## The body in Buddhist tantric yoga (1)

### Handout

# September 15th, 2016 Sanskrit Texts on Yoga Workshop

Harunaga Isaacson (Hamburg)

- I. Plausible (?) *pūrvapakṣa*: The body is of (virtually) no importance in tantric Buddhist yoga. Yoga is purely mental. For:
- IA. Yoga is commonly defined as/equated with  $bh\bar{a}van\bar{a}$ , implying that it is chiefly or entirely mental (activity of  $citta/vij\tilde{n}\bar{a}na$  rather than of the body), and associating it with insight/wisdom ( $praj\tilde{n}\bar{a}$ ), since that is said to be of three types, the highest of which is  $bh\bar{a}van\bar{a}may\bar{\imath}$   $praj\tilde{n}\bar{a}$ . And it is  $bh\bar{a}van\bar{a}/bh\bar{a}van\bar{a}may\bar{\imath}$   $praj\tilde{n}\bar{a}$  (alone) which is directly soteriologically effective. Cf. e.g.:

śrutam asati na bodhe nāśrute cāsti cintā dvayavipadi na yogo yogahānau na siddhiḥ || iti ciram iha tantre tāpam utkaṇṭhitānāṃ haratu hrdi nibaddhā hanta muktāvalīyam || 1

For  $praj\tilde{n}\bar{a}$  as alone directly soteriologically effective see e.g.

muktis tu śūnyatādṛṣṭes tadarthā śeṣabhāvanā|²

or

imam parikaram sarvam prajñārtham hi munir jagau tasmād utpādayet prajñām duḥkhanirvṛtikāṅkṣayā||³

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The sixth opening verse of Ratnākaraśānti's *Muktāvalī*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārttika* Pramāṇasiddhi 255cd; quoted by several tantric authorities, including Advayavajra/Maitreyanātha and Vilāsavajra.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Śāntideva, *Bodhicaryāvatāra* 9.1; the first three pādas are quoted in Samantabhadra's *Sāramañjarī* (edition by Péter-Dániel Szántó forthcoming).

IB. The importance of mind and body respectively is comparable to that of a wish-fulfilling jewel and a heap of garbage:

kāyopakaraṇavyāsaṅgināṃ dīrghaduṣkaradānādicaryaikasādhanāṃ ca bodhiṃ manyamānānāṃ bodhau protsāhanāya saṃkārakūṭopamaḥ kāyo narāṇāṃ cittaṃ tu cintāmaṇiprakhyam iti khyāpayitum āha ...  $^4$ 

IC. The (ordinary) body is often taught as being/having to be removed, i.e. dissolved, through meditation, into emptiness, in the preliminaries of tantric yoga/sād-hana. E.g.:

... jñānālokavajrasamādhiyogena prākṛtaśarīrābhāvaṃ dṛṣṭvā ... <sup>5</sup>

## ID. Philosophical underpinning.

The fact that the philosophical/theoretical basis of Buddhist tantric yoga is, for the overwhelming majority of teachers (perhaps without exception), either Yogācāra or Madhyamaka, might also be taken by the *pūrvapakṣin* to support the position that the body, or at least the 'ordinary' body, is of much less importance than the mind. Within the Yogācāra fold, the *nirākāra* or *alīkākāra* view, appears to have been more widely held by tantric teachers, and this too might be taken as supporting the *pūrvapakṣa*.

II. Siddhānta: The yogin's body as essential means to gaining awakening/Buddhahood.

IIA.

From a commentary on the  $Vyavasthol\bar{\iota}$  of Nāgabuddhi, explaining the word  $s\bar{\iota} k smayog\bar{a}rthatattvaj na$  (in a quotation in the  $Vyavasthol\bar{\iota}$  from the  $Sandhy\bar{a}-vy\bar{a}karanatantra$ ):

tathāgatebhyo 'nyeṣām ūhāpagatatvāt sūkṣmaṃ samyaksambodhihetubhūtaṃ yoginaḥ śarīram, tad eva vairocanādibhir yujyata iti yogaḥ, arthyata ity arthaḥ, aviparītatvāt tattvaṃ; taj jānātīti tajjñaḥ.

 $<sup>^4</sup>$ Ratnākaraśānti's *avataraṇikā* to the first verse of the *Sarvarahasyatantra* in his commentary *Rahaḥpradīpa* on that scripture.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Rāhulagupta's *Hevajraprakāśa* (quoted from draft edition by Torsten Gerloff.

IIB. The case of sexual yoga: merely imagined union (yoga = samāpatti), with an imagined/meditatively produced consort, is not sufficiently effective.

A statement of our pūrvapakṣa:

Another consequence of sahaja's dissociation from the physical would be found with the complete interiority of the practice, so that no longer any physical partner (karmamudrā) would be needed or even desirable. Instead, the real goddess – whose form is gnosis – will be invited as a gnostic partner (jñānamudrā). An excellent example of this direction is found in Ratnākaraśānti's Sahajayogakrama, where the good monk discusses a practice only marginally out of place in the secluded halls of the monastery.

Davidson 2002, 67.6

What the 'good monk' actually taught is however different. See e.g.:

asyām bhāvanāyām adhikṛto vīraḥ kvacid ekākī rahogata āsane niṣadya svabhāvaśuddhāḥ sarvadharmā iti niścityātmānam herukarūpam adhimucya manasā kāmcid ānīya nirātmikām tām adhimucya kakkole bolavilāsam yadi vā bolabile svanābhihṛdayād avatīrṇaprajñopāyavilāsam bhāvayan bhāvanābalena paramārtham abhimukhīkuryāt.

ayam ca yogo 'vasthābhedāc caturdhā bhavati—meghopamo māyopamaḥ svapnopamaḥ svapnajāgaropamaś ceti. prāk siddher meghopamas tanumeghacchannapūrṇacandravad aparisphuṭatvāt. siddhau māyopamo manonirmitavidyābalena vyaktam udayāt. tataḥ svapnopamo bolākṣarayogabalena yoganidrāgatasya sahasotpatteḥ. tadanu svapnajāgaropamaḥ. kathaṃ jāgaropamaḥ? bahirvidyāyogajanitatvāt. kathaṃ svapnopamaḥ? svaparayor anupalambhāt. ete ca yathottaraṃ viśiṣyante, pūrvapūrvabalād uttarottaraniṣpatteḥ. katham antimaḥ sarvottaraḥ? saty api vikṣepahetāv atyantasamāhitatvāt samagrasamayatvāc ceti.<sup>7</sup>

#### And:

mudrāyogī adhikṛtabāhyavidyāsaṃyuktaḥ. ... vidyāpuruṣasiddhiś ca mahāmudrāsiddhir iti nāsau kulavidyayā vinā syāt. prathamasamādhitraye tu sā nesyate, tadānīm viksepakāranatvāt tasyāh.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Ronald Davidson: Reframing *Sahaja*: Genre, Representation, Ritual and Lineage. In: JIPh 30 (2002), 45–83.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>From Ratnākaraśānti's *Hevajrasahajasadyoga*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Ratnākaraśānti's *Muktāvalī* ad *Hevajratantra* I.x.20.

IIC. Philosophical underpinning.

The basic mistake of the assumptions of ID.: cultivation of  $praj\tilde{n}\bar{a}$  alone can only result in an inactive state of freedom from rebirth, not in the  $apratisthitanirv\bar{a}na$  that is the goal of Mahāyāna Buddhism, both non-tantric and tantric. See e.g. the long excursus, with a  $p\bar{u}rvapakṣa$  that is close to our  $p\bar{u}rvapakṣa$  of I and with an answer to that, in Ratnākaraśānti's  $Mukt\bar{a}val\bar{\iota}$  on the first chapter of the first kalpa of the Hevajratantra. The idea of the union/identity of the two truths, conventional and ultimate, is also relevant.

IID. Without a body ...

dehābhāve kutah saukhyam?9

From Ratnākaraśānti's commentary on the first chapter of the *Hevajratantra*, explaining the name of the chapter, *vajrakulapaṭala*:

sahajamajājñānarūpo hevajra eva vajras tasya kulam gṛham yoginaḥ svadeho yasya tathaiva yad bhāvanam tad iha vajrakulālambanatvād vajrakulam ucyate. taddyotakaḥ paṭalo vajrakulapaṭalaḥ.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>*Hevajratantra* II.ii.35a.