

Early Exegesis of the Guhyasamāja

Philological Notes on the *Vyavasthali* of Nāgabuddhi

Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ*

田中公明、梵藏対照『安立次第論』研究 / Kimiaki TANAKA, *Samājasādhana-Vyavasthali of Nāgabodhi/Nāgabuddhi: Introduction and Romanized Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*, Tokyo, Watanabe Publishing Co., Ltd., 2016, 152 pages – ISBN 9784902119251

The bilingual publication under discussion here is primarily an edition (or rather, re-edition) of a very important tantric Buddhist work, the *Vyavasthali* of Nāgabodhi/Nāgabuddhi. For students of Vajrayāna, Dr Tanaka does not need an introduction (and for those who do, there is a helpful short biography at the end of this book, pp. 149–150). His scholarly output is quite simply immense: more than 50 books and 150 articles on esoteric Buddhism, Buddhist iconography, and Tibetan art with no compromise in quality for the sake of quantity. Unfortunately for people like myself, most of these are in Japanese, and so this bilingual book is a very welcome shift in policy. Japanese Buddhology has for a very long time produced almost as much as the rest of the world put together, but these materials have received less currency than they deserve. The fault is, of course, primarily ours, Western scholars and the academic system we grew up in. Alas, I too am ignorant of Japanese. It should therefore be understood that this review is concerned only with the English section (pp. 41–72) and the Sanskrit-Tibetan critical edition (pp. 79–138).

Among his many other virtues, Dr Tanaka is an untiring manuscript hunter. He has retrieved dozens of rare Sanskrit works from oblivion and has published a good number of these, with special attention to early Guhyasamāja literature. This book revisits his series of articles on the *Vyavasthali*, yet another rare and early work (dating to the late eighth or early ninth century, p. 58) of the so-called Ārya school of exegesis, a treatise seeking to elaborate on various aspects of meditational praxis. The complex circumstances in which this text was retrieved from a variety of witnesses (a *codex unicus* and some testimonia) are explained in the Introduction, pp. 41–48. This is followed by a lucid analysis of the work's four chapters aided by tables (pp. 48–69). Special attention is given to the various quotations and parallels as well as Tson kha pa's topical outline of the text. We are then introduced to the editorial conventions (pp. 69–72). After helpful

* All Souls College, University of Oxford, peter.szanto@all-souls.ox.ac.uk.

diagrams of the layout of folios on the Göttingen photographic plates (the only available record of the *codex unicus*) and an outline of the Guhyasamāja *maṇḍala* as advocated by Nāgabuddhi's school of exegesis, the text follows, presented in the form of a facing Sanskrit–Tibetan edition. A bibliography (pp. 139–142), a postscript (pp. 143–147), and the aforementioned biography complete the book.

A few notes are in order about the somewhat strange title, *Vyavastholi*. Dr Tanaka does not provide us with a solution, stating that “the original Sanskrit title of this work requires further consideration” (p. 45). He mentions that Muniśrībhadrā's *Pañcakrama* commentary refers to the work as *vyastholyām*, which is emended to *vyavasthālyām* by the editors of that text (Jiang & Tomabechi 1996), but stops short of proposing an alternative solution, which is most likely *vyavastholyām*. However, this is not the only time Muniśrībhadrā quotes Nāgabuddhi and his text. See Jiang & Tomabechi 1996 (I give the text as printed; the *akṣaras* in parentheses preceded by an exclamation mark are the editors' tentative corrections, whereas the plus sign means that the *akṣara* should be deleted): *uktañ ca vyavasthālyām*, “as it is taught in the *Vyavastholi*” and *vyavastho(!sthā)lyām [...]* *nāgabuddhicaraṇena darśitatvāt*, “as taught in the *Vyavastholi* by the venerable Nāgabuddhi” (p. 22); *āryanāgabuddhipādi(!da)racitavyavastho(!sthā)ligranthavyākhyānasampradāyena*, “according to the exegetical tradition [taught] in the work [called] the *Vyavastholi*, composed by the noble, venerable Nāgabuddhi” (p. 23); *ata evoktañ ca vyavastho(!sthā)lyā(+ñca)n*, “and it is for this very reason that in the *Vyavastholi* it is taught [...]” (p. 30).

I have found two further works providing us with referenced quotations, which were missed or ignored by Dr Tanaka.

The first is the *Gūḍhapadā* (Royal Asiatic Society London, Ms Hodgson 34, fol. 50v), a lengthy and as yet unedited commentary of the *Mañjuśrī-nāmasaṅgīti* by one Advayavajra.¹ This is the only known witness of the work and there is no Tibetan translation. This author quotes *Pinḍīkrama* 38 (as does Nāgabuddhi, but he references it as a quotation from the *Vajramālā*) and says: *vyavastholikāyām asyārtham tu vijñeyād iti*, i.e. “the meaning of this should be gathered from the *Vyavastholikā*.” This is a variant of the title with a *kan* suffix, which may or may not be significant. As we will see below, *vyavastholi* is a technical term, so perhaps the *kan* is justified.

The second reference comes from the *Trivajraratnāvalī(i)mālikāpañjikā* of Kelikuliśa (photographs in Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen Xc 14/36, fol. 8r), another long and unpublished commentary, but this time on the *Hevajratāntra* with special reference to the exegesis of the Ārya school. This too is a *codex unicus* and lacks a Tibetan translation. The photograph of the relevant folio is unfortunately blurred,

1. This is one of the longest pieces of tantric Buddhist exegesis surviving in Sanskrit: the copy consists of 180 densely written folios. The colophon gives the author's name as Advayacakra (or Advayavakra), probably a slip of the pen for Advayavajra. It is very unlikely that this author is the well-known Advayavajra, see Isaacson & Sferra 2014: 74–75.

but what I can make out says: *ācāryanāgabuddhipādīyaśrīguhyasamājacaturāṅgavyavastholer nyāsadeśanāṭṭṛṭīyaparicchede boddhavyeti*. Here we have the more usual form of the title, a reference to a sub-section of the work (perhaps to be emended to *dvitīyanyāsadeśanāparicchede*, see below), and incidental independent evidence for the author's name being Nāgabuddhi and not Nāgabodhi (this question, too, is left open by Dr Tanaka, pp. 41–42). I am somewhat hesitant as to how to interpret this reference: “[this matter] should be understood [by consulting] the third section, on the teaching of installation, [or: the section on teaching of the installation, the second,] of the *Vyavastholi*[, a work] on the four ancillaries [of practice] of the glorious Guhyasamāja, of the venerable master, Nāgabuddhi.” After reading a previous draft of this review article, Prof. Harunaga Isaacson has kindly pointed out to me (e-mail, 7.xii.2016) that there are at least three more references in this work: *vyavastholīṭṛṭīyopadeśam āha*, “[I shall now] explain the teaching related to the *Vyavastholī*, the third” (fol. 65r); *nāgabuddhipādair vyavastholāv uktam ākṣya*, “after having extracted from the teaching of Nāgabuddhi in [his] *Vyavastholi*” (fols. 97v–98r), and *nāgabuddhipādīyacaturāṅgavyavastholiyupadeśād ākṣyante*, “[...] shall be extracted from the *Vyavastholi*[, a work dealing with] the four ancillaries [of Guhyasamāja practice], by the venerable Nāgabuddhi” (fol. 215r). After having checked these *loci*, I realised that Kelikuliśa quotes entire passages from Nāgabuddhi's work and that these may help us considerably in solving some textual problems. I have therefore decided to give these passages below in an Appendix.

Furthermore, the word *vyavastholi* occurs not as a title, but as a technical term in the tantric Candrakīrti's *Vajrasattvaniṣpādanasūtra* (Luo & Tomabechi 2009: 4). The verse describes the propaedeutical sequence of learning the practice (perhaps the four *aṅgas* mentioned by Kelikuliśa):

mantrānvadhāraṇam pūrvam dvitīyam nyāsadeśanā |
vyavastholis ṭṛṭīyā tu caturtham tattvadarśanam ||

Tentatively:

“First, the ascertainment of mantra[s]; second, the teaching of installation; third, the sequence of arrangements (*vyavastholi*; see below); fourth, beholding reality.”

The evidence is quite clear therefore that the original reading is *vyavastholi* and nothing else. But what does the word mean?

The word *vyavasthā* is fairly straightforward, meaning “arrangement.” Of these, our text teaches four: that of the *utpattikrama* (the stage of generation), that of the *kāyamaṇḍala* (the body as a *maṇḍala*), that of the *utsargamaṇḍala* (the emanated *maṇḍala* – either from the semen ejaculated into the vulva of the consort or from mantras alone if the consort is visualised), and that of the *paramārthamaṇḍala* (the *maṇḍala* merging with supreme reality). But here we have another problem, since according to the section colophons (pp. 98, 105, 128, 137–138), there should be five such “arrangements,” with the second missing. I do not have a solution for this at present. However, perhaps

the final colophon can be solved. This, in Dr Tanaka's reading, is as follows: *iti śrīguhyasamāja[-]mahāyogataṁtre paramārthamaṇḍalavyavasthā[-]paricchedaḥ pañcamavyavastholis samāptā ||*. Besides compounding where needed, as indicated with bracketed hyphens, I think that the latter part should be emended thus: *°paricchedaḥ pañcamaḥ || vyavastholiḥ samāptā ||*. In other words, here we have the end of the fifth section and the final colophon of the work as a whole. I should perhaps also mention here that because of an archiving problem, I do not have access to the last folio (28r) of the manuscript, and so cannot check the reading.

What about *oli*? The Tibetan translation of the *Vajrasattvaṇiṣpādanasūtra* does not help us here (*op. cit.*, p. 36 has *rnam par b'zag pa yañ gsum ste* for the third *pāda* of the quoted verse), but the Tibetan translation of Nāgabuddhi's text (p. 79) gives us a clue, since *vyavastholir* is rendered as *rnam g'zag rim pa*. This makes it quite clear that *oli* is simply a Middle Indic form of *āvali*, meaning a row, a continuous line, series, that is to say, for all intents and purposes, a synonym of *krama*.

But why would Candrakīrti, whose Sanskrit largely adheres to classical norms, use a word from a decidedly non-classical register of the language? Luo & Tomabechi note a parallel to the aforementioned verse and seem to think that it is original, that is to say the author's. Adopting Ernst Steinkellner's taxonomy of quotations (Steinkellner 1988), they mark the parallel as a Ci'e, *citatum in alio usus secundarii modo edendi*, "a citation in another text, with redactional changes, not marked as a citation." This verse is provided in Appendix 1 (*op. cit.*, p. 71) and Appendix 2 (p. 85) in slightly varying forms. What the authors call "Anonymous Text (VNU*)" transmits *vyavastholi* in the third *pāda* (emended to *vyavastholis* in the constituted text by the editors), whereas what they call "the *Mantrōddhāra*" transmits *°āvadhāraṇa* (emended to *°āvadhāraṇam*) in the first *pāda*, *dviṭīyā* in the second, and *vyavastholi* (emended as above) in the third. This latter source also transmits *ca* for *tu*, but this is immaterial. Now, these could indeed be simple corruptions. But what if the verse is not original (i.e. Candrakīrti's) but an untraced scriptural citation? This might in part explain the fluctuations of the readings, the slight metrical problem resulting therefrom in one case (as *mantrāvadhāraṇapūrvaṁ* is not a valid *vipulā*), and the otherwise unnecessary use of a Middle Indic word. If my hypothesis is correct, *vyavastholi* is a scripturally sanctioned technical term.

Moreover, note that in both parallels the transmitted reading is *vyavastholi tṛtīyā*. We have this collocation in Nāgabuddhi's text as well, no less than three times and all of them puzzling: 1) *idānīm vyavastholis tṛtīyopadeśam āha* | = Tib. *rnam par g'zag pa dañ po ñe bar bstan par brjod par bya ste* | (p. 80); 2) *idānīm vyavastholitṛtīyopadeśam āha* | = Tib. *da ni rnam par g'zag pa 'i rim pa gñis pa ñe bar bstan pa 'i phyir* (p. 98); 3) *vyavastholitṛtīyopadeśam āha* | = Tib. *rnam par g'zag pa b'zi pa 'di ñid kyis rdzogs pa la gnas pa ñe bar b'sad par bya* (p. 131). In the second and third passage, the two words are compounded by Dr Tanaka and it can perhaps be conjectured that in the first passage the scribe emended to what seemed even to modern editors as the most sensible reading. Note also that Kelikuliśa,

too, gives a compound. But could *vyavastholi[-]tṛtīyā* not be the actual original reading, idiosyncratic as it is? In this case, in Nāgabuddhi's text we should always see an invisible **ity asya* before *upadeśam*. What then of the Tibetan? The translators seem to have “fixed” the text, taking these introductory sentences to refer to sub-sections of the work itself and adjusting the numbers as they saw fit. Nāgabuddhi is certainly aware of the verse, or at least of the arrangement the verse proposes. Closing his first sub-section, he writes: {*dviṭīyanyāśa*(sic)*deśanā paricchedaḥ*||} (p. 98, printed thus). At the beginning of the work, he says: *iti* || *nyāśa*(sic)*deśanā śūcitā*(sic)*syāt*|| (p. 80, printed thus).

If the verse is indeed scriptural, it becomes immaterial, at least for this case, whether Nāgabuddhi is quoting Candrakīrti or not. The chronological relationship between the two authors is unclear. Moreover, it is not conclusively settled, at least not to my knowledge, that the tantric Candrakīrti noted as the author of the *Vajrasattvaniṣpādanasūtra* and the (equally tantric) commentator, author of the *Pradīpoddyotana*, are the same or not. Following a different avenue, Dr Tanaka (p. 58) proposes that Nāgabuddhi is earlier than the author of the *Pradīpoddyotana*.

Let us now turn to the edition itself. Anyone who has even superficially engaged with the material used by Dr Tanaka will be aware what a difficult undertaking this is. The primary problem is that the manuscripts are not available for autopsy and we must be content with photographic records of, to put it mildly, imperfect quality. We are duly warned (p. 70) that “some parts of the romanization remain tentative.” It should be understood therefore that my following discussion of some *loci* is not an ungrateful exercise in pointing out faults, but an attempt to improve slightly where the lion's share of the work has already been done.

What one might call a global problem is that just like the manuscripts' “missing” *virāma* mentioned on p. 71, n. 64, we must occasionally see “invisible” hyphens in compounds printed separately. For example, *agni-maṇḍalas tu tad antarbhūta eva* (p. 82) should be *tadantarbhūta* (setting aside for the time being the fact that *maṇḍala* is overwhelmingly neut.); *suvarṇṇādayo rāśī kriyante* (p. 82) contains a *cvī* formation; *tad upari* (p. 83) should be printed as *tadupari*; *kim artham ... bodhisatvā mahāsatvās ... nāvataranti* (p. 85) would be better with *kimartham* (and thus again on p. 114); *sa jātiśuddhadivyaḥkṣa dṛśyaḥ* (p. 90) is one compound; *prajñā-sūtrokta dvāsaptati*^o (p. 93) should be joined by a hyphen; *evam bhūte* (p. 99) is more elegant as *evambhūte*; *caḥsur vikāro* (p. 131) ought to be read as *caḥsurvikāro*, and so on. We also have the opposite case, where words are printed as if they were compounds, when they are quite clearly not. These cases tend to occur when the line numbers are printed with the constituted text, so this may be a mere formatting error: *catasro*(22a3)*yonayaḥ* (p. 83), *jarāyujā*(22a4)*yonih katamā* (p. 84).

Sometimes awkward syntax should have prompted the editor to reconsider his reading of the manuscript. On p. 80 we have the following: *tato yogānuṣyogātīyogamahāyogāḥ krameṇa mahāvajradharam ātmānam*

niṣpādyā dvayendriyasamāpattiyā māṇḍaleyadevatām utsrjya japan bhāvanām ca kṛtvā etc. We have to intervene in three places to make the sentence yield good sense. First, my reading of the ms. is °mahāyogānukramena° (perhaps supported by the Tibetan *rnal 'byor chen po'i rim pas*, which ignores °anu° but suggests a compound nevertheless). Then, for the object of *utsrjya* we should read *māṇḍaleyadevatā* (fem. pl. acc. with *sandhi*) and not °devatām (this time fully supported by the Tibetan, which has *dkyil 'khor gyi lha rnams*). Third, for *japan* (unclear how the editor understood this, surely not an active participle) read *japam* (*japam* in standardised *sandhi*) with the ms. and Tibetan (which also has the more standard order of practices, meditation first, then recitation: *bsgom pa dañ bzlas pa byas nas*). The meaning hence is: “Then, after having accomplished [identification between] oneself and the Great Holder of the Vajra according to the sequence *yoga, anuyoga, atiyoga*, and *mahāyoga*, after having emitted the deities of the *maṇḍala* by means of uniting the two [sexual] organs, after having performed recitation and visualisation, [...]” Although perhaps only a typographical error, another example can be found on p. 84, where we have *ye satvā bhūtasā[m]svedajas tadyathā*, obviously an error for masc. pl. nom. °jās. Another such item can be seen on p. 89, where we have the strange *yāvad āyanti sāmagrīn na labhate*. A closer look at the ms. and the Tibetan (*ji srid du skye ba'i tshogs pa ma rñed pa*) reveals the correct reading: *yāvad utpattisāmagrīn* (i.e. °sāmagrīm). Also cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Pradhan 1967: 125): *kiyantam kalam avatiṣṭhate | [...]yāvad upapattisāmagrīm na labhate*.² The meaning is now clear: one abides in the intermediate state “until the ingredients for birth have been attained.” In the same longer passage (p. 91) we have the strange reading *saptāhātyajenā*°, apparently a correction of *saptāhātyajyanā*°. But the ms. makes perfect sense: *saptāhātyayenā*°, “after seven days have gone by.” This is also Kelikuliśa’s reading. In a passage describing how winds (i.e. vital energies) influence the foetus (p. 96), we read *vāyavo ... garbbhaśalyam ... dharmodayadvārābhimukho 'vasthāpayanti*. The editor here emends the ms., which according to him reads *abhimukhaḥ |*. Both reading and emendation are wrong, as the ms. correctly reads °*dvārābhimukham*, which makes perfect sense: “the vital energies place the foetus facing the door of the vulva.” The foetus is then determined to be either male or female. But we read (p. 96): *sacet punsān bhavati ... atha strī*, which quite clearly misreads masc. sg. nom. *pumān*. To stay with the same topic, the next page, I suspect, contains a misinterpretation. There, we read a sentence: *gandharvasatvo māmsacakṣuṣā dṛśyatāngataḥ*. This should be printed as *dṛśyatān* (or standardised, *dṛśyatām*) *gataḥ*. That is to say, “the *gandharvasattva* becomes visible to the naked eye.”

The same applies to awkward words, usage, and terminology. For example, the word *dārpyam* (p. 98) is unknown to me and I suspect that the editor thought this derivation from *darpa* possible because of its Tibetan mirror, *na rgyal*. In my view, the correct reading is *dārḍhyam*, “firmness”

2. I thank Mr Artemus Engle for pointing out this reference.

in meditative identification with the deity, which does indeed imply a special kind of “pride,” the technical term for which is *devatāhaṃkāra*. On p. 127 we read: *svāśucipratimām imām gṛhītvā jīnaratnapratimām karoty anarghā* |. This, as the editor points out in the introduction, is a quotation from the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, and so it is quite surprising that he did not follow the source text to print *śuci*^o (which I suspect is actually the reading of the ms.) and that he did not emend to *anarghām*. This is the only way in which the line makes sense: “After having taken hold of this impure image [i.e. the various bodies of transmigration], it [i.e. the resolve to become enlightened] turns it into a priceless image of a Buddha-jewel.” The words *kintu dyotitajñās* (p. 86) stand out as strange usage prompting one to revisit the manuscript, where we find the correct *kintūdghaṭitajñās*, meaning “however, highly intelligent persons [...]” We now have a careful and exhaustive treatment of the term in Muroya 2016.³ On p. 87 we find a description of humans at the beginning of an Aeon. They are said to be *sarvabuddhaguṇālamkṛtarūpiṇo manomayāḥ*, etc. The Tibetan is a little bit confused: *sañs rgyas kyi yon tan thams cad kyis brgyan ciñ yid kyi rañ bzin gyi lus can*. Another look at the ms. solves the problem, since it reads: ^o*ālamkṛtāḥ* [folio change] *rūpiṇo*, that is to say, they are “adorned with all qualities of a buddha, beautiful.” An example for unattested terminology can be found in *kṣaṇalavamuhūrttam āveśajñānasattva iva* (p. 93). A closer look reveals that this is indeed a “ghost,” as the ms. reads ^o*muhūrttamātreṇa jñāna*^o (“in a split second, a moment, an instant, just like the *jñānasattva*”) mirrored badly by the Tibetan *skad cig thañ cig gam yud tsaṃ gyis ye śes sems dpa’ltar*. The correct reading is also transmitted in Kelikuliśa, but since this particular passage falls on a folio side which has undergone reparation, we cannot be completely certain that it is genuine.

Then again, there are cases where the photographs are too blurred and the Tibetan or parallel passages do not suggest a conclusive reading. In these cases, the editor was forced to guess, but some of the guesses are not entirely felicitous. For example, on p. 83 we see *iyatās ca* []. The bracketed portion is indeed very blurred, and the guess before it is quite impossible. I propose *iyatā granthena* (to be construed with following *ity uktam bhavati*, meaning “this is what is taught by this passage”), a perfectly acceptable phrase often used by commentators to define the contents of a passage. Our author also uses it (p. 97). Moreover, at least to my eyes, this reading maps very well onto the blurred *akṣaras*. But if I am right, then the Tibetan translation (*der ni źes bya ba la sogs pa’i gzuñ gis*) is partially corrupt. This, my initially conjectured reading was confirmed by the Kelikuliśa manuscript, but the photos there too are slightly blurred. Another example can be found on pp. 105–106: *bodhicittād {yathāikavimānāddham} pūrvoktakrameṇa kūṭāgāraṃ niṣpādyā* = Tib. *sñon du gsuñs pa’i rim pas gzal yas khañ bsgrubs la byañ chub kyi sems las sgrub ciñ*. To the bracketed portion, Dr Tanaka adds a note: “This phrase, written in comparatively small letters, does not correspond with the Tibetan translation.” Indeed, it does not, because the

3. I thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for this reference.

Tibetan is corrupt. My reading of the bracketed passage and the word just before is *bodhicittān mantrākanirmāṇād vā*, a phrase otherwise repeated on p. 111. It is also used by Muniśrībhadrā (Jiang & Tomabechi 1996: 22). The meaning is that the palace of the deities can be created in two ways: through the emission of semen or merely by a mantra. I shall hazard an uncertain guess of my own. On pp. 86–87 the discussion is about bodhisattvas assuming voluntary birth only in Jambudvīpa in spite of the fact that there are human beings on other continents, too. Here we have the sentence *tena bodhisattvā jambudvīpe[] janapadeṣūpapadya dharman deśayanti* | = Tib. *des na byañ chub sems dpa' rnam s' dzam bu' i gliñ gi skye ba' i gnas kyi dbus su sku 'khruñs śiñ chos ston par 'gyur ro* ||. If we suppose that the Tibetan is somewhat corrupt, perhaps the missing passage reads *madhyameṣv eva*, meaning that bodhisattvas incarnate on our continent only in central countries, that is to say not in marginal (understand: barbaric) lands where Buddhism is unknown (*pratyantajanapada*). I see some difficulty in mapping this reading onto the blurred portion, but perhaps this takes us closer to a solution.

Editors of tantric Buddhist texts sometimes attribute much more weight to the Tibetan renderings than they should. After all, Tibetans were just as likely to have a corrupt reading and even if they did have a good reading, they were just as prone to misreading *akṣaras* as we are. The argument against this is the naïve assumption that because of their access to an Indian's contemporary explanation, they had a much better understanding of what they were reading. This, judging by the philological evidence, is mere fantasy. However, there are cases when a more careful consideration of the Tibetan can be fruitful. For example, we read on p. 81 that at the beginning of a new universe, winds gently become active: *mandamandā vāyavaḥ syandante*. Now, it is perhaps possible to squeeze that meaning out of *syand*, but Tibetan *g.yos te* strongly suggests another reading of the same *akṣara*, virtually the same in this hand, *spandante*. Kelikuliśa's reading is of no consequence here, because that manuscript too is in a similar hand, where *sya* and *spa* are virtually indistinguishable. Note, however, that author's superior reading, *mandamandam*. If we accept the adverb as the better reading, then the meaning is: “the winds [start to] blow ever so slightly.” The beginning of a passage elaborating on the previous point (p. 86) begins, according to the edition under review, with *tathāpy*. But the Tibetan *'di lta ste* makes it clear that we have to read *tathā hy* (that is to say, not “even though,” but “to elaborate”). We may also consider the passage where the person in the intermediate stage realises his or her future rebirth (p. 90): *evam ca prajānāti | idānīn taṁ madīyaṁ kalevaram iti* | = Tib. *'di ltaṅ yañ bdag gi lus de dan de ni 'di yin no źes rab tu źes so* ||. Granted, the Tibetan is not entirely clear, but we are much better off emending to *idānīntanam* or even conjecturing *idam idānīntanam*. That is to say, “and [the being in the intermediate stage] recognises the following: ‘this is my present body’.” Another example can be found on p. 131. Here the signs of death are conceived as heralds of the person's constituents melting into clear light. We are told the following about the eyes: *nayanendriye gate cakṣur*

vikāro bhavati | samkṣubhati ca | = Tib. *mig gi dbaṅ po 'gags pa na mig 'gyur zhiṅ zum par 'gyur ro* |. Besides the need to compound *caḥsurvikāro*, which I have already mentioned above, the second sign should be read *samkucati*; the Tibetan is therefore a good rendering. The meaning is: “once the faculty of sight has vanished [into clear light], there will be a distortion of the eyes and they will become contracted.”

Dr Tanaka does not standardise his readings too much; instead he prefers to retain the orthographic peculiarities of the manuscript when only one witness is available. This policy does have its virtues. However, there are cases where a correction is needed. For example, East Indian and Nepalese manuscripts sometimes omit the *visarga* before sibilants. On p. 81 we have *varddhamānā ṣoḍaśa°*, whereas it would have been more appropriate, at least in my view, to print *varddhamānāḥ* (or standardised *vardhamānāḥ*), either showing the correction with brackets (or in a note) or noting in the editorial conventions that such occurrences have been silently emended (or corrected). We see the same problem just below: for *meghā sambhūyā°*, understand *meghāḥ sambhūyā°*. The same feature is encountered before un-voiced stops, although perhaps less rarely than with sibilants. Having this in mind, the sentence *ayaṃ tu jambudvīpakarmabhūmiḥ* (p. 86) can be simply emended to *°dvīpaḥ karma°*, which is of course also required by *ayaṃ* (masc., while *bhūmi* is fem.) and has support in the somewhat awkwardly phrased Tibetan (*'dzam bu 'i gliṅ pa 'di ni las kyi sa pa yin te*). The meaning is: “But this [place], the Jambu continent, is a realm of *karma* [i.e. a place where buddhas appear and humans can achieve their state].”

There are also some serendipitous cases, where the manuscript has a faulty reading, but the editor prints the correct one, either because of a lucky misreading or because he has forgotten to add a note. For example, on p. 82 we read the correct *mahī bhavaty* where the ms. has a stray *anusvāra*, *mahīm bhavaty*. Occasionally, the editor prints a synonym, which is a good reading, but not the original one. For example, *toṣayitvā* (p. 93) actually reads *prīṇayitvā*.

Finally, there are cases where one would have welcomed the use of the *crux desperationis*. I cannot believe that the editor could make sense of such passages as *sarvāṅgarūpāṇi sthāmāni mlānāni mṛdūni mātrāṇi śīthilāni bhavanti* (p. 131) or *svakāyavivarṇṇa āyāmalīnatvaṃ* (emendation of *ayāmalīnatvaṃ!*) *bhavati* (pp. 131–132).

Despite all these, one may say minor, problems, Dr Tanaka must be congratulated and thanked for bringing to light with such arduous work a very important text from the early phase of mature Vajrayāna Buddhism. In his postscript, the author paints a somewhat bleak picture of the academic situation in Japan. However, as long as such texts keep being discovered and works of this quality published, I will continue to say that we, student of esoteric Buddhism, are living in a very happy age.

Appendix

The passages given here in diplomatic transcript are the relevant portions from Kelikuliśa's commentary as read from photographs in Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen Xc 14/36. It should be noted that I have not yet read this work of 240 folios in full, which means there may be many more such parallels. Only significant divergences from Tanaka's text (marked T) are given in the footnotes. *Ante/post correctionem* readings are not reported. The portions placed between double chevrons are paraphrases or introductory/concluding passages.

1. Kelikuliśa's commentary, Ms. f. 65r1–65v4 = Tanaka p. 80, l. 14 – p. 83, l. 23

«anayor gāthādvayor nnāgabuddhipādīyavivaraṇam ākṛṣya likhyate |»
 vyavastholitṛṭīyopadeśam⁴ āha | yadāsmiṇ loke gatisamvarttinīprāpte⁵
 traidhātuke | ekaḥ [2] sattvo pi nāvaśiṣṭo bhavati | bhājanalokamātram
 avatiṣṭhate | tadā kramakrameṇa sapta sūryāṇām raśmayah prādurbhūya
 traidhātukam dagdhvā ākāśamayam kurvanti | imam artha[3]m utpatti-
 kramabhāvako abhāvetyādigāthām⁶ uccāryyālbayati | punas tataḥ⁷
 pratīyasamutpādaprabandhabalāt mandamandaṁ⁸ vāyavaḥ⁹ spandante¹⁰ |
 tatas te vāyavo varddha[4]mānāḥ¹¹ ṣoḍaśalakṣayojanam udvedham¹²
 pariṇāhenāsamkhyam vāyumaṇḍalam abhinirvarttayanti¹³ | tasmin vāyu-
 maṇḍale meghāḥ¹⁴ sambhūya akṣamātrābhīr ddhārābhīr varṣanti¹⁵ | tad
 bha[5]vaty apām maṇḍalam tasya pramāṇam yojanānām ekādaśalakṣam
 udvedho vimśatis ca sahasrāṇi | tāś ca punar āpo vāyubhir āvarttya-
 mānāḥ kāñcanamayī mahī bhavaty apām upariṣṭāt¹⁶ | tasyāḥ pramā[65v]
 ṇam trayo lakṣāḥ¹⁷ sahasrāṇi vimśatiḥ | agnimaṇḍalam¹⁸ antarbhūtam
 eva¹⁹ | ayam sanniveśotpādo yoginām ākāśadhātumadhyastham bhāvayed
 vāyumaṇḍalam ityādinā caturmmaṇḍalakrameṇa bhūbhāgāvalambanam
 [2] | evam satvānām karmmaprabhāvasambhūtair vāyubhiḥ samhr̥tya
 suvarṇṇādayo rāśīkriyante | sumervvādayaḥ parvvatāḥ | devavimānā²⁰

4. vyavastholitṛṭīyopadeśam] vyavastholis tṛṭīyopadeśam T

5. gatisamvarttinīprāpte] gatisamvarttanīprāpte T

6. abhāvetyādigāthām] abhāveti gāthām T

7. punas tataḥ] punaḥ T

8. mandamandaṁ] mandamandā T

9. vāyavaḥ] also T's em. of vayavaḥ

10. spandante] syandante T

11. varddhamānāḥ] varddhamānā T

12. ṣoḍaśalakṣayojanam udvedham] ṣoḍaśalakṣayojanodvedham T

13. abhinirvarttayanti] ākāśopari nivarttayanti T

14. meghāḥ] meghā T

15. varṣanti] varṣayanti T

16. upariṣṭāt] upariṣṭhāt T

17. lakṣāḥ] lakṣā udvedhās (sic for udvedhas!) T

18. agnimaṇḍalam] agnimaṇḍalas tu T

19. antarbhūtam eva] tad antarbhūta eva T

20. devavimānā] devavimānāni T

dvīpāś cakravādaparyantā vṛkṣagulmalatādayaś ca bha[3]vanti²¹ | iyatā granthena²² bhavotpattibhāvakanām²³ śūnyatālambanapūrvvakam²⁴ caturmmanḍalakrameṇa bhūbhāgam niṣpādyā tadupari kūṭāgāram niṣpādayed iti uktam bhavati | tato vijñā[4]nādhipatir mmahāvajradharaḥ satvajanakah | bhājanalokam²⁵ niṣpādyā satvalokam nirmmiṇoti | ālayanispattipūrvvikā trivajrotpattibhāvaneti²⁶ vacanāt |

2. Kelikuliśa's commentary, Ms. f. 97v5–99r1 = Tanaka p. 91, l. 9 – p. 94, l. 7. NB: the sides 98v and 99r were at some point damaged and repaired by tracing the letters. This is probably the work of a Nepalese scribe, and while on the whole he seems to have been successful, a number of catastrophic misreadings are evident.

«caturṇṇām apy ānandānām sahaḥābhīdhānam katham atrocyate | nāga-buddhipādair vyavastholāv ukta[98r]m ākṛṣya likhyate | yadādau vijñānam rūpaskandhāt pracyutam syāt tathā māmsa(sic for māmsā°!)sthiviṣṭhādirahitaḥ | devatātavoktaṣaṭpañcavarṣapramāṇaḥ kumāro vajrādy(sic!?) abhedyamanomayakāya[2]ḥ |» antarābhavasthaḥ²⁷ saptāhātyayāt²⁸ | anādinānāvikalpavāsanāprabandhodbhūtakarmmaṇā²⁹ sañcodite sati | utpattim pariḡṛhṇāty³⁰ anena krameṇa tatrāyam [3] kramaḥ | prathamakalpikānām³¹ manuṣyāṇām amṛtam āharamāṇānām yāvat kavaḍikāhāraparyantena³² bhujjānānām kharatvam gurutvañ ca³³ kāye avakrāntam prabhā cānta[4]rḥṭā³⁴ tato andhakāre samutpanne³⁵ sūryācandramasau loke prādurbhūtau tataḥ prajñopāyavibhāgarāsanārtham teṣām strīndriyapuruṣendriye³⁶ prādurbhūte | samsthānaḥ ca bhi[5]nnaḥ teṣām anyonyam paśyatām pūrvvābhyāśvaśād anyonyam³⁷ rāgacittam utpānam (sic for utpannam!) | yato rāgacittā³⁸ vipratipannās tad ārabhya strīpuruṣa iti samjñāntaram adyāpi loke pravarttate tathā tataḥ³⁹ sa ga[98v]ndharvvasatvaḥ

21. bhavanti] sambhavanti T

22. iyatā granthena] iyatāś ca[] T

23. bhavotpattibhāvakanām] bhavotpattikramabhāvakanām T

24. śūnyatālambanapūrvvakam] śūnyatābhāvanālakṣaṇapūrvvakam T

25. bhājanalokam] bhājanalokān T

26. trivajrotpattibhāvaneti] trivajrotpattibhāvanā karttavyeti T

27. antarābhavasthaḥ] tathā 'ntarābhavastho 'pi T

28. saptāhātyayāt] saptāhātyajenā° T, reporting °tyajyanā° in the Ms, which has the same reading as Kelikuliśa

29. anādinānāvikalpavāsanāprabandhodbhūtakarmmaṇā] anādisvavikalpavāsanāprabandhodbhūta-karmmaṇā T

30. pariḡṛhṇāty] ḡṛhṇāty T

31. prathamakalpikānām] prāthamakalpikānām T

32. kavaḍikāhāraparyantena bhujjānānām] kavaḍikārahāraparyante T, reporting °kavalikārahāra° in the Ms

33. gurutvañ ca] gurutvam T

34. cāntarḥṭā] 'ntarhitā T

35. samutpanne] utpanne T

36. strīndriyapuruṣendriye] strīpuruṣendriye T

37. anyonyam] anyonya° T

38. yato rāgacittā] yato T

39. tathā tataḥ] tatas T

trayāṇām sthānānām saṁmukhībhāvāt | mātuḥ kuḥṣau garbbhāvakrānto⁴⁰
bhavati | mātā kalyavatī⁴¹ ṛtuvatī⁴² mātāpitarau raktau bhavataḥ | tataḥ
taylor anyonyam anurāgaṇavajrapadmā[2]dhiṣṭhānam āliṅganacumbanād
iti | yāyā⁴³ dvayendriyasamāpattim dṛṣṭvā kāmopādānād antavābhavaṁ⁴⁴
hitvā asvārohaṇavad vijñānādhipati [lacuna of 7 akṣaras] [3] [lacuna of 7
akṣaras]⁴⁵ śīghratarāma āgatya kṣaṇalavamuhūrttamātreṇa⁴⁶ jñānasatva iva
vairocanaadvāreṇa praṇiśī⁴⁷ jñānabhūmim prāpya tupāyajanakhanu [lacuna
of 4 akṣaras]⁴⁸ [4]bhūya niratiśayaprītyākṣiptaḥdayaḥ tantroktasarvva-
tathāgatābhībhavananyāyena⁴⁹ prajñātantroktadvāsaptatināḍīśahasraṁ⁵⁰
saṁcodya ubhāv api paramānandasukhena prī[5]ṇayitvā⁵¹ ālikālibhir⁵²
ekībhūya sūkṣmadhātvanupraveśena⁵³ prajñājñānaraśmyudayād ubhāv
api drāvayitvā śukraśonitābhyām miśrībhūya⁵⁴ yonimadhye bindurūpeṇa
patitaḥ | imam arthaṁ [99r] dyotayann āha mūlasūtre⁵⁵ sarvatathāgata-
kāyavākcittahṛdayavajrayośidbhageṣu vijahāreti || «tatas tatra krameṇa
kalalārbudapeśīghanādibhiḥ kāyānkuro niṣpadyate |»

3. Kelikuliśa's commentary, Ms. f. 215r1–215v4 = Tanaka p. 128, l. 19 –
p. 131, l. 5

«ata eva vijñānamanaścittānukramopadeśāna[2]bhijñānām sande-
hottrāsam āpannānām arnivṛtti(sic for anirvṛti!?)sthairyārtham
śrīguhyasamājasya mūlasutranirddeśādīnām ṣaṭkoṭyādivyākhyā-
tantraśrīvajramālādīnām anukrame[3]ṇa gāthā likhyante | tāḥ punar
nnāgabuddhipādīyacaturāṅgavyavastholypadeśād ākṣyante |» tad
idānīm⁵⁶ paramārthamaṅḍaladarśanāya uddeśanāpadam⁵⁷ guhyasa[4]
mājoktam⁵⁸ avatāryate || samayāt kṣarad⁵⁹ retan tu⁶⁰ vidhinā pibet phala-

40. garbbhāvakrānto] garbbhasyāvakrānto T

41. kalyavatī] kalyā bhavati T

42. ṛtuvatī] ṛtumatī T

43. °vajrapadmādhiṣṭhānam āliṅganacumbanād iti | yāyā] °vajrādhiṣṭhānenāliṅganacumbanādi-
kriyayā T

44. kāmopādānād antavābhavaṁ] kāmopadānāyāntarābhavaṁ T, reporting kāmopadānāya in the Ms

45. [lacuna]] °ś cittavajro vāyuvāhanasamārūḍhaś T

46. kṣaṇalavamuhūrttamātreṇa] kṣaṇalavamuhūrttam āveśa° T, but the Ms actually has the same
reading as Kelikuliśa

47. praṇiśī] praviśya T

48. tupāyajanakhanu [lacuna]] upāyājñānena sahādvayī° T

49. °ābhībhavananyāyena] °ābhībhavanasamādhinyāyena T

50. prajñātantroktadvāsaptatināḍīśahasraṁ] prajñāsūtroktadvāsaptatināḍīśahasraṁ T

51. prīṇayitvā] toṣayitvā T, but the Ms actually has the same reading as Kelikuliśa

52. ālikālibhir] ālikālikāv T, but the Ms seems the have the same reading as Kelikuliśa

53. sūkṣmadhātvanupraveśena] sūkṣmadhātvyaya? praviśan T

54. miśrībhūya] sanmiśrībhūya T

55. mūlasūtre] mūlatantre T

56. tad idānīm] idānīm T

57. paramārthamaṅḍaladarśanāya uddeśanāpadam] paramārthamaṅḍalavyavasthā pradārśanāyod-
deśapadam T

58. guhyasamājoktam] mūlasūtrād T

59. kṣarad] kṣared T

60. retan tu] retam T

kāmksayā | mārayet tāthāgataṃ vyūhaṃ⁶¹ sutarāṃ siddhim āpnuyād ity uddeśaḥ | tathānyatra tu ni[5]rddēśaḥ⁶² rūpādyādhyātmikān dharmmān paśyato tha⁶³ vipaśyanā | akṣobhyādi yathāsamkhyāṃ kalpayet⁶⁴ śamatho bhavet || anayor nniḥsvabhāvatvaṃ tathatāśāntasamjñakam | tathatāmaṇḍa[215v]le yogī sarvvabuddhān praveśayed iti || asyāpi⁶⁵ pratinirddēśaḥ śrīvajramālātantroktāḥ⁶⁶ | rūpaskandhagatādarśo bhūdhātur nnayanendriyaṃ rūpaṃ ca pañcamam yāti krodhamaitreyasamyutam || vedanā[2]skandha⁶⁷ (sic!) samatābdhātuḥ⁶⁸ śravaṇendriyaṃ śabdaś ca pañcamam yāti krodhadvayasamanvitaṃ || samjñā ca pratyavekṣaṇyaṃ hutabhuñ nāsikendriyaṃ | gandhaś ca pañcamam yāti krodhadvayasamanvitaṃ || [3] saṃskāraḥ⁶⁹ kṛtyānuṣṭhānaṃ māruto rasanendriyaṃ rasaś ca pañcamam yāti krodhadvayasamanvitaṃ || ūrddhvādhaḥ krodhasamyuktaṃ prakṛtyābhāsam eva ca | vijñānaskandham āyāti vijñā[4]nan tu⁷⁰ prabhāsvaram || sarvaśūnyaṃ ca nirvvāṇam⁷¹ dharmmakāyo nigadyate | dṛḍhīkaraṇahetoś ca mantram etad udāharet | om śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmako ‘ham iti ||

4. Kelikuliśa’s commentary, Ms. f. 215v4–216r2 (continued from 3.) = Tanaka p. 136, l. 11 – p. 137, l. 2

«tathā apara [5] evāśya mantrasyārthaḥ |» om ityādikaṃ | samyuktam⁷² iti dvitīyaṃ | śūnyateti⁷³ tṛtīyaṃ | jñānam ity evam⁷⁴ caturtham | vajrasvabhāvātmakam pañcākhyam⁷⁵ | śaṣṭho ham iti bodhyate⁷⁶ || evam tathāgataṣaṭkaṃ kathitaṃ co[216r]ttame⁷⁷ jane | om śūnyateti yasyādi⁷⁸ | jñānavajram dvitīyakam tatsvabhāvātmako ham syān tritativāñ cātra kalpitaṃ || tritativam ekaṃ bhavet samyag vyaktāvyaktasamjñakau⁷⁹ «anayā bhāvanayā pañcaskandhādisakalakayamaṇḍala[2]nilayāvasthāyām kramaśo varddhāmānāyām yāni yāni līnganimitāni yogī svakāye anubhavati | tāni tāni vyavastholitṛtīyopadeśaparicchede avaboddhavyānīti ||»

61. tāthāgataṃ vyūhaṃ] tāthāgatavyūhaṃ T

62. tathānyatra tu nirddēśaḥ] saptamapaṭale tv asya nirdeśo vyākhyātāntre sandhyāvyākaraṇa-ni[r]diṣṭaḥ | T

63. paśyato tha] paśyato[?] T, mentioning that the character here give as a question mark is illegible

64. kalpayet] kalpayan T

65. asyāpi] tasyāpi T

66. śrīvajramālātantroktāḥ] śrīvajramālāmāhāyogataṃtre vivṛtas tad avatāryate T

67. vedanāskandha] vedanāskandhāḥ T

68. samatābdhātuḥ] samatā abdhātuḥ T

69. saṃskāraḥ] saṃskārāḥ T

70. vijñānan tu] vijñānam ca T

71. sarvaśūnyaṃ ca nirvvāṇam] nirvvāṇam sarvaśūnyaṃ ca T

72. om ityādikaṃ | samyuktam] om ityādy ekasamyuktam T

73. iti dvitīyaṃ | śūnyateti] dvitīyaṃ śūnyateti ca T

74. tṛtīyaṃ | jñānam ity evam] tṛtīyaṃ jñānam ity eva T

75. caturtham | vajrasvabhāvātmakam pañcākhyam] caturtham vajrasamjñakam | svabhāvātmaka pañcamākhyam T, mentioning that the Ms reads pañcamakhyā

76. bodhyate] procyate T

77. kathitaṃ cottame] kathitaṃ uttame T

78. yasyādi] yugmādi T

79. vyaktāvyaktasamjñakau] vyaktāvyaktasamjñakam T

Bibliography

ISAACSON, Harunaga & Francesco SFERRA

- 2014 *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreyañātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla. Critical Edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with English Translation and Reproductions of the MSS.*, Hamburg, Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg/Napoli, “L’Orientale,” Università degli studi di Napoli (Manuscripta Buddhica 2).

JIANG Zhongxin & TOMABECHI Toru (eds.)

- 1996 *The Pañcakramaṭippaṇī of Muniśrībhadrā. Introduction and Romanized Sanskrit Text*, Bern, etc., Peter Lang.

LUO Hong & TOMABECHI Toru (eds.)

- 2009 *Candrakīrti’s Vajrasattvanīṣpādanasūtra (Vajrasattvasādhana). Sanskrit and Tibetan*, Beijing, China Tibetology Research Center/Vienna, Austrian Academy of Sciences.

MUROYA Yasutaka

- 2016 “The Nyāyamukha and udghaṭitajña,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Published in “Online First” version doi 10.1007/s10781-016-9309-8.

PRADHAN, Prahlad (ed.)

- 1967 *Abhidharm-Kośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*, Patna, K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

STEINKELLNER, Ernst

- 1988 “Methodological Remarks on the Constitution of Sanskrit Texts from the Buddhist *Pramāṇa* Tradition,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 32, pp. 103–129.