one witnesses increasing production of collections of translated literature—particularly in circles with close ties to the Mongol court, such as the Sa skya tradition—some of which likewise served as building blocks for what later came to be known as the Tibetan Buddhist Canon. Although some of these collections are referred to in later Tibetan sources as *bKa' 'gyur* or *bsTan 'gyur* (the former term is found, however, more often), this is, as will be argued in the following, very probably a retrospective employment of these two terms, for there is little evidence that either of these two collections or the terms designating them existed prior to the fourteenth century.

It has been generally accepted, both by the tradition and modern scholars, that the translated Buddhist literature was for the first time systematically divided into two distinct collections, which were in turn arranged according to a premeditated scheme—that is, (a) one comprising the works containing the Word of the Buddha, which has come to be known as the *bKa' 'gyur* (“The Word of the Buddha in [Tibetan] Translation”), and (b) one comprising the treatises, commentaries, and other related works, which has come to be known as the *bsTan 'gyur* (“The Treatises in [Tibetan] Translation”)—during the compilation work carried out in sNar thang,<sup>3</sup> presumably sometime in the 1310s. More recently, however, the opinion has also been expressed that there may be precedents for such large-scale undertakings of producing sets of the *bKa' 'gyur* and/or *bsTan 'gyur*—ones, that is, predating the compilatory undertaking in sNar thang, and that accordingly the two terms existed then as well.<sup>4</sup> In the following, I hope to be able to convincingly demonstrate that this opinion is not well grounded, and that it is fully justified to consider the Old sNar thang *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* to be the first such collections. I shall also argue that the designations *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*—which are truncated forms of the phrases *bka' 'gyur ro tshal/cog* and *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro tshal/cog*—likely came into vogue only sometime after the compilatory work in sNar thang, and so probably were not coined there either.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Almogi (forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> For a brief historical account of this *bKa' gdams pa* monastery, which was founded in 1153 by gTum ston Blo gros grags pa (1106–1166; BDRC: P3446), see Roerich 1949: 282–283. For a very recent overview of the *bKa' gdams pa* school, see Roesler 2019.

<sup>4</sup> See the Introduction in van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009, particularly pp. 25–26, 29.

2. From *bka' bstan bcos 'gyur ro tshal/cog*  
to *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*

In the introduction to their publication of *bCom ldan rig(s) pa'i ral gri's* (1227–1305; BDRC: P1217; henceforth *Rig ral*) *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, van der Kuijp and Schaeffer provide a detailed and impressive survey of early productions of canonical collections. Some of the reports led them to question the hitherto prevailing assumption that the *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* produced in sNar thang at the beginning of the fourteenth century were the first of their kind, and also to propose that although the terms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur* came into vogue in the fourteenth century, “there is some evidence to suggest that these designations date from the second half of the thirteenth century, at the latest.”<sup>5</sup> It is clearly beyond the scope of the present study to discuss all the numerous sources provided by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer. It would, however, suffice to remark here in general that while there is no doubt that collections of translated literature of various kinds and forms were produced from early on, most evidence provided by them for the existence of the terms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur*, and thus of the two corresponding separate collections, prior to the fourteenth century is based on later sources (or undated / anonymous ones). An examination of the materials, along with other evidence, suggests that the terms *bka' 'gyur* and (more rarely) *bstan 'gyur*, and the matching notion of two distinct canonical collections, found in these later sources when reporting on earlier collections are instead retrospective projections onto the various undertakings described by their respective authors.<sup>6</sup> These sources, therefore, can in my view serve as evidence for the existence of neither two distinct, systematically conceived and organized canonical collections nor the two terms associated with them. Several of the

<sup>5</sup> See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 10, and elsewhere throughout the Introduction.

<sup>6</sup> See Tauscher 2015: 107, where it is similarly argued in regard to the employment of the term *bka' 'gyur* to the collections compiled and produced in Gu ge at the dawn of the Later Period of Diffusion. Tauscher also notes that the term *bka' 'gyur* is not found in Rin chen bzang po's biography, which was composed by his disciple Ye shes dpal, but that rather the term *sde snod gsum ka (tripiṭaka)* is used (though it remains unclear what the term exactly refers to there). For the usage of the term *sde snod gsum* in reference to translated works, see Skilling 1997: 89–90, particularly n. 19, where references to the *lDe'u chos 'byung* and *Yar lung chos 'byung* and other sources in which the term *sde snod gsum* has been used are given, and where Skilling states that the exact meaning of the term as used there (in the context of discussing translation activities during the Early Period) is unclear. See also *ibid.*: 97, where the remark found in Rin chen bzang po's biography that “Rin chen bzang po deposited a ‘complete *Tripitaka*’ (*sde snod gsum ka tshang ba*), a total of 468 volumes (*po ti*), in the monastery of Rad nis” is referred to along with references to secondary sources discussing it. For a citation from 'Gos lhas btsas's *sNgags log sun 'byin*, where the phrase is used in a similar meaning (...*lo tstsha ba rnam kyis sde snod gsum bsgyur zhing*....), see Almogi 2020: 43 n. 46.

sources provided and discussed by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer will be nonetheless re-addressed and discussed here.

In their introduction to Rig ral's *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*, van der Kuijp and Schaeffer devote an entire section to "Early Canonical Production in the Sa skya Tradition," where they discuss, among other things, 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan's (1235–1280; BDRC: P1048) production of what they refer to as a *bKa' 'gyur*, based on 'Phags pa's "official announcement of this manuscript corpus," which he wrote in 1278. This "announcement," regarded by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer as "the earliest reference to the presence of a Kangyur in Sa skya," is included in 'Phags pa's Collected Writings under the title *bDe bar gshegs pa'i gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa'i gsal byed sdeb sbyor gyi rgyan rnam par bkra ba* (henceforth *gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa*). Referring to this title,<sup>7</sup> they also state that the "transition" from the term *gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal* to the later *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal* "is not altogether significant."<sup>8</sup> I wish to address two points in this regard: (a) whether van der Kuijp and Schaeffer's designation of the collection produced by 'Phags pa as *bKa' 'gyur* is justified, and (b) whether what they call the transition from *gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal* to *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal* is more significant than they would have us believe. As related by 'Phags pa, the production was done in stages and in segments of individual independent collections—including various Prajñāpāramitā (Shes rab pha rol phyin ma) collections, the Buddhāvataṃsaka (Sangs rgyas phal po che) and Ratnakūṭa (dKon mchog brtsegs pa) anthologies, a Tantra collection (rGyud 'bum), a Sūtra collection (mDo sde mang po, or short mDo mang), and a Vinaya ('Dul ba) collection (not necessarily in this order)—with no evidence for a systematic organization of the entire material into a coherent collection in the sense of what later came to be known as the *bKa' 'gyur*.<sup>9</sup> Based on the report found in the *gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa*, van der Kuijp and Schaeffer, who assume it to have been one collection, a *bKa' 'gyur*, suggest two possible sequences in which it was arranged. However, there is no evidence that either of these sequences reflects an organizational scheme that yields a single well-defined collection. On the contrary, the fact that the various segments are mentioned in two different sequences could serve as counterevidence to this assumption. At least one of them may simply reflect the order in which the various collections were produced. This

<sup>7</sup> This title is found twice, on the title page and immediately following it, at the beginning of the text. See the *gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa* (A, 599, 600.1; B, 402.1–5).

<sup>8</sup> See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 14–32, for their discussion of early canonical production in the Sa skya tradition, and 20–23, for the discussion of 'Phags pa's *gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa*.

<sup>9</sup> As rightly pointed out in van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 22 n. 43, the verb to "arrange" (*grigs pa*) is not found in 'Phags pa's *gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa*.

undertaking by 'Phags pa was in my opinion not necessarily different from other similar earlier projects to produce scriptural collections consisting of smaller independent units, and thus does not deserve the designation *bKa' 'gyur*.

As for the term *gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal*, except for its occurrence in the title, 'Phags pa refers to the collection (or rather collections) he had made either by their individual designations (i.e., rGyud 'bum, etc., as listed above) or, more generally, simply as *gsung rab rin po che* (/ *rin chen*), "The Precious Teachings."<sup>10</sup> Moreover, I would like to suggest reconsidering the source/date of the text's title (*bDe bar gshegs pa'i gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa'i gsal byed sdeb sbyor gyi rgyan rnam par bkra ba*). The question whether it stems from 'Phags pa himself (and thus also to be dated 1278) is legitimate, since, as has already pointed out, it is merely found as a cover and beginning title, and could very well be an editorial title added later, for example, during the compilation of 'Phags pa's Collected Writings. Such an assumption could be supported by what seems to be the "title" given by 'Phags pa himself, which is found at the end of the document and where again the phrase *gsung rab rin po che*, and not *gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal*, is used. This "title" might be rendered as follows: "A Text Faithfully Narrating the Production of All Precious Teachings [in Translation] with Precious Gold."<sup>11</sup> Of some interest is certainly the word "all" (*mtha' dag*), which is clearly a hint at an attempt to achieve (or give the impression of) completeness (although, as I shall argue below, it probably should not be taken too literally), so that the result of this undertaking could possibly be considered, retrospectively, a proto-*bKa' 'gyur*. Such proto-*bKa' 'gyurs*, as pointed out, for example, by Helmut Tauscher, present "an intermediate stage between the collections of imperial times and the fully developed Kanjurs." Ideally, they are "complete collections of the Buddha's word but not yet systematically arranged into Kanjurs," while "similar or related texts are compiled into larger volumes, which, however, do not have any particular order among them."<sup>12</sup> It would be perhaps more appropriate to consider the literary units produced by 'Phags pa (and others before and after him) as several of numerous other building blocks for what later became the *bKa' 'gyur*. And indeed we know that some of these small collections in Sa skya served as precisely that for the Old sNar thang *bKa' 'gyur*.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See the *gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa* (A, 609.2–3; B, 411.12–13): *de ltar gsung rab rin chen gser gyis rab bzhengs nas* | |.

<sup>11</sup> See the *gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa* (A, 610.1–2; B, 412.10–11): *gsung rab rin po che mtha' dag rin po che gser gyis bzhengs pa'i tshul* | *tshul bzhin du brjod pa'i rab tu byed pa 'di ni dge slong 'Phags pa zhes bya bas* | **Sa pho stag gi lo smin drug gi zla ba'i tshes lnga'i nyin par dpal Sa skya'i chos grwa chen po sbyar ba'o** | |.

<sup>12</sup> See Tauscher 2015: 107.

<sup>13</sup> See Jampa Samten 1987a, 1987b, Harrisson 1994, 1996.

With regard to the terminology, of particular interest is a passage where 'Phags pa explicitly states that the works translated by the *lo tsā bas* and *paṇḍitas* are known as '*gyur ro 'tshal*, "everything that / whatever has been translated."<sup>14</sup> In fact a similar state of affairs is observed in regard to the two canonical collections compiled in sNar thang several decades later under the supervision of dBus pa blo gsal, aka Sangs rgyas 'bum and rTsod pa'i seng ge<sup>15</sup> (ca. 1270–ca. 1355<sup>16</sup>; BDRC: P3090), as attested in his *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue, which will henceforth be referred to as *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*. The title as it appears on the title page of both manuscript versions lacks the term *bstan 'gyur* and simply reads *bsTan bcos kyi dkar chag* (though it, too, might well be a later editorial/copyist title). The translated works are referred to therein as either *gsung rab rin po che* ("Precious Teachings")—apparently referring both to the Word of the Buddha and to commentarial and other related works—or *bka' dang bstan bcos dri ma med pa* ("Immaculate Words [of the Buddha] and [Related] Treatises"), which are said to be '*gyur ro cog tu grags pa rnams* ("those [works] known as 'everything that / whatever has been translated'"), or in a less formal formulation, *bod du 'gyur ba ji snyed pa rnams* ("everything that / whatever has been translated in Tibet").<sup>17</sup>

Another example given by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer, this time as evidence that the term *bstan 'gyur* "dates from at least the middle of the second half of the thirteenth century," is a reference in the plural form—*bstan 'gyur chen po rnams*—found within a narrative of an oral teaching (*gsung sgros*) given by U rgyan pa Rin chen dpal (1229/30–1309; BDRC: P1448), which according to van der Kuijp and Schaeffer took place in the late 1270s.<sup>18</sup> This, they state, is "the earliest reference

<sup>14</sup> See the *gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa* (A, 606.3; B, 408.14–16): *sdud pa po yis legs bsdus nas | | lo paṇ rnams kyi legs bsgyur ba | | 'gyur ro 'tshal du grags pa rnams | |*.

<sup>15</sup> On the names of dBus pa blo gsal, see van der Kuijp 2011: 77–78.

<sup>16</sup> The dates provided here are according to van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 10, but cf. van der Kuijp 2011: 79, where it is argued that if dBus pa blo gsal indeed wrote his *bstan rtsis* in 1280, as suggested by several sources, he was more likely born closer to 1260.

<sup>17</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 2a6–b1; B, 2a5–6, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 1.24–25): ... *gsung rab rin po [A: po, B: pa] che'i tshogs rnams rim par bsdus shing rnam par phyé ba'i sgo nas bstan pa'i sgron ma 'jig rten du yun du gnas shing gsal bar mdzad la | ...*; *ibid.*: (A, 80b4–5; B, 59a2–3, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 117.22–23): ... *mkhas pa rnams kyi bslab par bya ba'i [A: bya ba'i, B: bya'i] gnas Bod du 'gyur ba ji snyed pa rnams sngon gyi smon lam gyi stobs bzang po dang |*; *ibid.*: (A, 2b5–3a1; B, 2b4–6, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 2.7–10): *skye dgu rnams kyi phan bde sgrub pa la brtson pa lha dang bcas pa'i ston pa yongs su rdzogs pa'i mkhas pa chen po 'Jam pa'i dbyangs kyi bde bar gshegs pa'i bka' dang bstan bcos dri ma med pa 'gyur ro cog tu grags pa rnams nye bar bzhengs pa las bstan bcos rnams kyi rim pa ni dkar chag tu bri bar bya'o | |*.

<sup>18</sup> See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 29. The authors refer to the *mKhas grub au rgyan pa'i gsung sgros rin po che gser gyi phreng ba*, a thirty-one folio manuscript (dBu med), C.P.N. catalogue no. 004804(3)/007005(3), marginal number Cha, 19a, to which I

to date of a Tengyur that is known to [them].” Nonetheless, the fact that the word is found there in the plural clearly shows that the phrase is not to be understood as “Tengyur” but rather simply as “the great translated treatises” (for more on the usage of the word in the plural, see below). Moreover, we cannot be certain that the transmitted narrative faithfully reflects each and every term used during the event it is reporting. On the contrary, it may be assumed that it underwent revisions of various kinds, even major ones, in the course of compiling and putting down in writing this master’s oral teachings (as in the case of, to give another example, sGam po pa’s oral teachings). One should bear in mind that such oral teachings are often compiled only after a master’s death. In the case of those of U rgyan pa Rin chen dpal, they were compiled and edited by his disciple Zla ba seng ge (b. 13th cent.; P5822). The date of the compilation is unknown to me, but it probably took place sometime in the first half of the fourteenth century after 1309 (the year of the master’s death). In addition, van der Kuijp and Schaeffer also draw our attention to a passage from the *Yar lung chos ’byung*, composed by Yar lung Jo bo Shākya rin chen sde (b. 14th cent; BDRC: P5273) in 1376 (Martin 1997, no. 96), in which the author reports that lHa Byang chub rin chen (1158–1232; P3449), the second abbot of the bKa’ gdams pa monastery of Se spyil bu, came to be known as lHa Lung gi dbang phyug (“lHa [chen], Master of Text Transmission”) “owing to his ability to give the *lung*-transmission of what he [i.e., Yar lung Jo bo] calls the Kangyur.”<sup>19</sup> In this case, too, I feel that equating the phrase *bka’ ’gyur ro ’tshal* with “Kangyur” is somewhat hasty, as not only was the history composed one and a half centuries after lHa Byang chub rin chen passed away, but the phrase also appears to be used there non-terminologically and simply loosely means “all translated [works containing the] Word [of the Buddha].”

Another two sources provided by van der Kuijp and Schaeffer that I wish to briefly discuss here are the *lHo rong chos ’byung*, composed 1446–1451 (Martin 1997: no. 118) by rTa tshag Tshe dbang rgyal (1400–1499; BDRC: P8672), and the biography of the Second Karma pa Karma pakṣi (1204/6–1283; BDRC: P1487), composed by the Second Zhwa dmar mKha’ spyod dbang po (1350–1405; BDRC: P1413), and thus to be dated to the late fourteenth or very early fifteenth century. These two sources include the phrase *bka’ ’gyur ro ’tshal* in their description of the salvific activities of Karma pakṣi. This led van der Kuijp and Schaeffer to state that, according to the *lHo rong chos ’byung*, Karma

---

unfortunately have no access. Some other versions are provided by the BDRC, for which see under Zla ba seng ge (P5822).

<sup>19</sup> See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 14, and the *Yar lung chos ’byung* (106.8–9): ... *bka’ ’gyur ro ’tshal gyi lung bzhugs pas | lHa Lung gi dbang phyug zhes grags |*.

pakṣi had a “[Kanjur] in vermilion ink”(!) made,<sup>20</sup> adding that the biography mentions even two such sets. Now, despite the fact that both sources are rather late and the fact that they employ the phrase *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal* rather than *bKa' 'gyur*, for various reasons it is worth looking at the two passages once again. The *lHo rong chos 'byung* states the following:<sup>21</sup>

[Karma pa Karma pakṣi] had everything that has been translated [containing] the Word [of the Buddha] written down, and [he himself] composed, both in China and in Tibet, numerous treatises on all [manner of topics, including such concerning] the Three Baskets (i.e., Vinaya, Sūtra, and Abhidharma), the New and Old Tantras, and the treatises and instructions [related to any of them]. [His own treatises] are called *rGya mtsho mtha' yas*, [a phrase] articulated at the beginning [of the works]. He was [thereby] creating auspicious circumstances for an unbiased propagation of the Doctrine.<sup>22</sup>

The passage in the biography is somewhat less clear. It appears, however, that the *lHo rong chos 'byung* has echoed it, and with this in mind, and with one substantial emendation of the text, I would like to offer the following translation:<sup>23</sup>

Having received extensive transmissions for countless scriptures, [Karma pa Karma pakṣi] taught [his] *bsTan pa rgya mtsho mtha' yas*—beginning with the *Ye shes rgya mtsho mtha' yas* and ending with the *Tshig bzhi tshigs su bcad pa*—pervading the world [with it] as much as all translated [works containing the] Word [of the Buddha and] the treatises, [these] two, do.

My emendation of the text from *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal gnyis* to *bka' bstan 'gyur ro 'tshal gnyis* may prima facie seem far-fetched, but it is in my view the only way to accommodate the word “two” (“two *bKa' 'gyur* sets” makes no sense whatsoever in this context<sup>24</sup>). If the passage from the *lHo rong chos 'byung* is indeed based on this (in my view corrupt)

<sup>20</sup> See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 13.

<sup>21</sup> *lHo rong chos 'byung* (237.21–238.2): *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa dang | sde snod gsium gsang sngags gsar rnying | bstan bcos man ngag thams cad la mtshan gyi thog mar smos pa'ang | rGya mtsho mtha' yas zhes pa'i bstan bcos rGya Bod du mang du mdzad nas bstan pa phyogs med du rgyas pa'i rten 'brel bsgrigs pa yin no |*

<sup>22</sup> On the *rGya mtsho mtha' yas skor*, see Kapstein 2000: 97–106. A somewhat poor-quality scan of the cycle has been made available by the BDRC (W22340).

<sup>23</sup> *Karma pakṣi'i rnam thar* (72.2–3): ... *rab 'byam bka' la lung chen po thob pas bsTan pa rgya mtsho mtha' yas | Ye shes rgya mtsho mtha' yas man chad | Tshig bzhi tshigs su bcad pa yan chad la | bka' bstan [em.: bka' bstan, Ms: bka'] 'gyur ro 'tshal gnyis tsam 'dzam gling khyab par bstan cing |*...

<sup>24</sup> To be noted, however, is that the passage from the biography has been reproduced verbatim in the *mKhas pa'i dga' ston* (A, 906.8–20; B, 460.20–22), which likewise reads *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal gnyis tsam!*



passage from the biography, it would mean that its reporting of Karma pakši “commissioning a *bKa’ gyur*,” or more precisely, “commissioning the production of everything that has been translated [containing] the Word [of the Buddha],” is historically erroneous, being perhaps a result of trying to make sense of the unintelligible passage.

Now, coming back to the phrase *bka’ gyur ro tshal*, the main problem with van der Kuijp and Schaeffer’s understanding of the passage (leaving aside their misinterpretation of *tshal* to mean “vermillion ink”) lies in their implied division of the phrase into the two components *bka’ gyur* and *ro tshal*.<sup>25</sup> As already hinted at above, the phrase actually consists of the components *bka’* and *gyur ro tshal*. This detail might seem negligible, but correctly understanding the phrase is vital for understanding not only the two above-discussed passages but also the actual process of formation of the Canon, with its two parts, and the formation of their respective designations *bKa’ gyur* and *bsTan gyur*. The phrase *gyur ro tshal* is already attested in the *lDan/lHan dkar ma*, in its opening paragraph, where it is found twice in combination with the word *chos* (or *dam pa’i chos*), which obviously includes both the *bka’* and *bstan bcos*.<sup>26</sup> It is thus clear that the phrase is known from at least the early ninth century—first in combination with the word *chos* in its broader sense—simply meaning “everything that / whatever has been translated” rather than referring to systematically compiled and arranged collections in such forms as the *bKa’ gyur* and *bsTan gyur*. As we shall see below, the plural forms *bka’ gyur ro tshal/cog rnam*s and *bstan bcos gyur ro tshal/cog rnam*s (or short: *bka’ gyur rnam*s and *bstan gyur rnam*s), occasionally found in early sources, must therefore refer to a number of individual works rather than numerous sets of the *bKa’ gyur* or *bsTan gyur*.

One question to be asked is what “everything that / whatever” in the phrase “everything that / whatever has been translated” actually

<sup>25</sup> A similar interpretation is observed in their translation of the phrase *gser rkyang gi bka’ gyur ro cog* (*gyur ro cog* being an alternative for *gyur ro tshal*) to mean “the entire Kangyur of pure gold” instead of “all translated [works containing] the Word [of the Buddha written] in pure gold.” See van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 12.

<sup>26</sup> See the *lDan/lHan dkar ma* (Lalou 1953: 319.5–6; Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 1.7–8): ... **Bod** *kyi rgyal khams su dam pa’i chos gyur ro tshal gyi mtshan byang dkar chag* ...; and *ibid.*: (Lalou 1953: 319.12–13; Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 1.24)... **Bod** *khams su chos gyur ro tshal gyi mtshan byang*.... The phrase is also found in the title of the catalogue, which reads: *Pho brang stong thang lDan/lHan dkar gyi chos* [CD: *chos*, GNP: *bka’ dang bstan bcos*] *gyur ro cog gyi dkar chag*. The reading variant *bka’ dang bstan bcos* (as recorded in Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 1 n. 2) appears, however, to be a later editorial or copyist alteration. Compare the less terminological phrase found in the colophon, which reads (Lalou 1953: 337.10; Herrmann-Pfandt: 411: “Colophon”): *gsung rab mdo sde dang bstan bcos thams cad*. The *’Phang thang ma* catalogue appears not to include the phrase *gyur ro tshal/cog*.

means. I believe that it would be safe to say that during the Early Period, when translation, compilation, and cataloguing were centralized undertakings, it undoubtedly literally meant “everything” (or “nearly everything”), whereas during the Later Period, when we witness the formation of various schools, decentralization, and in fact fragmentation, this was far from being the case. Now collections were produced, first and foremost, on the basis of the holdings of the individual religious centre, and often also those of neighbouring ones.<sup>27</sup> Most importantly, they were influenced by the school affiliation and philosophical/doctrinal inclination of those who commissioned, donated, or edited them. This state of affairs inevitably had an impact on the selection of works to be included in, or excluded from, the projected collection—a point particularly relevant in regard to Tantric works. In the case of (alleged) revisions or new translations of the same work, this same state of affairs undoubtedly also influenced the choice as to which versions to include or exclude. In addition, financial considerations likewise played a role in influencing the size of these collections. Thus during the Later Period, particularly its early phases, “everything/whatever” should be understood as “everything that / whatever was available and accepted as authentic.”

As pointed out above, the term *bstan 'gyur* is not employed by dBus pa blo gsal in his catalogue. The catalogue of the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* edition, which was prepared in the years 1317–1323 at the behest of the Tshal gung thang ruler sMon lam rdo rje (1284–1346/7; BDR: P9825) and under the supervision of one Bla ma Kun dga' don grub—who, I have recently suggested, can possibly be identified with sNye mdo Kun dga' don grub (b. 1268; BDR: P1452), one of the Third Karma pa Rang byung rdo rje's (1284–1339; BDR: P66) teachers<sup>28</sup>—does not employ the term *bstan 'gyur* either. This catalogue—which was compiled by dGe ba'i bshes gnyen dGe 'dun rin chen, who, too, I have suggested, may have been one of the Third Karma pa's teachers,<sup>29</sup> and which probably was also completed in 1323—does contain, however, several annotations in which the term is employed. The term is also found in the title on the front page. The manuscript, though, is not dated, so that both these annotations and the front-page title could be later scribal/editorial additions. In fact, there are indications—in terms of both palaeography-cum-codicology and content—that this is indeed the case, and therefore these occurrences should not be associated with the actual catalogue.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Skilling 1997: 98, Jampa Samten 1987a, 1987b, and Harrison 1994, 1996.

<sup>28</sup> See Almogi 2020: 114 n. 16.

<sup>29</sup> See Almogi 2020: 114–115 n. 17.

<sup>30</sup> The annotations found in the *Tshal pa bstan dkar* can be divided into two groups: (i) The first group consists of interlinear annotations, which appear to be written in

In contrast, Bu ston Rin chen grub's (1290–1364; BDRC: P155) religious history, composed in the years 1322–1326, does employ the terms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur* in its fourth chapter, which consists of the appended title index. For the works recorded in his index, Bu ston merely employs the general terms *bka'* and *bstan bcos*<sup>31</sup>—which, given that his index does not reflect the contents of any particular collection, is completely legitimate—but he does employ the terms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur* on several occasions to refer to existing collections or to their catalogues, as follows:

1. An occurrence of the term *bka' 'gyur* in a paragraph heading: *'dir sngar 'gyur nges pa deng sang gi bKa' 'gyur du ma tshud cing ma rnyed pa* (“in the following [are listed works that] are certainly Early Translations [but] are not included in present *bKa' 'gyur[s]* and [thus could] not be obtained”).<sup>32</sup>
2. Two occurrences of the term *bstan 'gyur* with reference to a *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue (*bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag chen mo*<sup>33</sup> and *bsTan 'gyur dkar chag*<sup>34</sup>), obviously referring to dBus pa blo gsal's catalogue to the sNar thang edition. In yet another instance, while listing the catalogues he relied on for the title index, he refers to the same catalogue and uses the full form of the phrase (*sNar thang gi bstan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag*<sup>35</sup>). It should be noted here in passing that it is remarkable that Bu ston does not refer to the catalogue of the sNar thang edition of the *bKa' 'gyur*, which was reportedly also compiled by dBus pa blo gsal (on which, see

---

the same hand as the main text, very possibly at the same time, and thus could, and perhaps should, be considered integral part of the catalogue. (ii) The second group consists of marginal annotations, which are undoubtedly written in a different hand, and are clearly later additions. (Although the scans available to me are in black and white, it can be said with certainty that the ink used for the annotations belonging to this second group is different from that used for the main text and the annotations belonging to the first group.) All annotations containing the term *bstan 'gyur* belong to the second group. Moreover, in all cases the term refers to *bsTan 'gyur* editions that are later than the Tshal pa edition—including those of rTse thang (69b, 86a, 87b, 93a, 96a, 99a), Zhwa lu, [gDan sa] thel, and Gong dkar (99a).

<sup>31</sup> See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (212.2–6; Nishioka 1980: 65): *gsum pa bka' dang bstan bcos Bod du ji ltar 'gyur/byung ba'i rnam grang la | [...] dang po la bka' dang | bstan bcos gnyis so | | bka' la...*; and *ibid.* (227.24; Nishioka 1981: 47): *gnyis pa bstan bcos kyi skor la...*

<sup>32</sup> See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (226.23; Nishioka 1980: 77, SIX), a subheading of the section *bKa' tha ma don dam rnam par nges pa'i 'khor lo bskor ba'i bka'* (“Teachings [that were propagated during] the last turning of the wheel [and that] determine the absolute”).

<sup>33</sup> See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (308.23; Nishioka 1983: 114).

<sup>34</sup> See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (313.4–5; Nishioka 1993: 118), in reference to Bc3048–Bc3060.

<sup>35</sup> See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (314.10–11; Nishioka 1993: 119).

below).

3. In addition, there are a number of occurrences of the term *bsTan 'gyur*, always within a phrase stating that the work/s just listed was/were “not included in the *bsTan 'gyur*” (*bsTan 'gyur du ma chud / tshud*), it being unclear which *bsTan 'gyur* Bu ston is referring to there, a question that I shall attempt to answer in the following.

The scenario whereby the numerous references to a *bsTan 'gyur* that does not include some specified work/s were added later and the *bsTan 'gyur* in question is his own Zhwa lu edition (completed in 1335) can be excluded with a high degree of certainty, for at least some of these titles are recorded in his *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*. Moreover, there appears to be neither palaeographical/ codicological nor philological evidence that suggests that these phrases were later insertions. Theoretically, they could be references to the Tshal pa edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, which was produced in the years 1317–1323. This seems, however, unlikely, not only because Bu ston has not included this edition or its catalogue as one of his sources, but also because it, too, seems to have contained at least some of these works, as attested by its catalogue. It is, therefore, quite probable that he is referring here, too, to the sNar thang edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, though possibly merely via its catalogue. And indeed, in all cases, the works in question seem (as far as one can judge on the basis of the titles) not to be listed in dBus pa blo gsal's catalogue. (For an overview of these instances, see Appendix A.) Interestingly, in one instance, Bu ston lists four works and states that two<sup>36</sup> of them are not found in the *bsTan 'gyur*. Indeed, of the four works in question only two are recorded in the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, in one of the two chapters that include rare texts and therefore were added to the catalogue at a later (unspecified) point in time, namely, one in chapter 19, which is found in both available manuscript versions of the catalogue, and one in chapter 21, which is only found in the later, longer version (MS A). Accordingly, the earlier version is missing three of the four titles. This state of affairs implies that Bu ston must have had the later version at his disposal. This is also confirmed through a passage in which Bu ston discusses the issue of duplicates. There he states that the total number of works contained in dBus pa blo gsal's catalogue is 2,350, which is indeed the number indicated at the end of the later version.<sup>37</sup> To be noted is also that in other similar instances he does not refer to a *bsTan 'gyur*, but merely states that the work/s in question “was/were *previously* not included” (*sngar ma*

<sup>36</sup> On the reading *gnyis*, see Appendix A, table 1, no. 9.

<sup>37</sup> See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (308.23; Nishioka 1983: 114.18–19): *bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag chen mo las | nyis stong sum brgya lnga bcur bshad kyang*.... For a discussion of the entire passage, see Almogi (forthcoming).

*chud*). These instances are too numerous to be examined within the framework of the present paper, but random examination of some of them shows a similar pattern, which suggests that Bu ston might be referring there, too, to the Old sNar thang edition.

In Bu ston's catalogue to the Zhwa lu *bsTan 'gyur*, which was compiled some years later, in 1335, one finds the full form *bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal* in the title given in the colophons (i.e., the one found at the end of the work and the chapter colophons) and also in the passage where the Old sNar thang *bsTan 'gyur* is referred to as the collection upon which the Zhwa lu *bsTan 'gyur* was primarily based.<sup>38</sup> Generally speaking, the employment of the full form in work titles is not surprising, the more elegant form seeming only natural. This is probably the reason, then, for Bu ston's using the full form as well when referring to the sNar thang edition itself. However, unlike in his religious history, where he employs the term *bsTan 'gyur* numerous times, in his catalogue to the Zhwa lu edition he appears to use it only once, in the phrase *yar lung pa'i bstan 'gyur gyi dkar chag* (which could mean either a catalogue to a *bsTan 'gyur* commissioned by Yar lung pa or a *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue compiled by Yar lung pa).<sup>39</sup> It is unclear, though, which

<sup>38</sup> For the full title, see the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*'s colophons, both the numerous chapter colophons and the colophon at the end of the catalogue. For the reference to the sNar thang edition, see *ibid.* (638.1): *chos gra chen po sNar thang na bzhugs pa'i bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal...* The catalogue to the sNe'u gdong *bsTan 'gyur*, which was compiled some three decades after Bu ston's catalogue, in 1362, and is based on the latter, to give another fourteenth-century example, also employs the full form *bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal* in both the title found in the colophons and in the passage where it is stated that the Zhwa lu *bsTan 'gyur* served as its basis. See the *sNe'u gdong bstan dkar*'s various chapter colophons and end colophon. For the reference to the Zhwa lu edition as its basis, see *ibid.* (567.5): **Zha lu gser khang gi gtsug lag khang na bzhugs pa'i bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal la phyi mo zhus...**

<sup>39</sup> See the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (475.6–476.2): *bzhi po 'di Yar lung pa'i bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag la bton snang | Ti THi Di Ni bzhi la | gSang 'dus le'u bcu bdun pa'i 'grel pa bam po brgya rtsa bcu dang shu lo ka bcu gnyis pa | slob dpon rab tu byung ba'i mtshan Pra bha pa | gsang mtshan 'Phags pa Kun dga' snying pos mdzad zer ba | pañdi ta Phra ras kyis | 'Bal Byams pa'i shes rab dang | gNyan Byang chub tshul khriims gnyis kyi don du bsgyur ba bzhugs | 'di Kun dga' snying po rang gis mdzad pa yin min the tshom za bar snang ngo | 'di sngar gyi rnams kyis Ye shes zhabs lugs kyi skor du bris mod kyi | 'di ni | 'Phags skor dang | Ye shes zhabs lugs la sogs slob dpon du ma'i lugs bkod snang bas lugs gud pa yin no | |* This passage is Bu ston's bibliographical record to the \*Śrīgūhyasamājahātantrārājāṭikā (*rGyud kyi rgyal po chen po dpal gsang ba 'dus pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa*), whose authorship is ascribed to Ānandagarbha, and a translation of it to Pañḍita 'Phra ras (apparently identical with Phra la ring ba; see BDRC: P4CZ15607; Tibskrit suggests the reconstructed Sanskrit name \*Sūkṣmadīrgha). Bu ston expresses there his doubt regarding the authenticity of its authorship ascription to Ānandagarbha, and also remarks that since the work seems to present a blend of various traditions he placed it in a separate section (i.e., neither in the section of the Jñānapāda tradition nor in that of the Ārya tradition). The work is not included in the sDe dge edition, but it is in the larger editions (PNG), where it also stretches over four volumes (e.g., P4787, rGyud 'grel, vols. Tsu, Tshu, Dzu, Wu). See also van der Kuip & Schaeffer 2009: 36, where a reference

edition Bu ston is referring to there and who this Yar lung pa is. In any case, it appears that by now the full forms *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal/cog* and *bstan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal/cog* have become the accepted designations for the two canonical collections of the translated works containing the Word of the Buddha and the treatises, respectively, and that their terminological abbreviations *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* were likewise in use, at least by Bu ston, from the early 1320s onward.

To go back to Tshal pa circles, Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje aka dGe ba'i blo gros (1309–1364; BDRC: P4525)—in his overview of the production of canonical collections in dBus in the biography of his father—clearly uses both the full forms *bKa' 'gyur ro cog* and *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro cog* alongside the terminological *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*.<sup>40</sup> To be sure, the biography appears to have been written after his father's death (i.e., after 1346/7) and is thus likewise a somewhat later source. Moreover, the *Deb dmar*—composed by him during the following two decades (1346–1363; Martin 1997, no. 77)—employs the truncated forms *bka' 'gyur* twice and *bstan 'gyur* once, the latter clearly in a non-terminological manner. In one instance Kun dga' rdo rje reports that Ānandamalla—who ruled the Ya rtse (Khasa) kingdom in the

---

to this passage is found and where the authors ask themselves whether this Yar lung pa could be Yar lung lo tsā ba Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1242–1346; BDRC: 2637). To the best of my knowledge, there is, however, no evidence that this master commissioned a *bsTan 'gyur* (or wrote a *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue). There is, notably, another reference to a *bsTan 'gyur* made by one Yar lung pa in Zhu chen's *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 306a6), which reads: ... **Zha lu gser khang gi gtsug lag khang gi bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal la phyi mor bgyis nas Yar lung pas bzhengs pa'i bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal nyid las....** This Yar lung pa is probably the ruler of sTag rtse who, as reported in the *Blues Annals*, commissioned a *bsTan 'gyur* based on the Zhwa lu edition. See Roerich 1949: 339. This figure can with certainty be identified with rDo rje tshé brtan of the Hor family of 'Phyong rgyas. At any rate, the Yar lung pa mentioned by Zhu chen cannot be the same one mentioned by Bu ston. That the passage in the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* is a later interpolation is unlikely, since the four volumes containing Ānandagarbha's work are omitted from the sNe'u gdong edition (and thus also from later editions that reproduce it more or less faithfully, such as sDe dge). See the pertinent location in the *sNe'u gdong bstan dkar* (414.4). At any rate, even though the catalogue to the reported Yar lung pa edition has not been identified, the work is recorded in two other early catalogues, namely, in the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 19b3–4; B, 15a3–4): Dza Wa Zha Za *rnams la slob dpon Kun dga' [B: dga', A: dga'i] snying po'i [N<sub>js</sub>338 = D1917/P2780] gSang ba [A: ba, B: pa] 'dus pa'i dka' 'grel Rin chen bzang po'i 'gyur dang | [N<sub>js</sub>339 = Dx/P4787] 'Grel chen Phra ras kyi rang 'gyur [B: rang 'gyur, A: 'gyur] du grags pa rnams [A: rnams, B: om.] bzhugs | |, and in the *Tshal pa bstan dkar* (13b.7): Wa Zha Za 'A Ya Ra *rnams la Kun dga' snying pos mdzad pa'i [T213 = Dx/P4787] gSang ba [em.: ba, Ms; pa] 'dus pa'i 'grel chen Phra ras kyi 'gyur | |, so that the Yar lung pa edition referred to could well be an early copy of one of them.**

<sup>40</sup> See the *sMon lam rdo rje'i rnam thar* (20a7) for both *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro cog* and *bsTan 'gyur*; (20b6–7) for *bsTan 'gyur*; (20b3) for *bKa' 'gyur*; and (62a1) for *bKa' 'gyur ro cog*.

1290s (perhaps 1293–1299)<sup>41</sup>—restored Buddhagayā [*stūpa*/temple] and erected a golden *bKa' 'gyur*, among other activities.<sup>42</sup> The second instance occurs in his brief biographical sketch of Bla ma Ri bo ba (/ rNgog) Rin chen bzang po (1243–1319; BDRC: P0RK1295),<sup>43</sup> who, he reports, commissioned a *bKa' 'gyur* in gold:<sup>44</sup>

Bla ma Ri bo ba Rin chen bzang po [...], having gone to Khams at the age of thirty-four (lit. “in his 35th year”), travelled around [there] for two years (1278–1280). [Upon his return] he became the *bla ma* of the Tshal pa'i yang dgon's<sup>45</sup> meditation centre and of the [Tshal pa] ruling family. He [then] commissioned a golden *bKa' 'gyur*.

To be noted in passing is that, as remarked by Ducher, this undertaking is also reported in the full biography of rNgog Rin chen bzang po. The formulation there is somewhat different, and it is not wholly evident from it that he produced a *bKa' 'gyur* as opposed to a mixed collection, which was rather common at the time. The collection is, in any event, referred to there as *bka' bstan bcos thams cad ma lus par*, which may be no more than an attempt to suggest that efforts to reach some sort of comprehensiveness were made. The short report reads as follows:<sup>46</sup>

<sup>41</sup> For a list of the Ya rtse rulers, see Tucci 1956: 50, 54; Petech 2003: 37, 39; Sørensen 1994: 461–463. Note that, according to Petech 2003: 37, this *bKa' 'gyur* edition was in silver, not gold.

<sup>42</sup> See the *Deb dmar* (44.2–3): **A nan smal gyis rdo rje gdan gsos | gser gyi bKa' 'gyur gzhengs | ...** The *rGya bod yig tshang chen mo*, composed by g.Yas ru sTag tshang dPal 'byor bzang po (b. 15th cent.; BDRC: P6979) in 1434 (Martin 1997, no. 115), seems to have reproduced this passage (and apparently also other passages) from the *Deb dmar*. See the *rGya bod yig tshang chen mo* (A, 160.17–19; B, 127.7–8): **A nan smal | ... gser gyi bKa' 'gyur bzhengs |**. Notable here is the immediately preceding report of Grags btsan lde having had numerous scriptures copied, where the term *gsung rab* is used. See *ibid.* (A, 160.14; B, 127.3): *gsung rab mang po'ang* [A: *po'ang*, B: *po*] *bzheng so | |*.

<sup>43</sup> For the biography of Bla ma Ri bo ba (or rNgog) Rin chen bzang po, see Ducher 2017: 307–311 (and *passim* for further discussions). See also van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 36–37, for a discussion of his dates.

<sup>44</sup> *Deb dmar* (77.14–22): **bla ma Ri bo ba Rin chen bzang po | ... so lnga pa la Khams su byon nas lo gnyis la 'khor | Tshal pa'i yang dgon | sgom sde dang | dpon brgyud kyi bla mar gyur | gser gyi bKa' 'gyur bzhengs | ...**

<sup>45</sup> The Tshal pa(i) yang dgon was founded by Bla ma zhang brTson 'grus grags pa (1123/1121–1193, BDRC: P1857) in 1175. See Sørensen, Hazod, Tsering Gyalbo 2007, vol. 1: 290 & vol. 2: 774.

<sup>46</sup> See Ducher 2017: 407 (§18.4): *... gsang sngags gyi rgyud sde dang | gzungs dang rig pa | mdo la sogs pa'i bka' bstan chos thams cad ma lus par gser dang dngul gyis glegs bam brgya* [em.: *brgya*, Text: *rgya*] *phrag du bzhengs cing | ...* Note, however, that Ducher's translation, which supplements the syllables 'gyur in order to gain the designations *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*, seems to be a rather distorted rendering of the report. See *ibid.*: 309–310: “He commissioned hundreds of volumes [written] in gold and silver of all of the *bKa' [gyur]* and *bsTan [gyur]* without omission, with the tantras of the Secret Mantra, dhāraṇī- and knowledge-[mantras], sūtras and so on.” See

[He] commissioned a hundred (or possibly: hundreds of) volumes [containing] all scriptures and treatises with no exceptions—[including those classified as or commenting on] *tantras*, *dhāraṇīs*, and *vidyās* of the Mantra[naya], the *sūtras*, and so forth—to be [written] in gold and silver.

The one instance Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje uses the truncated form *bstan 'gyur* in his *Deb dmar* is found in the short biography of the Third Karma pa Rang byung rdo rje (1284–1339; BDRC: P66) contained therein, where he reports on the *bsTan 'gyur* commissioned by the Karma pa, which was in fact prepared under his own supervision. Of particular significance is that the word *bstan 'gyur* is there in the plural, which is a clear indication that it is not being employed to refer to the collection as a whole but rather to individual works, that is, meaning “treatises in translation” or “translated treatises”.<sup>47</sup>

At Tshal pa, having given the necessary requisites, [he] commissioned the making of marvellous [volumes containing] “treatises in translations” (*bstan 'gyur*) in gold. When consecrating them (*de rnams*), it was evident that an innumerable number of *buddhas* and *bodhisattvas* actually dissolved [into the volumes (?)], and the sound of the Dharma resounded.

Since the composition of the *Deb dmar* stretches over almost two decades (1346–1363), it is impossible, based on it, to pinpoint exactly when these terms (or the truncated forms) started to be used by Kun dga' rdo rje or his milieu. One could, however, perhaps limit this span somewhat, considering the fact that the term *bka' 'gyur* is also found in the section colophons of the Tshal pa *bKa' 'gyur* prepared in the years 1347–1351, which have fortunately been preserved in the Li thang (aka 'Jang sa tham) *bKa' 'gyur* edition. In the colophons of the Sūtra, Tantra, and Vinaya sections, references are made to the set from sNar thang, which was taken as its basis and which is referred to therein as a *bKa' 'gyur*.<sup>48</sup> Interestingly, the term *bka' 'gyur* is also employed there in the

---

also van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 35–36, where references to reports concerning the production of a collection of canonical works commissioned by Ri bo ba are found, including in the above-mentioned *Deb dmar* and also in rTa tshag Tshed dbang rgyal's *lHo rong chos 'byung* (composed in 1446–1451), which despite having a somewhat different formulation—*mdo sngags kyi glegs bam brgya lhaḡ gser dngul gyis bzheḡs* (“He commissioned more than a hundred volumes of *sūtras* and *tantras* [written] in gold and silver”)—appears to refer to the same collection.

<sup>47</sup> *Deb dmar* (103.13–15): **Tshal pa** *la cha rkyen gtad nas gser gyi bsTan 'gyur phun sum tshogs pa bzheḡs de rnams rab gnas mdzad pa'i tshes sangs rgyas byang chub sems dpa' dpag tu med pa dngos su thim zhiḡg chos sgra sgroḡs par snang* l. Cf. van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 34, where *bstan 'gyur* is understood terminologically (“Tengyur”), and the plural *de rnams* is rendered as “these manuscripts.”

<sup>48</sup> The passages in question provided here are as cited in Jampa Samten 1987a. For the passage in the Sūtra section colophon, see *ibid.*: 31.29–30: ... *mkhas pa'i 'byung*



plural form in two instances in the Vinaya section, in both clearly referring to individual texts rather than to several *bKa' 'gyur* sets.<sup>49</sup>

The above instances demonstrate that the terms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur* came to be employed alongside the full forms *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal/cog* and *bstan 'gyur ro 'tshal/cog* already during the 1320s, as attested in the *Bu ston chos 'byung*, although the scholarly milieu in which the truncated forms were first coined, and where and when they started to be used terminologically to refer to the two parts of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon, remain uncertain. Of some interest is perhaps also the phrase *bka' bsgyur ba thams cad*, which is found in the biography of the Seventh sNar thang abbot mChims Nam mkha' grags (1210–1285, term of office: 1250–1285; BDRC: P1060), composed by the Eighth sNar thang abbot sMon lam tshul khrim (1219–1299, term of office: 1285–1299; BDRC: P1219) sometime between 1285 and 1299 (i.e., considering the dates of both persons involved).<sup>50</sup> Here, *bka' bsgyur ba* is not the truncated form of *bka' 'gyur ro 'tshal/cog*, but rather a simple compound consisting of the noun *bka'* and the verbal noun *bsgyur ba* (the intransitive and heteronomous form *'gyur ba* would have been better here, though). It is likewise evident that for a period of time the truncated forms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur* were employed both in a non-terminological manner to refer simply to individual texts (particularly when used in the plural), and in a terminological manner to refer to the two parts of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon. In any case, they seem to have been in common use in this latter sense by the mid-fifteenth century. This is attested in various histories and catalogues, including gZhon nu dpal's *Blue Annals*, in its report of the activities of

---

*gnas dpal gyi sNar thang nas | bKa' 'gyur dri med phyi mor gdan drangs te | ...* ("the immaculate *bKa' 'gyur* was brought from the Mine of Scholars, the Glorious sNar thang [to serve] as the principal copy"; for the one in the Tantra section colophon, see *ibid.*: 32.29–32: ... *mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas dpal sNar thang du lung rigs kyi dbang phyug shakya'i dge slong 'Jam pa'i dbyangs kyis legs par bzhengs pa'i bKa' 'gyur phyi mor gdan drangs nas...* ("the *bKa' 'gyur*, which was well made by the Buddhist monk 'Jam pa'i dbyangs, a master of scriptures and reasoning, in the Mine of Scholars, the Glorious sNar thang, was brought [to serve] as the principal copy"); and for the one in the Vinaya section colophon, see *ibid.*: 33.40: *de'i bKa' 'gyur gyi dpe phyi...* ("the *bKa' 'gyur* manuscripts [that were used as the basis for] it...").

<sup>49</sup> See Jampa Samten 1987a: 33.22–28: *bsod nams chen po'i dpal gyis phyogs las rnam par rgyal ba stobs kyis 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po chen po'i bla'i mchod gnas bde bar gshegs pa'i gzhung lugs mang du thos pa rig pa dang grol ba'i spobs pa dge ba can | lung dang rigs pa'i dbang phyug gang* (text reads *gans*) *can gyi rgyud kyi mkhas pa chen po sdom brtson dam pa shakya'i dge slong 'Jam dpal dbyangs kyis bKa' 'gyur legs par bzhengs pa rnam* (text reads *rnam*) *las 'di dag ni...* ("of the translated [text]s [containing] the Word [of the Buddha] that were well made by the Buddhist monk 'Jam dpal dbyangs [...], these..."); and *ibid.*: 35.1–2: ... *bka' 'gyur legs par grub pa rnam las 'di dag...* ("of the translated [text]s [containing] the Word [of the Buddha] that were well made, these...").

<sup>50</sup> See the *mChims chen mo'i rnam thar* (46a1): ... *bka' bsgyur ba thams cad kyi gsung sgrogs | [...] rgyun ma chad par mdzad do | |*.

compiling and producing the Canon in sNar thang, Zhwa lu, and elsewhere<sup>51</sup>; Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po's (1382–1456; BDRC: P1132) undated catalogue to the Sa skya *bsTan 'gyur*, where the full and truncated forms are used side by side<sup>52</sup>; and the late-fifteenth-century biography of Rab brtan kun bzang 'phags (1389–1442; BDRC: P6904), in its report on the rGyal rtse *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* editions made at the behest of this ruler and his successors.<sup>53</sup>

### 3. *The Compilation Activities in sNar thang:* *A General Remark*

Whether we consider the Old sNar thang collections to be the first *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* (even though the terms as such might have been coined somewhat later and/or elsewhere), or whether we take them, as suggested by Peter Skilling, to have merely been a “conceptual prototype,” thereby setting the precedent for future similar large-scale systematic undertakings, rather than their “textual archetype,” what is most significant is that the compilation activities carried out there led to, to use Skilling's words, “the permanent bifurcation of the *bKa' bstan bcos* into *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*.”<sup>54</sup> It is thus justified to assume that the history of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon as we know it today begins there, and that it was probably the compilation of the catalogue(s) of translated works carried out by Rig ral sometime in the second half of the thirteenth century that gave the first impetus for the compilation and systematization of the actual two collections. This large-scale compilation project is said to have been initiated and sponsored by one 'Jam (pa'i/dpal) dbyangs, a student of Rig ral. This grand project was carried out under the supervision of dBus pa blo gsal (who was a student of both Rig ral and 'Jam dbyangs), rGyang ro Byang chub 'bum (b. 13th cent.; BDRC: P3644), and others (the *Blue Annals*, for example, mention by name Lo tsā ba bSod nams 'od zer<sup>55</sup>), and the catalogue(s) were then compiled by dBus pa blo gsal. The concluding section of dBus pa blo gsal's *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue, which conveniently resurfaced some

<sup>51</sup> See the *Deb sngon* (411, 412), Roerich 1947: 338, and passim.

<sup>52</sup> See the *Sa skya bstan dkar* (269b1–2, 270a6).

<sup>53</sup> See the *Rab brtan rnam thar* (169.17–20, 370.16, 370.21). Notable is also the collective designation *bka' bstan* employed by the author in *ibid.* (170.2): *bka' bstan bzhengs pa'i...* and (170.11–12) ... *bka' bstan la chos kyi rnam grangs...*

<sup>54</sup> See Skilling 1997: 100. Note that Skilling merely talks about the *bKa' 'gyur* here, but his statements are in my view likewise applicable to the *bsTan 'gyur*.

<sup>55</sup> A short biography of bSod nams 'od zer is found in the *sGra sgyur lo rgyus* (248–249) under the name sNar thang Punya rasmi. According to van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 10, bSod nams 'od zer was responsible for translating the names of the Indian scholars back into Sanskrit. For a short discussion of the glosses containing these “back translations,” see below.

years ago, describes this state of affairs as follows:<sup>56</sup>

In accordance with the wish of the Buddhist monk 'Jam pa'i dbyangs, dBus pa blo gsal rTsod pa'i seng ge, rGyang ro'i btsun pa Byang chub 'bum, and others who touched (lit. "obtained") the dust under this [master]'s feet with [their] heads, acting as excellent contributing factors, took the Bla [ma]'s (that is, Rig ral's) great catalogue as [their] basis and had [books containing the translated treatises] properly made. After completing a fine consecration and [offering] a grand feast [to celebrate] their [completion], dBus pa blo gsal compiled a catalogue at the great college of sNar thang and offered it [to those present there (?)].

Not much is known about 'Jam dbyangs. Questions of his identity are somewhat complex and deserve a separate discussion. Here it would suffice to say that he has been commonly identified as 'Jam dgag Pakshi (the syllable *dgag* is also found in other spellings), who is reported to have been a chaplain at the court of the Mongolian king Buyantu Khan (1285–1320, r. 1311–1320), which allowed him to sponsor this huge and costly undertaking. Based on this identification, the compilation activities in sNar thang are commonly believed to have taken place sometime in the 1310s. To the best of my knowledge this identification is solely based on what is reported in the *Blue Annals*, which has been further cited by both traditional and modern scholars.<sup>57</sup> This figure is also referred to by some later Tibetan sources as mChims/'Chims 'Jam pa'i/dpal dbyangs, and has occasionally been further erroneously identified by Tibetan scholars with the seventh abbot of sNar thang, mChims Nam mkha' grags.

Regarding the cataloguing, dBus pa blo gsal is in fact reported to have written catalogues for both the *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* produced in sNar thang. Such reports are found, for example, in dPa' bo gTsong lag 'phreng ba's (1504–1564/66; BDRC: P319) history composed 1545–1564 (Martin 1997: n. 168),<sup>58</sup> the Fifth Dalai Lama's (1617–1682;

<sup>56</sup> *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 81a1–5; B, 58a5–b1): ... *shākya'i dge slong 'Jam pa'i dbyangs kyi thugs kyi dgongs pa ji lta bar | de nyid kyi zhabs kyi rdul spyi bos len pa dBus pa blo gsal rTsod pa'i seng ge dang | rGyang ro'i btsun pa Byang chub 'bum la sogs pas rkyen dam par bgyis te* [A: *te*, B, *ste*] | *Bla'i dkar chag chen mo* [A, *mo*, B, *po*] *nyid gzhir byas nas rnam par dag par bzhengs shing | rab tu gnas pa bzang po dang | de dag gi dga' ston rgya chen po dang bcas pa legs par grub pa'i rjes la | dpal sNar thang gi chos grwa* [A: *grwa*, B: *gra*] *chen por dBus pa blo gsal gyis dkar chag* [A: *chag*, B: *cag*] *tu bkod nas phyag tu phul ba'o* | | | |.

<sup>57</sup> See the *Deb sngon* (410–412). For English translations, see Roerich 1949: 337–339 and Harrison 1996: 75–76.

<sup>58</sup> See the *mKhas pa'i dga' ston* (A, 733.15–17; B, 374.25–27): *de gnyis ka'i slob ma dBus pa blo gsal Byang chub ye shes kyiis 'dul ba lung gi lung rgyun rgya nag nas blangs | bka' bstan 'gyur la bam tshad 'gyur byang sogs nges pa'i dkar chag brtsams* |. See also Skilling 1997: 99, where this reference is reported.

BDRC: P37) inventory of sMin grol gling monastery,<sup>59</sup> and 'Jigs med gling pa's (1729/30–1798; BDRC: P3) defence of the rNying ma school.<sup>60</sup> The bibliophile A khu ching Shes rab rgya mtsho (1803–1875; BDRC: P123) reports, however, that these catalogues had become rare by his period.<sup>61</sup> At least the *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue appears to have still been in circulation as late of the second half of the eighteenth century.<sup>62</sup> While the *bKa' 'gyur* catalogue is yet to surface, the *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue fortunately came to light some years ago, which provides us, for the first time, a closer look at these compilation activities.

#### 4. *dBus pa blo gsal's bsTan 'gyur Catalogue*

Two manuscript versions of the catalogue to the Old sNar thang *bsTan 'gyur* edition compiled by dBus pa blo gsal are available. I have been able to determine neither the provenance nor the dates of either of these manuscripts.<sup>63</sup> The two manuscripts, which show some palaeo-

<sup>59</sup> See the *sMin grol gling gi dkar chag* (279.5): **dBus pa blo gsal gyis bka' bstan 'gyur gnyis ka'i dkar chag**....

<sup>60</sup> See the *Log rtogs bzlog pa'i bstan bcos* (694.1): **dBus pa blo gsal gyis bka' bstan 'gyur gnyis ka'i dkar chag**.... See also van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 33, where this reference is reported.

<sup>61</sup> dBus pa blo gsal's catalogues are listed, along with his religious history, in A khu ching's list of rare texts. See the *A khu tho yig*: [10845] **dBus pa blo gsal gyi Chos 'byung dang** | [10846] **bKa' bstan gyi dkar chag** |.

<sup>62</sup> As already noted by Vostrikov, dBus pa blo gsal's *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue was available to the Second 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa dKon mchog 'jigs med dbang po (1728–1791, term of office: 1764–1768; BDRC: P169), who cites it in his catalogue to the *Co ne bsTan 'gyur* edition composed in 1773. See Vostrikov 1970: 208 n. 601. For the cited passage, see the *Co ne bstan dkar* (441.8–17). The passage in question is taken from the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar's* prologue (A, 1b3–2a1; B, 1b3–7).

<sup>63</sup> MS B, bears the text number Pi on the title page (top, centre), which suggests that it belonged to a collection. It is unclear which collection it was, but according to van der Kuijp this manuscript is stored at the Tibetan library of the Cultural Palace of Nationalities in Beijing. See van der Kuijp 1994: 388. This manuscript was published online by the TBRC in a 2-volume collection containing some of dBus pa blo gsal's writings, titled *dBus pa blo gsal gyi gsung phyogs bsdu*s (BDRC: W2PD17520). This collection presents, however, no codicological unit, but is rather a scan of various independent codicological units (including both manuscripts and xylographs) of various unspecified origins. MS A lacks such a text number, but it bears the shelf mark Phyi La 344 (likewise on the title page, top, centre), which appears to be a shelf mark of the 'Bras spungs monastery's gNas bcu lha khang collection. If so, the shelf mark would mean that the manuscript did not originally belong to the gNas bcu lha khang collection, but came from elsewhere, for such manuscripts are generally marked as "external" (Phyi), as opposed to those belonging to the original collection, which are marked as "internal" (Nang). The manuscript bearing the number Phyi La 344 is, unfortunately, one of those manuscripts that were not recorded in the two-volume 'Bras spungs catalogue, so that this assumption cannot be confirmed. See the *'Bras spungs dpe rnying dkar chag*, vol. 2: 1646, where one would have expected to find its record.

graphical and codicological differences,<sup>64</sup> differ in both length and content, and thus contain two different versions of the catalogue, reflecting two stages of the compilation process.<sup>65</sup> The manuscript containing the shorter version (MS B) is 58 folios long, and the version of the catalogue transmitted therein contains 20 chapters recording 141 volumes; while the one containing the longer version (MS A) is 81 folios long, and the catalogue version transmitted therein contains 21 chapters recording 144 volumes. According to the concluding statements, the shorter version records 2,015 works,<sup>66</sup> and the longer one 2,350,<sup>67</sup> that is, 335 more works. The counting method is, however, not always entirely transparent. This is evident, for example, from Jampa Samten's edition of the shorter version, where the total number determined by Jampa Samten is not always identical with the total number provided by the catalogue itself, that is, either in the concluding verses of individual chapters or in the statement at the end of the work. (For an outline of the two versions of the catalogue, including an overview of the total number of works recorded in their respective chapters, see Appendix B). One obvious difficulty is that several entries stand for entire mini-collections. The number of works contained in these individual collections is not always specified, but is nonetheless always included in the total number of works given at the end of each chapter. Moreover, even if the number of works contained in these collections could be deduced, in none of the cases does it correspond to the total number of works contained in these collections as found in the *bsTan*

<sup>64</sup> The two manuscripts are written in a similar but not identical dBu med script. While both are written in some variant of dPe tshugs, the script of MS A is slightly curly and has thus some slight affinity with 'Bru tsha. Moreover, some other palaeographical and codicological differences are observed, such as the scribal conventions regarding segmentation marks and the number of lines per page (6 in MS A and 7 in MS B). MS B has rubrication of chapter names and volume numbers (unfortunately, the scans of MS A are in black and white).

<sup>65</sup> To the best of my knowledge, the first reference in secondary sources to the existence of a manuscript containing the catalogue (shorter version) was made by van der Kuijp in an article from 1994, which cites a portion of the epilogue and the entire Epistemology and Logic section (*gtan tshigs rig pa yang dag pa'i rtog ge tshad ma'i bstan bcos*), that is, chapter 16 and the supplement in chapter 19. See van der Kuijp 1994: 388–392. An outline of the longer version is offered in van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 75–76. To be noted, however, is that van der Kuijp has not pointed out which version (short or long) was referred to by him in each case. (That the two manuscripts contain different versions might have been indeed overlooked by him.) An (uncritical) edition of the shorter version was published by Jampa Samten in 2015.

<sup>66</sup> *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (B, 58b1–2, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 118.8–9): *de ltar thams cad sdoms pas rgya gar gyi bstan bcos dri ma med pa stong phrag gnyis dang | bcu phrag phyed dang gnyis kyis brgyan pa bzhugs so | |*.

<sup>67</sup> *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 81b5–6): *de ltar snga phyi kun dril bas | | bstan bcos dri ma med pa'i tshogs | | stong phrag gnyis dang brgya phrag gsum | | bcu phrag lnga yis brgyan pa bzhugs | |*.

'gyur, so that it is impossible to determine which of these works were actually contained in the Old sNar thang edition.

Moreover, while one witnesses occasional differences between the two versions in nearly all chapters—not only concerning orthography and the like but also the actual bibliographical information (including additions or omissions of titles, differences in the bibliographical details of certain records, discrepancies in the order of the works, and the like)—two chapters show considerable differences, namely, chapter 1 containing the Stotra (bsTod pa) section and chapter 18 containing the Prayer (sMon lam, bKra shis, etc.) section. Chapter 1 in the shorter version, it is stated, records 100-plus (*brgya phrag gcig lhag*) works (Jampa Samten counts 108), while the figure for the same chapter in the longer version is 163 (it appears, however, to merely contain 162). The difference in chapter 18 is even greater: 15 works in the shorter version (Jampa Samten counts 14) as against 47 in the longer version.

Although one is tempted to think at first glance that the shorter version reflects the first draft of the catalogue, and the longer version the final one, this is obviously not the case. The actual first draft probably merely contained 18 chapters recording 131 volumes covering circa 1,815 works. This is the evident conclusion to be drawn from the closing statement of chapter 18:<sup>68</sup>

The [works] contained in these volumes—[that is], from the homages, eulogies, and the like (i.e., chap. 1) up to the prayers, benedictions, and proclamations of the power of truth (i.e., chap. 18)—have tentatively been properly compiled into a catalogue.

What calls for particular attention is that this statement is found in both versions before the concluding verse of the chapter (all chapters conclude with a verse, which, among other things, provides the total number of works), whereas one would expect it to appear after it. One may wonder why it was copied in later versions of the catalogue in the first place. At any rate, this statement makes it clear that our shorter version, containing two additional chapters, is not the first draft but the second or even a later one. It appears that the compilation of the Canon in sNar thang was a long and gradual process, possibly stretching over several years if not decades. Considering that it was the first undertaking of its kind, such a long span is not at all surprising. The collection kept on growing in the spirit of the statement concluding the catalogue according to which whatever rare texts were obtained later

---

<sup>68</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A 61a5–6; B, 49a4–5, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 99): *de ltar phyag 'tshal ba dang bstod pa la sogs pa nas smon lam dang bkra shis dang bden pa'i stobs brjod pa'i bar gyis glegs bam 'di dag na bzhugs pa rnam dkar chags tu re shig legs par grub pa'o | |*.

should be copied and added.<sup>69</sup> (The inclusion of such a statement became standard, reflecting the overall striving for completeness on the part of the Canon's compilers and editors, which has led modern scholars to term the Tibetan Buddhist Canon an "open canon."<sup>70</sup>) Accordingly, not only were existing volumes re-edited (along with the corresponding chapters of the catalogue), but new volumes were also added. These latter volumes were then recorded in the catalogue in three new chapters, as follows:

- Chapter 19 records works contained in "very rare manuscripts obtained later through much effort."<sup>71</sup>
- Chapter 20 records "works composed by the Eyes of the World, Tibetan codifiers/compilers [of the Buddha's Teaching] (or alternatively: by learned Tibetan mKhan po-s), contained in rare manuscripts."<sup>72</sup>
- Chapter 21 (only in the longer version) records works contained in "some more rare manuscripts, [this time ones] obtained by rGyang ro pa, the upholder of the [Tri]piṭaka."<sup>73</sup>

The addition of new works and their integration into the collection required a reorganization of the existing volumes and an adjustment of the catalogue accordingly. Obviously, adding new works to existing volumes would have been possible only to a certain extent. When the necessary changes to the individual volumes were minor, as in the case of the volumes recorded in chapters 2–17, they were in one way or another integrated into the existing volumes, including adding new works or changing the order of the works.<sup>74</sup> When, however, the

<sup>69</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 81a6; B, 58b2): 'di dag las gzhan yang [A: yang, om.: B] dpe phyi dkon pa rnyed na phyis bri dgos pas da dung bsnan du yod do | |.

<sup>70</sup> This striving for completeness, however, was by no means carried out indiscriminately and uncritically. See Almogi 2020: Part One.

<sup>71</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 61b2; B, 49a7–b1, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 101): *de nas yang dpe dkon pa phyis rnyed pa*, and *ibid.* (A, 69a2–4; B, 55b6–7, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 113): *shin tu dkon pa'i dpe phyis brtson pa mchog gis rnyed nas bris pa'i le'u ste bcu dgu pa'o | |*, for the opening and concluding statements of chapter 19, respectively.

<sup>72</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 69a4; B, 55b7, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 114): *da ni 'jig rten gyi mig tu gyur pa bod kyi sdud pa po dag gis mdzad pa'i dpe dkon pa*, and *ibid.* (A, 69b6–70a1; B, 56b2, cf. Jampa Samten 2015: 115): *bod kyi mkhan po mkhas pa rnams kyi mdzad pa'i dpe dkon pa bris pa'i le'u ste nyi shu pa'o | |*, for the opening and concluding statements of chapter 20, respectively.

<sup>73</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 70a1): *slar yang dpe dkon pa rnams rnyed nas bris pa*, and *ibid.* (A, 79a3): *slar yang dpe dkon pa rnams sde snod 'dzin pa rGyang ro pas rnyed nas bris pa le'u ste nyi shu gcig pa'o | |*, for the opening and concluding statements of chapter 21, respectively.

<sup>74</sup> Nothing is known about the foliation system of the volumes of the Old sNar thang edition. It is, however, very likely that the foliation was not consecutive but that, as is often observed in old collections, each work had an independent foliation,

changes required were major, the existing volumes had to be rewritten (as probably happened in the case of the volumes recorded in chapters 1 and 18) or else new volumes added, in which case the newly added works could no longer be included in the sections where they thematically belonged, but were rather copied into one of the appended volumes (as in the case of the volumes recorded in chapters 19 and 21; the content and organization of the volume recorded in chapter 20, containing the autochthonous works, was naturally independent of the remaining volumes). Chapter 19 records the works contained in altogether nine new volumes added later, namely, six volumes (Ni–Tsi) to the Tantra section—following the last volume (Di) recorded in chapter 10—and three volumes (Nye–The) to the non-Tantric (mTshan nyid) section—following the last volume (Je) recorded in chapter 18. Chapter 20 consists of the bibliographical records of the single volume (De) containing the autochthonous works admitted to the sNar thang edition—some authored by translators active in the Early Period but a number of them anonymous. Chapter 21 contains the records of an additional three volumes (Ne–Phe). The vast majority of the works contained in these volumes are Tantric, only the last 27 works of the last volume (Phe) being classified as belonging to the mTshan nyid section. This state of affairs makes one wonder why the edition's compilers did not follow here the policy observed in chapter 19 and append the three volumes to the Tantra section (i.e., with volume numbers Tshi–Wi), while adding the remaining non-Tantric works to the last volume of the mTshad nyid section recorded in chapter 19 (The) or, alternatively, grouping them in an additional volume (which could have been, for example, numbered The-'og, thereby enabling its placement before volume De containing the autochthonous works, commonly placed at the end). We can only speculate that this may have simply been the result of an error or because these volumes were added at a point in time when the compilation work was more or less concluded and not much thought was given any longer to the overall organization. Regarding the catalogue, we can in any case confidently say that there have been at least three versions of it, but there may have well been more of them. Moreover, we can also be quite certain that the longer version reflects the state of affairs in the early 1320s at the latest. As has already been demonstrated, Bu ston clearly had the longer version at his disposal when writing the title index contained in his religious history, which was composed in the years 1322–1326. A brief examination of the catalogue to the Tshal pa *bsTan 'gyur* edition, which was prepared in the years 1317–1323, shows that probably most of the

---

whereas the individual works were given a serial number marking their position within the volume (commonly on the front page or in the leftside marginal caption). If this was indeed the case, changing the order of the works or adding new works would have been a rather easy thing to do.



works recorded in chapter 21 were included in this edition, so that it could well be that the longer version reflects the sNar thang collection as it was as early as 1317.

Another clear indication that the Old sNar thang edition represents the first attempt at compiling a Tibetan Buddhist Canon with two distinct, systematically organized parts is the arrangement of the material as reflected in dBus pa blo gsal's *bsTan 'gyur* catalogue. The imperial catalogues generally organize the works according to a number of criteria including *yāna*, doxography, philosophical school, *sūtra* anthologies, commentaries, and the like alongside some more specific categories, such as works translated from the Chinese, compositions by King Khri srong lde btsan, unrevised translations, and unfinished translations. They do not, however, observe any systematic division between *bka'* and *bstan bcos*.<sup>75</sup> Rig ral, whose cataloguing activities probably gave the initial impetus to the compilation project in sNar thang, arranges his *rGyan gyi nyi 'od* according to three major categories, namely, the Early, Middle (Grey), and Later Periods of propagation of Buddhism in Tibet (*snga dar*, *bar dar*, and *phyi dar*, respectively). While in the Early Period section he follows a scheme similar to that found in the *'Phang thang ma* (which was his main source for it), in the sections of the Middle and New Periods he organizes the bibliographical records according to translators (in chronological order as far as possible), which are in turn grouped under various subcategories. For the latter two sections he relied on several catalogues compiled by gSar ma translators that apparently record both their own translations and others made by their circle.<sup>76</sup> There is no doubt, therefore, that the credit for introducing the new—and one may even say revolutionary—approach of separating the translated works into two distinct, systematically organized collections goes to dBus pa blo gsal (and his colleagues). Since the catalogue to the Old sNar thang *bKa' 'gyur* edition has not surfaced thus far, we do not have concrete evidence regarding its organization. Even if we assume that it did not reach the same level of compilation and systematic organization as the *bsTan 'gyur* (as suggested, for example, by Harrison<sup>77</sup>), we have no reason to believe that dBus pa blo gsal applied a different approach to each of these collections.

Lastly, I would like to briefly touch upon the glosses found abundantly in the longer version and, to a much lesser extent, in the shorter one. Most of the names of the Indian authors are provided in the catalogue in Tibetan renderings (the names of the *paṇḍitas* cooperating in

<sup>75</sup> See Skilling 1997: 104–105 for an outline of the *lDan/lHan dkar ma*; Halkias 2004: 79–81 for an outline of the *'Phang thang ma*; van der Kuijp & Schaeffer 2009: 65–70 for an outline of the *rGyan gyi nyi 'od*.

<sup>76</sup> See Almogi 2020: 34ff.

<sup>77</sup> See Harrison 1994 in general, and p. 308 in particular.

the translation are, as a rule, not mentioned therein). An anonymous author took pains to gloss these Tibetan names with the presumably original Sanskrit names (in Tibetan transliteration), while in the fewer cases in which the Sanskrit names have been given the glosses offer the names in Tibetan translation. In any event, there is no doubt that in most cases the Sanskrit names were reconstructed, probably on the basis of some bilingual glossaries without concrete preknowledge of the authors' actual names. The knowledge of Sanskrit on the part of whoever was responsible for reconstructing the names was apparently not very good. This is evident not only from the often wrong reconstructions of the Sanskrit names or the Tibetan translation of the ones provided, but also from the Sanskrit transliterations, which are often likewise faulty, and which in turn are occasionally the reason for the faulty translations (or possible reconstructions). Moreover, while one can observe some consistency within one and the same chapter regarding the reconstructed forms of Sanskrit names or Tibetan renderings of given Sanskrit names, this is not always the case when some particular name appears in different chapters, which either further supports a mechanical "back translation" on the basis of bilingual glossaries or suggests that several persons were behind the glosses, who worked independently of each other. While a systematic examination of all glosses would be required before one could say anything more about them, here I shall merely provide several examples to illustrate this state of affairs (the glosses referred to are found in MS A unless specified otherwise):

- (i) In chapter 11 Seng ge bzang po (Haribhadra) is three times erroneously glossed as *si ngha bha dra* or *sing ha bhā dra* (Sinhabhadra),<sup>78</sup> while in chapter 21 one finds a rather unusual Tibetan rendering of the name, 'Phrog byed bzang po, which is glossed as *ha ra bhā dra*.<sup>79</sup>
- (ii) In chapter 10 Sādhuputra is erroneously transliterated in MS A as *sā dhu su tra* (the syllable *su* appears to be a correction, though probably not of *pu*), and thus accordingly glossed as *legs pa mdo sde*.<sup>80</sup>
- (iii) In chapter 10 Lakṣmīkara (/Lakṣmīṃkarā) is glossed in MS A as *dpal 'byung gnas*, and in MS B as *pad ma byed*,<sup>81</sup> whereas in chapter 3, dPal mo mdzad (an erroneous reading in MS A for *dpal Nyin mo mdzad* (*śrī Divākara*) as in B) is glossed as

<sup>78</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 38b5; B, 30b4 = N<sub>JS</sub>829, D3790/P5188; A, 38b6; B, 30b6 = N<sub>JS</sub>832, D3791/P5189; A, 39b5; B, 31b3 = N<sub>JS</sub>850, D3793/P5191).

<sup>79</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 79a1 = D4274/P5772).

<sup>80</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 38a21; B, 30a3 = N<sub>JS</sub>821, D1359/P2076).

<sup>81</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 33a1; B, 26a6 = N<sub>JS</sub>695, D2485/P3311).

*lakṣmi ka ra*.<sup>82</sup>

- (iv) And lastly, a rather well-known case of confusion, which is also reflected in later sources. In three instances in chapter 2 Mi thub zla ba is glossed as *dhaṃ ka da sha* (\*Ṭaṅkādāsa or \*Dhaṅkadāsa, among other suggestions<sup>83</sup>) rather than Durjayacandra.<sup>84</sup> The colophons of D1185/P2315, which is recorded in the first of the three instances, name the author, notably, as sByang dka' ba'i zla ba (*sbyang dka' ba*, like *mi thub pa*, being a possible rendering of *durjaya*).<sup>85</sup> In another instance in chapter 2, Ḍaṃ ka dā sha is in turn glossed as *sbyang dka' zla ba* in MS A, whereas in MS B it is glossed as *bkul byed ma'i 'bangs* (which, however, rather renders \*Cundādāsa).<sup>86</sup> Moreover, in chapter 19 Du dza ya tsan dra is glossed as *rgyal ba zla ba*,<sup>87</sup> while Mi thub zla ba is glossed as *a dzi ta tsandra* (Ajitacandra).<sup>88</sup> Notable also is that in chapter 3 sKar rgyal zla ba is glossed as *puṣya tsandra* (Puṣyacandra), which gives a correct literal reconstruction,<sup>89</sup> but later Tibetan cataloguers identified the author with Durjayacandra (reading *dka'* instead of *skar*, yielding *dka' rgyal*, or more ideally *rgyal dka'*, which is another possible rendering of *durjaya*).<sup>90</sup>

<sup>82</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A 13b6; B 10a4 = N<sub>js</sub>204, D1501/P2216). Cf. *ibid.*, chapter 19 (A, 64b5; B, 52a4 = N<sub>js</sub>1387, D1261/P2390), where Nyin mo'i 'byung gnas zla ba is glossed as *di wa ā ka ra tsandra* (Divākaracandra); chapter 8 (A, 26b3; B 21a3 = N<sub>js</sub>519, D2895/P3721), where Nyin mdzad rdo rje is glossed as *di wa a ka ra badzra* (Divākaravajra); and chapter 21 (A 70a6 = D1929/P2792), where Nyin byed grags pa is glossed as *di wa ka ra kīrti* (Divākarakīrti).

<sup>83</sup> See Tibskrit, s.v. Ḍhaṅkadāśa for various possible spellings/reconstructions of the name and several further references to both primary and secondary sources.

<sup>84</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 10a4; B, 7a1 = N<sub>js</sub>111, D1185/P2315; A, 10b2; B, 7a5, referring to four works = N<sub>js</sub>118, D1240/P2369; N<sub>js</sub>119a, D1239/P2368; N<sub>js</sub>119b, D1307/P2437; N<sub>js</sub>120, D1241/P2370; and A, 12a3; B, 8b4 = N<sub>js</sub>172, D1321/P2453).

<sup>85</sup> This recurs in the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 342a3), whereas the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (438.7) and *lNga pa chen po'i bstan dkar* (25b8–26a1) stick to Mi thub zla ba.

<sup>86</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 10a6; B, 7a3 = N<sub>js</sub>114, D1184/P2314).

<sup>87</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 66a5; B, 53b1 = N<sub>js</sub>1424, D1622/P2494).

<sup>88</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 63a6; B, 51a1 = N<sub>js</sub>1354, D1321/P2453).

<sup>89</sup> See the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 13a4; B, 9b3 = N<sub>js</sub>189; D1404/P2120).

<sup>90</sup> While in his religious history Bu ston, too, states that the author is sKar rgyal zla ba, in his catalogue to the *Zhwa lu* edition of the *bsTan 'gyur* the name he gives is Mi thub zla ba. See the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (Bc2373) and *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (424.3–4), respectively. The *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 352a7–b1), notably, provides the hybrid form rGyal dka' mi thub zla ba. The colophons of D1404/P2120 by contrast have the less felicitous form dKa' rgyal mi thub zla ba. Cf. also the colophons of D1461/P2178, which have rGyal dka' zla ba, the same as in the *sDe dge bstan dkar* (vol. 2: 335b4–5), while the *Zhwa lu bstan dkar* (429.4–5) states that the author is Mi thub zla ba.

There are ample such examples, but I believe the above four examples are sufficient to demonstrate that the glosses were not done systematically, which may hint that they were written by different persons and by mainly relying on bilingual glossaries. It should be perhaps added that Bu ston, in his catalogue to the Zhwa lu edition of the *bsTan 'gyur*, put much effort into removing the inaccuracies and inconsistencies regarding the authors' identities.

### 5. Concluding Remarks

The present paper focuses on the Old sNar thang Tibetan Buddhist Canon, with special reference to the *bsTan 'gyur* and with regard to mainly two issues. The first part of the paper focuses on the question of whether the compilation and production of the two canonical collections in sNar thang can justifiably be considered the first of their kind, and thus whether the Old sNar thang *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*, as two distinct parts of a canon, are the first such collections produced on Tibetan soil. As part of the attempt to answer this question, the terms *bka' 'gyur* and *bstan 'gyur* were themselves discussed, mainly in an attempt to locate their earliest occurrences, commonly in reports of various production undertakings, and also to differentiate these from later similar reports. It is hoped that it has been convincingly demonstrated that the compilation and production project in sNar thang was indeed the first such undertaking and that the *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur* produced there can justifiably be considered the first of their kind, even if the organization of their content has not entirely matured and they thus differ in various ways from later editions. The second part of the paper is devoted to the actual undertaking in sNar thang, with a focus on the catalogue to the *bsTan 'gyur* collection compiled by dBus pa blo gsal. While a detailed outline of the two versions of the catalogue is offered in Appendix B, the catalogue has been mainly discussed in terms of the differences between the two versions, particularly with the aim of shedding light on the process of compilation as a whole, alongside an attempt at suggesting a *terminus ante quem* for the longer, later version. While many historical details surrounding the compilation project at sNar thang still remain uncovered, it is hoped that the present paper is a small contribution towards bringing them gradually to light.

## Appendix A

References in the *Bu ston chos 'byung*  
to the Old sNar thang *bsTan 'gyur*

## A. Table I

The following is a list of the instances where the phrase *bstan 'gyur du ma chud / tshud* is found in the *Bu ston chos 'byung* (catalogue numbers according to Nishioka 1980–1983, which are followed by the reference to the phrase in the modern print edition, given within parentheses). These are followed by references to the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (catalogue numbers for MS B according to Jampa Samten 2015, along with references to MSS A & B), *Zhwa lu bstan dkar*, and *Tshal pa bstan dkar* (catalogue numbers according to Jampa Samten 2016; merely in cases of works also found in DP), and sDe dge and Peking editions (catalogue numbers according to Ui et al. 1934 and Suzuki 1961, respectively). Whenever possible this is done by way of catalogue numbers; if these are not available, the existence of the work is marked with ✓ followed by the location of the entry in the respective catalogue (within parentheses). Cases where no reference for the work in question is found are marked with X.

	<i>Bu ston chos 'byung</i>	<i>dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar</i>	<i>Zhwa lu bstan dkar</i>	<i>Tshal pa bstan dkar</i>	sDe dge/Peking
1	Bc450 (228.16)	X	✓ (611.1–2)	X	D4110/P5611
2	Bc521 (231.17)	X	X	-	X
3	Bc980 (249.5)	X	X	-	X
4	Bc995 (249.15–16)	X	X	-	X
5	Bc1634– Bc1635 (269.6)	X	X	-	X
6	Bc1736 (272.6–7)	X	✓ (456.4–5)	X	D1683/P2555
7	Bc1956 (278.22)	X	X	-	X

8	Bc2118– Bc2127 (284.1)	×	×	-	×
9	Bc2235	✓ (A, 77a6– b1) / (B, NA)	✓	T1052 (43a5–6)	D2134/P2985
	Bc2236	×	✓	×	D2136/P2987
	Bc2237	✓ N <sub>JS</sub> 1476 (A, 68a4–5; B, 55a3)	✓	×	D2133/P2984
	Bc2238 (287.5) <sup>91</sup>	×	✓ (488.2– 3; 488.4–6)	×	D2137/P2988
10	Bc2380 <sup>92</sup> (287.5)	×	✓ (425.3)	T332 (18b1)	D1414/P2130

## B. Table II

In several instances, one finds the phrase *sngar ma chud*, “previously not included,” but it appears that these cases are again references to the Old sNar thang *bsTan ’gyur* edition:

	<i>Bu ston chos ’byung</i>	<i>dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar</i>	<i>Zhwa lu bstan dkar</i>	<i>Tshal pa bstan dkar</i>	sDe dge/Pe- king
1	Bc1957– Bc1977 (279.4–5)	×	×	-	×
2	Bc2224– Bc2225 (286.20–21)	×	×	-	×

<sup>91</sup> The phrase refers to two of these four works (Bc2235–Bc2238). Note, however, that Nishioka reads *gcig* (following the Lhasa version in the main text), but records that the variant *gnyis* is found in the three other versions consulted by him (DTS). See Nishioka 1983: 91 n. 4. The modern edition likewise reads *gcig*. Nonetheless, given that two (and not one) of the four works in question are not recorded in the longer version of the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, the reading *gnyis* is clearly preferable (in the shorter version three of the works are not recorded). To be noted is also that of the two works that are included, one is recorded in chapter 19 (found in both versions A & B) and one in chapter 21 (found only in version A), both of which are later additions to the catalogue.

<sup>92</sup> The phrase is recorded in the apparatus merely as a variant reading in version T (Nishioka 1983: 96 n. 4); in the modern print edition the phrase is missing (291.21). Interestingly, the work is listed in the *Tshal pa bstan dkar*!

3	Bc2487	X	X	X	D1589/P2297
	Bc2488	X	X	X	D1560/P2268
	Bc2489	X <sup>93</sup>	X	T482	D1561/P2269
	Bc2490	X	X	-	X
	Bc2491	X	X	-	X
	Bc2492	X	X	-	X
	(295.15)	X	X	-	X
4	Bc2539	X	✓	X	D1618/P2489
	Bc2540 (297.10)	X	✓ (450.6–7)	X	D1619/P2491
5	Bc2582	X	✓	X	D1706/P2577
	Bc2583	X	✓	X	D1707/P2578
	Bc2584	X	✓	X	D1708/P2579
	Bc2585	X	✓	X	D1709/P2580
	Bc2586	X	✓ (458.1–2)	T1152	X
	Bc2587	X	X	-	X
	(298.23)	X	X	-	X

There are several other instances in the *Bu ston chos 'byung* where it is simply stated “this/these is/are not included” (*di ma chud*), that is, without the phrases *bstan 'gyur du* or *sngar*. As this statement is too general there is no certainty that it refers to the Old sNar thang *bsTan 'gyur*. The instances are too numerous to be examined within the framework of the present paper, but a brief examination of several of these instances has shown that in none of them is/are the work/s in question recorded in the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar*, which suggests that these could also be references to the Old sNar thang edition.

<sup>93</sup> Note that *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (A, 68a4–5; B, 55a3 = N<sub>JS</sub>218): *grub thob rNgon pa pas mdzad pa'i rDo rje rnal 'byor ma'i sgrub thabs* |—which ascribes authorship to rNgon pa pa (\*Lubdhaka =? Sabari) but has no translation ascription—could theoretically be identified with either Bc2289 or Bc2290: *mKha' spyod ma dmar mo'i sgrub thabs gnyis*—which has no authorship ascription but ascribes the translation to dPyal Chos bzang—and if so, both records could be referring to D1561/P2269: *rDo rje rnal 'byor ma mkha' spyod ma dmar mo'i sgrub thabs*—where rNgon pa is given as the author, and Chos kyi bzang po as the translator in collaboration with Niškalaṅka. If this is indeed the case, it may be that Bu ston overlooked the entry in the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* due to the discrepancies just listed.

## Appendix B

A Comparative Table of Contents of the Earlier and Later Versions of  
the *dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* (*bsTan bcos dkar chag*)

The words *lhag* and *rtsa* (the latter only when not followed by a number) are rendered here with the plus sign (+), so that, for example, the numbers *brgya phrag gcig lhag* and *brgya rtsa* are given as 100+. When the catalogue does not specify the total number, this is marked with Ø. When a section/chapter starts/ends somewhere in the middle of a volume, this is counted as half a volume in the specification of the total number of volumes of the section/chapter in question, but this is not a real quantitative value. The total number of works in each chapter for MS B is given here as follows: the total number as stated at the end of each chapter/the number as counted by Jampa Samten, followed by the respective catalogue numbers ( $N_{js}$ ). When the total number includes works contained in collections that are counted as one record, the number of records as counted by Jampa Samten is followed by the corresponding estimated total number of texts within parenthesis. The total number of works recorded is commonly provided (in words) at the end of each chapter (with few exceptions) in the form of a verse, which is at times ambiguous. The pertinent phrase is thus cited in the respective footnotes (negligible variants found in the two MSS—for example, orthographical variants, variants resulting from *saṃdhi* rules, and the like—will not be recorded).

No.	Chapter's Title	B	A
<b>[Prologue]</b>			
1.	bsTod pa (A, 3a1–10a2; B, 2b6–6b5) 3 vols. <b>Ka–Ga</b>	100+ <sup>94</sup> /108 $N_{js}$ 1–108	163 <sup>95</sup> /162
<b>gSang sngags rdo rje theg pa'i bstan bcos</b>			
2.	Kye'i rdo rje (A 10a3–9a7; B, 6b6–13a) 5 vols. <b>Ka–Ca</b>	70+ <sup>96</sup> /77 $N_{js}$ 109–185	70+ <sup>97</sup> /79

<sup>94</sup> MS B (6b6; Jampa Samten 2015: 9): *brgya phrag gcig lhag*.

<sup>95</sup> MS A (10a2): *brgya dang drug bcu rtsa gsum*.

<sup>96</sup> MS B (9a7; Jampa Samten 2015: 14): *bdun bcu rtsa lhag*.

<sup>97</sup> MS A (13a1): identical.



3.	bDe mchog 'khor lo (A, 13a1–15b1; B, 9b1–11b1) 3.5 vols. <b>Cha–mid. Ta</b>	60 <sup>98</sup> /57 N <sub>js</sub> 186–242	60 <sup>99</sup> /59
4.	sGyu 'phrul chen mo (A 15b2–16b6; B, 11b1–12b4) 1.5 vols. <b>mid. Ta–Tha</b>	32 <sup>100</sup> /30 N <sub>js</sub> 243–272	32 <sup>101</sup> /31
5.	gSang ba 'dus pa (A, 16b6–21b5; B, 12b4–17a1) 13 vols. <b>Da–'A</b>	120 <sup>102</sup> /118 N <sub>js</sub> 273–390	120 <sup>103</sup> /122
6.	Dus kyi 'khor lo (A, 21b5–23b6; B, 17a1–18b6) 5 vols. <b>Ya–Sa</b>	41+ <sup>104</sup> /42 N <sub>js</sub> 391–432	41+ <sup>105</sup> /42
7.	rNal 'byor gyi rgyud (A 24a1–25a3; B, 18b6–19b6) 6.5 vols. <b>Ha–mid. Ci</b>	24 <sup>106</sup> /24 N <sub>js</sub> 433–456	24 <sup>107</sup> /23
8.	sPyod pa'i rgyud dang Bya ba'i rgyud	270 <sup>108</sup> /172(271)	270 <sup>110</sup> /177(276+)

<sup>98</sup> MS B (11b1; Jampa Samten 2015: 18) *drug bcu*.

<sup>99</sup> MS A (15b1): identical.

<sup>100</sup> MS B (12b2–4; Jampa Samten 2015: 21): *sgyu 'phrul sgyu ma'i chos sde lnga phrag gsum* | | *sangs rgyas mnyam sbyor gsal byed 'grel chen bzhi* | | *sangs rgyas thod pa dpal ldan gdan bzhi yi* | | *chos skor lnga dang brgyad rnam tshang bar bzhugs* | | (15+4+5+8=32).

<sup>101</sup> MS A (16b4–6): identical.

<sup>102</sup> MS B (16b7; Jampa Samten 2015: 29): *brgya dang nyi shu*.

<sup>103</sup> MS A (21b4): identical.

<sup>104</sup> MS B (18b4–5; Jampa Samten 2015: 33): *dpal ldan dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud 'grel skor* | | *bcu phrag gcig dang brgyad kyis lhag pa dang* | | *rgyud chen sgyu 'phrul dra ba'i rnam bshad gsum* | | *mtshan brjod chos skor bcu phrag gnyis lhag bzhugs* | | (18+ + 3 + 20+ = 41+).

<sup>105</sup> MS A (23b5–6): identical.

<sup>106</sup> MS B (19b6; Jampa Samten 2015: 35): *bcu phrag gnyis dang bzhi*.

<sup>107</sup> MS A (25a3): identical.

<sup>108</sup> MS B (24a2; Jampa Samten 2015: 45): *brgya phrag gnyis dang bdun bcu*.

<sup>110</sup> MS A (30a5): identical.

	(A, 25a3–30a5; B, 19b6–24a2) 2.5 vols. <b>mid. Ci–JI</b>	+) <sup>109</sup> N <sub>JS</sub> 457–628	
9.	IHa so so'i mngon par rtoqs pa (A, 30a5–32a3; B, 24a3–25b5) 1 vol. <b>Nyi</b>	380 <sup>111</sup> / 46(386 +) <sup>112</sup> N <sub>JS</sub> 629–674	380 <sup>113</sup> / 48(38 8+)
10.	gSang sngags kyi lam gyi rim pa (A, 32a4–38a6; B, 25b5–30b1) 3 vols. <b>Ti–Di</b>	150 <sup>114</sup> / 151 N <sub>JS</sub> 675–825	150 <sup>115</sup> / 179

<sup>109</sup> Strictly speaking, Chapter 8 contains 172 records, as counted by Jampa Samten. However, as pointed out by him, one of the records (N<sub>JS</sub>556) refers to a collection (*rNam 'joms sgrub thabs brgya rtsa*), the number of the works contained therein being specified as 100+ (*brgya rtsa*), which would yield a total of 271+. The collection as found in the *bsTan 'gyur* includes altogether 108 works (D2942–D3049 / P3767–P3873). For a discussion on this collection, see Almogi (forthcoming).

<sup>111</sup> MS B (25b4; Jampa Samten 2015: 49): *brgya phrag gsum dang brgyad bcu*.

<sup>112</sup> Strictly speaking, Chapter 9 contains 46 records, as counted by Jampa Samten. However, as pointed out by him, two of the records (N<sub>JS</sub>629 and N<sub>JS</sub>630) refer to collections, the number of works contained in the former (*Ba ri sgrub thabs brgya rtsa*) being specified as 100+ (*brgya rtsa*) and in the latter (*sGrub thabs rgya mtsho*) as 242 (*nyi brgya bzhi bcu rtsa gnyis*), which would yield 386+. Note that MS B glosses *brgya rtsa* as what seems to be *cung* followed by the numeral 70? (Jampa Samten reads *cung med*, which cannot be endorsed), of which I can unfortunately not make sense. Based on the Tshal pa catalogue, Jampa Samten counts for the *Ba ri sgrub thabs brgya rtsa* 138 (T1255–T1392) and for the *sGrub thabs rgya mtsho* 245 (T1393–T1637), the latter in contradiction to the catalogue, which gives the number of works to be 242! He thus counts for chapter 9 a total of 427. See Jampa Samten 2015: 46 nn. 1 & 2, 49 n. 1. At any rate, the collections as found in the *bsTan 'gyur* include, however, 94 (D3306–D3399 / P4127–P4220) and 245/246 (D3400–D3644 / P4221–P4466) works, respectively. For a discussion on these collections, see Almogi (forthcoming).

<sup>113</sup> MS A (32a3): identical.

<sup>114</sup> MS B (30a7; Jampa Samten 2015: 58): *brgya phrag phyed dang gnyis*.

<sup>115</sup> MS A (38a5–6): identical.

<b>mDo'i phyogs kyi bstan bcos</b>			
<b>A.</b>	<b>[Treatises on Various Buddhist Works &amp; Topics]</b>		
11	mDo sde (A, 38a6–42a3; B, 30b1–33a7) 21 vols. <b>Ka–Zha</b>	71 <sup>116</sup> / 70 N <sub>JS</sub> 826–895	71 <sup>117</sup> / 73
12	dBu ma (A, 42a3–44b6; B, 33a7–35b6) 12 vols. <b>Za–Gi</b>	69 <sup>118</sup> / 73 N <sub>JS</sub> 896–968	69 <sup>119</sup> / 72
13	Sems tsam (A 44b6–47a2; B, 35b6–37b5) 14 vols. <b>Ngi–Tsi</b>	51 <sup>120</sup> / 52 N <sub>JS</sub> 869–1020	51 <sup>121</sup> / 52
14	Theg pa chung ngu (A, 47a2–49b4; B, 37b5–40a4) 13 vols. <b>Tshi–Thu</b>	51 <sup>122</sup> / 54 N <sub>JS</sub> 1021–1074	51 <sup>123</sup> / 52
15	Byang chub sems dpa'i lam	230 <sup>124</sup> / 139(238+ ) <sup>125</sup>	230 <sup>126</sup> / 140(239+)

<sup>116</sup> MS B (33a7; Jampa Samten 2015: 65): *bdun bcu rtsa gcig*.

<sup>117</sup> MS A (42a2): identical.

<sup>118</sup> MS B (35b5; Jampa Samten 2015: 70): *drug bcu rtsa dgu*.

<sup>119</sup> MS A (44b5): identical.

<sup>120</sup> MS B (37b4; Jampa Samten 2015: 75): *lnga bcu rtsa gcig*.

<sup>121</sup> MS A (47a2): identical.

<sup>122</sup> MS B (40a3; Jampa Samten 2015: 81): *lnga bcu rtsa gcig*.

<sup>123</sup> MS A (49b3): identical.

<sup>124</sup> MS B (45a6; Jampa Samten 2015: 91): *nyis brgya sum bcu*.

<sup>125</sup> Strictly speaking, the chapter contains 139 records, as counted by Jampa Samten. However, as pointed out by him, one record (N<sub>JS</sub>1213) refers to a collection (*Chos chung brgya rtsa*, also known as *Jo bo chos chung*), which is specified as containing 100+ (*brgya rtsa*) works, so that the total number would amount to 238+ (Jampa Samten erroneously gives a total of 239). The collection in the *bsTan 'gyur* contains 103 works (D4465–D4567 / P5378–P5480). For more on this collection, see Almqvist (forthcoming).

<sup>126</sup> MS A (55b2): identical.

	(A, 49b4–55b2; B, 40a4–45a7) 5 vols. <b>Du–Bu</b>	N <sub>JS</sub> 1075–1213	
<b>B.</b>	<b>[Others]</b>		
16 .	Tshad ma (A, 55b3–58a1; B, 45a7–47a7) 16 vols. <b>Mu–Ke</b>	Ø/50 N <sub>JS</sub> 1214–1263	Ø/50
17 .	gSo spyad dang sGra la sog pa (A, 58a1–59b1; B, 47b1–48b4) 6 vols. <b>Khe–mid. Je</b>	Ø/33 N <sub>JS</sub> 1264–1296	Ø/33
18 .	sMon lam dang bKra shis (A, 59b1–61b2; B, 48b5–49a7) 0.5 vol. <b>mid.–end Je</b>	15 <sup>127</sup> /14 N <sub>JS</sub> 1297–1310	47 <sup>128</sup> /47
<b>[Later Additions]</b>			
19 .	Shin du dkon pa'i dpe phyis brtson pa mchog gis rnyed nas bris pa (A, 61b2–69a4; B, 49a7–55b7) 9 vols.: <b>Ni–Tsi</b> (6 vols. continuation of the Tantra section); <b>Nye–The</b> (3 vols. continuation of the Non-Tantric section (mDo'i phyogs kyi bstan bcos / mTshan nyid)	Ø/179 N <sub>JS</sub> 1311–1489	Ø/181
20	Bod kyi mkhan po	Ø/21	Ø/21

<sup>127</sup> MS B (49a7; Jampa Samten 2015: 100): *lnga phrag gsum*.

<sup>128</sup> MS A (61b1): *bzhi bcu rtsa bdun*.

.	mkhas pa rnam kyis mdzad pa'i dpe dkon pa (A, 69a4–70a1; B, 55b7– 56b1) 1 vol. <b>De</b>	N <sub>JS</sub> 1490–1510	
21	Slar yang dpe dkon pa rnam sde snod 'dzin pa rGyang ro pas rnyed nas bris pa (A, 70a1–79a2) 3 vols. <b>Ne–Phe</b> (Mixed: Mostly Tantric works (fols. 70a1–77b5), only the last 27 works of vol. Phe (fols. 77b5–79a1) are Non-Tantric)	NA	Ø/226
<b>[Epilogue]</b>			
<b>Total number of work</b>		2015 <sup>129</sup> /1510 (2048+) <sup>130</sup>	2350 <sup>131</sup> /1868 (2406+)

## Bibliography

### A. Tibetic Sources

*A khu tho yig* = A khu ching Shes rab rgya mtsho, *dPe rgyun dkon pa 'ga' zhib gi tho yig*. In *Materials for a History of Tibetan Literature*. 3 vols. Sata-Piṭaka Series 28–30. International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi, 1963, vol. 3: 503–601.

*'Bras spungs dpe rnying dkar chag* = dPal brtsegs bod yig dpe rnying zhib 'jug khang (ed.), *'Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsol ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*. 2 vols. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2004.

*Bu ston chos 'byung* = Bu ston Rin chen grub, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan*

<sup>129</sup> MS B (58b1); Jampa Samten 2015: 118: *stong phrag gnyis dang* | *bcu phrag phyed dang gnyis*.

<sup>130</sup> The total sum is given by Jampa Samten as 2090 (reflecting his own calculation of the number of works contained in the individual small collections). See Jampa Samten 2015: 115 n. 1.

<sup>131</sup> MS A (81a5): *stong phrag gnyis dang brgya phrag gsum* | | *bcu phrag lnga*.

- pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod.* (On the cover: *Bu ston chos 'byung*). Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang, 1991 (second edition); Title Index (chapter 4) as edited in Nishioka 1980–1983 (=Bc).
- Co ne bstan dkar* = 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa II dKon mchog 'jigs med dbang po, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bka'i dgongs 'grel ba'i bstan bcos 'gyur ro cog par du sgrub pa'i tshul las nye bar brtsams pa'i gtam yang dag par brjod pa dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu'i phreng ba.* (On the cover: *Co ne'i bstan 'gyur dkar chag*). Lanzhou: Kan su'u mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986.
- dBus pa blo gsal bstan dkar* = dBus pa blo gsal, *bsTan bcos kyi dkar chag.* A: MS, dBu med, 81 fols., s.l., s.n., n.d. [scans: BDRC: W2CZ7507]; B: MS, dBu med, 58 fols., in *dBus pa blo gsal gyi gsung phyogs bsdu,* 2 vols., s.l., s.n., n.d., vol. 1, separate foliation (PDF, 107–222). [scans: BDRC: W2PD17520] (= N<sub>JS</sub>, see also Jampa Samten 2015: 1–118).
- Deb dmar* = Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje, *Deb ther dmar po.* With annotation by Dung dkar Blo bzang 'phrin las. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1981. [scans: BDRC: W1KG5760].
- Deb sngon* = 'Gos lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal, *Deb ther sngon po.* Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984.
- gSung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa* = 'Phags pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan. *bDe bar gshegs pa'i gsung rab 'gyur ro 'tshal bzhengs pa'i gsal byed sdeb sbyor gyi rgyan rnam par bkra ba.* A: In *dPal ldan sa skya bka' 'bum.* Reproduced from the 1736 Derge edition. 15 vols. New Delhi: Sakya Center, Dehra Dun: 1992–1993, vol. 15: 599–610. [scans: DBRC: W22271]; B: In *Sa skya gong ma rnam lnga'i gsung 'bum dpe bsdur ma las 'gro mgon chos rgyal 'phags pa'i gsung.* 4 vols. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007, vol. 4: 402–412. [scans: DBRC: W2DB4571].
- Karma pakši'i rnam thar* = Zhwa dmar II mkha' spyod dbang po, *Chos kyi rje dpal ldan karma pa chen po'i rnam par thar pa bsam yas lha'i rnga chen.* In *The collected writings (gsuñ 'bum) of the second Žwa-dmar Mkha'-spyod-dbañ-po.* Reproduced from an incomplete manuscript preserved in the Rumtek Monastery. 4 vols. Gangtok: Gonpo Tseten, 1978, vol. 2: 1–87. [scans: BDRC: W23928].
- lDan/lHan dkar ma* = Various, *Pho brang stod thang ldan dkar gyi bka' dang bstan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag.* As edited in Lalou 1953: 319–337. See also Herrmann-Pfandt 2008.
- lHo rong chos 'byung* = rTa tshag Tshe dbang rgyal, *Dam pa'i chos kyi byung ba'i legs bshad lho rong chos 'byung ngam rta tshag chos 'byung zhes rtsom pa'i yul ming du chags pa'i ngo mtshar zhing dkon pa'i dpe khyad par can.* (On the cover: *lHo rong chos 'byung*). Ed. by Gling dbon Padma skal bzang & Ma grong Mi 'gyur rdo rje. Lhasa: bod ljongs bod yig dpe rnying dpe skrun khang, 1994.

- INga pa chen po'i bstan dkar* = Dalai Lama V Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho (disingenuously ascribed), *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro cog gi dkar chag 'jig rten gsum gyi bde skyid pad tshal bzhad pa'i nyin byed*. In *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition*. Ōtani University, Tokyo–Kyoto, 1955–1961, vol. 151, 61–4–119–1 (fols. 1–144).
- Log rtogs bzlog pa'i bstan bcos* = 'Jigs med gling pa mKhyen brtse 'od zer, *sNga 'gyur rnying ma la rgol ngan log rtogs bzlog pa'i bstan bcos*. In *'Jigs med gling pa'i bka' 'bum* (A 'dzom par ma). 14 vols. Chengdu?: s.n., 1999?, vol. 6: 593–735. [scans: BDRC: W7477].
- mChims chen mo'i rnam thar* = sMon lam tshul khrim, *mChims nam mkha' grags kyi rnam thar*. In *sNar thang gser phreng*. s.l., s.n., n.d. 50 fols. (separate foliation; PDF: 665–764). [scans: TBRC: W2CZ7888].
- mKhas pa'i dga' ston* = dPa' bo gTsug lag 'phreng ba, *Dam pa'i chos kyi 'khor los bsgyur ba rnam kyi byung ba gsal bar byed pa mkhas pa'i dga' ston ces bya ba'i legs par bshad pa*. (On the cover: *Chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*). A: 2 vols. Ed. rDo rje rgyal po. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1986. [scans: BDRC: W7499]; B: Ed. rDo rje rgyal po. Mi rig dpe skrun khang, 2005.
- Rab brtan rnam thar* = 'Jigs med grags pa, *rGyal rtse chos rgyal gyi rnam par thar pa dad pa'i lo thog dngos grub kyi char 'bebs*. (On the cover: *Rab brtan kun bzang 'phags kyi rnam thar*). Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1987. [scans: BDRC: W1CZ2417].
- rGya bod yig tshang chen mo* = g.Yas ru sTag tshang dPal 'byor bzang po, *rGya bod yig tshang chen mo*. A: In *Sa skya'i chos 'byung gces bsdu*. 6 vols. Ed. Sa skya'i dpe rnying bsdu sgrig u lhan. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, vol. 3. [scans: BDRC: W1PD90704]; B: *rGyal rabs mang po'i legs bshad rnam grangs yid 'dzin nor bu'i phreng ba*. Beijing: Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2007. [scans: BDRC: W2DB4576].
- Sa skya bstan dkar* = Ngor chen Kun dga' bzang po, *bsTan 'gyur dkar chag*. In *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum. The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa skya Sect of the Tibetan Buddhism*. Compiled by bSod nams rgya mtsho. Bibliotheca Tibetica 1. 15 vols. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1968–1969, vol. 10, 269a6 (349-2-6)–270a6 (349-4-6).
- sDe dge bstan dkar* = Zhu chen Tshul khrim rin chen, *Thams cad mkhyen pa chen po nyi ma'i gnyen gyi bka' lung spyi dang bye brag gi dgongs don rnam par 'grel pa'i bstan bcos gangs can pa'i skad du 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi chos sbyin rgyun mi 'chad pa'i ngo mtshar 'phrul gyi phyi mo rdzogs ldan bskal pa'i bsod nams kyi sprin phung rgyas par dkrigs pa'i tshul las brtsams pa'i gtam ngo mtshar chu gter 'phel ba'i zla ba gsar ba*. 2 vols. D4569. [scans: BDRC: W1KG10093].
- sGra sgyur lo rgyus* = dBang 'dus tshe ring & 'Phrin las rgya mtsho, *Bod kyi sgra sgyur lo rgyus dang lo tsā ba rim byon gyi mdzad rnam gsal ba'i me long*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2001.

- sMin grol gling gi dkar chag* = Dalai Lama V Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho, *Rigs kun khyab bdag sprul sku rigs 'dzin chen po chos rgyal gter bdag gling pas 'og min o rgyan smin grol gling nges don dga' ba'i tshal gyi bsti gnas gra phyi thar pa gling du dri gtsang khang shag skor sku gsung thugs rten dang bcas pa legs par bskrun pa'i dkar chag ngo mtshar rgya mtsho*. In *rGyal dbang lnga pa ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho'i gsung 'bum*. 28 vols. Krung go'i bod rig pa dpe skrun khang, 2009, vol. 20: 261–300. [scans: BDRC: W1PD107937].
- sMon lam rdo rje'i rnam thar* = Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje, *dPal ldan bla ma dge sbyong chen po zhes pa 'tshal drung chen smon lam pa'i rnam thar*. In Per K. Sørensen & Guntram Hazod, vol. 2, 805–827.
- sNe'u gdong bstan dkar* = bSod nams dpal bzang po, Shākya 'od pa, Byang chub rgyal mtshan (wrongly ascribed to sGra tshad pa Rin chen rnam rgyal), *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'tshal gyi dkar chag yid bzhin gyi nor bu rin po che'i za ma tog*. In *The Collected Works of Bu-ston (zhol par ma)*. Edited by Lokesh Chandra from the collections of Raghu Vira. 28 vols. Śata-piṭaka Series Indo Asian Literatures 41–68. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965-1971, vol. 28 (Sa), 343–573. [scans: BDRC: W22106].
- Yar lung chos 'byung* = Yar lung jo bo Shākya rin chen sde, *Yar lung jo bo'i chos 'byung*. (On the cover: *Yar lung chos 'byung*). Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang, 1988.
- Zhwa lu bstan dkar* = Bu ston Rin chen grub, *bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*. In *The Collected Works of Bu-ston (zhol par ma)*. Edited by Lokesh Chandra from the collections of Raghu Vira. 28 vols. Śata-piṭaka Series Indo Asian Literatures 41–68. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965–1971, vol. 26 (La): 401–643. [scans: BDRC: W22106].

## B. Sources in Modern Languages

- Almogi, Orna. 2020. *Authenticity and Authentication: Glimpses behind the Scenes of the Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 9. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- . forthcoming. “Editors as Canon-Makers: The Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon in the Light of Its Editors’ Predilections and Agendas.” In Orna Almogi & Chizuko Yoshimizu (eds.), *Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons*. Indian and Tibetan Studies Series. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- Ducher, Cécile. 2017. *A Lineage in Time: The Vicissitudes of the rNgog pa bka' brgyud from the 11th through 19th Centuries*. PhD Thesis. Paris: PSL Research University. Digital version at <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02106815/document>.



- Halkias, Georgios T. 2004. "Tibetan Buddhism Registered: A Catalogue from the Imperial Court of 'Phang thang." *The Eastern Buddhist* 36/1&2: 46–105.
- Harrison, Paul. 1994. "In Search of the Source of the Tibetan bKa' 'gyur: A Reconnaissance Report." In Per Kvaerne (ed.), *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies Fagernes 1992*. Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, vol. 1: 295–317.
- . 1996. "A Brief History of the Tibetan bKa' 'gyur." In José Ignacio Cabezón & Roger R. Jackson (eds.), *Tibetan Literature. Studies in Genre. Essays in Honor of Geshe Lhundup Sopa*. Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism Series. Ithaca: Snow Lion, 70–94.
- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2008. *Die lHan kar ma: Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Jampa Samten. 1987a. "Notes on the Lithang Edition of the Tibetan bKa'-'gyur." Translated with Jeremy Russell. *The Tibet Journal* 12/3: 17–40.
- . 1987b. "Origins of the Tibetan Canon with Special Reference to the Tshal-pa Kanjur (1347–1349)." Translated with Jeremy Russell. In *Buddhism and Science*. Seoul: Dongguk University, 763–781.
- (ed.). 2015. *Catalogue of the Narthang Manuscript Tangyur*. Compiled by dBus pa blo gsal rtsod pa'i seng ge. Lo rgyus deb phreng 19. Dharamshala: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives. (= N<sub>JS</sub>)
- (ed.). 2016. *bsTan 'gyur gyi dkar chag sna tshogs nor bu'i phung po. Tshal pa drung chen smon lam rdo rjes bzhengs pa'i tshal pa bstan 'gyur dkar chag. Catalogue of the Tshalpa Manuscript Tanjur*. Compiled by dGe 'dun rin chen. Miscellaneous Series 32. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central University of Tibetan Studies. (=T)
- Kapstein, T. Matthew. 2000. *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism. Conversion, Contestation, and Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. 1994. "Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History IV: The Tshad ma'i byung tshul 'chad nyan gyi rgyan: A Tibetan History of Indian Buddhist Pramāṇavāda." In Nalini Balbir & Joachim K. Bautze (eds.), *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn. Zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres. Dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag: 1994, 375–401.
- . 2011. "A Hitherto Unknown Tibetan Religious Chronicle from Probably the Early Fourteenth Century." *藏学学刊 Journal of Tibetology* 7: 21–50.
- van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J. & Kurtis R. Schaeffer. 2009. *An Early Tibetan Survey of Buddhist Literature: The bsTan pa rgyas pa rgyan gyi nyi 'od of bCom ldan ral gri*. Harvard Oriental Series 64. Cambridge, MA: The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard

- University.
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1953. "Contribution à la bibliographie du Kanjur et du Tanjur: Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-Iddebcan." *Journal Asiatique* 241 / 3: 313–353.
- Martin, Dan. 1997. *Tibetan Histories: A Bibliography of Tibetan-Language Historical Works*. In collaboration with Yael Bentor. London: Serindia Publications.
- Nishioka, Soshū. 1980–1983. "'Putun bukkyōshi' Mokurokubusakuin" ["Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu ston's 'History of Buddhism'"] (I-III). [*Tōkyō Daigaku Bungaku-bu*] *Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū-shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 4 (1980): 61–92, 5 (1981): 43–93, 6 (1983): 47–201.
- Petech, Luciano. 2003. "Ya-ts'e, Gu-ge, Pu-rang: A new study." In Alex McKay (ed.), *The History of Tibet*. Vol. 2: *The Medieval Period: c.850-1895. The Development of Buddhist Paramountcy*. London/New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 33–52. [Reprint of 1980].
- Roerich, George N. (tr.). 1949. *The Blue Annals*. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1988.
- Roesler, Ulrike. 2019. "The Kadampa: A Formative Movement of Tibetan Buddhism." Online publication. Oxford Research Encyclopaedias. Religion. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.568.
- Skilling, Peter 1997. "From *bKa' bstan bcos* to *bKa' 'gyur* and *bsTan 'gyur*." In Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon. Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*. PIATS, vol. 3. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 22. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 257. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 87–111.
- Sørensen, Per K. 1994. *Tibetan Historiography. The Mirror Illuminating the Royal Genealogies. An Annotated Translation of the XIVth Century Tibetan Chronicle: rGyal-rabs gsal-ba'i me-long*. Asiatische Forschungen 128. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Sørensen, Per K. & Guntram Hazod, in cooperation with Tsering Gyabpo. 2007. *Rulers of the Celestial Plain: Ecclesiastic and Secular Hegemony in Medieval Tibet. A Study of Tshal Gung-thang*. 2 vols. Veröffentlichungen zur Sozialanthropologie 10. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Suzuki, Daisetz T. 1961. *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto. Catalogue & Index*. Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Tauscher, Helmut. 2015. "Kanjur." *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. 1: 103–111.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. 1956. *Preliminary Report on Two Scientific Expeditions*

*in Nepal*. Serie Orientale Roma 10. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Ui, Hakuju et al. (eds.). 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.

Vostrikov, A. I. 1970. *Tibetan Historical Literature*. Trans. Harish Chandra Gupta. Soviet Indology Series 4. Indian Studies Past & Present, Calcutta.

### **3. Digital Sources**

BDRC = Digital Buddhist Resource Center, at <http://www.tbrc.org>.

Tibskrit = Dan Martin, *Tibskrit Philology. A Bio-bibliographical Resource Work*. Ed. Alexander Cherniak. Version from 2016.

