J. de Jong

Notes on the sources and the text of the Sang Hyang Kamahayanan Mantranaya

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 130 (1974), no: 4, Leiden, 465-482

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

NOTES ON THE SOURCES AND THE TEXT OF THE SANG HYANG KAMAHĀYĀNAN MANTRANAYA

For Dr. C. Hooykaas, on the occasion of his
seventieth birthday, in fulfilment of an old promise.

In 1910 J. Kats published the text of the Sang hyang Kamahāyānan Mantranaya¹ in his book *Sang hyang Kamahāyānikam* (pp. 17-30). The text consists of 42 Sanskrit verses together with an Old-Javanese commentary. A footnote (p. 12, n. 1) informs the reader that H. Kern had corrected the Sanskrit verses in accordance with the Old-Javanese translation. Kats does not indicate the readings of his manuscript. In 1913 J. S. Speyer published a new edition of the verses together with textual notes and a translation: "Ein altjavanischer mahāyānistischer Katechismus", *ZDMG*, 67, 1913, pp. 347-362. Speyer consulted the manuscript which had been the basis of Kats's edition (cod. 5068; MS. A in Kats's edition). Speyer's edition does not give the exact readings of the manuscript: "Ich habe die oft fehlerhafte Orthographie korrigiert und die Textverderbnisse stillschweigend verbessert, insoweit die Emendierung sicher ist; wo nicht, so gebe ich die handschriftliche Lesung, mit Vorsetzung eines Sternchens, eventuell mit Verbesserungsvorschlägen" (p. 354).² Kats's translation was severely criticized by K. Wulff who published a new translation in 1935: *Sang hyang Kamahāyānan Mantrānaya. Ansprache bei der Weihe buddhistischer Mönche aus dem altjavanischen übersetzt und sprachlich erläutert* (København, 1935). Wulff made several corrections in the Sanskrit text of the verses, mainly basing himself on the paraphrase given in the commentary. Apropos of Wulff's edition H. von Glasenapp published two articles: "Ein Initiations-Ritus im buddhistischen Java", *OLZ*, 39, 1936, Sp. 483-489; "Noch einmal: "Ein Initiations-Ritus im buddhistischen Java"", *OLZ*,

¹ Abridged: SHKM.

² Speyer probably did not omit any significant manuscript readings. Unfortunately Speyer has not edited the verses of the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan (Kats, pp. 31-70). It is not clear how far Kern has also emended the text of these verses. A critical edition of these Sanskrit verses would be of importance for the study of Javanese Tantrism.

41, 1938, Sp. 201-204. In these articles von Glasenapp tried to explain the meaning of the initiation rite described in the text. With regard to the text of the verses, von Glasenapp pointed out that several verses are also to be found in a text published by Louis Finot in his "Manuscripts sanskrits de sādhanā's retrouvés en Chine" (*JA*, 1934, II, pp. 1-85). This text, called Hevajrasekaprakriyā, contains the following verses of the SHKM: 1, 4, 5ab, 6, 13, 17, 31 and 41. However, these verses are not free from corruptions and they are of no help in establishing a more correct text. Finally, in 1952, von Glasenapp published a third article on the SHKM: "Ein buddhistischer Initiationsritus des javanischen Mittelalters", *Tribus, Jahrbuch des Linden-Museums Stuttgart*, N.F. 2/3, 1952/53, pp. 259-274. Apart from an introduction based on his above-mentioned articles it contains a metrical translation of the 42 verses.

The publications by Kats, Speyer, Wulff and von Glasenapp have made the SHKM widely known outside the small circle of specialists in Old-Javanese literature. However, none of these scholars have tried to trace the sources of the Sanskrit verses. Speyer assumed that they were not composed in Java but in India. His opinion was shared by von Glasenapp who discovered that several of the verses were also to be found in the Hevajrasekaprakriyā: "Das Auftreten so vieler auch anderwärts belegter Strophen im M [= SHKM] (sie machen fast ein Fünftel des ganzen Textes aus!) legt die Vermutung nahe, dass alle Strophen nicht in Java selbst gedichtet worden sind, sondern aus Indien stammen. Wahrscheinlich haben M und H [= Hevajrasekaprakriyā], beide unabhängig voneinander aus älteren tantrischen Ritualwerken geschöpft." (Ein buddhistischer Initiationsritus des javanischen Mittelalters, p. 263). He was unaware that two Japanese scholars had been able to identify most of the verses of the SHKM in two tantric texts preserved in Chinese and Tibetan translations. In 1915 Wogihara Unrai³ published an article entitled: "Jawa ni oite hakken-sararetaru

³ Wogihara Unrai (1869-1937) studied from 1899 to 1905 in Strassburg with Ernst Leumann. He obtained his doctorate in 1905 with a dissertation on Asaṅga's Bodhisattvabhūmi (Leipzig, 1908). Wogihara has edited several important Buddhist Sanskrit texts: Bodhisattvabhūmi (Tokyo, 1930-1936), Haribhadra's Abhisamayālaṃkāra (Tokyo, 1932-1935), Yaśomitra's Abhidharmakośavyākhyā (Tokyo, 1932-1936) and the Saddharmapuṇḍarika (with C. Tsuchida, Tokyo, 1935). A great number of his articles and translations have been brought together in his *Bunshū* (Tokyo, 1938) which also contains a reprint of his article on the SHKM (pp. 737-746). Wogihara has left a comprehensive Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary, six fascicles of which were published from 1940-1943. It is being published by the Suzuki Foundation (fascicles 7-15, Tokyo, 1964-1972). It will be complete in 16 fascicles of about 100 pages each.

mikkyō yōmon [An important tantric text discovered in Java]", *Mikkyō*, Vol. V, No. 2. Reading Speyer's edition of the text, Wogihara noticed that several of the verses (1-5ab, 6-9, 16, 17-18, 20-22) occurred in the Chinese version of the Mahāvairocanasūtra, one of the most sacred texts of the Shingon sect. Wogihara translated Speyer's introduction and gave a Japanese translation of the 42 verses, comparing the Chinese version of the above-mentioned verses and adding textual notes. Further progress in the identification of the verses of the SHKM was made in an article published in 1950 by Sakai Shirō⁴: "Jaba hakken mikkyō yōmon no isetsu ni tsuite [On a section of an important tantric text discovered in Java]", *Mikkyō bunka*, 8, 1950, pp. 38-46. Sakai traced the last 17 verses (26-42) to a tantric text which exists both in Chinese and Tibetan translation. The Chinese version of this text is known under the Sanskrit title Adhyardhaśatikā prajñāpāramitā-sūtra. The Tibetan version has the title Śrīparamādyamantrakalpakaṇḍa. Sakai reproduced the text of these 17 verses according to Speyer's edition, adding a Japanese translation, the text of the Tibetan version in the Derge edition of the Kanjur and the text of the Chinese version. Sakai did not add any textual notes but his article contains a short introduction on the importance of the text from the point of view of tantric studies.

The verses identified by Wogihara are to be found in the second chapter of the Mahāvairocanasūtra. A short summary of this chapter is given by R. Tajima in his *Étude sur le Mahāvairocana-sūtra* (Paris, 1936, pp. 111-115). According to the Tibetan version its title is "The treasury of the mantras which are to be placed in the maṇḍala" (*dkyil-'khor-du dgod-pa'i gsañ-shags-kyi mdzod*). It deals with the preparations for the construction of the maṇḍala and the performance of the abhiṣeka rite. The tantric texts are divided into four groups: *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yoga* and *anuttarayoga*. According to Sakai four kinds of abhiṣeka are mentioned in the *anuttarayoga* texts: 1. The Jar-consecration (*Kalaśābhiṣeka*); 2. The Secret Consecration (*Guhyābhiṣeka*); 3. The consecration in the knowledge of Wisdom (*Prajñājñānābhiṣeka*); and 4. The Fourth consecration (*Caturthābhiṣeka*). The Jar-consecration is again subdivided into six consecrations: those of water (*udaka*), crown (*mukūṭa*),

⁴ Sakai Shirō (1908-), professor at the University of Kōyasan, is a specialist in tantric studies. He has published a great number of articles and two books: *Chibetto mikkyō kyōri no kenkyū* [A study of the doctrines of Tibetan Tantrism] (Kōyasan, 1956) and *Dainichikyō no seiritsu ni kan-suru kenkyū* [A study on the formation of the Mahāvairocanasūtra] (Kōyasan, 1962). Sakai has devoted much attention to Tibetan versions of Indian tantric texts, many of which have never been translated into Chinese.

vajra, bell (*ghaṇṭā*), name (*nāma*), and master (*ācārya*).⁵ The last of these six consecrations, the master-consecration, is described in the SHKM.⁶ According to Sakai the Jar-consecration is described in texts belonging to the *caryā* and *yoga* groups, but the other three only in *anuttarayoga* texts. The Mahāvairocanasūtra, which belongs to the *caryā* group, described the Jar-consecration only in brief, whereas the Adhyardhaśatikā prajñāpāramitā does so in detail. Sakai remarks that Tibetan commentaries place this latter text in the *yoga* group but that it can also be considered as an *anuttarayoga* text because it is one of the principal texts dealing with the idea of 'Great Bliss' (*mahāsukha*).

The emendations, proposed by Kern (in Kats's edition of the SHKM), Speyer, Wulff and Wogihara, have done much for the establishment of a more satisfactory text. However, only Wogihara was able to compare the Sanskrit text of some of the verses with a different version. Wogihara did not compare the Tibetan version which is much closer to the Sanskrit text. Although he compared both the Chinese and Tibetan versions of 17 verses, Sakai did not propose any emendations. For this reason it is not superfluous to compare the verses identified by Wogihara and Sakai with the Tibetan and Chinese versions. For the Chinese versions of the Mahāvairocanasūtra and the Adhyardhaśatikā prajñāpāramitā I have used the so-called Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon; and for the Tibetan versions the photomechanic reprint of the Peking edition of the Kanjur [= P.].⁷ For verses 26-42 Sakai gives the text of the Derge edition [= D.] which I have adopted in a few places. The following tables indicate the numbers of the verses in the SHKM and their locations in the Tibetan and Chinese versions:

⁵ For a brief description of the abhiṣeka according to the *anuttarayoga* texts, see Sakai's *Chibetto mikkyō kyōri no kenkyū*, pp. 166-176. Sakai refers to Advayavajra's Sekatānvayasamgraha (Advayavajrasamgraha, *Gaekwad Or.Ser.* 40, Baroda, 1927, pp. 36-39) which gives the Sanskrit technical terms.

⁶ According to Sakai the ācāryābhiṣeka consists of eight parts. The SHKM describes the eighth. The Sanskrit names are: vajrasamaya, ghaṇṭāsamaya, mudrāsamaya, bhavyatā, anujñā, vrata, vyākaraṇa and āśvāsa, see Advaya-vajrasamgraha p. 38. 10-11.

⁷ In the Taishō edition the Mahāvairocanasūtra is No. 848. It is to be found in vol. XVIII (Tokyo, 1928, pp. 1-55). The Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā is No. 244 (vol. VIII, Tokyo, 1928, pp. 786-824). The Tibetan version of the Mahāvairocanasūtra is No. 126 in the Peking Kanjur (cf. *A comparative analytical catalogue of the Kanjur division of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka*, Kyoto, 1930-1932, pp. 45-48), vol. Tha ff. 115b-225b (*Chibetto daizōkyō*, vol. 5, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1957, pp. 240-284). The Śrīparamādyamantrakalpakaṇḍa is No. 120 (*A comparative analytical catalogue*, etc. p. 43), vol. Ta ff. 178a-277b (*Chibetto daizōkyō*, vol. 5, pp. 133-173).

A. Mahāvairocanasūtra

SHKM	Tib. version (Peking ed.)	Chinese version
1-5ab	Tha f. 125a3-5	XVIII, p. 4b7-16
6-9	128a3-6	6a17-24
16	138a3-4	12a13-14
17-18	138a4-5	12a17-20
20-22	138a6-8	12a23-28

B. Adhyardhaśatikā prajñāpāramitā (= Ch. version); Śrīparamādya-mantrakalpakhanda (= Tib. version)

26-41	Ta ff. 239b4-240a8	VIII, p. 815b13-c3
42	241a6	815c14-16

The verses 26-41 are not arranged in the same order in the Tibetan and Chinese translations as in the SHKM. The order of the verses in the Tibetan version is: 26, 27, A, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, B, 34, C, 37, 38, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41. The verses marked A, B and C, are missing in the SHKM. The Chinese version of the Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā does not correspond very well to the Sanskrit text and it is not always easy to find the corresponding Chinese text. In several places it would be possible to arrange the corresponding Chinese text differently from the way done by Sakai. In any case, the order of the verses is the same in the Chinese translation as in the Tibetan translation, but 31 is missing.

1. ehi vatsa mahāyānaṃ mantravāryanayaṃ¹ vidhim
deśayiṣyāmi te samyak bhājanas tvam mahānaye
khyod ni tshul-chen snod-yin-gyis
bu tshur theg-pa chen-po-yis
gsaṅ-sṅags spyod-tshul cho-ga ni
khyod-la yañ-dag bstan-par bya //

1) Kern *mantracārya*^o. Speyer hesitated between *mantracāryā*^o and *mantrācārya*^o which is to be found in verse 21. Wulff *mantracaryā*^o which is confirmed by Ch. [= Chinese version], T. [= Tibetan version] and Finot's MS. (p. 20.20).

- 2-3. atitā ye hi sambuddhāḥ tathā caivāpy anāgatāḥ
pratyuṭpannās ca ye nāthāḥ tiṣṭhanti ca jagaddhitāḥ
taiś ca sarvair imaṃ vajraṃ¹ jñātvā mantravidhim param
prāptā sarvajñatā vīraiḥ bodhimūle hy alakṣaṇa.²

2. rdzogs-pa'i sañs-rgyas gañ 'das dañ
de-bzin yañ-dag ma-byon dañ
da-ltar byuñ-ba'i mgon-po rnams
'gro-la phan-phyir zugs-pa dag //

3. de-dag kun-gyis gsañ-sñags-kyi
cho-ga mchog-bzañ 'di mkhyen dañ
dpa'-bos byañ-chub šiñ druñ-du
thams-cad mkhyen-pa mtshan-med brñes //

1) According to Wogihara Ch. has *dharmam* instead of *vajram* but Ch. *fa* renders *vidhim*. Ch. and T. do not translate *vajram*. 2) Speyer and Wulff *alakṣaṇā* which is confirmed by Ch. and T.

4. mantraprayogam atulaṃ yena bhagnaṃ mahābalaṃ
Mārasainyaṃ mahāghoraṃ śākyasiṃhena tāyinaṃ
gsañ-sñags sbyor-ba mñam-med de
śā-kya señ-ge skyob-pa-yis
bdud-sde śin-tu mi bzad (P. zad)-pa
dpuñ-chen dag kyañ de-yis bcom //

5ab. tasmān matiṃ imāṃ varya ¹ kuru sarvajñatāptaye
de-bas kun-mkhyen thob-bya'i phyir
bu-yis blo-gros 'di gyis-śig

1) Speyer *vatsa*. This is confirmed by T. *bu* which renders *vatsa* in 1a. Finot's MS. also has *vatsa* (p. 21.15).

6. eṣa mārḡavaraḥ śrīmān mahāyānamahodayaḥ
yena yūyaṃ gamiṣyanto bhaviṣyatha tathāgatāḥ
7ab. svayambhuvo mahābhāgāḥ ¹ sarvalokasya yetiyāḥ ²

6. theg-pa chen-po cher 'byuñ-ba'i
lam-mchog 'di ni dpal-dañ-ldan
khyed-rnams der ni doñ-bas-na
rañ-byuñ skal-ba chen-po-pa //

7ab. 'jig-rten thams-cad mkhyen-pa-yi
de-bzin gsegs-pa rnams-su 'gyur

1) Wogihara remarks that Ch. has *mahānāgāḥ* instead of *mahābhāgāḥ*. T. translates *mahābhāgāḥ*, but it is possible that *mahānāgāḥ* was the original reading. However, *mahānāga* is an epithet of śrāvakas and not of tathāgatas (cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*; Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, I, Louvain, 1944,

p. 212). ²) Kern *yajñīyāḥ*; Speyer *ye priyāḥ*. Wogihara has found the correct solution by emending it to *cetiyaḥ*. One finds *sarvalokasya cetiyo* in the Mahāvastu (cf. Edgerton, *op. cit.* s.v. *cetiya*). Ch. renders *cetiya* by "honoured as a caitya". T. has "known", deriving *cetiya* from the verb *cit-*.

7cd. *astināstivyatikrāntam ākāśam iva nirmalam*

8. *gambhīraṃ sarvatarkebhir apy atarkyam* ¹ *anāvilam* ²
sarvaprapañcarahitaṃ prapañcebhiḥ prapañcitam

9. *karmakriyāvirahitaṃ* ³ *satyadvayam anāśrayam* ⁴
idaṃ yānavaraṃ śreṣṭhaṃ labhiṣyatha naye sthitāḥ

7cd. *yod dañ med las rnam-par 'das*
nam-mkha' bzin-du dri-ma med //

8. *zab-mo rtog-ge thams-cad-kyis*
rab-tu mi-rtogs gnas med-pa
spros-pa kun dañ bral-ba ste
spros-pa rnam-s-kyis rnam-par spros //

9. *las dañ bya-ba la-sogs bral*
bden-pa gñis-la phan gnas-pa'i
theg-pa rab-kyi mchog 'di ni
tshul-la gnas-na thob-par 'gyur //

¹) Wogihara's emendation of *apy atarkyam* to *apratarkyam* is confirmed by T. ²) Wogihara *anālayam*. This, too, is confirmed by T. ³) T. has read *karmakriyādirahitaṃ*. The literal translation of Ch. is "action and act are excellent and incomparable". ⁴) Wogihara *satyadvayasamāśrayam*. T. (P.) is not clear but, in any case, it does not render the negation in *anāśrayam*. Instead of *phan gnas-pa'i* the Lhasa edition has *gnas-pa yis* which corresponds to *samāśrayam*.

11ab. *vajraṃ ghaṇṭāṃ ca mudrāṃ ca adya maṇḍalino* ¹ *vadet*

¹) Speyer *nādyāmaṇḍalino*; Wogihara *na hy amaṇḍalino*.

16. *ajñānapaṭalaṃ vatsa punitaṃ jinanes* ¹ *tava*
śālākair vaidyarājendraiḥ yathālokasya ² *taimiram*

snon-gyi mig-mkhan rgyal-po-yis
'jig-rten liñ-tog bsal-ba bzin
bu khyod-kyis ni mi śes-pa'i
liñ-tog rgyal-ba rnam-s-kyis bsal //

¹) Speyer *apanītāṃ jinais*. T. "removed by Jinas". ²) Read *yathā lokasya*. So T.

17. pratibimbasmā dharmā acchāḥ śuddhā anāvilāḥ
agrāhyā abhilāpyās¹ ca hetukarmasamudbhavāḥ
18. evaṃ jñātvā imān dharmān nissvabhāvān anāvilān²
kuru satvārthaṃ atulaṃ jāto 'sy urasi tāyinām

17. chos-rnams gzugs-brñan lta-bu ste
dañ-ziñ dag-la rñog-pa med
gzun-du med-ciñ brjod-du med
rgyu-dañ-las las byuñ-ba ste //
18. ño-bo ñid-med gnas med-pa
de-ltar chos 'di śes-nas-su
sems-can don ni mñam-med byos
'on-kyañ sañs-rgyas sras-su skyes //

¹) Speyer *agrāhyānabhilāpyās* which is confirmed by Ch. and T. ²) T. has *anālayān* but Ch. confirms *anāvilān*.

20. adyaprabhṛti lokasya cakram vartaya tāyinām
sarvatra pūrya¹ vimalaṃ dharmaśaṅkham anuttaram
chos-kyi duñ ni bla-med-pa
kun-tu rgyas-par bus-nas-su
de-riñ phan-chad 'jig-rten-la
skyob-pa rnams-kyi 'khor-lo bskor //

¹) Wogihara remarks that *pūrya* is an incorrect form. He quotes from I-hsing's commentary (see below) the pāda *āpurayan samantād vai*. T. seems to have read the same text.

21. na te 'tra vimatiḥ kāryā nirviśaṅkena cetasā
prakāśaya mahātulaṃ¹ mantrācāryanayaṃ² param
som-ñi yid-gñis mi bya-ziñ
dogs-pa med-pa'i sems-kyis khyod
gsaṅ-sñags spyod (P. spyad)-pa'i tshul-gyi mchog
'jig-rten 'di-la rab-tu śod //

¹) Both Ch. and T. have "proclaim in this world". Wogihara *prakāśa-
yasva loke 'smin*. ²) Ch. and T. have *mantracaryānayaṃ*, cf. 1b.

22. evaṃ kṛtajño buddhānām upakāṛiti gīyate¹
te ca vajradharāḥ sarve rakṣanti tava sarvaśaḥ
de-ltar byas-na sañs-rgyas-la
phan-dogs byas-pa bzo zes bya

rdo-rje 'dzin-pa de kun yañ
khyod-la rnam-pa kun-tu bsrūñ //

¹⁾ Wogihara quotes *gīyase* from I-hsing's commentary. This is not found in Ch. and T., but is required by the context.

26. dr̥ṣṭaṃ praviṣṭaṃ paramaṃ rahasyātkhama maṇḍalam ¹
sarvapāpair vinirmuktaḥ ² bhavanto 'dyaiva ³ śuddhitāḥ ⁴

gsaṅ-ba'i dkyil-'khor dam-pa ni
mthoñ-ba dañ ni žugs-pas kyañ
sdig-pa kun-las ñes-grol-žin
khyed-rnams der-ñid legs-par gnas //

¹⁾ Speyer *rahasyottamamaṇḍalam* which is confirmed by T. ²⁾ Speyer *vinirmuktā*. ³⁾ T. has *atraiva* but, by making a slight change, one can read *deñ-ñid* (*adyaiva*) for *der-ñid* (*atraiva*). ⁴⁾ T. *susthitāḥ* which is preferable.

27. na bhūyo ramaṇaṃ bhosti ¹ yānād asmān mahāsukhāt
avr̥ṣyās ² cāpy avandyās ³ ca ramadhvam akutobhayāḥ

bde-chen theg (P. thob)-pa 'di-las ni
slar 'chi-ba ni yod min-te
mi tshugs-pa dañ mi sod-pas
cis-kyañ mi-'jigs rol-par-gyis //

¹⁾ Speyer *bhramaṇaṃ bhoti*, Wulff *ramaṇaṃ bho 'sti*. T. has read *maranaṃ bhoti*. Probably one must read *ramaṇaṃ bhoti*. ²⁾ Speyer's emendation *adr̥ṣyās* is confirmed by T. and Ch. The latter has confused *adr̥ṣya* and *adr̥śya*. ³⁾ Speyer and Wulff *cānavadyās* but T. *cāpy avadyās* which must be the correct reading.

28. ayaṃ vaḥ satataṃ rakṣyaḥ siddhasamayasaṃvaraḥ
sarvabuddhasamaṃ proktaḥ ¹ ajñāpāramaṃśāsvatī ²

dam-tshig sdom-pa grub-pa 'di
khyod-kyis rtag-tu bsrūñ-bar bya
sañs-rgyas kun-gyis mthun-par gsuñis
dam-pa rtag-pa'i bka' yin-no //

¹⁾ Wulff ingeniously proposes *sarvabuddhasamāḥ proktāḥ*. However, T. and Ch. seem to have read *sarvabuddhaiḥ samam proktaḥ*. ²⁾ Speyer's emendation *ajñā paramaśāsvatī* is confirmed by T.

29. bodhicittaṃ tavātyājyaṃ ¹ yad vajram iti mudrayā
yasyotpādaikamātreṇa ² buddha eva na saṃśayaḥ

gañ-ṣig skyed-pa tsam-gyis ni
 sañs-rgyas ñid-du dogs med-pa'i
 byañ-chub-sems ni gtañ mi-bya
 phyag-rgya rdo-rje gañ yin-pa //

1) Wulff changed *tavā*^o to *tvayā*^o without indicating the MS reading. His emendation is unnecessary. 2) T. does not translate *eka*. Perhaps one must read *yasyotpādanamātrena*.

30. saddharmo na pratikṣepyaḥ na tyājyaś ca kadācana
 ajñānād atha mohād vā na vai vivṛṇuyāt ¹ sa tu
 dam-pa'i chos ni mi smod-ciñ
 nam-yañ btañ-bar mi-bya'o
 mi śes-pa 'am rmoñs-pa yis
 des ni smad-par mi-bya'o //

1) T. and Ch. have read *vivarnayet* which is preferable. For *vivarnayati* see Edgerton, *op. cit.*

31. svam ātmānaṃ parityajya tapobhir ṇaḥṭha ¹ pīḍayet
 yathāsukhaṃ sukhaṃ dhāryaṃ sambuddho 'yam anāgataḥ
 rañ-gi bdag-ñid yoñs-spañs-nas
 dka'-thub rnams-kyi gduñ mi-bya
 ci bde-bar ni bde-bar gzuñ
 'di ni ma-byon rdzogs sañs-rgyas //

1) Three different emendations have been proposed: Kern *nāti*-, Speyer *na tu*, Wulff *nātha*. T. is of no help. Kern's emendation is very attractive. Speyer's translation is not correct: "Wiewohl man sein Selbst preiszu-geben hat, soll man es doch nicht durch *tapas*-Arten quälen." The meaning is: "One must not give up one's self and harm it by mortifications." Finot's MS is different: [ā]tmanam na vai tyājyam tapobhir na ca pīḍayet (p. 27.3).

32. vajraṃ ghaṇṭāñ ca mudrāñ ca na saṃtyajya kadācana
 ācāryo nāvamantavyaḥ sarvabuddhasamo hy asau
 rdo-rje dril-bu phyag-rgyas rnams
 nam-yañ yoñs-su spañ mi-bya
 slob-dpon smad-par mi bya-ste
 'di ni sañs-rgyas kun dañ-'dra //
33. yaś cāvamanyed ācāryaṃ sarvabuddhasamaṃ gurum
 sarvabuddhāvamānena nityaṃ duḥkham avāpnuyāt

34. tasmāt sarvaprayatnena vajrācāryaṃ mahāgurum ¹
pracchannavarakalyāṇaṃ nāvamanyet kadācana

33. saṅs-rgyas kun mtshuṅs bla-ma yis
slob-dpon la ni gaṅ smad-pa
de (P. des) ni saṅs-rgyas kun smad-pas
rtag-tu sdug-bsñal thob 'gyur-pa //

34. de-bas 'bad-pa thams-cad-kyis
rdo-rje slob-dpon blo-gros-che
dge-ba rab-tu mi spyoms-pa
nam-yaṅ smad-par mi-bya'o //

1) T. has read *mahāmatim* but *mahāgurum* is confirmed by Ch.

35. nityaṃ svasamayāḥ sādhyo nityaṃ pūjyas tathāgataḥ ¹
nityaṅ ca guruvedeyaṃ ² sarvabuddhasamo hy asau

rtag-tu raṅ-gi dam-tshig bsrūn
rtag-tu de-bzin-gségs-pa mchod //
rtag-tu bla-ma la yaṅ dbul (P. 'bul)
'di ni saṅs-rgyas kun daṅ-'dra

1) Speyer *pūjyās tathāgatāḥ*. T. has no plural particle but this is often omitted. 2) Speyer *guruvidheyam*. T. has *gurave deyam* which is undoubtedly the correct reading.

36. datte 'smin sarvabuddhebhyo dattaṃ bhavati cākṣayaṃ
taddānāt puṇyasambhāraḥ sambhārāt siddhir uttamā

de-byin saṅs-rgyas thams-cad la
rtag-tu sbyin-pa űid-du 'gyur
de-byin bsod-nams tshogs yin-te
tshogs-las dños-grub mchog-tu 'gyur //

37. nityaṃ svasamayācāryaṃ prāṇair api nijair bhajet
adeyaṅ putradārair vā kiṃ punar vibhavaś calaiḥ

38. yasmāt sudurlabhaṃ nityaṃ kalpāsaṃkhyeyakoṭibhiḥ
buddhatvam udyogavate dadatīhaiva janmani

37. raṅ-gi dam-tshig slob-dpon ni
sbyin-min bu daṅ chuṅ-ma daṅ
raṅ-srog-gis rtag bsten byas-na
loṅs-spyod g.yo-ba smos ci-dgos //

38. gañ-gis bskal-pa bye-bar ni
 grañs-med-par ni rñed dka'-ba'i
 sañs-rgyas-ñid kyañ brtson-ldan la
 tshe 'di-ñid la ster-bar byed //
39. adya vaḥ saphalaṃ janma yad asmin supratīṣṭhitāḥ ¹
 samaḥ samāya devānām ² adya jātāḥ svayambhavaḥ ³
 de-phyir 'di ni legs gnas-pas
 deñ khyod skye-ba 'bras-bur bcas
 rañ-byuñ dam-tshig lha dañ-mñam
 deñ khyod gyur-bar the-tshom med //

1) Speyer *supratīṣṭhitāḥ*. 2) Speyer *samasamā ye devānām*. T. has read *samāḥ samayadevānām*, which is metrically preferable to Speyer's reading. However, I have not been able to trace the expression *samaya-deva*. Perhaps one must keep the MS readings *supratīṣṭhitāḥ* and *samaḥ* in spite of the grammatical incorrectness of the singular. 3) Speyer *svayambhuvah*.

40. adyābhiṣiktāyusmantaḥ sarvabuddhaiḥ savajribhiḥ
 traidhātukamahārājye rājādhipatayaḥ sthitāḥ
 sañs-rgyas rdo-rje-'dzin bcas-par
 kun-gyi deñ khyod dbaṅ-bskur-bas
 khams-gsum-gyi ni rgyal-po che
 rgyal-po'i bdag-por bstan-pa yin //
41. adya Māraṃ vinirjitya praviṣṭāḥ paramaṃ puram
 prāptam adyaiva buddhatvaṃ bhavadbhir nātra saṃśayaḥ
 deñ (P. D. de) ni bdud-las rnam-rgyal te
 groñ-khyer mchog-tu rab-tu zugs
 khyed-rnams kyi ni sañs-rgyas ñid
 deñ 'dir thob-par the-tshom med //
42. iti kuruta manaḥ prasādavajraṃ
 svasamayam akṣayasaukhyadaṃ bhajadhvam
 jagati laghusukhe 'dya sarvabuddha- ¹
 pratisamaśāśvatitām gatā bhavantaḥ
 de-ltar yid ni rab-dañ rdo-rje ñid-du gyis
 rañ-gi dam-tshig mi-zad bde-ster (P. gter) bsten-par gyis
 deñ (P. D. de) ni 'gro-la myur-bde rdo-rje sems-dpa' dañ
 rab-tu mñam-ziñ rtag-tu ñid-du rtogs-par gyis //

1) T. and Ch. have read *vajrasattva*.

In his introduction Wulff has briefly summarized the opinions of scholars on the date of the (Old-Javanese) text of the SHKM. Opinions vary from the 14th or 15th century to before the first half of the 10th century (*op. cit.*, p. 9).⁸ It is obvious that the verses must have existed in Java before the commentary was written. With regard to the verses the problem is twofold: the date of their original composition and the date of their arrival in Java. The identification of the majority of the verses of the SHKM makes it possible to give some indications on these two points. In order to do so it is necessary to consider briefly the date and the history of the two tantric texts to which most of the verses of the SHKM have been traced back. This is not an easy task because Tantrism, especially Indian and Tibetan Tantrism, is still largely a terra incognita. Most Sanskrit manuscripts are still as yet unedited. Of the Sanskrit Tantras which have been published only a very few have been critically edited. Japanese scholars have studied Tantrism for many centuries but until recently their studies were based entirely on Sino-Japanese materials. In the last fifty years, however, they have made many contributions to the study of Tibetan translations of tantric texts. These Tibetan translations are of great importance because they are in general much more faithful to the original Indian text than the Chinese translations. Moreover, many more tantric texts were translated into Tibetan than into Chinese. The catalogue of the Derge edition of the Kanjur and Tanjur (*A complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons*, Sendai, 1934) lists 4569 texts. Of these, the texts numbered 360-3785 belong to the Tantra sections of these two collections. In the Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon the tantric texts have been published in volumes XVIII-XXI (nos. 848-1420). As against more than 3400 texts in the Tibetan Buddhist canon there are less than 600 texts in the Chinese Buddhist canon. Tibetan scholars have also written many more commentaries and original works than their Chinese counterparts. Only when at least the most important of these texts have been translated and studied, will it become possible to obtain a better knowledge of the history of Indian Tantrism and its later developments in Tibet. For this reason it would at present be impossible to arrive at any definite conclusions even if one had read the already extensive literature on Tantrism in Western languages and in Japanese.

⁸ Tenth century according to Iwamoto Yutaka, "Jaba bukkyō bunken ni tsuite [On the Buddhist literature of Java]", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, II, 1953, p. 236.

The Mahāvairocanasūtra was translated into Chinese in 724-725 by Śubhakarā in collaboration with two Chinese scholars, Pao-yüeh and I-hsing.⁹ As was the custom in China, Śubhakarā, while translating the text, added explanations which were noted down by I-hsing (683-727). These notes formed the basis of his own commentary on the Mahāvairocanasūtra (Taishō no. 1796). In it, I-hsing quotes the Sanskrit text of several verses of the Mahāvairocanasūtra, which he had transliterated into Chinese characters.¹⁰ These verses were studied by a Japanese scholar, Jiun Sonja (1718-1804), who tried to reconstruct the Sanskrit text, using the Siddham script.¹¹ On the basis of Jiun's reconstruction, Ashikaga Atsuuji has published a romanized text of these verses: "A propos de certaines gāthās remontant au *Mahāvairocanasūtra*", *Studies in Indology and Buddhism presented in honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi* (Kyoto, 1955, pp. 106-121). Several of these verses occur also in the SHKM: 4cd, 6-9, 16-18, 20-22. The text of these verses, as transliterated by I-hsing, differs greatly in several places from the text of the corresponding verses of the SHKM. The main variants are the following:

7a. mahānāgāḥ instead of mahābhāgāḥ; 8. gambhīraṃ sarvadharmebhir apratarkyam anālayam / sarvaprapañcarahitaṃ prapañcāir¹² aprapañcitam; 9ab. sarvakriyābhir atulaṃ satyadvaye samāśrayam; 16b. apañtāṃ jinais tava; 17a. pratibimbamayā instead of pratibimbamā; 18d. buddhānām jātas tvam aurasaḥ¹³; 20c. āpūrayan¹⁴ samantād vai; 21c. prakāśayasva loke'smin; 22b. gīyase instead of gīyate.

⁹ Cf. Tajima, *op. cit.*, p. 35. Śubhakarā (or Śubhakarasiṃha) arrived in Ch'ang-an in 716. He died in 735. For a translation of his biography see Chou Yi-liang, "Tantrism in China", *HJAS*, 8, 1945, pp. 251-272.

¹⁰ In his textual notes, Wogihara quoted variant readings from I-hsing's transliteration. Jiun's work must have been unknown to him as it was only published in 1953.

¹¹ For the Siddham script see R. H. van Gulik, *Siddham*, Nagpur, 1956.

¹² Ashikaga reconstructs *sarvaprapañca(bhi)r*. One must correct Jiun's *°pañcer* to *°pañcāir*.

¹³ This pāda contains nine syllables. The text of the SHKM has: jāto 'sy urasi tāyinām. Ch. has: "You are born from the heart of Buddhas." T. has: "For you are born as the son of Buddhas." It is difficult to know whether Ch. and T. had read *Buddha* or *tāyin* because they may well have rendered *tāyin* by the equivalent of *Buddha*.

¹⁴ Ashikaga reads *āpūrayet* which does not make good sense (*cakram vartaya ... āpūrayet ... dharmaśaṅkham*). Jiun has clearly read *āpūrayaṃ* which I have changed to *āpūrayan*. The Chinese character which transliterates *-yaṃ* has been used by I-hsing for transliterating *-yaṃ* in *jayaṃ*. Probably the Sanskrit text had *āpūraya*.

If one compares the four versions of these verses: SHKM, Ch (Mahāvairocanaśūtra, Chinese tr.), T (id., Tib. tr.) and IH (I-hsing's transliteration), it becomes clear that in several instances SHKM and T go together as opposed to Ch and IH:

7a.	mahānāgāḥ	Ch - IH
	mahābhāgāḥ	SHKM - T
8a.	gambhīraṃ sarvadharmebhir	Ch - IH
	gambhīraṃ sarvatarkebhir	SHKM - T
8d.	prapañcair aprapañcitam	Ch - IH
	prapañcebhīḥ prapañcitam	SHKM - T
9a.	sarvakriyābhir atulaṃ	Ch (see above 9, n. 3) - IH
	sarvakriyāvirahitaṃ	SHKM; sarvakriyādirahitaṃ T

In other instances SHKM is isolated and the other three versions are essentially the same. In these cases there seems to be no doubt that the text of the SHKM is corrupt:

8b.	apratarkyam anālayam	Ch - IH - T
	apy atarkyam anāvilam	SHKM
9b.	satyadvaye samāśrayam	Ch - IH - T
	satyadvayam anāśrayam	SHKM
16b.	apanītaṃ jinaiś	Ch - IH - T
	punitam jinaneś	SHKM
20c.	āpūrayan samantād vai	Ch - IH - T
	sarvatra pūrya vimalam	SHKM
21c.	prakāśayasva loke'smin	Ch - IH - T
	prakāśaya mahātulaṃ	SHKM

It is obvious that there are two recensions of the Sanskrit text of the Mahāvairocanaśūtra. The first is the text translated into Chinese by Śubhakarā and transliterated by I-hsing. According to Chinese tradition the manuscript translated by Śubhakarā was obtained in India by Wu-hsing, who died in North India just as he was about to return to China. The manuscripts which he collected were brought to the Chinese capital and placed in the Hua-yen Temple.¹⁵ A Japanese scholar, Osabe Kazuo, has put this tradition in doubt. According to him two manuscripts of the Mahāvairocanaśūtra were brought to China: Wu-hsing's manuscript which arrived in China some time after his death and a manuscript brought by Śubhakarā himself. Both manuscripts were

¹⁵ Tajima, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

translated into Chinese by Śubhakara, the first by Imperial order in 717, the second in 724-725. The translation which is preserved is the second one.¹⁶ Osabe's arguments are not very convincing.¹⁷ There are, however, other arguments which can be adduced in support of the hypothesis of the existence of more than one manuscript of the Mahāvairocanasūtra in China at the beginning of the eighth century. Recently, a Japanese scholar, Kiyota Jakuun, has drawn attention to differences in the text of several mantras of the Mahāvairocanasūtra.¹⁸ Kiyota has consulted Sanskrit manuscripts of these mantras and their Chinese and Tibetan transliterations. He points out differences between Śubhakara's translation of the Mahāvairocanasūtra and I-hsing's transliterations in his commentary. He refers to Osabe's theory and advances the hypothesis that these differences may be explained by the fact that Śubhakara's translation was based on the manuscript obtained by Wu-hsing, and I-hsing's commentary on the manuscript brought to China by Śubhakara. However, it is not possible to attach much importance to the very minor differences which Kiyota has pointed out in the text of mantras in Śubhakara's translation and in I-hsing's commentary. They do not warrant the supposition that two different manuscripts were used by Śubhakara and I-hsing. One must not forget the fact that the texts were orally translated and explained. Under these circumstances slight variations in the text of mantras in Śubhakara's translation and I-hsing's commentary are no matter for surprise. In the absence of more conclusive evidence there seems to be no valid reason to doubt the tradition that the Sanskrit manuscript translated by Śubhakara and commented upon by I-hsing was the one obtained by Wu-hsing. This is not without importance for the history of Tantrism in Indonesia because Wu-hsing had been in Śrīvijaya and Malāyu, as we know from his biography by I-ching.¹⁹ The date of his stay there is not known. I-ching saw Wu-hsing for the last time in Nālandā in 685. Wu-hsing was then 56 years old.

¹⁶ Osabe Kazuo, "Ichigyō zenji no kenkyū", *Mikkyō kenkyū*, 87, 1944, pp. 13-17.

¹⁷ The information given by the *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* (cf. Tajima, *loc. cit.*) is more reliable than that found in later sources. The *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* was compiled in 730, six years after the completion of Śubhakara's translation, when Śubhakara was still alive. The *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* is considered to be a very reliable source, cf. P. Demiéville, "Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha", *BEFEO*, 24, 1924, p. 19, n. 1.

¹⁸ Kiyota Jakuun, "Dainichikyō shingon no genmon ni tsuite", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, VIII, 1960, pp. 276-279.

¹⁹ Cf. Éd. Chavannes, *Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande dynastie T'ang sur les religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la loi dans les pays d'Occident*, Paris, 1894, pp. 138-157 et p. 10.

He must have been in Śrīvijaya some time between 650 and 680. His biography does not tell us whether Wu-hsing collected manuscripts in Śrīvijaya, but this is not impossible. I-ching, who sojourned in Śrīvijaya in 672 and again from 685 to 695, translated several texts during his stay there.

The second recension of the Sanskrit text is represented by the Tibetan translation and the SHKM. The Tibetan translation was made in the beginning of the ninth century.²⁰ Nothing is known about the origin of the manuscript used. It may of course have been written long before the ninth century, because the work of translating texts began in Tibet only in the second half of the eighth century. Wu-hsing's manuscript probably dates from the second half of the seventh century. The manuscript used in Tibet may have been written in the eighth century.

The Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā was translated into Chinese and Tibetan much later than was the Mahāvairocanaśūtra. The Chinese translation was made in 999 by Fa-hsien.²¹ According to Chinese sources his original name was T'ien-hsi-tsai. He was a monk from Kashmir and arrived in China in 980 with Sanskrit manuscripts. In 987 his name was altered to Fa-hsien. He died in 1000.²² The Tibetan version (Śrīparamādyamantrakalpakaṇḍa) was translated by the Indian Mantrakalaśa and the Tibetans Lha btsan-po and Ṣi-ba'i od at Tho-ling²³ in the Suttlej river valley about 40 miles southwest of Gartok.²⁴ The translation was revised by Rin-chen bzai-po who died in 1055. The original Adhyardhaśatikā prajñāpāramitāsūtra was a short text. An incomplete Sanskrit text from the Petrovsky collection was published by Leumann in 1910. Leumann also edited and translated an incomplete Khotanese translation.²⁵ The text translated by Fa-hsien

²⁰ Cf. Tajima, *op. cit.*, p. 36. This translation is already mentioned in the Ldan-dkar catalogue, cf. Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan", *JA*, 1953, p. 326, no. 321. According to G. Tucci, the Ldan-dkar catalogue was compiled in 812, cf. *Minor Buddhist Texts*, II, Roma, 1958, p. 48.

²¹ Cf. Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, VIII, 1958, p. 264.

²² On Fa-hsien, see Jan Yün-hua, "Buddhist relations between India and Sung China", *History of Religions*, VI, 1966, pp. 34-37 and 147-151.

²³ Cf. F. A. Bischoff, *Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone*, I, Bloomington, 1968, p. 79.

²⁴ Cf. T. V. Wylie, *The geography of Tibet according to the 'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad*, Roma, 1962, p. 125, n. 96.

²⁵ For bibliographical information on this text see Yamada Ryūjō, *Bongo butten no shobunken*, Kyoto, 1958, pp. 88-89, 165 and 205; Edward Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 's-Gravenhage, 1960, pp. 79-80. See also P.

is a greatly expanded version which seems to have been unknown to previous Chinese translators. For this reason it is not likely that the text is much older than the tenth century.

Although the sources of the SHKM are known, it is not possible to know where the text was compiled. Sakai has tried to find a corresponding text in the Tibetan Buddhist canon, but in vain. However, it is not impossible that the text was compiled in India but not transmitted to Tibet and China. Neither should the possibility be excluded that the Sanskrit verses of the SHKM existed already in India before they were later incorporated into the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* and the *Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāparamitā*. Some of the verses are also found in other texts, for instance verse 17 in the *Kriyāsamuccaya* and 35cd in the *Ādikarma-pradīpa*.²⁶ However, these texts are probably rather late. It seems much more probable that the verses of the SHKM were taken from these two famous tantras in order to serve as a short ritual text to be used during the *ācāryābhiṣeka*. The text may have been compiled in India or outside India, but it is unlikely that this took place before the tenth century.

Addendum

In 1966 Matsunaga Yūkei published an article on Sanskrit fragments of the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* in which he compared the Sanskrit text of the verses, quoted in the SHKM, with the Chinese and Tibetan versions: "Dainichikyō no bonbun danpen ni tsuite [Sanskrit fragments of the *Mahāvairocanasūtra*]", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XIV (1966), pp. 858 (139) - 856 (141). Unfortunately, this article had escaped my notice. Matsunaga suggests that in 3a *vajraṃ* be corrected to *bhadraṃ* (cf. T. *bzañ*).

Demiéville's detailed summary of Toganoo Shōun's *Rishukyō no kenkyū: Bibliographie bouddhique*, IV-V, Paris, 1934, pp. 96-98. Most of the Japanese publications are not at my disposal.

²⁶ Cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme, Études et matériaux*, London, 1898, p. 209, n. 5 et pp. 194-195.