

Nairātmyāprakāśa

Advayavajra

ed. Ryan Conlon

May 9, 2022

1 Sigla and Symbols

Ñ	<i>Nairātmyāprakāśa</i> by Advayavajra. In <i>Hevajrasādhanaṅgraha</i> , ff. 260r5–264v5.
T _D	<i>bdag med ma'i rab tu gsal ba</i> by gNyes su med pa'i rdo rje. Translation by Vajrapāṇi and Jñānākara (Ye shes 'byung gnas). In <i>sDe dge bstan 'gyur</i> , Tōh. 1308, rgyud, vol. 10 (<i>ta</i>), ff. 218v5–223r1.
MuĀ	<i>Muktāvalī</i>
HeTa	<i>Hevajratantra</i>
<i>ac</i>	<i>ante correctionem</i>
<i>conj.</i>	conjecture
D	sDe dge
<i>deest</i>	ommitted in
<i>diag. conj.</i>	diagnostic conjecture [e.g. 'reconstructed' from Tibetan]
<i>em.</i>	emendation
f./fo.	folio/folios
<i>pc</i>	<i>post correctionem</i>

<i>r</i>	recto
<i>v</i>	verso
Σ_X	Reading is shared in all but witness X.
((kiṃcit))	Reading is uncertain—either illegible or otherwise in doubt.
<kiṃcit>	Reading is cancelled.
†kiṃcit†	Reading does not make sense to the editor and an adequate conjecture was not able to be chosen.
[kiṃcit]	Indication of a diagnostic conjecture.
⌊kiṃcit⌋	Indication of a lemma.
⊥	Change of folio/page.
..	Damaged <i>akṣara</i> (one . per half <i>akṣara</i>)
...	Lacunae of an unknown quantity of <i>akṣaras</i> .
°	Mark of abbreviation.

2 Edition of the Sanskrit Text

Ñ fo. 260^{r5} om̐ namaḥ śrīnairātmyāyai |¹

⊥
 pariḥṭaparikalpaṃ dharmakāyaṃ yam āhur
 nirupamasukhamātraṃ cārusambhogakāyaṃ |
 bhuvanahitavidhānād yasya nirmāṇakāyaṃ
 bhavatu sa bhagavān vaḥ śreyase vajrasattvaḥ ||²

5

Notes

1. Scribal homage.

2. This verse, in Mālinī metre, serves as a *maṅgalācaraṇa* in other texts attributed to Advayavajra. We find it in Mar pa chos kyi blo gros's Tibetan translation of the *Saptākṣarasādhana*: kun du rtog pa yongs su spangs pa'i chos skur gang gsungs dang/ /dpe med bde ba rtsal gyis mdzes pa longs spyod rdzogs sku dang/ /gang gi gnas la phan par mdzad pa las ni sprul pa'i sku/ /bcom ldan rdo rje sems dpa' de yis khyed la bde legs shog / (D f. 130r–v) (read *rtal* as *tsam*). It is absent from the text as printed in Bhattacharyya's edition of the *Sādhanaṃālā*.

The verse is also found at the beginning of Advayavajra's **Śricakrasaṃvaropadeśa*, for which rMa ban chos 'bar's translation reads: gang zhiḡ kun du brtags pa yongs su spangs pa'i chos sku dang/ /dpe med bde ba tsam gyis mdzes pa'i longs spyod rdzogs sku dang/ gang gi thugs rje sa nams phan mdzad sprul pa'i sku brjod pa/ /bcom ldan rdo rje sems dpa' de yis khyod la bde legs shog / (D

ekatra vitatam spaṣṭam abodhalaghuvistaram |³
nairātmyāsādhanaṃ brūmo yathāmati yathāgamam ||

yogī khalu śmaśānādīmano'nukūle sthāne pañcāmṛtādisamayasevī sukhāsa-
nopaviṣṭo niḥsaṅgo niḥsaṅkaḥ sattvārthodyatamatir nairātmyāhaṃkāram utpā- N fo. 260^v
5 dya, hr̥tsūrye nīla-HŪM-kāram dhyāyāt. tatas taddīptai raśmibhis traidhātukam a-
vabhāsamānair ākr̥ṣya, akaniṣṭhabbhuvanavartinam⁴ aṣṭayoginīparivṛtaṃ ṣoḍaśa-
bhujam aṣṭāsyam kapālamālāviracitāsekharam catuścaraṇasamākrāntacaturmā-
raṃ nīlavarnam dakṣiṇakaranikarakalitakapālasakalanilīnagaja-turaga-khara-vṛṣa-
bha-karabha-manuja-śarabha-vṛṣadaṃśam⁵ itarapāṇikadambagatapadmabhājana-
10 vartidharaṇi-varuṇa-samīraṇa-jvalana-rajanīnātha-taraṇi-yama-dhanadam kr̥ṣṇa-

Notes

f. 139r).

Furthermore, the verse is transmitted in the so-called *Sādhanaṣṭhāna* codex, on folio 3r, in an *adhyātmahomavidhi*. Péter-Dániel Szántó (personal communication) surmises that the colophon to this brief text is written in old Newar and amounts to saying that the *vidhi* was extracted from a *ṭippanī* on the *Samvarodayatantra*. The only noteworthy variant reading here is 'sa bhavatu bhagavān' in place of 'bhavatu sa bhagavān', both of which are equally plausible.

It may be worth comparing the two above Tibetan translations of this verse with Ye shes 'byung gnas's effort here for the NaiPra : kun du rtog pa yongs spangs chos skur gang brjod pa/ /dpe med bde ba tsam mdzes longs spyod rdzogs pa'i sku/ /sa yi phan pa'i rgyur gyur gang gi sprul pa'i sku/ /bcom ldan rdo rje sems dpa' khyod des dge bar shog/. The translation rgyur gyur for vidhānāt is difficult to account for; it also appears to be an adjective qualifying either gang or sprul pa'i sku rather than an ablative form (here it is perhaps Marpa's translation that has the clearest rendering with 'mdzas pa las'). Similarly, the syntax of the final line, with rdo rje sems dpa' separated from the pronoun de, is considerably more opaque than the other two translations.

3. T_D renders the first two pādas as follows: gcig tu gsal la rgyas pa yis/ /mi rtog nyung la rgyas pa dag/. If the translation has been transmitted correctly here, I am uncertain what meaning this was intended to convey. I understand, somewhat tentatively, the Sanskrit text as edited here in the following sense: '[A sādhanā which is] clearly (spaṣṭa—to be taken as an adverb, adjective, or both) spread out in a single place, with a small amount of prolixity for those who lack understanding.'

4. T_D reflects a plural form of akaniṣṭhabbhuvanavartin: 'og min gyi gnas na bzhugs pa rnams. Given that what follows is a description of only the eight-faced Heruka, the plural form can be regarded as an error.

5. T_D lacks a clear reflex of sakalanilīna in dakṣiṇakaranikarakalitakapālasakalanilīna°: g.yas pa'i phyag gi tshogs rnams kyis bsname pa'i thod pa rnams su gnas pa. The translation gnas pa, for which one might expect the Sanskrit sthita, is nonetheless perhaps a loose rendering of sakala-

Variants

1 spaṣṭam abodha°] em.; spaṣṭam((m a/sa))bodha° N 3–4 sukhāsanopaviṣṭo] em.; sukhāsanopaviṣṭaṣṭo N 4 niḥsaṅkaḥ] em.; niḥsaṅka 4 sattvārthodyatamatir] em.; satvārthodyamati N 5 tatas taddīptai] conj. (T_D de nas de'i gsal ba'i); tatasthadīpai N

pradhānavadanam indukundāvadātadakṣiṇamukham⁶ atimātralohitavāmavada-
nam atidhūmravikarālordhvavaktram atimalinetarāsakalavadanam śatārdhamu-
ṇḍamālālamkṛtaṃ nairātmyāliṅgitakandharam ambarataralavartinam agrato dhyā-
yāt.

tadanantaram bāhyaguhyatattvapūjābhir aṣṭayoginibhiḥ pūjayet. atra ca pra- 5
jñopāyayos tādā[tmyenāvabodhanāya picuvajrasya pūjanam. tato vandanaṃ pā-
padeśanāpāpākaraṇasaṃvaram puṇyānumodanātrīśaraṇagamanabodhicittotpādā]
tmabhāvanīryātānādhyeṣyaṇāś⁷ ca kṛtvā, caturbrahmavihārān bhāvayitvā, saka-
lavastutattvasārasaṅgrāhākātmakam OM ŚŪNYATĀJÑĀNAVAJRASVABHĀVĀTMAKO
Ñ fo. 261' 'HAM ŚŪNYATĀJÑĀNAVAJRASVABHĀVĀTMAKĀḤ SARVADHARMĀḤ⁸ iti mantrārthaṃ 10

Notes

nilīna. In any case, I do not see any strong reason to suspect corruption in the Sanskrit text here. The compound can be understood as 'who, in his collection of right hands, holds an elephant, horse, ... which have completely melted into skull cups'.

6. T_D lacks a reflex of *avadāta* within the compound *indukundāvadātadakṣiṇamukha*: *g.yas pa'i zhal ni zla ba dang/ kun da lta bu'o/*

7. Here the transmitted text has suffered from what was likely a scribe's eyeskip. I offer this conjectural reading based on T_D as well as a similar formulation in Advayavajra's *Saptākṣara-sādhana*: ... *yathāvidhinā pūjayet vandayet | tatas teṣāṃ purataḥ pāpadeśanāpāpākaraṇasaṃvaram puṇyānumodanātrīśaraṇagamanabodhicittotpāda-ātmabhāvanīryātānā-adhyeṣyaṇāyācanāś ca kṛtvā* ... (ed. p. 460). In the NaiPra, the word *yācanā* is reflected neither in the Tibetan nor the manuscript, which has resumed at the place where one would expect to see it. Otherwise the two texts are evidently closely parallel here.

It is impossible to be certain of Advayavajra's exact wording, but at least there should be little doubt regarding the content of the second sentence. The first sentence is a bit more obscure; if I have understood the Tibetan correctly, I believe Advayavajra is offering a justification for worshipping the eight-faced Heruka, i.e. Picuvajra, at the beginning of the *sādhana*: to put it somewhat baldly, a *sādhana* with meditation on both male and female deities serves to help one realise insight and means as having an identical nature.

8. T_D renders *śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmakāḥ sarvadharmāḥ* in Tibetan, indicating that, perhaps, these words were not understood as part of the mantra: *dngos po mtha' dag gi de kho na*

Variants

2 atimalinetara°] *conj.* (T_D shin tu gnag pa); alamalinetara° Ñ 3 °liṅgitakandharam] *em.*; li-
ṅgitamkandharam Ñ 5 bāhyaguhyatattvapūjābhir] *em.* (T_D phyi dang/ gsang ba dang/ de kho
na nyid rnam kyis mchod pa); bāhyapūjāguhyatattvapūjābhir Ñ 6–8 tādātmyenāvabodhanāya
... °cittotpādātmabhāva°] *conj.* (T_D [entire two sentences]: 'di la yang thabs dang shes rab dag gis
de'i bdag nyid rtogs par bya ba'i phyir pi tsu badzra'i mchod pa'o/ /de nas phyag 'tshal ba dang/
sdig pa bshags pa dang/ sdig pa slan chad sdom pa dang/ bsod nams la rjes su yi rang ba dang/
bsod nams yongs su bsngo ba dang/ gsum la skyabs su 'gro ba dang/ byang chub tu sems bskyed
pa dang/ bdag nyid kyi dngos po dbul ba dang/ gsol ba gdab pa byas te/); tādātmbhāva° Ñ

bhāvayann apratiṣṭhitarūpeṇa tiṣṭhet.

tataḥ praṇidhim anusmṛtya, samādhē vyutthāya, repheṇa purataḥ sūrya-
maṇḍalaṃ dhyātvā, tatra HŪM-kāreṇa viśvavajraṃ ca dhyātvā, tato viśvavajrāt

Notes

nyid kyi dngos po bsdus pa/ aom sh'u n+ya t'a dzny'a na badzra sva bh'a ba a'atma ko// ham/ stong pa nyid kyi ye shes rdo rje rang bzhin gyi bdag nyid la chos thams cad ces bya ba'i sngags kyi don bsgoms pas rab tu mi gnas pa'i ngo bor gnas so/ / Indeed the mantra *om śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmako 'ham* does generally stand on its own; however, leaving aside any aggressive emendations to the Sanskrit text, I believe the only natural way to understand the syntax of this sentence is to construe the words as part of the mantra.

Evidence to support this interpretation can also found in other *sādhana*s composed by Advayavajra, such as the *Saptākṣarasādhana*: *tataḥ om śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmakāḥ sarvadhāḥ om śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmako 'ham iti sakalavastutattvasārasaṃgrāhakaṃ mantrārtham āmukhīkurvan ...* (ed. p. 460). Note, however, that the Tibetan translation of the *Saptākṣarasādhana* does not reflect the first *om* and appears to have attempted to interpret the words as a stand-alone cloause: *de nas chos thams cad ni stong pa nyid kyi ye shes kyi rdo rje'i bdag nyid de/ om shū nya tā dznyā na badzra sva bhā wa ātma ko 'ham/ zhes bya ba dngos po ma lus pa'i de kho na nyid sdud par byed pa'i sngags kyi de kho na mngon du byed cing/* (*de kho na* may be a corruption of *don* or *don kho na*) (D f. 131r).

Advayavajra's *Hevajravisuddhinidhi* also has a formulation resembling the *Saptākṣarasādhana*: *etadantaraṃ sarvadharmapracicayalakṣaṇayā prajñayā sarvadharmān pratītyasamutpādakān svabhāvānutpannān adhimuñcan, tadarthaṃ dyotakatvāt sakalavastutattvasārasaṃgrāhakatvena ca, OM ŚŪNYATĀJÑĀNAVAJRASVABHĀVĀTMAKĀḤ SARVADHARMĀḤ | OM ŚŪNYATĀJÑĀNAVAJRASVABHĀVĀTMAKO 'HAM iti mantram imaṃ manasā paṭhitvā ...* (ms f. 66r7–v2). Here 'Gos lo tsā ba's Tibetan translation completely lacks any reflex to the words in question (see D f. 176r). We do, however, find what may be a rendering of more or less the same formulation in the Tibetan translation of Advayavajra's **Hevajrasādhana*: *de ltar bla na med pa'i chos thams cad rab tu 'byed pa'i mtshan nyid kyi shes rab kyis chos thams cad rten 'brel las skyes pa tsam rang bzhin gyis gzod ma nas skye ba med par gsal bar shes par bya ste/ dngos po ma lus pa'i bde ba de kho na nyid kyi snying por bsdus pa'i stong pa'i ye shes kyi rdo rje'i rang bzhin gyi chos shes nas om shū nya tā dznyā na badzra sva bhā va ā tma ko 'ham zhes pa'i sngags de yid kyis bzlas te/* (D f. 163r). Leaving aside other slight differences for the moment, we can see that the translator (whose identity is unknown to me) appears to have treated the words in question with an approach similar to that of Mar pa chos kyi blo gros.

Taken altogether, this evidence points towards Advayavajra having a special preference for an 'enhanced' formulation of the popular mantra, which may have caused some confusion for Tibetan translators. In view of this preference, it may also be worth noting that the formulation, as well as other key terms associated with Advayavajra's philosophy such as *apratīṣṭhita*, is wholly absent from the relevant portion of the *Hevajrākhyā*, which may be a factor to consider when evaluating the text's authorship: *tataḥ paṭhed jinamantrakam—OM ŚŪNYATĀJÑĀNAVAJRASVABHĀVĀTMAKO 'HAM. tasmin samaye svaparaśaradamalanabhasannibhaṃ paśyet* (ms reads *paśota*) (f. 9r).

Variants

3 tatra] *em.*; tatra ((*tya/tpa*)) Ṇ

sphuradbhir aṇusaṃhatair vajrair⁹ vajraprākāraṃ pañjarabandhanam adho vajramayim bhūmiṃ parikhāṃ ca vicintayet. raviviśvavajrābhyāṃ ca raśmibhūya, samantataḥ prasṛtābhyāṃ tat sarvaṃ dṛḍhikuryāt.

tadanantaraṃ khadhātau dharmodayākārāṃ antaḥsuśirāṃ atibahaladhavalām ūrdhvām¹⁰ prajñāṃ paśyet. tatas tadantarvarti viśvavarṇāṣṭadalaṃ viśālām 5 kamalaṃ dhyāyāt. tatas tanmadhye¹¹ rephodbhavasūryamaṇḍalamadhyavarti- HŪM-kārapariṇataṃ viśvavajraṃ cintayet. viśvavajramadhye ca mārutatejo jalāvanīr¹² dhūmraraktaśuklaharītāni dhanustrikoṇaparimaṇḍalacaturasrākārāṇi YAM-RAM -VAM-LAM-pariṇatāni upary upari paśyet. etat sarvaṃ jñānamātraṃ kalpayan tapariṇataṃ caturasraṃ caturdvāram¹³ aṣṭastambhopaśobhitam hārārdhahārabhū- 10

Notes

9. We may wish consider a more aggressive conjecture here, such as replacing 'aṇsaṃhater vajraiḥ' with 'sphuradbhir aṇusaṃhatair raśmibhiḥ', given the both the Tibetan translation's reading 'od zer' in place of *rdo rje* and the overall sense. But the manuscript's 'vajraiḥ' is neither impossible nor unattractive; we should, however, implicitly understand that these *vajras* consist of light.

10. T_D reads *steng yang pa*, perhaps reflecting *upari viśālām*. This reading has the advantage of many parallels in other descriptions of the *dharmodaya*, such as the one found in Advayavajra's *Hevajraviśuddhisādhana* (f. 67v): *adhaḥ sūkṣaṃ upari viśālām trikoṇam*. Perhaps, however, Advayavajra wrote *ūrdhvām* ('upright') as a more telegraphic description of the shape; otherwise, if we read *upari viśālām*, one might also expect to see here the words *adhaḥ sūkṣām*.

11. T_D renders *tanmadhye* and *tadantarvarti* of the previous sentence as *de'i steng du*. It renders *madhyavarti* in the following compound as *la gnas pa*. The translator appears, therefore, to have made a conscious decision to avoid translating these with words meaning 'inside' or 'in the middle of'.

12. **QUESTION** Is it correct that *māruta*^o is a *dvandva*, and that *dhūmra*^o etc. should be implicitly qualified by a word such as *maṇḍalāni*? I.e., 'One should visualize wind ... as [maṇḍalas] that are grey,' See Tib: *sna tshogs rdo rje'i dbus su yang rlung dang/ me dang/ chu dang/ sa rnams ni du ba dang/ dmar po dang/ dkar po dang/ ljang gu rnams/ gzhu dang/ zur gsum pa dang/ zlum po dang/ gru bzhi rnams/ yam ram bam lam rnams yongs su gyur pa las steng nas steng du blta'o/ /*

13. After *caturdvāram*, T_D reads *rta babs bzhi pa*, reflecting *catustoraṇam*. This word is certainly fitting, but at present I feel it is impossible to say whether it was added to the translation or lost from the Sanskrit witness.

The text here verges on entering *anuṣṭubh* metre, as it inspired by verses that can be traced back to at least the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṅgraha*, and which are often quoted or employed with

Variants

1 aṇusaṃhatair vajrair] *em.*; aṇsaṃhater vajraiḥ Ñ; 'od zer gyi rdul phra rab kyi tshogs 'phros pa des T_D 1 vajraprākāraṃ] *em.*; vajraprākārai Ñ 2 bhūmiṃ] *em.*; bhūmi Ñ 2 vicintayet] *em.*; viñcintayet Ñ 5 āṣṭadalaṃ] *em.*; āṣṭadala Ñ 5 viśālām] *em.*; viśāla Ñ; *Not reflected in T_D* 7 viśvavajramadhye] Ñ^{pc}; vijaśvavajramadhye Ñ^{ac} 7 jalāvanīr] *em.*; jalāvani Ñ 9 kalpayan] *conj.* (T_D brtags te); ((sā/mā))kalayan Ñ

ṣitaṃ kūtāgāraṃ paśyet.

tataḥ prākārābhyantare aṣṭa śmaśānāni cintayet. atra pūrve devendro harī-
takīvrkṣe¹⁴ mecakavarṇo dantivadanah. dakṣiṇe yamaś cūtavrkṣe mahiṣānanaḥ
sitavarṇah. paścime 'śokatarau varuṇo raktaḥ siṃhamukhaḥ. uttarato bodhiśā-
5 khini kubero haritābho manuṣyamukhaḥ. āgneyāṃ karañjavrkṣe vaiśvānaraḥ śu-
klavarṇaś chāgānanaḥ. latājapāyāṃ¹⁵ naravāhano manuṣyamukhaḥ pāṇḍuḥ nai-
rṛtyāṃ. vāyavyāṃ kakubhavrkṣe pavano mṛgānanaḥ pītaḥ. aiśānyāṃ bhūteśo
vṛṣabhānanaś citro nyagrodhapādape. sarve cāmī vāmakarakalitakapālā nānā-
stravyagradakṣiṇapāṇayo darśitapūrvārdhakāyāḥ.¹⁶

10 evaṃ pūrvādyāṣṭadikṣu yathākramam ananta-padma-vāsuki-mahāpadma-ta-
kṣaka-śaṃkhaḥpāla-karkkoṭa-kulikāḥ. meghāś cāṣṭau mecaka-śukla-śiti-pāṇḍu-ra-

Notes

variations in countless texts (see TRIBE 2016: 143 n. 24 for references, and p. 254–5 for Vilāsava-
jra's version of these in the *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*; see also, for example, HeTa 1.10.21).

14. For each of the trees in the eight charnel grounds, T_D treats the words as if they were nomi-
native forms. Ñ offers two instances of the words without case endings, two instances with forms
that are corrupt in other ways, and four instances in locative forms. If we were to accept nomi-
native forms, a conjunction such as 'ca' would also be natural; I therefore find this possibility
unlikely, and adopting it would require major alterations to the transmitted text. Compounded
forms such as *harītakīvrkṣamecakavarṇah* can, I believe, also be discounted, as they appear u-
nprecedented and strained. If locative forms were intended, we can account for the error in that
it appears relatively easy for a scribe to mistake *kṣa* for *kṣe*; we also see that forms less susceptible
to this confusion (e.g. *śākhini* or *tarau*) are here unambiguously locative.

According to other accounts of the eight charnel grounds, there is a *śirīṣa* in the east (see
GERLOFF 2020: vol. 2 739–740). The Pandanus Database of Plants identifies *śirīṣa* as *Acacia lebeck*
Willd. (Siris tree) and *haritakī* as *Terminalia chebula Retz.* (Chebulic myrobalan). It is unclear to
me whether or not Advayavajra regarded the two as synonyms.

15. Another possibility is to read *latājavāyāṃ* as *japā* and *javā* are variant forms of the same
word. According to other accounts of the eight charnel grounds there is *latāparkaṭi* in the sou-
thwest (see vol. 2 739–740). Dictionaries and *kośas* (REFERENCE) record *parkaṭi* as a synonym
of *plakṣa*, which the Pandanus Database of Plants identifies as *Ficus microcarpa L. f.* (Chinese
banyan). The database identifies *japā* or *javā*, however, as *Hibiscus rosa-sinensis L.* (Chinese hibi-
scus). It is unclear if Advayavajra thought of *japā* and *parkaṭi* as synonyms.

16. **QUESTION** : Is Advayavajra equating the *dikpālas* and *maharddhikas*? In what sense are
the 'in' trees?

Variants

2–3 haritakīvrkṣe] *em.*; haritakīvrkṣa Ñ 3 cūtavrkṣe] *em.*; cūtavrkṣa Ñ 5 āgneyāṃ] *em.*;
agneyāṃ Ñ 5 karañjavrkṣe] *em.*; karañja Ñ 6 latājapāyāṃ] *em.*; latāja((pyāṃ)) Ñ 7 aiśā-
nyāṃ] *em.*; aiśānyā Ñ

akta-pīta-harita-viśvavarṇāḥ cintanīyāḥ.¹⁷ evaṃ dikpālās cāṣṭau [prasiddhavarṇā. aṣṭa caityāny api sa]pakṣavarṇāni bodhavyāni.¹⁸

tato maṇḍalamadhye aṣṭadalaṃ raktakamalaṃ vicintya, tatkamalamadhyā-
pūrvādicaturdaleṣu¹⁹ tathā kūṭāgāracatuḥkoṇeṣu caturdvāreṣv adha ūrdhvaṃ ca
pañcadaśaśavān²⁰ paśyet. tadanantaraṃ śavārūḍhān ālikālipariṇatacandrasūrya- 5
madhyagatān akārādipañcadaśasvarān dhyāyāt. tataḥ A-kārādibījapariṇāmena
Ñ fo. 262' sarvatra sabījā kartikā. tataś candrasūryasabījakartikāpariṇāmena²¹ nairātmyā-
dipañcadaśayoginīr dhyāyāt. tatrādarśajñānavāṃś candraḥ, samatājñānavān²²
sūryaḥ, tayoṛ madhyagataṃ bījaṃ pratyavekṣaṇā, sarveṣāṃ aikyaṃ kṛtyānuṣṭhā-
nam, bimbaniṣpattiḥ suviśuddhadharmadhātuh.²³ 10

Notes

17. The word *cintanīyāḥ* has no reflex in T_D. It is not otherwise suspicious.

18. Here again it is evident that the transmitted text, which reads '*evaṃ dikpālās cāṣṭau pa-
kṣavarṇāni bodhavyāni*', has suffered from an eye skip. The neuter form *°varṇāni* lends support
to what can be understood from T_D: namely, there should be a second sentence regarding the
colour of *caityas*. The first sentence, which in T_D reads '*de ltar phyogs skyong brgyad kyi kha
dog ni grags par zad do/ /*', is relatively unproblematic. Here I have 'back translated' *grags par
zad do* with *prasiddha*—attestations of this correspondence cannot be found in the translation of
mTshur ye shes 'byung gnas, but we do find attestations elsewhere, such as in 'Gos lhas brtsas's
translation of Ratnākaraśānti's *Muktāvalī* ad HT 2.4.53 (ed. p. 183; D f. 186r).

The second sentence is slightly more problematic. T_D's reading—*mchod rten brgyad kyi kha
dog kyang rtogs par bya'o/ /*—suggests something along the lines of '*aṣṭacaityānāṃ varṇā °pi
bodhavyāḥ*'. Our Sanskrit manuscript, on the other hand, indicates that the sentence ends with
'*pakṣavarṇāni bodhavyāni*'. I suspect, therefore, that, for one reason or another, words are missing
from the Tibetan translation, which is indeed overly terse. Perhaps it could have read: *mchod
rten brgyad kyi kha dog kyang de dang mthun par rtogs par bya'o/ /*. In any case, the compound
sapakṣavarṇa is, as far as I can tell, unattested elsewhere, so perhaps it is not the best conjecture;
nevertheless, because it does seem to make good sense in the context, and because it requires
minimal alterations to the transmitted reading, I provisionally propose it as currently the best
solution.

19. T_D lacks a reflex of *tat* in *tatkamala*: *padma'i nang shar phyogs la sogs pa'i 'dab ma bzhi*.
QUESTION: Does this sit right? Do we actually want *tatkamalamadhye pūrvādi*?

20. T_D erroneously reads *ro bco lnga dang ldan par* for *pañcadaśaśavā*.

21. The compound as rendered in T_D does not reflect *sabīja*: *zla ba dang/ nyi ma dang/ gri gug
yongs su gyur pa las*.

22. T_D lacks a reflex for *jñāna* in *samatājñānavān*: *mnyam pa nyid dang ldan pa*.

23. This last sentence is a paraphrase of HeTa 1.8.6c–7: *ādarśajñānavāṃś candraḥ samatāvān*

Variants

1–2 cāṣṭau prasiddhavarṇā ... sapakṣavarṇāni] *diag. conj.*; cāṣṭau pakṣavarṇāni Ñ; de ltar phyogs
skyong brgyad kyi kha dog ni grags par zad do/ /mchod rten brgyad kyi kha dog kyang rtogs par
bya'o/ / T_D (entire two sentences) 8 °yoginīr] *em.*; °yoginī Ñ

atra varaṭakamadhye dhyeyā A-kārasvarasambhavā dveṣātmikākṣobhyamu-
 dritā vijñānaskandhātmikā prajñopāyasvarūpā bahirupāyarūpakhaṭvāṅgāliṅgi-
 takandharā²⁴ nairātmyā. pūrvādidaleṣu Ā-I-Ī-U-svarasambhavā mohapaśūnyarā-
 gersyāsvabhāvā vairocana ratnasambhavā mitābhāmoghasiddhimudritā rūpaveda-
 5 nāsaṃjñāsaṃskāraskandhātmikā vajrāgaurīvārīvajrādākinī dhyāyāt.

tato bāhyapute aiśānyādikoṇeṣu Ū-Ṛ-Ṛ-Ḍ-svaraniṣpannā²⁵ akṣobhyavairoca-
 naratnasambhavā mitābhāmudritāḥ pṛthivyāptejovāyusvabhāvāḥ pukkasiśavarī-
 caṇḍālīḍombīḥ paśyet.

tataḥ pūrvādidvāreṣu Ī-E-AI-O-svarasambhavāḥ sparśādimudrāmudritā²⁶ rū-
 10 paśabdagandharasasvarūpā gaurīcaurīvettālīghasmaryo bhāvyaḥ. tadanantaram
 adha ūrdhvaṃ ca moharāgamudrite AU-AM-svarasambhave sparśadharmadhātu-
 svabhāve bhavanirvāṇasvarūpe bhūcarīkhecaryau bhāvayet.

atra ca devīnām utpatyanantaram svakuleśābhiṣeke sati svakuleśamudrā bo-
 dhavyā.

Ñ fo. 262^v

15 etā pañca daśayoginyāḥ ṣoḍaśābdāḥ sūryamaṇḍalasthā bhinnāñjanābhā²⁷ bo-

Notes

saptāśvikaḥ || bījais cihnaiḥ svadeavṣya pratyavekṣaṇam ucyate | sarvair ekam anuṣṭhānam niṣpa-
 tti<ḥ> śuddhidharmatā ||

24. T_D may reflect a different reading for *bahirupāyarūpakhaṭvāṅgāliṅgitakandharā*: ‘kha tv’am
 gas gzugs ‘khyud pa’o’. There is no reflex of *bahirupāya*^o, and *gzugs* may be based on a Sanskrit
 word other than *kandhara*, which the translator previously rendered as *mgul*.

25. T_D erroneously reads *dbyangs la sogs pa’i* for *svaraniṣpannāḥ*.

26. For ‘*sparśādimudrāmudritāḥ*’ T_D reads ‘*pukka s’i la sogs pa’i rang bzhin du rgyas btab pa*’,
 TODO: What could have caused this? See HeTa 2.4.18: *gaurīṇ ca dveṣataḥ | caurīm mohamudreṇa
 vetālīm piśunamudrayā | ghasmarīm rāgamudreṇa*: i.e. Akṣobhya, Vairocana, Ratnasambhava, A-
 mitābha. So maybe conjecture *pukkasyādimudrāmudritā* - ‘they are sealed by the [same] seals of
 Pukkaśī and so on’?

27. T_D erroneously renders *bhinnāñjanābhā* as *dbyer med pa’i mig sman nag po’i mdog lta bu*,
 as if reading *abinnāñjanābhā*. A more common rendering by Tibetan translators for *bhinnāñjana*
 is *stang zil bcag pa* (see, for example, the *Lalitavistara*, in prose after 7.54 and D f. 57r). TODO:

Variants

1 A-kārasvarasambhavā] *em.*; akārasvarasa((hyā))**check ms** Ñ 3 Ā-I-Ī] *em.*; a ā i Ñ 3-4 °rā-
 gersyasvabhāvā] *em.*; °rāgersyāsvabhāva Ñ 5 °saṃskāra°] *em.*; °saṃskārā° Ñ 5 °dākinī]
em.; °dākinī Ñ 6 Ū] *em.*; ū Ñ 6 °svaraniṣpannā] *em.*; °svarāni<ā>spannā Ñ 9-10 rūpaśa-
 bdagandharasa°] *em.* (T_D gzugs dang/ sgra dang/ dri dang/ ro rnam); rūpaśabdagandha° Ñ 10
 tadanantaram] *em.*; tadanantara Ñ 11 moharāgamudrite] *em.* (T_D gti mug dang ’dod chags
 kyis rgyas btab pa); moharāge mudrite Ñ 12 °khecaryau] *em.*; °khecaryā Ñ 13 svakuleśā°]
 Ñ^{pc}; svakralesā° Ñ^{ac}

dhicittasvabhāvā jvalitapiṅgalordhvakeśās tāluke vajrasattvasvabhāvaçaturāṅgula-
lakapāladhārīṇyaḥ śīrasi ca pañcabuddhasvabhāvaśuddhāni²⁸ pañca muṇḍāni vi-
bhratyo raktavartulatrinetṛā daṁṣṭrākarālavadanāḥ pañcadaśamāṭṛkāsvabhāva-
śuṣkapañcadaśamuṇḍamālālamkṛtā vyāghracarmāṇvṛttakaṭīnitambā 'rdhaparya-
ṇkanāṭyasthāḥ śavārūḍhāḥ pañcamudrādhārāḥ. tatra—

5

akṣobhyaś cakrirūpeṇāmitābhāḥ kuṇḍalātmakāḥ |
ratneśaḥ kaṇṭhamālāyāṃ haste vairocanaḥ sthitaḥ²⁹ || 1 ||
mekhalāyāṃ sthito 'moghaḥ sarvāṅge vajradhṛk tathā³⁰

Notes

reference. On the meaning of the compound and example from literature, see VOGEL 1967.

28. The manuscript's reading of *pañcabuddhasvabhāvaśuddhapañcamuṇḍāni* yields an unnatural *karmadhāraya* compound. *T_D* does not have any word corresponding to *śuddha*, so one may also consider the conjecture '*pañcabuddhasvabhāvāni pañca muṇḍāni*'. I believe both conjectures are equally plausible.

29. See note 30 on the reading *sthitaḥ*.

30. 1-2a corresponds to HeTa 1.6.11–12a, and these *pādas* along with 2b are found in Saroruhavajra's *Sādhanaopāyikā* (ed. p. 112) and Bhadrāpāda's *Dveṣavajrasādhana* (ed. p. 358). Given the lack of parallel material for 2b (another instance is *Vajrācāryakriyāsaṅgraha* D f. 201r) (TODO reference), it is likely that Advayavajra is here drawing on the *Sādhanaopāyikā*.

In 1d, *smṛtaḥ* is the reading found in all palm-leaf witnesses of the HeTa available to me, and this is reflected in the Tibetan translations of the tantra (D f. 7r) and the NaiPra: *rnam par snang mdzad brjod*. The reading is also found in the verses as they appears in the *Sādhanaṃālā* edition of Ḍombīheruka's *Amṛtaprabhā* (p. 447), *Samputatantra* 5.4.33d, and the *Vajrāvalī* (ed. p. 452). Witnesses of both Saroruhavajra's *Sādhanaopāyikā* and Bhadrāpāda's *Dveṣavajrasādhana*, however, all support *sthitaḥ*. I therefore believe that the reading *sthitaḥ* should be maintained in the NaiPra, despite the Tibetan translation, which here appears to have been influenced by 'Brog mi's translation of the root tantra.

The word *tathā* in 2b is supported by *T_D*: *lus kun rdo rje 'dzin bzhin no*. For the parallels, Gerloff's edition of the *Sādhanaopāyika* prints *vaset*, which is reported to be found in one paper witness, while *paśyet*, unmetrical and ungrammatical, is the reading of the *Hevajrasādhanaṃgraha* codex. The canonical Tibetan translation here reportedly reads *yan lag kun spyod rdo rje 'dzin* (GERLOFF 2020: vol. 1 135), while a para-canonical translation reads *yan lag kun la rdor 'dzin dgod* (vol. 2 152)—neither, I believe, clearly favours any of the available Sanskrit readings. As reported by Gerloff, the *Hevajrasādhanaṃgraha* codex also reads *paśyet* in the *Dveṣavajrasādhana*, and this is presently the text's sole witness (there is no known Tibetan translation). In sum, I think it is difficult to regard any of the possible readings for the final word of 2b as particularly

Variants

1 vajrasattvasvabhāva°] *em.* (*T_D* rdo rje sems dpa'i rang bzhin thod pa); vajrasattvasvabhāva
Ñ 2 °śuddhāni] *conj.*; śuddha Ñ; *No reflex in T_D*. 3–4 pañcadaśamāṭṛkāsvabhāvaśuṣka°]
em. (*T_D* ma mo bco lnga'i bdag nyid kyi mgo bo skam po); pañcadaśamāṭṛkāsvabhāva śuṣka° Ñ
4 °āvṛtta] *em.*; °āvṛtta Ñ 6 °āmitābhāḥ] *em.*; °āmitābha Ñ

gurvācāryeṣṭadevasya namanāya śirasi cakrikā || 2 ||
 durbhāṣasyāśravaṇāya guror vajradharasya ca |
 karṇayoh kuṇḍalaṃ dhāryaṃ mantrajāpāya kaṇṭhikā || 3 ||
 mekhalā bhajitum mudrāṃ tyaktum prāṇivadhaṃ rucakaḥ |³¹

Notes

secure.

31. 2c–4b corresponds to HeTa 2.6.3–4d with slight variations. To asses these variations, we should first consider T_D, which reads :

bla ma slob dpon 'dod lha la/ /
 phyag 'tshal spyi bor 'khor lo 'dzin/ /

bla ma rdo rje 'dzin pa la'ang/ /
 smod tshig mi nyan pa yi phyir/ /
 rna ba dag la rna cha 'dzin/ /
 sngags bzlas phyir ni mgul ba'i phreng/ /

phyag rgya bsten pa ske rags te/ /
 srog gcod spangs pa gdu bu ste/ /

The verses in the HeTa run as follows :

gurvācāryeṣṭadevasya namanārthaṃ cakrikā dhṛtā |
 durbhāṣasyāśravaṇāya guror vajradharasya ca || 2.6.3 ||

3b namanārtha] Σ_P; navaṇārthaṃ P **3b** cakrikā] Σ_C; cakṛkā C **3c** °āśravaṇāya] Σ_P;
 °āśramaṇāya P **3d** guror] Σ_K; guro K

śravaṇayoh kuṇḍalaṃ dhāryaṃ mantraṃ japtum ca kaṇṭhikā |
 rucakaḥ prāṇivadhaṃ tyaktum mudrā bhajitum ca mekhalāṃ | 2.6.4a–d

4a kuṇḍalaṃ dhāryaṃ] Σ_K; kuṇḍalaṃ dhārya K **4b** japtum] Σ_K; japtam K **4c** ru-
 cakaḥ] C N K; rucakaṃ P E **4c** prāṇivadhaṃ] Σ_E; prāṇivandhaṃ E **4d** mudrā] Σ_E;
 mudrāṃ E **4d** bhajitum] C^{pc} N (bhajituṇ) E; bhañjitum P K (bhañjituṇ)

At present I am uncertain why we see these variations. One possibility is that Advayavajra simply used material from the tantra imprecisely. Of the variations, T_D includes a reflex of *śirasi* in 2d (= HeTa 2.6.3b), a word that we have no evidence for in the HeTa. It also supports reversing *pādas* c and d of HeTa 2.6.4. T_D does not clearly offer support for or against the remaining variants. Of these, the reading °*devatāsyā* for 2c (= HeTa 2.6.3a) found in the NaiPra's ms is an impossible form and metrically bad, and thus it must be rejected. It is interesting that the NaiPra's ms reading of *āśramaṇāya* in 3a (= HeTa 2.6.3c) is supported by a palm-leaf witness of the HeTa, but this does not make very good sense and should also probably be rejected. The variants *namanārthaṃ* v. *namanāya* in 2d (= HeTa 2.6.3b) and *japtum* v. °*jāpāya* in 3d (= HeTa 2.6.4b) are equivalents,

Variants

1 °*devasya*] *em.*; °*devatāsyā* Ñ 2 °*āśravaṇāya*] *em.* (T_D mi nyan pa); °*āśramaṇāya* Ñ 3 *dhā-*
ryaṃ] *em.*; *dhārya* Ñ

nūpurakeyūradharāḥ kṛṣṇāṅgo maitracittataḥ || 4 ||³²

keśānāṃ raktapiṅgatā mahārāgatākhyāpanāya, krodhapratipādanāyordhvātā.³³
kāyavākcetasām atirāgasvabhāvatvāt svabhāvena netrāṇāṃ mahārāgatā. bhava-
nirvāṇasvabhāvau bāhū. mānādidoṣān kartitum kartikā.³⁴ traidhātukaviśuddhyā
Ñ fo. 263' skandhādicaturmārarudhirapūrṇaṃ trikhaṇḍaṃ sakalavikalpaśarīri kapālam. dha- 5
rmasambhoganirmāṇaviśuddhyā tribhaṅgaḥ. svābhāvika-kāyaviśuddhyā śarīra-
yaṣṭiḥ. anāvaraṇatākhyāpanāya vyāghracarmavasanatā. traidhātukānāmbana-
tākhyāpanāy[†] ānardhenāka[†] caraṇatā. ekarasatākhyāpanāya³⁵ ekapādākṛāntabhū-
talatā.

tadanantaraṃ hṛdvartibījavinirgataiḥ pañcākāraraśmibhir akaniṣṭhabhuvana- 10
vartijñānasattvasvabhāvaṃ nairātmyācakram āniya hṛdbīje praveśayet. jñānasa-
ttvasamayāsattvayor aikyaṃ bhūtvā nairātmyāhaṃkāram udvahan nairātmyā-
samo³⁶ bhavet.

Notes

and I see no way of easily determining which of these forms Advayavajra originally wrote. The replacement of *śraṇayoh* with *kaṇayoh* results in a slight metrical improvement, but it must be said that imposing stricter metre on these verses was evidently not a priority for Advayavajra here. Finally while the tantra's manuscripts appear to point towards reading *mudrā* (probably to be understood as *mudrāḥ*, accusative plural), it seems equally possible that Advayavajra wrote *mudrām*, as the NaiPra's ms indicates.

32. 4d corresponds to HeTa 2.9.11b. Note that Snellgrove's edition reads *maitricittataḥ*, with no variants reported. The more expected *maitricittataḥ* would be unmetrical, but all palm-leaf manuscripts of the tantra that are available to me support *maitracittataḥ*, as do citations of the *pāda* in Ratnākaraśānti's *Bhramaharasādhana* (ed. p. 166) and the *Sādhnopāyikā* (ed. p. 111).

33. T_D treats this sentence as though it were verse.

34. cf. HeTa 1.8.20a: *tathā mānādiṣaḍḍoṣān kartitum kartikā* (note that Snellgrove's edition reads *karṭikā*).

35. T_D perhaps reflects *ekarasasvabhāvatā* in place of *ekarasatā*: *ro gcig pa'i rang bzhin*.

36. I believe we must accept the emendation of *nairātmyāsamayaḥ* to *nairātmyāsamaḥ* not simply because of support from T_D, but also because it makes the most sense. The practitioner is already *nairātmyāsamaya* insofar as he has been visualising himself as the goddess; however, only after dissolving the *jñānasattva* into that visualisation does he become *nairātmyāsama*.

Variants

3 svabhāvena] *conj.* (T_D rang bzhin gyis) ; svabhāvānāṃ Ñ ; tatsvābhāvānāṃ *possible conj.* 5
trikhaṇḍaṃ] Ñ^{pc}; trimukhaṇḍaṃ Ñ^{ac} 5 sakalavikalpaśarīri] *em.* (T_D rnam par rtog pa mtha'
dag gis lus); kamalavikalpaśarīri Ñ 6 tribhaṅgaḥ] *em.*; tribhaṅgām Ñ 8 ānardhenāka] Ñ;
zhabs ma sbyangs pa'o T_D (*sic for* ma brkyangs pa?); cf. *Hevajraviśuddhinisādhana* f. 77v6–7:
sakalatraidhātukanirāmbaviśuddhyā ardhaparyāṅkatā 10 °vinirgataiḥ] *em.*; °vinirgati Ñ 12–
13 nairātmyāsamo] *em.* (T_D bdag med ma dang mnyam par); nairātmyāsamayo Ñ

atra ca ṣaḍaṅgayogavyavasthārtham anukrameṇa kṛṣṇarakṭapīṭaharitanīlaśu-
klavarṇā bhāvanīyāḥ.³⁷

tatra bhāvanāprakarṣaprakrameṇa prathamam meghasaṃchannam pūrṇaca-
ndravat bhāti. tato 'pi prakarṣān mātāvadvat bhāti. tato 'pi prakarṣāt svapnavat
5 prakāśate. tadanantaram prakarṣaparipākāt svapnajāgraddaśayor abhedaprāpto
mahāmudrāyogī sidhyati. ity utpattikramaḥ.

anyatra³⁸ bolakakkolasamyogān mahāsukharūpi paramaviramamadhyagam³⁹
bodhicittam jāyate yat tad eva pañcadaśakalātmakam jhaṭiti pūrvoktavarnāci-
hnaśamsthānapañcadaśayoginīrūpaṃ paśyēt, tasya hi pañcaskandhacaturdhātu-
10 ṣaḍviśayakāyavākciṭtasvabhāvatvād iti gambhīrotpattikramaḥ.⁴⁰

Ñ fo. 263^v

Notes

37. cf. HeTa 22c–24a: *prathame bhāvayet kṛṣṇam dvitīye raktām eva ca || 22 || tṛtīye bhāvayet pītām caturthe haritām tathā | pañcame nīlavarṇam ca ṣaṣṭame śukladehikām || (23) ṣaḍaṅgam bhāvayed yogī* (as printed in Snellgrove's edition, with orthographic normalisation).

38. MATHES (2014: 374; 2021: 132), in an effort to advance his thesis that Advayavajra advocates a non-tantric form of Mahāmudrā practice, has written the following about this passage: '... it is not completely out of the question that an empowerment in Maitrīpa's system could start directly with the *prajñājñāna*-empowerment. In his *Nairātmyāprakāśa*, Maitrīpa thus explains the ordinary creation stage as an optional practice, and not as a necessary requirement for the subsequent stages.' Judging by Mathes's translation, his assertion here appears to rest on having understood the word *anyatra* in the sense of 'alternatively'—perhaps as an equivalent to *athavā*. I am unsure why we should understand *anyatra* here as having a meaning other than the expected 'elsewhere'. The meaning 'elsewhere' makes good sense in the larger context of the *Nairātmyāprakāśa*: the *utpattikrama* taught here in this *sādhana* consists in visualising the goddesses; elsewhere, a *gambhīrotpattikrama* and forms of *utpannakrama* are also taught, and they too are connected with Nairātmyā.

Even were we to grant that Advayavajra intends *anyatra* to mean 'alternatively', this still does not support Mathes's interpretation that 'the ordinary creation stage' is an optional practice. This would simply mean that practitioners can choose which practice to do—for instance, they may practice *bāhyotpattikrama* on Mondays and *gambhīrotpattikrama* on Tuesdays; but that does not tell us whether or not *bāhyotpattikrama* is a necessary prerequisite for the subsequent stages. There may be evidence elsewhere in Advayavajra's corpus regarding this question, which is indeed a very interesting one, but here the matter is simply not addressed.

39. T_D renders *virama* as *bral ba*, which may be an acceptable translation but is at odds with the more common renderings of this technical term as either *khyad par dga' ba* or *dga' bral gyi dga' ba*.

40. This passage (beginning *nairātmyāhaṃkāram udvahan*) has been translated in two publi-

Variants

1 °pīṭaharitanīla°] *em.* (T_D ser po dang/ ljang gu dang/ sngon po dang/); °pīṭaharitaṭītanīla° Ñ
7 paramaviramamadhyagam] *em.*; paramaviramadhyaga° Ñ 9 yoginīrūpaṃ] *em.*; yoginīrūpa
Ñ 9 tasya hi] Ñ; tasyāpi (T_D de yang) **possibleem.**

jhagiti bijam anavalokayann eva pañcadaśayoginyātmakam maṇḍalacakram paśyed iti utpannakramah.

atha pariniṣpannakramah. vajraśarīre khalu jñānādhiṣṭhite⁴¹ dvātriṃśan nā-
 ḍyo mahāsukhasthānāt sravanti. tās ca pañcadaśa yoginya iti śarīram eva nairā-
 tmyācakrātmakam. tathā hi lalanārasane kaṇṭhād ārabhya nābhiṃ yāvad vāme- 5
 tarapārśvavartinyo candrasūryākhye. nābher adhas te eva yonināḍyau⁴² lalanā-
 rasane akṣobhyarudhiravahe.⁴³ avadhūti śīraḥkaṇṭhahṛnnābhīyonimadhyasthā
 bodhicittāvahā. etā nāḍyo nairātmyā.

abhedyāsūkṣme śīraḥśikhāsthe yathāsaṃkhyam nakhadantakeśaromalakṣaṇa
 yugalavahe⁴⁴ vajrā. divyā dakṣiṇakarṇe svaṇmalavahā, vāmā prṣṭhavamśe piśi- 10
 tavahā gaurī. vāmanīkūrmaje vāmakarṇabhrūmadhyasthe snāyvasthimālāvahe
 vārī. bhāvakīseke cakṣurbāhumūlasthe vṛkkahṛdayavahe ḍākinī. doṣāvatimahā-
 viṣṭe kakṣastanavartinyau cakṣuḥpittavahe pukkasī. mātārāsarvaryau nābhinā-
 sāgrasthe phupphusāntramālāvahe śavarī. śītadoṣme mukhakhaṇṭhasthe pārśa-
 tantūdaravahe caṇḍālī. pravaṇā hṛdaye viṣṭhāvahā, hrṣṭavadanā⁴⁵ liṅge śimanta- 15

Notes

cations by MATHES (2014: 373–4; 2021: 132–3). In the former a draft edition of the passage by Isaacson is included in a footnote; and the latter publication also includes a translation of the sentence below that begins *anābhogayuganaddhāvayavāhi*.

41. T_D suggests reading *pañcājñānādhiṣṭhitāḥ* as an adjective describing *nāḍyah*: *ye shes lngas byin gyis brlabs pa'i rtsa*. N's reading is slightly more convincing: that the body is presided over by *jñāna* is frequently and famously expressed in the HeTa—for example, 1.1.12: *dehastam ca mahājñānam*. I also don't immediately see why the five forms of *jñāna* need to be mentioned here.

42. For *yonināḍyau*, T_D erroneously reads *skye gnas kyi rtsa la*, as if translating *yonināḍyām*.

43. This sentence strongly resembles a passage in Ratnākaraśānti's MuĀ: *lalanārasane eva kaṇṭhād ārabhya (yāvannābhiratrāntare?) vāmetarapārśvanāḍyau candrasūryākhye. nābher adhas te eva yonināḍyau lalanārasanākhye eva* (ed. p. 19). TODO: checks mss.

44. **QUE** Any justification for ms reading of *yugmayugala*?

45. This *nāḍī* has both the name *hrṣṭavadanā* and *kṛṣṇavadanā* (the *akṣaras* for *hr* and *kṛ* having similar forms in North Indian scripts). Here T_D reads *mdog nag ma* (read mdong? - TODO check

Variants

1 anavalokayann] *em.*; avalokayana N 3 dvātriṃśan] N^{pc}; dvātriṃśatan N^{ac} 5 kaṇṭhād] *em.* (T_D mgrin pa nas); karṇād N 7 °nābhi°] *em.*; °nābhiṃ N 9 °roma°] *orthographic change*; °loma° N 10 °yugala°] *conj.*; yugmayugala N 10 svaṇmalavahā] *em.*; tvajmalavaho N 11 vāmakarṇabhrūmadhyasthe] *em.*; vākarṇabhūmadhyesthe N 12 °bāhumūlasthe] *em.*; °bāhumūlesthe N 13–14 nābhināsāgrasthe] N^{pc}; nābhinā..kasāgrasthe N 14 phupphusāntramālāvahe] *em.*; phupphuṣāntranālāvahe N 15 liṅge] *em.*; hrllīnge N; *Not reflected in Tib.*

madhyagā ḍombī.

svarūpiṇīsāmānye meḍhragudayoḥ śleṣmapittavahe gaurī. hetudāyikāviyoge ūrujaṅghayoḥ śoṇitasvedavahe caurī. premaṇisiddhe pādāṅguṣṭhapādaprṣṭhayor medaḥkhedāśruvahe⁴⁶ vettālī. pāvakiśumane aṅguṣṭhajānudvayasthe. tatra pū-
5 rvā khetāvahā, aparā siṃhānavahā. te ime ghasmarī.

hr̥tkamalakarnīkāpūrvādidaleṣu yathākramaṃ trivṛttā-kāminī-gehā-caṇḍikā -māradārikāḥ. tatra prathamam nāḍidvayaṃ bhūcarī, [śeṣāḥ khecarī.] atra ca yā nāḍī yaṃ prasūte puṣṇāti gacchati vā sā tadvāhā.⁴⁷

kiṃcetāḥ kāyavākcittadharmasambhoganirmānatribhavaśvabhāvāś⁴⁸ catuṣca-
10 kreṣu śārīreṣu vyavasthitāḥ. tatra nirmānacakraṃ viśvavarṇaṃ catuṣṣaṣṭidalam kṛṣṇa-A-kārabījaṃ nābher adho vyavasthitam ūrdhvamukhaṃ ca. dharmacakraṃ śuklāṣṭadalakamalam kṣṇāvarṇa-HŪM-kārabījaṃ hr̥ddeṣe vyavasthitam. kaṇṭhe sambhogacakraṃ raktaṣoḍaśadalam raktapraṇavabījam. śīrasi śukladvātrimśadda-
lam śukla-HAM-kārabījaṃ adhomukhaṃ kṣaratpiyūṣadhāraṃ mahāsukhacakraṃ.
15 atrānandakṣaṇabhedādivyavasthā gurūpadeśato bodhavyā.

Notes

mss) and therefore reflects the latter.

46. Here as the second member of the compound we expect a word meaning ‘tears’. Note that T_D’s reading of *mchin pa* is probably a scribal error for *mchi ma*. The conjecture ‘*medo’śruvahe*’ is also plausible, but *medaḥkhedāśruvahe* is a more likely cause of error. Kamalanātha, in his *Ratnāvalī* (ms. f. 3r7), uses the word *śokāśru* in this context, which can be regarded as an equivalent to *khedāśru*.

47. This sentence is found in Ratnākaraśānti’s MuĀ : tatra yā nāḍī yaṃ prasūte puṣṇāti gacchati vā sā tadvāhā (ms-a f. X ; ms-b/c f. X ; ed. p. 20). T_D is problematic here : ‘*di yang rtsa nas rab tu ’dzag pas/ rgyas par byed pa dang/ ’gro bar byed pa dang/ de nas cung zad ’bab pa’o/ /*. I am not certain what the translator intended by this formulation, but there appears to have been some confusion on his part. TODO : Discuss prasūte v. prasūte.

48. The word *tribhava* is not reflected in T_D. See MuA on HeTa 1.1.3b on the correspondence of *tribhava* with *kāyavākcitta*. TODO : Quote MuA etc.

Variants

3 pādāṅguṣṭha] *em.*; pādāṅguṣṭhali 4 medaḥkhedāśruvahe] *conj.*; medaḥkhetāvahe Ñ 4 sumane] *em.*; samāne Ñ 5 aparā] *em.*; aparāla Ñ 7 prathamam] *em.*; prathamā Ñ 7 śeṣāḥ khecarī] *diag. conj.*(T_D lhag ma rnams ni mkha’ spyod ma’o/ /); *deest* in Ñ 8 prasūte] *em.*; **prasūte** Ñ TODO check MuĀ mss 9 °svabhāvāś] Ñ^{pc} (°svabhāvāḥ |); °svabhāvāḥ | ś Ñ^{ac} 10 viśvavarṇam] Ñ; **viśvavarṇa**° possible *em.* 11 kṛṣṇa-A-kārabījaṃ] *em.*; kṛṣṇām̐kārabījaṃ Ñ 12 vyavasthitam] *em.*; vyavasthita Ñ 13 raktaṣoḍaśadalam] *em.*; raktaṣoḍaśadala Ñ

anābhogayuganaddhāvayavāhi bodhicittasākṣātkaraṇam⁴⁹ svābhāvikaḥ kra-
maḥ.

Ñ fo. 264^v tato bhāvanākhinno nairātmyāhaṃkāram udvahan mantraṃ japet. tatrāmī
sahajasiddhāḥ praṇavādyāḥ svāhāntāḥ pañcadaśasvarasvabhāvā A-kārādayo ma-
ntraḥ. tadyathā—OM A Ā I Ū Ṛ Ṛ Ṛ Ṛ E AI O AU AṂ SVĀHĀ. 5

raktanairātmyāhaṃkāram udvahan mantraṃ imam japet. tatrāyaṃ mantraḥ—
OM A KA CA ṬA TA PA YA ŚA SVĀHĀ.

OM AKĀRO MUKHAṂ SARVADHARMĀṆĀM ĀDYANUTPANNATVĀT OM ĀḤ HŪM PHAT
SVĀHĀ—balimantraḥ.

OM ĀḤ HŪM—samayādhiṣṭhānamantraḥ. 10

tadanantaram maṇḍalacakrasākṣāddaśāyāṃ stanau hṛtvā[†] svābhā((ṅgānām))
[†] kakkolamadhyavarti bolam kuryāt. pārśvadvayaṃ ghaṇṭām vidadhyāt.

[mantrayāne] śāstraśāram⁵⁰ jñātvā yatnena sadguroḥ |
kṛpayāvihito 'smābhir nairātmyāyāḥ prakāśakaḥ ||

Notes

49. There are a few points to consider regarding the reading in T_D: 'bad pa med par zung du 'jug pa gnyis med bar 'byung ba'i byang chub kyi sems mngon du byed pa'i rgyu'o. First, the translation evidently takes this as a complete sentence. It has perhaps confused *karaṇa* with *kāraṇa*. It also reflects the word *advaya* within the compound ending *vāhin*, and it connects this compound with the following word, thus qualifying *bodhicitta*. These last two points are valid possibilities, and I wish to accept the former. We find a few parallels in Advayavajra's corpus for the compound *yuganaddhāvayavāhi*: e.g., *Amanasikārādhāra* (ed. p. 497), the *Sekatātparyasaṅgraha* (ed. p. 413), and *Pañcatathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa* (ed. p. 377).

Whether *anābhogayuganaddhāvāhi* should qualify *bodhicitta* or *sākṣātkaraṇa* is slightly more difficult to determine, but perhaps ultimately there is no great difference. *Bodhicitta*, the innate nature of mind, is *anābhogayuganaddhāvayavāhin* in that it supports (*vāhin* in the sense of 'bearing') the non-dual state of the effortless unity of bliss/compassion and emptiness; manifesting *bodhicitta* is *anābhogayuganaddhāvāhin* in that it produces/leads to (*vāhin* in the sense of *pra-√sū* etc.) the non-dual state that is effortless coalescence.

50. I have hesitantly settled on this conjecture with some inspiration from T_D: *gsang sngags tshul gyi bstan bcos snying/ /bla ma dam pa'i 'bad pa las shes pa*. We might expect *mantranaya* for *gsang sngags tshul*, but that would be metrically impossible; a genitive case ending would

Variants

1 anābhogayuganaddhāvayavāhi] conj. (T_D 'bad pa med par zung du 'jug pa gnyis med bar 'byung ba'i); anābhogayuganaddhāvāhi 3 mantraṃ] em.; mantra Ñ 6 raktanairātmyāhaṃkāram ... tadanantaram maṇḍalacakrasā°] *The text beginning raktanairātmyā° is written in a second hand. The text beginning japet is written as a marginal addition. The addition ends tadanantaram maṇḍalacakrasā°.* 13 [mantrayāne]] diag. conj.; cakranayā Ñ; gsang sngags tshul gyi T_D 13 saram] em.; °saram ram Ñ

- gahanamaṇḍalacakraviniścayo bata bhavet katham atra śarīriṇām |
 śavaranāthapadāmbujareṇubhir yadi na [rūkṣitamastakavān] bhavet ||⁵¹
 [abhisamayasuviṣṭtau] yad āptaṃ
 kuśalam anena bhavet samastalokaḥ |
 5 kuliśadharapadapratīṣṭhitātmā
 hatabhuvanaṭrayaḍuḥkhadaurmmaṇasyaḥ ||⁵²
 nairātmyāprakāśaḥ samāptaḥ.
 || kṛtir iyaṃ śrīmatpaṇḍitācāryyāvadhūtādvayavajrapādānām iti ||

Primary Sources

Amanasikārādhāra by Advayavajra

MATHES 2015: 489–498

Dveṣavajrasādhana by Bhadrapāda

GERLOFF 2020: vol. 2 pp. 335–360

Pañcatathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa by Advayavajra

Notes

also be impossible, but perhaps we could also conjecture the compound *mantrayānaśāstrasāraṇ*. My solution has the slight disadvantage of forming a *ra-vipulā* in the *pāda*, which is unexpected but not impossible, and we can't easily explain the formation of the corrupt manuscript reading: *cakranayā śāstrasāraṇ raṇ*. Note that T_D has also interpreted *guroḥ* as a genitive form connected to *yatnena*, leading a bizarre meaning: 'Having understood the essence of the *śāstras* of the Way of Mantra by means of [my] Guru's effort'. I interpret the text as I have construed it as follows: 'Having diligently understood from [my] guru the essence of *śāstra* in the Vehicle of Mantra ...'

51. I have made this conjecture by modifying the transmitted text minimally to arrive at something (perhaps) coherent. T_D appears to be translated rather freely: *dkyil 'khor 'khor lo zab mo yi/ / rnam par nges par 'gyur ba ni/ / ji ltar 'dir ni lus can rnam/ / ri khrod mgon gyi zhabs kyi chu skyes kyi/ / rdul rnam spyi bos ma blangs pa/ / de dag nges par ji ltar 'gyur/ /* We can see evidence for *mastaka* with the word *spyi bo*. The final *pāda*, *de dag nges par ji ltar 'gyur*, does not yield a coherent meaning for me. The metre is Drutavilambita.

52. I have yet to find a compelling conjecture for the first *pāda*. T_D reads as follows: *mngon par rtogs pa 'di yis thob pa yis/ / dge ba 'di yis 'jig rten mtha' dag ni/ / srid pa gsum gyi sdug bsngal yid mi bde spangs te/ / rdo rje 'dzin pa'i go 'phang rab gnas shog/ /*. The metre is Puṣpitāgrā.

Variants

- 2 [rūkṣitamastakavān] *diag. conj.*; rūkṣitamastako Ñ 3 [abhisamayasuviṣṭtau] *diag. conj.*; abhisamayavistarite Ñ 4 anena bhavet] *conj.* (ISAACSON); anena Ñ 6 °traya°] *em.*; °trayaṃ° Ñ

MATHES 2015: 371–384

Bhramaharasādhana by Ratnākaraśānti

Harunaga ISAACSON. 2002. “Ratnākaraśānti's Bhramaharanāma Hevajrasādhana: Critical Edition=(Studies in Ratnākaraśānti's tantric works III).” *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 5 (March): 151–176.

Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī by Vilāsavajra

See TRIBE (2016).

Muktāvalī (MuĀ) by Ratnākaraśānti

- ed. Ram Shankar TRIPATHI and Thakur Sain NEGI, eds. 2001. *Hevajratantra with Muktāvalī Pañjikā of Mahāpaṇḍitācārya Ratnākaraśānti*. Saranath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- ms-a National Archives Kathmandu, 4/19 (NGMCP A 994/6). Palm-leaf, Bhumi-mol script, 115 folios.
- ms-b NGMCP E 260/2. Palm-leaf, Proto-Bengali script, 25 folios.
- ms-c Tokyo University Library, M. 513. Palm-leaf, Proto-Bengali script, 40 folios. (part of E 260-2)
- D dpal dgyes pa'i rdo rje'i dka' 'grel mu tig phreng ba by Ratnākaraśānti. Translation by Śāntibhadra and 'Gos lhas btsas. In sDe dge bstan 'gyur, Tōh. 1189, rgyud, vol. 4 (ga), fo. 221r1–297r7.

Ratnāvalī by Kamalanātha

Ratnāvalī Hevajrapañjikā. Kaiser Library, 231 (NGMPP C 26-4[2]). Palm leaf, proto-Bengali script, 23 fos., complete.

Saptākṣarasādhana

- ed. *Sāadhanamālā* no. 251.
- D *Yi ge bdun pa'i sgrub thabs* by gNyi su med pa'i rdo rje. Trans. by Mar pa chos kyi dbang phyug. sDe dge bstan 'gyur, Tōh. 1483, rgyud, vol. 22 (zha), fo. 130r7–133v1.

Sāadhanamāla

Benoytosh BHATTACHARYYA, ed. 1925. *Sādhanaṃālā vol. 1*. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 26. Baroda: Oriental Institute..

Sādhanaṃālā

National Archives Kathmandu, NAK 3-693 (NGMPP A 936/11) ...

Sekatātparyasaṅgraha by Advayavajra

MATHES 2015: 403–414

Śrīhevajraviśuddhinidhi by Advayavajra

ms In *Hevajrasādhanaṃgraha*, fo. 65r-80v.

D *k ye r do r je'i s grub pa'i thabs r nam par dag pa'i gter* by gNyi su med pa'i r do r je. Trans. by Vanaratna and 'Gos gzhon nu dpal. sDe dge bstan 'gyur, Tōh. 1244, rgyud, vol. 9 (nya), fo. 175r1-189r4.

Hevajratāntra (HeTa)

ed. D.L. SNELGROVE. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: Śrīhevajradākinījālsamvara-mahātāntrarājā [Sanskrit text, romanized] and the Tibetan translation [romanized]. Yogaratnamālā, a commentary on the Hevajra-tantra by Kāṇha*. London oriental series. Oxford University Press.

N_a National Archives Kathmandu 7/11 (NGMPP A 993/7). Palm leaf, 45 ff., incomplete.

N_b National Archives Kathmandu, 5/93 (NGMPP A 48-8). Palm leaf, 28 ff., damaged.

C Cambridge University Library, MS Add.1697.2. Palm leaf, Bengali script, 34 fos., incomplete.

P Manuscript images of unknown provenance. Palm leaf, Newar script, incomplete.

K Kaiser Library KL 126 (NGMPP C 14-4), paper, Newari, 52 folios, complete. (775 NS = 1654 CE).

Hevajrasādhanaṃgraha

ms Reproductions of photographs made by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana at Ngor monastery. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Xc 14/38.

Hevajrasādhanopāyikā by Saroruhavajra
GERLOFF (2020: vo. 1 pp. 99–121)

**Hevajranāmasādhana* by Advayavajra
Kye rdo rje zhes bya ba'i sgrub pa'i thabs by gNyls su med pa'i rdo rje. No translator/paṇḍita attribution. In *sDe dge bstan 'gyur*, Tōh. 1243, rgyud, vol. 9 (nya), fo. 162r3-175r1.

Hevajrākhyā by Advayavajra
In *Hevajrasādhanaśaṅgraha*, fo. 8r-22v.

Secondary Sources

GERLOFF, Torsten. 2020. *Saroruhavajra's Hevajra-Lineage: A Close Study of the Surviving Sanskrit Works*. 2 vols. Indian and Tibetan Studies. Hamburg: Department of Indian / Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.

MATHES, Klaus-Dieter. 2014. "A Summary and Topical Outline of the *Sekanirdeśa-pañjikā* by 'Bum la 'bar." In *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreya-nātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla: Critical Edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with English Translation and Reproductions of the MSS*, edited by Harunaga ISAACSON and Francesco SFERRA, 367–384. Manuscripta Buddhica 2 = Serie Orientale Roma CVII. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale"/Asien-Afrika Institut, Universität Hamburg.

———. 2015. *A Fine Blend of Mahāmudrā and Madhyamaka: Maitrīpa's Collection of Texts on Non-conceptual Realization (Amanasikāra)*. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. ISBN: 9783700177869.

———. 2021. *Maitripa: India's Yogi of Nondual Bliss*. Boulder: Shambhala. ISBN: 9780834843981.

TRIBE, A. 2016. *Tantric Buddhist Practice in India: Vilāsavajra's commentary on the Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. Routledge Studies in Tantric Traditions. Taylor & Francis.

VOGEL, Claus. 1967. "On the Meaning of the Skr. (Pra)bhinnāñjana." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10 (2/3): 171–176.