Tattvaratnāvaloka
and its Vivaraṇa

Vāgīśvarakīrti

February 25, 2025

Some Conventions/Policies

- Tibetan translations are included in the apparatus when they indicate variant Sanskrit readings.

- Sanskrit renderings suggested by Tibetan appear in brackets after the translation's siglum. These renderings are hypothetical and cannot be provided in all cases.

- When two Tibetan translations differ slightly, they are separated by a semicolon. Only the second translation includes a Sanskrit rendering.

- A Tibetan translation's siglum is included when it appears to support one of multiple Sanskrit readings, based on the editors' judgment.

- Tibetan is not included in the apparatus when it offers no clear support for or against a reading.

- When both Tibetan translations of the commentary agree, they are given the siglum TV.

Some Things to Check

- Consistency in TV in rendering *vijñāna* and *jñāna*.

- Consistency in TV in rendering *iti*s.

Sigla and Abbreviations

TaRaa	Tattvaratnāvaloka
TaRaa-Vi	Tattvaratnāvalokavivaraṇa
E_{DH}	Dhīḥ vol. 21, pp. 129–149.
K	NAK 5–252 = NGMPP A 915/4
TM_D	*De kho na nyid rin po che snang ba.* Tōhoku no. 1889. sDe dge bstan 'gyur, vol. Pi, fols. 203r3–204r5. Tr. by 'Gos Lhas btsas
TVA_D	*De kho na nyid rin po che snang ba'i rnam par bshad pa.* Tōh. 1890. sDe dge bsTan 'gyur, vol. 44 (rGyud 'grel, Pi), fols. 204r5–214v4. Tr. by 'Gos Lhas btsas.
TVB_G	*De kho na nyid rin po che snang ba'i rnam par bshad pa.* Ōtani no. 4793. bsTan 'gyur gSer bris ma, vol. 84 (83 in BDRC outline(?)), (rGyud 'brel, Zhu), fols. 70v–85v. translator given.
TV	Both Tibetan translations of the commentary (differences, if any, indicated in a mini-aparatus)

ac	*ante correctionem*
deest	omitted in
diag. conj.	diagnostic conjecture [e.g. 'reconstructed' from Tibetan]
conj.	conjecture
em.	emendation [an emendation is made with a high degree of confidence, whereas a conjecture proposes a correction while acknowledging a greater possibility for alternatives]
fol./fols.	folio/folios
pc	*post correctionem*
r	recto
v	verso

Σ_X	Reading shared in all witnesses but X
((kiṃcit))	Reading uncertain—either illegible or otherwise in doubt
<kiṃcit>	Reading 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
..	Damaged *akṣara* (one . per half *akṣara*)
...	Lacunae of an unknown quantity of *akṣara*s
°	Mark of abbreviation

Text

1 maṅgalācaraṇam

[K fol. 1r] [siddhaṃ][1] namaḥ śrīsadgurupādebhyaḥ |[i]

anupamasukharūpī śrīnivāso 'nivāso
nirupamadaśadevīrūpavidyaḥ[2] savidyaḥ |
tribhuvanahitasaukhyaprāptikāro 'vikāro
jayati kamalapāṇir yāvad āśāvikāśāḥ || 1 ||[ii]

[K fol. 2r3] namaḥ samantakāyavākcittavajrāya.[iii]

anupametyādi. kamalaṃ padmaṃ pāṇau yasya sa kamalapāṇir a-
valokiteśvaro bhagavāñ jayatīti sambandhaḥ. kiṃviśiṣṭaḥ? anupa-

---

[i] Scribal homage
[ii] This verse is in Mālinī metre.
[iii] Scribal homage

---

[1] [siddhaṃ]] K; oṃ E_{DH}
[2] nirupama°] E_{DH}; nirūpama° K

mam ity[3,iv] atipraṇītatvamahattvāsaṃsārasthāyitvalakṣaṇair[4] dharmair yuktasyānyasyābhāvād upamārahitaṃ sukham eva rūpaṃ svabhāvo yasya sa tathoktaḥ. punar api kiṃviśiṣṭaḥ? śrīḥ puṇyajñānasambhāralakṣaṇā, tasyā nivāsa āśrayo yaḥ sa tathā. dharmakāyarūpatvena[5,v] sarvagatatvāt [E_DH p. 132] pratiniyatanivāsābhāvād anivāsaḥ.

punaḥ kīdṛśaḥ? nirupamāḥ paramarūpayauvanaśṛṅgārādirasamahākaruṇādiyuktatvenopamātikrāntā rūpavajrāditārāparyantadaśadevīrūpā vidyāḥ paricārakatvena[6] yasya sa tathā. saha svābhārūpayā vidyayā[7] vartata iti savidyaḥ. tribhuvanasya tribhuvanavartino janasya yad dhitam āyatipathyaṃ[8,vi] buddhatvādikaṃ, sau-

---

[iv] Here one may wish to conjecture a reading such as, *anumapetyādi. anupamam ity* …This reading is partially suggested by TV: *khyad par ji lta bu zhig dang ldan zhe na | dpe med ces bya ba la sogs pa smos te | dpe med pa ni* (*ni*] TVA_D; *dang* TVB_G). The corruption, if there is one, can be seen as a kind of haplography. The text nonetheless reads acceptably well with the transmitted reading (although perhaps less smoothly); thus we feel that while a conjecture is possible it is not strongly compelling.

[v] The manuscript's *dharmakāyarūpitvena* is theoretically acceptable and nearly synonymous; however, *dharmakāyarūpatvena* is more expected, with forms in °*rūpatvena* being vastly more frequent in Classical Sanskrit. TV's reading *chos kyi sku'i ngo bo nyid kyis* does not clearly confirm either variant, as *rūpin* in the root verse is also translated as *ngo bo*. We provisionally adopt *dharmakāyarūpatvena*, but cannot fully discount the transmitted reading.

[vi] We need not necessarily read a compound for *āyatipathyaṃ*, treating instead *āyati* as a locative of *āyat*. The expression appears as a gloss for *hita* in several Buddhists texts, such as in Vilāsavajra's *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*: *mahyaṃ hitaṃ maddhitaṃ hitam āyatipathyam āgāmipariṇāmatvāt* (p. 233). Similarly, Durvekamiśra writes in his *Hetubinduṭīkāloka*: *parasmai hitam āyati pathyaṃ* (p. 212). In

---

[3] kiṃviśiṣṭaḥ? anupamam ity] K E_DH; khyad par ji lta bu zhig dang ldan zhe na | dpe med ces bya ba la sogs pa smos te | dpe med pa ni TVA_D; khyad par ji lta bu zhig dang ldan zhe na | dpe med ces bya ba la sogs pa smos te | dpe med pa dang TVB_G (kiṃviśiṣṭa ity āha anupamam ityādi. anupamam)

[4] °saṃsārasthāyitva°] K; °saṃsārasthāyisva° E_DH

[5] dharmakāyarūpatvena] *em.*; dharmakāyarūpitvena K E_DH

[6] paricārakatvena] *em.*; sapari((c))ārakatvena K; saparivārakatvena E_DH

[7] vidyayā] K E_DH; rig pa ste | shes rab TV (vidyayā prajñayā)

[8] āyatipathyaṃ] *variant word division in* E_DH: āyati pathyaṃ; *and in* K: āyati | pathyaṃ

khyaṃ tadātve pathyaṃ[9] cakravartitvādikam,[vii] tasya yā prāptiḥ[10]

---

both cases, the construction is ambiguous, but in the latter case, the editors of Durvekamiśra's text have not taken it as a compound.

The word *āyatipathya* is used less ambiguously in compound by Śākyarakṣita, quoted in the following note. Similarly, the roughly parallel expression *āyatisukha* is evidnetly treated as a compound by Yaśomitra in his *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: *aihikasukhārtham apuṇyam iti. ihasukhāpekṣayā tat kṛtaṃ nāyatisukhāpekṣayety arthaḥ* (vol. 1 p. 299). Note also the contrast made with *aihikasukha*. Likewise, we can find a compounded form of *āyatiduḥkha* in a verse attributed to Naradatta in the *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*: *muṇḍāpriyād āyatiduḥkhadāyino vasantam utsārya vijṛmbhitaśriyaḥ | na kaḥ khalāt tāpitamitramaṇḍalād upaiti pāpaṃ tapavāsarād iva ||* 'Who does not become miserable because of a rogue who, like a hot day, is hated by widows (? *muṇḍā*) (the hot day being hated by bald men), who leads to future pain, whose wealth expands after he expels those living with him (like the hot day manifests its richness having dismissed the spring), and who annoys his circle of friends (like on a hot day the orb of the sun is heated) (cf. **ingalls1965**).

[vii] The text is insecure here but perhaps not far from the author's intention. Where the manuscript reads *tad dāpayati pathyaṃ* (word division unclear, *pa* and *ya* touching), we conjecture *tadātve pathyaṃ*, following only partially the lead of TVA$_D$. The Tibetan translations read as follows: *gang la phan pa ni ma 'ongs pa'i phan pa ste | sangs rgyas nyid la sogs pa'o ||* de la bde ba ni 'phral gyi phan pa ste | (TVA$_D$); *gang la phan pa ni ma 'ongs pa'i phan pa ste | sangs rgyas nyid la sogs pa dang | de la bde ba ni bde ba ste | 'khor lo bsgyur ba nyid la sogs pa'o ||* (TVB$_G$). It appears that TVB$_G$ also transmits a corrupt reading with *de la bde ba nit bde ba ste*. TVA$_D$ suggests reading something that contrasts with *āyatipathyaṃ*, for which *tadātve pathyaṃ* fits. Another possibility is *āpātapathyaṃ*, but *tadātva* is more often used in contrast with *āyati*. See, for example, Śākyarakṣita's *Vṛttamālāstutivṛtti*: *pṛthagjanatve 'pi āyatipathyadarśinas tadātve ca niṣpāpāḥ* (p. 299); 'Although ordinary people, they see the future welfare and are without sin in the present moment.'

The Tibetan translations also suggest that *hita* and *saukhya* are linked with relative and corelative pronouns: *gang la* and *de la*, or *yasya* and *tasya* in Sanskrit. This does not yield good sense. It is possible that *tadātve* was misread by the translator as a corelative pronoun, while it is also possible that a second relative pronoun (*yat*) or a conjunction (*ca*) was found in the original text near *saukhyaṃ*. Here *hitasaukhya* within the larger compound is only really viable as a *dvandva*: Avalokiteśvara causes the attainment of (ultimate) welfare and (temporary) happiness for all beings. Given that, *tayor yā prāptiḥ* might be preferable to *tasya yā prāptiḥ*, but the singular is also probably acceptable in place of the dual.

---

[9] saukhyaṃ tadātve pathyaṃ] *conj.*; tad dāpayati pathyaṃ K E$_{DH}$ (*word division unclear*); de la bde ba ni 'phral gyi phan pa TVA$_D$; de la bde ba ni bde ba ste TVB$_G$
[10] prāptiḥ] K E$_{DH}$; thob pa ni rnyed pa ste TV (prāptir lābhaḥ)

[K fol. 2v] sākṣātkriyā, tasyāḥ karaṇaṃ kāro yasya sa tathā.[viii] apari-
nirvāṇadharmakatvenāpratiṣṭhitanirvāṇarūpatvenā[11]nyathātvala-
kṣaṇasya vikārasyābhāvād avikāraḥ. evaṃviśiṣṭo bhagavāñ jayati.

kiyantaṃ kālam ity āha—yāvad āśāvikāśāḥ. āśā daśa diśo ga-
ganasvarūpāḥ. yadvā āśāḥ sarvasattvānāṃ bhavabhogatṛṣṇāḥ.[12] tā-
sāṃ vikāśā avakāśāḥ pravartanāni, prādurbhāvā iti yāvat. te yāvat
tāvad[13] bhagavāñ jayati, sarvahariharahiraṇyagarbhādibhyaḥ pra-
kṛṣṭo bhavatīty arthaḥ.

atrānupamasukharūpīty anena svārthasaṃpattiḥ kathitā. śrīni-
vāsa ity anena tadupāyaḥ, puṇyajñānasambhārayoḥ śrīśadbenābhi-
hitatvāt. tribhuvanahitasaukhyaprāptikāra ity anena parārthasaṃ-
pattir uktā. nirupamadaśadevīrūpavidyaḥ savidya ity anena tadu-
pāyaḥ, [14]tathābhūtadaśadevīdvātriṃśallakṣaṇāśītyanuvyañjanakā-
yākāraśūnyena[15] sarvākāraparārthasaṃpatteḥ kartum aśakyatvād
iti.

[viii] It is notable that Vāgīśvarakīrti evidently understands °*prāptikāra* as a *bahu-*
vrīhi, whereas other commentators may prefer to treat it akin to *kumbhakāra*
and therefore as an *upapadasamāsa* as per *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.2.19 (*upapadam atiṅ*).
Given the latter understanding, the expected gloss for *prāptikāra* would be *prā-*
ptiṃ karoti. Compounds ending in *kāra* are occasionally analysed as *ṣaṣṭhītatpu-*
*ruṣa*s: see, for examples, Vijñāneśvara's *Mitākṣarā* ad *Yājñavalkya-dharmaśāstra*
2.61 on *satyaṃkārakṛta*, here referring roughly to a thing 'acquired with a ple-
dge', i.e., acquired as earnest money: *karaṇaṃ kāraḥ, bhāve ghañ. satyasya kā-*
raḥ satyaṃkāraḥ—kāre satyāgadasya (*Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6.3.70) *iti mum. satyaṃkāreṇa*
kṛtaṃ satyaṃkārakṛtam (p. 275). We are unable to provide another example of a
compound ending in *kāra* analysed as a *bahuvrīhi*, but we should also note that
the compound *prāptikāra* is itself rare.

TV does not clearly reflect a *ṣaṣṭhībahuvrīhi* analysis, nor does it very clearly
point to another reading: *de dag sgrub par mdzad po gang yin pa de la de skad ces*
bya'o (TVA_D); *de dag gi rgyu mdzad pa gang yin pa de la de skad ces bya'o* (TVB_G).

---

[11] °rūpatvenā] K E_DH; ngo bo rnyed pas TVA_D; ngo bo brnyed pas TVB_G (°rūpa-
prāptyā°)
[12] °tṛṣṇāḥ] E_DH (°tṛṣṇās); tṛṣṇā K
[13] te yāvat tāvad] *em.*; tā yāvat tāvad K E_DH; de srid du TV (tāvad)
[14] tathābhūta°] K E_DH TVB_G (*de lta bu*); *no reflex in* TVA_D
[15] °kāyā°] K E_DH; dam pa'i sku TV (°satkāyā°)

2 prayojanādi

> śrīmantranītigatacārucaturthaseka-
> rūpaṃ vidanti na hi ye sphuṭaśabdaśūnyam |
> nānopadeśagaṇasaṃkulasaptabhedais
> teṣāṃ sphuṭāvagataye kriyate prayatnaḥ || 2 ||[ix]

śrīmantranītiśabdena[16] sāmānyayogatantravācakenāpi śrīsamājaḥ[17] parigṛhyate, caturthārthakasyānyatrāsambhavāt. śeṣaṃ subodham. nānācāryopadeśagaṇasaṃkulai[E_DH p. 133]r vyākulaiḥ[18] saptabhir bhedaiḥ prakārair[19] atītānāgatavartamānācārya[20]gatopadeśarāśisaṃ-grāhakaiḥ.[21,x] sphuṭāvagataye sukhena sphuṭapratītyartham[22] iti.

[ix] This verse is in Vasantatilakā.

[x] In this case TVB_G resembles closely the Sanskrit text transmitted in K, apart from the addition of a further gloss after *vyākula*. The reading *rnam par bkab pa* ('covered') doesn't yield much sense, but it could be a mistake for *rnam par bkang ba* ('filled'), which is perfectly fitting and synonymous with TVA_D's *rnam par khyab pa* (Negi records the latter as rendering *vipūrṇa* in some texts). One may wish to conjecture such a reading. TVA_D is significantly different here, e-ven though most of the words of the transmitted Sanskrit text are still reflected: *du ma'i man ngag ces bya ba la sogs pa la | 'das pa dang ma 'ongs pa dang | da ltar gyi slob dpon du ma'i man ngag gi tshogs yang dag par bsdus pa'i mdun gyi dbye bas yongs su dkrugs pa ni | rnam par dkrugs pas rnam pa thams cad la rnam par khyab pa ste | des bsgrub par bya ba dkrugs pa'o ||* The text is dubious but reflects a Sanskrit text along the following lines: *nānopadeśetyādi. atītānāgata-vartamānācāryopadeśarāśisaṃgrāhakaiḥ saptabhir bhedaiḥ saṃkulair vyākulaiḥ sarvatravipūrṇaiḥ taiḥ sādhyasaṃkulaiḥ.*

---

[16] śrīmantranītiśabdena] K E_DH TVB_G (dpal ldan sngags kyi gzhung lugs zhes bya ba'i sgras); dpal ldan sngags kyi gzhung lugs shes || zhes bya ba la sogs pa la | sngags kyi gzhung lugs zhes bya ba'i sgras ni | TVA_D (śrīmantranītigatetyādi. mantranītiśabdena)

[17] śrīsamājaḥ] K E_DH; shugs kyis dpal gsang ba 'dus pa TV (sāmarthyāt śrīsamājaḥ)

[18] vyākulaiḥ] K E_DH; rnam par dkrugs pas rnam pa thams cad la rnam par khyab pa TVA_D; rnam par 'khrugs pa rnam par bkab pa ste TVB_G; vyākulair vipūrṇaiḥ *possible conj.* (*see notes*)

[19] prakārair] K E_DH; *no reflex in* TV

[20] °vartamānā°] E_DH; °pravartamānā° K

[21] °gato°] K E_DH TVB_G (gtogs pa); *no reflex in* TVA_D

[22] sukhena sphuṭapratītyartham] K E_DH; bde bar gnas par khong du chud par bya ba'i phyir TVA_D; bde bar gsal bar khong du chud par bya'o TVB_G

3   tīrthikānāṃ tattvaṃ sādhyaṃ ca

> sambhrāntabodhā nikhilā hi tīrthyās
> tattvasya sādhyasya ca rūpavittau |
> tebhyaḥ prakṛṣṭaḥ kila tattvavettā
> vedāntavādīti janapravādaḥ || 3 ||[xi]

sambhrāntetyādi. sambhrānto vibhrānto bodhaḥ prajñāviśeṣo ye-
ṣāṃ tīrthikānāṃ te tatho[K fol. 3r]ktāḥ.[23] sarva eva tīrthyā ātmā-
tmīyagrahatimiropahatabuddhinayanāḥ. tattvam idam iti sādhyam
idam[24] iti ca tattvasya sādhyasya yat[25] svarūpam, tasya yā vittiḥ
pratītiḥ, tasyāṃ bhrāntāḥ. śeṣaṃ subodham.

nanu tattvasādhyayor upādeyatvenaikarūpatvāt kathaṃ tattva-
sya sādhyasya ceti[26,xii] bhedena nirdeśa iti cet. asad etat. tattvaṃ
hy upādeyatve 'pi[27] sukhaduḥkhopekṣādisakalapratibhāsasaṃdoha-
vyāpakam.[28] sādhyaṃ cānabhimataparihāreṇecchālakṣaṇaṃ pha-
lam upādeyatve 'pi sakalaprāṇibhir avaśyam evāsādhyavyāvṛttyā
sādhayitavyatvenābhimatam ity adoṣaḥ.

4   vedāntavādināṃ śrāvakapratyekabuddhānāṃ ca sādhyāni

tatra tāvad[29] vedāntavādyabhimataṃ sādhyam āha—ānandarūpam
ityādi.

[xi] This verse is in Indravajrā.

[xii] E_DH misreads the manuscript as *tattvasya sādhyasya ceti* and supplies *kathaṃ* after *ceti*. There is in fact a *kathaṃ* before *tattvasya* in the manuscript, but the *tat* preceding that *kathaṃ* is evidently a corruption.

---

[23] te tathoktāḥ] K^{pc}; te thoktāḥ K^{ac}; tathoktāḥ E_DH

[24] sādhyam idam] *em.*; sādhyaṃ cedam K E_DH

[25] yat] E_DH (*em.*); tat K

[26] kathaṃ tattvasya sādhyasya ceti] *em.*; tat kathaṃ tatvasya sādhyasya ceti K; tattvasya sādhyasya ceti kathaṃ E_DH (*em.*)

[27] upādeyatve 'pi] *conj.* (TV: blang bar bya ba nyid yin yang); upādeyatvenāpi K E_DH

[28] °vyāpakam] K (°kaṃ) E_DH TVB_G (khyab par byed pa yin la); shes bya tsam du khyab par byed pa yin la TVA_D (°vyāpakaṃ jñeyamātratvena)

[29] tāvad] K E_DH TVA_D (re zhig); *no reflex in* TVB_G

ānandarūpaṃ svavid[xiii] aprakampyaṃ
vedāntinaḥ sādhyam uṣanti śāntam[30] |
saśrāvakāḥ[31] khaḍgajināś ca sādhyam
icchanti rūpādyupadher virāmam || 4 ||

ānandarūpam iti sadā sukhamayatvāt. svavid iti jyotīrūpatvena[32]
svayaṃ prakāśamānatvāt.[33] aprakampyam iti nityatayā[34] kampayi-
tum aśakyatvāt. śāntam[35] iti kleśopakleśaśūnyatvena parikalpita-
tvāt. evaṃvidhaṃ sādhyam uṣanti kāmayante.

saha śrāvakair vartante ye khaḍgajināḥ khaḍgaviṣāṇakalpā e-
kacāriṇo vargacāriṇaś[36] ca pratyekabuddhās te sādhyam icchanti.
kīdṛśam? rūpādyupadher virāmaṃ rūpavedanāsaṃjñāsaṃskāravi-
jñānalakṣaṇānām upadhīnāṃ skandhānāṃ virāmaṃ vicchedam, ni-
rodham iti yāvat. [E$_{DH}$ p. 134] etad uktaṃ bhavati—sarvaśrāvaka-
pratyekabuddhāḥ sopadhiśeṣanirupadhiśeṣabhedena bhinne 'pi ni-
rvāṇe[37] nirupadhiśeṣam eva nirvāṇaṃ sā[K fol. 3v]kṣātkartavyatve-
na sādhyaṃ pratipannāḥ.

5   pāramitānayavādināṃ caturvidhaṃ sādhyam

idānīṃ pāramitānayavādinām abhimataṃ[38] caturvidhaṃ sādhyam
āha—ākāraśūnyam ityādi.

ākāraśūnyaṃ gaganendurūpaṃ
pratyātmavedyaṃ karuṇārasaṃ ca |
sallakṣaṇair bhūṣitam[39] arthakāri

[xiii] From the commentary it is clear that *svavid* is not in compound; thus, being
an accusative form of a feminine noun, we expect *svavidam*. The form may be
grammatically justifiable if it is treated as neuter adjective, akin to *vedavid*.

---

[30] śāntam] *corr.*; sāntam K E$_{DH}$; *no reflex in* TM$_D$

[31] saśrāvakāḥ] *em.*; saśrāvakā K E$_{DH}$

[32] jyotīrūpatvena] K; jyotirūpatvena E$_{DH}$

[33] prakāśamānatvāt] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); prakāśamānāt K

[34] nityatayā] E$_{DH}$; anityatayā K TV (mi rtag pa nyid kyis)

[35] śāntam] *corr.*; sāntam K E$_{DH}$

[36] vargacāriṇaś] K TV (tshogs kyi spyod pa); vanacāriṇaś E$_{DH}$

[37] nirvāṇe] E$_{DH}$; nirvāṇa° K

[38] abhimataṃ] E$_{DH}$; abhimata K

[39] bhūṣitam] E$_{DH}$; bhuṣitam K

10

dānādiniṣyandam apetasaukhyam || 5 ||

sānandasallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ
sambhujyamānaṃ daśabhūmisaṃsthaiḥ |
sattvārthakāri pravadanti sādhyaṃ
dānādiṣaṭpāramitānayasthāḥ || 6 ||[xiv]

5.1 pāramitānaye prathamaṃ sādhyam

ākārair nīlapītasukhaduḥkhādibhiś citrarūpaiḥ śūnyaṃ nirākāram.
ata eva gaganasyeva nirākāratvenendor iva prabhāsvaratvena rū-
paṃ svabhāvo yasya tat tathā. pratyātmavedyam iti svasaṃvedanai-
kavedyam.[40] karuṇā duḥkhād[41] duḥkhahetor vā sakalajagadabhyu-
ddharaṇakāmatā.[42,xv] saiva rasaḥ svabhāvo yasya tat tathoktam. e-
tad uktaṃ bhavati—nīlapītādicitrākāraśūnyaṃ nirābhāsaṃ[43] nira-
ñjanaṃ[xvi] gaganopamaṃ svacchaṃ sakalajagadarthakāri[xvii] mahā-
karuṇāyuktaṃ pratyātmavedyaṃ pāramitopadeśaśabdābhidheyaṃ
sādhyam iti pāramitānaye prathamaṃ sādhyam.

[xiv] These two verses are in Indravajrā.

[xv] An alternative to °abhyuddharaṇakāmatā is to read °samuddharaṇakāmatā.
This definition of *karuṇā*, in various forms, is well known in Buddhist texts.
See, for instance, Durvekamiśra's *Hetubinduṭīkāloka*: ... *duḥkhāt duḥkhahetor vā
samuddharaṇakāmatā nāma yā karuṇā* ... (p. 234); or Manorathānandin's *Pramā-
ṇavārttikavṛtti*: *duḥkhād duḥkhahetoś ca samuddharaṇakāmatā karuṇā* (edition
reads *dukhā°*; p. 21).

[xvi] One may instead wish to accept the manuscript reading *nirābhāsanirañjanaṃ*,
which is understandable as a *viśeṣaṇasamāsa*. The combination of *nirābhāsaṃ
nirañjanam* occurrs in a verse from an untraced source cited in Raviśrījñāna's
Amṛtakaṇikā: *yat kāyaṃ sarvabuddhānāṃ nirābhāsaṃ nirañjanam | ajñātam a-
kṛtaṃ śuddham abhāvādivivarjitam ||* (p. 19)

[xvii] *sakalajagadarthakāri* can also be read in compound with *mahākaruṇā°*. This
is reflected in TV: *'gro ba ma lus pa'i don byed pa'i snying rje chen po*. Regardless,
the two are evidently closely related.

---

[40] svasaṃvedanaikavedyam] E_DH (*em.*) (°vedyaṃ); svasaṃvedyanaikavedyaṃ K

[41] karuṇā duḥkhād] K; karuṇāduḥkhā° E_DH

[42] °abhyuddharaṇakāmatā] *em.*; °atyuddharaṇakāmatā K E_DH

[43] nirābhāsaṃ] *em.*; nirābhāsa° K E_DH

5.2 pāramitānaye dvitīyaṃ sādhyam

śobhanāni ca tāni lakṣaṇāni ca dvātriṃśallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni,[44,xviii]
tair bhūṣitam. arthaṃ janānāṃ prayojanaṃ kartuṃ śīlaṃ svabhāvo
yasya tad arthakāri.[45] dānādīnāṃ daśapāramitānāṃ niṣyandaṃ[xix]
tatprakarṣaprabhavatvena sadṛśaṃ phalam.[xx] duḥkhasya pūrvam
eva prahīṇatvāt, sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ[46,xxi] saukhyasyāpy abhā-
vāt,[47] upekṣārūpatvenāpetasaukhyam apagatasaukhyam. etad u-
ktaṃ bhavati—dvātriṃśallakṣaṇadharāśītyanuvyañjanavirājitaśarī-
raṃ sakalajagadarthakāri dānādipāramitābhyāsa†balenātmānaṃ[48]

---

xviii The manuscript reading *ceti* after *dvātriṃśallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni* appear super-
fluous. The commentary analyses *sallakṣaṇa* as a *karmadhāraya*, glossing *sat*
with *śobhana*; *dvātriṃśallakṣaṇa* serves as a clarification of that, requiring no fur-
ther conjunction. Likewise, the words *iti* and *saṃjñaka* together are redundant.
In TV, the *zhes bya* following the phrase may either render *iti* or *saṃjñaka*—we
find this rendering for the latter in the commentary on verse 9 for *mahāsukhasaṃ-
jñaka*. We cannot fully discount that Vāgīśvarakīrti wrote the transmitted reading,
nor can we give a clear explanation for the corruption, if it is one. Nonetheless,
given that this appears to be genuine redundancy rather than simply a stylistic
oddity, we provisionally conjecture a slightly smoother reading.

xix Here *niṣyandaṃ* should be understood either as an accusative form (as it is in
the verse) or (less likely) anomalously as a neuter noun.

xx cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 2.57c: *niṣyando hetusadṛśaḥ*. Vāgīśvarakīrti perhaps also
alludes to Dharmakīrti's definition of yogic perception in *Nyāyabindu* 11: *bhūtā-
rthabhāvanāprakarṣaparyantajaṃ yogijñānaṃ ceti*.

xxi Isaacson (personal communication) proposes *sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ* or *sā-
kṣātkṛtyāvasthāyāṃ* as potentially supperior readings to the manuscript's *sākṣā-
tkṛtāvatāsthāyāṃ* or the previous edition's *sākṣātkṛtāvasthāyāṃ*.

In support of the former, see Vāgīśvarakīrti's *Saṃkṣiptābhiṣekavidhi*: *tadanan-
taram ekatathatāmatena tayaiva bhinnamate tv ānayā svasaṃviditajñānasākṣāt-
karaṇāvasthāyāṃ pūrvoktagāthayā adhyeṣitavate śiṣyāya tatpāṇau tasyāḥ pāṇiṃ
pratisthāpya |* (p. 417)

---

44 dvātriṃśallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni] *conj.*; dvātriṃśallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni ceti K E$_{DH}$;
mdzes pa'i mtshan sum cu rtsa gnyis zhes bya ste TV (dvātriṃśatsallakṣaṇānīti /
dvātriṃśatsallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni)

45 tad arthakāri] K E$_{DH}$ TVA$_D$ (de ni don mdzad pa'o); de ni de'i don mdzad pa'o
TVB$_G$ (tad tadarthakāri)

46 sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ] *conj.* (Isaacson); sākṣātkṛtāvasthāyāṃ E$_{DH}$; sākṣā-
tkṛtāvatāsthāyāṃ K

47 abhāvāt] *em.* (Isaacson); abhāvatvāt K E$_{DH}$

48 °balenātmānaṃ] K E$_{DH}$; stobs kyis bdag nyid TVA$_D$; stobs kyis byung ba TVB$_G$

† samyaksaṃbuddharūpaṃ sukhaduḥkharahitatvenopekṣārūpaṃ dvitīyaṃ sādhyam.

5.3 pāramitānaye tṛtīyaṃ sādhyam

[E~DH~ p. 135] sānandetyādi. sahānandena vartata iti sā[K fol. 4r]nandam. sānandaṃ ca tat sallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ ca[49] sambhujyamānaṃ dharmadeśanādvāreṇopajīvyamānam.[50],[xxii] kaiḥ? daśabhūmīśvaraiḥ, pariśiṣṭabhūmisthitānām[51] agocaratvāt. daśabhūmiprāptair avalokiteśvaramañjuśrīprabhṛtibhir upabhujyamānam iti yāvat. etad uktaṃ bhavati—śuddhāvāsopari ghanavyūhasaṃjñake[52] samyaksaṃbuddhabhuvane yathā bhagavān ānandarūpaḥ sambhogakāyātmā nirmāṇadvāreṇa[53] sakalajagadarthasaṃpādakaḥ śrāvakapratyekabuddhanavabhūmīśvarair apy adṛśyaśarīro daśabhūmīśvarair eva paraṃ bodhisattvair[54] dharmaśravaṇadvāreṇopabhujyamāna[55] āsaṃsāraṃ cakāsti, tathaiva tat sādhyam iti tṛtīyam.

5.4 pāramitānaye caturthaṃ sādhyam

> saṃpūrya dānādiguṇān aśeṣān
> saṃbuddhakṛtyaṃ[56] sakalaṃ ca kṛtvā |
> yad bhūtakoṭeḥ karaṇaṃ ca sākṣāt
> sādhyaṃ tad apy asti nirodharūpam || 7 ||[xxiii]

[xxii] For *upajīvyamāna* we might expect *nye bar 'tsho ba* in Tibetan. Below *upabhujyamāna* is translated as *longs spyod par bya ba* and then *nye bar longs spyod par bya ba*.

[xxiii] This verse is in Indravajrā metre.

---

[49] sallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ ca] *em.* (Isaacson); sallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ K E~DH~

[50] °opajīvyamānam] K E~DH~; nye bar longs spyod par gyur pa'o TV (°opabhujyamānam)

[51] pariśiṣṭabhūmi°] *corr.*; pariśiṣṭa bhumi° E~DH~

[52] °saṃjñake] *em.*; °saṃjñako K; °saṃjñakaḥ E~DH~ (*em.*)

[53] nirmāṇadvāreṇa] K E~DH~; sprul pa'i sku'i sgo nas TV (nirmāṇakāyadvāreṇa)

[54] paraṃ bodhisattvair] K (°satvair) E~DH~; mchog tu gyur pa'i byang chub sems dpa' TV (paramabodhisattvair)

[55] °bhujyamāna] *em.*; °bhujyamānam K E~DH~

[56] saṃbuddhakṛtyaṃ] *em.* (*cf.* TaRaA-V: saṃbuddhānāṃ … avaśyakartavyaṃ kṛtsnaṃ); saṃbuddhya kṛtyaṃ K E~DH~

saṃpūryetyādi. dānādipāramitā eva guṇā, guṇyante[xxiv] 'bhyasyanta iti kṛtvā. tān saṃpūrya paripūrṇān[57] kṛtvā, yat saṃbuddhānāṃ kṛtyaṃ sakalam[58,xxv] avaśyakartavyaṃ kṛtsnaṃ tad api kṛtvā, bhūtakoṭeḥ śūnyatālakṣaṇāyāś cittacaittanirodhātmikāyā[59] yat sākṣāt karaṇaṃ tad api sādhyam astīti pāramitānayasthā evaṃ bruvate caturthaṃ sādhyam iti.

6   mantranaye saptavidhaṃ sādhyam

6.1   mantranaye prathamaṃ sādhyam

idānīṃ mantranayopadiṣṭaṃ saptavidham[60] sādhyaṃ kathayitum āha—svābhāṅganetyādi.

> svābhāṅganāśleṣi[61] janārthakāri[62]
> duḥkhaiḥ sukhaiś caiva vimuktirūpam |
> aśītyanuvyañjanabhūṣitāṅgam
> apetakalpaṃ pravadanti sādhyam || 8 ||[xxvi]

[xxiv] In the *Dhātupāṭha*, the tenth class verbal root √*guṇa* is said to express *āmantraṇa*. Here, however, this is a denominative verb with the sense of *āmreḍana* (multiplication/repetition) formed from the noun *guṇa*.

[xxv] The manuscript's reading of simply *sakalaṃ* instead of *kṛtyaṃ sakalam* is asymmetrical given the following gloss, *avaśyakartavyaṃ kṛtsnam*. Here TV reads simply *nges par mdzad par bya ba ma lus pa*, reflecting only the gloss and neither *sakalam* of K nor the conjecture *kṛtyaṃ sakalam*. It is also possible that *sakalam* is a mistaken scribal addition, but it's also possible that even if the Tibetan translators saw *kṛtyaṃ sakalam*, they chose not to render this because of the superfluous sounding result in Tibetan. We believe the manuscript's transmitted reading is improbable.

[xxvi] This verse is in Upajāti.

---

[57] paripūrṇān] *em.*; paripūrṇaṃ K E$_{DH}$

[58] kṛtyaṃ sakalam] *conj.*; sakalam K E$_{DH}$; *no reflex in TV*

[59] cittacaitta°] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); cittacaitya° K

[60] saptavidhaṃ] E$_{DH}$ (TM$_D$: rnam pa bdun); caturthaṃ K

[61] svābhāṅganāśleṣi] E$_{DH}$ (*corr.*); svābhāṅgaṇāśleṣi K

[62] janārthakāri] *conj.* (TM$_D$: 'gro ba yi don mdzad; TaRaA-V: jagadarthakāri); ta..rthakāri K (*akṣara uncertain, perhaps* gna *or* mva); tadarthakāri E$_{DH}$

svābhāṅganām[63] āśleṣituṃ śīlaṃ svabhāvo yasya tat svābhāṅganā-
śleṣi.[64] [E$_{DH}$ p. 136] apetakalpaṃ vyapagatakalpam, kalpanārahitam
iti yāvat. anyat subodham. ayam arthaḥ—samāliṅgitasvābhāṅganā-
śleṣi jagadarthakāri[65],[xxvii] dvātriṃśallakṣaṇavibhūṣitaśarīram[66] upe-
kṣārūpaṃ[67],[xxviii] prathamaṃ sādhyam.

6.2   mantranaye dvitīyaṃ sādhyam

svadevatākāraviśeṣaśūnyaṃ
prāg eva sambhāvya sukhaṃ sphuṭaṃ sat |
mahāsukhākhyaṃ jagadarthakāri
cintāmaṇiprakhyam uvāca kaścit || 9 ||[xxix]

svadevatetyādi. svadevatākāraviśeṣeṇa[68] sveṣṭadevatākāreṇa śū-
nyam, nirākāram iti yāvat. prāg eva prathamataram[69] upadeśāna-

[xxvii] The compound °svābhāṅganāśleṣajagadarthakāri is strictly speaking not im-
possible, and could perhaps be interpreted as an instrumental tatpuruṣa; how-
ever, given that this is a prose explanation of the verse, there is no need for the
author to use such a compound and it seems more likely that the scribe left off
the ikāra.

[xxviii] Something along the lines of āsaṃsārasthāyi sākṣāt kriyata iti may have dro-
pped out of the text here given TV, but there is no very compelling reason to
think that it did. The additional words are relevant, given that it is a pertinent
feature of the first sādhya that it remains active for as long as saṃsāra continues
to exist. We can be reasonably sure that TV reflects āsaṃsārasthāyi with 'khor
ba ji srid du bzhugs pa, as this is the Tibetan rendering of this word in the next
section.

[xxix] This verse is Viparītākhyānikī metre.

[63] svābhāṅganām] E$_{DH}$ (corr.); svābhāṅgaṇām K

[64] svābhāṅganāśleṣi] corr.; svābhāṅgaṇāśleṣi K E$_{DH}$

[65] °svābhāṅganāśleṣi jagadarthakāri] conj. (TVB$_G$: nyid dang mtshungs pa'i lha
mos 'khyud pa can 'gro ba'i don mdzad pa); °svābhāṅganāśleṣajagadarthakāri K
E$_{DH}$; nyid dang mtshungs pa'i lha mos 'khyud pa can | 'gro ba ma lus pa'i don
mdzad pa TVA$_D$ (°svābhāṅganāśleṣy aśeṣajagadarthakāri)

[66] śarīram] E$_{DH}$; śarīra K

[67] upekṣārūpaṃ] K E$_{DH}$; btang snyoms kyi ngo bo du 'khor ba ji srid du bzhugs
pa mngon du bya ba yin no zhe bya ba TVA$_D$; btang snyoms kyi ngo bo nyid du
'khor ba ji bzhugs pa mngon sum du bya ba yin zhes bya ba TVB$_G$ (upekṣārūpaṃ
āsaṃsārasthāyi sākṣāt kriyata iti)

[68] svadevatā°] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (rang lha'i); lha TVA$_D$ (devatā°)

[69] prathamataram] K; prathamataro° E$_{DH}$

ntaram eva[70],[xxx] devatākāranirapekṣaṃ sukhaṃ sambhāvya, bhāva-
nayā sākṣāt kṛtvā, sphuṭaṃ[71],[xxxi] sphu[K fol. 4v]ṭīkṛtaṃ san mahā-
sukhasaṃjñakaṃ bhavati. tac ca jagadarthakāri cintāmaṇisamāna-
rūpam. etad uktaṃ bhavati—upadeśānantaram eva mantramudrāde-
vatākārarahitaṃ[72] bhāvanayā sphuṭīkṛtaṃ mahāsukhasaṃjñakaṃ
cintāmaṇivaj jagadarthakāri[73] māyopamam āsaṃsārasthāyi dvitī-
yaṃ sādhyam.

6.3   mantranaye tṛtīyaṃ sādhyam

> kṛtvā sākṣāt svādhipaṃ [K fol. 1v] sātarūpaṃ
> paścāt tyaktvā sātamātraṃ phalaṃ syāt |
> śuddhaṃ sākṣāc chakyate naiva kartuṃ
> tenākāro bhāvitaḥ svādhipasya || 10 ||[xxxii]

kṛtvetyādi. svādhipaṃ sveṣṭadaivataṃ sākṣāt kṛtvāmukhīkṛtya sāta-
rūpaṃ sukhaikasvabhāvam, paścād devatākāraṃ parityajya, sukha-
mātraṃ[74] phalaṃ sādhyaṃ vyavasthitaṃ syāt.

   nanu yadi[75] sākṣāt kṛtvāpi devatākāras tyaktavyaḥ, tarhi pratha-
mam eva kasmād [E_DH p. 137] vibhāvitaḥ? sukhamātram eva dvitī-

---

[xxx] Normally *bshad ma thag pa* in Tibetan has the sense of *anantarokta*, but here
the translator probably did intend it to render *upadeśānantaram eva* as we find
the same rendering later in the paragraph.

[xxxi] The understanding offered by TV, which reflects *asphuṭaṃ* instead of *sphu-
ṭaṃ*, appears to indicate a misunderstanding on the translator's part, confusing
the word division of *kṛtvā sphuṭam*. It is not possible for *sphuṭīkṛtaṃ* to take an ac-
cusitve object, nor is a form such as *sphuṭīkṛtya* possible without larger changes
to the text.

[xxxii] This verse is in Śālinī metre.

---

[70] upadeśānantaram eva] E_DH (*em.*); upadeśāntaram eva K; bshad ma thag pa'i TV
[71] sphuṭaṃ] K; *deest in* E_DH; ma gsal ba TV
[72] °rahitaṃ] K E_DH TVB_G (spangs ste); spangs te | bde ba 'ba' zhig tsam TVA_D
(°rahitaṃ sukhamātra°)
[73] jagadarthakāri] K E_DH TVB_G ('gro ba'i don mdzad pa); 'gro ba ma lus pa'i don
mdzad pa TVA_D (aśeṣajagadarthakārī)
[74] sukhamātraṃ] *em.*; sukhamātra° K E_DH
[75] nanu yadi] *conj.*; nanu K E_DH; gal te TVA_D ([nanu] yadi); *no clear reflex* TVB_G

yasādhyavat kiṃ na vibhāvitam?[76] kiṃ vṛthāprayāsenety[77] āha—
śuddham ityādi. śuddhaṃ kevalaṃ devatākāravirahitaṃ sukhamā-
traṃ naiva sākṣāt kartuṃ śakyate, ākārarahitasya sukhasyānupa-
lambhāt.[78] tasmāt tena kāraṇenākāro bhāvitaḥ svādhipasyeti tṛtī-
yam.[79] ayam arthaḥ[80]—devatākārasaṃvalitam eva sukhaṃ vibhā-
vya, sākṣādbhūte devatākāraṃ tyaktvā, sukhamātram eva sādhyam
uktaguṇam.[xxxiii]

6.4   mantranaye caturthaṃ sādhyam

gagaṇasamaśarīraṃ lakṣaṇair bhūṣitāṅgaṃ
nirupamasukhapūrṇaṃ[81] svābhayā saṃgataṃ ca |
sphuradamitamunīndraiḥ[82] sarvasattvārthakārī
pravadati punar anyaḥ sādhyam ucchedaśūnyam || 11 ||[xxxiv]

gagaṇetyādi. gagaṇasamaṃ māyopamaṃ vicārāsahaṃ[83] śarīraṃ ya-
sya. lakṣaṇair dvātriṃśadbhir[84] aśītibhiś cānuvyañjanair maṇḍitāny
aṅgāni yasya. nirupamaiḥ sthaulya[85]-nairantarya[86]-āsaṃsārapravā-

---

[xxxiii] Here TV reads *yon tan du 'chad do*, whereas K transmits the reading *uktagu-
ṇam.* It is difficult to say if the Tibetan rendering represents a different underlying
Sanskrit reading, but it does convey a different sense. Whereas the Tibetan seems
to say that the *sādhya* 'is taught to be a good quality', the Sanskrit suggests the
meaning 'which has the previously mentioned qualities'.
[xxxiv] This verse is in Mālinī metre.

---

[76] vibhāvitam] *em.*; vibhāvitaḥ E_DH (*em.*); vibhāgato K

[77] vṛthāprayāsenety] E_DH; vyathāprayāsenety K

[78] sukhasyā°] K E_DH TVB_G (bde ba); bde ba 'ba' zhig TVA_D (kevalasukhasyā°)

[79] °eti tṛtīyam] *em.* TVB_G (zhes bya ba gsum pa yin no); °eti tṛtīyaḥ K E_DH; ste
bsgrub par bya ba gsum pa yin no TVA_D (tṛtīyaṃ sādhyam)

[80] arthaḥ] E_DH; artha K

[81] nirupama°] E_DH; nirūpama° K

[82] °munīndraiḥ] *em.*; °munīndraḥ K E_DH

[83] māyopamaṃ vicārāsahaṃ] K (*slightly unclrear*); māyopamavicārasaha E_DH

[84] lakṣaṇair dvātriṃśadbhir] K E_DH; mtshan gyi ste | mtshan sum cu rtsa gnyis
TVA_D; mtshan gyis te | mtshan sum cu rtsa gnyis TVB_G (lakṣaṇair [iti] dvātriṃ-
śadbhir lakṣaṇair)

[85] sthaulya°] K E_DH; rgya nom pa nyid dang | rgya che ba nyid dang TVA_D (praṇī-
tatvasthaulya°); lhun che ba nyid dang | TVB_G (sthaulya°)

[86] °nairantarya°] E_DH (*em.*) (TV: bar med pa nyid dang); °nairuttaryā° K

hitva[87]-nirāsravatvādibhir upamābhāvād upamātikrāntaiḥ sukhaiḥ pūrṇaṃ romāgraparyantaṃ[88,xxxv] saṃpūrṇam.[xxxvi] svābhayā ca tathābhūtayā saṃgataṃ samāliṅgitam. sphuradbhir[89] anantanirmitair munīndrais tathābhūtair eva sarvasattvārthakāri.[90] ucchedeneti nirodhena śūnyaṃ tucchaṃ riktam.[91]

etad uktaṃ bhavati—gagana-māyā-marīci[92]-gandharvanagara--udakacandra-pratibimba-svapnopamam[93,94] [K fol. 5r] ekānekabhāvābhāvagrāhyagrāhakasvabhāvarahitam anādyantam aśeṣavastusaṃdohasvabhāvam[95,xxxvii] anābhāsaṃ nirañjanaṃ sarvopamātikrāntaṃ paramasūkṣmātigambhīraprajñārūpatayā dharmakāyasvabhā-

---

xxxv This conjecture follows the Tibetan translation, with the reading in K being difficult to account for. See, for instance, a similar expression in *Siddhaikavīrasādhana* (author unknown): *tato niḥsṛtaraśmibhir ā pādatalād vālāgraparyāntaprāptaṃ bhāvyate* (*Sādhanamālā* no. 67, vol. 1, p. 67); *de las byung ba'i 'od zer gyis rkang pa'i mthil nas skra'i rtse mo'i mthar thug pa khyab par bsgoms te* (Tōh. 3461 fol. 116r). ADD REFERENCE

xxxvi TO CHECK: TVA$_D$ appears to be defective here, with different readings in Derge Koyosan and Delhi. TVA$_D$: *ba spu'i rtse mo'i mthar thug par gyur pa'o* || (*gyur pa'o* ||] Koyosan; *gyur ba'i* Delhi [MW23703]). TVB$_G$: *ba spu'i rtse mo'i mthar thug par yang dag par gang bar gyur pa'o* ||

xxxvii TV is perhaps ambiguous and may not reflect a different reading of the Sanskrit if *thog ma dang tha ma med pa'i* is understood to qualify *rang bzhin* instead of *dngos po.*

---

87 °āsaṃsārapravāhitva°] *em.*; °āsaṃsāraṃpravāhitva° E$_{DH}$ K

88 pūrṇaṃ romāgraparyantaṃ] *conj.* (TV: gang ba ni | ba spu rtse mo'i mthar thug pa); pūrṇṇaṃ masimāgrapayantaṃ K; pūrṇatāṃ samāśrayantaṃ E$_{DH}$

89 sphuradbhir] K E$_{DH}$; 'phro bar gyur pa de yang TVA$_D$ (sphuradbhir tair api) (*other syntactic placement possible*); 'phro ba yang TVB$_G$ (sphurdbhair api)

90 sarvasattvārtha°] K E$_{DH}$ (TVB$_G$: sems can thams cad kyi don); sems can gyi don TVA$_D$ (sattvārtha°)

91 tucchaṃ riktaṃ] K; bhūsthaṃ riktam E$_{DH}$; spangs pa'o TV (tucchaṃ / riktaṃ)

92 māyāmarīci°] K E$_{DH}$ (TVB$_G$: sgyu ma dang | smig rgyu dang |); sgyu ma dang | smig rgyu dang | smig rgyu dang | TVA$_D$ (māyāmarīcīndrajāla° / māyendrajālamarīci°)

93 °svapnopamam] E$_{DH}$; svapnāpayaṃ K

94 TVA$_D$ adds an element to the list, perhaps *indrajāla* in Sanskrit. The reading has the advantage of form a list of eight, but this precise list is otherwise unattested as a list of eight illusions.

95 anādyantam aśeṣavastusaṃdohasvabhāvam] K E$_{DH}$; thog ma dang tha ma med pa'i dngos po ma lus pa'i rang bzhin TV (anādyantāśeṣavastusvabhāvam)

vam, dvātriṃśallakṣaṇavibhūṣitaśarīram aśītyanuvyañjanavirājita-
gātraṃ[96] paramaśṛṅgārayauvanādyupetaṃ svābhāṅganāliṅgitāṅgaṃ
rūpavajrāditārāparyantadevīgaṇair anantaprabhedānimittarati[97]sva-
rūpaparamānandopabhogadvāreṇa[xxxviii] pratibimbavat [E_DH p. 138]
sambhujyamānaṃ karuṇāsaṃvalitodārarūpatayā sambhogakāya-
rūpam, nānādhimuktivineyajanaparipācanārtham[xxxix] anekavidha-
prātihāryadvāreṇa[98] nirmitānantakulāntarbhūtasaṃbuddhabodhi-

---

[xxxviii] The compound beginning *anantaprabheda°* is challenging to unpack and not
entirely secure in its reading. K transmits the compound in a way that includes
either the word *arati* or *ārati*, neither of which can reject *prima facia*. TVA_D sugge-
sts reading *rati*, while TVB_G has no reflex of the word but may be corrupt, given
that it sounds rather incomplete. TVB_G is also missing a reflex of *bheda*, although
it does have one of *pra* from *prabheda*, also indicating corruption. The term *ani-
mittarati* or *mtshan ma med pa'i dga' ba* does occurr in Jñānapāda's *Samantabha-
drasādhana*: *animittarativiśuddheḥ samastadevīgaṇasvabhāvaṃ tat* | (122ab; reco-
nstructed in **szantosaccone2023**); *mtshan ma med pa'i dga' ba rnam dag pa* | *ma
lus lha mo'i tshogs kyi ngo bo nyid* || (Tōh. 1855 fol. 34r5; the translation in Tōh.
1856 by Smṛtijñānakīrti poses some problems and need not be dealt with here);
'Because of purification by signless pleasure, that [awareness] has as its nature
the group of all goddesses.' This parralel does lend support to reading *animittarati*,
but the context is technical and esoteric, so some caution is due.
As for the analysis of the compound, while various possibilities may be entertai-
ned, the main ambiguity is whether *anantaprabheda* qualifies *animittarati* or *pa-
ramānanda*. An analysis on the basis of the former could read: *anantāḥ prabhedāḥ
yasya sānantaprabhedānimittaratiḥ, tatsvarūpasya paramānandasyopabhogaḥ, ta-
ddvāreṇa*. Of the Tibetan translation, while TVA_D renders all words found in the
Sanskrit text as constitued in some form, it is hard to intrepret if one does not re-
move or modify various instrumental and genitive particles. From *rūpavajrā°* up
to *sambhujyamānaṃ*, TVA_D reads: *gzugs rdo rje la sogs pa nas* | *sgrol ma'i mthar
thug pa'i lha mo'i tshogs kyis mtshan ma med pa'i dga' ba'i rang gi ngo bo'i rab
tu dbye ba dpag tu med pas mchog tu dga' ba la nye bar longs spyod pa'i sgo nas
| gzugs brnyan dang 'dra bas yang dag par longs spyod pa*. TVB_G has the same
readings, apart from the two suspected lacunae mentioned above.
[xxxix] E_DH misreports K as reading *paripāvanārtha*.

---

[96] °gātraṃ] K E_DH; *no reflext in* TV
[97] anantaprabhedānimittarati°] *conj.* (TVA_D: mtshan ma med pa'i dga' ba'i rang
gi ngo bo'i rab tu dbye ba dpag tu med pas); anantaprabhedānimittārati° KE_DH;
mtshan ma med pa'i rang gi ngo bo'i rab tu dpag tu med pas TVB_G
[98] anekavidhaprātihārya°] K E_DH; rdzu 'phrul dang cho 'phrul rnam pa du ma
TVA_D TVB_G (anekaṛddhiprātihārya°)

sattvaspharaṇasaṃhārakāritvena[99] nirmāṇakāyātmakam, śūnyatā-
karuṇābhinnabodhicitta[100]svabhāvāmalaprajñopāyasamādhisambhū-
tasatsukhāpūrṇam[xl] āsaṃsārasthitidharmaṃ[101] apratiṣṭhitanirvāṇa-
rūpaṃ nirmalanivātaniścalapradīpaśikhāprabandhanityatayā niro-
dhaśūnyaṃ caturthaṃ[102] sādhyam.

6.5 mantranaye pañcamaṃ sādhyam

> kṛtvā sākṣāt svādhipaṃ sātarūpaṃ
> tyaktvopekṣājñānamātraṃ[103] phalaṃ syāt |
> āsaṃsārasthāyi sattvārthakāri
> cintā[104]ratnaprakhyam[105] ekāntaśāntam || 12 ||[xli]

kṛtvetyādi. sākṣāt svādhipaṃ kṛtvā, paścāt[106] tyaktvā, upekṣārūpaṃ
yaj jñānaṃ tanmātraṃ sādhyaṃ syāt. anyat sugamam.[107] etad u-
ktaṃ bhavati—maṇḍalacakrarūpaṃ sākṣāt kṛtvā, paścāt tan niro-
dhya, upekṣājñānamātraṃ sādhyaṃ syāt pañcamam.

6.6 mantranaye ṣaṣṭhaṃ sādhyam

> kṛtvā sākṣān maṇḍalaṃ sātarūpaṃ
> paścāt tasya svecchayā nirvṛtiś[108,xlii] ca |

[xl] See Sahajavilāsa, *Svādhiṣṭhānakurukullāsādhana* (SāMā no. 183, p. 383): *tataḥ
prajñopāyāmalasamādhisambhūtasatsukhāpūrṇam iva svadehaṃ trailokya ca pa-
śyet.*

[xli] This verse is in Śālinī metre.

[xlii] Here the intended meaning, as stated in the commentary, is 'cesation'. In the

---

[99] °bodhisattva°] *conj.* (TVB_G: byang chub sems dpa'i); °bodhi° K E_DH; byang chub
sems dpa' la sogs pa'i TVA_D (°bodhisattvādi°)

[100] °bodhicitta°] E_DH; °bodhicittā° K

[101] °dharmaṃ] *conj.* (TV: chos can); °dharmāṇāṃ K E_DH

[102] caturthaṃ] E_DH; caturtha K

[103] tyaktvopekṣā°] K (E_DH *incorrectly reports as* tyajyo°) (TaRaa-Vi: tyaktvā, upe-
kṣārūpaṃ yaj jñānaṃ); bhāvopekṣā° E_DH (*em.*); no reflex in TM_D CHECK

[104] cintā°] K^{pc} E_DH; cittā° K^{ac}

[105] °prakhyam] E_DH; °prakhyaṃm K

[106] paścāt] E_DH; paścāta K

[107] sugamam] E_DH; sūgamaṃ K

[108] nirvṛtiś] K; nirvṛtiṃ E_DH

sattvārthasyāpy asti abhāvo na vāsmin
prādurbhāvo nirvṛtād[109] asti yasmāt || 13 ||[xliii]

kṛtvetyādi. kṛtvā sākṣān maṇḍalaṃ sātasaṃvalitam,[110] tasya sve-
cchayā nirvṛtir nirodhaḥ.

nanu yadi sākṣāt kṛtvāpi paścāt svecchayā nirodhayita[K fol.
5v]vyam,[111] tadā karuṇāyā anekakālābhyastāyā abhāvaḥ syāt. ta-
syāś cābhāvāt sattvārthābhāvaḥ [E_DH p. 139] syād ity āśaṅkyāha
—sattvārthasyāpy asti abhāvo na vetyādi. asmin pakṣe sattvārtha-
bhāvo nāsti, yasmān nirvṛtāc cakrāt karuṇāsaṃvalitāt sattvārthasya
prādurbhāvo 'sti.[xliv]

etenaitad evāha—sātasaṃpūrṇacakraṃ[xlv] sākṣāt kṛtvā, yāvad i-
ṣṭaṃ kālaṃ vyavasthāpya, paścāt tasya sarvathaiva pradīpavan ni-
rodhaṃ kṛtvā sthātavyam.[112,xlvi] yadā punaḥ sattvārthābhilāṣo bha-

---

lengthy discussion of this position the author later uses the more expected term,
'*nivṛtti*', which is not metrically viable here.

[xliii] This verse is in Śālinī metre.

[xliv] The syntax of TV suggests reading *karuṇāsaṃvalitasya*: *'gags pa'i 'khor lo las
snying rje'i rang bzhin can sems can gyi don* ('gags pa'i] TVB_G; 'gog pa'i TVA_D)
However, *karuṇāsaṃvalita* naturally qualifies *cakra* and not *sattvārtha*.

[xlv] Here one may wish to emend to *sātasaṃpūrṇaṃ cakraṃ* to avoid the *karma-
dhāraya*, given that the author did not previously use a *karmadhāraya* when refe-
rring to this (e.g., *maṇḍalaṃ sātasaṃvalitam*). Nevertheless, such a *karmadhāraya*
is not in any obvious way out of the normal scope of Vāgīśvarakīrti's usage.

[xlvi] It is possible that *kṛtvā sthātavyam* was missing from the original text or from
the version of it consulted by the Tibetan translators; alternatively, it is possible
that the translators simply didn't feel it was necessary to explicitly render. The
agent of *sthātavya* can be understood to be the unspecified *sādhaka* who is a-
lso the agent of the gerunds earlier in the sentence. Although a genudive of the
causative of √*sthā*, *sthātavya* here has no object that is specified apart from the
sādhaka himself: i.e., he should make himself rest or establish himself in a state
by doing what is described. The construction is frequently used in the *Hevajra-
tantra*, such as in 2.3.44: *satataṃ devatāmūrtyā sthātavyaṃ yoginā yataḥ*; '… for
the *yogin* should always establish himself/remain with the form of the deity.'

---

[109] nirvṛtād] E_DH; nivṛtād K

[110] sātasaṃvalitam] *em.* (TV: bde ba'i rang bzhin can); sātaṃ saṃvalitaṃ K E_DH

[111] nirodhayitavyam] *em.*; nirodhayitavyaḥ K E_DH

[112] nirodhaṃ kṛtvā sthātavyam] K E_DH; 'gog pa yin no TV (nirodhaḥ)

vati, tadā[113] niruddhād eva cakrāntaram utpādya sattvārthaḥ karta-
vyaḥ. cakrāntarotpāde[114] 'pi ciraniruddhād[115] eva cakrād yathābha-
vyatayā[116] vineyānāṃ yathābhilaṣitaprāptir bhavatīti ṣaṣṭham.[117]

6.7 mantranaye saptamaṃ sādhyam

> kṛtvā sphuṭaṃ rūpam abhīṣṭam eṣāṃ
> paścān nirodhaṃ[118,xlvii] phalam āha kaścit |
> abhinnarūpaś ca yato nirodho
> na pakṣabhede 'pi tato 'sti bhedaḥ || 14 ||[xlviii]

kṛtvetyādi. ṣaṇṇāṃ pakṣāṇām anyatamasya phalasya[119] sādhyatvād
yad yad evābhiṣṭaṃ[120] tad[121] eva sākṣāt kṛtvā, paścāt sarvathaiva
pradīpavan nirodha uttarakālaṃ sattvārthādiśūnyaḥ sākṣāt karta-
vyaḥ.

nanu ṣaṭpakṣabhedena ṣaḍ eva[122] nirodhāḥ syuḥ. tat katham eka
eva nirodha ity āśaṅkyāha—abhinnetyādi. abhinnaṃ[123] rūpaṃ ya-
sya sa tathā.[124] na hi nirodhānāṃ ṣaṭpakṣalakṣaṇabhede 'pi bhedo

---

xlvii Both readings—*nirodhaḥ* and *nirodhaṃ*—are possible, but the former is suppo-
rted by the following two verses, which have a similar structure in the second
pāda with a nominative form preceding *āha*: °*svādas turyaṃ sekam āhāvaraṃ tat*
|

xlviii This verse is in Rāmā metre.

---

113 tadā] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (de'i tshe); de'i TVA$_D$ (tad° ?)

114 cakrāntarotpāde] E$_{DH}$; cakrāntaropāde K

115 ciraniruddhād] *em.* (TV: ring du 'gags pa'i); citaniruddhād K; cittaniruddhād
E$_{DH}$

116 yathābhavyatayā] *variant word division in* E$_{DH}$: yathā bhavyatayā

117 ṣaṣṭham] K (ṣaṣṭaṃ) E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (drug pa'o); bsgrub par bya ba drug pa'o TVA$_D$
(sādhyaṃ ṣaṣṭham)

118 nirodhaḥ] *em.*; nirodha(ṃ) K (*fort. corr.* ḥ); nirodhaṃ E$_{DH}$

119 anyatamasya phalasya] *conj.*; arthaphalasya K E$_{DH}$; nang nas 'bras bu TV

120 phalasya sādhyatvād yad yad evābhiṣṭaṃ] K E$_{DH}$; 'bras bu bsgrub bya gang kho
na TVA$_D$ (phalaṃ sādhyaṃ yad eva); 'bras bu bsgrub bya gang kho na mngon par
'dod pa TVB$_G$ (phalaṃ sādhyaṃ yad evābhiṣṭam)

121 tad] E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (de); sad K; *no reflex in* TVA$_D$

122 ṣaḍ eva] E$_{DH}$; ṣatreva K

123 abhinnaṃ] E$_{DH}$; abhinna K

124 sa tathā] *em.*; tat tathā K E$_{DH}$

'sti, abhāvaikarūpatayā nirodhasya samānatvāt. ayam arthaḥ—anya-tamapakṣaṃ sākṣāt kṛtvā paścāt tasya santānocchedarūpo nirodha iti saptamaṃ sādhyam.

7 caturthaseke vipratipattayaḥ

7.1 caturthaseke vipratipattiḥ prathamā

> prajñājñānād uttaraṃ bodhicittā-
> svādas turyaṃ sekam[125] āhāvaraṃ tat |
> yasmāt[126] sarvo bhāvanāsu prayāso
> vyarthaḥ prāptas tatphalasya prasiddheḥ[127,xlix] || 15 ||[l]

[E$_{DH}$ p. 140] prajñājñānetyādi. prajñājñānopadeśād uttarakālam[128,li] yat bodhicittasyāmṛtarūpasya[129] rasanayā grahaṇam, tat turyaṃ ca-turthaṃ [K fol. 6r] sekam āha kaścit. tac cāvaraṃ hīnam, vinikṛṣṭam

---

xlix TM$_D$'s reading *rab tu mi rung phyir* is suprising, given that the commentary, presumably executed by the same tranlator, reads *rab tu grub pa nyid* [*kyi phyir*].

l This verse is in Śālinī metre.

li TV indicates that the text may have included a compound analaysis of *prajñā-jñāna*, but if so, it is unclear what kind of compound this analysis signifies. If it is for a *karmadhāraya*, we would expect the TV to read as it does elsewhere for such analyses, with something like *shes rab kyang de nyid yin la | ye shes kang de nyid yin* (cf. the commentary on 5cd). The reading in TVB$_G$ is probably corrupt after *phyis te*: *byang chub* appears to have been moved from the following clause with *bodhicitta* to this clause. Perhaps the text should read *phyis te rdzogs pa'i dus so || gang zhe na |*. Taken altogether, TV suggests the translator may have had a different reading here, but no compelling emendation is indicated.

---

125 sekam] E$_{DH}$; seṣam K
126 yasmāt] E$_{DH}$ (TV: gang phyir) (TaRaA-Vi: yasmāt); paścāt K
127 prasiddheḥ] K E$_{DH}$; rab tu mi rung phyir TM$_D$ (aprasiddheḥ?)
128 prajñājñānopadeśād uttarakālaṃ] K E$_{DH}$; shes rab dang ye shes ni shes rab ye shes te | dbang bskur ba'i bye brag go || phyis ni 'das pa'i 'og tu'o || gang zhe na | TVA$_D$ (prajñājñānetyādi. prajñā ca jñānaṃ prajñājñānaṃ sekaviśeṣaḥ. uttaram paścāt. kim iti); shes rab dang ye shes te | dbang bskur ba'i bye brag go || phyis te rdzogs pa'i dus kyi byang chub gang zhe na | TVB$_G$
129 bodhicittasyāmṛtarūpasya] *em.* (TVA$_D$: byang chub kyi sems te bdud rtsi'i ngo bo); saṃ bodhicittasyāmṛtarūpasya K E$_{DH}$; sems te bdud rtsi'i ngo bo TVB$_G$ (cittasya)

iti yāvat. kasmād avaram? yasmāt sarvaprayāso mantramudrādevatādyākārabhāvanāsu punaḥ punar anuṣṭhānalakṣaṇas tathāgatokto[130] vyarthaḥ prāptaḥ.[lii] kutaḥ? tatphalasya bhāvanāsādhyasya phalasya bodhicittāsvādakāla eva prasiddhatvāt prāptatvāt,[131] anyasya viśiṣṭasya phalasyābhāvād iti yāvat.

7.2 caturthaseke vipratipattir dvitīyā

> prajñājñānād uttaraṃ prāptarāmā
> svādas turyaṃ sekam āhādhamaṃ tat |
> yasmāt sarvo bhāvanādau prayatno
> buddhoddiṣṭo niṣphalaḥ saṃprasaktaḥ || 16 ||[liii]

prajñetyādi. prajñājñānād uttarakālaṃ yāḥ prāptā yathāmilitā rāmāḥ striyas tāsāṃ samāpattidvāreṇa[132] ya āsvādaḥ, tat turyaṃ sekam. tad apy adhamam. śeṣaṃ gatārtham.

[lii] TV reflects basically the same words as transmitted in K but with an understanding that may reflect a different underlying reading. Whereas the Sanskrit text as transmitted in K appears to suggest primarily one thing that would be *vyartha* on this position—namely, *sarvaprayāsa* taught by the *tathāgata*s that is characterised by repeated *anuṣṭhāna* directed at meditations on mantras and so forth. TV, on the other hand, seems to understand two items that would be *vyartha*: namely, *sarvaprayāsa* and *sgrub pa'i mtshan nyid*, probably *anuṣṭhānalakṣaṇa: gang gi phyir sngags dang phyag rgya dang | lha nyid la sogs pa'i rnam pa bsgom pa la yang dang yang du 'bad pa dang | gzhan yang de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa'i sgrub pa'i mtshan nyid don med pa thob par 'gyur ro ||* 'Because it would follow that repeated effort in meditation … and, what's more (*gzhan yang*; Skt. *ca*?), what is characterised as practice taught by the *tathāgata*s would be useless'. This understanding is made more noteworthy by the manuscripts reading the dual *tathāgatoktau*, but that may be just conicidental given the understnading reflected in TV is not very compelling on the level of overall sense.
[liii] This verse is in Śālinī metre.

---

[130] tathāgatokto] E$_{DH}$; tathāgatoktau K
[131] prasiddhatvāt prāptatvāt] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (grub pa nyid dang | thob pa nyid dang |); rab tu grub pa nyid dang | TVA$_D$ (prasiddhatvāt)
[132] samāpattidvāreṇa] E$_{DH}$; rig pa'i sgo nas TVA$_D$ (rig *fort. pro* reg); reg pa'i sgo nas TVB$_G$ (sparṣadvāreṇa)

7.3 āgamasya vyākhyānam

atha[133] caturthaṃ tat punas tatheti[134,liv] vyākhyāyate. caturtham
iti[135] prajñājñānaṃ tṛtīyam apekṣya caturtham ity ucyate. tad iti ta-
cchabdena tad eva prajñājñānaṃ tadrūpaṃ[136] parāmṛśyate.[lv] punar
iti punaḥśabdena tasmād viśeṣaḥ. viśeṣaś cātra[137] nirāsravaniruttā-
rātyantasphītāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva[138]lakṣaṇaḥ.[139,lvi]   ta-
theti tathāśabdena tādṛṣatvam abhidhīyate. tādṛṣatvaṃ ca yādṛśyā
prajñādiyuktayā[140] sāmagryā yādṛśaṃ prajñājñānam utpannam, pa-
ścād api tādṛśyaiva sāmagryā tathaiva cotpadyate, nānyatheti tathā-
śabdārthaḥ.

atra ca lakṣyalakṣaṇabhāvenārtho[141,lvii] boddhavyaḥ. lakṣyate
'neneti lakṣaṇam anubhūyamānaṃ prajñājñānam, apratīyamāna-

---

liv *Samājottara* 113f

lv The referent of *tat* in *tadrūpaṃ* is evidently *caturtham*. TVB_G essentially reflects
the transmitted Sanskrit reading but *eva*, if it is rendered by *nyid*, is slightly out
of place.

lvi E_DH emends *niruttara* to *nirantara* stating that this reading is *bhoṭānusārī*, but
the situation in TV is slightly more complex. The transmitted Sanskrit suggests
reading a string of adjectives starting with *anāsrava* that qualify *pravāhitva*. Here
reading *nirantara* and *avicchinaprabandha* would lead to redundancy. TV instead
renders a series of abstract nouns before *pravāhitva*, with TVA_D including some-
thing reflective of *nairantarya* (*bar ma chad pa nyid*). Both versions of TV lack a
reflex of *niruttara*.

lvii For *lakṣyalakṣaṇabhāva*, TVA_D reads *mtshon par bya ba'i don mtshan par byed*

---

[133] atha] K E_DH TVB_G (de la); *no reflex in* TV

[134] punas tatheti] E_DH (*em.*); punar iti K

[135] caturtham iti] K E_DH TVA_D (bzhi pa ni); *no reflex in* TVB_G

[136] tad eva prajñājñānaṃ tadrūpaṃ] K E_DH TVB_G (shes rab ye shes de nyid kyi
ngo bo de); shes rab ye shes kyi ngo bo de TVA_D

[137] °ātra] E_DH; *no reflex in* TV

[138] °niruttarātyantasphītāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva°] K; °nirantarātyanta-
sphītāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva° E_DH (*em.*); shin tu rgyas pa nyid dang |
bar chad med pa nyid dang | rgyun mi 'chad par skye ba nyid kyi TVA_D (°ātya-
ntasphītatvanairantaryāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva°); shin tu rgyas pa nyid
rgyun mi chad par skye ba nyid kyi TVB_G (°ātyantasphītatvāvichinnaprabandha-
pravāhitva°)

[139] °lakṣaṇaḥ] E_DH; °lakṣaṇaṃ K

[140] °yuktayā] *conj.* (TV: dang ldan pa'i); °yuktyā K E_DH

[141] °ārtho] K E_DH TVB_G (don); *no reflex in* TVA_D

sya lakṣaṇatvāyogāt, nāgṛhītaviśeṣaṇā [E_{DH} p. 141] viśeṣyabuddhir iti nyāyāt. lakṣyate jñāyate pratipādyata[142] iti[143,lviii] lakṣyaṃ sākṣāt kariṣyamāṇaṃ caturtham.

7.4 caturthaseke vipratipattis tṛtīyā

atra caturthaṃ[144] nāstīty eke.[lix] nanu caturtham ity etad asti tatpadam.[145,lx] tat kathaṃ nāstīty ucyate? satyam, upadeśasaṃrakṣā-

---

pa'i dngos po, which looks like a corruption for TVB_G's *mtshon par bya ba dang* rather than anything indicative of a variant reading in the Sanskrit.

[lviii] Although K reads *anenti*, and TVB_G also reflects this with *'dis*, by normal conventions the *anena* here would indicate that the word being glossed, *lakṣyaṃ* in this case, denotes the agent of verbal root, and this is clearly not the case. While the pronoun can potentially refer back to *prajñājñāna*, it is also an easy scribal slip. The pronoun is not reflect in TVA_D.

[lix] TVA_D adds near the beginning of this sentence *Samājottara* 113ab: *abhiṣekaṃ tridhā bhedam asmin tantre prakalpitam |*.

[lx] There is little doubt about the meaning of the text here, but its constitution is not very secure. Both Tibetan translation suggest that the whole of *Samājottara* missing 113f was cited. While TVA_D offers a somewhat cleaner text, TVB_G again may reflect something closer to K, with a pronoun immediately following *iti* and the word 'caturtha' marked off by an *iti* on its own. Various proposals could be entertained for a smoother Sanskrit text, but what K transmits can be understood: '[Objections]: But there exists (*asti*) a word (*pada*) for that (*tat*) [fourth initiation]—namely, this (*etat*): "'the fourth [is that again like that]".'

---

[142] pratipādyate] K E_{DH} (pratipādyate) ; go bar bya zhing bsgrub par bya bas na TVA_D; khong du chud par byed bsgrub par byed pas na TVB_G (pratīyate pratipādyata)

[143] iti] *conj.*; anenti K E_{DH}

[144] caturthaṃ] K E_{DH} TVB_G (bzhi pa ni); dbang ni rnam pa gsum dag tu | <lb n="6"/>gyud 'di las ni rab tu grags || zhes gsungs pas na | bzhi pa TVA_D (abhiṣekaṃ tridhā bhedam asmin tantre prakalpitam | iti vacanāc caturthaṃ)

[145] nanu caturtham ity etad asti tatpadam] K (nanu caturtham ity etad asti | tat padan) E_{DH}; de ltar de bzhin bzhi pa yang || zhes bya ba'i tshig bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa yod pa ma yin nam | TVA_D (nanu caturthaṃ tat punas tatheti padaṃ bhagavatoktam); de lta na de ma yin pa gzhan de ltar de bzhin bzhi pa yang zhes bya ba der bzhi pa zhes bya ba'i tshig bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa yod pa ma yin nam | TVB_G (nanu anyatra [? - de ma yin pa gzhan] caturthaṃ tat punas tathety asmin [? - der] caturtham iti padaṃ bhagavatoktam)

26

rthaṃ[lxi] sattvavyāmohanāya ca tṛtīyam eva caturthaśabde[K fol. 6v]noktaṃ bhagavatā. anyathā tat punar[146,lxii] iti noktaṃ syāt.

tad atyantāsaṃgatam, caturthasya pramāṇasiddhasya pratipāditatvāt pratipādayiṣyamāṇatvāc ceti.[lxiii]

7.5 lakṣyasya vicāraṇam

atra lakṣaṇaṃ prajñājñānaṃ pratītam eva sarvaiḥ. lakṣye[147] paraṃ vyāmohaḥ. tad vicāryate. lakṣyaṃ hi bhaved[148] artharūpaṃ vā syāt jñānarūpaṃ vā. na tāvad[149] artharūpam, arthasyaivābhāvāt,[150,lxiv] ekānekaviyogitvena pramāṇena tasya nirākṛtatvāt. mantranaye ca vijñānavādamadhyamakamatayor[151] eva pradhānatvād[lxv] jñānarū-

---

[lxi] After rendering *upadeśasaṃrakṣārthaṃ* (*man ngag bsrung bar bya ba'i phyir dang*), TVA$_D$ has apparently suffered from an eyeskip and resumes with its translation of *pratipādayiṣyamāṇatvāc ceti*.

[lxii] Here TVB$_G$ quotes again the entire *pāda* of *Samājottara* 113f. This is an undesirable reading: It is specifically the words *tat punaḥ* that indicate the Buddha real intention of speaking of *caturtha*, not the entire *pāda*.

[lxiii] Tib. discusses two further *pakṣa*s here: that the fourth referred to in *Samājottara* 113f is the four *aṅga* of *sevā* and so forth; and what appears to be the idea that the fourth initiation consists in the third accompanied by its fruits (*'bras bu dang bcas pa*). Of these the first is rejected on account of its rendering cultivation meaningless, and the latter is rejected as *siddhasādhana*.

[lxiv] K's reading *arthasyaikasya* is problematic. At face value, it would mean 'a single external object', whereas the argument is clearly concerning all external objects. Even if the meaning of *eka* were strained and taken in the sense of 'unitary', the following reason would become tautological. Emending *ekasya* to *eva* is also compelling based on the TV, which clearly renders the *eva* with *nyid*.

[lxv] TVA$_D$ finishes the clause ending *pradhānatvāt* with a *rdzogs tshig*: *gtso bo nyid yin pa'i phyir ro*. This creates an incomplete sentence with the clause pointing

---

[146] tat punar] K E$_{DH}$; TVA$_D$: *not available*; de ltar de bzhin bzhi pa yang TVB$_G$ (caturthaṃ tat punas tathā)

[147] lakṣye] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*) TV (mtshon par bya ba la); lakṣyā K

[148] lakṣyaṃ hi bhavet] *conj.* (TV: mtshon par bya ba yang srid na); lakṣyaṃ hi bhagavat K E$_{DH}$ (°gavad)

[149] tāvad] K E$_{DH}$; *no reflex in* TV

[150] arthasyaivābhāvāt] *conj.* (TV: don nyid med pa'i phyir); arthasyaikasyābhāvāt K E$_{DH}$

[151] °matayor] E$_{DH}$ TV ('dod gzhung); °tamayor K

paṃ vā syāt. jñānaṃ ca sākāraṃ vā nirākāraṃ vā. sākāram api citrādvaitarūpaṃ[lxvi] vā syād anekarūpaṃ vā syād iti vikalpāḥ.

7.5.1 sākārasya vijñānasya nirākaraṇam

tatra sākāravijñānaṃ sarvathaiva gagaṇakamalavan nāstīti nirākāravādino bruvate. nanu nīlapītaśuklādighaṭapaṭaśakaṭādi[152]rūpeṇākārāḥ[153] pratibhāsante[154] pratyakṣataḥ. te cārthasyābhāvād jñānarūpā eva. tat kathaṃ sākāraṃ nāstīti?[lxvii] satyam. pratibhāsanta evākārāḥ, param alīkarūpeṇa.[155] alīkarūpatā[156] caikānekaviyogitvena pramāṇalakṣaṇena[157] prasiddhā. tasya ca pramāṇasvarūpasyānyatra[158] kathitatvān, neha[159] pratanyate. alīkatvaprasiddhā ca māyā-

---

neither forwards or backwards, since the clause ending in *nirākṛtatvāt* also ends with *phyir ro*. The translation may either be corrupt, or perhaps the translator was uncertain about how to construe the clause. Here the reason should probably point forward: although it does support the non-primary of external objects, enough reasons have been given to support their general non-existence, and the primacy of awareness in the Vijñānavāda and Madhyamaka positions can be seen as a basis on which one might accept the *lakṣya* to be *jñāna*.

[lxvi] Here and at the end of the next paragraph, TV renders *citrādvaita* as *shes pa gnyis med*, as if reading *cittādvaita*. The more expected rendering is *sna tshogs gnyis med*.

[lxvii] TVB$_G$ presents this argument differently than what is transmitted in Sanskrit but maintains lotical flow: *don (rnam pa)de dag kyang med pa'i phyir shes pa'i ngo bo nyid kyang med yin na | de ji ltar rnam pa dang bcas pa ma yin zhe na |* 'Because those objects [i.e., *ākāra*s] also do not exist, the nature of cognition too cannot exist. So how can cognition not have *ākāra*s?' TVA$_D$'s forumulation is unclear: *don de dag la med pa'i phyir shes pa'i ngo bo nyid yin na | de ji ltar rnam pa dang bcas pa ma yin zhe na |*

---

[152] °śakaṭādi°] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*) TV (shing rta); °prakaṭādi° K

[153] °ākārāḥ] *conj.*; ((cā))kārāḥ K; vākārāḥ E$_{DH}$

[154] pratibhāsante] E$_{DH}$; pratibhāṣante K

[155] alīkarūpeṇa] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (brdzun pa'i ngo bor); brdzun pa yin no TVA$_D$ (alīka)

[156] alīkarūpatā] K TVB$_G$ (brdzun pa'i ngo bo nyid); brdzun pa nyid TVA$_D$ (alīkatā)

[157] °viyogitvena pramāṇalakṣaṇena] *em.*; °viyogitvapramāṇalakṣaṇena K E$_{DH}$; dang bral ba'i mtshan nyid kyis TVA$_D$ (°viyogalakṣaṇena); dang bral ba'i tshad ma'i mtshan nyid kyis TVB$_G$ (°viyogapramāṇalakṣaṇena)

[158] pramāṇasvarūpasyā°] E$_{DH}$; pramāṇa((pe))rūpasyā° K

[159] neha] E$_{DH}$; eha K

mayā ivākārā bhrāntirūpāḥ prakāśante.[160] bhrāntinivṛttau ca nirā-
kāram eva[161] śuddhasphaṭikasaṃkāśaṃ pāramārthikaṃ[162] siddhaṃ
bhavati.[163] ataś citrādvaitarūpam anekarūpaṃ ca sākāraṃ vijñānam
astīti vikalpadvayaṃ nirastaṃ bhavatīti.

7.5.2 nirākārasya vijñānasya samarthanam

nanu nirākāram api vijñānam upalabdhilakṣaṇaprāptaṃ svapne 'pi
nopalabhyate. tat kathaṃ tad asti paramārthata[164] i[K fol. 7r]ty u-
cyate? ucyate.[165],[lxviii] sukhākāraṃ vijñānam [166]antaḥparisphuradrū-
paṃ nirākāraṃ saṃvedyata eva.[lxix] nīlādyākārāḥ punar alīkāḥ pra-
tibhāsante. anyathā teṣāṃ satyatve sarva evākārāḥ satyāḥ syuḥ. ta-
thā hi grāhyagrāhakabhāvādikam api satyaṃ [E_DH p. 142] syāt. ta-
taś ca sarveṣām eva satyapratibhāsatvena muktiprasaṅgaḥ,[167] keṣā-

---

[lxviii] (TO EXPAND AND REORGANISE) Here *'on te* in TVB_G isn't a strong reflex
of *ucyate*, but like *ucyate* it does explicitly mark a change in *pakṣa*. The *ucyate*
ending the previous sentence may be suspect. A similar formulation was used in
the previous paragraph: *tat kathaṃ nāstīty ucyate*? There TV reads: *ji ltar med
ce na |* (TVB_G); *de ci ltar med ces brjod |* (TVB_G). Here, for *tat kathaṃ tad asti pa-
ramārthata ity ucyate*, TV reads: *de ji ltar na don dam par grub par yod pa zhes
bya zhe na* (TVA_D); *de ji ltar na don dam par yod par grub pa zhes bya |* (TVB_G).
From this it is difficult to draw firm conclusions, but *ces brjod* and *zhes bya* pro-
bably more strongly point towards *ity ucyate* rather than simply *iti*. Again TVA_D
demonstrates more simplified language.
[lxix] TV changes the subject of the sentence from *vijñāna* to the *ākāra*s of *vijñāna*.
TVA_D is likely corrupt or wrong edited with *shes pa rnams ni* in place of TVB_G's
shes pa'i nang na.

---

[160] prakāśante] K (prakāsante); prakāśyante E_DH
[161] nirākāram eva] K E_DH TVB_G (rnam pa med pa kho na); rnam pa med pa de
kho na TVA_D (nirākāram eva tad)
[162] pāramārthikaṃ] E_DH (*em.*); pārarthikaṃ K
[163] bhavati] K; bhavatīti E_DH
[164] paramārthata] *em.*; paramārtham K E_DH
[165] ucyate] K E_DH TVB_G ('on te); *no reflex in* TVA_D
[166] antaḥ°] K E_DH TVB_G (nang na); rnams ni TVA_D (*probably corruption*)
[167] muktiprasaṅgaḥ] *em.* (TV: grol ba nyid du thal bar 'gyur te); yuktiprasaṅgāt
K; muktiprasaṅgāt E_DH (*em.*)

ñcid api mithyāpratibhāsasya bhrāntirūpasyāpratibhāsanāt.[lxx] tathā coktam—

drassṭavyaṃ[168] bhūtato bhūtaṃ bhūtadarśī vimucyate |[lxxi]

tasmād akāmakenāpi nīlādyākārāṇām alīkatvam evaiṣṭavyam. sukhādikaṃ nirākāraṃ[169] satyam upalabhyate. tat kathaṃ nopalabhyata iti.

nanu sukhādyākāram sākāram eva vijñānam[170,lxxii] upalabhyate, sukhāder ākārasvabhāvatvāt. na ca sukhādyākāraśūnyaṃ jñānam[171] svapne 'pi saṃvedyate. sakalabhrāntivigamād aṣṭamyāṃ bhūmāv upalabdhilakṣaṇaprāptir bhavatīty atrāpi kośapānaṃ[172] vinā anyan

---

[lxx] Both Tibetan translation exhibit various degrees of corruption and/or confusion here: *cung zhig kyang log pa'i rnam par ngo bo ni snang ba'i phyir ro* || (TVA_D) *cung zhig dang log pa'i rnam par 'khrul pa'i ngo bo mi snang ba'i phyir ro* || (TVA_D). There is a possibility that *log pa'i rnam pa* reflects *mithyākāra* instead of *mithyāpratibhāsa*.

[lxxi] *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* 5.21; *Ratnagotravighāga* 154; *Pratītyasamputpādahṛdayakārikā* 7; etc.

[lxxii] The word *sākāram* appears to have been omitted from the text transmitted in K. It is supported by the Tibetan translations and can be inferred by the reason *sukhāder ākārasvabhāvatvā*, and the response to this objection later in the paragraph.

TV may reflect also the inclusion of an *api* somewhere in this sentence given the particle *yang* (e.g., *sukhādyākāram api*). Here again TVB_G as altered the argument slightly: *bde ba la sogs pa'i rnam pa yang rnam pa dang bcas pa'i shes pa kho na la dmigs pa yin te* |; 'Forms such as pleasure too are perceived with only a cognition that has forms.' TVA_D is closer to the Sanskrit syntax: *bde ba la sogs pa'i rnam pa'i shes pa yang rnam pa dang bcas pa kho na la dmigs pa kho na yin te* |; 'Cognition too that has the forms of pleasure and the like are only perceived to be none other than [cognitions] with forms.'

---

[168] drassṭavyaṃ] E_DH; drassṭavya K

[169] nirākāraṃ] K E_DH; rnam pa TVA_D (ākāraṃ); rnam pa brdzun pa TVB_G (alīkākāraṃ)

[170] sākāram eva vijñānam] *conj.*; eva vijñānam K E_DH; shes pa yang rnam pa dang bcas pa kho na TVA_D; rnam pa dang bcas pa'i kho na shes pa TVA_D (api sākāram eva jñānam)

[171] jñānaṃ] K E_DH; rnam par shes pa TV (vijñānaṃ)

[172] kośapānaṃ] K (kosapānaṃ); śapathollaṅghanaṃ E_DH (*em.*)

na[173] pramāṇam asti prasādhakam iti.[174] tad asat,[175] abhiprāyāpa-rijñānāt, sukhādyākārasyaiva[176] nīlādyākārarahitasya vijñānasya nirākāratveneṣṭatvāt.[177] tac cedānīm eva svasaṃvedanapramāṇasi-ddhaṃ sakalaprāṇabhṛtām astīti kathaṃ nopalabdhiḥ?

7.5.3 madhyamakamatasya samarthanam

nanu tad[178] apy ekānekasvabhāvaviyogād alīkam eva bhrāntimā-tram, ekānekasvabhāvarahitatvasya[179] sākāranirākāravijñānavyā-pitvāt.[180]

nanv anena nyāyena sakalasākāranirākāravijñānasyā[181]līkatva-prasādhanān na kiñcid api pāramārthikaṃ vastutattvam asti.[182,183] tat kathaṃ lakṣyasya svarūpaṃ pramāṇata upalakṣayitavyam? naiṣa doṣaḥ, madhyamakamate pramāṇato 'līkatāsiddhāv api [184]māyopa-mapratibhāsamātrasyaikānekasvabhāvarahitasya dharmirūpasyā-pratiṣedhāt. tatraiva cālīke pratibhāsamātre lakṣyalakṣaṇasaṃsā-ranirvāṇa[K fol. 7v]maṇḍalacakrādibhāvanāsakalajagadarthakriyā-

---

[173] anyan na] E_{DH}; anyatra K

[174] iti] K E_{DH} TVA_D (zhe na); *no reflex in* TVB_G

[175] tad asat] *conj.* (TV: de ni bden pa ma yin te); tad K E_{DH}; asad etat *possible conj.*

[176] sukhādyākārasyaiva] K E_{DH}; bde ba la sogs pa nyid TVA_D; bde la sogs pa nyid TVB_G (sukhāder eva)

[177] nirākāratveneṣṭatvāt] K E_{DH} TVB_G (rnam pa med pa nyid du 'dod pa nyid kyi phyir); med pa nyid du 'dod pa'i phyir TVA_D

[178] nanu tad K E_{DH}; tat *possible conj.*

[179] °rahitatvasya] *em.* (TV: dang bral ba nyid kyis); °rahitasya K E_{DH}

[180] °vijñāna°] K E_{DH}; shes pa TV (jñāna)

[181] °vijñānasyā°] K E_{DH}; shes pa TV (°jñānasyā°)

[182] asti] *conj.*; astīti K E_{DH} (astīti?); *no reflext in* TV)

[183] The *iti* following *asti* in K is superfluous with *tat* starting the next sentence in the sense of *tasmāt*, continuing the objection.

[184] māyopamapratibhāsamātrasyai°] K E_{DH}; snang ba tsam dang sgyu ma lta bu TVA_D (māyopamasya pratibhāsamātrasya cai°); snang ba sgyu ma lta bu ma TVB_G (māyopamapratibhāsasyai°)

dīnām[185] avyāhatā vyavasthā[186] sidhyati.[187,lxxiii] tathā coktam—

> buddhatvaṃ vajrasattvatvaṃ saṃvṛtyaiva prasādha-
> yet |[lxxiv]

iti.[188]

nanu sarvam eva vastujātam alīkarūpatayā niḥsāram, tadā kima-
rthaṃ maṇḍalacakrādibhāvanāprayāsaḥ[189] kriyate? asad etat,

> mithyādhyāropahānārthaṃ[190] yatno 'saty api[191] [E_{DH} p.
> 143] bhoktari |[192,lxxv]

iti vacanāt. yady api vicāryamāṇaṃ pāramārthikaṃ vasturūpaṃ
nāsti, tathāpy ahaṃ sukhī bhaveyaṃ mā[193] duḥkhy abhūvam iti

---

lxxiii E_{DH} appears to understand the text as saying that both *bhāvanā* and *saka-lajagadarthakriyādīnāṃ vyavasthā* are established. TV renders *bhāvanā* in the third case, suggesting it may have been seen outside of the compound or seen within the compound but understood as having a *tṛtīya* relationship with *saka-lajagadarthakriyā*. We understand a compound beginning with *lakṣyalakṣaṇa* up to *sakalajagadarthakriyādīnām* providing a list of that for which the *vyāvasthā* is still established in the Madhyamaka system.

Here too K seems to transmit a superfluous *iti*, here following *sidhyati*.

lxxiv *Kurukullākalpa* 3.16cd

lxxv *Pramāṇavārttika*, Pramāṇasiddhi 192cd. Verse 192 is frequently cited in Bu-ddhist and non-Buddhist texts alike and is transmitted with the readings *bho-ktari* and *moktari* in the final *pāda*, with the latter better represented in the core witnesses of and texts releated to the *Pramāṇavārttika* (for some references see **pecchia2015**).

---

185 °bhāvanā°] K; °bhāvanā E_{DH} (variant word division); bsgoms pas TV (bhāva-nayā)

186 vyavasthā] K; vyavasthā ca E_{DH} (*em.*)

187 sidhyati] *conj.* (TV: grub pa yin no); sidhyatīti K E_{DH}

188 iti] E_{DH}; deest *in* K

189 maṇḍala°] K E_{DH}; bri ba'i 'dkyil 'khor (lekhyamaṇḍala°)

190 mithyādhyāropahānārthaṃ] *em.*; mithyādhyāropaṇārthaṃ K E_{DH}

191 'saty api] K; 'styopi E_{DH}

192 moktari] *em.* (TVA_D: grol byed; TVB_Ggrol ba po) ; bhoktarī° K (*the letter* no *is added abhove* bho); muktaye E_{DH} (*em.*)

193 mā] E_{DH} (*em.*); deest *in* K

tṛṣṇā sakalaprāṇabhṛtām asti. yathā tulye 'pi mithyātve śubhāśu-
bhasvapnayoḥ śubhasvapnadarśanāt saumanasyam, aśubhasvapna-
darśanāc ca daurmanasyam, tadapanayanāya ca saddharmapāṭha-
mantrajāpādau pravṛttir bhavati, tathā mithyātvāviśeṣe 'pi duḥkhā-
diprākṛtavikalpahānāya[lxxvi] samyaksaṃbodhilakṣaṇaprāptaye[194] ca
prekṣāvatām arthinām pravṛttir bhaviṣyatīti.

8 saptavidheṣu sādhyeṣu sārāsāravicāraṇam

nanu yadarthas tv ayam[195,lxxvii] ārambhaḥ so 'rthaḥ pralayaṃ gataḥ.
tathā hi lakṣyalakṣaṇacintātra prastutā. sā ca vismṛtā,[196,lxxviii] kva
gateti na jñāyate.[197]

na tu[198] kṛtaiva sā saptabhir bhedaiḥ?

satyam, kintu guḍagorasanyāyena.[199,200] tathā hi na jñāyate, kiṃ
tat sāram asāraṃ veti.

[lxxvi] cf. *Samantabhadrasādhana* (as quoted in Kamalanātha's *Ratnāvalī* ad HeTa
2.2.45, fol. 16r6): prākṛtavikalpavṛttair aparaṃ na hi kiñcad asti bhavaduḥkham |
tasya viruddhaṃ caitat sākṣādavagamyate cetaḥ ||

[lxxvii] An alternative conjecture for whethere K reads *yadarthasvā'yam* could be
yadarthas tavāyam, but we see no reflex of a *tava* in the Tibetan translations:
rtsom pa 'di'i don gang yin pa (TVA_D); *gal te gang gi don du* (*bzhi pa bshad pa'i
bshad pa'i dus*) *'di brtsams pa'i* (TVB_G).

[lxxviii] TV may suggest a different reading (which cannot easily be guessed at), or it
may simply elaborate on what is found in the Sanskrit text: *de yang gtam gzhan
du thal bas brjod pa'i phyir | gang du song ba mi shes so zhe na* |; 'And (*yang*)
because you have spoken (*brjod pa*) by moving on to (*thal bas*) other topics (*gtam
gzhan*), where that (*de*) [main topic] has gone is not known.'

---

[194] °lakṣaṇaprāptaye] K E_DH; mtshan nyid kyi 'bras bu thob par bya ba'i phyir
TVA_D; mtshan nyid 'bras bu thob par bya ba'i phyir TVB_G (°lakṣaṇaphalaprā-
ptaye)

[195] yadarthas tv ayam] *conj.*; yadarthasvā'yaṃ K; yadarthatvād ayaṃ E_DH

[196] vimisṛtā] K E_DH; gtam gzhan du thal bas brjod pa'i phyir TV

[197] jñāyate] K E_DH; shes so zhe na TV (jñāyata iti [cet])

[198] na tu] *conj.*; nanu K E_DH

[199] guḍagorasanyāyena] K E_DH TVB_G (bu ram dang dar ba'i tshul gyis); bu ram
dang mngar ba nyid kyi tshul gyis TVA_D

[200] cf. verse 267 of Pramāṇasiddhi chapter in Prajñākāragupta's *Pramāṇavārttika-
bhāṣya*:⊠arthānarthakriyāśakto guḍagorasakārakaḥ |⊠sarvajño 'pi na sevyatvaṃ
prayāty anupakārataḥ ||; 'Because he is not helpful, a creator of [a mixture of]

ucyate.

8.1 prathamasyāsāratvam

mantranayavihitakramābhāvāt samāpattibhāvanāvaiyarthyād[201] yu-
ktyabhāvāc[202] ca prathamasya niḥsāratā. tathā hi samagrasāmagrī-
kaṃ yat[203] tad avaśyam eva bhavati. anyathā samagrasāmagrīkam
eva tan[204] na bhavet. sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ samagrasāmagrīkaṃ
tad vartate. tad avaśyaṃ tena[205] bhavitavyam. sati ca bhavet[206] pra-

---

guḍa and *gorasa*, capable of doing both harm and good, does not becomes an o-
bject of service/devotion, even if he is omniscient' (ed-s p. 37). On this Yamāri
comments: *bu ram dar ba byed pa po* || *zhes gsungs te* | *'di rigs pa dang mi rigs
pa 'dres pa la grags pa yin no* ||, *'... this is known as "mixing what is appropriate
and not appropriate"' (Tōh. 4226 fol. 12v6–7). Sāṃkṛtyāyana records a marginal
note in his manuscript on the term: '*lohita* (?) *guḍakārakaḥ, guḍagomayakāraka
ity apekṣyate.*'

The author of the *Vādarahasya* uses the term as well: *atadrūpaparāvṛttanīlā-
kārātanmātragrahaṇam iti vyavasthāyāṃ nāpi viṣayasārūpyaṃ, (tadabhāvān) kā
hi paramārthasadalīkarūpayoḥ samānarūpatā nāmetyādi guḍagorasayor ekatākā-
raṇaṃ kvopayuktam* | *bādhakapratyayād dhi tadalīkatvaṃ kiṃ prāgāropya cintā
kriyate śeṣaś ca doṣo 'bhimānasyaiva cintyatvādityādir ajatapratītiparāmarśād ga-
taḥ* | (p. 73–74); 'In the system where there is grasping to more than just a blue
form that excludes what is not of that nature, there is not even similarity to the
object (because of its absence [?]). For what indeed could be the so-called simila-
rity between what is ultimately real and what is unreal? Given this and similar
[arguments], how is the unification of *guḍa* and *gorasa* useful?' The context here
appears to be a refutation of the view that conceptual cognitions include both a
universal and a real object.

Although it is evidently not a widely reference '*nyāya*', the general idea seems
to be that these two substances represent the appropriate and the inapproriate
(or the useful and the useless), and that they should not be mixed. Precisely what
substances, then, *guḍa* and *gomaya* refer to are then difficult to determine, as
molasses and milk seem like a harmless combination.

[201] samāpatti°] K E_{DH} TVB_G (snyom par 'jug pa); lha'i rnal 'byor gyi snyoms par
'jug pa'i TVA_D (devatāyogasamāpatti°)
[202] yuktyabhāvāc] E_{DH}; yuktābhāvāc K
[203] yat] K E_{DH}; 'bras bu gang yin pa TV (yat phalaṃ)
[204] samagrasāmagrīkam eva tan] K E_{DH} TVB_G (tshogs pa dang tshogs can nyid du
de); de'i tshogs pa TVA_D (tasya sāmagrī)
[205] tena K E_{DH} TVB_G (de); de'i 'bras bu TVA_D (tena phalena)
[206] sati ca bhavet] *conj.*; sati ca bhavane na K E_{DH}; de ltar gyur pas TVA_D; de ltar

thamasya hānir iti.

8.2 dvitīyasyāsāratvam

śarīrādyākāraśūnyasya kevalasātarūpasyānupalabdher[207] na dvitī-
yasya sāratā. tathā hi pramāṇaniścitaṃ prekṣāvatā bhāvanīyam, na
yathākathañcit. pramā[K fol. 8r]ṇena saṃvalitarūpam eva sarvado-
palabhyate.[208] tad eva sarvajanānāṃ kamanīyatayā pratibhāsate. ta-
smāt kevalasya rucyabhāvāc[209] [210]cakrākārasaṃvalitasyānupalabdheḥ[211]
sākṣāt kartum aśakyatvāc[212],[lxxix] ca dvitīyasya kalpanāmātrateti.[213]

8.3 tṛtīyasyāsāratvam

nirupadravabhūtārthasvabhāvatvena sātmībhūtasya tyaktum aśa-
kyatvāt, saṃvalitarūpasya [E_{DH} p. 144] bhedābhāvāt, prayojanā-

---

[lxxix] TV suggests reading: *kevalasyānupalabdheḥ rucyabhāvāc cakrākārasaṃvali-
tasyānupalabdheḥ sākṣāt kartum aśakyatvāt*. The addition of *anupalabdheḥ* after
kevalasya renders the flow of logic less smooth and makes *sākṣāt kartum aśakya-
tvāc* superfluous. TV also adds the reason *'bad pa mtshung pa'i phyir* ('becaue the
effort is equal'), which is a fitting argument: although according to this system
only bliss is meditated on and achieved, this actually requires the same amount
of effort as the systems that include deity forms.

---

gyur pa TVB_G (evaṃsati)

[207] °labdher] E_{DH}; °bdher K

[208] saṃvalitarūpam eva sarvado°] K E_{DH}; grub pa kho na TVA_D (siddham eva);
grub pa'i ngo bo thams cad du TVB_G (siddharūpaṃ sarvado°)

[209] rucyabhāvāc] K E_{DH}; mi dmigs pa'i phyir dang | 'dod par bya ba ma yin pa'i
phyir dang | TVA_D; ma dmigs pa'i phyir dang | 'dod pa med pa'i phyir dang | TVB_G
(anupalabdhe rucyābhāvāc)

[210] cakrākārasaṃvalita°] K E_{DH}; 'khor lo'i rang bzhin TVA_D (cakrasvarūpa°); 'khor
lo'i rnam pa'i rang bzhin TVB_G (cakrākārasvarūpa°)

[211] °syānupalabdheḥ] *em.* (TVA_D: mi dmigs pa'i phyir dang) (TVB_G: ma dmigs pa'i
phyir); °syaupalabdheḥ K; °syopalabdheḥ E_{DH}

[212] aśakyatvāc] E_{DH} (*em.*); aśakyatāc K; mi nus ba'i phyir dang | 'bad pa nyid
mtshungs pa'i phyir TV (aśakyatvād yatnasyaiva tulyatvāc)

[213] kalpanāmātrateti] E_{DH} (*em.*); kalpanātrateti K

bhāvāc ca na tṛtīyasya kalyāṇabhāvaḥ.[214],[lxxx] tathā hi sahopala-
mbhena[215] tādātmyasiddhāv ekasya parityāge 'parasyāvaśyaṃ pari-
tyāgaḥ, na vā kasyacid iti.

8.4 caturthasya sārāsāratvavicāraṇam

prapañcatvena bahuprayāsatvād vicārāsahatvena bhrāntirūpatayā-
paramārtharūpatayā ca na tṛtīyāntapakṣasya[216] kalyāṇateti.[217] atra
kecid yuktiṃ varṇayanti.[lxxxi] prapañcarūpatvābhāve[218] 'pi sūkṣma-
sya bindvādeḥ punaḥ punar bhāvanayā sākṣātkaraṇaṃ yāvat, pra-
yāsas tāvat sarvatraiva bhāvyavastuni sambhavati.[lxxxii] tad atra yadi
prayāsabhayam, na kiñcid api bhāvanīyam.

[lxxx] Where we conjecture *na tṛtīyasya kalyāṇabhāvaḥ*, TV reads: *gsum pa dge ba
ma yin te*. The *kalyāṇatā* in the following paragraph is rendered with *legs pa*.
There too an abstract noun with another noun in the genitive case is not reflec-
ted, but such syntax would in any case be less natural in Tibetan. The reading of
(either a silent emendation or a misreading of the manuscript), *na tṛtīyaḥ kalpa-
nābhāvaḥ*, gives some sense ('the third is not without conceptual construction'),
and for this we must supply a masculine headword such as *pakṣa*. There are other
options to emend K's reading, such as *na tṛtīyasya kalyāṇatā* or perhaps *na tṛtī-
yasya kalpanābhāvam*. Note that *kalyāṇatā* in the following paragraph was also
copied in K with a dental *na*.
[lxxxi] TVA_D conveys a different meaning here: *de la 'ga' zhig las rigs pa cung zhig
cig brjod par mi bya ste* | It is possible that this sentence is corrupt (especially the
las after *'ga' zhig*).
[lxxxii] TV differs substantially in the second part of this sentence: *de srid du 'bad pas
yang dang yang du bsgoms pa'i phyir dang* | *thams cad du bsgom par bya ba dngos
po nyid du yod la* | (TVA_D); *de srid du 'bad pas yang dang yang du bsgom pa'i phyir
thams cad du bsgom par bya ba'i dngos po yod do* || (TVB_G). Of these, the intention
behind TVA_D is hard to discern, but TVB_G can be translated: 'For that long, be-
cause one repeated meditates with effort, the object of meditation remains.' Here
the meaning is not compelling and indicates corruption or mistranslation.

---

[214] na tṛtīyasya kalyāṇabhāvaḥ] *conj.*; na tṛtīyakalyanībhāvaḥ K^{pc}; na tṛtīyakalyā-
nībhāvaḥ K^{ac}; na tṛtīyaḥ kalpanābhāvaḥ E_DH
[215] sahopalambhena] E_DH; saholaṃbhena K
[216] tṛtīyāntapakṣasya] *em.* (TVA_D: gsum pa'i tha' ma'i phyogs) (TVB_G: gsum pa'i
mtha' ma'i phyogs); tṛtīyāntaḥ | pakṣasya K; tṛtīyapakṣasya E_DH
[217] kalyāṇateti] E_DH; kalyānateti K
[218] prapañcarūpatvābhāve] K E_DH; spros pa'i ngo bo nyid du gyur TV (prapañca-
rūpatve)

prapañcarūpatvād iti cet, prapañcāprapañcayor bhāvanāvasthā-
yāṃ ko viśeṣaḥ?[219] nanu[220] aprapañcaṃ śīghram eva sthirībhavatīty
ayaṃ viśeṣaḥ.[lxxxiii] yatraivālambane[221] cittaṃ punaḥ punaḥ preryate
nirantaraṃ[222] dīrghakālaṃ ca tatraiva sthirībhavatīty āgamo yuktiś
cātrāsti.[223] tathā coktam—

> tasmād bhūtam abhūtaṃ vā yad yad evābhibhāvyate |
> bhāvanābalaniṣpattau tat sphuṭākalpadhīphalam[224] ||[lxxxiv]

punaś coktam—

> aho kusīdatvam aho vimūḍhatā
> aho janasyāsya sadarthavakratā |
> svacittamātrapratibaddhabuddhatā[225]
> adūravartiny api yan na sevyate ||[226]

[lxxxiii] The sequence of the argumentation is off in K, with *iti cet* and *nanu* being
added to two sentences that represent the *siddhāntin*'s speech. Here the current
siddhāntin (probably equal to the author himself) is arguing against the criticism
just expressed about the fourth *sādhya*.

On can consider using the word *atha* instead of *nanu* in the sentence beginning
nanu aprapañcaṃ śrīghram eva, and one can also consider ending it with *iti cet*,
which may have accidentally been moved to the preceding sentence, and which
may have a reflex in TVB$_G$ with *zhe na*. The flow of argumentation is somewhat
less clear and certain in TVA$_D$, which ends the sentence with *'di khyad par yin te*.
Although *iti cet* is not strictly necessary here, what follows is certainly a response,
attempting to show that a lack of *prapañca* does not in fact lead to stability more
quickly. This is clear from the conclusion: *tasmān nāyaṃ viśeṣaḥ*.

[lxxxiv] *Pramāṇavārttika*, Pratyakṣapramāṇa 285. The reading *bhāvanābalaniṣpattau*
is supported by the Tibetan translation and occurs in other sources (*bsgom pa'i
stobs ni rdzogs pa na*). The more mainstream reading for this *pāda* is *bhāvanāpa-
riniṣpattau*.

---

[219] ko viśeṣaḥ] *em.* (TV: khyad par ci zhig yod |); ko viśeṣa iti cet K E$_{DH}$

[220] nanu] *conj.* (TV: 'on te); deest *in* K *and* E$_{DH}$

[221] yatraivālambane] *conj.* (*no reflect of nanu in* TV); nanu yatraivālambane K E$_{DH}$

[222] nirantaraṃ] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*) TV (rgyun mi 'chad par); niruttaraṃ K

[223] °īty āgamaḥ. yuktiś cātrāsti] K E$_{DH}$ (°ity āgamaḥ |) E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (zhes bya ba ni
lung yin no || 'di la rigs pa yang yod de |); zhes bya ba ni lung yin no || 'di la rigs
pa yang yod de | TVB$_G$ (°iti yuktiḥ. āgamaś cātrāsti)

[224] kalpadhīphalam] *em.*; kalpadhīḥ phalam K E$_{DH}$

[225] °pratibaddha°] *conj.* (TV: 'brel pa); °pratibuddha° K E$_{DH}$

[226] Untraced. Also cited in *Saptāṅga* fol. 202r7. The verse is in Vaṃśastha metre.

iti. tasmān nāyaṃ viśeṣaḥ.

bhrāntirūpatvenāparamārthatvam api sarvatraiva bhāvanāvi-
ṣaye vastuni[227] sambhavatīti na kiñcid api bhāvanīyaṃ syāt.[lxxxv] [K
fol. 8v] tataś ca sarvatraiva mokṣamārge bhāvanāyā[228] vaiyarthyaṃ
syāt. māyopamākārānupraveśena bhrāntirūpam apy[229] aprapañcaṃ
[E_DH p. 145] bhāvyamānam[230] aduṣṭaṃ bhavatīti cet, na tv ayaṃ
māyākārānupraveśaḥ prapañce 'pi samāna iti. tatrāpi ko doṣasyāva-
kāśaḥ? tasmāt[231] prapañcam aprapañcaṃ vā yad eva rocate pramā-
ṇasaṃgatam itarad vā, tad evālasyaṃ vihāya mahāmudrārthibhir[232]
bhāvayitavyam[233] ity alam atiprasaṅgeneti.

atra ca sāretaravibhāgaḥ paryupāsitagurubhir eva jñātavyaḥ.

[lxxxv] This sentence is significantly different in TV: *spros pa la dmigs pa ni 'khrul
pa'i ngo bo nyid kyis don dam pa ma yin pa nyid do zhe na | thams cad du bsgom
pa'i yul gyis dngos po (mi)(sic for ni?) 'khrul pas cung zhig kyang bsgom par bya ba
med par 'gyur la |* TVA_D; *'khrul pa'i ngo bo nyid kyis don dam pa ma yin pa nyid
do zhes na | thams cad du bsgom pa'i yul gyi dngos po ni | 'khrul pa yin pas cung
zhig kyang bsgom par bya ba med par 'gyur la |* TVB_G. Apart from other minor dif-
ferences, TVA_D adds *spros pa la dmigs pa ni* at the beginning of the sentence. The
text could be rendered in Sanskrit as follows: (*prapañcālambanasya*) *bhrāntirūpa-
tvenāparamārthatvam iti cet, sarvatraiva bhāvanāviṣaye vastuni sambhrāntatvān
na kiñcid api bhāvanīyaṃ syāt.*

---

[227] bhāvanāviṣaye vastuni] *conj.* (TVB_G: bsgom pa'i yul gyi dngos po); bhāvanā-
viśeṣe vastuni K E_DH; bsgom pa'i yul gyis dngos po TVA_D

[228] mokṣamārge bhāvanāyā] E_DH; mokṣamārge bhāvanāyāṃ K; thar pa'i lam
bsgom pa TVA_D; thar pa'i lam bsgom pa la TVB_G (mokṣamārgabhāvanāyā)

[229] bhrāntirūpam apy] K E_DH TVB_G ('khrul pa'i ngo bo la yang); de ltar 'khrul
yang TVA_D (evaṃ bhrāntam apy)

[230] aprapañcaṃ bhāvyamānam] K; aprapaṃcā bhāvyamāṇam K; aprapañcād bhā-
vyamānam E_DH; spros pa med par bsgom par 'gyur ba TVA_D; spros pa med pa'i
sgom par 'gyur ba TVB_G

[231] tasmāt] K E_DH; de bas na don du gnyer bas TV (tasmād arthī)

[232] mahāmudrārthibhir] *conj.* (TV: phyag rgya chen po don du gnyer bas); mahā-
puruṣārthibhir K E_DH

[233] bhāvayitavyam] E_DH; bhaviyitavyam K

8.5 pañcamasyāsāratvam

tṛtīyapakṣoktadoṣatvān[234] nīrasatvena[235] prayojanābhāvān mantra-
nayakramābhāvāc ca[lxxxvi] na pañcamaḥ parikṣīṇadoṣaḥ.

nanu sākṣātkaraṇāt[lxxxvii] pūrvaṃ mantranayaprayogo 'sti. tat
kathaṃ tasyābhavaḥ? satyam, sākṣātphalāvasthā sādhyā. tasyāṃ
ca nāsty asau kramaḥ sākṣāt. parityāge[236] ca na prayojanam utpa-
śyāma iti.[lxxxviii]

[lxxxvi] Both Tibetan translations lack a reflex of *nīrasatvena*, but there is otherwise
reason to assume the word to be an interpolation. While TVB$_G$ otherwise agrees
with K, TVA$_D$ suggests a different structure to the text here: *dgos pa la sogs pa
gsum pa'i phyogs la bshad pa'i nyes pa dang | gsang sngags kyi tshul gyi rim pa med
pa'i phyir*; *prayojanābhāvāditṛtīyapakṣoktadoṣatvān mantranayakramābhāvāc ca*.
It is true that *prayojanābhāva* was an argument given against the third *pakṣa*.
Here, however, if that argument is further qualified with *nīrasatvena*, its inclusion
as a different reason is cogent—unlike the fifth *pakñs*, the third includes bliss as
an integral part of the *sādhya*.

[lxxxvii] TV perhaps misinterprets *sākṣātkaraṇāt pūrvaṃ* rather than reflects a diffe-
rnet reading with *sngar mngon du byas pa'i phyir* (*sngon* is corrupted to *sngon* in
) ('before, for the sake of direct experience').

[lxxxviii] Both TV translations treat this section quite differently and may or may not
suggest different underlying readings: *bden te | bsgrub par bya ba 'bras bu mngon
du gyur pa'i gnas skabs de yang rim pa 'di la med pa dang | mngon du gyur ba
yongs su btang ba dang | dgos pa ma mthong ba'i phyir ro* || TVA$_D$; *bden te | bsgrub
par bya ba 'bras bu mngon du gyur pa'i gnas skabs na de yang rim pa 'di la med pa
dang | mngon sum du gyur pa yongs su btang ba la dgos pa yang ma mthong ba'i
phyir ro* || TVB$_G$.

The word *sākṣāt* could be taken with *parityāge* as K and E$_{DH}$suggest, but the
point is not so much that the *krama* is directly abandoned but that, according to
this *pakṣa*, it is not directly present when the direct result is directly experienced.
This Vāgīśvarakīrti sees as rendering the *sādhya* pointless.

---

[234] tṛtīyapakṣoktadoṣatvān] *conj.* (TVB$_G$: gsum pa'i phyogs la bshad pa'i nyes pa
yod pa dang); tṛtīyapakṣe ktato K; tṛtīyapakṣe kuto E$_{DH}$; gsum pa'i phyogs la
bshad pa'i nyes pa TVA$_D$ (*see note* concerning TVA$_D$)

[235] nīrasatvena] *conj.*; nīrasatvena te K E$_{DH}$; *no reflext in* TV

[236] kramaḥ sākṣāt. parityāge] *variant word divion in* K *and* E$_{DH}$: kramaḥ | sākṣā-
tparityāge

8.6 ṣaṣṭhamasyāsāratvam

svecchayā nirvāyayitum[237] aśakyatvāt, prayojanābhāvāt, sattvārthā-
bhāvāc ca na pañcāntaraprabhedakalpanā[238] kalaṅkāśūnyā.[lxxxix] ta-
thā hi[239] kasyacin nivṛttiḥ kāraṇanivṛttyā vyāpakanivṛttyā[240] vā
bhavati. na cātra sākṣātkṛtamaṇḍalacakrasya nivartakaṃ kāraṇaṃ
vyāpakaṃ vā icchākāle dṛśyate.[xc]

nanu śūnyataiva nivartikāsti. yathā dārusaṅghātaprajvalito[241,xci]
vahnir niḥśeṣam indhanaṃ bhasmīkṛtya paścāt svarasata eva ni-
vartate, tathā maṇḍalacakraprajvalitaḥ śūnyatājñānāgniḥ sākṣāt
kṛtvā[242] maṇḍalacakraṃ nivartayiṣyatīti cet.[xcii] tad asat, viṣamatvād

---

[lxxxix] TV an alternative structure to the sentence: *lnga pa'i mtha'i rab tu dbye ba
rtog pa'i dri mas stong pa ma yin no* ‖ (*no* TVA$_D$; *te* TVB$_G$); *na pañcāntaraprabhe-
daḥ kalpanākalaṅkāśūnyaḥ.*

[xc] TV lacks a reflex of *icchākāle dṛśyate.*

Both translations add an extra sentence to this paragraph: *rang gi 'dod pas* (*'dos
pas* TVB$_G$; *'gog par* TVB$_G$) *'gog pa yang mi nus te mi mthun pa med pa'i phyir | sdug
bsngal la sogs pa 'gog pa 'dod kyang sdug bsngal la sogs pa la 'jug pa mthong ba'i
phyir ro* ‖ 'And it cannot be stoped by one's voliotion because [volition alone] is
not doscordant with it. For, although they may desire to stop suffering and the
like, it is observed that people continue to engage in suffering'.

Given the Tibetan text, it is possible there is an omission between *vyāpakaṃ
vā* and *icchākāle*. The words *icchākāle dṛśyate* are strictly speaking not necessary
in this sentence, but they are also not inappropriate: according to this position, it
is *icchā* that is the occasion for the cessation of the *maṇḍala*.

[xci] Where K reads *dārusaṃghāt pravjalito* we conjecture the compound reading
dārusaṅghātaprajvalito on the strength of *maṇḍalacakraprajvalitaḥ* below. TV ren-
ders both compounds somewhat freely and does not clearly help in deciding the
matter.

[xcii] TV a fuller sentence here. TVB$_G$ reads: *de ltar dkyil 'khor gyi 'khor lo stong pa
nyid kyi ye shes kyi me rab tu 'bar bas mngon sum du byas nas kyang | dkyil 'khor*

---

[237] nirvāyayitum] K; nirvāpayitum E$_{DH}$

[238] pañcāntara°] *em.* TV (lnga pa'i mtha'i); prapañcāntara° K E$_{DH}$

[239] tathā hi] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ ('di ltar); de la ji ltar bzlog mi nus she na | TVA$_D$ (tatra
kathaṃ nirvāyayituṃ na śakyata iti cet)

[240] vyāpakanivṛttyā] E$_{DH}$; vyāpakānivṛttyā K

[241] dārusaṅghātaprajvalito] *conj.*; dārusaṃghāt pravjalito K; dārusaṃghāte pra-
jvalito E$_{DH}$

[242] sākṣāt kṛtvā] *conj.*; sākṣān K E$_{DH}$; mngon sum du byas nas kyang TV (sākṣāt
kṛtvāpi)

dṛṣṭāntasya. tathā hi tatrendhanaṃ kāraṇaṃ[243] vahneḥ. kāraṇasye-
ndhanalakṣaṇasya nivṛttau[244] yuktaiva vahnilakṣaṇasya kāryasya
nivṛttiḥ. iha tu na śūnyatā kāraṇaṃ maṇḍalacakrasya. tat ka[K fol.
9r]thaṃ tannivṛttau nivṛttiḥ? na[245] ca śūnyatāyā nivṛttir asti.[xciii]

nanu sā na[246] bhavatu kāraṇaṃ. śūnyatā vyāpakaṃ tu bhavi-
ṣyati. vyāpakasya vṛkṣasya nivṛttau śiṃśapātvasya vyāpyasya ni-
vṛttivan nivṛttir bhaviṣyatīti cet. etad apy asāram. tathā hi śūnyatā

*gyi 'khor lo ma lus par ldog par byed la | bdag nyid kyang rang gi ngang gis ldog par
'gyur ro zhe na |; … kṛtvāpy aśeṣamaṇḍalacakraṃ nivartyitvā svam api svarasato
nivartate.*

TVA$_D$ appears to be slightly more corrupt, but suggests roughtly same text: *de
dkyil 'khor gyi 'khor lo stong pa nyid kyi ye shes kyi me rab tu 'bar bas mngon sum
du byas nas kyang | dkyil 'khor gyi 'khor lo ma lus par ldog par byed la | de yang
rang gi ldog par 'gyur ro zhe na |*

[xciii] TV diverges significantly in this section: *'di ltar de la shing 'gyur bar byed pa'i
rgyur gyur pa'i me ni shing 'gyur ba yang dag par skyed pa nyid kyis | shing 'gyur
bar byed pa ni me yin no zhes 'jig rten pa rnams sems la | 'dir ni stong pa nyid ni
dkyil 'khor gyi 'khor lo 'gyur bar byed pa'i rgyu ma yin na | de'i phyir de ldog par
byed pa yin | stong pa nyid la rang gi ngang gis ldog go zhes kyang smra bar bya
ba ma yin no ‖.*

TVA$_D$ is again mostly the same text with a few more minor corruptions: *de la
'di ltar shing 'gyur bar byed pa'i rgyur gyur pa'i me ni shing gi 'gyur ba yang dag
par skyed pa nyid kyis shing 'gyur bar byed pa ni me yin no zhes 'jig rten pa rnams
sems la 'dir na stong pa nyid kyi dkyil 'khor los sgyur bar byed pa'i rgyu ma yin na
de'i phyir ldog par byed pa yin no ‖ de ci'i phyir zhe na | stong pa nyid la rang gi
ngang gis ldog go zhes kyang smra bar bya ba ma yin no ‖.*

Although K is also quite corrupt in this paragraph, it is difficult to see how
the text it transmits corresponds to the Tibetan translation. It is also not obvious
what Sanskrit potentially lay behind this Tibetan translation. TVB$_G$ can be rende-
red into English as follows: 'To explains, in [the example], fire, as the cause of
transmormation in wood, creates a transformation in wood, and by this common
people believe that fire transforms wood. In this case, however, emptiness is not a
cause for a transformation in the *maṇḍala*. Therefore, one cannot say that this [e-
mptiness] is a cause of cessation, nor that emptiness will cease of its own accord.'

---

[243] kāraṇaṃ] *conj.*; na kāraṇaṃ K E$_{DH}$
[244] kāryasyendhanalakṣaṇasya nivṛttau] *conj.*; kāryam indhanalakṣaṇanivṛttau K
E$_{DH}$
[245] na] *conj.*; athavā na K E$_{DH}$
[246] na] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); deest *in* K

sarvadā[247] sarvajñeyamaṇḍalavyāpikā tattvarūpā.[248] na ca tasyā[249] nivṛttiḥ kadācid apy asti. yadi syāt[250] samyaksaṃbodhisākṣātkaraṇāt [E_DH p. 146] pūrvam anantaram eva vā nivṛttiḥ[251] syāt. na ca bhavati, samyaksaṃbuddhībhūyāpi katipayakālāvasthānasya svayam eva svīkṛtatvāt.[252]

kintu śūnyatāpi jñānarūpā, cakram api jñānarūpam. śūnyatājñānotpattyā cakrajñānasyānivṛttau[253] śūnyatājñānaṃ kena nivartanīyam? tena nivṛttiś ca virodhino 'bhāvāt kāraṇavyāpakayoś cābhāvān nāsti. tasmāc chūnyatājñānasya na nivṛttiḥ,[254] nāpi maṇḍalacakrasya śūnyatāto nivṛttir iti śūnyatā na nivartikā.[xciv]

ko brūte śūnyatā nivartikā?[xcv] kiṃ tarhi yan nivartakaṃ[255] tad gurūpadeśato jñeyam ity apy asāram. gurūpadeśato 'pi na śūnyatāvyatiriktaṃ[256] pramāṇato 'stīti yatkiñcid etat.[xcvi] pratikṣaṇanivṛttiś

[xciv] TVB_G reflects closely the Sanskrit text transmitted in K, but TVA_D diverges significantly start from *tena nivṛttiś*: *de nyid kyis ldog pa ni 'gal ba'i phyir la | rgyu'am khyad par byed pa med pa de bas na stong pa nyid kyi ye shes la ldog pa med do || de bas na dkyil 'khor gyi 'khor lo yang stong pa nyid kyis ldog go zhes bya ba yang ma yin te |*. Given that the syntax and logic of the passage is far from clear, the translation has probably suffered corruption in a number of places (e.g., *khyad par* for *khyab pa* and possibly *'gal ba'i phyir* for *'gal ba med pa'i phyir*).

[xcv] Here again TVA_D divergers from K significantly, and transmits a text that is not easily comprehensible: *stong pa nyid la ldog par byed pa yin pa | log pa dang stong pa nyid kyis ldog par byed pa yin <lb n="7"/>no zhes su zhig smra |*

[xcvi] TV does not reflect the Sanskrit of K for this sentence: *bla ma'i man ngag las kyang stong pa nyid dang | de ldog pa las ma gtogs pa'i ldog par byed pa'i tshad ma gzhan cung zad yod pa ma yin no ||* (TVA_D); *bla ma'i man ngag las kyang*

---

[247] sarvadā] K E_DH TVA_D (sarvadā); *no reflex in* TVB_G

[248] tattvarūpā] E_DH; tatvarūpāḥ K

[249] tasyā] K E_DH; *no reflex in* TV

[250] syāt] K E_DH TVB_G; ldog par 'gyur na TVA_D (nivṛttiḥ syāt)

[251] nivṛttiḥ] K E_DH; sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das ldog par 'gyur na TV (bhagavataḥ buddhasya nivṛttiḥ)

[252] svīkṛtatvāt] K E_DH; zhal gyis bzhes pa'i phyir 'gyur ba yang ma yin no TV (na ca bhaviṣyati [?])

[253] °ānivṛttau] K E_DH; log na TV (nivṛttau)

[254] na nivṛttiḥ] *conj.* (TV: ldog pa med do); nivṛttiḥ K E_DH

[255] nivartakaṃ] *em.*; nivartikās K E_DH

[256] °vyatiriktaṃ] *conj.*; vyatiri((ktiḥ)) K (i *in* kti *lacks a* pṛṣṭhamātrā); °vyatiriktaḥ E_DH

ca kṣaṇabhaṅgarūpā sarvapadārthavyāpinī. na sā santānanivartikā. tasmān na svecchayā nivṛttiḥ.[257] na ca nivṛttyā[258] nīrasarūpayā prayojanam asti prekṣāvatām.[xcvii] tathā coktam—

mucyamāneṣu sattveṣu ye te[xcviii] prāmodyasāgarāḥ |
tair eva nanu paryāptaṃ mokṣeṇārasikena kim ||[xcix]

iti.

sattvārtho 'pi nivṛttau nāsti. na hi gagane[259] gaganakamale vā kācid arthakriyā sambhavati. ciraniruddhād apy atītād avasturūpāc[260] cakrāt sattvārtho bhaviṣyatīty apy asāram, ciranīrutasyāpi kukku[K fol. 9v]ṭasya[261,c] kaṇṭhadhvaniprasaṅgāt.

---

stong pa nyid kyis ldog par byed pa ma yin ldog pa'i tshad ma cung zhig kyang yod pa ma yin pas (TVB$_G$). Again TVA$_D$ appears corrupt and barely cohrenet. TVB$_G$ is understandable and somewhat related to the overall meaning of the Sanskrit: 'From a guru's instruction there is not even the slightest means of knowledge for a cessation that is not a cessation by means of emptiness; therefore, …'

[xcvii] This sentence too appears differently in TVA$_D$: *ldog pa'i snying po med pa la rtog pa dang ldan pa rnams kyis brtags pa dgos pa yod pa ma yin no ||*; 'There is no need for reflective people to examine insipid cessation.'

[xcviii] The pronound combination *ye te* can have the sense of "whatever there may be" (**speijer1886**). In this case, Prajñākaramati in his *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* interprets them as conveying the sense of inexpressibility: *ye te iti teṣām eva anubhavasiddhatvād idaṃtayā kathayitum aśakyāḥ* (p. 341).

[xcix] *Bodhicaryāvatāra* 8.108

[c] The conjecture *ciranīrutasyāpi* ('long-silent' or 'long-since mute') is paleographically closer to K's *cirutasyāpi*, though TV's suggested *ciramṛtasya* ('long-dead') offers a less ambiguous example.

---

[257] nivṛttiḥ] K^{ac} E$_{DH}$; nivṛrttiḥ K^{pc}; brtag par [mi bya ste] TVA$_D$ (sic *for* ldog par [mi bya]?); *no reflex in* TVB$_G$

[258] nivṛttyā] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); nivartyā K

[259] gagane] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (nam ka); *no reflext in* TVA$_D$

[260] avasturūpāc] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (dngos po med pa'i ngo bo); dngos po'i ngo bo TVA$_D$ (vasturūpāc)

[261] ciranīrutasyāpi kukkuṭasya] *conj.*; cirutasyāpi kukkuṭasya K; ciravirutasyāpi kukkuṭasya E$_{DH}$; yun rin por khyim bya shi ba TVA$_D$; yun ring por lon pa'i khyim bya shi ba TVB$_G$ (ciramṛtasyāpi kukkuṭasya)

nanu yogyadhiṣṭhānād gaganād apy arthakriyāḥ sambhavantīti cet.[262] na sambhavanti, yogyadhiṣṭhānād eva cittarūpād arthakriyā, na gaganāt, nīrūpatvāt tasya.[ci]

nanu nirodhya maṇḍalacakraṃ sattvārthakāle punar utpādyate. tato 'rthakriyā bhavati. tataḥ punar eva nirodhyate, punar evotpadyata iti cet. asad etat. yathā sattvārthakriyāyās tattvato[263] nāsti prādurbhāvaḥ, tathā cakrasyāpi. tato nārthakriyāyāḥ sambhavaḥ.[cii] na ca nirodhya[264] punar utpāde kiñcit prayojanam astīty alam atiprapañceneti.

8.7 saptamasyāsāratvam

ṣaṣṭhapakṣoktadoṣasandohasya saptame[265] 'pi bhāvān na piṣṭapeṣaṇaṃ[266] kriyate. nanu ṣaṣṭhena saptamasya samānatvāt kathaṃ saptamasya tato viśeṣaḥ?[267] asti viśeṣaḥ. pūrvāvasthāyāṃ niyataca-

---

[ci] TVA$_D$ varies significantly for this paragraph and is again not readily understandable: *rnal 'byor pa'i byin gyi rlabs kyis nam mkha' las kyang dngos po'i ngo bo 'das pa'i 'khor lo las sems can gyi don byed pa yin la | nam mkha' ni ma yin te | de'i ngo bo nyid ma yin pa'i phyir ro ||*

[cii] From *yathā sattvā°* to *sambhavaḥ*, TV is significantly different: *ji ltar sems can gyi don byed pa de las byung ba med pa de bzhin du don byed pa'i 'khor lo yang de la mi srid do ||* (TVA$_D$); *ji ltar sems can gyi don byed pa de las 'byung ba med pa de bzhin du 'khor lo yang de las mi srid do ||* (TVB$_G$)

It is likely that both translations reflect *tato* in place of *tattvato*, but it is is unclear what this pronoun would refer to. The reading *tattvatas* can be understood in the sense that accomplishing the aims of beings does not manifes spontaneously from the nature of reality, nor does the *cakra*; hence, this position cannot explain how the *cakra* and hence *sattvārtha* are made to restart after cessation.

---

[262] sambhavantīti cet] *conj.*; saṃbhavanti K E$_{DH}$

[263] tattvato] K (tatvato) E$_{DH}$; de las TV (tato)

[264] nirodhya] E$_{DH}$; niro((dhya)) K (*some kind of correction is made, but uncertain from what to what*); 'gogas pa las (*possibly* nirodhāt)

[265] ṣaṣṭhapakṣoktadoṣasandohasya saptame] *conj.* (TVB$_G$: drug pa'i phyogs la bshad pa'i skyon gyi tshogs bdun pa la) (TVA$_D$: *saṃd as* TVB$_G$, *with* gyis *for* gyi); ṣaṣṭhapakṣoktaṃ saṃdāhasyāṣṭame K; ṣaṣṭhapakṣoktasaṃdohasyāṣṭame E$_{DH}$

[266] piṣṭapeṣaṇaṃ] K^{ac} E$_{DH}$; piṣṭapre | ṣaṇaṃ K^{ac}

[267] dsaptamasya tato viśeṣaḥ] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (de las bdun pa khyad par ci yod); de la khyad par ci yod TVA$_D$ (tatra ko viśeṣaḥ)

krākāratā, punaḥ svecchayā nirodhaḥ svecchayotpādanaṃ[268] ca.[269],[ciii]
saptame punar etan nāsti. tato na samānatā. bhinnaś ca nirdiṣṭa iti.[civ]

9   caturthasya sekasya svarūpam

dambholibījasrutidhautaśuddha-[270]
pāthojabhūtāṅkurabhūtapuṣṭi[271]|
turīyaśasyaṃ[272] paripākam eti[273]
sphuṭaṃ caturthaṃ viduṣo 'pi gūḍham || 17 ||

[E[DH] p. 147] dambholītyādi. etat sadgurūpadeśato jñeyam.

10   aparāṇi mithyāsādhyāni mithyātattvāni ca

pañcapradīpāmṛtabinducandra-
bhrūmadhyabindūdbhavamaṇḍalāni |
vāyoḥ svarūpaṃ galaśuṇḍikādyam
atattvarūpaṃ svayam ūhanīyam || 18 ||[cv]

[ciii] The reading of K, *punaḥ svecchayā svecchetpādanaṃ*, suggests that a word dropped after *svecchayā*, and TVB[G] supplies a fitting word (*'gog / nirodha*). Surprisingly TVA[D] lacks a reflex of *svecchayā nirodhaḥ*, but without this the text does not sound complete: *yang dang yang du rang gi 'dod pas skyed par byed pa nyid yin la*; *punaḥ puunaḥ svechayotpādanaṃ*. This perhaps represents a reading that was an early corruption in the textual transmission.
[civ] TV reflects an alternative but mistaken interpretation of the text's word division: *de bas na mtshungs pa dang tha mi dad pa ma yin par bstan to ||; tato na samānatābhinnaś ca nirdiṣṭa iti*.
[cv] This verse is in Upajāti metre.

---

[268] nirodhaḥ svecchayotpādanaṃ] *conj.* (TVB[G]: yang rang gi 'dod pas 'gog cing rang gi 'dod pas skyed par byed pa); svecchetpādanaṃ K; svecchotpādanaṃ E[DH]; rang gi 'dod pas skyed par byed pa nyid TVA[D] (svecchayotpādanaṃ)
[269] ca] *conj.*; ceti K E[DH]
[270] °sruti°] *corr.*; śruti K E[DH]
[271] pāthoja°] E[DH] (E[DH]reports the ms. as reading pāthojña, *but this seems to be incorrect*); pāthauja° K
[272] turīyasasyaṃ] E[DH] (turīyaśasyaṃ); tutīyaśasyaṃ K
[273] eti] E[DH] (*em.*); eta K

45

pañcapradīpetyādi. pañcapradīpaśabdena gokudahanalakṣaṇasya, amṛtaśabdena[274] vimumāraśulakṣaṇasya satatānuṣṭhānam eva sādhyaṃ manyante. bindur iti hṛccandrasthaṃ binduṃ dedīpyamānaṃ tattvaṃ sādhyaṃ ceti kṛtvā kecid bhāvayanti. candra iti hṛdisthaṃ kalārūpam ardhacandraṃ vā[275] hṛtkamalasthaṃ kecid bhāvayanti.

bhrūmadhyabindūdbhavamaṇḍalānīti bhruvor madhya ūrṇāyāṃ binduṃ vibhāvya tadbindūdbhavāni maṇḍalāni vāyuvāruṇamāhendrāgneyalakṣaṇāni. etad uktaṃ bhavati—mukhaśravaṇacakṣurghrāṇarasanāni[276,cvi] hastāṅgulībhiḥ pidhāya bhrūmadhyabindur draṣṭavyaḥ. tasya sphuṭāvasthāyāṃ śubhāśubhani[K fol. 10r]-mittasaṃsūcakāni māhendrādimaṇḍalāny upajāyante. taṃ ca binduṃ tattvam iti manyante.

vāyoḥ svarūpam iti pūrakakumbhakarecakapraśāntakalakṣaṇam[277] ānāpānādilakṣaṇam[278] ceti. etad[279] uktaṃ bhavati—śaivasāṃkhyādinirdiṣṭaṃ[280] vāyusvarūpaṃ jñātvā taṃ vāyuṃ nirodhabhāvanayā[281] sthirīkṛtyākāśa utplutya[282] gamanaṃ parapurapraveśaṃ yāvan muktiṃ ca sākṣāt kurvanti vāyuvādinaḥ.

galaśuṇḍiketi. galapradeśe jihvāmūlopari hastiśuṇḍikākārā[283] adhaḥpralambamānā upajihvāsaṃjñikā galaśuṇḍikāsti. sā ca śakti-

---

cvi It what elements should be included in this compound, given TV omits the tongue and K includes the nose twice. Provisionally we adopt a reading with only one instance of the nose.

---

[274] amṛtaśabdena] K E$_{DH}$; bdud rtsi lnga'i sgra ni TV (pañcāmṛtaśabdena)

[275] kalārūpam ardhacandraṃ vā] K E$_{DH}$; zla ba phyed pa'am | zla ba rgyas pas TVA$_D$ (ardhacandraṃ pūrṇacandraṃ vā); zla ba'i bzhi dum bu'am zla ba phyed pa'am | zla ba rgyas pa TVB$_G$ (kalārūpam ardhacandraṃ pūrṇacandraṃ vā)

[276] mukhanāsikācakṣurghrāṇarasanāni] *conj.*; mukhaśravaṇanāsikācakṣurghrāṇarasanāni K E$_{DH}$; kha dang | rna ba dang | sna dang | mig TVA$_D$ TVB$_G$

[277] °recaka°] E$_{DH}$; recakaṃ K

[278] ānāpānādi°] E$_{DH}$; anāpānādi° K

[279] etad] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); tad K

[280] śaivasāṃkhyādi°] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*) TVB$_G$ (shi ba dang grangs can la sogs pas); saivasaṃkhyādi° K; grangs can la sogs pas TVA$_D$ (sāṃkhyādi°)

[281] nirodhabhāvanayā] K E$_{DH}$ ('gag pa'i sgom pa); bsgags pa las TVA$_D$ (nirodhena)

[282] ākāśa utplutya] *conj.*; ākāśenotplutya K E$_{DH}$

[283] hastiśuṇḍikākārā] K E$_{DH}$; hastiśuṇḍākārā *possible em.*

rūpā. tadadhaḥ śivarūpam[284] asti tattvam. sā ca [E$_{DH}$ p. 148] jihvā-greṇa spṛśyamānā nirantarāmṛtaṃ sravati.[cvii] tena ca ghargharā-mṛtavarṣaṇena santarpyamānam ātmānaṃ[285] dhyāyād iti galaśuṇḍi-kātattvam. ādiśabdena hṛnmadhyaṣoḍaśanāḍikācakramadhyastha-jñānasvarūpaṃ[286] śivarūpaṃ tattvaṃ bhāvayitavyam ityādīnāṃ pa-rigrahaḥ.[cviii]

tat sarvaṃ tīrthikādibhis tattvarūpeṇābhimatam atattvam iti svayam evohanīyaṃ vicāraṇīyam iti yāvat.

11 upasaṃhāraḥ

svapnendrajālapratibimbamāyā-[cix]
marīcigandharvapurāmbu[K fol. 2r]candraiḥ |

[cvii] Like the English verb 'to flow', the Sanskrit √*sru* is ambitransitive, although appears to be intransitive in greater frequency.

[cviii] TV continues to describe this practice. *yang smras pa | bcu las drug lhag rtsa dang ldan pa'i 'khor lo yi || dkyil na gnas pa'i snying gar rnam par gnas pa'i bdag | des ni de yi khyad par lta bu'i grub pa ster || de ni mngon par mi g-yo ba yi yid dag gis || rnal 'byor pa yi sems de de ltar mngon par bsam || nub par gyur pa'i mgon po rgyal bar gyur de ni || nus pa dag gis de ni yongs su bskor dang bcas ||* (TVA$_D$). *de yang smras pa | bcu las drug lhag rtsa dang ldan pa'i 'khor lo'i dkyil na gnas pa snying kar rnam par gnas pa'i bdag | des ni de'i khyad par lta bu yi grub pa ster | de ni mngon par mi g.yo ba'i yid dag gis || rnal 'byor pa yis de ltar mngon par bsam par bya || nus par gyur pa'i mgon po rgyal bar gyur || de ni nus pa dag gis de ni yongs su bskyor dang bcas ||* (TVB$_G$)

[cix] Although not entirely certain, the commentary, by separating the first three words into a compound, may suggest reading *svapnendrajālaiḥ* instead of *svapne-ndrajāla°*.

---

[284] tadadhaḥ śivarūpam] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (de'i 'og na zhi ba'i ngo bo); sdig pa'i rang bzhin du yong pa TVA$_D$

[285] ātmānaṃ] K E$_{DH}$; don dam pa'i bdag nyid TV (pāramārthikam ātmānaṃ)

[286] hṛnmadhyaṣoḍaśanāḍikācakramadhyasthajñānasvarūpaṃ] K E$_{DH}$ TVB$_G$ (snying ka'i dbus kyi 'khor lo rtsibs bcu drug pa'i dbus na gnas pa ye shes kyi rang bzhin); snying ga'i dbus kyi dkyil 'khor rtsibs bcu drug pa'i dbus na hūṃ gnas pa ye shes kyi rang bzhin (hṛnmadhyaṣoḍaśanāḍikāmaṇḍalamadhyahūṃsthajñānasvarūpaṃ)

anyaiś ca śabdair[287] upamābhidheyair[cx]
naivāsti sādhyaṃ kathitād ihānyat || 19 ||[cxi]

svapnendrajāletyādi. svapnendrajālopamaṃ pratibimbamāyāmarī-
cigandharvanagarodakacandropamam iti śabdaiḥ, anyaiś ca gaga-
napratiśrutkaphenopamam[288] ityādiśabdair upamābhidheyair upa-
māvācakair naivāsti sādhyaṃ kathitāt sādhyād anyat. paraṃ iha
kathita[289,cxii] eva sādhya ete śabdāḥ pravartanta iti svayaṃ boddha-
vyam.

gambhīraśūnyapratibhāsamātra-[290]
śāntāti[291]sūkṣmānabhilāpyaśabdaiḥ |
nirlepanīrūpa[292]nirañjanādyair
bhrāntir na kāryāparasādhyasattve || 20 ||[293]

[E$_{DH}$ p. 149] gambhīraśūnyaṃ pratibhāsamātraṃ śāntātisūkṣmam
anabhilāpyaṃ nirlepaṃ nīrūpam[294] nirañjanādi.[295,cxiii] ādiśabdāt śi-
vaṃ nirākāraṃ niṣprapañcam anādyantanidhanam i[K fol. 10v]tyā-
diśabdair bhrāntir na kartavyāparasādhyasattva aparasya sādhya-
sya sattve sattāyām.[296] ebhiḥ sarvair[297] eva param api kiñcit sā-

---

[cx] TV lacks a reflex of *upamā* in *upamābhidheyair* (*mngon par brjod pa yis*) as well
as in the commentary when translating *upamābhidheyair upamāvācakair* (*mngon
par brjod pa ni smra ba pos*).
[cxi] This verse is in Upajāti metre.
[cxii] Strictly speaking the text is not incorrect as K reads without *iha*, but its absence
here is stricking given that it is found in the root text and that it is important in
precisely conveying the intended meaning.
[cxiii] From *ghabhīra°* to *nirañjanādi* TV reproduces the root text.

---

[287] śabdair] *em.* (TaRaA-Vi); sarvair K E$_{DH}$
[288] gagana°] *corr.*; gagaṇa° K E$_{DH}$
[289] iha kathita] *conj.* (TV: 'dir bshad pa); kathita K E$_{DH}$
[290] °mātra°] E$_{DH}$; mātraṃ K
[291] śāntāti°] E$_{DH}$; sāntādi° K
[292] nirlepanīrūpa°] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); nirlepanīpa K
[293] This verse is in Indravajrā
[294] nīrūpam] E$_{DH}$ (*em.*); nirupamaṃ K
[295] nirañjanādi] K; nirañjanaṃ E$_{DH}$
[296] sattāyām] K; sattvāyā E$_{DH}$
[297] sarvair] K E$_{DH}$; sgra TV (śabdair)

dhyaṃ kathitād astīti bhrāntir na kartavyā. atha nātikathitam eva sādhyam ebhiḥ sarvair abhidhīyata iti niścayaḥ.

12 pariṇāmanā

akhilagaganagarbha[298]vyāpi[cxiv] saptaprakāra-[299]
grathitavacanarūpād yan mayāsādi puṇyam |
anupamasukhavidyāsaktasaddehanirmij-[cxv]
jinajanitajanārthas tena loko 'yam astu || 21 ||[cxvi]

tattvaratnāvalokaḥ samāptaḥ. kṛtir iyaṃ paṇḍitavāgī-
śvarakīrtipādānām.

śrīsamāje parā yasya bhaktir niṣṭhā ca[cxvii] nirmalā |
tasya vāgīśvarasyeyaṃ kṛtir vimatināśinī[300] ||

vikacakumudatārākṣīrakundānukāri[301,cxviii]
pracitam api ca puṇyaṃ yan mayā granthito 'smāt |
anupamasukhapūrṇaḥ svābhavidyopagūḍho
bhavatu nikhilalokas tena vāgīśvaraśrīḥ ||

[cxiv] One can either read °gaganagarbhavyāpi in compound with saptaprakāra° or as qualifying puṇya. It seems likely that the author intended this ambiguity.
[cxv] It would appear that nirmij (or nirmit) is metri causa for nirmimat.
[cxvi] This verse is in Mālinī metre.
[cxvii] Given the position of ca, it seems that we should take niṣṭhā as a substantive rather than an adjective qualifying bhakti. TV, somewhat unnaturally, reflects understanding niṣṭhā as an adjective meaning 'perfected' by rendering it mthar phyin pa.
[cxviii] The slight rearrangment of word order, from °kṣīratārā° to °tārākṣīra°, corrects the metre of the verse, which is Mālinī. Note, however, that TV perhaps reflects K's word order: 'o ma skar ma lta bu (TVA_D); 'o ma lta bur skar ma lta bu'i (TVB_G).

---

[298] °gaganagarbha°] corr.; °gagaṇagarbha° K E_DH
[299] °saptaprakāra°] E_DH; °sarvaprakāra° K
[300] vimatināśinī] E_DH; vimatināsanī K
[301] vikacakumudatārākṣīrakundānukāri] em.; vikacakumudakṣīratārakundānu-kāri E_DH; vikarektāmudakṣīratārākundānukāri K

tattvaratnāvalokavivaraṇaṃ samāptam. kṛtir iyaṃ paṇḍitācāryavā-
gīśvarakīrtipādānām.

References

Abhidharmakośa by Vasubandhu. **pradhan1975**

Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yośamitra. **wogihara1932to6**

Amṛtakaṇikā by Raviśrījñāna. **lal1994**

Nyāyabindu by Dharmakīrti. **scerbatskoj1918**

Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti by Manorathānandin. Sāṃkṛtyāyana ed.

Mantrārthāvalokinī by Vilāsavajra. **tribe2016**

Mitākṣarā of Vijñāneśvara. **acharya1949**

Vṛttamālāvivṛti by Śākyarakṣita. Hahn ed.

Saṃkṣiptābhiṣekavidhi by Vāgīśvarakīrti. **sakurai1996**sakurai1996)

Subhāṣitaratnakośa compiled by Vidyākara. **kosambigokhale1957**

Hetubinduṭīkāloka by Durvekamiśra. **sanghavi1949**

Secondary Sources