

Article

Tattva, vrata, caryā: On the Relationship of View and Practice in the First Chapter of Padmavajra's Guhyasiddhi

Julian Schott 

Institute for South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna, 1090 Vienna, Austria;
julian.schott@univie.ac.at

Abstract: The religious worldview of the *mantranaya* (esoteric Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna) can arguably be seen as rooted in the perspective that reality (*tattva*) is to be self-experienced (*svasamvedya*) through contemplative practices, serving as both their means (*upāya*) and expression (*caryā*). The tantric path-model of Padmavajra's *Guhyasiddhi*, an exegetical text in the Guhyasamāja tradition, supposedly enables individuals to rapidly realize reality, a state also referred to as *mahāmudrā* or other, within a single lifetime. This path-model describes a transformation leading to the revelation of ultimate realization leaving behind conventional means. These two levels correspond to two stages, the stage of arising (*utpattikrama*), serving as the foundation for the stage of the arisen (*utpannakrama*). While the first stage is like a supporting framework giving rise to the correct view, in the second stage, the practitioner cultivates the view that has arisen. The practices of the latter stage eventually become inseparable from the view itself, meaning they are practical expressions of the view exemplified in doctrines like *unmattavrata* and other forms of observances integral to the *mahāmudrā* doctrine. Thus, contemplative practices and the established worldview mutually inform each other in a reciprocal relationship. Simultaneously, this system of practice and view continues to influence and shape religious practices and rituals as they are transmitted, e.g., through teacher–disciple lineages (*guruparamparā*). In this paper, I will explore this relationship through the critical edition and annotated translation of *Guhyasiddhi*'s first chapter by Padmavajra (ca. late 8th and early 9th century), in which a clear exposition of the relationship in question is presented. My analysis of it, thus connecting the work to more general Buddhist concepts, follows a two-level framework, that is, the well-known two-fold system of conventional/implicit (a) and definitive/explicit (b), which can be seen as equivalent to *utpatti*- (a) and *utpannakrama* (b). The efficiency of promoted practices accords with the practitioner's correct assessment of *tattva* which, following Padmavajra, is the basis for engagement in tantric practices *per se*. The first part provides the analysis, given in 1.1–1.5, of Padmavajra's system and is based on the second part, the annotated translation (2.1) and critical edition (2.2) of Padma-vajra's *Guhyasiddhi* chapter one.



Citation: Schott, Julian. 2024. *Tattva, vrata, caryā: On the Relationship of View and Practice in the First Chapter of Padmavajra's Guhyasiddhi*. *Religions* 15: 279. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030279>

Academic Editor: Yaroslav Komarovski

Received: 21 December 2023

Revised: 13 February 2024

Accepted: 16 February 2024

Published: 25 February 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Buddhist philosophy and contemplation; Buddhist models of the mind, body, path, and reality; *Guhyasiddhi*; Padmavajra; tantrism; Buddhist tantra; *vrata*; *caryā*; *tattva*

1. Analysis of Padmavajra's View and Framework

“Enough with that, what is now the purpose of even more concepts (*vikalpa*)? Since the condition of reality (*tattva*) is not embodied in the *śāstra*(s) through *utpattikrama*[practices], after having at first discerned the arrangement [of practices] for the sake of reality's accomplishment by means of reality, one then should bring forth what is concealed[, i.e., the secrets] regarding meditation and so forth in accordance with reality. Then, one whose mind has been illuminated by *tattva* shall display tantric conduct (*caryā*). And following that, however, indeed the special observance (*vrata*) connected to the divine consort (*vidyā*) may be performed.” (*Guhyasiddhi* 1.22–24)

A meaningful response to the question at the heart of this special issue regarding the relationship of contemplative practices and the established worldview in tantric Buddhism (although a single or unified form of tantric Buddhism does of course not exist) should first revolve around determining whether the practices shape the beliefs or vice versa. With this thought in mind, I will elaborate on the question of their relationship based on the first chapter of Padmavajra's *Guhyasiddhi* (henceforth GS), titled "The Instruction on *Vrata* and *Tattva*, the Means for the Accomplishment of Vajrasattva" (*vajrasattvasādhnavratatattvanirdeśa*), a chapter that specifically addresses the relationship between contemplative practices and the established view in connection to the two *kramas* (*utpatti*- and *utpannakrama*, the two stages of tantric practice). The GS stands out as one of the earliest examples of the Buddhist tantric exegetical literature available, dating back to the late 8th or the earlier 9th century, and is regarded as the first exegetical work on the Guhyasamāja tradition.¹ Although it is a seminal text that significantly contributes to our understanding of the development of Indian tantric traditions, belonging to a text cycle known as the "Seven Texts of Accomplishment" (*Grub pa sde bdun*), it is, of course, not representative for tantric Buddhism per se. The *Grub pa sde bdun*, with Padmavajra's work traditionally considered the first, is associated with Uḍḍiyāna/Oḍ(ḍ)iyāna, considered the place where *Guhyasamājatantra* was first preached and believed by some to be the birthplace of tantric teachings in general (see, e.g., Tucci 1940, p. 2).² Despite myths and uncertainties surrounding the location, formation, and transmission of these texts, the textual traditions linked to Uḍḍiyāna and the *Grub pa sde bdun* are undeniably crucial for understanding the origins and evolution of major Indo-Tibetan Mahāmudrā traditions.

Before presenting the edition and translation in Part 2, although the framework developed by Padmavajra in his GS largely speaks for itself, I will, following a general introduction to the topic (in Section 1.1), isolate and discuss three major points that particularly pertain to the relationship of view and practice. In Section 1.2, the term *tattva* ("reality"), which forms the conceptual foundation for Padmavajra's presentation, will be explored. Then, in Section 1.3, a two-level hierarchy that is implied in the GS, corresponding to the two levels of tantric practice, namely, *utpatti*- and *utpannakrama*, will be addressed. These two aspects, I believe, can be seen as constituting the intellectual and doctrinal framework of Padmavajra's GS. Based on them, in Section 1.4, the soteriological concept of *vrata* and *caryā*, a well-known yet little-studied tantric observance, will be paraphrased. In all these points, different notions, and layers of crucial terms such as *tattva*, *upāya*, etc., are explored. These layers and notions, prevalent throughout the GS's first chapter, can be approached by breaking them down into a two-level framework: On the first level, the conventional or provisional one (*≈utpattikrama*), *tattva* is described as the basis on account of which practices can be correctly, i.e., effectively, applied (a). On the second level, the ultimate one (*≈utpannakrama*), *tattva* itself, through being personally experienced, is expressed by means of practices serving as a showcase precisely of one's insight into reality (b). Despite the fact that a neat and straightforward two-level hierarchy can be extracted from the GS, a nuanced perspective is necessary as we navigate Padmavajra's presentation, acknowledging that many sublevels and notions at play remain unexplored, exceeding the scope of this paper. Hence, this presentation (as summarized in subpoint five and the accompanying table) is merely a first analysis of Padmavajra's path-model rather than a detailed study. It aims to explore the interplay of view and practice that this special issue endeavors to elucidate and to provide a theoretical framework that helps approach texts of this kind, as well as to understand some of the later developments that took place, e.g., in the Tibetan sphere, for which the textual tradition and milieu connected to Padmavajra and his contemporaries was highly influential. Likewise, I acknowledge that the GS's relation to other important sources, by which the presentation given here could and should be enlarged and complemented (such as other texts included in or related to the *Grub pa sde bdun* corpus and *yogatantras* related to the *Guhyasamājatantra*,³ primarily the *Jñānasiddhi* and the *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi*), has not been explored comprehensively, systematically, or in detail.

1.1. Analysis of Padmavajra's View and Framework of Practices

The term “worldview” is understood here to refer to an individual's or a group's set of beliefs about the nature of reality and their place within it. It serves as a guiding framework for understanding various aspects of life, shaped by factors such as culture, religion, education, and personal experiences. “Contemplative practices”, on the other hand, encompass a range of techniques used to cultivate specific states of mind or awareness. In many tantric Buddhist traditions, such as in Padmavajra's GS, the text under investigation, these two concepts are intertwined, but accurately describing their relationship poses challenges. When defining a form of a tantric Buddhist “worldview” (in the exegetical tradition of the *Guhyasamāja*), it is essential to note that the equivalence of the term “worldview” in contemporary usage is not entirely clear in the context of tantric Buddhism and, for that matter, Buddhism in general. The term “view” in Buddhism, though it can represent a set of beliefs, carries strong connotations of correctness and falsehood, making it more evaluative than descriptive⁴. Nevertheless, the tantric Buddhist worldview in the sense of the correct view about reality emphasizes direct personal experience (*svasamvedya*), akin to the idea of (*yogi*)*pratyakṣa*, as the primary means of recognizing *tattva*, true reality (see, e.g., GS 3.71ab, given below).⁵ In certain contexts, *tattva* may be synonymous with *mahāmudrā* (*phyag chen*) and other terms used in Indo-Tibetan traditions to describe insight into reality or the nature of the mind, such as Dzogchen (*rdzogs chen*).⁶ In tantric Buddhist descriptions of reality, albeit that *tattva* is a multifaceted term carrying differing notions in different tantric systems, it is often referred to as nondual (*advaya*), without inherent nature (*niḥsvabhāva*), empty (*śūnya*), without a self (*nairātmya*), luminous (*prabhāsvara*), and having other qualities.⁷ In the *Guhyasamāja*, it is said to be “without beginning and end, calm, that in which there is the extinction of existence and non-existence, the mighty one, undivided from emptiness and compassion [and] taught as bodhicitta.”⁸ The nature of reality, as expressed in various texts, including Prajñākaramati's commentary to the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* or the *Śrīvajra maṇḍalālaṅkāra* quoted in the *Jñānasiddhi*, is further said to be ultimately indescribable (*anabhilāpya*). This contributes to the understanding of *tattva* as a concept situated in the realm of mystical spiritual experience (Snellgrove 1959, p. 19 ff.):

“That, which is the ultimate truth, is indescribable.”⁹

“Gnosis is unceasing, without letters, soundless, pure from the beginning, void of stains, luminous [and] inexpressible.”¹⁰

Moving on to the second concept to be briefly introduced, contemplative practices usually involve, but are not limited to, meditations of both a cognitive and physical nature, aiming at, as seems generally maintained in mindfulness and contemplative studies' circles, cultivating calm and insight (*śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*), terms that, although possibly implied here and there, are not found in the *Guhyasiddhi* (or, for that matter, play any significant role in the *Grub pa sde bdun* corpus). Therein, the contemplative practices addressed are not commonly found in discussions pertaining to the contemporary phenomenon of contemplative studies.¹¹ In considering the term contemplative practices, it is thus not at all certain which term(s) in their primary languages fall into the range of contemplative practices (as the concept is contemporarily used) and which among its subcategories, if any, are applicable to *devatāyoga*, *vidyāvrata*, and the like, that is, the specific practices of the *utpatti*- and *utpannakrama*. One term, however, that, in case of the GS (as well as many other tantric texts), naturally comes to mind is (*vi*)*bhāvanā*/^a. Practically speaking, *bhāvanā* (used here as a collective term encompassing also other terms used for “meditation” such as *dhyana*, *samādhi*, etc.) and various forms of physical training or rites and rituals (as listed in GS 1.73–75, ed., and transl. in Part 2) fall, within Buddhist usage, under the heading of *upāya* or *naya*, the “means” within the sphere of which the entire range of contemplative practices may be included (in older use, Vajrayāna Buddhism was seen as esoteric Mahāyāna Buddhism, i.e., Mahāyāna employing the methods (*naya*) of *mantras*, namely, esoteric methods). Although, as we will see in Padmavajra's GS, view and means/practice—*tattva* (*prajñā*, *drṣṭi* etc.) and *upāya*—are practically intertwined; the view, at the onset (the first level of the

two-level framework), always informs, regulates, and validates the practices (see (a) *Tattva*: intellectual framework), which must be differentiated based on their application within this framework. Particularly, as the practitioner progresses on the path, *tattva*, as an intellectual notion, becomes shaped by the experiences gained through specialized contemplative practices, giving rise to what could be termed a “praxis-driven philosophy”, in which mental-somatic/psycho-physiological experiences are the foundation of philosophy and doctrine. In this dynamic relationship, view (personal insight = *prajñā*) and practice (means = *upāya*)¹² are mutually influential, forming a symbiotic and reciprocal relationship:

“Due to the sameness of cultivation (=contemplative practices) and reality, that which has the nature of *prajñopāya* (insight and means [conjoined]) is auspicious.”¹³

This apparently ambiguous and seemingly self-inferential relationship is validated by the aforementioned aspect of the personal experience (*svasaṃvedya*) of the nature of reality, which itself lies beyond the scope of words:

“Reality is to be self-experienced, but it cannot be expressed [with words]”¹⁴

“Now, a little bit taught for the acquisition of the gem that is reality, intended for the sake of those whose selves are utterly deluded due to wandering about in existence, difficult to break free from. By me, the glorious Anaṅgavajra, whose mind is filled with compassion, the means, just as done by the previous buddhas, are briefly presented. It cannot be asserted, even by the victorious ones, that “This is like that”, and it is not comprehensible in view of external matters because it possesses a nature that is to be individually self-experienced.”¹⁵

The source of this inexpressible reality, as in most tantric traditions, is personified by the *guru*. It is through the *guru*’s instructions on *tattva* that transformative contemplative techniques unique to tantric traditions (not necessarily only Buddhist ones) can be practiced in accordance with their implied result. And indeed, Padmavajra dedicates a rather lengthy passage to the topic of the *guru* as one’s source of *tattvasiddhi* (e.g., GS 1.46, 55–63, ed., and transl. in Part 2), emphasizing the unsuitability of those lacking proper respect and the impossibility of conducting tantric practices without a teacher, respectively.

“Having been ascertained by the patrons, the buddhas, reality has been well and carefully concealed in the basket of [i.e., repository of teachings that is like] a heap of gems by following along the dispositions of beings. With great care, it [i.e., this reality] has been realized to be perfectly present in one’s own body as *bodhicitta*, pure and supreme, thanks to the kindness of one’s venerable guru. [...] Who indeed see the unity of the *guru* and Vajradhara, those, here [i.e., in this life], obtain reality, characterized as the totality of accomplishments. [...] Whose thoughts are turned to the deceit of *vajra*-friends and *gurus*, such beings never obtain the supreme stage of it grating accomplishments. [...] Those by who *mantras* are seized for themselves, and who are delighted having seen the book, [yet] without knowing a teacher, they are deprived of keeping the pledges.”¹⁶

The characterization of *tattva* (and *upāya*) as both the goal and a supportive view on the path practically implies a two-level framework or hierarchy. While view and practice may seem separate on the first level (a, see Sections 1.2 and 1.3), they become a unity on the second, more advanced level of the highest practitioners (b, see Section 1.4). On this advanced level, the practice ceases to function merely as a means separate from the view, but becomes an expression of one’s realization of it. This is articulated, for example, in *Sahajasiddhi* 3.6, which I translate as follows:

“Since, for the whole world is cultivated by the mind, nothing is to be cultivated. The cultivation is that there is no cultivation—the perfect cognition of all phenomena.”¹⁷

Thus, the view that negates all views in favor of the inexpressible mystical experience, as pointed out by Snellgrove in his introduction to the *Hevajratantra* (Snellgrove 1959, p. 19 ff.), is a practice designed to transcend itself. Everything that might be termed a view is considered nothing but fixations (*abhiniveśa*) to be abandoned. This view, on the one hand, can be seen as a direct link to Madhyamaka philosophy and, on the other, forms the foundation for the “practice as expression” in the form of *vrata* and *caryā*—a form of practice in which practitioners display their sanity by means of non-conceptual and counterintuitive behavior.¹⁸ The practice signifies a practitioner’s deliberate departure from societal norms and conventions to demonstrate their transcendence beyond those limitations (Schott 2023a, p. 3) as opposed to the “deluded ones” adhering to conventional norms and practices. This notion forms a major conceptual framework for the activities and the religious practices of the *siddhas*. The reciprocal nature of view and practice can, in this sense, be understood as a perpetually mutual relationship (see, e.g., *Jñānasiddhi* section 12), meaning that on the advanced level, there is no difference between view and practice. This is expressed in the following verse, which is found verbatim and as a concept across various tantras and their exegeses connected to various times and traditions. It is intimately linked to the doctrine of *caryā* and *vrata* (see Section 1.2 below):

“By whatever terrifying *karman* beings are indeed bound, by just that, however, being endowed with the means, they are liberated from the chains of existence.”¹⁹

It is through this tantric path in which both view and practice are intertwined individuals who are said to be able to rapidly explore and experience the most fundamental states of cognition and are connected to the exclusive promise within tantric Buddhism: the realization that (*buddha*)*jñāna*, the cognition of the true nature of reality (*tattvā*), can be achieved in one’s present life:²⁰

“Those, on the other hand, who have ascended reality, who are free from all mental concepts, they touch highest awakening even here in this life.”²¹

Brief Discussion of Intellectual, Doctrinal, and Sociological Frameworks in GS Chapter One

In the next three sections, I will present my attempt of analyzing the GS’s framework in terms of, what I define, as intellectual, doctrinal, and sociological frameworks. I will do so based on the terminology emphasized in the GS, connecting it with wider-known concepts and doctrines to contextualize Padmavajra’s exegesis in the larger frame of Buddhist thought, such as has been done, for instance, in the ‘*Bri gung chos mdzod*’s exegesis of the GS, in which the content of its first chapter is summarized as follows:

“In the absence of *tattva*, even one who [practices] *caryā* and *vrata*, will not get liberated. However, those who, in accordance with their capabilities, practice *vrata* and the path of *caryā* as endowed with reality will eventually [attain (?)] *tattva*. Moreover, [instructions on] the *caryā* to be done and so on are not found (lit. not possible to be) anywhere in treatises and commentaries. Relying on the *Guhyasamāja*, the “basket [of teachings,] a heap of gems” (*skandharatnakaraṇḍake*, GS 1.45d), it is evidently available (lit. possible). Also, relying on the teacher who possesses the instructions [on the attainment of *tattva*], it is crucial to bear in mind that *tattva* is the essential thing.”²²

1.2. *Tattva*: Intellectual Framework

As mentioned above, the concept of *tattva*, here rendered into English as “reality”, serves as both an intellectual basis to guide an individual’s contemplative practice on the first stage (i.e., the stage of *utpattikrama* practices (a)), and as the designation of the goal of an individual’s contemplative practices, which is the ultimate level and naturally connected to the second of the two *kramas* (i.e., the *utpannakrama* (b)). A similar stratagem can also be observed in the *Jñānasiddhi* regarding the term *jñāna*. Therein, like the term *tattva* in the GS, *jñāna* is used both as a means and a designation of the goal.²³ This two-level hierarchy of

tattva (in form of a hermeneutical distinction) is made clear in GS 1.18–19 (ed., and transl. in Part 2):

“Those seeking to obtain the highest, tranquil, and constant level of the Buddhas, those will accomplish the *Guhyasiddhi*, supreme and auspicious. [This is] what is to be clearly comprehended, in accordance with the *utpannakrama*, by those perfectly yoked to reality; otherwise, by those inferior in reality [and who practice only on the *utpattikrama*] *siddhi* will never be obtained.”

According to this citation the main function of *tattva* as a concept on the first level is that it serves as the intellectual basis of the view in Padmavajra’s framework of view and practice. It should be stressed that *tattva*, within this framework (and most certainly beyond that in Buddhist tantras in general), has a certain notion of objectivity. This is implied in formulations such as “Having been ascertained by the patrons, the buddhas, reality has been well and carefully concealed. . . .” (GS 1.45, ed., and transl. in Part 2). This means that all buddhas ascertain reality as it is, that is, the same reality. There are no different realities for different buddhas. From a Buddhist perspective, a doctrine that should serve as a reliable basis for any practitioner of a given path must fulfill the criteria of being in accordance with reality—able to be experienced by all who follow that path in the same way. And on the relative level, it must be a description that can guide a practitioner towards that goal.

“Enough with that, what is now the purpose of even more *vikalpas*? Since the condition of reality is not embodied in the *śāstra*(s) through *utpattikrama*[-practices], after having at first discerned the arrangement [of practices] for the sake of reality’s accomplishment by means of reality, one then should bring forth what is concealed[, i.e., the secrets] regarding meditation and so forth in accordance with reality.” (GS 1.22–23, ed., and transl. in Part 2.)

In *Jñānasiddhi* chapter one, which, like GS chapter one, also constitutes a concise presentation of *tattva*, the following complementary statement can be found:

“[Those,] however, who are unable to grasp through investigation based on reasoning and scripture the unsurpassed jewel of reality which has a nature that is to be self-experienced, they whose *yoga* is that of beginners are fit recipients of the lower Dharma [alone], having indiscriminating intellects, completely covered by delusion caused by ignorance. For them, the saviors of the world have taught the meditations of Vajrasattva and so forth fully furnished with arms and colors and with *mudrās*, *maṇḍalas* [and so forth].”²⁴

Hence, *tattva*, as the intellectual/theoretical foundation, ensures the efficacy of *utpattikrama* practices, serving as the conventional means (a). Then, *tattva* as the experiential/view, when applied on the *utpannakrama* level (b), as stated in GS 1.6–8 (ed. and transl. in Part 2), denotes a practitioner’s experience of *tattva* displayed through respective conducts (see the next subpoint 4).²⁵ In the effort to determine the relation of view and practice, it becomes clear that *tattva*, both as foundation and experience, is necessary for the application of any sort of practices. These practices consist of varying sufficient and modifiable possibilities that, in and by themselves, remain provisional, as articulated in GS 1.27 (ed. and transl. in Part 2):

“The *sādhakas* who are foremost/abiding in *tattva* are accomplished even without *vrata*, [but] those inferior in reality are not accomplished, even throughout hundreds of *cīrṇavratas* (preparatory practices).”

1.3. Two-Level Hierarchy: Doctrinal Framework

In terms of Buddhist thought and to trying to connect Padmavajra’s presentation to some larger doctrinal context, the description of *tattva* can also be analyzed according to the two truths doctrine (*dvayasatya*).²⁶ At the first level, the conventional or provisional one (a), there exists an implied difference between contemplative practices (*upāya*) and

the view (regarding *tattva*), where, as mentioned, the latter serves as the foundation for the correct application of the former. This implies that all sorts of practices and rites are not only conventional, but even useless unless integrated into a correct view (of *tattva*). Thus, one may speak of the conventional level as a “level of integration” since provisional practices need to be integrated into a system in which *tattva* is “properly conceptualized” to gain soteriological efficacy. According to Padmavajra, such *utpattikrama* practices are conventionally taught, while the *utpannakrama* practices and *tattva* are, except for the *Guhyasamājatantra*, not commonly taught but kept secret:

“Although that *tattva* is present in the tantra[s] it is made clear [only] in the Śrīsamāja. Elsewhere it is not made explicit (lit. kept secret), [but] indicated in great extent with many elaborations. [Reality is] only one, pure and supreme [but] abides with various aspects inasmuch as being differentiated into *kriyā*, *caryā* and so forth [and] through collections of scriptural discourses and so forth. [...] But, here [in the GS] in view of the teachings of the Glorious Samāja, leaving aside all conceptual elaborations (*pravistara*), one gets accomplished here in this very life on account of *utpannakrama* practices. ... Leaving behind the prolixity of tantra, and knowing wisdom and means, the practice of a beginner [and] established in accordance with reality, then, however, the wise single minded [i.e., single pointed] one may cultivate [it] with certainty. One by whom frequent practice is done throughout day and night, gets accomplished, there is no doubt.”²⁷

Hence, Padmavajra’s presentation (although he uses terms such as *gupta*, (*su*)*gopita* etc. cf., e.g., GS 1.43, 2.11, 13, 47; 3.1, 42; 5.2, 9; 6.93, 96) can also be interpreted according to the, especially in Buddhist tantra, well-known didactical tool or interpretive framework of *neyārtha* and *nītārtha* (implicit and explicit teachings). It focuses on how terms, methods, and scriptures can be understood and applied within different contexts and by practitioners of different capacities, suggesting that both conventional/provisional and ultimate meanings coexist.²⁸ What is commonly taught in *śāstras* and *āgamas*, and comprehensible through reason (*yukti*), is merely conventional (*samvṛti*) and thus in need of being interpreted (*neyārtha*), corresponding to the first level of the framework (a).²⁹ These are the practices of the beginners resorting to the level of the *utpattikrama* in which *tattva* serves as an intellectual basis rather than being itself experienced and in which advanced esoteric methods (*divyopāya*, etc.) are concealed (*gupta*/*gopita*). On the second level (b), in the stage of the *utpannakrama*, practices connected to the direct experience of *tattva*, that is, teachings on how to directly experience the nature of *tattva* (e.g., the aforementioned *divyopāya*), supposedly, are given explicitly (*nītārtha*), meaning that the ultimate (*paramārtha*) is not concealed and teachings are not in need of interpretation.³⁰ Besides the denominations of provisional and ultimate, implicit and explicit, or intellectual and experiential used thus far to classify *tattva*’s relation to *upāya* and *bhāvanā*, another way to denote these levels is “theoretical” (a) and “practical” (b), terminology which, although not finding good equivalents in Sanskrit or Tibetan, expresses the notions that the two levels of *tattva* and *upāya* carry. Since *tattva* can either refer to a doctrine or an experience (*svasamvedya*, cf. nt. 5) and the latter is to be gained qua the ultimate teachings of the *utpannakrama*, it seems certainly in line with the progressive spirit of the GS to adhere to the individual’s experiential validation of the doctrine as a practical level of understanding. At this point, the second level of Padmavajra’s two-level framework can be addressed more meaningfully—the practice as an expression of *tattva* as self-experienced.

1.4. Unmattavrata, Samaya, and Janmanīhaiva Sidhyante: Soteriological Framework of Unity

Having thus described the first of the two levels of Padmavajra’s framework in the previous paragraphs, the second level, which I define in this context as the “practice as an expression of *tattva*’s self-experience”, will now be briefly described. It is important to acknowledge that “practice as an expression of reality”³¹ (or, as Padmavajra would call it, “divine means”, cf. GS 1.11, 17, 48, and 54, ed. and transl. in Part 2) implies that there are fundamental quality differences among forms of *upāya* and *bhāvanā*, wherein *caryā* and

vrata, namely, tantric conduct and observances, are solely connected to advanced stages of the practice, as expressed, e.g., in GS 4.5 (ed. and transl. in Part 2). Hence, when exploring the “relation of worldview and contemplative practices”, their relation is not only to be explored, as done in sections two and three, in terms of their hierarchy—when taking practices in the sense of “practices as (provisional) means towards a goal”, emphasizing the importance of *tattva* as an intellectual framework—but also in terms of their quality. As shown several times regarding the second level of Padmavajra’s two-level framework, the relation of view and practice changes as the practices become more advanced (i.e., in the *utpannakrama*) until their relationship is mutual and no hierarchy exists any further. That is, until view and practice become identical. This very union of insight and means is the foundation of what marks the truly progressive nature within texts (and scriptures) of such kind. Namely, that the practitioner, given that one practices the *utpannakrama* under the conditions outlined above, is permitted to do absolutely anything, turning every act into a practice of expression.³²

“The *sādhakas* who conform to it [i.e., who are adepts of the *Guhyasiddhi* system] are at ease under any circumstances, fully united with the divine means, [and] are rooted in [their] practices. Even those who oppose the Dharma/rules [can] obtain supreme awakening which has a nature that is oneness of the three *vajras* by means of [their] secret observances (*pracchannavrata*).” (GS 1.11–12, ed., and transl. in Part 2)

Following this statement, Padmavajra lists, in verses 1.13–16ab, examples of various cardinal sins, including sexual misconduct, stealing, etc., by means of which the practitioners may reach accomplishment:

“I teach for *sādhakas* in a manner of secret observances (*vrata*), the supreme and divine secret *caryā* (tantric conduct) granting all accomplishments by which the state of Vajrasattva is obtained in this very lifetime.” (GS 1.16cd–17, ed., and transl. in Part 2)

Hence, the nature of (*unmatta*)*vrata* and *caryā* serves as an example of the second level of Padmavajra’s two-level framework, which, because of its application and mastery, promises the ultimate culmination and archetypical claim of the tantric path: realization in a single lifetime—“*janmanīhaiva sidhyate*” (b).³³

In this regard, the concept of the pledges (*samaya*), although only addressed twice within the negative context of “not keeping the *samayas* when not conjoined with the foundation of *tattva*”, also plays a significant role. In view of it, like the (*unmatta*)*vrata* and *caryā* doctrine, the pledges go hand in hand with the display of conduct and behavior and hence must be accounted for as another factor adhering to the characterization of the “worldview.” Further, one may note that this even entails the command not to spend one’s time among “unsuitable” company (e.g., GS 1.69 and *Jñānasiddhi* 17.24). Abiding by or keeping the pledges, in fact, means nothing less than “keeping the view.” GS 1.26 tells us that those practicing the means without reality go to hell, and GS 1.48–50 states that those without divine means are keeping wrong/perverted *samayas*, and thus go to hell. Hence, we can deduce that having an understanding of *tattva* as a foundation, being the basis for practicing the means effectively, practically speaking, means keeping one’s pledges or, in other words, the pledge is to keep one’s correct view of reality.

1.5. Summary

There is only one correct view of *tattva*, as expressed, e.g., in *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* 5.9–11 (note 32 above). Yet, reality can have a conventional/theoretical/provisional usage as verifying the “practice as a means” on the first level, the *utpattikrama*, within which the correct view and understanding arise before their integration into subsequent steps of the path. The second level of the *utpannakrama* within which the correct view and understanding have already arisen is the stage within which teachings are given explicitly (*nītārtha* = *na gopitam*) and reality is to be self-experienced (*svasamvedya*). On this level, view

and practice merge into one, “the practice of expression” (b). In this way, *vrata* and *caryā* can be seen as the expression of one’s understanding of conventionality and are thus equally contemplative practices as they are representative of some form of tantric worldview. The following table gives an overview of the two-level framework discussed above:

Two level framework → Categories ↓	(a) Conventional/provisional/theoretical	(b) Ultimate/ practical/experiential
Capacity of the practitioner (<i>sādhaka/yogin</i>)	Beginners (<i>ādikarmika</i>) and those of lesser and mediocre capacities (<i>mṛdu, madhya</i>)	Advanced practitioner and those with greater capacities (<i>adhimātra</i>)
Level of truth (<i>satya</i>)	Relative (<i>saṃvṛti</i>)	Ultimate (<i>paramārtha</i>)
Level of reality (<i>tattva</i>)	Intellectual foundation for the beginning and intermediate practitioner (<i>tattvasiddher vidhānakam</i>)	To be self-experienced (<i>svasaṃvedya</i>) by those connected to reality (<i>tattvasaṃyukta</i>) not by those lacking it (<i>tattvahīna</i>)
Level of practice (<i>krama</i>)	Preliminary stage, i.e., stage of integration (<i>srising = utpatti</i>)	Advanced stage (<i>arisen = utpanna</i>) ³⁴
Level of contemplative practices (<i>upāya, (vi)bhāvanā</i>)	Practice as means, i.e., contemplative practices are applied towards a goal	Practice as expression, i.e., devine means (<i>divyopāya ≈ guhyacaryā, vidyāvrata, etc.</i>) ³⁵
Efficacy and accomplishment (<i>siddhi</i>)	<i>tattvahīna, gurunindaka</i> = no efficacy ³⁶ / Hell (<i>naraka</i>)	<i>tattoyukta, guruprasāda</i> = efficacy / <i>antarābhava</i> ³⁷
Level of teachings (<i>deśanā</i>)	<i>tattva</i> is not directly taught in scriptures (<i>śāstrādi</i>), but concealed (<i>neyārtha ≈ tanreṣu gopita</i>)	<i>tattva</i> and how it is to be achieved (<i>utpannakrama</i>) are taught explicitly (<i>nītārtha ≈ saṃvṛtim utpādyā</i>) only in the <i>Guhyasamājatantra</i>

2. Edition and Annotated Translation of Padmavajra’s *Guhyasiddhi* Chapter One

2.1. Annotated Translation

2.1.1. Summary of the First Chapter

Padmavajra, following tradition, commences with introductory verses of obeisance introducing the topic, stating the triad of *abhidheya, sambandha, and prayojana*. It is noteworthy, however, that in the more elaborated first two stanzas (1–2), the *Guhyasiddhi* is qualified not as a text, but rather as a primordial state, whereas, in the next six stanzas (3–8), Padmavajra introduces the *Guhyasiddhi* as a work. After these introductory verses, Padmavajra defines the GS’s marvelous qualities (9–11) and provides the general framework of his text, namely eight verses (11–19) that, together with 6–8, provide the two-level framework of *tattva* and the two *kramas*, thus establishing the superiority of his approach characterized by the accomplishment in a single life. In verses 20–23, Padmavajra defines *tattva* and makes it clear that it cannot be described conceptually, but must be experienced. Moving on to verses 24–28, he elaborates that the realization of *tattva* is a precondition for the application of *vidyāvrata* and *caryā*, without which these have no soteriological efficacy. In verses 29–50(36), although not naming these explicitly, Padmavajra makes the *neyārtha* and *nītārtha* distinction in view of how *tattva* is presented in the *Guhyasamājatantra* compared to Buddhist tantra in general. In 29–46(32), he states that what is not openly displayed but concealed in scripture is obtained thanks to one’s *guru*. In stanzas 47–50(33–36), he concludes that the realized one is free to perform as wished, while those lacking understanding of reality will go to hell due to their corrupted pledges. This “rhetoric of downfall” has already been expressed in 24–26. In verses 54(37)–72(54), Padmavajra elaborates further on the preconditions for attaining

tattva, highlighting, on the one hand, the importance of the teacher and, on the other, the desired qualities of the student. He does so by oscillating between descriptions of the pre-eminence that can be reached through reliance on one's teacher and various negative counterexamples, i.e., listing various forms of unsuitable or superficial behavior that will counteract a practitioner's possibility to attain *tattva*. In the end of the chapter, in verses 73(55)–77(58), Padmavajra lists a number of conventional means, stating that in his system, these are not conducive towards the attainment of *tattva*. He then, in verses 80(59)–89(68), reiterates the uselessness of conceptuality and the superiority of the *Guhyasamājatantra* by reliance on which accomplishment can be achieved in a single lifetime. However, without the knowledge and application of this *Tantra*, the practitioner will be lost in his endeavor for accomplishment, comparing such a person to someone who is “wishing to drink the reflection of water.” In the final verse 89(68), Padmavajra summarizes his presentation, namely, the result of his path-system as “the source of all good qualities from which stains are gone [and] that is granting accomplishments in every way”.

2.1.2. Text

“The Accomplishment of Secrets—Arousing the Truth of All Tantras”³⁸

[1–2]³⁹ That which is freed from worldly customs, the most auspicious stage, pervading without inherent nature, beyond contemplation⁴⁰ and praised by the bulls, the best of sages as calm and always arisen⁴¹—that which is inconceivable even for the buddhas, from which stains have been completely removed, being the glorious state of the victorious ones, the supreme level which is pure by its own way of being—to that reality⁴² I pay homage. Now, I will teach⁴³ [this] *Śrīguhyasiddhi*, supremely well set out, most distinguished,⁴⁴ arisen from gems, the chief messenger in the quest for reaching the supreme state,⁴⁵ being the cause for obtaining Buddhahood,⁴⁶ connected with manifold tantric conduct, destroying disputes and stains, serving the removing of obstacles,⁴⁷ the place where *siddhis* originate,⁴⁸ the abode of a hundred qualities, like the mother of the victorious ones.⁴⁹

[3–4] Having first bowed to what bears limitless qualities, the state of the three unbreakable *vajras*,⁵⁰ great bliss [and] what is beyond the reach of speech,⁵¹ the unexcelled *Guhyasiddhi* is now taught [by me,]⁵² Padmavajra, with a mind filled with/overwhelmed by compassion, for the sake of the *sādhakas'* welfare.

[5] That which has been taught by the patrons of truth⁵³ also with many other tantras [and] which is perfectly endowed with the obtained instructions,⁵⁴ that is now told by me.

[6–8]⁵⁵ Leaving aside⁵⁶ the extensive *utpatti[krama]*-practices, the practice of beginners⁵⁷ [which they had undertaken] for a long time and with all efforts,⁵⁸ because of *utpannakrama* practices, resorting to the *Tantrasadbhāva*⁵⁹ characterized as abundant⁶⁰ accomplishments, and having abandoned all elaborations, causing obstacles for the practice, the unexcelled *Guhyasiddhi*, divine, auspicious and granting all *buddhasiddhis*, is now taught in brief and according to the method of wisdom and means.

[9]⁶¹ Being the source of fortune, appeasing, and cutting down all obstacles, [it is] the repository of all *siddhis*, like a supreme wish fulfilling gem.

[10] [It is] the mother⁶² of all Buddhas, crushing down confused foes, the means of accomplishing all aims and nothing but the appellation of complete and perfect awakening.

[11] The *sādhakas* who conform to it [i.e., who are adepts of the *Guhyasiddhi* system] are at ease under any circumstances (*yatra tatra*), fully united with the divine means, [and] are rooted in [their] practices.⁶³

[12]⁶⁴ Even those who oppose the Dharma⁶⁵ [can] obtain supreme awakening which has a nature that is the oneness of the three *vajras* by means of [their] secret observances.

[13–17]⁶⁶ Those who proceed to the unsurpassed state that is beyond the limits of time,⁶⁷ may take lives and be ferocious, taking pleasure in cruel deeds. Such men may also cause confusion through nets of lies. All those men who live [like this] get accomplished swiftly through *caryā*. They may make love to another's wife and steal another's wealth and even they are constantly performing the deeds of the disliked and inferior. Practicing that (*yāṃ*), they swiftly reach the highest [realm]⁶⁸ above the desire realm. I teach for

sādhakas, in a manner of secret observances (*vrata*), the supreme and divine secret *caryā* (tantric conduct) granting all accomplishments by which the state of Vajrasattva is obtained in this very lifetime.”⁶⁹

[18] Those who seek to obtain the highest, tranquil, and constant⁷⁰ level of the buddhas, those will accomplish the *Guhyasiddhi*, supreme and auspicious.⁷¹

[19] [This is] what is to be clearly comprehended in accordance with the *utpannakrama*⁷² by those perfectly yoked to reality [i.e., by those who possess perfect understanding of reality];⁷³ otherwise, by those inferior in reality [i.e., those whose understanding of reality is inferior] *siddhi* will never be obtained.

[20] Reality indeed is outside of [the range of] concepts, void of any bonds [tying one to repeated existence], without marks, without fallacious appearance,⁷⁴ non-dual, supreme, and auspicious.

[21] As long as [*tattva*] is conceptualized by reasoning and through *śāstras*, *āgamas* and rituals,⁷⁵ that long one goes to a state of diffusion—like a drop of sesamum oil [emulsifies] in water.⁷⁶

[22–23] Enough with that, what is now the purpose⁷⁷ of even more *vikalpas*. Since the condition of reality is not embodied in the *śāstra*(s) through *utpattikrama*[-practices],⁷⁸ after having at first discerned the arrangement [of practices] for the sake of reality’s accomplishment by means of reality,⁷⁹ one then should bring forth what is concealed [, i.e., the secrets] regarding meditation and so forth in accordance with reality.⁸⁰

[24] Then, one whose mind has been illuminated/inflamed by *tattva* shall display *caryā*. And following that, however, indeed the special observance (*vrata*) connected to the divine consort (*vidyā*) may be performed.⁸¹

[25] [Only] the one with a single mind (a focused mind) that has gained certainty shall display the secret conduct. And after that, when [such a] mind has been brought forth, then one shall perform the *vidyāvrata*.⁸²

[26] Otherwise, since [it would be] the cause of getting into hell, resulting in sustaining one’s life [there], what is the profit of [practicing] the [*vidyā*]*vrata* for one inferior in reality?⁸³

[27] The *sādhakas* who are foremost/abiding in *tattva* are accomplished even without *vrata*, [but] those inferior in reality are not accomplished, even throughout hundreds of *cīrṇavratas*.⁸⁴

[28] The stainless *sādhakas* who are perfectly endowed with reality always are accomplished, indeed, through the power of [their] meditation, they are freed from every stain.

[43⁸⁵(29)] Although that reality is present in the *tantra*[s] it is made clear [only] the *Śrīsamāja*.⁸⁶ Elsewhere it is not made explicit (lit. kept secret), [but] indicated in great extent with many elaborations.⁸⁷

[44(30)]⁸⁸ [Reality is] only one, pure and supreme [but] is established with various aspects inasmuch as being differentiated into *kriyā*, *caryā* and so forth [and] through collections of scriptural discourses and so forth.

[45(31)]⁸⁹ Having been located [i.e., ascertained] by the patrons of truth, reality has been well and carefully concealed in the basket of [i.e., repository of teachings that is like] a heap of gems by following along the dispositions of beings.

[46(32)] With great care, it [i.e., this reality] has been realized to be perfectly present in one’s own body as *bodhicitta*, pure and supreme, thanks to the kindness of one’s venerable teacher.

[47(33)] Therefore, whose nature is pure like the gem that is reality, void of any dualism,⁹⁰ shall practice *caryā* or [do] meditation staying at home, [i.e., can practice openly or privately.]

[48(34)] The divine stage of it,⁹¹ difficult to obtain, is called *tattva*; I, by whom its pure[ity] has been obtained, shall now teach the means for [obtaining] it.

[49(35)] On the other hand, who are without the divine means practice wrong *samayās*⁹² and so forth, those are cooked in the Raurava [Hell].⁹³

[50–51(36–37)] Just as a bundle of grass and wood,⁹⁴ when thrown into a burning fire, goes to ashes and there is no new sprouting, just so⁹⁵ those inferior in reality proceed with great amazement but to go to the distress of hell for as long as space endures.⁹⁶

[55(38)] Who indeed see the unity of the *guru* and Vajradhara, those, here [i.e., in this life], obtain reality, characterized as the totality of accomplishments.

[56(39)]⁹⁷ But who are angry, cruel, deceitful, fraudulent, and overcomplicated,⁹⁸ whose thoughts are absorbed in desire,⁹⁹ from where [i.e., how is reality] attained?—certainly from nowhere!

[57(40)] Pretending to pay homage to the *guru*, but aiming at finding faults, [such] corrupted [and] unjust haughty [men] are always pleased with debating words.

[58(41)] Whose thoughts are turned to¹⁰⁰ the deceit of *vajra*-friends and *gurus*, such beings never obtain the supreme¹⁰¹ stage of it[, namely reality,] grating accomplishments.

[59(42)] Others,¹⁰² however, who salute the *guru* steadily, are also seen here [in this world]; [they attend the *guru*] with homage, worship and care until what is longed for has been obtained.

[60(43)] Even if, however, the divine state of it were obtained, [and] remained present, the evil-natured do not recognize [it, wondering] “what is this, where has it come from?”

[61(44)] [Others, may] properly pay¹⁰³ obeisance when alone, even seeing [the *guru*] just from afar; but when welcoming [him] amidst a crowd, lack the energy [to do so].

[62(45)] Those people who are like that, however, do not obtain the [highest] level, the supreme, the excellent *nirvāṇa* which has been taught by those teachings the truth.

[63(46)] Other inferior/different beings,¹⁰⁴ moreover, who are shameless, a long way from good behavior¹⁰⁵ and corrupting the good qualities that have arisen, are even seen blaming the *guru*.

[64(47)] When merely collecting the *tantras*, [but] turning away from their (*tat*) nature [meaning using texts without understanding their meaning],¹⁰⁶ those are neither initiated nor have been [granted] permission to [teach],¹⁰⁷ [yet they] perform the gathering of beings.¹⁰⁸

[65(48)] Those by whom *mantras* are seized for themselves,¹⁰⁹ and who are delighted having seen the book, [but] not knowing a teacher, are deprived of keeping the pledges.¹¹⁰

[66(49)] [Although] assistance for the beings is provided on account of what is prescribed in the book,¹¹¹ [yet] reality is not perceived, just so¹¹² it has been taught by those teaching the truth.

[67(50)] And indeed, the course of these people¹¹³ and all their malpractices by which these have entered the wrong path, is solely relating to hell.

[69(51)]¹¹⁴ By whom the accomplishment relating to the *sugata*¹¹⁵ is desired, not even the dwelling with [i.e., the spending time among] those who are problematic to be around with¹¹⁶ [and] deprived of keeping the pledges should be made.

[70–71(52–53)] Having, wholeheartedly, for a long time and steadily saluted the teacher with body, speech and mind, until one has gone to supreme bliss, then the student without obstruction obtains the perfectly stainless reality, as it remains tradition,¹¹⁷ thanks to the kindness of the venerable *guru*.

[72(54)] With such a spirit,¹¹⁸ [kept] at day and night, accomplishment occurs rapidly; [it] has an abundant nature that is oneness of the three *vajras* with the king that is reality.

[73–75(55–57)] Accomplishment for best of *sādhakas* is also¹¹⁹ taught in many *tantras* with a variety [of means] such as with *mantras mudrās*, recitation, offering rites and observances, with four intervals of meditation (*sandhyāvidhi*), with [determining] places and drawing *maṇḍalas*, through conceptualizing the [various Buddha-]families qua their different colors and forms, and likewise through ritual bathing, practices of worship, and fasting rituals, though procedures involving consorts and physical actions,¹²⁰ by arranging paintings and so forth, and though abundant creations of places for worship (*caitya*).¹²¹

[76–77(58)] In this way, by creating various concepts of (i.e., for) various aspects, *siddhis* are taught by the protectors of truth in accordance with the stages of beings and [their] mental states. Although also by that which¹²² has been taught in this way by

those speaking the truth with innumerable alternatives (lit. “hundred thousand concepts”, *vikalpalakṣaiḥ*) *siddhi* [can be reached]—here [in the GS], however, the *sādhakas* are not getting accomplished on account of such [practices] (*taḥ*).¹²³ [80(59)] Enough with that, what is now the purpose here of that accomplishment?¹²⁴ Accomplishment is not obtained through pain than exceeds pleasures [and] the hardship of ascetic practices.¹²⁵

[81(60)] But, here [in the GS] in view of the teachings of the Glorious *Samāja*, leaving aside all conceptual elaborations (*pravistara*),¹²⁶ one gets accomplished here in this very life on account of *utpannakrama* practices.

[82(61)] There is nothing superior to the Glorious *Samāja*, the [one] true gem in the three realms. [It is] proclaimed the unsurpassed among the unsurpassed tantras, much better than the best.

[83(62)] [The *Guhyasamājatantra* is] established¹²⁷ with pith and elaborated instructions (*uddeśa-nirdeśa*) on account of the second stage of tantric practice (*utpannakrama*).¹²⁸ Those who¹²⁹ do not know the *Samāja*[*tantra*], how can [such people] reach perfect accomplishment?¹³⁰

[84–85(63–64)] The ignorant one,¹³¹ having rejected the Glorious *Samāja*—which is dispelling the blindness of ignorance, the remover of all doubts, the heap of Buddha-gems—who longs for accomplishment elsewhere because of having many mistaken ideas,¹³² that one [is like a person] who beats space with the hand, or (*ca*) who is wishing to drink the reflection of water.

[86–87(65–66)] Leaving behind the prolixity of tantra, and knowing wisdom and means, the practice of a beginner [and] established¹³³ in accordance with reality, then, however, the wise single minded [i.e., single pointed] one may cultivate [it] with certainty. One by whom frequent practice is done throughout day and night, gets accomplished, there is no doubt.

[88(67)] No auspicious days or constellations [and] no fasting rituals are known, for the one yoked to non-dual cognition, the accomplishment of the *sugatas* occurs.

[89(68)] Always creating devotion to Vajradhara, the receptacle of good qualities, to the stainless three *vajras*, the supreme having become the single boat on the impassable wave of intense evil in the ocean of life; the wise one shall energetically practice the secret *sādhana*, that follows the path taught in the Tantra, the source of all good qualities from which stains are gone [and] that is granting accomplishments in every way.

This is the first section in the glorious *Guhyasiddhi* which uncovers the truth of tantra though the three syllables of ultimate meaning¹³⁴—called “the Instruction on *Vrata* and *Tattva*, the Means for the accomplishment of Vajrasattva.”

2.2. Critical Edition

2.2.1. Sources and Sigla Codicum

Sanskrit¹³⁵

B—“Bauddhatantrasaṅgraha” (Baroda MS no. 13124); ff. 1v–35r³ (chapter one until 4v⁷ (omitting verses 1.83(62) ff. of chapter one; not used in S).

I—“Śrīguhyasiddhiḥ” (IASWR MBB-I-105); pp. 1–105. (chapter one until p. 13² = S_{ka}).

K₁—“Guhyasiddhyādi” (NAK 5-45, A 0915/03 (=A 0134/02)); ff. 1v–15r² (chapter one until f. 3r⁷; start 1.41b = S_{kha}).¹³⁶

K₂—“Guhyasiddhyādiñānasiddhi” (NAK 4-71, A 1012/5); ff. 1v–3r¹⁰ (chapter one until f. 3r¹⁰; start 1.41b; not used in S).¹³⁷

S—“Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhi-Saṅgraha”, by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi, 1987, pp. 6–62 (chapter one until p. 11).¹³⁸

Tibetan: canonical¹³⁹

D—rRyud ma lus pa’i don nges par skul bar byed pa, dPal gsang ba grub pa zhes bya ba. In *bsTan ’gyur sDe dge*, Tōhoku 2217, rKTs (MW23703), rgyud ‘grel, wi, 1v¹–28v⁴; chapter one: 1v¹–5v³.

Q—rGyud ma lus pa’i don nges par skul bar byed pa, dPal gsang ba grub pa zhes bya ba. In *bsTan ’gyur Pe cing*, Ötani 3061, rKTs (MW1KG13126) rgyud ‘grel, mi, 1v¹–31r⁶.

extra-canonical.

B—rGyud ma lus pa'i don dam pa'i don nges par skul bar byed, dPal gsang ba grub pa (zhes bya ba dPal mgon po Padmavajra mdzad pa bzugs so). In *'Brug lugs chos mdzod chen mo*, Drukpa kagyü heritage project: Kathmandu, 200?, Vol. ci (35): pp. 55–152 (img. 59–156); chapter one: 56¹–70¹.

T—rGyud ma lus pa'i don nges par bskul bar byed, dPal gsang ba grub pa. In: *'Bri gung bka' brgyud chos mdzod chen mo*, *'Bri gung mthil dgon: Lha sa, 2004, Vol. ka (1), 9²–69³; chapter one 9³–17⁴.¹⁴⁰

2.2.2. Signs and Abbreviations Employed in the Edition

a/p.c. = ante/post correction	Tib. = Tibetan
conj. = conjecture	*** ... *** verses only preserved in Tibetan translation
em. = emendation	[...] = additions made by the author/editor
om. = omission] = lemma
MS(s) = manuscript(s)	° = marks an abbreviated reading
r/v/f = recto, verso, folio	†... † = crux marks signify corrupted passages

2.2.3. Conventions

In the Sanskrit, germinations and degerminations (*satva* for *sattva* or *varjjita* for *varjita*) as well as homorganic nasals (*evaṇ ca* for *evaṃ ca*, *kintu* for *kiṃ tu*, or °*an* for °*aṃ*; as frequently in K₂), and interchangeably used sibilants (e.g., *śa* for *sa* and *visa versa*) or frequently interchanged letters, such as *ba* and *va*, which in fact are used almost interchangeably, have been standardized and are not reported in the apparatus. As for the Tibetan, no differences of the uses of *pa* and *ba*, and *tu*, *du*, and *ngu* have been reported. Neither have scribal conventions that cannot be considered actual reading variants, such as *bzhino* for *bzhin no*, etc., been recorded. Spelling conventions follow the IAST and Whyllie system for Sanskrit and Tibetan, respectively.

2.2.4. Text

[D1v¹, Q1v¹, B56¹, T5r²] rgya gar skad du | sakalatantrasadbhāvasaṅcodanī
Śrīguhyasiddhi nāma¹⁴¹ |

bod skad du | rgyud ma lus pa'i [Q1v³] don [B56²] nges¹⁴² par skul¹⁴³ bar byed |
[Q1v⁴] dPal gsang ba grub pa zhes [D1v²] bya ba |

[I p. 1] om prajñopāyāya namaḥ¹⁴⁴
[B1v¹] namo vajratikṣṇāya¹⁴⁵ namaḥ ||

dPal¹⁴⁶ rdo rje sems dpa' la phyag 'tshal lo || 'jam dPal [Q1v⁵] gzhon nur gyur pa la
phyag [B56³] 'tshal lo ||

[S p. 5] prathamāḥ pacricchedaḥ

lokācāir vimuktaṃ paramaśivapadaṃ vyāpinaṃ niḥsvabhāvaṃ
śāntaṃ nityoditaṃ yan¹⁴⁷ munivara[B1v²]vṛṣabhair vanditaṃ dhyānahīnaṃ |
buddhānāṃ apy agamyāṃ¹⁴⁸ paramuṣitamalaṃ tattvaṃ idaṃ¹⁴⁹ praṇamya
śrīmatkāyaṃ¹⁵⁰ jinānāṃ kim api padava[B1v³]raṃ śuddham apy ātmavṛttā¹⁵¹
|| 1.1 ||

dngos po med cing khyab pa [Q2r¹] mchog tu zhi¹⁵² ba'i go 'phang [T9⁴] 'jig rten spyod
 pa dag las [D1v³] rnam grol ba¹⁵³ | |
 gang [Q2r²] zhig¹⁵⁴ rtag 'byung zhe la rgyal ba dam pa [B56⁴] khyu¹⁵⁵ mchog rnam
 kyis¹⁵⁶ phyag byas bsam gtan dang bral ba¹⁵⁷ | | [Q2r³]
 ci yang rung ba'i gnas gyur dpal ldan rgyal ba'i sku yi¹⁵⁸ dam pa rnam dag [D1v⁴] nang
 gi¹⁵⁹ bdag nyid¹⁶⁰ [B57¹] kyis [Q2r⁴] 'jug pa | |
 sangs rgyas kyis kyang rtogs par [T9⁵] bya ba min zhing dri ma rnam dang bral ba'i de
 nyid de [Q2r⁵] la phyag 'tshal [B57²] nas | | 1.1 | |

vaksye¹⁶¹ śrīguhyasiddhiṃ paramasuracitāṃ¹⁶² śreyasīm¹⁶³ ratnabhūtām¹⁶⁴
 buddhatvāvāptihetutoh¹⁶⁵ parapadagamanā[B1v⁴]nveṣaṇeṣv agradūtīm |
 nānācaryānubaddhām¹⁶⁶ kalimalamathanīm vighnavikṣepakṛtyām¹⁶⁷
 siddhīnām janmabhūmim¹⁶⁸ guṇaśatanilayām mā[B1v⁵]tṛbhūtām¹⁶⁹ jinānām | | 1.2 | |

go 'phang mchog tu <¹⁷⁰> 'gro ba tshol byed pho nya mchog gyur [D1v⁵] sangs rgyas
 thob [Q2r⁶] pa'i rgyur gyur cing | | spyod pa sna tshogs dang 'brel rtsod pa'i dri ma'i
 [B57³] bgegs kyis byas pa'i g.yeng [Q2v¹] ba spong byed pa'i | |
 dngos grub rnam kyis skye sa rgyal ba rnam kyis yon tan [D2r¹] brgya [T10¹] phrag
 mang po'i¹⁷¹ gnas gyur ma lta [B57⁴] bu | | mchog tu legs spyod thar pa ster byed rin
 chen¹⁷² gyur ba dpal ldan gsang ba [Q2v²] grub pa bshad | | 1.2 | |

aparyantaḡuṇādhāraṃ¹⁷³ trivajrābhedyavigrahaṃ¹⁷⁴ |
 [I p. 2] mahāsukhaṃ praṇamyādaḡvākpathātītagocaraṃ¹⁷⁵ | | 1.3 | |

yon tan dpag med gzhir gyur pa | | mi phyed rdo [B58¹] rje gsum gyi¹⁷⁶ [D2r²] sku | |
 ngag gi¹⁷⁷ spyod yul las 'das pa | | dang por¹⁷⁸ bde chen phyag byas nas | | 1.3 | |

vaksyate pa[B1v⁶]dmavajreṇa guhyasiddhir¹⁷⁹ anuttarā¹⁸⁰ |
 sādhaḡkānām hitārthāya karuṇāviṣṭacetasā¹⁸¹ | | 1.4 | |

gsang [T10²] ba grub pa bla med pa | | sgrub pa po la [Q2v³] phan gdags phyir | |
 sems ni snying rje'i dbang gyur [B58²] pas¹⁸² | | padma rdo rje bdag gis bshad | | 1.4 | |

yenoktā bhūtanāthenānekatantrāntarair¹⁸³ api |
 āptopadeśasaṃyuktā¹⁸⁴ sā mayā kathyate 'dhunā | | 1.5 | |

[D2r³] rgyud gzhan du ma nyid du yang | | sangs rgyas mgon pos gang¹⁸⁵ gsungs pa
 | |
 nges pa'i man ngag dang ldan pas¹⁸⁶ | | [Q2v⁴] de ni da ltar bdag gis [B58³] bshad
 | | 1.5 | |

[S p. 6] utpannakramayogena tyaktvā¹⁸⁷ sarvaprayatnataḡ |
 utpattivistaraṃ dūraṃ ādika*rmikabhāvanam¹⁸⁸ | | 1.6 | |

rdzogs [T10³] pa'i rim pa'i rnal 'byor gyis¹⁸⁹ | | 'bad pa thams cad [D2r⁴] spang bar bya
 | |¹⁹⁰
 bskyed pa mang zhing ring ba dang | | dang po'i las can bsgom pa'i phyir | | 1.6 | |

tantrasadbhāvam āsṛitya siddhisam̐dohalakṣaṇam¹⁹¹ |
 vihāya vistaraṃ sarvaṃ¹⁹² bhāvanāyāntarāyikam | | 1.7 | |

rgyud kyi dam pa'i dngos [B58⁴] brten¹⁹³ [Q2v⁵] nas || dngos grub bsdu ba'i mtshan
nyid can ||
bsgom pa yi¹⁹⁴ ni bar chad can || rgyas pa thams cad rnam¹⁹⁵ spangs la || 1.7 ||

saṃkṣepād vakṣyate divyā buddhasiddhipradā¹⁹⁶ śubhā |
prajñopāyavidhānena guhyasiddhir anuttarā || 1.8 || ¹⁹⁷

sangs [T10⁴] rgyas dngos grub legs ster ba || shes rab thabs kyi [B58⁵] cho ga yis ||
[Q2v⁶]
gsang ba grub pa bla med pa || bzang pos¹⁹⁸ mdor bsdu bshad par bya || 1.8 ||

śubhodayā nirāyāsā sarvavighnanikartanī |
[B2r¹; I p. 3]¹⁹⁹ nidhānaṃ sarvasiddhīnāṃ²⁰⁰ cintāmaṇir ivāparā || 1.9 ||

dge 'byung nyon mongs med pa dang || [D2v¹] bgegs rnam thams cad 'jig mdzad
cing ||
dngos grub [B58⁶] kun gyi gter²⁰¹ gyur pa || yid bzhin [Q2v⁷] nor bu mchog [T10⁵] lta
bu || 1.9 ||

jananī sarvabuddhānāṃ²⁰² vikṣepāripramardanī |
sarvārthasāadhanī caiva abhisambodhilakṣaṇā || 1.10 ||

sangs rgyas thams cad skyed²⁰³ byed cing || g.yeng ba'i dgra²⁰⁴ rnam 'joms byed pa
||
don rnam thams cad grub²⁰⁵ byed [B59¹] pa || mngon par byang chub mtshan nyid
[D2v²] do || 1.10 ||

sidhyanti sādhakā yasyā [B2r²] yatra tatra vyavasthitāḥ²⁰⁶ |
divyopāyasamāyuktā bhāvanāsu pratiṣṭhitāḥ²⁰⁷ || 1.11 ||

gang dang gang der gnas na [Q2v⁸] yang || thabs bzang dag dang ldan pa yis²⁰⁸ ||
bsgom pa dag la²⁰⁹ rab gnas [B59²] na || sgrub²¹⁰ po gang der²¹¹ dngos grub [T10⁶]
'gyur || 1.11 ||

prāpunvanti parāṃ bodhiṃ trivajrābhedarūpiṇīm²¹² |
pracchannavratarūpeṇa dharmasyāpi virodhakāḥ²¹³ || 1.12 || ²¹⁴

sbas pa'i brtul zhugs²¹⁵ dang ldan pas || chos rnam dang²¹⁶ yang 'gal med par ||
rdor [Q3r¹] gsum dbye ru med gzugs can || byang [D2v³] chub mchog [B59³] ni
thob²¹⁷ par 'gyur || 1.12 ||

[B2r³] vrajanty anuttaraṃ sthānaṃ kālāvadhiṃ varjitam²¹⁸ |
prāṇātipātinaḥ krūrāḥ krūrakarmaratāś ca ye²¹⁹ || 1.13 ||

dus kyi²²⁰ nges pa yongs spangs nas || bla med gnas su 'gro bar 'gyur || ²²¹
srog chags gsod cing khro ba [Q3r²] dang || [T11¹] gang yang khro ba'i las dga'²²²
zhing || 1.14 ||

mithyāvāgvādajālena mohayitvāpi ye narāḥ |
narā jīvanti te 'py āśu²²³ yatra si[B2r⁴]dhyanti caryayā²²⁴ || 1.14 ||

brdzun gyi²²⁵ tshig [B59⁴] gi²²⁶ spros pa yis || mi gang rmongs pas 'tsho ba yi²²⁷ ||

mi de dag kyang myur [D2v⁴] bar 'dir || spyod pa 'dis ni²²⁸ 'grub par 'gyur || 1.14 ||

paradārābhigantāraḥ paracittāpahāriṇaḥ²²⁹ |

[I p. 4] jugupsāhīnakarmāṇi²³⁰ kurvanto 'pi nīrantaram || 1.15 ||

gzhan gyi chung mar²³¹ spyod pa dang || [Q3r³] gzhan gyi nor la rku ba [B59⁵] dang ||

dman pa'i las can smad pa dag²³² || [T11²] rtag tu spyod par byed pa dang || 1.15 ||

yāṃ caritvā vrajanty āśu²³³ kāmādhātūrdhvataḥ²³⁴ param |

pracchannavra[B2r⁵]tarūpeṇa²³⁵ sādhaḥkānām bravīmy aham²³⁶ || 1.16 || ²³⁷

gang la spyod pas 'dod kham s kyi || steng gi²³⁸ pha rol 'gro bar 'gyur ||

sbas pa'i brtul [D2v⁵] zhugs²³⁹ ngo bo [B59⁶] nyid || sgrub²⁴⁰ pa po [Q3r⁴] la bdag gis brjod || 1.17 ||

guhyacaryāṃ parāṃ divyāṃ sopāyāṃ²⁴¹ sarvasiddhidāṃ |

prāpyate janmanīhaiva vajrasattvapadaṃ²⁴² yayā || 1.17 ||

gsang ba'i spyod pa mchog bzang po || dngos grub kun ster thabs bcas pa ||

rdo rje sems dpa'i [T11³] gnas gang²⁴³ yin || tshe 'di nyid la²⁴⁴ thob par [B60¹] 'gyur || 1.17 || ²⁴⁵

[S p.7] icchanti ye param śāntaṃ buddhānāṃ śāśva[B2r⁶]taṃ padam |

samprāptuṃ tair²⁴⁶ anuṣṭheyā guhyasiddhiḥ parā śubhā²⁴⁷ || 1.18 ||

gang zhig²⁴⁸ mchog tu zhi ba nyid || [Q3r⁵] sangs rgyas rnam s kyi²⁴⁹ rtag [D2v⁶]

pa'i²⁵⁰ gnas ||

thob par 'dod pas mchog zhi ba'i²⁵¹ || gsang ba grub pas bsgrub par bya || 1.18 ||

vibhāvya tattvasaṃyuktair²⁵² utpannakramayogataḥ |

anyathā tattvahīnais tu naiva siddhir avāpyate || 1.19 || ²⁵³

rdzogs pa'i rim pa'i [B60²] rnal 'byor nyid || de nyid²⁵⁴ ldan pas bsgom par bya ||

gzhan du [Q3r⁶] de [T11⁴] nyid dman pas ni²⁵⁵ || dngos grub thob²⁵⁶ par mi²⁵⁷ 'gyur ro || 1.19 ||

tattvaṃ hi kalpanā[B2r⁷]bāhyaṃ sarvopādhivivarjitam |

nirnimittaṃ nirābhāsaṃ nirdvandvaṃ paramaṃ²⁵⁸ śivaṃ || 1.20 || ²⁵⁹

de nyid brtag²⁶⁰ pa rnam las gzhan || [D2v⁷] khyad par thams cad [B60³] rnam²⁶¹

spangs shing ||

mtshan ma med cing snang ba med || gnyis med mchog tu zhi ba [Q3r⁷] nyid || 1.20 ||

yāvad vikalpyate yuktyā śāstrāgamavidhikramāt²⁶² |

[I p. 5] tāvad vistaratām²⁶³ yāti tailabindu[B2v¹]r ivāmbhasi || 1.21 ||

lung dang bstan bcos lugs rim²⁶⁴ pas || ji²⁶⁵ srid rtog pa dang bcas pas²⁶⁶ ||

de srid bar [B60⁴; T11⁵] du rgyas 'gyur te || chu la 'bru mar thim pa bzhin || 1.21 ||

tad alaṃ kiṃ²⁶⁷ tāvat tena vikalpāntarakāriṇā²⁶⁸ |

śāstre na²⁶⁹ tattvaniṣṭhasya²⁷⁰ utpattikramarūpiṇaḥ²⁷¹ || 1.22 || ²⁷²

re zhig rtog des [D3r¹] dgos²⁷³ med mchog || [3r] rnam rtog sna tshogs [Q3r⁸] byed pa
 yis²⁷⁴ ||
 bstan bcos de nyid tshol mi dgos || bskyed pa'i²⁷⁵ rim pa'i ngo [B60⁵] bo nyid || 1.22 ||

prathamam tattvena²⁷⁶ vijñāya tattvasiddher²⁷⁷ vidhānakam |
 [B2v²] tataḥ saṃvṛtim utpādyā bhāvanādiṣu tattvataḥ || 1.23 ||

dang por de nyid shes byas la || ²⁷⁸ de nyid bsgrub phyir nyer²⁷⁹ gnas bya ||
 de nas bsgom [T11⁶] la 'bad pa yis || nyams su myong ba [Q3v¹] bskyed [D3r²] par bya
 || 1.23 ||

paścāc²⁸⁰ caryāṃ prakurvīta tattvoddīpitamānasah |
 tadantaram²⁸¹ tu vai kāryaṃ vrataṃ vidyāśamanvitam || 1.24 ||

de nyid gsal bar gyur²⁸² sems [B60⁶] kyis²⁸³ || phyi nas spyod pa yang dag spyad²⁸⁴ ||
 rig pa dang ldan brtul zhugs²⁸⁵ kyang || de yi²⁸⁶ rjes la spyad par bya || 1.24 ||

*** guhyacaryāṃ prakurvīta ekacittaḥ suniścayaḥ |
 tadantaram cittotpādam paścāt vidyāvratam caret || 1.25 || ²⁸⁷

gcig pu²⁸⁸ brtan pa'i²⁸⁹ sems kyis ni²⁹⁰ || gsang ba'i spyod pa [Q3v²] spyad nas [B61¹]
 ni ||
 de²⁹¹ ni [T12¹] mthar thug skyes gyur²⁹² nas || phyi nas [D3r³] rig pa'i brtul zhugs²⁹³
 spyad || 1.25 || ***

anyathā tattvaḥ[B2v³]nasya kiṃ vratenā prayojanam |
 jīvikāheturūpeṇa narakāvāptikāriṇā²⁹⁴ || 1.26 ||

gzhan du de nyid dman pa yi²⁹⁵ || 'tsho²⁹⁶ ba'i rgyu can nyid gyur pa ||
 dmyal ba [B61²] 'thob²⁹⁷ bar byed pa'i rgyu || brtul zhugs²⁹⁸ kyis ni ci zhig bya
 || 1.26 || [Q3v³]

vrataṃ vināpi sidhyanti sādhakās²⁹⁹ tattvatatparāḥ |
 tattvaḥinā na sidhyanti cīrṇavratā[B2v⁴]śatair³⁰⁰ api || 1.27 ||

sgrub po³⁰¹ de nyid la gnas pas || brtul zhugs med kyang³⁰² 'grub par 'gyur ||
 [T12²] brtul zhugs³⁰³ brgya phrag [D3r⁴] la spyad kyang || de nyid [B61³] dman³⁰⁴ na
 'grub mi 'gyur || 1.27 ||

sidhyanti tattvasaṃyuktāḥ sarvatraiva hi nirmalāḥ |
 [I p. 6] sādhakā³⁰⁵ bhāvanāśaktyā nirmuktāḥ³⁰⁶ sarvakalmaṣaiḥ³⁰⁷ || 1.28 ||

de nyid ldan na thams cad kyis³⁰⁸ || dri med³⁰⁹ de ni 'grub par 'gyur || [Q3v⁴]
 sgrub po sgom³¹⁰ pa dang ldan zhing || sdig pa kun las rnam grol bas || 1.28 ||

*** brtul zhugs³¹¹ kyis [B61⁴] ni chags med thob³¹² || dngos grub rgyal bas thob ma
 [T12³] gsungs ||
 dngos [D3r⁵] grub de nyid shes gyur nas || 'thob³¹³ kyi [read ni/pa ?] brtul zhugs³¹⁴
 sogs kyis [Q3v⁵] min³¹⁵ † || 1.29 ||

chags pa kun las log gyur cing || slong mo [B61⁵] gtso bor bya ba ste ||
de tsam brtul zhugs kyis khyab 'gyur || de nyid spangs nas³¹⁶ dngos grub med
|| 1.30 ||

'bab stegs lha rten sbyin pa'ang³¹⁷ min || khrus dang [Q3v⁶; D3r⁶] dka' [T12⁴] thub de
bzhin te ||
'di kun [B61⁶] bden pa ma yin gyi || 'di nyid gcig pu bden pa nyid || 1.31 || ³¹⁸

gnod pa skyed par byed pa yi || ngan pa'i las dag sngon byas pas ||
de nyid dman pa'i lus can gyis || brtul zhugs ngo bo [Q3v⁷] 'ma [B62¹] lus myong '†
|| 1.32 || ³¹⁹

mtshams³²⁰ med lnga po byed pa dang || srid par [D3r⁷] ngal bar byas pas kyang || ³²¹
de nyid ldan na 'grub [T12⁵] 'gyur te || dri med go 'phang thob³²² par 'gyur³²³
|| 1.33 ||

nor rnams phun tshogs [B62²] bdag nyid kyi³²⁴ || de nyid rin chen sgom³²⁵ byed na ||
brtul zhugs med kyang [Q3v⁸] de nyid ni || nges par bla na med par 'gro || 1.34 || ³²⁶

lung gi³²⁷ spyod pa las gsungs pa'i || brtul [D3v¹] zhugs gang zhig³²⁸ 'dir [B62³] gnas
pa ||
nor rnams sgrub³²⁹ par mi nus pas || 'tsho ba'i phyir [T12⁶] ni rtag³³⁰ pa nyid || 1.35 ||

phung po lnga yi³³¹ [Q4r¹] rang bzhin gzugs || rnam par shes pa'i gzhir gyur ltar ||
de ltar de nyid ldan brtul [B62⁴] zhugs || de nyid las ni 'jug par bstan³³² || 1.36 ||

'dul ba'i thabs kyi rgyu [D3v²] phyir dang || nor la sogs pa [Q4r²] sgrub³³³ phyir dang
||
sems can don du de nyid bcas || [T13¹] brtul zhugs zhal gyis bzhes [B62⁵] pa yin
|| 1.37 || ³³⁴

'tsho ba yi³³⁵ ni thabs tsam du || so so'i skye bos gtsor byed pas ||
ji ltar mtshan ma'i che ba nyid || de nyid [Q4r³] bral na dngos grub med || 1.38 ||

nor gyi³³⁶ 'byor pa [D3v³] ldan pa'i bdag || rtag tu [B62⁶] bsgoms pas ngal byas pa'i ||
smyon pa'i gzugs [T13²] nyid la brten³³⁷ cing || gsang ba grub par rnam gnas nas
|| 1.39 ||

de nyid rdo rje 'chang bla ma || bsgom dang [Q4r⁴] ldan pas 'grub par 'gyur ||
gzhan [B63¹] du de nyid ldan gyur kyang || dngos grub 'bras bu'i snod [D3v⁴] mi³³⁸
'gyur || 1.40 ||

de ltar phyi rol yongs bcad la || de nyid bla med shes byas nas ||
[T13³] sangs rgyas nyid du [B63²] nges bya³³⁹ ste || blo ldan gsang ba [Q4r⁵] grub par
spyod³⁴⁰ || 1.41 ||

rnam par g.yeng ba kun gyi³⁴¹ gzhi || brtul zhugs spangs shing³⁴² de nyid shes ||
shes rab thabs kyi cho ga yis || go 'phang [D3v⁵] mchog ni bsgrub [B63³] par bya
|| 1.42 || ³⁴³

tac ca tattvaṃ sthitaṃ tantrē³⁴⁴ śrīsamāje parisphu[B2v⁵]ṭaṃ |
guptaṃ anyatra nirdiṣṭaṃ prapañcānekavistaraiḥ³⁴⁵ || 1.43(29) ||

de nyid de yang rgyud gnas pas || dpal ldan gsang [Q4r⁶] ba ‘dus [T13⁴] par gsal ||
spros pa du ma rgyas gyur³⁴⁶ pas || gzhan du sbas nas³⁴⁷ bstan pa yin || 1.43 ||

[S, p. 8] kriyācaryādibhedena sūtrāntaṭṭhāḍḍibhiḥ |
ekam eva paraṃ śuddhaṃ naikākāraṃ vyavasthitam || 1.44(30) ||

bya ba spyod pa’i dbye ba [B63⁴] dang || mdo sde’i sde snod la sogs su ||
mchog tu dag pa gcig pu nyid || [D3v⁶] rnam pa du mar rnam par gnas || 1.44 ||
[Q4r⁷]

sthāpitaṃ [B2v⁶] bhūtanāthena³⁴⁸ tattvaṃ saṃgopya yatnataḥ |
sattvāśayānubhedena skandharatnakaraṇḍake || 1.45(31) ||

phung po rin chen snod nyid du || sems can bsam pa’i bye brag [T13⁵] gis³⁴⁹ ||
de [B63⁵] nyid ‘bad pas sba mdzad nas || sangs rgyas mgon pos rnam par bzhag³⁵⁰
|| 1.45 ||

tad viditvā³⁵¹ prayatnena svadehe saṃvyavasthitam |
bodhicittaṃ³⁵² paraṃ śuddhaṃ gurupāda[B2v⁷]prasādataḥ || 1.46(32) ||

byang chub sems mchog rnam par dag || bla ma’i zhabs kyi bka’ drin [Q4r⁸] gyis³⁵³ ||
rang gi [D3v⁷] lus la rab gnas [B63⁶] pa³⁵⁴ || de ni ‘bad³⁵⁵ pas rig par bya || 1.46 ||

tataś caryāṃ prakurvīta bhāvanāṃ vā gr̥he sthitaḥ |
tattvaratnaviśuddhātmā sarvadvandvavivarjitāḥ³⁵⁶ || 1.47(33) ||

de nas spyod pa bya ba ‘am || khyim du gnas te bsgom [T13⁶] par bya ||
de nyid rin chen rnam dag bdag || rtsod pa thams cad rnam spangs pa³⁵⁷ || 1.47 ||

anyathā ye prakurvanti divyo[B3v¹]³⁵⁸pāyavivarjitāḥ |
[I p. 7] viruddha¹[B3r]³⁵⁹samayādīni pacyante te tu raurave³⁶⁰ || 1.48(34) ||

thabs bzang [Q4v¹; B64¹] po ni rnam spangs nas || ‘gal ba’i dam tshig la sogs la ||
[D4r¹]
gzhan du gang zhig bsgrubs³⁶¹ gyur ba || de ni du ‘bod sogs par ‘tshed³⁶² || 1.48 ||

yathā vahnau³⁶³ pradīpte ‘smin³⁶⁴ tṛṇadārvādisaṃcayaḥ³⁶⁵ |
prakṣipto³⁶⁶ bhasma[B3v²]tām yāti praroḥaṃ³⁶⁷ na punar vrajet || 1.49(35) ||

ji³⁶⁸ ltar me ni ‘bar gyur pa³⁶⁹ || de ni rtswa³⁷⁰ shing [B64²] phung po [T14¹] dag ||
bcug nas³⁷¹ thal ba nyid du ‘gyur || [Q4v²] myu gu sogs pa’ang ‘byung mi ‘gyur
|| 1.49 ||

tathā³⁷² tattvavihīnās tu kurvanto ‘tyadbhūtāni tu |
vipannā narakam³⁷³ yānti yāvad ākāśasaṃbhavaḥ³⁷⁴ || 1.50(36) ||

de bzhin de nyid med bzhin du || ngo mtshar che ba ltar byed [D4r²] pa ||
ji³⁷⁵ srid nam mkha’ gnas bar [B64³] du³⁷⁶ || shi ba’i³⁷⁷ ‘og tu dmyal bar ‘gro
|| 1.50 ||³⁷⁸

*** ji³⁷⁹ ltar ‘ga’ zhig sbrul³⁸⁰ gdug la || [Q4v³] sman dang sngags sogs mi ldan par ||
[T14²] rmongs pa’i³⁸¹ bdag nyid³⁸² gang rtse ba || gshin rje’i gnas ‘gror³⁸³ [B64⁴] ‘dod
pa yin || 1.51 ||

ji ltar mtha' med rgya mtsho la || gru med [D4r³] 'ga'³⁸⁴ zhig 'jug 'gyur³⁸⁵ ba ||
thabs dang rten med [Q4v⁴] gyur nas ni || skad cig gis ni 'chi bar 'gyur || 1.52 ||

de bzhin jah yi³⁸⁶ mtha' can [B64⁵] rgyud || yang dag rab sbyin spangs gyur pa ||
[T14³] smad³⁸⁷ cing dman pa'i las rnam ni || byas na mnar med 'gro bar 'gyur
|| 1.53 || ***³⁸⁸

[B3v³] duṣprāpyaṃ³⁸⁹ tatpadaṃ divyaṃ tattvaṃ ity abhiśabditam³⁹⁰ |
prāpyate yena tacchuddhaṃ tadupāyaṃ bravīmy aham || 1.54(37) ||

rnyed dka' [Q4v⁵] bla med go [D4r⁴] 'phang mchog || de nyid ces byar mngon [B64⁶]
brjod pa ||
gang gis dag pa de thob pa || de yi³⁹¹ thabs ni bdag gis brjod || 1.54 ||

paśyanti ye hy anānātvaṃ guro[B3v⁴]r vajradhrasya ca |
prāpnuvanti atra te tattvaṃ siddhisam̐dohalakṣaṇam³⁹² || 1.55(38) ||

bla ma dang ni rdo rje 'dzin || gang gis gnyis su med par mthong ||
dngos grub bsdus [T14⁴] pa'i [Q4v⁶] mtshan nyid [B65¹] can || de nyid des³⁹³ ni 'dir
'thob 'gyur || 1.55 ||

ye punar māninaḥ krūrāḥ śathā dhūrtāḥ³⁹⁴ prapañcakāḥ³⁹⁵ |
gṛddhatāsakta[B3v⁵]cintās³⁹⁶ ca kuto labdhaṃ kuto na tu || 1.56(39) ||

gang yang [D4r⁵] khro zhing nga rgyal can || bsul pa byis³⁹⁷ dang spros la dga' ||
'dod cing chags pa'i [B65²] sems can gang³⁹⁸ || gang las rnyed cing gang las³⁹⁹ min
|| 1.56 ||

śāṭhyena⁴⁰⁰ tu guruṃ natvā cchidrānveṣaṇatatparāḥ⁴⁰¹ |
[I p. 8] mithyābhimānino⁴⁰² duṣṭā vāgvādeṣu sadā ra[B3v⁶]tāḥ || 1.57(40) ||

g.yo [Q4v⁷] sgyus bla ma⁴⁰³ phyag byed cing || skyon rtog pa la ched du byed ||
brdzun pas nga rgyal [T14⁵] gdug pa can || tshig gi⁴⁰⁴ rtsod la rtag tu gnas || 1.57 ||
[D4r⁶]

[S, p. 9] vajrabhrātṛgurūṇāṃ⁴⁰⁵ ca vañcanā[K₁2v^{1(start)}, K₂2v^{1(start)}]baddhacetasaḥ⁴⁰⁶ |
prāpnuvanti na te sattvās tatpadaṃ siddhidaṃ param⁴⁰⁷ || 1.58(41) ||

rdo rje [B65³] spun dang bla ma la || bsul⁴⁰⁸ ba'i bsam pa brten⁴⁰⁹ pa can ||
sams can des⁴¹⁰ ni [Q4v⁸] dngos grub kun || ster ba'i [D4r⁷] go 'phang de mi thob⁴¹¹
|| 1.58 ||

anye 'pi cātra dṛśyante paryu[B3v⁷]pāśya⁴¹² gurūn dṛḍham |
prañāmapūjāsatkārair yāvat prāptaṃ⁴¹³ [K₂2v²] samīhitam || 1.59(42) ||

'dir ni 'di⁴¹⁴ 'dra gzhan yang mthong || ji⁴¹⁵ srid 'dod pa [B65⁴] thob bar du ||
phyag 'tshal mchod dang bsnyen bkur gyis⁴¹⁶ || [T14⁶] brtan⁴¹⁷ par bla ma mnyes byas
nas || 1.59 ||

[K₁2v²] prāpte tu tatpade divye purato 'pi vyavasthitam⁴¹⁸ |
na jāna[B4r¹]nti durātmānaḥ ko 'yaṃ⁴¹⁹ kasmād ihāgataḥ || 1.60(43) ||

go 'phang [Q5r¹] mchog ni thob nas ni || mdun nyid na ni gnas na yang ||
su zhig gang nas ci⁴²⁰ [B65⁵] ltar 'ong || rang bzhin ngan pas⁴²¹ mi shes so || 1.60 ||

dr̥ṣṭvāpy⁴²² ekākinam⁴²³ dūre praṇāmaṃ kurva[K₂22v³]te dr̥ḍham |
bahūnām tu punar⁴²⁴ ma[K₁2v³]dhye svāgate ‘pi da[B4r²]ridratā⁴²⁵ | | 1.61(44) | |

gcig⁴²⁶ pu mthong nas⁴²⁷ ring po nas⁴²⁸ | | gus par phyag ni ‘tshal byed cing | | [Q5r²]
de yang mang po’i nang⁴²⁹ du ni | | bde bar [T15¹] byon nas rtsal⁴³⁰ gyis [B65⁶; D4v¹]
phongs | | 1.61 | |

evaṃvidhās tu⁴³¹ ye sattvāḥ prāpnuvanti na⁴³² te padam |
param paramanirvāṇam⁴³³ yad uktaṃ bhūtavādinā | | 1.62(45) | | ⁴³⁴

de lta bu yi⁴³⁵ sems can gang | | mya ngan ‘das mchog go ‘phang mchog | |
yang dag gsung bas gang gsungs pa | | de yis thob⁴³⁶ par mi⁴³⁷ ‘gyur ro | | 1.62 | |

[K₂2v⁴] anye ‘pi cāpare⁴³⁸ sattvā dr̥[B4r³]śyante gurunindakāḥ | [K₁2v⁴]
[I p. 9] tyaktalajjā⁴³⁹ dūrācārāḥ⁴⁴⁰ sambhūtaguṇadūṣakāḥ⁴⁴¹ | | 1.63(46) | |

gzhan yang [Q5r³] sems can ‘di [B66¹] lta bu | | bla ma smod pa⁴⁴² dag kyang
mthong⁴⁴³ | |
ngo tsha⁴⁴⁴ spangs⁴⁴⁵ shing [T15²] spyod pa ring | | yang dag rim pa sun ‘byin [D4v²]
pa | | 1.63 | |

tantrasaṃgrahamātreṇa⁴⁴⁶ tatsvabhāvabahirmukhā[K₂2v⁵]h⁴⁴⁷ |
nābhiṣiktā nānu[B4r⁴]jñātāḥ⁴⁴⁸ kurvate⁴⁴⁹ sattvasaṃgraham⁴⁵⁰ | | 1.64(47) | |

rgyud ni bsdu ba⁴⁵¹ tsam nyid kyis⁴⁵² | | de yi⁴⁵³ dngos la kha phyir bltas⁴⁵⁴ | |
dbang [B66²] bskur rjes gnam med par⁴⁵⁵ yang | | [Q5r⁴] slob ma dag ni sdud par byed
| | 1.64 | |

svayaṃ gr̥hītaṃmantrās⁴⁵⁶ ca pusta[K₁2v⁵]kaṃ vīksya⁴⁵⁷ harṣitāḥ |
ācāryaṃ naiva⁴⁵⁸ jānanti⁴⁵⁹ samayācārava[K₂2v⁵]rjitāḥ | | 1.65(48) | | ⁴⁶⁰

glegs bam mthong bas⁴⁶¹ dga’ gyur⁴⁶² nas | | gsang sngags rang nyid len par byed | |
slob dpon la⁴⁶³ ni [T15³] shes min [B66³] pa⁴⁶⁴ | | dam tshig [D4v³] spyod pa rnam⁴⁶⁵
par spangs⁴⁶⁶ | | 1.65 | | ⁴⁶⁷

[B4r⁵] anugrahaṃ ca sattvānām kurvate⁴⁶⁸ pustakājñayā |
na ca tattvaṃ vijānanti yad uktaṃ bhūtavādinā | | 1.66(49) | | ⁴⁶⁹

sams can rnam ni sdud pa ni⁴⁷⁰ | | [Q5r⁵] glegs bam bka’ yis⁴⁷¹ byed pa yin | |
de nyid shes pa ma yin par⁴⁷² | | gang phyir yang dag gsungs pas [B66⁴] bstan⁴⁷³
| | 1.66 | |

eteṣā[K₁2v⁶]m⁴⁷⁴ caiva teṣāṃ ca sarveṣā[B4r⁶]m pāpakarmaṇā[K₂2v⁶]m⁴⁷⁵ |
asanmārgapravṛttānām⁴⁷⁶ gatiṛ ekaiva nārakī | | 1.67(50) | |

de lta bu dang⁴⁷⁷ de dag nyid | | kun kyang sdig pa’i las can de | |
dam pa min pa’i lam zhugs [D4v⁴; T15⁴] nas | | dmyal ba [Q5r⁶] dag tu ‘gro bar gcig⁴⁷⁸
| | 1.67 | | ⁴⁷⁹

*** sdug bsngal phongs⁴⁸⁰ dang nyon mongs [B66⁵] dang | | sna tshogs nad kyis
gtses⁴⁸¹ pa’i mthar | |
shi nas dmyal bar ‘gro bar ‘gyur | | skye gnas ngan par skye bar ‘gyur⁴⁸² | | 1.68 | |
***⁴⁸³

[S, p. 10] ebhir durāsadaīḥ sārdham⁴⁸⁴ samayācāraavarjitaiḥ⁴⁸⁵ |
 vāso ‘pi⁴⁸⁶ naiva [B4r⁷] kartavyaḥ⁴⁸⁷ saugatīm⁴⁸⁸ si[K₁2v⁷]ddhim icch[K₂2v⁷]atā⁴⁸⁹
 || 1.69(51) || ⁴⁹⁰

bde gshegs dngos grub ‘dod na ni || [Q5r⁷] dam tshig spyod pa [B66⁶] spangs pa yis
 || [D4v⁵]
 bsgrub⁴⁹¹ dka’ [T15⁵] de dang lhan cig tu || gnas pa nyid du ‘ang mi bya’o || 1.69 |

[I p. 10] paryupāsya ciraṃ⁴⁹² kālaṃ⁴⁹³ kāyavākcittato dṛḍham⁴⁹⁴ | ⁴⁹⁵
 ācāryaṃ⁴⁹⁶ sarvabhāvena yāvat tuṣṭiṃ pa[B4v¹]rām gataḥ || 1.70(52) ||

dngos po kun gyis⁴⁹⁷ slob dpon la || ji⁴⁹⁸ srid mnyes par gyur bar du ||
 lus ngag yid kyis⁴⁹⁹ brtan pa [B67¹] ru⁵⁰⁰ || dus ni ring por mnyes byed⁵⁰¹ [Q5r⁸] pa’i
 || 1.70 ||

tataḥ prāpnoti nirvighnaṃ guru[K₂2v⁸]pādaprasādataḥ⁵⁰² |
 śiṣyaḥ⁵⁰³ [K₁2v⁸] sunirmalaṃ tattvaṃ saṃpradāyavyavasthitam || 1.71(53) || ⁵⁰⁴

slob ma shin tu dri med par⁵⁰⁵ || de nyid yang dag rab sbyin gnas⁵⁰⁶ ||
 bla [D4v⁶] ma’i zhabs [T15⁶] kyī⁵⁰⁷ bka’ drin gyis⁵⁰⁸ || de nas [B67²] bgegs⁵⁰⁹ med
 ‘thob ‘gyur ba⁵¹⁰ || 1.71 ||

tena siddhir⁵¹¹ bhava[B4v²]ty āśu⁵¹² bhāvitena⁵¹³ divānīśam⁵¹⁴ |
 vipulā tattvarājena trivajrābhe[K₂2v⁹]darūpiṇī⁵¹⁵ || 1.72(54) || ⁵¹⁶

rdo rje gsum dbyer med pa’i dngos || de nyid rgyal po yangs pa ste⁵¹⁷ ||
 nyin dang mtshan du [Q5v¹] bsgoms pa yis || dngos grub myur du des⁵¹⁸ ‘thob ‘gyur
 || 1.72 ||

siddhiś ca sādhakendrāṇāṃ mantraṃ[K₁2v⁹]drādivista[B4v³]raiḥ⁵¹⁹ |
 naikatantrāntare ‘py⁵²⁰ uktā japahomavratādibhiḥ || 1.73(55) ||

sngags [B67³] dang phyag rgya rgyas gyur pa’i || dngos [D4v⁷] grub sgrub⁵²¹ pa’i
 dbang po la ||
 rgyud rnam du mar [T16¹] gsungs pa yi || bzlas dang sbyin sreg brtul zhugs sogs
 || 1.73 ||

sandhyāvidhicatuṣkeṇa⁵²² deśama[K₂2v¹⁰]ṇḍalalekhanaiḥ |
 varṇarūpādibhedena kulā[B4v⁴]nāṃ ca vikalpanaiḥ || 1.74(56) ||

thun mtshams bzhi⁵²³ [Q5v²] yi cho ga [B67⁴] yis || yul⁵²⁴ dang dkyil ‘khor bri la sogs
 ||
 kha dog gzugs sogs dbye ba yis⁵²⁵ || rigs rnam su ni rnam brtags⁵²⁶ dang || 1.74 ||

snānārcanopa[K₁2v¹⁰]vāsaiś ca mudrābandhakramais⁵²⁷ tathā |
 pratimādividhānaiś ca cai[K₂3r¹]tyakarmapravistaraiḥ⁵²⁸ || 1.75(57) ||

khrus [D5r¹] dang lha mchod smyung⁵²⁹ ba dang || [5a] phyag rgya ‘ching ba’i rim⁵³⁰
 [B67⁵] de bzhin ||
 sku gzugs [T16²] la sogs cho ga dang⁵³¹ || [Q5v³] mchod rten las⁵³² ni rgyas pa dang
 || 1.75 ||

*** de ltar rnam pa sna tshogs pa'i || rnam rtog sna tshogs byed pa yis⁵³³ ||
grub pa sems can bsam rim [B67⁶] bzhin || dpal [D5r²] 'byung ba yi mgon pos gsungs
|| 1.76 || ⁵³⁴ ***⁵³⁵

evam⁵³⁶ vi[B4v⁵]kalpalakṣais tu yā proktā⁵³⁷ bhūtavādinām |
[I p. 11] siddhis tayāpi⁵³⁸ sidhyanti⁵³⁹ kiṃ tu tair [K12v¹¹] nātra⁵⁴⁰ sādhaḥ
|| 1.77(58) || ⁵⁴¹

de ltar rnam rtog 'bum phrag gis⁵⁴² || yang dag gsung pas⁵⁴³ [Q5v⁴] grub gsungs pa
||
der ni dngos [T16³] grub gang 'grub pa'ang⁵⁴⁴ || 'on kyang 'dir⁵⁴⁵ [B68¹] ni de⁵⁴⁶ mi
'grub || 1.77 ||

*** lo gcig⁵⁴⁷ la sogs bska⁵⁴⁸ pa dang || gcig⁵⁴⁹ dang gnyis su srid⁵⁵⁰ pa'i mthar ||
[D5r³]
sgrub⁵⁵¹ po gang gis⁵⁵² 'grub 'gyur ba || chos kyi rnam grangs [Q5v⁵] rgyas gyur pa
|| 1.78 ||

skye ba grangs [B68²] med du ma ru || bsgom la brtan⁵⁵³ zhing chags med pas ||
sgrub⁵⁵⁴ pa'i dbang [T16⁴] po⁵⁵⁵ grub pa ru || 'gyur bar gang zhing⁵⁵⁶ sngar gsungs pa
|| 1.79 || ***⁵⁵⁷

tad alaṃ kiṃ⁵⁵⁸ tayā tāvad bhū[K23r²]tayā[B4v⁶]py⁵⁵⁹ atra kāraṇam |
siddhiḥ saukhyādhikair duḥkhaiḥ prāpyate nātiyātanaḥ⁵⁶⁰ || 1.80(59) || ⁵⁶¹

de ni re zhig 'dir mi dgos || thob par [D5r⁴] 'gyur⁵⁶² ba [B68³] dgos ma yin || [Q5v⁶]
grub pa'i bde ba las lhag pa'i || lus gdung⁵⁶³ sdug bsngal gyis mi 'thob || 1.80 ||

asmimṣ tu śrīsamājākhye tyaktvā⁵⁶⁴ sarvapraṇi[K13r¹]staram⁵⁶⁵ |
[B4v⁷] sidhya[K23r³]te⁵⁶⁶ janmanīhaiva⁵⁶⁷ utpannakramayogataḥ || 1.81(60) ||

dpal ldan 'dus pa zhes bya 'dir || spros pa thams cad rnam⁵⁶⁸ spangs nas ||
rdzogs [T16⁵] pa'i [B68⁴] rim pa'i rnal 'byor gyis⁵⁶⁹ || tshe 'di nyid la 'grub⁵⁷⁰ par 'gyur
|| 1.81 || [Q5v⁷]

śrīsamājāt param⁵⁷¹ nāsti ratnabhūtaṃ tridhātuke |
sārāt sāratarāṃ proktaṃ tantrāṇām '[B5r]†⁵⁷² uttarottaram⁵⁷³ || 1.82(61) ||

dpal ldan [D5r⁵] 'dus las mchog gzhan med || 'jig rten gsum gyi⁵⁷⁴ rin chen 'gyur⁵⁷⁵ ||
snying po las kyang snying po [B68⁵] mchog || rgyud kun gyi⁵⁷⁶ ni bla ma'i bla
|| 1.82 ||

[S, p. 11] sthitam udde[K23r⁴]śa[K13r²]nirdeśair utpannakramayogataḥ⁵⁷⁷ |
samājam⁵⁷⁸ ye na⁵⁷⁹ jānanti susiddhau⁵⁸⁰ ghaṭate⁵⁸¹ katham || 1.83(62) ||
bstan dang bshad pas⁵⁸² rnam gnas pas⁵⁸³ || rdzogs pa'i rnal 'byor rim pa nyid ||
[T16⁶] 'dus [Q5v⁸] pa gang gis⁵⁸⁴ mi shes pa || de yis⁵⁸⁵ dngos grub ji⁵⁸⁶ [D5r⁶] ltar
[B68⁶] 'grub || 1.83 ||

sarvasaṃśayacchettāram ajñānatimirāpaham |
śrīsamā[K23r⁵]jam parityajya buddharatnakaraṇḍakam || 1.84(63) ||

the tshom thams cad gcod byed cing || mi shes rab rib sel⁵⁸⁷ byed pa ||
sangs rgyas rin chen za ma tog || dpal ldan 'dus pa yongs spangs nas || 1.84 ||

[K₁3r³] ajño⁵⁸⁸ vāñcchati⁵⁸⁹ so 'nyatra⁵⁹⁰ siddhiṃ naikavikalpitaiḥ⁵⁹¹ |
[I p. 12] hanty asau muṣṭinākāśaṃ pibec ca⁵⁹² mṛgaṭṛṣṇakām⁵⁹³ || 1.85(64) | | 594

rnam rtog du mas [Q6r¹] brtags⁵⁹⁵ pa [B69¹] yis⁵⁹⁶ || rmongs pa dngos grub 'dod gyur
pa ||
mkha' la khu [T17¹] tshur rdeg⁵⁹⁷ pa [D5r⁷] dang || smig rgyu'i chu la 'thung⁵⁹⁸ ba
bzhin || 1.85 ||

[K₂3r⁶] tantrasya vistaraṃ tyaktvā⁵⁹⁹ ādikarmikabhāvanam |
prajñopāyaṃ⁶⁰⁰ vidi[K₁3r⁴]tvā tu yathābhūtaṃ vyavasthitam || 1.86(65) ||
dang po'i las can bsgom pa [B69²] yi⁶⁰¹ || spros pa'i rgyud [D2r⁵] rnams spangs byas
[Q6r²] shing⁶⁰² ||
thabs dang shes rab shes byas nas || ji⁶⁰³ lta ba bzhin rnam par gnas⁶⁰⁴ || 1.86 ||

tatas tu bhāvayed dhīmān ekacittaḥ suni[K₂3r⁷]ścayāt |
aharniśaṃ⁶⁰⁵ kṛtābhyāsaḥ sidhyate⁶⁰⁶ nātra saṃśayaḥ || 1.87(66) ||

de phyir des⁶⁰⁷ byas sems gcig pa⁶⁰⁸ || blo dang ldan pas⁶⁰⁹ [B69³] bsgom par [T17²]
bya ||
nyin dang mtshan du [D5v¹] bsgom⁶¹⁰ byas na⁶¹¹ || [5b] 'grub 'gyur 'di la the tshom⁶¹²
[Q6r³] med || 1.87 ||

na tithir⁶¹³ na ca nakṣatraṃ⁶¹⁴ nopavāso vi[K₁3r⁵]dhīyate |
advayañānayuktasya siddhir bha[K₂3r⁸]vati saugatī || 1.88(67) || 615

tshes grangs med cing rgyu skar med || 'di la smyung⁶¹⁶ ba bshad pa med ||
gnyis med ye shes dang [B69⁴] ldan na || bde bar gshegs pa'i dngos grub 'gyur⁶¹⁷
|| 1.88 || 618

bhaktiṃ vajradhare⁶¹⁹ sadā guṇanidhau kṛtvā trivajrāmālāṃ⁶²⁰
janmābhdhāv atipāpavīcigahane⁶²¹ potaikaabhūtāṃ⁶²² parām |
[K₁3r⁶] paścāt sādhanā[K₂3r⁹]m ārabheta matimān⁶²³ tantroktamārgānugam⁶²⁴
⁶²⁵guhyaṃ sarvagūṇodayaṃ⁶²⁶ gatamalaṃ sarvārthasiddhipradam || 1.89(68) ||

yon tan gter gyur rdo rje 'chang la dri med rdo rje gsum gyi⁶²⁷ rtag [Q6r⁴; T17³] tu gus
[D5v²] byas la ||
skye ba'i rgya mtsho sdig pa'i rlabs drag⁶²⁸ mang ldan pa la [B69⁵] grur⁶²⁹ gyur gcig⁶³⁰
pu mchog ||
gsang ba'i yon tan 'byung 'gyur dri ma bral zhing don kun 'grub⁶³¹ cing rab tu sbyin
par byed pa yi || rgyud nas gsungs pa'i [Q6r⁵] lam dang ldan pa'i sgrub⁶³² po blo dang
ldan pas [B69⁶] deng nas⁶³³ brtsam par [D5v³] bya || 1.89 ||

iti paramārthasatryakṣaratantrasadbhāvoddhṛtā[K₁3r⁷]yām⁶³⁴ [K₂3r¹⁰] śrī[I p.
13]guhyasiddhau⁶³⁵ vajrasattvasādhanavratatattvanirdeśo⁶³⁶ nāma prathamāḥ
paricchedaḥ ||

[T17⁴] don dam pa'i yi ge gsum dang ldan pa'i rgyud kyi⁶³⁷ don nges par⁶³⁸ bsdu pa
dpal gsang ba grub pa zhes bya ba dpal rdo rje sems dpa' mnyes par bya ba [B70¹] las⁶³⁹
brtul [Q6r⁶] zhugs dang de kho na nyid nges par bstan pa'i⁶⁴⁰ le'u ste dang po'o || ||

Funding: Open Access Funding by the University of Vienna.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Notes

- ¹ The first actual exegetical work on the GST, according to Tson kha pa, is Padmavajra's GS, see Wayman (1977, pp. 90–91).
- ² Both Padmavajra and Uḍḍiyāna are very complex topics that cannot be discussed here. Notwithstanding, the many important contributions that have been made in the recent decades, both the figure Padmavajra and the historic–religious complex Uḍḍiyāna, both deserve to be studied more thoroughly. Regarding Padmavajra, he is mentioned in the 10th/11th century **Sahajasiddhipaddhati* (Tōh. 2261), a text authored by a Lakṣmīnkarā. This is perhaps our oldest Indian source of siddha hagiographies, see Kragh (2010, 2011). It is worth noting that his hagiographical account is not found with certainty in the well-known **Caturaśītisiddhapravṛtti* ('Phags yul grub chen brgyad cu rtsa bzhi'i byin rlabs skor las lo rgyus rnam par thar pa rnam), as translated by Grünwedel (1916), Robinson (1979), and Dowman (1985). Dowman suspects that the 74th story refers to Padmavajra. Further information on him can be found in 'Gos Lo tsa' ba gzhon nu dpal's 'Blue Annals' (*Deb ther sñon po*), wherein he is found, most importantly, in "The Chapter on the History of the Yoga (Tantra)", translated in Roerich (1995, p. 356 ff.). Two other sources are Tāranātha's *bKa' babs bdun ldan*, wherein Padmavajra appears in the third lineage labeled 'karmamudrā' (Templeman 1983, p. xii, 24ff.). Therein, several Padmavajra's are distinguished. Also, in the 'Bri gung chos mdzod, in the context of the *Grub pa sde bdun, lo rgyus* (see note 140) are contained and narrate the origin of these texts, also containing valid information about their authors. Regarding the identification and importance of Uḍḍiyāna, see Kuwayama (1991; republished in Kuwayama 2002, pp. 249–59), Hodge (2003, pp. 540–41, nt. 10), Esler (2005, pp. 49–52), Sanderson (2009, pp. 265–68), and van der Kuijp (2013). On sources for the study of Padmavajra in relation to Indrabhūti and Anaṅgavajra (both whose associated writings are connected to the GS and who are frequently appearing in relation to Padmavajra) and the complex of Uḍḍiyāna, see also Gerloff and Schott (2024, pp. 21–43, 46–49). Finally, it may be noted in brief that the *siddhas* are as much literary archetypes as they are rather elusive historic figures; exceedingly difficult to be located and differentiated as their spheres of activity often overlap and a lot of name confusion and historical mix-ups are at play. On the importance of the *siddhas* and their culture, see Davidson (2002) and Szántó (2019).
- ³ It has to be noted that the GS, from a rather early stage onwards, has been transmitted together with a more or less fixed set of other texts, the *Jñānasiddhi*, *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* and the *Advayasiddhi*. Over time, the collection was enlarged and complemented by further texts. In Tibet, these eventually were known as the *Seven Texts of Accomplishment*. Amongst these, the *Advayasiddhi* (first studied in Shendge 1964) and the *Jñānasiddhi* are both edited and translated by Torsten Gerloff and Julian Schott (Gerloff and Schott 2021, 2024). The *Sahajasiddhi* (of Ḍombī, i.e., Tōh 2223, not to be confused with that of a later Indrabhūti bearing the same title, i.e., Tōh. 2260) has been studied and translated in Malati J. Shendge (Shendge 1967). The *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* is currently being prepared by Davey Thomlinson et al. and has been edited together with seven other works in the so-called *Guhyaḍi-Aṣṭasiddhisamgraha* by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1987) and Dārikapāda's **Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa* has been studied and translated by Julian Schott (Schott 2023b). Some isolated passages from the 'Seven Siddhi Texts,' yet only little of the text is presented in this paper, is translated and discussed by Adam Krug (Krug 2018) who, in his dissertation, aimed in studying the entire corpus of the *Grub pa sde bdun*. It has to be emphasized that the GS, as being an exegetical treatise on the *Guhyasamājatantra*, is moreover connected to, and possibly influenced by, several further authoritative *Yogatantras* (many of which later were counted among the *Mahāyoga*- or even *Yoginītantras*) that circulated in the 7th and 8th centuries in India, such as *Sarvathāgatatattvasamgraha* and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara*, see also Gerloff and Schott (2024, pp. 19–21). To gain a comprehensive understanding of these mentioned texts and scriptures, their study should, ideally, involve the comparison of these with all others to be counted among this related group.
- ⁴ While there are a couple of possibly corresponding underlying terms, *dr̥ṣṭi* (*darśana*, etc.) might be among those coming relatively close to the concept of "worldview", quite literally meaning "standpoint." It is often employed to mean something like "philosophical position" or simply "view". Appearing once in the GS: *dhyāyed ekāgracittāḥ paramasukhapadaiḥ satpadanyāsayogād | ātmānam tattvayogī gatamalapaṭalāḥ divyasamdr̥ṣṭīśuddhaḥ | | 4.55 | |*. Therein, the semantic relation of *tattvayogin* and *divyasamdr̥ṣṭīśuddha* makes clear that, other than with what seems to me the connotation of "worldview", the term "view" is not only used as denoting ones comprehensive set of beliefs which can or can not be correct (namely, in accordance with reality). The term rather carries the connotation of a correct view (see also *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* 5.11 in note 32 below), one that is opposed to false/mitaken views (*mithyādr̥ṣṭi*), such as used in *Jñānasiddhi* 8.20. The underlying notion of right and false thus deserves further attention. I suspect that in modern usage, the term "worldview" is often used in a descriptive sense, while the tem "view" in Buddhist usage often is loaded and evaluative. In the *Jñānasiddhi*, for instance, as certainly being representative for most other Buddhist tantric traditions, we also find expressions such as *mithyātattva* (6.6, 8.1, 19.1) or *mithyājñāna* (5.10, 11.9, 13.13, 15.16), implying that terms such as "view, reality, or cognition" are not used, unlike the concept "worldview" which could be in a neutral (descriptive) sense that is applicable to any individual's or group's distinct set of beliefs regardless of another's ontological evaluation of them but, in fact, is quite the opposite. The dichotomy of *dr̥ṣṭi* (in the sense of *samyagdr̥ṣṭi* and *mithyādr̥ṣṭi*) implies that the term "worldview", when applied in the sphere of (tantric) Buddhism, can only mean "correct view about the world", which, in turn, also implies that all other views not being in agreement are, by definition, wrong views about the world. Hence, I will, in the following, use "view" precisely in this former sense.

- 5 Although the aspect of *svasaṃvedya* (“self-experience”) has, at least to my knowledge, not been emphasized in the study of early exegetical Buddhist tantric literature, it deserves attention as marking a fundamental aspect in understanding the idea and function of *tattva* as a concept of vital importance in the GS and beyond, being the decisive factor in validating the correcting notions of *tattva* as laid out in the GS and elsewhere. *svasaṃvedya* is found in GS 3.36 and 3.71, and *pratyakṣa* in GS 6.23 and 6.102. Further passages of relevance in view of these terms can be consulted in *Jñānasiddhi* 1.90, 4.28–29, 7.3, 12.8, and 17.4. See also Gerloff and Schott (2024, nt. 33 ad *Jñānasiddhi* 1.32). See also *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* 2.3 (given below), 3.2, and 5.11.
- 6 It seems that the conception of *tattva* and *jñāna* as these are found, e.g., in the *Guhya-* and *Jñānasiddhi* are equal with how terms such as *mahāmudrā* are employed within the *bKa’ brgyud* school of Tibetan Buddhism when used in their ultimate sense as denoting the nature of reality. Reference may be given, e.g., to the synopsis of the *Grub pa sde bdun* as found in the *’Bri gung chos mdzod* (Vol. I: 1815–1825), wherein the titles of the texts contained in this cycle are presented as denoting different aspects of the *mahāmudrā* doctrine. The passage is translated in Gerloff and Schott (2020, pp. 252–54) and has been, with minor changes, reproduced in Gerloff and Schott (2024, pp. 84–85). The term *mahāmudrā* appears a few time in both *Guhyasiddhi*, i.e., stanzas 3.34–36, 3.42, 3.49, 3.63, 3.70, 4.4, 4.15, 4.19, 4.43, 4.48, 5.7, 5.29 8.40, and 9.6, and *Jñānasiddhi* verses 1.48, 1.56–57, and 15.VII.vii. In the former, the term *mahāmudrā* seems to be used mostly (not, however, in 4.15, 4.29, 5.7, and the chapter title of the fifth section), in a rather narrow sense, denoting a more or less specific moment within the practice (see GS 4.1–4) and therein refers, in some way, to the tantric consort (female), such as can be seen in stanza 8.40 *mudrām ālīṅgya tattvena cumbayīta muhur muhur | cumbayītoā tu tāṃ vidyāṃ mahāmudrāvibhāvanaiḥ | |* (“Embracing the consort (*mudrā*) in accordance with reality, one should kiss [her] again and again; and one kisses her, the *vidyā* (i.e., consort), in a manner that brings forth *mahāmudrā*.”). In the latter, on the other hand, the term *mahāmudrā* seems employed in a more general sense. An important notion in which *jñāna*, *tattva*, and *mahāmudrā* overlap can be observed, for instance, in regard to the title of chapter one of the *Jñānasiddhi* whereby the Tibetans, instead of *tattva*, the term *mahāmudrā* is used, see Gerloff and Schott (2024, pp. 51–52). Significantly, the titles for sections five and seventeen of *Guhya-* and *Jñānasiddhi*, respectively, although in different terms, describe the initiation of the realized *yogin* into becoming an *ācārya*, whereas in the *Guhyasiddhi*, the term *sādhakamahāmudrābhīṣeka* is used; the *Jñānasiddhi* calls this process *vajrajñānābhīṣeka*. See also the GS 4.51 given in note 32.
- 7 One may note that there are, particularly in corpora related to Hevajra and Śaṃvara, as well as in the respective Tantras, e.g., the *Hevajratantra* and the *Herukābhīdhāna*, or the *dohā* traditions, positions associating the ultimate experience of reality with the innate (*sahaja*), innate joy (*sahajānanda*), or great bliss (*mahāsukha*), representing the culmination of tantric practices. The relation in the four joys (*caturānanda*) system and related aspects can, however, not be discussed in this context and it is not as explicitly emphasized by Padmavajra as in the above-mentioned traditions. For it, the reader may be referred to Isaacson and Sfera (2014).
- 8 *anādinidhanaṃ śāntaṃ bhāvābhāvākṣayaṃ vibhum | śūnyatākaruṇābhinnam bodhicittam iti smṛtam | |*, *Guhyasamājatantra* 18.38, cited in *Jñānasiddhi* 15.[I.i].
- 9 *yaḥ punaḥ paramārthaḥ so ’nabhilāpyaḥ | Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* ad 9.154, (p. 593).
- 10 *jñānam amaraṇam anakṣaram aghoṣam ādisuddham vimalaṃ prabhāsvaram anabhilāpyam iti | Śrīvajraṃḍalālāṅkāra*, cited in *Jñānasiddhi* 15.[VII.viii]. See also *Jñānasiddhi* 1.47 for further descriptive adjectives.
- 11 There are numerous studies regarding mindfulness-based and contemplative practices (Van Dam et al. 2018, or Dahl et al. 2015), but only few to acknowledge tantric traditions (Kozhevnikov et al. 2002) and, at least to my knowledge and an admittedly superficial survey (while I base myself on oral communication with scholars active in the respective field (such as Dr. Michael Sheehy or Dr. Perter Malinowski)), none to comprehensively include terminology pertaining to *utpatti-* and *utpannakrama* practices, or any in which the role of their circumstantial (cultural and religious) surroundings are a factor of significance towards the results of given practices, namely, the effects of meditative/contemplative practices are studied in detail (or even taken into consideration).
- 12 The pair of “insight/wisdom and means”, namely, *prajñopāya*, which in some sense is equivalent to other pairs such as *vajraghaṇṭā* or *śūnyatākaruṇā*, is prominent within tantric Buddhism. It signifies the unity where all borders between the provisional and ultimate are overcome and it denotes the union of the male and female principal frequently alluded to in all stages of tantric practice, particularly in the context of sexual *yoga* (on this see, e.g., succinctly presented dealing with a text which very frequently employs such doctrines). Similarly, the two can represent the two layers/members of the two level frameworks addressed in this paper: *prajñā dvividhā tattve samyagdr̥ṣṭi[s] tattvajñānaś ca | upāyo dvividha utpattikrame vidhibhāvanādiyogaḥ saṃvṛtīr utpannakrame ca guhyacaryāvidyāvratādiyogaḥ paramārthaḥ | |*. On this aspect, see also, e.g., *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* 5.16 as well as the fourth chapter of *Yoginī Cintā’s Vyaktabhāvanūgatattvasiddhi*.
- 13 *bhāvanātattvasāmarthyāt prajñopāyātmaṇi śivam |*, GS 3.75ab.
- 14 *svasaṃvedyaṃ tu tat tattvaṃ vaktum asya [na] pāryate |*, GS 3.71ab.
- 15 *athātaḥ kathyate kiṃcit tattvaratnasya labdhaye | hitāya bhavadurbhādabhrāntivyāmohitātmanām | | upāyaḥ pūroasambhuddhair yathoddīṣṭaḥ samāsataḥ | śrīmatānaḥgavajreṇa karuṇāviṣṭacetasā | | idaṃ tad iti tad vaktum naiva śakyam jinair api | pratyātmavedyārūpatvād bāhyārthe na ca gr̥hyate | |*, *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* 2.1–3.
- 16 GS 1.45–46, 55, 58, 65, ed., and trns. in Part 2. See also *Jñānasiddhi* 1.23–24 as well as sections 13 and 14 dealing with the characteristics of teacher and student, respectively.

- 17 *bhāvayate hi jagat sarvaṃ manasā yan na bhāvayate | sarvadharmaparijñānaṃ bhāvanā naiva bhāvanā | |* Shendge 1967. Another good example for such a rhetoric from another text of the *Grub pa sde bdun* cycle is found in the *Prajñopāyavinīscayasiddhi* 4.12–14: *na yatra bhāvakaḥ kaścīn nāpi kācid vibhāvanā | bhāvanīyaṃ na caivāsti socyate tattvabhāvanā | | na kartā kaścīd atrāsti bhoktā naivātra vidyate | kartrbhoktrvinirmuktā paramārthavibhāvanā | | na cātra grāhakaḥ kaścīn na vā kaścīt samarpakaḥ | na parihāryam ataḥ kiñcid grāhyaṃ naivātra vidyate | |*, ed. Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1987. Also, in verses 16 and 17 of *Dārikapāda*’s **Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa* a comparable statement is found: “By means of wisdom and method, Action and phenomena are the same. The yogin shall join [in his] thoughts what is equal and what not. Phenomena and action are the same, This the yogin always practices. Endowed with qualities [and yet] without; I, myself, am the creator, the destroyer and the sovereign.” (*shes rab thabs kyi cho ga yis | | las dang chos ni mnyam nyid du | | rnal ’byor pa yis sbyar bar bya | | mnyam dang mi mnyam snyoms sems pa | | 16 | | chos dang las ni mnyam nyid du | | rnal ’byor pa yis rtag tu spyad | | yon tan dang ldan yon tan med | | rang nyid byed po sdud po gtso | | 17 | |*), cf. (Schott 2023b).
- 18 A similar idea, one may note, seems implied in the insertion found at the second stanza of the GS in the version contained in the *’Bri gung chos mdzod* (Tib.^T), see notes 45 and 170 ad GS 1.2, respectively. It seems that, if my interpretation of this insertion is correct, that the unity of foundation and fruit is expressed as the cause for *jñāna* as the path-*mahāmudrā*.
- 19 *yena yena hi badhyante jantavo raudrakarmaṇā | sopāyena tu tenaiva mucyante bhavabandhanāt | |*, GS 6.86cd–87ab, also *Hevajratantra* II.ii.50; quoted in *Advayasiddhi* 7; *Amṛtakaṇīkā*, p. 68; *Subhāṣitasamgraha*, p. 38, *Dohakośaṭīkā* ad § 8.1. See *Jñānasiddhi* 1.15, which presents the same idea in slightly different words. See also Gerloff and Schott (2024, p. 335, nt. 15) where further references also to this stanza are given.
- 20 The claim of “realization in this very life;” is a fundamental claim within Buddhist tantric soteriology as proven by the many usages of this idiomatic expression. See, e.g., Schott (2023b, p. 154, nt. 104).
- 21 *ye tu tattvasamārūḍhāḥ sarvasaṅkalpavarjitāḥ | te spr̥ṣanti parāṃ bodhiṃ janmanīhaiva sādhakāḥ | |*, *Jñānasiddhi* 1.4.
- 22 From the *bdus don* of chapter one found in the *’Bri gung chos mdzod* (Tib.^T). For the Tibetan text, see note 140.
- 23 Indrabhūti’s exposition and usage of *jñāna* in his *Jñānasiddhi* can be seen to be strongly related to the GS’s framework of *tattva* and, overall, Padmavajra’s socio-religious milieu. Further, one may also note that, like the GS, the first chapter of the *Jñānasiddhi* (see below), labeled *tattvanirdeśa* or, in the Tibetan sources, *phyag rgya chen po bstan pa*, is also teaching a concise overview of tantric doctrines and views within which various notions and implications can be found that overlap with and/or complement Padmavajra’s presentation.
- 24 *svasaṃvedyasvabhāvaṃ yat tattvaratnam anuttaram | yuktyāgamavicāreṇa grahītuṃ ye tu na kṣamāḥ | | ajñānamohasaṃcchannā aparīkṣakabuddhayaḥ | | ādikarmikayogās te hīnadharmasya bhājanāḥ | | tān praty uktā jagannāthair vajrasattvāḍibhāvanāḥ | | bluajavarnasamāyuktā mudrāmaṇḍalakais tathā | |*, *Jñānasiddhi* 1.90–92.
- 25 This point, one may note, has likewise been recognised by Krug (2018, pp. 104–5, 162, 277), who, however, discusses the doctrine of *vrata***caryā* in the context of what he calls the “embodied dual apotropaic-soteriological doctrine”, focusing on the corporeal representation of *tattva* and *mahāmudrā* with an emphasis on chapter six of the GS.
- 26 This and the *neyārtha* and *nītārtha* distinction used below does not imply Padmavajra being a Madhyamika (but, like Indrabhūti (cf. sections 2–4 of his *Jñānasiddhi*), he might be). There are no clear text-internal references in the GS based on which he should be considered a proponent of a particular *siddhānta* system. However, Padmavajra applies a differentiation between two levels of truth/reality by the below cited verses also also by the use of terms such as *paramārthatattva* (prose section in GS 2.46–47). GS 3.47, for example, may be seen as an allusion to *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 2.1 et al. See also nt. 30 below.
- 27 GS 1.43–44, 1.81, 86–87, ed. and transl. in Part II.
- 28 On this see also nt. 30 below. In the *Jñānasiddhi*, a comparable rhetoric is found in the initial four verses of its 15th section. Although therein Indrabhūti does not imply that teachings about reality are entirely concealed, he yet makes a statement about the fact that the teachings found in scripture can be understood on different levels, thus implying the *neyārtha*-*nītārtha* framework in view of the practitioners with different capacities: “True reality as it is has been taught before together with the reasoning. Reality is in all Tantras; from these a little bit is taught [here]. Among some people, the word “cora” can convey the meaning “food”, for some it expresses only “thief.” And in a Tantra too, the words are in this way. Precisely with these verbal instructions, nothing but the Dharma is taught to the ones with lower, middling and superior [faculties] by the buddhas who are affecting the benefit of sentient beings. He teaches just reality alone [to the superior one] and to someone [of middling capacity he teaches] about both words/levels, [but] to someone with inferior faculties he only tells about the Dharma, not otherwise.” (*samyaktattvaṃ yathābhūtaṃ pūrvam uktam sayuktikam | sarvatantra sthitaṃ tattvaṃ tebhyaḥ kiñcin nigadyate | | 15.1 | | coraśabdaḥ kvacil loke bhakṣyārthaṃ pratipādayet | keṣāñcic cauram evāha tantra ’py evaṃ padās tathā | | 15.2 | | tair evāksaranirdeśair mṛdumadhyādhimātrake | dharma evocyate buddhaiḥ sattvānugrahaḥ kārikaiḥ | | 15.3 | | kevalaṃ tattvaṃ evāha kañcit padadvayaṃ tathā | | kañcin mṛdvindriyaṃ dharmam kevalam vakti nānyathā | | 15.4 | |*). The translation follows Gerloff and Schott (2024). Putting the *utpattikrama* into perspective, namely, pointing out its provisional nature, can also be observed in the twentieth section of the *Jñānasiddhi*.
- 29 One may note here that the rather explicit didactics of *neyārtha* and *nītārtha*, which are also at play on their texts on the *Grub pa sde bdun*, e.g., in *Dārikapāda*’s **Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa* verses two and three, are much less strong in the *Jñānasiddhi*, wherein logic, etc., are rather presented as something positive (see, e.g., stanzas 1.21 and 1.56). Thus, one may conclude that even

such categories may be seen on different levels of practice as either something useful (from a conventional standpoint) or as something to be overcome (from an ultimate standpoint).

That the two truths are related to the two *kramas* is stated, e.g., in Kyuma (2009, p. 477: 21). A related use of *neyārtha* and *nītārtha*, it may be referred to a *Sūta* passage (and the citations following it), a *Guhyasamājatantra* commentary, the content of which is not unrelated to GS chapter one. It reads: *idaṃ vajrapadaṃ neyanītārthabhedena dvividhaṃ devatāyogasyāpi yujyate. tatrotpattikramabhāvako nāsāgre sarśapaphalapramāṇaṃ svadevatācilmaṇi svacittadr̥ḥhikaraṇārthaṃ bhāvayed iti sūkṣmayogavya-padeśaḥ. anenaiva niṣpannakramasamādhisamāgatānāṃ sūkṣmayogam āha — ālikālibhīḥ strīpunnapuṃsakarūpeṇa tryakṣaram niṣpāḍya, akṣaratrayam api praveśya sthityutthāne niyojya caturmaṇḍalakrameṇa prāṇāyā[mā]tmakaṃ vajrajāpaṃ kuryād iti* (pp. 21–22).

This idea is verbalized in *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* 5.1–2 and 5.9–11 (see next note for the latter set). Stanzas 5.1–2 read: *athātaḥ kathyate spaṣṭaṃ saṃkalpārinīṣṭinī | sarvadharmasamudbhūtā tattvacaryā niruttarā || hitāya buddhaputrāṇāṃ saṃbodhau ye vyavasthitāḥ | tattvato ’naṅgavajreṇa prajñāpāramitā parā ||*. This passage, paired with GS 6.1 et al. and *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi* 5.9, shows that the terms *guhyacaryā* and *tattvacaryā* (“conduct of reality”) can be treated as almost synonymous.

This aspect is also expressed in the last chapter of the *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi*, as can be seen, e.g., in 5.9–11; reading: *praṇāmya sarvathā nāthaṃ śrīmādācāryavajriṇaṃ | āśrayed guhyacaryāṃ tu kṛtakṛtyo mahāmatih || tataḥ svacchandam ābhūya sarvāsaṅgabahirvukhaḥ | vicaret tattvayuktātmā kesarīva samantataḥ || yathābhūtārthasaṃvettā jagaduddharaṇāśayaḥ | samyagdr̥ṣṭipravarttātmā dr̥ḥhacitto nirāśrayaḥ ||* (“Bowing fully to the lord, the glorious teacher, the *vajra*-holder, the great-minded one who did what had to be done shall apply the secret conduct; then, who turns away from any forms of attachment remains according to one’s wishes; who has a nature united with reality shall proceed everywhere as if a lion; being one who completely experiences things in accordance with how these are is intend on liberating the world; who has a nature setting out with correct views has a firm mind [and] is without support (i.e., in no need for it)”). Also, GS 4.51 expresses the same idea, reading: *evaṃ tattvena vijñāya mahāmudrāvibhāvanam | sopāyaṃ tu tataḥ kuryād yad iṣṭaṃ rocate vratam ||* (“In this way, cognizing in accordance with reality, one may then, however, bring forth *mahāmudrā*, together with the means, one may enjoy which[ever] observance that is desired.”). On the point of the “progressive nature” of the text, see also Sanderson (2009, pp. 155–56, 163).

A list of some places wherein this stock-phrase appears within the *Grub pa sde bdun* and related scriptures can be found, e.g., in Schott (2023b, p. 154, note 104 ad verse 8). In *Dārikapa’s *Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa*, not coming as a surprise, various notions addressed here are likewise presented, including implicit references to the doctrines of the correct view, *caryā*, and rapid realization discussed above. Regarding those, verses 8–14 are of particular significance.

It is to be noted that *utpannakrama* practices (and the respective means, i.e., *divyopāya*) are not necessarily synonymous with some form of ultimate realization. They are categorized here under the heading of the second level within Padmavajra’s framework (as opposed to *utpattikrama* practices) to account for the general notion of more advanced practices and their associations, and for the sake of the overall presentation. However, it is important to keep in mind that *utpannakrama* practices, depending on the stage of the practitioner, may still involve certain forms of conventional and or provisional elements (e.g., forms of visualizations and other conceptual elements), only that their proportion, in theory, should be significantly reduced in comparison to the previous stage.

This, however, as made clear in GS 1.26–27 (and in some sense in GS 1.47–48), is not compulsory.

Here, when analyzing what marks the inferiority of certain practitioners, one may postulate that this lies in the inferiors’ misunderstanding of the fact that the efficacy of the path, at least according to how it seems implied by Padmavajra, does not at all depend on the nature of practices that are trained but, on the contrary, depends of whether these means are embedded within the framework of *tattva*.

It should be noted that, in the GS, Padmavajra does not explicitly mention the course or destiny of a practitioner who, although correctly applying the means on the *utpattikrama* level, does not proceed to the level of *utpannakrama* practices. Hence, I suspect that such practitioners, similar to how it is taught in the final three section of the *Jñānasiddhi* (i.e., 18–20), are to be situated in an intermediate stage of accomplishment, i.e., perhaps will not reach accomplishment in their present life time.

Translated from the Tibetan. Not extant in Sanskrit, yet the part is reminiscent of the GS’s colophon of chapter one, see nt. 140.

The second stanza is translated in Krug (2018, p. 102).

One may note here that Tib.^T renders the expression *dhyānahīnam*, which clearly should be a positive expression qualifying *tattva*, as *bstan dang ’brel ba*, i.e., as “endowed by the teachings.” Not only is this virtually impossible as a valid interpretation of the Sanskrit compound, but also any possible underlying Sanskrit expression (*uddeśa*^o / *deśanāyukta* etc.) that I can imagine would hardly be accounted for on any philological basis. This is a good example of the fact that the version Tib.^T has undergone a subsequent revision process with often doubtful results, whereof the quality and authenticity of this version must be seriously questioned. Admittedly, however, the expression *dhyānahīnam* is uncommon and among the tiny fraction of attestations I could find, the only one in Buddhist texts is indeed in the GS.

The reading in the beginning of pāda two follows MS B *śāntaṃ nityoditaṃ yat*. S emends to *nityotpannaṃ yatīndrair*. The Tibetan translation reads *gang zhig/gi rtag ’byung zhe la*, and tendentiously supports the reading of the MS. MS I, as a result of an eye-skip, reads only *nityoditaṃ yat*. The directly following formulation *muniavaravṛṣabhair*, one may note, is rendered in Tibetan with *rgyal ba dam pa khyu* [T *khyung*] *mchog rnam kyis* and it remains, although the meaning is not affected, overall, somewhat unclear what the

Tibetans had read since *muni* would commonly be rendered with *thub pa*, while *rgyal ba* rather corresponds to *jina*. For the time being, I accept this variant as translational freedom.

42 S prints *tattva*[*ta*]s in their edition, which implies that all Sanskrit MSs read *tattvas* and suggests *tattvatas* as an emendation, although this reading, in fact, is attested in MSs B and I. The Tibetan renders this as *dri ma rnams dang bral ba'i de nyid de la* which rather sounds like *malavinirmuktaṃ tattvaṃ tat* or the like, neither attesting a ^o*tas* suffix, or, for that matter, any other suffix. The reading *tattvaṃ taṃ*, which probably would require an emendation from *taṃ* to *tat* to account for the gender of *tattvaṃ* (*napuṃsakalingaṃ*), is, from the point of both sense and syntax, clearly preferable, yet it is one syllable short, i.e., metrically problematic (the stanza is composed as a 26-syllable *utkṛti*, see (Apte 1957, p. 16 'appendix')). The words *agamyāṃ* and *paramuṣitamala*, which are a *yat-kṛtanta* and a *bahuvrīhi*, respectively, i.e., which function as adjectives, cannot be the main referent of the verbal action *praṇāmya*. Therefore, and supported by the fact that *taṃ/tat* (or any other correlative pronoun for that matter) should be coreferential with *yat* in the preceding line, whereof the entire first line of this stanza should qualify a noun in *pāda* three, and, last but not least, due to the importance of the term *tattva* in the GS, I tentatively conjectured the text to *tattvaṃ idam*. The pronoun *idam* has been chosen to, on the one hand, account for the Tibetan translation, and, on the other, to have a reading that is metrically less problematic while palaeographical conceivable. This solution, however, remains to be reconsidered. Abstract noun formations (^o*tva*/^o*tā*), one may note—although coming to mind immediately as a possible solution—are not attested usages in combination with *tattva* throughout the GS. Finally, it is to be pointed out that the Tibetan translation, which reads *dri ma rnams dang bral ba'i* as if translating something like *vinirmuktamalaṃ*, can be taken as a case of translational liberty.

43 MS B reads *vande*, instead of *vakṣye* as printed in the previous edition S. MS I has something looking like *caṣpra*. The Tibetan renders this part as *bshad*, which should be taken in support of *vakṣye*. One may note that, from the point of view of Sanskrit syntax, stanzas 1.1–2 must be read as a single sentence since the gerund *praṇāmya* requires one to continue the sentence until the first finite verb form *vakṣye*. For reasons of readability, however, the two stanzas have been rendered as individual sentences and the grammatical anterior inherent in the gerund has been reflected in the adverb “now” in the beginning of stanza 1.2.

44 In Tib., where for syntactic reasons this first *pāda* is given as the last, the part corresponding to *śreyasīṃ* is rendered as *thar pa ster byed*, which rather sounds like *mokṣadāṃ* or something alike.

45 The Tibetan translation does reflect the seventh *vibhakti* in *ānveṣaṇeṣv agradūtīm* and rather sounds like a compound or *dvitīyā ekavacanāṃ*, both of which, although grammar wise working well, would be unmetrical. One may take the discrepancy as the meaning translation of this, maybe *metri causa*, to be slightly uncommon syntax.

Moreover, version Tib.^T inserts a one and half line intersection, perhaps once having been a marginal or interlinear note, after *go 'phang mchog tu* in the initial *pāda* of the Tibetan corresponding to the expression *parapada*^o in the second *pāda* of the Sanskrit. It has the nature of a general comment without being clear whether an element of the GS's first stanzas is commented or, being equally possible, whether this short addition was some readers/editors attempt to summarize the flavor of the work as such. It may be translated as: “A person (*skyes pa bu* [read *skyes bu*] *de*), when intelligent (*rig bzang na*), by integrating into the path (*de lam du byed pas*) foundation and fruit conjoined (*gzhi 'bras nga byar* [read *'byar*] *re*), [has] *jñāna*, the path-*mahāmudrā* (*ye shes ba* [read *ye shes* or *ye shes bar* ?] *ni lam phyag rgya chen po'o*). As water is poured into water (*hu la chu bzhas tu*), in that manner (*tshul gyis*) the conduct of uniting contemplation and its objects (*bsam dang bsam bya sbyar ba'i tshul khrims*), is to be realized and shown (*rtog* [read *rtogs*] *zhing ston du bya'i*).”

46 The emendation *tvāṇyā(vā)ptiheto[h]* proposed in the previous edition S, maybe on account of MS I, seems mistaken. MS B reads *buddhatvāvyāptiheta*^o and the Tibetan translation attests *sangs rgyas thob pa'i rgyur gyur cing*, which rather sounds like the underlying Sanskrit formulation ends in ^o*hetubhūtāṃ* or the like, which, being unmetrical, is perhaps the result of translational liberty. A similar compound, however, is found in 4.54d, reading *buddhatvāvyāptiheto*, which I suspect to be the underlying reading here since it seems closer to the variants attested for this stanza. Another alternative for which, on the other hand, no attestation is found in the GS would be to read ^o*tvaṇyāpti*^o.

47 The Tibetan translation of the part *kalimalamathanīṃ vighnavikṣepakṛtyāṃ* is far from being clear and remains with several points of doubt. First of all, the entire corresponding part *rtsod pa'i dri ma'i bgegs kyis byas pa'i g.yeng ba spong byed pa'i* sounds as if being read in apposition to an attribute of the following *siddhīnāṃ*, which, however, is more naturally construed with the following *janmabhūmiṃ* only. Further, ^o*mathanīṃ* is not reflected. Instead, the Tibetan seems to have read something like *kalimalavighnakṛta*^o. Also, the final words of this part are suspicious. The formulation *g.yeng ba spong byed pa'i* appears to be somewhat strange since, so it seems, *vikṣepa* (or a version of it) has been rendered twice. While *spong byed pa'i* is a totally acceptable rendering of *vikṣepakṛtya*, the word *g.yeng ba* is itself an attested translation of *vikṣepa* (Mahāvīyutpatti: no. 1977.), yet in the negative sense of “agitation, disturbance.” It remains unclear how this translation came about and what was the underlying reading of this in several places diverging Tibetan translation.

48 Here, the Sanskrit sources seem to point towards a plural ending of ^o*bhūmi*. S reports ^o*bhūmīd* and MS B reads ^o*bhūmīm*. The entire formulation *siddhīnāṃ janmabhūmi*, should, however, be taken as referring back to *śrīguhyasiddhiṃ* in the first line. Therefore, I have provisionally accepted the emendation ^o*bhūmiṃ* proposed in the previous edition S.

49 The Tibetan seems to take *jinānām* together with *guṇaśatanīlayāṃ* (which is also possible) and not, as done here, with *mātrbhūtāṃ* which it renders with *ma lta bu*. Here, the text follows the previous edition S, wherein the reading *māta* has, perhaps in support of the Tibetan translation, been emended to *mātr*.

- 50 The emendation from *abheda* to *abhedya* in S finds support in the reading of *pāda* two of stanza 5.16, in which the same compound, namely, *trivajrābhedyavigraha* is found. The translation of *vigraha* as a state follows the Tibetan rendering of this word with the honorific word for the body of a buddha, *sku*, which, although I was unable to find other attestations, seems appropriate.
- 51 Like in the previous instance, also here I follow the proposed emendation in S, which, given the popularity of the expression *vāḱpathātītāgocaraṃ* (e.g., *Hevajratāntra* I.viii.51.b; *Amṛtānikā* p. 84 et al.), is certainly correct, while all MSs show different forms of corruption. Here one may note, however, that the Tibetan translation Tib.^{BDQ} *gang gi spyod yul las 'das pa* is corrupt and I have, following Tib.^T, attesting *ngag gis* instead of *gang gi*, emended the text to *ngag gi*. The *Hevajratāntra*, for instance, translates the *pāda* as *ngag gi lam 'das spyod yul te*.
- 52 The Tibetan makes the self-reference in this verse, which, one may note, at not an all-too-commonly observed feature, is explicit by adding the implied pronoun *bdag gis*.
- 53 In *pāda* two, the Tibetan has *buddhanāthena* (*sangs rgyas mgon pos*) instead of *bhūtanāthena*, as found in S and the MSs. Although the former appears more attractive and can easily be argued for based on orthographic (and, although less easily so, also on palaeographical) grounds, the reading *bhūtanāthena* seems well attested and is supported by the same expression in 1.45(31)a (where, curiously, the Tibetan translation attests *sangs rgyas*), 2.42 and 4.2. Even more curiously, however, we find the expression *dpal 'byung ba yi mgon pos gsungs* in 1.76, i.e., one of the additional verses not extant in Sanskrit. Finally, one may note that the use of *bhūtavādin* in 1.62(45), 66(49) and 77(58) also supports the use of *bhūtanāthena*. One may note that I have translated the expression following my rendering of the *bhūtavādin*. Other translations, such as “lord of beings” or the like, are, of course, possible.
- 54 In the third *pāda*, the Tibetan attests *nges pa'i man ngag*, which rather sounds like *niyamopadeśa*^o instead of *āptopadeśa*^o (MS B attests *āyo*^o). Further, also the prefix *saṃ*^o in the following word is not reflected. Indeed, one wonders whether the reasons for such discrepancies are translational freedom, which I accept for the time being as the more likely hypothesis, not being able to see any reasons for a differently transmitted Sanskrit text, or whether a different exemplar was after all available to the Tibetan translators.
- 55 Verse 6 and 7 are translated in Krug (2018, p. 103).
- 56 One may note that the form *tyaktvā* the absolutive form suggested by S (on account of the MSs reading *tyakā*, (cf. also 1.81(60), 86(65))), is only weakly supported by the Tibetan, wherein the corresponding verb form appears as *spang bar bya*, which rather sounds as if having read *tyajet* or the like. The word order in the Tibetan, one may note in this context, is somewhat unusual. If it is correct to have *utpattivistaram tyaktvā* as the main sentence, then what is now printed as *pāda* two should be given as *pāda* four. Also, the formulation of *bsgom pa'i phyir* as unanimously attested in all Tibetan translation, which rather sounds like a *pañcamī* or *ṣaṣṭhī* (metrically problematic, resulting in a hypermetrical *pāda*) and which does not convey good sense, then must be emended to something *bsgom pa ni* or the like. Currently, it remains unclear to me what the Tibetan translators had read and understood.
- 57 Here the reading has been emended to *°bhāvanam* as a neuter noun, taking it as reference to *vistara* and following the use in 1.65. MS B is, unfortunately, not extant for this point and MS I (which seemingly was corrected from something like *°navanām*) and the previous editions S read the feminine *°bhāvanām*, which to contrue properly is difficult. The Tibetan reads *bsgom pa'i phyir* which rather sounds as if a rendering of the *caturthī*, as found in the following stanza. In view of all this and the fact that MS B is missing for this part, one may suspect that further corruptions happened.
- 58 One may note that there are various ways of taking the two adverbs *dūram* and *sarvapravṛttnataḥ* within this sentence. One may also, other than I have done, not relate them to the compound *bhāvanāyāntarāyikam* in *pāda* four, but also, basically following the Tibetan, take *sarvapravṛttnataḥ* with *tyaktvā* and *dūram* as an adjective qualifying *utpattivistaram*. One may even consider to connect these with the following sentence with which this stanza should be read together. None of these, however, will significantly influence the overall sense of the stanzas.
- 59 Perhaps, especially given the milieu of Padmavajra, it is not unlikely that he here refers to the Śaivatantra as a source for his presentation of practices. Following the discussion of this Tantra, its mention in the GS would be of intermediate age, given that references to it may be dated as early as the 6th century, see (Sanderson 2009, p. 50, nt. 22). On the manifold influences of this Tantra for Buddhists, see *ibid*. On this Tantra, see also Bang (2018).
- 60 Here I follow S's reading, an emendation to *saṃdoha* supported by the Tibetan *bsdu ba*, instead of the reading *saṃdeha* as reported in S.
- 61 Note that the main reference word, i.e., the subject of the passage, including verses 1.9–10, remains *guhyasiddhi*. Thus the pronoun “it” has been added.
- 62 Note that the Tibetan renders *jananī* with (b)skyed byed. This, although technically an acceptable and attestable translation of *janana* (literally “creating, producing”), does not reflect the feminine gender of the word *jananī*, which I, also in view of the previous verses 1.9, tend to rather translate as “mother”, a meaning that, obviously, in lack of the word *yum* or the particle *mo*, was not intended.
- 63 Note that the two *kta* forms, i.e., the part passive participles *vyavasthitāḥ* and *pratiṣṭhitāḥ* can be considered as almost synonymous with each other. In the Tibetan translation these are both rendered as *gnas na*, that is a conditional sense without the reflection of the *upasargas* (prefixes), and as *rab gnas*, rendering the *upsaraga prati-*, respectively. In the translation, some liberty has been taken to reflect the two slightly different notions of the two verbal forms in the context of this stanza.

- Verses 12 to 17 are translated in Krug (2018, p. 223) in the context of their relation to the *Guhyasamājatantra* and in view of the question how the ideas exhibited in these verses are related to the wider Indian literature, particularly Śaiva sources, that deal with the transgression of pledges (ibid. p. 224 ff.) and their religious implications.
- It should be noted that the Tibetan translation seems to have read not *virodhakāḥ*, but a negated form thereof, e.g., *apy avirodhakāḥ* (or perhaps *apratirodhakāḥ*), which would have resulted in something like “Those who are in accordance with the Dharma...”. It seems, however, that the entire passage (as well as the particle *api*) rather supports the reading as found in the Sanskrit. Besides this discrepancy, also the termination of the expression ‘*gal med par*’ using the *la don* remains suspicious. Since this word should express the subject of the clause, one rather would have expected simply a plural marker. Thus, one may consider emending the Tibetan text to something like ‘*gal ba rnams*’.
- Verse 14 is translated in Krug (2018, p. 158).
- There remain some doubts about the reading *kālāvadhivivarjitam* in 1.13b. MS B omits the word *avadhi* and the following prefix (*upasarga*) *vi*^o. While the prefix finds a clear reflex in the Tibetan translation *yongs*, the word *avadhi* is less clear. Instead of the expected *mtshams*, the Tibetan translation reads *nges pa*, which, although attested elsewhere (Negi 1993–2005, s.v. *nges pa*, vol. 3), is maybe not the most natural choice.
- Here, the Tibetan translation seems to have read *pāraṃ* (*pha rol*) instead of *paraṃ* (as attested in the Sanskrit text), which, more commonly, would correspond to *mchog* or the like. Although the reading *pāraṃ* would be rather nice, it can be excluded on account of the material constraints imposed by the *anusṭubh*, in which syllables 5–7 of an even *pāda* must form a *ja-gaṇa* (—).
- Translated and referred to in Schott (2023a). Cf. *Jñānasiddhi* 1.14 et al. The translation of 1.17c in Q, one may note, is somewhat corrupted attesting *tshe* ‘*dis la las*’ in place of *janmanīhaiva*. This very practice, often portrayed as archetypical for the *yogins*, is found, e.g., in *Jñānasiddhi* and *Advayasiddhi*, or, e.g., *Hevajratana* 2.4.76 ff.
- Here, the Tibetan unanimously reads *rtogs pa*, perhaps a corruption of *rtag pa* (the emendation proposed), as rendering *śāśvata*, or it was a conscious change based on, for instance, the attempt of correcting a damaged, illegible, or otherwise problematic reading.
- Note that the Tibetan text reads *zhi ba* twice as if the Sanskrit read *śānta* in the first and the second line. The second occurrence of *zhi ba*, however, is not correct and should be changed to reflect *śubhā*, the most common renderings of which are *sdug* and *bzang*.
- The abstract noun particle *nyid* in the first *pāda* of the Tibetan translation is somewhat misleading as a translation of the *tas* suffix since it gives the impression that “the state of *utpannakramayoga*” would be the object of the verbal action *vibhāvya*, whereas it rather is an adverbial construction. One may consider emending the Tibetan text, for instance, to *rual* ‘*byor bzhin*’.
- On Padmavajra’s criticism of the *utpattikrama* practices see also 1.6 ff. in which he implicitly addresses that, according to him, the completion stage practices are not taught in the tantric traditions, at least those known to him.
- Here, S^{nt} seems to remark that the Tibetan sounds as if reading *samadvayaṃ* (*samadvayaṃ—bho*). This statement must be mistaken since the Tibetan, for this stanza, seems a fair representation of the Sanskrit.
- The first line remains problematic. The reading *rtog pa dang bcas pa(s)* in the first *pāda* of the Tibetan translation rather sounds like *vikalpayuktena*, apparently not having read the feminine noun *yuktyā* in the 3rd *vibhakti*, which would normally be rendered with *rigs pas*, nor a finite verb, which should appear in the end of the *pāda*. Regrettably, I cannot account for the underlying reading of the exemplar used by the Tibetan translators on account of palaeographical considerations, remaining uncertain whether a number of corruptions should be assumed to have taken place, or if, after all, a different version of the GS was underlying the Tibetan translation. The reading *°kriyā* in the end of the next *pāda*, although found in primary sources, is not attested elsewhere in the GS, nor is it supported by the Tibetan translation. Here, the text has been emended following the Tibetan *lugs rim pas* to *°kramāt*, a *pāda* ending frequently used by Padmavajra. Although this emendation requires to supply a subject from the previous stanza, the fifth *vibhakti* in connection with the *tr̥tīyā* of *yukti* seems more plausible than *°kramaḥ* as the grammatical subject of the sentence. The pair *yuktyāgama*, moreover, is frequently found throughout the *Jñānasiddhi* (1.90–91, 2.12, 3.14, 4.12, 9.20, 11.9, 14.10, and *upasaṃhāra* 6), wherein, however, it has a more positive flavor. The same pair (*yathāyuktyā* and *śrīsamājakrameṇa*) is found in GS 5.47 where, like in the *Jñānasiddhi*, it is positively connoted. In the *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* and *Vyaktabhāvānugatatattvasiddhi*, no statements about “reasoning and scripture” are found, whereas in the **Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa*, two lines are found (i.e., 2c and 5c) that resemble the flavor of *yuktyāgama* that seems to be also found here in the GS.
- In the third *pāda* the emendation to *vistaratāṃ* in S has been followed (S^{nt} reports *vistarakāṃ*). Although it is unclear what underlies the Tibetan translation, attesting *bar du rgyas* ‘*gyur*’, the general sense seems supported by the Tibetan translation.
- The reading in *pāda* one is hypometrical, i.e., one syllable short. It has been conjecturally emended according to the reading found in 1.80a in which, besides the gender of the pronoun, the same formulation has been used. The Tibetan translation, one may note, differs in both places and it is, after all, not clear what the underlying reading of the Sanskrit of this *pāda* was. The reading in 1.80a is *de ni re zhig* ‘*dir mi dgos*’, it is generally closer to the Sanskrit in both places and one may consider adopting this reading also here. The adjective *mchog*, moreover, remains suspicious and cannot be accounted for. Also the choice to render *antara* with *sna tshogs* is not the most common one.
- In the third *pāda* of 1.22, the Tibetan interpretation of the Sanskrit as *śāstre na ... niṣṭhasya* (*bstan bcos ... tshol mi dgos*) is followed and the retroflex *ṇa* has been corrected to the dental *na*. Although *śāstreṇa ... niṣṭhasya* (as printed in S) is also possible, the Tibetan interpretation, owed to the overall context, has been given preference. In the fourth *pāda*, also in reliance on mz interpretation

of the Tibetan text, the proposed emendation in S has been adopted and the syntax interpreted as a so-called *hetu* construction (x-genitive and y-ablative), while other interpretation of the cases are of course possible.

79 The syntax of 1.23 is slightly unclear. The reading *tattvena* in 1.23a could, following the Tibetan (*de nyid shes byas la*), be emended to *tattvaṃ* in order to avoid the hypermetricism in this *pāda*. Doing so, however, requires either to take *pāda* b as a separate sentence or to take it adjectival to *tattva*. Both of these options seem less desirable than to accept the hypermetricism. If one, however, were to follow the Tibetan and take *pāda* b it as a separate sentence, one may render line one of 1.23, for instance, as “After having at first discerned reality [and after] the arrangement for the sake of reality’s accomplishment [has been made]. . .”.

80 In the second line of 1.23 a couple of problems are apparent in the Tibetan translation. First, it attests ‘*bad pa yis*, which, apparently, suggests that the exemplar underlying the Tibetan translation read *yatnatas* (“zealously”) instead of *tattvatas* in the end of the verse. The second major and more challenging problem regards the reading *nyams su myong ba*, which, since *bsgom la* should be reflecting *bhāvanādiṣu* (without reflecting the *ādi*), should correspond to *saṃvṛtim*. This, however, seems hardly correct as *nyams su myong ba* usually renders *anubhava*, *adhigama*, or the like. Without being able to conceivably explain this discrepancy on paleographical or orthographical accounts, further, more complicated corruptions or additional textual strata must be taken into consideration in order to explain this phenomenon. Hence, for the time being, no attempts have been made to harmonize the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts. The second line of the Tibetan translation translates as follows: “And then, one may produce an experience [of reality (?)] through zealous effort in meditation”.

81 After Padmavajra had defined *caryā* (tantric conduct) already previously, he now specifies that *vrata* (observances), at least in the context he presents here, can be seen as a closely related term, which, however, unlike this is at times portrayed, is not synonymous with what yet falls into the range of *caryā*. On this, see, e.g., Goodall (2020). *vidyāvratā*, one may note here, seems, for Padmavajra, to denote something roughly equivalent to the practice with a tantric consort (*mudrā*, *prajñā*, etc.), as becomes clear in the seventh chapter of the GS, the *vidyāvratānirdeśaḥ*. One may note, moreover, that Padmavajra presents something like a brief practice summary (*prathamam . . . tataḥ . . . paścāc . . . tadantaram . . .*) of the concepts of *tattva* and *caryā* in verses 1.22–24. The translation of *vidyā* follows Padmavajra’s characterization in, e.g., GS 3.33 ff., wherein the term maybe associated with various stages of sexual union practice: *mudrayāpi vinā divyaṃ yathā prāpnoti sādhaḥ | padaṃ paramanirvāṇaṃ saṃkṣepāt tad bravīmy aham | 133 | | karmamudrāṃ śaṭhām krūrāṃ jñānamudrāṃ tathāiva ca | vikalpabāhulāṃ tyaktvā mahāmudrāṃ vibhāvayet | 134 | | vihāya mānuṣiṃ mudrāṃ sarvavikṣepasambhāvām | mahāmudrāṃ viṣeveta svadehopāyasamyutām | 135 | | svasaṃvedyā hi sā vidyā mahāmudrā parā subhā | nijadehāśrayasthāpi svalpaprajñair na drṣyate | 136 | |*. Regarding the practice descriptions of the *vidyāvratā*, see the short seventh chapter of the GS, the *vidyāvratānirdeśa*.

82 Here, in the available transmission of the GS in Sanskrit, an entire verse seems to have dropped out, which, given the anticipated similarity of the verses, indeed could be the result of some form of eye-skip (cf. *prakurvīta* 1.24a and 1.25a, and *tadantaram* in 1.24c and 1.25c). I reconstructed 1.25a as *guhācaryāṃ prakurvīta* following the previous verse and 3.85. The reason to reconstruct this verse but not others that are either omitted in the Sanskrit or added in Tibetan is solely based on the facts that, on the one hand, there is a certain closeness in the wording to other parts of the GS giving the impression that this stanza could indeed be authorial (more so than in other vases) and, on the other, that the mentioning of *guhācaryā* seems a logical finish of the presented india. Without going further into the realm of speculation, however, I assume, until further evidence comes to light, that the respective Sanskrit verse has indeed dropped out and supply it accordingly. Thus, from here on, the counting disagrees with that of the previous edition S wherein the corresponding verses in the Sanskrit edition (not in the Tibetan edition wherein the additional verse is printed without, unfortunately, any sort of critical note) are one number higher. The first half of the stanza can, rather reliably, be reconstructed on account of GS 3.85. There remains, however, the slight stain that *sandhi* must not be applied to keep this *śloka* (in the *pāṭhya* form) intact. Support for not applying *sandhi* in the *pāda* break may be found in GS 4.7. The third *pāda* seems less obvious. Since the formulation *de yi rjes la* is, meaning wise, almost similar with *de ni mthar*, I tentatively supplied the formulation *tadantaram* here again. The part *thug skyes gyur nas* could, regrettably, not be reconstructed faithfully. On the one hand, this formulation is not found again throughout the GS and, on the other, the text internal evidences provide too many possible underlying readings. Tentatively, I have supplied a very well-known formulation that could be one of the various possible underlying readings. Another one, to name a further possibility, could be something like *mano jātvā*. Here, one may note that the expected reading for the Tibetan is rather *skyes ‘gyur nas*, i.e., with *a’ chung*. Hints in reconstructing *pāda* four can be found, e.g., with stanzas 6.11e (*tasmin vidyāvratam caret*), 8.31a (*tato vidyāvratam kāryam*), or 8.50d (*tasmin vidyāvratam caret*). Depending on whether one assumes the translation *phyi nas rig pa’i brtul zhugs spyad* to have translated a third or fourth *pāda*, a matter almost impossible to decide, one may choose either *kāryam* or *caret*, respectively.

83 The rhetoric of supremacy, resulting in limited accessibility, and the possible downfalls for those incapable, i.e., a very strong sense of exclusivity, is emphasized in *Jñānasiddhi* 1.15, and also in the *upasaṃhāra* section of the *Jñānasiddhi* in stanzas 2–4.

84 In the final *pāda* and in support of GS 8.49b, the reading has been emended to *cīrṇavratā*^o, taking it as short for *cīrṇavidyāvratā* since this seems to be an established term whereof the emendation proposed in S does not seem the best solution. On the term *cīrṇavratā* cp. (Goodall 2020, p. 68 f.), wherein the context of this term is described. One may roughly speaking, define this term in the given context as the “provisional completion of the set of prerequisite practices.” I add “provisional” inasmuch as the context, unlike this is formulated in Goodall in the context of mainly non-Buddhist tantric traditions, clearly implies this term does not denote the actual completion of the *vratas*. The formulation *vrataṃ vināpi* seems echoed in a famous verse.

- 85 Here, the Tibetan attests a number of verses absent in the Sanskrit that have not been included in the translation. The first number denotes the overall counting of verses and the second number (in parenthesis) denotes the counting of the verses in the Sanskrit text.
- 86 I take *tantr* in *pāda* as the singular for the plural (*metri causa*). Alternatively to my interpretation, one may also take the entire first line as a single sentence having both participles qualifying *tattva* in the sense of “And that reality is present and made very clear in the *Śrīsamājatantra*”.
- 87 In the final *pāda* the emendation to *prapañcānekavistaraiḥ* in S has been adopted in support of the Tibetan *spros pa du ma rgyas gyur pas*. The previous reading in B, so it seems, is simply the result of the loss of the syllable °*ne*°. Also here, one may note, one could interpret the line somewhat differently and take *guptam anyatra* as one sentence in the sense of *anyatreṣu tantrēṣu tattvaṃ gopitaṃ* and *nirdiṣṭaṃ prapañcānekavistaraiḥ* as another separated sentence in the sense of *iha guhyasiddhe tattvaṃ nirdiṣṭaṃ prapañcānekavistaraiḥ*. Although the second interpretation might be more in line with the possible contrast presented in the first line, I feel it somewhat unlikely that Padmavajra would refer to his own teachings using the terms *prapañca* and *anekavistara*, which both, clearly, have negative connotations. The same rethoric, one may note, is, not coming to anyone’s surprise, also found in various somewhat later traditions. See, e.g., *Hevajratantra* II.v.66 et al.
- 88 Verses 26 to 30 are translated in (Krug 2018, pp. 277–78), leaving out the additional Tibetan verses, in the context that “Padmavajra [though these verses] distinguishes his own sectarian identity from the broader Buddhist tradition of which it is a part.” Verses 29 and 30 are moreover found in *ibid.* 103.
- 89 This verse is translated in *ibid.*
- 90 The Tibetan translation, one may note, interprets the term *dvandva* as *rtsod pa*, i.e., quarrel, dispute, or conflict.
- 91 Here one may note that the Tibetan renders *tatpadaṃ divyaṃ* as *bla med go ‘phang mchog*, i.e., attesting an additional adjective. While *bla med* usually renders words such as *anuttara* or *uttama*, *mchog* is usually a translation of *para*, it remains entirely unclear what the Tibetans had read and whether *divyaṃ* is supposed to be reflected by one of these two adjectives or if this, after all, is simply translational liberty. There is, moreover, a certain inconsistency in the Tibetan translation of the GS with regard to translations involving *pada* and *tatpada* in general. Comparing stanzas 1.2, 1.60, and 1.62, wherein *parapada*°, *tatpade divye*, and *padam ... param* are the formulations found in the Sanskrit, we see that in the Tibetan translation these are all rendered as *go ‘phang mchog*. In 1.58(41), on the other hand, the Sanskrit reads *tatpadaṃ ... param*, which is rendered as *go ‘phang de*.
- 92 One may note that, in the GS, the term *viruddhasamaya* is seemingly used in two different ways. Here, as apparent by the context, the term is used literally and denotes the *tattvohīnas*. Later, however, in chapter six, the *sādhakasamatācintānirmalikarāṇa-guhyacaryāsakalavibhāṅgakramanirdeśa*, the term appears with a positive, that is not in a literal but metaphorical sense alluding to the idea of *unmattāvarata* and not connoting the *tattvohīnas* but rather the opposite. See GS 6.96–110, providing the context for what Padmavajra refers to when using the concept of *samayas*.
- 93 Raurava (lit. “dreadful”) is one of the eight great/hot hells of Buddhist cosmology. Another of these, namely *Avīci*, is mentioned a bit later in the text (see note 288), in a part only extant in Tibetan. *Avīci* is also mentioned in the *upasaṃhāraḥ* section (verse 4) of the *Jñānasiddhi*. One may note that the Tibetan translation usually corresponds to *raurava* is *ngu ‘bod*. Here, however, we find *‘bod sogs pa* as if the Sanskrit text read *rauravādi*, which would be unmetrical.
- 94 Here, I follow S’s emendation in support of the Tibetan (*shing*). The choice of emending the corruption, which, as it appears, could indeed be based on some weaker form of haplography, i.e., the skipping or omission of the syllables °*dāvā*°, seems, although other corrections are conceivable, reasonable.
- 95 Here, I follow S’s emendation of *yathā* to *tathā* in support of the Tibetan (*de bzhin*). This might be explained as a scribal mistake based on the previous and, in case the following Tibetan verses missing in the Sanskrit were indeed contained in the original, following verses which start with the relative *yathā*.
- 96 Here, again, I follow S’s emendation from *sambhavet* to °*sambhavaḥ*. This formulation is well attested throughout tantric materials, such as *Hevajratantra* I.i.57d or *Sarvatathāgatataṭṭvasaṃgraha* ad I.1.6.
- 97 Verses 39 to 49 are translated in Krug (2018, pp. 280–81) in the context of the description of proper *guru* and disciple.
- 98 The translation “overcomplicated” renders *prapañcaka*, in the Tibetan translation reflected as *spros la dga’*, which in the given context, can be seen as a free meaning translation. Although in many contexts *prapañca* can be seen to be roughly equivalent to *vikalpa* and other related terms, it here, in this very stanza, seems to denote a particular habitual tendencies rather than “mistaken concepts” in general as reflected in the Tibetan rendering “fond of elaborations.” Other interpretations are, of course, possible.
- 99 The reading in *pāda c* is uncertain with regard to both the Sanskrit as well as the Tibetan transmissions with, unfortunately, too many possible variants as to determine the correct reading beyond serious doubts. The overall meaning of the stanza, however, does not seem to be affected. To begin with, in the end of the compound, the previous edition S reads *cittāḥ*, MSs B and I have *cintāḥ*, which I have decided to follow. The Tibetan translations, on the other hand, attest *sems can (gang)*, i.e., *sattoāḥ*. While the variant *cittāḥ* is equally possible and frequently attested, the reading with *sattoāḥ*, as suggested by the Tibetan, is rather unlikely and could not be found elsewhere. Hence one may indeed consider to change *sems can* to *sems pa*. For the first part of the compound, S has read *rāgādyāsakta*°, which, as far as the MSs evidence is concerned, could to be an emendation. MSs B and I attest *grādhātāsakta*° and *grādhātāsakta*°, respectively, Tib.^{DQT} read *‘dod cing chags pa’i* and Tib.^B has *blo ngan ‘dod la chags*. Apparently, while *āsakta* seems consistently rendered with *chags pa*, it remains somewhat uncertain what was translated as the

first member of the compound. Lacking good arguments on account of which I could determine the most original reading I follow, against S, the MSs evidence which seems to be in line with the Tibetan 'dod. The particle verb connecting to adverbial particle *cing* seems suspicious since the verb *āsak* should attract a seventh *vibhakti*, i.e., 'dod la chags pa as found in Tib.^B in reliance of which I have emended the Text accordingly. Finally, one may note that in S^{nt} it is supposedly expressed that the "MSs in fact read *grhgranta* and that the text, following the Tibetan, should read *grhītaḥ*" ('grddhatā(grhgranto)'sakta' iti—ka. kha. ga., grhītaḥ pāṭho bhoṭānūsarī |'). I cannot follow either of these statements and these should, in my opinion be disregarded.

MSs B, I, K₂ all read *varddha*, which, although not impossible to make sense of, is likely a corruption of the *baddha*. All Tibetan translations attest (*b*)*slu ba'i bsaṃ pa brten/bṛtan pa can*, the syntax of which, although supporting *baddha*, is suspicious.

One may note that *paraṃ* follows the silent emendation in S. All Sanskrit MSs attest a second *padam*, which, in view of the preceding *tatpadam* is probably mistaken and the result of an eye-skip. S reports only MSs *kha* and *ga* reading *padam*, suggesting that MS *ka*, i.e., MS I, reads *paraṃ*. This, however, is not the case. The Tibetan translation does not reflect either of the two but can, in view of previous renderings of comparable formulations (cf. note as 1.54(37) above) be seen in support of S's emendation.

The Tibetan renders the expression *anye 'pi cātra* with 'dir ni 'di [de in Tib.^T] 'dra gzhan yang, which, although expressing a similar meaning, seems to add a word such as *īdṛśa* (= 'di dra). Also, this can probably be seen as translational liberty. See also 1.63, where another type of discrepancy is apparent.

Here one may note that the verb *kurvate* in the medium voice (*ātmanepada*) of the simple present (*laṭ*) in the 3rd person (*uttama*) plural (*bahuvacana*) can be taken as indicating that the ones paying homage do this without being subject to be observed, i.e., solely out of their intrinsic intention. The adverb *dṛḍham*, one may note further, is, in the Tibetan translation, somewhat freely rendered with *gus par*. Although *gur par* usually translates terms such as *bhakti*, *śraddhayā*, or the like, and although the correct rendering of *dṛḍham* would rather be something like *brtan par*, this choice is in the given context certainly an appropriate meaning translation.

The precise interpretation of *apara*, is somewhat ambiguous inasmuch as it is unclear if it should mean "others, different" or "lower, inferior", whereas the other main meaning as "higher, exalted" can be disregarded in the given context. The Tibetan, seemingly rendering this term with 'di lta bu, differs from both interpretations (see 1.59 above), and should probably be disregarded as mistaken or accepted as translational liberty. One may note further, that MS I, in fact, attests *cāparaṃ*, which also could be made sense of when interpreting it as an indeclinable, i.e., a conjunction meaning "and moreover." Yet, such a form would appear somewhat superfluous in combination with the preceding *api*.

Here, I have given preference to *dūrācārāḥ* as found in B, K₁ and K₂, and which is supported by the Tibetan *spyod pa ring*. The previous edition S prints *durācārāḥ*, which certainly is the much better attested and easier reading, being another argument for *dūrācārāḥ* as being more authorial. The overall meaning, however, is not influenced by either of the readings.

In this verse, several problems are apparent. The first *pāda*, as transmitted in the Sanskrit, reads *tatra sadgrahamātreṇa*. Here, I decided to follow S, wherein, seemingly following the Tibetan translation, the text has been emended to *tantrasaṃgrahamātreṇa* and which makes good sense in view of the following *tat* in *tatsvabhāva*^o (as referring back to *tantra*). This is the reading found in K₁ as well as the Tibetan translation. Also the attestations in MSs B, I and K₂ point towards this reading. In S^{nt}, one may add, only MSs *kha* and *ga* are reported to read *tatsvabhāva*^o, implying that MS *ka* (= MS I), reads *tattvabhāva*^o. This, however, is not the case.

In *pāda* three, the text has, in support of the Tibetan translation *dbang bskur rjes gñang med par yang*, conjecturally emended to *nābhiṣiktā nānujñātāḥ*, which I consider superior to the attested reading *na tu jñātāḥ* in K₁ and S. K₂ and I read *nābhiṣiktām anujñātāḥ* and *nābhiṣiktānujñātāḥ*, respectively, both partially supporting of the proposed correction. If one, however, wishes to keep the reading one may translate the *pāda* as "Those [...], however, are not initiated and do not know", a reading which does not impede the overall sense of the stanza. Further, it is worth noting that the Tibetan translation attests only one of the two negations found in the Sanskrit text, which, however, can be read with both of the preceding words and hence supports the chosen emendation.

In the last *pāda*, the form *kuvante*, similar to verse 66(49), as attested in the Sanskrit sources, has, following S, been emended to *kurvate*, a form likewise found in 61(44). One may note, however, that some doubts remain about this emendation, since, the forms *kuvante*, likewise could be a corruption of *kurvanti*, the simple present (*laṭ*) *parasmaipada* form, which likewise is found in the GS. Also, the Tibetan attests *śiṣya* (*slob ma*) instead of *sattva*. Krug (2018, p. 281) renders this verse, following the readings in the paper MSs and without reliance on the Tibetan as.

In *pāda* of the Tibetan translation corresponding to *pāda* one of the Sanskrit, a discrepancy is apparent. While the Sanskrit attests *grhītamātrāḥ*, the Tibetan reads *gsang sngags [...]* *len par byed* which rather would correspond to *grhītamantrāḥ* instead. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine on which side, i.e., the Tibetan translation or the Sanskrit transmission, the mistake lies. Also, I was unable to find another Sanskrit attestation of either of the two alternatives in any other primary text. Support for the Tibetan reading, on the other hand, is found in Tōh. 3948 (D: f. 288r³), wherein the *pāda* is cited verbatim. Therein, however, the *pāda* is cited together with 1.64c (also verbatim) directly preceding it and marked as being a citation (*yang rgyud las*). Hence, there is a certain likelihood that the GS as transmitted here was also the sample underlying the reading in Tōh. 3948, a fact significantly reducing the authority that can be attributed to this attestation. However, owing to the overall context of the passage, I have, not without doubt, decided to follow the Tibetan texts and to conjecturally emend the Sanskrit accordingly.

- 110 “Keeping”, here, is a meaning rendering of *ācāra*, which literally translates as “the good practice etc. of pledges.” One may note further, that *saṃyācāra* could also be interpreted as a *dvandva*.
- 111 One may note that another possible, yet somewhat less likely, interpretation of the compound *pustakāññayā* in *pāda* two could be “without knowing the book” (as done in Krug), interpreting the second member of the compound as *ajñā* and not, as I have done in accordance with the Tibetan translation (*bka'*), as *ājñā*.
- 112 The interpretation of *yad* is ambiguous. While I have taken it in the sense of *yathā*, the Tibetan translators seem to have taken it in the sense of *yasmāt* (*gang phyir*).
- 113 The pronoun *eteṣāṃ* in *pāda* one is doubtful. The Tibetan translation attests *de lta bu* which, in 1.62, renders *evaṃvidha*, being somewhat similar to *īdṛśa*. Both of these, however, would be unmetrical and, although it is unclear what exactly the Tibetans had read, *eteṣāṃ* can be accepted, when taking in an emphatic sense, meaning wise more or less equal *īdṛśa*.
- 114 A similar rhetoric, one may note, namely, that not even contact to “unsuitable” persons should be made, is also found in *Jñānasiddhi* 17.24 as a command directly the *vajrajñānābhiṣeka*.
- 115 The Tibetan translation of the first *pāda*, corresponding to *pāda* in the Sanskrit, reflects the expression *saugatīm siddhim icchatā* with *bde gshegs dngos grub 'dod na ni*. This leaves the grammatical function of *bde gsheg* unclear. It, since *'dod pa* is a *tha mi dad pa* verb, could without a genitive (*'grel sgra*) also be misunderstood as the agent of the sentence. Also the rendering on *saugatīm* as *bde gsheg* is in itself problematic since it commonly would be understood as a rendering of *sugata* rather than *saugati*/^o*ī*, which rather should be translated as something like *bde 'gro* (Mahāvīyutpatti: no. 5372).
- 116 The third *pāda* of the Tibetan, which corresponds to the first one in the Sanskrit, is rendering *ebhir durāsadaih sārḍham* with *'grub dka' de dang lhan cig tu*. The expression *'grub dka'* is somewhat surprising for *durāsada* which rather should correspond to something like *bsnyen dka'* (Mahāvīyutpatti: no. 6575 s.v. *bsnyen par dka' ba*).
- 117 Note that the term *saṃpradāya* in the compound in the final *pāda* can (as it seems in the Tibetan translation) also be interpreted differently. While I chose to render the term as “tradition” in the sense of “established traditions according to transmission”, here picking up the term *gurupādaprasāda*, the other possibility, which seems to be also the Tibetan interpretation (*rab sbyin*), is to translate the term as “granting” in the sense of *sarvasiddhidam* (e.g., GS 1.17b).
- 118 “With such a spirit”, is a free rendering of *bhāvita*, literally meaning “made to become” or “cultivated, meditated, fostered etc.”.
- 119 Here, I follow S's emendation °*antare 'py*. K₁ attests *āntarety*, which does not convey any good sense.
- 120 The compound *mudrābandhakramaiḥ* is ambiguous. I took it as a *ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa*, with a *dvandva* as its first member, i.e., *mudrāyā bandasya ca kramaiḥ*. Therein, I take *bandha* as more or less synonymous with *āsana*, i.e., bodily postures. Alternatively, one may also interpret the first member as a *trītiyā-tatpuruṣa*, taking *bandha* as somewhat equivalent with *yoga* in the sense of union, i.e., having intercourse, with the consort. The Tibetan translation supports the *ṣaṣṭhī*-relationship of *mudrābandha* and *kramaiḥ*, but does not analyze the first member. It is, however, also possible to take the entire compound as a *dvandva*. Then, *mudrā* and *bandha* could be interpreted in the same way and *krama* in the sense of *utpattikrama*, i.e., “with consorts, bodily and creation stage practices”.
- 121 On the motif of the conventionality of tantric rituals and practices, reference to various later traditions (e.g., the *Dohā* traditions) may be given. Among others, reference shall be given to the *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* 5.34, and **Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa* 9–12 (both belonging to the *Grub pa sde bdun*). And the *Advayavivaraṇaprajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* 13–16, another text attributed to Padmavajra, reads: *svādhiṣṭhānam idaṃ prāpya sarvaḍṣṭivādaṇam | sarvaṃ kuryān na kuryād vā yathāhūritaceṣṭitaḥ || 13 || caityakarma na kurvīta na ca pustakavācanam | karotu vācayec cāpi svādhiṣṭhānakrameṇa tu || 14 || devān na vandayed evaṃ bhikṣūṃś cāpi na vandayet | athavā vandayet sarvān svādhiṣṭhānakrameṇa tu || 15 || mantranyāsaṃ na kurvīta mudrābandhaṃ tathaiḥ ca | mantrajāpaṃ na kuryād vā kuryāc ca pratibimbavat || 16 ||* ed. Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1987, p. 213.
- 122 The translation of *pādas* b and c in the Tibetan remains problematic. The pronoun *yā* in *pāda* two has not been rendered and instead of the expected *gang* (cf. 1.62 and 1.66) we find *grub*. Unable to account for this or to make sense of it, one may, tentatively, consider emending to *gang*. In the next *pāda*, we find *der ni* (usually rendering *tatra*) and *gang*, whereas, in the Sanskrit, the pronoun *tayā* (taking up the previous *yā*) and the particle *api* are attested. The latter, probably as the result of a later revision of the text, is reflected in Tib.^T. Also here, I am, besides assuming some form of translational liberty, unable to account for these discrepancies as it would have been rather easy to reflect the Sanskrit accurately, such as by reading something like *dngos grub de yis 'grub pa yang*.
- 123 The reading of *pāda* four remains uncertain. Both the Tibetan translation and MSs B (reading *tai*) and K₁ attest a pronoun (*taiḥ*), presumably taking up the formulation *vikalpalakṣaiḥ* as referring back to the various rites and practices addressed in GS 1.73–75(55–57) ed., and transl. in Part II, while in the previous edition S, no pronoun is attested, but the emphatic particle *eva* is used. S even reports (S_{kha,ga}) the same reading, as found in K₁, that attests *kiṃ tair vātra* (hypometrical); and it seems likely that the initial *tu* as attested in MS B, dropped out and that *vātra* is, in fact, a misreading of *nātra*. Depending on the Tibetan and MSs B and K₁, I have tentatively emended the text to *kiṃ tu tair nātra* which I consider the possibly older and more authorial reading of this *pāda*. The reading as printed in S, keeping in mind that *ta* and *na* can be easily confused in some of the north Indian scripts, might be an attempt of correcting a somewhat corrupted or mistaken reading such as one in which the superscribed *repha* fell out (e.g., the reading *t(n)ainātra*, was corrected to *naivātra*). In any case, however, the overall meaning remains the same also when

following the previous edition S. Further, it should be noted that, somewhat disrespecting the *pāda* break, have construed *siddhis tayāpi* with the first line and *sidhyanti* with the last *pāda*.

124 In *pāda* b, I follow the Tibetan translation *thob par 'gyur ba dgos ma yin* and take the corresponding Sanskrit *bhūṭayāpy atra kāraṇam*, as attested in the MSs, as referring back to *yā proktā bhūṭavādinām siddhiḥ* in 1.78, i.e., as referring to the *utpattikrama* practices outlined before. The previous edition S interpreted the Sanskrit as *bhūṭayā 'py atra kāraṇam*. Also, it remains unclear whether, in view of stanza 1.22, *tāvad* should be kept on its own, or as being read in compound with the following *bhūṭayā*. The transmitted reading, obviously, not only remains somewhat unclear but is also problematic in view of the Tibetan translation, which rather sounds as if having translated something like *prāptena/labdhena na prayojanam*. However, *dgos pa* is acceptable as a rendering of *kāraṇam*, while the particle *api* and the pronoun *atra* are not accounted for. Considering the reading *bhūṭayā*, it is conceivable that the underlying reading for *thob par 'gyur ba* was something like *prāptayā* or *bhūṭasya*, both of which, admittedly, are palaeographical not too close, and none of which, however, occurs in the GS or seems well attested in idiomatic expression using *atra kāraṇam*. One may note, moreover, that also in 1.22, the first time that the expression *tad alaṃ* is used followed by the same grammatical structure (*kim* plus instrumental), the Tietan translation is not a very good representation of the Sanskrit text.

125 The expression *yātiyātanaḥ* does not seem to be correct and has been emended, not free from doubt, to *nātiyātanaḥ*, applying the negation attested in the Tibetan (*mi 'thob*) and suspecting that some form of metathesis or dittography has occurred. The Tibetan renders the expression with *lus gdung* which, although I was unable to find it attested elsewhere, seems an acceptable rendering of *atiyātanaḥ*, which, as should be noted, likewise could not be found elsewhere by me. Here, for metrical purposes, I accept *atiyātanaḥ* as equivalent to what should be the correct feminine *atiyātanaḥbhiḥ*. That the text here is likely being corrupted is further supported by the fact that the reading in MS K₁ appears to be the result of a correction. The scribe started out by writing *yātiyāti* (K₁^{a.c.}), then canceled both vowel characters, and, finally, decided to cancel both syllables, before writing the “correct” version °*yātiyāta*°. Be that as it may, the overall content of this stanza makes this emendation, I believe, necessary.

126 Here, I follow the Tibetan interpretation of *pravistara* as *spros pa*. While the Sanskrit term usually should be rendered as something like *rgyas pa*, the underlying Sanskrit expression for *spros pa* usually is *prapañca*. In this context, however, the choice to render *pravistara* as *spros pa* is a reasonable one as both terms carry a sense of diffuseness and abundance, here, probably referring to various prescribed tantric ritual and visualized practices as described in GS 1.73–77, ed., and transl. in Part II. One may note that, in this context, both *pravistara* and *prapañca* are somewhat synonymous with *vikalpa*. Also, the previous edition S, against all MSs, emended the text to *sarvaṃ* not reading it in compound with *pravistara*. I do not see any good reason to follow S.

127 In the first *pāda*, the Tibetan translation attests an *upasarga* (*rnam = vi*°) that is not found in the Sanskrit, as if the translators had read *vyavasthitam* instead. This, likely, is the result of translational liberty, perhaps in order to derive at a proper meter.

128 In *pāda* b, the Tibetan translation is doubtful and possibly corrupted. It attests *rdzogs pa'i rnal 'byor rim pa nyid* as a rendering of *utpannakramayogataḥ*. Not only does one wonder why the elements *krama* and *yoga* have been inverted since, but the Tibetan translation also suggests an abstract noun suffix instead of the *tas* suffix. A closer rendering and much easier rendering would have been, for instance, *rdzogs pa rim pa'i rnal 'byor pyhir*.

129 One may note that the pronoun *ye* follows the silent emendation in S, in the edition of which the reading *yam* is reported for S_{ka,ga}, implying that S_{khs}, i.e., K₁, has the reading *ye*, which, however, is not the case as it also reads *yam*. In fact, the emendation finds only support in the Tibetan translation wherein a relative-correlative construction is clearly attested.

130 The previous editors in S propose an emendation from *susiddhau* to *susiddhir* in the final *pāda*. The reading as attested, however, seems to work well and is, meaning wise, supported by the Tibetan translation and, therefore, the proposition in S has been rejected. One may note further that the Tibetan translation does not reflect the *upsarga su*°, but has supplied the correlative pronoun *te* instead. Also this can be seen as translational liberty.

131 Here, in fact, all Sanskrit witnesses attest *agre*, which, following S and in partial support of the Tibetan, has been emended to *ajñō*.

132 The first line remains problematic. Instead of the reading *ajñō*, which I adopted from the previous edition S on the basis of the Tibetan translation *rmongs pa*, all Sanskrit witnesses, in fact, attest *agre*, which must be corrupt. The reading in *pāda* b, in partial support of the Tibetan translation, has been emended *siddhiṃ naikavikalpitaiḥ* with MS I attesting *siddhinaikavikalpitā* and MS K₁ *siddhir naikavikalpitāḥ*. The previous edition S proposes an emendation to *siddhīr naikavikalpitāḥ*, which I am unable to continue grammatically. Either *siddhi* should be the grammatical subject, requiring a passive construction, which would create various problems (*karmaṇi* → *ajñēna vāñchyate*), or the grammatical object. Since the latter alternative requires only the change from a *visarga* to an *anusvāra* (although palaeographical somewhat doubtful because of the ligature °*rnai*°), I have adopted this correction for the time being. Also the reading of *naikavikalpitāḥ*, since the 1st *vibhakti bahuvacana* does not seem to have a corresponding noun, is difficult to be construed without an emendation. Other than the emendation proposed (from the *prathamā* to the *trītiyā*), also a reading *naikavikalpitāḥ* (from *bahuvacana* to *ekavacana*) would work, taking it to qualify *ajñāḥ*. The Tibetan translation can be interpreted along the lines of the proposed reading. Yet, unfortunately, the reading *rmongs pa dngos grub 'dod gyur pa* remains ambiguous without clearly marking the object of the sentence. The expected translation of the Sanskrit text as proposed would rather correspond to something like *rmongs pa dngos grub la/ni 'dod gyur*. Finally, one may note that the adverb *anyatra* is not reflected in the Tibetan, which, instead of the expected *gzhan du*, has *rnam rtoḡ* and *brtags pa yi(s)*, both of which could correspond to *vikalpita*. It is not clear to me what has happened here and I am, regrettably, unable to see which underlying Sanskrit reading could explain this discrepancy.

- 133 The Tibetan translation in Tib.^{BDQ} attests *rnam par mnos* instead of the expected *rnam par gnas* as found in the probably revised version Tib.^T. Although Negi (1993–2005) attests *pratiṣṭaḥ* (s.v. *nod pa*, vol. 7), the form remains somewhat suspicious.
- 134 The first compound remains doubtful, reading *paramārthast(r)yaḥsara* (K₂ omits the ‘r’), the same reading as found in most of the sub-colophons of the remaining chapters. The Tibetan text, in all instances, has *yi ge gsum dang ldan pa’i*. In the previous edition S, the Sanskrit readings were kept in all instances but chapters one and four, where, possibly in reliance on the Tibetan, the text was corrected to *paramārthasatryakṣara*, the reading also adopted here. It is attractive in view of the fact that the formulation *tryakṣara* can be seen as referring to *trivajrābhedyā* which is used throughout the GS and which appears frequently in the *Guhyasamājantra* (i.e., 7.38d, 8.6b, 9.2b, 9.19b, 11.2f, 11.36b, 12.38b, 12.70b ff., 13.4b, 13.8b, 14.3b, 14.30b, 16.31b, 17.18b and 17.28d) and others (*Pinḍikrama* 73 ff., *Sekoddeśatikā* ad 5.145 et al.). It may be understood as referring to body, speech and mind related to the *vajrajāpa* expressed, e.g., in *Guhyasamājantra* 11.2: *oṃkāraṃ jñānahṛdayaṃ kāyavajrasamāvaham | āhkāraṃ bodhinairātmyaṃ vākvajrasamāvaham | hūmkāraṃ kāyavākittaṃ trivajrābhedyam āvaham |*. The reading of the Sanskrit witnesses, however, can also derived some sense from when interpreted as the “imperishable female (*strī*) [i.e., the GS] of ultimate meaning.” Another, admittedly unsecure, possibility is to emend to *paramārthasatyākṣara* (or *paramārthasadakṣara*), i.e., “The imperishable truth of ultimate meaning”. For none of these two latter options a reflex is found in the Tibetan translation or *Guhyasamāja* material. Further, some doubts also exist regarding the reading *sadbhāvoddhṛtāyāṃ* in the latter part of the compound. I follow S and the fact that this formulation, apparently, is attested throughout the remaining sub-colophons of the GS. The Tibetan renders this with *dam pa’i don nges par* in the first three sections and with *don nges par* in the remaining ones. In the title, the formulation *don nges par skul bar byed* is, as supposedly being the Sanskrit transcription of the subtitle, rendering the formulation *sakalatantrasadbhāvasaṃcodanī*. Thus, I accept *don nges par* in the GSs’ sub-colophons as a rendering of *sadbhāva* and hence follows S in the Sanskrit and corrected the Tibetan reading accordingly.
- 135 For a description of B, K₁, and K₂ see Gerloff and Schott (2024, p. 51 f. ‘2: The Text and its Witnesses.’). With regard to MS I, one may add, that it is of doubt worthy origin and authority. It shares most (yet not all, see Gerloff and Schott 2024, p. 68, nt. 94.) features with IASWR MBB-1971/2-104-114. It may be suspected a preprint of the *editio princeps* of B. Bhattacharya in 1929 (see *ibid.*, p. 66 ff. (2.1.7) for a description. In it *Jñānasiddhi* and *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* but not the GS were edited.
- 136 The foliation does not indicate the initial page to be missing, yet, in the available images, the first recto side of folio one is not extant and the text, similar to K₂ (!) starts only with GS 1.40b. One wonders whether the missing first side was the cover page, meaning that the copyist did not have a complete text at his/her disposal.
- 137 Likely an apograph of K₁, see, e.g., 1.81(60)c.
- 138 For discrepancies of S’s chosen reading and their often eclectic reports cannot be accounted for. It often is unclear which readings are reported and on which MSs the chosen readings rely. Further, the following conventions are applied:
- S^{em}. is used in cases where it seems clear that S proposed an emendation, either apparent due to a note or indicated by a reading in brackets that follows what is the reported MS(s) reading(s).
 - S^{ms}. is used for reports of MS(s) reading(s), may these be in footnotes, or the main text within parenthesis. In cases of, for instance, readings that are followed by proposed corrections etc. (S^{em}), the reported reading is also given as S^{ms}.
 - S^{nt}. is used to refer to all other forms of notes and annotations.
- 139 Note on the Tibetan Translation: According to all versions of the translation, the text was translated by the translator Tshul khriims rGyal ba (1011–1064) and a certain Indian *paṇḍita* Kṛṣṇa (*rgya gar gyi mkhan po krishna pandi ta dang | lo tsā ba dge slong tshul khriims rgyal bas bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa*, D: f. 28v⁴). Regarding the translator, see Thinlay Gyatso (2013), “Naktso Lotsāwa Tsultrim Gyelwa, Treasury of Lives”, accessed on 4 March 2022, <http://treasuryoflives.org/biographies/view/Naktso-Lotsawa-Tsultrim-Gyelwa/5801>. In the various colophons, the revisor of the *Jñānasiddhi* is named dGe slong Tshul khriims rGyal ba and, in other, he sometimes is called simply Nag ’tsho. Besides being accredited with the translation of the GS, it is noteworthy that he also was involved in the revision of the *Jñānasiddhi* which, as was discussed elsewhere (see Gerloff and Schott 2024, p. 117 ff. ‘2.2 Tibetan Translation’) could have taken place after 1042/3 CE when Rin chen bZang po, Dharmaśrībhadrā, Nag ’tsho and Atīśa met in Tibet at Thod ling (BDRC: G2194), the monastery founded by Rin chen bZang po under the patronage of Lha Bla ma Ye shes ’Od (BDRC: P8344) in 996/7 CE. Given the relation of GS and *Jñānasiddhi* and the fact that the GS is to be counted among a class of exegetical works related to the *Guhyasamājantra* of which also the *Jñānasiddhi* is part, one may assume that Nag ’tsho and Rin chen bZang po were not only aware about each other’s works but also collaborated in some respects. Overall, all Tibetan versions are very homogeneous, i.e., show only little and hardly significant variants. Unlike, e.g., the *Jñānasiddhi* (wherein significantly more substantial differences are found, see *ibid.*) or the *Advayasiddhi* (in the case of which significant differences exists comparing the canonically and extracanonical transmitted versions, see (Gerloff and Schott 2021, p. 11 ff.), ‘2.2 The Tibetan Translation(s)’), the witnesses of the GS consulted here, quite likely share a common ancestor. It may be noted further, that the quality of Q is mostly worse than that of D, i.e., with many orthographical mistakes such as *bṛtan* for *bṣtan*. B, mostly, follows D but, at times, preserves better readings. T, on the other hand, is very likely the result of heavy editorial work, which, however, gives the impression of being unfinished business. Almost in all cases, the readings are worse than in the other three witnesses investigated; the text is full of scribal errors, while the absolute majority of editorial revisions found are entirely unnecessary attempts to improve the text, which, mostly, was fine as it where, whereof most changes applied, in fact, make the text worse than it was prior to these changes. More noteworthy, however, is that all Tibetan versions consulted attest 21

additional verses not found in the Sanskrit text of the GS. Their readings, moreover, are, besides T, strikingly homogeneous with fewer variants than in the remaining verses. There are indications, as it were, on account of which it can be doubted that all of these additional verses were part of the original Sanskrit composition

Version T comprises of several rather elaborate paratexts for the entire section of the *Grub pa sde bdun*, including a *lo rgyus* (a narrative describing a text's origin), and a *bsdus don* (summary section) and a content outline (*sa bcad*). These are found on pp. 8–9 and pp. 69–88, respectively. The *bdus don* for chapter one in T reads: *de ltar gsang ba drub pa'i le'u dang pos de kho na nyid med na spyod pa dang brtul zhugs gang gis kyang mi 'grol da dang | de kho na nyid dang ldan spyod lam [T69⁵] brtul zhugs ci [read ji] ltar rigs pas cho ga pa dang | de kho na nyid (?) de yang ma ro sde (?) bya bas spyod pa sogs kyis kun nas bshad pa'ang mtshon mi nus pa de | dpal gsang ba 'dus pa las brtan nas phung po rin po che'i za ma tog du mngon sum du mtshon nus la | [T69⁶] de yang man ngag dang ldan pa'i bla ma brten pa la rab las de nyid gtso bo yin zhes 'chang bar byed do |*. For a brief description and discussion of the auxiliary textual materials found in T, see also Krug (2018, pp. 474–80) (dissertation).

The transcription in extended Whylied reads *sa ka (ka BDQ) ga T la tan+t+ra sad [Q5r²] b+hA wa (sad b+hA wa T] swa b+hA wa B; sa b+hA ba DP) sany+tso (sany+tso BDQ) san+tso T) dA (dA B] da DP; ta T) [T9³] ni shrI gu h+ya sid+d+hi nA ma | BDP] sa ga la tan+t+ra sad b+hA wa san co ta [T5r³] ni shrI gu ya si na di nA ma.*

don nges DQT] don dam pa'i don nges B.

skul BDQ] bskul T.

om prajñopāyā namaḥ I, S] om prajñopāyā S^{ms}. (haplography); om. B.

vajratikṣṇāya namaḥ S] namo vajratikṣṇāya B; namo vajratikṣṇāya nama I; S^{nt} notes that the homage formula, following the Tibetan (*bhoṭānusārī pāṭhaḥ*), should read *śrīvajrasattvāya namaḥ*. In fact, according to all Tibetan versions, it should read *śrīvajrasattvāya namo mañjuśrīkumāra[bhūtā]ya namaḥ |*.

dpal BDQ] om. T.

śāntaṃ nityoditaṃ yan (°t) B] nityoditaṃ yat I; nityotpannaṃ yatīndrair S^{em}. ; ya... mu S^{ms}. (lacuna); gang zhig rtag 'byung zhe la Tib.

agamyaṃ B, S] agam I (haplography).

tattvaṃ idaṃ em., Tib. (*de nyid de la*)] tattvatas taṃ B, I, S^{em}. , tattvas taṃ S^{ms}.

śrīmatkāyaṃ st., S^{em}.] śrīmaṅkāyaṃ B, I, S^{ms}.

°vṛtyā Sst.] °vṛtyā B, I.

zhi BDQ] zhing T.

rnam grol ba BDT] rnam grol ma Q.

zhig BDQ] gi T.

khyu BDQ] khyung T.

kyis BDQ] kyi T.

bsam gtan dang bral ba BDQ] bstan dang 'brel ba T.

sku yi BDQ] sku'i T.

gi BDQ] gis T.

nyid BDQ] gnyis T.

vakṣye S, Tib.] vande B; cakṣra I.

°sucaritāṃ S^{em}.] sucaritāṃ B, I, S^{ms}.

śreyasīṃ S^{em}.] śreyasī B, I, S^{ms}.

ratnabhūtāṃ S^{em}.] ratnabhūtā B, I, S^{ms}.

°tvāvāptihetoḥ em. (cf. 1.65)] °tvāvāptihetā° B; °tvāṃ vyāptiheto I, tvānyā(vā)ptiheto[h] Sed.; thob pa'i rgyur gyur cing Tib.

°baddhāṃ S] °baddhā B, I.

°kṛtyāṃ S] kṛtyā B, I.

janmabhūmiṃ S^{em}.] janmabhūmī B, I; janmabhūmīd S^{nt}.; skye sa rgyal ba rnams kyi Tib.

mātrī° S, Tib. (*ma*)] māta° B, I.

Here T inserts *rig bzang na skyes pa bu de | gzhi 'bras nga byar re de lam du byed pas | ye shes ba ni lam phyag rgya chen po'o | | bsam dang bsam bya sbyar ba'i tshul khriṃs rtog zhiṅ ston du bya'i* [T9⁶] *tshul gyis chu la chu bzahag tu |*.

po'i BDQ] po T.

rin chen BDQ] rin po cher T.

°ādhāraṃ B, S] °ādhārāṃ I.

°bhedyā° S^{em}. (= 5.16.b)] °bheda° B, I, S^{ms}.; mi phyed Tib.

vākpathātīta° S^{em}.] vāktathātīta° B; vākpathāgīta° I; vākkathātīta° S^{ms}.; gang gi spyod yul las 'das pa Tib.

- 176 gyi BDQ] gyis T.
 177 ngag gi em.] gang gi BDQ; ngag gis T.
 178 dang por DQT] dang po B.
 179 guhya° I, S, Tib. (*gsang*)] guñka° (?) B.
 180 anuttarā I, S, Tib. (*gsang ba grub pa bla med pa*)] anuttarām B.
 181 °cetasā I, S, Tib. (*sems ni*)] °cesā B.
 182 pas DQT] pa B.
 183 bhūtanāthena° I, B, S; cf. 1.45(31)a] sangs rgyas mgon pos Tib. → *buddhanāthena*.
 184 āpto° I, S] āyo° B; nges pa'i Tib.
 185 gang BDQ] ma T.
 186 pas DQ] pa BT.
 187 tyaktvā S^{em.}, Tib. (*spang bar bya*)] tyaktā B, I, S^{nt.} (cf. 1.81(60), 86(65)).
 188 °bhāvanam em. (cf. 65)] °bhāvanām I^{p.c.}, S; °navanām I^{a.c.}; bsgom pa'i phyir Tib.
 189 gyis BDQ] gyi T.
 190 Line one is cited in Tōh. 2098 (D: f. 108b).
 191 °saṃdoha° S^{em.}, Tib. (*bsdu ba*)] °saṃdeha° I, S^{nt.}.
 192 sarvaṃ S] sarva° I.
 193 brten DQT] bstan B (orthography).
 194 yi BDQ] yis T.
 195 rnam B] rnam DQT (orthography).
 196 °pradā S, Tib. (*ster ba*)] °padā I.
 197 Line one ≈ GS 1.4ab.
 198 pos BDQ] po T.
 199 Stanzas 1.6d (after *ādika**) up to 1.9b are omitted in B. There must have been some kind of eye skip during turning the page for copying the MS as the omission appears between the folio change from 1v to 2r.
 200 °siddhīnām B, S] °siddhinā I.
 201 gter BD] rten QT.
 202 °buddhānām B, S] °buddhānā I.
 203 skyed BDQ] bskyed T.
 204 dgra BQ] sgra DT (orthography).
 205 grub BDQ] bsgrub T.
 206 vyavasthitāḥ B, S] vyavasthitā I, S^{ms.}.
 207 pratiṣṭhitāḥ B, S] pratiṣṭhitā I, S^{ms.}.
 208 pa yis BDQ] pa'i T (possibly hypometrical).
 209 bsgom pa dag la BDQ] bsgom dag du ma T.
 210 sgrub BDQ] bsgrub T.
 211 der B] de DQT, Skt. (*yaśyā*).
 212 °rūpiṇīm I, S] °rūpiṇī B.
 213 virodhakāḥ S^{em.}] virodhikāḥ B, I, S^{ms.}; 'gal med par Tib.
 214 *pāda* c = GS 1.16c.
 215 zhugs BDQ] shugs T.
 216 dang BDQ] dang ba T (hypermetrical).
 217 thob DQT] 'thob B.
 218 °avadhivarjitam S^{em.}] °avadhivarjitām I, S^{ms.}; °varjitām B (haplography); nges pa yongs spangs nas Tib.
 219 ca ye B, S, Tib. (*gang yang*)] °cayaḥ I.
 220 kyi BDT] kyis Q.
 221 Line one is cited in Tōh. 1399 (D: f. 263a).
 222 dga' BDQ] dag T.
 223 āśu S, Tib. (*myur*)] āśu B, I.
 224 caryayā B, S] caryayāḥ I

- 225 brdzun gyi D] rdzun gyi BQ; rdzun gyis T.
 226 tshig gi B] tshig ni D, tshig gis Q; tshigs kyi T.
 227 yi BDQ] dang T.
 228 'dis ni BDQ] 'di yin T.
 229 paracittāpahāriṇaḥ I, S^(em.)] paracipahāriṇaḥ B; paravittāpahāriṇaḥ S^{ms}; (the emendation in S is within brackets as the edition suggests that MS I reads *vi*. It can however, be read as *ci*).
 230 jugupsāhīna° I, S] jugupyāhīva° B.
 231 mar B] ma DQT.
 232 dag BD] gang Q; dang T.
 233 āśu S] āṇu B, I, S^{ms}; om. Tib. (cf. 1.14c).
 234 °dhātūrdhvataḥ S^{em}, Tib. ('*dod kham*s kyi steng gi)] °dhātūrddhataḥ B, I, S^{ms}.
 235 °eṇa B, S] °ena I.
 236 ahaṃ I, S] aha B.
 237 *pāda* c = GS 1.12c.
 238 see note 159 above.
 239 see note 215 above.
 240 see note 210 above.
 241 sopāyāṃ I, S] sopāyī B.
 242 vajrasattva° I, S] varajasatva° B.
 243 gang BDQ] ba dang T (hypermetrical).
 244 tshe 'di nyid la BDT] tshe 'dis la las Q.
 245 Line two finds a parallel in Tōh. 477 (D: f. 253v), reading; *rdo rje sems dpa' nyid 'dra bar | | tshe 'di nyid la 'thob par 'gyur | |*, a text explicitly cited in *Jñānasiddhi* section 15, and, moreover, related to the earlier exposition of the Guhyasamāja-related traditions. On this tantra see also [Aciri \(2016\)](#), pp. 74-75).
 246 samprāptuṃ tair S^{em}, Tib. (*thob par* ...)] samprāpn(t)un ter B; samprāṣṇunter I; samprāṣṇuter S^{ms}.
 247 śubhā B, S] śubhāḥ I.
 248 see note 154 above.
 249 kyi BT] kyis DQ.
 250 rtag pa'i em., Skt. (*śāśvataṃ*)] rtogs pa'i BDQT ("Bindefehler").
 251 ba'i T] ba BDQ.
 252 tattvasaṃyuktair I, S, Tib. (*de nyid ldan pas*)] tattvaṃ saṃyuktair B.
 253 *pāda* b = GS 1.59d, 1.61b.
 254 de nyid BDQ] om. T (eye-skik from *nyid* to *nyid*).
 255 pas ni BDQ] pa yin T.
 256 thob DQ] 'thob B.
 257 mi BDQ] om. T (hypometrical).
 258 °dvaṃ paramaṃ S, Tib. (*mchog*)] °dvamaramaṃ I, B (hyplography).
 259 *pāda* d = GS 3.7b; line two cf. *Pañcakrama* 2.52cd.
 260 brtag BD] brtags Q; rtag T.
 261 rnam Q] rnams BDT.
 262 °vidhikramaḥ em.] °vidhiḥ kriyā B; °vidhikriyā I, S; rim pas Tib.^{DQ} → °*kramāt*.
 263 vistaratāṃ S^{em}] vistarakāṃ B, I, S^{ms}.
 264 rim DQT] rigs B.
 265 ji BDQ] ci T.
 266 pas BDQ] pa T.
 267 kim conj. (cf. 1.80a)] om. B, I, S.
 268 vikalpāntarakāriṇā B, S^{em}] vikalpyo nantarakāriṇā I; vikalpayo 'nantarakāriṇā S^{ms}.
 269 śāstre na em., Tib. (*bstan bcos ... mi dgos*)] śāstreṇa I, B, S.
 270 °niṣṭhasya S^{em}] °niṣṭhasyā I, B, S^{ms}.
 271 °rūpiṇaḥ S^{em}] °rūpiṇā B; °rūpiṇāḥ I, S^{ms}.
 272 *pāda* a ≈ GS 1.80a.

- 273 rtog des dgos DT] rtogs der dgo B, rtogs des dgos Q.
 274 pa yis BD] pa yi Q; pa'i yin T.
 275 pa'i BDQ] pa T.
 276 tattvena I, B, S] de nyid Tib. → *tattvaṃ*.
 277 °siddher S^{em}] °siddhe I, B, S^{ms}.
 278 *Pāda* d of 1.22 and *pāda* a of 1.23 are found in Tōh. 2098 (D: f. 108v).
 279 nyer BDT] nyes Q.
 280 S prints *paścāt*.
 281 tadantaraṃ B, I, S^{ms}, Tib. (*de yi rjes la*)] anantaraṃ S^{em}.
 282 gyur BDQ] 'gyur T.
 283 see note 156 above.
 284 spyad DQT] spyod B.
 285 see note 215 above.
 286 de yi BDQ] de'i T.
 287 guhyacaryāṃ ... caret conj., Tib.] om. B, S.
 288 gcig pu Q] gcig tu B, gcig pa D; cig dang T.
 289 brtan pa'i BDQ] bstan pa T.
 290 kyis ni DQ] nyid kyis B; nyid kying (*kyang* or *kyi* ?) T.
 291 de BDQ] der T.
 292 skyes gyur BDQ] skye 'gyur T.
 293 see note 215 above.
 294 °kāriṇā B, S] °kāraṇā I.
 295 yi Q] yis BDT.
 296 'tsho BDQ] mtsho T.
 297 'thob BDQ] mthong T.
 298 see note 215 above.
 299 sādhaḥ S] sādhaḥ B, I.
 300 cīrṇa° em.] cīrṇa° B, I, S^{em}; cīrṇair S^{em}; cf. 8.49b: *cīrṇavidyāvrataḥ sudhīḥ*.
 301 sgrub po BD (cf. 1.28c)] grub po Q; sgrub pa po T (hyoermetrical).
 302 kyang B] par DQT.
 303 see note 215 above.
 304 dman BDQ] man T.
 305 sādhaḥ S] śādhakā B, I.
 306 nirmuktāḥ S] nirmuktā B; nimuktāḥ I.
 307 °kalmaṣaiḥ S] °karmmaṣaiḥ B, I.
 308 see note 156 above.
 309 med BDQ] om. T.
 310 sgom BDQ] bsgom T.
 311 see note 215 above.
 312 thob BDQ] 'thob T.
 313 'thob DQT] thob B.
 314 see note 215 above.
 315 sogs kyis min B] kyis ni min DQ; sogs kyi min T.
 316 nas BDQ] na T.
 317 pa'ang NDQ] 'ang T.
 318 Cf. GS 1.27; see also *Jñānasiddhi* 16.9 et al.
 319 Cf. GS 1.28.
 320 mtshams BDQ] 'tshams T.
 321 Line in is found in Tōh. 3903 (D: f. 85v).
 322 see note 217 above.
 323 *pāda* om. Q.
 324 phun tshogs bdag nyid kyi DQT] phun sum tshogs bdag nyid B.

- 325 see note 310 above.
 326 Cf. GS 1.27.
 327 gi BDQ] kyi T.
 328 see note 154 above.
 329 see note 210 above.
 330 rtag BDQ] brtag T.
 331 lnga yi BDQ] lnga'i T.
 332 bstan BDT] brtan Q.
 333 see note 210 above.
 334 This verse is, with some variants, cited in Tōh. 2098 (D: f. 108b).
 335 see note 194 above.
 336 see note 176 above.
 337 brten BDQ] bsnyen T.
 338 mi BDQ] min T.
 339 bya BDQ] byas T.
 340 spyod BDQ] spyad T (*na ro* effaced).
 341 see note 176 above.
 342 spangs shing BDQ] sbang zhing T.
 343 Here, the Tibetan translation attests 14 verses (1.29–42) that are not extant in the Sanskrit as it is transmitted in the paper manuscripts. One can only hope that, at one point, an older and more complete Sanskrit witness of the GS will come to light by means of it and it can be discovered whether these verses were part of the original Sanskrit or not. The translation of this portion, without the Sanskrit, remains rather speculative in various places. Unlike in the case of 1.25, I was not able to reconstruct possible underlying Sanskrit readings since, and this certainly is a major point of doubt leaving the reader with a fair amount of suspicion, in most of the preceding fourteen verses the seemingly underlying readings of what supposedly should in many cases have been rather common expressions are not found at all in other places of the GS. This, given the nature of the GS, wherein we often find certain idiomatic expressions and other similar formulations dozens of times throughout the text, makes one wonder, unlike in the case of 1.25, if all these additional verses were of the hand of Padmavajra. Be that as it may, the content of these additional verses, basically elaborates on that of stanzas 1.27–28, i.e., pointing out that the efficacy of rituals and practices (including observances (*vrata/brtul zhugs*)) is limited and depends primarily on the tantric practitioners' (*sādhaka/sgrub po*) comprehension of reality (*tattva/de nyid*). In this way, this set of verses presents itself with a number of very famous topoi, that all can be summarized as the “conventional/limited nature of ritual and custom” and the “unfortunate course of the inferior.”
 344 tantre S] tamtrantre B (f. 2v⁴; dittography); trantre B (f. 3r⁴), I.
 345 prapañcāneka° B, S^(em.), Tib. (*du ma*)] prapañcāka° I, S^{ms.}.
 346 see note 282 above.
 347 sbas nas DQT] spang nas B.
 348 bhūta° B (3r⁵), I (cf. 1.5a.)] sūtā° B (2v⁶); buddha° S, Tib. (*sangs rgyas*).
 349 gis BDQ] kyi T.
 350 bzhag Q] gzhag BD; bzhags T.
 351 viditvā S] vititvā B; viditvā I.
 352 °cittam I, S] °cirttam B.
 353 see note 189 above.
 354 pa BDQ] pas T.
 355 'bad BDQ] bad T.
 356 °dvandva° S, Tib. (*rtsod pa*)] °dvanda° B, I.
 357 See note 354 above.
 358 One may note that, perhaps, the scribe changed from the folio 3r to 3v. The vowel sign for the *e*, for instance, was previously written either, as found in modern Nāgari, a line running diagonally from bottom right to top left with a curved hook at the end, e.g., *bhede*; or, alternatively, as a short thick line with a thickening to the left which is placed in front of the letter or the ligature, e.g., *ntre*. Now, however, it is written simply as a small stroke lengthening of the upper head line towards the left, e.g., *nte te* or indicated by a curvy way of writing the upper head line, e.g., *ve*. Also the retroflex *ṇa*, to name another example, is written differently, namely, with only a single right hand stroke following two E-shaped circles, e.g., *trṇa*, whereas before these letters were written in the “more modern” form, a right-left curved stroke running down to the right that underruns the two following right-handed straight downward strokes, e.g., *kariṇā*.
 359 On f. 3r in B, the text jumps back to °mānasah in 1.24b and repeats the entire text up to divyo° (marking the end of f. 3r⁷) in 1.48b, meaning that stanzas 1.24b–48(43)b are repeated on f. 3r for a second time. This must be the result of some kind of mix-up

of the folios in the copying process leading to the repetition of the verses. The readings in this repeated part are, besides two noteworthy variants, the same as those already reported. The first of the variants regard the dittography *taṃtrāntre* 1.43(29)a which is not found in the second occurrence of these verse wherein, simply *trāntre*, i.e., another form of dittography is read. The second of these variants regard the doubt worthy reading *sūtanāthena* (instead of *bhūtanāthena*) in 1.45(31)a, where in the second occurrence the reading *bhūtanāthena* is attested, a reading that, although at least goes into the right direction.

360 raurave B, S, Tib. (*'bod sogs par*)] raurava I.

361 bsgrubs BT] grub DQ.

362 sogs par 'tshed BDQ] la sogs 'tshod T.

363 vahnau S] vaktau B.

364 Cp. GS 1.24.

365 ṭṛṇadārvādi° S^{em}, Tib.] ṭṛṇadāvādi° B, I; ṭṛṇādai° S^{ms}.

366 °kṣipto I, S] °kṣiptā B.

367 °rohaṃ B, S] °vohan I.

368 see note 265 above.

369 'bar gyur pa DQ] spar gyur pas B.

370 rtswa BD] rtsa Q.

371 nas DQ] na BT.

372 tathā S^{em}, Tib. (*de bzhin*)] yatha B, I, S^{ms}.

373 narakam B, S] naraka I.

374 °saṃbhavaḥ S^{em}] saṃbhavas B; saṃbhavet I, S^{ms}.

375 see note 265 above.

376 gnas bar du DQ] gnas kyi bar B.

377 shi ba'i BDQ] shi'i T.

378 Line two is also found in Tōh. 3711 (D: f. 99v).

379 see note 265 above.

380 sbrul BDT] sbul Q.

381 rmongs pa'i BD] rmongs pa Q; mongs pa T.

382 nyid BDQ] gis T.

383 'gror B] 'gro DQT.

384 'ga' B] gzhan DQT.

385 'jug 'gyur DQ] 'jug gyur B; 'ju 'gyur T.

386 *jaḥ yi* (standardized) = dzaḥ yi B] dza yi DQ; dza'i T.

387 smad BDQ] rmad T.

388 Here, the Tibetan attests another three verses not extant in the Sanskrit. Therein, essentially (similar to the previous instance (i.e., stanzas 1.29–42), no crucial new content is added. These verses simply provide further similes related to the unfortunate inferior practitioner. In 1.51, the inferior practitioner is compared to someone who is “not being equipped with the antidotes (medicine or spell) for a poisonous snake and, being deluded, goes to the realms of Yama”, in 1.52 as someone who “is [like] without a boat to cross the vastness of the ocean, i.e., without supporting means, as death occurs”, and in 1.53 (about the correct interpretation of which I am in doubt) the inferior practitioner “being completely without generosity” is described “to go to Avīci on account of lesser and inferior actions”. References to the formulation *jaḥ yi mtha' can* can, e.g., be found in Tōh. 1808: D: f. 118v, wherein more elaborate context in relation to the above formulation can be consulted. The formulation appears more than a dozen times throughout exegetical Guhyasamāja literature in the *bsTan 'gyur* (Tōh. 1793, 1847, 1852, 2541, 4287, 4288, 4430, D 4420a).

389 duṣ° S] duṣ° B, I.

390 abhi° I, S] ābhi° B.

391 see note 286 above.

392 °saṃdoha° S^{em}, Tib. (*bsdus pa*)] °saṃdeha° B, I, S^{ms}.

393 des B] de DQT.

394 dhūrtāḥ S^{em}] dhūrtā B, I, S^{ms}.

395 °pañcakāḥ B, I, S^{ms}, Tib. (*spros*)] °vañcakāḥ S^{em}.

396 gr̥ddhatā° B, I] rāgādyā° S; 'dod cing Tib.^{DQT} • āśakta° B, I, Tib.^{DQT} (*chags pa'i*)] āśakta I; • cintās B, I] °cittās S; sems can Tib. (→ *sattvās*); blo ngan 'dod la chags Tib.^B.

397 byis BDQ] phyir T.

398 'dod la chags pa'i sems can gang em.] 'dod cing chags pa'i sems can gang DQT; blo ngan 'dod la chags sems can B.

- 399 las DQT] la B.
 400 śāṭhyena S^{em.}, Tib. (*g.yo sgyus*)] sādhyena B, I, S^{ms.}.
 401 °parāḥ S^{em.}, Tib. (*ched du byed*)] °parāḥ B; °param I, S^{ms.}.
 402 °abhimānino S] °abhimāninto B, I.
 403 ma DQT] mar B.
 404 gi DQT] gis B.
 405 vajrabhrātṛ° S^{em.}] vajamrātṛ° B; vajramātṛ° K_{1,2}, I, S^{ms.}.
 406 baddha° K₁, S, Tib. (*brtan pa*)] varddha° B, I, K₂.
 407 °daṃ paraṃ S] °sampadaṃ B; °daṃ padaṃ K₁^{P..c.} (dittography, K₁^{a..c.} effaced/overwritten); °daṃ padan K₂; °daṃ paraṃ S;
 om. Tib.
 408 bslu BT] slu DQ.
 409 brten T] brtan BDQ.
 410 des BDQ] de T.
 411 see note 217 above.
 412 °sya K₁, S] °śya B, K₂; °ṇya I.
 413 In MS B, beneath *yāvat prāptaṃ* in the lower margin a note is found reading “*nprā*”, which I interpret as the suggestion to correct the *sandhi*, i.e., to the read *yāvan prāptaṃ* instead of *yāvat prāptaṃ*. The correct *sandhi*, however, should rather be *yāvad prāptaṃ*. I have kept the reading *yāvat* in the *pausa* as attested in all other MSs.
 414 'di BDQ] de T.
 415 see note 265 above.
 416 see note 189 above.
 417 brtan BDQ] brten T.
 418 In MS B, for unknown reasons, an *avagraha* seems inserted before *vyavasthitam*.
 419 ko (')yaṃ B, I, K₁, S, Tib. (*su zhig*)] kāyaṃ K₂.
 420 ci T (em.), Skt. (*ka°*)] ji BDQ; Note that *ci* and *ji* are often used interchangeably and that in T *ci* is commonly used in place of *ji*, whereof em. has been added in parenthesis before the *lemma*.
 421 see note 266 above.
 422 S prints *dr̥ṣṭvā 'py*.
 423 ekākinam K₁, S, Tib. (*gcig pu*)] kākinan B, I, K₂.
 424 punar B, K_{1,2}, S] puna I.
 425 daridratā B, K_{1,2}, S] daridratāḥ I.
 426 gcig BDQ] cig T.
 427 nas DQT] na B.
 428 ring po nas BDQ] ri bor gnas T.
 429 nang BDQ] nad T.
 430 nas rtsal D] nas tsam BQ; nam T (hypometrical).
 431 vidhās tu S, Tib. (*de lta bu yi*)] vidhā tu B, I, K_{1,2}.
 432 na B, I, K₁, S, Tib.^{BDQ} (*mi*)] ra K₂; myur Tib.^T.
 433 paraṃ parama° B, K_{1,2}, S, Tib.] parasparan I.
 434 *pāda* d = 1.66d, ≈1.58b.
 435 bu yi BDQ] bu'i T.
 436 see note 217 above.
 437 mi BDQ] myur T (dittography).
 438 °apare BP^{c.}, K_{1,2}, S, Tib.] °apa > r < re B^{a.c.} ('r' hook canceled); °aparam I.
 439 tyaktalajjā S, Tib. (*spangs*)] tyaxxlajjā K₁^{P..c.} (K₁^{a..c.} effaced), tyakṣalajā B, I, K₂.
 440 dūrācārāḥ B, I, K_{1,2}, Tib. (*spyod pa ring*)] durācārāḥ S.
 441 °guṇadūṣakāḥ BP^{c.}, K₁, S] °gu > ṇa < dūṣakāḥ B^{a.c.} (added interlinear); °guṇadūyakāḥ I; °guṇaduṣakāḥ K₂.
 442 pa BDT] dang Q.
 443 mthong BDQ] ba thong T (hypermetrical).
 444 tsha BDQ] mtshar T.
 445 spangs DQ] spong B; spang T.

- 446 tantrasaṃgraha° S^{em.}, Tib. (*rgyud ni bsdu ba*)] tatra sadgraha° B, I, K_{1,2}, S^{ms.}; (the ligatures *ñgra* and *dgra* are almost identical in K₁).
- 447 tatsvabhāva° K₁, S^{ms.}, Tib.] ta > tsa < bhāva° B^{a.c.} (added interlinear); tabhāva° B^{a.c.}; tatsābhāva° K₂; tatmabhāva° I; tattvabhāva° S^{em.}.
- 448 nābhiṣiktā nānujñātāḥ conj., Tib. (*dbang bskur rjes gnang med par yang*)] nābhiṣiktā na tu jñātāḥ K₁, S; nābhiṣiktām anujñātāḥ B, K₂; nābhiṣiktānujñātāḥ I.
- 449 kurvate S^{em.}] kurvante B, I, K_{1,2}, S^{ms.}; (see 1.66).
- 450 sattva° B, I, K_{1,2}, S^{ms.}] śiṣya° S^{em.}, Tib. (*slob ma*).
- 451 bsdu ba DQ] bsdus pa BT.
- 452 kyis BDQ] kyid T (*kyi* or *kyang* ?).
- 453 de yi BD] de'i T.
- 454 bltas BDQ] lta T.
- 455 med par BDQ] mder T (haplography, hypometrical).
- 456 °mantrās em., Tib (*gsang sngags*)] °mātrās B, I, K_{1,2}, S.
- 457 vīkṣya K₁, S, Tib. (*mtshong*)] vī?ta B; vikṣya I; vījya K₂.
- 458 naiva B, K_{1,2}, S, Tib.] taiva I.
- 459 jānanti B, I, K₁, S, Tib. (*mtshong*)] jānunti K₂.
- 460 *pāda* b = GS 1.69(51)b.
- 461 bas DQT] na B.
- 462 dga' gyur BDQ] dag 'gyur T (*tsheg* misplaced).
- 463 la T (em.), Skt. (*ācāryaṃ*)] las BDQ.
- 464 pa DQT] pas B.
- 465 rnam BDQ] rnam T.
- 466 spangs DQ] spang B; spongs T.
- 467 *pāda* three of 1.64 and *pāda* two of 1.65 are found in Tōh. 3948 (D: f. 288r).
- 468 kurvate S^{em.}] kurvante B, I, K_{1,2}, S^{ms.}; (see 1.64).
- 469 *pāda* d = 1.62d, ≈ 1.58b.
- 470 ni BD] na Q; nas T.
- 471 bka' yis BD] bka' yi Q; bka'i T.
- 472 par BDQ] om. T (hypometrical).
- 473 pas bstan DT] pa bsten B; pas brtan Q.
- 474 eteṣāṃ K₁, S] eteṣāṃs B, I, K₂.
- 475 pāpa° B, I, K₁, S] pā° K₂.
- 476 asan° I, K_{1,2}, S] asat° B • °vṛttānām I, K_{1,2}^{a.c.}, S] °varttanām (?) K₂^{p.c.}.
- 477 dang DQT] ni B.
- 478 see note 426 above.
- 479 This verse is cited in Tōh. 3948 (D: f. 289v).
- 480 phongs BDQ] 'phongs T.
- 481 nad kyis gtse BD] nad kyis btse Q; kyis ni gtse T.
- 482 bar 'gyur BDQ] ba yin T.
- 483 This verse is likewise not found in the available Sanskrit texts of the GS. Similar to the previous two instances, no comparable formulations in the GS are found with the help of which the verse could be reconstructed faithfully. Its somewhat repetitive content accords with that of the directly preceding verse, stating that "After death, one is tormented by pain, miseries, afflictions and various diseases, one will proceed to hell [and] one will be go to a bad rebirth."
- 484 dūrāsadaīḥ sārdhaṃ K₁, S, Tib. (*'grub dka'*)] dūrāsadaīḥ sārdhaṃ B; dūrāsadaīḥ sārdha I, K₂.
- 485 °varjitaiḥ B, K_{1,2}, S] °vajjitaiḥ I.
- 486 vāso 'pi I, K₁, S] vāsāpi B, K₂ (dittography).
- 487 kartavyaḥ B, K₁, S, Tib. (*bya*)] vārtavyaḥ I, K₂ (dittography).
- 488 saugatīm I, K₁, S] saugatām B; saugatī° K₂.
- 489 icchatā K₁^{p.c.}, S] icchatām B; ithatām I; icchatā<ya> K₁^{a.c.} (effaced); icchatān K₂.
- 490 *pāda* b = GS 1.65(48)d.

- 491 bsgrub T] 'grub BDQ.
 492 ciraṃ B, K_{1,2}, S, Tib.] ciuṃ I.
 493 kālaṃ B, K₁, S, Tib. (*du*s)] kāraṃ K₂.
 494 dṛḍham B, K₁^{P.C.}, S] dṛ<ḍha>m K₁^{a.c.} (added interlinear, effaced spot left free).
 495 Line one, cf. GS 1.42, 1.44.
 496 ācāryaṃ B, K₁, S] ācārya I, K₂.
 497 gyis BDT] gyi Q.
 498 see note 265 above.
 499 kyis BQ] kyi DT.
 500 brtan pa ru DQ] brtan par ni B; bsnyen par ni T.
 501 byed BDQ] om. T.
 502 gurūpādaprasādataḥ B, I, K₁, S, Tib. (*bla ma'i zhabs kyi(s) bka' drin gyis*)] gurūpādataḥ K₂ (haplography).
 503 śiṣyaḥ S, Tib.] śiṣya° B, I, K_{1,2}.
 504 *pāda* b ≈ GS 2.4b; *pāda* d ≈ GS 5.31b.
 505 par B] pa'i DQT.
 506 rab sbyin gnas BDQ] par byin nas T.
 507 kyi BQ] kyi D.
 508 see note 189 above.
 509 bgegs DQ] gegs BT.
 510 med 'thob 'gyur ba DQ] med par 'thob 'gyur B (unmetrical); med thob 'gyur pa T.
 511 siddhir I, K₁, S] siddhi° B, K₂.
 512 āśu S] āśu I, K₁, āśu B, K₂.
 513 bhāvitena I, K₁^{P.C.}, S] bhāvitena<ā> B, K₁^{a.c.} (rubbed out), K₂.
 514 divānīśam K₁, S] divānīśam B, I, K₂.
 515 °rājena trivajrā° K₁^{P.C.} ('tri' added interlinear), S] rājena >ja° < vajrā K₁^{a.c.} ('ja' rubbed out), rājatṛvajrā° B, K₂; rājena trvajā° I.
 516 *pāda* d ≈ GS 1.3b, 1.12b.
 517 ste BDQ] te T.
 518 des 'thob DQ] nges 'thob B; de 'thob T.
 519 °mudrā° I, K₁, S] °mūdṛā° B, K₂ (cf. 1.75(57)b) • °vistaraiḥ B, K_{1,2}, S] °vistāraiḥ I.
 520 naika° B, K_{1,2}, S] neka° I • 'py S] °ty B, I, K_{1,2}; om. Tib.
 521 see note 210 above.
 522 °catuṣkeṇa B, K_{1,2}, S, Tib.] ca guhyeṇa I; ca guhyena S^{ms.} (S_{ka} = I).
 523 mtshams bzhi BDQ] 'tshams bzhis T.
 524 yul BDQ] 'chad T.
 525 yis BDT] yi Q.
 526 brtags DQ] bratg B; dag T.
 527 °mudrā° I, K₁, S] °mūdṛā° K₂ (cf. 1.73(55)b) • °kramais I, K_{1,2}, S] kramaiḥ B.
 528 caitya S, Tib. (*mchod rten*)] caitra° B, I, K_{1,2}.
 529 smyung BDQ] bsnyung T.
 530 rim B, Skt. (°*kramaiḥ*)] rigs DQ; rig T.
 531 dang BDQ] yang T.
 532 las BDQ] la T.
 533 byed pa yis DT] skyed byed pas B; byed pa yi Q.
 534 *pāda* b = GS 1.22b.
 535 Also this verse is not found in the available Sanskrit texts of the GS. The content of the verse, however, seems a little less repetitive than in the previous instances and, like in the case of the first reconstructed verse (1.25), seems a relatively likely candidate for having been part of the original composition, whereof I have decided to introduce this verse in the main body of the annotated translation. Moreover, it is noteworthy that in *pāda* d of 1.76, the expression '*byung ba yi ngon po*, i.e., **bhūtanātha* is used, whereas the two occurrences of the term *bhūtanātha* in the Sanskrit text of the GS (in verses 1.5 and 1.45(31)), the Tibetan translation attests **buddhanātha* (Tib. *sangs rgyas ngon po*) instead.
 536 evaṃ S, Tib. (*de ltar*)] ekaṃ B, I, K₁, eka° K₂ ("Bindefehler").

- 537 MS B appears to have cancellation marks on top of the syllable *pro*, however without any sort of proposed correction or alternative form this ligature somewhere in the margins etc.
- 538 tayāpi I, K_{1,2}, S (prints *tayā* 'py)] tayo 'pi B.
- 539 K₁, for unknown reasons, has an insertion mark seemingly indicating the addition of another "d" written interlinear above the work (*si<d>dhyanti*). The same phenomenon is found in GS 1.81(60)c and 1.87(66)d.
- 540 kiṃ tu tair nātra em., Tib. ('on *kyang* 'dir/der ni 'di/de mi)] kintu tai vātra B; kiṃ tair vātra K₁, S_{kha,ga} (hypometrical); vi cātra K₂; kiṃ tu naivātra I, S.
- 541 pāda b ≈ 1.62d, 1.66d.
- 542 gis BDT] gi Q.
- 543 gsung pas BD] gsung ba Q; gsang ba T.
- 544 pa'ang T] pa'am BDQ
- 545 'dir DQT] der B.
- 546 de DQT] 'di B.
- 547 see note 426 above.
- 548 bskal BDQ] skal T.
- 549 see note 426 above.
- 550 srid BDQ] bsrid T.
- 551 see note 210 above.
- 552 gis BDQ] gi T.
- 553 see note 417 above.
- 554 sgrub Q] bsgrub BT; 'grub D.
- 555 po BDQ] pos T.
- 556 zhing BDQ] gis T.
- 557 Also the content of these additional verses does not seem necessarily relevant for the content at hand and, perhaps, feels slightly misplaced within the overall context. The first verses tell us that "Who [practices] for a year, an eon, or to the end of one or two lifetimes, will obtain accomplishment, and will increase the doctrine (*dharmaparyāya*). The next one states that "Who is firm and without attachment in meditation for innumerable births, becomes a siddha with the capacity of being accomplished [?] and will teach [the Dharma] just as before."
- 558 kiṃ B, I, K₁, S, Tib.] om. K₂.
- 559 S prints *bhūtayā* 'py.
- 560 nātiyātanañi conj., Tib. (*lus gdung. . . mi*)] yātiyātanañi B, I, K₁^{P.c.}, K₂, S; yāti<yīti>nañi K₁^{a.c.} (canceled, dittography).
- 561 *pāda* a ≈ GS 1.22a.
- 562 'gyur BDQ] gyur T.
- 563 gdung DQT] gdungs B.
- 564 tyaktvā S, Tib. (*spangs nas*)] tyaktā B, I, K_{1,2} (cf. 1.5, 86(65)).
- 565 sarva° B, I, K_{1,2}] sarvaṃ S.
- 566 K₁, for unknown reasons, has an insertion mark seemingly indicating the addition of another "d" written interlinear above the work (*si<d>dhyate*). The same phenomenon is found in GS 1.77(58)c and GS 1.87(66)d.
- 567 janmanīhaiva S, Tib.] om. K₁, K₂ (omission indicated by double dots in the length of the missing piece).
- 568 See note 465 above.
- 569 see note 189 above.
- 570 'grub BDQ] grub T.
- 571 °samājāt paraṃ B, I, K₁, S, Tib. ('*dus las mchog gzhan*)] °samājāraṃ K₂ (haplography).
- 572 Here the first chapter of the GS in MS B is finished as, apparently, one folio side has been skipped in the copying process of this MS as the text after here continues with the second line of GS 2.13 *ni(h)svabhāvasya śuddhasya . . .*
- 573 °ṇām ut° I, K₁^{P.c.}, S, Tib.] °ṇā >u<t° K₁^{a.c.} ("u" canceled, "mu" added in upper margin).
- 574 see note 176 above.
- 575 See note 562 above.
- 576 gyi BD] gyis QT.
- 577 ut° I, K₁, S] ūt° K₂.
- 578 samājaṃ I, K₁, S] samāje K₂.
- 579 ye na I, K₂, S, Tib. (*gang gis mi shes pa*)] yan na K₁; S_{ka,ga}.
- 580 susiddhau K₁, S^{ms.}] susiddhir S^{em.}.

- 581 ghaṭate I, K₁, S] ghaṭake K₂.
 582 pas Q] pa'i BD; pa T.
 583 pas B] pa DQT.
 584 See note 552 above.
 585 de yis BDQ] de'i T.
 586 ci T (em.), Skt. (*ka*^o)] ji BDQ (cf. note 413)
 587 rib sel BDQ] rim gsal T.
 588 ajño S^{em.}, Tib. (*rmongs pa*)] agre I, K_{1,2}, S^{ms.} ("Bindefehler"); S^{nt.} notes that the accepted reading follows the Tibetan "*grhūtapāṭhas tu bhoṭānusārini*".
 589 vāñcchati K₁, S] vācchati I; vācchatri K₂.
 590 so (')nyatra I, K₁, S] so (')nyetra K₂; om. Tib.
 591 siddhiṃ naikavikalpitaiḥ em.] siddhinaikavikalpitā I; siddhir naikavikalpitāḥ K₁, S^{ms.}, siddhīr naikavikalpitāḥ S^{em.}; rnam rtog du mas brtags pa yis... dngos grub Tib.
 592 ca K₁, S, Tib. (*dang*)] om. I, K₂.
 593 °tṛṣṇakām S] °tuṣṇikā I; °>mu<ṣṇikā K₁^{a.c.} (dittography); °<tṛ>ṣṇikā K₁^{p.c.} ("mu" canceled, "tṛ" aded interliner); °tṛṣṇikā K₂.
 594 In the last *pāda*, I have adopted the correction of the text to *mṛgatṛṣṇakām* as found in S. The witnesses show various smaller forms of corruptions. Variations of this famous verse (with a focus on the simile in line two) are found, e.g., in the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā* 6.6.9.1, the *Laghusaṃvaratantra* (i.e., *Herukābhidhāna*) 3.19, as well as non-Buddhist sources, e.g., the *Brahmayāmālatantra* 12.45, and the *Tantrasadbhāva* 28.88.
 595 brtags BDQ] brtag T.
 596 yis BDQ] yi T.
 597 rdeg BDQ] brdeg T.
 598 'thung DQT] 'thungs B.
 599 tyaktvā K₁, S, Tib. (*shing/zhing*)] tyaktā I, K₂ (cf. 1.5, 81(60)).
 600 °upāyaṃ K_{1,2}, S] °upāya I.
 601 yi DQT] yis B.
 602 spangs byas shing BDQ] spang bya zhing T.
 603 see note 265 above.
 604 gnas T] mnos BDQ.
 605 aharniśaṃ S] ahanniśaṃ I; aharnisaṃ K_{1,2}.
 606 K₁, for unknown reasons, has an insertion mark seemingly indicating the addition of another "d" written interlinear above the work (*si<d>dhyate*). The same phenomenon is found in GS 1.77(58)c and GS 1.81(60)c.
 607 des DQ] nges B; nge T.
 608 gcig pa DQ] gcig la B; cig pas T.
 609 see note 266 above.
 610 bsgom DQT] goms B.
 611 na BDQ] nas T.
 612 tshom BDQ] tsom T.
 613 tithir K₁, S] tithi I, K₂.
 614 na ca nakṣatraṃ I, K₁, S] na ca kṣatraṃ ca K₂ (haplography).
 615 cf. *Advayasiddhi* 2 and 3, *Jñānasiddhi* 1.86 and 16.9 and also GS 4.71.
 616 see note 529 above.
 617 'gyur BDQ] 'grub T.
 618 Line one of this verse is found in Tōh. 495 (D: f. 418r); Line two is found in Tōh. 2220 (D: f. 61v).
 619 vajra° K_{1,2}, S] vaja° I.
 620 trivajrāmālāṃ em., Tib. (*rdo rje gsum*)] tṛvajyāmālāṃ K_{1,2}; tu vajāmālā I; tu vajrāmālāṃ S.
 621 janmādbhāv atipāpavīcigahane S^{em.}] janmo vandhati yāpavīcigahane I; janmāvandhati pāpavīcigahane K₁^{p.c.} ('o' canceled); janmo bandhati pāpavīcigahane K₁^{a.c.}, S_{ka,kha,ga}; janmo bandhati pāpavīcigahana° K₂; skye ba'i rgya mtsho ... mang ldan pa la Tib.
 622 potaika° I, S, Tib._B (*grur*)] yonaika K_{1,2} (badly copied).
 623 ārabheta matimān I, K₁, S] ārabheti mamān K₂ (metathesis, haplography).
 624 tantroktamārgānuṣaṃ K₁, S] tantroktamārgānuṣaṃ I; tantraiktamārgānuṣaṃ K₂.

- 625 In K₁, the final “m” (ma with *virāma*), somewhat strangely, has been canceled and the written again.
 626 °udayaṃ K_{1,2}, S] °udaya I.
 627 gyi BT] gyis DQ.
 628 rlab drag D] rlab dag BQ; brlab dag T.
 629 grur B] grub DQT.
 630 see note 426 above.
 631 sgrub B] ’grub DQ; bsgrub T.
 632 see note 210 above.
 633 deng nas BDQ] de nas T.
 634 °satrya° S^{em}. (cf. remaining chapter titles), Tib. (*yi ge gsum dang ldan pa’i*)] °strya° IP.^c (°āstry° I^{a.c}), K₁, S^{ms}; °styā° K₂ • °sadbhāva° I, S] °sabhāva° K₁, K₂; dam pa’i don Tib.
 635 °siddhau S^{em}.] °siddhi I, K_{1,2} • °sādhana° K₁, S] °dhana° K₂.
 636 °vrata° I, K₁^{p.s.}, K₂, S’ °vrata>° K₁^{a.s.} (canceled).
 637 see note 220 above.
 638 don nges par em.] dam pa’i don nges par BDQT.
 639 las B] dang DQT.
 640 bstan pa’i BDQ] bstan pa zhes bya ba’i T.

References

Primary Sources

- Advayavajra, *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgītiṭīkā Sārābhisamaya. mTshan brjod ’grel pa snying po mngon par rtogs pa. Tōh. 2098. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 49 (tsi), ff. 95r–129r.
- Abhayadatta, *Caturaśītisiddhapravṛtti. (not preserved in Sanskrit). ’Phags yul grub chen brgyad cu rtsa bzhi’i byin rlab skor las lo rgyus rnam par thar pa rnam. Ō. 5091. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (Pe cing), rGyud, Vol. 87 (lu), ff. 1r–68r (pp. 173–201).
- Abhayākara Gupta, *Muni-matālaṃkāra. Thub pa’i dgongs pa’i rgyan, Tōh. 3903. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), mdo (dbu ma), Vol. 109 (a), 73v–293r.
- Anaṅgavajra, *Prajñopāyavinīcayasiddhi*. 1987. *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhisamgraha. Rare Buddhist Text Series No. 1*. Edited by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).
- Amṛtavajra, *Dohākoṣaṭīkā*. 2019. *Kṛṣṇacaryāpādasya Dohākoṣaṭīkā—A study of its commentaries: Edited, translated, and annotated, together with a survey of his life and works and a study on the dohā as a literary genre*. Edited by Julian Schott. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Hamburg in the doctoral studies program Indology (South Asian Studies) in partial fulfillment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Dr. Phil.).
- Āryadeva, *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (a.k.a. *Sūtaka*). 2000. *Caryāmelāpakapradīpam of Ācārya Āryadeva. Rare Buddhist Text Series No. 22*. Edited by Janardan Shastri Pandey. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).
- Āryadeva, *Śrīguhyasamājanīṣpannakramāntaka. dPal gsang ba ’dus pa’i rgyud kyi dka’ ’grel. Tōh. 1847. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 39 (nyi), ff. 145r–318r.
- *Āryācalamahākroḍharāṅjasya Sarvathāgatasya Balāparimitavīravīnayasvākyāta nāmakaḥ. De bzhi gshegs pa thams cad kyi khro bo’i rgyal po ’phags pa mi g.yo ba de’i stobs dpag tu med pa rtul phod pa ’dul bar gsungs ba zhes bya ba’i rtog pa. Tōh. 495. In *bKa’ ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 10 (pha), ff. 232v–285v.
- Āryadeva, *Śrīguhyasamājanīṣpannakramāntaka. dPal gsang ba ’dus pa’i rdzogs rim mthar phyin pa. Tōh. 1808. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 35 (ngi), ff. 118v–121r.
- Atīśa Dīpaṃkara-Śrījñāna, *Bodhi-mārga-pradīpa-pañjikā. Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma’i dka’ ’grel, Tōh. 3948. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), mdo (dbu ma), Vol. 111 (khi), ff. 241r–293r.
- Bhavyakīrti, *Pradīpoddyotanābhisamdhīprakāśika (nāma vyākhyāṭīkā). Gron ma gsal ba byed pa’i ṭī kā dgongs pa rab gsal. Tōh. 1793. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 32 (ki) ff. 1v–292r (Tōh. 1793.1) and Vol. 33 (khi) fol. 1v–155r (Tōh. 1793.2).
- ’Bri gung A mgon Rin po che et al., ’Bri gung chos mdzod (’Bri gung bka’ brgyud chos mdzod chen mo). Lha sa: ’Bri guñ mthil dgon. 2004. (BDRC: MW23779).
- Dārikapāda, *Guhyamahāguhyatattvopadeśa. 2023. *Dārikapa’s Instruction on Reality—The Great Secret of Secrets from Uddīyāna*. Edited by Juian Schott. Asian Literature and Translation 10.2, pp. 134–168.
- *Dharmendra, *Tattvasārasamgraha. De kho na nyid kyi snying po bsdu pa, Tōh. 3711. In *bsTan ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 78 (tsu), fol. 78v–100r.
- Ḍombīheruka, *Sahajasiddhi*. 1967. *Sahajasiddhi*. Edited by Malati J. Shendge. In *Indo-Iranian Journal* (III) X.2/3, pp. 126–149; Tōh 2223.
- Guhyasamājantra. 1978. *The Guhyasamāja Tantra—A New Critical Edition*. Edited by Yukei Matsunaga. Osaka: Toho Shuppan, Inc.
- Guhyendumañitilaka (nāma Mahātantrārāja). dPal zla gsang thig le zhes bya ba rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po. Tōh. 477. In *bKa’ ’Gyur*, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 83 (ja), ff. 247v–303r.

- Hevajratantra. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study. Part II Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*. Edited by Snellgrove, David L. London: Oxford University Press.
- Indrabhūti, Jñānasiddhiḥ. 2024. *Indrabhūti's Jñānasiddhiḥ: A Revised Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text and its Tibetan Translation with English Translation and Reproductions of the MSS*. Edited by Torsten Gerloff and Julian Schott. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente (Manuscripta Buddhica 4).
- *Kākacakraḥkīrti/yaśas, *Āryamañjuśrīnāmasaṃgītiānuśaṃsāvṛtti. 'Phags pa 'jam dpal gyi mtshan yang dag par brjod pa'i phan yon gyi 'grel pa. Tōh. 1399. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 15 (pha), ff. 232v–285v.
- Kuladatta, Kriyāsaṃgrahaṇīkā. 2004. *Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgrahaṇīkā—A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Selected Chapters*. Edited by Ryugen Tanemura. Groningen Oriental Studies No. 19. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Laghuśaṃvaratantra (a.k.a. Herukābhīdhāna). 2002. *Śrīherukābhīdhānam Cakrasaṃvaratantram with the commentary of Bhavabhṭṭa*. Edited by J. S. Pandey. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series No. 26. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).
- Lakṣmīnārā, Advayasiddhi. 2021. *Śrīlakṣmīnārā's Advayasiddhi—gNyis su med par grub pa'i sgrub thabs—Critically edited, translated, and annotated*. Edited by Torsten Gerloff and Julian Schott. Crema: Libri di Marpa; 1964. Advayasiddhi. Edited by Malati J. Shendge. In M.S. University Oriental Series 8; Tōh. 2220.
- Lakṣmīnārā, *Sahajasiddhipaddhati. lHan cig skyes grub kyi gzhung 'brel zhes bya ba (*Sahajasiddhipaddhati nāma). Tōh. 2261. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 52 (zhi), ff. 4r–52r.
- *Mamhikavi, *Kalāpasūtravṛttisādhivibhaktiprakriyā. Ka lā pa'i mdo dang 'grel pa'i si la sogs pa'i rnam dbye'i bya ba. Tōh. 4288. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), mDo (sgra), Vol. 196 (she), ff. 54v–97r.
- Mahāvīyutpatti. 1916–25. *Honyaku myōgi taishū (Mahāvīyutpatti)*. Edited by Ryōzaburō Sakaki. 2 vols. Kyoto: Shingonshū Kyōto Daigaku, [Reprint: Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1987].
- Nāgārjunapāda, Pañcakrama (a.k.a. Sarvaśuddhivīśuddhikrama). 1994. *Pañcakrama—Sanskrit and Tibetan texts critically edited with verse index and facsimile edition of the Sanskrit manuscripts*. Edited by Mimaki, K. and Toru Tomabechi. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- Nārōpā, Sekoddeśatikā (a.k.a. Paramārthasaṃgraha). 2006. *The Śaḍāṅgayoga by Anupamarakṣita with Raviśrījñāna's Guṇabharaṇī-nāma-śaḍāṅgayogaṭippaṇī—Text and Annotated Translation*. Edited by Francesco Sferra. Serie Orientale Roma No. LXXXV. Roma: IsIAO.
- Padmavajra, Advayavīraṇaprajñopāyavinīśayasiddhi. 1987. *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhisamgraha. Rare Buddhist Text Series No. 1*. Edited by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).
- Padmavajra, Guhyasiddhi. 1987. *Baroda MS no. 13124, ff. 1v–35r3; IASWR MBB-I-105, pp. 1–105; NAK 5-45, A 0915/03 (=A 0134/02), ff. 1v–15r2; NAK 4-71, A 1012/5), ff. 1v–3r10; Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhisamgraha. Rare Buddhist Text Series No. 1*. Edited by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).
- Piṇḍīkramasādhana. 1876. *Études et textes tantriques: Pañcakrama. Piṇḍīkramasādhana*. Edited by Louis De la Vallée Poussin. Gand: H. Engelcke.
- Prajñākaramati, Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā. 1901–1914. *Prajñākaramati's Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Āntideva*. Edited by Louis De la Vallée Poussin. Bibliotheca Indica: Collection of oriental works, new series No. 983, 1031, 1090, 1126, 1139, 1305, 1399. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- *Pramuditākara, *Śrīguhyasamājatantrarājāṭīkācāndraprabhā. dPal gsang ba 'dus pa rgyud kyi rgyal po'i bshad pa zla ba'i 'od zer. Tōh. 1852. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 41 (thi), ff. 120r–313r.
- *Ratnākara Gupta, *Āryamañjuśrīnāmasaṃgītipañjikāsaṃgraha. 'Phags pa 'jam dpal gyi mtshan yang dag par brjod pa'i dka' 'grel bsdu pa. Tōh. 2541. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 64 (gu), ff. 221r–235r.
- Raviśrījñāna, Amṛtakaṇīkā. 1994. *Āryamañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti with Amṛtakaṇīkā-ṭippaṇī by Bhikṣu Raviśrījñāna and Amṛtakaṇīkodyotanibandha of Vibhūticandra*. Edited by B. Lal. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica No. 30. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).
- Sarvatathāgatataṭṭvasaṃgraha (a.k.a. Taṭṭvasaṃgraha). 1983. *Bon-Zō-Kan Shoe-Kongchōgyō no Kenkyū. Vol. 1. Sarvatathāgatataṭṭvasaṃgraha*. Edited by Kanjin Horiuchi. Kōyasan: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo.
- Śrīvajramāṇḍalāṅkāra (a.k.a. Śrīvajramāṇḍalāṅkāra). (not extant in Sanskrit). dPal rdo rje snying po rgyan ces bya ba'i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po (*Śrīvajramāṇḍalāṅkāranāmamahātāntrarāja); Tōh. 490. In bKa' 'Gyur, (sDe dge), rGyud, Vol. 86 (tha), ff. 1r–82r.
- Subhāṣitasamgraha. 1905. *Subhāṣita-saṃgraha—An Anthology of Extracts from Buddhist Works Compiled by an Unknown Author, to Illustrate the Doctrines of Scholastic and Mystic (Tāntrik) Buddhism*. Edited by Cecil Bendall. London: Luzac.
- unknown, *Lalāpadhātukāya. Byings kyi tshogs. Tōh. 4430. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), mDo (bstan bcos sna tshogs), Vol. 211 (no), ff. 122v–1347r.
- unknown, *Pāṇinivākyakaraṇasūtravṛttiprakriyākaumudī. bRda sprod pa pa ṇi ni' mdo'i 'grel pa rab tu bya ba shin tu rgyas pa. D 4420a. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), mDo (bstan bcos sna tshogs), Vol. 208 (to), ff. 27v–452r.
- unknown, *Syādyantaprakriyā. Si la sogs pa'i mtha'i bya ba. Tōh. 4287. In bsTan 'Gyur, (sDe dge), mDo (sgra), Vol. 196 (she), ff. 1v–254r.
- Yoginī Cintā, Vyaktabhāvanūgatataṭṭvasiddhi. 1987. *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhisamgraha. Rare Buddhist Text Series No. 1*. Edited by Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (CIHTS).

Secondary Sources

- Acri, Andrea. 2016. *Esoteric Buddhism in Mediaeval Maritime Asia: Networks of Masters, Texts, Icons*. Singapore: Mainland Press Pte Ltd.
- Apte, Vaman Shivram. 1957. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, rev. and enlarged ed. Poona: Prasad Prakashan.

- Bang, Junglan. 2018. Selected Chapters from the Tantrasadbhāva Based on the Tradition of 11th Century Śaiva Sanskrit Manuscripts in Nepal. Ph.D. dissertation, Faculty of Humanities at the University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.
- Davidson, Ronald M. 2002. Reframing *Sahaja*: Genre, Representation, Ritual and Lineage. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30: 46–83. [CrossRef]
- Dahl, Cortland J., Antoine Lutz, and Richard J. Davidson. 2015. Reconstructing and deconstructing the self: Cognitive mechanisms in meditation practice. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19: 515–23. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Dowman, Keith. 1985. *Masters of Mahāmudrā. Songs and Histories of the Eighty-Four Buddhist Siddhas*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Esler, Dylan. 2005. The Origins and Early History of rDzogs chen. *The Tibetan Journal* 30: 33–62.
- Gerloff, Torsten, and Julian Schott. 2020. Towards a Reassessment of Indrabhūti's *Jñānasiddhi*. *Buddhist Studies Review* 37: 241–60. [CrossRef]
- Gerloff, Torsten, and Julian Schott. 2021. *Śrīlakṣmīnīkarā's Advayasiddhi—gNyis su med par grub pa'i sgrub thabs—Critically Edited, Translated, and Annotated*. Crema: Libri di Marpa.
- Gerloff, Torsten, and Julian Schott. 2024. *Indrabhūti's Jñānasiddhiḥ: A Revised Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text and Its Tibetan Translation*. Rome Oriental Series; Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.
- Goodall, Dominic. 2020. Dressing for Power: On vrata, caryā, and vidyāvratā in the Early Mantramārga, and on the Structure of the Guhyasūtra of the Nisvāsattattvasaṃhitā. In *Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions—Essays in Honour of Alexis G.J.S. Sanderson*. Boston: Brill, pp. 47–83.
- Grünwedel, Albert. 1916. *Die Geschichten der vierundachtzig Zauberer (Mahāsiddhas)*. Baessler-Archiv No. 4/5. Leipzig: BG Teubner, vol. 5.
- Gyatso, Thinlay. 2013. Naktso Lotsāwa Tsultrim Gyelwa, Treasury of Lives. Available online: <http://treasuryoflives.org/biographies/view/Naktso-Lotsawa-Tsultrim-Gyelwa/5801> (accessed on 4 March 2022).
- Hodge, Stephen. 2003. *The Mahā-Vairocana-Abhisambodhi tantra: With Buddhaguhya's Commentary*. (2015 paperback reprint). London and New York: Routledge.
- Isaacson, Harunaga, and Francesco Sferra. 2014. *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla*. Naples: Serie l'Orientale Roma.
- Kozhevnikov, Maria, Alina Veronika Irene Strasser, Elizabeth McDougal, Rupali Dhond, and Geoffrey Samuel. 2002. Beyond mindfulness: Arousal-driven modulation of attentional control during arousal-based practices. *Current Research in Neurobiology* 3: 100053. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Kragh, Ulrich Timme. 2010. On the Making of the Tibetan Translation of Lakṣmī's **Sahajasiddhipaddhati*: 'Bro Lotsā ba Shes rab Grags and his Translation Endeavors. Materials for the Study of the Female Tantric Master Lakṣmī of Uḍḍiyāna, part 1. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 53: 195–232. [CrossRef]
- Kragh, Ulrich Timme. 2011. Appropriation and Assertion of the Female Self—Materials for the Study of the Female Tantric Master Lakṣmī of Uḍḍiyāna. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion (JFSR)* 27: 85–108. [CrossRef]
- Krug, Adam Charles. 2018. The Seven Siddhi Texts: The Oḍḍiyāna Mahāmudrā Lineage in Its Indic and Tibetan Contexts. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA, USA.
- Kuwayama, Shoshin. 1991. L'inscription du Gaṇeśa de gardez et la chronologie des Turki-Ṣāhis. *Journal Asiatique* 279: 267–87. [CrossRef]
- Kuwayama, Shoshin. 2002. *Across the Hindukush of the First Millenium—A Collection of the Papers by S. Kuwayama*. Kyoto: Kyoto University.
- Kyuma, Taiken. 2009. Superiority of Vajrayāna, Part I: Some Remarks on the *Vajrayānāntadāvanirākaraṇa* (rDo rje theg pa'i mtha' gñis sel ba) Ascribed to Jñānaśrī. In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Edited by Shingo Einoo. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series No. 23; Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 469–85.
- Negi, Jita Sain. 1993–2005. *Bod skad dang legs sbyar gyi tshig mdzod chen mo—Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (Dictionary Unit), vols. 1–16.
- Robinson, James B. 1979. *Buddha's Lions: The Lives of the Eighty-Four Siddhas*. Berkeley: Dharma Publishing.
- Roerich, George N. 1995. *The Blue Annals, Parts 1 & 2 (Bound in One)*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2009. The Śaiva Age—The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Edited by Shingo Einoo. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series No. 23; Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 41–349.
- Schott, Julian. 2023a. Rethinking Terms: Dohā, Vajra-, and Caryāgīti. *Religions* 14: 1076. [CrossRef]
- Schott, Julian. 2023b. Dārikapa's Instruction on Reality—The Great Secret of Secrets from Uḍḍiyāna. *Asian Literature and Translation* 10: 134–68. [CrossRef]
- Snellgrove, David L. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study*. Part I Introduction and Translation. London: Oxford University Press.
- Szántó, Péter-Dániel. 2019. Siddhas. In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Edited by Jonathan Silk, Richard Bowring and Vincent Eltschinger. Leiden: Brill, vol. 2: Lives, pp. 443–51.
- Templeman, David. 1983. *Taranātha's bKa' babs bdun ldan—The Seven Instruction Lineages by Jo.nang Taranātha*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. 1940. *Travels of Tibetan Pilgrims in the Swat Valley*. Greater India Studies No. 2. Calcutta: The Greater India Society.

- Van Dam, Nicholas T., Marieke K. van Vugt, David R. Vago, Laura Schmalz, Clifford D. Saron, Andrew Olendzki, Ted Meissner, Sara L. Lazar, Cathrine E. Kerr, Jolie Gorchov, and et al. 2018. Mind the Hype: A Critical Evaluation and Prescriptive Agenda for Research on Mindfulness and Meditation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 13: 36–61. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- van der Kuip, Leonard W. J. 2013. On the Edge of Myth and History: Za hor, its Place in the History of Early Indian Buddhist Tantra, and Dalai Lama V and the Genealogy of its Royal Family. In *Studies on Buddhist Myths: Texts, Pictures, Traditions and History* (佛教神话研究: 文本、图像、传说与历史). Edited by Bangwei Wang, Junhua Chen and Ming Chen. Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company (中西書局), pp. 114–64.
- Wayman, Alex. 1977. *Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra: The Arcane Lore of Forty Verses: A Buddhist Tantra Commentary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.