

JIASBS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies



Volume 36/37 2013/2014 (2015)

The *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (ISSN 0193-600XX) is the organ of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Inc. As a peer-reviewed journal, it welcomes scholarly contributions pertaining to all facets of Buddhist Studies. *JIABS* is published yearly.

The *JIABS* is now available online in open access at <http://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/jiabs>. Articles become available online for free 24 months after their appearance in print. Current articles are not accessible online. Subscribers can choose between receiving new issues in print or as PDF.

Manuscripts should preferably be submitted as e-mail attachments to: editors@iabsinfo.net as one single file, complete with footnotes and references, in two different formats: in PDF-format, and in Rich-Text-Format (RTF) or Open-Document-Format (created e.g. by Open Office).

Address subscription orders and dues, changes of address, and business correspondence (including advertising orders) to:

Dr. Danielle Feller,
IABS Assistant-Treasurer, IABS
Department of Slavic and South Asian
Studies (SLAS)
Anthropole
University of Lausanne
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
E-mail: iabs.treasurer@unil.ch
Web: <http://www.iabsinfo.net>

Subscriptions to *JIABS* are USD 65 per year for individuals and USD 105 per year for libraries and other institutions. For informations on membership in IABS, see back cover.

EDITORIAL BOARD

KELLNER Birgit
STRAUCH Ingo
Joint Editors

BUSWELL Robert
CHEN Jinhua
COLLINS Steven
COX Collett
GÓMEZ Luis O.
HARRISON Paul
VON HINÜBER Oskar
JACKSON Roger
JAINI Padmanabh S.
KATSURA Shōryū
KUO Li-ying
LOPEZ, Jr. Donald S.
MACDONALD Alexander
SCHERRER-SCHAUB Cristina
SEYFORT RUEGG David
SHARF Robert
STEINKELLNER Ernst
TILLEMANS Tom

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

Font: "Gandhari Unicode"
designed by Andrew Glass
(<http://andrewglass.org/fonts.php>)

© Copyright 2015 by the
International Association of
Buddhist Studies, Inc.

Print: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne
GesmbH, A-3580 Horn

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 36/37 2013/2014 (2015)

BRANDON DOTSON

*The Remains of the Dharma: Editing, Rejecting, and
Replacing the Buddha's Words in Officially Commissioned
Sūtras from Dunhuang, 820s to 840s* 5

SEONG-UK KIM

*The Zen Theory of Language: Linji Yixuan's Teaching of
"Three Statements, Three Mysteries, and Three Essentials"
(sanju sanxuan sanyao 三句三玄三要)* 69

New Approaches to Studying the Materiality of Buddhist Manuscripts

ORNA ALMOGI, EMANUEL KINDZORRA, OLIVER HAHN, IRA RABIN

*Inks, Pigments, Paper: In Quest of Unveiling the History of
the Production of a Tibetan Buddhist Manuscript Collection
from the Tibetan-Nepalese Borderlands* 93

MARTIN DELHEY, EMANUEL KINDZORRA, OLIVER HAHN, IRA RABIN

*Material Analysis of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Manuscripts
Preserved in Nepal* 119

ORNA ALMOGI, MARTIN DELHEY, CLAIRE MACDONALD,
BORYANA POUVKOVA

*Recovering Lost Writing and Beyond: Multispectral Imaging
for Text-related and Codicological Studies of Tibetan
Paper and Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Manuscripts* 153

 CONFERENCE

Authors and Editors in the Literary Traditions of Asian Buddhism

Guest editors

 CATHY CANTWELL, JOWITA KRAMER, ROBERT MAYER,
 AND STEFANO ZACCHETTI

CATHY CANTWELL AND ROBERT MAYER

Authors and Editors in the Literary Traditions of Asian Buddhism 195

JONATHAN A. SILK

Establishing/Interpreting/Translating: Is It Just That Easy? . . . 205

ROBERT MAYER

*gTer ston and Tradent: Innovation and Conservation in
 Tibetan Treasure Literature* 227

CATHY CANTWELL

*Different Kinds of Composition/Compilation Within the
 Dudjom Revelatory Tradition* 243

JOWITA KRAMER

*Innovation and the Role of Intertextuality in the Pañca-
 skandhaka and Related Yogācāra Works.* 281

OSKAR VON HINÜBER

*Building the Theravāda Commentaries: Buddhaghosa and
 Dhammapāla as Authors, Compilers, Redactors, Editors and
 Critics* 353

L. S. COUSINS †

The Case of the Abhidhamma Commentary 389

SARAH SHAW

*In What Way is There a Saṅghavacana? Finding the
 Narrator, Author and Editor in Pāli Texts* 423

MARTA SERNESI

*The Collected Sayings of the Master: On Authorship,
 Author-function, and Authority* 459

MARTIN SEEGER

*'The (Dis)appearance of an Author: ' Some Observations
and Reflections on Authorship in Modern Thai Buddhism* 499

PÉTER-DÁNIEL SZÁNTÓ

*Early Works and Persons Related to the So-called
Jñānapāda School* 537

ULRICH PAGEL (GENERAL SECRETARY, IABS)

*Report of the XVIth Congress of the International Association
of Buddhist Studies.* 563

Notes on the contributors 571

Early Works and Persons Related to the So-called Jñānapāda School

Péter-Dániel Szántó¹

One of the gravest problems the study of late Indian Buddhism faces is the lack of reliable dates. Without at least a relative chronology of texts and authors, charting developments and innovations becomes quite impossible. Applying our efforts to scriptures is, with a few honourable exceptions, not the best place to start, for scriptures naturally try to present themselves as timeless revelation. It is much better to direct the greater part of our attention to exegesis and exegeses first: references, quotations, and occasional prosopographical data must be collected and cross-referenced with the utmost diligence and studied with a critical eye. The aim of this paper is to elucidate some details about what may be seen as a milestone in the development of tantric Buddhism, the life, career, and works of the author known as Jñānapāda (“the Great Man of the [Śrī]jñāna [ordination lineage]”), and some important people around him.

As it is well known, at least to Tibetanists and students of tantric Buddhism, the *Guhyasamājatantra* had two exegetical schools, the so-called Ārya school and the so-called Jñānapāda school, named after the founder of each (Ārya here stands for deuterio-Nāgārjuna). While the influence of the latter is widely acknowledged, during the Tibetan career of the *Guhyasamājatantra* and related teachings, it was the Ārya school that became more prominent. The causes for this (and the question of just how these two exegetical schools were recognized, if at all, in the early Indian tradition) are beyond the scope of the present paper. The two schools are sometimes thought of as if they had been the only ones. This, in my view, is at the

¹ I wish to thank the editors of this volume for their kind suggestions, as well as Mr. Iain Sinclair for his valuable critical comments.

very best imprecise and perhaps even misguided. There is plenty of evidence to show that there were other exegetical schools, but what indeed did happen is that already in India they were somehow eclipsed by the aforementioned two. For a rather long time, and this view is still held in some quarters, it was thought that as far as Sanskrit originals are concerned, we have sources only from the Ārya school and nothing from the Jñānapāda school. This is fortunately not true anymore. The last couple of decades witnessed the discovery of several such Sanskrit sources and some of these will be announced for the first time here. Besides listing and discussing the surviving Sanskrit materials for the study of the Jñānapāda school, I also wish to elucidate the identity, dates, and geographical location of some of the persons active in this intellectual tradition, including the founder himself.

Jñānapāda's dates – a slight revision

Jñānapāda (sometimes referred to as *Buddhajñānapāda or *Buddhaśrījñāna) is usually viewed as a contemporary of the Pāla emperor Dharmapāla and therefore thought of to have flourished in the late eighth century. The main reasons for this have already been listed elsewhere (e.g. Tomabechi 2008), here I cannot do anything but to review them.

On the strength of his so-called “travel account” (Davidson 2002: 309–316, more on which below), we know that Jñānapāda was a student of the famous *Prajñāpāramitā* scholar Haribhadra. This author finished his magnum opus, the *Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka*, stating that he wrote in a monastery called Trikaṭuka under Dharmapāla's patronage (Sanderson 2009: 90). Moreover, the Tibetan historian Tāranātha, perhaps based on Indic sources, claims that Jñānapāda was something akin to a royal chaplain to Dharmapāla (Sanderson 2009: 93–94).

However, Jñānapāda's activity probably stretched beyond this, into the rule of Dharmapāla's son and heir, Devapāla. This piece of information is to my knowledge overlooked, although it comes from a source that is well known and studied, namely the

**Bodhipathapradīpapañjikā* of *Atīśa² *Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (Tōh. 3948, 288b–289a). In the passage discussing tantric practice, the author notes:

'o na yo byad kyis phoñs śiñ dbul po dag gis ji ltar bya že na / bka' sgrub la sogs zes pa'o // 'dir skye bo 'byor ba can dag gis ni rgyal srid rin po che bdun la sogs pa tha na bdag ñid kyi lus kyañ dbul bar bya ste / ji ltar slob dpon Sañs rgyas ye śes žabs la rgyal po De ba pā las rgyal srid thams cad phul ba'i rjes su btsun mo dañ rañ ñid kyañ phul nas phyis rgyal po dañ btsun mo gñis gser de gñis dañ mñam pas bslus pa lta bu'o //

In Sherburne's translation (1983: 172) this is rendered as follows:

But then, what should those who are poor and bereft of worldly goods do? They should give “**Obedience to his word.**” For even men of means must [still] offer their own bodies over and above the Seven Precious Things of Royalty. For example, King Devapāla, after offering his entire kingdom to Ācārya Buddhajñānapāda, offered his queen and himself also. And later he enticed him, as it were, with gold equal [in weight] to both himself and the queen.

I disagree with what is the last sentence in the English translation, which I take to mean something more along the lines of: “And [immediately] later he ransomed the king [i.e. himself] and the queen with gold equalling twice [their value/weight].” Presenting oneself and one's wife (or another woman) to the master bestowing initiation and then paying a ransom for their release is a not uncommon motif in the context of paying the fee for initiation. It occurs for example in the *Vajramañḍālaṃkāra*³ and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*⁴ (this is perhaps the

² This form is generally the best known, although Helmut Eimer tried to argue that we should read Atīśa. Recently, Prof. Harunaga Isaacson suggested that the name might be *Adhīśa, a common enough Indic name and a perfect match for the Tibetan Jo bo rje. Most scholars take the name to be self-evident and they do not use an asterisk before it, in spite of the fact that it is not attested anywhere in Indic sources.

³ Tōh. 490, 81b: / rtsa ba me tog 'bras bu sogs // bu mo legs par brgyan byas dañ // 'dod pa'i chuñ ma phul byas nas // slar yañ rin gyis bslu bar bya /

⁴ Ms IÉI Lévi 48, fol. 21r: *kanyāṃ svalaṃkṛtāṃ kṛtvā bhāryāṃ cāpi priyāṃ tathā / dattvā tu mokṣayen mūlyair buddhabodhyagradakṣiṇāṃ //*; Tōh.

same passage reworked, but the direction of borrowing is unclear for the time being).

To return to the significance of the passage to the present discussion: whether *Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna is reporting an actual event or not is, of course, debatable. I do not see any serious reason to doubt that this is a trace of historical memory, but we must give allowance to the fact that the person reporting it wrote two centuries after the event. If, on the other hand, we accept it as genuine, then the passage would suggest that Jñānapāda was active at Devapāla's court as well. This means that he was still alive and holding high office after approximately 810 CE and before ca. 850 CE.⁵

Jñānapāda's works

Jñānapāda was not a very prolific author and it is not entirely clear which of the works attributed to him in the Tibetan Canon are truly his. There is little controversy about the following texts: the **Mañjuśrī-mukhāgama* – also known as the **Dvikramatattvabhāvanā* – (Tōh. 1853), the *Samantabhadra* – also known as *Caturaṅgasādhana* – (Tōh. 1855 and Tōh. 1856), the *Muktibindu* – usually erroneously re-Sanskritized as **Muktililaka* (Tōh. 1859), the *Ātmasādhanāvātāra* (Tōh. 1860), and the *Mahāyānalakṣaṇasamuccaya* (Tōh. 3905).

The **Mañjuśrī-mukhāgama* is in many respects a remarkable work. The core of the text is a series of innovative revelations said to have been heard directly from the mouth of Mañjuśrī in a vision, after the author's disappointing spiritual search at the feet of a host of teachers. The work opens with a description of this journey, beginning with studying with Haribhadra and culminating in his vision of the deity. The passage in question (Tōh. 1853, 1b4–2b2), along with **Vitapāda*'s⁶ commentary (Tōh. 1866, 89a6–90b7), has

366, 165a: / bu mo śin tu brgyan pa 'am / / de bzin chui ma sdug pa dag / phul nas rin gyis blu ba ni / / sañs rgyas byañ chub mchog gi yon /

⁵ Although Pāla chronology is still fraught with very serious problems, this is the usual interval Devapāla's reign is placed in (e.g. Sircar 1977: 967).

⁶ It has been suggested by Leonard van der Kuijp in a talk he gave in Oxford in February 2008 (“Historical Notes on the Jñāna Tradition of the Secret

already been studied, most recently by Davidson (2002: 309–316). In my view, several of his interpretations are in need of revision.

One of the earliest masters in Jñānapāda's account is Vilāsavajra, who is usually identified with the early tantric exegete, the author of the *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*.⁷ Somewhat unusually, Vilāsavajra actually cites Jñānapāda. If all our data and inferences are correct, then this is a rather exceptional case of a teacher citing the work of a pupil. In his regrettably still unpublished study of the *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*, Tribe has already noticed this quotation, but he was unable to trace it.⁸ We are now in the fortunate position to identify it, since the work in question has partially survived in the original. This is the *Mahāyānalakṣaṇasamuccaya*, a fragment of which is extant in China, which has been published in 1998 by Yonezawa. The verse quoted by Vilāsavajra is the opening stanza.⁹ Since there seems to be no mention of Vilāsavajra later on, it would seem that this work must have been one of Jñānapāda's juvenilia, however, one which did not fail to impress Vilāsavajra.

From here he moved on to eventually end up in Jālandhara, in a city called Ko no dze,¹⁰ with a master called Bā li pā da, from

Union Tantra [*Guhyasamājatantra*]: Buddhajñāna and Sman [pa] žabs") that the name should be reconstructed as *Vaidyapāda. While I acknowledge the strength of his arguments, I will maintain the more common usage.

⁷ For a discussion of his dates see Tribe 1994: 9–23. One of the sources to set Jñānapāda's lower limit in Tribe is a quotation he identifies as hailing from an unidentified work of Kamalaśīla: *ibid.* 16, n. 50 has *Kamalācāryeṇāpy uktam / rāgādīmalinaṃ cittaṃ saṃsāras tadvimuktatā / saṃkṣepāt kathito mokṣaḥ prahīṇāvaraṇair jinair iti //*. However, Tribe is mistaken here. His ms. B does indeed read *Kamalācāryeṇā-*, but the superior ms. A (Cambridge University Library Add. 1708.I, quote on fol. 81r–81v) has *Kambalācāryeṇā-*. The verse is the fourth of the *Ālokamālā*.

⁸ The text is given in Tribe 1994: 16, n. 49: *tathā coktaṃ Jñānapādaiḥ / sambodhicittam utpādyā mahāmaitrīṃ prayogataḥ / sarvadharmā nirātmāna iti jñātvā vimucyata iti //*. *Pāda* b should be read *mahāmaitrīprayogataḥ*.

⁹ The reading of the fragment is corrupt in *pāda* d (and corrupted further still in the Tibetan translation), I give here Yonezawa's (1998: 50) reading: *sambodhicittam utpādyā </> mahāmaitrīprayogataḥ / sarvadharmā nirātmāna iti jñātvā dhimucyate //*.

¹⁰ Davidson identifies this with Kanauj, in spite of the fact that the famous

where he proceeded to Koṅkana, to a place called Nam mkha'i śiṅ ldan (Kāṅherī, according to Davidson), to an apparently eponymous master, Bā li pā da.¹¹ Davidson notes (2002: 315):

The teacher's name given by Vitapāda, *Rakṣāpāda, was not the one that Buddhajñānapāda himself employed. In his own short statement, Buddhajñānapāda indicates that the teacher in Kanauj, Bālipāda (or, Balipāda), and the ācārya in Kāṅherī were one and the same.

This statement is fraught with problems. First of all, Jñānapāda tells us nothing of the sort. The source of Davidson's misleading statement is that the Derge edition of the Tibetan translation happens to have *Bālipāda twice. However, if we look at the forms in the Peking blockprint (which are, granted, also corrupt), 'Ba' mo pa ta and Ba li pa ta respectively (Ōta. 2716, 2b3–5), we may start suspecting that the two masters are not one and the same. Furthermore, in the translation of *Vitapāda's commentary we have for the names of the two masters Byis pa chuṅ ba'i źabs and Bsrūṅ ba'i źabs respectively (Tōh. 1866, 90a2 & 90a4).

In my view, the Sanskrit name of the first must have been either *Bālakapāda or *Bālikapāda,¹² whereas the second is not *Rakṣāpāda, but Pālitapāda. While the first reconstruction is a conjecture, there is plenty of evidence to prove that the correct form for the Konkani master's name is Pālitapāda; thus Davidson's *Rakṣāpāda is nothing but a ghost.

city is nowhere near Jalandhar. While I disagree with the identification, I cannot propose an alternative for the time being.

¹¹ Tōh. 1853, 2a3–2a5: / de nas Dzā lendha rar groṅ khyer Ko no dzer / / phyin nas Bā li pā da źes byar grags pa rab thob gaṅ / / mñes byas gźuṅ thos luṅ ni maṅ du thos gyur nas / / lho phyogs Nam mkha'i śiṅ ldan Koṅ ka na ru bgrod / / grub pa'i dbaṅ phyug Bā li pā dar rab grags pa / / rdzu 'phrul ldan pa'i slob ma'i tshogs daṅ rab tu bcas / / de kun yo byad gos zas Nor rgyun gyis sbyor ba / / bla ma dam pa de druṅ lo dgur rab tu btud /

¹² To hazard a further guess, it is perhaps not out of the question that this is also a corrupt form (or a variant spelling) of *Bālhikapāda, where the first element corresponds to a toponym, the area we usually refer to as the province of Balkh. Presumably the same toponym is spelt Bālika on the British Museum inscription of Mahendrapāla, 9th regnal year (ca. middle of ninth century), see Banerji 1915, plate xxxi, second image.

In order to show the evidence for this, we must first deal with one of Jñānapāda's chief works, his *sādhana* of Mañjuśrī/Mañjuḥṣa/Mañjuvajra, the main deity of the *Guhyasamāja* according to his teaching. This work is usually referred to as the *Samantabhadra* or the *Caturaṅgasādhana*.

The text has been translated twice into Tibetan: Tōh. 1855 by Śraddhākaravarman with Rin chen bzañ po and Tōh. 1856 by Smṛtijñānakīrti. Some differences between the two translations have prompted some scholars to state that these are two different texts in the original (cf. Kikuya 2012: 141), but judging by the portions I have studied in greater detail, this claim needs better substantiation. Until very recently we had no concrete evidence to the effect that the text survives in its entirety in Sanskrit. Scholars were constrained to small fragments as listed below.

That verses 10–17 of the *Samantabhadra* survive independently, incorporated in a Nepalese ritual manual, the **Mañjuvajramukhyākhyāna* (IASWR MBB–I–11),¹³ was first noted by Kimiaki Tanaka in 1987, who also published an edition¹⁴ of these verses in

¹³ The title must bear an asterisk, since it is not attested anywhere in the manuscript; moreover, the second part is probably a slip for **-mukhākhyāna*.

¹⁴ I disagree with Tanaka's edition on several points. Here is a verse by verse list of these *loci*: 10a read *anādimati bhavaughe* (two locatives) instead of *anādimatibhavaughe*; 10c read *vidhivan* (correct *sandhi*) for *vidhivat*; 11c read *tadavaśeṣam* (as a compound) for *tad avaśeṣam*; 11d read *samyak pariṇāmayāmi* (adverb plus verb) for *samyakpariṇāmayāmi*; 12ab read *vilas-anmano'malenduprasādhitā-* for *vilasatmanāmalenduḥ prasāditā-*; 12d read *ātmananovartino* (correct plural accusative) for *ātmananovartinān*; 14a read *samyannirastabandhanam* (correct *sandhi* and compound) for *samyag nirastabandhanam*; 15b read *sarvāvṛtīvāsānā-* for unmetrical *sarvāvṛtīvāsānā-*; 16cd read *saṃbuddhātmāsamasāsvabhāvabuddhyā* (compound) for *sambuddhātmāsamasā svabhāvabuddhyā* (cf. Dīpaṅkarabhadra's *Maṅḍalavidhi* v. 17c: *sarvabuddhātmāsadbuddhyā*); 18a perhaps read *svabhāvavirahād* instead of *svabhāvavirahaṃ*; 18b yields good sense, but it is unmetrical, read: *dhetuviyogāt tathānimittam tu*; 18c read metrically correct *ūhāpagamād akhilaṃ* for *ūhāpagamanākhilaṃ*; 18d read *vastu praṇidhāna-* (not as a compound and with correct internal *sandhi*) for *vastupraṇidhāna-*. Because of my lack of experience, I did not take into account the Chinese evidence provided by Tanaka.

1996 (181–187), after he located two more sources with the same passage: NAK 1/1697 = NGMPP A 936/1 (f. 1r and upper margin of 1v) and Cambridge University Library Add. 1708.III (f. 2r4–5), catalogued as “fragment of a Buddhist tantra” by Bendall (1883: 205).¹⁵

Tanaka has also made the significant discovery that a fragment of one of the commentaries written to the *Samantabhadra*, the *Sāramañjarī* by one Samantabhadra, has survived in the NAK. The discovery was first announced in 1988–1989, passages were published in portions following this date, and a unified edition was published in an appendix to a monograph in 2010 (505–550). From the *lemmata* preserved in the commentary further verses could be reconstructed, but no such effort has been published by Tanaka, at least not to my knowledge. One significant point noted by the Japanese scholar was that the fragment he had studied reflects a different recension from the one on which the Tibetan translation (Tōh. 1869) was based.

The *Sāramañjarī* survives in yet another, hitherto unstudied witness, found among the photographs taken by Giuseppe Tucci during his journey in Tibet.¹⁶ A few months ago I have gained access to

¹⁵ This source was pointed out to me separately by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson in a personal communication. I had the opportunity to consult the ms. in the original. Unfortunately, it is a rather corrupt witness and does not add much to our understanding. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the previous work in this bundle, Add. 1708.II, is catalogued as a witness of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* (Bendall 1883: 204–205), but is in fact a fragment from an unknown commentary on that text.

¹⁶ See description by Sferra 2008: 45. As n. 62 cautiously remarks, “[t]he text is [only] probably complete.” In the same publication, p. 72, Sferra gives the number of folia as 39. A *Caturaṅgasādhana* manuscript is reported by Wang Sen (as published by Hu-von Hinüber 2006: 310, item 83); this catalogue entry also speaks of 39 folia. It is likely that the referent is the same manuscript, which since Tucci’s time was transported to Beijing in 1960 and back to Lhasa in 1993. Presumably the same manuscript was seen by Sāṅkrtyāyana at Sa skya, as he too gives the number of leaves as 39 (1937: 44). Moreover, the transcription of the colophon also matches the one seen by me on the Tucci photographs. This informs us that the copy was finished during the 5th regnal year of Nayapāla (therefore middle of the eleventh century, cf. Sircar 1977: 968). Discounting some damage, the manuscript seems to be

this source owing to the kindness of Prof. Francesco Sferra, but my study of the text is still very far from complete. What can be stated right away, however, is that here we have yet another recension of the commentary, different from both the presumed original of the Tibetan translation and the Nepalese fragment studied by Tanaka.

The defining mark of this recension is not only its different phrasing when compared to the Nepalese fragment, but also a set of long excursuses consisting mainly of quotations. One group of such quotations is particularly valuable, because these come from Jñānapāda's own works, namely the already mentioned *Mahāyānalakṣaṇasamuccaya*,¹⁷ the *Ātmasādhanāvatāra*, and possibly the *Muktibindu*, which we have thus far known as the **Muktilaka*.¹⁸

Quotations from the *Ātmasādhanāvatāra* are particularly significant, since thus far we have had no access to this text in the original. Besides some scattered quotations, some referenced, some not, the recension of the Tucci ms. contains in one block (37v5–38v5) a little more than one third of the work, equivalent to 53b6 to 57a4 out of 52a7–62a7 of the Derge print of Tibetan translation (Tōh. 1860).

complete – however, due to an error, the photographs do not document 32v and 33v, instead, they have images of 32r and 33r twice – and photographed in sequence – with the exception of fols. 9 and 25, which are interchanged.

¹⁷ The work is quite unambiguously attributed to Jñānapāda, inasmuch as some of the quotations are introduced by *tad uktam ācāryeṇaiva* or similar phrases; the word *ācārya* always refers to Jñānapāda in this work. Thus, while the authorship of the *Mahāyānalakṣaṇasamuccaya* can still be debated, there can be no doubt that very early on and within Jñānapāda's own tradition (as I show later on, two generations after him) it was already attributed to him.

¹⁸ Besides Jñānapāda, a great number of scriptures and works are quoted, with or without reference. The most common are early Yogācāra *sāstras*, such as the *Madhyāntavibhāga* with the *Bhāṣya*, and the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* with the *Bhāṣya*. There are also quotations from the *Guhyasamāja* including the *Uttaratantra* (that is to say, what is now referred to as the 18th chapter), the *Vajrasikhara*, the *Guhyatilaka*, the *Paramādyā*, the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, the *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṃkarabhadra (usually styled “by Bhadrāpāda,” on which see below), the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the *Alamkāra* of Prajñākaragupta, the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, and the *Ratnāvalī*. Some of these are also seen in the other recensions.

Other large blocks include 26v5–27r2 = 52b3–53a4, 28r6–28v3 = 53a4–53b3, 34v6–35v2 = 59a2–60a5; further careful study will no doubt reveal even more.

To return to the *Samantabhadra*, Jñānapāda tells us that his composing this work was instigated by “a virtuous friend” or “virtuous friends.”¹⁹ The four commentators of the *Samantabhadra* show some disagreement when it comes to determining the identity of this person or persons.

Perhaps the least informative is the gloss of *Thagana,²⁰ who takes this *sanmitra* to mean the Tathāgatas or masters and Tathāgatas (*Śrīsamantabhadrasādhanavṛtti, Tōh. 1868, 189a1–5).

*Śrīphalavajra’s explanation is more extensive (**Samantabhadra-sādhanavṛtti*, Tōh. 1867, 141a4–7). He interprets this word as a collective noun encompassing three fellow initiates (*spun zla*, *[*vajra*] *bhrāṭṛ*) and four disciples (*slob ma*, **śiṣya*), who are later on styled as Jñānapāda’s chief (*mchog*, **agra*) disciples. Of the fellow initiates only two are named, along with the names of their native lands: Koṅka na’i Chos kyi ’byuñ gnas (*Dharmākara from the Konkan) and Ri bo ha sa ra’i Gtsug tor rdo rje (*Uṣṇīṣavajra from Mt. Hasara).²¹ The disciples are named as Mar me mdzad bzañ po

¹⁹ The Rin chen bzañ po translation has *bśes gñen ni || dam pa*, Smṛti-jñānakīrti’s has *dam pa’i bśes gñen*. From the Tucci ms. we may reconstruct this, the second verse, in the *āryā* metre as follows: **śrīmatsamājanīyā sanmitraprārthanākṛtotsāhaḥ | sakalajagadarthasampannidānabhūtaṃ vidhiṃ vakṣye ||*. Those familiar with the *Maṅḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṃkarabhadra will immediately notice that his 2a, *śrīmatsamājasannīyā*, is an *anuṣṭubh* version of *pāda* a above. This is only one of an overwhelming amount of phraseological parallels between the two works.

²⁰ I am slightly puzzled by this name. It should perhaps be reconstructed as *Thagaṇu (“thief”) or some Middle Indic cognate. Cf. also Thakkana, a name of unknown origin figuring several times in the *Rājataranṅinī*, including the name of a Śāhī king (Stein 1900: I.255, 302, *passim*).

²¹ This toponym cannot be identified with certainty. Perhaps it is not impossible that it is the same as Uraśā in the *Rājataranṅinī*, which, as Stein (1900: I.215, n. to verse V.215) showed, is in modern times known as Hazāra, even more currently a region in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. If this identification is correct, Kalhaṇa uses an already archaic name for the region

(doubtless the famous Dīpaṃkarabhadra), Rab tu źi ba'i bśes gñen (*Praśāntamitra),²² Rdo rje bde ba chen po (*Vajramahāsukha), and Sgra gcan 'dzin bzañ po (*Rāhulabhadra).

*Vitapāda, supposedly Jñānapāda's direct student, gives two alternatives (**Samantabhadrā*, Tōh. 1872, 131b6–7). In the second, perhaps more banal version, he understands the “virtuous friend” to have been 'Jam dpal dbyaṅs (Mañjuḥoṣa) himself. However, his first interpretation glosses the lemma in question with the already mentioned name Bsrūñ ba'i źabs, who is described as Jñānapāda's master (*bla ma ñid*).

Finally, let us examine Samantabhadra's view. I have already shown that this commentary, the *Sāramañjarī*, was transmitted in at least three recensions. Since the initial part of the Nepalese fragment is missing, we can read only the Tibetan translation and the Tucci ms., which are remarkably different. The Sanskrit text in the Tucci ms. (2r3) is extremely short:

sanmitraṃ guruḥ. evaṃ hi śrūyate— gurubhiḥ Pālitapādaiḥ sādhanalikhānāya prārthanā kṛtā.

The “virtuous friend” [here] means [Jñānapāda's] master. For this is what has come down to us: the master Pālitapāda placed a request for [Jñānapāda's] writing the [present] *sādhana*.

and the Sanskrit *Hasāra in Tibetan garb (note that Tibetans often confuse vowel quantity, the difference between Ha sa ra and *Hasāra is banal) is an attestation of a middle term in the series Uraśā > *Uśāra > *Usāra > Hasāra > Hazāra. That this region would have fostered Buddhists at this time is no surprise at all. In fact, one close contemporary, Vīradeva, a native of Nagarahāra (today Nangarhar, Afghanistan), was appointed to a high office in Nālandā during Devapāla's time, as his inscription tells us (Kielhorn 1888).

²² I find it extremely likely that this is the same person as the author of a commentary on the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinijālaśaṃvara* (Tōh. 1663), a commentary on the *Māyājāla* (Tōh. 2514), and a commentary on the *Vajramanḍalaṃkāra* (Tōh. 2515). Although my study of his works is not extensive, I think we can be more or less certain that he does not cite any text that can be later than the ninth century. That all three commentaries are by the same author is clear on stylistic grounds. For example, the dedicatory verses at the end of each work contain a verse-quarter that can be reconstructed as **saha Praśāntamitreṇa*.

The version the Tibetan translation (Tōh. 1869, 2b6–3a2) is based on is much more extensive. The name of the person is the same, although here we have it translated in a different way: Bskyañs pa'i źabs. The text lacking in the Sanskrit we have in the Tucci ms. is a small narrative about Jñānapāda's travel to see Pālitapāda and the latter's request to him to compose a *sādhana* that would eventually materialize as the *Samantabhadra/Caturaṅgasādhana*. The Tibetan translation of the passage is rather awkward and possibly corrupt in more than one place.

bśes gñen dam pas Bskyañs pa'i źabs te / de ltar slob dpon lña brgya dag gis bskor ba ñid na 'Dus pa'i lugs yañ dag par śes par bya ba'i phyir de rig pa tshol bas de'i yul du soñ bar gyur pa dañ / ha cañ mi riñ ba gañ na 'dug pa de 'oñ bar śes nas de'i źabs la phyag bya ba'i phyir Ye śes źabs chas par gyur pa de'i tshe mtshan ma thob pas ni de 'Dus pa'i don rtogs par dpyad ciñ 'oñ bar yañ rig nas / Bskyañs pa'i źabs rañ ñid de'i thad du soñ ste 'Dus pa'i don bstan pa'i don du de la gsol ba gdab bo // de nas de'i slob ma yin pas de'i dbañ du bya ba dañ bral ba nas des khas [mi] blañs so [!] // de nas de la sgrub thabs bya ba'i don du **gsol ba btab** ciñ don du gñer ba des **spro bar byas** śiñ bdag brtson pa bskyed pas **brjod par bya'o** źes bya ba yin no //

By a virtuous friend [means] the venerable Bskyañs pa (i.e. Pālitapāda). To explain, [Jñānapāda], already surrounded by five hundred *ācāryas*, sought someone to find out the ways of the [*Guhya*]-*samāja*. He therefore went to his [i.e. Pālitapāda's] country. When he was already quite close, [Pālitapāda] became aware of his arrival. Jñānapāda was making preparations to bow to his [i.e. Pālitapāda's] feet, [but] at the same time he [i.e. Pālitapāda] witnessed an omen and [thus] found out that [Jñānapāda] was somebody who knew the import of the *Samāja* meticulously, and also that he was about to arrive. Then the venerable Pālitapāda himself set out to meet him [i.e. Jñānapāda], and requested him to teach the meaning of the *Samāja*. Following this [request], [Jñānapāda] refused,²³ since he [i.e. Jñānapāda] was his [i.e. Pālitapāda's] disciple and therefore lacked the authority (**adhikāra*) to do so. Then [Pālitapāda] addressed him [i.e. Jñānapāda] with **a request** to compose a *sādhana*. [Jñānapāda hence says:] **inspired** by this entreaty, I [was made to] become diligent, and **will** therefore **teach** [the method to worship Mañjuvajra].

²³ This emendation, *khas blañs* to *khas mi blañs*, is discussed immediately after the translation.

There are several oddities about the narrative, at least as it is transmitted here.

First of all, we must emend *khas blañs* to *khas mi blañs*, otherwise the statement does not make any sense. Jñānapāda's refusal is thoroughly justified: he was following proper etiquette, as a disciple is not supposed to teach or perform rituals (beyond his personal practice) when his master is in the vicinity. An exception to this rule is when the master gives his consent, which is exactly what happens here once we emend the text.²⁴ The emendation is further strengthened by a slightly different version of the story preserved among the Sa skya. 'Phags pa, in his biography of Jñānapāda,²⁵ writes this:

*de nas snar gyi slob dpon Pa li pa ta'an byon nas chos gsan par bzed
pa dan / slob dpon gyis khyed na'i slob dpon yin pas chos 'chad pa mi
'thad gsuñs nas / 'bel gnam gyis the tshom rnam chod par mdzad nas
/ de'i don du sgrub pa'i thabs Kun tu bzañ po mdzad do //*

Then his previous master, Palipata [i.e. Pālitapāda], too came and wished to hear teachings, but the *ācārya* [i.e. Jñānapāda] told him: “You are my master, it is inappropriate that I should be teaching you.” [However, Pālitapāda] put his doubts to rest by holding a sermon [on when it is nevertheless appropriate to do so]. [Then Jñānapāda] composed the *sādhana* [known as] the *Samantabhadra* for his sake.

Incidentally, here we have yet another form of Pālitapāda, which is rather close to the original.

Both narratives seem to agree that the petitioner of the *Samantabhadra* was Pālitapāda, but they disagree when it comes to the place where the text was requested. 'Phags pa suggests that Pālitapāda came to his former disciple when he was already established in

²⁴ For this rule see *Gurupañcāśikā* v. 40 (this stanza survives only in Tibetan, Tōh. 3721, 11b2–3): */ rab gnas dkyil 'khor sbyin sreg dan // slob ma sdud dan 'chad pa rnam // yul der bla ma gnas pa na // rjes ma gnañ bar mi bya 'o /* “Should [his] master be present in that land, [a disciple] should never perform rites of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*), *maṇḍala*[-initiation], oblations into fire (*homa*), he should not accept disciples (**śiṣyaśaṃgraha*) and he should not teach, unless he is allowed to [do so by the master].”

²⁵ *Ye śes žabs kyi rnam thar dan brgyud pa'i rim pa* (215b5–6), contained in the second volume of 'Phags pa's collected works (TBRC vol. serial 0775).

Magadha as a famous teacher, but the author Samantabhadra (at least according to the recension at the base of the Tibetan) states that it was Jñānapāda who visited Pālitapāda. The first half of the narrative apparently suggests that the two did not meet each other beforehand. However, when Jñānapāda expresses his reluctance to teach, it is stated that he was already Pālitapāda's student. It is very likely therefore that this was the second time the two have met. There is some evidence to this effect in a different work by Jñānapāda, the already mentioned **Mañjuśrīmukhāgama* (Tōh. 1853, 16a6):

/ de nas bla ma chen po Bā li pā da'i²⁶ druñ du bgrod /
/ bdag gis bla ma de yañ mñes bya'i phyir na sgrub pa'i thabs /
/ cuñ zad bsdus pas de ru bla ma la sogs kun /
/ mñes par byas te sñon gnas bgrod nas (P, gnas D) skal ldan don
'ga' (D, dga' P) byas /

After that [i.e. after having experienced the vision of Mañjuśrī and after having spent some time north of Bodh Gaya] [I] travelled to the great master, Pālitapāda. Furthermore, I gratified this master by composing some short *sādhana*[s?]. I gratified the master and all the others there [i.e. fellow disciples]. Then I returned to my previous abode and worked a little for the benefit of [some] fortunate ones.

This statement seems to confirm Samantabhadra's account. Since Pālitapāda was already mentioned as an inhabitant of the Konkan, and since Jñānapāda says that he went to see him setting out from Magadha, it stands to reason that this was Jñānapāda's second journey to the Konkan.

I have already mentioned above that the toponym on the Konkan where Pālitapāda was supposed to have lived is given in the Tibetan translation of **Vitapāda's* commentary to the **Mañjuśrīmukhāgama* as Nam mkha'i śiñ ldan, which Davidson identifies with Kāṇherī. His reasoning is as follows (Davidson 2002: 312 and 412): *nam mkha'* must stand for **kha* and *śiñ ldan* for **anhri* (misprint for *amhri* or *añghri*), thus we would have a form **Khānghri/Khāmhri*, which is close enough to Kāṇherī. **Vitapāda* also gives an etymology (Tōh. 1866, 90a3–4):

²⁶ The Peking print (Ōta. 2716, 18b4–5) has Bha li pa tri here.

*de nas yul dbus nas lho phyogs su dpag tshad sum brgya yod pa na yul
Koñka na źes bya ba yod de / de la Nam mkha'i śiñ ldan źes bya ba ste
/ ci'i phyir źe na / rtsa ba med par śiñ rnam la 'khris śiñ steñ tu bris
pa lta bur gnas pa'o //*

In Davidson's translation:

About three hundred yojanas [~ 1,200 miles] from Kanauj in the southern direction is the country of Koñkana. There is a place in Koñkana called Kāñherī. Why is it called that? Because it is a place that seems to exist like rootless vines entwined up trees [*anhri*] into the sky [*kha*].

The translation, as it is regrettably usually the case in this monograph, is imprecise. First, the distance is not measured from Kanauj, but from the Middle Country (i.e. Magadha), but this is practically speaking irrelevant here. A more serious problem is that Davidson did not take into account variant readings and chose to emend the text himself. If we read the text as transmitted in the Peking Canon (Ōta. 2729, 108a3: ... *śiñ rnam 'khril śiñ steñ du bres pa lta bur gnas pa'o //*) and if we grant closer attention to Tibetan grammar, it would seem that the meaning is something more along the lines of: "the trees are such that they are coiled and spreading upwards."

One wonders why such a convoluted etymology would be needed for a toponym the meaning of which is quite clear. Kāñherī is nothing else but a Middle Indic form of Skt. Kṛṣṇagiri, that is to say "Black Mountain," and it is in this form that the place is called on inscriptions from the ninth century *in situ* (Tsukamoto 1996: I.425–428 = Kañheri 21–23). Furthermore, as far as I know, Kṛṣṇagiri is usually not taken to be part of the Konkan.

With these doubts in mind, I wish to advance the hypothesis that Pālitapāda's residence was not in Kṛṣṇagiri/Kāñherī, but another site, which exists up to this day. This is Kadri, currently a suburb of Mangalore, centred on a Śaiva temple the deity of which is called Mañjunātha. This is a rather unique epithet of Śiva, unattested elsewhere, and strangely reminiscent of Mañju-śrī/Mañju-ghoṣa/Mañju-vajra, the chief deity of the *Guhyasamāja* in Jñānapāda's teaching, and presumably also in Pālitapāda's school.

The toponym Kadri is attested as Kadirikā on a dedicatory inscription in place. This is an inscription on a rather splendid

Lokeśvara bronze statue (now worshipped as Brahmā) by the Āḷupa king, Kundavarman II, dating from January 13th, 968 CE.²⁷ The inscription styles the place as “the *vihāra* called Kadirikā,” therefore the site must have been Buddhist, as no Śaiva institution is ever called a *vihāra*.

Let us suppose another possible reconstruction of Nam mkha’i śiñ ldan. I would like to keep *nam mkha’i* = **kha* from Davidson’s attempt, but take *śiñ* as **dāru*, and *ldan* as the suffix *-*ka*. We would thus have a hypothetical *Khadāruka. Deaspiration is a common feature of Dravidian languages, therefore the shift *kha/ka* is perfectly possible. However, explaining the shift of vowels from *Kadāruka to Kadirikā is beyond my competence.

This hypothesis – and I must stress that it is nothing more than that – has two distinct advantages over that of Davidson: Kadri in Mangalore is indeed on the Konkan coast and the current name, Mañjunātha, chimes very well with the deity Mañjuvajra.

The writings of Pālitapāda and his disciple, Śrīkīrti

To our current knowledge, no traces remain of Pālitapāda’s school, except of course the master’s influence over Jñānapāda. Fortunately, this is not the case anymore. Two years ago I came across a work by somebody calling himself Śrīkīrti, very likely a disciple of Pālitapāda. Already then I suspected that Pālitapāda must be the original hiding behind *Rakṣāpāda, etc. but I did not have the clinching piece of evidence that is the testimony of the Tucci ms.

The work called *Parikramapadopāyikā* survives in a bundle of leaves, now NAK 5–86 = NGMPP 24/34.²⁸ The work is a manual

²⁷ See Saletore 1936: 94–95. The verse giving the information relevant here reads: *Lokeśvarasya devasya pratiṣṭhām akarot prabhuḥ / śrīmatKadirikānāmnī vihāre sumanohare //*. See also Jaini 2001 [1980]: 147–149. Jaini calculated the date to 1068 CE.

²⁸ The bundle holds another precious fragment, the initial two folios of Ānandagarbha’s *Vajrasattvodayā* (Tōh. 2517), an edition of which I intend to publish in the near future. It also contains the third and last folio of an unidentified *sādhana* of Tārā (this fragment is dated [Nepal Samvat] 445 = 1325 CE),

dealing with particular aspects of the initiation ritual with special attention given to choreographical minutiae. The author is identified in the colophon on f. 8v: *kṛtir ācāryaśrīkīrtipādānām // o //*

The penultimate verse on the same folio is a praise of a guru, very likely his own:

*jayaty atulyo guṇakīrtisaṃcayāḥ
prakāmaṅkhyātayaśonidhir mahān /
ācāryaśrīPālitapādasadguruḥ
śiṣyānanāmbhojavānaikabhāskaraḥ //*

Victorious is [he,] the master, the true guru, the venerable Pālitapāda, that incomparable heap of virtue and fame, that great repository of exceptionally spread renown, the sole Sun in the forest of water-lilies that are the faces of [his] disciples.

The fourth introductory verse of the text (fol. 1v) mentions the same name, but the stanza is corrupt:

*kṛpāvātā Pālitapādaśrīmātā
uktaṃ yathā maṅḍalakarmasādhanam /
†tadupāyakaṃ saṃstutaspaṣṭavistaraṃ
vajraṃ padamārasasainyaśāsanam //†*

Just as the venerable, compassionate Pālitapāda has taught the accomplishment of rites relating to the *maṅḍala*, [...]

In spite of the corruption, we can gather with some certainty the information that Pālitapāda wrote an initiation manual, and that the present work by Śrīkīrti is somehow in the spirit of that manual. This work by Pālitapāda is presumed lost, but given the more than incidental parallels with the anonymous **Mañjuvajrodaya* (Tōh. 2590), it cannot be entirely dismissed that this is the manual referred to.²⁹

a single last folio of a *Vajrayoginīsādhana* (attributed here to Anupamavajra and styled *trayodaśātmaka-*, but not the same as GSS16, see English 2002: 364–365), and perhaps a sort of appendix to the *Parikramapadopāyikā* called (?) the *Karmaprasara*. The *Parikramapadopāyikā* begins on a folio numbered ‘1,’ ends on 8v5, and lacks folios 2 and 7.

²⁹ As I intend to edit the *Parikramapadopāyikā* in a different publication in the near future, here I shall limit myself to only a few examples. The first half

The author Śrīkīrti is not unknown to the Jñānapāda tradition. In fact, he is mentioned as the one who commanded Samantabhadra to write a commentary on Jñānapāda's *sādhana*, viz. the *Sāramañjarī*, as witnessed by an introductory verse in the recension behind the Tibetan translation of that text (Tōh. 1869, 1b3).³⁰ There can be little doubt that Śrīkīrti and Kīrtipāda are the same person, since this tradition is well-known for referring to its authors by taking an element of their full name with the honorific *pāda*: *Buddhaśrījñāna becomes Jñānapāda and Dīpaṃkarabhadra becomes Bhadrāpāda. Since Samantabhadra writes that he was commanded and not petitioned by Kīrtipāda, it would seem that he was his junior, possibly a disciple.

Dīpaṃkarabhadra's *Maṅḍalavidhi*

Among the works of Jñānapāda's pupils, perhaps the most influential is Dīpaṃkarabhadra's *Maṅḍalavidhi*, an initiation manual in approximately four and a half hundred verses. Although an in-depth comparative study has not yet been undertaken, even a cursory reading of this text next to Jñānapāda's *Samantabhadra* reveals the profound influence of that work on the initiation manual. The manual itself is very often quoted, with or without attribution, and the program prescribed therein became a template for many other *abhiṣeka* manuals. Abhayākara Gupta's famous *Vajrāvalī* is one such work. The *Vajrāvalī*, in turn, greatly influenced one of the most important ritual manuals used by Newars, the *Kriyāsamuccaya* of Jagaddarpaṇa, the lion's share of which is practically a word-for-

of the third verse in Śrīkīrti's work (fol. 1v) is *anekaduḥkḥāhatīsocyatām gatam jagad vilokyāśaraṇam kṛpātmakaḥ |*, whereas the **Mañjuvajrodaya* (Tōh. 2590, 225b1) reads *| sdug bsñal du mas bcom źiñ mya ñan gnas | | 'gro ba mgon med bltas nas brtser ldan bas |*. The initial part (fol. 3v) of a section introduced by Śrīkīrti as "the superior [method] for quelling obstacles" (*adhimātraviḥnopaśamana*) is an almost word-for-word match with **Mañjuvajrodaya* 250a2–5. The section describing nine postures, beginning with the *vajraparyāṅka* up to the *parāñmukha* (fol. 8r), is a verbatim match with **Mañjuvajrodaya* 251b2–5.

³⁰ *| Ye śes źabs kyis gañ mdzad yin | | de yi man ñag rjes 'brañs te | | Grags pa'i źabs kyis bkas bskul bas | | sgrub pa'i thabs ni bdag gis bya |*.

word copy. Both the *Maṅḍalavidhi* and the *Vajrāvalī* were influential for authors such as Tsoṅ kha pa. It can therefore be said, that Dīpaṅkarabhadra is influential to this very day.

The Tibetan Canon preserves a translation of this work and two commentaries: one by *Vitapāda (Tōh. 1873) and one by Ratnākaraśānti (Tōh. 1871). The fact that most of this work survives in Sanskrit has been known for some time, and an e-text³¹ has been circulated before the editio princeps in *Dhīḥ* (vol. 42, pp. 109–154).³² Both of these are based on the same manuscript, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, Cod. ms. sanscr. 257 (Bandurski 1994: 113–114). The manuscript is incomplete: it is most likely the case that the last folio was at some point detached from the bundle. A little more than 16 verses were hence lost.

The discovery that the Göttingen manuscript is not a *codex unicus*, as it was hitherto thought, was almost accidental: I came across a second witness in April 2013 whilst calling up some still uncatalogued manuscripts at the University Library of Cambridge.³³ The manuscript Or. 132, hitherto known only from the Kanjilals' reproduction of a handlist (2005: 86) as “Maṅḍalopekṣā,” turned out to be another manuscript of this fundamental work. To our great fortune, here it is not the last, but the first folio (out of a total of

³¹ <http://www.tantric-studies.uni-hamburg.de/en/research/e-texts/buddhist-e-texts/gusamavi.txt>, last visited 14/02/2015. The input was prepared by Sabine Klein-Schwind and proof-read and revised by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson.

³² There is now a new edition published in Sarnath (see Bahulkar 2010). Unfortunately, I gained access to this book right after the final draft of the present paper. Bahulkar reconstructs the final verses from the Tibetan translation, except the very last, which he reproduces from Sāṅkṛtyāyana's famous 1937 report (see xi–xiii in the Hindi introduction). It seems that the Bengali scholar still had access to the last folio, which is now lost from the Göttingen ms.

³³ I owe thanks to the Principal Investigator (Dr. Vincenzo Vergiani) and his Research Associates (Dr. Daniele Cuneo and Dr. Camillo Formigatti) of the Sanskrit Manuscripts Project, Cambridge, as well as Dr. Gergely Hidas (ELTE Budapest) for their kind help in facilitating my access to this manuscript.

twenty-five) that went missing; hence we now have access to the entire work in the original.³⁴ Based on the script, which does not display the hook-tops, the manuscript perhaps dates from the 12th century, or possibly slightly later.

³⁴ I give here the hitherto missing verses in diplomatic transcript. The Göttingen witness breaks off after the fifth syllable of *pāda* d of v. 416 (420 in the Dhīh edition). The rest reads: *-kam manaḥ // sarvādhvadharmmadigvyāptyo saṅgasaccakrabhāsini yan na tat kalpanā bhāti svabhyāsāntar nviśayet //* [24r4] *yena yat syāt kadāpīha* (p.corr., *kādāpīha* a.corr.) *viruddhan tena tat sadā / nivarttayet tad atyantam svahetoḥ sātmatāptitah // sarvadharmātmasaccakrajagatsamśuddhivṛttitah / sākṣāddhetor bhaved bodhiḥ kalpāpekṣātra ni + + [24r5] // kramād dānādigāmbhīryan deyaśīlādyasambhavaḥ / naudāryaṃ prākṛtāhāner bbodhis tv atrādhvamānataḥ // nījādhvadeśabhāvātmaprākṛtaṃ kathitaṃ budhaiḥ / jagat sambodhicakrātmā kṣaṇād ihaiva bodhibhā + + [24v1] deyādyanupalambho pi dānādiḥ prākṛtātmakah / nairātmyaṃ prākṛtāghāti saccakre tan na vidyate // tasmān nirastasaṃkalpaṃ samantaspharaṇatviṣaṃ / samantabhadram ātmānaṃ bhāvayann eva bodhibh+ + (this verse is an incorporation of *Ātmasādhanāvatāra*, Tōh. 1860, 56a1–2) [24v2] *atas tricakraṃ uddiṣṭaṃ dharmmasambhoganirmmitaṃ / cittavākkāyaguhyān tat trikāyakraṃ saṃsuddhitah // pañca jñānaṃ trikāyaś ca sādhyāś cakrātmayogataḥ / sarvākārajñātāsiddhau* (p. corr., *sarvākārajñātāsiddhau* a.corr.) *na siddhaṃ kim uta + + [24v3] // bauddhāḥ pāramitāḥ siddhā dhāraṇyo bhūmayo yataḥ /* (the half-verse is strongly reminiscent of *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* 4.4ab, Ms IEI Lévi 48, fōl. 6r; also on 53v) *svayaṃ pratyanusidhyante yogād asmān mahāsukhāt // ity avabudhya tac chrīmān svayan dharmāryasaṃgrahaḥ / sarvaṇvantas trisaccakraṃ ko na dhyāyā + + [24v4] kam manaḥ // saddharmmasadrasāsvādabāhuśrutyakṛtāspadaḥ / sajjano tra pramāṇan tat svacittyenātra sāhasaṃ // gurumataṃ dhṛtam vā yac chradhayaḥ prakatīkṛtaṃ / śraddhādi hi dhanāṃ sevyāṃ bhāvye bhāvyo na vāsa + [24v5]k // mannyūne matsame sty artho bālād vāpi subhāṣitaṃ / grāhyam uttamasatvais tat svacittyeneti sāhasaṃ // kramasaṅgatasampūrṇacakraṃ ālikhya yac chubhaṃ / mañjuvajro stv ato lokaḥ syām ahaṃ mañjurāt svayaṃ // [25r1] anuṣṭucchandasā ślokaiḥ śataiḥ sārddhañ catuṣṭayaiḥ kṛteyaṃ maṅḍalopaikā matsmrtyālokakārikā // [circle] // kṛtir ācāryadīpaṅkarabhadreṇeti // [fleuron] // The manuscript ends with a scribal statement in barbaric Sanskrit dedicating the merits accrued from copying and a series of garbled verses invoking minor supernatural beings.**

The Lhasa birch-bark manuscript

One of the most important documents for the study of the Jñānapāda school is not accessible to us at this date. This is an eleventh-century³⁵ birch-bark composite manuscript now housed at the Tibet Museum in Lhasa, TAR, China. More than a decade ago, Kazuhiro Kawasaki was allowed to consult an index sheet from this codex. He published a short study of this sheet, a table of contents of sorts, in 2004. Unfortunately, he was not allowed to consult the works themselves. From the index it is apparent that quite a few works of the total of 27 in this codex are related to the Jñānapāda school, including some that are possibly by Jñānapāda himself. The *Ātmasāadhanāvātāra* is most likely extant here (item 10), as is also the *Samantabhadra* (item 3).

As pointed out by Kawasaki (2004: 52, n. 1), some photographs of the manuscript have been published in Chinese publications showcasing the riches of the TAR. The Tibet Museum Catalogue (2001) reproduces two facing pages bearing the folio number 3, and the abbreviated title “A. Vi.” (pp. 54–55). There can be little doubt that this matches the entry “Abhiṣekavidhiḥ” (item 4) in the list. The text explains the symbolism (I am rendering *tattva* thus for lack of a better word) of elements of the *maṇḍala* and the deities, making frequent reference to verses from the *Maṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṅkarabhadra. It is thus an unknown work of the Jñānapāda school. The publication *Precious Deposits, Historical Relics of Tibet, China. Volume One. Prehistoric Age and Tubo Period* (2000) contains an image of the closed codex revealing the fine leather binding (p. 113), two facing pages with the abbreviated title “Jñā Ṭī,” presumably standing for the entry “Jñānapādīyavaraṇaṃ Śrīpadmavajrakṛtam” (item 18), yet another commentary on the *Samantabhadra*, also describing the symbolism of elements of the *maṇḍala* (pp. 114–115), and a cropped image (that is to say without the margins) of a single page on which the text describes the end of a daily *sādhana* (p. 116).³⁶

³⁵ More precisely, the colophon mentions the reign of Anantadeva (1028–1063 CE) and a year that may correspond to 1057 CE.

³⁶ I am deeply grateful to Dr. Kazuo Kano (Koyasan University) for sharing his thoughts, notes, draft transcripts of these images, and copies of the images

Unfortunately, all my efforts to gain access to this very important tome have thus far been in vain.

Conclusions

The aim of this short paper was to present a summary of the currently available material for the study of the Jñānapāda-school of *Guhyasamāja* exegesis. Based on the evidence of the **Bodhipathapradīpapañjikā*, it would seem that we must place Jñānapāda's latter activity at least a decade or two later than previously assumed, into the reign of Devapāla. Some details about the life of Jñānapāda are now hopefully a little clearer. There are good reasons to assume that he travelled twice to the Konkan coast to visit a master called Pālitapāda (known in Tibetan sources as Bsruñ ba'i žabs, Bskyans pa'i žabs, Pa li pa ta, Bā li pā da, Ba li pa ta, and Bha li ba tri; incorrectly reconstructed as *Rakṣāpāda in current scholarship). This person, whose name is now fixed with certainty, was presiding over a flourishing school of *Guhyasamāja* practice, one that continued to be active at least two generations after him. His residence was presumably not Kanheri as previously assumed, but Kadri-Mañjunātha, a site that continues to exist to this day as a Śaiva place of worship. Pālitapāda was the author of at least one work, a *Guhyasamāja* initiation manual. It is possible that we have some sort of virtual access to some of the ideas contained in this work. His disciple, Śrīkīrti/Kīrtipāda, continued this tradition, and is the author of at least one, possibly two, surviving works also related to initiation. His junior, possibly disciple, *Samantabhadra*, was the author of a learned commentary on Jñānapāda's fundamental work, the *Caturāṅgasādhana/Samantabhadra*, which survives in at least three recensions: one in a Nepalese fragment, one in the Tucci ms., and one behind the Tibetan translation. *Samantabhadra*

themselves with me. It is hoped that his well-known competence will in the near future be directed to publishing these extremely important fragments. [After the last draft of this paper my hopes have partially materialized in Kano's new publication: "Fugen jojuho no shinshutsu bonbun shiryo (Newly Available Sanskrit Materials of Jñānapāda's *Samantabhadrasādhana*)."
Mikkyogaku kenkyu 46, 2014: 61–73.]

was already aware of Dīpaṃkarabhadra's initiation manual, the influential *Maṇḍalavidhi*, since he often quotes him. This work in turn is now available in the original in full, thanks to the discovery of the Cambridge manuscript. The activity of Pālitapāda very likely falls within the second half of the eighth century. The next generation, Jñānapāda and Śrīkīrti, probably lived in the second half of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century. The generation of their respective disciples, Dīpaṃkarabhadra and Samantabhadra should be placed in the middle of the ninth century.

Bibliography

- Bahulkar, S.S. (ed.). 2010. *Śrīguhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiḥ of Ācārya Dīpaṃkarabhadra*. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 31. Sarnath: Central University of Tibetan Studies.
- Bandurski, Frank. 1994. "Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von Rāhula Sāṅkrītyāyana in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, III)." Frank Bandurski et al., *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch den buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 9–126.
- Banerji, R. D. 1915. "The Pālas of Bengal." *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* V/3: 43–113.
- Bendall, Cecil. 1883. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Cambridge: University Press. (Reprint Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992.)
- Davidson, Ronald M. 2002. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism. A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- English, Elizabeth. 2002. *Vajrayoginī. Her Visualizations, Rituals, & Forms. A Study of the Cult of Vajrayoginī in India*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 2006. "Some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra found in Tibet." Ute Hüsken, Petra Kiefer-Pülz, and Anne Peters (eds.), *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna. Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*. Indica et Tibetica Band 47. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 283–337.
- IASWR – [Christopher George & William Stablein]. 1975. *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts. A Title List of the Microfilm Collection of The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions*. [New York].
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 2001 [1980]. *Collected Papers on Buddhist Studies*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Kanjilal, Dileep Kumar & Kripamayee Kanjilal. 2005. *Sanskrit and Allied Manuscripts in Europe*. Kolkata: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- Kawasaki, Kazuhiro. 2004. "On a Birch-bark Sanskrit Manuscript Preserved in the Tibet Museum." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 52/2: 50–52.
- Kielhorn, F. 1888. "A Buddhist Stone-inscription from Ghosrawa." *The Indian Antiquary* 17: 307–312.
- Kikuya, Ryuta. 2012. "Reconstruction of Jñānapāda's **Caturaṅgasādhana-Samantabhadri*." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 60/3: 140–146.
- NGMPP – Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project. Numbers as in <http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de>.
- Ōta. – Suzuki, Daisetz T. 1962. *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition – Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto – Reprinted under the Supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto. Catalogue & Index*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Precious Deposits, Historical Relics of Tibet, China. Volume One. Prehistoric Age and Tubo Period*. Beijing: Morning Glory [sic!] Publishers, 2000.
- Saletore, Bhasker Anand. 1936. *Ancient Karnataka vol. I. History of Tuluva*. Poona Oriental Series no. 53. Poona: Oriental Book Agency.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2009. "The Śaiva Age – The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism in the Early Medieval Period." Shingo Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series, 23. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, 41–349.
- Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhula. 1937. "Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet." *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* XXIII/1: 1–57.
- Sferra, Francesco. 2008. "Sanskrit Manuscripts and Photographs of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Giuseppe Tucci's Collection." Francesco Sferra (ed.), *Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection. Part I. Serie Orientale Rome Vol. CIV, Manuscripta Buddhica 1*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 15–78.
- Sherburne, Richard. 1983. *A Lamp for the Path and Commentary of Aīśa*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Sircar, D.C. 1977. "The Pāla Chronology Reconsidered." Wolfgang Voigt (ed.), *XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag [Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Supplement III,2], 964–970.
- Stein, M. A. 1900. *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir*. Vols. I–III. London: A. Constable & Co. (Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979).
- Tanaka, Kimiaki. 1996. *Indo Chibetto Mandara no Kenkyū [A Study of Indo-Tibetan Maṅḍalas]*. Tōkyō: Hozokan.

- Tanaka, Kimiaki. 2010. *Indo ni okeru Mandara no Seiritsu to Hatten* [Genesis and Development of the Maṇḍalas in India]. Tōkyō: Shunjūsha.
- Tibet Museum Catalogue – *Xīzàng bówùguǎn / Bod ljongs rten rdzas bśams mdzod khai*. Beijing: Zhōngguó dà bǎikē quánshū chūbǎn shè, 2001.
- Tōh. – Ui, Hakuju, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, & Tōkan Tada. 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.
- Tomabechi, Toru. 2008. “Vītapāda, Śākyamitra, and Āryadeva: On a Transitional Stage in the History of Guhyasamāja Exegesis.” *Esoteric Buddhist Studies: Identity in Diversity. Proceedings of the International Conference on Esoteric Buddhist Studies, Koyasan University, 5 Sept. – 8 Sept. 2006*. Koyasan University, 171–177.
- Tribe, A. H. F. 1994. *The Names of Wisdom. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Chapters 1–5 of Vilāsavajra’s Commentary on the Nāmasaṃgīti, with Introduction and Textual Notes*. DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.
- Tsukamoto, Keisho. 1996. *Indo bukkuyō himei no kenkyū* [A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions]. Vols. I–II. Kyoto: Heirakuji-Shoten.
- Yonezawa, Yoshiyasu. 1998. “A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Mahāyānalakṣaṇa-samuccaya*.” *Journal of Research Society of Buddhism and Cultural Heritage* 7: 36–65.