Editorial

The sixth issue of the Newsletter of the NGMCP, which it is my pleasure to present herewith, is an occasion to introduce new things and to look forward, but also, even more importantly, an occasion to look back. To begin with the new: with this issue we will be starting a changed schedule, appearing with increased regularity but at a slower pace. From now onwards a Newsletter will be released twice yearly: a Spring-Summer issue and an Autumn-Winter one, with a minimum page-count of 24 per issue.

New are also two of the contributors to this issue, both young scholars who already have remarkable experience in working with Sanskrit manuscripts. Kazuo Kano, an assistant professor at Koyasan University in Japan, joins forces with Kengo Harimoto, of the NGMCP in Hamburg, to present an early manuscript fragment of an otherwise unknown commentary on the Tattvasaṅgraha of Śaṅtaraśṭrīya. Identified some twenty years by Prof. Kazunobu Matsuda, the well-known ‘manuscript-hunter’, this fragment has never before been studied in detail or published. Here Harimoto and Kano edit and translate the first of two surviving folios, with material which they show to be important for our understanding of the history of the Sāṃkhya system. A similar study of the second folio is forthcoming in a future Newsletter issue.

The second contributor whom we welcome for the first time in this issue is P´eter-D´aniel Sz´ant´o, who holds MA degrees in Tibetology and Indology from ELTE University, Budapest, and is at present a doctoral student in Oxford University. Sz´ant´o presents a pioneering study of a group of texts which deal with initiation into the Catuspiṭha, a major, but virtually unstudied, tantric Buddhist system. Sz´ant´o is able to clarify the relationships between a number of texts, and sheds much light on their complex history.

We have also, as is customary, a book notice in this issue. Kengo Harimoto introduces a publication which edits and translates, for the first time, an early and influential work on hathayoga. The author, James Mallinson, has used a large number of manuscripts, including no less than six which were filmed in Nepal by the NGMPP; unusual is that to elucidate the practices taught in the text he has conducted extensive fieldwork with living hathayoga practitioners.

I am proud of the fine and ground-breaking contributions which appear in this issue; they would suffice to make it a memorable one. It is, in my view, a landmark also for other reasons. Firstly, it marks the half-way point of the projected duration of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Begun in 2002, the project is expected to be concluded in 2014. A retrospective of the first six years is planned for the next issue of the Newsletter. I do not take this as an occasion for self-congratulation; but I think it can be said that much has been done in the first six years of this project, and we are looking forward to increasing our activity in the coming years, and to doing even more towards uncovering, making available, and making scholarly use of the treasures of the manuscript collections of Nepal.

Finally—and I have saved what is for me personally the important as the last—I would like to note another anniversary: this Spring-Summer issue appears not long after the 70th birthday of Prof. Albrecht Wezler, the founder of the NGMCP and my predecessor as holder of the chair for classical Indology in Hamburg. Cause for congratulation and for celebration indeed! Without his foresight, the NGMCP would not have come into being, and as a result a very large number of important indological discoveries (some of the more recent of which have been introduced in the six issues to date of the Newsletter of the NGMCP) would not have been made. Sāṃkhya, which is central in the paper by Harimoto and Kano, has long been one of the main focuses of Prof. Wezler’s scholarship; and the breadth of interest, extending to countless little-known areas, that has been so noticeable throughout his long and distinguished career will, I hope, lead him to peruse also the other contributions to this issue with attention and pleasure. To our founder, and our teacher, most respectfully namah; to all our readers: Happy reading with the Newsletter of the NGMCP!

Harunaga Isaacson
Antiquarian Enquiries into the Initiation Manuals of the Catuspitha

Péter-Dániel Szántó

Introduction

The aim of this paper is not to deal extensively with the contents of the Catuspitha initiation manuals. That is far too difficult a task to be undertaken at the moment, due to the paucity of material on one hand, and the ‘barbaric’ language peculiar to these works on the other. My aim is merely to present a certain corpus of manuscripts, mostly from the microfilm archives of the NGMPP, and try to clear up some points of confusion regarding them.

The Initiation Manuals

The maṇḍalopāgikā is a genre of works in Tantric Buddhist (Vaiṣṇava/Maṭananyya/Maṭramahāyāna) literature prescribing in greater or lesser detail the modus operandi for initiating a would-be member of a Tantric cult.

In the core part of the ceremony described in these works, the officiant (ācārya) introduces the initiate (sīṣya) to the schematically arranged pantheon (maṇḍala) of the cult, provides the desired consecrations (abhiṣeka), subjects the initiate to pledges (saṃaya) and vows (saṃvara), and gives specific teachings (upadeśa) relating to the scriptural cycle that he is a master of. At the end of the ceremony the consecrated sīṣya becomes an initiate with the right—and indeed, duty (adhikāra)—to undertake meditative visualization of the central deity and his/her retinue (devatābhāvāna), to perform the rites taught by the cult, and to confer initiation himself, provided that he had taken the Consecration of the Officiant (acāryābhiṣeka). The rest of the prescriptions in these manuals relate to a large number of auxiliary rites which may or may not require active participation on the initiate/initiate’s part. They are, nevertheless, considered essential.

The need for such manuals is quite evident: scriptures rarely provide clearly formulated and unambiguous prescriptions for initiation (or anything else for that matter). A tantrā at best will usually provide the broad framework for the rite, leaving plenty of room for interpretation and detail.

Initiation in the Catuspithatantra

The Catuspithatantra (CAPṬA) is a typical example. The tantra teaches initiation explicitly only in IV.1, whilst saying next to nothing about essentials such as the number and the proper order of consecrations. The synoptical outline of CAPṬA IV.1. is as follows:

- vv. 1–8. teach the characteristics of a proper officiant (ācārya) and the way an initiate should regard him;
- vv. 9–14. give the initiate the rules of conduct (caryā) concerning his officiant;
- vv. 15–17. contain a terse list of the consecrations with very unusual names: mantrābhiṣeṣa, adaitābaliṣeṣa, and acāryābhiṣeka;¹
- vv. 18–19. describe the way the initiate should petition the officiant and the way the officiant should accept him;
- vv. 20–27. contain formulas to be recited by the initiate such as the refuge (saranyagamanu), the vow (saṃvara), and the triple purification (triśīṣuddhi);
- vv. 28–33. the blindfolded initiate is led in front of the maṇḍala (here called balbhāma), then the blindfold is removed and formulas are recited;
- vv. 34–45. the initiate is given the pledge-water (saṃyodaka) mixed with the five nectars (paṇcāmyāla), he then supplicates in front of the officiant who gives him the rules of conduct and some spiritual instructions;
- vv. 46–48. describe offering the fee (gurudaksinā):
- vv. 49–61. contain a mixture of topics describing amongst others the dangers the initiate will have to face if he breaks his allegiance and vows, further general ethical rules, and some verses glorifying the rite.

With this the chapter ends.

Unfortunately the only extant Sanskrit commentary we have to this passage is that of Bhavabhaṭṭa. The other ²

¹It is here that one of the most important commentators, Bhavabhāṭṭa, forces the text to include the series of consecrations up to the ‘Fourth’ (caṭūrthābhiṣeka).

²I wish to thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson and Iain Sinclair for their corrections, comments and constant support.

³Lit. ‘method (upāya) for the maṇḍala[-rite]’. The affix -kā should perhaps be understood as qualifying ‘anthology (sāṅhīṭa)’, ‘booklet (pustika)’, or ‘work (ravāna)’. Sometimes maṇḍalopāgikā is also seen in the Sanskrit titles preserved (or back-translated) in the Tibetan Canon. Perhaps this should not be readily dismissed as a corruption. According to Pāṇini 5.3.80 (BÖHIGHLIN 1887:259) this is a justified abbreviation in the view of the ‘Eastern’ grammarians. However, it should be noted that this rule applies to male names only (cf. 5.3.78 ibid).

⁴I use the male pronoun here in accordance with the usage of our texts. Although there is some evidence that women could be and were initiated as well, the references to initiand/s are overwhelming male. The singular also follows the practice of the manuals, although there can be a number of initiands in the rite. In this case the most prominent of them will act on behalf of the others in the more crucial phases. Since this person can dispose of wealth, I tend to think that the paradigmatic initiate the authors had in mind was a well-to-do male householder. Beyond the laity monks and yogins are also in the foreground. However, the identification of the agents taking part in the ritual is and was controversial. The investigation of this matter is beyond the scope of this paper.
two Indian exegetes, Kālayānavarman and Durjayacandra, comment only up to the end of the third chapter (pīṭha).\(^5\)

Despite our lacking his commentary to the fourth chapter, it is quite evident that Kālayānavarman must have thought that the actual teaching of the initiation rite is hinted at in CaPīṭa II.3.\(^6\) At this point in the commentary he makes a huge digression comprising more than one third of his work\(^7\) to give the additional details of the ceremony. On the other hand Bhavabhat and Durjayacandra understand this sub-chapter as teaching the meditative visualization of the deities that make up the mandala.

An Insertion in CaPīṭTa ms. A.

Kālayānavarman does not seem to have been the only one who thought that CaPīṭa II.3. did not provide enough information on the initiation rite. This was also the case with one of the scribes\(^8\) of one of the earliest CaPīṭa

\(^{\text{5From Smṛtiḥjñānakārtti’s colophon to his translation of Kālayānavarman’s work we are informed that the commentary (i.e. the CaPīṭa-Pa) was never completed. “These chapters of the commentary” to three pīṭhas were written by the practitioner Kālayānavarman who thought compassionately of sentient beings. It is said that when he was working on the introduction to this [last] pīṭha he met the dākini forbade [him to continue]. Or, it is said that just when he was about to begin the commentary [to the fourth pīṭha] he met the dākini/s face to face and thus achieving realization he disappeared. Hence [1], the Indian upādhyāya Smṛtiḥjñānakārtti, have begun writing a commentary to the fourth pīṭha of the CaPīṭa according to what I have heard from my consecrated masters.” Tōh. 1608. 43°–43° de dag gdan ’gnyan na sgrub pa po Dge ba’i go chos sems can la thugs yugs dgyungs nas mdzad de ŋar dag ’di (’di em.) ’di ni D) gling gahi’s (gling gahi’ em.) gling bahi’ D) nang na mkha’ ‘gro ma tsams kyi nas gnyan nyo zhes kyang zer! ti ka mdzad pa’ thad ka na (thad ka na em.) thad ka nas D) mkha’ ‘gro ma dang zhal nyil nas grub ste mi nang bard song nyo zhes kyang zer|| phyi nas rgya gar gyi mkhan po Smṛt ti dngny na ki rits bla ma’i byrgud (byrgud em.) gyugud D) las thos pa yi bzhin du de ltar gdan bzhin pa’i gling phyi ma’i ti ka ‘di brtsams so || Smṛtiḥjñānakārtti’s addenda to Kālayānavarman’s translation, i.e. his own commentary to the fourth pīṭha, is most likely to have been written directly in Tibetan.

Durjayacandra’s MīPāPa seems to be unfinished. He is certainly the latest commentator since he knows Yogābāra, the male buddha superimposed on the originally exclusively female mandala of the Čatuṣpīṭha.

That both works seem to be unfinished is a curious coincidence rather than a sign that originally there were only three chapters in the tantra. It is certain that Kālayānavarman knew the fourth chapter, since he cites a lemma from it.

\(^{\text{6Kālayānavarman’s introduction to CaPīṭa II.3.: evam(em evan em.) eva CaPīṭa} \text{hākṣatāspa yogināl mandalādikāśanām antareṇa u-} \text{ttamastādīnār na bhavatītī dhruvagrop bhārāja saṃsārapārāla} \text{kaṇḍam ityādānā mandalojañalām ārabhate. CaPīṭa 18°.}}\)

\(^{\text{7CaPīṭa 18°–32° out of 44 folios.}}\)

The first, up to fol. 37\(^{\text{°}}\), is the most legible and orderly. Thence another scribe took over who worked in an angular Newari script up to fol. 49\(^{\text{°}}\). It seems to me that from this point the first scribe took over again, however, there seems to be much more space between the aksaras and it is possible that this is the work of yet another scribe. From fol. 64\(^{\text{°}}\) the final hand takes over, writing in a hurried form that foreshadows the pravacanavārākṣara, with occasional variations.

\(^{\text{8There were at least three scribes working on this manuscript. The first, up to fol. 37°, is the most legible and orderly. Thence another scribe took over who worked in an angular Newari script up to fol. 49°. It seems to me that from this point the first scribe took over again, however, there seems to be much more space between the aksaras and it is possible that this is the work of yet another scribe. From fol. 64° the final hand takes over, writing in a hurried form that foreshadows the pravacanavārākṣara, with occasional variations.}}\)

\(^{\text{9Since nothing suggests that the foreign hands are making up lost portions in the text, I believe that all folios were penned in a short space of time, the scribes taking turns.}}\)

\(^{\text{9This ms. has been miscatalogued as a sûtra tantra and in lack of a better title, it has been named the Prokaraṇatantra, no doubt because of its colophons which usually end ‘its prakaraṇe . . . ’.}}\)

\(^{\text{10CaPīṭa, ms. A 17°–25°.}}\)

\(^{\text{11CaPīṭa, ms. A 26°–28°.}}\)

\(^{\text{12CaPīṭa, ms. A 30°–31°.}}\)
already present. If one reads ms. A. of the CAPITA in the absence of other witnesses, one would have great difficulty identifying the insertions, for they emulate the grammatical (or rather, ungrammatical) style of the tantra. Since stylistically these verses do not stand out clearly, they would not have prompted a copyist to suspect contamination.

The inserted passages in ms. A. match closely with material found in two works from among the satellite texts of the CAPITA. As I will argue below, the insertions are more likely to have served as the ancestor of both these works than the other way around.

**The Catuspīthamaṇḍalopāyikā of Cavyārvatipaḍā**

The *Catuspīthamaṇḍalopāyikā* (CAPIMA) survives in its entirety in a single, old, palm-leaf manuscript in Bhumijol characters, now kept at the National Archives (NAK 5-89/1 = NGMPP A 1298/6 and duplicate B 30/35).

The short colophon informs us that it is the work of Cavyārvatipaḍā.

This manuscript is not dated but it looks remarkably similar in measurement and script to hand to a manuscript in the National Archives of another work, the *Yogāmasāḍhānupāyikā* (YoSĀU, NAK 3-366 = NGMPP B 23/10) of Amitavajra, which is dated to the 13th regnal year of Vīgrahapāda. Since the subject matter is related (Yogāmba is later considered the deity of the cult propagated by the CAPITA) and the two ms. look significantly alike, it is probably not unreasonable to suspect that they formed part of the same collection. Thus we may surmise that this work was already in circulation by the last quarter of the eleventh century (or a little later if the dating is auktorial) together with the CAPIMA.

Pinning down the author, Cavyārvatipaḍā, is a bit difficult. He may or may not be the same person as Kṛṣṇa/Kānha, who bears this epithet in the colophon of the *Vasantatilaka* (VAṬI) and several other works. The earliest reference I am aware of for this author comes from the *Śaivaśāstra-nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* (SAUMLU) of Bhūvācārya, who mentions him twice.

The only surviving and incomplete ms. of the SAUMLU was

---

11This ms. is described in DBGP 1:140–142 with a useful list of the chapter colophons. Janardan Pandey mentions another fragment of this work in the National Archives (14 folios, desanāpuri) as no. 125, but it is not entirely certain what he means by this number. His report states that this additional ms. ends in the 15th chapter of the CAPIMA. Probably the manuscript is NAK 3-602 = NGMPP A 142/10, A 1275/7, but this remains to be confirmed.

12Fol. 30: *kṛṣṇa vam maṇḍalopāyikā* Cavyārvatipāḍaśc, itn. This folio is misread. The inserted passages in ms. A. match closely with material found in two works from among the satellite texts of the CAPITA. As I will argue below, the insertions are more likely to have served as the ancestor of both these works than the other way around.

13For the Tibetan translation of this work see Tōh. 1465. 10* dbu pa blo ldan* dāsa ms. pa sgrub thabs slob don chen po brtal zhugs sspod pa’i shal snga nas mdzad pa r dzogs so; Bcom ldn ’das dāsa dbe mchog ’khor lori dikyi ’khor gyi cho ga (*Bhagavaccharakirasamvaranamalandalavidihi)*. Tōh. 1464. 92* bcom ldn* ’das dāsa dbe mchog ’khor lori dikyi ’khor gyi cho ga slob don chen po brtal zhugs sspod pa ng po pas mdzad pa r dzogs so; Tshigs su bcad pa lnga pa (*Paincagāthā)*, Tōh. 2222. 138* brtal zhugs sspod pa’i slob don chen po nag po nas mdzad pa’i tshigs su bcad pa bya pa r dzogs so; Sdom pa bshad pa (*Samvaravākyākya*), Tōh. 1460. 10* slob don chen po brtal zhugs kyi sspod la žangs pa ng po pas mdzad pa r dzogs so. On the latter see work below.

14The title is misread and the work is incorrectly catalogued as *Śaivaśāstra-nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* in MatsuMAni 1965:160. This misreading is slightly corrected by PEtEch 1984:44 to *Śaivaśāstramāṇḍalopāyikā* (Note that Petech misreads the catalogue number: 454 instead of 450). The date is rather NS 174 than MaTsumAni’s NS 178 and PEtEch’s NS 176. The folios of the ms. are shuffled at present. It should be kept in mind that when I quote from this codex below, I am referring to the restored pagination and my provisional verse numbering. The Tibetan ‘translation’ is canonical (Tōh. 1538.). It is unsigned and of such a low quality that I am inclined to believe that it is no more than a rough first attempt which somehow found its way into the Canon.

15His name was variously reconstructed as *Bhavaṇatī (Bhau ba blo idan)*, *Madhyavetākumāti (Dbus pa blo idan)*, *Ariṣṭādhikatā (Dbus pa blo idan)* or simply Dhīmaṇ – no doubt because of an attribute in the closing verse: *śrīnāta ratnakaravastavavasātsvātārthahetanā kṛṣṭeyam maṇḍalopāyikā Bhūvācārya dhīmatā* [= v. 70].

16This is most likely Vīgrahapāda III who ruled during the third quarter of the eleventh century and possibly a decade further. His copper plate grants (the Āṃgāchi grant from his 12th regnal year and the Bangāon plate from his 17th regnal year) show similar palaeographical features with these manuscripts. See *Epigrapha*.

---
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copied in NS 174 = 1054 CE. The author could not have been much earlier than this date since he also mentions Dārikāpāda22 who is credited with a work related to the Kālacakra.23

Some further indirect evidence may be gathered from the CAPIPA. In his commentary to CAPITA 1.2.30, Kālayānavarman directs the reader to the/a Maṇḍalopāyika/maṇḍalopāyikā for the visualizing meditation of Vājasattva.24 Such an instruction is indeed to be found in the CAPIMAU,25 but of course we may not state with certainty that he is referring to either Caryāvatāpāda’s CAPIMAU or some other work with the same title or designation, such as that of Āryadeva’s, dealt with in the next section of this paper. For the time being I will assume that he does. Thus, since the ms. of the CAPIPA is dated 1012 CE, all circumstantial evidence seems to point to the late tenth/early eleventh century as the terminus ante quem for this author.

In order to ascertain Caryāvatāpāda’s authorship, we need to make a longer digression and deal with the Tibetan carrier of his work. The canonical Tibetan translation26 bears the reconstructed title ‘Sricaturūpīṭhatantrarājaśya maṇḍalopāyikā vidhipañḍī[sic] sārasamuccaya rāma from Rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal Gdan bzhī pa zhes bya ba’sikyil ’khor gsrub pa ’i thabs ’di ni dpal Spryog pa ’i brtul zhugs zhabs kyi mdzad pa’i | de ltar Rdlo rje gdan bzhī’i sikyil ’khor cho ga Snying po mdo r

22Uktam śrīDārikāpāda adviṣṭhaṁ sa lokaṁ[= v. 192a] SaUMaU 5’; Indrabhūṭaḥ kramena Saṅcāre Dārikeya[= v. 211a] SaUMaU 18’–18’; līkātā Dārikānā[= v. 323b] SaUMaU 26’.

23Tōh. 1355. Rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal Dus kyi ’khor lo’i dbang gi rab tu byed pa’i ’grel pa (‘Sricākākramatrantraśākaprakāryāvarti’). Dārikāpāda (if the two authors are one and the same person) thus probably does not predate the early eleventh century.

There are references to several other siddhas and scriptures in this text which might help establish a relative chronology. Authors named include Jālandhāraṇāpita, Kacchāpāti, and Indrabhūti. Scriptures mentioned include the Saṃcāra (i.e. the Yoginsaṃcāra), the Herukabhūṣyā, ‘saṃajjatantras’ [sic. for sāmājya] (i.e. scriptures related to the Guhyasamāja), the Vajrānātha, and the Sarvajuddha (i.e. the Sarvajuddhasaṃjñapādākānajñalāsaṃcāra). With the exception of the Yoginsaṃcāra this list of tantras looks quite ancient, so it is possible that the argument related to Dārikāpāda should be overruled with the hypothesis that there were two Dārikāpādas (or, even more likely, someone adopted his name to write a Kālacakra work).

24Aṣam upadesāḥ maṇḍalopāyikopaktaśravānena kṛta-vajrasattvatvagah vajrāsattvam ahāṃ pathet vajrāsattvam ‘ham iti kaṭhaṁkāra bhāvasyed ity arthāḥ CAPIPA, 9’–10’.

25Candraśālayalamaṇḍūkṣetram samdžiṣītāṁ sa śrīsaṃśajñapabhairavam[= v. 2.14.] dvābhur-yaṁ saṅkṣiptyṣyam karavibhābhābhābhiṣkaraṇam[= v. 2.15.] saṅkṣiptaḥ prajñāya pūrṇasya ghanvāmaṇavoṣyasya [sic. for pāṣyasya] rāmiṣṇāmānaṁ anākṣa ca vajrasattvatvam ahāṃ pathet[= v. 2.16.] CAPIMAU 2’.

26Tōh. 1613. = Öta. 2484. Translated by Gayadharo (or Gaṅgādhara?) and ‘Gsos Kung pa lhás bstan, a duo otherwise responsible for translating a number of important works related to the CAPITA (Tōh. 1607. = Öta. 2478, the longest known commentary to the tantra, i.e. the CAPIN of Bhavabhāttā; Tōh. 1616. = Öta. 2487, a sādhana by the same author; Tōh. 1620. = Öta. 2492, an auxiliary work on the ‘realities’ by Jetārī).

27Tōh. 1613. 113.’

28de la dngos po tsaṅ bsdus pa’i snying po mdo brsangs zhes bya ba stet Tōh. 1613. 137’ corresponding to tasya sāgrahavāraṇavāṇī sārasamuccayanā[= v. 28.28.] CAPIMAU 30’.

29sloŋ zhon pa bya brtul zhugs zhabs kyi mdzad pa’i dpal Gdan bzhī pa zhes bya ba’i sikyil ’khor gsrub pa ga’i Snying po mdo brsangs pa zhes bya ba rdzogs so Tōh. 1613. 137’.

30Born in Ngam ring in Gtsang in 1376/8 and died in 1450/1. Also known as ‘Jigs med grags pa, and Chos kyi rgyal mtshan. Although by far the most prolific Tibetan author ever (ET numbers 137 volumes), he seems to have fallen in relative obscurity. Later dge leg pa authorities confuse him with Jo nang Phyogs las rnam rgyal, and classify him as an adherent to the controversial, even persecuted, gzhon stong doctrine. Cf. Smith 2001:192.

31The title page has: Gdan bzhī’i sikyil chos ’Phags lugs bzhugs So. The work begins unceremoniously with the following: da ni rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal Gdan bzhī pa zhes bya ba’i sikyil ’khor gsrub pa ga’i Snying po mdo brsangs pa la . . . The rest is Caryāvatāpāda’s work.

bsaqs zhes pa 'di'i rgya dpe Ba'i yul nas btsal te dpal 'Brug pa rin po che Bka' rgyud phrin las shing rta mchog gi zhub nas] Mdo kham su nged la lta rtags byed dgos sbe cing rten dang bcas stsal ba las lo shas brel g.yeng gis las pa slar mi zad pa'i lor 'gyur rnying dang bstan nas zhus dag byigs par bal dper ma dag pa mang yang 'gyur rnying du chad pa 'ya' re 'dag pa bstan dzod bcas pa'i nyin byed kyi sug las so.\(^{33}\)

This means to accomplish the manḍala-initiation is the work of the venerable Cāryādēva. Now, the Sanskrit manuscript of this manḍala-rite of the Catusṇīṭha called the ‘Condensed Essence’ was obtained from Nepal. ‘Brug pa rin po che Bka’ rgyud phrin las shing rta mchog\(^ {34}\) permitted that it should be seen and examined by me, and [thus] sent it to Mdo Kham along with a support (rten).\(^ {35}\) Due to [my] distracting engagements, for a few years it remained neglected. Then, in the year of Inexhaustibility I have compared it with the old translation (‘gyur rnying). As far as re-editing (zhus dag) goes, although the Nepalese manuscript has many corruptions (ma dag pa), the old translation contained some lacunae (chad pa). These I saw quite necessary to restore. [I also made] some corrections (bcas pa). [All] this was well achieved in the year of the Male-Fire-Hound [= 1766 CE] in Thub bstan chos ‘khor [through] the work of Si tu Bstan pa’i nyin ‘byed.\(^ {36}\)

It is interesting to note that Si tu pa did not make an issue out of this restoration, although I find it highly improbable that he was not aware of Āryadeva’s putative authorship in the Tibetan opinion.

The parallels for the inserted passages in CAPIṬA ms. A. can be found in the CAPIṬA in the following locations:

ins. 1 CAPIṬA ms. A. 17°–25° = CAPIṬA 3°–11° [= vv. 4.2–10.23]
ins. 3 CAPIṬA ms. A. 30°–31° = CAPIṬA 18°–20° [= vv. 19.1–33]

The most striking difference between the two versions is that the name of Yogāmbāra is missing from CAPIṬA ms. A whereas the CAPIṬA mentions him twice. Thus (the passages are given here in diplomatic transcription):

\[
\begin{align*}
tato va\mathclose{\textit{jrasa}}\mathclose{\textit{tama}}\mathclose{\textit{nay}} & = \text{deha-cārya kṛṭasyātakam} | \text{(Ms. A 20°)} \\
tato yogāmbāraya\mathclose{\textit{ya}} & = \text{deha-cārya kṛṭam ātakam} | \text{(CAPIṬA 6°)} \\
& \quad \text{“Then the officiant should visualize his own body as \ldots”}
\end{align*}
\]

&

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{asya buddha-mahāvañjra dhīya-paṇya nāḍhyācetasā} & = \text{(Ms. A 21°)} \\
\text{asya yo-гаmba-rī-buddhaḥ dhīya-paṇya madhyācetasā} & = \text{(CAPIṬA 7°)} \\
& \quad \text{“He should meditate on this \ldots with an equipoised mind.”}
\end{align*}
\]

It is quite evident that the text has been tampered with. The CAPIṬA does not mention Yogāmbāra at all, and nor do the two earlier commentators, Bhavabhāṭṭa and Kalyāṇavarmā. It is only in Durjayacandra’s commentary that we find Yogāmbāra as the main deity of the cult, but even this commentator does not find the name of the deity in the text.

On the other hand it is quite natural that if someone wanted to superimpose Yogāmbāra, he would change not the text of the tantra, but rather that of the manḍalopāyikā. Many ācāras following and propagating the cult might never have read the basic text. They simply officiated at the rituals and gave the relevant teachings according to the orderly arranged manuals.

The Catusṇīṭhamanḍalopāyikā of Āryadeva

The material treated above can be met with in a hitherto unidentified fragment in ms. NAK 5-37 [= NGMPP A 138/10]. This paper ms. of 118 folios containing the CAPIṬA and two fragments, was once part of a composite codex together with NAK 5-38 [= NGMPP B 112/4], which contains in its present state an incomplete CAPIṬA.\(^ {37}\) The two fragments of the NAK 5-38 are: a) 72°–73° a seemingly incomplete word by word commentary to the

\(^{34}\) This is ‘Brug chen VII. 1718–1766, who, although his junior, is listed as Si tu pa’o’s teacher.
\(^{35}\) This is most likely a reference to some accompanying gift, such as a statue.
\(^{36}\) This monastery in Derge was Si tu’s main seat.
beginning of the tantra. The listing of pratikas and the terse commentary suggests that it was used as a teaching aid for exposing the tantra; and b) a fragment in the same linguistic style as the tantra discussing elements related to the initiation rite and other material.

Fragment b) begins abruptly in the middle of a pada. We may surmise from this that the scribe of the composite codex had only a fragmentary manuscript at his disposal. The text is very corrupt.

There are several internal colophons (given here in diplomatic transcription):

1. iti pūrvasvābodhanapāṭalā samāptah (fol. 4*/75*)
2. iti bhāmiparigrāha dviṭīya pāṭalā samāptah (fol. 6*/77*)
3. iti maṇḍalapāṭalas tṛṭiyāḥ (fol. 30*/101*) - iti paścapaśicakramanirdeśah samāptah (fol. 37*/108*)
4. iti caturthapāṭalā samāptah (fol. 40*/111*) - iti praṇāvajaya-vatārānapoṣaḥ samāptah (fol. 47*/118*)

The text ends on the same page, but there are some additional verses before the closing formula ye dharmā, etc. This second part of the manuscript is not dated.

Up to the third chapter, i.e. what is described here as the maṇḍalapāṭalā is by and large the same text as the CAPIMAU. Thus, the pūrvasvābodhanapāṭalā corresponds to CAPIMAU 2.3b, second word (this is where the fragment starts) to the end of chapter 3; the second section of the fragment, i.e. the bhāmiparigrāha, corresponds to CAPIMAU ch. 4. The rest of the CAPIMAU is closely parallel to the fragment’s third section, that of the maṇḍalā: up to first half of ch. 8 in the CAPIMAU the text is essentially the same; from here, up to ch. 16 in the CAPIMAU the subject matter is similar, but the text is arranged differently; the parallel resumes with ch. 16 of the CAPIMAU and from there on the two texts run closely parallel to each other once again.

What follows in the present fragment (i.e. the ‘fourth pāṭalā’) is actually the text which in the ‘Buddhist Bīja’

138/10 [first 71 folios]; MBB-I-42 for an unidentified short commentary to the beginning of the tantra and the fragment treated above (+ NAK 5-37 [= NGMPP A 138/10] 72°–73° and 73° up to the end of the ms. respectively), and MBB-I-43 for the apograph of CAPIMAU ms. N (NAK 5-38 [NGMPP B 112/4]). I am extremely grateful to Iain Sinclair (Hamburg) and Daniel Stender (Bonn) for their help in procuring a copy of MBB-I-42.

The final section has been incorrectly described as an independent work, the “Prājñāpāramitāvṛtavagga” in DBGP1:206–207. The editor is wrong in stating that the tantra is on folios 1–110. As I have shown above, the CAPITa ends in fact on fol. 71.

[38]The colophon to the first part, i.e. the end of the CAPITa, has NS 265 = 1145 CE, which is obviously too early for this paper ms. and must be the date of a direct or indirect ancestor.

40The full title is: Dpald gdan bzhis pa’i bshad pa’i rygud kyi rgyal po snags kyi cha = Tōh. no. 429. Tr. by Gayadhara and Shākya ye shes. The other auxiliary tantra, which already has Yogābharā as its major figure, is the *Caturthaparājasaṅgaratvāra* (Dpald gdan bzhis pa’i mān par bshad pa’i rygud kyi rgyal po) = Tōh. no. 430. Tr. by Smṛtiśīkānākirti and revised by Bu ston. The present reconstruction of the Sanskrit title is evidently a back-translation. I propose it should read -vyākhyatatvāra instead of -viśkhyatatvāra. In Bu ston’s long recension of the Rgyud sde spis’s rnam par bzhag po (The Complete Works of Bu-ston, Part 15 (Ba). Satapitaka Series, International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi, 1969, p. 462.) this latter tantra is called Rnal ‘byor ma thams cad gsang ba (perhaps to be reconstructed as *Sarvanayakaguhya/ka*).

41The text corresponds to Tōh. 429. 231b6–244b6. The Tibetan text ends on 260a2.

42The lemmata in this commentary match the verses on fol. 30*/101* line 1–32*/103* line 1 in NAK 5-37 (Tōh. 429. 23116–233a4 in the translation in the translation).

43Note that it is miscatalogued as Catuspithamanḍalopāyikā on the NGMPP library card. The correct number of folios is 13, and not 12. The ms. is shuffling. The sequence of the microfilm frames is: 1°, 12°, 12°, 11°, 11°, 10°, 9°, 9°, 8°, 7°, 7°, 6°, 6° bis, 6°, 4°, 4°, 3°, 3°, 3°, 2°, 2°, 1°, 1°. The numbering, although old, seems to be wrong, I find that one folio is misplaced.

44The apograph is also miscatalogued as Catuspithamanḍalopāyikā. The fact that it is an apograph of NAK 1-1679 2/24 can be easily determined: the scribe wrote only the sūtra for each missing aśuṣu and the colophon states that the copy was made from an old Newari ms. (*sty añalekhaputat?*) prācānusvāravārakasūkhāti prācānātadapatrapustakād uddhiṭha 1987 vaikramāde lakṣitaṃ idam pustakam).

45caturthapāṭalae conj.; caturthapāṭalā Ms.

46yan mayā] conj.; padmayā Ms.
Glorious [Ārya]devapāda composed the nectar of immortality that is the maṇḍalopāyikā, having extracted it from that ocean of wisdom, the great tantra in Four Chapters. Through the grace of my master (guru) I have come to know an agreeable exposition of the ‘raising of spells’ [contained] in the fourth chapter of that [work]. I, the blind one (vicaksuḥ) [i.e. unable to understand it myself], after having heard the speech of my mentor (kalyaṇasakhi = kalyaṇamitra), shall proceed to [have it written down], in order to make my mind constantly firm.

I am not quite sure that I have interpreted every verse correctly. The essentials should suffice for the time being. What the author says is that: a) there was a maṇḍalopāyikā composed by [Ārya]deva; b) it is based on the CAPTA; c) it has at least four chapters; d) the fourth chapter partially deals with the extraction (lit. ‘raising’) of encoded mantras. This information tallies with the colophon we find in fragment b) of the second part of NAK 5-38 (but it does not agree with the chapter colophons in that portion). The subject here is Śridevapāda for purely metrical reasons becomes clear later on in the work when the mythical history of the tantra is given. Unfortunately this passage is marred by physical damage to the manuscript:

\[\text{atraiva ca pada + + + + + + + + + + + +} \\
\text{aad oṣṭādaśalaksāṁ śrīCaturśpīthamahātantrarājām bhagavatā śrīVajrānandaśāśvādana + +} \\
\text{+ + (2')nikāye}^{47} \text{bhāṣṭan}^{\text{am}} \text{tasmāḥ cīrVajrānāpiṇā śaṃśṛtya dvādaśāśavāsikām tantrarājām śrīmadOḍīyāne śītkotiyogayoginībhīḥ} | \text{prabodhya ta + + + +} \text{tam} \text{tasmād āpi śrīNāgārjunabhāṭṭarākena tatrā gatvā mahāgūptena śrūtvā dvādaśāśatīkamulatantraṃ}^{48} \text{loke pracāritam} \text{| etac cchruva Āryadevapādename tantrarājasya}^{49} \text{maṇḍalopāyikāṃ kṛtya laksyā caturthena pāṭalena mantrasya viniyaśādi kṛtāṃ iti saṃbandha uktāḥ} \text{| (CAPIMAUMAPA 1°−2°).}^{50}

And in the same [verse] . . . . . . the great king of tantras, the glorious Four Chapters in 180,000 [verses], which was uttered by the Lord, the Bearer of Vājra, in the congregation of . . . . . . gods] of a pure abode. Then Vajrapāni, having condensed [the long tantra] into the king of tantras in 12,000 [verses] in the glorious [land of] Odīyāna, . . . (prabodhya?) . . . by 80 crores of yogins and yoginis. From that [12,000 verse version], the glorious lord Nāgārjuna disseminated in the world the basic tantra in 1,200 verses after having gone there [i.e. to Odīyāna] and after having heard [the 12,000 verse version] in great secret (mahāgūptena!). Having heard this [1,200 verse tantra], the venerable Āryadeva composed a maṇḍalopāyikā for this king of tantras, and in the fourth chapter of that he taught (kṛtam?) [procedures relating] to mantras such as their positioning [on the body]. With this the ‘connection’ (saṃbandha) is explained.

Conclusions

The CAPTA in its original form lacked detailed injunctions for the maṇḍala initiation ritual. For this reason, an author, emulating the un-grammatical style of the tantra, started to write supplementary verses which found their way into one ms. transmission of the basic text (witnessed here by ms. A). These verses form a kind of proto-maṇḍalopāyikā, one that still does not recognize Yogāmbara as the main deity of the cult.

At some point, most likely towards the end of the tenth century, a full maṇḍalopāyikā emerges. It is not only an initiation manual, but a wide-ranging anthology of many kinds of practices. This version incorporates the verses of the proto-maṇḍalopāyikā and tweaks the text to state that Yogāmbara is the presiding deity of the cult. There is also an effort to appropriate this ‘new Catuspītha’ into the *Ārya exegetical school of the Guhyasamāja. By the twelfth century the text is thought to have been authored by Āryadeva.

The CAPIMAUMAPA of Cārvāraptipāda is most likely to have been a separate and incomplete version of an extract from the work of Āryadeva, the one that deals strictly with the maṇḍala-initiation (i.e. what originally were but three chapters of the work). New chapter colophons are given to the text, making it consist of 27 chapters. This is not a unique occurrence. Another work attributed to Cārvāraptipāda has also been identified in this article as part of the SAUMAMA of Bhāvacārya.

---

47+ + + nikāye] Ms. pc., nikāyo Ms. ac.
48mūlantāntaraṁ em.; mūlantāntaram Ms.
49tantrarājasya conj.; tantr+ + ()jasya Ms.

50It has been suggested by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson that the portion missing here might have read suddhāvāsikadevanikāye or suddhāvāsakājakadevanikāye. This conjecture is substantiated by CAPTA I.1.1c suddhāvāsikājasthānam and the commentary to that verse by Bhavabhūta (CAPIN Kaiser ms. 1°): suddhāvāsikājasthānam tā—suddhāvāsikā devās, tān avati suddhāvāsikābhāv, sūmeruḥ, ta- tra sthānam sthitārhas yaṣya sa tathā. sūmerupūṣṭe kājāravastha ity arthah. The subject here is bhagavān, the speaker of the tantra (the neuter stands for masculine). It is also possible that the reading was suddhāvāsikadevanikāye.
The CAPIMAU is translated into Tibetan with the not unfounded attribution to Āryadeva. This Tibetan conviction stretches on for at least six centuries. In the meantime the Cārvāṇatipāda CAPIMAU continues to circulate in Nepal as an independent work. A copy is retrieved from there in the 18th century and re-translated by the Tibetan scholar Si tu pa chen. He does not change the author in the edition of the Canon he supervised.

What remained of Āryadeva’s work after extracting the first three chapters and circulating it as an independent work, that is, chapter four and onwards, is separately translated into Tibetan as the *Mantrāmaṇḍalopāya, one of the two auxiliary tantras to the CAPITa. However, the Tibetan *Mantrāmāṇḍa is twice the size of the surviving Āryadeva recension. The single surviving ms. of this work seems to end halfway through the text.

It is quite evident that the Tibetan translators encountered the Catuspīthā tradition at a stage where it was still (or, yet again?) quite malleable.
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