

Kimiaki Tanaka, *Samantabhadra nāma sādhana-ṭīkā*:  
*Introduction, Romanized Sanskrit Text and Translation*, Tokyo,  
Watanabe Publishing Co., Ltd., 2017  
Péter-Dániel Szántó

---

**Citer ce document / Cite this document :**

Szántó Péter-Dániel. Kimiaki Tanaka, *Samantabhadra nāma sādhana-ṭīkā: Introduction, Romanized Sanskrit Text and Translation*, Tokyo, Watanabe Publishing Co., Ltd., 2017. In: Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient. Tome 103, 2017. pp. 570-574;

[https://www.persee.fr/doc/befeo\\_0336-1519\\_2017\\_num\\_103\\_1\\_6263\\_t15\\_0570\\_0000\\_1](https://www.persee.fr/doc/befeo_0336-1519_2017_num_103_1_6263_t15_0570_0000_1)

---

Fichier pdf généré le 08/11/2019

田中公明、梵文『普賢成就法註』研究 / Kimiaki TANAKA, *Samantabhadra nāma sādhana-ṭīkā: Introduction, Romanized Sanskrit Text and Translation*, Tokyo, Watanabe Publishing Co., Ltd., 2017, 156 pages – ISBN 978-4902119275 ; 42,25 \$

After last year's monograph on the *Vyavastholi* of Nāgabuddhi (Tanaka 2016;<sup>1</sup> for a review article in this journal, see Szántó 2016<sup>2</sup>), Dr Kimiaki Tanaka has graced us with yet another splendid publication, this time centred on a pair of fundamental texts from the so-called Jñānapāda School of Guhyasamāja exegesis. The importance of this school and its founder for the development of mature esoteric Buddhism cannot be overstated, but this is a phenomenon we are still coming to terms with, especially now that quite a lot of material in the original Sanskrit has surfaced (see Szántó 2015<sup>3</sup> and Dalton & Szántó forthcoming<sup>4</sup>). To keep to the very essentials and ignoring for the time being the doctrinal-philosophical aspects, it should be noted that the *Guhyasamājatantra* does not teach its pantheon and the daily procedure of its worship clearly. The *Samantabhadrasādhana* of Jñānapāda is a text which does just that, describing a step-by-step procedure for the worship of the pantheon consisting of nineteen deities headed by Mañjuvājra. Another name for the text is *Caturaṅgasādhana*, but it is not quite clear to me whether this was a designation by the author himself, or whether the structuring of the practice into four “limbs” was a later addition by his commentators. The importance of this text is shown also by the fact that the Tibetan Canon preserves four commentaries on it. The Sanskrit manuscript discussed in this book is a fragment of a commentary of the *Samantabhadra*, which, as Dr Tanaka notes, presents some resemblances to one of the Tibetan translations, although it is not identical to it. I shall have more to say on the matter below.

The book is in many ways the previous monograph's sibling: the publisher is the same, the format is the same, it is again bilingual (Japanese and English), and this book too summarises and upgrades a series of Dr Tanaka's previous studies in Japanese. However, this time the edited text is accompanied by a facing-page English translation (pp. 50–143), and the introduction (pp. 7–24 in Japanese, pp. 25–44 in English) is much shorter. The ancillary material consists of two plates with images of the manuscript (before p. 1), a reproduction of a very handsome print of the deities from Sde-dge (p. 2), a table of contents (p. 3), a Tibetan block-print illumination of Jñānapāda (p. 4), a summary of the book in Tibetan (p. 5), an image of a beautiful sculpture of Mañjuvājra from the Metropolitan Museum (p. 6), a tabular

1. Kimiaki Tanaka, *Samājasādhana-Vyavastholi of Nāgabodhi/Nāgabuddhi: Introduction and Romanized Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*, Tokyo, Watanabe Publishing Co., Ltd., 2016.

2. Péter-Dániel Szántó, “Early Exegesis of the Guhyasamāja: Philological Notes on the *Vyavastholi* of Nāgabuddhi”, *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 102, pp. 437–450.

3. Péter-Dániel Szántó, “Early Works and Persons Related to the So-called Jñānapāda School”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 36–37, 2015, pp. 537–562.

4. Catherine Dalton & Péter-Dániel Szántó, “Jñānapāda,” in Jonathan A. Silk *et al.* (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. II, Leiden, forthcoming.

synopsis of the meditative procedure (p. 45 in Japanese, p. 46 in English), a reproduction of a Tibetan representation of the pantheon (p. 47), a diagram of the same with the names of the deities inscribed (p. 48 in Japanese, p. 49 in English), a bibliography (pp. 144–146), a postscript detailing the aetiology of the book (pp. 147–149 & 153 in Japanese, pp. 150–152 in English), and, finally, a biography of the author (p. 154 in Japanese, p. 155 in English). Since I unfortunately do not read Japanese, it should be understood that the present review applies only to the English (and Sanskrit) portions.

I shall start with a few notes to the introduction. The author tells us (p. 25) that Jñānapāda was the first *vajrācārya* of Vikramaśīla monastery. Unfortunately, we seem to have only Tāranātha's word on this matter and no independent evidence. We are also told that Jñānapāda “wrote fourteen works” (*ibid.*). This is a widespread misconception stemming from a misreading of a remark made by one of his commentators, \*Vaidyapāda (a.k.a. \*Vitapāda). What the text actually tells us is that Jñānapāda wrote fourteen works *after* he received a vision of Mañjuśrī. This number therefore does not include what might be called his juvenilia on non-tantric matters (the \**Saṅcayagāthāpañjikā*, the *Mahāyānalakṣaṇasamuccaya*, and the *Pradīpāvalī*). Dalton and I consider this matter at greater depth in our forthcoming entry in *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Dr Tanaka also says that “[w]e can refer to most of these fourteen works since they are included in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, but their Sanskrit originals have been lost” (*ibid.*). This is not entirely accurate. In fact, quite a few works from this series were lost – one, an initiation manual, already to \*Vaidyapāda, who tells us that the text was available only in Kashmir – and some are actually extant in Sanskrit, albeit partially and, indeed, in some cases inaccessibly at the moment. On the next page, the author briefly mentions Dīpaṅkarabhadra's *Maṅḍalavidhi* in 450 stanzas, a fundamental work that was to influence almost all initiation manuals to come. Dr Tanaka says that “the two texts do not share identical verses” (p. 26). This statement, while true, is slightly misleading. In fact, large portions of Dīpaṅkarabhadra's manual are Jñānapāda's *āryā* stanzas recast as *anuṣṭubhs*. He also says that the Göttingen copy of the *Maṅḍalavidhi* contains 415 out of the original 450 stanzas, forgetting to mention that the Cambridge manuscript does contain the missing passage (as reported in Szántó 2015, a paper Dr Tanaka does not seem to be aware of). Moreover, the number is only an approximation to begin with.

As for the *Samantabhadra*, we are indeed very fortunate that Kazuo Kano published whatever little can be accessed in the notorious Lhasa birch-bark manuscript (as described on p. 28). Otherwise, with the exception of a few more stanzas found by Dr Tanaka incorporated into a variety of texts, we must refer to the two Tibetan translations, one by Smṛtijñānakīrti, the other by the duo Rin chen bzañ po and Śraddhākaravarman. The author states that the text contains 165 stanzas (actually, only 164) and that he follows the numbering of Kanamoto Takuji. I am not aware of this publication, if indeed it is one, and unfortunately the bibliography does not contain an entry for it either.

Concerning the commentary, Dr Tanaka is very careful in pointing out that a Tibetan translation of a commentary by one Dpal Kun tu bzañ po matches the contents of his manuscript only partially. He also mentions that there is another relevant manuscript with the title *Sāramañjarī*, which went missing during the Cultural Revolution, and which can be accessed through Tucci's photographs. I have had the great fortune of being able to work on this manuscript for a couple of years now, and I am happy to share here some of my preliminary, somewhat bolder, conclusions. In fact, there is very good evidence that the manuscript is not lost, although I have not seen it directly. In any case, Tucci's photographs, to which I gained access through the courtesy of Prof. Francesco Sferra, are on the whole relatively legible. According to the colophon, the copy was finished in an unspecified location under Pāla control, as the date is expressed in regnal years (those of Nayapāla), and converts to *ca.* mid-11th century. It is quite clear to me that this manuscript of the *Sāramañjarī*, the manuscript edited by Dr Tanaka, and the Tibetan translation are witnesses of one and the same work in three different recensions. The name of the author is, somewhat confusingly, also Samantabhadra: in my 2015 paper I have proposed the hypothesis that he was a grand-disciple of Jñānapāda's Konkani master, Pālitapāda. At this point, I am working under the assumption that the text gradually became longer as Samantabhadra worked more on it, but one could make arguments for the opposite scenario as well. Be that as it may, let us not lose sight of a rather unique opportunity: here we seem to have access to the workshop of a ninth-century esoteric Buddhist author, gradually expanding (or reducing) his text. It is of course impossible to say how long the "Nepalese" recension was, since the eight folios edited in the book under scrutiny are the only ones we have. The "Tibetan" recension (i.e. the Sanskrit text as it was once used by the translators) is of mid-length and perhaps slightly more elaborate than the "Nepalese", while the "Pāla" recension, as witnessed by the manuscript mentioned above, is by far the longest, containing also large portions of Jñānapāda's other works, most notably the crucial *Ātmasāadhanāvātāra*. This manuscript also allowed me to reconstruct most of the *Samantabhadra*, and we can now say with certainty that although it is predominantly written in *āryā* metre (and its varieties), not counting the stanzas directly incorporated from the *Guhyasamājatantra*, there are two stanzas in other metres: the first is a *vasantatilakā*, whereas the penultimate is a *mālinī*. Dr Tanaka, however, seems to be convinced that the entire text was written in *āryā* (p. 31). This might seem like a minor point, but the metre is crucial in establishing the lemmata, as I hope to show below.

For those of us who were aware of Dr Tanaka's previous edition (published in instalments beginning with 1990 and in full in 2010), the version in the book is an obviously major improvement, the chief reason being that he has in the meantime gained access to high-quality colour images of the manuscript to replace the occasionally near-illegible microfilm copies on which he previously had to rely. However, as is nearly always the case, further improvements can be made. As for the translation, on the whole the language is elegant and accurate. This is especially impressive, because

exegetical Sanskrit is very difficult to convey in good English. Some rather bizarre instances, however, remain. Since I will deal with the text in depth in my forthcoming monograph centred on the *Sāramañjarī*, here I will present only a small sample of my observations.

The translation is aided by a good number of bracketed additions in order to make the meaning easier to grasp. In one such addition on p. 53, we are told that the compound **nijabñjabhābhīḥ** “is to be construed as a *dvandva*”. Just how, one wonders, when the commentator himself breaks it up as two genitive *tatpuruṣas*, and Dr Tanaka translates it accordingly as “with the flames of their seed[-syllables]” (p. 51).

Although the author does not try to reconstruct the verses of the *mūla*, providing the two Tibetan translations instead, with a little more thought he could have made out the lemmata more precisely. To give a very simple example, on p. 54 **Hūmkāreṇa Cītavajraṃ** is marked in bold throughout (which means a lemma in the editor’s conventions), whereas it is quite clear that the instrumental ending is the commentator’s addition, because *\*hūmkāracītavajraṃ* would make a perfect opening *pāda* in an *āryā*. Two pages later, but remaining with the same verse, we find the phrase *tasya nābhau madhyabhāge Āhkāreṇa Vāgvajraṃ praṇava Omkāras tena Kāyavajraṃ dhyāyād iti sambandhaḥ*. The synonyms are very obviously glosses, so that *nābhau* and *praṇava* should be marked in bold. A glance at the Tibetan makes it clear that *āh°* too is a lemma. In fact, we can now probably reconstruct the entire second line as *\*āhpraṇavābhīyām dhyāyād vāgvajraṃ kāyavajraṃ ca*. As a short aside, Dr Tanaka claims that the translator Smṛtijñānakīrti “mistook” *praṇava* for *praṇama*, inasmuch as his translation for it is *phyag ’shal* (p. 32). This is not entirely accurate, since in East Indian scribal dialect intervocalic *v* and *m* are quite frequently interchangeable (e.g. Govinda/Gominda).

Another inconsistency with regard to editorial conventions can be seen on p. 58, where we find *paścād iti cītavajradharaḥ śrīmān ityādikrameṇa* translated as follows: “‘After’ means by the sequence beginning with [the verse] *Cītavajradhara* [sic!; PDSz] *śrīmān* (i.e. v. 58 or Guhyasamāja XII, 74).” It is clear that the editor took *paścād* as a lemma and forgot to mark it in bold. In fact, the lemma is not *paścād*, but the *iti* immediately thereafter.

A closer scrutiny of the commentator and a slightly more critical editorial policy would have resulted in better sentences. For example, on pp. 58–59, we find **trivajrābhedyabhāvina** *iti trivajrakāyavajrādi tadabhedabhāvabhāvitatsvabhāva ity arthaḥ* | translated as follows: “Verse 58 (*trivajrābhedyabhāvina* *iti*). ‘The three vajras’ means Kāyavajra and so on [= body, speech and mind vajras]. ‘Practising them inseparably’ means [the one whose] nature is such.” To the lemma Dr Tanaka adds the following note: “I have adopted *trivajrābhedyabhāvinaḥ* in accordance with the Sanskrit commentary, although Matsunaga 1978 [the edition of the *Guhyasamājantra*, as the commented stanza has been lifted from there; PDSz] has *trivajrābhedyabhāvitaḥ*.” However, the commentator, judging by his analysis of the compound, must have read *°bhāvitaḥ* and not

°*bhāvinah*, which is quite impossible grammatically speaking as well, even by the standards of the *Guhyasamājatantra*. We are therefore dealing with a scribal slip in copying the lemma and not a genuine reading. Moreover, *trivajrakāyavajrādi* is immediately suspicious. My first instinct was to emend to *trivajram kāyavajrādi*, but then I checked the manuscript and found that the *anusvāra* is indeed where it should be; this is probably an oversight on the editor's part, because the translation does reflect the actual and correct reading. The interpretation of what comes next is, however, completely wrong. One cannot possibly think of “Practising them inseparably” as a lemma. It is a gloss, where *tad*° refers to the vajra-triad, °*abhedabhāva*° explains °*ābhedyā*°, and °*bhāvitas* simply repeats the last member of the compound in the lemma.

Another misreading of the manuscript is found on the very next page, p. 60: *vākpatha iti vacanasthāpanopapannaḥ*. This is translated somewhat strangely as follows: “Pathway of speech means the appearance of the fixed meaning of the word.” First, consistency in translation conventions would dictate placing the lemma between quotation marks. The gloss is nonsensical, especially when one checks the manuscript and discovers that this is in fact an *ante correctionem* reading: the first °*pa*° has been cancelled by the scribe by two small vertical strokes as is the custom. Thus, the *post correctionem* and correct reading is *vacanasthāna*°, which simply means the tongue where Vāgvajra is to be visualised. As an aside, I should mention that – if I am right in thinking that the longer recension is later – Samantabhadra too must have thought that this comment is slightly ambiguous, inasmuch as in the “Pāla” recension (Ms 16r4) we have *jihvāmūle niṣpannaḥ* instead.

On pp. 64–65 we read the following sentence: *tasya hr̥tprabhābhīḥ sakalākāśavalayavarttimunivṛndam iti sarvadiksamūhashthitam | sugatanivaham samcodya*. This is the translation: “‘With the rays from his hearts [sic!; PDSz],’ [one should] send forth the assembly of the Munis until they are in multitudes in all directions.” The manuscript is confusing at this point. It once again contains a correction which was not noted by the editor: the scribe first wrote *sakalākāśa*° and then cancelled all *akṣaras* but the first. However, with due attention to the gloss and the metre, we can be certain that the correct reading is *sakalāśāvalayavartti munivṛndam* (*sakala*° = *sarva*°, °*āśā*° = °*dik*°, °*valaya*° = °*samūha*°, °*vartti* = °*sthitam*, °*muni*° = *sugata*°, °*vṛndam* = °*nivaham*; the *daṇḍa* after °*sthitam* is superfluous). The translation will have to be modified accordingly; moreover, *samcodya* does not mean “[one should] send forth”, but “after having impelled” (note the translation “[h]e should provoke” on p. 85).

In spite of such minor shortcomings, which are quite numerous, the book is an extremely valuable publication which will be read with great profit by scholars of esoteric Buddhism. I would wish to reiterate my gratefulness to Dr Tanaka for his policy of producing bilingual publications, and, with due apologies for my ignorance of Japanese, I hope that it will start a new trend.

Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ (All Souls College, University of Oxford)