

SELECTED CHAPTERS FROM THE
CATUṢPĪṬHATANTRA

(1/2) Introductory study with the annotated
translation of selected chapters

Péter-Dániel Szántó
Balliol College

December 16, 2012

Acknowledgements

I first came across the *Catuspīṭha* during a visit to Oxford in 2005. Dr. Somadeva VASUDEVA (then editor of the Clay Sanskrit Library, now at Kyoto University) kindly allowed me to consult and copy some of the digitized manuscripts he kept in his office. One of these was the sole available ms. of the *Raktayamāritantra* which subsequently became the topic of my M.A. dissertation at ELTE, Budapest. Among many other valuable mss. there was the Cambridge palm-leaf ms. of the *Catuspīṭha* (ms. C herein). My preliminary forays into the text left me perplexed but also excited. If an old ms. is so corrupt – I thought somewhat naively – then the tantra must be quite old. Only later did I realize that I stumbled across the text that can assuredly claim the title of ‘work written in the worst-ever Sanskrit’ if there ever were such a competition. I spent the best part of the next six years studying the text and the literature in its environs and I still cannot claim that the work I am about to present is anything more than a preliminary inroad into the murky and mercurial world of mediaeval Tantric Buddhist literature in general and the *Catuspīṭha* in particular.

The reason for starting this introduction somewhat anecdotally is to point out what is merely the fountainhead of a large number of individuals that graciously helped me during my studies. First and foremost I would like to thank Prof. Alexis SANDERSON (All Souls College) for supervising this thesis. The ways in which he helped me are numerous. First, we spent many hours of term-time reading through my preliminary edition which directly or indirectly bears his mark at almost every step. Second, he shared his research material and vast expertise in both Śaiva and Buddhist lore and beyond with the greatest generosity. However, the most valuable way in which he helped was by example: how to tackle a corpus and a text, how to ask questions, and how to present the possible answers in a scholarly way. I have received constant encouragement, invaluable suggestions, and priceless research materials from Prof. Harunaga ISAACSON (Universität Hamburg). His dedication to the subject was and is a constant source of inspiration. Indeed, it was due to meeting him in 2003 that I finally decided to choose Vajrayāna as my main area of research. I am grateful to Prof. Francesco SFERRA (l’Orientale Napoli) for his interest in this work and the various ways he helped to move it further towards completion. Mr. Iain SINCLAIR’s name should probably figure on every second page in the introduction; his impressive knowledge of primary and secondary sources provided me with indispensable pieces of information. Dr.

Ryugen TANEMURA, Dr. Kenichi KURANISHI, Dr. Kazuo KANO, Dr. Kengo HARIMOTO, Mr. Jason BIRCH, and Mr. Daniel STENDER were all examples of generosity and interlocutors in many stimulating and informative conversations. Mr. Art ENGLE and Mr. Ritesh BANSAL provided me with research tools without which this thesis would be much poorer. I thank Dr. Csaba KISS for his help with both scholarly and technical matters. The layout of the edition is based on his vast knowledge of L^AT_EX typesetting. My studies were generously supported by the Clarendon Fund, the Boden Fund (with special thanks to Prof. Christopher MINKOWSKI), and Merton College. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family and in particular Dr. Bihani SARKAR (now Universität Hamburg). The ways in which she helped me, both directly and indirectly, are quite simply too manifold to list here or elsewhere. If it were permissible to dedicate a thesis the page would bear her name.

All remaining errors are of course entirely mine. I can apologize for these only with the words of a late author, Rāhulagupta:¹

*aparādhō 'yam alpatvāt kṣantavyo viduṣāṃ mama /
vikṣepo 'pi hi bālasya tanoty eva mudam guroḥ //*

¹The source is the last folio of the Kathmandu ms. of the *Vajrācāryanayottama* or a work closely related to that text (NGMPP E 290/12).

Contents

1	Prologue	6
2	Introductory study	18
2.1	A word on approach and method	18
2.2	Previous scholarship on the Catuspīṭha	19
2.3	Title, structure, taxonomical position	25
2.4	Brief outline of contents and the presumed target audience . .	32
2.5	Early attestations of the Catuspīṭha	35
2.5.1	Nepal 1012 CE	36
2.5.2	Dunhuang ~ 977 CE	36
2.5.3	Sumatra ~ 1012 CE (?)	37
2.5.4	Sri Lanka ~ early 10th c.	38
2.5.5	Jayabhadra	40
2.5.6	Jñānagarbha	41
2.5.7	Bhavyakīrti (I)	42
2.5.8	The Vajradāka	48
2.5.9	The Sampuṭa	49
2.6	Peculiarities of the Catuspīṭha	54
2.6.1	Stylistic	54
2.6.2	Iconographic	55
2.6.3	Doctrinal and ritual	57
2.6.4	Linguistic	60
2.7	Sites of study and worship	67
3	The literature of the Catuspīṭha	73
3.1	Scriptural	73
3.1.1	The Catuspīṭha	73
3.1.2	The *Mantrāṃśa	89

3.1.3	The *Vyākhyātantra	89
3.1.4	The Yogāmbārīprabheda	91
3.1.5	The Yogāmbaramahātāntra	94
3.2	Exegetical	95
3.2.1	Lost exegesis	95
3.2.2	The Nibandha of Bhavabhaṭṭa	97
3.2.3	The Pañjikā of Kalyāṇavarman	115
3.2.4	The Mitapadā of Durjayacandra	119
3.3	The initiation manuals	123
3.3.1	The Caryāvratīpāda recension	125
3.3.2	The Āryadeva recension	145
3.3.3	The proto-maṇḍalopāyikā	147
3.3.4	The Mantroddhārapañjikā (anonymous)	147
3.4	Satellite texts	152
3.4.1	The Catuspīṭhasādhanaśaṃkṣepa (anonymous)	153
3.4.2	The *Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā of Āryadeva	154
3.4.3	The *Catuspīṭhasādhanopāyikā of Āryadeva	159
3.4.4	The *Jñāneśvarīsādhana of Āryadeva	160
3.4.5	The *Vajraghaṇṭāpūjākrama of Āryadeva	161
3.4.6	The *Kakṣapuṭa of Nāgārjuna	161
3.4.7	The *Catuspīṭhasādhanopāyikā of Bhavabhaṭṭa	162
3.4.8	The *Catuspīṭhajalahoma of Bhava	163
3.4.9	The Catuspīṭhacatustattva of Jitāri	165
3.4.10	The *Ṣaṭtattvavyavasthāna of Smṛtijñānakīrti	168
3.4.11	The *Jñānaḍākinīsādhana of Abhayākaragupta	168
3.4.12	The Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā of Amitavajra	170
3.4.13	The Yogāmbarasādhanavidhi of Jagadānandajīvabhadra	173
3.4.14	The Kalpasādhana (anonymous) with fragments	178
3.4.15	The Ratnamālā (anonymous) with fragments	181
3.4.16	Selected Nepalese Works	186
3.4.17	Selected Tibetan Works	187
3.4.18	Works compiled or copied by Amṛtānanda for B. H. Hodgson	189

5	Annotated translation of selected sub-chapters with synopses of sub-chapters falling outside the selection	198
5.1	Annotated translation of vv. 1.1.1-8 with a synopsis of 1.1.9-105	199
5.2	Annotated translation of 1.2	208
5.3	Annotated translation of 1.3	243
5.4	Annotated translation of 1.4	252
5.5	Synopsis of 2.1.1-105 with an annotated translation of 2.1.106-111	271
5.6	Synopsis of 2.2	278
5.7	Annotated translation of 2.3	283
5.8	Synopsis of 2.4	357
5.9	Synopsis of 3.1	367
5.10	Synopsis of 3.2	374
5.11	Annotated translation of 3.3	380
5.12	Synopsis of 3.4	411
5.13	Annotated translation of 4.1	417
5.14	Synopsis of 4.2	450
5.15	Synopsis of 4.3.1-33 & 56-75 with an annotated translation of 4.3.34-55	454
5.16	Synopsis of 4.4	471

Chapter 1

Prologue

In order to avoid awkward and inconvenient cross-referencing, in the present prologue I shall present a brief outline of my research. The statements made here are not substantiated, since the points raised are discussed later on in greater depth. The role of the prologue is thus that of a snapshot: it is meant to introduce the reader to the topic, the sources, the protagonists, and the problems concerning the study of the *Catuṣpīṭha* in a condensed way.

The *Catuṣpīṭha* is a Buddhist Tantric scripture (*tantra*). Quite soon after its inception it was regarded as a *yoginītantra*, although the earliest authority writing on the subject, a rather nebulous Āryadeva, still seems to refer to it as both a *mahāyogatantra* and a *yoginītantra*. The *yoginītantras* constitute the latest stream of revelations within Indian Tantric Buddhism, but it can be determined with relative certainty that within this latest stream the *Catuṣpīṭha* is one of the earliest products. This text and its related literature which could be loosely termed as the *Catuṣpīṭha*-cycle has thus far received little scholarly attention, certainly less than it deserves.

The complete text of the *Catuṣpīṭha* survives in several incomplete manuscripts. For the edition I have used five, of which three are old palm-leaf mss. from Nepal. Of the remaining two paper mss. (also Nepalese) one is a copy of an old ms. which is no longer available to us, whereas the other is its apograph. I have also traced and used five palm-leaf fragments. The *tantra* has been translated into Tibetan by Gayādhara and Khug pa lhas btsas of the 'Gos clan sometime in the eleventh century. Perhaps mistakenly some Tibetan authorities maintain that there was another, earlier translation by Smṛtijñānakīrti.

The name of the *tantra* is somewhat misleading. It does not refer to *pīṭhas*

as sacred sites chiefly associated with goddesses. In the present instance *pīṭha* simply means ‘assembly’ or ‘collection’ of sub-chapters called *paṭalas*. To borrow the title of several books circulating in mediaeval Europe, *Catuspīṭha* here simply means *Quadripartitum*.¹ Each of the four *pīṭhas* bears a separate name, and each is divided into four sub-chapters of varying length, averaging at about 80 verses per sub-chapter. In total, the text is of a middling size among its counterparts, the *yoginītantras*. There was a tradition, although this is not substantiated by the main body of the text, that the present *tantra* is merely an abridged version of a much larger *Ur-tantra*.

Despite some peculiarities, content-wise the text teaches what we would expect from a *tantra* of its kind. The focal point of practice is a pantheon of thirteen goddesses headed by Jñānaḍākinī. The goddesses, whose forms and ways of propitiation are taught in reasonable detail, are arranged into a *maṇḍala*. Propitiation and yogic practice can be taught only to those who have obtained initiation (*abhiṣeka*) into the cult from a qualified officiant. Once initiated, the practitioner (*yogin*) can undertake a wide variety of procedures, ranging from rainmaking and divination to sexual practices and consciously leaving the body. These procedures consist of ritual acts coupled with complex visualizations, in other words eidetic meditation (*bhāvanā*).² Some of the rites are what may be termed antinomian: they employ substances and procedures considered impure by brahmanical standards. The aim of trespassing into the impure is to realize the insubstantiality of the very distinction between pure and impure. In other words, the point is to transcend all sorts of dichotomies and abide in a state of non-duality. This is the main doctrinal message of the text. All in all it can be said that the *Catuspīṭha* is a closed and self-sufficient system, providing both the specialist and the client with ample religious material to consider and put to use from the time of initiation until the time of death.

Since the text itself claims to be scripture, or more precisely a revelation,

¹E.g. a standard manual of astrology attributed to Ptolemy, the *Quadripartitum* (from the Greek Τετράβιβλος); a judicial book, the *Quadripartitum - Opus Juris Consuetudinarii Regni Hungariae* commissioned by Ferdinand I, etc.

²I borrow the term eidetic (from the Greek εἶδος, form, ultimately a derivate of the root cognate with Skt. √*vid*) from modern psychology. Persons claiming to have eidetic memory can recall images with unusual vividness, and those suffering from eidetic hallucination see images as if they were present. I am not of course implying that Tantric Buddhist practitioners had such conditions, but it is quite clear the detailed images of deities, mantras, etc. had to be cultivated until some degree of vividness was obtained.

it is understandable that the redactors³ would have been careful not to leave marks pointing to the spacial and temporal conditions in which it was born. We must therefore look to external evidence for placing and dating the text. For this we must examine the associate literature consisting of other *tantras*, commentaries, ritual manuals, and Tibetan translations where available. The size of this literature may also point to the degree of influence that the *Catuspīṭha* may have had. Furthermore, it is essentially from this literature that we can gain some understanding how exactly the roughly delineated revelations of the *tantra* were put into use.

The earliest such text after the *tantra* itself is an initiation manual simply called the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. The recension history of this text is rather complex, as the text had at least three stabilized versions. The first, the version I call the proto-*Maṇḍalopāyikā* is a more or less postulated entity. This version simply provided further detail on how the initiation rite was to be conducted, introducing a series of rites not taught in the *tantra* and some new terminology. A subsequent version became responsible for thoroughly reshaping the pantheon of the cult, going as far as to replace the main female deity of the cult, Jñānaḍākinī, with a male consort, Yogāmbara. Eventually the text proved so influential that it practically overtook the role of the *Catuspīṭha* itself as the main pseudo-scripture of the cult.

Probably parallel with the proto-*Maṇḍalopāyikā* there existed some exegesis of the text, but this can be ascertained only from vague references by other commentators. The two earliest commentators whose works did survive up to this day are the *Pañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman (probably a Nepalese) and the *Nibandha* of Bhavabhaṭṭa (most likely a Bengali). The two seem to have worked independently of each other. They must have been roughly contemporary, although there is some circumstantial evidence to the effect that Kalyāṇavarman was somewhat earlier. Both these authors already had knowledge of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* for they restructure their teachings on initiation exactly along the lines proposed by that text. But they still do not have any knowledge of Yogāmbara, it should therefore be inferred that what they knew was the non-Yogāmbara proto-*Maṇḍalopāyikā*.

Kalyāṇavarman's *Pañjikā* survives in a single, very early, but rather cor-

³I am very much aware that my terminology when it comes to scriptural production is destined for failure. For this reason it should be kept in mind that I use 'redactor', 'compiler', 'author' and the Plural of these words as synonyms. We might be talking about one person, a small group, or many people, male, less likely, but not impossibly, female, working together or independently of each other, or any combination of the above.

rupt manuscript in Nepal. The date of this ms., 1012 CE, is the earliest solid evidence we have for dating the individual items of the *Catuspīṭha* cycle. The commentary is incomplete. It does not touch on the fourth and last *pīṭha*, but a lemma from the beginning proves that the author did know of the entire text. The *Pañjikā* was translated into Tibetan by the famous Smṛti-jñānakīrti, who not only translated the text, but also ‘completed’ it with his own commentary on the last four sub-chapters. What we have thus is a rare example of a kind of joint authorship in Tantric Buddhist literature, as well as a possible example of a South Asian writing directly in Tibetan. As far as I can tell, Kalyāṇavarman’s commentary did not prove extremely influential, although one of his verses was borrowed for use in Nepalese Buddhist daily worship and there was at least one author who claimed to have upheld his lineage.

By far the most influential commentator was Bhavabhaṭṭa. The best ms. of his *Nibandha* almost certainly hails from Vikramaśīla, where according to Tibetan authorities he held high office. Some features of his commentary and a passage from another of his works shows almost beyond doubt that he was an East Indian, very likely from what is now the Bardhaman-Birbhum region of West Bengal. Two further palm-leaf mss. in old Newar script, as well as a joint transmission of the *tantra*, the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, and the *Nibandha* in several paper mss. shows that the work was highly important in Nepal. One of the most influential subsequent high dignitaries of Vikramaśīla, Abhayākaragupta, borrows large swathes of the *Nibandha*, pointing to the fact that roughly two centuries after its composition Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary was still considered authoritative.

In fact, without the *Nibandha* our understanding of the *Catuspīṭha* would be considerably poorer. For Bhavabhaṭṭa not only conscientiously attempts the impossible by explaining or simply trying to give some meaning to almost every statement of the highly elusive *tantra*, but he also cites the text in long lemmata. The *mūla* frozen in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s *pratīkas* are in my view the best transmission of the *tantra* that we have, and the closest that we will ever get to an old recension. It is for this reason that my edition is essentially an attempt to restore a text that was close to what Bhavabhaṭṭa may have read, and it is for this reason that I edit his commentary along with the *mūla*. Given the linguistic peculiarity of the text, restoring anything ‘earlier’ or more plausible than this is simply impossible with the material that we have. However, this is not to say that I agree with everything that Bhavabhaṭṭa conveys as the ‘meaning’ of the text, since I do not think that

there was any organic transmission between the original redactors and what they may have thought that their text means and the exegete. As it becomes all too evident reading the *Nibandha*, Bhavabhaṭṭa is often just as much in the dark as we are, and his not always informed guess is just as good as any. Indeed, watching as it were the exegete at work is for the most part much more interesting from a scholarly viewpoint than what he actually says. I believe that my notes to the translation provide ample testimony for this observation.

The *Nibandha* was also translated into Tibetan, a co-production of the famous pair Gayādhara and Lhas btsas of the 'Gos, who were also responsible for the translation of the *tantra*. Unusually for the Tibetan Canon, it is not a word for word translation, but rather an enlarged and sometimes very free rendering of the *Nibandha*. To my knowledge there is no evidence to the effect that the *Nibandha* was ever circulated in such a recension, since the ms. evidence we have shows a very unitary transmission. It must therefore be assumed that the Tibetan text was the product of the translators' taking licence with the commentary.

The latest of the Sanskrit commentators is another important figure of late Tantric Buddhism, probably once another high officiant of Vikramaśīla, and very likely a Bengali. Durjayacandra's work, the *Mitapadā pañjikā* survives in a high-quality but incomplete Nepalese ms. and a modern apograph thereof. The work itself is also not complete: just like Kālyāṇavarman, Durjayacandra stops short of commenting on the last *pīṭha*. Two commentators stopping at the same locus may normally give rise to some doubt, but in this case this is very likely a simple coincidence. The *Mitapadā* has not been translated into Tibetan, and there are no signs that Tibetans ever knew about it. For that matter, there is only one very slight piece of evidence that the work was known and read in Nepal after the old copy had been prepared. Although perhaps the most learned of the three commentaries, Durjayacandra's text seems to have been also the least influential. This is rather curious, since the author himself was very famous and as such figures in many lineage lists. The reason why I assume that he is the latest of the three is because for Durjayacandra it is a matter of course that the main deity of the *tantra* is Yogāmbara, although in the surviving part of the commentary he never tackles the curious fact that the *Catuṣpīṭha* never actually mentions that deity.

Among the satellite texts of the *Catuṣpīṭha*-cycle there are three or four that merit special attention. The first of these, the *Mantroddhārapañjikā* is

an incomplete learned commentary on a section of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. The author is anonymous. From the date of the earlier ms. we can ascertain that he must have lived before 1153 CE. The most significant feature of this work, beyond the fact that it throws much light on the transmission history of the initiation manual, is that it seeks to link the *Catuṣpīṭha* revelation to the Ārya-school of the *Guhyasamāja* exegesis. This very important commentary has escaped the attention of Tibetans. The second is a partial, *vārtika*-style commentary on a *mantra* taught in the main text for the *bali*-offering.⁴ I reconstruct the title as **Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā*. The authorship is attributed to an Āryadeva. This work accentuates the parallel between the said *mantra* and its probable source, the *Nīśisaṃcāra*.⁵ The most significant of the *sādhana*-manuals, to judge from the number of surviving mss., is the *Yogāmbarasādhana-vidhi* of a Newar Buddhist, Jagadānanda-jīvabhadra (*fl.* 14th c. CE). As far as I can tell, whatever survives of ritual practices based on the *Catuṣpīṭha* in contemporary Nepal is based on this manual. This manual became so influential that at some point it was even enshrined in scripture thus becoming the second text to assume the role of the root-*tantra* itself: the second, ‘practical’ half of the *Yogāmbaramahātantra*, a scripture transmitted exclusively in Nepal, is practically the same as Jagadānanda-jīvabhadra’s work. This *sādhana*-text can be interpreted as the descendant of another manual, the *Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā* of Amitavajra, which was probably authored in Bengal in the early eleventh century. All these works, with the exception of the *Yogāmbaramahātantra*, have a Tibetan translation. The remaining literature, some of it not translated into Tibetan, provides crucial pieces of evidence only very rarely, but these texts will be discussed nevertheless, as well as those in the Tibetan Canon, the originals of which have not (yet) been traced.

Although a high percentage of *Catuṣpīṭha* texts has been transmitted to Tibet from the very beginning of the Later Diffusion (*phyi dar*) onwards, the cult never attained anything more than a secondary role in that country. The only author to dedicate greater attention to the *tantra* and its rites was the encyclopaedic author Bo dong Phyogs las rnam rgyal (1376-1451), who amongst other works wrote a commentary of his own to the *mūla*. According to my knowledge no contemporary Tibetan practitioner assumes either

⁴This *mantra*, as first pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson, has Śaiva antecedents, probably the *Nīśisaṃcāra/Nīśāṭana*.

⁵As pointed out below, Āryadeva’s work shows close parallels with an exegetical passage in that Śaiva text.

Yogāmbara or Jñānaḍākinī as their main tutelary deity.

The situation is very different in the Kathmandu valley, where institutionalized, public, and private worship of both deities is still current. Yogāmbara is the *āgam*-deity of several Newar monasteries, including the important Kwā bāhā (better known as the Golden Temple) of Lalitpur. Jñānaḍākinī still retains some supremacy over her male consort at the Mhaypi shrine in Kathmandu, and she is regarded by some as the ‘mother’ of one of the most important Buddhist deities of the Valley, the red Avalokiteśvara (Buṅga dyah). She is also worshipped simultaneously as the Hindu goddess Annapūrṇā at a small but popular shrine in the heart of Newar Kathmandu. Although the study of the *Catuṣpīṭha* was once institutionalized in Bengal, nothing remains of the cult in that region except the manuscript evidence.

With a textual corpus of this size, the *Catuṣpīṭha* would count as a cycle of middling importance among the *yoginītantras*. It certainly seems to have been more important than the *Vajrāmṛta*, the *Buddhakaṭāla*, the *Aralli* tantras, the *Khasama*, and the *Mahāmāyā*, but not even close to the size and influence of the *Śaṃvara* and the *Hevajra* cycles. Nevertheless, our *tantra* proved influential exactly through the *Śaṃvara* cycle, since an overwhelming number of *Śaṃvara* scriptures lift over some *Catuṣpīṭha* material, the amount varying from a few stanzas to more than two hundred verses worth of text per scripture.

The most noteworthy among these are the *Vajradāka* and the *Samputa*, most likely tenth-century East Indian products, but also the *Ḍākārṇava* and the *Samvarodaya*, scriptures that are relatively late and probably of Nepalese origin. What exactly the editors of the said scriptures sought to achieve by borrowing from the *Catuṣpīṭha* and why certain passages were adopted and not others, is a question that I am unable to answer for the time being. But the act of borrowing cannot be denied and nor can the fact that the editors at work already found some of the *Catuṣpīṭha* passages puzzling. These they either sought to replace with something more intelligible and/or more in line with their own doctrines, or very simply left out.

I have already alluded to the peculiar language of the text. Indeed, this is the most outstanding feature of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The ‘Sanskrit’ of this scripture is not the Aiśa register of the language, it is not the sloppily edited language of *Śaṃvara* texts such as the *Herukābhidhāna*, and it is not Sanskrit written by a person thinking in Middle Indic. In fact, it is all these and much more, a *sui generis* register of the language. Commentators are hard-pressed to hide their embarrassment in face of what is sometimes referred

to as ‘barbaric Sanskrit’ (*mlecchabhāṣā*). Others on the other hand, such as the first authority to lend a name to a text of the cycle, Āryadeva, embraced it and sought to emulate it in their own writing. The author/editor of the *Catupīṭha* was very much grounded in the Indic world, and we have no special reason to suspect that he was an outsider. Here arguably every single rule of Pāṇinian grammar is violated, and it is done so without any apparent system. In other words, according to my examination there is no ‘method in the madness’. Beyond standard features of Aiśa Sanskrit, genders, cases, and numbers are conflated freely and very often, conjugation is almost non-existent, words are truncated at will, and syntax is almost absent. There are several *hapax legomena*, in the sense that there are some terms that are used only in this cycle, and sometimes only in the *tantra*. Indeed, the only regularity we seem to come across (but this is also not universally valid) is some sort of sense of propriety regarding the metre. The statistically improbable irregular usage as well as the idiosyncratic terminology in my view points to the fact that the unique register of Sanskrit employed in the *Catupīṭha* is not the result of the author’s unfamiliarity with the language, but rather that of a conscious effort.

We may only guess what the intention behind this project was. What immediately comes to mind as probable reason, and there is some corroboration for this in the exegetical literature, is an effort to guard the secrets revealed in the text even from those who might chance to come across it. The second best guess would be a more philosophical intention: transgressing the rules of language and still managing to convey meaning points to the constructed and conventional nature of that very language. By extension the reader would realize a very Buddhist truth, namely that everything is ultimately constructed and conventional. Thirdly, the nearly total deconstruction of the language may have resulted from competition. Very coarsely put, the author was seeking to create a super-Aiśa form of the language to outdo his rivals. Fourth, we must also consider the somewhat disturbing but not implausible scenario that the more important role of a scripture is simply to exist rather than to make sense. Whatever the intention may have been, the author’s project in some sense backfired, or, in other words, it succeeded so well that it actually rendered the gains ineffective: he managed to create a scripture that is so arcane that not even close contemporaries from related groups could fully understand it. I am referring of course to the commentators and the editors of *tantras* that borrow from the *Catupīṭha*. Curiously, however, the scripture did not simply sink into oblivion: it was used, argued

over, copied, and borrowed from. All this would have been impossible had the *tantra* not commanded some respect and if it had not had at least some popularity. I would argue that this was the case, and this is not only circumstantially supported: to be given attention in Vikramaśīla was to be given attention in one of the most important Buddhist institutions of the age.

But if this is the case, i.e. if the text is almost beyond comprehension, a very legitimate concern is how can we, and indeed why should we seek to, gain any understanding of it. The second question is, I believe, already provided with an answer: because it was of concern to Tantric Buddhist communities, be that lay or monastic, and because it can be demonstrated that the text was at some point quite influential. In order to find an answer to the first question we must first ask whether we have enough material to tackle the text. The answer to this is positive: the manuscript material is, if not copious and comprehensive, enough for a general understanding, at least from a scholarly viewpoint, of the cycle. Once collated and critically examined, the material does yield a more or less clear picture, and for this we are first and foremost indebted to the commentators. For it is their way of tackling the text that seems to be the most productive method, and this is to deconstruct the deconstructed, that is to say to ignore the pseudo-grammar of the text completely, disregard most *sup-tiñ* endings and attempt to construct statements from the bare stems and roots. This approach also protects us greatly from ‘corruptions’ in the manuscript transmission: if the endings had no fixed role and were thus almost freely interchangeable, it is entirely understandable that scribes were just as baffled as we are and tried to do their best.

Perhaps one of the thorniest questions is where does the *Catuṣpīṭha* fit into the wider history of Indian Tantric Buddhism. My contention is that it was a product of the so-called Dark Ages, i.e. the period roughly bracketed by 850 and 1000 CE (with preference for an earlier date), and that its birthplace was East India, most likely the historical region of Bengal.⁶ Applying Tantric taxonomy retrospectively we can say that the text is one of the earliest *yoginītantras*, certainly older than the *Hevajra* and a very close contemporary of the *Herukābhidhāna*.

Possibly the earliest reference to the *Catuṣpīṭha* comes from the earliest

⁶It should be understood that I use ‘Bengal’ very generously in the sense of lands more or less continuously associated with the Pāla empire, i.e. what is now West Bengal, Bangladesh, North Eastern Orissa, and Northern and Eastern Bihar (historically Magadha and Mithilā).

extant commentator of the *Herukābhīdhāna*, Jayabhadra. The first author to actually name the text is again a *Herukābhīdhāna* commentator, Bhavyakīrti. Both authors must be earlier than Bhavabhaṭṭa (also a *Herukābhīdhāna* commentator), since they comment on a shorter recension of the *Herukābhīdhāna*, and Bhavyakīrti must be later than Jayabhadra, since he refers to the latter, albeit under another name, Koṅkanapāda. Bhavyakīrti's testimony is crucial, since his commentary reveals that during his time the *yoginītantras* were considered extremely controversial, perhaps on account of their novelty and because of their obvious similarity to Kaula practices. Whether Bhavyakīrti knew the *Hevajra* or not is a question that still needs to be settled. Even if it turned out that he did, it certainly seems that he did not consider it as important as it already was during Bhavabhaṭṭa's time.

On another line of inquiry we again start with Bhavabhaṭṭa, who is also said to have been a commentator on the *Vajradāka*, which in turn borrows copiously from the *Catuṣpīṭha*. To consider relative dating from yet another angle: from Bhavabhaṭṭa's work we may infer that by his time there already was some kind of exegesis of the text, since he cites variant opinions; furthermore, by this time there already was divergence in the textual transmission, since he considers variant readings. We have very scanty evidence as to when Bhavabhaṭṭa lived. From certain toponyms in his commentary to the *Herukābhīdhāna* we can very tentatively infer that his time coincided with the rise of Harikela, a short-lived dynasty on previously Pāla-occupied lands in the late 9th to early 10th centuries.

With Kalyāṇavarman the evidence becomes even thinner. The only certain date we have for him is 1012 CE, the date of the single ms. of his commentary. No other works by this author can be traced. However, the textual pool that he uses in the *Pañjikā* again points to a pre-*Hevajra* environment. The other authors of the cycle can be excluded from this enquiry, since their dates are either too late or unknown. A late 9th century date chimes rather well with another piece of evidence, a reported list of scriptures followed by a controversial sect at Abhayagiri in Śrī Laṅkā in the 860's. However, the work reporting this list, the *Nikāyasaṅgraha* of one Dhammakitti, comes from the 14th century and its historical accuracy is questionable.

The supposition that the *Catuṣpīṭha* comes from East India rests on circumstantial evidence. Two of the three Sanskrit commentators (Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra) can be shown to have hailed from Bengal, and the earliest exegete to name the text that we can find, Bhavyakīrti, is also said to have belonged to Vikramaśīla. A passage on extracting a *mantra* raises

-b- where we would expect -v-, a characteristic conflation by East Indians. Most other authors mentioning the *Catuṣpīṭha*, or having some association with it, are Easterners. Some of the most valuable manuscripts of the cycle (most notably the Vikramaśīla ms. of the *Nibandha*, the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* attr. to Caryāvratīpāda, and the *Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā* of Amitavajra) are proven to have been products of the East. Another very strong contender would be Nepal (i.e. the Kathmandu Valley). However, this would require very strong proof that during the age the transmission of Buddhist culture went both ways, and not almost exclusively from the Pāla lands northwards, a hypothesis that seems to hold rather strongly.

In order to further contextualize the *Catuṣpīṭha*, we must examine its place from the viewpoint of style and content. Although the text contains much that sets it apart as a unique item, at the same time there are features that show a rich inheritance from the past and foreshadow many elements of later scriptures. The first stylistic feature that should be noted is that the text is almost entirely in verse. With this the *Catuṣpīṭha* breaks away from illustrious predecessors such as the *Guhyasamāja* and the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, which are written in a mixture of prose and verse, and foreshadows later texts. Second is its unique *nidāna*, halfway between a proper Buddhist *nidāna* and the complete absence thereof in texts such as the *Herukābhidhāna* and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*, to which, however, our text seems to pay some sort of allegiance. As far as the assimilation of Śaiva elements goes, the *Catuṣpīṭha* shows an incomplete adoption thereof. *Kāpālīka* imagery is only partially adopted: cremation grounds appear occasionally and skulls feature often, but the deities do not wear bone ornaments and are not smeared with ash. Despite the name of the scripture, it does not advance any kind of sacred geography based on sites of goddess-worship. The adoption of counter-clockwise handling of ritual elements (*vāmācāra*) is also half-hearted: e.g. goddesses of the cardinal directions are visualized so, but those in the intermediate direction are handled in a clockwise fashion. The buddhicization of adopted elements already begins here, but it is by no means a complete and systematized assimilation. The female pantheon is again a *yoginītantra* feature, but in the earliest stratum there is no male, still less a Heruka-type deity, to act as their leader. Furthermore, although the *yoginīs* are paramount rulers of the *maṇḍala*, there are some practices which teach murdering them if they do not obey the call of ritual, as if they were the common *yakṣiṇīs* of earlier texts. The text does not teach a system of tubes (*nāḍī*) and wheels (*cakra*), but it does teach some sort of breath-yoga and

it does teach, perhaps as the first Buddhist scripture to do so, the practice of yogic suicide (*utkrānti*). The *Catuṣpīṭha* is also one of the earliest texts to teach elements of group worship (*gaṇacakra*), and probably the earliest *tantra* to teach verses in a kind of *apabhraṃśa*. But the most significant pointer to the age of the text is the primitive set of initiation rites it teaches. Unfortunately the terminology employed in this crucial passage is very obscure, but it is very certain that it is not the set that we meet with in later texts and mature Tantric Buddhism.

Finally, we must consider the social milieu in which and for which the *Catuṣpīṭha* came into existence. I would argue that the ideal clients of the cult were relatively wealthy and urbanized householders. The most significant body of evidence for this is the very first chapter's passage on divination, where the primary concern reflected seems to be business: one's status in one's family, moneylending, cultivation, and business travel.

With this the *uddeśa* as it were of my findings is finished. In what follows I shall give a more extensive introduction to the study of the *Catuṣpīṭha* cycle discussing the above considerations in greater depth and substantiating them with the available evidence. The second major part is a translation of selected sub-chapters from the text with a commentary of my own where needed. Untranslated chapters are summarized in synopses. An appendix volume contains the critical edition of the selected sub-chapters accompanied by a critical edition of Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Nibandha*. This is followed a descriptive bibliography.

Chapter 2

Introductory study

2.1 A word on approach and method

Given the nature of the material I propose to study – mostly unedited manuscripts – the nature of the present thesis is more descriptive than analytical-argumentative, although of course I am fully aware of the fact that one is not possible without the other. However, if we want to get closer to the aim of producing a comprehensive history and sociography of Tantric Buddhism what we need at the moment are texts. In other words, the most immediate task is to unearth, evaluate, critically edit and – as far as possible – translate and annotate manuscript material, clearly marking whatever we may have found to be a certainty or plausibility, but at the same time highlighting problems we have found for the time being unanswerable, be that because of lack of material or lack of capability. It is perhaps counterproductive to claim of a thesis at its very outset that it raises more questions than it provides answers, but an honest look at the field – which is fortunately going through nothing short of a renaissance – proves that this indeed is the case for each new chunk of material that is tackled within the literature Tantric Buddhism has produced. In spite of its esoteric character Tantric Buddhism was not the preoccupation of a chosen few but rather one of the defining religions of Asia. It should therefore merit scholarly attention in direct proportion with its influence.

It is sometimes the custom to start a work on Tantric Buddhism, especially a thesis, with a sweeping account of its history, doctrines, and practices. I shall resist the appeal of doing so. This is not because these matters are

now commonplace knowledge, but rather because of my still very patchy understanding of the subject even in the restricted but, in my view, fundamentally important arena of mediaeval India. Even if one were to disregard the not inconsiderable corpora of Chinese, Japanese, Newar, and Tibetan,¹ translations and autonomous works and were to focus on Sanskrit (or better said: Indic) sources alone, one is still to face an embarrassing richness of material. Without the slightest exaggeration, the number of texts available in the ‘original language’ run into the hundreds, and the witnesses for those texts into the thousands. Yet some of the basic works, the most important scriptures, and some of the most important exegetical works have still not been converted into reliable critical editions, the very base of constructive scholarship.²

This is not to say that we should not think beyond the production of editions, but anyone who is sincere in his or her scholarly thinking realizes that such efforts are prone to becoming obsolete if they are not based on reading solid sources. It would equally be a crucial mistake to think of critical editions as entities that can or should be created in the narrow constraints of one’s immediate sources. Just as these texts were not created in a vacuum, in the same way the editor should look far beyond the immediate in every sense: textual, doctrinal, social, and cultural.

2.2 Previous scholarship on the *Catuṣpīṭha*

To the best of my knowledge until the current date there have been no editions,³ translations, or monographs dedicated to the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The body

¹The list of languages is not exhaustive; one could very well add Korean, Mongolian, Manchu, and Uighur.

²This is not to say that critical editions do not exist. However, many are now outdated. A few examples should suffice: David SNELLGROVE’s groundbreaking edition of the *Hevajra* could be significantly improved with the use of further Sanskrit manuscripts of the text, lemmata extracted from other commentaries than that of Kṛṣṇācārya which are now available in great numbers, and less reliance on the Tibetan; Shinichi TSUDA’s edition of the *Samvarodayatantra* is incomplete, and at the time he was not in a position to consult Sanskrit manuscripts of the commentary by Ratnarakṣita; the edition of the *Kālacakra* and the *Vimalaprabhā* from the CIHTS was deemed necessary to be re-edited by the editors themselves; one could easily add dozens of other texts outside the public knowledge, some of which are quite crucial for our understanding of Tantric Buddhism.

³With the exception of SZÁNTÓ 2008a for 1.3 and a partial edition of 1.1 scattered through notes in SUGIKI 2005a.

of in-depth partial studies consists of only a handful of articles. All in all it can be said that the text and cycle is one of the most understudied regions of Tantric Buddhist literature, and although the *Catuṣpīṭha* does not rate above the *Śaṃvara*, the *Hevajra*, or the *Kālacakra* in importance, it was certainly a very influential rival.

The first Western scholar to have learnt something of the *Catuṣpīṭha* was – as far as I can tell – Brian Houghton Hodgson. In his 1828 article he mentions a ‘*Pátna Bauddha*’ he met in 1823 and who imparted to him some of the jealously guarded secret doctrines.⁴ This man was undoubtedly the famous Amṛtānanda, who prepared several small texts that could be described as *Catuṣpīṭha* material. These mss. are today kept in the British Library, and a full description is given below. The said article publishes a long list of ‘Sanskrit Bauddha Works’, of which the following are relevant to us: item 79. *Yogāmbara Tantra*, 104. *Yogapīṭha Tantra*, (perhaps) 105. *Pīṭhāvatāra Tantra*, 124. *Yogāmbarapīṭha Tantra*, and (although perhaps a misreading⁵) 143. *Niṣpanna Yogāmbara Tantra*. HODGSON
1823-28

The first descriptive notice of the *Catuṣpīṭha* appeared in the pioneering articles of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös [Kőrösi Csoma Sándor]. The three canonical sources (the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the **Mantrāṃśa*, and the **Vyākhyātantra*⁶) are presented on p. 494 of his ‘Analysis of the Gyut’ that appeared in Asiatic Researches between the years 1836-1839.⁷ The text is given here with all the idiosyncrasies of the original. The item nos. refer to the order of examined works in the fourth volume of the [Snar thang] Bka’ ’gyur. CSOMA
1836-39

⁴A rather fascinating account of this meeting is given in HODGSON 1828 [1874:40]. It is not impossible that the ‘*Bhótiya*’ picture which triggered the transaction between the two and which Hodgson mentions in this account was a *thang ka* (or *paubhā*) of Yogāmbara (see the section ‘Works compiled or copied by Amṛtānanda for B. H. Hodgson’ below).

⁵‘Niṣpannayogāmbara’ is very often a misreading for Abhayākara Gupta’s *Niṣpannayogāvalī*.

⁶The **Mantrāṃśa*, as I show below, was actually part of a recension of the *Maṇḍa-lopāyikā*, whereas the **Vyākhyātantra* survives only in Tibetan and some quotations by Durjayacandra in his *Mitapadā*. For more on these works see the description of literature in the next chapter.

⁷See TERJÉK 1984, vol. IV, p. 494 = 366. It is generally held (especially among Hungarian writers) that Csoma had ‘read’ the entire Tibetan canon during his stay in Ladakh. However, some of his descriptions (and this is especially true for the Tantric section) are so superficial (and sometimes plainly wrong) that the verb ‘perused’ would be a much more appropriate description for Csoma’s activity. In general it is clear that the Tantric canon, with the exception of the *Kālacakra*, was not of primary concern to him.

6. Sans. *Shri Chatur pitháh*. Tib. *Dpal-gdan-bzhi-pa*, From leaf 57–128. Salutation–Reverence be to the merciful CHENRE´SIK. (Sans. *Avalokésvara*.) A *Tantrika* treatise on the purification of the soul, and the mystical union with the Supreme being. There are several *mandalas* to be made, and many ceremonies to be performed, and *mantras* to be repeated for obtaining entire emancipation. Translated by KHAN-PO (Sans. *Upádhyáya*), GAYADHARA, and *Lotsavá* GOS-LAS-CHAS.

7. Sans. *Mantra añsa*. Tib. *Sñags-kyi-ch´ha*. From leaf 128–166. Part of a *Tantrika* treatise. Salutation–Reverence to the merciful A´RYA AVALOKE´SWARA. This is an abridgment of the preceding *tantra*, or of the large work whence it has been taken. Translators as above.

8. Sans. *Chatur pithá mahá yoginí guhya sarva tantra rája*. Tib. *Rnal-hbyor-ma-thams-chad-gsang-vahi-rgyud-kyi-rgyal-po-dpal-gdan-bzhi-pa-zhes-bya-va*. From leaf 166–227. A principal *tantra* on the mysteries of all *Yoginís* (or the four noble seats.) Delivered by BHAGAVA´N (*Vajra Satwa*) at the request of VAJRA PAN´I´, on the same subject as the two preceding works. Translated by SMRITI JNA´ANA KIRTTI.

It is readily apparent that neither of the two pioneering authors had their attention arrested by this material. Hodgson merely acknowledges in his writings that Yogāmbara is one of the most important deities of the Kathmandu Valley, while Csoma’s description is so general that the description could be a fitting description of any Tantric scripture considering the standards of that time.⁸

Nearly half a century later the first notice about a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Catuspīṭha* appeared in Bendall’s catalogue of the Cambridge Buddhist Manuscripts (BENDALL 1883:197-198). This description is evaluated below,

BENDALL
1883

⁸Somewhat unusually Csoma does not have any remarks on the issue of the calendar advanced by the *Catuspīṭha*, in spite of the fact that he dedicated quite a lot of his attention to chronometrical issues. The reason is perhaps the fact that the system did not gain any currency and therefore had no practical value. Nevertheless, one of Csoma’s favoured authors, the Bhutanese polymath best known as ‘Suresāmati’, did dedicate quite a lot of attention to this system (cf. synopsis of 1.1).

under Ms. C of the tantra. Bendall correctly identified the work as Csoma's item 6.⁹

Further *Catuṣpīṭha*-related manuscripts were found and described by Hara Prasād Śāstrī in his 1915 catalogue. In the introduction to that pathbreaking effort the author gave a short evaluation of four such works (ŚĀSTRĪ 1915:vii-viii), which we can now identify as the *Pañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman (the *codex unicus*, further described *ibid.* pp. 12-13), the *Nibandha* of Bhavabhaṭṭa (parts of my ms. S), the anonymous *Sādhanaśaṃkṣepa* (both on *ibid.* pp. 7-9), and the *Mitapadā* of Durjayacandra (the old Nepalese ms., *ibid.* p. 57). These descriptions proved to be very influential, but at the same time the source of some confusion.

H.P. ŚĀSTRĪ
1915

Several points communicated in this catalogue are noteworthy. According to Śāstrī, Nepalese *paṇḍitas* were of the opinion that the only old ms. of the *Catuṣpīṭha* was to be found in Cambridge (i.e. my ms. C). This is surely wrong, since mss. A, B, and several palm-leaf fragments were and are kept in Nepal, but it shows that there was no awareness of them among the learned of the Valley. Śāstrī's evaluation of the subject matter is equally interesting. His disgust is barely restrained when introducing the *Mitapadā* (p. viii), and is revealed in full when actually describing the same work (p. 57) stating that “... the *Catuṣpīṭhā* (sic!) Tantra, [is] one of the dirtiest Tantras of the Buddhists.” It is not clear whether this judgment was based upon the language¹⁰ or the overtly sexual material he chanced to come upon (the last sub-chapter in both the *Pañjikā* and the *Mitapadā* is 3.4, which is indeed explicit). The textual excerpts from the mss. given are far from satisfactory, but this is entirely understandable given the circumstances and the overwhelming load of mss. the eminent scholar had to process. One such curious ‘misreading’ is the case of the *Catuṣpīṭhāloka* (i.e. Kalyāṇavarman's *Pañjikā*) where the text is copied from two folios which were actually not in sequence (namely the first and the last). This mistake explains the curious translation of the text in HARTZELL 1997 (367-376), a confused and confusing tentative account of *Catuṣpīṭha* literature.

The next scholar to examine *Catuṣpīṭha*-material was Giuseppe Tucci.

TUCCI
1930

⁹This may sound like a banal statement; however, up to this day scholars sometimes conflate the *Catuṣpīṭha* and the **Vyākhyātantra*, e.g. CHANDRA 1993:43 (presumably following MUDIYANSE 1967:18) and SCHNEIDER 2010:21.

¹⁰The assertion that the third part, the *yogapīṭha*, was written in Prakrit is most likely based on a superficial reading of the last folio from Durjayacandra's work, where the exegete tackles an *apabhraṃśa* verse.

The Italian scholar did not base his quotation (1930:134) on Śāstrī's excerpts, but read Durjayacandra's commentary in the original.¹¹ The fact that he misread the title *Mitapadā* as *Amitapadā* suggests that his examination must have been a superficial one.

Hartzell was not the only one to base his speculations on reading the excerpts given in the catalogue. In his still widely used *The Śākta Pīṭhas* the eminent epigraphist D. C. SIRCAR has this to say on the *Catuṣpīṭha* (1948 [1973:11]¹²):

Some of the early *Tantras* refer to four Pīṭhas. This *Catuṣpīṭha* conception may have been associated with a conception of the Sahajayāna school of the Buddhist, according to which one can rise to eternal bliss from sexual pleasure. A Sahajayāna text entitled *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* and its commentaries (one of which was copied in 1145 A.D.; cf. H. P. Sastri, *Cat. Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Manuscripts belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal*, II, p. viii) speak of the four Pīṭhas as Ātmapīṭha, Parapīṭha, Yogapīṭha and Guhyapīṭha and deal with the various kinds of Vajrasattva's intercourse with the Yoginīs, such as Prajñāpāramitā and others. This philosophical concept of the *Catuṣpīṭha* was either the cause or the effect of the early recognition of four holy places as Pīṭhas.

Sircar uncharacteristically misunderstands the information given in the catalogue. Nowhere does Śāstrī intimate that the *pīṭhas* refer to sacred places of pilgrimage. Sircar seems to conflate here two sets of *pīṭhas*: the four major sites of Jālandhara, Oḍḍiyāna, Pūrṇagiri and Kāmarūpa, and the four *pīṭhas ātma, para, yoga, and guhya* of the text. In fact, there is nothing in common between these two, except that they are called *pīṭhas* and that their number is four. What exactly the *pīṭhas* mean in the present context is the topic of the next section.

The assertions of these two scholars stubbornly held out for some time to come. E.g. Agehananda BHARATI [Leopold Fischer] (1963:166-167) even elaborates on what was already merely a speculation on Sircar's part. In sum, knowledge of this tantric cycle was based more and more on speculation as consultation of the actual sources grew ever further remote.

¹¹I cannot ascertain whether this was the old Nepalese ms. or the copy prepared for Tucci. On these mss. see the description of the *Mitapadā* below.

¹²I do not cite the footnote to this paragraph, since it does not add anything significant to the discussion.

With the activity of the Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies¹³ CIHTS we move to the contemporary study of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. Several issues of the periodical *Dhīḥ* deal with mss. related to the *Catuṣpīṭha*; these passages in *Dhīḥ* have been gathered in the second volume of *Durlabha Bauddha Grantha Parichaya* (pp. 73-79, items 26-28) by J. Sh. PĀṆḌEY (1997), who is most likely the author of the entries as well. The items described correspond to a late ms. of the tantra and Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary (personal copy of Āśā Kāji *vajrācārya* = NGMPP E 629/2, which is unavailable to me), and the old ms. of the *Mitapadā*. In the case of all three item-entries a short excerpt is given from the beginning and the end of the text: the already lamentable condition of the text was most likely compounded with several misreadings, therefore discussing these passages can be overlooked. The tantra is given preference with a topical outline (*viśayanirdeśa*), which, although useful, is not comprehensive. Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary is simply said to qualify as an independent work (sic!), whereas Durjayacandra's commentary is identified as a short gloss on three of the four *pīṭhas*. Next to these descriptions the editor announced the imminent publication of the *mūla* with Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary (but see below). LĀL's evaluation (1997), a study written in Hindi, is little more than a list of catalogue entries of available works in Sanskrit and Tibetan. In a footnote (p. 26, n. 1) Lāl again announces that the CIHTS is preparing a project to publish the *tantra*, and this time it is said that it will be accompanied by its commentaries.¹⁴ This project has not yet materialized in any way.¹⁵ Lāl's reading of the material is certainly more than superficial, since he mentions the fact that Kalyāṇavarman cites Āryadeva (*ibid.*, p. 23); however, he identifies this Āryadeva with the *Catuṣpīṭha*-author Āryadeva, which is by no means certain.¹⁶

The most recent and best studies come from Japan. Kazuhiro KAWASAKI KAWASAKI

2002

¹³The institute is now known as Central University of Tibetan Studies. I shall continue to use the older form, since most publications cited here were published under that name.

¹⁴To the three actual commentators Lāl adds Āryadeva with his '*Ekadrumapañjikā*' (that is to say the **Ekavrkṣādīpañjikā*, for which see the eponymous section below). This is only a partial commentary on a few verses.

¹⁵In fact, the project seems to have been abandoned altogether (Iain Sinclair, oral communication 2006).

¹⁶For the different Āryadevas (one can distinguish at least three tantric Āryadevas) see the discussion of the initiation manuals. Unless I refer to the author of the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, it should be understood that Āryadeva here is by default the '*Catuṣpīṭha*' Āryadeva. However, the issue of attributions and the number of individuals behind this name even within this system is insufficiently explored.

(2002a) discusses very shortly the *maṇḍala* of the system,¹⁷ and his second study (2002b) is a short summary of the *utkrānti* passage in 4.3 with the valuable conclusion that these passages were influential for the *Samp[u]ṭodbhava* and the *Vajradāka*.

By far the most detailed studies are those by Tsunehiko SUGIKI. The earliest of these (2003a) is a short sketch in Japanese on astrological passages in *yoginītantras* (or ‘mother-tantric literature’ as he prefers to call this corpus). This grew into a detailed study in English (SUGIKI 2005a) starting out with the system proposed in the first sub-chapter of the *Catuṣpīṭha* and showing how it was developed in the *Vajradāka* and the *Ḍākārṇava* and their commentaries. Another early study (2003c) is concerned with the death-signs (or ‘death-signals’ as the English abstract has it), that is to say with the *mṛtyulakṣaṇas* described in 1.3, and how they were adopted and adapted in the *Vajradāka*. A comprehensive article about *chommā* in Tantric Buddhism (2005b) briefly touches on the secret signs taught by the *Catuṣpīṭha* (2.4.102-154 in my numbering). I shall have the opportunity to mention these studies and their findings in more detail in the introductions to the relevant chapters.

Finally, the present author has two short relevant publications (SZÁNTÓ 2008a and 2008c). The critical edition of the *tantra* (1.3) and Bhavabhāṭṭa’s commentary are re-edited in the present thesis incorporating new ms. material.

With so little to set out with and even that little fraught with so many misunderstandings, I believe that the case for an in-depth study of the *Catuṣpīṭha* and related material should not be argued any further. I also hope that the review of the meagre secondary literature will provide an excuse for the sometimes tedious description of surviving manuscripts and insistence on minutiae in the sections to come.

2.3 Title, structure, taxonomical position

The most overwhelmingly attested form for the title is *Catuṣpīṭha*,¹⁸ and this can refer to both the *tantra* (sometimes I shall refer to it also as the *mūla*) and

¹⁷To my greatest regret this article is not available to me.

¹⁸ The spelling variant *catuḥpīṭha* is more common in newer mss., but it is also present in old and good ones (e.g. Mahāmati’s *Tattvaviśadā*, 7^r 5). The spelling *catuḥpīṭha* would also be correct, but as of yet no testimony is available in scripts using the *upadhmānīya* (such as Śāradā).

SUGIKI

2003-2005

SZÁNTÓ

2008

TITLE

the system of practices and texts at the basis of which the *tantra* supposedly stands. In other words, when an author says something akin to ‘according to the *Catuṣpīṭha*’ it is not necessarily the case that the author refers to the *tantra*. Padmaśrīmitra’s *Samājānusāriṇī* is a case in point. When the author states that he will give the *bali* ritual (5^v 3 ff.) as according to the *Catuṣpīṭha* (*catuṣpīṭhavidhānena*) what he means is actually both the *tantra* and the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*.¹⁹ This is not to say that we do not have spurious quotes, such as that of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna in his most famous work.²⁰ The second introductory verse of Kalyāṇavarman’s *Pañjikā* refers to the text as *Śrīmatpīṭhamahātāntra*, but this variant is probably prompted by the metre.

In English secondary literature the title is usually translated from the Tibetan *gdan bzhi* as ‘four seats’,²¹ and this is a practice that is not accompanied by justification. We have already seen that D. C. Sircar viewed the title of the text as referring to the four major pilgrimage places, but this holds good only for *tantras* such as the Hevajra. The *Catuṣpīṭha* never refers to any pilgrimage places,²² therefore the title must mean something else.

The only suitable meaning to my mind is ‘heap’, by extension ‘collection’, and by extension of that, ‘chapter’. That the word can have this meaning is attested by Śaiva usage, where *pīṭham* is used interchangeably with *samūhaḥ*, a ‘collection’.²³ In a related, though perhaps somewhat more restricted, usage the term is employed to describe one of the Ur-*tantras* of the Śaiva revelation.²⁴ It cannot be conclusively shown that our *Catuṣpīṭha* is calqued on the

¹⁹There are certain spells employed here which cannot be traced in the *tantra*, but are taught in the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. Furthermore, Padmaśrīmitra teaches four kinds of *bali* (for *devas*, *nāgas*, *yakṣas*, and *bhūtas*), a distinction again not made in the *tantra* but in the initiation manual.

²⁰The **Bodhipathapradīpapañjikā* (278^r) has: *de yang Rdo rje gdan bzhi pa'i rgyud las/ «dmangs rigs stong phrag drug cu ni/ bram ze gtsang ma gcig la sbyar/» zhes bya ba la sogs pa rgyas par gsungs pa dang [...]*. The quote cannot be traced in the *tantra*, but it matches *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 28.21cd (*śūdradvekasahasrāṇi śuciviprasya m-ekavat/*) almost perfectly.

²¹GRAY 2007:220, n. 15; HOPKINS 2008:236, 390; and elsewhere.

²²The interpretation of the learned *Mantroddhārapañjikā* is an exception. Here the anonymous author does gloss *pīṭham* as ‘*dāginīsthānam*’ (Ms A 2^r).

²³*Tantrāloka* 37.18-19ab: *śrīmadĀnandaśāstrādaḥ proktaṃ bhagavatā kila | samūhaḥ pīṭham etac ca dvidhā dakṣiṇāvāmataḥ // mantrō vidyēti tasmāc ca mudrāmaṇḍalagaṃ dvayam |*. The relevant commentary by Jayaratha: ***bhagavatā kila āgame samūhaśabdena pīṭhaṃ proktaṃ evam paribhāṣitam ity arthaḥ***//. For a translation see SANDERSON 2009:45-46, n. 11.

²⁴The *Brahmayāmala* more than once refers to a *Bhairava[tantra]* ‘in four parts’ (*ca-*

Śaiva version, but such borrowing of a title would not be unusual.²⁵

Nor is it unusual that the title of a scripture refers to its structure: one of the best-attested alternative names of the *Hevajra* is *dvikalpa*[/-ka/-tantra/-rāja], where *kalpa* refers to the two larger parts the text consists of.²⁶ The most suitable rendering of the title should therefore be ‘The *tantra* in four chapters’, or, to borrow a historic example from the European context, the *Quadripartitum*, the title of a seminal astrological work attributed to Ptolemy.

A less common name of the text, one that can be reconstructed as **Vajracatuṣpītha* could further strengthen the case that the title is a borrowing. I have not yet traced this form in extant Sanskrit texts, but it is rather well attested in Tibetan translations of Indic works, including some of the earliest works citing the *Catuṣpītha*.²⁷ Analogous to other adaptations and appropriations of names and terms by using the prefix *vajra-* such as *Vajrarudra*, *Vajrabhairava*, *Vajravārāhī*, *vajrācārya*, etc., the alternative name could suggest an understanding of the title as ‘The *tantra* in four chapters of the Tantric Buddhist kind’.

The names of the *pīthas*, however, in our case are significantly different from the Śaiva ones. Whereas in the Śaiva usage these are *mantra*, *vidyā*, *mudrā*, and *maṇḍala*,²⁸ the four sections in the Buddhist *Catuṣpītha* are *ātma*, *para*, *yoga*, and *guhya*. Without reading the text this looks like a neat classi-

tuspītham). For a discussion see HATLEY 2007:262-270. Prof. Sanderson kindly provided me with further references: *Svacchandatantra* 1.4c-5, which refers to the [Ur-]*Svacchanda* as *catuspītham mahātāntram*; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *ṣaṭka* 1 (NAK 3-358, f. 337v3-4 (= 44.1): *jñātaḥ sarvo mahādeva mantratāntrāntarakramaḥ | gurukramo viśeṣeṇa catuspīthe tu bhairave ||*; *Śrīkaṇṭhīyasamhitā*, as cited in the *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati* (Bodleian Library Ms Stein Or. d. 43, f. 20r1-2): *mudrā maṇḍalapītham tu mantrapītham tathaiiva ca | vidyāpītham tathaiveha catuspīthā tu samhitā* (this verse is quoted without attribution by Kṣemarāja *ad Svacchanda* 1.4-5).

²⁵Cf. SANDERSON 2009:156, especially n. 358 for the Śaiva antecedents of the title *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*.

²⁶E.g. *Marmakalikā* p. 68, where one should read *Dvikalparāje* for *vikalparāje*, *Gūḍhapadā* Ms 22^v, *Amṛtakaṇikā* p. 4, *Padminī* of Ratnarakṣita Ms A 2^r, and elsewhere.

²⁷I do not wish to be exhaustive here, but the following works should be mentioned: the **Hevajravivṛti* of Bhavabhaṭṭa (283^v), the **Vīramānoramā* of Bhavyakīrti (31^v), the **Samāyogālanikāra* of *Pramuditavaḥjra (406^v), the **Caturdevīparipreccāṭikā* of Jñānagarbha (260^v), and the already mentioned **Bodhipathapradīpapañjikā* (278^r, cf. n. 20, also 287^v). The Tibetan rendering of the *Tattvaviśadā* (see n. 18) has *rdo rje gdan bzhi las* (T_D 67^v), where, however, the Sanskrit has simply *Catuṣpīthe*.

²⁸Cf. n. 23.

fication for an esoteric text: the first section would deal with the inner world (the body, etc.), the second with the outer (cosmography, etc.), the third with the correspondences between the two and the practices based on these parallels, and the fourth would teach various matters, such as transcending the inner-outer duality. But, in fact, the actual contents of the sections do not confirm to this model. While it is true that the *guhya-pīṭha* teaches what one might consider ‘secret’ matters such as yogic suicide (*utkrānti*), and the *yogapīṭha* teaches various practices and parallelisms better described as *viśuddhi*, the *guhya-pīṭha* also teaches initiation, and the *yogapīṭha* the fashioning of amulets (*cakra*), which are not based on mystic parallelisms but simply the power of the spells inscribed on them. None of the sources I have so far consulted offer a convincing or at least reasonable explanation why the chapters are so named, and the utterly haphazard arrangement of subject matter does not seem to mirror any kind of conscientious editorial plan, still less one that would confirm to the series *ātma*, etc. Four kinds of *pīṭhas* with minor but significant variations in the names do occur in later Tantric Buddhist literature, but as far as I can tell the ideas advanced in these sources do not have anything in common with the contents of the *Catuṣpīṭha*.²⁹

The four *pīṭhas* (I shall henceforth refer to them as ‘chapters’) are further subdivided into four sub-chapters each. These are usually called *paṭalas*, but very rarely also *prakaraṇas*.³⁰ This usage is probably the result of a contamination, since most sub-chapter colophons have the phrase *iti[-]prakaraṇe [...]-pīṭhe [...]*. This peculiar phrasing has led to one of the mss. of the *tantra* (A, q.v.) to be catalogued as the ‘*prakaraṇatantra*’. In fact it is more correct to follow the commentators here and read *itiprakaraṇe* as a *bahuvrīhi* with whatever textual subunit is meant. The structure of the text therefore is four chapters with four sub-chapters each, sixteen in total. The sub-chapters are of uneven length with as little as 17 units and as many as 177. It should be pointed out that for the sake of convenience I number every unit, be that a verse, a *mantra*, or a prose section, and sometimes refer to each such unit as

²⁹The latter two *pīṭhas* are [re-?]named *mantra-* and *tattva-* in the Kālacakra system, cf. *Vimalaprabhā*, vol. 3, p. 107 & *Laghutantratīkā* p. 73 *passim*; the four here designate areas in the yogic body. The *Samvarodayā* vv. 297-8 (quoted without attribution in the *Amṛtakaṇikā*, p. 84) equates four *pīṭhas* ([re-?]naming the last as *tattva-*) with *upāya*, *prajñā*, the union of the two, and the transcendence of that in order to obtain *sahaja* respectively, but it is unclear what the first set means. It does not seem to designate textual material.

³⁰E.g. Ms A sub-chapter colophon of 1.1 on 6^r.

‘verse’.

As for the categorization of the text, if authorities refer to this feature, they usually identify the group to which the *Catuṣpīṭha* pertains to as the corpus of *yoginītantras*. Surviving colophons of the *mūla*, amongst which the earliest is perhaps that of ms. A, also call the text a (*mahā*)*yoginītantra*.³¹ In the extant portions of the proto-*Maṇḍalopāyikā* and the ‘Āryadeva recension’ of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* there are no clear statements about the doxographical affiliation of the text, but in the colophon of the ‘Caryāvratīpāda recension’ we have the expression *Catuṣpīṭhamahāyoginītantrarāje*.³² One of the earlier commentators, Kalyāṇavarman does not say anything on the issue, while Bhavabhaṭṭa only indirectly alludes to the fact that we are here in the realm of the *yoginītantras*.³³ All later authorities follow this slotting with the concession that we consider the category *yoganiruttara* as a synonym of *yoginītantra*. The only possible exception to this is Āryadeva’s **Catuṣpīṭha-sādhanoṣāyikā*, where the Tibetan translation of the title and the colophon tag the *Catuṣpīṭha* as a (*mahā*/)*yogatantra*.³⁴ We should call to mind, however, that titles and colophons in the Tibetan cannot always be considered as original and the introduction to that work calling the text a **mahāyoginītantra*³⁵ should strengthen our suspicion that this is indeed the case here.

It nevertheless remains a somewhat confusing fact that the text seems to refer to itself, or the greater corpus of texts it forms part of, as a *yogaśāstra* (1.1.104, 2.3.171, 2.4.2 & 37, 3.1.75-77). Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the first occurrence (1.1.104) as *mantranaya*, i.e. Tantric Buddhism. The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* in its peculiar language seems to state that the *Catuṣpīṭha* is the best of *yogaśāstras*, one that puts other such texts to shame.³⁶ The *Yogāmbarīprabheda*, a kind of essay towards a *vyākhyātantra* surviving in a single Sanskrit ms., also mentions the term (1.2, 2.26, 4.15, 13.1), but its meaning cannot

³¹The final colophons of the two other palm-leaf mss., B and C, are lost.

³²For the three recensions of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* see the section ‘The initiation manuals’ below.

³³*Nibandha* ad 3.4.36d: [...] *dakṣiṇābhīmukhatvaṃ prajñāyāḥ, tasyāḥ prādhānyaṃ hi yoginītantrē rataviṣaye vā*.

³⁴73^v: *Bod skad du/ rnal ’byor gyi rgyud dpal Gdan bzhi pa’i bsgrub thabs*], however, the Sanskrit title does not have the corresponding ‘*yogatantra*’; 82^r: *dpal Gdan bzhi pa zhes bya ba’i rnal ’byor chen po’i rgyud kyī sgrub pa’i thabs* [...] *rdzogs so*||.

³⁵73^v-74^r: *’di la dang por dpal Gdan bzhi pa zhes bya ba’i rnal ’byor ma’i rgyud chen po’i lha rnam* [...].

³⁶1.6cd: *yogaśāstrāṇi śreṣṭhasya m-anyaśāstraviḍa[m]bakā* ||

be discerned clearly.³⁷ Perhaps the intended meaning is that *yogaśāstra* is a teaching where *yoga* (i.e. meditation) prevails over ritualism (*kriyā*).

The influential Tibetan author Bu ston argues that within the *yoginītantra* class, the *Catuṣpīṭha* is a member of the Vairocana family. The artificiality of this classification is evident, especially since the proof he offers from the corpus comes mainly from texts that came into being after the superimposition of Yogāmbara.³⁸

As in the case of most *yoginītantras*³⁹ it is claimed in the present tradition too that the extant *tantra* is merely an abbreviation of a much larger *Ur-tantra*. In fact, in the case of the *Catuṣpīṭha* the text we have is said to be a twice-removed descendant of the *Ur-tantra* in eighteen lakh units with an intervening scripture in twelve thousand units. Thus Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Nibandha* ad 1.1.1 declares: *idaṃ khalv aṣṭādaśalakṣāntaḥpātīdvādaśasāhasrikaCatuṣ-*

UR-
TANTRA(S)

³⁷For more on this text see the next chapter under the same heading.

³⁸*Rgyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (p. 466): *Gdan bzhi'i gtso bo Rnal 'byor nam mkha' ni | slob dpon Ārya de bas | Rnal 'byor nam mkha' gang yin pa | de nyid Rnam par snang mdzad gtso || zhes gsungs la | Gdan bzhi'i bshad rgyud las | ji ltar Rnal 'byor nam mkha' nyid | de ltar Rnam par snang mdzad bdag | ji ltar Rnam par snang mdzad lha | de bzhin rgyab kyī rtsa nyid do || zhes gsungs shing | Rnal 'byor nam mkha'i sngags la bai ro tsa na zhes gsungs pa'i phyir dang | yang rgyud las | dbus su Rnam par snang mdzad dgyes | shar du de bzhin Mi bskyod pa | zhes gsungs shing | Gdan bzhi'i rtsa ba'i rgyud las kyang | rdo rje rwa dbus ma la Rnam snang | ngos gcig gi dbus ma la Ye shes mkha' 'gro ma sgom par gsungs pa'i phyir de gnyis yab yum yin pas | Ye shes mkha' 'gro ma ni | Rdo rje dbyings kyī dbang phyug ma dang | Rnal 'byor nam mkha' ni Rnam snang du gsal lo ||* “As for the chief [deity] of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, Yogāmbara, the master Āryadeva says [in the *Maṅḍalopāyikā* ~ 28.18ab]: «He, Yogāmbara, is the same as Vairocana, the chief [Tathāgata].» Furthermore, the *Catuṣpīṭhavyākhyātantra* says: «Yogāmbara himself is the same as the lord Vairocana, and the god Vairocana is the tube at the back.» Furthermore, the spell of Yogāmbara has [the word] ‘vairocana’ in it. Again, the [*Vyākhyā*]*tantra* says: «Vairocana shines forth in the middle, and in the same way, on the eastern [part], Akṣobhya.» The *Catuṣpīṭhamūlatantra* also says that on the middle prong of the thunderbolt [one should visualize] Vairocana [3.1.4a], and on the middle [prong] on the other side, Jñānaḍākinī [3.1.7d]. Therefore the two form a couple and it seems that Jñānaḍākinī is [none other than] Vajradhātviśvarī, and Yogāmbara Vairocana.”

³⁹For instance the *Buddhakaṭāla* is said to have a *dvādaśasāhasrika* ‘root-tantra’ (referred to in the *Abhayapaddhati*, Ms A 6^v *passim*), the *Herukābhīdhāna* is said to derive from a *śatasāhasrika* ‘root-tantra’ called the *Khasama* (cf. e.g. the *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 105 *passim*), and Vajragarbha states that the ancestor of the *Hevajra* is a *pañcalakṣa* ‘root-tantra’ (*Piṅḍārthaṭikā*, p. 7 *passim*). Some *yogatantras* are also said to have had longer *mūlatantras*, e.g. the colophon of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* testifies to a sixteen thousand unit *Māyājāla*.

pīthasamuddhṛtaṃ tantraṃ [. . .].⁴⁰ The relevant passage from the *Mantrōdhārapañjikā* (Ms. A 1^v-2^r) is discussed in SZÁNTÓ 2008c and below: here too we have first the gigantic Ur-*tantra* revealed by Vajradhara, which was then condensed into the 12,000-unit version and spread in the world of men by Nāgārjuna. The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* is supposedly based on this version. The shortest recension, i.e. the text we have now is termed *dvādaśāsataka* in the colophon to ms. D (and ms. E, its apograph).⁴¹ This number roughly tallies with the actual extent of the text if we only count verses as the unspecified unit. The main body of the text does not refer to its own extent.

The role of the mythical *mūlatantras* is still quite controversial and much work remains to be done on the topic.⁴² One particularly important role these largely imaginary texts fulfilled was to act as a plausible scriptural source to refer to when some sort of innovation not promoted by the original revelation was introduced. Most typically the absence of the standard *nidāna* in *yoginītantras* is explained away by claiming that it is present in the *mūlatantra*, therefore its repetition is not needed.⁴³ In the present case the middling-size revelation is mentioned as the source for the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, which – even discounting the introduction of a new main deity – does indeed introduce a host of rites not taught in the *tantra*. Kalyāṇavarman employs the 12,000 verse version in a similar way: before quoting a verse which can be traced in the *Kakṣapuṭa* attributed to Nāgārjuna he claims that the passage is actually from the *dvādaśasāhasrika* (*Pañjikā*, Ms. 44^r). This exegetical technique is attested in other cycles as well, but the only authors I am aware of who actually cite from the *mūlatantra* and not only refer to it are exclusively Kālacakra ones.⁴⁴ The conclusion that could be drawn from this, namely that it

⁴⁰This section is extant only in ms. K, which reads *trayodaśasāhasrika*-. I have emended this reading on account of the Tibetan translation (one of the very few instances where this is recommendable), since no other authority testifies to a 13,000-unit Ur-*tantra*.

⁴¹The colophon is lost in mss. B, C, the fragments, and it is damaged in ms. A.

⁴²Cf. e.g. NEWMAN 1987 for the *Ādibuddha*, the Kālacakra Ur-*tantra*, HATLEY 2007:258 ff. for the Śaiva *Brahmayāmala*.

⁴³Cf. the *Nibandha* just cited above, also *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 105. The rule that all teachings put into scripture should be headed by the formula *evaṃ mayā śrutam* etc. is said to have been laid down by the Buddha himself in the *Dharmasaṃgītisūtra*. The passage is often cited in Tantric exegesis, e.g. *Muktāvalī* p. 2, *Ratnāvalī* Ms. 1^v, *Padmāvātī* Ms 1^v and elsewhere.

⁴⁴See NEWMAN 1987. Perhaps speaking of ‘post-Kālacakra’ authors might be more appropriate since the *Gūḍhapadā* of [pseudo-]Advayavajra also quotes from the Kālacakra *Ādibuddha* profusely.

is a unique feature of Kālacakra authors to cite from the otherwise nebulous and presumed lost *mūlatantras*, is nullified by the latest commentator of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, Durjayacandra, who on several occasions claims to cite the *dvādaśasāhasrika*-recension thereby implicitly stating that he has had access to it.⁴⁵

2.4 Brief outline of contents and the presumed target audience

The *Catuṣpīṭha* is revealed in the shape of a dialogue between an unnamed *bhagavān* and Vajrapāṇi. A new topic is usually introduced by a new set of questions from Vajrapāṇi, although this is not consistently maintained – the *bhagavān* sometimes teaches without being asked to do so – and sometimes the answers do not address the questions directly, that is to say the *bhagavān* either postpones answering or he teaches something that was not asked about. The revelation takes place in a timeless space alluded to as a ‘pure realm’ (some commentators take this to mean Mount Meru) before a retinue of supernatural beings headed by *bodhisattvas*, among which Vajrapāṇi is the most eminent. Thus the frame story is fairly conventional, but some elements such as the unusual *nidāna*, the unparalleled names of the chief *bodhisattvas*, and some epithets of the *bhagavān* are unique to this scripture.

REVELATION

The *Catuṣpīṭha* is a self-sufficient revelation inasmuch as it has its own pantheon, its own initiation system, rituals and other procedures, which only rarely appeal to deities outside the prescribed *maṇḍala*. It also equips the practitioner with a spiritual program ‘from the cradle to the grave’ so to speak: the ritual and meditative procedures allow the initiate to obtain both worldly goals (both for himself and others) as well as liberation.

RELIGIOUS
PROGRAM

The boundary between a mere follower of the cult and the full-time ritualist professional are not clearly drawn, and it does not seem to me that such boundaries were strictly envisaged. The prospective initiate is described in the broadest possible terms (2.1.106-111), the only truly important requirements being unshakeable faith in the *guru* and some degree of acquaintance with Buddhism. It is not specified whether the ideal candidate and the officiating specialist (4.1.1-8) are laymen or monastic persons, and this seems to suggest that the compilers wanted to keep the pool of candidates as well

INITIATION

⁴⁵ *Mitapadā* 13^r, 39^v-40^r, 41^v.

as that of officiants as large as possible. The initiation rite is, as far as the *tantra* is concerned, quite simple (4.1.15-62). The candidate is made to pledge allegiance to Buddhism in general and to the officiant and the Tantric deities in particular. He is then blindfolded and led in front of the *maṇḍala* (called here the *balibhūmi*). There he receives the pledge-water mixed with the five nectars and is shown the deities with due explanation of their symbolism. The standard series of consecrations (*abhiṣeka*) is not followed here. Instead we have a very odd and quite unparalleled list without any clear explanation of their function: *mantrābhiṣeka*, *adaityābalyabhiṣeka*, *yogābhiṣeka*, and *ācāryābhiṣeka*. After having received *abhiṣeka* the initiate is bound by certain rules, especially concerning his behaviour towards the officiating master (4.1.9-14). One prerequisite seems to be the candidate's entering into a state of possession (*āveśa*), but the text seems to propose that this can also be induced. Such techniques are also treated separately from the initiation rite proper (3.3.1-32).

Although not emphatically stated in the text it is understood that the initiation rite is a strict prerequisite for the initiate's practice. The better part of the text describes such practices, which are first and foremost based on eidetic visualization (*bhāvanā*). The term is usually translated as 'deity-yoga', but this would only partially cover the facts. For although the efficacy of the ritual is by and large based on the power of a deity or deities and the practitioner's handling of and control over them, *bhāvanā* involves much more beyond merely the visualization of gods. The practitioner must also visualize seed-syllables, architectural elements, and dynamic images to mention but a few. The common feature of the visualizations is that they have to be cultivated towards an ever-increasing vividness until the imagined object appears as if it were a true form. A more or less common feature of deity visualization is to contemplate emptiness (*śūnyatā*) at the outset, a procedure taught in detail in 1.3.1-17.

PRACTICE

The *tantra* does not explicitly distinguish between rituals to be observed daily, periodically, or optionally, but the context and nature of these procedures makes it quite clear that such a distinction was followed. Thus we can gather from *sādhana* texts that daily practice involved the visualization of the chief deities of the *maṇḍala* with the appropriate spells and gestures, worship articles, praises, and so forth with special emphasis on the *bali*-offering. These are described in great detail in 1.4.1-20, most of 2.3, with incidental or overlapping details elsewhere. A crucial rite to be periodically observed was the *gaṇacakra*, or group worship, which in spite of the fact that it is

never mentioned within the text under this name is one of the most important features of the text as the *Catuspīṭha* is the earliest scripture to teach the *apabhraṃśa* songs widely adopted in later manuals of *gaṇacakra* rituals, including what I call the ‘password-song’ (2.4.101). The injunction to perform the group worship reveals another not unimportant fact about the cult, namely that it was the business of a community (including both sexes) and not an isolated transmission between master and disciple or a small group of disciples. The greater part of the remaining text consists of either topics that can be counted as explanatory appendices to the above, such as the symbolism of the ritual implements (3.1.1-64), or procedures and rituals the performance of which is incidental and with a particular aim, such as curing snakebite (1.2.35-69), the manipulation of rain (1.2.70-101 and 1.4.27-34), oblation into fire (2.1.1-105), or oblation into water (2.2.1-28).

Among such incidental rituals the teachings concerning death and dying are of particular significance. The *tantra* teaches various portents of death (1.2.1-9, 1.2.103-105) on the appearance of which the initiate has the choice of either counteracting them and thus prolonging his lifespan (1.2.10-34), or preparing for egress/yogic suicide (*utkrānti*), the earliest such teaching in a Buddhist scriptural source (4.3.19-66). Another important set of teachings is given in the first sub-chapter (1.1.4-105). This section teaches a somewhat novel method of reckoning time and a set of divination methods based thereupon.⁴⁶ Introducing a new calendrical system shows not inconsiderable ambition on the compilers’ part, and this ambition was to some degree fulfilled as it was adopted by later *tantras* (the *Vajradāka* and the *Ḍākārṇava*) only to be superseded by the even more ambitious and sophisticated system of the Kālacakra.

The methods of divination are significant in their own right, but perhaps even more important is what they reveal about the concerns of the envisaged clients. Amongst other things, which do not reveal the social standing of the client, we have references to journeys, trading goods, moneylending, acquisition of wealth, number of wives, military valour, craftsmanship, relationships with an extended family, and to a lesser extent, agricultural activities. The section about initiation also contains three verses (4.1.46-48) about the fee to be paid for *abhiṣeka*. Here the options include giving away servants, livestock, houses, and land, the implication being that the envisaged initiand was in a position to do so. The social groups best described by all these elements are

TARGET
AUDIENCE

⁴⁶This section has already been studied by SUGIKI 2003a and 2005a.

male lay householders, predominantly urban, with wealth acquired through trade, crafts, or a military career. This chimes well with the epigraphic evidence we have for the Pāla period,⁴⁷ and with the groups that were seen as traditional patrons of Buddhism.

The *tantra*'s relationship to royal courts is ambivalent and not very significant. The only two such references are a type of *homa* performed for the restoration of a king (2.1.102-105) and a method involving a pill (*gulikā*) with the aim of gaining entry into a royal court and thereby securing wealth and prosperity (2.4.38). It seems to me therefore that the compilers did not foster ambitions for their cult to become a royal religion.

2.5 Early attestations of the *Catuṣpīṭha*

The present section lists and discusses the earliest examples of evidence for the existence of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The aim of the exercise is to contextualize the text in geographical space and historical time. I seek to prove that the *Catuṣpīṭha* is an early *yoginītantra*, or at any rate one that has come into being in a pre-*Hevajra* environment. Arguing *ex silentio* is of course a precarious procedure, however, the cumulative force of individually only circumstantial pieces of evidence in my view testifies that this was indeed the case. Starting from the earliest piece of hard evidence I shall seek to demonstrate that by the end of the tenth century and very possibly earlier the *Catuṣpīṭha* is attested as far as Nepal, Dunhuang, Sri Lanka, the Konkan coast and possibly Sumatra. I then examine three early exegetes and two relatively early *tantras* which further point out the popularity of the *tantra*. The next section examines the *tantra* stylistically, iconographically, doctrinally and linguistically. Piecing the two enquiries together I shall then set out a relative timeline for

⁴⁷E.g. the Jagajjibanpur copper-plate grant of Mahendrapāla (EI 42, no. 2) and a grant by Gopāla II (FURUI 2008) describe *vihāras* commissioned by generals (*mahāsenāpati* and *mahāsainyapati* respectively); a *stūpa* at Nālandā (EI 42, no. 14), a stone statue at Patna (HUNTINGTON 1984, no. 17), and a bronze statue from Kurkihār (*ibid.*, no. 37) were donated by goldsmiths (*suvarṇakāra*); a Padmapāṇi image (BANERJI 1915:93-94) and a Buddha image (HUNTINGTON 1984, no. 64) were donated by merchants (*vaṇik*); a large water-tank at Bodh Gayā (CUNNINGHAM 1892, pl. xxviii. 3) was excavated at the expense of Keśava, the son of a stonemason/sculptor (*śilābhīd*); a Hārītī metal image (HUNTINGTON 1984, no. 8) was dedicated by a potter (*kumhāra* = *kumbhakāra*); and an unidentified goddess from Munger (*ibid.*, no. 45) was commissioned by a publican's (*śaundika*) daughter, presumably at her husband's expense.

the development of the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

2.5.1 Nepal 1012 CE

The earliest solid piece of evidence for dating the *Catuṣpīṭha* is the date seen on the single surviving manuscript of Kalyāṇavarman's *Pañjikā*, that is NS 132 = 1012 CE. This date presupposes therefore not only the existence of the commentary itself and of the *tantra*, but also of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (without Yogāmbara), the influence of which on Kalyāṇavarman is undeniable. Furthermore, the ms. is rather corrupt, which lessens the chances that it is close to the archetype. The Nepalese dating does not necessarily presuppose also the transmission of the cult to Nepal, since Kalyāṇavarman himself may have been a native to that region.

2.5.2 Dunhuang ~ 977 CE

Around this time or slightly earlier the *Catuṣpīṭha* was already known as far as Dunhuang. An extraordinary document (P[elliot] t[ibétain] 849) containing a list of *tantras* mentions a *Ba dzre cha tu sprī sti tan tra* (ll. 29-30), which is glossed in Tibetan as *Rdo rje gdan bzhī 'i rgyud*.⁴⁸ According to Kapstein's argumentation this manuscript must postdate 965 or 977 CE (calculation is based upon a mentioned year of the ox and historical events), concluding that for the sake of simplicity we should view the last quarter of the tenth century as the most plausible time-frame for the composition of the document. The *terminus ante quem* is of course the year in which the cave-library that once contained Pt 849 was walled in. This happened at some point in the early half of the 11th century.⁴⁹ Kapstein also points out a significant difference between

⁴⁸The most recent study is KAPSTEIN 2006. A pioneering study of the document is HACKIN 1926.

⁴⁹This point is still controversial. A long-held consensus was based on an *argumentum ex silentio*: the Dunhuang region came under Tangut/Xia occupation in 1035, and the cave library our ms. comes from (Mogao cave 17) does not have any Tangut documents. The most cautious contemporary scholars argue that the question should be revisited. Several other dates have been suggested for the event: 1002, 1006, or even 1052. The most up-to-date report on the state of the field is IMAEDA 2008, but clearly much more evidence needs to be examined. For the time being there are several ideas about what the nature of the ms. collection was and how it was sealed in, see *op. cit.*, but also some excellent blog entries entitled 'Secrets of the Cave' by VAN SCHAİK (<http://earlytibet.com>, last accessed on July 8, 2011).

the list of *tantras* in this document and the imperial catalogues (i.e. the *Ldan kar ma* and the *Phang thang ma*): while the eighth-century lists contain no texts of what Kapstein calls the ‘*anuttarayoga-tantra*’ class, the list in Pt 849 has several such scriptures: the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (*sar ba ’bu ta sa ma dzo ga*, ll. 25-26), the *Vajrāmṛta* (*ba dzre am ’brī ta*, ll. 29-30), the *Herukābhyudaya* (*he ru ka a pu tha*, ll. 29-31)⁵⁰, an unspecified *Yoginītantra* (*zo gi ni tan tra*, l. 35) and a *Yoganiruttaratantra* (*zo go nyi rod tan tra*, l. 35). The two latter may simply be categories, as the text sometimes cites texts proper but also groups of texts. There are several conspicuous absentees from this list. The absence of the *Kālacakra* is perhaps not so surprising, since that system emerged about 1030 CE, but that of the *Hevajra* is. Given the overwhelming influence of the *Hevajra* in the tenth century, it is very unlikely that any representative list of *yoginītantras* (or *tantras* for that matter) would omit that scripture, unless of course the compiler of the list was unaware of its existence. Two plausible explanations could be that either a) the list is rather old and is merely reproduced in the late tenth-century Pt 849, or b) the list reflects a not quite up-to-date knowledge of the latest *tantras* in faraway India.

2.5.3 Sumatra ~ 1012 CE (?)

There may exist a clue to knowledge of the *tantra*’s existence in the Indonesian archipelago. [A] Dharmakīrti, in a commentary to the *Hevajratantra* (Tōh. 1191), mentions the *Catuspīṭha* (309^r 4-5) as one *tantra* over which mastery can be gained through knowledge of the Hevajra. VAN DER KUIJP (2003:420, n. 6) identifies this author with the Dharmakīrti ‘from Suvarṇadvīpa’, a teacher of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna. According to the Tibetan hagiography Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna visited the archipelago and met this master there in the second decade of the 11th century. However, there are some who doubt the authenticity of this journey, most significantly EIMER 1986. Moreover, for the time being it cannot conclusively be shown that the commentator Dharmakīrti is the same as the Sumatran Dharmakīrti, given the widespread popularity of the name. But we cannot entirely rule out the possibility either, for

⁵⁰It is not unlikely that *He ru ka a pu tha* is either a mistake for *Herukābhīdhāna*, or that we are dealing with an eyeskip *he* – *he* and the *Herukābhīdhāna* was once part of the list as well. The *Herukābhyudaya* does have some archaic features (see SANDERSON 2009:213-214), and it is not entirely impossible that it is earlier than the *Herukābhīdhāna* itself.

political and cultural contacts between the heartland of Tantric Buddhism and Suvarṇadvīpa were anything but minor.⁵¹ Therefore knowledge of the *Catuspīṭha* in Sumātra is circumstantial at best, but not impossible.

2.5.4 Sri Lanka ~ early 10th c.

Another famous list of *tantras* shows awareness of the text in Sri Lanka. The *Nikāyasamgraha*, a Sinhalese chronicle from the 14th or early 15th century by the pontiff Dhammakitti (Jayabāhu Devarakkhita Dhammakitti Thera), narrates that during the reign of Matvalasen (Sena I, r. 846-866) the doctrines of the ‘heretical’ Vājiriyavāda and the Nīlapaṭadarśana⁵² were introduced to the country. The monarch’s acceptance of the former was obtained by an ascetic of the ‘Vajraparvatanikāya’ who gained entry into the royal household by bribing the cook, a story that was doubtless extremely appealing to orthodox sensibilities.⁵³

The same work contains a list of scriptures followed by the ‘Vajraparvatavāsī’ monks.⁵⁴ The list is divided into *tantras* and *kalpas*, and in the first group we have a *tantra* called ‘the *Catuspīṣṭa*’. There can be little doubt

⁵¹The best-known example of such contacts is the Nālandā endowment of Bālaputradeva (EI 17, no. 17) during the 35th regnal year of Devapāla (for the correct reading of the numerals see MAJUMDAR 1941 and SIRCAR 1975). Bengal also ‘exported’ preceptors to the archipelago as witnessed by the Kelurak inscription of Śaka Samvat 704 = 782 CE (MAJUMDAR 1937:151-152): here we find a royal preceptor (*rājaguru*) called Kumāraghoṣa, who is said to have come from Bengal (*Gauḍadvīpaguru*), and who installed an image of Mañjuḥoṣa, a Vajrayāna deity.

⁵²This somewhat obscure cult was otherwise known as the *nīlāmbaras*, cf. DEZSÖ 2004:158 and 171ff. The *Āgamaḍambara* presents them as roaming in pairs under or clad by dark blankets, singing in *apabhraṃśa* and celebrating sensual pleasures. This kind of antinomianism did not sit well with the Kashmiri king Śaṅkaravarman (883-902 CE), and king Bhoja of Dhārā (1018-1060 CE), who banned them and extirpated them respectively. These *nīlāmbaras* are described as some kind of Śaivas, but the *Nikāyasamgraha* seems to see them as heretic Buddhists. The verse cited there (p. 75) as a kind of epitome of doctrines only makes sense in a Buddhist context: *veśyāratnaṃ surāratnaṃ devo [ratnaṃ] mato bhavaḥ | etadratnatrayaṃ vande hy anyat kācamaṇi[s] trayam ||*. Square brackets indicate my tentative emendations. That ‘other triad’ opposing the triad of prostitutes, liquor, and Cupid cannot be anything else but the Three Jewels.

⁵³*Nikāyasamgraha* pp. 74-75, MUDIYANSE 1967:8-9 (note that the edition used by me is different from the one used by Mudiyanse, that of Ariyaratna 1951), also CHANDRA 1984, 1993.

⁵⁴*Nikāyasamgraha* pp. 62-63, MUDIYANSE 1967:16-18, also CHANDRA 1993:43 ff. which adds very little to Mudiyanse’s research.

that this is the same as the *Catuṣpīṭha*[*tantra*] in the garb of a false re-Sanskritization. Mudiyanse (followed uncritically by Chandra) identifies the work as the **Vyākhyātantra* (Tōh. 430), but this is hardly justifiable. The list given by Dhammakitti is not dissimilar to that of Pt 849. From what are known as the *yoginītantras* (the text does not make the distinction) he lists the following: the *Vajrāmṛta*, the *Cakrasaṃvara* (most likely the *Herukābhidhāna*), the *Herukābhyudaya* (spelt as *He ru kā dbhu da*), the *Mahāmāyā*, and the *Sarvabuddha* (i.e. the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*). Here too the conspicuous absentees are the *Kālacakra* and the *Hevajra*.⁵⁵

It would be very tempting to infer that the list of texts and the adoption of Tantric doctrines by Sena I are contemporary and thus the earliest attestation of the *Catuṣpīṭha* dates from the middle of the ninth century, but we must resist doing so. For the chronicle of Dhammakitti is relatively late and it cannot be guaranteed that the information it conveys was not somehow garbled in transmission during what amounts to more than half a millennium.⁵⁶ On the other hand the absence of the *Hevajra* is significant and we should be cautious of the contention that Sri Lanka was far away from the Vajrayāna heartland, and therefore more ‘orthodox’ or not quite up-to-date with current developments. In fact, the journey by ship from the international port of the Pālas, Tāmralipti, to Sri Lanka took as little as two weeks and it was undertaken often by merchants.⁵⁷ Though we have no other testimonia for the *Catuṣpīṭha* from Sri Lanka, Tantric presence on the island is well-attested in the early tenth century.⁵⁸

⁵⁵Other common titles between the two lists are: the *Māyājāla* (of which the Dunhuang documents lists several), the *Guhyasamāja*, the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, the *Bhūtaḍāmara*, and the *Mārīcīkalpa* (of which the Singhalese document lists several).

⁵⁶That the list is somewhat corrupt is suggested by the fact that it mentions the well-known *Trisamayārāja* as two texts: the ‘*Trisamayakalpa*’ and the ‘*Rājakalpa*’.

⁵⁷This was the personal experience of the Chinese pilgrim, Faxian (see LEGGE 1886:100). Also cf. MAJUMDAR (ed.) 1943:662, the testimonies gathered there suggest that under favourable conditions it might have taken even less time to reach the island.

⁵⁸MUDIYANSE 1967:113-119, but practically the entire monograph is devoted to the subject. What the author sees as Mahāyāna is in actual fact very often exoteric (and to lesser extent esoteric) Vajrayāna. Beyond the statuary evidence and *dhāraṇī* stones some epigraphic evidence testifies to institutionalized Tantric Buddhism: one inscription talks of one Buddhmitra as the ‘son by sacred sprinkling’ (*abhiṣekayen*) of one Harṣa. The edict is meant to ensure the transfer of property from master to disciple (WICKREMASINGHE 1904-1912, no. 16).

2.5.5 Jayabhadra

The earliest relatively securely dateable text to possibly mention elements that may be specific to the *Catuṣpīṭha* is the earliest extant commentary to the *Herukābhīdhāna*, the *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Jayabhadra. In his commentary to 3.1d Jayabhadra mentions a ‘twenty-fold worship’ which includes that of sounding (or miming the sounding of) a small kettle-drum (*paṭahikā*). There is an earlier list of the ‘twenty-fold worship’ in the *yogatantras*, but that list does not include the *paṭahikā* whereas the *Catuṣpīṭha* list does (for a more elaborate treatment see notes to 2.3.86cd). As far as I am aware, there are no other such lists and there is a passage in Jñānagarbha’s **Caturdevī-paripṛcchātīkā* (260^v) which seems to suggest that the ‘twenty-fold worship’ was seen as something specific to the *Catuṣpīṭha* (see parallel to 2.3.102).

Jayabhadra seems to have led an itinerant life. From his own work we know that he was born in Laṅkā,⁵⁹ that he wrote his commentary in the vicinity of the *Mahābimbastūpa*⁶⁰ which can be located on the Konkan coast,⁶¹ and in the account of Tāranātha we are told that he held high office at Vikramaśīla.⁶² His connection to the Konkan is further strengthened by the fact that his alternative name was Koṅkana[pāda].⁶³ Jayabhadra’s dates have not yet been settled with certainty: according to a reasoning proposed by

⁵⁹ *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* p. 141, also in the **Navaśatikā* (116^r): *nor ni ma lus skyes pa’i gzhī | skyes pa’i sa ni Lang ka ste | Rgyal ba’i zhabs kyis byas pa la | mtha’ ni Bzang po’i ming gsal byas ||*

⁶⁰ *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* *ibid.*

⁶¹ Cf. CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:325. The CUL Ms. Add. 1643 as reported by MITRA 1971:150 has an image of a ‘Mahāviśva-Lokanātha’ located on the Konkan. This is very likely a misreading or misspelling of the same ‘Mahābimba’. The name of the monastery mentioned in the same colophon seems to be ‘Tārāvihāra’, which was founded by/for/in memory of Agrabodhi. (I thank Prof. Sanderson for sharing this information from his topographical files.) Buddhagupta, the famous teacher of Tāranātha seems to have visited this place in the 16th century: the *bimbakāya* in *Kongka na’i gling* he mentions is probably the same as the ‘Mahābimba’. What he seems to describe is perhaps a natural phenomenon such as the vapours of a waterfall, it is not unlikely therefore that the ‘great reflection’ was what Tibetans call a *rang byung* pilgrimage site (*Buddha gupta’i rnam thar* p. 552, TUCCI 1931:696).

⁶² CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:18, 325.

⁶³ This is how Bhavyakīrti refers to him in the **Vīramānoramā* some 55 times (3^r, 3^v, 4^r, 4^v, *passim*). Since the passages quoted from ‘Koṅkana[pāda]’ are a perfect match with the *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the two. A hitherto unnoticed sub-commentary to Jayabhadra’s work, the **Ubhayanibandha*, also refers to the author as Koṅkanapāda (207^r).

SANDERSON (2009:158 ff.) he was active sometime during the earlier part of the tenth century, and it is not entirely impossible that he wrote somewhat earlier. At any rate, he seems not to refer to the *Hevajra*.

2.5.6 Jñānagarbha

One of the two early authorities to refer with certainty to the *Catuspīṭha* is Jñānagarbha. There were at least three authors bearing this name, and here I do not wish to trace the identity of each. The Jñānagarbha I am referring to is the author of the already mentioned **Caturdevīpariṣcchātīkā*, of which unfortunately no Sanskrit mss. are known to be extant. The Tibetan translation was prepared by Smṛtijñānakīrti, whose dates are again not known with certainty, but he is definitely one of the earliest translators of the *phyi dar* period.⁶⁴ This very strongly suggests that Jñānagarbha was active before the turn of the millennium. I cannot cite any evidence that would locate the author geographically.

His work is rather rich in references and quotations and the textual pool is in my view quite revealing. For the sake of brevity I shall not take into consideration *sūtras* or early Madhyamaka and Yogācāra authors, however, it is worth noting that Śāntarakṣita (fl. late eighth century) is already quoted here.⁶⁵ This may at first sight provide a *terminus post quem*, but our author is later still since he identifiably quotes Buddhajñānapāda⁶⁶ and his disciple Dīpaṃkarabhadra.⁶⁷ The list of scriptural Tantric works to which the author refers to explicitly (R) and/or quotes from (Q) is as follows: the *Paramā-*

⁶⁴Cf. SMITH 2001:315 and n. 599 advancing a date not beyond the early 11th century. For some, perhaps anecdotal, details of his life see DAVIDSON 2004:122-123.

⁶⁵The quotation on 252^r beginning with *bdag dang gzhan smra dngos 'di dag* is the first verse of the famed master's *Madhyamakālaṃkārahārikā* (Tōh. 3884).

⁶⁶On 262^v there is a half-verse from the *Samantabhadra*, better known as the *Caturaṅga-sādhana* (40^r-40^v). TOMABECHI 2008 establishes Buddhajñānapāda's dates as *cca.* 750-800 CE. Tomabechi does not seem to take into consideration Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna's remark in his **Bodhipathapradīpapañjikā* (288^v) to the effect that Jñānapāda was worshipped and lavished with gifts by Devapāla (*cca.* 810-850) and his queen. If Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (**Atīśa*, **Atīśa*, **Adhīśa*?) is reporting historical memory accurately, the relative chronology must be pushed forward by probably not more than 20 years. For the most likely scenario is that the emperor was still young and Jñānapāda was already at the very pinnacle of his career.

⁶⁷On 264^r Jñānagarbha quotes v. 342b of the *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*, known to him – as indeed it was to several authors – as the *'Jig rten snang ba* (**Lokāloka*?).

dya (Q/R⁶⁸), the *Sarvarahasya* (Q⁶⁹ & Q/R⁷⁰), the *Guhyasamāja* (Q/R⁷¹), the *Samājottara* (Q⁷² & Q/R⁷³), the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* (Q⁷⁴), the *Guhya-maṇṭilaka* (Q/R⁷⁵), the **Vairocanamāyājāla* (Q/R⁷⁶), the **Vairocanakalpa* (Q/R⁷⁷), the *Vajrāmṛta* (Q/R⁷⁸), and lastly, the *Catuṣpīṭha*.⁷⁹ The conspicuous absentee is again the *Hevajra*, moreover, the popularity of scriptures centered on Vairocana also suggests an early environment.

It should be pointed out here that the list of Tantric texts evoked by Jñānagarbha is not dissimilar to the textual corpus Kalyāṇavarman worked with.⁸⁰ Significantly, both authors quote an otherwise unknown *kāmaśāstra*-style work, the *Aṣṭāṣṭaka*.⁸¹

2.5.7 Bhavyakīrti (I)

The second early authority to quote from the *Catuṣpīṭha* is Bhavyakīrti, the author of an early commentary to the *Herukābhīdhāna*, the **Vīramānoramā*.⁸²

⁶⁸255^v.

⁶⁹250^v traced as *Sarvarahasyatantra* v. 83.

⁷⁰256^v, 264^r, 264^v, 265^r, 265^v.

⁷¹253^v (as from the ‘*mūlasūtra*’) = *Guhyasamāja* 3.12a, 261^v, 262^r, 266^v, 267^r.

⁷²250^r traced as *Samājottara* 175-176, 250^v = *ibid.* 40ab, 255^v = *ibid.* 56ab.

⁷³253^v.

⁷⁴250^v = *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* 327^v, 258^r = *ibid.* 308^v.

⁷⁵258^v.

⁷⁶261^v -262^r; this text is now lost.

⁷⁷262^r (*kalpa* is rendered as *gal po*), this text is now lost.

⁷⁸259^v (as from the **Amṛtodaya*) = *Vajrāmṛta* 11.6d.

⁷⁹260^v refers to the twenty-fold worship of the **Āryavaṅgracatuṣpīṭha*’ (see discussion of Jayabhadra), and on 262^r he quotes a quarter-verse corresponding to 3.3.65a as from the **Āryacatuṣpīṭha*’.

⁸⁰For the list of texts used by Kalyāṇavarman see the description of his *Pañjikā* below.

⁸¹253^v with no attribution, same quotation in the *Pañjikā* 41^r; 254^r as from the *Gtsug lag brgyad pa* (**Aṣṭakaśāstra*) matches *Pañjikā ibid.*, the continuation of the quote. The only other author I am aware of to have quoted this text is Smṛtijñānakīrti in the **Caturdevīparipṛcchāvākyā* (228^v, the title here is ‘*dod pa’i gtsug lag Brgyad brgyad*), but that work seems to be based on Jñānagarbha’s commentary. The quoted passage by the two aforementioned authors has a slight echo in the **Mukhāgama* (6^r and 8^r).

⁸²Until very recently this work has been referred as the *‘Śūramānojñā’*, doubtless an erroneous Tibetan reconstruction. By using this much more plausible but still unattested form I follow SANDERSON 2009:158, n. 363. The name of Bhavyakīrti should not be asterisked, since it is attested in the *Gūḍhapadā* (Ms 92^r): *tathā cokta{ṁ}m ācāryaBhavyakīrtinā[-]suratagaganagāmī bodhitāśeṣapadmah kumatikumudadāhī darśitānantamārga iti/ anupamasukhahetuḥ sarvagatattvabhānuḥ sapadi hara{nta}[tu] loka hār-*

In my view there were at least two Bhavyakīrtis: on stylistic and doctrinal grounds I find it very difficult not to differentiate between the author of the **Vīramānoramā* and the author of the **Sandhyāprakāśikā*, the two chief works attributed to the author under that name.⁸³ The fact that Bhavyakīrti is one of the earlier *Śaṃvara* exegetes has already been proven by SANDERSON (2009:158 ff.): Bhavyakīrti – along with Jayabhadra – comments on a shorter recension of the *Herukābhīdhāna* as both authors ‘stop’ at 50.18. Sanderson proposes that this is the earlier recension of the text, since the addendum (up to 51.22) contains features designed to make the *Herukābhīdhāna* more Buddhist. Since Bhavyakīrti is not only a commentator, but also – as we will see shortly – an apologete of this text, it is very unlikely that he knew of the longer recension and declined making any use of it. Sanderson also advanced a philological argument that Bhavyakīrti is later than Jayabhadra. This argument is strengthened by the fact that Bhavyakīrti actually cites Jayabhadra under the alternative name Koṅkanapāda.⁸⁴ He may also have known the *Vajraḍākatantra*, since in the obeisance verse he pays homage to the eponymous deity.⁸⁵ As far as I can tell he does not cite the *Hevajra* and does not seem to betray any knowledge of it even in places where we would expect a quotation.⁸⁶ Bhavyakīrti therefore seems to be a

damohāndhakāra{r}[m] iti. The *iti* between the two quoted lines is probably a contamination since the two form a single verse according to the Tibetan translation where this is the fifth introductory verse of the **Vīramānoramā* (1^v -2^r): *rab dga'i mkha' la rgyu zhing ma lus padma 'byed | blo ngan ku mud bsreg mtha' yas lam ston pa | mnyam med de rgyu kun 'gro de nyid nyi mas ni | 'jig rten snying gi rmongs mun mod la bsal bar shog ||*

⁸³E.g. a quotation ‘from the *Catuṣpīṭha*’ in the **Sandhyāprakāśikā* (20^r -20^v) on the very same topic, rosaries, shows a text that is very different from the one quoted in the **Vīramānoramā*. I find it very unlikely that the same author would quote two different recensions of the same passage for the same – rather banal – topic. Cf. register of parallels ad 3.1.43-50 in the edition. Another differentiating stylistic feature is that in the **Vīramānoramā* the author introduces his *siddhānta* with a ‘signature’: *Skal ldan grags pa ni [. . .]*. There are significant doctrinal differences as well: the exposition of **Sandhyāprakāśikā* reflects a much more mature phase of *abhiṣekas*, whereas in the **Vīramānoramā* the culminating initiation is the *guhyaḥhiṣeka*.

⁸⁴Already discussed in 2.5.5 above.

⁸⁵1^v: *rnam rtog ma lus bcom gyur zhing | thugs rje chen pos rnam par rol | sems can kun gyi don mdzad pa | dpal ldan Rdo rje mkha' 'gror 'dud ||*

⁸⁶Such is the case of a passage on 7^v where the author tries to ‘encode’ the blisses into the *Herukābhīdhāna*. Surely the most eminent *tantra* to teach the theory of the blisses is the *Hevajra*, but here the scriptural material evoked is the *Guhyasamāja* and another, untraced verse.

pre-*Hevajra* author. He must also predate Bhavabhaṭṭa (*pace* Tāranātha⁸⁷) since that exegete comments on the longer recension of the *Herukābhīdhāna* and because he is also a commentator of the *Hevajra*, but must postdate Jayabhadra/Konkanapāda.

Although Bhavyakīrti does not state that he considered the *Catuspīṭha* a *yoginītantra*, I see no reason why he should not have thought of it as such. We may therefore inferentially apply the reception of the *Herukābhīdhāna* as described in Bhavyakīrti to some extent to the *Catuspīṭha* as well. A careful reading of the **Vīramānoramā* reveals two important facts about early *yoginītantras*: that their reception was not unproblematic, and that the early exegesis of such *tantras* was the business of *siddhas* rather than the monastic environment.

The first feature is evident first and foremost in a polemic passage (10^r - 11^v) where Bhavyakīrti seeks to defend certain traits of the *yoginītantras* against the questions of an opponent. This objector may well be imaginary, but the problems he brings forward are in my view reflections of very real concerns among Bhavyakīrti's co-religionists. This rather fascinating passage can be summarized as follows:⁸⁸

APOLOGY

The objector sees the form of Heruka visualized as extremely wrathful problematic. The Lord is supposed to be beyond wrath and passion, which are well-known causes for transmigration. The objector proposes that the *maṇḍala* of Heruka is the work of the Devil (*Māra).

Q1

Bhavyakīrti retorts with three quotations.⁸⁹ The gist of these passages is that if one applies the same actions (ultimately causes)

A1

⁸⁷In his famous list of Vikramaśīla Tantric scholars (CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:18) Bhavyakīrti is placed after Bhavabhaṭṭa, whereas in reality he should be between Jayabhadra and Bhavabhaṭṭa. The placement of the intervening Śrīdhara is not untenable, since he is best known for his association with the cult of Yamāri, and the scriptures of that cult – most importantly the *Kṛṣṇayamāritantra* – are noted for their transitional character: stylistically they appear very similar to *mahāyoga/yogottara* texts (headed by the *Guhyasamāja*), but sometimes they read like *yoginītantras* (e.g. the *Kṛṣṇayamāritantra* contains injunctions about the visualization of a Heruka). Tāranātha's list is discussed in greater detail in SANDERSON 2009:158 ff.

⁸⁸I intend to publish in the near future a complete analysis of the passage with special attention to textual problems, see SZÁNTÓ forthcoming a.

⁸⁹One attributed to (one of many) Indrabhūti(s) which remains untraced; one by the Lord himself, a verse also quoted by Āryadeva as from the *Vinayāmoghasiddhimahātantra* (cf. *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, p. 80), and finally, a celebrated verse, the *locus classicus* of

that send others into damnation *skillfully* (*sopāyena*), they can act as causes towards liberation.

The opponent is not convinced and states that this being the case, *Kaulas (*rigs ldan*) and other heretics who practice such acts would also obtain liberation.

Q2

Bhavyakīrti points out that this is the reason his quotations say ‘skillfully’ (*sopāyena*), viz. realizing that ‘all things’ are eventually belying. To this effect he cites a verse from the *Laṅkāvatāra* (10.153c-154b)⁹⁰ and explains that Kaulas and others do the same sinful acts while clinging to the false views of ‘I’ and ‘mine’, not realizing the belying nature of ‘all this’ and as a consequence they will indeed go to hell and suffer.⁹¹ Those innocent of knowledge of poisons will suffer and die if they consume such substances, but someone who knows their nature [i.e. an alchemist] will obtain a ‘divine’ body by the very same substances.⁹² Furthermore, according to the testimony of a scriptural verse,⁹³ there is little use of peaceful deities when one wishes to control the wicked, but one should meditate on these externally wrathful deities as being peaceful inside. For one who sees the *maṇḍala* of Heruka in such a way, there is no contradiction. His point is further strengthened by quoting the *Guhyasamāja* 5.1-5. Bhavyakīrti concludes (preparing the ground for the next counter-argument) that it

A2

which is perhaps the *Guhyasiddhi* 6.86cd-87ab, which was later on taken over to form part of the *Hevajra* II.ii.50, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 17.20, the *Advayasiddhi* v. 7, and the *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa* v. 6.

⁹⁰Identified by Prof. Sanderson. The verse is also found in the Madhyamaka section of Sahajavajra’s *Sthitisamāsa* (v. 84, Skt. missing at this point in the *codex unicus*).

⁹¹This is a standard argument, already articulated in the *Tattvasiddhi*: [...] *yasyātma-darśanam tasyaite kleśāḥ sambhavanti| yas tu nairātmyasātmikaraṇāt samāsāditanairā-tmyarasas tasya naite tathā bhavanti*], etc.

⁹²This is again parallel to the *Tattvasiddhi*: *yathā garalādikaṃ mantrādikaṃ mantrādi-bhiḥ saṃskṛtyopayujyamānam anyad eva rasāyanādikaṃ phalam āvahata iti tadanyeṣāṃ ca bālānāṃ niyamena pañcatvaṃ karotīti, evaṃ viṣayā api mantramudrādhiṣṭhitā viśiṣṭataram eva phalam āviṣkurvantīti [...]*

⁹³It is difficult to pinpoint the verse exactly. The first line functions as a kind of refrain in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (traced at least in three *loci*: 256^v -257^r ; 275^v ; 278^v). The first line is otherwise attested in the *Yamārīmaṇḍalopāyikā* of Śrīdhara (16^v): *atyantaduṣṭaraudre[ṣu] saumyatā nopayujyata iti*. I thank Prof. Isaacson for his illuminating comments on this passage, including the identification of the parallel.

is befitting to meditate on Vajrasattva in the form of an emperor (*cakravartin*), holding all kinds of implements, with wrathful faces, etc. [i.e. as Heruka].

The opponent states that if the form of Heruka is indeed for subjugating devils and the such, then why is it that these devils are still around, day and night tormenting the Three Jewels.

Q3

Bhavyakīrti retorts that this is an abject argument. For the methods for counteracting devils and afflictions, such as gems, spells, herbs, etc. are available to everyone, but people do not or will not use them. How could the Lord be responsible for these afflictions? He has shown the methods, but it is up to people to put them into practice.⁹⁴

A3

The opponent insists that one could just as well meditate on peaceful deities such as Lokeśvara with two arms, and one face. There is no use for these *vīras* and *vīreśvarīs* [i.e. the deities in the *maṇḍala* of Cakrasamvara].

Q4

Bhavyakīrti responds with an age-old Mahāyāna adage, namely that people are taught according to their inclinations. If there are some who wish to work for the benefit of beings by assuming the forms of these deities, why should they be stopped from practicing this teaching?⁹⁵

A4

Mutatis mutandis the objection could very well apply to the *Catuṣpīṭha*, too. Although our text does not teach a form of Heruka, some of the goddesses do have his wrathful traits, Kaula-type practice such as the *gaṇacakra* and sexual rites abound, as do aggressive rituals. From this and other passages in the same **Vīramanoramā* we can infer that the objector was far from being an ‘orthodox’ Buddhist such as a Theravāda follower. It is more likely that Bhavyakīrti is dealing with an adept of the *yogatantras*, here including the *Guhyasamāja*.⁹⁶ For retorting with passages from that environment would

⁹⁴The quotation here is probably a recast form of the *Udānavarga* 12.9cd & 12.10cd, also quoted by Bhavabhaṭṭa (see *Nibandha* ad 4.1.60).

⁹⁵For Bhavyakīrti’s defense of aggressive rituals see GRAY 2007b.

⁹⁶See next note and also 4^r: [...] *dpal Gsang ba ’dus pa la sogs pa rnal ’byor gyi rgyud* [...]

otherwise be counterproductive.⁹⁷ Moreover, later in the text the author cites an opinion according to which “the *yogatantras* have been announced by the Tathāgata, whereas the *yoginītantras* are the words of the devil.”⁹⁸ It is therefore clear that the revelations of the *yoginītantras* with their aggressive iconography, outlandish practices, and obvious similarities with the Kaulas and other – unfortunately unnamed – antinomian cults were crossing a line. Buddhists, including tantrics, were far from being receptive to them. The enemy was not only outside,⁹⁹ but also within the fold.¹⁰⁰ One would be hard-pressed to find post-millennial Vajrayāna authors who would see the *yogatantras* and the *yoginītantras* as not complementary but antithetic. I propose therefore that Bhavyakīrti’s time is one in which the *yoginītantra* revelations were still only in a fledgling stage and not universally accepted.

The second significant feature of the **Vīramānoramā* for our discussion is that besides quoting Jayabhadra/Koṅkanapāda – whose opinion he frequently refutes, making it unlikely that he was his master – Bhavyakīrti refers to an unusually high number of *siddhas*: Indrabhūti, one Padma, Oḍḍiyānapāda, Kambalapāda, Ḍombipāda, Caryāpāda, one Kumārī, and one Dri sbyor (*?). Their diverging opinions mainly concern ritual or meditative minutiae, suggesting a malleable and thus premature stage of the cult, but also suggesting that explaining and thus shaping the cult was the business of *siddhas*. One need not assume that in the above list Kambalapāda is the same as the author of the *Sādhanaṅidhi*, a mature commentary of the *Herukābhīdhāna*, or that the Indrabhūti here is the same as the author of the

SIDDHAS

⁹⁷Also consider this passage (19^r): [. . .] *'di ni mu stegs pa'i bshad pa yin gyi/ rnal 'byor ma'i rgyud du bstan par 'os pa ni ma yin no zhe na/ dpal Gsang ba 'dus pa la sogs pa rnal 'byor gyi rgyud thams cad du go ku da ha na la sogs pa'i sman bza' bar bshad pa de yang mu stegs pa'i rigs yin par 'gyur na de ni ma yin no*|| “[. . .] One may say that this is the teaching of heretics and it is not befitting to be taught in the *yoginītantras*. But we see in *yogatantras* such as the *Guhyasamāja* teachings about consuming restorative substances involving the five meats (*gokudahana*) very often. [If your objection is correct] we should consider these too as heretic teachings, but this is clearly not the case.”

⁹⁸19^r: *rnal 'byor gyi rgyud ni de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa yin la/ rnal 'byor ma'i rgyud ni bdud kyis bshad pa yin . . .*

⁹⁹That *yoginītantra* practitioners considered the Kaulas as their enemies is fairly clear. Cf. the passage paraphrased above and Kṛṣṇācārya’s *Yogaratnamālā* pp. 122-123: *duṣṭā iti– sugataśāsanavidviṣṭāḥ kaulādayaḥ*/.

¹⁰⁰The problem seems to have been acute, as it is addressed in later *yoginītantras*, such as the *Hevajra* (II.ii.51): *rāgeṇa badhyate loko rāgeṇaiva vimucyate | viparītabhāvanā hy eṣā na jñātā buddhatīrthakaiḥ*||. Thus the *Hevajra* mocks Buddhists who are not willing, or are intellectually incapable to grasp the intent of antinomian practices as ‘heretics’.

**Sādhanaśamuccaya*. A perusal of the passages where in Bhavyakīrti's opinion these authors diverge reveals that the opinion of Indrabhūti and Kambala do not appear in their putative commentaries. It is not impossible that the texts we have today are much later and that they were written under the names of these early *siddhas* in order to partake of their charisma and authority.

2.5.8 The Vajradāka

The early influence and popularity of the *Catuṣpīṭha* can best be gleaned from the 'explanatory *tantras*' of the Śaṃvara cult. There were very few such texts that do not contain either at least parallels (possibly 'plagiarized' passages, but the direction can sometimes not be proven conclusively) or entire passages lifted over with very little or no editorial intervention.¹⁰¹ The earliest Śaṃvara scripture to contain *Catuṣpīṭha* passages is the *Vajradāka*, and the richest in such 'plagiarism' is the *Samputa*. All traced passages are noted in the edition and treated in the notes to the translation wherever such discussion is deemed necessary. The following table (2.1) summarizes the parallels between the *Vajradāka* and our text.

The direction of borrowing is quite clear as already partially shown by SUGIKI (2005a:160 ff.) in the case of the twelve *bhuvaneśvaras* taught in 1.1. The *Vajradāka* is an eclectic text to start with. This is shown not only by the constant shift of interlocutors, but also by clumsy editing. For example, when the *Vajradāka* lifts over passages describing the *ācārya*, sandwiched between metrically decent *Catuṣpīṭha* lines (4.1.8cd and 8ef are *Vajradāka* 32.4cd and 7ab) we have a passage where the metre breaks down completely (32.5-6).¹⁰² Furthermore, just as in the case of the *Samputa*, wherever the editors of the *Vajradāka* thought that a *Catuṣpīṭha* passage was too obscure, they simply

¹⁰¹The verse beginning with *na māro na ca māreṇa* in the *Abhidhānottara* (f. 11^v) is probably a copy of 3.4.11. The *Vajradāka* parallels are discussed here. The *Ḍākārṇava* has already been shown to contain passages from the *Catuṣpīṭha* by SUGIKI (2005a), but the text is late and probably of Nepalese origin, therefore it is not immediately relevant for our discussion. The case of the *Samvarodaya* is similar. In the *Yoginīśamcāra* the following passages can be traced back to the *Catuṣpīṭha*: 17.15 = 4.4.90; 12.2-3ab = 4.4.28cd-29ab-30ab; 12.4 = 3.4.44cd-45ab. The *Samputa* parallels are discussed in the next sub-section.

¹⁰²*sattvāśayaviśeṣajñāḥ anāthena tu bāndhavaḥ || priyadarśana sādhuḥ mantranayābhyāśasamayācāranīpuṇaḥ | mudrāsamketayogavidaḥ yoginīśamayasamketadarśakaḥ || advaitaṃ cāpratihatam ca mantravajrācāranīpuṇaḥ | abhīṣekārthe guṇodayaḥ pīṭhadarśanaśīlaś ca || daśatattvaparijñātā ācāryo 'sau vidhīyate ||*

Table 2.1: Catuspīṭha verses in the Vajradāka

<i>Vajradāka</i>	based on <i>Catuspīṭha</i>	topic
ch. 10	1.1.7-89	see SUGIKI 2005a
18.61cd-74	2.3.145-164ab	<i>bali</i>
20.2, 5-9, 36-44	1.2.1, 2-9	<i>mṛtyulakṣaṇa</i>
21.1, 9-14, 24-25, 30cd-37	4.3.1, 67-74, 38-46, 52-55	<i>utkrānti</i>
ch. 22	2.4.102-153	<i>chommā</i>
29.3-12	1.3.8-16	see SZÁNTÓ 2008a
30.1-7, 11-17	3.1.67-79	<i>jñānatattva</i>
31.1, 3-5, 15-23	3.1.4-12, 14-15,	<i>vajratattva</i>
31.33-43	3.1.24ab-29	<i>ghaṇṭātattva</i>
32.1cd-4ab, 7-10ab	4.1.3cd-8	<i>ācārya</i>
32.12ab, 15-19	4.1.9-14ab	<i>caryā</i>
32.20-38, 43-45	4.1.14cd-15ab, 18-21, 27, 39-43, 49-55, 59-61	<i>abhīṣeka</i>
ch. 45	3.1.42-64	<i>akṣasūtra</i>

left it out and went on copying over the next line or verse. It would be very difficult to explain the reverse, namely that the *Catuspīṭha* editors took over (curiously: only metric) passages from the *Vajradāka* and then added obscure lines or verses of their own.

The *Vajradāka* was probably one of the first texts to borrow from the *Catuspīṭha*, since it is already commented on by Bhavabhaṭṭa; there is also some circumstantial evidence that the text was already known to Bhavyakīrti.¹⁰³

2.5.9 The Sampuṭa

A scripture on which the *Catuspīṭha* left its mark most extensively is the so-called *Sampuṭa* or *Samputodbhava*.¹⁰⁴ The text has received the attention of several scholars already,¹⁰⁵ but the amount of work, however pioneering,

INTRODUCTION

¹⁰³See n. 85.

¹⁰⁴In the colophons it is also styled *sarvatantranidāna*, the ‘source’ or ‘essence’ of all tantras.

¹⁰⁵Chapters 1-4 (that is to say the first chapter of four sub-chapters) has been edited in 1978 by George Elder in an unpublished thesis from three late paper mss. (for the list

still fails to do justice to the importance of the *Samputa* for mature Tantric Buddhism. If the number of extant manuscripts can be used as a barometer for the popularity of a text, the *Samputa* was certainly one of the most widely read Buddhist scriptures. Further testimony to the influence of this scripture is the exegetical attention it attracted. Two earlier commentaries were written by one of the many Indrabhūtiś, ¹⁰⁶ and a *Vīravajra, ¹⁰⁷ presumably the one reputed to have been a disciple of Durjayacandra. ¹⁰⁸ Both were overshadowed in size and influence by the *Āmnāyamañjarī* of Abhayākaragupta. ¹⁰⁹ Abhayākaragupta was doubtless aware of the anthological nature of the text (see below) and it was presumably this reason why he chose it for the basis of his tantric *magnum opus*: to kill more than one bird with the same stone if the simile is not inappropriate. Before Abhayākaragupta's commentary was given an almost canonical status by the *Dge lugs pa* owing to Tsong kha pa's *Sngags rim chen mo*, the early *Sa skya pa* masters have already produced a significant number of commentaries in Tibetan.

The *terminus ante quem* for the *Samputa* (and the *Samputatilaka*) can be set with confidence to the mid-11th century, the approximate date of the oldest known manuscript (H), now kept at the Royal Asiatic Society in London. ¹¹⁰ The text is probably not much earlier, since it contains several passages consonant with 10th-century development. It is in any case later

RELATIVE
DATE

see ELDER 1978:20-22). Three different but also late paper mss. were used in SKORUPSKI 1996 and SKORUPSKI 2001 for the edition of the first and the second chapters (that is to say eight sub-chapters altogether). Partial editions and studies on textual sources and parallels have been published by Keiya NOGUCHI 1984, 1986a, 1986b, 1987a, 1987b, 1987c, 1988, and 1995. I thank Dr. Kenichi Kuranishi for supplying me with his overview of these Japanese publications. As far as I can tell none of these publications make use of all four early and superior palm-leaf mss.

¹⁰⁶Extant only in Tibetan, Tōh. 1197, translated by Vajrabodhi and Gyi jo Zla ba'i 'od zer. Somewhat confusingly the colophon identifies the work as a commentary to the *Kha sbyor thig le*, that is to say the *Samputatilaka*, but in fact the commentary does not stretch beyond the tenth chapter. The *Samputatilaka* is an *uttaratantra* of the *Samputa*. Two of the palm-leaf mss. (A & H) transmit the 'Tilaka' together with the main text.

¹⁰⁷Extant only in Tibetan, Tōh. 1199, no translators specified. The title of the work was most likely **Ratnamālā*.

¹⁰⁸See under the description of the *Mitapadā*.

¹⁰⁹A complete ms. has now been traced in China (Prof. Isaacson, personal communication). A Sanskrit fragment has been identified and edited in TOMABECHI & KANO 2008.

¹¹⁰The ms. is not dated, but the scribe is the same Kumāracandra who copied the *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanaśamkṣepa* (see below) in 1045 CE. The alleged date of ms. C, NS 145 = 1025 CE (SHĀSTRĪ 1917), cannot be verified, as that ms. is now a 'national treasure' and therefore (!) unavailable for consultation at the Asiatic Society.

than the *Hevajra*, but precedes the *Kālacakra* of which it does not show any knowledge.

The taxonomical position of this *tantra* is somewhat controversial. All Tibetan authorities subscribe to the position that it is an ‘explanatory tantra’ (*bshad rgyud*), but to which cycle is a matter of debate. Mkhas grub rje refers to it as a ‘general explanatory tantra’ (*thun mong ba’i bshad rgyud*),¹¹¹ whereas somewhat earlier Bu ston identified it as an explanatory tantra mainly of the Śaṃvara with the concession that it is at the same time a *bshad rgyud* to other cycles.¹¹² In fact the *Samputa* is a somewhat carelessly edited anthology of several scriptural and non-scriptural passages. Although the *Samputa* does contain several large chunks of the Śaṃvara tantras (e.g. the *Herukābhīdhāna*, the *Vajradāka*) and the *Hevajra*, the list of sources stretches way beyond these two seminal cycles to include the *Vajrabhairavatantra*,¹¹³ the *Māyājāla*,¹¹⁴ the *Vajrāmṛta* and a commentary on that text by one Bhago,¹¹⁵ the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*,¹¹⁶ the *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi*,¹¹⁷ and others.¹¹⁸ However, the text that seems to have had

TAXONOMY
& SOURCES

¹¹¹LESSING & WAYMAN 1968:252.

¹¹²*Rgyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (p. 429): ‘*di spyi rgyud du ma’i bshad rgyud yin yang gtso bor Bde mchog yin te/ ’di’i dkyil ’khor gyi gtso bo Rdo rje sems dpa’ Bde mchog gi khyad par yin pa’i phyir dang/ Bde mchog gi gleng gzhi la bshad par bya ba’i phyir dang/ ’grel pa rnam nas Bde mchog gi bshad rgyud du bgrangs pa’i phyir ro//*. “Although this [i.e. the *Samputa*] is an explanatory *tantra* to several general [i.e. *mūla*-] *tantras*, it is chiefly a Śaṃvara [scripture]. To wit, the Vajrasattva heading the *maṇḍala* is a kind of Śaṃvara, it is to be explained as an introduction to the Śaṃvara (?), and because the commentaries count it as an explanatory *tantra* of the Śaṃvara.” I shall not venture into identifying which Indian commentaries he based this statement on.

¹¹³Several passages in 7.2 (almost half of that sub-chapter) are lifted from ch. 6 of the *Vajrabhairavatantra*, a chapter which does not survive in Sanskrit according to our present knowledge (for the edited Tibetan translation see SIKLÓS 1996a:103-106). The iconography of the deity in 7.4 is based on chs. 4 and 5 of the *Vajrabhairava*.

¹¹⁴A major portion of ch. 8 is copied into 7.4, a significant part of ch. 9 is reproduced in sub-chapters 7.4 and 10.4.

¹¹⁵The prose passages in the first half of sub-chapter 7.4 are reproduced almost verbatim from the commentary (79b-80b) which to my knowledge survives only in Tibetan (Tōh. 1651).

¹¹⁶E.g. 9.1.6cd-11ab reproduces vv. 4.16cd-21ab.

¹¹⁷Almost all the verses in sub-chapter 5.3 are based on the fifth chapter of Anaṅgavajra’s work without editing out the name of the author: 5.3.2c (= 5.2c) *tattvato ’naṅgavajreṇa*.

¹¹⁸The list is not meant to be exhaustive. I intend to publish in the near future an article on the structure and sources of the *Samputa*, see SZÁNTÓ forthcoming b.

the most profound influence on the *Samputa* is the *Catuṣpītha* (see table¹¹⁹ 2.2).

A glance at the adopted topics is sufficient to make it clear that the *Samputa* took over the most important aspects of the ritual of worshipping the visualized deities, the teachings about the three most important ritual objects (the *vajra*, the bell, and the rosary), the most essential parts of the *gaṇacakra*, protective rites, and finally the method of yogic suicide. The most important absentees are the *homa* rites, the calendar system, initiation and its corollaries, signs of death and the rites for cheating death. Significantly, these subjects (with the exception of *homa*) have been more or less entirely adopted by the *Vajradāka* (see table 2.1). It may be presumed that this ‘division of labour’ as it were is not accidental.

While reserving the discussion of individual cases for the notes to the translation, I shall endeavour to give here an outline of how these passages were adopted with limited examples. This is not to say that the editing was done thoroughly and methodically, in fact the *Samputa* stays rather close to its original, inheriting most of its idiosyncrasies.

On the whole the *Samputa* tries to give a more grammatical text, sometimes even at the cost of sacrificing the metre: e.g. 1.1.13a *prathamam śūnyatām vicintya* replaces 1.3.2c *prathamam śūnya saṃcintya*; 1.1.18 eliminates the hiatus-bridger in 1.3.7a *kāya-m-ātmeti* and reads *kāyātmeti*. Case endings are frequently emended to more appropriate ones: e.g. the goddess Prajñāpāramitā is originally described with masculine adjectives (3.2.32ab *dvibhujam sattvaparyāṅkaṃ sarvābharaṇaśobhitam*), whereas the *Samputa* (2.4.35ab) emends the text to *dvibhujāṃ sattvaparyāṅkāṃ sarvābharaṇa-bhūṣitām*.

Additional text is introduced if it was felt that the contents do not give sufficient explanation: see the case of the expanded version of 1.3.3 ff. transmitted in the *Samputa* and mss. C, D, E in SZÁNTÓ 2008a:8 ff.

Incomprehensible text was edited out and replaced by more banal readings. E.g. 1.3.7 has the problematic last quarter-verse ‘*manaś cāpi vikalpayet*’ which 1.1.18 of the *Samputa* replaces with the refrain-statement of the previous verses ‘*madhye vijñā katham bhavet*’. The near senseless 1.1.4ab was simply skipped over, but the previous verse (1.4.3 = *Samputa* 1.1.25cd-26ab)

¹¹⁹The table does not deal with the specifics of editorial intervention (omission of lines or *pādas*, rephrasing, etc.), it merely points out the passages which served as the textual base for the *Samputa*.

Table 2.2: Catuspīṭha verses in the Sampuṭa

<i>Sampuṭa</i>	based on <i>Catuspīṭha</i>	topic
1.1.2-4a	1.1.2-4a	<i>nidānavākya</i>
1.1.13-18	1.3.2cd-7	<i>śūnyatābhāvanā</i>
1.1.21ab, 24-27	1.4.1-5	(cont'd)
1.1.34-37	1.4.7b-10	<i>aṣṭāṅgakalana</i>
2.4.1-16	3.2.1-26	<i>rakṣācakra</i>
2.4.31-36	3.2.27-33	<i>prajñācakra</i>
3.2.1cd-43	2.3.6cd-54	<i>devatābhāvanā</i>
4.1.1, 8-12	2.4.1-105-113	<i>chommā</i>
5.2.1-43	4.4.1-41	(various)
7.1.9-19	2.4.104-114	<i>chommā</i>
7.2.1-2	2.1.1-2	<i>homa</i>
8.1.1-37	3.1.1-37	<i>vajra & ghaṇṭā</i>
8.2.1-20	3.1.42-65	<i>akṣasūtra</i>
8.2.21-24	3.2.70cd-73	<i>Vairocanabhāvanā</i>
8.3.1-41	4.3.34-74	<i>utkrānti</i> etc.
9.1.11cd-28	2.4.4ab-6cd, 2.3.107cd-2.3.113, etc.	<i>pañcāmṛta</i>
9.2.11-16	2.3.164-167	<i>guhyaṇṭā</i>
9.2.18-27	2.3.147-156	<i>bali</i>
9.2.28-29	2.3.128cd-130	<i>amṛtādhiṣṭhāna</i>
9.2.30-35	2.3.135-140	<i>gaṇacakra</i>
9.3.36-44	2.3.168-176	<i>visarjana</i>
9.4.16	2.4.101	<i>gāthā</i>
10.4.18-19	4.4.90, 92, 102	(ending)

and the second line of the verse was lifted over (1.1.4cd = 1.1.26cd).

Sometimes text is replaced even if the contents were intelligible once some degree of familiarity with the strange register of ‘Catuṣpīṭha-Sanskrit’ is obtained. Thus 3.2.7cd ‘*bhāvaye Tārasaṃtānam ātmadehābhi nirmītam*’ is replaced by 2.4.7cd ‘*bhāvayed ātmadehaṃ tu sarvasiddhipradāyikām*’.

2.6 Peculiarities of the Catuṣpīṭha

2.6.1 Stylistic

The first stylistic peculiarity can be found at the very beginning of the text. Instead of the usual *nidāna* (*evaṃ mayā śrutam* etc.) and the non-*nidānas* of the early Śaṃvara scriptures (*athātaḥ* etc., *rahasye parame* etc.), we have something that reads like almost a compromise: the text does begin with *evaṃ*, but the first unit is in verse and omits the rest of the required formulae (1.1.1). This is followed by an unusual list of *bodhisattvas* and a return to an already known scene of revelation, the smile of the *bhagavān* upon beholding Vajrapāṇi. Thereupon Vajrapāṇi adopts the gesture of petitioning and asks his first set of questions.¹²⁰ Although the text is revealed as a conversation between the *bhagavān* and Vajrapāṇi, neither takes an active role in the actual pantheon of the cult, the original *maṇḍala* of which is exclusively female. The revelation proceeds throughout in the question/answer format without the *bhagavān* immersing himself in *samādhis* as in the *yoga*- and *yogottaratantras*.

NIDĀNA

The second feature worthy of attention is that the text is almost entirely in relatively decent *anuṣṭubh* verse. This is on the one hand different from previous scriptures such as the *Tattvasaṃgraha* and the *Guhyasamāja* but also dissimilar to Śaṃvara-type scriptures where pseudo-metrical passages and odd *pādas* pasted to complete verses abound. The *Catuṣpīṭha* on the whole seeks to maintain decent 4-*pāda* verses (sometimes 6 *pādas*, especially when the topic changes) with the fifth syllable kept almost scrupulously short - even at the expense of grammatical propriety.¹²¹

VERSIFICATION

¹²⁰The placing of the upper garment on one shoulder does not necessarily suggest that Vajrapāṇi is portrayed as a monk-figure. The gesture can very well be performed by lay householders (e.g. *Bhaiṣajyavastu* f. 141^v, 145^r, 146^r, *passim*), women (e.g. *Abhisamayālaṃkāṛālokā* quoting the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, p. 743) or gods (e.g. *Mahāsāhasrapramardīnī* p. 3, 4, 6, 37) as well.

¹²¹E.g. 1.4.11b has *Jñānadākinīm ātmakāḥ*, whereas the name of the goddess should naturally end in a long -ī; in 1.2.7c *dantadanturabhilagnau* the *sandhi* resulting in a long

Some of the verses are in *Apabhraṃśa*, a salient feature of *yoginītantras*. Arguably the *Catuṣpīṭha* is one of the first, if not the first ever, Buddhist scripture to use this language-shift. The *Apabhraṃśa* grammar that can be gleaned from these few verses is unfortunately just as chaotic and arbitrary as the Sanskrit of the scripture itself. In other words, one cannot state with absolute certainty which of the *Apabhraṃśas* the *tantra* uses. However, the Eastern features dominate (cf. notes in the introduction to 2.3.108-117 below).

APABHRAṂŚA

The most important stylistic feature, however, – although one could also consider this a doctrinal or linguistic one – is the compilers’ effort to use either new and unparalleled terminology, opt for rarely used terms, or mix the two where terms are transmitted in sets. A few examples should suffice here as all such occurrences are discussed in the notes. In 1.1 the set of *bhuvaneśvaras* beginning with *rohitā* seems to be a *Catuṣpīṭha* invention as all other occurrences in other texts can be shown to have been inspired by this scripture. The list of *bodhisattvas* heading the audience of the revelation (1.1.2) is also unique. I have already described the unique terms in the *abhīṣeka* system above. The offering for which the usual term *bali* would have sufficed becomes *adaityābali* in the *Catuṣpīṭha*. While keeping in line with the tradition by using *amṛta* for the bodily fluids, for the five meats the text (especially in 2.4) uses the less usual collective term *aṅkuśa* instead of *pradīpa*. The names of the meats are unparalleled (see 2.4.29-35). Whereas most traditions use a sextet of seed-syllables to install on the body, the *Catuṣpīṭha* has an *aṣṭāṅgakalana*. The series of vowels and consonants are almost universally called *āli* and *kāli* in the Tantric tradition, but our text emphatically uses *ali* throughout (also in 2.4). The list of eight *nāgas* almost always begins with Ananta elsewhere, but in our text they are headed by Vāsuki (see notes ad 1.2.46cd-48). The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* continues this tradition of creating and using a unique terminology. One of the most distinctive innovations in that text is the set of unusual names for the fingers (*śvetā*, *dhūmā*, *śaṅkhā*, etc.), which are then used to describe *mudrās*.

TERMINOLOGY

2.6.2 Iconographic

The *Catuṣpīṭha* is an unusual *yoginītantra* since it does not teach a Heruka

–ā is sacrificed for the metre and not because the author was ignorant of the rule (cf. *dantadantābhilagnasya* in 1.2.12c).

LACK OF
HERUKA

form. This is not to say that all major *yoginītantras* do so, but those that do not form a minority. For even *tantras* outside the *Śaṃvara* and *Hevajra* cycles proper at least refer to a Heruka: the *Buddhakaṭāla*, the *Vajrāmṛta* and so forth.

It is even more unusual that the original pantheon of the text is exclusively female. The chief goddesses are headed by Jñānaḍākinī (whose *bīja* is HŪṂ as in the case of Herukas). They surround her in a 4+4+4 configuration, a feature otherwise reminiscent of Śaiva pantheons affiliated to the Vidyāpīṭha.¹²² It is only later that the cult acquires a chief male deity, Yogāmbara, and a host of other male gods. This feature, to superimpose a male-dominated group on a female one, is exactly the reverse of a trend already identified by SANDERSON (1988:670 ff. with elaborations in later articles, especially 2009:173 ff.) in both the Śaiva and the Buddhist case, and ENGLISH (2002:47 ff.) in the case of the Vajravārāhī/Vajrayoginī in the Śaṃvara cycle. These studies point out that the tendency was for goddesses to gain independence from their previous status as consorts, to become chief deities in their own right, and finally to surpass their male counterparts rising to paramount prominence. In the *Catuṣpīṭha* it is exactly the opposite: it is Yogāmbara who takes over and Jñānaḍākinī who is relegated to the role of consort, her unequal status suggested by alternative names such as Yogāmbarī. Such development is to my knowledge unique in the history of late Tantric Buddhism.¹²³

PANTHEON

As regards another trend discussed in SANDERSON 2009 (145 ff.), namely the adaptation of *kāpālika* iconography, the *Catuṣpīṭha* seems to occupy the middle ground between no such influence and the full appropriation observable in the Śaṃvara cycle. In other words, the adoption of cremation ground imagery is still only partial. The goddesses do carry skull-bowls (here called *yogapātra*, another rare usage) and skull-staffs, but other bone ornaments are missing (although they wear snakes as ornaments) as is the iconized custom of smearing the body with ash. The cremation ground itself is only rarely mentioned and it is not an obligatory location for practice. Compared to the full-blown ferociousness of Śaṃvara deities, the *Catuṣpīṭha* goddesses seem somewhat tame. For example, though the hair of goddesses is dishevelled, they are still fully clad. They are not portrayed in dynamic dancing positions but seated. Although Jñānaḍākinī is said to have a ferocious face, this

KĀPĀLIKA
IMAGERY

¹²²Prof. Sanderson, personal communication 2008.

¹²³For the superimposition of Yogāmbara see SZÁNTÓ 2008c and below.

is not the chief one (i.e. the one facing the practitioner). Only some of the goddesses are described as ferociously laughing (i.e. displaying the *aṭṭahāsa*). Although many of the goddesses are zoocephalic, the main goddess and her four immediate attendants in the cardinal directions are not.

Since the original pantheon is female, there are no copulating deities, in spite of the fact that most of 3.4 describes sexual practices. However, when the chief male god and his male attendants appear, the main couple Yogāmbara-Jñānaḍākinī are portrayed in sexual embrace as are some of the attendants.

PORTRAYAL

Bu ston's discussion of Vairocana as the 'clan-deity' of the text has already been summarized above.¹²⁴ Without intending to do so the Tibetan scholar here identifies an archaic feature signaling the still powerful influence of the *yogatantras*.

VAIROCANĀ

2.6.3 Doctrinal and ritual

The archaic and unique *abhiṣeka* set has already been discussed above (also see notes to 4.1.17).¹²⁵ The sequence of consecrations in the *Catuṣpīṭha* does not conform in any way to what later became the mainstream model, i.e. *kalaśābhiṣeka* (which subsumes the archaic set of the *yogatantras*), *guhya-bhiṣeka*, *praññājñānābhiṣeka*, and the *caturtha*. The culmination of initiation seems to be the *ācāryābhiṣeka* in which the 'secrets' are revealed to the initiate. We are not told exactly what these are, but conjecturally we may guess that they refer to the elements of the *maṇḍala* and their doctrinal equivalents plus further specialized ritual knowledge an *ācārya* should possess. Although the sexual element is not at all foreign to the *Catuṣpīṭha*, it seems that intercourse did not form part of the *abhiṣeka*. This is somewhat unusual.

ABHIṢEKA

Another unusual feature for a supposedly full-fledged *yoginītantra* is that the *Catuṣpīṭha* does not teach a system of wheels (*cakra*), tubes (*nāḍī*), and drops (*bindu*) or vital energies (*prāṇa*). The closest the text ever gets to such a system is in the *guhyaḥoma* section (see 4.2.68-78), but this apparatus of a single 'knot' (*gīṇṭhā*) and eighteen veins seems to be occasional, certainly not a central teaching and not a system that pervades the entire body.¹²⁶

LACK OF
CAKRAS
ETC.

¹²⁴See note 38.

¹²⁵Kalyāṇavarman's set of consecrations are given in *Pañjikā* 29^v: *śiṣyābhiṣeka*, *mantrābhiṣeka*, *tantrābhiṣeka*. This, yet another unusual, list makes the problem even graver.

¹²⁶Another 'tube' called the 'bird-beak' (*khagamukhā*) is described and used in e.g. 3.3.59-62, 3.4.49ff., but this vein or tube seems to be present only in female bodies.

The lack of such teachings did not go unnoticed and their absence was felt undesirable: the **Vyākhyātantra* teaches an abundance of procedures based on a comprehensive system of yogic ‘tubes’. Teachings about breath-*yoga* is again present in the text, indeed it forms a seminal part, but we find nothing about manipulating that breath *qua* vital energy in regions of the body. However, even with the absence of a tube-system, the *Catuspīṭha* teaches *utkrānti*, i.e. the volitional departure of consciousness from the body through defined apertures, otherwise known as yogic suicide. Although monadic consciousness does seem to ascend to the fontanelle, there is no clear reference to a central tube (most often called *avadhūtī* in later texts) as it would be described in mature Vajrayāna texts.

In spite of its name the *Catuspīṭha* does not refer to any kind of sacred geography or *pīṭha* cult in the style of the Śaṃvara or Hevajra scriptures. On the other hand the importance of *yoginīs* (elsewhere associated with pilgrimage sites) is paramount.

LACK OF
SACRED GE-
OGRAPHY

Non-dualistic/transgressive practice abounds: a substantial part of the text is concerned with impure substances used in ritual, types of consorts and sexual practices, the use of blood and poisonous substances in aggressive ritual and so forth. However, some signs show that the adoption of what one could label *vāmācāra* was still not complete. For example, when the goddesses of the *maṇḍala* are visualized only those in the cardinal directions are processed in a counterclockwise fashion, the ones in the intermediate directions are installed through visualization in the auspicious clockwise direction. Facing the inauspicious southern direction during practice is missing. The *yoginī* is under no obligation to dress in *kāpālīka* fashion (skull-cup, bone ornaments, smearing with ash, etc.) and is not required to undergo observances such as the *unmattavrata*.

VĀMĀCĀRA

Another very important archaic feature is the way selected *yoginīs* of the *maṇḍala* are propitiated in 2.4.46 ff. and 3.4.125 ff. The rites described here strongly echo the *yakṣiṇī*-summoning rites of the older *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* and the similarly archaic *Bhūtaḍāmara*.¹²⁷ If the goddesses – supposedly paramount deities of the *maṇḍala* – refuse to obey the *yoginī*’s call, he can perform rites to inflict pain in them, split their heads asunder, or murder

YOGINĪS/
YAKṢINĪS

¹²⁷For the former see DELHEY forthcoming. For the latter it is difficult to provide exact references, since practically the entire text consists of such summoning rites, and not only for *yakṣiṇīs* (Ms 16^r ff.) but *bhūtinīs* (Ms 2^v ff. and again 13^v ff.), *kātyāyanīs* (Ms 5^v ff.), *ceṭīs* and *ceṭikās* (Ms 7^v ff.), *apsarases* (Ms 14^r ff.), *nāginīs* (Ms 17^v ff.), and *kiṃnarīs* (Ms 18^v–19^v).

them. The motifs, language and tone used in these rites are unmistakably of the exorcist-magician's world and not that of the gnostic goddess-worshipper.

Yet another, in my view, archaic feature of the text is the importance attached to *mudrās* and other elements of choreography such as dance-steps (cf. 2.3.68-84, 2.3.87-106, 3.4.100-109, *passim*). Such attention to the minutiae of external ritual elements – the mainstay of *yogatantras* – are already mocked by the ninth-century Āryadeva,¹²⁸ but this supposedly gnosis-oriented *yoginī-tantra* is still replete with them. It is only in the last chapter, the *guhyaṣṭha*, that the text becomes expressly anti-ritualistic (e.g. 4.1.59, 4.2.4-5).

Another feature reminiscent of earlier Tantric doctrine is the triad Surocana (for Vairocana), Padmeśvara (for Avalokiteśvara), and Vajreśvara (for Vajrapāṇi) used in the purification of the nectars (2.3.130, 2.4.12). Although the text is fully aware of the quintet of Tathāgatas, this triad corresponds to the lords of three families (*tathāgata, padma, vajra*) of the *kriyātantras*.¹²⁹

The incorporation of Mahāyāna doctrinal terms into the ritual framework (to use the technical term: *viśuddhi*) is still at an imperfect and somewhat clumsy stage. This is best exemplified by 3.4.8-15, where there is an attempt to identify elements of the *maṇḍala* with the perfections *pāramitā*. Thus the rampart (*prākāra*) is said to be *dāna*, the protective cage is *śīla*, and the daggers (*kīla*) pinned around the ritual space are *kṣānti*. Now here we would expect *vīrya* as the next element, but instead we have the fragrant powders as equanimity (*samatā*) and further we have flowers as, again, *kṣānti* where we would expect *dhyāna*. The list returns to expected standard only with the lamps, which are said to stand for *prajñā*.

It is not unusual in *yoginītantras* to find references to other scriptures, not only to claim their superiority over them, but also to establish scriptural affinity or a pedigree. E.g. the *Herukābhīdhāna* refers back to the *Paramādya*, the *Vajrabhairava*, the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*.¹³⁰ The *Yoginīsaṃcāra* refers to the *Samvara* (i.e. the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*), the [*Heruk*] *abhīdhāna*, and the [*Herukābhy*] *udaya* (13.10-11). The *Ḍākinīvajrapañjara* not only lists scriptures but groups them as well.¹³¹ The *Ḍākārṇava* in ch. 15 refers to the

¹²⁸ *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (p. 81): *athavā kecit sādhakās Tattvasaṃgrahāditantrānusāriṇo hastamudrāgītopahārākṣepābhīnayanatanartakādīprayogair nityam udyuktamanaso 'har-nīśaṃ prapañcacaryayā mahāmudrāsiddhiṃ sādhayanti*.

¹²⁹ See e.g. LESSING & WAYMAN 1968:100 ff.

¹³⁰ SANDERSON 2009:163.

¹³¹ GRAY 2007a:6. I disagree with his interpretation on many points. E.g. the Tibetan

MUDRĀS

THREE
KULEŚVARAS

VIŚUDDHI

REFERENCES

12,000-verse *Catuṣpīṭha* Ur-*tantra*.¹³² But the *Catuṣpīṭha* is very uninformative in this respect. 1.1.1d (*yoginījālasamvaram* or *-samvaram*, according to Kalyāṇavarman's reading) may only tentatively be seen as a nod to the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālasamvara*. The same verse contains the odd word *rigīnām* in the second *pāda*, which may show an awareness of the *Rigiarallitantra* or, more likely, an earlier related scripture.¹³³

2.6.4 Linguistic

The highly idiosyncratic register of the language in which the *Catuṣpīṭha* was written is to my knowledge unparalleled in the history of Sanskrit. It is of course well-known that most early tantras, Śaiva or Buddhist, were written in a special register of Sanskrit called either *aiśa*¹³⁴ or *ārṣa*¹³⁵, but the *Catuṣpīṭha* goes even further by violating practically every rule of standardized usage, classical or 'tantric'. Some metrical decency is retained, presumably

translation *Gsang mdzod* is restored as the **Guhyagarbha* and tentatively identified with the controversial scripture known under that name. The solution here is doubtless the *Guhyakośa*, a scripture referred to and quoted by Indian authorities (*Gūḍhapadā* Ms 68^v, **Vajradākavivṛti* 191^r). GRAY omits identifying the *'byung ba*, which is most likely a shorthand for the *Herukābhyudaya*. The list of 'male' *tantras* in the two previous verses is not even discussed. Here, incidentally, we have an odd title *Gser gyi char pa* (**Suvarṇavr̥ṣṭi?*) which the Tibetan polymath Bo dong identifies with the *Catuṣpīṭha* (*Gdan bzhi'i rgyud bshad* pp. 120-121 = 1^v -2^r).

¹³²Ms 35^v: *Catuṣpīṭheṣu vakṣyante tantr[e] dvādaśasahasrake ||*

¹³³Note, however, that Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses the word as *buddhānām*, whereas the *Rigiarallitantra* sees *rigi* as either the proper name of a goddess, the consort of the Heruka Ārali/Aralli (176^r *passim*), or a synonym of 'dākinī' (179^r). For this spelling of the *tantra* as opposed to **Rigīārālī* suggested by the Tibetan see *Amṛtakanīkā* p. 11. This quotation was first pointed out to me by Prof. Isaacson in August 2008, who also informed me that an uncatalogued single-folio fragment of the *tantra* survives in CUL Add. 1680 (*non vidi*).

¹³⁴[The language] of the Lord (Īśa, i.e. Śiva): For a short description of *aiśa* grammar and style see TÖRZSÖK 1999:xxvi-lxx (mostly following an unpublished draft descriptive grammar by SANDERSON). A systematic description of *Aiśa* phenomena keyed to the text will be used in an edition by Csaba KISS (*The Religious Observances and Sexual Rituals of the Tantric Practitioner. A Critical Edition, Annotated Translation and Analysis of Chapters 3, 21 and 45 of the Brahmayāmalatantra*, forthcoming). This will certainly become the standard to follow, but the concept reached me too late to implement it. I thank Dr. Kiss for sending his draft and for fruitful discussions concerning the grammar of the *Brahmayāmala*.

¹³⁵[The language] of sages (*r̥ṣi*): This is how Bhavabhaṭṭa calls the language of another *yoginītantra*, the *Herukābhīdhāna*. Cf. SANDERSON 2001:46, n. 54.

so that the text could be recited.¹³⁶

The commentators are well-aware of this problem and conceal their embarrassment only with great difficulty. Thus Bhavabhaṭṭa in the second opening verse of his commentary makes an unflattering pun:

[II] “Born from nectar (*amṛtodbhavam*), the [tantra in] Four Chapters (*Catuṣpīṭham*¹³⁷) is like the stalk of the water-lily (*nalinīnālam*): although (*api*) overall / all around [on the outside] (*samantāt*) it has clear virtues / it has white fibres (*viśadagaṇam*), from time to time / [but] in its inner core (*antarāntaram*) [there are] manifold [instances when] / there are plenty of (*bahutaḥ*) [its] virtues are less clear / black fibres (*aviśadagaṇam*).”

Then, with feigned humility, in the fourth verse he portrays his inadequacy to comment of the text thus:

[IV] “How is a poor (*tapasvī*) deer, who grazes (*carati*)¹³⁸ here (*iha*) on grass which would break under a [falling] tear (*bāṣpacchedyam*),¹³⁹ supposed to (*sambhāvyah*) snatch the jewel from [the brow of] the elephant (*gajamaṇi*) - when [that task] could only be accomplished by the valour of a lion (*lit.* the lord of beasts, *mṛgapati*-)?”

‘Grass’ is a common metaphor for worthless or trivial things in the Indian idiom. Perhaps Bhavabhaṭṭa here alludes to his usual literary habits: easy, straightforward texts. Finally, in the seventh verse he reveals the way he proposes to explain the text:

¹³⁶Verse 4.4.100 promises rewards in heaven and this life for reciting and listening to the text.

¹³⁷The *āryā* metre is violated here. Although a *vipulā* would be possible here to extend the caesura for the next syllable, that syllable must be short (cf. JACOBI 1886). Perhaps Bhavabhaṭṭa committed this error on purpose to allude to the metrical (and general) deficiency of the tantra, although such a private joke would be highly idiosyncratic.

¹³⁸For this sense see *Dhātupāṭha* 1.591: *cara bhakṣaṇe*.

¹³⁹The image is standard. It is found e.g. in the *Harṣacarita* (p. 42): . . . *bāṣpacchedyatṛnatṛptair godhanair dhavalitavipinaḥ* . . . (‘its woods made white by herds of cows content with [blades of] grass [so tender] that [they] can be cut by a [falling] tear’).

[VII] “Metre (*chandas*), gender (*liṅgam*), case endings (*vibhakti*), number (*-vacana-*), and the such are beyond worldly usage (*atilaukikam*)¹⁴⁰ here [i.e. in this tantra] (*iha*). This jewel of a scripture (*tantraratanam*) should be adorned with having the ornament that is the meaning in mind (*arthālaṅkāradhiyā*).”

Further on, *ad* verse 1.1.4, he states:

“And one should not criticize grammatical or ungrammatical expressions (*śabdāpaśabdau*) in this [*tantra*]. For both are [just] constructs (*tayoḥ kalpitatvāt*).”

This seems to suggest that in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s view the text wants to teach by example that language (just like everything else) is constructed and based on mere conventions and not ultimate truths.

Kalyāṇavarman outlines his similar *modus operandi* thus:

evaṃ bhāṣitety ārabhya yāvad abhyandann itivacanāntaṃ vibhaktiṅgavacanasamāsādayaḥ gurulaghuyaticchandādayaś cārthopadeśavaśād yathāyogaṃ yojanīyāḥ.

‘[In this whole tantra] from the words *evaṃ bhāṣita* at the beginning up to *abhyandan* at the end, the suffixes of case, gender and number, [the semantic relations between members of] compounds and [other matters of grammar and syntax], as well as such features as length of vowels, caesurae and metre, should be interpreted as each case demands on the basis that they are intended to convey an [apposite] sense.’¹⁴¹

This terse statement in fact describes the method of all three commentators. For the most part the elucidation of words consists of giving the correct grammatical form a word should have (in the commentator’s viewpoint, of

¹⁴⁰I thank Dr. Jim Benson for improving on my interpretation here. Initially I understood *atilaukikam* as ‘utterly worldly’, i.e. grammar is just a worldly construct from the viewpoint of the *tantra*.

¹⁴¹Translation from SANDERSON 2001:47, n. 54. I follow Sanderson’s emended text, with the exception of *abhyandann* (or perhaps better yet: *abhyandann itīti*), which I think is the original lemma instead of the correct *abhyandann*.

course), and if this requires further elaboration a gloss or a short explanation is given. Grammatical rules are cited only very rarely.¹⁴²

Durjayacandra summarizes his view in a rather beautiful but unfortunately incomplete half-verse containing an elegant *double-entendre*:

*varṣākāśam ivāprakāśam amitair abdair aśabdair idaṃ
tantraṃ mantravipaścītām api durālok+ + + + + + + [||]*¹⁴³

This tantra is like the firmament during the rainy season: dark (*aprakāśam*) with countless (*amitair*) silent (*aśabdair*) clouds (*abdair*) / unclear (*aprakāśam*) [in spite of] many (*amitair*) years (*abdair*) [of study due to its] ungrammatical words (*aśabdair*). It is difficult to + + + + even for those versed in [the scriptures] of mantras.

It was not only the commentators that struggled to come to terms with the language of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The editors of the *Vajradāka* and the *Samputa* copy over large chunks of text from the *Catuṣpīṭha* frequently improving on its language. The passages that presumably did not make sense to the editors were left out. Thus the highly arcane *samayam eṣo na rakṣitāḥ* in 4.1.28d is rewritten in bad metre as *evaṃ daśavidhaṃ karma* in the parallel *Vajradāka* 32.21d, and similarly the obscure line *ṭṛṣṇābhāvena mūrkhānāṃ bhavaghora-patātmakaiḥ* (4.1.52cd) is simply skipped after *Vajradāka* 32.25cd, where it should have followed. If the intention of the compilers of the *Catuṣpīṭha* was to make their revelation unintelligible to outsiders, we may say that they did an excellent job, inasmuch as not even those working in closely related traditions and removed in time by what must not have exceeded a few decades found their text completely beyond interpretation in places.

The wide range of variant readings is ample testimony to the fact that the text was freely tampered with during transmission and not because scribes/editors felt that their reading was better: the question was rather to make something utterly senseless into something meaningful. That this was the case we have the testimony of one of the commentators, Durjayacandra, who says ad 1.1.88 (*Mitapadā* 10^v):

¹⁴²Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa's somewhat unexpected citation of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.5 ad 1.1.36 to justify an Accusative instead of a Locative: **mikiraṃ dārako jāta** [...] "A child born during the time of Mikira [...]"

¹⁴³*Mitapadā* 1^v.

*khagadve ṛtuṃ kṛtvety abudhyamānaiḥ pāṭhāntaraṃ kalpitaṃ
kharādibhi ṛtuṃ kṛtvetyādi.*

“Certain people did not understand the reading **khagadve ṛtuṃ kṛtvā** and conjectured a variant, namely **kharādibhi ṛtuṃ kṛtvā** and so forth.”

It is very probable that by ‘certain people’ he actually means Bhavabhaṭṭa, since the interpretation of the *Mitapadā* follows the ameliorated reading and the commentary thereto of the *Nibandha*.

We may never know what the original intention of the compilers was. The only thing we do know is the reported opinion of authors working in the tradition. I have given above the relevant quotes from the commentators. What groups them together is that they were monastic exegetes trying to tame, appropriate, and somehow make sense of what was a new and bewildering revelation. There remains one significant author to mention, that of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, perhaps the first satellite text written after the *Catuṣpīṭha* came into being. This particular author sought to emulate the grammatical (or rather, ungrammatical) style of the *tantra* throughout, and he makes statements to the effect that this choice was conscious. Speaking on the *tantra* in the introduction he states (v. 1.11cd):

gopitā guhyam arthasya mlecchabhāṣeṇa bhāṣitam

“[This *tantra*] hides the secret meaning by teaching [it] in a barbaric language (*mlecchabhāṣā*).”

He also calls the *tantra* (v. 1.7cd) a treatise on *yoga* (*yogaśāstra*) told in ‘the language of *yoga*’ (*yogavākyena*), and in the closing verse he says:

*na cchandatarkavākyasya artha arthena saṃgraham /
gopitā yogatattvena mlecchabhāṣeṇa¹⁴⁴ bhāṣitam //*

In a tentative rendering:

“These words are devoid of metre and logic, and they should be understood according to their meaning. They are concealed by the principles of yoga, spoken in a barbaric language (*mlecchabhāṣā*).”

¹⁴⁴In the opinion of some scholars calling the language of the tantras ‘barbaric’ is politically incorrect. However, as this example shows, the usage is warranted by tradition.

Catūṣpītha authors are of course not alone in reflecting on the bizarre language of their scripture. Indeed, we even have scriptures and commentaries with almost scriptural status that do the same (cf. *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 13.17-19 & *Vimalaprabhā* vol. 1, pp. 29-30¹⁴⁵). However, the irregular Sanskrit of those texts is very dissimilar from the complete chaos of the *Catūṣpītha*.

Several phonological phenomena are noteworthy. Especially in the case of the word *praṇava* the -v- becomes an -m- (**praṇamā** in 1.2.19b). -Ri- is very often spelt -ṛ-, but this is also seen in scribal practice. Somewhat oddly -tn-, especially in the word *patnī*, turns into -ṇṇ-¹⁴⁶ -Ts- is rather often spelt as -cch-. The latter two phenomena probably reflect the influence of vernaculars or Middle Indic pronunciation. -Ba- and -va- are of course indistinguishable in our manuscripts, but a *mantra*-encoding (1.4.27 ff.) reveals the form *baḍabe* for *vaḍave*, most likely capturing an east-Indian pronunciation.

There is complete promiscuity in matters of gender, case, and number. Masculine nouns, especially in Nominative and Accusative, are freely conflated with Neuters, sometimes with Feminines.¹⁴⁷ The Dative is almost completely absent, the most common ‘case’ being that of the stem form (*prātipadika*), in other words the nil-suffix. This can stand for any case.¹⁴⁸ Cases are otherwise also interchangeable in any permutation, perhaps most bizarrely the Genitive Singular or Plural is frequently to be understood as a Nominative¹⁴⁹ or an Accusative,¹⁵⁰ but also a Locative¹⁵¹. An Instrumental can also stand for a Locative.¹⁵² Very frequently *sup* endings are simple verse-fillers.¹⁵³ Aiśa endings with shortening or lengthening are common,¹⁵⁴ but

¹⁴⁵Cf. NEWMAN 1988.

¹⁴⁶E.g. **paṇṇī** (1.1.22c, 31b, *passim*).

¹⁴⁷E.g. **īśvaram** for *īśvaraḥ* (1.1.1b), but **nāmam** for *nāma* (1.2.16c), and **ghaṇṭam** for *ghaṇṭā* (1.2.20a).

¹⁴⁸E.g. **Maitreya** for Nominative (1.2.20b), **paṇṇī** for Accusative *patnīḥ* (1.1.24d), **dola** for Instrumental (1.1.8b), **vivāha** for Dative (1.1.15e), **dvaya** for Genitive (1.1.8d), **karma** for Locative (1.1.6d).

¹⁴⁹E.g. **dhyānasya** for *dhyānaṃ* (1.1.5b).

¹⁵⁰E.g. **yathādiśasya** for the adverbial Accusative *yathādiśam* (1.2.24c).

¹⁵¹E.g. **dolasya** for *dolāyām* (1.1.8c).

¹⁵²E.g. **antena** for *ante* (1.2.17c).

¹⁵³E.g. **hārādolasya śvāsānām** for *hārādolaśvāsānām* (1.1.8a).

¹⁵⁴E.g. **ṣaṇmāsā** for *ṣaṇmāsāt* (final consonants are otherwise frequently silent, cf. **bāndhavai** for *bāndhavaiḥ* in 1.1.32b), **ebhi** for *etena* or *ebhiḥ* (1.2.14d), **devya** for Aiśa *devyā*, that is to say *devī* (1.2.21b). The -bhi ending is not always with an Instrumental sense, e.g. **Ḍākinibhi** should be understood as a Genitive.

they are not universally observed.¹⁵⁵ The Dual is almost completely missing. Singulars and Plurals are interchangeable and one frequently qualifies the other.¹⁵⁶ Sometimes a noun qualifies another standing in a different case.¹⁵⁷

The same randomness applies for numerals: the ordinal and cardinal numerals can take each other's place,¹⁵⁸ and very often they are declined as nouns. In composite numbers there is frequent metathesis of elements.¹⁵⁹

Verbs and conjugation do not fare any better. Singular and plural is frequently confused,¹⁶⁰ Active and Medial are indistinguishable, and the simplex and the Causative are also conflated.¹⁶¹ The Passive Past Participle can stand for any finite verb.¹⁶² An Ablative¹⁶³ or Instrumental¹⁶⁴ can also be a finite verb, and sometimes even a Genitive is interpreted thus.¹⁶⁵ The *lyap* and *ktivā* Absolutes are more often conflated than not, but this is a standard feature even in non-Tantric texts. Some forms seen in Aśā are also present.¹⁶⁶

Enclitics are sometimes misplaced.¹⁶⁷ Pronouns, *ādi*, and the *tasil* ending are sometimes meaningless and employed only to fill the metre.¹⁶⁸ Hypermetrical or hypometrical *pādas* are not the norm, but they are not too common either.¹⁶⁹ Sometimes words are truncated for the sake of the metre¹⁷⁰ or for no apparent reason¹⁷¹, but sometimes where truncation would be expected, it is not present.¹⁷² Vowels, especially when in the fifth syllable of a *pāda* can

¹⁵⁵E.g. **likhed rocana**^o should be **likhe . . .**, but the commentators' *pratīkas* preserve the consonant.

¹⁵⁶E.g. **mṛtyucihnāni . . . rakṣitam** and **ebhi bījena** are for *ebhir bījaiḥ* (1.2.14cd).

¹⁵⁷E.g. **Maitreya śirasi sthitā** (1.2.20b).

¹⁵⁸E.g. **ṣaṣṭha** for *ṣaṣ* (1.1.7b).

¹⁵⁹E.g. **aśīticatvāri** for *caturaśīti* (1.1.19a).

¹⁶⁰E.g. **līyante** for *līyate* (1.1.8c).

¹⁶¹E.g. **kārayet** for *kuryāt* (1.2.43b).

¹⁶²E.g. **darśitam** for the first person future (1.2.2b), **jāpitam** for the third person Optative (1.2.11d).

¹⁶³E.g. **kāraṇāt** for *kuryāt* (1.2.4d, 35b).

¹⁶⁴E.g. **cetasā** for *cetayasva* (1.3.15b).

¹⁶⁵E.g. **kalpasya** for *kalpayet* (1.1.25c, 29c, 45a, *passim*).

¹⁶⁶E.g. **dadet** for *dadyāt* (1.2.49b).

¹⁶⁷E.g. **mṛtyukālam iva sthitam** (1.2.2d).

¹⁶⁸E.g. **idaṃ** (1.2.7a, 12a), **koṣṭhādi** (1.2.16a), **uktitaḥ** (1.2.22d).

¹⁶⁹E.g. 1.2.15 was perhaps read with an epenthetic vowel, whereas in 1.2.14b the initial U- in the name was probably silent.

¹⁷⁰E.g. **vāyavyāṃ Lūki hūṃkṛtiḥ** (1.2.23d).

¹⁷¹E.g. **sya** for *asya* (1.2.16), **pañcaḍākinidhiṣṭhitam** (1.2.30b).

¹⁷²E.g. 1.2.14b where we would expect **Lūkībījena** instead of *Ulūkībījena*.

also be shortened.¹⁷³ *Sandhi* is frequently suspended for the sake of the metre,¹⁷⁴ with or without a hiatus-bridging consonant (most frequently -m-¹⁷⁵ but also -r-), and it can also be frozen¹⁷⁶.

These are but a few peculiarities of the text. I have not striven to give a systematic description for the simple reason that there does not seem to be a system to describe. We must indeed follow the commentators' recipe and disregard the super-Aiśa grammar completely, seeking to figure out the meaning from the most basic meaning of nouns and roots.

2.7 Sites of study and worship

Early sites of *Catuṣpīṭha*-based worship are suggested only by textual evidence. Thus the cult established itself in Nepal before 1012 CE (the date on the ms. of the *Pañjikā*), acquired popularity in the middle of the next century (as several mss. date from *cca.* 1150), and continues to flourish to some extent even today (see below).

In the Pāla empire¹⁷⁷ popularity of the cult is evidenced by the twelfth-century Vikramaśīla ms. of the *Nibandha* (q.v.) and the late eleventh-century ms. of Amitavajra's work (q.v.). If we are to believe the Tibetan historian Tāranātha, there existed in the early 11th century institutions dedicated solely to the cult. One such religious establishment (*chos gzhi*) was founded by the influential Tantric scholar Vāgīśvarakīrti. Unfortunately Tāranātha does not tell us what exactly a *chos gzhi* was and how it worked.¹⁷⁸ The

PĀLA
INDIA

¹⁷³E.g. **Vajrīdevatīnāmataḥ** (1.2.18d).

¹⁷⁴E.g. **huta-akṣara antasya** (1.2.18a).

¹⁷⁵Sometimes, however, the hiatus-bridger has no such role as it stands at the beginning of an odd *pāda*, e.g. **m-uccāṭa** (1.1.57a).

¹⁷⁶E.g. **catvāro ṣaḍbhir** (1.2.24b).

¹⁷⁷I use this term for the sake of convenience. Historical sources clearly demonstrate that the lands subsumed here under this name were at different times under the dominion of rival minor dynasties. I am referring roughly to the territory halved by the Ganges from Patna to the confluence, comprising what is now Bangladesh, the Indian federal states of West Bengal, Bihar, and Jharkhand, and the eastern half of the Nepalese southern plains.

¹⁷⁸CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:297 with a faulty translation “[...] four for the teaching of the Guhyasamāja and one seat [?] each for the teaching of Hevajra, Cakrasamvara and *Māyā [?] [...]” The note attached to this erroneous translation (n. 21) has the more correct interpretations of Schiefner and Vasil'ev. The *'Dzam thang* print for the passage in question reads (*Rgya gar chos 'byung* 186^r): “[...] *Gsang ba 'dus pa 'chad pa'i chos gzhi bzhi | Bde Dgyes Gdan bzhi Mā yā 'chad pa'i chos gzhi re re | [...]*” which must

toponyms in the preceding narrative are Nālandā and Vikramaśīla, and we have other evidence to place Vāgīśvarakīrti in Eastern India.¹⁷⁹ It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that such establishments were located in what is now Bihar and Bengal.

The deities of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, both the original set of goddesses and the superimposed Yogāmbara, are at present worshipped only in the Kathmandu Valley. NEPAL

The oldest and most significant of sites where Jñānaḍākinī is still worshipped as an equal of, or somewhat superior to, Yogāmbara is the Mhaypi shrine in Kathmandu. The name is attested in several spellings: Mhayapi, Mhyapi, Mhaypi (LOCKE 1980), Mhepi (BANGDEL 2002), Mhaypi (YOSHIZAKI 2001), Mhaipī, Mhepy, Mhepi (inscriptions *in situ*), Mhyepi (Google Maps) with or without the affix Ajimā (Newar: ‘grandmother’). According to a modern inscription dated NS 1120 (= 2000 CE) recording donors at the site identify it as Mhaspṛṅga or Mhasapīṭhadola mentioned in documents of the Licchavi era. Nowadays the site, which comprises several clusters of religious items surrounding and topping a hillock, is thoroughly eclectic. The oldest remains are Buddhist (relief of Mañjuśrī, a *viśvavajra*, etc.). When I visited the shrine in September 2008 there was a perceptible influx of Tibetan Buddhist, and of Vaiṣṇava worship. These objects are present not only at the bottom of the hill (i.e. at the ‘periphery’), but also close to the main shrine (e.g. a recent Kṛṣṇa-Rādhā statue). MHAYPI

The ‘grandmother at Mhaypi’ in her public, exoteric aspect is known as Māheśvarī, queen of the eight mother-goddesses (*aṣṭamātr*), but for initiated Newar Buddhists, her esoteric aspect is Jñānaḍākinī or Jñāneśvarī together with Yogāmbara.¹⁸⁰ Yet another identification says that she is a *yakṣiṇī*, and the mother of Avalokiteśvara.¹⁸¹ The goddess in the main shrine is aniconic,

mean “four religious establishments for the exegesis of the *Guhyasamāja* and one religious establishment each for the exegesis of the *Śaṃvara*, the *Hevajra*, the *Catuṣpīṭha*, and the *[Mahā]māyā*.” The Sanskrit equivalent for *chos gzh* is *dharmādhikāra* as witnessed by the *Ratnāvalī* (SANDERSON 2009:104, n. 218).

¹⁷⁹The *Caturthasadbhāvopadeśa*, a work by the Kashmiri Ratnavajra written before 1063 CE, calls the author of the **Caturthāloka* (157^r : *Bzhi pa *sgron* (em., *sgrol* T_D) *ma mdzad pa*) an Eastern *paṇḍita* (*shar phyogs kyī* [. . .] *mkhas pa* [. . .]). The title is another name for the *Tattvaratnāvaloka* of Vāgīśvarakīrti as evidenced by that author himself in his **Saptāṅga* (190^v, 199^r, 199^v). Ratnavajra’s work very likely survives in the original in a Kashmiri birch-bark ms. described by KAWASAKI 2004.

¹⁸⁰SLUSSER 1982:325.

¹⁸¹WRIGHT 1877:143-144.

a stone crowned with a beautifully fashioned silver crown, with other silver ornaments being placed on her during special times of worship. The site is also known as a *pīṭha*.¹⁸² This used to be an open-aired shrine, but sometime between 1996 and 2002 a two-tiered pagoda has been built over the sanctum.

The image in sexual union of these two deities is preserved in the chanting hall of the site on a recent painting (1965) by one Pūrṇaratna. Yogāmbara is dark blue, three-faced (dark blue, R white and L yellow), has six arms (R1 *vajra* in embracing hand, R2 *kalaśa*, R3 arrow, L1 *ghaṇṭā* in embracing hand, L2 skull-bowl with blood and entrails, L3 bow). Jñānaḍākinī is white, one-faced, two-armed (these are hidden behind Yogāmbara's neck, so the implements are not visible). The west courtyard wall has another recent painting, this time of Jñānaḍākinī alone, although labelled Mhepī Jogāmbar. Here she sits on a buffalo, she is white, one-faced and four-armed (R1 rosary, R2 skull-bowl in front of her, L1 *khaṭvāṅga*, L2 *abhayamudrā* over the bowl in R2). The recently carved *toraṇa* over the entrance to the shrine also shows her in this iconographic representation.

In the middle of the 18th century this site was visited by the famous Tibetan scholar Chos kyi nyi ma, the Fourth *Khams sprul* (1730-1780 CE). His guide book (*Yul chen po nye ba'i tshandho ha Bal bo'i gnas kyi dkar chag Gangs can rna ba'i bdud rtsi*) records the presumably not unfounded rumour that orgiastic worship was still taking place here at the time.

The tiny hill, known to Tibetans as *Dzo ki a 'bar*, is called in Sanskrit *Yogāmbara*, i.e. *Rnal 'byor nam mkha'*. The pronunciation style of the [corresponding] mantra by Indians and Nepalis, and the different way it is [phonetically] perceived by Tibetans, through linguistic corruption produced *Dzo ki a 'bar*.¹⁸³ This [sacred] spot is also known as the residence of *Śrī Catuṣpīṭha*. When I was on my way to this [sacred] place I addressed an Indian: *ih tīrthi kuṇi devatā kaun he?* ('Who is the [presiding] deity of this

¹⁸²More precisely one of twelve pilgrimage places (*tīrthasthān*), see Hemarāj ŚĀKYA, *Nepāl Bauddha Vihāra va Grantha Sūci*, quoted in LOCKE 1980.

¹⁸³I suspect that the author alludes here to the fact that Yogāmbara is often pronounced in Nepal as Jogāmbar, which is then transcribed in Tibetan as Dzo gā mba ra or Dzo ga a mba ra with the *sandhi in pausa*. Since Dzo ga is unfamiliar for a Tibetan, it can easily become Dzo ki, a current corrupt form of *yogin* (cf. the name of Mitrayogī/Mi tra dzo ki). The *mantra* he refers to here ought to be one of the more exoteric mantras of this deity such as *oṃ namo Yogāmbarāya namo namaḥ*, etc.

pilgrimage site?'), and he replied: *Jñāneśvarī he* ('It is Jñāneśvarī'). [His statement] was in agreement with the conventional opinion, as the consort of *Catuṣpīṭha* is *Jñāneśvarī*. Generally speaking this is a [sacred] spot where *vīras* and *yoginīs* spontaneously gather in great numbers; numerous 'field-born' *dākinīs* which appear in the guise of human females reside here from all over this land of Nepal. And they gather in this spot without being perceived queueing up as *vīras* and *vīreśvarīs* to join the *gaṇacakra*. Though their family members usually notice them [going there] and thoroughly understand [what is going on at such events] they keep it secret from others and they can't speak about it. I understand that there are many [events] of this nature [around here in the Kathmandu Valley]. As for the Hindus, they perform here offerings of red *argham*.¹⁸⁴

The Mhaypi site has an important role during the greatest festival of the year in Patan, as the thirty-two different kinds of clay to refurbish the Karuṇāmaya image (Buṅga dyah) at Buṅgamati must come from this hill.¹⁸⁵ It is reported that in the *Svayambhūpurāṇa* the goddess at Mhaypi is the lineage deity (*digu dyah*) of Śāntikara, who could cover the rays of Jyotīrūpasvayambhū with a *stūpa* only after extensive propitiation of Yogāmbara-Jñānaḍākinī.¹⁸⁶ There are furthermore several Yogāmbaras in the Valley the

¹⁸⁴I use here the *dbu can* transcript provided by MACDONALD 1975 as his transcription into Roman letters contains several errors (28^r 6-28^v 5): *yang Bod rnams kyis Dzo ki a 'bar du 'bod pa'i ri de'u 'di ni legs sbyar gyi skad du Yo ga mba ra ste Rnal 'byor nam mkha' zhes grags pa la Rgya Bal gyi sngags bklags tshul dang Bod kyī go phyogs tha dad du 'gyur cing sgra zur chag pas Dzo ki a 'bar du song ba yin/ gnas 'di ni dpal Rdo rje gdan bzhī'i gnas su yang grags kho bos kyang gnas 'dir phyin pa'i tshe Rgya gar ba'i mi zhig la | ih tirthi kuñ de ba ta kaun he zhes dris par/ Dznyā ne shwa rī he zer ba'ang grags tshod kyī gtam de dang mthun te Rdo rje gdan bzhī'i yum Ye shes dbang phyug ma yin pas so|| spyir gnas 'di dpa' bo dang rnal 'byor ma mang po ngang gis 'du ba zhig yin 'dug cing/ Nai pā la'i ljongs 'di kun nas (em., na ed.) zhing skyes kyī mkha' 'gro ma mi mo'i rnam par snang ba yang ji snyed pa yod 'dug/ de rnams kyang mi mngon pa'i tshul du gnas 'dir dpa' bo dpa' mo'i gral du tshogs kyī 'khor lo la 'gro ba nang mi phal gyis mthong zhing nyams 'og tu chud kyang gzhan la gsang zhing smra mi nus pa'i rigs can de 'dra mang du yod par go|| phyi rol pa rnams ni gnas 'di la'ang dmar gyi a rgham gyis mchod par byed do||. I am grateful to Hubert Decler and Iain Sinclair for bringing this text to my attention. Mr. Decler was also kind to supply me with his translation of this passage which greatly influenced my own rendering.*

¹⁸⁵LOCKE 1980:264.

¹⁸⁶BANGDEL 2002:30, but I cannot find this in the printed version.

origins of which are traced to this site.¹⁸⁷

Another Jñānaḍākinī shrine is a small but impressive two-tiered construction that stands in a busy square in Asan Tol, Kathmandu.¹⁸⁸ The deity here is usually known as the goddess Annapūrṇā and she is worshipped in the form of a silver vase of plenty (*pūrṇakalāśa*). The alternative, perhaps esoteric identity of this goddess with Jñānaḍākinī (again as consort of Yogāmbara) is ascertained by the two rows of inscriptions around the gilded roof canopies, the objects of donation. These inscriptions, punctuated with *kūtākṣaramantras* in the middle of the line, are written in very corrupt Sanskrit mixed with Newari, but they allow us to ascertain some data about the historical circumstances. Thus the lower inscription after an obeisance verse to Yogāmbara and Jñāneśvarī as a pair¹⁸⁹ dates itself from NS 1006 = 1886 CE, the month of *kārttika*, 8th day of the bright fortnight. The name of the donor is now obscured by the tin roof of an adjoining shop, but from the legible parts it is clear that he hailed from Kāntipur. The names of the reigning king and the powerful Rāṇa regent are also given. The upper row of inscription dates from two years earlier. On the main gilt-copper *toraṇa* Jñānaḍākinī is tastefully represented as one-faced, eight-armed (R1 sword, R2 *vajra*, R3 rosary, RM skull-bowl, L1 shield, L2 *ghaṇṭā*, L3 vase, LM *bindupātramudrā*), seated on a snake. On the struts gilt-copper images of the mother goddesses form her retinue, reinforcing her public identity as Maheśvarī.

ANNAPŪRṆĀ
(ĀSAN
TOL)

The Buddhist rituals here are performed by a *vajrācārya* from Takṣe/Tacchē Bāhāḥ (Surataśrīmahāvihāra), which is just in the next lane south-west of the Chowk. According to GELLNER (1992:271) this is the only place where Yogāmbara initiation is still preserved.

Yogāmbara is the *āgaṃ* deity of Kwā Bāhāḥ (Hiraṇyavarṇamahāvihāra) in Patan (Lalitpur). According to tradition this monastery was founded by Bhāskaradeva (r. 1045-1048 CE), and the ancient shrines, that of Yogāmbara

KWĀ
BĀHĀḤ
(PATAN)

¹⁸⁷LOCKE 1985:79 (Yachu Bāhāḥ and Uku bāhāḥ in Patan), 84 (Bhiñche Bāhāḥ, *ibid.*), 229 (Lagan Khel, *ibid.*), 269 (Kwā Bāhāḥ in Kathmandu), 397 (one of the Yogāmbaras enshrined at Svayambhū).

¹⁸⁸The importance of this shrine was first pointed out to me by Mr. Iain Sinclair, who very kindly also supplied me with photographs from the location before I could visit the site.

¹⁸⁹To give an idea about the highly idiosyncratic language, I give here the *maṅgala* verse: *oṃ namaḥ śrī yogāmbarajñāneśvarīḥ yogāmbara namas tubhya sarvasaṃpatidāyaka śāśakuṇatvarṇābhā jñānadevi namastute*, that is: *oṃ namaḥ śrīyogāmbarajñāneśvarībhyām yogāmbara namas tubhyaḥ sarvasaṃpattidāyaka śāśakundendvarṇābhe jñānadevi namo 'stu te*.

being one of them, are thought to date from this period. The earliest historical evidence *in situ* is a copper-plate inscription affixed to a beam at the northern end of the court of the main temple dating from NS 529 (= 1409 CE) about the donation of a crested banner (*dhvajā*) to Yogāmbara by some senior members of the monastery.¹⁹⁰

We have no information about how Yogāmbara is represented here in the chamber on the upper floor on the eastern side of the courtyard, since only the Cakreśvara/Casalāju (the senior *vajrācārya*) is allowed to enter this shrine for worship. There seems to be no exception to this rule, not even for royals.¹⁹¹ This initiation lineage seems to have died out.¹⁹² The importance and age of this site is reinforced by the fact that many communities in near-contemporary greater Kathmandu originated from here, as their lineage deity is the Yogāmbara of Kwā Bāhāḥ.¹⁹³ The regular worship takes place on the full-moon day. A special worship of this lineage deity as reported by GELLNER¹⁹⁴ is in my view a toned-down version of a *gaṇacakra*.

There are several other sites where Yogāmbara is worshipped (with or without consort); here I have limited myself to the major sites.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁰SHAKYA 2004:18 n. 16.

¹⁹¹“A [...] story is told, sometimes of Mukunda Sena (who invaded the Valley in the early sixteenth century), sometimes of Jang Bahadur Rana: he forced his way into Yogāmbara’s shrine in Kwā Bāhāḥ, but a green field opened up in front of him, and however far he walked it was just the same. Realizing his fault, he begged the deity’s forgiveness (*kṣamā*) by offering a headdress to him.” GELLNER 1992:284. Also see LOCKE 1985:34, 38.

¹⁹²“The initiations of Yogāmbara and Kālacakra are not nowadays taken in Lalitpur as far as I have been able to establish. The senior Vajrācārya of Kwā Bāhāḥ, the Casalāju, ought to have the initiation of Yogāmbara to tend the shrine of Yogāmbara which is the monastery’s main *āgaṃ*. But the last Casalāju to have it died about sixty years ago without giving it to anyone else. According to Asha Kaji Vajracharya, a divination ritual was performed (‘yaḥ/ma yaḥ kaykegu’) to find out if the god would permit worship by those with only Cakrasaṃvara Initiation, and the answer was positive.” GELLNER 1992:271.

¹⁹³LOCKE 1985:48 (Yatā Bāhāḥ in Patan), 217 (Dhaugā Bahī, *ibid.*), 180 (three out of five lineages of the Kyapu/Cilañco Bāhāḥ in Kirtipur), 214 (Ikhā Bāhāḥ in Chapagaon), 433 (Laskadyayā Bāhāḥ in Bhaktapur), 516-518 (list).

¹⁹⁴“Traditionally, [...] a special rite is performed called ‘taking the skull-bowl’ (‘*pātra kāyegu*’). All male members of the lineage sit in order of seniority; all female members are excluded except the most senior unwidowed woman, the *nakī*. She trembles, possessed by the deity, and proceeds down the line, giving to each in turn a fish and an egg, and the skull-bowl of beer to sip from. [...] The ritual is clearly one of lineage solidarity since - a point emphasized by informants - all share others’ pollution (*cipa*) by sipping from the same bowl.” (1992:242)

¹⁹⁵See e.g. LOCKE 1985:123, 227, 370, 397, 447, 459, 460, 462, 465, 470.

Chapter 3

The literature of the Catuṣpīṭha

3.1 Scriptural

3.1.1 The Catuṣpīṭha

[A] The best, but at the same time also the most peculiar manuscript of this *tantra* is the incorrectly named and classified ‘*Prakaraṇatantra*’ in the collection of the National Archives, Kathmandu under accession number 1-1078/*vi. śaivatantra*. This palm-leaf ms., which in fact contains a slightly augmented root-text of the *tantra*, consists of 76 folios with five or six lines measuring 29 x 4.5 cm and is kept between illuminated covers. It was micro-filmed by the NGMPP in 28.9.1970 under reel number B 26/23.¹ The error in the naming of the ms. obviously comes from misinterpreting the colophons, which by themselves do indeed seem to name this scripture ‘*prakaraṇa*’ for anyone who is not acquainted with the text and its structure.² The painted covers are slightly damaged and identifying them the deities depicted on them without seeing the pictures in colour would be hazardous at this stage. The front cover contains a series of five goddesses each brandishing a sword and a skull-staff in their upper arms and different types of flowers and weapons

NGMPP
B 26/23

¹Folios 3^v and 4^r were not microfilmed, or they are missing from my copy.

²Although I have come to this conclusion independently, it should be noted that Tsunehiko Sugiki has already recognized this ms. as the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* as early as 2005. Dr. Sugiki has informed me that he was not the first to identify the ms. However, he was certainly the first to publish some of its readings.

in the lower. The back cover is more damaged, only two figures being recognizable: a six-armed goddess and a male deity (perhaps Vajrapāṇi) turning towards her. I cannot state with absolute certainty that the covers were originally intended for the present ms. There are many damaged folios due to fraying, worms, water, and other causes, but on the whole the ms. is easily legible.

At least four different scribal hands may be distinguished in this ms. The first occupies the cover folio: this is probably no more than a simple scribal exercise. It contains several obeisance formulae and a fragment of what is known as the ‘hundred-syllable Vajrasattva mantra’ (i.e. the *śatākṣara*). The bulk of the manuscript has been written in three other hands. The first, up to f. 37^v is the most legible and orderly. Thence another scribe took over who worked in an angular Newar script³ up to f. 49^v. It seems to me that from this point the first scribe took over again, however, there seems to be much more space between the *akṣaras* and it is possible that this the work of yet another scribe. From f. 64^r the final hand takes over, writing in a hurried form that foreshadows the *pracalitanevārākṣara*, with occasional variations. Since nothing suggests that the ‘foreign’ hands are making up for lost portions in the text, I believe that all folios were penned in a short space of time, the scribes taking turns in much the same way that priests in Newar temples take turns at reciting scriptures.⁴

MULTIPLE
SCRIBAL
HANDS

Further scribes or librarians at work may be determined from the large number of corrections and additions in the margins. These are written either in a pointed stylus or a blunt pencil and may be found on any margin including the string space. Where not apparent (i.e. when there is no space in the immediate proximity of the textual referent), the scribe/s indicated the place in the text to which they refer by writing the line number after the correction/addition. The indication of the line number follows the more popular of the two systems in vogue for marginal glosses: it indicates the line-count either from above or below depending on where the supplement is written, namely the upper or the lower margin. The folio numeration (which is undoubtedly scribal) follows the customary Newar letter-number system with one single peculiarity, which is the digit 4 where the number is in last

MARGINALIA

³This type of script is usually seen in 12th century mss., cf. the palm-leaf ms. of the *Mitapadā* and ms. C which is dated slightly earlier by Bendall, q.v.

⁴The most famous example being the recitation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* from an ancient manuscript at Kwā Bāhā, Lalitpur. For such composite manuscripts see the ‘*Sādhanaividhāna*’ collection.

position (i.e. not in decades).

The most striking feature of this ms. is the insertion of several lengthy passages in sub-chapter 3 of the *parapīṭha* (dealing with tracing the *maṇḍala* and related rites) which are not to be met with in other copies of the tantra, indeed, occasionally replacing the text of the *mūla*. These passages occur in three batches. The first, of 222 verses (note that I count mantras, instructions, etc. as separate ‘verses’), starts after 3.3.7ab, apparently intended to replace the root-text up to and including 3.3.54ab. The second, of 70 verses, is nested between 3.3.81ab. and 3.3.81cd. The third and shortest, of 36 verses, starts after 3.3.137. and ends before 3.3.143. They are all in the same hand, that of the first scribe, who was responsible for copying the greatest part of the text. The passages are parts of an older recension of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. Thus the first batch corresponds to *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 4.2-10.23 (the last verse in that chapter); the second to *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 15.32-66 for the first 35 verses and *Maṇḍalopāyikā* ch. 13 for the rest; and the third to *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 19.1-33.⁵

INSERTIONS

The insertions are no doubt intentional. It cannot be the case that the scribe was copying a ms. with shuffled folios of the *mūla* and the *maṇḍalopāyikā*, although there is some evidence in later composite codices that these texts were transmitted together (augmented with Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary).⁶ For all insertions occur beginning with a new and complete verse, never in the middle of a *pāda*. Were it the case that the folios were shuffled, I find it highly unlikely that all leaves would have begun and ended neatly with complete verses. It is possible however that the scribe was copying a text in which the insertions were already present, although I do not see any evidence as to the existence of such a copy. If the latter is the case, then the expanded version must form a separate transmission. If this were the case then it is quite understandable why the sudden shift did not baffle the scribe in any way since the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* emulates the grammatical style of the root-text. It may be suspected that in the case of the first batch the scribe (or a previous redactor) felt that there is not enough material in the *mūla* for the *maṇḍala*-initiation.

The other two insertions are evidence of later material. I see them as the first attempt to supplement both the iconographical and the ritual material of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, an effort that later will culminate in the superimposition of Yogāmbara – with a host of brahmanical deities in his retinue (which

⁵I have dealt with this problem more extensively in SZÁNTÓ 2008c.

⁶See discussion to ms. D.

came to augment the outer perimeter of the original *maṇḍala*, creating thus three more layers) – as the supreme deity of the *maṇḍala* formed originally of exclusively female deities. Yogāmbara, however, is still missing at this point. Wherever we read ‘Yogāmbara’ or ‘Yogāmbarī’ (as the main goddess, Jñānaḍākinī, is named later on) in the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, the version preserved in the insertions in ms. A has ‘Vajrasattva’ or ‘Buddhamahāvajra’.⁷

On the whole, despite the precarious condition of some folios due to fraying, effacement and occasional wormholes, after stripping away the additional material this witness is a strong contender for the title of ‘best manuscript’ of the root-text. However, caution needs to be observed. In more than one instance it is evident that the text preserved in this ms. has undergone some interventions, especially regarding its metre. Although the metre is no more polished than the grammar of the text, which is far below standard, the basic *śloka* pattern is, on the whole, followed. Ms. A usually contains the readings which are the most correct metrically. However, we may ascertain from the readings of the commentators that this was not always the case. Strangely, the scribes seem to have been sometimes unaware of the metre: it is decidedly their habit to join in *sandhi* quarter-verses where the metre glaringly requires that the rules of euphony be suspended.

Ms. A is the sole major witness of a transmission family, as it stands quite apart from the other mss. with its individual readings.⁸ When Bhavabhaṭṭa reports variant readings of the *mūla*, A agrees with the cited variant in a little over half of the cases (but agrees with the reading preferred by the commentator about 45% of the time).

[B] Another strong contender for being the most valuable palm-leaf witness of the basic text is to be found in the National Archives, Kathmandu under accession number 4-20/*vi. buddhatantra* 20.⁹ Its size is 30 x 4 cm with five lines per folio in a legible, bold Old Newar script. The manuscript is incom-

QUALITY
OF
READINGS

TRANSMISSION
LINEAGE

NGMPP
B 30/36

⁷Cf. *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 7.9ab: *tato yogambarammayam dehācārya kṛtam ātmakam = tato vajrasatvamayam dehācārya kṛtasyātmakam* ms. A, v. 88cd in first series of insertions; *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 8.12cd: *asya yogāmbarībuddhaḥ dhyaṅpayen madhyacetasā = asya buddhamahāvajra dhyaṅpaya nādhyaquetasā* ms. A, v. 118cd in same series. The passages are presented here in diplomatic transcription.

⁸Another possible witness of this family is F₁ (on which see below), but since this is only a fragment it is difficult to ascertain whether A and the ms. F₁ was once part of shared more than an affinity.

⁹“*buddhatantra 20*” is corrected from “*buddhatantra 59*.”

plete, both the beginning and the end – and thus the colophon – are missing. The ms. has been microfilmed by the NGMPP under reel number B 30/36 on 18.10.1970. The short title of the library card “*Catuṣpīṭhanivadha*” is incorrect since this is not a manuscript of Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary (that is to say the *Catuṣpīṭhanibandha*). The reason for the confusion could have been the fact that the ms. begins with a stray folio. The style of the text contained on this page might have suggested to the person preparing the library cards that it is the beginning of a commentary. However, the format is not the same, as this folio has eight lines on it and its correspondence in size to the rest of the ms. is merely due to the damage to both horizontal margins.

The mentioned folio begins thus: + + + *mmakāya+ mahāsukhaṃ| nityaṃ vajradharaṃ natvābhiṣekārtho nīrucyate|* and ends with + + + *m eva dharmāṇāṃ tatvād udbhavabhāvanaiḥ| kāyakarmādibhiś + + +* containing approximately twelve verses. This folio is hence the beginning of a ms. containing Sujayaśrīgupta’s *Abhiṣekanirukti*, a highly complex polemic centering on the controversial *prajñājñāna* and Fourth (*caturtha*) initiations in the *Guhyasamāja* and the *yoginītantra* tradition represented here by the Hevajra cycle.¹⁰

STRAY
FOLIO

The sequence of folios can be restored with little difficulty. All folios (with the exception of f. 45) which were not damaged on the left side and thus retain the original numeration in the numeral-letter system are grouped together in two batches: f. 8 to f. 18¹¹ (frame values 1l[ower] to 12u[pper]) and f. 21 to f. 56 (frame values 12l to 48u). The original values were reproduced¹² quite accurately by a librarian¹³ in *devanāgarī* numerals in the string space which separates the writing area in a ratio of 1/3 on the left side. The third batch consists of a medley of pages where the original numeration is either barely visible, partially visible or completely lost. Here the librarian ventured

NUMERATION

¹⁰For a duly acknowledged provisional edition by Harunaga Isaacson with a translation and interpretation, see ONIANS 2003. Onians (following Isaacson) lists a number of scattered folios (including the one in question, cf. also my manuscript F₂) containing fragments of this work which might have formed a single ms. at some point. I incline to disagree with this. It seems to me that in spite of the palaeographical resemblances, the size and layout of this folio is rather different from the fragment found in F₂. The only complete ms. seems to be that of the Royal Asiatic Society, MS Hodgson 35, fol. 40^r 3ff. (I am indebted to Dr. Onians for generously providing me with a copy of her as yet unpublished dissertation.)

¹¹F. 11 is incorrectly marked as f. 10 due to overwriting, cf. below.

¹²With the following exceptions: f. 18 is marked “18 vā 19” [i.e. 18 or 19]; 46 and 56.

¹³It is this accuracy which leads me to believe that the secondary numeration was the work of a librarian and not a vendor.

into secondary numeration only on f. 63, where the original numeration was visible; on f. 62, where only the letter combination standing for 60 was visible; and tried his luck with one guess signaled by a question mark on folio 60 which is, however, correct. By examining the contents and having the advantage of other manuscripts at hand, the real value of the shuffled folios can be determined thus: 64^v, 64^r, 58^r,¹⁴ 58^v, 65^v, 65^r, 60^r, 60^v, 62^r, 62^v, 63^r, 63^v, 59^r, 59^v, 20^v, 20^r, 57^v, 57^r, 19^v, 19^r, 61^r, 61^v corresponding to frame values 48l to 59. It is not difficult to guess what had happened. The ms. was brought to the archive as a bundle of scattered leaves and a Nepalese librarian tried to restore their sequence, leaving off where he could not read the original foliation and grouping such folios together at the end. By restoring the order of the leaves it becomes apparent that the ms. in its present state contains verses 1.2.11b to 4.4.76c beginning on f. 8^r and ending on f. 65^v. Although the ending of the text is prone to some fluctuation, I would venture to say that there are probably no more than two folios missing from the end.

The readings of this ms. – as far as the strange language of the *tantra* allows to determine – are rather accurate; this is also apparent from the evident care with which the text was copied. There are a number of corrections and additions *propria manu*. However, most of the marginal notes are secondary corrections and additions in *pracalitanevārākṣara* written with a pointed stylus. The system of signifying the line number where the *akṣara* is supposed to belong is that observed in ms. A above. Some of the notes are explanatory glosses in cases when a *mantra*-syllable is coded or is referred to by a special name rather than given directly. Thus on f. 30^r we find OM̐ and SVĀHĀ in the lower margin glossing *praṇamāhuta* in 2.4.39 and on f. 40^r glossing 3.2.66 *dīśe amṛtacatvāra* we find A Ā AM̐ ĀM̐ (for A Ā Ā3 AM̐).

MARGINALIA

We can also distinguish a third hand that tried to correct the ms. Ff. 11^v and 12^r were at some point badly effaced and an ignorant scribe writing in *pracalitanevārākṣara* (but imitating the bold letters of his predecessor) tried to trace the faint *akṣaras*. The result is disastrous. For this reason I am constrained to eliminate these readings from the apparatus affecting vv. 1.2.91 to 1.3.10. For another example of trying to mend a ms. in such a way see ms. F₄ below.

PALIMPSESTIC
CORRECTION

It is difficult to say whether the secondary corrections were merely learned guesses or results of a comparison with another specimen. If the latter is the

MISSING
PASSAGES

¹⁴Owing to the presence of some obstructing object (a ruler?) ff. 64^r and 58^r were filmed twice (frame 49 and 49^{bis}) thus making the contents perfectly legible.

case, the collation must have been a superficial one. Were it the case that the ms. was subjected to a thorough check, I find it hardly tenable that the corrector would not have noticed the following missing portions: 1.2.75c-76d; 2.1.101-104 (due to eyeskip: *atha – atah*); 3.1c-3c. (due to eyeskip: *catuḥtattva – catuḥtattva*) and 4.2.58-60.

These omissions and a number of variant readings that will be individually noted in the edition point to the fact that ms. B is the last surviving descendant of a transmission which again stands quite separate from the other available mss. The readings of ms. B usually (about 70% of the cases) agrees with Bhavabhaṭṭa's second best choice wherever he cites variant readings. At the same time B is also the closest to Bhavabhaṭṭa's lemmata.

TRANSMISSION
LINEAGE

[C] The third palm-leaf manuscript that is available to me is a damaged but early ms. now kept in the Cambridge University Library, Add. 1704(12). It has previously been described in BENDALL 1883:197-198. The ms. originally had 83 leaves (with 4 or 5 lines) measuring 31 x 5cm. Ff. 81 and 82 are now lost. The last two of the remaining ones have been replaced with paper. Half of f. 80 is missing, this has been repaired by a later scribe by stitching paper to the palm-leaf and copying the missing text from another source. Bendall tentatively dated the older part of the ms. to the 11th century. He omits to mention that f. 33 contains almost one and a half pages worth of writing in another, hurried Newar hand. Many leaves are quite badly effaced. Although the colophons were identified by Bendall, due to an unfortunate repetition he believed that the work consists of five *prakaraṇas*. The existence of ms. C was well-known to the Nepalese scholars H. P. Śāstrī worked with. They claimed that this was the only extant old copy of the *tantra* in Nepal (SHĀSTRĪ 1915:vii-viii). Hence this was probably the only old copy of the *tantra* that was studied in some fashion up to the time the ms. was transferred to Cambridge.

CUL
1704 (12)

The last folio of the ms. does not belong to the main text. Bendall (loc. cit.) described it as follows:

STRAY
FOLIO

At the end is a leaf containing, on one side only, 4 1/2 lines of Nepalese writing of the XIII-XIVth cent. The title is jñānavāga(?) - sekaprakriyā. The fragment is in ṣlokas, and apparently discusses the relations of impregnation and hereditary knowledge. It begins: ... di buddhe | kāmako 'pi virāgaśna kāmaśāstraṃ samīkṣate | Ends: sukhaticca(?) tathā cittaṃ duḥkhatvaṃ nānugacchati |

I fail to see how his description relates to the contents of this folio. The text certainly is the end of a work on initiation (=impregnation?), however, the quotes employed here by the author refer to the yogic practice of seminal retention as propagated by Kālacakra-related texts. Indeed the author specifies his source for the first and third batch of verses as the *Paramādibuddha*, the semi-mythical Ur-text of the Kālacakra cult. The title in the colophon was also misread by him: it is actually *Jñānadhārāsekaprakriyā*, “A procedure for initiation [called] the Flood of Gnosis.” I am unable to identify this text with any related title known in the Sanskrit Buddhist Tantric corpus or the Tibetan Canon. Most of the verses are well known from other works such as Padmavajra’s *Guhyasiddhi* or the *Vimalaprabhā*.¹⁵

Needless to say, the readings contained in these modern restorations should not be considered authoritative. However, the rest of the manuscript, wherever it is legible, contains valuable old readings, but not quite the oldest. In at least one instance (1.3.3cd-4) C transmits an expanded version of verses agreeing with the later Nepalese copies D and E.¹⁶ From this, as well as many other affinities in readings with D and E it can be inferred that ms. C is closer to the ‘modern’, i.e. post-exegetical transmission of the text.

TRANSMISSION
LINEAGE

¹⁵I provide here the complete text in diplomatic transcription with identified parallels: ... *dibuddhe/ kāmuko [']pi virāgan na kāmāśāstre samikṣate/ mayoktaṃ kiṃ punas tantrē yogī duḥkhaṃ samīhate/ (= Sekoddeśa 134) aparā/ yāvan na kurute yogī bodhicittavisarjanam/ tāvat prāpnoty avicchinnam kim apy ānandajam sukham|| (Guhyasiddhi 8.36cd-37ab with mantrī instead of yogī) patite bodhicitte tu sarvasiddhīnidhānake/ mūrccite skandhavijñāne kutaḥ siddhir aninditā|| (Guhyasiddhi 8.38cd-39ab with 'smīn instead of tu, utthite skandha° for mūrccite skandha°) bhage liṅgaṃ pratiṣṭhāpya bodhicittam na cotsrjet/ kṣobhayitvā tam ānandam cittam āpūrya bhāvayet|| (Guhyasiddhi 8.35cd-36ab); punaḥ paramādibuddhe/ karmamudrāsāṅgena jñānamudrānurāgaṇāt/ rakṣaṇīyam sadā saukhyam bodhicitta dṛḍhavratae|| (quoted as from the *Paramādibuddha* in *Vimalaprabhā* vol. 2, p. 107. *ad Kālacakra* 2.120 with °prasaṅge 'pi for °prasaṅgena, °rāgaṇe for °rāgaṇāt, mahā° instead of sadā, the grammatical reading bodhicittam and dṛḍhavrataiḥ for dṛḍhavratae; also quoted in the *Amṛtakaṇikā* of Raviśrījñāna p. 58 with the same readings as found in the *Vimalaprabhā* except °rāgiṇe for °rāgaṇāt) na rāgo na virāgaś ca madhyamā nopalabhyate/ jñānadṛṣṭir yadā yogī sukhan tiṣṭhe kṣaram nna ca/ (quoted in this pairing in Kuladatta’s *Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā* 6.15 with sukham tiṣṭhed akṣareṇa ca for pāda d) rasavidham yathā loha lohatvam nānugacchati/ sukhavidham tathā cittam duḥkhatvam nānugacchati|| (very similar to *Sekoddeśa* 134: rasavidho yathā loha na punar lohatam vrajet/ sukhavidham tathā cittam na punar duḥkhatam vrajet||) jñānadhārāsekaprakriyā samāptā || o ||*

¹⁶These extensions are also present in the oldest palm-leaf mss. of the *Sampuṭa* in mostly secondary additions. However, the expanded verses are not quite as modern as the additions, since Abhayākaragupta already shows awareness of them in his commentary.

[D] I now turn to the paper mss. of the root-text. The most valuable ms. in this respect is kept in the National Archives, Kathmandu under accession number 5-37. It has been microfilmed by the NGMPP under reel-number A 138/10. The library card names this ms. *Catuṣpīṭhamahātantram prakīrṇam*. However, the folios seem to be in order and the text is complete, hence I suspect that someone has rearranged the leaves since the title was given. It is also possible that ‘*prakīrṇam*’ here refers to the second part of the ms. which is indeed not part of the main text. The 118 paper folios measure on average 37.5 x 6.5 cm with five lines per page. They were carefully written in the *pracalitanevārākṣara* by a single scribe. The following folios are illuminated: 1^v (probably Vajrasattva, with two attendants), 2^r (probably Vajrapāṇi, with two attendants), 2^v (probably Yogāmbara, with two attendants), 36^v (Gaṇeśa, no attendants), 37^v (middle space left empty for the illustrator), 69^v (probably Daṇḍapāṇi, with two attendants), 70^v (same figure but apparently in dark-blue, with two attendants).

NGMPP
A 138/10¹

It is this ms. that has been shortly and rather inaccurately described in PANDEY 1997 without specifying the original accession number. One example for this inaccuracy should suffice: *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* 1.2, which contains in addition a ritual for cheating death, the method of rain-making, and signs of messengers heralding an unsuccessful outcome, is described merely as the chapter on the signs of death and the method to combat them, in other words only the first two topics in this section.¹⁷

PANDEY'S
DESCRIPTION

Corrections and additions are surprisingly scarce. They are the work of either the original scribe or of a second hand, more likely that of a reader or a librarian than a corrector, since these latter are in *devanāgarī*. The numeration is in digits throughout.

MARGINALIA

Of the 118 folios in total only the first 71 contain the complete text of the tantra. It ends with the following ungrammatical colophon which may or may not have been part of the original: *ryyadvādaśasāhasrike tantra sahrtya dvādaśasātakasya śrīcatuṣpīṭhamahātantrarājendra samāptaḥ*, which must mean the following: “[Here] ends the Great Overlord of Tantras the Venerable Catuṣpīṭha in twelve hundred [verses] extracted from the Noble Tantra in twelve thousand [verses].” The colophon then gives the date: *samvat ā cu hr phalguṇa kṛṣṇaḥ* (sic!), meaning the dark fortnight of the month of *Phālguna* 1145 A.D. This is surely not the dating of this ms. but that of the ancestor from

COLOPHON

¹⁷PANDEY 1997:73-76. The example under discussion is: द्वितीय पटल में मृत्युसूचक चिह्नों का विवरण और उनसे होने वाले दोषों की निवृत्ति के उपाय बताये हैं ।

which, or from a copy of which, this ms. has been penned. Copying the original date of the ms. seems to have been common, if not regularly observed, practice. Then follows another scribal colophon in Newari.¹⁸

After the end of the *mūla* an empty page follows with librarians' scribbles specifying the folio measurements in inches and a title in cursive modern Devanāgarī: *Catuṣpīṭhanibandha*. Henceforth the numeration continues in the left margin with 72 up to 119 and is reset from 1 up to 47 in the right margin. The manuscript resumes with a short exegetical work in the *pañjikā* style up to the second line of 2^v, a fragment of a commentary which is different from the three available to me (cf. below). Both these folios are illuminated in the same style, 72^v / 1^v with Daṇḍapāṇi (?) and 73^r / 2^r with a white Vajrasattva in embrace with his consort, judging from the text, most probably Prajñāpāramitā. This text suddenly breaks off and continues with verses from the so-called fourth chapter of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* known to Tibetans as the **Mantrāṃśa* (q.v.). In order to distinguish this large batch of text from the rest of the contents I propose that we refer to the text of the *mūla* as NAK 5-37¹ [= NGMPP A 138/10¹] and the portion containing further texts as ms. NAK 5-37² [= NGMPP A 138/10²].

FURTHER
CONTENTS

Before it had been taken into the National Archives, this ms. formed a composite codex with NAK 5-38 [= NGMPP B 112/4], i.e. an incomplete ms. of Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary, the *Nibandha*. This is not only evident from the measurements of the folios, the illustrations in the same style, and the same scribal hand, but also from the continuing primary and secondary numeration in the left and right margins respectively. This is not an isolated case as the following table (3.1) shows. All these three (once unitary) manuscript bundles transmit the same works in the same order, probably witnessing an early (from mid-12th century?) composite transmission in Nepal.

COMPOSITE
TRANSMISSION

One could argue that the readings found in this ms. could be dispensed with entirely on account of our having three relatively good-quality palm-leaf mss. for collation. To a certain extent this is true. Mistakes abound and there is a large number of omissions due to eye-skips in ms. D. However, when one is acquainted with typical mistakes that Newar scribes make in producing apographs, in some cases valuable readings may be recovered from a ms. dating from the middle of the 12th century, the ancestor of D.

READINGS

¹⁸The text runs as follows: *thute samvatsara yāna boṇa puthi-sa lheyaa*. This short note seems to state that the year NS 265 on the exemplar has been copied over into this ms. I thank Iain Sinclair for his help in figuring out the purport of this statement.

Table 3.1: Composite transmission of D etc.

work	NGMPP	IASWR MBB	Nagoya Takaoka
Catuşpīṭhatantra	A 138/10 ¹ ff. 1-71	I-41	Ka 51-3
Commentary (frag.)	A 138/10 ² ff. 72-73 ^v 2	I-42 p. 1, ll. 1-18	Ka 51-2 1- 2 ^v 4
Maṇḍalopāyikā ch. 4 ff.	A 138/10 ² ff. 73 ^v 2-118	I-42 p. 1, ll. 18 - p. 40	Ka 51-2 2 ^v 4-33 ^v
Catuşpīṭhanibandha	B 114/4	I-43	Ka 51-4

The date in the colophon also seems to point to the fact that around this date, corresponding to the rule of Narendradeva and Ānandadeva,¹⁹ there was an upsurge in copying texts related to the *Catuşpīṭha*. It is exactly in this period that the palm-leaf ms. of the *Mitapadā* was copied (1141 CE), followed by the *Mantroddhārapañjikā*, a learned commentary to a now lost version of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (1153 CE). It may also be safely assumed on palaeographical grounds that further, undated, mss. also hail from this period (e.g. ms. C of the *mūla*).

A MID-12TH
C. SURGE?

[E] Ms. E is a modern apograph of ms. D, originally kept in the private collection of Mānabajra Bajrācārya in Kathmandu. Its present location is unknown. I am using here a microfilm copy prepared in 1971 by the recently defunct Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions,²⁰ catalogued under reel no. MBB-I-41. in [GEORGE-STABLEIN] 1971. The ms. was penned in a stitched booklet of sheets of Nepalese paper in a legible *pracalitanevārākṣara* by a single scribe on 62 leaves measuring 14 x 23 cm each. Page 6 is illegible as the photograph is out of focus. The title page of the microfilm contains the following description: *This text is very important to understand the Yoga*

IASWR
MBB-I-41

¹⁹Cf. PETECH 1984:59-61.

²⁰It is said that the microfilms have been taken over by the University of Virginia. However, no arrangements have been made as yet to provide copies or printouts (Iain Sinclair, personal communication, e-mail, November 1 2007). A complete microfilm copy of the IASWR mss. exists in Bonn, to this I had only partial access due to the kindness of Mr. Daniel Stender.

(*joining stage of Prajñā and Upāya*) which is divided into four stages as *Atmapīṭha*, *Parapīṭh*, *Yogapīṭha* and *Guhyapīṭha*. This has been copied over into NEGI 1990:56 without any acknowledgments.

That this ms. is an apograph of ms. D (or one very closely related) can be easily determined by the occurrence of identical omissions (e.g. 1.2.66-67ab), by the horizontal lines employed by the scribe exactly where ms. D is illegible, as well as by a decisive number of identical readings against other witnesses (with only a minute, but nevertheless significant, number of scribal emendations). There is a number of missing verses not lacking in ms. D (e.g. 4.1.24b-26d), but all these can be explained as eyeskips on the part of the scribe of ms. E. The scribal hand of ms. E agrees with that of MBB-I-42 (see table above) and MBB-I-43, the IASWR copy of Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary. The three copies were hence probably prepared following the composite codex NAK 5-37 – NAK 5-38.

APOGRAPH
OF MS. D

With the availability of what is the direct ancestor, the readings of ms. E could safely be eliminated as they add nothing to our reconstruction of the text. Nevertheless, I have decided to make use of this ms. for two reasons: in some places D is illegible owing to further damage since E has been prepared, and because the scribe of E sometimes uses his own judgement to emend readings. Furthermore, he also made a few mistakes which I believe are pedagogically instructive for our knowledge of typical mistakes that Nepalese scribes are prone to.

READINGS

Nagoya Ka 51-3 As I have already stated in table 3.1, there is another paper ms. of the *mūla* in the Buddhist Library, Nagoya.²¹ The ms. consists of 77 folios with six lines per page, and approximately 45 *akṣaras* per line. The copy is dated [*Nepal] Samvat 1028, Āśvina month, 7th day of the bright half, Śukra which is verified for Friday, October 2, 1908 CE. The scribe names himself as Narendrarāja, son of Dhīpati, of the Yaśodhara monastery.²² Ff. 1, 2, 39, 75, 76 contain illuminations with the deities seen on ms. D, of which

²¹I had access to a scanned b/w microfilm copy due to the kindness of Dr. Ryugen Tanemura.

²²Or perhaps more exactly one of the associated sites with the Yaśodhara *mahāvihāra*, which is most likely Bū bāhā in Lalitpur (LOCKE 1985:154-172). The location is given in the colophon thus: *śrījaśodharamahāvihārāc cottare mūladvāre vasthitaḥ*. As far as I am aware the earliest ms. copied in this, presumably the same, institution is the Royal Asiatic Society ms. of the *Ādikarmapradīpa* (Hodgson no. 69) dating from NS 215 = 1095 CE (de la Valée Poussin's date NS 218 is due to a misreading).

this ms. is very likely a copy. This ms. has not been collated for the edition.

[F₁] By far the longest and most important fragment can be found in the National Archives, Kathmandu under no. 1-1697 2/22 (= NGMPP B 31/27). Although the NGMPP title card claims that there are 12 palm-leaf folios measuring 31 x 5.5 cm, in actual fact there are only six. The numbering of the folios survives, hence in this bundle we have ff. 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 47. The text is not identified but merely described as ‘[*Bauddhatantra*]’. Two more folios can be recovered from this apparently once complete ms. from the *prakīrṇapatra* NAK 1-1607 (= NGMPP A 49/18).²³ These bear the numbers 45 and 46 fitting into the lacuna of the previous fragment.

The two fragments reunited contain a good portion of the *guhyaṣpīṭha*, or more precisely verses 4.2.16a’–4.2.74 and 4.3.17d’–4.4.54ab. It is a matter of great pity that no more of this ms. seems to survive, for what we can tell from its readings it was a very fine witness of the text. By and large the readings agree with those of ms. A, but it should be noted that this fragment contains an extra verse (between 4.4.40 and 41). The characters are an early version of the ‘hook-topped’ variety of Old Newari; a very rough estimate would assign it to the 13th century.

[F₂] This motley of five palm-leaves of varying sizes is kept in the National Archives, Kathmandu under call no. NAK 1-1697 11/6 (= NGMPP A 994/2). Its short title is given as [*Mahāpīṭha yoginī tantra rāja*] *Catuṣpīṭha mahā yoginī tantra rāja* (sic!); the long title is: *Śrī vajra varī toṣitam śrī catuṣpīṭha mahā yoginī tantrarājaṃ samāptam eti* (sic!). The first of these is the transcription of a librarian’s note which may be found in the string space of the first folio in a rather odd *devanāgarī* hand.²⁴ The second is a misreading of the colophon on the same folio which actually runs thus: *śrīvajradharībhāṣitam śrīcatuṣpīṭhamahāyoginītantrarājaṃ samāptam iti* followed by the customary closing formula *ye dharmā hetuprabhavā* etc. Except the last folio, all are written in a neat Old Newar hand not unlike that of ms. B. Hence these leaves probably date from the same period or environment. On the library card the size is

²³I owe it to the kindness of Dr. Kazuo Kano that I had access to the scanned microfilm copies of these two mss. For the other items in this, one of the richest collection of fragments, NGMPP A 49/18, see SZÁNTÓ (forthcoming a) and ms. F₃ below.

²⁴The same type of peculiar *devanāgarī* can be seen on the last folio of Kalyāṇavarman’s *Pañjikā* and a host of other mss. in the National Archives. It is tempting to guess that this in none other than Hara Prasād Śāstrī’s handwriting.

given as 28x4.5 cm, which are presumably the measurements of the first folio. The following three are slightly smaller and the last is altogether different (cf. below).

The ms. has been microfilmed at least twice by the NGMPP: the microfilm that I am reading bears the reel. no. A 994/2.²⁵ Upon inquiry I have been told by Navraj Gurung, Manager of the NGMPP at the Nepalese Research Center,²⁶ that the same manuscript has been filmed under A 1306/31 as well.²⁷

DUPLICATE:
NGMPP
A 1306/31

This small collection of odds and ends contains fragments from three separate works of which only the first one is part of the *Catuspīṭha*, namely the end of the work, or, more precisely, a variant of the ending when compared to other mss. It begins with the second part of the first *pāda* of an *apabhramśa* verse and then goes on with what might be described as the *phalaśruti*. Since the folio ends in the middle of the closing formula *ye dharmā* etc. we may presume that the photographer did not find it important to film the verso of the folio as well. The size and palaeographical features of this folio suggest that it is a fragment of an independent ms. and not the ending of ms. B.

CONTENTS

The second part consisting of three leaves is another fragment of Sujayaśrīgupta's *Abhiṣekanirukti* (cf. the stray folio in ms. B above) and comparing them with Isaacson's provisional edition in ONIANS 2003 their correct order is as follows: frame values 3l beginning with ...*yajñānaṃ/ prajñāntakaḥ/ rāgakṣayajñānaṃ/* and 4u ending with *tatsādhanam iha mantranaye dṛṣṭāntamudrayā lakṣaṇīyam[//] ataḥ ...* correspond to ONIANS 2003:356 l. 13-357 l. 18.; 2u beginning with ...*rvākārajagadarthakriyākaraṇalakṣaṇaṃ* and 1l ending with *dvitīyena cākāreṇa samayasahitam bhāvayataḥ* (the folio has been photographed inversely) correspond to ONIANS 2003:358 l. 19-359 l. 24.; and 2l beginning with ...*pyasya tasya/ tatprāptimātram upādāya bhedād bhidyate na rūpam* and 3u ending with *tatra ca ekānekavicārāyogāt[//]* correspond to ONIANS 2003:361 l. 5-362 l. 8. Unlike the other folios (although the left-hand margin is intact), the verso of the latter contains the original letter-numbering: f. 10.

STRAY
FOLIOS

The third element of this collection (frame values 4l and 5u) is a smaller leaf of eight and nine lines in what is usually called the Maithili (or Old

²⁵This number is correcting A 993/2 on the library card.

²⁶Personal communication, e-mail, November 29, 2006.

²⁷Note that this is the microfilm that ONIANS 2003 [following Isaacson] mentions, however, she confuses it with the fragment in my ms. B (providing furthermore an incorrect reel-number B 30/3 whereas it is B 30/36).

Maithili, or Proto-Bengali, etc.) script. Some palaeographical features, such as the shape that the *akṣaras ha* and *ya* assumes in ligature, suggest however a later date, closer to the emergence of the modern Bengali script. The contents have not been identified as yet, but it seems to be some sort of grammatical treatise. The *recto* side begins: ... *bhāṣāyāṃ dṛśyata iti sūtrakāram abhibhāva(?)*; and ends with continuation on *verso* (turn of the folio marked by •): ... *tatra yadyapītyādi tayūkta(?)nītivṛttau katham ava • gamyata ity āha*; the folio ends with: ... *gevanikaḥ gevaniṣaḥ gevaninaḥ upā* [space of about 9 *akṣaras*] *dvaya upikaḥ upi....*

[F₃] The previously mentioned *prakīrṇapatra*, NAK 1-1607 (= NGMPP A 49/18), has another fragment from an otherwise unknown *Catuṣpīṭha* ms. This consists of a single palm-leaf folio (frames 62l-63u) bearing the number ‘30’, and containing the text equivalent to 3.2.59d’–76 with the sub-chapter colophon. The manuscript was most likely penned in the 13th century.

NGMPP A
49/18 (bis)

[F₄] The fourth fragment is another single folio at the beginning of the *prakīrṇapatra* Kaiser Library 132 = NGMPP C 106/9. This is a collection of fragments from several works loosely indexed as ‘[*Maṇḍalasaṅgraha*]’. It contains 18 palm leaves of a similar size (29 x 4.1 cm), but different scripts.

NGMPP
C 106/9

The single folio of the *Catuṣpīṭha* (faintly numbered as ‘7’) contains verses 1.1.101b’–1.2.10d’. The script looks very modern at first glance but a more careful look reveals that most of the leaf has been written over tracing older but rubbed-off characters (this is immediately visible in the middle of the *recto* side where some of the more ancient ‘hook-topped’ *akṣaras* have been left intact). The restoration greatly diminishes the value of the fragment’s readings and I have chosen to disregard them.

CONTENTS

The remaining 17 folios are from at least four different works. Two of these are two different fragments from Abhayākaragupta’s *Vajrāvalī*: a folio 128 and a set of folios numbered 15, 16, 26, 27, 30 in a very elegant hook-topped Newar script. Further seven folios (numbered 4, 5, 25, 31, 57, 72 and one where the numeration is damaged) is from an unidentified work (or works) dealing with Buddhist initiation and *maṇḍalas*. Three leaves contain topic closers using the words *tippitam* and *tippih*, therefore it is not impossible that the leaves represent a hitherto unknown gloss perhaps to the works of Abhayākaragupta.²⁸ I have been unable to trace the text in the Tibetan canon. The

OTHER
WORKS

²⁸Judging by his style and the minutiae under discussion our author was certainly not

remaining four folios (numbered 12-15) are penned in an altogether different hand and contain some text from the *Mahīrāvāṇavadhanāṭaka* of Jayata.²⁹

[F₅] The fifth and last of the fragments I have been able to trace consists of three palm-leaf folios in a *prakīrṇapatra*, Cambridge University Library Add. 1691. Bendall (1883:182) gives the measurements as 11 x 2 inches, and dates the ms. to *cca.* 13-14th century. His description of the contents of item VIII. is almost completely erroneous:

Fragment of a treatise on ASTROLOGY, or of an AVADĀNA. / The leaves are broken at the edges where the numbers were apparently placed. / In the work much is said of births, conjunctions, etc.; but characters are also introduced, especially a merchant Mikira and his wife Bhidrikā. / Thus the fragment may be from an astrological treatise with illustrations from tales, or an astrological episode of an avadāna.”

The merchant couple is two of the twelve *bhuvaneśvaras*, and the verses are a match for 1.1.10cd'-1.1.71. What we have here is a continuous fragment (folios *2-4) of an otherwise unknown manuscript of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The folios are damaged at the edges, but otherwise the fragment is quite legible. The quality of the readings is quite good.

[T_D] The Tibetan translation of the *mūla* that we have in the extant recensions of the *Bka' gyur*³⁰ is said to have been the work of Gaya[']dhara and 'Gos [Khug pa] Lha[s] btsas.³¹ According to Bu ston, however, the translation

devoid of learning. At one point he even refutes the famed and influential *yogatantra* exegete, Ānandagarbha (25^r): [. . .] *lekh[y]ānīti vyākhyātam Ānandagarbheṇa tan na saṃgatam* [. . .]

²⁹I thank Dr. Csaba Dezső for pointing out the possibility that this fragment might be from Jayata's work. For another ms. (dated NS 457 = 1337 CE) see NAK 3-362 = NGMPP B 15/22. The edition by Jñānamaṇi Nepāla (Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu 1983) is unavailable to me at present.

³⁰The following were available to me: Tōh. 428 (in other words, the Derge edition; this edition is my main reference), Ōtani 67 (in other words the Peking edition); I have occasionally glanced at the Stog (no. 389), Them spangs ma (no. 458), Lithang (no. 410), Cone (no. 67), Lhasa (no. 404), Narthang (no. 392), and Urga (no. 458) editions. For the catalogue nos. see <http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/xml3/sub/bibliography.php>

³¹For the stories associated with the two and a discussion of their importance see DAVIDSON 2005:139 *passim*. The Vanaratna-codex spells the name as 'Gaṅgādhara'

was prepared by Smṛti[jñānakīrti].³² It is not at all clear what the reason for this discrepancy is: Bu ston could have been thinking of an earlier translation, or perhaps he confused the translator of the *mūla* with the translator of the *Vyākhyātantra.

After having tested the translation for the three initial sub-chapters I have come to the conclusion that it is a secondary source: the readings seem to mirror a post-exegetic transmission of the text. This is not surprising, since the same duo, Gayādhara and 'Gos Lhas btsas was responsible for the translation of Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Nibandha*; the commentary was probably translated in tandem with working on the *mūla*. I therefore refer to the Tibetan version only occasionally.

3.1.2 The *Mantrāṃśa

The **Mantrāṃśa* (Tōh. 429) is scriptural only from the viewpoint of the Tibetan tradition, where a translation of this work was introduced in the *Bka'* 'gyur as an explanatory tantra of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. Its status is already confirmed by the translators' colophon ("bshad pa'i rgyud mantra ang sa zhes bya ba"). If this statement is original, then the text was already circulating as a separate work in the latter half of the 11th century.³³ However, as I will show later under the heading of initiation manuals, this text was once part of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. It was probably on account of Gayādhara's authority and the same, peculiar, register of Sanskrit employed by the author that the text had been considered scriptural.

3.1.3 The *Vyākhyātantra

To my knowledge this scripture of the *Catuṣpīṭha* corpus survives only in a Tibetan translation (Tōh. 430) with some possible citations in the *Mitapadā* of Durjayacandra. The Tibetan colophon states that it was re-translated by

(ISAACSON 2008:4), which should probably be dismissed as inauthentic and a result of re-Sanskritization. The name Gayādhara is attested, see e.g. the list of donees on the eighth-century Neulpur copper plate of Śubhākara (EI 15, p. 7, l. 27) and one Gayādhara is also mentioned on a Haihaya inscription (BANERJI 1931:29). Prof. Sanderson kindly pointed out to me further occurrences of this name, e.g. EI 14, no. 15 (the list also contains a 'Gaṅgādhara', i.e. Gaṅgādhara); EI 4, no. 20; EI 10, no. 5a, and EI 31, no. 11.

³²EIMER 1989:70.

³³The translators are the same as those of the *mūla*: Gayādhara and 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas.

Smṛtijñānakīrti (the old translation does not seem to survive) and it was revised by Bu ston by comparing it to ‘old manuscripts’.³⁴

Smṛtijñānakīrti’s dates are still a matter of some debate, but even by the most pessimistic estimates he was active in the early half of the 11th century. ’Gos Gzhon nu dpal in his Blue Annals says that Smṛtijñānakīrti translated the *Catuspīṭhatantra* amongst other texts (ROERICH [& DGE ’DUN CHOS ’PHEL] 1949:204). This statement more likely refers to the **Vyākhyātantra* and/or Smṛti’s translation (and completion) of Kalyāṇavarman’s *Pañjikā*.³⁵

The title appears in the Tibetan transmission as *shrī tsa turpī ṭha bi khyā ta tantra rā dza* – doubtless a false re-Sanskritization of **vyākhyātantra*, since the Tibetan has *bshad pa’i rgyud*. The colophon given in the previous footnote has another title for the text, which may be reconstructed as **Sarvaguhya-tantra* (or °*rahasya*°). A variant of this title is given by Bu ston in his *Rgyud sde spyi’i rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (p. 462): *rnal ’byor ma thams cad gsang ba’i rgyud*, that is to say **Sarvayoginīguhya* or **Sarvayoginīrahasya*. For convenience’s sake I have decided to cite the tantra by its designation.

The text seems to have been translated while still in an editorial stage. Both the colophon – which speaks of 104 chapters –³⁶ and Bu ston – who counts only 101 –³⁷ complain about the chaos surrounding the chapter numbering.

I shall refrain from giving a complete synopsis of the work, since this would only unnecessarily dilute the present section. At the same time the silence of the earlier exegetes about this scripture and the dearth of quotations from it in the *Mitapadā* seem to suggest that the text only had a marginal influence, if any. It should be pointed out here that secondary literature sometimes

³⁴304^r: *Dpal gsang ba thams cad kyi rgyud ces bya ba ’di ni/ paṇḍi ta Smṛti dznyā na kīrtis gsar du bsgyur nas bshad cing gtan la phab pa/ [. . .] slad nas Bu ston thams cad mkhyen pa’i thugs dam rgyud ’bum dang dpe dbang rnying pa dag dang yang gtugs te sdebs zhus dang bcas pa ches shīn tu dag par bgyis so//*

³⁵The statement runs thus on the Yangs pa can blocks (book Nga [=4] 1a): *[. . .] Khams su dus phyis Mtshan yang dag par brjod pa Sgeg pa rdo rje’i skor dang/ dpal Gdan bzhi pa dang/ Gsang ba ’dus pa’i skor la sogs pa mang du bsgyur mod kyi/ [. . .]*. It is likely that we should construe *Gdan bzhi pa* with *skor* in the sense ‘[texts belonging] to the cycle of the Catuspīṭha’ and not ‘the *Catuspīṭha*[tantra] and texts from the *Guhyasamāja* cycle’.

³⁶304^r: *de ltar na rgyud ’di’i le’u sil bu rnams phyogs gcig tu bsdoms na le’u brgya dang bzhi bzhugs so//*

³⁷*Rgyud sde spyi’i rnam bzhag rgyas pa* (p. 466): *’di’i le’u rnams la grangs kyi rim pa’i nges pa mi snang ste/ bar nas chad pa yin nam brtag par bya’o// bod kyi bla ma rnams kyiis ni grangs rim pa bzhin du mdzad par snang ngo//*

confuses the **Vyākhyātantra* with its predecessor, the *Catuṣpīṭha* itself.³⁸

The contents could be best described as eclectic. Like the *Yogāmbārīprabheda* (discussed below), the text introduces goddesses from the *yogatantra* traditions (Pāṇḍaravāsīnī, Māmakī, etc.), but at the same time retains the original goddesses in some chapters. It teaches *mantras* and *mudrās*, yogic and ritual procedures, the system of tubes (*nādī*), and supplementary teachings to the ones already given or alluded to in the *mūla*. All in all it requires all the fulfillments that a *vyākhyātantra* should possess. At the same time it also shares a good number of verses with the *Catuṣpīṭha*. I have striven to give all of these where applicable in the parallels register of the edition.

3.1.4 The Yogāmbārīprabheda

This text is very similar but not identical to the **Vyākhyātantra*. As presumably that scripture, the *Yogāmbārīprabheda* seeks to emulate the language of the *Catuṣpīṭha* while teaching topics that reiterate or complement the ones taught in the *mūla*, occasionally not shying away from providing new material as well. Just like the **Vyākhyātantra*, it seems to have been a scripture of little consequence as it is not mentioned or quoted anywhere in the exegetical corpus.³⁹

The text survives in a single palm-leaf fragment⁴⁰ kept at the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, and has been assigned the shelf-no. G 4818 by H. P. SHĀSTRĪ (1917:88-89). It consists of 10 folios of which f. 9 is missing. The text must have been much longer, but the exact extent is impossible to determine at present. Shāstrī somewhat surprisingly claims that the script is Newari of the 17th century. I cannot of course claim to be more competent in this matter,

ASB
G 4818

³⁸E.g. CHANDRA 1993:43 and more recently SCHNEIDER 2010:21. The latter writes: “Im *Śrī-Caturpīṭhavvyākhyātantrarāja* (TT [that is to say the Peking Bka’ ’gyur] 69) ist das 6. Kapitel den Todesvorzeichen und der Todesüberlistung gewidmet. Auf das *Catuhpīṭha* spielt auch der Glossist an (z. B. 1.21/3). In der Tat finden sich einige inhaltliche Parallelen hierzu im Mvup [the *Mṛtyuvañcanopadeśa of Vāgīśvarakīrti*], doch – soweit aus dem tibetischen Kanjur zu schließen ist – nicht im Wortlaut.” The problem pointed out by Schneider can be easily solved if we presume that Vāgīśvarakīrti’s source was – as indeed the parallels demonstrate – 1.2 of the *Catuṣpīṭha* and not ch. 6 of its explanatory scripture.

³⁹There is perhaps one exception, v. 3.3 is quoted in Kalyāṇavarman’s *Pañjikā* (see SZÁNTÓ 2008a:14) without mentioning the source. On the other hand, the verse is widely spread, enjoying an almost aphoristic status.

⁴⁰I thank Dr. Somdev Vasudeva for providing me with a b/w digital copy of this ms.

but in my view this is more than a couple of centuries off the mark, if not more. Corrections are rare and all in the scribal hand. Chapters 1-7 and 12, 67 units of chapter 8, the end of chapter 11, and the very beginning of chapter 13 survive in this ms. On the whole the text is transmitted very badly, I shall therefore restrict myself to giving a very short synopsis with special regard to the parallels with the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

The title appears in the chapter-colophons, although for the most part it is spelt with a short -i.

The work is organized in *paṭalas*. The interlocutors are the same as in the *Catuṣpīṭha*, and the *nidāna* is virtually identical.

The first chapter (17 verses) summarizes what were probably seen as the essential teachings contained in 1.1 of the *mūla*: the relationship of breath to the twelve units of time (i.e. the *rohitādi* system, although the *bhuvaneśvaras* are not named) and the two processions of the Sun. CH. 1

The second chapter (26 verses) starts with describing the characteristics of the initiand (cf. 2.1.106-111). A short teaching on applying the regulation of breath follows. The rest of the chapter describes a meditation process similar to the one in *Catuṣpīṭha* 1.3 and 1.4. CH. 2

The beginning of the third chapter (26 verses in total) is again similar to the beginning of 1.3. What follows is more similar to the pantheon advanced by the **Vyākhyātantra*, one that breaks away from the goddesses of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. Eight goddesses are mentioned surrounding the chief god Jñāneśvara: Pāṇḍarā, Māmakī,⁴¹ Tārā, Locanā, Ratnakāntikā, Padmanetrī, Pretapālikā, and Madhurā. These are equated with the fingers of the *yogin*'s hand, and with the elements (later on in the work also with the colours). Four *mantras* not seen in the *mūla* are given for the four basic rites. CH. 3

The entire fourth chapter (15 verses) teaches the procedure known in the corpus as the *aṣṭāṅgakalana* (1.4.7 ff. and *passim*), a protective installation of seed-syllables onto the body. CH. 4

The fifth chapter (18 verses) is perhaps the most obscure of the entire fragment. It teaches the definition and usage of the ingoing and outgoing breath with the terms specific to the corpus (i.e. *dolā* and *hāra*). CH. 5

The sixth chapter (19 verses) summarizes the teachings given in *Catuṣpīṭha* 1.2.2ff. on the signs of death and the methods to thwart them. It is to be noted that here the bodily signs are explained as a result of damage CH. 6

⁴¹I have standardized the name of this goddess. The ms. uses the *aiśa* lengthened feminine 'Māmakyā' throughout (cf. *Aiśa devyā/devī, bhagavatīyā/bhagavatī*).

to the ‘tubes’ (*nāḍī*), which is an innovation to the original teaching, as the *Catuṣpīṭha* does not advance a theory of the *nāḍīs*.

The seventh chapter (25 verses) deals with these *nāḍīs*, their evolution, function, and homologations with deities, bodily fluids, fingers, elements, etc. The total number is said to be 72,000 of which nine are considered most important. CH. 7

The eighth chapter (67 verses of an unknown total survive) describes the visualizations proper to deity-*yoga*. The *yogin* first applies the eightfold protective installation of syllables, then contemplates everything as emptiness. In emptiness he sees a body of water emerge, on it a lotus, and on that the abode of the deities. The main deity (Yogāmbara, but not named thus) emerges first: he has three faces, six arms, he is dark blue, wearing a crown and resplendent clothes. His hands are said to hold a sword (R1), the breast of the consort (R2), a *vajra* (R3), a hatchet (L1), again the breast of the consort (L2), and a bell (L3). He is seated in the comfortable position (*sattvaparyāṅka*). He is embraced left and right by Locanā and Māmakī, who hold a skull-bowl filled with blood in their other hand. Pāṇḍarā is in front holding *bali*-offerings, and Tārā at the back holding a garland. They also seem to be embracing the main deity. Once visualized the deities are offered visualized worship. Thereafter the *yogin* recites the seed of consciousness (i.e. HŪṂ) one, two, or three lakh times. Three verses teach the homology of the elements and *nāḍīs* with these goddesses. V. 19 returns to the ritual sequence by giving the [pledge-]*mantras* and [pledge-]*mudrās* to be employed. Thereafter the text teaches more of the same for worship with the first eight elements of the so-called twenty-fold *pūjā* (cf. *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.3.87-107). Just before the lacuna that is folio 9 some more spells are given for placating, attracting, subjugating, killing with the instruction that they are to be recited on the bank of a river for 100,000 times before the actual ritual, which for its turn culminates in worship and the reabsorption of the deities into the *yogin*’s body. CH. 8

The eleventh chapter (only the last 12 verses survive) most likely dealt with the ritual copulation of the *yogin* and the consort with the aim of obtaining the ‘nectars’. The chapter closes with a short *prayoga* for subjugating women, presumably for the case in which the *yogin* cannot obtain a suitable consort by himself. CH. 11

The twelfth chapter (complete in 11 verses) teaches an internal *homa*-sacrifice (cf. *Catuṣpīṭha* 4.2.68-78). CH. 12

The ms. breaks off in the third quarter-verse of 13.1, which promises to

teach the ‘yogaśāstranaya’ (cf. *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.4.2?).

3.1.5 The Yogāmbaramahātantra

This text was most likely compiled and used in Nepal. Tracing its sources is very instructive for it reveals an overall trend in the cult of Yogāmbara: borrowing textual passages from a variety of sources for the deity without a scripture (also cf. Amṛtānanda’s compilations below).

[A] IASWR MBB-II-120. Nepalese paper, 8x28 cm, ll. 6 per page, Common Newari script. The title page has a count of 56 folia, but there are only 55. The description states: “*This is [a] very important text dealing [with] the subject [of] Yoga. It is [= was] found under the chaitya when it was renovated.*” I have been unable to identify which *chaitya* is talked about here. The text is almost complete (missing at most 3 folia); it breaks off little before the end.

IASWR
MBB-II-120

[B] Buddhist Library, Nagoya, Takaoka Ka 51-1. Although treated as one text in the catalogue (TAKAOKA 1981:19), this is actually a so-called *prakṛṇapatra*. There are 6 folia plus 2 single sides for the first chapter, whereas the second is complete in 35 folios.⁴² For the date and provenience of this ms. see the description of Nagoya Ka 51-3 above.

NAGOYA
KA 51-1

I have extracted the title from the chapter colophons: *iti yogāmbaramahātantrē vajrasattvasya saṃvegacittaparīkṣāsūtrapāṭalaḥ prathamah & iti śrīyogāmbaramahātantrarāja ātmapīṭhaḥ samāptaḥ*.

TITLE &
CONTENTS

There are two large chapters in this text. The principle of redaction seems to have been to split the scripture into a ‘theoretical’ and a ‘practical’ side.

The first chapter contains about 130 verses and is in actual fact a compilation not unlike a *subhāṣita*-anthology. I have been able to identify the sources for about half of these. Scriptural verses are naturally dominated by tantric verses: *Hevajra* (II.ii.44 twice, II.iv.77cd), *Dākinīvajrapañjara* (1.31-34), *Guhyasamāja* (7.4), *Kālacakra* (2.93), the ‘*Ādibuddha*’ (as quoted in the

CH. 1

⁴²I have not had the opportunity to consult the following mss. which most likely contain the *Yogāmbaramahātantra*: NAK 5/3 = NGMPP A 138/11 (or B 48/25) dated NS 972; NAK 4/2917 = NGMPP A 142/12, dated NS 1036, and NAK 3/598 = NGMPP B 110/05, dated VS 1955.

Vimalaprabhā), *Abhidhānottara* (several verses from ch. 65), *Guṇakāraṇḍavyūha* (96), and an unidentified Prajñāpāramitā passage. Verses with identifiable authors are dominated by Advayavajra: *Kudrṣṭinirghātana* (4), *Tattvaratnāvalī*, *Tattvaparakāśa* (6-7), *Mahāsukhaprakāśa* (17, 24), *Māyānirukti* (6), *Sekanirdeśa* (7-17, 19, 21-22, 33-35), *Yuganaddhaprakāśa* (2), *Pañcathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa* (1, several verses in quotation), *Mahāyānaviṃśikā* (8), *Pañcākārābhīśambodhi* (4), and the *Premapañcaka* (3-4). He is followed by Nāgārjuna and pseudo-Nāgārjuna (probably the same person as far as the compiler was concerned): *Ratnāvalī* (1.6, 1.12, 1.20-21, 4.54-56, 4.58), *Acintyastava* (44), *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* (6), the *Bodhicittavivarāṇa* (56, probably as a quotation from Advayavajra), and the *Pañcakrama* (3.10, 4.38, 5.11). Several other authors of the Ārya-school are also represented: three verses are from the *Pradīpoddyotana*, and one from the *Svādhiṣṭhānakramaprabheda* (47). There is also at least one verse from the *Paramārthasevā* (163), one verse by Kambala (*Ālokamālā* 274), and one by Kṛṣṇācārya (*Vasantatilaka* 1.12). The presence of Puṇḍarīka and Advayavajra in this list set the lower limit of this half of the compilation to the middle of the 11th century.

The second large chapter of the tantra is actually Jagadānandajīvabhadrā's *sādhana*, the most widespread ritual manual of Yogāmbara in Nepal. The compiler did very little to change the text, but the inflection of the section-colophons is noticeable, e.g. *iti yogāmbaramahātantrarāje ādiyogo nāma samādhiḥ*, which is the result of simply inserting the name of the newly created scripture as the larger textual unit. The incorporation of this *sādhana* into a scripture of Yogāmbara explains the odd colophons sometimes found in Nepalese mss. of Jagadānandajīvabhadrā's work (q.v.).

CH. 2

3.2 Exegetical

3.2.1 Lost exegesis

Kalyāṇavarman, who may be reasonably suspected to have been the earliest of the three commentators, indicates that there was already some form of exegesis, if oral, at the time he wrote his *Pañjikā*. He refers to his otherwise unnamed and for the time being unidentifiable *guru* (or *gurus*) several times (ad 1.1.10, 1.24, 1.2.27) as well as to other oral teachings (ad 1.2.42, 1.2.74).

Bhavabhaṭṭa suggests very strongly in his fifth opening verse that his – again unnamed and unidentifiable – master has already ‘set into order’

PREDECESSORS
TO THE
PAÑJIKĀPREDECESSORS
TO THE
NIBANDHA

(*pragunīkṛtam*) the *Catuṣpīthatantra* and that some readers might thus question the utility of his effort of writing a commentary. To this objection he retorts with a simile: is it not the case that people would eat even iron if it has been softened up by herbs?⁴³ ‘Softening up’ the text and ‘setting it into order’ is suggestive of a *pañjikā*-type commentary, probably one in which the topics were clearly delineated and the tougher passages cracked. However, the word ‘*vacana*’ in the verse is rather ambiguous: it could denote purely oral teaching as much as explanations in a written form.

The author of the *Nibandha* not infrequently cites variant explanations to certain terms and passages. Unfortunately he never identifies the exegete behind the second opinion but uses the customary (and, at least for the historian-philologist, rather frustrating) ‘*kecit*’. Of course, not every instance of the pronoun necessarily signals previous exegesis, especially not when a term is explained. For these explanations can derive from texts unrelated to the present cycle.⁴⁴ One case which is decisive in my view is his comment ad 1.1.32f, where ‘according to some’ the said *pāda* refers back to 1.1.30b. This second opinion must have come from an explanation keyed to the text.⁴⁵ This still does not prove conclusively that there was any written form of exegesis, but it shows a certain engaging with the text beyond the narrow confines of what survives to this day.⁴⁶

⁴³This is a reference to a *rasaśāstra* procedure, cf. e.g. *Rasajalanidhi* III:2-95. Purified iron is beaten into thin sheets and then ‘softened up’ in clarified butter and several kinds of herbs, according to diagnosis. The two *apis* in the same line is very inelegant, but Bhavabhaṭṭa is not a poet.

⁴⁴Such is the case for example ad 1.1.15 explaining *agnikārya*, or ad 2.1.90 and 94 giving two meanings for *ksīrapeya* and *aṣurī* respectively.

⁴⁵Other instances where the variant explanation is linked not just to a term but the very idiom of the text are ad 3.4.77 and 4.3.25.

⁴⁶The question arises whether Bhavabhaṭṭa knew of Kalyāṇavarman’s commentary and whether he could be hiding behind one of the ‘*kecit*’s, or even the title *guru*. I find this very unlikely. I am aware of only one case where the explanation attributed to ‘*kecit*’ concurs with that of the *Pañjikā*. This is a discussion ad 3.2.57 about the technical term *saptamanāda*: Bhavabhaṭṭa does not disregard the ‘eunuch letters’, thus the seventh vowel is Ṛ, but the unnamed authorities he cites as second best – and Kalyāṇavarman – do, thus the seventh vowel is E. The two ways of raising the vowels is not uncommon, therefore this piece of evidence cannot be conclusive to establish that the *Nibandha* cites the *Pañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman.

3.2.2 The Nibandha of Bhavabhaṭṭa

Bhavabhaṭṭa,⁴⁷ according to Tāranātha's list,⁴⁸ was a tantric preceptor of Vikramaśīla monastery. To my knowledge there is nothing that would substantiate this statement, but also nothing to disprove it. In the colophon to his *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* he is styled (or, if the colophon is auctorial, he styles himself) *paṇḍitācārya*, a title which is attested as a presumably high-ranking office in Vikramaśīla (see notes to Ms. K below). If he did hold the office that Tāranātha attributed to him, it was presumably in such a position that he made it his aim to comment on most major *yoginītantras* of his day. Besides the extensive commentary on the *Catuṣpīṭha* he is the author of the published *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti*, the only other known commentator on the *Vajradākatantra*,⁴⁹ and an important commentator of the *Hevajra*.⁵⁰ Besides these major pieces of exegesis he is also the presumable author of several shorter works, mainly of the *sādhana* type.⁵¹

THE
AUTHOR

⁴⁷Variants for his name include Bhavabhadrā, Bhavabhaṭṭa, and Bṛhadbhaṭṭa. The first is used in Tibetan sources. The second variant was communicated to me by Prof. Sanderson in November 2007. His source for this spelling was the colophon of the *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* ms. copied during the first year of the reign of Śūrapāla. This ms. is presently kept in China, and it has been partly edited by Li Nan in 2005. The copy is somewhat hard to make out but it is not inconceivable that under the 'ṭa' there is a faint arc, a customary way of marking a doubling of that consonant. The third – doubtless referring to our exegete – comes from a fragment in the *Kalpasādhana* ms. for a description of which see below. The passage in question juxtaposes two exegetical opinions about the arrangements for the outer deities: *nīlapīṭasūklaraktā diksthā[ś] ca vidīksaṃsthītā[h]|| iti Bṛhadbhaṭṭapādāḥ|| vidīkṣu sthītāḥ. Sīṃhinyādivarṇā iti Kalyāṇavarmapādāḥ||*

⁴⁸CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:18 & 325-329, as well as 436-437. The Tibetan historian's longer entry is translated there as follows: "He [i.e. Śrīdhara] was succeeded by *Bhavabhadrā. Broadly speaking, he was also a scholar of all aspects of the Doctrine. He studied in particular Vijñāna-vāda and acquired proficiency in about fifty Tantras. He received the blessings of Cakrasaṃvara in dream [sic!] and also had the vision of Tārā. He practiced the Guṭikā-siddhi and attained success. Later on, he attained success in the practice of alchemy, etc, which proved highly beneficial for himself and for others."

⁴⁹Despite the importance of this tantra there is only a single, partial, but highly interesting, commentary besides Bhavabhaṭṭa's, that of Nor bzangs (most likely *Sudhana), the **Vajradākapañjikā*. Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary is entitled *Rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal rdo rje mkha' 'gro zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad pa* in the Tibetan Canon, Tōh. 1415, translated by Gayādhara and 'Gos Lhas btsas. Neither are proven to be extant in Sanskrit. A 25-folio fragment of a *Vajradāka* commentary is known to exist in China.

⁵⁰The **Hevajravivṛti* is not known to be extant in Sanskrit.

⁵¹E.g. the **Catuṣpīṭhasādhana*, the **Catuṣpīṭhajalahoma*, and several other works centering on the goddess Tārā.

There is further evidence to locate Bhavabhaṭṭa in eastern India. In his *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* ad *Herukābhīdhāna* 42.8 he mentions three toponyms: Nandigrāma, Mahāraṇya, and Varddhamāna.⁵² Mahāraṇya, i.e. ‘great forest’ is sufficiently vague to think nothing more of it. Nandigrāma can be located in contemporary Purba Medinipur district of West Bengal, very close to the ancient seaport of Tamruk (i.e. Tāmralipti). As for Varddhamāna, there can be little doubt that this is contemporary Burdwan/Bardhaman. Varddhamānapura rose to prominence under the opportunist king Kāntideva, who left us the copper plate of Chittagong.⁵³ These places must have been prominent at the time and in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s vicinity, since Varddhamānapura and Nandigrāma are not the obvious choices when one is prompted to give an example for a city and a village. Majumdar advanced the opinion on palaeographical grounds that the Chittagong inscription is a product of the ninth century. In the absence of a careful palaeographical study of early-mediaeval Bengali inscriptions it is perhaps more cautious to assume that Kāntideva could have usurped the Pāla heartlands at some point between the decline already in full swing in 866 and the restoration of Mahīpāla at the end of the tenth century.⁵⁴ An earlier date is to be preferred since by the middle of the tenth century another dynasty, the Candras, seems to have taken over the region.⁵⁵ If my reasoning is acceptable, then even by the most cautious standards we should see Bhavabhaṭṭa active in what is referred to as the Bengal cultural area, in the middle of the tenth century.

Strengthening the case for eastern India as Bhavabhaṭṭa’s region of activity is a rather curious *nirukti* for the term *vajra* ad 2.4.15: *bhavo ramante ’neneti vajram*. In order for the etymology to make sense we must read the term in an eastern pronunciation ‘*bajram*’. This not only points to the possibility that Bhavabhaṭṭa ‘thought’ in an Eastern accent, but also to the fact that he expected his audience to do so as well.⁵⁶

The quotations in the *Nibandha* may be tabulated as follows (Table 3.2 & 3.3). Compared to its size the commentary is relatively poor in quotations.

QUOTATIONS

⁵²*Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* (vol. 2, p. 555) with the lemmata marked in bold: ***grāma ityādi/ Nandigrāmādaḥ/ araṇye mahāraṇye/ nagareṣu Varddhamānādiṣu***. I am grateful to Prof. Sanderson for pointing out this reference to me.

⁵³EI 26, no. 45, edited and translated by R. C. Majumdar.

⁵⁴Cf. MAJUMDAR 1974:119-131.

⁵⁵Cf. the Rāmpāl copper-plate of Śrīcandra in MAJUMDAR 2003. Śrīcandra’s inscription alludes to the fact that his father, Trailokyacandra, possessed the royal umbrella of Harikela, the region to the future kings of which Kāntideva had intended to address his

Bhavabhaṭṭa almost never specifies his source (there is only one such exception, ad 2.4.20), which seems to suggest that his audience was expected to be a learned one.

From the viewpoint of seeking to establish a relative chronology of Indian Tantric Buddhist authors and scriptures the most remarkable quotation is perhaps that from Saraha's *Dohakoṣa* ad 3.4.11, to my knowledge the earliest attestation of the famous *mahāsiddha*.⁵⁷ Another mentionable quotation is that from the *Gurupañcāśikā*, although Kalyāṇavarman may also be suspected of citing one verse from this seminal and in my view rather early work by Vāpilladatta. Among scriptural material the *Mahāmāyā* quotation ad 4.3.2 is noteworthy, since the *mūla* of that once important cycle does not survive.⁵⁸ The case of the quotation ad 1.1.11 is somewhat questionable. On first reading it looks like a *saṃgrahaśloka* composed by Bhavabhaṭṭa himself, however, the verse does appear in the Calcutta ms. of the *Vajradāka* after what according to the Tokyo ms. and the Tibetan translation should be the end of that scripture. Deciding who is citing who in this case should be deferred until a careful study of the transmission of the *Vajradāka* is published.

Besides the quotations there is very little concrete information in the commentary that would allow us to pinpoint Bhavabhaṭṭa's date and environment. He possibly dedicates the commentary to one Guṇamati in the first closing verse.⁵⁹

I have chosen to edit the *Nibandha* with the root-text for several reasons. Bhavabhaṭṭa may not be the most eloquent and learned of the three commentators, but he is certainly the most conscientious one: for the most part the best readings can be recovered from his *pratīkas* (which are fortunately verbose) and he tends to have something to say about most verses. It is only his commentary that survives in multiple manuscripts of good quality. The commentator's obvious penchant for *yogācāra* doctrine very rarely interferes with the interpretation of the text, which is on the whole faithful in the sense that he tries to avoid fanciful exegesis where unnecessary. He is also faithful

STYLE &
INFLUENCE

grant (the Chittagong copper-plate lacks a beneficiary).

⁵⁶Also cf. SANDERSON 2009:165-166.

⁵⁷Also cf. *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* vol. 1, p. 18.

⁵⁸The cited verse offers an improvement to the reconstruction offered by the Sarnath editors of the *Guṇavatī*, although this superior reading could have been inferred from Ratnākaraśānti's gloss had it been read more carefully.

⁵⁹This is available only in Ms. K 57^v: *guṇavan matilocanaṃ na me na ca vāṇī matiman manoharā*/. The name – if it is one – is split up in the two Vocatives.

to the state of the text: he does not seem to have interfered with the bizarre grammar of the *tantra*, and he not infrequently cites and interprets variant readings. Bhavabhaṭṭa's exegesis of the *Catuṣpīṭha* was quite influential. Several passages from the *Nibandha* are taken over word for word or with little editorial intervention into the *Āmnāyamañjarī* of Abhayākaragupta. In other words, Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary was still read at Vikramaśīla almost two hundred years after its probable date.

The *Nibandha* is available in the following manuscripts:

[K] The manuscript I henceforth refer to as 'K' was once complete in 53 folios. Folios 16-18,⁶⁰ 21,⁶¹ 27,⁶² 34-35⁶³ are unaccounted for, whereas folios 1, 29, and 49 are to be found at the beginning of Kaiser 231 = NGMPP C 26/4.⁶⁴ The largest part of the ms. is to be found in Kaiser 134 = NGMPP C 14/11.⁶⁵

DISPERSED
MS.

Besides the largest portion of K there are three stray folios in this bundle: a folio 1 is the first of a commentary to the *Dākinīvajrapañjara*, the *Tattvavīśadā* by Mahāmati (for the rest see the list below), a folio 17 belongs to a ms. of the *Laghutāntraṭīkā* similar to Kaiser Library 225 = NGMPP C 25/6 (note, however, that folio 17 is extant in that ms. and curiously ends exactly where the present folio ends), and a folio 18 to the *Abhayapaddhati*, the rest of which is found as NAK 5/21 = NGMPP A 48/2.

STRAY
FOLIOS

The manuscript must have received the attention of a Tibetan librarian at some point, since the cover page has a scribble in the Tibetan cursive: the first line reads *gdan bzhi rgyud kyi 'grel pa 'dra* ('this looks like a commentary of the *Catuṣpīṭha*'), whereas the second line is somewhat difficult to decipher: *bdes mchogi cha(?) zhabs pa khas(?) dang ... pa'i tik*. It very much looks like

COVERS

⁶⁰Affecting the commentary ad 1.4.28-2.1.99; 16^r ought to begin with *-reti/ trīyavar-gasya* and 18^v should end with *uccāṭane 'py aṣṭāṅgulamā-*.

⁶¹Affecting the commentary ad 2.3.16-59; 21^r ought to begin with *sarvamudrāṇām madhye* and 21^v should end with *catvāri ṛ ṛ-*.

⁶²Affecting the commentary ad 2.4.3-20; 27^r ought to begin with *bhagavān āhetyādi* and 27^v should end with *paryāyāḥ / katha-*.

⁶³Affecting the commentary ad 3.2.34-3.3.4; 34^r ought to begin with *madhye ātmacetasya* and 35^v should end with *bhasmapuñjamā-*.

⁶⁴I am grateful to Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for pointing out the location of these folios to me in Fall 2006.

⁶⁵This ms. had also been photographed by Giuseppe Tucci (see SFERRA 2008:56, item 23) with the stray folios (see next paragraph) already 'in place'. I thank Prof. Sferra for providing me with a copy of these plates.

Table 3.2: List of authorities cited in the Nibandha

Location	Introduced/followed by	Quotation	Identified as
ad 1.1.1	tathā cāha	<i>sarvabuddhādhipaḥ ... dharmatā</i>	Guhyasamāja 18.178
ad 1.1.1	iti vā	<i>janakaḥ sarvabuddhānām</i>	Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti 1.60a
ad 1.1.1.1	iti vacanāt	<i>praññopāya ° ... bhāvalakṣaṇaḥ</i>	Guhyasamāja 18.33
ad 1.1.11	yathā	<i>rohītāmakare ... sapta ca</i>	possibly Vajraḍāka ch. 52
ad 1.1.23	yathā	<i>aṅgāni ... aṣṭādaśa</i>	Mahābhārata? Purāṇas?
ad 1.1.36	iti	<i>kāladhvanor atyantasaṃyoge</i>	Aṣṭādhyāyī 2.3.5
ad 1.3.16	tathāha	<i>ahaṅkārodbhavaṃ sarvaṃ</i>	untraced
ad 2.1.107	tathā cāha	<i>śrāvaka ° ... °kṛtacittotpādaḥ</i>	untraced
ad 2.3.1	iti vacanāt	<i>āvartyate ... arthāntarāśrītaḥ</i>	PPpīṇḍārthasaṃgraha 57cd
ad 2.3.1	tathā cāha	<i>astīti ... paṇḍitaḥ</i>	Samādhirājasūtra 9.27
ad 2.3.2	iti vacanāt	<i>advayāḥ ... dharmalakṣaṇavarjitaḥ</i>	Guhyasamāja 2.6ab
ad 2.3.2	iti vacanāt	<i>na svato ... kecana</i>	Mūlamadhyamakakārikā 1.2
ad 2.3.4	tathā cāha	<i>utpādayantu ... vākpravyāhāreṇa</i>	Guhyasamāja 2.3
ad 2.3.111	iti vacanāt	<i>praññayā ... sthitiḥ</i>	Abhisamayālamkāra 10ab
ad 2.3.146	tathā cāha	<i>dhānyavalkādisandhānaṃ ... iṣyate</i>	untraced
ad 2.3.164	tathā cāha	<i>sarvaṃ ... sādhakāḥ</i>	untraced
ad 2.4.20	tathā cāha	<i>sukhasya ... śabdītam</i>	Hevajra II.iv.31ab
ad 2.4.20	tathā cāha	<i>śukrākāro ... bhagavān</i>	Hevajra I.viii.50a
ad 2.4.21	tathā cāha	<i>bolakakkolayogena ... mataḥ</i>	Hevajra II.ii.53
ad 2.4.22	tathā cāha	<i>buddharatnakaraṇḍakam</i>	Hevajra II.iii.4d

Table 3.3: List of authorities cited in the Nibandha (cont'd)

Location	Introduced/followed by	Quotation	Identified as
ad 3.4.3	yathoktam	<i>śūnyatāiva hi samvṛtīh</i>	untraced
ad 3.4.11	tathā cāha	<i>jattiu ... na ko vi</i>	Sarahadohakoṣa 74
ad 4.1.8	iti	<i>mandalam ... °yogopasambhṛtī</i>	possibly Māyājāla ch. 10
ad 4.1.8	yad āha	<i>yathoktācaraṇāt ... parigadyate</i>	untraced
ad 4.1.9	āha ca	<i>bodhicittavajras ... advaidhākāram</i>	Guhyasamāja between 17.51-52
ad 4.1.9	anyac ca	<i>nānātvam ... vajradharasya ca</i>	Gurupañcāsikā 22cd
ad 4.1.60	tathā cāha	<i>kāyenaiva ... kām bhaviṣyati</i>	Bodhicaryavatāra 5.109
ad 4.1.60	iti vacanāt	<i>gṛṣmābhir ... tathāgataḥ</i>	probably Udānavarga 12.9cd
ad 4.2.11	tad āha	<i>karmaṇo ... janayanti tat</i>	Triṃśikā 19
ad 4.2.14	tad āha	<i>samsārād ... iti kathyate</i>	Hevajra II.iv.32cd
ad 4.2.14	anyac ca	<i>nirvāṇasya ... samsaraṇasya ca</i>	Mūlamadhyamakakārikā 35.20ab
ad 4.3.2	yathāha	<i>sukhair ... sadā</i>	Mahamāya 1.18cd

a title, which was then discarded as a possibility and replaced with the line above, which identifies the first folio correctly. On the right hand side of the cover page there is a schematic scribble in the format 8+1 with the *bīja* Aṅ in the middle. I am unable to identify what the importance or intent of this small image is.

The pagination is given in two sets of numbers: one on the left and one on the right margin. The set on the left is the older and correct one. The numbering on the right is more recent and sometimes erroneous (such errors can be seen for instance on folios 22, 23, 36, 37 where the numbering on the right is given as 23, 22, 34, and 35 respectively).

NUMERATION

The ms. has been very carefully written and damage is minimal. *Prima manu* marginal corrections are almost entirely absent; wherever the scribe had noticed a copying mistake, he rubbed out his previous letters and overwrote the correction. This procedure sometimes renders the ms. legible only with great difficulty. There are several later additions in the margins in a *devanāgarī* hand written with a blunt pencil. In some cases the scribe decided that he does not wish to write more on a leaf, most likely because of the uneven surface. In such instances, in order to signal that there is no textual omission in the lacuna, the remaining space is covered with a series of letters resembling the *akṣara* “ṣa”.⁶⁶

SCRIBAL HABITS

It was Prof. Isaacson who first pointed out that a number of very good manuscripts in the so-called Proto-Bengali-cum-Maithili (sometimes also ‘Gomola’) script might originate from the same source, an east-Indian scriptorium. The common features of these mss. are the aforementioned script, their almost uniform size (varying from 56 to 56.7 x 5.3 to 5.5 cm) with two string holes written around, and the high quality of their readings.

A MS. FROM VIKRAMAŚĪLA

I cannot pretend to exhaust the list of works that are to be found in this corpus, therefore I shall limit myself to listing only those mss. to which I have had access:

- the *Tattvaviśadā* of Mahāmati, a commentary to the *Ḍākinīvajrapañjara* (spread across Kaiser 134 = NGMPP C 14/4, NAK 5-20 = NGMPP A 47/17, NAK 5-23 = NGMPP A 47/18)
- the *Laghutantraṭīkā* of Vajrapāṇi, a commentary of a portion of the *Herukābhidhāna* from the Kālacakra viewpoint (Kaiser Library 225 = NGMPP C 25/6)

⁶⁶Cf. however ISAACSON 2010:19 and the passage quoted there from Steinkellner.

- the *Guṇavatī tīkā* of Ratnākaraśānti, a commentary of the *Mahāmāyā* (Kaiser Library 226 = NGMPP C 25/7)
- the anonymous *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya*, a short commentary to the *Samputa* (Kaiser Library 228 = NGMPP C 26/1)
- the *Katipayākṣarā*, the commentary to the *Herukābhyaḍaya* of (a) Kumāracandra (Kaiser Library 229 = NGMPP C 26/2)
- the *Ratnāvalī*, Kamalanātha's commentary to the Hevajra (Kaiser Library 231 = NGMPP C 26/4)
- the anonymous *Trisamayarājaṭīkā* (NAK 5-20 = NGMPP A 47/17)
- the *Kalyāṇakāmadhenuvivarāṇa* attributed to Nāgārjuna (NAK 5-20 = NGMPP A 47/17)
- the *Abhayapaddhati* of Abhayākaragupta, a commentary to the *Buddhakapālatantra* (NAK 5/21 = NGMPP A 48/2)
- the *Smṛtyupasthāna* (ms. of unknown provenance in the collection of Prof. Wallace)

Among the photographs now held in Rome in the Tucci collection (see SFERRA 2008:45, item 31) Prof. Isaacson located a b/w photo of a folio belonging to the *Kalyāṇakāmadhenuvivarāṇa* which was apparently not photographed by the NGMPP (it is very possible that the folio simply disappeared after the time of Tucci's photos and before the NGMPP archival project). This contains evidence that the place where that ms. was copied was none other than Vikramaśīla:

*likhāpitā pustikeyaṃ paṇḍitabhikṣuJinaśrīmitreṇa svaparārhahetori
iti || likhitā ca Vikramaśīlavihārāvasthāne Mahādharaṇāmneti ||*

Noting the strikingly similar palaeographical and codicological features it is probably not a far-fetched inference that the other mss. have also been copied on the same site, and that therefore ms. K was a copy prepared at the same monastery, Vikramaśīla, where Bhavabhaṭṭa was active as preceptor a few centuries before. At a lecture delivered at the Third International Workshop on Early Tantra in 2010 Prof. Isaacson also pointed out

DATING

the palaeographical differences in the above-mentioned mss. and advanced the hypothesis that there was an earlier and a later phase in copying this corpus (or that there was a more conservative and a more innovative group of scribes). Our ms. K – along with the mss. of the *Laghutantraṭīkā* and the *Abhayapaddhati* – belongs to the later phase, which Prof. Isaacson identifies as the second half of the 12th century.

I have read ms. K from high quality colour photographs.⁶⁷

[M] The second best ms. for the *Nibandha* designated here as ‘M’ is available in a b/w microfiche copy prepared for the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions in 1971.⁶⁸ The current location of the original is unknown. The ms. is severely damaged by just about every imaginable factor: breaking off, fraying, worms and presumably water (some pages are badly effaced). It has been carefully written in an Old Newar hand resembling mss. from the 12th and 13th century. The exact size of the leaves cannot be determined from the reproduction, but it is likely that they were relatively small in size. There is only one string space, on the left hand side. A page usually has 6 lines of writing. Corrections, marginal and interlinear, both in the scribal and a later hand[/s] abound. The readings are usually decidedly inferior to the ones seen in ms. K. M and ms. S (described below) most likely shared an ancestor.

DESCRIPTION

There are in total 142 frames on the microfiche. However, there are duplicate or even triplicate photographs. The total of surviving folios is only 127. Almost nothing of the original numeration survives, and this probably explains why no effort has been taken to restore the original order. The following list will give some idea of just how shuffled this manuscript is. Fortunately the numeration survives on folios 4 and 7. From these and comparing the contents with other mss. I have been able to restore the original sequence and to ascertain that there are two folios missing from the beginning, fols. 84 and 87 are lost and 82^v has not been photographed. The restored order of folios as related to the microfilm frames is as follows:

NUMERATION

Fols. 1-2 = missing; fol. 3 = 106l - 105u; fol. 4 = 107l - 106u; fol. 5 *Ad 1.1*

⁶⁷I thank Prof. Isaacson for making the arrangements with the curators of the Kaiser library for a renewed digital archiving of this ms.

⁶⁸I thank Prof. Sanderson for allowing me to borrow his microfiches to prepare a printout. For the status of the IASWR collection see notes to ms. E of the *Catuspīṭha* above.

= 107u - 108l; fol. 6 = 103l - 102u; fol. 7 = 101u - 102l; fol. 8 = 105l - 104u; fol. 9 = 104l - 103u; fol. 10 = 82u - 83l; fol. 11 = 47l - 46u; fol. 12 = 47u - 48l; fol. 13 = 10l - 9u; fol. 14 = 10u - 11l; fol. 15 = 8l - 7u; fol. 16^r = 22l;

fol. 16 = 22l - 21u; fol. 17 = 83u - 84l; fol. 18 = 23u - 24l; fol. 19 = 23l - 22u; fol. 20 = 66u - 67l (duplicates: 131l - 130u); fol. 21 = 34l - 33u; fol. 22 = 37l - 36u; fol. 23 = 52l - 51u; fol. 24 = 28u - 29l; fol. 25 = 31l - 30u; fol. 26 = 53u - 54l; fol. 27^r = 57l; *Ad 1.2*

fol. 27 = 57l - 56u (duplicate for fol. 27^v = 56u: frame 140); fol. 28 = 29u - 30l; fol. 29 = 55l - 54u; fol. 30^r = 6l; *Ad 1.3*

fol. 30 = 6l - 5u; fol. 31 = 91u - 92l; fol. 32 = 93l - 92u; fol. 33 = 93u - 94l; fol. 34 = 95l - 94u; fol. 35 = 8u - 9l; *Ad 1.4*

fol. 35^v = 9l; fol. 36 = 1 - 2l; fol. 37 = 5l - 4u; fol. 38 = 3u - 4l; fol. 39 = 2u - 3l; fol. 40 = 28l - 27u; fol. 41 = 27l - 26u; fol. 42 = 25u - 26l; fol. 43^r = 25l; *Ad 2.1*

fol. 43 = 25l - 24u; fol. 44 = 20u - 21l; fol. 45^r = 38l; *Ad 2.2*

fol. 45 = 38l - 37u; fol. 46 = 40l - 39u; fol. 47 = 38u - 39l; fol. 48 = 40u - 41l; fol. 49 = 19l - 18u; fol. 50 = 112l - 111u; fol. 51 = 64u - 65l (duplicates: 133l - 132u); fol. 52 = 65u - 66l (duplicates: 132l - 131u); fol. 53 = 62u - 63l (duplicates: 135l - 134u); fol. 54 = 63u - 64l (duplicates: 134l - 133u); fol. 55 = 58u - 59l (duplicates: 139l - 138u); fol. 56 = 61l - 60u (duplicates: 136u - 137l); fol. 57 = 113l - 112u; fol. 58 = 62l - 61u (duplicates: 135u - 136l); fol. 59 = 59u - 60l (duplicates: 138l - 137u); fol. 60 = 16u - 17l; fol. 61 = 44l - 43u; fol. 62^r = 45u; *Ad 2.3*

fol. 62 = 45u - 46l; fol. 63 = 15l - 14u; fol. 64 = 45l - 44u; fol. 65 = 16l - 15u; fol. 66 = 42u - 43l; fol. 67 = 41u - 42l; fol. 68 = 20l - 19u; fol. 69 = 50l - 51l; fol. 70 = 49u - 50l; fol. 71 = 18l - 17u; fol. 72 = 36l - 35u; fol. 73^r = 34u; *Ad 2.4*

fol. 73 = 34u - 35l; fol. 74 = 33l - 32u; fol. 75 = 31u - 32l; fol. 76 = 11u - 12l; fol. 77 = 49l - 48u; fol. 78^r = 13l; *Ad 3.1*

fol. 78 = 13l - 12u; fol. 79 = 14l - 13u; fol. 80 = 80l - 79u; fol. 81 = 70l - 69u (duplicates: 127u - 128l); fol. 82^r = 72u (duplicates: 124u, 125l); fol. *Ad 3.2*

82^v = not photographed; fol. 83 = 74u - 75l; fol. 84^r = missing;

fol. 84^v = missing; fol. 85 = 76l - 75u; fol. 86 = 79l - 78u; fol. 87 = missing; *Ad 3.3*
fol. 88 = 78l - 77u; fol. 89 = 77l - 76u; fol. 90 = 89l - 88u; fol. 91^r = 87u;

fol. 91 = 87u - 88l; fol. 92 = 86u - 87l; fol. 93 = 85u - 86l; fol. 94 = 55u - *Ad 3.4*
56l; fol. 95 = 81l - 80u; fol. 96 = 85l - 84u; fol. 97 = 91l - 90u; fol. 98 = 82l -
81u; fol. 99 = 90l - 89u; fol. 100 = 70u - 71l (duplicates: 127l - 126u); fol. 101
= 67u - 68l (duplicates: 130l - 129u); fol. 102 = 68u - 69l (duplicates: 128u -
129l); fol. 103 = 97l - 96u; fol. 104 = 98l - 97u; fol. 105 = 73u - 74l; fol. 106
= 123l - 122u; fol. 107 = 119u - 120l; fol. 108 = 124l - 123u (duplicate for
108^r : 141l);

fol. 108^v = 123u; fol. 109 = 109l - 108u; fol. 110 = 53l - 52u; fol. 111 = *Ad 4.1*
57u - 58l (duplicate for 111^v : 139u); fol. 112 = 118u - 119l; fol. 113 = 111l -
110u; fol. 114 = 110l - 109u;

fol. 114^v = 109u; fol. 115 = 113u - 114l; fol. 116 = 114u - 115l; fol. 117 *Ad 4.2*
= 115u - 116l (duplicate for 117^v : 117l); fol. 118 = 122l - 121u; fol. 119 =
71u - 72l (duplicates: 126l - 125u); fol. 120^r = 120u;

fol. 120 = 120u - 121l; fol. 121 = 100l - 99u; fol. 122 = 99l - 98u; fol. 123 *Ad 4.3*
= 96l - 95u; fol. 124 = 6u - 7l; fol. 125^r = 117u;

fol. 125 = 117u - 118l; fol. 126 = 101l - 100u; fol. 127 = 116u - 142 *Ad 4.4*
(duplicate for 127^r : 141u).

[S] The folios of the manuscript I refer to with the siglum ‘S’ are currently
to be found spread across four mss. of which three are housed at the National
Archives, Kathmandu, and one at the Asiatic Society, Calcutta (see below
and Table 3.4). How and why these folios were separated in such a disparate
fashion is something of a mystery. One possibility is that the ms. was once
in a private collection and upon the owner’s death folios were distributed
among his descendants.⁶⁹ However, in such a case it would be expected that

DISPERSED
MS.

⁶⁹Such cases are well attested, the most celebrated being that of the *codex archetypus*
of the *Rājatarāṅginī*. M. A. Stein reported in the introduction to his critical edition that
upon the death of Paṇḍit Keśavarām, the owner of said codex, the book was divided into

the manuscript is broken up into roughly equal parts.

The full extent of the manuscript cannot be determined with certainty; an estimate would be around 70 folios, probably less. The leaves are long, measuring 57 x 5,5 cm, inscribed in six lines, with roughly 1550 *akṣaras* per folio. The left string space is left empty, whereas the right is flushed around with text leaving only two lines empty in the immediate vicinity. The script is a rather elegant, bold, Old Newar veering towards the later, hook-topped variety of that script. Lack of palaeographic experience prevents me to providing an educated guess about its time, but the 12th-13th centuries is probably not widely off the mark. There are corrections in both the scribe's hand and in the hand of a later, rather perceptive but unfortunately not thorough, reader. The readings and omissions very often coincide with ms. M, but the ms. cannot be said to be a descriptive ms. of M. It is much more likely that M and S shared an ancestor. On the whole it is the least reliable of the palm-leaf witnesses of the *Nibandha*.

DESCRIPTION

The largest portion of the manuscript (ff. 13-48, 50-53) survives in NAK 3-359 *vi. jātaka* 2 = NGMPP A 38/11. This serendipitous find was graciously pointed out to me by Dr. Albrecht Hanisch in September 2008, who also discovered that missing folios from this ms. of the *Jātakamālā* can be traced in Calcutta (ASB G 9980).⁷⁰ Dr. Hanisch has also very obligingly arranged that I consult this portion from high-quality colour digital photographs.

NGMPP
A 38/11

This find complemented a manuscript currently held at the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, under call-number G 9992. Seven folios (ff. 3, 5, 54-57, 59) survive in this ms. Owing to the arbitrary, absurd, and counter-productive policies enforced by that library⁷¹ I could not procure a copy of this ms. and was forced to collate it *in situ* against a printout of a control-text. For this reason the reader should be aware that reported readings from the above-said folios are perhaps not always accurate.

ASB
G 9992

three among his heirs which made securing the ms. for consultation even more difficult (STEIN 1892:viii). Mr. Sanjay Rath, a collector of Orissan manuscripts, informs me that this is the case even today, and that tracing thus separated manuscripts is most fruitful in what he calls 'marriage-triangles'. The Kathmandu Valley, Bengal, and Mithila is such a triangle.

⁷⁰See HANISCH 2005: xlili-iv & xlvii-viii, and HANISCH (forthcoming).

⁷¹Government policy current during my visit in January 2008 stipulated that no more than 5% of a ms. is to be reproduced for a reader. My request to produce digital images which I then would have more than gratefully shared with the Society for future use was signed by the Secretary General, but was blocked by the librarian in charge – who should remain unnamed – only one floor below.

As pointed out by Hara Prasad Śāstrī in his catalogue of the ASB collection, the first folio in G 9992 is not part of the *Nibandha*. Shastri gives a full transcript of this leaf (SHĀSTRĪ 1917:142-143) without any comments. The text is the beginning of a *sādhana* belonging to an unstudied Tantric cycle based on the rather curiously entitled scripture, the *Bhagavatyāsvedāyā yathālabdhatantrarāja*.⁷² Almost the entire basic text of this cult survives in an early Nepalese manuscript (NAK 3-359 = NGMPP A 47/16) dated July 10th, 1024 CE.⁷³ Another item from this cycle is preserved in two folios (numbered 3 and 4) kept at the Bodleian Library, Oxford Ms. Sansk. C11. This fragment has been described by Kimiaki Tanaka (TANAKA 1995:47-49) as a *sādhana* of a goddess named Praçaṇḍavegavatī. The Japanese scholar also pointed out an important parallel with the *Vairocanābhīśambodhi* and speculated that the text might be the only surviving representative of the Caryā tantras in Sanskrit. But the text is surely scriptural in style. Returning to the *tantra* itself, it is indeed difficult to pinpoint which larger textual group it belongs to. The structure, the frame-narrative, the syntax and the aims of rites are reminiscent of a *kriyātantra*, but the presence of antinomian elements, *apabhraṃśa* verses, broken Sanskrit, cremation-ground symbolism, and an overwhelming presence of wrathful goddesses suggests a *yoginītantra* environment. This is not a unique situation, for *kriyātantras* did augment themselves with later material, presumably to keep up to date with developments and demand. An excellent case in point is that of the *Subāhuparīpṛcchā*, the later Chinese⁷⁴ and the Tibetan translations of which is rife with *kāpālika* materials from chapter 6 onwards. As far as I can tell the Tibetan tradition is entirely ignorant of this cycle. Whatever the case may be it is certain that a

STRAY
FOLIO

⁷²After the obeisance verse the qualifications of the *sādhaka* is given thus: *Bhagavatyāsvedāmbujāyāḥ kalpoktavīdhinā praviṣṭamaṇḍalābhīśekavidyālabd[h]asya mantriṇo* (em., *mantriṇā* Ms).

⁷³The date has been verified by PETECH 1984:37-38. The owner and scribe, Kṣa(Kya?)raṇākaradatta (sic for Karuṇākaradatta?), describes himself as an inhabitant of Śrīgāṅkulāṅga (Gāṃ Bāhā in Kathmandu?). The same institution is mentioned at the very end of the Royal Asiatic Society copy of the *Samputatilaka* (*‘śrīgāṅkulaṅge kulaputra’*), although that ms. was copied at the Dharmacakramahāvihāra. Perhaps the short note indicates a transfer of ownership, or it is only a partial entry with the name of the sponsor to be added later.

⁷⁴This significant fact, namely that it is only the later translation, that of Fatian at end of the 10th century, which is significant for the present case and not the earlier translation from the early 8th century was pointed out to me by Iain Sinclair. DAVIDSON 2002:387 seemed to have conflated the two versions.

study of this text and the satellites identified above would be very rewarding.

Four further folios (ff. 8, 10-12) survive in NAK 3-359 *vi. bauddhadarśana* 41 = NGMPP A 38/7, otherwise containing a manuscript published in facsimile of the *Daśabhūmīśvarasūtra/Daśabhūmikasūtra*. For a comprehensive description of this ms. see MATSUDA 1996:xvi. Prof. Matsuda writes in his introduction that the first five folios belong to ‘apparently an esoteric Buddhist text’. This is only partially true. Four folios do belong to the *Nibandha*, but the fifth is a fragment of the *Samādhirāja* (a prose passage from ch. 35), in spite of a librarian’s scribble in the right margin space identifying the text as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*. The existence of these folios of the *Nibandha* was very kindly pointed out to me by Prof. Isaacson. NGMPP
A 38/7

Lastly, two folios (ff. 7, 9) of ms. S survive in NAK 3-359 *vi. bauddhadarśana* 90 = NGMPP A 38/8. This bundle contains five folios of the *Samādhirāja* in the same hand as the single folio identified above and the two extant folios of the *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanasamkṣepa* for which see below. NGMPP
A 38/8

It is to be noted that the NAK call numbers are the same (3-359) for all three mss. mentioned in this subsection. The explanation is that the current NGMPP library cards did not adopt Śāstrī’s method of assigning capital letters to differentiate between the ms. bundles kept under the same number. Thus A 38/7 is III.359.J, A 38/8 is III.359.E, and A 38/11 is III.359.I.⁷⁵ ‘3-359’

I have read NGMPP A 38/7 and A 38/8 from high quality b/w photographs of the corresponding microfilms.⁷⁶

Note: For ASB G 9992 the numbers given between quotation marks are the ones that had been entered into the margins by a librarian or a vendor. The letters ‘u’ and ‘l’ indicate the position of the page on the microfilm frames. If no letter is specified, the frame has only a single page. Two sets of values being given means that there are duplicates. An asterisk before the folio number means that the numeration is not available in the present state of the folio.

⁷⁵The other mss. under the same number are the *Bhagavatyaśvedāyā yathālabdhata-ntararāja* (Shastri’s III.359.A), a ms. of the *Uṣṇīṣaviṅṣayādharāṇī* with a portion of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (dated NS 88 = 968 CE, Shastri’s III.359.B), a ‘Catuṣpīṭhanibandha’ and a ‘Catuṣpīṭhasādhanasamkṣepaḥ’ which are in fact the *Catuṣpīṭhapañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman (Shastri’s III.359.C¹ and C²), mss. of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Shastri’s III.359.D, F, G), a ms. of the so-called *Dīvyāvadānamālā* (Shastri’s III.359.H). I was able to consult all of these mss. with the exception of C¹ and C². None of them seem to contain more folios of S.

⁷⁶I thank Dr. Kengo Harimoto for allowing me to examine these copies.

Table 3.4: Folios of Ms S

Location	Frame	Folio no.	Note	Affected text
unknown		*1-2	missing	beginning–ad 1.1.8
ASB G9992	“2”	*3		ad 1.1.8-19
unknown		*4	missing	ad 1.1.19-33
ASB G9992	“8”	*5		ad 1.1.33-53
unknown		*6	missing	ad 1.1.53-70
NGMPP A 38/8	10l-11u	*7		ad 1.1.70-88
NGMPP A 38/7	8l-9u	*8		ad 1.1.88-1.2.3
NGMPP A 38/8	10u-9l	*9		ad 1.2.3-15
NGMPP A 38/7	8u-7l	10		ad 1.2.15-25
NGMPP A 38/7	5-6u	11		ad 1.2.25-38
NGMPP A 38/7	3-4 (6l-7u)	12		ad 1.2.38-62
NGMPP A 38/11		13-15		ad 1.2.62-1.4.1
NGMPP A 38/11	6l-7u	*16		ad 1.4.1-10
NGMPP A 38/11		17-48		ad 1.4.10-3.4.19
unknown		*49	missing	ad 3.4.19-3.4.35
NGMPP A 38/11		50-53		ad 3.4.35-104
ASB G 9992	“7”	*54		ad 3.4.104-122
ASB G 9992	“6”	*55		ad 3.4.122-4.1.3
ASB G 9992	“5”	*56		ad 4.1.3-15
ASB G 9992	“4”	*57		ad 4.1.15-48
unknown		*58	missing	ad 4.1.48-61
ASB G 9992	“3”	*59		ad 4.1.61-4.2.11
unknown		*60-?	missing	ad 4.2.11–end

I shall now describe the paper mss. of the commentary. With a single exception (ad 2.3.53) these mss. have not been collated for the edition.

NAK 5-38 [= NGMPP B 112/4] The best paper ms. of the *Nibandha* is housed at the National Archives, Kathmandu under accession number NAK 5-38, entitled *Catuṣpīṭhamahātantraṭīkā*. The major characteristics of this manuscript, such as shape and palaeographical features, agree with those of ms. D of the *mūla*. At some point this ms. formed a composite codex with NAK 5-37 and has been transmitted together with it. The ms. in its present state consists of 74 folios, but there is some evidence that the fragmentation is quite recent and the missing portion still extant but unidentified. The fact that the ms. that is its apograph, IASWR MBB-I-43, is complete, seems to point towards the correctness of this supposition.

NGMPP
B 112/4

Just as in the case of NAK 5-37² [= NGMPP A 138/10²], the main counter goes on on the left margin starting at 119 and the right counter restarts from 1 on the right margin. A tertiary numeration system is introduced on 236^v/119^v in the lower left and right corners. The first of such folios have a Ka on the left and a continuing series of digits up the point that the ms. breaks off. I have been unable to ascertain the role of this numeration.

NUMERATION

The leaves are placed between illustrated wooden covers. The one presently at the top depicts the five Tathāgatas. The figures at the bottom of the bundle are a bit more hazardous to identify at the moment. It depicts at the middle a standing figure with the gesture known as *abhaya* (most likely an Avalokiteśvara), with two figures on each side turning towards him. The illustrations on 1^v and 2^v depict Yogāmbara and a white Vajrasattva with two attendants each. All illustrations are in the same style.

ILLUSTRATIONS

This ms. (again without the accession number of the National Archives) has been described by PANDEY (1997:76-78.) He fails to mention that the ms. contains two large gaps and informs us that it is complete. Pandey describes Bhavabhaṭṭa as a commentator who does not only comment on the root-text but also sometimes goes into descriptions which make his work an independent treatise.⁷⁷ This is somewhat inaccurate, since the rather orthodox commentator seems to stick very closely indeed to the root-text and goes into digressions only rarely. It is also in this description that Pandey announces the imminent publication of the root-text accompanied by the the

PANDEY'S
DESCRIPTION

⁷⁷PANDEY 1997:78 यह केवल मूल की टीका मात्र नहीं है, विद्वान टीकाकार ने विशेष स्थलों पर विस्तृत विवेचन द्वारा इसे स्वतन्त्र ग्रन्थ की कोटि में ला दिया है।

Nibandha, a project that has since been aborted.⁷⁸

The folios under this accession number contain two large fragments of the *Nibandha*. Ff. 119^v /1^v to 168^v /51^v have the text from the beginning up to the commentary to verse 2.1.103ab and ff. 224^r /107^r up to 246^v /129^v are a witness for the commentary ad 3.3.1.-3.4.67d.

CONTENTS

IASWR MBB-I-43 The second paper ms. discussed here is available on a microfiche copy prepared for the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions in 1971.⁷⁹ The present location of the original is unknown. The major features of this manuscript agree with those of ms. E of the *mūla*. It is quite certain that just like as ms. E is an apograph of ms. D, so this ms. is an apograph of what used to be the complete ms. of NAK 5-38 [= NGMPP B 112/4]. The library card contains the following description: “*This manuscript is the best commentary on Caṭuḥ pītha mahā*⁸⁰ *tantraraḥa which is very useful to understand the secret meanings of tantra.*” Just as in the case of ms. E, this description is taken over verbatim without acknowledgment in NEGI 1990:56. The 138 folios contain the whole text of the commentary, but the readings are rather inferior. Page 137 is illegible as the photograph is out of focus. I have used this manuscript only once (with the siglum N_a): ad 2.3.53, where the two palm-leaf mss. M and S are guilty of an eyeskip (*ity arthaḥ – ity arthaḥ*) and K is missing a folio. This eyeskip very strongly suggests that the present ms. and its paper ancestor (see above) descend from a different line to that of mss. M and S.

IASWR
MBB-I-43

Nagoya Ka 51-4 The third and last of the paper mss. I have been able to secure is currently kept at the Buddhist Library in Nagoya.⁸¹ The catalogue of that collection (TAKAOKA 1981) follows the scribble on the cover page ‘*Dhūmāṅgādi[-]sādhana[-]ratnakalpa[-]tantra*’ to identify the work, but in actual fact this is yet another copy of the *Nibandha*. The ms. has been carefully copied from a rather inferior exemplar which doubtless came from the same transmission as the two paper mss. from Nagoya discussed above. It too had once been part of a composite codex with the rest of Nagoya Ka 51, since it also has a double numeration, one for the individual work on

NAGOYA
KA 51-4

⁷⁸Iain Sinclair, personal communication, e-mail, December 2, 2006.

⁷⁹I thank Prof. Sanderson for allowing me to use his microfiche copy.

⁸⁰After this the word *yāna* has been crossed out.

⁸¹I thank Dr. Ryugen Tanemura for allowing me to consult his copy of this ms.

the right margin and one for the composite codex on the left. There are two illustrations on ff. 1^v and 2^v. The first is most likely a Yogāmbara with two attendants, the second is a two-armed Jñānaḍākinī with two attendants. The ms. is complete in 174 folios. It ends without a colophon, however, it can be inferred from its appearance that it too was copied in circumstances similar to those of Nagoya Ka 51-3.

Partial transmission Testimony to the popularity of Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary in Nepal is a small but significant fragment preserved in a rather remarkable composite codex usually referred to as the ‘*Sādhanavidhāna*’ (NAK 3-369 = NGMPP A 936/11). This 109-folio ms. has been described rather inadequately in PANDEY 1990:208 ff. Pandey must have read the ms. very superficially, since he misses several colophons⁸² and fails to identify works which must have been very well known to him.⁸³ I will refrain from commenting further the contents of this ms. since it is not immediately essential for the *Catuṣpīṭha*, and because part of it is already under publication.⁸⁴

SĀDHANA-
VIDHĀNA

The one-folio fragment (110l-111u = f. 44) under scrutiny here is an edited extract from Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary to 2.3.135, or more exactly the commentary to the first song to be used in the *gaṇacakra*. As many works in this ms. the fragment presents itself as a separate work as it is introduced by an obeisance formula. The editor leaves out several phrases and introduces some more lemmata, but the text is unmistakably based on the *Nibandha*. Transmitting a commentary only partially is by no means unique in this ms.: ff. 68-70 are from the commentary to the 19th chapter of the *Samvarodaya* from the *Padminī* of Ratnarakṣita.

NIBANDHA
AD 2.3.135

[T_D] The Tibetan translation (I have relied mostly on the Derge edition, Tōh. 1607) of the *Nibandha* was prepared by Gayādhara and ’Gos Lhas btsas. The title *Dran pa’i rgyu mtshan* (= **Smṛtinibandha*) is very likely a false reconstruction from an unreliable rendering of the sixth introductory verse.⁸⁵

TIBETAN
TRANSLATION

⁸²E.g. a colophon in Old Newar on 3^r.

⁸³E.g. the verses from the *Kālacakratantra* on 109^v went completely unnoticed, as the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇasādhana* immediately thereafter.

⁸⁴See SINCLAIR (forthcoming). I thank Mr. Sinclair for providing me with a draft of his richly annotated edition of the *Maṇḍalagāthāṭīpanī* as well as a copy of the ‘*Sādhana-vidhāna*’ ms.

⁸⁵The *pāda* “*guṇayann arthaṃ nibadhnāmi*” is translated as *don rnam dran pa’i rgyu mtshan byas pa la* (T_D 137^v).

The translation is probably one of the most unusual seen in the *Bstan 'gyur* inasmuch as it is not a literal rendering of the Sanskrit. The commentary guides the reader through the text according to the arrangement of *pādas* of the Tibetan text and frequently contains much additional material, which is not seen in any of the Sanskrit manuscripts. It is not likely that Gayādhara brought with him an extended recension of the commentary, and we must therefore suspect that the passages not corresponding to the Sanskrit text contain his own *upadeśas*. On the whole the translation is very unreliable and I have decided to refer to it only on the rarest occasions, although I have consulted it frequently when trying to establish the critical text.

3.2.3 The *Pañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman

Kalyāṇavarman is the obscurest of the three commentators. There are no other works in either Sanskrit or Tibetan that could be confidently assigned to this exegete.⁸⁶ The anonymous author of the *Ratnamālā* (q.v.) seems to refer to Kalyāṇavarman as his *guru*, suggesting that he was a Nepalese, and perhaps a scholar of great renown. The *Pañjikā* itself reveals nothing concrete, save the fact that it was written at the behest of one Senavarman.⁸⁷ The suspicion that Kalyāṇavarman may have been Nepalese (or well-known in Nepal) is strengthened by the fact that his obeisance verse⁸⁸ was adopted in the *Nityakarmapūjāvidhi* (pp. 160-161) and the *Mañjuśrīmukhākhyaṇa*

THE
AUTHOR

⁸⁶The name itself is not uncommon. The famed Śāntideva's father is said to have been the king Dge ba'i go cha (NIYOGI 1983). An author of the same name is mentioned in the *Ldan/Lhan kar ma* catalogue (LALOU 1953, no. 611 *Bsgom pa'i sgo bstan pa*). It is not inconceivable that this is the same as the author of the **Aśucībhāvanākrama* (*Mi gtsang ba bsgom pa'i rim pa*, Tōh. 3921 & 4540), since the colophon explicitly states that there was an earlier translation, most likely from the Imperial Period. Yet another Dge ba'i go cha translated Sahajavajra's commentary to Advayavajra's *Tattvadaśaka* (Tōh. 2254) together with Jñānākara of the Mtshur. All these seem to have lived either too early or too late to be the same with our exegete.

⁸⁷1^v: *Pañjikā likhyate seyaṃ prārthanāt Senavarmanah*/. Note that the Tibetan curiously translated the last *pāda* with what should be the name of the author: *Dge ba'i go chas zhus phyir rol*/.

⁸⁸1^v: *bibhrāṇaṃ Buddhabimbaṃ divasakaradharollāsibālendulekhaṃ Maitreyaṃ cārurūpa[m] śirasi varatanuṃ Mañjuḡhoṣaṃ ca gātre/ Padmotthaṃ daṇḍarūpaṃ kuṭi[l]itavapuṣaṃ Vajriṇaṃ bhīmanādaṃ vijñānaṃ jñānarūpaṃ nihatabhavabhayaṃ pañcamūrtiṃ praṇamya*/|. The verse describes the syllable HŪM, cf. *Catuṣpīṭha* 1.2.19cd-20 *passim*.

(4^r),⁸⁹ two texts that are more than likely of Nepalese origin. The colophon simply refers to the author as an *ācārya*.

[Ms] The Sanskrit text of the commentary survives in a single manuscript, NAK 3-360 / *vi. bauddhatantra*⁹⁰ 23 = NGMPP B 30/37. It consists of 45 palm-leaf folia measuring 29 x 5 cm with six or seven lines of writing per page. The cover folio contains several librarians' scribbles. The letter-numeration is complete and accurate, presumably it is original. The quality of the text, in spite of the manuscript's age, is not very good.⁹¹ There are dozens of corrections in both the scribal hand and by subsequent readers. The last folio has a scribble in the by now familiar headless *devanāgarī*.⁹² The ms. is dated to NS 132 = 1012 CE, the dark fortnight of Bhādra (the day is not given), making it one of the earliest manuscripts to contain a Tantric Buddhist exegetical work. Several of the sub-chapter colophons as well the final colophon suggest that the title of the work is *Catuṣpīṭhāloka*, but the verse describing the circumstances of writing (see n. 87) refers to a *Pañjikā*. The work stops short of commenting on the last 23 verses of 3.4 and the *guhyaṣṭhā*, but from examining the Tibetan translation we may determine that it is the commentary that is incomplete and not the manuscript. Kalyāṇavarman also cites a lemma from the very last verse of the *tantra* (see n. 141), in other words he knew the text in a complete form and not only a recension with 12 sub-chapters.

NGMPP
B 30/37

[T_D] I have mainly relied on Tōh. 1608, i.e. the Derge edition of the Tibetan

TIBETAN
TRANSLATION

⁸⁹Both these texts transmit the *sragdharā* verse somewhat garbled. The first work leaves the gerund 'hanging', that is to say there is no finite verb after it, therefore the verse is clearly copied from another source and not part of the original text. The second source replaces the last word with *namāmi*.

⁹⁰-*tantra* is a correction. The person preparing the title-card first intended to write *-darśana*.

⁹¹All customary scribal blunders are represented here. One curious habit is to spell *ḍākinī* as *ḍāginī*, which may be auctorial. The form is also present in the *Mantroddhārapañjikā* (cf. n. 124). Prof. Sanderson kindly informed me that this spelling is also seen in Śaiva sources, e.g. the *Picumata*, the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, and the *Jayadrathayāmala*, *ṣaṭka* 2.

⁹²I have proposed above that it is not impossible that this is the writing of H. P. Śāstrī. The scribble is somewhat puzzling: *Catuṣpīṭhāloka/ suṃdarānaṃdapā //*. The first is the title as extracted from the colophon (which I do not accept as auctorial), whereas the second seems to contain an otherwise unknown name, if *pā-* is for the honorific *-pādah/-pādāḥ*.

rendering, which is signed by Smṛtijñānakīrti. The translation stops exactly where the ms. does, and here Smṛtijñānakīrti informs us that at this point Kalyāṇavarman was either forbidden by the *ḍākinīs* to continue his work, or just as about he was to comment on the fourth *pīṭha* he met the *ḍākinīs* face to face and disappeared.⁹³ This proves that the work is incomplete. Smṛtijñānakīrti certainly used another ms. than the one available to us, a fact proven not only by variant readings that can be restored from the translation, but also by renderings of passages which are missing in NAK 3-360 (some of these can be explained by conjecturing an eyeskip in the transmission that lead to our Ms). On the whole the translator is quite faithful to the original, but occasionally he introduces comments of his own.⁹⁴

Following the passage describing the fate of Kalyāṇavarman, Smṛtijñānakīrti completes the *Pañjikā* with his own commentary to the *guhya-pīṭha*. I refer to his commentary in notes to 4.1 and 4.3 as *Smṛti*. It is perhaps not uninteresting to note that thus the commentary is a rare example of ‘joint authorship’. I am unaware of any other Tantric Buddhist exegetical text that was completed after the death of the author by another person. Since Smṛtijñānakīrti knew good Tibetan, it may be suspected that he completed the work in that language during his stay in Khams. It is not at all clear how Smṛtijñānakīrti obtained a ms. of the *Pañjikā*: if the anecdotes about him are true, namely that he was lost in Central Tibet and had to work as a shepherd for a while, we can hardly believe that he kept manuscripts on his person during his trials. On the other hand we know on the authority of Bu ston that he was an avid manuscript collector, frequently inquiring of Tibetans whether they had come across any.⁹⁵

The *Pañjikā*, although a terse work, is very rich in quotations. Unfortunately, Kalyāṇavarman rarely mentions his sources, and many of the quotes cannot be traced, or cannot be traced with certainty. Most significantly, it can be demonstrated beyond doubt that he knew and used the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* – most likely the proto-recension, since he does not mention Yogāmbara

Smṛti

QUOTATIONS

⁹³I have edited and translated this passage in SZÁNTÓ 2008c:3, n. 5.

⁹⁴On T_D 3^r he notes the following about the four *bhuvaneśvaras* (*rohītā*, *makara*, *raṇḍā*, *mikira*) that are collectively referred to by the text as ‘those containing *rephas*’: *de la ra can ni ’dzag pa dang | chu srin dang | sbom po dang | sdig pa rnam te | rgya gar gyi tshig la yi ge yod pa’i phyir ro ||* (similarly three lines further: *rgya gar gyi tshig la ra yig yod pa’i phyir ro ||*). Obviously he thought that it would be difficult for Tibetans without access to the Sanskrit to realize the import of the collective term.

⁹⁵*Yo ga’i bshad thabs* 88^v -89^v.

–,⁹⁶ and he never quotes the *Hevajra*.

Texts quoted with attribution include the *Laṅkāvatāra* (ad 1.4.2 = traced as 2.106), the *Paramādyā* (ad 2.3.142), the *Māyājāla* (ad 2.4.9 = traced as perhaps on 128^r), the *Guhyasamāja* (ad 3.4.3 = 17.46ab; ad 3.4.46 untraced), a work by [another?] Āryadeva (ad 3.4.68: *sarvavikalpaprahāṇān mokṣaḥ*), and two verses from the *Śrīsamvara* (i.e. the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*, ad 3.4.115 traced on 164^v).

Reference is made to a *Bhūtatantra* or *bhūtatantras* (ad 1.4.30, cf. notes), the *Kakṣaputa* or *kakṣaputa* (ad 3.4.71, see description of that work) from a text called the *dvādaśasāhasrikā* (most likely the middling Ur-*tantra*), ‘the syllabary of *ṛṣis*’ (ad 1.1.88⁹⁷), a *vistarasādhana* (ad 1.2.49), a quotation ‘known in all *tantras*’ (ad 2.4.26 = *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 4.46), the *Śaṃvarottara* (ad 3.4.10, but in fact the verse is from the *Mahāvairocanaṅghisambodhi* 176^r), a *Rājaputrikā* (? , ad 3.4.33), a *kāmaśāstra*-style work, and the *Aṣṭāṣṭaka* (7 1/2 verses ad 3.4.32, cf. sub-section 2.5.6 above). More than once the cited authority is oral teaching (*gurūpadeśaḥ* ad 1.1.10, 1.2.4, 1.2.27; *upadeśaḥ* ad 1.2.42, 1.2.74).

Quotations that can be traced with relative certainty include the *Tattvasaṃgraha* (ad 2.3 on 20^r = 1.110.204 ff.), the *Gurupañcāsīkā* (ad 2.3. on 30^r = v. 20), the *Herukābhīdhāna* (ad 2.3.139 = 1.12cd-13ab), the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (ad 2.3.173 = 152^v and 156^v-157^r), the *Vajrāmṛta* (ad 2.4.8 = 1.6), the *Pramāṇavārttika* (ad 3.1.65 = Svārthānumāna v. 40), the *Daśabhūmika* (ad 3.1.66), and perhaps the *Guhyendutilaka* (ad 2.4.9, cf. MORIGUCHI 1993:173-174).

Some quotations cannot be traced except as also quoted in other sources: for ad 1.3.8 see SZÁNTÓ 2008a:14; the verse beginning with *eko bhāvaḥ* ad 2.4.9 is also quoted in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (p. 909), the *Amṛtakaṇṭhikoddyotanibandha* (p. 212), the *Spandapradīpikā* (p. 49), and, as pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson, partially in the *Mālinīśloka-vārttika* (1.641) and fully in the *Āgamaḍambara* (p. 104); a *sūtra* passage ad 3.4.68 is quoted in the *Tattvasiddhi* as from the *Ratnakūṭa*; the verse ad 3.2.46 on joining the *praṇava* and SVĀHĀ to *mantras* even if unstated is also cited by the *Mantroddhārapañjikā* (Ms A 4^r). About fifteen quotations remain untraced.⁹⁸

⁹⁶The work is quoted once, ad 1.2.30: *Maṅḍalopāyikoktakrameṇa kṛta Vajrasattvayogaḥ*, which is a reference to vv. 2.14-16.

⁹⁷*Ārṣimātrikāyāṃ* (recte: *Ārṣa-*) *yavaraleti pāṭhāt*. This seems to evoke the rule that in this particular syllabary the -va- is the second of the semivowels and not the last.

⁹⁸Ad 2.4.8, 17, 23 & 3.4.34, 39, 49, 55, 68, 91, 93, 96, 97, 98.

A curious case is the quotation ad 1.2.6 (6^v -7^r). Here Kalyāṇavarman has just finished giving a long prose *upadeśa* on how to calculate one's remaining lifespan according to measuring disturbances in the breath.⁹⁹ A corrupt *sragdharā* verse follows, which at first sight seems to act as a *saṃgrahaśloka*. This verse is the same as *Kālacakra* 2.62. The Tibetan translation does not translate it, raising the suspicion that its presence in the ms. is the result of a scribal initiative. The verse is also quoted by Durjayacandra, and it is also present in the *Samvarodaya* (5.25) and the *Mṛtyuvañcanopadeśa* (2.53). The presence of the verse in a manuscript dating from 1012 CE does not of course mean that the *Kālacakra* was already in existence at this point, but it is significant that certain verses that later came to form part of it were already in circulation.

The *Pañjikā* for the most part stays faithful to its designation: without being uninformative the commentary is very terse, sometimes jumping over even problematic passages or entire chapters with complete silence or just a few words (such is the case of 3.3). There is one significant exception, the commentary to sub-chapter 2.3, which takes up almost a third of the entire text (18^v -32^v), mostly due to Kalyāṇavarman's additions about initiation. These passages follow the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* very closely (see synopsis of that work below).

3.2.4 The Mitapadā of Durjayacandra

It is quite certain that Durjayacandra is the latest of the three commentators, since he mentions Yogāmbara. Had Yogāmbara been known to Bhavabhaṭṭa or Kalyāṇavarman as the main deity of the cult we could hardly expect them to omit mentioning such an important fact. Durjayacandra may be placed a little before the end of the millennium, since 'Brog mi Shākya ye shes met his main disciple, *Vīravajra, during a study-trip to Bengal around 1010-1020.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹The procedure is not very clear. The curious set of numbers to be written in a diagram (5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33) raise the suspicion that the procedure is based on the *Brahmayāmala* 100.3-6.

¹⁰⁰Cf. DAVIDSON 2005:164-166 on the testimony of the chronicle authored by the Sa skya pontiff, Grags pa rgyal mtshan (late 12th - early 13th century). There it is stated that 'Brog mi also studied with Ratnākaraśānti, an older contemporary of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna. I see no reason to doubt this date. In fact it may have been the case that Durjayacandra was the *paramaguru* of Vīravajra, and Vīravajra was the *paramaguru* of 'Brog mi. The so-called *Marmopadeśa* lineage-list (studied in ISAACSON 2008) shows one Siṃhavajra between Vīravajra and 'Aprāptacandra', and Gaṅgādhara between Vīravajra and 'Śākya-

That Durjayacandra was active in Bengal we have his testimony at the end of a short *sādhana* he composed ‘at the order of a merchant’s daughter, a *yoginī*, a manifestation of Vajravārāhī, in the city of ’Khor lo gcig pa.’¹⁰¹ The toponym is most likely Ekacakra in Birbhum district of West Bengal. Furthermore, Tāranātha mentions him as a tantric preceptor at Vikramaśīla.¹⁰² The colophon of the *Mitapadā*, his commentary to the *Catuṣpīṭha*, describes him as a *mahāmaṇḍalācārya*, which is more likely to have been an office rather than a mere honorific.¹⁰³ Durjayacandra is a noted author of several major works, including commentaries to the *Hevajra* (Tōh. 1185) and the *Mahāmāyā* (Tōh. 1622). Some of his minor works survive in Sanskrit, e.g. the *Saptākṣarasādhana* (*Sādhanamālā* no. 250 = Tōh. 1461), and the unpublished *Ṣaḍaṅgasādhana* in the Hevajra tradition (see ISAACSON 2009, item 26 = Tōh. 1239). His initiation manual, the **Suparigraha* (? , Tōh. 1240), is an extensive and finely detailed work on the subject.

[Ms] The *Mitapadā* survives in an incomplete palm-leaf manuscript, NAK 3-336 / *vi. bauddhadarśana 70* = NGMPP B 23/14. According to the title card the sixty remaining leaves measure 30 x 5 cm. Except some badly effaced pages (19^v , 27^v , 29^r , 37^v , 50^v , 56^v) the ms. is legible and discounting some tears at the edges in good condition. The uniform script is a more angular form of old Newar, not unlike the third hand of ms. A. The copyist calls himself a monk and an officiant, Suvarṇabhadra, of Southern Patan. The

NGMPP
B 23/14

jñāna’. This ‘Aprāptacandra’, as Isaacson observes, is a an odd re-Sanskritization of Mi thub zla ba (i.e. Durjayacandra). ‘Śākyañāna’ obviously stands for Shā kya ye shes, whereas ‘Gaṅgādhara’ is a ‘correct’ form of ’Brog mi’s notorious co-translator, Gayādhara. The lineage-list – as Isaacson concludes – was back-translated from Tibetan. Hence we should treat it with due caution, for Tibetans were not unknown to fabricate prestigious lineages after their return from India. Further details of Tibetans coming into contact with Durjayacandra’s students can be gleaned from STEARNS 2001:212, noting that Stearns’ reconstruction of the name (**Durgacandra*) is erroneous. Tibetans render the name in various ways: Rgyal dka’ zla ba, Rgyal dka’ mi thub zla ba, even Sbyangs dka’ zla ba.

¹⁰¹The **Amṛtakṣara* (Tōh. 1462) has the following colophon: *rtaḡ tu gdungs shing rab gdungs pas/ gdungs las skye bo kun grol phyir/ dus ’dir Mi thub zla ba yis (em., yi T_D)/ Sdom pa’i sgrub thabs Bdud rtsi ’dzag/ ’Khor lo gcig pa’i grong khyer na/ tshong dpon bu mo rnal ’byor ma/ gnas pa Rdo rje phag mo’i sprul/ de bkas Sdom pa’i sgrub thabs bris/|.*

¹⁰²CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:18, 327.

¹⁰³The earliest attestation of this title to my knowledge is the Khadipada inscription (tentatively dated to the seventh century) describing the donor Rāhularuci as both *mahāmaṇḍalācārya* and *paramaguru* (EI 24, pp. 247-248).

date is verified for Tuesday, April 1, 1141 CE.¹⁰⁴ Ff. 2 and 3 are missing, and they have been missing since at least the time the apograph was prepared. The last folio to have a number is f. 61, the text of which breaks off in the middle of comments to v. 3.4.34. Here a lacuna starts, the full extent of which cannot be determined. With the recto side of the last folio we arrive to v. 3.4.69. The commentary is cut short (the sub-chapter contains 151 units) by a simple *alam bahunā*. In other words Durjayacandra's commentary also seems to be incomplete, just like Kalyāṇavarman's.¹⁰⁵ This is very likely a coincidence, and not a sign that the *tantra* had a recension in twelve sub-chapters. Whether Durjayacandra fared the same way as his colleague with the *dākinīs* is unknown to us, but the fact that Tibetans, otherwise avid translators of his works, show no signs of ever having known the *Mitapadā* seems to suggest that the work was perhaps interrupted by the author's death and the commentary received little circulation. The manuscript is of a comparatively high quality, but not free of errors.

There are several numerations in the ms., of which the one on the left margin is correct and probably original. I have been unable to find any logic behind the numbers on the right margin and the upper margin. Perhaps the ms. was shuffled at some point and the person trying to rearrange it had no knowledge of the old Nepalese system. Corrections and additions are not infrequent; they are mostly interlinear and almost exclusively scribal if not entirely so. I have read the ms. from high-quality b/w photographs of the microfilm copy.

[**Apograph**] A paper manuscript in 55 folios, no. XLV in the Tucci Collection in Rome (SFERRA 2008:65, item 51), is an apograph of the above palm-leaf ms. This fact can be established easily by observing that the numeration introduced in the body of the text follows the numbering of the old manuscript, and that horizontal lines instead of the *sūtra* are placed exactly where the old ms. is damaged. Unfortunately, the longer lacunae indicated above (i.e. ff. 2-3, and an unknown number of leaves before the last) were

¹⁰⁴The last folio (number cannot be determined) has: *samvat ā cu 1 caitrakṛṣṇ[ṇāṣ]ṭamyām aṅgāradine śrīNarendradevaviṣa[ya]rājye Dakṣiṇavaiḥārikabhīkṣu-r-ācāryaSuvarṇabhadreṇa svaparārthāya likhitam iti*|| Cf. PETECH 1984:59.

¹⁰⁵It seem that Durjayacandra was aware of a fourth chapter, but he knew it as the **jñānapīṭha*. This can be conjectured from the first line of his second introductory verse (1^v): *ātmā yogīsarīram ukta itaraḥ prāṇī paraḥ procyate yogo daivatamūrtisampadudito jñānaṃ dvayoh sādhanam*./

already present at the time this copy was prepared, hence the apograph does not provide more text than the old witness. The quality of copying is not very good, even in spite of careful corrections in a second hand, which are frequent (these are made in purple ink between the lines or on the margins, sometimes even modifying *akṣaras*). I have been able to study the beginning and end of this manuscript thanks to the kindness of Prof. Sferra and Dr. Margherita Serena Saccone who provided me with high-quality colour digital images of ten folios.

Since we can determine the date of Durjayacandra more or less precisely, tracing the quotations in the text is perhaps of less interest in this case than in those of Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman. Nevertheless, some quotations and references merit special attention.

QUOTATIONS

The author quotes a *Vyākhyātantra* twice (ad 1.1.10 & ad 1.2.2). The second batch of verses can be identified as *Vajradāka* 20.3cd-5ab, whereas the first is probably from a different recension of the same text, as the ideas expressed are close to *Vajradāka* ch. 24, and the interlocutor is the goddess Mahāmāyā, to whom several chapters are addressed in that scripture. This is somewhat odd, since the *Vajradāka* is usually seen as an ‘explanatory *tantra*’ of the *Herukābhīdhāna*, and not of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. If Durjayacandra does quote the *Vajradāka* under this denomination, it means that there was a current of thought significantly different from later Tibetan groupings of *yoginītantras*. This should not come as a surprise, since the *Vajradāka* does indeed copy many *Catuṣpīṭha* verses, therefore there is no obvious reason why one could not consider it a *Catuṣpīṭha vyākhyātantra*.

Ad 1.2.4 five verses are cited from the *Mūladvādaśasāhasrikā*: two are in the *anuṣṭubh* metre, one in *sragdharā*, and two in *anuṣṭubh* again. While the bracketing verses are untraced, the *sragdharā* verse is the already familiar v. 2.62 from the *Kālacakra*.¹⁰⁶ This is the second time we meet with this particular *Kālacakra* verse in an environment which predates the emergence of that text by a few decades.¹⁰⁷ The title most likely means to refer to the middling *Ur-tantra* of the cult. Thus Durjayacandra claims that he has had access to this text. This, to my knowledge, is somewhat unique, since outside the so-called *bodhisattva* commentators of the *Kālacakra* no other exegete can boast

¹⁰⁶The verse is also present, although not original, in the *codex unicus* of the *Pañjikā*, see above.

¹⁰⁷For the emergence of the *Kālacakra* dated to between 1025 and 1040 CE see NEWMAN 1998.

to have cited from the ‘mythical’ revelation.¹⁰⁸ The *dvādaśasāhasrikā* is also mentioned further on in the text ad 2.3.21 & ad 2.3.77, where a modified set of *mantras* and *mudrās* for worship are described. Further texts, presumably parts from the *Catuṣpīṭha* cycle, are also referred to: ad 2.3.21 Durjayacandra mentions a *Jñānaḍākinīyabhisamaya* and a *Yogāmbārāgāra* (-*sāgara* !?) extracted from the 12,000-verse recension, and ad 2.3.119 he mentions an *Abhisamaya*, presumably a *sādhana*-text.

Quotations that can be traced with relative certainty include the *Samājottara* (ad 1.3.2 = 37a), the *Hevajra* (ad 1.3.7 = I.v.1, also *Samputa* 1.1.19ab), the *Samputa* (ad 1.3.14 = 10.3.4 & 6)¹⁰⁹, and the *Herukābhyaḍaya* (ad 2.3.88 = 42.10cd-11a). Several quotations are simply introduced as ‘from other *tantras*’ (ad 1.1.12, ad 1.1.104), or ‘from a certain text’ (*kvacit*, ad 2.3.1). A *yogācāra* doctrinal verse is quoted twice (ad 1.3.3 & ad 3.1.69): I am unable to trace this *śloka*, but it is also quoted in the *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Advayavajra (p. 18 beginning with *na citteṣu*).

Durjayacandra’s Sanskrit is certainly more polished than that of the other two commentators. On the other hand, he is also the most fanciful of the three, frequently trying to produce a more sophisticated exegesis. Perhaps one of the best examples of this effort to produce a more gnostic interpretation is his commentary to 1.3.11-14, where the names of well-known rituals (*śāntika*, etc.) are unnecessarily reinterpreted. Of the three exegetes Durjayacandra’s lemmata are perhaps the most updated. He often seems to have read a very different text to that of the two earlier and more orthodox commentators, but it is also possible that some variant readings are his own ‘emendations’.

STYLE

3.3 The initiation manuals

I have already alluded to some of the problems pertaining to the *Catuṣpīṭha* initiation manuals in SZÁNTÓ 2008c. I now think that a recension which is not available to us in its entirety was the earliest satellite work to emerge after the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* itself. The question of how the multiple recensions of this influential *maṇḍalopāyikā* emerged is a difficult one. Therefore it should be understood that my reconstruction of its history is still in many ways

THREE
RECENSIONS

¹⁰⁸This for the Kālacakra authors is the *Ādibuddha*, for which see NEWMAN 1987. The *Gūḍhapadā* also quotes (or claims to quote) this text often, possibly also verses that are not in the three ‘*bodhisattva*-commentaries’.

¹⁰⁹In my edition 2008a I was not able to trace this quotation.

hypothetical.

The verses transmitted in ms. A of the *Catuspīṭha* point to the existence of an early *maṇḍalopāyikā*, the most significant feature of which is that here the deity Yogāmbara was still unknown. The work presumably contained further material, especially on the sequence of initiation, since the two earlier exegetes, Kalyāṇavarman and Bhavabhaṭṭa, describe initiation according to this model. This proto-*maṇḍalopāyikā* was recast by an author later identified as Āryadeva. In this work only the first three chapters deal with the *maṇḍala* itself (especially the lengthy third chapter), whereas the rest is dedicated to descriptions of ritual with some passages on yogic dogma. The portion from the fourth chapter onwards was transmitted to Tibet as scripture, an ‘explanatory *tantra*’ styled the **Mantrāṃśa*. As far as we can determine from our sources (unfortunately only relatively new Nepalese mss.) the third chapter already has Yogāmbara as the chief deity, therefore Āryadeva may reasonably be suspected of reworking the pantheon of the cult. In the last phase an author identified as Caryāvratīpāda took the first three chapters of Āryadeva’s work and re-edited them in 28 shorter chapters, keeping Yogāmbara as the chief deity and introducing further changes to the rite. This became the most successful recension: it can be shown that it circulated in Bengal, in Nepal, and that in Tibet it was transmitted both canonically and extra-canonically. In the present work references in the parallels and elsewhere are made to this recension.

All three recensions share the feature of emulating the odd grammar of the *tantra*. It is for this reason that the extra verses in ms. A of the *tantra* (i.e. what I see as the surviving portion of the proto-*maṇḍalopāyikā*) blend in seamlessly with the text until they are isolated via a comparison with other witnesses, and it is probably for this reason that the so-called **Mantrāṃśa* could be marketed (knowingly or unknowingly) in Tibet as scripture. The two putative authors (Āryadeva and Caryāvratīpāda) were fully aware of this emulation, since several passages reflect on what they call the ‘language of yoga’ (*yogavākya*), ‘barbaric language’ (*mlecchabhāṣā*), or ‘code language’ (*brda skad* in a passage available only in Tibetan). The importance of these reflections is that they show that at least in these cases the ‘barbaric’ language was used consciously by authors.

LANGUAGE

Thus, with the material available to us we may isolate three distinct recensions, which for convenience’s sake I shall refer to as the proto-*maṇḍalopāyikā*, the Āryadeva recension, and the Caryāvratīpāda recension. Since what are presumably the first two are transmitted only fragmentarily (and

most likely garbled) it is more practical to tackle the evidence working our way backwards in time.

Before we launch into examining the material, it should be pointed out that there probably existed yet another initiation manual, the existence of which may only be ascertained from a reference. The *Nibandha* ad 3.3.17 directs the reader to a work Bhavabhaṭṭa calls the *Sekavidhi* for the level of teachings that should be given to initiands according to their ability. This topic is not taken up in the extant *maṇḍalopāyikās*, therefore he is probably referring to either a lost work on *Catuṣpīṭha* initiation, or – perhaps less likely – a recension of the said manual which did not survive up to this day.

LOST
MANUAL

3.3.1 The Caryāvratīpāda recension

The recension which is presumably the latest, but also the most popular of the three, is what I term as the Caryāvratīpāda recension, following the colophon of ms. A. I have traced and examined the following witnesses:

SOURCES

[A] NAK 5-89/1 *vi. bauddhatantra* 22 = NGMPP A 1298/6 [and duplicate: B 30/35]. I am reading this ms. in high-quality b/w photographs of the microfilm. The ms. is complete in 30 palm-leaf folia (31.6 x 4.5 cm with 5 or 6 lines per page). It is not dated, but it is in the same format and script as ms. B of Amitavajra's *Yogāmbarasādhanavidhi* (q. v.). The similarities are so striking that I would venture to state that these two manuscripts were copied in the same scriptorium, if not by the same scribe.¹¹⁰ Since the aforesaid copy of Amitavajra's work is dated to the 12th or 13th regnal year of Vighrahapāla, this manuscript must have been copied around the same time, i.e. around the seventh decade of the eleventh century, in a polity under Pāla rule (i.e. the region of Bihar or Bengal).¹¹¹ Although this ms. is the best witness of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* and should be used as the base for an eventual critical edition, the ascertainable corruptions point to a long history of copying.

NGMPP
A 1298/6

¹¹⁰The size of the folios and the hand is virtually the same. Both mss. define the margin and the string space (slightly to the left in both) by double or triple thin vertical lines spanning from top to bottom of the leaf. The symbols used for numeration in the left margin are the same. The later numeration on the right hand side is also similar, pointing to the fact that the two mss. might have circulated together.

¹¹¹This Vighrahapāla must of course be the third king with that name. The script on his copper plates are very similar to the script of these two mss. Cf. EI 15, no. 18 and EI 29, no. 7.

[B] Oriental Institute Library (now in Maharaja Sayajirao University), Baroda (Vaḍodarā) no. 13243 (see NAMBIYAR 1950:1460).¹¹² The catalogue identifies the text wrongly as the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra*. The ms. is complete in 30 paper leaves (measurements cannot be ascertained, there are 10 lines of writing per page). The verso of the leaves is smeared with a yellow substance (most likely *haritāla*, a paper insecticide). The ms. is dated the 6th of the dark fortnight of the Kārtika month, year 1049 of an unknown era. This most likely corresponds to NS, therefore the date can be converted to November 22, 1929 CE). This ms. is very likely a modern copy of a ms. similar to A, but it is not a direct copy.¹¹³ At the beginning of the work there are minor corrections in red ink. Quite naturally the readings are far inferior to those of ms. A.

OILB
NO. 13243

[F₁] This is a single-folio fragment traced in NAK 1-1697 5/6 *vi. bauddhatantra* 89 = NGMPP B 31/23. This is in effect a so-called *prakīrṇapatra* with four miscellaneous palm-leaf folios roughly measuring 30 x 5 cm (not all leaves are of the same size). The title on the library card ‘*Hevajratantra*’ is puzzling since there is nothing in here to justify that denomination. The first folio is penned on one side only in a script reminiscent of 11th century mss. with the text of a *dhāraṇī* I am unable to trace for the time being. The second is a fragment from the *Abhiṣekanīrukti* of Sujayaśrīgupta (text corresponds to ONIANS 2002, p. 355, l. 12 – p. 356, l. 13) in a script similar to those of late 12th - early 13th century mss. The fourth folio is a fragment from Abhayākaragupta’s *Vajrāvalī* (end of ch. 15 - beginning of ch. 16). It is the third folio (also numbered fol. 3) that contains verses 2.19b’-3.29b’ from the Caryāvratīpāda recension in the hook-topped variety of the Old Nepalese script (most likely late 13th century). In spite of its brevity this fragment merits attention since it contains some very good readings, suggesting that the ms. it formed part of was a reliable witness.

NGMPP
B 31/23

¹¹²I am reading this ms. from high-quality colour photographs kindly procured by Mr. Jason Birch (Balliol College, Oxford).

¹¹³Two observations should suffice to prove this assertion. The scribe of B leaves a horizontal line for an *akṣara* on 15^v, l. 8 thus: *ghryāḥ*. However, ms. A is perfectly legible in the corresponding location (14^v, l. 3): *vyāghryāḥ*. The *akṣara* could have been guessed even by a mediocre scribe, therefore we must infer that the master copy the scribe of B was working from was damaged at this point. Furthermore, the authorship colophon is missing in B.

[**T_D**] For the Tibetan rendering I have mainly relied on Tōh. 1613, where authorship is attributed to Āryadeva. The translators are the same as those of the *mūla* and several other works of the cycle, Gayādhara and 'Gos Khug pa lhas btsas. The canonical translation transmits a title *Snying po mdor bsags pa* (i.e. **Sārasamuccaya*) but this is not attested in any of the Sanskrit sources I have seen, unless we take into account v. 28.28d (*piṇḍasārasamuccayam*), which was rendered into Tibetan as if it were a title: *snying po mdor bsags zhes bya ste* (cf. SZÁNTÓ 2008a:5). In my view this rather expresses the *modus operandi* of the author rather the title he would have preferred for this work. However, the title did gain currency among Tibetan authors (see e.g. Tsong kha pa's *Sngags rim chen mo*, p. 169).

TIBETAN
TRANSLATION

This earliest translation was not of a very high quality. This was also the opinion of reliable Tibetan scholars, for Bu ston Rin chen grub closes his work, the *Mi brjed par dran byed* (see below under 'Tibetan works') with the statement: "should an Indian manuscript of the **Sārasamuccaya* be obtained, it should be collated [with the statements I have extracted from that work]" (*Snying po mdor bsags kyi rgya dpe zhig rnyed na gtugs dgos pa yod do*)).

BU STON'S
NOTE

Before the desired revision took place, the work appeared in the Collected Works of that most prolific author, Bo dong Phyogs las rnal rgyal (1375-1450). His initiation manual¹¹⁴ is in fact the same as the *Snying po mdor bsags* minus the first chapter and the closing colophon. No authorship statement is extant; however, since he attributes the work to the 'Phags lugs, the perceived original author was very likely Āryadeva (for more detail see SZÁNTÓ 2008a:5).

BO DONG'S
VERSION

Roughly three centuries later, in 1766 CE, the revision was finally undertaken by Si tu Bstan pa'i nyin 'byed (1700-1774).¹¹⁵ According to his testimony in the informative colophon, a ms. was obtained from Nepal by a high dignitary of the 'Brug pa Bka' brgyud, who sent it to Si tu for examination. The ms. was apparently an inferior copy, but Si tu decided to use it nevertheless (for more details and the text of the colophon see SZÁNTÓ 2008a:5-6).

SI TU'S
REVISION

For the name Caryāvratīpāda (spelt thus, with a long *ī*) see SZÁNTÓ

THE
AUTHOR

¹¹⁴See vol. 108, pp. 1-117 in *Encyclopedia Tibetica*.

¹¹⁵See vol. 7 (Ja), pp. 165-227 in *Ta'i Si-tu-pa Kun-mkhyen Chos-kyi-'byun[sic]-gnas-bstan-pa'i-ñin-byed[sic] kyi bka' 'bum = Collected works of the great Ta'i Si-tu-pa Kun-mkhyen Chos-kyi-'byun[sic]-gnas-bstan-pa'i-nyin-byed*, Palpung Sungrab Nyamso Khang, Kangra 1990.

2008a:4-5. There is very little I can add to my findings there. He must have lived before 1054 CE, the date of the *Samvarodayā* by Bhūvācārya, where he is mentioned.

Below I give a full synopsis of the contents with a transliteration of the section-colophons. The folio numbers and line numbers in the right margin refer to ms. A.

SYNOPSIS
OF
CONTENTS

1.1-5 obeisance verses

1.6-13 statement of purpose (*pratijñā*) verses; long characterization of its source, the 12,000-verse *Catuṣpīṭha*, with special reference to its barbaric language (*mlecchabhāṣena bhāṣitam*)

1.14 the kind of initiand (*śiṣya*) that should be given consecration

Section-colophon: *iti śiṣyaparīkṣāvatāravidhiḥ prathamah*

2^r 2

2.1 the preliminary service (*pūrvasevā*) that is to be undertaken by the officiant (*ācārya*) in a pleasing place¹¹⁶

2.2-6ab purifying the hands (*karaśuddhi*, although not explicitly called so); gives the code-words for the fingers and defines a *mudrā*

2.6cd-13 shielding the body (*kalana*) with a *mudrā* and the eight seed-syllables (*bīja*)

2.14-16 visualizing a two-armed Vajrasattva (holding a *vajra* and a bell)

2.17-19 repeating the main mantra (most likely the Oṃ HŪṢ SVĀHĀ) 3 lakhs, the mantras of the eight *yoginīs* 40,000 times, the *mantras* of the outer *yoginīs* 20,000 times, and the mantras of the *laukika* deities 3,000 times.

2.20 one who does not perform the preliminary service is not a *maṇḍalī*; success promised, also the power to possess (*adhiṣṭhākrama*)

Section colophon: *pūrvasevādevatārādhanaavidhiḥ dvitīyah*

2^v 5

¹¹⁶Starting the description of the initiation rite with the preliminary service is very likely due to the influence of Dīpaṃkarabhadra's seminal work, the *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*. This feature is pointed out by Tsong kha pa in his *Sngags rim chen mo*, p. 169.

- 3.1** announces the subject matter of *mantras* to possess (*āveśa*) inanimate things and beings
- 3.2-3** Three lakhs for OṂ VAJRĀVEŚA to possess buddhas [!?!]
- 3.4-5** Three lakhs for OṂ HILI 2 HŪṂ JAḤ to possess men etc. by a mere glance (*dr̥ṣṭyāveśa*)
- 3.6-7** One lakh for OṂ MĀTALI HŪṂ PHAṬ to possess through hearing (*śru-tyāveśa*)
- 3.8-9** One lakh for OṂ MĀTALI CITTACĀLITE HŪṂ PHRUṂ PHAṬ to possess from afar (*dūrāveśa*)
- 3.10-11** Three lakhs for OṂ VATTALI 2 HŪṂ PHAṬ to possess *nāgas*, ghosts, *yakṣas*, and all gods
- 3.12-13** One lakh for OṂ PĀTINI PĀTINI HŪṂ PHAṬ to possess water, clods of earth, rocks, and trees
- 3.14-21** the procedure to possess an excellent pupil during initiation with the *mantra* HŪṂ RAMA RAMA HO HO HO A A AḤ PHAṬ
- 3.22-26** procedures for people who do not become possessed through the above rite; through fumigation of empowered goat meat, bdellium, etc.
- 3.27-28** possession through a *Datura*-based potion
- 3.29-31** qualifications of an initiand that should be accepted

Section colophon: *iti sarvāveśaśiṣyaparīkṣāvidhis tṛtīyaḥ*

3^v 5

- 4.1** announces the beginning of the *maṇḍalavidhi* proper starting with acquiring the site (*bhūmipari-graha*)
- 4.2-3** selecting a place pleasing to the mind, adorning it with a canopy (*vitāna*), streamers, bells, etc.
- 4.4-7** sprinkling the earth, drawing an eight-petalled lotus with fragrant powder, setting the all-purpose (*sārvakarmika*-) vase (*kalaśa*) in the middle, and arranging the ritual requisites

- 4.8-13** the officiant visualizes himself as Vajraḍākinī, offers worship and wards off obstructing forces of the site (*viḡhnotsāraṇa*): *nāgas*, *yakṣas*, *gandharvas*, etc. with the given *mudrā* and *mantra*
- 4.14-16** the ground is requested (*bhūmiyācanā*) with the given *mudrā* and *mantra*
- 4.17-22** visualization of Vajraḍākinī into the vase, she is worshipped with the given heart-(*hṛdaya*-)mantra (ॐ अ॒ः स्व॒ह्रा) and *mudrā*
- 4.23-24** purification of the outlining cords (*sūtra*) with the mantra ॐ ह॒म स्व॒ह्रा
- 4.25-26** purification of the coloured powders (*rajaḥ*) with the mantra of Siṃhini (ॐ स्म॒र्यु॒ स्व॒ह्रा)
- 4.27** offering non-dual bali (*adaityābali*) to the eight directions
- 4.28** giving the vows and disciplines (*samayaśikṣā*) to the craftsmen (*śilpī*)
- 4.29** the preliminary set-up is gathered and the ground is again anointed with scented powder

Section-colophon: *iti bhūmiparigrahavidhiś caturthaḥ*

4^v 3

- 5.1** the outlining of the *maṇḍala* is announced
- 5.2-6** the officiant should visualize himself as Vajrasattva and again purify the cords with a *mantra* resembling that of the *ḍākinīs* (ॐ अ॒ ा॒ ा॒ ३ ा॒ स्व॒ह्रा)
- 5.7-9** the officiant and the initiand should take hold of the cord and start outlining the *maṇḍala* starting with the initiand in the north-east and proceeding with the axes SE-NW, E-W, N-S thus creating eight slices; around these they should outline a rectangle
- 5.10-13** the compartments for the inside of the *maṇḍala* are drawn, on the sides [the visible part] of the *viśvavajra* [upon which the *maṇḍala* is supposed to rest], the doors, etc.
- 5.14-16** colouring the thus outlined compartments

- 5.17-21** the minor adorning elements are added: strings of bells, garlands, streamers, etc.
- 5.22-25** the eight vases are prepared (filling them with scented water, placing shoots as adornments; the ones in the cardinal directions are named: *jayamaṅgala* [E], *siddhiriddhi* (sic!) [N], *vijaya* [W], *siddhighora* [S]) and placed in the eight directions

Section-colophon: *iti jñānasūtraraja[h]saṃskārakumbhasthāpanāvidhiḥ pa- 5^v 3
ñcamah*

- 6.1-2** the officiant visualizes himself as Vajraḍākinī and places four initiands (if possible) at the four gates of the *maṅḍala*; he should then start driving off demons (*duṣṭamāra*)
- 6.3-5** the officiant circumambulates the *maṅḍala* counterclockwise visualizing himself as the *ḍākinī* appropriate to the directions, adopting the prescribed dance poses (*kṣepa* for *ākṣepa*), and reciting the given mantras; starts in the east as Vajrī
- 6.6-8** same for the north as Ghorī
- 6.9-10** same for the west as Vettālī
- 6.11-13** same for the south as Caṇḍālī
- 6.14-15** returns to the east and visualizes himself as Jñānaḍākinī
- 6.16-19** maintaining the visualization of Jñānaḍākinī the officiant creates with the given *mudrā* and *mantra* the protective fence (*pañjara*) around the *maṅḍala*
- 6.20-22** creates the protective rampart (*prākāra*)
- 6.23-25** nailing down obstructive forces (*kīlana*)

Section-colophon: *iti maṅḍalarakṣāvidhiḥ ṣaṣṭhaḥ*

6^r 6

- 7.1-5** the officiant visualizes himself as Vajraḍākinī and prepares the vases: filling them with Ganges-water while reciting a given mantra, adorning them with flowers, fragrances, the five nectars (*pañcāmṛta*), etc.

- 7.6-8** the mudrā and mantra for holding the vases (*kalaśadhāraṇa*) are given
- 7.9** the vases are placed in the eight directions
- 7.10-11cd** the officiant visualizes himself as Yogāmbara
- 7.11ef-14** he applies the ‘great cuirass’ (*mahākavaca*) with the given *mudrā* and *mantra*
- 7.15-19ab** grasping the *vajra* and the bell he applies the shield for the eight body-parts (*aṣṭāṅgakalana*)
- 7.19cd** the officiant worships himself with flowers and fragrant powders
- 7.20-22** *mantras* for the body, speech, and mind
- 7.23-26** triple purificatory formula (*triviśuddhi*, although not referred to so explicitly)

Section-colophon: *iti ātmayogakaraṇavidhiḥ saptamaḥ*

7^r 2

- 8.1** announces the *mahāyoga* which seems to refer to the visualization of the main deities (called here *lokottara*)
- 8.2-12** raises the *mantra* and teaches the detailed visualization of the main deity-pair in sexual union (the male is called here *Buddhayogāmbarī* and the female *Yogāmbarībuddhaḥ* presumably to accentuate their union)
- 8.13-16** the detailed visualization of Vajraḍākinī in the east
- 8.17-20** ditto for Ghorī in the north
- 8.21-23** ditto for Vettālī in the west
- 8.24-27** ditto for Caṇḍālī in the south
- 8.28-30** ditto for Siṃhinī in the north-east
- 8.31-32** ditto for Vyāghri in the south-east
- 8.33-34** ditto for Jambukī in the south-west
- 8.35-36** ditto for Ulūkī (here Lūkī) in the north-west

- 8.37-43 ditto for the door-guardian goddesses Ḍākinī, Dīpinī, Cūṣiṇī, and Kāambojī
- 8.44 concludes the visualization of the thirteen inner goddesses and announces the visualization of the twenty *yoginīs* outside the *vajra*-girdle
- 8.45-46 Pukkasī, Drāmiḍī, Caṇḍī in the east
- 8.47-48 Ghorī, Rucirā, Māmsī in the north
- 8.49-50 Ugrī, Jvalitā, Bībhatsī in the west
- 8.51-52 Kapālī, Vajrī, Kumbhī in the south
- 8.53 Lāsyā and Gandhā (here called Supriyā) in the north-east
- 8.54 Vīṇā and Puṣpā in the south-east
- 8.55 Gītā and Dhūpā in the south-west
- 8.56 Nṛtyā and Dīpā in the north-west
- 8.57 wraps up the visualization of the outer goddesses, specifying that their colour is in accordance with their *kula* (i.e. the direction they are facing)

Section-colophon: *iti lokottarajñānaparapīṭhadevatāmahāmudrāvidhir a- 9^r 5*
ṣṭamah

- 9.1-4 continues the description of the *maṇḍala* with the outer gatekeepers: Hari with Lakṣmī and Vārāhī in the east
- 9.5-8 Brahmā with Brahmāṇī and Sarasvatī in the north
- 9.9-12 Hara with Māheśvarī and Gaṅgā in the west
- 9.13-15 Śakra with Indrāṇī and Tilottamā in the south
- 9.16-19 Indra with Śacī and Rambhā in the north-east
- 9.20-23 Kuvera with Vasumatī and Hārītī in the south-east
- 9.24-27 Bhūtarāja with Laṅkeśvarī and Raktapriyā in the south-west
- 9.28-32cd Varuṇa with Bhogavatī and Utpalapriyā in the north-west

9.32ef wraps up the visualization calling it that of the *laukikadevapīṭha* which is again surrounded by a girdle of *vajras* (here: *vajramālā*)

Section-colophon: *iti yogapīṭhe laukikadevatāvarṇabhujavāhanavidhir navamaḥ* 10^v 2

10.1-23 continues the description of the *maṇḍala* with the outer heroes and heroines, the name of each beginning with the letters of the alphabet starting with ‘ka’ and ending with ‘ba’ (excluding nasals), thus Karaṅkabhairava and Kamalākārī, etc. 20 plus 20 deities altogether

Section-colophon: *iti guhyapīṭhe vīrādvayapūjāvidhir daśamaḥ* 11^v 1

11.1 announces the end of the *samayacakra* and the beginning of inviting the *jñānacakra*

11.2-3ab the officiant places in front a clean mirror and a washbasin filled with milk, white flowers, and grains

11.3cd-6 the two pairs of ‘hook’ (*aṅkuśa*) *mudrās* and *mantras* for attracting (*ākaraṣaṇa*) the deities are given: one for the *lokottara*, and one for the *laukika* deities

11.7-10ab the deities are offered *argha*, *satkāra*, *pādya*, and worship with the five *upacāras*

11.10c-13 ditto with an *apabhraṃśa* song (*maṅgala-gīti*)

11.14-22 the preparation of the washbasin is described (in a similar way to the vases above)

11.23-25 the deities are bathed and offered a cloth (*vastra*)

11.26-28 after having again been offered *argha* and *pādya* the deities are made to enter and abide in the *maṇḍala* with the ‘noose’ (*pāśa*-) *mudrā* and *mantra*

11.29 obstructing forces are driven away with the mantra of Siṃhinī and the gates of the *maṇḍala* are shut with the counterintuitively named *vajrasphoṭa-mudrā* and *-mantra*

Section-colophon: *iti jñānacakrākaraṣaṇasnānavidhir ekādaśaḥ* 12^v 2

12.1-2 the main deity-pair (called here Yogāambarī-Tathāgata) is shown to its lion-throne

12.3-7 displaying the ‘pledge’ (*samaya-*) *mudrās* and *mantras* for the main deity-pair

12.8-20 ditto for Prajñāpāramitā [!], Jñānaḍākinī [!], Vajraḍākinī, Ghoṛaḍākinī, Vettālī, and Caṇḍālī; they are shown to their lion-thrones

12.21 ditto for the guardian goddesses beginning with Ḍākinī (who share the same pledge)

Section-colophon: *iti lokottarasamayamudrāmantravidhir dvādaśaḥ* 13^r 2

13.1-17 the same procedure for the outer gatekeepers beginning with Hari and ending with Varuṇa (here called Nāgādhipati)

13.18-35 their consorts beginning with Lakṣmī and ending with Utpalapriyā share the *mudrās* but the *mantras* are different

Section-colophon: *iti yogapīṭhadevatāsamayamudrāmantravidhiḥ trayodaśaḥ* 13^v 3

14.1-43 the same procedure for the outer heroes and heroines beginning with Karaṅkabhairava and ending with Bhramarakeśī; the *samayamudrā* is the same, *mantras* are different

Section-colophon: *iti guhyapīṭhe vīrādvayasamayamudrāmantravidhiś caturdaśaḥ* 14^r 4

15.1ab announces applying the four *mudrās* to the deities (the *samayamudrās* above presumably considered collectively to be the first)

15.1cd describes the *dharmamudrā* which seems to consist in visualizing the letter A on the tongue

15.2-3 gives the *karmamudrā* for each deity: Yogāambarī-Tathāgata

15.4-5 ditto for Jñānaḍākinī

- 15.6-7** ditto for Prajñāpāramitā
- 15.8-31** ditto for the twelve inner goddesses (from the inner goddesses of the intermediate corners onwards their seed-syllables are also give bracketed by OṂ and SVĀHĀ)
- 15.32-55** ditto for the twenty *yoginīs* outside the *vajra*-girdle beginning with Pokkasī and ending with Dīpā
- 15.56-57** gives the *mudrā* and *mantra* for the *vajra*
- 15.58-59** ditto for the bell (*ghaṇṭā*)
- 15.60-61** ditto for ‘all *ḍākinīs*’
- 15.62-63** ditto for the ‘weapon’ (*astra*)
- 15.64-65** ditto for the ‘secondary weapon’ (*apāstra*)
- 15.66** seems to define the *mahāmudrā* which is said to be the complete visualization of the deities with their implements, clothing, etc.
- 15.67** when the four *mudrās* have been applied the officiant again applies the shielding (*kalana*), the empowerment of body, speech, and mind, the cuirass (*kavaca*), and worships the deities yet again

Section-colophon: *iti laukikalokottaradevatācaturmudrāvidhiḥ pañcādaśaḥ* 15^v 6

- 16.1** goes on with the worship: the twenty-fold worship is offered
- 16.2-3** gives the *mudrā* and *mantra* ‘of all fruits’ (*sarvaphala*) [!?]
- 16.4-6** offering the five nectars (*pañcāmṛta*) to the eight directions from an oyster-shell with the appropriate *mudrā* and *mantra* to purify and empower them
- 16.7-8** ditto for the five meats (*pañcāṅkuśa*) offered along with all kinds of food
- 16.9** pleasing the deities with the *mahātoṣaṇamantra*
- 16.10-16** grasping the *vajra* and the bell with the appropriate song (for the *vajra*) and *mantra* (for the bell), and *mudrās*

16.17-21 offerings (flowers, rice, curd, meat, fish, etc.) are given in the intermediate directions

Section-colophon: *iti bāhyacatuḥkoṇe balipūjāvidhiḥ ṣoḍaśaḥ*

16^v 6

17.1-4ab the officiant still holding the *vajra* and the bell sings the *apabhraṃśa* song referred to as the *hūṃkāragītikā* in this corpus (given in the next chapter) to propitiate the *yoginīs*

17.4cd-14 a long Sanskrit hymn beginning with *paramādya mahāsattva* is sung

Section-colophon: *sarvaviśuddhiparamādyastutipūjāvidhiḥ saptadaśamaḥ*

17^v 2

18.1 the officiant still holding the *vajra* and the bell continues with the songs of praise, this time in *apabhraṃśa*

18.2-5 the songs with the refrain *tennā hūṃ* etc.

18.6-17 *apabhraṃśa* songs for the eight innermost goddesses

18.18-19 another hymn, in Sanskrit

18.20-21 a *mantra* offered in worship

Section-colophon: *iti lokottaratattvagītopahāravidhir aṣṭādaśaḥ*

18^v 4

19.1 announces the ‘outer’ *bali* worship (*bāhyabalipūjā*) for which the officiant should either commission other ‘heroes’, or if they are not available, he should do it himself

19.2-6ab dressed in full attire he should dance in a circular motion and prepare a rectangle of fragrant powder strewn with flowers, etc.

19.6cd-9 the deities are attracted and invited with the appropriate *mudrās* and *mantras*

19.10-15 the *bali* is offered to the gods (*deva*) who are then dismissed

19.16-22 ditto for *nāgas* with a white *maṇḍala* in the north

19.23-29 ditto for *yakṣas* with a red *maṇḍala* in the west

19.30-46 ditto for unspecified (elsewhere the fourth is offered to *bhūtas*) with a red, triangular *maṇḍala* in the south; it is here that the *ekavṛkṣa-mantra* is recited

Section-colophon: *iti maṇḍalāṣṭadiśābalipūjāvidhi[r] ūnaviṃśatimaḥ* 20^v 1

20.1-3 announces the making fit (*adhivāsanā*) of the initiand: he should be visualized as Vajrasattva and should be made to sit on a lion-throne with folded hands on the eastern or the northern side of the *maṇḍala*; again the rite is not necessarily performed by the officiant (see above 19.1)

20.4-6 the initiand is given an empowered toothpick (*dantakāṣṭha*) and water to rinse his mouth

20.7-16 the so-called *samvarapāṭha* is recited (there are no precise indications here but this text is to be recited by the initiand in other manuals)

20.17 the officiant announces in a verse that this teaching is the best of paths, bestowing the fruit of the Mahāyāna, a path to buddha-hood

20.18 the initiand is given some teachings before he gets to see the *maṇḍala*

20.19-21 the officiant visualizes himself as Vajrasattva and recites a hybrid Sanskrit-*Apabhramśa* song about the glory of Vajrasattva

Section-colophon: *iti śiṣyādhivāsanāsamvaravidhiḥ viṃśatimaḥ* 21^r 3

21.1 a detailed description of the fire-sacrifice (*homa*) to propitiate ‘all goddesses’ (*sarvadevati*) which is to be performed on the eastern, northern, or western side [of the *maṇḍala*]

21.2-8 the measurements and adornments for the parts (*oṣṭha*, *vedī*, *prākāra*, etc.) of the fire-pit (*kuṇḍa*) following chapter 2.1 of the *tantra* almost verbatim

21.9-10 the fire-god Agni is ritually invited

21.11-12 the fire-wood and articles to be burnt are enumerated

21.13-15 worship offered to Vajradākinī who is visualized into the fire

21.16-17 the *mantra* to purify the substances (*dravya*) [to be burnt] is given

21.18-20 the *mudrā* and *mantra* for the *āhutis* are given

21.21-25ab specifies the order in which the substances are to be offered;
the *pūrṇāhuti* is given with ghee mixed with the five nectars

21.25cd-27ab the *vajragīti* to be sung during the sacrifice

21.27cd-32 customization of the offerings if the sacrificer has any supernatural power as aim

21.33-38 worship offered while ringing the bell

Section-colophon: *iti kuṇḍalakṣaṇahomavidhir ekaviṃśatimah*

22^r 5

22.1 the entire chapter is dedicated to again purifying and offering the five meats (*pañcāṅkuśa*) and the five nectars (*pañcāmṛta*) to the *yoginīs*

22.2-4 the *mudrā* and *mantra* for the five meats are given

22.5-10 the *mudrā* and *mantra* for the five nectars are given

22.11-12ab drops (*chidīṅgā*) are offered to each *yoginī* from an oyster-shell

22.12c-f the *yoginīs* are worshipped

22.13-18 Vajrasattva is worshipped with a series of *Apabhraṃśa* songs

Section-colophon: *iti pañcāṅkuśādisarvapūjānirjātanā[!]vidhir dvāviṃśa-* 23^r 2
timah

23.1ab announces the *vīrapūjā* [with the possible injunction that it is to be visualized mentally (*cetasā*)]

23.1cd-2 *yogins* and *yoginīs* are made to sit in pairs on eight seats in the eight directions

23.3-5 with coquetry, laughter, and sounding the bell worship is offered (fragrant powders, flowers, incense, lamps, food, and the five meats)

23.6-7ab the officiant visualizes himself as Yogāmbarī, after which he bows to and purifies the five nectars in a conch

- 23.7cd-10** the conch is passed around the circle with the appropriate songs and gestures for offering and receiving
- 23.11-13** an *Apabhraṃśa* hymn (here called *tattvagīta*) is sung
- 23.14ab** an injunction for singing further *vajragītis*
- 23.14cd-18** offering the *ucchiṣṭabali* with the given *mudrā* and *mantra*
- 23.19ab** specifies the four places where this type of *bali* should be offered: a cremation ground (*pitṛvana*), a mountain (*śaila*), under a [solitary] tree (*vrkṣa*), or [on the shores of] a great river (*mahānadī*)
- 23.19cd** dismissal (*visarjana*)

Section-colophon: *iti sarva[!/?]pūjā-m-utsṛṣṭabalividhi[s] trayoviṃśatamaḥ* 24^v 1

- 24.1** the officiant prepares in an conch shell a mixture of the ten substances (i.e. the five nectars and the five meats), fragrances, milk, and water
- 24.2-3ab** he should then empower the mixture called ‘pledge-water’ (*samayodaka*) with a given *mantra*
- 24.3cd-5** the initiands (if there are more) are made to enter one by one, with hands in obeisance holding a flower and with blindfolded eyes
- 24.6-15** they are made to recite the triple purificatory (*triviśuddhi*) and other standard formulas
- 24.16-19** they are made to taste the nectars from the conch shell
- 24.20-25** the initiands are possessed by the officiant (*āveśa*), they are then made to return to their natural state
- 24.26** the initiands throw a flower upon the *maṇḍala* from which their clan-affiliation (*kulabheda*) is determined
- 24.27-43** the blindfold is removed and the initiand is shown the deities one by one (beginning with an unnamed male deity [Yogāmbara?], followed by Jñānaḍākinī and ending with Varuṇa)

Section-colophon: *iti devatāpūjāvidhi[ś] caturviṃśatamaḥ*

26^r 1

- 25.1-2** the initiand bows to the officiant, worships him, and formally requests initiation
- 25.3-7** the initiand joins his palms and recites four *mantras* declaring that he has entered the *maṇḍala*
- 25.8-9** the officiant visualizes the initiand as ‘the lion [i.e. foremost] among disputants’ (*vādisiṃha*) and declares his intention to give the consecrations
- 25.10-13** the initiand is protected by the eightfold shielding (*kavaca*)
- 25.14-19** he is also made to recite six *mantras* called here ‘the secret discipline’ (*guhyaśikṣā*)
- Section-colophon: *iti aṣṭayoginīkavacaśikṣāvīdhi[h] pañcavi[ṅ]śatimaḥ* 26^v 2
- 26.1** announces the *abhiṣekas* to be given with four vases in the four directions
- 26.2-5ab** the initiand is seated, his hands are joined and holding a flower; he is visualized as Vajrasattva and is sprinkled from the vases
- 26.5cd** he is announced that he is receiving the *abhiṣeka* that leads to perfect enlightenment and to the end of the ocean of transmigration
- 26.6-7** the *abhiṣekamantra* is given
- 26.8-10** with a *mudrā* and a *mantra* he is protected in the eight places [of the body]
- 26.11-13** the officiant holds a *vajra* and a bell, and gives the initiand the crown with the five buddhas; the appropriate *mudrā* and *mantra* are given
- 26.14** this concludes the crown-consecration (*makutābhiṣeka*)
- 26.15-19** the initiand is given a *vajra*; the appropriate verses and *mantras* are recited
- 26.20** this concludes the *vajra*-consecration (*vajrābhiṣeka*)

- 26.21-22** the initiand is given a bell; the appropriate verses are given
- 26.23** this concludes the bell-consecration (*ghaṇṭābhīṣeka*)
- 26.24-26** the initiand holds them as if in an embrace and is given a new name preceded by *śrī* with the appropriate formula
- 26.27** this concludes the name-consecration (*nāmābhīṣeka*)
- 26.28-29** the initiand is told to hold the *vajra*-observance (but there are no details given what it is exactly; unless it is the passages that follow beginning with ‘dance’ collectively)
- 26.30** this concludes the *vajra*-observance (*vajravrata*)
- 26.31-32** the initiand is told to perform worship of buddhas, *yoginīs*, and their sons with dance (*nṛtya*)
- 26.33-34** the initiand is told to strike [!?] heroes and *yoginīs* as if in jest with a garland (*mālā*)
- 26.35-36** the initiand is told to sing all teachings to all men, through which he will soon enjoy the *yoginīs* (*geyam*)
- 26.37-38** the initiand is told to perform worship of buddhas and *yoginīs* with fragrant powders (*gandha*)
- 26.39-40** the initiand is told to worship *yoginīs* with incense (*dhūpa*) through which he will gladden all men with ‘the possession of the Buddha’ (*saugatāveśa*)
- 26.41-44** the initiand is given a *śalākā* and told to enlighten all men with the light of knowledge
- 26.45-47** the initiand is given a mirror (*ādarśa*) to illustrate that all phenomena are like pure reflections
- 26.48-49** the initiand is given a wheel (*cakra*) to ‘turn the wheel of the law’ consisting of the *kriyā*- and *caryā-naya* [i.e. he obtains the right to practice and teach the lower tantric corpora, the *Kriyā*- and *Caryā-tantras*]

- 26.50-51** the initiand is given a conch (*śaṅkha*)
- 26.52-55** the officiant confers the *vyākaraṇa* (a technical term for a rite in which the officiant ‘predicts’ the enlightenment of the initiate) with the appropriate gesture and formula, visualizing himself as Jñānaḍākinī
- 26.56-58** this crucial passage is unfortunately also the most obscure; the initiand seems to be given a series of mantras beginning with HŪM (here: *pañcabuddhātmakeṣu bījam*)
- 26.59ab** seems to conclude with the mantra-consecration (*mantrābhiṣeka*)
- 26.59cd** a short injunction to confer the officiant-consecration (*ācāryābhiṣeka*)
- 26.60** the first verse seems to conclude the yoga-consecration (*yogābhiṣeka*) and states that he who has received this is to be told ‘all secrets and the rest’ (*sarvaguhyādi*); this is said to be the great secret-consecration (*mahāguhyābhiṣeka*) [26.61-68] list of rules that the initiate is to abide by: not to torment beings, not to speak harshly, not to steal, to display temperance, etc.
- 26.69** all this is to be shown to the foremost initiand (*agraśiṣya*) who is then made to worship and bow to the deities; after that all present may see the *maṇḍala*

Section-colophon: *iti sarvābhiṣekavidhi[h] ṣaḍvi{ṣa}ṃśatimaḥ*

28^v 5

- 27.1-4** lists the articles that the initiate should give to the officiant as fee (*gurudakṣiṇā*): his wife, sons, relatives, servants, land, clothes, silver, copper, rice paddy, a seat, a parasol, a bedstead, etc.
- 27.5-8** worship is offered to the deities with *Apabhraṃśa* songs [27.9-14] the *dākinī*s should be pleased with their ‘garland-mantra’ (*mālāmantra*)
- 27.15-16** the initiate reiterates his intention to save all beings by partially reciting the *samvarapāṭha*
- 27.17-20** the officiant recites some verses to the initiate and the patrons (*dānādhipa*) of the rite and then dismisses them

Section-colophon: *iti gurudakṣiṇāśiṣyakṣamāpūjāvidhiḥ saptaviṃśatimah* 29^v 1

28.1-9 the officiant dismisses (*visarjana*) the deities with the appropriate *mudrās* and mantras (beginning with the *jñānamaṇḍala*), followed by the *samayacakra*, and ended by the *laukikas*, i.e. from the inside out)

28.10-12ab the *maṇḍala* is dismantled, and the coloured powders are thrown into a river

28.12cd-16 a closing *bali* is offered

28.17 a feast is held with song and dance

28.18-20 the main deity pair (called here Yogāambarībuddha) is homologized with Vairocana, and the four main goddesses (Vajraḍākinī, Ghorāḍākinī, Vettālaḍākinī, and Caṇḍālaḍākinī) with the four main goddesses of the Guhyasamāja (Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsini, Tārā, and Buddhālocanā)

28.21-24 glorifying the officiant: 21,000 *śūdras* are equivalent to one priest (*vipra*), 21,000 priests to a monk (*bhikṣu*), 21,000 monks to a king (*rājā*), 100,000 kings to a gnostic (*jñānī*), and 21,000 gnostics to a single officiant (*ācārya*), who is worthy of receiving donations

28.25 sinners who see the *maṇḍala* are freed [from their sins], those who entered the *maṇḍala* will rejoice in a pure abode (*śuddhāvāsa*), and those that donate to the craftsmen-*yogins* (*śilpayogin*) will soon obtain perfect enlightenment

28.26-28 another hybrid Sanskrit-*Apabhraṃśa* song praising Yogāmbara

28.29-30 concluding verses: the source is said to be the 12,000 verse Catuspīṭha and the work (called the *Piṇḍasārasamuccaya?*) is a condensation thereof; it is written in a barbaric language (*mlecchabhāṣā*) with reference to the meaning, and not metrical propriety, or logic, or grammar, for it is a secret work of yogic topics

Colophon: *Catuspīṭhamahāyoginītantrarāje sarvayoganṛtyageyapūjāvidhi- vistaramaṇḍalopāyikā saptaviṃśatimah/ kṛtir iyaṃ maṇḍalopāyikā Caryāvratīpādānām iti //* 30^v 2

3.3.2 The Āryadeva recension

What I call here the ‘Āryadeva recension’ does not survive in its entirety in Sanskrit, and has to be pasted together from Tibetan sources with some additional information provided by the *Mantroddhārapañjikā* (q. v.). In other words there is no ms. which transmits this work, which is still to some extent a postulated entity. I have already discussed some aspects of this problem in SZÁNTÓ 2008c. This recension consists of the text of what later became the Caryāvratīpāda recension (with the chapters organized differently: here the 28 sections of that recension were still organized into three, with the third chapter as the longest), and what later came to be known in the Tibetan Canon as the **Mantrāṃśa*. The evidence that this was the case is provided by the *Mantroddhārapañjikā*, which attributes the work to Āryadeva (even providing a short textual etiology) and claims to comment on some verses from the ‘fourth chapter’, which are now those from the beginning of the **Mantrāṃśa*. I have no clear explanation of why the first three chapters were later transmitted as a separate work, but it should be noted that the so-called **Mantrāṃśa*, i.e. the remainder of the Āryadeva recension, does not touch on initiation directly. It is rather more concerned with matters related to ritual and *mantras*.

STRUCTURE

It was presumably this recension that was responsible for a significant change in the pantheon of the cult, namely the superimposition of a male deity, Yogāmbara, on the original, exclusively female *maṇḍala*. Yogāmbara himself does not have a scripture of his own, and several works (such as the Nepalese *Yogāmbaramahātāntra* and the works by Amṛtānanda) show that this was an acute problem. The solution of the tradition was therefore to first ‘marry’ the deity with Jñānaḍākinī of the *Catuspīṭha*, and produce scriptural or semi-scriptural works in order to obtain substantiation for the worship and status of Yogāmbara. The extra verses transmitted in ms. A and their subsequent modification in order to fit Yogāmbara in (see SZÁNTÓ 2008c) show that the proto-*maṇḍalopāyikā* – while it certainly introduced new deities, procedures, *mantras*, etc. – did not yet have Yogāmbara as the chief deity. Had it been so, Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman would have certainly mentioned this fact. However, while the two early exegetes restructure their description of initiation according to the *maṇḍalopāyikā* (and in the case of the latter even reference is made to the text), they do not mention Yogāmbara at all. I therefore conjecture that they read a proto-version of the text, one that was subsequently modified by an author later thought of as

YOGĀMBARA

Āryadeva with Yogāmbara as the chief god. Most of our evidence for the worship of Yogāmbara comes from the Kathmandu Valley, therefore one could reasonably suspect that the superimposition took place there. However, the very existence of the Bengali ms. of the Caryāvratī recension of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* and Durjayacandra's mentioning the deity probably invalidates this presupposition. The general trend in this age was for Buddhist Tantric culture to be transmitted from the South into the Valley and not the other way around.¹¹⁷ It is therefore much more reasonable to suspect that although the superimposition took place in Bengal, it became overwhelmingly successful in Nepal.

The first three chapters of the Āryadeva recension are very similar to the Caryāvratīpāda recension, although arranged differently. The 'fourth chapter' and part of the fifth is available in the following witnesses: SOURCES

[D] NAK 5-37² = NGMPP A 138/10². See description of ms. D of the *tantra*, of which this is ff. 73^v 2 to 118 with the fourth chapter beginning on 101^r. The text in this ms. runs up to what was once v. 5.127c (= T_D 244^v 3). The **Mantrāṃśa* ends on T_D 260^r 3, therefore a substantial amount of the Sanskrit is missing.

[E] IASWR MBB-I-42. See ms. E of the *tantra* for the physical description. As in the case of the *tantra*, this is an apograph of ms. D above. The title 'Prajñāvatāraṇayoga' was extracted from a section-colophon.

[F₁] A two-folio fragment in TUL no. 312 (the ms. of the *Ratnamālā* below).¹¹⁸ The contents by and large correspond to chs. 9 & 10.1-11b, but there are slight structural differences: after the iconographical description of ch. 9 the *mantras* of these deities are given in an immediately following section, whereas these *mantras* are given along with the corresponding *mudrās* in ms. A in ch. 13. There is no section-colophon between the two chapters. We should conclude therefore that this is a fragment from a slightly separate recension.

¹¹⁷As far as I know we do not have a single example where a text or cult that came into being in Nepal was transmitted successfully into East India. There are of course several examples of Bengali/Bihari authors working with Nepalese material, but as far as we can tell they always did so *in situ*, e.g. Vanaratna or Ratnarakṣita.

¹¹⁸The first begins with ((*khe sa*)) *pūrvadiśye*, the second with *dakṣiṇapārśve Lankeśvarī*.

Nagoya Ka 51-2 See ms. Nagoya Ka 51-3 of the *tantra* for the physical properties. This witness comes from the same scriptorium. I have not collated this witness for my draft edition.

3.3.3 The proto-maṇḍalopāyikā

This entity is a conjectured one. Essentially it must have been very similar to the Caryāvratī recension (= first three chapters of the Āryadeva recension), but without mention of Yogāmbara. I propose that some verses survive in ms. A of the *Catuṣpīṭha* (q. v., also SZÁNTÓ 2008c), and that the repertoire it advances is witnessed and paraphrased by Bhavabhaṭṭa ad 4.1 and Kalyāṇavarman ad 2.3. I cannot state with certainty that it included any of the material in the Āryadeva recension, i.e. what the Tibetans translated as the **Mantrāṃśa* only parts of which survive in Sanskrit. The aim of this text must have been to outline the initiation rite, especially the preparatory phase, in much greater detail than 4.1 of the *tantra*.

3.3.4 The Mantroddhārapañjikā (anonymous)

This learned commentary to a part of the Āryadeva recension of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* survives in a single Sanskrit fragment and an apograph thereof.¹¹⁹ SOURCES

[A] NAK 1-1697 2/24, *vi. bauddhatantra* 21 = NGMPP B 31/9; the ms. is incorrectly catalogued as ‘*Catuṣpīṭhamaṇḍalopāyikā*’. The ms. is dated [NS] 273 (*samvat ā cū 3 a + n + śuklapratipad ādityadine* || *śrīmadrājādhirāja-parameśvara*{*h*} *śrīyĀnand*{*r*}*adevasya mahāvijayarāj*[*y*]*e*) = 1153 CE (the damaged portion most likely read a corrupt spelling of *āśvine*; the corresponding date is therefore September 20¹²⁰). The palm leaves measure according to the library card 28 x 5 cm, some of the pages are badly torn. The exact extent of the text cannot be determined, but this becomes apparent only after a careful reading of the text (see below). The surviving folios are: 1-4, 7-12, and two further fragments of one folio each, one of them being the last.¹²¹

¹¹⁹To the best of my knowledge this work has not been translated into Tibetan.

¹²⁰Cf. PETECH 1984:61 who silently restored the damaged part. Ānandadeva ruled between 1147-1167 CE (*ibid.*).

¹²¹From a codicological point of view it is worth noting that the numeration on the left margin prefixed by *śrī* and the format of the leaf is similar to NAK 1-1697 2/27 = NGMPP B 31/8 (titled ‘*Dākinīsādhana*’, most likely by Dārikāpāda or a disciple), although

[B] NAK 5-80 *vi. bauddhatantra* = NGMPP A 141/17; incorrectly catalogued as ‘*Catuṣpīṭhamāṇḍalopāyikā*’). Dated VS 1987 = 1930 CE. These six paper folios are a relatively modern apograph of ms. A above. The peculiar, left-slanting hand is not uncommon among apographs prepared by *paṇḍitas* in the employ of *rājaguru* Hemarājaśarman (Hemrāj Śarmā) in the first part of the 20th century.¹²² The colophon runs: *ity antalekhaputāt (sic for -yutāt, cf. e.g. the colophon of NGMPP B 432/19) prācīnanevārākṣaralikhītāt prācīnatādapatrapustakād uddhṛtya 1987 vaikramābde likhītam idaṃ pustakam*. The longer lacunae and damaged *akṣaras* marked by a horizontal line perfectly match ms. A, therefore there can be very little doubt that the original mentioned by the scribe is anything other than ms. A. Although on the whole the apograph is faithful to ms. A, the modern scribe did not note that the two leaves with the missing page numbers are out of sequence and mistakenly copied them as the continuation to f. 12. However, he did note the lacuna ff. 5-6 and signaled this by leaving an empty space on f. 3^r after the second line.

The colophon of ms. A given the informative but unwieldy title *Catuṣpīṭhamāṇḍalopāyikāyāś caturthapaṭalabhāṣitamantroddhāralakṣaṇasya pañjikā*. For convenience’s sake I shall refer to the work as *Mantroddhārapañjikā*. Unfortunately the otherwise very learned author does not name himself, but in the *pratiṣṭhā* verses and an introductory prose passage he identifies his lineage as the *Ārya* school.¹²³

TITLE &
AUTHORSHIP

As indicated by the title the work is a mini-commentary to the *mantroddhāra* section of the *Māṇḍalopāyikā*. Since the author states that this in the fourth chapter, it is immediately clear that he was not reading the recension that survives in the Bengali ms. with 28 chapters (i.e. what I call the Caryāvratīpāda recension), but the recension available from the composite Nepalese manuscripts, where the so-called fourth chapter coincides with what

CONTENTS

the script in that ms. is somewhat later, already foreshadowing in some of its features the hook-topped variety of Old Newar.

¹²²I am grateful to Prof. Sanderson for pointing this out to me in early 2007. For an exemplar with a very informative colophon see NAK 5-214 = NGMPP A 106/4, a copy of an old ms. of Haribhadra’s *Āloka* by one Pūrṇaprasādaśarman dating from only four years before. These apographs – according to the testimony of the scribe in question – were prepared for the *bhāratībhavana* (i.e. library) of the *rājaguru*. Note that the date VS 1883 in the NGMPP catalogue is a misreading. For similar cases cf. e.g. ACHARYA 2007:4, n. 6.

¹²³For the text see SZÁNTÓ 2008c:8-9, the contents are summarized below.

is known in the Tibetan Canon as the scriptural **Mantrāṃśa* (i.e. what I call the Āryadeva recension).

The *maṅgalaśloka* pays homage to ‘the five *ḍākinīs*’ (most likely Jñāna-ḍākinī and her retinue in the cardinal directions) who are said to bestow powers in their form as the five tubes (*nāḍī*). Since the *tantra* itself does not teach a system of *nāḍīs* and therefore does not postulate the equivalence of its five main goddesses with them, it can be determined that the author of the present work is from a later date, after the core teachings of the *tantra* have been updated with new material (e.g. the **Vyākhyātantra*).

The *pratijñā* verses state in gist the perceived history of the cult. To paraphrase: from the sea of gnosis that is the great tantra called the *Catuṣpīṭha*, Devapāda (i.e. Āryadeva) extracted his nectar-like work, the *Maṅḍalopāyikā*. The image is of course the cliché of churning the ocean. The guidelines to raise the *mantras* from the fourth chapter of that work has been elucidated to the author by his guru, an elucidation that was augmented by explanations from his preceptor (*kalyāṇasakhi*).

This lineage history is given in greater detail in a lacunose prose passage shortly thereafter: the Lord Vajradhara taught the *Catuṣpīṭha* in eighteen lakh verses in the pure abode of the gods; Vajrapāṇi condensed this work into twelve-thousand verses and taught it to the *yoginīs* of Oḍiyāna; Nāgārjuna visited that sacred site and propagated a twelve-hundred verse version in the world of men; Āryadeva mastered this version and composed the *maṅḍalopāyikā*. As far as the material I am aware of, this account is unique; beyond the mere names Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva it is clear evidence that before the mid-twelfth century at latest there was an effort to link the cult to the founding fathers of the Ārya school, and the sacred country of Oḍiyāna.

The introductory part of the work identifies four items to be known about a text before a discerning person proceeds to abide by its teaching: the homage (*namaskāra*), the connection (*saṃbandha*), the purpose (*prayojana*), and the subject matter (*abhidheya*). After clearing these points the text launches into the commentary proper. The first two verses – according to the author – seek to elucidate the source of the teaching, that is to say the *Catuṣpīṭha*,¹²⁴ or even more precisely, the first chapter of the third *pīṭha*. The author was no doubt aware that that chapter has nothing to say on *mantras*, hence he silently proposes that the manual is referring to the middling re-

¹²⁴The word *pīṭha* is glossed here as ‘the abode of *ḍākinīs*’ (*ḍāginīsthānam*, note that the spelling is also found in the *Pañjikā*, cf. n. 91).

cension of the text, the twelve-thousand verse *Catuṣpīṭha*, in other words the middling recension of the Ur-*tantra* (*madhyamamūlatantra*).

Vv. 3-6 describe the shape of the *praṇava*¹²⁵ and its customization (such as colouring) depending on the nature of the rite it is used in (white for *śānti*, etc.).

The next section, a commentary on v. 7 ff., describes the shape and presumably the customizations of the *jñānabīja* (i.e. HŪṂ); the ms. breaks off shortly after the beginning.

The available fragment picks up with f. 7, a commentary on v. 14-15ab, seeking to elucidate the various uses of the *nāda* (i.e. the vowel *u/ū*).

Vv. 15cd-16 define the seed-syllable for paralyzing (in this system HĀ), of which the author mentions several sub-types: setting out the borders [of the *maṇḍala*, etc.] (*sīmā*), paralyzing armies (*sainyastambhana*), flowing water (*jalastambhana*), fire (*agnistambhana*), rain (*varṣastambhana*), and magical diagrams (*yantrastambhana*). The latter case most likely refers to neutralizing the power of a rival magician.

Vv. 17-19 define the seed-syllables for attracting (here KROM and KRIM). From the viewpoint of terminology it is worth noting that the author seems to view *vaśya* and *bhedana* as sub-types of *ākaraṣaṇa*.

Vv. 20-21 introduces a distinction rarely met with in Buddhist *mantra-śāstra*, namely ‘consonants of day’ (*dinākṣara/divākṣara/divasākṣara*) and ‘consonants of night’ (*rātryakṣara*). The first group contains the first sixteen stops (i.e. KA to DHA), whereas the second all nasals and everything remaining. The *dviguṇākṣara* (i.e. KṢA) pertains to both, although this is not made clear in the root text. The somewhat surprising practical application advanced by the author is that [*mantras* containing] ‘consonants of day’ should be used only during the day and those of night only at night.

Vv. 22-23 describe the *amṛtabīja* (i.e. SA). The syllable is also described with the unfamiliar term *pātanabīja*, since it causes gods, men, etc. to ‘fall’ into the hands of the *yogin*.

Vv. 24-32 again describe the syllable HŪṂ. This is a repetition (see v. 7 ff.). The author justifies it as a ploy to confuse the learned, presumably those who are infatuated with their own *pāṇḍityam*. The shape of the syllable is again described using the letters Ḍ and Ḍ̄ as building blocks.¹²⁶

¹²⁵Unfortunately the passage is damaged. The ‘building blocks’ for the image of the mantra are Ḍs, i.e. two circles joined by a semicircle on the left side.

¹²⁶Cf. note to vv. 3-6.

In conformity with the teaching of the *tantra*, the syllable HŪṂ is described as the embodiment of five bodhisattvas (and their corresponding *kuleśas*, the five Tathāgatas). The next verses describe the customizations applicable for the rites of placating, etc. with special emphasis on the colour the *bīja* ought to assume and the way in which the *nāda* (i.e. the vowel Ū) is to be pronounced. The last verse (v. 32) to be commented upon in this second continuous fragment is a praise of the syllable HŪṂ.

The first of the single-folio fragments comments on further specifications of reciting mantras (e.g. spells of peaceful deities ought to end with SVĀHĀ but those of wrathful deities with PHAṬ), rules specifically applying for the preliminary service (*pūrvasevā*). Altogether, the lemmata from this portion amount to five verses. If we trace the verses in the extant Nepalese mss. and the Tibetan **Mantrāṃśa* (T_D 235^r -235^v) it becomes evident that these verses are distanced from the last available continuous portion by roughly one hundred lines, that is to say about fifty verses. It is therefore quite apparent that a significant portion of the *Mantroddhārapañjikā* is either lost or, we may hope, lies unidentified in the National Archives.

The second of the single-folio fragments was the last folio of the ms. The lemmata are not informative enough to allow us to determine which verse this corresponds to. The topic seems to be the mantra SVĀHĀ. The commentary ends rather abruptly with the dedication of merits in a single *mālinī* verse.

The author carefully comments on each word, points out grammatical structures (not an easy feat, since the language of the manual seeks to emulate that of the *tantra*), and gives his justifications in a very learned manner, even quoting abstruse grammatical rules. Quotations are sparse,¹²⁷ and the source is rarely identified, as if the author expected that his audience will be equally versed. By and large the author manages to extract suitable meaning from the verses. At the same time he cannot hide his exasperation with some features; he comments thus on a meaningless *ādi* in v. 15c: *ādiśabdo mlecchabhāṣaṇayākṣiptaḥ*, and justifies a Genitive ending in the Nominative sense with: *atha vā kṛṣṇasya mlecchabhāṣatvāt hūṃkārasya viśeṣaṇam*. One can only suspect that it was probably not with the greatest approbation

¹²⁷The loci quoted from the *tantra* are: 1.1.1, 1.2.19c (= 3.3.6a), 4.4.102. The *Amarakośa* (3.3.868 = *Agnīpurāṇa* 360.7ab) is quoted but not referenced. Pāṇini is referenced when quoting *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.65. I am unable to trace the following line giving a *nirukti* of the word *tantra*: *taṃkāraṃ reta ity uktam trakāraṃ kṣatajaṃ tathā*. The following verse cannot be traced, but is also quoted by Kalyāṇavarman: *prāyeṇa sarvamantrāḥ praṇavasvāhāyutāḥ prakṛtyaiva/ tasmād avyākṛtam api kuryād dvandvābhīniveśanam/|*.

that he glossed **bījavat** in v. 18b with *vanśabdo nirarthakah, upameyādisambandhābhāvāt*.

The author was aware of variant readings, e.g. the last word of 14b could read either *tathā* or *budhaḥ* according to his sources. We can only lament the fact that the author did not dedicate his acumen to a commentary of the *tantra* itself. However, the very fact that a relatively insignificant portion of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* received such learned attention is a good testimony of its paramount importance for the cult.

3.4 Satellite texts

What I call satellite texts of the *Catuṣpīṭha* are mainly ritual manuals surviving in Sanskrit, Tibetan, or both. One could classify these works in various ways. The arrangement of the *Bstan 'gyur* is somewhat haphazard: Tōh. 1607-1621 group together the satellite texts, but without any internal order, except that the two initial works are commentaries (Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman). One could draw a line between Yogāmbara and non-Yogāmbara works, but this classification is also problematic. Some of the surviving works are fragments and do not allow us to determine exactly whether Yogāmbara was present or not. Furthermore, the mere absence of Yogāmbara does not mean that the author did not know about him: the writer could have followed a separate tradition that opted not to incorporate the male deity. Sometimes the absence of Yogāmbara (e.g. in works by Abhayākara Gupta) simply means that the author saw the two *maṇḍalas* or pantheons as two separate transmissions.¹²⁸ In some cases the obeisance is to Yogāmbara (this could be either auctorial or scribal), but there is no further talk of him in the body of the text, often because the subject-matter is not concerned directly with the deities. In other words, just because Yogāmbara is not present in a satellite text, it does not mean that the author predated the superimposition of that deity via the Āryadeva recension of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*.

In the following I shall discuss these satellite texts one by one. Naturally, greater attention is allocated to works in Sanskrit, or works that survive in Sanskrit and those that do not focus on Yogāmbara.

¹²⁸For example the *Niṣpannayogāvalī* ch. 4 & ch. 14 treats the *Jñānaḍākinīmaṇḍala* and the *Yogāmbaramaṇḍala* separately. Also cf. SZÁNTÓ 2008c, n. 15: Padma dkar po (1527-1592) even entitles these two traditions as *yum bka'* and *yab bka'*.

3.4.1 The *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanasaṃkṣepa* (anonymous)

Source Fragment of two folia out of nine in NAK 3-359 *vi. bauddhadarśana* 90 = NGMPP A 38/8 which bears the library-card title ‘Samādhirājah’. This is only partially correct. The bundle contains in addition two folia of ms. S of the *Nibandha* and two folia with the fragment discussed below. I have read this ms. from b/w photographs of the microfilm.

Title The title I have given above is a conjecture. The closing colophon is fragmentary: *saṃkṣepato balihomayāgavidhayah śrīCatuṣpīṭhatantrāmnāyena likhitā iti* // *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanam *saṃkṣe + +* (after correction, *saṅkhe* before correction) *+ samāpteti* // . This seems to suggest that the original title might have been *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanasaṃkṣepa* (ignoring the *anusvāra*), but the feminine *samāptā* is slightly problematic.

Contents This ms. merits a more than perfunctory discussion, first and foremost on account of its much-discussed colophon which runs as follows:

samvat a cu hya śrāvaṇaśukladaśamyāṃ śukradine // *rājñe śrī-Bhāṣkaradevasya* / *śrīGuṇakāmadevakārīta* // ⊗ // *śrīDharmacakramahāvihāre sthitaḥ ŚākyabhikṣuKumāracandrena likhitam iti* / *mātāpitāguro* // ⊗ // *pādhyāyakalyāṇamittrasarvasatva-m-anuttarājñā-naphalaprāptaya iti* // *śrīGāṅkulaṅge kulaputra* [empty space].

Penned in the year 165, on the tenth of the bright fortnight of Śrāvaṇa, a Friday, during the reign (understand *rājye*) of His Glorious Majesty, Bhāskara, by a monk of Śākyā[muni], Kumāracandra, in the great monastery of glorious Dharmacakra founded by His Glorious Majesty Guṇakāma, in order that all mortals [beginning with] my mother, father, master, preceptor, and guide should obtain the fruits of unsurpassed knowledge (understand *anuttarājñāna*-). In Kathmandu the noble son [empty space]

The date has been verified by PETECH (1984:40) as Friday, July 26th, 1045 CE. The Italian scholar misread *dharmacakra* as *padmacakra*, but nevertheless identified it as the Dharmacakra-mahāvihāra (Taran Bahal / Tadhañ Bāhā in Wotu Tole, Kathmandu). The same identification is made by LOCKE (1985:351) who discusses the implications at length. Both scholars are wrong in stating that this is a manuscript of the *Catuṣpīṭhanibandha*.

A rather important implication of the colophon is that the scribe is the same as the scribe of ms. H of the *Samputa*. That ms. is not dated, but it could scarcely be removed in time from this one by more than a few decades. I have been unable to consult ms. C of the *Samputa* in its entirety, but if the colophon cited by H. P. Śāstrī is not original (SHASTRI 1917) – and there are reasons to suspect that it is not – this would become the oldest known ms. of that text.

The first of the two folia starts with the very end of what must have been the description of the *samayamudrās* for the thirteen goddesses, since the prose here are a reworking of *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.3.76 and 77, which describe the gestures for Cūṣiṇī and Kāmbojī. The practitioner is then instructed to worship with previously stated *mudrās* and *mantras* which were most likely to have been echoing 2.3.78-84. This is followed by sporting the *vajra* and sounding the bell whilst reciting the appropriate song (for the *vajra*, see 3.1.34) and *mantra* (for the bell, = 3.1.35). Then follows a series of verses which are prescribed for the *stutipūjā* (= 2.3.108-115). A description of the *bali* with non-vegetarian substances again closely follows the description in the *tantra*.

The second folio opens with offering *bali*, but this time this is merely a preliminary for a *homa* into fire. A floral ornament separates this passage from a short description of the *homa* into water (this follows *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.2 and Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Jalahoma* described below), which should end again with a *bali* offering. Some general guidelines are given as to the mental attitude of the *yogin*, the colour of his dress, etc. for the rites of placating (*śāntika*), for bringing about prosperity/reinvigoration (*pauṣṭika*), for overpowering (*vaśya*) and aggressive rites (*abhicāra*).

Given that our fragment begins with the *mudrās* of the last two goddesses we may surmise that the complete text was a *sādhana* followed by the description of the *bali*, the two types of *homa* and worship as a kind of appendix. The work does not seem to show any awareness of Yogāmbara.

3.4.2 The *Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā of Āryadeva

Sources

[A] ASB G 9993, described by SHASTRI 1917:174-175.¹²⁹ I have not been able to consult the original ms.; my observations and readings are based on photographs of a b/w copy, courtesy of Prof. Harunaga Isaacson. The manuscript is incomplete: there are two folia surviving of what must have been not more than four. The title in the catalogue is *Yogayoginīmaṇḍalavalīkrama*, which H. P. Śāstrī most likely extracted from what is the opening verse of the work as transmitted in this ms. (*samayī sādhakī caiva **yogāyoginīmaṇḍale**/ avaśyam eva kartavyam **balīkarma** viśeṣataḥ/*). There is an alternative title given in the Alphabetical Index (p. viii): *Sarvayoginīkarmavalividhi*, where the ms. shelf number is given as 9973. Both the title and the no. seem to me to be the result of a mistake (it is not impossible that the Index was prepared not by the author himself but an unacknowledged contributor). I cannot of course claim the expertise of H. P. Śāstrī in palaeographical matters, but it seems to me that there are some similar features in this script with that of somewhat earlier (late 11th - 12th century) mss. As for his remark about multiple hands, indeed, what must have once been the empty cover page (that is to say, 1^r) is filled with a rather inelegant scribble in a much later hand, doubtless a writing exercise. The scribble is not legible throughout, but the parts that are suggest the beginning of a scriptural or liturgical text in the tradition of the deity Mahākāla. The numeration is lost on both folia, hence we are unable to tell whether the ms. was part of a composite codex; a secondary numbering is discernible in the left string space.

[B] TUL, no. 312 (old no. 230), described by MATSUNAMI 1965:113-114.¹³⁰ This composite ms. holds four of what must have been not more than five folia containing the complete work. The available leaves are numbered 1, 2, 3, and 5. Despite the fact that the material support is palm leaf, this ms. must have been penned rather late, perhaps in the 15-16th century. The other

¹²⁹The descriptive entry runs as follows: “Substance, seasoned palm-leaf. 20” x 1 1/2”. Folia, 2. Lines, 5 on a page. Character, Newari of the 13th century. The leaves are not in the same hand. [...] The leaves seem to be fragments of a bigger work.” In the part marked here by an ellipsis Shastri transcribed a fair bit of the text.

¹³⁰The short entry is as follows: “Yogāmbārī-sādhana-ratna-mālā and two fragments. Palm leaf, 36 leaves, 7 lines, 12 1/8 x 2 1/8 inch., Siddhānta, (ON. 230). For details, see Matsunami’s Note Book 34, p. 31 ff.” The ‘note book’ is not available to me, therefore I cannot state whether Matsunami noticed that there are in fact fragments from at least seven or eight works in this composite codex.

items are described below. Although the end seems to be clearly marked,¹³¹ when compared to the Tibetan translation it seems that marking the end was premature: the text goes on for three more verses, and the colophon is missing. There was enough space to go on writing, therefore we must surmise that the scribe's archetype was already lacunose.

[**T_D**] Tōh. 1614. This is our only source which attributes the authorship to [an] Āryadeva. The translators are not mentioned. The title given here (without the Sanskrit) is *Dpal gdan bzhi pa 'i zab don ston pa Shing gcig gi dka' 'grel*, i.e. “A commentary on the [mantra beginning with] *ekavṛkṣa* revealing the profound meaning[s] of the glorious *Catuṣpītha*.” Since the said *mantra* begins with *om ekavṛkṣe* it is obvious that the form *Ekadrumapañjikā* seen in catalogues is an artificial and incorrect re-Sanskritization. The translation is not always an exact match with the surviving Sanskrit, and there are three additional verses at the beginning and three more at the end. The anonymous translators most likely had a more complete version at their disposal as the missing verses are essential from the viewpoints of compositional style: they contain the *pratijñā* and the final statement.

Title Inspired by the Tibetan title I shall refer to the work as *Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā*, but it should be noted that this is merely for convenience's sake.

Author As mentioned above, only the Tibetan translation attributes the authorship to [an] Āryadeva, who may or may not be the same as the author of the *sādhana* and the *maṅḍalopāyikā*.

Contents The work is chiefly a treatise on the purported esoteric meaning of a *mantra* (v. 2.3.147 ff.) generally viewed as one to be recited during offering the *bali* sacrifice.

The first three verses that are available only in Tibetan describe an unnamed goddess who should be visualized seated on a lotus inside a triangle on which there are three disks, the sun, the moon, and fire, then another lotus, and a ‘great *preta*’ in order to obtain *siddhi*(s) quickly. These probably served as the *maṅgala* verses, since the next one is the *pratijñā*, which

¹³¹Two double *daṇḍas* bracket a flower design, and the line is filled with *śrī* syllables before another pair of double *daṇḍas*.

states that the work seeks to elucidate the *ekavṛka*[-*mantra*] according to the teaching of (or rather: oral teachings associated with?) the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

The first available Sanskrit verses have the injunction that both *samayins* and *sādhakas* (note the Śaiva usage) should perform *bali* on prescribed dates after having worshipped ‘*yoginīs*’ (most likely in the form of young virgins) in their own house. This statement makes it rather likely that the ideal practitioner for the author is a householder. The rite is further preceded by worshipping the deity of the threshold (*dehalīdeva*) both from the inside and the outside.¹³² Then the *bali* proper should be offered in the prescribed places beginning with a solitary tree.

The work turns to its subject matter by declaring that those who do not know the true meaning of the *mantra* ‘[merely] roam outside [the esoteric and true teaching]’ and their worship, even if it lasts a hundred crore eras, will fail to please the deities.¹³³ Hence the author, addressing an otherwise unnamed disciple by ‘*bhadra*’, undertakes the task to elucidate that spell for the sake of ‘beings intent on [following] the *yogatantras*’. This statement shows that the work is rather archaic: it indirectly refers to the *Catuṣpīṭha* as a *yogatantra*.

The body of the text describes the esoteric meaning of the following locations: the solitary tree, the cremation ground, [the top of a] mountain, the gorge, the cave, the village, several types of crossroads, the field, the empty house, a ‘worthy vessel’, and the untouchable[’s house]. The sections usually begin by giving the everyday definition of the location (e.g. a solitary tree is one which does not have any other trees nearby up to a distance of one *krośa*) and then gives the esoteric meaning (e.g. the tree is to be understood as the *yogin*’s body, or on an even more esoteric level of interpretation the system of tubes in which the vital energies flow). In almost half the cases the esoteric interpretation is justified or augmented by *nirukti*. In one case the author steps outside the Buddhist realm and criticizes the (understand: exoteric) ‘Vedānta view’ of the solitary tree, even supplying a line from the *Bhagavadgītā* (15.1: *ūrdhvamūlam adhaḥśākham aśvattham prāhur avyayam* on A1^v, B1^v).

¹³²The deity of the threshold merits some attention, since it is mentioned only very rarely. The only other instance I am aware of is on a fragment from the *Kalpasādhana* manuscript (for which see below): *pūjayed dehalīdeva[m] svapārś[v]e vāmatas tathā*].

¹³³Here we have another parallel with the fragment mentioned in the previous footnote: *tanmantrārtham ajānantah paryatet mantriṇo bahiḥ/ kalpakotiśatārādhyam naiiva sidhyati devatā*]].

After explaining the locations the work turns to elucidate the correlation between parts of the body and the minor deities enumerated in the *mantra* (vv. 2.3.148-152); the location, names, corresponding sacred fords and implements of the eight **kṣetrapālas* (not mentioned in the *mantra*); a further list of correlations between the twelve houses of the zodiac, the twelve *bhuvaneśvaras* of the *Catuṣpīṭha* system, corresponding location on or element of the body, and the presiding *bīja*; and finally a list of days (of which there are only seven, therefore most likely days of the week) and activities that are guaranteed to succeed if undertaken on those days. With this the available Sanskrit text ends.

The Tibetan translation has three more verses rather typical of an ending: an admonition to worship one's guru and a dedication of merits. Here too the prospective practitioners are called 'those fortunate [to have the chance to follow the] *mahāyoga[tantras]*' or the great *yoga[tantras]* (*rnal 'byor chen po skal ldan rnam*s).

In spite of its brevity, its less than satisfying transmission, its questionable grammar, as well as the fact that we do not have the complete Sanskrit text, the work serves as a valuable pointer towards the otherwise elusive sources *Catuṣpīṭha* authors were inspired by. The *ekavṛkṣamantra* itself is an inflected version of four verses from the Śaiva *Niśisaṃcāra/Niśātana* (f. 48^r). Although the parallel is significant, it may simply mean that both texts draw on a third source. The present work, however, has further parallels. The *Niśisaṃcāra* too goes on (f. 48^v ff.) to explain the esoteric meaning of these locations. The most obvious example for the parallelism is again the solitary tree. The present work opens the description thus:

*ekavṛkṣeti sarveṣāṃ kathyate na ca jñāyate/
śarīram vṛkṣam ity uktam karaśākhādiyojitam//*

Whereas the *Niśisaṃcāra* has (48^v):

*vṛkṣam parīkṣ[y]am ity uktam sāmānyam guhyagocare/
vṛkṣa[ṇ] śarīram ity uktam pādādīkaraṭṭnātmayoḥ†//¹³⁴*

Both works give a further, even more esoteric meaning to the tree, namely the system of tubes in the body. The present work begins that description

¹³⁴Also cf. this line with *Jñānakārikā* 3.15cd: *vṛkṣaḥ śarīram ity uktam pādādīkaraśākhayoḥ*. I thank Prof. Isaacson for pointing this out to me. This somewhat obscure Kaula work contains further parallels with the two works under discussion here.

thus: *caturaṅgulaṃ adho nābhes tatra skandha[h] pratiṣṭhitah| tenordhvagā trayah śākhā*. The *Niśisaṃcāra* similarly describes a ‘secret tree’ as the highest of three (49^v): *ākhyāmi uttamā (for uttamam) vṛkṣa[m] garbhastham samvyavasthitam|* which similarly sprawls from the navel (*nābhikandāsanāsīnam*). There are similar parallels in other cases, e.g. the cremation ground is equated on the esoteric level with the breaths/vital energies (*prāṇam śmaśānam ity uktam*), which is very similar to the definition of the *Niśisaṃcāra* (49^r): *[ś]maśānam ca niśvāsaśvāsasambhavaḥ*.

Although the author of the *Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā* for the most part ably converts the Śaiva source to Buddhist terminology, there are traces to testify that his attention was not very thorough. For example one can cite the esoteric meaning of one of the ‘crossroads’:

*ūrdhva brahmapatha jñeyam adho viṣṇupathocyate|
rudra madhyam vijānīyā traye te mārgam iṣyate||*

To compare, the *Niśisaṃcāra* (51^v -52^r) has: *trīpatha nābhisaṃcāraṃ brahmaniṣṇumaheśvaraḥ*. Furthermore the *trīpatha* is also equated with the three main tubes; significantly these are referred to by their Śaiva designation: *idā, piṅgalā, and suṣumnā*.

3.4.3 The *Catuspīṭhasādhanopāyikā of Āryadeva

Source Tōh. 1610, tr. by Kamalagupta and Rin chen bzang po. To my knowledge no Sanskrit ms. of this work survives.

Title The Tibetan title and the Sanskrit reconstruction are very likely unreliable: *Rnal 'byor gyi rgyud Dpal gdan bzhi pa'i sgrub thabs / *Śrī-catuspīṭhayogatantrasādhanopikā*. Although Āryadeva does occasionally refer to the text as a *yogatantra*, in the main body (74^r) the *Catuspīṭha* is called a *yoginītantra*. However, the colophon (82^r) once again calls the text a **mahāyogatantra*. *Sādhanopikā* is an attested form, but in the reconstruction I prefer to use the more correct reading.

Author Perhaps this is the same author as the author of the **Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā*. He may also be the same as the author of the Āryadeva recension of the *Maṅḍalopāyikā*, since the obeisance verse matches the first verse of that text. The second verse of the *pratiññā* can also be traced in that text.

Contents The text is a fairly elaborate *sādhana* using the extended pantheon headed by Yogāmbara. The structure in many ways foreshadows the presumably later work of Amitavajra (q. v.). Most of the procedures here can be traced in the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. After the preliminaries the deities are visualized, invited with the appropriate gestures and spells, they are worshipped, and finally dismissed. The text closes with a brief injunction about worshipping with the ten *samaya*-substances. Quotations are sparse: one verse about the placement of the *pūjā* articles (74^r) and one verse about purifying the seven underworlds (74^v) cannot be traced, the *tantra* is quoted once (75^r = 1.3.16).

An interesting clue about the pronunciation of the *kūṭākṣaramantras* is provided by a verse on 76^r: *lkog mar smryuṃ bsam par bya/ nang 'tshong de bzhin hmryuṃ bsam/ snying gi phyogs su ymryuṃ ngo/ lte bar kṣmryuṃ dgod par bya/*. Since the number of expected syllables is seven, it follows that there was an extra, probably *schwa*-like sound uttered within the syllables *smryuṃ*, etc. Whether this is a reflection of Indian practice remains to be investigated.

3.4.4 The *Jñāneśvarīsādhana of Āryadeva

Source Tōh. 1612, tr. by Smṛtijñānakīrti, rev. by Samayaśrījñāna. I have been unable to locate this text in Sanskrit.

Title I have extracted the title from the Tibetan heading and the colophon. The *pratijñā* verse seemingly alludes to a **jñāneśvara*, but this must be an error for the feminine of the same word.

Author Authorship is attributed to [an] Āryadeva in the colophon. I find it likely that this is a false attribution, since the text does not say anything about Yogāmbara or the extended *maṇḍala*, which seems to be the hallmark of the *Catuṣpīṭha* Āryadeva.

Contents The text is similar to the *sādhana* above, except that the pantheon is the original one, i.e. without Yogāmbara and his retinue. The only difference is that after 110^r, the work also contains an elaborate description of *homa*, and another kind of worship called *mchod sbyin*. A short passage at the end (112^v-113^r) contains an appendix of sorts about customizations

for different rites, e.g. the direction the *yogin* should face, the colour of the offerings, and the number of beads on the rosary.

3.4.5 The *Vajraghaṇṭāpūjākrama of Āryadeva

Source Tōh. 1615, translators are not given.

Title The title is a tentative reconstruction from the Tibetan, where the Sanskrit reconstruction contains an extra *sādhani*, perhaps for *sādhana*.

Author According to the colophon this is yet another work of Āryadeva. I am unable to confirm or dispute this claim.

Contents Curiously, the *maṅgala* verse pays homage to the ‘secret Śaṃvara’ (*Bde mchog gsang*). Furthermore, except that the subject-matter (the worship and symbolism of the *vajra*-sceptre and the bell) is similar to *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.1, and that the putative author is one that wrote several works related to the cult, there is nothing in the main body that would unequivocally link this short versified text to the cult.

3.4.6 The *Kakṣapuṭa of Nāgārjuna

Source Tōh. 1609, translators are not given.

Title Several other recensions of this work are available in Sanskrit, therefore the reconstruction of *mchan khung* is beyond dispute.

Author Both the Tibetan and surviving recensions of the text attribute authorship to the *siddha* Nāgārjuna.

Contents The text is an alchemical/medical work and otherwise has nothing to do with the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The reason why it was nevertheless grouped among works related to that cult is, I propose, the fact that its first verse in the *mālinī* metre is quoted by Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 44^r). The exegete describes the origin of the verse as the *dvādaśasāhasrika*, i.e. the middling recension of the *Ur-tantra*.

3.4.7 The *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanopāyikā of Bhavabhaṭṭa

Source Tōh. 1616. Tr. by Gayādhara and Lhas btsas of the 'Gos. To the best of my knowledge no Sanskrit manuscripts of this work have surfaced.

Title The full title was perhaps *ŚrīCatuṣpīṭhasādhanopikā, or perhaps with the more correct form °sādhanopāyikā.

Author In the colophon the author names himself / is called¹³⁵ the great preceptor (*slob dpon chen po*, *mahācārya), Bhavabhadra, a well-attested form in Tibetan sources, but more likely a 'standardization' of Bhavabhaṭṭa. This is very likely the exegete Bhavabhaṭṭa.

Contents The obeisance/benediction (*maṅgala*) and the statement of purpose (*pratijñā*) are accommodated in a single verse. The author bows to an unspecified deity who [appears] from the realm of both being (*dngos*, *bhāva*) and non-being (*dngos med*, *abhāva*) equipped with the major and minor marks (*dpe mtshan ldan*, *lakṣanānuvyañjanopeta) in order to benefit the world.

In order to do this one must undertake meditative visualization. Hence the statement of purpose claims that since the manifestation [of oneself] (*mngon du bya ba*, *sākṣātkāra) as the thirteen [goddesses] is not described clearly in the [*Catuṣpīṭha*]tantra the author takes it upon himself to describe it in a condensed (*bsdus te*, *samkṣīpya) [but clear] form.

The qualifications of the practitioner (*sādhaka*) are said to be: having obtained the consecration of the Vase (*bum pa*, *kalaśa*) and the Secret [consecration] (*gsang ba*, *guhya*),¹³⁶ and being firm in his awareness (*rig pa*, *samvid).¹³⁷ The reason for undertaking the *sādhana* are said to be the at-

¹³⁵In case this is a Tibetan addition, which is possible.

¹³⁶The absence of the Knowledge of Wisdom (*prajñāñāna*) consecration and the Fourth (*caturtha*) consecration should not be taken as an archaic feature as in the case of Jayabhadra for example. For Bhavabhaṭṭa knew of all four consecrations. See *ad Catuṣpīṭha* 4.1.17. It is rather the *minimal* qualifications that are envisaged here.

¹³⁷The present state of the text is not satisfactory: *de la re zhig slob dpon bum pa dang gsang ba'i dbang thob cing*/. I propose to emend the text to *slob dpon las*, etc. The word *slob dpon* cannot in this case refer to the *ācāryābhīṣeka* for two reasons. First, it was not obligatory to receive this consecration in order to practice the propitiation of a deity; and second, this consecration is given *after* the *kalaśābhīṣeka*, hence the word order would be wrong. Nor can it be that the *ācārya* is the subject of the sentence. The idea is that one

tainment of common *siddhis* and the best of them, that is liberation.

The greater part of the text very closely resembles *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.3.10cd ff. with ideas, songs, and procedures borrowed from elsewhere in the text (e.g. 1.3). The last passage (148^r -148^v) describes shortly the *utpannakrama* stage. Four *cakras* are mentioned here. In the navel a sixty-four petalled lotus with the mantra OM corresponding to Great Bliss (*mahāsukha*). In the heart an eight petalled one governed by HŪM and standing for the *dharmakāya*. These two are said to pertain to the ‘*upāya*’ side. As for the ‘*prajñā*’ side there is a sixteen-petalled lotus in the throat with mantra A and corresponding to the *nirmāṇakāya*, and a thirty-two petalled lotus in the head with the mantra HAM standing for the *saṃbhogakāya*. For further details about the letters on the petals, about how to kindle the fire in the procedure known as *caṇḍālī* (*gtum mo*), and about how to arouse bliss the reader is referred to his *guru*. The text closes with a short dedicatory verse. The text, as indeed the exegete, seems to be completely ignorant of Yogāmbara.

3.4.8 The *Catuṣpīṭhajalahoma of Bhava

Source Tōh. 1617. Tr. by Tshul khriims gzhon nu.¹³⁸ This work to my knowledge survives only in Tibetan.

Title The title given above is a tentative reconstruction, the work is headed only by the Tibetan *dpal gdan bzhi pa'i chu'i sbyin sreg bzhugs*. The titles of shorter works or *upadeśas* were often not reconstructed into Sanskrit in the Canon.

Author The colophon says that this is a teaching (*man ngag, upadeśa*) of the preceptor (*ācārya*) Bha ba. This was perhaps intended as a shorthand for Bhavabhaṭṭa. However, the differences with *Nibandha* ad 2.2 make this identification unlikely.

Contents Except for a minor deviation (see n. 140), the work follows *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.2 very closely. There is no benedictory verse, only a prose obeisance to Jñānaḍākinī. The statement of purpose explains that there already is a

needs to obtain consecration from a qualified master in order to practice.

¹³⁸There are several translators with this name. Perhaps this is the Tshul khriims gzhon nu born in the 14th century according to the database of TBRC.

description of the *jalahoma* (presumably in the *tantra*) but the author will undertake a description nevertheless. Bhavabhaṭṭa is aware of the anomaly that the *jalahoma* poses, for the oblation is usually done into fire. He says that since both procedures purify sins, it does not matter whether this is done by burning in fire or washing away with water.¹³⁹

In a suitable location the *sādhaka* traces a *maṇḍala* with scented powder and spreads a canopy over it. Then a suitable vessel for water is smeared with a white substance. It can be either rectangular or round, i.e. similar to the pit (*kuṇḍa*) used in *homa*. Its diameter is fourteen [thumbs], its depth should be two thirds of that measure. The vessel is filled with scented water mixed with milk and adorned with new blossoms. Around the vessel eight vases (*kalaśa*) are placed, these are also filled with water mixed with milk and adorned with shoots.

The practitioner then visualizes himself as Jñānaḍākinī. In this text she assumes a different form. Instead of red garments she wears white and has only two arms in which she holds sticks topped by *vajras*.¹⁴⁰ Thereafter she is worshipped with the common offerings.

The *sādhaka* then with a *mudrā* imitating a lotus and the appropriate *mantra* visualizes a lotus in the middle of the vessel and then invites the goddess upon it with the *mudrās* and *mantras* of the pledge. She is worshipped again.

Then the *mūlamantra* is recited accompanied with its *mudrā*. Then a lotus or any white flower is pierced with a blade of *dūrva* grass. This is then dipped in another vessel with pure water and then sprinkled on the crown of the visualized deity.

A list of customizations to the rite follow with specific targets in mind: to increase one's lifespan, to placate dangers threatening a house, a village, or a country, to defeat an enemy's army, and to bring about prosperity/reinvigoration.

Jñānaḍākinī is then praised in two verses (these are not present in the *tantra*). In order to make up for any omissions in the rite the hundred-syllable *mantra* (the well-known *śatākṣara*) is prescribed. The deities are then dis-

¹³⁹148^v -149^r: *chu yis sbyin sreg ji ltar 'gyur/ sgrub pa po ni the tshom skyes/ mes (mes] em., med T_D) kyang sdig sreg sdig pa sbyong/ chu yang de bzhin 'dra bas na/ des na sbyin sreg ces bya'o||*

¹⁴⁰This is slightly different from what we find in the *tantra* and Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary thereupon. There the practitioner visualizes Jñānaḍākinī according to chapter 2.3. and it is only the *jñānasattvī* which assumes this special form.

missed with the mantra MUḤ.

Unusually, there are two kinds of dedicatory verses. The latter is a general one where the merits are dedicated for the well-being of all. The former, however, specifically mentions the author and a disciple (*bdag dang slob ma gnyis ka*). This presumably alludes to some event that prompted the production of the manual.

3.4.9 The *Catuṣpīṭhacatustattva* of Jitāri

Sources An incomplete Skt. ms. (ff. 1-4 & 7 out of what were seven folia) may be found shuffled in among other works in NAK 3/363 *vi. bauddha-karmakāṇḍa* 31 = NGMPP B 24/16 titled ‘*Yīgāmvarakalpasādhanaṃ*’ (i.e. the ‘*Kalpasādhana*’ ms., see below). The work is available in Tibetan: Tōh. 1620, tr. by Gayādhara and ’Gos [Khug pa] lhas btsas.

Title The title from the Tibetan Canon seems to be attested by the *prati-jñā* verse: *Catuṣpīṭhakramāyātamaṃ catuścakre vyavasthitam/ catustattvaṃ yad ākhyātamaṃ tan mayā likhyate sphuṭam//*.

Author The work is signed off thus: *likhitam ... ācāryeṇa Jitāriṇā//*. This may or may not be the same with the logician Jitāri (also incorrectly known as Jetāri), who seemed to have been active at the turn of the millennium in Bengal, best known to Tibetan historians as one of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna’s teachers.¹⁴¹ But there is considerable confusion as to the identity of this person. Some Tibetans distinguish between Jitāri sr. and Jitāri jr. Tāranātha describes the elder as having received a tenure (**patra*) from Mahīpāla (cca. 984-1032 CE) after a long period of unemployment.¹⁴² For the present purposes the elucidation of Jitāri’s identity is immaterial. However, it should be said that the material he presents in this work is consonant with developments that began in the eleventh century, namely the superimposition of Yogāmbara and the emergence of *utpannakrama*-style material in addition to the original practice of the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

¹⁴¹ROERICH [& DGE] ’DUN CHOS ’PHEL] 1949:243. See ELTSCHINGER 2003:137, n. 1 for a list of sources discussing Jitāri’s date.

¹⁴²CHIMPA & CHATTOPADHYAYA 1970:292.

Contents The Sanskrit text begins with two obeisance verses, one to Yogāmbara and one to his consort here called Sumaneśvarī.¹⁴³ These are not found in the Tibetan translation and are in dissonance with the more polished Sanskrit in the rest of the work. Notice for example the very odd but metrical epenthetic *-r-* in the last quarter of the first verse (the metre is *śikharinī*, the second verse not given here is in *drutavilambita*):

*iḍāpiṅgāsūkṣmāvivaracaracakreśatilakas
tilānāṃ simvīkopamasugatanirmāṇacaturah/
sadānanda[⁻]cārah saha jagṛh[i]ṅvīgrahadharah
sphuranmūrtir Yogāmbara-r-avatu yuṣmān anudinam//*

The Śaiva terminology alone (*iḍā*, *piṅgā*) would not discredit these verses since it is used in the Yogāmbara-Catuṣpīṭha tradition (cf. Āryadeva's *Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā* described above).¹⁴⁴ However, the passage attested by the Tibetan rendering again begins with an obeisance to a deity which must be Yogāmbara in allusion, as *vyomāṅganā* doubtless refers to Jñānaḍākinī as Yogāmbarī:

*śrīmadvyomāṅganāsaṅgaṃ caturānandadarśinam/
trailokyajanakam nātham taṃ vande viśvarūpinam//*

In spite of this obeisance Yogāmbara does not play any further role in the practices described in this work.

The *Catustattva* consists of four sections (*pariccheda*). The Sanskrit is available only for section 1, 2.1-5c, and 4.14c-end.

The first section in 39 units is the least esoteric. It contains a visualization of the *maṇḍala* with the thirteen goddesses, some verses on prognostications (cf. *Catuṣpīṭha* 1.3), a short passage on raising *mantras*, which are then given in their decoded form, and a few verses on empowering the anti-nomian substances used in worship. The section closes with the colophon: *ity adhyātmacihna[!]nirmitātmapiṭhabhāvanāmantrabindutattvaṃ prathamah paricchedaḥ//*, which is more or less in keeping with the contents.

The second section with 32 units begins with a description of a similar procedure but this time with customized *mantras* and supernatural aims in

¹⁴³These verses are repeated on both sides of the first folio.

¹⁴⁴Furthermore, in one of the closing verses (4.18) Jitāri says that through the grace of the guru's teaching sentient beings go to '*paramaśaivapadam*'.

mind: the four rites (most likely *śāntika*, *pauṣṭika*, *vaśya*, *abhicāra*), removing snake poison, causing earthquakes, and fashioning a protective amulet. A subsequent passage (vv. 21-28) describes a procedure of inducing possession (*āveśa*) faintly echoing *Catuspīṭha* 3.2.2-27. The section ends with two verses on the *pūrvasevā* procedure with required amounts of recitation in accordance with the four *yugas* (numbers increase with the degree of degeneration), and an aphorism-cum-exhortation to meditators. The Tibetan rendering of the colophon reads: *nang gi sems las sprul pa yi/ byin gyis brlabs pa'i rim pa dang bcas pa'i gzhan gyi gdan bsgom pa'i de kho na nyid de dum bu gnyis pa'o//* supposing something like **ity adhyātmacittanirmitasādhiṣṭhānakrama-parapīṭhabhāvanātattvaṃ dvitīyaḥ paricchedaḥ//*.

The third section in 19 units is dedicated to a procedure to prevent illnesses and greying, and the technique of conscious death (*utkrānti*, for which see *Catuspīṭha* 4.3.35-55). The Tibetan translation of the colophon reads: *nang gi sems las sprul pa'i sbyor ba'i gdan gyi bsam gtan gyi de kho na nyid dang/ bdag med ma'i mngon par byang chub pa dang/ gong du 'pho ba ste dum bu gsum pa'o//* which might tentatively be reconstructed as: **ity adhyātmacittanirmitayogapīṭhadhyānatattvanairātmyābhisaṃbodhyutkrānti[tattvaṃ?] tr-tīyaḥ paricchedaḥ//*.

The fourth and last section in 21 units opens with the visualization of a male deity simply called *dpa' bo* (**vīra*), most likely Vajrasattva. The practitioner should become conjoined with this deity 'like butter poured into butter, like water poured into water, like space into space' (v. 4.8). This merging is said to be the **mahāmudrā*. The Sanskrit text becomes available from the second half of verse 14 onwards, a section containing aphoristic closing verses about following one's master, taming the mind, and the such. The section colophon comes after the signature verse: *iti Catuspīṭhasya prajñājñānābhisaṃbodhinirṇayaś caturthaḥ paricchedaḥ samāptaḥ//*.

With this short synopsis of the contents it becomes fairly clear what Jitāri's purpose was: to give the essential teachings (I think *tattva* here is used in this sense) of the *Catuspīṭha* by rearranging topics therein more in harmony with the somewhat odd chapter names *ātma-*, *para-*, *yoga-*, and *guhya-pīṭha*.

The Sanskrit ms. is glossed in some places, e.g. on 2^v *metri causa* epithets are explained: *śvapacāṃ* is glossed as *caṇḍālī*, and *pecikāṃ* as *ulūkī*.

3.4.10 The *Ṣaṭṭattvavyavasthāna of Smṛtijñānakīrti

Source Tōh. 1621, tr. by the author.

Title I have followed the Tibetan and the reconstructed heading in Sanskrit, which is probably correct.

Author The work is signed in both a verse and the colophon by Smṛtijñānakīrti. I see no reason to doubt this attribution. The work was written upon a request from [an] unnamed disciple[/s].

Contents The *maṅgala* verse pays obeisance to Jñānaḍākinī. The *pratijñā* verse states that the author has extracted from the **Āryacatuṣpīṭha*, a secret *tantra* (*gsang rgyud 'phags pa Gdan bzhi las*), six **tattvas* for the benefit of disciples of lesser capabilities. The six are in fact four plus two, the four *tattvas* described in *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.1 (the *vajra*-sceptre, the bell, the rosary, and *jñāna*) plus the *amṛtas* (following 2.3 and 2.4) and the reliquary (*stūpa*), on which there are no clear instructions in the *mūla*. In other words the text seeks to explain the ‘true nature’ (i.e. for the most part what we would call ‘symbolism’) of these elements. There is very little in addition here that is not already described in the *tantra*. The point was perhaps to teach the same topics in intelligible Sanskrit.

3.4.11 The *Jñānaḍākinīsādhana of Abhayākaragupta

Sources Tōh. 1618. Tr. by Rin chen rgyal mtshan at Sa skya monastery (here *chos grwa chen po*). Although this is a common name, the person here is most likely to have been the 7th abbot (*khri chen*) of Sa skya (1238-1279). After the translator’s colophon there is a small anonymous addendum on *mantras*. To the best of my knowledge this work is not extant in Sanskrit.

Title The re-Sanskritized title in the Tibetan translation is likely to give the correct form. The Tibetan has *Ye shes mkha' 'gro'i sgrub thabs*. As pointed out to me by Dr. Ulrike Roesler *mkha' 'gro* and *mkha' 'gro ma* are often used interchangeably.

Author Abhayākaragupta, the famed author of Vikramaśīla, does not need introduction. He was a contemporary of Rāmapāla (cca. 1075-1128 CE), as some of his works are dated in auctorial verses to regnal years of this emperor.

Contents Although Yogāmbara and his extended *maṇḍala* were known to Abhayākaragupta, here – just as in the case of his *Niṣpannayogāvalī* – he keeps separate the original, exclusively female *maṇḍala* and the later, extended *maṇḍala*.

The *maṅgala* verses are slightly odd. The first calls Jñānaḍākinī, embodiment of all benefits, to radiate with joy (*dga' gyur cig*) like an assembly of water-lilies (*ku mud can bzhin*) in a feast of tasting nectar for [the benefit of] all beings. It is likely that a wordplay / alliteration on \sqrt{mud} and *kumuda* was employed in this verse. The second verse is problematic. There seems to be an identification of Jñānaḍākinī with Vajrayoginī and Vajravārāhī but how exactly this is done is beyond my comprehension. There is no statement of purpose (*pratijñā*).¹⁴⁵

After the customary preparations the *yogin* visualizes himself as Jñānaḍākinī, starts visualizing the deities of the *maṇḍala* in a manner similar to the procedure described in *Catuspīṭha* 2.3. He then merges the deities of the *samayacakra* with the *jñānacakra* and ‘seals’ them with the appropriate Tathāgatas. The *yogin* is then instructed to conduct a worship of his own body, to sing praises to the deities, and to taste the nectars. He should then perform the **binduyoga* and the **sūkṣmayoga*, but no clear details are provided. At the end he should make up for omissions with a *mantra* (presumably the *śatākṣara*). The work closes with giving the *mantras* of the goddesses for recitation. The set is not the one advanced by the *tantra*, e.g. the *mantra* of Jñānaḍākinī is given as OM HRĪḤ SVĀHĀ. The dedicatory verse prays that Abhaya (i.e. the author) should quickly obtain [identification with] the body of Jñānaḍākinī by virtue of merits gained by composing the text.

The translator’s colophon is followed by a short addendum listing the *mantra* of Jñānaḍākinī (as above) and the *bījas* of the other goddesses.

¹⁴⁵T_D 150^r: *gang don sna tshogs sku 'dzin pa'i | lha mo ye shes mkha' 'gro ma | bdud rtsi'i dga' ston gyis 'gro rnams | ku mud can bzhin dga' gyur cig || 'dir ni rdo rje 'dzin pa'i sku | bsam yas rdo rje rnal 'byor ma | bla na med pa'i gnas thob phyir | bsten bya rdo rje phag mo'o ||*

3.4.12 The Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā of Amitavajra

Sources A not inconsiderable number of early witnesses are available for this text, which in my view proves its popularity. However, the text is not very well transmitted. A preliminary collation of the sources shows great fluctuation: passages are left out, readings vary to a great degree, and passages are interchanged.

[A] A manuscript of unknown provenance obtained from Prof. Vesna Wallace's collection of photocopies.¹⁴⁶ The ms. is nearly complete; there are seven tripartite large-format folia available of what must have been no more than eight. Palaeographical features are reminiscent of features employed in the 11th century. The last folio, the recto only of which is inscribed is not part of this ms. I have not been able to identify the text with absolute certainty, but it seems to be a commentary on Buddhajñānapāda's *Caturāṅgasādhanā/Samantabhadra*.¹⁴⁷

[B] NAK 3/366 *vi. bauddhadarśana* 74 = NGMPP B 23/10. This ms. has 12 palm leaves measuring 32 x 4.5 cm, and contains some extra material,¹⁴⁸ which might point to its having been used as a composite codex in Nepal. One leaf worth of text (6^v-7^r) has not been photographed under this microfilm reel number. The ms. hails from Bengal/Bihar as it is dated to the 13th regnal year of Vighrahapāla (the 23rd day of Vaiśākha). This must be Vighrahapāla III (r. c. 1047-1073), hence the ms. dates from the second half of the eleventh century. It is recorded to have been the pious gift (*deyadharmā*) of one Viśuddhiśrījñāna, a monk. After the colophon there is a short appendix describing the codewords for the fingers extensively used in the text.¹⁴⁹ As I have already stated above, ms. A of the *Maṅḍalopāyikā* is a ms. from the same scriptorium, if not the work of the same scribe. Unless stated otherwise, this is the ms. referred to in the notes to the edition.

¹⁴⁶For which I offer Prof. Wallace my sincere thanks.

¹⁴⁷The terminology and process outlined is very similar to a fragment studied by TANAKA 1997.

¹⁴⁸Cf. TANEMURA 2004:4-5 (the *Kriyāsaṃgrahakārikā*), also some *mantras* of Cakrasamvara in a much later hand.

¹⁴⁹I give the full transcript here: *dakṣiṇakarasya tarjanī śvetā/ madhyamā dhūmā/ anāmikā śaṅkhā/ kaniṣṭhā padmā/ aṅguṣṭhaṃ jñānam// evaṃ vāmakarasya/ rocanā/ trimalā/ bhaṅgā/ bhūcchatrā/ vijñānasamjñakāḥ//*. The terminology is not present in the *tantra*, but first introduced in the *Maṅḍalopāyikā*.

[C] NAK 3/366 vi. *bauddha* 65 = NGMPP A 935/3 (duplicate A 1333/20), complete in 15 leaves. Once part of a composite codex. The ms. is not dated, but the hook-topped script is similar to other Nepalese mss. dating from the late 14th century. A librarian's scribble on 1^r and 2^r mysteriously identify [!?] this ms. as '*buddhacaritamahākāvya*'. Fol. 1^r contains three somewhat garbled verses in the same hand: two are *maṅgala*-verses in the *mālinī* metre, the third is an obeisance verse in *śārdūlavikrīḍita*. The second verse is a corrupt version of the verse (*sajalajalada*- etc.) also present in the *Kalpasādhana* ms. fragments. Fol. 15^v l. 3 onwards contains the beginning of another work seeking to elucidate the iconography of the cremation grounds according to an oral teaching.¹⁵⁰

[F₁] A long fragment (ff. 2, 3, 13-17, 20-21) of a manuscript once complete in 21 folia, is preserved in NAK 3/363 vi. *bauddhakarmakāṇḍa* 31 = NGMPP B 24/16 titled '*Yīgāmvarakalpasāadhanam*'.

[F₂] Another fragment (ff. 1, 4, and a damaged leaf) is to be found in TUL ms. no. 312 (old no. 230).

[T_D] Tōh. 1619, where it is attributed to one *Vijayendrasena, for details see SZÁNTÓ 2008c:4, n. 15. He is considered by at least one Tibetan authority to have been the disciple of Senavarman, who figures in the *Pañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman as the person who requested that the commentary be written. Translators are not given.

Title The colophon of ms. B has the form °*sāadhanopayikā*, I tacitly corrected the length of the syllable *-pā-*, although it is possible that the spelling is authentic. The *pratijñā* verse suggests that an alternative title could be conjectured: *Yogāmbarārādhana*.

Author The text is signed by Amitavajra (less likely: Asitavajra), but the Tibetan attribution is to one *Vijayendrasena. If my observations about the palaeographical features of ms. A are correct, he must have lived earlier than the 11th century, but in any case earlier than the late 11th century (the date of ms. B).

¹⁵⁰The introductory statement runs thus: *aniścitaśmaśānabhūmer niścayam ātmano[!] smaraṇānimittaṃ guruparvakramāyātaṃ vivariṣyāmi||*.

Contents The *maṅgala* verse pays respect to Yogāmbara as the leader of the coven of *yoginīs* (*yoginījālanāyakam*), and the statement of purpose describes the work as one teaching the propitiation of that deity according to the *Catuṣpīṭha*. In other words, that Yogāmbara is the main deity of the cult is already a *fait accompli* for this author. The practitioner is also described amongst other things as one who has obtained initiation according to the injunctions of the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

The *sādhana*, which is written in a mixture of verse and prose, has a tripartite structure.

The *Ādiyoga* section describes the preliminaries such as purifying the hand and the tongue (an archaic feature of the *yogatantras*), preparing the vessels used in worship, constructing the defenses, a preliminary *pūjā*, and several usual formulae. The section culminates with the visualization of oneself as Yogāmbara, who is manifested as if awakened by songs sung by four *yoginīs*. He is three-faced, seated, wearing a skull tiara, six-armed (holding a *vajrasceptre*, the breast of the consort, an arrow, a bell, a [skull-]bowl, and a bowl), and is embraced by his consort (i.e. Jñānaḍākinī, who is not even named here).

The *Maṅḍalarājāgrīsamādhi* is a more elaborate visualization, that of the entire extended pantheon in a palace upon mount Meru.

The *Atiyoga* section describes a long ritual program in which the transcendental deities are invited and merged with the visualized image. Further sets of *mantras* and *mudrās* are employed after they are imagined to take up their respective places, these are grouped under *samaya-*, *dharma-*, *karma-*, and *mahāmudrā* respectively. The text seems to be entirely ignorant of later speculations on these four *mudrās*, such as those in the influential works of Advayaṅgira. The deities are then worshipped and praised. The *yogin* is then instructed to cultivate the awareness of selflessness of all phenomena. When he is fatigued, he should again offer worship and *bali*, which is again accompanied by the singing of praises. He may then ask the deities anything he wishes. Then he should beg them for forgiveness in case any mistakes were made in worship and dismiss them: the ‘inner’ deities are reabsorbed into his body.

An appendix to the three parts is not named, but it certainly alludes to performing the *gaṇacakra* with the nectars. That rite finishes with the *ucchiṣṭabali/utsrṣṭabali*.

3.4.13 The *Yogāmbarasādhanavidhi* of Jagadānandajī-vabhadra

This *sādhana* is doubtless the most important text for the ritual worship of Yogāmbara from the late mediaeval period onwards. A large number of mss. survive in Nepal (however, not one on palm-leaf), which testifies to its importance and popularity. Most later Nepalese manuals are nothing more than excerpts from this work. At some point it was even enshrined as scripture (see *Yogāmbaramahātantra* above).

Sources

[A] NAK 3-290 *vi. bauddhatantra* 43 = NGMPP A 134/6, paper ff. 31 measuring 31 x 8 cm. The ms. is undated, probably rather modern, penned in the common Newar script. The scribe identifies himself as one Vajradhara. Space for illumination left empty on 1^v, but there is no image. This is a rather inferior witness.

[B] Kaiser Library 125 *vi. bauddhatantra* = NGMPP C 14/3, paper ff. 31, measuring 32.3 x 8.2 cm. The ms. is undated, modern, penned in the common Newari script. Although this ms. is already rather corrupt, it contains the best readings of all the witnesses I have consulted. All references are made to this manuscript.

[C] IASWR MBB-I-142. Paper, ff. 50, measuring 7 x 20 cm, penned in the common Newar script. The ms. is dated NS 979, 5th of the dark half of the *Pausa* month, Sunday. The date is verified for January 23, 1859 CE. In the Newar colophon the scribe identifies himself as *vajrācārya* Pūrṇānanda of the Makhaṃ Bāhā (most likely the Ratnakīrti *mahāvihāra* in Makhaṃ Tole, central Kathmandu).¹⁵¹ The library card describes the work thus: “To be a yogī how he should practice, is written in detail here.” This is also a late and unreliable witness.

[D] IASWR MBB-III-5. Paper, ff. 54 measuring 18 x 6 cm. The copy is rather modern, in the common Newar script. The first folio and an unknown number of folios from the end are missing, hence it cannot be deter-

¹⁵¹On which see LOCKE 1985:282-284.

mined whether the copy was dated. The library card misidentifies the work as the ‘*Catupīṭhavr̥hatmahātantra*’ and describes the work thus: “Meditation on Ātmapīṭha”. This is also a late and corrupt witness.

[E] Āśā Saphū Kājī Archives (sic!) 994 (sic!), reported in PANDEY 1990:147-148, item 18. It is described as having ff. 62 on Nepali paper, 22.5 x 7.5 cm. Dated NS 994, 1st of the dark half of the *Āṣāḍha* month = 1874 CE. The copy is reported to have been in Dharmaratna *vajrācārya*’s personal collection; an additional note reports an apograph (of this work?) in Jagannāth Upādhyāya’s collection, now in the Śāntarākṣita Library of the CIHTS. The *mudrā* descriptions from this work form the basis of an article in *Dhīh* vol. 1. I cannot locate such a ms. under the given number, and I am constrained to think that Pandey has mistakenly given the date of the ms. (NS 994) as the catalogue number. The ms. he might be talking about is Asha Saphu Kuti 3387, a microfilm copy of which is also to be found in Nagoya as Takaoka DH 262. The description, length and date match exactly the data supplied by Pandey, and there is also a stamp identifying the same *vajrācārya* as the owner. The fact that the stamp also contains the institution of which the owner was a member has not reported: this is the Surataśrī *mahāvihāra*, that is to say the Takṣe Bāhā just off Asan Tol in central Kathmandu.¹⁵² On the whole the ms. is quite corrupt.

[F] A fragment reported and transcribed in its entirety in PANDEY 1997:87-89, item 34. Only 4 paper ff. survive, these are numbered 2-5,¹⁵³ penned in Newar script. Pandey notes that he obtained the fragment from a ms. bundle containing a *Catuṣpīṭhatantraṭīkā*, but he does not tell us which. He also states that this fragment he entitled ‘*Adhiṣṭhānamantrāḥ*’ has nothing to do with that work and leaves the question open whether the work is complete or not. It is not, and it does have something to do with the exegesis of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, inasmuch as it is a fragment from one of the most popular *sādhanas* associated with that text.

¹⁵²See LOCKE 1985:298-300. Note that the Nagoya copy does not yet bear this stamp, which has presumably been added during the efforts of the ASK to collect privately-held mss.

¹⁵³Pandey is either guessing the numbers or he does not respect them, since some text is transcribed out of sequence.

[G] NAK 4-954 *vi. bauddhakarmakhāṇḍa* 484 = NGMPP A 129-26, paper, ff. 42 measuring 25.5 x 8.5 cm. Dated NS 991, 9th of the dark half of the *Bhādra* month = 1871 CE. Penned in the common Newar script. In the Newar colophon the scribe identifies himself as *vajrācārya* Vividhiratna (sic for Vidhiratna?) of the Maitrīpura *mahāvihāra* (this is most likely the Kwā Bāhā of Kathmandu).¹⁵⁴ As in the case of ms. A, some space is left empty for an illumination on 1^v, but there is no image. Although carefully written and very legible, this is also an inferior copy.

[H] Asha Saphu Kutī 3933, of which an earlier microfilm copy is in the Buddhist Library Nagoya, Takaoka DH 125. The ms. is on paper ff. 48 measuring 28.5 x 9.5 cm. It is undated, probably modern, penned in the common Newar script. As in the case of ms. E, this also bears the stamp of having been owned by Dharmaratna *vajrācārya* of the Surataśrī *mahāvihāra*. Although again a late and inferior copy, this is the only ms. among those that I have thus far consulted which shares a common ancestor with the best ms., B.

[I] TUL no. 310 (old no. 307), paper ff. 65 measuring 19 x 7 cm. The ms. is undated, modern, in the common Newar script by two different hands (1-24, 24-end respectively). This is again an inferior copy.

[J] TUL no. 311 (old no. 460), paper ff. 18 measuring 20 x 6 cm. The ms. is incomplete, modern, penned in the common Newar script. This is another rather inferior copy.

There are doubtless many more copies of this work (e.g. NAK 4/2159 = A 141/2, ff. 63, dated NS 969 = 1849 CE) to which I have no access at present. Except mss. B and H, all witnesses I have consulted stem from an already faulty exemplar characterized by a substantial omission at the very beginning, affecting most of the *karasodhana* section up to the section on the *argha* offering. In spite of the relatively great number of Sanskrit mss. for this work, one of the best sources for an eventual edition is the Tibetan translation, which was undertaken only a generation after the text was written.

¹⁵⁴See LOCKE 1985:269-270.

[**T_D**] Tōh. 1611. The translators' colophon¹⁵⁵ here is extremely useful, as it is the only source to shed some light on the identity of the author. We are told that the Sanskrit manuscript (*rgya dpe*) which formed the basis of the translation was obtained from the chief disciple or son (the term *sras kyi thu bo* is ambivalent), Mahābodhi, of the author himself, who is said to have been Jagadānandajīvabhadrā, a Nepalese (*Bal po*). The Tibetan individuals mentioned in this colophon cannot be identified with certainty. The translation is said to have been prepared on the orders of 'Phags pa (1235-1280) at Sa skya. The first translator gives his name in Sanskrit, Matidhvajaśrībhadra, that is to say Blo gros rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po. This could be one of Dpang lo's students rather than 'Phags pa himself; his dates are known to have been 1294-1376. The second translator, Smra ba'i seng ge, here calls himself a disciple of Byang chub rtse mo. These two prominent individuals lived between 1367-1449 and 1303-1380 respectively. The dates obviously do not match and I have no explanation for this discrepancy. The question of precise dating should therefore remain open for the time being.

There are signs of some revision work: on 95^r we find this somewhat unusual note: 'di dang 'og gi yas (= *phyag?*) rgya'i skangs (= *skabs?*) kyi sngags gnyis ma 'grigs pa slar dpyad byar bzhag, prompting the reader to a discrepancy of *mantras* with another set given earlier in the text. It is, however, equally possible that this is not a sign of revision, but rather a note for eventual revisers. This note is present only in the Derge edition, the Peking editors seem to have omitted it.

Title I have extracted the title from ms. B. Other possible titles include *Yogāmbaravidhi* and *Yogāmbarārādhanavidhi*. Most colophons seem to state that the subject-matter was extracted from the *ātmapīṭha* of the '*Catuspīṭha-brāhmanmahātantra*'. However, in the *Catuspīṭha* we have, most of the subject-

¹⁵⁵103^v: . . . 'di ni Bal po'i paṇḍi ta chen po Dza ga ta ā nanda dzī ba bha dras mdzad pa rdzogs so || || sgrub thabs 'di nyid dang mthun pa'i bka' lung sngon chad Bod du mi snang ba las | Dza ga ta ā nanda'i sras kyi thu bo | paṇḍi ta Ma hā bo dhi las legs par mnos shing | bka' lung mi 'chad par bya ba'i don du | paṇḍi ta'i phyag nas rgya dpe gdan drang zhing | bka' lung don du gnyer ba mang pos kyang gsol ba 'debs pa'i ngor | gsung rab dgongs 'grel dang bcas pa'i bka' lung man ngag du mas nye bar spras pa'i dge ba'i bshes gnyen dam pa bla ma 'Phags pa'i bkas bskul ba la brten nas kham s gsum gyi bla ma dus gsum gyi sangs rgyas thams cad kyi ngo bo chos kyi rje | bod kyi paṇḍi ta Ma ti dhwa dza shrī bha dra dang | dpal ldan Byang chub rtse mo'i bka' drin gyis bskyangs pa'i lo tsā ba'i ming tsaṃ 'dzin pa dpal ldan Smra ba'i seng ges tshig dang don gyi cha la legs par dpyad nas | dpal Sa skya'i gtsug lag khang chen por legs par bsgyur ba'o ||

matter used here is in the third sub-chapter of the *parapīṭha*. It is possible that the tradition or perhaps the author himself thought that the scriptural source is one of the two Ur-*tantras*.

Author Most of our information for Jagadānandajīvabhadra comes from the Tibetan colophon discussed above. 'Gos Gzhon nu dpal mentions this name in a lineage list, specifying that he hailed from Ye rang, that is to say Patan/Lalitpur.¹⁵⁶ The fountainhead for this lineage is Jagaddarpaṇa, who must have lived in the 13th century, since he draws heavily on Abhayākaragupta's work, and because the earliest known ms. of his chief work, the *Kriyāsamuccaya*, is dated 1305 CE.¹⁵⁷ The source of (or a sibling to) 'Gos lo's lineage-list is extant in Sanskrit on the last folio of another *Kriyāsamuccaya* ms., Kaiser Library 110 = NGMPP C 11/6 – C 12/1.¹⁵⁸ Here too more than a dozen individuals are listed between Jagaddarpaṇa and our author. The lineage closes with Jagadānandajīvabhadra but one: he is followed by one Munīndrajīvamahābodhibhadrapāda, doubtless the same with Mahābodhi, the chief disciple/son mentioned by the Tibetan colophon. All our data seems to point to the 14th century as the most likely *floruit* for our author.

Contents The work is mainly in verse. In essence it is an extended reworking of the *Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā*. It follows the same tripartite structure with some differences. The *Ādiyoga* section for example includes a *cittaśodhana* before the purification of the hand and the tongue, other items in the ritual sequence such as the empowerment of offerings are placed in a different way, and some further visualizations are included in addition, but there is no change in the essentials, nor the form of *Yogāmbara*. The *Maṇḍalarājāgrī* section merges the eponymous section from Amitavajra with the invitation of the *jñānacakra* and the application of the four *mudrās*. The *mudrās* are described more extensively, but not more esoterically. At the same time the visualization of the *maṇḍala* in this section is significantly extended with a passage on delineating the *rajomaṇḍala* and its measurements. The next section is renamed the *Karmarājāgrīsamādhi* and includes specifications on

¹⁵⁶ROERICH [& DGE 'DUN CHOS 'PHEL] 1949:1045.

¹⁵⁷Cf. BANDURSKI 1994:77.

¹⁵⁸This ms. is said to date from NS 511 = 1391 CE (e.g. MORIGUCHI 1998:67), but in actual fact the text where this date is given is penned in a different hand to that of the main scribe.

japa and *prāṇāyama* according to the rite the *yogin* wishes to accomplish. The section closes with offering *argha* and the dismissal of deities. The passages that make up the *Atiyoga* in Amitavajra are adopted, but not grouped under that heading. The unnamed section in the *Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā* is also pasted here.

3.4.14 The Kalpasādhana (anonymous) with fragments

Sources A ms. which was complete in nine folia (fol. 4 missing) is scattered across NAK 3/363 *vi. bauddhakarmakāṇḍa* 31 = NGMPP B 24/16 titled ‘*Yīgāmvarakalpasādhanam*’. This collection of works has 36 leaves in total and is penned in a variety of scribal hands resembling mss. from the 12th to the 14th centuries. A fragment partially making up for the loss of fol. 4 in the previous ms. can be found on a single stray folio (a fol. 2) in TUL ms. 312¹⁵⁹ (i.e. the ‘*Ratnamālā*’, see below). No Tibetan translation is known to me.

This ms. bundle, penned perhaps in the 12th century, is very rich in fragments, including Amitavajra’s work and Jitāri’s *Catustattva*, for descriptions of which see above.

Title The title I have given above is a simplification of the one given in the colophon which reads: *āryaYogā{ra}mbarabhaṭṭārakasya kalpasādhanam samāptam//*

Contents The work opens with a *maṅgala*-verse in the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre, describing the iconographical features of Yogāmbara:

*prajñopāyasukhodbhavo nirupamo jñānāṅganāliṅgito
dambholiṃ dadhataḥ payodharaśaram ghaṇṭāṃ karoṭam dhanuḥ/
dvātriṃśadvaravīravīriṇicatuhṣaṣṭiprakārai[r]vṛtaś
cakreśo gaṇadākinīparivṛto Yogāmbaraḥ pātu vaḥ//*

The text then proceeds to describe what seems to be a daily *sādhana*. After the necessary purifications he should go to a/the chapel (*mantrī devagrhaṃ praviśed*) and gratify the deities. This seems to be a significant

¹⁵⁹Starts with *-vivareṇa sarva-*.

detail inasmuch as it suggests that worship takes place in a permanent setting as opposed to itinerant practitioners taking up temporary residence in cremation grounds.

Customary introductory elements such as confessing sins (*pāpadeśanā*), rejoicing in merit (*puṇyānumodanā*) and so forth are here linked with visualizations and breath control, an esoteric feature unique among the *sādhana*s of this tradition. A further esoteric feature is the equation of the eight inner goddesses with tubes (*nāḍī*). Curiously, the names are the same as the code-words for the fingers in Amitavajra's *sādhana* and other texts: *śvetā*, *dhūmā*, *śaṅkhā*, *padmā*, *rocanā*, *trmalā*, *bhaṅgā*, and *bhūcchatrā*.

The visualization of the *maṇḍala* is slightly odd. First the practitioner is instructed to imagine the core of the *maṇḍala* with Yogāmbara embracing his consort surrounded by the eight inner goddesses. Then a long passage about the subsidiary deities is given only to be followed by a more detailed series of instructions about the visualization of the twelve goddesses (without Jñāna-ḍākinī). The passages setting out the iconographical details seek to emulate the language of the *tantra*. The *yogin* should then grasp the *vajra* and the bell with the appropriate mantras, and offer worship with the five *upacāras*, the five *amṛtas*, and the five *aṅkuśas*. This is followed by the twentyfold worship (*viṃśatipūjā*, cf. *Catuspīṭha* 2.3.87ff.), sung praises (= 2.3.108-116), and the offering of *bali*. Worship closes with the recitation of two *praṇidhāna* verses (= 2.3.170-171), and the dismissal of the deities. The *yogin* may then do as he pleases (*tataḥ sthāpayed* (understand: *tiṣṭhed*) *yathāsukham*), i.e. he can see to his worldly activities.

There are several glosses in a second hand. These fall into two categories: some are explanatory (e.g. on 1^v *mukhādisaṃśodhanā*^o is glossed with *mukhe pañcāmṛtaguṭiko*, ^o *susnāto* with *jñānakṣālitah*; on 2^v *sthāne* is explained as *prajñāpadmodare*, and *arbuda*^o as *saṃvṛtabodhicittam*), whereas some seek to standardize the author's peculiar Sanskrit (e.g. on 2^r *mantriṇaḥ* is made to be understood as the subject by the gloss *mantri*).

Further to the *Kalpasādhana* the manuscript bundle contains the following works:

*Jñāneśvarīsādhana (anonymous)

Source The first half-folio of this text is in NAK 3/363 vi. *bauddhakarmakāṇḍa* 31 = NGMPP B 24/16 titled 'Yīgāmvarakalpasāadhanam'. There is no

Tibetan translation.

Title I have reconstructed the title from the *pratijñā* verse given below.

Contents Only the beginning of this *sādhana* seems to have survived. The employed terminology and the first described procedure (to wit, the *karaśodhanavidhi*) suggest a later date of composition. The obeisance and *pratijñā* verses are as follows:

*sarvabhāvamalātītāṃ sahajānandarūpiṇīm/
mahāsukharatāṃ devīm vande [']haṃ mokṣadāyinīm//
śrīmat-Jñāneśvarīm natvā prajñopāyātmikāṃ parām/
tatsādhanam ahaṃ vacmi mūlatantrānusārataḥ//*

A possible penultimate folio of this work might be in the same bundle. This leaf¹⁶⁰ begins with the end of a hymn addressing the goddesses. After reciting the dedicatory verses the deities beginning with Jñānaḍākinī are dismissed by resorption into the practitioner's body, who then offers worship and presents the *ucchiṣṭabali*.

Further fragments

The text on a fol. 4^v (not part of the *Kalpasādhana*) quotes two diverging views on the colour of some goddesses: that of Bṛhadbhaṭṭa, and that of Kalyāṇavarman. Bṛhadbhaṭṭa is undoubtedly a variant for Bhavabhaṭṭa. Before this passage the author alludes to unnamed previous masters.

Some further stray folia contain rites of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. Their topic and manner of description are similar but not identical to the *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanaśamkṣepa* described above.

Four such folia¹⁶¹ describe the *bali* rite. With the inner *maṇḍala* visualized, the *yogin* should imagine the outer assembly beginning with Kṛṣṇarudra. He then invites the *jñānamaṇḍala* into what must have been the previously imagined *samayamaṇḍala*, worships them with red *upacāras*, and the twenty-fold

¹⁶⁰Numbering is damaged. The folio begins with *pravaraḍāyine Cūṣiṇī ca*.

¹⁶¹The first begins with + + + + *maṇḍalapravṛtte*, the second with *-ṣataḥ/ kṛṣṇarudram*, the third with + + + + *mūlamantrasahitena*, and the fourth with *((ga))ṇadūte dhūmāṅgārī*. The numbering is damaged.

pūjā. He then recites the *ekavṛkṣamantra* and the *balimantra*. What follows is similar to the rite of tasting the *amṛtas* in the context of the *gaṇacakra*. The fourth folio seems to contain the end of the *balividhi*, and the beginning of preparations for the *homa*.

One folio¹⁶² describes a *kumārīpūjā* adapted to the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The fact that this ritual is here related to the cult can be determined from a reference to the *ekavṛkṣamantra*, and a marginal annotation, a *mantra* for inducing possession (OM A AM JÑĀNADĀKINI HŪM AVATARA 2 SVĀHĀ| ADHIṢṬHĀ-NAMANTRA), presumably with the aim of using the virgin as an oracle. The passage is closed by a corrupt section-colophon: *iti yoginī ete cakrayoginīpūjā*. The reverse of the folio contains four verses, one mentioning ‘donors’ (*dāna-patīnām*). It is not clear to me how these are related to the ritual.

On the last folio of Amitavajra’s work there are two further fragments. The first is a short *prayoga* describing a spell identified as the *śṛgālabalimantra* promising ‘great accomplishment’. The second is a *maṅgala*-verse in the *mālinī* metre describing Yogāmbara:

sajalajaladanīlah svābhavidyāṅgasaṅgaḥ
śarakuliśakucāgravyagraavyatrihastah|
dhanunṛkavaramaṇḍāśliṣṭavāmatridoṣṇas
trimukhaviṣamanetraḥ pātu Yogāmbaro vah||

Perhaps this was the beginning of another work, but since the obeisance-formula before the verse is lacking, I find it more likely that the stanza served simply to fill up the scribal *horror vacui*.

3.4.15 The Ratnamālā (anonymous) with fragments

Source The sole source for this text is an incomplete Sanskrit ms. in the composite codex catalogued under the title ‘*Yogāmbarīsādhana ratnamālā*’ in TUL, no. 312 (old no. 230).¹⁶³ This collection of texts has 36 palm leaves in total. The script is almost uniform throughout, and is very similar to that of the *Yogāmbarīprabheda*. The exact number of folios extant for the present

¹⁶²Begins with *((kṣa))yanīyaśalākayā*.

¹⁶³Cf. MATSUNAMI 1965:113, where only this work is identified with two fragments. This description can now be improved upon.

work is difficult to determine, but for the time being I propose that of what must have been twenty leaves we have the following extant: 1-6, 8, 11-12, 15-19.¹⁶⁴ No Tibetan translation of this work is known to me.

Title The title *Yogāmbārīsādhanaratnamālā* is specified both in the opening and closing verses which I give below. The abbreviation is for convenience's sake.

Author The author does not name himself in the extant portion of the text, but he provides an essential clue, namely that he was a disciple of Kalyāṇavarman, who is most likely the same as the author of the *Pañjikā*. The author also seems to state that this guru composed a text called *Catuṣpīthasamādhiratna*. The *pratijñā*-verses (the metres are *upendravajrā* and *upajāti*) run as follows:

*praṇamya Nāgārjunam Āryadevaṃ
guruṃ ca¹⁶⁵ sa[r]vāṅgasamarpaṇena |
tadaṃhrisaṃvāhanapūṇyalabdhaṃ
mayā Catuṣpīthasamādhiratnam //*

*jagaddhitārthaṃ pravibhaktum icchan
Yogāmbārīsādhanaratnamālām |
karomi cārukramabandharamyām
bhāsvatprayogāmalaratnarājim //*

The reading *āryavarma+ gu((ru))ñ ca* is unacceptable in my view. First, the author knew his Sanskrit and would not have used *āryavarmaṃ* as an Accusative. Second, the lineage-head Nāgārjuna-Āryadeva is well-attested elsewhere in this corpus. Third, this script can easily confuse *-de-* with *-va-*, which might have been the source of the suspected corruption. The identity of the thus anonymous *guru* is revealed in the closing verses (the metres are *upajāti*, *indravajrā*, and *upajāti* respectively):

¹⁶⁴I am referring to fol. 1 starting with *namo yogāmbārīṇe*, fol. 2 starting with *-malam ākalayya*, fol. 3 starting with *-tnāgryalokeśā-*, fol. 4 starting with *-raṃ puṇḍarīkam*, fol. 5 starting with *ity anayā*, fol. 6 starting with *vijāṇīae*, fol. 8 starting with *pratyāliḍhāsana*, fol. 11 starting with *darśayet*, fol. 12 starting with *-cūṣiṇṣu*, fol. 15 starting with *vajrāñ-jalim*, fol. 16 starting with *-pāla kulīśapāla*, fol. 17 starting with *svāhā*, fol. 18 starting with *kulīśaṃ mahat*, and fol. 19 starting with *-nna san*.

¹⁶⁵° *devaṃ guruṃ ca*] conj., ° *varma+ gu((ru))ñ ca* Ms

*Nepālabhūbhūṣaṇabhūtamūrṭi[ṃ]
gambhīratāntrārṇavadr̥ṣṭigopam /
VarmāntaKalyāṇapadābhīdhānaṃ
gurum gaṛyānsam upāśya yena¹⁶⁶ //*

*śrīmacCatuḥpīṭham upāṅgam uktaṃ
durbodhamudraṃ kramagopitārtham /
astaṃ samastaṃ sunigūḍhamantraṃ
śrutvābhīyogān adhigamya¹⁶⁷ samyak //*

*satsaṃpradāyoparatiprasaṅgān¹⁶⁸
mayā¹⁶⁹ nibaddhāṃ praḡṇakrameṇa /
kurvantu kaṇṭhe sudhīyaḥ sadaināṃ¹⁷⁰
Yogāmbarīsā- . . .¹⁷¹*

It is very tempting to identify the anonymous author with Senavarman, whose entreaty is mentioned at the outset of Kalyāṇavarman's commentary. There is one difficulty, however, in accepting this Kalyāṇavarman as identical with the commentator. Whereas Kalyāṇavarman is entirely silent about Yogāmbara, this text shown signs of the superimposition already in place.

Be that as it may, we can extract the following historical information: Kalyāṇavarman was considered as the upholder of the lineage starting with [pseudo-]Nāgārjuna and [pseudo-]Āryadeva. He is spoken of very highly as the 'ornament of the land of Nepal' and 'defender of the Doctrine of the deep sea of *tantras*', epithets worthy of a royal chaplain or a famous pontiff. He was the author of a *sādhana* called *Catuspīṭhasamādhiratna*, which was in need of an elaboration, the very task that our author set out for himself.

Contents The work is extremely rich in ritual details. Unfortunately, the uncertain number of folia and the lack of a parallel ms. or a Tibetan translation makes it difficult to determine what was originally part of the text.

¹⁶⁶ *yena*] conj., *yatnataḥ* Ms. Although *yatnataḥ* fits the sense, it is unmetrical. My tentative conjecture fits the metre and should be construed with *uktaṃ* in the next verse.

¹⁶⁷ ° *ābhīyogān adhigamya*] conj., ° *ābhīyogāṃ dadhigamya* Ms

¹⁶⁸ I thank Prof. Isaacson for this conjecture. The ms. reads *satsaṃpadāyoraṭiḥ prasa +*, a reading that has puzzled me for some time.

¹⁶⁹ *mayā*] conj., + *yā* Ms

¹⁷⁰ *sadaināṃ*] em., *sadenāṃ* Ms

¹⁷¹ The context and the metrical pattern would fit 'Yogāmbarīsādhānaratnamālām' perfectly.

The practitioner is mentioned as a *yogin* who has obtained initiation into the ‘great *tantra* of the *Catuṣpīṭha*’. The prescription for the place mentions a meditation-pavilion (*dhyānamandira*), suggesting a settled lifestyle.

The description of the *ādīyoga* (continuous up to 6^r) is sufficiently close to Amitavajra’s description and does need a separate examination. What follows most likely describes the beginning of the *anuyoga* and the *mahāyoga* (end on 15^r, which is quite likely to be part of this text). The next stage, the *atīyoga* describes offering the four kinds of *bali* (for the deities, the *nāgas*, the *yakṣas*, and the *bhūtas*).

The following rites seem to be a sort of appendix, the reason being that they are perhaps not be performed on a daily basis. These include offering the five nectars and five meats in the *gaṇacakra* (although this is not explicitly stated, 17^r-18^r), the rite of fashioning the rosary, the proper way of reciting spells (18^r-18^v), and offering the *ucchiṣṭabali* when the practitioner is fatigued by recitation (18^v-19^r). The closing rituals include singing praises, dedicating merit, and dismissing the deities. The short instruction describing what the practitioner should do after the ritual suggests that he is a religious specialist (19^v): *samutthāya pustakavācanacaitīyakarmajapahomādīkam ucitam ācaran vihared iti*||.

Catuṣpīṭhasamādhiratna [?]

Since the ms. containing the *Ratnamālā* is a composite codex, perhaps it would not be unreasonable to suspect that they were transmitted together, and that some of the disparate fragments in the same bundle are from his master’s basic text. I see one likely candidate, a fragment entirely in verse (ff. numbered 6, 7, and possibly 9 as well¹⁷²). This text must have followed a similar, although not identical, structure to that of the *Ratnamālā* since on 7^v a section colophon closes the *anuyoga* (*īty anuyogo maṇḍalarājāgrī nāma samādhīḥ*) and the beginning of the new chapter which sets out the purification of implements for *pūjā* or *bali* is announced as *atīyoga*.

¹⁷²I am referring to fol. 6 starting with *buddhameghaughapañcakam*, fol. 7 starting with *-dhye ca koṇṇesu*, and fol. 9 starting with *tām eva mudrām*.

Fragment with apabhraṃśa quotations

A series of five folia (numbered 8, 9, 10, 12, 13¹⁷³) in the same codex are part of what must have been a *sādhana* combined with exegetical bits in places. The peculiarity of this text is that it contains a variety of *apabhraṃśa* quotations. In its present state the text is quite corrupt but it must have been a work from an author not devoid of learning.

Fol. 8 begins with the end of a section describing a meditation procedure. The *yogin* should firmly believe that all phenomena are nothing but his mind (*svacittamātram eva*), and he should behold that mind as ‘the great bliss that is nothing but light’ (*prakāśamātramahāsukham*), similar to the endless sky (*anantakham iva*), homogenous (*samarasam*), untainted (*nirlepam*), and uninterrupted (*nirantaram*). The passage ends with an *apabhraṃśa* verse and a section colophon: *iti vajrakomçikā*[sic for *-kuñcikā?*]*vidhānas tṛtīyaḥ*||.

The next section (fol. 8^r-9^v) describes a kind of subtle *yoga*. The practitioner should enter his meditation pavilion (*dhyānālaya*), execute the preliminaries, and visualize himself as Jñānaḍākinī. The meditation described involves the visualization of syllables in the navel-*cakra* (here alluded to as *nirmāṇābhidhāna*). He should maintain the visualization until he perceives signs of success (*nimitta*, listed as per *Samājottara* 150cd-151). He may then apply the same visualization to other parts of the body in order to obtain supernatural powers linked to that organ: divine sight if applied to the eyes, poetic talent if applied to the neck, etc. The passage ends with an *apabhraṃśa* verse and a section colophon: *iti jñānakaṇṭhikā*[sic!]*vi + + turthah*||.

The longest extant section (9^r-10^v, 12^r-13^r) is a detailed syllable-for-syllable commentary on the first verse of the *ekavṛkṣamantra* (= 2.3.147). Each word from OM to *mātaṅga* is analyzed (sometimes in more than one way) by attributing a concept to each syllable. E.g. the four syllables of *ekavṛkṣa* are homologized with the four *brahmavihāras*, the four *bindus*, etc. Each explanation is closed by an *apabhraṃśa* verse.

The last extant passage (13^r-13^v) is an iconographical description of the original *maṇḍala* and the outer *maṇḍala* beginning with Kṛṣṇarudra. Yogāmbara is not mentioned at all, hence the work might stem from an early date.

¹⁷³I am referring to the following: fol. 8 begins with *-laṃ sthiraçala-*, fol. 9 begins with *śrotrasarva-*, fol. 10 begins with *-śūnyatā-*, fol. 12 begins with *dhanādi aṅgaṃ*, fol. 13 begins with *-rghā samutthitāṃ*.

Further fragments

The same composite codex contains further fragments of ritual texts, but the text on most of these is too general for any identification to be made.¹⁷⁴

A fol. 3¹⁷⁵ begins with the *mudrās* and *mantras* for the *pañcopacārapūjā* and the preliminary *bali*. It is followed by the customary verses recited in taking refuge, awakening *bodhicitta*, etc.

A fol. 10¹⁷⁶ begins with the end of a description for the extended *maṇḍala*, and goes on with the invitation of the *jñānamaṇḍala*. The text contains an *apabhraṃśa* song not found elsewhere, *mudrās*, *mantras*, etc.

A fol. 13¹⁷⁷ might perhaps be from the same text. It begins with a *mantra* and a *mudrā* identified as those to be displayed for the *lokottara* deities. It goes on with the twenty-fold *pūjā*, an *apabhraṃśa* song and some verses reminiscent of, but not identical to, the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* (perhaps they are from the *Paramādya*).

A damaged fol. 14¹⁷⁸ contains a description of a *gaṇacakra*. This was the last folio of what must have been an initiation manual, since it ends with the injunction that coloured powders and other implements should be cast into a river. The colophon is damaged: *śrīmat-mahā . . .*

3.4.16 Selected Nepalese Works

Several paper manuscripts related to the worship of Yogāmbara survive in Nepal. I cannot of course claim that I have traced every single one of them, but as far as I can tell from the sample at my disposal, they are for the most part condensed versions of Amitavajra's and Jagadānanda-jīva-bhadra's longer manuals.

The *Yogāmbara-pūjā* (NAK 5-221 = NGMPP A 129/27, paper, ff. 7, common Newar script) is a case in point, since it even adopts the obeisance verse from the *Yogāmbarasādhana-pāyikā*. The work is incomplete as it breaks off having concluded with *nyāsa*. The text essentially extracts the names of the

¹⁷⁴The ms. is rich in identifiable fragments as well, these are discussed under the appropriate headings: the *Ekavṛkṣādīpañjikā*, the *Sādhana-pāyikā*, the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, and the *Kalpasādhana*.

¹⁷⁵Starts with *oṃ hūṃ svāhā*.

¹⁷⁶Starts with *-riṃ/ uttaradvāri*.

¹⁷⁷Starts with *tikṣṇe svāhā*.

¹⁷⁸Starts with *-ve pralambayet*.

deities and the *mantras* from the above-mentioned work and gives short ritual instructions, sometimes in Newar.

The *Yogāmbaramukhākhyāna* (NAK 4-258 = NGMPP 119/14, paper, ff. 8, common Newar script, also calls itself the *Devatāghorapañjikā* in the colophon) is compiled much along the same lines as the *Yogāmbara*, except that the first five verses are adopted from the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* and the text is occasionally augmented with verses from other scriptures (e.g. *Guhyasamāja* 2.9 = *Piṇḍīkramasādhana* 16). The text also survives in a palm-leaf witness, but in fact this is a palimpsest.¹⁷⁹

There are several works circulating with the title *Yogāmbarasamādhi*. A composite codex, NAK 4-1031 = NGMPP A 128/17 (paper, ff. 14, common Newar script, with an illumination portraying a single Yogāmbara) also contains what the colophon calls an *āryayogāmbarakālacakradhāraṇītantra*,¹⁸⁰ in actual effect a collection of *mantras* and short instructions. Part of this ms. (34^r-45^v) or a similar one has also been published with instructions in Newar.¹⁸¹ This text is also heavily indebted to Amitavajra's and Jagadānanda-jīvabhadra's work.

3.4.17 Selected Tibetan Works

Although the *Catuspīṭha* was not unknown in Tibet, it could never attain the kind of success seen with other *yoginītantras* (first and foremost the *Hevajra* and the *Śaṃvara* cycles) or the *Kālacakra*. The teachings that originally belonged to the *Catuspīṭha* exerted their influence indirectly, through the *Samputa* and perhaps even more importantly through Abhayākaragupta's exegesis on that text, i.e. the *Āmnāyamañjarī*. Nevertheless, consulting some samples of *Catuspīṭha* literature is not without use.

¹⁷⁹My identification of this text has already been published in SFERRA 2008:55, item 13. Since then Prof. Sferra has traced the ms. in the Kaiser Library, no. 584 (= NGMPP C 114/9).

¹⁸⁰There are several other mss. containing *dhāraṇīs* attributed to Yogāmbara and/or Jñānaḍākinī (Buddhist Library Nagoya Dh 100, *ibid.* Dh 297).

¹⁸¹*Vajrayāna pūjāvidhi saphu* ed. by the Vajrācārya pūjāvidhi adhyayana samiti, NS 1128 (= 2008 CE). I thank Iain Sinclair for pointing out this publication to which he has also significantly contributed.

Bu ston Rin chen grub

Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290-1364), an extremely prolific and defining author, has a mere two works in vol. Ja of his *Gsung 'bum*.

The *Gdan bzhi'i rkang stabs bco brgyad pa* is probably nothing more than a memorandum dealing with the postures described in *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.4.81-98 and Bhavabhaṭṭa's notes on these verses. In spite of the title the work goes on to describe the twenty-fold worship as given in 2.3.87-106, again with little more than rehashing the *Nibandha*.¹⁸² The final section deals with further postures, but this time the source in the 6th ch. of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (Caryāvratīpāda recension).¹⁸³

The longer work, a 23-folio *sādhana* called *Mi brjed par dran byed*, is based on the extended *maṇḍala*, and is little else than a compilation of canonical Indic sources as listed in the colophon. Perhaps the most interesting feature of this text is that Bu ston occasionally (e.g. 16^r) refers to multiple translations ('*gyur*) of the *tantra*, to readings in Indian manuscripts (*rgya dpe*) and that he lists the lineage the text reached him in a prayer to the *guruparamparā*.¹⁸⁴

Bo dong Phyogs las rnam rgyal

Perhaps the most prolific Tibetan author ever, Bo dong Phyogs las rnam rgyal (1376–1451) was also the most productive *Catuṣpīṭha* author, indeed, perhaps the only one to have given serious attention to the cycle. The author almost fell into oblivion in Tibet, and it is only recently that his impressive body of work (published as *Encyclopaedia Tibetica*) has received greater attention.

I have already mentioned above his *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (ET vol. 108, pp. 1-117), which in fact is a variant translation of the Caryāvratīpāda recension. He is also the author of an *upadeśa*, in reality a *sādhana* text (*ibid.*, pp. 371-593), another *sādhana* (vol. 109, pp. 1-329), a consecration manual based on *Catuṣpīṭha* deities (vol. 110, 1-73), a *homa* manual (*ibid.*, pp. 75-163), a shorter *sādhana* (vol. 112, pp. 271-447), a condensed *sādhana* (*ibid.*,

¹⁸²Ad 2.3.106 he cites the views of other authors: Kṛṣṇācārya's commentary to the *Kṛṣṇayamāri*, a Sanskrit ms. (unclear whether this is the *Nibandha* or the above-mentioned work), and the oral authority of the Kashmiri *paṇḍita*, Sumanaśrī, whom Bu ston claims to have personally consulted on the question of what a *kāhāla* is.

¹⁸³Here too he refers to consulted Indian pandits: Sumanaśrī and one Madanācārya, who seemed to have disagreed on some minutiae.

¹⁸⁴17^r -17^v. The 'Indic' side of the lineage is: Vajradhara, Vajrapāṇi, Jñānaḍākinī, Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Tilopa, and Nāro. The propagation in Tibet begins with Mar pa.

pp. 447-475), a longer initiation manual (*ibid.*, pp. 475-605), and a shorter initiation manual (*ibid.*, pp. 605-659). But most importantly he also wrote a commentary to the *mūla* (vol. 109, pp. 119-369), to my knowledge he is the only Tibetan author to have done so. Although the commentary relies heavily on the known Indian exegesis, he frequently voices his disagreement with Bhavabhaṭṭa.

3.4.18 Works compiled or copied by Amṛtānanda for B. H. Hodgson

A rather special corpus relating to the *Catuṣpīṭha* is that of texts compiled or copied by Amṛtānanda for the British resident at the court of Nepal, Brian Houghton Hodgson (1801-1894). The mss. examined below are now at the British Library.¹⁸⁵ The numbers given in the sources are as follows: first the item no. given by F. W. Thomas in his catalogue;¹⁸⁶ next the old no. of the India Office as per the same catalogue; and finally the vol. no. and page nos. where they can be presently located.

Jñāneśvarīmaṇḍala

Source IOL 7738; Hodgson 31/3e; vol. 27, p. 56.

Title The page is headed by a note: ‘*jñāneśvarīmaṇḍalam|| 13 mūrṭṭayah|| rahasyam||*’. The colophon reads: *iti jñāneśvarīmaṇḍalam||*.

Author Except the introduction and the *mantroddhāra*, the text is lifted from the *Kriyāsamuccaya* of Jagaddarpaṇa (who in turn lifted the entire passage from the *Niṣpannayogāvali* of Abhayākaragupta).

¹⁸⁵I thank Iain Sinclair for pointing out this valuable but often overlooked collection, as well as for his illuminating comments. I have consulted the b/w microfilm archival copies and not the mss. themselves. During my visit to the BL there were some difficulties in locating this collection formerly belonging to the India Office Library. Therefore it is not a banal piece of information to specify that presently these volumes are kept as ‘Mss Eur Hodgson’ followed by the volume number (1 to 90). A more thorough hand-list of this collection is under preparation by Ramesh Dhungel. I thank the Curator of Tibetan Collections, Burkhard Quessel, for his help.

¹⁸⁶*Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prākṛit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, Volume II, Brahmanical and Jaina Manuscripts by Arthur Berriedale KEITH with a supplement Buddhist Manuscripts by F. W. THOMAS. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1935.

Contents The text flows around a diagram, a sketch of the 13-deity *maṇḍala* (i.e. the more archaic form with 13 goddesses). The places of deities are signaled with numbers, and the text is keyed to this. The diagram is odd, for it is not the deities which are placed according to the directions, but the lines separating their respective places. This is certainly wrong, since the text given does indicate the position of goddesses according to the directions.

The first verse in *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre gives a concise description of Jñānaḍākinī: she embodies the *prajñāpāramitā*, praised by buddhas, wearing a radiant crown with the five Tathāgatas, she has three faces with three eyes each, and six arms holding a skull-staff, a hatchet, a *vajra*, a bell, a skull-bowl, and a sword.

The text then proceeds announcing the description of the *Jñāneśvarīmaṇḍala* according to the *Kriyāsamuccaya*. This is accurate, except that at the end it is not the *mantras* proper that are given, but a rather cryptic *mantroddhāra* in four verses.

Jñāneśvarīmāhātmya

Source IOL 7738; Hodgson 31/3f; vol. 27, pp. 57-61.

Title The first page is headed by a title: ‘*jñāneśvarīvarṇanaṃ*’, however, the text itself (p. 57, l. 15) seems to suggest the title ‘*jñāneśvarīmāhātmyam*’, which is more appropriate. There is no colophon. Between the title and the text proper we find a note in Hodgson’s handwriting: “*Account of the first Tantrika Devi named Jnyaneshwari - wife of adi Yogambara - full account*”.

Author The compiler is perhaps Amṛtānanda, although there are instances where horizontal lines are given for *akṣaras* that were illegible. As discussed below, the authority the text is based upon is Raviśrījñāna. It is likely that Amṛtānanda’s copy of the *Amṛtakaṇikā* was damaged in places.

Contents The text is written across the page (‘European style’). It opens with three *maṅgala* verses (*śārdūlavikrīḍita*, *upajāti*, and *sragdharā*), 1 and 3 of which are seen in other works in this corpus.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁷1 = *Pratimānāmadhyānāni* v. 2 with the same changes to the endings (mostly fem. Nom. to Voc.), 3 = *Pratimānāmadhyānāni*, v. 1 = *Yogāmbaramaṇḍala*, v. 1.

The next section is prefixed with the expression “*atha khalu bhagavān āha*” and is identical to the famous *nidāna* to the *Guhyasamāja*.

The next section is lifted from the *Amṛtakaṇṭhikā* (p. 1, l. 14 - l. 17), stopping short of the quotation and affixing ‘*jñāneśvarīmāhātmyam*’ as a second object of *deśitavān*.

Two short sections follow, the first gives an explanation of the name ‘*Jñāneśvarī*’, and the second describes a short practice of: a) visualizing the goddess as the consort of Yogāmbara, with one face, white, with two arms clasping the god’s neck and rubbing up against him with her ‘mountain-like’ breasts; and b) reciting her mantras.

The last and largest section is introduced by: *atha ca tasyā mahimaślokāni katicil likhyate|| || vimalaprabhādike śākyasiṃhoktāni|| ||*. The ‘*māhātmya*’ here actually consists of ten verses lifted from the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṅgīti*¹⁸⁸ with Raviśrījñāna’s commentary to these *loci*.¹⁸⁹ Except the first verse all Nom. masc. case endings are changed to the feminine with the aim of transforming the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṅgīti* into a praise of the goddess. The compiler was only partially successful in imposing the feminine endings in the commentary, and this gives rise to rather clumsy readings, e.g. *jñānābhīṣekamukutā . . . anena caturthābhīṣekarūpo bhagavān uktaḥ||* instead of * . . . ° *rūpā bhagavatī uktā||* had the compiler been consistent. A rather original contribution is the postulation of a ‘variant reading’ *jñāneśvari* for *jñānakāye* in the last quarter of the last verse (i.e. 162 = 11.5 in the original).¹⁹⁰

Yogāmbaramaṇḍala

Source IOL 7732 (2); Hodgson 31/3; vol. 27, pp. 48-51.

Title The text proper is headed by a note: ‘*Śrīyogāmbaramaṇḍalam|| 57*¹⁹¹*mūrtayah|| rahasyam idam||*. The colophon reads: *iti yogāmbaramaṇḍalam||*.

¹⁸⁸V. 55 = 6.14, 81 = 8.5, 83 = 8.7, 84 = 8.8, 122 = 9.4, and 158-162 = chapter 11.

¹⁸⁹Corresponding to p. 41, l. 11 – p. 42, l. 13; p. 56, l. 12 – p. 57, l. 8; p. 57, l. 22 – p. 58, l. 2; p. 58, l. 5 – p. 59, l. last (here the *Amṛtakaṇṭhikā* is particularly rich in quotations and the compiler notes that out of fear of prolixity he will not copy further: *anyāni ślokāni santi vistarabhayāt tyaktāni||*; p. 79, l. 8 – l. last; and p. 97, l. 16 – p. 99, l. 18

¹⁹⁰These are the last lines of the work: *jñāneśvarī vā pāṭhaḥ|| jñānī nāma upāyayogāmbaramapurūṣas tasya īśvarī|| iti tasyāḥ sambodhanam he jñānīśvarīti pāṭhaḥ||*.

¹⁹¹Note that the ‘7’ is written very differently in the caption to the sketch.

Author Except the introduction and the *mantroddhāra*, the text is lifted from the *Kriyāsamuccaya* of Jagaddarpaṇa (who in turn lifted the entire passage from the *Niṣpannayogāvali* of Abhayākaragupta).

Contents This text is related to the *Jñāneśvarīmaṇḍala* above. The first two pages of the work are occupied by a sketch of the 57-deity *maṇḍala* (i.e. the updated form with Yogāmbara and Jñānaḍākinī in the middle, the 12 original goddesses, and three more circuits of deities). The places of deities are signaled with numbers, and the text is keyed to this. This time the sketch is accurate, inasmuch as it places the deities according to the directions. The three outermost protective circles are captioned *padmāvalī*, *vajrāvalī*, *juvālāvalī*, and the directions are given with the east-west axis corresponding to the joining of the two pages. The caption to the sketch reads: *yogāmbaramaṇḍalam idam, kriyāsamuccayamaṇḍalapāṭaloddhṛtam, saptapañcāsatāṃ devatānāṃ dhyānaṃ 57*.

The *maṅgala verse* asks for the protection of Yogāmbara.¹⁹²

The text then announces the description of the *Yogāmbaramaṇḍala* according to the *Kriyāsamuccaya*, the corresponding chapter of which is given verbatim, except - as above - the mantras, instead of which there is a cryptic one-verse *mantroddhāra* supposedly encoding the *hṛdayamantra* and the *kavacamantra* (for the latter the *Kriyāsamuccaya* gives the *sārvakarmikamantra*).

Pratimānāmadhyānāni I

Source IOL 7740; Hodgson 31/3h; vol. 27, pp. 62v-70r.

Title There is no heading before the work. The introductory line simply states that it will describe a number of deities on a cloth painting. The colophon gives the date in three eras: VS 1883 = ŚS 1748 = NS 946, *iṣa* (= *āśvina*) month, first day of the bright fortnight, that is Oct. 2, 1826 CE) and closes with the title given above.

Author Most likely by Amṛtānanda.

¹⁹²Same verse as in *Pratimānāmadhyānāni*, v. 1 = *Jñāneśvarīmāhātmya* v. 3.

Contents After two *maṅgala* verses¹⁹³ the following statement is given: *ut-tarāpaṃthe jikhāche nāma pradeśe likhitāyāṃ paṭapratimāyāṃ nepālabhāṣayā paubāhā iti prakhyātāyāṃ likhitānāṃ devadevīgaṇānāṃ mūrtidhyānanāmāni likhyaṃte//*. This is corroborated by Hodgson’s statement on the front page: ‘*The tāntrika doctrine of the Buddhists extracted chiefly from Yōgāmbara Tuntra and Wódiyána Tuntra in explanation of the picture on cloth Thunga i.e. Bhotiya red silk with red silk blind to it see also other Thanga marked no. 1.*’

The work describes under no less than 95 headings deities (some of the with consorts) and patriarchs on a *thang ka* from ‘Jikhāche’ (i.e. Gzhis ka rtse). I am given to understand that this painting is no longer traceable in Hodgson’s bequests. A *Yogāmbarantra* is indeed referred to when describing the chief Yogāmbaras on the painting, but the ‘*Wódiyána Tuntra*’ remains a mystery.

The painting was dominated by Yogāmbara and Jñānaḍākinī figures in various iconographical inflections. It was most likely produced in Tibet, since it contains several what the author calls ‘*lāmā jūs*’, one of them named Lumuci (= *Rumuci* = *rin po che*).

*Pratimānāmadhyānāni II

Source IOL 7739 (same work described as IOL 7787); Hodgson 31/3g; vol. 26, pp. 88-91.

Title No title is given.

Date The colophon gives the date in three eras: VS 1884 = ŚS 1749 = NS 947 (= 1826 CE).

Author Amṛtānanda on request by Khaḍasena (= Hodgson).

Contents There are two notes in Hodgson’s handwriting to introduce the work: ‘*Yogambar & Jnyaneswari Mahatum Esoteric Doctrine. See Thangah marked no. 1 - also that with red silk blind before it.*’ accompanied by some writing in Persian in the upper margin, and another note in the right margin:

¹⁹³First = *Jñāneśvarīmāhātmya* v. 3 = *Yogāmbaramaṇḍala* v. 1; second = *Jñāneśvarīmāhātmya* v. 1 with feminine Voc. endings.

‘Name and Dhyān only of Yogāmbara as one & of Yogāmbara and Jnyāneshwari copulated’.

The author states that he will describe the deities on a painted cloth from ‘somewhere near Tibet’ (*yatra kutracit kāmbojadeśasamīpavartideśeṣu*). There are two Yogāmbaras on the image: one as a single *āgamadevatā*, and one in copulation with Jñānaḍākinī. These two main images are surrounded by bodhisattvas in the form of lamas, a Śākyamuni, two nuns, a form of Mahākāla called Vajravīra, a *siddha* called Vyāghrapāda, a *balibhāṇḍa*, and a figure called *Ūrdhvajñānarumuci* (most likely Tib. *ye shes bla ma rin po che*). The rest of the work (about one third) is taken up by a legend about the ‘Rumuci’ comprising of his debates and magical battles with the buddhophobic Śāṅkara.

Ṣaṭkarmaprayogāni

Source IOL 7762; Hodgson 31/2; vol. 26, pp. 68-77.

Title The title above is given in the *pratijñā* statement: *yogāmbarādī-tamtroddhṛtāni katicit ṣaṭkarmaprayogāni likhyate[!]/*.

Date Not given. Probably late 1820’s.

Author Or rather the compiler was most likely Amṛtānanda.

Contents After a *maṅgala* verse praising Yogāmbara and his consort and the *pratijñā* the text starts with a *nidāna*. Then Yogāmbara speaks to Jñānaḍākinī, exhorting her and devotees to keep secret all that will be told lest their accomplishments will suffer. What follows thereafter up to the end of the second page is a slightly modified version of the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* chs. 11 & 12. Little is done to mask the original, but the intentions of the author – to inflect the text to seem like a Yogāmbara-revelation – are clear. E.g. where the tantra reads *caṇḍaroṣaṇasamādhistho* (12.4a) our text has *yogarājasamādhistho* (p. 68, l. 22), the names of deities from the *tantra* and *mantras* in which *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* is present are expurgated.

The rest of the pages (p. 70 to the end) were originally not part of this work. These pages comprise of much the same text from the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra*, but without expurgations. Pp. 71 to the end contain *sādhanas* of Kurukullā.

Chapter 4

Concluding remarks

The inception of the cult (which is probably equivalent with the coming into being of the *tantra*) cannot be dated with absolute certainty. However, the *Catuṣpīṭha* is already discussed in environments which seem to be ignorant of the *Hevajra*. The earliest possible reference to hallmark procedures of the *mūla* comes from Jayabhadra, certainly one of the earliest if not the earliest exegete of the *Herukābhīdhāna*. But even if this proves to be incorrect, we still have the testimony of another early *Śaṃvara* exegete, Bhavyakīrti. The list of *tantras* from Dunhuang and Sri Lanka also contain the *Catuṣpīṭha*, but not the *Hevajra*. Given the paramount importance of that text for post-10th century developments in Vajrayāna, I think it is reasonable to assume that these lists and authors do not cite the authority of the *Hevajra* simply because they do not know about it and not because they ignored it. Several peculiarities of the *Catuṣpīṭha* can be identified as archaic features, most notably the still somewhat this-worldly character of the *yoginīs* (who can be killed like *yakṣiṇīs*), the unique set of *abhiṣekas*, the archaic meaning attributed to the four *mudrās*, the absence of *nāḍīs* and *cakras*, and the still not full-blown adaptation of *Kāpālika* imagery to name just a few. On the other hand the description of *utkrānti* and several features of *sādhana* show that the text is influenced by the root-text and the two exegetical schools of the *Guhyasamāja*, and possibly also by the proto-*yoginītantra*, the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*. The *Catuṣpīṭha* was very influential in the development of the *Śaṃvara* scriptures, the later stratum of which adopted a great number of verses and/or doctrines for their own use. Among these the *Vajradāka* is probably the earliest, as its presence is already attested in the tenth century. We obtain a similar timeline if we try to establish the

relative chronology of the exegetes. Bhavabhaṭṭa must certainly predate Durjayacandra, who probably lived around the turn of the millennium. But the longer recension of the *Herukābhīdhāna* must precede Bhavabhaṭṭa, since this is the text he comments on. This in turn must have come after Bhavyakīrti, since he knows only the shorter version of the *Herukābhīdhāna* and refers to the *Catūṣpīṭha*, but is completely silent about the *Hevajra*. Everything seems therefore to point to the early tenth century, and one cannot outright dismiss that the origin of the text stretches back into the late ninth.

As for the place of composition, I see little reason to doubt that the larger geographical region we should be looking at is east India, most likely Pāla Bengal. Some phonological features (*ba* for *va*, etc.), the very existence of manuscripts, as well as the fact that two of the three exegetes, Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra, were Bengalis make it very difficult to posit a place of provenance outside the heartland of Vajrayāna. It should nevertheless be observed that already at an early date the text was disseminated as far as Dunhuang, possibly Sumatra and the Konkan coast, Sri Lanka, and Nepal, where both the text and its later developments enjoyed their greatest success.

If my tentative argumentation is correct, we should see the emergence of the *Catūṣpīṭha* between *cca.* 880-980 CE in east India. It can hardly be an accident that this coincides with the most obscure period in Pāla history, a century that on account of the scarce historical evidence could reasonably be termed the Dark Ages. Curiously, this period also coincides with an epoch of political turmoil in Nepal and Tibet. I am of the opinion that linking the rise of the *yoginītantras* and the dissolution of imperial political structures could yield some very insightful research.

The *Catūṣpīṭha* is also unique in many respects, and it is difficult to find a clear explanation for these idiosyncrasies. First and foremost, the language of the text (which is occasionally also embraced by authors, e.g. Āryadeva), which is perhaps the most unusual kind of ‘deconstructive’ Sanskrit or a kind of super-Aiśa, is quite unparalleled. Some solace should be found in the fact that it does not seem baffling only to us, but also the commentators and compilers of later scriptures. The second striking feature is the development of the pantheon. The *maṇḍala* of the *tantra* is exclusively female, where the chief deity is Jñānaḍākinī. A Vajrasattva is occasionally referred to, but he has no place in the *maṇḍala*. With the manipulation of texts the pantheon underwent radical change: Yogāmbara, a male deity without scriptural substantiation, and his retinue occupied and surrounded the original *maṇḍala* of the *yoginīs* and relegated their chief goddess to the role of a consort. This is extremely

unusual, since the observable trend at this time was the rise of female deities over male ones, both in Śaivism and in Vajrayāna.

A careful consideration of the surviving evidence shows that the *Catuṣpīṭha*, although perhaps not the most defining scripture of Tantric Buddhism, was certainly a very influential and a comparatively early text. As such it should definitely merit more attention than it had received thus far. The present work is merely an inroad into what should become a full and even more detailed investigation, especially when more evidence comes to light. Although I have consulted about five dozen manuscripts strictly from within the cult and almost four scores of mss. in order to establish parallels and trace quotations, I have no doubt whatsoever that many more manuscripts relevant for the *Catuṣpīṭha* will be discovered in the near future. I hope that my present effort will be helpful to contextualize those works.

Chapter 5

**Annotated translation of
selected sub-chapters with
synopses of sub-chapters falling
outside the selection**

5.1 Annotated translation of vv. 1.1.1-8 with a synopsis of 1.1.9-105

1.1 is one of the very few sub-chapters from the *Catuṣpīṭha* to have received detailed scholarly attention in two studies, namely SUGIKI 2003 – an introductory article – and SUGIKI 2005, a greatly expanded study in English. The Japanese scholar did not make use of all the available manuscripts;¹ nevertheless, his study remains an admirable work for its clarity and thoroughness.

In what follows I shall summarize Sugiki’s findings and occasionally supplement them with my own. Since Sugiki’s main interest lies in the cult of *Cakrasamvara*, he approached the topic from that angle and found that the calendar system and the dependent teachings on divination used in the *Vajraḍāka* and the *Ḍākārṇava* are derived from the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

The authors of the *Catuṣpīṭha* devised a cycle of time marked by twelve divisions presided over by twelve ‘sovereigns of the abodes’ (*bhuvaneśvara*): *rohitā*, *mohitā*, *bhadra*, *vṛṣabha*, *kūrma*, *makara*, *raṇḍā*, *mikira*, *bhidrika/bhidri*, *vyākuli/vyākulī*, *svapna*, and *kāma*. Sugiki points out that the end of the list has been misinterpreted, and that the authors of the *Vajraḍāka* and the *Ḍākārṇava* have ‘*bhuvaneśvara*’ as the twelfth sovereign instead of *kāma*.² As the present study verifies, this is but one in a long list of borrowings, modifications, elaborations, and corrupt transmissions from the *Catuṣpīṭha* into the *Śaṃvara* scriptures. Therefore Sugiki’s claim regarding the direction of borrowing is beyond debate.

The twelve ‘abodes’ are not specific, but general units of time. Thus they are applied not only to specific divisions of the day (be they equal or not), but also to years, fortnights, and days.³ According to the tantra these twelve ‘abodes’ also correspond to other sets of twelve, namely twelve *nāgas*,⁴ and

¹For the *Catuṣpīṭha* he used the mss. I present as A (his K1), C (his C), and D (his K2). Sugiki was doubtless aware of B, but did not use it since the present chapter is not available in that ms. E was either not taken into consideration, or was rightly identified as an apograph of D and hence a descriptive codex. For the *Nibandha* of Bhavabhaṭṭa (note that SUGIKI constantly refers to him as ‘Bhava’) he used NAK 5-38 = NGMPP B 112/4, and – although he does not seem to identify it as such – its apograph, IASWR MBB-I-43. Thus K, M, and S, the best available manuscripts for the commentary were not taken into consideration. The single ms. of Kalyāṇavarman’s commentary is mentioned in the bibliography, but not the commentary of Durjayacandra.

²This is the result of a corrupt transmission of 1.1.11cd.

³See SUGIKI 2005, pp. 171ff.

⁴1.1.65-67 with an indication in 1.1.68-69 that the poison of snakes corresponding to

the twelve vowels.⁵ Bhavabhaṭṭa gives further elaborations: the ‘abodes’ are distributed unevenly during a day,⁶ the twelve also stand for the twelve signs in the procession of the Sun (from Aries to Pisces), he also explains the way in which the twelve cover the twenty-seven lunar asterisms.⁷ The *Vajradāka* and its commentary, the **Vajradākavivṛti* go even further with the correlations: the twelve abodes also correspond to the twelve *bhūmis*,⁸ whereas the *Ḍākārṇava* posits a correlation with the twelve limbs of interdependent origination.⁹ It is therefore clear that the system underwent subsequent developments in exegesis, and parallel to this there was an increased attempt to fill the system with as much Buddhist meaning as possible.

There is clearly much more work to be done on this chapter. Although the calendar system advanced in the *Catuspīṭha* and its derivatives does not seem to have had any currency in the present day, it was influential in the middle ages since it is discussed in a variety of sources. Thus Ms. Kaiser 162 = NGMPP C 17/6 is a work based on the correlation of the *bhuvaneśvaras* with the twelve limbs of the *pratītyasamutpāda*, an idea discussed further by Tibetan authorities such as Bo dong Phyogs las rnam rgyal.¹⁰ Trying to bring the present chronological system into harmony with that of the *Kālacakra* – an attempt already signaled by Vajragarbha¹¹ – is the topic of many larger works, such as those of the Bhutanese scholar Lha dbang blo gros (better known as Sureśamati[bhadra], 1548?-1631).¹²

these *nāgas* can be healed only in the case of four (see below).

⁵1.1.90-102ab where a system of divination based on this correlation is taught.

⁶Ad 1.1.11, tabulated in Table 1 by Sugiki.

⁷Ad 1.1.55, tabulated in Table 1 by Sugiki.

⁸Tabulated in Table 2[b] by Sugiki. The correspondences similar to the ones given in the *Nibandha* are tabulated in 2[a]. The names of the *nāgas* slightly differ, and the procession from *rohitā* to *kāma/bhuvaneśvara* is clockwise rather than counterclockwise.

⁹Tabulated in Table 3 by Sugiki. This idea, as Sugiki points out, is already present as a ‘*gurūpadeśaḥ*’ in Kalyāṇavarman’s commentary (COD. 2^v).

¹⁰See *Encyclopaedia Tibetica* vol. 2, pp. 24ff., with a *dbu med* version of the same in vol. 9.

¹¹*Piṇḍārthaṭīkā* p. 25: *idaṃ dvādaśalagnātmakam rāśīcakram makarādīkam catuḥpīṭhe jñātavyam*

¹²I have access to the following works provided by the TBRC: *Gdan Dus thun mong gi rtsis gzhi*, *Gdan Dus thun mong gi dus rtsis Bltas chos dpyod ldan rig pa* (both are contained in no. 25103). The influence of these works was by no means restricted to Bhutan. Sangs rgyas phun tshogs, the main teacher of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, wrote a short summary based on Sureśamati’s works (MTA Tib. 6/b), and presumably also helped to procure the actual works of the Bhutanese polymath. (MTA Tib. 7, 29-31). Sangs rgyas phun tshogs’s

Translation of vv. 1-8

I. The nidāna

Thus spoke the omniscient one, the lord and gnosis of Rīgīs, he whose abode is the protector of those of the pure realms [i.e. Sumeru], he who encloses the net of yoginīs. 1.1.1

Thus This is an unusual, curtailed version of the *nidāna* ‘*evaṃ mayā śrutam*’, etc. Both explanatory *tantras*, namely the *Yogāmbarīprabheda* and the **Vyākhyātantra* have adopted this introductory verse, which is to my knowledge unattested elsewhere. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s explanation for omitting the customary *nidāna* is that the present *tantra* is extracted from the much longer, 12,000-verse version, which is itself an abbreviation of the 18,000-verse *Ur-tantra*.¹³ Preparing the recensions is the duty of the *saṃgītikāra*, which in the Tantric corpus is usually Vajrapāṇi.¹⁴ After the obeisance verses and a short discussion on the *saṃgītikāra* we lose sight of the *Mitapadā* (ff. 2-3 are missing). Durjayacandra’s comments become available yet again ad v. 4ab. The Tucci apograph does not have the text of these, doubtless extremely valuable, folios either.

Rīgīs This bizarre word occurs only here in the text. Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses it as ‘Buddhas’, i.e. the *bhagavān* is said to be the Lord of Buddhas. I am aware of only a single locus where the term is explained, the *Rīgīarallitantra* (179^r): *ri gi mkha’ ’gro mar ni gsungs/*, where it is explained as the *ḍākinī* (i.e. the consort of the Heruka Aralli), or perhaps generally *ḍākinīs*. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 1^v) has *ṛśī+ām* in the lemma, which should probably read as *riḡīnām* or *ṛḡīnām*. His gloss is the same as Bhavabhaṭṭa’s. In addition

work is available in a facsimile edition, see TERJÉK 1976b, pp. 339-373.

¹³The only extant ms. of the *Nibandha* reads *trayodaśa-* for the middling version, but this 13,000-line recension is not mentioned anywhere else. For the ‘recension history’ of the *Mantroddhārapañjikā* see SZÁNTÓ 2008c.

¹⁴On the need for and duties of the assessor of sermons see e.g. *Padmīnī* (Ms A, 1^v). When facing the problem of a non-standardized *nidāna* the scripture cited in the *prima facie* view is typically the *Dharmasaṃgītisūtra*. See e.g. *Abhayapaddhati* (Ms A, 1^v), *Padmāvatī* (Ms 1^v), *Muktāvatī* (p. 2), *Yogaratnamālā* (p. 103), *Ratnāvatī* of Kamalanātha (Ms 1^v), *Abhisamayālaṃkāṛālokā* (p. 5), and elsewhere.

he cites a variant reading *ṛṣṇām*, and claims that this does not change the meaning, i.e. the gloss is again ‘Buddhas’.

gnosis Perhaps in order to bring it in line with the *Guhyasamāja* verse he is about to quote, Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses **jñānam** as *jñeyam*.

he whose abode etc. I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa’s analysis here, although it is equally possible, if not more probable, that we have to break the compound at *avasthānam*.

he who encloses etc. The manifold possible interpretations of this *pāda* render it virtually untranslatable in any single way. E.g. the *Nibandha*’s interpretation would suggest ‘he who delivers¹⁵ [all beings] from transmigration¹⁶ through ‘the net’ [i.e. the pure emanation] of *yoginīs*, who are so called because they simultaneously possess wisdom and means.’ Kalyāṇavarman’s interpretation (*Pañjikā* 1^v-2^r) differs slightly, since his reading is °*śaṃvaram* instead of °*saṃvaram*.¹⁷ The *yoginīs* for this author are Prajñāpāramitā and so forth, whereas *jāla* is a mere plural marker (the gloss is *samūha*). *Śaṃ* is taken in the most usual sense, i.e. bliss, and √*vr* is employed in the less common usage ‘to enjoy [sexually]’ (the gloss is *bhajate*, but the choice of meaning reflects *Dhātupāṭha* 9.38: *vrī sambhuktau*).

II. The retinue

**After having beheld Vajrapāṇi amidst the lords of yogins
[numbering] eighty crore [who were headed by] Dhutagaṇa,
Bībhatsa, Lambaka, Trikaṇṭha, Meru, Meruśikhara, Padma,
Padmodara, [the omniscient one] smiled.**

1.1.2

lords of yogins The list is unusual and to my knowledge unparalleled (except the derivative *Yogāmbarīprabheda*). Both the *Nibandha* and the *Pañjikā* (2^r) seek to homologize these odd names with the more standard list of *bodhisattvas*. Kalyāṇavarman’s list is virtually identical.¹⁸ It is also possible that

¹⁵√*vr* in the meaning of restrain, suppress, prevent from, therefore also ‘to deliver from’.

¹⁶*Śaṃ* is taken as an abbreviation of *saṃsāra*.

¹⁷For the interchangeability of these two forms and the implication (namely, to suspect an east-Indian setting) see SANDERSON 2009:166-169.

¹⁸The alternative or reported alternative readings are given in the apparatus. Instead of Mañjuśrī (for Padmodara) he uses the name Prajñātikṣṇa.

this is an alternative spelling of *yogeśvara*.

III. Vajrapāṇi's entreaty

No sooner had he smiled than Vajrapāṇi rose from his seat, placed his upper garment on one side, bent his right knee-cap to the ground, and with palms joined [in reverence] addressed the Lord thus: 1.1.3

I wish to hear, O lord of gnosis, the characteristics of secret yoga. How is [the nature of] the beautiful one [i.e. earth], [of] space, [and] how is [the nature of] water [and] fire? 1.1.4

secret yoga Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets this as a *dvandva* compound of two collective terms, *rahas* and *yoga*. The first in his interpretation refers to knowing the *mudrā* (more likely sexually experiencing the consort, cf. 3.4.16 ff.) and the pledges (more likely those of the *bhakṣaṇīya* kind, cf. 2.4.3 ff. *passim*) and so forth. *Yoga* is attributed two possible meanings: rites of *śāntika* and so forth (in other words, it is taken as shorthand for *prayoga*) or the *yogic* exercises related to the elements (these are breathing exercises alluded to but not clearly explained in the *Nibandha* ad 1.1.88).

How should the meditation of the ingoing (anā) and outgoing (apāna) breaths be meditated upon? How is the maṇḍala of the gods who are defenders of the realms, and so forth? How should one who has [conjoined his] body with gnosis and consciousness undertake rituals, etc.? 1.1.5

meditation ... meditated upon The inelegant repetition seeks to render the tautological expression of the original. *Anā* (*ānā* in all other sources except the lemma of the *Nibandha*) is an unusual derivation of the root \sqrt{an} (*Dhātupāṭha* 2.61 & 4.66). The more often used terminology of the text, *hārā* & *dolā*, is first given in v. 8 below.

the gods etc. For the most part all three commentators agree that ‘the realm’ is the body (or better said, the person). That elements of the person are constituted by gods (again, better said: deities) is by this time commonplace in Tantric thinking, cf. the famous line of the *Guhyasamāja* (17.50ab): *pañca skandhāḥ samāseṇa pañca buddhāḥ prakīrtitāḥ*/. The role of the **ādi** is unclear, perhaps it is just a line-filler.

body with etc. The translation of this line is tentative. Bhavabhaṭṭa understand *pādas* e & f in a more philosophical sense: *jñāna* means discriminative knowledge, and *viññāna* the life principle. Hence *karma* cannot here mean ritual, but rather the deeds of a person. Perhaps he takes the question to allude to 3.1.65 ff. The *Pañjikā* (2^r) takes *jñāna* and *viññāna* to mean the pairs the *yogin* and his consort, and means and wisdom respectively. The *Mitapadā* (3^v) offers yet another interpretation: *jñāna* means achievements in the otherworld (i.e. liberation) whereas *viññāna* the accomplishments in this very life (i.e. enjoyment of supernatural accomplishments, etc.). The compound *jñānaviññāna* is sometimes also interpreted in the corpus as the syllable HŪṀ (e.g. *Pañjikā* 11^r, *Nibandha* ad 4.3.31, *passim*). The **ādi** is either simply a verse-filler, or perhaps to be understood as more meditative processes (as opposed to external rituals).

IV. On breath

Hear, oh Vajra[pāṇi], according to the truth, that which characterizes the transcendence of transmigration: the act (°karma) of breathing is primordial (ādi) to all, [but it is only] gnostics [who] employ it in rituals (karma). 1.1.6

employ Bhavabhaṭṭa understand this to allude to a teaching which is somewhat puzzlingly not given in the *Catuspīṭha* proper, and which he describes briefly ad v. 88. The teaching proposes different kinds of breathing during different rituals. Moreover, these are correlated with the elements. Thus in *sāntika* one uses the *vāyavya* breathing, which measures six digits; in *pauṣṭika* the *āgneya*, which measures four; in *vaśya* the *vāruṇa*, which measures twelve; and in *abhicāra* the *māhendra*, which measures sixteen.

ādi I translated this as if the underlying idea were that although all beings breathe, it is only *yogins* who can utilize breathing as a means of accomplish-

ment. The *Mitapadā* (4^v) understand the pronoun to refer to ‘all rituals’ and not beings.

Breaths numbering two ten-thousands [plus one] thousand [plus] six hundreds, [or otherwise] as sixty hours, is proclaimed to be a day-and-night. 1.1.7

numbering The sum, 21,600 breaths per nychthemeron, is a common feature of *yogic* lore.

hours A *ghaṭi* (also called *daṇḍa* in the *Mitapadā*, 4^v) is a unit of 24 minutes, in other words this kind of reckoning is exactly the opposite of our inherited system, which counts with 24 units of 60 minutes.

[Betwixt] the [two kinds of] breaths [called] the ‘string’ (hārā) and the ‘swing’ (dola[⁻]) counting is observed by the swing. [For], O clever one, betwixt the two [kinds of] breaths [it is] the string [that] merges with the swing. 1.1.8

the ‘string’ and the ‘swing’ Durjayacandra tries to derive the meaning by analyzing the verbal roots: *hriyate ’pakṛṣyata iti hārā praveśagatiḥ, dolyate preṅkhyata iti dolā nirgamagatiḥ/* (*Mitapadā* 5^r).

merges etc. The idea seems to be that a unit of breath is to be counted for a pair, and not one for the outgoing breath and one for the ingoing breath. Nevertheless, when counting one should keep tally by counting the outgoing breaths.

Synopsis of 1.1.9-105

At this point we would normally expect more detail about breath-*yoga*, but in fact the text switches topics and starts discussing the twelve *bhuvaneśvaras* (see above, the names are first given in 10cd-11cd).

The next large section (vv. 12-52) deals with what SUGIKI (2005:180-194 & edition in the notes *ad loc. cit.*) calls ‘fortune-telling according to the day of birth’, in other words a kind of natal prognostication. This section is translated and edited in the said work (*ibid.*). The prognostications are not always comprehensive, that is to say some items are given for one *bhuvaneśvara* (e.g.

number of wives, circumstances of death) but not for the others. Usually the verses foretell the lifespan of the person, material conditions, character, and family situation. Interspersed with this natal prognostication the text also teaches certain actions (e.g. moneylending, business travel) that are to be undertaken under the tutelage of the said *bhuvaneśvara*.

More such miscellaneous information is given by the next section (vv. 53-69), but here too some prognostications are given from the viewpoint of being born under the influence of a particular *bhuvaneśvara*. Most importantly the text prescribes the proper times for aimed rituals¹⁹ and the *nāgas* correlated with the *bhuvaneśvara* which is used in the rite of healing snakebit (cf. next sub-chapter).

Vv. 70-89 describe the northern and southern procession of the Sun and the measures for daylight and nighttime for each month with a precision of one *ghaṭikā* (i.e. 24 minutes). This computation is tabulated and discussed in SUGIKI 2005:177-179, Table 6.²⁰

Vv. 90-104 describe a divination method. The *yogin* should prepare a diagram with twelve numbered boxes. In each he should place a *bhuvaneśvara* and one of vowels with the ‘eunuchs’ (Ṛ, Ṝ, Ḍ, Ḍ̄) excepted in due order. Then he should count the number of syllables in the client’s question, multiply that number by six, take the first digit of the result, multiply that by three, add sixty-five, and divide by twelve. The remainder is then identified in the diagram and the result for each vowel from the text is applied to the question. Alternatively the *yogin* may operate the divination according to the *horacihna* (?),²¹ or he can simply throw a flower into the diagram and

¹⁹ *Rohitā* for *śānti*, *vṛṣabha* for *puṣṭi*, *makara* for *vaśya*, *bhidrika* for *abhicāra*, *mohitā* for *uccāṭana*, *kūrma* for *stambhana*, *raṇḍā* for *vidveṣa* (i.e. causing hatred between two targets), and *vyākuli* for *oṣadhi* (i.e. rites involving herbs, not necessarily healing). Here the *bhuvaneśvara* stand for time-units during a day.

²⁰ We can only add that the computation (9 h 36 m of daylight for the winter solstice) holds good for approximately the 37th parallel (in this case much more likely North). There is only one region in India crossed by this parallel, Kashmir (roughly one degree north of Śrīnagar), but this does not necessarily mean that the computation was produced there. Ultimately the calculation may be of Babylonian origin, since the 37th parallel runs only 5 degrees north from Al-Ḥillah (the location of the remains of Babylon), an error margin which is perfectly possible with such a rough computation in units of 24 minutes. If the calculation was ever used in Gangetic India, it was probably adjusted to local conditions. My calculation has been prepared with the aid of http://ptaff.ca/soleil/?lang=en_CA

²¹ This statement is obscure. Both Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 5^v) propose that the *yogin* should draw lines in a zig-zag (*gomūtradhārākāreṇa* / *gomūtravat*) at random (i.e. without keeping count). When he decides to stop he should count the num-

interpret the question according to the box it falls in. The section closes with the *bhagavān*'s assurance that the method is infallible.

ber of lines and repeat the operation given above. The *Mitapadā* (11^v -12^r) is beyond my comprehension at this point.

5.2 Annotated translation of 1.2

There is probably no religious tradition with a practical aspect in India that did not adopt the observation of signs that herald death. Typically such signs are arranged into sets: those observable on the body, those that appear in dreams, and so forth. These sets – which in a way may be considered ‘secular’ – were freely adopted across religious traditions, therefore the direction of borrowing is quite difficult to establish if no other evidence concerning dating is available. Testimony of the popularity of prescience of death is the *Ḥauḍ al-Ḥayāt*, a translation of a lost Sanskrit work, the *Amṛtakunḍa*, studied in Sufi circles.²² Tibetan authorities also prepared catalogues of such signs. One such celebrated list is an appendix to the *Bar do thos grol* (pp. 169-191) compiled presumably by Karma gling pa, which includes the first set of signs given by the *Catuṣpīṭha* under the heading of ‘nye ba’i ’chi ltas’ (pp. 180-181). Another such collection is a small but very neatly structured work by Dge ’dun grub pa, posthumously the 1st Dalai lama (Gsung ’bum, vol. 6, pp. 343-382, ff. 1r-20v).

In later Tantric Buddhism this knowledge served two aims. If the signs were discovered by a client, the *yogin* could perform an appropriate ritual to counteract them and to prolong the client’s lifespan with a given amount of time, typically six months (cf. 1.2.33d). If on the other hand the *yogin* perceived these on himself, he had two options: either to perform the ritual of ‘cheating death’ for himself (*mṛtyuvañcana*), or to ready himself for ‘yogic suicide’, or egress (*utkrānti*).²³ Rituals for cheating death are again a genre in Tantric Buddhism. Perhaps the best known specimen of such texts is the *Mṛtyuvañcanopadeśa* of Vāgīśvarakīrti, in fact an anthology of such rites, an edition of which has recently been published by Johannes SCHNEIDER.²⁴ There are several other such handbooks preserved in the Canon (e.g. Tōh.

²²For a very comprehensive, yet still not exhaustive list beginning with *āraṇyakas* and ending with the grand mediaeval compendia, as well as the *Ḥauḍ al-Ḥayāt* see EINO 2004. Restricting ourselves to Śaiva, Buddhist, and Yogic texts (i.e. not taking into consideration other texts, such as medical works) the list could be enlarged with the following and many more: a) the *Brahmayāmala* ch. 100, *Tantrasadbhāva* ch. 24 ; b) *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* ch. 23, *Dākārṇava* ch. 12 ff.; c) *Yogacintāmaṇi* ch. 4; *Haṭhatattvakaumudī* ch. 56.

²³Cf. e.g. Ratnarakṣita’s *Padmīnī* (A 35^r): *yadā tu mṛtyur nivārayitum na śakyate tadotkrāntyā śarīraṃ yoginā tyājyam [...]*.

²⁴I intend to publish a review of this scholarly work. It should be mentioned in passing here that several of Vāgīśvarakīrti’s formulations show more than incidental resemblances to the *Pañjikā* of Kalyāṇavarman.

1702 by Tathāgatarakṣita, Tōh. 2839 by *Ajitamitra, Tōh. 3495, 3496, 3504 all *sādhanas* of Tārā aimed at cheating death, etc.)

The *Catuspīṭha* limits itself to the sets of bodily signs, the examination of breath, and external omens. Although the scripture itself does not envisage a theory of channels or tubes (*nāḍī*), all three commentators interpret the bodily signs as the result of some disturbance in the tubes. The first scripture I am aware of to advance this theory is the *Vajradāka*, which takes the signs from the *Catuspīṭha* and weaves around these passages the names of *nāḍīs* and other supplementary material.

I. Vajrapāṇi's questions

Oh Lord, I wish to hear particularly [about] true knowledge (jñānatattvam): what are the signs [of death] in this [human] body, [and] how is truth practiced? 1.2.1

true knowledge (jñānatattvam) The questions are put in rather general terms, hence Bhavabhaṭṭa must restrict their meaning. Thus 'true knowledge' refers to counteracting poison and so forth, the topics of the present chapter.

truth Here 'truth' in Bhavabhaṭṭa's view must refer to the mantras that are used to combat the bodily signs of death. It is to be noted that the *Vajradāka* (20.2d) changes the reading to *nāḍī*. This is not unnatural for that text, since the signs of death there are interpreted – as Bhavabhaṭṭa does in the present commentary – as the result of a collapse in the tubes. However, the *Catuspīṭha* does not envisage a theory of tubes.

II. The bodily signs of death

Hear, O Vajra[pāṇi], great king, I shall teach the bodily signs [of death]. No sooner than these are perceived, the time of death is as if at hand. 1.2.2

O Vajra[pāṇi], great king Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this somewhat odd form of address as a *bahuvrīhi* compound, where **vajramahārāja** refers to the *kulapati* of Vajrapāṇi, Akṣobhya, whose emblem is the thunderbolt. According to the *nirukti* given here he 'shines forth (*rājate*) by virtue of the emanation-body etc.' therefore he is called a *rājā*. The *Vajradāka* (20.5a) re-writes this

quarter-verse altogether, since the editors had to have the interlocutor as the goddess, and not Vajrapāṇi. I find it more natural to understand two Vocatives here.

If the length of breaths is perturbed (visphura), – provided that one has not perceived something disturbing – [such] men [shall] die in six months; [and the same applies when] crevices (ghūrṇasandhikā) [appear] on the cheeks. 1.2.3

perturbed (visphura) Normally *visphuraṇa* means either palpitation or swelling. Bhavabhaṭṭa wants to see both meanings, and explains the word as a general irregularity in breath: it becomes unnaturally longer or shorter. In what seems to be an alternative explanation he suggests that breath should be observed at dawn (but cf. 1.2.4cd). The third quarter stating the exception is in Bhavabhaṭṭa's opinion an *upalakṣaṇa*, so that the exceptions should include injury, exertion, and so forth, in short everything that alters natural breathing. The natural flow of breath presumably means 21,600 per day (i.e. 4 seconds per one cycle of breathing) as stated in 1.1.7.

crevices (ghūrṇasandhikā) **Ghūrṇa** is most likely a hyper-Sanskritized form of *ghuṇa*, which is Durjayacandra's gloss (*Mitapadā* 13^r : *gaṇḍapradeśe ghuṇarandhram iva sandhir lakṣayitavyaḥ*). Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses this with *kūpakau*, 'two small hollows'.

In times of distress the breaths are constantly perturbed (chijjati cchijjati), [therefore the examination of] signs [provided by breath] in this matter (tatra) should be done (kāraṇāt) at the break of dawn, the period [presided over by] rohitā. 1.2.4

constantly perturbed (chijjati cchijjati) This form of *chid* most likely reflects a middle-Indic pronunciation.

in this matter (tatra) should be done (kāraṇāt) The *Vajradāka* (20.6d) slightly improves this: *nimittam tasya lakṣayet*.

rohitā Applied to the day, *rohitā* means the first three watches (of 24 minutes each) counted from the break of dawn.

If the flesh of the nose is damaged (vicchidya), there are seven days [left until death] – of this there is no doubt. And when the cover of the eye ceases [to function], destruction is five days away. 1.2.5

damaged (vicchidya) Bhavabhaṭṭa explains that when this happens the nose becomes crooked (see *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* 23.20). In the other parallels *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* 23.17 and Vāgīśvarakīrti's text indicates a loosening (*śaithilya*) of the flesh.

cover (°ambara°) Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss 'water, tear (*lotam*²⁵)' is surprising. The verse seems to state that when the lid of the eye ceases to function death is at hand (see *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* 23.19), whereas the commentary suggests the absence of lubrication between the eyelid and the eye. The *Mṛtyuvañcanopadeśa* suggests a further interpretation: the absence of pulse between the eye and the nose.

[If the flesh] on the side of the cheeks [is damaged] life ends in one night. If the auricle of the ear is damaged, there are five watches [until death] – of this there is no doubt. 1.2.6

on the side of the cheeks I have completed this elliptic statement based on the parallels, which seem to link the statement to 1.2.5ab. Bhavabhaṭṭa's explanation – that there are two channels along the cheeks, and when these are damaged a long and sunken line (?) appears on the surface of the cheeks – can only be counted as secondary. Note the odd word °*jodikā*°, which is not attested by dictionaries known to me, but should probably be derived from *joda* 'chin', therefore *jodikā* a [line] belonging to the chin? This is consonant with the Tibetan translation *ri mo* 'line'. Bhavabhaṭṭa also points out that this sign is different from the one described in 1.2.3d, where it is two round crevices (*kūpakau*) that appear on the cheeks.

²⁵Normally *lota* should be masculine.

auricle of the ear (udukarṇaka°) I must follow Bhavabhaṭṭa here, since I am unable to explain the word *udu*°. If his interpretation is correct and *udu*° stands for *puṭa*, then we must treat this as an inverted compound. Again I cannot accept seeing this omen being the result of channels collapsing other than a secondary interpretation.

If a black line appears on the tongue, men shall perish in two nights. If the upper and lower [rows of] teeth (dantadantura°) become clamped, death will come in three nights. 1.2.7

a black line None of the commentators make any sense of the puzzling *idam* (also see 1.2.12a, 2.1.18, 3.2.27a).

upper and lower [rows of] teeth (dantadantura°) Although these are by no means attested meanings of the two words, the parallels and the commentators seem to take it to mean the maxillary and mandibular teeth.

If the vessels on the sides of the neck become protuberant, [death comes] in a fortnight – of this there is no doubt. When the cage of the heart sinks, [death comes] in a fortnight without cure by a doctor (vaidyācikitsayā). 1.2.8

vessels It is not needed to take this to mean a ‘subtle channel’, but rather the perceivable jugular vein and carotid artery.

the cage of the heart Bhavabhaṭṭa again conjectures a channel in the heart, but this again probably secondary. I have been unable to identify which anatomical part is referred to by this compound, perhaps the breastplate or the ribcage is meant. In his *saṃgrahaśloka* of omens²⁶ Durjayacandra speaks of a crevice in the spine (*vaṃśagarta*).

If the nails of the body become bloodless, [death is at hand] in eight days – of this there is no doubt. These are the eight signs of the body which herald the time of death. 1.2.9

²⁶*Mitapadā* 13^v.

eight In actual fact there are nine signs, which is why ms. A, and the *Vajradāka* change the reading to *nava*. Durjayacandra also speaks of nine omens.²⁷ Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, true to the original reading as he usually is, embarks on a tour de force to derive **aṣṭa** from the root *aś* in the sense ‘to pervade’, then to conjecture a lost Genitive ending, and then to construe it with **mṛtyukālam**, which he takes to be in the Genitive as well. Hence in his explanation the omens are ‘concomitant’ with the time of death.

III. Counteracting with mantras

After having described the bodily signs of death, the text moves on to present the several ways in which death may be ‘cheated’. The first is to counteract the nine signs with the nine *bījas* of the main goddesses of the *maṇḍala*.

In the case of damage to the flesh of the nose, one should oppose [the danger of death] with the seed[-syllable] of Jñāna[ḍākinī]. In the case of death [heralded by] damage to the cover of the eye, one should protect [oneself from death] with the seed[-syllable] of Vajrī. 1.2.10

protect Cf. *Dhātupāṭha* 1.249: *teja pālāne*. This goes somewhat against Bhavabhaṭṭa, who interprets this and the following optatives as ‘to nourish, to replenish’, etc. It is in the commentary to this verse that he gives the doctrine behind these meditative rites: if the channels ‘collapse’ death can enter, but if they are ‘replenished’ by a seed-syllable (or the visualized form of the respective deity) emitting blazes of light death is forced out of the body.

[Threat of death heralded by damage to the flesh] on the side of the cheeks should be opposed with the seed[-syllable] of Ghorī. Should the auricle of the ear become damaged, one should recite the seed[-syllable] of Vettālī. 1.2.11

[When death is announced by a black line on the tongue, 1.2.12

²⁷ *Mitapadā* 13^v: *kāni tāni punar aṅgacihṇāni nāḍīcakroktāni naveti darśayann [...]; [...] iti navacihṇasamgrahaślokaḥ [...]; ibid.* 14^r: *[...] ebhir eva navabhiś cihṇair mṛtyor udayakālāḥ pradarśitaḥ.*

one should meditate upon the seed[-syllable] of Caṇḍālī. When the upper and lower [rows of] teeth become clamped, one should fight [death heralded thus] with the seed[-syllable] of Siṃghī.

If the vessels on the sides of the neck become protuberant, [death thus announced] should be counteracted with the seed[-syllable] of Vyāghrī. When the cage of the heart sinks, one should support [oneself] with the seed[-syllable] of Jambukī. 1.2.13

If the nails of the hand become bloodless, one resorts to the seed[-syllable] of Ulūkī. These are the seed[-syllables that provide] protection against the bodily signs of death. 1.2.14

hand Note that 9a had °dehānām, presumably to indicate the nails of the feet as well.²⁸ This slight inconsistency is not addressed by the commentators.

Ulūkī The reading is unmetrical. It is quite possible that the metrically correct reading was **Lūkī** (as in mss. B & D). This is not the only example where the initial vowel is silent or dropped (cf. 1.2.16c, 1.2.23d).

IV. Cheating death

Next (paścād), in order to protect consciousness through gnosis, [the yogin] should draw [the protective] circle according to the injunction with [cow-]bile and/or saffron, after having secured a pair of unbaked vessels. 1.2.15

Next (paścād) Normally this would mean that after counteracting death-signs with the seed-syllables of the goddesses the yogin should perform the following ritual as an appendix. This interpretation is the one advanced by Kalyāṇavarman and Durjayacandra. However, according to Bhavabhaṭṭa and the variant reading cited by him (attested by all mss. except A and C which is unavailable here) this is a separate method altogether.

²⁸ *Pañjikā* 7^v: *akasmād dhastapādanakhānām raktabhāvāpagame sati [...]*

consciousness through gnosis Since Bhavabhaṭṭa does not gloss these words it must be assumed that he saw them in their primary meaning: consciousness is metonymic for life and gnosis the know-how of cheating death. Durjayacandra reads the entire *pāda* as a compound and offers two interpretations: 1) **jñāna** means men and **viññāna** means women, the intended meaning being that the rite can be used for both sexes; 2) **jñānaviññāna** is a *bahuvrīhi* meaning ‘life’, where **jñāna** stands for ‘means’ (i.e. the father) and **viññāna** for ‘wisdom’ (i.e. the mother), for it is their union that produces life (*jīvitam*) that is to be protected by the present rite.²⁹

circle In actual fact this is rather an apparatus (*yantra*) than a circle.³⁰ For similar usage see KURANISHI (forthcoming).

with [cow-]bile and/or saffron Bhavabhaṭṭa allows both interpretations, whereas Kalyāṇavarman sees this as an option.³¹ It is only appropriate that a life-protecting rite should use yellowish substances, for *pauṣṭika* rituals frequently use the colour yellow.

The first [vessel] is divided into nine boxes, and the upper [vessel] is divided into twelve. [The yogin] should write his (sya) name in the middle accompanied by the encasement (°veṣṭanabhis) of seed[-syllables].

1.2.16

into twelve Bhavabhaṭṭa envisages four lines to divide the lower vessel into nine, and a further four to divide the upper one into twelve. This is possible only if each of the intermediate corners are split into two and the central box on the upper vessel is not counted.

his (sya) This is not the *yogin*’s own name but the target’s (*sādhyasya*).

²⁹ *Mitapadā* 14^r : **jñānaviññānarakṣitam** iti- *jñānaṃ pumān, viññānaṃ strī, tayo rakṣaṇaṃ jñānaviññānarakṣitam. yad vā prajñopāyāṅgadvayayogāḥ jīvitam eva jñānaviññānaṃ, tasya rakṣā jñānaviññānarakṣitam.*

³⁰ *Mitapadā* 14^r : [. . .] *cakraṃ jīvarakṣaṇaṃ yantram.* Also see below ad 1.2.29 and verse 1.2.30.

³¹ *Pañjikā* 7^v : *rocanena kuṅkumena veti vikalpaḥ.*

encasement (°*veṣṭanabhis*) This is not entirely consonant with Bhavabhaṭṭa's terminology, since he uses *garbhaṇam* for the innermost mantras, and *veṣṭanam* for the letters on the exterior boxes and the felly. He seems to be unique in this aspect, cf. *Pañjikā* 8^r : *evaṃ madhyaṃ vidarbhya [. . .]*.

seed[-syllables] As Bhavabhaṭṭa points out these are not restrictively the seed-syllables of the goddesses, but *mantra*-letters which enclose the name of the target as described below.

First the sound of obeisance, [then the name of the target] before the word 'rakṣa', then the seed[-syllable] adorned by the five buddhas at the end, . . . 1.2.17

obeisance (*praṇamā*) Although I translate this word in accordance with its appearance, it should be pointed out that intervocalic -v- can and does sometimes change into -m- in Middle Indic, e.g. Govinda/Gominda.³²

. . . [and] at the [very] end the syllable[s] of oblation. The vowels [go both] above and below. [For the other boxes the yogin should employ] the syllables of field (kha), gale (pha), the twofold one, [and] the one that belongs to the goddess known as Vajrī. 1.2.18

at the [very] end The whole mantra for the central box then is: OM So-and-so RAKṢA HŪṂ SVĀHĀ. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa, duplication of RAKṢA is prescribed by oral teaching (*upadeśāt*). Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 8^r) also has a duplicated form but mentions no authority. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 14^v) seems to have preferred a single RAKṢA.

vowels According to Bhavabhaṭṭa (and perhaps also Durjayacandra) all sixteen vowels are used. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 7^v) specifies the exclusion of the *napuṃsakas* (i.e. ṛ, ṝ, ḷ, and ḹ).

³²Cf. the *Laṭakamelaka* of Śaṅkadhara (or Śaṅkara), where the edition (*Kāvyaṃālā* no. 20) and other mss. have Govinda in verse 4 and elsewhere, but a Nepalese fragment (Kaiser Library 88 = NGMPP C 6/22 1^v, *passim*) consistently has Gominda. See TAGARE 1948, pp. 81 & 83-86.

above and below I.e. the vowels are inscribed on both vessels. Although in Bhavabhaṭṭa's explanation this is given as a second alternative, it is perhaps the more natural interpretation. In his first **ūrdhvaṃ** means 'beyond', i.e. outside (viz. the nine or twelve boxes), and **nimnakaiḥ** is taken to mean the felly, which consists of two lines.

syllables, etc. These are the syllables of the four inner goddesses given in reverse order. **Kha** is hardly (if ever) attested as 'field' or 'earth', but that is how the commentators seem to take it: Bhavabhaṭṭa simply gives the *bīja* HṀṀ, whereas Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 8^v) glosses it with *prthivī* and then gives the same syllable. **Pha** is again rarely attested as 'gale' or 'wind', but again Bhavabhaṭṭa gives YṀṀ, whereas Kalyāṇavarman (*ibid.*) glosses it with *vāyuh* and gives the same syllable. **Dviguṇa** is widely attested to mean **kṣa**, therefore the *bīja* is KṢṀṀ. The seed-syllable of Vajrī or Vajradākinī is SṀṀ.

[Add for each] the seed[-syllable] in which [all] five [Tathāgatas] are joined, obeisance, and oblation at the end.

1.2.19ab

five [Tathāgatas] The intrusive and unmetrical 'buddha' in mss. of the commentary and ms. A was most likely a gloss.

The baton is the overlord Lokeśvara, and the curl is Vajrapāṇi. The body is Mañjuvara, and the bell is Maitreya, presiding over the head. The letter 'ma' blazes at the top; it indeed delivers from transmigration.

1.2.19cd-20

This celebrated description of the syllable HṀṀ is repeated in chapter 3.3, it is quoted in the literature at least once, and it inspired an ameliorated verse by Jitāri and a rather elegant rewriting by Kalyāṇavarman (see the register for parallels). Note that although the syllable is described as the one that embodies the five buddhas, it is not the *kulapatis* that are given for the parts of the graph, but the main bodhisattvas. Thus Lokeśvara stands for the closing line at the bottom of the letter 'ha' (alternatively, but perhaps less likely the short -u, which was once represented by a straight hanging line), Vajrapāṇi stands for the curl that is the long 'u' (alternatively the right-hand side of the graph in the old elongated 'ha'), Mañjuvara is embodied in the actual body of the letter 'ha', and Maitreya is the moon-digit (i.e. the lower half of the *candrabindu*). I have followed Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation here,

namely that 20d refers to the entire graph, but it is perhaps not unlikely that 20d is an epithet for the fifth, otherwise unnamed, bodhisattva representing the *bindu* (described here as blazing ‘ma’). According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the bodhisattvas correspond to Amitābha, Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amoghasiddhi, and the fifth is Vairocana. Kalyāṇavarman gives a different interpretation: he reads **ghaṇṭam** (which he sees as a code-word for Prajñāpāramitā) as corresponding to **aṅgam**. Thus the body of the letter ‘ha’ can represent either Mañjuvara (or Mañjunātha according to his gloss) or Prajñāpāramitā. But in this way Maitreya must be represented by the *sūtra*, i.e. the vertical closing line, and the fifth, Vairocana, by both elements of the *candrabindu*.³³ Although palaeographically speaking the graph described here seems to be of some age (perhaps pre-9th century, cf. BÜHLER 1896:table 4 for the letter ‘ha’), this is not direct evidence for the age of the text. For elements of *mantraśāstra* can be inherited even if the script changes in the meantime. For other interpretations of HŪṂ see e.g. HAKEDA 1972:246-262 (a translation of Kūkai’s *Ungi gi*), EVANS-WENTZ 1935:plate viii (a facsimile of a Tibetan drawing), etc.

Beginning with the eastern quarter [the yogin] should place [the mantra of] the goddess, the ḍākinī, her with the [word] ‘vajra’ [in her name]. In the north [the goddess] is the one with ‘ghora’ in her name – [the yogin] should employ her mantra [in the northern box]. 1.2.21

Vettālī abides in the west – [the yogin] should employ her seed[-syllable in the western box]. Caṇḍālī abides in the eastern quarter – [the yogin should employ her] seed[-syllable] together with the completion. 1.2.22

the completion In other words the *bījas* (which are SUṂ, KṢUṂ, YUṂ and HUṂ) are not enough, they have to be furnished with the *praṇava*, the name, the imperatives RAKṢA RAKṢA, HŪṂ and SVĀHĀ, as spelled out by Bhavabhaṭṭa.

³³ *Pañjikā* 8^v -9^r : [. . .] **daṇḍa** *iti*- HAKārasyaḍhastād rjurekhā, sa Lokeśvaraḥ. **kuṭīlam** *iti*- HŪṂkāre Ūkāraḥ sa Vajrapāṇi[h]. **aṅgam** HAKāraḥ, sa Mañjunātha[h]. **ghaṇṭeti** Prajñāpāramitā ca. tayor ekasvabhāvatvāt. Mañju[nātha]svabhāvo HAKāraḥ, Prajñāpāramitāsvabhāvo veti vikalpaḥ. **Maitreyaṃ śīrasi tatheti**- HAKārasya yā śīrorekhā, sa Maitreyaḥ. **makāram jvalitam ūrdhvam vai**- tatra **makāram** ity ardhacandrākṛtī rekhā, **jvalitam ūrdhvam** *iti* tadantabinduḥ. tau dvau **saṃsāramocaka** *iti*- Vairocanaḥ.

In the same way [use the seed-syllable of] Siṃhinī in the north-east; place that of Vyāghrī in the south-east; let [the bīja of] Jambukī [be used] in the south-west, [and that of] Ulūkī, she who roars [the sound] hūṃ, in the north-west. 1.2.23

As Bhavabhaṭṭa explains these seed-syllables (SMRYUṂ, HMRYUṂ, YMRUYUṂ, and KṢMRYUṂ) are not customized (*vidarbhaṇa*) with the name, etc.

The four seed[-syllables] of six letters each [should be placed] in each of the corners. [In short: the yogin] should place the seed[-syllables] in each of the[ir respective] directions. 1.2.24

of six letters I.e. the ones given above. These are otherwise known as *kūtabījas*, *kūṭākṣaras*, or *kūṭamantras* (the latter does not appear in the *Catuspīṭha* corpus) because the letters are stacked on one another. As for pronunciation, it is very likely that *schwas* were employed where appropriate, e.g. kṣ-ə-m-ə-ryuṃ, h-ə-m-ə-ryuṃ, etc.

Above, into the twelve places [the yogin] should install the seed[-syllables that are] the vowels. [Again he should use the sound of] obeisance, [of] oblation, [as well] the one at the end. Into [the boxes in the cardinal] directions he should install the eunuchs. 1.2.25

the eunuchs For the intermediate directions Bhavabhaṭṭa again cites the authority of oral transmission.

[The eunuchs are the syllables of] Dīpinī, Cūṣinī, Kāmbojī, and Ḍākinī. [The yogin] should install each in their appropriate places [accompanied] by [the sound of] obeisance, oblation, and the one at the end. 1.2.26

[accompanied] by Although the text seems to be saying that the ‘eunuchs’ are also bracketed by OṂ, SVĀHĀ, and HŪṂ, Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this to be a reiteration referring to the box in the middle on the upper vessel.

The east is the abode of Ḍākinī, Dīpinī dwells in the north, Cūṣiṇī is said to be in the west, and Kāmbojī should be installed in the south. 1.2.27

In the middle [the yogin] should write the name [of the target], just like the [customized] name above. [Then] he should place [the two vessels] one on top of the other and tie them together with a red string. 1.2.28

He should [then] anoint a place which is level all around with red sandalwood-paste. [Then he should offer worship] with all kinds of flowers, incense, fragrant powders, [preceded by] the ādhānakā food-offering. 1.2.29

[preceded by] the ādhānakā This is Bhavabhaṭṭa's addition. I have not found any parallels for the word ādhānakā. The corpus usually has *ohārabali* (cf. the reading of ms. A). Bhavabhaṭṭa does not attempt an etymology, but explains that such a *bali* is one where raw fish and meat, onion, garlic, flour, and similar substances are used.

[The yogin] should place the yantra presided over by the five ḍākinīs in the middle [of that place]. He should visualize himself as the vajra-bearing [goddess] and recite: 'I am Vajrasattva!' 1.2.30

presided over As Bhavabhaṭṭa explains he should visualize on top of the apparatus Jñānaḍākinī, Vajraḍākinī, Ghoraḍākinī, Vettālī, and Caṇḍālī.

the vajra-bearing [goddess] Bhavabhaṭṭa insists that the *yogin* should visualize himself as Jñānaḍākinī with or without her retinue, however, the text could very well simply allude to Vajrasattva. This is the interpretation adopted by Kalyāṇavarman, who sends the reader to the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* for a description of the procedure.³⁴ As a further option one can also visualize

³⁴*Pañjikā* 9^v-10^r: *ācāryeṇāpi kiṃsvabhāvena bhāvyaṃ ity āha- ātma vajradhṛg yogasyeti. ayam upadeśaḥ- Maṇḍalopāyikoktakrameṇa kṛta Vajrasattvayogaḥ [...]* The verses alluded to are most likely 2.14-16 in Caryāvratīpāda's text: *candramaṇḍalamadhyasthaṃ Vajrasattvābhi cintitam/ padmam āsanam āsīnaṃ himakundasamaprabham// divbhujam sattvaparyāṅkaṃ pañcabuddhābhi śekharam/ vajraṃ hṛdayapāṇasya ghaṇṭā vāma-kaṭiṃ nyaset// sarvābharaṇagātras tu suśobhāvāstrabhūṣitam/ raśmijvālām anekāś ca Vajrasattvam ahaṃ paṭhet//*.

the lack of self in all phenomena (*naiḥsvābhāvyam*) – so Bhavabhaṭṭa.

[Then the yogin,] with vajra in hand, should visualize a vajra on the tip of his hand [and] touch [the apparatus]. [Then] he should recite the seed[-syllable] that has been given for the middle [box of the two vessels] a hundred [and] eight times. 1.2.31

visualize a vajra Bhavabhaṭṭa omits commenting on this procedure. According to Kalyāṇavarman the *yogin* should visualize a *vajra* into the palm of his hand, taking the first **vajra** as alluding to the deity Vajrasattva whom the *yogin* was told to generate in the previous verse according to his interpretation.³⁵

touch [the apparatus] The commentators are divided as to the object of this verb. I have supplied the comments of Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman, but Durjayacandra says that the *yogin* should touch the target.

recite the seed[-syllable] The *mūla* seems to allude to the syllable HŪṀ (this is Kalyāṇavarman's interpretation). Durjayacandra gives this *bīja* as OM HŪṀ SVĀHĀ, whereas Bhavabhaṭṭa takes it in the wider sense to mean the entire customized *mantra* that has been written in the middle box: OM [name of the target] RAKṢA RAKṢA HŪṀ SVĀHĀ.

a hundred [and] eight times All three commentators state the number as eight-hundred. Durjayacandra states that this *mantra* empowers not the apparatus but the *yogin*'s hand.³⁶

The following three verses, which are designated by Bhavabhaṭṭa as a praise of the above rite, are not taken into consideration by the other two commentators.

[The yogin] should bind in (veṣṭayet) the [target's] sins 1.2.32

³⁵ *Pañjikā* 10^r : *vajrahasta karāgreṇeti- uktakrameṇa kṛta Vajrasattvayogī* (perhaps emend to °*yogaḥ* or *yogavān*?) *karāgra iti- svahastatale pañcasūcikam ṛitīṅ vajraṃ vicintya tena śarāvam saṃsprśet.*

³⁶ *Mitapadā* 15^v : *hastasya madhye uparitanacakroktam OM HŪṀ SVĀHĒty aṣṭaśataṃ japet. aṣṭaśatajaptamantreṇa hastena sprśet* [scil. *taṃ gatāyusaṃ*].

**committed in previous lives with the deities and the rest.
His body shall never [thenceforth] suffer, and there will
be no untimely death.**

bind in (veṣṭayet) This is perhaps the most puzzling statement in the entire chapter. The first **ādi** is probably a verse-filler, whereas the second most likely refers to the *mantras* inscribed on the vessels. What Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to be saying in his comment is that the rite alone does not protect one's life, but its efficiency is guaranteed if the sins of previous lives are 'enveloped' (assumed by?) the deities that were visualized on the top of the apparatus. For pādas a & b cf. *Samvarodaya* 17.24ab where seeing the *maṇḍala* 'scatters' (*nirvāpya*) previously committed sins. The Tibetan translation for this problematic half-verse 32ab runs thus: *tshe rabs snga ma'i sdig la sogs/ lha la sogs la bsgo bar bya/* (*jñāpayet 'to confess'?).

He will never be afflicted by disease. If [the yantra] is placed next to [a] patient (glānaṃ) in whose body life has been shattered, he will live for another six months. 1.2.33

[Alternatively,] he may place it anywhere else [he wishes, but he should] always be intent on worshipping it. Protected by only this much, who is it whose consciousness will leave [the body]? [There is no such man.] 1.2.34

V. Curing snakebite

[And now for] something else (aparaiḥ): [the yogin] should examine his own breath and [only then] undertake (kāraṇāt) this [rite of healing snakebite] (tatra). If the place [of the messenger/the client] is on the same [side] as the breath, that is said to be granting all accomplishments. 1.2.35

place [of arrival for the messenger/the client] As explained below the 'place' refers to the direction where the person asking the question concerning omens (*praṣṭr*) or announcing that someone has been bitten (*dūta*) is standing.³⁷ If the breath flows in the same nostril where the messenger is standing,

³⁷For such *dūtas* see e.g. *Kriyākālaguṇottara* 4.11-16. The section starts with the statement: *atha dūtāni pravakṣyāmi śu[bhā]ni aśubhāni ca/ yathā vijñāyate karma asādhyam sādhyam eva ca//*. I am grateful to Prof. Sanderson for pointing out this parallel.

then the rite will be successful. According to Indian physiology breath flows alternating between the two nostrils according to a defined rhythm.

is said (kathyate) Bhavabhaṭṭa construes the verb with **aparaiḥ** as the logical object. However, **aparaiḥ** can single-handedly introduce a new topic, cf. 1.2.102a.

Clever [yogins ought to know this:] [the] right [nostril] (dāyīṇa) for the right side [and the] left for the left. If [the] words [of inquiry come] from that [same] side, that is said to be granting all accomplishments. 1.2.36

Clever Alternatively this could be a Vocative addressing Vajrapāṇi.

right (dāyīṇa) This form perhaps illustrates the artificiality of the text's non-standard forms. TURNER's dictionary does not list any language that shows *y* in the place of the second consonant. I thank Prof. Sanderson for this note.

If the words [are uttered] while the breath is absent, accomplishment is far from being obtained. [The yogin] should know that these are two units (yogasya): the unit of 'moment' (kṣaṇa°) and the unit of 'breath' (prāṇa°). 1.2.37

on leave In other words although the messenger may stand on the correct side, he must ask the question when the *yogin* is breathing in, otherwise the rite is prognosticated to be without success.

the unit of 'moment' (kṣaṇa°) and the unit of 'breath' (prāṇa°) These are breathing in and breathing out respectively. In this there is no disagreement among the three commentators. Kalyāṇavarman even glosses them with the native terminology *hārā/hāra* and *dolā/dola*.³⁸ For **yoga** in this sense cf. *Mitapadā* 15^v : *tad eva yujyate ghaṭīsaṃkhyayā* (Ms^{p.c.} , *ghaṭīśvāsasaṃkhyayā* Ms^{a.c.}) *vyavasthāpyata iti yogah*.

³⁸ *Pañjikā* 10^r -10^v : *śvāsasthānasamatve 'pi hārādolavibhāgata iṣṭāniṣṭaviśeṣatām upadaśayann āha- kṣaṇaprāṇasya yogasyetyādi. kṣaṇa iti hāraśvāsaḥ. prāṇam iti dolaśvāsaḥ. śvāsasthānayoḥ ekasthāne saty apī yadī hāre pṛcchati tac chubham. yadā dole pṛcchet tadanyat.*

Any rite [begun] on the ‘moment’ [i.e. the ingoing breath] is said to bring prosperity/reinvigoration. If a rite is begun during ‘breath’ [i.e. the outgoing breath], success is nigh impossible – of this there is no doubt. 1.2.38

to bring prosperity/reinvigoration Here I follow Kalyāṇavarman³⁹ and Durjayacandra.⁴⁰ Bhavabhaṭṭa would like to see this word in the technical sense to specify *sarvakāryeṣu*. In this case *parikīrtitam* awkwardly remains without a subject.

Let [the yogin] perform healing [only] in [such] cases [where] he has pondered over [the chances of healing] a bitten person, etc., [and] the [chances for remedying the] poison. The knowledgeable [yogin should thus consider] the aforesaid [time-]units (°yoga°) in which *nāgas* can be commanded, and other [such circumstances]. 1.2.39

a bitten person, etc. Both Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra wish to extend the statement to all kinds of poisons, not only that of snakes. Thus Bhavabhaṭṭa takes *ādi* to mean any kind of patient, whereas Durjayacandra states that here snake-poison is to be taken metonymically, it being the strongest possible poison.⁴¹

aforesaid In 1.1.65-69, where each of the chief *nāgas* are assigned to one of the *bhuvaneśvaras*. 1.1.58 states (for the first time, the statement is repeated in the passage referred to) that healing can be undertaken during five of the time-units: *vṛṣabha*, *rohitā*, *makara*, *raṇḍā*, and *mikira* (the last four are collectively referred to as the *rephas*). However, Bhavabhaṭṭa gives a different list in his commentary to the next verse.

He who is bitten during the four [time-]units (°yoga°) and the other will die – of this there is no doubt. [If he was bitten] at any other [time], healing is [possible] through the yoga of extracting poison. 1.2.40

³⁹ *Pañjikā* 10^v : *pauṣṭikam* iti sarvakārye siddhir ity abhiprāyah.

⁴⁰ *Mitapadā* 17^r : [. . .] *pauṣṭikaṃ pūraṇaṃ pūrṇatā{ṃ}*. *tatkāryasiddhir avaśyam bhavātīti yāvat*.

⁴¹ *Mitapadā* 17^r : *sarvaviṣāṇāṃ daṃṣṭrāviṣaṃ balavad iti tadadhikāreṇa viṣacikitsām āha* [. . .]

the four [time-]units (°yoga°) and the other According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these are the *bhuvaneśvaras mikira, bhidrika, svapna, and kāma*. This is somewhat at odds with the previous statement of the tantra (see above). Kalyāṇavarman⁴² also takes these four to be the four *rephas*, while Durjayacandra adds *vṛṣabha* to the four.⁴³

[First the] knowledgeable [yogin] should install the various installations of [mantra-]letters on the body of the bitten person, [that is to say] he should place eight mantra-letters on eight limbs [of the victim]. 1.2.41

install the various installations The tautology did not escape Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra. Whereas the first tries to make most of the prefix **vi-**, the second is more imaginative taking **vinyāsam** as an adverb in the sense ‘without omitting to take into consideration the proper place’.⁴⁴

eight mantra-letters These are the eight seed-syllables of the eight *ḍākinīs* in Jñānaḍākinī’s retinue. The procedure is in this corpus otherwise referred to as *aṣṭāṅgakalanam*. The differences among the commentators regarding the accurate placement of *bījas* may be tabulated as follows. It is to be noted that Kalyāṇavarman and Durjayacandra give the first three *bījas* in the order KṢUṂ HUṂ YUṂ, and that Kalyāṇavarman also gives the colours (yellow, black, red, white, yellow and white, white and black, black and red, red and yellow⁴⁵) mentioning that this is how they should first be placed on the body of the victim, and that these are only later, during the actual removal of the poison, visualized as white (as 42a suggests).⁴⁶

⁴² *Pañjikā* 10^v: **caturyoga** iti catvāro rephāḥ. teṣu daṣṭānām cikitsā na kāryā{ḥ}.

⁴³ *Mitapadā* 17^r-17^v: rephopalakṣitā rephāś catvārah, **ādiśabdād** vṛṣa[bha]pañcamāḥ, rohitāmakararaṇḍāmikirāḥ. eṣu daṣṭānām gatāyusām niyatam mṛtyutvān na cikitsām icchatī viṣabhīśagvaraḥ. kva punar asyāś cikitsāyā icchā kāryeti ced āha- **cikitsām anyeṣu sarveṣu** ityādi. vṛṣa[bha]rephetaṣu saptasu yogeṣu daṣṭānām śakyacikitsātvāc cikitsāivety arthaḥ.

⁴⁴ *Mitapadā* 17^v: **vinyāsam** iti kriyāvīśeṣaṇam anatīkrāntayathāsthānam.

⁴⁵ The word he uses to describe the combination of two colours is *anuviddha*. This would normally mean that the colours are mingled, but chapter 2.3 makes it quite clear that the goddesses in the intermediate corners, whose *bījas* these are, assume their colours half and half.

⁴⁶ *Pañjikā* 11^r: [scil. aṣṭa ḍāginībījāni] svakīyavarṇayuktāny eva yathāsthānam prathamam vinyasya viṣāpahārādhikāre punaḥ sarvāny eva śvetībūtāni bhāvayed iti niścayaḥ.

bīja	Bhavabhaṭṭa	Kalyāṇavarman	Durjayacandra
KṢUṂ	head	head	head
YUṂ	nostrils & ears	nostrils & ears	eyes
HUṂ	eyes	eyes	forehead
SUṂ	throat	tongue	mouth
SMRYUṂ	neck	neck	neck
HMRYUṂ	shoulders	armpits	sexual organs
YMRYUṂ	heart	chest	thigh
KṢMRYUṂ	navel	navel	toes

It is observable that the first two commentators give more or less the same list, whereas Durjayacandra was inspired by 1.2.72.

After having visualized [these seed-syllables] white in colour, he should extract the seed [of death that is the] poison [for that is nothing else but] the mind. [Then] with the [seed-syllable of] gnosis he should block consciousness in the central region of the maṇḍala [that is the body].

1.2.42

the seed etc. I have followed Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation here, although it is not untinged by *yogācāra* ideas. Originally **manaḥ** could have meant 'by mental visualization'. Durjayacandra takes **manaḥ** and **bīja** as subject and apposition, the idea being that the *bījas* are not separate from the yogin's mind.⁴⁷ Kalyāṇavarman does not give a direct gloss, but from the *upadeśa* described by him it can be gathered that he took **manaḥ** to refer to the consciousness of the victim. The terminology he uses (*tāraḥbhūtāṃ ālaya-vijñānaṃ*) merits some attention. As pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson,⁴⁸ this term is most likely derived from the Śaiva tradition (viz. the *Svacchanda* 3.170-171⁴⁹) where the soul of the candidate for initiation is thus visualized (*caitanyaṃ bhāvayec chiśoḥ [...] sphurattāraḥsaprabham*) and extracted from the body. Although the usage of the term in Tantric Buddhism

⁴⁷*Mitapadā* 18^r: *īdrśaṃ bījaṃ mano'nanyatvāt manas tathākāroditaṃ yogicittaṃ viṣān avaśyaṃ haret.*

⁴⁸E-mail, 7 November 2007.

⁴⁹Further occurrences of the term are most likely derivatives from that scripture: *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Bhojadeva (Ms 29^v: [...]) *śiśoś caitanyaṃ sphurattāraḥkāraṃ [...]*, *Somaśambhupaddhati* (vol. 1, vv. 14-15: [...]) *tāraḥkāraṃ jīvaṃ [...]* & *ibid.* vol. 3, v. 3: [...]) *prasphurattāraḥkāraṃ caitanyaṃ [...]*, etc.

is somewhat rare (and to my knowledge unattested with the *cvi* formation), it is not unprecedented: cf. *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* ch. 4 (copied verbatim by the *Gūḍhapadā* 16^r): [. . .] *cittaṃ māyopamākāram ākāśadeśasthaṃ prakṛtiprabhāsvaraṃ tārakākāraṃ vicintya* [. . .].

with the [seed-syllable of] gnosis etc. This is again Bhavabhaṭṭa’s view, arrived at by reading the words separately and supplying the appropriate endings for the nil-suffix. Kalyāṇavarman’s cited *upadeśa* takes both **jñāna**^o and **°vijñāna**^o to mean the syllable HŪṂ. The pair is said to ‘flank’ (**°tambhitam** in his reading) the consciousness of the victim visualized as a shining star (see above) in the region of the heart (thus tacitly he also seems to take **maṇḍala** to mean ‘the body’).⁵⁰ Durjayacandra’s explanation is in a way a composite of the two: he takes **jñāna** as the *jñānabīja* (i.e. HŪṂ), **vijñāna** as the consciousness of the victim which is seen as a pulsating light (*jyotir-īṅgananibhaṃ daṣṭakajīvam*), and **stambhitam** as blocking off poison from that.

the maṇḍala [that is the body] The verse is unmetrical, but I have kept it in this way, as it was presumably this form that was read by Bhavabhaṭṭa. Kalyāṇavarman’s reading is metrical (**saṃsthānam**), but with no change to the meaning. Durjayacandra and all mss. of the *mūla* introduce an **’pi**, which that commentator interprets as signaling an option: the visualization is either focused on the heart, or done for the eight limbs mentioned before.

After having performed the yoga of protecting the body [of the victim] (aṅge), [the yogin] should undertake the outer [rite]. He should fill a pot [of clay] etc. with water mixed with milk. 1.2.43

a pot [of clay] etc. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman the **ādi** refers to the material of the vessel. Durjayacandra takes this as an inverted compound with the sense ‘a new pot’.

In the middle [of that pot] he should visualize a lotus 1.2.43-46ab

⁵⁰ *Pañjikā* 11^r -11^v: [. . .] *jñānavijñānatambhitam*– *jñānam* HŪṂkārāḥ, *vijñānam* *api sa eva. tasmād ayam arthaḥ*– *prajñopāyabhūtābhyāṃ* HŪṂkārābhyāṃ *tārakābhūtavijñāna-pārśvasthitābhyāṃ śvetābhūtābhyāṃ tad eva vijñānam pīḍayed ity upadeśaḥ.*

adorned with a moon-disk. [On this] he should visualize Vajraḍākinī adorned with a white parasol, with two arms, seated in the comfortable position, embellished with snakes as ornaments, [sporting] a skull-staff and a yoga-bowl, beautified with resplendent garments, sitting atop the lotus pressing down the heads of the eight nāgas.

Vajraḍākinī As stated by Bhavabhaṭṭa she emerges from her *bīja*, which is *SUṂ*. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 11^v) has some preliminaries before this: the lotus should be generated with the *kamalābhamudrā* and the spell *OM KAMALĀBHE SVĀHĀ*. Atop the lotus the moon-disk is generated from the letter *A*, on which a *SUṂ* is visualized. This turns into a vajra with *SUṂ* inscribed on its handle, and omits rays of light which spread out and then resorb the coven of *ḍāginīs*. Then the mantra *OM VAJRAŚUDDHĀḤ SARVADHARMĀ VAJRAŚUDDHO 'HAM* is recited and the vajra turns into the white Vajraḍākinī. Durjayacandra also states that the lotus is generated with *OM KAMALĀBHE SVĀHĀ*, but there the moon-disk emerges from *SAM* (a corruption?), and Vajraḍākinī directly from *HUM* (*Mitapadā* 18^v).

the comfortable position The *sattvaparyāṅka* is defined as placing the right foot on the left thigh and the left under the right in the *Parikramapadopāyikā* (Ms 8^r): *vāmorūpari dakṣiṇapādaṃ nyasya vāmaṃ tadadhaḥ sthāpayet – sattvaparyāṅkaḥ*.

yoga-bowl In other words a skull-bowl, a term not often used, cf. *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 6.11b (*yogapātraka*), *Hevajra* II.v.31d (*yogapātrikā*).

the heads of the eight nāgas Bhavabhaṭṭa specifies that the heads are in between the calyx of the lotus (which should also be white) and the moon-disk. According to Kalyāṇavarman they occupy the petals of the lotus.

In the east he should visualize Vāsuki, Takṣaka in the north, Karkoṭa in the west, the one called Padma in the south, Mahāpadma in the north-east, Śaṅkhaḍāka in the south-east, the one with Kuliśa in his name in the south-west, and Hulaṇḍaka in the north-west. [The yogin] should visualize that [Vajraḍākinī] is seated pressing down the heads of the eight nāgas.

1.2.46cd-
48

Vāsuki etc. This list of the *nāgas* somewhat deviates from the standard, which is to begin with Ananta (who is reintroduced in texts such as the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*). Outside the Catuspīṭha corpus I am aware of the following texts which use the present list: an anonymous *Cakrasamvarasādhana* fragment (NAK 1-1697 11/7 = NGMPP A 994/7, f. 6^r), the *Samvarodaya* 17.40, the *Śmaśānavidhi* of Lūyipāda (the last of the eight is lost perhaps due to corruption). Note that Kuliśa is frequently conflated with Kulika (with or without the affix ‘pāla’), and Hulaṇḍaka has several variants such as Huluhulu. Therefore it can be said that the present list did enjoy some success in the *Samvara* corpus. Otherwise, as Prof. Sanderson kindly informed me, the list is the standard brahmanical/Śaiva list, with one alien, Buddhist element, Hulaṇḍaka (also known as Hulaṭa, Hulaṇṭa), the *nāga* guardian of Kashmir according to the tradition of the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya.

[The yogin] should worship [her/the nāgas] with all kinds of articles [such as] flowers [and] incense. [Then] he should offer bali. He should visualize his body in conjunction with Vajraḍākinī.

1.2.49

should worship [her/the nāgas] Bhavabhaṭṭa does not state the object of worship. Durjayacandra says that the *yogin* worships the *nāgas* having first offered worship to Jñānaḍākinī. According to Kalyāṇavarman the colours of the *nāgas* are the same as the *bījas* previously visualized to protect the body of the victim (*Pañjikā* 11^v). Durjayacandra quotes from an unidentified *vyākhyātantra* which provides the details (*Mitapadā* 18^v).

in conjunction with Vajraḍākinī There is some variation in both readings and interpretation here. Bhavabhaṭṭa clearly read the last quarter in this form and states that the *yogin* visualizes himself as Vajraḍākinī at the time of removing poison. In light of **yogavat** in the next verse this is perhaps the most acceptable interpretation. Kalyāṇavarman has Vajrasattva as the deity, additionally supplying that it should be visualized as oneself either instantly or according to the *vīstārasādhana*, an untraced work (*Pañjikā* 12^r). Durjayacandra’s reading is uncertain as he offers both options, but for him the visualization is to be done during worship (*Mitapadā* 19^r).

bali Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 19^r) adds that this offering should contain milk.

With a bunch of peacock’s tail-feathers, whilst maintaining meditative conjunction with the deity (yogavat), he should extract and then [do the] opposite (m-anya). After having drawn [the poison] from all [limbs down to the] sole of the foot, [he should make it] mix in with the water [in the pot].

1.2.50

a bunch of peacock’s tail-feathers A *piccha/ka* (also *piñccha/ka*) is often employed to cure snake-bite, cf. *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (p. 231), *Uḍḍāmareśvaratantra* 12.46, *Tantrasadbhāva* 23.305 (prose). It is also one of the implements of Mahāmāyūrī, the *par excellence* goddess to handle *nāgas* in the earlier tantric tradition. Peacock feathers are also carried by the *bhūtātāntrikas* as stated in the *Kriyākālaguṇottara* (f. 49^r). I thank Prof. Sanderson for this last reference.

whilst . . . with the deity (yogavat) It is likely that Bhavabhaṭṭa’s text is corrupt here. The interpretation is suggested by Kalyāṇavarman who states that the tail-feather should be visualized in the hand of Jñānaḍāginī, whom the *yogin* visualizes himself as.

[do the] opposite (m-anya) If Bhavabhaṭṭa’s text is correct, he interprets this puzzling reading as *tyajed* (perhaps as the opposite of ‘to draw’).

having drawn [the poison] For a very similar procedure see *Sādhanamālā* no. 121, a *kalpa* of Jāṅgulī,⁵¹ and perhaps the closest parallel – although the procedure is done the other way around –, *Raktayamāritantra* 10.2-8.⁵²

⁵¹Ed. p. 251: *tataḥ sarpadaṣṭakam purataḥ samsthāpya tāmradibhājane udakam pratiṣṭhāpyānaya vidyayā saptavārābhimantritam tam sapta vārān śiraḥprabhṛtiḥ | viṣam ākr̥ṣya tat[r]odaka eva prakṣipet punaḥ punaḥ | etena nirviṣo bhavati |*

⁵²Ms f. 1v-2r: *catvārilakṣajāpena siddhārthabījasaṃcayaiḥ* (em., °*saṃjayeḥ* Ms) | *supt[ak]otthāpana[ṃ] kāryam jīvate ca na saṃśayaḥ || 2 || śānta[ṃ] śukla[ṃ] yama-gaṃ* (em., *yamadyaṃ* Ms) | *ca bhāvayed yogavit sadā | haste siddhārthabījāni japel lakṣa-catuṣṭayam || 3 || daṣṭakam saṃmukham* (em., *sumukham* Ms) | *kṛtvā tādayet* (em., *tatrayat* Ms) | *sarṣapena tu | uttiṣṭhati na saṃdehaḥ kālena grhīto yadi || 4 || sādhyasya hṛdaye* (em., *kṛtaye* Ms) | *dhyeyaṃ* (em., *dhyayaṃ* Ms) | *hūmkāram sitasaṃnibham | hr̥iṣṭryādīmantram āvartya raśmibhir ākarṣayed viṣam || 5 || savyahaste tathā vāme padmam aṣṭadalaṃ nyaset | tasya{ } madhye ca hūmkāram raśmibhiḥ sravate* (em., *dhravate* Ms) | *sudhām || 6 || punaḥ śirasi tasyaiva śitāṃśumaṇḍalamadhye haḥkāram cintayed budhaḥ | tato hr̥iṣṭryādī-*

[The chief mantra to extract the poison is:] **om hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara hūṃ phaṭ svāhā**. In meditative conjunction with Vajrasattva he should [recite it] one lakh times for the preliminary service (sevādi). 1.2.51-52

hūṃ phaṭ According to Bhavabhaṭṭa oral transmission enjoins to triple these two *mantras*. According to Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 12^r) this is the heart-*mantra* of the eight chief *nāgas* (°*nāgarājahṛdayam*). He also adds that during *pūrvasevā* only this much is to be recited.

preliminary service (sevādi) The *ādi* is either a verse filler or a synonym for *pūrvā*^o, in which case we should read it as an inverted compound.

Om Vāsuki hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Takṣaka hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Karkoṭaka hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Padma hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Mahāpadma hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Śaṅkhapāla hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Kuliśapāla hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om Hulaṇḍaka hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā. Om hrīḥ taṭṭaṇḍara svāhā hūṃ 3 phaṭ 3 make so-and-so free of poison **hūṃ phaṭ svāhā**. 1.2.53-61

Om etc. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa all the above mantras, excluding the first – which is the heart-*mantra* to be recited three lakh times (cf. ad 68a below) – and the last – which is the customized form to be used in the ritual proper – are to be recited one lakh times to gain mastery over them. Kalyāṇavarman seems to suggest that the mantras containing the names of *nāgas* are also to be customized, perhaps by having first established under which *nāgarāja*'s command the snake in question belongs to (*Pañjikā* 12^v). Durjayacandra uses a word unknown to me (*jhāṭanakrama*) to refer to the rite proper after the mantras have been mastered (*Mitapadā* 19^r).

Having drawn out [the poison] into the milk [mixed with water in the pot] the milk instantly becomes black. 1.2.62ab

[The yogin] should [then] mix [white] mustard-seeds, white 1.2.62cd-63

mantram ca † daṇḍen† ākarṣayed viṣam || 7 || om hrīḥ ṣṭrīḥ haḥ hūṃ jaḥ phuḥ-kāramantreṇa mastakād ārabhya pādānte mantrair apamāṛjayet || 8 ||

flowers, and [white] sandalwood-paste and hit the heart of the bitten victim whilst reciting the mantra. No sooner than the heart [starts to] throb [he should] hold back [consciousness] by blocking it with the [seed of] gnosis.

[then] Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets this procedure as following the moment when the milk becomes black after the extracted poison is mixed in. For Durjayacandra this is a separate procedure altogether (*Mitapadā* 19^v).

with the [seed of] gnosis All three commentators seems to interpret the same word twice (following the exegetical license of *āvṛtti*): once to mean consciousness (*viñāna* or *jīvitendriya*) and once to mean the syllable HŪṂ.

No sooner than consciousness is held back the breaths begin to quiver. No sooner than the breaths begin to quiver [the yogin] should force [the victim's breath to return into his body] with his own breath. 1.2.64

force his own breath According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the *yogin* should force the victim's outgoing breath to return into his body. In effect this is a primitive mouth to mouth resuscitation. Kalyāṇavarman sees a more meditative procedure alluded to here: the *yogin* should force back the victim's *jīvitendriya* with the seed-syllable of wind (which in this system is YUṂ).⁵³ Durjayacandra's explanation is close to Bhavabhaṭṭa's. The only addition in his commentary is that the *yogin* should visualize himself as Yogāmbara or any other deity (*Mitapadā* 19^v).

No sooner than the breath is forced [to return, the victim's] hands, feet, etc. will tremble. When all the limbs are trembling [the yogin] should sing the song, ... 1.2.65

the song This is the hallmark *apabhraṃśa gītikā* (also called *hūṃkāragītikā* in the next verse and by Kalyāṇavarman) of the *Catuṣpīṭha* given in 4.4.93cd *passim* (**te nā hūṃ te nā hūṃ te nā te te hūṃ**). Here only the refrain is given by Bhavabhaṭṭa. He comments thus ad loc. cit.:

te kāyavākcittātmakāḥ skandhadhātuvāyatanalakṣaṇāḥ padārthāḥ.

Nibandha ad
4.4.93cd

⁵³ *Pañjikā* 12^v: *ayam āśayaḥ- sādhyasya jīvitendriyaṃ vāyubījena pīḍayed iti yāvat.*

*neti pratiṣedhe. grāhyagrāhakādirūpeṇa te na santi prakṛtipra-
bhāsvaratayā santīti bhāvaḥ. kuta ity āha- hūṃ iti. hūṃ iti-
cittamātram sarvaṃ yata ity arthaḥ.*

‘te’ (those) are the categories of existence: the aggregates, the *dhātus*, the *āyatanas*, which have body, speech, and mind as their nature. ‘nā’ (no) stands for negation. Those [categories] do not exist in the sense that they can be perceived or act as perceivers, and so forth, but exist as being pure by their very nature. Why is this so? [The text] states: ‘hūṃ’. Because of ‘hūṃ’, that is to say because all things are merely consciousness.

In light of this explanation it becomes easy to grasp why Bhavabhaṭṭa chose to explain **manaḥ** in the way he did ad 1.2.42b. For him the reason why the ritual works is because everything is merely consciousness. Here the *yogin* merely calls to mind that fact. In Kalyāṇavarman’s view with the song the *yogin* performs a *jñānāveśa*.⁵⁴ He does not explain the procedure, but it is perhaps similar to what we find in Dīpaṃkarabhadra’s *Guhyasamāja-maṇḍalavidhi* vv. 350cd-353ab. Durjayacandra seems to miss the point and takes the injunction to mean the recitation of HŪṂ as if it were a song, with the syllable prolonged (*Mitapadā* 19^v).

... namely the song with the syllable hūṃ [in it]. [The yogin should] snap his fingers thrice, [whereupon the victim] will rise. No sooner than the bitten [victim] rises, [the yogin] should perform a protective rite for him. 1.2.66

a protective rite This to Bhavabhaṭṭa means to visualize the now cured victim as Vajraḍākinī. Durjayacandra’s view is to reiterate the visualization of the eight seed-syllables so that the victim will become protected from the poison spreading, *ḍākinīs*, and so forth.⁵⁵

After having extracted [the poison] he should pour that milk [mixed with water and the poison] into a place inhabited by nāga[s]. 1.2.67ab

⁵⁴ *Pañjikā* 12^v: hūṃkāragūtikayā sādhyasya jñānāveśa{na}ṃ kuryād iti bhāvaḥ.

⁵⁵ *Mitapadā* 19^v: utthāpitasya viṣākramaṇaḍākinīyādyair anabhibhavanāya rakṣām aṣṭā-
ṅgeṣu kṛtvā, [...]

a place Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra gloss this as ‘a lake’. Kalyāṇavarman is more permissive: ‘a great river, etc.’

Having visualized [himself] as Vajrasattva seated upon a moon-disk he should first recite [the heart-mantra] three lakh times [thus] achieving the preliminary service. [Yogins who do so] will obtain success in extracting poison[s] – of this there is no doubt.

1.2.67cd-68

Vajrasattva Bhavabhaṭṭa adds further iconographical details: the deity is two-armed, white, seated in the *vajra*-position atop a moon-disk which is on a lotus, holding a bell in his left and a *vajra* in his right.

If one is bitten on the face, the forehead, on the eyes, above, on the neck, on the nostrils, on the heart, on the private parts, on the navel, on the thumbs/toes, or on the feet, [that person] is incurable, [for such bites] are said to be fatal.

1.2.69

above According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this is the palate, although I find it very difficult to imagine how one could become bitten there.⁵⁶

on the heart, on the private parts Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses these as the sexual organs and the anus respectively.

I am aware of at least one text which closely follows the procedure described above (vv. 39-69). It survives only in Tibetan (Tōh. 2174), where the title is *Gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po lag na rdo rje gos sngon po can gyi sbyor ka chen po'i cho ga*, but judging by the closing verse (29^r) it is more likely that the title was something along the lines of **Prayogaratnamālā*. This is perhaps a more appropriate title for the very reason that the work is just that: a series of rites, mostly centered around Vajrapāṇi of the Blue Robe

⁵⁶However, there are parallels, such as the *Kriyākālaguṇottara* 4.5-6: *kaṅṭhe ca bas-timedhre ca karamadh[y]eṣu sandhiṣu | adhare śīrabhrūmadhye śāṅkhe* (em., *sāṅkha* Ms) *netre gude{s} tathā || staneṣu kakṣaskandheṣu grīvāyāṃ tālūke tathā | marmakṣetrāṇi etāni eṣu daṣṭo na jīvati ||*; or the *Viṣanārāyaṇīya* 2.38cd-39 (paralleled in the *Kāśyapa-saṃhitā*): *indriyāṇy oṣṭhahṛtkakṣabhrūmadhyakucakukṣayaḥ || tāluśāṅkhau galo mūrdhā cibukaṃ nābhimastake | dohpādamadhyaṃ skandhaś ca sarpaḍaṃśasya ninditāḥ ||*

(*nīlāmbaradhara*). The work is attributed in the Canon to one Bhava, who may or may not be Bhavabhaṭṭa, although I am inclined to think that it is not. In any case, the author of that text was more than certainly influenced by Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary in his chapter 20 describing the healing of snakebite.⁵⁷

VI. Making rain

With the penultimate topic in this sub-chapter we remain in the realm of general magic. Just as in the case of foretelling death, the brahmanical religion, the Śaivas, and the Buddhists included in their ritual repertoire methods to bring about rain, and it seems that it was one of their most sought after powers. Buddhist monks from Central Asia and India who came to the Chinese imperial court were frequently appointed to make rain or stop excessive rain. Such accounts begin as early as the late 4th century (CHOU 1945:243) and include the most celebrated figures of Chinese Esoteric Buddhism such as Śubhakarasiṃha (*ibid.* p. 268), Vajrabodhi (*ibid.* 276-277), and Amoghavajra (*ibid.* p. 292, p. 298-299 & p. 303). Unfortunately the Chinese accounts do not specify which texts were used.

The literature in this respect is quite large. The classic scripture of the early middle ages for controlling rain (which is under the control of the *nāgas*) is the proto-tantric *Meghasūtra*. For a succinct examination of the way in which such rituals were thought to have been effective and the gradual shift in the officiants' attitude from appealing to the friendliness of *nāgas* and other supernatural creatures towards ever-increasing aggressive control see SCHMITHAUSEN 1997.

Almost each new wave of Tantric revelation of the later middle ages had its own method of rain-making: the late *kriyātantra* entitled *Vajratuṇḍanāgasamaya*, the *Kṛṣṇayamāri* (9.1-2), the *Vajradāka* (three such procedures in

⁵⁷A few examples should suffice: a) the verse describing the places on the body where snakebite is fatal (15^v -16^r) has *rkan* (**tālu*) for where the *Catuṣpīṭha* reads **ūrdhva** (cf. *Nibandha* ad 1.2.69); b) when giving the heart-*mantra* for healing snakebite (15^v) the text states that the *mantra* should be recited with three HŪMS and three PHATs as per oral transmission (cf. *Nibandha* ad 1.2.52); c) for the four time-units the text (16^r) gives the same list of snakes: Rigs ldan (*Kulika/Kuliśa), Mgo brgya (*Śataśīrṣa), Gtsigs pa (*Karāla), and Dug gi mche ba (*Kāladaṣṭa) (cf. *Nibandha* ad 1.2.40a); d) the numbers (15^r) for the preliminary service are the same: three lakhs for the main *mantra* and one lakh for each of the secondary *mantras* (cf. *Nibandha* ad 1.2.68).

ch. 4, but also in chs. 3 & 5), the *Abhidhānottara* (ch. 31 or 34 depending on numeration), the *Hevajra* (I.ii.20), the *Buddhakapāla*, the *Kālacakra* (4.136), and the *Catuṣpīṭha*. Testimony to the popularity of these passages and the rites they describe is the fairly large number of manuscripts containing *varṣāpaṇa* anthologies.⁵⁸ These rites could also circulate in separate booklets or scribbles on extra space (e.g. Asiatic Society ms. G 9984), and they inspired a number of monographs, such as the *Varṣāpaṇavidhi* attributed to Abhayākara-gupta surviving in Tokyo Library no. 307V⁵⁹ and *ibid.* no. 1016. All the anthologies I have consulted contain *Catuṣpīṭha* 1.2.70-101ab verbatim.

The passage is introduced by the Lord himself. Bhavabhaṭṭa attributes this to the fact that the topic is kindred to the previous one, as both snakebite and rain fall under the rubric of *nāgas*. Kalyāṇavarman explains the lack of exhortation by stating that the Lord knew that Vajrapāṇi is ever ready to act for the benefit of others, therefore this is a topic that he surely wishes to hear.⁶⁰

Hear, O great king, the true principle [which is] the supreme [method] to make rain (varṣāpaṇam). In a place pleasing to the heart, next to water, [the yogin] should spread a canopy draped with variegated cloths and perform the rite of preparing the powders which are ground [substances] in the five colours, and so forth. [With those he should build a maṇḍala:] with four corners, four gateways, adorned with the eight nāgas – with two heads [each] at the [four] gateways and their tails at the corners.

1.2.70-
72

⁵⁸One late paper ms. is Tokyo Library no. 353 (old no. 293) dated NS 901 = 1781 CE beginning with a specifically Nepalese rain-making rite in the tradition of Sāhmyaṅgu (Svayambhū). I propose that the remote Indian ancestor for this anthology is to be found in the *prakīrṇa* NAK 4-130 = B 29/20, which also contains an early Nepalese copy of the same anthology and one folio from the Svayambhū rite in a different Nepalese hand. I intend to examine this ms. in detail elsewhere.

⁵⁹This ms. also gives a lineage headed by Vanaratna, followed by Sarvamitra, Ravindra, and the scribe himself, Rūparāja.

⁶⁰*Pañjikā* 12^v: *parārthaba[ddhaka]kṣasya Vajrapāṇe[ś] cetasai[va] ceta[h]parivitar-kam a[-]jñāya bhagavān svayam eva vaktukāma āha [. . .]*. For the first emendation (suggested by Prof. Sanderson) where both the Sanskrit and the Tibetan are corrupt cf. *Nāgānandanāṭaka* act 4, v. 16, Candragomin's *Śiṣyalekha* 105a.

to make rain (varṣāpaṇam) For the sake of the metre this was probably read *variṣāpaṇam*.

next to Bhavabhaṭṭa tries to solve the tautology **samīpe/°pārśvataḥ** by taking the first to mean a lake where *nāgas* live, and the second to mean the north-western side of a reservoir. Durjayacandra also includes rivers, lotus-ponds, and other receptacles (*Mitapadā* 20^r).

the five colours According to Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 20^r) these are black, white, yellow, red, and dark green (*śyāma*).

and so forth If not a verse filler this probably refers to preparing the cords (*sūtra*) which are used to delineate the *maṇḍala*, preparing flasks (*kalaśa*), etc.

Jaya and Bhadra in the east, Śrī and Nanda in the north, Suvṛṣṭi and Priya in the west, Dhruva and Ghora in the south. These eight nāgas are on the rampart [of the maṇḍala].

1.2.73-
74a

In the [cardinal and] intermediate corners [of the maṇḍala he should install] the eight [heads of the nāga] families: Vāsuki on the eastern side, Takṣaka in the north, Karkoṭa in the west, Padma in the south, Mahāpadma in the north-east, Śaṅkhapāla in the south-east, Kuliśapāla in the south-west, and Hluṇḍaka in the north-west.

1.2.74b-
76ab

the [cardinal and] intermediate corners Most mss. and Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 13^r) have a somewhat improved reading, but Bhavabhaṭṭa chose to retain what seems to be the original and make sense of it in a roundabout way: **vidiśe** must mean *diśi vidiśi*. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 20^v-21^r) also notices the inverse installation (first the rampart, then the womb of the *maṇḍala*), and he takes the previous *nāgas* to be the ‘lords of the clouds’ (*meghānāṇ rājānaḥ*). The tradition he follows is attested elsewhere, e.g. Lūyipāda’s *Śmaśānavidhi* vv. 21-22ab.

From the eight directions he should attract the [eight] great kings [who are] the lords of the clouds. And the

1.2.76cd-
78ab

names of these eight kings are Garjita, Ghūrṇita, Ghora, Āvarta, Ghana, Caṇḍa, Varṣa, [and] Prapūraṇa. He should install them beginning in the east applying [the appropriate] directions and colours.

lords of the clouds According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these are installed outside the *maṇḍala*.

[the appropriate] That is, in due order, with the colours being the same as those of the *nāgas* in the same direction.

In the middle [of the maṇḍala he should visualize] Vajraḍākinī seated in the lotus position, [holding] a skull-staff and a yoga-bowl, adorned with snakes as ornaments, blazing white, adorned with resplendent garments. [The yogin] should appoint the snakes as [her] seat [in the middle of] the lotus surrounded by the snakes.

1.2.78cd-
80ab

yoga-bowl That is to say, a skull-bowl. See comments to 1.2.43-46ab.

resplendent garments According to Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 21^r) this means garments of various colours (*citravastraparidhānā*).

seated in the lotus position Normally this should be interpreted that she is seated on a lotus. However, in the next verse we are told that she is seated on the snakes. Bhavabhaṭṭa allows another interpretation, namely that in the calyx of the lotus another lotus is drawn as the seat of the goddess.

[The yogin] should offer a munificent pūjā beginning with eight bowls of milk, flowers, incense, fragrant powders, lamps, and other such articles (*vividha m[-]anyakā*).

1.2.80cd-
81ab

other such articles (*vividha m[-]anyakā*) For reasons beyond my comprehension Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses *manyakā* as ‘the *yogin*’ (also cf. ad 3.2.45 for the same gloss).

The knowledgeable yogin should visualize himself as Vajraḍākinī.

1.2.81cd

Vajraḍākinī I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa's paraphrase here, in spite of the fact that all mss. and the two other commentators read "Jñānaḍākinī". Bhavabhaṭṭa adds that first the *yogin* should draw the *maṇḍala*, then visualize himself as Vajraḍākinī, and then recite the appropriate mantras. Durjayacandra seems to suggest that the *yogin* identifies himself with Jñānaḍākinī during the entire procedure (*Mitapadā* 21^r).

The mantra for the offerings is: oṃ bhūr bhuvaḥ svāhā. 1.2.82-

The eight mantras of the nāga-kings are: oṃ Vāsuki hūṃ svāhā, oṃ Takṣaka hūṃ svāhā, oṃ Karkoṭaka hūṃ svāhā, oṃ Padma hūṃ svāhā, oṃ Mahāpadma hūṃ svāhā, oṃ Śaṅkhapāla hūṃ svāhā, oṃ Kuliśapāla hūṃ svāhā, [and] oṃ Hulaṇḍaka hūṃ svāhā. 83
1.2.84-
92

The eight mantras of the kings of the clouds are: oṃ ghili ghili varṣa varṣāpaya hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ ho ho ṭha ṭha ṭha svāhā. 1.2.93-
94

eight Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets **aṣṭau** in a compound. Durjayacandra states that the name of each *megharāja* is to included after **ghili ghili** (*Mitapadā* 21^v). I have followed the latter interpretation.

ṭha ṭha ṭha Bhavabhaṭṭa is quite insistent that these stand for the syllable PHAṬ. Normally ṬHA ṬHA is a code-word for SVĀHĀ.

In the **Vajraḍākavivṛti* this and the *mantra* given in 1.2.99 are said to be encoded in the *Vajraḍāka* 4.4 in Prakrit or the vernacular (*phal pa'i skad*). The extraction may be reconstituted as follows: for 93 Oṃ GHILI GHILI BARISA BARISĀPAYA HŪṂ HŪṂ HŪṂ HO HO HO ṬHA ṬHA ṬHA (which the commentator takes to be PHAṬ PHAṬ PHAṬ) SĀHĀ & for 99 Oṃ BAJJAḌĀIṆĪ BARISA BARISĀPAYA HŪṂ BHŪ SĀHĀ. The Sanskrit forms are also given by the commentator with the very interesting note that the Prakrit mantra is mastered by reciting it one lakh times, whereas the Sanskrit form is mastered by two lakhs.⁶¹ This seems to suggest that at least for this author the Prakrit mantra is somehow more accessible and more powerful than its Sanskrit counterpart.

⁶¹ **Vajraḍākavivṛti* 41^v -42^r : *de yang phal pa'i skad kyis 'bum phrag gcig bzlas pas 'grub pa legs par sbyar ba'i skad kyis 'bum phrag gnyis bzlas na 'grub par 'gyur ro||*

The *mudrā* for the eight kings of the clouds is [the following]: he should turn his hands in a circular motion. He should display this to the eight directions. 1.2.95-96

The *mudrā* for the eight *nāga*-kings is [the following]: he should make his left hand into a fist, spread out the thumb and the little finger, and hold the right hand [on the left fist] in the shape of a hood. 1.2.97-98

hold the right hand Bhavabhaṭṭa adds that it is the elbow (*kaphoṇi*) that rests on the left fist, which is perhaps more appropriate to imitate a rearing snake.

The root mantra is: om Vajradākinī varṣa varṣāpaya hūṃ bhū ho svāhā. 1.2.99-100

At first he should recite [these mantras] three lakh times, [thus] accomplishing the preliminary service. With these [mantras] the rite that is the supreme method to make rain [will be successful] for yogins. 1.2.101

VII. Omens by messengers

The chapter closes with a short section on ‘messengers’ (*dūta*), that is to say human beings with certain peculiarities which herald lack of success if they are perceived by the *yogin* when setting out to undertake a ritual (presumably the ones just discussed: counteracting signs of death, healing snakebite / resuscitating poisoned victims, and making rain). Durjayacandra adds that if the *yogin* decides to set out nevertheless, he will become a laughing stock for he will not achieve anything.⁶² Examining such omens is not something peculiar to the *Catuṣpīṭha*,⁶³ but interpreting their presence as relevant for all rituals is perhaps the commentators’ fancy forced by the

⁶²*Mitapadā 22^r : yadi gacchaty upahāsyō bhavati, siddhīhāneḥ.*

⁶³I give here only the obvious parallels from the *Kriyākālaguṇottara* 4.11-16: *atha dūtāni pravakṣyāmi śu[bhā]ni aśubhāni ca/ yathā vijñāyate karma asādhyam sādhyam eva ca/ [...] dūto rudate ca muhur muhuḥ/ [...] kṛṣṇavastrāvṛtāṅgaś ca/ [...] nagno vā [...] vikrośaḥ śastrapāṇinaḥ [...] etair na sidhyate karma sarvakarmasu varjitaḥ/;* also note *Viṣanārāyaṇīya* 2.41-44ab (paralleled in the *Kāśyapasamhitā*).

placement of the passage in the text. If we examine the original meaning of *dūta* in the *gāruḍika* sources, it seems that they are indeed the messengers bringing the news that someone has been bitten, and not anybody the *yogin* might chance to come across on his way to performing a rite.

Next [I shall explain] the omens by messengers: a squint-eyed person, [someone with] grey hair, a hunchback, [someone wearing] terrifying clothes, etc., a person with a stick, the arrival of a pair with [one of them being] a woman, [a person] with hair let loose, etc., [a person] crying, a naked [person], one interrupting [the yogin's words?]. [Such omens perceived] during the four time-units [are signs] of loss. 1.2.102-103

messengers Both Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra change the gender of this noun to masculine, whereas Kalyāṇavarman already has *dūta*^o.

[I shall explain] Although the reading of ms. A is perfectly acceptable, Bhavabhaṭṭa's supplying *vakṣyate* raises the suspicion that the second quarter was doctored at some later point.

squint-eyed Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 21^v) includes other ophthalmologically afflicted persons such as the blind (*andha*) and the one-eyed (*kāṇa*).

terrifying clothes Black clothes according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, or dirty clothes according to Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 21^v-22^r).

with a stick Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 22^r) takes this to mean weapons (*āyudha*).

etc. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa messengers starting their sentence with the syllable 'na' and so forth. Some syllables were considered inauspicious, cf. *Viṣanārāyaṇīya* 2.50-53 (paralleled in the *Kāśyapasaṃhitā*).

one interrupting [the yogin's words?] Or 'speaking aggressively' as Bhavabhaṭṭa explains it.

the four time-units These are *mikira*, *bhidrika*, *svapna*, and *kāma*.

[The yogin] should perform [these] two examinations: just like he [examined] himself [previously, he should now examine] the messengers. If it is [auspicious] he should desire to set out [to perform the rite, for there will be] success. [Otherwise] the mantrī will suffer [a setback in his powers]. 1.2.104

VIII. Sub-chapter colophon

[Here] ends second chapter in the ātmapīṭha which takes up such topics. 1.2.105

5.3 Annotated translation of 1.3

I have already published the present sub-chapter with all three commentaries in 2008. I am reproducing here with some minor corrections the edition of the root-text with the commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa, in which now the readings of ms. S, unavailable to me at the time, have also been collated. The references to the *Pañjikā* and the *Mitapadā* in this chapter are not given according the folio number of the mss. but the page numbers in SZÁNTÓ 2008a.

Bhavabhaṭṭa refers to the present chapter as *śūnyatāpaṭala* and gives as the reason of this teaching the principle that meditating upon the deity must be performed after having discarded the ‘natural aggregates’. This usage probably stems from the *Guhyasamāja* exegetical tradition.⁶⁴ Raviśrījñāna, a late exegete but one who recycles older material, mentions as their counterpart the ‘purified aggregates’ (*pariśuddhaskandha*^o).⁶⁵ The usage needs some clarification in the sense that the aggregates are referred to as ‘natural’ inasmuch as we presently perceive them, and not by their innate nature (*prakṛtipariśuddha*). Kalyāṇavarman calls the chapter the *bodhicittapaṭala*, his reason being that without having generated the resolve of enlightenment one will not obtain accomplishment related to mantras and so forth.⁶⁶ Durjayacandra does not give a specific name for the chapter here – but he refers to it in his introduction to 1.4 as *śuddhipaṭala* –, instead he launches into a discussion about Vajrapāṇi’s question. It is inconceivable that he, a *bodhisattva* of the tenth level, would not know about the beginnings of *yoga*. Therefore **viśeṣataḥ** in the first verse must qualify **yogārambham** (and not **śrotum** as Bhavabhaṭṭa has it). This *yoga* is special, for it leads to the state of Vajradhara.⁶⁷

I. Vajrapāṇi’s questions

**Lord, I would very much like to hear about the initial
undertaking of yoga. How should one know the mantras?
How should one keep in mind this knowledge?**

1.3.1

⁶⁴Cf. Candrakīrti’s quotation from a lost work, the *Ārṣavyākhyāna* (if this is a title), in his *Pradīpoddyotana* (p. 84): *cūrṇanam dehavajreṇa prākṛtaskandhanāśanam/*.

⁶⁵Cf. *Amṛtakaṇikā* p. 17.

⁶⁶*Pañjikā* (p. 7). However, note that in his colophon he does refer to the chapter as *śūnyatāpaṭala* (*ibid.*, p. 21).

⁶⁷*Mitapadā* (p. 7).

the mantras This question is answered only in the next chapter.

this knowledge This, according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, means more specifically the knowledge related to the signs of accomplishment, which are discussed in section III.

II. Meditating on emptiness

Hear, oh Vajra[pāṇi], according to the truth, so that [you will become able to assume] the self of a deity (devatātmakais). At first [the yogin] should meditate on emptiness [thus] cleansing the body of impurity. 1.3.2

the self of a deity (devatātmakais) The statement is slightly awkward. Bhavabhaṭṭa in both his interpretations sees the plural Instrumental as having a Dative flavour. Durjayacandra interprets it modally and construes it with *śṛṇu*.

impurity (mala) This seems to follow the idiom of Candrakīrti.⁶⁸ Bhavabhaṭṭa explains *mala* as ‘clinging to [the dichotomies of] subject[-object], etc.’ Durjayacandra is somewhat more elaborate:

‘**Impurity**’ means the obscuration[s]. ‘**Of the body**’ means of the incarnate. With this meditation on emptiness resembling water the impurity[es] of the aggregates, *dhātus*, *āyatana*s, etc. will become cleansed, whereby those deities [representing] the aggregates, *dhātus*, *āyatana*s become cleansed. For it is well-known that being cleansed is nothing else but buddha-hood. Having this in mind purposeful [*yogins*] first of all perform this cleansing of impurities.⁶⁹

Mitapadā
p. 8

At first [he should realize that] form is empty and so 1.3.3

⁶⁸Cf. *Vajrasattvasādhana* (p. 15): *evaṃ śūnyatāmbanena sakalakleśamalaṃ prakṣālyā tasmād ātmānaṃ Vajrasattvamahāmudrārūpaṃ niṣpādayed [...]*. Also cf. *Pañcakramaṭīppanī* p. 16.

⁶⁹We find the same idea somewhat more developed in Ratnarakṣita’s *Padminī*, where intrinsic buddha-hood is said to be achieved by doing away with everything that obscures it. Ms. A f. 3^r: [... *sādhakasya prakṛtisiddhaprakṛtipariśuddhabuddhagarbhatve vaimalya-pariśuddhyāmbanenaiva sakalavīpakṣapratikṣepeṇābhimatasādhyasiddhiḥ*.

forth, [and he should do so for all] until the eighteenth, mind. The constituent [that is] form is empty, and so he should [apply for] sound as well.

form Bhavabhaṭṭa takes **rūpaṃ** metonymically to mean all five aggregates, etymologizing it as ‘that which is represented’ (*rūpyata iti*).

and so forth According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the **ādi** stands for realizing that form etc. are not only empty of a self, but also lacking a cause (*animitta*), and not bent on anything (*apraṇihita*). In other words **śūnyādi** means the three *vimokṣas*. Cf. his comments ad 2.3.2.

until the eighteenth, mind I believe that this was the original intention of the text, having the last of the *indriyas* at the end of the list of eighteen *dhātus*. Bhavabhaṭṭa however insists upon reading his favoured *yo-gācāra* doctrine into **manaḥ**, as if the text gave an *arthāntaranyāsa* in one word. Durjayacandra’s interpretation is somewhat similar: after having examined all eighteen constituents the *yogin* realizes that all are empty of an intrinsic nature, and only mind remains (*Mitapadā* p. 10).

The constituent that is smell is empty, and so he should [understand for] taste as well. The constituent that is touch is empty, and so he should [apply for] form as well. 1.3.4

form The awkward coming full circle is resolved by Bhavabhaṭṭa by glossing this second *rūpa* as *dharmadhātu*, the object of the mind (*manas*). This interpretation probably lead to the *facilior* reading of ms. A (*dharmam*) and presumably what Durjayacandra had in front of him (cf. his gloss in *Mitapadā* p. 11).

The faculty of seeing is empty of an intrinsic self. How could there be a [non-empty resultant] consciousness betwixt [it and its object]? The faculty of hearing is empty of an intrinsic self. How could there be a [non-empty resultant] consciousness betwixt [it and its object]? 1.3.5

The faculty of smell is empty of an intrinsic self. How 1.3.6

could there be a [non-empty resultant] consciousness betwixt [it an its object]? The faculty of taste is empty of an intrinsic self. How could there be a [non-empty resultant] consciousness betwixt [it an its object]?

The faculty of touch is empty of an intrinsic self. How could there be a [non-empty resultant] consciousness betwixt [it an its object]? The faculty of mental perception and its external [object] are empty of an intrinsic self, [hence] he should think of mind [as empty] as well. 1.3.7

faculty of mental perception etc. I translate thus based on the parallels above, Durjayacandra's gloss (*Mitapadā* p. 13) and the *Āmnāyamañjarī*,⁷⁰ although it must be said that choosing **bahiḥ** for the object of mental cognition (*dharma*) is somewhat bizarre. For the second **manas** Bhavabhaṭṭa finds yet again an opportunity to encode *yogācāra* into the text by interpreting it as 'consciousness' (*cittam*). For a consonant interpretation see *Mitapadā* ad 1.3.3 above.

Mind dissolves into space. [Thus] he should think of everything as empty. He should [mentally] dissolve the triple world [beginning with] the dissolution of [mount] Meru and the continents other [from Jambudvīpa]. 1.3.8

everything (sarvādi) The **ādi** is most likely merely a verse-filler as none of the commentators seem to think much of it. The same holds for 9a below.

[beginning with] The *Vajraḍāka* reverses the order *tridhātukaṃ/Meru* etc. to go from particular to general, a tendency already notable in the Tibetan translation of vv. 8-9. It also adds several further elements: names of mountains, names of continents, and the types of seas surrounding the continents in Abhidharmic cosmography. Durjayacandra most likely had (or preferred) the reading **tridhā dhātum** instead of **tridhātukam**, which he interprets as the three hexads of constituent elements (*dhātu*) discussed before (*Mitapadā* p. 14).

⁷⁰11^v: *yiḍ ni dbang po dang phyi rol ni yul chos kyi khams te/ [...]*.

the continents other [from Jambudvīpa] Note Durjayacandra's gloss *suvarṇādīdvīpaviśeṣāḥ*, which is a rare reference to Suvarṇadvīpa as one of the known islands and not as one of the *upamelāpakas* in the system of sacred sites in the Śaṃvara cycle.

Having appropriated everything as emptiness, above, between, and below, he should meditate on the dissolution of form and so forth in all divisions of the world in the ten quarters. 1.3.9

above, between, and below Both Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra gloss the three as sky/heaven (*ākāśa* or *svarga*), earth/the world of men (*pṛthvī* or *martya*), and the underworlds (*pātāla*), although Durjayacandra construes the sentence differently.

[Then] he should dissolve the sense of Self and blend in all things with the sky. The clever yogin, after having meditated with equanimity on [the] emptiness [of everything], ... 1.3.10

blend in all things I.e. he should realize that their intrinsic nature is the same as that of the sky. For a procedure very similar to the one outlined above cf. Āryadeva's *Pratipattisāraśataka* v. 64: *tac cittam kalpitākāram bahirarthaś ca kalpitaḥ/ anayoḥ kalpanā hānā[t] kalpitā gaganātmikā/*. I have followed Bhavabhaṭṭa here, who glosses **bhāvam** as *bhāvagrāmam*, although it is possible that it refers back to the 'sense of Self' in the first *pāda*.

III. Signs of accomplishment

... should gaze into that [emptiness] and examine the [signs of accomplishment] therein. [If he sees something resembling the flicker of] a lamp there will be [success in] pacification; [if he sees] reddish dust there will be [success in] rites for prosperity/reinvigoration. 1.3.11

reddish dust (rajarajam) Bhavabhaṭṭa simply glosses this as the colour red (*raktavarṇam*). Kalyāṇavarman explains one of the elements as dust (*rajo*

reṇuh). Durjayacandra's interpretation is perhaps the most convincing (*rajo-
rajaḥ paṭavāsaraḥ pītam*) since red is normally the colour of *ākarṣaṇa* and
not *pauṣṭika*, the associated colour of which is yellow (*pīta*).

If [he sees something] resembling the orb of the Sun, he will accomplish the red rite and the other. As for the rest (śeṣaḥ), if he sees black smoke, that is said to be [the herald of accomplishment in] aggressive rites. 1.3.12

the orb of the Sun Durjayacandra specifies this vision as that resembling the autumn Sun immediately after it has risen (*Mitapadā*, p. 17), in other words it is a discernible orb without blinding rays, as the Sun during autumn is said to be very mild.

the red rite and the other (raktakarmādi) That is to say subjugation (*vaśya*) and attraction (*ākṛṣṭi*).

If [he sees] the colour of murky wind, [there will be] instant [success] in the rite of expelling. If he sees a white-coloured moon [with] everything [surrounding it] in white ... 1.3.13

instant [success] I am unaware of the term *tatkṣaṇoccātana*, hence it should probably not be read as a compound, although Durjayacandra seems to have done so. Durjayacandra has a more gnostic interpretation of the accomplishments. Whereas Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to have been satisfied with the signs pointing to ritual success, he reinterprets the list thus: a) *śāntika* means the calming of the senses, turning away from enjoying their objects;⁷¹ b) *pauṣṭika* means developing one's visualizing meditation;⁷² c) *rakta (vaśya)* means gaining mastery in meditation;⁷³ d) *abhicāra* means overcoming all afflictions;⁷⁴ e) *uccātana* means dislocating all dichotomous thought.⁷⁵

... [then] he should know [that as a sign of] accomplish- 1.3.14

⁷¹ *Mitapadā* (p. 16): *śāntir iti- viśayopabhoganivṛttir indriyāṇām upaśamaḥ śāntiḥ.*

⁷² *Mitapadā* (*ibid.*): [*...*] *yogapuṣṭaye.*

⁷³ *Mitapadā* (p. 17): *raktam iti vaśībhāvaḥ samādhanau.*

⁷⁴ *Mitapadā* (*ibid.*): *abhicāraṃ tu kīrtitam iti- sarvaktlēśābhībhavanam.*

⁷⁵ *Mitapadā* (*ibid.*): *tatkṣaṇoccātanaṃ sakalavikalpānavasthānam.*

ment in yoga. [He will also have] cognition of [his previous] births and situations. Thereafter he should undertake yoga by visualizing the sprouts and so forth.

accomplishment in yoga For *yogasiddhi* see Ratnākaraśānti's *Guṇavatī* (p. 25): *yogo devatāsamādhis, tasya siddhir niṣpattiḥ, phalaṃ tasyā eva niṣpatter mahāmudrāsiddhiḥ/ te dve prakarṣeṇa dadātīti yogasiddhiphalapradam/* (the lemma is from *Mahāmāyātāntra* 2.1 qualifying **guhyākṣaram**). However, cf. *Śrībhūṣaṇa's comments in his *Mahāmāyāpañjikā* (Ms 10^v): *yogasiddhiḥ prajñopāyātmikasiddhiḥ/* after having quoted the well-known definition of *yoga* from the *Guhyasamājatantra* (18.33ab); & ad loc. cit. (*ibid.* f. no. lost): *yogasiddhiḥ prajñopāyārūpānāsraṇānandamayātmanīṣpattiḥ/*. Unfortunately none of our commentators elaborates on this term.

The procedure described above inspired the following verses in Jitāri's *Catustattva*:

etadbhāvitayogātmā sarvasiddhiṃ prasādhayet/
anārādhitamāntrātmā karma kartuṃ kṣamo na saḥ || 1.21 ||
tāvat tad bhāvayed yogī yāvac chubhrāvalokanam/
prāptacihnas tataḥ kṣipraṃ siddhiṃ muktiṃ vrajet sadā|| 1.22 ||
nāsāsyaśrotranetrāṇi svakarābhyāṃ ruṇaddhi yaḥ/
samāhitamatīḥ samyag yogabinduṃ sa paśyati|| 1.23 ||
anilānalagotoyaś cakreṣu bindubhāvitāḥ/
viññāya lakṣaṇaṃ tasya yathākarma niyojayet|| 1.24 ||
śuklena kriyate śāntiṃ pītaraktena pauṣṭikam/
kṛṣṇena kriyate vyādhiṃ (vyādhir?) dhūsreṇocāṭanamāraṇam||
 1.25 ||

It should be noted that the procedure comes after visualizing the *maṇḍala* and not the *vipaśyanā*-type meditation we have in the present chapter. Blocking the senses physically is an addition by Jitāri. I am unaware of any other *Catuspīṭha* source describing this practice, therefore the verses deserve to be quoted in full.

the sprouts and so forth These, according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, are the seed-syllables (*bījākṣaram*).

IV. In praise of emptiness

Know, [O Vajrapāṇi,] (cetasā) that he who knows that [all] phenomena (bhāvāḥ) are emptiness [will obtain] liberation swiftly after having contemplated [all] that there is to be known (jñeyam) by gnosis, and having visualized (īkṣayā) the specifics (gatim) of those that are to be known (jñeyānām). 1.3.15

Know, [O Vajrapāṇi,] (cetasā) I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss, an Imperative (*cetayasva*) addressing Vajrapāṇi.

after having contemplated etc. This highly puzzling half-verse is interpreted thus by Bhavabhaṭṭa: first the *yogin* contemplates 'all that there is to be known', that is the phenomenal world beginning with the aggregates that constitute the person, through 'gnosis', by realizing that they are empty of an intrinsic nature. After he has done so he should undertake the visualization of 'those that are to be known', that is to say the deities with their 'specifics' (seed-syllable from which they emerge, number of arms, colour, implements, and so forth), and merge himself with that eidetic image. He will soon obtain liberation if he does so. Kālyāṇavarman seems to give up on the last verse-quarter, directing the reader to consult a *guru* for explanation (*Pañjikā*, p. 19).

A man is said to be pure after having killed his mother, father, the king, his two chaplains, and after having killed the [entire] kingdom with all its attendants. 1.3.16

For the allegory a perhaps more contemporary rendering is the Caryāgīti collection of Kāṇha (KVÆRNE 1977:119, with the variants of BHAYANI 1997: 95): *māria śāsu naṇanda gharē śālī/ māa māria (māri Bh.) Kāṇha (Kaṇhu Bh.) bhāila (hua Bh.) kabālī/*, "Killing the mother-in-law (*śvaśrū/śvāsa*), the aunt (the senses/resultant consciousness), and the sister-in-law (?) in the house, killing the mother (*mātā/māyā*), Kāṇha became a *kāpālīka*."⁷⁶

The philosophical referents of the 'murder victims' in this allegorical verse may be tabulated as follows:

⁷⁶Neither of the editors seem to have noticed that the entire verse is a pun based on the Bengali pronunciation. However, I have been unable to locate what *naṇanda* and *śālī* refer to.

	Bhavabhaṭṭa	Kalyāṇavarman	Durjayacandra
mother	<i>tṛṣṇā</i>	<i>tṛṣṇā</i>	<i>tṛṣṇā</i>
father	<i>mohaḥ</i>	<i>mohaḥ</i>	[missing]
king	<i>ahaṃkāraḥ</i>	<i>ahaṃkāraḥ</i>	<i>ahaṃkāraḥ</i>
chaplains	<i>rāgaḥ & dveṣaḥ</i>	<i>indriyāṇi</i>	<i>indriyāṇi & viśayāḥ</i>
kingdom	<i>śarīram</i>	<i>skandhāḥ</i>	<i>śarīram</i>
attendants	<i>skandhādayaḥ</i>	<i>vikalpavijñānam</i>	<i>vikalpāḥ</i>

The presence of this verse in ancient Buddhist sources did not escape the attention of Vajrayāna theologians. Ratnākaraśānti uses this allegory to demonstrate that such intentional statements (*dgongs pa*) are used in all three vehicles (*śrāvakayāna*, *pāramitāyāna*, *vajrayāna*) with the implicit statement that non-Tantric Buddhism cannot thus object against such apparently anti-nomian passages that require further clarifications.⁷⁷

V. Sub-chapter colophon

[Here ends] the third chapter in the ātmapīṭha which takes up such topics.

1.3.17

⁷⁷ **Guhyasamājamāṇḍalavidhīkā* 62^v -63^r. The verse is sometimes referred to by Guhyasamāja exegetes of the Ārya-school (e.g. the **Guhyasamājatantraṭīkā* 132^v; the **Sandhyāprakāśikā* 98^r; and the **Pañcakramavyākhyā* 63^v), and very often quoted in Vinaya, Abhidharmic, and Mahāyāna exegesis.

5.4 Annotated translation of 1.4

I. Meditating on the deity

According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the Lord has now taught about emptiness, and in this chapter proceeds to give some indications concerning how to meditate on the deity after realizing this emptiness. The other two commentators identify the subject matter and the reason why this passage follows here slightly differently. Thus Kalyāṇavarman states that the Lord has in mind the principle that even though the *yogin* has grasped reality that is emptiness, he will not obtain success in his rituals without proper identification with the deity's self.⁷⁸ Because of the variant reading **tattva** for **Vajra**, Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 25^v) considers that this sub-chapter is that of 'truth' (*tattvapatala*), which immediately follows the sub-chapter of 'purification' (*śuddhipatala*).

**Hear, O Vajra[pāṇi], in accordance with the path, the
non-dual free of duality! For those whose bodies abide
amidst this terrifying ocean that is transmigration for-
midable with pelagic foes, the highest aim is taught;**

1.4.1-
2ab

O Vajra[pāṇi] etc. As mentioned above the two other commentators (plus mss. D E and the *Samputa*) read **tattva** here. In my view this is a secondary reading introduced by an unknown editor who thought - not unreasonably - that **advayam** (or the variant **advayaḥ**) cannot function as a noun and it must qualify something. In this case we must read the nil-suffix as a neuter accusative, which is how Durjayacandra understands it. Just like *ad* 1.3.2a Durjayacandra is once again influenced by *Guhyasamāja* 18.37a to interpret *tattvam* as the five Buddha-families (*pañcakulam*). In the next quarter verse he sees the opportunity to elaborate on this idea in an exegetical fashion not dissimilar to that of the Mahāyoga.⁷⁹

pelagic foes According to all three commentators this is a metaphor for the *kleśas* beginning with lust (*rāga*).

⁷⁸ *Pañjikā* 14^v : *evaṃ tathatām avalambakasya yoginaḥ devatāhaṃkāram antareṇa karmasiddhī[r] na bhavatīti devatāyoga[m]]stambhanamāraṇādikaṃ ca vaktukāmo* (em., *vaktukāmāha* Ms) *bhagavān śṛṇu tattva yathāmārgam ityādinā caturthaṃ paṭalam ārabhate.*

⁷⁹ *Mitapadā* 25^v : *advayam ekaṃ pañcātmakam api bhedaṃpratibhāsād dvayavarjitam.* Cf. VAN SCHAIK 2008:51. This was an enduring concept, for the *Anāvīla* (15^v) defines true *devatāyoga* as *sarvabuddhāgramelakaḥ*.

know that to be the aim, aiming, the aimer, consciousness, and knowledge.

1.4.2cd

know that (cetasā) For this interpretation see Bhavabhaṭṭa *ad* 1.3.15b above, where the instrumental is taken as an imperative *cetayasva*.

the aim, etc. The intended meaning is that the *yogin* should realize the non-duality (or rather, the identity within emptiness) of these elements, for which the commentators give diverging interpretations. Thus Bhavabhaṭṭa has eidetic meditation (*devatāyoga*) for (**lakṣya**) ‘aim’, the contemplation of the deity for ‘aiming’ (**lakṣaṇa**), and the *yogin* as the ‘aimer’ (**lakṣa**). Unfortunately, Kalyāṇavarman’s text is corrupt beyond my comprehension here. Durjayacandra reads **lakṣya** instead of **lakṣa** and offers two interpretations for the triad: a) the *maṇḍala* for **lakṣya**, the colour, implements, gestures etc. of the deities for **lakṣaṇa**, and the completed circle of deities for the second **lakṣya**; b) the places in the body one focuses on for **lakṣya**, the tantra and the words of the *guru* for **lakṣaṇa**, and the *Hevajra*-borrowed ‘moments’ for the second **lakṣya**.⁸⁰

One should contemplate by means of gnosis [all] that there is to be known, [for] by observing [all] there is to be known [one realizes their] nature (gati) [as emptiness]. For [the yogin who has] a cognition (cetasya) of [the true] nature (gati) [of phenomena] by observation there is a path by which he may arrive [to enlightenment] at his own will.

1.4.3

[all] that there is to be known I.e. the aggregates as the deities (cf. 1.3.15cd where Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets these elements slightly differently). Kalyāṇavarman does not comment on this passage except a terse note that it is a further clarifying explanation of what has been stated previously. Durjayacandra picks up on his second, *Hevajra*-influenced, interpretation and takes **jñāna** as ‘a thorough knowledge of the moments and blisses’, **jñeya**

⁸⁰ *Mitapadā* 26^r: **lakṣyalakṣaṇalakṣyetyādi**– *lakṣyaṃ maṇḍalam, lakṣaṇaṃ varṇacihnamudrādi, lakṣyaṃ devatācakram. [...] yad vā lakṣyate ’sminn iti lakṣyaṃ hṛdayādi-sthānam, lakṣyate yena tal lakṣaṇaṃ tantraṃ guruvacanaṃ ca, lakṣyata iti lakṣyaḥ kṣaṇa-viśeṣaḥ.*

as truth which cannot be communicated, only perceived for one's self, and **jñeya** as the deities corresponding to the building blocks of Abhidharma psychology and the deities they are identified with in post-*Guhyasamāja* esoteric Buddhism.⁸¹

Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 26^v) introduces the following verse with a rare reference to what seems to have originated as a Cārvāka concept: *hā dhik! kim anayā tattvacintayā punar ayam avicāraramyo bhavaḥ paribhūyata iti ced [...]* “Now, if someone were to say: «Can this reflection of reality overcome existence, that is an object of delight [only] if it is not subjected to critical analysis?» [...]”⁸²

Or let there be the fetters of transmigration, the elephant is nourished by [this] vulnerable point. And if he has not joined (ayogī) for one thousand previous births, [he now] goes on course.

1.4.4

fetters of transmigration (saṃsārādi vā pāśa) – The word **ādi** is silently dismissed as a verse-filler by Bhavabhaṭṭa. Durjayacandra's reading (if it is not his own emendation) **saṃsāradivāpāśam** permitted him with a more imaginative interpretation: *saṃsāre dīvyantīti saṃsāradivāḥ saṃsārīṇas teṣāṃ pāśam (Mitapadā 26^v)*. It is noteworthy that this somewhat odd half-verse has not been taken over into the *Samputa* by its editor[s].

the elephant is nourished Bhavabhaṭṭa uses another meaning of the root *murch/murch*, to become strong, to increase, etc. The ‘elephant’ is a metaphor for the *yogin*.⁸³

⁸¹*Mitapadā* 26^r: *jñānena kṣaṇānandādi pariñānena. jñeyam ananyakathyaṃ svasaṃvedyam. jñeyānāṃ gati ikṣayeti– jñeyāḥ skandhāyatanadhātusaṃbaddhā buddhās, teṣāṃ ikṣā piṇḍībhāvapratyavekṣā.*

⁸²I am grateful to Dr. Csaba Dezső for pointing out this concept to me (cf. DEZSŐ 2005, section 3.120 and adjoining notes) and Prof. Sanderson for correcting my first interpretation. Also cf. *Pañjikā* 33^v ad 2.4.9ab where the concept is rather something to be embraced. I am unaware of any further occurrences of this concept in Vajrayāna exegesis. It is, however, discussed in Buddhist philosophical texts.

⁸³I am aware of only one parallel for the expression *puruṣakuñjara*, the *Pañjikā* of Prajñākaramati ad *Bodhicaryāvatāra* 1.36a where it stands as a gloss for *bodhisattvas*.

vulnerable point This according to Bhavabhaṭṭa is the knowledge about the nature, *scil.* of all things as emptiness, in other words this is the weak point of existence: once its reality is recognized, it ceases to act as fetters. Durjayacandra construes the word as belonging to beings in transmigration: they are just like elephants, which are stupefied if their vulnerable points are acted upon.⁸⁴

if he has not joined (ayogī) Here I am constrained to conjecture against all testimonia. I propose that *akṣaṇaprāpta* in Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary is a gloss on **ayogī**, where the *avagraha* has been lost in the manuscript transmission of the commentary. This is the only way in which Bhavabhaṭṭa's explanation makes good sense. Furthermore it is not his style to bring in doctrinal concepts out of nothing. The 'unfavourable circumstances' (*akṣaṇa*), are a set of eight conditions in which a person's spiritual advance is hindered by his incapability to listen to the Buddha's teaching.⁸⁵ If my conjecture is valid, then instead of **vā yogī** we must read **cāyogī**.

In Kalyāṇavarman's view the intended meaning is that among a hundred (sic!) thousand *yogins* this ultimate reality will be obtained by only one, or maybe not even one.⁸⁶ Durjayacandra's interpretation states the exact opposite. According to him the text here glorifies its method of meditation on reality by which not only one, but a thousand *yogins* have achieved Buddhahood.⁸⁷ Abhayākaragupta introduces this parallel passage in the *Samputa* as praise of the *yogin's* merits.

previous births Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 14^v) interprets his reading **pūrvajanmagati** as 'the way of the *Tathāgatas*' (*tathāgatamārga*), but he does not give his reasons for doing so. This seems to be followed by Durjayacandra, who glosses his reading **pūrvajanmagatiṃ** with *janmanaḥ pūrvamaṇ pūrvajanma, anutpādānālabhābhedyāvītathābhāvam* (*Mitapadā* 26^v), "previous birth means before birth: a true state, unarisen, independent, indivisible."

⁸⁴*Mitapadā* 26^v: *marmaspr̥ṇi marma. marmacchedā [a]r̥m̥tudāḥ. tena moham̥ prāpitāḥ prāpyante vā yathā kuñjarās, tathāyaṃ saṃsāriṇaḥ saṃsārapāśo murchākarah, śaktair̥ api sodhum aśakyah.*

⁸⁵For the different lists see BHSD:2.

⁸⁶*Pañjikā* 14^v: *ayam aśayaḥ- śatasahasrayogināṃ madhye eko 'dhigacchati* (em., 'pi gacchati Ms) *na veti* (em., *ceti* Ms) *yāvat.*

⁸⁷*Mitapadā* 26^v: **ekeṣv** *īti- ekas tāvad āstām, etasyāṃ tattvacintāyāṃ sahasrasaṃkhyā yogīno bhavam abhībhuya [. . .] buddhā bhūtā ity arthaḥ.*

on course Only Bhavabhaṭṭa reads **gatiṃ** as a separate word, with the explanation that even if the *yogin* does not obtain full accomplishment after having contemplated emptiness he is at least guaranteed a favourable rebirth.

1.4.5

After having meditated [through] emptiness on equanimity, the characteristics which have been explained before, for one endowed with intelligence whose field-body has been emptied, [there is] the implantation of seeds.

intelligence Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this to mean the discrimination of phenomena (*dharmapравicaya*) stated in the previous chapter. *Dharmapравicaya* is the definition of *vipaśyanā* given in *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* 18.66b.

whose field-body is emptied The **ādi** is again treated by Bhavabhaṭṭa as a meaningless verse-filler.

Kalyāṇavarman's gloss for the same reading is rather surprising: *śūnya-tābhāvanena niḥśeśīkṛtarāgādidehasya* (*Pañjikā* 15^r). I am unfamiliar with *kṣetra* or any of its synonyms being interpreted as one of the *kleśas*. Thus Kalyāṇavarman's gloss makes me suspect that his reading was rather ***śūnyakleśādidehasya**. However, this is not supported by any of the witnesses.

The only one to endow **ādi** with some meaning is Durjayacandra: *śūnyakṣetrādidehasyetyādi- śūnyatā kṣetram, ādidehasya YogāmbaraJñā[na]dākinyor ekatarasya [vā] niṣpattaye bījāropam iti bījam āropayet* (*Mitapadā* 27^r). Interpreting emptiness as 'the field' (**kṣetra**) is made plausible by the fact that in *bhāvanā* the *yogin* invariably meditates on emptiness before generating the deity, hence the space in which the deity appears is actually emptiness.

1.4.6

Just as the house of an untouchable [when burned by] fire is said to be [a] suitable [place] for erecting [the image of] a deity, [or suitable to be] occupied by the learned [who consider it] a superior abode, in the same way the abodes [that are the bodies of the yogins become suitable] for contemplative meditation.

fire Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation might be a misunderstanding. Kuladatta's *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā* (sect. 1.6.2) has a protective rite in which fire from an untouchable household serves as the *homa*-fire to do away with any

obstacles before consecrating a monastery. I am not aware of any sources that indicate the building of a temple on the site purged of *caṇḍāla* houses. Durjayacandra follows this interpretation further adding that the deity can be Harihara, etc. (*devasya Hariharāder*), and that the *paṇḍitas* and the agents of **ucyante** are *smārta* brahmins (*Mitapadā* 27^r -27^v). This might be seen as an attempt to distance the statement from Buddhists.

Verses 7-10 teach the *aṣṭāṅgakalanam*, a process already alluded to in 1.2.41 and fully explained by the commentators there (see table ad loc. cit.). It is rather odd that Bhavabhaṭṭa gives the relevant verse in an approximate form. He is quite right on the other hand to state that the question Vajrapāṇi posed about *mantras* in 1.3.1 has remained unanswered in that chapter.

[The yogin] should install the installation of the syllables: above he should visualize fire, he should join two seed[-syllables] of earth onto the eye[s], he should visualize (cetasā) the seed[-syllable] of wind-emptiness onto the nostrils and ears, [and] the seed[-syllable] of water-nectar onto the organ that is the tongue, [for the seed-syllable is the presiding] lord and sovereign [of that organ]. 1.4.7-8

visualize I find Bhavabhaṭṭa's explanation unconvincing. It is much more likely that the instrumental *cetasā* stands for an optative (**cintayet*) or an imperative as before, cf. 1.3.15, 1.4.2.

wind-emptiness This is puzzling. Only Bhavabhaṭṭa ventures to give an explanation, namely that 'wind' stands for emptiness in the process known as *viśuddhi*, but this is hardly acceptable. The recurrence of wind as a gloss to *calitā* ad 10a is also suspicious.

[Then] he should take the stack[-syllables] and install them in due order onto the four places: the seed[-syllable] of delusion onto the neck, the one belonging to affliction onto the arms, the 'moving' onto the heart, and the animal onto the pit of the navel. 1.4.9-10ab

The code-words, their corresponding seed-syllables and the region of the body they are installed on may be tabulated as follows (differences with the table ad 1.2.41 are marked with an exclamation mark):

code & bīja	Bhavabhaṭṭa	Kalyāṇavarman	Durjayacandra
agni = KṢUṢ	palate (!)	head	head
pṛthivī = HUM	eyes	eyes	eyes (!)
vāyu-śūnya = YUṢ	nostrils & ears	nostrils & ears	nostrils & ears (!)
amṛta-ambu = SUṢ	tongue (!)	tongue	tongue (!)
moha = SMRYUṢ	neck	neck	neck
kleśa = HMRYUṢ	armpits (!)	shoulders (!)	arms (!)
calitā = YMRYUṢ	heart	heart (!)	heart (!)
paśu = KṢMRYUṢ	navel	navel	navel (!)

Putting on [the seed-syllables thus] unto the eight parts of the body protection [by those] seed-syllables of the eight body-parts [is achieved].

1.4.10cd

putting on Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses the noun formed from the root *kal* (called the wish-granting cow by grammarians as it can yield any desired meaning) as *kavacanam*, ‘armouring’. *Catuspīṭhatantra* 2.1.20, Durjayacandra, and the *sādhana*-texts specify that each *bīja* is put on with the gesture known as the *tripatākā* (the thumb presses down the little finger with three fingers extended in the shape of a ‘triple banner’).⁸⁸

[Having] joined the body with the seed[-syllable]s [the yogin should visualize] himself as Jñānaḍākinī. [She/the yogin] is seated on lotus seat adorned with the orb of the Sun, ...

1.4.11

[should visualize] himself etc. The process described in the *tantra* seems to be putting on the ‘*mantra*-armour’ first and then visualizing oneself as Jñānaḍākinī, but judging from the wording of Bhavabhaṭṭa and his comments

⁸⁸ *Mitapadā* 28^r: *kṛtakaraśuddhinā yoginā tripatākayā mudrayāṣṭāṅgeṣūktamantranyāsaḥ kalanam*. For the *karaśuddhi* or *karaśodhana* see Amitavajra’s *Yogāmbarasāadhanopāyikā* (1^v). Purifying the hand and the tongue so that the *yogin* becomes suitable for displaying *mudrās* and reciting *mantras* is an ancient feature, cf. e.g. *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana* p. 133. A similar gesture for applying the eight *bījas* is referred to in the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* as *alimudrā* (2.7cd-8ab): *śāṅkhā jñānena saṃyojya śeṣām ucchritaśūcikā/ alimudreti vikhyātā kalanam aṣṭabījakaiḥ//*. *Śāṅkhā* and *jñāna* are code-words for the ring-finger and the thumb of the right hand respectively (see the appendix to the *Yogāmbarasāadhanopāyikā* in ms. B).

ad 1.4.7a he seems to have seen the procedure take place in reverse order. In actual fact the *sādhana* texts prescribe armouring both in the preliminaries (e.g. Amitavajra describes this immediately after purifying the tongue and before empowering body, speech, and mind) and at the very end of the procedure (e.g. *Yogāmbārīsādhanaratnamālā* 19^v : [. . .] *aṣṭāṅgakalanakavacādikam pūrvavad vidhāya samutthāya pustakavācanacaityakarmajapahomādikam ucitam ācaran vihared iti*). As far as I can tell, *kalanam* in this sense is unique to the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

. . . protected by a white parasol, radiant [with the colour of] molten gold, three-faced and six-armed, seated in the comfortable position. 1.4.12

[Her] tiara, fastened by and hanging with strips [of cloth], has a vajra on top. [She has] three eyes [on each face], she is smiling and angry, bedecked with radiant garments. 1.4.13

she is smiling and angry As pointed out by Bhavabhaṭṭa (but glossed over by Durjayacandra), the passage is elliptical, since these are the characteristics of the left and right faces only. Her main face has an expression languid with lust (*śṛṅgārālasa°*), or coquettish (*śṛṅgārarasa°*) if we accept the readings of mss. M & S.

radiant Blindingly white as Bhavabhaṭṭa has it, whereas Durjayacandra simply has ‘covered by garments of prime quality’ (*suvastraparidhānā*), which for him also means multi-coloured (cf. ad 1.2.78cd-80ab).

[She] holds the [following] distinctive implements (cihnāmudrābhi): a sword, a hatchet, and a vajra in her left [arms]; [the hand of her lowest right arm displays] the threatening gesture [while the other two arms sport] a lance and a skull-staff [held] aloof. 1.4.14

[She] emanates clouds of buddhas intent upon working for the benefit of beings, and innumerable heaps of rays. [The yogin should] visualize [Jñānaḍākinī thus] with motionless breath. 1.4.15

emanates clouds of buddhas This collocation is typical of the *Māyājāla* (103^r)⁸⁹ and the literature of the *Guhyasamāja* (e.g. *Guhyasamāja* 7.21, 13.76, 13.82).

with motionless breath According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this adverbial expression means that the mind has become focused (*cittaikāgratā*). The *pāda* is something of a hallmark refrain of the *Catuṣpīṭha* (cf. 2.1.22f, 3.3.10d, 4.3.63d).

According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the sub-section 1.4.16-17cd describes a procedure known as ‘subtle yoga’ (*sūkṣmayoga*). Neither of the other two commentators give this process a separate name.

[The yogin] should imagine the mind, gnosis, consciousness appearing [pure as] crystal. Uniting the vowel and the consonant he should extract the seed[-syllable that is hūṃ]. 1.4.16

the mind, gnosis, consciousness To Bhavabhaṭṭa these are synonyms for the syllable HŪṂ. Durjayacandra construes the *pāda* as having two elements: **manojñāna** and **vijñāna**, where the first stands for *ālayavijñāna* and the second for the five awarenesses. These two then form a single noun (*Mitapadā* 28^r).

appearing [pure as] crystal Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this to mean white, whereas Durjayacandra describes it as ‘having an appearance with colour of the light of an autumn moon’ (*śaradinducandrikābham*).

the vowel and the consonant Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets these as holonyms for Ū and HA, the main constituent parts of HŪṂ. **Ali** is standard *Catuṣpīṭha* terminology for the more common *āli*.⁹⁰

The yogin should visualize this seed[-syllable hūṃ by] 1.4.17

⁸⁹The Skt. is guaranteed by a *sādhana* based upon this *tantra*, that of Vajraśṛīkhalā (*Sāadhanamālā* no. 209).

⁹⁰Cf. *Nibandha* ad 2.4.15: *tato 'yaṃ alir upāya ucyate, vajram ity arthaḥ. Hevajratantre tv āliśabdasyākāro dīrgha eva. sa cāliśabdaḥ prajñāvācakaḥ. ayaṃ tv aliśabda upāyābhidyāyī.*

placing [its] drop [i.e. the anusvāra] in the middle of [his] forehead. [Then] he should recite this syllable-seed [which is] adorned by the five buddhas.

placing [its] drop For Bhavabhaṭṭa this means that the syllable HŪṂ is visualized upside down. Kalyāṇavarman takes his reading **bindusthānam** as a synonym for HŪṂ without justification (*Pañjikā* 15^v). Durjayacandra (*Mi-tapadā* 28^r) construes it with **bhrūmadhye**, the idea being that this is where the *bindus* originate (*bindūdayasthāne*). This interpretation presupposes the existence of yogic teachings later than the *Catuspīṭha*.⁹¹

syllable-seed (akṣarabījam) Bhavabhaṭṭa is unwilling to interpret this as an inverted compound and takes **akṣara** in its other meaning, ‘imperishable’, to signify Jñānaḍākinī.

adorned by the five buddhas See comments to 1.2.19cd-20.

Take the seventh from [both] wind and fire, [where the latter is] impelled by the [first, the] seed[-syllable] of Vajrī. It is pressed [in between] the drop and the roar. It is said [that it showers nectar like] a torrent of rain.

1.4.18

Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets this verse as follows:

Beginning with ‘**the seventh from wind and fire**’ [the Lord] teaches the extraction of the syllable HŪṂ. The word ‘**sapti**’ means ‘the seventh’ (*saptamaḥ*). The seventh from ‘wind’, that is to say the syllable ‘ya’, is the syllable ‘sa’. The seventh from ‘fire’, that is to say the syllable ‘ra’, is the syllable ‘ha’. [These are then] the ‘saptis’ of wind and fire. And that [‘sapti’] is striven for (*arthyate*), hence the word **artha**, in the sense that one should take it. The singular denotes a genus. [As for] ‘**impelled by the seed of Vajrī**’, the seed[-syllable] of Vajr[āḍākin]ī is [nothing but this] seventh [syllable] from wind [i.e. ‘sa’]. Because both the syllable ‘sa’ and the crescent moon have nectar as their nature, the

Nibandha
ll. 1-10

⁹¹Most likely those of the *Hevajra*. For the forehead being the place of origin for the ‘drops’ see Ratnākaraśānti’s *Muktāvalī* ad *Hevajra* I.i.13.

word ‘the seed of Vajrī’ is nothing but the crescent moon. The fact that ‘sa’ is the seed of Vajrī is well-known. Thence that seventh from fire, that is to say the syllable ‘ha’, is **‘impelled by’**, that is to say joined with, the seed of Vajrī which is the crescent moon. This should be construed [as the object of] **he should recite** [in 17c]. What can be said further [of this syllable HŪṢṢ]? This is given by [the line] beginning with **‘drop’**. The syllable ‘ha’ is pressed down by a drop (**bindu**) [seated] atop the [previously given] crescent moon and pressed from below by ‘the roar’, that is to say a long ‘-u’. [Understand with this] the [verb] ‘he should recite’. Combining [all this] the seed[-syllable] of Jñānaḍākinī is HŪṢṢ.

Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 15^v) arrives at the same result, but interpreting the elements somewhat differently. He awkwardly takes *anilānala* as the two letters ‘ya’ and ‘ra’ combined. The seventh in this case is the seventh from ‘ra’, that is ‘ha’. Vajrī for him does not mean Vajraḍākinī but Vajrapāṇi, and – as stated in 1.2.19d – he symbolizes long -u. In this case **bindunāda** must be taken as one element, the ‘line’ that is the *anusvāra* (in the case of *mantras* the nasal is frequently illustrated not with a dot but with something similar to a fireball).

For another interpretation of this verse see e.g. *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya* (Ms f. 5^r 1-2). It is not entirely out of the question that the terms were borrowed from *Vidyāpīṭha* sources, cf. *Brahmayāmala* 62.61: *anilānasaptasthaṃ ta[t]-stha{ṃ}rudravibheditam/kālacandrasamāyuktaṃ śikhānādasamanvitam//* and *Tantrasadbhāva* 1.472cd: *anilānasamāyuktaṃ (add: saptasthaṃ?) bindunādasamalaṅkṛtam/*.

a torrent of rain (dhārāvarṣa) Bhavabhaṭṭa understands it as part of the visualization. Durjayacandra follows this interpretation, but he seems to have simultaneously understood the word as a technical term (*Mitapadā* 28^v). This idea did gain some currency, cf. *Yogāmbarīsādhanaṭṭamālā* (Ms 18^v): *[. . .] dhārāvarṣādinavabījanita Yogāmbarādisvabhāvair navabhis sūtraiḥ [. . .]*.

[The yogin], endowed with meditative [identification with Jñānaḍākinī], should recite [hūṢṢ] preceded by the syllable of the guru and followed by the syllable[s] of oblation. He should do [so] three lakh times.

1.4.19

the syllable of the guru That is to say OM. Durjayacandra adds that the guru of the gods is Brahmā, and his syllable is OM (*Mitapadā* 28^v).

the syllable[s] of oblation That is to say SVĀHĀ. Thus the *mantra* of Jñānaḍākinī to be recited in the preliminary service is OM HŪM SVĀHĀ.

For those who are furnished with [the completion] of reciting in such a fashion [everything] is accomplished no sooner than thought of. [But] before the eight rites and the rest the preliminary service etc. must be performed. If [the yogin] undertakes the rites after [successfully completing the preliminary service], they will be accomplished – of this there is no doubt. 1.4.20

those who are furnished Alternatively one could take **jāpitayogānām** as ‘recitation *and* eidetic meditation’.

before Bhavabhaṭṭa construes the statement differently. He understands ‘before’ as ‘before enlightenment’, the idea being that the *yogin* first accomplishes all sorts of rites, enjoys their benefits, and then reaches liberation. In other words he obtains both *bhukti* and *mukti*.

the eight rites and the rest Bhavabhaṭṭa silently takes the **ādi** as a verse filler. The list for the eight rites given in Kalyāṇavarman differs: [. . .] *śāntika-pauṣṭikavaśyābhicārajambhanastambhanamoha*{ } *nāveśādayo grhyante*. He also gives several supernatural accomplishments meant by **ādi**: *khadga[h]*⁹² *pātā-*

⁹²The accomplishment of the sword is said to be rejuvenation, the ability to fly, and longevity. Cf. Mahāsukhavajra’s **Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇābhisamaya* 282^v: ‘ga’ *zhig skra* ‘*khri*l ba lo bcu drug gi rnam pa can nam mkha’ la ‘gro *zhing* lo stong phrag bcu rnam su ‘tsho bar ‘gyur ro zhes pa ni ral gri’i dngos grub kyi cho ga’o||

*laṃ*⁹³ *vetālaṃ*⁹⁴ *kuhakāñjana[ṃ]*⁹⁵ *ro[ca]nā*⁹⁶ *siddhārthaḥ*⁹⁷ *tālakā (?)*⁹⁸ *gairī* (em., *gerī* Ms)⁹⁹ *paṭa{la}m*¹⁰⁰ *anya[d vā] yathepsitam* (*Pañjikā* 15^v).

the preliminary service etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa again overlooks **ādi**, whereas Kalyāṇavarman completes the gap with *vrataniyamopavāsādayaḥ* (*Pañjikā* 15^v).

II. Paralyzing with the vajra-scissors

Hear, O Vajra[pāṇi], according to the truth, a special kind of (viśeṣataḥ) paralyzing. First [take] the word ‘vajra’, [then] the first of the first group [i.e. ‘ka’]. 1.4.21

First . . . first Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to read the word **pūrvasya** twice, which is a permissible exegetical technique.

[Then] one takes the first letter from the fourth in the 1.4.22

⁹³The accomplishment to perceive (e.g. in a dream) entrances to subterranean worlds famed for their riches and women. Cf. *Kṛṣṇayamāri* 13.16cd: *svapne tu paśyate mārgaṃ vajrapātālayogavān/ = Raktayamāri* (Ms 23^r): *svapne jāyate vivaraṃ vajrapātālayogavān/*.

⁹⁴Here the *yogin* obtains powers and/or services from a resuscitated corpse. Perhaps one of the earliest descriptions in Tantric Buddhism is in the *Subāhupariṣcchā* (ch. 6, vv. 33-49); cf. also *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (p. 228); *Herukābhīdhāna* 32.8; *Vajrāmṛta* ch. 10; etc.

⁹⁵This collocation is unique to Kalyāṇavarman. Perhaps two separate accomplishments are meant, trickery and the eye-ointment, in spite of the Tibetan translation: *mī snang bar bya ba’i mig sman*. For the potentials of the *añjana* see e.g. the *Abhayapaddhati* (Ms A 23^r), Kumāracandra’s *Ratnāvalī* ad *Kṛṣṇayamāri* 3.10.

⁹⁶According to Buddhaguhya’s **Vairocanābhīśambodhitantraṭīkā* (229^v) a preparation from cow-bile has similar properties to eye-ointment.

⁹⁷The Tibetan translation (*bsgrub pa’i don*) completely misunderstands this. The name is common for mustard-seeds which are used mainly in exorcism, but also cf. above 1.2.62c. As far as I know this is not mentioned as a separate accomplishment, therefore the text may be suspect.

⁹⁸Or, as suggested by the Tibetan translation, **tārakā*. I cannot make sense of either, unless the Tibetan is right and it is a reference to the *tārakībhūta* consciousness Kalyāṇavarman mentions ad 1.2.42.

⁹⁹This is again not an accomplishment itself but a substance, a powdered ore, which is used in various ways, cf. e.g. *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* 12.6.39, *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (p. 443), *Vajraḍāka* 43.19 (= *Samvarodaya* 28.19), etc.

¹⁰⁰This most likely refers to a group of supernatural powers accomplished by using the painted image of a deity. Cf. *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* 12.6.8, *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* ch. 26, etc. As far as I know there is no *paṭalasiddhi*, and the Tibetan *snam bu* also substantiates the emendation.

series of groups [i.e. ‘ta’]. [This] is doubled with a ‘ra’ at the top [i.e. ‘rtta’]. [Join] the letter ‘i’ joined with a ‘ra’ [i.e. ‘ri’].

From the second group [take] the second (dvibhir) letter [i.e. ‘cha’] with a drop [i.e. ‘ṃ’], joined (pīḍasya) by a goad [i.e. ‘i’] and the third of the fourth [i.e. ‘da’]. 1.4.23

with a drop Note that Bhavabhaṭṭa says that the *bindu* (i.e. the *anusvāra*) is not above but on the side (*samīpe*). For another example hinting at an Eastern script, see ad 1.4.28.

Having recited both twice [i.e. ‘chīmḍa chīmḍa’] [the yogin] should anoint [them] (*carcitam*) with the fifth [i.e. ‘hūṃ’]. [The whole] is preceded by the syllable of obeisance [i.e. ‘oṃ’] and ended by the terrifying syllable [i.e. ‘phaṭ’]. 1.4.24

anoint (*carcitam*) with the fifth Using the root *carc* in this sense (‘to add’) is very unusual. Neither of the other two commentators preserve this reading. Kalyāṇavarman had **pañcamena tu varjitam** explaining **varjitam** as *āvarjitam svīkṛtam* (*Pañjikā* 16^r), whereas Durjayacandra read (or chose to read) **pañcabuddhayojitam**, the easiest *lectio* (*Mitapadā* 29^r). In any case, **pañcamena** should probably be understood as meaning ‘the one embodying all five [buddhas]’.

The raised *mantra* is complete thus: Oṃ VAJRAKARTTARI CHIMḌA CHIMḌA HŪṂ PHAṬ, “oṃ, vajra-scissors! Cut, cut! Svāhā.” All three commentators arrive to this final form. Bhavabhaṭṭa insists that the *anusvāras* are not standardized to ‘n’. Durjayacandra inserts a customization, presumably as an example, before the imperatives: *śatrugrīvām* (*Mitapadā* 29^r). For a related procedure see *Hevajra* I.ii.22.

The yogin should recite this [group of] seed[-syllable]s. He will [be able] to cut through anything. [The yogin] should join his hands and put them to his mouth. 1.4.25

anything (sarvavastūni) Bhavabhaṭṭa’s comment is puzzling: “because paralyzing is [merely] a metonym, reciting this mantra [the *yogin*] will accomplish all [sorts of other] rituals [as well].” This leads me to believe that he read something else for °vastūni, most likely *°kāryāṇi, a reading unattested in any of the sources available to me.

join his hands and put them to his mouth I follow Kalyāṇavarman and Durjayacandra here, since °saṃmiśraṃ and yojayet is otherwise tautological. The Tibetan translation (*bza’ ba lta bur sbyar*) seems to have been influenced by Bhavabhaṭṭa.

1.4.26

He should stretch out the index and the middle finger [and move them so that] they repeatedly touch each other. This is the gesture of the scissors, of a brilliant shining light. It cuts through anything, be that the throat of an enemy or [anything] else. It is [all in the] mind (manaḥ)!

stretch out According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this is a new movement after joining (i.e. rubbing?) the hands against each other. One makes a *vajra*-fist – which he explains below as a fist where the thumb is enclosed between the clutched fingers and the palm – and then stretches out the two fingers which will then imitate the scissors.

of a brilliant shining light The expression is by no means unusual, but having it refer to a *mudrā* is (cf. however immediately below, 1.4.32b). The light is normally explained as that of the fire at the end of the aeon.¹⁰¹

or [anything] else (°ādi vā) The ears, the nose, etc. as Bhavabhaṭṭa elaborates.

It is [all in the] mind! (manaḥ) Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss *manovilāsa* is ambiguous. Does he mean to say that all this is a manifestation of the mind, or is it the case that the procedure causes pleasure to the *yogin*’s mind?

III. Stopping excessive rain

¹⁰¹E.g. *Guṇavatī* ad *Mahāmāyā* 3.8-9, *Sādhanaṃālā* no. 88 (p. 174).

Next I shall explain [another method] to paralyze, viz. 1.4.27
all [kinds of] rites, water, and so forth. With respect to
the [due order of the] groups he should take the third
(tribhir) letter from the last [i.e. ‘ba’].

viz. all [kinds of] rites, water, and so forth I take *kārya* to mean
karma, rites that other magicians may direct towards the *yogin* or his client.

Then [he should take] the third letter from the third of 1.4.28
the groups [i.e. ‘ḍa’] [and] the third of the fortunate seeds
(bhāgabījakaiḥ) [i.e. ‘ba’] preceded by the letter ‘e’.

the fortunate seeds (bhāgabījakaiḥ) I conjecture that this refers to
the labials. Durjayacandra’s gloss is *aparo bakāraḥ* (*Mitapadā* 29^v) where the
sandhi makes it clear that we must read ‘ba’ and not ‘va’.

preceded by the letter ‘e’ This makes it clear that the script the com-
piler[s] of the tantra had in mind used the *prṣṭhamātra* -e. The Tibetan
translation ‘standardizes’ this by *steng du e zhes bya bar sbyar*].

He should join the first of the fifth [i.e. ‘pa’] with a goad 1.4.29
[i.e. ‘i’]. Betwixt [this and] the final seed of Vajrī [he
should place] the syllable of emission (visargākṣara) [i.e.
‘ba’/‘va’].

the syllable of emission (visargākṣara) In two out of three cases the
script makes it impossible to decide whether Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavar-
man meant ‘va’ or ‘ba’. Durjayacandra was very likely aware of this problem
and gives the gloss *dantyausṭh[y]o vakāraḥ*, thus voting for ‘va’ (*Mitapadā*
29^v).

seed of Vajrī Durjayacandra remains consistent with the terminology of
the tantra and decodes this as *SUM*. Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman on the
other hand gloss this as ‘ha’.

[Then] he should add a ‘ra’ with a goad [i.e. ‘Ṛ’] at its 1.4.30
side, the syllable of blow [i.e. ‘phaṭ’] to the end, and

the praṇava [i.e. ‘om’] to the beginning. [Thus] the arrangement for the seed[s that make up the mantra] of paralyzing.

a ‘ra’ (repha) Durjayacandra glosses this as the seed-syllable of Ghorī, KṢUṂ.

a goad [i.e. ‘ī’] Short -i according to Durjayacandra, long -ī according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, whereas Kalyāṇavarman has the solution in a compound, hence it can be both ‘i’ and ‘ī’.

The raised mantra after all the differences have been taken into account is the following (with the more likely variant first): a) Bhavabhaṭṭa: OM BAḌABE/BAḌAVE PIBA/PIVA HRĪ PHAṬ; b) Kalyāṇavarman: OM BAḌABE/BAḌAVE PIBA/PIVA PIBA/PIVA HRĪ/HRI PHAṬ; c) Durjayacandra: OM BAḌABE PIVA SUṂ KṢUṂ RI PHAṬ. Kalyāṇavarman adds that during the procedure the *yogin* should visualize himself as Paramāśva, and that because of the injunction of the *Bhūtatāntras* PIBA is reduplicated. Unfortunately he does not explain what principle he had in mind here.¹⁰²

[The yogin] should join his hands in reverence with the ring fingers [pressed] against each other. The index finger[s] press down the ring fingers and the [two] middle fingers. [To this he should] join the little fingers [to accomplish] the gesture [called] the mare’s muzzle.

1.4.31-
32ab

This *mudrā* is otherwise known as that of Hayagrīva (Jap. Batōkannon), cf. *Hōbōgirin* fasc. 1, p. 59a: the gesture is called *bakugyō* in Japanese and is described as “*les mains sont jointes paume contre paume, les médiums et les auriculaires dressés l’un contre l’autre, les index et les annulaires repliés dos à dos vers les paumes; les pouces sont tendus en arrière pour figurer la gueule ouverte du cheval «dévorant»*”, which is quite similar to the present *mudrā*. Also cf. the **Paramādyatikā* (vol. Hi 335^r & vol. I 141^v) for a similar description.

¹⁰² *Pañjikā* 16^v: *atrāyam upadeśaḥ– etat sarvaṃ Paramāśvāhaṃkāreṇa* (em., *paramasvāhaṃkāreṇa* Ms, cf. Tib. *’phags pa Rta mchog gi*) *yoginānuṣṭheyam iti. Bhūtatāntrānusāreṇa piba piba iti draṣṭavyaḥ*. The Tibetan translation of *bhūtatāntra* is corrupt: *rgyud gzhan gyi*.

The closest parallel comes from even earlier, namely the **Vajrapāṇy-abhiṣeka*, where although the *mudrā* is called ‘the gaping vajra-mouth’ (*rdo rje’i kha glal ba*) and only compared to a mare’s muzzle, the effects (most notably stopping rain) and some idiomatic expressions (such as describing the *mudrā* as radiant) are very similar to those described in the *Catuspīṭha*. I therefore propose that this is older material recycled by the compilers of the tantra.

“Next the great **vajra-mantrī* should create a **vajrodaya* (a seat with a crossed-vajra?), place his legs uneven, cross his hands, and make a fist. He should stretch out his thumbs, bring together his middle fingers and stretch them out. The two index fingers should be stretched out making a pair. This is called the **vajra-mukha* [gesture]. He should [then] raise his right foot [and then] the [previously motionless] left foot in the same way. [He should] display [this gesture] similar to a mare’s muzzle, radiant like the fire that is the tongue of a thunderbolt. He should utter a HŪṀ like a delicate sound of thunder, [and then] put [his hands fixed in the above gesture] to his mouth. [By this] he is able to drink up the four oceans in the four directions, what to speak of these [petty] enemies that show themselves in front of our eyes! If he does so anything coming from the four quarters will wither away: any storm, lightning, and the clouds gathering from all sides. By scattering them with this ‘gaping vajra-mouth’ they will become utterly scattered. [...] With the gesture of the **vajra-mukha* he will eat up all obstacles [...]”¹⁰³

Vajrapāṇy-abhiṣeka
fasc. 10

As pointed out to me by Dr. Roesler, the mare’s muzzle is probably alluding to the submarine fire otherwise known as the *vaḍavāgni*. The connection

¹⁰³129^r-129^v: *de nas rdo rje sngags pa ches/ rdo rje ’byung bar byas nas su/ mi mthun rkang stabs byas nas su/ lag pa bsnol te khu tshur bcang// mthe bo gyen du bsgreng byas la/ gung mo gshibs te bsgreng bar bya/ mdzub mo de gnyis zla ba bsgreng/ rdo rje kha zhes brjod pa yin// rkang pa g.yas pa bteg par bya/ g-yon pa gzugs shing de bzhin bya/ rdo rje lce ni me ltar ’bar/ rgod ma’i kha ltar mngon sum bya// ’brug sgra dal ’dra’i hūṁ brjod de/ kha yi thad kar gzhas par bya/ phyogs bzhi dag ni thams cad kyi/ rgya mtsho bzhi yi chu ’thungs na// mig sngar snang bar gyur pa yi/ sdang ba kun lta smos ci dgos/ de ltar byas na phyogs bzhi po/ kun nas ’byung ba thams cad skems// ’tshub ma kun dang lce ’bab dang/ sprin rnam kun nas ’du ba dang/ rdo rje’i kha ni glal ba dang/ gtor bas rab tu ’thor bar ’gyur// [...] rdo rje kha yi phyag rgya yis/ bgegs rnam thams cad bza’ bar bya/ [...]*

is very appropriate since that fire is first supposed to dry up the oceans when it blazes up to consume the world.

This is the gesture [called] the mare’s muzzle (vaḍavā-mukha), of a brilliant shining light. Blazing in the ten directions it eats up the gods of the clouds and the others. 1.4.32cdef

of a brilliant shining light Cf. ad 1.4.26. Kalyāṇavarman adds that these rays of light are in the shape of many Paramāśvas who are then visualized as eating the deities of the clouds (*Pañjikā* 16^v-17^r).

and the others None of the commentators specify to whom the **ādi** refers to. Since rain is made by overpowering *nāgarājas*, *nāgas*, and *megharājas* in 1.2.70-101, I assume that the first two groups are meant.

The yogin should employ this gesture when he [wishes] to stop [excessive] rain. He should recite [the mantra] one lakh times, [thus] first accomplishing the preliminary service. 1.4.33

IV. Chapter colophon

Thus the ātmapīṭha ends. 1.4.34

5.5 Synopsis of 2.1.1-105 with an annotated translation of 2.1.106-111

Sub-chapter 2.1, the first chapter in the *parapīṭha*, discusses two large topics: oblation into fire (units 1-105) and the characteristics of the suitable initiand (106-111). It is not readily clear why these two themes are discussed in the same unit, since the topic of the initiand has more to do with initiation (which is discussed mostly in 4.1). The tantra otherwise has three types of *homa*: the first, discussed here, where oblations are cast into fire, one where oblations are made into water (*jalahoma*), the subject of the next sub-chapter, and the ‘secret’ or internal *homa* (*guhياهوma*) which is taught in 4.2.69-78.

Understanding the *homa*-system advanced by the Catuspīṭha is fraught with several problems. The sub-topics are not clearly delineated, the terminology is somewhat confusing, and some of the verses are hopelessly obscure. This is not only true for the present editor but also the three commentators, who give widely divergent readings and interpretations. Kalyāṇavarman does not even comment beyond the fourteenth verse. The most significant problem, however, is that the folios of the *Nibandha* that would have commented on the present chapter are missing in the Vikramaśīla manuscript (viz. 16-18 affecting vv. 1-99).

The present sub-chapter seems to have inspired little derivative literature,¹⁰⁴ but at the same time it cannot be said that it was not influential at all. Several verses are adopted into the *Samvarodaya* (most notably 23.1-9),¹⁰⁵ many of the *mantras* and *mudrās* are incorporated in Abhayākara-gupta’s comprehensive *homa*-manual, the *Jyotirmañjarī*,¹⁰⁶ and Kumāracandra’s commentary to the *Kṛṣṇayamāritantra*, the *Ratnāvalī*.¹⁰⁷ The strongest

¹⁰⁴The only complete manual I am aware of is the *Gdan bzhi’i dkyil ’khor dang ’brel ba’i sbyin bsreg* by Bo dong Phyogs las rnam rgyal (vol. 110 of *Encyclopedia Tibetica*, pp. 75-163). In Sanskrit several fragments of what must have been short *homa*-manuals survive: a fragment in the *Kalpasādhana* ms., and some portions – mainly lost – of the *Catuspīṭhasādhanasamkṣepa*.

¹⁰⁵However, a very strong parallel with 23.6cd is not with the tantra, but with one of Bhavabhaṭṭa’s remarks. This might be a piece of evidence that shows that the compilers of the *Samvarodaya* might have known the *Nibandha*.

¹⁰⁶E.g. the second option of the two *mantras* given for purifying the grounds (ed. p. 32), and the *mantras* for purifying the substances and firewood (ed. p. 102).

¹⁰⁷E.g. the *mantra* and *mudrā* for purifying the grounds (ed. p. 49), and the entire set of the same for purifying the substances for offering (ed. 60; it should be noted that the text in the ed. here is quite corrupt).

parallels come from the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, but not even that very influential manual took over the entire set of procedures for its *homa*-rite which is described mostly in chapter 21.

The sub-chapter opens with Vajrapāṇi's questions (v. 1). They seem to refer to not only the present sub-chapter but the *parapūṭha* as a whole.¹⁰⁸

Answering Vajrapāṇi's request the *bhagavān* promises to teach the topics relevant to *homa* (v. 2), pointing out that the officiant must first undertake the preliminary service of the *mantras* (v. 3ab). He should then purify the grounds (the spells and gestures are given only later) and measure out the base of the hearth (*vedi*) according to the nature of the rite. This is somewhat unusual, as it is usually not the measurement of the base that counts, but the diameter of the pit (*kuṇḍa*) that counts. The allowed size is stated to be between eight digits and a hundred cubits, therefore the units are counted in either of these two. The latter limit may sound so overly ambitious – little over quarter of a mile – that we may suspect a corruption at first sight, but see e.g. *Vimalaprabhā* ad *Kālacakratantra* 3.19 where similarly large *rajomaṇḍalas* are envisioned.

Vv. 4-6 give the proper measurements: eight units for killing enemies (*ripughāta[na]*), ten for prosperity/reinvigoration (*pauṣṭika*), twelve for subjugation (*vaśa*), fourteen for placating (*śānti*), sixteen to increase a clan with (male) progeny (*kulavardha[na]*), eighteen to increase fertility in cattle (*gokulavardha[na]*), and a twelve-digit base for averting danger threatening a city or a country (*nagararāṣṭraśānti*).

In vv. 7-9 further measurements are given for the depth of the pit (said to be two-thirds of the diameter), the 'lip' of the hearth (*oṣṭha*), the 'rim' (*nemi*), an eight-petalled lotus surrounding the hearth, and the rampart (*prākāra*) which acts as the last line of defence. Then another lotus with a *vajra* in the middle is drawn inside the pit.

Vv. 10-11 teach the shape of the hearth for different rites: triangular for aggressive *homa* (*abhicāra*), square for placating, round for subjugation and prosperity/reinvigoration, half-moon for expelling (*uccāṭa[na]*), and octangular for attracting (*[ā]karṣa[na]*) and paralyzing (*stambhana*).

In vv. 12-14 various adorning elements are taught: the symbols of the five buddhas, a *vajra* on a moon-disk, a mound in the shape of mount Kailāsa, and the deities (presumably the *ḍākinīs* of the *maṇḍala*). The commentators

¹⁰⁸This is not unprecedented, cf. 1.3.1b which is answered only in 1.4.7ff.

disagree on the placement of these decorations.

After reciting a *mantra* for offerings (vv. 15-16) the *yogin* should visualize himself as Jñānaḍākinī (17ab) starting with applying the eightfold armouring (vv. 17cd-20. This version of the *aṣṭāṅgakalana* is virtually identical to the one given in 1.4.9-10ab. The form of Jñānaḍākinī given here is white, two-armed, holding a skull-staff and a *vajra* (vv. 21-22).

Vv. 23-26 teach the spell and gesture for purifying the grounds (cf. 2.3.14), whereas vv. 27-38 teaches a series of *mantras* linked with the same *mudrā* for purifying the substances, the clarified butter, the rice, other foodstuffs, and the firewood.

Vv. 39-47ab describe attracting the god of fire into the lotus previously drawn in the hearth. With the appropriate *mudrā* and *mantra* the *yogin* summons the deity, described as sporting a tawny topknot, having the colour of jaggery, holding a rosary and a water-pot. With another *mudrā* and *mantra* the fire is established in the pit by snapping the fingers thrice.

The next unit (vv. 47cd-59) describes the purification of the site and ritually building the protective elements much as in the case of a *maṇḍala*. The *yogin*, holding a *vajra* in his hand, should sprinkle the area and the hearth itself with water, flowers, and mustard seeds. Then he builds the ‘rampart’ (*vajraprākāra*), the ‘cage’ (*pañjara*), and pins down obstructive entities (*kīlana*) with the taught *mantras* and *mudrās*.

With the ritual area complete the *yogin* summons Jñānaḍākinī into the hearth (vv. 60-63). First he visualizes a lotus in the fire, upon it a sun-disk, and a white parasol above. In the middle of the lotus he visualizes a *vajra* having the colour corresponding to the rite. The *yogin* then ‘breathes out’ the deity which emerges from the *vajra* (for this hallmark procedure see 2.3). She holds a skull-staff and a *vajra*. Her colour is customized according to the rite as before.

Vv. 64-65 teach the ‘root-*mantra*’ for the oblations. This, according to the text, is OM ṬHA ṬHA ṬHA SVĀHĀ. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the three central elements are code-words for as many HŪMs (however, cf. his comments to 1.2.93, where he dissolves ṬHA as PHAṬ).

Vv. 66-68 teaches another ‘root-*mantra*’ (OM HŪM SVĀHĀ) and a variant visualization with a staff in one hand and a [skull-]cup in the other. We are not told by the text what exactly the purpose of this passage is. Bhavabhaṭṭa thinks it is another purificatory mantra, but Durjayacandra is probably closer to a logical explanation when he identifies the *mantra* as a variant for the one given above when the rite is of the *abhicāra*-type.

Vv. 69-83 describe the spells and gestures for the five items of worship: fragrant powders, flowers, lamps, incense, and *bali*. The *mudrās* are the same as the ones given in 2.3.78-84, but the set of *mantras* differs from the ones taught in the *maṇḍala*-chapter. It is the latter set that gained greater currency (cf. Amitavajra's *Sādhanopāyikā* B 2^v, Jagadānanda-jīvabhadra's *Sādhanavidhi* B 2^r). It seems likely that the group given here was intended only for the offerings given in the context of *homa*.¹⁰⁹

Verse 84 describes in rather nebulous terms the *homa* proper. The *yogin* should recite the *mantra* (for the oblations?) once and give (an oblation of ghee?) once. The second line (*saptādhikaṃ tu saṃgrhya madhye madhyama-piṇḍikā*) is obscure; perhaps the intended meaning is that the oblations are performed in a series of seven.

Vv. 85-88 are somewhat obscure again. Once the rite proper has been performed, the *yogin* offers the remainders and re-merges the deities/deity into his body. The god of fire is visualized again, offered worship accompanied by three oblations, whereupon it is also dismissed.

As an appendix of sorts vv. 89-101 teach several customizations regarding the materials offered, as well as the size and type of woods that are used to feed the fire. Thus in a placatory *homa* (vv. 89-91) the offerings are rice, sesame, white mustard seeds, barley, grain, parched grain, etc. whereas the wood must come from one of the five sappy trees with the sticks cut to measure fourteen digits. Similar specifications are given for *pauṣṭika homas* (vv. 92-93), *homas* aimed at subjecting someone into one's will (vv. 94-95), aggressive *homas* (vv. 96-97), a rite for expelling an enemy (vv. 98-99), and paralyzing (vv. 100-101).

Vv. 102-105 teaches a special type of *homa*, one aimed at restoring a king who has been ousted from power ('*rājabhraṣṭasya*'). Here five hundred oblations accompanied by milk, honey, ghee, oil, and *bel*-fruits (*śrīphala*) are given in a fire fueled by wood from the *bodhi*-tree. It is not clear to me whether the last verse is simply a reiteration of the rite or a general *homa* for prosperity/reinvigoration (or royal fortune).

The last unit in the sub-chapter describes the characteristics of the initiand. Durjayacandra's commentary simply gives a paraphrase of these verses

¹⁰⁹The mantras in due order are: OM TĪKṢṆAGANDHE HŪṂ SVĀHĀ, OM PUṢPAMĀLE HŪṂ SVĀHĀ, OM TĪKṢṆADĪPE HŪṂ SVĀHĀ, OM DHŪPEŚVARI HŪṂ SVĀHĀ, OM KURU KURU MAHĀBALE HŪṂ SVĀHĀ.

without adding anything revealing or significant (*Mitapadā* 35^r).

Next I shall teach the characteristics of the initiand to be adopted. 2.1.106

the initiand to be adopted The terminology employed here is somewhat confusing, for the passage does not deal with the way in which a *śiṣya* is to be adopted (*saṃgrahaṇa*), but rather with his characteristics. For the rite in which an initiand formally requests a *guru* and the *guru*'s adoption of the pupil is described in more detail in e.g. *Vajrāvalī* ch. 4. On an auspicious day the initiand should call on the *ācārya* and petition him twice or thrice for initiation. Ideally the initiand should provide all the ingredients for the rite. If he cannot provide them, the *ācārya* should perform a short rite to dispel any obstacles that bar the *śiṣya* from acquiring them. He is then formally accepted and the *abhiṣeka* rite may proceed.

[The initiand should be] able-bodied, educated, calm in his behaviour, a believer in the three teachings, [but] constantly intent upon [following] the Great Vehicle. 2.1.107

able-bodied Lit. 'with all his limbs intact.' Bhavabhaṭṭa gives another possible interpretation for **aṅga**, namely the *śāstras* such as grammar.¹¹⁰ In other words he has in mind a list analogous to that of the six *vedāṅgas*. It is often said of the ideal initiand that he must be young, in good health, and not holding monastic vows. Cf. e.g. *Vajradāka* (32.13): [...] *vayasātīte ca bhikṣubhāvasthite ca/ dīne rujābhībhūte ca na [...]*, and the celebrated verse *bhikṣubhāve ratā ye ca ye ca tarkaratā narāḥ/ vṛddhabhāve sthitā ye ca teṣāṃ tattvaṃ na deśayet//* quoted earliest in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (p. 78) and the *Tattvasiddhi*, but also in later works such as the *Samkṣiptābhiṣekavidhi* (ed. p. 419).

educated To be understood in both meanings, 'versed' and 'well-behaved', although Bhavabhaṭṭa gives only the first.

¹¹⁰Note that *śabdaśāstrādīkam* is my conjecture. Cf. the list cited and elaborated upon by Bhavabhaṭṭa ad 1.1.23: *aṅgāni vedāś catvāro mīmāṃsā nyāyavistarāḥ / dharmasāstram purāṇam ca trayīdam sarvam ucyate // āyurvedo dhanurvedo gāndharvam ceti te trayāḥ / arthasāstraiḥ samam jñeyā vidyā amūr aṣṭādaśeti. śikṣā kalpo vyākaraṇam niruktaṃ cchandovicitir jyotiṣam ceti ṣaḍ aṅgāni. śikṣā hastiśikṣādīśāstram. kalpo 'nukalpaḥ smṛtiśāstrādi.*

the three teachings According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this refers to the classification of the Buddhist revelation into *śrāvakayāna*, *pratyekabuddhayāna*, and *mahāyāna*. Although the initiand should regard the previous two piously, he should nevertheless see the Great Vehicle as the supreme revelation. I have been unable to trace the exact source of Bhavabhaṭṭa's quotation here, but the *Samkṣiptābhiṣekavidhi* of Vāgīśvarakīrti contains a very similar phrasing when describing a monk who is qualified for tantric practice but not yet eligible for the initiations that involve intercourse.

He [should be] proficient in the application of mantra and tantra, interested in all [kinds of] crafts and so forth. [He should] delight in yoga and meditation, and [should be] devoted to listening [to sermons] and reading [the revelations]. 2.1.108

mantra and tantra This seems to suggest that even before initiation the pupil has already some skill in esoteric practice. Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses the two terms somewhat restrictively: the application of mantras means using the mantras for placating and so forth, whereas proficiency in tantra means knowledge of drawing the circles for placating etc. These *cakras* are taught in 3.2.1-41.

yoga and meditation Bhavabhaṭṭa sees the two words as synonyms, which is justifiable as the usual gloss for *yoga* is *samādhi* (cf. *Nibandha* ad 2.3.110 & ad 4.1.53, but also *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* p. 130, *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* ad 9.3, etc.).

[He should be] devoted to his guru at every time and under any circumstances. [He should honour him] with auspicious gifts. [He should] not [be] given to desire or overcome by sensory pleasures. 2.1.109

gifts Cf. *Gurupañcāśikā* 20abc: *yad yad iṣṭataraṃ kiṃcid viśiṣṭataram eva ca/ tad tad dhi gurave deyam*. The next verse in that seminal text explains that a gift given to the *guru* is one given to all buddhas whereby the initiand furthers his aim of completing the 'equipment of merit' (*puṇyasambhāra*). These gifts were presumably different from the *gurudakṣiṇā* which is offered at the end of the initiation ceremony (cf. 4.1.46-48). We are not given the

details in the present text, but according to the authors of the *Kālacakra*-cycle this included a one-sixth ‘tax’ of the initiate’s income (see comments to loc. cit.).

[He should] not [be] irritable, egotistic, lazy, [he should not harbour] harsh feelings, or speak ill of any man, his officiant, the guru, [or] the deity. 2.1.110

speak ill of [...] his officiant, etc. Cf. 4.1.10c where it is said that such initiands go to the Avīci hell.

[He should not be] cruel-minded, wicked, constantly thinking of sin, speaking idly or harshly. Such [prospective initiands] should be refused. 2.1.111

The sub-chapter closes with a colophon similar to the previous ones.

5.6 Synopsis of 2.2

Oblation into water (*jalahoma*) is as far as I know a not very widely attested term, the *Catuspīṭha* being one of the very few texts in which the rite is described in greater detail. The earliest attestation I can find is the **Paramādyabrhatṭikā* of Ānandagarbha (130^v), glossing *Paramādyā* (156^v) *chu'i sbyin blug* with *chu'i sbyin sreg*. In both texts the aim of the rite is to stop excessive rain (*char gcad pa*). According to the commentator the *yogin* should visualize a white Vajrasattva as the transformation of the syllable HŪM seated on *nāgas*, much like our Vajraḍākinī in 1.3. He should then offer drops of pure water. The *nāgas* will be satisfied and they will withdraw excessive rain. It is not unlikely that the procedure described here is based on the *Paramādyā* and its exegesis, but the parallel is too weak to state that with absolute certainty.

I am aware of the following four items that can be identified as derivative literature of 2.2. The **Catuspīṭhajalahoma* is not extant in Sanskrit, but the Tibetan translation is canonical. Its author is a 'Bhava', who may or may not be the same as the commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa. I am inclined to think that he is not the same, since some of the idiosyncrasies in the *Nibandha* are not followed here.¹¹¹ The work otherwise follows 2.2 very closely.¹¹² It starts out by explaining the somewhat anomalous nature of the term. To paraphrase his explanation: just as fire [employed in the *homa* rite] burns up one's sins, it is the same with water [except that the substrate is different].¹¹³ Another description of the rite based on the present sub-chapter is included in an anthology, the **Nānātantrodhṛtabalividhayaḥ* attributed to Nāgārjuna (148^v -150^r). I have described the most important differences in the footnotes below. After an almost exact parallel with the present sub-chapter the anthology veers into a rite which is centered on Jambhala and other *yakṣas*. As far as I can tell this is inspired by the **Jambhalajalendrasādhana* (Tōh. 1861)

¹¹¹E.g. the *mudrā* described in 2.2.13: while Bhavabhaṭṭa explains that the fists are joined at the back of the hand, the **Catuspīṭhajalahoma* does not give this specification.

¹¹²There are very few elements added: the *pratijñā* verse, a short explanation of why the procedure may be called a *homa* (see note below), a verse praising Jñānaḍākinī at the end of ritual, an injunction to recite the *śatākṣara* to make up for any shortcomings, the often-used *mantra* OM VAJRA MUḤ to dismiss the deities, and the customary end material with the dedication of merits.

¹¹³**Catuspīṭhajalahoma* 148^v -149^r : *sgrub pa po ni the tshom skyes/ mes (em., med) kyang sdig sreg sdig pa sbyong/ chu yang de bzhin 'dra bas na/ des na sbyin sreg ces bya'o||* It is possible that a *nirukti* is behind the Tibetan translation.

which is attributed in the Canon to the famous Jñānapāda.¹¹⁴ The earliest datable ‘work’ available in Sanskrit on this topic is a section of the *Catuṣpīthasādhanasamkṣepa* (8^r -8^v), a manual which must predate 1045 CE, the date on the only available copy. This manual adds very little to what is described in the tantra, except prescribing a *bali*-offering at the conclusion of the rite. Lastly, the understudied *maṇḍalopāyikā* of Padmaśrīmitra dedicates a short section (14^r 9-14^v 6) of this manual to the *jalahoma* openly acknowledging the source in the introductory verse: *jalahomavidhiṃ vakṣye Catuṣpīthakramāgatam/*. These thirty-five verses also follow the present sub-chapter, essentially recasting that in intelligible Sanskrit. The additional details reveal the influence of Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary: the fourth verse prescribes that the water should be free of small creatures, a specification which is not in the *mūla*; the twelfth verse describes the *mudrā* to be formed with the fists joined at the back, a feature unique to Bhavabhaṭṭa. Padmaśrīmitra must have either innovated the rite or must have been inspired by other sources inasmuch as he offers the alternative of installing the goddesses in the vases merely through their emblems (*cihna*) and not a full visualization. The last verses of the section also seem to customize the rite with the incorporating of *Guhyasamāja* deities. Unfortunately this section is rather corrupt.

In addition to the above there is a parallel of about four and a half verses in ch. 10 of the *Vajradāka* (T_D 29^v). This section falls within a lacuna in both Sanskrit manuscripts (C 29-30, T 28-32), hence the exact verbal parallelism cannot be established for the time being. The editors of the *Vajradāka* included only the preparatory stage of the *jalahoma* and compounded it with the rite of healing snake-poison. The **Vajradākavivṛti* (67^v -69^r) reverses this editorial decision by splitting up the rite into two (*jalahoma* and *viṣāpahāra*) and interpreting them according to and including details from the *Catuṣpītha*.¹¹⁵

The sub-chapter starts out (v. 1) with Vajrapāṇi’s question about oblation into water.

The Lord promises to teach the topic and does so immediately by explaining the preparations (vv. 2-6). The *yogin* should first examine the water he intends to use. We are not given the particulars, but Bhavabhaṭṭa explains

¹¹⁴The canonical base for this work is most likely the **Jambhalajalendrayathālabdhakalpa* (Tōh. 770).

¹¹⁵For the latter rite cf. register of parallels to the *Nibandha* ad 1.2.41-69.

that the water should be without any small creatures, it should be pure, and brought from an auspicious place. Once the water is secured he should erect a canopy hanging with all kinds of cloths, and smear the ground beneath it making a large square shape with fragrant powders. In the middle of this he should place a pot (which is smeared with white fragrant powders) filled with the previously described water mixed with milk. In the eight directions of the pot he should install eight vases (*kalaśa*) filled with fragrant water and adorned with young shoots (typically that of mango). Durjayacandra adds that the place should be in the proximity of a stream of water and interprets the central pot as the *viṣayakalaśa*, that is to say the main vase (or one of the main vases) in the initiation rite (*Mitapadā* 35^v). The *yogin* should then visualize himself in an instant as Jñānaḍākinī (Vajraḍākinī according to Kalyāṇavarman) and worship himself as the deity with flowers, incense, etc. He should then start the visualization of the deities in the ritual space.

Vv. 7-21 describes this configuration of the ritual space. The *yogin* first displays the gesture of the lotus (cupped hands opened in the shape of a lotus) and recites the appropriate mantra (OM KAMALĀBHE SVĀHĀ). He then visualizes a lotus in the middle of the water (in the central pot), then a moon-disk, and finally a white parasol above. The ‘seat’ thus ready he visualizes *the* syllable (i.e. HŪṂ)¹¹⁶ which transforms into the deity, that is to say Jñānaḍākinī, who is projected out of the *yogin*’s body through his breath (see 2.3). She is two-armed, seated in the comfortable position, adorned with all kinds of ornaments, holding two *vajradaṇḍas*,¹¹⁷ white, radiant, three-faced. Kalyāṇavarman sees the visualization as a mere template and notes that the implements and the colour of the deity is in accordance with the aim of the rite (*Pañjikā* 18^r-18^v).

With the visualization complete the *yogin* should display the pledge-gesture (fists put together with the index fingers stretched out and the thumbs interlocking)¹¹⁸ and utter the pledge-mantra (OM SAMAYE TIṢṬHA HŪṂ PHAṬ).

¹¹⁶The *bīja* is not stated explicitly, but since the emerging deity is Jñānaḍākinī it is only natural that Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra identify it as HŪṂ. Durjayacandra adds that the seed-syllable should be white.

¹¹⁷Or, as prescribed in the *Catuṣpūthasādhanaśamkṣepa*, a *vajra* and a *daṇḍa* in the left and right hand respectively.

¹¹⁸Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the *mudrā* differently: the fists are said to be joined in an inverted position and it is the index fingers that are interlocked. The *Catuṣpūthasādhanaśamkṣepa* gives the same description except the fists do not join each other at the back.

Thereafter he should install the goddesses onto the vases: Vajrī in the east, Ghorī in the north, Vettālī in the west, Caṇḍālī in the south, Siṃhī in the north-east, Vyāghrī in the south-east, Jambukī in the south-west, and Ulūkī in the north-west.¹¹⁹ At this point Durjayacandra describes the iconography of the eight goddesses in seven and a half *śloka*s. These are more likely to have been composed by the commentator, since they cannot be traced in any known source (*Mitapadā* 36^r -36^v). The *Catuṣpīṭhasādhanasamkṣepa* teaches that first each of the vases must be empowered by reciting the *bīja* bracketed by OṂ and SVĀHĀ of the goddesses they represent one hundred and eight times.

As before the *yogin* should display the pledge-gestures and utter the pledge-mantras. We are not given these since they will be taught in the next chapter. The *yogin* should then offer worship to the goddesses with flowers, incense, etc. Thereafter he should display the ‘root-mudrā’ (left fist on the heart with the right fist either on it or stretched out) and utter the ‘root-mantra’ (OṂ JRŪṂ SVĀHĀ).¹²⁰

Vv. 22-23 describe the *jalahoma* proper. The *yogin* should pierce a white flower such as jasmine with the tip of a blade of *dūrvā* grass. Reciting the mantra just taught he should imagine hitting the *vajra* on the crown of Jñānaḍākinī previously visualized above the water in the central pot. For each flower thus offered he should recite the root-mantra once. The last line describes the effects of the default case: if the *yogin* does so ten thousand times his lifespan will greatly increase.

Vv. 24-27 teach several inflections of the rite. If the flower used is a red *karavīra* (i.e. the Oleander) the ritual will bring about placating in a household. If he uses *nāga/kesara* flowers (i.e. the Cobra’s saffron) dipped in thickened milk the ritual will bring about placating in a village. If he uses lotuses he will achieve placating for an entire country.¹²¹ The number stays the same, ten thousand for each. He may also use *priyaṅgu* (panic seed), bel, *utpalas*, and

¹¹⁹Here the version of the **Nānātanroddhṛtabalividhayaḥ* (149a-149b) differs somewhat. Instead of the goddesses it prescribes the eight *yakṣas* (Maṇibhadra, Pūrṇabhadra, etc.) with Jambhala in the middle. Immediately following the text has another injunction about installing the same set of deities on the fingers and the palm of the hand in order to obtain wealth.

¹²⁰In the **Nānātanroddhṛtabalividhayaḥ* (149b) the mantra is preceded by OṂ NAMO RATNATRAYĀYA.

¹²¹In Durjayacandra’s view the rite employing lotuses is ‘fit for all purposes’ (*sārvakamika*), that is to say it can achieve placating in all three civic units (*Mitapadā* 36^v).

kumudas for ‘royal rites’ (*rājakarma*) such as overcoming another kingdom.¹²² The number is not specified in these cases, but it is presumably the same. The last effect mentioned is that if the *yogin* drinks a handful of water (presumably from the central pot) it will bring about prosperity/reinvigoration. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s interpretation here is that the *yogin* should empower a hundred handfuls of water with the *mūlamantra* and then offer them into the pot. Kalyāṇavarman’s comment is similar, but in his view the *yogin* should offer a handful of water each day onto the crown-*vajra* of the goddesses beginning with Vajraḍākinī (*Pañjikā* 18^v). Durjayacandra distances the procedure from the rite and suggests that the *yogin* should drink milk or water which has been empowered by the mantra in order to achieve invigoration of the body (*kāyapuṣṭi*).

The sub-chapter closes with the usual colophon.

¹²²Or, as Durjayacandra paraphrases this passage, in order to obtain a kingdom or to conquer another (*Mitapadā* 36^v).

5.7 Annotated translation of 2.3

According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the aim of the sub-chapter is the elucidation of deity-yoga and explaining the 'pledges' (*samaya*). Kalyāṇavarman calls the sub-chapter that of the *maṇḍala*, for without drawing the *maṇḍala* the *yogin* will not be able to obtain supreme accomplishment.¹²³

I. The Lord's exhortation

O Vajra[pāṇi], great king, hear [now] the characteristic[s] of [that principle by which] the transmigratory world is traversed: utterly liberated from [dualistic thoughts such as] existence and non-existence, [the yogin] should avoid [distinguishing between] pure and impure. 2.3.1

- **hear** The chapter starts with the Lord's exhortation, in other words there is no question from Vajrapāṇi. Bhavabhaṭṭa's view is that there is no need to ask about the particulars of deity-yoga (*devatābhāvanā*), because that question has already been asked in broad terms. To substantiate this he evokes an exegetical principle from the Prajñāpāramitā tradition: the same topic can be brought up again in another context. Such sudden worries for stylistic propriety are typical for this commentator.

- **the characteristic[s] of [that]** Bhavabhaṭṭa has non-dual gnosis (*advaya-jñāna*) as the unstated object of this sentence. However, he takes the third verse-quarter to refer to emptiness before applying the last verse-quarter to non-dual gnosis again, but again applies the entire line to non-dual [gnosis] in l. 14 (I see *advaya* as a *bhīṃavatsamāsa* for *advaya-jñāna* here). Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 37^r) simply has 'cause [by which transmigration is traversed]' as the subject.

- **should avoid** Bhavabhaṭṭa here takes the Optative to stand for a Past Participle qualifying emptiness: it is devoid of existence and non-existence, freed of purity and impurity. I find my translation more in line with the following verses.

¹²³ *Pañjikā* 18^v: [...] *yoginaḥ maṇḍalalikhanaṃ antareṇa uttamasiddhir na bhavatīti* [...] *maṇḍalapaṭalam ārabhate*.

- **purity and impurity** The original meaning was perhaps ritual purity and impurity, rather than a philosophical one as Bhavabhaṭṭa would have it: purity is the (original) absence of afflictions, impurity is the (adventitious) presence of the same. Similarly, Durjayacandra glosses the two as 'absence of passion' (*virāga*) and 'passion' (*rāga*)

What [we] conceive of as phenomena are non-dual, freed of duality. [Thus the yogin should] correctly establish the emptiness of [the aggregates of] form [etc.] at the beginning, end, [and] middle [of his meditation session]. 2.3.2

- **non-dual** The corroborating quotation from the *Guhyasamāja* is either a conflation of two passages, or Bhavabhaṭṭa had a recension we cannot access anymore. The short excursus that follows seeks to elaborate on the statement by bringing forth a well-known triad.

- **[Thus the yogin] etc.** I am greatly influenced by Bhavabhaṭṭa here. It is equally possible that this is not a ritual instruction, but rather a continuation of the philosophical oration. If this is the case we must read **rūpa śūnyādi** keeping 'form' as a cumulative term, and force the meaning of **ādi** and **antānām** to mean any of two extremes: pure and impure and so forth. Something along these lines is given by Durjayacandra; the passage is marred by damage to the leaf and we cannot follow his entire reasoning.¹²⁴

Only the impartial view [should be adopted by the yogin], the middle [between] pure and impure. An equanimous mind will come about for he [who takes] the middle [between] that which is to be cultivated and that which should not be cultivated. 2.3.3

- **the middle** I believe that the text originally put forward the 'middle' as the path to take. However, according to the *Samādhirāja* quotation used by Bhavabhaṭṭa (ad 2.3.1, ll. 16-19) as well as Durjayacandra, the *yogin*

¹²⁴ *Mitapadā* 37^r-37^v: [...] rūpam adhikṛtya parihāram āha- **rūpa śūnyādi antānām** ityādi. utpādahetor asattvād anutpannatayā rūpam ādau śūnyam. anutpannasyāvāsane 'py anavasthānād ante 'pi śūnyam. evaṃ śabdagantharasasparśādyāḥ sarvadharmā[h] [...].

should not adopt any standpoint, not even that of the middle (a *prāsaṅgika* view?).¹²⁵

- **that which is to be cultivated etc.** The words *sevyā* and *gamyā* (Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss) could refer to women that the *yogin* could have sexual relations with. Cf. e.g. *Jñānasiddhi* ch. 11. But here the pairs probably carry a more general meaning referring to food, drink, articles of worship, sensory data, etc. Cf. *Jñānasiddhi* 1.18 and the verses leading up to it, *Advayasiddhi* 21, *Hevajra* I.vi.21, etc.

For those whose body abides in equanimity, there will analogously be equanimity in speech. In those who maintain the position of viewing [all with] equanimity, equanimous knowledge will be born.

2.3.4

- **body** Bhavabhaṭṭa notices the sudden backtracking of the text from mind (3d) to body. The way out in his interpretation is that it is the principle described above that should be adopted for the other two members of the triad body, speech, and mind. Incidentally, here he reveals his *cittamātra* schooling: the summary (ll. 3-8), in spite of the *Guhyasamāja* quotation (cf. *Pradīpoddyotana* p. 30 for an interpretation of this difficult passage), bears the mark of Vasubandhu.

- **equanimous knowledge** Bhavabhaṭṭa, presumably since he had undertaken to explain *advaya-jñāna* before, does not elaborate on this. For Dujayacandra this is the realization that *saṃsāra* and *nirvāṇa* are the same.¹²⁶

II. Vajrapāṇi's questions

O Lord, I wish to hear what [this] 'position of equanimity' is. As for those 'non-dual phenomena', how should one know them [thus] for one's self?

2.3.5

¹²⁵ *Mitapadā* 38^r ad 2.3.5b: [...] *śucyaśucyanubhayabhedatrayabhinne vastuni katham punar iyaṃ samadṛṣṭīr* [...].

¹²⁶ *Mitapadā* 38^r: *sama-jñānaṃ bhavanirvāṇayor avaisadṛśyaṃ* [...]. This is perhaps an oblique reference to *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 25.9.

- **what** Lit. 'how'. Bhavabhaṭṭa states that the question refers to the coming about of this position, in other words the question refers to the technicalities of how one should realize equanimity.

- **for one's self** Bhavabhaṭṭa again makes the question refer to the actual process: how should one realize the non-duality of phenomena for one's self (perhaps more precisely: one's person), which is identified with the form of the deity/deities in what is to follow.

III. The Lord's answer

Hear [then], O Vajra[pāṇi], according to the truth, the characteristics of non-dual gnosis: it is free of duality [and thus] it cognizes phenomena in a non-dual [fashion]. 2.3.6abcd

- **it is free of duality** The interpretation of *pādas* cd is tentative. The 'duality' in this case is most likely the dichotomy between perceiver and perceived, cf. Durjayacandra's interpretation.¹²⁷

III. The triple purification

Before the beginning of every meditation [session the yogin] should recite the three [mantras containing the word] 'pure', [namely:] 2.3.6ef

«All phenomena are purified of an essential nature, I am purified of an essential nature. 2.3.7

- **purified of** To paraphrase Bhavabhaṭṭa, they are devoid of an essential nature: one cannot state in truth that they are existent or non-existent, eternal or non-eternal, etc. Since this is the case with all phenomena, which includes the constituents of the person, it necessarily follows that the meditator is also primordially pure. Although this is so, the meditator should nevertheless 'purify' himself with these mantras, for he is tainted with adventitious afflictions.

All phenomena are vajra-purified, I am vajra-purified. 2.3.8

¹²⁷ *Mitapadā* 38^v: *tatra grāhyagrāhakayor dvidhā dvayam [...]*.

- **vajra-purified** Among the many ways in which one could interpret this statement, Bhavabhaṭṭa chooses to take **vajra** as indivisible, non-dual knowledge (cf. *Hevajra* I.i.4).

All phenomena are yoga-purified, I am yoga-purified.» 2.3.9

- **yoga-purified** **Yoga** is taken here to mean eidetic visualization, in which the meditator sheds his common appearance and takes on that of the deity, whereby his constituents are purified.

It would be impossible to list all interpretations of these celebrated mantras (the fact that they are mantras is indicated by the fact that very often they are preceded by OM). Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 38^v) states that the three enunciations refer to the triad *kāyavaṅjra*, *cittavaṅjra*, and *vāgvaṅjra* [of the *yogatantra*-systems]. The order is somewhat odd, but he manages to justify it by taking **yoga** as the ‘employing of mantras’ (*mantrāṅām saṃyojanaṃ yogah*). After the treatment of the triple formula Bhavabhaṭṭa gives a long passage about what should have preceded it. The aim was no doubt to bring the *bhāvanā* procedure of the Catuspīṭha in line with must have been current preparatory practice.

The intended meaning is that [the *yogin*] should first visualize in his own heart his own seed[-syllable] and create an apparition of the guru and his chosen deity by means of a flood of rays issuing forth from that [seed]. He should then enact offering flowers and so on [in worship] by means of gestures beginning with that of [offering] flowers. He should then perform confession of sins, delighting in virtues, endorsing of virtues, taking the triple refuge, surrendering oneself, aspiration, relying on the Path, and the contemplation of [the Four Immeasurables] beginning with loving kindness. [It is] thereafter [that] he should recite the three purificatory [mantras] (*trivīsuddhim*).

NIBANDHA
II. 2-6

Having recited these, he should join his hands in reverence [with the aim of reaching] unsurpassed [knowledge]. 2.3.10ab

- **[with] etc.** I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa's filling out the gaps. Kalyāṇavarman takes this to mean 'to perform an unsurpassed worship of the Buddhas'.¹²⁸ Durjayacandra reads **anantarasyaiva**, which is the *lectio facilior*.

IV. Arranging the place for meditation

He should set himself up in a place which is pleasing to the mind. 2.3.10cd

- **pleasing to the mind** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this should either be taken literally, or have it refer to the standard places such as a mountain. Cf. *Guhyasamāja* 11.35 and 12.2 as quoted in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* p. 96 and p. 91 respectively.

He should spread out a canopy with all kinds of hanging sheets of cloth. He should erect streamers and banners adorned with lattices of small bells. 2.3.11

- **streamers and banners** The difference, according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, is that streamers do not have any insignia, whereas banners do. For the insignia cf. *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 5.19-21.

He should also make a maṇḍala of [fragrant] powders spread evenly into the ten directions. 2.3.12ab

- **a maṇḍala of [fragrant] powders** The *gandhamaṇḍala* is usually associated with the preliminary rite of initiation called *adhivāsana* (cf. *Padmāvātī* 7^r, *Vajrāvālī* chs. 9-10). The word **ādibhis** does not seem to have any suitable meaning here.

- **into the ten directions** This simple *maṇḍala* is two-dimensional, therefore the injunction to spread it into the ten directions is somewhat absurd. Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra explain that 'spreading' towards the zenith is done by throwing a pinch of fragrant powder into the air, whereas the 'spreading' towards the nadir is either already achieved by anointing the middle, or by throwing another pinch of powder for 'below'.

¹²⁸ *Pañjikā* 18^v: *bodhicittam utpādyānuttarāṃ buddhapūjāṃ kuryād ity arthaḥ.*

V. Visualizing the palace

With the procedure of the instant kind (**jhaṭitākārayogena**) he should visualize his own body maintaining the form of **Jñānaḍākinī**. He should [then] worship himself [as the goddess].

2.3.12cd-
13ab

- **procedure of the instant kind (jhaṭitākārayogena)** Here I disagree with Bhavabhaṭṭa, who glosses only **jhaṭita** (not taking it to mean the more usual and correct *jhaṭityākārayogena*), and even that in a puzzling way to mean ‘solitary’ (*ekākinī*), that is to say the visualized goddess is not accompanied by her attendants. It is more likely that what is meant here is that the goddess should be visualized instantly as opposed to gradually: emerging from a *bīja*, which has a certain colour, sits on a moon-disk, after having contemplated the *brahmavihāras* and so forth.¹²⁹ This goes against the interpretation of Durjayacandra: he does prescribe a gradual visualization referring the reader back to sub-chapter 2.1. We cannot be entirely sure that he read **jhaṭita**, since he does not give lemmata at this point in the commentary.¹³⁰ That the *yogin* visualizes Jñānaḍākinī twice is an apparent contradiction: according to the logic of mature tantric ritual one must become the deity to worship the deity.

He should [then] raise his hand and visualize in it a vajra. [With it] – accompanied by [the recitation of the mantra consisting of the] hūṃ-syllable, the obeisance, and the blow at the end – he should strike the five places [thus] purifying the seven underworlds.

2.3.13cd-
14

- [the mantra etc.] The encoded mantra is OM HŪM PHAṬ.

- **the five places** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these are the middle [of the previously prepared maṇḍala], then the eastern side¹³¹ and the other three directions proceeding counter-clockwise.

¹²⁹For this distinction cf. e.g. *Padmāvatī* 16^v : *pūrvoktamaitryādibhāvanākramanirapekṣo yogī jhaṭityākārayogena [...]*.

¹³⁰*Mitapadā* 39^r : [...] *parapīṭhīyaprathamapaṭaloktena kalanam aṅgānetyādīnā krameṇa Jñānaḍākinīm ātmānaṃ nirmāyātmanah pūjāṃ kuryāt.*

¹³¹I have conjectured here *pūrvāyāṃ* instead of *paścīmāyāṃ*. The reading cannot be accepted, for proceeding from west to north goes clockwise.

• **[thus] purifying the seven underworlds** What is meant is that the *yogin* purifies the earth where the palace is to be visualized down to and including the seven underworlds. The more usual idiom is that evoked by Bhavabhaṭṭa: to visualize the earth becoming *vajra*-like all the way down to the *rasātala*[-underworld]’ (*rasātalaparyantam*, usually preceded by an *ā-*). Bhavabhaṭṭa also evokes other elements usually visualized at this stage: the *vajra*-rampart, etc. in other words the defensive structures. He also adds that according to an oral teaching one should face west at the outset of this visualization. This is rather unusual, since the direction is given as either east or (in the more antinomian systems) south.

He should [then] visualize [mount] Meru covered with the four colours and so forth, and on its top a palace made of gold, studded with the seven precious materials, with lattices of small bells [and] garlands, spanning evenly in any size he wishes.

2.3.15-
16ab

• **visualize [mount] Meru** Bhavabhaṭṭa takes the mantra encoded in 14cd to be the mantra from which Mount Meru emerges. Although this is accepted exegetical procedure (*kākākṣiṇyāyena*), the more usual mantra for the mountain is the seed-syllable *SUM*.¹³²

• **covered with the four colours and so forth** The four sides of Meru are said to be made of silver, beryl, rock-crystal, and gold, each side radiating its appropriate hue. The side facing us is that of beryl, hence we perceive the sky as blue. See *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ad 3.50a, also cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 99^r which has sapphire instead of beryl. The **ādi** must refer to other characteristics of Sumeru, such as the eight summits (*aṣṭaśṛṅga*). According to Durjayacandra’s commentary here one should visualize the seed-syllable *OM* atop a lotus and a moon-disk; this changes into a discus, which turns into a [four-faced] Vairocana, who then turns into a golden palace coloured white, yellow, red, and black on its four sides.¹³³

¹³²Cf. e.g. *Cakrasamvarapañjikā* p. 109: [...] *tadupari SUMkāreṇa Sumeruṃ caturasraṃ* [...]; *Padmāvatī* 12^r: [...] *tadūrdhvaṃ caturvarṇa[ṃ]]SUMkāraṃ dhyātvā tatpariṇatam Sumeruṃ catūratnamayam* [...].

¹³³*Mitapadā* 39^r: *tatra vajramayyāṃ bhūmau caturvarṇādīchhāditam iti padmendau praṇavajacakreṇa Vairocanaṃ vibhāvya tenaiva sitapīṭaraktakṛṣṇavarṇacatuṣṭayo-petaṃ kāñcanāgārasaṃbhūtam iti kāñcanasyāgāraṃ kāñcanāgāraṃ svarṇanīrmāṇa-*

• **and on its top** Following Bhavabhaṭṭa we must read **mūrdham** out of sequence (*bhinnakrameṇa*).

• **palace made of gold** Here too we must follow Bhavabhaṭṭa and understand ‘*kāñcanasaṃbhūtam āgāram*’.

• **the seven precious materials** These are enumerated by Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 39^r) as: moon-stone (*candrakānta*), sun-stone (*sūryakānta*), sapphire (*indranāla*), topaz (*puṣparāga*), ruby (*padmarāga*), emerald (*marakṭa*), and beryl (*vaidūrya*). Notice the less common spellings for the last two. Two further lists are given in the *Āmnāyamañjarī* 99^r-99^v.

Before any other gesture [the yogin] should bind [and display] the gesture of the pledge: after having bound two vajra-fists he should place the left on his heart with the right raised (?). [This is] displayed as the gesture of the pledge.

2.3.16cd-
17

• **with the right raised (?)** The phrase **savyakakṣikam utkṣipya** is highly problematic. Bhavabhaṭṭa simply glosses it as ‘having raised the right hand’ (*dakṣiṇabāhum utkṣipya*), the tentative interpretation adopted here. According to Kalyāṇavarman – after applying some conjectures based on the Tibetan translation – the left fist is placed on the heart and the right fist is placed under the left armpit.¹³⁴ In Durjayacandra’s interpretation the thumb of the right fist (called a **kakṣikā**) is clenched (?) or topped (?) by the left.¹³⁵ It is equally possible that the right fist is placed (raised up?) next (**kakṣikam** as in *kakṣastha*, cf. Modern Bengali *kācha* ‘nearness’) to the left fist with the back of the hands joined (and then both are raised?).¹³⁶

[The mantra] which (yathā) [consists of] the vajra-seed (vajramayaṃ bījaṃ), the obeisance [at the beginning], and the oblation at the end, is taught to be the (tathā)

2.3.18

kūṭāgāram āvirbhūtam ity arthah.

¹³⁴*Pañjikā* 21^v: *vajramuṣṭidvayaṃ baddhvā vāmamuṣṭi[ṇ] hṛdaye [saṃ]sthāpya [ava]-savyamuṣṭim {ava}savyakakṣe nyased iti samayamudrā.*

¹³⁵*Mitapadā* 39^v: *kakṣiketi muṣṭer ūrdhvavṛddhāṅgurī kakṣikā, tatra savyamuṣṭim utkṣiped utthāpayec ca.*

¹³⁶Also cf. TURNER 2588.

mantra of this previously (° ādi) [taught] gesture of the pledge.

- **which (yathā) etc.** I interpret the **yathā-tathā** pair as simple pronouns, in spite of Bhavabhaṭṭa. The encoded mantra is ॐ HŪṢ SVĀHĀ.

- **gesture of the pledge** Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this as the *samayamudrā* shown to Jñānaḍākinī (ad 16, ll. 2-3). Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 39^v), renaming the gesture *mūlamudrā*, states that it is shown to all five goddesses whose seats are described in the next verse.

In the five places he should place five lion-thrones. [Then] he should visualize a [/ five] sun-disk[/s] adorned with a [/ five] white parasol[/s].

2.3.19

- **the five places** I.e. the middle and the cardinal directions.

- **a sun-disk etc.** The goddesses' seats vary within the tradition. All three commentators advocate that all five lion-seats have a sun-disk and a white parasol. The artwork does not subscribe to this view: usually only Jñānaḍākinī is given a sun-disk and parasol (cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 100^v). This means that the second half of the verse was read as part of the next section, the visualization of the chief goddess. The *sādhanas* prescribe the lion-throne only for Jñānaḍākinī, the other four goddesses have an elephant, a peacock, a *garuḍa*, and a *kiṃkara* as their seat.¹³⁷ The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* maintains what must have been the older view (26.2ab): *siṃhāsanamādīpañcasya mūrdhni cchatravibhūṣitam/*.

VI. Visualizing the goddesses

¹³⁷ **Śrīcatuṣpīṭhasādhana* attr. to Āryadeva 76^v ff., *Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā* of Amitavajra 4^v, *Yogāmbarasādhanavidhi* of Jagadānandaḥīrabhadra 8^r, *Ratnamālā* 6^v, *Catustattva* of Jitāri 1.5 & 1.17 (the third seat here is called *haṃsa*, but a gloss makes it clear that what is meant is a *garuḍa*), *Kalpasādhana* 4^r (after a lacuna of one folio, only mention of a *garuḍa* is available), **Jñānaḍākinīsādhana* of Abhayākara Gupta 150^v only mentions that the five goddesses have different seats of their own (*rang rang gi gdan sna tshogs*).

With the *ādhāramaṇḍala* as it were complete, the *yogin* visualizes the deities, that is to say what in other systems would be termed the *ādheyamaṇḍala*.¹³⁸

VI.i. Jñānaḍākinī

Emitted from his breath [the yogin should visualize] Jñānaḍākinī in the middle. [She is] three-faced and six-armed, seated in the comfortable posture. 2.3.20

- **from his breath** Bhavabhaṭṭa sees this as an allusion to another level of the visualization, namely when the merely imagined *samayasattva* ('pledge-being') is merged with the *jñānasattva* ('gnosis-being'). However, the tantra seems to advocate that the five main goddesses are correlated with the five elements beginning with ether (*ākāśa*)¹³⁹ in the *yogin*'s body, from which they are 'breathed out' onto the *maṇḍala*. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 21^v -22^r) correlates the goddesses with tubes (*nāḍī*) corresponding for each element. He does not elaborate on these unfortunately. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 39^v -40^r) alludes to the visualization process only very briefly, and refers the reader to a work that does not seem to survive or cannot be identified.¹⁴⁰

[Her] hair is spread out, dishevelled, and adorned with the five Buddhas. [She is] dark-blue, greatly terrifying, adorned with snakes as ornaments. 2.3.21

- **adorned with the five Buddhas** The intended meaning was very likely a tiara (*makuta/mukuṭa*) with the five Tathāgatas or five skulls representing the same. Abhayākaragupta has an even more elaborate image (**Jñānaḍākinīsādhana* 150^r -150^v): she wears a tiara with a *vajra* on top and fillets (*dar dpyangs, *paṭṭa*) adorned with the five radiant Buddhas. Also cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 99^v.

¹³⁸Note, however, that thus far it is only the seats of the five goddesses that are given, the others are described together with the description of the goddesses themselves.

¹³⁹Although it should be noted that the element ether is not actually mentioned here, this is an interpretation of Bhavabhaṭṭa ad v. 24.

¹⁴⁰The passage is somewhat corrupt: *Jñānaḍākinīyabhisamayād vistare dvādaśasāhasrikoddhṛta Yogāmbārāgāre (-sāgare?) etā Vajraḍākinīyādayo vaktavyāḥ. tatraivāsāṃ varṇacihnam vyaktībhaviṣyatīti tad atra nocyate.*

- **adorned with snakes as ornaments** The *sādhana* texts (or their scribes) frequently misread this as *sarvābharāṇamaṇḍitā*, ‘adorned with all sorts of ornaments’. The depictions sometimes have only one snake curled around the goddesses’ left shoulder with the tail hanging onto their lap. Verse 31c, however, makes it clear that there should be snakes on all the goddesses’ limbs.

[She has] three eyes on [each of her] three faces, which are laughing, fierce, and coquettish. She is roaring with laughter and grinning. [She is] made resplendent with red garments. 2.3.22

- **three faces** Bhavabhaṭṭa specifies that it is the face in the front *mūla-mukha* that is coquettish, with the one laughing on the left, and the fierce one on the right.

Furthermore, [she holds] skull-staff aloof, a battle-axe in the second, a vajra with the third, sounding a bell [with her first] left, a bowl in the second, a sword is held in the third. The wise one should visualize her [thus] in the middle, [emitting] numerous blazes of light. 2.3.23-24

- **skull-staff etc.** The prescribed order of implements seems to be as follows: R1 (top hand on the right) *khaṭvāṅga*, R2 *paraśu*, R3 *vajra*, L3 *ghaṇṭā*, L2 *pātra*, L1 *asi*. Depictions, however, have the order R1 *paraśu*, R2 *vajra*, R3 *khaṭvāṅga*. With the superimposition of Yogāmbara the iconography, including the implements, changes yet further.

VI.ii. Vajraḍākinī

East of Jñāna[ḍākinī], emitted from one’s water, resplendent, white in colour, adorned with dishevelled hair, two-armed, seated in the comfortable posture, adorned with snakes as ornaments, with a skull-staff and a bowl of yoga, adorned with resplendent garments, [emitting] numerous blazes of light, he should visualize Vajraḍākinī. 2.3.25-27ab

- **a bowl of yoga** I.e. a skull-bowl, sometimes said to be full of blood. Cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 99^v.

- **Vajraḍākinī** The name is sometimes contracted to Vajrī.

VI.iii. Ghoraḍākinī

On the northern side of Jñānaḍākinī, emitted from one's fire, resplendent, yellow in colour, seated in the comfortable posture, adorned with dishevelled hair, adorned with snakes as ornaments, with a body resplendent with [fine] garments, splendid, two-armed [holding] a skull-staff and a bowl of yoga, [he should visualize the goddess] known as Ghoraḍākinī.

2.3.27cd-
29

- **Ghoraḍākinī** The name is sometimes contracted to Ghorī.

VI.iv. Vettālī

On the western side of Jñāna[ḍākinī], emitted from one's wind, two-armed, seated in the comfortable position, shining [with the glow] of molten gold, with a skull-staff and a bowl of yoga, adorned with dishevelled hair, with snake-ornaments on all her limbs, adorned with resplendent garments, [emitting] numerous blazes of light, [he should visualize] the ḍākinī called Vettālī.

2.3.30-
32ab

- **shining [with the glow] of molten gold** That is to say, red.
- **Vettālī** Otherwise Vetālī, but this is the spelling almost consistently given by Bhavabhaṭṭa.

VI.v. Caṇḍālī

On the southern side of Jñāna[ḍākinī], emitted from one's earth, two-armed, seated in the comfortable posture, resplendent, dark-blue in colour, with a skull-staff and a bowl of yoga, adorned with snakes as ornaments, adorned with dishevelled hair, roaring with laughter, terrifying, [emitting] numerous blazes of light, [he should visualize] the ḍākinī called Caṇḍālī.

2.3.32cd-
34

The following verse concludes the visualization of the chief goddesses, i.e. those of the middle and cardinal directions. Note that the goddesses in the cardinal directions were enumerated counter-clockwise, but those in the intermediate directions are given clockwise. The latter set also distinguishes itself by being zoo-cephalic (cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa's comment ad v. 43 in the present sub-chapter).

Having emitted thus (iti) from one's five [elements] the five ḍākinīs [as] named [above], [the yogin] should visualize the five as five, endowed with beauty and perfect forms. 2.3.35

- **five as five** This statement is obscure. Bhavabhaṭṭa gives two options: the five goddesses are purified by the five kinds of knowledge, which is to say, if we may use a concept more ours than the author's, that they 'symbolize' these knowledges; alternatively, each of the five goddesses embodies all five kinds of knowledge.

VI.vi. Siṃhī

On the north-eastern side he should visualize the lion-faced one [i.e. Siṃhī]. She is white and yellow in colour, stands in the archer posture on the lord of nāgas. [She holds] a vajra-goad with her finger threatening. [She is] adorned with resplendent garments. [The yogin] should visualize her body in a burn[ing halo], [emitting] numerous blazes of light. 2.3.36-37

- **Siṃhī** This goddess is also called Siṃhinī, Siṃghī, and Siṃghinī, the last two showing the Middle Indic form of these names.

- **white and yellow** This is not mixture of colours: the right half of the goddess is yellow, and the left is white, as if mirroring both ways the goddesses of the cardinal directions. The same principle applies to the other three goddesses in this set.

• **the lord of nāgas** Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses **nāgendra-** with *hastī* ‘elephant’. Thus he takes *nāga* here in the meaning ‘elephant’ and *nāgendra* in the meaning ‘lordly elephant’ rather than ‘lord of the elephants’, namely Airāvata. So for him Siṃhī’s mount is an elephant, whereas for Amitavajra and Jagadānandaḥivabhadra it is a lion (4^v and 8^v respectively).

• **a vajra-goad with her finger threatening** Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this to mean that in her right hand she holds a goad marked by a *vajra*, while her left is stretched out displaying the threatening gesture. The depictions combine these two for her left hand (i.e. she holds a goad while pointing with her index finger) and have a skull-staff in her right. In place of the *khaṭvāṅga* the *sādhanas* of Amitavajra and Jagadānandaḥivabhadra have a sword (4^r -5^v and 8^v respectively). The *Kalpasādhana* (6^r -6^v) has her left hand holding a noose while pointing with her index and her right holding a goad and displaying the gesture of ‘drawing in’ (*karṣaṇī*). There are yet further divergences in the fragmentary *sādhanas*.

VI.vii. Vyāghrī

In the south-east [he should visualize the goddess] called Vyāghrī on a throne made of seven precious materials. [She is] two-armed, white and dark-blue, adorned with resplendent garments. [Her right] hand is embellished with a goad, the left is [held in the] threatening [gesture] while holding (-vat) a noose. [The yogin] should visualize her body in a burn[ing halo], [emitting] numerous blazes of light.

2.3.38-39

• **a throne made of seven precious materials** Amitavajra (4^r) has a vulture or *agaruḍa* (*vajratuṇḍa*) as her seat, whereas Jagadānandaḥivabhadra (8^r) has a wild sow (*vārāhī*).

VI.viii. Jambukī

In the south-west [he should visualize] the goddess Jambukī, roaring with laughter, terrifying, seated on a buffalo as her throne; her colours are red and black. Her

2.3.40-42ab

body is resplendent with [fine] garments. She is embellished with two arms: [one holds] a goad and [the other] a noose while [displaying] the threatening [gesture]. She is adorned with snakes as ornaments. Her entire body is in a burn[ing halo], [emitting] numerous blazes of light.

- **Jambukī** As alluded to by the name, she has the face of a jackal. Similarly, Ulūkī has the face of an owl.

VI.ix. Ulūkī

In the north-east [he should visualize] Ulūkī. Her colours are yellow and red. Pressing down a snake [which is her] throne, she is adorned with snakes-ornaments. She is two-armed, seated in the comfortable posture, [holding] a goad and a noose while [displaying] the threatening [gesture]. Her entire body is in a burn[ing halo], [emitting] numerous blazes of light.

2.3.42cd-
44ab

- **Ulūkī** This is the most common spelling as far as Bhavabhaṭṭa goes. The tantra frequently dispenses with the initial vowel, thus Lūkikā, Lūkī, but sometimes also Ullūkī.
- **a snake [which is her] throne** The *sādhana*s of Amitavajra and Jagad-ānanda-jīvabhadra give a she-jackal (*śivā*) instead. The *Kalpasādhana* (6^v -7^r) keeps the originals both here and for Jambukī.

The following half-verse concludes the visualization of the goddesses seated in the cardinal and intermediate directions and announces the last set of four, that of the door-guardians. The last set is again described counter-clockwise. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 40^v) distinguishes the two sets by calling the first nine *cakravartinīs* and the remaining four *dvārapālīs*. The first set, excepting the chief goddess, is further divided by him into *digdevīs* and *koṇadevīs*.

[Thus] the eight ḍākinīs in the middle. Outside [their group] there is a quartet [of goddesses as follows].

2.3.44cd

- **in the middle** Bhavabhaṭṭa calls the previous set of eight (in fact nine with Jñānaḍākinī) the *madhyapuṭa* and the set of four to come the *bāhyapuṭa*. The later *sādhanas* also use this terminology, but there the entire original *maṇḍala* of the thirteen goddesses is itself the *madhyapuṭa* or the *prathamapuṭa*.

VI.x. Raudrī/Ḍākinī

The ḍākinī in the east[ern gateway], O lord of kings (rājendra), is two-armed, white in colour; she is seated on a corpse [which is her] throne, adorned with snakes as ornaments. Raudrī's hair is dishevelled, and she is shining with blazes of light. She is roaring with laughter and burning brightly, placing her hands on her mouth.

2.3.45-46

- **Raudrī** The name of this goddess varies greatly according to how the verse is interpreted. Bhavabhaṭṭa takes one of her epithets to be the name, hence Raudrī. Most sources simply call her Ḍākinī (*Maṇḍalopāyikā* 8.37, *Pañjikā* 22^r, *Mitapadā* 40^v, *Yogāmbarasādhanopāyikā* of Amitavajra 5^v, *Yogāmbarasādhanavidhi* of Jagadānandaśivabhadra 9^r, *Kalpasādhana* 7^r), but there are works which take the Vocative **rājendra** to be a feminine Nominative and have her name as Rājendrī (**Śrīcatuṣpīthasādhana* attr. to Āryadeva 77^v, **Jñānaḍākinīsādhana* 151^r). Also note that Bhavabhaṭṭa himself refers to this goddess as Ḍākinī ad 2.3.64 below.

- **placing her hands on her mouth** Bhavabhaṭṭa elaborates that her palms are held joined. This is not always supported by depictions.

VI.xi. Dīpinī

In the north, O lord of kings, [he should visualize] Dīpinī, yellow in colour, wrathful, her two hands joined in reverence and placed above her head resembling [the flame of] a lamp. [She is] grinning, her form is terrifying; she is adorned with resplendent garments. She is seated on a corpse as her throne, and is ablaze in a glow similar to that of fire.

2.3.47-48

VI.xii. Cūṣiṇī

In the west [he should visualize] the goddess Cūṣiṇī: she is red in colour and terrifying. She is seated on a corpse as her throne, and is adorned with resplendent garments. [As if holding] a red string in her hand, she drinks blood from her hands folded in reverence. She has the divine splendour of a blaze of fire. The goddess Cūṣiṇī is wrathful [indeed].

2.3.49-
50

VI.xiii. Kāmbojī

In the south [he should visualize] the [goddess] called Kāmbojī. [Her] radiance is akin to a dark glow. [She is] seated on a corpse [which is her] throne, [she is] adorned with dishevelled hair, resplendent with red garments, adorned with snakes as ornaments. [Her] hands [hold] a pestle [and display] the threatening gesture. [She] overpowers the mind of [all sentient] beings.

2.3.51-
52

• **a pestle etc.** Bhavabhaṭṭa specifies that the *tarjanī* is displayed by the left hand and the right hand holds the pestle. Again the iconography varies in later texts: Amitavajra (5^v), Jagadānandajīvabhadra (9^v), and some depictions have her holding the pestle with both hands. The *Kalpasādhana* (7^v), the *Āmnāyamañjarī* (100^r) and the **Jñānaḍākinīsādhana* (151^r) dispense with both elements and describe Kāmbojī as displaying *añjali* in front of her pudenda (cf. v. 77 below, the most likely source for this variation). The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (8.43)¹⁴¹ and **Śrīcatuṣpīṭhasādhana* (77^v) this time agree with the tantra.

The next verse concludes the visualization of the goddesses and announces the next topic, the depiction of the pledge-*mudrās* that the *yogin* should display to each of the deities. Oddly enough, we must wait until v. 68 ff. for that, for the text first gives the mantras of the goddesses.

The omniscient [yogin] (sarvavit) should visualize all [these

2.3.53

¹⁴¹Ms. A here has a lacuna, which can be restored with the help of the parallel passages in Ms. A of the tantra.

goddesses as] radiating blazes of fire and wrathful. In the front of these [visualized] images (bimbādi) he should display the pledge[-gestures].

- **the omniscient [yogin] (sarvavit)** This is a frequent epithet for the practitioner in this corpus and it does not mean that the *yogin* is supposed to be omniscient (or not at this stage at least). He is simply versed in all sorts of ritual procedures. Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa's note ad 1.1.23a: *sarvaśabdo hi bāhulyasūcakah*. The reading of B and Bhavabhaṭṭa, **sattvavit**, does not yield any satisfactory meaning and it is also unparalleled. Furthermore, the text for the *Nibandha* here comes from a single, late, paper apograph (IASWR MBB-I-43), so that the evidence for **sattvavit** is even weaker.

- **all [these goddesses]** Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to take this to refer to the entire *maṇḍala*, the visualization of which is now complete. But this would rather suggest that the first verse-quarter should be understood as part of the description for Kāmbojī. This boundary would be somewhat odd, hence I take the entire line as one unit trying to say that all the goddesses are wrathful and in a halo of light.

- **images (bimbādi)** An important variant for this reading is suggested in the paper mss. F and E (**vidyātir**), as well as Kalyāṇavarman's lemma (**vidyā**), both being corruptions of **vidyābhir/vidyādi**. The meaning could still be the same, since goddesses are very often referred to as *vidyā* in especially in the earlier traditions. On the other hand this reading could also refer to the pledge-mantras, which would explain why they are given immediately after this verse, when the verse itself seems to introduce the gestures. However, such usage of *vidyā* is not attested in this corpus.

VII. The bījas and mantras of the goddesses

The following verses contain the encoding of what may be termed the pledge-mantras. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these mantras should be recited simultaneously with the display of the pledge-gestures in front of the goddesses, who appear from their seed-syllables (which is the unique element of the pledge-mantra, i.e. the syllable between OṂ and SVĀHĀ).

VII.i Jñānaḍākinī

[The yogin] should split with the seed[-syllable] of Vajrī, the seventh element from wind, the [seventh element] from fire, [then he should place this] pressed between the drop and the roar. [The syllable thus obtained] is said to be the torrent of rain. [Then he should join] the obeisance and the oblation at the end. [Thus] the seed-syllable of Jñānaḍākinī.

2.3.54-
55ab

- **should split etc.** Cf. the interpretation of this verse with Bhavabhaṭṭa ad 1.4.18. The word **bhedayet** (**coditam** in 1.4.18) means according to this commentator ‘placing on the head’ (i.e. as if one were to seek to split the head).

- **the seventh element etc.** Note that here the interpretation of the word *artha* seems to differ from that given ad 1.4.18. Counting seven ‘from wind’ means taking the letter seventh from the letter *ya*, that is to say *sa*. This is then taken to be explained by the second *pāda*: it is the seed of Vajrī, for her seed-syllable is **SUṂ**. But **SUṂ** is said to be embodying nectar, therefore it is related to the moon, which also oozes nectar. Hence this *sa* actually refers to the semicircle above the mantra, the *candra*. This is then placed under the seventh ‘from fire’ (the letter *ra*), that is to say *ha*. The *ha* with the semicircle is then placed in-between the ‘roar’ (a long -u), and a ‘drop’, the *bindu*. Thus the raised mantra is **HŪṂ**. Durjayacandra seems to suggest that he did not see this verse here.¹⁴² Abhayākaragupta raises the same mantra, but he applies some changes to Bhavabhaṭṭa’s interpretation. In the *Āmnāyamañjarī* (100^r -100^v; see the text given as a parallel to the edition) he takes **anila** to mean a wind-disk, which is semilunar in shape. This becomes the *candra*. Although irregularly, he interprets **Vajrībījena** as the short -u. For yet more views on this verse see *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya* 5^r.

- **the obeisance and the oblation at the end** That is to say the *bīja* is placed between the syllable **OM** and **SVĀHĀ**: **OM HŪṂ SVĀHĀ**. Thus one obtains the recited pledge-mantra, whereas the seeds **HŪṂ** etc. by themselves

¹⁴² *Mitapadā* 40^r: *tatrātra †ye† prathamapaṭaloddhṛtaJñānaḍākinīmantram dhārāvargaṣaṁ tyaktvā Vajraḍākinīyādīnāṁ mantram āha [...]*.

are used to generate the goddesses in visualization.

With this verse the first large parallel with the *Samputa* ends. The *Āmnā-yamañjarī* (100^v-102^r) goes on to give a description of the mantras and mudrās, largely following the section below and Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary, but changing the mantra-system.

Because the text here is fairly straightforward, it is an opportune locus to closely observe the editorial methods of the *Samputa*'s redactors. First, awkward phrasings in the Catuspīṭha are slightly modified (e.g. °*virājitam* for °*laṃkṛtam*, °*śobhitam* for *vicchārya*), although the ameliorated readings are not always correct (*jvalitam* for *jvalas* is neither correct nor metrical, but it is more intelligible) and the editorial intervention is not thorough. This means that the editors did not find the irregular Sanskrit problematic as long as the appropriate meaning could be extracted, but they did find hyper-barbarisms too much to bear. Second, passages that must have been unintelligible or too obscure were simply replaced (e.g. *idaṃ yogī* for *pañcapañceti*), or left out altogether (vv. 1-6ab). This seems to suggest that the original exegesis was no longer available, in other words, there was a rupture in the transmission and the finer points of obscure passages were not understood anymore. This should not come as a surprise, since Bhavabhaṭṭa's occasional guesswork also suggests that he did not have direct and complete access to the hypothetical oral transmission that would have enlightened the text where badly needed. Third, some practical or doctrinal features are purged: while the Catuspīṭha teaches that the *yogin* should 'emit' the *yoginīs* from the elements of his own body (through his breath), the *Samputa* carefully replaces this with the simple act of 'breathing out' the *yoginīs*. The *mudrā* and mantra taught in the context of visualizing mount Meru (13cd-14) are removed. Some changes are applied to modify the iconography: e.g. Vettālī and Caṇḍālī seem to exchange colours. This could be a conscious modification, although two of the mss. contain traces that the problem was observed and efforts to harmonize this exchange with the otherwise consistent colour pattern were made.

VII.ii. Vajrī

The first seed[-syllable] is the first vowel [accompanied in recitation] by the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. This is known as the seed[-syllable] of the [goddess] called Vajrī [who resides] in the east.

2.3.55cd-
56ab

• **the first etc.** Bhavabhaṭṭa here, and my translation reflects that effort, seeks to establish a meaning for what was probably nothing more than a verse-filler **ādi**. Since this is not the first *bīja*, the meaning must be that it is the first *bīja* leaving that of Jñānaḍākinī aside. If this is what is meant, then the statement of the *Mitapadā* given above gains strength to show at least in some mss. the *bīja* of Jñānaḍākinī was indeed not given at this point. The raised spell is ॐ A SVĀHĀ.

VII.iii. Ghoraḍākinī

[The yogin should take] the second from the vowels and join the obeisance and the oblation. This is the seed[-syllable] of Ghoraḍākinī, [whose] abode is in the north.

2.3.56cd-
57ab

• **this etc.** The raised spell is ॐ Ā SVĀHĀ.

VII.iv. Vettālī

Using the same seed[-syllable the yogin] should place a baton on its side, [with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. [This is the seed-syllable of] Vettālī, [the goddess] in the west.

2.3.57cd-
58ab

• **a baton** The meaning is that there is an additional *mātrā* after the \bar{A} . The result is the *pluta*-vowel; the complete spell is ॐ Ā3 SVĀHĀ.

VII.v. Caṇḍālī

Using the same seed[-syllable the yogin] should place a drop on its top, [with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. [This is the seed-syllable of] Caṇḍālī, the sovereign of the south.

2.3.58cd-
59ab

• **using the same etc.** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this again refers to \bar{A} , and not the *pluta*-vowel. The complete spell is ॐ ĀṀ SVĀHĀ.

VII.vi. Siṃhī

[The yogin should take] the first of the eunuchs [as the] seed[-syllable], [joining it with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end [when recited]. [This] is known as the seed[-syllable] of the goddess Siṃghinī in the north-east.

2.3.59cd-
60ab

- **the eunuchs** The eunuch-vowels are ṛ, ṝ, ḷ, and ḹ. The raised spell is ॐ Ṛ SVĀHĀ.

VII.vii. Vyāghrī

[The yogin should take] the second of the eunuchs [as the] seed[-syllable], [joining it with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end [when recited]. [This] is known as the seed[-syllable] in the south-east, in truth (tattvataḥ) [it is] of the goddess Vyāghrī.

2.3.60cd-
61ab

- **the second etc.** The raised spell is ॐ Ṝ SVĀHĀ.

VII.viii. Jambukī

[The yogin should take] the third of the eunuchs [as the] seed[-syllable], [joining it with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end [when recited]. [This is] the individual (viśeṣataḥ) seed[-syllable] of the goddess Jambukī [who resides] in the south-west.

2.3.61cd-
62ab

- **the third etc.** The raised spell is ॐ ḹ SVĀHĀ.

VII.ix. Ulūkī

[The yogin should take] the fourth of the eunuchs [as the] seed[-syllable], [joining it with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end [when recited]. He should use [this] seed[-syllable as that of] Lūkī, [she who] utters a [terrifying] hūṃ, [the goddess of the] north-west.

2.3.62cd-
63ab

- **the fourth etc.** The raised spell is ॐ ḹ̄ SVĀHĀ.

- [she who] utters a [terrifying] hūṃ Bhavabhaṭṭa notes that this is her *bīja*, whereas her mantra is HŪṢ. But this is inconsistent with other descriptions, where the mantra assigned to Ulūkī is KṢMRYUṢ.

VII.x. Ḍākinī/Raudrī

The knowledgeable [yogin] (jñāninām) should take the second letter from the fifth group, [assign to it] the root and the roar (mūlanādaṃ) [to obtain] the seed[-syllable], [and add] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end [when reciting it]; O lord of kings, this is the seed-syllable of Ḍākinī in the east.

2.3.63cd-
64

- the second letter etc. This is the letter PHA. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa ‘root’ here means the *bindu*, and the ‘roar’ stands for a short U. The mantra is therefore OṢ PHUṢ SVĀHĀ. This interpretation is somewhat forced: it is possible that Bhavabhaṭṭa’s text was lacunose at this point, for it would be much more natural to have the PHA described as the **mūlanāda**, since it does serve as the basic element in the *bījas* of the door-guardians. Durjayacandra circumvents this problem in a similar way, but he assigns the meanings the other way around.¹⁴³ Cf. however 74b below, which seems to suggest that the syllable we should arrive at is PHAḤ.

VII.xi. Dīpinī

[The yogin] should place Dīpinī in the north; [her seed-syllable is the second from] the fifth group joined with the letter ‘e’ and a drop. [In recitation this is joined between] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end.

2.3.65

- [the second from] the fifth group The tantra, as in the next verse, omits to mention that this is the second syllable from the *pa-varga*. Perhaps the intended meaning was ‘the same syllable from the fifth group’. Bhavabhaṭṭa simply fills in the portion that is missing. The raised spell is thus OṢ PHEṢ SVĀHĀ.

VII.xii. Cūṣiṇī

¹⁴³ *Mitapadā* 40^v: **mūlanādaṃ tv iti-** dharmasaṃketān mūlam ukāraḥ. nādo bindūthito [ṃ]kāraḥ. ābhyām adha ūrdhve yuktaḥ.

[The yogin should take] the [same letter] from the fifth with the letter ‘o’ and a drop [to form] the seed of the goddess Cūṣiṇī in the west. [In recitation it is accompanied by] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. 2.3.66

- the [same letter] etc. As above, we are not told that this is the second letter. The raised spell is OM PHOM SVĀHĀ.

VII.xiii. Kāmbojī

[The yogin] should take the second letter from the fifth group with a ‘r’, a goad, and a drop [and] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. [This] is known as the seed[-syllable] of Kāmbojī [who guards] the eastern quarter. 2.3.67

- the second etc. The raised spell is OM PHRIṀ SVĀHĀ.

In my interpretation of these verses I have by and large followed Bhava-bhaṭṭa. However, it is equally possible that the goddesses are each supposed to emerge from another set of *bījas* as explained elsewhere and here we have only their *samayamantras*. The matter is tabulated as follows.

Goddess	position	bīja	mantra	colour
Jñānaḍākinī	middle	HUM̐	OM̐ HŪM̐ SVĀHĀ	dark-blue/black
Vajraḍākinī	east	SUM̐	OM̐ A SVĀHĀ	white
Ghoraḍākinī	north	HUM̐	OM̐ Ā SVĀHĀ	yellow
Vettālī	west	YUM̐	OM̐ Ā3 SVĀHĀ	red
Caṇḍālī	south	KṢUM̐	OM̐ ĀM̐ SVĀHĀ	black
Siṃhī	north-east	SMRYUM̐	OM̐ Ṛ SVĀHĀ	yellow-white
Vyāghrī	south-east	HMR̐YUM̐	OM̐ Ṛ SVĀHĀ	black-white
Jambukī	south-west	YMRYUM̐	OM̐ ḷ SVĀHĀ	black-red
Ulūkī	north-west	KṢMR̐YUM̐	OM̐ ḷ SVĀHĀ	yellow-red
Raudrī/Ḍākinī	east	-	OM̐ PHUM̐ SVĀHĀ	white
Dīpinī	north	-	OM̐ PHEM̐ SVĀHĀ	yellow
Cūṣiṇī	west	-	OM̐ PHOM̐ SVĀHĀ	red
Kāmbojī	south	-	OM̐ PHRIṀ SVĀHĀ	black

VIII. The mudrās of the goddesses

The following section gives the [pledge-]gestures to be displayed to the goddesses after they have been visualized. According to the commentators the above mantras are to be recited simultaneously with the display of the gestures.

VIII.i. Jñānaḍākinī

[The yogin] should clench tightly both fists, stretch out the middle fingers with the two tips touching each other, and display [it] to Jñānaḍākinī. 2.3.68

- **with the two tips touching each other** Lit. ‘kissing’ each other. This seems to suggest that the gesture is dynamic, i.e. the two middle fingers repeatedly touch each other (also cf. next verse).

VIII.ii. Vajrī

[The yogin] should join his hands with the thumbs and the middle fingers moving to touch each other again [and again]. He should show [this] to Vajrī in the east. 2.3.69

VIII.iii. Ghorī

[The yogin] should clench his fists tightly, put them together (samau), and stretch out the two thumbs. [This is] the gesture shown to Ghorī [when he] starts [moving] (m-ārabhet) to the north. 2.3.70

- **[when he] starts [moving] (m-ārabhet)** The interpretation is tentative.

- **the two thumbs** Although not stated explicitly, it is very likely that here and in the next gestures the fingers are either joined or touching each other repeatedly as above.

VIII.iv. Vettālī

[The yogin] should bind firmly the same (atra) gesture and stretch out the two little fingers. Vettālī [is the goddess] of the western quarter; he should employ this gesture for her (tatra). 2.3.71

VIII.v. Caṇḍālī

[The yogin] should clench his fists in the same (atra) gesture and stretch out the two middle fingers. This is taught to be the gesture of [the goddess Caṇḍālī in] the south. Thus the [first] quartet of gestures. 2.3.72

- the [first] quartet That is to say, not counting the main goddess.

VIII.vi-ix. Shared gesture of the goddesses in the intermediate quarters

[The yogin] should make two vajra-fists and stretch out the two index-fingers. [He should first hold them] motionless (sthite) [and then make] the tips touch [each other]. [This is] the shared (-vat) gestures of [the goddesses in] the four corners. 2.3.73

VIII.x. Ḍākinī

[The yogin] should place both hands on the mouth and [then] gradually [move them away] (krama) using the sound ‘phaḥ’. 2.3.74

- gradually [move them away] (krama) I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa’s interpretation here. The verse is quite obviously corrupt as suggested by the fact that it consists of three *pādas*, a rather rare occurrence in the text. Durjayacandra’s description of the gestures (*Mitapadā* 41^r) does not employ lemmata, but it is strongly suggested that he read **hūṃ** instead of **phaḥ**. The gesture otherwise imitates that of the goddess (see 45-46 above). The same applies for Dīpinī and Cūṣiṇī.

VIII.xi. Dīpinī

[The yogin] should cup his hands [as if] in reverence and place them on his head. Dīpinī resides in the north[ern gate] and he should show this gesture to her. 2.3.75

VIII.xii. Cūṣiṇī

[The yogin] should join [his hands] in respectful reverence and place them on his mouth [whilst] uttering ‘hūṃ’. The goddess Cūṣiṇī [resides] in the west[ern gate] and he should use this gesture with respect to her. 2.3.76

- [whilst] uttering ‘hūṃ’ This seems to be at odds with the exegetical idea that the gesture ought to be shown with the pledge-mantra recited simultaneously.

VIII.xiii. Kāambojī

[The yogin] should circle his hands and join them in reverence in front of himself; [then] he should place [them in front of his] pudenda. [This is the gesture of] Kāambojī, [the goddess of] the [gate in the] southern quarter. 2.3.77

- place [them in front of his] pudenda Cf. notes to vv. 51-52 above. The later *sādhanas* describe Kāambojī with this gesture.

IX. The mantras and mudrās for worship

IX.i. Fragrant powders

[The yogin] should join the obeisance, and the oblation at the end with the syllable ‘hūṃ’ in the middle. He should stretch out both hands [moving them towards] all [the directions]. [This is] the gesture of [offering] fragrant powders together with the mantra. 2.3.78

- **all [the directions]** Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss 'miming the rubbing in of fragrant powders' (*gandhamrakṣaṇābhīnayena*) seems to suggest that **sarveṣāṃ** refers to the movement of applying fragrant powders with attention to all parts of the object (the body or a sculpted image). This interpretation is applied to **sarva** in 80b and **sarveṣāṃ** in 84c below. I do not think that limiting the gesture to the right hand (l. 2: *dakṣiṇaṃ hastam prasārya* [. . .]) is necessarily what is meant.

IX.ii. Flowers

[The yogin should join] nectar with 'r' and the drop [with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. [He should] stretch out [his hands] in the gesture of the fragrant powders and join the thumb[s] with the index finger[s]. The omniscient [yogin] should display (dāpaye) in all [the directions] (sarva) [this] gesture (° mudrādi) of [offering] flowers with the mantra.

2.3.79-
80ab

- **nectar etc.** The nectar[-syllable] is SA. The raised mantra is OM SRAM SVĀHĀ.

- **gesture (° mudrādi)** I take **ādi** as a meaningless verse-filler as I do in the case of 81a and 81c below. One possible explanation would be that in all cases the *yogin* displays the gesture first (**ādi** for *ādau*) and recites the mantra later, but this is apparently contradicted by 86b.

IX.iii. Incense

[The yogin should take] the first from the first group [with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. Using the same (atra) gesture he should stretch out the [two] middle finger[s]. [Thus] the gesture of [offering] incense.

2.3.80cd-
81ab

- **the first from the first group** Here there is some exegetical disagreement. Kalyāṇavarman's text is either lacunose, or he chose to avoid commenting on this passage altogether. Bhavabhaṭṭa takes the group to mean the first group of consonants and adopts 83b as a statement that applies here as well. The mantra in his view is therefore OM KUṂ SVĀHĀ. Durjayacandra

arrives at OM I SVĀHĀ, by taking 80c to mean ‘that in front of which there is the initial group’, where the group refers to A and Ā.¹⁴⁴ The reason for this somewhat unusual analysis is that Durjayacandra at the beginning of this passage gives a long quotation from a scripture he calls the *Dvādaśa-sāhasrikā*, where the mantras are slightly different. While he does point out some of the irreconcilable differences, he also seeks to bring the lists into harmony.

- **the same (atra) gesture** That is to say, the basics are the same as taught in 78c, the only difference being that here the middle fingers are stretched out. This goes against the interpretation of Bhavabhaṭṭa, who thinks the **atra** refers to the gesture of offering flowers. However, that gesture is also based on the *mudrā* taught in 78c (cf. 79c), hence it is more natural to assume that here we have permutations of a basic gesture rather than the development of the previous one.

IX.iv. Lamps

[The yogin] should worship all the goddesses with the gesture and spell of [offering] lamps [as well]. He should take the seed[-syllable] which is the ninth and final (navānta °) [and join it with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. He should clench his fist[s] and stretch out the thumb[s]. [Thus] the gesture and spell for [offering] lamps.

2.3.81cd-
82

- **the ninth and final (navānta °)** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa we should count from the first semi-vowel (YA). The ninth letter is thus KṢA. Again, as in the case of 80c, he adopts the injunction in 83b to add the ‘u’ and the *bindu*. Thus the mantra is OM KṢUM SVĀHĀ. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 42^r) does not follow this procedure, which is slightly puzzling since his quotation does prescribe the mantra KṢUM, and one would expect that he would seek to harmonize the two. However, he also maintains that the counting should be done from the first semi-vowel. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 22^r) also raises the mantra as simply KṢA.

¹⁴⁴*Mitapadā* 41^v: [...] vargapūrvam ādisvarayugam, tat pūrvam asyeti vargapūrvakapūrvā ikārah.

- **his fist[s]** Again, we cannot determine with absolute certainty whether this refers to both hands, or only to the right hand as Bhavabhaṭṭa would have it.

IX.v. Bali

[The yogin] should take the third from the first group and join it with the roar and the drop, [as well as with] the obeisance, and the oblation at the end. [This] is the raised seed[-syllable] of [offering] bali. He should stretch out both hands and move the thumb[s] and the middle finger[s]; again [and again] he should move [the fingers] in all [directions]. [Thus] the gesture of bali with [its] spell.

2.3.83-
84

- **the third etc.** For Bhavabhaṭṭa the first group here is the group of consonants, therefore the raised mantra is Oṃ GUṃ SVĀHĀ (he has it on oral authority that in this case **nāda** refers to the short -u). Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 22^r) gives the same mantra, but he does not elaborate on the procedure. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 41^v-42^r) takes the first group to refer to the vowels, hence his mantra is Oṃ Iṃ SVĀHĀ, which is in consonance with his quoted source, the *Dvādaśasāhasrikā*.

- **the raised seed[-syllable]** This is a slight inconsistency, and we should perhaps read the last two quarters in reverse sequence to arrive at the desired meaning. Joined with Oṃ and SVĀHĀ the *bīja* becomes a mantra.

- **bali** In other systems this would be referred to as the *naivedya*. Note that the text seems to differentiate between this, apparently a simple food offering, and the ‘non-dual *bali*’ (**adaityābali** in 85b), one in which antinomian substances are employed. However, none of the commentators subscribes to this view (namely, that first the usual pentad is offered with the non-dual *bali* as an extra), as they interpret v. 85 as an elaboration on vv. 83-84, and not as a topic-closer and a new topic as I do.

IX.vi. Non-dual bali

[The yogin] should worship [the goddesses] accurately

2.3.85

(**tattvena**) with these (**ebhi**). [Then,] as [described] before (**pūrvavat**), [he should offer] a non-dual bali (**adaityābali**): first (**pūrvāṇi**) the five substances and [then] the various kinds of hooks (**aṅkuśā**).

- **accurately (tattvena)** In my interpretation this is an adverb referring to the way in which the worship is conducted. A more sophisticated interpretation would be that **tattvena** refers to the mental attitude of the *yogin* of not perceiving a difference between worshipper, worshipped, and object offered. Because the commentators see this verse as an elaboration on the previous one (Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra explicitly state so), **tattvena** in their view means ‘principle’ (the glosses are *balitattvena* and *balimantramudrātattvena* respectively).
- **with these (ebhi)** In my interpretation this is a plural noun referring to all the articles of worship described above. Because of their interpretation Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra are constrained to understand it as a singular, referring to *bali* (both gloss the lemma with *anena*).
- **as [described] before (pūrvavat)** I take this as a reference to other instances where the *yogin* is enjoined to offer *bali*, e.g. 1.2.29, but also in 2.1 and 2.2. Bhavabhaṭṭa has the word refer to the mantra and *mudrā* described in 83-84. Durjayacandra interprets it as ‘supreme’, lit. ‘having precedence [over balis described in other systems]’.¹⁴⁵ Kalyāṇavarman’s ms. has what seems to be a corrupt reading **pūryavat** and no explanation.
- **non-dual bali (adaityābali)** This is a term unique to the Catuspīṭha. The ‘non-dual’ element refers to the negation of dualistic considerations of what is pure or impure in the offering. I find it very unlikely that we should not read *adaitya/-ā* as an idiosyncratic form of *advaita* but understand ‘*bali* of the gods’ (*a-daitya* as if modeled upon *a-sura*). This is substantiated by Bhavabhaṭṭa who describes this *bali* as one where the five nectars, the five ‘hooks’, raw fish and meat, onions, etc. are offered. Also cf. Kalyāṇavarman’s *Pañjikā* (22^r). Durjayacandra confirms that we should understand *advaita*

¹⁴⁵ *Mitapadā* 42^r: **pūrvavad** *iti- agro balyantarebhyah śreṣṭhaḥ*.

for this odd word, but he opts for a more mystical interpretation, similar to the one I offered as a second best choice for **tattvena** above.¹⁴⁶

- **first (pūrvāṇi) the five substances** I confess ignorance as to how Bhavabhaṭṭa understood this as an adjective (see his gloss in l. 6). The five substances, otherwise known as *amṛtas*, are explained later, especially in 2.4.3-14 q.v. According to Durjayacandra these are ‘inner’ offerings, whereas the ‘hooks’ are ‘outer’.¹⁴⁷

- **various kinds of hooks (aṅkuśā)** In other systems these are called ‘lamps’ (*pradīpa*), referring to a group of five kinds of meat. While the codeword is not unique to the Catuspīṭha it is definitely the much rarer one and there are good chances that other sources that use this term do so on account of this text (cf. notes to 2.4.29-35). According to Bhavabhaṭṭa’s etymology they are called ‘hooks’ because they ‘extract’ (*kuṣṇanti* for *-kuś-*)¹⁴⁸ the desired (*abhimataṃ* for *aṃ-/aṇi-*) accomplishment.¹⁴⁹ The five kinds of meat are those of an elephant, a cow, a dog, a horse, and a human. Bhavabhaṭṭa here gives the usual codeword *go-ku-da-ha-na*, an acronym for *go-kukkura-danti-haya-nara*. We are not explicitly told in this corpus how the *yogin* should obtain his human flesh, or indeed any of the other types of flesh. A later manual suggests that it was obtained from a corpse/corpses.¹⁵⁰ Also cf. 161

¹⁴⁶ *Mitapadā* 42^r: *kiṃnāmāyaṃ balir iti ced āha- ādyaitiyā* [sic!]. *advaito, bhokṛ- bhojayitror advidhābhāvah.*

¹⁴⁷ *Mitapadā* 42^r: *pañca dravyāni sārīrāṇi pañcāṅkuśāni bāhyapañcamāṃsāni.*

¹⁴⁸ *Dhātupāṭha* 9.46: *kuṣa niṣkarṣe.*

¹⁴⁹ Cf. notes to 2.4.29-35, where *abhimataṃ* is substituted with *atyarthaṃ*. Also cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 293^v (ad *Sampuṭa* 9.2.9): *’di rnams lcags kyu bzhin du mngon par ’dod pa’i don nye ba ru byed pa’i phyir lcags kyu rnams so||.*

¹⁵⁰ This is the *Guṭikāvidhīnyama* contained in the composite codex referred to as the *Sādhanavidhāna* (3^v-5^v). On fol. 4^r we read: *tataḥ śaṣṭhyāṃ mṛtakasya pūjāṃ kṛtvā naramāṃsaṃ grāhyam.* This may or may not be toning down previous practice. Cf. SANDERSON 2001:12, n. 10, discussing Karṇakagomin’s reports that such practice was taking place in early Śaiva tantra, much of which was adopted into later Tantric Buddhism: *ḍākinītantre samayavyavasthā, yadā prāṇinaṃ hatvā khādati tadā mantrasiddhīm āsādayati.* As pointed out by ELTSCHINGER (2001:27) Karṇakagomin here draws on *Śākyabuddhi (*Pramāṇavārttikatīkā* 39^v 6): *de ltar na gang gi tshe mkha’ ’gro ma’i rgyud la srog chags bsad nas zos pa de’i tshe sngags kyi dngos grub grub par ’gyur ro zhes dam tshig rnam par gzhas pa yin no||.* The reports about Śaiva material in this case is therefore from nearly a century earlier. For the relationship between these two authors see STEINKELLNER 1979:141-150.

ff. in this sub-chapter.

[In the case] of [offering] flowers, incense, etc. as well as
fragrant powders, the gesture and the spell [are used]
simultaneously.

2.3.86ab

• [are used] **simultaneously** This again goes against the interpretation advanced by Durjayacandra. According to him here flowers etc. are offered again and the appropriate spells and gestures are used to make the ten *bali*-substances into nectar.¹⁵¹

X. The twenty-fold worship

The next section describes a specific set of twenty elements used in worship. Bhavabhaṭṭa understands the process of ‘twenty-fold worship’ as part of the *bali* offering and other types of worship, whereas Durjayacandra describes it as a process following the *bali*.¹⁵² For the arrangement of these twenty elements see note to 107a below.

Thereafter the clever [yogin] should worship [with] the
twenty-fold worship (**viṃśatipūjaṃ**).

2.3.86cd

• **the twenty-fold worship (viṃśatipūjaṃ)** As far as I am aware there are two sets covered by this term. The first, and presumably older, is transmitted in *yogatantra* works, such as those of Ānandagarbha.¹⁵³ The second set is first seen described here. One early testimony, that of Jñānagarbha, seems to suggest that the term covering these elements was something that was seen as specific to the cycle (see parallel to 2.3.102). If this is true, then

¹⁵¹*Mitapadā* 42^r-42^v: *satkārasāmagryantaram āha- puṣpadhūpādītyādi. mudrāmantram tu yojayed iti- amṛtikaraṇāya baler uktamudrāmantrau dravyadaśake niyoktavayau.*

¹⁵²*Mitapadā* 42^v: *amṛtāpyāyanānantaram pūjāṃ āha- viṃśatītyādi.* ‘Satiating with nectar’ refers to the *bali*; cf. previous note.

¹⁵³E.g. *Sarvavajrodāya* 6^r 7 (Skt. not available for this section), *Vajrasattvodaya* 54^v 6, **Paramādyabrhaṭṭikā* vol. Si 89^v 7, vol. I 251^v 4 & 256^v 2. With some minor differences this seems to be the set transmitted in the *Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā* sect. 6-2-2-5. The hallmark of this set is that the mantras invariably begin with Oṃ SARVATATHĀGATA° . . . and ending with °MEGHASAMUDRASPHARAṆASAMAYE HŪṢ. Also cf. MORIGUCHI 1984:29-32, which reproduces images from the *Vajradhātumukhākhyāna*, an illustrated handbook widely disseminated in Nepal.

we have a very early – in fact the earliest relatively dateable – reference for this process, and implicitly the tantra itself. Jayabhadra in his *Cakrasamvarapañjikā* (p. 114) writes: **paṭahikāṃ cetyādinā viṃśatipūjāvīdhir uktaḥ**. The lemma is from *Herukābhīdhāna* 3.1d, where a process of worshipping the officiant is described.¹⁵⁴ Imitating the sounding of a small kettle-drum is part of the twenty-fold worship (see 93 below), hence Jayabhadra must have understood the word as an *upalakṣaṇa*. At the same time the ‘kettle-drum gesture’ does not form part of the *yogatantra* set. The possible implications have already been discussed in the introduction q.v.

The syllable ‘hūṃ’ [recited] in the form of a song is the pleaser of the foremost yoginī. 2.3.87ab

• **‘hūṃ’ etc.** Both Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 42^v) take this to mean that all twenty elements are performed with the melodious recitation of the mantra HŪṂ.

• **the foremost yoginī** I disagree with Bhavabhaṭṭa here: he takes **pūrva** with **toṣikā** to mean ‘the foremost pleaser of the *yoginīs*’. Note, however, that 107b singles out eight *yoginīs* (see my notes there). It is unlikely that the chief goddess would not be included as an object of worship, therefore we must infer that **pūrvayoginī** ° here refers to Jñānaḍākinī. Durjayacandra has an apparently easier but probably corrupt variant reading **sarva** °.

X.i.

Clenching two vajra-fists he should place them on the hips. 2.3.87cd

• **clenching etc.** This imitates the gesture of holding the *vajra* and the bell. Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s paraphrase ad 2.3.107ab.

X.ii.

[Then he should] move (° cālanam) the three body-parts [whilst again] reciting ‘hūṃ’. 2.3.88

¹⁵⁴At least this is what the tantra itself is saying. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s *Cakrasamvaravivṛti* (p. 37) describes the passage as referring to the *ghaṇṭābhīṣeka*, but this is irrelevant for our purposes.

• **the three body-parts** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these are the hips, the torso, and the head. Durjayacandra has a more sophisticated interpretation: the three limbs are the navel, the heart, and the throat. Tacitly employing the principle that ‘ra’ and ‘la’ are interchangeable, he takes °cālanam to mean *uccāraṇam*, referring to the three ways in which the mantra HŪṀ is recited. To this effect he cites the [*Heruka-*] *abhyudaya* (42.10cd-11a), which puts forward the view that HŪṀ recited with the protracted vowel (*pluta*) will bring forth liberation, recited with the long vowel will bring prosperity/reinvigoration, and recited with the short vowel will bring accomplishment in rites of subjugation.¹⁵⁵

X.iii-viii.

[The yogin should display the gesture of] the lute by imitating [the sounding of] a lute, the flute by imitating [the sounding of] a flute, the drum (phomam) by imitating [the beating of] a drum, the brass cymbal etc. (vādyam) by imitating [the sounding of] a brass cymbal etc., the kettle-drum by imitating [the beating of] a kettle-drum. He should move his body imitating dance.

2.3.89-
94

• **drum (phomam)** I cannot find any attestation for this word, hence I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss (*kāhala*). The Tibetan rendering is *cang te’u*, a word normally reserved to render *damaru*.

• **brass cymbal etc. (vādyam)** Normally *vādya* refers to a type of musical instrument. Once again I am constrained to follow Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss (*kaṃsatālādi*).

X.ix-xiii.

[He should display the gesture of] the fan by imitat-

2.3.95-
99

¹⁵⁵ *Mitapadā* 42^v: *nābhīḥṛtkaṇṭham aṅgatrāyam. taccālanāt tatra tatroccāraṇāt pluta-dīrghahrasvatridhāvastho hūṃkāro ’yaṃ gātavya iti darśayati. tatprayojanam Abhyudaye gaditam- plutena tu bhaven mokṣo dīrghaḥ puṣṭipradaḥ smṛtaḥ | hrasvenāpi bhaved vaśyam ityādi. Also cf. Herukābhyudayapañjikā (p. 167): [...] anīṣṭamocanān mokṣaḥ śāntiḥ. āvaraṇamocanāc ca mahāmudrā ca. iyaṃ ca śāntiḥ sarvāvaraṇaśamanāt. tadarthi plutam uccaret.*

ing [the movement of] a fan, the banner by imitating [the fluttering of] a banner, the canopy by imitating [the stretching out of] a canopy, the streamer by imitating [the fluttering of] a streamer, the parasol by imitating [the holding of] a parasol.

- [the holding of] a parasol Once again I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss. Normally one would expect this gesture to imitate the parasol itself (e.g. cupping the hands with the palms facing downwards).

X.xiv-xv.

[He should display the gesture of] the clay drum by imitating [the beating of] a clay drum (*mauñjyam*), [and] the tabor by imitating [the sounding of] a tabor (*paṇava*). 2.3.100-101

- **clay drum (*mauñjyam*)** It is difficult to see how what is obviously a derivate of *muñja*[-grass] could mean a drum, but this is how Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets it. The gloss is *mardala*, perhaps a cousin of the more widely known *mṛdaṅga* (the Tibetan rendering is also *rdza rnga*). Bhavabhaṭṭa further specifies that this is sounded 'from above', which I take to mean that the membrane of the drum is held parallel with the ground as opposed to the *mardala* in 106, which is said to be sounded 'sideways', which probably means that the drum is held next to the body of the musician, attached to his torso with a belt.

- **tabor (*paṇava*)** I.e. a *praṇava*. This is confirmed by the Tibetan rendering *rnga zlum*.

X.xvi-xviii.

[He should display the gesture of] laughter by imitating laughter, fierceness by imitating fierceness, [and] coquetry by imitating coquetry. 2.3.102-104

X.xix-xx.

[He should display the gesture of] wantonness by imitating wantonness, [and the gesture of] the side-drum by imitating [the beating of] a side-drum (*mardalam*). 2.3.105-106

• **side-drum (mardalam)** Cf. note to 2.3.100 above. This element is omitted in all mss. I reconstructed it as 2.3.106 (although this assigned number is by no means certain) from Bhavabhaṭṭa's comment, which otherwise would not make sense.

[The yogin] should worship accurately (**tattvataḥ**) the eight yoginīs with all these things (° **vastūni**), as well as with the syllable 'hūṃ' in the form of a song intoned by himself. 2.3.107

• **accurately (tattvataḥ)** Cf. note to 2.3.85 above. Bhavabhaṭṭa takes it to mean 'because of the supremacy [of the eight *yoginīs*]' or 'chiefly' (*prādhānyāt*). It is noteworthy that here eight *yoginīs* are singled out, omitting the chief goddess and the door-guardians. The omission of the latter group can be explained easily: they are subordinates of the chief group. However, the omission of Jñānaḍākinī is surprising, hence my interpretation of 87ab against that of Bhavabhaṭṭa.

• **with all these things (° vastūni)** This is rather crudely put, but Bhavabhaṭṭa makes it quite clear that *vastu* refers to the twenty gestures described above. It is difficult to see any clear logic behind the arrangement of this series. The actions described in 87-88 obviously imitate the deity holding the principal implements and roaring HŪṂ. 89-94 seem to describe a festive celebration with all sorts of music and dance. 95-99 continue with this image describing the visual elements of a procession, either of a deity or of a monarch. 100-101 and 106 again describe percussion instruments, which would go with the group 89-94, whereas 102-104 doubtless allude to the three faces of Jñānaḍākinī (cf. 2.3.22), thus showing an affinity with 87-88. 105 should probably be taken with this group, but there is no correspondence for it in the iconography.

• **as well as with the syllable 'hūṃ'** This reads like a reiteration of 87ab. What the verse seems to be saying is that while the eight goddesses are propitiated with the twenty-fold worship, Jñānaḍākinī is worshipped with a melodious intonation of HŪṂ. Since Bhavabhaṭṭa overlooked this (cf. notes to 87ab and 107b above), he is constrained to conjure the hallmark *apabhraṃśa* song from the end of the text (v. 4.4.93) to give some kind meaning to

the second line. With this, however, he has a new element, therefore he conjectures that 107cd refer to a new scene in the ritual repertoire, that of the *gītapūjā*. As I have shown above, this stretching of the text is unnecessary.

XI. Sung praises

The following section can be further divided into praises sung in a kind of *Apabhraṃśa* and praises sung in Sanskrit. For the translation of these extremely problematic verses I have by and large relied on the readings and interpretations of Bhavabhaṭṭa. Kalyāṇavarman does not comment on these verses, whereas Durjayacandra's readings and interpretations are so different that they need a separate and thorough discussion. The single ms. of the *Mitapadā* also seems to be marked by grave corruptions at this point. However, the text is solid enough to establish that there was no unitary tradition as to the meaning of these verses. I am unable to state with absolute certainty what kind of '*Apabhraṃśa*' these praises were written in, since they do not seem to conform entirely to any grammatical description in established grammars of that language (or rather: languages). However, they contain some significant features of Eastern *Apabhraṃśa*: e.g. endings in -ae for Nominative, Accusative, and Vocative (e.g. *pādas* b and d of 2.3.108 up to 113) are a distinctive feature of Eastern *Apabhraṃśa* (TAGARE 1948:109); the 2nd pers. sg. imperative in -u is very rare in *Apabhraṃśas* other than the Eastern, in Southern it is the 3rd pers. equivalent (*ibid.*, p. 299). However, we also find some features that point to artificiality, e.g. *dāyīṇa* in 1.2.36, the hyper-Prakrit *-aṇḍa* instead of *-anta* (3.3.14) and frequent confusion of the stem-form and the Nominative (which regularly ends in -u). Sanskritizations are also not infrequent, e.g. *ṇamata* for regular *ṇamaha* in 2.3.113.¹⁵⁶

I work under the assumption – and under the influence of Bhavabhaṭṭa – that these praises are a continuation of the process of worship. Durjayacandra however sees the recitation of these verses as a moment during the revelation of the scripture. The *apabhraṃśa* verses are recited by the *yoginīs*, whereas the Sanskrit ones by Vajrapāṇi.¹⁵⁷

XI.i. Apabhraṃśa praises

O (hu) vajra[-deity], glancing [with] eyes capable of plea-

2.3.108

¹⁵⁶I am indebted to Prof. Sanderson for these observations.

¹⁵⁷*Mitapadā* 43^v: [...] *anayā ṣaṭpadyā gāthayā yoginībhir abhiṣṭutasya bhagavato bhīprasādād Vajrapāṇir api stutim āha* [...].

sure (suraa-), [you whose] nature is imperishable essence,
sporting in emptiness, ...

- **vajra[-deities]** The supplied portion is based on the suggestion of Bhavabhaṭṭa, who takes the entire praise as addressing both male and female deities as the case would require. He/she is addressed so, because he/she is indistinguishable from *dharmakāya*, which is indivisible like a *vajra*.

- **glancing etc.** ‘Pleasure’, normally referring to lovemaking, here means - according to Bhavabhaṭṭa - acting for the benefit of the world. The deity is said to have all five kinds of vision, and thus he/she is eminently capable to act thus, for there is nothing he/she cannot perceive and thus know. For the five kinds of vision (lit. ‘eyes’) in Tantric sources, see e.g. *Śaḍaṅgayoga* of Anupamarakṣita (p. 95 & 113, *passim*).

- **imperishable essence** That is to say non-dual knowledge, which recognizes the lack of essence in all things.

- **sporting in emptiness** The meaning is that the deity, since he/she has such powers of perception and the gnosis of non-duality, appears as if he/she were playing in the world, although it is known to him/her to lack any sort of essence.

... known as the [very] marrow [of all things] (°majja°), 2.3.109
which is utterly free from existence and non-existence,
[you] who are meditated upon as [what is] the remainder
after having cast away all words, ...

- **marrow (°majja°)** In other words essence, truth.

- **[you] who are etc.** The intended idea according to Bhavabhaṭṭa is that the *yogin* first casts away everything that could be referred to with words, that is to say all conceptual knowledge. Whatever remains is ineffable, and ultimately it is in this form that the deity should be meditated upon.

... [you] whose concern is with the water [born] from 2.3.110
the yoga [arising from] the coupled embrace, [you] who

after having truly obtained non-dual truth have obtained liberation, ...

- **with the water etc.** Water here mean the *bodhicitta*. The verse very strongly suggests that we ought to take *bodhicitta* in the Tantric sense, which is semen. If this is correct, the verse must be an allusion to the officiant conferring the secret consecration (*guhyaḅhiṣeka*), for which see e.g. *Cakrasamvara-pañjikā* (p. 114), *Cakrasamvaravivṛti* (vol. I. p. 38 ff.), *Vajrāvalī* (sect. 35). The officiant here copulates with his/a consort and the semen/ejaculates produced from this union is given to the blindfolded initiand. The second half of the verse also suggests that this praise refers to the *guru*, who in theory is not different from the deity. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s scholastic note (l. 7-8 to the next verse) also strengthens this view.

- **non-dual truth** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss this is selflessness (*nairātmya*).

... [you] who have forfeited liberation [for the sake of those] deluded by the world of pleasures, with all [your] forms you have made the yoginīs intoxicated and made them dance! 2.3.111

- **forfeited** Bhavabhaṭṭa adduces a quotation from the *Abhisamayālamkāra*: “With wisdom [alone he has] no place in transmigration, [and] with compassion [alone he cannot] abide in *nirvāṇa*.”

- **with all [your] forms** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this means the body, speech, and mind. The second half of this verse is rather obscure. The idea perhaps is that the manifold appearances that constitute the world of experience are the dancing of the *yoginīs*.

[O you] who have thoroughly ascertained all five yoginīs to be [nothing but] the reality of the Buddhas, [you] who have with manifold displays brought beings to [spiritual] maturation, ... 2.3.112

• **the reality of the Buddhas** Bhavabhaṭṭa's comment is elliptical. The 'knowledge[s] of cessation and non-arising [of afflictions]' is synonymous with enlightenment (see e.g. *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* 5.18ab). But we are not told how exactly the five *yoginīs* are integrated into this. A further problem is the number five, which probably alludes to Jñānaḍākinī and the four goddesses in the cardinal directions. The intended meaning was perhaps that the five (representing the five elements¹⁵⁸ or the five *skandhas*?) are in reality not different (*vilakṣita*) from the Tathāgatas, but then taking the entire phrase as a Vocative is problematic.

... [you] who have figured out well this business through
vajra[-like gnosis], [you] who have [put an end] to the
delusion of phenomena! [O mortals!] bow in obeisance
[to this deity] which is [also] the choicest of teachings
[and who has also] liberated the yoginīs.

2.3.113

• **who have figured out etc.** Bhavabhaṭṭa here takes advantage of the fact that all verbs of motion can also mean 'to understand', hence his analysis of **susāria**. The 'business' seems to refer to the spiritual path. **Vajra** here stands for non-dual gnosis, and hence emptiness. I find the entire interpretation forced, but I cannot offer a viable alternative.

• **delusion of phenomena** Bhavabhaṭṭa through a clever exegetical ploy takes 'phenomena' to refer to beings, but he finds it difficult to reverse the meaning of the compound. His solution is to supply the words *nivartitās tvayā*. Thus the meaning is that beings are made to turn away from delusion by the Lord. addition. This is highly artificial.¹⁵⁹ The intended meaning was perhaps an allusion to the antinomian elements of the tantra, thus 'you who have deluded the dharma', or to paraphrase: the deity through his revelation has – but only in appearance – turned the normally accepted dharma on its head.

• **the choicest of teachings** Or perhaps 'the best thing that there is', supreme reality. Cf. *Guhyasamājatantra* 5.8c and *Pradīpoddyotana* ad loc. (p.

¹⁵⁸This is how Abhayākaragupta interprets the five *yoginīs*, see *Āmnāyamañjarī* 293^v.

¹⁵⁹Yet the interpretation is followed almost word for word in the *Āmnāyamañjarī* 293^r displaying yet another very clear piece of evidence that Abhayākaragupta incorporated quite a lot of the *Nibandha* into his chief Tantric work.

49): *sāradharmaṃ paramārthasatyam.*

XI.ii. Sanskrit praises

Obeisance to [you,] the liberator of beings through supreme yoga! Obeisance to [you,] born in all bodies through [sharing] the single essence! 2.3.114

- **through supreme yoga** This is the interpretation favoured by Bhavabhaṭṭa, although he admits that one could take this as a separate Vocative, thus: ‘obeisance to the liberator of beings, [obeisance to] the lord of yoga’.

- **born in all bodies** Here I disagree with Bhavabhaṭṭa, as I take the expression to be an echo of the phrase *sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ*, a hallmark of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*. Why this is possible is explained by the last word of the verse: because all and everything shares the same essence. The commentator takes **ātma** to mean the *dharmakāya*, hence all that is born from that can be considered the deity’s issue, because they are part of a single ‘mind’, that is to say consciousness.

Obeisance to [you,] the dispeller of delusion that is [the cause of this] ocean of transmigration. Obeisance to [you,] single truth! I bow to you perpetually. 2.3.115

- **that is [the cause of this] ocean** This slightly diverges from Bhavabhaṭṭa, who reads an additional °*sthitānām* to make the verse mean ‘you who dispel the delusion of those who are in the ocean of transmigration.’

[The yogin] should worship [the deities] with these particular (itiviśeṣata) praiseful songs and hymns. [Then] he should sound the bell [whilst] reciting ‘hūṃ’. 2.3.116-117

- **particular** The idea seems to be that the *yogin* could sing other praises if he so wishes, but these are the ones that are to be invariably recited in the present system.

• **praiseful songs and hymns** I take the first to refer to the *apabhraṃśa* ones and the second to the Sanskrit ones. Bhavabhaṭṭa reads the compound as a tautology, simply glossing it as *stutigīta*. He further points out that this is a technical term as opposed to *gīta*, a simple song (4.4.93 is brought up as a case in point). For a praise reveals something about the true nature of the object of praise, whereas there is precious little that is revealed about reality in songs.

XII. The triple dedication

Next he should perform (akārṣīt) the triple dedication.
He should firmly [cup his hands] in the vajra-reverence
[gesture] and place [them] on his heart.

2.3.118-
119

• **dedication** This is in effect the same as the triple purification (see 7-9 above) except that here the enunciations are preceded by OM̐.

• **vajra-reverence** This is quite clearly the gesture coupled with the recitation of mantras below, but Durjayacandra would have this only as a second best interpretation, since he takes the gesture described in 123 to go with these mantras. The primary interpretation then is as follows: *vajra* stands for the indivisibility of the [chief Tathāgata's] body, speech, and mind, whereas *añjali* refers to the emanations from that, in other words the five Buddhas. The *yogin* should keep this principle firmly in his heart. The quotation with which he seeks to strengthen his point cannot be traced.¹⁶⁰

[Then he should recite:] «OM̐, all phenomena are purified of an essential nature, I am purified of an essential nature. OM̐, all phenomena are vajra-purified, I am vajra-purified. OM̐, all phenomena are yoga-purified, I am yoga-purified.»

2.3.120-
122

¹⁶⁰ *Mitapadā* 44^r: *tathatākārāpannam abhedyatayā kāyavākcittaṃ vajraṃ, tadvikurvāṇam añjalir buddhapañcakaṃ, tathābhūtam añjaliṃ dṛḍhaṃ baddhvā grhītvā sthīrikṛtya, hr̥ḍi sthāne hr̥ḍaya eva dhārayet. yathā punar nā skhalati, tathā kṛtveti yāvat. uktaṃ ca- tritattvaṃ tu bhaved vajraṃ añjalih pañca devatā[h̥] | śāśvatākṣobhyaratneśāmitābhāmogha- siddhaya iti.*

Om̐, etc. Cf. notes to 7-9 above.

XIII. Displaying the great gesture

It is not entirely clear what the role of this next section is. The mantra strongly suggests that it has to do with the purification of the five nectars dissolved in liquor which are placed into a skull-bowl (cf. 128cd-129ab here, as well as 2.4.13). Bhavabhaṭṭa makes the same observation (introduction to ad 126), but he does not specify what the primary role is.

Having circled his hands in the waving-lotus [gesture] he should visualize a lotus in his right [palm] and cast forth [into it his] left [hand visualized to hold] a vajra. [Thus] he should display the great gesture. 2.3.123

• **waving-lotus [gesture]** This is best described by Durjayacandra: “The ‘waving lotus’ is making the hands [joined] at the tip [of the] outstretched fingers dance as if it were a blooming lotus waved by the wind.”¹⁶¹

• **visualize a lotus etc.** The gesture seems to be described in an elliptical way. Bhavabhaṭṭa clarifies that the lotus is actually a skull-bowl (*padma-bhājanam*) into which one places the left hand. The original meaning was probably that one visualizes a *vajra*-sceptre in the left hand: Bhavabhaṭṭa substitutes this with another gesture, the thumb pressing down the [tip of the] little finger. ‘To place’ (*niyojayet*) is a rather weak gloss for **utsrjya**, which suggests that the movement is dynamic if not violent. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 22^r -22^v) – whose comments become yet again available after a long pause – describes a combination of these two views: the left hand is visualized to hold a *vajra*-sceptre while the fingers display the *tripatākamudrā*, essentially the same gesture as the one given by Bhavabhaṭṭa.

[Simultaneously he should recite:] «om̐ ha ho hrī svāhā». 2.3.124-
Thus the great gesture [and its] spell. 125

The yogin (yogīnām) should at the same [time] (samam) [do] ‘that’ (tāpi ca) [purification of the liquor and nectars], [as well as] visualizing all the deities. 2.3.126ab

¹⁶¹ *Mitapadā* 44^r: *mārutapreṇāt prabuddhapadmasyeva prasṛtāṅguler agrapāṇīyugasya narttanam̐ kamalāvartaḥ.*

- **at the same [time] (samaṃ) etc.** The translation reflects the reading and interpretation of Bhavabhaṭṭa. Both Kalyāṇavarman and Durjayacandra read the *pāda* as **samantāpi ca yogīnām**. Both interpretations amount to ‘to all those deities inside the *maṇḍala*’. This probably is closer to the intended meaning than Bhavabhaṭṭa’s taking **tāpi ca** as a euphemism.

- **visualizing all the deities** In Bhavabhaṭṭa’s view this amounts to visualizing all the deities in an instant as a separate process. Durjayacandra seems to take this *pāda* as a reiteration of the first one, since he has nothing to say about it. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 22^v) has a different reading **sakṛd evaṃ**, which he naturally interprets as a ritual injunction.

XIV. Offering bali to the worldly deities

It is here that the *maṇḍalopāyikā*-influenced exegetes could ‘plug in’ the deities of the two further *puṭas* that came to be superimposed on the original *maṇḍala* of the thirteen goddesses. The tantra, however, seems to be quite clear in stating that these *laukika* deities are worshipped in a separate *maṇḍala*, or outside the *maṇḍala* [of the goddesses], or most likely both: in a separate *maṇḍala* outside the principal one. The topic is taught in greater detail in vv. 141-160.

As for the worldly [deities] (laukikādīn), the knowledgeable [yogin] (jñānīnām) ought to prepare [articles of worship] outside the maṇḍala.

2.3.126cd

- **the worldly etc.** Bhavabhaṭṭa takes the entire *pāda* to refer to what he terms as the guardian deities of the site (*kṣetrapālāḥ*), who are worldly, eminent (**ādi** glossed as *śreṣṭhāḥ*), and knowledgeable (*jñānīnaḥ*). I take the **ādi** as a meaningless verse-filler, although it has great significance for the latter pantheon of the Catuspīṭha.

- **outside the maṇḍala** Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this as an object of **kalpa-**yet, that is to say the *yogin* should prepare an ‘outer’ *maṇḍala*. “It is called outer because it is outside oneself” states the exegete. The intended meaning is that the outer deities do not have correspondences in the *yogin*’s body, whereas the goddesses of the ‘inner’ *maṇḍala* do.

Bhavabhaṭṭa describes this outer pantheon as follows (I summarize here *Nibandha* ad 126 ll. 7-14, as well as ad 148-152): with red sandalwood paste or saffron (or more likely a cheaper substitute, Asafoetida) a triangle is drawn, and inside this a circle.¹⁶² The circle is divided into nine boxes by drawing four lines (two lines from top to bottom and two lines from left to right). The middle is occupied by Jñānaḍākinī, who here embodies all thirteen goddesses. In the eight boxes around her the following eight male deities are placed beginning in the east and proceeding counterclockwise for the cardinal directions and clockwise for the intermediate: (1 = E) dark Kṛṣṇarudra, (2 = N) yellow Mahārudra, (3 = W) white Devadatta, (4 = S) red Kṛṣṇa, (5 = NE) half-dark half-yellow Karāla, (6 = SE) half-dark half-red Bībhatsa, (7 = SW) half-red half-white Nandātīta, and (8 = NW) half-white half-yellow Vināyaka. All are four-armed, with three eyes, clad and adorned.¹⁶³ Each is surrounded by a quartet of *yoginīs* who are installed counterclockwise beginning with the front of the deity: [1] white Cāmuṇḍī, yellow Ghorī, red Bībhatsā, dark Umādevī; [2] yellow Jayā, red Vijayā, dark Ajitā, white Aparājitā; [3] red Bhadrakālī, dark Mahākālī, white Sthūlakālī, yellow Indrī; [4] dark Candrī, white Ghorī, yellow Duṣṭī, red Lambakī; [5] white Tridaśeśvarī, yellow Kāmbojī, red Dīpinī, dark Cūṣiṇī; [6] dark Ghorarūpā, white Mahārūpā, yellow Daṃṣṭrārūpā, red Karālinī; [7] red Kapālamālā, dark Mālinī, white Khaṭvāṅgāyī, yellow Maharddhikā; and [8] yellow Khaḍgahastā, red Paraśuhastā, dark Vajrahastā, white Dhanurhastā.¹⁶⁴ The first twenty-eight are said to be coquettish and holding the five articles of worship (flowers, etc.), whereas the last group hold the implements suggested by their names.

On the depictions these deities are not arranged in a separate *maṇḍala*. Instead, each group of five (one male deity with four goddesses) is placed outside the circle of flames in the appropriate directions with *śmaśāna* depictions in the leftover spaces.

Kalyāṇavarman's *Pañjikā* (23^r -23^v) by and large agrees with Bhavabhaṭṭa, but here the deities are still within the main *maṇḍala* separated from the thirteen chief goddesses by another cycle of twenty goddesses, the one

¹⁶²Or, according to the description given ad 141, a square.

¹⁶³Their implements are simply stated to be *yathokta*^o (*Nibandha* ad 148 l.3 and *Pañjikā* 23^r), but never described. On the other hand the **Vajradākavivṛti* (123^v -124^r) gives the full list.

¹⁶⁴The colours here are as given by Bhavabhaṭṭa. The depictions differ.

beginning with Pokkasī and ending with Dīpā.¹⁶⁵ The arrangement of the goddesses differs: in group [3] the last goddess is Yoginī, [4] is Indracandrī, Ghoraduṣṭī, Lambakī, Tridaśeśvarī, and [5] is Kāmbojī, Dīpinī, Cūṣiṇī, and Grāmāvasthitayoginī. This difference, although minor, suggests that the very names of the goddesses depended on how verses 148b-151b were read. In the edition I have capitalized the names according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, but it should be kept in mind that alternative sets can be created from the text. A further remarkable element in Kalyāṇavarman's description is that each goddess-group is assigned a designation: [1] *devyaḥ* [2] *paricarāḥ* [3] *bhagīnyāḥ* [4] *devatyāḥ* [5] *dākinīyāḥ* [6] *yoginīḥ* (sic!) [7] *bhāryāḥ* [8] *vilāsinyāḥ*.

[After having] meditatively visualized each [deity,] (pṛ-
thag) the yogin] should smear each with fragrant pow-
ders, offer flowers to each, [and] fumigate each with in-
cense. 2.3.127

each Several meanings can be assigned here: I have translated according to Durjayacandra's gloss (*Mitapadā* 44^v: pratidaivatam), since this seems the most natural interpretation. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the first three occurrences as 'not enjoyed by any other [entity]', in other words the offerings should not have been used for any purpose before being given to the deities, and the fourth occurrence as 'separate', in the sense of 'outer', referring to the fact that the *maṇḍala* of these deities is outside/separate from the chief one.

XV. Purification of the nectars, etc.

The next section describes what must have been a crucial rite, the purification of the substances beginning with the five nectars. The verses are placed immediately after the description of the *bali* offering to the worldly deities, but it is not entirely clear whether the process was part of that offering. The topic seems to move us towards what other sources would describe as a *gaṇacakra*, where the shared consumption of these substances was the pivotal point of the rite. However, the text makes no explicit statement that a new topic is started here. There is evidence to the effect that this process was seen to form part of the *bali*, cf. *Samājānusāriṇī* of Padmaśrīmitra

¹⁶⁵Cf. *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 8.45-56.

(5^v) and the *sādhanas* (given as parallels in the edition), but v. 133 clearly states that after the nectars and the liquor have been ritually purified they are offered to the *yoginīs*, rather than the recipients of the *bali*, the *laukika* deities.

[Then] he should visualize (dhyāpayed) [the purification of] the five nectars mixed [together] in an oyster shell or [any] other [suitable receptacle]: the syllable ‘ha’ removes the colour, the syllable ‘ha’ neutralizes the smell, and the the syllable ‘hrī’ does away with the potency. This is the prescribed method[./:] [A/a]fter having repeated the[se] three [syllables] thrice [each] he should visualize [them] as the three deities.

2.3.128-
129

- **he should visualize (dhyāpayed)** Bhavabhaṭṭa seemingly reduces the dhyā- syllable to dā-, as he glosses the verb with ‘he should give’. But this is inconsistent with his reading. This process of applying the three syllables to the nectars (which here, according to some authorities, stand as an *upalakṣaṇa* for the nectars, the meats, and liquor)¹⁶⁶ is said to remove the ‘natural’ (*prākṛta*) colour, smell, and potency of the concoction.

- **[any] other [suitable receptacle]** A shell is usually the receptacle of choice, but several other materials can be used, most notably a conch-shell (*śaṅkha*), cf. *Hevajra* II.iv.39ab where the texts forbids the use of such a receptacle for collecting the ejaculates in initiation. In the Kālacakra tradition four types of chalices are assigned to the directions: oyster shell, coconut shell, burnt clay chalice, human skull. Cf. *Kālacakraṅgavidhi* 30^r. For materials for a simple *argha* chalice see *Jyotirmañjarī* (p. 38), *Bhūtaḍāmaramaṇḍalopāyikā* of Subhūtipālita (part I. 3^r), etc. Usually the nectars etc. are placed in a skull-bowl.

- **method[./:] [A/a]fter** 129b could refer both ways: to 128-129a or to 129c-130.

The Lord of the Lotus [transforms] the colour into a

2.3.130

¹⁶⁶ *Mitapadā* 44^v: HA-HO-HRĪ-*varṇatrayaṃ varṇagandhavīryaṃ sahajapañcamalānām pañcāṅkuśānām api viṣayamadanādīnām ca harati*. However, the purification and offer-

splendid golden [hue], the brightly radiant one [transforms the] natural [smell] into [that of] scented water, the taste [is purified] by the Lord of the Sceptre, he who holds a sceptre; these three deities are to be visualized in three different [colours].

- **Lord of the Lotus** With a curious detour Bhavabhaṭṭa first takes this to mean Amitābha, the lord of the lotus-clan, and then choses the most prominent ‘son’ of that clan, Lokeśvara as the deity that turns the natural colour of the nectars into a golden hue. Later still (l. 8) he calls the first deity *vāg*, i.e. Vāgvajra. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 28^r) and Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 44^v) identify the deity as Amitābha and Vāgvajra respectively.

- **the brightly radiant one** All three commentators agree that this is Vairocana.

- **Lord of the Sceptre** Normally one would read **vajrapāṇi** capitalized, but all three commentators read it as an epithet for Akṣobhya.

- **three different [colours]** Golden, white, and dark respectively. The other two commentators do not see a reference to colour here, reading the statement of the last *pāda* as an identification of colour, smell, and potency/taste with the three deities.

[Then the yogin should visualize] a moon[-disk] in [his] left hand, and in the middle of [that] moon[-disk] the syllable [of] nectar [accompanied by] nothing else (°mātrā) but the omniscient one. [With] the thumb [symbolizing] the earth and the ring finger [symbolizing] Sumeru he should churn [the] potent (balinā) nectar (amṛtā). [In order to purify the] thus achieved (iti) fluid (m-ambho) he should visualize the threefold [purification as above].

2.3.131-
132

ing of liquor is discussed in the next section, whereas the meats are discussed separately in v. 161 ff.

• **in [his] left hand** Notice the difference in the two glosses (here and ad 132 l. 6-7) *vāmapāṇitale* and *vāmahastatāluni*. It is very tempting to emend the second, but the form is not unattested although it is very rare. The only instance I could trace is *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* 12.6.25 (ms. A 41^r): *... daṣṭakam apamārjayed dhastatāludvayena*.

• **nectar etc.** This is the letter SA to be conjoined with the ‘omniscient one’, a frequent epithet of Vairocana, whose *bīja* is OM. The visualized syllable is therefore SOM. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 28^r) raises the same mantra, but he arrives to OM by taking ° **mātrā** as a technical term (‘the measure of Vairocana’?). I am unfamiliar with this usage.

• **churn [the] potent (balinā) nectar (amṛtā)** My interpretation is that these two verses describe the way in which the previously purified five nectars (and five meats) are dissolved in liquor. When the fluid mixture is achieved it is yet again purified with the process described in 128-130 above. To take ‘nectar’ as liquor is entirely acceptable, but I find Bhavabhaṭṭa’s interpretation of **balinā** forced. In his view the word qualifies the two fingers, which as he further states symbolize wisdom and means, and thus have the power (*bala*) to turn the concoction into nectar.

• **the thumb ... and the ring finger** The same gesture is used when offering the five nectars, cf. *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa* 21-22: *vicintya samayaṃ sarvaṃ devatāpūjanāvidhim (=vidhau?)| śuddham ālokyā niḥśaṅkaṃ bhoktavyaṃ mantracoditam|| śodhyaṃ bodhyaṃ tathā dīpyaṃ akṣaratrāyayogataḥ| aṅguṣṭhānāmikāgrābhyāṃ¹⁶⁷ prīṇayec ca tathāgatān||*. Note the parallel usage of three mantras. Durjayacandra prefers to see the ‘nectar’ and ‘earth’ elements as codes for mantras. Thus the thumb is visualized with the syllable HA, whereas the ring finger with a ‘nectar-syllable’ (in his view either AM or SA) on the tip (this accounts for ‘Sumeru’).¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷Better read *anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ* as in the fragment NAK 1-1697 = NGMPP B 24/21, a phrasing based on the *Herukābhidhāna* 1.12c, also cf. *Cakrasamvarapañjikā* p. 111.

¹⁶⁸*Mitapadā* 45^r: *aṅguṣṭhe kṣitīm eva ceti- tatr{aty}āṅguṣṭhe kṣitīm pṛthivyakṣaram HAkāram. anāma- anāmikā, tasyāḥ sumerau- anāmikāgre, amṛtām uktām ekāṃ nyaset.*

XVI. Offering liquor

[From this preparation the yogin] should give [with] the thumb a sprinkle (chīḍiṅgā) to each yoginī [in turn]. Then he should visualize [the same?] for his own body. 2.3.133

- **with the thumb** Bhavabhaṭṭa – perhaps not entirely needlessly – insists that this means both the thumb and the ring finger (see the gesture in the verse above).

- **a sprinkle (chīḍiṅgā)** Also spelled (sometimes within the same line even in the best mss.) *chīḍriṅgā*, *chidriṅgā*, sometimes with a short -a, this is a specific Catuspīṭha-word. The glosses are *dravavikiraṇam* (here), and *chaṭā* (in the *Mitapadā*).¹⁶⁹ The Tibetan rendering is *'thor 'thung*, ‘libation’.

- **Then etc.** This line is highly obscure. The intended meaning is perhaps that the *yogin* visualizes the *yoginīs* residing in his own body and offers them liquor again by smearing points on his body as described in the next verse. Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to think that here the *yogin* should merge his mind with Jñānaḍākinī, i.e. he should (again?) visualize himself as the chief goddess. Kalyāṇavarman laconically comments: ‘he should perform empowering his own body’.¹⁷⁰ Durjayacandra sees this as a closing of the process; in his view the line indicates that after the deities have been emanated and worshipped they are reabsorbed into the constituents of the *yogin*’s person.¹⁷¹

[With this same liquor he] should anoint thrice the pile (stūpasya) of the five bursts (pañcasphoṭam). The clever [yogin should know that] the three places are the tip of the tongue, the point (bindu), and above. 2.3.134

¹⁶⁹The reading in the ms. is *ccha-cchaṭā* with the folio changing at the hyphen. It is very unlikely that this is a meaningful word, furthermore, such reduplications can frequently be met with when the scribe starts a new page, a new line, or even if interrupted by the string space.

¹⁷⁰*Pañjikā* 28^r : *svāṅgādhiṣṭhānaṃ kuryād iti*.

¹⁷¹*Mitapadā* 45^v : *sphāritapūjitadevatācakram ātmani skandhadhātṅvādirūpeṇa cetasā praveśayet*.

• **the pile etc.** This Bhavabhaṭṭa takes to mean the body. The ‘bursts’ are the five aggregates (*skandhāḥ*), so called because they ‘burst’, i.e. perish. Durjayacandra takes the phrase to mean the neck and the heart, but his reasoning is obscure.¹⁷² Elsewhere the idiosyncratic terms *pañcasphoṭa* and *stūpa* are taken to mean HŪṀ and the forehead respectively, cf. *Nibandha* ad 4.3.26a, 4.3.43c. The collocation appears once more in 4.4.64c, but that verse is not commented upon. The anonymous author of the *Kalpasādhana* takes the entire phrase to mean HŪṀ.¹⁷³ Yet further interpretations include that of the *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya*, where the *stūpa* means the forehead (or the point between the eyebrows) and the *pañcasphoṭa* the syllable HAṀ. The anonymous author of that commentary also mentions a variant interpretation with the meanings ‘the uvula’ and ‘the syllable HŪṀ’ respectively.¹⁷⁴ The *Samvarodaya* (2.19) uses the term for the stage that is reached by the embryo in the fifth month of gestation.

• **the point (bindu)** In the present system this word can also refer to the point between the eyebrows.

• **above** According to Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman the head (most likely the fontanelle). Since he has already extracted two of the locations from the first quarter, Durjayacandra is constrained to find another meaning for **bindu ūrdhvānām**, which he takes to mean the syllable HŪṀ with the *bindu* facing upwards. Sometimes HŪṀ is visualized upside down, cf. *Nibandha* ad 4.3.25. The *Gaṇacakravidhi* of the Ngor ms. (266^r) also mentions these three locations on the body.

With the next six verses we move into what is definitely not individual worship anymore. The text stops short of using the generally accepted terms *gaṇacakra* or *gaṇamaṇḍala* (instead see 136: *yogayoginīmaṇḍala*), but the instructions make it quite clear that this is the topic. This short [sub-]section, especially the *apabhraṃśa* verses 135 & 138 proved enormously influential as

¹⁷² *Mitapadā* 45^v: *a-i-u-e-kalāṅgās catasraḥ. ābhir āvrta okāraḥ. ete pañca buddhāḥ pañca-nāḍīrūpāḥ sphuṭantya asminn iti pañcasphoṭaḥ kaṇṭhaḥ. stūpasyeti- kṛtibhūtapañcabuddha-devīcatuṣṭayatayā stūpaṃ hṛdayam.*

¹⁷³ *Kalpasādhana* (2^v-3^r): *kaṇṭhe pañcasphoṭastūpena nirgataHŪṀkāreṇa raśmisahitena hṛdaye padmaṃ vikāśayet.*

¹⁷⁴ *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya* 10^v: *pañcasphoṭikastūpānām iti- stūpaṃ lalātamadhye pañcasphoṭikahaṃkāram. kecid galaśuṅḍikāyāṃ pītaHŪṀkāro bhaṇyate.*

witnessed by the abundance of parallels outside the Catuspīṭha cycle.¹⁷⁵ The verses frequently appear in Tibetan descriptions of the *gaṇacakra* (*tshogs 'khor*), but by this time (early 13th century) the memory that the *locus classicus* is the Catuspīṭha has faded as most authorities identify the source as the *Samputa*.¹⁷⁶ As mentioned before, Kalyāṇavarman has an altogether different exegetical agenda for this sub-chapter. For him smearing liquor on the body is a way of making fit the initiands, whereas the *gāthās* (which he does not comment on) are uttered by the officiant and the initiand when giving and receiving the *samaya*-substances (*Pañjikā* 28^v).

«[All] phenomena are beheld as pure, [so] let go of [this] nihilistic supposition! Brahmins, dogs, and *caṇḍālas* are eaten as having the same nature.»

2.3.135

I give here Bhavabhaṭṭa's full commentary in translation.

[Then the Lord] teaches the verse with which liquor is offered in the group worship beginning with **pecchia**. The meaning of **pecchia sohia dhammu** is that 'all phenomena are beheld as pure', because of non-adherence [to them as true/untrue existents]. So what of that? **ṇahisaṃbhāvaṇu mellu** means 'let go of the nihilistic supposition', for all phenomena do exist, it is just that they are utterly pure. This is the intended meaning. It follows from this that distinguishing between brahmins [and non-brahmins] and so forth is incongruous [with reality]. This is what is said by **bamhaṇu** etc. Brahmins, dogs, and *caṇḍālas* are

Nibandha

ad

2.3.135

¹⁷⁵*Śiṣyānugrahaṅgādhī* 19^r, *Gaṇacakraṅgādhī* in Ngor cod. 269^v, *Gaṇacakra* (fragment in NAK 1-1697 = NGMPP B 24/24), *Gaṇacakraṅgādhī* in the *Sādhanavidhāna* cod. 27^v, *Padmīnī* of Ratnarakṣita 16^r, *Kriyāsamuccaya* of Jagaddarpaṇa (Ms. B 202^r), **Sarvabuddhasamāyogagaṇavidhī* of Indrabhūti 196^v, *Kālacakraṅgādhī* 31^r, *Gaṇacakraṅgādhī* of Vajraghaṇṭa 239^r, *Gaṇacakraṅgādhī* of Kṛṣṇācārya [A 284^v, B 247^r], *Gaṇacakraṅgādhīcintāmaṇi* of Ratnarakṣita 252^r, etc. Also cf. SHIZUKA 2007:229 *passim* and 2008:195 *passim*.

¹⁷⁶One such authority is the otherwise extremely well-informed Sa skya paṇḍita. He even accuses the translators of the *Samputa* that their knowledge of Prakrit (!) was not up to scratch and they left some errors in the translation. He states in no uncertain terms that the 'faultless' rendering into Tibetan is the one given by him. *Tshogs 'khor cho ga* (p. 263): *tshigs bcad 'di gnyis Saṃ pu ṭa'i rgyud na bzhugs/ saṃ skr ṭa'i skad mīn/ pra kr ṭa'i skad yīn/ de'i stobs kyīs lo tsā bas ma go bar bsgyur bas nor pa bag re snang/ 'gyur 'di ni ma nor ba yīn/*. This does not mean that Sa paṇ retranslated the verse, for the same readings can be found in his uncle's *Tshogs 'khor 'bring po* (p. 222).

‘eaten’ as having the same nature. [By ‘eaten’] he means they are understood to have the same nature. For brahmins and so forth are not [in any way] different [from each other inasmuch as all possess] semen and menstrual blood etc., passion and hatred etc.¹⁷⁷ Hence the distinction between them is not real, but fictitious. The word **bamhaṇu** [here stands] for brahmins, *kṣatriyas*, and *vaiśyas*. The word **kukkuru** includes [all kinds of] animals, which are well-known. The word **caṇḍālu** stands for all untouchables. We have not mentioned *sūdras*, but they should also be included, for they are also said to be a *varṇa*. The intended meaning [of the whole verse is:] there is nothing pure or impure, therefore ‘drink up’ all dichotomies.

This is only one possible interpretation of one possible group of readings. Durjayacandra has a slightly different reading (*pāda* b is: **lehi sambhāva na hi melu**) and an altogether different interpretation, which I paraphrase as:¹⁷⁸

After having beheld [this food and liquor as nectar, that is to say] purified and true, [the *yogin* or the *yoginī* should pass it to the next person in the group, saying:] «Take [it and eat it] as [something that is to be] highly honoured, do not reject it! Eat it together with brahmins, dogs, and *caṇḍālas*.»

Sa skya paṇḍita’s ‘faultless’ translation takes the verse to mean:

Behold phenomena in this world as auspicious! Do not entertain doubts regarding [all that is] constructed! Eat brahmins, dogs, and untouchables as having the same nature.¹⁷⁹

One should pass [the receptacle with liquor and the nectars] in the gathering of yogins and yoginīs with this verse.

2.3.136

¹⁷⁷ Alternatively: ‘inasmuch as [all are born from the union of] semen and menstrual blood [and all lead an existence ending in death], and [all are equally tainted with afflictions] such as passion and hatred’.

¹⁷⁸ *Mitapadā* 45^v : *idaṃ khādyam bhojyam vāmṛtam yoginā yoginī vā dīyamānam katham dadyād iti ced āha- pecchia ityādi. pecchia prekṣya vyavalokya. sohia śodhitam pariśuddhikṛtam. dhammu dharmatāsuviśuddharūpatam gatam. lehi labhasva grhāṇa. sambhāva sambhāvya khādyam idam. katham khādyata iti kṛtvā. na hi melu na tu muñca. na cen moktavayam kiṃ nāma kartavyam iti ced āha- khaddhu ityādi. prāṇitvāviśeṣāt*

First [they should display] the waving-lotus [gesture] with a mind pure as a [piece of] crystal. [Then they] should display [with the left hand] a *vajra*-sceptre by [forming] the triple-prong gesture, [and visualize] the seat [of the receptacle] as a lotus in the right [palm]. 2.3.137

• **a mind** *citta* ° and ° *cetasā* is probably nothing more than a tautology, although Durjayacandra does try to make some sense of the compound.¹⁸⁰ The attitude and gesture described here probably refers to both the person who passes on the chalice, and the person who receives it.¹⁸¹

• **triple-prong** This has been described above as the thumb pressing down the little finger and the rest of the fingers outstretched like to resemble a three-pronged *vajra*-sceptre. Alternatively the gesture does not imitate the sceptre, which could then be visualized separately as held between the thumb and the little finger. It is equally possible that the participants here held actual *vajras*.

«Welcome! This priceless practice, freed from grasping and detachment, washes off the filth that is passion. Bow to [this, O mortals, in order] to [obtain] truth!» 2.3.138

Again, the translation is only one of the many possible interpretations, but here I cannot agree with Bhavabhaṭṭa's rather artificial and complicated interpretation.

After having explained [the verse with which the liquor is] given, beginning with **svāgadu** [the Lord] teaches the verse with which the liquor is accepted. [The word **svāgadu** should be analyzed *Nibandha*
ad
2.3.138

brāhmaṇakukkurādibhiḥ sārđhaṃ bhūñkṣveti dadyāt.

¹⁷⁹ *Tshogs 'khor cho ga* (p. 262): 'dir ni chos rñams bzang por ltos/ 'du ba rñams la the tshom med/ bram ze khyi dang gdol pa yang/ rang bzhin gcig pa nyid du zo//. The differences can be explained thus: **pecchia** was taken as **prekṣasva*, instead of **sohia** there was a reading along the lines of **soha iha*, **mellu** was interpreted as **mela* (cf. *Mahāvīyutpatti* 3291), and **ṇahisambhāvaṇu** as **na hi sambhāvaya*.

¹⁸⁰ *Mitapadā* 45^r -46^v : **cittasphaṭīkacetaneti**– *mātsaryādimalaviraheṇa nirmalatayā cittaṃ sphaṭīkam iva cittasphaṭīkaṃ, tasya cetanā †vida+ti†nirmalā, tayā tathāśayeneti yāvāt.*

¹⁸¹ Cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 296^r : *bya ba ni sbyin pa po dang len pa pos kyang ngo //*

as] *sva* in the Instrumental, [that is to say] by itself, [plus] *āgata*, that is to say perceived; for it is to be perceived [only] by oneself. What exactly? [The Lord] says: **dhammu**, [that is to say] *dharma* [in the sense of] the [primordial] nature of things such as the aggregates [that make a person]. And that is nothing but ‘suchness’, and that is [the same as] non-dual knowledge, which is [nothing but] the Tathāgata. [The Lord then] teaches how this [primordial] nature (*dharma*) is beginning with **aṇagghu**, [that is to say ‘priceless’]. It is so called because there is nothing [in the world], no matter how pricy, that would be suitable to be used to worship it. It is only enlightenment that is truly fit for that purpose. This is the intended meaning. [As for] **rāamalā-gatae**, passion means thirst [for sensory gratification]. That itself is ‘filth’, for it tarnishes the mind. For this reason it [i.e. *dharma*] is [**āgatae** =] **āgata**, [where *ā*- should be interpreted as slightly] that is to say it is ‘slightly off’, [in other words] corrupt. But it is not entirely corrupt, because passion in its true state *is* pure. One may object: why single out passion, leaving aside the other afflictions such as hate? [There is some] truth [to this, but] the main cause of transmigratory existence is experiencing pleasure, and the cause of that is passion. By purifying passion [this] transmigratory existence together with all [its] auxiliary elements will become pure. [As for the line] beginning with **gāha**, since the true nature [of things] is one from which the filth of passion has gone, it is free of both grasping, [that is to say] emotional engagement, and non-grasping, which is the opposite. The intended meaning is that [the *yogin*] is free of [the conceptualization] ‘I am adhering’, but also free of ‘I am non-adhering’, which is also a kind of adherence. The thus described *dharma* should be construed with ‘bow to’ [as its direct object]. For what reason? [The Lord] says: **tattiae**, in order to contemplate truth. The reason is so that the mind may rest on reality by bowing to that. Thus the intended meaning.¹⁸²

¹⁸²I have allowed myself some freedom in translating these sentences. I am not entirely sure whether the reading *tasya tatpūjeti* in l. 6 is trustworthy, hence I conjectured *tasya satpūjā* based on the parallel in the *Āmnāyamañjarī*.

Durjayacandra's approach is more natural. He takes **svāgadu** to mean 'welcome'. He does not spell out who is addressed, but it is rather clear that the recipient here welcomes the chalice with the nectars and liquor. His interpretation of **āgatae** as a Dative of *apagati* has also been accepted above, although regularly we would need ***ogatae** or ***ogaae**. One minor variant reading here, although this can be determined only from the gloss, is ***bhattiae** for **tattiae**.¹⁸³

Sa skya paṇḍita's translation, advanced by him as the only correct one, can be interpreted as follows:

The teaching of the Sugata is priceless! Bow in reverence to truth, which has cast off the filth of passion etc., and which is free of grasping and grasping.¹⁸⁴

With this verse [the recipient] should the [the chalice] in accordance with the prescribed practice in order to achieve the accomplishment of yoga. [For] in reality everything is pure for yogins.

2.3.139

• **for in truth** Bhavabhaṭṭa does not comment on **tattvena** and takes **yathā** as an elliptic word for *yathālābham* 'whatever [liquor] can be obtained', for which see ad 146. Durjayacandra takes this as a *bhinnakrama* 'compound' (i.e. construes **yathā** with **tattvena**), the meaning being that the participants of the *gaṇacakra* are prompted to consume the substances with the conviction that they are consuming the 'nectar of gnosis'. Oddly, he takes a less gnostic view of the statement regarding purity, suggesting that the substances are to be considered pure because they have been empowered by mantras and not because the participants do not entertain dualistic thought.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ *Mitapadā* 46^r: *dātā tāvad anayā dadāti, gr̥hītā punaḥ kayā gr̥hnātīti ced āha- svāgadu dhammu ityādi. svāgadu svāgataḥ. pavitratayā puṇyākaratayā dhammu dharmam, mokṣāvāhanayā aṇagghu- anarghaṃ, rāamalāgatae yogino rāgādikleśamalapañcakā-pagataye, gāhāgāhavivajjia grāhyagrāhakavivarjitaṃ, paṇavaha praṇamata{ḥ} bhaktyā.*

¹⁸⁴ *Tshogs 'khor cho ga* (pp. 262-263): *bde gshegs chos la rin thang med/ 'dod chags la sogs dri ma spangs/ gzung dang 'dzin pa dang bral ba/ de bzhin nyid la gus phyag 'tshal/* This translation implies that **sv-** was interpreted as *sukha*. Alternatively the reading may have been **sugada**.

¹⁸⁵ *Mitapadā* 46^r: *yathā m-ācara tattveneti- yathātattvena jñānāmṛtarūpeṇācara* (sic!; or rather: *-rūpeṇa/ cara*?) *bhakṣaya. śuci sarvasmīn iti- mantrapūtatayā yogino nāśuci kim apy asti.*

[Then] one should say: «As you please.»

2.3.140

• «As you please.» According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this is uttered by the *yogin* who passes the chalice, whereas according to Durjayacandra by the person who receives it just before consuming the contents. However, other *gaṇacakra* descriptions suggest that the word is pronounced by the sponsor of the rite (occasionally the overseer of the rite), signifying that once the substances have been consumed the main point of the rite has been accomplished and the participants can turn to other activities, such as eating and drinking, singing and dancing, etc.¹⁸⁶

XVII. Offering bali to the worldly deities (bis)

As Bhavabhaṭṭa points out, the following section is an elaboration on vv. 126cd-127. I have summarized his commentary to this verses in the notes to that section, q.v. According to Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 46^r) this *bali* is offered at the end of the feast.

Outside [the main maṇḍala the yogin] should fashion a red maṇḍala with a triangular base.

2.3.141ab

- **base** The red circle or square is enclosed with a triangle.
- **a red maṇḍala** As described above, Bhavabhaṭṭa prefers sandalwood-paste, or saffron. The first is mentioned also by Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 30^v), who further specifies that the red maṇḍala is drawn at the eastern gate (of the main maṇḍala). Durjayacandra seems to state that the substance should be blood (cf. 145d if read with **m-ātmakaiḥ**).¹⁸⁷

He should [then] make two vajra-fists, join them back

2.3.141cd-142

¹⁸⁶ *Śiṣyānugrahaśāstra* (19^v): *tribhir gāthābhiḥ saṃstutya sānandaṃ gaṇamaṇḍale/ «yathāsukham» iti brūyād dātāraḥ kṛpayā khalu// vidhinā bhakṣayet sarvaṃ devatām api tarpayet/ madirotsavasānandair vajragītaiḥ supūritaiḥ/ ḍamaruvādibhir ghaṇṭānānāvādyamanoharaiḥ/ nṛtyataiḥ paramānandair [. . .]; Padminī (19^r): *tadanantaraṃ dānapatiḥ kṛtamaṇḍalaḥ sapuṣpāñjalīḥ stutipraṇāmapūrvakaṃ «yathāsukham» iti vadet*. This injunction in Ratnarakṣita's work comes after the recitation of the two songs (our vv. 135 & 138) and two further stanzas in praise of the deities sung by the overseer. Also cf. *Gaṇa-**

to back, link the two little fingers, and stretch out the two index fingers with the right [slightly] bent [and the left] joined [to it]. [With this] he should invite the outer deities.

«Om, overlord[s] of the pledge, do! do! hūṃ jaḥ svāhā.» 2.3.143

Thus the gesture and spell for inviting [the deities]. 2.3.144

He should offer red flowers, incense, fragrant powders, lamps, and so forth. [He should place] within a vessel the truce-bali (ohārabalikā): raw meat, [raw] fish, and so on. 2.3.145

• **truce-bali (ohārabalikā)** This term is again specific to the Catuṣpīṭha. The commentators see it as a technical term for food-offering that includes flesh, fish, onions, garlic, etc. Durjayacandra derives the word from *upahāra*,¹⁸⁸ but the more likely ancestor is *avahāra*, ‘truce’, but also ‘tax’. Cf. *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 4.27, where the *adaityābali* and the *ohārabali* are taken to be two distinct kinds of offering.

• **fish** One possible reading is **m-ātmakaiḥ**, ‘one’s own [flesh etc.]’. Although this is not very likely for this text (most importantly see the parallel in *Vajradāka* 18.62b), nor can it be completely dismissed. In kindred *śākta* worship the practice of offering one’s own blood and flesh is widely attested.¹⁸⁹

All these substances, joined with the five nectars, should [also] be eaten [not only offered]. [In order to offer the bali the yogin should stand] on the left side of the vessel and point [to it] with the right index finger. 2.3.146

cakravidhi attr. to Ratnākaraśānti vv. 21-22.

¹⁸⁷ *Mitapadā* 46^r: [. . .] raktēna maṇḍalakam kuryāt.

¹⁸⁸ *Mitapadā* 46^r: upahriyanta ity upahārā matsamāmsādyāḥ. tair balir ohārabaliḥ.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. *Kādambarī* (2.150-154): [. . .] Caṇḍikārudhirabalipradānārtham asakṛnniṣitaśastro-
llekhaviṣamitaśikhareṇa bhujayugalenopaśobhitam [. . .] Mātāṅgakanāmānaṃ śabarasenā-
patim apaśyam. Also *Devīmāhātmya* (13.9-10ab): dadatus tau baliṃ caiva nijagātrāsṛguḥṣi-
tam/ evaṃ samārādhayatas tribhīr varṣair yatātmanoḥ/ parituṣṭā jagaddhātrī pratyakṣam
prāha Caṇḍikā// [. . .]. My thanks to Dr. Bihani Sarkar for pointing out these references.

• **all these etc.** Bhavabhaṭṭa restricts the meaning to liquor. He further points out that whatever liquor can be found is suitable. He quotes a verse I cannot trace about types of alcohol: *surā* is distilled from grains, barks etc., whereas *maireya* is the distilled juice of sugarcane, etc.

• **joined** I take this to mean simply ‘with’. Bhavabhaṭṭa sees a more esoteric meaning: joined means that ‘yoga’, the installation of the appropriate mantras, has been applied to the nectars. These mantras are described in the next sub-chapter.

• **on the left side etc.** Bhavabhaṭṭa offers two interpretations: 1) the *yogin* places his left hand on the left side of the vessel, raises his right in a fist and points with the index to the vessel, presumably to indicate the offerings to the deities; 2) the offering is to be split into two with the left portion (*bhāga*) offered to the main *maṇḍala* (the alternative gloss for **bhāṇḍasya**), and the right portion to the wrathful guardian deities (id. for **krodha**) outside the main *maṇḍala*. The *Gaṇacakra* of the Ngor ms. (266^r) has this gesture and its variations in conjunction with the mantras HA, HO, HRĪ to purify (lit. ‘nectarize’) the offering.

[Then he should recite:] «Om, [deities dwelling] at solitary trees, in cremation grounds, on mountains, in glens, in caverns, in the outskirts of villages, at [cross-]roads, on fields, and especially in empty houses, in water receptacles, on fallow lands, on [cultivated] lands, and especially in [the dwellings of] untouchables, . . . 2.3.147

. . . Kṛṣṇarudra, Mahārudra together with Devadatta, Kṛṣṇa, Karāla, Bībhatsa, Nandātīta, Vināyaka; mothers Cāmuṇḍī, Ghorī, Bībhatsī, Umādevī; Jayā, Vijayā, Ajitā, Aparājitā; yoginīs Bhadrakālī, Mahākālī, Sthūlakālī, Indrī; Candrī, Ghorī, Duṣṭī, Lambakī; Tridaśeśvarī, Kāmbojī, Dīpi[nī], Cūṣiṇī, yoginīs dwelling in villages; Ghorarūpā, Mahārūpā, Daṃṣṭrārūpā, Karālinī; Kapālamālā, Mālinī, Khaṭvāṅgāyī, Maharddhikā; Khaḍg[ahast]ā, Paraśuhastā, Vajrahastā, and Dhanur[hastā]! 2.3.148-152

• **at solitary trees, etc.** The source for this mantra is the Śaiva *Niśi-saṃcāra* (ch. 13, f. 48^r).¹⁹⁰ In that text these verses are not mantras, but an indication of places where *bali* ought to be offered and a list of the corresponding deities.¹⁹¹ Because of the importance of the parallel I give here the relevant (unedited) verses from that source with the identification of their location in the Catuspīṭha.

ekavṛkṣe śmaśāne vā parvate kandare guhe (= 147ab)
grāmapārśve tathā kṣetre śūnyāgāre tathaiva ca (= 147cd)
bhājane sthalagate vāpi mātāṅgaś ca tathaiva ca (= 147ef)
kṛṣṇarudra mahārudra (= 148a) *nandātīta vināyakam* (= 148d)
aghorī ghora bībacchī (= 149a) *lambakī ṛḍaśeśvarī* (= 150d)|
jayā ca vijayā caiva ajitā aparājitā (= 149cd)
karālī ghoṭtanī caiva grāmāvasthitacūṣanī (= 151b)
indrī caṇḍī ghorī duṣṭī lambakī ṛḥaseti(!) ca (= 150cd)

It is very likely that the transmission of these verses in the single surviving ms. of the *Niśisaṃcāra* is corrupt. E.g. we can conjecture an omission between *mahārudra* and *nandātīta*, and we can state with relative probability that the first occurrence of *lambakī ṛḍaśeśvarī* is out of place, whereas the enigmatic *ṛḥaseti ca* ought to read *ṛḍaśeśvarī* (for *tridaśeśvarī*). For further parallels between this Śaiva text and the Catuspīṭha corpus see the description of Āryadeva's **Ekavṛkṣādīpanjikā*. That the source is the *Niśisaṃcāra* is first and foremost shown by the names of the deities, which are obviously Śaiva, e.g. the Jayā series are the four sisters of Tumburu from the *Vṛṇāśikhā*. The list must have seemed very unusual for Abhayākaragupta since he seeks to standardize it by glossing every name with a better known counterpart.¹⁹²

¹⁹⁰This was first pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson (as far as I can remember) during a discussion about the *Vajradāka*, which also contains these verses. A parallel edition of the *Niśisaṃcāra* with the present version, that of the *Vajradāka*, that of the *Ḍākārṇava*, and that of the *Saṃpūṭa* is included in one of his handouts (6c) for the lecture series “The Śaiva Sources of the Buddhist Tantras of Śaṃvara” delivered at All Souls in Trinity Term, 1998. I was unaware of this handout at the time of writing the present note.

¹⁹¹Cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 294^v: *phal che bar 'dir lha rnams nye bar byed do zhes pa nag po'i phyogs* (9.2.17a) *zhes pa la sogs pa'o|| shing gcig* (9.2.18a) *ces pa la sogs pa gtor ma sbyin pa'i gnas gsungs pa'o||*. The reason why Abhayākaragupta does not take this as a mantra – although he must have been aware of Bhavabhaṭṭa's treatise – is because the *Saṃpūṭa* does not prefix the verses with OM.

¹⁹²*Āmnāyamañjarī* 294^v (ad *Saṃpūṭa* 9.2.19): *Nag po drag po ni Dbang po'o|| Drag po chen po ni Lus nḡan no|| Lha mo ni Lhas byin te Chu lha'o|| Nag po ni Gshin rje'o|| Thod*

I invite all of you by this, the command of the lady of the thunderbolt, [who is] the great [unifying] principle of the five yoginīs, the accomplisher of all desires, the empress of yoga and pantheon, lady of the thunderbolt, ruler, the great embodiment of [all] Tathāgatas, revealer of faultless yoga!

2.3.153-
154

• **lady of the thunderbolt etc.** Although my interpretation has the fault of repetition (**vajreśvarī** twice), I assume that the verses refer to Jñānaḍākinī with whom the *yogin* is in meditative identification. Bhavabhaṭṭa takes 153ab to refer to the guardians Dīpinī etc., 153cd' to the entire *maṇḍala*, and **prabhus** to the guardians of the directions with 154ab qualifying them. At first sight this is not unreasonable, but we must keep in mind that the text clearly differentiated between the inner *maṇḍala* and the present, outer one, containing only the above-named minor deities. Furthermore, Bhavabhaṭṭa (in this he is followed or paralleled by Durjayacandra) does not include 154cd in the mantra, while I think it is an essential part of it, since the construction [name of the deity] + *ājñāpayati* is overwhelmingly attested in similar mantras.¹⁹³

Om, d-dd-drag, b-bb-bind, g-gg-guzzle, kill kill, terminate terminate all wretched [impediments] of so-and-so, hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ, phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ, jaḥ svāhā!»

2.3.155

• **d-dd-drag** Inspired by a corrective comment by Prof. Sanderson, I interpret **kaḍḍhana** as *karṣaya*. The word occurs frequently in sources such as the *Bhūtaḍāmaratantra*. The sense must be 'to attract, to draw near'.¹⁹⁴

Filling the mouth (mukham āpūrya) with nectar, [the

2.3.156

pa can ni Dbang phyug chen po'o|| Mi sdug pa ni Me lha'o || Dga' las 'das ni Bden bral lo|| Log 'dren ni Rlung lha'o|| Notice the odd gloss for the third: the original reading of the *Samputa* is *devatī*, which is first glossed with its Catuspīṭha counterpart, *devadatta*, and then stated to be Varuṇa.

¹⁹³E.g. *Guhyasamāja* 14. prose between 58-59, *Sarvavajrodāya* sect. 37: OM GHA GHA GHĀTAYA 2 SARVADUṢṬĀN [...] VAJRADHARA ĀJÑĀPAYATI [...].

¹⁹⁴E.g. 3^r -3^v : *mahābhūtinī yadi samayam atikrāmati anena krodhasahitenākṛṣyāṣṭaśataṃ jayet*– OM KAḌḌHA 2 AMUKABHŪTINĪ HŪM PHAṬ. *anena krodhasahitenāṣṭaśataṃ jayet. śīghram āgacchati. yadi śīghram nāgacchati akṣimūrdhni sphuṭati śuṣyati mṛyati vā*. Similar usage *ibid.* 13^r , 15^v , *passim*.

yogin] should contemplate [performing] the ritual dance-movements and so forth (padakarmādi). [Thereafter] the yogin[s] [and/or] yoginī[s] should meditate on [whatever aim they wish to achieve]. Success in all rites will come about.

- **filling the mouth (mukham āpūrya)** More likely the mouth of the deities as in Bhavabhaṭṭa's first interpretation. In his second interpretation and acc. to the two other commentators it is the *yogin* who fills his own mouth with the nectars. The term probably stems from the *Māyājāla* as witnessed by parallels in the *Samputa*.¹⁹⁵

- **the ritual dance-movements and so forth (padakarmādi)** The first two interpretations of Bhavabhaṭṭa seem very unlikely.¹⁹⁶ The third, where he evokes unknown authorities, is arguably the most plausible meaning. The dance movements are described in 3.4.81 ff. To exonerate Bhavabhaṭṭa, the quarter-verse must have been considered obscure from a very early stage. The 18th ch. of the *Vajradāka* reproduces this section almost word for word, but it replaces this *pāda* with the neutral *sarvadevatāṃ prṇayet*. The **ādi** very likely refers to 3.4.100, which lists a series of further movements called *abhinayas*. These movements are frequently employed in initiation before constructing the *maṇḍala* in order to remove obstacles. Cf. e.g. *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 6.4 ff., *Vajrāvalī* sect. 7, and the *Parikramapadopāyikā*, a small

¹⁹⁵ *Samputa* 7.4.34: *śāntike pauṣṭike vaśye śubhadravasya homānam/ viṇmūtrarudhiramajjāsthīmahāmāṃsasya homena sarve mukhapūritā bhonti*; cf. *Māyājāla* 341^r: *zhi dang rgyas dang dbang rnams la/ dge ba rdzas rnams sbyin sreg bya/ bshang gcī khrag rkang rus pa dang/ sha chen dag kyang sbyin sreg bya*/. Here the *mukhapūraṇa* element is missing. However, in another parallel the *bhagavān* is asked in consternation how offering such substances does not incur sin: *Samputa* 10.4.1abc: *kathaṃ jñānasattveṣu aśuci[nā] mukhapūraṇe/ kathaṃ na jāyate pāpaṃ [...]*, which is based on *Māyājāla* 341^r: *ci ste ye shes sems dpa'i zhal/ mi gtsang ba yis bkang na ko/ ji ltar sdig pa mi skye 'gyur [...]*.

¹⁹⁶ Perhaps *pikākāreṇa* in l. 5 begs some explanation. Most Indo-Aryan languages have this word for 'spit' (especially the spittle associated with chewing betel) with a short -i (Sindhi, Assamese, Bengali, Oriya, Maithili, Gujarati), only Panjabi and Hindi pronounce it as *pik*, whereas Marathi sometimes nasalizes the vowel (cf. TURNER no. 8144, who reconstructs the ancestor as **pikkā*). Since the word is obviously onomatopoeic, I do not think that the length of the vowel points to anything significant. Spitting (usually a mouthful of alcohol) on the offering before taking it out of the ritual space is also attested practice, cf. *Gaṇacakravādhicintāmaṇi* 253^v quoting the *Vajramālābhidhāna* (ch. 64?), *Gaṇacakravādhī* of Kṛṣṇācārya [A 285^r, B 247^v]

monograph dedicated to the subject. Alternatively, the statement might be an injunction to observe a certain decorum concerning walking, gesticulating, etc. and with this in mind one should not consume too much *amṛta* (which here would mean liquor).¹⁹⁷

• **yogin[s] [and/or] yoginī[s]** Bhavabhaṭṭa takes **bhāvayed** less literally, but the context seems to suggest an eidetic visualization according to what kind of goal is sought: pacifying etc. Durjayacandra seeks to explain away the option of male or female *yogins* by interpreting **yoga** as the application of the mantra taught in 155, and **yoginyā** as Jñānaḍākinī in one of her forms, according to the goal sought.¹⁹⁸

Clenching two vajra-fists he should join them back to back. He should interlock the two ring fingers and form a chain [with] the index fingers. 2.3.157

• **form a chain** That is to say the index fingers (**krodha** means *tarjanī* as in 146d) are also interlocked.

[Then the following mantra is to be recited:] «Om, eat, eat, empress of all yogas, hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ jruṃ svāhā.» 2.3.158

[One] should employ [the mantra?] according to the rite. 2.3.159

¹⁹⁷Cf. **Samayapañcaka* of Padmākara 28^r: *tshogs kyis 'dus pa la bya ba/ lag pa rkang sogs bag ldan bya/ shin tu bag med rgyu yi phyir/ btung ba mang po spyad mi bya// mang dag gis ni g.yeng bar 'gyur/ g.yengs pas rnal 'byor 'khrug 'gyur zhing/ rnal 'byor nyams pas dngos grub med/ bdud kyi las ni bzlog par dka'//* “During the communal feast (*gaṇacakra*) one should pay attention to one’s actions, [such as] moving the hands, the feet, etc. In order to [maintain] this careful attention, one should not drink [too] much. For by [drinking too] much one[’s mind] wavers, and by wavering his yogic [concentration] is compromised. By the compromising [his] yogic [concentration he will] fail [to obtain] accomplishment. [O,] the workings of Māra are difficult to resist!” Also cf. *Gaṇacakraavidhi* of Bhadradata 248^v: *ra ni ro bar gyur na ni/ nan tan gyis ni lus ngag bsdam/* “Should he become intoxicated, he should restrain his body and speech with the greatest care.” The same text states further below that if this cannot be done, one should leave. Also cf. *Gaṇacakraavidhicintāmaṇi* of Ratnarakṣita 252^r, quoting the *Vajramālābhīdhāna* ch. 62.

¹⁹⁸*Mitapadā* 46^v: [. . .] **bhāvayed yoga yoginya iti– yujyata iti yogaḥ kakkakaḍḍhanā-dikasya. yatra karmaṇi yā niyuktā tat karma kurvatīm bhāvayet.**

• **employ** This statement is obscure. The point is perhaps that the mantra just taught should be customized according the rite for which the *bali* is employed. Durjayacandra suggests that this statement refers to the direction the mental attention of the *yogin* ought to take according to the aim he wishes to achieve.¹⁹⁹

The rites [are:] placating, producing prosperity/reinvigoration, subjugating, killing, driving off, producing enmity, [and] paralyzing. [Thus the yogin should observe] the correct [procedure] (*tattvena*) for the outer *bali*. The *bali* [correctly performed] shall accomplish [all] rites. 2.3.160

XVIII. Offering the meats

Next [I shall teach] the special worship, [one that is] devoid of conceptualization and non-conceptualization. [The yogin] should [first] realize the true [nature] of each of the five ‘hooks’. 2.3.161

• **conceptualization and non-conceptualization** Durjayacandra’s interpretation seems to be the most attractive here. Conceptualization is thinking of the meats as things to be eaten or not to be eaten, that is to say, to entertain ideas of ritual purity and impurity. Surely, that would mean non-conceptualization, hence the meaning he assigns to the second element: not realizing that the five ‘hooks’ are of the nature of the deities.²⁰⁰ Acc. to Bhavabhaṭṭa it is the *yogin* who will become devoid of conceptualization. Ka-lyāṇavarman simply ‘translates’ the two terms into *bhakṣya* and *abhakṣya*.²⁰¹

• **true [nature]** I.e. that they are the five Tathāgatas as described below.

That which [goes by] the name ‘great hook’ should be 2.3.162-163ab

¹⁹⁹ *Mitapadā* 46^v : *yathākarmeti- yādṛśaṃ śāntipuṣṭyādikaṃ karma, tan manasikṛtya* [...].

²⁰⁰ *Mitapadā* 46^v -47^r : *kalpyākalpavivarjitaṃ- abhakṣyabhakṣyam iti vikalpaḥ kalpaḥ. devatātvenāṅkuśānām aniścayo ’kalpaḥ. tābhyāṃ varjitaṃ kalpākalpavarjitaṃ.*

²⁰¹ *Pañjikā* 30^v : [...]. *bhakṣ[y]ābhakṣ[y]avikalparahītena śuddhasvabhāvena viśeṣasamaya-pūjāṃ kuryād iti.*

regarded the deity of gnosis. [Similarly,] the ‘vajra hook’ is Akṣobhya, the ‘place hook’ is Ratna[sambhava], the great one [known] as the ‘royal hook’ is Amogha[siddhi], and the ‘fickle hook’ is Amitābha.

- ‘great hook’ etc. I.e. human flesh (the key to Bhavabhaṭṭa’s terms *nādiḥ* etc. = ‘that which begins with *na*’, i.e. *nara* etc.), which has the nature of Vairocana (also acc. to Kalyāṇavarman, *Pañjikā* 31^r). The term **jñānadevata** is unusual, this word is normally a synonym for *jñānasattva*. Durjayacandra proposes that the deity is Jñānaḍākinī.²⁰²

- ‘vajra hook’ I.e. cow meat. Acc. to Kalyāṇavarman elephant meat.

- ‘place hook’ I.e. dog meat. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s glosses *ādiśvaḥ* here and *antaśvaḥ* for horse meat are from the terminology of the *Hevajra* (I.xi.8c & II.x.5).

- ‘royal hook’ I.e. elephant meat. Acc. to Kalyāṇavarman cow meat.

- ‘fickle hook’ I.e. horse meat. For the gloss *antaśvaḥ* see just above.

[Thus the yogin] should employ all [five] true [natures] for the five hooks. Since they are desired [thus] by all the deities [i.e. the yoginīs], he should propitiate all the yoginīs [with them].

2.3.163cd-
164ab

- **employ** etc. The statement is somewhat opaque, but I think it is best interpreted as a conclusion of a topic. The **ādīni** does not seem to have any significant role (Bhavabhaṭṭa does not even bother to find a meaning for it), except perhaps as a reiteration of **ādibhi** in 161c.

- [thus] I.e. after having realized the true nature of the substances.

[However,] he should not be attached to these pleasures,

2.3.164cd-
165ab

²⁰² *Mitapadā* 47^r: *pañcāṅkuśānām pañcatattvaṃ niścetum āha- mahāṅkuśānāmānam ityādi. mahāṅkuśaṃ naraṃ, Jñānaḍākinī[m], vajrāṅkuśaṃ gāṃ, Akṣobhyam, śvānaṃ Ratnasambhavam, rājāṅkuśaṃ gajam, Amogham, calam aśvam, Amitābham ity anena pañca-buddhasvabhāvenāṅkuśapañcakena sarvadevatācakraṃ prīṇayet pañcāṅkuśam ācaratām.*

nor should he be overcome by [their] enjoyment. He should perform the rite of worship and so forth [regarding] all and everything as pure (svacchā).

- **attached to these pleasures** The point is to warn the *yogin* not to treat these acts (offering liquor, meats, etc.) as pleasurable and become attached to them, an attitude which would undermine the very reason for which they were undertaken. Durjayacandra sees this controlled ritualistic enjoyment of sense objects such as food as opposed to mere eating as jackals (*Mitapadā* 47^r). Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, sees the first statement as a warning to respect the ritual prescriptions strictly and not according to the *yogin*'s wish or fancy. The verse he cites to validate this statement cannot be traced in this form, but three of the *pādas* are transmitted in various sources (see notes to edition). The Tibetan rendering of this verse interprets *bheda* as '[willing?/unwilling?]' disclosure [to non-initiates]' (*rig pa*).

- **overcome by [their] enjoyment** Acc. to Bhavabhaṭṭa the point of consuming the *samayas* is to become disengaged from worldly pleasures, but if the *yogin* becomes engaged with [i.e. attached to] the *samayas*, he will fall in the same trap as it were. Cf. however a parallel in the *Gaṇacakra* of the Ngor cod. (269^v) which seems to suggest that this was not a general statement, but rather a rule of *gaṇacakra* worship. The participants should not eat and drink to satisfy their hunger and thirst, furthermore, they should wait with passing items to others until they are directed by the overseer of the rite.²⁰³

- **pure** I.e. not ritually or otherwise pure (*bhakṣya*, *peya*, *gamyā*, etc.), but pure in the sense of not perceiving the implied dualities or multiplicities of worshipper, worship, and worshipped, etc. Durjayacandra, however, sees the statement as referring to post-initiatory practice: the *yogin* should consume the meats etc. only if he finds himself in such a situation, and not necessarily.²⁰⁴ This seems to contradict Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation paraphrased

²⁰³The only exception is the active officiant: *anyonyam ca na dātavyam pānāhāraṃ vinājñāyā/ bubhukṣito na grhṇīyāt svayaṃ vā pānabhojanam// karmavaḥjri tu pānādi svayaṃ grhṇan na duṣyati*. Also cf. *Gaṇacakra* of Bhadradata 248^r-248^v.

²⁰⁴*Mitapadā* 47^r: *kathaṃ nāmācarantīti ced āha- svecchā sarvetyādi. yadā labhyate yadā rocate tadācaren, na punar avaśyaṃbhāvena.*

above. Although the injunctions seem to be given only for the case of the meats, it is more likely that the redactors meant to apply them to all kinds of worship including that with liquor above and that with intercourse just below.

XIX. Offering the ejaculates

[Then] the heroes who are in (madhye) that (tasya) [gathering] should join ‘ali’ and ‘kāli’.

- ‘ali’ and ‘kāli’ These are codes for the male and female sexual organs respectively (amongst other meanings). Cf. 2.4.15-28. ‘Joining’ them means intercourse, cf. the glosses of Bhavabhaṭṭa (*prajñopāyasamāpatti*) and Kalyāṇavarman (*advayayogasamāpatti*).²⁰⁵ Durjayacandra reads **bījānām** instead of **vīrāṇām**, therefore he takes the terms in their primary meaning (‘vowels’ and ‘consonants’), making the statement refer to the *bījas* that are used to empower the meats (these are taught in 2.4.29-35). This implies that his commentary does not see 165cd-166 as a new section.²⁰⁶ For **ali** rather than **āli** cf. notes to 2.4.15-28.

By joining ‘ali’ and ‘kāli’ he should propitiate all the deities. All those (te) [present] in (madhye) [that gathering] should taste the nectar that has been extracted thus (tathā).

- **thus (tathā)** I.e. from intercourse. Bhavabhaṭṭa spells out that the *yogin* should first take the ejaculates directly from the consort’s vagina with his tongue. Then he should place the remainder into a skull-bowl and offer it to the other participants. I cannot agree with his interpretation of **sarva** (which he takes to refer to the substances) rather than the participants in the *gaṇacakra*. It is not clear how Kalyāṇavarman construes **sarva**. Because of his variant reading Durjayacandra steers off course here, therefore his comments are of no immediate use.

²⁰⁵ *Pañjikā* 31^r-31^v: [...] *vakṣyamāṇalakṣaṇā{a}likāliprayogeṇa supariśuddhavīracakre sati, advayayogasamāpattiyogaṃ kuryād iti bhāva[h].* [...] *sarvabuddhānurāgaṇaguhyapūjāṃ kṛtvā toṣayed iti.*

²⁰⁶ *Mitapadā* 47^r: *tasya madhye tu bījānām iti- tadanūkuśapañcakamadhye, bījānām iti bījam ālikāliṃ yojayet.*

The issue of intercourse as part of the *gaṇacakra* merits some (by no means exhaustive) discussion. Some authorities are very open about it and explain details without any obfuscation.²⁰⁷ Some authors are not quite so clear, e.g. the *Gaṇacakraavidhi* attr. to Ratnākaraśānti v. 25 cd: *anyonyatarpaṇaṃ kṛtvā kelikrīḍārasotsavaiḥ*||,²⁰⁸ whereas the anonymous author of the *Gaṇacakraavidhi* in the Ngor ms. and many other authors of such manuals fail to mention any sexual element. [...] The process of ‘sanitization’ can be clearly viewed through the Sa skya *gaṇacakra* manuals, since we know that they are based on each other. Grags pa rgyal mtshan has only this cautious statement to say: “Then they should also propitiate [the deities] with the union [known as] *kundurū*.”²⁰⁹ Sa skya paṇḍita replaces the rite with breath-yoga or a visualization of the deity in union with his consort.²¹⁰ Later still Ngor chen Kun dga’ bzang po retains only the visualization process.²¹¹ I find unlikely that the sexual element was omitted on account of secrecy. For the *gaṇacakra* was a secret that everyone knew about.²¹²

²⁰⁷Cf. the *Gaṇacakraavidhi* of Ḍombīheruka 44^v: the participants are said to offer their wives or any other [suitable] woman. The *ācārya* copulates with her behind a curtain and consumes his semen by taking it [from the consort’s vulva] with his tongue. This is repeated by the participants. Substitutes are provided for the case in which they are unable to do so. Also *Kālacakragāṇavidhi* 31^v: the participants are instructed to perform all kinds of [sexual] positions (*karāṇa*) and are specifically instructed not to reject anyone on account of their caste or outer appearance.

²⁰⁸Further terse references include the *Gaṇacakraavidhi* of Bhadrādatta 248^r: *rang gi dga’ ba’i rtsed mo yi/ yi dam lha ni mnyes par bya/*, **Sarvabuddhasamāyogagaṇavidhi* 196^v - 197^r: *sgyu ma lta bu mdzes pa yi/ ’o byed sogs sbyor kun ’khyud pa/ sems can don du yang dag spyad/*.

²⁰⁹*Tshogs ’khor ’bring po* (p. 223): *de’i rjes la kun tu ru’i sbyor bas kyang tshim par par byas te [...]*. *Kundurū* is a code-word from the *Hevajra* II.iii.60b: *dvīndriyayogaṇ kundurūm*.

²¹⁰*Tshogs ’khor cho ga* (pp. 265-266). As his manual is based on that of his uncle, here, in section 1.5.2.6, we would expect an elaboration on the above statement about *kundurū*.

²¹¹*Kun bzang rnam rol* (pp. 297-298).

²¹²Cf. Si tu’s description of Mhaypi in the Introduction. In the parallel Kaula tradition we are fortunate to have not only prescriptive texts but also public satirization of the event, Kṣemendra’s *Narmamālā* 3.76 ff. The description of Kashmiri poet has remarkable parallels with the present *gaṇacakra*: the participants sing and dance, the overseer of the rite sings in the vernacular, alcohol is consumed, the vessels are said to be skull-bowls, and the rite culminates in an orgy where – Kṣemendra notes with obvious venom – one can hardly tell who is having intercourse with whom. For Śaiva sources of orgiastic worship see SANDERSON 2007:281ff.

XX. Removing the leftovers

The remainders from all these substances should be deposited outside the maṇḍala. [During this act / Thereafter the participants should intone] the syllable ‘hūṃ’ in the form of a song accompanied by auspicious sounds.

2.3.167

• **remainders etc.** I interpret the line against Bhavabhaṭṭa, who sees this as an injunction linked to 166cd. It is much more likely that the line refers to what ought to be done with the unconsumed meat, liquor, etc.²¹³ According to Durjayacandra these remainders are given to non-initiate lay Buddhists.²¹⁴

• **[During this act / Thereafter] etc.** Acc. to Bhavabhaṭṭa this happens after the ejaculates have been consumed, but acc. to Durjayacandra this refers to the removal of the remainders. The ‘hūṃ’ in the form of a song could refer to the melodious intonation of the syllable, but it could also refer to – as Bhavabhaṭṭa explains – the song the hallmark of which is HŪṂ, i.e. verse 4.4.93. Note, however, that the song just hereafter also has a triple HŪṂ at the end. Similarly **maṅgaladhvani** could refer to auspicious sounds (ringing the bell, blowing a conch-shell, etc.), but it could also refer to the *apabhraṃśa* song taught immediately below.

**O supplicants! Bow to [the Lord] beyond [this] existence!
Beseech [him] with [your] entire body! [O, you who are]
adorned with the magical display of union in embrace.
Hūṃ! Hūṃ! Hūṃ!**

2.3.168

• **O supplicants etc.** To facilitate my understanding of this verse, I give a tentative *chāyā* for the first part: *he nāthitāḥ! aṅgopāṅgena bhāvavivarjitaṃ [prabhuṃ] praṇamata*. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s interpretation, though nothing short of

²¹³Cf. *Pañjikā* 31^v : *śeṣādi sarvavastūnām iti- vīracakropabhuktaṃ pītaśeṣam iti yāvat. bāhya maṇḍala yojayed iti- maṇḍalabāhye catuṣpathādāv ucchiṣṭabalim āharet*. Also cf. *Gaṇacakravādhī* of Ḍombīheruka 45^r : *de nas lhag dang phud bsres te/ ’byung po kun la gtor ma ni/ rnal ’byor phun sum tshogs pas btang/*. Also cf. *Kālacakraṅgavidhī* 32^v -33^r where the leftovers are first offered with a mantra and then hidden in a pit.

²¹⁴*Mitapadā* 47^r : *śeṣādi sarvavastūnīti- samayījanopabhuktaśeṣāṇi khādyabhojyāni vastūni, bāhyamaṇḍala kalpayed iti- maṇḍalabahiṣṭhitebhya upāsakopāsikādibhyaḥ kalpayet*.

an exegetical *tour de force* and largely followed by Abhayākaragupta, seems to me rather far-fetched:

[Now, for the words] **bhāvavivajjia**. One should construe thus: existence (*bhāva*) means coming into existence. Bow [Pl.] to him who is free of that [coming into existence]. The intended meaning is that coming into existence does not [take place] from the viewpoint of ultimate truth, only from the viewpoint of conventional truth. After having described [the Lord] through [the accomplishment] of his own welfare [he] describes [the same] through [his accomplishment] of others' welfare beginning with **ṇāhia**. [The word **ṇāhia** is equivalent to Sanskrit] *nāthita*, and means 'requested'. [The first **aṅga** is to be understood as a collective singular] meaning sentient beings, [so called] because they *aṅg*, that is to say go from rebirth to rebirth by the power of [their] action[s].²¹⁵ [The second **aṅga**, however,] means coming into existence, [the meaning being justified by the analysis] 'by this the welfare of sentient beings is reached' (*aṅgyate*). Hence **ṇāhia aṅgam uaṅgu** is [he] by whom coming into existence for the benefit of sentient beings is wished.

Nibandha
ll. 1-7

It is to be noticed that Bhavabhaṭṭa, although reading *pāda* b thus, does not explain the role of the syllable *-m u-*. Durjayacandra interprets the entire verse as a call to bow to Yogāmbara, who is embraced by the body of his consort.²¹⁶

[They] should also ring the vajra-bell [and sing] auspicious songs according to their will.

2.3.169ab

• **according to their will** I.e. other songs, in addition to the one taught above. Alternatively, for as long as they wish.²¹⁷

XXI. Dedication of merits

[The yogin] should [cup his hands in the] vajrāñjali[-

2.3.169cdef

²¹⁵The root is a variant of *Dhātupāṭha* 1.155 *agi* [etc.] *gatyarthāḥ*.

²¹⁶*Mitapadā* 47^v : *praṇamata bhāvavivarjitanāyikāṅgasvāṅgāya* (?) *dvandvālīṅgayogamāyāvibhūṣitāya Yogāmbarāya*. We should probably emend to °*aṅgapariṣvanṅāya* or something similar.

²¹⁷Cf. *Mitapadā* 47^v : *mānam āha- svecchetyādi. yāvad icchati tāvad gāyati*. The singular most likely refers to the overseer of the rite.

gesture] and place [them] on his heart. [With this gesture] he should dedicate [the accrued merit] for [the sake] of each and every sentient being.

• **dedicate etc.** Other authorities single out the sponsor of the rite and his ancestors. Cf. *Kālacakraḡavidhi* 33^r (dedication only for the *yon gyi bdag po*), *Ḡaṇacakravīdhi* of Kṛṣṇācārya [A 284^v -285^r, B 247^v] (prayers separately dedicated to the *yon bdag* and food given to *piśācas* in var. A and the departed of his household in var. B).

[He should recite:] «May all beings become happy! May all beings [become] free from pain. May [all beings] proceed by the path [through] which they will acquire Buddhahood. 2.3.170

I shall free [all those who] are bound [in transmigration], I shall liberate [all those who] are not liberated. In the present I shall [show them] compassion and act [according to this] teaching of yoga.» 2.3.171

• **In the present etc.** A translation of a parallel (Vajraghaṇṭa’s manual given to the text) suggests the interpretation: “[as] for the present, may [all beings/I] abide by the pledges [prescribed] in the yoga teaching.” Also cf. the rendering from Kṛṣṇācārya’s work *ibid*. Also cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* 296^v for the ameliorated reading of the *Samputa: yogaśāstrakriyāmayam*.

XXII. Dismissing the deities

At the end of the rites the deities are dismissed. This section consists of two sub-sections: the dismissal of the *maṇḡala*-deities (i.e. the *yoginīs*) in vv. 172-174, and the dismissal of the outer deities in vv. 175-176. The latter are dismissed by sending them to their ‘outer’ abode, while the first group is reabsorbed in the *yogin*’s body from which they were emitted. Acc. to Bhavabhaṭṭa the first dismissal is further divided into dismissing the *jñānasattvas* (172-173) and dismissing the *samayasattvas* (174).

He should clench two vajra-fists and place the left [fist] on his heart. [Then] he should stretch out his right hand place it on the ground [thus] dismissing [the yoginīs]. 2.3.172

[He should recite:] «Om, abide in [my] body hūṃ svāhā.» 2.3.173

Then he should [visualize that the deities] are absorbed [back] into his body through his breath. [Then] he should worship himself visualizing [the deities as abiding in his own body] in an instant. 2.3.174

• **in an instant** See 12cd here. Acc. to Kalyāṇavarman it is only Jñāna-ḍākinī who is visualized at this point. A possible implication (as the *Pañjikā* 32^r suggests) is that the *yogin* should maintain the awareness of being the deity in his day to day activities.

[Then he should recite:] «Om, take, take all wretched [impediments and] go! Hūṃ phaṭ.» 2.3.175

[Whilst reciting this mantra] he should snap his fingers thrice [thus] dismissing the outer deities. 2.3.176

XXIII. Sub-chapter colophon

[Here] ends the third [sub-]chapter of the parapīṭha which takes up such topics. 2.3.177

5.8 Synopsis of 2.4

The last sub-chapter of the *parapīṭha* is very rich in content, but it is at the same time one of the most obscure. This is so not only for the present editor, but also for the three commentators: it is here that they truly battle it out with the text, giving divergent and sometimes necessarily fanciful interpretations, especially concerning the first thirty-five verses.

The sub-chapter opens with Vajrapāṇi's questions entreating the Lord to teach in greater detail the nature and use of the five nectars (*pañcāmṛta*) and the five hooks (*pañcāṅkuśa*), that is to say the five bodily fluids and the five meats employed in several rituals throughout the text (1bc). Another question refers to the polyvalent terms *ali* and *kāli* (1d). The last question seeks to find out about the secret language and sign-language of initiates (2c). Beyond answering these questions (3-14, 29-35, 15-28, 102-153 respectively) the sub-chapter also teaches several details about offering *bali* (36-45), the rites to individually propitiate four of the *yoginīs* previously taught (46-100), and an *apabhraṃśa* song which acts as a password for joining the *gaṇacakra* (101).

Vv. 3-14 answer the question about the five nectars. The Lord first teaches what the text calls *vajra*-water (*vajrāmbu*). The commentators concur that this is – despite the expectation that it should refer to urine – the chief of nectars, semen. It is taught that semen embodies all five elements (fire, wind, water, earth, and ether) and the five gods, that is to say the five Tathāgatas.²¹⁸ The highly obscure verses 6-8 teach the syllables that embody the Tathāgatas and which are presumably to be visualized upon semen in a first round of mantra-empowerment: SUṂ, KṢUṂ, YUṂ, HUṂ, and HŪṂ. In Bhavabhaṭṭa's explanation this holds good for the other four nectars as well. Furthermore, in a second round of empowerment the *yogin* visualizes atop these seed-syllables a moon-disk with the letter A. He is instructed to do away with his delusion (*moha*) regarding these substances, in other words he should not regard them in terms of 'pure-impure'.²¹⁹ The process

²¹⁸Except for Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* f. 48^r), who quotes a verse from the **Catuṣpīṭhavyākhyātantra* (without naming its source) substantiating in his view that the words 'five gods' refer to the seed-syllables of the four goddesses Tārā, Pāṇḍaravāsīnī, Buddha[locanā], and Māmakī that are to be visualized on the five nectars. He does not explain the discrepancy in the numbers.

²¹⁹To strengthen this point Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* f. 34^r) quotes from the *Māyājāla* which rhetorically asks how one could speak of these substances as impure if they are born

of empowering with *mantras* and thus purifying the nectars is likened to the process of cooking, except that here the fire is represented by knowledge. In a third round of purification the *yogin* should complete the visualization by keeping all the previous elements and adding a sun-disk with what the text calls the *ciccākṣara*, taken by the commentators to mean the syllable KṢUṢ. The *yogin* is reminded yet again not to view the nectars in a deluded fashion. The passage ends with three verses already taught as 2.3.128cd-130, q.v.

Oddly enough the passage never makes it absolutely clear what exactly the five nectars are. Presumably the commentators are right to identify *vajrāmbu* as semen. Two more substances are given in 9d: *viṭ* and *drava*, i.e. faeces and urine.²²⁰ According to Bhavabhaṭṭa (ad 2.4.22) the remaining two are menstrual blood²²¹ and phlegm.²²² The last element is at odds with what might be called the usual list, which has – somewhat confusingly – flesh as the fifth nectar.²²³ Bhavabhaṭṭa’s list is very likely to be older and more

from the elements [scil. just like everything else]. The half-verse (*mahābhūtodbhavatvāc cakatham tv aśucir ucyate*) cannot be traced in the Tibetan translation of the *Māyājāla*. However, there are similar passages at the end of the ninth chapter of that text justifying the use of antinomian substances, a passage which was deemed so important as to be incorporated as the last sub-chapter, 10.4, of the *Saṃpūṭa*. Leading up to this quotation are two other verses most likely already considered dictums by Kalyāṇavarman’s time. The first, beginning with *eko bhāvaḥ sarvasvabhāvaḥ*, is already present in Haribhadra’s *Abhisamayālaṅkārikā* (p. 909); it is quoted later (with the lines reversed) in the *Amṛta-kaṇikoddyotanibandha* (p. 212) and other works. Śaiva authorities claim this verse as their own, as it is quoted as by Śrīśambhubhaṭṭāraka in Yogarāja’s *Vivṛti* to Abhinavagupta’s *Paramārthasāra*, and Abhinavagupta himself incorporates the first half as 1.641ab of his *Mālinīśloka-vārttika*. The verse or a half thereof is quoted in later works as well, such as the *Spandapradīpikā* of Bhāgavatotpala (p. 48). The second quotation (*nāsti kiṃcin na kartavyaṃ praññopāyena cetasā*) turns up several times and in several redactions in Tantric Buddhist sources (cf. *Tattvasiddhi*, *Hevajra* II.iii.47, *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 15.16). The *locus classicus* is, or was seen to be, the *Guhyendutilaka* (cf. 76b of the **Mantranayāloka* by one Mtho btsun mtso yags, a work highly critical of antinomian practices).

²²⁰The *pāda* also has *ucchiṣṭa*, but this is presumably not part of the nectars, unless we are dealing with a very unusual list.

²²¹The *Nibandha* seeks to identify *puṣpam* in 22d with menstrual blood, which is of course entirely justifiable.

²²²Bhavabhaṭṭa specifies ‘tradition’ (*upadeśataḥ*) as his source.

²²³Cf. ENGLISH 2002:491-492 based on a draft edition by Sanderson of a corrupt passage in the *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* and SANDERSON 2009:142, n. 331 & 217, n. 493. It is noteworthy that early sources such as the *Guhyasamāja* and its satellites do not seem to have a crystallized list of the five nectars. This may also point to a relatively early date of the *Catuspīṭhatantra*.

original, as it reproduces the list we may gather from Śaiva sources.²²⁴

Vv. 15-28 answer the question about *ali* and *kāli*. Bhavabhaṭṭa is quick to point out the difference in terminology: whereas elsewhere, such as the Hevajra system, the terms are *āli* and *kāli*, here the a- in the first is short. Moreover, *ali* stands for the masculine *upāya* and *kāli* for the feminine *prajñā*. The text provides several referents and several synonyms for the terms. Thus *ali* can refer to the ‘means’ (that is to say the *yogin*), to *bodhicitta* (i.e. semen), and the thunderbolt (*vajra*). Its synonyms include ‘the bee’ (*bhramara*),²²⁵ Vajrabhairava,²²⁶ *dharmadhātu*, etc. Up to v. 19 the text focuses on *ali* in its aspect as semen: describing its origin, and raising the seed-syllables used to empower it (HŪṂ and A).

The term *kāli* is described as the polar opposite of *ali*: it stands for ‘wisdom’ (that is to say the *yogin*’s consort²²⁷), menstrual blood, and the vulva/clitoris. Its synonyms include ‘the mother’, ‘the flower’ (*puṣpam*), the female Tathāgata (*tathāgatī*), and ‘the sea containing the water of gnosis’ (*jñānāmbusamudrah*). V. 23 raises the syllables KṢUṂ and A, which are used to empower *kāli* in its aspect as menstrual blood.²²⁸ The last two verses of this highly obscure passage describe the benefits obtained by those who employ the nectars with this gnostic knowledge.

Vv. 29-35 deal with the *aṅkuśas*, that is to say the five meats. The term is again a more singular one,²²⁹ since the usual denomination is *pradīpa*,

²²⁴Cf. SANDERSON 2005a:110 ff., n. 63.

²²⁵The tantra most likely had this term as a synonym to point out that the a- in *ali* is short. This shows that the authors were aware of the fact that they are creating an idiosyncrasy. Bhavabhaṭṭa does not seem to realize this and analyzes the term as *bhramam hārayaty aneneti*.

²²⁶The *nirukti* given by Bhavabhaṭṭa is: *bahavo ramante ’neneti vajram. bhairavo bhayado bālānām advayapratīhetutvāt*. This makes it clear that the commentator read *vajra* as *bajra* in the Eastern fashion, otherwise the etymology does not make sense.

²²⁷Bhavabhaṭṭa etymologizes the term as follows: *kaṃ sukham āleḍhi samāsvādaty asyām iti kāliḥ*.

²²⁸Bhavabhaṭṭa’s explanation here seems to be confused, since above he claimed that all nectars are to be empowered by all the syllables. The syllable A is here raised not phonetically but according to its shape. The text describes it as the union of a ḍA and a *danda*.

²²⁹Outside Catuspīṭha texts I am aware of only the *Samvarodaya* (1.9b) and the *Jñānodayatantra* (p. 13) and the *Gaṇacakravādhī* attr. to Ratnākaraśānti that use this terminology. Both scriptures may be suspected to have borrowed their term from the *Catuspīṭhatantra*.

‘lamps’.²³⁰ The contents are described much more clearly in this passage. The five types of meat are elephant (*mahāmati/vighnāṅkuśa*), cow (*vākya/vajrāṅkuśa*), dog (*sajātī/sthānādhipati*), horse (*cchṛṣṭavīraka/hayāṅkuśa*), and human flesh (*mahāṅkuśa*). The empowering seed-syllables are HŪṂ, SRIM GHRIM, JRIM, and HŪṂ respectively. The terms, especially the first set given in brackets for the first four, are unparalleled. Almost every verse in this passage commands the *yogin* to do away with his dualistic conceptions regarding the substances. Thus he should ‘eat them with a mind [pure as a] crystal’, ‘split asunder delusion’, ‘leave dichotomous thoughts far behind’, etc.

Vv. 36-45 teach several miscellaneous details about the *bali* offering. The most important elements of this rite have already been taught in the previous sub-chapter. The *bali* should be given on the eighth and fourteenth lunar days as well as at the time of full moon. The Lord promises both supernatural accomplishment and liberation to those who offer *bali* conjoined with the above-said substances. The accomplishments also include gaining entry into the royal court (*rājakulapraveśa*) and thereby securing wealth, prosperity, and immovable property. After death the *yogin* goes to the Sukhāvātī heaven. If the substances are empowered by their corresponding seed-syllables which the *yogin* should also recite one lakh times, he will become able to delude the entire world; if he mixes the ten substances with saffron and ornaments his forehead with that, he will become loved by all; etc.

Vv. 46-100 start with a new question by Vajrapāṇi asking for the *sādhanas* of four *yoginīs*, a collective term which here refers to the four outermost goddesses of the *maṇḍala*: Dīpinī, Dākinī, Cūṣiṇī, and Kāambojī. Before they were worshipped collectively, but here they are propitiated to appear in flesh and blood in order to become the *dūtīs* (i.e. both sexual partner and servant) of the *yogin*. The most surprising feature of these *sādhanas* is that if the *yoginīs* refuse to materialize, the *yogin* can kill them.

Dīpinī (vv. 48-59) should be evoked at the foot of a solitary tree. Her mantra (OM DĪPEŚVARĪ HŪṂ SRIM PHEṂ) is recited one lakh times, and her shape measuring twelve digits is drawn on a cloth measuring one cubit. The painted image is worshipped with red flowers and red coloured powders, with

²³⁰Bhavabhaṭṭa gives the etymology *atyartham siddhiṃ kuṣṇantīty* (em., *kuśnantīty* K, *kuśantīty* M S) *aṅkuśāḥ*, ‘they are called *aṅkuśas* for they extract excessive accomplishments’.

the fumes of burning dried meat, with *bali* including fish, meat, and garlic, and with the five substances (most likely the *amṛtas*). Her manifestation is preceded by the following omens: first a sound is heard, second there is a smell of meat, then the tree trembles. The *yogin* then displays the pledge-*mudrā* (hands joined in reverence and placed on the head), recites her mantra, and offers her pledge-water mixed with the five nectars. He then grabs her with his left hand and says ‘I have mastered you as my *yoginī*!’ (*siddhāsi mama yoginyā*). He should then copulate with her for no longer than one watch (*yāma*). She will bring him food, drink, and gold. If the above rite is not successful, the *yogin* is enjoined to customize the spell with the seed-syllable of Ghorī (KṢUM).²³¹ If she still refuses to obey, her head will split (*Dīpinī mūrdhni sphālayet*).

The rite given for Ḍākinī (vv. 60-71) is quite similar except that here the place of propitiation is a charnel ground,²³² the cloth measures two cubits, and it is smeared with blood. The omens this time are: the ground shakes, laughter is heard. After these Ḍākinī appears and seeks the *yogin*’s command. She will become his servant (*cetī*), able to kill or inflict pain on the *yogin*’s enemies. Ḍākinī’s mantra (OM ḌĀKINĪ HŪM AIṢ PHUḤ or OM CAṆḌĀLĪ HŪM GHRŪM PHUḤ²³³) is customized with the seed-syllable of Vajrī (i.e. SUṢ) should she refuse to show herself.

Cūṣiṇī (vv. 72-82) is drawn on a goat hide. The painted image is worshipped at a crossroads, spread on a surface smeared with cow dung and adorned with flowers. As before she is offered *bali* with blood, meat, fish, and garlic. Her appearance is preceded by the following omens: the *yogin* first hears dogs howling, then a loud roar of laughter. Cūṣiṇī appears weapon in hand asking for the *yogin*’s command. She also provides the *yogin* with half a *pala* of gold each day.²³⁴ Should she fail to comply her mantra (OM CŪṢIṆY

²³¹According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this means placing KṢUM at the beginning and at the end of the mantra given above. Ghorī is thus in some way a superior of the door-guardian goddess. The reason why Ghorī is chosen for this role is quite simple: she is the northern chief attendant of Jñānaḍākinī, whereas Dīpinī is the guardian of the northern door. The same holds good for the other goddesses as well, except Kāambojī who is apparently placed under the authority of Jñānaḍākinī herself.

²³²The actual term is *prthivībhājanam*, which Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses as a pyre in the charnel ground.

²³³Bhavabhaṭṭa allows both mantras, although most mss. of the *mūla* seem to know only of the second.

²³⁴This is probably not a very great amount. The Tibetan translation probably exaggerates when giving the equivalent ‘half a *strang*’.

ĀKARṢAYA HŪṢ PHAṬ) is customized by the seed-syllable of Vettālī (i.e. YUṢ). If she fails to answer her head will split (*Cūṣiṇī mūrdhni sphāṭayet*).

Lastly, Kāmbojī's (vv. 83-98) image drawn on a cow hide is venerated on the banks of a river. She is offered worship and *bali* (called both *ohāra* and *adaitya*, see above ch. 2.3), and her mantra (OṢ KRIM KRUM PHRUM HŪṢ PHAṬ) is recited one lakh times. She appears and offers her services after the following omens: the water begins to tremble, dense rain falls, and thunder strikes. It is taught that she is able to take the *yogin* on the peaks of the Kailāsa mountain for various enjoyments, or to bring him a princess, gold, silver, copper, garments, food, and drink. Should she fail to appear the *yogin* ought to visualize himself as Jñānaḍākinī, and repeatedly trample the painted cloth with his left foot whilst reciting her mantra five hundred times. If this method too fails he should take the cloth to a gathering of *yoginīs* and *vīras*,²³⁵ and rip it to parts whilst reciting the mantra JRIM PHAṬ. He (or they) should then eat the pieces while meditating on the syllable HŪṢ. Kāmbojī will die (98c: *mriyate sādhyayoginyah*).

Alternatively he may offer the pieces of any of the painted cloths into fire. The rite is described by vv. 99-100. The fire is made with *bhallāta* and *kālavṛkṣa* wood; he should feed the fire with mustard seed oil mixed with blood. Visualizing HŪṢ into the middle of the fire he should offer 108 oblations. The unresponsive *ḍākinīs* will die screaming painfully (100cd: *mriyante sādhyāḍākinīya ārtasvarabhi kranditam*).

V. 101 is a rather important verse in *Apabhraṃśa* and was faithfully lifted over as *Samputa* 9.4.16. The structural connection to the previous *yoginīsādhanas* is not immediately clear. The reason for placing this verse here might have been the injunction to take the painted cloth of Kāmbojī 'amidst heroes'. Logically, then, the *yogin* ought to know how to proceed about joining such a gathering. The text does not speak of the role this verse fulfills, but Bhavabhaṭṭa's comments²³⁶ as well as *gaṇacakra* manuals²³⁷ make it clear that

²³⁵The *mūla* has **vīramadhye tu m-ānayet**, which Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses both as *yoginī-cakramadhye* and *vīramadhye*. Presumably a *gaṇacakra* is meant here.

²³⁶He introduces the verse with: *idānīm gaṇamaṇḍalapraveśakāle dvārapālaprārthanā-gāthām āha- sohai ityādi*.

²³⁷E.g. Indrabhūti's *Gaṇavidhi* (196a): *dam tshig brda sogs brtag pa'i phyir/ khro bo'i rgyan sngon las mkhas gnyis/ rig pa'i sngags brjod tho ba 'dzin/ bsrung ba'i don phyir sgo 'gram gnyis/ [. . .]*. The translation is in my view corrupt. A tentative translation would be: "In order to inspect the [keeping of] vows, [knowledge of] secret signs, and the rest, [the

the verse is in actual fact a ‘password’, intoned to gain entry to a gathering of initiates.²³⁸ Because of its importance I give here the verse:

sohai nīla kodhu tuhu samayaceddhu
pāṇihi dharai daṇḍa māṇikkehi baddhu|
pecchavi vīra mellu saṃsāra uttāra
jāmi duvāra mella mahum joini majju||²³⁹

2.4.101

presiding officiant should appoint] two attendants wearing dark [clothes and] wrathful ornaments [i.e. bone ornaments] to stand guard on the two sides of the doorway. [*the song follows*]” • Kṛṣṇācārya’s *Gaṇapūjākrama* (first translation, Tōh. 1258, 283a; revised translation, Tōh. 2492, 245b): *de nas rnal ’byor pa pho mo ’du bar ’os pa kun bsogs pa/ de dag gis dang por gsol ba gdab ste/ [. . .] zhes gsol ba gdab nas/ nang du bkug ste/* “Then he [i.e. the sponsor of the rite] should assemble all those *yogins* and *yoginīs* who are fit to gather [in the *gaṇacakra*]. They [i.e. the invited *yogins* and *yoginīs*] should first entreat [the guardian] thus: [*the song follows*]. After this they should be shown inside.” • Sa skya paṇḍita’s *Tshogs ’khor cho ga* (p. 256): *bzhi pa dbyug sngon can gyi nga rgyal ’dzin pa’i rdo rje slob mas las thams cad pa’i bum pa dang ldan pa sgo drung du bzhag la brda dang brda’i lan byas te mi ’phrod pa rnams phyir bskrad/ ’phrod pa rnams nang du ’jug pa’i don du ’di ltar gsol ba gdab ste/ [. . .]* “[As for] the fourth [topic at hand:] [a] *vajra*-disciple maintaining the pride of being [the deity] Nīladaṇḍa and holding the *sārvakarmika* vase should be placed in front of the door [to the chamber where the assembly is held]. He should see to the [matter of the] secret signs and their [proper corresponding] answers and chase away those that are unfit [because they are ignorant of the secret signs or know them incorrectly]. As for those who are fit [to enter], they should entreat him thus in order to gain entry: [*the above song follows*].” • the *Gaṇacakra* *vidhi* of the Ngor ms. (265^v) also prefixes the song (which is copied here in a rather garbled manner) with the note: *tatrāyaṃ praveśamantraḥ*.

²³⁸It is this verse that DAVIDSON (2002:319) translated as one to be recited not by the initiate seeking entry, but by the doorkeepers. Beyond this surprising misinterpretation his rendering of a substantial passage from Indrabhūti’s manual (the *Gaṇavidhi* quoted above survives only in Tibetan, Tōh. 1672) is bristling with serious mistakes.

²³⁹The variants and lemmata from the other commentaries are as follows: sohai] β δ A B C^{p.c.} D E, sohia κ, sohi C^{a.c.} • nīla] κ A B C, ṇa δ, ṇīla D E • kodhu] β, koddhu κ δ A B, krodhu C, kehu D E • tuhu] B C D E, tuhum A • samaya °] B C D E, samaa δ, samayahim A • °ceddhu] β, ciṭṭha δ, °viddhu A, °viddu B, hi ciṭṭhu C, hi cciṭhu D E • pāṇihi] β A B, pāṇehim β^{rep}, pāṇahi C D E • dharai] β B C D E, varai A • daṇḍa] β A C, daṇḍu B, duṇḍu D E • māṇikkehi] β, māṇukyaṃ hi A, mānikkahi B C, ṇikabu D E • baddhu] β, baṃddhu A, baddhuḥ B D, badhuḥ C, baddhaḥ E • pecchavi] β B, pekkha δ, yeccha A, pekhui C, yecchai D E • mellu] β B, melu δ C D, mellu mahu A, mella E • saṃsāra] B C, saṃsāru A, sasārū D, sasāru E • uttāra] β, uttāru A C, uttāruḥ B, utāra D E • jāmi] β, yāmi δ, jāvi A^{p.c.}, jāṇa A^{a.c.}, jāi B C, jāi D E • duvāra] B C D E, duvvāru A • mella] β C D E, omitted in A, mellu B • mahum] β, mahu A C D, mama B, mahu mahu E • majju] A, majjuḥ B, majhu((ḥ)) C, majjaḥ D E

Bhavabhaṭṭa's *chāyā* may be reconstructed as:

*śobhate nīla krodha tava samayaceṣṭā
pāṇau dhārayasi daṇḍaṃ maṇibhir baddham/
prekṣye vīra tyaja saṃsārottāraṃ
yāmi dvāraṃ tyaja māṇ yoginīmadhyam//*

Whereas his interpretation, which is by no means unproblematic, is:

“Ferocious one, [holding] a dark [staff]/Nīla[daṇḍa]!
Your conduct [according to the] vows is splendid
as you hold in your hand a staff set with jewels.
Hero! Open the gateway! I see the hub of *yoginīs*.
Let me in! I am to go in to deliver the world.”

Kalyāṇavarman – as far as the only surviving manuscripts allows us to determine – did not have anything to add about the song except acknowledging its presence in the text with a short *pratīka* (*Pañjikā* 37^v : ***sohia nīla koddhu iti gāthāntaṃ yāvat***). Surprisingly, Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* f. 52^v) maintains that this verse is sung by the *yoginīs* once they have been summoned and interprets it accordingly. I find no straightforward explanation for this. The exegete presumably had in mind the *Hevajra* (II.v.19 ff.) and other *yoginītantras* where the goddesses incite the main deity with *apabhraṃśa* songs. If this is true, then the usage of the song either fell out of fashion by Durjayacandra's time and/or environment,²⁴⁰ or – perhaps less likely – he was simply ignorant of its role in the Catuspīṭha system.

The last large unit in this sub-chapter (vv. 102-153) deals with the secret signs and codewords employed by initiates. These are normally known as *chommā*, but the Catuspīṭha does not use this term.²⁴¹ For codewords the term is *vākyamudrā* or *mudrāvākya*, for signs the denomination is either *cihnamudrā* or *cittamudrā* or *saṃketa*. Of the latter the Lord teaches (103cd) that *yogins* should form them with the right hand, and *yoginīs* with their left.

²⁴⁰In fact, except Indrabhūti's and Kṛṣṇācārya's manuals, none of the other *gaṇa-cakravādhis* preserved in the Bstan 'gyur mention this song.

²⁴¹For a very lucid presentation and classification of gestures and codewords in Tantric Buddhist sources see SUGIKI 2005.

As far as editorial choices go, placing the section on secret signs after the ‘password song’ (v. 101) is a logical choice, since *gaṇacakra* manuals quite clearly state that these signs are to be used in the gathering.²⁴² Some scriptures and authors even maintain that it amounts to breaking one’s vows and an offense to the *yoginīs* not to do so.²⁴³

Most signs are given in sets of three: first the displayed gesture is described, then its meaning, and finally its corresponding codeword. E.g. when one touches the region between the eyebrows means ‘I desire you, dear’ if the word *agnidāha* is uttered. The presumable reason for combining a gesture and a codeword was to exclude the possibility of revealing oneself to non-initiates if they accidentally or unknowingly displayed one of the gestures, which are not uncommon movements.

The first four sets of signs and codewords (104-111) are said to be the signs (*cihnikā*) of the four *yoginīs* previously mentioned, but their role is not stated clearly. Two of the gestures correspond to the pledge *mudrās* given above and in 2.3, but two do not. The sets between vv. 112 and 137 relate to everyday situations: asking for the other’s well-being, a sign to continue displaying the secret gestures,²⁴⁴ confessing attraction, invitation to worship and *balī*, invitation to one’s house, asking for food, etc. With 137-152 the list seems to continue much in the same vein, but some of the explanations of

²⁴²E.g. Abhayākara Gupta’s *Gaṇacakravidhi* (244a): *nang gi bdag nyid sbyin sreg gis/ rang ’dod lha ni tshim par bya/ glu sogs kyis ni mnyes bya zhing/ yang dang yang du brda tshig smra/* “They [i.e. the participants] should gratify their chosen deities with inner *homa*. They should gladden them with songs etc., and they should always talk with [employing the secret] codewords.”

²⁴³*Hevajra* II.iii.65-67: *yo ’bhiṣikto ’tra hevajre na vadet samdhyābhāṣayā/ samayavidrohanam tasya jāyate nātra samśayah/ ity*(em., ity Snellgrove ed.) *upadravacauraiś ca graha-jvaraviśādibhiḥ/ mṛyate ’sau yadi buddho ’pi samdhyābhāṣān na bhāṣayet/ svasamayavidāṃ prāpya yadi na bhāṣed idam vacaḥ/ tadā kṣobham prakurvanti yogīnyas catuḥpīṭhajāḥ/*; Sa skya paṇḍita’s *Tshogs ’khor cho ga* (p. 264): [. . .] *brda’i skad kyis ma smras na ye shes kyi mkha’ ’gro ma rnams kyi byin gyis mi rlob/ las kyi mkha’ ’gro ma rnams kyi bar chad ’byung ste/ [. . .]* “If they [i.e. the initiates] do not speak using the codewords, they will not obtain the blessings of the *jñānaḍākinīs* and will face obstacles at the hands of the *karmaḍākinīs* [. . .]” & (p. 264-265): *brda mi shes par tshogs kyi ’khor lo byed pa dang/ yul nyi shu rtsa bzhir ’gro ba la bar chad ’byung la/ brda shes pa rnams la dngos grub myur du ’byung bar rgyud las gsungs so/* “If one does not know the codewords, he will face obstacles in organizing a *gaṇacakra* or visiting the twenty-four sacred places. On the other hand those who do know the codewords will obtain accomplishments quickly. This is what the tantra states.”

²⁴⁴Up to here all signs are lifted over into the *Samputa*, 4.1.8-12 and 7.1.9-19.

what the signs mean are frequently missing. It is very likely that the text is corrupt here. The last two units remaining are closers: the first sums up the passage, the second is the customary sub-chapter colophon.

5.9 Synopsis of 3.1

Sub-chapter 3.1 can be divided into four clearly distinct passages after Vajrapāṇi's question (v. 1) and a generic answer (vv. 2-3). The text itself refers to the fact that the topic described is the four *tattvas*, which in the present case are the 'realities' of the *vajra* (vv. 4-21), the *ghaṇṭā* (vv. 22-41 with some passages that also apply to the *vajra*), the *akṣasūtra* (vv. 42-64), and *jñāna* (vv. 65-77). The first three are well-known ritual implements – i.e. the *vajra*-sceptre, the bell, and the rosary – and hence their 'reality' is in essence nothing but a *viśuddhi* – attributing Buddhist concepts to items of ritual. However, the bundling together of the fourth with them is unusual. In actual fact here 'knowledge' does not refer to gnosis, or any kind of knowledge that the practitioner should acquire, but rather the extent of knowledge allocated to different categories of beings.

The sub-chapter was quite influential as vv. 1-64 are reproduced almost word-for-word in the *Samputa* (sub-chapters 8.1 & 8.2), vv. 4-15 and 24-29 are lifted over into the *Vajradāka* (ch. 31), the section on the rosary is referred to and/or quoted by both Bhavyakīrtis (i.e. the author of the **Vīramanoramā* and the author of the **Sandhyāprakāśikā*), the installed deities, the *apabhraṃśa* song and the *mantra* given for the *vajra*-sceptre and the bell are used by a wide variety of sources, including the influential twelfth-century initiation manuals of Abhayākaragupta (*Vajrāvalī* ch. 50) and Jagaddarpaṇa (*Kriyāsamuccaya* Ms B p. 457 ff.), and incidental passages are referred to by other authors (these are indicated below). The *Nibandha* of Bhavabhaṭṭa is yet again traceable as a significant source of inspiration for the *Āmnāyamañjarī* ad parallel passages in the *Samputa* (e.g. T_D 268^v-269^r, 271^r-272^v).

After having declared that the [knowledge of the] four *tattvas* delivers men from transmigration, the *bhagavān* proceeds to describe the deities to be installed on a five-pronged *vajra* (vv. 4-13). On the prongs on one side the *yogin* should place Vairocana (middle), Akṣobhya (E), Ratna[sambhava] (S), Amitābha (W), and Amoghasiddhi (N). Note that the order of installation is clockwise and that Vairocana is in the central position. Under the prongs on the eight-petaled lotus he should install Padmapāṇi (= Avalokiteśvara), Maitreya, Gagana[gañja] (= Ākāśagarbha), Samantabhadra, the overlord of *yakṣas* (= Vajrapāṇi), Mañjuśrī, [Sarvanivaraṇa]viṣkambhin, and Kṣiti[garbha]. The list in effect is a standard list of the eight *bodhisattvas*; here it is said that they symbolize the eight ancillaries of enlightenment

(*sambodhyaṅga*).²⁴⁵ In the middle of the *vajra*-sceptre²⁴⁶ he should install the gnosis-deity (*jñānadeva* = Jñānaḍākinī²⁴⁷). On the eight-petaled lotus on the facing side he should install the following eight goddesses: Vajrāṅkuṣī, [Vajra]pāśī, Vajrasphoṭā, and Tāriṇī in the cardinal directions; Cundā, Ratnolkā, Bhṛkuṭī, and Vajraśṛṅkhalā in the intermediate directions; and somewhat asymmetrically – since there is no ninth *bodhisattva* on the ‘male side’ – Aparājītā on all petals of the intermediate directions. On the four prongs he should install Vajraḍākinī (E), Ghorī (N), Vettālī (W), and Caṇḍālī (S). Note that the order of installation is counter-clockwise, but also that the text does not seem to teach a goddess for the middle prong, since Jñānaḍākinī has already been used for the bulb in the middle. We should nevertheless understand that she is on the middle prong as well. The last verse of this section gives further details about the shape and ornamentation of the *vajra*-sceptre: the handle should be clearly delineated with auspiciously [ornamented] girdles, the prongs should be even in size and [come together at the end so that] the *vajra* resembles an *utpala*-bud.

Vv. 14-15 teach a similar procedure for a nine-pronged *vajra*, but here the deities are not named, except that the ‘Buddha’ is in the middle. It is further specified that the prongs excepting the middle one emerge from the mouths of *makaras*, a design often seen on *vajra*-sceptres, but here it is very likely that the specification is not to be taken as a general injunction, but only relating to the nine-pronged version. Bhavabhaṭṭa adds that the five prongs symbolize the five types of gnosis (*ādarśa*, etc.) and the nine prongs stand for the nine promulgations of the *saddharma*, but this teaching could hardly be extracted from the text itself.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁵This creates an exegetical problem, since there are only seven such ancillaries (cf. BHSD p. 403, and notes to 4.1.3 below). Bhavabhaṭṭa is constrained to interpret the word as *upāya*, whereas Abhayākaragupta in his commentary of the parallel in the *Sampuṭa* (*Āmnāyamañjarī* 269^r) states that this is a ‘trick-statement’ (*thabs kyis* and we should see the eight ancillaries as those of the path, i.e. the last of the Fourth Truths).

²⁴⁶The term used for the middle of the *vajra* is *tridaśa aṇḍānām*, which the commentators interpret as the ‘sphere of the gods’. However, it is not unlikely that we have to take the words literally as the ‘egg (i.e. place of origin) of the thirteen (i.e. the deities on the five prongs plus eight petals)’.

²⁴⁷This is probably what the text meant and Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 38^r) claims that it is Mahāvairocana, or any of his synonyms: Vajradhara, Samantabhadra, or Paramādyā. In his commentary to v. 20 he also includes the consort Vajradhātviśvarī here.

²⁴⁸The list is not given in the *Nibandha*, and somewhat oddly the same author in his **Hevajravivṛti* (246^r-246^v) enumerates twelve items under this heading. Also cf. *Vi-*

Vv. 16-21 contain a number of miscellaneous statements about the *vajra*, mainly with the aim of pointing out its manifold symbolism. Thus the *vajra* is said to be both the body (*ātma*) and consciousness (*cetanā*). The *vajra* ought to be seen as all phenomena (*dharmā*), the mind (*manah*), all ‘realities’ (*tattva*), and all rituals (*karma*). Since the *vajra* is visualized as spreading light, bringing in [deities], and making them abide, it is also a saviour of beings. The *vajra* of gnosis (probably to be interpreted as non-dual gnosis, indivisible like a *vajra*) with its light removes the darkness consisting of afflictions (*kleśa*). Targets of rituals are also said to be visualized as *vajras*. The *vajra* is the *yogin*’s body, the essence of phenomena, and liberation itself. The *vajra* in its meaning of penis is the one that is coupled with the *padma* (i.e. the vagina) and thus the practitioner is able to save sentient beings. This last statement is very likely a reference to the procedures described in 3.4.

Vv. 22-30 are concerned with the *ghaṇṭā*. The sound of the bell symbolizes wisdom (*prajñā*), which similarly pervades the entire Universe starting off from the *bodhimaṇḍa*, i.e. the platform under the *bodhi*-tree at Bodhgayā. The next verses describe the goddesses to be installed on the eight petals of a lotus that is depicted on the top part of the bell with the *vajra*-handle issuing from the calyx. The goddesses are as follows: in the cardinal directions Tārā (E), Pāṇḍarā (N), Māmakyā (= Māmakī) (W), and Buddhalocanā (S); in the intermediate directions Sauvarṇī, Madhurā, Kāntī, and Vajramālā.²⁴⁹ All eight are said to issue from their seed-syllables, but these are not taught. The calyx is occupied by Prajñāpāramitā. The handle is called the *jñānaḍaṇḍa*, and there do not seem to be any deities on it. The handle ends in a five-pronged *vajra* on which the *yogin* should install the deities ‘as before’, but it is not specified whether it is the deities of the male side or the female side that are used.

Vv. 31-36 describe how the *vajra*-sceptre and the bell should be used as a pair. Before grasping them the *yogin* should display five times the *kamalāvarta* gesture. Then he should visualize a sun and a moon in the palms of his hands respectively, grasp the *vajra* and the bell and then raise the *vajra*. Having uttered HŪṂ he should sing an *apabhraṃśa* song praising the *vajra* and a longer *mantra* for the *ghaṇṭā*. He should simultaneously realize that they are of the nature of means (*upāya*) and wisdom (*prajñā*) which are inseparable.

malaprabhā, vol. 3, p. 149; *Yamāriṃaṇḍalopāyikā* 15^v-16^r.

²⁴⁹According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these correspond to Vasudhārā, Cundā, Bhṛkuṭī, and Vajramālā respectively. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 38^r) on the other identifies them with Cundā, Ratnolkā, Bhṛkuṭī, and Vajraśṛṅkhālā respectively.

Vv. 37-38 praise the above method: this is what is meant by ‘truly’ (*tattvena*, *dharmena*) grasping the *vajra*-sceptre and the bell. It is only thus that the welfare of beings will be served. The *yogin* who does not know this ‘truth’ rings the bell as an elephant would do.²⁵⁰ He is deprived of the ‘truths’ of *yoga* and he will not attain any accomplishment. Vv. 39-41 seem to describe something called a ‘subtle’ (*sūkṣma*) or ‘secret’ (*guhya*) *vajra*. The passage is beyond my comprehension.

Vv. 42-64 describe the rosary (here called *akṣasūtra*, once *mālākṣa* in 51a).²⁵¹ The passage first discusses the different materials of which the beads of the rosary should be made in correlation with the desired effect of the rite in which it is used. Thus, crystal, mother of pearl, pearls proper or any other white material are to be used in *śāntika* rites; gold, silver, copper, lotus-seeds are proper for *pauṣṭika*; in *vaśya* rites the beads should be smeared with saffron or [any other reddish] fragrant powder; for *abhicāra* one should use *rudrākṣa*, soapberries (*kālabīja*, glossed by Bhavabhaṭṭa as *riṣṭikābīja*,

²⁵⁰This simile (38ab) is quoted in the *Pañcakramaṭīkā* of [Śrī]Lakṣmī (241^r): *Gdan bzhi'i rgyud las kyang| de nyid med pa'i rnal 'byor la| glang po'i dril bu sgra sgrogs ltar| zhes bya ba gsungs so||*

²⁵¹This passage is referred to and partially quoted by both Bhavyakīrtis as described in the introduction. Note that the two quotations seem to testify to two recensions of the same passage, and I do not find it very likely that the same author would have used both. Vv. 43-47 are partly quoted, partly rephrased in Bhavyakīrti (II)'s **Sandhyāprakāśikā* (20^r-20^v): *ji skad du Gdan bzhi las kyang| grangs la rab tu 'jug pa ni| bgrang phreng yang dag bsten par bya| (?) shel dang dung dang mu tig dang| de bzhin dkar po khams las byung| zhi ba yi ni las rnam la| shes rab can gyi gzung bar bya| (43) dngul dang gser dang zangs dag ni| rgyas pa la ni rgyal bas gsungs| (44) dbang la gur kum gla rtsi dang| bzhi mnyam rang bzhin shes par bya| (45) dgug pa la ni ru drā kṣa| (46) sdang ba la sogs glang po'i rus| (47) rtsa ba'i sngags kyi bzlas brjod la| mi rus rang bzhin yin par 'dod| (?) las rnam thams cad rab bsgrub phyir| bo dhe tse yi phreng bar 'dod| (47) ces bya ba la sogs pa 'byung ngo. Vv. 43-50ab are quoted in Bhavyakīrti (I)'s **Vīramānoramā* (31^v-32^r): *de yang Rdo rje gdan bzhi las| shel dang nya phyis mu tig dang| 'byung khungs las byung dkar po sogs| gang rung zhi ba la sogs kyi| khyad par phreng ba sogs mtshan nyid|| gser dang dngul dang zangs ma dang| khyad par du ni padma yi| phreng ba rgyas pa'i las rnam la| mkhas pa yis ni bgrang bar bya| (44) gur kum la sogs dri dang ni| khyad par du ni dri kun gyis| bcas pa'i ri lu byas pa ni| dbang gi yin par yongs su bshad| (45) ru drā kṣa dang lung thang dang| khyad par du ni mi rus phreng| mngon spyod ces bya bshad pa yi| drag po'i las la sbyar bar bya| (46) zhi rgyas dbang dang mngon spyod la| bo de tse las thams cad pa'o | gsang sngags sgrub la lnga bcu ste| dbang don gnyer la de'i phyed nyid| (47) zhi ba la ni brgya phrag gcig| rgyas la brgyad kyis lhag pa'o| mngon spyod la ni drug cu ste| las kyi khyad par rnam la sbyar| (48) ji ltar rnam par dbye ba yis| phreng ba la sogs bya ba yin| (49ab) zhes gsungs so||.**

Sapindus Detergens), or [pieces of] human bone. *Putraṃjīva* (Putranjiva roxburghii) beads can be used in all four rites.²⁵² Vv. 47cd-49ab give the number of beads correlated with the aim of the recitation: for *mantrasādhana* fifty, half that number for *vaśya*, one hundred for *śāntika*, one hundred and eight for *paṇṣṭika*, and sixty for *abhicāra*. The beads are strung on nine threads, which again symbolize eight deities with ‘the Buddha’ in the middle.²⁵³ The threads [should be spun by a girl] who is beautiful, pure, and pleasant in speech. The *yogin* who uses such a rosary will attain both supernatural accomplishments (*siddhi*) and liberation (*mukti*). The practitioner should also view the beads (*guḍikā*) of the rosary as *arhats*, and the threads (*guṇa*) as the doctrine of the Buddha (*buddhanaya*).²⁵⁴ An obscure line seems to describe the closing bead: this marks the end of a cycle on the rosary, it is usually somewhat bigger than the other beads, and it is skipped over in recitation or a different *mantra* is recited upon reaching it. It seems to be named a *stūpa*, described as a ‘witness of the dharma’ (*dharmasākṣī*), and correlated with the *dharmadhātu*. Oddly, all three commentators are silent about this passage.

Vv. 52cd-55 describe the manner in which the rosary should be held, much in the same style as the other two ritual implements described above. The *yogin* should visualize a sun[-disk] in the palm of his [right] hand, with the first vowel (i.e. A) upon it. This is said to be red. On his right palm he should visualize a moon[-disk] with a white nectar-syllable (i.e. *SUM?*). [Both] *bījas* are then imagined to emit rays of light. Then he should stretch out the fingers of his [right] hand in the shape of a five-pronged *vajra* and imitate a lotus with his left. He should then bring together the two palms with the rosary in between, and contemplate its symbolism. This action will empower the *akṣasūtra*.

Vv. 56-58 are transmitted with very different readings in the manuscripts, and 59-60 are not attested anywhere except ms. A. The topic is the correlation between the fingers that touch and roll the beads and the sought-after ritual effect. The readings of ms. A yield the best meaning, but the terminology

²⁵²This statement is quoted by Bhavabhaṭṭa in his *Cakrasamvaravivṛti*, vol. II, p. 522.

²⁵³According to Bhavabhaṭṭa these are the eight *bodhisattvas* taught for the *vajra*, whereas ‘the Buddha’ is either all Buddhas, or Vajradhara. The other two commentators are silent about this passage.

²⁵⁴It is not at all clear what the text means by this. The nine threads have already been identified with nine deities in v. 50ab. Perhaps the idea is that they symbolize the nine promulgations, cf. n. 248.

used by that witness (viz. the peculiar names for the fingers²⁵⁵) is not attested anywhere else in the *tantra* and they are most likely intrusions from the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*.

V. 61 states that the *yogin* who is not familiar with the ‘reality’ of the rosary will not succeed. V. 62 is an *apabhraṃśa* song and v. 63 a *mantra*. These are to be recited when taking hold of the rosary in order to purify it. The last line of the section promises accomplishment.

Vv. 65-69 present a kind of cosmography, described under the heading *jñānatattva*. The passage is somewhat obscure. The text seems to propose that categories of beings are different from each other on account of their *jñāna*, which Bhavabhaṭṭa immediately glosses as *karma* although the intended meaning was probably ‘consciousness’. What follows is a list (with Bhavabhaṭṭa’s explanation in brackets): *daityas*, *adaityas*, supreme *daityas* (all three simply glossed as *daityas*), *yakṣas*, *asuras* (*rākṣasas*), *siddhakas* (gods), *nāgas*, beasts, *guhya[ka]s*, *mahoraḡas*, *kiṃnaras*, humans, *pretas*, *dāk-inīs*, dwellers of hells, tiny beings (*sūkṣma*), and egg-born (*aṇḍā* = *aṇḍajāḥ*). It is rather difficult to perceive any kind of logic behind this arrangement. All these beings are said to consist of the elements water, fire, air, and earth, as are the insentient beings such as grass, mud, mountains. All is, however, also said to be pervaded by *jñāna* (here: consciousness), which the text elsewhere identifies with ether.

In v. 70 Vajrapāṇi interrupts and asks how beings are nevertheless different if everything is equally pervaded by *jñāna*. The *bhagavān*’s answer (vv. 71-74) is unfortunately extremely obscure and does not seem to answer the question adequately. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa’s long commentary to v. 72 the statements refer to the lifespan of gods, which multiplies by two with every ascending step.²⁵⁶ The next two verses are even more surprising: they state that *guhya[ka]s* (normally identified with *yakṣas*) perceive [only? / predominantly?] touch, *asuras* cognize wrath, *pretas* pain, the dwellers of hell fear and cries, beasts stupefaction, whereas humans all five.

Vv. 75-77 seem to outline a kind of spiritual career: ignorant beings (*bāla-jñāna*) starts off stupid (*jaḍa*) and dumb (*mūka*); they are then initiated (*anudīkṣita*) into yogic teachings (*yogaśāstra*); after a hundred crore incarnations they are impelled by the gnosis of the Buddha (*buddhajñāna*) and hav-

²⁵⁵These – *śvetā*, *dhūmā*, etc. – are also given in an appendix to the Bengali witness of Amitavajra’s *sādhana*, s.v.

²⁵⁶Here the *Nibandha* is largely inspired by *Abhidharmakośa* 3.79-80ab and *-bhāṣya* ad loc. cit.

ing developed faith they follow the yogic teachings after having realized that the teachings of heretics (*bāhyaśāstra*) are illusory (*naṭaraṅgasamopama*); through these they obtain [both] enjoyment (*bhukti*) and liberation (*mukti*).

Whereas all three commentators agree that in the passage just considered the text teaches *cittamātra* doctrine, the ways in which they interpret individual verses varies considerably.²⁵⁷ This is yet another telling example of the lack of exegetical consensus among the three commentators whose works survive in Sanskrit.

The sub-chapter closes with the customary colophon.

²⁵⁷ *Pañjikā* 38^v-39^r & *Mitapadā* 53^r-54^v .

5.10 Synopsis of 3.2

The second sub-chapter of the *yogapīṭha* teaches a variety of minor rites, among which drawing circles (*cakra*) with various aims is prominent. Although the text never refers to them as *yantras*, they are in effect such magical instruments.

The edition of this chapter faces the same difficulties as 2.1. Folios 34 and 35 of the Vikramaśīla ms. are missing (the commentary from v. 34 to the end is thus lost in that ms.), the folios of ms. M are damaged in an even greater percentage than the average; moreover, 82^v has not been photographed by the IASWR archivers, and folio 84 is either lost or overlooked.

The first 33 verses of the sub-chapter are reproduced almost word for word in sub-chapter 2.4 of the *Samputa* (vv. 1-36), and the *Nibandha* acted as the inspiration for many a passage in the *Āmnāyamañjarī* ad loc. cit. The first three verses on the visualization of Vairocana (vv. 71-73) have been worked into chapter 8.2 of the same text.

There is no petition from Vajrapāṇi. The Lord begins (v. 1) by stating that he will teach another type of ritual to achieve placating, prosperity/reinvigoration, subjugation, protection, and aggression.

Vv. 2-26 present the first kind of *cakras* by employing seeking protection as the paradigm. It is made clear however that the circle can be used through customization for other aims as well. The circle has a hub, eight spokes, and the felly. The mantra employed, OM TĀRE TUTTĀRE TURE SVĀHĀ, is that of Tārā, a goddess otherwise not present in the *maṇḍala* of the Catuṣpīṭha. OM and HĀ are placed in the hub bracketing the name of the target in the accusative and the imperative RAKṢA. The eight syllables that thus remain from the original mantra are placed in the spaces between the spokes. Durjayacandra suggests a different arrangement: the hub has the first two syllables of the mantra with OM and SVĀHĀ bracketing the name of the target and RAKṢA. The remaining syllables of the mantra are placed between the spokes, each accompanied by OM and SVĀHĀ, as are the vowels on the felly (*Mitapadā* 54^v -55^r).

The *yogin* then performs the preliminary meditation of ‘cleansing’ himself through equanimity and emptiness. He then starts visualizing himself as the goddess Tārā. She is seated on a lotus atop moon-disk, two-armed, with a skull-staff (against her shoulder?), displaying the gesture of offering

protection (*abhaya*) and holding the stem of an *utpala* which touches her ear, seated in the comfortable position, adorned with ornaments. The deity and the rays that she emits should be of the colour associated with the aim of rite: white for placating, etc.

The description of the goddess brackets a *nyāsa* procedure which is different from the *aṣṭāṅgakalana* the Catuspīṭha usually employs (Bhavabhaṭṭa's term is *ṣaḍaṅganyāsa*, while Durjayacandra calls the procedure *ṣaḍaṅgakalanā*). Here inflections of the root-mantra are placed on six body parts: Oṃ TĀRE SVĀHĀ on the head, Oṃ TUTTĀRE SVĀHĀ on the eyes, Oṃ TURE SVĀHĀ on the nose, Oṃ TU SVĀHĀ on the ears, Oṃ RE SVĀHĀ on the tongue, and Oṃ TĀRIṆĪ SVĀHĀ on the heart. The spell recited during the visualization is the same as the one given above (presumably including the customization according to the rite).

The last three verses of the first unit teaches the benefits that can be gained by undertaking this rite: the king's enemies (or the king and enemies) shall be kept in check, there will be protection for those embarking on a difficult journey, old age, untimely death, and poisons shall be kept at bay. Men of questionable intelligence will become wise. The *cakra* can be kept as an amulet as well.

Vv. 27-33 describe a similar *cakra*, this time the specific aim of increasing one's intelligence. The employed mantra is Oṃ PRAJÑĒ MAHĀPRAJÑĒ HŪṂ SVĀHĀ, the spell of the deified Prajñāpāramitā. As before Oṃ and HĀ are placed in the hub, while the rest of the mantra in the spaces between the spokes syllable by syllable. The vowels are placed on the felly. The entire 'circle' is white. Durjayacandra again has a slightly different arrangement: the hub contains the first two syllables of the mantra with Oṃ and SVĀHĀ at the beginning and at the end. Of the many possible customizations we are given one example: the name of the target in the genitive with PRAJÑĀVṚDDHIṂ KURU. Between the eight spokes are the remaining syllables of the main mantra and on the felly the sixteen vowels, each of both series bracketed by Oṃ and SVĀHĀ. The *cakra* has filaments like a lotus, on these eight HŪṂs are installed (*Mitapadā* 55^r).

The *yogin* then contemplates equanimity and emptiness before visualizing himself as the deity. She is white, radiating white rays, seated on a lotus atop a moon-disk, two-armed, seated in the comfortable position, adorned with ornaments. The goddess is simply referred to as 'Prajñā', but there can be little doubt that she is indeed Prajñāpāramitā. Details not given in the text

are completed by Bhavabhaṭṭa thus: she emerges from the syllable HŪṂ which first turns into a book of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, her hands display the gesture of explaining the doctrine (*vyākhyānamudrā*). From her two elbows stem two lotuses each of which holds a manuscript of the same text.

The *yogin* should maintain the visualization whilst reciting the mantra given above. The last three quarter-verses of the passage describe the benefits: one's wisdom increases like the branch of a tree, etc. Hence Bhavabhaṭṭa's name for this circle: *prajñācakra*.

Vv. 34-41 teach yet another *cakra*, but this time of a more complicated design and actually named *jñānacakra*. It consists of three concentric wheels, the first with the hub and eight spokes, the second with twelve spokes, the third with sixteen, girdled by a felly. The hub is inscribed with OṂ HŪṂ SVĀHĀ (but only HŪṂ according to Kalyāṇavarman and Durjayacandra), the first circuit contains the eight seed-syllables of the eight internal *dākinīs*, the second the vowels with the exception of the 'eunuchs' (i.e. ṛ, ṝ, ḷ, and ḻ), the third the first three groups of consonants (i.e. 'ka' to 'ṇa') plus the first of the fourth (i.e. 'ta') with the 'roar' (i.e. 'u') and the 'drop' (i.e. ṃ). The felly is inscribed with an unspecified number of PHAṬS. The first circuit is white, the second yellow, the third red, and the 'fourth' (that is to say the felly) black.

As before the *yogin* ought to contemplate equanimity and emptiness. The circle is visualized in a blaze burning up demons (*mārāḥ*). The benefit is said to be nothing less than the achievement of buddhahood. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the two penultimate verses suggest that one should visualize the *cakra* as a manifestation of Jñānaḍākinī, therefore the *yogin* should visualize himself as the chief goddess.

Vv. 42-45 teach a method for bringing into the *yogin's* power a king and/or the king's capital. He should first contemplate equanimity and see himself as emptiness. Then he ought to visualize a blazing sun-disk with the seed-syllable KRṪṂ in the middle.²⁵⁸ The rays issuing forth from this *bīja* are supposed to attract and bring under the *yogin's* will whatever he directs them upon.

²⁵⁸This is how all three commentators raise the coded *bīja*. The code-word *aṅkuśa* could otherwise refer to both 'i' and 'ī'.

Vv. 46-47 describe another method of subjugation by reciting the seed-syllable KṢUṢ (or KṢŪṢ?)²⁵⁹ one lakh times. The second verse tersely states that one should add the name of the desired woman. No sooner than thought of, the rite will successfully subjugate her.

Bhavabhaṭṭa gives another, more detailed, explanation for the rite: the mantra to be repeated in the preliminary service is OṢ KṢUṢ SVĀHĀ, which is then to be recited in a customized form (inserting the desired person's name with ME VAŚAM ĀNAYA before the SVĀHĀ) while maintaining a visualization of one's self as a red Jñānaḍākinī during the actual rite. This would very conveniently describe both verses. However, Bhavabhaṭṭa sees verse 47 as another application of the seed-syllable KRIM. The *yogin* should visualize the *bīja* into the pudenda of a woman or the heart of a man, depending on whom he wants to attract. Durjayacandra does not seem to have seen the second verse as a different rite. Besides raising the *bījas* he merely states that the place to visualize them is a woman's heart (*Mitapadā* 55^v).²⁶⁰

Vv. 48-49 teach another small rite, this time to attract material wealth. The *yogin*, as before, should contemplate emptiness. Then he should visualize a yellow seed-syllable, SOṢ, radiating bright rays from atop a moon-disk. Then he should visualize that his breath (presumably carrying the seed-syllable) attracts the wished item such as a jewel.

Bhavabhaṭṭa yet again sees two separate rites in the two verses. The aim of the first one (described according to the exegete in v. 48) is to make a woman's (sexual) fluids flow. The *yogin* imagines himself as a yellow Jñānaḍākinī, and then visualizes a radiating red SOṢ on a moon-disk under the desired woman's navel, and a KRIM on her pudenda. Durjayacandra establishes the *bīja* as SUṢ, from which not Jñānaḍākinī but Vasudhārā emerges (*Mitapadā* 55^v-56^r).

Vv. 50-54 explain another kind of meditative ritual to achieve attracting. The *yogin* visualizes a sun-disk and a seed-syllable (KRIM according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, but KṢUṢ according to Kalyāṇavarman and I according to Du-

²⁵⁹The code-word for the vowel is *nāda* which normally means long 'u', but Bhavabhaṭṭa insists that on account of an oral teaching it should be short in the present case. Kalyāṇavarman also gives the *bīja* as KṢUṢ, but for him the complete mantra is OṢ KṢUṢ SAḤ SVĀHĀ (*Pañjikā* 39^v). Similarly, Durjayacandra has OṢ KṢUṢ SA SVĀHĀ (*Mitapadā* 55^v).

²⁶⁰Prof. Sanderson kindly pointed out that *Vāmakeśvarimata* 4.34-43 is a significant parallel to this practice.

rjayacandra) surrounded by an unspecified number of wind-syllables (YUṀ or YAṀ) in the body of the target.²⁶¹ This represents the heart (*citta* or *manas*) of the target and should be visualized as red. The *yogin* then generates himself as a red Jñānaḍākinī, seated atop a moon-disk, in her full beauty. She is visualized as holding a goad, which is then made to attract the heart of the target, in her left hand. The *yogin* moves his index finger (presumably in a hook-shape) with the syllable KRṀ visualized upon it whilst reciting KṢUṀ (Bhavabhaṭṭa gives a fuller mantra: OṀ KṢUṀ [name of the target in the genitive] MANA ĀKARṢAYA SVĀHĀ). The last verse gives the numbers for the preliminary service and the rite proper (one lakh each).

Vv. 55-61 teach another *cakra*, this time specifically aimed at bringing about prosperity/reinvigoration. The *yogin* visualizes a radiating golden wheel with eight spokes and a hub. On the felly he should install the vowels, BRṀ (or BREṀ)²⁶² in the eight spaces between the spokes, and the *bīja* BRṀ in the middle. Then, as above, he contemplates emptiness before generating himself as the goddess Vasumatī (that is to say Vasudhārā). The iconographic details are not specified, but Bhavabhaṭṭa describes her as emerging from the syllable BRṀ which first turns into a grain-shoot (*dhānyamañjarī*). She is yellow, two-armed holding a grain-shoot and displaying the gesture of protection with her right and left respectively. Her crown is adorned by Vajrasattva. The *yogin* should recite the mantra OṀ BRṀ SVĀHĀ either during the visualization, or, as the more usual norm and according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, when he becomes fatigued, that is to say when he is not able to maintain the visualization vividly (*bhāvanākhinna*).

Durjayacandra's arrangement of the *bījas* again differs: PRṀ on the hub, Ṛ in the cardinal directions, and BA in the intermediate directions. It is these three seed-syllables that the *yogin* has to recite whilst maintaining a visualization of the *cakra* and himself as Vasudhārā (*Mitapadā* 56^v -57^v).

Vv. 62-68 describes the last of the 'circles'. The *yogin* contemplates emptiness, then a sun-disk, thereupon a moon-disk, and thereupon a HŪṀ. This acts as the middle of the *cakra*, whereas on the eight 'petals' (i.e. the spaces between the spokes) he should install 'the four nectars' (according to Bhava-

²⁶¹For the wind-syllables acting as 'jet-engines' to propel consciousness out of the body cf. 4.3.50 and *Nibandha* thereto.

²⁶²The code for the vowel is 'the seventh', but we are not told whether the 'eunuchs' count or not. Both options are allowed by Kalyāṇavarman as well (*Pañjikā* 39^v).

bhaṭṭa these are A, \bar{A} , $\bar{A}3$, and AṀ, but Kalyāṇavarman identifies them as A, \bar{A} , AṀ, and AḤ) in the four cardinal directions and four HŪṀs in the intermediate directions. The *cakra* is visualized in the *yogin*'s heart, from where it emits a multitude of rays which then return into their place of origin. The last verse describes the effects of the visualization: the *yogin*'s mental dullness, inferior wisdom, adhering to false views etc. will vanish in an instant.

Durjayacandra's view differs: in the middle there are either one or two HŪṀs, and the sun-disk and the moon-disk are inside the *cakra* and not the other way around. The 'nectars' are four SUṀ syllables bracketed by OṀ and SVĀHĀ. The commentary says nothing on vv. 66cd-72, and links the last topic, the visualization of Vairocana to this one (*Mitapadā* 57^v -58^r).

Vv. 69-70 teach another application of the *cakra* given above. With a composed mind and contemplating equanimity the *yogin* emits and retracts white particles of dust from his heart into the ten directions. When they return he will be able to cognize the thoughts of others. The last line states that through this procedure he will also become able to overcome transmigration.

Vv. 71-75 constitute the last topic in the sub-chapter. It teaches a visualization of Vairocana with the aim of reaching perfect enlightenment (*saṃbodhikrama*). The *yogin* first visualizes a moon-disk, upon it a lotus, and the white seed[-syllable] of gnosis, that is to say HŪṀ (however, Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses the word *jñānabīja* as either one's own mind or the *bīja* AḤ). The syllable changes into a Vairocana, two-armed, seated in the comfortable position, adorned, displaying the *mahāmudrā* (which in this system is the gesture of embracing the consort, but Kalyāṇavarman identifies it as the *bodhyagrīmudrā*). He wears white garments and radiates clouds of buddhas and intense rays of light in order to deliver all beings from transmigration. Lastly the *mantra* to be recited (OṀ AḤ SVĀHĀ) is given in code.

The sub-chapter finishes with the usual colophon.

5.11 Annotated translation of 3.3

The third sub-chapter of the *yogapīṭha* deals with several methods to induce possession and several miscellaneous rites. Inducing possession preceding initiation proper first appears in Tantric Buddhism in the *Tattvasaṃgraha* or possibly somewhat earlier. The practice was borrowed from Kaula-type Śaivism as shown by SANDERSON (2009:133ff. and notes thereto).

The role of possession is twofold, although there is some overlap. On the one hand *āveśa* is a magical feat either used for a desiderative rite,²⁶³ or displayed in order to convince potential converts of the efficacy of Tantric Buddhism in general.²⁶⁴ On the other it is a prerequisite for initiation, in a way showing the approval of the deity that the candidate is fit for being shown the *maṇḍala*.²⁶⁵ Authorities tend to agree that becoming possessed is a *sine qua non* requirement for initiation.²⁶⁶ Some texts seem to suggest that there were cases in which achieving possession could also be forced, since they describe methods to induce *āveśa* artificially, e.g. by fumigation.²⁶⁷

²⁶³For example a subject – typically a young child – is possessed in order to act as an oracle. Cf. SANDERSON 2009:136 and fn. 318.

²⁶⁴Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa ad 2c and Durjayacandra ad 1cd below.

²⁶⁵Alternatively, failure to become possessed signals that the candidate has too many sins. Cf. Agrabodhi's *Mañjuśrīmaṇḍalavidhī* (95b), where after describing several methods this influential 8th century author states: *des kyang ma phebs na sdiḡ pa sbyong ba'i sbyin sreg bya|| des mi phebs pa mi srid do||* “If [the candidate] does not become possessed even by those [methods previously described], [the officiant] should perform a *homa* to cleanse [the candidate's] sins. If he does not become possessed even after that, it is not possible [to bestow initiation].” Also cf. SANDERSON 2009:135 translating Ānandagarbha's text, and fn. 316 for the Śaiva parallel.

²⁶⁶E.g. Ānandagarbha in his seminal *Sarvavajrodaya* sect. 69 writes: *evam api yasyāveśo na bhavati tasyābhīṣekaṃ na kuryād iti* “Those that do not become possessed even thus [i.e. by the above-stated methods] should not be given initiation.” Cf. SANDERSON 2009:135.

²⁶⁷The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 3.22-28 teaches recipes to this effect. E.g. *mahāguggulutailaṃ tu samabhāgaṃ tu kārītam| saptamahauṣadhayuktasya amṛtodakaguggulum|| dhūpayet pūjayā kāle vajrabhījaṃ tu jāpitum| asyā ghrāṇitagandhasya āviṣṭas tatkṣaṇād api||* “[The officiant] should take equal amounts of ‘great bdellium’ and [‘great’] oil, mix it with the seven great herbs, nectar-water and bdellium. At the time of worship he should fumigate [the mixture] and recite the mantra of Vajrī. As soon as [the candidate] smells the odour he will become possessed.” What the substances are is irrelevant at this level of the argument. Another recipe is given for preparing a *Datura*-based substance which the candidate is supposed to ingest. It should be pointed out, however, that the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* regards artificial possession as an inferior substitute. The passage is introduced by: *atha mahauṣadhaṃ vakṣye abhavyā adhikamānuṣaiḥ|* “Next I shall teach the ‘great medicine’ which is not

Although the term *āveśa* is not unknown to the *Catusepīthatantra*, it nevertheless prefers to call possession *adhiṣṭhā* or *adhiṣṭhāna*, 'empowerment'.

Only Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra comment this sub-chapter in detail. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* f. 39^v-40^r) simply states citing the beginning and the end of the *prakaraṇa* that it teaches rites of possession.

I. Vajrapāṇi's question

Your highness, I am curious to hear: how is the sequence for empowerment (adhiṣṭhānakrama), by which, when displayed (darśita), beings become possessed through the power of yoga? 3.3.1

sequence That is to say the ritual sequence, the *modus operandi*. Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa's glosses: *vidhi* and *vidhāna*.

yoga This must refer to the meditative visualizations or physical actions (*yoga* in the sense of *prayoga*) undertaken by the officiant to induce possession. Durjayacandra's interpretation goes one step further: *yoga* means 'joining [the fold, i.e. Buddhist converts]', once faith in the efficacy of the religion has been gained (due to having witnessed the officiant inducing possession successfully).²⁶⁸

II. Rites of possession

Hear, O Vajra[pāṇi], according to the truth, [that which] duly liberates from transmigration. One should display this method, possession, [as] a remedy for deluded beings. 3.3.2

remedy To paraphrase Bhavabhaṭṭa's chain of thoughts: once possession is manifested those witnessing or experiencing it will gain faith (*śraddhā*). Further, if they meditate on the deity with faith, sooner or later their obscurations (*kleśa*) will be remedied.

worthy of superior men."

²⁶⁸ *Mitapadā* (f. 58^r): *yena darśitasattvānām adhiṣṭhānayogabhāvanam iti- yena dhiṣṭhānakrameṇa darśitena yogo yuñjanaṃ tena sattvānām vicikitsakānām śraddhotpādāt samayamaṇḍalacakrādaḥ ca cīṭāropanam adhiṣṭhānayogabhāvanam bhavati*. Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa's argumentation to 2c below.

One should visualize on the heart a moon[-disk], with a hūṃ syllable-seed in its middle, [possessing] divine light emitting rays of fire to [all] worlds in the ten directions. 3.3.3

[possessing] This is how we should apparently read the *mūla*, with *pāda c* qualifying the syllable HŪṂ. Bhavabhaṭṭa forces the text to introduce another element, a fire-disk (i.e. a triangle) with the syllable RA in the middle placed on the target's heart.

[All] worlds in the ten directions will then disintegrate fully and utterly. Having then visualized a fire-disk, [there is] a blaze in all its shapes. 3.3.4

[there is] a blaze in all its shapes This statement is very puzzling. Bhavabhaṭṭa construes it with an unstated genitive 'of the target', meaning that the *yogin* should visualize the target burning in all his limbs. Durjayacandra interprets *saṃsthāna* as referring to everything to be found in the worlds. My interpretation would be that the *yogin* visualizes another HŪṂ (cf. 5d), this time on a fire-disk, in the target's heart. It is this HŪṂ that blazes in all its constituents (which are stated in 6-7cd).

Bhavabhaṭṭa sums up the process as follows: first the *yogin* generates himself as Jñānaḍākinī, visualizes a HŪṂ in his heart. This syllable emits rays which burn the entire world reducing it to emptiness. The same happens to the target, who, however, is revived by the same HŪṂ. Once revived the *yogin* visualizes in the target's heart a fire-disk (i.e. a triangle), upon that a lotus, upon that a sun-disk, and upon that another HŪṂ.

Observing the previous definition, he should first carry out [contemplating] emptiness and so on. Then he should visualize the [one embodying the] five Buddhas [i.e. hūṃ] seated in the middle of a fire-disk. 3.3.5

the previous definition This is a reference to 1.3.2-10, at least as far as the logic of the text and Bhavabhaṭṭa are concerned. Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* f. 59^r) interprets the first **pūrva** as *bodhicitta*, and the second **pūrva** as qualifying it. The first *bodhicitta* according to this commentator is the so-called *prasthānabodhicitta*. The **ādi** in his interpretation stands for building the defenses: the rampart, the cage, etc.

The baton is the overlord Lokeśvara, and the curl is Vajrapāṇi. The body is Mañjuvara, and the bell is Maitreya, presiding over the head. The letter ‘ma’ blazes at the top; it indeed delivers from transmigration. 3.3.6-7ab

The baton, etc. See notes to 1.2.19cd-20.

One should meditate upon this (asya) seed[-syllable], if one wishes mastery over the triple world. 3.3.7cd

He should [then] imagine a lotus as a seat placed on the middle of a sun-disk. From that which has gnosis as its nature [i.e. hūṃ], one should generate the form of Jñānaḍākinī. 3.3.8

generate In keeping with *yoginītantra* custom, Bhavabhaṭṭa adds that the *yogin* ought to visualize himself as the deity; in other words it is not to be visualized in front of the meditator. Durjayacandra at this point insists that no other deity is to be used for this rite.²⁶⁹

[She is] two-armed, seated in the comfortable position, red and beautiful; [her] diadem is adorned by the five Buddhas, with a vajra on top. 3.3.9

adorned by the five Buddhas I.e. the five Tathāgatas. The configuration is given by Bhavabhaṭṭa beginning in the east (the face facing the meditator, or in this case his own face) and proceeding counterclockwise: Vairocana, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, Amoghasiddhi, with Akṣobhya in the middle. The *vajra* is five-pronged.

[She holds aloft] a [skull-]staff and a yoga-bowl, is adorned with all [kinds of] ornaments, [emitting] numerous rays and blazes. [Thus he] should visualize [her] with unwavering breath. 3.3.10

yoga-bowl I.e. a skull-bowl. Cf. notes to 1.2.43-46ab.

²⁶⁹ *Mitapadā* (59^r): *karmaprasaro [']yam niyatadaivato, na punar adavato niyatetaradavato vā sidhyatīti darśayitum āha- [...].*

unwavering breath This feature has already been seen in previous meditations in the text. The calming of the breath is a sign that the mind has become focused, hence Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation 'until the mind has become firm'.

He should take the third letter from the third group in due order [i.e. ḍa]. He should then [add] a baton (daṇḍa °) and the baseline (° mātrasya), and circumscribe it with a girdle of vajras and so on (mekhalādibhi). 3.3.11

a girdle of vajras and so on (mekhalādibhi) The role of the ādi is unclear as none of the commentators attempt to explain it, both here and to the parallel verses inside the text. The 'girdle' is described by Kalyāṇavarman (ad 2.4.26c) as part of the letter, but I am unable to identify the script he has in mind.²⁷⁰ Otherwise the raising of the seed-syllable is done somewhat unusually, graphically rather than phonetically (ḌA + *daṇḍa* + *mātrā* = A).

[Add] obeisance [i.e. om̐] [before] and oblation [i.e. svāhā] at the end. It [i.e. om̐ a svāhā] should be repeated for three lakhs. Then he should undertake the deed [i.e. inducing possession], [having first performed] the rite of adaityābali. 3.3.12

[having first performed] The raising of the mantra, the preliminary service, and the *bali* precede the actual rite of inducing possession. Bhavabhaṭṭa adds that in the rite proper the *yogin* should empower mustard-seeds with the said mantra and then hurl them towards the target once the visualization described in 3a ff. is completed.

adaityābali Cf. notes to 2.3.85.

[The yogin] – observing the method – should give [to the target liquor/the pellet] mixed with/consisting of the five nectars recited over eight and hundred times; [the target] will become possessed in that very instant. Once he is possessed the yogin should perform [the following] vajra-song. 3.3.13

²⁷⁰ *Pañjikā* (36^r -36^v, leaving *sandhi* in pausa as in the Ms.): *mekhalādibhi veṣṭayed iti- tayos* [scil. *ḍakāradāṇḍayos] *tiryak mekhālākṛtīrekhā iti yojite akārah.*

mixed The grammatical object is missing. Citing oral tradition Bhavabhaṭṭa claims that the five nectars are mixed in with liquor (*madana*). In Durjayacandra's interpretation (*Mitapadā* f. 59^v) the object is the pellet (*gulikā*) made of the five nectars which is administered to the target mixed in food or drink.

observing the method Whereas Bhavabhaṭṭa introduces the verse as another method (*prayoga*) for inducing possession, Durjayacandra sees it as the continuation of previous verses. In the latter case the phrase **vidhinā yuktam** is little more than a verse-filling commonplace, but in Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation it is an injunction to reiterate the rite just described (with the possible implication that the merely meditative rite and hitting the target with mustard seeds was not sufficient).

eight and hundred One hundred and eight according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, but eight hundred according to Durjayacandra. The mantra is the one given above, ॐ A SVĀHĀ.

the yogin The last line is ambivalent. Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to interpret **yoginām** as the target, who has become 'joined' with the state of possession. According to Durjayacandra it is the officiant who sings the *vajra*-song in order to incite the target, who has now become similar to Vajrasattva.²⁷¹

Ho, Vajra[dhara]! Delight, delight, in all equanimity (savvasamatthena)! Eat up that which was given (dīaṇḍa) and that which was made to be given (dāaṇḍa)! May your yoga deliver me from transmigration this instant!

3.3.14

in all equanimity (savvasamatthena) This follows the *Nibandha*, which gives the *chāyā* 'sarvair . . . samasthaiḥ'. The *Mitapadā* reads **savvasamattha** as a Nominative qualifying **vajra** (= *Vajradharaḥ*) in the sense 'able to accomplish all accomplishments' (*sarvasiddhisādhanasamarthaḥ*).

²⁷¹*Mitapadā* (59^v): *tam āviṣṭam Vajrasattvam iva vajragītyā codayitum āha- rama rama ho vajja tuhum ityādi.*

was given (*dāṇḍa*), etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa explains this obscure phrase as unrighteous acts that all beings have committed or have made others to commit. Durjayacandra's glosses are beyond my comprehension.²⁷²

**With/by this song [and] by the sound of the vajra-bell,
he will dance.** 3.3.15

With/by The instrumental is again ambivalent, since it is not decided who recites the song, the officiant or the target. Durjayacandra's explanation is that when the target hears the song, the sound of the bell, and sees the *vajra* being shaken he will come to understand his Vajradhara-nature, and by virtue of his joy upon this realization he will dance, sing, and spontaneously enter a meditative state.²⁷³

Om tiṣṭha yoga mahākrodha hūṃ 3 svāhā. 3.3.16

Om, etc. This mantra is designed to make the target return to his normal state.

**After all [this] he should gratify him and show him all
the yoginīs. [Then] he should reveal to him the Doctrines,
fledgling, intermediate, [or] advanced.** 3.3.17

gratify According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this means giving some liquor to the target, who is now revealed as the initiand since he is about to be shown the *yoginīs*. Although the syntax of the sentence is odd, Bhavabhaṭṭa further reveals that the initiand was blindfolded and led in front of the *maṇḍala*. As soon as he returns to his normal state the blindfold is removed. The sequence implied by the *Nibandha* ad *pāda c* is the initiand's throwing a flower or a wreath on the *maṇḍala* to discover his affinity with one of the deities or a clan of deities, as well to prognosticate his success.

²⁷² *Mitapadā* (59^v): *tuhum dāṇu tvam dīyamānaḥ. dāṇu dāyakaḥ, grahītā.*

²⁷³ *Mitapadā* (59^v): *iti ghaṇṭādhvanivajrollālanasānāthena gītena svasyāropita Vajradharatvam avetya praharṣān nṛtyati, gāyati, dhyāyati.* For other symptoms of *āveśa* see SANDERSON 2009: 134-135.

reveal to him the Doctrines Durjayacandra specifies that the level corresponding to the initiand's capability is decided by²⁷⁴ the intensity of his *āveśa*. Thus, if the disciple did not become possessed, he is considered fit for inferior (*hīna*) teachings; if the possession was but minor (*kiṃcidāveśa* or **īśadāveśa?*), he is deemed intermediate (*madhyama*); if possession was perfect (*samyagāveśa*), he may receive the highest teachings as he is of a superior (*uttama*) quality.²⁷⁵ Unfortunately he does not explain what these teachings are, and nor does Bhavabhaṭṭa, who sends the reader to another work, the *Sekavidhi*, for details. The *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, at least in the state in which we may read it today, does not have any detailed information on this matter,²⁷⁶ therefore we must conjecture that the *Sekavidhi* is a now lost work, or one that cannot be identified.²⁷⁷ It is not unlikely that a later, but very influential work, Jagadānanda-jīvabhadrā's *Yogāmbarasādhanavidhi*, alludes to this classification 'fledgling, intermediate, supreme'. In his obeisance

²⁷⁴He interprets **darśayet** as referring to the capability of the student (*Mitapadā* 59^v : **darśayed** *iti tathāvidhaṃ sāmārthyam pratipādayet*). However, in doing so he must construe **yoginī sarva** with **prīṇayet** in the first *pāda*. I find this interpretation slightly forced.

²⁷⁵*Mitapadā* (59^v) : **tatra dharmāni kartavyam** *iti– tatrāveśanavidhāv † anāveśeṣu kiṃcidāveśasamyagāveśena pratipannānām hīnamadhyottamānām śiṣyāṇām yathābhavyatayā dharmāḥ prakāśayitavyaḥ, na punar anyatheti darśayati*. The cruxed passage perhaps originally read *anāveśeśadāveśa*^o, with *kiṃcit* as an intrusive gloss.

²⁷⁶The only relevant verse I can discern is the rather nebulous 3.29: *hīna uttama sattvasya prayogā dharmā deśayet/ suvicāriṇaśiṣyasya ācārya likhya maṇḍalam*// I suspect that *uttama* in the first quarter should in fact read *madhyama* (the text describes the three levels in 3.18cd: *uccāmr̥dumadhyasya viśeṣaṃ nara veśayet*). If this conjecture is correct, the correspondences are as follows: for inferior students the officiant teaches *prayogas*, miscellaneous magical rites; for middling ones the *Dharma*, most likely standard Mahāyāna teachings; for supreme students he will draw the *maṇḍala* and grant initiation.

²⁷⁷Giving teachings after the disciple has ceased to be possessed is a standard feature, cf. e.g. *Śiṣyānugraha* (A18v, B3r) which incidentally very graphically describes symptoms of possession: *evaṃ susthiracittasya jāyate siddhilakṣaṇam/ jñānāviṣṭo bhavet chiṣyo romāñcaṃ jāyate tadā// aśrupātaś cyutiś caiva himagharmagataṃ punaḥ/ prakampanaṃ cālanaṃ ca tiṣṭha vajra tadā bhavet// svarūpāvasthitasyāsya bhāvanām kathayet tataḥ/ pūjāṃ mantraṃ ca devīnām tattvaṃ ca saha-jātmikam*// "Thus, for those with well-composed minds, the signs of accomplishment will appear. When the disciple is possessed by gnosis, his hair stands on end, his tears flow, he ejaculates, experiences hot and cold [at the same time], shakes and trembles. [The master] should [then recite the mantra] TIṢṬHA VAJRA. When [the disciple] has resumed his normal state, [the master] should teach him the visualizing meditation, the worship and mantras of the goddesses, and the truth which is *saha-jā*." Also cf. *Tattvajñānasamśiddhi*, *śiṣyānugraha* section vv. 5-6 and Vīryaśrīmitra's *Marmakalikā* thereto.

verse he states (A1v, B1r): *natvā Yogāmbaram nātham yogināgaṇanāyakam/ tatsādhanam ahaṃ vaksye mṛdumadhyādibhedataḥ*|| “Having first bowed to the overlord Yogāmbara, the leader of the coven of *yoginīs*, I shall explain his propitiation according to the distinction [of meditators:] fledgling, intermediate, and foremost.” Now this author presents his manual according to the *trisamādhi* system. We may then surmise that in his view at least the *ādiyogasamādhi* was for fledgling meditators, the *maṇḍalarājāgrīsamādhi* for the intermediate level, and the *karmarājāgrīsamādhi* for advanced *yogins*.

Om yogāveśa aḥ. 3.3.18

Om, etc. With this a new type of *āveśa*, one accomplished by mere mantra-recitation, is described.

Concentrated by means of yoga he should accomplish the preliminary service. The yogin [should use] mustard-seeds in conjunction with the adaityābali. 3.3.19

yoga Bhavabhaṭṭa specifies that this refers to the visualization of Jñāna-ḍākinī during *pūrvasevā*. Once the mantra is perfected, it is enough to offer *bali*, empower mustard seeds with the mantra, and hurl them at the target while shouting ‘hūṃ’.

The yogin should then possess [the target] with frightful roars of the syllable hūṃ. [He may be brought] to his natural state (ātmasvecchābhi) with that previous mantra. 3.3.20

his natural state (ātmasvecchābhi) Cf. 27b below for this interpretation. The idea is that the target regains his ‘autonomy’, in other words control of himself which was temporarily suspended in the state of *āveśa*.

that previous mantra That is to say 3.3.16 above.

Om maṇa ghuru 2 dṛṣṭi cili 2 hūṃ 3 phaṭ. 3.3.21

Om, etc. With this mantra another type of *āveśa*, that induced by a glance (*dr̥ṣṭyāveśa*) is described. A *dr̥ṣṭyāveśa* with a different mantra and a longer *pūrvasevā* is described in *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 3.4-5: *om hili 2 hūṃ jaḥ|| tribhir lakṣeṇa sidhyate dr̥ṣṭyāveśa narādikam||*.

The yogin should repeat this [mantra] one lakh times [and] possession by [a mere] glance (dr̥ṣṭiveśam) will be accomplished. By [the power of this inducing] possession by a glance whomever he looks at during worship (pūjānām) will dance. 3.3.22

during worship (pūjānām) According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this includes ‘the times of the *maṇḍala* and eating and drinking’ by which he most likely means the initiation rite and the *gaṇacakra* feast.

Om vettāli rakṣa 2 hūṃ 3 phru phuḥ phaṭ. 3.3.23

Om, etc. With this mantra the description of *āveśa* methods end. Henceforth two practical applications (*prayoga*) are given. These are related to possession only inasmuch as the mantras may achieve *āveśa* as well if perfected in *pūrvasevā* (cf. 27cd and *Nibandha*).

If one recites [this] seven times and touches a corpse with dust [thus empowered], it [i.e. the corpse] can be kept for seven nights and nothing will be able to eat it. 3.3.24

dust Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses this with *bhasma*, ‘ashes’, which is surely more appropriate to the context. We may only guess why one would wish a corpse to remain intact for seven days. One rite that requires an undamaged corpse is the *vetālasādhana*²⁷⁸ or the rite of initiating a corpse,²⁷⁹ but the *Catuspītha* does not teach either of these rituals. It is possible that Bhavabhaṭṭa’s

²⁷⁸E.g. *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (p. 228): *atha vetādam sādhayati| akṣatāṅgaṃ puruṣaṃ gr̥hītvā [. . .] • Vajradāka* (44.1cd-2): *bhūtadīne śavaṃ* (em., sarvaṃ Mss) *prāpya ud-baddham anyathām api| pūrvoktavīdhānaṃ vai nī[r]vraṇaṃ cāru śobhanam| taṃ gr̥hya sādhayed yogī sarvasiddhiprasādhakaḥ|| [. . .]*

²⁷⁹Cf. Vilāsavajra’s *Mañjuśrīmaṇḍalavidhi* (103b): *de ltar zhag bdun nam lnga’am| gsum gyi bar du bya’o|| de ni ro’i dkyil ’khor chen por gzhag cing dbang bskur ba’i cho ga ste [. . .]* “He should perform [the above said rites] thus for seven, five, or three days. Here ends the rite of placing a corpse on the great *maṇḍala* and bestowing initiation [upon it] [. . .]”

interpretation is off the mark. Dust is typically collected from the footprint of a target in order to establish a connection between him/her and the substances or objects that act as their ritual referent. It was presumably thought that this dust somehow contained a person's 'imprint'.²⁸⁰ With this in view it could be conjectured that the verse means that the *yogin* should collect some of this dust and touch it against a dead body. The target will not be able to eat for seven nights, or will not be eaten by anything. Both should be considered as a positive outcome, since the mantra suggests that the rite is a protective one.

With the first quarter of this verse Durjayacandra ends his commentary to this sub-chapter.

Om phuru 2 matte jaḥ hūṃ. 3.3.25

[The yogin] should empower a red string with the mantra by reciting [it] one hundred eight [times]. Whosoever limbs are tied [around with this string] will roam like a jackal. 3.3.26

one hundred eight Eight hundred according to Bhavabhaṭṭa, but one hundred and eight would be equally possible.

like a jackal I have adopted the reading of ms. A here as it seemed more plausible that the target loses control and starts roaming *like* a jackal versus turning *into* a jackal. The latter interpretation is favoured by all other mss. and Bhavabhaṭṭa himself, who specifies the 'limb' as the neck.

As soon as the string is removed, he will resume his own state (ātmasvecchā). [If the yogin] recites [the above mantras] in a concentrated manner, [he will also achieve success in] the yoga [that is] the [ritual] sequence [for inducing] possession (adhiṣṭhāna°). 3.3.27

²⁸⁰Cf. *Pradīpodyotana* (p. 150): [. . .] *tāṃ ca* [scil. *puṭṭalikām*] *ubhayataṭavalmūkamrdā sādhyapādapāṃsunā pañcāmṛtasamanvitena ghaṭitāṃ kapālasampute sthāpayet/ tato madhyāhne 'rdharātre vā vāmapādenākramyāṣṭaśataṃ jayet/ mriyate/ • Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (p. 244): *atha rājānaṃ vaśīkartukāmaḥ tasya pādapāṃsu{ṃ} grhītvā sarṣapais tailaiś ca miśrayitvā juhuyāt{}* } *saptāhaṃ trisandhyaṃ{}* } *vaśyo bhavati{}*

his own state (ātmasvecchā) That is to say he will regain control of himself and not roam about like a jackal anymore; alternatively, he will cease to be a jackal and regain his human form once again.

[If], etc. The intended meaning seems to be that the mantras given from 3.3.23 onwards may also be used to induce *āveśa*, although Bhavabhaṭṭa restricts the referent of the statement to 3.3.25. He further states that the mantra can be used in conjunction with any of the methods stated above – empowering and hurling mustard seeds at the target, by mere recitation, and by a mere glance – with the implication that the *yogin* should first gain mastery over the spell.

III. Inducing possession/Driving away

[The yogin] should imagine [himself in] the form of Vajradākinī seated upon a moon-disk, her limbs adorned will all kinds of jewelry, and emitting numerous blazing rays. 3.3.28

Vajradākinī Bhavabhaṭṭa completes this injunction with the customary elements of first contemplating emptiness, the moon-disk being visualized atop a lion-throne, and the goddess appearing as the transformation of her *bīja*.

[Then] he should visualize in front [of himself] the target seated upon a wind-disk; [then he should visualize] two wind-syllables on the feet [in such a way that] the two feet are seated [on the syllables]. 3.3.29

a wind-disk A wind-disk is described elsewhere as bow-shaped, in other words a half-circle.²⁸¹

²⁸¹Cf. *Vajrasattvasādhana* (p. 9): [...] *dhanvākṛti vāyumaṇḍalaṃ* [...] • *Yogimanoharā* (p. 35): [...] *vāyumaṇḍalaṃ haritaśyāmaṃ kodaṇḍākṛtiṃ vajradvayāṅkitaṃ* [...] • *Hevajrasekaprakriyā* (p. 5): [...] *śīrasi vāyumaṇḍalaṃ dhanvākāraṃ dhūmravarṇaṃ yaṃbhavaṃ calajjayadhvajāṅkitaṃ haḥkārādhiṣṭhitaṃmadhyaṃ vicintayet*. • *Tattvaviśadā* (f. 1^v): [...] *vāyumaṇḍalaṃ dhūmraṃ dhvajāṅkaṃ dhanvābhaṃ yaṃbhavaṃ ca* [...] • *Hevajrasādhanaopāyikā* (p. 133): *tato yaṃkāraṃ ardhacandrākāraṃ nīlavarṇaṃ vāyumaṇḍalam*].

wind-syllables The wind-syllable in this system is YUṂ. However, the *bindu* and *nāda* (i.e. the *anusvāra* and the vowel -u) are given only in the next verse, so it is possible that at this stage – and in 30a – the syllable is merely YA or YAṂ (assuming the default *anusvāra*).

In the middle of [the target’s] heart, [itself] surmounted on [a] wind[-disk] (vāyuveṣṭasya), [he should imagine] a seed[-syllable] of wind conjoined with the drop [i.e. ṁ] and the roar [i.e. u], dark blue throughout. [He should further imagine] conjoining a wind[-syllable behaving as if it were an] arrow on the tip of his [outgoing] breath. 3.3.30

The interpretation above is my own. Bhavabhaṭṭa in my view stretches the meaning of both **bindu** and **madhyataḥ** which he takes to refer to the target’s consciousness set in the *bīja*. Interpreting **nādaṁ** as ‘mantra-recitation’ is also rather odd. **Vāyuveṣṭasya** is odd: we would expect this to mean ‘encircled by wind[-syllables]’, but the rite requires upward propulsion by means of this syllable.

Oṁ yuṁ prera vāyuṁ of so-and-so yuṁ phaṭ. 3.3.31

The yogin should recite this mantra one hundred [and] eight [times]; he will succeed. 3.3.32

one hundred [and] eight Or, as before, eight hundred times. Bhavabhaṭṭa quite plausibly interprets this to refer to the number of times the mantra ought to be recited during the rite proper. He adds that the *pūrvasevā* numbers one lakh and is to be performed in meditative conjunction with *Jñānaḍākinī*.

he will succeed The text does not reveal the result of this meditation. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets it as an *uccāṭana* rite.²⁸² But it is possible that the commentator is wrong and the rite is in fact for inducing *āveśa*.

²⁸²The imagery and some parallels seem to support this interpretation, cf. e.g. the *Tattvaviśadā* (f. 14^v): *sādhyam ca vāyumaṅḍalārūḍhoṣṭropari sthītam paścād danḍahas-taraudrarūpeṇa †. . . † dakṣiṇām diśam nīyamānam dhyāyan nīyatam uccāṭayati* “Then he should visualize the target sitting on a camel mounted on a wind-disk being led towards the south by †. . . † holding clubs in their hands and having terrible forms. He will certainly be driven off.” Furthermore, the next ritual is an *uccāṭana* proper; this fact may also have influenced the exegete’s interpretation.

First, it is strikingly similar to a rite described in the *Maṅḍalopāyikā* (3.16): *cintayed viṣṭam agrasya vāyumaṅḍalaveṣṭitam/ hrdaye vāyu vāyūnāṃ vāyubhājena cālītam//* “[The *yogin*] should visualize [the target] seated in front of him and encircled by/surmounted on a wind-disk. [Then he should visualize a] wind[-syllable] on [a] wind[-disk] in [his] heart, [which is] impelled by [another] wind[-syllable].” Incidentally, this seems to be the rite most strongly advocated by the author of that text, as it befits a supreme disciple, one to whom initiation should be given. It should be remembered that the *Maṅḍalopāyikā* was known to both Bhavabhaṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarman. It is therefore the text closest in time to the tantra itself. Second, visualizing wind-disks under the disciple’s foot is a standard feature of early rituals to induce *āveśa*.²⁸³

²⁸³Vilāsavajra’s *Mañjuśrīmaṅḍalavidhi* (95a-95b): *de nas slob ma yol ba’i nang du bkug la «de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyis byin gyis rlobs la ’Jam pa’i rdo rje bdag la dbab tu gsol» zhes gsol ba btab la slob ma’i snying gar AḤ bsams la ’di skad ces brjod de/ «sangs rgyas thams cad kyis byin gyis rlobs la/ ye shes ’bab par gyur cig» ces brjod de/ de nas rkang pa’i mthil du YAṂ las rlung gi dkyil ’khor ba dan gyis mtshan pa spyi bor OṂ las ’od zer spros pas rkang pa g.yon pa g.yas pas mnan la/ kun tu dril bu’i sgra yang dag par dkrol zhing dbab// BADZRA Ā BE SHA A ĀḤ zhes lan brgya rtsa brgyad la sogs pa brjod la dbab bo//* “Then [the officiant] should summon the disciple behind the curtain and [make him] recite the following invocation: «May all the Tathāgatas empower me, may Mañjuvajra possess me!» Then he should visualize in the disciple’s heart [the syllable] AḤ and recite the following: «May all Buddhas empower [him], may he be possessed by gnosis!» Then he should visualize on the soles of the [disciple’s] foot [two seed-syllables] YAṂ [which] turn into [two] wind-disks adorned with [fluttering] banners. [Then he should visualize] in his forehead an OṂ radiating light, step on his left foot with his right [?], incessantly ring the bell, and possess [him]. He should recite VAJRĀVEŚA A ĀḤ one hundred and eight times or [any other number of times that is deemed necessary] and [thus induce] possession.” Another suggestive piece of evidence is from Bhūvācārya’s *Samvarodayā* (v. 641): *nābhī-padmasthasaccakraṃ dyotamānaṃ saraśmikam/ caraṇādhovāyunā prerya āviṣṭam śiṣyam iḥṣate//* “[The officiant] will observe the disciple becoming possessed after having impelled the radiantly shining *cakra* [seated] in the lotus of [his] navel with wind[-syllables visualized] under [his] feet.” I leave the word *sat*^o untranslated, for in my view it is nothing more than a nod to Dīpaṅkarabhadra and his influential *Guhyasamājamāṅḍalavidhi* where *sat*^o is often used to complete the metre (v. 15, 27, *passim*). For a more elaborate version of this rite, completed with the ‘disks’ of the other elements, see *Vajrāvalī* sect. 22. I call the *Mañjuśrīmaṅḍalavidhi* ‘early’ because I identify the author of this work with the eight-century commentator, Vilāsavajra. The attribution to one ‘Bodhivara’ in the catalogues of the Tibetan canon is most likely mistaken. The translation of the colophon is corrupt and the actual name of the author is not given, but the phrase *byang chub mchog gi skal ba dang ldan pa* surely suggests ‘he whose maternal uncle (*bhāgineya*) is Agrabodhi’, i.e. Vilāsavajra (see TRIBE 1994:19).

IV. Driving off by writing

Having taken birch-bark and so on, he should inscribe [it] with poison [and] blood. First, he should maintain the yoga, [then] he should inscribe [the support] with everything in due order. 3.3.33

birch-bark and so on Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses **ādi** with ‘a shroud discarded and so forth’ (*avadhūtādīkarpāṭam*). The expression *avadhūtākarpāṭa* is unattested by sources available to me. The usual support for writing (or painting, or sitting upon, or for fashioning wicks, etc.) is the funerary shroud (*śmaśānakarpāṭa* or *mṛtakarpāṭa*), or the shroud covering heroes fallen on the battlefield (*vīrakarpāṭa*). These are mainly, but not exclusively, used in aggressive rites,²⁸⁴ or as a canvas for painting wrathful deities upon. The menstrual cloth (*rajaḥkarpāṭa* or *rajasvalākarpāṭa*) is mainly used in rituals of attracting and subjugating.²⁸⁵ However, there is considerable overlapping. The *Vajrabhairavatantra* for instance considers all the above (and more) as suitable for becoming a canvas.²⁸⁶ Otherwise for a very similar rite see *Kālacakratantra* 3.21-22 with the *Vimalaprabhā*.

blood According to Bhavabhaṭṭa blood must be drained from (one’s) index finger. He adds two further substances: *rājikā*²⁸⁷ and salt.

maintain the yoga, etc. Here Bhavabhaṭṭa tacitly finds two more reasons for interpreting the previous rite as one of *uccāṭana*. **Agre** in his view must refer to the previously stated eidetic meditation on Vajradākinī. I disagree

²⁸⁴Cf. *Tattvaviśadā* f. 14v, *Vimalaprabhā* vol. 2. p. 19, *Vajrabhairavatantra* p. 167 *passim*, *Tantrasadbhāva* 21.34, *Vīṇāśikhā* 178-179).

²⁸⁵Cf. *Kṛṣṇayamāritantra* 4.17 together with Kumāracandra’s gloss; *Samvārodayatantra* 10.20.

²⁸⁶106a-106b: *de nas dpal ’Jigs byed chen pos bstan pa’i bris sku’i cho ga rab tu gsungs pa/ dpa’ bo’i ras sam/ ro la bkag pa’i ras sam/ me tog can gyi ras sam/ bu skyes pa’i ras sam/ de ma rnyed na ras gang yang rung ba la/ [...]* “Next the glorious Vajrabhairava teaches the rite of painting his image. On the shroud of a [fallen] hero (**vīrakarpāṭa*), a shroud that had covered a corpse (**mṛta/[ka]karpāṭa*), on a menstrual cloth (**rajasvalākarpāṭa*), on a cloth used at the birth of a boy (**prasūtākarpāṭa*), or any other cloth, should he not come across any of the above [...].”

²⁸⁷I.e. red mustard-seed, *Sinapis ramosa*. Also known as *priyāngu*, *madhuraka*, *āsuri*, and *raktasarṣapa*.

with this interpretation and translated accordingly. The nebulous reading **sarvasamsthitam** should refer to the visualization concerning the target. Alternatively this could refer to the proper customization of the mantra.

With a recitation of hundred eight he should wrap [the support] with a red string (raktasūtrādi). He should hang [the parcel] from the top of a tall (uccādi) tree where there is a blow of wind. [Then he should perform the] visualization. 3.3.34

hundred eight This time Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss is 'eight hundred', but this number could equally be one hundred and eight.

a red string (raktasūtrādi) & tall (uccādi) The two *ādī*s are most likely verse fillers without any meaning.

visualization (bhāvanam) Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this to refer to the previous visualization of the target. Alternatively the last *pāda* could be translated as 'where the blow of the wind is perceptible'.

[The target] will feel an urge to go in whichever direction the wind blows [the wrapped parcel]. Driving off [thus] will be mastered by yogins; of this there is no doubt. 3.3.35

V. Attracting

The wise one should visualize his own body imagined as Vajraḍākinī seated in the middle of a moon-disk. He should recite the mantra complemented by an adaityābali. He should place in its middle. 3.3.36

visualize ... imagined For this tautology also see 41bc.

He should place in its middle. This incomplete statement should be construed with 38b and 38d according to the commentator. The injunction is that the *yogin* should smear the ground with red fragrant powder and write the customized mantra in the middle.

Om diśam ākarṣaya 2 hūṃ phreṃ phruṃ phuḥ. 3.3.37

Om, etc. In the commentary Bhavabhaṭṭa gives the full customized mantra, presumably based on oral tradition.

There are eight Cutch wood pegs. After having made a red maṇḍala, along with offering a full bali, he should write the name in the middle. 3.3.38

eight Cutch wood pegs The red circle, measuring the expanse of a cow hide as we are told, should be surrounded in the cardinal and intermediate directions with eight pegs. *Khadira* (*Acacia catechu*) wood was widely used in *vaśya/ākaraṣaṇa*-type rites across all Tantric traditions, and hence was also aptly called *madana*. It was especially appreciated for burning without smoke;²⁸⁸ its hardness made it fit for fashioning pegs or spikes. Spikes made of *khadira* wood are used to keep out demons from the *maṇḍala*-space when it is constructed with the purpose of mastering attraction.²⁸⁹

Reciting [the mantra] he should wrap red string seven [times around the circle delineated by the pegs to create] a rampart. He should repeat this [same] mantra whilst attracting with a vajra-goad. 3.3.39

Reciting Bhavabhaṭṭa takes this to refer to empowering the red string with the mantra by reciting it eight hundred times. But it is perhaps more natural that the *yogin* should recite the mantra whilst constructing the enclosure.

whilst attracting In other words he should again recite the mantra whilst visualizing the target. Bhavabhaṭṭa adds that the target is not only drawn towards to *yogin* with a visualized goad (although the goad is used to impel

²⁸⁸Cf. e.g. *Kṛṣṇayamāritantra* (4.23): *vaśyā yadi nāgacchati taṃ yantram tāpayed vratī/ghṛtādirahitaṃ kṛtvā nīrdhūmakhadirānāle/* “If she does not become subjugated, the observant one should burn the *yantra* in a smokeless fire of Cutch wood, without [other] fuel such as ghee.” • *Svacchandatantra* (13.17): *khadirānāle vidhūme suragurum apy ānayatyanilavegāt/* “[burning it] in a smokeless fire of Cutch [wood] will attract even Bṛhaspati with the speed of the wind.”

²⁸⁹Cf. *Vimalaprabhā* (vol. 2. p. 13): *iha śāntike nyagrodhakīlakāḥ [...] vaśye khadirajāḥ [...]* “Here, in placating the spikes are of *nyagrodha*[-wood] [...] In attracting they are of Cutch[-wood] [...]” • *Sarvavajrodaya* (sect. 37): *tataḥ khadiravajrakīlakāḥ maṇḍalakṣṇe catuṣṭaye vajreṇākṛtyāḥ* “Then in the four corners of the *maṇḍala* one should nail [four] *vajra*-pegs of *khadira*[-wood].”

the elephant), but also tied around his neck with a noose. Both are standard features of *ākarṣaṇa* rites.²⁹⁰

By [the power of] this ritual he will return, [even from a] distance (bāhye) [of] a hundred leagues. It is said (iti) that [he] will be bound in the [constraints of the] maṇḍala. These [rites] will succeed; of this there is no doubt. 3.3.40

return Perhaps the intended meaning is that the target will come in front of the *yogin*, and not necessarily ‘return’ (as in a lost lover?). Cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss ‘*ākṛṣyate*’.

bound in the [constraints of the] maṇḍala Here I disagree with the commentator, who takes the phrase to refer to ‘wrapping up’ (*upasaṃhāra*) the rite, although he does not explain how exactly.

VI. Paralyzing

The wise yogin should visualize his own body imagined as Ghorāḍākinī seated on the middle of a sun-disk. 3.3.41

visualize ... imagined For this tautology see 36bc above.

Having caught a fish or more, he should perform a bali to the ḍākinīs. He should then write the [target’s] name within the mantra and place it in the mouth of fishes. 3.3.42

²⁹⁰Cf. *Kṛṣṇayamāritantra* (4.28): *raktavarṇānkuśākṛṣṭam sādhyam caiva vibhāvayet/ hrdaye ankuśair viddham gale pāsena bandhitam*// “He should imagine the target as well, attracted by a red-coloured goad. He is pierced in the heart with goads and his neck is tied in a noose.” • *Raktayamāritantra* (f. 6^r -6^v): *ankuśena viddhvā galake pāsena baddhvānīyamānaṃ cintayet*// “[The *yogin*] should imagine [the target] being brought toward, pierced by a goad, his neck bound in a noose.” • the same passage is found with the feminine *ānīyamānām* in the *Yamāriṃmaṇḍalopāyikā* (f. 18^r) • *Samvarodayatantra* (10.21cd): *sādhyasya hrdayam ankuśair viddhvā gale pāsena bandhayet*// “After having pierced the target’s heart with goads he should bind his neck in a noose.” • *Siddhaikavīratantra* (p. 21): [...] *sādhyam muktakeśam vivastram kaṅṭhe pāsena baddham hrdaye ankuśenākramya* [...] “[...] [The *yogin* should visualize] the target with dishevelled hair, naked, bound by the neck with a noose, his heart attacked with a goad [...]”.

[Then, whilst repeatedly] treading upon the head [of the fish] with his feet he should repeat [the mantra] a hundred eight.

write The support is not specified by the text. Bhavabhaṭṭa proposes birch bark. A close parallel for this procedure, that is writing the name of target with a mantra on a support (in this case palm-leaf) and feeding it to aquatic creatures in order to silence him, is found in the *Siddhaikavīraṅtra* (p. 6): *tālapatre śātror nāma mantreṇa saha vidarbhya karkaṭagarte sthāpayet/mukhabandhaṃ karoti/* “After having customized the mantra with the name of the enemy [and writing this mantra] on palm-leaf, he should place it in a cave [where] crabs [live]. It [i.e. this procedure] will paralyze his mouth.”

the mantra We may infer from the mantra that this is primarily a specific rite of paralyzing, that was directed against the power of speech. The procedure is otherwise known as *vākstambhana* (also *mukhabandhana*, *mukhastambhana* and *jambhana*²⁹¹).

the mouth of fishes It is somewhat uncertain what Bhavabhaṭṭa means by *balālamatsya*^o. *Balāla* (perhaps *ballāla*, or *bilāla* as in ‘catfish’?) seems to be a *hapax*, if it is not a corruption of *bālaka* or *bila*, names that lexicographers have for types of fish. Boal or borali is the name of the freshwater fish Wallago attu in Bengal and Assam.

**Om phruṃ phruṃ so-and-so’s mukhaṃ bandha 2 hrī 3
phu phaṭ.** 3.3.43

**As soon as the [mantra] is recited, all his paralyzing deeds
[are achieved].** 3.3.44

all his paralyzing deeds According to Bhavabhaṭṭa, the intended meaning is that by customizing the mantra one can achieve paralyzing a target’s body or mental capacity as well. In light of this explanation it is very tempting to emend °*kāryāṇi* to °*kāyādi*.

²⁹¹Cf. Ratnākaraśānti’s *Guṇavatī* (p. 11): *jambhanaṃ mukhikaraṇam/*

VII. Paralyzing (bis)

I will teach another ritual [for paralyzing], †... † He should envelop [the target's name] in wheat-flour conjoined with this mantra and so on. 3.3.45

†... † Except ms. A no other source has anything in place of this verse-quarter. Bhavabhaṭṭa does not seem to have read it either, unless we consider *jalādhāre* ('water-tank') in the commentary a gloss on **jalādikam**.

wheat-flour Cakes of this type are called *śankulikā* or *śaṣkulikā* elsewhere. Dough is widely used in sympathetic magic for creating images of what one wishes to overpower. The staple material is usually rice-flour (*śālīpiṣṭaka*), occasionally sesame-flour (*tilapiṣṭaka*).²⁹²

and so on Bhavabhaṭṭa most likely takes this to refer to the support (birch bark and so forth) on which the name and the mantra are written.

Wherever there is a place with fishes, he should drop it [i.e. the dough globules] in the mouth of fishes. He should do this times a hundred eight: one [recitation of the] mantra [for] each [globule] thrown. All his paralyzing rites will come about. 3.3.46

All his paralyzing rites Cf. notes to v. 44. Using fish in this *prayoga* rather suggests that once more we are dealing with a *vākstambhana*.

VIII. Blocking a vulva

[The yogin should visualize] himself in the form of Caṇḍālī, seated upon a wind-disk, of excessive beauty and so on (sarvarūpādisampūrṇa), radiant as a blaze of fire. 3.3.47

²⁹²Cf. *Hevajratāntra* (I.ii.27): *candrasūryau vaśīkartukāmena śālīpiṣṭakamayaṃ candrārkaṃ kṛtvā vajrodake nikṣipet/* "If one wishes to overpower the Sun and the Moon, he should make the images of a Sun and a Moon from rice-flour and drop it in *vajra*-water [i.e. urine or wine]." • *Herukābhidhāna* (49.2): *śālīpiṣṭakamayaṃ mantrī paśuṃ kṛtvā yathākramam/* "The *mantrī* should in due order fashion [the image] of the sacrificial victim from rice-flour."

and so on The *ādi*, unless it is a verse-filler, should refer to Caṇḍālī's ornaments, garments, and implements.

After having offered an adaityābali he should make [a ?] in the middle. Having outlined a lotus [i.e. a vulva] with cow-dung he should install the name and the mantra. 3.3.48

he should make [a ?] in the middle From Bhavabhaṭṭa's speculative interpretation it can be gathered that this nebulous *pāda* should be construed out of sequence. This is doubtless the intended meaning of text, viz. that the name and the mantra are to be placed in the middle of the vulva drawn with cow-dung, but it still leaves the tautology *kārayet* and *sthāpayet* unsolved.

Om stambha stambhaya bhagaṃ mūtraṃ phuṃ phu phaṭ. 3.3.49

Om, etc. As suggested by the commentator, the mantra is again to be customized, written on a piece of birch-bark (or palm-leaf), and placed in the middle of the vulva. In the commentary above, here, and below it is specified that the vulva has the shape of a *dharmodayā*, that is to say a triangle.²⁹³

He should then tread on this mantra and the name with his left foot. With a recitation of a hundred eight it [i.e. the rite] will succeed; of this there is no doubt. 3.3.50

tread We are not clearly told this, but presumably the *yogin* treads on the cow-dung drawing repeatedly, once for each *mantra*-recitation.

succeed Bhavabhaṭṭa's view is that the target's [natural] flow of urine will become blocked. The 'vulva' therefore here refers to the urinary tract.

One should employ this rite against extremely wicked wives. When milk and water are poured the (idaṃ) vulva will be freed of [its] bond. 3.3.51

²⁹³ *Yogaratanmālā* (p. 123): *śaśidhavalam trikoṇam dharmodayākhyam bhāvayet* • *Vimalaprabhā* ad *Kālacakratantra* 4.8: *[...] prajñādharmodayam trikoṇam*/.

freed In other words the above is a recipe for reversing the magical effect once the target has learnt her lesson. The technical term is *pratyāyana* (used also in Buddhism, e.g. in the *Bhagavatyāśvedāyā yathālabdhatantrarāja* 5^r, and the *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* p. 238, 438, *passim*).

milk etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa has two interpretations here: in the first the *yogin* pours milk (into a river?) with a placated mind, in the second he washes away the *mantra* from the drawing with milk.

IX. Another method to block a vulva

[The yogin] should visualize the goddess Vajrī seated in the middle of a wind-disk, dark-blue and resplendent, luminous like the blaze of a fire. 3.3.52

She is endowed with full splendour, decorated with all sorts of ornaments, seated upon a deceased [person used as her] seat, laughing wildly and terrifying. 3.3.53

all sorts of ornaments It is very tempting to emend here to ‘snakes as ornaments’ (*sarpābharāṇa-* for **sarvābharāṇa**), but none of the sources attest this reading.

a deceased I.e. a corpse.

He should perform this rite after having completed (° pūrṇasya) a non-dual bali offering. He should [then] draw a lotus shape, preferably (viśeṣeṇa) with flour. 3.3.54

after having completed (° pūrṇasya) One may also consider emending to ° **pūrvasya**, but the variants do not suggest any basis for this. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s explanation of the previous verse (*balidānapuraḥsaraṇ*) could support both the reading if it is interpreted in this way and the emendation.

preferably (viśeṣeṇa) Bhavabhaṭṭa would have no doubt voiced his opinion had he understood the text as referring to ‘special kinds of flour’.

a lotus shape We must understand this as the female sexual organ, cf. Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss (*dharmodayā* ° = a downward-pointing triangle) and 57b below, where the shape is referred to as **guhyaḅhi** (= *guhye*).

He should fill [the shape] with dog hair and join the name and the mantra. But he should perform this deed [only] after the rite of the adaityābali. 3.3.55

join the name and the mantra In other words he should fashion the shape and then recite the spell given in v. 56 customized with the name of the target.

Om krodheśvari phum phim phaṭ. 3.3.56

Om, etc. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the customization goes before the PHAṬ and includes the call to action ('spoil the vulva!') with the name of the target in the Genitive.

With a repetition of hundred eight he should place [the/a] vajra into the pudendum. When this rite is undertaken, [the target's] vulva will become blocked and pained. 3.3.57

hundred eight In spite of previous glosses to similar expressions (see ad 50c just above), here Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the number as 108 and not 800. He further adds that this refers to the number of recitations during the rite proper and not the preliminary service, which he has already stated to be one lakh (ad v. 55).

[the/a] vajra Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss here is very odd, as he takes this to mean 'indivisible' (cf. *Hevajra* I.i.4a: *abhedyam vajram ity uktam*) and make it refer to the spell. It is much more likely that the *yogin* should place into the shape his *vajra*-sceptre (or, less likely, his penis).

The rite will inevitably succeed. When removed [she] will heal. One should apply this rite against extremely wicked wives. 3.3.58

removed It is most likely that the *vajra*-sceptre is removed from the shape. This reverses the effect of the rite, cf. v. 51.

X. Making the nāḍīs flow

[The yogin] should visualize a nectar-syllable [seated upon] a moon-disk in the womb [of the target]. [The womb] will drip with nectar-water drawn from all nāḍīs. 3.3.59

a nectar-syllable I.e. SUṂ.

from all nāḍīs The *ādi* does not have any meaning. Bhavabhaṭṭa here postulates an entire network of *nāḍīs*,²⁹⁴ but what we seem to have here is a rudimentary ‘model’ of a tube that carries semen (which, according to Tantric physiology, is present in both sexes). In later texts this is paired with a tube that carries menstrual blood.²⁹⁵ The visualized seed-syllable is supposed to excite the tube with its rays and thus activate the flow. It is quite likely that the original meaning of *sarvā* was ‘completely’, in other words the *nāḍī* is completely drained. I have nevertheless kept this interpretation along the lines suggested by the *Nibandha* for the text does later on speak of eighteen locations in the body (cf. vv. 68-78, also see below, v. 62).

He should [then] visualize in the middle [of the target’s vulva] a goad-syllable, [which is similar to] a blossoming flower of Scarlet Mallow, radiant red-coloured and divine, the secret onto the secret [place]. 3.3.60

goad-syllable According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this is KRIM, supposedly similar in shape to the *bandhūka* flower.

²⁹⁴For which see e.g. e.g. *Mahāmudrātilaka* 4.1-12, Ms 6r-6v; *Samvarodaya* 7.1-23; and elsewhere.

²⁹⁵Cf. *Sekoddeśa* (50cd): *yādhaḥ khagamukhā sā ca śāṅkhinī śukravāhinī* “The one below [in the form] of a bird-beak is called *Śāṅkhinī* and carries semen.”; & *ibid.* (56ab): *caṇḍālī rajaso vāhāt khagamukhā śukravāhataḥ* “She is called *Caṇḍālī* for she carries blood; the bird-beak carries semen.” For ‘bird-beak’ see note below.

the secret etc. This obscure quarter-verse is interpreted by the *Nibandha* as the secret seed-syllable placed on the ‘bird-beak tube’ (*khagamukhānādī*) of the pudendum. The term is attested elsewhere as a code-word for the vagina.²⁹⁶

[Then] he should visualize a nectar-syllable [i.e. *suṃ*] on the tip of the wrathful finger. With that finger he should agitate [the vagina]. [In short: the yogin should] visualize three couplings. 3.3.61

the wrathful finger I.e. the index finger, which is used for warning and threatening (*tarjanī*).

three couplings As explained by Bhavabhaṭṭa this refers to the three *mantra*-installations: *SUṂ* in the womb, *KRIṂ* on the vagina, and again *SUṂ* on the index finger.

[He should finally] visualize that the vulva drips the fluid [collected] from various regions [of the body]. [The yogin] should pummel [thus] the vulva of extremely wicked wives. 3.3.62

the vulva This reading is attested only by Bhavabhaṭṭa, all other sources read **aṅga**. His interpretation of the word as *bhagavati*, therefore a woman, is in my view superfluous.

²⁹⁶Cf. *Cakrasamvarapañjikā* p. 106 commenting on the line *repho vajram iti prokto ha-kāraḥ padmam ucyate* (“The letter *ra* is taught to be the *vajra* [i.e. the penis], the letter *ha* is taught to be the lotus [i.e. the vagina].”) from an untraced quote Jayabhadra says: *rephasya vajrasūcyākāratvāt/ hakārasya khagamukhākāratvāt/* “Because the letter *ra* has the shape of a *vajra*-needle [and] because the letter *ha* has the shape of a bird-beak.” In the *Ratnāvalī* Kumāracandra explains *Kṛṣṇayamāri* 7.18a (*khagamukhād vajramārgāca*) as *khagamukhād iti bhagamārgāt/ vajramārgād iti puruṣendriyandarhrāt/* “Through the bird-beak means via the vagina. Through the path of the *vajra* means via the orifice of the male organ.”; the same interpretation is given when glossing *idem* 15.16a (*strīṇāṃ khagamukhānta[ḥ]sthām*): *khagamukhānta[ḥ]sthām iti sādhyastriyonimadhyastham/* “Seated in the bird-beak means seated in the middle of the female target’s vagina.”

pummel The reading **bhagākoṭaṃ tu** is my conjecture based on Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss. It is not immediately clear how a woman is made to suffer from this procedure. The idea perhaps is that she is drained of her vital fluids and thus made weak.²⁹⁷ Alternatively, perhaps he inflicts pain by forcing his finger violently and repeatedly into her vagina.

XI. Inducing madness through herbs

[The yogin] should mix into human oil the luminous, weights, five limbs of the intoxicating one, and a chunk of great bdellium. 3.3.63

the luminous I.e. sesame oil according to the *Nibandha*.

weights Glossed by Bhavabhaṭṭa as the *guñjā* berry, i.e. the jequirity bean (*Abrus precatorius*, also known as the Rosary pea, Crab's Eye, Precatory bean, and Indian Licorice). The use of jequirity beans in this ritual is perhaps owing to the fact that its seeds contain abrin, a poison similar to ricin but much more lethal. Its ingestion in lesser quantities is known to provoke hallucinations.²⁹⁸ The term **guru** may have been inspired by the fact that the beads of this plant are used as the smallest of the jeweler's and goldsmith's weights.²⁹⁹

five limbs etc. I.e. the five parts of the *Datura* plant (*dhuttūraka*, but there are several other spellings): the leaves, the flowers, the fruit, the root, and the bark.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁷There are several procedures to increase vitality through an increase in the sexual fluids, cf. *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* ch. 17,

²⁹⁸Cf. FERNANDO 2001, SUBRAHMANYAM & AL. 2008.

²⁹⁹Cf. KOSAMBI 1981:12.

³⁰⁰Such use of the *Datura* plant, otherwise known as the thorn-apple, is commonplace, cf. SIKLÓS 1993. The five parts of the *Datura* plant are mentioned in Śaiva sources as well, cf. *Svacchandatantrōddyota* ad *Svacchandatantra* 13.36d (*pañcakonmattasamyutām*): *pañca-vidham unmattakaṃ mūlakāṇḍapatrapuṣpaphalākhyāvayavapañcakayuktaṃ dhattūrakam*/. Notice that Kṣemarāja has 'bulb' instead of 'bark'. The *Uḍḍāmareśvaratantra* (2.32-35ab) also describes poisoning by *datura* (amongst other ingredients) to induce madness and prescribes healing by a ghee-based mixture (cf. v. 64 here).

great bdellium Except the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* the term is unparalleled as far as I know. Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss is 'human brains'.

The mantrī should [then pour the mixture] into liquor. [Whosoever] tastes [this] with the tongue will become insane that very instant. [The target] will be freed [from the effect] by eating ghee. 3.3.64

liquor I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa here, although the term is attested in other meanings, e.g. the *Nibandha* ad 3.3.59, where it is glossed as 'semen'. Also cf. *Amoghapāśakalparāja* (20^r), where the nectar-water is emitted by a woman whereby the *vidyādhara* becomes capable to fly.

become insane A very similar procedure is taught in the *Vajrāmṛta* (T_D 22^r - 22^v): *dur dur ar ka'i 'bras blangs te/ bdud rtsi dang ni bsres par byas na/ zhal gsum drag po'i gzugs dang ni/ Gshin rje'i gshed khro bzlas nas su/ sha chen dang ni ldan byas te/ chang dang bsres la sbyin par bya/ rtag tu myos nas 'khor nas su/ mi ni bskams nas shi 'gyur ro//* "Take the fruit of datura and the *arka*[-plant] (*Gynandropsis Pentaphylla*) and mix it with nectar. Adopt the form of a three-eyed wrathful Yamāri and repeat [the *mantra*] in a furious state. Mix in human meat and dip it in liquor. Whoever drinks this will become mad and roam around only to wither and die." According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the targets are wrongdoers of the *guru*, the Buddha, and so forth. Besides iconoclasm it is difficult to see how one could hurt the Buddha and this seems to have bothered native exegetes as well. In the *Pradīpoddhyotana* (p. 175), commenting on *Guhyasamāja* 15.88-89, a passage describing a rite to ritually kill an enemy who is a wrongdoer of the Buddha (*ripum buddhāpakāriṇam*), Candrakīrti offers the following interpretation: *buddhāḥ śāsanasthāḥ śīlādiguṇasaṃpannāḥ/ bodhisattvāḥ tatpratibaddhāḥ pañcaśikṣā-disamanvitāḥ [...]* "The buddhas are those that live by the Doctrine and are endowed with virtues such as moral conduct. Bodhisattvas are their subjects, who follows the five commandments and so forth. [...]" We should hence understand 'the Buddha' metonymically for higher-ranking Buddhists such as monks, and take Bhavabhaṭṭa's *ādi* to cover Candrakīrti's 'bodhisattvas', i.e. lay followers.

XII. Ointment

[The yogin] should make a wick out of the not [yet] fallen cloth of a deceased person. Having obtained leaves[/a lamp-stand] from the lord of nāgas[/of lead] he should burn human fat in them. 3.3.65

not [yet] fallen cloth I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation, namely that one should use a cloth covering a corpse before the body has been lifted from the bier and placed on the ground. Cf. *apatitagomaya* 'cow dung gathered before it hits the ground'.

the lord of nāgas Bhavabhaṭṭa's gloss seems to be a spelling unique to him. *Śīśaka* is most likely a variant spelling or a re-Sanskritization from a vernacular of the well-known *Śimśapā*-tree (*Dalbergia Sissoo*) the leaves of which are slightly concave and thus able to hold oil for a small lamp. *Śīśaka* or *śīśaka* normally means lead. Both interpretations are accepted by Ratnarakṣita in his *Padminī* (A 42^r) ad *Samvarodaya* 28.23, a prose passage that is essentially a rephrasing of this procedure: *pretavastram iti/ mṛtakācchādanam (conj., mṛtakādanam A)/ nāgamalliketi/ nāgakesarakāṣṭhakṛta-pradīpamallikā/ śīśakamalliketi kaścit/*. *Mallikā* can again mean both a leaf and a lamp-stand.

He should empower with mantras, [that is to say] the core of the ḍākinīs, the place [where he will offer] the bali. He should [then] make the [eye-]ointment and repeat the mantra a hundred eight. 3.3.66

the place I cannot agree with Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation of this passage. In my reading here we have an injunction to empower the location of the bali, and in 67ab the options for this location. According to the *Nibandha*, the *balīsthāna* is the cremation ground. But this constrains him into reading **śmaśāna balikā** as a compound and technical term and not as a Locative expressed with the nil-suffix plus an object of **dadyāt** as I take it. Furthermore, if we continue his reasoning **catvare** cannot then mean the most natural 'crossroads', but the number of cremation grounds. This is rather idiosyncratic, since the number of *śmaśānas* is conventionally eight.

the core of ḍākinīs According to Bhavabhaṭṭa, the *mantra* of Jñānaḍākinī, in this context most likely OM HŪM SVĀHĀ.

He should offer a bali at a cremation ground, at a crossroads, [or] at a solitary tree. He, to whom this lampblack is given will [become able to] see all ḍākinīs. 3.3.67

bali etc. See note above.

lampblack Bhavabhaṭṭa's prescribed process is attested elsewhere as a visualization, cf. *Vajravārāhīsādhana* of Umāpatideva (v. 60): *tasyopari sthitam śuklam āḥkārajam karotakam/ ākrāntakamtrayodbhūtatrimumḍakṛtacullikam//* For the translation see ENGLISH 2002:289 and *ibid.* p. 209 for a graphic representation. A similar *upadeśa* is given in the *Pradīpoddyotana* (pp. 221-222). A kind of hearth is constructed with a 'tripod' of three skull-bowls. The lampblack is 'distilled' in a fourth, presumably placed upside down so that the soot can accumulate on the inner surface. The term *pātanam* is borrowed from the alchemical tradition where it is usually applied to distill or sublimate, and thus purify, mercury. For types and examples see e.g. *Rasajalanidhi* vol. I. p. 59ff.

see etc. The eye-ointment is typically used to become invisible, cf. e.g. *Amoghapāśakalparāja* (4^r) & *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (p. 230). Very similar procedures may be found in e.g. the *Guhyasamāja* (17.71 & prose thereafter): *catuspathaikavṛkṣe ca māṭṛsthāne śivālaye/ vajrāñjanapadam tatra kapāle pātayet sadā// mahātailarudhiram viṣṭam padmasūtram arkatūlena vartim kṛtvā kṛṣṇacaturdaśyām ardharātrau vajrāñjanam pātayed budhas tatraivāṣṭaśatābhimantritam kṛtvā/ trividhā siddhir bhavatīty āha bhagavān Samantabhadrah//* "At a crossroads, a solitary tree, a temple of the mothers, or in a temple of Śiva [the *yogin*] should distill the traces of *vajra*-ointment into a skull. The wise one should [take] human fat, blood, faeces and a lotus-garland. He should make a tuft of *arka*[-grass] into a wick and at midnight of the fourteenth day of the dark fortnight he should distill it whilst reciting upon it the *mantra* eight hundred times. The threefold supernatural powers will come about. Thus says the Lord Samantabhadra." The *Pradīpoddyotana* (pp. 221-222 ad loc. cit.) mentions invisibility (*antardhānam*) as the supreme of the three accomplishments. Also cf. *Kṛṣṇayamāri* (3.9): *nṛtailam*

nṛkapālasthaṃ nṛkeśair vartikā tathā/ śmaśāne kajjalam pātyaṃ karmavajra-prayogataḥ// “[Put] human fat into a human skull and [make] a wick out of human hair. Then distill the lamp-black in the cremation ground in meditative union with Karmavajra.”; and the *Vajrāmṛta* (Ms 6^r): [...] *añjanaṃ kathayīṣyāmi te/ mahāmedena vartiṃ ca kapāle gṛhṇa kajjalam//* “[...] I shall teach you the [procedure of] the ointment. [Anoint] a wick with human fat and obtain the lampblack in a skull.” Remarkably similar descriptions abound in Śaiva tantras, e.g. *Brahmayāmala* 66.51-58; *Uddāmareśvaratantra* 9.11-15.

XIII. Causing strife

[The yogin] should take two pots [that have been used to contain] leftovers and inscribe [on them the following spell] with a crow-feather [stylus] using [as ink] charcoal from the cremation ground mixed with astringent substances. 3.3.68

crow-feather The crow-feather is the writing tool of choice in *abhicāra* rituals, another feature in common with Śaiva magical procedures (cf. *Picumata* 5.119-120ab). A further specification from other sources is that the crow should preferably be old (*vṛddhakāka*). Cf. e.g. *Ratnāvalī* ad *Kṛṣṇayamāri* 4.46a and 5.16c.

astringent substances Bhavabhaṭṭa includes among these red mustard seeds, poisons, and blood.

Om kiri 2 krodhe so-and-so phuḥ phruṃ phaḥ. 3.3.69

so-and-so The customization requires the names of the two persons the *yogin* wishes to create dissension between. It is not specified whether the *mantra* should contain both names on both pots, or one name for one pot and the other for the other. It is fairly clear that this spell is intended to be inscribed, whereas the one in v. 71 is to be recited during the procedure.

Unto the two pots he should write the names of the two persons, and [then] rub them [against each other] filled with fury. He should [first] offer an adaityābali. 3.3.70

Oṃ kali vattali krodhamukhe so-and-so's hili 2 vajre ti-
ṣṭha mukha phu phroṃ phaṭ 3. 3.3.71

He should recite this a hundred times. Strife among the
two shall quickly ensue. Peace is restored when, accom-
panied by an adaityābali, [the yogin visualizes the two
targets] inundated with water [poured from pots] (ab-
hiṣekaṃ). 3.3.72

a hundred According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this is shorthand for a hundred and
eight.

XIV. Sub-chapter colophon

Here ends the third sub-chapter of the Yogapīṭha con-
taining such topics. 3.3.73

5.12 Synopsis of 3.4

The contents of sub-chapter 3.4, the last in the *yogapīṭha*, can be best described as eclectic. Vajrapāṇi's question at the outset of the sub-chapter (v. 1) inquires about 'non-dual yoga' (**advayo yoga**), but in actual fact the text teaches much more besides. The content for the most part is related to sexual *yoga*, the place of which is not entirely clear in the program of the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The initiation chapter (4.1) seems not to allude to copulation taking place during the consecrations.

The *bhagavān*'s answer (vv. 2-3) begins with enjoining *yogins* to take hold of the *vajra*-sceptre, the bell, and the consort (*mudrā*) 'truly' (*tattvataḥ*), a matter already elucidated for the first two items in sub-chapter 3.1. However, in this context the *vajra*³⁰¹ is said to be the *yogin* himself, the bell the goddess (i.e. the consort), and the *mudrā* the union of the two.³⁰²

Vv. 4-7 describe the outset of practice: the *yogin* recites the 'triple purification' *mantra* (ॐ SVABHĀVAŚUDDHĀḤ, etc.). He should then realize the symbolism (*viśuddhi*) of several items of the *maṇḍala*. Here (vv. 8-15) it is mainly the protective apparatus that is identified with Mahāyāna doctrinal concepts: the rampart (*prākāra*) is [the perfection of] giving (*dāna*), the cage (*pañjara*) is [the perfection of] morality (*śīla*), the pegs or daggers (*kīla*) are said to represent [the perfection of] forbearance (*kṣānti*). The three are said to collectively keep demons at bay,³⁰³ however, it is also made clear that the said demons are only the products of one's mind.³⁰⁴ When that is kept under control no demons whatsoever can injure the practitioner.³⁰⁵ Continuing

³⁰¹Bhavabhaṭṭa at this point provides two *niruktis*, which are rather crucial for localizing the commentator. The first explains *vajra* as *bahu rajaty anena prajñeti vajram upāyah*, the second *bahavo rajanty aneneti vajram*. This makes it very clear that he read *vajram* in an east-Indian pronunciation, that is to say *bajram*. Cf. SANDERSON 2009:165-166 for a similar case in the *Herukābhīdhāna*: *bhagavate* raised as *bhagabate* in a *mantra*.

³⁰²Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 40^r) seeks to harmonize this statement with the somewhat anti-ritualistic tone of *Guhyasamāja* 17.46ab (*hastamudrāṃ na badhnīyāt*, etc.).

³⁰³This verse is possibly the inspiration behind a verse in the *Abhidhānottara* (Ms A 11^v): *kīlanavajraprākāraṃ vajrabhūmau tu pañjaram| vitānavitatam ramyam duṣṭamāraṃ tu cchādanam||*.

³⁰⁴The *Pañjikā* (40^v) here quotes a half-verse with a similar meaning (*mārāḥ svacītasambhūtāḥ purā mātsaryasevanāt*). Kalyāṇavarman claims that the line is from the *Śaṃvarottara* (or, according to the Tib. tr., the **Samāyogaśaṃvarottara*), but I was able to trace it only in the *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi* (176^r).

³⁰⁵In the commentary to this verse (3.4.11) Bhavabhaṭṭa quotes a stanza from Saraha's *Dohakoṣa* (Ms Göttingen 7^v 2; Shāstri ed. p. 109, Shahidullah ed. v. 76, T_D 75^r); to my

along the same lines the fragrant powders with which the *maṇḍala*-ground is anointed are said to correspond to equanimity (*samatā*),³⁰⁶ the flowers scattered unto this ground are [again] forbearance,³⁰⁷ the offered incense corresponds to the essential purity of phenomena (*svabhāvaśuddha[tā]*), the lamps to [the perfection of] wisdom (*prajñā*), and the *bali*-offering to reassurance (*āśvāsa*) and bestowing of fearlessness (*abhayaṃdāna* [sic]). The sequence of doctrinal concepts do not correspond to any list know to me. I therefore view the attribution of these terms to elements of ritual as somewhat haphazard if not clumsy.

Vv. 16-30 start to describe a new set of practices. The *yogin* should find a pleasing place and sit on a comfortable seat. He is most likely accompanied by his consort, since the next injunction is to visualize himself ‘as the *vajra*’ and his consort (*prajñā*) ‘as the bell (*ghaṇṭā*)’. The consort should at this point be at a distance of one cubit from the practitioner. Next he should visualize a HŪṂ in his heart and contemplate emptiness. Then he should imagine Mount Meru with a palace (*vimāna*) on top. In the middle of the palace he should visualize a moon-disk, and upon that a *vajra* embodying the twenty-eight deities (cf. 3.1). Next he should imagine that the *bindu* of the previously visualized HŪṂ syllable blazes up and shoots forth rays. [From this syllable] the *yogin* emerges as Vajrasattva. He should next install the octet of syllables in order to protect himself. Vajrasattva is described as white, adorned with [a tiara of] the five Buddhas, two-armed, seated, ornamented, displaying the gesture of the great seal (*mahāmudrā*)³⁰⁸ and emanating clouds of Buddhas. Simultaneously with this visualization the *yogin* should repeatedly intone the syllable HŪṂ. Then he should imagine that the white Vajrasattva starts to assume the colour of molten gold as it develops a desire to act for the benefit of beings.

Next a similar type of visualization is applied to the consort. The *yogin* again contemplates emptiness. Atop a moon-disk the consort is imagined as the bell embodying twenty-three deities (cf. 3.1). She emanates clouds of Buddhas and assumes the form of Prajñāpāramitā, two-armed, seated, ornamented, adorned with [a tiara of] the five Buddhas, and displaying the

knowledge this is the earliest traceable quotation from the famous *mahāsiddha*.

³⁰⁶Trying to bring the list in line with the list of perfections, Durjayacandra glosses this as the *vīryapāramitā* (*Mitapadā* 60^r).

³⁰⁷The *Mitapadā* (60^v) glosses the second occurrence of *ksānti* as the *dhyāna[pāramitā]*.

³⁰⁸The *Nibandha* describes this as miming the embracing of the consort while holding the *vajra*-sceptre and the bell to one’s heart.

great seal. She is made to recite the appropriate seed-syllable.³⁰⁹ Finally, the *yogin* applies the octet of syllables as before to the consort's body as well. She too assumes a reddish hue.

With the visualization of the practitioner and the consort into deities complete, vv. 31-44ab describe the copulation of the two. The *yogin* unites with the consort and places his hands on her breasts as a symbol of delivering sentient beings [from transmigration]. Then he should visualize the nectar-syllable (i.e. SUM) on the tip of his thumb and excite the consort's 'bird-beak' and cause her nectar to flow.³¹⁰ Then the embrace is interrupted and the consort moves to face east.³¹¹ They unite again in a particular position, and repeat the process towards the south, and the west.³¹² The amount of detail given for these particular positions is akin to that of *kāmaśāstra* descriptions. The somewhat unusual *viśuddhi* of the process is said to be the delivery of beings from the corresponding quarters. At the end both should recite a dedicatory prayer for the benefit of all beings.³¹³

Vv. 44cd-66 reiterate some parts of the above procedure in greater detail. It is stated that the visualizations, beginning with assuming the form of deities up to the protective installation of syllables, should be done 'in an instant' (*jhaṭitā* [sic]). While the *yogin* visualizes himself as Vajrasattva, he should reaffirm this conviction by reciting 'I am Vajrasattva!' We are given more details about the 'bird-beak' (the *Catuṣpīṭha* codeword for the clitoris): it is hidden inside the lotus (i.e. the vulva) and is as if it were the root or sprout of that flower. It is also said to be similar to a blossoming Scarlet Mallow (*bandhūka*). More light is thrown on the seed-syllables used for the protective installation (*kalana*) and yet more detail is given regarding the sexual postures.

Vv. 67-70 describe the postlude. The pair should drink 'nectar-water' (it

³⁰⁹Perhaps HUM , as Durjayacandra explains (*Mitapadā* 61^r), but AM or OM AM SVĀHĀ according to the *Nibandha*.

³¹⁰This nectar is again said to issue from the eighteen parts of the body, but yet again we are not told what these are. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 42^v -43^r) seeks to fill in the gap with a quotation from a now lost work, the *Aṣṭāṣṭaka*, for which cf. section 2.5.6 here.

³¹¹It is around this point that we lose trace of Durjayacandra's commentary, the last available *pratīka* being from 34b on f. 61. An unknown number of folia is lost up until the last one, which begins inside a comment to v. 69, which is in *apabhraṃśa*. After having finished commenting on this verse he signs off the entire work.

³¹²I cannot for the time being determine why the northern direction is omitted.

³¹³The explanation to this section and the next in the *Pañjikā* is quite rich in quotations from works that cannot be traced (e.g. the *Rājaputrikā*), or verses that are unparalleled.

is not clear whether liquor or the sexual fluids are meant here), repeatedly intone HŪṀ, and the sing two *apabhraṃśa* verses praising emptiness, the method, and the deities. Then they should sound the bell and sing further, unspecified *gītis*. Whatever they wish for will come about.

Vv. 71-76 describe methods for bringing targets under command (*vaśīkaraṇa*). In the first the *yogin* mixes saffron, cow-bile, *palāśa* flower, mead/honey, sugar, bits of yellow sandalwood, and crape ginger in equal amounts. If he smears his forehead with this mixture he will seem pleasing to everyone: the king, ministers, and all subjects of the realm.³¹⁴ In the second the *yogin* should ground into fine powder all sorts of wood, chickenweed (*mohanī*, glossed by Bhavabhaṭṭa as *vaṭaparnikā*), ticktree (*stambhanī*, glossed by the same as *śālaparnī*), and the five bodily nectars. If he administers the mixture in liquor, food, or betel, the target will not leave him even in death. The third method seems to involve menstrual blood and semen with the recitation of an unspecified *mantra* one lakh times.

Vv. 77-79 describe the appropriate consorts for the rites *śānti[ka]*, *pauṣṭika*, *vaś[y]a*, and *abhicāra*. For the first the practitioner should employ a lady undertaking vows (*vratī*),³¹⁵ a Brahmin woman (*brahmī*), or a ‘gnostic’ lady (*jñātī* or *jñānī*³¹⁶ [sic]). For the second he should use a Kṣatriya lady (*rājñī*) or a *guravaguhya*³¹⁷ [sic]. For the third he should employ a Vaiśya or a Śūdra woman. For the fourth, aggressive rites, he should use the wife/daughter of a tanner (*cirmikā* [sic]), a butcher (*māmsikā*), or a fisherman (*mīnā* [sic]). In order to attain success in *yoga* he should employ a Caṇḍāla woman, a washerwoman (*rajakī* or *rajanī* [sic]), or a barbarian lady (*mlecchī*).

Vv. 80-99 teach a series of eighteen so-called *bandhas*, kinds of choreographic positions for the legs, also called *ākṣepas*. While some of these are met with in the *Guhyasamāja* tradition in the context of preparing the *maṇḍala*,³¹⁸ here they are employed during the sexual act. Vv. 100-109 teach

³¹⁴The *Pañjikā* (44^r) here quotes from what he claims to be ‘the *kakṣapuṭa* taught in the 12,000-verse [recension of the *Catuṣpīṭha*]. It is perhaps on account of this statement that the work called the *Kakṣapuṭa* attributed to the *siddha* Nāgārjuna, which otherwise has nothing to do with the *Catuṣpīṭha*, found its way into the Tibetan canon among texts of this cycle (Tōh. 1609).

³¹⁵Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss is *kāpālikī*.

³¹⁶Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss is *kāṇḍakārīṇī* (!?), in other words a soothsayer (*daivajñā*).

³¹⁷Bhavabhaṭṭa gives two possible interpretations: we should either read this together and understand a Brahmin woman, or as a *dvandva* compound, in which case according to unstated authorities (*kecīt*) the meaning is a Brahmin woman and a dancing girl (*natī*).

³¹⁸Cf. the *Parīkramapadopāyikā* of Śrīkīrti, the third chapter of Nāgabuddhi’s *Vimśa-*

a series of ten gestures here called *abhinayas*, which are employed in the same context.

Vv. 110-122ab contain general statements on a variety of topics. Several statements praise the coupling of *vajra* and *ghaṇṭā* (in other words, the *yogin* and his consort); without one the other cannot succeed and ultimately the benefit of beings and liberation will not be attained.³¹⁹ However, this secret should not be revealed to those fools whose minds are intent only on outside object (i.e. sensory pleasures), but only to those who know the scriptures (here: *āgama*) and whose minds are pure as a crystal, in other words, *yogins*. Even they, should their mind waver in doubt, will fall into the Avīci hell. They should never allow themselves to be overcome by sexual pleasure and enjoyment. The *yogin* should always strive to maintain his merging with the visualized deity.

Vv. 122cd-124 contain a somewhat unusual intervention of the retinue. *Yogins* and *yogeśvarīs* from among the audience are said to have at this point joined their hands in reverence and sung a praise of the Lord and the teaching.³²⁰

Vv. 125-149 teach the individual *sādhana*s of Vettālī and Siṃhinī, with those of Vyāghrī, Jambukī and Ulūkī lumped together.

For Vettālī the *sādhana* (vv. 125cd-127) is quite simple: she is to be visualized and her *mantra* recited three hundred thousand times.³²¹

For the propitiation of Siṃhinī (vv. 128-148) the *yogin* should procure a funerary shroud and paint her image on it while abiding in the cremation ground. She is two-armed, half white and half yellow, radiant, bellowing with laughter, with bared teeth, and dishevelled hair. She sits upon a human corpse and she is covered by a human hide. Her crown has an image of Amoghasiddhi, and she is further adorned with snakes, an elephant hide, a chaplet, and a skull-staff. She holds a skull-bowl filled with liquor. The

tividhi, etc.

³¹⁹Vv. 114-115 are quoted in the **Vajrapadasārasaṃgrahaṇīkā* of Yaśobhadra (Tōh. 1186, 73^r). I am informed by Prof. Francesco Sferra that a Sanskrit ms. of this work has been identified in China, but it is not yet available for study.

³²⁰124cd (*na tithir na ca nakṣatra* [sic] *nopavāso vidhīyate*) is a cliché to be found in many other texts in both Śaiva (*Tantrāloka* 29.65ab, *Kaulajñānanirṇaya* 21.10ab, *Niśvāsaguhyasūtra* 14.101, *Tantrasadbhāva* 15.56ab, etc.) and Buddhist (*Guhyasiddhi* 1.66ab, *Advayasiddhi* 24ab, *Abhidhānottara* 4.4.ab, *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* 35.249ab & 249ab, etc.) lore.

³²¹Here Kalyāṇavarman's commentary ends, the last *pratīka* is from 127a dealing with the *mantra* of Vettālī.

practitioner is to offer a *bali* and then a *homa* with eight hundred chunks of human meat marinated in blood and liquor. Meanwhile he should recite her *mantra*, which here is given as OM SMRYUM PRUM PHU PHAṬ. If the propitiation is successful the practitioner will perceive five signs: first the earth will shake, second the painted cloth will tremble, third there will be a smell of human flesh, fourth a lion's roar will be heard, and fifth, the *yogin's* assistant (*sahāya*) will become possessed and come to resemble a lion.³²² The *yogin* displays the pledge-gesture, honour her, and offer a seat. Then the goddess will reveal herself and ask, addressing the summoner as her son (*vaccha* [sic]), what task is to be accomplished. The *yogin* should again display the pledge-gesture, utter the *mantra* OM TIṢṬHA MAMA KURU HŪM 2 JAḤ 3 SVĀHĀ, and offer her a *bali* of meat, blood, and sour gruel. The goddess will procure for him a bride from among the titans (*asuras*), *nāgas*, ghosts, gods, *yakṣas*, *gandharvas*, *kiṃnaras*, *pretas*, or humans. If the *yogin* desires riches, she will bring it forth from the caves of titans and *nāgas*. Should he wish his enemies killed or a target to flee, the goddess can accomplish that as well, or indeed, anything else he wishes for.

V. 149 states that the same rite – *mutatis mutandis* – can be used for propitiating Vyāghrī, Jambukī (here called Śivī), and Ulūkī. Although the gruesome description of the rite is more akin to later *yoginītantra*-materials, some elements, e.g. the presence of the helper, the way in which the goddess[es] manifest[s], the signs of accomplishment, and the dialogue format have a decidedly archaic feel.³²³

The last verse (v. 150) reiterates the statement given in vv. 2-3.

The sub-chapter closes with the customary colophon.

³²²This character is normally termed the *uttarasādhaka*, or *gsang g.yog* ('*mantra*-servant', *Skt.?). His presence is not typical for *yoginītantras* (except initiation), but is widely attested in *kriyātantras* such as the *Susiddhikara* (ch. 4 is entirely dedicated to describing his qualifications, T_D 171^r -171^v) or the *Subāhupariṣcchā* 1.35-38 (T_D 119^v).

³²³Cf. also 2.4.46-100 and peculiarities under the heading 'yoginīs/yakṣiṇīs' in section 2.6.3. I am thinking here of the *yakṣiṇīsāadhanas* in early Vajrayāna texts such as the *Bhūtaḍāmara* and the *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*.

5.13 Annotated translation of 4.1

Chapter 4.1 can be roughly divided into three or four parts. Verses 1-8 describe the characteristics of the officiant (*ācārya*), verses 8-14 describe the observances that the initiate should conform to, and verses 15-48 deal with initiation proper. The fourth section (vv. 48-61) describes teachings given to the initiate after initiation, and hence does not strictly constitute a part of the treatment of the ritual itself, but can nevertheless be subsumed under it.

More or less the entire chapter is copied over into chapter 32 of the *Vajradāka*, and there are several verses that are taken over into the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, the primary initiation manual of the cult. From the viewpoint of textual history the most important feature to note here is that Bhavabhaṭṭa restructures the initiation sequence according to the program of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, as does Kalyāṇavarman in his commentary to 2.3. The direction of borrowing is quite clear, since Bhavabhaṭṭa here (especially ad 24, 27, and ff.) does not follow his usual style of commenting on verse after verse.

I. Characteristics of the officiant

[The Lord said:] Hear, O Vajra[pāṇi], according to the path, the characteristics of the [officiant, who] delivers from transmigration. [For in the vows it is stated:] «I will also (ca) adopt the officiant,» [who is] versed in the application of spell[s], gestures, and the rest. 4.1.1

[The Lord said] We must understand the speaker to be the Lord (*bhagavān*). Most chapters begin with the interlocutor's question, but it is not unparalleled that they begin with an exhortation.

the characteristics etc. We must understand *saṃsārottāra* as referring to the *guru* or *ācārya*. Bhavabhaṭṭa's analysis (ll. 2-3) suggests that he considers the officiant an instrument, and not a cause for liberation.

according to the path Bhavabhaṭṭa goes to great lengths to explain that this should be taken adverbially. In his interpretation *mārgaḥ* means the teaching (*śāstram*), for it is by means of this that one seeks (*mṛgyate 'nena*) [the truth].

[For in the vows it is stated:] This is not how Bhavabhaṭṭa understands the last two quarter-verses. In his view the speaker for the second line is Vajrapāṇi. In my view this interpretation is slightly forced. The compiler of the *tantra* presumably had in mind a *pāda* from the list of vows recited during initiation (*samvarapāṭha/samvaragrantha*), namely *vajraṃ ghaṇṭāṃ ca mudrāṃ ca pratigrhṇāmi tattvataḥ/ ācāryaṃ ca grahīṣyāmi mahāvajrakuloc-caye//*, the *locus classicus* of which is either in the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana* (p. 146, correcting *vajra°* to *vajraṃ*), or the *Vajraśikhara* (T_D 184^r). That Bhavabhaṭṭa is forcing his interpretation is substantiated by his taking the root $\sqrt{\text{grah}}$ in the epistemological sense (*jñāsyāmīty arthaḥ*). A further clue that his interpretation is unnatural is that the next verse begins with Vajrapāṇi addressing the Lord (the Vocative *bhagavan*), the usual way in which the text changes speakers.

versed In light of what Bhavabhaṭṭa says in l. 12 (*mantrādivijñāḥ*), it is necessary to emend the reading of all mss. from °**vat** to °**vit**. This emendation is also confirmed by the testimony of Nāgārjunagarbha: *sngags dang phyag rgya la sogs mkhas/*.

application ‘*Yoga*’ is not infrequently understood in the sense of ‘*prayoga*’ (usage). If we do not accept this, we must side with Bhavabhaṭṭa, who silently interprets the *ādi* preceding *yoga* out of sequence (*bhinnakrama*), an otherwise permissible exegetical procedure. He takes °**yoga°** to mean meditative absorption (*samādhiḥ*), and glosses °**ādi°** as ‘[knowledge] related to the diagram of the deities and so on (*maṇḍalādikam*)’.

of spell[s] The *mantras*, according to the commentator, are those used in the rites of placating etc. (*śāntikādimantrāḥ*).

gestures Bhavabhaṭṭa (ll. 9-12) explains the gestures as those pertaining to body, speech, and mind:

The ‘**gestures**’ (**mudrā**) are the gestures of the body and so forth. The gestures of the body (*kāyamudrā*) are the hand-gestures (*karamudrā*). The ‘gestures’ of speech (*vāṇimudrā*) are the ones produced by speech, meaning the secret language [used by initiates] (*vākchommakam*). The ‘gestures’ of mind (*cittamudrā*) are

the ones seen in [visualizing] meditation (*bhāvanayā*), [to wit,] the specific colour, shape, [the number of] arms [held in gestures or holding implements], and the rest. When the gestures of the body etc. are thus meditated upon, they are called ‘gestures of the mind’, for [they become the objects] of mental attention (*cit-tagatatvāt*).

It is very possible that in doing so he had a passage from the *Ḍākinīvajrapañjara* in mind.³²⁴ The only difference is that that tantra takes ‘gestures of speech’ to be the recitation of mantras, and not *chommā*.

[Vajrapāṇi said:] Lord, how should one view the officiant? What are [his] virtues like? How should one behave towards (yoktavyam) the officiant? Why is he called a ‘guru’? 4.1.2

kena, kīdṛśam, katham These interrogative particles are best construed not according to what they actually mean, but rather the flavour of the interrogative that is needed.

Why is he called a ‘guru’ This sentence is obscure. Smṛtijñānakīrti’s explanation is equally puzzling (*Smṛti* 43^v): **bla ma zhes bgyi ji ltar lags/ zhes pa ni rdo rje slob dpon brnyas pa’i sdig pa dang/ bstod pa’i bsod nams ji ltar yin [...]** “**How is one called a guru** means how is it sinful to belittle a *vajrācārya*, and how is it virtuous to extoll him?”

[The Lord said:] O Vajrapāṇi, listen to the truth [about the officiant], who is (lakṣaṇam) [an embodiment of] all enlightenments. The limbs of awakening reside in the parts of his body, which [embodies] all buddhas. 4.1.3

³²⁴The threefold classification of *mudrā* is in ch. 4 (I have reconstructed the Sanskrit from Mahāmāti’s *lemmata*, *Tattvaviśadā* Ms 6^v): [**...*] *phyag rgya rnam gsum shes par bya/ [*kāye tu karamudrā syāt] sku la lag pa’i phyag rgya yin/ [*vāṇimudrā mantrajāpataḥ/]* *sngags bzlas pa las ngag phyag rgya/ [*citta tu cihnamudreti] sems la mtshan ma’i phyag rgya yin/ [*saiva tu dhyānamaṇḍalah/]* *de nyid bsam gtan dkyil ’khor la’o/*.

the truth [about the officiant] The word ‘truth’ (other meanings: ‘principle’, ‘reality’, etc.) in this corpus frequently means ‘the topic under scrutiny’. It is in this way that Bhavabhaṭṭa explains it as referring to the officiant (... *ācāryasya prakṛtatvāt*).

who is (lakṣaṇam) I am more inclined to understand this word in a weak sense. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets it as the officiant’s name received in initiation (*abhiṣekanāma*)³²⁵ and goes on to identify the ‘enlightenments’ with terms borrowed from the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, namely omniscience (*sarvajñatā*), knowledge of the path (*mārgajñatā*), and knowledge of all aspects [of existence] (*sarvākārajñatā*).³²⁶ This is a rather ingenious solution on his part, but it is quite clear that it is forced. Note that the *Vajradāka* did not appropriate this quarter-verse, no doubt because it was felt to be highly obscure.

The limbs of awakening Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets these as the seven limbs of awakening for which see BHSD:403. He does not explain what the seven limbs of the body are, and – somewhat surprisingly – he gives a different reading for the corresponding verse in the *Vajradāka* (32.8b): **yan lag byang chub sems dpa’ ste/ zhes bya ba ni mig dang lag pa la sogs pa’i yan lag rnam snying po la sogs par blta’o//** (**Vajradākavivṛti* 160^r). Here it is the bodhisattvas beginning with [Kṣiti]garbha (or [Ākāśa]garbha) that are to be homologized with the eyes, arms, etc. of the officiant. Smṛtijñānakīrti (*Smṛti* 43^v) takes the second (and third?) quarter-verse to mean that the body of a *vajrācārya* has the characteristics of a perfectly enlightened buddha (**byang chub rdzogs pa’i mtshan nyid kun/ zhes pa ni rdo rje slob dpon gyi lus dngos ni yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas kyi mtshan nyid do zhes pa’i don to//**), and the fourth quarter to mean that his limbs are of the nature of bodhisattvas (**yan lag byang chub sems dpa’ ste/ zhes pa ni rdo rje slob dpon gyi yan lag byang chub sems dpa’i rang bzhin yin no zhes pa’i tha tshig go//**).

³²⁵That is, not his worldly name. This esoteric name – usually ending in *-vajra* for men and beginning with *vajra-* for women with the other element depending on the clan-affinity of the initiand – is received during the *nāmābhiṣeka*. For lists of such names see e.g. Abhayākara Gupta’s *Vajrāvalī* ch. 28, Mahāmātī’s *Tattvaviśadā* Ms 6^r-6^v, etc.

³²⁶See OBERMILLER 1933:3-5.

which [embodies] all buddhas Bhavabhaṭṭa understands ‘all buddhas’ as one deity, Mahāvajradhara, who embodies all buddhas. He offers the same interpretation to the parallel in the *Vajradāka: sangs rgyas kun zhes bya ba ni rdo rje ’dzin pa’o*// (**Vajradākavivṛti* 160^r). Perhaps he had in mind a line of praise offered to Mahāvajrasattva in the *Kṛṣṇayamāri* (2.2): *sarvabuddhamayaḥ śāntaḥ* (or variant *śāstā*) *kāyavajra namo ’stu te*; or a line from the ‘hallmark-verses’ of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara: sarvabuddhamayaḥ sattvo vajrasattvaḥ param sukham* (as quoted in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* ch. 9; but also reproduced in the *Samputa* 1.3.4cd and elsewhere, e.g. the *Anāvilatantra* 38ab).

His body-hair is the arhats, his crown is the clans of five and so forth, his foot-stool is the worldly [deities], rays [issuing from his body] are the guhyakas – yakṣas and so on.

4.1.4

the arhats Bhavabhaṭṭa stretches the meaning of *arhat* to mean buddhas. But in the **Vajradākavivṛti* (160^r) he again opts for a different solution taking *arhats* in a more natural sense: *dgra bcom zhes bya ba ni khams gsum gyi ’dod chags dang bral ba rnam* so//.

his crown etc. The °*ādi* after ‘the five clans’ in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s view can mean three or six. This is a reference to the clan-systems on the different levels of Buddhist esoteric revelation: generally speaking the earlier texts have three clans (*tathāgata, vajra, padma*), with the *yogatantras* the most current model becomes that of five (*tathāgata, vajra, ratna, padma, karma*), which is sometimes said to be surpassed by the clan of Akṣobhya or Heruka, the sixth, in the *yoginītantras*. But there are other classifications as well, e.g. that of the *Guhyendutilaka* (this passage survives in quotation, *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* p. 9): *kulāḥ śatavidhāḥ proktāḥ samkṣepeṇa tu pañcadhā/punas trividhatām yānti kāyavākcittabhedataḥ*//, etc. Smṛtijñānakīrti’s interpretation (*Smṛti* 43^v) is more appropriate. He takes **śekharam** to mean topknot, and it is this that should be seen as a crown adorned by the five Buddhas beginning with Vairocana (*spyi gtsug dag tu rigs lnga ste/ zhes pa ni rdo rje slob dpon gyi dbu ni Rnam par snang mdzad la sogs pa rigs lngas dbu brgyan no zhes pa’i don to*//). This crown is received in initiation during the rite of the *makuṭābhīṣeka/mukutābhīṣeka* (‘crown consecration’), and it

is indeed usually adorned with the images of five Buddhas. The main goddess, Jñānaḍākinī, also wears such a headdress called *kirīṭa*, which is adorned with the five Buddhas: Vairocana in the east, Ratnasambhava in the north, Amitābha in the west, Amoghasiddhi in the south, and Akṣobhya in the middle. It is sometimes said to be topped by a *vajra* (cf. *Nibandha* ad 3.2.9).

his foot-stool etc. Surprisingly, Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets **pādapiṭha** as the officiant's feet (*pādau*). The imagery, however, is clear: worldly deities (which in Buddhism usually means Brahmanical deities) constitute the officiant's foot-rest, i.e. they are submitted to his will.

rays etc. The root-text seems to take *yakṣas* as one class of *guhyakas*, although usually they are equated. For example Vajrapāṇi is interchangeably called *yakṣādhipati* (cf. *Nibandha* ad 3.1.6: *yakṣādhipatiṃ Vajrapāṇim; Buddhakapāla* Ms 3^v: *atha Vajrapāṇi[r] mahāyakṣādhipatiḥ*), and *guhyakādhipati* (cf. *Ratnāvalī* ad 18.3: *mahāguhyakā yakṣāḥ, teṣāṃ patis tu Vajrapāṇiḥ*).

Bhavabhaṭṭa was aware of the problem, hence he glosses **guhyakam** as *gandharvāḥ* ('heavenly musicians'), and silently interprets the °**ādi**° out of sequence (*bhinnakrama*) by glossing it with *bhūta* ('ghosts'). The latter is an odd choice, since ghosts are usually considered inauspicious supernatural beings.

Smṛtijñānakīrti follows the first interpretation; however, it is unclear what he equates *yakṣas* with since **raśmi** remains unaccounted for in his interpretation: *'od zer gnod sbyin gsang ba sogs/ zhes pa ni/ rdo rje slob dpon gyi †. . . † gsang ba'i ris gnod sbyin la sogs pa'i rang bzhin no zhes pa'o||*.

This passage about the way of looking upon the guru and its exegesis is mentioned by Tsong kha pa in his commentary to the *Gurupañcāśikā*, the *Slob ma'i re ba kun skong* (SPARHAM 1999:111-112). The textual problem in Smṛtijñānakīrti's text was noticed by Tsong kha pa who solved it through reintroducing the lemma *'od zer* where our obeli are (*pace* SPARHAM).

The body of yogins, knowledgeable ones whose endowment with qualities is of a definition to be known, should always be viewed as consisting of such qualities.

4.1.5

whose etc. The text is hopelessly obscure at this point, and the bizarre English follows Bhavabhaṭṭa's equally bizarre attempt to make sense of the

second line (by glossing **lakṣaṇayoktavyam** as *lakṣaṇayogaḥ*, and **jñeyalakṣaṇam** as *vakṣyamāṇarūpaḥ*). **Yoginām** should have perhaps been interpreted as ‘for [initiate] *yogins*’ referring to the disciples, and it is in this way that Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets (**Vajradākavivṛti* 160^r) the parallel line in the *Vajradāka*: *de ltar mtshan nyid shes par byas la/ ye shes don du gnyer ba’i rnal ’byor pas rtag tu bsten par bya’o [...]* “After having ascertained [the officiant’s] qualities, the *yogin* seeking knowledge should eternally subject himself to him.”

Smṛtijñānakīrti’s interpretation (*Smṛti* 43^v-44^r) is unhelpful (*ye shes can gyi shes bya’i rtags/ zhes pa ni rdo rje slob dpon gyi yon tan de ’dra ba ye shes can slob mas shes par bya’o//*, “... such qualities of the vajra-master should be known by knowledgeable students”).

The editors of the *Vajradāka* tried to make a relative clause out of this line and provided it with a prose passage of their own: *gurur īḍṛk yatnāt sevyaṃānaḥ/* “It is such a guru that should be diligently served, whose [...]” but this is equally unsuccessful.

The original intention of this verse was most likely to bridge the description about the officiant’s body and the description of his behaviour.

[The ideal officiant] is disciplined, of gentle habit (śāntaveśam tu), giving refuge to all sentient beings, knowledgeable in the application of mantra[s] and tantra[s], versed (°vā) in meditation, crafts, the arts, and so forth. 4.1.6

of gentle habit (śāntaveśam tu) Bhavabhaṭṭa’s interpretation is that the officiant is *śāntaveśaḥ* for he has abandoned his worldly attire (*laukikaveśaparihārāt*). We should understand °**veśa** as either an error or variant for *veśa*. A similar expression is glossed by *Jinadatta in his **Guhyaśamāja-tantrapāñjikā* (195^r): *zla ba’i ’od mtshungs pa zhes bya ba ni zhi ba’i cha byad dkar po’o//*. Associating *śānta* with the colour white is also present in the *Sādhanamālā* no. 33 where the iconographic description of Avalokiteśvara has [...] *bhagavantam āryāvalokiteśvaram sarvāṅgaśuklaṃ jaṭāmakuṭīnam śāntaveśam [...]* and similarly no. 34: [...] *bhagavalLokēśvaram sthiracitenātmānam vibhāvayet ṣaḍbhujam śuklavarnam jaṭāmukūṭīnam śāntaveśam [...]*. Are we to understand from the root-text that the officiant is wearing white robes, that is, he is a householder? If so, then Bhavabhaṭṭa’s explanation as someone who has abandoned his worldly attire, i.e. the officiant is a monk or an ascetic, is contrary to the original meaning. In the view of

the *Maṅḍalopāyikā* the officiant is quite clearly a householder (see notes to vv. 46-48 below). Surprisingly the **Vajradākavivṛti* (159^r) yet again offers a different interpretation for the parallel verse in the *Vajradāka*: **cha lugs mdzes pa zhes bya ba ni rjes su 'cham pa'i spyod pa dang ldan pa ste/ [...]** “He has a radiant attire means that he is endowed with an agreeable behaviour [...].”

tantra[s] Bhavabhaṭṭa’s gloss is surprising: “tantra[s] are the circular diagrams (*cakram*) of placating and so forth.” The circular diagrams he alludes to are taught in 3.2.1-41. The underlying idea behind this interpretation was to include among the repertoire of the officiant’s skills topics related to the *tantra* under scrutiny. In the **Vajradākavivṛti* (159^r) also the glosses are selected in accordance with the topics of that tantra: “**Tantra[s]** are the [procedures involving] herbs.³²⁷ **Mantra[s]** are the *aṣṭapada* [*mantras*]³²⁸ and so forth.” (*rgyud ni sman rnamso// sngags ni rkang pa brgyad pa la sogs pa'o//*)

versed (°vā) This should be understood as a form of the suffix *-vat* (‘endowed with’, ‘in the possession of’), which in Nominative would be *-vān*, here losing the ending probably through an interim stage of nasalization (**-vā̃*). Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, takes it as the root $\sqrt{vā}$ meaning $\sqrt{jñā}$ ‘to know’ (*vāti jānātīti*). This, to my knowledge, is unattested, unless Bhavabhaṭṭa is stretching one of the lexicographical meanings, ‘to go’ (*Dhātupāṭha* has *vā gatigandhanayoḥ*), in the sense ‘to understand’, i.e. ‘to know’.

meditation (yoga°) According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this ‘yoga’ is the *yoga* related to wind etc. (*vāyavyādi°*). This is an allusion to *Catuṣpīṭha* 1.1.88, a passage which in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s view alludes to the depth of breath during certain rituals. Thus, during ‘wind-yoga’ the breath measures six breadths of a finger, during ‘fire-yoga’ four, during ‘water-yoga’ twelve, and during ‘earth-yoga’ sixteen (*Nibandha* ad loc. cit.: *tatra vāyavyaṃ ṣaḍaṅgulaṃ, āgneyaṃ caturaṅgulaṃ, vāruṇaṃ dvādaśaṅgulaṃ, māhendraṃ ṣoḍaśaṅgulaṃ iti*). In

³²⁷The *Vajradāka* excels in such procedures, cf. for example ch. 17.

³²⁸These are two series of eight mantras (one for the chief deity and one for his consort) peculiar to the Śaṃvara cult. They are given in several texts, e.g. Abhayākaragupta’s *Śrīsamvarābhisamayopāyikā* Ms 7^v.

his commentary to the *Vajradāka* (**Vajradākavivṛti* 159^r), however, he simply glosses *yoga* with *bya ba* (‘performing [rituals]’).

crafts Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses this as ‘painting’ (*citrakarma*), presumably referring to painting icons. Cf. **Vajradākavivṛti* (159^r) ad parallel in the *Vajradāka*: “**crafts** cover drawing the *maṇḍala* and so forth” (*dkyil ’khor bri ba la sogs pa’i bya ba la bzo ba’o//*).

the arts, and so forth There are several lists for the arts in Indian literature, the most popular being that of ‘the sixty-four *kalās*’. Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses this as the “discipline of medicine and so forth”. In his view the °**ādi**° denotes the discipline of grammar and so on.

[There is] sweetness in all [his] words; all beings [are to him] like an only son; he always delights in giving and so on; he is focused on yoga and meditation. 4.1.7

giving and so on Giving is the first of the six or ten ‘perfections’ (*pāramitā*) that a perfect bodhisattva possesses, and this is what Bhavabhaṭṭa alludes to with his gloss by continuing the list with the next two: morality (*śīla*), and forbearance (*kṣānti*).

yoga and meditation The two, *yoga* and *dhyāna*, are more or less interchangeable, and it is for this reason that Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the first as ‘the union of wisdom and means’ (*prajñopāyayogaḥ*).³²⁹

He speaks the truth, [observes] non-violence, his mind is committed to compassion; having generated an equanimous attitude, he is (°*bhūtakaiḥ*) a protector of beings; he thoroughly knows the ten topics (*daśatattva*°)– such a man is called an officiant. 4.1.8

the ten topics (*daśatattva*°) Bhavabhaṭṭa lists the ten topics in an untraced verse:

³²⁹This is the widely quoted definition of the *Samājottara* (33ab): *prajñopāyasamāpattir yoga ity abhidhāyate*].

The maṇḍala, one's own meditation (*svasamādhiḥ*), the gesture[s] (*mudrā*), the [dancing] postures (*karaṇam*), the [yogic-]positions (*āsanam*), recitation (*japa*), the fire sacrifice (*homa*), worship (*pūjā*), the application of rituals (*karmayoga*), and concluding [rites] (*upasamḥṛti*).

In his commentary on the verbatim parallel in the *Vajradāka* (32.7a) Bhavabhaṭṭa gives the very same list in prose (**Vajradākavivṛti*, 159^v): **de nyid bcu ni dkyil 'khor dang/ ting nge 'dzin dang/ phyang rgya dang/ ka ra ṅa dang/ 'dug stangs dang/ bzlas pa dang/ sbyin sreg dang/ mchod pa dang/ las kyi sbyor ba dang/ nye bar bsdu ba ste bya ba de dag la mkhas pa'o//**. It is not entirely certain which particular source he has in mind here, but I am inclined towards relating it to a list of the *Māyājāla* (133^v), despite the fact that there the list seems to be part of a prose passage (although the prose in the Tibetan translation could have been a slip on the translators' part): *dkyil 'khor dang/ ting nge 'dzin dang/ phyang rgya dang/ stang stabs dang/ 'dug stangs dang/ bzlas brjod dang/ sbyin sreg dang/ mchod pa dang/ las la sbyar ba dang/ slar bsdu ba rnams ni/ gsang sngags kyi tshul de kho na nyid bcu yin par gsungs so//*.

An identical list - this time in meter - is found in the **Vajrahṛdayālamkāra* (58^r). However, here this series is considered to be merely the 'exoteric' (*phyi'i de nyid bcu*, **bāhyadaśatattva*) half of two *daśatattva* lists: *dkyil 'khor ting 'dzin phyang rgya dang/ stang stabs 'dug stangs bzlas brjod dang/ sbyin sreg mchod pa las sbyor dang/ slar sdud pa yi rnam pa ni/ phyi yi de nyid bcu yin no//* I find it improbable that Bhavabhaṭṭa would have opted to quote only the exoteric topics an officiant should be proficient in, and ignore the 'esoteric' list (*gsang ba'i de nyid bcu*, **guhyaśatattva*) which runs as follows (*ibid.* 57^v-58^r): *phyir bzlog gnyis kyi cho ga (*pratyāṅgirāvidhī) dang/ gsang (*guhya[-abhiṣeka]) dang/ shes rab ye shes (*prajñājñāna[-abhiṣeka]) dang/ kha sbyor 'byed pa'i cho ga (*saṃpuṭīkaraṇavidhi) dang/ gtor ma (*bali) rdo rje'i bzlas pa (*vajrajapa) dang/ drag shul sgrub pa'i cho ga (*abhicāraavidhi) dang/ rab tu gnas (*pratīsthā) dang/ dkyil 'khor sgrub (*maṇḍalasādhana)// gsang ba'i de nyid bcu yin no//*.

When faced with the problem of harmonizing the two lists, Tsong kha pa opted for the elegant solution of attributing the list of exoteric topics to masters of the lower *tantras* and the esoteric list to masters of the higher *tantras* (SPARHAM 1999:100): *de ltar na rgyud sde 'og ma'i rdo rje slob dpon yin na bcu tshan 'og ma dang/ bla med kyi rdo rje slob dpon gyis ni bcu tshan*

dang po'i de nyid bcu legs par shes dgos so||.

Smṛtijñānakīrti stands apart from Bhavabhaṭṭa, since he gives a non-standard list (or at least not standardized anywhere to my knowledge). This seems a more natural enumeration since it lists topics with which the tantra deals (*Smṛti* 44^r): *rdo rje'i de kho na nyid (*vajratattva) dang| dril bu'i de kho na nyid (*ghaṇṭātattva) dang| ye shes kyi de kho na nyid (*jñānatattva) dang| lha'i de kho na nyid (*devatātattva) dang| dkyil 'khor gyi de kho na nyid (*maṇḍalatattva) dang| sbyin sreg gi de kho na nyid (*homatattva) dang| sngags kyi de kho na nyid (*mantratattva) dang| rdul mtshon gyi de kho na nyid (*rajastattva) dang| gtor ma'i de kho na nyid (*balitattva) dang| dbang bskur ba'i de kho na nyid (*abhiṣekatattva) dang| bcu po rnamso||.*

There are yet further lists of the 'ten topics', e.g. in the anonymous commentary on Ratnākaraśānti's *Gaṇamaṇḍalavidhi* (3^r), Kṣitigarbha's *Daśatattvasaṃgraha*, and elsewhere.

is called an officiant In Bhavabhaṭṭa's view (ll. 7-14) this is to be understood through *nirukti*:

It is these, beginning with discipline (*vinaya*^o) [mentioned in 6a], that those who want what is best (*śreyo'rthibhiḥ*) repeat (*guṇyante*), i.e. practice (*abhyasyante*), hence they are called qualities (*guṇāḥ*). Through conjunction with these there is worthiness of being an officiant (*ācāryakam*), and also [worthiness of] having the name 'guru' (*gurusamjñā*) – through practicing the said qualities (*yathoktaguṇācaraṇāt*). In this respect it is said–

*Through the perfect practice (°ācaraṇāt)
of what has been said (yathokta°),
either for the benefit of others or one's self,
the guru is called 'ācārya' by the wise.*³³⁰

II. Definition of the observance

[O Vajrapāṇi!] Hear [something] else [now], according to the truth: the observance that is the duty of initiates.

4.1.9ab

³³⁰The verse remains untraced. For similar explanations cf. the *Kriyāsamuccaya* (MORIGUCHI 1998:71): *laukikalokottarācāraṃ darśayatīty ācāryaḥ|| atha vā| arād dūraṃ pāpakebhyaḥ dharmebhyaś caratīty ācāryaḥ|.*

He who despises the officiant, the secrets, the yoginī[s], the yoga, the deities, the pledge[s], the observance, the [wordly] gods, [and] those engaged (°yaugikā) in the secret bali and so forth, will quickly fall into the Avīci [hell]; [and also the one] not [keeping the] pledges – whatever the case (sarvatra).

4.1.9cd-
10

the officiant etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets this passage in two ways. My translation mirrors his second opinion. It is this, the more natural, interpretation that is seemingly given by the same author in the **Vajradākaviṛti* (130^v). As outlined e.g. in the *Mūlāpattisaṃgraha* despising the officiant, fellow initiates (read *vajrabhrātr̥ṇām* for *vajrajñāt̥ṇām*), the teaching, consorts, etc. are all ‘root transgressions’ (*mūlāpattayaḥ*), and despising the pledges (perhaps here the consumables are meant) is a ‘gross transgression’ (*sthūlāpattiḥ*).

In the first interpretation Bhavabhaṭṭa construes all elements in 9c-10b with the *ācārya* in 9c. Thus it is the officiant who is ‘the secret’ (**guhyanām**), which is glossed as Vajradhara. To substantiate this claim he quotes without attribution two famous passages, one from the *Guhyasamāja* and one from the *Gurupañcāsikā* which claim that the officiant/guru and the paramount deity are one and the same. Similarly it is the officiant who is ‘the *yoginīs*’ beginning with Jñānaḍākinī, and it is the officiant who is the **yogadevatā** (reading it as a compound), i.e. deities in sexual union (*prajñōpāyasamāpannāḥ*). 10a (*samayācāradevasya*) is also taken as a compound, and interpreted as ‘the one who rejoices³³¹ in the practice (°**ācāra**°) of the pledge[s] (**samaya**°)’, i.e. the officiant. The pledges are here defined as ‘the ones to be eaten’,³³² namely the five meats (*pañcāṅkuśa*), and the five nectars (*pañcāmṛta*).

[and also the one] not [keeping the] pledges etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa explains that the intended meaning is that even if one has obtained the pledges unintentionally (*anicchann api*), through aversion one will fall into the Avīci [hell]. He presumably has in mind those who have obtained the Tantric

³³¹Deriving **deva** from the root \sqrt{div} , which can also mean to rejoice or to be busy with (*Dhātupāṭha* 4.1).

³³²Pledge (*samaya*) has two meanings in Tantric Buddhism: pledges that are to be kept (*rakṣaṇīyāḥ*), and the pledges that are to be eaten (*bhakṣaṇīyāḥ*), i.e. the antinomian substances. Cf. *Cakrasamvarapañjikā*, p. 109.

pledges through being the subordinates (people of the household, servants, and the such) of the initiate. These subordinates (and other onlookers) are often enjoined to see the *maṇḍala* and receive minimal instructions (and sometimes the pledge-water) after the consecrations of the main initiand have taken place. Cf. e.g. *Buddhakaṇḍala* ch. 4 (T_D 154^v): *de nas gzhan yang don du gnyer ba'i sems can de rnam s thams cad la dkyil 'khor bstan te/ dung phor kyī chu 'thungs pa des na dug med par 'gyur te/ sbrul gyis mi 'dzin no*||. Alternatively, perhaps the commentator means the craftsmen (*śilpin*) employed in constructing the *maṇḍala*. They are also said to receive some pledges, cf. e.g. *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 4.28cd: *raja[h]śilpī tu karmāṇā[ṇ] samayaśikṣaṃ tu kārayet*||.

He who uses [the officiant's] bedstead, seat (°niṣadya°), slippers, parasol, [or] clothes, he who steps over [or] treads on [his] shadow, and he who openly (praśrabdhā) says (°vat) [to him] the word 'no', will also fall into the Avīci hell].

4.1.11

openly etc. This meaning is problematic. Dictionaries attest *praśrabdhī* in the sense 'trust', 'confidence', but it is not a word generally used. The mss. of the *Nibandha* give different glosses for this word: the more trusted ms. K has '*vacanāt*', whereas mss. M and S have *balāt*. It seems that Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets **praśrabdhā** adverbially 'openly' (*vacanāt*), as referring to an explicit refusal, and then adds that objections on the student's part need to be expressed politely, e.g. "This is a fine act that his reverence has ordered! However, ..." This is not an unknown trope. The *Gurupañcāśikā* (v. 24) says: *yatnāt kuryād guror ājñāṃ hr̥ṣṭacitto mahāmatih/ aśaktau śrāvayet tasmā upapattyā tv aśaktitām*³³³|| "The magnanimous one should exert himself with a happy heart to fulfill the command of the guru. When unable [to do so], he should respectfully inform him of his inability in a suitable manner." Another, not entirely clear, interpretation is given in the **Vajradākavivṛti* (130^v) for the odd word *praśrabdhā*: *co 'dri ba ni bzhad gad la sogs pas slong ba'o*|| "**Ridicule** means violation through making fun of, etc."

[will also fall into the Avīci hell] I have followed Bhavabhaṭṭa who construes this from the previous verse, although it is equally possible that the semantic construction should go with the next verse.

³³³ *tv aśaktitām*] em., *tv aśaktinām* Ed. (LÉVI), *tadaśaktitām* Ms

If these are [committed], pain and possession [by evil spirits] (grastā) will follow at all times. [The initiate will suffer] a loss of purpose, removal of fortune, and he will be tormented by wicked demons. 4.1.12

possession [by evil spirits] (grastā) The root \sqrt{gras} is overwhelmingly attested in this meaning in the exorcists' idiom, especially for suffering from evil planetary influences. In order to remove the tautology (much the same is stated in the last quarter verse) Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets **grastā** as *labdhā* 'obtained', and construes it with **pīḍā**.

removal of fortune Fortune, according to the commentator, has two meanings here. It can simply mean 'prosperity' (*lakṣmīḥ*), or it can have a more technical sense: the two 'equipments' (*sambhāra*), of merit and wisdom, that a bodhisattva has to provide himself with.

Stepping over [or] treading on the [guru's] shadow is said to be [equivalent] to destroying a reliquary. Verily, he who despises the officiant, will never obtain accomplishment, [not even] in dreams. 4.1.13

destroying a reliquary This is said to be the last of the five crimes of immediate retribution (*ānantaryakarmāṇi*). The list varies slightly from source to source, cf. *Abhidharmakośa* (4.106-7ab): *dūṣaṇaṃ mātur arhantyaṃ niyatiṣṭhasya māraṇam/ bodhisattvasya śaikṣasya saṃghāyadvārahārikā// ānantaryasabhāgāni pañcamaṃ stūpabhedanam/* with the notes to 4.3.52cd-53.

The virtues of the officiant should be adopted, but never his faults. It is through (mārgeṇa) him (tasya) that there is accomplishment in the application of spell[s], gesture[s], etc. 4.1.14

The virtues etc. This statement is severely contested in the *Kālacakra* exegesis, see Vajragarbha's *Piṇḍārthaṭīkā* 1.12-15ab, and *Vimalaprabhā* vol. II, p. 4. According to these exegetes gurus with faults should be avoided at all costs, since a true master is faultless.

III. Initiation

After accepting [the initiand for initiation] by first [bestowing] the disciplines[, the officiant should perform] the [construction of the] maṇḍala, etc. and the bali rites. First he should teach the single graph as the five Buddhas.

4.1.15

first [bestowing] the disciplines This in Bhavabhaṭṭa's view means giving instructions related to the ten wholesome actions (*daśakuśala*), which are defined elsewhere as abstaining from killing, stealing, etc. He also includes other preliminaries such as taking refuge. In other words, it seems that if the initiate was not a Buddhist before, is converted just before taking initiation.

[, **the officiant etc.**] As the passage is very laconic, we must assume that here **maṇḍalādi** means all rites related to constructing the diagram of the deities. For these see *Maṇḍalopāyikā* chs. 2-22, *Pañjikā* ad 2.3 (Kalyāṇavarman's long excursus based on the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* on drawing the *maṇḍala*), for a general overview see *Vajrāvalī* chs. 3-16, 20-21, etc.

the bali rites According to the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (ch. 19, see synopsis above) there are four *bali* rites (usually offering food) to be performed on the four sides of the *maṇḍala*: for gods (*deva*) in the east, for *nāgas* in the north, for *yakṣas* in the west, and for ghosts (*bhūta*) in the south.

the single graph etc. This is the syllable HŪṂ, the seed-mantra of Jñānaḍākinī, which is frequently described as embodying the five Buddhas in this corpus (e.g. 1.2.19cd-20, 3.2.6-7ab & *passim*, the obeisance verse of the *Pañjikā* 1^v, etc.).

Bhavabhaṭṭa forces the second line to mean bestowing the crown-consecration (*makuṭābhīṣeka/mukuṭābhīṣeka*). The only grip he has in this respect is **pañcabuddhābhi**, since the crown indeed has the images of the five Buddhas (or Tathāgatas). He then interprets **pūrvākṣaram** as the 'primordial graph', i.e. HŪṂ, and very implausibly takes **ekasya** to mean the mantra ĀḤ, adding that OM and SVĀHĀ should be understood as being implicit. The reason for this artifice is that the mantra given for the crown-initiation in the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* (26.13) is OM HŪṂ ĀḤ SVĀHĀ.

Ritual[s] will succeed in accordance to his wishes [if the initiate performs them] in conjunction with that [i.e. the syllable hūṃ]. [Then the officiant] should visualize the eight syllables [on the body] of [the initiand thus] endowed with the consecration of the mantra [hūṃ]. 4.1.16

the eight syllables This is a procedure in which the eight *mantras* of the central goddesses are visualized on certain parts of the body in order to protect it. The procedure is otherwise called *aṣṭāṅgakalana*, first alluded to in the tantra in 1.2.41. Bhavabhaṭṭa explains the correspondences thus: KṢUṂ on the head, YUṂ on the nose and ears, HUṂ on the eyes, SUṂ on the throat, SMRYUṂ on the neck, KṢMRYUṂ on the the shoulders, YMRYUṂ on the heart, and HMRYUṂ on the navel.

[The officiant] should [then] teach [him] the consecration of the non-dual bali together with its doctrine. [Then, after the initiand has been] joined with the consecration of yoga, [the officiant] should teach the knowledge [and] the understanding. As for the consecration of the officiant, [therein] all secret[s] and the rest are told. 4.1.17

the consecration of the non-dual bali This seems to be one of the consecrations envisioned by the *Catuspīṭha*, one unattested elsewhere. The non-dual³³⁴ *bali* offering plays a major role in the tantra, indeed, it is one of its most important rituals. Teachings related to this rite are given in several passages, most importantly in 2.3.85-86ab and 2.4.36-45. Beyond the usual articles offered in worship (flowers, incense, etc.) here antinomian substances³³⁵ are given in propitiation: raw fish and meat, garlic,³³⁶ the five ‘nectars’ (urine, semen, menstrual blood, faeces, and flesh),³³⁷ and the five ‘hooks’ (elephant-meat, beef, dog-meat, horse-meat, and human flesh).³³⁸

³³⁴*Adaityā* mirrors a Bengali pronunciation of *advaita/advaitā*.

³³⁵Cf. *Nibandha* ad 2.3.85: *yatra pañcāmṛtāni pañcāṅkuṣā āmamatsyamāṃsapalāṇḍvādīkaṃ ca so 'daityābaliḥ*

³³⁶*Alliaceae* are forbidden in the strict brahmanical diet.

³³⁷This topic is extensively taught in 2.4.3-14.

³³⁸This topic is extensively taught in 2.4.29-35.

together with its doctrine I take this as a reference to the teachings attached to the non-dual *bali*, such as the mantras to empower the substances, different ways of application in order to obtain supernatural accomplishments, etc. Cf. *Nibandha* ad 2.4.36-45.

Bhavabhaṭṭa reads the first line differently: he takes **adaityābaly** separately to indicate that at this point in initiation such a *bali* should be offered. The rest of the line he interprets as a reference to the consecrations of the *vajra* (*vajrābhīṣeka*) and the bell (*ghaṇṭābhīṣeka*), but offers no further clarification how this actually works.

Smṛtijñānakīrti's interpretation is equally unconvincing (*Smṛti* 44^v): he understands **dharmeṇa** as referring to “teachings about the reality of phenomena (**dharmatā, chos nyid*), whereby the initiand receives a ‘non-dual consecration’ (gnyis su med pa'i dbang bskur)”. Again, no further clarification is given.

joined etc. Smṛtijñānakīrti explains that this is the consecration in which the initiand is taught the meaning of being ‘joined with truth’ (**tattvayoga, de nyid sbyor ba*), but offers no further explanation except citing the *Guhya-samāja*-definition of ‘yoga’ (see note ad 4.1.7 above).

the knowledge (jñāna°) [and] the understanding *Jñāna* and *vijñāna* are frequently juxtaposed in the tantra, and the commentators offer a plethora of interpretations, usually varying from context to context. Thus at the first occurrence in 1.4.5e Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets *jñāna* as means (*upāya*), and *vijñāna* as wisdom (*prajñā*), which are also code-words for the male and female deity, and the practitioner and his consort respectively. Kalyāṇavarman (*Pañjikā* 2^r), however, interprets *jñāna* somewhat mysteriously as ‘the knowledge of [dichotomies] such as reality and unreality’ (*sadasadādi°*), and *vijñāna* as ‘life’ (*jīvitam*). Durjayacandra (*Mitapadā* 2^r) offers a third interpretation: *jñāna* stands for the means of obtaining transcendence (*paraloka°*), whereas *vijñāna* for the means of obtaining accomplishments related to this world (*aiḥika°*). Further interpretations include taking them as synonyms for consciousness (*Nibandha* ad 1.4.16a), meditating upon the syllable HŪṀ (*Nibandha* ad 3.2.63d), or simply the syllable HŪṀ (*Mitapadā* ad 3.2.63d, *Nibandha* ad 4.3.23d), and others.

the consecration of the officiant This line is crucial for determining the relative chronology of the *Catuspīṭha*. The *guhyaḥhiṣeka* from the tenth century onwards is taken to mean a consecration in which the officiant copulates with his consort, and the ejaculates are given to the initiand. However, here it is the more archaic usage of *guhya* that seems to be implied, namely explaining through verbal instruction to the initiand all matters related to becoming an officiant (cf. *Sarvavaḥrodāya* sect. 75).

Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, sees (or has to see) in this passage references to the model of consecrations that was current at his time. In order to achieve this he again forces the text: he takes the missing ‘name-consecration’ (*nāmāḥhiṣeka*) to be implied in the word **sarva**, ‘the secret-consecration’ (*guhyaḥhiṣeka*) to be indicated by **guhya**, and ‘the fourth consecration’ (*caturthāḥhiṣeka*) by **ādi**.³³⁹ He resorts to the same exegetical artifice in his *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* (vol. I, p. 39). Cf. SANDERSON 2009:208-212.

The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* transmits 4.1.17cdef by re-arranging its quarter-verses, as if it read *cfed. This cannot be a scribal error in the transmission of the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, since the re-arranged order is witnessed by Smṛtijñānakīrti (*Smṛti* 44^v -45^r).

The initiands should then first stand [in front of the guru] with their palms cupped in reverence after having arranged their upper robe on one shoulder and placing their right knee-cap on the ground.

4.1.18

The initiands etc. Here we see the literary trope, standard in the proemia of Buddhist scriptural texts (cf. 1.1.3), in which students are said to have petitioned a teacher for instruction by assuming this posture and gesture. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets this passage as not only prescribing the way in which initiands³⁴⁰ are to petition the officiant, but also as referring to a crucial moment in initiation, the rite of ‘making [the initiand] fit’ (*adhivāsanā*),³⁴¹ beginning with giving him some water empowered by a *mantra* and a toothpick for cleansing the mouth.

³³⁹Note that he is still missing the *prajñājñānāḥhiṣeka*, which he tries to include before verse 31 below.

³⁴⁰The text has a plural here, but Bhavabhaṭṭa consistently speaks of a single initiate. This is permissible, since in the case of multiple initiands one is always appointed as a ‘chief disciple’ to act on behalf of others if required. Cf. *Vajrāvalī* ch. 20: *śiṣyam ekaṃ pradhānīkṛtya [...]*

³⁴¹I.e. to purify him ritually so that he may undergo further stages.

The skilled guru, seated on a throne, [after] visualizing himself as the deity should take the hand [of the initiand] in [his] hand and impart [to him] the discipline. 4.1.19

on a throne That is, a ‘lion-throne’ (*siṃhāsana*), a seat supported by lions, imitating a royal throne.

should take the hand etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa slightly modifies this ritual detail. He says that the guru should touch with his right hand the cupped hands of the initiate whilst he is holding them in front of his chest. The same description is given in *Smṛti* (45^r).

the discipline Here the *saṃvarapāṭha* is meant. The initiand is made to recite the verses that follow.

«I eternally take refuge in the Buddha, the doctrine, and the community [of monks], in all the three vehicles, in the yoga, in the secret[s] and so on, in the dākinī[s], the heroes and heroines, the goddesses, the magnanimous bodhisattvas, and I eternally take refuge especially in the officiant. Bear witness to me all you Buddhas and bodhisattvas headed by Vairocana, Akṣobhya, Ratnāgrya, Lokeśa, [and] Amoghasiddhi! I, of so-and-so name, beginning from this moment up to the time [I] take up [my] abode at the bodhimaṇḍa, will deliver those that are not delivered [from transmigration], I shall release those that are not released [from transmigration]. Be now compassionate [to me,] the abode for the deeds of the great doctrine!» 4.1.20-23

I etc. The text is a reworked amalgamation of several formulae, for more ‘classical’ forms see e.g. *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 4.8-14, for a similar reworking see e.g. *Samvarodayā* vv. 445-448.

bodhimaṇḍa I.e. the *vajrāsana* at Bodh Gaya, imitating the historical Buddha.

[The initiand] should recite (uktavān) thus either twice or thrice with an equanimous mind. 4.1.24

Bhavabhaṭṭa introduces hereafter several rituals of which the root-text is silent. In his view the ‘making fit’ of the initiand (*adhivāsana*) concludes here, but he also states that some teachings, such as the doctrine of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, should be given at this stage. Thereafter the officiant should worship the *maṇḍala* with the twenty-fold *pūjā*,³⁴² songs, and hymns. Then he should blindfold the initiand, make him hold a handful of flowers, and lead him to the door of *maṇḍala*.³⁴³ There he should make him recite the vows again.

Om, all phenomena are pure by nature – I am pure by nature. Om, all existents are purified by non-dual [essence] (vajra°) – I am purified by non-dual [essence]. Om, all phenomena are purified by yoga – I am purified by yoga. 4.1.25-27

It is here that Bhavabhaṭṭa seeks to rearrange and expand the text to confirm with the sequence prescribed by the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*. First the initiand is made to recite the ‘triple purificatory formula’ (25-27), then he should recite the vows of temperance given in vss. 42-43, after that he should bow to the *maṇḍala* with the *mantras* given in 39-41. Then the officiant should recite the *mantra* given as v. 44, empower the initiand’s body, speech, and mind according to vss. 33-34ab, and give him the five nectars as per 35-36ab. Then the officiant should make the initiand enter into a state of possession (*āveśa*), the procedures for which is given in 3.2.1-27 and *Maṇḍalopāyikā* ch. 2. Then the initiate should cast a flower unto the *maṇḍala*. His blindfold is removed. Upon seeing the *maṇḍala* he recites three *mantras*: “om, I have entered the great *maṇḍala*,” etc. Thereafter the officiant visualizes *mantras* on the initiand’s body in order to protect him, instructs him to visualize himself as a deity, and finally starts bestowing the consecrations beginning with the *udakābhiṣeka*.

The three deeds of the body, the four [deeds] of speech, and the three [deeds] of the mind – these vows (samayam) 4.1.28

³⁴²A group of acts of worship peculiar to this corpus, taught in 2.3.87ff.

³⁴³The *maṇḍala* is drawn in an enclosed space, either a permanent construction (*maṇḍalagrha*), or the area is surrounded by a curtain.

eṣo) are not to be respected (na rakṣitāḥ). [The officiant] should teach the doctrine as stated to [the initiand] who is endowed with the knowledge of equanimity in mind.

The three deeds of the body *Smṛti* (45^v) explains these as killing, stealing, and promiscuity.

the four [deeds] of speech *Ibid.* explained as lying, slander, abuse, and revealing the faults of others.

the three [deeds] of the mind *Ibid.* explained as greed, malice, and false views.

these vows (samayam eṣo) are not to be respected (na rakṣitāḥ) Bhavabhaṭṭa explains this as a rhetorical question: ‘Should not these vows be respected?’ (*na rakṣaṇīyāḥ kiṃ? api tu rakṣaṇīya ity arthaḥ*). The negative particle is indeed puzzling, and it is for this reason that we have so many variant readings in the mss. The underlying idea was perhaps that these well-known Buddhist ethical rules are re-interpreted in the Tantric tradition. The *Guhyasamāja* has (16.61)³⁴⁴:

*samayaṃ śrāvayed guhyaṃ sarvabuddhair udāhṛtam |
prāṇinaś ca tvayā ghātyā vaktavyaṃ ca mṛṣā vacaḥ |
adattaṃ ca tvayā grāhyaṃ sevanaṃ yoṣitām api ||*

[The officiant] should recite [to the initiand] the secret vows, which have been spoken by all buddhas (or: the All-buddha, i.e. Vajradhara): you should kill living beings, you should utter false words, you should take what has not been given, and you should frequent women as well.

These ‘secret’ vows are then interpreted in an anti-antinomian way, e.g. ‘lying’ means reciting the mantras, or teaching the doctrine. For from the viewpoint of definite truth ultimate reality cannot be expressed (*anabhilāpya*),

³⁴⁴This famous verse (cdef of v. 61) is copied over into the *Hevajra* (II.iii.29), the *Vajradāka* (32.42), etc.

and as such anything stated about it is falsehood. ‘Killing’ in this interpretation means realizing the insubstantiality (*nihsvabhāvatva*) of the constituents of the person.³⁴⁵

Then [the officiant] should cover the eyes [of the initiand] with a cloth and lead him to the bali-ground. Taking [the initiand’s] hand into his hand he should then instruct [him] (kārayet) in the discipline and the rest. 4.1.29

the bali-ground According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this is the ground where the *maṇḍala* was drawn. I see no other possible interpretation, but the expression is unusual because the *bali* – essentially a ransom for undesirable entities – is usually offered outside the sacred *maṇḍala*-ground. Perhaps this is the point in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s second gloss for this passage (*maṇḍaladvārasamīpanayanād anantaram*): the initiate is led into the grounds but he is made to halt at the entrance of the *maṇḍala* proper. This interpretation is also the one in *Smṛti* (46^r): *gtor ma’i sa ru zhes pa ni phyi nang gi sgo’i bar gyi sa’o*||.

the discipline and the rest The ‘discipline’ refers to repeating the previous vows (4.1.20-23), and ‘the rest’ refers to the next verse (4.1.30).

«I take refuge in the officiant [whose] body consists of all buddhas, [and I] bow to the sacred site of yoga (yogapīṭham), [and] the circle of heroes and heroines (°vīrāṅga°).» 4.1.30

sacred site of yoga (yogapīṭham) The *maṇḍala*, according to Bhavabhaṭṭa.

heroes and heroines (°vīrāṅga°) This must mean the enactment of the *maṇḍala* in the orgiastic feast (*gaṇacakra/gaṇamaṇḍala*) since the *maṇḍala* of the *Catuṣpīṭha* has only goddesses, not pairs. We must understand **vīrāṅga** in the sense of *vīrāṅganā*.

[The officiant] should make sure (jñeya) that the ini- 4.1.31

³⁴⁵Cf. e.g. the *Pradīpodyotana* pp. 47-48 citing a *vyākhyātantra* of the *Guhyasamāja*.

tiand is [like] a supreme (°ādi°) lion [roaming] the forest (°dava°) [of existence with the knowledge of] ultimate truth, that he is dedicated to meditation (yogavān), [and] that he aims at cutting through the blindfolding shrouds [of transmigration].

should make sure (jñeya) In other words the officiant must be satisfied that the initiand's intentions are genuine and that he is capable of undertaking the observances which involve antinomian behaviour.

[like] a supreme (°ādi°) lion The image of the initiate as a lion is standard. Cf. *Guhyasamāja* (18.67b-68): *sarvasaṃtrāsavarjitaḥ/ śiṃhavad vicaren mantrī nirviśaṅkena cetasā// nākāryaṃ vidyate hy atra nābhakṣyaṃ vidyate tathā/ nāvācyaṃ vidyate kiṃcin nācintyaṃ vidyate sadā//* “The mantrī should roam about like a lion, freed of all fear, with an uninhibited mind. For there is nothing that he may not do in this world, nothing that he may not eat, nothing that he may not speak, and nothing that he may never think.” The imagery is also present e.g. in the *Guhyasiddhi* 6.40cd and 7.7, *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* p. 84, etc.

dedicated to meditation (yogavān) I follow Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation here: *yogavantam yogaratam ity arthaḥ*.

[The officiant should then say:] «May you destroy the obscuration[s], the birthplace of the sin that is existence! May you accomplish the supreme lord of reality, the ultimate aim of yoga!»

4.1.32

«**May you etc.**» The imperatives make it clear that this is a benediction uttered by the officiant before imparting the antinomian substances to the initiand. Bhavabhaṭṭa on the other hand implausibly explains this and the previous verse as referring to the ‘fourth consecration’, after the *prajñāseka* (i.e. the *prajñājñānābhiseka*) has been bestowed. He remains oblivious to the imperatives and construes them as qualifying **sutattvarājam**, which in his view should be seen as spoken to the initiate (postulating a *kathayet* as the finite verb of the two verses).

«The letter ‘a’ is the chief of all letters, [and it is] presided over by Vāgvajra. The syllable ‘hūṃ’ burns [all] obscurations, [and it is] presided over by Hṛdivajra [i.e. Cit-tavajra]. The letter ‘i’ is said to be knowledge, [and it is] presided over by Kāyavajra. The body of one crossing transmigration is presided over by Jñānavajra.» 4.1.33-34

«The letter ‘a’ etc.» This verse most likely follows the terminology of the *Guhyasamāja*. By reciting this formula and visualizing the appropriate mantras the officiant empowers the body, speech, mind, and gnosis of the initiand. The first quarter echoes the much-cited verse, *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgītī* 28ab.

[The the officiant should then] give the pledge-water mixed with the five nectars [to the initiand]. The syllable ‘ha’ takes away the[ir] colour, the syllable ‘hoḥ’ neutralizes the[ir] smell, [and] the syllable ‘hrīḥ’ removes the[ir] potency – he should recite the mantra[s] for each (kvacin). 4.1.35-36ab

the pledge-water This procedure is otherwise known as the *udakābhīṣeka*. Accepting the pledge-water amounts to a feudal oath of allegiance. The *Tattvasaṃgraha* (1.123.221-223) describes that after the giving the *samayodaka*, the officiant says to the initiand: *adya prabhṛty ahaṃ te Vajrapāṇī, yat te ’haṃ brūyām: idaṃ kuru, tat kartavyam. na ca tvayāham avamantavyo mā te viṣamāparihāreṇa kālakriyām kṛtvā narakapātanam syād* “From today onwards I am your Vajrapāṇī, and whatever I tell you to do, you must do. You should never despise me, lest you should die a painful death³⁴⁶ and then fall into a hell.”

The syllable ‘ha’ etc. The aim of visualizing these three letters unto the five nectars is explained by *Nibandha* ad 2.3.128cd-129ab. The three *mantras* remove the natural smell, colour, and presumably taste of the five substances, whereafter they were perceived as ‘divine nectar’ (*amṛta*). This procedure was known to be a hallmark of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, cf. Padmaśrīmitra’s *Samājānusāriṇī* Ms 5^v.

[The initiate] (sa) should then see [the *maṇḍala*] with 4.1.36cd-37ab

³⁴⁶Lit. ‘not avoiding misfortune’ (*viṣamāparihāreṇa*).

his eyes [uncovered], and he should be made to prostrate with all five limbs. [Thereafter] he should be made to throw onto the sacred site of yoga †... †

his eyes [uncovered] The phrase is obscure, but it is logical that the initiand's blindfold is removed at this stage.

with all five limbs That is, touching the ground with feet, hands, and head.

†... † Normally at this point the initiand is made to throw a flower unto the *maṇḍala*. However, for that he should still be blindfolded. Perhaps the intended meaning is that the officiant should also throw his body unto the ground in a gesture of devotion towards the *maṇḍala*. *Smṛti* (46^v) interprets this passage silently skipping over the problem. In his view the initiand should cast a flower unto the *maṇḍala*, and then he should bow on the ground.

Thereafter, [the officiant] should ascertain which sign (liṅga) is the [initiand's] own (sve). The versed [officiant] should [then] bestow [meditative union] upon the [initiand's] body with the corresponding [deity].

4.1.37cd-
38ab

which sign (liṅga) is the [initiand's] own (sve) This sentence is obscure. I am following *Smṛtijñānakīrti*'s interpretation, which includes the element of the flower landing on a particular section of the *maṇḍala* whereby the initiand's affiliation with his chosen deity (*yi dam gyi lha, *iṣṭadevatā*) is determined (*Smṛti* 46^v).

bestow etc. The interpretation is tentative. It is very tempting to conjecture **devasya* for **dehasya**, but this form is attested in all mss. and in *Smṛti*.

[The officiant] should again bestow upon [him] the disciplines and so forth, [and also] the characteristics of the mind, as taught before. [The initiand] should [then] bow and touch with his head the feet of the guru.

4.1.38cdef

the characteristics of the mind (manalakṣitam) The translation is again tentative. Smṛtijñānakīrti interprets this cryptic passage in the following way (*Smṛti* 46^v): the officiant should examine the mind of the initiand, and then give appropriate teachings which are not contained in the *samvara-pāṭha* and so forth. While this is certainly appropriate and ingenious, it is very difficult to see it in the text. The intended meaning perhaps alludes to 1.3.2-14, which teaches a method of examining one's mind in order to divine accomplishment for a particular ritual.

[Then he should recite the following:] «Om, I dedicate myself to the propitiation of the five ḍākinīs. Om, I dedicate myself to the propitiation of the officiant. Om, I dedicate myself to the cause of delivering all sentient beings [from transmigration].» 4.1.39-41

the five ḍākinīs That is, Jñānaḍākinī and the four goddesses in the directions: Vajraḍākinī, Ghoraḍākinī, Vettālī, and Caṇḍālī.

[And also the following:] «[I shall] desist from anger, selfishness, insult, and cruel speech. [I shall] desist [from the company] of sinful friends and actions [such as] injury, [and] stealing. [I shall] desist from all pleasures, I [shall be] satisfied and steadfast. [I shall] desist from [following] the scriptures of the outsiders, which are [delusive] like an actors' stage.» 4.1.42-43

scriptures etc. That is, everything apart from Buddhist scriptures. For the same simile cf. 3.1.77ab. Notice the tautology °samopamā.

«You are the pledge, samaya hoḥ hoḥ hoḥ a ā ā3 āṃ hūṃ jaḥ.» 4.1.44

You etc. According to both commentators this should also be recited by the initiand.

ā3 This is the *pluta* (prolated, or protracted) vowel.

Having first applied the gesture of the sceptre, he should protect (dhārayet) [the initiate's] six limbs with the [appropriate] seed[-syllables]. He should [then] reveal [to him] all other teachings [related to] the gradual path of perfect enlightenment.

4.1.45

protect (dhārayet) etc. This procedure is similar to the eight-fold variety, called *aṣṭāṅgakalanam*. According to *Smṛti* (47^r) the six limbs are the [top of the] head, eyes, the ears, the nose, the tongue, and the heart, the corresponding seed-syllables being KṢUM, HUM, YUM, SUM with YUM used twice (for the eyes and the nose). The gesture of the *vajra*-sceptre is given in *Maṇḍalopāyikā* 12.4-5ab (quoted by *Smṛti* 47^r).

other teachings According to Bhavabhaṭṭa this indicates the ceremony of foretelling [the initiate as a Buddha] (*vyākaraṇam*), for which see e.g. *Vajrāvalī* ch. 41. According to *Smṛtijñānakīrti* (*Smṛti* 47^r) these are scriptural teachings (*lung*, **āgama*) oral teachings (*man ngag*, **upadeśa*), the symbolism of the deities (*lha'i de kho na nyid*, **devatātattva*) and the *maṇḍala* (*dkyil 'khor gyi de kho na nyid*, **maṇḍalatattva*), etc. which are conducive to perfect enlightenment.

Then the initiate should always conscientiously (bhāvena) pay the guru's fee: his own wife, or [his wife] accompanied by [his] son[s] or relatives, and servants. [He should also give wealth such as] an elephant, a horse, cows, jewellery, a house, land equipped with a cow-pen (gotravān), gold, silver, copper, clothes and so on, rice, and grain. [He should also give objects] for his exclusive use [such as] a bedstead, a seat (niṣadya), slippers, [and/or] a parasol. At the end he should offer his own body as the guru's fee.

4.1.46-48

the guru's fee This passage makes it clear that the ideal candidate for initiation is a householder. The question whether the officiant was envisioned as a householder or a monastic person is a vexing one. Theoretically it is not impossible that all such gifts would be transferred to the monastery. The *Maṇḍalopāyikā* has a series of praising verses in its last chapter (28.21cd-23)

which are worth quoting in full since they make it quite clear that the *ācārya* is a householder.

*śūdradvekasahasrāṇi śuciviprasya m-ekavat//
vipraṃ dvekasahasraṃ vai bhikṣu-m-eka prayuñjayet/
bhikṣudvekasasāhasraṃ tu raja-m-ekopamena tu//
rajasatasahasrāṇi jñānīnām ekam eva tu/
jñānīdvekasahasraṃ vai ācārya-m-eka kalpitam*

“Twenty-one thousand *śūdras* make up one pure [brahmanical] priest (*śucivipra*), and twenty-one thousand priests make up for one [Buddhist] monk. Twenty-one thousand [Buddhist] monks are equal to a king, and one hundred thousand kings are equal to a single gnostic (*jñānī*). An officiant (*ācārya*) is worth twenty-one thousand gnostics.”

his own wife The *Vimalaprabhā* (vol. II, p. 144) stipulates that the initiate should offer his wife to the *guru* five times a month on top of one sixth of his income (*śaḍaṃśa*) in wealth and livestock.

[The officiant] should [then again] teach the gradual path of perfect enlightenment [by saying:] «The nature of phenomena is pure [and] so is your nature, O doer of nature (svabhāvakṛt)! Verily, there is no [such thing as] ‘nature’.»

4.1.49

O doer of nature! This Vocative is rather mysterious, and apparently not only to the present reader, but already to Bhavabhaṭṭa who analyzes the word as *su+abhāva+kṛt*, glossing the verbal element with ‘to hold’. He then cites a variant reading, **abhāvataḥ**, in which case the meaning would be: “[You will possess] your [original] nature after adopting *abhāva*, i.e. emptiness.” The somewhat puzzling *lyablope pañcamī* seems to be saying that the Ablative is used after the noun there being a substitution of zero for the *lyap sātṃkṛtya* that would require that noun to be in the Accusative.³⁴⁷ Smṛtijñānakīrti had a reading closer to this one, but instead of **te** he probably had ***sa** or ***tad** (*Smṛti* 47^r). According to the same commentator this verse describes the

³⁴⁷I thank Prof. Sanderson for elucidating the meaning here.

gradual path from the viewpoint of gathering the equipment of knowledge (**jñānasambhāradvāreṇa, ye shes kyi tshogs kyi sgo nas*), whereas the next verses describe the same from the viewpoint of the equipment of merit (**puṅyasambhāra, bsod nams kyi tshogs*). This idea is quite close to Bhavabhaṭṭa's introductory statement to the next verse.

[The genuine practice] of the Teaching is preceded by forbearance, therefore [the initiate] should not torment sentient beings. [Nor should he utter] slanderous words, rough words [or] flattery, which are invariably the result of fatigue. 4.1.50

forbearance Should there be any lack of forbearance, says Bhavabhaṭṭa, it should be that directed towards the obscurations (*kleśa*).

slanderous etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the second word of *pāda c* as an apposition of the first, but it is more likely that we have a list here (therefore we must understand the pronoun **sa** as a Plural).

sentient beings The **ādi** is most likely just a verse-filler.

[The initiates] should keep their morality and vows, and non-aggression towards sentient beings. [The initiate] should never hurt sentient beings. [Verily,] it is better to die. 4.1.51

[The initiates] Although I give here the Plural because of the verbal ending, I am not entirely convinced that it is not the Singular that is meant.

sentient beings Here again *sattva* is meant by **jantu** and **prāṇā** (i.e. *prāṇī*); the **m-ādinā** in *pāda b* is a verse-filler.

The wealth etc. of others [should be like] fire [for the initiate] and he should not touch it [with the intention of misappropriating it] just like [he wouldn't touch] blazing fire. The sentiment of craving [wealth] is one that [leads such] fools to falling into terrible realms. 4.1.52

fire ... blazing fire The tautology is somewhat disturbing, but the general idea is clear. Bhavabhaṭṭa adds yet another ‘mystical’ interpretation: should there be taking the ‘wealth of others’ it should be taking the *bodhicitta* (i.e. semen) from the lotus of wisdom (i.e. the vagina of the consort).

Yogins ought to guard [themselves from] lying concerning deeds [no matter how] grave or insignificant. For yogins observant of yoga there cannot be lies. 4.1.53

grave or insignificant This is probably the most natural way to interpret the statement, also taking *ādi* without any meaning. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s glosses are slightly puzzling.

[The initiates should exercise] restraint in lovemaking, restraint at the time of [offering] bali, restraint in ascetic observances, [and] restraint in eating and drinking. 4.1.54

Yogins desiring accomplishment will succeed by pleasing sentient beings. For this reason the omniscient [officiant] should teach to the initiate and the [way to make] beings persevere [on the path to Buddhahood]. 4.1.55

pleasing sentient beings For this term cf. e.g. the *Sattvārādhana* in LÉVI 1929.

For etc. Bhavabhaṭṭa perceives this line as alluding to the *āśvāsadāna* (‘bestowal of reassurance’), a post-initiatory ritual for which see e.g. *Vajrāvalī* ch. 43. However, it is more likely that the line is to be construed with the *sattvārādhana* described immediately before. *Smṛti* (47^v) construes **sarvajña** with *śiṣyasya* (possibly reading it as a compound), stating that the initiate is now to be considered ‘omniscient’, since he has been taught the ‘outer’ and ‘inner’ principles (*phyi nang gi don*), presumably esoteric and exoteric teachings.

[The initiate] should first cultivate the gnosis of equanimity and then see everything as equal. He should always [maintain this] equanimity in his behaviour, [and always be] intent on meditation and contemplation. 4.1.56

everything Probably all phenomena are meant, but *Smṛti* (47^v) restricts the meaning to all beings.

With every donation motivated by craving [for its beneficial results] the profits of commerce increase. [But] when that sprout [i.e. giving] comes to bloom it blocks progress on the path. 4.1.57

profits of commerce The sentence as it is seems to state that initiates should not make motivated donations (*kāmikaṃ dānam* according to the *Nibandha*) to the officiant etc. only in order to increase their profits. If we take the statement at face value, it very strongly suggests that the paradigmatic initiate is a merchant, which I think is the case here.

progress on the path Bhavabhaṭṭa, in order to remove what he must have seen as a tautological statement and enrich the verse with doctrinal content, takes **gati** to refer elliptically to the six conditions of existence (gods, titans, etc.), which stem from giving (here *pars pro toto* for any kind of motivated action) and act as obstacles to Buddhahood. The only kind of giving conducive to that state is giving while realizing that there is no gift, no giver, and no one to give to.

Receiving [another] bodily receptacle [he will enjoy] the desired enjoyments in heavens and so forth. [But] through these enjoyments [such as] lovemaking he will necessarily fall [into an unfavourable rebirth]. 4.1.58

Receiving etc. The first quarter-verse is somewhat obscure. Perhaps we could equally well interpret **kṛta** as ‘having done with’, i.e. after having left this body the initiate is reborn in some kind of heaven. **Ālaya** could also be interpreted as ‘clinging’, in which case we should understand the statement as ‘creating a clinging towards’ bodily existence (?).

enjoyments The idea is that once he has exhausted his merit in the heavens through enjoyment, the initiate will inevitably return to lower states.

He should not perform acts concerning reliquaries and he should not recite from books. He should not perform hand gestures and he should not repeat mantra-syllables. 4.1.59

He should not etc. This line probably stems from the *Guhyasamāja*. The *Pradīpoddyotana* (p. 220) explains *caityakarma* as “rites of worshipping reliquaries made of clay, sand, etc.” (*mṛdvālukādīstūpapūjākriyām*), although the **ādi** most likely includes other pious acts such as renovation or mopping the circuit around the *stūpa*. The same sentence states that the *yogin* should worship himself as the embodiment of all Tathāgatas. Such anti-ritualistic statements are commonplace from the *Guhyasamāja* onwards, although most commentators – and Bhavabhaṭṭa is no exception – see such statements in a gradualist context. In other words, they are said to express principles to be followed by advanced *yogins* and not every initiate.

hand gestures This prohibition is rather odd given the fact that the *Catuṣpīṭha* goes to great lengths to explain such *mudrās*. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the prohibition as also stating that the *mudrā* of uniting with the consort should be performed.

It is easy to [recite or listen to sacred] texts; it is practice that is difficult to master. The wise officiant should show the path. 4.1.60

practice I.e. putting into practice what one has read or heard in a sacred text as Bhavabhaṭṭa specifies.

show According to Bhavabhaṭṭa he should do so by example, just like a craftsman would demonstrate his art to an apprentice and not just instruct him in theory.

[Betwixt] the deity that is one’s person and deities outside the deity that is the person is superior. [However,] those who are not dedicated to the image [of the deity] that is one’s person should fashion [other kinds of] reflections [such as statues, painted scrolls, and so forth]. 4.1.61

the deity that is one’s person Bhavabhaṭṭa restricts the meaning to the body of the initiate, but it is more likely that the entire *skandha*-based structure of the person is meant here. *Smṛti* (48^r) takes the expression to mean the *jñānasattva* visualized in the heart ([...] *rang gi snying gar bsgoms pa’i ye shes sems dpa’i lha* [...]).

deities outside For a similar idea and phrasing cf. *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* as quoted in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (p. 19, p. 83, p. 365), and the *Jñānasiddhi* (p. 144); also *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* 5.32, *Vajradāka* 1.6. As Bhavabhaṭṭa elaborates those who are not entirely given over to³⁴⁸ cultivating the deity as one's person are entirely justified to worship external idols, but the merit gained from this is significantly lesser.

[Here ends] the first sub-chapter of the guhyapīṭha containing such topics.

4.1.62

³⁴⁸Although it is very tempting to read the *mūla* with **ātmabimbam aśaktānām** 'those who are unable to cultivate the image of the deity as one's self', the gloss *atatparāṇām* makes it clear that the commentator did not read the last word with the palatal sibilant.

5.14 Synopsis of 4.2

The overall topic of the sub-chapter according to Bhavabhaṭṭa is a condensed method of attaining accomplishment (*saṃkṣiptasiddhyupāya*). The sub-chapter opens somewhat unusually with an exhortation (v. 1) by the *bhagavān* towards Vajrapāṇi to listen to a method [which leads one to liberation], since a *yogin* who does not obtain true accomplishment (*atattvī*) is [forever] subject to transmigration.

Addressed thus, Vajrapāṇi wishes to find out more about the true nature of the body, and the methods thus far described: *yoga*, *mantras*, *mudrās* and so forth (vv. 2-3).

The *bhagavān* begins his response (vv. 4-5) with a warning: all constituents of the body are impermanent (with the elements singled out) as are the results obtained by offering *bali*, muttering spells, etc. In other words rites do bring their benefit, but after the *yogin* has reaped them inevitable fall into transmigration follows. Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets this passage not as a completely anti-ritualistic statement, but rather as a warning that the *yogin* should not become emotionally engaged with ritual and its benefits.

At this point Vajrapāṇi intervenes with a question (vv. 6-7) about the nature of consciousness (*cetanā*), with special reference to its becoming incarnate in the three realms.

The *bhagavān*'s answer (vv. 8-10) is somewhat opaque, but the general idea seems to be that consciousness is able to choose where it will appear: in the formless realm as a bird soaring in the sky (?), in the realm of form after having resorted to a [particular kind of] meditative immersion (*samādhi*), and in the realm of desire if it wishes to experience the result [of actions] (*bhukti*). Finally, the lord exhorts Vajrapāṇi to listen to the method that overcomes transmigration. Bhavabhaṭṭa's contribution here is to interpret along more acceptably Buddhist lines what the text seems to understand as 'free will' (*svecchā*), namely as inclinations caused by *karma*-defilement, and to provide the appropriate *Abhidharma* cosmography of the three realms.

Vajrapāṇi again voices his doubts (vv. 11-12) and repeats his question about the fundamental nature of consciousness. Because of his peculiar Vi-jñānavādin explanation of this passage Bhavabhaṭṭa must postulate that in 11ab we have the words not of Vajrapāṇi but that of the *saṃgītikāra*. The intrusion of the narrator is highly implausible: it would be the only such occurrence in the text (discounting the units identifying the speaker: *X āha*), and it would create a *saṃgītikāra* other than Vajrapāṇi. Finally, the text

yields good sense even if we do not accept Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation.

The *bhagavān* describes (vv. 13-20) consciousness as pure as a crystal which is sullied only by the defilements of being and contact with sense objects. In essence it does not have any virtues or faults, but it is modulated by anything it comes into contact with. It is like space: without colour and yet bearing all colours, unattached yet attaching itself to those incarnate, formless yet assuming all forms, without characteristics and yet bestowing all sorts of characteristics, etc. [The true nature of consciousness is hidden, beyond the senses, inaccessible to those who [merely] read scriptures. It is this [unsullied] nature that should be pointed out by the *guru*: [the disciple should be made to abide] in equanimity and ought not torture his body.

The next section is not clearly delineated from the previous teaching, but vv. 21-44 clearly describe a practical method. Free of worry the *yogin* should go to a location he finds pleasing, sit on a comfortable seat, cross-legged, palms placed upon each other. He should concentrate on the tip of his nose and breath deeply [as if] absorbing air into the navel. After having obtained equanimity of mind, he should present offerings mentally. He should then visualize seed-syllables blocking the apertures of the body. The procedure is somewhat similar to the one described in 4.3 for *utkrānti*, but here the *brahmadvāra* is also blocked. There is some discrepancy about raising the *bījas* in the text and the *Nibandha*, and Bhavabhaṭṭa describes nine apertures, whereas the *mūla* clearly speaks of only eight and only later nine.³⁴⁹ The seed-syllables are then imagined as blazing. Then from a location somewhat obscurely defined as above the dentures a nectar-like (*rasavat*) fluid (*kṣīro-dakā* [sic!]) starts dripping which the *yogin* should taste with his tongue and then [imagine] that [his entire body] is bathed in it from the inside. Then the *yogin* ought to visualize a radiant moon[-disk] in his heart with the alphabet around it (minus the eunuch letters). Thereafter he should visualize [himself] as Jñāna[ḍākinī] and recite the *mantra* (most likely OM HŪM SVĀHĀ) with equanimity. The last three verses describe the effects of this practice: the *yogin* will not feel hunger, thirst for sense objects, he will not be tormented by fever, hot, cold, or pain, and he will live strong in body for a hundred years.

The next section begins with a question by Vajrapāṇi (v. 45). According

³⁴⁹ *Nibandha* ad 4.2.25a: *pīṭetyādīnā navadvāramantranyāsam āha*. But 4.2.30ab: *dhārayed aṣṭa bījasya aṣṭadevatīyūñjītam*/ and 35cd: *karṣitam ekadvāraṃ tu nava dvārābhi sthāpayet*/

to Bhavabhaṭṭa the verses following (on which he hardly comments) describe a visualization of Vajrasattva. This is not clear from the text, which rather seems to describe a visualization of Jñānaḍākinī with the aim of reading other people's minds (vv. 46-57).

The *yogin* should first cultivate a non-dual state of mind and purge himself of passion and hatred. He should meditate on emptiness and imagine both his body and the outside world as transparent as a crystal. Then he should raise the seed-syllable [HŪṂ, place it in his heart] and see it shoot forth bright rays. Then he should visualize himself as Jñāna[ḍākinī] radiant with clouds of Buddhas whilst reciting the *mantra* OṂ A SVĀHĀ.³⁵⁰ After having obtained equanimity he should direct his attention to the Akaniṣṭha [heaven] above and the seven underworlds below. He will then be able to read any being's mind at his will.³⁵¹

Vv. 58-67 describe another such method. The *yogin* visualizes the syllable HŪṂ on a [moon-]disk in his heart and contemplates [emptiness] after dismantling the universe [according to the method given in 1.3]. He then visualizes a wind-disk adorned with a moon-disk and again a radiating HŪṂ atop. The text does not indicate this clearly, but the second HŪṂ is very likely visualized by the *yogin* in the target's body. The *yogin* then visualizes himself as Jñānaḍākinī with all her characteristics, radiating white light as if these were rays of dust-particles. The target is visualized as a red Vajrasattva seated atop a moon-disk.³⁵² He bears a red HŪṂ in his heart. If the *yogin* wishes to find out what the target is thinking he should with a composed mind concentrate on the red seed-syllable. He will be able to read the target's mind (*paracittajñāna*). The section closes with a recommendation that this procedure should be used for the benefit of beings and that of heroes (?).

Vv. 68-78 describe the internal fire sacrifice.³⁵³ Bhavabhaṭṭa uses the usual term *guhyaḥoma*, but the text does not, describing the process as 'oblation (*āhuti*) into the fire of gnosis (*jñānāgni*)' or 'the fire-rite (*agnikarma*) within the body (*ātmanaḥ*)'. The internal fire-pit is the 'knot' (*giṇṭhā*, a peculiar form of *granthi*, cf. Bihari *gēṃṭh*, TURNER 4354) in the navel. The more detailed

³⁵⁰The central *bīja* is raised graphically: first one takes the letter which is third of the third (i.e. ḍA), and adds a *daṇḍa*. See above.

³⁵¹I interpret the line *nitya cetanatābhāve ālokaṃ yoga kāmataḥ* (57cd) thus against Bhavabhaṭṭa's suggestion at the outset of the passage.

³⁵²The *Nibandha*, which is unusually terse for this chapter sees the procedure henceforth (vv. 63 ff.) as a separate procedure, a *yoga* of Vajrasattva. I reject this interpretation.

³⁵³The external *homa* is taught in 2.1.1-104.

description of this point in the body is obscure: it is said that there are seven ‘digits’ (*aṅgula*) next to the navel, which Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets as lines (*rekhā*) which form a kind of railing. Amidst this internal pit there is a multi-coloured lotus with a sun-disk on top of the calyx, which bears Jnāna[ḍākinī]. The four goddesses of the cardinal directions (Vajraḍākinī, Ghorī, Vettālī, and Caṇḍālī) symbolizing the elements from earth to ‘knowledge’ (here for ether) surround the main goddess. The *yogin* should then visualize that from the eighteen parts in his body (we are not told what these are) nectar collects and is offered into the pit that is the navel. This is the closest the *Catuspīṭha* gets to advancing a theory of what later become *cakras* and *nāḍīs*.

The effects of the practice are somewhat anticlimactic. First, the *yogin* obtains nourishment (*pauṣṭikam*), which Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets as a life-prolonging measure (*rasāyana*). Everything that the *yogin* consumes whilst simultaneously practicing the internal *homa* will become purified. The last statement is strange: the text says that the *yogin* will become free of debt (*riṇa* for *ṛṇa*). Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets the statement specifying that the practitioner will not be in the debt of the patron (*dānapatī*), presumably the person who offered the food.

The last unit (v. 79) is the usual sub-chapter colophon.

5.15 Synopsis of 4.3.1-33 & 56-75 with an annotated translation of 4.3.34-55

Synopsis of vv. 1-33

The present sub-chapter is the subject of a Japanese article (KAWASAKI 2002b), which, as far as I can determine, outlines the contents of 4.3 and determines that both the *Vajradāka* (ch. 21) and the *Samputa* (8.3) are based on this text.

The first part of the sub-chapter is too obscure to merit a full translation. In v. 1 Vajrapāṇi asks how equanimity is to be attained, and what the *yoga* relating to the body is. Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, interprets *yoga* and *samatā* as union and identity, viz. between consciousness and breath. The *bhagavān*'s answer seems to begin with a method to calm the mind (v. 2).

However, the next verses (vv. 3-12) break away from this topic and describe a series of 'proofs' that the elements beginning with water are present in the body. Each element is equated with one of the goddesses of the cardinal directions in Jñānaḍākinī's immediate retinue (for this idea see 2.3). Thus the existence of bodily hair is given as proof for the presence of water (for without water things do not grow) and by extension as proof for the presence of Vajrī in the human body. Digestion is taken as proof for the existence of fire, and therefore of the goddess Ghorī. Wind is present in the body since it breathes. This is also evidence for the presence of the goddess Vettālī. Earth serves as the basis for the existence of all the other elements, since without it they could not abide anywhere as they would be without adequate support. This proves the presence of the goddess Caṇḍālī in the body. Finally, the presence of consciousness, i.e. Jñāna[ḍākinī], is proven by the fact that the body grasps, acts, and consumes. Hence there is something that takes decisions, governs the senses, and experiences sensory data.

The next passage (vv. 13-17) seeks to prove that consciousness is identical to the elements since the elements depart once the body is lifeless. If it were otherwise, there would be water in a corpse, if fire remained a corpse would not be cold, if wind remained a corpse would still be breathing, and if earth remained the corpse would not become light. But we perceive that corpses float on water. Therefore the inevitable conclusion is that they, the elements and consciousness, are unitary.

Vv. 18-19 state that all this will become clear to a disciple who serves a

master (*kalyāṇamitrāsevanāt*) and comes to know yogic truths (*yogatattvaṃ*). Those that torment themselves by retracting the senses will merely obtain further bondage. What the *yogin* should truly ‘bind’ is his consciousness, retracting it into the region of the heart the text calls a ‘bird-cage abode’ (*aṇḍajāgrha m-ālayam*).³⁵⁴

Vv. 20-33 teach the procedure proper, which Bhavabhaṭṭa calls the *bandhanayoga*. The *yogin* should focus on the outgoing breath (*dolā*) and bind his consciousness upon a lotus [visualized in the heart]. Then he should visualize a plantain flower, empty on the inside, stemming in his navel and reaching up to the heart. [The lotus in the heart] has eight petals and filaments. In the middle he should visualize the syllable HŪṂ (here coded as *jñānavijñāna*). The flower in the heart emits rays that are six digits in length, and that in the navel emits rays that measure five digits. These are said to resemble young crops on a field, whereas the light emitted from the seed-syllable are curving back and hanging down like a *kadalī* flower. The HŪṂ syllable should then be seen as striking below [with its rays] at the navel. The lotus [in the heart] is further developed by installing upon it the syllables of the goddesses: the already stated HŪṂ is transparent as a crystal, the petals in the cardinal directions are occupied by the vowels of the four *ḍākinīs* (i.e. A, Ā, Ā᳚, ĀṂ), and the petals in the intermediate directions by the ‘eunuchs’ (i.e. Ṛ, Ṝ, Ḍ, Ḍ̄) corresponding to Siṃhinī, etc. Whilst concentrating on the HŪṂ in the heart and reciting the same syllable, the *yogin* should imagine that nectar enters through the nine gates (see below) beginning with the topmost aperture (here called *gavāksyora*) and floods his body inundating every single pore with white nectar. The passage concludes with an injunction that the *yogin* should constantly maintain this practice, whether walking, traveling, sitting, or sleeping. Although the *tantra* does not refer to this specifically, it very much seems that this is a preliminary, purificatory procedure for *utkrānti*.

Translation of vv. 34-55 on utkrānti

The *Catuspīṭha* is very likely the first Tantric Buddhist scripture to contain teachings on *utkrānti*, i.e. the directed egress of consciousness from the body resulting in death, but it is not the very first Tantric Buddhist text to do so. The earliest such text to my knowledge is the famous **Mukhāgama* of Buddhajñānapāda, with which the *Catuspīṭha* shows several striking parallels,

³⁵⁴ However, Bhavabhaṭṭa comments ad 19d that this is nothing but the egg itself: *aṇḍajāgrhaśabdenāṇḍam eva*.

which in my view are not at all accidental.³⁵⁵ The genre of the **Mukhāgama* is an odd hybrid between scripture and treatise, as it is the result of a mystical experience of Jñānapāda. The text is viewed as the revelation of a deity, and is therefore of scriptural value, but it is also conveyed by a well-known human author, and in that sense it counts as a treatise. The genre is therefore an ideal choice for introducing innovative material such as *utkrānti*. If this supposition is true, then by the time of the *Catuspīṭha* the Tantric Buddhist community must have felt confident enough to place *utkrānti* into scripture.

This yogic technique is most likely not Buddhist in origin. The earliest sources to teach something akin to *utkrānti* are brahmanical. E.g. the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* describes the soul leaving the body through one of the bodily apertures (4,4.1 ff.) and its path to different levels of the Universe (5,10.1). A similar course is described in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (5,10.1 ff.), while another passage (8,6.1 ff.) also describes tubes in the body and an egress through which one obtains immortality. The *Mahābhārata* (12,305.1-7) contains teachings about points of egress from the body and corresponding rebirths, much along the same lines as seen in the present text. The Kashmirian recension of the *Bhagavadgītā* (vv. 8.12-13) describes closing the bodily apertures through which egress is not desired and a method of concentrating in the heart upon the syllable OM. This is again a very similar to what we have here: the gates are closed with *mantras* while consciousness is seen as a HŪM.³⁵⁶

In the Śaiva body of scriptures the practice is attested on nearly every level of revelation, beginning with the Atimārga (the second revision of the *Pāśupatasūtras*, 5.30-40 and the *Ur-Skandapurāṇa* 182.6-53), through the Mantramārga (the early *Niśvāsaḡuhyasūtra* 8.115cd-123 and especially the *Kālottara* corpus: *Sārdhatṛisati* 11.10-19 with the signs of death taught in 18.1-5, *Adhyuṣṭaśata* 10.13-19ab, *Dviśatika* 7.1-7, *Bṛhatkālottara*, *utkrāntyantyestīpaṭala* vv. 1-7, etc.), the Siddhānta (*Parākhya* 14.105-107, *Kiraṇa* ch. 59, *Mataṅgapārameśvara* yogapāda ch. 7, *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 22.1-8), the Vidyāpīṭha (*Brahmayāmala* ch. 100), and finally, the Trika (*Mālinīvi-*

³⁵⁵The **Mukhāgama*, especially the prologue dealing with Buddhañānapāda's travels, has been discussed in DAVIDSON 2002:309-316. I disagree with much of what he states, especially with his reconstruction of names, but this is not the place to go into these matters.

³⁵⁶All brahmanical occurrences have been pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson during a tutorial on *utkrānti* in 2007.

jayottara ch. 17).³⁵⁷

In Abhidharmic Buddhism the idea that consciousness ceases at a particular point in the body at the time of death is known (cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ad 3.43abc), moreover, the idea that it exits at a particular point by which the future rebirth is determined is also attested (cf. DE LA VALÉE POUSSIN 1923-1931, vol. 2, p. 135, n. 1).³⁵⁸ However, as far as I can tell, in Buddhist Tantric sources we have nothing clearly resembling *utkrānti* before the **Mukhāgama*, i.e. before the second half of the eighth century.³⁵⁹

Furthermore, at least one early *yoginītantra* commentator, *Sudhana, alludes to the fact that the teaching of *utkrānti* is meant to convert heretics, a statement strongly suggestive that the egress of consciousness is not clearly in line with Buddhist doctrine.³⁶⁰ Two problems were probably in need of some explanation. The first is ethical in nature. While most Śaiva sources seem to describe *utkrānti* as something volitional, in other words a kind of suicide by yogic means,³⁶¹ Buddhist adaptations are quick to point out (as does the *Catuṣpīṭha*) that the procedure should only be undertaken when the death of the *yogin* seems inevitable, i.e. when the signs of death have manifested. It is for this reason I am somewhat reluctant to use the customary translation ‘yogic suicide’ and use the more literal and neutral ‘egress’ instead. The second problem is doctrinal: although the unit exiting the body is described as ‘consciousness’, it may have seen slightly uncomfortable to Buddhist exegetes that this consciousness can be perceived and manipulated as a monad, in the shape of the *bīja* HŪṂ. The procedure was nevertheless adopted into Tantric Buddhist lore along with much else of Tantric Śaiva

³⁵⁷All Śaiva occurrences have been pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson during the same tutorial. Numberings, if an edition is not available, refer to his draft editions.

³⁵⁸I again owe thanks to Prof. Sanderson, for pointing out this Abhidharma discussion. Also see SANDERSON 2009 with this reference and a discussion of *utkrānti*, especially pp. 127-128.

³⁵⁹For the relative dating of early *Guhyasamāja* exegetes see TOMABECHI 2008.

³⁶⁰Cf. **Vajradākapañjikā* 235^v: *da ni mu stegs can gyi dbang du byas te gsungs pa/ [. . .] gzhan gyi lus la gzhus pa dang/ gong du 'pho ba bstan pa yin no/|*. The *Vajradāka* passage commented upon here is based on the *Catuṣpīṭha* verses given below with the addition of teaching the *parakāyapraveśa*, i.e. evicting and occupying another’s body. *Sudhana, in order to support this cleverness in means, quotes from a *sūtra* affirming the existence of the soul in order to convert those who believe in it.

³⁶¹See GOODALL 2004:384 ff., especially n. 842: “. . . the motivation for yogic suicide is supposed to be either that the yogin feels weariness for the world or that he has enjoyed the pleasure that he wishes to enjoy; . . .”

material. Whether this was a matter of skillfulness in means, or that Vajrayāna adepts sought to heighten the prestige of their own ritual palette (or possibly both), is a problem for further scholarly enquiry.³⁶²

Lastly, it should be pointed out that the procedure is described in the present text without presupposing a system of tubes (*nāḍī*) and wheels (*cakra*), something that most later sources entail, most importantly perhaps the *Vajradāka*, probably the earliest scripture to borrow and further adapt the teachings of the *Catuṣpīṭha*.

Hear, O Vajra[pāṇi], according to the truth, the characteristics of the yoga [called] ‘the egress’ (utkrānti). [If the yogin]’s consciousness leaves the body] via [one of the] good path[s], it will see a beneficial rebirth. 4.3.34

[Vajrapāṇi said:] O Lord of gnosis, I wish to hear [this:] which are the nine gates and which of the gates [through which] consciousness [departs] are good or bad? 4.3.35

Hear, [O Vajrapāṇi,] the correct procedure [to be undertaken when] proof (pramāṇam) of the time of death [appears]. Through a good path [one obtains] a good abode, through a bad path a bad [re]birth. 4.3.36

proof (pramāṇam) The interpretation here is tentative. Following Smṛtijñānakīrti (*Smṛti* 60^v, also cf. **Mukhāgamavṛtti* 130^r -130^v) I take *pramāṇa* to mean the signs of death only upon the manifestation of which should the *yogin* undertake *utkrānti* (cf. v. 42 below). Alternatively, one may conjecture **prāṇānām**, in which case the meaning is: “Hear the correct procedure regarding the breath at the time of death.” According to *Smṛti* (*ibid.*) six gates are ‘good’, i.e. lead to a beneficial rebirth and three are ‘bad’. This division most likely stems from the **Mukhāgamavṛtti*.

The nine gates are: the drop (bindu), the navel, the one above (ūrdhvānām), the eyes, the nostrils, the mouth (ādi), the ears, the gateway of drink (pāna- dvārasya), and the anus. 4.3.37

³⁶²The *Parākhya* (see GOODALL, loc. cit.) shortly describes *utkrānti* after discussing the matter of faith (*pratyaya*). There the *yogin* is encouraged to display his powers in order to inspire faith in others. Though it is not immediately apparent from the text, it is not impossible that *utkrānti* was such a power (surely, the ultimate).

the drop (bindu) Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Smṛti* (60^v) and most parallels (**Mukhāgama*, *Samājānusāriṇī*, *Āmnāyamañjarī*) identify this as the space between the eyebrows.

the one above (ūrdhvānām) In the next verse Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses this as the ‘golden gate’ (*kanakadvāra*). The parallels indicate that this is the top of the head, sometimes identified with the fontanelle.

the mouth (ādi) This is very likely a pseudo-derivate of the root \sqrt{ad} , to eat. This aperture is in v. 40a referred as *bhavadvāra*, where it is glossed as ‘the mouth’ (*Nibandha* ad 45, *Smṛti* 60^v).

the gateway of drink (pāna- dvārasya) *Pāna-* on its own is glossed by the *Nibandha* as the aperture of the penis (*vajra*), but in this case the word *dvārasya* would be a mere repetition. The *Samājānusāriṇī* has *mūtrasya cchidraṃ*, whereas the **Mukhāgama* has *gnas* (Tib. rendering for **dvāra*?) affixed to both *chu yi* and *chu min* (i.e. the urinary aperture and the anus, possibly rendering *pāna* and *apāna*?). *Pāna* is very likely a pseudo-derivation from *apāna* on the model of *asura/sura*. The only source to my knowledge that distinguishes the apertures of urine from that of the sexual fluids is the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* (Ms 3^r-3^v), which has both a *retomārga* and a *mūtrādhvan*, thus teaching ten gateways in total.³⁶³

[Exiting] through the navel [consciousness will reincarnate] in the heavens of the desire realm. [Exiting] through the drop [i.e. the space between the eyebrows] it will incarnate in the [realm of] form. [Exiting] above [it will go to] an abode above. Having gone there †... †

4.3.38

an abode above *Smṛti* (60^v) interprets the ‘abode above’ as the formless realm, while Bhavabhaṭṭa noncommittally explains the words as ‘a special incarnation’. Smṛtijñānakīrti’s gloss is in agreement with the parallels from the *Samvarodaya* and the **Mukhāgama*. Padmaśrīmitra (if the verse is not corrupt) seems to propose the form realm for the *bindu* exit, and a ‘good abode’ for the exit through the [top of the] head. For other lists, mostly

³⁶³I thank Prof. Sanderson for pointing out this passage to me in an e-mail in 2008.

derivates of the above, see *Samvarodayatippati* Ms 23^r -23^v ; *Padminī* Ms A 35^r ; **Ratnamālā* 99^r -99^v .

†...† Perhaps we could conjecture *aviparītataḥ* in the sense ‘from which it shall not return’. Note the *Vajradāka*’s attempt to rewrite the obscure *pāda*.

[Exiting] through the nostrils it [will go] to the abode of yakṣas, [and] through the ears to the siddha-gods. If consciousness exits through the eyes, it [will reincarnate] as a king among men. 4.3.39

the siddha-gods The *Vajradāka* and the *Samvarodaya* replaces these with the more familiar *kiṃnaras*. The **Mukhāgama* has *vidyādharas*. *Smṛti* (61^r) enumerates eight categories of such beings, one for each of the eight accomplishments (sword [to enable flight], ointment [for making one invisible], etc.).

[Exiting] through the gate of existence (bhavadvārasya) [it reincarnates] among the ghosts, and through the urina[ry channel] among beasts. [Exiting] through the anus [it] quickly [reincarnates] among the eight [types of] hell-dwellers. 4.3.40

gate of existence (bhavadvārasya) This seems to be a unique usage. Both Bhavabhaṭṭa and *Smṛtijñānakīrti* take it to mean the mouth. Only the latter attempts to explain the import of the compound: it is called thus because food nourishing the constituents of the body first passes through the mouth (*Smṛti* 61^r). The *Samvarodaya* modifies the reading slightly to *vaktradvāram*.

through the anus This idea is used to a humorous effect in Kṣemendra’s *Narmamālā*, where a despised clerk meets his end in a ditch, his vital energies leaving the body through his anus propelling him to hell: *nṛpurīṣapraṇāle ’tha patito ’sāv adhomukhaḥ | uccaiḥkṛtakatīḥ prāṇān utsasarja narādhamah || iti ... prāpto narakam narakatakah ||* (v. 3.110-111).³⁶⁴

³⁶⁴The implication of the verse was pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson (2009, personal communication).

eight [types of] hell-dwellers There are of course many more hells in Buddhist cosmography. Therefore the *Āmnāyamañjarī* (276^v) considers this statement an *upalakṣaṇa*.

Since [re-]emergence in the different levels of transmigration depends on the kind of gate [through which consciousness exits], yogins [should know] the kinds of gates [through which] the path is good. 4.3.41

[Only those should perform] the supreme yoga of the ascent who have reached the time of death and have perceived the portents of death. [The yogin] should not split [the body and consciousness apart from each other] because of old age and so forth. 4.3.42

portents of death See 1.2.2-9, 102-104, etc. For the idea cf. *Adhyātmasāraśataka* v. 85 ff. and elsewhere.

should not split etc. The verse could be interpreted in several ways. In Bhavabhaṭṭa's view (perhaps inspired by the **Mukhāgama*) the *yogin* should not wait for too long after having perceived the time of death, because in a moribund state he will find it difficult to perform *utkrānti*. Also cf. *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya* (10^v): *mṛtyucihnaṃ jñātvā yoginā utkrāntiyogaḥ kartavyaḥ. na bhedaye jarādīnām iti- yāvaj jarādipīḍito na bhavati.*³⁶⁵ However, in light of v. 55 it is more plausible that the injunction reflects a Buddhist ethical concern and refers to not performing *utkrānti* prematurely, since that would amount to suicide (lit. 'killing the deity'). This view is also attested elsewhere, cf. *Samvarodayaṭippati* (23^v), also transmitted separately in the *Sādhanavidhāna* Ms (ff. 68-70): *utkrāntikālasaṃprāptam itikālamṛtyusamāgama evotkrāntiḥ kartavyā. akāle saty āyusi vijñānavisarjane devavadhād asuragatiḥ syāt, narakam ante.*; the *Padminī* ad *Samvarodaya* 19.38 (A 35^r); & *Āmnāyamañjarī* 276^v: *'chi ba'i dus lam bab pa kho nar rgas pas dang nad rnams kyis gdungs pas ni rnam shes dbye mi bya ste 'pho bar mi bya'o || gsung bar 'gyur ba yang | dus min lha rnams gsod pa'o || zhes so ||*

³⁶⁵This line from the *mūla* is quoted in this meaning by Tsong kha pa in his influential *Yid ches gsum ldan* (58^v-59^r): *gshan yang Gdan bzhi las| rims la sogs pas ma phog par| 'pho ba sbyong ba mchog yin no|| zhes gsungs pas| . . .*

[The yogin] should first start with [performing] a kumbhaka[-type breathing, maintaining which] he should block all the [nine] gateways. 4.3.43ab

kumbhaka Note that Bhavabhaṭṭa devaluates the Plural to a Singular (**kumbhakaiḥ** – *kumbhakena*). This is the only time that the text uses the more usual yogic terminology for types of breath control. It is not entirely clear whether the *kumbhaka* is supposed to be maintained during the visualization of syllables in order to block the gateways through which consciousness may exit the body, but this seems to be the most natural interpretation.

[He] should visualize the blocking of the gateways [beginning with] the [syllable] of the five bursts [visualized on the gateway named] the reliquary. 4.3.43cd

[beginning with] etc. The syllable is HŪṂ, which is – according to Bhavabhaṭṭa – white. The ‘reliquary gateway’ is explained as the space between the eyebrows, formerly also referred to as the *bindu*. According to the **Mukhāgama* all seven ‘upper’ gateways are blocked by this syllable (note the striking similarity in the terminology: *sgrogs pa lnga* = **pañcasphoṭika*).

[Then he should block] the gateway[s] under that (tato) with the white seed[-syllable] belonging to water, [and the gateways] of drink and the anus with the blazing seed-syllable of fire. 4.3.44

under that (tato) The only missing item in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s list provided to this verse is the aperture of the ears. We may surmise, therefore, that SUṂ is intended for the ears. According to this commentator the penis and anus are covered by the fire-syllable (KṢMRYUṂ), the fontanelle by KṢUṂ, the eyes by a dark HUṂ, the nostrils by a red YUṂ, and the mouth by a white SUṂ. This is very likely not what the text means. I propose that the original system was much simpler and closer to that taught in the **Mukhāgama*. In this model the forehead is blocked by HŪṂ, all other apertures below that by the water-syllable, with the exception of the penis and the anus, which are blocked by the fire-syllable. The **Mukhāgama* model is to block the upper seven apertures by HŪṂ, the penis with SUṂ, and the anus with KṢUṂ.

blazing This very likely refers to the fiery colour of the *bīja*. According to *Smṛti* (61^v) it is yellow.

[Maintaining / performing again] the/a kumbhaka breathing [the yogin], well composed, should visualize [his] body in the colour of wind (i.e. dark-blue/black) and [his] consciousness (cetasā) [atop] a wind-disk. 4.3.45

should visualize etc. The interpretation of this verse is somewhat tentative. It is not entirely clear to me what Bhavabhaṭṭa means when stating that the fourth *pāda* refers to the syllable HŪṂ. It is possible that the statement is corrupt and the intended meaning is that consciousness in the shape of a HŪṂ is visualized atop a wind-disk, which is a dark semicircle. What seems to be happening here is that the *yogin* starts visualizing the ‘apparatus’ through which he will perform *utkrānti*, much along the lines suggested by the same commentator *ad v.* 50 below.

After having affixed [to it] the drop and the roar, [the yogin should visualize] a wind-syllable at the base and [another] wind[-syllable] at the [other] end of the base. [With these] he should [start] drawing the root-syllable. 4.3.46

the drop and the roar In other words he adds to the basic form of the wind-syllable (YA) the vowel -u and the *anusvāra*. The raised *bīja* is thus YUM.

at the base etc. The statement is extremely obscure. Bhavabhaṭṭa refrains from giving an explanation here, but *ad v.* 50 he makes it clear that the syllable HŪṂ (presumably here referred to as the ‘root-syllable’) on the wind-disk is equipped with two wind-syllables, one at the bottom and the other at the top. These YUMs function like ‘engines’ to mobilize the HŪṂ syllable, which in essence is the yogin’s consciousness.³⁶⁶ According to *Smṛti* (61^v), however, the YUM syllables are visualized at the soles of the feet, a procedure seen elsewhere in order to induce *āveśa* (cf. 3.3.29 here, *Śiṣyānugrahaśāstra* A 18^r, B 3^r).

³⁶⁶Consciousness is visualized as HŪṂ in other texts as well, cf. e.g. **Utkrāntiyupadeśa* 141^v of the Yamāri cycle. The **Mukhāgama* (15^r) teaches the manipulation of *vajras* rather than *bījas*.

He should [then] join the Vajrī seed[-syllable] with [that] of the frightful one (ghorāṇām) with a hook (aṅkuśādi). He should draw [the syllable hūṃ?] from [its] place with the frightful one (ghorā) [while] breathing twenty-one times. 4.3.47

join etc. This verse is also obscure. Bhavabhaṭṭa identifies the seed-syllable of Vajrī as SUM and the ‘frightful one’ as that of Ghorī, i.e. KṢUM. Furthermore, he takes the hook (aṅkuśādi, with the ādi without meaning) to mean the syllable HIK (which is nowhere taught in the text) and ghorā as AM, about which he later teaches that it is to be visualized in the navel. However, the role of the first two *bījas* is still doubtful. *Smṛti* (61^v) identifies the first two *bījas* as HŪM (i.e. not the syllable of the goddess Vajrī) and KṢUM, and states that the latter acts as a ‘hook’ to draw the former upwards. But this leaves the second occurrence of *ghora* in *pāda* c unaccounted for.

[With each breath he should draw] upwards [the consciousness-mantra] one step at a time [until it reaches] beyond the ninth juncture (navasandhiṃ). 4.3.48ab

one step at a time Lit. one step resting, one step upwards. I take this to mean that consciousness is not drawn upwards in a single continuous motion, but in stations, the number of which, judging by the number of breaths, ought to be twenty-one. I do not find Bhavabhaṭṭa interpretation convincing here: in his view *pada* refers to principle and secondary parts [viz. of the body].

ninth juncture (navasandhiṃ) The *mūla* and Bhavabhaṭṭa unfortunately never make it clear what these nine are (the expression is again used in 52b), but judging by the number and the context ‘juncture’ here must refer to the gates, of which the ninth is the most desirable. For *Smṛti* (61^v-62^r) the procedure begins with a focusing in the soles of the feet (see notes to v. 46 above), thus in his view the nine junctures are parts of the body: the soles of the feet, the ankles, the knees, the loins, the navel, the heart, the shoulders, the throat, and the head.

†...†

4.3.48cd

†...† This line is beyond my comprehension. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa it refers to a procedure to stop the greying of hair, but it is difficult to see what this has to do with *utkrānti*. *Smṛti* completely avoids the line, and Abhayākara Gupta's comment to the parallel (*Āmnāyamañjarī* 277^v) is not very convincing either: according to this commentator the line alludes to two mantras (HAM and HŪM). Also cf. 51cd below.

**Having uttered a terrible roar (ghoranādena), [with] the
seed[-syllable called] the final of the eight (aṣṭāntasya)
joined with the first of the first group [as a] half-syllable
...**

4.3.49

the final of the eight (aṣṭāntasya) etc. This is the letter HA (cf. *Guṇavati* p. 26; *Sādhanaśidhi* Ms 38^r; the term perhaps stems from the *Pañcakrama* 1.53). Bhavabhaṭṭa understand the term metonymically, as he glosses it as HŪM and understands the second line as describing a separate mantra, AM. However, it is more natural to understand the verse as raising a single *bīja*. It is not entirely certain what the *bīja* is. The *aṣṭānta* could also refer to KṢA (cf. *Smṛti* 62^r), but this is the less likely solution. The 'first of the first' may be either A or KA. But what could the 'half-syllable' be? I propose that it means we have to remove the inherent -a. The mantra we obtain thus is HAK. However, Bhavabhaṭṭa's present commentary, parallels, and the later tradition almost unanimously suggest that one of the *mantras* used for *utkrānti* is HIK.³⁶⁷ If this is what the *Catuṣpīṭha* teaches, then the 'terrible roar' in the first quarter-verse must refer to the vowel -i. For similar *mantras* (SKRK, etc.) in the Śaiva tradition see VASUDEVA 2004:439 ff.

**... [the yogin] should impel [his] consciousness [seated
atop] the wind-disk from the bottom part of the wind-
disk, which is joined with the seed[-syllables] of wind,
interrupting [the process with each breath] with the roar
[described above].**

4.3.50

[the yogin] etc. The interpretation of the verse is somewhat tentative. The process seems to be that the consciousness of the *yogin* embodied in the

³⁶⁷Sometimes also HIKA. Cf. *Nibandha* ad v. 50 here and *passim*; *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya* 10^v; *Yid ches gsum ldan* 60^r; *Samvarodayaṭīpatī* 23^r quoting 'the *upadeśa* of Nāropāda'; **Ratnamālā* 100^r.

visualized HŪṂ on the wind-disk is impelled upwards, propelled by the wind-syllables YUṂ affixed to the bottom and top of the wind-disk. This ought to be done twenty-one times, reciting HIK for each step. Simultaneously, the *yogin* should visualize that the seed-syllable HŪṂ is drawn upwards by the KṢUṂ via a hook – most likely a ray of light –, which is presumably visualized on the top of the head.

Bhavabhaṭṭa expounds the procedure as he sees it in the commentary to this verse. This includes an extra element, a syllable AṂ in the navel, which blazes up with rays and ‘kickstarts’ the HŪṂ in the heart. It is not only the wind-syllables that mobilize the HŪṂ, but also the two elements of the *mantra* HIK. When the HŪṂ is being taken upwards the wind-syllable at the bottom of the wind-disk is propelled by HI and the one above by the element K. When the HŪṂ reaches the top of the head it is taken back, and the position of the two *mantra*-elements is reversed. The reason why the HŪṂ must be brought back is that this procedure is merely an exercise for the final performance of the rite, when the HŪṂ (i.e. consciousness) is forced to egress the body and the *yogin* dies. The syntax of this long sentence ad v. 50 is quite awkward, but the meaning seems to be clear.

Through twenty-one stages [the yogin propels his consciousness in the form of hūṁ] higher and higher, and then beyond. 4.3.51ab

If the yogin [should suffer] from greying, he should eat the ‘half-root’ (ardhamūlaṁ). 4.3.51cd

If etc. Compare this with the puzzling intervening statement 48cd. Bhavabhaṭṭa did perceive the awkwardness of the line, and he was constrained to sacrifice *pāda* b (which must go with the previous statement) in order to obtain a meaning. The ‘half-root’ is to my knowledge unattested in the sense of something to be consumed. The *Nibandha* proposes that it is a concoction of phlegm, semen, and menstrual blood. The original meaning was already unknown to the redactors of the *Vajradāka*, which has *ūrdhvamūlaṁ*, a reading also attested in the Tibetan rendering of this *Catuspīṭha* verse.

[Proceeding] upwards, beyond the nine junctures is called the instant egress (sadyotkrāntiṁ). 4.3.52ab

nine junctures Again, probably the nine gates of the body, cf. notes to 48ab. What is somewhat odd is that the text seems to propose avoiding all nine gates, whereas one would expect from the parallels that the *yogin* ought to opt for the ninth gate, i.e. the *kanakadvāra*.

instant egress As pointed out to me by Prof. Sanderson, this term also derives from the Śaivas, as is evident from the following provided references: *Niśvāsaguhya* 8.119: *kṣurikā pañcadhā jñeyā sadya-m-utkrāntikārikā*; *Niśvāsakārikā-Dikṣottara* 5.36c: *sadyotkrāmakarā hy ete*; *Adhyuṣṭaśatakālot-tara* 8.33: *kasmīn sthāne ca te cchedyāḥ sadyotkrāntīś ca kīdrśī*; *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṃgraha*, *Sāmānyaviśeṣapaṭala* v. 8a: *sadyotkrāntividhānajñāḥ*; *Picumatā* 100.81cd: *sthiracittasya deveśe sadyotkrānti[h] prasidhyati*; *Tantrāloka* 16.178a.

[Even] a destroyer of gods [and a murderer] of brahmins,
[even] one who performs the five [acts] of immediate retri-
bution, [even] one who steals [and/or] relishes pleasures
will become pure through this path (i.e. utkrānti). He
shall not be tainted by sins, and [will be] far [removed]
from the conditions of existence.

4.3.52cd-
53

a destroyer of gods By this the text presumably means an iconoclast, cf. *Āmnāyamañjarī* (278^r): *lha sku gzugs la sogs pa rnams . . . gsod pa po*. Note that while 52c is more evocative of a brahmanical context, 52d uses proper Buddhist terminology. The *Āmnāyamañjarī* (*ibid.*) glosses ‘brahmins’ as all pure men (*sdig pa dang bral ba’i mi*). ° **ghātasya** is to be construed with **viprāṇām** as well.

five [acts] of immediate retribution As listed by *Smṛti* (62^v) and the *Āmnāyamañjarī* (278^r) these are matricide, patricide, killing an *arhat*, causing schism in the *saṅgha*, and to draw the blood of a Tathāgata with malice (i.e. not for medical purposes, etc.).

conditions of existence Here I follow Abhayākaragupta’s gloss (*Āmnāyamañjarī* 278^r-278^v), which explains **bhāva** as afflictions, sickness, old age, etc. Both the *Vajradāka* and the *Sampuṭa* replace the compound with *bhavadoṣam*. Bhavabhaṭṭa’s explanation (*utpāde ’pi*) seems to be suspect:

perhaps he intended to say that even in a subsequent incarnation the *yogin*'s consciousness will not be tainted.

Just as a beautiful, utterly spotless lotus arises from the mire, in the same way [consciousness egressing] from the body [which is as impure as a] mire (pañkādi) becomes gnosis embodied (?) at will. 4.3.54

gnosis embodied The rendering is doubtful. Both *Smṛtijñānakīrti* and *Bhavabhaṭṭa* cautiously avoid expressing any views as to what **jñānakāyebhi** might mean.

mire (pañkādi) The simile does not require that the **ādi** have any meaning; it is probably nothing more than a verse-filler.

[The yogin should perform] the egress only when the time [of death] is nigh. [Should he do it] at an improper time, [he will be tainted by the sin of being] a murderer of the deity. Therefore the wise one should start [undertaking this procedure only after] the signs [of death have manifested] on the body. 4.3.55

a murderer of the deity This oft-quoted statement³⁶⁸ is usually taken to mean that the *yogin* murders the deities that are the constituents of his person in Tantric thinking, cf. *Smṛti* (62^v): *shi ba'i dus ma yin par 'pho ba byas nas/ rigs lnga la sogs pa'i lha gsod par 'gyur te/ phung po lnga rigs lnga'i ngo bo nyid kyī phyir ro//* “If [the *yogin*] performs *utkrānti* when the time of death is not yet nigh, he will become a murderer of the deities from the five [Tathāgata-]families. For the five *skandhas* have as their nature the five families.” The *locus classicus* for this idea is the *Guhyasamāja* (17.50ab): *pañca skandhāḥ samāsenā pañca buddhāḥ prakīrtitāḥ//*.

³⁶⁸E.g. in the *Yid ches gsum ldan* (58^v). Tsong kha pa also adds that if one holds Tantric vows, untimely abandonment of the body counts as the eighth gross transgression. The eighth *mūlāpatti* is defined as defiling the constituents of the person, which are inseparable from the Tathāgatas; cf. *Mūlāpattayaḥ* v. 3d: *jñātmaskandhadūṣaṇe*) and *Mūlāpattisaṃgraha* v. 6ab: *pañcabuddhātmakāḥ skandhās teṣāṃ avajñayāṣṭamī*].

Synopsis of vv. 56-75

The role of this passage cannot be determined with absolute certainty. It is a part of an old recension of the text, since Smṛtijñānakīrti has a condensed commentary to it (he calls it an ‘appendix-*yoga*’ to *utkrānti*) and the *Samputa* lifts over the entire passage almost word for word,³⁶⁹ but Bhavabhaṭṭa seems to ignore it completely. Depending on the interpretation of certain key verses, and how we group this section with the next (i.e. whether they go together or are separate) three plausible solutions can be discerned.

The first depends on the interpretation **yoga sādhya viśeṣataḥ** in 56b. If we take this in the strong sense, i.e. ‘a special kind of yoga to be performed [during *utkrānti*]’, then the passage must describe another type of meditation to be performed during the egress of consciousness.

The second possibility is that **viśeṣataḥ** simply praises the method, in which case we are dealing with a visualization of an ectype of Jñānaḍākinī. This special form does not entirely correspond to the iconographic description given in 2.3, especially when it comes to the implements the goddess is holding.

The third possible solution is that the procedure goes together with the last verses of the sub-chapter, and that it describes a special kind of *yoga* through which the *yogin* becomes able to read other people’s minds. I favour this possibility.

The passage (vv. 56-66) opens with an exhortation of the Lord: Vajra[pāṇi] should listen to a special kind of meditation. The *yogin* must first cultivate equanimity, and then perform the teaching taught previously (this very clearly points to 1.3, where one cultivates emptiness). He should then visualize in his heart the syllable embodying the five Buddhas (i.e. HŪṀ), which radiates and burns up the constituents of the universe. Then the syllable changes into Jñānaḍākinī. She is three-faced (laughing, wrathful, and coquettish) with three eyes on each face, six-armed holding an arrow (R3), a goad (R2), a *vajra* (R1), displaying the threatening gesture (L1), holding a noose (L2) and a stringed bow (L3). She is white, adorned with a tiara and other ornaments, sitting in the comfortable posture upon a lotus, and radiating clouds of Buddhas. The *yogin* should then perform the installation

³⁶⁹The commentator of that text, Abhayākara Gupta, proposes that this type of deity-yoga should be performed after having perceived the signs of death as a preparatory practice for *utkrānti* (*Āmnāyamañjarī* 281^r).

of the eight syllables (this is referred to elsewhere as *aṣṭāṅgakalana*, but here a more common term, *akṣaravinyāsa*, is used). All these syllables should be white and radiating white light. 65cd-66ab are not entirely clear: the *yogin* should perhaps imagine a plantain flower in his heart (i.e. the calyx of the flower is pointing downwards) and upon it (yet another?) HŪṂ. He should concentrate on this intensively.

With the next section (vv. 67-74) Bhavabhaṭṭa resumes his commentary. He interprets the first *pāda*, **tato bāhyādi yogasya**, as the beginning of ‘another *yoga*’. He does not tell us which *yoga* the last one may have been, therefore it cannot be determined with certainty that vv. 56-66 were available to him. However, **tato** could be interpreted as introducing the continuation of the previous procedure.³⁷⁰ Here the *yogin* ought to direct his attention outwards, I propose that this means towards the consciousness of the person he would like to perceive. This should be visualized as a red *bīja* (perhaps also HŪṂ) upon a wind-disk, a fire-disk and a sun-disk in due order. The *yogin* should then start a breathing exercise in order to manipulate the *bījas*. With the outgoing breath his own HŪṂ is seen to strike at the other *bīja*. Then he should appropriate the consciousness of the other, in other words, he should read the target’s mind. With each breath he should recite unspecified *mantras*. If he maintains equanimity he will succeed. The last two verses, vv. 73-74, merely seem to wrap up the contents of the last passage, but Bhavabhaṭṭa interprets them as teaching yet another kind of meditation, a kind of *vākstambhana*. While the text quite clearly mentions here the reading of the target’s mind, Bhavabhaṭṭa proposes that the procedure makes the target silent (lit. as if dumb, *mūkavat*) until the time of his death. This interpretation is probably not adequate.

The sub-chapter finishes with the customary colophon.

³⁷⁰It should be noted, however, that the *Vajraḍāka* reproduces this passage, but not the previous one (vv. 56-66). This suggests that for the editors of that text the two passages did not form a unit as I examine it here.

5.16 Synopsis of 4.4

Although supposedly the last sub-chapter teaches ‘the secret of secrets’, 4.4 is the most scantily commented passage in Bhavabhaṭṭa’s *Nibandha*. Verse 1 contains Vajrapāṇi’s question about the process of obtaining perfect enlightenment (*saṃbodhikrama*).

The *bhagavān* (vv. 2-15) promises to teach that method. After having received the teachings [of the *Catuṣpīṭha*] (*śāstrāṇi*) and [the supplementary teachings] traditionally handed down to the officiant, the *yogin* should go to a pleasant place, sit on a comfortable seat, and cultivate equanimity (free himself of passion etc.). He should dissolve the universe [as described in 1.3] and meditate on emptiness [until] he sees everything as being as pure as a crystal. He should then visualize [himself] as a white, radiant, two-armed, clad and adorned Jñānaḍākinī seated on a moon-disk and a lotus. He should display the *mahāmudrā* (here: the pledge-gesture of the goddess) in front of his heart and recite ‘I am the *jñānasattva*’.

The *yogin* should then visualize a plantain flower (*kadalīpuṣpa*) stemming in the navel and reaching up to his heart. [There] he should visualize an eight-petaled lotus and install seed-syllables on the petals: a white syllable (called *viññāna*) in the middle, the syllable of Akṣobhya on the eastern petal, that of Ratna[sambhava] in the south, that of Amita[⁻bha] in the west, and that of Amogha[siddhi] in the north. The first two *tathāgatās* are equated with the *brahmavihāras* of *maitrī* and *karuṇā*, but the set is not completed to the total of four. According to Bhavabhaṭṭa the five unspecified *bījas* are AṀ, HŪṀ, ĀṀ, HRĪṀ, and KHṀ but the text very strongly suggests that they are HŪṀ, A, Ā, Ā3, and AṀ.³⁷¹ On the intermediate petals he should install the ‘eunuchs’ (i.e. Ṛ, Ṝ, Ḍ, and Ḍ̄). Finally, he should visualize a HŪṀ in the heart.

The description of the procedure seems not to be complete, so that Vajrapāṇi’s question in v. 16 can be seen as an interruption: if all is uncharacterized emptiness how can *yoga* (here: eidetic meditation) and so forth be effective (lit.: how can it act as a ‘sprout’)?

The *bhagavān* answers (vv. 17-22) that here it is indeed the case that something with no essence (*asāreṇa*) gives rise to something of essence (*sārā-*

³⁷¹I interpret the line *svrapūrvādibījasya daṇḍa bindu yathākramam* (14ab) as “the seed[-syllables] are the first vowel and adding the baton and the drop in due order.” The ‘trick’ is to add the *daṇḍa* twice as described in 2.3.57cd first to obtain the long -a and then the *pluta* vowel.

ṇām). The simile is obscure (*amṛtārambhamocavat*) and here Bhavabhaṭṭa's interpretation is very helpful. For it not only sheds light on this particular passage but it also elegantly solves a dilemma of Tantric Buddhism. Procedures such as *mantras*, deity-visualization, and seed[-syllables] are like the plantain tree, which does yield fruit, though it is empty on the inside. In other words procedures advanced by Vajrayāna are somehow 'special' causal factors of enlightenment [and supernatural accomplishments] in a Universe without essence.³⁷² The next three verses seem to continue the description of the above procedure: the *yogin* should contemplate the conviction that gnosis is without characteristics and unsullied. He should in due course obtain perfect enlightenment. The *bhagavān* warns that the true teaching comes from the *guru*; scripture is merely an indicator.

According to Bhavabhaṭṭa vv. 23-37 teach a new procedure, but the passage is best viewed as further continuation of the above interrupted by a short excursus. After the *yogin* has visualized the apparatus given above he should see white rays of light spring forth [from the HŪṀ in his heart]. This nectar-like light cleanses his body. Then he visualizes yet another HŪṀ between the eyebrows, which is also white and radiating white light. In the middle of this aperture he should visualize consciousness in the shape of a drop (*bindu*), as subtle as the hundredth of the tip of a newborn's hair. He is then supposed to manipulate this monadic consciousness in some way, but here the *bhagavān* abruptly states that henceforth one should follow the teaching of the *guru*. Two verses (vv. 29-30) praise the merits of direct teaching as opposed to that obtained only from texts. The *yogin* should continue this meditation composed and unperturbed. The *bhagavān* states that since all phenomena are based on consciousness, it is consciousness that should be tamed. If he becomes perturbed he should recite *mantras* to re-obtain his composure.

Vv. 38-41 teach a progressive series of eight signs of accomplishment. In the first instance the *yogin* perceives the shape of a flame, in the second flickers of light as that of fireflies, in the third shining speckles of white dust filling the ten directions and a diminishing of afflictions. In the fourth he perceives the joys of the gods in the realm of desire, in the fifth same of the realm of form, in the sixth same of the formless realm (although here one can speak of 'enjoyment' only figuratively), in the seventh he perceives the *dhar-*

³⁷² *Nibandha* ad 4.4.18: *asārāpi kadaly amṛtopamaṃ phalaṃ sārāṃ phalati yathā, tathā niḥsāramantradevatābījādikaṃ bhāvvyamānaṃ sambodhyādīlakṣaṇaṃ sārāṃ phalaṃ phalati.*

madhātu, and in the eighth he attains buddhahood. The first set of three is reminiscent of the *siddhinimittas* of the *Samājottara* (150-152), although the order is different. The second set of five is essentially an ascending conquest of the Universe, in principle not unlike the Śaiva ontological ascent. As far as I am able to tell the present octet of signs is unparalleled (except of course the *Samputa* 5.2.40 ff. which lifts over this passage).

In the next section (vv. 42-57), the *bhagavān* teaches another procedure, without having been prompted to do so, this time named in the last unit as the *dharmadhātuyoga*. The *yogin* should visualize in his heart a moon-disk, thereupon a blazing white HŪṂ. The blazes are seen to engulf everything, leaving only emptiness in their wake. After having contemplated emptiness the *yogin* rearranges the world (which is also seen as his own body) in the shape of a *stūpa*. Mount Meru is seen in the middle of the dome of the reliquary (here called a *ghaṇṭā*, standing for ether), the gods of the desire-realms are imagined on the *harmikā*, the gods of the formless realm are equated with the stories of the parasol. The *yogin* merges his consciousness with this apparatus and contemplates the empty nature thereof and the non-duality of perceiver and perceived. He then worships the *stūpa* with the perfections (*pāramitā*) beginning with giving (*dāna*). Composed and unperturbed the *yogin* should maintain the visualization until he attains accomplishment. Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary is very terse at this point, but he does seek to find the *raison d'être* of the passage: he links it with a prohibition voiced in 4.1.59a according to which the *yogin* should not venerate external *caityas*. The commentator's view is that according to the text one should venerate only this internalized form of the *stūpa*, essentially the *yogin*'s own body.

The section vv. 58-84 begins with Vajrapāṇi's enquiry for a procedure he calls the secret meditation (*raho-yoga*). The Lord begins to describe yet another procedure. First the *yogin* must bring his mind to rest (here the mind is compared to both a swift steed and intoxicated bees), for a disciplined mind is the source of all accomplishments. Then he should visualize [himself as] Jñānaḍākinī, perform the eightfold cuirass, and block the apertures of the body with *mantras*. He should then visualize a plantain flower, perform the installation of syllables (here identified not with the Tathāgatas but the elements), etc. (cf. vv. 2-15). While maintaining this visualization he should not become engrossed in their form but maintain equanimity. This obscure passage (again not commented by Bhavabhaṭṭa) seems to come to an abrupt end with the *yogin* directed to obtain the teaching of the *guru* for the teachings of scripture alone are insufficient.

Vv. 85-89 discuss two practical topics linked to meditation. Should the *yogin* find that he cannot focus properly he should seek a solitary location, without noise and people: a forest, a glen, or a mountain. A recipe is given for his daily alimentionation. The concoction is said to alleviate hunger and thirst for a hundred years.

V. 90 explains through an obscure simile how the soteriological path ought to be taught and listened to. V. 91 prohibits Buddhists and initiates in particular from observing the teachings and practices of the Veda, and venerating the gods of the ‘outsiders’. If they do so their *abhiseka* and observances will come to nothing.

Vv. 92-99ab describe the joy of the audience upon having heard [the revelation of the *Catuṣpīṭha*]. The *yogins*, *yoginīs*, *dākas*, *dākinīs*, and the *bodhisattvas* headed by Vajrapāṇi respectfully bow and sing six songs in *apabhraṃśa* the first four of which end with the hallmark refrain *te nā hūṃ te nā hūṃ te nā te te hūṃ*.³⁷³ Bhavabhaṭṭa attempts to interpret the line thus: *te* meaning ‘those’ refer to existents such as *skandhas*, *nā* denies their existence in the perceiver/perceived duality, their true nature is to exist as radiance pure by its very nature (*prakṛtiprabhāsvaratayā*). For *hūṃ* expresses that the entire Universe is consciousness (*cittamātram sarvaṃ yataḥ*). Cf. notes to 1.2.65.

In vv. 99cd-101 the *bhagavān* speaks for one last time to teach the benefits of the revelation. Whosoever hears even a letter or a quarter-verse [of the *Catuṣpīṭha*] will obtain the joys of heaven or universal rulership. Whosoever writes down the text or commissions it to be written down and recites the *mantras* with faith will upon death be reborn in the formless realm. Finally, those who practice the visualizations, meditations, and rituals herein will swiftly obtain perfect enlightenment.

The last unit (v. 102), which is in prose, closes the speech of the *bhagavān* and describes the joy of the retinue. This is a rephrased repetition (cf. v. 92), and the audience is described here differently as *yogins*, *yoginīs*, *bodhisattvas* headed by Vajrapāṇi, but also gods, *nāgas*, *yakṣas*, *gandharvas*, *asuras*, *kiṃnaras*, and *mahoragas*. Before closing the text the compilers could not resist introducing one last barbarism, *abhinandann iti* instead of the usual and correct *abhyandann iti*, although they could have easily lifted over the proper form from a great number of scriptures.

³⁷³In this form the ‘refrain’ is a hallmark *Catuṣpīṭha* line, but the predecessor is to be found in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (T_D 161^r): *te na te te hūṃ*.