

Minor Vajrayāna texts V: The *Gaṇacakra* attributed to Ratnākaraśānti

Péter-Dániel Szántó

Overview

There are very few studies on the *gaṇacakra*, a ritualised communal feast as celebrated by followers of the Vajrayāna, i.e., Tantric Buddhist communities. LALOU's preliminary study (1965) is still useful, and it was only recently followed up. The only monograph on the subject, which I was unable to consult in its entirety, is in Japanese by SHIZUKA (2007), who has before and since authored several articles on the topic, including a very useful English summary of his research (2008). Shizuka mostly worked with Tibetan canonical translations, however, as I will demonstrate below, a relatively small amount of material does survive in the original Sanskrit.

The main point of this article is to present a *gaṇacakra* manual in Sanskrit. First, I will say a few general points on the rite for the non-specialist reader. I will then give a rough overview of the earliest (eighth to ninth centuries CE) sources for this rite in Buddhist literature, followed by a brief discussion of later (tenth to thirteenth centuries CE) sources and Sanskrit manuals, or fragments thereof, specifically devoted to it. I will then turn to announce a fortunate discovery of one such manual in the original. After some introductory notes, in the next section I will provide a diplomatic edition of the text accompanied by philological notes and a tentative translation. The final section contains a diplomatic edition of a short and incomplete gloss that was found together with the manual.

The non-specialist reader will probably be baffled by the amount of philological groundwork required to clarify sometimes even very basic points as well as by the amount of unpublished and/or unstudied/untranslated literature provided in the references. Alas, such is the state of our field.

General introduction

The main points of a *gaṇacakra* (or *gaṇamaṇḍala*), lit. “assembly circle,” essentially a ritualised communal feast, are as follows: The ritual should be observed periodically, at least once a year, but preferably more often. It is not a public affair, as participation is limited to initiates of a particular Tantric cult, ideally both male and female. They are headed by their master who is seated in the middle, usually accompanied by his consort, and officiates during the key points of the rite. Lesser duties are delegated to an assistant. The resources are provided by a sponsor, who is also present. The chief aim of the rite is to consume the so-called *samaya* (“vow,” “pledge”) substances – bodily fluids and meats – in a communal fashion. These are placed in a vessel (usually a skull bowl) filled with liquor and are consecrated by the main officiant. The vessel is then passed around, usually accompanied by verses in Apabhraṃśa, a kind of literary Middle Indic, with everyone obliged to partake. This is followed by a feast with food, drink, song, and dance. Some descriptions specify that participants should communicate using secret signs and secret codewords (both called *chommā*). It is usually assumed that intercourse also takes place, and we do indeed find allusions to this in some of our manuals, e.g. the one discussed here, but this is not the main point. The ritual usually takes place at night and can last until daybreak. Thereupon the participants are dismissed respectfully.

The ritual manuals explain the rationale behind celebrating a *gaṇacakra* in various ways. Most relevant authors will state that the primary reason is to gather the equipments of merit and knowledge (*punya*^o and *jñānasambhāra*), which are obligatory requisites for one’s spiritual career. Abhayākara Gupta, a highly influential East Indian author from the late eleventh and early twelfth century, claims (Tōh. 2491, 243b) that it is a transgression not to perform it, while his disciple Ratnarakṣita lists as aims (Tōh. 2494, 249a) restoring transgressed Tantric vows, gaining victory over enemies, achieving all objects of desire, pleasing the deity, and ultimately obtaining the accomplishment of the highest state of consciousness, the *mahāmudrā*. However, there are also dangers: at least one author, the somewhat obscure *Bhavya, warns (Tōh. 2176, 31b–32a) that participants will be killed by *dākas* (or *dākinīs*), either malevolent spirits or possibly the deities themselves, if the rules of the feast are not observed correctly.

Modern anthropological theory would no doubt find such manuals a rich resource for topics such as celebrating and maintaining identity, testing

communal loyalty, distribution of resources, ritual etiquette, transgressive behaviour and control thereof.

The earliest textual sources for the *gaṇacakra* ritual

While I am fully aware that the Buddhist *gaṇacakra*/^o*maṇḍala* probably imitates a Śaiva ritual (note that *gaṇa* primarily means an attendant of the god Śiva), I will ignore this point in my brief historical overview (for more on this topic, see SANDERSON 2009: 154).

To the best of my knowledge, the earliest reference in Buddhist literature to a *gaṇacakra* or *gaṇamaṇḍala* dates to the early eighth century or possibly slightly earlier.¹ This is in a nebulous but incredibly important text, the so-called *Longer Paramāḍya* (Tōh. 488, 238a):

The *vajra*-holder (i.e., the initiate) together with (i.e., holding) his *vajra*-sceptre should place in the middle of the assembly (*tshogs* = **gaṇa*) great (i.e., human) blood together with camphor (i.e., semen) and sandalwood (i.e., faeces) mixed with [menstrual] blood. [In the state of] the best of *yogas* (i.e., meditative identification) with **Sarvākāśa* (i.e., the deity?), he should taste [the mixture] as if it were Soma,² [lifting a bit from the vessel] with the [joined] tips of his ring finger and thumb; [by this] he shall obtain eternal accomplishment.³

¹ This dating is based first and foremost on the fact that the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (on which see GRIFFITHS & SZÁNTÓ 2015), which borrows extensively from the *Longer Paramāḍya*, was already extant in the first half of the eighth century. SHIZUKA (2008, 188) proposes that the *gaṇacakra/gaṇamaṇḍala* is a historic outgrowth of *guhyaṇḍalas* taught in the *Tattvasaṃgraha* (ca. early 7th c.). This may be accurate, but one significant difference is that the pivotal moment of consuming the antinomian substances is missing in the description of the *guhyaṇḍala* in the *Tattvasaṃgraha*.

² Here the intended sense is more akin to “drink of immortality,” rather than a reference to the drink usually consumed in Vedic ritual.

³ Tōh. 488, 238a: | *khrag chen ga bur dang bcas pa* | | *tsandan dmar dang sbyar ba ni* | | *tshogs kyi nang du rab zhugs nas* | | *rdo rje dang bcas rdo rje 'dzin* | | *srin lag mthe bo rtse mo yis* | | *nam mkha' thams cad sbyor mchog ldan* | | *zla ba 'i btung ba bzhin myangs na* | | *rtag pa 'i dngos grub thob par 'gyur* |.

This crucial passage is reproduced with two changes (marked here in bold and irrelevant for our present discussion) in a dependent text, the famous *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* (ms. fol. 14r):

mahāraktaṃ sakarpūraṃ raktacandanayojitam |
*gaṇamadhye pratiṣṭhaṃ śrīsarvocchiṣṭarasāyanam ||*⁴
anāmānguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ svādhīdevātmayogavān |
*somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnoti śāsvatim ||*⁵

The *Longer Paramādya* does not actually use an equivalent of the Sanskrit term *gaṇamaṇḍala*, but it is not unlikely that the word *tshogs* (Skt. **gaṇa*) and the use of *gaṇa* in *gaṇamadhye* in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* are simply abbreviations with the same meaning. On the other hand, in another passage the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* already uses the term *gaṇamaṇḍala* (ms. fol. 13v: *kalpayed gaṇamaṇḍalam*) and gives a more detailed but still rather obscure description. It seems to me that the point here is to recreate a “live” version of the deities, in other words, an enactment or re-enactment of the *maṇḍala*. The participants wear costumes, and if their number does not match the number of entities in the *maṇḍala*, simulacra made of wood or metal are used. There are very few restrictions imposed and possession (*āveśa*) plays a major part. This stands in contrast with later, more standardised descriptions, where behaviour is controlled and dignified: for example, singing and dancing is to be performed only with the officiant’s permission, and alcohol is to be consumed with moderation.

Most of the relevant verses from the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* are rehashed and expanded in what may be regarded the classical description of the *gaṇacakra*, namely, Āryadeva’s *Sūtaka*, chapter 9. This work dates from the ninth century and played a major part in establishing one of the two major schools of exegesis of the *Guhyasamājatantra*, one of the most (if not the most) influential Tantric Buddhist scriptures. An English translation has been published by WEDEMEYER (cf. 2008: 291 ff. for the relevant part), which is, however, in need of revision.

The next important scriptural source is the *Catuspīṭhatantra* (ca. mid or late ninth century), which does not explicitly mention the standard term

⁴ The word *pratiṣṭhaṃ* should be interpreted as a present participle. The reading °*occhiṣṭa*° is my emendation, the ms. has °*ontiṣṭha*°.

⁵ The manuscript reads *ādmoti*, which I have corrected to *āpnoti*.

gaṇacakra or *gaṇamaṇḍala*, but it does have *yogayoginīmaṇḍala*, which in the strange language of this text means “the circle of *yogins* and *yoginīs*.” It does not give a precise description of what the rite consisted of, however, it does teach several features which later became standard, most notably the Apabhraṃśa songs intoned when gaining entry in the assembly and when passing around the vessel with the transgressive substances as well as the *mantras* to purify them (cf. SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 330ff. & 357ff.).

Later sources

Some of the later scriptures from the so-called Yoginītantras are also noteworthy: the *Hevajratantra* (ca. 900 CE) passages are quite well-known (II.vii.5–13 in SNELLGROVE 1959; there are some other details scattered throughout this text), as is the eighth chapter of the *Samvarodayatantra*, most likely a relatively late (eleventh to twelfth centuries?) Nepalese composition-compilation, one among the selected chapters published by TSUDA (1974). The commentaries on these passages are also very rewarding to consult (e.g. *Padminī* ms. fols. 15r–17r). Perhaps less well-known is a chapter entirely dedicated to the subject, the twenty-third of the unpublished *Mahāmudrātilaka* (ms. fol. 47r ff.), a scripture probably compiled in the late eleventh century. This is almost entirely a copy of the sixty-second chapter of the *Vajramālābhīdhāna*, a *Guhyasamāja* explanatory scripture (Tōh. 445, 267a ff.; KITAY 2011: 728–736), one of the many parallels between the two texts.⁶

Further material in Sanskrit can be gathered from ritual compendia. The *Vajrāvalī* of Abhayākaragupta does not teach the *gaṇacakra*, but the author wrote a separate manual that survives only in Tibetan translation (Tōh. 2491). Kuladatta’s version of the *gaṇacakra* ritual, which is heavily dependent on the text we examine here, constitutes the final chapter of his *Kriyāsamgrahaṇjikā* (edited by SAKURAI 2001). Dating this author is a tricky matter: he must precede 1216 CE, the date of the oldest manuscript of his compendium, but he could be as early as the middle of the eleventh century (TANEMURA 2004: 5–10). Jagaddarpaṇa, a Nepalese author from ca. the thirteenth century who was heavily influenced by Abhayākaragupta, describes a number of

⁶ The historical aetiology of the *Vajramālābhīdhāna* is very obscure, I will therefore refrain from assigning it a date. Some parts must date from as early as the ninth century.

Gaṇavidhis in his *Kriyāsamuccaya*, which probably demonstrates a local diversification among Newar Buddhists (ms. fol. 22v ff.⁷).

Some shorter but still noteworthy witnesses are the second half of the ninth section (and various details elsewhere) in the initiation manual *Samvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* (ms. fol. 38v ff.) of Bhūvācārya, an author active before 1054 CE at Ratnagiri in present Odisha, and the fourth chapter of the anonymous and undatable *Śiṣyānugrahaḥvidhi* (ms. A fols. 18v–19v, ms. B fols. 3v–5r), a short compendium on various subjects related to the worship of the deity Cakrasaṃvara.

Gaṇacakra manuals

Besides the present text, the only other complete and self-standing manual surviving in Sanskrit is to be found in the so-called Ngor Hevajrasādhana collection as its last item (see ISAACSON 2009: §45). The manuscript is now said to be in China, and the only way to access it for the time being is through copies of Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana's photographs taken in Tibet (ms. fols. 264v–271v). Appropriately for the collection, this text describes a *gaṇacakra* for Hevajra initiates, although the influence of the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* is substantial. The work is anonymous, has no identifiable Tibetan translation, and has not been edited yet.

The manuscript NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/13, catalogued under the misleading title “*Samājatathānuṣārini*”, contains two fragments of one folio each from works related to the *gaṇacakra*. The first fragment, penned in the so-called hook-topped Nepalese script, is very corrupt, but from the statement of purpose it can be made out that it is a manual based on the *Guhyasamājatantra*. The available text amounts to a little more than ten verses and contains descriptions of the ideal officiant (*ācārya*), his empowering of the assistant (*karmavajrin*), and some preliminary purificatory acts. The most striking feature of this text is its very existence. Āryadeva openly admits that the *Guhyasamājatantra* does not contain injunctions concerning the *gaṇacakra* (which he equates with “practices with elaboration,” *saprapaṅcācaryā*), which is why he supplies the description from the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* (cf. WEDEMEYER 2008: 291). From this manual, as well as the *Vajramālābhīdhāna* description mentioned

⁷ Note that the Tibetan translation in the Derge Canon omits a significant part, as the parallel ceases after Tōh. 3305, 216a4, which is probably unintentional.

above, it would seem that followers of the *Guhyasamāja* thought they were lagging behind and needed to update their ritual repertoire.

The second fragment from the same bundle (NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/13) is penned in a rather different, bolder, hook-topped script. Here we have not the first, but the final page of a work styling itself a Gaṇacakravīdhi. About seven verses survive in this fragment, but none deal with the rite proper. The penultimate verse, which is rather corrupt, describes either the author or the patron as the ruler of Dhavalapura,⁸ named either Sumati or Udayacandra. The colophon also contains a date falling within the reign of Abhayamalla, which can be converted to Friday, November 24, 1217 CE.

Another fragment, in this case of two folios, can be found in NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/24, catalogued as “*Mahāpratisarādhāriṇī*”. Unfortunately, most of the fragment is badly effaced. From what remains legible, it can be determined that the work once described a *gaṇacakra* of the Catuṣpīṭha cycle, or that at the very least it was heavily influenced by that ritual system. There are several parallel phrasings with works of that cycle, the meats usually styled *pradīpa* (“lamps”) are here called *aṅkuśas* (“hooks”), and the *mantras* used to empower them (*śrīm*, *hūṃ*, *ghruṃ*, *jriṃ*, *saḥ*) are hallmarks of the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* as well (SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 359–360).

A newly discovered manuscript

About half a decade ago, the aforementioned Shizuka, who can without doubt be called the world’s foremost expert of Buddhist Gaṇacakra manuals, published a study of a canonical Tibetan text that is titled **Vajrabhairavagaṇacakra* (Tōh. 1995) and attributed in the translators’ colophon to Ratnākaraśānti, one of the most famous and influential Buddhist thinkers from East India (floruit ca. late tenth to early eleventh century). In the English summary of his study, SHIZUKA (2011) stated the following: “In the Sde-dge edition this manual amounts to only two and a half folios, and a Sanskrit manuscript has not yet been reported.” I am happy to announce that I have identified a Sanskrit witness of the manual (according to my notes, in 2013), which is the main subject of this paper. Since ignorance of Japanese is one among my many shortcomings, I may reproduce some of

⁸ Converted into Modern Indo-Aryan, this would sound something like Dholpur. This is a fairly common toponym, but I do not find it impossible that here we have a variant of Dhavalasrotas, for which see PANT & SHARMA 1977: 22–24.

Shizuka's findings and claim them my own. Should this indeed occur, I apologise profusely.

The witness in question is a manuscript kept at the National Archives in Kathmandu under call number 5-7871. I had no opportunity to perform an autopsy of the manuscript, but I was able to consult it from digital images of the microfilm prepared by the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project, reel no. B 104/10. I cannot tell how long the original manuscript was; here we have only three initial folios, which contain the complete text of the *Gaṇacakravidhi* and the beginning of a gloss calling or describing itself as (a) *Samkṣiptā Pañjikā*, that is to say, "a short commentary on difficult points."

The script is a rather unusual, headless *devanāgarī*, employed throughout, except for the first two lines of fol. 2r and a single *akṣara* on fol. 3v. This hand, or a very similar one, can also be seen in other manuscripts from Nepal, both in the main text and in paratextual notes. A thorough palaeographical analysis would perhaps be aided by a hypothesis I wish to advance here: I think that this is the hand of a famous Nepalese scholar active in the first half of the nineteenth century, a man called Sundarānanda. Sundarānanda was not only an author and avid collector of manuscripts on various subjects,⁹ but he also maintained a scriptorium¹⁰ and occasionally copied manuscripts himself.¹¹

From Shizuka's wording in the aforementioned summary it seems to me that he accepted the attribution to the great eleventh-century East Indian scholar and perhaps even accepted the suggestion of the Tibetan title that this work forms part of the *Vajrabhairava* corpus, i.e. the group of works, both scriptural and exegetical, centred on the cult of the eponymous deity, a Buddhicised form of Śiva-Bhairava. I would disagree on both counts. First, it is quite impossible that Ratnākaraśānti, whose Sanskrit is beyond re-

⁹ His signature or ownership mark can be seen on the final folio of the only Sanskrit witness of Kalyāṇavarman's *Catuspīṭhapañjikā* (ms. fol. 45v), dated Nepāla Samvat 132 = 1012 CE; see SZÁNTÓ 2012: I:116. In my thesis (ibid. and p. 85, n. 24), I suggested that this may be Hara Prasād Śāstrī's handwriting. I now wish to withdraw that statement.

¹⁰ I thank Iain Sinclair for this information as well as for making me aware of Sundarānanda's importance and influence in the first place in personal communications (e-mail, June–July 2013).

¹¹ For example a manuscript of the *Śālihotra* of Indrasena, a treatise on hippology – further testimony for his wide-ranging cultural interests – with a Nepali translation and commentary, dated Śaka Samvat 1765, Nepāla Samvat 963, that is to say, 1843 CE.

proach, would have perpetrated any of the “barbarisms” (*mlecchita*, *mlecchabhāṣā*) in diction I will point out in my notes. Second, there is not a single word about the deity Vajrabhairava in the text or even the slightest allusion in wording, or otherwise, to texts of that cycle. I suspect that the work was grouped thus on account of its Tibetan translator, who identifies himself in the colophon as “the monk rDo rje grags.” This is none other than the famous and infamous translator of the Rwa clan, the foremost propagator of Vajrabhairava teachings in the Land of Snows.¹²

Indeed, the text does not seem to affiliate itself to any Tantric cycle. On the contrary, it seeks to stay as general as possible, allowing for particular customisations according to the liturgy of whichever cycle the participants followed. The strongest scriptural influence I could detect is that of the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra*. However, this scripture, which I tentatively date to the middle or second half of the ninth century, cannot be accepted as the lowest terminus post quem, since the present text also alludes to a *cakra* in the navel, a feature completely missing from the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* along with all other paraphernalia of so-called subtle body practices. The terminus ante quem is also slightly difficult to determine. As I will point out in the notes, the text’s influence on Kuladatta’s description of the *gaṇacakra* in the final chapter of his *Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā* is very clear, but Kuladatta’s dates are not fixed with certainty. The date and authorship of the gloss is impossible to determine. I find it very unlikely that the author was the scribe (Sundarānanda, if my hypothesis is correct), since the gloss uses lemmata which sometimes differ from the main text. It is also too corrupt for an autograph.

A few words about how I wish to proceed in presenting these two texts. In September 2013, in the idyllic setting of the island of Procida in the Bay of Naples during the Third Manuscripta Buddhica Workshop I had the good fortune of submitting my preliminary draft to what may be described without exaggeration as the most competent panel of experts of Tantric texts in the world. During our reading, my understanding of the texts grew considerably, but so did my despair. A host of new problems were pointed out and some passages were declared beyond redemption. Our verdict was unanimous that this is not the work of Ratnākaraśānti. Several emendations were proposed, but in the heat of the moment I stupidly forgot to record each and every person’s name who came to the rescue. Alexis Sanderson and Harunaga Isaacson will stand behind most emendations and conjec-

¹² For the life of Rwa lo, see CUEVAS 2015, a recent English translation of his biography.

tures, but I also recall excellent suggestions by Kazuo Kano and Kenichi Kuranishi. I wish to apologise to anyone who might feel left out. I also wish to thank the editors of the present volume for their excellent suggestions and gentle persuasion to include a translation, something I was initially reluctant to do. In spite of all this remarkable learning that came to my aid and for which I feel forever grateful, I still think that a definitive edition and precise translation cannot be attempted at this stage. I will therefore give the text as it stands in the manuscript, accompanied by a highly tentative translation (where this is possible) and a running commentary, which may point the reader in the right direction. Needless to say, all errors are my own.

Annotated diplomatic edition and tentative translation

[1r] *namo Vajrasatvāya* || ||

Obeisance to Vajrasattva!

This is the scribal obeisance and does not form part of the text, although most editions of Buddhist texts ignore this point. Vajrasattva is a kind of undifferentiated main deity of Tantric Buddhism, portrayed with two arms holding a *vajra*-sceptre (a symbol of means, *upāya*) and a bell (a symbol of wisdom, *prajñā*), which are also the two chief implements of Tantric Buddhist initiates. Most exegetes would agree that other Tantric deities (e.g. Hevajra, Cakrasaṃvara) are, roughly speaking, “emanations” or forms of Vajrasattva.

[1] *Vajrasatvaṃ praṇamyādau bhāvābhāvātmaṃ vibhuṃ* ||
sarvakāmapradaṃ devaṃ vakṣye haṃ gaṇamaṇḍalaṃ ||

After having first bowed to Vajrasattva, the pervading Lord, embodying both existence and non-existence (i.e., conventional and ultimate reality or transmigration and liberation), the god bestowing all objects of desire (or: the absolute object of desire), I shall teach the *gaṇamaṇḍala*.

This is the customary *maṅgala* (obeisance, auspicious utterance) and *pratijñā* (statement of purpose). Both *ādau* and [']*haṃ* are superfluous: the meaning of the first is already implicit in the absolute *praṇamya*, whereas

the meaning of the second can be gathered from the finite verb *vakṣye*. The object of *vakṣye* – unless we understand it to mean “I shall describe” – is a *bhīmavat* compound for *gaṇamaṇḍalavidhim*. The description *bhāvābhāvātmaḥ* is understood by the glossator as “embodying [both] conventional/superficial and ultimate truth,” whereas *sarvakāma*^o is interpreted as the absolute object of desire, i.e., great bliss (in this literature a synonym of Buddhahood), and not “all objects of desire.”

[2] *nirvikalpaparo maṁtrī sarvakālasamāhitah |*
sarvataṁtrānusārajño daśatatvavidāṁ varaḥ ||

The *mantra*-practitioner (here: the chief officiant), whose aim is the non-discursive [state], who is composed at all times, who knows the intent of all Tantras, who is a great expert in the ten fundamentals,

This verse describes the qualifications of the chief officiant. Here he is simply called *mantrin*, but later (v. 10) more appropriately *gaṇanāyaka*. *anusāra*^o is best understood as a synonym of *abhiprāya*. There are several lists for the ten *tattvas* (see KLEIN-SCHWIND 2012: 28 ff., she translates *tattva* as “fundamentals”), essentially types of rituals a *vajrācārya* (i.e., a Tantric Buddhist officiant, master) is expected to know, but none match the one given by the glossator (see p. 307), which is most likely an ad hoc creation and not something supported by scriptural or exegetical authority. Note his variants: *nityakāla*^o for *sarvakāla*^o and *vidhānavit* for *vidāṁ varaḥ*.

[3] *gambhīrodāradharmyarbhyā sārdravībhūtamānasaiḥ ||*
nirābhīmānaiḥ sacchiṣyaiḥ śuśrūṣaṇaviśāradaḥ ||

with true disciples, whose minds are †...† in the profound and vast doctrine, who are free from pride, who are obedient [and] skilled,

This verse describes the disciples accompanying the chief officiant. The second quarter must have begun with a *cvī* formation, otherwise the first line is beyond repair. Perhaps the point is that the disciples should have faith in or be versed in the profound and vast doctrine (i.e., the Buddhist *dharma*). The ungrammatical lengthening in *nirābhīmānaiḥ* seeks to avoid the metrical fault of having both second and third syllables short.

[4] *devatāgaṇasamkīrṇe paṃcakāmaphalaprade ||*
vivikte ramyagehe smin nijapūjām samārabhet ||

should undertake self-worship [as taught] in this [system] in a secluded, lovely house, which is scattered with groups of deities and which bestows the five objects of desire (i.e., the five sensory objects).

The exact meaning of the first quarter is obscure. The glossator would want the deities to mean “young women passionate about reality,” but this is doubtful, unless he means *yoginīs* incarnated into young women. However, in that case the author would have surely used that word, which is metricaly equivalent. Perhaps the first line does not necessarily describe the house, but the larger polity where the rite is to take place. In that case, *devatā* might refer to local deities with a friendly disposition towards Buddhism. Should the compound refer to the house after all, perhaps it means that the consecrated ritual space was adorned by images of deities on scroll paintings or sculpted. Privacy was crucial to the rite; Indrabhūti’s manual (Tōh. 1672, 196a) mentions two appointed door guardians. Āryadeva’s *Sūtaka* mentions both elaborate, three-storied brick palaces and more humble cottages as suitable locations (WEDEMEYER 2008: 294–295). Other manuals (e.g. Tōh. 1231, 43a; Tōh. 1439, 238b; Tōh. 2491, 243b) list the usual places for practice (a cremation ground, the top of a mountain, a thicket, a grove, banks of a river, etc.), but most stress that they should be isolated. The glossator’s explanation is somewhat opaque: “where there are no bad people [or] people” or perhaps “where there are no people, who are bad people.” “Bad people” in this kind of literature are opponents of (Tantric) Buddhism. It is perhaps not out of the question that the author used the pronominal locative ending, thus °*gehesmin*. The glossator, however, interprets [°]smin as an equivalent of *iha*, meaning *asmin tantrē*, “in this scripture.” The collocation *nijapūjā* is unattested elsewhere, but *nija*° is sometimes mentioned in the sense of the chosen deity’s *mantra*, e.g. *hūṃ*. The deity and its *mantra* are not separate, and one is supposed to visualise oneself as a deity, therefore we are probably not far from capturing the intended meaning: “worshipping oneself as the deity, who is the same as its *mantra*.”

[5] *jyeṣṭhānukramayogena vaṃdanā pūjanā smṛtā ||*
atha gaṇamāhātmyād ātitheyatvagauravāt ||

Homage and worship are taught [to take place] according to the rule of seniority; alternatively, according to the greatness of virtues or out of respect for a guest.

This verse explains the rule of seniority, which was observed not only in the order in which the participants are greeted and honoured, but also in the order of entry and seating. For an elaboration on *jyeṣṭhānukrama* by Kuladatta, see SAKURAI 2001: 18–19. Five kinds of seniority are listed there: according to initiation (*abhiṣeka*), according to observance (*vrata*), according to knowledge (*jñāna*), according to birth (*janma*), and according to learning (*vidyā*). Our glossator acknowledges only the first. For *atha* we should adopt the glossator’s *atha vā*, otherwise the line would be hypometrical. The formation *ātitheyatva*^o is excessive for *ātitheya*^o or *atithitva*^o; the irregularity, however, allows for a metrical verse quarter. This last rule is especially noteworthy, because it suggests that the list of participants was not stable, but it could also include foreigners to the land, as the glossator suggests, provided of course that they are initiates. The glossator’s variants are *matā* for *smṛtā* and *atitheyatva*^o for *ātitheyatva*^o, provided that this latter is genuine.

[6] *snānaṃ gaṃdhaṃ ca vastraṃ ca mālābharaṇalepanaṃ ||*
arhaṃ dhūpaṃ yathāśaktyā gaṇamaṇḍalam ārabhet ||

[After having gathered] according to one’s means [articles for] bathing, scented powders, cloths, garlands, ornaments, ointments, the guest water, incense, one should begin the *gaṇamaṇḍala* [ritual].

This verse lists the articles of worship. Although not mentioned separately here, later on (see v. 7) a sponsor (indeed, sponsors) is mentioned, so it stands to reason that these are charged to him and that it is his duty to prepare them. We should probably see an invisible absolute meaning “after having gathered/prepared” for the accusatives. Note the glossator’s variants *mālyam ca vastrā*^o for *vastraṃ ca mālā*^o.

[7] *samāhitāya karaṇī proktaiṣā karmavajriṇī ||*
karṇe kṛtvāmjaliṃ mūrddhni dātā cāṣṭāṃgato namet ||

The gesture calling to order is taught to be this: the female chief assistant, after having placed the folded palms on the ears [she should place them] on the head. As for the sponsor, he should perform a prostration of the eight parts [of the body].

Understand *samāhitāya* as *samāhitatvāya*. It is slightly unusual that the absolute and the finite verb have different subjects, but otherwise the verse does not seem to make sense. It is also somewhat unusual that the chief assistant (elsewhere, as in the Tibetan translation, *karmavajrin*) is female, but this reading as well as its interpretation as instrumental is reinforced by the glossator. The point of her gesture (*karaṇī*) is to call the participants to attention. This feature is not paralleled in any other manual known to me.

[8] *baḷiṃ ratnādibhāṇḍasthaṃ datvā lokottarān jinān ||*
laukikān maṃtradevāṃś ca pūjayet tatvatatparaḥ ||

After having given the food offering, which is [to be] placed in a vessel [made of some kind of] precious material [such as gold and silver] or something else [such as clay], the one intent on reality (i.e., the chief officiant) should worship the supramundane Victors, the mundane [gods], and the *mantra* gods.

The absolute should probably be understood as a present participle. Alternatively, offering the *bali* and worshipping the three groups are distinct. The compound *tattvatatparaḥ* may suggest that the worshipper should be aware of the ultimate nature of the mentioned deities. The last group, namely the *mantradevas*, is interpreted by the glossator as *genii locorum*. The word *ratna* is frequently translated as “jewel,” but the actual meaning is simply “precious material,” including some metals.

[9] *maṃtrābhīprāyayogena padmabhāṇḍe mahāmṛtaṃ ||*
daśāṃkuśaṃ ca saṃjapya sarvās tān paritoṣayet ||

He should [then] satisfy all [participants] with the great nectar and the ten hooks [which are placed] in a skull bowl and empowered by recitation according to the intent of the Tantra.

The transgressive substances, normally referred to as *samayas*, here called great (or “special”) nectars (*mahāmṛta*) and hooks (*aṅkuśa*) – both collective singulars – are placed in a skull cup (*padmabhāṇḍa*), empowered by recitation, and distributed. Although not mentioned here, it is usually understood that the substances are provided in small quantities (usually fashioned into a pellet) and dissolved in liquor (cf. SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 327 ff.; SAKURAI 2001: 19). Correct *sarvās* to *sarvāms*. The recipients are not described clearly; they could be the three groups mentioned above or, as the glossator would have it and what seems more likely, the participants themselves. We should accept the Tibetan reading and emend to *tantrābhiprāya*^o; the glossator’s reading *tattvābhiprāya*^o seems to be a corruption of this. The substances are alluded to below by their acronyms (see v. 16). Two points are noteworthy here. The first is that the meats are usually called *pradīpas* (“lamps”), *aṅkuśa* is a somewhat less used term and inextricably linked to the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* (SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 315, 348–349). The influence of that text is observable also in v. 17, which features the odd word *chiḍiṅga*. The second interesting point is that here, as well as in v. 18, the hooks are said to number ten, but in fact this is the total number of the nectars and the meats (see commentary on v. 16). The glossator discreetly ignores this problem.

[10] *sarvāḥ sādharmaṇāḥ pūjāḥ sarvaguhyottarottarāḥ ||*
mahāsukhapade sthivā varteta gaṇanāyakaḥ ||

All common acts of worships and all [acts of worship which are] utterly and ultimately secret should be performed by the leader of the assembly [after having] established [himself] in the state of great bliss.

Perhaps it would make the verse more elegant to emend to *sarvā guhyo*^o. The medial optative *varteta* is a barbaric form, understand *vartayeta*.

[11] *vinayanibhṛtanārī namravaktrāravimḍā*
vīpulaguṇaviśālā tatvatas tatvayogyā |
hṛdi vīgatavikalpā sarvanepathyayuktā
prthumtarakucayugmā sandade kāntibhāṇḍam ||

The vessel with the charming [substances] should be presented by a shy woman, whose lotus-face is bent, who is rich in extensive virtues, who is truly suitable for truth, in whose heart discursiveness has disappeared,

who is wearing all kinds of makeup, and who has a pair of exceedingly large breasts.

This verse in the *mālinī* metre picks up the ninth stanza. The vessel with the consecrated transgressive substances is presented (understand: distributed?) to the assembly. The usage *kānti* for the *amṛtas* and *aṅkuśas* in the vessel is unknown to me from elsewhere, but this is what it must mean (see also v. 33). It is not clear who this attractive young woman is, perhaps the same as the *karmavajriṇī* mentioned above (v. 7) or the officiant's consort. We must emend *pr̥thum̐tara*° to *pr̥thutara*°. The form *sandade* probably stands for *saṃdadet*, another barbaric optative for *saṃdadyāt*. Kuladatta paraphrases the verse thus (SAKURAI 2001: 20): *īṣannamramukhapadmā* (I conjecture this reading for *īṣattāmra*° against Sakurai, his mss., and the Tibetan translation) *ghananirantaratuṅgastanayugalā* (I prefer this, the mss.'s reading, over Sakurai's *ghananirantarā tuṅgastanayugalā*) *sarvābharāṇavibhūṣitā ativistaraṅṇayuktā manovikalparahitā savinayā yoṣid* [...]; "A woman, whose lotus-face is slightly bent, who has a pair of breasts which are firm, with no space in-between and very prominent, who is decorated with various kinds of ornaments, who is endowed with extensive virtues, who is free from mental conceptualisations, who is shy, [...]" There she is also to recite a verse. Note that Kuladatta does not render the most obscure of her descriptions, *tattvatas tattvayogyā* (the point is perhaps that she must be suitable for nondual, antinomian practice), at the same time, there is a striking parallel between his paraphrase and the glossator's text, which breaks off at this point.

[12] *kāyem̐dhanam̐ samujvālyā jñānasaptārciṣā svayam̐ ||*
tatvahomāya vaktrādau pātaye[1v]d rasādikaṃ ||

After having kindled at will the firewood (here: constituents) of the body (or: one's person) with the fire of gnosis, one should drop the juice etc. in the mouth etc. in order [to achieve] the fire sacrifice of reality.

We should either emend to *pātayeta* to fix the metre or read *pātayed* with a slight pause after it. Also, *samujvālyā* should be corrected to *samujjvālyā*. Juice (*rasa*) must mean the nectars (*amṛta*), in which case *ādi* stands for the meats. The meaning of °*ādau* is beyond my understanding; perhaps we have a double *sandhi*, that is to say, we must understand *vaktre ādau*, where the word "first" is picked up by *tato* in the next verse. Alternatively,

ādau stands for the other points in the body which are reached by nectars. Otherwise the general import of this and of the next two verses is fairly clear: the tasting of the transgressive substances (normally *amṛtāsvāda/na*) is framed here as an internalised fire sacrifice (*tattvahoma*), where the fuel is the body, the fire is knowledge, and the oblation the aforementioned substances. The word *svayaṃ* is also slightly difficult, perhaps it does not mean more than “spontaneously” or “at will.” There are some similarities with what the commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa calls *guhyaḥoma* in the *Ca-tuṣpīṭhatantra* (see SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 452–453).

[13] *tato hr̥ccaṃdramadhyasthaṃ biṃdudevaṃ mahāvibhuṃ ||*
athavā sveṣṭadevādiṃ cakrābharaṇabhūṣitam ||

Thereafter, the deity [in form of a] drop, the great pervasive Lord located on a moon-disk in the heart, or one’s chosen deity, etc. adorned with the retinue

The worshipped recipient of this internal *homa* is said to be the deity either in an aniconic or iconic form. The former is in the shape of a drop (*bindu*) atop a moon-disk in the heart. The latter appears in the fully visualised form adorned either with a discus or, more likely (also cf. Kuladatta’s paraphrase, *māṇḍaleya*^o, below), his retinue (*cakra*). Kuladatta seems to conflate the two, since he writes (SAKURAI 2001: 21): *tato mano-’ntargatasūkṣmabudbudākārapratimam* (I conjecture this reading against Sakurai’s *°buddhabuddhākārapratimam* inspired by the reading of the Cambridge ms., not consulted by the Japanese editor, which is itself corrupt but more revealing: *°budbuddhākāra*^o) *mahāprabhuṃ* (I disagree with Sakurai’s *mahāprabhu*^o) *māṇḍaleyadevatāśahitam* [...] *snāpayet*; “Thereafter, he should bathe the great pervasive Lord accompanied by the deities of the *maṇḍala* (i.e., his retinue) in the shape of a subtle bubble within his heart.” *budbuda*, “bubble,” seems to paraphrase the word *bindu*.

[14] *anāmāṃguṣṭhabiṃdvagrais tritatvonmathitabhāsuraiḥ ||*
svalpajihvāgrasannyastaiḥ sudhādhārāṃbubhiḥ snapet ||

should be bathed by oozing streams of nectar [emitted from the substances blazing with] rays [owing to their] having been agitated by the three realities (i.e., three *mantras*) placed on the tip of the tongue in a small quantity by the [joined] tips of the ring finger and the thumb.

Taking the substances with the joined ring finger and thumb is a standard and old feature, compare the section on the earliest textual sources above. The reading °*bimdv*° is very problematic, a (somewhat diagnostic) conjecture °*baddha*° would solve the problem. The three *tattvas* must mean three *mantras*, which purify (again?) the substances. The *Catuspīṭhatantra* teaches the triad *ha*, *ho/hoḥ*, and *hrī/hrīḥ* (SZÁNTÓ 2013: I: 331, 440), which removes the disagreeable colour, smell, and potency respectively. Kuladatta (SAKURAI 2001: 19) seems to teach *aṃ/a*, *haḥ*, and *hoḥ* to purify the liquor holding the nectars and meats and the standard *om*, *āḥ*, *hūṃ* to empower it. He also uses the root *math* in the same context, but there it is taken literally to mean mixing in with the ring finger and the thumb. We should probably emend *svalpajihvāgra*° to *svalpaṃ jihvāgra*° and understand the irregular simplex to stand for the causative *snāpayet*. The description is elliptical, but perhaps we are not very far from the point: the substances are first placed in a small quantity on the tongue, and as they are swallowed, they turn into streams of nectar which then bathe the deity.

[15] *nābhicakrotthitair nādair ākr̥ṣyākṣya tadrasam ||*
puṭikātrayataḥ pītvā mahāyogī sukhaṃ vaset ||

Gradually drawing in that nectar with subtle sounds (or: channels) arising from the discus in the navel, after having taken three sips, the great *yogin[s]* should rest at ease.

The first line of this verse seems to describe this gradual journey aided by subtle sounds (*nāda*) or perhaps channels (if we emend to *nāla*) issuing from the *cakra* in the navel. Kuladatta (SAKURAI 2001: 21) has vital energies to correspond to this element: *tato nābhimaṇḍalagatāyāṃavāyubhis tadrasam ākr̥ṣya* [...]; “Then, after having drawn in that nectar by means of the restraining[-type] of vital energies located in the discus of the navel [...]” The word *puṭikā* in this sense is unattested elsewhere (our standard dictionaries give “bag” or “vessel”), save Kuladatta’s text as transmitted in the Cambridge ms.; Sakurai accepted *ghuṭikā*° (ibid.). I am also inclined to emend *puṭikā*° to *ghuṭikā*°, especially after having consulted TURNER’s entry on *ghuṭṭ*, “gulp, swallow” (1962–1966: 242), a word ultimately of Dravidian origin. The two letters *pa* and *gha* look very similar in Old Newar and other East Indian scripts. The subject, *mahāyogī*, should be understood as a collective singular.

[16] *vimūmaraśu __ d anyac ca dahanagokupaṃcakam ||*
taṃtrataṃtrāṃtare proktam anyac cāpi mahāmṛtaṃ ||

[The substances are:] faeces, urine, meat, [menstrual] blood, semen as well as [the meats of] a horse, an elephant, a human being, a cow, and a dog. But there are other [such lists of] great nectars taught in various Tantras.

This is a description of the transgressive substances by their acronyms. The nectars are *vi* [faeces (*viś*)], *mū* [urine (*mūtra*)], *mā* [meat (*māṃsa*)], *ra* [menstrual blood (*rakta*)], and *śu* [semen (*śukra*)]. The hooks are *da* [horse or elephant (*damyā/dantin*)], *ha* [elephant or horse (*hastin/haya*)], *na* [human (*nara*)], *go* [cow (*go*)], and *ku* [dog (*kukkura*)]. The second line seems to state that there are other possible lists for the nectars. By this perhaps the following is meant: the duplication of meat is usually taken for granted, but there is another list, which incidentally tallies better with the Śaiva tradition, where *māṃsa* is replaced by phlegm (*kheṭa*), see, e.g., SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 358–359. It is not entirely clear why the scribe signals two lost/illegible syllables in the first quarter. With lengthening ^o*mā*° (for *māṃsa*), the quarter should read *vimūmāraśum anyac ca*.

[17] *chiḍiṅgaṃ sarvato dadyād aṃtarīkṣasthitāya tat ||*
vīro vīrāya devāya sarvadevīgaṇāya ca ||

The hero should offer sprinklings [of] that [mixture of substances] in all directions to the hero (i.e., the chief officiant), to the gods, and to the assembly of various goddesses [visualised] in the sky.

After tasting the substances, they should be offered to the officiant, the deity, and the goddesses. It is only the latter two who should be visualised in the sky, as the officiant is present. This happens through sprinkling, which is the meaning of the odd and specifically Catuṣpīṭha word *chiḍiṅga*, also spelt *chiḍriṅga* (SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 334).

[18] *tatvaṃ daśāṃkuśaṃ prāpya dātīṇāṃ cittaśuddhaye ||*
pratipāta _ sākalyaṃ bāhyadevāya dhaukayet ||

After having obtained the ten hooks, reality, in order to purify the minds of the sponsors †...† should be offered to the external gods.

This verse is corrupt, but perhaps the point is that some of the aforementioned offering is extended to outer gods, so that the minds of the sponsors (note the plural) are purified. The connection between the two is not readily apparent.

[19] *bhūtānām sarvabuddhatvaṃ siddhaye karuṇābalaiḥ ||
vajraghaṇṭānvitaiḥ stotraś cakravartī tam arcayet ||*

The one strong in compassion should propitiate the universal ruler (i.e., the deity) with praises accompanied by [shaking] the *vajra*-sceptre and [sounding] the bell, so that all beings may achieve absolute buddhahood.

For *bhūtānām* the Tibetan has *sems can rnam la*, which may suggest a variant **sattvānām*. Emend °*buddhatvaṃ* to °*buddhatva*°. Since we are lacking a subject and because the adjective is not apposite to *stotra*, we must emend *karuṇābalaiḥ* to *karuṇābalaḥ* to describe the officiant. We would have a subject in the final quarter, however, here there is nothing to pick up the pronoun *tam*, therefore we are constrained to emend to *cakravartinam*, meaning the deity, the object of the finite verb. Understand *vajraghaṇṭānvitaiḥ* as an elliptical compound meaning “accompanied by shaking the *vajra*-sceptre and sounding the bell,” alternatively, “accompanied by sounding the *vajra*-bell,” so called because the bell is topped by a half-*vajra*.

[20] *śṛṅgārābhinayenaivam datvā naivedyabhājanam ||
pratyekam sarvam ekam vā śuddhyaśuddhaviṣayaiḥ ||*

After having offered thus (?), with an (or: with the same?) erotic gesture, a vessel [containing] food, either one each or the same to all, overturning [the concepts of] pure and impure,

This verse is also puzzling. We should probably understand that the *naivedya* vessel presented here is not the *padmabhāṇḍa* with the transgressive substances, but a new vessel with food. The third quarter seems to evoke two scenarios: there is only one vessel and everyone eats from that (which is of course highly impure by Indic standards) or there are as many vessels

as participants. At any rate, the text enjoins that conventional values of purity-impurity should be suspended, indeed, overturned (we should emend to *śuddhāsuddha*^o or *śuddhyaśuddhi*^o). The first quarter describes the gesture with which the vessel is presented. This is elsewhere (e.g. in the *Kriyā-saṃgrahapañjikā*, see SAKURAI 2001: 20; SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 327) called the *kamalāvarttamudrā*, an elegant gesture with which the vessel containing the *samayas* is received and passed on. If we emend *evaṃ* to *eva*, this would mean that the *naivedya* vessel is to be handled in the same way. However, the gesture was not mentioned before.

[21] *yatheṣṭhaṃ bhojanaiḥ pānair nānāpūjākadaṃbakaiḥ ||*
yathāsukhaṃ yatheṣṭaṃ ca vaded dātā ca vajriṇī ||

[a vessel accompanied] with food and drink, as much as desired, [as well as] a multitude of offerings, the sponsor should say to the initiates “as you please” or “as you wish.”

The first line should probably be construed with *naivedyabhājanam* from the previous verse (while correcting *yatheṣṭhaṃ* to *yatheṣṭaṃ*). Then, the sponsor should utter the words “as you please” or “as you wish” (emend the first *ca* to *vā* or understand it to have that meaning). We should also emend *vajriṇī* to *vajriṇām*, i.e., the initiates addressed by him. The point of this utterance seems to be that the strictly formalised part of the rite is over, and the feasting can begin. This is a standard feature of the rite (e.g. the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā*, see SAKURAI 2001: 21), although the older, scriptural injunction does not make it clear who says the words (cf. SZÁNTÓ 2012: I: 341).

[22] *iti vigatavikalpaḥ siṃhavan nirviśaṃko*
bhavaśamapadasaṃsthas tatvasadbhāvayuktaḥ ||
svaḥṛdayasamaprajñāḥ kaiśikādīn pragāyan
sakalajinaganaughān pūjayen nṛtyato 'pi ||

Thus, [the officiant,] uninhibited like a lion [roaming at will], in whom conceptualisation has waned, who is [equally situated] in transmigration and liberation, who is merged with the true essence of reality, accompanied by the consort pleasing to his heart, should worship the mass of all Victors singing [in various musical scales] beginning with the *kaiśika*, and also with dance.

There follows a session of song and dance as acts of worship. This part is opened by the officiant accompanied by his consort (*prajñā*). *kaiśika* is a kind of musical scale (*rāga*).

[23] *yasya haste patet pātraṃ kramaśaḥ karavartanaiḥ ||*
bhaven mohād avajñair vā tiraskārī sa daṇḍabhāk ||

Should the vessel drop from one's hand [during] the gradual activity of the arms (i.e., passing the vessel around) because of lack of attention or disgust, that person is an offender liable for punishment.

The next two verses address the issue of fines or punishments meted out in case of slight misdemeanours such as dropping the vessel or lack of decorum. Emend *haste* to *hastāt*.

[24] *kasyacid avinayotpanne manovākkāyakarmabhiḥ ||*
yuktaṃ tasya prakalpeta daṇḍa gaṇḍādiśāmtaye ||
 [Gloss in lower margin:] *kapardakapalacatuṣṭayam*

Should one commit indecorous thoughts, speech, or deeds, it is fitting to mete out punishment in order to counteract [karmic retribution] such as boils. [Gloss: four weights of cowrie shells]

Emend *otpanne* to *otpannaiḥ* and *daṇḍa* to *daṇḍam*. The idea that one will become infected with boils (*gaṇḍa*) as karmic retribution for indecorous thoughts, speech, or deeds is otherwise unknown to me. The Tibetan omits rendering this word. The gloss is a rather interesting detail: to my knowledge, this is the only case in this kind of literature where a well-defined penalty is mentioned. The amount, four *palas* of cowrie shells (on the monetary use of which see GOPAL ²1989: 213–214), seems rather meagre. Unbecoming acts, according to, e.g., the *Mahāmudrātilaka* (ms. fol. 47v, the passage is copied from the *Vajramālābhidhāna*, Tōh. 445, 267b), include chatting, quarrelling, expectorating, laughing, stretching the limbs, getting up again and again, and singing or dancing without permission from the officiant. Quarrelling during the *gaṇacakra* is singled out as a gross trespass in several works containing lists thereof (e.g. LÉVI 1929: 268: *gaṇacakre vivādakāriṇaḥ [...] sthūlāpattir bhavati*), but it is not made clear what the subject of such a quarrel may be.

[25] *hastadvayena mudrābhir vidhivat tatvatām varaḥ ||*
anyonyatarpa[2r]ṇaṃ kṛtvā kelikrīdārasotsavaiḥ ||

That best of experts, after having mutually propitiated [his consort] with displays of gestures with the two hands [and] nectar[-like] merriments of amorous sport and play, as prescribed,

For *vidhivat tatvatām varaḥ* there are several possible emendations: *vidhivat tadvidām varaḥ*, *vidhitattvavidām varaḥ*, less likely *vidhivat tattvatatparaḥ*, since we have the same compound following the predicate in the next verse.

[26] *gambhīrodārasāṃkathyaiḥ pūjayet tatvatatparaḥ ||*
gītavādyādibhir nṛtyaiḥ prajñopāyاراتottamaiḥ ||

the one intent on reality should worship with conversations on the profound and vast [doctrine], with dance accompanied by singing, music, etc., and most exquisite amorous acts [in which] Wisdom and Means [unite].

The last quarter is an explicit mention of intercourse, since *prajñā* and *upāya* are codewords for the female and male initiates.

[27] *samādareṇa cānyonyaṃ samaśuśrūṣayā bhr̥śaṃ ||*
daśapāramitāyogair yajeta yajñavad vratī ||

The observer of the vow, who is an expert in propitiatory sacrifice, should, with mutual respect and mutual reverence, sacrifice intensively with meditation practices [embodying] the ten perfections.

Emend *yajñavad* to *yajñavid*. The precise meaning of the third quarter escapes me. An exegete, Mahāsukhavajra, states in his commentary to the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* (*Padmāvātī* ms. fol. 30r): *suratayoga evaikasmīn ṣaṭ pāramitāḥ pūritā bhavanti* |; “The six perfections become fulfilled in a single place, the *yoga* of intercourse.” The list of six is older, but in later literature both are used interchangeably. Achieving the perfections (of giving etc.) occurs through arduous and lengthy practice in the non-Tantric Mahāyāna; the Tantric mode of practice has the same aim, but it offers a “shortcut.”

[28] *kṣamitvā gaṃtukāmo pi sāmjalim saṃmukhaṃ gataḥ ||*
kāryaṃ kṛtvāgato dhīmān praviśet praṇato nataḥ ||

As for a person wishing to leave [the assembly temporarily], he should, after having excused himself, depart with folded hands, facing [the officiant]. Having finished his business, the wise one should return and enter bowing dutifully.

This verse contains the rule for excusing oneself to leave the assembly temporarily. Emend *sāmjalim* to *sāñjaliḥ*, and *praṇato nataḥ* to *prayato nataḥ* or *praṇato 'bhitaḥ*.

[29] *sadā yogātmako bhūtvā sadā tatvaparaṇāyaṇaḥ ||*
sadā vinayasampannaḥ sadā cakram samācaret ||

One should consistently perform the [*gaṇa*]cakra, [and he should do so] always intent on *yoga*, always dedicated to reality, and always with due decorum.

A general injunction. The final *sadā* is perhaps superfluous, unless we are to understand it as a call to celebrate the ritual periodically.

[30] *pakvānnaṃ iva vīrāṇāṃ mudrā sādharmaṇā smṛtā ||*
tasmān niḥśeṣakāmena svaṃ parāṃś caiva pūjayeta ||

Just like (the?) cooked food, the *mudrā*[s] (consort[s]? hand gesture[s]?) [are] taught to be common to [all] heroes (i.e., the male initiates). One should therefore worship one's private [*mudrā*], but also those of others, with all objects of desire.

Understand the second quarter as collective singulars; alternatively, emend to *mudrāḥ sādharmaṇāḥ smṛtāḥ*. I am forced to emend *svaṃ parāṃś* to *svām parāś*, and we must correct the predicate to *pūjayet* metri causa. The overall meaning is somewhat obscure. The cooked food perhaps refers back to the communal *naivedya* vessel. The verse might suggest that the female participants must yield sexually to all.

[31] *yāvat svechā sadānaṃdaṃ līlayā tatvalīlayā ||
tāvat tatvanijāṃ pūjāṃ kartavyaṃ prajñāyānāyā ||*

The worship of reality as oneself (!?) should be performed together with this (?) consort (wisdom?) until one so desires, with true bliss, with grace, with the grace of reality (?).

We should correct to *svechā* and emend to *tattvanijā pūjā kartavyā*. The strange *sadānandaṃ* seems to be adverbial. The overall meaning is obscure: the act of self-worship together with the consort (*prajñā*) should be continued while it causes pleasure?

[32] *caḥṣurādiṃ mahopāyai rūpādi lalānāgaṇaiḥ ||
vijñānena mahānandaṃ bāhye nityaṃ pravartayet ||*

[After having empowered] the eyes etc. (i.e., the sense faculties) and form etc. (i.e., the respective objects of the sense faculties) [as] the host of [divine] women together with their consorts, with this awareness (?) one should constantly activate great bliss in the external [world].

This verse, too, is obscure. I conjecture that it may be an injunction to empower the senses (eyes etc.) as the goddesses (emend to °*lalanā*°), e.g. Rūpavajrā etc., together with their male consorts (in which case we must emend to *sahopāyai*) and thus, with this knowledge, one should experience great bliss with respect to external sensory objects during ordinary activities, i.e., outside meditation sessions. At least this accords with general Tantric practice.

[33] *kulīśakamalakāṃtiṃ caṃdraśubhraṃ suśubhraṃ
ghṛṇivisarajinaughān niḥsvabhāvān svabhāvān ||
atitararatiramyāṃ prajñayā sājñayā ca
vihati mukhaśuddhyā sarvasatvaṃ susatvaḥ ||*

This verse is beyond my comprehension.

[34] *atha visarjane prāpte maṅgalāgītistotrataḥ ||
stavitvā sarvadevānāṃ cakrāṇāṃ ca samakṣataḥ ||*

Next, once the time for dismissal has arrived, after having chanted praises with hymns of auspicious songs, in the presence of all deities and [the participants of] the assembly,

This is the last section proper of the rite, the dismissal of deities and the participants. Understand *maṅgalagītistotraiḥ*: the irregular lengthening is required by the metre (but note that the very same rule is broken in the first quarter), whereas the suffix *taḥ* stands for a plural instrumental. *stavitvā* means *stutvā*. *cakrāṅgāṃ* must mean the participants of the *cakra*.

[35] *dātṛṅābhyukṣarā śiṣyā saṃyojya jinasamvaram ||*
sarvabuddhāni buddhatve cānusaṃśya niruttare ||

[the officiant] should besprinkle the sponsors, then [re]appoint [his] good disciples to the vow[s] of the Victors (i.e., buddhas), then praise (i.e., foretell? pray for?) all beings [to reach] unsurpassed buddhahood,

I conjecture *dātṛṅ abhyukṣya sacchiṣyān [...]* °*saṃvare* | *sarvabhūtāni [...]* *cānuśaṃsya*. For the plural “sponsors,” cf. v. 18 above. The Tibetan suggests placing a flower on the head of the sponsor. The accusative °*saṃvaram* is perhaps original; note, however, that the Tibetan does not mirror disciples, but has another absolutive meaning “having uttered auspicious words.” The second line is more obscure: note the irregular accusative neuter; the Tibetan also suggests plural °*bhūtān*.

[36] *ucchiṣṭadevān saṃtuṣya samāsrjya mahābaliṃ ||*
dharmajñānātmako bhūtvā yuṅjīta matimān śubham ||

then propitiate the deities of the leftovers [by] having dispersed a great food offering. Then the clever one should perform [this] auspicious [practice] after having developed in himself the gnosis of the doctrine:

Understand or correct *saṃtuṣya* as/to *saṃtoṣya*. *śubham* should perhaps be emended to *śubhe* with the meaning *śubhāya*, in which case the translation would be: “the clever one should perform [the following] yogic exercise for the sake of auspiciousness.” For this practice (vv. 36cd–39), we once again have a parallel with the *Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā* (SAKURAI 2001: 21): *tadanu nairātmyajñānātmako buddhimān svaśirasa* (although widely attested, I cannot make sense of *svasvaśirasa*, which I have corrected) *ūrdhvaṃ vi-*

tastimātropari sravadaparyantajñānāmṛtadhāraṃ (Sakurai reproduces the present participle outside the compound) *candramaṇḍalaṃ vibhāvya | tadmadhye svasvadevatābījāni [] sthire sati hṛdantaḥsuśirasthacandra- maṇḍalopari* (Sakurai reads *hṛdantaḥsvaśirastha*^o, which does not make sense to me) *svasvadevatācihnāni yavaphalapramāṇāni vibhāvya prīṇayet ||*; “Thereafter, the wise one, who has interiorised the gnosis of selflessness, should visualise one span above his head a moon-disk oozing boundless streams of gnosis-nectar. Then, in the middle of that [he should visualise] each deity’s seed[-syllable]. When this [visualisation] has become stable, he should visualise on a moon-disk situated within the subtle space in his heart each deity’s implement measuring a barleycorn [each]. Then he should propitiate [himself as the deity].” According to Kuladatta’s paraphrase, *dharmajñānātmakaḥ* means *nairātmyajñānātmakaḥ*.

[37] *kiṣkumātropari sūkṣmaṃ dhyātvā dharmālayaṃ jinaṃ ||
anantāmṛtavat tasmāt skravaṃtaṃ cīṃtayet svake ||*

After having visualised one cubit above [his head] a subtle abode of the doctrine, that of the Victors (i.e., a moon-disk), containing endless [amounts of] nectar, he should think that [streams of nectar] ooze from that onto his head.

Again judging from Kuladatta’s paraphrase quoted above, the *dharmālayaṃ jinaṃ anantāmṛtavat* must be a moon-disk oozing nectar. The author could not write *jainaṃ* for metrical reasons, but this is the meaning. Emend *skravaṃtaṃ* to *sravaṃtaṃ*. Note that *kiṣkumātropari [...] svake* was somewhat reformulated in Kuladatta’s paraphrase. It may be significant that this distance is twice as much as the *dvādaśānta* of the Śaiva tradition, note, however, that Kuladatta’s *vitasti* could be equal to that length.

[38] *siddhārthamātra[2v]sūkṣmaṃ tat cihnaṃ vā vajriṇaṃ svakaṃ ||
vajrāgre nāsikāgre vā dhyātvā sphārayate sthire ||*

Or, after having visualised either the holder of the *vajra* (i.e., the deity) himself or his [chief] implement (i.e., a *vajra*-sceptre), small in size like a mustard seed, on the tip of the *vajra* (i.e., the penis) or the tip of his nose. Once [the visualisation is] stable, he should emit [the nectar].

This verse is somewhat obscure. It seems to present alternatives for the moon-disk visualised above the head. If this is correct, then Kuladatta reinterpreted the passage freely, since there is no mention of the insignia of the deity (*tat cihnaṃ* should then be corrected to *taccihnaṃ*) or the deity himself (understand *svakaṃ* as *svayam*) as a suitable variant, nor does he give alternatives for the locus of visualisation (alternatively, *svakaṃ* is perhaps a corruption of *svake*, “on his head,” but that would be a repetition). For *sphārayate*, we should probably understand *sphārayet*. We should also read *sthire* as a locative absolute as in Kuladatta. Of course, there is a variety of further ways in which one could emend the text, but this is the one that seems most likely to me.

[39] *hṛdayāmbaramadhyesminn akhaṇḍaśaśiṃḍalaṃ ||*
tatra dharmasamālīnaṃ sūkṣmavajraṃ sadā smaret ||
yavaphalapramāṇaṃ ca __ vajraṃ bhāvayet ||

In the middle of the subtle space in his heart, he should imagine a disk [in the shape of a] full moon, and on that, joined with [that abode of] the doctrine, [he should] always [visualise] a small *vajra*-sceptre †...† measuring a barley corn †...†

This stanza too is obscure and corrupt. The compound *dharmasamālīnaṃ* is somewhat puzzling (but we had *dharmālaya* in v. 37 describing the moon-disk), as is the sixth verse quarter. The word *sadā* is a mere verse-filler.

[40] *karuṇādirasopetaṃ trivimokṣaṃ manomayam ||*
sarvākārārthasamyuktaṃ nirvikāramahāsukhaṃ ||

Endowed with the essence of foremost compassion, [having the nature of] the three liberations, consisting of mind, endowed with †...† all aspects, unchangeable great bliss—

Here we have another parallel with the *Kriyāsaṃgrahaṇīkā* (SAKURAI 2001: 21–22): *tato yogatatparo yogī prajñopāyasvabhāvo mahākaruṇā-rasasamyuktaṃ vimokṣatrayasvabhāvaṃ sarvavastusaṃśuddham avikāra-paramārthasukhaṃ sarvakarmasu sarvaprakāreṇānantatathāgataparamarūpaṃ vicintayet ||*; “Then, the *yogin*, dedicated to *yoga*, having the nature of wisdom of and means, should contemplate [the resolve of enlightenment] as being joined with the essence of great compassion, having the

nature of the three liberations, pure regarding all things (?), [equal to] the unchangeable bliss of absolute truth, having the supreme form of endless Tathāgatas, in all rituals, in all aspects.” If Kuladatta’s reading is correct, beginning with v. 40 we have a new topic, a general injunction concerning all rituals undertaken subsequently by the *yogin*. I suspect that Kuladatta’s text is missing the actual object of contemplation, which is the resolve of enlightenment, which is also semen in the Tantric tradition (*bodhicitta*), as we have it here (41c). My interpretation of *karuṇādi*^o is somewhat unusual (not “compassion etc.”), but it is inspired by Kuladatta’s *mahākaruṇā*^o. The point is that this is not common compassion, but the compassion felt by the Buddhist practitioner in spite of his/her knowledge that all beings and existents are ultimately empty (lacking an inherent nature). The three liberations, also often called gateways thereof, are *śūnyatā* (emptiness), *animitta* (causelessness), and *apraṇihita* (desirelessness). Kuladatta’s *sarva-vastuśuddham* seems to mirror *manomayaṃ*, but I do not quite see how. Alternatively, it mirrors *sarvākārārthasamyuktaṃ*, an opaque expression. Emptiness is frequently described as *sarvākāravaroṣeṣaṃ*, “endowed with all best aspects.” Perhaps *°artha*^o is a corruption for a synonym of *°vara*^o. Kuladatta’s *°anantatathāgataparamarūpaṃ* does not seem to have an equivalent in our text, unless this is the way in which he intended to say *bodhicitta*, which is not impossible.

[41] *prajñopāyātmako yogī sarvakarmaṇi sarvathā ||*
saṃbodhicittasadrūpaṃ cimtayet tatvatatparaḥ ||

[thus] should the *yogin*, who [unites] within himself wisdom and means [and] is dedicated to reality, contemplate the true nature of the resolve of perfect enlightenment in all [subsequent] rituals, at all times.

[42] *prāṇamaṃtrākṣarair japtaṃ bimdu prakṛtibhāsvaram ||*
dharmādharmair vinirmuktaṃ tatvataḥ paribhāvayet ||

He should contemplate the *bindu*, luminous by its very nature, recited with the syllables of the *mantras* of the vital energies (?), as utterly free of both *dharma* and *adharmā* (?).

Emend to *binduṃ*. Judging from Kuladatta’s paraphrase, this verse and the next one do not form part of the practice previously described. What exactly the first quarter refers to is beyond my comprehension, since the *bindu*,

that is to say, the *anusvāra* crowning *mantra*-syllables, is not recited on its own. In any case, we are assured in the next verse that this practice, whatever it may be, or practice in general, is conducive to liberation.

[43] *tatkāle sarvakāle vā mokṣodyamaparāyaṇaḥ ||*
kṛtvābhyāsaṃ sadākālaṃ sa labhen mokṣasaṃpadaṃ ||

Whether at that time (i.e., the *gaṇacakra*) or any other time, if the one dedicated to the effort [which brings about] liberation performs the practice consistently, he will obtain the accomplishment of liberation.

[44] *sampūjyaṃ jagatāṃ manorathaparaṃ sarveṇa dānādīnā*
piṣṭvā sarvavikalpamohanagaraṃ nairātmyavajrādīnā ||
yaś cakraṃ prativartate jinaguror jñānodayaṃ mokṣadaṃ
tasyāryasya kṛpāparasya mahato nityaṃ bhṛśaṃ śreyase ||

The supreme wish of people should be honoured with everything, giving etc. He, who after having destroyed with [weapons] beginning with the *vajra*-sceptre of selflessness the city of delusion [founded on] various conceptualisations, celebrates the knowledge-raising, liberation-giving assembly of the Victor-Guru, for such a great, noble man, intent on compassion, there will always be great success.

This somewhat obscure verse in the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre, which I have translated rather freely, describes the benefits of the practice (*phalaśruti*). Before *jagatāṃ*, the scribe first wrote *sarva*^o, but then realised his mistake and deleted it. Understand *prativartate* as simply *vartayati* or emend to *parivartate*. The compound *jinaguror* is unusual and unparalleled. It is also somewhat unclear who the intended beneficiary is. Perhaps it is the sponsor(s), but it is equally possible that all the participants are meant.

[45] *gaṇāya gambhīraguṇopayuktaye*
vikalpakalpājītakleśahāriṇe ||
savāsanāvāsavimuktamuktaye
vibhāvabhāvāya namo stu yogine ||

Homage to the *yogin*[s], [members of] the assembly, endowed with profound virtues, [they] who remove the obscurations acquired due to conceptualisations [entertained] through the aeons, [they] who possess lib-

eration free from the abode of latent imprints, [they] who [are beyond both] liberation and bound existence.

The work concludes with four verses of praise, and it is perhaps here that the author's idiosyncratic usage is most visible. Apparently, he strives to achieve poetic effect through alliterative *yamakas* (*vikalpakaḥ*°, *savāsanāvāsa*°, *vibhāvabhāvāya* in the first verse) and by using somewhat more sophisticated metres (*vaṁśastha*, *upajāti*, *vaṁśastha*, and *svāgatā* respectively), much to the detriment of lucidity. We should most likely understand °*upayuktaye* as simply °*yuktāya*. Emend °*ājita*° to °*ārjita*° or °*ācita*° and understand the first members of the compound in reverse, that is to say, *kalpārjitavikalpa*° or *kalpācitavikalpa*°. It is helpful to go into “soft focus” while interpreting the third quarter. *vibhāva* probably stands for *abhāva*, that is to say, *nirvāṇa*. The object of obeisance in this verse is most likely the group of male participants (in which case we take *gaṇāya* literally and understand *yogine* as a collective singular; this interpretation is supported by the next verse) or, perhaps less likely, the officiant (in which case we understand *yogine* literally and *gaṇāya* as *gaṇanāyakāya*).

[46] *vibhūṣaṇair bhūṣitayāṅgayasthā*
cakrāmbare caṁdrakaleva dhāmnā ||
karoti yā kṛtyakalāpakāya
namo stu tāyai lalanāgaṇāyai ||

Homage to that assembly of ladies, whose slender bodies are adorned with ornaments, who resemble the digit of the moon because of their lustre as they move through the sky that is the assembly, performing all duties.

This somewhat freely translated verse describes and pays obeisance to the female participants. The datives are at the very least irregular, note especially *tāyai* for *tasyai*.

[47] *salaukikaṁ lokaguruṁ sacakriṇaṁ*
vibhāvya bhāvyaṁ jagatāṁ vimuktaye ||
hitāśayā yo nukaroti maṅḍalaṁ
namo stu tasmai gaṇacakravartine ||

Homage to the leader (lit. universal monarch) of the assembly, who, after having visualised [all] that needs to be visualised – the teacher of the world (i.e., the Buddha or Vajrasattva) together with the worldly deities and the retinue – with the intention of [bringing spiritual] benefit [for beings], imitates the *maṇḍala* for the liberation of the world.

This verse pays obeisance to the leader of the assembly. Understand *sacakriṇaṃ* as *sacakraṃ* and *hitāśayā* as *hitāśayena*. For *anukaroti*, the Tibetan reads **atra karoti* (SHIZUKA 2011: 69). In this case, we should translate: “who performs the *maṇḍala*[-rite] ... in this world.”

[48] *sarvasatva[3r]gatinirmalabhāva-*
bhāvanodbhavamahāsukhapīṇḍaṃ ||
piṇḍitottamaparārtham udāraṃ
dārayā saha name kṛtasarvam ||

I pay homage to him, together with [his/my] consort, who has performed all, who [possesses] a heap of great bliss born from meditation on the spotless nature of [he] who is the refuge of all beings (i.e., the deity), who has distilled the supreme benefit for others, the lofty one.

The obscure final verse also eulogises the chief officiant. Alternatively, the object of homage is in the first line, i.e., great bliss, in which case the obeisance is performed by the author together with his consort, which is perhaps what the Tibetan translation suggests (SHIZUKA 2011: 69). Understand °*gati*° as *śaraṇam*, alternatively emend to °*gata*° following the Tibetan. The reading *dārayā* is guaranteed by the metre; ironically, the correct form would be *dāraiḥ*.

|| *gaṇacakravidhiḥ samāptaḥ* ||

The Ritual Procedure for the *Gaṇacakra* is completed.

Diplomatic edition of the fragmentary gloss

|| *namo buddhāya* || ||

taṃtreṣv abhiṣiktānām caryāyatayennānām gaṇacakravidhānam aṃtarenā siddhir na bhavatīti kṛtvā vighnotsāraṇāya mahate siddhaye prāpanārtham | sveṣṭadevamahāvajraṃdharanamaskārapūrvakagaṇacakravidhānasya saṃkṣiptā paṃjikeyaṃ || ||

[ad 1] *tatrādau tāvat || vajrasatvam iti || abhedyāyuktaparamārthasatvam bhāvābhāvātmakam iti || saṃvṛtiparamārtharūpe | vibhuṃ prabhuṃ | sabodhipakṣayogāt sarvakāma iti, mahāsukhakāmaṃ taṃ pradadātīti sarvakāmapradaṃ, devam iti divyatīti devas taṃ praṇamyādau ahaṃ gaṇamaṇḍalam, yogayoginī<dva>dvayamaṇḍalam vaksye vadiṣyāmi ||*

[ad 2] *nirvikalpaparah || nirvikalpasvabhāvaḥ | maṃtram asyāstīti maṃtrī | nityakālasamāhitaḥ | niṣadyaca||karmayānaśayanāsanamaithunādiṣu tatsvarūpeṇa samāhitaḥ, sarvataṃtrānusārajñāḥ, niravaśeṣataṃtrānugataḥ | daśatatvavidhānavit | daśatatvam iti | bāhyaguhyābhiṣekī 1 nirvikalpaviśuddhī 2 bāhyaguhyamaṇḍalajñāḥ 3 vivekasamādhikovidāḥ 4 paramārthacaryābhirataḥ 5 mudrādisarvagamanāgamane sarvakarmānusārajñāḥ 6 japahomapūjāpravartakaḥ 7 sarvatṛṣṇāvinirmuktaḥ 8 yathāyathāgocaradharmadeśakaḥ 9 advayasamatāvidhijñāḥ 10 iti || evaṃvidho yogī gaṇamaṇḍalam ārabhed (= 6c) iti saṃbaṃdhaḥ ||*

[ad 4] *devatāgaṇasaṃkīrṇaḥ | tatvasadbhāvānuraktayuvatījanākule, rūpādipaṃcaviṣayānuyukte vivikte, asajjanajanarahite, ramye gehe, manojñe, asmimś taṃtre nīje pūjyāḥ | para[3v]mārthapūjāṃ samārabhet || kuryād ity arthaḥ |*

[ad 5] *jyeṣṭhānukramayogena vaṃdanā pūjanā matā || abhiṣekadīkṣā-jyeṣṭhānukrameṇa vaṃdanāpūjanādikaṃ kartavyaṃ | atha vā guṇamāhātmyaṃ guṇaprakarṣāc ca, atītheyatvagauravāt, deśāṃtaragato 'tithitva-gauravāt ||*

[ad 6] *snānaṃ gaṃdhaṃ ca mālyam ca vastrābharaṇalepanam || artha dhūpaṃ yathāśaktyā gaṇamaṇḍalam ārabhet || yathāśaktyā kubjaṃvo(?) - payuktena gaṇacakraṃ kartavyam || śeṣam sugamaṃ ||*

[ad 7] *samāhitāya karaṇī prokṣeṣū karmavajriṇī || karṇe kṛtāmjalim mūrddhnā kāyavākcittavikṣepārthaṃ yogakaraṇīm karmavajriṇyā gaṇānām pratyekamūrddhni aṃjalim kṛtvā karṇe kartavyam || paścād dātā cā-ṣṭārgena cakram praṇāmyate ||*

[ad 8] *balim ratnādibhāṇḍastham khādyādikaṃ ratnābhāṇḍe sthāpayitvā lokottarān jinān tathāgatādīn ādau datvā paścāl laukikān harihara-hiraṇyagarbhādīn maṅtradevāṃś ca kṣetrādipratibandhān pūjayet tatva-tatparaḥ || arcayet tatvavidhānāñṇaḥ ||*

[ad 9] *tatvābhiprāyayogena samāyātitaṃtrakrameṇa padmabhāṇḍe mahāmṛtam || kapālādibhāṇḍe paṃcāmṛtādikam aṃkuśaś cādau samaya-kuśam ca saṃjāpya maṅtrapūtam kṛtvā sarvān tān gaṇān paritoṣayet || pradātavyam ||*

[ad 10] *sarvāḥ sādharmaṇḥ pūjyā sakalajagatsukhāvāptakāraṇāḥ sarvaguhyogurottarā niravaśeṣaparamārtharahasyānām rahasyatarā || mahāsukhapade sthītvā prajñopāyasamarase sthītvā vartanta gaṇanāyakaḥ || taccakravartī*

[ad 11] *vineyanibhṛtanārī savinayā yoṣit namravaktrāraṇidā īṣanna-mramukhapadmā vipulaguṇaviśālā, ativistaraguṇayuktā tatvā tatvayogyā paramārthataḥ paramārthaguṇayuktā, hṛdi viga [explicit ms.]*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts¹³

Kriyāsaṃgrahaṇjikā

Ms. (one of many) Cambridge University Library, Add. 1697.12.

Kriyāsamuccaya of Jagaddarpaṇa

Ms. (one of many) Kyoto University Library no. 7.

¹³ NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu. NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project microfilms.

Gaṇacakraṣṭī & Saṃkṣiptā Pañjikā

Ms. NAK 5-7871 = NGMPP B 104/10.

Catuṣpīṭhapañjikā of Kalyāṇavarman

Ms. NAK 3-360 = NGMPP B 30/37.

Padmāvātī of Mahāsukhavajra

Ms. NAK 3-402 = NGMPP B 31/7.

Padminī of Ratnarakṣita

Ms. Buddhist Library Nagoya, Takaoka CA 17.

“Mahāpratisarādhārīnī”

Ms. NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/24.

Mahāmudrātilaka

Ms. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz Orientabteilung
Hs. or. 8711.

Śālihotra of Indrasena

Ms. NAK 4-1640 = NGMPP A 47/3.

Śiṣyānugrahaṣṭī

Ms. A six folios in Kaiser Library 139 = NGMPP C 14/16; ms. B nine
folios in NAK 1-1697 = NGMPP A 936/1.

“Samājatathānuṣārīnī”

Ms. NAK 1-1679 = NGMPP B 24/13.

Samvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā of Bhūvācārya

Ms. Tokyo University Library no. 450.

Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara

Ms. Collège de France, Institut d'Études indiennes, Lévi no. 48.

Hevajrasādhana collection of various authors

Ms. photographic copy in Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen Xc 14/39.

Editions, translation, and studies

CUEVAS, B.J. 2015. *Ra Yeshé Sengé – The All-pervading Melodious Drum-beat. The Life of Ra Lotsawa*. New York: Penguin Books.

GOPAL, L. 2nd 1989. *The Economic Life of Northern India, c. A.D. 700–1200*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

GRIFFITHS, A. & SZÁNTÓ, P.-D. 2015. *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*. In: J. Silk, V. Eltschinger, O. von Hinüber (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Volume I: Literature and Languages*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 367–372.

- ISAACSON, H. 2009. A collection of *Hevajrasādhanas* and related works in Sanskrit. In: Ernst Steinkellner in cooperation with Duan Qing and Helmut Krasser (eds.), *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China: Proceedings of a panel at the 2008 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies October 13 to 17*. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, pp. 89–136.
- KITTAY, D.R. 2011. *Interpreting the Vajra Rosary: Truth and Method Meets Wisdom and Method*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University.
- KLEIN-SCHWIND, S.G. 2012. *The Compendium of the Ten Fundamentals. Daśatattvasaṃgraha of paṇḍita Kṣitigarbha. Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text with Introduction and Annotated English Translation*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Hamburg.
- LALOU, M. 1965. Préliminaires d'une étude des gaṇacakra. In: *Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism*. Koyasan: Koyasan University, pp. 41–46.
- LÉVI, S. 1929. Autour d'Aśvaghōṣa. *Journal Asiatique* 215, pp. 255–285.
- PANT, M.R. & SHARMA, A.D. 1977. *The Two Earliest Copper-plate Inscriptions from Nepal*. Kathmandu: Nepal Research Centre.
- SAKURAI, M. 2001. Kriyāsaṃgraha shosetsu no ganachyakura girei [Kriyāsaṃgraha 所説のカナチャクラ儀礼]. *Chisan Gakuho* [智山学報] 50, pp. 17–40.
- SANDERSON 2009. The Śaiva Age: An Explanation of the Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. In: Sh. Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 41–349.
- SHIZUKA, H. 2007. *Ganachyakura no kenkyu: Indo koki mikkyo ga kaita chihei* [ガナチャクラの研究: インド後期密教が開いた地平]. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin.
2008. An Interim Report on the Study of Gaṇacakra: Vajrayāna's New Horizon in Indian Buddhism. In: Editorial Boards ICEBS (eds.), *Esoteric Buddhist Studies: Identity in Diversity*. Koyasan: Koyasan University, pp. 185–198.
2011. Ratnākaraśānti no ganachyakura giki [ラトナーカラシャーンティのガナチャクラ儀軌]. *Mikkyo Bunka* [密教文化] 224, pp. 51(78)–83(46).
- SNELGROVE, D.L. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study, Part 2: Sanskrit and Tibetans Texts*. London: Oxford University Press.
- SZÁNTÓ, P.-D. 2012. *Selected Chapters from the Catuspīṭhatantra*. 2 vols. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oxford.

- TANEMURA, R. 2004. *Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā. A critical edition and annotated translation of selected sections*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Tōh. Tibetan canonical material in the Derge (Sde dge) print according to Ui Hakuju, Suzuki Munetada, Kanakura Yenshō, Tada Tōkan. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University, 1934.
- TSUDA, Sh. 1974. *The Saṃvarodaya-tantra: Selected Chapters*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press.
- TURNER, R.L. 1962–1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press, including three supplements published between 1969–1985. Online version: <http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/soas/> (accessed July 4, 2018).
- WEDEMEYER, Ch.K. 2008. *Āryadeva's Lamp That Integrates the Practices (Caryāmelāpakapradīpa). The Gradual Path of Vajrayāna Buddhism According to the Esoteric Community Noble Tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

