Tattvaratnāvaloka and its Vivaraņa

Vāgīśvarakīrti

February 24, 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.

Sigla and Abbreviations

TaRaa Tattvaratnāvaloka

TaRaa-Vi Tattvaratnāvalokavivaraņa 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 comme-

ntary (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 acknowle-

dging a greater possibility for alternatives]

fol./fols. folio/folios

pc post correctionem

 $egin{array}{ll} r & ext{recto} \ v & ext{verso} \end{array}$

Σ_{X}	Reading shared in all witnesses but X
((kiṃcit))	Reading uncertain-either illegible or othe-
	rwise in doubt
<kimcit></kimcit>	Reading cancelled
†kiṃcit†	Reading does not make sense to the editor and
	an adequate conjecture was not able to be cho-
	sen.
[kiṃcit]	Indication of a diagnostic conjecture
••	Damaged akṣara (one . per half akṣara)
	Lacunae of an unknown quantity of akṣaras
0	Mark of abbreviation

Text

mangalācaraņam 1

```
[K fol. 1r] [siddham]<sup>1</sup> namah śrīsadgurupādebhyah |<sup>i</sup>
anupamasukharūpī śrīnivāso 'nivāso
nirupamadaśadevīrūpavidyah² savidyah |
tribhuvanahitasaukhyaprāptikāro 'vikāro
jayati kamalapānir yāvad āśāvikāśāh || 1 || ii
```

[K fol. 2r3] namah samantakāyavākcittavajrāya. iii

anupametyādi. kamalam padmam pānau yasya sa kamalapānir avalokiteśvaro bhagavāñ jayatīti sambandhah. kimviśistah? anupa-

ⁱ Scribal homage

ⁱⁱ This verse is in Mālinī metre.

iii Scribal homage

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

mam ity^{3,iv} atipraņītatvamahattvāsaṃsārasthāyitvalakṣaṇair⁴ 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 paramarūpayauvanaśṛṅgārādirasa-mahākaruṇādiyuktatvenopamātikrāntā rūpavajrāditārāparyantada-śadevīrūpā vidyāḥ paricārakatvena⁶ yasya sa tathā. saha svābhārū-payā vidyayā⁷ vartata iti savidyaḥ. tribhuvanasya tribhuvanavartino janasya yad dhitam āyatipathyaṇ^{8,vi} buddhatvādikaṃ, sau-

 $^{^{\}mathrm{iv}}$ 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] TVAD; dang TVBG). 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.

Y 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 $\bar{a}yatipathyam$, treating instead $\bar{a}yati$ as a locative of $\bar{a}yat$. The expression appears as a gloss for hita in several Buddhists texts, such as in Vilāsavajra's $N\bar{a}mamantr\bar{a}rth\bar{a}valokin\bar{\imath}$: mahyam hitam maddhitam hitam $\bar{a}yatipathyam$ $\bar{a}g\bar{a}miparin\bar{a}matv\bar{a}t$ (p. 233). Similarly, Durvekamiśra writes in his $Hetubindut\bar{\imath}k\bar{a}loka$: parasmai hitam $\bar{a}yati$ pathyam (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° $E_{\rm DH}$

⁵ dharmakāyarūpatvena] em.; dharmakāyarūpitvena K E_{DH}

 $^{^6}$ paricārakatvena] em.; sapari((c))ārakatvena K; saparivārakatvena $\mathrm{E_{DH}}$

⁷ vidyayā] K E_{DH}; rig pa ste | shes rab TV (vidyayā prajñayā)

 $^{^8}$ āyatipathyam] variant word division in $E_{DH}\!\!:\!$ āyati pathyam; and in K: āyati | pathyam

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 Śākyaraksita, quoted in the following note. Similarly, the roughly parallel expression ayatisukha is evidnetly treated as a compound by Yasomitra in his Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: aihikasukhārtham apunyam iti. ihasukhāpeksayā tat krtam nāyatisukhāpekṣayety arthaḥ (vol. 1 p. 299). Note also the contrast made with aihikasukha. Likewise, we can find a compounded form of *āyatiduhkha* in a verse attributed to Naradatta in the Subhāsitaratnakośa: mundāpriyād āyatiduhkhadāyino vasantam utsārya vijrmbhitaśriyah | na kah khalāt tāpitamitramandalād upaiti pāpam tapavāsarād iva || 'Who does not become miserable because of a rogue who, like a hot day, is hated by widows (? mundā) (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 pathyam (word division unclear, pa and ya touching), we conjecture tadātve pathyam, following only partially the lead of TVAD. 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 ayatipathyam, for which tadatve pathyam fits. Another possibility is āpātapathyam, but tadātva is more often used in contrast with āyati. See, for example, Śākyaraksita's Vrttamālāstutivrtti: prthagjanatve 'pi āyatipathyadarśinas tadātve ca nispāpāh (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 saukhyam. 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 prāptih might be preferable to tasya yā prāptiḥ, but the singular is also probably acceptable in place of the dual.

6

 $^{^9}$ saukhyam tadātve pathyam] conj.; tad dāpayati pathyam K E_{DH} ($word\ division$ unclear); de la bde ba ni 'phral gyi phan pa TVAD; de la bde ba ni bde ba ste TVBG ¹⁰ prāptih] K E_{DH}; thob pa ni rnyed pa ste TV (prāptir lābhah)

[K fol. 2v] sākṣātkriyā, tasyāḥ karaṇaṃ kāro yasya sa tathā. viii aparinirvāṇadharmakatvenāpratiṣṭhitanirvāṇarūpatvenā 11 nyathātvalakṣaṇasya vikārasyābhāvād avikāraḥ. evaṃviśiṣṭo bhagavāñ jayati.

kiyantam kālam ity āha—yāvad āśāvikāśāḥ. āśā daśa diśo gaganasvarūpāḥ. yadvā āśāḥ sarvasattvānām bhavabhogatṛṣṇāḥ. 12 tāsām vikāśā avakāśāḥ pravartanāni, prādurbhāvā iti yāvat. te yāvat tāvad bhagavāñ jayati, sarvahariharahiraṇyagarbhādibhyaḥ prakrsto bhavatīty arthah.

atrānupamasukharūpīty anena svārthasaṃpattiḥ kathitā. śrīnivāsa ity anena tadupāyaḥ, puṇyajñānasambhārayoḥ śrīśadbenābhihitatvāt. tribhuvanahitasaukhyaprāptikāra ity anena parārthasaṃpattir uktā. nirupamadaśadevīrūpavidyaḥ savidya ity anena tadupāyaḥ, ¹⁴tathābhūtadaśadevīdvātriṃśallakṣaṇāśītyanuvyañjanakāyākāraśūnyena¹⁵ sarvākāraparārthasaṃpatteḥ kartum aśakyatvād iti.

TV does not clearly reflect a $\dot{s}a\dot{s}th\bar{b}ahuvr\bar{i}hi$ 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).

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 prāptim karoti. Compounds ending in kāra are occasionally analysed as ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣas: see, for examples, Vijñāneśvara's Mitākṣarā ad Yājñavalkya-dharmaśāstra 2.61 on satyaṃkārakṛta, here referring roughly to a thing 'acquired with a pledge', i.e., acquired as earnest money: karaṇaṃ kāraḥ, bhāve ghañ. satyaṣya kāraḥ 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.

 $^{^{11}}$ °rūpatvenā°] K $E_{DH};$ ngo bo rnyed pas TVA $_{D};$ ngo bo brnyed pas TVB $_{G}$ (°rūpaprāptyā°)

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

śrīmantranītigatacārucaturthasekarūpam vidanti na hi ye sphuṭaśabdaśūnyam | nānopadeśagaṇasaṃkulasaptabhedais teṣāṃ sphuṭāvagataye kriyate prayatnaḥ $\parallel 2 \parallel^{\mathrm{ix}}$

śrīmantranītiśabdena¹⁶ sāmānyayogatantravācakenāpi śrīsamājaḥ¹⁷ parigṛhyate, caturthārthakasyānyatrāsambhavāt. śeṣaṃ subodham. nānācāryopadeśagaṇasaṃkulai $[E_{DH}\ p.\ 133]$ r vyākulaiḥ¹⁸ saptabhir bhedaiḥ prakārair¹⁹ atītānāgatavartamānācārya²⁰gatopadeśarāśisaṃgrāhakaiḥ.^{21,x} sphuṭāvagataye sukhena sphuṭapratītyartham²² 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 $vy\bar{a}kula$. 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 $vip\bar{u}rna$ in some texts). One may wish to conjecture such a reading. TVA_D is significantly different here, even 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: $n\bar{a}nopade\acute{s}ety\bar{a}di$. $at\bar{i}t\bar{a}n\bar{a}gatavartam\bar{a}n\bar{a}c\bar{a}ryopade\acute{s}ara\acute{s}isamgrāhakaiḥ$ saptabhir bhedaih samkulair $vy\bar{a}kulaih$ $sarvatrav\bar{i}p\bar{u}rnaih$ taih $s\bar{a}dhyasamkulaih$.

 $^{^{16}}$ śrīmantranītiśabdena] K $E_{\rm DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (dpal ldan sngags kyi gzhung lugs zhes bya ba'i sgras); dpal ldan sngags kyi gzhung lugs shes \parallel zhes bya ba la sogs pa la \mid sngags kyi gzhung lugs zhes bya ba'i sgras ni \mid TVA $_{\rm D}$ (śrīmantranītigatetyādi. mantranītiśabdena)

 $^{^{17}}$ śrīsamājaḥ] K $\mathrm{E_{DH}};$ shugs ky
is dpal gsang ba 'dus pa TV (sāmarthyāt śrīsamājaḥ)

 $^{^{18}}$ vyākulaiḥ] K $E_{\rm DH};$ rnam par dkrugs pas rnam pa thams cad la rnam par khyab pa TVA $_{\rm D};$ rnam par 'khrugs pa rnam par bkab pa ste TVB $_{\rm G};$ 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 $\rm E_{DH}$; b
de bar gnas par khong du chud par bya ba'i phyir TVA $_{\rm D}$; b
de bar gsal bar khong du chud par bya'o TVB $_{\rm G}$

3 tīrthikānām tattvam sādhyam ca

sambhrāntabodhā nikhilā hi tīrthyās tattvasya sādhyasya ca rūpavittau | tebhyaḥ prakṛṣṭaḥ kila tattvavettā vedāntavādīti janapravādaḥ || 3 ||^{xi}

sambhrāntetyādi. sambhrānto vibhrānto bodhaḥ prajñāviśeṣo yeṣāṃ tīrthikānāṃ te tatho[K fol. 3r]ktāḥ.²³ sarva eva tīrthyā ātmātmīyagrahatimiropahatabuddhinayanāḥ. tattvam idam iti sādhyam idam²⁴ iti ca tattvasya sādhyasya yat²⁵ svarūpam, tasya yā vittiḥ pratītiḥ, tasyāṃ bhrāntāḥ. śeṣaṃ subodham.

nanu tattvasādhyayor upādeyatvenaikarūpatvāt kathaṃ tattvasya sādhyasya ceti^{26,xii} bhedena nirdeśa iti cet. asad etat. tattvaṃ hy upādeyatve 'pi²⁷ sukhaduḥkhopekṣādisakalapratibhāsasaṃdohavyāpakam.²⁸ sādhyaṃ cānabhimataparihāreṇecchālakṣaṇaṃ phalam upādeyatve 'pi sakalaprāṇibhir avaśyam evāsādhyavyāvṛttyā sādhayitavyatvenābhimatam ity adoṣaḥ.

4 vedāntavādinām śrāvakapratyekabuddhānām ca sādhyāni

tatra tāvad 29 vedāntavādyabhimatam 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 $_{\rm DH}$

²⁴ sādhyam idam] *em.*; sādhyam cedam K E_{DH}

²⁵ yat] E_{DH} (em.); tat K

²⁶ katham tattvasya sādhyasya ceti] em.; tat katham tatvasya sādhyasya ceti K; tattvasya sādhyasya ceti katham $E_{\rm DH}$ (em.)

 $^{^{27}}$ upādeyatve 'pi] $\mathit{conj}.$ (TV: blang bar by
a ba nyid yin yang); upādeyatvenāpi K $\mathrm{E_{DH}}$

 $^{^{28}}$ °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 śāntam³⁰ | saśrāvakāḥ³¹ khaḍgajināś ca sādhyam icchanti rūpādyupadher virāmam || 4 ||

ānandarūpam iti sadā sukhamayatvāt. svavid iti jyotīrūpatvena³² svayam prakāśamānatvāt.³³ aprakampyam iti nityatayā³⁴ kampayitum aśakyatvāt. śāntam³⁵ iti kleśopakleśaśūnyatvena parikalpitatvāt. evaṃvidhaṃ sādhyam uṣanti kāmayante.

saha śrāvakair vartante ye khaḍgajināḥ khaḍgaviṣāṇakalpā e-kacāriṇo vargacāriṇaś³⁶ ca pratyekabuddhās te sādhyam icchanti. kīdṛśam? rūpādyupadher virāmaṃ rūpavedanāsaṃjñāsaṃskāravijñānalakṣaṇānām upadhīnāṃ skandhānāṃ virāmaṃ vicchedam, nirodham iti yāvat. [E_{DH} p. 134] etad uktaṃ bhavati—sarvaśrāvakapratyekabuddhāḥ sopadhiśeṣanirupadhiśeṣabhedena bhinne 'pi nirvāṇe³⁶ nirupadhiśeṣam eva nirvāṇaṃ sā[K fol. 3v]kṣātkartavyatvena sādhyaṃ pratipannāḥ.

5 pāramitānayavādinām caturvidham sādhyam

idānīṃ pāramitānayavādinām abhimataṃ 38 caturvidhaṃ sādhyam āha—ākāraśūnyam ityādi.

ākāraśūnyaṃ gaganendurūpaṃ pratyātmavedyaṃ karuṇārasaṃ ca | sallaksanair bhūsitam³⁹ 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*.

 $[\]overline{^{30}}$ śantam] corr.; santam K E_{DH}; no reflex in TM_D

 $^{^{31}}$ saśrāvakāh
] $\mathit{em.};$ saśrāvakā K $\mathrm{E_{DH}}$

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 vargacārinaś] K TV (tshogs kyi spyod pa); vanacārinaś E_{DH}

³⁷ nirvāņe] E_{DH}; nirvāņa° K

³⁸ abhimatam] E_{DH}; abhimata K

³⁹ bhūsitam] E_{DH}; bhusitam K

dānādiniṣyandam apetasaukhyam || 5 || sānandasallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ sambhujyamānaṃ daśabhūmisaṃsthaiḥ | sattvārthakāri pravadanti sādhyaṃ dānādiṣaṭpāramitānayasthāḥ || 6 ||^{xiv}

5.1 pāramitānaye prathamam sādhyam

ākārair nīlapītasukhaduḥkhādibhiś citrarūpaiḥ śūnyaṃ nirākāram. ata eva gaganasyeva nirākāratvenendor iva prabhāsvaratvena rūpaṃ svabhāvo yasya tat tathā. pratyātmavedyam iti svasaṃvedanaikavedyam. A karuṇā duḥkhād duḥkhahetor vā sakalajagadabhyuddharaṇakāmatā. Saiva rasaḥ svabhāvo yasya tat tathoktam. etad uktaṃ bhavati—nīlapītādicitrākāraśūnyaṃ nirābhāsaṃ nirañjanaṃ gaganopamaṃ svacchaṃ sakalajagadarthakāri mahākaruṇāyuktaṃ 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 Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti: duḥkhād duḥkhahetoś ca samuddharaṇakāmatā karuṇā (edition reads dukhā°; p. 21).

xvi One may instead wish to accept the manuscript reading $nir\bar{a}bh\bar{a}sanira\tilde{n}janam$, which is understandable as a $vi\acute{s}esanasam\bar{a}sa$. The combination of $nir\bar{a}bh\bar{a}sam$ $nira\tilde{n}janam$ occurrs in a verse from an untraced source cited in Raviśrījñāna's $Amrtakanik\bar{a}$: $yat k\bar{a}yam sarvabuddh\bar{a}n\bar{a}m nir\bar{a}bh\bar{a}sam niranjanam \mid ajnatam a-krtam śuddham abhāvādivivarjitam || (p. 19)$

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 evidenly closely related.

 $^{^{40}}$ svasamvedanaikavedyam] E_{DH} (em.) (°vedyam); svasamvedyanaikavedyam K

 $^{^{41}}$ karuņā duḥkhād] K; karuņāduḥkhā° $\rm E_{DH}$

⁴² °abhyuddharanakāmatā] em.; °atyuddharanakāmatā K E_{DH}

⁴³ nirābhāsam] *em.*; nirābhāsa° K E_{DH}

5.2 pāramitānaye dvitīyam sādhyam

śobhanāni ca tāni lakṣaṇāni ca dvātriṃśallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni, 44,xviii tair bhūṣitam. arthaṃ janānāṃ prayojanaṃ kartuṃ śīlaṃ svabhāvo yasya tad arthakāri. 5 dānādīnāṃ daśapāramitānāṃ niṣyandaṃ tatprakarṣaprabhavatvena sadṛśaṃ phalam. duḥkhasya pūrvam eva prahīṇatvāt, sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ saukhyasyāpy abhāvāt, upekṣārūpatvenāpetasaukhyam apagatasaukhyam. etad uktaṃ bhavati—dvātriṃśallakṣaṇadharāśītyanuvyañjanavirājitaśarīraṃ sakalajagadarthakāri dānādipāramitābhyāsa balenātmānaṃ

xviii The manuscript reading ceti after dvātriṃśallakṣaṇasaṃjñakāni appear superfluous. The commentary analyses sallakṣaṇa as a karmadhāraya, glossing sat with śobhana; dvātriṃśallakṣaṇa serves as a clarification of that, requiring no further 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 mahāsukhasaṃjñaka. 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: bhūtārthabhāvanāprakarṣaparyantajaṃ yogijñānaṃ ceti.

xxi Isaacson (personal communication) proposes $s\bar{a}k\bar{s}\bar{a}tkara\bar{n}\bar{a}vasth\bar{a}y\bar{a}\bar{m}$ or $s\bar{a}-k\bar{s}\bar{a}tkrty\bar{a}vasth\bar{a}y\bar{a}\bar{m}$ as potentially supperior readings to the manuscript's $s\bar{a}k\bar{s}\bar{a}-tkrt\bar{a}vat\bar{a}sth\bar{a}y\bar{a}\bar{m}$ or the previous edition's $s\bar{a}k\bar{s}\bar{a}tkrt\bar{a}vasth\bar{a}y\bar{a}\bar{m}$.

In support of the former, see Vāgīśvarakīrti's Saṃkṣiptābhiṣekavidhi: tadanantaram ekatathatāmatena tayaiva bhinnamate tv ānayā svasaṃviditajñānasākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ pūrvoktagāthayā adhyeṣitavate śiṣyāya tatpāṇau tasyāḥ pāṇiṃ pratisthāpya | (p. 417)

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

 $^{^{45}}$ tad arthakāri] K $E_{\rm DH}$ TVA $_{\rm D}$ (de ni don mdzad pa'o); de ni de'i don mdzad pa'o TVB $_{\rm G}$ (tad tadarthakāri)

 $^{^{46}}$ sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ
]conj. (Isaacson); sākṣātkṛtāvasthāyāṃ $\rm E_{DH};$ sākṣātkṛtāvatāsthāyāṃ K

⁴⁷ abhāvāt] *em.* (Isaacson); abhāvatvāt K E_{DH}

 $^{^{48}}$ °balenātmānaṃ] K E_{DH} ; stobs kyis b
dag nyid TVA $_{D}$; stobs kyis byung ba TVB $_{G}$

† samyaksaṃbuddharūpaṃ sukhaduḥkharahitatvenopekṣārūpaṃ dvitīyam sādhyam.

5.3 pāramitānaye tṛtīyam sādhyam

[E_{DH} p. 135] sānandetyādi. sahānandena vartata iti sā[K fol. 4r]nandam. sānandam ca tat sallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ ca⁴⁹ sambhujyamānam dharmadeśanādvāreṇopajīvyamānam. 50,xxii kaiḥ? daśabhūmīśvaraiḥ, pariśiṣṭabhūmisthitānām⁵¹ agocaratvāt. daśabhūmiprāptair avalokiteśvaramañjuśrīprabhṛtibhir upabhujyamānam iti yāvat. etad uktaṃ bhavati—śuddhāvāsopari ghanavyūhasaṃjñake⁵² samyaksaṃbuddhabhuvane yathā bhagavān ānandarūpaḥ sambhogakāyātmā nirmāṇadvāreṇa⁵³ sakalajagadarthasaṃpādakaḥ śrāvakapratyekabuddhanavabhūmīśvarair apy adṛśyaśarīro daśabhūmīśvarair eva paraṃ bodhisattvair⁵⁴ dharmaśravaṇadvāreṇopabhujyamāna⁵⁵ āsaṃsāraṃ cakāsti, tathaiva tat sādhyam iti tṛtīyam.

5.4 pāramitānaye caturtham sādhyam

saṃpūrya dānādiguṇān aśeṣān saṃbuddhakṛtyaṃ⁵⁶ sakalaṃ ca kṛtvā | yad bhūtakoṭeḥ karaṇaṃ ca sākṣāt sādhyaṃ tad apy asti nirodharūpam || 7 ||^{xxiii}

xxiii This verse is in Indravajrā metre.

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

⁴⁹ sallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ ca] *em.* (Isaacson); sallakṣaṇamaṇḍitāṅgaṃ K E_{DH}

 $^{^{50}}$ °opajīvyamānam] K $E_{\rm DH};$ nye bar longs spyod par gyur pa'o TV (°opabhujyamānam)

⁵¹ parisistabhūmi°] *corr.*; parisista 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) $E_{\rm DH};$ mchog tu gyur pa'i byang chub sems dpa' TV (paramabodhisattvair)

⁵⁵ °bhujyamāna] *em*.; °bhujyamānam K E_{DH}

 $^{^{56}}$ saṃbuddhakṛtyaṃ] $\it em.$ (cf. TaRaA-V: saṃbuddhānāṃ ... avaśyakartavyaṃ kṛtsnaṃ); saṃbuddhya kṛtyaṃ K $\rm E_{DH}$

saṃpūryetyādi. dānādipāramitā eva guṇā, guṇyante^{xxiv} 'bhyasyanta iti kṛtvā. tān saṃpūrya paripūrṇān⁵⁷ kṛtvā, yat saṃbuddhānāṃ kṛtyaṃ sakalam^{58,xxv} avaśyakartavyaṃ kṛtsnaṃ tad api kṛtvā, bhūtakoṭeḥ śūnyatālakṣaṇāyāś cittacaittanirodhātmikāyā⁵⁹ yat sākṣāt karaṇaṃ tad api sādhyam astīti pāramitānayasthā evaṃ bruvate caturthaṃ sādhyam iti.

6 mantranaye saptavidham sādhyam

6.1 mantranaye prathamam sādhyam

idānīm mantranayopadiṣṭam saptavidham⁶⁰ sādhyam kathayitum āha—svābhāṅganetyādi.

svābhāṅganāśleṣi⁶¹ janārthakāri⁶² duḥkhaiḥ sukhaiś caiva vimuktirūpam | aśītyanuvyañjanabhūṣitāṅgam apetakalpaṃ pravadanti sādhyam || 8 || xxvi

^{xxiv} In the $Dh\bar{a}tup\bar{a}tha$, the tenth class verbal root \sqrt{guna} is said to express $\bar{a}ma-ntrana$. Here, however, this is a denominative verb with the sense of $\bar{a}mredana$ (multiplication/repetition) formed from the noun guna.

xxv The manuscript's reading of simply sakalam instead of kṛtyam sakalam is asymmetrical given the following gloss, avaśyakartavyam 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 kṛtyam sakalam. It is also possible that sakalam is a mistaken scribal addition, but it's also possible that even if the Tibetan translators saw kṛtyam 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 paripūrņān] *em.*; paripūrņam K E_{DH}

 $^{^{58}}$ kṛtyam sakalam] conj.; sakalam K E_{DH} ; no reflex in TV

⁵⁹ cittacaitta°] E_{DH} (em.); cittacaitya° K

 $^{^{60}}$ saptavidham] E_{DH} (TM $_{\mathrm{D}}$: rnam pa bdun); caturtham K

 $^{^{61}}$ svābhāṅganāśleṣi] E_{DH} (corr.); svābhāṅgaṇāśleṣi K

 $^{^{62}}$ janārthakāri] conj. (T $\rm M_D$: 'gro ba yi don mdzad; TaRaA-V: jagadarthakāri); ta..rthakāri K (akṣara uncertain, perhaps gna or mva); tadarthakāri E $_{\rm DH}$

svābhāṅganām⁶³ āśleṣituṃ śīlaṃ svabhāvo yasya tat svābhāṅganā-śleṣi. [E_{DH} p. 136] apetakalpaṃ vyapagatakalpam, kalpanārahitam iti yāvat. anyat subodham. ayam arthaḥ—samāliṅgitasvābhāṅganā-śleṣi jagadarthakāri dvātriṃśallakṣaṇavibhūṣitaśarīram upekṣārūpaṃ 67,xxviii prathamaṃ sādhyam.

6.2 mantranaye dvitīyam sādhyam

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

svadevatetyādi. svadevatākāraviśeṣeṇa⁶⁸ sveṣṭadevatākāreṇa śūnyam, nirākāram iti yāvat. prāg eva prathamataram⁶⁹ upadeśāna-

xxvii The compound *svābhāṅganāśleṣajagadarthakāri* is strictly speaking not impossible, and could perhaps be interpreted as an instrumental *tatpuruṣa*; however, 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 dropped 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] $\it corr.;$ svābhāṅgaṇāśleṣi K $\rm E_{DH}$

 $^{^{65}}$ °svābhāṅganāśleṣi jagadarthakāri] conj. (TVB $_{\rm G}$: nyid dang mtshungs pa'i lha mos 'khyud pa can 'gro ba'i don mdzad pa); °svābhāṅganāśleṣajagadarthakāri K ${\rm E}_{\rm DH}$; nyid dang mtshungs pa'i lha mos 'khyud pa can | 'gro ba ma lus pa'i don mdzad pa TVA $_{\rm D}$ (°svābhāṅganāślesy aśesajagadarthakāri)

⁶⁶ śarīram] E_{DH}; śarīra K

 $^{^{67}}$ upekṣārūpaṃ] K $E_{\rm DH}$; b
tang snyoms kyi ngo bo du 'khor ba ji srid du bzhugs pa m
ngon du bya ba yin no zhe bya ba TVA $_{\rm D}$; b
tang snyoms kyi ngo bo nyid du 'khor ba ji bzhugs pa m
ngon sum du bya ba yin zhes bya ba TVB $_{\rm G}$ (upekṣārūpaṃ āsaṃsāras
thāyi 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, bhāvanayā sākṣāt kṛtvā, sphuṭaṃ^{71,xxxi} sphu[K fol. 4v]ṭīkṛtaṃ san mahāsukhasaṃjñakaṃ bhavati. tac ca jagadarthakāri cintāmaṇisamānarūpam. etad uktaṃ bhavati—upadeśānantaram eva mantramudrādevatākārarahitaṃ⁷² bhāvanayā sphuṭīkṛtaṃ mahāsukhasaṃjñakaṃ cintāmaṇivaj jagadarthakāri⁷³ māyopamam āsaṃsārasthāyi dvitīyaṃ sādhyam.

6.3 mantranaye tṛtīyam sādhyam

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

kṛtvetyādi. svādhipaṃ sveṣṭadaivataṃ sākṣāt kṛtvāmukhīkṛtya sātarūpaṃ sukhaikasvabhāvam, paścād devatākāraṃ parityajya, sukhamātraṃ⁷⁴ phalaṃ sādhyaṃ vyavasthitaṃ syāt.

nanu yadi 75 sākṣāt kṛtvāpi devatākāras tyaktavyaḥ, tarhi prathamam eva kasmād [$\rm E_{DH}$ p. 137] vibhāvitaḥ? sukhamātram eva dvitī-

 $\overline{^{70}}$ upadeśānantaram eva] $\overline{\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{DH}}}$ (*em.*); upadeśāntaram eva K; bshad ma thag pa'i TV

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 sphuṭaṃ, appears to indicate a misunderstanding on the translator's part, confusing the word division of kṛtvā sphuṭaṃ. It is not possible for sphuṭīkṛtaṃ to take an accusitve object, nor is a form such as sphuṭīkṛtya possible without larger changes to the text.

xxxii This verse is in Śālinī metre.

⁷¹ sphuṭaṃ] K; deest in E_{DH}; ma gsal ba TV

 $^{^{72}}$ °rahitam] K E_{DH} TVB $_{G}$ (spangs ste); spangs te | bde ba 'ba' zhig tsam TVA $_{D}$ (°rahitam 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 (aśesajagadarthakāri)

 $^{^{74}}$ sukhamātraṃ] em.; sukhamātra° K ${
m E}_{
m DH}$

 $^{^{75}}$ nanu yadi] $\emph{conj.};$ nanu K $E_{DH};$ gal te TVA $_{D}$ ([nanu] yadi); $\emph{no clear reflex}$ TVB $_{G}$

yasādhyavat kim na vibhāvitam?⁷⁶ kim vṛthāprayāsenety⁷⁷ āha—śuddham ityādi. śuddham kevalam devatākāravirahitam sukhamātram naiva sākṣāt kartum śakyate, ākārarahitasya sukhasyānupalambhāt.⁷⁸ tasmāt tena kāraṇenākāro bhāvitaḥ svādhipasyeti tṛtīyam.⁷⁹ ayam arthaḥ⁸⁰—devatākārasaṃvalitam eva sukham vibhāvya, sākṣādbhūte devatākāram tyaktvā, sukhamātram eva sādhyam uktaguṇam.^{xxxiii}

6.4 mantranaye caturtham sādhyam

gagaṇasamaśarīraṃ lakṣaṇair bhūṣitāṅgaṃ nirupamasukhapūrṇaṃ⁸¹ svābhayā saṃgataṃ ca | sphuradamitamunīndraiḥ⁸² sarvasattvārthakāri pravadati punar anyaḥ sādhyam ucchedaśūnyam || 11 || xxxiv

gagaṇetyādi. gagaṇasamaṃ māyopamaṃ vicārāsahaṃ⁸³ śarīraṃ yasya. lakṣaṇair dvātriṃśadbhir⁸⁴ aśītibhiś cānuvyañjanair maṇḍitāny aṅgāni yasya. nirupamaiḥ sthaulya⁸⁵-nairantarya⁸⁶-āsaṃsārapravā-

xxxiii Here TV reads yon tan du 'chad do, whereas K transmits the reading uktagunam. 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.*; vibhāvitah E_{DH} (*em.*); vibhāgato K

⁷⁷ vṛthāprayāsenety] E_{DH}; vyathāprayāsenety K

 $^{^{78}}$ sukhasyā°] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (bde ba); bde ba 'ba' zhig TVA $_{\rm D}$ (kevalasukhasyā°)

 $^{^{79}}$ °eti tṛtīyam] $\it em.~TVB_G$ (zhes by
a ba gsum pa yin no); °eti tṛtīyaḥ K $E_{\rm DH};$ ste bsgrub par by
a ba gsum pa yin no $TVA_{\rm D}$ (tṛtīyaṃ sādhyam)

⁸⁰ arthah] E_{DH}; artha K

 $^{^{81}}$ nirupama°] $E_{DH};$ nirūpama° K

^{82 °}munīndraiḥ] *em.*; °munīndraḥ K E_{DH}

 $^{^{83}}$ māyopamam vicārāsaham] K (slightly unclrear); māyopamavicārasaha $\rm E_{DH}$

 $^{^{84}}$ 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] dvātriṃśadbhir lakṣaṇair)

 $^{^{85}}$ sthaulya°] K E_{DH} ; rgya nom pa nyid dang | rgya che ba nyid dang TVA $_D$ (praṇītatvasthaulya°); lhun che ba nyid dang | TVB $_G$ (sthaulya°)

⁸⁶ °nairantarya°] E_{DH} (*em.*) (TV: bar med pa nyid dang); °nairuttaryā° K

hitva⁸⁷-nirāsravatvādibhir upamābhāvād upamātikrāntaiḥ sukhaiḥ pūrṇaṃ romāgraparyantaṃ^{88,xxxv} saṃpūrṇam.^{xxxvi} svābhayā ca tathābhūtayā saṃgataṃ samāliṅgitam. sphuradbhir⁸⁹ anantanirmitair munīndrais tathābhūtair eva sarvasattvārthakāri.⁹⁰ ucchedeneti nirodhena śūnyaṃ tucchaṃ riktam.⁹¹

etad uktaṃ bhavati—gagana-māyā-marīci⁹²-gandharvanagara-udakacandra-pratibimba-svapnopamam^{93,94} [K fol. 5r] ekānekabhāvābhāvagrāhyagrāhakasvabhāvarahitam anādyantam aśeṣavastu-saṃdohasvabhāvam^{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

<code>xxxvi</code> TO CHECK: TVAD appears to be defective here, with different readings in Derge Koyosan and Delhi. TVAD: ba spu'i rtse mo'i mthar thug par gyur pa'o \parallel (gyur pa'o \parallel) Koyosan; gyur ba'i Delhi [MW23703]). TVBG: ba spu'i rtse mo'i mthar thug par yang dag par gang bar gyur pa'o \parallel

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° ${
m E_{DH}}$ K

 $^{^{88}}$ pūrņam romāgraparyantam] $\mathit{conj.}$ (TV: gang ba ni | ba spu rtse mo'i mthar thug pa); pūrņnam masimāgrapayantam K; pūrņatām samāśrayantam E_{DH}

 $^{^{89}}$ sphuradbhir] K $E_{\rm DH};$ 'phro bar gyur pa de yang TVA $_{\rm D}$ (sphuradbhir tair api) (other syntactic placement possible); 'phro ba yang TVB $_{\rm G}$ (sphurdbhair api)

 $^{^{90}}$ sarvasattvārtha°] K E_{DH} (TVB $_{\!G}$: sems can thams cad kyi don); sems can gyi don TVA $_{\!D}$ (sattvārtha°)

⁹¹ tuccham riktam] K; bhūstham riktam E_{DH}; spangs pa'o TV (tuccham / riktam)

 $^{^{92}}$ māyāmarīci°] K E_{DH} (TVB $_{G}$: sgyu ma dang | smig rgyu dang |); sgyu ma dang | smig rgyu dang | smig rgyu dang | TVA $_{D}$ (māyāmarīcīndrajāla° / māyendrajāla-marīci°)

⁹³ °svapnopamam] E_{DH}; svapnāpayam 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 (anādyantāśesavastusvabhāvam)

vam, dvātriṃśallakṣaṇavibhūṣitaśarīram aśītyanuvyañjanavirājitagātraṃ paramaśṛṅgārayauvanādyupetaṃ svābhāṅganāliṅgitāṅgaṃ rūpavajrāditārāparyantadevīgaṇair anantaprabhedānimittarati svarūpaparamānandopabhogadvāreṇa pratibimbavat [E_{DH} p. 138] sambhujyamānaṃ karuṇāsaṃvalitodārarūpatayā sambhogakāyarūpam, nānādhimuktivineyajanaparipācanārtham anekavidhaprātihāryadvāreṇa 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 \bar{a} rati, neither of which can reject prima facia. TVA_D suggests 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 animittarati or mtshan ma med pa'i dga' ba does occurr in Jñānapāda's Samantabhadrasādhana: animittarativiśuddheḥ samastadevīgaṇasvabhāvaṃ tat | (122ab; reconstructed 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 entertained, the main ambiguity is whether anantaprabheda qualifies animittarati or paramānanda. An analysis on the basis of the former could read: anantāḥ prabhedāḥ yasya sānantaprabhedānimittaratiḥ, tatsvarūpasya paramānandasyopabhogaḥ, taddvāreṇa. Of the Tibetan translation, while TVAD renders all words found in the Sanskrit text as constitued in some form, it is hard to intrepret if one does not remove or modify various instrumental and genitive particles. From rūpavajrā° up to sambhujyamānaṃ, TVAD 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. TVBG has the same readings, apart from the two suspected lacunae mentioned above.

xxxix E_{DH} misreports K as reading paripāvanārtha.

 $^{^{96}}$ °gātram] K E_{DH} ; no reflext in TV

 $^{^{97}}$ anantaprabhedānimittarati°] conj. (TVAD: mtshan ma med pa'i dga' ba'i rang gi ngo bo'i rab tu dbye ba dpag tu med pas); anantaprabhedānimittārati° KEDH; mtshan ma med pa'i rang gi ngo bo'i rab tu dpag tu med pas TVBG

 $^{^{98}}$ anekavidhaprātihārya°] K $E_{\rm DH};$ rdzu 'phrul dang cho 'phrul rnam pa du ma $\rm TVA_D$ TVB $_G$ (anekaṛddhiprātihārya°)

sattvaspharaṇasaṃhārakāritvena⁹⁹ nirmāṇakāyātmakam, śūnyatā-karuṇābhinnabodhicitta¹⁰⁰svabhāvāmalaprajñopāyasamādhisambhūtasatsukhāpūrṇam^{xl} āsaṃsārasthitidharmaṃ¹⁰¹ apratiṣṭhitanirvāṇarūpaṃ nirmalanivātaniścalapradīpaśikhāprabandhanityatayā nirodhaśūnyaṃ caturthaṃ¹⁰² sādhyam.

6.5 mantranaye pañcamam sādhyam

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

kṛtvetyādi. sākṣāt svādhipaṃ kṛtvā, paścāt¹⁰⁶ tyaktvā, upekṣārūpaṃ yaj jñānaṃ tanmātraṃ sādhyaṃ syāt. anyat sugamam.¹⁰⁷ etad u-ktaṃ bhavati—maṇḍalacakrarūpaṃ sākṣāt kṛtvā, paścāt tan nirodhya, upekṣājñānamātraṃ sādhyaṃ syāt pañcamam.

6.6 mantranaye şaştham 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 paśvet.

^{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 $_{\rm G}$: by
ang chub sems dpa'i); °bodhi° K $\rm E_{DH}$; by
ang chub sems dpa' la sogs pa'i TVA $_{\rm D}$ (°bodhisattvādi°)

¹⁰⁰ °bodhicitta°] E_{DH}; °bodhicittā° K

¹⁰¹ °dharmam] conj. (TV: chos can); °dharmānām K E_{DH}

¹⁰² caturtham] E_{DH}; caturtha K

 $^{^{103}}$ tyaktvopekṣā°] K (E $_{\rm DH}$ incorrectly reports as tyajyo°) (TaRaa-Vi: tyaktvā, upekṣārūpaṃ yaj jñānaṃ); bhāvopekṣā° E $_{\rm DH}$ (em.); no reflex in TM $_{\rm D}$

 $^{^{104}}$ cintā°] K pc E $_{
m DH}$; cittā° K ac

¹⁰⁵ °prakhyam] E_{DH}; °prakhyamm K

¹⁰⁶ paścāt] E_{DH}; paścāta K

¹⁰⁷ sugamam] E_{DH}; sūgamam K

¹⁰⁸ nirvrtiś] K; nirvrtim E_{DH}

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

kṛtvetyādi. kṛtvā sākṣān maṇḍalaṃ sātasaṃvalitam,¹¹⁰ tasya svechayā nirvṛtir nirodhaḥ.

nanu yadi sākṣāt kṛtvāpi paścāt svecchayā nirodhayita[K fol. 5v]vyam, 111 tadā karuṇāyā anekakālābhyastāyā abhāvaḥ syāt. tasyāś cābhāvāt sattvārthābhāvaḥ [E_{DH} p. 139] syād ity āśaṅkyāha—sattvārthasyāpy asty abhāvo na vetyādi. asmin pakṣe sattvārthābhāvo nāsti, yasmān nirvṛtāc cakrāt karuṇāsaṃvalitāt sattvārthasya prādurbhāvo 'sti. xliv

etenaitad evāha—sātasaṃpūrṇacakraṃ^{xlv} sākṣāt kṛtvā, yāvad iṣṭaṃ kālaṃ vyavasthāpya, paścāt tasya sarvathaiva pradīpavan nirodhaṃ kṛtvā sthātavyam.^{112,xlvi} yadā punaḥ sattvārthābhilāṣo bha-

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

xliii This verse is in Śālinī metre.

 $^{^{}xliv}$ The syntax of TV suggests reading $karun\bar{a}samvalitasya$: '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, $karun\bar{a}samvalita$ naturally qualifies cakra and not $sattv\bar{a}rtha$.

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 referring 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 $krtv\bar{a}$ $sth\bar{a}tavyam$ 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 $sth\bar{a}tavya$ can be understood to be the unspecified $s\bar{a}dhaka$ who is also the agent of the gerunds earlier in the sentence. Although a genudive of the causitive of $\sqrt{sth\bar{a}}$, $sth\bar{a}tavya$ here has no object that is specified apart from the $s\bar{a}dhaka$ himsef: 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 Hevajratantra, such as in 2.3.44: $satatam\ devat\bar{a}m\bar{u}rty\bar{a}$ $sth\bar{a}tavyam\ yogin\bar{a}$ yatah; '... for the $yogin\ should\ always\ establish\ himself/remain\ with\ the\ form\ of\ the\ deity$.'

¹⁰⁹ nirvrtād] E_{DH}; nivrtād K

 $^{^{110}}$ sātasaṃvalitam] $\it em.$ (TV: bde ba'i rang bzhin can); sātaṃ saṃvalitaṃ K $\rm E_{DH}$

¹¹¹ nirodhayitavyam] *em.*; nirodhayitavyah K E_{DH}

 $^{^{112}}$ nirodham kṛtvā sthātavyam] K $\rm E_{DH};$ 'gog pa yin no TV (nirodham)

vati, tadā¹¹³ niruddhād eva cakrāntaram utpādya sattvārthaḥ kartavyaḥ. cakrāntarotpāde¹¹⁴ 'pi ciraniruddhād¹¹⁵ eva cakrād yathābhavyatayā¹¹⁶ vineyānāṃ yathābhilaṣitaprāptir bhavatīti ṣaṣṭham.¹¹⁷

6.7 mantranaye saptamam 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 phalasya¹¹⁹ sādhyatvād yad yad evābhiṣṭaṃ¹²⁰ tad¹²¹ eva sākṣāt kṛtvā, paścāt sarvathaiva pradīpavan nirodha uttarakālaṃ sattvārthādiśūnyaḥ sākṣāt kartavyaḥ.

nanu ṣaṭpakṣabhedena ṣaḍ eva¹²² nirodhāḥ syuḥ. tat katham eka eva nirodha ity āśaṅkyāha—abhinnetyādi. abhinnaṃ¹²³ rūpaṃ yasya sa tathā.¹²⁴ na hi nirodhānām satpaksalaksanabhede 'pi bhedo

xlvii Both readings—nirodhaḥ and nirodhaṃ—are possible, but the former is supported by the following two verses, which have a similar structure in the second $p\bar{a}da$ with a nominative form preceding $\bar{a}ha$: °sv $\bar{a}das$ turyaṃ sekam $\bar{a}h\bar{a}varaṃ$ 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] $\it em.$ (TV: rin du 'gags pa'i); citaniruddhād K; cittaniruddhād $\rm E_{DH}$

¹¹⁶ yathābhavyatayā] *variant word division in* E_{DH}: yathā bhavyatayā

 $^{^{117}}$ ṣaṣṭham] K (ṣaṣṭhaṃ) E_{DH} TVB $_{G}$ (drug pa'o); bsgrub par bya ba drug pa'o TVA $_{D}$ (sādhyam sastham)

¹¹⁸ nirodhah] em.; nirodha(m) K (fort. corr. h); nirodham E_{DH}

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

 $^{^{120}}$ phalasya sādhyatvād yad yad evābhiṣṭaṃ] K $E_{\rm DH}$; 'bras bu bsgrub bya gang kho na TVA $_{\rm D}$ (phalaṃ sādhyaṃ yad eva); 'bras bu bsgrub bya gang kho na mngon par 'dod pa TVB $_{\rm G}$ (phalam sādhyam yad evābhistam)

¹²¹ tad] E_{DH} TVB_G (de); sad K; no reflex in TVA_D

¹²² sad eva] E_{DH}; satreva K

¹²³ abhinnam] E_{DH}; abhinna K

 $^{^{124}}$ sa tathā] *em.*; tat tathā K E_{DH}

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

7 caturthaseke vipratipattayaḥ

7.1 caturthaseke vipratipattiḥ prathamā

prajñājñānād uttaraṃ bodhicittāsvādas turyaṃ sekam¹²⁵ āhāvaraṃ tat | yasmāt¹²⁶ sarvo bhāvanāsu prayāso vyarthah prāptas tatphalasya prasiddheh^{127,xlix} || 15 ||¹

[E_{DH} p. 140] prajñājñānetyādi. prajñājñānopadeśād uttarakālaṃ^{128,li} yat bodhicittasyāmṛtarūpasya¹²⁹ rasanayā grahaṇam, tat turyaṃ caturtham [K fol. 6r] sekam āha kaścit. tac cāvaram hīnam, vinikrstam

¹²⁶ yasmāt] E_{DH} (TV: gang phyir) (TaRaA-Vi: yasmāt); paścāt K

^{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*].

¹ This verse is in Śālinī metre.

^{li} TV indicates that the text may have included a compound analaysis of $praj\tilde{n}a-j\tilde{n}ana$, but if so, it is unclear what kind of compound this analysis signifies. If it is for a $karmadh\bar{a}raya$, 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}; seşam K

 $^{^{127}}$ prasiddheḥ] K $\rm E_{DH};$ rab tu mi rung phyir $\rm TM_{D}$ (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] \it{em} . (TVA $_{\rm D}$: byang chub kyi sems te bdud rtsi'i ngo bo); saṃ bodhicittasyāmṛtarūpasya K $E_{\rm DH}$; sems te bdud rtsi'i ngo bo TVB $_{\rm G}$ (cittasya)

iti yāvat. kasmād avaram? yasmāt sarvaprayāso mantramudrādevatādyākārabhāvanāsu punaḥ punar anuṣṭhānalakṣaṇas tathāgatokto¹³⁰ vyarthaḥ prāptaḥ. lii kutaḥ? tatphalasya bhāvanāsādhyasya phalasya bodhicittāsvādakāla eva prasiddhatvāt prāptatvāt, ¹³¹ anyasya viśiṣṭasya phalasyābhāvād iti yāvat.

7.2 caturthaseke vipratipattir dvitīyā

prajñājñānād uttaraṃ prāptarāmāsvādas turyaṃ sekam āhādhamaṃ tat | yasmāt sarvo bhāvanādau prayatno buddhoddiṣṭo niṣphalaḥ saṃprasaktaḥ || 16 || 16 ||

prajñetyādi. prajñājñānād uttarakālam yāḥ prāptā yathāmilitā rāmāḥ striyas tāsām samāpattidvāreṇa¹³² ya āsvādaḥ, tat turyam sekam. tad apy adhamam. śesam gatārtham.

_

lii TV reflects basically the same words as transmitted in K but with an understnading 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 *tathāgatas* 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 *tathāgatas* 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] $\rm E_{DH};$ 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)

 $^{^{132}}$ samāpattidvāreņa] E_{DH} ; rig pa'i sgo nas TVA_D (rig *fort. pro* reg); reg pa'i sgo nas TVB_G (sparsadvārena)

7.3 āgamasya vyākhyānam

atha¹³³ caturtham tat punas tatheti^{134,liv} vyākhyāyate. caturtham iti¹³⁵ prajñājñānam tṛtīyam apekṣya caturtham ity ucyate. tad iti tacchabdena tad eva prajñājñānam tadrūpam¹³⁶ parāmṛṣyate.^{lv} punar iti punaḥṣ́abdena tasmād viṣ́eṣaḥ. viṣ́eṣaṣ́ cātra¹³⁷ nirāsravaniruttarātyantasphītāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva¹³⁸lakṣaṇaḥ.^{139,lvi} tatheti tathāṣ́abdena tādṛṣ́atvam abhidhīyate. tādṛṣ́atvam ca yādṛṣ́yā prajñādiyuktayā¹⁴⁰ sāmagryā yādṛṣ́aṃ prajñājñānam utpannam, paṣ́cād api tādṛṣ́yaiva sāmagryā tathaiva cotpadyate, nānyatheti tathāṣ́abdārthah.

atra ca lakṣyalakṣaṇabhāvenārtho^{141,lvii} boddhavyaḥ. lakṣyate 'neneti lakṣaṇam anubhūyamānaṃ prajñājñānam, apratīyamāna-

liv Samājottara 113f

^{lv} The referent of tat in $tadr\bar{u}pam$ is evidently caturtham. TVB_G essentially reflects the transmitted Sanskrit reading but eva, if it is rendered by nyid, is slightly out of place.

 $^{^{\}mathrm{lvi}}$ E_{DH} emends niruttara to nirantara stating that this reading is bhotanusari, but the situation in TV is slightly more complex. The transmitted Sanskrit suggests reading a string of adjectives starting with $an\bar{a}srava$ that qualify pravahitva. Here reading nirantara and avicchinaprabandha would lead to redundancy. TV instead renders a series of abstract nouns before pravahitva, with TVAD including something reflective of nairantarya ($bar\ ma\ chad\ pa\ nyid$). Both versions of TV lack a reflex of niruttara.

 $^{^{}m lvii}$ For lakṣyalakṣaṇabhāva, TVA $_{
m D}$ 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 $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (shes rab ye shes de nyid kyi ngo bo de); shes rab ye shes kyi ngo bo de TVA $_{\rm D}$

 $^{^{137}}$ °ātra] E_{DH} ; no reflex in TV

 $^{^{138}}$ °niruttarātyantasphītāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva°] K; °nirantarātyantasphītāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva° $E_{\rm DH}$ (em.); shin tu rgyas pa nyid dang | bar chad med pa nyid dang | rgyun mi 'chad par skye ba nyid kyi TVAD (°ātyantasphītatvanairantaryāvicchinnaprabandhapravāhitva°); shin tu rgyas pa nyid rgyun mi chad par skye ba nyid kyi TVBG (°ātyantasphītatvāvichinnaprabandhapravāhitva°)

¹³⁹ °laksanah] E_{DH}; °laksanam 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 pratipādyate 142 'neneti 143,lviii lakṣyaṃ sāksāt karisyamānam caturtham.

7.4 caruthaseke vipratipattis tṛtīyā

atra caturthaṃ¹⁴⁴ nāstīty eke.^{lix} nanu caturtham ity etad asti tatpadam.^{145,lx} tat kathaṃ nāstīty ucyate? satyam, upadeśasaṃrakṣārthaṃ^{lxi} sattvavyāmohanāya ca tṛtīyam eva caturthaśabde[K fol.

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 By normal conventions the *anena* here would indicate that the word being glossed, laksyam in this case, denotes the agent of verbal root. That is clearly not the case, so *anena*, if it is not a corruption (it is not reflected in TVA_D), must refer back to the laksana.

 lix TVA_D adds near the beginning of this sentence $Sam\bar{a}jottara$ 113ab: abhiṣekam $tridh\bar{a}$ 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 $Sam\bar{a}jotara$ 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]".

 $^{
m lxi}$ After rendering upadeśasamrakṣārtham (man ngag bsrung bar bya ba'i phyir dang), TVA $_{
m D}$ has apparently suffered from an eyeskip and resumes with its translation of pratipādayiṣyamāṇatvāc ceti.

 $^{^{142}}$ pratipādyate] K $E_{\rm DH};$ go bar by
a zhing bsgrub par bya bas na TVA $_{\rm D};$ khong du chud par byed bsgrub par byed pas na TVB $_{\rm G}$ (pratīyate pratipādyate)

¹⁴³ 'neneti] K E_{DH} TVB_G ('dis); no reflex in TVA_D

 $^{^{144}}$ 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) $E_{\rm DH}$; de ltar de bzhin bzhi pa yang || zhes bya ba'i tshig bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa yod pa ma yin nam | TVA $_{\rm D}$ (nanu caturtham tat punas tatheti padam 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 $_{\rm G}$ (nanu anyatra [? - de ma yin pa gzhan] caturtham tat punas tathety asmin [? - der] caturtham iti padam bhagavatoktam)

6v]noktam bhagavatā. anyathā tat punar^{146,lxii} iti noktam syāt.

tad atyantāsaṃgatam, caturthasya pramāṇasiddhasya pratipāditatvāt pratipādayisyamāṇatvāc ceti. lxiii

7.5 lakşyasya vicāraņam

atra lakṣaṇaṃ prajñājñānaṃ pratītam eva sarvaiḥ. lakṣye¹⁴⁷ paraṃ vyāmohaḥ. tad vicāryate. lakṣyaṃ hi bhaved¹⁴⁸ artharūpaṃ vā syāt jñānarūpaṃ vā. na tāvad¹⁴⁹ artharūpam, arthasyaivābhāvāt,^{150,lxiv} ekānekaviyogitvena pramāṇena tasya nirākṛtatvāt. mantranaye ca vijñānavādamadhyamakamatayor¹⁵¹ eva pradhānatvād^{lxv} jñānarū-

lxii Here TVB_G quotes again the entire $p\bar{a}da$ of $Sam\bar{a}jottara$ 113f. This is an undesirable reading: It is specifically the words $tat\ puna\dot{p}$ that indicate the Buddha real intention of speaking of caturtha, not the entire $p\bar{a}da$.

lxiii Tib. discusses two further *pakṣas* here: that the fourth referred to in *Samājo-ttara* 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 $pradh\bar{a}natv\bar{a}t$ with a rdzogs tshig: gtso bo nyid yin pa'i phyir ro. This creates an incomplete sentence with the clause pointing neither forwards or backwards, since the clause ending in $nir\bar{a}krtatv\bar{a}t$ 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,

 $^{^{146}}$ tat punar] K $E_{DH};$ TVA $_{\!D}:$ not available; de ltar de bzhin bzhi pa yang TVB $_{\!G}$ (caturtham tat punas tathā)

¹⁴⁷ laksye] E_{DH} (em.) TV (mtshon par bya ba la); laksyā K

 $^{^{148}}$ lakṣyaṃ hi bhavet] conj. (TV: mtshon par bya ba yang srid na); lakṣyaṃ hi bhagavat K $\rm E_{DH}$ (°gavad)

¹⁴⁹ tāvad] K E_{DH}; no reflex in TV

 $^{^{150}}$ arthasyaivābhāvāt] $\it{conj.}$ (TV: don nyid med pa'i phyir); arthasyaikasyābhāvāt K $\rm E_{DH}$

^{151 °}matayor] E_{DH} TV ('dod gzhung); °tamayor K

pam vā syāt. jñānam ca sākāram vā nirākāram vā. sākāram api citrādvaitarūpam vā syād anekarūpam vā syād iti vikalpāḥ.

7.5.1 sākārasya vijñānasya nirākaraņam

tatra sākāravijñānam sarvathaiva gagaņakamalavan nāstīti nirākāravādino bruvate. nanu nīlapītaśuklādighaṭapaṭaśakaṭādi¹⁵²rūpeṇākārāḥ¹⁵³ pratibhāsante¹⁵⁴ pratyakṣataḥ. te cārthasyābhāvād jñānarūpā eva. tat kathaṃ sākāraṃ nāstīti?^{lxvii} satyam. pratibhāsanta evākārāḥ, param alīkarūpeṇa.¹⁵⁵ alīkarūpatā¹⁵⁶ caikānekaviyogitvena pramāṇalakṣaṇena¹⁵⁷ prasiddhā. tasya ca pramāṇasvarūpasyānyatra¹⁵⁸ kathitatvān, neha¹⁵⁹ pratanyate. alīkatvaprasiddhā ca māyāmayā ivākārā bhrāntirūpāḥ prakāśante.¹⁶⁰ bhrāntinivṛttau ca nirā-

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 lak sya to be j n ana.

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*.

 $[\]bar{l}$ xvii TVB_G presents this argument differently than what is transmitted in Sanskrit but maintains lotical flow: $don(rnam\ pa)de\ dag\ kyang\ med\ pa'i\ phyir\ shes\ pa'i\ ngo\ bo\ nyid\ kyang\ med\ yin\ na\ |\ de\ ji\ ltar\ rnam\ pa\ dang\ bcas\ pa\ ma\ yin\ zhe\ na\ |\ ^{\rm `Because}$ those objects [i.e., $\bar{a}k\bar{a}ras$] also do not exist, the nature of cognition too cannot exist. So how can cognition not have $\bar{a}k\bar{a}ras$?' 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 °ākārāh] *conj.*; ((cā))kārāh K; vākārāh E_{DH}

¹⁵⁴ pratibhāṣante] E_{DH}; pratibhāṣante K

¹⁵⁵ alīkarūpena] K E_{DH} TVB_G (brdzun pa'i ngo bor); brdzun pa yin no TVA_D (alīka)

 $^{^{156}}$ alīkarūpatā] K $\, {\rm TVB_G}$ (brdzun pa'i ngo bo nyid); brdzun pa nyid ${\rm TVA_D}$ (alīkatā)

 $^{^{157}}$ °viyogitvena pramāṇalakṣaṇena] em.; °viyogitvapramāṇalakṣaṇena K $E_{\rm DH}$; dang bral ba'i mtshan nyid kyis $TVA_{\rm D}$ (°viyogalakṣaṇena); dang bral ba'i tshad ma'i mtshan nyid kyis $TVB_{\rm G}$ (°viyogapramāṇalakṣaṇena)

 $^{^{158}}$ pramāṇasvarūpasyā°] $E_{DH};$ pramāṇa((pe))rūpasyā° K

¹⁵⁹ neha] E_{DH}; eha K

¹⁶⁰ prakāśante] K (prakāsante); prakāśyante E_{DH}

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 paramārthata¹⁶⁴ i[K fol. 7r]ty ucyate? ucyate. ^{165,lxviii} sukhākāraṃ vijñānam ¹⁶⁶antaḥparisphuradrūpaṃ nirākāraṃ saṃvedyata eva. lxix nīlādyākārāḥ punar alīkāḥ pratibhāsante. anyathā teṣāṃ satyatve sarva evākārāḥ satyāḥ syuḥ. tathā hi grāhyagrāhakabhāvādikam api satyaṃ [E_{DH} p. 142] syāt. tataś ca sarveṣām eva satyapratibhāsatvena muktiprasaṅgaḥ, ¹⁶⁷ keṣāñcid api mithyāpratibhāsasya bhrāntirūpasyāpratibhāsanāt. lxx tathā coktam—

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 paramārthata 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 probably 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 $vij\tilde{n}\bar{a}na$ to the $\bar{a}k\bar{a}ras$ of $vij\tilde{n}\bar{a}na$. TVA_D is likely corrupt or wrong edited with shes pa rnams ni in place of TVB_G's shes pa'i nang na.

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 $ro \parallel (TVA_D)$ cung zhig dang log pa'i rnam par 'khrul pa'i ngo bo mi snang ba'i phyir $ro \parallel (TVA_D)$.

 $^{^{161}}$ nirākāram eva] K $E_{\rm DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (rnam pa med pa kho na); rnam pa med pa de kho na TVA $_{\rm D}$ (nirākāram eva tad)

¹⁶² pāramārthikam] E_{DH} (em.); pārarthikam 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 antah°] 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 $\rm E_{DH}$ (em.)

drastavyam¹⁶⁸ bhūtato bhūtam bhūtadarśī vimucyate | lxxi

tasmād akāmakenāpi nīlādyākārāṇām alīkatvam evaiṣṭavyam. sukhādikaṃ nirākāraṃ¹⁶⁹ satyam upalabhyate. tat kathaṃ nopalabhyata iti.

nanu sukhādyākāram sākāram eva vijñānam^{170,lxxii} upalabhyate, sukhāder ākārasvabhāvatvāt. na ca sukhādyākāraśūnyam jñānam¹⁷¹ svapne 'pi saṃvedyate. sakalabhrāntivigamād aṣṭamyām bhūmāv upalabdhilakṣaṇaprāptir bhavatīty atrāpi kośapānam¹⁷² vinā anyan na¹⁷³ pramāṇam asti prasādhakam iti.¹⁷⁴ tad asat,¹⁷⁵ abhiprāyāparijñānāt, sukhādyākārasyaiva¹⁷⁶ nīlādyākārarahitasya vijñānasya

There is a possibility that $log\ pa'i\ rnam\ pa$ reflects $mithy\bar{a}k\bar{a}ra$ instead of $mithy\bar{a}-pratibh\bar{a}sa$.

TV may reflect also the inclusion of an api somehwere in this sentence given the particle yang (e.g., $sukh\bar{a}dy\bar{a}k\bar{a}ram\ api$). 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 pleausre and the like are only perceived to be none other than [cognitions] with forms.'

İxxi Abhisamayālaṅkāra 5.21; Ratnagotravighāga 154; Pratītyasamputpādahṛdaya-kārikā 7; etc.

lxxii The word $s\bar{a}k\bar{a}ram$ 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 $sukh\bar{a}der~\bar{a}k\bar{a}rasvabh\bar{a}vatv\bar{a}$, and the response to this objection later in the paragraph.

 $^{^{168}}$ drastavyam] $E_{\rm DH};$ drastavya K

 $^{^{169}}$ nirākāram] K $E_{DH};$ rnam pa TVA_{D} (ākāram); rnam pa brdzun pa TVB_{G} (alīkākāram)

 $^{^{170}}$ sākāram eva vij
ñānam] conj.; eva vijñānam K $\rm E_{DH};$ shes pa yang r
nam pa dang b
cas pa kho na TVA $_{\rm D};$ rnam pa dang b
cas pa'i kho na shes pa TVA $_{\rm D}$ (api sākāram eva jñānam)

¹⁷¹ jñānaṃ] K E_{DH}; rnam par shes pa TV (vijñānaṃ)

 $^{^{172}}$ kośapānam] K (kosapānam); śapathollanghanam E_{DH} (em.)

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 $E_{\rm DH}$; asad etat *possible conj.* 176 sukhādyākārasyaiva] K $E_{\rm DH}$; bde ba la sogs pa nyid TVA $_{\rm D}$; bde la sogs pa nyid TVB $_{\rm G}$ (sukhāder eva)

nirākāratveneṣṭatvāt.¹⁷⁷ tac cedānīm eva svasaṃvedanapramāṇasidhaṃ sakalaprāṇabhṛtām astīti kathaṃ nopalabdhiḥ?

7.5.3 madhyamakamatasya samarthanam

nanu tad 178 apy ekānekasvabhāvaviyogād alīkam eva bhrāntimātram, ekānekasvabhāvarahitatvasya 179 sākāranirākāravijñānavyāpitvāt. 180

nanv anena nyāyena sakalasākāranirākāravijñānasyā¹⁸¹līkatvaprasādhanān na kiñcid api pāramārthikam vastutattvam asti. ^{182,183} tat katham lakṣyasya svarūpam pramāṇata upalakṣayitavyam? naiṣa doṣaḥ, madhyamakamate pramāṇato 'līkatāsiddhāv api ¹⁸⁴māyopamapratibhāsamātrasyaikānekasvabhāvarahitasya dharmirūpasyāpratiṣedhāt. tatraiva cālīke pratibhāsamātre lakṣyalakṣaṇasaṃsāranirvāṇa[K fol. 7v]maṇḍalacakrādibhāvanāsakalajagadarthakriyādīnām¹⁸⁵ avyāhatā vyavasthā¹⁸⁶ sidhyati. ^{187,lxxiii} tathā coktam—

 $^{^{}m lxxiii}$ ${
m E}_{
m DH}$ appears to understand the text as saying that both $bh\bar{a}van\bar{a}$ and $sakalajagadarthakriy\bar{a}d\bar{\imath}n\bar{a}m$ $vyavasth\bar{a}$ are established. TV renders $bh\bar{a}van\bar{a}$ in the third case, suggesting it may have been seen outside of the compound or seen within the compound but understood as having a $trt\bar{\imath}ya$ relationship with $sakalajagadarthakriy\bar{a}$. We understand a compound beginning with laksyalaksana up to $sakalajagadarthakriy\bar{a}d\bar{\imath}n\bar{a}m$ providing a list of that for which the $vy\bar{a}vasth\bar{a}$ is

 $^{^{177}}$ nirākāratveneṣṭatvāt] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (rnam pa med pa nyid du 'dod pa nyid kyi phyir); med pa nyid du 'dod pa'i phyir TVA $_{\rm D}$

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] coni.; 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.

 $^{^{184}}$ māyopama
pratibhāsamātrasyai°] K $E_{\rm DH}$; snang ba tsam dang s
gyu ma lta bu TVA $_{\rm D}$ (māyopamasya pratibhāsamātrasya cai°); snang ba s
gyu ma lta bu ma TVB $_{\rm G}$ (māyopama
pratibhāsasyai°)

 $^{^{185}}$ °bhāvanā°] K; °bhāvanā E_{DH} (variant word division); bsgoms pas TV (bhāvanavā)

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

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

buddhatvam vajrasattvatvam samvṛtyaiva prasādhayet $|^{\rm lxxiv}$

iti ¹⁸⁸

nanu sarvam eva vastujātam alīkarūpatayā niḥsāram, tadā kimartham mandalacakrādibhāvanāprayāsah¹⁸⁹ kriyate? asad etat,

mithyādhyāropahānārtha
ṃ 190 yatno 'saty api 191 [E_{DH} p. 143] bhoktari
 $|^{192,lxxv}$

iti vacanāt. yady api vicāryamāṇaṃ pāramārthikaṃ vasturūpaṃ nāsti, tathāpy ahaṃ sukhī bhaveyaṃ mā¹⁹³ duḥkhy abhūvam iti tṛṣṇā sakalaprāṇabhṛtām asti. yathā tulye 'pi mithyātve śubhāśubhasvapnayoḥ śubhasvapnadarśanāt saumanasyam, aśubhasvapnadarśanāc ca daurmanasyam, tadapanayanāya ca saddharmapāṭhamantrajāpādau pravṛttir bhavati, tathā mithyātvāviśeṣe 'pi duḥkhādiprākṛtavikalpahānāya^{lxxvi} samyaksaṃbodhilakṣaṇaprāptaye¹⁹⁴ ca prekṣāvatām arthināṃ pravṛttir bhaviṣyatīti.

still established in the Madhyamaka system.

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

lxxv $Pram\bar{a}nav\bar{a}rttika$, Pramāṇasiddhi 192cd. Verse 192 is frequently cited in Buddhist and non-Buddhist texts alike and is transmitted with the readings bhoktari and moktari in the final $p\bar{a}da$, with the latter better represented in the core witnesses of and texts releated to the $Pram\bar{a}nav\bar{a}rttika$ (for some references see pecchia2015).

 $^{\bar{l}xxvi}$ cf. $Samantabhadras\bar{a}dhana$ (as quoted in Kamalanātha's $Ratn\bar{a}val\bar{\iota}$ ad HeTa 2.2.45, fol. 16r6): prākṛtavikalpavṛttair aparaṃ na hi kiñcad asti bhavaduḥkham | tasya viruddhaṃ caitat sākṣādavagamyate cetaḥ ||

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

lxxiv Kurukullākalpa 3.16cd

¹⁸⁸ iti] E_{DH}; deest in K

¹⁹⁰ mithyādhyāropahānārtham] *em.*; mithyādhyāropanārtham K E_{DH}

¹⁹¹ 'saty api] K; 'styopi E_{DH}

 $^{^{192}}$ moktari] em. (TVAD: grol byed; TVBGgrol ba po) ; bhoktarī° K (the letter no is added abhove bho); muktaye $\rm E_{DH}$ (em.)

¹⁹³ mā] E_{DH} (em.); deest in K

 $^{^{194}}$ °lakṣaṇaprāptaye] K $E_{\rm DH}$; mtshan nyid kyi 'bras bu thob par bya ba'i phyir ${\rm TVA_D}$; mtshan nyid 'bras bu thob par bya ba'i phyir ${\rm TVB_G}$ (°lakṣaṇaphalaprāptaye)

8 saptavidhesu sādhyesu sārāsāravicāranam

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 tu¹⁹⁸ kṛtaiva sā saptabhir bhedaiḥ?

satyam, kintu guḍagorasanyāyena. 199,200 tathā hi na jñāyate, kiṃ tat sāram asāram veti.

The author of the Vādarahasya uses the term as well: atadrūpaparāvṛttanīlā-kārātanmātragrahaṇam iti vyavasthāyāṃ nāpi viṣayasārūpyaṃ, (tadabhāvān) kā hi paramārthasadalīkarūpayoḥ samānarūpatā nāmetyādi guḍagorasayor ekatākaraṇaṃ kvopayuktam | bādhakapratyayād dhi tadalīkatvaṃ kiṃ prāgāropya cintā kriyate śeṣaś ca doṣo 'bhimānasyaiva cintyatvādityādir ajatapratītiparāmarśād gataḥ | (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-

^{lxxvii} An alternative conjecture for whethere K reads $yadarthasv\bar{a}'yam$ could be $yadarthas\ tav\bar{a}yam$, 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.'

 $^{^{195}}$ yadarthas tv ayam] conj.; yadarthasva'yam K; yadarthatvād ayam $E_{\rm DH}$

 $^{^{196}}$ vimisṛtā] K $\rm E_{DH};$ g
tam gzhan du thal bas brjod pa'i phyir TV

 $^{^{197}}$ jñāyate] K $E_{\rm DH};$ shes so zhe na TV (jñāyata iti [cet])

 $^{^{198}}$ na tu] $\mathit{conj.};$ nanu K $\mathrm{E_{DH}}$

 $^{^{199}}$ guḍagorasanyāyena] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (bu ram dang dar ba'i tshul gyis); bu ram dang mngar ba nyid kyi tshul gyis TVA $_{\rm D}$

²⁰⁰ cf. verse 267 of Pramāṇasiddhi chapter in Prajñākāragupta's *Pramāṇavārttikabhāṣya*:⊠arthānarthakriyāśakto guḍagorasakārakaḥ ⊠sarvajño 'pi na sevyatvaṃ prayāty anupakārataḥ ∥; 'Because he is not helpful, a creator of [a mixture of] guḍa and gorasa, capable of doing both harm and good, does not becomes an object 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'.

ucyate.

8.1 prathamasyāsāratvam

mantranayavihitakramābhāvāt samāpattibhāvanāvaiyarthyād²⁰¹ yuktyabhāvāc²⁰² ca prathamasya niḥsāratā. tathā hi samagrasāmagrīkam yat²⁰³ tad avaśyam eva bhavati. anyathā samagrasāmagrīkam eva tan²⁰⁴ na bhavet. sākṣātkaraṇāvasthāyāṃ samagrasāmagrīkaṃ tad vartate. tad avaśyaṃ tena²⁰⁵ bhavitavyam. sati ca bhavet²⁰⁶ prathamasya hānir iti.

8.2 dvitīyasyāsāratvam

śarīrādyākāraśūnyasya kevalasātarūpasyānupalabdher²⁰⁷ na dvitīyasya sāratā. tathā hi pramāṇaniścitaṃ prekṣāvatā bhāvanīyam, na yathākathañcit. pramā[K fol. 8r]ṇena saṃvalitarūpam eva sarvadopalabhyate.²⁰⁸ tad eva sarvajanānāṃ kamanīyatayā pratibhāsate. ta-

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 ' $ny\bar{a}ya$ ', 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, guda 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 phalam)

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 $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (de); de'i 'bras bu TVA $_{\rm D}$ (tena phalena)

 $^{^{206}}$ sati ca bhavet] conj.;sati ca bhavane na K $\rm E_{DH};$ de ltar gyur pas TVA $_{\rm D};$ de ltar gyur pa TVB $_{\rm G}$ (evaṃsati)

²⁰⁷ °labdher] E_{DH}; °bdher K

 $^{^{208}}$ samvalitarūpam eva sarvado°] K $E_{\rm DH};$ grub pa kho na TVA $_{\rm D}$ (siddham eva); grub pa'i ngo bo thams cad du TVB $_{\rm G}$ (siddharūpam sarvado°)

smāt kevalasya rucyabhāvāc 209 210 cakrākārasaṃvalitasyānupalabdheḥ 211 sākṣāt kartum aśakyatvāc 212,lxxix ca dvitīyasya kalpanāmātrateti. 213

8.3 tṛtīyasyāsāratvam

nirupadravabhūtārthasvabhāvatvena sātmībhūtasya tyaktum aśakyatvāt, saṃvalitarūpasya [$E_{\rm DH}$ p. 144] bhedābhāvāt, prayojanābhāvāc ca na tṛtīyasya kalyāṇabhāvaḥ. 214,lxxx tathā hi sahopalambhena tādātmyasiddhāv ekasya parityāge 'parasyāvaśyaṃ parityāgah, na vā kasyacid iti.

lxxix TV suggests reading: kevalasyānupalabdheḥ rucyabhāvāc cakrākārasaṃvalitasyānupalabdheḥ sākṣāt kartum aśakyatvāt. The addition of anupalabdheḥ after kevalasya renders the flow of logic less smooth and makes sākṣāt kartum aśakyatvāc 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.

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 reflected, 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 kalpanābhāvaḥ, 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 tṛtīyasya kalpanābhāvam. Note that kalyāṇatā in the following paragraph was also copied in K with a dental na.

 $^{^{209}}$ 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)

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

 $^{^{211}}$ 'syānupalabdheḥ] $\it em.$ (TVA $_{\rm D}$: mi dmigs pa'i phyir dang) (TVB $_{\rm G}$: ma dmigs pa'i phyir); 'syaupalabdheḥ K; 'syopalabdheḥ E $_{\rm DH}$

 $^{^{212}}$ aśakyatvāc
] $\rm E_{DH}$ (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

 $^{^{214}}$ na tṛtīyasya kalyāṇabhāvaḥ] conj.; na tṛtīyakalyanībhāvaḥ K pc ; na tṛtīyakalyānībhāvaḥ K ac ; na tṛtīyaḥ kalpanābhāvaḥ E $_{\rm DH}$

²¹⁵ sahopalambhena] E_{DH}; saholambhena K

8.4 caturthasya sārāsāratvavicāraņam

prapañcatvena bahuprayāsatvād vicārāsahatvena bhrāntirūpatayāparamārtharūpatayā ca na tṛtīyāntapakṣasya²¹⁶ kalyāṇateti.²¹⁷ atra kecid yuktiṃ varṇayanti. lxxxi prapañcarūpatvābhāve²¹⁸ 'pi sūkṣmasya bindvādeḥ punaḥ punar bhāvanayā sākṣātkaraṇaṃ yāvat, prayāsas tāvat sarvatraiva bhāvyavastuni sambhavati. lxxxii tad atra yadi prayāsabhayam, na kiñcid api bhāvanīyam.

prapañcarūpatvād iti cet, prapañcāprapañcayor bhāvanāvasthā-yāṃ ko viśeṣaḥ? 219 nanu 220 aprapañcaṃ śīghram eva sthirībhavatīty ayaṃ viśeṣaḥ. lxxxiii yatraivālambane 221 cittaṃ punaḥ punaḥ preryate

 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 | (TVAD); 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 || (TVBG). Of these, the intention behind TVAD is hard to discern, but TVBG can be translated: 'For that long, because one repeated meditates with effort, the object of meditation remains.' Here the meaning is not compelling and indicates corruption or mistranslation.

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 $aprapa\~ncam$ śr"ighram 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 $prapa\~nca$ does not in fact lead to stability more quickly. This is clear from the conclusion: $tasm\~an$ $n\~ayam$ viśeṣaħ.

 $^{^{216}}$ tṛtīyāntapakṣasya] $\it em.$ (TVA $_{\rm D}$: gsum pa'i tha' ma'i phyogs) (TVB $_{\rm G}$: gsum pa'i mtha' ma'i phyogs); tṛtīyāntaḥ | pakṣasya K; tṛtīyapakṣasya $\rm E_{DH}$

²¹⁷ kalyāṇateti] E_{DH}; kalyānateti K

 $^{^{218}}$ prapañcarūpatvābhāve] K $\rm E_{DH};$ spros pa'i ngo bo nyid du gyur TV (prapañcarūpatve)

²¹⁹ ko viśesah] em. (TV: khyad par ci zhig yod |); ko viśesa 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 $\rm E_{DH}$

nirantaraṃ²²² dīrghakālaṃ ca tatraiva sthirībhavatīty āgamo yuktiś cātrāsti.²²³ tathā coktam—

tasmād bhūtam abhūtam vā yad yad evābhibhāvyate | bhāvanābalanispattau tat sphutākalpadhīphalam²²⁴ || lxxxiv

punaś coktam-

aho kusīdatvam aho vimūḍhatā aho janasyāsya sadarthavakratā | svacittamātrapratibaddhabuddhatā²²⁵ adūravartiny api yan na sevyate ||²²⁶

iti. tasmān nāyam viśesah.

bhrāntirūpatvenāparamārthatvam api sarvatraiva bhāvanāviṣaye vastuni²²⁷ sambhavatīti na kiñcid api bhāvanīyaṃ syāt. lxxxv [K

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 bhāvanāpariniṣpattau.

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 | TVAD; '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 | TVBG. Apart from other minor differences, TVAD adds spros pa la dmigs pa ni at the beginning of the sentence. The text could be rendered in Sanskrit as follows: (prapañcālambanasya) bhrāntirūpatvenāparamārthatvam iti cet, sarvatraiva bhāvanāviṣaye vastuni sambhrāntatvān na kiñcid api bhāvanīyaṃ syāt.

²²² nirantaram] E_{DH} (em.) TV (rgyun mi 'chad par); niruttaram 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.*; kalpadhīh 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.

 $^{^{227}}$ bhāvanāviṣaye vastuni] $\it conj.$ (TVB $_{\rm G}$: bsgom pa'i yul gyi dngos po); bhāvanāviśeṣe vastuni K $E_{\rm DH}$; bsgom pa'i yul gyis dngos po TVA $_{\rm D}$

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 doṣasyāvakāśaḥ? tasmāt 231 prapañcam aprapañcaṃ vā yad eva rocate pramāṇasaṃgatam itarad vā, tad evālasyaṃ vihāya mahāmudrārthibhir 232 bhāvayitavyam 233 ity alam atiprasaṅgeneti.

atra ca sāretaravibhāgaḥ paryupāsitagurubhir eva jñātavyaḥ.

8.5 pañcamasyāsāratvam

tṛtīyapakṣoktadoṣatvān²³⁴ nīrasatvena²³⁵ prayojanābhāvān mantranayakramābhāvāc ca^{lxxxvi} na pañcamah pariksīnadosah.

lexxvi Both Tibetan translations lack a reflex of $n\bar{\imath}rasatvena$, 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 $n\bar{\imath}rasatvena$, its inclusion as a different reason is cogent—unlike the fifth $pak\bar{\imath}s$, the third includes bliss as an integral part of the $s\bar{a}dhya$.

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 bhāvyamānam $E_{\rm DH}$; spros pa med par bsgom par 'gyur ba $TVA_{\rm D}$; spros pa med pa'i sgom par 'gyur ba $TVB_{\rm G}$

²³¹ tastmāt] 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); mahāpuruṣārthibhir K $\rm E_{DH}$

²³³ bhāvayitavyam] E_{DH}; bhaviyitavyam K

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

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

8.6 şaşthamasyāsāratvam

svecchayā nirvāyayitum²³⁷ aśakyatvāt, prayojanābhāvāt, sattvārthābhāvāc ca na pañcāntaraprabhedakalpanā²³⁸ kalaṅkāśūnyā. laxxix tathā hi²³⁹ kasyacin nivṛttiḥ kāraṇanivṛttyā vyāpakanivṛttyā²⁴⁰ vā bhavati. na cātra sākṣātkṛtamaṇḍalacakrasya nivartakaṃ kāraṇaṃ vyāpakaṃ vā icchākāle dṛśyate. xc

lxxxvii TV perhaps misinterprets sākṣātkaraṇāt pūrvaṃ rather than reflects a different 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 $s\bar{a}k\bar{s}\bar{a}t$ could be taken with $parity\bar{a}ge$ as K and E_{DH} suggest, but the point is not so much that the krama is directly abandoned but that, according to this $pak\bar{s}a$, it is not directly present when the direct result is directly experienced. This $V\bar{a}g\bar{a}s$

 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); $na\ pa\~nc\=antaraprabhe-dah\ kalpan\=akalank\=as\~unyah$.

xc TV lacks a reflex of icchākāle dṛṣyate.

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

 $^{^{\}overline{236}}$ kramaḥ sākṣāt. parityāge] variant word divion in K and E_{DH} : kramaḥ | sākṣātparityāge

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 \mid TVA $_{D}$ (tatra kathaṃ nirvāyayituṃ na śakyata iti cet)

²⁴⁰ vyāpakanivṛttyā] E_{DH}; vyāpakānivṛttyā K

nanu śūnyataiva nivartikāsti. yathā dārusaṅghātaprajvalito^{241,xci} vahnir niḥśeṣam indhanaṃ bhasmīkṛtya paścāt svarasata eva nivartate, tathā maṇḍalacakraprajvalitaḥ śūnyatājñānāgniḥ sākṣāt kṛtvā²⁴² maṇḍalacakraṃ nivartayiṣyatīti cet. ^{xcii} tad asat, viṣamatvād dṛṣṭāntasya. tathā hi tatrendhanaṃ kāraṇaṃ²⁴³ vahneḥ. kāraṇasyendhanalakṣaṇasya nivṛttau²⁴⁴ yuktaiva vahnilakṣaṇasya kāryasya nivṛttiḥ. iha tu na śūnyatā kāraṇaṃ maṇḍalacakrasya. tat ka[K fol. 9r]thaṃ tannivṛttau nivṛttiḥ? na²⁴⁵ ca śūnyatāyā nivṛttir asti. ^{xciii}

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 $vy\bar{a}pakam$ $v\bar{a}$ and $icch\bar{a}k\bar{a}le$. The words $icch\bar{a}k\bar{a}le$ $dr\acute{s}yate$ are strictly speaking not necessary in this sentence, but they are also not inappropriate: according to this position, it is $icch\bar{a}$ that is the occasion for the cessation of the mandala.

xci Where K reads dārusaṃghāt pravjalito we conjecture the compound reading dārusaṅghātaprajvalito on the strength of maṇḍalacakraprajvalitaḥ below. TV renders 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 gyi 'khor lo ma lus par ldog par byed la | bdag nyid kyang rang gi ngang gis ldog par 'gyur ro zhe na \mid ; ... 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

 $^{^{241}}$ dārusa
ṅghātaprajvalito] $\mathit{conj.};$ dārusaṃghāt pravjalito K
; dārusaṃghāte prajvalito E_{DH}

 $^{^{242}}$ sākṣāt kṛtvā] conj.;sākṣān K $\rm E_{DH};$ m
ngon sum du byas nas kyang TV (sākṣāt kṛtvāpi)

²⁴³ kāranam] *conj.*; na kāranam K E_{DH}

 $^{^{244}}$ kāryasyendhanalakṣaṇasya nivṛttau
] $\mathit{conj.}$; kāryam indhanalakṣaṇanivṛttau K $\mathrm{E_{DH}}$

²⁴⁵ na] *conj.*; athavā na K E_{DH}

nanu sā na²⁴⁶ bhavatu kāraṇaṃ. śūnyatā vyāpakaṃ tu bhaviṣyati. vyāpakasya vṛkṣasya nivṛttau śiṃśapātvasya vyāpyasya nivṛttivan nivṛttir bhaviṣyatīti cet. etad apy asāram. tathā hi śūnyatā sarvadā²⁴⁷ sarvajñeyamaṇḍalavyāpikā tattvarūpā.²⁴⁸ na ca tasyā²⁴⁹ nivṛttiḥ kadācid apy asti. yadi syāt²⁵⁰ samyaksaṃbodhisākṣātkaraṇāt [E_{DH} p. 146] pūrvam anantaram eva vā nivṛttiḥ²⁵¹ syāt. na ca bhavati, samyaksaṃbuddhībhūyāpi katipayakālāvasthānasya svayam eva svīkṛtatvāt.²⁵²

kintu śūnyatāpi jñānarūpā, cakram api jñānarūpam. śūnyatājñānotpattyā cakrajñānasyānivṛttau²⁵³ śūnyatājñānaṃ kena nivartanīyam? tena nivṛttiś ca virodhino 'bhāvāt kāraṇavyāpakayoś cābhā-

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 \parallel de ci'i phyir zhe na \mid stong pa nyid la rang gi ngang gis ldog go zhes kyang smra bar bya ba ma yin no \parallel .

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 rendered 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 *mandala*. Therefore, one cannot say that this [emptiness] is a cause of cessation, nor that emptiness will cease of its own accord.'

²⁴⁶ na] E_{DH} (em.); deest in K

²⁴⁷ sarvadā] K E_{DH} TVA_D (sarvadā); no reflex in TVB_G

 $^{^{248}}$ tattvarūpā] E_{DH} ; tatvarūpāh K

 $^{^{249}}$ tasyā] K $\mathrm{E_{DH}};$ no reflex in TV

 $^{^{250}}$ syāt] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$; ldog par 'gyur na TVA $_{\rm D}$ (nivṛttiḥ syāt)

 $^{^{251}}$ nivṛttiḥ] K $\rm E_{DH}$; sangs rgyas b
com ldan 'das ldog par 'gyur na TV (bhagavataḥ buddhasya nivṛttiḥ)

 $^{^{252}}$ svīkṛtatvāt] K $\rm E_{DH};$ 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)

vān nāsti. tasmāc chūnyatāj
ñānasya na nivṛttiḥ, 254 nāpi maṇḍalacakrasya śūnyatāto nivṛttir iti śūnyatā na nivartikā.
xciv

ko brūte śūnyatā nivartikā?^{xcv} kiṃ tarhi yan nivartakaṃ²⁵⁵ tad gurūpadeśato jñeyam ity apy asāram. gurūpadeśato 'pi na śūnyatāvyatiriktaṃ²⁵⁶ pramāṇato 'stīti yatkiñcid etat.^{xcvi} pratikṣaṇanivṛttiś ca kṣaṇabhaṅgarūpā sarvapadārthavyāpinī. na sā santānanivartikā. tasmān na svecchayā nivṛttiḥ.²⁵⁷ na ca nivṛttyā²⁵⁸ nīrasarūpayā prayojanam asti prekṣāvatām.^{xcvii} tathā coktam—

mucyamānesu sattvesu ye te^{xcviii} prāmodyasāgarāḥ |

xciv TVB_G reflects closely the Sanskrit text transmitted in K, but TVA_D diverges significantly start from tena nivrttis: 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

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 \parallel (TVA_D); bla ma'i man ngag las kyang 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, ...'

stong pa nyid kyis ldog par byed pa yin <lb n="7"/>no zhes su zhig smra |

^{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* \parallel ; '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

 $^{^{254}}$ na nivṛttiḥ] $\mathit{conj}.$ (TV: ldog pa med do); nivṛttiḥ K E_DH

²⁵⁵ nivartakam] *em.*; nivartikās K E_{DH}

 $^{^{256}}$ °vyatiriktam] conj.;vyatiri
((ktiḥ)) K (iinktilacks~apṛṣṭhamātrā); °vyatirikta
h $\rm E_{DH}$

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

 $^{^{258}}$ nivṛttyā] E_{DH} (em.); nivartyā K

iti.

sattvārtho 'pi nivṛttau nāsti. na hi gagane²⁵⁹ gaganakamale vā kācid arthakriyā sambhavati. ciraniruddhād apy atītād avasturūpāc²⁶⁰ cakrāt sattvārtho bhaviṣyatīty apy asāram, ciranīrutasyāpi kukku[K fol. 9v]ṭasya^{261,c} kaṇṭhadhvaniprasaṅgāt.

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 tattvato²⁶³ nāsti prādurbhāvah, tathā cakrasyāpi. tato nārthakriyāyāh sambhavah.^{cii} na

It is likely that both translations reflect tato in place of tattvato, but it is is u-

be" (**speijer1886**). In this case, Prajñākaramati in his *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* interprets them as conveying the sense of inexpressibility: *ye te iti teṣām eva anubhavasiddhatvād idamtayā kathayitum aśakyāh* (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.

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 \parallel (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 \parallel (TVB_G)

 $^{^{259}}$ gagane] K $E_{\rm DH}$ TVB $_{\!G}$ (nam ka); no reflext in TVA $_{\!D}$

 $^{^{260}}$ avasturūpāc] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (d
ngos po med pa'i ngo bo); dngos po'i ngo bo TVA $_{\rm D}$ (vasturūpāc)

 $^{^{261}}$ ciranīrutasyāpi kukkuṭasya] conj.; cirutasyāpi kukkuṭasya K; ciravirutasyāpi kukkuṭasya $E_{\rm DH};$ yun rin por khyim bya shi ba $\rm TVA_D;$ yun ring por lon pa'i khyim bya shi ba $\rm TVB_G$ (ciramrtasyāpi kukkutasya)

²⁶² sambhavantīti cet] *conj.*; sambhavanti K E_{DH}

²⁶³ tattvato] K (tatvato) E_{DH}; de las TV (tato)

ca nirodhy
a 264 punar utpāde kiñcit prayojanam astīty alam ati
prapañceneti.

8.7 saptamasyāsāratvam

ṣaṣṭhapakṣoktadoṣasandohasya saptame²⁶⁵ 'pi bhāvān na piṣṭape-ṣaṇaṃ²⁶⁶ kriyate. nanu ṣaṣṭhena saptamasya samānatvāt kathaṃ saptamasya tato viśeṣaḥ?²⁶⁷ asti viśeṣaḥ. pūrvāvasthāyāṃ niyataca-krākāratā, punaḥ svecchayā nirodhaḥ svecchayotpādanaṃ²⁶⁸ ca.^{269,ciii} saptame punar etan nāsti. tato na samānatā. bhinnaś ca nirdiṣṭa iti.^{civ}

nclear 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.

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.

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] $\it conj.$ (TVB $_{\rm G}$: drug pa'i phyogs la bshad pa'i skyon gyi tshogs bdun pa la) (TVA $_{\rm D}$: $\it samd$ $\it as$ TVB $_{\rm G}$, $\it with$ gyis $\it for$ gyi); saṣṭhapakṣoktam saṃdāhasyāṣṭame K; ṣaṣṭhapakṣoktasaṃdohasyāṣṭame E $_{\rm DH}$

 $^{^{266}}$ pistapesanam] K ac E_{DH}; pistapre | sanam K ac

 $^{^{267}}$ dsaptamasya tato viśeṣaḥ] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (de las bdun pa khyad par ci yod); de la khyad par ci yod TVA $_{\rm D}$ (tatra ko viśeṣaḥ)

 $^{^{268}}$ nirodhaḥ svecchayotpādanaṃ] $\mathit{conj}.$ (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}

9 caturthasya sekasya svarūpam

dambholibījasrutidhautaśuddha-²⁷⁰ pāthojabhūtāṅkurabhūtapuṣṭi²⁷¹| turīyaśasyaṃ²⁷² paripākam eti²⁷³ sphuṭaṃ caturthaṃ viduṣo 'pi gūḍham || 17 ||

[E_{DH} p. 147] dambholītyādi. etat sadgurūpadeśato jñeyam.

10 aparāņi mithyāsādhyāni mithyātattvāni ca

pañcapradīpāmṛtabinducandrabhrūmadhyabindūdbhavamaṇḍalāni | vāyoḥ svarūpaṃ galaśuṇḍikādyam atattvarūpaṃ svayam ūhanīyam || 18 ||^{cv}

pañcapradīpetyādi. pañcapradīpaśabdena gokudahanalakṣaṇasya, amṛtaśabdena²⁷⁴ vimumāraśulakṣaṇasya satatānuṣṭhānam eva sādhyaṃ manyante. bindur iti hṛccandrasthaṃ binduṃ dedīpyamānaṃ tattvaṃ sādhyaṃ ceti kṛtvā kecid bhāvayanti. candra iti hṛdisthaṃ kalārūpam ardhacandraṃ vā²⁷⁵ hṛtkamalasthaṃ kecid bhāvayanti.

bhrūmadhyabindūdbhavamaṇḍalānīti bhruvor madhya ūrṇāyāṃ binduṃ vibhāvya tadbindūdbhavāni maṇḍalāni vāyuvāruṇamāhendrāgneyalakṣaṇāni. etad uktaṃ bhavati—mukhaśravaṇaca-

 $^{^{\}rm cv}$ This verse is in Upajāti metre.

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

 $^{^{272}}$ turīyasasyam] E_{DH} (turīyasasyam); tutīyasasyam K

²⁷³ eti] E_{DH} (em.); eta K

²⁷⁴ amrtaśabdena] K E_{DH}; bdud rtsi lnga'i sgra ni TV (pañcāmṛtaśabdena)

 $^{^{275}}$ kalārūpam ardhacandram vā] K $E_{\rm DH}$; zla ba phyed pa'am | zla ba rgyas pas TVAD (ardhacandram pūrṇacandram vā); zla ba'i bzhi dum bu'am zla ba phyed pa'am | zla ba rgyas pa TVBG (kalārūpam ardhacandram pūrṇacandram vā)

kṣurghrāṇarasanāni^{276,cvi} hastāṅgulībhiḥ pidhāya bhrūmadhyabindur draṣṭavyaḥ. tasya sphuṭāvasthāyāṃ śubhāśubhani[K fol. 10r]-mittasaṃsūcakāni māhendrādimaṇḍalāny upajāyante. taṃ ca bindum tattvam iti manyante.

vāyoḥ svarūpam iti pūrakakumbhakarecakapraśāntakalakṣaṇam²⁷⁷ ānāpānādilakṣaṇaṃ²⁷⁸ ceti. etad²⁷⁹ uktaṃ bhavati—śaivasāṃkhyādinirdiṣṭaṃ²⁸⁰ vāyusvarūpaṃ jñātvā taṃ vāyuṃ nirodhabhāvanayā²⁸¹ sthirīkṛtyākāśa utplutya²⁸² gamanaṃ parapurapraveśaṃ yāvan muktiṃ ca sākṣāt kurvanti vāyuvādinah.

galaśuṇḍiketi. galapradeśe jihvāmūlopari hastiśuṇḍikākārā²⁸³ adhaḥpralambamānā upajihvāsaṃjñikā galaśuṇḍikāsti. sā ca śaktirūpā. tadadhaḥ śivarūpam²⁸⁴ asti tattvam. sā ca [E_{DH} p. 148] jihvāgreṇa spṛśyamānā nirantarāmṛtaṃ sravati.^{cvii} tena ca ghargharāmṛtavarṣaṇena santarpyamānam ātmānaṃ²⁸⁵ dhyāyād iti galaśuṇḍikātattvam. ādiśabdena hṛnmadhyaṣoḍaśanāḍikācakramadhyasthajñānasvarūpaṃ²⁸⁶ śivarūpaṃ tattvaṃ bhāvayitavyam ityādīnāṃ pa-

^{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.

 $^{^{\}rm cvii}$ Like the English verb 'to flow', the Sanskrit \sqrt{sru} is ambitransitive, although appears to be intransitive in greater frequency.

mukhanāsikācakṣurghrāṇarasanāni] *conj.*; mukhaśravaṇanāsikācakṣurghrānarasanāni K E_{DH}; kha dang | rna ba dang | sna dang | mig TVA_D TVB_G

²⁷⁷ °recaka°] E_{DH}; recakam 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 $E_{\rm DH}$ ('gag pa'i sgom pa); bsgags pa las TVA $_{\rm D}$ (nirodhena)

²⁸² ākāśa utplutya] *conj.*; ākāśenotplutya K E_{DH}

 $^{^{283}}$ hastiśundikākārā] K $\mathrm{E_{DH}};$ hastiśundākārā possible em.

 $^{^{284}}$ tadadhaḥ śivarūpam] K $\rm E_{DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (de'i 'og na zhi ba'i ngo bo); sdig pa'i rang bzhin du yong pa TVA $_{\rm D}$

²⁸⁵ ātmānam] K E_{DH}; don dam pa'i bdag nyid TV (pāramārthikam ātmānam)

 $^{^{286}}$ hṛnmadhyaṣoḍaśanāḍikācakramadhyasthajñānasvarūpaṃ] K $E_{\rm DH}$ TVB $_{\rm G}$ (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 (hṛnmadhyaṣoḍaśanāḍikāmaṇḍalamadhyahūṁsthajñānasvarūpaṃ)

rigrahah.cviii

tat sarvam tīrthikādibhis tattvarūpeņābhimatam atattvam iti svayam evohanīyam vicāranīyam iti yāvat.

11 upasamhāraḥ

svapnendrajālapratibimbamāyā-^{cix} marīcigandharvapurāmbu[K fol. 2r]candraiḥ | anyaiś ca śabdair²⁸⁷ upamābhidheyair^{cx} naivāsti sādhyam kathitād ihānyat || 19 ||^{cxi}

svapnendrajāletyādi. svapnendrajālopamam pratibimbamāyāmarīcigandharvanagarodakacandropamam iti śabdaiḥ, anyaiś ca gaganapratiśrutkaphenopamam²⁸⁸ ityādiśabdair upamābhidheyair upamāvācakair naivāsti sādhyam kathitāt sādhyād anyat. param iha kathita^{289,cxii} eva sādhya ete śabdāḥ pravartanta iti svayam boddhavyam.

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 || (TVAD). 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 || (TVBG)

^{cix} Although not entirely certain, the commentary, by separating the first three words into a compound, may suggest reading *svapnendrajālaiḥ* instead of *svapnendrajālai*.

^{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.

 $^{^{287}}$ śabdair] em. (TaRaA-Vi); sarvair K $\rm E_{DH}$

²⁸⁸ gagana°] corr.; gagana° K E_{DH}

 $^{^{289}}$ iha kathita] conj. (TV: 'dir bshad pa); kathita K E_{DH}

gambhīrasūnyapratibhāsamātra- 290 sāntāti 291 sūkṣmānabhilāpyasabdaiḥ | nirlepanīrūpa 292 nirañjanādyair bhrāntir na kāryāparasādhyasattve || 20 || 293

 $[E_{DH}\ p.\ 149]$ gambhīraśūnyam pratibhāsamātram śāntātisūkṣmam anabhilāpyam nirlepam nīrūpam²94 nirañjanādi.²95,cxiii ādiśabdāt śivam nirākāram niṣprapañcam anādyantanidhanam i[K fol. 10v]tyādiśabdair bhrāntir na kartavyāparasādhyasattva aparasya sādhyasya sattve sattāyām.²96 ebhiḥ sarvair²97 eva param api kiñcit sādhyam kathitād astīti bhrāntir na kartavyā. atha nātikathitam eva sādhyam ebhiḥ sarvair abhidhīyata iti niścayaḥ.

12 pariņāmanā

akhilagaganagarbha²⁹⁸vyāpi^{cxiv} saptaprakāra-²⁹⁹ grathitavacanarūpād yan mayāsādi puṇyam | anupamasukhavidyāsaktasaddehanirmij-^{cxv} jinajanitajanārthas tena loko 'yam astu || 21 ||^{cxvi} tattvaratnāvalokaḥ samāptaḥ. kṛtir iyaṃ paṇḍitavāgī-śvarakīrtipādānām.

cxiii From ghabhīra° to nirañjanādi TV reproduces the root text.

^{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.

²⁹⁰ °mātra°] E_{DH}; mātraṃ K

²⁹¹ śāntāti°] E_{DH}; sāntādi° K

 $^{^{292}}$ nirlepanīrūpa°] $\mathrm{E_{DH}}$ (em.); nirlepanīpa K

²⁹³ This verse is in Indravajrā

²⁹⁴ nīrūpam] E_{DH} (*em.*); nirupamaṃ K

 $^{^{295}}$ nirañjanādi] K; nirañjanaṃ $\rm E_{DH}$

²⁹⁶ sattāyām] K; sattvāyā E_{DH}

 $^{^{297}}$ sarvair] K $E_{\rm DH};$ sgra TV (śabdair)

 $^{^{298}}$ °gaganagarbha°] corr.; °gaganagarbha° K $\rm E_{DH}$

 $^{^{299}}$ °saptaprakāra°] $E_{\rm DH};$ °sarvaprakāra° K

śrīsamāje parā yasya bhaktir niṣṭhā ca $^{\rm cxvii}$ nirmalā | tasya vāgīśvarasyeyam kṛtir vimatināśinī 300 ||

vikacakumudatārākṣīrakundānukāri^{301,cxviii} pracitam api ca puṇyaṃ yan mayā granthito 'smāt | anupamasukhapūrṇaḥ svābhavidyopagūḍho bhavatu nikhilalokas tena vāgīśvaraśrīh ||

tattvaratnāvalokavivaraņam samāptam. kṛtir iyam paṇḍitācāryavāgīśvarakīrtipādānām.

References

Abhidharmakośa by Vasubandhu. pradhan1975

Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yośamitra. wogihara1932to6

Amṛtakaṇikā by Raviśrījñāna. **lal1994**

Nyāyabindu by Dharmakīrti. **scerbatskoj1918**

Pramāṇavārttikavṛtti by Manorathānandin. Sāṃkṛtyāyana ed.

cxvii Given the position of ca, it seems that we should take nistha as a substantive rather than an adjective qualifying bhakti. TV, somewhat unnaturally, reflects understanding nistha as an adjective meaning 'perfected' by rendering it $mthar\ phyin\ pa$.

^{cxviii} The slight rearrangment of word order, from " $k\bar{s}$ ratārā" to " $t\bar{a}$ rā $k\bar{s}$ ra", 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).

 $^{^{300}}$ vimatināśinī] E_{DH} ; vimatināsanī K

 $^{^{301}}$ vikacakumudatārākṣīrakundānukāri] $\it em.;$ vikacakumudakṣīratārakundānukāri E $_{\rm DH};$ vikarektāmudaksīratārākundānukāri K

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