

Péter-Dániel Szántó

BEFORE A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE SAMPUṬA

The Dark Ages in India

The present study is at first glance out of harmony with the rest of the volume, which seeks to elucidate aspects of the “Dark Ages” in Tibet. However, there are several points which redress this dissonance. First, a very important parallel: the “Dark Ages” in Tibet co-incide almost perfectly with perhaps an even darker age in Buddhist India, by which I here mean first and foremost the lands of the Pāla Empire, Nepal, and Kashmir,¹ strongholds of Buddhism in general and Tantric Buddhism in particular. Second, Buddhist religious developments in India always somehow inevitably link up with Buddhism in Tibet. As is well known, many of the developments of the *phyi dar* period are fed by developments in India during these dark 150 years (roughly 850-1000 CE).

The word ‘dark’ ought to be used with several caveats. The most apparent reason why we are justified in using the adjective is the dearth of historical records for this period. From the erstwhile Pāla Empire (also termed the First Pāla Empire, from its founding up to the end of a long rule by Devapāla) we have but a handful of inscriptions. I propose to address these issues elsewhere, but preliminarily it should be mentioned that it very much looks as if, after the rule of Devapāla, there was a succession struggle between the senior and the junior line. Eventually it was the latter that emerged victorious, but as far as Buddhism was concerned this victory was not a preferable outcome. The most illustrious ruler of the period, Nārāyaṇapāla, very likely came under the influence of a powerful brahmanical family,² and lavish patronage of Buddhism

¹ Since the *Sampuṭa* was very likely composed in East India, I shall not take into account the historical circumstances in Nepal and Kashmir. These are at any rate very meagre. We are almost totally in the dark concerning the so-called “Transitional Period” in Nepal (see Petech 1984:31 ff.), especially between 880 and 980 CE (note that in 880 CE the calendar is reset. This is the beginning of the so-called *Nepālasamvat*), whereas Kalhaṇa’s account of events in Kashmir following the glorious reign of Avantivarman (883 CE onwards) paints turbulent times, with military overspending, revolts, weak kings, struggles for the throne, and such (see Stein 1900, vol. 1, pp. 202 ff.).

² This fact is best evidenced by the Badal pillar inscription; see *Epigraphia Indica* vol. 2, no. 10.

seems to have come to a halt.³ Several records from the Second Pāla Empire (from Mahīpāla onwards, i.e. roughly beginning with the turn of the millenium) speak of sacred sites in need of restoration⁴ and burnt monasteries.⁵ From this we can deduce that the century leading up to the rule of the illustrious and pious Buddhist ruler, Mahīpāla, was not an easy one.

In other words, the situation is similar to the one in Tibet. We have a collapsed centralized empire, lack of large-scale patronage for Buddhism, and no institutional control over religious matters. But developments in religion did not come to a halt under such circumstances. On the contrary, the Dunhuang documents testify to very vigorous activity in post-imperial times, whereas in India this is the time for the rise of the *yoginītantras*, which will become very popular during the *phyi dar*. As I shall argue below, the scripture known as the *Sampuṭa* is a more or less direct product of this very period. In effect, in my view it is a somewhat haphazard anthology of innovations during the Dark Ages.

Previous work on the *Sampuṭa*

The *Sampuṭa* is still not edited in its entirety, but it is not completely unstudied either. All in all there are forty chapters in the text, with two ways of referring to them. The original numeration has a 10x4 structure, i.e. ten large chapters with four sub-chapters each. Later on, most significantly in Abhayākaragupta's famous commentary, the *Āmnāyamañjarī*, this is changed to a serial numeration, i.e. 1 to 40. I shall here use the earlier system.

The first partial edition (of the first four [sub-]chapters) appeared in a thesis submitted at Columbia University by Georg Elder. The preliminary study bears the indelible mark of Alex Wayman's ideas; consequentially, issues such as the dating of the text are rather optimistically treated.⁶ The edition is doubtless a

³ It should be noted that, contrary to a widespread but inaccurate scholarly consensus, patronage of Buddhism in the early Pāla period was for the most part not imperial, at least not according to the testimony of the inscriptions, but imperially sanctioned. The Pāla emperors were not the donors themselves, but gave their consent to the donation.

⁴ Cf. the Sarnath inscription from the reign of Mahīpāla recording the restoration of the two most important reliquaries of the site, the Dharmarājikā and the Dharmacakra, by two princes of the house (Huntington 1984:223-225, no. 33, fig. 58).

⁵ In a later inscription narrating the events during the lives of the donor's spiritual ancestors, we have an account of Somapura monastery being torched by an invading army from Bengal (see Huntington Archive no. 0003310).

⁶ Elder (1978:16) proposes on very shaky evidence the late fifth century to the late sixth century (with preference for the early to middle sixth century) as the probable date for the final form of the text. This, as I shall seek to demonstrate, must be adjusted by roughly half a millenium closer to our time.

pioneering effort, but it is one greatly hampered by the fact that the editor used only relatively recent paper manuscripts.⁷

The first four chapters were re-edited by Tadeusz Skorupski in 1996, and four further chapters were edited by the same in 2001. However, the manuscripts used here were again relatively recent paper copies.⁸

Much more superior editions and a series of studies were published by Keiya Noguchi (1984, 1986a, 1986b, 1987a, 1987b, 1987c, 1988, 1995). Unfortunately for people such as myself, these are in Japanese. I here rely on the editions in roman letters and a series of summaries graciously prepared by Dr. Ken'ichi Kuranishi. Yet again, Noguchi for the most part relied on paper witnesses, using one of the palm-leaf manuscripts only from 1995 onwards.⁹ This codex, Royal Asiatic Society London, Ms. Hodgson 37, is a crucial witness to which I shall return shortly.

Some verses from sub-chapter 1.1 were published by myself (Szántó 2008) in notes to an edition of *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* 1.3, a scripture with which the *Sampuṭa* shares many more verses. This effort is not very significant with regards to a better understanding of the *Sampuṭa*, but it was the first time that all four known palm-leaf witnesses have been used. I wish to withdraw the tentative datings I have provided for these witnesses in that article, as I have since realized that I had quite seriously underestimated their antiquity.¹⁰

Not very long ago a pledge to publish the entire text has been issued from the recently-renamed Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies (now Central University of Tibetan Studies) in Sarnath. Unfortunately the website from which I had obtained this information has since been discontinued. In February 2011, during a visit to the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta, I was informed that the staff of the National Mission for Manuscripts is also preparing an edition of this text. With this in mind, they have laminated one of

⁷ To wit: ms. A = Tokyo University Library (henceforth TUL) 428, ms. B = Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions (henceforth IASWR, this collection is currently housed at the University of Virginia), and ms. C = TUL 427. See Elder 1978:20-22.

⁸ To wit: ms. A = Bibliothèque Nationale Paris (henceforth BNP) 148, ms. B = BNP 144 (sic! perhaps for 147?), and ms. C = Kyoto University Library 2739287 (sic! perhaps for 116?).

⁹ Noguchi's witnesses are as follows: ms. A = TUL 427, ms. B = Kyoto University 116, ms. C = TUL 428, ms. D = BNP 148, ms. E = BNP 147, ms. F (used only from 1987/88 onwards) = National Archives, Kathmandu (henceforth NAK) 3-323. The palm-leaf ms. I refer to in the next sentence received the siglum G.

¹⁰ Szántó 2008:6. I had estimated there that the Calcutta mss. (C1 & C2) are from the ca. 14th century, whereas the Wellcome Institute ms. (We) and the Hodgson ms. (Rh) are from the 13th. I will here ignore discussing the witness Aa from that article, since it does not provide us with any truly significant information.

the early witnesses (C2, see below), and have proclaimed it a ‘national treasure’, which unfortunately means that it cannot be accessed anymore. It would be a very fortunate event if either (or both) of these plans were to come to fruition, and I would be very glad if the present introduction to the study of the text were not to escape the attention of the prospective editors and if they were to improve my findings. In many ways this article is an unsolicited introduction to their work.

The Old Manuscripts of the *Samputa*

Why the four old and best mss. of the text were not used in previous editions is something of a mystery, since their existence was well known. The Hodgson ms. (Rh) was described by Cowell & Eggeling in 1876 (item no. 37); the Calcutta mss. have been described by Shāstri in 1917 (items no. 62 & 63 in his catalogue = C2 & C1 here); the Wellcome Library witness (We) was described by Wujastyk in 1985 (:153-154), although he mistakenly classified it as a Śaiva tantra.

Let us begin with the Calcutta manuscripts (ASB no. 3828 and no. 4854, here C2 and C1), which are notoriously difficult to access nowadays.¹¹

C1 is perhaps the ‘best manuscript’ we have of this text. It is complete in 91 folia, almost completely undamaged, and it was penned very carefully (although, of course, not without shortcomings) in an easily legible script. The character is called by Shāstri “Bengali of the early 12th century”. This is probably correct; the script bears more resemblance to the newly identified Vikramaśīla manuscripts (i.e. the so-called Proto-Bengali-cum-Maithili) than to Nepalese manuscripts. However, it cannot be excluded that the copy was prepared in Nepal by a foreign scribe. This is mere speculation, but we can be quite certain that the codex had once been in the custody of a Nepalese institution, since the very last leaf, besides a writing exercise, has the following words, which I interpret as an ownership mark: *bu bāhārayā*. In other words, the manuscript was very likely once in the possession of the Bū Bāhā, very likely the Yaśodhara Mahāvihāra, a major institution of Patan.¹² This manuscript was also graced by a very careful reader (again, judging by the script, probably not a Newar), who inserted in the margins several missing passages and applied a good many corrections.

I have already alluded to the fate of C2. This witness is not available to me in its complete form (I have a copy only up to f. 56, whereas there ought to be 83 leaves). Perhaps most frustratingly, I cannot read the colophon which, according to Shāstri’s catalogue, bears the date N[epal] S[amvat] 145 = 1025 CE.

¹¹ I read b/w photocopies prepared from copies in the possession of Prof. Alexis Sanderson, for which I owe him much gratitude.

¹² For a description, see Locke 1985:154-159.

I must confess that I find this reading very difficult to believe. To start with, according to Shāstri's testimony, the last leaf is a restoration, but he does not make it clear whether the colophon is on this last, restored leaf. At any rate, there are certain palaeographical features which makes the assertion rather doubtful. I am referring first and foremost to the sometimes very pronounced hooked tops, which are characteristic of Newar script only from the 13th century onwards. For the time being, I shall refrain from hazarding yet another estimate and reserve my judgement for the time when, if ever, the codex becomes available for study in full. It should also be mentioned that, according to Shāstri's description, this witness also contains the *Samputatilaka*, which is sometimes taken as an eleventh chapter of the *Samputa* by cataloguers.

Let us now proceed to the Hodgson ms. of the tantra (here with the sigla Rh), which is currently with the Royal Asiatic Society, London, no. 37. This complete ms. has 127 folia in total, but this number includes the text of the *Samputatilaka*.¹³ This is a codex which gives us almost conclusive proof for a *terminus ante quem*. The colophon gives us this valuable information:

śrīguṇakāmadevakāritaśrīdharmacakramahāvihārabhikṣukumāracandreṇa li
 + + «m [read: *likhitam*] *idaṃ* ||»

The ending (placed between double chevrons) is an addition making up for a damaged portion, but this should not concern us here. The statement doubtless means that the scribe identifies himself as one Kumāracandra, a monk of the great monastery called Dharmacakra, which was founded by Guṇakāmadeva. The institution is almost certainly the Tadhañ Bāhā in Wotu Tole, Kathmandu.¹⁴ This does not provide us with a certain date. However, we are fortunate to have another manuscript, NAK 3-359 [= Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (henceforth NGMPP) A 38/8],¹⁵ which has the following colophon on f. 8v:

samvat a cu hya śrāvaṇaśukladaśamyāṃ śukradine|| rājñe śrībhāskaradevasya|
śrīguṇakāmadevakārita-śrīdharmacakramahāvihāre sthitaḥ śākyabhikṣuku-
māracandreṇa likhitam iti|

¹³ The description given by Cowell & Eggeling is inaccurate, since they state that the text is in eleven *kalpas*, each of four *prakaraṇas*. The "11th chapter" (in reality the explanatory tantra, the *Samputatilaka*) is not divided into sub-chapters.

¹⁴ See Locke 1985:349-352.

¹⁵ This ms. is usually spoken of as a copy of the *Catuspīṭhanibandha* (see Petech 1984:40, Locke 1984:351). It is not, but I shall not go into the particulars here.

The date is given with letter-numerals and the era is very likely the Nepalese one, therefore N.S. 165, 10th of the bright half of the Śrāvaṇa month, the day of Śukra (Venus) = Friday, July 26th, 1045 CE. The scribe is the same monk, Kumāracandra, working in the same location, the Dharmacakra monastery. It is probably not a far-fetched inference to make that therefore the Hodgson ms. of the *Samputa* was also copied sometime in the middle of the 11th century. Finally, a few words about ms. We, Wellcome Institute for the Study of Medicine ser. no. 630 / shelved at ε 2. The codex as we have it now has 184 palm-leaf folia. These are occasionally very damaged, and shuffled. The text of the *Samputa*, which runs up to f. 144v2, is nearly complete; according to my calculations only the following folia are missing: 92, 93, 103, 110, 113v-114r (lapse in archiving in my copy), 127, and 129. Wujastyk tentatively dates the manuscript to the 11-14th centuries, and estimates upon the advice of J.P. Losty that a miniature at the end of the text is from the 13th century. The front cover has some scribbles containing two dates, as does the back cover, which has three. These are somewhat difficult to make out, but judging by the script they seem to be much later additions. Hazzarding a good guess based upon palaeographical features would again require more familiarity with old Newar than what I possess, but it does not seem to me out of the question that here we have yet another ms. from the eleventh century. In spite of its apparent antiquity, the codex is not a very good one, and it very likely shares an ancestor with ms. Rh, since the two contain a number of identical, very conspicuous corruptions.

The Approximate Date of the *Samputa*

Based on ms. Rh we can determine that, by approximately the middle of the eleventh century, the text has already been transmitted in the Kathmandu Valley. There is some circumstantial evidence that allows us to push this date a little bit further back.

First, as I shall seek to show below, the *Samputa* is a compilation from most major tantras, such as the *Hevajra*, the *Herukābhīdhāna*, the *Catuṣpīṭha*, etc. A conspicuous absentee is the *Kālacakra*, which according to current scholarly consensus, came into being around 1030 CE. Second, there are good chances that a Bengali exegete, Durjayacandra, quotes this text. I have already published this passage, but at the time I failed to recognize the very strong possibility that the source is the *Samputa*.¹⁶ Durjayacandra may be placed

¹⁶ Szántó 2008:18-19, in the *Mitapadā* ad *Catuṣpīṭha* I.3.14, beginning with *sarvagataḥ*. The text in the *Samputa*, which does not correspond exactly (correspondences are here given in italics) runs as follows (C1, f. 89v6-90r1): *sarvagataḥ sarvajñaḥ sārvaḥ sarvārthaḥ | sarvasattvacittasthaḥ sarvāpāyavinirmuktaḥ | sarvaguṇālamkṛtaḥ sarvīyaḥ | śivamasamo (!?) nityodito nāthas trātā vidhūtasamkalpaḥ | samsthānavarṇarahito 'pi*

around the turn of the millenium, if not a little bit before, since we know that 'Brog mi Shākya ye shes met his main disciple, *Vīravajra (Dpa' bo rdo rje), during a study-trip to Bengal around 1010-1020.¹⁷ Durjayacandra was active in Bengal and Vikramaśīla. He is mentioned as an abbot of that monastery by Tāranātha,¹⁸ and he mentions the polity 'Khor lo gcig pa in the colophon of one of his *sādhana*-texts (Tōhoku no. 1462), which should in all probability be identified with Ekacakra in present Birbhum district of West Bengal. At any rate, the text was already well-known and considered authoritative at Vikramaśīla during the early 11th century, since it is quoted and referred to by Ratnākaraśānti in his commentary to the *Hevajratantra*, the *Muktāvalī* (pp. 18, 19, 26).¹⁹ The *terminus post quem* will be provided by an eventual future dating of mature *yoginītantras* such as the *Hevajra* that are present in the composition of the *Samputa*.

Commentarial Literature

Before we move on to the sources and composition of the *Samputa*, perhaps a few words about its early exegetical literature would not be without use. I specifically state 'early', since I do not intend to survey Tibetan commentaries to this text. They are, as *e.g.* a glance on the *Sa skya bka' 'bum* would prove, quite extensive.

Perhaps the first 'exegesis' on the tantra is itself a scripture, the *Samputatilaka*. The text is fully extant in Sanskrit, and it was often transmitted together with the *Samputa* itself; in the case of the old palm-leaf mss. it is only C1 that does not contain this 'eleventh' chapter. My study of this text is very patchy, but I can state with some certainty that it too incorporates passages from earlier works, most notably the famous and early *Tattvasiddhi*.²⁰

The translations of Sanskrit commentaries to the *Samputa* are grouped together in the Tengyur, Tōhoku nos. 1197-1199. The first of these is attributed to (an) Indrabhūti. Elder (1978:9) did try to use this author for his dating of the text, but since the identity of Indrabhūti (indeed, Indrabhūtis) is such a tangled

jinasyaṅocarō rājā | vajraṃ durbhedyatvāc candraḥ kleśopatāpamuktatvān niḥśaṅkatvāt
siṃho jalarāśī[r]duravagāhatvāt |

¹⁷ Davidson 2004:164-166.

¹⁸ Chimpa & Chattopadhyaya 1970:18, 327.

¹⁹ I thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for reminding me of this fact in a personal communication in early 2011.

²⁰ For example the very last section of the *Samputatilaka* (ms. Rh, f. 127) beginning with *yad apy uktaṃ rāgapratipakṣo 'śubhādir dveṣapratipakṣo mairī*, including a quotation from the *Tattvasaṃgraha* corresponds almost word for word with the polemic text attributed to Śāntarakṣita. This crucial work is currently being edited by Toru Tomabechi from the thus far known mss. and a palm-leaf witness recently identified in China.

question, this speculation is best viewed with the greatest suspicion. The last commentary is authored by one Dpa' bo rdo rje. The name is sometimes re-Sanskritized as *Śūravajra, but it is perhaps not out of the question that it is *Vīravajra. Furthermore, this *Vīravajra cannot be excluded as having been 'Brog mi's master and a student of Durjayacandra (see above). Tōhoku no. 1198 is Abhayākaragupta's perhaps most famous work, the *Āmnāyamañjarī*. The influence of this text on Tibetan authors, most significantly Tsong kha pa, is well known to Tibetanists and should not be insisted upon further. However, it is perhaps less well-known that Abhayākaragupta himself is an 'anthologic' author. In my edition of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, I have discovered that he very frequently lifts over entire passages from older commentaries, such as that of Bhavabhaṭṭa, but the list could further be extended with authors such as Ratnākaraśānti, Kamalanātha (a *Hevajra* exegete, whose commentary has not been rendered into Tibetan), and so on. Although to my knowledge Abhayākaragupta never actually states so, it is to my mind beyond doubt that he had recognized that the *Samputa* is a digest of *yoga-*, *mahāyoga-/ yogottara-*, and *yoginītantras*, and it is therefore no accident that he chose to write his Tantric *magnum opus* on this text.²¹

There is a further, little-known and almost complete commentary in Sanskrit in the Kaiser Library, Kathmandu (no. 228 = NGMPP C 26/1). The eleventh folio of this manuscript breaks off inside the commentary to sub-chapter 10.4. Therefore, it seems very likely that we are missing only the very last leaf. Besides the high-quality readings that this commentary preserves in lemmata and beyond its intrinsic importance, the manuscript is perhaps most interestingly one of the so-called 'Vikramaśīla codices'.²² The name of the author is unfortunately unknown, but the title can be recovered from the *pratijñā* verse with some degree of certainty: most likely it was *Prakaraṇārthanirṇaya*.²³

It should also be mentioned that the *Samputa* itself is also considered an exegesis of sorts, especially by Tibetan doxographers, since it is regarded as an "explanatory tantra" (Elder 1978:13-15 has already touched upon this subject). Some authorities view it as a so-called "shared [explanatory] tantra" (*chamthun pa'i rgyud*). In other words, it can be interpreted as an explanatory ta-

²¹ A small fragment of the *Āmnāyamañjarī* has been discovered among the Göttingen manuscripts; see Tomabechi & Kano 2008. A complete manuscript is said to survive in China. It is hoped that this precious witness will become available for study soon.

²² That a certain group of codices in the Kaiser Library and elsewhere formed a group and were copied at Vikramaśīla was officially revealed by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson at the Third International Workshop on Early Tantra, Hamburg in 2010.

²³ Ms. f. 1v: *natvā śrīśahajānandaṃ svasaṃvedyasvarūpiṇam | likhāmi samputasyāhaṃ prakaraṇārthanirṇayam ||*

ntra to both “father” and “mother” tantras, or more restrictively to both the Hevajra and the Śaṃvara cycles. Others, such as Bu ston, view it as an explanatory tantra of the Śaṃvara chiefly, and of other groups and cycles only secondarily.²⁴

Sources of the *Samputa*

The fact that the *Samputa* is for the most part an anthology of other Vajrayāna tantras has already been stated by e.g. Skorupski (1996:201), who singled out the *Guhyasamāja* and the *Hevajra*. Some parallels with the latter were traced by Noguchi (see below). Noguchi 1995 also identified parallels between the *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* and sub-chapter 2.2 (see below), and was thus the first to point out that the scripture shares passages with texts the author of which is known, in other words, texts not considered ‘revelation’. Sanderson (most recently in 2009:147, 157, 177, 182, 220) identified parallels with the *Herukābhīdhāna* and pointed out that the *Samputa* also reaches into the territories of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, the *Vajrabhairava*, and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara* (henceforth: *Samāyoga*). As we shall immediately see, it also reaches beyond these scriptures and even into further, non-scriptural works. I cannot claim to have traced every single passage of the text, but I do believe that the present survey is the most up to date such effort.²⁵

SCh. 1.1 (C1 1v1-4r6, Skorupski 1996: 216-224)

The *nidāna* is a blend between the “*bhaga*-type” opening of the *Guhyasamāja* and the *Hevajra*, that is to say, instead of some well-known geographic location or a pure land, the Lord resides in the vulva of *vajra*-ladies.²⁶ However, immediately afterwards, the entreaty (*adhyeṣāṇā*) is taken from the opening of the *Catuṣpīṭha* with the difference that the *adhyeṣaka* is not Vajrapāṇi, but

²⁴ See *Rgyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa*, 429: ‘*di spyi rgyud du ma’i bshad rgyud yin yang gtso bor bde mchog yin te | ’di’i dkyil ’khor gyi gtso bo rdo rje sems dpa’ bde mchog gi khyad par yin pa’i phyir dang | bde mchog gi gleng gzhi la bshad par bya ba’i phyir dang | ’grel pa mams nas bde mchog gi bshad rgyud du bgrangs pa’i phyir ro ||*

²⁵ Wherever editions were available I used their numeration, imperfect though they may be (e.g. *Guhyasamāja*, *Hevajra*, *Herukābhīdhāna*). Where an edition was not available, but the Sanskrit is extant, I have referred to draft editions mostly prepared by myself (e.g. the *Catuṣpīṭha*, occasionally the *Samputa* itself). Where the Sanskrit is not available, I have referred to the Tibetan translation of the text from the Derge Kangyur (abbreviated as KD), with occasional verse numbers where I possess or have prepared a draft edition (e.g. *Caturdevīpariprcchā*, *Samāyoga*, *Vajrāmṛta*). There is one exception, where the Tibetan translation has an edition (i.e. the *Vajrabhairava*).

²⁶ Skorupski 1996:216, ll. 1-2.

Vajragarbha (i.e. the *adhyeṣaka* of the *Hevajra*).²⁷ The question refers to the name of the scripture, and the corresponding answer is specific to the *Samputa*.²⁸ This is perhaps all that is truly original in this sub-chapter. The Lord's praise of the entreaty is itself modelled upon *Hevajra* I.i.2,²⁹ and the bodhisattvas' eagerness to ask their questions is a modified version of *Samājottara* 7.³⁰ After the analysis of the title, the Lord's exhortation to listen to this tantra, which embodies both *prajñā* and *upāya* is again from the *Hevajra* (I.i.7cd).³¹ The following passage of five verses concerning meditation on emptiness has already been identified as having its source in the *Catuṣpīṭha* and was published in Szántó 2008.³² The concluding verse of this passage is again from the *Hevajra* (I.v.1).³³ The next exhortation of the *bhagavān*³⁴ begins with a line from the *Catuṣpīṭha* (1.4.1ab), continues with two and a half verses from the *Caturdevīparipṛcchā* (1.10cd-12 = KD f. 278r),³⁵ only to return to the continuation of the *Catuṣpīṭha* (1.4.1cd-5),³⁶ and to again switch to five and a half verses of the *Caturdevīparipṛcchā* (1.15cd-20 = KD f. 278r).³⁷ The alternation is again repeated with three and a half verses from the *Catuṣpīṭha* (1.4.7cd-10)³⁸ and four and a half from the *Caturdevīparipṛcchā* (1.21-25ab = KD f. 278v).³⁹ The lines from the *Guhyasamāja* explanatory tantra, the *Caturdevīparipṛcchā*, are particularly significant, since—save for some quotations—this text does not survive in Sanskrit. The last passage is, with minor editorial interventions, again from the *Hevajra* (I.v.2-21).⁴⁰

²⁷ Ibid.:216, ll. 2-6.

²⁸ Ibid.:216, ll. 6, 12-14 and 217, ll. 1-8. For a re-edition of this passage and an identification of passages from the *Hevajra*, see Noguchi 1986a.

²⁹ Skorupski 1996: 216, ll. 7-10.

³⁰ Ibid.:216, ll. 11-12.

³¹ Ibid.:217, l. 8.

³² Ibid.:217, l. 9 - 218, l. 9. Note that here some verses are attributed to Vajragarbha, and not the *bhagavān* as in the original *Catuṣpīṭha* passage.

³³ Ibid.:218, ll. 10-12.

³⁴ Ibid.:218, l. 14.

³⁵ Ibid.:218, l. 15 - 219, l. 4.

³⁶ Ibid.:219, ll. 5-12. Note that the highly obscure verse 1.4.4ab is simply glanced over by the compilers of the *Samputa*. This is not a simple omission, but rather a conscious editorial decision to exclude a statement the meaning of which was probably already unknown. Both the editors of the *Samputa* and the *Vajradāka* (which also lifts over many dozens of verses from the *Catuṣpīṭha*) proceed thus habitually.

³⁷ Ibid.:219, l. 14 - 220, l. 10. I am unable to trace 219, l. 13.

³⁸ Ibid.:220, l. 11 - 221, l. 1.

³⁹ Ibid.:221, ll. 2-10. I am unable to trace l. 11 immediately after.

⁴⁰ Ibid.:221, l. 12 - 224, l. 13.

SCh. 1.2 (C1 4r6-7v1, Skorupski 1996:224-232)

The sub-chapter opens with a list of the 37 *dharmas* conducive to enlightenment.⁴¹ This general list would normally be considered 'sūtra material', but for the cult of Śaṃvara it is essential to be reiterated, since the thirty-seven deities of the chief *maṇḍala* are identified with these *dharmas*. When the text switches to verse, we find yet another source where the author is known: four verses immediately after the prose list correspond with some differences to the *Vasantatilakā* (4.7-10) of Kṛṣṇācārya.⁴² With the last section of the sub-chapter we are again in very familiar territory: this is the famous list of tubes (*nāḍī*) from the *Hevajra* (I.i.12-13, 16-20ab).⁴³

SCh. 1.3 (C1 7v1-8v2, Skorupski 1996:232-236)

The prose introduction of this sub-chapter consists of stock-phrases from the *Guhyasamāja*.⁴⁴ As the text switches to verse the source also changes: the first five stanzas are from the fourth chapter of the *Samāyoga* (4.9-13 = KD f. 154v-155r)⁴⁵, and the next three and a half from the first (1.6-8ab, 13 = KD ff. 151v-152r).⁴⁶ An intervening prose passage does not have a precise parallel in the *Guhyasamāja*, although it certainly fits into the style of that text.⁴⁷ The next five verses are, with minor differences, again from the *Samāyoga* (5.18-21 = KD f. 156r). The last of these verses describes that the retinue started to praise the Lord with a hymn, but the glorifying stanza is from another source, the *Catuṣpīṭha* (2.3.114-115).⁴⁸ The next two lines bear some resemblance to a *Guhyasamāja* stock-phrase and 2.1a of the same scripture.⁴⁹ The next verse is similar to *Samāyoga* 5.32ab (= KD ff. 156v-157r), but the last two *pādas* may also have their source as *Samājottara* 69ab.⁵⁰ I have been unable to trace the remaining three and a half verses.

SCh. 1.4 (C1 8v2-11v3, Skorupski 1996:236-244)

I have not managed to identify the sources for this sub-chapter.

⁴¹ Ibid.:224, l. 15 - 231, l. 2.

⁴² Ibid.:231, ll. 3-10.

⁴³ Ibid.:231, l. 11 - 232, l. 8. I have not traced the last verse on p. 231.

⁴⁴ Ibid.:232, l. 11 - 233, l. 2.

⁴⁵ Ibid.:233, ll. 3-12.

⁴⁶ Ibid.:233, l. 13 - 234, l. 4.

⁴⁷ Ibid.:234, ll. 5-6.

⁴⁸ Ibid.:234, l. 17 - 235, l. 5.

⁴⁹ Ibid.:235, ll. 5-6.

⁵⁰ Ibid.:235, ll. 8-9.

SCh. 2.1 (C1 11v3-14v2, Skorupski 2001:226-238⁵¹)

The first five verses correspond almost exactly to Hevajra I.x.1-5,⁵² whereas the next four to the *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* 3.2-5.⁵³ The source of the next two verses, a prose passage, and another full verse still remains to be identified.⁵⁴ Although Skorupski does not print this as verse, thereafter we have *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* 3.6ab,⁵⁵ then another prose passage which remains untraced,⁵⁶ and finally the continuation of the same verse with its two final *pādas* (3.6cd). From here onwards, the parallel with the *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* runs unimpeded from 3.7 to 25 in that work.⁵⁷ After this we have a single untraced verse⁵⁸ before the text switches to copying the *Hevajra* (I.x.6cd-11ab, then I.viii.31, and then back to I.x.12).⁵⁹ The verse immediately after the passage announcing that the (higher) initiations are four in number corresponds to the oft-quoted and troublesome verse *Samājottara* 113cdef.⁶⁰ The following nine and a half verses are word for word from the *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* 3.26-35ab.⁶¹ The adaptation goes on up to the end of the sub-chapter with verses 3.35cd-39;⁶² the natural flow of the text is interrupted by three verses on the issue of the fee given to the officiant for initiation. These latter are taken from the *Herukābhīdhāna* (3.10-12ab, 13ab).⁶³ Most of these parallels have already been pointed out in Noguchi 1984. It should be noted that what I identify here as the *Herukābhīdhāna*, Noguchi interpreted as a parallel with the *Samvarodaya*. In my view it is much more likely that this is a case of common borrowing from the same source, in other words, it is both the *Sampuṭa* and the *Samvarodaya* that borrow verses from the *Herukābhīdhāna*.

⁵¹ Since in the 2001 article the text and its Tibetan translation has been typeset on facing pages, the numbers here refer to even pages only.

⁵² Skorupski 2001:226, ll. 1-10.

⁵³ *Ibid.*:226, ll. 11-18.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*:226, l. 19 - 228, l. 9.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*:228, l. 9: *navayauvanasaṃpannāṃ prāpya mudrāṃ sulocanām*.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*:228, ll. 9-15.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*:228, l. 16- 232, l. 16.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*:232, ll. 17-18.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*:232, l. 19 - 234, l. 9.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*:234, ll. 10-12

⁶¹ *Ibid.*:234, l. 13 - 236, l. 8.

⁶² *Ibid.*:236, l. 16 - 238, l. 7. Note that Skorupski does not print the last two passages as verse.

⁶³ *Ibid.*:236, ll. 9-15.

SCh. 2.2 (C1 14v2-16v5, Skorupski 2001:238-250)

The lion's share of this sub-chapter is again from the *Prajñopāyavinīscayasiddhi*: the first fourteen verses correspond to 4.1-14,⁶⁴ four and a half verses immediately thereafter are untraced,⁶⁵ and the next twelve verses are from the same work, 4.15-26.⁶⁶ I have been unable to trace the rest of the sub-chapter. Most of these parallels have already been pointed out in Noguchi 1995.

SCh. 2.3 (C1 16v5-19r3, Skorupski 2001:250-260)

The first three verses are from the *Samāyoga* (7.1-3 = KD ff. 163v-164r).⁶⁷ The next five verses remain untraced.⁶⁸ The next large section of sixteen verses is by and large following *Hevajra* I.iii.1-16ab, except that here we have a Śamvara-type Heruka, rather than a Hevajra.⁶⁹ The rest of the sub-chapter remains untraced.

SCh. 2.4 (C1 19r3-21v3, Skorupski 2001:260-268)

This sub-chapter on magical diagrams is greatly inspired by the *Catuṣpīṭha*. Except a single mantra, the first twenty-six units follow *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.2.1-21 and 3.2.24-26 almost verbatim.⁷⁰ After four verses⁷¹ the parallel resumes with *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.2.27, 29-33.⁷² The rest remains untraced.

SCh. 3.1 (C1 21v3-22v4, Noguchi 1987a)

The source for fourteen verses out of a total of thirty-five from this sub-chapter (3.1.4-8 and 9-17) has been identified as *Hevajra* II.v.19-23, 27-29ab, 8, 26, 9-12 by Noguchi in his edition. I was unable to trace the rest of the verses.

SCh. 3.2 (C1 22v4-24v2)

Except a single half-verse (1ab), which nevertheless refers to the chief goddess of the *Catuṣpīṭha*, Jñānaḍākinī, the entire sub-chapter is lifted over with some

⁶⁴ Ibid.:238, l. 10 - 240, l. 16.

⁶⁵ Ibid.:240, l. 17 - 242, l. 5.

⁶⁶ Ibid.:242, l. 6 - 244, l. 20. The last verse is not printed as such by Skorupski.

⁶⁷ Ibid.:250, ll. 5-10.

⁶⁸ Ibid.:250, ll. 11-21.

⁶⁹ Ibid.:252, l. 1 - 254, l. 15. 254, ll. 9-11 are not from the Hevajra.

⁷⁰ Ibid.:260, l. 6 - 262, l. 14. The mantra mentioned above is 262, l. 8; instead of a spell of Kurukullā, the *Catuṣpīṭha* here has the classic mantra of Tārā: *oṃ tāre tuttāre ture svāhā*.

⁷¹ Ibid.:262, l. 15 - 264, l. 2.

⁷² Ibid.:264, ll. 3-13.

minor changes from the ‘flagship-*paṭala*’⁷³ of the *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.3, verses 6cd-54.

SCh. 3.3 (C1 24v2-25v3, Noguchi 1987c and 1988)

Noguchi’s earlier edition is only partial, but in the accompanying short study he has identified the source for this sub-chapter on the visualization of Nairātmyā and her retinue, which is *Hevajra* I.viii.1-20. This is not an exact match, but there can be little doubt that the compilers of the *Samputa* followed the scripture named after Nairātmyā’s consort.

SCh. 3.4 (C1 25v3-29v2, Noguchi 1986c and 1987b)

This entire sub-chapter contains *yogatantra* material, the only sub-chapter to do so in its entirety. An edition and study has already been done by Noguchi, who pointed out the significant parallel between this text and a scripture surviving only in Chinese, the *Pi mi siang king* (*Mimi xiang jing*). There is very little that I can add to these two studies.

SCh. 4.1 (C1 29v2-30r5)

This very short sub-chapter on matters related chiefly to secret communication signs (*chommā*) is taken from the *Catuṣpīṭha* (4.1.1, 8-12 = 2.4.1, 105-113), whereas three *apabhramśa* songs are from the *Hevajra* (4.1.3-6 = II.iv.6-8). The source or sources for the rest remains to be identified.

Ch. 4.2 (C1 30r5-30v5)

This, again very short, sub-chapter on signs betraying *ḍākinīs* is practically recycling the entire 17th chapter of the *Herukābhīdhāna* (more precisely vv. 3-12). The first line is probably original, since it mentions Vajragarbha as the interlocutor (as is the last, since it mentions the title of the text). A similarly interventional editorial can be seen in the next verse, where *devi* (a vocative in the original) is changed to *etāḥ* (a plural pronoun referring to the subject matter of the section).

SCh. 4.3 (C1 30v5-32v1)

The compilers here made further use of the same scripture. The sub-chapter is in effect a mix and match compilation of chs. 16, 18, and 19 of the *Herukābhīdhāna*. The precise order is as follows: 19.1ab, 16.3, 16.4a-18.3bcd, 18.4ab-16.6a-18.4d, 18.4ef-18.5cd, 18.6 with the two last *pādas* rephrased, 18.7, 16.8cd-9ab, 18.8c-9a-16.9b, 18.10 (rephrased), 18.11-16 (with some minor

⁷³ I consider this the most important sub-chapter of that text, since it teaches the forms, spells, gestures, and modes of worship for the goddesses of the cult. Most of the *Catuṣpīṭha* satellite texts are based on this *paṭala*.

changes), 18.4e (or 18.16e), 18.8a-18.16f-18.17ab, 18.17cd-18ab, 19.2-5ab, 19.6-8ab, 19.10abc-11b, 19.11cd, 19.12cd-17ab, 19.18-25ab (again, with very minor changes).

SCh. 4.4 (C1 32v1-33r1)

Except two stanzas' worth of text the entire chapter can be shown to stem from the *Herukābhīdhāna*, as follows: one introductory line, 21.1cd-5, an untraced half-verse, 6ab, 7ab, 4ab, 7cd, 8-9, 22.2, and finally an untraced verse.

SCh. 5.1 (C1 33r1-33v6)

The opening of the sub-chapter is very similar to 10.10 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*. Immediately thereafter we have a section from the *Hevajra* (prose between I.vii.9 and 10 up to 18 with some modifications), then a short prose passage which remains untraced, then three verses from the *Herukābhīdhāna* (50.21-23ab and 24ab), another untraced verse, with three final verses again from the *Hevajra* (I.vii.20-22ab & 25).

SCh. 5.2 (C1 33v6-36r6)

With some changes and with the exception of the third, fourth and fifth verses, the first forty-three verses from this sub-chapter correspond to *Catuṣpīṭha* 4.4.1-41. With the exception of the first line, the next passage is from the *Hevajra* I.ix.1-7. The three verses immediately thereafter correspond to *Vajradāka* 1.16, 17ab, 21, and 22. Only the last three verses remain untraced.

SCh. 5.3 (C1 36r6-38r5)

The initial three quarters of the text is almost entirely identical with *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* 5.1-37. The exceptions are: instead of 5.7cd there is a small unmetrical passage, there is a different line where 5.29ab should be, and 5.34cd is missing. The remainder is untraced.

SCh. 5.4 (C1 33r1-33v6)

I have been unable to trace the sources for this sub-chapter on post-initiatory observances (*caryā*).

SCh. 6.1 (C1 40r3-42v2)

The composition of this sub-chapter is quite complicated. Vv. 17-18 correspond to *Herukābhīdhāna* 1.4-5. The next verse is quoted in the *Vyavastholikā* of Nāgabuddhi (f. 23r8), and is also incorporated into the *Samvarodaya* (2.23-24ab). Verse 31-32ab corresponds to *Vasantatilakā* 3.2-3ab. The parallel runs further as follows: 6.1.36 = 3.4, 37 = 3.3d-5ab, 38-42 = 3.5cd-9. From 6.1.49 onwards, up to the end of the sub-chapter, we have an almost

exact parallel with *Vasantatilakā* 5.1-15cd, which, however, may be a copy of *Vajraḍāka* 14.1-14ab. Much of this chapter (vv. 13-16, 21-24, 25-27, 30-42) also corresponds to a work transmitted in the Tibetan Canon as the **Sahajamaṇḍalatrayāloka* (Tōhoku no. 1539) of (a) Jñānaśrī, who may perhaps be identified with a disciple of Rin chen bzang po bearing that name.⁷⁴ Whether this work is based on the *Samputa*, or they are both inspired by a third source is a matter for further investigation.

SCh. 6.2 (C1 42v2-44r2)

The entire sub-chapter is based on *Vasantatilakā* 6.1-39ab, except that the names of the goddesses of the Śaṃvara pantheon followed in Anaṅgavajra's work are changed; e.g., Vārāhī is renamed as Nairātmyā. (Note, however, that after this it is not the Hevajra goddesses that are named as replacements).

SCh. 6.3 (C1 44r2-46r4)

Except the introductory passage amounting to three units, the entire sub-chapter corresponds to the *Vasantatilakā* again: twenty-four verses are from 8.2cd-26, whereas the next twenty-five are from 10.1-25ab.

SCh. 6.4 (C1 46r4-49r1)

The introductory prose passage and the second line of the first verse are probably original. The first two and last two pādas of the second verse correspond to *Hevajra* II.iv.48. The *Hevajra* is copied further up to II.iv.64 (with the exceptions of 54ab, 58, and 63ab). Halfway through the eighteenth verse, however, the *Samputa* starts copying from another chapter, II.ii.41cd-45. After a section closer, which is untraced, the compilers switch back to II.iv.65-66, some short untraced prose is inserted between this passage and II.iv.69cd and 71. The thirty-first verse again switches back to II.ii.46 and follows the source faithfully up to II.ii.60. I was unable to trace the remaining sixteen verses.

SCh. 7.1 (C1 49r1-57r1)

With the exception of the first half-verse, the initial eight verses of this sub-chapter correspond to *Hevajra* II.iii.53-60. The section immediately afterwards is taken from the list of secret signs and syllables from the *Catuspīṭha* (2.4.104-114). The next two sections are untraced, but since they elaborate on a list of codewords from sub-chapter 4.1 they are perhaps original. Vv. 7.1.39-43 are again from the *Hevajra* (I.xi.1-5). The remainder is untraced. Units 44-47 on gazes (called here *ḍṛṣṭimudrā*) are also from an untraced source. After this the

⁷⁴ This Western Tibetan environment is also suggested by the fact that according to the colophon the work was translated at the request of Pho brang Zhi ba 'od.

topical unity of the sub-chapter is broken: thus far we had material on secret communication signs and related material, but the remaining three quarters of the text is a large collection of about seventy magical procedures (*prayoga*) involving a variety of substances. I have been unable to determine their source.

SCh. 7.2 (C1 57r2-59v1)

The first two verses on this sub-chapter on matters related to *homa* are most likely inspired by *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.1.1-2. Some of the verses thereafter show superficial resemblances to verses in the *Hevajra* (7.2.5a is similar to II.i.6a, 7.2.12 very likely derives from II.i.8cd-9). These introductory passages discuss general prescriptions for the fire-sacrifice. From about halfway across the sub-chapter we start having prose descriptions of *homas* with specific aims: bringing about prosperity, attracting, killing, and so forth. These are almost all taken from the sixth chapter of the *Vajrabhairava*, a chapter which is extant in Sanskrit only in a small fragment of about two sentences (in an unpublished manuscript, NAK 4-20 = NGMPP A 1306/32, f. 11v). The Tibetan translation of the *Vajrabhairava* has already been edited by Siklós (1996), and it is this edition I shall refer to below. Thus 7.2.21-24, a *pauṣṭika* rite corresponds very closely to Siklós 1996:105, 7.2.25-26 to a *vaśīkaraṇa* rite in *ibid.*:106, 7.2.27-29 to an *abhicāra* rite in *ibid.*:103, 7.2.30-33 to an *uccāṭana* rite in *ibid.*:103-104, 7.2.34-37 to a *stambhana* rite in *ibid.*:104. After a small gap of untraced passages, the parallel resumes with 7.2.45-48 corresponding to another *vaśīkaraṇa* in *ibid.*:106, 7.2.49-50 to another *uccāṭana* in *ibid.*:106, 7.2.51 to an *unmattīkaraṇa* in *ibid.*:105, and finally 7.2.52-54, containing some general instructions to *ibid.*:107.

SCh. 7.3 (C1 59v1-66v2)

This sub-chapter consists of two main parts. The first deals with raising spells (*mantroddhāra*), whereas the second contains a series of about forty-five *prayogas*. I was able to trace only a few verses from the first part, namely: 7.3.9 = *Guhyasamāja* 14.4, 7.3.12 = *Guhyasamāja* 14.6, 7.3.17 = *Guhyasamāja* 14.8; vv. 7.3.22-28 are slightly modified versions of *Hevajra* II.ix.16-22. Towards the end of the second half (C1 65r ff.), there are some parallels with *Herukābhīdhāna* 6.1cd-4ef and 2.5ab-7c.

SCh. 7.4 (C1 66v2-75v3)

The composition of this sub-chapter—centered on *homa*-related materials, but containing much else as well—is perhaps the most complex in the entire text. There are at least seven sources that have inspired this *paṭala*, and the identity of one of them is quite surprising.

7.4.1.ab-2ab correspond to *Hevajra* II.i.1, a request to reveal teachings on consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*). This is rather odd, since we do not seem to have anything on that matter in the text. Instead we have instructions revealing the preparation for the fire-sacrifice.⁷⁵ 7.4.6 is a verse rearranged from a short and early *yoginītantra*, the *Vajrāmṛta* (namely 4.3ab-4a-5c = KD ff. 20r-20v). The next verse and five sentences in prose remain untraced.

The prose section after this (7.4.14-25 in my numbering) begins with what looks like a lemma and its explanation: *namaskṛtvā gurum iti| mantropādhyāyaṃ vandayitvā [...]*. In fact, this is exactly what it is: a passage from a commentary, namely the *Vajrāmṛtaṭīkā* of one Bhago⁷⁶ (Tōh. no. 1651). The entire prose section corresponds to ff. 79v-80v of the Tibetan translation. There are some editorial interventions; e.g., where the commentary states that one should use the spell beginning with *oṃ ehy ehi mahādevi* in order to summon the goddess of the earth. Here, the editors of the *Samputa* reintroduce the complete mantra from the *Vajrāmṛta* (KD f. 20v). The most striking intervention comes in prose section 7.4.18. Here, the commentator Bhago asks the question of whether the “seal” (*mudrā*) that is to be introduced to the ritual area at this stage should be an artificial woman (i.e. a simulacrum, a puppet) or a real one. His answer is that it should, indeed, be a real woman. Here is the Tibetan translation of the passage in question (*Vajrāmṛtaṭīkā*, KD f. 80a2):

*ci rdzas la sogs pa la brdungs shing lugs su blugs pa de nyid gzhug gam zhes pa
la ma yin par gsungs pa | gtum mo zhes pa ni gtum mo la sogs pa'i mi'i bu mo
zhes pa'i don to ||*

And here is the corresponding statement in the *Samputa* (C1 67v5):

*kiṃ bhagavan niṣiktasamskṛtavicitritāṃ dārvādighaṭitāṃ vidyādevīm praveśa-
yed ity āha || bhagavān āha || cāṇḍālādīmānuṣīm kanyām praveśayet ||*

It is readily apparent that the editors introduced a vocative (*bhagavan*) after the interrogative pronoun, and a speaker marker (*bhagavān āha*) before the answer to the question. In other words, the exegete's question, which is simply

⁷⁵ The solution to this textual problem is that, in the view of the compilers, purifying the earth for the *homa*-rite corresponded with purificatory preparations used for consecration. Moreover, consecration did often involve the performance of a *homa*-rite.

⁷⁶ This is the form transmitted in the Tibetan translation. Since the last draft of the present paper a Sanskrit manuscript of this work (the actual title is *Amṛtadhārā*) has been found in China; there the name is Śrībhānu. I thank Prof. Francesco Sferra for this information.

respecting the exigencies of his genre, here becomes a question from the *adhyeṣaka*, and the answer to the question becomes a revelation of the Lord. This reveals that the compilers were very much aware that they were constructing scripture. Why Bhago's commentary was deemed so important by them is still an unanswered question.

The passage lifted from the *Vajrāmṛtaṭīkā* comes to a rather abrupt end, just before a lemma is introduced.⁷⁷ The verses following (7.4.26-43) are from ninth chapter of the *Māyājāla* (KD ff. 129v-130v).⁷⁸ I am uncertain about the provenance of the next five verses, but it should be mentioned that most of them are also quoted (or are the author's own) in the *Ratnāvalī Pañjikā* of Kumāracandra (p. 62). With 7.4.49-54 we are back to the *Māyājāla*, where the previous passage has left off (KD f. 130v). The parallel with the ninth chapter goes on in sub-chapter 10.4 (see below). The following prose section and two verses are taken from the beginning of the eighth chapter of the *Māyājāla* (KD f. 124v).

The next passage on the visualization of an eight- or seven-faced, sixteen-armed Tārā remains untraced. The following two visualizations of Vajrabhairava are taken from the eponymous tantra. The first section encompasses most of the iconographical descriptions in chapter 4 (Siklós 1996:96 ff.), whereas the second is taken from *Vajrabhairava* ch. 5, where the deity is painted on a cloth (this passage survives in Sanskrit in Ms. NAK 4-20 = NGMPP A 1306/32, f. 11r-11v). The following visualization of Mārīcī remains untraced, as does the visualization of Parṇaśavarī thereafter, although the latter does show some very significant parallels with *Sādhanamālā* no. 149. The following visualization of Vajrakrodha is taken from the *Herukābhīdhāna* (32.12-14) and the *Vajradāka* (1.44cd), with only a single line untraced. The next passage in prose describing a rite to excite a woman has some superficial resemblance to a rite described in *Vajrabhairava* ch. 7 (Siklós 1996:111). The next three verses and an accompanying mantra describing a ritual to make a target bleed are taken from the *Māyājāla*, ch. 8 (KD f. 126r). The following rite is based on a *māraṇa* ritual from the same chapter of the *Māyājāla* (KD ff. 125v-126r), but the parallel is not exact. Moreover, the second spell used in this ritual (*oṃ hrīḥ ṣṭrīḥ vikṛtānana hūṃ 3 phaṭ*) is that of Yamāntaka/Yamāri. The

⁷⁷ The passage runs as follows (C1 68r4): *evaṃ yogī pīṭhasthānabhūte bhūpradeśe kuṇḍam kuryād ity āha*. "Thus the yogin should dig the pit in that area, which has been conceived of as a sacred ford. To this effect [the text] says:"

⁷⁸ Beyond their intrinsic interest, the parallels with the *Māyājāla* are important, since until very recently the original Sanskrit text of this very influential tantra was thought lost. A few years ago a fragment of five folios surfaced. The present whereabouts of these leaves is unknown (personal communication in January 2012 by Toru Tomabechi).

following six verses describe an *uccāṭana* and a *vidveṣaṇa* ritual; these are again taken from the same chapter of the *Māyājāla* (KD f. 126r). The following visualization of Hayagrīva remains untraced. The next short passage describing a *prayoga* to make a victim vomit is taken from the *Hevajra* (I.ii.25). The next large section in alternating prose and broken verse deals mostly with matters related to rainmaking. These rites are very closely following the eighth chapter of the *Māyājāla* (KD. ff. 126r-127r). The following visualization of Kurukullā is untraced. The next *vaśīkaraṇa* rite follows *Hevajra* I.ii.26. Two small passages follow: the first describes a rite seeking protection from lightning, and the second a small injunction related to customizing spells in rites of killing. These are untraced. The next *vaśīkaraṇa* rite is again very similar to *Hevajra* I.ii.26 (see above). The following passage describing the healing of snakebite is taken almost word for word from the seventh chapter of the *Vajrabhairava* (Ms. NAK 4-20 = NGMPP A 1306/32, f. 15r). The remaining rituals are all taken from the *Hevajra*: stopping the sun and the moon in their course equals *Hevajra* I.ii.27; the rite to paralyze an army I.ii.22; a rite to make deities burst (?) equals I.ii.23; and finally, some more rainmaking magic closely follows *Hevajra* I.ii.20-21.

SCh. 8.1 (C1 75v3-77r4)

This entire sub-chapter on the symbolism of the sceptre (*vajra*) and the bell (*ghaṇṭā*) is a slightly rearranged version of *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.1.1-41.

SCh. 8.2 (C1 77r4-78r5)

This sub-chapter (chiefly on the symbolism of the rosary, here called *akṣasūtra*) simply continues where 8.1 left off, being in effect an almost exact copy of *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.1.42-65ab. Of the remaining one fifth, four verses correspond to *Catuṣpīṭha* 3.1.65ab -70cd & 71-73 (these describe a visualization of Vairocana). Only the last two verses remain untraced.

SCh. 8.3 (C1 78r5-80r6)

For the most part, this sub-chapter on yogic egress (*utkrānti*) and related material follows again the *Catuṣpīṭha*: the first forty-one verses are following 4.3.34-74, with only minor differences. The rest of the sub-chapter, about nine verses worth, is probably from another source, where the interlocutor is a goddess. I have been unable to trace this passage.

SCh. 8.4 (C1 80r6-82v5)

This sub-chapter is simply a compilation of mantras related to the cults that have inspired the *Samputa*.

SCh. 9.1 (C1 82v5-84r2)

The first five verses and the first four *pādas* of the sixth remain untraced. 9.1.6ef-11ab correspond with a passage from the *Samāyoga* (4.16cd-21ab = KD f. 155r). The next section on the five nectars (*pañcāmṛta*), which reaches up to the end of the subchapter, 9.1.11cd-29, consists of verses selected from the *Catuṣpīṭha* in the following order: 9.1.11cd-18 = 2.4.14cd-22 (with a slight rearrangement), 9.1.19ab is untraced, 9.1.19cd-22ab = 2.4.4-6, 9.1.22cd-29 = 2.3.107cd-113.

SCh. 9.2 (C1 84r2-85v6)

This sub-chapter deals mostly with offering *bali*. The first ten verses are untraced. The rest of the sub-chapter consists almost entirely of selected verses from the *Catuṣpīṭha*. The correspondences are as follows: 9.2.11cd-12ab = *Catuṣpīṭha* 2.3.164, 9.2.13cdef = 2.3.165cd-166ab, 9.2.15 = 2.3.166cd-167ab, 9.2.16ab = 2.3.146cd, 9.2.18-27 = 2.3.147-156, 9.2.28-29 = 2.3.128cd-130, 9.2.30-35 = 2.3.135-140, and finally 9.2.36-44 = 2.3.168-176.

SCh. 9.3 (C1 85v6-87r2)

The first section worth about twenty-two verses on how to draw a scroll image of the deity (*paṭa*) has some non-verbatim parallels with the fifth chapter of the *Vajrabhairava*. The last three verses on how to prepare a book (*pustaka*) is a modified version of *Hevajra* II.vii.2-4.

SCh. 9.4 (87r2-88r5)

I have been unable to trace the source or sources for most of this sub-chapter, which contains injunctions for performing the *gaṇacakra*, except an initial passage describing the characteristics of a rattle-drum (*damaru*). A single verse, a song in a *apabhramśa* which is sung as a kind of password before gaining entry to the feast, is from the *Catuṣpīṭha* (2.4.101). The last three verses are virtually identical to *Hevajra* II.vii.11-13.

SCh. 10.1 (C1 88r5-89r4); SCh. 10.2 (C1 89r4-89v5); SCh. 10.3 (C1 89v5-90r5)

I have been unable to trace the source or sources for these three short sub-chapters.

SCh. 10.4 (C1 90r5-91r6)

Except the first line of this sub-chapter, which nevertheless refers back to the end of sub-chapter 7.4, the most significant part, vv. 1cd-17, copies a continuous passage from the ninth chapter of the *Māyājāla* (KD ff. 130v-131v). The penultimate verse is from the *Catuṣpīṭha* (v. 4.4.90), as is the ending, a composite sentence formed from *Catuṣpīṭha* 4.4.92 and 102.

Conclusions

It can thus be shown that a very significant part of the *Samputa* goes back to other sources, both scriptural and exegetical. I have no doubts that this sketchy pointing out of parallels can be and will be improved upon in further studies. My aim here was to point out that a prospective, truly critical edition cannot afford to ignore the fact that there is very little that is original in this influential text. The *Samputa* simply does not make sense if it is not interpreted as largely an anthology.

Nor can a prospective edition keep using relatively recent paper manuscripts, when good and old palm-leaf witnesses (especially the very good ms. C1) are available. Although I have not discussed this fact here, many of the chosen readings of the editors who have worked on the text thus far can be greatly improved upon with the testimonia of these manuscripts. Furthermore, at least one of these manuscripts allows us to determine with relative certainty the upper limit for the compilation of the text, and this would come at around the middle of the eleventh century. I have also discussed here a possible testimony (that of Durjayacandra) and argued *ex absentia* that because of the lack of *Kālacakra* passages, the compilation of the *Samputa* could be dated earlier still. I am fully aware of the circumstantial nature of these arguments, but I nevertheless do not find it unreasonable that, as a working hypothesis, we could place the *Samputa* to the turn of the millenium.

If this is true, then the *Samputa* seems to be a kind of anthology of passages from texts produced mostly during the “Dark Ages” preceding it. Why and how these passages must have seemed important to the compilers, and why some were not, is a matter that can be studied only after a careful critical edition of the text.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Guhyasamāja* — Yukei Matsunaga (ed.), *The Guhyasamāja Tantra*. Osaka: Toho Shuppan, 1978.
- Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhi-Saṅgraha — Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (eds.). *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhi Saṅgraha*. Sarnath: Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, 1987.
- Rgyud sde rnam bzhag rgyas pa — *Rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par gzhag pa Rgyud sde rin po che'i mdzes rgyan*. Lokesh Chandra (ed.), *The Collected Works of Bu ston* (vol. Ba). New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture 1966.
- Catuṣpīṭha — Draft edition prepared by myself from the following mss.: NAK 1-1078 = NGMPP B 26/23; NAK 4-20 = NGMPP B 30/36; Cambridge University Library Add. 1704 (12); NAK 5-37 = NGMPP A 138/10; IASWR MBB-I-41; NAK 1-1697 2/22 = NGMPP B 31/27; NAK 1-1697 11/6 = NGMPP A 994/2; NAK 1-1607 = NGMPP A 49/18; Kaiser Library 132 = NGMPP C 106/9; Cambridge University Library Add. 1691.
- Caturdevīparipṛcchā — Tōhoku no. 446. Tr. by Smṛtijñānakīrti.
- Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi — By Anaṅgavajra. See *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhi-Saṅgraha*, no. 2.
- Māyājāla — Tōhoku no. 466. Tr. by Rin chen bzang po.
- Muktāvalī — Ram Shankar Tripathi & Thakur Sain Negi (eds.). *Hevajratantram with Muktāvalī Pañjikā of Mahāpaṇḍitācārya Ratnākaraśānti*. Sarnath: Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, 2001 (Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series XLVIII).
- Yoginīsaṃcāra — Janardan Shastri Pandey (ed.). *Yoginīsaṃcāratantram with Nibandha of Tathāgataraksita (sic!) and Upadeśānusāriṇīvyākhyā of Alakakalaśa*. Sarnath: Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, 1998 (Rare Buddhist Texts Series 21).
- Ratnāvalī — Pañjikā Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (eds.). *Kṛṣṇayamāritantram with Ratnāvalī Pañjikā of Kumāracandra*. Sarnath: Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992 (Rare Buddhist Texts Series 9).
- Vajradāka — For ch. 1, see Sugiki 2002; for ch. 14, see Sugiki 2003.
- Vajrabhairava — See Siklós 1996.
- Vajrāmṛta — Tōhoku no. 435. Tr. by Gyi jo Zla ba'i 'od zer.
- Vasantatilakā — Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (eds.). *Vasantatilakā of Caryāvratī Śrīkṛṣṇācārya with Commentary: Rahasyadīpikā by Vanaratna*. Sarnath: Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, 1990 (Rare Buddhist Texts Series 7).

- Vyavastholikā — Of Nāgabuddhi. Ms. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen Xc 14/30 (a composite codex), ff. 21v2-27v*2.
- Samājottara — See Guhyasamāja, last chapter.
- Samāyoga — I.e., the Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara. Tōh. 366, translators not given.
- Samvarodaya — Shinichi Tsuda, *The Samvarodaya-Tantra. Selected Chapters*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1974.
- Sādhnamālā — Benoytosh Bhattacharya (ed.), *Sādhnamālā*. 2 vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1925-1928 (Gaekwad Oriental Series vols. 26 & 41).
- Herukābhidhāna — Janardan Shasti Pandey (ed.). *Śrīherukābhidhānam Cakrasaṃvaratantram with the Vivṛti Commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa*. 2 vols. Sarnath: Central Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies, 2002 (Rare Buddhist Texts Series 26).
- Hevajra — D. L. Snellgrove (ed.). *The Hevajra Tantra. A Critical Study*. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press 1959 (London Oriental Series volume 6).

Secondary sources

- Chimpa, Lama & Chattopadhyaya, Alaka. 1970. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*. Simla: Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Cowell, E[dward] B[yles] & Eggeling, J[ulius]. 1876. "Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Possession of the Royal Asiatic Society (Hodgson Collection)." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, N.S. 8,1: 1-52.
- Davidson, Ronald M. 2004. *Tibetan Renaissance: Tantric Buddhism in the Rebirth of Tibetan Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Elder, George Robert. 1978. *The Saṃpuṭa Tantra: edition and translation. Chapters I-IV*. [Unpublished Ph. D. thesis submitted at Columbia University]
- Huntington, Susan L. 1984. *The "Pāla-Sena" Schools of Sculpture*. Leiden: E. J. Brill (Studies in South Asian Culture 10).
- Huntington Archive. <http://kaladarshan.arts.ohio-state.edu/>
- Locke, John K. 1985. *Buddhist Monasteries of Nepal: a Survey of the Bāhās and Bahīs of the Kathmandu Valley*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press.
- Noguchi, Keiya. 1984. "The fundamental character of the Saṃpuṭodbhavantra." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 32(2): 726-727. [In Japanese]
- . 1986a. "The Saṃpuṭodbhavantra I-i—especially on the issue of the title." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 34(2): 124-128. [In Japanese]
- . 1986b. "The Saṃpuṭodbhavantra and the Pi mi siang king." *Buzan Gakuho: Journal of Buzan Studies* 31:39-63. [in Japanese]

- ___ . 1987a. "The Heruka-maṇḍala in the Saṃpuṭodbhavantra." *Mikkyogaku Kenkyu: The Journal of Esoteric Buddhist Studies* 19:65-86. [In Japanese]
- ___ . 1987b. "The Vajrasattva-maṇḍala in the Saṃpuṭodbhavantra." *The Journal of Buddhist Iconography* 5: 1-14. [In Japanese]
- ___ . 1987c. "The Saṃpuṭodbhavantra III-iii, especially on the Nairātmyā-maṇḍala." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 36(1): 134-136. [In Japanese]
- ___ . 1988. "The Nairātmyā-maṇḍala in the Saṃpuṭodbhavantra." *Buzan Gakuho: Journal of Buzan Studies* 33: 75-92. [in Japanese]
- ___ . 1995. "On the inserted verses among the citation from the Prajñopāyaviniścaya-siddhi IV in the Saṃpuṭodbhavantra II-ii." *Studies on the Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, edited by the Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group and The Buddhist Tantric Texts Study Group*, Tokyo: Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University 1995:141-145.
- Petech, Luciano. 1984. *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1482). Second, thoroughly revised edition*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma vol. LIV).
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2009. "The Śaiva Age – The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period." Einoo Shingo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture 2009:41-349.
- Shāstri, Hara Prasad. 1917. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanscrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. I. Buddhist Manuscripts*. Calcutta: The Baptist Mission Press.
- Siklós, Bulcsu. 1996. *The Vajrabhairava Tantras: Tibetan and Mongolian Versions, English translation and annotations*. Tring: Institute of Buddhist Studies (Buddhica Britannica Series Continua VII).
- Skorupski, Tadeusz. 1996. "The Saṃpuṭa-tantra: Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions of Chapter One." *The Buddhist Forum: Volume IV*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1996:191-244.
- ___ . 2001. "The Saṃpuṭa-tantra: Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions of Chapter Two." *The Buddhist Forum: Volume VI*. Tring: The Institute of Buddhist Studies, 2001:223-269.
- Stein, M[árk] A[urél]. 1900. *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī: a Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr translated, with an introduction, commentary, & appendices*. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1979 reprint)
- Sugiki, Tsunehiko. 2002. "A Critical Study of the Vajraḍākamahātantrarāja (I) – Chapter 1 and 42." *Chizan Gakuho: Journal of Chizan Studies* 51:81-115.
- ___ . 2003. "A Critical Study of the Vajraḍākamahātantrarāja (II): Sacred Districts and Practices Concerned." *Chizan Gakuho: Journal of Chizan Studies* 52:53-106.
- Szántó, Péter-Dániel. 2008. "A Critical Edition of Catuṣpīṭhatantra I.3. with Three Sanskrit Commentaries." *Tantric Studies* 1:2-21.

- Tomabeche, Toru & Kano, Kazuo. 2008. "A Critical Edition and Translation of a Text Fragment from Abhayākaragupta's Āmnāyamañjarī: Göttingen, Cod.ms. sanscr.259b." *Tantric Studies* 1:22-44.
- Wujastyk, Dominik. 1985. *A handlist of the Sanskrit and Prakrit manuscripts in the Library of The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine. Vol. 1.* London: The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine.

This is a slightly revised version of my 2013 article. Since then many more identifications have come to light, especially parallels with the *Samāyoga*, a Sanskrit manuscript of which has been found in the meantime (this will be published by myself in the next year). I am especially grateful to Wiesiek Mical for his comments on a previous draft.