

4 The Chinese and Tibetan texts

For the textual study of the oftentimes corrupt Sanskrit manuscripts, their Chinese and Tibetan translations are indispensable means to reconstruct the original Indic text, and to better understand Indian Buddhist practices. It is generally assumed that the strict rules for the translation of Sanskrit texts into Tibetan result in almost verbatim and faithful renderings.¹ Even though, Eimer stresses this fact in his important survey on the transmission of the Tibetan Kangyur,² there are, too many unknown or uncertain factors on both the Indian and Tibetan side to consider the faithfulness of Tibetan translations to be a general rule. Different recensions or forms of Indic texts, which might have been corrupt and rife with errors due to numerous transcriptions, as well as the Indic language skills of the Tibetan translators, different translation schools and styles contribute to the quality of a translation. Thus, every case should be carefully studied.

Early Buddhist Sanskrit texts, which mostly survive in fragmentary manuscripts found in the northern parts of the Indian subcontinent and in the oases of the region that is today known as Xinjiang, Central Asia, were brought to China and translated into the local language. The translation process then resulted in the creation of a Chinese Buddhist canon. Comparative surveys on the Sanskrit manuscripts and their Chinese counterparts show, however, that the former cannot form the sole source for Chinese Buddhist texts. In most cases the Central Asian versions are not identical with the recensions preserved in the Chinese canon, which especially holds true for the *Sūtra-piṭaka*.

In his edition of the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*, Brough demonstrated that the Chinese copies of the *Dīrgha-āgama* originated from a Middle Indic model. The agreement of the Chinese renderings with the language of the Gāndhārī

¹ For the transmission of Indian Buddhism to Tibet and the principles of translation into Tibetan, see Scherrer-Schaub 2002, and 2009: 162–165.

² “Die chinesischen und tibetischen Übersetzungen buddhistischer Texte gehören bislang zu den wesentlichen Quellen für die Kenntnis des indischen Buddhismus. Sie ermöglichen es, die Aussagen der in der Heimat des Buddhismus verlorenen Schriften zu verstehen und einzuordnen. Die tibetischen Wiedergaben lassen aufgrund ihrer genauen, wortgetreuen Übersetzungsweise oft sogar den Wortlaut der Originalfassung der Texte erkennen” (Eimer 1992: 1). For another considerable study on the importance of Tibetan translations for Sanskrit philology, see Simonsson 1957.

Dharmapada is evident to such an extent so that Brough came to the conclusion that the Chinese texts must have been translated from that very Middle Indic language.³ In an examination of the *Upāligāthās* of the *Madhyama-āgama*, von Hinüber showed that this work also underlies a Middle Indian original, most likely Gāndhārī.⁴ Furthermore, Hartmann was able to strengthen this assertion in his study on the ten most popular Central Asian Buddhist Sanskrit texts and their relation to the Chinese canon, where he stated at one point that the extremely widespread texts from northern Turkestan did not necessarily serve as source for the Chinese translations:

Of the ten texts especially widespread in Northern Turkestan, [...] only five are available in the Chinese canon in the same or at least a closely related recension. Of these five, only three could possibly be derived from originals stemming from Central Asia, but this connection cannot be proven for any of them. In other words, the texts held in highest esteem by the Buddhists of Northern Turkestan played an amazing small role in the transmission of Buddhist literature into China, at least as far as can be judged from the surviving Sanskrit fragments.⁵

In his study of the earliest Chinese translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* by Dharmarakṣa dated to 286 CE, Boucher clearly brought to light more evidence for the hypothesis that a good number of Chinese Buddhist texts has been translated from a Gāndhārī Prakrit written in Kharoṣṭhī script.⁶ The case, however, is not so easy as it seems and we not only have take into consideration phonological and linguistic data, but also the complex translation process. Moreover, Buddhist Sanskrit texts could well display Gāndhārī features and might have been written in

³ Cf. Brough 1962: 50–54.

⁴ Cf. von Hinüber 1982: 243–251, and 1983: 27–34. Waldschmidt (1980: 136f.) already pointed out that the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* and *Samyukta-āgama* correspond to the Sanskrit texts of the Sarvāstivāda tradition, forming a counterpart to the *nikāyas* of the Theravādins (for the school affiliation of the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama*, see also Anālayo 2017: 55–76), while the *Dirgha-āgama* can be attributed to the Dharmaguptakas, and the *Ekottarika-āgama* belongs to one school of the Mahāsāṃghikas. Recent research has shown that the *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Samyukta-āgama* were, however, not translated from Sanskrit but from some Middle Indian language with Sanskrit elements. For the underlying language of the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama*, see Karashima 2017: 197–207. Moreover, Karashima (2017: 200) describes the original text of the *Dirgha-āgama* as “a mixture of elements of Sanskritisation, Prakrit, and local dialects as well as Gandhari.”

⁵ Hartmann 2012: 62.

⁶ Cf. Boucher 1998.

Kharoṣṭhī under Brāhmī influence. And in any case, an Indian text has already undergone various translation processes from one Middle Indic language to another before it arrived in China. On this basis, Boucher concludes “that these early Chinese translations are imperfect testimonies to the Indian source texts.”⁷

The same holds true for the Chinese recensions of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*. Both versions, the canonical as well as the *rakṣā* version, largely deviate from the Sanskrit texts and thus cannot be exclusively derived from the latter.⁸ The two Sanskrit texts of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*, which already significantly differ from each other, seem to have more divergence than agreement with their Chinese and Tibetan counterparts. It is, therefore, evident that none of the Sanskrit manuscripts could have served as model for the Chinese and Tibetan translations. This fact further complicates the history and transmission of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*. As a consequence, the Chinese *rakṣā* version and the Tibetan text, which mostly agree with each other, must have descended from another source: either a now lost Sanskrit text, or a text in a language other than Sanskrit. The preserved Sanskrit texts only provided the core passage with its verses and *mantras* for the Chinese and Tibetan translations. The increase of *mantras*, *dhāraṇīs*, and specific *rakṣā* elements is a distinctive mark for the further development of *rakṣā* texts. The structure of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* thus completely changed with its transmission.

⁷ Boucher 1998: 502.

⁸ The *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* is by no means an exception in the transmission of Buddhist texts into Chinese. The same applies to the Chinese translation of the *Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra*. The Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia of this text attest to another recension than the Nepalese manuscript tradition. For an introduction to the *Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra* and its complex history of redaction and transmission, see Gummer 2015, for the Tibetan text, see Nobel 1944, for a translation of the Chinese version into German, see Nobel 1958, for an English translation of the Sanskrit text, see Emmerick [1970] 200, and for an edition of the Khotanese text with Sanskrit parallels, see Skjærvø 2004.

4.1 The Chinese version

The Chinese *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* exists in different recensions as can be seen in the table below:

Table 11: The Chinese versions of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*.

Texts without linguistic <i>rakṣā</i> elements		<i>Rakṣā</i> text	
MN	MĀ		
131			
132	167		
133	165		Taishō XXI 1362
134	166	Taishō I 77	

There are four canonical Chinese *sūtras*: three texts included in the *Madhyama-āgama*, and an independent translation, Taishō I 77, with parallels in the Pāli *Majjhima-nikāya*.⁹ Like the four independent Pāli discourses they all centre around the verses, but differ in terms of interlocutor and narrative setting. These texts do not contain any linguistic *rakṣā* elements, let alone *mantras*. The texts included in the *Madhyama-āgama* represent the versions transmitted by the Sarvāstivāda school. The recension Taishō XXI 1362 parallels MĀ 165 only in the first part, as it continues after the verses with *dhāraṇīs*. These are included in an appendix, which was added to the core passage after the verses instead of the commentary of the *gāthās*. The fact that the two Sanskrit versions also show protective elements indicates that the *sūtra* was already well-known for its *rakṣā* status in Central Asia. It is, however, at the moment impossible to determine the source text of Taishō XXI 1362. As mentioned above, the Sanskrit texts and the Chinese *rakṣā* text of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* diverge substantially. The original Indic model, if there ever was one and which in this case served not only as a basis for the Chinese translation of this *sūtra*, but also for the Tibetan translation, did not come down to us.

The following survey only considers the text Taishō XXI 1362,¹⁰ which represents the only Chinese *rakṣā* version of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* containing protective

⁹ For a translation of MĀ 165 at Taishō I 696b26–698c1, and a comparison with its Pāli counterpart MN 133, see Anālayo 2012: 421–448 (originally published 2008: 5–29).

¹⁰ The complete Chinese text can be found in the appendix of the present work.

elements and *mantras*. The text was included in volume 21 of the Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon under Dhāraṇī Sūtras (Ch. 諸陀羅尼經類 *Shodaranikyōru*).¹¹

4.1.1 General notes on Taishō XXI 1362

Date of translation

The Chinese translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* was produced in the early eighth century during the Tang dynasty (618–907 CE)¹². The colophon of the text gives the title, the name of the translator, the Chinese monk Yijing (Ch. 義淨, 635–713 CE), who stayed in India from 671 until 695 CE,¹³ as well as the dynasty under which it was translated. The colophon of the Chinese translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* runs as follows:

佛說善夜經一卷
唐三藏法師義淨奉 制譯

(Taishō XXI 1362 at p0881c03–p0881c05)

Discourse spoken by the Buddha on [the topic of] an auspicious night, one fascicle.

Translated by the Tripiṭaka Dharma Master Yijing during the Tang dynasty.

Yijing spent ten years at the Nālandā monastery in the present state of Bihar in Northeast India, where he studied the Sanskrit language and translated a multitude of Sanskrit texts into Chinese. He collected and brought back to China some four hundred Sanskrit texts in more than five hundred thousand stanzas. An index giving

¹¹ Strickmann distinguishes three classes of *dhāraṇī sūtras* among the Chinese corpus of Buddhist texts: The first class comprises translations or transcriptions of *dhāraṇīs* from the Indic original. The second class consists of *dhāraṇīs* directly written in Chinese, often using and rewriting older translations, and the third class is made of long anthologies containing several *dhāraṇī sūtras* (cf. Strickmann 1996: 72). The Chinese version of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* belongs to the first class of *dhāraṇī sūtras*.

¹² Date according to Weinstein 1987.

¹³ Dates according to Rongxi 2000: 1f. Yijing's stay in India is well recorded in his travel account entitled *A Record of the Inner Law Sent Home from the South Seas (Nan-hai-ji-gui-nei-fa-zhuan)*, Taishō LIV 2125, in four fascicles.

all the works ascribed to Yijing can be found in Nanjio's *Catalogue of the Chinese Translations of the Buddhist Tripitaka*. The *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* is listed as number 500 under the title *Fo-shwo-shan-yê-kiñ 'Sūtra spoken by the Buddha on the good night' Bhadrakâ-râtrī*. This entry also gives with the year 701 CE a precise date for the Chinese translation of Taishō XXI 1362. The full entry reads:

Translated by I-tsiñ, A.D. 701, of the Thâu dynasty, A.D. 618–907. 4 leaves. In this Sūtra the Devaputra Kandana awakened Bhikshus and caused them to ask Buddha a question, then Buddha spoke the Sūtra together with three Mantras or spells.¹⁴

Structure

The text of the Chinese translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* can be divided into two parts: the core passage followed by an appendix. The core passage corresponds almost literally to MĀ 165 and MN 133. The appendix of the Chinese version of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* shares much in common with other texts of the early *raṅṣā* genre. Its structure is simple and formulaic, and follows a pattern that also appeared in the composition of other apotropaic texts. The appendix opens with the verse on the aspiration for the welfare of all sentient beings, which directly follows the four common verses. This verse became a characteristic mark of early Buddhist *raṅṣā* texts and features in several other protective scriptures. It also appears in the Sanskrit manuscript SI 2044 and in the Tibetan version of the *sūtra*. The text then continues with *mantras* and closes with a concluding formula.

The structure of Taishō XXI 1362 can be summarized as follows:

0. Title and colophon

Part I: Core passage

1. Introduction (*nidāna*): Rājagṛha
2. Introductory narration: a god appears before a monk and tells him to request the *Discourse on an auspicious night* from the Buddha

¹⁴ Nanjio 1883: 116. See also the entries on the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* in Bagchi's (1938: 533) description of early Chinese translations, and in the online *Database of Chinese Buddhist texts*: <http://www.kanji.zinbun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~wittern/can/can4/t21/t21n1362.htm> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020).

3. The monk approaches the Buddha and relates his conversation with the god
4. The Buddha teaches the requested discourse and the four common verses

Part II: Appendix with four *mantras*

5. The verse on the aspiration for the welfare of all sentient beings
6. The Buddha teaches the first two *mantras*
 - 6.1. The 1st and 2nd *mantra* (*dhāraṇī*)
 - 6.2. The effects of the *mantras*: awakening, list of calamities
7. Narrative break
 - 7.1. The 3rd *mantra* and its effects: protection
 - 7.2. The 4th *mantra*
8. Conclusion

Summary of content

The core passage of the Chinese recension of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* (Taishō XXI 1362) is situated in the Veṇuvanavihāra near Rājagṛha. A monk, whose name is not mentioned, was staying nearby at the Tapodārāma, the Hot Springs. The *sūtra* begins with a conversation between the monk and a god, who appears, encompassed by majestic radiance after the first watch of the night. This god requests the monk to approach the Buddha and ask for the Discourse on an Auspicious Night. The monk then approaches the Buddha and relates his conversation with the god. The Buddha now addresses the monk and tells him the name of this god, that is Candana, the chief of the gods of the Heaven of the Thirty-three.¹⁵ He then expounds the requested discourse together with the four common verses on an auspicious night and its great merit of becoming enlightened. The verses run as follows:

It is not proper to think of the past, do not long for the future.

In relation to the present, contemplate all according to the Dharma. Erroneous thinking is difficult to dispel, the wise should contemplate properly.

It is fitting to quickly make an effort, who knows what will happen tomorrow, because the Lord of Death [and his] assembly are closely following you.

¹⁵ According to DN II 258 and DN III 204, Candana is a “vassal of the Four Great Regent Gods. He is mentioned as one of the chief Yakkhas to be invoked by the followers in case of need” (Malalasekera 1937: 847).

For this reason I, the sage, have now expounded the discourse on the wholesome night.

(tr. Ānalayo 2011: 757f.)

The core passage ends here and the *sūtra* continues with the appendix. The appendix begins with the verse on the aspiration for the welfare of all sentient beings. This stanza reads:

常願諸有情 離苦獲安樂
不造諸惡業 恒修於眾善

(Taishō XXI 1362: 882a9–10)

May all sentient beings always be free from afflictions and attain happiness.
May no evil whatsoever befall. May they always experience auspiciousness.

Hereafter the Buddha teaches the first two *mantras*, which he introduces as *dhāraṇī*, and their effects. Namely, if a monk, a nun, a lay follower, or a lay woman recites, memorizes, respectfully worships and correctly explains the verses, the *mantras*, or the meaning of the discourse to others, he or she will attain knowledge of one's former lives, will go towards *nirvāṇa*, and therefore will attain awakening. If one acts in accordance with the teachings of this scripture one will also be spared from untimely death and will be entirely protected. The benefits of the *mantras* are enumerated in a long list of calamities from which one will be liberated.

Then follows a break in the narrative and the voice changes from the the third-person voice to a first-person perspective. With the third *mantra* the narrator invokes Vajrapāṇi¹⁶ in order to protect him and all sentient beings from a number of miseries. Subsequently, the fourth and final *mantra* is pronounced. The appendix concludes with the Buddha enjoining the assembly and the audience rejoiced in receiving the Buddha's teaching.

¹⁶ For an investigation of the invocation of protectors in *rakṣā* texts, see chapter 5.2.3 of the present work.

4.1.2 The *mantras* and their effects

Even though they do not comprise a large part of the text, the study of the four Chinese *mantras* is extremely problematic.¹⁷ Copp designates Chinese *dhāraṇīs* as “[s]trange on the page and in the ear” and as “the most mysterious feature of medieval Chinese Buddhist practice”.¹⁸ The major challenge faced by Chinese translators of Indic texts was the rendering of the original reading of the *mantras* into Chinese characters without losing their phonological fidelity, which is considered to be crucial for the effectiveness of the *mantras*. This was a difficult task and it was not always possible to adhere to, as Nobel noted:

Denn da die Wirksamkeit der *dhāraṇīs* von der Wahrung der korrekten Lautgestalt der betreffenden Silben, Worte und Sätze abhing, so musste jeder Übersetzer darauf achten, den Lautwert, wie ihn der Sanskrittext bot, auch wirklich so wiederzugeben. Dieses Ziel konnten aber die Chinesen mit ihren Begriffszeichen kaum erreichen, so viel Sorgfalt sie auch darauf verwandten.¹⁹

A Romanised transliteration of the Chinese reading of *mantras*, which is at the same time a reconstruction of the underlying Indic model, is far from easy.²⁰ It is generally admitted that *mantras* displayed in translated texts, whether Chinese or Tibetan, are transliterations from Sanskrit. As we have seen above, it is clear that many of the Indic texts were not translated from Sanskrit but from a Middle Indic recension of the text, which was Sanskritised at a later date. Thus, we can assume that the same may be the case for the Indic *mantras*, which were brought to China together with the texts they are embedded in. Accordingly, the original Indic variants were written in a language other than Sanskrit.

The question of whether transliterated Chinese *mantras* and *dhāraṇīs* are comprehensible or not is highly debated in scholarly research. In a standard

¹⁷ There is, nevertheless, quite a good number of theoretical and methodological surveys involved in the study of Chinese *dhāraṇīs*. For general studies on the meaning of *dhāraṇīs* in Chinese Buddhist incantatory practice, see Copp 2008, and 2011; for contexts, formats, uses, and ancillary practices associated with *dhāraṇīs*, see Copp 2014.

¹⁸ Copp 2014: 4.

¹⁹ Nobel 1958: XXXIII.

²⁰ A tentative attempt was undertaken by Harrison and Coblin (2012), who reconciled the DKP *mantras* with the help of their Tibetan parallels. The authors, however, conclude that “much of it is sheer guesswork, the product of desperation rather than inspiration” (Harrison/Coblin 2012: 81).

reference on Chinese incantations, Strickmann calls Chinese Buddhist spell practice a “thicket of Sanskrit that has traditionally been considered one of the least attractive, least rewarding areas of Buddhist studies”, “unintelligible gibberish” and a “cacophony of Sanskrit spells”.²¹ In his case study on an exploration of the Chinese version of the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya-dhāraṇī*, the *Dhāraṇī of the Glory of the Buddha’s Crown* (Ch. *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni*), commonly known as the *Incantation of Glory* (Ch. *Zunsheng zhou*), Copp demonstrates on the other hand that “*dhāraṇīs* were profoundly meaningful, *readable*, texts; their words could be elaborated and their implicit narratives unpacked”.²² Though most of the Chinese characters used to render Indic *mantras* have a semantic meaning, one should not seek for grammatical intelligibility, but merely be mindful of their sound since *mantras* are efficacious based on their sonic dimensions.

The following discussion of the four *mantras* of the Chinese translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* gives the Chinese reading of the *mantras* together with an attempt to reconstruct the underlying Indic model and provides a translation of their effects. A reconstruction of the Chinese *mantras* was made possible with the help of an index of all Chinese characters employed in the wording of the *mantras* giving the phonetic transcription of each character, and through a comparative study with the Tibetan variants of the *mantras*, which coincide at large (though not in their entirety).²³ The reconstruction, however, cannot be regarded as a definitive reading of the underlying Indic source, but rather as one possible reading and has to be seen as a tentative attempt to reconcile the Chinese with the Indic original.

Mantra 1 and 2

The text of the first two Chinese *mantras* corresponds to the first and third Tibetan *mantra* and includes the invocations of the female deities *gauri*, *gandhari*, *caṇḍali*, *matāṃgi*, and *śabari*.²⁴ While the first *mantra* is introduced with *tadyathā*, the second one opens with **saṃyethida*, which should be reconstructed as *saryathīdam*. The *mantra* passage is introduced as *dhāraṇī* with the following words:

²¹ Strickmann 2002: 103, 171.

²² Copp 2012: 169f.

²³ This index can be found in the appendix of the present work.

²⁴ For a discussion of these invocations, see chapter 5.2.3 of the present work.

復更說此陀羅尼曰

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882a13)

Then [the Blessed One] taught this *dhāraṇī*:

Quotation:

怛姪他 毘尼婆(引)喇爾 跋柁摩單滯 摩膩爾擻擻擻擻 瞿里健陀里
旃茶里摩登 祇(上)薩囉爛帝 莫呼刺膩攝鉢利 斫羯囉 婆(引)枳
攝伐里莫訶攝伐里 步精揭(巨列)爾 爾弭爾名揭爾 訖栗多(引)爾
莎(引)訶(引)僧拽體(天移)曇(去) 頰[口*束*頁]伽帝 捺囉伽帝
謗蘇迦波(引)裔 劫布得(都洛)迦波(引)裔 答布檀泥(去)莎訶

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882a14–21)

Reconstructed Indic transliteration:

*tadyathā binibhāraṇi buddhamatānadhe maṇiṇīṭīṭīṭi gauri gandhari
caṇḍali matamgi saralamte maholana śabari cakra pāti śabari mahāśabari
bhucidgini nīminimīnggini kilitāni svāhā saṃyethidha arakāṭe narakāṭe
bamsukapāyi kapotakapāyi tapodhane svāhā*

The effects of this *mantra* are of twofold nature. The memorization and recitation of it will bring the practitioner near to *nirvāṇa* and it grants protection for all sentient beings. The miseries against which the *mantra* protects are enumerated in a list of calamities, which includes those caused by water and fire, kings and thieves, thunder and lightning, poison, enemies, battle, and time. The text of the *sūtra* reads as follows:

Quotation:

當知是人於一切時無諸災厄。亦無狂橫及諸衰惱。能知過去七生之事。
亦不忘失大菩提心。決定能趣涅槃正道。

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882a25–27)

擁護諸眾生 令離病憂怖
不祥及惡夢 險路常安隱

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b4–5)

由此經威力	終無有惡報
若水火王賊	雷電毒害等
怨家戰諍時	念經皆得脫
又復有明咒	若能讀誦者
於一切時中	長善滅諸惡

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b9–13)

Translation:

You should know that this person will never experience any misfortune. Disease and suffering do not befall him. One will know the state of one's seven previous births and will not forget the great mind of awakening. One will certainly go near *nirvāṇa* on the correct path.

May there be protection for all sentient beings. Should disease, grief, fear and misfortune come near, or in the case of an unwholesome dream and calamity, happiness will always be received.

Through the power of this discourse, untimely death, water and fire, kings and thieves, thunder and lightning, poison, enemies and fight will not occur. Everyone who recites the discourse will attain liberation. Furthermore, if one recites this *vidyā*, one will always cultivate virtue and annihilate various evil deeds.

Mantra 3

The variant of the third Chinese *mantra* is in line with the fourth Tibetan *mantra*. It contains a long list of calamities, which is still part of the *mantra* itself. This is made clear through the discourse marker *svāhā* at the end of this list. While the first part of the *mantra* represents a transliteration of the Indic mantric syllables, it continues in the second part with a translation of its effects. It seems, however, highly probable that the translator was mistaken about the end of the *mantra*. The discourse marker *svāhā* is missing in the Tibetan version, so that we do not exactly know whether the list of calamities still belongs to the *mantra* or not. Presumably, the translator of the Chinese text was not sure about where this *mantra* ends. This is the reason why I excluded the list of calamities from the *mantra*, which runs as follows:

即說咒曰

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b14)

The *mantra* is thus now spoken as:

Quotation:

怛姪他 儻弭尼民達哩 室哩盧迦(引)盧 枳儻 室哩輪攞陀唎儻 惡
矩比 姪哩底 奴麗 矩都軍底 矩都屈此 雞唎底矩比儻

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b15–18)

Reconstructed Indic transliteration:

*tadyathā nīminimindhari trilokālo kani trisūladharāṇi akupī tiriti nili
kudtokuṅto kudtokupī kurtikupini*

The list of calamities reads as follows:

Quotation:

擁護擁護我某甲於一切恐怖處 於一切疾病苦痛處 於一切憂愁相惱
處於一切 毒蟲毒藥處 於一切鬼魅厭禱處 於一切王賊水火處 於一
切猛獸驚怖處 於一切謗讟言訟處 於一切怨家鬥諍處 於一切身意
惡業處 所有語業四過處 於一切厄難危亡處 并執金剛神 常衛護
我某甲 并諸眷屬莎(引)訶(引)

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b18–25)

Translation:

Protect [us]! Protect me and others from all frights, all diseases and pain, all kinds of miseries and afflictions, all venomous insects and poisonous herbs, all evil spirits and imprecations, all kings and thieves and water and fire, all wild animals and fear, all malicious accuse and arguments, all enemies and fights, all evil practices of body, mind and the four errors of verbal actions, all distress and indolence. Together with Vajrapāṇi always protect me and others together with our kinsmen. *svāhā*

Mantra 4

The fourth *mantra* of the Chinese *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* is in accordance with the fifth Tibetan *mantra* and goes as follows:

復說咒曰

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b26)

The *mantra* is now also spoken as:

Quotation:

恒姪他 呬里呬里弭里弭里 畢舍脂鉢拏 攝伐里止里莎訶

(Taishō XXI 1362 at 882b27–28)

Reconstructed Indic transliteration:

tadyathā hili hili mili mili piśāci pārṇāśabari cili svāhā

4.2 The Tibetan version

The Tibetan translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* was included in many Kangyur collections. The term “Kangyur” (*bka’ ’gyur*, also commonly transliterated as Kanjur) literally means “translated words (of the Buddha)”. It comprises the entire collection of texts regarded as *Buddhavacana* “the word of the Buddha” translated into Tibetan. The history of translation, when the Sanskrit texts were brought from India to Tibet, started in the mid-seventh century CE and continued for a long period in various monasteries reaching a heyday in the early ninth century. At that time the already existing translations were revised and standardized under royal patronage.²⁵ The first collection of handwritten Tibetan translations was compiled at the monastery of Narthang in the fourteenth century, which no longer exists. This so-called Old Narthang Kangyur is considered to be the archetype of all the succeeding redactions. Copies of it were brought to all parts of Tibet and evolved into two different branches. This caused a division in the line of transmission into two main traditions, the eastern and western branch, and thus two groups of recensions. The eastern branch became later known as the Tshal pa group, whereas the western branch gave rise to the Them spangs ma lineage.

It is important to keep in mind that there does not exist one standard and authorized edition of the Tibetan Kangyur. Various editions, both manuscript and block print editions, always existed side by side, showing considerable differences in the classification of the texts, content, and order in which the scriptures are arranged. These disagreements result in the fact that the form of one individual text may vary in the several recensions. The usual definition of a canon does thereby not apply for the body of translated Tibetan texts, which is nevertheless often called a ‘canon’ because it represents a collection of authoritative scriptures. Most of the editions of the Kangyur preserved until today date back to the eighteenth century.

²⁵ For a survey in the field of Kangyur studies in general, and an extensive discussion of the history of the Tibetan Kangyur in particular, with references to other publications, see Eimer 1992. Further studies of several editions of the Tibetan Kangyur and historical considerations are available with Harrison 1992: xvi–xxiv, and Skilling 1994a: xl–xlvi. For a recent publication, see Tauscher’s entry “Kanjur” in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism* Vol. 1 (2015).

4.2.1 General notes on the text

Date of translation

The *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* was translated into Tibetan under the title *'Phags pa mtshan mo bzang po zhes bya ba'i mdo* by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, and Ye shes sde. The Indian scholar Jinamitra was one of the leading translators of Sanskrit texts into Tibetan in the late eighth and early ninth century. He worked on a variety of translations belonging to different literary genres, such as Vinaya, Abhidharma, Cittamātra, *sūtra*, and *dhāraṇī* and *rakṣā* scriptures. Even though we do not know the exact date of Jinamitra, as well as of any of the contemporary translators, we can establish a rather firm date for the Tibetan translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*.

Our earliest records, which mention the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*, are the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue and the *'Phang thang ma* catalogue, two of three catalogues of Buddhist texts compiled under royal patronage.²⁶ The *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue, which emerged at the royal palace of Stong thang ldan dkar or Stong thang lhan kar, is included in the later canonical collection in the Tengyur section and lists all texts present at the palace that had been translated and revised by that time, including the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*.²⁷ The dating of the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue is not undisputed but out of the variety of suggested dates, Halkias, Dotson, and Herrmann-Pfandt agree on the year 812 CE.²⁸ The *'Phang thang ma* catalogue was long considered to be lost and came to light only a few years ago. The date of its composition is highly discussed in scholarly works. Halkias argued that the *'Phang thang ma* catalogue refers to the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue and therefore must have been compiled after the latter one,²⁹ while Herrmann-Pfandt speaks in favour of an earlier time of origin, that is the year 806 CE.³⁰

²⁶ The third catalogue, the *Mchims phu ma* catalogue, is at present regarded missing.

²⁷ The cataloguing process is recorded in Bu ston's work *Chos 'byung*, which Obermiller translated as follows (1932: 191): "In the year of the dragon the teachers residing in the palace of Den-kar, the translators Ban-de Pal-tseg, the Ban-de Nāgendra and others made a list of the titles of the sacred texts that were translated in Tibet, as well as the number of divisions and Ślokas contained in them, and wrote all this down in the form of a catalogue."

²⁸ For a discussion of the date of the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue, see Halkias 2004: 48 n. 4, Dotson 2007: 3 n. 7, and especially Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: xviii–xxii.

²⁹ Cf. Halkias 2004: 54–58.

³⁰ Cf. Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: xxiv–xxvi. The present study is not the place to discuss both lines of arguments in order to draw a definite conclusion.

Another date we have to take into consideration is that of the compilation of the *Madhyavyutpatti* (Tib. *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*), which originated at about the same time as the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue, and “which now unanimously is taken to be 814 A.D.”³¹ The Tengyur’s colophon names those scholars who worked on its formation, among them Jinamitra and Ye she sde, the translators of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*. The redaction of the Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionary *Mahāvyutpatti* (Tib. *Sgra bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen mo/po*) and its commentary *Madhyavyutpatti* is usually connected to the reign of Khri Lde srong bstan, alias Sad na legs (798–800, 802–815),³² who directed the compilation in order to standardize the Tibetan translation practice. A team of Indian and Tibetan translators collaborated on the bilingual lexicon, putting together grammatical and lexical rules for rendering Buddhist terminology from Sanskrit into Tibetan, which then became a standard reference.

Given the historical considerations we can conclude that the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* was translated into Tibetan in the early ninth century CE, at about the same time as the Mūlasarvāstivādin *mahāsūtras*.³³ The translations attributed to Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, and Ye shes sde are excellent, clearly rendered from one language into the other and in accordance with the *Mahāvyutpatti*, so that the quality is of the highest standard of translation. The leading translator Jinamitra is mentioned as a *vinayadhara* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins in Vinaya colophons.³⁴ Furthermore, King Khri Gtsug lde brtsan, alias Ral pa can (815–841)³⁵ enacted in a royal edict three regulations concerning the translations from Sanskrit into Tibetan, of which the first prescription forbid the translations of any Śrāvākayāna texts other than those of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. These regulations are cited by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–

³¹ Panglung 1994: 161. See further Tucci 1985: 48 n. 1, and Scherrer-Schaub 2002: 280f., who agree on the date 814 CE for the compilation of the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue.

³² For the dates of the Tibetan kings at the turn of the ninth century, see Dotson 2007: 15.

³³ The *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue lists a group of nine *mahāsūtras* preserved in Tibetan translation to which Skilling adds the *Vaiśālīpraveśa-mahāsūtra* in his important edition and study of the Tibetan *mahāsūtras* (1994a, 1997a). The *mahāsūtras* represent one category of the Śrāvākayāna *raṅṅā* literature (see chapter 1.1 of the present work for a classification of *raṅṅā* texts). For the date of translation of the *mahāsūtras*, see Skilling 1997a: 140f.

³⁴ As an example serves the colophon to the Vinaya-vibhaṅga (D 3 ’dul ba, 269a6): *’phags pa gzhi thams cad yod par smra ba’i ’dul ba ’dzin pa kha che’i bye brag tu smra ba’i slob dpon dzi na mi tra* | “Jinamitra, the *vinayadhara* of the noble Mūlasarvāstivādins, a master of the Kashmiri Vaiḅṅṅasikas.” Cf. Mvy 5142: Skt. *vinayadhara* for Tib. *’dul ba ’dzin pa*.

³⁵ Date according to Dotson 2007: 6.

1364)³⁶ in his chronicle of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism *Chos 'byung*, or *History of Buddhism* (lit. *Origin of the Dharma*): “With regard to the different sects he prescribed that (works) other than Mūlasarvāstivāda as well as mantras were not to be translated”.³⁷ All this points to a Mūlasarvāstivādin affiliation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*.

Classification in the Tibetan Kangyur

The classification of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* in the Tibetan Kangyur is varied. The *sūtra* is included in the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue and in the *'Phang thang ma* catalogue. The *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue classes the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* (Ldk 228) under miscellaneous Mahāyāna-sūtras (Tib. *Theg pa chen po 'i mdo sde sna tshogs la*).³⁸ The *'Phang thang ma* catalogue lists our title (Ptm 346) under miscellaneous *dhāraṇīs* (Tib. *Gzungs che phra sna tshogs la*).³⁹ In his *History of Buddhism*, Bu ston places the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* under Sūtras together with the two Mūlasarvāstivādin *mahāsūtras*, the *Mahāsamāja* and the *Ātānāṭīya*. In the catalogue section he points out:

'dir kha cig gis gser 'od dam pa (=Nos. 208-210?) *rin po che 'i tog* (=No. 223)/*dkon mchog ta la la/mtshan mo bzang mo* (=No. 46)/*'dus pa chen po* (=No. 374)/*rdo rje snying po* (=No. 224)/*nyi ma 'i snying po* (=No. 338)/*kun tu rgyu ba dang kun tu rgyu ba ma yin pa dang mthun pa* (=No. 13) *la sogs pa bris pa ni nor ba yin te mdo dang rgyud ma 'dres par phye ba 'i dkar chag dag tu mdor bshad pa 'i phyir rol*

(Nishioka 1983: 64f.)

³⁶ Date according to Ruegg 1966: 3.

³⁷ Vogel 1985: 109f.

³⁸ Cf. Lalou 1953: 324, and Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 120f. In the edition of the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue Herrmann-Pfandt mentions, by a slip in the line, a second translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* done by Viśuddhasiṃha and Ye shes snying po together with the revisers Vidyākarasiṃha and Ye shes sde based on Bu ston's Tantra catalogue. This is, however, mistaken and this translation cannot be found in Bu ston's work.

³⁹ Cf. Halkias 2004: 80.

Some list here [under Kriyā Tantra] the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama*, the *Ratnaketu*, the *Bhadrakarātrī*, the *Mahāsamāja*, the *Vajramaṇḍa*, the *Sūryagarbha*, the *Āṭānāṭīya*, etc.: this is mistaken, because the catalogues which clearly distinguish the Sūtra and Tantra place them under Sūtra.

(tr. Skilling 1997a: 79)

In his later Tantra Catalogue (Tib. *Rgyud 'bum gyi dkar chag*), Bu ston changes the classification of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* and places it under Kriyā Tantra (Tib. *'Bya ba'i rgyud*) in the first of two sections (Tib. *Rigs so so'i rgyud*). Within this section he assigns the *sūtra* to the first family, the Tathāgatha family (Tib. *De bzhin gshegs pa*) and finally to the subsection male and female messengers of the family (Tib. *Rigs kyi pho nya pho mo*).⁴⁰ The classification of a Śrāvakayāna text under Tantra seems to be odd at a first glance. The Kriyā Tantra, the lowest of the four classes of Tantra, includes ritual texts employed for blessing, protection, and healing, and consequently comprises *rakṣā* and *dhāraṇī* literature. This fact justifies the classification of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* under Tantra as Skilling already stated:

It may seem surprising that a number of Śrāvakayāna texts—including the *Mahāsamāja*, *Āṭānāṭīya*, and *Vaiśālīpraveśa*, as well as the *Bhadrakarātrī*—are classified under Tantra and Dhāraṇī in the Tibetan Kanjur, side-by-side with texts of the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. When we note that the Theravādin counterparts of several of these are paritta—protective texts to be recited in ritual contexts—it should be less surprising.⁴¹

This uncertainty about where to place the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* finally resulted in an assignment to two or three different categories, namely the Sūtra, Tantra, and Dhāraṇī divisions of the Tibetan Kangyur. The classification of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* in the extant editions of the Tibetan Kangyur varies according to the different lineages, the Tshal pa group, Them spangs ma lineage and the mixed group. Some editions of the Kangyur contain two versions of the *sūtra*, other editions even three recensions. The Kangyur editions of the Tshal pa group do not coincide, so that some incorporated one version of the text, others two and still others even three recensions in the three sections Sūtra, Tantra, and Dhāraṇī, while the Them spangs ma group exclusively places the *sūtra* in the Tantra division. The Lhasa and the Narthang edition, as well as the Lang mdo Collection of the mixed group of the

⁴⁰ Cf. Eimer 1989: § 244.

⁴¹ Skilling 1997a: 78.

Kangyur editions contain one recension of the text under Sūtra. The *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* also is included in the Newark manuscript from Bathang, in the Gondhla Collection, and is listed in the catalogue of the Early Mustang Kangyur.⁴² The *sūtra* is not included in the Phug brag Kangyur.

Recensions

The *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* is included in the following editions of the Tibetan Kangyur:⁴³

Tshal pa group

Berlin Kangyur: B 320 mdo sde, sa 222a2–225a2 (vol. 80); B 973 rgyud, ya 120b4–123b3 (vol. 108).

Cone Kangyur (*co ne bka' 'gyur*): C 604 rgyud, ya 98a6–100b6 (vol. 24); C 952 mdo sde, sa 200b5–203b2 (vol. 52).

Derge Kangyur (*sde dge bka' 'gyur*): D 313 mdo sde, sa 161b1–163b5 (vol. 72); D 617 rgyud, ba 56a7–58b3 (vol. 91); D 974 gzugs, wam 90a3–92a7 (vol. 102).

Lithang Kangyur (*li thang bka' 'gyur*): J 253 mdo sde, sa 175b4–178a2 (vol. 67).

Peking Kangyur (*pe cin bka' 'gyur*): Q 599 rgyud, ya 96b3–98b8 (vol. 11, p. 216); Q 979 mdo sna tshogs, shu 171a7–173b5 (vol. 39, p. 70).

Urga Kangyur (*u rga bka' 'gyur*): U 313 mdo sde, sa 161b1–163b5 (vol. 72); U 618 rgyud, ba 56a7–58b3 (vol. 91); U 976 gzugs, wam 90a3–92a7 (vol. 102).

Ragya Kangyur (*rwa rgya bka' 'gyur*): R 313 mdo sde, sa 161b1–163b5 (vol. 72); R 617 rgyud, ba 56a7–58b3 (vol. 91); R 955 gzugs, wam 90a3–92a7 (vol. 98).

⁴² No copy of the Early Mustang Kangyur is extant, only its catalogue (*dkar chag*) survived. For a structured edition of the catalogue, see Eimer 1999.

⁴³ The following list was established on the basis of the online databases *Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies*, provided by the University of Vienna: <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=313> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020), and *The Buddhist Canons Research Database*, a project of the American Institute of Buddhist Studies (AIBS), and the Columbia University Center for Buddhist Studies (CCBS): http://databases.aibs.columbia.edu/index.php?id=a0c78f129e4e06eba633a962c157995f&enc=sanskrit_romanized_title_4_search&coll=kangyur (last retrieved on 20.11.2020).

Wanli Kangyur: W 50.29 Pander Pantheon 50 (1111)./Wanli Kanjur, rgyud, vol. YA, fol. 96b3–98b8.

Them spangs ma group

London Kangyur: L 465 rgyud, pa 358b5–361b1 (vol. 83).

Stog Kangyur (*stog pho brang bris ma/ bka' 'gyur*): S 575 rgyud, pa 405b2–408b6 (vol. 104).

Tokyo Kangyur: T 570 rgyud, pa 378b3–381b5 (vol. 109).

Ulanbaatar Kangyur: V 644 rgyud, pa 365b2–368b5 (vol. 109).

Shey Kangyur (*shel mkhar bris ma/ bka' 'gyur*): Z 588 rgyud, pa 419b8–422b7 (vol. 100).

Mixed group

Lhasa Kangyur (*lha sa bka' 'gyur*): H 317 mdo sde, la 248a7–252a4 (vol. 72).

Narthang Kangyur (*snar thang bka' 'gyur*): N 298 mdo sde, la 253b1–257a6 (vol. 72).

Lang mdo Collection: Lg 29.111, mdo ha–l 15 301a5–303b2.

Independent group

Newark Kangyur from Bathang: E 149, 214b9–216b2 (vol. 19).

Gondhla Collection: Go 36,92, ka–ma 44a1–46b2 (vol. 36).

Early Mustang Kangyur: EM 134 gzungs 'dus ka pa / gzungs 'bum cha; EM 412 gzungs 'dus ka pa / gzungs 'bum cha.

Title

The Sanskrit title is given in Tibetan transcription in three slightly different variants. The recensions included in the Sūtra division of the Kangyur (C 952, D 313, H 317, N 298, U 313, Q 979) and the version of the Stog (S 575) and Shey Kangyur (Z 588)

included in the Tantra division read *ārya-bhadrakarātrī-nāma-sūtra*. The other recensions included in the Tantra or Dhāraṇī division (C 604, D 617, D 974, U 976, Q 599) give the title *ārya-bhadrarātrī-nāma-sūtra*. The independent Kangyur from Gondhla (Go 36,92) reads *arya-bhaddrakarātri-nama-sutra*. The first variant is confirmed by the two Central Asian Sanskrit manuscripts, which read *bhadragarātrīya* (SHT III 816 r3) and *bhadrakarātrīya* (SI 2044 4v4).⁴⁴ In his Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary Lokesh Chandra translates the Tibetan word *bzang po* with Sanskrit *bhadra* or *bhadra*, and Tibetan *mtshan mo* with Sanskrit *rātrī*.⁴⁵

Colophon

The translators' colophon is mentioned in D 617, D 974, U 976, Q 599, and Z 588, and runs as follows:

'phags pa mchan mo bzang po zhes bya ba 'i mdo rdzogs so // // rgya gar gyi mkhan po dzi na mi tra dang / dā na shī la dang / zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban dhe ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te / skad gsar bcad kyis kyang bcos nas gtan la phab pa // //

The noble *Discourse on an Auspicious Night* is finished. Translated, put into the new language⁴⁶ and finalized by the Indian preceptors Jinamitra and Dānaśīla, and the great editor, the translator, the monk Ye shes sde.

Other versions (C 604, C 952, D 313, Go 36,92, H 317, N 298, U 313, Q 979, and S 575) finish with the conclusion:

'phags pa mtshan mo bzang po zhes bya ba 'i mdo rdzogs so // //

The noble *Discourse on an Auspicious Night* is finished.

We can make out two variant readings of the title and colophon and, as we will see, of the *mantras* according to the location within the Kangyur. That is, the Sūtra division on one side, and the Tantra and Dhāraṇī division on the other side. The

⁴⁴ See chapter 2 of the present work for more details on the Sanskrit title of the *sūtra*.

⁴⁵ Cf. Lokesh Chandra 1971: 2064, 1968.

⁴⁶ The expression *skad gsar bcad kyis kyang bcos* usually indicates the revision of an already existing translation in line with the new standards regarding linguistic and grammatical aspects collated in the *Mahāvīyutpatti*.

recension in the Shey Kangyur takes up a special status and cannot be attributed to either side. Interestingly, these variations do not occur in the different lineages of the Kangyur following the Tshal pa, Them spangs ma, and mixed group, as we would have expected, but within one edition of the Kangyur with different recensions of the text.

The Tibetan title states that this text was translated from “the language of India” (Tib. *rgya gar skad*), which usually means the Sanskrit language. The Sanskrit title as well as the translators’ colophon give reason to assume that the Tibetan translation was done from a Sanskrit model. If this is the case this text did not come down to us. The fact that there is no Sanskrit original gives rise to another assumption. The Tibetan translation could well have been done from the Chinese version, since the latter one was produced earlier and both recensions coincide at large. But why should two Indian *paṇḍitas* mentioned as translators in the colophon translate a work from a language they are not trained in? This leads us to the question about the authenticity of titles and colophons in the Tibetan Kangyur in general. Skilling examined the titles of 17 and the colophons of five Tibetan translations, mostly *sūtras* from the Mūlasarvāstivāda school, and comes to the conclusion that they are for the most part reliable. He also remarks that, nevertheless, they should be treated with caution and carefully checked in all editions of the Tshal pa and Them spang ma groups, as well as in available manuscripts.⁴⁷ It was common practice that the compilers of one edition of a Kangyur added colophons later on the basis of oral information, or by adopting colophons from other manuscripts.

Since some of the Kangyurs contain multiple copies of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* of slightly different readings, with or without colophon, in the Sūtra, Tantra, and Dhāraṇī sections, it cannot be ruled out that these versions are not only copies of different recensions, but also different translations of the same text. Whatever might be the case, the parallel with its Chinese counterpart is so striking that I cannot give a satisfactory answer from which language the Tibetan *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* was translated as long as no Indic original was found. Yet, it seems plausible, supported by the authentic Sanskrit title, that the colophon here is reliable, which means that the Tibetan translation of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* was done from a lost Indic model.

⁴⁷ Cf. Skilling 1994b.

Structure

The structure and content of the Tibetan text agrees to a large extent with Yijing's Chinese translation Taishō XXI 1362 of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*. After the title and the invocation, the *sūtra* opens with the introductory narrative, parallel to the Pāli and Chinese versions in the *Majjhima-nikāya* and *Madhyama-āgama*. The Buddha then pronounces the common verses. It is, however, surprising that the verse on the aspiration for the welfare of all sentient beings was placed in between the common verses, unlike in the Chinese protective version Taishō XXI 1362, since the appendix only begins after the *gāthās*. Here the Tibetan text follows the structure of the Sanskrit manuscript SI 2044. The core passage is followed by an appendix, giving *mantras* and their effects as well as ritual instructions. Like in the Chinese version there is a narrative break and a change of voice before the last two *mantras* are pronounced. This passage opens with another statement of homage to the Tathāgatas, Arhats, and Samyaksambuddhas of the past, present, and future. The appendix closes with a standard concluding formula.

The structure can be summarized as follows:

0. Title and invocation
 - 0.1. Sanskrit title
 - 0.2. Tibetan title
 - 0.3. Invocation

Part I: Core passage

1. Introduction (*nidāna*): Rājagṛha
2. Introductory narration: a god appears before a monk and tells him to request the *Discourse on an auspicious night* from the Buddha
3. The monk approaches the Buddha and relates his conversation with the god
4. The Buddha teaches the requested discourse
 - 4.1. Common verses 1–3
 - 4.2. The verse on the aspiration for the welfare of all sentient beings
 - 4.3. Common verse 4

Part II: Appendix with five *mantras*

5. The Buddha teaches the *mantras* in order to protect all sentient beings
 - 5.1. The first three *mantras* (*mantrapadas* of Drāmiḍa)
 - 5.2. The effects of the *mantras*: awakening, list of calamities

6. Narrative break
 - 6.1. Statement of homage
 - 6.2. The 4th *mantra* (*vidyā*) and its effects: protection
 - 6.3. The 5th *mantra*
7. Conclusion
8. Colophon

4.2.2 Notes on the present edition

The critical edition of both the main text and the *mantras* is based on the Derge (D 313, 617, 974), Lhasa (H 317), Peking (Q 599, 979), Shey (Z 588), and Stog (S 575) editions, as well as the Gondhla Collection (Go 36,92) of the Tibetan Kangyur. The facsimile edition of the eighteenth century Derge Kangyur, the manuscript Kangyur produced at the Shey palace in the 1730s, and the early eighteenth century manuscript Stog Palace Kangyur are provided by the *Buddhist Digital Resource Center* (formerly TBRC).⁴⁸ The e-text of the Lhasa Kangyur is available through the *Asian Classics Input Project* (ACIP)⁴⁹ and the printed edition made in Peking in 1737 with the edition by Suzuki (1955–1961). Digitized pages of the Gondhla proto-Kangyur compiled in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century in Lahul, northern India, are accessible through the online database *Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies*.⁵⁰

Even if it is common practice to publish critical editions in Romanised transliteration, I here present the main textual body of the *sūtra* in Tibetan script, while annotations are given in Wylie transliteration. The reader who is not familiar with the Tibetan language might have difficulties even with a Romanised text, especially since there are multiple transliteration systems, whereas the non-Western scholar is often not familiar with transliterations. The *mantras* are edited separately, otherwise almost every syllable would bear a footnote, rendering the text illegible. The wording of the *mantras* in the present edition conforms to the parameters of D 313.

⁴⁸ <http://www.tbrc.org> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020).

⁴⁹ <http://tibetan.works/etext/reader.php?collection=kangyur&index=317> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020). The ACIP input versions are, however, frequently published unchecked and are rife with typographical errors.

⁵⁰ <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=313> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020). On the Gondhla Collection in general, see introduction to Tauscher 2008.

This edition strictly preserves the original punctuation, and variants are recorded in the notes. Only the *tsheg shad*, which is used instead of a normal *shad* after the first syllable in a line, was not maintained. The employment of the *tsheg* has been standardized according to modern editorial practices. This punctuation mark leads to myriad irregularities, and in many cases it is not at all easy to decide whether there is a *tsheg* or not. In addition, the Tibetan syllable always serves as reference and not the complete word. In other words, when H reads *bha dra ka rā tī* instead of *bha dra ka rā trī*, it is indicated with H: *tī*. Where it is not obvious, the word *for* is added. Unfortunately, some of the reproductions of some manuscript and xylograph Kangyurs, in particular the reproduction of the Peking xylograph, are poorly printed and copied and it is often difficult to see the distinction between *ba* and *pa*, and short *da* and long *nga*, what makes it difficult to decide which letter was used.

Sigla

D	Derge Kangyur	Q	Peking Kangyur
Go	Gondhla Manuscript Kangyur	S	Stog Kangyur
H	Lhasa Kangyur	Z	Shey Kangyur

4.2.3 Critical edition

༄༅། །འཕགས་པ་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོ་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་མདོ།

[0.] ༄༅། །ཀྱུ་གར་སྐད་དུ། ལྷ་བྱ་རྣམ་པ་ཀ་⁵¹རྩ་⁵²འི་⁵³ལྷ་མ་སྤྱ་བྱ་⁵⁴

⁵⁵བོད་སྐད་དུ། ⁵⁶འཕགས་པ་མཚན་མོ་⁵⁷བཟང་པོ་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་⁵⁸མདོ་⁵⁹།།

⁵¹ D 617, 974, Q 599 omit: *ka*.

⁵² Q 979 omits: *rā*.

⁵³ H: *tī*; S: *tri*.

⁵⁴ Go: *aryabhadrakarātrinamasutra* for *āryabhadrakarātrīnāmasūtra*.

⁵⁵ Q 979 inserts: *//*.

⁵⁶ Go inserts: */*.

⁵⁷ Go: *ma*.

⁵⁸ Z: *shes bya 'i* for *shes bya ba 'i*.

⁵⁹ Go: *mdo*'.

སངས་རྒྱལ་དང་⁶⁰བྱུང་ཚུབ་སེམས་དཔའ་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ།།

[1.] འདི་རྒྱལ་བདག་གིས་ཐོས་པ་⁶¹དུས་གཅིག་⁶²ན། ⁶³བཙོམ་ལྡན་འདས་རྒྱལ་པོའི་ཁབ་ན་
⁶⁴འོད་མའི་ཚལ་⁶⁵བྱ་ག་ལན་ད་⁶⁶ག་གནས་པ་⁶⁷ན་བཞུགས་ཏེ།⁶⁸

[2.] དེའི་ཚེ་དགོ་སྤོང་ཞིག་རྒྱལ་པོའི་ཁབ་ཀྱི་⁶⁹ཚུ་ཏ་⁷⁰པོ་⁷¹ཏའི་འགམ་ན་འདུག་གོ།⁷² དེ་
ནས་སྟེ་ལ་དོག་⁷³མཚོག་དང་ལྡན་པ་ཞིག་ནམ་སྟོས་ནས་⁷⁴དགོ་སྤོང་དེ་⁷⁵ག་ལ་བ་དེར་སོང་
སྟེ་ཕྱིན་ནས་⁷⁶ཚུ་ཏ་⁷⁷པོ་ཏའི་⁷⁸འགམ་ཐམས་ཅད་སྤང་བ་རྒྱ་ཆེན་པོས་ཁྱབ་པར་སྤང་⁷⁹བར་
⁸⁰བྱས་ཏེ།⁸¹ དགོ་སྤོང་དེ་⁸²ལ་འདི་རྒྱལ་ཅེས་སྟུགས་སོ།།⁸³ དགོ་སྤོང་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་
པོའི་མདོ་སྡེ་ཤེས་སམ། དེས་⁸⁴འདི་རྒྱལ་ཅེས་སྟུགས་སོ།། ལྟ་⁸⁵བདག་གིས་ནི་⁸⁶མཚན་མོ་བཟང་

60 Go, H, Q 599 insert: /.
61 Go: pa'i.
62 Q 979: cig.
63 Go inserts: /.
64 Go inserts: /.
65 Go: 'tshal.
66 Q 599: dā; S, Z: ta.
67 Z inserts: nas ba.
68 Go inserts: /.
69 Q 979: gyi.
70 Q 979: te; D 974, Q 599, S, Z insert: la.
71 S, Z: po.
72 H, Q 599, 979, Z omit: /.
73 S, Z inserts: bzang po.
74 Go inserts: /.
75 Go omits: de.
76 H, S, Z insert: /; Go inserts: //.
77 D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z insert: la.
78 S, Z: ta; Go: da'i.
79 D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z omit: ba rgya chen pos khyab par snang.
80 Go omits: snang bar.
81 D 974, Q 599 omit: /.
82 Go inserts: dag.
83 Q 979 omits: /.
84 Q 979: ngas.
85 H inserts: /.
86 Go omits: ni.

བོའི་མདོ་སྡེ་མ་འཚལ་⁸⁷ བ། ལྷ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་བོའི་མདོ་སྡེ་མཁུན་ཏམ་⁸⁸ མི་⁸⁹
 མཁུན་⁹⁰ |⁹¹ དེས་འདི་རྣམ་ཅེས་སྤྲུམ་སོ། དགེ་སྦྱོང་⁹² བདག་གིས་ཀྱང་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་བོའི་
 མདོ་སྡེ་མི་⁹³ ཤེས་སོ། ལྷ་⁹⁴ འོ་ན་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་བོའི་མདོ་སྡེ་འཚལ་⁹⁵ བ་དེ་ལྷ་བྱ་⁹⁶ སུ་མཆིས།
⁹⁷ དེས་འདི་⁹⁸ རྣམ་ཅེས་སྤྲུམ་སོ།⁹⁹ རྒྱལ་བོའི་ཁབ་ཀྱི་འོད་མའི་ཚལ་¹⁰⁰ བྱ་ཀ་ལན་ད་¹⁰¹ ཀ་
 གནས་པ་འདི་ན་¹⁰² བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་བཞུགས་ཀྱིས་¹⁰³ |¹⁰⁴ ཁྱོད་¹⁰⁵ བཅོམ་¹⁰⁶ ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱི་
¹⁰⁷ ཐད་དུ་སོང་ལ་ཞུས་ཏེ། བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས་དེ་ཁྱོད་ལ་ཇི་ལྟར་¹⁰⁸ ལྟང་བཞུན་¹⁰⁹ པ་དེ་
 བཞིན་དུ་བྱུང་¹¹⁰ ལ་བཙོན་པར་གྱིས་ཤིག་¹¹¹ ཅེས་སྤྲུམ་ནས།¹¹² ལྷ་དེ་དེ་ཉིད་དུ་མི་¹¹³ ལྷང་
 བར་གྱུར་¹¹⁴ ཏོ།།

87 Go: *mtshal*.

88 Go, H insert: /.

89 Z omits: *mi*.

90 Go: *mkhyend*.

91 Q 979 omits: /.

92 H inserts: /.

93 Go: *myi*.

94 H inserts: /.

95 Go: *'tshald*.

96 D 313, Go, H, Q 979: *da ltar* for *de lta bu*.

97 Go inserts: /.

98 H: *di*.

99 Q 979 omits: /.

100 Go: *mtshal*.

101 Q 599, S, Z: *ta*.

102 Go inserts: /.

103 H, S, Z: *kyi*.

104 Q 979 inserts: /.

105 Q 599 inserts: *kyi*.

106 Q 599: *com*.

107 Z: *kyis*.

108 S, Z omit: *ji ltar*.

109 Go: *bstand*.

110 Go: *song*; H: *gzung*.

111 Q 599 inserts: /.

112 D 617, 974, Q 599 omit: /.

113 Go: *myi*.

114 Go: *gyurd*.

[3.] དེ་ནས་དག་སློང་དེ་ནང་པར་¹¹⁵ལངས་ནས་¹¹⁶བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ག་ལ་བ་དེར་སོང་སྟེ་
¹¹⁷ལྷོན་¹¹⁸ནས།¹¹⁹བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱི་¹²⁰ཞབས་ལ་མགོ་¹²¹བོས་ཕྱག་འཚལ་¹²²ཏེ།¹²³ལྷོགས་
གཅིག་ཏུ་འདུག་གོ།¹²⁴ ལྷོགས་གཅིག་ཏུ་འདུག་ནས་¹²⁵དག་¹²⁶སློང་དེས་¹²⁷བཅོམ་ལྡན་
འདས་ལ་འདི་སྐད་ཅེས་གསོལ་ཏོ།། བལྟོན་པ་¹²⁸མདང་དགུང་ཚོངས་¹²⁹ནས་བདག་གི་
¹³⁰དེར་སྟེ་¹³¹ལ་དོག་མཚོག་¹³²དང་ལྡན་པ་ཞིག་བདག་ག་ལ་བ་དེར་མཚིས་ཏེ། ཆབ་ཏུ་
¹³³ལོ་ཏེ་¹³⁴འགྲམ་¹³⁵ཐམས་ཅད་སྣང་བ་རྒྱ་ཆེན་པོས་ལྲབ་པར་¹³⁶སྣང་བར་¹³⁷བགྱིས་
¹³⁸ནས་¹³⁹བདག་ལ་འདི་སྐད་¹⁴⁰མཚེའོ་¹⁴¹།། དག་སློང་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་མཚན་མོ་¹⁴²བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་
སྟེ་ཤེས་སམ། བདག་གིས་¹⁴³དེ་ལ་འདི་སྐད་ཅེས་བགྱིས་¹⁴⁴སོ།། ལྟ་¹⁴⁵བདག་གིས་ནི་མཚན་མོ་

115 S, Z: *nas* for *nang bar*.
116 Go, S, Z insert: /.
117 Q 979 inserts: /.
118 Go: *phyind*.
119 Q 979 omits: /.
120 Q 599: *kyis*.
121 Go: *mgo* '.
122 H: *btsal*.
123 D 617, 974, H, Q 599, 979, S, Z omit: /.
124 H, Q 599, 979, S omit: /.
125 Go inserts: /.
126 Z: *de ge*.
127 S inserts: /.
128 H inserts: /.
129 Q 599: *rmos*.
130 Z: *gis*.
131 Go omits: *lha*.
132 S, Z omit: *mchog*.
133 H: *tu*; D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z insert: *la*.
134 Go: *da 'i*.
135 Go: *khyim*.
136 D 617, 974, Q 599: *pas*.
137 S, Z omit: *snang bar*.
138 Q 599: *gyid*.
139 Go inserts : /.
140 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z insert: *ces*.
141 Go, Q 979: '*chi'o*.
142 Go: *ma*.
143 Z: *gi*.
144 Q 599: *bgyi*.

བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་ལྷེ་མ་འཚལ་¹⁴⁶ བ། ལྷ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་¹⁴⁷ མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་ལྷེ་མཁུན་
¹⁴⁸ ཏམ་¹⁴⁹ མི་¹⁵⁰ མཁུན་¹⁵¹ དེ་¹⁵² འདི་སྐད་ཅེས་མཚེའོ། དག་སྒོང་¹⁵³ བདག་གིས་ཀྱང་མཚན་
 མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་ལྷེ་མི་ཤེ¹⁵⁴ ས་སོ། ལྷ་¹⁵⁵ འོ་ན་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་ལྷེ་འཚལ་¹⁵⁶ བ་
 དེ་¹⁵⁷ ལྷ་བུ་¹⁵⁸ ལྷ་མཚེས།¹⁵⁹ དེ་¹⁶⁰ འདི་སྐད་ཅེས་མཚེའོ།¹⁶¹ རྒྱལ་པོའི་ཁབ་¹⁶² ཀྱི་འོད་མའི་
 ཚལ་¹⁶³ བྱ་ཀ་ལན་ད་¹⁶⁴ ཀ་གནས་པ་¹⁶⁵ རྩ་¹⁶⁶ བཅོམ་ལྷན་འདས་བཞུགས་ཀྱིས། ཁྱོད་¹⁶⁷ བཅོམ་
 ལྷན་འདས་¹⁶⁸ ཀྱི་ཐད་དུ་སོང་ལ་ལྷས་ཏེ།¹⁶⁹ བཅོམ་ལྷན་འདས་ཀྱིས་¹⁷⁰ དེ་ཁྱོད་¹⁷¹ ལ་ཇི་ལྟར་
 ལྷང་བལྟན་¹⁷² པ་དེ་¹⁷³ བཞིན་དུ་¹⁷⁴ ཟུང་¹⁷⁵ ལ་བཙོན་པར་གྱིས་ཤིག་ཅེས་སྣང་ནས།¹⁷⁶ ལྷ་དེ་

¹⁴⁵ Go: *lha 'i*; H inserts: *.*

¹⁴⁶ Go: *mtshald*.

¹⁴⁷ D 313, H, Q 979, Z insert: *lta*.

¹⁴⁸ Go: *mkyend*.

¹⁴⁹ Go, H insert: *.*

¹⁵⁰ Go: *myi*.

¹⁵¹ Go: *mkyend*.

¹⁵² D 617, 974, Q 599 insert: *bdag la*; S, Z: *des bdag la ni* for *de*.

¹⁵³ H inserts: *.*

¹⁵⁴ Go: *myi*.

¹⁵⁵ H inserts: *.*

¹⁵⁶ Go: *'tshald*.

¹⁵⁷ S: *da*.

¹⁵⁸ D 313, Go, H, Q 979: *da ltar* for *de lta bu*; S, Z omit: *bu*.

¹⁵⁹ Q 979 inserts: *.*

¹⁶⁰ D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z: *des*.

¹⁶¹ S, Z insert: *dge slong*.

¹⁶² H: *khyab*.

¹⁶³ Go: *'tshal*.

¹⁶⁴ Q 599: *dā*; S, Z: *ta*.

¹⁶⁵ D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z insert: *'di*.

¹⁶⁶ Go, S, Z insert: *.*

¹⁶⁷ H inserts: *kyi*.

¹⁶⁸ D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z omit: *bcom ldan 'das bzhugs kyis / khyod*.

¹⁶⁹ D 617, 974 omit: *.*

¹⁷⁰ Go: *kyi*.

¹⁷¹ D 617, 974, Q 599: *khyed*.

¹⁷² Go: *bstand*.

¹⁷³ Go: *de'*.

¹⁷⁴ D 617, 974, Go, Q 599 insert: *'di*; S, Z inserts: */'di*.

¹⁷⁵ H, S, Z: *gzung*.

དེ་¹⁷⁷ཉིད་དུ་མི་¹⁷⁸སྤང་¹⁷⁹བར་གྱུར་¹⁸⁰ཏོ།།¹⁸¹བཙུན་པ་¹⁸²བཙམ་ལྡན་འདས་དེའི་སྦྱང་དུ་
 བདག་འདིའི་¹⁸³དོན་¹⁸⁴ཡོངས་སུ་བྱུངོ།།བཙམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས་བཀའ་སྡུལ་¹⁸⁵པ།¹⁸⁶དག་
 སྦྱང་བྱོད་ཀྱིས་¹⁸⁷སྣ་དེ་ཤེས་སམ།དག་སྦྱང་དེས་གསོལ་པ།བཙུན་པ་¹⁸⁸བདག་གིས་སྣ་དེ་མ་
 འཚལ་¹⁸⁹ཏོ།།¹⁹⁰བཙམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས་བཀའ་སྡུལ་¹⁹¹པ།སྣའི་བྱ་དེ་ནི་སུམ་རྩ་¹⁹²ཙ་གསུམ་
 གྱི་¹⁹³སྣ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་སྡེ་¹⁹⁴དཔོན་ཏེ་¹⁹⁵།¹⁹⁶ཙན་དན་ཞེས་བྱུངོ།།དག་སྦྱང་དེས་གསོལ་¹⁹⁷པ།
 བཙུན་¹⁹⁸པ་བདག་¹⁹⁹མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་སྡེ་ཐོས་²⁰⁰པར་འཚལ་ལོ།།

[4.] བཙམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས་བཀའ་སྡུལ་²⁰¹པ།དག་སྦྱང་བྱོད་²⁰²དེའི་²⁰³ཕྱིར་ལེགས་པར་
 རབ་དུ་²⁰⁴ཉོན་ལ་ཡིད་ལ་བྱུང་²⁰⁵ཤིག་²⁰⁶དང་།དས་བྱོད་ལ་བཤད་པར་བྱུངོ་²⁰⁷།།དག་སྦྱང་

176 D 617, 974, Q 599 omit: /.
 177 Z omits: *de*.
 178 Go: *myi*.
 179 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z: *gda*’.
 180 Go: *gyurd*.
 181 Q 979 omits: /.
 182 H inserts: /.
 183 D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z: *’di*; Go: *gi*.
 184 D 617, 974, Q 599, Z omit: *don*; Go inserts: *’di*.
 185 Go: *stsaldo*.
 186 Go inserts: /.
 187 Z: *kyi*.
 188 H inserts: /.
 189 Go: *’tshald*.
 190 Q 979 omits: /.
 191 Go: *stsaldo*.
 192 Go, Q 599, 979: *bcu*.
 193 Z omits: *gyi*.
 194 D 617, 974, S, Z: *ded*.
 195 Go: *ste*; S, Z: *de*.
 196 D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z omit: /.
 197 Go: *gsold*.
 198 Q 599: *btsum*.
 199 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z insert: *kyang*.
 200 Q 979: *thob*.
 201 Go: *stsaldo*.
 202 H: *khyed*.
 203 Go: *de*.
 204 S, Z omits: *rab tu*.

²⁰⁸ཚོས་གསུམ་དང་ལྡན་ན་²⁰⁹དགོ་སྤོང་²¹⁰མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་²¹¹ལྡེ་ལ་གནས་པ་ཞེས་
 བྱའོ།། གསུམ་གང་ཞེ་ན།²¹² འདི་ལྷ་སྟེ། འདས་པ་ལ་རྗེས་སུ་སྤང་²¹³པར་²¹⁴མི་²¹⁵བྱེད་པ་
 དང་། མ་འོངས་པ་ལ་རེ་བ་²¹⁶མེད་²¹⁷པ་དང་། ད་ལྟར་བྱུང་བའི་ཚོས་རྣམས་²¹⁸ཀྱིས་མི་
²¹⁹འཕྲོགས་²²⁰པར་གནས་པའི་ཚོས་ཅན་ཏེ། ཚོས་གསུམ་པོ་དེ་དག་དང་ལྡན་ན་²²¹དགོ་སྤོང་
²²²མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་ལྡེ་ལ་གནས་པ་²²³ཞེས་བྱའོ།། བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས་དེ་རྒྱུ་
 ཅེས་བཀའ་རྩལ་²²⁴ཏེ་²²⁵། བདེ་བར་གཤེགས་པས་²²⁶དེ་རྒྱུ་ཅེས་²²⁷གསུངས་ནས། ལྷོན་
²²⁸པས་²²⁹གཞན་ཡང་འདི་རྒྱུ་²³⁰གསུང་ངོ་²³¹།²³²
 [4.1.] འདས་²³³ལ་²³⁴རྗེས་སུ་སྤང་²³⁵མི་²³⁶བྱེད་²³⁷།²³⁸ མ་འོངས་པ་ལ་རེ་བ་མེད།²³⁹

-
- 205 H: *zung*; Z: *gzung*.
 206 S, Z: *zhig*.
 207 Go: *do for par bya 'o*.
 208 H inserts: /.
 209 Go, H, S, Z insert: /.
 210 H inserts: /.
 211 Go: *mo 'i mdo 'for mo bzang po 'i mdo*.
 212 D 974 omits: /.
 213 Go: *'phrad*.
 214 D 313: *phar*; H: *phard*.
 215 Go: *myi*.
 216 Q 979: *reg pa*.
 217 Go: *myed*.
 218 Q 599: *nam* (?).
 219 Go: *myi*.
 220 D 617, 974, Q 599: *phrog*; Z: *'phrog*.
 221 Go, H, S, Z insert: /.
 222 H inserts: /.
 223 H: *par*.
 224 Go: *stald*.
 225 D 617, 974, Q 599: *nas*.
 226 Go: *pa*.
 227 D 313, Go, H, Q 979 omit: *ces*.
 228 Go: *stond*.
 229 Go, Q 599: *pa*.
 230 D 617, 974, Q 599 insert: *du*.
 231 Z: *gsung so*.
 232 H, Q 979 omit: /.
 233 Q 979: *'dis*.

འདས་པ་གང་ཡིན་དེ་འགགས་ཏེ་²⁴⁰||²⁴¹ མ་འོངས་དེ་²⁴²ནི་མ་ཕྱིན་²⁴³པའོ།།
 གང་དག་ད་ལྟར་བྱུང་བའི་ཚོས།། དེ་དང་དེ་ལ་རབ་བཞུགས་ནས་²⁴⁴།།
 རྣམ་པར་རྟོག་²⁴⁵པས་མི་²⁴⁶འཕྲོགས་²⁴⁷པར།།²⁴⁸ དེ་དག་མཁས་པས་²⁴⁹ཁོང་²⁵⁰དུ་རྒྱུད།།
 མང་ཚམ་གྱི་ཡང་²⁵¹སྐྱུས་²⁵²ཤེས་ཀྱིས་²⁵³།། དེ་རིང་ཉིད་དུ་བརྒྱན་ཏེ་²⁵⁴བྱ་²⁵⁵།།
 འཆི་བདག་སྡེ་²⁵⁶ཆེན་དེ་དང་ནི།། བདག་²⁵⁷ཏུ་²⁵⁸ཤེས་²⁵⁹པ་མ་ཡིན་ལོ།།

[4.2] སེམས་ཅན་ཀུན་དང་སློབ་ཆགས་ཀུན།། འབྱུང་པོ་ཀུན་དང་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱང་།།
 བདེ་བ་འབང་ཞིག་²⁶⁰སྐྱབ་སྐྱར་²⁶¹ཏེ།། ཐམས་ཅད་ཉོན་མོངས་མེད་²⁶²པར་ཤོག།།

234 D 617, 974, Q 599: *pa* for *la*; Go: *pa la*.

235 Go: *'phrad*; Z: *phrag*.

236 Go: *myi*.

237 S, Z: *bya*.

238 Z omits: *.*

239 Go omits: *.*

240 S, Z: *'gag ste*.

241 Go omits: *.*

242 Go: *pa*.

243 Go: *phyind*.

244 S: *na*.

245 D 974: *rtogs*.

246 Go: *myi*.

247 D 617, 974, Q 599: *phrogs*; S, Z: *'phrog*.

248 Q 979 omits: *.*

249 D 313, H, Q 979: *thams cad* for *mkhas pas*; Go: *par*.

250 Q 979: *khod*.

251 D 617, 974, Q 599: *'chi 'am*, S: *shi 'am* for *shi yang*; Z: *ba* for *yang*.

252 D 617, H, Q 599, 979: *su*.

253 H, Q 599: *kyi*.

254 D 617, 974: *rtun de*; Q 599: *rten (?) de*.

255 Q 979: *ta byas*.

256 Z: *bde*.

257 S, Z: *rtag*.

258 Go: *dang* for *tu*.

259 D 313, Go, H, Q 979, S, Z: *bshes*.

260 Go, Q 979: *shig*.

261 D 617, 974, Q 599, Z: *'grub 'gyur*; Go: *gyurd*; S: *'gyur*.

262 Go: *myed*.

ཐམས་ཅད་བཟང་པོ་²⁶³མཐོང་གྱུར་²⁶⁴ཏེ།²⁶⁵གང་ཡང་²⁶⁶སྤྲིག་པར་མ་གྱུར་²⁶⁷ཅིག།

[4.3] དེ་ལྟར་གནས་ཤིང་རབ་བཙོན་ལ།²⁶⁸ ཉིན་མཚན་སྟོམ་²⁶⁹ལས་མེད་²⁷⁰པས་ན།²⁷¹
དེ་²⁷²ལྱུར་མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོ་ཡི་²⁷³།། མདོ་སྡེ་སྤུབ་པས་²⁷⁴ཏྲག་ཏུ་གསུངས།།

[5.] དེ་ནས་བཙོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས་སེམས་ཅན་ཐམས་ཅད་²⁷⁵ རྗེས་སུ་བསྐྱུང་²⁷⁶ བའི་ལྱིར་
²⁷⁷མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་སྡེ་²⁷⁸འདི་²⁷⁹བཤད་²⁸⁰ནས་²⁸¹འགྲོ་མྱིང་བའི་གསང་སྤགས་ཀྱི་
²⁸²གཞི་འདི་²⁸³དག་གསུངས་སོ།།

[5.1] ²⁸⁴ཏྲུ་ལྷ། བེ་ཞི་རྣ་ར་དེ། བེ་རི་ནི། བེ་ར་ནི། ལུང་རྣ་མ་ཉར་རྒྱ་ནག་རྣ། མ་ཉི་ནི་མི་ན་
ནི། བེ་ཞི་ཞི་ཞི། ཉི་ཉི་ཉི་ཉི། བེ་ར་ཉི། ལྷོ་རི། གཤ་རྣ་རི། ཅན་ཏ་ལི། མ་ཉང་གི། ལུ་ག་སི། བསྐྱ་
ནི། ང་མི་ཉི། ང་མི་ཉི། ལྷ་རྣ་དེ། ས་རྒྱ་ལམ་རྣ། ཉི་རྒྱ་མ་ཉུ་མ་ཉུང་ཉ་ར་ནི། མ་ཉོ་ལ་ན། ང་ལ་
རྣ་ནི། ང་ལྷ་རྣ་དེ། མ་རྒྱ་ད་ལྷ་ནི། ཅ་ལྷ་ནི། ལྷ་སྡེ་ཅ་ཀྲ་རྣ་གི། མ་རྒྱ་ཅ་ཀྲ་རྣ་གི། ཤ་བ་རི། ཤ་
བ་རི། མ་རྒྱ་ཤ་བ་རི། ལྷ་ཅོད་གི་ནི། ལྷ་ཅོད་རིང་གི་ན། བེ་མི་ནི་མིང་གི་ནི། བེ་མི་ནི་རྣ་རི་རྣ་ཉ་

263 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599: *por.*
264 Go: *gyurd*; S, Z: *'gyur.*
265 Q 599 omits: *l.*
266 D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z: *dag* for *yang.*
267 Go: *gyurd.*
268 Q 979 omits: *l.*
269 H, Q 979, Z: *snyoms.*
270 Go: *myed.*
271 Q 599 omits: *l.*
272 Go: *de 'i.*
273 Go: *po 'i* for *po yi*; Z: *yis.*
274 Z: *pa 'i.*
275 Go inserts: *la.*
276 D 313, H, Go, Q 979, S, Z: *gzung* for *bsrung.*
277 Go inserts: *//*; S, Z insert: *l.*
278 D 313, H, Q 979 omit: *sde.*
279 Z omits: *'di.*
280 Go inserts: *pa.*
281 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z insert: *l.*
282 Go, Q 599 omit: *kyi.*
283 S omits: *'di.*
284 Go inserts: *//.*

བྱེད་པར་ཡང་མི་³⁰⁷ འགྱུར་ཞིང་³⁰⁸ དེས་པར་ལྷ་པོ་ལས་འདས་པར་³⁰⁹ ཉེ་བར་འགྲོ་བར་
 འགྱུར་རྗེས་³¹⁰ །། གང་དང་གང་དུ་སྐྱེས་པར་ཡང་།།³¹¹ མཚན་མོ་བཟང་པོའི་མདོ་བཟང་གས་
³¹² རྒྱུ་།། སྐྱེ་བ་དྲན་དང་དག་བཅོམ་དང་།། དབང་ལྷན་ཏུ་ཡང་དེས་པར་འགྱུར།། ལན་ཅིག་
³¹³ གིས་ནི་གནས་ཀུན་ཏུ།། ཏུས་མིན་³¹⁴ འཆི་དང་བར་མ་དོར།། བདག་གིས་བདག་ལ་མི་
 སྐྱོར་བར་³¹⁵ །། ཏུས་མིན་³¹⁶ འཆི་དང་ཚོས་མ་ཡིན།། སེམས་ཅན་ཐམས་ཅད་སྤང་³¹⁷ ཞིང་
 སེལ་³¹⁸ །། རད་དང་ལྷ་པོ་འཇིགས་སྐྱེ་དང་།། མི་³¹⁹ ལམ་མི་³²⁰ ཤེས་³²¹ ལྷ་པོ་དུ་³²² །།³²³
 བརྗོད་ན་དཔལ་དུ་བྱེད་པར་འགྱུར།། གང་གིས་བྱིས་ཉེ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་³²⁴ །། ལུང་མེད་³²⁵ ལྷས་
 ལ་བཏགས་³²⁶ རྗེས་།། ལྷལ་³²⁷ པ་བཟང་དང་གཟེ་³²⁸ བརྗོད་དང་།། དེ་ཡི་³²⁹ དཔལ་ཡང་སྐྱེ་
 བར་འགྱུར།། ལྷས་དང་ལག་དང་ཡིད་ཀྱིས་སྤྲ།། མི་³³⁰ དག་རྩལ་ཟད་གང་བྱས་པ།། དེ་དག་
 ཐམས་ཅད་བཟང་པོའི་མདོས།། ཏུས་མ་ཡིན་པར་³³¹ འཆི་³³² ལས་³³³ སྐྱོབ།། ལྷལ་པོ་ལྷ་དང་

³⁰⁷ Go: *myi*.

³⁰⁸ D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z insert: /.

³⁰⁹ S, Z insert: *yang*.

³¹⁰ Z omits: *ro*.

³¹¹ Go, H, S omit: /.

³¹² Go: *blags*; H: *bklag*; Q 979: *klags*.

³¹³ Go, H: *gcig*.

³¹⁴ Go: *myin*.

³¹⁵ S, Z: *ba*.

³¹⁶ Go: *myin*.

³¹⁷ Q 599: *bsrung*.

³¹⁸ Go: *seld*.

³¹⁹ Go: *rmyi*.

³²⁰ Go: *myi*'.

³²¹ D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z: *shes*.

³²² Go: *tu*.

³²³ Q 979 omits: /.

³²⁴ Go: *'am*.

³²⁵ Go: *myed*.

³²⁶ Q 599: *las tags* for *la btags*.

³²⁷ Go: *bskal*.

³²⁸ Go: *gzi*'.

³²⁹ Go: *de'i* for *de yi*.

³³⁰ Go: *myi*.

³³¹ S, Z: *ltas*.

³³² Go: *'chi*'.

མི་³³⁴ དང་སྐྱོག་³³⁵ | ཚཱ་པོ་ནད་དང་དག་དག་དང་། གཡུལ་³³⁶ སྐྱོད་པ་³³⁷ དང་འཐབ་
³³⁸པར་ཡང་། བཟང་པོ་དྲན་ན་སྐྱོབ་པར་བྱེད། རིག་པ་བཟང་པོ་འདི་³³⁹དང་ནི། གསང་
སྐྱགས་འདི་དག་ཉྱག་³⁴⁰བཅོམ་ན། མི་³⁴¹དག་མི་³⁴²ལྷུ་ལྷུ་³⁴³ཀྱུ་ལྷུ་³⁴⁴། དེ་བས་འདི་
ནི་ཡིད་ཀྱིས་བཅོམ་།

[6.1] འདས་པ་དང་། མ་ཕྱོན་³⁴⁵པ་དང་། ད་³⁴⁶སྣར་བྱུང་བའི་དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་དག་
³⁴⁷བཅོམ་པ་ཡང་དག་པར་རྒྱུགས་པའི་སངས་རྒྱས་རྣམས་ལ་ཕྱག་འཚལ་ལོ། ཕྱག་འཚལ་
ནས་རིག་³⁴⁸སྐྱགས་འདི་དག་བཅོམ་པར་བྱ་སྟེ། རིག་³⁴⁹སྐྱགས་འདིས་བདག་འབྱོར་³⁵⁰བར་
གྱུར་³⁵¹ཅིག།

[6.2.] ཉུ་སྒྲ། བེ་མི་བེ་མི་བེ་རྟེ། ཉི་མི་ཉི་མིང་ག་ལི། ཉི་ལོ་ཀ་ཨ་བ་ལོ་ཀ་ནི། ཉི་ཕྱུ་ལ་རྟེ་
ར་ཤི། ཨ་ཀྱ་ཕི་ནི། ཁྱི་སྐྱི་ཁྱི་ཉི། ཀེ་ལི་ཀེ་ལི། ཀྱང་ཉོ་ཀྱང་ཉོ། ཀྱང་ཉོ་ཀྱང་སི། ཀྱའི་ཀྱ་ཕི་ཉི།
བདག་དང་³⁵²སེམས་ཅན་ཐམས་ཅད་ལག་ན་དོ་རྗེ་དང་སྣན་ཅིག་ཏུ་³⁵³འཇིགས་པ་ཐམས་

333 Q 979: pas.
334 Go : mye.
335 Q 599: klog.
336 Go: yul.
337 Go, Q 599, 979: sa.
338 Go: thab; Q 979: 'tha'.
339 Z: de.
340 Q 979: dash tag for dag rtag.
341 Go: myi.
342 Go: myi.
343 D 617, 974, Go, Q 974, S, Z: gnas for dus.
344 D 617, 974, Q 599: du.
345 Go: byond.
346 Q 599: de.
347 Q 599: gsheg pa 'dgra for gshegs pa dgra.
348 Go: rigs.
349 Go: rigs; Q 599: rag.
350 Go: 'byord.
351 Go: gyurd.
352 H inserts: /.
353 Go inserts: /.

ཅད་དང། རྣམ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། རྣམ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། རྣམ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། གདོན་
 355 ཐམས་ཅད་དང། 356 གདུག་ 357 པས་ཟིན་ 358 པ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། ཚམས་ཀྱི་ཐམས་ཅད་
 དང། མི་ 359 དང། 360 མི་ 361 མ་ཡིན་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། འཇིགས་ 362 པ་དང། 363 གཞོན་པ་
 དང། རྣམ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། འཐབ་པ་དང། རྣོག་པ་དང། རྣོག་པ་དང། རྣོག་པ་དང། རྣོག་པ་
 དང། འགྲེང་པ་དང། མཚང་ 365 འདྲུ་བ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། ལྷས་དང། 366 ངག་དང། ཡིད་
 གྱིས་ངན་པར་སྦྱད་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་དང། 367 ཐམས་ཅད་དུ་འཇིགས་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་ལས་
 སྤངས་ 368 ཤིག། 369 སྤངས་ཤིག། 370

[6.3] ཏཱ་ལྷན་ ཏི་ལི་མི་ལི། ཅི་ལི། ཨི་ལི། མི་ལི། བི་ཤ་ཅི་ལྷ་ ཆ་ཤ་བ་འི་ཅི་ལི་ཅི་ལི་སྐྱ་དུ།

[7.] བཅོམ་ལྷན་འདས་ཀྱིས་དེ་སྐད་ཅེས་བཀའ་ 371 ལྷས་ 372 རས། དགོ་སྤོང་དེ་དག་དང། 373
 ཐམས་ཅད་དང། ལྷན་པའི་འཁོར་དེ་དག་ 374 དང། 375 ལྷ་དང། 376 མི་ 377 དང། 378 ལྷ་མ་ཡིན་

354 Go inserts: *nad*.

355 Z: *gnod pa*.

356 Z inserts: *gdug pa thams cad dang /*.

357 Q 599: *gdugs*; Q 979: *gdub*.

358 Go: *zind*.

359 Go: *myi*.

360 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599 omit: */*.

361 Go: *myi*; Q 599 omits: *mi*.

362 Q 599: *'digs*.

363 Q 979 inserts: */*.

364 Z: *mgo*.

365 Go: *'tshang*; Q 599: *'tshangs*; Z: *tshangs*.

366 S, Z omit: *dang /*.

367 Q 979 omits: */*.

368 Go: *bsrungs*.

369 D 617, 974, Q 599, S, Z omit: */*.

370 Go omits: *srungs shig /*.

371 Q 979 omits: *ces bka'*.

372 Go: *stsald*.

373 Go: *dge slong de dang / dge slong de dag / for dge slong de dag dang*; D 617, Q 979 omit: */*.

374 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599 omit: *dag*.

375 D 617 omits: */*.

376 D 617 omits: */*.

377 Go: *myi*.

དང་། རྣམ་མཁའ་མྱེད་དང་། ཇི་ཟ་དང་། མིའམ་³⁷⁹ཅི་དང་། ལྷོ་འབྲེ་³⁸⁰ཆེན་པོ་དང་། གཞོན་
 སྐྱེན་ཆེན་པོ་³⁸¹དང་། སླིན་པོ་དང་། ཡི་དགས་³⁸²དང་། ཤ་ཟ་དང་³⁸³བཅས་པའི་འཇིག་རྟེན་
 ཡི་³⁸⁴རངས་ཏེ།³⁸⁵ བཅོམ་ལྷན་འདས་ཀྱིས་གསུངས་པ་ལ་མངོན་པར་བསྟོན་དོ། ། འཕགས་པ་
 མཚན་མོ་³⁸⁶བཟང་པོ་ཞེས་³⁸⁷བྱ་བའི་མདོ་³⁸⁸རྗེས་སོ་³⁸⁹། ། །³⁹⁰

[8.] ལྷ་གར་གྱི་མཁའ་པོ་རྩོ་ན་མི་ཏ་དང། དུ་ན་ཤྱི་ལ་དང། ལྷ་ཆེན་གྱི་ལོ་ཙ་³⁹¹བ་བན་རྟེ་
³⁹²ཡི་ཤེས་སྤྲེས་བསྐྱར་ཅིང་ལྷས་ཏེ། ལྷ་གསར་ཆད་³⁹³ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་བཅོས་ནས་གཏན་ལ་ཕབ་
 པ། ། །

4.2.4 The mantras

While editing the Tibetan text, it soon became clear that a critical edition of the *mantras* is quite problematic. The major problem is the multitude of variants, which mostly arose from rendering the Sanskrit phonemes into the Tibetan script. This leads us to the challenge of reconstructing the underlying Sanskrit original. Is it at all possible to reconstruct an original Indic version of the *mantras*? The advantage over the above-cited Chinese recension of the *mantras* is the fact that the Tibetan script is a script with letters and not symbols and retains special characters to

378 D 617 omits: /.

379 Go: *myi 'am*.

380 Go: *phye*.

381 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599, S, Z omit: *chen po*.

382 H: *dwags*.

383 D 617, 974, Go, Q 599: *zar* for *za dang*.

384 Go, Q 599, 979: *yid*.

385 D 617 omits: /.

386 Q 979 inserts: /.

387 Z: *bzhes*.

388 Go: *gzungs* for *mdo*; Q 979 inserts: //.

389 Q 599, 979: *sto*.

390 Q 979 omits: //.

391 D 617, 974, Q 599: *tstsha*.

392 D 617, 974: *bande*.

393 Z: *bcad*.

transliterate Brāhmī *akṣaras*, which are unknown to the Tibetan language and script. This concerns the retroflex and aspirated consonants, the vocalic *r* and *l*, the diphthongs, and the long vowels, as well as the *visarga*, and the *anusvāra* (see table below).

Table 12: Special characters for the transliteration of Devanāgarī *akṣaras* into Tibetan script.

र	ट	ṭa	ष	ठ	ṭha	ड	ड	ḍa	ढ	ढ	ḍha	ण	ण	ṇa
झ	घ	gha	ञ	झ	jha	झ	ध	dha	झ	भ	bha			
रि	ऋ	ṛ	रि	ळ	ḷ	रि	ऐ	ai	रि	औ	au			
मू	मा	mā	मी	मी	mī	मू	मू	mū						
अः	अः	aḥ	अं	अं	aṃ									

To deal with the mass of different readings, and to avoid an overload of notes, in the present edition I follow Skilling's example of the edition of the Tibetan *mahāsūtra mantras*, which in turn was influenced by the work of Inagaki.³⁹⁴ They divided the *mantras* into units from *shad* to *shad* and gave variant readings in separate lines with corresponding syllables below. Minor variants within one line are listed in the annotations. The wording of the *mantras* in the main body of the *sūtra* edited above corresponds to the text in the first line.

With regard to the problem of reconstruction, we have to consider the aim of the Tibetans when rendering Sanskrit texts. The translation guidelines in the *Madhyavyutpatti* clearly forbade the literal translation of Sanskrit *mantras* into Tibetan. The rule 25 of the introduction runs as follows:

gsang sngags kyi rgyud rnams gzhung gis gsang bar bya ba yin te | snod du ma gyur pa rnams la bshad cing bstan du yang mi rung la | bar du bsgyur zhing spyod du gnang gis kyang | ldem po dag tu bshad pa ma khrol nas sgra ji bzhin du 'dzin cing log par spyod pa dag kyang byung | sngags kyi rgyud kyi nang nas thu zhing bod skad du bsgyur ba dag kyang byung zhes

³⁹⁴ Cf. Skilling 1994a: 1, and Inagaki 1987: 314–352.

*gdags kyi | phyin chad gzungs sngags dang rgyud bla nas bka' stsal te |
sgyur du bcug pa ma gtogs pa | sngags kyi rgyud dang | sngags kyi tshig thu
zhing bsgyur du mi gnang ngo ||*

(D 4347 p. 132b6–7³⁹⁵)

The Tantras with their mantras are to be kept secret in accordance with the scriptures themselves, and it is not proper that they are explained and taught to those not worthy. However, in the meantime they have been translated and given for practice, but their concealed meanings were not the subject of an oral explanation, thus [the words] were understood literally – and false practices have originated. While it is an established fact that selections from among the Mantra-Tantras and translations into Tibetan do exist, henceforth, with regard to dhāraṇīmantras and the Tantras, it has been decreed that unless permission is granted to translate [a specific such scripture], it is not allowed to collect or translate the Mantra-Tantras and the words of the mantras.

(tr. Braarvig³⁹⁶)

This passage can be interpreted in two ways: first of all, the Tibetan kings did not want the esoteric and magic *mantras* to be brought to Tibet at all and tried to keep magic out of their country. This argumentation, however, does not seem to be very convincing as we have evidence in Bu ston's *History of Buddhism* that *mantras* were translated, though with restrictions. The second interpretation is thus more likely, namely that it was not allowed to translate the secret *mantras*, but to transliterate them in order to maintain the original sound when recited.

Reconstructing the Indic text of the *mantras* is, to put it mildly, not an easy task. To determine with certainty the original Indic form is easy only in the case where all recensions agree. Where there is no conformity in the wording of the *mantra*, it is impossible to resolve the underlying Sanskrit. All attempts can only be regarded as tentative as long as the original source was found and assigned. Furthermore, the original Sanskrit *mantra* could well belong to another line of tradition and thus

³⁹⁵ The e-text is provided by the *Asian Classics Input Project* (ACIP): <http://tibetan.works/etext/reader.php?collection=tengyur&index=4347> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020).

³⁹⁶ Cf. the online publication of the translation of the *Madhyavyutpatti* by Jens Braarvig: <https://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/index.php?page=fulltext&vid=263&view=fulltext> (last retrieved on 20.11.2020).

differ from the version transmitted in Tibet as Skilling puts it for the *mantras* of the Sanskrit *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra*:

Needless to say, even when all editions agree or can be reduced to a common form, this does not absolutely lead us back to the original form of the mantra in the Sanskrit manuscript(s) used by the translator in about the year 800, or even to the original transliteration adopted to their translation. Furthermore, even when a Sanskrit manuscript is available, it may well belong to a different textual lineage. For *Mahāsūtra* 9, for example, the Sanskrit fragments of the mantras of the *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra* cannot be described as the ‘correct’ or ‘standard’ form: they are simply the mantras as transmitted by the Central Asian Sarvāstivādins.³⁹⁷

The alterations in the wording of the *mantras* may well have been unintended, as well as deliberate. To the category of unintended changes, we can ascribe scribal errors such as the failure to reverse the consonants to represent retroflex *akṣaras*, omission or addition of a *tsheg* or the loss of the prototype. Deliberate editorial changes mostly concern the orthography, the way Sanskrit phonemes were rendered into the Tibetan script, for example the use of superscripts und subscripts. That is exactly the reason why the main text of the *mantras* is here given in Tibetan script, which enables the reader to better trace minor orthographical variants.

In the wording of the five *mantras* of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* we can make out four, and for the first *mantra* even five, slightly variant readings. We can group together those versions classed under Sūtra, which are given in the first line of the present edition and those placed under Tantra or Dhāraṇī, listed in the second line. The text of the Shey and Stog editions take up a special status and are, therefore, listed separately. Nevertheless, the wording of these editions, which are classified under Tantra, are closer to the other Tantra recensions given in the second line, than to those in the Sūtra division. The last line represents the reading of the Gondhla Manuscript Kangyur. For the first and longest *mantra* I decided to give a fourth line with the wording of the Lhasa edition, as it shows considerable differences to the other Sūtra versions. With this classification of different readings according to the place within the Kangyur, the *mantra* passages are perfectly in line with the division of the two variants regarding the title and the colophon.

³⁹⁷ Skilling 1994a: liv.

Mantra 1: D 313 at 162b4–6, D 617at 57b2–4, D 974 at 91a5–7, Go 3692 at 45a7–45b1, H 317 at 250b1–4, Q 599 at 97b7–8, Q 979 at 172b3–5, S 575 at 407a6–407b1, Z 588 at 421a9–421b3

D 313 Q 979	།ཏཱ་ཐ།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ར་ད།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐི་ར་ ³⁹⁸ ཐི།	ཐུང་ཚྭ་ ³⁹⁹ མ་ཏར་ ⁴⁰⁰
D 617, 974 Q 599	།ཏཱ་ཐ།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ར་ཐི།	ཐ་ཐི་	ཐུ་ར་ཐི།	ཐུ་ཚྭ་ ⁴⁰¹ མཏེ་ ⁴⁰²
S 575 Z 588	།ཏཱ་ཐ།	ཐི་ཐུ་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐི་ཐི་ ⁴⁰³	ཐུ་ར་ཐི།	ཐུ་ཚྭ་མཏེ་ཐེ།
H 317	།ཏཱ་ཐ།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ར་ད།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐུ་ཚྭ་མ་ཏར་
Go 36,92	།ཏང་ཡུ་ཐ།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐུ་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐ་ཐི་	ཐུ་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐུང་མ་ཚྭ་མོང་

D 313 Q 979	ཏུ་ཐ་ཐེ།	མ་ཏི་ཐི་མི་ཐ་ཐི།		ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཏི་ཏི་ཏི་ཏི།	ཐི་ར་ཏི།
D 617, 974 Q 599		མ་ཐི་ཐི།		ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཏི་ཏི་ཏི་ཏི།	ཐ་ར་ཏི།
S 575 Z 588		མ་ ⁴⁰⁴ ཐི་ཐི་མ་ ⁴⁰⁵ ཐི་ཐི།	མ་ཐི་ཐི།	ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཏི་ཏི་ཏི་ཏི།	ཐུ་ར་ཏི།
H 317	ཏུ་ཐ་ཐེ།	མ་ཏི་ཐི་མི་ཐ་ཐི།		ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཏི་ཏི་ཏི་ཏི།	ཐི་ར་ཏི།
Go 36,92	ཏར་ཐི།	མ་ཐི་ཐི།		ཐི་ཐི་ཐི་ཐི།	ཏི་ཏི་ཏི་ཏི།	ཐི་ཐི་ཏི།

³⁹⁸ Q 979: *ri*.

³⁹⁹ Q 979 inserts: */*.

⁴⁰⁰ Q 979: *ha ra*.

⁴⁰¹ Q 599: *bud dha*.

⁴⁰² Q 599: *mar te*.

⁴⁰³ Z: *nī*.

⁴⁰⁴ Z: *ma*.

⁴⁰⁵ Z: *ma*.

D 313 Q 979	གོ་རི།	གན་རྣ་རི།	ཅན་ཁ་ལི།	མ་ཉང་གི།	ཕུ་ཀ་སི།	བཟུ་ནི།
D 617, 974 Q 599	གོ་རི།	གརྣ་ ⁴⁰⁶ རི།	ཅརྣ་ ⁴⁰⁷ ལི།	མ་ཉླ་གི།	ཕུརྣ་ ⁴⁰⁸ སི།	རྣ་མ་ ⁴⁰⁹ ནི།
S 575 Z 588	གོ་འུ་རི།	གན་རྣ་ར་རི།	ཅརྣ་ལི།	མ་ཉླ་གི།	ཕུརྣ་སི།	རྣ་མ་ནི།
H 317	གོ་རི།	གརྣ་རི།	ཅརྣ་ལི།	མ་ཉང་གི།	ཕུ་ཀ་སི།	བཟུ་ནི།
Go 36,92	གོ་འུ་རི།	གན་རྣ་རི།	ཅན་ཁ་ལི།	མ་ཉང་གི།	ཕུག་ཀ་སི།	རྣ་མ་ནི།

D 313 Q 979	ང་མི་ཉི་ ⁴¹⁰	ང་མི་ཉི་ ⁴¹¹	ཕུ་རྣ་ ⁴¹² ཉི་ ⁴¹³	ས་རྒྱ་ལམ་རྣེ།	ཉི་རྒྱ་མ་ཉུ་མ་
D 617, 974 Q 599	ང་མི་ཉི།	ང་མི་ཉི།	ཕ་བ་རི།	ས་ར་ལམ་རྣེ་ ⁴¹⁴	ཉི་རྒྱ་མ་རྣེ་མ་
S 575 Z 588	ང་མི་ཉི།	ང་མི་ཉི་ ⁴¹⁵	ཕ་བ་རི།	ས་ར་ལི་རྣ།	ཉི་རྒྱ་མ་རྣེ་མོ་
H 317	ང་མི་ཉི།	ང་མི་ཉི།	ཕུ་རྣ་ཉི།	ས་རྒྱ་ལམ་རྣེ།	ཉི་རྒྱ་མ་ཉུ་མ་
Go 36,92	ངཱི་མི་ཉི།	ངཱི་མི་ཉི།	ཕ་བ་རི།	ས་ར་ལམ་རྣེ།	ཉི་རྒྱ་མ་རྣེ་མོང་

D 313 Q 979	ཟུང་ཉ་ར་ནི།	མ་ཉོ་ལ་ན།	ད་ལ་རྣ་ནི།	ད་ལ་རྣ་བེ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	རྣ་ཉ་ར་ནི།	མ་ཉོ་ལ་ན།	ད་ལ་བ་ནི།	ད་ལ་བ་དེ་ ⁴¹⁶

⁴⁰⁶ Q 599: *gan dha*.

⁴⁰⁷ Q 599: *tsaṅ ḍa*.

⁴⁰⁸ Q 599: *bug ga*.

⁴⁰⁹ Q 599: *tha*.

⁴¹⁰ Q 979: *ti*.

⁴¹¹ Q 979: *ma ṭi*.

⁴¹² Q 979: *bā*.

⁴¹³ Q 979 omits: */*.

⁴¹⁴ D 974: *lambhe*.

⁴¹⁵ Z omits: *drāmiḍi*.

⁴¹⁶ D 974: *batte*.

S 575 Z 588	ར་ཏ་ནི།	མ་ཉོ་ལོ།	ད་ལ་བ་ནི། ⁴¹⁷ ད་ལ་བ་ཏི།	ད་ལ་བ་རྟེ།
H 317	ཟུང་ཏ་ར་ནི།	མ་ཉོ་ལ་ན།	ད་ལ་རྟ་ནི།	ད་ལ་རྟ་བེ།
Go 36,92	ཏ་ར་ཞི།	མ་ཉོ་ལ་ནི།	ད་ལ་བ་ནི། ད་ལ་བ་ཏི།	ད་ལ་བ་ད་ཏི།

D 313 Q 979	མ་རྒྱ་ ⁴¹⁸ ད་ལ་ནི།	ཅ་ལ་ནི།	ཟུ་རྟེ་ ⁴¹⁹ ཅ་ཀ་རྟ་གི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཅ་ཀ་རྟ་གི།
D 617, 974 Q 599	མ་རྒྱ་ད་ལ་ནི།	ཅ་ལ་ནི།	ཟུ་རྟེ་ཅ་ཀ་རྒྱ་ཏི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཅ་ཀ་རྒྱ་ཏི།
S 575 Z 588	མ་རྒྱ་ད་ལ་ནི།	ཅ་ལ་ནི།	ཟུ་རྟེ། ཅ་ཀ་བ་ཏི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཅ་ཀ་བ་ཏི།
H 317	མ་རྒྱ་ད་ལ་ནི།	ཅ་ལ་ནི།	ཟུ་རྟེ་ཅ་ཀ་རྟ་གི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཅ་ཀ་རྟ་གི།
Go 36,92	མ་རྒྱ་ད་ལ་ནི།	ཅ་ལ་ནི།	ཟུ་རྟེ་ཅ་ཀ་ཀ་བ་གི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཅ་ཀ་ཀ་བ་གི།

D 313 Q 979	ཤ་བ་རི།	ཤ་བ་རི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཤ་བ་རི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་ད་གི་ནི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་རིང་གི་ནི།
D 617, 974 Q 599	ཤ་བ་རི་	ཤ་བ་རི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཤ་བ་རི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་ད་གི་ ⁴²⁰ ནི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་རིང་གི་ནི།
S 575 Z 588	ཤ་བ་རི་	ཤ་བ་རི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཤ་ ⁴²¹ བ་རི་	རྒྱ་ཚོ་གི་	རྒྱ་ཚོ་རིང་ ⁴²² གི་ནི།
H 317	ཤ་བ་རི།	ཤ་བ་རི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཤ་བ་རི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་ད་གི་ནི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་ད་རིང་གི་ནི།
Go 36,92	ཤ་བ་རི།	ཤ་བ་རི།	མ་རྒྱ་ཤ་བ་རི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་ད་གི་ནི།	རྒྱ་ཚོ་རིང་གི་ནི།

417 S omits: /.
 418 Q 979: *phā*.
 419 Q 979 inserts: /.
 420 D 974: *tsinggi*.
 421 S: *shā*.
 422 Z omits: *ram*.

D 313 Q 979	འི་མི་འི་མིང་གི་འི།	འི་མི་བ་རྣ་རི་རྩུ་ཏ་འི་	སྣ་ལྷ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	འི་མི། འི་མིང་གི་རི།	འི་མི་བ་རྣ་རི། རྩུ་རྣ་འི་	སྣ་ལྷ།
S 575 Z 588	འི་མི་འི་མི་གི་རི།	འི་མི་རྣ་རི། རྩུ་ཏ་འི་	སྣ་ལྷ།
H 317	འི་མི་འི་མིང་གི་འི།	འི་མི་བ་རྣ་རི་རྩུ་ཏ་འི་	སྣ་ལྷ།
Go 36,92	འི་མི་འི་མིང་གི་འི།	འི་མི་བ་རྣ་རི་ལུ་ཏ་འི་	སྣ་ཏ།

Mantra 2: D 313 at 162b6–7, D 617at 57b4–5, D 974 at 91a7–91b1, Go 3692 at 45b1–2, H 317 at 250b4–5, Q 599 at 97b8–98a1, Q 979 at 172b5–6, S 575 at 407b1–2, Z 588 at 421b3–4

D 313, H 317 Q 979	ཏཏ་སྣ།	ཨི་ཏུ་ཏུ་ཏུ།	བ་ཏུ་མི་རྩི།	གེ་རྩི་ཨིང་གྲ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	ཏཏ་སྣ།	ཨི་ཏུ་ཏུ་ཏུ་ཏུ།	བ་ཏུ་མི་རྩི། ⁴²³	གེ་རྩི། ཨིང་གྲ། ⁴²⁴
S 575 Z 588	ཏཏ་སྣ།	ཨི་ཏུ་ཏུ་ཏུ་ཏུ།	བ་ཏུ་མི་རྩི།	གེ་རྩི། ཨི་གྲ།
Go 36,92	ཏཏ་ཡམ་སྣ།	ཨི་ཏུ་ཏུ།	ཏུ་བ་ཏུ་མིང་རྩི།	གར་རྩི། ཨིང་གྲ།

D 313, H 317 Q 979	སྣ་ཏ་ཏ་རི་ཙལ་ལྷ།	བར་ཏ།	བར་མ་ལྷ་ལྷ།	གལ་ལྷ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	སིང་ད་ཏ་རི། ཙལ་ལྷ།	བླ་ཏ། ⁴²⁵	བར་ལམ་ལྷ།	⁴²⁶ གལ་ལྷ།
S 575 Z 588	སི་ཏ་ཏ་ར། ཙལ་ལྷ།	རྩི་ཏ།	རྩི་མ་ ⁴²⁷ ལྷ།	གལ་ལྷ། ⁴²⁸
Go 36,92	སྣ་ཏ་ཏ་རི་ཙལ་ལྷ།	བར་ཏ།	བར་མ་ལྷ།	གལ་ལྷ།

⁴²³ Q 599 omits: /.

⁴²⁴ D 974: *engku*.

⁴²⁵ Q 599: *naṃ rtu ra* for *naṃ tu* /.

⁴²⁶ Q inserts: /.

⁴²⁷ S: *nirma*.

⁴²⁸ S omits: /.

D 313, H 317 Q 979	ཨ་བ་ཅ་ལོ་ལེ།	ཤོ་ཀ་ལོ་ར།	ལྷ་ར་ལྷ་ས་ལེ།	ཏ་ར་གེ་ཏ་རེ་
D 617, 974 Q 599	ཨ་བ་ཅ་ལོ་ལེ ⁴²⁹ །	ཤེ་ཀྲ་ལོ་ར་	བ་རད་ས་ལེ།	ཏ་ར་གེ ⁴³⁰ ། ཏ་རེ།
S 575 Z 588	ཨ་བ་ཅ་ལོ་ལེ།	ཤེ་ཀྲ།	ལོ་ས་ར་ཏ་ ⁴³¹ ས་ལེ།	ཏ་ར་གེ། ཏ་རེ།
Go 36,92	ཨ་བ་ཅ་ལོ་ལེ།	ཤེ་ཀྲ་ལོ་ར་	ལྷ་རད་ས་ལེ།	ཏ་རེ་གེ་ཏ་རེ།

D 313, H 317 Q 979	ལྷ་ཏྲ།	ལོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ཏ་ལ་ ⁴³² ལྷ་ལྷ།	བ་ཏ་ལྷ་ཏི།	ཡ་ལྷ་ཏི་ཡེ་	སྣ་ཏྲ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	ཏ་རོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ལོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ཏི་ལ་ལ་ལྷ།	ལྷ་ཏ་བ་ཏི་ཡ ⁴³³ །	བ་ཏ་ཡི་ཡེ་	སྣ་ཏྲ།
S 575 Z 588	ཏ་རོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ལོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ཏི་ལ་ལ་ལྷ།	ལྷ་ཏ་བ་ཏི་ཡ།	བ་ཏི་ཡི་ཡེ་	སྣ་ཏྲ།
Go 36,92	ཏ་རོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ལོ་ད་ཏྲ།	ཏི་ལ་ལ་ལྷ།	ལྷ་ཏ་བ་ཏི།	ཡི་ཡེ་	སྣ་ཏྲ།

Mantra 3: D 313 at 162b7, D 617 at 57b5, D 974 at 91b1, Go 3692 at 45b2–3, H 317 at 250b5–6, Q 599 at 98a1–2, Q 979 at 172b7, S 575 at 407b2, Z 588 at 421b4

D 313, H 317 Q 979	ཏ་ཏྲ་ལྷ།	ཨ་ར་ཀྲ་ཏི།	ན་ར་ཀྲ་ཏི།	པོ་སྣ་ཀྲ།	བ་ཡི་ ⁴³⁴ ཡེ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	ཏ་ཏྲ་ལྷ།	ཨ་ར་ ⁴³⁵ གཞེ།	ན་ར་གཞེ།	པོ་ ⁴³⁶ སྣ་ཀྲ།	བ་ཡི་ཡེ།
S 575 Z 588	ཏ་ཏྲ་ལྷ།	ཨ་ར་གཞེ།		པོ་ ⁴³⁷ སྣ་ཀྲ།	བ་ཡི་ ⁴³⁸ ཡེ།

429 D 974: *no.*

430 Q 599: *ka.*

431 S: *da.*

432 Q 979: *tī* for *ta la.*

433 Q 599: *ā.*

434 Q 979: *ye.*

435 D 617: *a ra.*

436 D 974: *baṃ.*

437 S: *pām.*

Go 36,92 །ཏད་ཡ་ཐཱ། ཨ་ར་ག་ཏེ། བ་ར་ག་ཏེ། བང་སྲུ་ག། བའི་ཡི་ཡེ།

D 313, H 317 ཀ་པོ་ཏ་ཀ་བ་⁴³⁹ཡི་⁴⁴⁰ཡེ་ཏ་ཚོ་ཏ་ནེ་ ལྷ་སྲུ།
Q 979

D 617, 974 ཀ་པོ་ཏ་ཀ་བ་ཡི་ཡེ་ཡེ་ཏ་པོ་རྣ་ནེ་ ལྷ་སྲུ།
Q 599

S 575 ཀ་པོ་ཏ་ཀ་བ་ཡི་ཡེ། ཏ་པོ་⁴⁴¹རྣ་ཤེ་ ལྷ་སྲུ།
Z 588

Go 36,92 ཀ་པོ་ཏ་ག། བ་ཡི་འི་ཡེ། ཏ་པོ་ད་ནེ་ ལྷ་སྲུ།

Mantra 4: D 313 at 163a7–163b1, D 617 at 58a5, D 974 at 92a1–2, Go 3692 at 46a3–4, H 317 at 251b3–4, Q 599 at 98b2, Q 979 at 173a7–8, S 575 at 408a5–6, Z 588 at 422a7–8

D 313, H 317 །ཏཏ་ཐཱ། བེ་མེ་བེ་མེན་རྣ་རེ་⁴⁴²⁴⁴³ ཏི་མེ་ཏི་མང་ག་ཡི།
Q 979

D 617, 974 །ཏཏ་ཐཱ། བེ་མེ་བེ་མེན་རྣ་རེ། ཏི་མེ་ཏི་མང་གེ་ཡི།
Q 599

S 575 །ཏཏ་ཐཱ། བེ་མེ་བེ་མེན་རྣ་རེ། ཏི་མེ་ཏི་མོ་གེ་ཡི།
Z 588

Go 36,92 །ཏད་ཡུ་ཐཱ། བེ་མེ་བེ་མེན་རྣ་རེ། ཏི་མེ་ཏི་མང་གེ་ཡི།

D 313, H 317 ཏི་⁴⁴⁴ལོ་ཀ་ཨ་བ་ལོ་ཀ་ནི། ཏི་ཤུ་ལ་རྣ་ར་ཤེ་⁴⁴⁵། ཨ་ཀུ་པི་⁴⁴⁶ནི། ཏི་ལྷ་ཏི་ཏི།
Q 979

438 Z: *pa*.

439 H: *pa*.

440 Q 979: *ye*.

441 S: *po*.

442 H: *ra*; Q 979: *ri*.

443 Q 979 inserts: *l*.

444 Q 979: *tai*.

445 Q 979: *ni*.

446 H: *pa*.

D 617, 974 Q 599	ཉི་ལོ་ལོ་ལོ། ལ་ལོ་ལོ་ལོ། ཉི་ལུ་ལ་ལྷ་ར་ཅི། ལ་ལུ་ལི་ཅི་ ⁴⁴⁸ གི་མི་གི་ཉི།
S 575 Z 588	ཉི་ལོ་ལོ་ལོ། ལ་ལོ་ལོ་ལོ། ཉི་ལུ་ལ་ལྷ་ར་ཅི། ལ་ལུ་ལི་ཅི། གི་མི་གི་ཉི།
Go 36,92	ཉི་ལོ་ལོ། ལ་ལོ་ལོ་ལོ། ཉི་ལུ་ལ་ལྷ་རི་ལོ། ལ་ལུ་ལི་ལོ། གི་མི་གི་ཉི།

D 313, H 317 Q 979	གི་ལི་གི་ལི། ལུང་རྟོ་ལུང་རྟོ། ལུང་རྟོ་ལུང་ལི། ⁴⁴⁹ ལུང་ལུ་ལི་ཉི།
D 617, 974 Q 599	གོ་ལི་གོ་ལི། ལུང་རྟོ་ལུང་རྟོ། ⁴⁵⁰ ལུ་རྟོ་གི་ལི། ⁴⁵¹ ལུ་ཉི་ ⁴⁵² ལུ་ལི་ཉི།
S 575 Z 588	གོ་ལི་གོ་ལི། ལུང་རྟོ་ལུང་རྟོ། ལུང་རྟོ་ལུ་ལི། ལུ་ཉི། ལུ་ལི་ཉི།
Go 36,92	གོ་ལི་གོ་ལི། ལུང་རྟོ་ལུང་ཉི། ལུ་རྟོ་ལུང་ལི། ལུ་ཉི། ལུ་ལི་ཉི།

Mantra 5: D 313 163b3–4, D 617 at 58a7–58b1, D 974 at 92a4, Go 3692 at 46a8, H 317 at 251b7–252a1, Q 599 at 98b5, Q 979 at 173b3, S 575 at 408b2, Z 588 at 422b2–3

D 313, H 317 Q 979	ཁྱུ་ལྷ། ཉི་ལི་ ⁴⁵³ མི་ལི། ཙོ་ལི། ཨི་ལི། མི་ལི། ལི་ཤ་ཙོ་
D 617, 974 Q 599	ཁྱུ་ལྷ། ཉི་ལི་མི་ལི། ཙོ་ལི། ⁴⁵⁴ ཨི་ལི་ མི་ལི། ལི་ཤི་ཙོ་ལ།
S 575 Z 588	ཁྱུ་ལྷ། ཉི་ལི་མི་ལི། ཙོ་ལི། ཨི་ལི། མི་ལི། ལི་ཤི་ཙོ་ལི།
Go 36,92	ཁྱུ་ལྷ་ལྷ། ཉི་ལི་མི་ལི་ མི་ལི། ཨི་ལི་ མི་ལི། ལི་ཤི་ཙོ་ལི།

447 Q 599: *tre*.
 448 Q 599: *na*.
 449 Q 979 repeats: *kud to kud si* /.
 450 D 974 omits: /.
 451 Q 599: *kud to // gi si* for *ku to ki si*.
 452 Q 599: *ta*.
 453 H inserts: /.
 454 Q 599 omits: /.

D 313, H 317 Q 979	བླ་ཆ་ ⁴⁵⁵ ག་བ་རི་ ⁴⁵⁶ ཙི་ལི་ཙི་ལི་	སྐྱ་ལྷོ།
D 617, 974 Q 599	བཏུ་ག་བ་རི། ཙི་ལི་ཙི་ལི་	སྐྱ་ལྷོ།
S 575 Z 588	བཏུ་ག་བ་རི་ཙི་ལི་ཙི་ལི་ ⁴⁵⁷	སྐྱ་ལྷོ།
Go 36,92	བར་ན་ག་བ་རི། ཙི་ལི་ཙི་ལི།	སྐྱ་ལྷོ།

4.2.5 Translation

The Discourse on an Auspicious Night

[0.] In Indian language: *ārya bha dra ka rā trī nā ma sū tra*
 In Tibetan language: *'phags pa mtshan mo bzang po zhes bya ba 'i mdo*
 Homage to all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.

[1.] Thus have I heard. At one time⁴⁵⁸ the Blessed One was dwelling at Kalandakanivāsa⁴⁵⁹ in the Veṇuvana⁴⁶⁰ near Rājagṛha.

[2.] At that time, a monk was staying at the bank of the river Tapoda in Rājagṛha. During the first watch of the night, a certain god of beautiful colour went to the place where that monk was. Having reached [him], an immense brilliance pervasively illuminated the whole bank of the river Tapoda.⁴⁶¹ [The god] said to the

⁴⁵⁵ Q 979: *rnā*.

⁴⁵⁶ H inserts: *.*

⁴⁵⁷ Z inserts: *.*

⁴⁵⁸ For this phrase see p. 80 n. 185 of the present work.

⁴⁵⁹ Mvy 4138: Skt. *kalandakanivāsaḥ* (*kalandakanivāpaḥ*) for Tib. *ka lan da ka gnas pa*. BHSD 171/2: *kalandakanivāpa* “squirrel food-offering.” PTSD 197: *kalandaka* “N. of a locality in Veṇuvana, near Rājagaha, where oblations had been made to squirrels.”

⁴⁶⁰ Mvy 4108: Skt. *veṇuvanam* for Tib. *'od ma 'i tshal*. Bamboo Grove.

⁴⁶¹ The Pāli parallel *Mahākaccānabhaddekaratta-sutta* (MN 133 at MN III 192,2) gives the name of the monk Samiddhi. A similar introductory narration occurs in the *Samiddhi-jātaka* (Jā 167 at Jā II 56,24). Here the monk Samiddhi is addressed by a deity after bathing in the Tapoda. The meeting of Samiddhi and a god is also related in the *Samiddhi-sutta* (SN 1.20 SN I 8.16) even though the narrative context is different. The *Lomasakāṅgiyabhaddekaratta-sutta* (MN 134 at MN III 199.22) gives the name of the deity Candana.

monk: “Monk, do you know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night?” He answered: “God, since I do not know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night, god, do you know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night or not?” He replied: “Monk, I also do not know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night.” “Well then, god, who is the one who knows the Discourse on an Auspicious Night?” [The god] said: “The Blessed One is dwelling at Kalandakanivāsa in the Veṇuvana near Rājagṛha. Therefore you should approach the Blessed One and request it. Just how the Blessed One teaches it to you, in the same way you should make an effort to hold it. Having said so, the god disappeared just then.

[3.] That monk then arose in the morning and went to the place where the Blessed One was. Having reached [him], he paid homage with his head to the feet of the Blessed One, and sat down to one side. After sitting to one side, he said to the Blessed One: “Lord, last night, when it became dark, a certain god of beautiful colour came to the place where I was. An immense brilliance pervasively illuminated the whole bank of the river Tapoda. He addressed me: ‘Monk, do you know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night?’ I told him: ‘God, I do not know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night. God, do you know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night or not?’ He replied: ‘Monk, I also do not know the Discourse on an Auspicious Night.’ ‘Well then, god, who is the one who knows the Discourse on an Auspicious Night?’ He said: ‘The Blessed One is dwelling at Kalandakanivāsa in the Veṇuvana near Rājagṛha. Therefore you should approach the Blessed One and request [it]. Just how the Blessed One teaches it to you, in the same way you should make an effort to hold it. Having said so, the god disappeared just then. Lord, because of that I ask the Blessed One for the meaning.” The Blessed One responded: “Monk, do you know that god?” The monk replied: “Lord, I do not know that god.” The Blessed One said: “That god⁴⁶² is the general of the gods of the Heaven of the Thirty-three called Candana⁴⁶³.” The monk requested: “Lord, I wish to hear the Discourse on an Auspicious Night.”

⁴⁶² *Devaputra* here refers to a male god, and not to the son of a god. See *deva* in BHSD 270/1: “often also *devaputra*.” Alsdorf (1974: 588f.) showed that the word *putra* in a compound can indicate the affiliation to a specific group.

⁴⁶³ Mvy 4209: Skt. *candanam* for Tib. *tsan dan*. Sandalwood.

[4.] The Blessed One responded: “Monk, listen and bear this well and carefully in mind⁴⁶⁴ [what] I will explain to you. Monk, if a monk is endowed with the three characteristics, he is called one who adheres to the Discourse on an Auspicious Night. What are these three? It is like that: By possessing the qualities, one does not meet the past later on, regarding the future there is no hope, and one is not carried away by whatever presently arisen phenomena. If a monk is endowed with the three characteristics, he is called one who adheres to the Discourse on an Auspicious Night.”

The Blessed One spoke this, and after the Sugata had said this, the Teacher spoke further:

[4.1.] “One does not meet the past later on, regarding the future there is no hope. What is past has ceased, the future has not [yet] come.

Having fully observed all aspects of whatever presently arisen phenomena, the wise [should] integrate them without being carried away by discursive thoughts.

One could die just tomorrow - who knows? Therefore, one should be diligent today, [so that] the Lord of Death and [his] great army do not recognize you.

[4.2.] May all sentient beings, all living beings, and all *bhūtas*, everyone, attain only happiness. May they all be free from afflictive emotions. May they all experience auspiciousness. Whosoever may he not fall into evil.

[4.3.] In this way one should abide very diligently, without laziness, day and night. For that reason the sage always declared the Discourse on an Auspicious Night.”

[5.] Having explained this Discourse on an Auspicious Night in order to protect all sentient beings, the Blessed One taught these *mantrapadas* of Drāmiḍa⁴⁶⁵:

⁴⁶⁴ Mvy 6315: Skt. *dena hi śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru* for Tib. *de'i phyir legs par rab tu nyon la yid la zungs shig*.

⁴⁶⁵ *Drāmiḍa* in BHSD 273/ 1: “(precisely this form seems to be un-recorded; cf. AMg. Dāmila), *Dravidian*.” Bernhard (1967) argues for a Dravidian origin of *mantra* syllables. The use of many retroflex sounds indeed points in this direction as they are much more common in the Dravidian languages than in Sanskrit. Davidson (2014: 48) develops this idea further by stating that there are “apparently Dravidian-based words – *īti miṭi kiṭi* – [...] and the *Mahāmāyūrī* in three places recognizes that it employs similar Dravidian words (*Mahāmāyūrī: ili misti kili misti ili kili ili me sidhyantu drāmiḍā mantrapadāḥ*, pp. 9.18, 14.7, 44.18; see also *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka* 39.1–3: *Sarvajñatākāra-dhāraṇī* 16.1, 19.8)”. The term *drāmiḍā mantra* is also attested in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Bbh 69.3: *tadyathā drāmiḍānām*

[5.1.] *tadyathā, bi ni bha ra di, bi ri ni, bi ra ni, bud dha ma har tā na dhe, ma hi ni mi na ni, ni ni ni ni, ti ti ti ti, bi ra ti, gauri, gandhāri, caṇḍāli, mātaṅgī, pukkasī, bramhani, drāmiḍī, drāmiḍī, śabarī,⁴⁶⁶ sa dā lam bhe, hi nā ma tya ma ud ta ra ni, ma ho la na, da la bha ni, da lā bha dre, mahā da lā ni, ca lā ni, u shhe cakra bha ki, mahācakra bha ki, śabarī, śabarī, mahāśabarī, bhu tsid gi ni, bhu tsi ring gi na, ni mi ni ming gi ni, ni min dha ri bhu ta ni svāhā.*

tadyathā, e tu tu tu, na tu mi rni, ke rni ing ku, sud ta ri tsa la la, nar ta, nar ma lu lu, ga lu lu, a ba tra no ne, sho ka ni ra, bha ra dha sa le, ta ra kre ta re dhā tu, nod du, ta la lā lu, ba ta bha ti, ya bha ti ye svāhā.

tadyathā, a ra kā te, na ra kā te, baṃ su ka, ba yai ye, ka po ta ka ba yai ye ta bho ta ne svāhā.

[5.2.] Monk, when any son of a good family, any daughter of a good family, in order to protect all sentient beings, holds, keeps, recites, concentrates on, masters, or even teaches others extensively, and in detail the meaning, the prose and the verses, and the *mantrapadas* of Drāmiḍa of the Discourse on an Auspicious Night, fire, poison, weapon, and water will not harm their bodies, [they will not be subject to] punishment of kings, and [actions] of thieves. The time of untimely death will not come either, and you will definitely approach *nirvāṇa*. Wherever one is born, when one has read the Discourse on an Auspicious Night, one will remember one's previous births,⁴⁶⁷ and will become an Arhat, and a great Lord.⁴⁶⁸ Even just once, in all places of rebirth, untimely death [will] not prematurely [occur]. For people who have applied it to themselves, there will not be the characteristics of untimely death. All sentient beings are protected and cured. If this is recited in times of disease, pain, fear of rebirth, and sorrow caused by inauspicious dreams, glory will arise. Whoever writes it down, man or woman, if he or she ties it around the body, good

mantrāṅām), in the *Śikṣasamuccaya* (Śikṣ 333.2: *drāmiḍamantrapadebhī*), in the Tibetan *Ārya-mahābala-nāma-mahāyānasūtra* (Bala 22.19: 'gro lding ba'i gzungs "dhāraṇī of *drāmiḍa*"), and in the Tibetan *Ārya-drāviḍa-vidyā-rāja* (De 2009 36.8, 37.4: 'gro lding ba'i *gsang sngags*).

⁴⁶⁶ This series of feminine vocatives represents invocations of female deities. For a discussion of these invocations, see chapter 5.2.3 of the present work.

⁴⁶⁷ A similar phrase occurs in the *Mahāpratisarā*: *yatra yatropapadyate tatra tatra jātau jātau jātismaro bhaviṣyati* (Hidas 2012: 247). "Wherever he is born, there, in every single birth, he will remember his former existences" (tr. Hidas 2012: 247). For the term *jātismara* in Indic sources, see Schopen 1983.

⁴⁶⁸ Mvy 639: Skt. *īśvaraḥ* for Tib. *dbang phyug*.

fortune, splendour, and glory will arise for them. Whoever committed even the smallest non-virtue by body, speech, and mind, all of them are protected from untimely death through the auspicious discourse. If one remembers the auspicious [*sūtra*] one is protected from kings, water and fire, lightning, thieves, diseases, enemies, fight, and dispute. If one always speaks this auspicious *vidyā* and these *mantras*, especially when one recites it silently, it makes people become undaunted in all circumstances.

[6.1.] Homage to the Tathāgatas, Arhats, and Samyaksambuddhas of the past, present, and future. Having paid homage, one should speak these *vidyās*. May I attain wealth through this *vidyā*.

[6.2.] *tadyathā, ni mi nimindhare*⁴⁶⁹, *ti mi ti ming ga li, trailoka a ba lo ka ni, trishula dharaṇi, a ku phi ni, kri mī kri ti, ki li ki li, kud to kud to, kud to kud si, kurti ku pi ti.*

Together with Vajrapāṇi protect me and all sentient beings, from all fears and all diseases, all poisons, all kinds of fever, all evil spirits, everything afflicted with miseries, all thieves, all human beings and non-human beings, fright, injury, and all infections, battle, trouble, evil deeds, conflict, dispute, weakness, and evil practices of body, speech, and mind, and from all fears at all times! Protect us!

[6.3.] *tadyathā, hi li mi li, tsi li, i li, mi li, piśācī pārṇaśabari tsi li tsi li svāhā.*

[7.] When the Blessed One had said these words, the monks, the entire retinue, and the world with its gods, humans, *asuras*, *garuḍas*, *gandharvas*, *kiṃnaras*, *mahoragas*, *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *pretas*, and *piśācas* rejoiced and praised the words of the Blessed One.

[8.] The noble Discourse on an Auspicious Night is finished. Translated, put into the new language and finalized by the Indian preceptors Jinamitra and Dānaśīla, and the great editor, the translator, the monk Ye shes sde.

⁴⁶⁹ See *Nimindhara* in BHSD 298/1: “n. of a *nāga*-king.”