

Thomas Dreitlein of Kōyasan University for translating this review from Japanese.

Kōyasan University  
Japan

MUROJI Yoshihito

\*\*\*\*\*

Masahide Mori, *Vajrāvālī of Abhayākaragupta: Edition of Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, 2 vols., Buddhica Britannica Series Continua XI, Tring, UK: Institute of Buddhist Studies, 2009, xxvi + 324 Pp. (vol. 1), v + 325-722 Pp. (vol. 2). (Hardback)

Abhayākaragupta's *Vajrāvālī* is an authoritative work on tantric Buddhist consecration composed in the early twelfth century. Over the past twenty years, Prof. Mori has produced more research on the *Vajrāvālī* than anyone else; some thirty-three related publications are listed in his bibliography, including two books in Japanese. Here Mori offers a revised and much expanded version of his doctoral dissertation presented to SOAS, London, in 1996, and the first complete edition of the text.<sup>1</sup> It consists of five parts: (I) an introduction to the life and literary output of Abhayākaragupta and the composition of the *Vajrāvālī*; (II) a brief description of the manuscripts and editorial policy employed in the edition; (III) an edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the *Vajrāvālī*; (IV) textual parallels to the edition; and (V) a series of appendices: a concordance of the Sanskrit and Tibetan sources used in the edition, diagrams of the maṇḍala types and architectural elements described in the *Vajrāvālī*, a table and Sanskrit-Tibetan index of the maṇḍalas' deities and their corresponding emblems, and a partial synopsis of Tsong kha pa's *sNgags rim chen mo*. Eleven colour plates of Himalayan scroll paintings depicting maṇḍala sets are also provided.

The ritual set out in the *Vajrāvālī* may be performed either as a rite of initiation bestowed upon a human candidate (*abhīṣeka*), which Mori calls "consecration", or a rite of installation applied to an image, building or other object (*pratiṣṭhā*). Both alternatives are treated in considerable detail. Abhayākaragupta, writing in a relatively late period, draws upon a large repertoire of named and unnamed tantric sources; some fifty sub-rituals are treated, grouped by Mori into six main topics (v.1, Table 4). The first volume of the edition covers the "preparation of the materials to be installed" such as holy water and the ritual site itself, by means of visualizations, offerings, and divinations such as the

<sup>1</sup> The sections edited in Mori's dissertation correspond to sections §0 & §16-47 of the present edition. I understand that Mori has separately published Japanese translations of several sections: §§1.1 [1991b], 8 [1992a], 12.1-4 [2004a], 12.5-8 [2005a], 13 [2005b], 16-19 [1995], 45 [1993a] and 48 [1994a], as well as a summary of §§20-44 [1992c] and a partial English translation of §§16-19 [2005c]. Appendices 2 & 3 [2001b] and 5 [1998a] have also been published separately. For full citations, see Mori's bibliography (v. I: xxi-xxii).

inspection of the *vāstunāga* (1); the “preliminary rituals” of sanctifying water and the participants in the ritual (2–4); and “maṇḍala construction”, beginning with further site-purification rites — occupying the site at an auspicious time, nailing down interfering deities, and the investiture of the earth goddess — followed by the delineation of the maṇḍala with threads, the sprinkling of coloured powders, and the summoning of the deities into their designated positions; the configuration of least twenty-six maṇḍalas is described (5–15). The second volume covers the “installation ceremony”, namely, the setting up, lustration and sanctification of an image of the maṇḍala’s main deity, with options for installing water fountains or gardens (16–19); the “consecration ceremony” for initiating a candidate into the cult of the maṇḍala’s main deity (20–44); and the “concluding or supplementary rituals”, comprising the *homa* rite, *bali* offerings, and the lore of the vajra and bell held by the practitioner (45–50).

Much of the *Vajrāvalī*’s importance derives from the fact that it brings together centuries of Indian precedent on the consecration ritual. There are few other works on ritual in the mature Buddhist corpus which are quite as rich or as widely accepted among the present-day successors of Indian Buddhism, the tantric Mahayāna institutions of the Newars and Tibetans. Although the *Vajrāvalī* is the product of a late and advanced Buddhist tradition, its subject matter and internal organization follow the mould of earlier compositions. Chief among them are Nāgabuddhi (or -bodhi)’s *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā Vimśatividhi* and Dīpaṅkarabhadra’s *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* (parallels with the latter are collated in Mori’s Table 1). The *Vajrāvalī*, having synthesized such seminal works into a new compendium, in turn superseded them and became important for later figures; Jagaddarpaṇa, for one, reproduces or reworks almost all of it in his (*Ācārya*)*kriyāsamuccaya*. Mori briefly discusses the transmission of the *Vajrāvalī*’s ritual system to Tibet by Śākyaśrībhadrā and others (pp. 28–30).

In introducing his edition of the *Vajrāvalī*, Mori focuses on the structure of the text and its relationship to the Vajrayāna corpus. The *Vajrāvalī* frequently refers the reader to other works by Abhayākaragupta, above all the *Niṣpanna-yogāvalī* and the *Jyotirmañjarī*, which are concerned with the visualization of the maṇḍala’s occupants and with various aspects of the *homa* rite, respectively — both requisites for the consecration process (pp. 8–11). These topics require more exposition than Abhayākaragupta deems manageable for a single work. Mori observes that a large portion of the *Vajrāvalī* is reproduced with slight differences in the *Abhiṣekaprakaraṇa*, a manual attributed to Abhayākaragupta (Table 2), which he understands to be an abridgement of the *Vajrāvalī*, rather than a precursor to it (p. 20). Consequently, the Tibetan text of the *Abhiṣekaprakaraṇa* — it is not known to be extant in Sanskrit — is incorporated within the edition. Although Mori does not question the authorship of the *Abhiṣekaprakaraṇa*, he draws attention to inconsistencies in the form of unresolved references (“misleading statements”) incurred during careless copying. If it is indeed the case that the *Abhiṣekaprakaraṇa* is not mentioned anywhere in Abhayākaragupta’s

works, and that contains nothing original,<sup>2</sup> it appears unlikely that that it was written by Abhayākaragupta. Rather, to me it seems more akin to a class of derivative practically-oriented works circulating in Nepal, which I plan to discuss on another occasion. Mori remarks that the *Abhiṣekaprakaraṇa* “has received no scholarly attention at all” (p. 19); however, Yoeli-Tlalim [2009: 441 n.7] has cited an unpublished 1999 translation (in fact, an “abridged translation”) by Tadeusz Skorupski. Remarkably, Mori does not refer to his earlier research on the \**Śrīkālacakrasupratīṣṭhopāyikavidhi* attributed to Kālacakrapāda [2005c: 228–231], a manual which likewise appears to have been based upon the *Vajrāvalī*.

The edition of the Sanskrit text is based on ten manuscripts. Eight of these are complete, and two are nearly complete. Nine are written on palm leaves; the apparatus refers only to the readings of these manuscripts. As far as I can determine — little or no information regarding scripts, colophons, copyists or place of copying is given — all are of Nepalese origin.<sup>3</sup> It appears that nearly all available Sanskrit witnesses have been used, apart from those which represent later and divergent textual traditions — the *Kriyāsamuccaya* and the like. Four manuscripts known to Mori were not collated; one was illegible (MS IASWR MBB-I-6, siglum L), another inaccessible (MS Baroda 13189, siglum P). Chandra’s 1977 facsimile edition of a twentieth-century paper manuscript (siglum M), which Mori determines to be an apograph of National Archives of Nepal MS 3-402 (siglum D), was not collated. Mori helpfully identifies two distinct affinity groups or textual traditions among the Sanskrit manuscripts (Tables 9–10). The Tibetan edition of the text employs the Peking, Derge and Narthang impressions (sigla P, D, N) of the Tibetan translation, which carries unusual weight, as it was reportedly translated by ’Khor lo grags in collaboration with Abhayākaragupta himself, although the colophon records that it was ‘edited’ or ‘revised’ by later hands (p. 44).

As Mori does not describe the edited text as a critical edition, it cannot be faulted for falling short of the standards expected of critical editions. Mori has taken the trouble to track down many textual parallels in the Tibetan canon, in particular, and hundreds of such parallels are recorded in the fourth section of the book. I should however point out that a number of the sources cited only in Tibetan are also extant in Sanskrit, for example Ratnarākṣita’s *Padminī nāma (Samvarodayatantra)pañjikā*.<sup>4</sup> In particular, more of Abhayākaragupta’s works

<sup>2</sup> For example, the five verses appended by the *Abhiṣekaprakaraṇa* to the section corresponding to *Vajrāvalī* 10.7 (see v. I: 132) = Dīpaṅkarabhadra’s *Guhyasamājamāṇḍalavidhi* vv. 95–99.

<sup>3</sup> The sigla used in the edition and their corresponding Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel numbers are, as far as I can establish, as follows: MS C = A 1297/10 = B 31/14; MS D = A 48/3; MS F = B 31/12; MS G = B 31/13; MS H = C 106/9 (Kesar 132); MS I = A 968/8; MS N = B 31/15; MS O = A 48/14. No MS corresponding to National Archives of Nepal 5-6906, NGMPP A 48/12, seems to have been used. In addition to these MSS, an unpublished catalogue mentions that a palmleaf manuscript of the *Vajrāvalī* comprising 168 folios is or was preserved at the Nor bu gling ka in Lhasa.

<sup>4</sup> The *Padminī* uses (or is otherwise related to) the *Vajrāvalī*; cf. the many parallels: ed. 6.2 <1>, 10.7 <1>, 12.2.1 <1>, 12.3.6 <1> & <3>, 14.1 <2>, 14.2 <1> & <2>, 15.2 <1>, 20.7 <2>.

are partly or wholly available in Sanskrit than those mentioned by Mori (p. 4): the *Abhayapaddhati*,<sup>5</sup> *Āmṇayamañjarī*,<sup>6</sup> *Madhyamakamañjarī*,<sup>7</sup> *Munimatālan-kāra*,<sup>8</sup> *Pañcakramatātparyapañjikā Kramakaumudī*,<sup>9</sup> the (Śrī)samvarābhisa-mayopāyikā,<sup>10</sup> and a *Varṣāpanavidhi* not mentioned by Mori (MS University of Tokyo Matsunami 307-V and others).

Naturally, many of the abovementioned Sanskrit texts could not have been used in preparing the edition. However, the *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṅkarabhadra, which is an especially authoritative source for the *Vajrāvālī*, and which Mori refers to only in Tibetan — “the Sanskrit text is not available at present” (p. 14) — is mostly available in Sanskrit. The extant first 415 of the text’s 450 verses were published in 2006 (*Dhīh* 42, pp. 109–154), and moreover have been made freely available online in 2008 in the form of an e-text prepared by Sabine Klein-Schwind.<sup>11</sup> By referring to the Sanskrit original of Dīpaṅkarabhadra’s manual, more parallels may be located than by relying on the Tibetan translations alone. To give an example, *Vajrāvālī* §12.2.7<sub>9</sub>, *vibhajec ca...* = *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* v.233cd. Many textual parallels not traced in the book may be located in other published Sanskrit texts: e.g. *Vajrāvālī* ed. 35.1<sub>3</sub>, *yuṣmatpādaprasādena ... anugraham* ≈ Padmavajra’s *Guhyasiddhi* 5.22; 12.1.7 [2ab] = *Samvarodaya* 17.23cd. All of section §7.5, which describes the postures adopted by the *ācārya* while purifying the ground, is taken from *Viṃśatavidhi* 3 or another earlier source in which it appears (as was discussed by Tanaka [2004]; this and other parallels are more thoroughly treated in Tanaka [2010: 573–581, 612–628]). There is no index to the parallels, which would have improved the usefulness of the fourth section.

Textual parallels should be traced not merely for the sake of completeness, of course, but in order to assist the editing process and to clarify the author’s motives and influences. Parts of the *Vajrāvālī*’s thread-laying procedure (*sūtraṇa-vidhi*), for instance, are substantially similar to the method prescribed by

21.1 <1>, 22.2.2 <1>, 23.1.2 <4>, 24.2 <2> *et al.* Manuscripts of the *Padmīnī* are discussed in Tanemura’s edition of the commentary on *paṭala* 21 [2009: 24–26]; see also Sferra [2008: 62, #2.7.16]. An edition of the commentary on *paṭala* 1 by Kazuo Kano & Kenichi Kuranishi is reportedly underway; Claudio Cicuzza is now preparing an edition of the whole commentary for publication.

<sup>5</sup> A non-critical edition was published by Chog Dorje [2009]; a three-volume critical edition by Isaacson, Isaacson & Li and Luo [2010] is in press.

<sup>6</sup> This commentary is often referred to in the *Vajrāvālī*; for references and an edition of a folio kept at Göttingen, see Tomabechi & Kano [2008]. An MS in China consisting of 172 folios is mentioned in *Dhīh* 41, MS Tantra-35.

<sup>7</sup> A manuscript is kept in China (*Dhīh* 41, MS Śāstra-41), and an edition based on this manuscript is forthcoming in a project of the China Tibetology Research Centre.

<sup>8</sup> An MS, 202 folios in length, is kept in China (*Dhīh* 41, Śāstra-23).

<sup>9</sup> Mori’s No.7 (Ōt. 2700). An edition is under preparation by Tōru Tomabechi in an official joint project of the China Tibetology Research Centre and the Austrian Academy of Sciences; see Tomabechi & Kano [2008: 22 n.5].

<sup>10</sup> Mori’s No. 6. Leaves of this text have been identified by Péter-Dániel Szántó (forthcoming).

<sup>11</sup> Available at the URL <http://www.tantric-studies.org/e-texts/bauddha/GuSaMaVi.txt>.

Kuladatta in his *Kriyāsaṅgraha*(*pañjikā*),<sup>12</sup> and more generally these two works share a great deal in terms of their scope and subject matter. If we are to understand that Kuladatta’s manual precedes the *Vajrāvalī*, as may be surmised from its near-total exclusion of yoginītantric material,<sup>13</sup> it appears likely that Abhayākaragupta has used the *Kriyāsaṅgraha*, yet for some reason declines to mention it by name.

Mori observes that the *Vajrāvalī* “is an original work and [...] not a commentary on any other tantric text” (p. 12). Nonetheless, the *Vajrāvalī* relies so heavily upon the manuals of Nāgabuddhi/bodhi and Dīpaṅkarabhadra that it may be conceived as a kind of remake of these manuals — undertaken, perhaps, because they were held in especially high regard in Abhayākaragupta’s circle (unlike the unnamed texts which the *Vajrāvalī* claims to improve upon). According to Mori, one of Abhayākaragupta’s models appears to be Ratnākaraśānti’s commentary on Dīpaṅkarabhadra’s *vidhi* (p. 16). Mori locates a great number of parallels in the Tibetan text of Ratnākaraśānti’s *Guhyasamājamāṇḍala-vidhiṭkā*,<sup>14</sup> yet remarks:

We cannot conclude whether Abhaya ... utilised the commentaries of Dīpaṅkarabhadra ... [even though] in seven out of eight cases in which [Abhaya] comments on verses originating from Dīpaṅkarabhadra’s *Maṇḍalavidhi*, Abhaya’s comments on those verses are exactly the same as comments made by Ratnākaraśānti [op.cit.]

Similarly, although Mori states that there “exists no specific commentary on the VA in Tibet” (p. 28), “lCang-skya wrote large works which may be regarded as commentaries on the VA, NPY and the *Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya*” (p. 30), and Tsong kha pa’s *sNgags rim chen mo* is also shown to have substantial affinity with the *Vajrāvalī*.

The edition — I will confine my remarks to the Sanskrit text — contains a few errors, many of which are trivial and easily corrected. A few examples taken from an arbitrary section of the text: §12.1.6 *maṇḍalāt dviguṇāyatam* → *maṇḍalād dviguṇāyatam*; 12.1.7<sub>2</sub> *uttaradiṇmukha* → *uttaradiṇmukha*; 12.2.5<sub>4</sub>: *pratyekam ūrdhvam* → *pratyekam ūrdhvam*; 12.2.7<sub>9</sub> *sūtrām* → *sūtram*; 12.3.3<sub>1-2</sub> *pad masthatve* → *padmasthatve*; 12.3.5<sub>7</sub> *antarāntrareṣu* → *antarāntareṣu*. Some poorly chosen readings in the edited text are also readily fixed: to give one example, §13.3.5, p. 251, which describes the emblems of the goddesses in Lord Hevajra’s retinue: ... *saśuklakapālasthabhikṣū raktabhṛtakapālasthavyāghraḥ* ... — here the text should follow the reading of MS F (*saśukra-*), which agrees with the Tibetan (*khu ba* ...). Mori’s edition of §13, the section on the emblems of the

<sup>12</sup> *Vajrāvalī* ed. 12.1.2 ≈ *Kriyāsaṅgraha* 3.5.3; see Tanemura [2004: 141].

<sup>13</sup> The matter of whether the *Kriyāsaṅgraha* precedes the *Vajrāvalī*, or vice versa, has been discussed in some depth by Tanemura [2004: 9–15]. Mori does not mention most of the parallels adduced by Tanemura.

<sup>14</sup> Namely, §§7.4 <1>, 8.1 <1>, 8.2 <1>, 9.1 <1>, 10.1 <1>, 10.2 <2>, 10.3 <1>, 10.3 <2>, 10.4 <1>, 10.5 <3>, 10.7 <1>, 11.1 <1> and many others.

maṇḍala deities, is a vast improvement over the 1981 effort of D.C. Bhattacharyya based on one manuscript, although the apparatus to the edition does not record many variants which appear in Bhattacharyya's text.

It is apparent that the bibliography, the section on textual parallels and much of the other front and back matter have not been thoroughly checked. A small sample of typos from the bibliography: Manuscripts Sanskrits → Manuscripts sanscrits; Kiyio → Kiyo; Pratiṭhā → Pratiṣṭhā (p. xvii); Sarvathathāgata → Sarvatathāgata (p. xix); Birthsday → Birthday; Hounour → Honour (p. xxii); Felicitaion → Felicitation; Marylin → Marilyn (p. xxiii); Critiquial → Critical (p. xxv). Some Japanese terms are written with long *ō* or *ū* diacritics, some not — even in the same sentence: e.g. Taisho daigaku bukkyo kenkyūsho nenpo → Taishō daigaku bukkyō kenkyūsho nenpō (p. xx). Many of the 'Secondary Sources' contain editions of Sanskrit texts which should have been listed among the 'Primary Sources'. The parallels section has recurrent typos: Śrīhrerukabhūta, Rahūraśrīrjñāna, Divākṛacandra, etc. These small yet pervasive problems, including shortcomings in English style that need not be discussed, are glaring enough that they should have been obvious to the editorial board of the *Buddhica Britannica* series, whose members include English native speakers. The American Jesuit John K. Locke, whom the book credits as a member of the board, died in March of 2009<sup>15</sup> — whether after or before the book went to press that year, I do not know.

In closing, let me affirm that the present edition of the *Vajrāvālī* is a very welcome contribution to the study of Indian tantric Buddhism, and offers a foundation for work on the text for a long time to come. Mori's diligence and long experience with the *Vajrāvālī* has yielded patent good results, a natural outcome of the scientifically minded and non-sectarian outlook that produces the best work in the field. I hope that many more of Mori's findings on tantric Buddhist art and praxis will reach the wide audience they deserve.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chog Dorje (ed.), *Abhayapaddhati of Abhayākaragupta: Commentary on the Buddhakapāla-mahātantra*, Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2009.
- Isaacson, Mei (ed.), *Abhayākaragupta's Abhayapaddhati, Chapters 1–5*, Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region (STTAR) 12; Isaacson, Harunaga & Li Xuezhong (eds.), *Abhayākaragupta's Abhayapaddhati, Chapters 6–8*, STTAR 13; Luo Hong (ed.), *Abhayākaragupta's Abhayapaddhati, Chapters 9–14*, STTAR 14 (3 vols.), Beijing-Hamburg: China Tibetology Publishing House & Centre for Tantric Studies, 2010.
- Mori, Masahide, "The Installation Ceremony in Tantric Buddhism", in Shingo Einoo & Jun Takashima (eds.), *From Material to Deity: Indian Rituals of Consecration*, Japanese Studies on South Asia 4. Delhi: Manohar, 2005(c), pp. 199–240.
- Sferra, Francesco, "Sanskrit Manuscripts and Photographs of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Giuseppe Tucci's Collection", in Francesco Sferra (ed.), *Sanskrit texts from Giuseppe Tucci's collection*, Serie Orientale Roma CIV, Roma: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2008, pp. 15–78.
- Szántó, Péter-Dániel, "A Fragment from Abhayākaragupta's *Śrīsamvarābhīsamayopāyikā*", (forthcoming).

<sup>15</sup> See Gregory Sharkey, "John K Locke, scholar of Buddhism", *The Nepal Times* 443, 20–26 March 2009.

- Tanaka, Kimiaki, “NāgabodhiのŚrī-guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi における5種のsthānakaと53種のākṣepaについて (On the Five Postures (Sthānaka) and Fifty-three Poses (Ākṣepa) According to Nāgabodhi’s Śrī-guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi)”, *Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 東洋文化研究所紀要 146, 2004, pp. 199–240.
- Tanaka, Kimiaki, インドにおける曼荼羅の成立と発展 (*The Genesis and Development of the Mandala*), Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 2010.
- Tanemura, Ryūgen, *Kuladatta’s Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā: a critical edition and annotated translation of selected sections*, Groningen Oriental studies 29, Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2004.
- Tanemura, Ryūgen, “*Samvarodayatantra* 第21章 *Caryānirdeśapaṭala* に関する一考察 — *Padmīnī* 第21章校訂テキスト並びに註 (Some remarks on the *Caryānirdeśapaṭala* of the *Samvarodayatantra*: with a critical edition of and notes on the *Padmīnī*, chapter 21)”, *Mikkyōgaku Kenkyū* 密教学研究 41, 2009, pp. 23–39.
- Tomabechi, Tōru and Kano, Kazuo, “A Critical Edition and Translation of a Text Fragment from Abhayākaragupta’s *Āmnāyamañjarī*. Göttingen, Cod. ms. sanscr. 259b”, *Tantric Studies* 1, 2008, pp. 22–44.
- Yoeli-Tlalim, Ronit, “The Kālacakra Empowerment as Conducted by Kirti Tsenshab Rinpoche”, in Edward A. Arnold (ed.), *As Long as Space Endures: Essays on the Kālacakra Tantra in Honor of H.H. the Dalai Lama*, Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2009, pp. 415–449.

Monash University  
Melbourne

Iain SINCLAIR

\*\*\*\*\*

Bansi Pandit, *The Hindu Mind: Fundamentals of Hindu Religion and Philosophy for All Ages*, New Delhi: New Age Books, 2004, 448 Pp. Rs. 395 (First Asian Edition: Delhi, 2001). (Paperback)

Hinduism, the Sanātana Dharma is the oldest surviving religion in the world. This book presents the fundamental Hindu religious and philosophical thoughts in a logical and straight forward manner. Since the religious and philosophical literature of Hindu religion is vast, diverse and provides information about spiritual experiences on a large number of Hindu seers and saints, it is very difficult for a beginner to know about this religion without going through volumes of literature.

This book “Hind Mind” has two-fold purposes. First, it serves the purpose for those who are anxious to learn the basic concepts of Hindu religion without consulting the time-consuming research or involved in the complex Hindu thought. Second, the children born in Hindu families, especially outside India, lacking the opportunity to get some information about their own religion.

The author of this book mentions an excellent introduction to the philosophical, ritualistic, social, ethical and historical prospects of Hinduism. The main contribution of this treatise is that it emphasizes the interconnections and inter-relations among these different types of concept. The author tries his best to explain the important and essential fundamental concepts of Hinduism such as Brahman, *karma*, *dharma*, *māyā*, *saṃskāra* etc.