

The *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*: Continuity and Change in Buddhist Sūtras

Ulrich Pagel

In this paper, I intend to present a series of observations concerning the relationship between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*.¹ Analysis of these sūtras has shown that the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* is greatly indebted to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* for its material, often to the extent of reproducing entire passages from the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* verbatim. Presumably in response to changes in current Buddhist thinking, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* deliberately introduced also a number of unambiguous doctrinal and editorial adjustments. On the whole, they are rather minor and are well blended into the wider context of the exposition, affecting only selected aspects of the Bodhisattva career. In several instances, modifications indicate doctrinal development and allow us to establish the chronology of the two works beyond reasonable doubt.² The main body of

¹ All references, unless stated otherwise, refer to the Peking Edition of the Tibetan *Tripitaka* (ed., D.T. Suzuki, Kyoto, 1958); vols. 22/23 for the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, vol. 34 for the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and vol. 104 for the *Akṣayamatīrdeśaṭīkā*. However, since I have produced elsewhere a critical edition of chapter eleven of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, utilising the sNar-thang, sDe-dge, Peking and sTog-Palace editions as well as two manuscript fragments from Tun-huang, I have occasionally incorporated data from this critical edition included in my doctoral dissertation “The *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*: Its Doctrines and Practices and their Position in Mahāyāna Literature”, London, SOAS, 1992. When translating quotations from the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, I follow as a rule the Peking reading. Only where the Peking text deviates considerably from the other four editions I adopt the reading of my own edition. In these instances I provide the Peking reading in round brackets. Square brackets in the Tibetan text point to those passages in my quotations that I left untranslated because of the need for brevity. In my translations, they are indicated by the insertion of three ellipsis points in the appropriate lacuna.

² Except for a few Sanskrit quotations of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* that are extant in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* and *Arthavinīścayasūtra*, my comparison is wholly based on Tibetan sources. For an array of references to Sanskrit quotations from the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, see Jens Braarvig, “The *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra* and the Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought”, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oslo, 1989, lvi–lxi. Confirmed *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* quotations are much rarer and do not appear in surviving Sanskrit works. But compare the following sections: *Śikṣ*, 316.13–317.13, *Akn*, TTP, 69.4.2–5.6, *Bdp*, TTP, 86.3.2–4.5; *Śikṣ*, 233.6–8, *Akn*, TTP, 67.2.3–3.3, *Bdp*, TTP, 83.1.4–2.3; *Śikṣ*, 278.4–14, *Akn*, TTP, 72.2.2–3.2, *Bdp*, TTP, 87.1.4–2.3; *Śikṣ*, 117.13–16, *Akn*, TTP, 69.1.1–2, *Bdp*, TTP, 86.1.4–5; *Śikṣ*, 236.6–13, *Akn*, TTP, 68.3.5–4.1, *Bdp*, TTP, 84.2.1–5; *Arthav*, 320–322, *Akn*, TTP, 70.4.4–71.2.1, *Bdp*, TTP, 85.1.1–3.4.

the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* consists of an exposition of eighty inexhaustible (*akṣaya*) faculties and attributes of a Bodhisattva. Here, many of the more important practices of the Bodhisattva-training are discussed and set into an early Mahāyāna context.³ Significantly, only the first ten of the eighty *akṣayas* bear unmistakable marks of Mahāyāna thought. Virtually all other practices fall within the scope of pre-Mahāyāna Buddhism and figured, in one way or another, already in the *sūtras* of early Buddhism.

A number of otherwise well-known Mahāyāna concepts are not included in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, most notably the theory of lineage (*gotra*) and the scheme of the ten stages (*daśabhūmi*) of the Bodhisattva's career.⁴ Instead, much attention is given to such basic training aspects as the generation of the thought of enlightenment (*bodhicittotpāda*), the cultivation of the perfections (*pāramitā*) and super-knowledge (*abhijñā*) and a number of early precepts including the practices conducive to enlightenment (*bodhipāḥṣika-dharma*), recourses (*prati-saraṇa*) and analytical knowledge (*pratisamvid*). This preoccupation with the more ancient practices of the Buddhist path seems to endorse the circumstantial evidence found in Chinese catalogues placing the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* in the early, formative period of the Mahāyāna.

Let us now turn to comparing the issues that are central to the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* with those found in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. In doing so, we note many

³ As Wayman has demonstrated in his article on the *samādhi*-list in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* ("The Samādhi Lists of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra* and the *Mahāvīyūtpatti*", *AOH*, 34, 1980, 305–12), it is this enumeration of eighty *akṣayas* that was taken as a basis in the *Sūtrālaṅkāra* where the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is cited as authority for the twenty-two forms of generating the thought of enlightenment (S. Lévi, ed., *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, Paris, 1907, iv.15–20). Cast into twenty-two similes in the *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, they correspond in content and sequence to the eighty *akṣayas* listed in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*. The similes themselves, however, did not originate in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, but appear to have been derived from a number of sources, including passages in the early *Prajñāpāramitā* literature. The list of the similes is, for instance, contained in three *Kārikās* of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (Th. Stcherbatsky, ed., *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, St. Petersburg, 1929, 4, vv.18–20).

⁴ In the opening passage of the fourth *akṣaya*, there is however one brief reference to the 'stages' of the Bodhisattva path. Since these are left undefined and do not seem to be part of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*'s overall scheme, we may be dealing here with a stray reference included to acknowledge the existence of the *daśabhūmika* scheme (41.5.3). The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśaṭīkā* interprets the Bodhisattva practices in terms of the ancient path division of the *saṃbhāramārga*, *prayogamārga*, *darśanamārga* and *bhāvanāmārga*. This scheme is not explicitly put forward in the root text.

themes that are common to both *sūtras*. In a number of instances, whole passages correspond word by word. Structural affinities are found also in the internal design and logical sequence of the dialogues. Particularly striking is the frequent recurrence of long, almost identical, Abhidharma-type lists that enumerate the various qualities and practices associated with the Bodhisattva. But the overall order of the practices differs in several respects. In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, most of the concurrences are found in the *prajñāpāramitā* chapter, while in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, they are more evenly spread out over the whole exposition. The reason for this lies in the differing concentration of Bodhisattva practices. In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, most of the practices are allocated to chapter eleven, while in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, no such accumulation prevails. Clearly, such far-reaching agreement in the contents of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* points either to the existence of some commonly accepted patterns of exposition current at the time of their composition, or to a particularly close connection between these two texts. Further below, I shall show at some examples that the direction of this influence must have flowed from the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* to the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*.

When we turn to the practices, we note that in both texts the *pāramitās* are treated separately and are not linked with any path structure. Also, the material that is included in the expositions of the six perfections corresponds in many points. For example, the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* include in their discussions of patient acceptance (*kṣānti*) a practically identical exposition of the nature of highest patient acceptance (*Bdp*, 46.4.2–47.1.2; *Akn*, 45.3.3–4.8). In the context of the perfection of meditation (*dhyānapāramitā*), both texts cite a largely concurring list of about 100 meditations (*samādhi*). In their energy (*vīrya*) expositions, both *sūtras* stress the importance that mental exertion assumes in the Bodhisattva’s training, and provide an identical way of explication (*Bdp*, 55.3.6–5.3; *Akn*, 48.1.5–3.7). However, similarities in contents go well beyond the *pāramitā* expositions. They are found in about eighty percent of the practices that are dealt with in both works. Outstanding examples are provided by the discussions of the equipment (*sambhāra*) of merit (*puṇya*) and gnosis (*jñāna*), the treatment of concentrative calm (*śamatha*) and analytical insight (*vīpaśyanā*), the factors of enlightenment (*bodhyaṅga*) and the noble eightfold path (*āryāṣṭāṅgamārga*). In fact, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* are often so close that I found it possible on several occasions to draw on the *Akṣayamatīrdeśaṭīkā* to clarify obscure passages in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.⁵

⁵ Wayman has drawn our attention to some, in his opinion, significant philosophical shifts in emphasis between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (“A Report on the *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*”, *SIAAC*, 6, 1980, 220). However, on close examination of the respective passages in both *sūtras* and referring to the *Akṣayamatīrdeśaṭīkā*, these discrepancies seem to be of a rather minor nature. Chiefly they spring from variant readings in the editions of the Tibetan text and occasional misreadings (examples are given in notes 18, 22).

The first person to point to the textual parallels between the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* was Jikido Takasaki in an article published in 1974.⁶ Noting that approximately two thirds of the material of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* has counterparts in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Tathāgatamahākaruṇā-nirdeśa*, he argued that these two *sūtras* “produced the raw material for the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, themselves possessing forerunner character of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*”. Had Takasaki undertaken a more detailed comparison of some of the key passages in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, he would have noticed that there is actually very little to support this proposition, for there are distinct traces of doctrinal and editorial development between the two texts that point in the opposite direction. It is the aim of this article to provide evidence strong enough to correct Takasaki’s conclusion, and to show that, in fact, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* drew on the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.⁷

⁶ J. Takasaki, “Bosatsuzokyo ni tsuite”, *IBK*, 1974, 578–86.

⁷ In addition to pointing to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka/Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* affinity, Takasaki made the important observation that parts of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* appear also in the *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa*. While the parallels between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa* are less sweeping than those of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, and correspond rarely word by word, they demonstrate the influence of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* on later Mahāyāna *sūtras*. The parallels between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa* affect four categories of practice, that is, the ten powers (*bala*), four assurances (*vaiśāradya*), great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*) and the eighteen exclusive qualities of the Buddha (*āveṇika-dharma*). As they do not possess separate headings in the *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa*, but are incorporated into a larger scheme, I give here their page references in the TTP, vol. 32: *mahākaruṇā*, 282.4.7–288.2.6; *balas*, 288.2.7–294.4.3; *vaiśāradyas*, 294.4.4–296.3.8; *āveṇika-dharmas*, 296.4.1–300.4.3. Takasaki also speaks of parallels in the respective *bodhicittotpāda* discussions. Close analysis of both sections, however, indicates little similarity beyond a broad thematic agreement. It is noteworthy that there also exist differences in the degree of correspondence between the four other sections. The least agreement is found in the *mahākaruṇā* expositions which show quite different structures and deviate on many points, with the *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa* giving generally the longer account (see, however, *Tathāgatamahākaruṇānirdeśa*, 284.5.1–285.1.1 & *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 18.1.8–2.6). Elsewhere, most notably in the *vaiśāradya* discussion, it is the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* that gives more detail and provides a somewhat fuller treatment (*Tkn*, 294.5.6–7 & *Bdp*, 15.5.8–16.1.4). The text portions dealing with the *balas* and *āveṇika-dharmas* show the greatest number of concurrences. Very often, the sentences contain identical thoughts that correspond either verbatim or are slightly rephrased. For the *balas*, see: *Tkn*, 288.3.1–289.1.6 & *Bdp*, 7.2.5–8.4.6; *Tkn*, 292.3.1–293.1.8 & *Bdp*, 12.3.5–13.3.6; *Tkn*, 194.2.3–4.3 & *Bdp*, 14.4.7–15.2.5. For the *āveṇika-dharmas*, see: *Tkn*, 298.4.2–8 & *Bdp*, 22.1.8–2.5; *Tkn*, 300.2.5–4.3 & *Bdp*, 23.3.3–4.6. As I have not undertaken a detailed study of these parallels but noted their existence only in passing, I hesitate to postulate the direction of borrowing. It is clear, however, that the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Tathāgatamahākaruṇā-nirdeśa* share important propositions on the nature of the Tathāgata. Since both texts belong to the earlier strands of Mahāyāna writings (the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* was probably composed during the first century AD and the *Tathāgatamahākaruṇā-nirdeśa* is extant in a third-century Chinese translation, T 398), a careful comparison of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Tathāgatamahākaruṇā-nirdeśa* may reveal interesting material for the study of the emergence of the Mahāyāna in general and on the ways in which its *sūtras* came into being.

In 1980, Alex Wayman, while preparing a translation of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, noted the association between the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. He acknowledged their common ground on many topics, correlated a few of their sentences and concluded that the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* must have been the earlier of the two texts.⁸ Regrettably, he produced very little convincing evidence in support of this hypothesis and proceeded with undue haste in the collection of the data, so that his examination is marred by oversights, omissions and misreadings. Intrigued by Wayman's bold claims and sensing the potential significance of this phenomenon of borrowing for the origin of Mahāyāna *sūtras* in general, I set out to add precision to his observations and investigated other areas where parallels occur. Leaving aside a handful of uncertain cases, we can distinguish three categories of textual parallels. First, there is a group of concurring enumerations. Second, there is a large body of formulaic sections, so common in the *suttas* of the Pāli Canon. Third, there are several independent, non-formulaic passages that are shared by both works.

Of the three areas of parallelism, it is easiest to explain the concurrences that appear in lists. Altogether, I found a far-reaching agreement in six enumerations. These include the lists of types of skill,⁹ thirty-two pairs of mental energy

⁸ A. Wayman, "A Report on the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*", 219.

⁹ In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, skill (*kauśalya*) is classified into skill in *skandhas*, *dhātus*, *āyatanas*, *satya*, *pratisamvids*, *pratisaraṇas*, *vijñāna* and *jñāna*, *bodhipākṣika-dharmas*, *pratītyasamutpāda* and *mārga* (77.2.3–87.5.6). In the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, the list runs as follows: skill in *skandhas*, *dhātus*, *āyatanas*, *satya*, *trikāla*, *yāna*, *pratītyasamutpāda* and *sarvadharmas* (52.2.8–56.1.6). The remaining five topics that occur in the list of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* are not treated as skills in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, but they are given an independent treatment in a different place (62.2.7–63.48; 64.2.4–3.5; 66.4.3–70.4.3, 70.4.4–71.2.1 respectively). The variations in the categories and scope of the Bodhisattva's types of skill are in itself a highly interesting subject-matter that warrants further research. So far, I have identified six distinct, though partly overlapping schemes, occurring in such different texts as the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (U. Wogihara, ed., *Bodhisattvabhūmiḥ*, Tokyo, 1930, 308.9–309.6), *Śrutamayībhūmi* (TTP, 109, 287.3.2–3), *Madhyāntavibhāga* (G. Nagao, ed., *Madhyāntavibhāgabhāṣya*, Tokyo, 1964, 44–9), *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (J. Rahder, ed., *Daśabhūmika Sūtram*, Paris, 1926, 78.3–4), *Ratnameghasūtra* (TTP, 35, 182.5.1–3), *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* (E. Lamotte, *L'explication des mystères: Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, Paris, 1935, 116.15–119.4), *Pūrṇapariprechā* (TTP, 23, 237.4.4–5), *Pāramitāsamāsa* (C. Meadows, ed., *Pāramitāsamāsa*, Bonn, 1986, 254–9), *Visuddhimagga* (H.C. Warren, ed., *Visuddhimagga*, 128–36). The earliest reference to the concept of skill is found in the *Niddesa* (Mahāniddesa, ed., L. de La Vallée Poussin, London, 1916–17; 69, 1–6, 71, 27–72, 4; *Cullaniddesa*, ed., W. Stede, London, 1918, 128, 1–13). Like the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (which however does not quote them individually in the heading), the *Niddesa* speaks of skill (*kusala*) in aggregates, sensefields, elements, dependent co-origination, mindfulness, perfect efforts, bases of success, faculties, powers, factors of enlightenment, path, fruit and nibbāna. A full study of the concept of skill in the Bodhisattva training is in preparation and will be published shortly.

(*cittavīrya*), the 100 meditations in the *dhyāna* section and the forms of learning. In theory, owing to the tendency in oral traditions to compose lists for mnemonic purposes, it is possible that this correspondence is ascribable to a third source and not to direct borrowing between the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapīṭaka*. In spite of intensive research in this area, I have not been able to trace enumerations in earlier texts from which they might have stemmed.¹⁰

The second category comprises a number of parallel passages that are largely composed of set expressions, turns of phrase and formulae. Above all, parallels are present in the exposition of the *bodhipāṅṣika-dharmas*, in skill in *skandhas*, *āyatanas* and *dhātus*, and in the section on the *pratisamvids*. While it was an easy task to identify them, it is virtually impossible to determine the texts from which the particular set phrases were originally taken. Being well acquainted with Buddhist *sūtras*, the authors of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapīṭaka* probably recited them from memory without having in mind any specific work. And yet, a number of interpolations of non-standardised text elements in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*, such as connecting phrases indicate that the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* attempted to improve on the structure of such portions in the *Bodhisattvapīṭaka*.

¹⁰ See: A. Wayman, “The Samādhi Lists of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra* and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*”, 305–18.

In this article (page 312), Wayman writes that the *samādhis* in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* were adopted from the list of the *Bodhisattvapīṭaka*. He does not give any reasons to substantiate his assumption but he is certainly correct in proposing this direction of borrowing. Of the total of 118 meditations in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*, seventy-two occur also in the *Bodhisattvapīṭaka*. For the most part, the meditations that are common to both texts appear in clusters of six to ten *samādhis* each. Perhaps to account for changes in doctrine, we have several cases in which the *samādhi* titles appear in slightly altered versions in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*. What puzzles me is the rationale behind the choice by which the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* adopted *samādhis* from the *Bodhisattvapīṭaka*. Why, of 101 meditations in the *Bodhisattvapīṭaka* are only seventy-two found in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*? What were the reasons for excluding the remaining forty-six meditations—some of which bear well-known titles including the *śūraṃgamasamādhi*? Neither the order in which they are listed nor the actual wording of their titles appear to hold the key to these questions. I have tabulated the meditations of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapīṭaka* in Chart II.

Finally, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* share very many non-formulaic passages that are kindred in spirit, almost identical in phrasing and appear to be unique to these two *sūtras*. As will become clear further on, it is the non-standardised contents and phrasing of these passages that indicate persuasively the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*'s indebtedness to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. The most interesting examples of this category are found in the sections dealing with the skill in truth (*satya*), factors of existence (*dharma*) and recourse (*pratisaraṇa*).

Next, let us look in some detail at examples from each of the three categories of parallels. Amongst the six concurring enumerations, the most interesting example is the list detailing the Bodhisattva's forms of learning. Wayman, noticing their agreement but not providing any reasons, saw in the list of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* a kind of prototype for that of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*. I share his judgment, but I wish to add precision to his observations and to corroborate it with additional findings. For one thing, Wayman thought that we are dealing with two, essentially identical lists. This is not the case. The first obvious variation is the difference in the length of the lists. The *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*'s enumeration gives eighty-four forms of learning, whereas the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* knows of only seventy-two.¹¹ Furthermore, the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* contains thirteen

¹¹ A similar list is also given in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall, 190.4–191.3) where Śāntideva speaks of eighty types of learning. In fact, he attributes this list to the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, saying that it relates to the Bodhisattvavinaya. It is noteworthy that the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* quotation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* does not agree with the 'original'. It gives a list of eighty items whilst the 'original' enumeration consists of eighty-four. Moreover, since in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya ākāra* no. 8 (*gaurava*) is repeated in no. 43, Śāntideva includes only seventy-nine different forms of learning. Of the eighty-four *ākāras* contained in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, three are omitted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. That is, *arthaśravaṇa* (31), *jñānapratisaraṇa* (78) and *nīrtarthapratisaraṇa* (79). Finally, *ākāras* no. 54 and 55 (*animittaśravaṇa* and *apraṇihitaśravaṇa*) are joined to *ākāra* no. 53 (*śūnyatāśravaṇa*) and therefore do not figure in the overall count as independent types of learning. Carol Meadows, briefly noting this divergence in her study of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* (*op. cit.*, 105–106), suggested that "in the process of translating both the *sūtra* and its commentary into Tibetan eighty was changed or mistranslated as eighty-four". I do not think that this is very likely. First, it is doubtful whether such a mistake could have escaped the attention of the translators at the revision of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* (cf. note 24). Second, as we have seen, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and its commentary give indeed eighty-four types of learning and are, therefore, fully congruent with their introductory statements. It is more probable that we are dealing here with two slightly different manuscript traditions, one containing eighty-four forms of learning and the other only eighty (or indeed, seventy-nine). This would explain why Śāntideva speaks of eighty *ākāras* and the Tibetan translators one century after him knew of eighty-four types of learning, with both of them being perfectly faithful to their Sanskrit copies of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*. For the study of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, this finding is important since it underlines the fluidity of such lists in general and indicates perhaps a gradual increase of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*'s seventy-two *ākāras* to the eighty-four of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*.

topics that are not found in the list of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, raising the number of variant constituents to twenty-five—roughly a third of the sum total of the practices included. The substitution of individual items suggests that one of the lists was carefully edited. The greater length of the list in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* would seem to indicate that it was composed later, because it is doubtful whether the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* would deliberately reduce its scope. On the contrary, if one’s experience with other texts is anything to go by, material is usually added in the process of transmission rather than taken away.

The majority of discrepancies that exist between the two lists are found in the second half of their enumerations. Up to topic number thirty-three, most items correspond closely both in sequence and contents. After that, apart from two codified sets of practice (no. 49–52, 53–55), the items are generally ill-matched and display few parallels. Thus far, I have not managed to identify a rationale behind this process of restructuring. Apart from some well-known standardised groupings,¹² no scheme springs to mind when comparing the organisations of the two lists.¹³ Since both enumerations contain a remarkably comprehensive catalogue of practices, but exclude the *pāramitās*, it is tempting to conjecture that their purpose was to gather all known secondary Bodhisattva practices in a single group on the pattern of Abhidharma-type *mātrkā*.

While their placement in the text immediately preceding the treatment of the minor Bodhisattva practices adds weight to this theory, it is important to note

¹² e.g., *Bodhisattvapiṭaka ākāras* no. 49–52: four summary statements of the Doctrine (*dharmodāna*); *ākāras* no. 53–5: three gateways to liberation (*vimokṣamukhā*); *ākāras* no. 76–7: recourses (*pratisaraṇa*); *ākāras* no. 63–4: practices conducing to enlightenment (*bodhipāksika-dharma*); *ākāras* no. 65–71: buddha-powers (*buddhabala*).

¹³ Among the individual forms of learning, one meets with a few inconsistencies that warrant mentioning. First, there is the *ākāra* called “study of the *bodhisattvapiṭaka*” (*Akn*, no. 39; *Bdp*, no. 35). Its position in the list next to the perfection of discriminative understanding (*prajñāpāramitā*), the means of conversion (*saṃgrahavastu*) and skilful means (*upāyakauśalya*) suggests that it was conceived of as a (code of) practice and not as a single text (or body of scriptures) as it is generally interpreted. Since the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* is chiefly concerned with the six perfections, it is possible that we are dealing here with an indirect reference to the study of the five preliminary *pāramitās*. Indeed, among the forms of learning, there is no other reference to the perfections. Second, there exists a discrepancy between the title *brahmavihāra* given to *ākāra* no. 42/38 and its designation in the texts themselves where the four practices it includes are invariably referred to as *apramāṇas*. While one cannot speak of a standard title for this set of practices, this incongruence might indicate that the list of types of learning was implanted in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* in a prefabricated form and does not stand in any ‘organic’ relation to the exposition itself.

that the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* omits several of the practices in its ensuing exposition (e.g., *upāyakauśalya*). As it changes also the order in which they are discussed, we can hardly regard the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* version of the list as a ‘table of contents’ of its exposition of Bodhisattva practices. In the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, the situation is slightly different, since its list (and its order of arrangement) accord closer with the topics treated in the main-body of the text. *Prima facie* this would seem to indicate that the author of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* was aware of the (*Bodhisattvapiṭaka*) list when he set out to compose the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and that it influenced his choice of topics, including the order of their presentation.

In the other enumerations that I have cited, where there is much closer accord in number as well as contents, it is more difficult to determine the direction in which the borrowing took place. Here, the only clue is the presence of numbering schemes in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* that are not found in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. While the inclusion of these schemes, taken on its own, does not establish that these lists originated in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, it will become increasingly clear, as my argument unfolds and when we consider a series of editorial modifications, that there is good reason to assume borrowing on the part of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*.

Proceeding now to the second category of evidence, I propose to look at two excerpts that exemplify the close concurrence between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* particularly well. The first example shows how the *sūtras* interpret the skill in aggregates (*skandha*). In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (77.2.3–3.6), it runs as follows:

“What is skill in aggregates? [The Bodhisattva] expounds the aggregates by way of allegories. That is to say, he shows that they are like froth, a mirage, a water bubble, a plantain tree, an illusion, a dream, an echo, an illusory appearance and a reflected image. Matter is like froth and froth is non-substantial, without a sentient being, a life-force, an individual, a man, a human being or a person. The own-being of froth is also the own-being of matter. Skill in that is skill in the aggregates. Feeling is like a water bubble and a water bubble is non-substantial ... Conception is like a mirage and a mirage is non-substantial ... Notional constructions are like a plantain tree and a plantain tree is non-substantial ... Consciousness is like an illusion and an illusion is non-substantial ... Furthermore, the aggregates constitute the world and the world bears the distinguishing mark of destructibility. The own-being of the worlds is also the own-being of the aggregates. But what is the own-being of the world? Its own-being is that of impermanence and suffering. This, too, is the own-being of the aggregates. Skill in that is skill in the aggregates.”

In the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* (52.2.8–4.6), the discussion of skill in aggregates is closely modelled on the above account given in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Yet it introduces some minor modifications in the scope and order of the argument:

“What is the Bodhisattva’s skill in aggregates? He expounds the aggregates by way of allegories. He shows that they are [like] froth, a water bubble, a mirage, a trunk of the plantain tree, an illusion, a dream, an echo, an illusory appearance, a reflected image and a magical creation. Why? Matter is like froth and froth is non-substantial, without a sentient being, a life-force, a being, a man or an individual. The own-being of froth is also the own-being of matter. Skill in that is skill in aggregates. Feeling is like a water bubble. Conception is like a mirage. Notional constructions are like a plantain tree. Consciousness is like an illusion and illusions are non-substantial ... The aggregates are like a dream and dreams are non-substantial, without a sentient being ... (And so forth, with the aggregates being likened to an echo, illusory appearance, reflected image and magical creation.) The aggregates constitute the world and the world bears the distinguishing mark of destructibility. The own-being of the world is intrinsic impermanence, suffering, emptiness, non-substantiality and calm. Skill in that is the Bodhisattva’s skill in aggregates.”

While unremarkable in terms of contents (employing well-known, stereotyped patterns of allegory), the passages thus quoted exemplify several important points for our analysis. First, we note the almost word by word agreement between the two excerpts. No doubt, such degree of correspondence in a non-formulaic text portion is surprising and surely not coincidental, and can only be explained through a close interdependence of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.

The other important feature is the presence of additional material in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*. While this material does not alter the meaning of the section *per se*, it complements the train of thought, rounds off the argument and is apparently designed to improve the underlying organisation. Unlike the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* takes up all allegories that are cited in the introduction and adds the marks of emptiness, non-substantiality and calm to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*’s impermanence and suffering. As I shall demonstrate, such logico-organisational improvement on *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* passages by the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* is quite characteristic and occurs in several places. The length to which this is taken varies considerably, ranging from the interpolation of a few words to the insertion of entire paragraphs. A fine example of a lesser interjection is found in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*’s exposition of the basis of

mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*) concerning feeling (*vedanā*). First, I cite again the passage from the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (83.2.1–3.2):

“A feeling that is comprehended [through discriminative understanding and gnosis] leads to happiness. A feeling that is not comprehended leads to suffering. What are feelings that are comprehended? Nowhere in the self, sentient being, life-force or individual is there any agent of feeling. Feeling is attachment. Feeling is appropriation. Feeling is clinging. Feeling is misconception. Feeling is dichotomous conceptual constructions. Feeling is tendencies to defilement inherent in heterodox theories. Feeling is the notion of the eye up to the notion of the mind. Feeling is the notion of matter up to the notion of mental objects. (And so forth, discussing the arising of feeling from the interplay between the sense organs (*indriya*) and sense objects (*viṣaya*).)

Furthermore, by way of enumeration, feeling is one, viz., perception by a single thought. Feeling is twofold, viz., internal and external. Feeling is threefold, viz., perception of the past, present and future. Feeling is fourfold, viz., perception of the four elements. Feeling is fivefold, viz., mentation concerning the five aggregates. Feeling is sixfold, viz., examination of the six sensefields. Feeling is sevenfold, viz., the seven abodes of consciousness. Feeling is eightfold, viz., the eight mistaken modes of practice. Feeling is ninefold, viz., the nine abodes of sentient beings. Feeling is tenfold, viz., the path of the tenfold virtuous activity. Correspondingly, everything is feeling. To the degree that there exists objectification and mentation, to that degree everything is felt. Hence, the feeling of incalculable sentient beings is infinite.”

In the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* (67.3.1–4.3), we find a slightly expanded and somewhat altered reading of the same excerpt. In the first part, explaining the nature and scope of feeling, we learn of feeling as comprehended with gnosis. Furthermore, we are told that feeling is also objectification, an aspect that is omitted in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Finally, in a fashion similar to that encountered when comparing the respective recensions of skill in aggregates, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* expands the basic formulae to include more examples. It runs as follows:

“Feelings that are comprehended with misknowledge lead to suffering. Feelings that are comprehended with gnosis lead to happiness. What are feelings comprehended with gnosis that lead to happiness? There is no self, sentient being, life-force, progenitor, being, individual or person, human being or man whatsoever that develops feeling, but feeling is attachment. Feeling is appropriation. Feeling is clinging. Feeling is objectification. Feeling is misconception. Feeling is dichotomous con-

ceptual constructions. Feeling is tendencies to defilement inherent in heterodox theories. Feeling is the notion of the eye. Feeling is the notion of the ear, nose, tongue, body and mind. Feeling is the notion of matter. Feeling is the notion of sound, scent, flavour, contact and mental objects.” (And so forth as found in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, discussing the arising of feeling from the interplay between the sense organs and sense objects.)

Since the second part, enumerating the divisions of feeling, follows practically verbatim the reading of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, there is no need to repeat it. The only significant difference concerns the last division where the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* postulates that “feeling is tenfold, viz., the ten ways of non-virtuous action”.¹⁴ In view of the adverse orientation of most of the previous divisions of feeling, this modification is clearly intended to bring also the last variety in line with the negative tenor of its predecessors.

In the concluding passage of the discussion of mindfulness concerning feeling, the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* differs. In substance, however, the deviation is slight, providing merely greater detail and perhaps a logically more coherent account of the steps that lead up to the final statement. It runs thus:

“This is the explanation of all feelings. To the degree that there exists objectification, to such a degree there exists mentation. To the degree that there exists mentation, to such a degree there exists discursive examination. To the degree that there exists discursive examination, to such a degree there exists feeling. Hence, the feeling of incalculable sentient beings is infinite.”

Let us sum up the information we have gleaned from these two brief excerpts. First, we saw that both texts corresponded closely in their treatment of the subject-matter. Second, we noticed the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*’s tendency to expand on topics raised in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. In most cases, the purpose of these *addenda* is organisational. That is to say, they improve and consolidate the underlying logical structures of the argument, they homogenise the line of reason and add little substance. There are, however, several instances where interesting new details are supplied, and it is to these passages that I shall turn next.

Contrary to concurrences in enumerations and set phrases, agreement in non-formulaic portions is improbable to stem from a third independent source. In the absence of mnemonic mechanisms of transmission, parallels in these passages

¹⁴ Since this change in terminology, consisting of the insertion of one syllable only, occurs in all editions of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* that I have consulted for this paper, one can safely exclude the possibility of it being a carving error.

point decidedly to a link between the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Hence, it is the (variant) readings of these text portions that warrant particular attention. Once again, I shall launch my argument by citing a passage from the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (87.1.4–2.3):

“Furthermore, in brief, the path of Bodhisattvas is lonely. That is to say, it is a path that is wandered on solitarily. The Bodhisattva is unaccompanied and on his own. Intent on unsurpassed and perfect enlightenment but alone, he is clad in armour that upholds the force of his diligent power. He is self-sufficient and does not depend on others. He practises all by himself and excels by virtue of his own power. Being thus clad in hardened armour, he reflects: ‘I shall achieve that which no other sentient being has achieved. I shall achieve that which no other noble one or newly-set-out Bodhisattva has achieved. Generosity is not my companion, but I am a companion of generosity. Morality, patient acceptance, energy, meditation and discriminative understanding are not my companions, but I am their companion. I ought not to be raised by the perfections, but the perfections ought to be raised by me. Correspondingly, I ought to understand all roots of virtue in every detail, that is, I ought not to be raised by any roots of virtue, but all roots of virtue ought to be raised by me. Once I take a seat on the *vajra*-throne without recourse to such factors and defeat Māra together with his host, single-handedly, I shall acquire supreme and perfect enlightenment by means of discriminative understanding springing from a single moment of thought.’”

The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*’s reading of this extract (72.2.1–3.3) is closely modelled, in both wording and meaning, on that of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.¹⁵ The first discrepancy occurs in the Bodhisattva’s resolution in part two where we read:

¹⁵ The only significant difference is the variant interpretation given in the Tibetan of the Sanskrit compound *vīryabalaparigrhītena* (*Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 278.5). In the ‘original’, this difference almost certainly did not exist, but sprang from interpreting this compound either in a *dvandva* or *karmadhāraya* mode. This incongruence in the Tibetan highlights another important point that should not be forgotten. Owing to the absence of Sanskrit versions, our analysis has to be based on several layers away from the original version of the texts. The first level consists of the Tibetan translations that, while generally very reliable, cannot be a substitute for the Sanskrit reading. Some of the variant readings in the Tibetan may well have come from deviating interpretations of uniform Sanskrit readings by their translators. Second, even if we possessed Sanskrit versions of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, we could not be absolutely positive that these conveyed the original wording, since Sanskrit manuscripts frequently underwent change in the course of their transmission. That the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* was no exception in this regard we have seen in connection with the enumeration of the forms of learning (see, note 11).

“I shall achieve everything to be achieved by all sentient beings. I shall achieve everything to be achieved by all noble ones and all newly-set-out Bodhisattvas.”

The *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* continues to define the Bodhisattva’s approach to the six perfections with an affirmation of the kind that is found in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*:

“Generosity is not my companion, but I am a companion of generosity. Morality, patient acceptance, energy, meditation and discriminative understanding are not my companions, but I am a companion of morality, patient acceptance, energy, meditation and discriminative understanding. I am not to be attended by the perfections, but the perfections are to be attended by me.”

The next paragraph differs from its counterpart in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, since it omits the connecting phrase: “Correspondingly, I ought to understand all roots of virtue in every detail” and includes in its place an additional set of practice:

“I am not to be attended by the means of conversion, but the means of conversion are to be attended by me.”

In the sentences that conclude this section and predict the successful completion of the Bodhisattva career, both texts run again very close, showing only three insignificant dissimilarities in the wording of the Tibetan text.

The key to the chronology of the above quoted passages lies once more in the propositions where the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* differ. First, there is the announcement of the scope of the Bodhisattva’s attainments. In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the Bodhisattva proclaims that his attainments will be superior to the accomplishments of all noble ones and newly-set-out Bodhisattvas. The fact that in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* this somewhat overbearing assertion is modified indicates a shift in portrayal of the Bodhisattva. Research in other Mahāyāna *sūtras* has shown that this change in attitude occurred in adjustment to religious development and does not represent the earliest understanding of the ‘model Bodhisattva’.¹⁶ The other difference, that is, the interpolation of the means of conversion in the list of practices to which the Bodhisattva resorts, points in the same direction. The inclusion of this item in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* suggests that the relevant section in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* postdates that of the

¹⁶ P. Harrison, “Who Gets to Ride in the Great Vehicle?”, *JIAS*, 10, 1987, 67–89. A. Hirakawa, “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas”, *MRDTB*, 1963, 22, 57–106; A. Hirakawa, “Stūpa Worship”, in *ER*, 14, 1987, 92–6. G. Schopen, “The Inscription of the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India”, *JIAS*, 10, 1987, 99–134. N. Schuster, “The Bodhisattva Figure in the *Ugraparipṛcchā*”, in A.K. Warder, ed., *New Paths in Buddhist Research*, Durham, 1985, 26–57; N. Schuster, “The *Ugraparipṛcchā*: The *Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra* and Early Mahāyāna Buddhism”, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1976.

Bodhisattvapiṭaka, going back to a time when the *saṃgrahavastu* reached sufficient prominence to warrant such a step. The alternative scenario—their removal from the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* reading in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* due to a loss of popularity—is unconvincing because of the reluctance of Buddhists of all ages to subtract from the Buddha’s word; in particular as it would remove a cardinal group of Bodhisattva practices. Within limits, the variant readings in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* attest, therefore, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*’s posterity and indebtedness to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.

Endorsement for this direction of borrowing is also found in the discussions of skill in all factors of existence (*dharma*).¹⁷ In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (87.3.8–4.2), skill in the factors of existence is defined as follows:

“What is the Bodhisattva’s skill in all factors of existence? The sum total of factors of existence comprises conditioned and unconditioned factors. Thus, the Bodhisattva should be skilled in the conditioned and un-conditioned. What is skill in the conditioned? [The Bodhisattva] purifies of the notional constructions of body, speech and mind. He dedicates the virtuous [notional constructions] of body, speech and mind to all-knowing because he has analysed them as unconditioned enlightenment. That is skill in the unconditioned.”

While the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*’s treatment of skill in the factors of existence is largely analogous to that of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the second part of its introductory passage (55.4.8–5.4) differs by closing a gap that renders the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*’s reading so ostentatiously inconsistent:

“What is the Bodhisattva’s skill in all factors of existence? In brief, the sum total of factors of existence comprises conditioned and un-conditioned factors. Thus, the Bodhisattva should be skilled in the conditioned and unconditioned. What is the Bodhisattva’s skill in the conditioned? He dedicates all conditioned, virtuous notional constructions of body, speech and mind to supreme and perfect enlightenment. That is the Bodhisattva’s skill in the conditioned. In addition, he dedicates all conditioned, virtuous notional constructions of body, speech and mind to all-knowing because he has analysed them as enlightenment. That is skill in the unconditioned.”

Quite clearly, without this modification the argument is ill-structured, because it begins with a question on the conditioned, but ends with a statement on the un-

¹⁷ Contrary to Wayman’s assertion (*A Report*, 219), both texts are equipped with such a section. Wayman was probably misled because the skill in all factors of existence is not given in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*’s heading of its varieties of skill, but figures as an eleventh (informal) type of skill that is appended to the ten kinds enumerated in the introductory statement (TTP, 55.4.8–56.1.6).

conditioned.¹⁸ In its new, improved reading, the passage makes not only good sense by itself, but also corresponds in structure with the organisation of the following sections on skill in the factors of existence describing first skill in the conditioned and then skill in the unconditioned.

Next, I propose to look at the discussions of skill in truth (*satya*). The discussion of truth belongs to the most influential passages of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and has already been the object of a paper delivered at the Buddhist Forum.¹⁹ In the present context, skill in truth is relevant because its exposition exemplifies the textual proximity of our *sūtras* and clarifies the direction in which the ideas must have flowed. Unfortunately, it is in this important section that most of Wayman's oversights and misreadings occur. While individually none of them is very serious, *en bloc* they tend to misrepresent the relationship between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and need, therefore, to be corrected. Once again, I shall start with an extract from the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (78.1.1–2.8):

“What is knowledge of suffering? Knowledge that the aggregates are non-originating is knowledge of suffering. What is knowledge of its origin? Knowledge that thirst has been vanquished is knowledge of its origin. What is knowledge of its cessation? Knowledge that suffering is free from becoming and destruction is knowledge of its cessation. What is knowledge of the path? Not imputing distinguishing marks to uniform factors of existence is knowledge of the path. Although the Bodhisattva understands the four noble truths by means of discriminative understanding in this way, he does not directly perceive them there and then in order to develop sentient beings. That is skill in truth.

Furthermore, skill in truth is threefold. These are the conventional truth, the absolute truth and the truth of distinguishing marks. The conventional truth is just worldly convention and is expressed by letters, language and symbols. That is the conventional truth. What is the absolute truth? If the mind is quiescent, how much more letters? That is the absolute truth. What is the truth of distinguishing marks? All distinguishing marks consist in one distinguishing mark and that single distinguishing mark is without distinguishing mark. The Bodhisattva does not tire of explaining the conventional truth. He does not lapse into direct perception of absolute truth. He comprehends the truth of distinguishing marks as the absence of distinguishing marks. That is the bodhisattva's skill in truth.

¹⁸ This inconsistency was noted by the editors of the Peking *Tripitaka* who alone altered the final phrase to read: “this is skill in the conditioned” (87.4.2).

¹⁹ C.E. Freeman, “*Samvṛti, Vyavahāra and Paramārtha in the Akṣayamatīrdeśa*”, *The Buddhist Forum*, 2, London, 1991, 97–114.

Furthermore, truth is one, not two. That is the truth of cessation. He does not impute [distinguishing marks] to the one truth, but establishes in truth sentient beings who have lapsed into imputations. That is the Bodhisattva’s skill in truth.”

The *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* (53.4.4), like the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, begins its discussion of skill in truth by first referring to the four noble truths. These it characterises as “engagements” (*’jug pa, pravṛtti*) with truth. Its interpretation of skill in truth in terms of these four truths corresponds, word by word, to that of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.²⁰

Next, in keeping with the organisation of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* formulates its conception of the threefold truth. Again, this exposition is closely modelled on the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. The only difference is located in the penultimate sentence that it expands to set the Bodhisattva’s attitude towards the ‘three-truth-theory’ in the wider frame of the training (53.4.3–5.4.4):

“Even though [the Bodhisattva] comprehends the [two types of truth] as one truth by way of the truth of distinguishing marks, he still develops sentient beings.”

After examining the three kinds of truth, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* (53.5.4–8) introduces a division of truth that is not found in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*:

“Furthermore, truth is twofold. What are the two? These are the conventional transactional truth and the absolute truth. The conventional transactional truth refers to truth in terms of time. It is the truth of suffering, the truth of its origin, the truth of its cessation and the truth of the path. It is the truth of worldly conventions and all that is expressed by letters, language and symbols. The absolute truth is furnished with the quality of ineffability—it is nirvāṇa. Why? Because it always [refers to] the true state of things and because its lineage is permanent. The bodhisattva tires neither of explaining the conventional transactional truth

²⁰ Wayman thought to have identified a series of important divergencies between the respective readings of this section. However, close examination of the readings in the various editions of the bKa’-’gyur reveals that, except for one, no such dissimilarities exist. The only disagreement that is documented concerns the “truth of cessation”. In the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, the proposition of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* that knowledge of cessation is to understand that suffering is free from origination and destruction is replaced by the explanation that “knowledge of cessation is [knowledge that] misknowledge and tendencies to defilement are free from origination”. Furthermore, to say that the texts differ in their interpretation of the “truth of the path” is incorrect (*A Report*, 220), since this assumption is based on a lacuna that is only found in the Peking Edition of the Tibetan bKa’-’gyur that, in all probability, was caused by the breaking off of a piece of wood in the block (78.1.4).

nor does he lapse into direct perception of the absolute truth, [but] develops sentient beings. That is the Bodhisattva’s skill in truth.”

This section, being self-contained in contents but missing in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, represents in my view a later stratum in the ‘theory’ of truth. It was evidently unknown to the author of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (or possibly ignored by him), but received great attention in later commentarial literature.²¹ Although this passage on “truth in two” does not appear to break much new ground—it largely reformulates thought that is already expressed in the section on the three types of truth linked with a new referent—its inclusion here represents a marked structural improvement in that it couples the division of “truth in three” with “truth in one”. For the description of “truth in one” the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* gives once again a slightly extended version of the corresponding passage in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. I do not share Wayman’s opinion that there is any substantial disagreement between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* on this matter.²² Essentially, the reading in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* is an expansion of the thought that is explored in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, supplemented by phrases taken from the preceding divisions of truth. In the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, the passage runs as follows (53.5.8–54.1.2):

“Furthermore, truth is one, not two. The one truth is free from imputations concerning all factors of existence and guides to truth even those sentient beings who have lapsed into imputations. [The Bodhi-sattva] does not tire of teaching the Bodhisattva’s truth of imputation. Nor does he directly perceive the teaching of the one truth of non-imputation, [but] develops sentient beings. That is the Bodhisattva’s skill in truth.”²³

Next, I shall discuss passages from the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* that show clear signs of deliberate editorial modification. First, we have a number of cases where the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* adds carefully selected words or phrases in order to consolidate parallelisms that are only hinted at in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. A good example of this kind is found in the section dealing with

²¹ C.E. Freeman, *op. cit.*, 105–114.

²² Wayman is of course correct in pointing out that the identification of “truth in one” as “truth of cessation” is particular to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (*A Report*, 220).

²³ Following the discussion of these three/four divisions of truth, both texts set out to elaborate, in an analogous fashion, the understanding by which the truth of suffering characterises the aggregates, feeling and birth. The pattern in which this is carried out resembles the paradigm adopted for the analysis of the four noble truths. As in the preceding excerpts that I have quoted, these passages cover much common ground and agree frequently down to the letter. Wayman’s observation (*op. cit.*, 220), therefore, that in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* this section is incomplete (i.e., lacking the passage on the aggregates) is unfounded.

the four perfect efforts (*samyakprahāṇa*). In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (86.1.2–4), discussing the nature of non-virtuous factors, we read:

“[Non-virtuous factors] counteract moral conduct, meditation and discriminative understanding. What is counteractive of moral conduct? Factors that corrupt moral conduct and some other [factors] that impair it, that is counteractive of moral conduct.”

In the following two sections (*Bdp*, 86.2.4–6) dealing with meditation and discriminative understanding respectively, the sentence: “Factors that corrupt ... and some other [factors] that impair it” continues with the phrase: “viz., factors that counteract the meditation/discriminative understanding-aggregate”. In the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, this addition is also found in the passage on moral conduct. In perfect analogy to its treatment of meditation and discriminative understanding, we read about non-virtuous factors affecting morality (68.5.8–69.1.1):

“Factors that corrupt moral conduct and some other [factors] that impair it, viz., factors that counteract the morality-aggregate, that is counteractive of moral conduct.”

Another good example of editorial improvement is found in the *pratisaraṇa* section. It occurs in the context of the *artha/vyañjana* discussion and shows clear signs of textual adjustment. On the differences between the letter and the meaning, the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (80.1.8–2.1) says:

“While the letter displays the incalculable excellent qualities of the three jewels (*triratna*), the meaning is the dispassionate Dharma and the unconditioned qualities of the *Saṅgha*.”

In the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* (64.1.8–2.2), this sentence is extended to complete the characterisation of *artha*:

“While the letter displays the incalculable excellent qualities of the three jewels, the meaning is vision of the Buddha’s body consisting of *dharmas* and knowledge of the dispassionate true state of cessation and the unconditioned qualities of the Buddha, Dharma and *Saṅgha*.”

In spite of the brevity of these two quotations, one easily detects the editing hand in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*’s reading of this sentence. First, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* incorporates the notion of the *Dharmakāya* in its description of the meaning. This inclusion may reflect the coming to prominence of the theory of the Buddha-body in the emerging Mahāyāna. Second, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* adds to the qualities of the *Saṅgha* in the last part of the sentence also those of the Buddha and Dharma. This completes the imagery of the three refuges and

establishes a parallelism to the characteristics of the letter which is said to reveal the qualities of the three jewels.²⁴

²⁴ In this note, I wish to draw attention to a textual oddity for which I have not managed to find a satisfactory explanation. As I stated earlier, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* share a section that discusses the Bodhisattva's skill in *skandhas*, etc. The second member of this division is entitled skill in elements (*khamś la mkhas*). In the Tibetan translation of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the term *khamś* is employed throughout, that is to say, no distinction is made between the various points of reference. So one finds *chos kyi khamś* alongside (and in conjunction with) *bdag gi khamś* and *'dod pa'i khamś*, *gzugs kyi khamś* and *gzugs med pa'i khamś*. Theoretically, it is possible that *chos kyi khamś* refers here to the twelfth dhātu or sixth kind of external object (*viṣaya*), viz., the class of non-sensuous objects. Contextual considerations render this explanation implausible, since they point quite clearly to the *Dharmadhātu*—of which *chos kyi khamś* is a highly unusual translation—and not to the series of elements (*dhātu*) that are represented in the composition of an individual stream of life (*santāna*). Thus, we read in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (77.3.6–4.1):

“Next, what is skill in elements (*khamś*)? Although it is true that the quintessential element of the Dharma (*chos kyi khamś*) is the element of earth, it is not the distinguishing mark of compactness. Although it is true that the quintessential element of the Dharma is the element of water, it is not the distinguishing mark of moisture. Although it is true that the quintessential element of the Dharma is the element of fire, it is not the distinguishing mark of heat. Although it is true that the quintessential element of the Dharma is the element of wind, it is not the distinguishing mark of motion. Although it is true that the quintessential element of the Dharma is the element of visual consciousness, it is not the distinguishing mark of seeing. (And so forth for the remaining senses and their objects.)

In the corresponding passage in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, the term *chos kyi khamś* (except for one unambiguous reference to non-sensuous objects) is invariably replaced by *chos kyi dbyings*. This modification establishes beyond any doubt that, in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, it is the *Dharmadhātu* and not the *dharmadhātu* that is referred to. All other occurrences of the term *khamś*, whether in conjunction with *nam mkha'*, *'dod pa* or otherwise are preserved as they occur in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Thus, the Tibetan of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* puts forward what is in effect a (re)interpretation of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*'s probable Sanskrit reading. As we have seen, this is a general feature of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka/Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* relationship and does not pose much of a problem.

D. Ruegg, noting a similar terminological divergency in his translation of Bu ston's *De b'zin g'segs paḥi śhīn po gsal 'zin mdzes par byed paḥi rgyan*, proposes to take this difference in translation as indicating a shift in the point of reference (Ruegg, 1973, 67, n. 2). He suggests that *dbyings* refers to the “nature essentielle” (*ngang*) on the level of the absolute reality, whereas *khamś* is generally used in connexion with *saṃsāra* when the texts speak of “l'Element au niveau de la relativité”. He concedes, however, that not all Tibetan translations uphold this distinction and that there are, in fact, a number of recorded cases where the usages of *khamś* and *dbyings* is rather fluent (*op. cit.*, 34).

What puzzles me is the mechanism by which this particular incongruity arose, since the texts' chronological order could not have been of any concern to their Tibetan translators. They found presumably in both texts—assuming that they were translated from the Sanskrit which seems certain—the term *dharmadhātu*. And yet, they opted for different terms to translate the same word in

So far, I have based my hypothesis about the relationship between the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* mainly on two factors. I have argued that the presence of extended *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* passages in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* implies its indebtedness to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and I have pointed to concrete editorial modifications leading to a contextual and structural superiority of the respective sections in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*. I shall now discuss a number of variant readings that relate specifically to doctrinal matters.

the same sentence, passage and context; employing *chos kyi khams* in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *chos kyi dbyings* in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*. In the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*, their choice might have been influenced by the explanation given in the *Akṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā* (195.5.1–7), since it establishes quite clearly the *Dharmadhātu* and not non-sensuous objects as point of reference. But again, we cannot be certain that the commentary was at hand when the translators set about their task. First, I thought to find the key to this discrepancy in the terminologic revision (*sgra gsar bcaḍ*) that took place in Tibet at the beginning of the ninth century. That is to say, I expected to learn that the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* had been translated before the Great Revision and was then left unrevised. This assumption proved ill-founded, since its translation was carried out by the very persons who played a major role in the Great Revision, namely Surendrabodhi, Śīlendrabodhi and Dharmatāśīla (N. Simonsson, *Indo-Tibetische Studien*, Uppsala, 1957, 241). Even if they had translated the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* before receiving the royal command to undertake the general revision, they would surely have redrafted it afterwards. Moreover, already the first unrevised translation of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* contains the terms *chos kyi dbyings* (La Vallée Poussin, *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library*, item 48, vol. 37, folio 10a.1–10b.4). I then discovered that Dharmatāśīla not only had part in the translation of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, but had also revised the early translation of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*. It is probably safe to assume that he would have employed consistent terminology had he held the word *dharmadhātu* to refer to the same concept in both texts. Alternatively, he might have contributed to the translation of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* after he had worked on the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and neglected to go back to it for revision. In any event, it is quite unthinkable that he should have failed to notice the close parallels that exist between the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* while working at them. Today, it is impossible to say whether Dharmatāśīla translated the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* before or after revising the old *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* version, but given that an unrevised translation of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* was already extant, one would expect him to have first turned to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. On the other hand, being a thorough and accomplished scholar, he might as well have given priority to correcting the old faulty translations before looking at new texts. To whatever view one chooses to subscribe, there seems to be no convincing evidence to support either of them. As far as the translation of the passage is concerned, it is probably safe to follow the reading of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*. First, it fits the context and, second, it is confirmed by *Akṣayamatinirdeśaṭīkā*. And yet, it fails to address the question that lies at the heart of the problem, that is, how such incongruence arose in the first place. Furthermore, it raises the methodological problem of basing the translation of a passage on a reading that is not found in the text itself, however close its affiliation to this text may be. Finally, it does not account for the somewhat unusual practice of employing the term *chos kyi khams* to render *Dharmadhātu* into Tibetan.

The most telling examples of this kind are found in a section expounding the Bodhisattva's equipment (*saṃbhāra*) of merit (*puṇya*) and gnosis (*jñāna*). In this context, we read in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (81.4.2) that Bodhisattvas of pure resolve “appear in all worlds”. In the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* (65.3.7), this sentence has been altered to say that purity of resolve endows Bodhisattvas with “power over all worlds”.

Now, it takes little acumen to see that this variation sprang from a shift in perception of the ‘model Bodhisattva’. In all likelihood, it dates to the period when the early characterisation of the Bodhisattva as a human being was superseded by a more transcendental concept of Bodhisattvahood. Unfortunately, we have little information to indicate when this shift took place. If one follows Harrison's findings—based on the earliest Chinese translations of Mahāyāna *sūtras*—it did not occur before the third century.²⁵ Other scholars, basing their propositions either on iconographic evidence²⁶ or by correlating the final stages of the *daśabhūmika*-path with the emergence of mythical Bodhisattvas,²⁷ have suggested the second century.²⁸ Today, this view has been seriously challenged by Schopen's (re)interpretation of the ancient rock and pillar inscriptions found at the Buddhist sites in northern India. He shows that in epigraphical sources, mythical Bodhisattvas are not attested before the fourth to fifth centuries.²⁹ Without entering the intricacies of the controversy (which, in any event, is based on rather slim documentation), it is, therefore, prudent to place the emergence of mythical Bodhisattvas in a rather later period.³⁰ In principle, this would fit in with the chronological order that I proposed for the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, and would account for their differing views on the Bodhisattva's role in the world. My theory on the relationship between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is further corroborated by a variant

²⁵ P. Harrison, “Who Gets to Ride in the Great Vehicle”, *JIAS*, 10, 1987, 67–89.

²⁶ V.S. Agrawala, “Dhyāni Buddhas and Bodhisattvas”, *JUPHS*, 11, 1–13.

²⁷ E. Conze, *A Short History of Buddhism*, London, 1982, 49.

²⁸ Gregory Schopen's findings about the Kuṣān image of Amitābha have made this early date—by implication—unlikely (G. Schopen, “The Inscription of the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of Early Mahāyāna in India”, *JIAS*, 10, 1987, 111–125).

²⁹ G. Schopen, *op. cit.*, 119.

³⁰ Epigraphic evidence and iconographic representations point to a considerable discrepancy between the literary forms of Mahāyāna Buddhism (dating back to the beginnings of our era) and their public manifestations. There was virtually no popular support for the Mahāyāna before the 4th/5th century that is documented in the various inscriptions, and even then it is chiefly of monastic origin and not by lay-supporters (G. Schopen, *op. cit.*, 124; G. Schopen “Two Problems in the History of Buddhism”, *IJ*, 10, 1985, 9–47; G. Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions”, *IJ*, 21, 1979, 1–19).

reading that is given in a tetrad enumerating the means by which the Bodhisattva increases his equipment of gnosis. In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (82.3.1), we learn in this connection of the following four paths: 1. The path of the perfections; 2. The path of the practices conducing to enlightenment; 3. The noble eightfold path; 4. The path that leads to the gnosis of all-knowing.

While this list is not particularly remarkable in itself, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* reading of this tetrad (66.3.4) contains one interesting deviation. It replaces the third limb, the noble eightfold path, with the path of the stages (*bhūmi*). Since the other three paths correspond to those of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, preference to the scheme of stages indicates tangible doctrinal progress. It is plausible that the author of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* felt compelled to account for this progress and consequently modified the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* reading accordingly.

Another interesting, though somewhat more ambiguous, variant reading is found in the discussions of the practice of having recourse to the meaning and not on the letter (*arthapratisaraṇena bhavitavyam na vyañjanapratisaraṇena*). In the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* (79.5.7), we learn that the letter instructs the Bodhisattva “not to abandon any sentient being”, but the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* changes the sentence to say (63.5.6) that the letter teaches Bodhisattvas “to renounce all possessions”. The reading in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* is a reference to the Bodhisattva’s moral obligation to pursue actively universal liberation. Historically, it probably stemmed from the thought contained in several early Mahāyāna scriptures that give prominence to the ideal of the lay Bodhisattva over that of the mendicant Bodhisattva. Texts, such as the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and (early versions of the) *Ugraparipṛcchā*, provide illustration of this literary strand. In contrast, the reading of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, advocating total renunciation of worldly possessions, belongs to a somewhat later period. Its message is strongly reminiscent of a trend to replace the lay-ideal with that of the mendicant Bodhisattva as ‘model Bodhisattva’. The dating of Chinese translations of Mahāyāna texts suggests that this reorientation to the mendicant model of early Buddhism was well advanced by the fourth century AD. Again, this would accord with the proposed chronology of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.

There exists, however, a second possibility of interpretation. Mahāyāna *sūtras* of all ages agree in propounding generosity (*dāna*) as the cardinal virtue of the lay Bodhisattva. Generosity epitomises his obligations and efforts, and is the principal means by which the lay Bodhisattva becomes cleansed from the three root defilements. Indeed, pure generosity is often set forth on its own as a model for the lay Bodhisattva’s middle way faring between affection and aversion—the two extremes against which he battles every day. Hence, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*’s admonition could also be understood as referring to the lay Bodhi-

sattva's obligation to practice generosity at all times with the aim of universal liberation. In this event, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* would subscribe to the very same ideal. However, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*'s plea for a very severe form of generosity—which in its radicalism is fundamentally incongruous with the well-balanced middle way that is trodden by lay Bodhisattvas—renders this line of interpretation possibly less convincing.

To sum up the results of my analysis. It has been shown that the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* betray a very close association. Both texts abound with thoughts and practices that are expressed in exactly the same manner—often down to the letter. Enlaced into this parallelism, we have noted a series of variations that bear the hallmarks of editorial change or doctrinal adjustment. Invariably, these occur in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*. First, there is the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*'s tendency to increase the number of practices. This applies to minor aspects of the path as well as to major categories as can be gleaned from Chart I. In many of the passages where both texts concur the reading of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* is supplemented with non-essential detail. In some cases, additional information is given in order to convey a fuller, more systematic treatment of the subject-matter. In others, it serves to consolidate internal parallels that are only incompletely implemented in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Other editorial modifications include the removal of structural irregularities and the insertion of contextual links. Finally, taking account of religious developments the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* shows a series of adjustments relating to doctrinal matters. For the most part, these are rather subtle and do not stand in the foreground.

We have, therefore, every reason to believe that it is the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* that is indebted to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* for material—not the other way around. I cannot see how the author of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* could possibly have chosen to dispose of the editorial apparatus and consistency which renders the exposition of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* so much more coherent. What is more, I very much doubt whether he would have been prepared to undertake subtractions and abridgements from what is after all regarded as *buddhavacana*.

There still exists the possibility that the parallels between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* stemmed from a third source on which both texts drew for material. The editorial adjustments and doctrinal modifications between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* could then be interpreted as pointing to different periods in which the borrowing took place. So far, I have not found any work that could have possibly served as their fount of inspiration. The fact that individual, non-standardised elements of their expositions are known to have predecessors in the earliest strands of Buddhist literature does not allow to postulate a continuous, direct link of transmission. If anything, it

exemplifies the strong tendency towards conservatism and continuity in Buddhist thinking.

Moreover, the early date of composition that is generally ascribed to the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* does not speak in favour of this hypothesis, since it reduces the number of candidates considerably. The works that contain sections from the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* are all much younger and acknowledge the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* as the source of their quotation. My research into the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* has shown that the contents and structure of its exposition of the Bodhisattva practices are quite unique and have no identifiable parallels in other *sūtras* of its age—that is, except for the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*. Its rudimentary depiction of the Bodhisattva ideal means that, if there ever existed such a third source, it must have been among the earliest Mahāyāna *sūtras*. That such an early source could have been lost in the bustle of the formative period of the Mahāyāna is quite possible. Slightly less convincing is that it should have vanished without ever attracting the attention of Buddhist scholastics, in particular, since it would have contained some of the most fundamental pioneering thought on the Bodhisattva practice.

With no individual single text in sight by which the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* might have been inspired, we are left with the possibility that both *sūtras* were influenced by ideas stemming from a number of texts. Identification of such a group of texts is of course much more complex and requires a drawn out research in its own right. It is also questionable whether it could have resulted in the close verbatim correspondence we find between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Thus, with this final scenario being perhaps more of a theoretical nature, I propose—until a corresponding body of texts has actually been identified—to confirm the close association between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, with the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* being the earlier of the two texts.

Chart I: Forms of Learning in the *Akn*, *Śikṣā* and *Bdp*

no.	<i>Akṣayamatīnirdeśa</i>	<i>Akn in the Śikṣāsamuccaya</i>	<i>Bodhisattvapiṭaka</i>
1	'dun pa	chanda (1) †	'dun pa
2	bsam pa	āśaya (2)	bsam pa
3	lhag pa'i bsam pa	adhyāśaya*	sbyor ba
4	sbyor ba	prayoga (3)	dge ba'i bshes gnyen
5	dge ba'i bshes gnyen	nirmāṇa (5)	nga rgyal med pa
6	nga rgyal med pa	apramāṇa (6) ¹	rab tu 'dud pa
7	bag yod pa	kalyāṇamitra (4)	ri mor byed pa
8	gus par byed pa	gaurava (7)	'thun pa
9	'thun pa 'dzin pa	pradakṣiṇa (8)	bka' blo bde ba
10	bka' blo bde ba	suvacana (9)	bsnyen bkur byed pa
11	bsnyen bkur byed pa	paryupāsana (10)	rna ba blags te nyan pa
12	rna ba blags te nyan pa	avahitaśrotra (11)	bkur sti byed pa
13	yid la byed pa	manasikāra (13)	yid la byed pa
14	rnam par mi g.yeng pa	avikṣepa (14)	mi.gyeng pa
15	gnas	avasthāna*	rin po cher 'du shes pa
16	rin po cher 'du shes pa	ratnasamjñā (15)	sman du 'du shes pa
17	sman du 'du shes pa	bhaiṣajyasamjñā (16)	nad thams cad rab tu zhi bar byed pa'i 'du shes pa
18	nyon mongs pa'i nad thams cad zhi bar byed pa	sarvavyādhiśamana (17) ²	dran pa'i snod
19	dran pa'i snod	smṛtibhajana (18)	rtogs pa shes pa
20	rtogs pa shes pa	gatibodhana (19)	blo gros 'dod pa
21	blo gros 'dod pa	matirocana (20)	blo la 'jug pa
22	blo la 'jug pa	buddhipraveśa (21)	sangs rgyas kyi chos thos pas mi sgoms pa nyan pa
23	sangs rgyas kyi chos thos pas mi sgoms pa nyan pa	atrptabuddhadharma śravaṇa (22)	gtong pa spel pa
24	gtong pa spel pa	tyāgabṛmhaṇa (23)	byin nas mi smod pa
25	dul zhing cang shes pa	dāttājāneya	mang du thos pa brten pa
26	mang du thos pa brten pa	bahuśrutasevana (25)	gus par dga' ba myong bar byed pa
27	sti stang du byas te dga' ba myong par byed	satkṛtyaprītyanubhavana (26)	lus sim pa
28	lus bde pa	kāyaudbilya (27)	sems rangs pa
29	sems rab tu dga'	cittaprahādana (28)	mi skyor bar nyan pa
30	mi skyor bar nyan pa	aparikheda śravaṇa (29)	don nyan pa
31	don nyan pa	dharma śravaṇa (31)	chos nyan pa

32	chos nyan pa	(artha śravaṇa) ³	nan tan nyan pa
33	nan tan nyan pa	pratipatti śravaṇa (32)	theg pa gzhan la 'dod pa med pa nyan pa
34	gzhan gis bstan pa nyan pa	paradeśanā śravaṇa*	pha rol tu phyin pa nyan pa
35	chos ma thos pa nyan pa	aśruta śravaṇa*	byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod nyan pa
36	mngon par shes pa nyan pa	abhiññāśravaṇa (39)	bsdu ba'i dngos nyan pa
37	theg pz gzhan la 'dod pa med pa nyan pa	anyayānāśprhaṇa śravaṇa (33)	thabs mkhas pa nyan pa
38	pha rol tu phyin pa nyan pa	prajñāpāramitā śravaṇa (34)	tshangs pa'i gnas pa nyan pa
39	byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod nyan pa	bodhissatvapitaka śravaṇa (35)	mngon par shes pa nyan pa
40	bsdu ba'i dngos nyan pa	saṃgrahavastu śravaṇa (36)	dran pa nye bar gzhags pa nyan pa
41	thabs mkhas pa nyan pa	upāyakauśalya śravaṇa (37)	yang dag par spong ba nyan pa
42	tshang pa'i gnas pa nyan pa	brahmavihāra śravaṇa (38)	rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa nyan pa
43	dran pa dang shes pa bzhin nyan pa	smṛtissamprajanya śravaṇa (40) ⁴	rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba nyan pa
44	skye ba la mkhas pa'i nyan pa	utpādakauśalya śravaṇa*	mi rtag pa nyan pa
45	mi skye ba la mkhas pa nyan pa	anupādakauśalya śravaṇa *	sdud bsngal ba nyan pa
46	mi sdug pa	aśubha*	bdag med pa nyan pa
47	byams pa	maitryāḥ śravaṇa*	zhi ba nyan pa
48	rten cing 'brel bar 'byung pa	pratītyasamutpāda śravaṇa (43)	stong pa nyid nyan pa
49	mi rtag pa nyan pa	anitya śravaṇa (44)	mtshan ma med pa nyan pa
50	sdud bsngal ba nyan pa	duḥkha śravaṇa (45)	smon pa med pa nyan pa
51	bdag med pa nyan pa	anātma śravaṇa (46)	mngon par 'du mi byed pa nyan pa
52	zhji ba nyan pa	śānta śravaṇa (47)	dge ba'i rtsa ba mngon par 'du byed pa nyan pa
53	stong pa nyid nyan pa	śūnyatā śravaṇa (48)	rang dbang du gyur pa
54	mtshan ma med pa nyan pa	(animitta śravaṇa) ⁵ (50)	chos ñan par 'du shes pa

55	smon pa med pa nyan pa	(apraṇihita śravaṇa) ⁶ (49)	kun tu 'dre ba mi 'thun pa'i phyogs su 'du shes pa
56	mngon par 'du mi byed pa nyan pa	anabhisamṣkāra śravaṇa (51)	nyon mongs pa thams cad tshar gcod pa
57	dge ba'i mngon par 'du byed pa	kkuśalābhisamṣkāra śravaṇa (52)	mkhas oa ka mngon par bga' ba
58	bden pas byin gyis brlabs pa	sattvādhiṣṭhāna ⁷	'phags pa sten pa
59	chud mi gazon pa	avipraṇāśā*	'phags pa ma yin pa yongs su spong pa
60	rang gi kha na las pa	svādhina (53)	'phags pa nyan pa
61	rang gi sems srung pa	svacittārakṣaṇa*	dbang pa nyan pa
62	brtson 'grus mi gtod pa	viryasyāsrāmsana	rjes su dran pa sgom pa nyan pa
63	snyon mongs pa'i gnyen po	dharmanidhyapti*	byang chub kyī yan lag nyan pa
64	chos la nges par sems pa	kleśavipakṣa (56)	'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyud pa nyan pa
65	rang gi phygos srung pa	svapakṣaparikarṣaṇa*	de bzhin gshegs pa'i stobs nyan pa
66	pha rol gyi phyogs dang nyon mongs pa tsar gcod pa	parapakṣakleśanigraha*	mi 'jigs pa nyan pa
67	nor bdun yang dag par 'du pa	saptadhanasamavaśaraṇa*	byams pa nyan pa
68	dbul ba thams cad tsar gcod pa	sarvadāridryopaccheda*	snying rje nyan pa
69	'dzangs pas bsngags pa	sarvavidvatpraśasta*	dga' ba nyan pa
70	mkhas pa mngon par dga' pa	pañḍitābhinandana (57)	gtang snyoms chen po nyan pa
71	'phags pas kun shes pa	āryasamṃmata (58)	so so yang dag par rig pa nyan pa
72	'phags pa ma yin pa dad par byed pa	anāryaprasādana (59)	sangs rgyas kyī chos ma 'dres pa bco brgyad rnams nyan pa
73	bden mthong pa	satyadarśana (60)	
74	phung po'i skyon rnam par spongs pa	skandhadoṣavivarjana*	
75	'dus byas yongs su 'dzal pa	samskṛtadoṣaparitulana*	
76	don la rton pa	arthapratisaraṇa*	
77	chos la rton pa	dharmapratisaraṇa*	
78	ye shes la rton pa	(jñānapratisaraṇa) ⁸	

79	nges pa'i don gyi mdo sde la rton pa	(nītārthapratīsarāṇa) ⁹	
80	sdig pa thams cad mi bya ba	sarvāpāpākaraṇa*	
81	bdag dang gzhan la phan pa legs par byas pa'i las	ātmaparahita*	
82	mi 'gyod pa	sukṛtakarmānanutāpyana*	
83	khyad par du 'gro ba	viśeṣagamana*	
84	sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad 'thob pa	sarvabuddhadharma-pratīlābha	

† Numbers in brackets indicate location of the *Bdp* terms.

* Items not cited in *Bdp*.

¹ *Bdp*: praṇama

² closer to *Bdp*.

³ om. in *Śikṣ*

⁴ *gaurava* is here repeated in *Śikṣ*.

⁵ not listed as a separate item in *Śikṣ*.

⁶ not listed as a separate item in *Śikṣ*

⁷ *Akn* and *Bdp*: *satyādhiṣṭhāna*

⁸ om. in *Śikṣ*.

⁹ om. in *Śikṣ*.

Akn: TTP, 50.4.7–51.1.5; *Bdp*: TTP 73 .2.3–4.1; *Śikṣ*, Bendall, 1902, 190.4–191.3

Chart II: Samādhi Lists in the *Akn* and *Bdp*

no.	<i>Akṣayamatīnirdeśa</i>	<i>Akṣayamatīnirdeśa</i> (Skt)	<i>Bodhisattvapīṭaka</i>
1	glog gi sgron mas bgryan	vidyutpradīpālamkāra (<i>Mvy</i> 546)	rnam par sngan (3) †
2	zla ba'i 'od	*candraprabhā	mdzad zhi ba
3	dge bkod rnam snang de bzhin sems	śubhavyūhapratibhāsa (<i>Mvy</i> 556)	zla 'od (2)
4	mi khyab	*acintya	rnam pa bkod pa (3?)
5	'phags par snang	udgataprabhā (<i>Mvy</i> 511, 568)	de nyid glog gis rab tu brgyan pa
6	dri ma med pa	vimala (<i>Dbh</i> , p. 82.10)	mngon par 'phags (56)
7	chos rnams kun la dbang byed	*sarvadharmavaśavartin	de bzhin sems dpa' (3?)
8	yon tan 'od	*guṇaprabhā	dri ma med (6)
9	myan ngan med	*aśoka	snang ldan
10	brtul zhugs grub pa	*siddhavrata	yon tan 'od (8)
11	grags pa brten	*dṛḍhakīrti	grub 'od
12	kun nas 'phags pa	samudgata (<i>Mvy</i> 512)	mya ngan med (9)
13	chos kyi sgron ma	*dharmapradīpa	chos rnams thams cad la ni dbang sgyur (7)
14	chos dpal lhun po che	*dharmaśrīmahāmeru	chos sgron (13)
15	chos kyi dbang phyug	*dharmaśvara	de bzhin chos dpa'
16	chos shes dbang byed	*dharmajñānavaśavartin	chos kyi dbang phyug (15)
17	chos kyi phung po	*dharmaskandha	ri rab dpa' (14)
18	rnam par 'thor ba	vikiraṇa (<i>Mvy</i> 569)	dam pa'i chos kyi ye shes dbang byed (16)
19	chos rnams 'dzin pa rnam par dag pa	dharmadharaviśuddhi (<i>Kv</i> , pp. 51.14, 83.12)	dam chos kun 'dzin shin tu rnam dag (19)
20	pha rol sems kyi spyod pa spyod pa	*paracittacaritacaryā	gzhan gyi sems la rnam dpyod (21)
21	rgyal mtsan rtse mo'i dpung rgyan	dhvajāgrakeyūra (<i>Mvy</i> 530)	dam chos kyi mchog
22	nyong mongs sel	*kleśāpaha	'od zer
23	bdud bzhi'i stobs rnams rab tu 'joms pa	*caturmārabalapramardin	rgyal mtsan rtse mo dpung rgyan (21)
24	stobs bcu 'phags pa stobs dang ldan pa	*daśabalodgatabalin	nyong mongs sel (22)
25	chags med chags pa shin du gcod pa	*asaṅgasāṅgātyanta-samuccheda	bdud bzhi'i stobs rnams rab tu 'joms pa (23)

26	lag na sgron ma	*hastadīpa	stobs bcu 'phags pa stobs dang ldan pa (24)
27	shin du sgra bsgrags	*atyantaśabdita	kun bcad chags med
28	sa 'dzin	*nimimdhara	lag na sgron ma (26)
29	brtan pa 'di dang rang bzhzin	*dṛḍhasvabhāva	bdud sbyin bsgrags pa
30	lhun po sgron ma	*merupradīpa	sa 'dzin (28)
31	mi pham rgyal ba	*ajitamjaya	legs par gnas pa (71?)
32	shes rab bkyed	*prajñotpāda	ri rab sgron (30)
33	ye shes tal la	jñānolka (<i>Mvy</i> 744)	rgyal ba mi 'pham (31)
34	bsam gtan 'byung gnas	*dhyānākara	ye shes sgron (80?)
35	mtha' yas dbang byed	*anantavaśavartin	de bzhin mig gtsang
36	sems rnam las su rung par byed pa	*cittakarmanyatākāra	rgyal thams cad dran pa (45)
37	byed dang byas dang tshor byang med	*akārakakrtakavedaka	chos dran yon tan ye shes 'jug (46?)
38	chu yi zla ba	*udakacandra	stong par 'jug (51)
39	nyi ma'i dbyangs dag	*sūryaghoṣa	de bzhin mtsan me (52)
40	ting 'dzin mi gtong	samādhyānutsarga	smon med (53)
41	bdud rnam 'joms pa	*jārapramardaka	de bzhin zhi ba'i sa
42	rnam pa sna tshogs 'du shes med pa	*avicitrasamjñin	'du shes sna tsogs bral (42)
43	stag shin du dul ba	*suvinītahastivyāghra	rab dul klu dbang stag (43)
44	glang po shin du dul ba	*sudāntahastivyāghra	'khyil ba
45	rgyal ba kun gyi rjes su dran pa	*sarvijñānumṣṛti	rnam par ldog pa
46	chos dran dge 'dun ye shes dbang byed	*dharmānumṣṛti- saṃghajñānavaśavartin	'jums pa med pa (49?)
47	mi ldog pa	avivarta (<i>Mvy</i> 553)	stobs
48	ldog pa med pa	avinivartaniya (<i>Mvy</i> 740)	mig dag (49?)
49	mig mi 'dzums	*animiṣa	rdo rje 'dra (55)
50	bdga med rab dge	*nairātmyaprasuddhi	rdo rje sa
51	rtag tu stong pa'i rnam par 'jug pa	*nityaśūnyākārapraveśa	mngon 'phags (56)
52	rtag tu mtsan med	*nityānimitta	mi 'um lhun po lha bu
53	rtag tu mi smon	*nityāprāṇihita	kun nas glong 'khyil (58)
54	gnas par bsam gtan	*saṃsthitāsaktadhyāyin	rnam pa dag sgra (59?)

55	rdo rje lta bu'i ting nge 'dzin	vajropamasamādhī (<i>Mvy</i> 560)	nges rtogs (60?)
56	mngon par 'phags	*abhyudgata	nyon mongs bral ba (61)
57	nges par bcom pa	*nirghāta	nam mkha' 'dra (62)
58	kun nas 'khyil	*samāvarta	nam mkha'i bar skabs
59	rnam par dag pa	*viśuddha	yon tan thams cad gus par len pa (64?)
60	nges par sems	*nidhyapti	blos gros dran rtogs blo 'phel (65?)
61	nyon mongs bral ba	*apagatakleśa	stobs mi zad
62	yangs pa nam mkha' lta bu	akāśasamavipula (<i>Dbh</i> , p. 82.13)	nges tsig bstan pa
63	gzung ba 'jug pa	*avatāraṇa	mtha' yas mi zad
64	yon tan 'ug pa	*guṇāvātāra	legs byas byas pa (71)
65	dran rtogs bla gros shes rab bsgrub pa	*smṛtigatimatiprajñāsādhaka	chud mi za ba (70)
66	spobs pa dag ni mi zad byed pa	*pratibhānākṣayakārin	lha ba
67	sgra ston pa	*śabdaśāsana	'gro ba tsim byed (72)
68	bden pa mthong ba	*satyadarśana	byams pa mngon 'phags (76)
69	'dzin pa	*dhātraṇa	snying rje yangs pa'i rtsa (77)
70	chud mi za	*aviṣpranāśa	dga' la 'dug pa
71	legs byas sbyin	*sukṛtadāna	mchog tu dga' la 'dug pa (78)
72	'gro ba tsim par byed	*jagatsamtarpaṇa	btang snyoms gnyis la chags grol (79)
73	bltar mi mthong	*adr̥ṣya	chos don chos kyi 'od zer (80)
74	rab tu rtogs	*prativedha	'grug med (21)
75	dga' mgu rnam par dag la 'jug pa	*suṣṭhityutpāda	ye shes sgron (82?)
76	byams pa 'phags pa	*maitryudgata	ye shes mtso
77	snyin rje chen po'i rtsa ba bsam dag pa	*mahākaruṇāmūla-śuddhāśaya	rnam grol snying po 'gro tsim byed (83)
78	dga'	*muditākārapraveśa	rdo rje rgyal mtsan (85)
79	btan snyoms gnyis la chags las grol ba	*dvayasaṅgavimuktopekṣā	padma dam pa (87)
80	chos don chos byed ye shes tal la	*dharmārthadharmakārya-jñānolka	chos kyi rgyal
81	mi 'grugs pa	*avikopita	mi g.yo (69)
82	ye shes rgya mtso	*jñānasāgara	shes rab rtsibs
83	'gro ba tsim byed rnam par dul ba	*vinītajagatsamtarpaṇa	zhi ba

84	rnams par grol ba'i ye shes dbang byed	*vimuktijñānavaśavartin	sangs rgyas mtso
85	rdo rje'i rgyal mtsan	*vajradhvaja	'od zer mtha' yas
86	snyin po'i padma	*hṛdayakamala	rnam grol sbyin pa ye shes (96)
87	padma 'das	*atikrāntakamala	de bzhin gshegs kyi rgyan (97)
88	'jig rten chos bral	*lokadharmavirahita	bkod pa chen po
89	mi g.yo ba	aniñjya (<i>Mvy</i> 554)	zhing bkod snang na
90	rdo rje lta bu	vajropama (<i>Mvy</i> 516)	sems can bsam ba yongs rang dga' (100)
91	dpa' bar 'gro	sūraṃgama (<i>Mvy</i> 506)	rdzogs pa'i byang chub lam la rtag mthun (103)
92	sangs rgyas dgongs	*buddhābhiprāya	pha rol phyin pa rgyan bkod mchog gtsug (104)
93	de bzhin mi 'grugs	*aprakampya	byang chub yan lag me tog sbyin (105)
94	gzi brjid can	tejovatī (<i>Mvy</i> 549)	rnam grol snying po bdung rtsi sbyin (106?)
95	gzi brjid 'od zer	*tejoraśmi	rlung dang rlung bzhin 'gro ba mi dmigs (108)
96	rnam par grol ba'i ye shes mchog sbyin	*vimuktijñānavarada	rgya mtso shugs 'dzin (110)
97	sangs rgyas rgyan rnams shin tu bkod pa	*buddhālamkāṛātyantavyūha	rin chen mdzod ldan (109)
98	kun tu snang	samantālok (<i>Mvy</i> 562)	brag dang ri 'thab rgyal po (111)
99	sangs rgyas zhing dag	*viśuddhabuddhakṣetra	rdzu 'phrul yangs (112)
100	sems can bsam pa rab tu 'jug pa	*sattvāśayapraveśa	sangs rgyas yul ston (113)
101	mgu byed	*ārādhana	
102	shin tu mgu	*atyantārādhana	
103	byang chub lam gyi rjes su 'thun pa	*bodhipathānulomika	
104	pha rol phyin bgyan gtsug na rin po che	*pāramitālamkāracūdamaṇi	
105	byang chub lam na lag me tog sbyin pa	*bodhyaṅgapuṣpadāna	
106	rnam par grol ba'i 'bras bu sbyin pa	*vimuktiphaladāna	
107	mi 'chi dbyangs	*amṛtasavara	

108	dnigs med rlung bzhin 'gro	*yathāvāyvanālbana-gamana	
109	rin chen mtha'	ratnakoti (<i>Mvy</i> 504)	
110	rgya mtso' shugs 'dzin	*arṇavavegadhārin	
111	ri dang brag rnam rdob par byed pa	*giriśailāspalana	
112	rdzu 'phrul don chen yang dag bkyed pa	*maharddhyarthasamputpāda	
113	sangs rgyas dpag med pa mthong ba	*aprimeyabuddhadarśana	
114	thos pa thams cad 'dzin	*sarvaśrutadhāra	
115	mi g.yen	*avikṣipta	
116	g.yel ba med pa	*atandrita	
117	skad cig gcig la ye shes sbyin pa	*ekakṣaṇajñānadāṭṭr	
118	yon tan mtha' yas rgya mtso rnam par dag	*anantaḡaṇaviśuddhārṇava	

† Numbers in brackets indicate location of the *Bdp*'s *samādhis* in the *Akn*'s *samādhi* list.

* Conjectural reconstructions by J. Braarvig (1989, 246–8).

Akn: TTP, 50.2.2–4.2; *Bdp*: TTP, 72.4.5–73.1.3.

Appendix: Tibetan Text of Quotations

Bodhisattvapiṭaka

Skill in Aggregates (77.2.3–3.6)

de la phung po la mkhas pa gang zhe na
 | gang 'di phung po rnams kyi dper bya
 ba (P: 'jog cing) bstan (P: 'chad; and
 below) pa 'di lta ste | dbu ba rdos ba lta
 bur bstan pa dang | smig rgyu lta bur
 bstan pa dang | chu bur lta bur bstan pa
 dang | chu shing (P: shing elm skyes;
 and below) lta bur bstan pa dang | sgyu
 ma lta bur bstan pa dang | rmi lam lta
 bur bstan pa dang | brag cha lta bur bstan
 pa dang | mig yor lta bur bstan pa dang |
 gzugs broyan lta bur bstan pa'o ||
 gzugs ni chu'i dbu ba lta bu ste | dbu ba
 la yang bdag med | sems can med | srog
 med | gang zag med | skyes bu med |
 shed bu (P: shed can; and below) med |
 shed las skyes med do || dbu ba'i rang
 bzhin gang yin pa gzugs kyang de'i rang
 bzhin te | gang de la mkhas pa de ni
 phung po la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||
 tshor ba ni chu'i chu bur lta bu ste || chu
 bur la yang bdag med | sems can med |
 srog med | gang zag med | shed bu med |
 shed las skyes med | skyes bu med de ||
 chu bur gyi rang bzhin gang yin pa tshor
 ba yang de'i rang bzhin yin te | gang de
 la mkhas pa de ni phung po la mkhas pa
 zhes bya'o ||
 'du shes ni smig rgyu lta bu ste | [smig
 rgyu la yang bdag med | sems can med
 pa nas | skyes bu'i bar du med de || smig
 rgyu'i rang bzhin gang yin pa 'du shes
 kyang de'i rang bzhin yin te | gang de la
 mkhas pa de ni phung po la mkhas pa
 zhes bya'o ||
 'du byed rnams ni chu shing lta bu ste |
 [chu shing la yang bdag med | sems can
 med | srog med pa nas | skyes bu'i bar
 du med pa ste || chu shing gi rang bzhin
 gang yin pa 'du byed dag kyang de'i
 rang bzhin yin te | gang de la mkhas pa
 de ni phung po la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||
 rnam par shes pa ni sgyu ma lta bu ste |
 [sgyu ma la yang bdag med | sems can
 med | srog med | gang zag med | shed bu
 med | shed las skyes med | skyes bu med
 | byed pa po med | tshor ba po med pa
 ste || sgyu ma'i rang bzhin gang yin pa
 rnam par shes pa'i rang bzhin yang de
 yin te | gang de la mkhas pa de ni phung
 po la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||

Akṣayamatirdeśa

Skill in Aggregates (52.2.8–4.6)

de la byang chub sems pa'i phung po la
 mkhas pa gang zhe na | gang 'di phung po
 rnams kyi dper bya ba bstan pa ste | lbu ba
 rdos ba bstan pa dang | chu'i chu bur bstan
 pa dang | smig rgyu bstan pa dang | chu
 shing gi sdong po bstan pa dang | sgyu ma
 bstan pa dang | rmi lam bstan pa dang | brag
 cha bstan pa dang | mig yor bstan pa dang |
 gzugs broyan bstan pa dang | sprul pa bstan
 pa'o || de ci'i phyir zhe na |
 gzugs ni lbu ba rdos ba lta bu ste | lbu ba
 rdos ba lta bu ni bdag ma yin | sems can ma
 yin | srog ma yin | gso ba ma yin | skyes bu
 ma yin | gang zag ma yin no || lbu ba rdos
 ba'i rang bzhin gang yin pa gzugs kyi rang
 bzhin yang de yin te | gang 'di la mkhas pa
 de ni phung po la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||
 tshor ba ni chu'i chu bur lta bu'o | 'du shes
 ni smig rgyu lta bu'o || 'du byed rnams ni
 chu shing lta bu'o || rnam par shes pa ni sgyu
 ma lta bu'o || sgyu ma yang bdag ma yin |
 [sems can ma yin | srog ma yin | gso ma yin |
 skyes bu ma yin | gang zag ma yin no | sgyu
 ma'i rang bzhin gang yin pa rnam par shes
 pa'i rang bzhin yang de yin te | gang 'di la
 mkhas pa de ni byang chub sems dpa'i
 phung po la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||
 phung po rnams ni rmi lam lta bu ste | rmi
 lam yang bdag ma yin | [sems can ma yin |
 srog ma yin | gso ma yin | skyes bu ma yin |
 gang zag ma yin no || rmi lam gyi rang bzhin
 gang yin pa phung po rnams kyi rang bzhin
 yang de yin te | gang 'di la mkhas pa de ni |
 byang chub sems dpa'i phung po la mkhas
 pa zhes bya'o ||
 phung po rnams ni brag cha lta bu ste | brag
 cha ni bdag ma yin | [sems can ma yin | srog
 ma yin | gso ma yin | skyes bu ma yin | gang
 zag ma yin no || brag cha'i rang bzhin gang
 yin pa phung po rnams kyi rang bzhin yang
 de yin te | gang 'di la mkhas pa de ni | byang
 chub serns dpa'i phung po la mkhas pa zhes
 bya'o || phung po rnams ni mig yor lta bu
 ste | mig yor ni bdag ma yin | [sems can ma
 yin | srog ma yin | gso ma yin | skyes bu ma
 yin | gang zag ma yin no || mig yor gyi rang
 bzhin gang yin pa phung po rnams kyi rang
 bzhin yang de yin te | gang 'di la mkhas pa
 de ni | byang chub sems dpa'i phung po la
 mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||

Skill in Aggregates (continued)

gzhan yang phung po rnams zhes bya ba
(de) ni 'jig rten yin te | 'jig rten yang 'jig
pa'i mtshan nyid do || 'jig rten rnams kyi
rang bzhin gang yin pa phung po rnams
kyi rang bzhin yang de yin no || yang
'jig rten gyi rang bzhin gang yin zhe na |
'di lta ste | mi rtag pa'i rang bzhin dang |
sdug bsngal gyi rang bzhin te | phung po
yang de'i rang bzhin no || gang de la
mkhas pa de ni phung po la mkhas pa
zhes bya'o ||

Skill in all Dharmas (87.3.8–4.2)

de la byang chub sems dpa'i chos thams
cad la mkhas pa gang zhe na | chos
thams cad ces bya ba ni | 'di lta ste | 'dus
byas dang 'dus ma byas so (P: pa'o) || de
la byang chub sems dpas 'dus byas dang
'dus ma byas la mkhas par bya ste |
de la 'dus byas la mkhas pa gang zhe na
| gang |us kyi 'du byed dang | ngag gi
'du byed dang | yid kyi 'du byed dag pa
ste || gang yang lus dang | ngag dang |
yid kyi dge ba de dag 'dus ma byas pa'i
byang chub la so sor rtog pa'i phyir |
thams cad mkhyen pa nyid du sngob
de ni 'dus ma (P om.: ma) byas la mkhas
pa'o ||

Skill in Aggregates (continued)

phung po rnams ni gzugs brnyan lta bu ste |
gzugs brnyan ni bdag ma yin | [sems can ma
yin | srog ma yin | gso ma yin | skyes bu rna
yin | gang zag ma yin no || gzugs brnyan gyi
rang bzhin gang yin pa phung po rnams kyi
rang bzhin yang de yin te | gang 'di la mkhas
pa de ni | byang chub sems dpa'i phung po la
mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||]
phung po rnams ni sprul pa lta bu ste | sprul
pa ni bdag ma yin | [sems can ma yin | srog
ma yin | gso ma yin | skyes bu ma yin | gang
zag ma yin no || sprul pa'i rang bzhin gang
yin pa phung po rnams kyi rang bzhin yang
de yin te | gang 'di la mkhas pa de ni | byang
chub sems dpa'i phung po la mkhas pa zhes
bya'o ||]
phung po zhes bya ba de ni 'jig rten te | 'jig
rten kyang 'jig pa'i mtshan nyid do || 'jig
rten kyi rang bzhin gang yin pa de rang
bzhin gyis mi rtag pa'o || rang bzhin gyis
sdug bsngal ba'o | rang bzhin gyis stong
pa'o | rang bzhin gyis bdag med pa'o || rang
bzhin gyis zhi ba ste | gang 'di la mkhas pa
de ni byang chub sems pa'i phung po la
mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||

Skill in all Dharmas (55.4.8–5.4)

de la byang chub sems dpa'i chos thams cad
la mkhas pa gang zhe na | chos thams cad
ces bya ba ni mdor na 'dus byas dang | 'dus
ma byas so || de la byang chub sems dpas
'dus byas dang | 'dus ma byas la mkhas par
bya ste |
de la byang chub sems dpa' 'dus byas la
mkhas pa gang zhe na | gang de dag |us kyi
'du byed dge ba dang | ngag gi 'du byed dge
ba dang | yid kyi 'du byed dge ba mngon par
'dus byas pa de dag thams cad bla na med pa
yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu
yongs su bsngob ba 'di ni byang chub sems
dpa'i 'dus byas la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||
gang yang dge ba'i |us dang | ngag dang |
yid kyi 'du byed mngon par 'dus byas pa de
dag thams cad byang chub la rtog pas thams
cad mkhyen pa nyid du yongs su bsngob ba
'di ni de'i 'dus ma byas la mkhas pa zhes
bya'o ||

<p><i>Skill in Elements (77.3.6–4.1)</i> chos kyi khams de ni sa'i khams mod kyi chos kyi khams sra ba'i mtshan nyid ma yin no chos kyi khams (de) ni chu'i khams mod kyi chos kyi khams rlan pa'i mtshan nyid ma yin no chos kyi khams (de) ni me'i khams mod kyi chos kyi khams tsha ba'i mtshan nyid ma yin no chos kyi khams (de) ni rlung gi khams mod kyi chos kyi khams g.yo ba'i mtshan nyid ma yin no chos kyi khams (de) ni mig gi rnam par shes pa'i khams mod kyi chos kyi khams mthong ba'i mtsban nyid ma yin no (and so forth for the remaining sense organs.)</p> <p><i>Reliance on Meaning/Letter (80.1.8–2.1)</i> yi ge zhes bya ba ni dkon mchog gsum gyi yon tan bsngags pa 'tha med pa yang dag par rab tu 'chad pa'o don ces bya ba ni gang chos 'dod chags med pa dang 'dus ma byas pa'i dge 'dun gyi yon tan no </p> <p><i>Skill in Perfect Efforts (86.1.2–4)</i> tshul khirms kyi log pa'i gnyen po dang ting nge 'dzin gyi log pa'i gnyen po dang shes rab kyi log pa'i gnyen po'o de la tshul khirms kyi log pa'i gnyen po gang zhe na 'di lta ste tshul khirms nyams pa dang gang gzhan yang la tshul khirms nyams par 'gyur pa'i chos rnams te de ni tshul khirms kyi log pa 'i gnyenpo zhes bya'o </p>	<p><i>Skill in Elements (52.4.6–5.1)</i> chos kyi dbyings ni sa'i khams yin mod kyi chos kyi dbyings sra ba'i mtsban nyid (ni) ma yin no chos kyi dbyings chu'i khams yin mod kyi chos kyi dbyings rlan pa'i mtshan nyid ni ma yin no chos kyi dbyings me'i khams yin mod kyi chos kyi dbyings tsha ba'i mtshan nyid ni ma yin no chos kyi dbyings rlung gi khams yin mod kyi chos kyi dbyings g.yo ba'i mtshan nyid ni ma yin no chos kyi dbyings mig gi khams mod kyi chos kyi dbyings lta ba'i mtshan nyid ni ma yin no (and so forth for the remaining sense organs.)</p> <p><i>Reliance on Meaning/Letter (64.8.1–2.2)</i> tsig 'bru zhes bya ba ni gang dkon mchog gsum gyi yon tan dang bsngags pa mtha yas pa bstan pa'o don ces bya ba ni gang sangs rgyas kyi chos kyi sku mthong ba dang 'dod chags dang bral zhing 'gog pa'i chos nyid dang 'dus ma byas kyi sangs rgyas dang chos dang dge 'dun gyi yon tan sgrub pa'i ye shes so </p> <p><i>Perfect Efforts (68.5.7–4)</i> gang 'di tshul khirms kyi mi mthun pa'i phyogs dang ting nge 'dzin gyi mi mthun pa 'i phyogs dang shes rab kyi mi mthun pa'i phyogs so de la tshul khirms kyi mi mthun pa'i phyogs gang zhe na gang 'di tshul khirms nyams pa dang gang dag gzhan gyi tshul khirms kyang nyams par 'byed pa'i chos ci yang rung ste gang dag tshul khirms kyi phung po'i mi mthun pa'i phyogs su 'gyur ba 'di ni tshul khirms kyi mi mthun pa'i phyogs shes bya'o </p>
--	---

<p><i>Path Traversed Alone (87.1.4–2.3)</i> gzhan yang mdor bsdu na byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyis lam ni mgo (P: phyogs) gcig pa ste 'di lta ste lam bgrod pa gcig pa'o 'di lta ste byang chub sems dpa' gcig pu gnyis su med pa bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu grogs med par shin tu brtson pa'i stobs kyis mthu yongs su gzung ba'i bsam pas go cha bgos pa ste gzhan gyis ma bshad pa gzhan gyi dring mi 'jog pa bdag byed pa bdag gi slob kyis yang dag par 'phags pa ste de lta go du ngam du bgos nas gang sems can thams cad kyis rna myed pa de bdag gis rnyed par bya'o gang 'phags pa thams cad dang gang theg pa la gsar du zhugs (P: gnas) pa'i byang chub sems dpa' thams cad kyis ma myed pa de bdag gis rnyed par bya'o sbyin pa ni nga'i grogs ma yin gyi nga ni sbyin pa'i grogs so tshul khrims dang bzod pa dang brtson 'grus dang bsam gtan dang shes rab ni nga'i grogs ma yin gyi nga ni de dag gi grogs so nga ni pha rol tu phyin pa rnam kyis hslang bar bya ba ma yin gyi pha rol tu phyin pa rnam ngas bslang bar bya'o de bzhin du bsdus te dge ba'i rtsa ba thams cad la rgyas par shes par bya'o nga ni dge ba'i rtsa ba thams cad kyis bslang bar bya ba ma yin gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba thams cad ngas bslang bar bya'o zhes de lta bu' i chos rnam la grogs med cing nga gcig bu gnyis su med pas rdo rje'i gdan la 'dug nas bdud slob dang bcas pa htul te skad cig ma gcig dang ldan pa'i shes rab kyis bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mttgon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya (P: sangs rgyas) par bya'o </p>	<p><i>Path Traversed Alone (72.2.1–3.3)</i> btsun pa sā ra dva ti bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyis gcig bu bgrod pa'i lam mi zad pa yin te de la gcig bu bgrod pa'i lam gang zhe na gcig bu bgrod pa'i lam la byang chub sems dpa' rnam gzhan gyi dring mi 'jog pa yin te gcig bu bgrod pa'i lam zhes bya ba ni byang chub sems dpa' gcig pu gnyis ma yin zhing grogs med par bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu go cha gyon te bdag gyi brtson 'grus dang mthu dang stobs kyis yongs su gzung ba'i lhag pa'i bsam pas gzhan kyis skabs med par bdag nyid byed cing bdag gi mthu stobs kyis 'phags te des de lta bu'i go cha sra ba bgos nas sems can thams cad gyis yongs su thob par bya ba gang ci yod pa de dag thams cad bdag gis yongs su thob par bya'o gang 'phags pa thams cad dang theg pa la gsar du zhugs pa'i byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyis thob par bya ba la de bdag gis yongs su thob par bya'o sbyin pa ni bdag gi grogs ma yin gyi bdag ni sbyin pa'i grogs so tshul khrims dang bzod pa dang brtson 'grus dang bsam gtan dang shes rab ni bdag gi grogs ma yin gyi bdag ni tshul khrims dang bzod pa dang brtson 'grus dang bsam gtan dang shes rab kyis grogs so bdag la ni pha rol tu phyin pa rnam kyis rim gro mi bya'i bdag gis ni pha rol tu phyin pa rnam la rim gro bya'o bdag la ni bsdu ba'i dngos po rnam kyis rim gror mi bya'i bdag gi ni bsdus ba'i dngos po rnam la rim gro bya'o bdag la ni dge ba'i rtsa ba thams cad kyis rim gror mi bya'i bdag gis ni dge ba'i rtsa ba lham cad la rim gror bya'o gang 'di lta bu' i chos la grogs med par bdag nyid med cing gzhan gyi go skabs med par bdag gcig bu gnyis ma yin zhing grogs med par rdo rjes'i snying po la 'dug ste bdud stobs dang bcas pa rnam btul la sems kyis skad cig gcig dang ldan pa'i shes rab kyis bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar bya'o </p>
---	---

<p><i>Skill in Truth (78.1.1–2.8)</i> de la byang chub sems dpa'i (P: dpa') bden pa la mkhas pa gang zhe na byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa la 'jug pa (P om.: pa) mkhas pa ni rnam par bzhi ste 'di lta ste sdug bsngal shes pa dang kun 'byung ba shes pa dang 'gog pa shes pa dang lam shes pa'o de la sdug bsngal shes pa gang zhe na gang phung po rnam la mi skye bar shes pa de ni sdug bsngal shes pa zhes bya'o de la kun 'byung ba shes pa gang zhe na gang sred pa 'joms pa (shes pa) de ni kun 'byung ba shes pa zhes bya'o de la 'gog pa shes pa gang zhe na gang mi 'byung (ba) mi 'jig par shes pa de ni 'gog pa shes pa zhes bya'o 'de la lam shes pa gang zhe na gang mnyam pa nyid thob pa'i chos rnam la sgro mi 'dogs pa de ni lam shes pa zhes bya'o gang gi tshe byang chub sems dpas bden pa 'di bzhi dag de lta shes rab kyis shes kyang sems can yongs su smin par bya ba'i phyr mngon du mi byed pa de ni bden pa la mkhas pa zhes bya'o gzhan yang bden pa la mkhas pa (ni) rnam pa gsum ste 'di lta ste kun rdzob kyi bden pa dang don dam pa'i bden pa dang mtshan nyid kyi bden pa'o de la kun rdzob kyi bden pa (gang zhe na) 'jig rten gyi tha snyad ji snyed pa dang yi ge dang sgra dang bdrar (P: kun rtog pa) 'chad pa ste de ni kun rdzob kyi bden pa zhes bya'o de la don dam pa'i bden pa gang zhe na gang sems de nyid kyang rab tu mi rgyun yi ge dag lta ci smos te de ni don dam pa'i bden pa zhes bya'o de la mtshan nyid kyi bden pa gang zhe na 'di lta ste mtshan nyid thams cad mtshan nyid gcig la mtshan nyid gcig pa'ang mtshan nyid med pa'o de la byang chub sems dpa' kun rdzob kyi bden pa 'chad pas mi skyo don dam pa'i bden pa mngon du byed par mi ltung mtshan nyid kyi bden pa mtshan nyid med pas rtog pa de ni byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa la mkhas pa zhes bya'o </p>	<p><i>Skill in Truth (53.4.4–54.1.2)</i> de la byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa la mkhas pa gang zhe na 'jug pa bzhi ni byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa la mkhas pa yin te 'jug pa bzhi gang zhe na gang 'di sdug bsngal shes pa dang kun 'byung ba shes pa dang 'gog pa shes pa dang lam shes pa'o de la sdug bsngal shes pa zhes bya ba ni gang phung po rnam ni mi skye bar shes pa'o kun 'byung bashes pa zhes bya ba ni gang sred pa legs par 'joms pa'i shes pa'o 'gog pa shes pa zhes bya ba ni ma rig pa dang bag la nyal ba rnam mi 'byung ba'o lam shes pa zhes bya ba ni mnyam pa nyid du gyur pa'i chos thams cad la sgro mi 'dogs pa ste de ni byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa shes pa'o de la byang chub sems dpa'i 'phags pa'i bden pa bzhi po de dag la de lta bus shes rab dang ye shes kyis rab tu shes kyang sems can la blta ba'i phyr mngon sum du mi byed cing sems can rnam kyang yongs su smin par byed de de ni byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa la mkhas pa zhes bya'o gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa rnam pa gsum ste gsum gang zhe na gang 'di kun rdzob kyi bden pa dang don dam pa'i bden pa dang mtshan nyid kyi bden pa'o de la kun rdzob kyi bden pa gang zhe na 'jig rten gyi tha snyad dang yi ge dang sgra dang brdas bstan pa ji snyed pa'o don dam pa'i bden pa ni gang la sems kyi rgyu med pa ste yi ge lta ci smos mtshan nyid kyi bden pa ni gang 'di mtshan nyid thams cad mtshan nyid gcig pa ste mtshan nyid gcig po yang mtshan nyid med pa'o de la byang chub sems dpa'i kun rdzob kyi bden pa bstan pas kyang yongs su mi skyo don dam pa'i bden pa mngon sum du byed pa yang mi tung mtshan nyid kyi bden pas bden pa gcig tu rtogs kyang sems can rnam kyang yongs su smin par byed de de ni byang chub sems dpa'i bden pa la mkhas pa zhes bya'o </p>
--	---

Skill in Truth (continued)

gzhan yang bden pa ni gcig pu gnyis po
med pa ste | 'di lta ste | 'gog pa'i dben
pa'o || de la bden pa gcig pu la gang sgro
mi 'dogs pa dang | sems can sgro 'dogs
par ltung ba rnams la bden pa sbyor bar
byed pa de ni byang chub sems dpa'i
bden pa la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||

Skill in Feeling (83.2.1–3.2)

tshor bas rtogs pa ni | bde bar 'gur ro ||
tshor bas rtogs pa ni sdug bsngal bar
'gur ro || lde la rtogs pa'i (P: pas) tshor
ba gang zhe na | 'di la bdag gam | sems
can nam | srog gam | gang zag gang du
yang tshor bar (P: rtogs par) byed pa
med do || chags pa ni tshor ba'o || yongs
su 'dzin (P: len) pa ni tshor ba'o || len pa
ni tshor ba'o || phyin ci log rti tshor ba'o
|| rnam par rtog pa ni tshor ba'o || lta ba'i
bag la nyal ba ni tshor ba'o ||

Skill in Truth (continued)

gzhan yang bden pa rnam pa gnyis te | rnam
pa gnyis po gang zhe na | gang 'di tha snyad
kyi bden pa dang | don dam pa'i bden pa'o |
de la tha snyad kyi bden pa ni | dus su bden
par smra ba ste | gang 'di sdug bsnyal gyi
bden pa dang | kun 'byung ba'i bden pa dang
| 'gog pa'i bden pa dang | lam gyi bden pa
dang | 'jig rten gyi tha snyad kyi bden pa
dang | yi ge dang | sgra dang | brdas bstan pa
ji snyed pa'o | don dam pa'i bden pa gang |
'di brdzod pa med pa'i chos can | mya ngan
las 'das paste | de ci'i phyir zhe na | rtag tu
chos kyi de bzhin nyid kyi phyir | de'i rigs ni
rtag pa'i phyir ro || de la byang chub sems
dpa' tha snyad kyi bden pa bstan pas kyang
yongs su mi skyo || don dam pa'i bden pa
mnyon sum du byed par yang mi ltung la
sems can rnams kyang yongs su smin par
byed de | 'di ni byang chub sems dpa' bden
pa la mkhas pa zhes bya'o ||

gzhan yang bden pa ni gcig ste | gnyis su
med do || de la bden pa gcig ni gang 'di chos
thams cad la sgro 'dogs pa med cing sgro
'dogs par ltung ba'i sems can rnams kyang
bden pa la rab tu 'dzud pa'o || de la byang
chub sems dpa'i sgro 'dogs pa'i dben pa
bstan pas kyang mi skyol | sgro 'dogs pa
med pa'i bden pa gcig bstan pa yang mnyon
sum du mi byed cing | sems can rnams
kyang yongs su smin par byed pa 'di ni
byang chub sems dpa' bden pa la mkhas pa
zhes bya'o ||

Skill in Feeling (67.3.1–4.3)

ma rigs pas rtogs pa'i tshor ba ni sdug
bsngal du 'gur || yes shes kyis rtogs pa'i
tshor ba ni bde bar 'gur te | de la ye shes kyis
rtogs pa'i tshor ba ni bde bar 'gyur ba gang
zhe na | 'di la bdag gam | sems can nam |
srog gam | skye pa po 'am | gso ba 'am |
skyes bu 'am | gang zag gam | shed las skyes
sam | shed bu yang rung | bdag gis kyang
tshor bar 'gyur ba med kyi mngon par zhen
pa ni tshor ba'o || yongs su 'dzin pa ni tshor
ba'o || nye par len pa ni tshor ba'o || dmigs
pa ni tshor ba'o || phyin ci log ni tshor ba'o ||
rnam par rtog pa ni tshor ba'o || lta ba'i (P:
dang) bag la nyal ba ni tshor ba'o ||

Skill in Feeling (continued)

mig tu 'du shes pa tshor ba nas | yid kyi
bar du 'du shes pa ni tshor ba'o || gzugs
su 'du shes pa tshor ba nas | chos su (P:
kyi) 'du shes pa'i bar du ni tshor ba'o ||
gang mig gi 'dus te reg pa'i rkyen las
byung ba'i tshor ba bde ba 'am | sdug
bsngal ba 'am | bde ba'ang ma yin | sdug
bsngal ba yang ma yin pa'i bar dude ni
tshor ba zhes bya'o || de bzhin du sbyar
te | nang dang phyi'i chos rnams kyi bar
dang yid kyi 'dus te reg pa'i rkyen las
byung ba'i tshor ba bde ba 'am | sdug
bsngal ba 'am | bde ba yang ma yin |
sdug bsngal ba yang ma yin pa'i bar du
ni tshor zhes bya'o ||
gzhan yang rnam grangs su tshor ba gcig
ste | de ni (P: gcig ni 'di lta ste; and
below) sems gcig pus rnam par rig pa'o
|| tshor ba gnyis te | (de ni) phyi dang
nang gi'o || tshor ba gsum ste | (de ni)
'das pa rnam par rig pa dang | ma ongs
ba'i rnam par rig pa dang | da ltar byung
ba (P om.: byung ba) rnam par rig pa'o ||
tshor ba bzhi ste | de ni khams bzhi rnam
par rig pa'o || tshor ba lnga ste | de ni
phung po lnga yid la byed pa'o || tshor
ba drug ste | de ni skye mched drug
yongs su rtog pa'o || tshor ba bdun te | de
ni rnam par shes pa gnas pa bdun no ||
tshor ba brgyad de | de ni log par ngcs
pa'i sbyor ba brgyad de || tshor ba dgu
ste | de ni sems can gyi gnas dgu'o ||
tshor ba bcu ste | de ni dge ba bcu' i las
kyi lam rnams mo ||
de bzhin du sbyar te | thams cad ni tshor
ba ste (P: reverse order) | dmigs pa ji
snyed pa dang | yid la byed pa ji snyed
pa de thams cad yin par rig par bya ste ||
de bas na sems can tshad med pa'i tshor
ba tshad med pa zhes bya'o ||

Skill in Feeling (continued)

mig tu 'du shes pa ni tshor ba'o || de bzhin
du rna ba dang | snad dang ltsc dang | us
dang | yid du 'du shes pa ni tshor ba'o ||
gzugs su 'du shes pa ni tshor ba'o || de bzhin
du sgra dang dri dang ro dang reg bya dang
chos su 'du shes pa ni tshor ba'o || gang
yang mig dang gzugs 'dus te reg pa'i rkyen
las skyes pa'i bde ba 'di rung || sdug bsngal
ba yang rung | bde ba yang ma yin | sdug
bsngal ba yang ma yin pa yang rung ste de ni
tshor ba zhes bya'o ||
de bzhin du rna ba dang sgrar 'dus te reg
pa'i rkyen dang | sna dang drir 'dus te reg
pa'i rkyen dang | ltse dang ror 'dus te reg
pa'i rkyen dang | lus dang reg byar 'dus te
reg pa'i rkyen dang | gang yang yid dang
chos su 'dus te reg pa'i rkyen las byung ba'i
tshor ba bde ba yang rung | sdug bsngal ba
yang rung | bde ba yang ma yin | sdug bsngal
ba yang ma yin pa yang rung ste 'di ni tshor
ba zhes bya'o || gzhan yang rnam grangs su
na tshor ba ni gcig bu kho na ste | gang 'di
sems kyi rnam par rig pa'o || tshor ba gnyis
te | gang 'di nang dang phyi'o || tshor ba
gsum ste | gang 'di 'das pa rnam par rig pa
dang | ma ongs ba rnam par rig pa dang | da
ltar byung ba rnam par rig pa'o || tshor ba
bzhi sle | gang 'di khams bzhi rnam par rig
pa'o || tshor ba lnga ste | gang 'di phung po
lnga yid la byed pa'o || tshor ba drug ste |
gang 'di skye mched drug yongs su rtog pa'o
|| tshor ba bdun te | gang 'di rnam par shes
pa gnas pa bdun no || tshor ba brgyad de |
gang 'di log pa'i sbyor ba brgyad do || tshor
ba dgu ste | gang 'di sems can gyi gnas
dgu'o || tshor ba bcu ste | gang 'di mi (sic)
dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam rnams mo ||
'di ni tshor ba kun gyi tshul te | dmigs pa ji
snyed pa de snyed du yid la byed do || ji
snyed du yid la byed pa de snyed du yongs
su rtog pa'o || ji snyed du yongs su rtog pa
de snyed du tshor baste | de'i phyir na sems
can tshad med rnams kyi tshor ba tshad med
pa zhes bya'o ||