

# Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts

Theories and Practices of Translation

Edited by

Dorji Wangchuk



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 5

Hamburg • 2016

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg



# Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES

Edited by Harunaga Isaacson and Dorji Wangchuk

---

Volume 5

Hamburg • 2016

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

# Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts

Theories and Practices of Translation

Edited by

Dorji Wangchuk



INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 5

Hamburg • 2016

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](mailto:indologie@uni-hamburg.de)

© Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2016  
ISBN: 978-3-945151-04-4

Wangchuk, Dorji: Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts

First published 2016

*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@adityapublishers.com](mailto:contact@adityapublishers.com)

Website: [www.adityapublishers.com](http://www.adityapublishers.com)

Digitally printed and bound in India by Replika Press Pvt. Ltd.

ਸ੍ਰੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰਮਤਿ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰਮਤਿ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰਮਤਿ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰਮਤਿ





## Table of Contents

Foreword	iii
Orna ALMOGI Translation as Proofs and Polemics of Authentication: rNying ma versus gSar ma Translation Practices	1
Daniel BOUCHER Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: Reconsidering an Old Hypothesis in Light of New Finds	23
Martin DELHEY From Sanskrit to Chinese and Back Again: Remarks on Xuanzang's Translations of the <i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> and Closely Related Philosophical Treatises	51
Michael HAHN Multiple Translations from Sanskrit into Tibetan	81
Rachel LUNG A Cultural Approach to the Study of Xuanzang	99
Hong LUO The <i>Kārika</i> Section of Rāmacandra's <i>Prakriyākaumudī</i> : A Comparative Study of the Sanskrit Original and the Tibe- tan and Mongolian Translations	119
Bill M. MAK Matching Stellar Ideas to the Stars: Remarks on the Translation of Indian <i>jyotiṣa</i> in the Chinese Buddhist Canon	139
Florinda DE SEMINI & Francesco SFERRA On the Fence Between Two Wor(l)ds: Theory and Prac- tice in Translating Indian and Indo-Tibetan Texts	159

Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts

David SEYFORTH RUEGG On Translating Buddhist Texts: A Survey and Some Reflections	193
Weirong SHEN Chinese Translations of Tibetan Tantric Buddhist Texts in Tangut Xia, Mongol Yuan and Chinese Ming Dynasties	267
Jonathan A. SILK Peering Through a Funhouse Mirror: Trying to Read Indic Texts Through Tibetan and Chinese Translations	289
Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ On the Permeable Boundary between Exegesis and Scripture in Late Tantric Buddhist Literature	315
Dorji WANGCHUK A Rationale for Buddhist Textual Scholarship	335
Chizuko YOSHIMIZU How Did Tibetans Learn a New Text from the Text's Translators and Comment on It? The Case of Zhang Thang sag pa (Twelfth Century)	353

## Foreword

Issues surrounding the theories and practices of translation of Buddhist texts have been an interest for modern scholars from early on, and accordingly have been the main topic of sundry academic gatherings. In February 1990, Tibet House, based in New Delhi, organized an international seminar with the title “Buddhist Translations: Problems and Perspectives,” the proceedings of which were edited and published under the same title.\* After a somewhat lengthy interval, in July 2012, the Khyentse Center for Tibetan Buddhist Textual Scholarship (KC-TBTS), Universität Hamburg, organized a three-day international symposium on “Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation” (July 23–25, 2012, Hamburg). This symposium has been followed by a series of international events focusing on various aspects of translation of Buddhist texts: Shortly after the Hamburg symposium, in December 2012, the K. J. Somaiya Centre for Buddhist Studies in Mumbai organized an international conference on “Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Critical Edition, Transliteration, and Translation.” A year and a half later, Prof. Dr. Klaus-Dieter Mathes and Mr. Gregory Forgues organized a one-day workshop on “Translating and Transferring Buddhist Literature: From Theory to Practice” (May 21, 2014, University of Vienna). The latter was followed by yet another related symposium, dealing with “Studies on Translation of Buddhist Sūtras: On ‘Outstanding’ Translation” (May 24, 2014), which took place within the framework of the 59th International Conference of Eastern Studies (ICES) and was organized by the Toho Gakkai and chaired by

---

\* Doboomb Tulku, (ed.) *Buddhist Translations: Problems and Perspectives*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers, 1995.

Prof. Dr. Akira Saito (then at the University of Tokyo). Later that year, the Tsadra Foundation, in collaboration with several other foundations and institutions, organized a conference on “Translation and Transmission” (October 2–5, 2014, Keystone, Colorado), in which numerous academics, practitioners, translators, and interpreters dealing with Tibetan Buddhist texts or oral teachings (or both) participated in various capacities. Most recently, in March 2015, the Institute for Comparative Research in Human and Social Sciences and International Education and Research Laboratory Program (Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences), University of Tsukuba, Japan, organized a symposium on “Philosophy across Cultures: Transmission, Translation, and Transformation of Thought” (March 5–6, 2015, Tsukuba).

I had the privilege to attend all these events and thus to experience first-hand the rapid developments in the field. It was indeed a humbling experience, which taught me not only (a) the complexity of themes relevant to theories and practices of translation, but also (b) the existence of a persistent interest on the part of various groups—be they academics from the field of Buddhist Studies or Translation Studies, translators, interpreters, or Buddhist masters and practitioners—in exploring and deepening our understanding of the challenges involved in translating and transmitting Buddhist texts and ideas.

The present volume mostly consists of scholarly contributions by participants (arranged in alphabetical order) of the above-mentioned symposium “Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation,” which took place in Hamburg in 2012. Each of these contributions deals, in one way or another, with issues concerning the cross-cultural transmission of Buddhist texts in general or with theories and practices of translation of Buddhist texts in the past or present in particular. I would like to take this occasion to pay homage to the late Prof. Dr. Emeritus Michael Hahn (Philipps-Universität Marburg), who over the years contributed in various ways to the translation of both Sanskrit and Tibetan texts into modern western languages. Despite his illness, he worked tirelessly to revise and finalize his contribution to the present volume, which he submitted on March 30, 2014, only about three months before his passing away on July 12. Sadly, he did not live to see this volume in print. I am thankful for having had the opportunity to be in frequent email

## Foreword

correspondence with him over various issues regarding the finalization of his contribution. Michael Hahn was widely known for being particularly kind to younger colleagues, and I can confirm this with much retrospective gratitude.

It is hoped that this volume, with its rich and diverse contributions, will be of some relevance and usefulness to those interested not only in the cross-cultural transmission of Buddhist texts but also in the cross-cultural transmission of texts and ideas—or in specific theories and practices of translation—in other disciplines and fields of specialization.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to all the institutions and individuals who contributed in various ways to the success of the above-mentioned symposium “Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts.” My thanks go to all the participants (including those who unfortunately were not able to contribute to the present volume), and also to the students and staff of the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg, for their help and support in organizing the event. Special thanks are due to Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche and the Khyentse Foundation without whose vision and support the Khyentse Center would not exist and academic activities such as the symposium on the cross-cultural transmission of Buddhist texts could not take place. Last but not least, I thank the Fritz Thyssen Foundation (*Die Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für Wissenschaftsförderung*) for their generous financial support of the same event.

Dorji Wangchuk

9.9.2016, Hamburg



## **On the Permeable Boundary between Exegesis and Scripture in Late Tantric Buddhist Literature**

Péter-Dániel Szántó<sup>1</sup> (Oxford)

In his *Indian Esoteric Buddhism*, in a chapter entitled “Siddhas, literature, and language”, which contains much food for thought, Ronald Davidson wrote (2002: 252):

The subculture of tantric composition (especially the *yoginī tantras* [sic!]) exhibited clearly different values from those of the commentarial subculture: one is creative and outrageous while the other represents rapprochement with institutional norms.

Although there is quite a lot in the said chapter that would disprove, or at least partially invalidate this statement, the sentence encapsulates a neat dichotomy that has proven rather influential in scholarly thinking about Tantric Buddhism, especially when it comes to trying to identify the social groups behind the two types of composition, scripture and exegesis. According to this thinking, exegesis was, at least for the most part, the duty of the monastic community, or at least some kind of group that would try to ‘tame’ the *tantras* and make them more palatable for the larger Buddhist fold. It follows therefore that the *tantras* themselves came from a different environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Prof. Dorji Wangchuk for his kind invitation to the conference of which this is the proceedings volume; Prof. Alexis Sanderson, Prof. Harunaga Isaacson, and Dr. Ryugen Tanemura for their help in accessing manuscripts; and the Warden and Fellows of Merton College (Oxford) for their financial help.

While there is probably some truth to this line of thinking, since quite a lot of evidence could be cited and plausibly interpreted in such a way as to support this dichotomy, in my view there is substantial evidence to point to the fact that such a well-defined borderline does not hold as neatly as one would like it to. Davidson himself recognizes that some authors—he cites Padmavajra and his famous *Guhyasiddhi* as a prime example—occupy some sort of middle ground, “offer[ing] voices that side with one, then with another”, as he says, “just to keep life interesting” (*ibid.*: 292). He also alludes to the case of the so-called explanatory *tantras* (*vyākhyā-* or *uttaratantras*), which, although technically scriptures, often seek to elucidate statements from the so-called basic (*mūla-*)*tantra*, sometimes radically changing the message therein. (This is by no means their exclusive role, since they can contain what might be termed as additional revelations.)

The present brief paper proposes to draw attention to some, mostly unpublished, texts from the canon of the *yoginītantras* that might change, or better said, put some more subtle shades on the problem of texts and passages that are in this greyish middle, between outright scripture and outright exegesis. As I hope to show through some examples, scriptures can sometimes become scriptures as if by accident, or they can be created from exegesis, partially or entirely. By examining the texts and passages in question, I shall briefly discuss—if at all discernible—the (mostly not too subtle) *modus operandi* of the compiler (or compilers), and offer some reflections concerning their presumable reason for acting in the way they did. The overall aim is to present evidence that would allow a more nuanced understanding of scriptural production in the later phase of Tantric Buddhism.

### 1. The Misclassification of the So-called \**Mantrāṃśa*

The \**Mantrāṃśa* (Tōh. 429<sup>2</sup>), according to Tibetan authorities, whose judgement decided the position of this text in the Tibetan Canon, is one of the explanatory *tantras* of the *Catuṣpīṭha* (Tōh. 428). I have already published a small article on this problem in

---

<sup>2</sup> I refer to all canonical Tibetan translations according to the numbers in Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, & Tōkan Tada, *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University, 1934.



2008, but I now realize that my phrasing may have given room for misunderstanding (see Wedemeyer 2013: 250, n. 54). I shall therefore reiterate my conclusion as briefly as possible here.

The *\*Mantrāṃśa* is considered scripture only by Tibetans. Originally it was part of an initiation manual (*maṇḍalopāyikā*), the author of which may or may not have been [an] Āryadeva. The recension history of this text is somewhat complicated, and we are very fortunate to have witnesses in Sanskrit for at least three stages of the text. The first stage—better said, parts that allow us to infer that such a primitive stage existed—survives as additions in a manuscript of the *Catuspīṭhatantra* itself. This stage is most importantly characterized by the fact that the main deity is still not Yogāmbara, but Jñānaḍākinī, as taught by the *tantra*. A next stage survives only partially: here the main deity is already Yogāmbara, and the text contains as its “fourth chapter” what we now have as the *\*Mantrāṃśa* in the Tibetan Canon. The last stage contains only what used to be the first three chapters of the above recension, with different chapter-markers. We have it on the authority of a small fragment dated 1153 CE, an anonymous commentary on some verses of the “fourth chapter” of the *maṇḍalopāyikā*, that is to say the “*\*Mantrāṃśa*”, that the text was known in India as one authored by Āryadeva.

In other words here we have a text (or part of it) that due to its contorted transmission south of the Himalayas somehow came to be known as a *tantra* for Tibetans. The reason or reasons for this could have been manifold. Given the identity of the Indian translator, the (in)famous Gayādhara (see Davidson 2005: 167 *passim*), it could be suspected that the misattribution was conscious, since translating a scripture presumably came with greater prestige than the translation of a *śāstra*. However, we must remember that the Indic author, whether it was [an] Āryadeva or not, consciously sought to emulate the ungrammatical style of the *Catuspīṭhatantra*, therefore a mere look at the text by somebody who was familiar with the curious language of that scripture could have plausibly resulted in the judgement that the text is in fact an explanatory *tantra* of that cycle.

## **2. The *Yogāmbaramahātantra*, an Anthological Scripture**

To stay within the cycle of the *Catuspīṭha*, our second example is probably a Nepalese composition—or better said, compilation—,

which although identifying itself as a *tantra*, is in fact a collage of scriptural and non-scriptural passages (overwhelmingly in verse), and a meditation manual. Several manuscripts survive under this title, but I have had the opportunity to consult only two: IASWR<sup>3</sup> MBB-II-120 (Nepalese paper, ff. 55, common Newar script, undated) and Buddhist Library, Nagoya,<sup>4</sup> Takaoka Ka 51-1 (Nepalese paper, ff. 43, common Newar script, dated 1908 CE).

The *tantra* is split into two *paṭalas*. The first chapter mysteriously identifies itself as *yogāmbaramahātantrē vajrasattvasya samvegacittaparīkṣāsūtrapāṭalaḥ*, while the second ends with another somewhat obscure colophon: *śrīyogāmbaramahātantrarāja ātmāpīṭhaḥ samāptaḥ*. In actual fact the first chapter is a *subhāṣita* anthology of esoteric and exoteric Buddhist principles and serves as a kind of theoretical basis, whereas the second forms the practical part.

This, the second, part is nothing else but the text of a well-known *sādhana* manual, that of Jagadānandajīvabhadra, a Nepalese author, which is extant in several Sanskrit manuscripts (to my knowledge the best of which, though still rather inferior, is Kaiser Library no. 125 = NGMPP<sup>5</sup> C 14/3) and a Tibetan translation (Tōh. 1611).

The first part is an anthology of 129 scriptural and non-scriptural verses (the number of prose passages is negligible). There does not seem to be any clear method or organizing principle in the way these verses follow each other. I could not identify the provenance of each and every stanza, but I am quite confident that a separate, more in-depth study could trace most of the remaining verses.

Among verses that are lifted from other scriptures, as expected, the ones from other *tantras* are in the greatest number. The sources are: the *Hevajra*, the *Dākinīvajrapaṅjara* (102–105 = 1.31–34<sup>6</sup>), the *Guhyasamāja*, the *Kālacakra* (and sometimes the

<sup>3</sup> [Christopher George & William Stablein,] *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts. A Title List of the Microfilm Collection of The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions*. New York, 1975.

<sup>4</sup> Hidenobu Takaoka, *A Microfilm Catalogue of the Buddhist Manuscripts in Nepal*. Vol. I. Nagoya: Buddhist Library, 1981.

<sup>5</sup> <http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/>

<sup>6</sup> Tōh. 419, 380v–381r. With this single exception I have not given the loci for other scriptures, since these are not immediately relevant for the discussion.

“*Ādibuddha*” as quoted in the *Vimalaprabhā*), and the *Abhidhānottara*. Sūtric sources include the *Guṇakāraṇḍavyūha*, the *Candrapradīpa*, and the *Prajñāpāramitā* corpus.

Verses from non-scriptural sources are again dominated by tantric material, especially from authors of the so-called *Ārya* exegesis of the *Guhyasamāja* and the works of Advayavajra. I have identified the following from the first group (the first number is the verse no. in my draft transcript of the *Yogāmbaramahātāntra*): *Pañcakrama*<sup>7</sup> (1 = 4.38, 2 = 3.10, 5 = 5.11), *Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda*<sup>8</sup> (4 = 47), *Pradīpodyotana*<sup>9</sup> (59–61 = first three verses). Advayavajra’s<sup>10</sup> verses are even more numerous: *Kudrṣṭinirghātana* (47 = 4), *Pañcathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa* (28 = 1), *Pañcākāra* (36 = 4), *Premapañcaka* (37–38 = 3–4), *Tattvaparakāśa* (49–50 = 6–7), *Tattvaratnāvalī* (47–48 = on p. 22), *Mahāyānavimśikā* (35 = 8), *Mahāsukhaprakāśa* (54 = 17, 64 = 14), *Māyānirukti* (55 = 6), *Yuganaddhaprakāśa* (118 = 2), *Sekanirdeśa* (27 = 35, 33–34 = 33–34, 86 = 19, 87–88 = 21–22, 89–91 = quoted as 7–9, 92 = quoted as 10, 93 = quoted as 11, 94–99 = quoted as 12–17). There is a minor presence of *Kālacakra* authors as well: *Paramārthasevā*<sup>11</sup> (85 = 163), *Hevajrapīṇḍārthaṭīkā*<sup>12</sup> (100 = 1.59).

---

<sup>7</sup> Katsumi Mimaki & Tōru Tomabechi, *Pañcakrama. Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts Critically Edited with Verse Index and Facsimile Edition of the Sanskrit Manuscripts*. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 8. Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko, 1994.

<sup>8</sup> Janardan Pandey (ed.), *Buddhalaghugranthasamgraha [A Collection of Minor Buddhist Texts]*. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 14. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1997, pp. 169–177.

<sup>9</sup> Chintaharan Chakravarti, *Guhyasamājantrapradīpodyotanaṭīkāṣaṭkoṭivyaḥkhyā*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series No. 25. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1984.

<sup>10</sup> For all following works see Haraprasad Shastri, *Advayavajrasamgraha*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1927.

<sup>11</sup> Francesco Sferra, “Fragments of Puṇḍarīka’s *Paramārthasevā*”. In: Konrad Klaus & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 66. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studies Universität Wien, 2007, pp. 459–476.

<sup>12</sup> Francesco Sferra, “The Laud of the Chosen Deity, the First Chapter of the *Hevajratrapīṇḍārthaṭīkā* by Vajragarbha”. In: Shingo Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series, 23. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, 2009, pp. 435–468.

Nāgārjuna is well-represented by the following verses: *Ratnāvalī*<sup>13</sup> (39 = 2.12, 40 = 4.58, 41 = 4.56, 42 = 4.55, 43 = 4.57, 65 = 1.6, 66–67 = 1.20–21), *Yuktiśaṣṭikā*<sup>14</sup> (32 = 6), *Bodhicittavivaraṇa*<sup>15</sup> (6–7 = 61–62, 13 = 68, 36 = 57<sup>16</sup>), *Acintyastava*<sup>17</sup> (44 = 44). Miscellaneous authors include Candrakīrti, *Trīśaraṇasaptati*<sup>18</sup> (83ab = 35cd); Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārtika*<sup>19</sup> (63 = *pratyakṣapariccheda* 285); Kambala, *Ālokamālā*<sup>20</sup> (101 = 274), and Kṛṣṇācārya, *Vasantatilakā*<sup>21</sup> (110 = 1.12). All in all close to half of the first chapter of this tantra can be traced back to works the authors of which are well-known, indeed, one may say, “classics”.

Although the number of untraced verses remains quite large, judging by the above list it is perhaps not implausible to accept as a working hypothesis that they are not original but simply untraceable for the time being. The *Yogāmbaramahātantra* would

<sup>13</sup> For the first chapter see Giuseppe Tucci, “The Ratnāvalī of Nāgārjuna”. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 2, April 1934, pp. 307–325. For the second and fourth chapters see Giuseppe Tucci, “The Ratnāvalī of Nāgārjuna”. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 2, April 1936, pp. 237–252.

<sup>14</sup> Christian Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana. Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Buddhist Traditions vol. II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987 [reprint of 1982]. As Lindtner notes on p. 105, (the second half of) this verse is also quoted in the *Advayavajrasaṅgraha* (more precisely, in the *Pañcākāra*).

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* Vv. 61–62 and 68 were at that time not known to have been extant.

<sup>16</sup> As Lindtner has already noted (op. cit., p. 203 and n. 57), this verse is quoted by Advayavajra (again in the *Pañcākāra*).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Per K. Sørensen, *Candrakīrti - Trīśaraṇasaptati. The Septuagint on the Three Refuges*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 16. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studies Universität Wien, 1986. This half-verse was at that time not known to have been extant.

<sup>19</sup> Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana (ed.), *Pramāṇavārtikam by Ācārya Dharmakīrti*. Appendix to *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, vol. XXIV, 1937.

<sup>20</sup> Christian Lindtner, “A Treatise on Buddhist Idealism: Kambala’s *Ālokamālā*”. In: Christian Lindtner (ed.), *Miscellanea Buddhica*. Indiske Studier V. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1985, pp. 109–221.

<sup>21</sup> Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (eds.), *Vasantatilakā of Caryāvratī Śrīkṛṣṇācārya with Commentary: Rahasyadīpikā by Vanaratna*. Rare Buddhist Text Series 7. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1990.

thus merit an in-depth study, especially since some of the verses listed above are (again, for the time being) not known to have survived elsewhere in Sanskrit.

In spite of the fact that there seems to be no clear reason as to why these verses were selected and why were they arranged in this way, the compilation was almost certainly a conscious act. The most plausible reason, at least to my mind, for the creation of this compilation could have been the fact that Yogāmbara did not possess his own scripture.

### 3. Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* Enshrined as Scripture

Up to this point I have used the word “exegesis” somewhat loosely, making it refer not only to commentaries proper, but to any kind of treatise the author of which is known. However, there are cases where commentaries proper are either partially incorporated into or almost entirely recycled as scripture.

An example for the first case is one \*Bhago's commentary on the *Vajrāmṛtatantra* (Tōh. 1651).<sup>22</sup> I have dealt with this case elsewhere (Szántó, 2013) and the details ought not be repeated here. In short, sub-chapter 7.4 of the *Samputodbhava*, a very influential *yoginītantra* from the late tenth century, contains prose passages that are almost an exact match with the Tibetan translation of \*Bhago's commentary. The parallel is interrupted merely by a few vocatives (e.g. *bhagavan*) and speaker-markers (e.g. *bhagavān āha*), presenting the commentators' standard question-answer format as if it were a dialogue between a petitioner and a deity addressed as “Lord” revealing a *tantra*. The text lifted over from the commentary ends abruptly. We shall see a similar case just below.

An even bolder repackaging of exegesis proper was pointed out to me by Prof. Alexis Sanderson. IASWR MBB-I-70–73, a late Nepalese manuscript, has the following description of its contents in the colophon (139v4–5): *āryacakrasaṃvaravivṛttau mahātantrarāje hūṃkāranirgata-oḍiyānasapādalakṣād uddhṛtaḥ*. The colophon thus betrays that the compiler was aware of the original title,

---

<sup>22</sup> Since the last draft of this paper, Prof. Francesco Sferra has located a Sanskrit manuscript of this commentary in China and he has kindly communicated to me the name of the author in the colophon: Śrībhānu.

*Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti*, and that he made it into a scripture by prefixing it with *ārya-*, and styling it as a “great king of *tantras*”. The opening of the text is almost word-for-word the opening section of the *Samputodbhava*. The editor was, however, careful, and wherever the title of that *tantra* appeared, he changed it to *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti*. E.g. the *Samputodbhava* has this petition (ed. Skorupski<sup>23</sup>, p. 216):

*śrotum icchāmi jñānendra sarvatantranidānaṃ rahasyaṃ samputod-  
bhavalakṣaṇam |*

But our text has (1v7–2r1):

*śrotum icchāmi jñānendra sarvatantranidānaṃ rahasyaṃ **cakra-  
saṃvaravivṛttau** lakṣaṇam |*

After some further initial verses from the *Samputodbhava*, on f. 3v4 we start having the text of Bhavabhaṭṭa’s *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti*<sup>24</sup> proper, picking up in mid-sentence: p. 3, l. 6 in the Sarnath edition. It is to be noted that two of the codices (Kha and Ga) used by the Sarnath editors also become available from exactly this point. It is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that the compiler had access only to the/an ancestor of these manuscripts that lacked the beginning. Could it have been the case that he piously thought he was merely restoring the beginning of a fragmentary scripture?

#### 4. Śāstric Passages in the *Samputatilaka*

It could be argued that “recycling” exegetical passages into scripture was a late Nepalese phenomenon, since both the *Yogāmbaramahātantra* and the *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* as a *tantra* are extant in late Nepalese manuscripts. However, the case of \*Bhago’s commentary in the *Samputodbhava* seems to invalidate such a proposition, since the *Samputodbhava* is very likely not a Nepalese, but an East-Indian composition. In other words, the procedure of recycling commentaries as scripture was already in vogue in tenth-century East India.

<sup>23</sup> Tadeusz Skorupski, “The Saṃputa-Tantra, Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions of Chapter One”. In: *The Buddhist Forum: Volume IV*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1996, pp. 191–244.

<sup>24</sup> Janardan Shastri Pandey (ed.), *Śrīherukābhidhānam Cakrasaṃvaratantram with the Vivṛti Commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa*. Vols. I–II. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 26. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2002.

The *Samputatilaka*<sup>25</sup> is sometimes transmitted as the eleventh chapter of the *Samputodbhava*, but the two old manuscripts that do so are Nepalese, therefore it could be suspected that it was compiled in Nepal. However, the *Samputatilaka* shares many passages with an anonymous commentary on the *Samputodbhava* called the *Prakaraṇārthanirmaya* (Kaiser Library no. 228 = NGMPP C 26/1), and the only known manuscript in which this text is transmitted is undoubtedly from East India, more precisely from the scriptorium of the famous Vikramaśīla monastery. The direction of borrowing is not entirely clear for the time being: as a working hypothesis I will assume that the *Prakaraṇārthanirmaya* is lifting over without attribution large chunks of the *Samputatilaka*, but the opposite could also be the case, especially in light of the evidence presented below, namely that the *Samputatilaka* contains fairly long passages from śāstric texts.

Either way, the matter I wish to focus on here is something of a different nature. Up to this point we have seen that recycled material is overwhelmingly, though not exclusively, tantric. The *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* is a prominent example of Vajrayāna exegesis, and even the first chapter of the *Yogāmbaramahātantra* is dominated by tantric authors such as Advayavajra. Verses by non-tantric authors (or works that do not, at least primarily, discuss tantric matters) are almost incidental. Furthermore, it can be suspected that some of these non-tantric verses were not lifted over from the original work, but from quotations in tantric exegesis. For example, although *Yogāmbaramahātantra* v. 26 ultimately is from the *Candrapradīpasūtra*, the same verse is quoted by e.g. Advayavajra in his *Pañcatathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa*. Similarly, v. 101 = *Ālokamālā* 274 is also quoted in the same work, and v. 63, traced back above to the

---

<sup>25</sup> Although there are some more manuscripts of the text, I shall here use only the two oldest, palm-leaf witnesses with the following sigla: W = Wellcome Institute Library ε 2, ff. 186, palm-leaf, old Newar, undated, perhaps 11th century (miscatalogued as a *Saiva tantra* in Dominik Wujastyk, *A Handlist of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*. Vol. 1. London: The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1985.); R = Royal Asiatic Society, London, Hodgson Ms. no. 37, ff. 127, palm-leaf, old Newar, undated, but very likely from the middle of the 11th century (E. B. Cowell & J. Eggeling, “Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Possession of the Royal Asiatic Society (Hodgson Collection)”. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, new series 8,1, 1876, pp. 1–52).

epistemologist Dharmakīrti, is quoted e.g. in Ratnarakṣita's *Padmīnī*,<sup>26</sup> a commentary on the *Samvarodaya*.

The *Samputatilaka* also borrows passages from tantric works. For example, the very last portion of the text (given here in the appendix as 2a and 2b) corresponds to a section of the *Tattvasiddhi*<sup>27</sup>, a famous apology of antinomian practice by [a] Śāntarakṣita. Editorial intervention is kept to a minimum. In 2a, just before the quoted verse, the *Samputatilaka* introduces two vocatives (*bhagavan kulaputrāḥ*) that defy interpretation, but do lend a “scriptural” flavour to the text. Similarly, in 2b instead of *evaṃ te rāgādaya āśayaviśeṣabhāvīno viśiṣṭaphalāvāhakā bhavanti* we have *evaṃ te **kulaputrā** rāgādaya āśayaviśeṣabhāvīno viśiṣṭaphalāvāhakā bhavanti*. A more serious, rather ad hoc intervention comes at the very end. In the original, Śāntarakṣita presents his reasoning in a standard formulation (introduced by the word *prayogaḥ*), identifying his *hetu* as the *svabhāvahetuḥ* at the end. The *Samputatilaka*, however, changes this to *svabhāvasuddhāḥ*, which sounds rather mystical, but does not make good sense in the context. If one were to edit the *Samputatilaka* without knowledge of its sources, one would often, such as here, be hard-pressed to find any plausible meaning.

But it is not only tantric works that are recycled in such a way. The passage immediately before the one discussed above, has a somewhat surprising provenance: the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and its *Bhāṣya*.<sup>28</sup> I have presented this passage with its corresponding loci in appendix 1a and 1b, not only to demonstrate how it is turned into scripture, but also because of the relative rarity of sources for this very important text.

The śāstric text is “scripturalized” in an unobvious way. As in the case of the *Samputodbhava* and \*Bhago's *Vajrāmyta* commentary, the compiler took advantage of standard exegetical style and by inserting speaker-markers turned the text into a dialogue between a petitioner and a revealer. Thus, introducing v. 4.4, Vasubandhu

<sup>26</sup> Ms. Buddhist Library, Nagoya, Takaoka CA 17, f. 22r. Tōh. 1420, 42v.

<sup>27</sup> For this text see the forthcoming edition of Toru Tomabechi (the section number in the appendix also refers to this edition). I have access to a preliminary draft for which I owe many thanks to the author.

<sup>28</sup> Gadjin M. Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya. A Buddhist Philosophical Treatise Edited for the First Time from a Sanskrit Manuscript*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964.



writes: *katame pañca doṣā ity āha* and then gives the text of the *kārikā*; in the *Samputatilaka* we have *katame (/katame te) pañca doṣāḥ | bhagavān āha* followed by the *kārikā* introduced by a somewhat mysterious and superfluous *tatra*. Similarly, introducing *pāda* a of verse 1.18, the *Bhāṣya* has: *kimarthaṃ ca prapadyate* [scil. the bodhisattva], followed by the text of the *kārikā*: *śubhadvayasya prāptyarthaṃ*. Again, the commentator's *avataṛāṇikā* is turned into a question of a petitioner: *kimarthaṃ (/kimarthaṃ ca) pratipadyate (/prapadyate) | bhagavān āha | śubhadvayasya prāptyarthaṃ*. The insertions are no doubt intentional: they show that the compiler knew very well that he was modifying the status of the text.

What is more difficult to ascertain is why these particular passages were selected and why they were arranged in this order. At least to my mind, they do not add anything to our understanding of any part of the *Samputodbhava*. Moreover, the running theme of one passage is strongly disrupted by the following unit. This is most evident in the (non-existent) transition between 1b and 2a: 1b ends in mid-sentence with *tatra sūnyatāyāḥ piṇḍārthaḥ*. The *Bhāṣya* continues with the rest of the sentence: *lakṣaṇato vyavasthānataś ca veditavyaḥ*; however, the *Samputatilaka* jumps to incorporating a passage from the *Tattvasiddhi* that deals with something completely different.

If I am right in thinking that there is no logic in the sequence in which these passages follow each other, we must face the somewhat disturbing hypothesis that the compiler was simply copy-pasting almost randomly. In the present case we are fortunate to have the source-texts available, and we can show that e.g. the half-sentence mentioned just above is indeed the original reading, in spite of the fact that it is a meaningless one. Were we to edit the text without knowledge of the *Madhyāntavibhāga/bhāṣya* and the *Tattvasiddhi*, cruces of desperation would have to be used profusely. But if a scriptural statement does not have good meaning, what then is its role?

### Conclusion

I hope to have managed to identify several further grey areas between scripture/*tantra* and exegesis/*śāstra* in the literature of late tantric Buddhism. It would seem that sometimes texts that did not claim to be scripture became just that by accident. It would also seem that commentaries and treatises, sometimes of well-known

authors were often consciously recycled, in whole or in part, as scripture. I find it difficult to believe that nobody in Buddhist communities took notice of this fact, but, unfortunately, as to this date I have been unable to find any traces suggesting that the problem was ever raised or debated. Furthermore, it can be shown that such compositions were mostly done in a very unsubtle and careless manner, the result often being nothing more than a strange collage of non-sequiturs and half-sentences that defies traditional philological criticism.

## Appendix

The text given here, the concluding part of the *Samputatilaka* discussed in section 4, is a diplomatic transcript of ms. W with the variants or R given in brackets. <kiṃcit> denotes an addition/correction; ≤kiṃcit≥ denotes deletion; as in kiṃ + t, + with spaces on both sides denotes loss of an entire *akṣara*, in kiṃ+it it refers to partial loss of an *akṣara*; om. abbreviates ‘omission’, including that of *danḍas*; I occasionally use asterisks \*to denote larger units to which a critical note is added\*. Although the four passages here given as 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b run as continuous text in the *Samputatilaka*, for the sake of convenience I have split it up according to the textual units they copy. Some standardization has been applied, such as removal of gemination after -r-.

[1a]

*Samputatilaka* [W 181v2–183v4, R 124v2–126r1] = *Madhyāntavibhāga* 4.1–6 with the *Bhāṣya* [ed. Nagao, pp. 50–52]

pratipakṣasya bhāvanā bodhipakṣa<sup>29</sup> (bodhipakṣ<ā> R) bhāvanā (bhāvanān R) idānīm vaktavyā | tatra tāvatādau (tāvad ādau R)

dauṣṭhulyāt tṛṣṇāhetutvād  
adhimohataḥ | (avimo≤kṣata≥hataś R)  
catu(catuḥ- R)satyāvatārāya  
mrtyupasthāna(smṛtyupasthāna- R)bhāvanā

kāyena hi dauṣṭhulyaṃ prabhāvyate | (om. R) tatparīkṣayāya (tatparīkṣayā R) duḥkhasatyam avatarati | tasya dauṣṭhulya (dauṣṭhulyasya R) saṃskāralakṣaṇatvāt | dauṣṭhulyaṃ hi saṃsāra+ḥ + + + (saṃskāraduḥkhataḥ tayā R) sarvaṃ (sārdhaṃ R) sāsra-vam avastv ādyā (sāsravañ cādṛṣṭvāryā R) duḥkhata<ḥ> paśya-≤|≥ntīti (paśyamntīti R) | tṛṣṇāhetuḥ vedanā (tṛṣṇāhetuḥ verdanā R) tatparīkṣayāya (tatpar<si>īkṣayā R) samudayasatyam avatarati | [W182r] ātmāniveśavastu (ātmābhīniveśavastu R) citta (cittaṃ R) tatparīkṣayāya (tatparīkṣayā R) nirodhasatyam avatarati | ātmācchedatayāpagamāt | (ātm≤ābhīniveśavastu≥chedabhayāpagamāt R) dharmaparīkṣayāya (dhurmaparīkṣayā R) sāmkleśīkavyavadānāni + + + saṃmohāt (sāmkleśīkavy<aiya>vadānikadharmā-

<sup>29</sup> Insertion mark, presumably for -sya, but insertion lost due to a partial tear of the lower margin.

saṃmohāt R) | mārgasatyam avatarati | ata ādau (≤dā≥<ā>dau R) catu(catuḥ- R) satyāvatārāya smṛtyupasthānabhāvanā (smṛtyu- <pa>sthānabhā[R123r (sic! for 125)]vanā R) vyavasthāpyate | tataḥ (ataḥ R) saṃprahānabhāvanā | (saṃ-prā<hā>ṇabhāvanā R) yasmāt

parijñāne vipakṣe ca  
pratipakṣe ca sarvathā (sarva≤ta≥thā≤ga≥ R)  
tadavagamāya (R adds: \*vīryaṃ  
caturdhā saṃpravartate

smṛtyupasthānabhāvanā yā vipakṣe pratipakṣe ca sarvaprakārah |  
parijñāto vipakṣāpagamāya\*) pratipakṣāpagamāya (pratipakṣāva-  
gamāya ca R) vīryaṃ caturdhā saṃpravartate | utpannānāṃ pā-  
pānāṃ (pāpakānāṃ R) akuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ prahāṇāyeti vīsta-  
rah | (vistara≤ta≥ḥ R) prak kathita iti [ed. Nagao, p. 51]

karmatāsthite | (karmaṇyatāsthites R) tatra  
sarvārthānāṃ sambuddhaye (samṛddhaye R)  
pañcadoṣaprahāṇāṣṭa- (-prahāṇā<yā>ṣṭa- R)  
saṃ[W182v]skārasedhanānaya (-saṃskārasevanānvayāḥ | | R)

tasmā (tasmāt R) tadigamāya (tadadhigamāya R) vīryabhāvanayā  
cittasthite (cittasthiteḥ R) karmaṇyatā | catvāra ṛddhipādāḥ (ṛddhi-  
padāḥ R) | sarvārthasamṛddhihetutvāt | (om. R) sthitir atra citta-  
sthitī (citrasthitiḥ | R) samādhir veditavyāḥ (veditavyā R) | ataḥ  
samyakprahāṇāntaraṃ (-prahāṇānantaraṃ R) ṛddhipādāḥ sā  
punaḥ karmaṇyatā | (om. R) pañcadoṣaprāhāṣṭaṣṭa(-prahāṇāyāṣṭa-  
R)saṃskārabhāvanātvayā veditavyā (veditavyāḥ R) | katame (kata-  
me te R) pañca doṣāḥ | (| | R) bhagavān āha | tatra

kausīdyam avavādasya  
saṃmoṣo laya uddhata eva ca (layaḥ | uddhataḥ R) |  
asaṃskāro 'rtha ('tha R) saṃskārah  
pañca doṣā ime matā (mat≤āḥ≥<e> R) |

tatra layoddhatyam (layoddh≤r≥atyam R) eko doṣaḥ kriyate | an-  
abhisamskāro layoddhatyaprasasanakāle (layauddhatyapra-  
samanakāla R) [R123v (sic! for 125)] doṣaḥ | anabhisamskāra  
(abhisamskāra R) prasāntau | eṣāṃ prahāṇāya katham aṣṭau  
prahāṇasaṃskārā vyavasthāpyante (vyavasthāpyante | R) catvārah  
| (om. R) kausīdyaprahāṇāya cchandavyāyāmaśraddhāprasra-  
bdhayaḥ (-prasrabiddhayaḥ R) | te punar yathākramaṃ [W183r]  
veditavyāḥ |

āśrayo athāśriya (thāśritas R) tasya  
nimitaṃ phalam eva ca |

āśraya (āśrayas R) cchando (chando R) vyāyāmaḥ (vyāyāmasyā-  
śrito vyāyāmaḥ R) | tasyāśraya (-āśrayas R) cchandasya (chanda-  
sya R) nimittaṃ śraddhā | (om. R) saṃpratyaya (saṃpratyaye R)  
saty abhilāṣāt | (om. R) tasyāśrita (tasyāśritasya R) vyāyāmasya  
phalaṃ prarabdhi (prarabdhis R) sa cchandavīryasya (chanda-  
vīryasya R) samādhi[ed. Nagao, p. 52]viśeṣādhighamāt | (om. R)  
śeṣās catvāraḥ prahāṇasaṃskārāḥ smṛtisaṃprajanyacetanopekṣās  
(-opekṣās R) caturṇāṃ (caturṇāṃ doṣāṇāṃ R) yathāsaṃkhyāṃ  
pratipakṣaḥ (pratipakṣ<ā>ḥ R) | te punaḥ smṛtyādayo veditavyā  
yathākramaṃ |

ālambane asaṃmoṣo (ālambaṇne 'saṃmoṣo R)  
layoddhatyānubadhyatā  
tadvayāyābhisamskāra (tadupāyābhisamskāraḥ R)  
śāntau prasavavāhitā (prasa<va>ḥthavāhitā | R)

smṛtir ālambanāsaṃpramoṣaḥ | (ālambaṇ<ā>saṃpramoṣaḥ R)  
saṃprajanyam asaṃpramose satī layoddhatyānubodhaḥ |  
abudhya (anubudhya R) tadupagamārthā'bhisamskāraś (tadapaga-  
mārtho 'bhisamskārās R) cetinā (cetanā R) layauddhatyasya (la-  
yoddhatyasya R) upasāntau satyāṃ prasavavāhitā (prasa<tha>vā-  
hitā R) cittasya upekṣā (upekṣā | R) \*ṛddhipādā[W183v]nantaraṃ  
pañcendriyāṇi śraddhādīni teṣāṃ kathaṃ vyavasthānam

āropyate | mokṣabhā<sup>30</sup>ye  
cchandayogādhipatyataḥ |  
ālambane 'saṃmoṣau  
dhisārādhipatyataḥ |

adhipatyata iti vartate |\* (\*...\* om. R due to an eyeskip) ṛddhipā-  
dau (ṛddhipādaiḥ R) karmanya(karmanya- R)cittasyāvaropite  
mokṣabhāgīye kuśalamūla cchandādhipataḥ (cchandādhipatyataḥ  
R) prayogādhipatyataḥ | (<prayogādhipatyataḥ |> R) ālambanā-  
saṃpramoṣadhipatyataḥ | [R124r (sic! for 126)] avisārādhipatyata-  
taḥ | (om. R) pravicyādhipatyas ca (-ādhipatyatasva R) yathākra-  
maṃ | pañca sraddhādīnindriyāṇi (śraddhādīnīndriyāṇi R) vedita-  
vyāni |

---

<sup>30</sup> Space of one *akṣara*, presumably for an illegible -gī-.

[1b]

*Samputatilaka* [W 183v4–185r5, R 126r1–127r2] = *Madhyāntavibhāga* 1.17 (*kārikā* excluded)–22 with the *Bhāṣya* [ed. Nagao, pp. 25–27]

tatra bhokṭṛbhojanasūnyatām āhuḥ (āha R) | adhyātmikāny āyatanāny ārabhya bhojanasūnyatā bāhyāni | taddeha (+ ddehas R) tayor bhokṭṛbhojanayo (-bhojanayor R) d adhiṣṭhāna (yad adhiṣṭhānaṃ R) śarīraṃ tasya sūnyatā | (om. R) api paśyan akhinyaḥ (akhila- R) saṃskāraṃ parityajet (parityajate | R) kuśalasyākṣayāya ca (ca | R) nirupadhiśeṣe (nirupadhiśeṣe | R) adhyātmabahi-[W184r]rddhāsūnyatety (-sūnya tad R) ucyate | pratiṣṭhāvastu bhājanalokas tasya vistṛṇatvāt | sūnyatā (tacchūnyatā R) mahāsūnyatety ucyate | tac cādhyātmikāyatnādi (-āyatanādi R) yena sūnyam (sūnya R) dṛṣṭam (dṛṣṭa R) sūnyatājñānena tasya sūnyatā | (om. R) sūnyaśūnyatā (sūnyatāśūnyatā R) | yathā dṛṣṭam paramārthākāreṇa tasya (tac- R) sūnyatā (-chūnyatā R) paramārthaśūnyatā | tadarthaṃ ca bodhisattvaḥ prapadyate | tasya sūnyatā | (om. R) kimarthaṃ (kimarthaṃ ca R) pratipadyate | (prapadyate || R) bhagavān āha |

śubhadvayasya prāptyarthaṃ

kuśalasya saṃskṛtā | saṃskṛtasya (saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛtasya R)

sadā sattvahitāya ca (ca | R)

atyantasattvahitārthaṃ (atyamrthaṃ sattvahitārthaṃ R)

saṃsāratyajanārthaṃ ca (saṃsārātyajanārthaṃ tu R) |

anavarāgrasya saṃsāra (saṃsārasya R) sūnyatām apasyaṃ (apaśyan R) khinnaḥ saṃsāraṃ parityajet |

kuśalamṣyākṣayāya (kuśalasyākṣayāya R) ca |

nirupadhiśeṣanirvāṇe pi yatnāvākirati (yan n<ā>vakirati R) notsrjati (notsrjati | R) tasya śū[R124v (sic! for 126)]n[ed. Nagao, p. 26]yatā | ana≤ka≥vakāśāsūnyā (anavakāśāsūnyatā R)

gotrasya (≤śro≥gotrasya R) vi[W184v]ddhyarthaṃ (viśuddhyarthaṃ | R)

gotraṃ hi prakṛtiḥ (prakṛti R) svābhāvikatvāl

lakṣaṇavyaṅjanāptaye

mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇānāṃ sānuvyāṅjanānāṃ prāptaye

śuddhaye buddhadharmāṇām  
bodhisattva (bodhisattvā R) prapadyate (prapadyante | R)  
balavaiśāradyādīnām eva (evaṃ R) tāvac caturdaśānām śūnyatā-  
nām vyavasthānaṃ veditavyaṃ | (om. R) kā punar atra śūnyatā  
pudgalasyārtha dharmāṇām  
abhāvaḥ | (om. R) śūnyatā (śūnyatā | R) tarhi  
tadabhāvasya sadbhāva (sadbhāvas R)  
tasmin sā śūnyatā parā  
pudgaladharmatābhāvaś (pudgaladha+ma + bhāvaś R) ca śūnyatā  
| (om. R) tadabhāvasya (tadbhāvasya ca R) sadbhāvaḥ  
(saṃ≤d≥bhāvaḥ R) | tasmin yathoktādaḥ (yathoktabhoktrādaḥ R)  
śūnyateti śūnyatālakṣaṇakṣāpanārthaṃ (-khyāpanārthaṃ R) vi-  
dhāma te (vidhāmate R) śūnyatā (śūnyatām R) vyavasthāpayati |  
abhāvaśūnyatā (-śūnyatām R) abhāvasvabhāvaśūnyatām ca (ca |  
R) pudgaladharmāsamāropasya | (pudgala + rmasamāropasya R)  
tacchūnyatāpadavādasya (tacchūnyatāpavādasya R) ca parihārā-  
rthaṃ yathākramam (yathākramaṃ | R) eva (evaṃ R) śūnyatāyāḥ  
pra<bhe>do (prabhedo R) vi[W185r]jñeyaḥ | kathaṃ sādhanam  
vijñeyaḥ (vijñeyaṃ R) |  
saṃkṣiptā ced bhava (bhaven R) nāsau  
muktā (muktāḥ R) syuḥ sarvadehinaḥ |  
viśuddhā ced bhaven nāsau (nā + R)  
vyāyāmo niṣphalo (niṣphallo R) bhavet |  
yadi dharmāṇā (dharmāṇām R) śūnyatā āgantukaiḥ saṃkleśair  
anutpanne [ed. Nagao, p. 27] ti (<'>pi R) pratipakṣe na saṃkṣiptā  
bhavet | saṃkleśābhāvāt | (saṃkleśābhāvād R) ayatnata eva mu-  
ktāḥ (muktās R) sarvasattvā bhavyeḥ (bhavyeḥ | R) athotpanne  
pi (athotpanna pi R) pratipakṣe (prati + [R127r] kṣe R) na (na R)  
viśuddhā bhavet | mokṣārthārambho niṣphalo bhavet | evaṃ (e-  
vaṃ ca R) kṛtvā  
na kṣiptā nāpi vākṣiptam (<nāpi vākṣiptā> R)  
śuddhāśuddhā nā caiva (na caiva ≤|≥ R) sā  
kathaṃ na kṣiptānām (n<ā>kṣiptānā R) śuddhā prakṛtyaiva (≤pra-  
tyava≥prakṛtyaiva R)  
prabhāsvaratvāc cittasya |  
kathaṃ nākṣiptā (na kṣiptā R) na śuddhā

kleśasyāgantukatvāt (kleś≤ā≥syā + + + tv<ā>t R) |

evaṃ ś+ + + (śūnyatāyā R) upadiṣṭa (uddiṣṭa<ḥ> R) prabhedataḥ  
| (prabhedaḥ R) sādhitō bhavati (bhavati | R) tatra śūnyatāyāḥ  
(śūnyatāyā<ḥ> R) piṇḍārthaḥ |

[2a]

*Samputatilaka* [W 185r5–185v3, R 127r2–127r4] = *Tattvasiddhi* §17  
(five lines from beginning)

tad (yad R) apy uktam | (om. R) nāga(rāga- R)pratipakṣo aśubhādi  
(śubhādir R) dveṣapratipakṣo maitrī | [W185v] mohapratipakṣaḥ  
(mo≤kṣa≥hapratipakṣ≤ā≥ḥ R) pratīyasamutpādaḥ | tatra katham  
rāgato (rā + to R) vinivṛttiḥ | (vinivṛttis R) tadviruddhatvād iti cet  
(itiś cet R) | nanu yad (yady R) eva (evaṃ R) rāgasyātmīyakaraṇe  
pi virāga<ḥ> (virāgaḥ R) syāt | tathā coktam (coktam | R) bhaga-  
van kulaputrā | (kulaputrāḥ | | R)

aho hi sarvabuddhānām rāgaññānam anāvilam |  
hatvā virāgam rāgeṇa (rāgena R) sarvasaukhyam dadanti te (te |  
R)<sup>31</sup>

+ + + gādīnām (na ca rāgādīnām R) prakṛtisāvadyaṃtvam (-sāva-  
dyatvam R) | anyathā śrotāpannasya rāgapratilambhaḥ (-pratila-  
mbha<ḥ> R) syāt tasya rāgādyaparihāreṇa (-aparihākāreṇa R)  
pravṛtteḥ |

[2b]

*Samputatilaka* [W 185v3–186v5, R 127r4–] = *Tattvasiddhi* §17  
(resuming after a short omission)

kiṃ tu santānaviśeṣād guṇaviśeṣā'vāhakā (kiṃ tu saṃtānaviśeṣāvā-  
hakā R) bhavanti | yathā ketakīpuṣpaṃ (ketakīpuṣpaṃ R)  
gandhahastinopabhuktaṃ kastūrikādibhāvena (kasturikādibhāvena  
R) pariṇamati | (pariṇamati | | R) itaraiś ca hastibhir upabhuktaṃ  
amedhyabhāvena pariṇamati | te<na> (tena R) na tatra ketakīpu-  
ṣpadoṣas (-doṣaḥ | R) tathā rāgādayo pi vistarasantānavartino (vi-  
śuddhasam + [R127v]navartino R) viśiṣṭam (vi≤śiṣṭa-nopi≥śiṣṭam  
R) eva phalam kurvam [W186r]ty (kurvanty R) āśayaviśeṣayogāt |

<sup>31</sup> The quotation is from the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha* (ed. Horiuchi 1,44,55).



yathā kṣīraṃ sarpādibhir upabhuḡyamānaṃ viṣādibhāvena pariṇa-  
mayati (pariṇamati R) | anyaiś ca punaḡ puruṣai bhujyamānam  
(puruṣair upabhuḡyamānam R) amṛtabhāvam (ṛtabhāvam R) āpa-  
dyate | (āpadyate + R) evaṃ te kulaputrā rāgādaya āśayaviśeṣa-  
bhāvino viśiṣṭaphalāvāhakā bhavantīti (bhavantīti | R) prakṛtinira-  
vadyatvāt prayoga + (prayogaḡ | R) + + (ye ye R) viśiṣṭasantāna-  
bhāvinas te ti (-bhāvinas te R) viśiṣṭaphalavāhakā (-phalāvāhakā R)  
yathā te (yathā R) ketakyādayo viśi + + + tānavartinās ca (+ śiṣṭa-  
santānavartinasva R) rāgādaya iti svabhāvaśuddhāḡ (svabhāva-  
≤vi≥śuddhā R) | |

### **Bibliography of Secondary Sources**

Davidson 2002 — Ronald M. Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism. A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Davidson 2005 — Ronald M. Davidson, *Tibetan Renaissance. Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Szántó 2008 — Péter-Dániel Szántó, “Antiquarian Enquiries into the Initiation Manuals of the Catuspīṭha”. In: *Newsletter of the NGMCP*, Number 6.

Szántó 2013 — Péter-Dániel Szántó, “Before a Critical Edition of the Samputa”. In: Robert Mayer & Michael Walter (eds.), *Between Empire and Phyi dar: the Fragmentation and the Reconstruction of Society and Religion in Post-Imperial Tibet*. Lumbini: LIRI, pp. 343–365.

Wedemeyer 2013 — Christian K. Wedemeyer, *Making Sense of Tantric Buddhism. History, Semiology, & Transgression in the Indian Traditions*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Books that appeared in the “Indian and Tibetan Studies Series” of the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg. Orders can only be made from Biblia Impex: [contact@bibliaimpex.com](mailto:contact@bibliaimpex.com).

1. Kengo Harimoto, *God, Reason, and Yoga: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Commentary Ascribed to Śaṅkara on Pātañjalayogaśāstra 1.23–28*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 1. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2014. ISBN: 978-3-945151-00-6.
2. Alexander Schiller, *Die “Vier Yoga”-Stufen der Mahāmudrā-Meditationstradition: Eine Anthologie aus den Gesammelten Schriften des Mönchsgelehrten und Yogin Phag mo gru pa rDo rje rgyal po (Kritischer Text und Übersetzung, eingeleitet und erläutert)*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 2. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2014. ISBN: 978-3-945151-01-3.
3. Ayako Nakamura, *Das Wesen des Buddha-Erwachens in der frühen Yogācāra-Schule*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 3. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2016. ISBN: 978-3-945151-02-0.
4. Orna Almogi, (ed.) *Tibetan Manuscript and Xylograph Traditions: The Written Word and Its Media within the Tibetan Cultural Sphere*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 4. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2016. ISBN: 978-3-945151-03-7.
5. Dorji Wangchuk, (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation*. Indian and Tibetan Studies 5. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg, 2016, pp. 351–370. ISBN: 978-3-945151-04-4.

