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Buddhist Sanskrit in the 
Kālacakra Tantra

by John Newman

Vajrayāna Buddhist texts were composed in at least three Indian languages: Sanskrit, Apabhraṃśa, and an East Indian dialect usually referred to as "Old Bengali." By far the greatest part of Vajrayāna literature was written in Sanskrit, the lingua franca of pan-Indic culture. This is not surprising—the Vajrayāna, like Buddhism as a whole, developed among diverse linguistic communities, and it is only to be expected that Indian Vajrayāna Buddhists used the common language of educated discourse to communicate their ideas.

The Sanskrit of the Vajrayāna literature, however, is not the Sanskrit of Pāṇini. According to M. Winternitz: "The Sanskrit in which the [Buddhist] Tantras are written, is, as a rule, just as barbarous as their contents" (Winternitz 1933:401). The question remains as to the exact nature of this linguistic "barbarism"—is it due simply to incompetence on the part of Vajrayāna Buddhist authors, or does some other factor, such as Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, come into play here?¹

Perhaps the earliest Western comment on the Sanskrit of a Vajrayāna text is L. de la Vallée Poussin's description of the language of Nāgārjuna's Pañcakrama: "Il est... rédigé en sanscrit, dans une langue riche de termes techniques et de particularités grammaticales ou prosodiques, mais qui, du point de vue phonétique, est correcte et n'exige pas les vastes connaissances et la sûreté de main que suppose l'édition du Lotus ou celle du Mahāvastu" (de la Vallée Poussin 1896:VII). In other words, the Sanskrit of the Pañcakrama does not always follow Pāñinian norms, but it is not what we today would call Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, or Buddhist Ārṣa.²
Some scholars reject the influence of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit on the language of Vajrayāna texts. D.L. Snellgrove, describing the Sanskrit of the Hevajra Tantra, says: "The language need not be graced by the term Buddhist Sanskrit. It is just bad Sanskrit" (Snellgrove 1959:xi). C.S. George, after a meticulous study of the first portion of the Candamahārōṣaṇa Tantra, appears to concur with Snellgrove: "The language of the [Candamahārōṣaṇa Tantra]...is Sanskrit. Although the vocabulary is often technical, this seems hardly sufficient grounds to confuse the issue of language by describing it as 'Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit' or even 'Buddhist Sanskrit.' The subject matter is Buddhist, but the language is Sanskrit, close indeed to the Sanskrit of the Epics" (George 1974:14).

Other scholars, on the contrary, discern a relationship between the Sanskrit of the Vajrayāna literature and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. B. Bhattacharya says: "The Sādhanamālā, for all intents and purposes, is written in Sanskrit, but the Sanskrit used here is far from what we usually understand by the word. It is the Sanskrit of the Buddhists,—similar to that employed in the Mahāvastu Avadāna, the Lalitavistara, the Śikṣāsamuccaya, the Kāraṇḍavyūha, the Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka, and similar works" (Bhattacharya 1925:viii). T. Skorupski, commenting on the language of the Sarvadurgatiparīśodhana Tantra, says: "The text of this Tantra, like many other works of this kind, has many peculiarities of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. To a Sanskrit scholar who is not acquainted with this kind of literary work and who has no sympathy for Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit many grammatical endings will appear simply as wrong" (Skorupski 1983:118).

Most pertinent to the present essay is H. Hoffmann's description of the Sanskrit of the Paramādibuddha—the Kālacakra mūlataṇtra: "[The Kālacakra mūlataṇtra] is not only written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit but in a very corrupt barbarian Sanskrit of a semi-Indian region in the far north-west" (Hoffmann 1973:136). A characterization such as this, however, must be evaluated in light of what the Kālacakra tradition itself has to say about the question of "correct" language.5

In what follows we edit and translate the Sanskrit and Tibetan of a passage from the Vimalaprabhā, the great commentary on the Śrī Kālacakra (the Kālacakra laghutantra). This passage describes the language of the Paramādibuddha, the Śrī Kālacakra,
the *Vimalaprabha* and, by extension, the entire early Kalacakra literature. The Sanskrit text of this passage was first published seventy years ago, but Western scholars have not given it the attention it deserves.

\[\text{tesam ca sușabdavādinām sușabdagrahavānāsāyārthaśa-
raṇatām āśritya kvacid vṛtte 'pașabdaḥ/ kvacid vṛtte yatibhangāḥ/ kvacid avibhaktikām padam/ kvacid varṇa-
śvaralopah/ kvacid vṛtte dirgho hrasvaḥ hrasvo 'pi dīrghaḥ/ kvicit pañcamyarthe saptami caturthyarthe saśthi/ kutraci parasmaipadini dhātāv ātmanepadam āt-
manepadini parasmai padam/ kvacid ekavacane bahuvacanam bahuvacanam ekavacanam/ puṃlīṅge napumṣakāṇīmāṃ napumṣake puṃlīṅgam/ kvicit tālavyāśakāre dantyāmūrdhanyau/ kvacin mūrdhanye dantyatālavyau/ kvacid dantye tālavyāmūrdhanyau/ evam anye 'py anusartavyās tantradeśakopadesāneti/ tathā mūlatantre bhagavān āha/}

\[sucandra sarvabuddhānāṃ deyām nityeṣṭavastukam/ śiṣye ṇhi ca gurūnām ca bhāryāduhitṛputrakam/ (1) gandho bhavati medinyāṃ toye rūpaṃ raso 'nale/ vāyau sparśo 'kṣare sabda dharmadhātur/ mahānabhe/ (2) gandhadhūpādīpēbhīḥ khānapanādivāsasaiḥ/ pūjāyitvā sadā mudrāṃ guror dadati satsutāḥ/ (3) ity evam ādayo 'nve 'py apaśabdāḥ yogināvagantavyā āgamanāpāṭhād iti/ evām tīkāyām api su-
śabdābhimānanāśaya likhitavyām mayārthaśa-raṇatām āśrityeti/ atha yena yena prakāreṇa kulavidyāsā sab-
dābhimānakṣayo bhavati tena tena prakāreṇārthaśa-
raṇatām āśritya buddhānāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ dharma-
ādesāṇā desabhāṣāntareṇa sabdasāstrabhāṣāntareṇa mokṣārtham/ \]

\[Vimalaprabha I.3\]

“In order to destroy the attachment to correct language of those (brahman sages) who advocated correct language, (Kalki Yaśas) relied on the meaning. In some verses (of the Śrī Kālacakra) there are ungrammatical words. In some
verses the caesuras are lacking. Some have words without case endings. In some, letters and vowels are elided (BHSG 2.3, 2.17, 2.72, 2.84 ff., 2.90, 3.106, 3.122, 3.118). In some verses long vowels are short, and short vowels are long (BHSG 1.10, 3.1–46). In some the locative case is used for the ablative case (BHSG 7.82), and the genitive case is used for the dative case (BHSG 7.63; Whitney 294b, 297a; Holtzmann 297). In some a middle voice is attributed to a root that possesses an active voice, and an active voice is attributed to one that possesses a middle voice (BHSG 37.22 ff. & 37.10 ff.; Whitney 529a, 774; Holtzmann 530, 774).

In some the plural number is used for the singular number, and the singular number is used for the plural number (BHSG 1.10, 1.101, 25.4). The neuter gender is used for the masculine gender, and the masculine gender is used for the neuter (BHSG 1.10, 6.1; cf. Holtzmann 263). In some the dental (sa) and the cerebral (sa) are used for the palatal letter ña; in some the dental and the palatal are used for the cerebral; in some the palatal and the cerebral are used for the dental (BHSG 2.56 ff.; Holtzmann 63). There are also other such things that must be understood in conformity with the instructions of the tantra teacher. Likewise, the Bhagavān (Buddha) said in the basic tantra (the Paramādībuddha):

Sucandra, disciples should constantly offer desired things—wives, daughters, and beloved sons—to all the Buddhas and gurus.//(1)
Odor arises from earth, form from water, taste from fire, tactility from wind, sound from the unchanging, the sphere of phenomena from the great sky.//(2)
Constantly worshipping the mudrā with perfumes, incense, lamps, and so forth, and food, drink, clothing, and so forth, the noble son gives her to the guru.//(3)

A yogi should understand ungrammatical words like these, and others too, by reading the sacred texts. Likewise, I (Kalkī Pundarika) must write the (Vimalaprabhā) commentary relying on the meaning, in order to destroy conceit in correct language. Thus, Buddhas and bodhisattvas teach the Dharma for the sake of liberation—relying on the meaning, they use the different vernaculars and the different
languages of the grammatical treatises, whichever eliminate conceit in family, learning, and correct language."

It should be noted that I have translated the Sanskrit of this passage in accordance with the Tibetan translation. An exception to this is the verses cited from the *mūlātantra*, where the Tibetan faithfully reproduces the grammatical solecisms of the Sanskrit.24

As Bu ston points out, the genitives *sarvabuddhānām* in verse 1a, *gurūnām* in 1c, and *guroh* in 3d must all be glossed as datives (Bu ston 1324:611/5–6). In 1c the first *ca* is syntactically redundant, and *sīsyebhiḥ* is a Vedic form of the instrumental plural for the *a*-stems (BHSG 8.110; Whitney 329d).

All the locatives in the second verse—*medinīyām, toye, anale,* and so forth—are to be taken as ablatives (Bu ston 1324:611/4–5). In 2c *sabda* is lacking a case ending.

In 3a & b *ādi* should properly come at the end of the compounds. In 3a *dīpebhīḥ* is, again, a Vedic form of the instrumental plural for the *a*-stems. In 3b *vāsasaṅgh, vāsas,* neuter, is treated as an *a*-stem (BHSG 16.26; Whitney 1315). In 3d the plural *dadatī* should properly be *dadāti,* singular (BHSG 28.11).

It is important to note that the language described above is *not* Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Buddhist Ārṣa). As F. Edgerton explains, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit "is a blend of Middle Indic with Sanskrit, but its basis, or substratum, is Middle Indic; the Sanskrit features are secondarily and superficially laid on" (Edgerton 1956:134). Edgerton stresses that Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit "originally was, or was based on, an ancient, pre-Christian, Middle Indic vernacular. That is, it is not, and never was, Sanskrit" (Edgerton 1954:2). In particular, "[BHS] vocabulary is to a very large extent not Sanskrit, but Middle Indic" (ibid); and "[Middle Indic words] stamp the language of the [BHS] works containing them as based upon another dialect than Sanskrit" (BHSG 1.37). "Even the latest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit texts still retain numerous words, lexical items, which show their vernacular origin" (Edgerton 1956:134).

The language of the Kālacakra literature, on the other hand, is Sanskrit. As the passages cited in this essay exemplify, it is not based on a Middle Indic dialect; it contains very few Middle Indic words.25
The grammatical "rules" given in the *Vimalaprabhā* can indeed be applied to the language depicted by Edgerton in his *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*, but many of these features are also common to the Sanskrit of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Purāṇas*, and the Hindu tantras (cf. Goudriaan 1981:27–28). Moreover, these grammatical irregularities are not the outcome of a natural linguistic development from an earlier Prakrit—they appear to have been deliberately introduced into the Kālacakra literature.

Early Buddhist traditions record that the Buddha authorized his followers to recite the *buddhavacanam* in their individual dialects in order to convert the unconverted (cf. BHSG 1.6–1.13; Edgerton 1954:5–6; 1956:130–133). In the same spirit, concern for the meaning rather than the words of the Dharma is often exhibited in the early Kālacakra literature. For example, in the *Paramādibuddha* the Buddha says:

\[
yena yena prakāreṇa sattvānāṁ paripācanam/
tena tena prakāreṇa kuryād dharmasya deśanām\//(5)
\]
\[
yogi śabdāpaśadbena dharmam grhṇāti yatnatah/
deśaśadbena labde 'rtthe śāstraśadbena tatra kim\//(6)\]

One should teach the Dharma in whatever fashion completely matures sentient beings.\//(5)

A yogi zealously grasps the Dharma through grammatical and ungrammatical words. When one gets the meaning from the local words, what is the use of technical terms?\//(6)

Likewise, the verse introduction to the *Vimalaprabhā* says:

\[
śabdāśabdavicāraṇā na mahaṭī sarvajñamārgārthiniṁ
nānādesakubhāṣayāpi mahatāṁ mārga pravṛttiḥ sadā/
sattvānāṁ adhimukticittavaśataḥ sarvajñabhāsa parā
anyā vyākaraṇe surāhiricitā śabdādīvādārthaṁ\//(37)
apaśabdād artham api yogī grhṇāti desābhāsātaḥ/
toye payo niviṣṭaṁ pibanti haṁsās tad uddhṛtya\//(38)
paramāṭhatattvaviśaye na vyaṅjanaśaraṇatā\// sadā mahatā\//
dēsaśaṁjñābhir arthe jñāte kim śāstraśadbena\//(39)
jñānaṁ tad eva na bhavati udite yasyāpaśadbāsadbāḥ\// syuḥ/
sarvajñasya na bhāṣā yā sā prādeśikī jagati\//(40)\]
Those intent on the path to omniscience do not greatly discriminate between grammatical and ungrammatical words. They always enter the path of the great ones, even through the lowly languages of various countries. The Omniscient One’s language is Other, in accordance with the dispositions of sentient beings. Quite different is the language of those intent on arguing about the words and so forth the gods and nagas arranged in the grammars.

A yogi grasps the meaning even from vernaculars and ungrammatical words. Swans draw out and drink the milk mixed in the water.

In the realm of ultimate reality great ones never rely on the letters. What is the use of technical terms when one understands the meaning through the local expressions?

That which grammatical and ungrammatical words can express is not gnosis. That which is parochial to the world is not the language of the Omniscient One.

Puṇḍarīka, the author of the *Vimalaprabhā*, tells us that his father Yaśas introduced “ungrammatical words” and so forth in the text of the *Śrī Kālacakra* “in order to destroy the attachment to correct language of those (brahman sages) who advocated correct language.” Likewise, the irregular Sanskrit of the *Vimalaprabha* is intended to “destroy conceit in correct language.” Excessive esteem for Sanskrit appears to have had a deleterious effect on some members of the Buddhist community during Puṇḍarīka’s time:

\[
\text{anena pradeśikasamśkrtaikavacanena buddho\textsuperscript{99} pi pradeśiko bhavati sarvasattvarutasvabhāvinyā sarvajñabhāṣayā vinā/ iha āryaviśaye sābdavādināṃ tīrthikānāṃ paṇḍitānāṃ abhimānaṃ dṛṣṭvā bālamātināṃ bauddhānāṃ abhiprāyaḥ/ yathā brahmahariharādayāyaḥ sanmśkrta vaktāro brāhmaṇavaiśṇavāvāsa vādānāṃ īṣṭadevataḥ tathāmakāṃ yā īṣṭadevataḥ buddhabodhīsattvāḥ sanmśkrta vaktāro bhavantītī/ iha na ca te anena pradesīkasaṃskṛtaikavacanena sarvasattvarutair dharma dēsaśākāḥ samgiti kārakā bhavantī buddhabodhīsattvāḥ sarvajñabhāṣayā vinā/ āto devajātīpratibaddhā pradesīkā bhaṣā\textsuperscript{88} buddhabodhīsattvānāṃ na syād iti nānasattvarutadharma dēsaśakatvā \textsuperscript{84}
\]

“If he did not use the omniscient language that has the
nature of the utterances of all sentient beings, if he used only this parochial Sanskrit speech, then the Buddha would be parochial as well. Here in the land of the Aryans, foolish Buddhists see the arrogance of the scholarly heterodox proponents of correct language, and come to believe: 'Just as the chosen deities of the brahmans, Vaiṣṇavas, Śaivas, and so forth—Brahmā, Hari, Hara, and so forth—speak Sanskrit, so too our chosen deities, the Buddhas and bodhisattvas, speak Sanskrit.' But here, these Buddhas and bodhisattvas do not use the utterances of all sentient beings to teach and redact the Dharma solely by means of this parochial Sanskrit speech, without using the omniscient language. Therefore, Buddhas and bodhisattvas do not use a parochial language that is entangled with birth as a god, because they teach the Dharma using the utterances of various sentient beings."

We are not dealing with simple bad Sanskrit in the Kālacakra literature because the irregular grammar employed in the Śrī Kālacakra and the Vimalaprabhā is not the result of incompetence. The authors of these texts, Yaśas and Puṇḍarika, demonstrate considerable knowledge of the full range of brahmanical learning, including grammar, prosody, and poetics. They compose correct, even elegant, Sanskrit when they so desire. Moreover, in the Vimalaprabhā Puṇḍarika sometimes even points out the irregular forms appearing in the Śrī Kālacakra, and explains how they deviate from standard usage. For example:

1. Comment on the declension of kālayoge in Śrī Kālacakra I.26d: kālayoge iti pañcamyarte saptamī (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 31b/3; U 77.19); the locative is used for the ablative.

2. Comment on the declension of jñānadhātau in Śrī Kālacakra II.24a: iha śarīre aprāṇavāyur jñānadhātor bhavati atrāpi pañcamyarte saptamī (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 57b/7; U 168.26); the locative is used for the ablative.

3. Comment on the number of satśandhiḥ in Śrī Kālacakra II.25d: satśandhir iti bhuvacane ekavacanam (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 58a/2; U 169.12–13); the singular is used for the plural.

4. Comment on mahi in Śrī Kālacakra II.25d: mahīti hrasvo bhūparāyaḥ (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 58a/3; 169.14); short vowel for long.

5. Comment on antrameghāḥ in Śrī Kālacakra II.34b: antrameghā 'ntra ity avibhaktikam padam antrāni meghā bhavantīti (Vimalaprabhā
(5) B 60a/1; U 174.27–28); antra is lacking a case ending.

(6) Comment on the declension of karne in Śrī Kālacakra II.79c: karne ity āgamapāthaḥ pañcamyarthe saptāmi (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 75b/2; U 213.11); the locative is used for the ablative.

The fact that the Sanskrit of the early Kālacakra literature is strewn with irregular grammatical forms presents special problems for the editor and translator. If these forms were used consistently, it would be simple enough to learn to recognize and understand them. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The irregular forms appear in verses and prose passages that are otherwise written in standard Sanskrit, and sometimes an irregular form is disguised in such a way that it can be interpreted meaningfully, but wrongly, as though it were standard usage.

An example of this is kālāc chūnyēṣu in Śrī Kālacakra I.4a, which the Tibetans consistently translate as dus kyis stong pa rnams las. Kālāt as an ablative of instrumental use is not extraordinary, but the locative sūnyēṣu as an ablative would be extremely problematic if we did not have the Tibetan translation (cf. Holtzmann 301).

Another example is Puṇḍarīka’s usage of the words vivarta and samvarta in his comment on Śrī Kālacakra I.4. These terms usually mean “evolution” and “devolution,” respectively (cf. Abhidharmakośa 3.90), but the Vimalaprabhā exactly inverts their meaning: lokadhatuśpado nirodho veditavyāḥ samvarto vivartakālaś ceti; jīgṛ ten gyi khams byung ba dang ’gag pa chags pa dang ’jig pa’i dus kyang rig par bya’o (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 22a/6; U 54.18–19; (T) 425/4). On first glance the Tibetans seem to have blundered in translating samvarta as chags pa and vivarta as ’jig pa, but this idiosyncratic usage is confirmed by Puṇḍarīka’s use of samvarta in apposition to utpāda and upatti: atah samvartād utpāda kālavāsat sūnyēṣv iti; des na chags pa ni ’byung ba’i dus kyi dbang gis stong pa rnams las shes pa (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 22a/6; U 54.19; (T) 425/4); and kālayogā prajātāṃ samvartotpattikālavāsat; dus kyi sbyor ba dag las rab tu skyes shes pa chags pa skye ba’i dus kyi dbang gis (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 28a/1; U 68.12; (T) 457/7 [comment on Śrī Kālacakra I.11d]).

The linguistic peculiarity of the Kālacakra literature once again underscores our dependence on Tibetan translations and Indian and Tibetan commentaries for correct editing and translation of the Vajrayāna literature in Sanskrit. Without their aid
we would be at a loss to establish the Sanskrit texts, not to speak of understanding their meaning.\textsuperscript{38}

The language of the early Kālačakra literature is not Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Buddhist Ārṣa), nor is it simply substandard Sanskrit. It is Sanskrit into which various types of nonstandard forms have been intentionally introduced. Most of these irregularities are common to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and late classical Sanskrit. While some of these solecisms have a pedagogic purpose, for the most part they are designed to counteract pedantic arrogance. How far these findings can be applied to other Vajrayāna texts will be an important subject for future research.

APPENDIX: Rare Vocabulary from the Kālačakra Literature I

Although the Kālačakra literature contains negligible Middle Indic vocabulary, it does present a number of Sanskrit words that are either rare or unattested elsewhere. (Here we are not concerned with technical terminology, which is notorious for being poorly represented in current dictionaries.) Unless otherwise noted, the following words are not found (with these meanings, at least) in the lexicons of Böhtlingk and Roth, Böhtlingk, Schmidt, Monier-Williams, Apte, or Edgerton.

(1) \textit{ekololibhūta} m. (Tib. gcig tu 'dres pa gyur pa) "become blended into one":

\begin{quote}
\textit{esam niravaranatā samarasatvam ekalolibhūtatvam śūnyam ity ucyate; 'di mams sgrīb pa dang bral ba nyid dang ro mnyam pa nyid dang gcig tu 'dres pa gyur pa nyid la stong pa zhes brjod do} (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 19a/2; U 47.22–23; (T) 407/3–4).
\end{quote}

"Their quality of being free from obscuration, of having a single taste, of being blended into one, is called 'void.'" (The things "blended" here are various aggregates, elements, faculties, and so forth that are components in the Kālačakra abhidharma.) \textit{-loli-} appears to be derived from \textit{V/ul} or \textit{V/tul}; cf. \textit{lolīa}. Schmidt lists \textit{ekalolibhāvā} in the sense of "Begehren" [desire] (Schmidt 125, 318).

(2) \textit{kalka} m. (Tib. rigs) "clan":

\begin{quote}
\textit{ataḥ kalasaguhya-prajñānābhiṣekataḥ sarvevarāṇāṁ ekakalko bhavati/ sa kalko 'syātīti kalki/ tasya gotraṁ kalkīgotraṁ vajrakalābhiṣekataḥ sakalamantrindm iti nītārthaḥ; bum pa dang gsang ba dang shes rab ye shes kyi dbang bsur ba 'di las rigs thams cad rigs gcig tu 'gyur ro/ rigs de 'di la yod pa'i phyir rigs ldan no/ de'i rigs ni rigs ldan gyi rigs te sngags pa miha' dag rdo rje'i rigs kyi dbang bsur ba'i phyir ro zhes bya ba nges pa'i don tol} (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 8b/3–4; U 22.8–10; (T) 345/2–3).
\end{quote}

"The vase, secret, and wisdom-gnosis initiations make all the castes into a single clan. Because he possesses that clan, he is Kalkī. The definitive meaning of this is: 'His lineage is the lineage
of Kalki because all mantra adepts are initiated into the vajra family." Similarly, Śrī Kālacakra I.158ab:

so ˈyaṇaḥ śrīmanjuvajraḥ suravaranamitio vajratoṣṭaṇa kalkī
dattvā vajrābhiṣekām sakalamunikāṇy ekaekaṁ kariṣyat/

"He (i.e., Maṇjuśrī Yaśas) will be Śrī Maṇjuvajra, saluted by the best of gods, Kalki by means of the vajra lineage. Having given them the vajra initiation, he will make all the families of sages into a single clan."

The usual meanings of kalka—"dregs", "filth", "feces", "sin", and so forth—are clearly inapplicable here. This usage of kalka is unique to the Kālacakra literature (cf. Newman 1985:64 & n. 4; 1987a:94). For discussion of other etymologies of kalka and kalkī see: Schrader (1937).

(3) pratisena f. (Tib. pra phab pa) "prognostic image": pratyaśaṇa svacittapratibhāṣo yoginām gagane pratibhāṣate kumārākāyā ādārādau pratisenaṇavād iti; gzhon nu ma rnams kyi me long la sogs pa la pra phab pa bzhin du rnal 'byor pa rnam kyi rang gi sems kyi 'od gsal mngon sum du nam mkha' la snang ba (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 16b/6; U 42.23–24; (T) 394/3–4). "Like a maiden's prognostic image in a mirror and so forth, the clear light of the yogis' own minds appears manifest in the sky." The "sky" here refers to the void. (Note: I take kumārākāyā as a genitive singular against the Tibetan instrumental plural.) Vimalaprabhā I.35ab (U 4.21–22) notes that mahāmudrā is similar to the eight prognostic images (aṣṭaprasenaṇopama). In his Paramārthasamgrahaṇāma-sekodesaṭīkā Nārāyaṇa refers to the Pratisena-vatāra-tantra on the eight kinds of prognostication: pratisena-vatāra-tantra kila darpana-khādga-guṇa-ṭhaprati-pacandra-sūrya-dakakundane-treśv avā斯塔ṣu (read: aṣṭasu) pratisena-vatāra uktah (Carelli 1941:49.6–7). "Indeed, the Pratisena-vatāra-tantra speaks of the manifestation of prognostic images in the eight: mirror, sword, thumb, lamp, moon, sun, water well, and eye." Pratisena appears to be a Sanskritized form of (Prakrit?) prasena (m. or n.), -nā (f.): "a kind of conjuring" (Bohtlingk 176.2). Edgerton, following Böhltingk, lists prasena with a query, and also cites Mahāvyutpatti #4268: prasenā; gsal snang (BHSD 389.1). Edgerton translates gsal snang as "bright light, or bright clear," but it is most likely the old orthography for dag snang, "a mystic vision." It is interesting to note that prasenā appears in the Mahāvyutpatti in the section on tantric terminology (Mahāvyutpatti #4234–4387).

(4) li (Tib. li) "Khotan": bhoṭa li ca cīnādeśesu. . .sambhalavisayāṇtam; bod dang li dang rgya nag la sogs pa'i yul rnam su. . .shambha la'i yul la thug pa'i bar du (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 40a/2; U 101.8; (T) 521/4). "In the countries of Tibet, Khotan, and China and so forth. . .through to the land of Sambhala. . ." The context here is a discussion of the duration of daylight in various regions north of India. This passage of the Vimalaprabhā is the source for the only other known occurrence of li in Sanskrit, Abhayākaragupta's Kālacakravatāra: bhoṭa li ca cīnādeśesu sambhalavisayāṇtam (Asiatic Society of Bengal MS G.4732 f. 6b/5). Li is an example of a very rare phenomenon, a Tibetan loanword in Sanskrit.
NOTES


2. D.S. Ruegg notes: “ Ârśa is indeed in several respects a more convenient (and a less linguistically questionable) term than Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit to designate the basically Middle Indo-Aryan language of much of the Canon and could therefore be used instead by modern scholars, at least for certain stages of BHS” (Ruegg 1986:597). We add the qualification “Buddhist” to distinguish this language from the Jaina and brahmanical ārśa-s (cf. Winternitz 1933:430; Goudriaan 1981:27).

3. As we will see, the Kâlacakra literature is not written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, and its language is not simply “very corrupt” or “barbarian” Sanskrit. Hoffmann has not presented any evidence to support his view that the Kâlacakra originated in “a semi-Indian region in the far north-west.” The Vimalaprabhä, in any case, was by its own account written in India (see note 35). The earliest historically identified proponent of the Kâlacakra, Atisâ’s guru Piṇḍo, was born in Java (Newman 1985:71–75; 1987b:96–106).

4. For discussion of this literature see: Newman (1985:52–54, 58, 63–65, 73; 1987a; 1987b). I believe all of these texts were composed in India during the first few decades of the 11th century.

5. By H.P. Shâstri (1917:78–79), under the heading “The Buddhist did not care for Correct Sanskrit.”


7. Tibetan scholars were well aware of the grammatical anomalies of the early Kâlacakra literature. See: Bu ston (1324:610–612); mKhas grub (1434:444–448).


10. Vimalaprabhâ (S) D: paraspai-.


12. Vimalaprabhâ (S) N: danta-.


15. Vimalaprabhâ (S) N: ādayo py apaśabdâs tadhâne pi.

16. Vimalaprabhâ (S) N: āgaṅgama- (emendation deletes -ṇga-).

17. Vimalaprabhâ (S) D: susabdâbhimânam nāśa.

18. Vimalaprabhâ (S) N: -saṇatâm (emendation adds -ra-).
20. Vimalaprabha (S) N: desa- (emended to desa-).
21. Vimalaprabha (S) N 21b/4–22a/4; D 17b/1–9; cf. U 29.21–30.6. I have standardized the sandhi, the orthography with respect to use of the avagraha and doubling of consonants after -r-, and have supplied the dandas. Unfortunately, the leaf containing this passage is missing from Vimalaprabha (S) B, by far the best of the three MSS available to me. The Tibetan for the passage quoted reads:

Vimalaprabha (T) 361/5–362/7: /sgra bzang po smra ba de dag rnams kyi sgra bzang po la zhen pa spang ba'i slad du don la rton pa nyid la brten te/ tshigs su bcad po kha cig tu zur chag gi sgra dang/ tshigs su bcad pa kha cig tu gcod mshams nyams pa dang/ kha cig tu rnam dbye med pa'i tshig dang/ kha cig tu dbyangs dang gsal byed [better: yig 'bru dang dbyangs] phyis pa dang/ tshigs bcad kha cig tu ring po lo thung ngu dang thung ngu la ring po dang/ kha cig tu inga pa'i don la bdun pa dang/ bzhis pa'i don la drug pa dang/ kha cig tu gzhan gyi tshig can gyi byings la bdag nyid kyi tshig dang/ bdag nyid kyi tshig can la gzhan gyi tshig dang/ kha cig tu gciąg gi tshig la mang po'i tshig dang/ mang po'i tshig la gcig gi tshig dang/ kha cig tu pho'i rtags la ma ning gi rtags dang ma ning gi rtags la pho'i rtags dang/ kha cig tu rkan las byung ba sha yig la so dang spyi bo las byung ba dang/ kha cig tu spyi bo las byung ba la so dang rkan las byung ba dang/ kha cig tu so las byung ba la rkan dang spyi bo las byung ba ste/ de lta bu gzhan yang rgyud ston pa po'i man ngag gi rjes su 'brang bar bya'o/ de bzhin du rtsa ba'i rgyud las bcom idan 'das kyi/

/zla bzang sangs rgyas thams cad dang/
/bla ma rnam kyi slob ma yis/
/chung ma bu mo bu sdug dang/
/rtags tu 'dod pa'i dngos po dbul(1)
/dri ni sa la 'byung ba ste/
/chu la gzugs dang me la ro/
/rlung reg 'gyur ba med la sgra/
/nam mkha' che la chos kyi dbyings/(2)
/dri dang spos sogz mar me dang/
/bza' dang buang sogz gos rnam kyi/
/rtags tu phyag rgya mchod byas te/
/dam pa'i bu yis bla ma'i dbul(3)

/zhes gsungs te de lta bu la sogs pa'i sgra zur chag gzhan yang rnal 'byor pas lung bklags pa las rtogs par bya'o/ de bzhin du 'grel bahad las kyang sgra bzang po'i mngon pa'i nga rgyal nyams par bya ba'i slad du bdag gis don la rton pa nyid la brten te bri bar bya ste/ rnam pa gang dang gang gis rigs dang rigs pa [read: rig pa] dang sgra bzang po'i mngon pa'i nga rgyal zad par 'gyur ba'i rnam pa de dang des don la rton pa nyid la brten te yul gyi skad gzhan dang sgra'i bstan bcos kyi skad gzhan gyis sangs rgyas dang byang chub sems dpa' rnam thar pa'i don du chos ston to/

22. The "brahman sages" referred to here are the thirty-five million brahman sages of Sambhala. The story told in the Vimalaprabha of how Kalki Yasas converted them to the Vajrayana is translated in Newman (1985:59–63; 1987b:304–314). The passage on grammar edited and translated here im-
mediately follows the conversion story, and makes up the end of the third uddeśa of the first paṭala of the Vimalaprabhā.

23. This refers to the first of the four pratisaranas; cf. Mahāvyutpatti #1545–1549.

24. Vimalaprabhā (T) usually translates the Sanskrit according to the meaning rather than the words: it does not attempt to reproduce grammatical irregularities, but provides the sense. In this instance, however, it “mechanically” reproduces the irregular grammar because the irregular grammar itself is part of the meaning.

25. In editing a passage of the Kālacakra mūlatantra, Hoffmann creates “Middle Indic” out of correct Sanskrit forms metri causa (Hoffmann 1973:137, n. 3 & 7). This is difficult to justify given the fact that the verses of the Paramādibuddha are often hypercatalectic or catalectic: cf. verses 11a, 13c, 15b in Reigle (1986:5–6, 9).

26. Sanskrit after Reigle (1986:5); cf. Vimalaprabhā (S) U 24.27–30. These verses are part of a twenty-one and one-half verse quotation from the Paramādibuddha that appears towards the middle of the third uddeśa of the Vimalaprabhā. Vimalaprabhā (T) 351/7–352/2:

/rnam pa gang dang gang dag gis/
/sems can rnam ni yongs smin byed/
/rnam pa de dang de dag gis/
/chos ni bstan par bya ba yin/(5)
/sgra dang sgra nyams dag gi [read: gū] chos/
/rnal 'byor pa ni 'bad pas 'dzin/
/yul gyi sgra yis don rnyed pa/
/de la bstan bcos sgra yis cu/(6)

27. Vimalaprabhā (S) D: -saranatā.
29. Vimalaprabhā (S) D: -sabdaḥ sabdāḥ.
30. Vimalaprabhā (S) N 3a/6–3b/2; D 3a/2–5; cf. U 5.3–12; leaf missing in B. These are verses 37–40 of the first uddeśa of the Vimalaprabhā. Verse 37 is flawless śārdūlavikriyāta; 38–40 are āryā. Pundarīka employs a wide variety of metres in the Vimalaprabhā, and his Śrī Paramārthasevā is composed of various kinds of triśṭubh. Vimalaprabhā (T) 307/5–308/2:

/kun mkhyen lam don gnyer ba rnam la sgra dang sgra min
rnam dpyad chen po med/
/sna tshogs yul skad ngan pa yis kyang chen po rnam ky lam
la rtag tu 'jug/
/sems can rnam kyi mos pa'i sens kyi dbang gis thams cad
mkhyen pa'i gsung gzhana la/
/lung ston dag la [better: brda sprod dag la] lha klus bkod pa'i sgra
sogs rtsod pa don gnyer rnam kyi gzhan/(37)
/yul gyi skad dang zur chag sgra las kyang/
/rnal 'byor ldan pas don ni 'dzin byed de/
/chu la 'o ma nges par zhugs pa de/
/ngang pas rab tu phyung nas 'thung bar byed/(38)
31. Here “Other” refers to the transcendent aspect of the Kālacakra triad: evam sarvatra vajrayogā bhāyē adhyātmani pare yoginā 'vagantavya iti; de bzhin du rdo rje mnyen 'byor yang phyi dang nang dang gzhan thams cad la mnyen 'byor pas rtogs par bya'o (Vimalaprabhā (S) B 17a/7-17b/1; cf. U 44.10-11; (T) 398/2-3).

“A yogi should realize the vajrayoga everywhere in the Outer, Inner, and Other.”

32. Vimalaprabhā (S) B: sarvabuddho (emendation deletes sarva).

33. Vimalaprabhā (S) B: omit bhāsā (emendation adds).

34. Vimalaprabhā (S) B 13a/7-13b/1; cf. U 34.11-18. MS B spells sattva as satva, and I have supplied the dandas, but otherwise I have retained its orthography in this and all other quotations from it. Vimalaprabhā (T) 372/6-373/4:

/sems can thams kad kyi rang bzhin can thams cad mkhyen pa'i skad med par legs par sbyar ba'i skad ngyi tshe ba gcig pu 'di yis yin na sngags rgyas kyang ngyi tshe bar 'gyur ro/ 'phags pa'i yul 'dir sgra smra ba po mu stegs pa mkhas pa'i mngon pa' nga rgyal dang ldan pa rnam [sic!] mthong nas/ ji itar bram ze dang khyab 'jug pa dang zhi ba pa la sogs pa rnam kyi 'dod pa'i lha tshangs pa dang khyab 'jug dang drag po la sogs pa rnam legs par sbyar ba smra ba po yin pa de bzhin du bdag cag gi 'dod pa'i lha sngags rgyas dang byang chub sms dpas' rnam legs par sbyar ba smra ba po yin no zhes pa ni/ sngags rgyas pa byis pa'i blo can rnam kyi bsam pa stel/ 'dir sngags rgyas dang byang chub sms dpas' de dag thams cad mkhyen pa'i skad med par legs par sbyar ba'i skad ngyi tshe ba [add: gcig bu] 'di yis ma yin te sms can thams cad kyi skad kyi chos ston par byed pa po dang yang dag par sdu' byed pa po yin no/ de'i phyir sngags rgyas dang byang chub sms dpas' rnam ni lha'i skye ba dang 'brel ba'i [add: skad] ngyi tshe bas ma yin te sms can sngas tshogs kyi skad kyi chos ston pa po yin pa'i phyir/

35. This is one of several instances in the Vimalaprabhā in which Pundarika writes “here in the land of the Aryans,” demonstrating that this text was written in India. (Elsewhere in the Vimalaprabhā “the land of the Aryans” is clearly defined as India [cf. Newman 1985:61; 1987b:309–310].)

36. sanggitiśāra; yang dag par sūd u byed pa po. The use of this term to indicate the “redactor” of a text is not quite clear at BHSD 548, s.v. sanggiti (3). It is often used in this sense in the Vimalaprabhā: e.g., King Sucandra, an emanation of Vajrapāṇi, redacted the Paramādībuddha, and Kalkī Yaśas, an emanation of Mañjuśrī, condensed the Paramādībuddha and redacted it in the form of the Śrī Kālacakra (Newman 1985:54, 63; 1987a:93–94).

37. Likewise Skorupski: “It must be said that one does get frustrated by
the fact that the correct grammatical forms are used side by side with the hybrid forms. It is practically impossible to discern the principle of using the correct grammatical forms instead of the hybrid ones or vice versa" (Skorupski 1983:118). The same can be said about the early Kālacakra literature, although, again, I do not think we are confronted with "hybrid forms" in the strict sense of forms that developed directly from Prakrit.

38. I agree completely with Snellgrove’s remark that we must be content with “a text that accords with the required sense as it may be ascertained from the Tibetan translation and the several commentaries” (Snellgrove 1959:x); cf. Tsuda (1974:6–16).
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