

On the Identity and Authenticity of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayāntra*: A Tantric Scripture Associated with the Vikramaśīla Tradition

Dorji WANGCHUK

Prologue

One of my first encounters with the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayāntra* (*Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud*) was through citations found in the writings of rNying-ma scholars such as Klong-chen-pa Dri-med-'od-zer (1308–1364). Klong-chen-pa cites this scripture in a number of his writings,¹ namely, in his (1) *Legs bshad rgya mtsho*, a general commentary on his *Ngal gso skor gsum* trilogy, (2) *rNal 'byor bzhi'i rim pa*, belonging to the *Zab mo yang tig* cycle of the rDzogs-chen-snying-thig teachings, (3) *Zab don rgya mtsho'i sprin*, a work belonging to the *Yang tig skor gsum* trilogy, (4) *Yid kyi mun sel*, a general commentary on the **Guhyagarbhatantra* belonging to the *Mun sel skor gsum* trilogy, and finally in his (5) *Padma dkar po*, an extensive commentary on his *Yid bzhin mdzod*, one of his so-called “Seven Treasures” (*mdzod bdun*). During the past few years I have been, whenever possible, making a modest attempt to investigate the issues of the identity, professed superiority, authenticity, and canonical affiliation of what is known as the *Vidyādharaṭīka*, mainly as found in Tibetan sources including indigenous Tibetan works and Indian treatises in Tibetan translations. With regard to the canonical affiliation of the *Vidyādharaṭīka*, we come across various positions. The *Vidyādharaṭīka* is said to belong either to the *Vinayaṭīka*, *Sūtraṭīka*, *Abhidharmaṭīka*, all three, or, to none of the three *ṭīkas* but rather to form a fourth and independent *ṭīka*. As a scriptural justification for the

¹ For the references to all Klong-chen-pa's works that cite the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayāntra*, see ARGUILLÉRE 2008: no. 297. The Tantric scripture has also been cited by a number of other Tibetan scholars. For examples, see below, n. 24.

position according to which it belongs to the *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, the following passage from the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* has been cited by A-mes-zhabs Ngag-dbang-kun-dga’-bsod-nams (1597–1659), a prolific Sa-skya scholar:²

O Mañjuśrī, the *Vinayapiṭaka* is like a cow. The *Sūtrapiṭaka* is like milk. The exoteric *Abhidharmapiṭaka* is like curd. The esoteric *Abhidharmapiṭaka* is like butter. This **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* is the quintessence of butter.

But what do we know about the Tantric scripture in question? Its provenance is obscure and its authenticity has been questioned by some Tibetan scholars. What I hope to do in this paper is to address some of the issues related to its identity, provenance, translation-cum-transmission, and authenticity.

1. The Identity of the Tantric Scripture

For obvious reasons, secondary sources (i.e. here publications in English)³ that allude to the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* often provide no information about its identity. The Tantric scripture, a greater part of which is in easy-to-read verses, appears to have been transmitted in none of the *bKa’ gyur* editions/versions. In recent years, however, some very interesting discoveries of Tibetan manuscripts have been made, including three manuscript editions of the *mūla* text of our Tantric scripture in Tibetan (translation), which was reported in 2008 by dByangs-can of the dPal-brtsegs Research Center. dByangs-can provides some useful information relating to the *tantra*, and it is, in fact, her contribution in Tibetan that has inspired me to write this article. dByangs-can reports the discovery of three manuscripts of the *tantra*.⁴ As reported by her, there is a manuscript (*bris*

² **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* (fol. 2a3–4): ‘jam dpal ‘dul ba’i sde snod ni ba lta bu’o || mdo sde’i sde snod ni ’o ma lta bu’ o || phyi’i mngon pa’i sde snod ni zho lta bu’o || nang gi mngon pa’i sde snod ni mar lta bu’o || zab mo’i chos man ngag mngon par rtogs pa ’di ni mar gyi snying khu lta bu’o ||. Cf. the passage as cited by A-mes-zhabs in his *mDo sngags sgo ’byed* (p. 36.11–18) and the same lines as found in the *gZi brjid snang ba* (B, vol. 37, pp. 180.19–181.1).

³ Cortland Dahl reports information provided by A-lag gZan-dkar-rin-po-che (b. 1943) according to which the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* is an “uncategorized” Tantric scripture that is found neither in the *bKa’ gyur* nor in the *rNying ma rgyud ’bum*, and at present is “only partially existent.” See DAHL 2007: 237.

⁴ dByangs-can, *rGyud kyi mtshams sbyor* (p. 115.5–11): *chos spyod kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyud ’di’i ma dpe ni | bal yul zhe chen dgon gyi dpe mdzod nang*

ma) kept in the library of the Zhe-chen Monastery in Kathmandu, written in the Tibetan script style called 'Bru-tsha-zhabs-ring, and which is, of course, not listed in the 'Bras spungs dkar chag. The dPal-brtsegs Research Center has at its disposal perhaps only a (handwritten?) copy (*ngos bshus*) made from a photocopy (*par log brgyab pa*) of the Zhe-chen manuscript. dByangs-can reports two further manuscripts that were discovered in the 'Bras-spungs-gnas-bcu-lha-khang in Lhasa. Some details provided by her, however, require minor corrections. Although according to her the two manuscripts are both in dBu-can script with several archaic orthographical and palaeographical features, the 'Bras spungs dkar chag indicates that the script of one of the two manuscripts is 'Bru-tsha. dByangs-can seems to have confused the script of one of the manuscripts of the *tantra* with the script of the commentary, which is indeed dBu-can. With regard to these two manuscripts of the *tantra* discovered in the 'Bras-spungs-gnas-bcu-lha-khang, she erroneously states that they bear the reference numbers "phyi ma 380" (i.e. within the range of serial numbers 008728–008735) and "phyi ma 414" (i.e. within the range of serial numbers 008961 and 008964). But actually, according to the 'Bras spungs dkar chag, the 10-folio 'Bru-tsha manuscript bears the number "phyi ma 575" (serial number 010206). The 16-folio dBu-can manuscript indeed bears the number "phyi ma 414" (serial number 008961).⁵

Karma-bde-legs of the dPal-brtsegs Research Center kindly provided me with an electronic copy of the 10-folio manuscript in 'Bru-tsha (i.e. a type of dBu-med script). To mention some of the details of the manuscript not mentioned in the 'Bras spungs dkar chag: the Tantric scripture contains interlinear annotations in a script that is more cursive than the 'Bru-tsha script of the main text (i.e. a kind of Sug-ring). Except for the last page, which contains five lines, the text is written in six lines per page. The writing is executed quite carefully and neatly. The scripts of the basic text and the interlinear annotations are akin to the scripts and styles of many early bKa'-gdams texts that have been published by the dPal-brtsegs Research Center. The Tantric scripture contains a bilingual title, the Sanskrit title provided there being very close to the one that I have proposed here.⁶ There

du bzhugs pa bris ma 'bru tsha zhabs ring par slog brgyab pa'i ngos bshus dang | 'bras spungs gnas bcu lha khang dpe rtags phyi ma 380 nang bzhugs bris ma dbu can zhig dang | yang 'bras spungs gnas bcu lha khang dpe rtags phyi ma 414 nang du bzhugs pa'i rtsa 'grel gnyis char dbu can bris ma mying pa | yig mying gi khyad chos dang | 'a mtha' | gi gu log pa sogs yod pa | zhig bcas dpe gsum mjal rgyu byung ba mams...

⁵ dPal-brtsegs-zhib-'jug-khang, 'Bras spungs dkar chag (vol. 2, pp. 804.9, 907.8).

⁶ The bilingual title of the Tantric scripture reads (fol. a1): *rgya gar skad du | sarba dha rma tsarya u pa dhe sha a bhi sa ma ya tan tra | bod skad du chos spyod thamd* [or-

is unfortunately no translation colophon, but an annotation beneath the last line ending in *chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud* || *rdzogs s.ho* || reads: *bdag gis 'di bris dge' ba yis* || 'gro kun bla myed 'bras thob shog || ("Through the virtue of writing this, may all sentient beings attain the highest [soteriological] result!"). And, as pointed out by dByangs-can, the manuscript reveals some archaic features.

2. Commentaries on the Tantric Scripture

There are reports of at least one Indian and one Tibetan commentary on the Tantric scripture and some minor Tibetan writings related to it. The purported Indian commentary is called the *gZi brjid snang ba* (**Tejāloka*), which is ascribed to one *Nāgeśvara (Klu'i-dbang-phyug). The author is said to have been a king of Śrī-Laṅkā, who was known as an emanation of Avalokiteśvara, having been prophesied in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* as a *bodhi-sattva* of the eighth stage.⁷ The '*Bras spungs dkar chag* records two manuscripts of the *gZi brjid snang ba*, namely, a 55-folio manuscript in dBu-can script (i.e. "phyi ma 414; serial number 008964") and a 22-folio manuscript in 'Bru-tsha (i.e. "phyi ma 643; serial number 010922").⁸ Interestingly, however, the compilers of the '*Bras spungs dkar chag* provide the author's name in the former instance as Nāgabodhi (Klu'i-byang-chub), which may well be a mistake (they themselves wonder if he is not Nāgārjuna's student of the same name).⁹ But in the latter instance, they identify the author as *Nāgeśvara (Klu'i-dbang-phyug). In addition to these two manuscript editions of the *gZi brjid snang ba*, it has been transmitted in the sNar-thang and Golden versions of the *bsTan 'gyur*¹⁰ (i.e. not in the Peking, sDe-dge, or Co-ne versions). dByangs-can points out that the catalogue of the *Tshal pa bstan 'gyur* compiled by Tshal-pa sMon-lam-rdo-rje (thirteenth century) and the catalogue of the *sDe dge bstan 'gyur* compiled by Zhu-chen Tshul-

thographic abbreviation for thams cad] *kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud* |. Interlinear annotations provide the corresponding Tibetan words of the Sanskrit title and the corresponding Sanskrit words in the Tibetan title.

⁷*Nāgeśvara, *gZi brjid snang ba* (B, vol. 37, p. 247.13–17): *slob dpon chen po yul sing ga la'i rgyal po 'phags pa spyan ras gzigs kyi sprul par grags pa | mdo sde lang kar gshegs pa nas sa brgyad pa'i byang chub sems dpar lung bstan pa | klu'i dbang phyug ces bya bas mdzad pa | chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rnam bshad | gzi brjid snang ba zhes bya ba rdzogs so* ||.

⁸dPal-brtsegs-zhib-'jug-khang, '*Bras spungs dkar chag* (vol. 2, pp. 804.12, 967.8).

⁹dPal-brtsegs-zhib-'jug-khang, '*Bras spungs dkar chag* (vol. 2, p. 804.12): *klu'i byang chub 'di klu sgrub kyi slob ma klu byang min nam snyam*.

¹⁰*Nāgeśvara, *gZi brjid snang ba* (N, vol. *nyu*, fols. 71b–106b; G, vol. *nyu*, fols. 93a–142b; vol. *nyu*; B, vol. 37, pp. 173–248).

khirms-rin-chen (1697–1774) mention the Indian commentary, whereas in fact neither of the *bsTan 'gyurs* has transmitted it.¹¹ The catalogue of the *bsTan 'gyur* commissioned by the Third Karma-pa Rang-byung-rdo-rje (1284–1339) also mentions the commentary titled *gZi brjid snang ba*.¹² The three Tibetan works provide the background story (*gleng zhi*) to the *tantra*, and a summary (*bsdus don*) and outline (*khog don*) of it, all of which may have been composed by one gTsang-ston, a thirteenth-century exegete of the **Guhyagarbhatantra*. In addition, Chos-grags-bzang-po, a direct student and biographer of Klong-chen-pa, lists among Klong-chen-pa's writings a commentary on the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*,¹³ which, however, seems not to have survived. Judging from the fact that Klong-chen-pa often cited from it and even wrote a commentary on it, the Tantric scripture seems to have been held in high regard by him. The catalogue of the *bsTan 'gyur* commissioned by Karma-pa Rang-byung-rdo-rje, finally, mentions a certain *Man ngag bdud rts'i 'khor lo*, which is said to be extracted from the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*.¹⁴

3. The Authenticity of the Tantric Scripture and Its Indian Commentary

The issue of the authenticity of a scripture in Tibet is invariably linked with the issue of its provenance and accounts of its translation and transmission. One of the earliest scholars to address the issue of the authenticity of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* is Chag-lo-tsā Chos-rje-dpal (1197–1263/64) in his queries to Sa-skya-panḍita Kun-dga' rgyal-mtshan (1182–1251), who lists the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* as an example of a Tantric scripture “composed by old Tibetans” (*bod rgan*

¹¹ dByangs-can, *rGyud kyi mtshams sbyor* (pp. 115.19–116.8). See Zhu-chen's *sDe bstan dkar chag* (pp. 727.19–728.1): *chos spyod ma byung thams cad kyi mngon par rtogs pa'i man ngag gi rgyud kyi 'grel pa gzi brjid snang ba zhes bya klū'i dbang phyug gis mdzad pa | dge tshul khyung grags kyi 'gyur | 'di rtsa 'grel gn̄yis ka rdzun ma yang dag pa cig [= zhiḡ] 'dug ste | nag tsho lo tsā ba yang dag tu bzhed pa yin zer nas | sngar gyi rnams kyis bris 'dug pas 'dir yang bzhugs su bcug pa yin no ||*. This is almost a verbatim reproduction of Bu-ston's statement, concerning which see below, n. 16.

¹² Anonymous, *Rang byung bstan dkar* (p. 483.6): *chos spyod mngon par rtogs pa'i man ngag gi rgyud kyi 'grel pa gzi brjid snang ba | klū'i dbang phyug gis mdzad pa khyung grags kyi 'gyur |*.

¹³ Chos-grags-bzang-po, *mThong ba don ldan* (p. 216.1–2): *Chos spyod thams cad mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud kyi bshad 'grel byang chub ljon shing*. One wonders if *bshad 'grel* in the title should be 'grel *bshad*.

¹⁴ Anonymous, *Rang byung bstan dkar* (p. 483.6): *chos spyod kyi mngon rtogs kyi rgyud las phyung ba'i man ngag bdud rts'i 'khor lo |*.

rnams kyis sbyar ba).¹⁵ Bu-ston himself considered both the *mūla* and the Indian commentary to be “genuinely fake” (*rdzun ma yang dag pa zhig*), although at one point he states that the authenticity of the commentary is a matter of dispute (*rtsod pa can*) in Tibet. He also states that some persons (*kha cig*) had maintained that the *tantra* must be authentic because Nag-tsho-lo-tsā-ba Tshul-khrims-rgyal-ba (1011–1064) considered it so.¹⁶ Probably Bu-ston was thinking of the passage in Atiśa’s biography composed by mChims ’Jam-pa’i-dbyangs, where it is stated that Nag-tsho-lo-tsā-ba, who at the behest of lHa-bla-ma Byang-chub-’od travelled to India to pass on an invitation to Atiśa, found out that while the Tibetans in Tibet dismissed the claim that the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* was a work composed by dGe-tshul Khyung-grags, the *pañḍitas* in the Vikramaśīla seminary in India were studying it.¹⁷ Note that Helmut Eimer has misunderstood the passage.¹⁸ What the text is actually saying is that it is said that dGe-tshul Khyung-grags discovered the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *tantra* and its commentary in the dKor-mdzod-gling (i.e. Treasury Complex) in bSam-yas monastery, translated them, and started to teach their contents, but people did not come to listen to his teachings, believing that the works were his own compositions. Eimer, however, understood the text to be saying that it was because dGe-tshul Khyung-grags presented the works as his own compositions that nobody came to listen to his teachings. Eimer also misunderstood the meaning of *dkor mdzod*, rendering it as “Verwalter” (i.e. caretaker or custodian). At any rate, the positions of Tibetan scholars on the authenticity of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* seem to have remained divided despite the reported discovery of the Sanskrit manuscript

¹⁵ Sa-pan, *Chag lo’i zhus lan* (p. 500.4–6): *chos spyod mngon par rtogs pa dang || lam lnga bkol ba la sogs pa || gsar rnying kun la mang po zhig || bod rgan rnams kyis sbyar ba mthong ||*.

¹⁶ Bu-ston, *bsTan dkar za ma tog* (p. 354.14–18): *chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa’i man ngag gi rgyud kyi ’grel pa gzi brjid snang ba zhes bya klu’i dbang phyug gis mdzad pa | dge tshul khyung grags kyi ’gyur | ’di rtsa ’grel gnyis ka rdzun ma yang dag cig ’dug ste | nag tsho lo tsā ba yang dag bzhed pa yin zer nas sngar gyi rnams kyis bris ’dug pas ’dir yang bzhugs su bcug pa yin |*. The same statement can be found in his *bsTan dkar phreng ba* (pp. 120.19–121.2). See also Zhu-chen’s *sDe bstan dkar chag* (pp. 727.19–728.1), which seems to be a simple repetition of Bu-ston’s statement. Cf. *Bu ston chos ’byung* (p. 271.15–16): *chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa’i ’grel pa gzi brjid snang ba dge tshul khyung grags kyi ’gyur | ’di rtsod pa can yin |*.

¹⁷ EIMER 1979b: 175: *dge tshul khyung grags kyis bsam yas dkor mdzod nas rgyud ’di rtsa ’grel gnyis rnyed nas gzigs rtog mdzad pas bod du ’gyur ba’i chos legs gsungs nas bshad pas kho rang gi byas pa yin zer nas nyan mkhan ma byung skad |*.

¹⁸ EIMER 1979a: 226 (translation); cf. 75–76 (discussion).

by dGe-tshul Khyung-grags in the bSam-yas dKor-mdzod-gling (or dBu-rtse), and despite Nag-tsho-lo-tṣā-ba's report of the existence and popularity of the *tantra* in the Vikramaśīla seminary in India. With regard to the *gZi brjid snang ba*, the Indian commentary on the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*, Bu-ston states that its “[authenticity (i.e. Indian provenance)] is controversial” (*rtsod pa can*).¹⁹ The issue of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*'s authenticity and its reported vindication through Nag-tsho-lo-tṣā-ba's report of its popularity in Vikramaśīla are taken up in later apologetic works, such as one by Sog-zlog-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan (1552–1624).²⁰

4. The Supposed Translator of the Tantric Scripture and Its Indian Commentary

Both groups of Tibetan scholars, that is, those who reject and those who recognize the authenticity of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*, obviously accept the involvement of one dGe-tshul Khyung-grags.²¹ For those who rejected the authenticity of the *tantra* and its commentary, dGe-tshul Khyung-grags was the author, or rather forger, of the *tantra*, whereas for those who recognized the authenticity of the *tantra* and its commentary, he was its translator. He is said to have been a contemporary of the early eleventh-century lHa-btsan-po Devarāja, a descendant of Khride-yum-brtan, the adoptive son of Glang-dar-ma's elder queen. According to Ne'u-panḍita, lHa-btsan-po Devarāja hosted and supported 'Bring Yeshe-yan-tan, one of the “ten men of dBus and gTsang” (*dbus gtsang mi bcu*), who revived the Vinaya tradition in central Tibet. Both the translation colophon of the *tantra* found in one of the manuscripts (cited by dByangs-can) —to which I have no access—and a small piece written by

¹⁹Bu-ston, *bKa' bstan rnam grangs* (p. 548.9–10): *chos spyod thams kyi man ngag gi mngon par rtogs pa'i 'grel ba gzi brjid snang ba dge tshul khyung grags kyi 'gyur | 'di rtsod pa can yin |*

²⁰Sog-zlog-pa, *Nges don 'brug sgra* (p. 315.1–10): *yang kha cig chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud dang | slob dpon 'jam dpal grags pas mdzad pa'i rtsa ltung rgya cher 'grel gnyis dge tshul khyung grags kyi byas pa'i bod ma yin no || zhes zer | 'di la nag tsho lo tṣā ba'i zhal snga nas kyi [= kyiis?] dang po rgya gar du ma phyin gong du de ltar gtsigs mi 'dug pa la | physis bi kra ma shī lā'i paṇḍi ta rnam 'di la 'chad nyan byed kyin 'dug par | de la bdud rtsi thig pa zhes bya ba'i gdams ngag ngo mtshar can cig (sic) 'dug pa'ang nag tshos bsgyur te shin tu gtsigs che bar mdzad pas thams cad yid ches pa yin zhes grags so ||*

²¹For a short biography of Khyung-grags, see Ko-zhul, *mKhas grub ming mdzod* (p. 1676.3–16).

dGe-tshul Khyung-grags himself in praise of the king state that he translated the *tantra* at the behest of the king, who provided him with a Sanskrit manuscript of it from the dBu-rtse (of the bSam-yas temple). According to the translation colophon of the commentary, Khyung-grags translated the commentary at the behest of King Bodhirāja, who received Atiśa on his visit to bSam-yas.²² According to Bu-ston, the commentary too was translated by dGe-tshul Khyung-grags.²³

5. Epilogue

In the absence of the Sanskrit manuscript of the *tantra* (or of its commentary), or some independent testimony, such as citations in Indian works in the Sanskrit original or in translation, we cannot say anything definitive about the authenticity or the Indian provenance of the *tantra* in question. If, however, we grant some credibility to the reports about Nag-tsho-lo-tsā-ba's personal inspection of the *tantra* in the Vikramaśīla monastic seminary in India, we could consider it to be authentically Indian in provenance. A cursory attempt to trace some verse lines cited in later Tibetan sources that are said to be from the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*, however,

²²*Nāgeśvara, *gZi brjid snang ba* (B, vol. 37, p. 247.18–20): *lha dbang phyug dam pa'i mnga' dag bo dhi rā dza'i bka' lung gis | dbu rtse nas rgya gar gyi dpe phyung nas | bod kyi dge tshul khyung grags kyis bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa'o* ||. Bodhirāja was the ruler of Chos-'khor bSam-yas and received Atiśa on his visit there. See Las-chen Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan (1432–1506), *bKa' gdams chos 'byung* (p. 96.10–12): *chos 'khor bsam yas su phyag phebs | lha btsun bo dhi rā dzas zhabs tog legs par mdzad | bod kyi mi chen mang po'ang 'dus* . For a conversation between Bodhirāja and Atiśa, see *ibid.* (p. 135.12–19).

²³See above, n. 19.

²⁴See ARIS 1977: 226, n. 66, where the following six verse-lines that are said to be from the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* have been cited: *yi ge 'bri mchod sbyin pa dang || nyan dang klog dang 'dzin pa dang || 'chang dang kha ston byed pa dang || de sems pa dang sgom pa ste || spyod pa 'di bcu'i bdag nyid ni || bsod nams phung po dpag tu med* ||. A cursory attempt to trace these verse-lines in the *tantra* yielded no exact correspondence. The following verse-lines, said to be from the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*, are cited by dPal-sprul 'Jigs-med-chos-kyi-dbang-po (1808–1887) in his *sNgon 'gro'i khrid yig* (p. 23.5–10): *me tog stan sogs rab 'bul zhing || sa phyogs spyod lam sdom pa dang || srog chags kun la 'tshé mi bya || bla ma la ni yang dag dad || ma yengs bla ma'i gdams ngag nyan || dogs sel phyir na skyon tshig dri || nyan po yan lag drug dang ldan* ||. Cf. the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra* (fol. 3a5–6): *me tog stan sogs rab phul dang || sa phyogs spyod lam bsdam pa dang || srog chags kun la 'tshé myi byed || bla ma la ni gsol ba 'debs || ma yengs bla ma'i gdam ngag 'dzin || rtog sel phyir na skyon tshig dri || sgrol ma yan lag drug dang ldan* ||.

suggests that its textual history is not without problems,²⁴ and only a careful study is likely to shed any more light on this controversial Tantric scripture, which has, to say the least, an interesting textual history.

Bibliography

A. Primary (Indic and Tibetan) Sources

- bKa' bstan rnam grangs* Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, *bKa' dang bstan 'gyur bod du ji ltar 'gyur ba'i rnam grangs*. In *bsTan 'gyur bzhugs byang*, pp. 473–606.
- bKa' gdams chos 'byung* Las-chen Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan, *bKa' gdams kyi rnam par thar pa bka' gdams chos 'byung gsal ba'i sgron me*. Lhasa: Bod-ljongs-mi-dmangs-dpe-skrun-khang, 2003.
- '*Bras spungs dkar chag* dPal-brtsegs-bod-yig-dpe-rnying-zhib-'jug-khang, '*Bras spungs dgon du bzhugs su gsal ba'i dpe rnying dkar chag*. 2 vols. Beijing: Mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, 2004.
- bsTan dkar phreng ba* Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'shal gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu dbang gi rgyal po'i phreng ba*. In *bsTan 'gyur bzhugs byang*, pp. 239–238.
- bsTan dkar za ma tog* Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, *bsTan bcos 'gyur ro 'shal gyi dkar chag yid bzhin nor bu rin po che'i za ma tog*. In *bsTan 'gyur bzhugs byang*, pp. 239–272.
- bsTan 'gyur bzhugs byang* Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, *rGyal ba'i dgongs 'grel bstan 'gyur rin po che'i bzhugs byang dkar chag*. Chengdu: Si-khron-dpe-skruntshogs-pa & Si-khron-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, 2011.
- Bu ston chos 'byung* Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod* (on cover: *Bu ston chos 'byung*). Beijing: Krung-go'i-bod-kyi-shes-rig-dpe-skrun-khang, 1991.
- Chag lo'i zhus lan* Sa-skyapaṇḍita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan, *Chag lo tsā ba'i zhus lan*. In *Sa skya gong ma rnam lnga'i gsung 'bum dpe bsdur ma las sa paṇ kun dga' rgyal mtshan gyi gsung pod dang po*. Mes-po'i-shul-bzhag 15. Beijing:

- gZi brjid snang ba* Krung-go'i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrun-khang, 2007, pp. 481–502.
*Nāgeśvara, *Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rnam bshad gzi brjid snang ba*. N [= sNar-thang], vol. *nyu*, fols. 71b–106b; G [= Golden], vol. *nyu*, fols. 93a–142b; B [= dPe-bsdur-ma], vol. 37, pp. 173–248.
- mDo sngags sgo 'byed* A-mes-zhabs Ngag-dbang-kun-dga' bsod-nams, *rGyu dang 'bras bu'i theg pa'i spyi don legs par bshad pa mdo sngags bstan pa rgya mtsho'i sgo 'byed*. In *A mes ngag dbang kun dga' bsod nams kyi gsung 'bum*. 42 vols. Lhasa: Bod-ljongs-dpe-rnying-dpe-skrun-khang, n. d., vol. 11.
- mKhas grub ming mdzod* Ko-zhul Grags-pa-'byung-gnas & rGyal-ba Blo-bzang-mkhas-grub, *Gangs can mkhas grub rim byon ming mdzod*. Lanzhou: Kan-su'u-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, 1992.
- mThong ba don ldan* Chos-grags-bzang-po, *Kun mkhyen dri med 'od zer gyi rnam thar mthong ba don ldan*. In *Kun mkhyen klong chen rab 'byams kyi rnam thar*. Chengdu: Si-khron-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, 1994, pp. 167–232.
- Nges don 'brug sgra* Sog-zlog-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, *gSang sngags snga 'gyur la bod du rtsod pa snga phyir byung ba rnam kyi lan du brjod pa nges pa don gyi 'brug sgra*. Chengdu: Si-khron-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, 1998.
- Rang byung bstan dkar* Anonymous, *rJe rang byung rdo rje'i thugs dam bstan 'gyur dkar chag*. In *Karma pa rang byung rdo rje'i gsung 'bum*. 16 vols. [Xining: Tshur-phu-mkhan-po Yo-lag-bkra-shis, 2006], vol. *nga*, pp. 415–594.
- rGyud kyi mtshams sbyor* dByangs-can, *Chos spyod thams cad kyi man ngag mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyud kyi mtshams sbyor mdor bsodus*. In *Sa mth'o'i bu mo 2*. Beijing: Krung-go'i-bod-rig-pa-dpe-skrun-khang, 2008, pp. 111–117.
- rNam thar rgyas pa* Zul-phu-pa Bya 'Dul-ba-'dzin-pa *et al.* (?), *Jo bo rje dpal ldan mar me mdzad ye shes kyi*

- rnam thar rgyas pa*. In EIMER 1979b: 1–391 (Tibetan Text).
- **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*. Unpublished Ms. in dBu-med (’Bru-tsha) script [courtesy of Karma-bde-legs].
- Zhu-chen Tshul-khrims-rin-chen, *Kun mkhyen nyi ma’i gnyen gyi bka’ lung gi dgongs don rnam par ’grel ba’i bstan bcos gangs can pa’i skad du ’gyur ro ’shal gyi chos sbyin rgyun mi ’chad pa’i ngo mtshar ’phrul gyi phyi mo rdzogs ldan bskal pa’i bsod nams kyi sprin phung rgyas par dkrigs pa’i tshul las brtsams pa’i gtam ngo mtshar chu gter ’phel ba’i zla ba gsar pa* (on cover: *bsTan ’gyur dkar chag*). Lhasa: Bod-ljongs-mi-dmangs-dpe-skrun-khang, 1985.
- dPal-sprul ’Jigs-med-chos-kyi-dbang-po, *sNying thig sngon ’gro’i khrid yig kun bzang bla’i zhal lung*. Chengdu: Si-khron-mi-rigs-dpe-skrun-khang, 1993.
- **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*
- sDe bstan dkar chag*
- sNgon ’gro’i khrid yig*

B. Secondary Sources

- ARGUILLÈRE 2008
Stéphane ARGUILLÈRE, “Index des citations dans les œuvres de Klong-chen rab-’byams, III.” *Tibétologie et philologie*, 2008 [<http://s.anguillere.over-blog.com/article-20779719.html>]
- ARIS 1977
Michael ARIS, “Jamyang Khyentse’s Brief Discourse on the Essence of All the Ways: A Work of the *Ris-med* Movement.” *Kailash: A Journal of Himalayan Studies* 5 (3), 1977, pp. 205–330.
- DAHL 2007
Cortland DAHL, tr., *Great Perfection: Outer and Inner Preliminaries*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion Publications, 2007.
- EIMER 1979a
Helmut EIMER, *rNam thar rgyas pa: Materialien zu einer Biographie des Atiśa (Dīpaṃkāraśrījñāna). 1. Teil: Einführung, Inhaltsverzeichnis, Namenglossar*. Asiatische Forschungen 67. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1979 [Study and Transla-

EIMER 1979b

tion].

Helmut EIMER, *rNam thar rgyas pa: Materialien zu einer Biographie des Atiśa (Dīpaṃkāraśrījñāna). 2. Teil: Textmaterialien*. Asiatische Forschungen 67. Wiesbaden: Otto HARRASSOWITZ, 1979 [Tibetan Text].