


# A Philological Study of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda*

Ai Nishida

(Kyoto University)

he *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* is a Sanskrit text elucidating a divination method based on the Twelve Nidānas. More precisely, it is a collection of several kinds of chronologically sorted omens to each of which is assigned one of the Twelve Nidānas—a well-known doctrine of Buddhism. As for this Sanskrit divination text, we have two other editions in both Tibetan and Chinese canonical texts.<sup>1</sup> In 1995 Kimura published full transliterations of these three texts, namely a Sanskrit text based on a manuscript kept in Nepal and the Tibetan and Chinese editions recorded in the *Bstan 'gyur* and *Taishō Tripiṭaka* (*Dazheng xin xiu dazing jing* 大正新脩大藏經), alongside the translation for the Sanskrit text.<sup>2</sup> Showing a comparative table of content across these texts, he mentioned that the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts were almost in accordance whereas the Chinese text was sorted in a different order.<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, Kimura did not go into particulars regarding the correlation between the translations, either in terms of their content or the structure.

What is notable here is that a similar method of divination is found in the Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts. Pelliot tibétain 55 (hereafter PT 55),<sup>4</sup> the longest manuscript, has been the most extensively studied among the four Dunhuang manuscripts under consideration.<sup>5</sup> It is worth noting that the correlation between these Dunhuang manuscripts is not yet well understood. This is mainly because previous studies mostly aimed at providing translation and transliteration of PT 55, where they sometimes preferred to adapt the

---

<sup>1</sup> Other than them, a Tangut version of this text is also known to us, however it is apparently based on the Chinese text. This paper thus excludes the Tangut version from philological comparison of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda*. For the Tangut text, see Xu Peng 2016.

<sup>2</sup> Kimura 1995.

<sup>3</sup> Kimura 1995: 285–87.

<sup>4</sup> PT is an abbreviation for Pelliot tibétain which refers to the Pelliot tibétain collection kept at the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

<sup>5</sup> Detailed references of these Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts will be provided below.

interpretation of the *Taiśhō Tripīṭaka* text to ambiguous Tibetan expressions instead of referring to the other Dunhuang manuscripts.<sup>6</sup>

In this paper, I will first revisit the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan and Chinese canonical texts, focusing on their mismatched content. I will then examine what lays behind their discrepancy by comparing with the Dunhuang Tibetan texts.

### 1. Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan Texts

The only Sanskrit manuscript of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* is found in the Asha archives collection preserved at the Asha Saphu Kuthi in Nepal, a private library founded by Mr. Prem Bahadur Kansakar. The project of microfilming the manuscripts in this collection was conducted by at least two associations: The Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project and the Buddhist Library, the latter of which was founded in Nagoya, Japan by Hidenobu Takaoka. To date, several catalogues have been published according to these respective projects. In his previous study, Kimura referred to the one published by Takaoka.<sup>7</sup> Kimura's transliteration of the Sanskrit text was also

---

<sup>6</sup> Kelsang Yangjen 1998; Huang Weizhong 1998; Chen Jian 2011; and Chen Jian 2016.

<sup>7</sup> The Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project has microfilmed more than 180000 manuscripts and is now succeeded by the Nepal-German Manuscripts Cataloguing Project. Their films are preserved both in Berlin (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz) and at the National Archives (Rāṣṭrya Abhilekālāya) in Nepal; the latter provides photocopies of the microfilms for a fee; Tanaka 1990: 385–82; and Yasue 2011: 87–90. The catalogue for this project was published by Grünendahl 1989. Currently an online catalogue is also available (<https://www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/en/forschung/ngmcp>); however, I still have not been able to find the manuscript of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* there. The Buddhist Library has microfilmed the manuscripts kept by several private collectors in Nepal, such as Mr. Prem Bahadur Kansakar and Mr. Dharmaratna Bajracharya. In 1981, Takaoka, the founder of the Buddhist Library, published a catalogue for this project entitled *The Microfilm Catalogue of the Buddhist Manuscripts in Nepal*, Takaoka 1981. According to Tanaka, the names of the manuscripts' owners were not clearly labeled in Takaoka's catalogue. Although a KA number indicates a manuscript from Mr. Kansakar and a DH number indicates the collection of Mr. Dharmaratna, the catalogue displays seven other numbers: i.e., A, KH, GA, GH, CA, CH, and JA. This means that the catalogue includes the collections of nine owners. The Sanskrit text targeted in this paper belongs to the collection numbered with CA. These private collections are integrated into the Asha Archives collection, Tanaka 1990: 383–32; Takaoka 1981. Asha Saphu Kuthi published a catalogue in 1986 under the title: *Catalogue of Selected Buddhist Manuscripts in Asha saphu kuthi*. Besides, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Newari Manuscripts in the Asha Archives (Asha Saphu Kuthi)*, *Cwasa Pasa, Kathmandu, Nepal* was published in 1991 by Yoshizaki with the help of the Asha Saphu Kuthi, which

based on Takaoka's microfilm.<sup>8</sup> According to the descriptions in Takaoka's catalogue, this text was written on palm leaves, of which the first and last leaves are nowadays lost.<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that this manuscript is written in Newari script, and, given that the first attested use of Newari script was in 1173, this manuscript can only date from the late 12th century onward.<sup>10</sup>

The Chinese text, *Shi'er yuansheng xiangrui jing* 十二緣生祥瑞經, involved in the *Taishō Tripitaka*<sup>11</sup> lists its translator as Dānapāla (Ch. Shihu 施護) who is a famous Indian Buddhist monk and a translator of Sanskrit Buddhist sutras during the Song dynasty. He arrived at the Song dynasty capital of Bianjing in 980, and, by order of Emperor Song Taizong, the sutra translation institute was built two years later. As is revealed in the previous studied the title *Chaosan dafu shi honglu shaoqing* 朝散大夫試鴻臚少卿, prefixed to Dānapāla in this text, was conferred on him in 985. Judging from these historical facts, the Chinese text was most likely translated between 985 and 1017—when Dānapāla passed away.<sup>12</sup> This implies that Dānapāla's translation was accomplished more than 150 years earlier than the Sanskrit version in the Asha archives collection.

The Tibetan version is found among the Peking, Narthang, and Kinsha editions of the *Bstan 'gyur*, under the names *Rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba'i khor lo* in Tibetan and *Pratītyasamutpādacakra-nāma* in Sanskrit.<sup>13</sup> It bears the name of Klu sgrub (Nāgārjuna) as the author, while the translator's name is absent; furthermore, this text is listed neither in *Dkar chag ldan (/lhan) dkar ma* nor in *Dkar chag 'phang thang ma*. In this respect, it is impossible to state if it was translated during the Tibetan imperial period.

Turning our attention to the later catalogue, the *Dkar chag* of Bu

---

records roughly 5000 manuscripts. Yet, the text targeted in this paper does not appear there, since this catalogue does not include the palm leaf manuscripts.

<sup>8</sup> Kimura seems to have had a chance to investigate Takaoka's microfilm during their personal communication, Kimura 1995: 285.

<sup>9</sup> Takakoka 1981: 39 (CA61). Kimura revised the title of the manuscript numbered CA 61 which was misspelled in Takaoka's catalogue, Kimura 1995: 285.

<sup>10</sup> Kansakar 1981: 1–2. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Ryuta Kikuya, who provided me with several information on the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts. Of course, all errors remain under my own responsibility.

<sup>11</sup> Vol.16, no. 719: 845–52.

<sup>12</sup> See Kelsang Yangjen 1998: 250; Huang Weizhong 1998: 211; Chen Jian 2011: 130–31; and Chen Jian 2016: 220.

<sup>13</sup> Peking: vol. 143, no. 5811, Go 32b3–43b8; Narthang: no. 3803, Go 31b5–42a5; Kinsha: no. 3813, Go 50b1.

*ston chos 'byung*,<sup>14</sup> provides us with a clue to the translator of this text; this catalogue mentions the text with the title of *Rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba'i gtsug lag gi de kho na nyid* annotated with “*slob dpon Klu sgrub kyis mdzad pa*”, or “made by the master Klu sgrub” which agrees with the description in the *Bstan 'gyur*.<sup>15</sup> Hence, it is safe to say that this text must have been translated into Tibetan before 1322, when the *Bu ston dkar chag* was compiled. Furthermore, Bu ston provides the translator's name as 'Gos, who appears four times in *Dkar chag*:<sup>16</sup> twice as 'Gos Lhas btsas in the respective sutras in the *Bstan 'gyur*, once as a translator, and once as a reviser.<sup>17</sup> I think that 'Gos Lhas btsas is most likely to be 'Gos Khug pa Lhas btsas who was a famous Tibetan monk and translator of the 11th century.<sup>18</sup> If this hypothesis is relevant to present text, it was therefore translated during the 11th century, possibly during the first half of the 11th century by 'Gos Lhas btsas.

In sum, the Chinese text belongs to the early 11th century and is the oldest among these three versions; the Tibetan text dates possibly from the same period or a little later, while the Sanskrit text seems to have appeared a hundred years later.

## 2. Overview of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda*

Judging from Kimura's translation of the Sanskrit text, the content of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* can be classified into the following seven sections:

1. Notes on the allocation of the Twelve-Nidānas (hereafter, TN).
2. Allocation of the TN to each day of each month.
3. Analysis of events.
4. Analysis of the physical signs and external signs.
5. Introduction.
6. Preparation for divination.

<sup>14</sup> The *Dkar chag* is involved in the fourth chapter of *Bu ston Rin chen 'grub's* work: *Bde bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzad ces bya ba*.

<sup>15</sup> No. 1106 of the section XXIX, Nishioka 1982: 71.

<sup>16</sup> Nos. 506, 727, 849, and 1106, Nishioka 1982: 83.

<sup>17</sup> As a translator, 'Gos lhas btsas appears in no. 5199 of the Peking edition of the *Bstan 'gyur* and as a reviser in no. 5577, which apply nos. 506 and 849, respectively, of the *Bu ston dkar chag*. Nishioka 1982: 50, 62.

<sup>18</sup> 'Gos Khug pa Lhas btsas was a contemporary of Mar pa and Rwa Lotsaba. Although the exact date is not clear, Davidson suggests that his possible birth year is around 1015, Davidson 2004: 139.

## 7. Instructions for inquiry.<sup>19</sup>

As for the above classification, the biggest difference is between the Sanskrit and the other two versions: section 5, introduction, is placed at the top of the texts in both the Tibetan and Chinese.

I shall now provide an overview the content of each of seven sections; following some notes in section 1, the TN are allocated to each day of each month in section 2 and by these allocations, one can know to which day of the TN the current day corresponds; section 3 includes an analysis of the events that occur on each day of the TN. This section consists of five events: birth, behavior,<sup>20</sup> outing,<sup>21</sup> theft, and sickness. The omens related to these events were examined by the date assigned by the TN. For example, the first column of section 3-i, i.e., analysis of birth is as follows:

A baby who was born on the day of *Avidyā*, as long as he doesn't die on the ninth day, ninth month, or ninth year in a disaster, will be peaceful, wealthy, talkative, belligerent with his relatives, healthy, and will live 81 years before passing away on the day of *Samskāra*.<sup>22</sup>

Section 4 analyzes the eight signs on the body: tremble of the left eye, tremble of the right eye, tinnitus, sounds of the throat, tremble of the palate, sneeze, tremble of the limb, and thoughts arising in one's mind. In addition to these physical signs, several kinds of external signs which are nothing to do with one's body, such as a dog barking, crow sounds, or an earthquake, are slipped into this section with no

<sup>19</sup> Kimura classified the text into nineteen sections, according to the given titles in each section. The first and fifteenth sections are omitted from the Sanskrit text, but the contents of the first section are substituted in section eighteen, Kimura 1995: 286. Accordingly, the latter is absent from the other two texts which place the first section at the initial part of the texts. Kimura's classification corresponds to mine as follows: 1=5, 2=1, 3-8=3, 4-14 and 16-17= 4, 18=5-6, 19=7.

<sup>20</sup> 'Behavior' includes various behaviors such as washing one's hair, bathing, making one's clothes, marriage, construction of one's house or castle, trimming one's beard, hair, or nails, and so on.

<sup>21</sup> 'Outing' describes the omens led by directions to go out on the respective TN days.

<sup>22</sup> *Avidyā-divase dārako jātaḥ, navame divase navame māse navame varṣe vā cchalād yadi na mriyate, tadā sa sukhī dhanavān bahu-bhāṣī savajana-kalaḥ nirujah jīvati varṣāny ekāṣṭīḥ*, Kimura 1995: 296. This passage is my retranslation of Kimura's Japanese translation for the Sanskrit version, Kimura 1995: 296. Regarding the description of the birth on the day of *Avidyā*, the risky dates, and the lifespan perfectly correspond among three versions. In the columns of *Nama-rupa* day and *Sparśa* day they still mostly correspond. However, discrepancies become more striking as it goes to the end of section 3-i.

independent title.

As Kimura pointed out, the Sanskrit text concludes at the end of section 4, and then places the introduction in section 5.<sup>23</sup> The text goes on to section 6, the preparation for the divination, where it is noted that one has to purify the earth with mantras and draw a wheel or wheels on the earth to fill in the names of the TN there; these descriptions of the divination preparation are absent either in the Tibetan and Chinese texts.

Section 7 explains the topics suitable for answering an inquiry for each day of the TN, for example:

When you are inquired [by someone] on *Saṃskāra* day, you should tell [him/her] about [your] thought for food, children, and the path.<sup>24</sup>

Succeeding section 7, the Tibetan and Chinese texts display a short colophon; here, the Tibetan text refers to “Klu sgrub”, while the Chinese text mentions the translator in its introduction, i.e., the first section. The Sanskrit text does not provide a colophon except for the brief concluding phrase, “*Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* completed”.<sup>25</sup>

### 3. Comparison of the Contents

As mentioned above, the three versions roughly agree regarding the construction of their content. However, investigating their descriptions in detail, we find that the Chinese text greatly differs from the others. First, it does not clearly present the titles, whereas the other two texts give titles at the end of each topic in sections 3 and 4, as follows:<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Kimura 1995: 286. Kimura does not explain the reason why the Sanskrit text places the introduction after section 4 instead of the initial part of the text. I suppose it might be because the copier could have integrated some fragmentary texts of the *dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* into one, so that the order of sections appears to be partly shuffled.

<sup>24</sup> *Saṃskāre pṛṣṭo bhavet, āhāra-cintā putraṅca mārgaṃ vinirdiśet*, Kimura 1995: 346. Here, I retranslated Kimura’s Japanese translation for the Sanskrit version, Kimura 1995: 346. The Tibetan text reads “when you are contacted [by someone] on *Saṃskāra* day, you should tell [him/her] that [he/she] will go for a trip. [Also,] you will tell [him/her] about [your] thought for [his/her] children, food, and works” (*‘du byed la ni reg tsam gyis // lam du ‘gro bar ‘gyur ba ston // bu dang zas kyi bsam pa dang // las kyi bsam ba rnam par bstan //*); Peking edition: 42a6. Note that this section in the Tibetan text is written in verse consisting of seven syllables.

<sup>25</sup> *Dvādaśāṅga-pratītyasamutpādaḥ samāptaḥ*, Kimura 1995: 348.

<sup>26</sup> Regarding the Sanskrit text, I follow Kimura’s transliteration and his Japanese translation hereafter.

## 3. Analysis of the events.

- i) Birth: (Skt.) *jāti-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *skye ba rtag pa*.
- ii) Behaviors: (Skt.) *karma-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *las rtag pa*.
- iii) Outing:<sup>27</sup> (Skt.) *yātrā-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *'gro ba rtag pa*.
- iv) Thief: (Skt.) *caura-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *rkun ma brtag pa*.
- v) Sickness: (Skt.) *glāna-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *nad rtag pa*.

## 4. Analysis of the physical signs and external signs.

- i) Tremble of the left eye: (Skt.) *vāmākṣi-spandati-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) no title.<sup>28</sup>
- ii) Tremble of the right eye: (Skt.) *dakṣiṇākṣi-spandati-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *mig 'gul ba brtag pa*.
- iii) Tinnitus: (Skt.) *dakṣiṇa-vāma-karṇa-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *rna ba ngu ba brtag pa*.
- iv) Sounds of the throat: (Skt.) *kaṇṭha-vāṣita-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *mgrin pa'i sgra brtag pa*.
- v) Tremble of the palate: (Skt.) *tālu-spandana-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *rkan 'gul ba brtag pa*.
- vi) Sneeze: (Skt.) *kṣut-parīkṣā-cakram*, (Tib.) *ltogs brtag pa*.
- vii) Tremble of the foot: (Skt.) —,<sup>29</sup> (Tib.) *rkang pa sbrid pa brtag pa*.
- viii) Tremble of the limb: (Skt.) *aṅgapratyaṅga-vispan dana-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *phyi'i lta brtag pa*.
- ix) Thoughts arising in one's mind: (Skt.) *cintā-parīkṣā*, (Tib.) *bsam pa brtag pa*.

Instead of the above titles, each topic of the Chinese text begins with a brief introduction; for example, at the initial part of section 3-iii, it says:

At that time the world-honored one said to the great assembly; if you consult the wheel of Twelve (-Nidānas) for going out, you will thus find out whether it is good or it is evil.<sup>30</sup>

In section 4 of the Chinese text, some brief introductions are given to

<sup>27</sup> The Chinese text omits the descriptions of “outing” here; instead, it places this topic between sections 4-vi and 4-vii.

<sup>28</sup> In the Tibetan text, section 4-i mentions the tremble of the left eye and 4-ii covers the right eye similar to the Sanskrit text, but the integrated title is attached only to the end of 4-ii as *mig 'gul ba rtag pa*, “examination of the tremble of the eyes”.

<sup>29</sup> As I shall discuss below, the Sanskrit text lacks this topic.

<sup>30</sup> *Ershi shizun gao dazhong yan. Ruofu youren yu chuxing shi guan shi'er zhi yingzhi shan'e* 爾時世尊告大眾言。若復有人於出行時觀十二支應知善惡。

every two signs, namely, “tremble of the detail part [of the body]”<sup>31</sup> is provided to the beginning part of section 4-i, and it explains the tremble of the left eye in 4-i, and that of the right eye in 4-ii, respectively. Likewise, first, it leads sections 4-iii and 4-iv by “sounds of a crow”,<sup>32</sup> then the omens are listed off: those when one hears the sounds of a crow on one’s right and left sides in 4-iii; those when one hears them from north in 4-iv. Sections 4-v and 4-vi are explained as “tremble of the heart and the palate”.<sup>33</sup> The tremble of the palate is examined in 4-v, and that of the heart in 4-vi.

Section 4-vii of both the Tibetan and Chinese texts list off the omens led by “the foot numb” (Tib. *rkang pa sbrid pa*) or “the tremble of the foot” (Ch. *zuxuan* 足胸), whereas the Sanskrit text omits this section.<sup>34</sup> The titles of section 4-viii are different between the Sanskrit and Tibetan text, namely “tremble of the limb” and “external signs”. However, I prefer to think that each column given to each day of the TN in section 4-viii of the Sanskrit text consists of two parts: the omens led by the tremble of the limb, and those by the external signs. The following is an example:

On the day of *Avidyā*, if one feels a tremble on his/her side, a conflict will occur. On his/her hand, a conflict will occur. On his/her chest, a conflict will occur. On his/her tongue, there will be something good. On his/her calf, a guest will come. On his/her front arm, he/she will encounter a guest. On his/her thigh, he/she will suffer loss. On his/her left foot, he/she will have something good, and on his/her right foot, a conflict will occur. On his/her feet, a noble guest will come. If a dog barks, someone will come from afar. If his/her cloth burns, something useless will occur. If a mouse gnaws a cloth, a great disaster will occur. If a crow emits a sound, a noble person who has a question will come. If a cloth is stained with oil, a person will die. If the earth shakes, one will reach a rec-

<sup>31</sup> *Zhifen xuandong* 支分胸動.

<sup>32</sup> *Wuniao mingyin* 烏鳥鳴吟.

<sup>33</sup> *Xine shangxuan* 心齶上胸.

<sup>34</sup> The Chinese text enumerates all topics at the beginning part of section 4-vii: the tremble of the foot, the earthquake, crow sounds, a dog barking, and damages [of cloth] by fire, oil, and mice (Ch. *zuxuan* 足胸, *didong* 地動, *wuyin* 烏吟, *quanfei* 犬吠, *youhuo shushang* 油火鼠傷) Kimura 1995: 329. Then the omens led by the tremble of the foot are exclusively mentioned in section 4-vii. In section 4-viii of the Tibetan and Chinese texts the other external signs are examined after mentioning the omens on one’s foot again: “the tremble of the foot” (Ch. *zuxuan* 足胸) or “the sounds of foot /footsteps” (Tib. *rkang pa’i sgra*).



conciliation with a king.<sup>35</sup>

From the dog barking onward, the external signs, namely the signs apparently irrelevant to one's body are explained here. Note that the Sanskrit text enumerates the tremble of one's side, hand, chest, tongue, calf, arm, and thigh as well as the tremble of one's feet in the first half of the omens given to each TN in section 4-viii, in spite that the Tibetan and Chinese versions do not mention physical trembles other than the foot.<sup>36</sup>

As shown in the example of 4-viii below, the topics of external signs (*phyi'i ltas*) in the Tibetan text mostly correspond with the Sanskrit text we have previously seen:

On the day of *Avidyā*, if one hears the sounds of his/her foot (/ footsteps), he/she will obtain a great treasure, otherwise, a guest will come in a short time. If a dog eats [something],<sup>37</sup> someone will come from afar. If a cloth burns, there will be a profit as one wishes. If a mouse gnaws a cloth, a great conflict will occur. If a crow emits a sound, a person of a noble birth will come to ask [something]. If a cloth is stained with oil, one will hear of someone's death. If the earth shakes, one will have a capable king.<sup>38</sup>

It is interesting that the Chinese text repeats the omens led by the sounds of a crow in section 4-viii which are already listed in the preceding sections 4-iii and 4-iv.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, the Chinese text, regardless

<sup>35</sup> *Avidyā-divase kuṣṣiḥ spandati kalih syāt, haste kalih, hṛdaye kalih, jihvāyāṃ śobhanam, jaṅghayor atithir āgacchati, bāhvor atithi-saṅgrahaḥ, urvoḥ kṣatīḥ syāt, vāma-pāde śobhanam, dakṣiṇa-pāde kalih, caraṇayor mahātithir āgacchati, śvā krośati dūrāt kaścid āgacchati, prāvāraṇam dahyati nirarthakaṃ syāt, mūśakah prāvāraṇam khādati mahāvyaśanam syāt, kāko vāśati kulīnah pṛechaka āgacchati, prāvāraṇam snigdham bhavati mriyate, bhūḥ kampate rājñā saṃdhānam syāt*, Kimura 1995: 330.

<sup>36</sup> Most of the omens in section 4-vii of the Tibetan and Chinese texts, i.e., the omens led by “the foot numb” or “the tremble of the foot” seem to correspond with those given to “the tremble of one's left foot” in 4-viii of the Sanskrit text.

<sup>37</sup> In the Tibetan text, the omens concerning dogs are consistently written as “*khyi za na*” (‘if a dog eats / if one eats a dog?’). Considering the other two texts’ descriptions, the verb *za* might be a mistake for *zugs* (‘to bark’), which appears in PT 1050.

<sup>38</sup> *Ma rig pa'i nyi ma la rkang pa'i sgra grag na gter chen po rnyed pa'am mgron po myur du'ong ngo // khyi za na ring po nas 'ga' zhig 'ong ngo // gos tshig na don nyams par 'gyur ro // byi bas gos zos na rtsod pa chen po 'byung ngo // bya rog skad sgrog na rigs can 'dri ba 'ong ngo // gos la snum 'bags na 'ga' zhig 'chi ba thos so // sa 'gul na rgyal po nus pa dang ldan no //*, Peking edition: 40b5–40b7.

<sup>39</sup> Kimura seems to understand section 4-iii of the Sanskrit text as the omens when one hears the sounds of “a crow”, probably because he does not refer to the Tibetan text but to the Chinese one. However, I prefer to take this section of San-

of exclusively recording the omens related to the tremble of the foot (Ch. *zuxuan* 足响) in section 4-vii, repeats the tremble of the foot in section 4-viii followed by other external signs such as a dog barking. Likewise, section 4-viii of the Tibetan text also starts with “the sounds of the foot (/footsteps)”. Yet, it seems inadequate that the omens on one’s feet are enumerated in the section entitled “the external signs” (*phyi’i bltas*); moreover, “the sounds of foot (/footsteps)” itself seems an odd sign; I shall leave it to be an open question until the end of this paper.

With respect to the inconsistency of sections 4-vii and 4-viii among three versions, it seems reasonable to assume that the two originally separate sections, “tremble of the limb” and “external signs”, are integrated into a single section in the Sanskrit version. This division clearly explains the structure of the other two versions, even though they skip most of the topics in “tremble of the limb” except for those of the foot. Notwithstanding the great inconsistencies which remain to be discussed, i.e., analysis of “sneeze” is the focus of section 4-vi of the Sanskrit text, while “hunger” (*ltogs*) and “the tremble of the heart” (*xinshang xuandong* 心上响动) are respectively analyzed in the Tibetan and the Chinese texts. I shall revisit this question after examining the versions among Tibetan Dunhuang manuscripts.

Finally, section 4-ix explains the kinds of thoughts that arise on each day of the TN; for example, “the thought about brothers will arise on the *Vijñāna* days”.<sup>40</sup>

#### 4. Dunhuang Manuscripts

Four Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts are so far known to contain this divination method: PT 55, PT 1050, IOL Tib J 474, and S. 3991.<sup>41</sup> The

---

sanskrit text as relating to “tinnitus” or the “sounds of one’s ear”, since a crow or a bird never appear in section 4-iii of the Sanskrit text as same as the respective section of the Tibetan text. Furthermore, Kimura translates the verb *vāśati* as “[one’s] throat makes a sound” (*kaṅṭho vāśati*) in section 4-iv, which should be applicable here; namely, “[one’s] ear makes a sound” (*karṇe vāśati*). Thus, I regard section 4 as related to “the physical signs” and “external signs”, the latter of which are listed in 4-viii.

<sup>40</sup> *Vijñāne bhrāṭṛ-cintā*. Kimura suggests that we should understand this section as enumerating the matters such as brothers or friends which one should think of on each day of TN, Kimura 1995: 342.

<sup>41</sup> IOL Tib J is an abbreviation for India Office Library Tibetan [Group] J in the Stein Collection, which is now preserved in the British Library. S number refers to the number Or.8210 in the Stein Collection of the British Library, which consists mostly of the Chinese texts from Dunhuang. Yet, 88 Tibetan texts are known to be

last one has only six lines of Tibetan script, and the first three lines relate to this divination text.<sup>42</sup> In contrast, PT 55 has the longest text, lacking only the beginning of the manuscript. It consists of the above-mentioned sections 3, 4, 6 and 7. Here, I shall show the titles given to sections 3 and 4.<sup>43</sup>

Section 3.

- i) *Skye ba rtag pa.*
- ii) *Yen 'drog gso' ba.*
- iii) *Phyog su 'gro ba'i brtag pa.*
- iv) *Rkun pho brtag pa.*

Section 4.

- i) *Myig g.yon pa 'gul.*
- ii) *Myig g.yas pa 'gul.*
- iii) *Na<sup>44</sup> g.yas pa g.yon pa ngu.*
- iv) *Rna ba ngu.*
- v) *Dkan g.ya'.*
- vi) *Sbrid pa byung.*
- vii) *Rkang pa g.ya'.*
- viii) *Phyi rol gyi mtshan ma brtag pa.*
- iv) *Bsam ba brtag pa'.*

As we have visited above, Section 3-ii contains the omens led by several kinds of behaviors in the Sanskrit text and the other two canonical versions. However, PT 55 does not provide the respective omens here but mentions “*yen 'drog gso' ba*” instead. This section concerns, first, how many days the *yen 'dog* (= *ye 'drog*)—a kind of evil spirit that brings obstacles to a person—stays with a person and second, when he will be free from *yen 'drog*. In spite of the title “to cure of *yen 'drog*”, no exact treatment is mentioned here:

To a person of the *Avidyā* day,<sup>45</sup> *yen 'drog* stays for half a

---

scattered among them, Iwao et al. 2012. The transliterations of these four texts are available on OTDO website (<https://otdo.aa-ken.jp>).

<sup>42</sup> The full text of S. 3991 is published by Iwao et al. 2012: 59. It corresponds to a part of section 3-iii, and seems to be a scribble or a writing exercise.

<sup>43</sup> The titles of sections 4-i to 4-vii are given by me, since PT 55 offers no clear titles there.

<sup>44</sup> Although I understand *na* as *rna* (= ‘an ear’), it is quite strange to examine the omens of ‘an ear’ again in the following section. There seems to be some textual confusion here.

<sup>45</sup> In this section every omen is led by this stereotyped expression, namely “to a person of *Saṃskāra* day” (*‘du byed gyi nyin mo pa*) etc. A person of X day might mean ‘a person who was born on X day’, otherwise, ‘a person who gets sickness

month. If he/she protects [himself/herself] for five days, he/she will be free [from *yen 'dog*].<sup>46</sup>

This section seems to be equivalent to section 3-v of the Sanskrit and the other two canonical texts.<sup>47</sup> For this reason, section 3-v, examining the omens for “sickness” (*nad*), is omitted in PT 55. In short, in PT 55 the display order of the sickness section is shuffled, and section 3-ii “behaviors” is absent. Chen Jian suggests that the section of “behaviors” is intentionally left out in PT 55, since it refers to unfamiliar practices to Tibetans such as washing or trimming one’s hair and bathing.<sup>48</sup> However, it should be noted that the Tibetan text in the *Bstan 'gyur* records the section of “behaviors”, which includes hair washing, hair cutting, and bathing. Furthermore, even among the Dunhuang texts, IOL Tib J 474 clearly explains the omens led by these unfamiliar “behaviors”.<sup>49</sup> As mentioned above, PT 55 was the only Dunhuang version studied by scholars, sometimes helped by the Chinese canonical text. This has created further misunderstandings. For instance, Chen Jian considers PT 55 as three independent texts: a text of divination concerning the TN, a text of mantras for poisoning and detoxifying, and a text of dream interpretation.<sup>50</sup> While the last certainly a separate text,<sup>51</sup> the second one probably belongs to the text under consideration, since similar content involving mantras for purifying the earth certainly exist in the Sanskrit version of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda*.<sup>52</sup> It says that before demonstrating this divination one needs to draw a wheel or wheels on the earth in which the names of TN are filled. Purifying or detoxifying the earth by mantras in advance is probably the indispensable procedure for the preparation for this divination.

IOL Tib J 474, consisting only of a single sheet of *pothi*, lacks both its beginning and end, while the content continues from *recto* (12

---

on X day’. Referring to the Tibetan text in *Bstan 'gyur* and IOL Tib J 474, the latter interpretation seems more suitable here.

<sup>46</sup> *Ma rig pa'i nyin mo pa la' // zla ba pyed gyi yen 'drog yod de // zhag lnga bsrungs na thar ro //* PT 55: l. 19.

<sup>47</sup> The Tibetan text in the *Bstan 'gyur* reads: *ma rig pa'i nyi ma la nad kyis btab na shin tu 'bad de bsrung bar bya ste / gal te zla ba phyed na ma shi na / de'i 'og tu mtshan mo lnga na grol bar 'gyur ro //*. Peking edition: Go 38b4.

<sup>48</sup> Chen Jian 2016: 222.

<sup>49</sup> This section is entitled “auspiciousness and inauspiciousness distinguished by the behaviors on each [TN] day” (*nyi ma gang la las byas na bzang ngan bltas*); IOL Tib J 474: l. r5.

<sup>50</sup> Chen Jian 2016: 220–48.

<sup>51</sup> For the text of dream interpretation, see Crescenzi and Torricelli 1995; and Chen Jian 2016: 244–46.

<sup>52</sup> See section 6 of the Sanskrit text.

lines) to *verso* (13 lines).<sup>53</sup> Sections 3-ii, 3-iii, 3-v, and a part of 4-viii thus remain in this manuscript, and it is interesting to note that section 3-v of IOL Tib J 474 mentions the omens of “sickness”, where “*gdon*” is mentioned as the cause of disease instead of “*yen 'dog*”.<sup>54</sup>

Similarly, PT 1050 is written on both sides of a single *pothi* sheet, with the right and left edges missing due to paper damage; this manuscript provides a brief description of section 2, and a part of sections 3-iii and 4-viii. This is the only manuscript in which a section other than the omens is kept, namely section 2—allocation of the TN to each day of each month.

By integrating all sections of the four manuscripts into one, we can expect that the Dunhuang manuscripts were originally composed in almost the same manner as the text in the *Bstan 'gyur*, despite the missing introduction. Roughly speaking, PT 55 has the closest content and structure to the Sanskrit and two canonical texts. For instance, PT 55 adapts the Tibetan translation of the TN names almost identically to the text in the *Bstan 'gyur*, while the other Dunhuang versions bear phonetical renderings of names from Sanskrit.<sup>55</sup>

Sanskrit	<i>Bstan 'gyur</i>	PT 55	PT 1050	IOL Tib J 474
<i>avidyā</i>	<i>ma rig pa</i>	<i>ma rig pa</i>	<i>^a byi dya</i>	<i>^a byi dya</i> <sup>56</sup>
<i>saṃskāra</i>	<i>'du byed</i>	<i>'du byed</i>	<i>sang ska ra</i> <sup>57</sup>	<i>sang ska ra</i>
<i>viññāna</i>	<i>rnam par shes pa</i>	<i>rnam par shes pa</i>	<i>byid nyi na</i>	<i>byid nya na</i> <sup>58</sup>
<i>nāmarūpa</i>	<i>ming danggzugs</i>	<i>mying danggzugs</i>	<i>na ma ru pa</i>	<i>na ma ru pa</i>
<i>ṣaḍāyatana</i>	<i>skye mched drug</i>	<i>drug 'du mched</i>	<i>sha ta ya ta na</i>	<i>sha ta ya ta na</i>
<i>sparśa</i>	<i>reg pa</i>	<i>reg pa</i>	<i>spa ra sha</i>	<i>spar sha</i> <sup>59</sup>
<i>vedanā</i>	<i>tshor pa</i>	<i>tshor pa</i>	<i>be da na</i>	<i>be da na</i>
<i>tr̥ṣṇā</i>	<i>sred pa</i>	<i>sred pa</i>	<i>dri sna</i> <sup>60</sup>	<i>dri sna</i> <sup>61</sup>

<sup>53</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Brandon Dotson for tolerantly sharing his transliteration of IOL Tib J 474 and giving me insightful suggestions for this divination method. However, all errors naturally remain under my own responsibility.

<sup>54</sup> Most omens in section 3-v of IOL Tib J 474 begin with the expression: “On the X day, if one is affected by a sickness of *gdon*” (*X'i nyi ma la / gdon nad gyis btan na*).

<sup>55</sup> S. 3991 presents the TN name only once as “*dza ra ma ra*”.

<sup>56</sup> Or, *^a byid nya ya*.

<sup>57</sup> Or, *sang ra*.

<sup>58</sup> Or, *bed nya*.

<sup>59</sup> Or, *spa ra sha*.

<sup>60</sup> Or, *ti sna*.

<i>upādāna</i>	<i>len pa</i>	<i>len pa</i>	<i>^u pa da na</i> <sup>62</sup>	<i>^u pa da na</i>
<i>bhava</i>	<i>srid pa</i>	<i>'byung ba</i>	<i>bhab</i>	<i>bha ba</i>
<i>jāti</i>	<i>skye ba</i>	<i>skye ba</i>	<i>'dza ti</i>	<i>'dza ti</i>
<i>jarāmarāṇa</i>	<i>rga shi</i>	<i>rga shi</i>	<i>dza ra ma ra na</i> <sup>63</sup>	<i>ja ra ma ra na</i>

### 5. Inconsistencies Among the Texts

Let us turn our attention to the remaining problems. As mentioned above, the physical signs in section 4-vi, such as “sneeze”, “hunger”, and “tremble of the heart” are different among the Sanskrit and two canonical texts. Moreover, the corresponding part of PT 55 records *sbrid pa byung*, which can be interpreted not only as ‘sneeze’ but also as ‘numb’. As a result, there are four options of signs for this section: “sneeze”, “hunger”, “tremble of the heart”, and “numbness”. It is noteworthy that these options might be derived from equivocal Sanskrit words with similar spelling: *kṣut*, *kṣud*, and *kṣudh*, that respectively are, ‘sneeze’, ‘be shaken’, and ‘be hungry’.<sup>64</sup> The ambiguous spelling or illegible handwriting of the Sanskrit text might have generated these different interpretations which, otherwise, can be comprehended as variant readings of the Sanskrit word *kṣut*.<sup>65</sup> In addition, *kṣut* in the Sanskrit text appears as “*kṣut-parīkṣā-cakram*” in the title and as “*kṣud bhavati*” in the first omen. Given the latter expression, *kṣud* (*/kṣut*) can be interpreted as ‘hungry’, because *bhavati* or *bhū* is an intransitive verb meaning ‘become’. Whereas, ‘sneeze’ seems more adequate as a topic for enumerating together with a tremble of the eyes, tinnitus, sounds of the throat, and a tremble of the palate, all of which relate to the physical parts of the head.

Another example of outstanding discrepancy is seen in section 4-viii. The given title of the Sanskrit text is “tremble of the limb” which,

<sup>61</sup> Or, *ti sna*.

<sup>62</sup> Or, *^u pa da ma*.

<sup>63</sup> Or, *dza ma ya ra na*.

<sup>64</sup> Monier-Williams 1899: 330–31.

<sup>65</sup> In the Sanskrit orthography, the ending voiceless consonant of a word changes into voiced one when it is followed by an initial voiced word. There is another example that seems a strange expression to me. In section 6, instructions for the inquiry, the Sanskrit text says: “If [you are] inquired [of something] on X day”, while the Tibetan texts both in the *Bstan 'gyur* and Dunhuang manuscripts state: “If [you are] contacted [by someone] on X day”. In Tibetan texts, the verb is *reg* (‘touch, contact’) instead of *'dri* (‘inquire’), the latter of which should be a proper translation for the Sanskrit *prṣṭa* (‘inquired’). In my supposition, there seems to be a confusion of Sanskrit words here again, namely *prṣṭa* (‘inquired’) and *sprṣṭa* (‘touched’).

as mentioned above, is supposed to consist of two separate sections: the tremble of the limb and the external signs. Although the latter title is absent from the Sanskrit text, the Tibetan text in the *Bstan'gyur*, in PT 55, and in IOL Tib J 474 present it as "the analysis of the external signs" (*phyi'i ltas brtag pa, phyI rol gyI mtshan ma brtag pa, ltas bzang ngan*). Conversely, no texts include the title "tremble of the limb" other than the Sanskrit text. It is also quite strange that in two canonical texts, the omens relating to one's foot are required to repeat as the first topic of the external signs, right after being exclusively mentioned in section 4-vii.

By contrast, looking into the Dunhuang texts, we find a different topic: PT 55 states the "shaking of a house" (*khang pa g.yos* or *khang pa 'gul*) as the first topic of the external signs, and both PT 1050 and IOL Tib J 474 begin with "if a house makes a rattling noise" (*khang pa tseg tseg zer na*). Hence, all Dunhuang texts mentions the shaking of a house or its sounds instead of the tremble or the sounds of one's foot (/footsteps). It is reasonable to enumerate the omens relating to a house as one of the external signs rather than those relating to one's foot. Thus, I am inclined to expect the confusion between the similar pronunciation of the Tibetan words *rkang pa* ('a foot') and *khang pa* ('a house'); in other words, the topic that originally concerned 'a house' (*khang pa*) as revealed in the Dunhuang texts may have been confused with 'one's foot' (*rkang pa*) due to their phonetic similarity. If so, the ambiguous expression or the odd topic in the *Bstan'gyur* text, "the sounds of one's foot or footsteps" (*rkang pa'i sgra*) could be understood as the more intelligible expression, "the sounds of a house" (*khang pa'i sgra*). While some variants can be explained as cases of misreading or mistranslation, there is still the question as to why the Sanskrit text records the omens of both feet (*caranayor*) after addressing those of the left foot and right foot (*vāma-pāde, dakṣiṇa-pāde*) instead of the unusual incidence of a house. This could be explained by the intervention of some kind of Tibetan text into the establishment of this Sanskrit version, but this hypothesis remains unanswered.

## 6. Conclusion

The oldest texts of the *Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda* so far available are the Dunhuang Tibetan texts, followed by the Chinese and Tibetan canonical versions, whereas the Sanskrit manuscript is written later, probably from the 12th century onward. In spite of the absence of the complete text among the Dunhuang manuscripts, it is safe to assume by putting the content of all manuscripts together that they had almost the same structure as the later version. However, outstanding

differences still remain among them, concerning discrepant topics such as “sneeze”, “hunger”, and “numbness” which, in my supposition, were caused by the multiple interpretations or mistranslation of a word due to the ambiguous spelling or illegible handwriting of the original Sanskrit manuscript, and sometimes due to the phonetic confusion of Tibetan words.

What is certain is that none of these texts is confirmed to be based on a single identical Sanskrit text, even the Dunhuang Tibetan texts. Therefore, several variations of Sanskrit text or slightly different tradition of this divination practice are assumed to have prevailed from the period of the Dunhuang manuscripts until at least the 12th century. However, after the text of this divination method was included in the canonical texts, no other variant text in either Tibetan or Chinese has been brought forth.

### Bibliography

Asha Archives. 1986.

*Catalogue of Selected Buddhist Manuscripts in Asha saphu kuthi. Exhibited on the occasion of the 15th conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists.* Kathmandu: Asha Archives.

Chen Jian 陳踐. 2011.

“P.T. 55 shi’er yinyuan zhanbo P.T. 55 十二因緣占蔔 [Divination through 12 dependent originations in P.T. 55]”, in Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林 and Huang Weizhong 黃維忠 (eds.), *Dunhuang tufan wenxian xuanji, wenhua juan* 敦煌吐蕃文獻選輯, 文化卷 [Selected Tibetan documents from Dunhuang, Culture volume], 130–37. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.

Chen Jian 陳踐. 2016.

“P.T. 55(1) hao shi’er yinyuan zhanbo shu P.T. 55(1) 號十二因緣占蔔書 [Divination through 12 dependent originations in P.T. 55.1]”, in Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林, Huang Weizhong 黃維忠, and Chen Jian 陳踐 (eds.), *Dunhuang tufan wenxian xuanji, zhan bo wenshu juan* 敦煌吐蕃文獻選輯, 占蔔文書卷 [Selected Tibetan documents from Dun-huang, Divination volume], 220–27. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe.

Crescenzi, Antonella and Torricelli, Fabrizio. 1995.

“A Tun-huang Text on Dreams: Ms Pelliot tibétain 55 – IX”, in *The Tibet Journal* vol. XX, no. 2, 3–17.



Davidson, Donald M. 2005.

*Tibetan Renaissance*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Grünendahl, Reinhold, 1989.

*A concordance of H.P. Śāstri's Catalogue of the Durbar Library and the microfilms of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

Huang Weizhong 黃維忠. 1998.

“P.T. 55 hao “Shi'er zhi yuan sheng xiang” chutan P.T. 55 號《十二支緣生相》初探”, in Wang Yao 王堯 (ed.), *Xianzhe xin yan 賢者新宴 [Mkhas pa'i ston gsar]*, 211–15. Beijing: Beijing chubanshe.

Iwao, Kazushi, van Schaik, Sam and Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (eds.). 2012. *Old Tibetan Texts in the Stein Collection Or. 8210*. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.

Imaeda, Yoshiro, Kapstein, Matthew, and Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (eds.). 2011.

*New Studies of the Old Tibetan Documents: Philology, History and Religion*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Language and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Kansakar, Tej R. 1981.

“Newari Language and Linguistics: Conspectus”, in *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* vol. VIII, no. 2, 1–18.

Kelsang Yangjen (Gesang Yangjing 格桑央京). 1998.

“Dunhuang zangwen xiejuan P.T. 55 hao yishi 敦煌藏文寫卷 P.T. 55 號譯釋 [Translations of Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript P.T.55]”, in *Zangxue yanjiu, di jiu ji 藏學研究, 第九輯 [Tibetan Research, 9<sup>th</sup> Series]*, 247–72.

Kimura, Takayasu 木村高尉. 1995.

“Dvādaśāṅgapratītyasamutpāda”, in Taishō daigaku sougou bukkyō kenkyūsyō syoumonchi kenkyūkai, Mikkyō seiten kenkyūkai 大正大學総合佛教研究所聲聞地研究會,密教聖典研究會 [A joint study on the Sravakabhumi, Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University] (ed.), *Bongo bukkyō bunken no kenkyū 梵語佛教文獻の研究 [Studies on the Buddhist Sanskrit Literature]*, 285–349. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing.

Monier-Williams, Monier. 2006 [1899].

*A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged, with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

Nishioka, Soshu 西岡祖秀. 1982.

“Putun bukkyō shi mokuroku-bu sakuin II プトゥン仏教史目録部索引 II [Index to the catalogue section of Bu ston’s *History of Buddhism II*], in *Tokyō daigaku bungaku-bu bunka kōryū kenkyū shisetsu kenkyū kiyō* 東京大學文學部文化交流研究施設研究紀要第5號 [*Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange, Tokyo University*, vol.5], 43–95.

Takaoka, Hidenobu (ed.). 1981.

*A Microfilm Catalogue of the Buddhist Manuscripts in Nepal, vol. 1*. Aichi: Buddhist Library.

Tanaka, Kimiaki 田中公明. 1990.

“Nepāru sanskuritto-go bukkyō bunken kenkyū (1) — Syahon hozonpurojekuto to kenkyū no genjō — ネパールのサンスクリット語仏教文献研究 (1) — 写本保存プロジェクトと研究の現状— [On the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal and the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project]”, in *Indo-gaku bukkyō-gaku kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 [*Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] vol. 39(1), 385–81.

Xu Peng 許鵬. 2016.

“Xixia wen “Shi’er yuansheng xiangrui jing” chushi 西夏文《十二緣生祥瑞經》初釋 [A Study on Tangut Version *Shi’er Yuansheng Xiangrui Jing*], in Du Jianlu 杜建錄 (ed.), *Xixia xue, di shi’er ji* 西夏學, 第十二輯 [*Tangut Studies, 12<sup>th</sup> Series*], 101–18.

Yasue, Akio 安江明夫. 2011.

“Yashi no ha kara kami he—Nepāru syahon kenkyū nōto— ヤシの葉から紙へ—ネパール寫本研究ノート— [On the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in Nepal and Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project]”, in *Gakushuin daigaku kenkyū nenpō* 學習院大學研究年報 [*The Annual Collection of Essays and Studies Faculty of Letters, Gakushuin University*] vol. 58, 87–14.

Yoshizaki, Kazumi. 1991.

*A Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Newari Manuscripts in the Asha Archives (Asha Saphu Kuthi), Cwasa Pasa, Kathmandu, Nepal.* Kumamoto: Kurokami Library.

