Chapter 3

Reflections on the Original Form and Function of the *Testimony of Ba* From Dunhuang

How the fragments were found

The manuscript from the Dunhuang ‘library cave’ containing a portion of the narrative found in the *Testimony of Ba* was discovered by Kazushi Iwao and myself, and the textual features of the manuscript have been discussed in a jointly-authored article.¹ Named the BL fragment in this book, I shall also refer to it as the *Testimony* fragment in this chapter in order to distinguish it from other fragments from the British Library’s Dunhuang collection. It remains the earliest exemplar of any portion of the text. My intention here is to complement that earlier work by looking more closely at the manuscript itself, using palaeography and codicology to enquire into its original form, the date of its creation, and the social context in which it functioned. I will also consider the relationship between the BL fragment and the later texts of the *Testimony*, extending earlier comparisons with the *Dbā’ bzhed* by bringing in the manuscript recently published under the name *Rba bzhed* in the Dpal brtsegs series.²

The manuscript actually comprises two fragments, clearly from the same original piece, that were separately numbered in the British Library sequence Or.8210 (See Figure 3.1) This sequence was intended for the Chinese scrolls acquired by Aurel Stein from Cave 17 in Dunhuang, and sent to the British Museum for cataloguing and numbering. The first part of the sequence (S. 1–6890) contains scrolls mainly from Stein’s first Central Asian expedition, with some 600 at the end from his third expedition. These are followed by twenty printed documents (Or.8210/P.1–

20).³ After this, the sequence continues from S. 7009 onwards, with mostly smaller scrolls. Many of these were neither catalogued nor numbered until much more recently. This sequence includes smaller pieces that were either neglected because of their size, or only came to light during the conservation of the larger scrolls, since they were folded into or pasted onto the more complete scrolls. After recent conservation work, the fragments in the latter part of the Or.8210 sequence are now preserved in clear plastic Melinex sheets, often with several manuscripts in each sheet. The *Testimony* fragments belong to this latter part of the Or.8210 sequence.

The first, larger fragment is numbered Or.8210/S. 9498. It is composed of four parts, distinguished by the letters A to D (see Figure 3.2), of which A has the text of the *Testimony*. Though we do not have any conservation records for this item, the four manuscripts were probably pasted together when recovered from the Dunhuang cave, and then removed from each other in the modern conservation process. Parts B, C and D look to have originally been a single manuscript fragment composed of three layers of fine paper. Given that the *recto* (the side with text) is darkened, apparently with dried glue, it seems that this fragment was pasted written-side-down onto Parts B, C and D, probably as a support for them.⁴

On part D, we can see what remains of a printed design, with curling foliage and two human figures probably representing babies with the traditional three tufts of hair on their heads (see Figure 3.3). These resemble the auspicious babies of the *nianhua* (年画) genre. Thus, this seems to have been a print with a talismanic function, on weak paper that was repaired at some point by addition of the *Testimony* fragment, glued face-down. These *nianhua* type prints are known to have been in circulation from the eleventh century onwards, so this may be an early example of the genre, dating from the late tenth century.⁵

¹ Sam van Schaik and Iwao Kazushi, “Fragments of the Testament of Ba from Dunhuang,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128, no. 3 (2008): 477–88. See also the catalogue of the Tibetan manuscripts in the Or.8210 sequence: Kazushi Iwao, Sam Van Schaik and Tsuguhito Takeuchi, *Old Tibetan Texts in the Stein Collection Or. 8210* (Tōkyō: Tōyō Bunko, 2012).

² This *Rba bzhed*, RBA 2011.1, is reproduced on pages 64–110 of volume 36 of the Dpal brtsegs *Bod kyi lo rgyus rnam thar phyogs bsgrigs* series, though it is actually two texts conflated in one (see also Chapter 1 in this volume). The *Testimony* portion ends abruptly at the end p. 70 (folio 4v), whereas p. 71 (folio 5r) contains a different text that continues to the end of the manuscript. The passage corresponding to the BL fragment is on p. 70.

³ The Buddhist manuscripts from the first part of the sequence were catalogued by Lionel Giles, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tun-hung in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1953).

⁴ Several other Tibetan documents apparently cut up and used as patches are found in this sequence; e.g. Or.8210/S. 9323.

⁵ See Sung-nien Po and David Johnson, *Domesticated Deities and Auspicious Emblems: The Iconography of Everyday Life in Village*

Figure 3.1: The two fragments of the *Testimony of Ba* manuscript, shown together

The smaller fragment, which fits at the bottom left of the larger fragment, is numbered Or.8210/S. 13683. This is also in four parts, distinguished as A to D, with the *Testimony* fragment being Part C (See Figure 3.4). Part A is a fragment of a Chinese document. Part B is a blank fragment of the same type of paper as Or.8210/S. 9498B, and Part D is a wooden roller, similar to scroll rollers, but without any lacquer or other treatment. One possibility is that it was the support used to hang the print onto which the *Testimony* fragments were pasted.⁶

Not a great deal can be concluded from all this, except that we would expect some time to have passed between the creation of the *Testimony* manuscript, which was (as will be discussed below) an expensive and carefully produced object, and its re-use as backing for a talismanic print. By the time the manuscript was put to this use, it was no longer valued enough to repair; instead its only value was as material with which to repair other items. Moreover, there was another stage subsequent to this repair involving the ripping of the print into fragments (unless that happened after the manuscript was acquired by Stein, which is unlikely). Given that an expensively

produced manuscript should not become repair material immediately, we can estimate the passage of at least some decades between the creation of the manuscript, its later re-use, and the subsequent closing of the Dunhuang cave in the early eleventh century.

Palaeography and Codicology

The size of the *Testimony* fragment as we have it now is 24 cm long at its top edge, and 9.5 cm high at its right edge. It was obviously once both longer and higher. The length was probably a little more than double the current longest edge, at 48–52 cm, the length of many of the loose-leaf *pothi* manuscripts from Dunhuang. This measurement makes it highly unlikely that the original format was a scroll, and is also wider than the usual size of concertina manuscripts. Therefore, it seems that we have a folio from a *pothi* volume. The height, if there was one more line at the top, would have been some 1.5 cm higher, at roughly 11 cm, also a common height for *pothi* pages. This would mean the folios contained seven lines of text. The folio could have been even higher, but more than eight lines of text would result in unusual proportions for a *pothi* page. Thus, it is likely that there were 7 or 8 lines of text per page in the original.

The *verso* of the folio is blank, which suggests that the original folio was composed of two pieces of paper pasted together. This method is seen in the large Perfec-

China (Berkeley: The Chinese Popular Culture Project, 1992), 10. Several other illustrated fragments are found in the latter part of the Or.8210 sequence, both printed and hand-illustrated, including a deity in a Chinese style in Or.8210/S. 9497.

⁶ Several illustrated paper panels from the Dunhuang cave possess string-holes, presumably for hanging. At least one of these, Pelliot tibétain 1122, retains a loop of string through one hole.

Figure 3.2: British Library fragments, Or.8210/S. 9498A–D, in Melinex sheet

Figure 3.3: British Library fragments, detail from Or.8210/S. 9498D

Figure 3.4: British Library fragments, Or.8210/S. 13683A–D, in Melinex sheet

tion of Wisdom manuscripts made during the first half of the ninth century, and suggests that the original manuscript was a relatively expensive production. It also raises the possibility that the manuscript was made during the Tibetan imperial period, since most of the Tibetan *pothi*-format manuscripts from the tenth century are made with only one layer of paper.⁷

Turning to the original *mise-en-page* or layout of the folio, we can see that horizontal guidelines were ruled in red ink. This feature is common in the Tibetan Dunhuang manuscripts, perhaps more so in the earlier *pothi* manuscripts. Furthermore, red guidelines can be seen in some folios found in the Central Asian site of Miran, which was

probably abandoned soon after the mid-ninth century. One example of this style is Or.15000/332, a folio from a manuscript of the *Pratimokṣa sūtra* (see Figure 3.5). This latter manuscript also has string-holes surrounded by red circles, a feature found in both early and late Dunhuang manuscripts. It is quite possible that the Dunhuang manuscript containing the *Testimony of Ba* narrative originally had either one or two of these holes and circles, though they are not seen on the *Testimony* fragment.

The writing style of the *Testimony* fragment is somewhat puzzling. It does not fit into any of the common styles of the imperial-period manuscripts, which I have described elsewhere.⁸ On the other hand, neither does

⁷ On the *Perfection of Wisdom* (*Prajñāpāramitā*) manuscripts, see Kazushi Iwao, “The Purpose of Sūtra Copying in Dunhuang under the Tibetan Rule,” in *Dunhuang Studies: Prospects and Problems for the Coming Second Century of Research*, ed. Liu Yi and I.F. Popova (St Petersburg: Slavia Publishers, 2012), 102–105.

⁸ See Sam van Schaik, “Towards a Tibetan Paleography: A Preliminary Typology of Writing Styles in Early Tibet,” in *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*, ed. Jan-Ulrich Sobisch and Jörg B. Quenzer (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 299–338 and Sam van Schaik, “Dating Early Tibetan Manuscripts: A Paleographical Method,” in *Scribes*,

Figure 3.5: British Library fragments, Or.15000/332, a fragment of a *sūtra* page from Miran Fort (first half of ninth century)

it show the characteristic features of the post-imperial Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang. The writing shows most of the archaic orthographic features found in the Dunhuang manuscripts, including the inverse *gi gu*, the *ya btags* under the *ma*, and the upper hook on the *ʼa*. Though the latter feature is not found in some later texts, it is used by some scribes through to the tenth century, so this is not (on its own) proof of an early date but should be considered alongside other indicators of dating.

The closest example of this writing style in another manuscript is seen in Pelliot tibétain 1064, and also IOL Tib J 480, another folio from the same manuscript (see Figure 3.6). This interesting manuscript was also re-used. In its original condition it was a concertina manuscript containing regulations for the local Buddhist communities. Each section of regulations was sealed with an official stamp, of the kind seen only in imperial-period manuscripts. Like the *Testimony* manuscript, this was constructed by gluing together two sheets of paper; the later re-use of the manuscript involved separating these sheets and pasting them back together with the blank sides facing outwards.

There are many shared characteristics between the writing style of Pelliot tibétain 1064/ IOL Tib J 480 and the *Testimony* fragment, though the hand is clearly different. The inverse *gi gu* and *ya btags* under *ma* appear, but more specifically, key letter forms such as *ga*, *cha* and *zha* are formed with exactly the same ductus. On the other hand, the *Testimony* manuscript is more carefully written, with greater attention to consistency of letter forms, and

making a more careful distinction between heavy and light strokes. In short, it is still not possible to date the *Testimony* fragment through analysis of its format and script, but several indicators point towards it being a product of the late imperial era or the decades following, that is, mid- to late-ninth century.

Comparison with *Dbā' bzhed* and *Rba bzhed*

The *Testimony* fragment or BL fragment is similar enough to the same passage in the *Dbā' bzhed* manuscript, DBA' 2000, that these two may be considered (in the passage represented in the fragment) to be variants of the same text.⁹ Later versions of the *Testimony* diverge much further from the BL fragment. However, the newly published manuscript of the *Rba' bzhed*, RBA 2011.1, is also similar to the fragment (see Appendix 2 ending this chapter). The *Rba' bzhed* diverges from the BL fragment to about the same extent as the *Dbā' bzhed*, though often in different ways, and in places the *Rba' bzhed* is closer to the fragment (see Appendix 3). For example, at the beginning of line 2 the BL fragment has *bcugs na* “when he entered,” whereas the *Dbā' bzhed* gives *mjal nas* “after meeting.” The *Rba' bzhed* is much closer here with *gzhuks na*, “when he went in.”

Both later manuscripts contain significant interpolations into the passage in the BL fragment. The longest interpolation occurs in the first line of the fragment,

Texts and Rituals in Early Tibet and Dunhuang, ed. Brandon Dotson, Kazushi Iwao and Tsuguhito Takeuchi (Weisbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2013), 119–35.

⁹ See van Schaik and Iwao, “Fragments of the Testament of Ba,” 484.

Figure 3.6: British Library fragments, IOL Tib J 480, monastic regulations (first half of ninth century)

where the *Dbā' bzhed* inserts a line repeating Khri Srong lde brtsan's doubts about whether Śāntarakṣita is bringing foreign black magic. The *Rba bzhed* also inserts text here, but it is completely different: a statement that Gsal snang returned to the palace.¹⁰

RBA 2011.1 also throws an interesting new light on a problem that was raised in van Schaik and Iwao, “Fragments of the Testament of Ba”: the *Dbā' bzhed* contains too much text (at 42 syllables) to fit in the lacuna between lines 1 and 2 of the BL fragment. The text in DBA' 2000, 7v: 2–3 reads (in translation):

... Seng 'go Lha lung gzigs and 'Ba' Sang shi, “You three ministers, go to Ra sa Pe har (vihāra) to meet A tsa rya Bo dhi sa twa and prostrate in front of him.”

There must be some interpolated text in this passage, and in the previous article, we suggested that it might be the part “... Seng 'go Lha lung gzigs and 'Ba' Sang shi, ‘You three ministers’” This would mean that the *Dbā' bzhed* adds two extra ministers to the earlier version, in which only one minister, Rgyal sgra legs, is mentioned. This raised in our minds the interesting possibility that members of the Ba clan were inserted into the narrative at some point during the evolution of the text after the BL fragment (or its exemplar) was written. The *Rba bzhed* now appears to support this, since it mentions only one minister at this point, just like the BL fragment. It does go on to mention the three ministers at a slightly later point, which corresponds to the lacuna in the fragment between lines 2 and 3. Also RBA 2011.1 at this point where the three ministers are enumerated contains too much text to fit the

¹⁰ At other points, the *Dbā' bzhed* and the *Rba bzhed* both differ from the BL fragment in much the same way: (i) Both refer to the temple as *Ra sa pe har* rather than *Ra sa ben khang*. (ii) Both state that Śāntarakṣita was “asked to remain” in the temple rather than that he “was placed” there, though the *Dbā' bzhed* further softens this by the addition of “a little while” (*cung zhig*). (iii) Both change the skills of Ānanta from *gtsug lag* and *smrang rabs* to *sgra* and *smān brlabs*.

lacuna in the BL fragment (31 syllables, in comparison to 23 in DBA' 2000), suggesting that the extra ministers were not mentioned in the fragment lacuna at this point either. This strongly suggests that the two extra ministers' names were indeed inserted into the text as part of the later development of the narrative, at different points in the *Dba' bzhed* and *Rba bzhed*.¹¹

Original Context and Function

The key remaining question is, how much of what we now call *The Testimony of Ba* narrative, as represented in the early manuscript tradition of the *Dba' bzhed* and *Rba bzhed*, was found in the complete manuscript of which the Dunhuang fragments were once a part? There is, unfortunately, nothing in the BL fragment itself that might offer a clue to this. Perhaps the expensive and finely-produced nature of the manuscript suggests that it would not have been merely a couple of folios, since such expense would only be justified in the production of a significant manuscript object. Nevertheless, the *Testimony* text might only have been one of many in a compendium, which is often the case with the Dunhuang manuscripts.

It might be better to look for clues in the earliest version of the fuller narrative, the *Dba' bzhed*. Given that the narrative written on the BL fragment is also found in the middle of the *Dba' bzhed* section on the reign of Khri Srong lde brtsan, perhaps the original narrative corresponded to the portion of the *Dba' bzhed* that deals with Khri Srong lde brtsan's establishment of a Buddhist orthodoxy in Tibet. This would begin with his ascension to the throne (folio 4v: 5), continue through the invitation of Śāntarakṣita to the building of the Bsam yas monastery. It might have ended with the description of the emperor's edict (*bka' shog*), i. e. the text of the pillar at Bsam yas pledging his support to the Buddhist establishment (folio 17v: 6).

Of course, even if this was the full extent of the original Dunhuang manuscript, we would expect that the *Dba' bzhed* would contain further interpolations into the text of the kind described above. If it is true that members of the Ba clan were inserted into the narrative at a later date, then it is possible that the *Dba' bzhed* episode in which

Dba' Gsal snang and 'Ba' Sang shi travel to China would not have been present in the hypothetical original Dunhuang manuscript narrative. This episode sits uneasily in the *Dba' bzhed* between the expulsion of Śāntarakṣita from Tibet and his return with Padmasambhava. The later *Testimony of Ba* tradition places it in a different part of the narrative, during the period when Khri Srong lde brtsan is still a child and Buddhism is banned in Tibet. Thus, it appears to be a separate mini-narrative that was inserted into the main narrative at different points in different later versions of the text (compare the insertion of the extra ministers names into the BL fragment passage, discussed above, which occurs at different points in the *Dba' bzhed* and *Rba bzhed*).

It is generally accepted that the *Testimony of Ba* served the interests of the Ba clan itself, by placing their ancestors front and centre at the key moments of the establishment of Buddhism in the text. If the narrative represented by the BL fragment was not written in order to put forward the interests of the Ba clan in this way, it nevertheless would have had a function when the original manuscript was produced. This was perhaps to reiterate the imperial support for the Buddhist monastic community at the time of Khri Srong lde brtsan and his immediate successors, making this past event present in the act of reading the narrative.

The justification of a practice or tradition through narrative is a widely spread phenomenon. Sources can be seen among two types of text also found among the Dunhuang manuscripts: the *nidāna* (*gleng gzhi*) or introductory narratives of the Indian Buddhist tradition, and the *smrang* or ritual narratives of the non-Buddhist Tibetan tradition. Two specific examples are particularly apposite to the BL fragment: Pelliot tibétain 149 and 996.¹² The first is a narrative introduction to the *Ārya-bhadracaryā-praṇidhāna* prayer, set in the same period and milieu as the fragment (the Pelliot tibétain 149 manuscript probably dates from the tenth century). Here the practice of the regular recitation of the prayer is sanctioned by a story involving the emperor, his priest Dba' Dpal byams (*sic*) and Śāntarakṣita. Other figures associated with the succession of spiritual heads of Bsam yas also figure in the narrative.

¹¹ The number of syllables corresponding to the lacunae in the BL fragment are as follows:

DBA' 2000, between lines 1–2: 42; between 2–3: 23; between 3–4: 16; between 4–5: 23; between 5–6: 24.

RBA 2011.1, between lines 1–2: 30; between 2–3: 31; between 3–4: 17; between 4–5: 25; between 5–6: 30.

¹² On Pelliot tibétain 149, see Sam van Schaik and Lewis Doney, "The Prayer, the Priest and the Tsenpo: An Early Buddhist Narrative from Dunhuang," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 30, no. 1–2 (2007): 175–217. On Pelliot tibétain 996, see Marcelle Lalou, "Document tibétain sur l'expansion du dhyāna chinois," *Journal Asiatique* (1939): 505–23 and Sam van Schaik, *Tibetan Zen: Discovering a Lost Tradition* (Boston: Shambhala, 2016), 163–82.

The second narrative, found in Pelliot tibétain 996 (probably also dating to the tenth century), is an account of a lineage of Buddhist Chan masters that culminates with the composition of the Tibetan Chan treatise *Mdo sde bgyad bcu khungs*. Royal patronage forms an important theme of the text, and one of the masters, Nam ka'i snying po (*sic*), is stated to have taken ordination during the reign of Khri Srong lde brtsan. Thus, both narratives invoke the imperial patronage of Buddhism and are

clearly written as justifications of their associated texts and practices.

It seems reasonable, then, to suggest a similar function for the narrative of which we now have only the part represented in S. 9498 and S. 13683: as a justification or ratification of a religious tradition and its representatives. This becomes even more evident with the later incorporation of the text of these Dunhuang fragments into the full *Testimony* narratives in the following centuries.

Appendix 1: Transliteration and Translation of the BL Fragment

Or.8210/S. 9498A and Or.8210/S. 13683C (the latter in italics)

- 1: [...] lags gtol ma mchIs / ra sa'I beng gang du bzhang / / zhang lon chen po blon rgyal sgra legs [...]
- 2: [...] du bcugs na / lha bal gyI ngan sngags dang / 'phra men lta bu yod dam myed / / thugs phrI[g][...]
- 3: [...]l[o ts[a][pa] [m]a mchIs te / / tshong dus kha drug du / kha che dang yang lI lo tsa pa 'tshal [...]
- 4: [...]e [sby]In che chung gnyis dang / / kha che a nan ta dang gsum rnyed ma [...]
- 5: [...] bram ze skyes zang kha che yul na / stson rngams po che [...]u[...]
- 6: [...]u lags st[e] / / *bram z[e]I* [g]tsug lag dang / smrang lugs da[ng][...]

Translation

- 1: [...] He was uncertain whether [...] was placed in the Ra sa Beng khang. To the great minister Blon rgyal sgra legs [...]
- 2: [...] he ordered: "Investigate whether there are any foreign evil spirits or black magic." [...]
- 3: [...] there was no interpreter. [...] interpreters of Kashmir and Yang li at the six market-places [...]
- 4: [...] Three interpreters were found: the two [...]e sbyin brothers and A-nan-ta from Kashmir. [...]
- 5: [...] the son of the brahman Skyes zang who was a serious convicted criminal in Kashmir. [...]
- 6: [...] sacred scriptures of the brahmans and the tradition of ritual exposition [...]

Appendix 2: Corresponding Passages from the *Dbā' bzhed* and *Rba bzhed*

The passages in which the ministers are mentioned are marked in bold.

DBA' 2000, 7v:1-7: ... ci lags gtol ma mchis te/ ra sa pe har du cung {zhig} bzhugs su gsol {te}/ lho bal gyi ngan sngags dang phra men dag yod par thugs 'phrig bzhes nas/ **zhang blon chen po sbrang rgyal sbra legs gzigs dang/ seng 'go lha lung gzigs dang/ 'ba' sang shi dang gsum** la bka' stsal pa/ blon po khyed gsum ra sa pe har du song la/ atsarya bo dhi sa tva'i zhal sngar phyag 'tshal zhing mjal nas/ lho bal gyi ngan sngags dang phra men lta bu yod daM med thugs 'phrig bzhes dgos sam mi dgos khyed kyis rtogs shig ces bka' stsal nas/ **de gsuM** gyis ra sa pe har du mchis te/ lo tsa ba ma mchis te tshong 'dus kha drug tu kha che dang yang le'i lo tsa ba 'tshal ba su mchis zhes tshong dpon so sor rmas nas/ ra sa'i tshong 'dus nas kha che lhas byin che chung 2 dang/ kha che a nan ta dang gsum rnyed pa las/ lhas byin che chung 2 kyis ni tshong gi lo tsa ba tsam las rngo ma thog/ a nan ta ni phra bram ze skyes bzang bya ba 1 kha che'i yul du nyes pa rngams chen zhig byas pa las lho bal kha che'i chos lugs kyis bram ze dgum du mi rung nas/ bod yul du spyugs pa'i bu lags te bram ze'i gtsug lag dang sgra dang sman bslabs pas chos sgyur ba'i rngo thog nas/

RBA 2011.1, 70:5-10 (4v:5-10):

... da rung gang lags ci gtol ma mchis nas ra sa pe har du bzhugs gsol te/ gsas snang ni pho brang du mchis nas/ gnyer bskum pa dang/ zhang blon chen po **rgyal sbrang legs gzigs la bka' stsal pa**/ blon chen po ra sa'i pe har

du song la/ a rya bo dhi sa tva btsan po'i spyang sngar phyag tshal du gzhug na/ lho bal gyi ngan sngags dang 'phra len ma lta bu yod dam med kyi thugs 'phrig dgosaM mi dgos rtog dpyod gtong bar chad nas/ **sbrang legs gzigs dang/ seng mgo lha lung gzigs dang/ dba' sang she dang 3** ra sar mchis pa las/ lo tsha ba ma mchis te tshong dus kha drug kha che dang/ yang le'i phru gu lo tsha ba 'tshal na ci mchis zhes tshong dpon so sor smras pa las/ ra sa'i tshong dus nas kha che lha sbyin che chung 2 dang/ kha che a nan+ta 3 rnyed pa las/ lha sbyin che chung 2 kyis ni tshong brang(?) gi lo tsha ba las sngo ma thog/ kha che a nan+ta ni kho'i pha braM ze skye bzang zhes bya ba zhig gis/ kha che'i yul du nyes pa chaM song ci chig byas pa las/ lho bal kha che'i chos lugs kyis braM ze dguM du mi rung bas/ bod yul du spyugs pa'i bu a nan+ta lags te/ a nan+ta braM ze'i gtsug lag sgra dang sman bslabs pas chos bsgyur ba'i rngo thog ste/

Appendix 3:

Comparison Between (A) the BL Fragment, (B) DBA' 2000, 7v:1–7, and (C) RBA 2011.1, 70:5–10 (4v:5–10)

Interpolations marked in bold. Significant alternative readings marked with italics.

Line 1

A: [c]I lags gtol ma mchIs/ ra sa'I beng gang du bzahag// zhang lon chen po blon rgyal sgra legs

B: ci lags gtol ma mchis te/ ra sa *pe har* du **cung {zhig}** *bzhugs su gsol {te}*/ **lho bal gyi ngan sngags dang phra men dag yod par thugs 'phrig bzhes nas/** zhang blon chen po sbrang rgyal sbra legs

C: *gang lags ci gtol* ma mchis nas ra sa *pe har* du *bzhugs gsol te*/ **gsas snang ni pho brang du mchis nas/ gnyer bskuM pa dang/** zhang blon chen po rgyal sbrang legs

Line 2

A: du bcugs na / lh[o] bal gyI ngan sngags dang / 'phra men lta bu yod dam myed / / thugs phrI[g]

B: *zhing mjal nas/* lho bal gyi ngan sngags dang phra men lta bu yod daM med thugs 'phrig

C: du gzhug na/ lho bal gyi ngan sngags dang 'phra len ma lta bu yod dam med kyi thugs 'phrig

Line 3

A: [l]o ts[a] pa [m]a mchIs te / / tshong dus kha drug du / kha che dang yang lI lo tsa pa 'tshal

B: lo tsa ba ma mchis te tshong 'dus kha drug tu kha che dang yang le'i lo tsa ba 'tshal

C: / lo tsha ba ma mchis te tshong dus kha drug kha che dang/ yang le'i **phru gu** lo tsha ba 'tshal

Line 4

A: [...]*e* [sby]In che chung gnyis dang / / kha che a nan ta dang gsum rnyed ma

B: lhas byin che chung 2 dang / kha che a nan ta dang gsum rnyed pa

C: lha sbyin che chung 2 dang/ kha che a nan ta 3 rnyed pa

Line 5

A: bram ze skyes zang kha che yul na / stson rngams po che [...]*u*

B: bram ze skyes bzang **bya ba 1** kha che'i yul du *nyes pa* rngam chen

C: braM ze skye bzang **zhes bya ba zhig gis/** kha che'i yul du *nyes pa chaM song*

Line 6

A: [...]*u* lags st[e] / [/]*bram z[e]*I [g]tsug lag dang / smrang lugs da[ng]

B: bu lags te bram ze'i gtsug lag **dang sgra** dang *sman bslabs pas*

C: bu a nan+ta lags te/ a nan+ta bram ze'i gtsug lag **sgra** dang *sman bslabs pas*