

Péter-Dániel Szántó

Minor Vajrayāna Texts IV. A Sanskrit fragment of the *Rigyarallitantra*

Abstract: This paper is centred on the first edition of a Sanskrit palm-leaf fragment of the *Rigyaralli* (Add.1680.12), a slightly obscure, late Buddhist *tantra*. The introductory study contains a description of the multiple-text manuscript the fragment is transmitted in, an examination of testimonia, a brief overview of the Tibetan translation of the tantra and some related literature, and a short note on the pantheon. I argue that the text must date from the early 11th c. CE. Accompanied by a tentative translation and some notes, the edition is given in two forms: critical and diplomatic.

1 Cambridge fragments Or.158 and Add.1680.12/13

The fact that the fragments under scrutiny here, Or.158 of 12 folios and Add.1680.12 plus 1680.13 of one folio each, originally formed part of the same multiple-text manuscript, as well as the fact that the texts contained therein are fragments of the *Buddhakapālatantra*, the *Vajrāmṛtatantra*, and the *Rigyarallitantra*, were first determined by Harunaga Isaacson in 1997.¹

Manuscript Or.158² was purchased by Bendall during his 1898–99 tour (see Formigatti's contribution in this volume). The latter fragment of two folios has been described by Bendall (1883, 171), but he could not identify the contents. About Add.1680.12 Bendall stated that it is 'a leaf of a work on Buddhist mudrās'. He dated it to the 12th–13th century and gave two short transcriptions with one misprint or misreading in the first and two in the second. The first of these transcripts is from line 1 of the recto: *aṅkuśamudreti | karadvayasya kaṅṣkā[sic!]bhyām anyonyam aṅkuśarūpaṃ*; whereas the second is from the line 2 on the verso, a final rubric: *svare[sic!]ya[sic!]buddhākhyāna(?)paṭalaś caturthaḥ ||*. Bendall added a short note after this: 'At the beginning of the next chapter occur the names of Çuddhodhana

¹ Isaacson, personal communication, 2008. Luo 2010 has used the *Buddhakapāla* fragment for his edition; a study of the *Vajrāmṛta* is currently under preparation by Francesco Sfera (see his contribution to the present volume).

² <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-00158-00001/1>.

[sic!], Aralli, Rāhula, etc.’ About Add. 1680.13 he had nothing to say, except to conjecture a title ‘*Niruttara Tantra*’ and to describe it as ‘Non-Buddhistic’. The present paper will focus on Add.1680.12.

The document, of which for the time being unfortunately we have only the aforementioned fragments, was either created as a multiple-text manuscript, or was treated as such shortly after its copying. Suggestive of this fact is that on fol. 1r, or one might say the title page, of Or.158, in the upper left corner we find — in addition to some scribal exercises in Sanskrit and Newar — a short list rather similar to the main scribal hand. This list, or one might say table of contents, runs as follows: [siddham sign] *vajrāmṛtatantra* || *vajrāraṇitantra* || *buddhakaṭātantra* || (Cf. Sanderson 2009, 315, who silently corrects *vajrāraṇi-* to *vajrārali-*). However, if we reunite Or.158 and Add.1680.12 and 1680.13, the contents seem to be the *Vajrāmṛtatantra*, the *Buddhakaṭātantra*, and one folio of the *Rigyarallitantra*; in other words, the *Vajrāralitantra* is either missing (but then the *Rigyarallitantra* is not recorded) or confused with the *Rigyarallitantra*.

Since it starts on fol. 1v, the first item in the multiple-text manuscript is the *Vajrāmṛtatantra*, but, curiously, this text also has a colophon at its end giving the date of copying as [Nepāla]samvat 282, the 13th of the bright fortnight of *āśvina*, day of *Śan[a]iścara* = Saturday, September 22, 1162 CE (See Luo *ibid.* n. 47, only the year is given in Sanderson 2009, 315). Had the scribe intended to go on to copy the other *tantras* into a multiple-text manuscript, he would have more likely given the date of copying at the very end and not after the first item of the collection. However, there can be little doubt that the scribe of the other texts is the very same or that there are at least two scribes writing in very similar ways, for which the most likely scenario is that they were trained in the same scriptorium. I therefore propose that either the original scribe or somebody working in the same environment continued copying the other scriptures as a kind of afterthought. Unfortunately, we do not have colophons for the other texts.

At first glance there seem to be good chances that the date for the copying of the other scriptures must be somewhere in the more or less immediate range of 1162 CE. However, we cannot be entirely sure. For manuscripts in the Indo-Nepalese world sometimes contain additions in the same hand as late as sixty years after the first colophon. A case in point is a manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* now kept at the Asia Society, New York. The first colophon dates to the 15th regnal year of Vighrahapāla, the son of Nayapāla (i.e. Vighrahapāla III), whereas the second colophon recording some renovation dates from the 8th regnal year of Gopāla IV. Although the image I have at my disposal is not of a very high quality,³ I cannot

3 www.himalayanart.org, item no. 88677.

find any significant differences between the two scribal hands. We are therefore dealing either with the same scribe at the very beginning and presumably very end of his career, or with a hand from the same scriptorium.

Be that as it may, once we are ready to accept that all our fragments were part of the same manuscript, we face another problem. The texts in this multiple-text manuscript are individually numbered, but for the fragment containing the *Rigyarallitantra* the surviving folio number on the margin is 13. It is quite impossible that the content of the previous folios (up to fol. 13, which survives) was exclusively the *Rigyarallitantra*. The *Rigyarallitantra* in the Sde dge edition of its Tibetan translation numbers 68 lines. The single surviving folio accounts for eleven lines of Sde dge text. It follows that only about six and a half to seven folios of the kind we are presently dealing with are needed for the entire text. The best candidate to make up for the missing space would be the *Vajrārallitantra*, which is only slightly longer than the *Rigyarallitantra* (by two and two thirds of Sde dge line, to be exact), and would therefore also need about seven folios in our palm-leaf manuscript. Moreover, this would account for the ‘table of contents’ mentioned above. In this case, however, it seems that, although the *Vajrāmṛtatantra* and the *Buddhakaṭātantra* were numbered individually, the two ‘*Arali*’ *tantras* were taken as one and copied as a continuous text.

2 Testimonia for the *Rigyarallitantra*

In surviving Sanskrit texts there is a single⁴ known attestation for the existence and currency of the *Rigyarallitantra*. This is a referenced quotation in Raviśrījñāna’s

4 During the editorial process, I became aware of another, very important, testimony, the fourth and the seventeenth chapters of Abhayākaragupta’s *Āmnāyamañjarī* (Tōh./D 1198): 1) D 53a: *ri gī a ra lli’i rgyud du gsungs pa | ri gī lha mo rol pa ni rdo rje ’dzin pa’o zhes so ||*; 2) D 151b–152a: *ri gī a ra lli’i rgyud du | shar lus ’phags po dang lho ’dzam bu gling dang nub pa glang spyod dang byang sgra mi snyan ni gnas te | gnas bzhir ni lha mo bzhi mams dang ri rab kyi rtse mo la ri gī gnas so zhes gsungs pa dang | [...]*. Very recently, the first seventeen chapters of this major work became available in a splendid bilingual manuscript published facsimile: Institute of the Collection and Preservation of Ancient Tibetan Texts of Sichuan Province (compilers), *Dpal yang dag par sbyor ba’i rgyud kyi rgyal po’i rgya cher ’grel pa by Pandita ’jigs med ’buying gnas sbas pa*, Rare and Ancient Tibetan Texts Collected in Tibetan Regions Series vol. 1, Sichuan Nationalities Publishing House & Guangming Daily Press. (I am grateful to Toru Tomabechi and Kazuo Kano for alerting me to this fact as well as to the Codrington Library of All Souls College for promptly purchasing a copy.) The passages read: 1) Ms 154r (p. 309) *uktam hi rigyarallitantrē | rigī devī arallir vajradhara iti* |; 2) Ms 430v (p. 864) *rigyarallitantrē ca | pūrvavideho jambūdvīpam* (em.,

commentary on the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṅgīti*, the *Amṛtakaṇikā* (ed. Lal 1994, 11). To my knowledge, the dates of Raviśrījñāna have not been satisfactorily settled. He must postdate the *Vimalaprabhā*, that is to say the mid-11th century, and he must predate c. 1200 CE, since Vibhūticandra (for whose dates see Stearns 1996) wrote a subcommentary, the *Amṛtakaṇikoddyota*, on the *Amṛtakaṇikā*. The testimony amounts to one and a half verses, the initial three hemistichs of chapter 5. Since this passage also survives in the present fragment, I will discuss the particulars below.

The same passage and its continuation, amounting to a total of four verses, are quoted in a long commentary on the *Hevajratantra*, the **Vajrapadasārasaṅgraha* of *Yaśobhadra.⁵ There is an as yet unsubstantiated suspicion that this text survives in Sanskrit. We do not know much about the author,⁶ but he must post-date the *Vimalaprabhā*, which he quotes and refers to. He too therefore cannot predate the mid-11th century.

jambūpam Ms) aparagodānīyam uttarakuruś ca pīṭhaṃ | catuṣpīṭhe caturdevyo merumūrdhni riḡ sthītety uktam |.

5 D 64b: *de bzhin du dpal ā ra lli chen po'i rgyud du yang gsungs pa | rgyal po chen po zas gtsang ni || ā ra lli ru yang dag gsal || sgyu ma chen mo ri gi d[e]r || 'gro ba shes rab thabs bdag nyid || rdo rje sems dpa' don kun grub || mchog tu dga' ba bde ba che || lha mo sa 'tsho phyag rgya che || sgra gcan 'dzin bzang bde ba che || sa 'tsho ma ni sgyu 'phrul che || sgyu ma'i rang bzhin spros pa las || lhan cig skyes dga' dga' rab bshad || rdo rje sgyu ma'i rnam 'phrul gyis || slar yang bcom ldan rdo rje can || skyed pa por ni rab tu grags || sgyu ma chen mo skyed mor 'gyur || de nyid phyag rgyar rab tu grags || zhes so ||.* The quoted text is from the beginning of the fifth chapter (D 179b–180a). Somewhat curiously, the title of the source text is given as *Mahārallitantra. This must be a slip of the pen on the author's part, or perhaps an error of the translators. *Yaśobhadra quotes from the *Mahārallitantra at another point (D 60b), but the quoted text here is not from the Rigyarallitantra, but the Vajrārallitantra (beginning of the eighth chapter, D 175a).

6 This is in spite of the fact that his colophon (D 146a–146b) is quite informative. Here the author tells us that he was a Kashmiri monk living in Paṭṭikeraka (*pa ṭṭi ke ra ka*) at the *Kanakastūpa (*gser gyi mchod rten*) monastery, and that he finished his commentary in the 18th regnal year of one *Haribrahmadeva (*'phrog byed tshangs pa'i lha*), styled king of Vaṅga (*bhaṃ ga*). A ruler bearing a very similar name, Harikāladeva, is mentioned in the so-called Maināmati copperplate inscription dated Śaka year 1141 = 1220 CE (Bhattacharyya 1933). This document records a gift to the Durgottārā *viḥārī*, clearly a Buddhist institution, in the city of Paṭṭikerā. The matching toponym (which can almost certainly be located in the vicinity of present Comilla in Bangladesh), the possibility of a generally Buddhist environment, and the similarity in the royal names suggest some sort of connection, but it is one that cannot be determined more precisely for the time being. Another candidate for this ruler may be Harivarmadeva (Sanderson 2009, 82); perhaps the confusion in the Tibetan translation was due to an Eastern pronunciation: Harivarma > *Haribormo > *Haribrommo > *Haribrahma > 'Phrog byed tshangs pa. I know of at least three Buddhist manuscripts copied during his reign.

Another major commentary, this time on the *Herukābhīdhāna*, which can be suspected to have survived in Sanskrit (*Krung bod dkar chag*, p. 120, no. 134), but is not yet accessible, is the **Tattvaviśadā* of **Śāśvatavajra*. This author mentions the name of the text (together with the *Vajrāralli*) in a list of *yoga-* and *yoginītantras*,⁷ and quotes it at least once.⁸ We cannot determine the identity of the author for certain, but he too must postdate the emergence of the Kālacakra system, since he shows awareness of this deity and at least one of the cult's texts (cf. D 325b).

Among works that are now available only in Tibetan with no Sanskrit original in sight, a referenced quotation⁹ can be found in the **Piṭhādinīṛaya* of **Śākya-rakṣita*. There might have been several authors by this name; here we are most likely dealing with the disciple of Abhayākara-gupta, therefore not a very early author.

By far the longest quotation, roughly half of chapter three, is to be found in the **Lūyīpādābhisamayavṛtti* of **Tathāgatavajra*.¹⁰ While this is a very important

7 D 342a–342b: rgyud du ni shes rab dang thabs dag gis gzhung yang dag par spel ba mams su ste der rgyal bas gsal bar byed pa mams ni 'dus pa phyi ma la sogs pa mal 'byor gyi rgyud nyi shu rtsa bzhi dang rnal 'byor ma'i rgyud rnam kyang ste dpal he ru ka mngon par 'byung ba dang | mngon par brjod pa bla ma dang | nam mkha' dang mnyam pa dang | kun spyod dang || rdo rje mkha' 'gro dang | r gi a ri [!] lli dang || rdo rje a ra lli dang || dpal he ru ka mngon par brjod pa dang | rig pa rgya mtsho dang | gsang ba rgya mtsho dang | ral pa gyen brdzes phyi ma dang || kha sbyor 'byung ba'i rgyud mams su rtogs par bya'o zhes pa sgra ji bzhin pa'o ||. The titles in this passage are: *Samājottara*, *Herukābhyūdaya*, *Abhīdhānottara*, *Khasama*, [*Yoginī*] *saṃcāra*, *Vajradāka*, *Rgiaralli*, *Vajrāralli*, *Herukābhīdhāna*, **Vidyārṇava* (?), **Guhyārṇava* (?), **Ūrdhvaṛjottara* (?), *Saṃpuṭodbhava*.

8 D 348a: r gi a rallir yang | | mgo bo yang ni nyon mongs bdud | | thod pa nam mkha' dag pa zhes so |. The quoted text is from the surviving *viśuddhi* section in the fourth chapter (D 179b).

9 D (I) 320a and D (II) 133b: ri gi ā ra lli'i rgyud las kyang | shar gyi lus 'phags 'dzam bu gling | | nub kyi ba lang spyod dang ni | | byang gi sgra mi snyan yang gnas | | gnas bzhir lha mo bzhi mams te | | ri rab rtse mor ri gi gnas || zhes gsungs so ||. The quoted text is from the beginning of the first chapter (D 176a).

10 D 303a–303b: [...] ri gi a ra lli'i rgyud las de bzhin du yang | a ra llis zhus lha mo la | | ye shes mchog kyang ji lta bu | | gang zhig mam par shes tsam gyis | | sgrub pa po yis dngos grub thob | | lha mo rigs kyis [!] yang dag gsungs | | ye shes chen po bde ba mchog | kun mkhyen ye shes las byung ba | | bsrub bya srub byed las byung ba | | bsam pa thams cad yongs spangs te | | dbang po thams cad des bkag nas | | skye 'gro med pa'i dben phyogs su | | gnyis pa thams cad dang bral ba'i | | mig gnyis ma phyē ma btsums par | | smin ma'i mtshams su sems gtad nas | | mun pa mi bzad tshul yang ni | | sgrub pa po yis dang por mthong | | de nas g.yon pa'i rna ba ni | | dal bus dal bus g.yo bar byed | | shes rab ma yi bde ba gang | | de bzhin phyag rgya chen po'i bde | | nyes pa'i rang bzhin mi phyag rgya | | de yis shes pa'ang nyams pa yin | | de phyir ye shes phyag rgya bsgom | | bde ba chen po bsgrub bya'i phyir | | ye shes chen po 'di kho na | | rang gi rig bya'i rang bzhin te | | gzhan la bstan par mi nus pa | | gzhon nu ma yis bde myong bzhin | | sbyor ba 'di dang bcas pa yi | | sems can mgu byed sems kyis su | | snying rjes sems can thams cad la | | sbyor ba 'di ni bde bar byed | | 'di la goms pa'i sbyor ba yis | | mkha' dang mnyam pa'i sems kyis su | | snying rje chen po'i rdzu 'phrul can | |

witness, the author does not bring us any closer to a solution as far as dating is concerned, since he seems to be even later than Raviśrījñāna. At the end of the work (D 307b–308a) he gives the same story as the one found in the introduction of Raviśrījñāna's *Guṇabharaṇī* (ed. Sferra 2000, 73–74). Here too the lineage starts with Anupamarakṣita, but after Dharmākaraśānti it continues with one *Kīrtideva (Grags pa'i lha) and one *Dharmodgata (Chos 'phags), *Tathāgatavajra's teacher, instead of Guṇaratnākara and Raviśrījñāna. The author was therefore either one generation younger than Raviśrījñāna or his junior by a few years.

It would therefore seem that we cannot gather any evidence from testimonies to date the *Rigyarallitantra* any earlier than the middle of the eleventh century. The scripture was apparently only moderately popular, as it is mentioned only by a handful of authors. All can be dated between c. 1050 and 1250 CE; in cases where they can be localized, most seem to have been active in East India.

3 The Tibetan translation of the *Rigyarallitantra*

The Tibetan translation was prepared by a famous duo, *Gayādhara and [ʼBrog mi] Shākya ye shes, whose activity is usually placed in the mid-11th century. When compared to the Sanskrit fragment and the identified testimonia, it becomes clear quite quickly that this was not their finest work. The translation is full of misunderstandings, omissions, and obscure renderings.

If the translation mirrors a Sanskrit original, and I do not see any reason to doubt that, then the *tantra* consisted of five chapters.

The first chapter opens with the usual *nidāna*: *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye*. The Lord, who is here Aralli, resides in the vulva (?) of the goddess, Rigī; it is immediately pointed out that they form a non-dual entity. Somewhat unusually, the petitioner is Aralli; he first poses a set of questions related to the sacred sites beginning with the *pīṭhas* and ending in the *upaśmaśānas*. The goddess replies that the *pīṭhas* are the four continents (known from Abhidharma cosmogra-

rnal 'byor grub 'gyur the tshom med || dang por mun pa byed pa mthong || gnyis pa dkar po du ba bzhin || gsum pa srin bu me khyer mtshungs || bzhi pa dza ba'i me tog ltar || lnga pa sprin med nam mkha' ste || bdag dang gzhan gyi tshor ba bral || thams cad mkhyen pa'i rgyu de yang || sprin med nam mkha'i dpe dang ldan || rgyun du goms pa'i sbyor ba yis || rtse gcig sems dpa' 'di ltar byos || rtag tu ye shes bdud rtsi yis || btung bas bkres pa'i dgag bya med || rga dang nad kyis gdung ba med || thabs kyi sbyor ba 'di yis ni || rim gyis thams cad mkhyen par 'gyur || zhes so ||. The quoted text is the middle section of the third chapter (D 178b).

phy); these are the abodes of four goddesses (those in the first circuit of the pantheon), with Rigī on top of Sumeru in the middle. She then proceeds to describe the rest of the *maṇḍala* integrating the remaining sacred sites and giving some iconographical information on the deities, who are all female. There are three circuits of attendants, corresponding to body, speech, and mind. Between the first two, so the goddess teaches, one must install the hells.

The second chapter opens by picking up this matter. The answer of the goddess as to why one must install the hells is obscure: because all beings are burning or freezing in hells, and the *yogin* should visualize himself in the middle of the word *evam* and rescue them. A short visualization is taught whereby the *yogin* emerges as the deity. The section closes with a spell, presumably the **mūlamāntra*. The next passage teaches seven minor rituals, some of which are quite obscure; the identifiable ones are those for rainmaking, paralyzing, and attracting. The rest of the chapter teaches matters related to daily visualization and worship: protecting oneself and the place of practice, self-empowerment, attracting the so-called gnostic deities (with a mantra based on the second half of the famous *śatākṣara*), installing mantras on the body, the seed-syllables of the deities, initiation by the deities, and further details related to the *maṇḍala*.

The third chapter teaches the secret gestures (*brda*, **chommā*) which are usually to be employed by initiates for communication. Or at least that is what one would expect, but in fact here the term seems to be employed as a means of identifying the already mentioned sacred sites in one's body. The next passage describes a kind of meditation, which is to be performed in isolation. Success is heralded by a series of visionary signs; at the end the practitioner becomes the omniscient deity. A short section after this identifies the first four syllables of the *nidāna* with the four elements beginning with earth. The final passage explains the name Rigī and the first few rather obscure words of the tantra. Here Rigī is said to be the equivalent of *ḍākini*.

The fourth chapter opens with two minor rituals: the first is to draw the blood of an enemy who harms the Buddha, the Law, and the Community; the second is to destroy the images of (rival) deities. The Sanskrit fragment is from the next section, which seems to describe further details of daily visualization, a famous mantra used on the cusp of the preliminary rites and visualization of the deity proper, as well as two hand-gestures. The next section deals with *viśuddhi*, a 'mystical correspondence' of elements of the *maṇḍala* with Mahāyāna doctrinal terms. This is followed by a second *viśuddhi*, where parts of one's body are described in terms of a *stūpa*.

The fifth and final chapter continues in a similar vein: here, protagonists of the historical Buddha's life are identified with various tantric deities and the four

blisses. This is followed by further ‘mystical correspondences’. Thereafter two mantras are taught, these are called the heart-mantra and a ‘second’ auxiliary heart-mantra. The next section describes a variety of *samayas*: here the term seems to mean various kinds of meat, which are recommended for particular rites. However, the text points out, one must not kill in order to obtain any of the meats. The next section returns to the topic of the *maṇḍala*, this time the kind made of coloured powders for initiation. Various details are taught, such as precious materials that are to be used, the number of vases, the ritual sequence leading up to building the edifice, the ritual of offering food along with a mantra, and a protective ritual to take hold of the site. The tantra ends somewhat abruptly here.

4 The Pantheon

The structure of the *maṇḍala* is fairly simple: a pair of chief deities with three circuits of attendant goddesses. The central pair is formed by Rigī (also spelt Rigi), a goddess, and Aralli (also Āralli, Arali, Ārali), a male deity. The former is dark-blue (*nīla*) and holds a noose and a goad. Her legs are embracing the consort; therefore they are depicted in a sexual embrace. The latter is black and has six arms: with two he embraces the goddess, the others hold a *vajra*, a rattle-drum (*ḍamaru*), a battle-axe (*paraśu*), and a skull-bowl with a head. He is trampling on Bhairava. The first circuit of attendants, also called the circle of mind, is formed by *Sisā (also: *Sisi, *Śiśi, Śaṣi, Śaśi), Kāminī (or *Kāmalatā), *Ahosukhā (also: Ahosaukhyā), and *Saṃvarī. They hold a flaying-chopping knife (*karṭṛ*) and a skull-bowl (first described as a **yogapātra*, then *kapāla*); they are naked, with dishevelled hair, and standing in a dancing position. This set is clearly an inheritance from the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinijālaśaṃvara*. The second circuit, the circle of speech, is formed by Ghorā (or *Ghorī), Tikṣṇā, Mahāmāyā, and Utuṅgā. The third circuit, the circle of body, is made up by Jambukā (or *Jambukī), *Mahiṣī, *Hayagrīvā, and a goddess whose name cannot be reconstructed with certainty, but must mean a she-elephant. As the names imply, they are most likely zoocephalic, a feature of door-guardians in other systems. The iconographic particulars are not given separately for the second and third circuits; it may be assumed that they are similar to the first set.

The names of the two central deities, Rigī and Aralli, are surprising and obscure. As far as I am aware, the earliest attestation of the word *aralli* is in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinijālaśaṃvara*, where, if not transcribed phonetically, it is usually translated into Tibetan as *mkha' 'gro ma*, i.e. the customary

rendering of *ḍākinī*;¹¹ this is also how the text itself seems to define the word.¹² As for *rigī*, the earliest occurrence known to me is the *Catuṣpīṭhatantra*; there, two commentators interpret the word as buddha(s) (Szántó 2012, I., 201–202). The reasons behind the words’ becoming proper names and the deities’ gender exchange are unclear.

5 Related literature

The related literature is quite small, consisting of merely two canonical works: a scripture, the *Vajrārallitantra* (Tōh. 426), and a *sādhana* (Tōh. 1658), both available only in Tibetan translation.

The *Vajrārallitantra* is most likely earlier than the *Rigyarallitantra*. Here the male deity, more often called Heruka and only thrice Ārali, appears without a consort, unless one tacitly assumes that Prajñāpāramitā, in whose vulva he is said to reside in the *nidāna*, has this role. More importantly, there is no mention of the system of Four Bliss, although it is possible that other echoes of the *Hevajratāntra* are present.

The *sādhana* is anonymous. It was translated by [Bu ston] Rin chen grub, ‘according to an Indian manuscript’ (*rgya dpe ji lta ba bzhin du*), by which he presumably meant that he had only one witness available; the *sādhana* must therefore predate the first half of the 14th century. It is short and adds almost nothing to our understanding of the text, except some clarifications concerning the iconography and some variant translations of the goddesses’ names.

¹¹ *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, Ms 18r = D 163a (twice, *mkha’ ’gro* perhaps *metri causa*), Ms 25r = D 168a.

¹² Ms lacuna, D 186a: | *mkha’ ’gro ma yang a ra li* |

6 Edition

NB: no separate notes for *sandhi* and other customary standardizations.

-to herukodbhavaḥ | mantraś ca oṃ śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmake 'ham ||

aṅkuśamudreti |

karadvayasya kaniṣṭhikābhyām anyonyam aṅkuśarūpam |
madhyadvayāṅgulī vṛddhāṅguṣṭhena pīḍayet ||

pāśam api tarjanīdvayena ||

viśuddhiṃ kathaiṣyāmi |

dharmajñānaviśuddhena Vajrārallir¹³ mahāyaśāḥ |
dharmajñānasya kṣāntyā ca Rigī caiva prakīrtitā¹⁴ ||
caturāryasatyarūpeṇa Śaṣyādyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ |
caturbrahmavihāreṇa Ghorādyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ ||
saṃgrahavastucatuṣkeṇa Jambukyādyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ |
ṣaḍ gatyāḥ ṣaḍ¹⁵ bhujāḥ proktās trinetraṃ tribhavaṃ matam ||
Bhairavam ātmacittaṃ tu¹⁶ pātitaṃ¹⁷ pādamūlataḥ |
muditādi daśa bhūmyas tu pīṭhādyāḥ¹⁸ saṃprakīrtitāḥ ||
ṣaṭ pāramitāḥ ṣaṇmātraṃ kapālaṃ gaganamaṇḍalam |
evaṃmayāmadhyastham ātmānaṃ vicintayet ||
astavyastasamasta¹⁹rūpeṇa sarvatantre vyavasthītam |
avidyācchedanā kartṛ karuṇā madyaṃ kapālake ||
mantrajāpaṃ bhaved ḍamarū hūṃ-phem-arallī-nādataḥ |

13 vajrārallir] *em.*, vajrāralli Ms

14 prakīrtitā] Ms *p. corr.* (*secunda manu*), prakīrtitā Ms *a. corr.*

15 ṣaḍ] *em.*, ṣaḍa Ms

16 °cittaṃ tu] *conj.*, °citta + Ms

17 pātitaṃ] *em.*, pātintaṃ/pātinta Ms

18 pīṭhādyāḥ] *em.*, pīṭhādyā Ms

19 °samasta°] *conj.*, ° + + sta° Ms

paraśur²⁰ dharmodayaṃ proktaṃ vajraṃ vajraṃ²¹ prakīrtitaṃ²² ||
muṇḍaṃ ca kleśamārasya kṣṣṇaṃ vyomaviśuddhitaḥ |
aṅkuśaṃ Rigikiñjalkaviśuddhyā pāśaṃ mantramālāviśuddhitaḥ ||

samudāyaṃ caiva kāyaviśuddhyā |

paryaṅkaṃ²³ pīṭhikā jñeyā Jambudvīpaṃ bhagaṃ matam |
trivalī varaṇḍakaṃ nityam udaraṃ bimbakaṃ bhavet ||
grīvaṃ grīvakam ity uктаṃ skandhaṃ ca skandhakaṃ tathā |
vedikā mastakaṃ jñeyaṃ mūrdhnā cchattrāvalī tathā ||
candrasūryaṃ²⁴ dve netraṃ patākā mūrdhajaṃ bhavet |
buddhabimbaṃ tataḥ kāyaṃ nityaṃ pūjanti yoginaḥ ||
atthi sugatadhātuś ca adhiṣṭhānaṃ bhavet tataḥ ||

svarūpabuddhākhyānapāṭalaś caturthaḥ || ||

Śuddhodano mahārājā Aralliḥ²⁵ samprakāśitaḥ²⁶ |
Rigī tatra Mahāmāyā prajñopāyātmakaṃ jagat²⁷ ||
Vajrasattvas tu Siddhārthaḥ paramānando mahāsukhaḥ |
Gopādevī mahāmudrā Rāhulabhadro²⁸ mahāsukhaḥ ||
Gopaiva tu mahāmāyā māyāra + + pañcataḥ |
sahajānandas²⁹ tu Siddhārtho³⁰ vajramāyāvīkurvaṇaiḥ ||
punas tu bhagavān Vajrī vajrījanakaḥ prakīrtitaḥ |
Mahāmāyā bhavet janani saiva mudrā prakīrtitā ||
vṛddhāṅguṣṭhaṃ bhaved vajraṃ nābhīr³¹ dharmodayaṃ matam |
Siddhārtha eva jyotiṣko mahāmāyāvīkurvaṇaiḥ ||
svarūpeṇa jagad buddhaḥ Aralle śṛṇu madvacāḥ |

20 paraśur] *conj.*, pāśaṃ Ms

21 vajraṃ] *em.*, vajra Ms

22 prakīrtitaṃ] *conj.*, prakīrti + Ms

23 paryaṅkaṃ] *em.*, paryaṅka Ms

24 °sūryaṃ] *em.*, °sūrya Ms

25 aralliḥ] *em.*, 'ralli Ms

26 samprakāśitaḥ] *conj.*, samprakāśi + Ms

27 jagat] *conj.*, yatuḥ Ms

28 °bhadro] *em.*, °bhadra Ms

29 sahajānandas] Ms *p. corr.* (*secunda manu*), sahanandas Ms *a. corr.*

30 siddhārtho] *em.*, siddhārtha Ms

31 nābhīr] *conj.*, nā + r Ms

karmabhuktivikalpena dehināṃ bādhatē sadā ||
 ānandas tu Śaṣī proktā paramānandas tu Kāminī |
 viramānandas tv Ahoṣaukhyā sahaḥjānandas tu Saṃvarī³² ||
 Ghorā cumbanaṃ proktaṃ Tikṣṇāliṅganam eva tu |
 stanamardanaṃ Mahāmāyā Uttuṅgā³³dharacūṣaṇam³⁴ ||
 Jambukī ratika-

7 Tentative translation

[...] from the [...] the becoming of Heruka.³⁵ The mantra is:³⁶ Oṃ, I am identical to the vajra-nature of the gnosis of emptiness.³⁷

As for the goad-gesture: with the two interlocked little fingers of the two hands, [form] a goad-shape; the two middle fingers should be pressed down by the thumbs. As for the noose-gesture, [it is the same as above, except that one uses] the two index fingers.³⁸

I shall now teach the purification (*viśuddhi*):³⁹ Vajrāralli, he of great fame, symbolizes the knowledge of phenomena [as empty]. Rigī is taught to symbolize the tolerance [that puts up] with the knowledge of phenomena [as empty].⁴⁰ Śaṣī and the other [three goddesses of the mind-circle] are taught to symbolize the Four Truths of the Noble One[s]. Ghorā and the other [three goddesses of the speech-circle] are taught to symbolize the Four Abodes of Brahmā.⁴¹ Jambukī⁴² and the other [three

32 saṃvarī] *conj.*, satvarī Ms

33 uttuṅgā°] *em.*, uttūṅgā° Ms

34 °cūṣaṇam] Ms *p. corr.*, °bhūṣaṇam Ms *a. corr.*

35 The Tibetan does not mirror this sentence helpfully; instead it says: ‘From the *mudrā*, the deities arise.’

36 This introductory phrase is omitted in the Tibetan.

37 Naturally, this mantra is open for other interpretations.

38 The text amounting to this paragraph is entirely versified in the Tibetan, which adds the following, puzzling line at the end: ‘the vajra, the sword, and the great noose’ (alternatively: the vajra-sword).

39 This introductory phrase is omitted in the Tibetan.

40 The Tibetan translation of this hemistich is non-sensical; the corruption possibly started with an eye-skip.

41 The Tibetan has ‘the Four Self-confidences’ (*vaiśāradya*) instead.

42 The Tibetan has simply *wa*; *wa mo* or *lce spyang ma* would have been more helpful.

goddesses of the body-circle] are taught to symbolize the Four Means of Attracting [converts to the Path]. The six arms [of Aralli] are taught to represent the Six Realms. The triad of eyes⁴³ is taught to symbolize the Three Worlds. Bhairava, lain under the soles of [Aralli's] feet is one's mind. [The sacred sites] beginning with the *pīṭhas* are the Ten Levels beginning with the Joyful. The six [cremation ground] ornaments⁴⁴ are the Six Perfections. The skull-bowl is the expanse of the sky.⁴⁵ One should visualize oneself in the middle of the [syllables] *evaṃ mayā*.⁴⁶ All [this] is present [i.e. taught] in all the *tantras*, [but done so] in a scattered manner.⁴⁷ The chopping-flaying knife [represents] cutting through Ignorance. The liquor in the skull-bowl [symbolizes Great] Compassion.⁴⁸ The rattle-drum [represents] the recitation of mantras, by means of the sounds 'hūṃ', 'phem', 'aralli'.⁴⁹ The battle-axe⁵⁰ is taught to be the Source of Dharmas; the *vajra* is taught to be *vajra* [i.e. the non-dual essence of all things]. The head [in the skull-bowl held by Aralli] is that of the Māra of Taints. [The colour of Aralli's body is] black⁵¹ in order to symbolize the void.⁵² The goad [held by Rigi] symbolizes Rigi's filaments [i.e. her pudenda], [whereas] the noose symbolizes the mantra-garland.⁵³

43 Both the male and the female deity have three eyes, although judging by the context here it is probably Aralli's eyes that are referred to.

44 More usually, these are called *mudrās*: five bone-ornaments and ash. The term *mātra*, quite common in Śaiva texts of the Vidyāpīṭha class, is rare but not unattested.

45 The import of this sentence is obscure to me.

46 This sentence is also unclear. Being situated in the middle of *evaṃ* alone would make good sense, as the two syllables are frequently understood to form a six-pointed star on account of their shape, which often stands in the middle of a *maṇḍala*.

47 I have taken some liberty in interpreting this statement. The Tibetan rendering is quite obscure.

48 The Tibetan omits 'liquor', taking the skull alone to mean compassion. The chopping-flaying knife and the skull-bowl are the implements of the subsidiary goddesses, although the description does not specify that the bowl is filled.

49 The second half of this sentence is unclear. The Tibetan has something almost completely different: 'The sound Rigi-Aralli, the rattle-drum symbolizing the recitation of the mantras hūṃ he' or 'the rattle-drum is the syllable hūṃ, because it symbolizes the recitation of that'. Both seem non-sensical to me.

50 The Tibetan also attests battle-axe, as does the iconographical description of Aralli, hence I had no hesitation in making the conjecture.

51 Instead, the Tibetan has 'the skull', which is also attested in Śāśvatavajra's testimony. I nevertheless hesitate to make a conjecture here, as the meaning is not entirely inapposite.

52 Void here most likely stands for Emptiness.

53 Perhaps on account of a corruption the Tibetan does not have any reference to the mantra-garland.

As for the totality (?) symbolizing the body:⁵⁴ the crossed legs should be known to [represent] the base; the private parts⁵⁵ are taught to be the Jambu-continent; the triple fold [over the navel]⁵⁶ is always [to be seen as] the mound; the abdomen is the image; the neck is taught to be the neck [of *stūpa*] and the shoulders the shoulder [of the *stūpa*];⁵⁷ the head should be known [to represent] the pavilion and the forehead the row of parasols; the two eyes are the Sun and the Moon; hair stands for the banners. The body is therefore a reflection of the Buddha [and it is thus] that yogins constantly worship [it]. The bones are the relics of the Sugata [deposited in the *stūpa*] and it is thence that empowerment comes.⁵⁸

The [end of the] fourth chapter explaining one's form [as] the Buddha.

The great king Śuddhodana is revealed as Aralli [and] Rigī in that context [i.e. the historical Buddha's family] is [the queen] Mahāmāyā. The nature of the world⁵⁹ is [inseparable] Wisdom and Means. [The prince] Siddhārtha is Vajrasattva, Supreme Bliss, and Great Pleasure⁶⁰.⁶¹ Gopādevī is the Great Seal, Rāhulabhadrā is Great Pleasure. Gopā, again, is Great Illusion, [...].⁶² Siddhārtha, by means of the manifestations of the vajra-illusion, is Innate Bliss. Again,⁶³ the Lord, the Holder of the Vajra, is taught to be the begetter of the holder of the vajra,⁶⁴ [whereas] Mahāmāyā is

54 Here I failed to make good sense of the Sanskrit; the Tibetan is equally obscure, including an extra quarter-verse.

55 I take this to refer to private parts in general and not just the female (*bhaga*, rendered into Tibetan with *snying po*).

56 This is unusual, as the triple fold, as far as I know, is a sign of beauty in women.

57 The last verse-quarter is omitted in the Tibetan, perhaps due to an eye-skip.

58 The Tibetan, not without good reason, gives the two lines in reverse.

59 This reading, which is here a conjecture, is attested by the Tibetan, by the Sanskrit testimony of the *Amṛtakaṇikā*, by the Tibetan translation of that, and by Yaśobhadra's testimony.

60 There is nothing in the Tibetan to correspond to *paramānando mahāsukhaḥ*.

61 These are the six *pādas* quoted in the *Amṛtakaṇikā* (ed. p. 11). A manuscript not used by the Sarnath editors is Cambridge University Library Add.1108, which reads (fol. 6r, l. 5-6): *yathoktam | (!) śrīgyavalli(!)mahātantre śuddhodano mahārājā arallīḥ samprakāśitaḥ | ṛgis tatra mahāmāyā prajñopāyātmakaṃ jagat || vajrasatvas tu siddhārthaḥ paramānando mahāsukha iti ||* (See <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01108/13>). As far as I can tell, this quotation is missing in another important witness not used by the Sarnath editors, the so-called Vanaratna codex (Royal Asiatic Society, London, Ms Hodgson 35).

62 The Tibetan would suggest **māyārūpaprapañcataḥ*, 'by means of the proliferation of forms [due to] illusion'; perhaps this is a synonym of *vajramāyāvīkurvaṇaiḥ* and *mahāmāyāvīkurvaṇaiḥ* below.

63 Instead, the Tibetan has 'the son' (**putras/sutas*).

64 This idea is somewhat strange. Perhaps *vajrī vajrī*^o is a dittography?

the mother; she is also taught to be the *mudrā* [i.e. the consort]. The thumb is the *vajra*, the navel is taught to be the Source of Dharmas.⁶⁵ Siddhārtha himself, by means of the manifestations of the Great Illusion, is the luminaries.⁶⁶

The world is innately enlightened – hear my word, oh Aralli⁶⁷ – and it is only through the dichotomy of deed and retribution that the incarnate are forever in bondage.

Śaśī is taught to be Bliss, Kāminī is Supreme Bliss, Ahosaukhyā is the Bliss of Cessation, Saṃvarī is Innate Bliss.⁶⁸ Ghorā is taught to be kissing, Tikṣṇā is the embrace, Mahāmāyā is fondling the breasts,⁶⁹ Uttuṅgā is the sucking of the lower lip. Jambukī is amorous quarrel, [...]

8 Appendix: diplomatic transcript of Add.1680.12

Although a diplomatic transcript is not entirely free of editorial decisions – one must decide when to write ba for va and vice-versa, etc. – I give here the text without corrections.

Conventions:

∅ - string-space

ñ - *candrabindu*-style *anusvāra*

<| |> - deletion

< > - addition

: - ‘alignment’ *daṇḍa*

[fol. 13r1]to herukodbhavaḥ | mantras ca | om śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmako
haṃ || ∅ aṃkuśamudreti | karadvayasya kaniṣṭhikābhyām anyonyam
aṃkuśarūpaṃ | madhyadvayāṃgulī vṛddhāṅguṣṭhena piḍayet || pā[2]śam api

⁶⁵ The order of ideas is unclear: why are suddenly two body-parts mentioned here?

⁶⁶ Again, the meaning is obscure.

⁶⁷ However, the Tibetan has the goddess Rigi addressed here.

⁶⁸ The series of four blisses is from the Hevajratantra. Their order suggests that the compiler/s of the tantra sided with what is called in Isaacson and Sferra 2014, ‘position B’, i.e. that held by authors such as Kamalanātha and Kālacakra followers.

⁶⁹ Tibetan has a corrupt rendering, ‘the begetting of illusion’.

tarjanīdvayena viśuddhiṃ kathayīṣyāmi | dharmajñānaviśuddhena ø vajrāralli
mahāyaśāḥ | dharmajñānasya kṣāntyā ca | rigī caiva pra<|kṛ|><kīr>⁷⁰ttitā | ca-
turāryasatyarūpeṇa śasyādyāḥ prakī[3]rttitāḥ | caturbrahmavihāreṇa ghorādyāḥ
prakīrttitāḥ || saṃgrahava: ø stucatuṣkeṇa jambukādyāḥ prakīrttitāḥ | ṣaḍ gatyāḥ
| ṣaḍa bhujāḥ proktāḥ trinetrāṃ tribhavaṃ mataṃ | bhairavam ātmacitta +⁷¹ [4]
pātinta⁷² pādāmūlataḥ | muditādi daśa bhūmyas tu pīṭhādyā saṃprakīrtti ø tāḥ |
ṣaṭ pāramitā ṣaṭ mātraṃ | kapālaṃ gaganamaṇḍalaṃ || evaṃmayāmadhyasthaṃ
| ātmānaṃ vicintayet | astavyasta + +⁷³[5]starūpeṇa sarvatantre vyavasthitaṃ |
avidyā⁷⁴cchedanā karttī⁷⁵ | karuṇā: ø madyaṃ kapālake | mantrajāpam bhaved
ḍamarū hūmhem⁷⁶ arallinādātāḥ | pāsaṃ dharmodayaṃ proktaṃ vajraṃ vajra
prakīrtti + + +⁷⁷ [6] muṇḍaṅ ca kleśamāryasya kṣṇaṃ vyomaviśuddhitaḥ |
aṃkuṣaṃ rigi: ø kiṃjalkaviśuddhyā | pāsaṃ mantramālāviśuddhitaḥ | sam-
udāyaṃ caiva kāyaviśuddhyā | paryaṅka pīṭhikā jñeyā jambu⁷⁸[f. 13v1]dvīpaṃ
bhagaṃ mataṃ trivalī varaṇḍakaṃ nityaṃ | udaraṃ bimbakaṃ bhavet | grīvaṃ
grī ø vakam ity uktaṃ | skandhaṅ ca skandhakaṃ tathā | vedikā mastakaṃ
jñeyaṃ | mūrhdhnā cchatrāvalī tathā candrasūrya dve netraṃ patākā
mūrddhajaṃ bhave[2]t | buddhabimbaṃ tataḥ kāyaṃ nityaṃ pūjanti yoginaḥ⁷⁹ ||
acchi⁸⁰ sugatadhā ø tuś cā⁸¹dhiṣṭhānaṃ bhavet tataḥ || svarūpabuddhākhyāna-
paṭalaś caturthaḥ || || śuddhodano mahārājā 'ralli saṃprakāśi +⁸² [3]ḥ rigī tatra
mahāmāyā prajñopāyātmakaṃ⁸³ yatuh | vajrasatvas tu siddhārtha ø ḥ |
paramānando mahāsukhaḥ | gopādevī mahāmudrā | rāhulabhadra mahāsukhaḥ

70 Correction in a second hand. The syllable kṛ (or kṣa?) is corrected to a ka with the -ī and the *repha* on the next syllable added.

71 Torn, only the sūtra is visible.

72 Possibly an *anusvāra* is added in fainter ink.

73 Torn, perhaps an i is just visible.

74 A very small part of the va, and a large part of the dyā is damaged due to a wormhole/tear.

75 Or should we read *kartī*?

76 Or should that be *phem*?

77 Torn, the second t in rtti is also lost.

78 Torn at the end, but only a small part of yā and mbu are lost.

79 Torn, but only an insignificant part of yo and gi are lost.

80 Or should we read *atthi*?

81 The half-syllable śc is the result of a correction, the pre-correction reading cannot be determined.

82 Torn, a small part of saṃ, the middle part of pra, a part of ka, the lower part of śi is lost, as is the next akṣara, only the hook-sūtra of which is visible.

83 The uppermost part of kaṃ is torn.

| gopaiva tu mahāmāyā māyār+ + + [4]pañcataḥ | saha<jā>⁸⁴nandas tu siddhārtha vajramāyāvīkurvaṇaiḥ | punas⁸⁵ tu bha: ø gavān vajrī vajrī janakaḥ prakīrtitaḥ | mahāmāyā bhavej janani saiva mudrā prakīrtitā vṛddhāṃguṣṭhaṃ bhaved vajraṃ | nā + [5]r ddharmodayaṃ mataṃ | siddhārtha eva jyotisko mahāmāyāvīkurvaṇaiḥ | sva ø rūpeṇa jagad buddhaḥ | aralle śṛṇu madvacaḥ karmabhuktivikalpena dehināṃ bādhaḥ sadā | ānandas tu śaśī proktā: [6] paramānandas tu kāmīnī | vīramānandas tv ahosaukhyā sahañānandas tu ø sa⁸⁶ndaṛī | ghorā cumbanaṃ proktaṃ | tīkṣṇāliṃganam eva tu | stanamardanaṃ mahāmāyā | uttūṅgādharaḥbūṣaṇaṃ⁸⁷ | jāmbukī ratika-

References

Primary sources

Amṛtakaṇikā — by Raviśrījñāna. Banarsi Lal (ed.), *Āryamañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti with Amṛtakaṇikā-tīppaṇī by bhikṣu Raviśrījñāna and Amṛtakaṇikodyota-[sic]nibandha of Vibhūticandra*.

Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica XXX. Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, 1994.

Amṛtakaṇikodyota — by Vibhūticandra. See under *Amṛtakaṇikā*.

Guṇabharaṇī — by Raviśrījñāna. Francesco Sferra (ed.), *The Śaḍaṅgayoga by Anupamarakṣita with Raviśrījñāna's Guṇabharaṇīnāmaśaḍaṅgayoga-tīppaṇī*, text edition and annotated translation. Serie Orientale Roma 85. Rome, 2000.

**Tattvaviśadā* — by *Śāśvatavajra. Tōh./D 1410.

**Pīṭhādīnirṇaya* — by *Śākyarakṣita. (I) Tōh./D 1215 and (II) Tōh./D 1606, same text.

**Rigyarallisādhana* — anonymous. Tōh. 1658.

**Lūyīpādābhisamayavṛtti* — by *Tathāgatavajra. Tōh./D 1510.

**Vajrapadasārasaṃgraha* — by *Yaśobhadra. Tōh./D 1186.

Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍakīnījālaśaṃvara — Institut d'études indiennes, Ms. Sylvain Lévi 48; Tōh./D 366.

Secondary sources

Bendall, Cecil (1883), *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland; Suppl.-Bd. 33 /

84 Correction/addition in a second hand. The syllable has a 4 added, which means that here the corrector was counting lines from above.

85 The syllable na is perhaps underlined. Is this a correction?

86 A faint trace of an -u is visible under the sa, possibly a deletion.

87 Possibly corrected to -cūṣaṇaṃ.

- Publications of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project 2, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992 [reprint].
- Bhattacharyya, Dinesh Chandra (1933), 'The Maināmati Copper-Plate of Raṇavaṅkamalla Harikāladeva', in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 9: 282–289.
- Krung bod dkar chag — Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig zhib 'jug lte gnas su nyar ba'i ta la'i lo ma'i bstan bcos (spyin shog 'dril ma'i par) kyi dkar chag mdor gsal.* n.a.
- Isaacson, Harunaga, and Francesco Sfera (2014), *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreyaṅgātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla. Critical Edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with English Translation and Reproductions of the MSS.* Manuscripta Buddhica 2. Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg and Università degli studi di Napoli 'L'Orientale', Napoli.
- Luo Hong (2010), *The Buddhakapālatantra Chapter 9 to 14 Critically Edited and Translated.* China Tibetology Research Center – Asien-Afrika-Institut (University of Hamburg).
- Sanderson, Alexis (2009), 'The Śaiva Age — The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period', in Shingo Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series, 23: 41–349.
- Stearns, Cyrus (1996), 'The Life and Tibetan Legacy of the Indian Mahāpaṅḍita Vibhūticandra', in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 19.1: 127–171.
- Szántó, Péter-Dániel (2012), 'Selected Chapters from the Catuspīṭhatantra', vols I–II., unpublished PhD dissertation, Oxford University.