

Minor Vajrayāna Texts VI

A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Anāvilatantra*

Péter-Dániel Szántó (Universiteit Leiden)*

1 Introduction

Tokyo University Library Ms. 517 (old no. 557)¹ is a fragmentary but extremely valuable multiple-text manuscript consisting of 19 disordered palm-leaf folios. The catalogue of the collection describes only two works: the *Satsukhāvabodhana* and the *Dohākoṣa* of Saraha.² In fact, the bundle contains fragments from four more tantric works.

1. A three-folio fragment of Ratnākaraśānti's *Guṇavatī*, a commentary on the *Mahāmāyātāntra*. This fragment was not used in the *editio princeps* of the text, but it has been collated in an unpublished MA thesis (Damron 2014).
2. A six-folio fragment from *Śrībhūṣaṇa's **Pañjikā*, another commentary on the *Mahāmāyātāntra*. The text is almost complete and a critical edition of it is being published in installments (Ōmi 2009a and 2009b).
3. A significant portion of Āryadeva's *Svādhiṣṭhānakrama-prabheda* (vv. 15c–58 out of 60). This witness was not used in the *editio princeps*. This important fragment was first identified by Toru Tomabechi.³

* Acknowledgments: This work was (partially) supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No 741884), as well as by All Souls College, Oxford.

¹ The digitised collection became available online in b/w images a little after 2006 at <http://utlsktms.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp>.

² See Matsunami 1965: 182–183.

³ See Tomabechi 2006: 17.

4. A block of five untraced verses.⁴

The present study focuses on the so-called *Satsukhāvabodhana*.⁵ This title was read by Matsunami from the colophon, who did not seem to have realised that he had chanced upon a text also transmitted in the Tibetan Canon (D414/P58), albeit under a different title, the *Anāvilatantra* (*rNyog pa med pa'i rgyud*).

There is very little published literature on this short esoteric scripture. A brief assessment of the Tibetan translation is given by Ronald Davidson:⁶

[...] the *Anāvilatantrarāja* [...] is very much a *dohā*-like deconstruction of traditional Buddhist categories, with an

⁴ The text, given here in diplomatic transcript in the hope that the verses will be eventually identified, comes after the colophon of the *Dohākoṣa* on 21 verso:

indracāpaḍinmeghavātolkā cāsanidhvani |
niśrtā nabhasā sarvve | punas tatra layaṃ gatāḥ ||
tadvad vidyāgamā sarve devatānekakoṭayaḥ |
cittād eva samutpanā cetasī ca layaṃ gatāḥ ||
na hi cittena vinā kiñcitra vyañjanānnalavādayaḥ
prabhavantīha dehasthāṃ trbhavodbhavadehināṃ ||
liṅgayonisamāpattimanthanaṃ surataḥ sukhaṃ
cittasyānuhavaṃ sarvvaṃ | sarvvaṃ ātmani sammatam ||
cittena citta gaveśya tanniṣaṃ yadi cintatā |
anyathā viphalam sarvvaṃ bhrānticcittasya mānavaḥ ||

The metrical and grammatical irregularities suggest that the verses are from a scripture. The meaning of the first two verses is easy to guess: “Rainbows, lightning, clouds, wind, comets, and the sound of the thunderbolt—all these come forth from the sky, and into the sky they disappear. In the same way, all spells, scriptures, and the many crores of deities spring forth from nothing else but the mind, and into the mind they dissolve.” In other words, what we have here is something one may call a *cittamātra* reading of the tantric revelation.

⁵ I will edit Saraha’s *Dohās* in a separate publication, a forthcoming monograph co-authored with Klaus-Dieter Mathes.

⁶ Davidson 2005: 206.

emphasis on the fundamentals of meditation combined with caustic criticism of certain unspecified yogins' misuse of esoteric terminology.

I am quite puzzled by this statement. I do not find any 'deconstruction of traditional Buddhist categories' in the text; in fact, we have the very opposite. I also find very little similarity with the *dohās*. I do not read the text as having 'an emphasis on the fundamentals of meditation,' nor do I feel that the criticism is particularly 'caustic,' not to mention the fact that the target of criticism is not 'misuse of esoteric terminology.'

The only more in-depth study of the text I am aware of is that of Roger Jackson, whose description, in spite of some of its inaccuracies, is perhaps closer to the facts:⁷

The main text of the *tantra* [...] is a mixture of gnostic pronouncements about reality and quasi-systematic expositions of the symbolic and meditative significance of a variety of tantric themes, including the *maṇḍala*, joyful gnosis, fire-rituals, deity, consecration, vows, and the five nectars.

Jackson too worked only with the Tibetan translation, which, as he himself notes, is not of outstanding quality, therefore his synopsis of the text is in places very misleading. In his short historical discussion, he points out that the *Anāvīlatantra* has been largely neglected in Tibet, in spite of the fact that it is one of only two scriptures—and the only *tantra*—included in the *Mahāmudrā* / Great Seal collections (e.g., the *Phyag chen khrid mdzod*). He conjectures that the text may have been important to the eleventh-century Indian master Vajrapāṇi and therefore for his master, Maitrīpāda/Advayavajra.

Jackson also notes the meagre popularity of the work in India, as there is only one short commentary of the text, the **ṭīkā* (or, given its style and the author's *pratijñā*, more likely: *pañjikā*) of a

⁷ Jackson 2009: 12.

Kumāracandra.⁸ This is available to us only in Tibetan (D1204/P2334) for the time being. A complete, twelve-folio Sanskrit manuscript of the commentary was found in China. I am aware that Dr. Luo Hong is preparing an edition of it, but unfortunately I could not consult either his draft or the manuscript.

I think Jackson is right when he says that the *Anāvilatantra* was not very popular on the Indian subcontinent. I could not find it quoted or referred to anywhere in Sanskrit Vajrayāna sources. In fact, its very survival in the original is something of a surprise.

In the Tibetan Canon, the *Anāvilatantra* is grouped with a cycle of thirty-four *tantras*,⁹ whose authenticity—that is, their having been transmitted from India—was doubtful.¹⁰ In his long overview of the tantric corpus, the great editor of the Canon, Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) analysed¹¹ and dismissed several of these, mostly very short, texts, but they remained canonical and were transmitted in all versions of the printed *bKa' 'gyur*. A few

⁸ On stylistic grounds, I think that we have at least two authors named Kumāracandra. 'Ours' is perhaps the same as the author of the *Katipayākṣarā* and perhaps the **Vajrabhairavatāntrapañjikā* (D1973/P2837), but not identical with the verbose author of the *Ratnāvalī*.

⁹ See Davidson 2005: 205–207.

¹⁰ See Sanderson 2009: 157 n. 360.

¹¹ His *rGyud sde nam bzhag rgyas pa* (429–439) discusses 34 texts as 'explanatory *tantras*' of the *Śamvara/Samvara* corpus under a separate heading called 'a cycle of *tantras* the authenticity or spuriousness of which is debated' (*rgyud yang dag yin min rtsod pa can gyi skor*). He groups the first thirty-two into eight '*tantras* of mind' (D383–D390/P28–P35), eight '*tantras* of speech' (D391–D398/P36–P43), eight '*tantras* of body' (D399–D406/P44–P51), and eight '*elaboration tantras*' (D407–D414/P52–P58, slightly differently ordered with one omission); the remaining two are simply labeled as 'doubtful' and 'fake' (D415, D416 / P59, P60).

examples should suffice. This is what Bu ston says of the *gSang ba gcod pa* (D384/P29):¹²

In this [*tantra*], too, there are explanations that do not tally with Sanskrit. For example: “The Secret Initiation is merit (*dge ba*), and he who adopts this way (*tshul*) is one who is on a way of merit (i.e., a novice monk, *dge tshul*). The Knowledge of Wisdom [Initiation] is merit (*dge ba*), and he who requests (*slong*) it is one who collects merit (i.e., an ordained monk, *dge slong*).”

The Sanskrit terms are obviously *śrāmaṇera* and *bhikṣu*, therefore the semantic analysis proposed by the *tantra* can work only with the Tibetan translation of the two words. In his analysis of the *sKu gsung thugs kyi rgyud* (D388/P33), he catches the Tibetan compiler red-handed on palaeographical grounds:¹³

Here [we have statements such as] “The ‘*a* is Amitābha,” explaining the ‘*a* [element] in [the Tibetan transliteration of the *mantra*] *hūṃ* [as a deity]. This is treachery.

What is called ‘*a chung* is not a Nāgarī glyph, but a Tibetan one, here used to lengthen the vowel *u* in *hūṃ*, since Tibetans did not adopt the sign of long *ū* when they created their script. Yet another spurious semantic analysis is pointed out in the case of the *rDo rje rgyal po* (D403/P48) and the *Dur khrod kyi rgyan rmad du byung ba* (D413/P57):¹⁴

[In this *tantra*,] ‘*das pa* in *bcom ldan ‘das* (*bhagavān*) is explained [in the passage] “The nature of transmigration is

¹² *rGyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (429): ‘*di la’ang* | *gsang ba’i dbang ni dge ba ste* | ‘*di yi tshul ldan dge tshul yin* | *dge ba shes rab ye shes yin* | *de nyid slong bas dge slong yin* | *zhes sogs rgya gar gyi skad dang mi ‘grig pa’i bshad pa byung ngo* ||.

¹³ *rGyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (430): ‘*di la* | ‘*a ni de bzhin ‘od dpag med* | *sogs hūṃ gi ‘a la bshad pa byas pas bla btsong ‘dug go* ||.

¹⁴ *rGyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (433 & 435–436): ‘*khord ba’i chos ni mya ngan te* | *de dang bral phyir ‘das pa ‘o* | *zhes bcom ldan ‘das kyi ‘das pa bshad byas pas bla btsong ‘dug go* ||.

suffering (*mya ngan*), and he is called ‘gone beyond’ (*‘das pa*) because he is free of that [suffering].” This is treachery.

Once again, the analysis can only work if one is looking at the standard Tibetan translation of the word, and not the Sanskrit original.

Testimony to his formidable critical acumen, the *Anāvilatantra* is the only one about which Bu ston says that it “looks authentic.”¹⁵ Somewhat surprisingly, he does not mention Kumāracandra’s commentary, the existence of which could have been a powerful argument for the *tantra*’s existence in India. It cannot be the case that he was not aware of Kumāracandra’s work, because he mentions it in the appendix to his *Chos ‘byung*.¹⁶

Had the *Anāvilatantra* been at the base of a popular body of practice, the discovery of its Sanskrit original would have created something of a sensation among learned Tibetans concerned with scriptural authenticity. However, the *Anāvila* cannot claim the fame and controversy of, for example, the *Vajrakīlamūlatantra*, the discovery and translation of which by Sa skya paṇḍita (1182–1251) silenced critics doubting its authenticity,¹⁷ or the *Guhyagarbha*, two manuscripts of which are reported by Sog bzlog pa Blo gros rgyal mtshan (1552–1624) in reply to allegations from inter alia the Eighth Karma pa (1507–1554),¹⁸ or its *uttaratantra*, about which

¹⁵ *Rgyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (436): ‘*di rgyud yang dag cig ‘dra bar ‘dug go* ||.

¹⁶ See Nishioka 1983: 101, no. 2518. The translation of the commentary is not signed, which makes the dating very problematic. It is perhaps also worth mentioning that here Bu ston lists the commentary in a rather surprising context: the commentaries of the *Hevajra* ‘explanatory *tantras*.’ It cannot be the case that the text is corrupt, for this is indeed where the commentary is placed in the *bsTan ‘gyur*.

¹⁷ See Roerich 1949: 103; Rhoton 2002: 13.

¹⁸ See Roerich 1949: 103–104; Davidson 2005: 153. More recent studies have shown that the document containing the abovementioned allegation is a forgery itself; see Almogi 2020: 105–106 (I thank the author for pointing this out to me during the review process).

gZhon nu dpal (1392–1481) says that its manuscript was in his personal possession.¹⁹

The *tantra* can be seen to contain three units. The very beginning, by way of the statement of purpose (*pratijñā*), contains a short description of ultimate reality (verses 1–3). The text then criticises other approaches—both Buddhist and non-Buddhist—towards achieving the same, ending with the statement that ultimately these too are the work of *buddhas* (verses 4–9). It then launches into the major theme, which is essentially an esoteric interpretation of tantric ritual and its elements (verses 10–55), with special attention to the ‘symbolism’ of the *maṇḍala* (verses 10–27). This is what other texts refer to as *viśuddhi*.²⁰ In order to achieve this, it employs a variety of techniques from Sanskrit semantic analysis (*nirvacana* or *nirukti*), at times in a rather clever and imaginative way. I will refrain from giving a tentative translation until the Sanskrit text of the commentary becomes published.

While the textual and doctrinal influences of several important precursors are evident (*Māyājāla*, *Guhyasamāja*, *Sarvabuddha-samāyogaḍākinījālasamvara*, *Hevajra*, and perhaps the *Samantabhadrasādhana* of Jñānapāda), the *tantra* does not seem to propagate any particular cult, in spite of the fact that Akṣobhya is mentioned as a central deity in line 17d. The influence of the *Hevajra* shows an environment after 900 CE, whereas the floruit of the translators, *Gayādhara and 'Brog mi Shākya ye shes, fixed the terminus ante quem around the mid 11th century.

In spite of its brevity, the *Anāvīla* is available to us in two recensions: one witnessed by the present, almost complete fragment, and the one behind the Tibetan translation. In the critical edition of the Sanskrit text I have underlined the passages not mirrored in the Tibetan.

¹⁹ See Roerich 1949: 104.

²⁰ See Sferra 1999.

2 Text, Notes, Translation

2.1 Formatted Diplomatic Transcript

NB: A bullet denotes the string space; *m* renders the *virāma*-type *anusvāra*. The folio numeration is that of the manuscript; r means recto side, v means verso side.

[14r1]lekhanam | abhiṣekādikalpan tu bhūtabhautikavigrahaṃ ||
evamādyās tv anantāgrā buddhavajrādikalpanāḥ | susthitan tu
yadā cittan tathatākāragocaram | prakṛtiprabhāsva[14r2]rā
dharmmā ādisuddhā hy anāvilāḥ | maṇḍalan tu tathābhūtaṃ
jñātavyaṃ hitaiṣiṇā || skandhadhātvdibhir vṛndai rañjitaṃ yad
viśeṣataḥ | rajomaṇḍalam ity uktaṃ kāyavākcittarañjanā[14r3]t ||
tad vakta gaṇamaṇḍalam ity uktaṃ skandhādyānidarśanāt | tac
cittama•ṇḍalam śuddhaṃ bhāvayen niḥsvabhāvataḥ || ādarśaṃ
naṃ hi bhaved evaṃ prathamāsrāvabodhakaṃ |
pra[14r4]tyavekṣaṇam ity uktaṃ pratīyaśravibhūṣaṇam ||
kṛtānuṣṭhānakaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ uttarāśravirājakaṃ | samateti
mahājñānam avācyaśānuśāsakaṃ || evam asracatuṣkaṃ tu
kalpitaṃ jñā[14r5]nagocaram | etattattvapraveśena asramadhyeṣu
sarvvataḥ || dvāracatuṣayaṃ coktaṃ catuḥsmṛtyodayaṃ sadā |
uktaṃ tathā catuṣkoṇam ca<tu>²¹rdvāraśuddhitaḥ | madhye
maṇḍala[14v1]rūpaṃ tu akṣobhyaākāramaṇḍitaṃ | maṇḍalam
sarvvadā siddhaṃ sāntadharmmātvamaṇḍanāt ||
hārārdhahāracandrādi yal likhitaṃ tu maṇḍale | toraṇādyāni
sarvvāṇi samādhyāṅgaṇi[14v2]bhāni hi || toraṇam
citta²² paryantam uktan tatvasvabhāvataḥ | cittasya yat tu
pravarttanam samādhyāṅge vyavasthitaṃ || hāreti tad evoktam²³
arddhahāras tadarddhataḥ || ghaṇṭikā hārasaṃla[14v3]gnā
bodhayanti svaghoṣataḥ | pratiśrutakopamāna sarvvāna
dharmmāṃś ca pratibudhyati | dhvajāvalī tad evoktā
dharmmānutpādadarśanāt || vitataṃ hi sadā cittaṃ

²¹ Added in the lower margin by a second hand.

²² Before correction by cancellation: *citte*.

²³ Before correction by cancellation: *oktam*.

bhāvā[14v4]dyādyavilepataḥ | cittaṃ vitānam ākhyātam²⁴ uktaṃ
hi paramārthataḥ || mālyāmbara hi tat sarvam
vicitrādyavabhāsataḥ | vajrākāran tu yac cittaṃ catijñānena
cāṅkitaṃ || [14v5] tenārthenodita nityaṃ ḍākinīsaṃvarodayam
|| koṇasandhis ca <sa>²⁵ rvaḥ khacitaṃ vajraratnais tu
vajraratnāvabodhataḥ || yad uktañ candrasūryan tu
prajñopāyārthadarśanāt | [15r1] prajñopāyamayañ cittaṃ ebhir
jñānair vibhūṣitaṃ || maṇḍalaṃ hi tad evoktaṃ
kāyavākcittavajrajaṃ | kāyavākcittasānidhyād ekākāram
alakṣaṇaṃ | praveśaś ca sa evokto [15r2] viṣpaṣṭaṃ guruśiṣyayoḥ
|| homaṅ ca kathayiṣyāmi devatāpyāyanottamaṃ²⁶ || avikalpaṃ
tu yac cittaṃ kuṇḍaśabdena cihnitaṃ | vivekānalamadhye tu
rūpaskandhādipañcakaṃ [15r3] || juhuyāt tat samastaṃ hi
samidhañ cittaśaṃbhavaṃ | rūpādayaś ca ye • bhāvāḥ samidheti
prakīrtitaḥ || evaṃ homaḥ praśastan tu pratiṣṭhā tu nigadyate |
sthiriḥbhū[15r4]tan tu yac cittaṃ kāyavākcittataḥ sadā || pratiṣṭhā
tu tam evāhuḥ skandhānām ekabhāvataḥ | idānīm kathyate
spaṣṭaṃ mantrāṇaṃ yac ca lakṣaṇaṃ || rahasyaṃ yan mayā
pro[15r5]ktaṃ bhāṣayā manasāpi ca | anutpādaṃ nirābhāṣaṃ
lakṣyalakṣaṇavarjitaṃ || etan mantraṃ iti proktaṃ
rahasyārthāvabodhataḥ | mantraṃ ca kathitaṃ spaṣṭaṃ devatā tu
niga[15v1]dyate | skandhāyatanadhātuś ca svabhāvena yata
sthitaṃ | samyakabodhyadhimokṣeṇa yat tat sarvvaṃ
prakalpitam || devateti samākhyātaṃ yac citaina lakṣitaṃ |
mudrāpi ca tad e[15v2]voktaṃ kāyavākcittamudraṇāt ||
devatācādhyanaṃ yogaṃ spaṣṭan tan nigadāmy ahaṃ || rahasye
parame ramye sarvvātmani sadā sthitaḥ || sarvvabuddhamayaḥ
satvo vajrasa[15v3]tvaḥ paraṃ sukhaṃ | paryaṅkan tu <ta>²⁷to
baddhvā²⁸ nāśāgrāgata²⁹ drṣṭitaḥ || • svasvabhāvakayogena

²⁴ Before correction by cancellation: *ākhyātaṃ*.

²⁵ Added in the lower margin, possibly by a second hand.

²⁶ Before correction by cancellation: *°omattamaṃ*.

²⁷ Added between the lines in the scribal hand.

²⁸ Before correction by cancellation: *badhvāddhvā*.

sthātavyaṃ tatvadarśibhiḥ | ṣaṭ cakre tu saṃyuktaṃ
saṃpuṭībhāvayaṃs tat || [15v4] hastadvayan tu hṛddeśe
saṃpuṭīkr̥tya yatnataḥ | nirvikalpasvabhāvan tu yadā cittaṃ
pravarttate | tadā sampadyate tasya sarvvabuddhāgramelakaḥ ||
svādhiṣṭhānaṃ bhave[15v5]d āśu sarvvabuddhātmmamelakaḥ
sarvvabuddhātmmamelā tu sarvvabuddhātmasamvaram |
saṃbuddhas tu bhaved yogī cittavajravaco yathā | kathitaṃ tu
mayā spaṣṭaṃ kāyavākcitta[16r1]siddhidaṃ || sarvvat-
antrārthaguptārthaṃ prajñopāyārthagocaraṃ | satvārthe mayā
kr̥payā buddhabodhiprabodhakaḥ || nāsāgrādi paryāṅka yud
ukta h+ mayā ca yat | [16r2] sarva saṃsthānamātraṃ na kṛtaṃ
paramārthataḥ || samayārthaṃ tad eveti na bodhavyaṃ
kadācana | kalpanā hi iyanmātrā yad bhavec ca kadācana ||
saṃsārasya bhaved dhetur vva[16r3]gvajrasya vaco yathā |
avikalpāvimokṣeṇa sādhyed yat sādha•kottamaḥ || raktaṃ
śukran tathā mānsaṃ mūtraṃ purīṣaṃ eva ca | uktañ ca yan
mayā bāhyaṃ sama[16r4]yeti prayatnataḥ || tathāgatā hi te
sarvve mlecchitā vyavahārataḥ | samaraktaṃ yadā cittaṃ
satvahitena pravarttate yadā satvo na vidyate etadarthā-
vabodhena raktaṃ [16r5] bhakṣitaṃ bhavet || <bha>³⁰kṣite tu
mahārakte amitābhaṃ ca gacchati | dharmmāṇāṃ yo 'nutpādaḥ
śukraśabdena śabditaṃ || tadanutpādāvabodhād bhakṣaṇaṃ
samudāhṛtaṃ | [16v1] samatā tu yad bhāvānāṃ mānsam iti
prakāṣitaṃ || anupalabdhiyogād bhakṣaṇaṃ ity abhidhīyate |
prasravitañ ca yac cittaṃ samayatvānuयोगataḥ || mūtraśabdena
tac co[16v2]ktaṃ pītan tu karmmayogataḥ | na kiñcid api yac
cittaṃ sthitañ cānavabhāsataḥ | purīṣaṃ ca tad uktaṃ hi bhakṣita
hi anavabodhataḥ || etad dhi kathitaṃ spaṣṭaṃ samayasya tu
lakṣaṇaṃ | [16v3] etadanvo(?)vabodhena buddhadharmmo
nugamyate || [bullet-like fleuron] || śrīmatsatsukhā•va-
bodhanaṃ nāma tantrarāja mahādhiṣṭhānaṃ samāptaṃ ||
[viśvavajra with spokes pointing outwards] || [viśvavajra with

²⁹ Before correction by rubbing out and adding a *dhvaja* respectively:
nāgrāragata°.

³⁰ Added in the lower margin in the scribal hand.

spokes pointing inwards] || [*viśvavajra* with the combination of the two features] ||

2.2 Critical Edition of the Sanskrit

NB: Customary standardisations (gemination of *t* in *ttv*, degemination after *repha*, obvious sibilants, homorganic nasals, *dh/ddh*, or addition of *avagrahas*) are not pointed out separately. The underlined passages are not mirrored in the Tibetan translation. The abbreviation *st.* means standardisation; *corr.* means correction; *em.* means emendation; *conj.* means conjecture. The numeration in square brackets is mine, added for convenience and not to denote syntactic units. In the apparatus, *pādas* (a, b, c, d) are marked in bold; prose (p) is likewise marked in bold. The condemned reading is given in a standardised form, followed by the sigla Ms for manuscript. I have not performed a personal autopsy of the manuscript, but read it from good colour photographs.

(...)lekhanam || [8]

abhiṣekādikalpaṃ tu bhūtabhautikavigrahaṃ |

evamādyās tv anantāgrā³¹ buddhavajryādikalpanāḥ³² || [9]

ḍ °vajryādi°] *em.*, °vajrādi° Ms

susthitaṃ tu yadā cittaṃ tathatākāragocaram |

praktiprabhāsvarā dharmā ādisuddhā hy anāvilāḥ ||³³ [10]

³¹ This *pāda* is an echo of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (or its precursor, the *Longer Paramādya* or **Paramādyamantrakalpakaḥḍa*, D488; it is also found in another related text, the *Vajramaḥḍālaṅkāra*, D490), where it is something of a stock phrase (Ms 2r, 1.16a and *passim*).

³² The emendation is inspired by Kumāracandra's commentary (D, 274v): *sangs rgyas ni de bzhin gshegs pa'o* || *rdo rje can ni rdo rje 'dzin pa'o* || *sogs pa'i sgras ni byang chub sems dpa' la sogs pas so* ||. The Tibetan is inadequate.

³³ This line is missing in the Tibetan, but it is witnessed in Kumāracandra's commentary (D, 274v). It is most likely an appropriation from the *Māyājālatantra* (D, 123r); the line and its pair are quoted with this attribution in the *Jñānasiddhi* (142). The first three

maṇḍalam tu tathābhūtam jñātavyam hitaiṣiṇā³⁴ |
skandhadhātvdibhir vṛndai rañjitaṃ yad viśeṣataḥ || [11]
rajomaṇḍalam ity uktaṃ kāyavākittarañjanāt |
gaṇamaṇḍalam ity uktaṃ³⁵ skandhādyādinidarśanāt³⁶ || [12]
 c gaṇa°] *em.*, tadvakta gaṇa° Ms
 d °ādyādi°] *em.*, °ādyā° Ms
tac cittamaṇḍalam śuddham bhāvayen niḥsvabhāvataḥ |
ādarśaṃ hi bhaved ekaṃ³⁷ prathamāśrāvabodhakam³⁸ || [13]
 c ādarśaṃ] *em.*, ādarśaṃ naṃ Ms; ekaṃ] *conj.*, evaṃ Ms
pratyavekṣaṇam ity uktaṃ pratīcyāśravibhūṣaṇam |
 b pratīcyāśra°] *em.*, pratītyāśra° Ms
kṛtyānuṣṭhānakaṃ śreṣṭham uttarāśravirājakam || [14]
 c kṛtyā°] *em.*, kṛtā° Ms; śreṣṭham] *corr.*, śreṣṭhaṃ Ms
samateti mahājñānam arvācyāśrānuśāsakam |
 b arvācy°] *em.*, avācy° Ms; °āśrā°] *em.*, °aśā° Ms
evaṃ aśracatuṣkaṃ tu kalpitaṃ jñānagocaram || [15]
etattattvapraveśena aśramadhyeṣu sarvataḥ |
dvāracatuṣṭayaṃ coktaṃ catuṣsmṛtyodayaṃ sadā³⁹ || [16]

syllables must be scanned very quickly (*drutocāraṇena*), as if there were only two.

³⁴ Recite *hitaiṣiṇā* for the sake of the metre. The Tibetan renders **hitaiṣiṇām*.

³⁵ The contamination eliminated by my emendation is puzzling. It is as if the scribe intended to write *tad uktaṃ*, misspelt it slightly, and then forgot to delete it. There are no signs anywhere that such an element was ever part of the text.

³⁶ The emendation is once again inspired by Kumāracandra (D, 275r), who must have read two *ādis*: *sogs pa'i sgra ni gcig gis ni skye mched du gzung zhing gnyis pas ni khams te* |. The Tibetan suggests **skandhādyānyādidarśanāt*: *phung sogs gzhan sogs mthong ba'i phyir* |.

³⁷ The conjecture is inspired by the Tibetan.

³⁸ Kumāracandra (D, 275r) helpfully points out that *aśra* in this context must be understood as 'side,' rather than 'corner': *rtsibs kyi sgra 'dis phyogs brdar btags pa'o* || [...] *rtsibs te logs zhes bya ba'i don to* || (*phyogs* and *logs* were probably the same word in Sanskrit).

uktaṃ tathā catuṣkoṇaṃ caturdānaviśuddhitaḥ⁴⁰ |

b °dāna°] *em.*, °dvāra° Ms

madhye maṇḍalarūpaṃ tu akṣobhyākāramaṇḍitam || [17]

maṇḍalaṃ sarvadā siddhaṃ śāntadharmārthamaṇḍanāt⁴¹ |

b śānta°] *st.*, sānta° Ms; °dharmārtha°] *em.*, °dharmātva° Ms

hārārdhahāracandrādi yal likhitaṃ tu maṇḍale || [18]

torāṇādyāni sarvāṇi samādhyāṅganibhāni hi |

torāṇaṃ cittaparyantam uktaṃ tattvasvabhāvataḥ || [19]

cittasya yat tu pravartanaṃ⁴² samādhyāṅge vyavasthitam |

hāreti tad evoktam⁴³ ardhahāras tadardhataḥ || [20]

ghaṇṭikā hārasaṃlagnā bodhayanti svaghoṣataḥ |

pratiśrutkopamān sarvān dharmāmś ca pratibudhyati || [21]

c °śrutko°] *corr.*, °śrutako° Ms; °opamān] *corr.*, °opamāna Ms; sarvān] *corr.*, sarvāna Ms

dhvajāvalī tad evoktā⁴⁴ dharmānutpādadarśanāt |

vitataṃ hi sadā cittaṃ bhāvādyādyavilepataḥ || [22]

cittaṃ vitānam ākhyātam uktaṃ hi paramārthataḥ |

mālyāmbaram hi tat sarvaṃ vicitrādyavabhāsataḥ || [23]

³⁹ Understand °*udayaṃ*, but the reading is perhaps original, if we see *smṛti* with the *Aiśa/Ārṣa* extended stem *-yā*.

⁴⁰ The emendation is substantiated by the context and Kumāracandra's comment, in spite of its being muddled (D, 275v): *chos dang zang zing mi 'jigs byams pa dang | de dag bzhi sbyin pa ni gru bzhi ste |*. The corruption was most likely caused by 16c.

⁴¹ The emendation is again supported by both the Tibetan translation and Kumāracandra.

⁴² This is a slightly hypermetrical *pāda*. We could solve it by removing the *tu*.

⁴³ This time the *pāda* is hypometrical, which could be solved by a verse-filler particle, e.g., **hāreti hi*.

⁴⁴ The Tibetan supports *dhvajāvalī*, but Kumāracandra mirrors *vajrāvalī* (D, 276r): *lhag par mos pa'i chos thams cad skyed pa (!) ston pa nyid rdo rje'i phreng ba'o ||*. The exclamation mark means that a negative particle is missing from the translation.

c °āmbaram] *em.*, °āmbara Ms
vajrākāraṃ tu yac cittaṃ ratijñānena cāṅkitam |
b rati°] *em.*, cati° Ms
tenārthenoditaṃ nityaṃ dākinīsamvarodayam⁴⁵ || [24]
c °oditaṃ] *em.*, °odita Ms
koṇasandhiṣu sarvataḥ |⁴⁶
a' °sandhiṣu] *em.*, °sandhis ca Ms; sarvataḥ] *em.*, sarvaḥ Ms
khacitaṃ vajraratnais tu vajraratnāvabodhataḥ || [25]
yad uktaṃ candrasūryaṃ tu prajñopāyārthadarśanāt |
prajñopāyamayaṃ cittaṃ ebhir jñānair vibhūṣitam || [26]
maṅdalaṃ hi tad evoktaṃ kāyavākcittavajrajam |
kāyavākcittasāmnidhyād ekākāram alakṣaṇam || [27]
c °sāmnidhyād] *em.*, °sānidhyād Ms
praveśā ca sa evokto vispaṣṭaṃ guruśiṣyayoḥ |
homaṃ ca kathayiṣyāmi devatāpyāyanottamam || [28]
avikalpaṃ tu yac cittaṃ kuṇḍasābdena cihnitam |
vivekānalamadhye tu rūpaskandhādipañcakam || [29]
juhuyāt tat samastaṃ hi samidhaṃ cittaśambhavam |
rūpādayaś ca ye bhāvāḥ samidheti prakīrtitāḥ || [30]
evaṃ homaḥ praśastaṃ tu⁴⁷ pratiṣṭhā tu nigadyate⁴⁸ |

⁴⁵ This *pāda* is not mirrored by the Tibetan, but it is witnessed in Kumāracandra. The readings *śamvara/śamvara* and *samvara/samvara* constantly alternate, and in an East Indian environment it is ultimately immaterial which one we choose. Kumāracandra's commentary seems to interpret the word with both meanings (D, 276r): *bde mchog byung ba'o || bsgom pa las skyes pa'i bde mchog ces bya ba'i don to || [...] sdom pa ni bcom ldan 'das te rdo rje sems dpa' 'am gzhan dag kyang ngo ||*.

⁴⁶ There is no trace anywhere that there was an odd *pāda* before this, we must therefore accept it as a scriptural idiosyncrasy. Both emendations are inspired by the Tibetan.

⁴⁷ In this register of the language, the conflation of the masculine and the neuter is not surprising, therefore I do not think that we should emend to *praśastas tu*.

⁴⁸ Kumāracandra has a slightly puzzling comment here (D, 276v): *rab tu gnas pa zhes bya ba la sogs pa la | dang po'i don gyi rkyen can no ||*. The *pratyaya* (*rkyen can*) he has in mind is most probably a *tasil*, meaning that

sthīrībhūtaṃ tu yac cittaṃ kāyavākcittataḥ sadā || [31]
pratiṣṭhā tu tam evāhuḥ skandhānām ekabhāvataḥ |
idānīm kathyate spaṣṭaṃ mantrāṇām yac ca lakṣaṇam || [32]
rahasyaṃ yan mayā proktaṃ bhāṣayā manasāpi ca |
anutpādaṃ nirābhāsaṃ lakṣyalakṣaṇavarjitaṃ || [33]
etan mantraṃ iti proktaṃ rahasyārthābhāvabodhataḥ |
mantraṃ ca kathitaṃ spaṣṭaṃ devatā tu nigadyate || [34]
skandhāyatanadhātuś ca svasvabhāvena yat sthitaṃ⁴⁹ |
 b svasva°] *conj.*, sva° Ms; yat] *corr.*, yata Ms
samyagbodhyadhimokṣeṇa yat tat sarvaṃ prakalpitaṃ || [35]
 c samyag°] *corr.*, samyaka° Ms
devateti samākhyātaṃ yac cittaṃ ca lakṣitaṃ⁵⁰ |
 b cittaṃ ca] *conj.*, citaina Ms
mudrāpi ca tad evoktaṃ kāyavākcittamudraṇāt || [36]
devatārādhanam yogaṃ spaṣṭaṃ tan nigadāmy aham |
 a °ārādhanam] *em.*, °ācādhyanaṃ Ms
rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ || [37]
sarvabuddhamayah sattvo vajrasattvah param sukham |⁵¹
paryāṅkaṃ tu tato baddhvā nāsāgrāgatadrṣṭitaḥ || [38]
svasvabhāvakayogena sthātavyaṃ tattvadarśibhiḥ |
ṣac cakre tu samyuktaṃ samputībhāvayams tat ||⁵² [39]

he read *pratiṣṭhāto* and for reasons unclear decided not to understand it as *pratiṣṭhā+atas*, but *pratiṣṭhā+tas* taken as a nominative, silently evoking the principle *sārvavibhaktikas tasil*.

⁴⁹ The conjecture is inspired by the context. The Tibetan translation suggests **svabhāvena yat susthitaṃ*.

⁵⁰ The Tibetan translation mirrors **yac cittenopalakṣitaṃ*, but Kumāracandra's lemma is simply *mtshon pa*, hence the conjecture.

⁵¹ This verse, an appropriation of *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* Ms 1v, 1.1 = Ms 7v, 5.9 = Ms 25r, 9.1, is not mirrored in the Tibetan, but it is witnessed by Kumāracandra (D, 277r).

⁵² This line is not mirrored in the Tibetan, but it is commented upon by Kumāracandra. Both *pādas* are hypometrical; perhaps *pāda* d could end in **tu tat* (a meaningless insertion) or *tataḥ* (picking up *tato* in 38c or pointing forward to 40a). The third quarter is much more problematic. Kumāracandra (D, 277v) unambiguously suggests that here the six

hastadvayaṃ tu hr̥ddeśe saṃpuṭīkṛtya yatnataḥ |
nirvikalpasvabhāvaṃ tu yadā cittaṃ pravartate || [40]
tadā saṃpadyate tasya sarvabuddhāgramelakaḥ |
svādhiṣṭhānaṃ bhaved āśu sarvabuddhātmamelakaḥ || [41]
sarvabuddhātmamelā tu sarvabuddhātmasaṃvaram |
saṃbuddhas tu bhaved yogī cittavajravaco yathā⁵³ || [42]
kathitaṃ tu mayā spaṣṭaṃ kāyavākcittasiddhidam |
sarvatantrārthaguptārthaṃ prajñopāyārthagocaram || [43]
sattvārthe mayā kṛpayā buddhabodhiprabodhakam |
 b °prabodhakam] *em.*, °prabodhakaḥ Ms
nāsāgrādi saparyaṅkaṃ yad uktaṃ h(*i) mayā ca yat || [44]
 c saparyaṅkaṃ] *conj.*, paryaṅka Ms
 d yad] *em.*, yud Ms; uktaṃ] *em.*, ukta Ms
sarvaṃ saṃsthānamātraṃ tan na kṛtaṃ paramārthataḥ |
 a sarvaṃ] *em.*, sarva° Ms; tan] *conj.*, omitted Ms
samayārthaṃ tad eveti na boddhavyaṃ kadācana || [45]
kalpanā hi iyanmātrā yad bhavec ca kadācana |
saṃsārasya bhaved dhetur vāgvajrasya vaco yathā || [46]
 c saṃsārasya] *corr.*, saṃnsārasya Ms
avikalpādhimokṣeṇa sādhayed yat sādhakottamaḥ |
 a °ādhimokṣeṇa] *em.*, °āvimokṣeṇa Ms
raktaṃ śukraṃ tathā māṃsaṃ mūtraṃ purīṣam eva ca || [47]
uktaṃ ca yan mayā bāhyaṃ samayeti prayatnataḥ |
tathāgatā hi te sarve mlecchitā vyavahārataḥ || [48]
samaraktaṃ yadā cittaṃ sattvahite pravartate |

cakravartins are meant (but he does not say which set he has in mind), the singular locative is therefore deeply worrying. If we emend to a singular accusative *cakraṃ*, we still have the metrical lack, which could perhaps be fixed by emending *saṃyuktaṃ* to *samāyuktaṃ*. Alternatively, if the text did indeed mean without ambiguity the six *cakravartins*, then we might consider emending *cakre* to *cakreśaṃ*. I am inclined towards this solution. It is very unlikely that the text advocates a system of yogic *cakras*. In any case, the only tantric Buddhist school to teach six such discuses (*cakra*) is the *Kālacakra*, and we do not see any such influence on this text.

⁵³ This *pāda* is an echo of *Guhyasamājantra* 16.73d.

b °hite] *em.*, °hitena Ms

yadā sattvo na vidyate || [49]

etadarthāvabodhena raktaṃ tu bhakṣitaṃ bhavet |

b tu] *conj.*, omitted Ms

bhakṣite tu mahāraakte amitābhaṃ ca gacchati || [50]

dharmānāṃ yo 'nutpādaḥ śukraśabdena śabditam |

tadanutpādāvabodhād bhakṣaṇaṃ samudāhṛtam || [51]

samatā tu yad bhāvānāṃ māṃsam iti prakāśitam |

anupalabdhivyogād bhakṣaṇam ity abhidhīyate || [52]

prasravitaṃ ca yac cittaṃ samayatvānuyogataḥ |

mūtraśabdena tac coktaṃ pītaṃ tu karmayogataḥ || [53]

na kiṃcid api yac cittaṃ sthitaṃ cānavabhāsataḥ |

purīṣaṃ ca tad uktaṃ hi bhakṣitaṃ hi anavabodhataḥ || [54]

d bhakṣitaṃ] *em.*, bhakṣita Ms

etad dhi kathitaṃ spaṣṭaṃ samayasya tu lakṣaṇam |

etadarthāvabodhena buddhadharmo 'nugamyate || [55]

c °arthā°] *conj.*, °anvo° Ms

śrīmatsatsukhāvabodhanaṃ nāma tantrarājaṃ mahādhiṣṭhānaṃ
samāptam ||

p °rājaṃ] *em.*, °rāja Ms

2.3 Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation

The Tibetan translation is the work of *Gayādhara and [ʼBrog mi] Shākya ye shes, and it thus probably dates to the middle of the 11th century. While semantic analysis in particular does not lend itself to easy rendering into Tibetan, the duo is responsible for several blunders even where the meaning was evident. All in all, this is not the product of their finest hour as translators. I have used only a selection of *bKa' 'gyurs* available to me and I do not expect great surprises when eventually the other witnesses too are collated. I have also used an extra-canonical transmission of the text (M); this is a very special witness, because it contains a quarter verse (46d) omitted in the canonical transmission, perhaps because the compilers of the *Phyag chen khrid mdzod* collection had had access to a Sanskrit witness. This is not the only time M excels

in this way. However, the precise reason behind these better readings will need a separate study.

C = Co ne, rGyud, Nga, 83r7–85v6 (= no. 58, cf. Bethlenfalvy 1982: 70).

D = sDe dge, rGyud, Ga, 259v3–261v3 (= Tōhoku no. 414).

L = Shel dkar, rGyud, Ga, 54r4–57r1 (= Pagel & Gaffney 1996, no. 293).

M = *Phyag chen khrid mdzod*, vol. 1 (OM), 1–4v5.

N = sNar thang, rGyud, Da, 1–5v4 (= no. 388, cf. Bethlenfalvy 1982: 70).

P = Pe cing, rGyud, Nga, 77v6–80r3 (= Ōtani no. 58).

S = sTog, rGyud, Ga, 59r6–62r7 (= Skorupski 1985, no. 376).

V = Ulan Bator rGyal rtse them spangs ma, rGyud, Ga, 221r9–224r2 (Bethlenfalvy 1982, no. 445)

NB: The portions bracketed by obeli (†) are regarded as plainly corrupt and without any ideas how to remedy them.

rgya gar skad du | a nā bi la tantra rā dza nā ma |

 p a nā bi la] D N V, a nā bi laṃ C, shrī a nā bi la L M S, a na
 bi laṃ P; dza] C D L M S, dzā N P V

bod skad du | rgyud kyi rgyal po rnyog pa med pa zhes bya ba |

 p rnyog pa med pa] C D N P V, dpal rnyog pa med pa L M
 S

rdo rje mkha' 'gro la phyag 'tshal lo ||

 p rdo rje mkha' 'gro] C D L N P S V, dpal rdo rje
 mkha' 'gro M

sems can rnams la phan 'dod pas ||

 a pas] C D L M N S V, pa P

rnyog med rab tu bshad par bya ||

snang ba med cing dpe med pa ||

tshig gi yul las rnam par 'das || [1]
zhi zhing bdag med⁵⁴ dag pa nyid ||
mtshan med mtshan gzhi rnam par spangs ||
 b gzhi] C D L M N S V, bzhi P
tngang gi sangs rgyas 'di nyid tshul ||†
 c ngang] C D L M N S V, dag P; gi] C D N P, gis L M S V
mtshan med mtshan gzhi rnam par spangs || [2]
 d omitted in L M S; med] D N V, nyid C P; gzhi] C D N V,
 bzhi P
khyad par du yang mdor bsdu pas ||
 a yang] C D L N P S V, ni M; pas] C D L N P S V, pa M
bdag gis gsal bar bshad pa yin ||
rmongs pa rnams la phan 'dod pas ||
snying rjes 'di ni bstan pa yin || [3]
kha cig stong par 'dod pa dang ||
kha cig thig le'i gzugs can dang ||
kha cig khyab 'jug tshul gyis ni ||
 c gyis] C D L M N S V, gyi P
blo dman dag ni 'jog par byed || [4]
†de nyid nges par yang dag par ||
rgyu yi gnas kyi spyod yul nyid ||†
rgyu dang 'bras bu ma grub na ||
sgom pa med cing byang chub med || [5]
 d sgom] M P, bsgom C D, bsgoms L N S V
rgyu yi yid ches spangs pa 'di ||
 a yid ches] C D M N P S V, ches L
thog ma tha ma med pa'i bdag ||
sgyu ma'i ye shes las byung ba ||
rnam pa sna tshogs ston par byed || [6]
kha cig drag po'i rang bzhin du ||
kha cig zhi ba chen po che ||
kha cig phyag rgya'i rang bzhin gzugs⁵⁵ ||

⁵⁴ The Tibetan translation reflects **nirātmakam*. Kumāracandra (272v) seems to have read **nirāmayam*, although the lemma in the translation is *bdag med pa*. For he understands this to refer to the absence of the obscuration of taints (*klesāvaraṇa*).

kha cig 'dar zhing g.yo ba dang || [7]
glu gar de bzhin sil snyan dang ||
lha yi sngags ni brjod pa nyid ||
kha cig sngags ni yang dag dgod ||
 c ni] C D L M N S V, na P
kha cig dkyil 'khor bri ba dang || [8]
dbang la sogs pa brtag pa dang ||
'byung dang 'byung las gyur pa'i lus ||
 b lus] C D L N P S V, las M
de ltar la sogs mtha' yas mchog ||
sangs rgyas la sogs rdo rje brtags || [9]
gang tshe sems ni legs gnas pa ||
de bzhin nyid kyi spyod yul nyid || [10]
dkyil 'khor de bzhin 'gyur ba ni ||
 a bzhin] C D M N P V, nyid L S
phan 'dod rnams kyis shes par bya ||
 b kyis] L N S V, ni C D M P
phung po la sogs tshogs rnams kyis ||
 c la] C D L N P S V, khams M
gang zhig khyad par gyis bcos pa || [11]
 d pa] C D L N P S V, pas M
lus ngag yid gsum bcos pa'i phyir ||
rdul tshon dkyil 'khor zhes byar gsungs ||
phung sogs gzhan sogs mthong ba'i phyir ||
tshogs kyi dkyil 'khor zhes byar gsungs || [12]
sems kyi dkyil 'khor dag pa ste ||
rang bzhin med par bsgom par bya ||
 b bsgom] C D L M P S, bsgoms N V
me long lta bu gcig nyid de ||
 c bu] C D M P, bu'i L N S V
dang po grwar ni rtogs par bya || [13]
 d grwar] D M, grur C L N P S V
so sor rtog pa zhes gsungs pas ||
shar gyi grwar ni nam par brgyan ||

⁵⁵ I suspect that here we had **rūpāḥ* ('women') and not **rūpa* (*gzugs*).

b grwar] C D M, grur L N P S V; brgyan] C D L M N P S,
rgyan V
bya ba nan tan khyad 'phags pa ||
byang gi grwar ni nram par spros || [14]
d grwar] C D M P, grur L N S V; spros] C D L N P S V,
spras M
mnyam nyid ye shes chen po ni ||
bag chags med grwa rjes rtogs byed ||
b med] D M L N P S V, mang C; grwa] C D M P, gru L N S
V; byed] C D L M N S V, byang P
gzhan du'ang dkyil 'khor gru bzhi pa ||
grwa yi dbus ni thams cad du || [15]
de nyid 'di ni rab 'jug pas ||
ye shes spyod yul du ni brtag ||
sgo bzhir yang dag brjod pa ni ||
de bzhin dran pa bzhir byung ba || [16]
d byung] C D L M N S V, bya P
de bzhin grwa bzhir gsungs pa ni ||
a grwa] C D L M P S V, gra N
sbyin pa bzhi ni nram dag pa ||
b dag] C D L M P S V, deg N
dbus su dkyil 'khor gzugs su ni ||
mi bskyod pa yis nram par brgyan || [17]
d pa yis] D L M S, pa'i C, pa yi N P V; brgyan] C D L M P
S, rgyan N V
zhi dang chos don brgyan pa las ||
a brgyan] C D L M P S, rgyan N V
de dag thams cad dkyil 'khor 'grub ||
dra ba dra phyed zla ba sogs ||
b dra ba] C D L N P S V, drwa ba M; dra phyed] C D L N S
V, drwa phyed M, dra phye P
dkyil 'khor du ni bris pa dang || [18]
rta babs la sogs thams cad ni ||
ting 'dzin yan lag rta babs nyid ||
sems kyi mthar thug brjod pa ste ||
de nyid rang bzhin las ni gsungs || [19]
gang zhig sems kyi rab 'phel ba ||

a 'phel] C D L M N P S, phel V
ting 'dzin yan lag rnam par gnas ||
de nyid dra ba zhes su gsungs ||
c dra] C D L N P S V, drwa M
dra ba phyed pa phyed du ste || [20]
d dra] C D L N P S V, drwa M
dril bu do shal brtag pa ni ||
a brtag] D L M N S V, brtags C P
rang gi btsun mo rtogs par byed ||
sgra brnyan rnam pa lta bur ni ||
c ni] C D M N P V, na L S
chos rnams thams cad so sor rtogs || [21]
d rtogs] C D L N P S V, rtog M
chos rnams ma skyes mthong ba'i phyir ||
de nyid rgyal mtshan phreng bar gsungs ||
b phreng] C D M N P V, 'phreng L S
bla re la sogs gang bres pa ||
c re] C D L N P S V, bre M; la] C D L M N S V, las P
dngos po la sogs dang por nges || [22]
d la] C D L M N S V, las P; por] C D L M, po N P S V
sems ni bla re zhes byar bshad ||
a re] C D L N P S V, bre M
dam pa'i don las gsungs pa 'o ||
gos phreng de dag thams cad ni ||
b phreng] C D M N P S V, 'phreng L
rnam pa sna tshogs snang ba nyid || [23]
gang zhig rdo rje rnam pa'i sems ||
dga' ba'i ye shes kyis ni mtshan ||
b ba'i] C D L M N S V, ba' P
de yi 'og tu rtag tu gsungs || [24]
grwa yi mtshams ni thams cad du ||
rdo rje rin chen rtogs pa'i phyir ||
rdo rje rin po che yis spras || [25]
zla ba nyi ma gang gsungs pa ||
thabs dang shes rab don mthong phyir ||
thabs dang shes rab bdag nyid sems ||
ye shes 'dis ni rnam par brgyan || [26]

d ye] D L M N P S V, ya C; brgyan] C D L M P S, rgyan N
V

sku gsung thugs kyi rdo rje skyes ||
de nyid dkyil 'khor du ni gsungs ||
sku gsung thugs ni nye ba'i phyir ||
rnam pa gcig tu mtshan nyid med || [27]
bla ma slob ma rnam gsal bar ||

a mam] L S, rnam CD M N P V

rab tu 'jug pa de nyid gsungs ||
sbyin sreg yang ni bshad pa yang ||

c sreg] C D L M N S V, bsreg P; yang] C D N P V, kyang L
M S

lha rnam tshim pa nga yis brjod || [28]
rnam rtog med pa'i sems gang ni ||
thab khung sgra yis mtshan pa nyid ||

b pa] C D M P, ma L N S V

bye brag phyed pas me nang du ||
gzugs kyi phung sogs lnga po rnam || [29]
sams las byung ba'i yam shing nyid ||
thams cad kyi ni sreg lugs bya ||

b kyi] C D L N P S V, kyis M; sreg] C D L S, bsreg M N P
V; lugs] C D N P V, blugs L M S

gzugs la sogs pa gang byung ba ||
yam shing zhes ni rab tu grags || [30]
de ltar sbyin sreg bshad nas ni ||

a sreg] C D L M N S V, bsreg P

rab tu gnas pa brjod par bya ||
sku gsung thugs la rtag tu ni ||
gang zhig sems ni brtan gyur pa || [31]

d sems] D L M N P S V, sams C

de nyid rab tu gnas par brjod ||
phung po rnam kyi dngos po ci ||

b ci] C D M N P S V, cig L

gang zhig sngags kyi mtshan nyid ni ||
de ni gsal bar brjod par bya || [32]
yid rnam kyis ni skad du yang ||
gang zhig gsang ba bdag gis brjod ||

skye ba med cing snang med pa ||
c pa] C D L M N S V, par P
mtshan gzhi mtshan nyid rnam par spangs || [33]
d gzhi] C D L M N S V, bzhi P
gsang ba'i don ni rtogs pa'i phyir ||
a rtogs pa'i] C D M N P S V, rtogs L
'di ni nga yis sngags su gsungs ||
sngags ni gsal bar bshad nas ni ||
lha rnam yang ni brjod par bya || [34]
d yang] C D M N P V, kyang L S
phung po khams dang skye mched kyi ||
rang bzhin gyi ni legs gnas gang ||
b gyi] C D N P S V, gyis L M; gang] C D M N P S V, kyang
L
yang dag byang chub thar pa nyid ||
de kun yang dag rab brtags shing || [35]
gal te sems kyi nyer brtags gang ||
a kyi] C D N P S, kyis L M V
lha zhes bya bar yang dag bshad ||
sku gsung thugs kyi phyag rgya las ||
de nyid du ni yang dag gsungs || [36]
d de] C D L N P S V, 'di M
lha la gsol btab rnal 'byor ni ||
gsal bar nga yis brjod par bya || [37]
de nas skyil krung bcas nas ni ||
a skyil] C D L M N S V, dkyil P; krung] C D L M N P S,
krungs V
sna yi rtse mor bltas nas kyang || [38]
b mor] C L M N P S V, mar D
rang gi rang bzhin rnal 'byor gyis ||
de nyid mthong ba gzhag par bya || [39]
b ba] C D M P, bar L N S V; gzhag] C D L M S, bzhag N P
V
snying ga'i gnas su lag pa gnyis ||
a ga'i] C D M N, ka'i L S V, kha'i P
'bad pas mnyam par sbyar nas su ||
mi rtog pa yi rang bzhin du ||

gang tshe sems ni rab rgyu ba || [40]
sangs rgyas thams cad 'dus pa'i bdag ||
de tshe de la skye bar 'gyur ||
 b la] C D L N P S V, las M
sangs rgyas thams cad 'dus pa'i bdag ||
myur bar byin gyis rlob par 'gyur || [41]
 d rlob] C D N P S V, brlab M
sangs rgyas thams cad 'dus pa'i bdag ||
sangs rgyas kun gyi sdom pa'i bdag ||
 b sdom] C D M P, rtog L N S V
thugs kyi rdo rjes gsungs pa bzhin ||
 c rjes] C D M N P V, rje L S; gsungs] C D M N P V, gsum L
 S
rnal 'byor sangs rgyas thams cad 'gyur || [42]
 d rnal 'byor] C D L N P S V, yo ga'i M
nga yis gsal bar brjod pa ni ||
 a nga] D L M N P S V, de C; gsal] C D L M N S V, bsal P
sku gsung thugs kyi grub sbyin pa ||
sangs rgyas kun mchog gsang ba'i don ||
thabs dang shes rab spyod yul don || [43]
sems can don du snying rje che ||
 a che] C D L N P S V, ches M
sangs rgyas byang chub rab sgrub pa ||
 b sgrub] C D L M N S V, bsgrub P
sna rtse'i dkyil 'khor nga yis gsungs || [44]
 c rtse'i] C D M P, rtse L N S V
de dag thams cad dbyibs tsam du ||
mdor bsdus thams cad ma byas so ||
res 'ga' dam tshig 'khor lo yang ||
 c 'ga'] D L M N P S V, dga' C; lo] C D L N P S V, lor M
de nyid zhes bya ma gsungs so || [45]
 d zhes] C D L N P S V, ces M; bya] C D L N P S V, byar M;
 gsungs so] C D M N P S V, gsungs L
rtogs pa cung zad tsam gyis ni ||
gang 'grub de ni res 'ga' yang ||
 b res] C D L M P S, re N V; 'ga'] D M L N P S V, dga' C
gsung gi 'khor lor gsungs pa bzhin ||

c bzhin] L M S, yin C D N P V
'khor ba'i rgyu ru 'gyur ba yin || [46]
d omitted in C D L N P S V
rnam rtog med par lhag mos pas ||
sgrub po dam pas bsgrub par bya ||
khrag dang khu ba de bzhin sha ||
bshang ba dang ni gci ba nyid || [47]
dam tshig zhes bya rab 'bad par ||
a zhes] C D N P V, ces L M S; bya] C D L N P S V, byar M
gang zhig bdag gis tshig gsungs pa ||
de mams kun la de bzhin gshegs ||
de mams tha snyad tsam gyis gnas || [48]
gang tshe dam tshig 'dod chags sems ||
des ni de nyid rab tu spyod ||
gang tshe sems ni chags gyur pa ||
de ni sems can yod ma yin || [49]
d ni] C D L N P S V, tshe M
de la kun tu rtog pa yi ||
a kun] C D L N P S V, rtag M; tu] C D L M N S V, du P
khrag ni za bar 'gyur ba 'o ||
khrag ni chen po zos nas ni ||
'od dpag med pa'ang bza' bar bya || [50]
gang zhig chos mams las skyes pa ||
khu ba'i sgrar ni bsgrag par bya ||
b bsgrag] D M, bsgrags C L N P S V
de tshe ma skyes rtogs pa'i phyir ||
bza' bar yang dag gsungs pa nyid || [51]
dngos po kun gyi mnyam pa nyid ||
sha chen du ni rab tu dbye ||
b tu] D L M N P S V, du C
mi dmigs pa yi mal 'byor gyis ||
c pa yi] D L M N P S V, pa'i C
bza' ba zhes byar mngon par brjod || [52]
gang zhig rab tu 'dzag pa'i sems ||
nus pa'i rjes su sbyor ba las ||
phyag rgya las kyi sbyor ba yis ||
c kyij] C D L M P S V, ni N

de yang gci ba'i sgra yis brjod || [53]
chos dang chos min nges pa'i sems ||
 a nges] D L M N P S V, ngas C
sbas pa'i char ni gnas pa 'di ||
chos rnams thams cad rab rtogs pa'o ||
 c pa'o] C D M N P S V, pa'i L
bshang ba za bar yang dag brjod || [54]
dam tshig nyid kyi mtshan nyid ni ||
 a nyid ni] C D M N P S V, nyid L
'di rnams thams cad gsal bar bshad ||
'di rnams don ni rtogs pa yis ||
sangs rgyas kun gyi bdag nyid 'gyur || [55]
 d kun gyi] C D L M N P S, gyi V

dpal bde ba dam pa rtogs par byed pa dang ldan pa zhes bya ba'i
rgyud byin gyis brlab pa'i rim pa chen po mkha' 'gro ma dra ba
sdom pa'i brtag pa rnyog pa med pa zhes bya ba rdzogs so ||

p rgyud] C D L N P S V, rgyud kyi rgyal po M; dra] C D L
N P S V, drwa M; so] D L M N P S V, su'o C; C P add the
formula *ye dharmā* etc. here; at the bottom of the folio, V
has a pasted slip with *dbu med* writing: *'di nas phreng ba
gcig las ma tshang* (I cannot make out the next word). This
perhaps refers to the missing *pāda* 46d.

rgya gar gyi mkhan po paṇḍi ta ga ya dha ra dang | bod kyi lo
tstsha ba dge slong shā kya ye shes kyi bsgyur ba'o ||

p ga ya dha ra] D L M N S V, gā ya dhā ra C, gha ya dhā ra
P; tstsha] C D N P V, tsā M, tsa L S

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources (Indic)

Anāvīlatantra = Tibetan version: D414/P58.

**Anāvīlā Pañjikā* = Kumāracandra, **Anāvīlatantraṭīkā*. Tibetan version: D1204/P2334.

Guṇavatī = Ratnākaraśānti, *Guṇavatī nāma Mahāmāyāṭīkā*. In *Mahāmāyātantram with Guṇavatī by Ratnākaraśāntī(!)*. Ed. by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajavallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text 10. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992.

Guhyasamājantra = Yūkei Matsunaga (ed.), *The Guhyasamāja Tantra*. Osaka: Toho Shuppan, 1978.

Jñānasiddhi = Indrabhūti, *Jñānasiddhi*. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajavallabh Dwivedi (eds.), *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhisāgraha*. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1987.

Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara = Ms. Collège de France IÉI Lévi no. 48. [Verse numeration is from my draft edition.]

Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda = Pandey, Janardan (ed.), "Durlabh granth paricay." *Dhīḥ* 10 (1990): 3–24.

2. Primary Sources (Tibetic)

Phyag chen khrid mdzod = Nges don phyag rgya chen po'i khrid mdzod. 13 vols. New Delhi: rNam par rgyal ba dpal zhwa dmar ba'i chos sde, 1997. [scans: Buddhist Digital Resource Centre (BDRC): W23447].

rGyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa = Bu ston Rin chen grub, *rGyud sde spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa rGyud sde rin po che'i mdzes rgyan*. In *The Collected Works of Bu-ston (zhol par ma)*. Edited by Lokesh Chandra from the collections of Raghu Vira. 28 vols. Śata-piṭaka Series Indo Asian Literatures 41–68. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965–1971, vol. 15 (Ba), 307–917.

3. Secondary Sources

- Almogi, Orna. 2020. *Authenticity and Authentication: Glimpses behind the Scenes of the Formation of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 9. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- Bethlenfalvy, Géza. 1982. *A Hand-list of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-rtse them spañs-ma*. Debter. Deb-ther. Debtelin. Materials for Central Asian and Altaic Studies 1. Fontes Tibetani I. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Damron, Ryan C. 2014. *The Great Illusion: A Preliminary Study of the Mahāmāyā Tantra and Its Corpus*. MA thesis. University of California, Berkeley.
- Davidson, Ronald M. 2005. *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jackson, Roger R. 2009. "Two *Bka' 'gyur* Works in Mahāmudrā Canons: The *Ārya-ātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra* and the *Anāvīlā-tantra-rāja*." *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 5: 1–24.
- Matsunami, Seiren. 1965. *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Nishioka, Soshū. 1983. "Index to the Catalogue Section of Buxton's History of Buddhism (III)." [In Japanese.] *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange* 6: 47–201.
- Ōmi, Jishō. 2009a. "Ratnākaraśānti and Alaṃkāraśrī's Interpretation on the Mahāmāyātantra, chapter 1, passage 3 to chapter 1, passage 5." [In Japanese.] *Bulletin of the Research Institute of Esoteric Buddhist Culture/Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho* 22: 179–208.
- . 2009b. "Ratnākaraśānti's and Alaṃkāraśrī's Interpretations of the Mahāmāyā-tantra, Chap. 1, v18, and Chap. 1, v23 to

- Chap. 2, v5: Focused on the Critical Edition of the Sanskrit-Tibetan Text of the Mahāmāyānāmapañjikā with Commentaries." [In Japanese.] *Journal of Esoteric Buddhism / Mikkyō Bunka* 222: 27–65.
- Pagel, Ulrich & Séan Gaffney. 1996. *Location List to the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Śel dkar (London) Manuscript bKa' 'gyur (Or. 6724)*. *Catalogus Codicum Tibetanum* 1. London: British Library Publications.
- Rhoton, Jared D. 2002. *A Clear Differentiation of the Three Codes: Essential Distinctions among the Individual Liberation, Great Vehicle, and Tantric Systems*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Roerich, George N. 1949. *The Blue Annals: Parts I & II*. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Sanderson, Alexis G. J. S. "The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism in the Early Medieval Period." In Shingo Eino (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, 41–349.
- Sferra, Francesco. 1999. "The Concept of Purification in Some Texts of Late Indian Buddhism." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27: 83–103.
- Skorupski, Tadeusz. 1985. *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Tomabechi, Toru. 2006. *Étude du Pañcakrama: Introduction et traduction annotée*. PhD thesis. University of Lausanne.

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons

The Buddhist Case

Edited by

Orna Almogi



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 13

Hamburg • 2022

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES

Edited by Harunaga Isaacson, Dorji Wangchuk, and Eva Wilden

Volume 13

Hamburg • 2022

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons

The Buddhist Case

Edited by

Orna Almogi



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 13

Hamburg • 2022

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Published by the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Asien-
Afrika- Institut, Universität Hamburg, Alsterterrasse 1,
D-20354 Hamburg, Germany
Email: indologie@uni-hamburg.de

© Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2022

ISBN: 978-3-945151-12-9

Almogi, Orna: Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons: The
Buddhist Case

First published 2022

All rights reserved.

*Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism
or review, no part of the book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by
print, photoprint, microform or any other means without written permission.*

Enquiry should be made to the publishers.

Printing and distribution:

Aditya Prakashan, 2/18 Ansari Road, New Delhi, 110 002, India.

Email: contact@bibliaimpex.com

Website: www.bibliaimpex.com

Printed and bound in India by Replika Press Pvt. Ltd.

This publication has been supported by the Khyentse Center for Tibetan
Buddhist Textual Scholarship (KC-TBTS), Universität Hamburg.