

# JIABS

## Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 27 Number 1 2004

David SEYFORTH RUEGG <i>Aspects of the Investigation of the (earlier) Indian Mahāyāna</i> .....	3
Giulio AGOSTINI <i>Buddhist Sources on Feticide as Distinct from Homicide</i> .....	63
Alexander WYNNE <i>The Oral Transmission of the Early Buddhist Literature</i> .....	97
Robert MAYER <i>Pelliot tibétain 349: A Dunhuang Tibetan Text on rDo rje Phur pa</i>	129
Sam VAN SCHAİK <i>The Early Days of the Great Perfection</i> .....	165
Charles MÜLLER <i>The Yogācāra Two Hindrances and their Reinterpretations in East Asia</i> .....	207

### Book Review

Kurt A. BEHRENDT, <i>The Buddhist Architecture of Gandhāra</i> . Handbuch der Orientalistik, section II, India, volume seventeen, Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2004 by Gérard FUSSMAN .....	237
Notes on the Contributors .....	251

PELLIOT 349:  
A DUNHUANG TIBETAN TEXT ON RDO RJE PHUR PA

ROBERT MAYER<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

In 1978, the late R.A. Stein published a paper under the title ‘A propos des documents anciens relatifs au *phur-bu* (*kīla*)’.<sup>2</sup> In this paper, Stein made a wide-ranging analysis of ancient texts concerning the *kīla*, including two Dunhuang texts (Pelliot 44 and Pelliot 349), as well as various materials from the later canonical collections of the Kanjur, Tenjur and the rNying ma’i rgyud ‘bum (henceforth NGB). Much of what Stein reported in that article remains valid at the time of writing over two decades later; but inevitably, with the passage of time, some of his findings have also become more debatable. What remains valid is his important identification

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this paper was delivered on December 12, 2000 at the University of Hamburg’s Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets, at the kind invitation of Professor David P. Jackson. This text was one of those studied by my advanced reading group during my time as Visiting Professor at the Humboldt University of Berlin, 1999-2001. Two students made contributions to this paper: Gudrun Melzer most significantly by preparing the presentation of items 5.1 and 5.2 in the Appendix, by locating texts within the *Sādhnamālā*, and by discovering the parallel text in the *Piṇḍīkṛtasādhanoṣāyikāvṛtīratnāvalī* (see under Appendix 5.2). Melzer also prepared the initial transcription of the Tibetan text, a difficult task that she worked on with Kerstin Grothmann. My thanks to these two students, whose outstanding keenness also made short work of the arduous tasks of locating P349 within the largely uncharted microfilm, and printing it out in a readable form. My many thanks also to Dr. Ralf Kramer of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, who went to a great deal of trouble to procure for me a clearer view of the text than we had been able to achieve in Berlin. Our thanks also to Professor Matthew Kapstein for his help on an item of vocabulary. At a later stage, Professor Cristina Scherrer-Schaub made a number of useful points on the presentation and the contents of this paper, for which we are very much indebted. Above all, many thanks to Dr Cathy Cantwell for making her studies in the Sa skya pa and rNying ma pa Vajrakīlaya literature available to me, and for many other extremely useful and learned suggestions made in the course of reading this paper through in its final stages of preparation.

<sup>2</sup> See *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös memorial Symposium*, ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest, pages 427-444.

of a strong connection between the *kīla* materials and the *Guhyasamāja* tradition; and also the importance of the occurrence of the shared identity of the forms Vajrakīla and Amṛtakuṇḍalin. I believe Stein's article was the first to remark that Vajrakīla and Amṛtakuṇḍalin often and on significant occasions share a merged identity: while Bischoff's 1956 study of the *Mahābala-nāma-sūtra* had showed that Vajrakīla and Amṛtakuṇḍalin occur as different deities in the same maṇḍalas, Bischoff had not yet encountered any evidence of the merged identity these forms often share, a feature that took particular significance in the important *Guhyasamāja* literature and its many derivatives.<sup>3</sup> What have become more questionable however are some of Stein's minutiae in historical and textual data.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Vajrakīla in this context is generally depicted as a deified stake, rather than a heruka who wields a stake as his main implement (more on this distinction below). The occurrences of Amṛtakuṇḍalin/Vajrāmṛta merged with Vajrakīla in *Guhyasamāja* Chapter 13 (verses 74-75) and also (if less specifically) in Chapter 14 (verses 59ff) seem to have proven very influential, and are certainly the distant basis of the verses and mantra in the concluding lines of the text Pelliot 349 analysed here; although Pelliot 349's concluding lines follow the specific arrangement as found in Nāgārjuna's commentarial *Pañcakrama* rather than the root text of the *Guhyasamāja* itself. Not surprisingly, many important *Guhyasamāja* commentarial texts such as Candrakīrti's *Pradīpoddyotana* and Nāgārjuna's *Pañcakrama* reaffirm the identity of the deity described in *Guhyasamāja* Chapters 13 and 14 as Amṛtakuṇḍalin appearing as Vajrakīla, as do subcommentarial texts like Muniśrībhadrā's *Pañcakramaṭippaṇi*. Boord 2002:26ff gives very useful citations from the *Guhyasamāja* literature of Amṛtakuṇḍalin/Vajrāmṛta identified as Vajrakīla. Perhaps based on such materials, Boord's earlier work (Boord 1993:6 and the whole of Ch. 2) argued at length that Amṛtakuṇḍalin or Vajrāmṛta is in fact the main precursor of Vajrakīla. However I find this a considerable oversimplification. For a different and more broadly cultural and Indological (rather than narrowly Buddhological) view of the precursors of Vajrakīla, see Mayer 1991.

<sup>4</sup> For examples of what has become questionable, on page 428 Stein stated categorically that the *Guhyasamāja* was not translated into Tibetan before about 1000 C.E., yet we now know differently — for a clear resumé, see Toru Tomabechi's paper *Selected Tantra Fragments from Tabo Monastery*. See also Kenneth Eastman's 1980 more detailed study and *stemma codicum* of the *Guhyasamāja* made from all the extant Tibetan versions available to him at the time, to which Tomabechi refers. We can add to Eastman's and Tomabechi's findings that in fact several witnesses of this famous scripture as found in the NGB (Rig 'dzin vol. Tsā; sDe dge vol. Na; gTing skyes vol. Tsā), give very specific colophonic information that the main *Guhyasamāja mūlatantra* (i.e. chapters 1-17 without the *Uttaratantra* or 18<sup>th</sup> chapter) was first translated by Vimalamitra and sKa ba dpal rtsegs (*paṇḍita bi mā la dang lo tsa ba ska wa dpal rtsegs kyi bsgyur pa'ol*), i.e. around 200 years earlier than the date Stein gives, and moreover that in these particular editions, the *Uttaratantra* (i.e. Chapter 18) was translated later by Buddhaguhya and a certain 'Brog mi dpal ye shes (*rgya gar gyi mkhan po sangs rgyas gsang ba dang/ l bod kyi lotstsha ba*

Of the two Dunhuang *kīla* texts Stein addressed in his paper, the longer and more significant one had already been studied in some detail by Bischoff and Hartmann (1971), who produced both a transcription of the Tibetan text, and a full translation. Stein made considerable use of their work, while adding more of his own insights. The text in question is the famous P44, a text that describes Padmasambhava bringing the *Vajrakīlaya* tradition to Tibet, and which includes the famous and important Yang le shod narrative that re-occurs in much later literature, in which Padmasambhava meditates at Pharping in Nepal and subdues demons there by means of the *Vajrakīlaya* brought to him from Nālandā.

*'brog mi dpal yeshes bsgyur ba'o//*). The Rig 'dzin and sDe dge edition colophons also suggest that the famous Rin chen bzang po translation was a reworking of the earlier translation (*slad kyi mkhan po ātsārya shraddha ka ra war ma dang / zhu chen gyi lo tstsba ba dge slong rin chen bzang pos bsgyur te gtan la phab pa'o//*), although it is not absolutely clear if this refers to the whole text or only to the *Uttaratantra*. One should note however that not all NGB editions have the so-called NGB version — some merely reproduce the Kanjur's Rin chen bzang po version. Of course NGB colophons are not always reliable as historical sources, but additional information comes from the *Blue Annals* (p.204-5), which also mentions that there existed translations of the *Guhyasamāja* made earlier than Rin chen bzang po, although here the earlier translations are attributed to the comparatively late figure of Smṛti, who along with his near contemporary Rin chen bzang po traditionally marks the watershed between Old and New translation periods. In addition, of course, we are now aware of the important testimony of the Dunhuang text Tib 438 and 431, which together comprise a complete 17-chapter *Guhyasamāja mūlatantra* in Tibetan with many marginal notes — which Kenneth Eastman believes to date from between 800 and 900, and which he has attempted to demonstrate as the sole source for all subsequent *Guhyasamāja* editions in Tibetan, all of which he says merely revise this Dunhuang original. This would include Rin chen bzang po's version, and those that followed Rin chen bzang po's, such as the editions by 'Gos lo tsā ba Khug pa lhas btsas (Tomabeche dates him as 11 century) and by Chag lo tsā ba Chos rje dpal (Tomabeche dates him as 1197-1264) and even by Tsong kha pa, who is said to have studied many *Guhyasamāja* manuscripts comparatively. How exactly the Dunhuang text compares with the NGB version found in some NGB editions and attributed to Vimalamitra and sKa ba dpal rtsegs remains to be seen — Eastman did not present a full critical or comparative edition. My thanks to Dr Adelheid Hermann-Pfandt, who very kindly made Eastman's work available to me.

Another possible error of Stein's: on p. 437-8 he explains how in following a textual clue from Ratna gling pa's *rNying ma chos 'byung*, he sought key verses in the two *Kī la ya bcu gnyis* texts found in volume Ha (29) of the NGB (presumably, referring to the Rig 'dzin and gTing skyes editions then available to him), but could not find the verses in either of those texts. He seemingly remained unaware that the main *Kī la ya bcu gnyis* is not in the Rig 'dzin or gTing skyes volumes Ha at all — where only two minor texts of that name occur — but in volume Dza (19) of the Rig 'dzin, gTing skyes and mTshams brag editions alike.

Bischoff and Hartmann's study was of course a pioneering work, and it might well prove fruitful to retranslate their renderings when time and opportunity permits (note that the first chapter has already been retranslated recently by Matthew Kapstein in his book published in 2000, *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism*).

The other Dunhuang text Stein addressed is the shorter Pelliot 349, which has not to our knowledge so far been transcribed and translated. Although apparently the first person to look at this text, Stein himself made no effort at all to present a transcription of the Tibetan, nor did he present any translation. Rather, he limited himself to a very brief summary comprising only 9 lines in his own words of the basic gist as he saw it of the text (not all of which we can now fully agree with). He also made a few important observations such as pointing out its citation of materials found in *Guhyasamāja* commentarial materials attributed to Nāgārjuna (Stein cites the Tibetan translation of the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* from the Peking Tenjur vol. 61, no. 2661, p. 269; and Louis de la Vallée Poussin's Sanskrit edition of the *Pañcakrama*, found in his *Études et Textes Tantriques*, Gand & Louvain, 1896. Pp. 1-2.). These materials include the important mantra found in the root *Guhyasamāja's* Ch.14 v58, with which Pelliot 349 comes to its culmination.

Our effort here is therefore in the first instance to transcribe and translate the text of P 349 in full. This has by no means been easy, and we can see why Stein did not attempt either task. Firstly, regarding the transcription, the text is damaged in parts, and it has proven impossible to reconstruct the missing portions with any certitude. By and large, we have resisted the temptation to attempt reconstruction except where the reconstruction is quite uncontroversial. Secondly, the remaining parts of the text are here and there illegible in the monochrome microfilm available to us, and might remain so even if good quality colour images eventually become available from the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (or even if we get an opportunity to view the original). Hence we can sometimes only guess at the shape of the Tibetan letters underneath the vagueness of our available images. Illegible parts of the text are clearly marked in our transcription.

Our inability to read parts of the text of course in several places contributes to uncertainty in our translation of connected readable portions. Moreover it is also likely that the text itself contains some errors, for

example, giving in line 8 the seed syllable (*bīja*) *Nya* when *A* was much more likely intended (see comments on line 6 below). Like IOL Tib J 754 (81-82) (Mayer & Cantwell 1994), this text with its untidy layout and the poor quality of its writing, very much gives the appearance of a note or *aide-mémoire* for personal use, rather than a carefully and neatly written scripture for communal use. But even if the whole text had been readable and error-free, we could not have given entirely confident translations of all of it. Line 21, for example, is largely readable, but remains a little ambiguous. Wherever our translation is uncertain, we mark it clearly.

Unfortunately perhaps for students of the rNying ma canonical tradition, it is not only ancient Dunhuang Tantric materials that are difficult to understand: considerable portions of existing canonical materials from the NGB continue to defy the best efforts of even the most learned rNying ma pa lamas, who, with the best will in the world, simply can not understand them. Of course this is frequently due to transmissional errors, many of which one might hope will eventually be removed through careful textual criticism. Take for example the famous and widely cited *rDo rje phur bu chos thams cad mya ngan las 'das pa'i rgyud chen po*, in which, if one examines all surviving witnesses, one finds that the level of transmissionally generated confusion can be quite severe.<sup>5</sup> But over and above transmissional obscurities, the materials are also inherently difficult. This is particularly true of some of the more arcane Mahāyoga materials where the root texts are extremely terse condensed references to extremely complex and highly technical ritual categories, and which imply access to a parallel oral or commentarial tradition for filling in the details. But as is so often the case with Tantric texts for which a specific commentarial tradition is no longer available, the remaining root text becomes *de facto* partially lost when the oral or commentarial materials are lost. This is apparently the case for sections of the Vajrakīlaya materials in the NGB:

<sup>5</sup> This occurs in 26 chapters at Rig 'dzin Vol. Sa 113v-155v, at gTing skyes Vol. Sa 141r-192r (Kaneko 336), and at Nubri Vol. Sha 44r-96v. However, it also occurs in 28 chapters at sDe dge Vol. Zha 46r-82r and at mTshams brag Vol. Chi 229.5-340-3 (Taipei 5102 Vol 61 pp. 164-180). The difference is caused by a number of folio misplacements, which subsequently became incorporated into some of the transmissions with a number of quite confusing results. Nevertheless this tantra is among the most frequently cited within commentarial literature. Cathy Cantwell and I are currently engaged in editing this text at the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford.

the famous *Phur pa bcu gnyis*, for example, has no commentarial works written specifically for itself, and lamas trying to read it have to rely on general Vajrakīlaya commentaries, of which there are of course many. But the problem with relying on the general commentaries is that when the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* presents unusual materials or unique rites, especially if in abbreviated and terse outline only, the general commentaries can provide only the vaguest of clues as to the exact meaning. As a result, I found that not even the most learned *Phur pa mkhan po*'s of our time could understand substantial passages of the *Phur pa bcu gnyis*. And so on.<sup>6</sup> It should therefore not surprise us to find similar difficulties in interpreting Dunhuang *kīla* materials, and to some extent that is the case with Pelliot 349. Nevertheless I hope much of our translation is valid, especially where the text is not destroyed or illegible.

One of Stein's great contributions in his brief study of P349 was to point out the close relation between some *Guhyasamāja* and *Vajrakīla* materials. Indeed, although Stein did not point this out, Chapter 14 of the *Guhyasamāja* root tantra even has important text uttered by "the Blessed One, the Great Vajrakīla" (*bhagavān mahāvajrakīlaḥ, bcom ldan 'das rdo rje phur bu chen po*, Ch.14 v70-72), and this chapter in particular contains a great deal of *kīla* ritual. This relationship has since also been commented on briefly in Mayer 1991 and at greater length in Boord 1993 and 2002. The full relationship between these two Mahāyoga traditions is an extremely complex issue that we do not wish to go into in much detail in the present paper, since it requires at the very least a full length monograph treatment and moreover the textual transmission of the *Guhyasamāja* tradition in Tibet gives signs of being quite complicated. Nevertheless we add as an appendix Gudrun Melzer's demonstration of some important textual parallels to passages of Pelliot 349 that occur in the *Pañcakrama* commentarial texts of the *Guhyasamāja* tradition attributed to Nāgārjuna, which Stein clearly remarked but did not actually present

<sup>6</sup> Even for those few NGB texts where commentaries do exist, the commentaries can often be later than or slightly at variance to the actual NGB texts they comment upon — sometimes taking a particular view, sometimes following a slightly different text, and so to varying degrees departing from or failing to illuminate the intentions of the authors or redactors of the actual NGB texts as transmitted. Commentaries certainly can not solve all our problems, but they often help.

to his public. Thus Melzer presents the Sanskrit of de Vallée Poussin's *Piṇḍikramasādhana* edition of 1896, with additional reference to Mimaki's facsimile edition of 1994; and from the Tibetan, she adds the sDe dge and Peking Tenjur versions of the same. In fact versions of the verses in question also occur elsewhere, in texts Stein did not remark. Melzer found them also in the *Piṇḍikṛtasāadhanopāyikāvṛttiratnāvalī* attributed to Ratnākaraśānti, although here in a discontinuous form with word by word commentary interspersed (note the term *sāadhanopāyikā* in the title, which we will comment on below; Peking Tenjur 2690, folios 297b-298b). Other parallels — some more exact, some less exact, and some with particularly interesting continuities to P349 — also occur in more recent Sa skya and rNying ma pa Phur pa texts of various genres: we cite an example below of a citation from the ritual text the *Sa skya Phur Chen*, and Boord 1993:107 gives a translation (but does not give the Tibetan) of a parallel passage from a Phur pa historical text by the 18th century Byang gter author 'Phrin las bdud 'joms. I should add, I have also found further related passages in several NGB Mahāyoga scriptural texts, for example, in the *gZi ldan 'bar ba mtshams kyi rgyud*, usually classified within the *Tantra sde bco brgyad* section of Mahāyoga and dedicated to the Ten Wrathful Deities (*daśakrodha, khro bo bcu*).<sup>7</sup> In some of these NGB scriptures, we appear to find extremely interesting evidence of *Pañcakrama* verses entering NGB canonical scriptures (compare Appendices 5.2 and 5.3 below); but of course a lot more work will have to be done before we can say with any certainty quite what such definitely existent but extremely complicated textual relationships amount to. Elsewhere in the NGB, in the *Phur pa phrin las skor* section of Mahāyoga, there appear to be remixes of the *Pañcakrama*-derived *kīla* verses that more closely follow some of the words found here in P349 (e.g. in chapter 16 of the *Phur pa gsang chen rdo rje 'phreng ba'i rgyud*;<sup>8</sup> we include this example in Appendix 5.4 below). These parallels with the commentarial *Pañcakrama* verses bear interesting comparison with the Dunhuang Phur pa text IOLTibJ754,81-82, and

<sup>7</sup> This text occurs as the 6th text in the Rig 'dzin NGB in vol. Dza (folio 234 -253), in the gTing skyes NGB also in vol. Dza (pages 516-561), in the mTshams brag NGB in volume Zha (pages 533.3-580.4), and in sDe dge vol Pha, folios 36-52.

<sup>8</sup> Rig 'dzin Vol. Sha folios 43-60; gTing skyes Vol. Sha: 93-128; mTshams brag vol. Ji folios 214-258; Taipei 5120 vol. 61 pages 316-322; sDe dge Vol. Zha folios 145-161.

also several instances in the NGB such as the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch.11, where the parallels might follow the *Guhyasamāja* root tantra itself or its commentaries.<sup>9</sup>

By examining the constant textual remixes and permutations so characteristic of much rNying ma pa Tantric literature, we hope eventually to arrive at a clearer understanding of the cultural, religious and literary processes through which these texts were produced and reproduced as commentary, revelation and canonical scripture.

## 2. Tibetan text in transliteration:

We present the transliteration according to the conventions established in Tsuguhito Takeuchi's *Old Tibetan Manuscripts from East Turkestan in The Stein Collection of the British Library*, Tokyo 1998:

\$	page initial sign ( <i>mgo yig</i> , <i>siddham</i> )
I	reversed <i>gi gu</i>
[abc]	our conjectural restorations of letters partly illegible or lost in the original
[abc?]	uncertain readings
[...]	illegible letters, number unknown
[---]	illegible letters, number known, indicated by broken line
[±3]	illegible letters, approximate numbers known, indicated by numeral with ±
[a(b)]	ambiguous readings
abc [	end of line lost through damage
<del>abc</del>	text deleted in the original manuscript

<sup>9</sup> This is not the occasion to digress at length on such relationships — but to give a short example, the *Guhyasamāja* root tantra (Ch.14 65-68) has three Vajrakīla mantras that strike at the *samayas* of body, speech and mind. These mantras reappear in IOLTibJ754,81-82 and in NGB texts such as the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch.11 as mantras for bestowing consecrations of body, speech and mind to the material kīla. The first of the three (that of body) reappears throughout Vajrakīlaya literature of all periods in the mantras of the goddess 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma, Vajrakīlaya's main consort, and also in the mantras of Amṛta-kunḍalin as used in Vajrakīlaya texts. Whether passages such as *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch.11 relate more closely to the root *Guhyasamāja* or to its commentaries remains to be examined. The latter might seem more likely, but we can not be sure as yet.

- [1] \$// // phur ba'i [--]m rgyud ni/ /cho ga 'i rgyud [ni?] ki la ya [---]  
gnyis [k?]yi [don dang?]
- [2] tan tra sde gsum kyi mdo' btus nas/ /las nam s[-]u [±2] gi cho ga  
'i rgyud ni las cher b[t?][--]
- [3] la phur ba'i rtsis mgo nam pa bzhi bstan te/ /phur bu'i no phyi ka  
dang phur ba'i bsam [rgyud?]
- [4] [-]/phur ba'i yon tan dang/ phur bu 'i grub pa'i rgyu dang / nam pa  
bzhi 'o/ /de la phur bu [-]
- [5] no phyi ka ni/ lha tib ta tsag kra khro bo chen po 'i sku mdog dmar/ /  
sryan gsum phyag
- [6] [dru]g pa/ /zhabs gcig rdo rje bu [--][rtse?] [±2]/ /[khams?] kyi  
[g?]nod sbyin [-]an po 'tshir [zhing/(zhig)]
- [7] [bdag?] dang gnyis su [±3]r dbyings [gcig?] pa ni / no phyi ka 'o/ /  
bsam rgyud [n?]i [...]
- [8] dbyings gcig pu las/ /lag pa g.yas kyi mthil tu/ nya las zla ba'i dkyil  
tu [sgyur?] /
- [9] thabs kyi rang bzhin yin bas/ /khro bo chen po bcu/ g.yon kyi mthil  
du ma las/ /
- [10] nyi ma 'i dkyil 'khor tu gyur te//shes [rab] kyi rang bzhin kyi rtags  
[tags?] [yin bas?]
- [11] khro bo chen mo bcur dmyigs pa la rtsogs pa ni/ / [bsam?] rgyud  
[phu]r bu 'i yon tan
- [12] nI/ /de ltar khyab pas tshe 'di la bgegs zhi ste/ /bsod nams kyi tshogs  
thob/ /[±2]
- [13] pha rol kyi mtho ris kyi gnas su phyin pas/ /ye shes kyi tshogs thob  
pas/ /bsod
- [14] nams dang ye shes kyi tshogs nam pa gnyis thob pas/ /yon tan/  
/phur bu 'i grub
- [15] rgyu ni de ltar byas nas/ /bgegs zhi ste/ yon bdag gi bsam ba grub/  
/mtho [ris]
- [16] kyI gnas thob/ /tshogs chen po gnyis kyang rdzogs/ /thabs dang shes  
rab kyi
- [17] rang bzhin kyi las ma g.yos pas/ yon tan dang grub pa'i rgyu 'o /  
/phur bu 'di lag pa
- [18] gnyis kyi bar du dril zhing gsor ba'i tshe/ /gnan bzlog gi phur bu'i  
rgyu ni/ / mtshon

- [19] myI la babs pa'i lcags la bgyi' /rgya mdud kyi steng du he ru ka  
dgod/ /ngos bzhir phrin
- [20] las kyi khyad bar dang [sbyar(/rgyud)] te dgod/ /mgul zur brgyad la  
ma mo chen mo brgyad dgod/ /rtse mo la
- [21] mu ka brgyad bgod nas/ /sna la bdag rang la gdab/ [-]'i bsam rgyud  
ni/ rgyu phun sum tshogs pa
- [22] ste/ /lhar byin kyis brlabs nas grub pa gsol te/ /'dod pa'i khamns man  
cad du gdab / bgegs
- [23] la gdab pa'i thabs ni/ /rgyu kun lhar tshogs nas/ /lag pa'i bar du  
drild pas zhe sdang gi
- [24] bsam ba myI skyed/ snyIng rje chen pos gzhi bzung/ /'od zer dang  
'phro 'du byung bas// gang la bya ba
- [25] 'i gzugs la phog pas byang cub kyi sems sk[y?]es pas/ /zhi ba chen  
po 'i rang bzhin [tu?]
- [26] gyur par bsams nas/ /phur bu bsgrags pa'I tshig bshad 'di brjod do/  
khro bo rgyal po 'di dag
- [27] gis/ /bgegs nI bkug nas nam par gzhig/ /blo ldan rab du sbyor ba  
yis/ cho ga bzhin du
- [28] phur bus gdab/ /rdo rje rgyal chen bdud rtsi po/ /rdo rje phur bu  
nyid gnas pas/ ud dpal sngon po
- [29] 'i mdog 'dra ba/ /bgigs kyi tshogs la 'og du gzigs/ /lte ba man cad  
cha namns ni rtse mo
- [30] lta bur nam par [...] de 'i sngags namns sbyor bas yis/ / rdo rje phur  
nges btab na/ bgegs
- [31] [lus?] shin tu myI g.yo 'o/ /om̄ gha gha gha ta ya gha ta ya/ sa rwa  
tu shta ni phat/ ki la ki la ya
- [32] sa rba ba pham phat/ / hūṃ hūṃ [ba]dzra dha rod a [-] pa ya ti / [

### 3. Translation as a whole, without comments

Conventions:

- [---] Gaps in the text, one dash for each missing syllable.
- [...] Gaps where enumerating the number of missing syllables is impos-  
sible.
- [abc] Conjectures occasioned by illegible text or difficult meaning of  
which we are reasonably confident

- [abc?] Conjectures of which we are a little doubtful  
 (abc) Occasionally we present the relevant Tibetan word in italics within round brackets, sometimes with a Sanskrit or English gloss, to help the reader understand our thinking.

In particular, please note that the beginning of the text is damaged and illegible, and an accurate reconstruction does not seem possible.

Note also that the text variously uses the words *phur bu*, *phur ba*, and *kīlaya* to describe the implement and deity; we reproduce these usages verbatim as they occur. This is for a reason: the names and terms are currently used differently to the way they appear in P349 and are also subject to contemporary debate. The term *phur bu* (sometimes interpreted as equivalent to *kīlaka*) in more modern usage more generally refers to the implement, while *phur pa* (sometimes interpreted as equivalent to *kīla*) can refer to the deity or the implement. While such restricted usages might possibly be intended in our text — with the difference that here *phur pa* takes the form *phur ba* (see lines 1, 3 and 4) which does not nowadays occur at all except as an error — unfortunately our text is not consistent. We have *phur bu'i yon tan* in line 12, referring back to *phur ba'i yon tan* in line 4. As for the term *kīlaya* or *vajrakīlaya*: this is absolutely ubiquitously used in Tibetan texts of all historical periods (including the present) to refer to the yidam form of the deity or to its tantric texts rather than the implement, yet it is nowadays under attack from the majority of Western scholars, who wish to impose a term more commonly used for the implement (*kīla* or *vajrakīla*) in its place. I have argued however that there is little point in hyper-Sanskritising the Tibetan usage of *kīlaya* into *kīla*.<sup>10</sup> At all other times, technical terms are in English, or Sanskrit where no English term is established (eg *heruka* or *mātr*).

- [1] As for the Phur ba [*gtam rgyud*, oral tradition? or *bsam rgyud*, Tantra meditation tradition?], the Tantra ritual [tradition] [- -] the meaning of the two [- -] Kīlaya [...]

<sup>10</sup> All the more so since such a learned expert in Sanskrit Tantric languages as Alexis Sanderson has also argued that the form *kīlaya* might well have been current in Indian Tantric circles to refer to the deity, and need not be a Tibetan distortion of *kīla* (the implement). See Mayer 1996:165-6.

- [2,3] extracted from the sūtras of the three sections of Tantra: regarding the ritual traditions of the [- - -] rites greatly [- - -] four principal headings are taught for Phur ba: Phur bu's means for attainment (*no phyi ka = sādhanopāyikā*), Phur ba's meditational [tantra tradition?]
- [4] [-], Phur ba's qualities, and Phur bu [as a] basis for accomplishment, four in number. From these,
- [5] regarding the Phur bu means for attainment: the deity Dīptacakra (*lha tib ta tsag kra*), the great wrathful one, has a body colour of red; is three-eyed and [six]-armed;
- [6] has a single lower limb (*zhabs gcig*) [of a] Vajra [-] [point?][- -]; he crushes the [- -] [yakṣas] of [the world?]; and
- [7] [onself?] being [one] with the [non-dual] expanse [- - -], this is the means for attainment. As for the meditational tantra [tradition][.....]:
- [8] from out of the single [non dual] expanse, on the palm of the right hand, [visualise arising out of] the syllable *Nya*, a moon disc;
- [9] being of the nature of skilful means, [upon it arise?] the Ten Great Wrathful Deities. On the left palm, from the [syllable] *Ma*
- [10] arises a sun maṇḍala; [since it is?] [- - -] the sign for the nature of wisdom,
- [11] meditate and so forth as [arising upon it?] the Ten Great Female Wrathful Deities. As for the [Tantra meditation tradition's] virtuous qualities:
- [12] by pervading [one's hands] in this way, one's obstacles in this life will be pacified; [thereby] the accumulations of merit can be attained [-]
- [13] [so that] one passes on to an abode in the transcendent heavens [where] the accumulation of wisdom can [also] be attained;
- [14] and thus the two accumulations of merit and wisdom can both be attained: [hence these are its] virtuous qualities. Regarding the Phur bu as a
- [15] basis for accomplishment: having done accordingly [as above], the obstacles [will be?] pacified, patron's wishes will be accomplished,
- [16,17] heavenly abodes will be attained, and even the two great accumulations will be completed. Since these rites whose [very] nature is skilful means and wisdom do not waver, they are a basis for accomplishment and qualities.

- [18] On the occasion of rolling and brandishing such a Phur bu between one's two hands, regarding the materials of the suppressing and repelling Phur bu,
- [19] make it out of iron from a weapon [that has fallen on a man?]; above its knotted cords, establish Heruka; on the four faces,
- [20] establish those endowed with the [four] particular enlightened activities; on the eight sides of the neck, establish the eight great Mātrs;
- [21] having established the eight Mukhas (*mu ka brgyad*) on its point, [with such a tip (*sna la*), one can strike at one's own self?]. As it is said in the meditation tradition: since this is the Perfection of Material,
- [22] consecrate it as the deity and request accomplishment, and one will be able to strike at [all] the Realm of Desire (*kāmadhātu*) below.
- [23] As for the means of striking at the obstacles: having assembled all the material as the deity, when rolling it between the hands, do not give rise to angry thoughts,
- [24] [but] with great compassion, adhere to the Base (*gzhi*). Giving rise to the emanation and reabsorption of rays of light,
- [25] as these strike at the form of whoever [the rite] is to be done for, generating bodhicitta, imagine that they become transformed into the nature of the Great Peace,
- [26] and utter these verses of Phur bu recitation:
- [27] By this wrathful king  
The obstacles are summoned and totally destroyed.  
Those supremely endowed with good intellect
- [28] Strike with the phur bu in accordance with the rite.  
The great Vajra King, the Amṛta being,  
Abides as the Vajra Phur bu itself,
- [29] Blue in colour like an utpala,  
Gazing down at the hosts of obstacles.  
The part below his navel
- [30] Is like a point, and utterly [.....] [*brlag*, destroys?]  
If, endowed with his mantras,  
One definitively strikes with Vajra Phur [bu],
- [31] The bodies of the obstacles will become quite immobilised  
om̐ gha gha gha ta ya gha ta ya / sa rva du shta ni phaṭ // ki la ki la
- [32] ya sa rva ba pham phaṭ// hūṃ hūṃ [ba] dzra dha rod a [-] pa ya ti [...]

#### 4. Translation with our comments

##### *Translation of line 1-4*

- [1] As for the Phur ba [*gtam rgyud*, oral tradition? or *bsam rgyud*, Tantra meditation tradition?], the Tantra ritual [tradition] [- -] the meaning of the two [- -] Kīlaya [...]
- [2,3] extracted from the sūtras of the three sections of Tantra: regarding the ritual traditions of the - - - rites greatly - - - four principal headings are taught for Phur ba: Phur bu's means for attainment (*no phyi ka = sādhanopāyikā*), Phur ba's meditational [tantra tradition?]
- [4] [-], Phur ba's qualities, and Phur bu [as a] basis for accomplishment, four in number.

##### *Comments on lines 1-4*

##### Line 4:

Even if the beginning of the text has been partially destroyed rendering it untranslatable, we can at least with some certainty interpret the term *no phyi ka*, which is one of the four topics or headings that structure the text (*phur ba'i rtsis mgo rnam pa bzhi*). This term had puzzled Stein who remarked that he could not understand it ('mot inconnu'), but Matthew Kapstein has provided us with the answer. According to Kapstein (personal communication, February 1, 2000), it is quite common within Dunhuang ritual texts, and seems to be a Tibetan vulgar Sanskrit based on *sādhanaupayika* > *naupayika* > *no p(h)yi ka*, i.e. it means 'methods for sādhana'. Following Das, Hackin and other sources, we have found various citations of the term that support Kapstein's interpretation: DVP 553 (*no pyi ka*) and 554 (*no pyi kā*), both on page 171 of the de Vallée Poussin catalogue; Hackin pages 8 and 46 (*no phyi ka*); see also *Sādhana-mālā* 209, 228, 240, 248, which mention *sādhanopāyikā*.<sup>11</sup> See also Edgerton p.146, who cites *Sādhana-mālā* 415.5, 449.17, 468.12, and 486.3 (all colophons); and *Blue Annals* p. 160, which refers to the Tenjur text 'Jig rten snang byed zla ba'i no pi ka, Tg. rGyud no. 3584.

<sup>11</sup> Thanks to Gudrun Melzer for discovering these titles within the *Sādhana-mālā*.

*Translation of lines 5-7*

From these,

- [5] regarding the Phur bu means for attainment: the deity Dīptacakra (*lha tib ta tsag kra*), the great wrathful one, has a body colour of red; is three-eyed and [six]-armed;
- [6] has one foot, a Vajra [-] [point?][- -]; he crushes the [- -] [yakṣas] of [the world?]; and
- [7] [onself?] being [one] with the [non-dual] expanse [- - -], this is the means for attainment.

*Comments on lines 5-7*

One of the questions that arises here concerns the deity Dīptacakra, whose name appears on line 5. Here in P349 Dīptacakra is clearly male: *lha tib ta tsag kra khro bo chen po*. Moreover we find passages in a number of other authoritative ancient sources that remix many of the words of P349, and which also affirm Dīptacakra as a male deity. Such passages occur in the Vajrakīlaya writings of the early Sa skya pa master Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1147-1216); in an NGB Vajrakīlaya scripture called the *Phur pa gsang chen rdo rje 'phreng ba* (for these passages, see Appendix 5.4 below); and also in the still current major Sa skya pa Vajrakīlaya ritual, the *Phur chen*, with its commentaries (which we will discuss shortly). Yet in much of the very recent tradition, above all in most Western translation and study of Vajrakīlaya, Dīptacakra is almost invariably taken to be the Sanskrit name of the female deity whom Tibetan sources call 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma.<sup>12</sup> This 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma is the central

<sup>12</sup> For Dīptacakra used as the Sanskrit name for 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma, see for example my own previous work, Mayer 1996:174 and Mayer 1998:293; or see Boord 2002:39 and Boord 2002:316. Both Boord and myself have here been continuing the usage already well established in the modern West. See also the numerous unpublished works on Vajrakīlaya produced by various Western Dharma organisations for their practitioners, for example, the impressively extensive and detailed works of the Vajravairocana Translation Committee based in the USA to which half a dozen leading rNying ma pa lamas and *mkhan pos* contributed; or those circulated among the Western Sa skya pa community, to which several major Sa skya pa lamas have contributed: in all of these, Dīptacakra is ubiquitously used to indicate the female consort 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma. However, Boord 1993 temporarily changed his usage from Dīptacakra to Tṛptacakra, without giving any reasons for doing so; I have never encountered the form Tṛptacakra other than in Boord 1993, and

Vajrakīlaya deity's famous female consort of union (*sbyor*), a more common counterpart to Ekajaṭā who is his female consort of killing (*sgrol*) — although whether these two are really separate consorts, or two aspects of the same consort, is very ill-defined — sometimes they are described as two separate consorts, sometimes as two aspects of the same. But it is noteworthy that while so many recent sources now give 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma the Sanskrit name Dīptacakra, this usage is very rare in Tibetan literature, where she is, as far as I can see, nearly always called only by her Tibetan name. In fact, I can not recollect ever having encountered Dīptacakra — nor any other Sanskrit name — offered for 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma in any traditional Tibetan sources whatsoever. I am not saying there are no such — only that I have no recollection of encountering any. On the other hand, there are several occasions when Ekajaṭā is identified as 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma, for example, in the Sa skya literature; but here the tendency seems to be more a conflation of the two consorts.<sup>13</sup>

Nevertheless, there is at least one good justification for the modern usage of Dīptacakra — it comes from her mantra, *oṃ dīptacakra hana hana hūṃ phaṭ*. But there is also a good argument against it: it in no way translates her Tibetan name. The Tibetan name 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma means something like 'She who seals with the wheel(s)'. But, as 'Jam mgon kong sprul points out (following earlier commentarial tradition), the etymology of the mantra is as follows: *dīpta* means blazing, *cakra* is a wheel, and *hana hana* is the exclamation strike! strike!; so the whole mantra means "strike, strike with the blazing wheel!" He adds that it is because of the meaning of this mantra that the *yum* appears holding a wheel of destruction in her right hand.<sup>14</sup> Thus the literal Tibetan translation of Dīptacakra would be 'Khor lo 'bar ba, not 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma.

We must also note at this point that the root *Guhyasamāja* (14.65) has a mantra *oṃ chindha chindha hana hana daha daha dīptavajracakra hūṃ*

certainly not so far in any Tibetan sources. More recently, Boord 2002 has (albeit again with no explanation) reverted from *Trīptacakra* back to the more usual *Dīptacakra*.

<sup>13</sup> Compare *Phur Chen* 16.4 ff where the usual Sa skya form of 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma is elaborately visualised, with *Phur Chen* 36b. — 37a where with no explanation this same visualisation is lengthily praised as Ekajaṭā; for a similar passage, see also Grags pa rgyal mtshan p. 184.4. A myes zhabs offers no explanation in his great commentary (see below).

<sup>14</sup> See his famous commentary, *dPal rdo rje phur pa rtsa ba'i rgyud kyi dum bu'i sgrel pa snying po bsud pa dpal chen pa'i zhal lung zhes bya ba*, p. 101.

*phaṭ* which clearly anticipates the Tibetan tradition of this consort of Vajrakīlaya, since she subsequently takes the greater part of this mantra as her own; but unfortunately, the *Guhyasamāja* root tantra is not at all clear about what (if any) the gender implications of the words *dīptavajracakra* might be — does this point to a male name, as our several quoted traditional sources would have it, or to a female name, as many modern and recently translated sources would have it? Or neither? Or both? Unfortunately, the *Guhyasamāja* commentaries are not any more clear than the root tantra about the gender implications of the words — from what I have seen so far, they only add to the uncertainty.<sup>15</sup>

But here in Pelliot 349, the name *Dīptacakra* certainly refers not to the very well known female consort deity of Vajrakīlaya, but to a wrathful male deity (*khro bo chen po*, *khro bo rgyal po*) with a Heruka upper body and a *kīla*-shaped lower body. In the broader Vajrakīlaya literature, such an iconographical form most typically represents the ‘Supreme Son’ or

<sup>15</sup> Unfortunately, I have not had time to check on these commentaries with adequate thoroughness (there are a great many of them — around a dozen Tenjur volumes are dedicated to *Guhyasamāja* commentaries!). Chintaharan Chakravarti’s edition of the Sanskrit manuscript of Candrakīrti’s *Guhyasamājantrapradīpodyotanaṅkā* from the Rahul Collection does clearly interpret *Guhyasamāja* 14.65 as referring to a female (page 159, paragraph 3: *omīyādiko nīranto mantraḥ | chinda chinda sādhyakāyam | hana hana kāyabalam | daha daha kāya[m] | dīptavajraṃ ca cakraṃ ca yasvā dīptavajracakretyāmantraṇam | hūṃ phaṭīti codanam*). Boord translates this very nicely, but accepts it without further question (Boord 2002:39). However, J.S. Jha points out in his introduction that the Rahul Collection text appears to comment on a *Guhyasamāja* root text that has a number of readings not found in other *Guhyasamāja* editions — so further research of Sanskrit sources is probably called for. Meanwhile, the Tibetan translation of this famous commentary by Candrakīrti as witnessed in the Peking and Golden Tenjurs (Peking 2650, Vol. Sa f.155b; Kinsha rgyud ‘grel vol Sa,201) does not specify a female at all (*om zhes bya ba la sogs pa ni sngags te/ ming mtha’ med ces bya’o/ /tshinda tshinda zhes bya ba ni/ bsgrub par bya ba’i lus chod cig pa’o/ /ha na ha na zhes bya ba ni lus kyi stobs choms shig pa’o/ /da ha da ha zhes pa ni lus bsregs shig pa’o/ /dīpta badzra cakra zhes bya ba ni rdo rje dang ‘khor lo ‘bar ba can gang yin pa la/ ‘bar ba’i rdo rje ‘khor lo can zhes bod pa’o/ /hūṃ phaṭ ces pa ni bskul ba’o/). Another *Guhyasamāja* commentarial text from the Peking Tenjur (Vol. Sha, 243b-244a) which is attributed to Nāgārjuna, the *Śrīguhyasamājantraprasāyantraṅkānāma* or *dPal gsang ba ‘dus pa’i rgyud kyi rgyud ‘grel pa*, also comments on *Guhyasamāja* 14.65 in such a way as to leave gender unspecified: *om ni rnam par snang mdzad do/ /tshinda zhes pa ni chod ces ston to/ /ha na zhes pa ni bsgrub bya’i lus sod cig ces par ston to/ /dīpta badzra zhes pa ni rdo rje ‘bar ba ste/ /bod pa’i tshig go /hūṃ dang phaṭ ni khros pa la’o/). Clearly, we will need to look further in both Sanskrit and Tibetan sources before arriving at a clear decision about *Dīptacakra*’s gender in *Guhyasamāja* commentarial literature.**

*sras mchog* form of the Vajrakīlaya deity, frequently associated with the quintessentially male material *kīla* as a ritual implement and the deity's *nirmāṇakāya*.<sup>16</sup>

This application of the name *Dīptacakra* to a male deity with a *phur bu* shaped lower body is certainly not unknown even in literature in regular contemporary use: the *Phur chen* *sādhana*, the major current practice of the Sa skya *Khon lugs phur pa* tradition, has the following verse (starting on folio 24r line 6):

*tīpta ca kra phur pa'i lha/ mthing nag gcer bu ral pa can/ sku stod khro bo  
chen po la/ zhal gsum phyag kyang drug pa ste/ dbu la rigs lnga'i sangs rgyas  
rdzogs/ lte ba man chad sku yi cha/ utpal ngon po'i 'dab 'dra ba/ 'bar ba'i  
phreng ba 'khrigs pa'i 'od/ lcags kyi phur pa zur gsum pa/ drag por gyur ba'i  
phur pa ste/ ttab na lha yang brlag par 'gyur/ gnod byed bgegs la smos ci  
dgos/*

'*Dīptacakra*, *Phur pa* deity, / Dark blue and naked, with matted hair, [Your] upper body is a great male wrathful one./ With three heads and six arms./ [Your] heads are perfected by the Buddhas of the Five families./ The part of your body which is below the middle/ Is like the petals of a blue lotus./ With light amassing in a blazing garland/ [Around] the three-sided iron *phur-pa*./ This is the *phur pa* [which has] become wrathful! If it were to strike, even the gods would be destroyed, / What need is there to speak of the harmful forces and obstacles?'

The great 17th century Sa skya savant 'Jam mgon A myes zhabs wrote the definitive commentary on the *Sa skya Phur chen*, and his analysis of the words *tīpta ca kra phur pa'i lha* etc as cited above are most interesting and quite clear. He says that: they refer to the material *kīla* held in one's hands, which is visualised as the 'Supreme Son' *kīla*; that this is Vajrakīlaya (ie not his consort); and that the Tibetan meaning of his name is 'khor lo 'bar ba'.<sup>17</sup> We can see that the words 'khor lo 'bar ba follow the literal translation of *dīptacakra* that we find in much Tenjur commentary

<sup>16</sup> One should note that exceptions do of course occur. For example, in some instances forms with heruka upper bodies and *kīla* lower bodies can represent *dharmakāya* deities of the five enlightened families (but these are nevertheless still male!). But this form most typically represents the male *nirmāṇakāya* 'Supreme Son' or material *kīla*.

<sup>17</sup> *dīpta tsa kra phur pa'i lha ces sogs brjod/ de dagi don ni/ dīpta tsa kra zhes pas ni lag na yod pa'i sras mchog de nyid gsal ttab pa yin la/ 'o na 'di badzra kī la ya yin pa la/ dīpta tsa kra ste 'khor lo 'bar ba zhes brjod pa*. See 'Jam mgon A myes zhabs, ed. Sopa 1973:347.

on Guhyasamāja Ch.14, and also in Tibetan commentarial explanations of the meanings of the Sanskrit mantra of Vajrakīlaya's female consort — but which is generally denied her as her actual name in Tibetan sources, which instead call her 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma.

Note also that some of the lines here from the *Phur chen* are parallel to the *Guhyasamāja* commentarial materials presented in the appendix given below: / *utpal sngon po'i 'dab 'dra ba/ 'bar ba'i phreng ba 'khrigs pa'i 'od*, and also *sku stod khro bo chen po la/ zhal gsum phyag kyang drug pa ste/*; also *lte ba man chad sku yi cha*. In addition, the above verses are close to the verses from Grags pa rgyal mtshan and from the NGB's *Phur pa gsang chen rdo rje 'phreng ba'i rgyud* that we cite in Appendix 5.4, where we again find a male Dīptacakra — although there following P349 in giving the deity's colour as red rather than blue.

In fact, as we have already pointed out above, these particular verses (or, more commonly, various remixes of them) are quite widespread in Vajrakīlaya literature in general, but interestingly they are not always taken to indicate a single male deity as they do above and in P349 — or perhaps, even where they seem to, they are often interpreted otherwise. For example, Martin Boord has presented a translation of the verses as found in the 18th century Byang gter author Phrin las bdud 'jom's *Byang gter phur pa'i dbang gi lo rgyus legs par bshad pa nor bu'i do shal*. However, (perhaps following an uncited oral explanation?), Boord appears to conjecturally introduce the word 'and' into his text, to get around what he quite understandably (but perhaps mistakenly in this case) sees as the anomaly of the name Dīptacakra being applied to the quintessentially male kīla deity. In this way Boord tries to attribute the name Dīptacakra to the female consort instead. Hence he gives us a *yum-yab* interpretation: 'Oh Tr̥ptacakra [and] the Kīla god, dark blue in colour, naked, with long dishevelled hair...'; I wonder if Boord should have more simply written: 'Oh Dīptacakra, Kīla god, dark blue in colour, naked, with long dishev-

<sup>18</sup> Boord (1993:108, note 398) seems to say that Phrin las bdud 'joms took his text from the 17th century bKa' brgyud pa author gTsang mkhan chen 'Jam dbyangs dpal ldan rgya mtsho's *rDo rje phur pa'i chos byung*, but I am not sure if this is what he means. Nevertheless it is clear that the author (whether Phrin las bdud 'joms or gTsang mkhan chen) associates these verses with the famous Pharping narrative, which we find in Pelliot 44 and throughout subsequent Phur pa histories: hence the author has Padmasambhava utter a

elled hair...'. thus accepting the transmitted textual evidence of *Dīptacakra* applying to a single male deity? See Boord 1993:107.<sup>18</sup>

So the question arises: is the name *Dīptacakra*, ubiquitous in the last 30 years or so as referring to *Vajrakīlaya*'s female deity of union 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma, being correctly used? I regret that adequate answers to this question can probably only be achieved by a detailed study we can not attempt here — we would have to look through enough sources to ascertain at which point the Sanskrit name *Dīptacakra* became applied to 'Khor lo rgyas 'debs ma. Given that her mantra contains the element *dīptacakra*, and the sheer depth of contemporary opinion that calls her *Dīptacakra*, this identification might in fact turn out to be quite old, and traditionally accepted. In which case, it raises the issue of the double application of the name *Dīptacakra* to *Vajrakīlaya*'s Supreme Son and to his consort of union alike. While some Indological scholars might argue that such name and gender ambiguities are unremarkable from their point of view, my impression is that they are sufficiently rare in rNying ma pa literature — at least for deities with such prominent and clearly defined personalities as these — to pose an interesting question. If this is anything more than just a modernist confusion prompted by the Sanskritising impulse of Western scholarship, then was the ambiguity originally 'planned', a doctrinal and ritual development that was deliberate from its outset? — after all, there are few Indian tantric traditions more minutely analysed than the *Guhyasamāja*, and few Tibetan tantric traditions more commented upon than *Vajrakīlaya*. Or was it a possibly anachronistic anomaly arising from the gradual emergence of *Vajrakīlaya* and his maṇḍala out of the conceptual vagueness of the pantheonic margins — where identity and gender is more often ill-defined — into the minutely scrutinised limelight of pantheonic centrality — where identity and gender is usually more clearly defined? Or did it originally arise from the confusion of a faulty

version of these verses in the Asura cave at Pharping in order to tame the various troublesome goddesses there (he lists them as *Sho na*, *bDag nyid chen mo*, and *bSe mo*).

<sup>19</sup> Some examples of potentially confusing passages: Ch.11 of the NGB's *Phur pa bcu gnyis* bestows the body consecration on to the male material *kīla* with the mantra: *om chindha chindha hana hana dīptackara hūṃ*, a form of words which on its own and without added commentary might imply to the reader that *dīptackara* is the name of the male material *kīla*, as in P349. Incidentally, we know this must be an old tradition, because an almost identical pattern occurs in the Dunhuang texts IOLTibJ 754, 81-82, and IOLTib

scribal transmission that was later rationalised? Or from some other kind of interpretational confusion between mantras and names?<sup>19</sup> Or was it a result of alternative interpretations of *Guhyasamājantra* 14.65 and its commentaries?

Not without important reservations, one can also consider an additional perspective: the ‘Supreme Son’ can be *functionally* very close to the consort. Both can represent Vajrakīlaya’s practical apotropaic activities of summoning and liberating obstacles (which typically make use of a further minor pantheon of more marginal deities), as opposed to the more central soteriological functions closely associated with the main deity Vajrakīlaya himself and his immediate circle. Or, to use rNying ma pa terminology, the Supreme Son and the consort alike (along with other more

J331.III, where the former bestows the body consecration with *om tshin dha tshin dha da ha da ha ha na ha na tib ta ca kra hum phad*; and in the latter with *om ha na ha na tib ta ca kra hūṃ phat*. (Note: these mantras, and the other mantras for consecrations of speech and mind that accompany them, are all derived from the *Guhyasamāja* Ch.14). But *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch.11 continues by seemingly indicating that the latter part of the mantra is that of the female consort, invoked to make the body consecration of the male material *kīla* by joining in union with the male deity so that they can produce ‘*bodhicitta*’; hence it is not necessarily the case that ‘*Dīptacakra*’ refers to the male material *kīla* itself or its male deity form. The *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch. 11 gives the following explanation: *Then, interlinking together one’s eight fingers./ In between one’s thumbs which are in line./ Insert the kīla, and say the following words:/ Om and chindha chindha and/ Hana hana dīpta and/ Cakra hūṃ; with this superlative utterance./ The bodhicitta of the lord’s union with his consort/ Emanates superlatively, and dissolves into the [kīla]. Sparks filling a thousand worlds shoot forth./ And [the kīla] obtains a great power and glory/ Which can attain all goals with certainty; [Upon this], present it to rest within the centre of the secret consort.* The interlinking of hands or fingers in such a context to represent a *yab-yum* is also mentioned in *Guhyasamāja* 14.66 and its commentaries, as well as in most Vajrakīlaya literature. The *chindha chindha* elements occur in much Vajrakīlaya literature in mantras of Amṛtakunḍalin, who is often identical to Vajrakīla; while the *hana hana dīpta* and *cakra hūṃ* elements are probably here taken to be those of ‘Khor lo rgyas ‘debs ma, Vajrakīlaya’s consort of union (*sbyor*). The placing of the *kīla* to rest within the centre of the secret consort probably refers to the *phur khung* or *kīla* stand, which is often identified with the consort’s “sky” into which the [male] implement can be put to rest vertically. We can conclude that this mantra in this instance is not necessarily indicative of the male deity being called *Dīptacakra*; rather, it might simply be the mantra of ‘Khor lo rgyas ‘debs ma. But such passages (especially the mantras on their own without further commentary) can easily become a source for confusion.

<sup>20</sup> Her Sanskrit name is variously rendered as Śvānamukhī, Śvanmukhā, Śvāna, or Śvana and her Tibetan name as Sho na or Shwa na. She is the most famous of the Vajrakīlaya protectresses, whose place in the Vajrakīlaya maṇḍala traditionally goes back to her being tamed by Padmasambhava at Pharping (cf Pelliot 44).

marginal often female Vajrakīlaya maṇḍala deities such as the dog-headed goddess Śvāna<sup>20</sup>) can be especially important in the *smad las*, the ‘lower rites’ of eliminating obstacles, rather than the *stod las*, or ‘upper rites’ of realising *dharmatā*.<sup>21</sup> Could this functional closeness of the male *nirmāṇa-kāya* form to the more marginal female deities of activity and his consequent co-habiting of various subsidiary maṇḍalas with them contribute to occasional name or gender ambiguity? But a problem with this analysis is that it is the consort of liberation (*sgrol*), Ekajaṭā, who fits this scenario, rather than the consort of union (*sbyor*), Khor lo rgyas ‘debs ma.

Nevertheless, gender and name ambiguity is certainly not so rare among the more marginal deities of the Vajrakīlaya maṇḍala: one can point out that the twenty attendants of the Ten Wrathful Deities (two for each) can sometimes be seen as all female, and sometimes as ten males and ten females; likewise Śvāna can also sometimes (but comparatively rarely) have male counterparts<sup>22</sup>, and the descriptions of the other Vajrakīlaya protectors can also vary quite a lot. We can conclude — if it is not simply a confusion of both ancient and modern scholarship! — that what might be surprising about the gender and name ambiguity of Dīptacakra is not so much the ambiguity as such, but its existence between such famous and well-defined deities as Vajrakīlaya’s main consort and his ‘Supreme Son’.

### *Translation of lines 8 to 11*

<sup>21</sup> Evidence for this can again be found in the *Phur pa bcu gnyis*, where Ch. 9 is devoted entirely to the Supreme Son. Here the Supreme Son is envisaged as having his home in the maṇḍala of the secret consort, ‘encircled by a blazing radiance of fire,’ (perhaps an allusion to Dīptacakra as a female, perhaps an attribute of himself), where he co-habits with relatively marginal and mainly female ‘lower rite’ deities of killing and liberating and the largely female Vajrakīlaya protectors such as Śvāna and Remati.

<sup>22</sup> The *gter ma* of mChog gyur gling pa (*mChog gling gter sar*) have both male and female Śvāna deities: for example, the *Zab bdun mchog zab yang dag gi shwa na chen po'i zlog pa'i phrin las bcol ba* (volume 17, pp. 559-569) has the passage: *yab gcig shwa na mu kha che/ mthu chen bdud rgyal rnams kyi gshed..I khyod kyi yum gcig shwa na mal mkha la 'khor 'das thams cad rdzogs/* (p. 562). Thanks to Andreas Doctor for these texts. Note however that in the *Shwa na dkar nag gi rgyud* of the NGB (sDe dge Zha f. 260; mTshams brag Ji p. 1096; gTing skyes Sha p. 493; Nubri Sa f.65 gong; Rig 'dzin Sha f.222), which is the only Tantra specifically for Śvāna deities with which I am currently familiar, only female forms of Śvāna are ever explicitly mentioned (although it is also just conceivable that male ones might also be very vaguely implied, especially with a liberal helping of creative exegesis; at least they are not explicitly precluded).

As for the meditational tantra [tradition][.....]:

- [8] from out of the single [non dual] expanse, on the palm of the right hand, [visualise arising out of] the syllable Nya, a moon disc;  
 [9] being of the nature of skilful means, [upon it arise?] the Ten Great Wrathful Deities. On the left palm, from the [syllable] Ma  
 [10] arises a sun maṇḍala; [since it is?] [- - -] the sign for the nature of wisdom,  
 [11] meditate and so forth as [arising upon it?] the Ten Great Female Wrathful Deities.

*Comments on lines 8 to 11*

Line 8:

The text here reads Nya. We know however that this is quite likely an error for A because more or less all other sources give A in this context of visualising the sun and moon on the hands as part of the *kīla*-wielding ritual: to mention but a few, the old Dunhuang texts IOL Tib J 754, 81-82; the NGB's *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch. 11;<sup>23</sup> the main current *Sa skya sādhanas* (*Sa skya Phur chen* f. 24r and the *dPal rdo rje phur pa'i bsnyen sgrub gsal byed bdud rtsi'i 'od can* f. 150). The process is a complex one of consecrating the hands and the *kīla* and solemnly wielding them both in elaborate and graceful hand gestures or *mudrā*. P349 gives an extremely abbreviated reference to this famous *kīla* rite.

Lines 9 and 10:

The Ten Wrathful Deities (*khro bo bcu*) and their consorts are very important in the Vajrakīlaya traditions and of course occur throughout many other Vajrayāna texts in addition. In this version of this rite, the Ten Wrathful Deities and their consorts are mentioned as arising directly from the visualised sun and moon on the palms of the hands. In the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch.11<sup>24</sup> and the current *Sa skya* traditions (*dPal rdo rje phur pa'i bsnyen sgrub gsal byed bdud rtsi'i 'od can* folio 150; *Sa skya Phur chen* f. 24r), the process is more gradual, with the wrathful deities developing

<sup>23</sup> gTing skyes Vol Dza p. 110; sDe dge Vol Pa f.217r

<sup>24</sup> gTing skyes Vol. Dza pp. 110-112, sDe dge Vol. Pa f. 217r-218r

in stages out of the unions of the male and female peaceful Buddhas, all performed with elaborate visualisation and hand gestures or *mudrā*.

*Translation of lines 11-17*

As for the [Tantra meditation tradition's] virtuous qualities:

- [12] by pervading [one's hands] in this way, one's obstacles in this life will be pacified; [thereby] the accumulations of merit can be attained [-]
- [13] [so that] one passes on to an abode in the transcendent heavens [where] the accumulation of wisdom can [also] be attained;
- [14] and thus the two accumulations of merit and wisdom can both be attained: [hence these are its] virtuous qualities. Regarding the Phur bu as a
- [15] basis for accomplishment: having done accordingly [as above], the obstacles [will be?] pacified, patron's wishes will be accomplished,
- [16,17] heavenly abodes will be attained, and even the two great accumulations will be completed. Since these rites whose [very] nature is skilful means and wisdom do not waver, they are a basis for accomplishment and qualities.

*Comments on lines 11-17*

lines 11-14:

Here we find a rationale for the apotropaic aspects of the Vajrakīlaya rites: specifically aimed at removing this-worldly obstacles, they only do so in order to enable spiritual practice, as the first stage of a gradualist spiritual program. This kind of rationale is also found in hagiographic materials about early Vajrakīlaya practitioners: see for example the story of gNyags Jñānakumāra as contained in the *bDud 'joms chos 'byung*.<sup>25</sup> The reference to the rebirth in a pure realm is noteworthy: in most Vajrakīlaya literature this is a virtue enjoyed by practitioners of Vajrakīlaya and their 'liberated' victims alike. Another of the Dunhuang Phur pa texts, IOLTibJ331.III, makes this connection clear in its title, *Zhi ba'i mchog*

<sup>25</sup> Dudjom1991:601-605.

<sup>26</sup> I hope to comprehensively study this important text in the near future.

*'pho ba'i 'phrin las bsdus pa'o* — where *'phrin las* refers to the Phur pa 'liberation' ritual, and *'pho ba* to the yogic transference of consciousness to the pure realm, here glossed as *zhi ba'i mchog*, supreme peace.<sup>26</sup>

Lines 15-17:

This reiterates much of the above, but taking the perspective of yogic accomplishment rather than the virtuous qualities of the practice.

*Translation of lines 18-22*

- [18] On the occasion of rolling and brandishing such a Phur bu between one's two hands, regarding the materials of the suppressing and repelling Phur bu,  
 [19] make it out of iron from a weapon [that has fallen on a man?]; above its knotted cords, establish Heruka; on the four faces,  
 [20] establish those endowed with the [four] particular enlightened activities; on the eight sides of the neck, establish the eight great Mātrs;  
 [21] having established the eight Mukhas (*mu ka brgyad*) on its point, [with such a tip (*sna la*), one can strike at one's own self?]. As it is said in the meditation tradition: since this is the Perfection of Material,  
 [22] consecrate it as the deity and request accomplishment, and one will be able to strike at [all] the Realm of Desire (*'dod pa'i khams, kāma-dhātu*) below.

*Comments on lines 18-22*

Lines 19-21:

*Phur pa bcu gnyis* Chapter 10<sup>27</sup> describes the materials for making a *kīla* as ideally to be taken from weapons such as knives and arrowheads, as well as from meteors or thunderbolts, and to have qualities of cutting, sharpness, and hardness etc. It is also possible that the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* advocates the use of iron from an arrowhead that has pierced a person's heart, but the text is corrupt at that point, and the meaning ambiguous. The text here in P349 is slightly obscure (*mtshon myi la babs pa'i lcags*),

<sup>27</sup> gTing skyes Vol. Dza page 106; sDe dge Vol. Pa folio 216r

but it seems a reasonable conjecture that the material is meant to be iron from a weapon that has actually struck a person.

These lines also support one of the findings of Mayer & Cantwell 1994: that the classic Tibetan *kīla* design as we know it today was already in place by the time the Dunhuang texts were written. Although extremely terse in describing the *kīla*, nevertheless here at the very least we have the knotted cords, the four-square base, and an eight-faceted shaft, features that make unmistakable reference to the *yūpa* or Indian sacrificial stake (Mayer 1991).

The establishment of deities on the different parts of the *kīla* is ubiquitous in all *kīla* literature, but the details of which deity is put where seems to vary from text to text and *sādhana* tradition to *sādhana* tradition, which is perhaps understandable in that the different Vajrakīlaya maṇḍalas are populated by slightly different arrangements of deities. Nevertheless the placement of Heruka in his ‘palace’ above the knotted cords (as here also) does seem to be a constant. The deities of the four enlightened activities will probably be those of the standard list of peaceful, increasing, powerful and wrathful activities, or else the well-known four goddesses with iron hook, noose, iron chain and bell who summon and bind. Mention is made here of the eight *mu ka*; possibly a popular Sanskritism (*mukha* = face or head), referring to the famous animal-headed goddesses as found in many Vajrakīlaya texts all of whose names end in *-mukha*; for example, eight occur in Chapter 7 of the *Phur pa bcu gnyis*, in the context of the definitive arrangement of the central Vajrakīlaya maṇḍala.

More problematic is the culmination of this section, *sna la bdag rang la gdab//*. In particular we have problems interpreting *sna*: the tip of the *phur bu* is more often referred to as *dbal* than *sna*, and striking oneself on the nose with the consecrated *phur bu* is not mentioned elsewhere! However, Cristina Scherrer-Schaub has pointed out to me that in Old terminology, *sna* is an ancient term for *gtso bo*, which may be understood as a metaphorical expression for *dbal*, meaning pinnacle or tip. I am following her suggestion here. *dBal* is of course widely used to refer to the point of a *phur bu*, and is especially widespread in the Bon Phur pa tradition. There is an important part of the rNying ma and Sa skya rite where the freshly empowered *kīla* is solemnly touched (not struck) to ‘the five places and three gates’, i.e. (1) crown of head, (2) forehead, (3) back of right ear, (4) back of

head, (5) back of left ear, (6) forehead again (7) throat and (8) heart. More generally, from a soteriological point of view, the ultimate function of the phur pa is to enable one to strike at the ignorance, desire and aggression within oneself: this is always seen as the ultimate usage of the implement, a soteriological interpretation that goes back to the *Guhyasamāja*.

Line 22:

The Dunhuang Phur pa text IOL Tib J 331.III explains it will subsume the Vajrakīlaya teachings within ‘Seven Perfections’ (*phun sum tshogs pa bdun*). The first two of these are *gzugs phun sum tshogs pa*, the ‘Perfection of Form’, and *byin rlabs phun sum tshogs pa*, the ‘Perfection of Consecration’. The first details the materials and form to be used in making the *kīla*, and the second the methods of consecrating it. The ‘Perfection of Material’ (*rgyu phun sum tshogs pa*) mentioned here in P349 does not occur in IOL Tib J 331.III, but its initial ‘Perfection of Form’ seems to cover similar ground, and as in P349 is likewise followed by consecration of the implement as the deity, which then forms the basis for the subsequent rituals.

*Translation of lines 23-26*

- [23] As for the means of striking at the obstacles: having assembled all the material as the deity, when rolling it between the hands, do not give rise to angry thoughts,
- [24] [but] with great compassion, adhere to the Base (*gzhi*). Giving rise to the emanation and reabsorption of rays of light,
- [25] as these strike at the form of whoever [the rite] is to be done for, generating bodhicitta, imagine that they become transformed into the nature of the Great Peace,
- [26] and utter these verses of Phur bu recitation:

*Comments on lines 23-26:*

The description of the actual wrathful rite makes clear its adherence to conventional Buddhist ethics. Even while striking at the obstacles (*bgegs*), P349 insists the practitioner should not give rise to angry thoughts, but should proceed with a mind of compassion that adheres to the Base (*gzhi*,

equivalent to Sanskrit *ālaya*, of course originally a Mahāyāna term but also much adapted in rDzogs chen texts). Although not spelt out by name, the rite of forceful liberation or ‘killing’ (*sgrol ba* or *mokṣa*) is clearly being referred to. In Tib J 754 81-2, also a Dunhuang text dealing with the same rite, similar Buddhist principles are likewise invoked (Mayer & Cantwell 1994). We find similar sentiments in the opening passages of IOL TibJ 331.III. The clear evidence of the Dunhuang *kīla* ‘killing’ rites taken as a whole seems to be that they were fully ethicised and soteriologised. As we would expect from materials so closely linked to Guhyasamāja, the early Tibetan *kīla* tradition of *mokṣa* was not a sorcery tradition, but a Mahāyāna Buddhist one, albeit in the final analysis most likely a bloodless calque on non-Buddhist Tantric blood sacrificial rites of the type still so widespread in Śākta religion. The rite of *mokṣa* of course continues as a central practice in contemporary rNying ma pa ritual, especially in the *Vajrakīlaya* traditions, and it is remarkable how little the rite described in these Dunhuang texts has changed over the last millennium, if at all. For a detailed study of *mokṣa*, see Cantwell 1997.

The mention of the projection and reabsorption of light rays in line 24 is very similar to the instruction given at the same point in the same ritual as described in IOL Tib J 754, 81-82 (Mayer & Cantwell:59-60).

*Translation of lines 27-32*

- [27] By this wrathful king  
The obstacles are summoned and totally destroyed.  
Those supremely endowed with good intellect
- [28] Strike with the phur bu in accordance with the rite.  
The great Vajra King, the Amṛta being,  
Abides as the Vajra Phur bu itself,
- [29] Blue in colour like an utpala,  
Gazing down at the hosts of obstacles.  
The part below his navel
- [30] Is like a point, and utterly [...] [*brlag*, destroys?]  
If, endowed with his mantras,  
One definitively strikes with Vajra Phur [bu],
- [31] The bodies of the obstacles will become quite immobilised

om̐ gha gha gha ta ya gha ta ya / sa rva du shta ni phaṭ // ki la ki la  
[32] ya sa rva ba pham phaṭ// hūṃ hūṃ [ba] dzra dha rod a [-] pa ya ti [...]

*Comments on lines 27-32:*

As R.A. Stein has already discussed, these verses are found also in several places in the Guhyasamāja tradition (see the appendix below). The culminating mantra does not survive intact in P349, but is easily recognisable as a famous mantra from verse 58 of the *Guhyasamāja's* Chapter 14: *Om̐ gha gha ghātaya ghātaya sarvaduṣṭān phaṭ kīlaya kīlaya sarvapāpān phaṭ hūṃ hūṃ vajrakīla vajradhara ājñāpayati sarvaviḡh-nānām̐ kāyavākcittavajraṃ kīlaya hūṃ phaṭ*. In fact, this mantra has had a long and varied career in Vajrayāna literature, and appears in a variety of traditions beyond the Guhyasamāja, for example in the Yoginī traditions of Vajravārāhī. This mantra is still found in the rNying ma pa Vajrakīlaya traditions, but interestingly the deity to which it is attached can often be a female one. In the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch. 13 and again in Ch. 20, this mantra is given as that of rDo rje sder mo, or 'Vajra claw'. This is one of the special lower rite goddesses (according to *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch. 20) who takes their orders from the central deity and perform the actual strikes against the obstacles, in this sense closely related by function to the male deity form with the heruka upper body and the *kīla* lower body who here in P349 (line 28) is called *rdo rje rgyal chen bdud rtsi po*, the Great Vajra Amṛta King. rDo rje sder mo's Sanskrit name remains unclear;<sup>28</sup> but rDo rje sder mo under her Tibetan name also occurs in the Dunhuang text IOL Tib J 331.111, where she also has the same mantra as appears here (*Om̐ gha gha ghātaya* etc.), and the same lower-rite function as in the *Phur pa bcu gnyis* Ch. 20. The Dunhuang text IOL Tib J 754, 81-82 also has the same mantra with the same function, but does not mention the name of any deity either male or female.

<sup>28</sup> The rNying ma text does not attempt a Sanskrit name, although *Sa skya phur chen* folio 18b line 2 calls her *Vajra Tātā* but has here identified her as a regular member of its *sambhogakāya* maṇḍala rather than as a special goddess of killing in the *nirmāṇakāya* maṇḍala.

**5. Appendix: some parallel Sanskrit and Tibetan texts to P349 lines 27-32 (5.1 and 5.2 prepared by Gudrun Melzer)**

**Piṇḍikramasādhana (PKS) of Nāgārjuna:**

Facsimile Edition in Mimaki 1994: A PKS 2a4-2b3

Ms. of Vallée Poussin's edition B PKS 2a3-2b1,

**5.1. Piṇḍikramasādhana**

(Vallée Poussin 1896, pp. 1-2)

Anena krodharūpeṇa  
 ākṛṣyaivaṃ vināyakān |  
 kīlayed vidhivat sarvān  
 prayogeṇa tu buddhimān ||10  
 vajrāmṛtamahārājaṃ  
 vajrakīlaṃ vibhāvayet |  
 nīlotpaladalaśyāmaṃ  
 jvālāmālākulaprabham || 11  
 nābhideśād adhobhāgaṃ  
 śūlākāraṃ vibhāvayet |  
 ūrdhvaṃ krodhākṛtim<sup>i</sup> caiva  
 trimukhākāraṣaḍbhujam || 12  
 adho vighnagaṇān vikṣya  
 tan mantraṃ samudāharan<sup>ii</sup> |  
 nikhaned vajrakīlaṃ tu  
 vighnadeheṣu niścalam || 13  
 om̐ gha gha ghātaya ghātaya sarvaduṣṭān phaṭ<sup>iii</sup> kīlaya kīlaya sarvapāpān  
 phaṭ<sup>iv</sup> hūṃ hūṃ<sup>v</sup> vajrakīla vajradhara<sup>vi</sup> ājñāpayati sarvavighnānāṃ kāya-  
 vākcittam<sup>vii</sup> kīlaya hūṃ<sup>viii</sup> phaṭ

**[5.2]**

**sgrub pa'i thabs mdor byas pa (Piṇḍikṛtasādhana)**

sDe dge vol. Ngi, 3,1.4-4,1.2; Peking 2661.

khro bo'i gzugs can 'di yis ni //  
 bgegs kyi dbang po nyid bkug nas //  
 blo dang ldan pas sbyor ba yis //  
 cho ga bzhin du phur bus gdab //

rdo rje bdud rtsi rgyal po che //  
 utpal sngon po 'dab ma'i mdog //  
 'bar phreng 'khrigs pa'i 'od ldan pa //  
 rdo rje phur bu nmam par bsgom //  
 lte ba'i phyogs nas smad kyi cha //  
 rtse mo lta bur nmam par bsam //  
 stod ni khro bo'i dbyibs can te //  
 zhal gsum phyag drug lta bur bsgom //  
 de yi gsang sngags legs brjod la //  
 bgegs kyi tshogs la 'og gzigs pas //  
 rdo rje phur bu nges btab na //  
 bgegs kyi lus ni myi g.yo 'gyur //  
 oṃ gha gha ghā ta ya ghā ta ya / sa rva du ṣṭām phaṭ phaṭ /  
 kī la ya kī la ya / sa rva pā paṃ phaṭ phaṭ hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ /  
 badzra kī la ya / badzra dha ro ā dznyā pa ya ti / sarva bighnān /  
 kā ya vāk ci tta / badzra<sup>ix</sup> kī la ya hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ phaṭ phaṭ

The **Piṇḍikṛtasādhanopāyikāvṛttiratnāvalī** or **mDor bsdu pa'i sgrub thabs kyi 'grel pa rin chen phreng ba** attributed to Ratnākaraśānti (Peking 2690: 297b 1.7. to 298b 1.2) contains a slightly different version of the verses to the above. Here, the verses are broken up with word by word commentary interspersed. Thanks to Gudrun Melzer for discovering this passage.

/rdo rje bdud rtsi rgyal po che/  
 /utpal sngon po'i 'dab ma'i mdog  
 /'bar phreng 'khrigs pa'i 'od ldan pa/  
 /rdo rje phur bus nmam par bsgom/  
 .....  
 lte ba'i phyogs nas smad kyi cha/  
 /rtse mo lta bur nmam bsam zhing/  
 /stod ni khro bo'i dbyibs can te/  
 /zhal gsum phyag drug lta bu bsgom/  
 .....  
 de yi gsang sngags legs brjod la/  
 /bltas pas 'og tu bgegs kyi tshogs/  
 /rdo rje'i phur bus nges btab na/

/bgegs kyi lus la mi g-yo 'gyur/

.....

om̄ gha gha gha ta ya sarba du ṣtaṃ hūṃ phaṭ phaṭ /

kī la ya kī la ya sarba pā paṃ phaṭ phaṭ hūṃ hūṃ badzra kī la ya badzra  
dharo adznyā pa ya ti/

sarba bighnām kā ya bā ka ci ttaṃ kī la ya hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ phaṭ phaṭ

[5.3]

**gZi ldan 'bar ba mtshams kyi rgyud**

This text of about twenty folios has no chapter divisions or titles. The text cited below is taken from folios 274r-v of vol. Zha of the mTshams brag edition (Vol 21 pages 551-552 in the modern pagination). It is very close to the text from the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* cited above in Appendix 5.2:

/hūṃ/ khro bo'i rgyal po 'di bdag gis/

/bgegs kun bkug nas rnam par 'jig

/blo ldan rab tu 'byor pa yis/

/cho ga bzhin du phur kun btab/

/rdo rje bdud rtsi rgyal po yi/

/rdo rje'i phur bu nyid gnas pa/

/utpal sngon po'i mdog 'dra bar/

/bar ba'i 'phreng ba 'khrig pa'i 'od/

/lte ba man chad chas rnam ni/

/phur rtse lta bur rnam par sgom/

/ro stod khro bo lta bu nyid/

/zhal gsum phyag kyang drug pa ste/

/bgegs kyi tshogs la 'og tu gzugs/

/de yi sngags ni brjod bya ste/

/rdo rje phur pa nges btab nas/

/bgegs lus bzhin du mi g-yo ba'o/

/om̄ gha gha gha ta ya sarba dustan hūṃ phaṭ/

/kilaya kilaya sarba pāpaṃ hūṃ phaṭ/

/hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ badzra kilaya/

/badzra darod adnya payati/

/ka ya bag citaṃ badzra ki la ya hūṃ phaṭ/

## [5.4]

**Phur pa gsang chen rdo rje 'phreng ba'i rgyud, Chapter 16**

Rig 'dzin edition of the NGB, Vol. Sha folios 43v to 60r

tib ta cakra phur pa'i lha//  
 dmar po gcer bu ral pa can//  
 kun kyang khro bo chen po la//  
 zhal gsum phyag ni drug pa ste//  
 ral gri sku la phur pa'i so//  
 lte ba yan chad chas rnam ni//  
 na za rdo rje go cha gtams//  
 lte ba man chad chas rnam ni//  
 utpal sngon po'i mdog 'dra ba//  
 'bar ba'i 'phreng bas 'khrig pa'i 'od//  
 lcags kyi phur pa zur gsum pa//  
 btab na lha yang rlag pa'i phyir//  
 gnod byed dgra bgegs smos ci dgos//  
 kī la ya/  
 mā ra ya phat/

**Phur pa'i las byang**, by Grags pa rgyal mtshan

rDo rje phur pa'i sgrub skor, Sa skya bka' 'bum, vol. 4, p 182.

dīb ta tsakra phur ba'i lha/  
 /dmar po gcer bu ral pa can/  
 /sku stod khro bo chen po la/  
 /zhal gsum phyag kyang drug pa ste/  
 /ral gri'i sgra la phur bu'i so/  
 lte ba man chad sku yi cha rnam ni/  
 /utpal sngon po'i 'dab ma 'dra/  
 /'bar ba'i phreng ba 'khrugs pa'i 'od/  
 /lcags kyi phur pa zur gsum pa/  
 /drag po gyur pa'i phur bu ste/  
 /btab na yang brlag 'gyur te/  
 /gnod byed bgegs la smos ci dgos/  
 /om badzra kī la ya sarba bighnāṃ baṃ hūṃ phat/



### Notes to appendix texts:

i A, B ūrdhvakrodhākṛtiṃ ii A samudāharet iii A +phaṭ iv A +phaṭ v A +hūṃ vi A vajradharo vii A kāyavākcittavajraṃ viii A +hūṃ hūṃ ix Peking omits

## 6. Bibliography

### *Tibetan Sources:*

- bDud 'joms 'jigs bral ye shes rdo rje: *dpal rdo rje phur bu thugs gyi sgrub pa gsang ba'i rgya can bdud 'joms gnam lcags spu gri'i las byang khrag 'thung mngon par rol pa'i dga' ston*. From the Collected Works of H.H. bDud 'joms Rin po che, vol. 10.
- Grags pa rgyal mtshan: *rDo rje phur pa'i sgrub skor*, in *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum* vol. 4, pp. 175-199. Tokyo, 1968.
- 'Jam mgon a myes zhabs kun dga' bsod nams: *bCom ldan 'das rdo rje gzhon nu'i gdams pa nyams len gyi chu bo chen po sgrub pa'i thabs kyi rnam par bshad pa 'phrin las kyi padmo rab tu rgyas pa'i nyin byed*, in Ngawang Sopa, ed: *The Vajrakīla Rites As Practiced by the 'Khon Lineage of Sa skya*, New Delhi, 1973.
- Kong sprul blo gros mtha' yas: *dPal rdo rje phur pa rtsa ba'i rgyud kyi dum bu'i 'grel pa snying po bsodus pa dpal chen dgyes pa'i zhal lung zhes bya ba* n.d., n.p.
- rNying ma'i rgyud 'bum*, 'The Collected Tantras of the Ancient School of Tibetan Buddhism'. *gTing skyes* edition: Ed. Dil mgo mKhyen brtse. Reproduced from a manuscript copy from gTing skyes dgon pa byang monastery in Tibet. 36 vols. Thimbu, 1973-75.
- Rig 'dzin* edition: original manuscripts held by the British Library, London. An electronic catalogue by Cathy Cantwell, Robert Mayer and Michael Fischer can be found at <http://ngb.csac.anthropology.ac.uk:8080/>
- mTshams brag* edition: *The Mtshams brag Manuscript of the rNying ma rgyud 'bum*, Photo-offset litho reproduction made in Delhi under the auspices of the National Library of Bhutan. 46 volumes. Thimpu 1982.
- dpal rdo rje phur pa'i bsnyen sgrub gsal byed bdud rtsi'i 'od can*. From the *sGrub thabs kun btus* vol Pa, p. 140 ff.
- Phur pa bcu gnyis kyi rgyud ces bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo* sDe dge rNying ma'i rgyud 'bum vol. Pa, folios 176r-251v; and *gTing skyes dgon pa byang monastery ms.*, Khyentse Rinpoche reprint, vol Dza 1r-100r (pp. 1-199)
- Sa skya phur chen: dPal rdo rje gzhon nu'i sgrub thabs bklags pas don grub*. Rajpur, India.

*Other Languages*

- Bhattacharya, Benoytosh (1968). *Sādhnamālā* vols. 1 and 2. GOS nos. 26 & 41. Baroda.
- Bischoff, F.A. & Charles Hartmann (1971). 'Padmasambhava's Invention of the Phur-bu: Ms. Pelliot Tibétain 44.' *Études Tibétaines Dédiées à la Mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris, pp. 11-28.
- Boord, Martin J. (1993). *The Cult of the Deity Vajrakīla*. Tring.
- . (2002). *A Bolt Of Lightning From The Blue*. Berlin.
- Cantwell, Cathy (1997). 'To meditate upon consciousness as vajra: ritual "killing and liberation" in the rNying ma pa Tradition', In *PIATS 7, Tibetan Studies, Volume 1*, ed. Krasser, Much, Steinkellner & Tauscher, Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien pp. 107-118.
- Chakravarti, Chintaharan, ed. (1984). *Guhyasamājatantrapradīpodyotanaṭīkāṣaṭ-koṭiyākhyā*. Patna.
- Dudjom Rinpoche, Jikdrel Yeshe Dorje. (trans. Dorje and Kapstein) (1999). *The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism*. Boston.
- Eastman, Kenneth W. (1980). *Chibetto-go Guhyasamājatantra no tonkoo shutsudo shahon*. Tokyo.
- Edgerton, Franklin (1970). *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*. Delhi.
- Fremantle, Francesca (1971). *A Critical Study of the Guhyasamāja-tantra*. PhD diss. SOAS, London.
- Hackin, Joseph (1924). *Formulaire Sanscrit-Tibétain du X<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Paris.
- Kapstein, Matthew (2000). *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism. Conversion, Contestation and Memory*. New York.
- Lalou, M. (1939, 1950, 1961). *Inventaire des Manuscrits Tibétains de Touen houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris.
- Matsunaga, Yukei (ed.) (1978). *The Guhyasamāja Tantra*. Osaka.
- Mayer, Robert (1996). *A Scripture of The Ancient Tantra Collection: The Phur-pa bcu-gnyis*. Oxford.
- . 1991 'Observations on the Tibetan Phur-pa and the Indian Kīla'. *The Buddhist Forum II*. London.
- Mayer, Robert & Cathy Cantwell (1994). 'A Dunhuang Manuscript on Vajrakīlaya [IOL MSS TIB J 754, 81-82]'. (Reprint) *Tibet Journal* XIX.1, pp. 54-67.
- Mimaki, Katsumi (1994). *Pañcakrama: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts Critically Edited with Verse Index and Facsimile Edition of the Sanskrit Manuscripts*. Tokyo.
- Roerich, George N. (1976). *The Blue Annals* Delhi.
- Stein, Rolf A. (1978). 'A propos des documents anciens relatifs au phur-bu (kīla)', *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös memorial Symposium*, ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest. Pp. 427-44.
- Scherer-Schaub, Cristina (1999-2000). 'Prière pour un apostat — Fragments d'histoire tibétaine'. In *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie II* (1999-2000), pp. 217-246.

- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (1998). *Old Tibetan Manuscripts from East Turkestan in The Stein Collection of the British Library Volume II. Descriptive Catalogue*. Tokyo and London.
- Vallée Poussin, Louis de la (1896). *Études et Textes Tantriques, Pañcakrama*. Gand & Louvain.
- (1962). *Tibetan Manuscripts from Dunhuang in the India Office Library*. London.
- Jiang, Zhongxin & Toru Tomabechi (eds) (1996). *The Pañcakramaṭippani of Muniśrībhadrā (Yogīmanoharā)*. Bern.