

A NEW HISTORY OF TANTRIC LITERATURE IN INDIA*

J. W. de Jong.

Matsunaga Yūkei (1929-) belongs to the younger generation of Tantric scholars in Japan. He has published many articles and several books, including a brief history of Tantrism (*Mikkyō no rekishi*. Kyōto, Heirakuji shoten, 1969) and a critical edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Guhyasamājatantra* (Ōsaka, Tōhō Shuppan Inc., 1978). Whereas in the past Japanese scholars studied only the Chinese translations of Tantric texts, Matsunaga's research takes into account Sanskrit manuscripts and Tibetan translations. Moreover, he is well acquainted with the work of Western and Indian scholars. In his recent book, entitled 'Historical studies on the formation of Tantric texts', Matsunaga has published the results of his studies on the formation of important Indian Tantric texts and rituals. This book is an important contribution to Tantric studies and contains much information on the development of Tantrism in India. It is therefore perhaps not superfluous to summarise its contents in some detail and to point out some of the results obtained by Matsunaga.

Matsunaga's book is divided into an introduction and four chapters, each subdivided into several sections. Below we will indicate the Introduction by the letter A, the chapters by Roman numerals and the sections by Arabic ciphers. A,1 deals mainly with terminological matters and the divisions of Buddhist tantras. In Japan the opposition between Mikkyō and Kengyō (the esoteric and the exoteric doctrines) goes back to Kūkai (774-835). However, Kūkai's definition of Mikkyō was not accepted by other monks such as Ennin (794-864), and in later times the Mikkyō of the Tendai school (Taimitsu) and the Mikkyō of the Shingon school (Tōmitsu) were opposed to each other. The expressions *Mikkyō* and *Kengyō* are found in a text translated by Pu-k'ung (705-774), the *Sung-shih t'o-lo-ni i-tsan* (T. 902), but the attribution of this translation to Pu-k'ung is doubtful and it is not at all certain that the terms *Mikkyō* and *Kengyō* are based upon Indian terms. M. [=Matsunaga] points out that in the West such terms as esoteric Buddhism, Buddhist Tantrism and Tantric Buddhism are used. He examines the meaning of the word tantra in Indian non-Buddhist texts and in Buddhist texts, especially the *Guhyasamāja*.

* Matsunaga Yūkei, *Mikkyō kyōten seiritsushi-ron*. Kyōto, Hōzōkan, 1980. 330+31 pp.

The term Buddhist Tantrism, he concludes, indicates a Buddhist variant of an Indian religious and cultural phenomenon, whereas the term Mikkyō points to the secret elements in Buddhist doctrine. In Japan, Tantric studies are concentrated on the doctrines of the Shingon and Tendai schools, whereas, in the West, more attention has been paid to Tantrism as a religion in India and Tibet and Tantric texts in Sanskrit and Tibetan have been carefully studied. According to M. both approaches have their valid points and should be combined in the study of Indian Tantrism. Considered in the light of both Western Tantric studies and the Japanese tradition of Mikkyō studies, Mikkyō can be regarded as encompassing within the boundaries of Buddhism with bodhi as its main goal, all the secret doctrines, ceremonies, spells and symbols which are derived from Tantrism. It is in this sense that the word Mikkyō is used by the author in this book. Henceforth, we will take the liberty to use in its place the term Tantrism.

In Japan the terms *junmitsu* (pure Tantrism) and *zōmitsu* (mixed Tantrism) were used first by Kūkai. According to his terminology *zōmitsu* indicated the Tantric doctrines not included in the systems of the *Dainichikyō* and the *Kongōchōkyō* (T. 848 and 865). It is only much later that these two terms were used by Ekō (1666-1734) to indicate an opposition implying a value judgment. In Shingon studies *zōmitsu* is used as a deprecatory term to indicate ritual and dhāraṇī texts which have as their chief goal worldly goods and benefits, whereas *junmitsu* designates *Dainichikyō* and the *Kongōchōkyō* texts which deal mainly with the attainment of bodhi. M. distinguishes three periods in the history of Tantric Buddhism, the early period, the middle period (the seventh century) and the later period (from the eighth century onward). Most of the *zōmitsu* texts are products of the early period; the *Dainichikyō* and *Kongōchōkyō* texts date from the middle period. The so-called Tantras of the left-hand arose in India in the later period and the texts of this school have not been transmitted to Japan. M. points out that von Glasenapp wrongly used the terms *junmitsu* and *zōmitsu* as corresponding to a pure Tantrism of the right hand and a Tantrism mixed with śākta elements of the left hand (cf. *Buddhistische Mysterien*, p. 41).

In Western publications on Tantrism many names of *yāna*-s are mentioned, but without references to sources. M. points out that in Tibetan historical works and in commentaries written by Tibetan scholars, Tantrism is designated by the name *Śñag-kyi theg-pa* (Mantrayāna) in opposition to the *Pha-rol-tu phyin-pa'i theg-pa* (Pāramitāyāna). However, in the *Guhyasamāja*, the term Mantrayāna is not found, but only the term *Mantranaya*. In the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* the term *mantracaryānaya* is used. The eighth century commentator Buddhaguhya distinguishes a *pāramitānaya* and a *mantranaya*. The same distinction is made in the eleventh and twelfth century by Advayavajra

and Ratnākaraśānti who also make use of the term *mantrayāna*. Both *mantrayāna* and *mantranaya* are found in the *Sekoddeśaṭīkā*, a commentary of the *Kālacakratānta*. It is not possible to indicate exactly the meaning of these two words and how the term *mantrayāna* has arisen from the term *mantranaya*. However, when Advayavajra and Ratnākaraśānti use the term *mantrayāna*, it indicates a subdivision of Mahāyāna, the other subdivision being the Pāramitāyāna. Therefore, Tantrism is not, as is commonly assumed, a third *yāna* opposed to both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna.

In a brief survey of the Tantric texts M. points out that most Chinese translations of Tantric texts date from the T'ang dynasty. In Tibet the first translations were made in the second half of the eighth century. Especially in the period of the later spread of the doctrine (*Phyi dar*) in the eleventh century and following centuries, a great many Tantric texts were translated into Tibetan. Many Tantric texts are only preserved in Tibetan translations, which have the advantage of being more accurate than Chinese translations.

In the thirteenth century Bu-ston divided Tantric texts into four groups: *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yoga* and *anuttarayoga*. This classification must have originated in India, for the eighth-century commentator Buddhaguhya had already divided Tantric texts into two groups, *kriyā* and *yoga*, and subdivided the *kriyātantra*-s into general (*spyi'i cho-ga*) and special (*bye-brag*) tantras. In a work written in the tenth century, the *Vajrajñāna-samuccayatantra*, a five-fold division is given: *mahāyoga* (rnal-'byor chen-po), *dvaya* (gñis-ka), *caryā*, *kriyā* and *kalpa* (rtog-pa). Several other systems of classification are mentioned by M., such as the seven-fold division found in Atiśa's *Bodhimārgapradīpapañjikā*.

In A. 2 and A. 3 M. gives a short history of Tantric studies in Japan and Europe. In the final section of this chapter (A. 4) M. points out that Indian Tantrism can be studied in two ways, by examining the literature and archaeological remains and by studying Tantrism as a living religion in Tibetan communities and in Japan. Both methods have their weak points and it is necessary to combine them in the study of Indian Tantrism.

Chapter I is entitled 'Ancient Indian culture and Tantrism'. In I. 1 M. points out that Buddhism has absorbed many elements of ancient Indian culture, such as spells and rituals which aim at obtaining worldly goals, although the attainment of bodhi and the reaching of Nirvāṇa were taught by the Buddha himself. In the early Tantric texts, worldly goals were more important than the pursuit of bodhi. However, in the middle period, the attainment of Buddhahood became the chief goal and many rituals were re-interpreted, sublimated and purified. On the other hand, abstract Buddhist Mahāyāna concepts such as that of the Void (*śūnya*) and the Pure Light (*prabhāsvara*) came to be symbolised

by Tantric rituals. Many Hindu gods were incorporated into the Buddhist pantheon as represented in the two maṇḍalas, the Garbhamaṇḍala and the Vajradhātumaṇḍala. The same process continued in the later period in which the *anuttarayogatantra*-s were composed.

I. 2 deals with the acceptance of evil in Tantrism. Many Tantric rituals stand in opposition to ordinary ethics, which explains the hostile reaction to both Hindu and Buddhist Tantrism in recent times. However, Tantrism does not blindly accept evil. Its presence in Tantrism is due, on the one hand, to the fact that Tantra yoga has as its goal union with the Absolute, and, on the other, to the fact that many ancient religious elements have been preserved in Tantrism. The opposition to ordinary ethics is especially strong in *anuttarayoga*. In the *Guhyasamāja*, a representative text of the 'father' tantras of the *anuttarayoga*, the yoga system contains six members, omitting from the eight members of the system of the Yogasūtra 'prohibition' (*yama*) and 'restraint' (*niyama*). In the *sādhana*-s of the *anuttarayoga* it is said that for the yogin in possession of 'wisdom' (*prajñā*) and 'means' (*upāya*) evil does not exist. The *anuttarayoga* texts declare that ordinary rituals are useless for obtaining the highest siddhi. Most conspicuous is the opposition to ordinary ethics in the attitude to sexual acts. M. points to the relation between agricultural activities and procreation in agricultural communities. Quoting Eliade, M. states that for primitive peoples the sexual act was a sacrament expressing holy union. Physiological functions were thought to correspond to cosmic activities. In the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. non-Brahmanical religions such as Buddhism and Jainism developed in mercantile centres, where there was less use for the ancient agricultural magic. However, with the revival of Hinduism during the Gupta period, Hindu customs and old Indian magical practices were revived and adopted by Mahāyāna Buddhism, wherein they were transformed by mystical explanations, and by a process of symbolisation and purification. The union (*yuganaddha*) of *prajñā* and *upāya* symbolised the union of the masculine and feminine principles. In Hindu tantras the five makāras were taught (*maḍya*, *māṃsa*, *matsya*, *mudrā* and *maithuna*), but they were explained as representing the five elements. The practice of Tantric rituals was dangerous and could not be undertaken without correct preparation and the supervision of a teacher.

Tantric texts taught that it was sometimes even necessary to kill, and commentators such as Amoghavajra explain that one may kill those who want to destroy the doctrine and to harm living beings, and that one must abolish one's own bad thoughts. On the other hand, killing could be an act of mercy with the intention of thereby saving sinners and leading them to deliverance. The three *kleśa*-s, passion (*rāga*), hate (*dveṣa*) and delusion (*moha*), which were called the three poisons, came to be valued in a positive

way in Tantrism, which taught that one ought to transcend passion by means of passion. M. points out that Avalon and de La Vallée Poussin were the first Western scholars to explain correctly the symbolic character of Hindu and Buddhist Tantric doctrines.

II. 1 deals mainly with the *dhāraṇī*, its original meaning and later developments. According to M. *mantra*, *ju* 'spell' and *dhāraṇī* have almost the same meaning in the middle and later periods of Tantrism, but *mantra* is by far the oldest of them and already found in the Atharvaveda as a spell to ward off evil and to obtain happiness. The Chinese translation of the word *vidyā*, *ming-chou* (Japanese *myōju*), combines the two meanings of science and magic. The Prajñāpāramitā texts are considered to be a great magical science, *mahāvidyā*, by means of which one is not only able to ward off evil but also to obtain the supreme *bodhi* and the wisdom of the Buddha.¹

The word *dhāraṇī* is derived from the verb *dhṛ*-and is translated into Chinese and Tibetan by words meaning 'to hold'. This meaning is related to the *yoga* exercise *dhāraṇā* which originally meant the concentration of the mind on one point. In early Mahāyāna texts the word *dhāraṇī* is used to indicate the memorizing of texts. In early Buddhism the words *saccakiriyā* and *paritta* are used in the meaning of 'spell', but the word *dhāraṇī* is not found. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* divides *dhāraṇī*-s in four groups: *dharma*, *artha*, *mantra* and *bodhisattvākṣāntilābha*. The *mantradhāraṇī* is a spell capable of appeasing many plagues. The *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* divides the *dhāraṇī*-s into three groups: *śrutadhara*, *vibhajyajñāna* and *ghoṣapraveśa*. M. compares these three to the *dharma*-, *artha*- and *bodhisattvākṣāntilābhadhāraṇī*-s mentioned in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, and supposes that in the third or fourth century the *mantradhāraṇī*-s were added to the three other groups.

M. points out that *dhāraṇī* in the meaning 'spell' is not found in the earliest Mahāyāna texts but in additions made to these texts in the third century A. D. The word *dhāraṇī* has also assimilated the two meanings of the word *vidyā*, i. e. science and magic. In several texts the *dhāraṇī* is considered to incorporate the wisdom of the Buddha and the doctrine of the Buddha. In Mahāyāna Buddhism the doctrine of the Buddha is believed to be capable of warding off evil. According to M., by memorizing a *dhāraṇī* (in the sense of the concentration of the mind in meditation) one obtains the wisdom of the Buddha. By the power of memorizing the *dhāraṇī* which incorporates the doctrine of the Buddha, and by the power of the wisdom of the Buddha, one is able

1 Matsunaga does not refer to the materials collected by Lamotte in his study on *dhāraṇī* (*Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, tome IV, Louvain, 1976, pp. 1854—1864). Many texts discussed by Matsunaga have been studied also by Lamotte.

to conquer external enemies such as the *kleśa*-s and calamities. On the other hand, if a monk is threatened by robbers, poisonous snakes, etc., it is possible for him to ward off such dangers by entering into meditation.

In Mahāyāna texts *dhāraṇī* is used in two meanings: the memorization of texts and a magic spell. In the many versions of the *Anantamukhadhāraṇī* from the beginning of the third century to the later half of the eighth century *dhāraṇī* is always used to indicate the memorization of texts, but in other Mahāyāna texts this meaning gradually disappears and the *dhāraṇī* becomes more and more a magic spell possessing the power attributed to *paritta*-s in early Buddhism.

The overwhelming majority of the early Tantric *dhāraṇī* texts are all magical, but in the Tantric texts of the middle period the problem of attaining Buddhahood becomes of major importance. Of the five versions of a *dhāraṇī* text (T. 1137, 1138a, 1138b, 1139 and 1140) three were translated during the Eastern Chin (317—420 A. D.), one by Bodhiruci in the beginning of the T'ang dynasty, and one by Fa-hsien in the beginning of the Sung dynasty. All versions mention the twenty advantages of reciting *dhāraṇī*-s, but only Bodhiruci's version mentions among these advantages that of rapidly obtaining the supreme *bodhi*. In the middle of the seventh century Tantric texts were translated by five translators, Chih-t'ung, Ch'ieh-fan-to-mo, Atigupta, Puṇyodaya and Hsüan-tsang. In texts, translated by Chih-t'ung, Atigupta and Puṇyodaya many spells are found, but the problem of attaining Buddhahood also becomes important. Of the ten texts translated by Hsüan-tsang, only one (T. 1034) does not make any mention of the attainment of Buddhahood, but the other nine texts repeatedly stress that this is one of the advantages derived from reciting *dhāraṇī*-s. However, in other versions of several of these texts, this is not mentioned at all, and it is therefore quite possible that Hsüan-tsang, who was not greatly interested in Tantrism, made alterations in the Tantric texts translated by him.

In the first section of II. 2 M. studies the development of Tantric ritual on the basis of Chinese translations of Tantric texts. Statues of Buddhas are already mentioned in a text translated at the end of the second century A. D. (T. 417), and the adoration of statues must have been practised in the third century. More detailed descriptions are given in texts translated in the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth century. Several texts translated in the same period describe the veneration of the seven Buddhas, the eight bodhisattvas and of Avalokiteśvara. The *sīmābandha* (*kekkaï*) and the *homa* (*goma*) rituals were probably practised by the beginning of the fourth century. The *abhiṣeka* (*kanjō*) is described in a text (T. 1331) the translation of which is attributed to Śrīmitra, who translated several texts in the period 317—322. M. remarks that the

authenticity of this work has been called into question but that the passage describing the *abhiṣeka* is certainly of Indian origin. The meditation on Buddhas (*buddhānu-smṛti*, *kanbutsu*) is first mentioned in a text translated in the beginning of the fourth century (T. 643). In a text translated in the first half of the sixth century (T. 1007), one can find the early stage of the *maṇḍala*, and descriptions of Buddhas and bodhisattvas with many arms. In it *mudrā*-s are mentioned for the first time. A text translated by Chih-t'ung about 650 A. D. (T 1103b) describes in detail the meditation on Tārā by means of the *bīja* *trūṃ*, which is transformed into a blue lotus, which in turn transforms itself into the bodhisattva Tārā. In several texts which are considered to be precursors of the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* (*Dainichikyō*) the three rituals of warding off evil (*sokusai*), increasing happiness (*zōyaku*) and exorcising demons (*chōbuku*) are described (T. 893, 895 and 897).

In the second section of II. 2 M. examines the history of the two *maṇḍalas* (Vajradhātu- and Garbha-) with their two groups of five Buddhas; Garbhamāṇḍala: Vairocana in the centre, and in the East, the South, the West and the North respectively Ratnaketu, Saṃkusumitarāja, Amitāyus and Dundubhisvara; Vajradhātumaṇḍala: Vairocana in the centre, and in the East, the South, the West and the North respectively Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitāyus and Amoghasiddhi. Already in the fourth century there existed a group of four Buddhas: Akṣobhya, Ratnaketu, Amitāyus and Dundubhisvara. This group continued to exist in the same form until the end of the seventh century. It is only in the beginning of the eighth century that groups of five Buddhas with Vairocana in the centre first appear in Chinese translations. In a text translated by Bodhiruci (T. 1092) two groups of five Buddhas are described, one with Śākyamuni in the centre, and in the four directions (E, S, W, N) Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Lokeśvararāja, and the other with Vairocana in the centre, and in the four directions Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Avalokiteśvararāja and Amoghasiddhi. Another text translated by Bodhiruci (T. 951) describes a group of five Buddhas with Śākyamuni in the centre, and in the four directions Ratnaketu, Saṃkusumitarāja, Amitābha and Akṣobhya. In the *Dainichikyō* this group developed into two different groups, one with Vairocana in the centre, and in the four directions Ratnaketu, Saṃkusumitarāja, Amitāyus and Acala, and the other with Issaisekensaisontokushin (Skt. ?) in the centre, and in the four directions Ratnaketu, Saṃkusumitarāja, Amitāyus and Dundubhisvara. M. considers the first group to be older and the second a later development. From the eighth century in India, the Garbhamāṇḍala did not change much, but there were important changes in the Vajradhātumaṇḍala. As to the pictorial representations of the Garbhamāṇḍala, two different traditions exist, one going back to Śubhakarasiṃha, and the other to Amoghavajra and Buddhaguhya.

However, it is doubtful that Amoghavajra and Buddhaguhya were responsible for the second tradition, which is better described as the non-Śubhakarasiṃha tradition.

Chapter three deals with the formation of some of the most important Tantras of the middle period, such as the *Dainichikyō* (T. 848), the *Kongōchōkyō* (T. 865) and the *Rishukyō* (T. 243). The texts of this period can be distinguished from those of the first period by the following five characteristics. 1. The goal of the Tantric rituals is no longer worldly gain but the attainment of Buddhahood (*jōbutsu*; *abhisambodhi*). 2. In the early tantras, *mudrā*-s, *dhāraṇī*-s and *samādhi*-s were not systematically arranged. In the middle period they are grouped together systematically as the three secrets (*sanmitsu*) of body, word and mind (*kāyavākcitta*). 3. The content of many early tantras was magical, with no direct relation to Buddhist teaching. In the tantras of the middle period, Mahāyāna ideas are incorporated in Tantric ritual. M. proposes to call this the ritualisation (*gikika*) of Mahāyāna ideas. 4. A special characteristic of the tantras in the middle period is the formation of maṇḍalas, namely the Mahākaruṇāgarbhoḍbhavamāṇḍala, which is based on the *Dainichikyō* and the Vajradhātumaṇḍala which is described in the *Shinjitsushōkyō* (*Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgrahasūtra*, T. 882). 5. In the early Tantras the preacher is Śākyamuni, but in the tantras of the middle period the preacher is the Tathāgata Mahāvairocana. According to the tradition of Japanese Tantrism, the preaching of Mahāvairocana is that of the *dharmakāya* as opposed to the preaching of the *nirmāṇakāya* by Śākyamuni.

Mahāyāna ideas are found above all in the first chapter of the *Dainichikyō*, which has as its chief theme the explanation of the *sarvajña-jñāna*, the knowledge of the Buddha and the highest reality. Madhyamaka influence is visible in the explanation of the *bodhi* and the *citta* as free from all ideas (*vikalpa*), void (*śūnya*), without marks (*alakṣaṇa*) and unperceivable (*anupalabdha*). Connection with the Tathāgatagarbha system is shown by the conception of the mind as originally pure (*prakṛtivyūḍha*). According to Buddhaguhya's commentary, the *bodhicitta* is of two kinds, the mind which is directed towards bodhi, called *prañidhicitta* and *prasthānacitta*, and the mind which has bodhi as its essence. The idea that the essence of the *bodhicitta* is identical with the supreme bodhi is not found in ordinary Mahāyāna Buddhism. The influence of Mahāyāna ideas can also be traced in the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, and especially in the five-fold meditation described in the first chapter. This meditation, which later is called the *Gosōjōshingan*, culminates in the identification of one's body with the body of the Buddha. In this meditation such Mahāyāna ideas as that of the Void, of the luminosity of the mind and of the symbolism of the *vajra* are expressed in the ritual to be performed. M. points out that by incorporating these ideas in this ritual they are

gradually transformed in the process of the so-called ritualisation of Mahāyāna ideas. He explains how this process is further developed in two representative *anuttarayoga-tantra*-s, the *Guhyasamājatantra* and the *Hevajratantra*.

In the Tantric texts of the middle and later periods the chief goal is the union of the individual with the Buddha, the *nyūga-ganyū*, the merging of the Buddha with the self and the merging of the self with the Buddha. Several rituals which aim at obtaining this goal are described in the texts, for instance the so-called *shusanzongan* or *jiingyōkan* in which the union with the Buddha and bodhisattva is obtained by meditating on his *bīja* (a Sanskrit syllable), his symbol (*samaya*) and finally on his external form. This ritual is first described in a text translated by Chih-sung in the beginning of the seventh century (not eighth as said on p. 151) which describes the meditation on Tārā. Another ritual is the *gojigonshingan*, the ritual of the five syllables *a*, *va*, *ra*, *ha* and *kha*, which is found in the *Dainichikyō* and related texts. These five *bīja*-s possess five colours and five forms and represent the five elements. They are located in meditation in five places in the body. Another ritual found in the *Dainichikyō* is the four-fold recitation (*jāpa*, *nenju*, tib. *bzlas-brjod*²). The *Dainichikyō* belongs to the *caryā* class of Tantras. In the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, a *yogatantra*, the *gosōjōshingan*, the fivefold meditation in which one's body is united with the Buddha is described. Many rituals are found in *anuttarayoga* texts and it is impossible to designate any one which is representative of this class of tantras. As an example of a ritual, M. summarises the *caturaṅga-sādhana* which is found in the *Guhyasamāja*, consisting of *sevā*, *upāsādhana*, *sādhana* and *mahāsādhana*. In the Uttaratantra *sevā* is divided into two parts, the fourfold *vajra* ritual (*vajracatuṣka*) and the *yoga* in six members (*ṣaḍaṅgayoga*). The first forms the basis of the *utpattikrama* and the second of the *utpanna-* or *sampannakrama*. These two *krama*-s are described in the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* and the *Pañcakrama*, which were edited by de La Vallée Poussin in 1896 (*Études et textes tantriques. Pañcakrama*). Finally, M. points out that the ritual of the identification of the self with the Buddha (*nyūgaganyū*) is found in a rather complete and standardised form in Japan, but that in India many different forms existed, based upon different texts, rituals and schools. However, all these rituals have as their final goal the union of the microcosmos (the individual) with the macrocosmos (the Buddha), the unio mystica.

Sections 2, 3 and 4 of chapter three examine the history of three Tantric texts which are of great importance for Sino-Japanese Tantrism: the *Dainichikyō*, the *Kongōchōkyō*

2 R. Tajima, *Étude sur le Mahāvairocana-sūtra* (Paris, 1936), pp. 117—118.

and the *Rishukyō*. M. first gives some information on the Chinese and Tibetan versions of the texts and their commentaries, and then examines the problem of the *randatsu*, the inversion of words or passages. According to the tradition these inversions in the text were made purposely so that it would not be possible to understand the text without the aid of the oral tradition. M. rejects this traditional explanation, and by comparing the Chinese translation of the *Dainichikyō* with the Tibetan translations of this text and of Buddhaguhya's commentary, he shows that the theory advanced in this commentary (T. 1796) of an inversion in the *maṇḍala* is not confirmed by other texts. This inversion is not found in the original text of the *Dainichikyō*, and therefore goes back to Śubhakarasiṃha or to the oral tradition handed down by him. Another case of *randatsu* is found in the two groups of four Buddhas in the Garbhamāṇḍala. The first group comprises Acala (i. e. Akṣobhya) and the second Dundubhisvara. The commentary tries to explain this difference away by considering Acala not to be a proper name. M. explains that the text of the *Dainichikyō* is not well arranged and is incomplete. There are many differences between the four versions of the text, i. e. in the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the text and the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the text as found in the two commentaries (T. 1796 and the Tibetan translation of Buddhaguhya's commentary). It is obvious that the text of the *Dainichikyō* has been much changed in the course of time, and that different traditions have been established. The so-called *randatsu*-s are due to conflicting traditions and not to a conscious effort to hide the meaning of the text.

Previous scholars assumed that the Sanskrit text of the *Dainichikyō* was written either in 660—670, or about 650 or slightly earlier. M. points out that the archaeological evidence shows that Padmapāṇi and Vajrapāṇi are already found together at the end of the sixth century in the cave-temples of Aurangabad. The three basic *kula*-s of the *Dainichikyō* are represented by the Buddha, Padma and Vajra. It is therefore possible that this text had already been written in the first half of the seventh century. The problem remains why the text had not been brought to China by the middle of the seventh century. Ōmura Seigai thought that the *Dainichikyō* was written in Nālandā, but Toganoo Shōun opted for Lāṭā in Western India. M. rejects Toganoo's arguments and points out that the text was obtained by Wu-hsing in Nālandā. Archaeological evidence also points to the same region.

The Sanskrit text of the *Dainichikyō* has so far not been found, but several quotations have been traced, one in the first *Bhāvanākrama* by Kamalaśīla, fourteen

3 Cf. Tajima, *op. cit.*, p. 54, n. 1.

and a half verses in a text discovered in Java, three quotations in the *Pradīpoddya-na*, a commentary on the *Guhyasamāja*, and one quotation each in the *Guhyasamāja* and in the *Sādhana-mālā*. Wogihara Unrai identified the fourteen and a half verses which were quoted in the *Sang hyang Kamahāyānikam* and compared the Sanskrit text with the Chinese translation. M. gives the text of these versions and in the notes refers to both the Chinese and Tibetan translations.⁴

Kongōchōkyō is the name of the translation of the *Sarvata^{ra}tathāgata^{ra}tattvasaṃgraha* (hence *Tattvasaṃgraha*) by Amoghavajra (T. 865), but is also the name of a collection of eighteen texts preached in eighteen assemblies. This extensive text, which is said to contain 100.000 ślokas (i. e. 3.200.000 syllables), is described by Amoghavajra (T. 869). Of the eighteen texts described by him the first is the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, and the sixth and fifteenth correspond to the *Rishukyō* and the *Guhyasamājatantra*. However, at the time of Amoghavajra these last two texts were much shorter than those now extant. The same must be true of the other texts described by him, with the exception of the first, the *Tattvasaṃgraha*. According to tradition, Vajrabodhi lost the larger recension of the *Kongōchōkyō* during his sea voyage to China and was able to save only a smaller recension in 4.000 ślokas. This tradition is not to be relied upon. However, it is possible that at the time of Amoghavajra there existed several texts belonging to the *Kongōchōkyō* and many rituals which, together, can be considered as a large recension of the *Kongōchōkyō*.

The Sanskrit text of the *Tattvasaṃgraha* has been published recently by Horiuchi Kanjin. The Tibetan translation by Śraddhākaravarma and Rin-chen bzañ-po dates from the eleventh century. The *Tattvasaṃgraha* was translated three times into Chinese, by Vajrabodhi (T. 866), by Amoghavajra (T. 865) and by Shih-hu (T. 882). The last is the most complete text and corresponds to the Tibetan translation. It consists of 26 sections and is divided into five chapters. Amoghavajra's translation corresponds to the first six *chüan* of Shih-hu's translation in thirty *chüan*. The manuscript brought from India by Amoghavajra contained four of the five chapters of the recension translated by Shih-hu, but he was unable to translate more than the first chapter. The text translated by Vajrabodhi represents a much shorter recension than the one translated by Amoghavajra.

Shih-hu arrived in China in 980, and the text translated by him must have been written in India at the latest in the middle of the tenth century. Tibetan versions of three

4 See also J. W. de Jong, 'Notes on the sources and the text of the Sang hyang Kamahāyānan Mantranaya', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 130 (1974), pp. 465—482.

commentaries written by Buddhaguhya, Śākyamitra and Ānandagarbha in the eighth century are found in the Tanjur. The text must therefore have been in existence in its final form at the end of the eighth century. The recensions translated by Amoghavajra and Vajrabodhi date from the first half of the eighth century and the end of the seventh century. At the end of the seventh century the original recension of the *Tattvasaṃgraha* was already in existence. Until the end of the eighth century the text was continually expanded. As to its place of origin, several traditions seem to confirm that the *Tattvasaṃgraha* was written in the South of India.

In Japan the name *Rishukyō* is normally used for Amoghavajra's translation, (T. 243) which is regularly recited in Shingon temples. However, there are six Chinese translations, by Hsüan-tsang (T. 220, no. 10; 660—663 A. D.), Bodhiruci (T. 240; 693 A. D.), Vajrabodhi (T. 241; the attribution of this translation to Vajrabodhi is doubtful), Amoghavajra (T. 243; 765—771 A. D.), Shih-hu (T. 242; 991 A. D.) and Fa-hsien (T. 244; 999 A. D.). There are three Tibetan translations, *Śrīparamādya nāma mahāyāna-kalparāja* and *Śrīparamādya mantrakalpakaṇḍa nāma* (Tōhoku nos. 487—488), *Śrīvajramaṇḍalālaṃkāra nāma mahātantrarāja* (Tōhoku no. 490) and *Āryaprajñāpāramitānayaśatapañcaśatikā* (Tōhoku no. 489). Finally, there is a text written partly in Sanskrit and partly in Khotanese (cf. E. Leumann, 'Die nordarischen Abschnitte des Adhyardhaśatikā-Prajñāpāramitā', *Taishō daigaku gakuhō*, 1930, pp. 47—87). The translation by Fa-hsien and the first two Tibetan translations are designated as the larger recension, and all the other texts as belonging to the smaller recension. The relations between these different translations and the development of the text have been studied first by Toganoo Shōun in his book *Rishukyō no Kenkyū* (Kōyasan, 1930; cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, IV—V, 1934, no. 450), and, in recent years, by Nasu Seiryū, Nagasawa Jitsudō, Kanaoka Shūyū and Fukuda Ryōsei. All scholars agree on two points. The oldest and most primitive recension is the one translated by Hsüan-tsang. Out of this recension developed the one translated by Bodhiruci. However, there is no agreement at all with regard to the text's further development. Some think that the larger recension is older and the smaller an extract from it. Others think that the larger recension has developed out of the smaller one. Still others suppose that the original text was different from both the larger and smaller recensions.

M. recapitulates the different theories proposed and subjects them to a critical examination. He points out that it is wrong to assume that the different texts can be supposed to have developed in a direct line one out of the other because there are too many discrepancies between them. In the first half of the seventh century a brief quotation from the *Prajñāpāramitā-ardhaśatikā* or *Dvyardhaśatikā* is made by Candrakīrti in his

Prasannapadā: *śūnyāḥ sarvadharmā niḥsvabhāvyogena* “all dharmas are empty as they are without essence” (pp. 238.8, 278.14, 444.8, 500.11 and 504.7). Sakai Shinten has traced this quotation to Amoghavajra’s translation (T. 243, p. 785a 25). Important information on the development of the *Rishukyō* is found in the introduction of Jñānamitra’s commentary, which is preserved in Tibetan translation (Tōhoku no. 2647). M. re-examines this passage, which was previously used by Toganoo and Nagasawa, but with whose interpretations M. does not agree. According to this passage, an ācārya named Kukure or Kukupa, who was versed in the eighteen great texts, the *Sarvabuddhasamayoga*, etc., came to the kingdom of Zahor and taught Śakrabhūti, the son of king Indrabhūti, the traditions (*luñ*; Skt. *āgama*) and the secret instructions (*man-ñag*; Skt. *upadeśa*). Śakrabhūti extracted for his daughter Govadevī the *Tshul brgya-lña-bcu-pa* (*Nayaśatapañcaśatikā*) from the *Dpal-dam-pa* (*Śrīparamādi*?). Govadevī developed the traditions and the secret instructions, and so created the text which is now extant. Toganoo supposed that the *Śrīparamādi* was identical with the larger version, called *Śrīparamādya* (cf. Tōhoku nos. 487—488), and that the *Adhyardhaśatikā*, the smaller version, was extracted from it. According to Nagasawa the *Śrīparamādi* is not identical with the *Śrīparamādya* but represents the original text, from which the smaller recension was extracted and which was expanded to form the larger recension. M. disagrees with this conclusion. He quotes another passage from the introduction of Jñānamitra’s commentary which refers to the *Dpal dam-pa phreñ-ba* as a Prajñāpāramitā text. This text must be closely related to the texts which are called *Śrīparamādya*. According to M. the *Dpal dam-pa* refers to the larger recension and not to the original text. Moreover, M. has doubts regarding the correctness of the Sanskrit reconstruction of *Śrīparama* for *Dpal dam pa*, because the Tibetan translation of the *Śrīparamādya* translates *parama* by *mchog* and not by *dam-pa*, and because the *Śrīparamādya* ⁽⁵⁾*mantrakalpakhaṇḍa* distinguishes between *dam-pa* and *mchog*. Furthermore, the eighteen texts mentioned in Jñānamitra’s commentary are not the eighteen texts of the *Kongchōkyō* as supposed by Toganoo and Nagasawa, but the eighteen tantras which are transmitted by the rñiñ-ma-pa school. Finally, M. points out that Jñānaśrīmitra’s commentary mentions not only the *Dpal dam-pa* but also traditions (*āgama*) and secret instructions (*upadeśa*). According to M. the ācāryas developed different traditions and secret instructions. In a later period these traditions and instructions were written down in the form of sūtras and in this way different texts were created. Jñānamitra explained that

5 Matsunaga remarks that *dam pa* can translate *agra*, *vara*, *uttama*, *para*, etc. However, the reconstruction *Śrīparama* for *Dpal dam-pa* is the most likely one.

the *Nayaśatapañcaśatikā* was extracted from the *Dpal dam-pa*. A text of this name existed already in the first half of the seventh century because it is mentioned by Candrakīrti. Therefore, it can be considered nearly certain that in the course of the development of the *Rishukyō* from a *Prajñāpāramitā* text an important role was played by a text called *Śrīparamādya* or *Śatapañcaśatikā*. Already Bodhiruci's translation is Tantric in style, and this shows that this development of a *Prajñāpāramitā* text into a Tantric text was already well advanced in the seventh century.

The larger recension, *Śrīparamādya*, according to the Tibetan translation, (Tōhoku nos. 487—488) consists of three parts. The first part corresponds to the smaller recension but contains moreover descriptions of constructions of *maṇḍala*-s and rituals connected with *maṇḍala*-s. Probably the original text was expanded by means of all kinds of *sādhana*-s and rituals which were practised in connection with it. The larger recension did not yet exist at the time of Amoghavajra because his analysis of the contents of the *Rishukyō* (cf. T. 869) has no relation with the existing larger recension. Three texts translated by Amoghavajra (T. 1119, 1120 and 1123) are considered to be extracted from the *Śrīparamādya*. However, their main theme is the idea of the *gohimitsu* (the five secrets represented by the five Vajra Bodhisattvas). At the time of Amoghavajra the *Śrīparamādya* was only a short text, which was later expanded into the larger recension by incorporating all kinds of traditions and secret instructions.

In the process of the transformation of a *Prajñāpāramitā* text into a Tantric text important changes took place. In the texts translated by Hsüan-tsang and Bodhiruci the preacher is the Bhagavat himself or the Bhagavat who takes the aspect of different Tathāgatas, but in the text translated by Amoghavajra the text is preached by different Tathāgatas. In sections 3 to 10 of the main text which comprises 17 sections the preaching is repeated by eight great bodhisattvas who summarise the teaching in the form of a *bīja*, a spell consisting of one syllable. These bodhisattvas are the *sambhogakāya*-s of Mahāvairocana. Spells are not found in Hsüan-tsang's translation. In Bodhiruci's translation at the end of each section it is only said that the Tathāgata pronounced the following spell. However, in Amoghavajra's translation the spell is considered to express the essence of the teaching in each section. In early Tantric texts spells were used to ward off evil and to obtain happiness. In the middle period the motivation of the spell is turned inwards (*naimenka*). The third change concerns the description of the merits of the recitation of the text. The merits are mentioned in greater detail at the end of the first section than at the end of the other sections. At the end of this section Hsüan-tsang's version mentions the attainment of Buddhahood, but this is not found in the texts translated by Bodhiruci and Amoghavajra, which stress respectively the attainment of the

vajrakāya of the Buddha-Tathāgata-s and the attainment of the states of Tathāgata and Vajradhara. Although in the tantras of the middle period the attainment of Buddhahood is the goal, this is not often expressly stated. According to M. the reason is that one strives to obtain union with the Absolute, for instance with Mahāvairocana. This implies the attainment of Buddhahood.

The text translated by Amoghavajra is a Tantric text, but it still shows traces of the fact that it developed out of a Prajñāpāramitā text. Amoghavajra's version contains no important ritual elements, and the philosophical contents are more important. However, from the eighth century onwards the text was greatly transformed by the addition of many rituals. The larger recension represents a ritualisation of the text. At the time of Amoghavajra there were already rituals relating to the *Rishukyō* but they were not yet incorporated in the text. The complete transformation into a Tantric text was achieved by the creation of the different texts belonging to the larger recension by the addition of many rituals.

The fourth chapter deals almost entirely with the *Guhyasamājatantra* and related texts. The G. [=Guhyasamāja] belongs to the *anuttarayoga* tantras which are divided into three groups: 1. the *yuganaddha* or *advaya* tantras; 2. the *prajñā* or mother (*ma*) tantras; 3. the *upāya* or father (*pha*) tantras. To the first group belong the *Kālacakra* tantras. The second and third group are divided into seven and six families. The G. belongs to the Akṣobhya family of the *upāya* or father tantras. It has eighteen chapters, of which seventeen form the *Mūlatantra* and the eighteenth the *Uttara-tantra*. The G. was translated into Tibetan by Śraddhākaravarma and Rin-chen bzañ-po in the beginning of the eleventh century and by Shih-hu into Chinese in 1002. The G. was very popular in India and Tibet but not in China.

The *Mūlatantra* can be divided into two parts, the first comprising chapters 1—12 and the second chapters 13—17. There are two important traditions relating to the G., the Jñānapāda school which goes back to Jñānapāda, and the 'Phags-lugs which goes back to Āryanāgārjuna. In one of the oldest commentaries (*Ākhyānat Tantra*), the *Sam-dhivvyākaraṇa*, there is as yet no clear influence of one of these two schools. The *Sam-dhivvyākaraṇa* explains only the first 12 chapters of the G. This is an indication that this part of the G. is older than the second part. The same conclusion emerges from an examination of the G. itself. A commentary of the Dge-lugs-pa school on the *Pradīpo-ddhyotana*, a commentary on the G., distinguishes three traditions regarding the construction of *maṇḍala*-s: the Indrabhūti tradition with thirteen Venerables⁶, the Jñānapāda tra-

6 The word 'Venerable' translates Japanese *son*, which is always used to indicate the different persons (Buddhas, bodhisattvas, Vidyārājas, etc.) in a *maṇḍala*.

dition with nineteen Venerables and the 'Phags-lugs with thirty-two Venerables. The first is described in Indrabhūti's *Jñānasiddhi* and agrees entirely with the maṇḍala found in the first chapter of the G. (five Buddhas with Akṣobhya as central figure, four *śakti*-s and four *krodha*-s) The maṇḍala of the Jñānapāda tradition comprises a group of five Buddhas with Mañjuvajra as central figure, four *śakti*-s and ten *krodha*-s, adding six *krodha*-s to the four in the previous maṇḍala. However, the names of these six *krodha*-s are not found in the first part of the G., but only in the second part. The maṇḍala of the 'Phags-lugs is not found in the G. itself and must have developed in a later period. The *Uttaratantra* mentions the fourfold *upāya* (*sevāsādhana*, *upāsādhana*, *sādhana*, *mahāsādhana*) and declares that chapters 2—17 of the G. correspond to these four *upāya*-s, cf. below p. 108. However, the original form of these four *upāya*-s is already found in the twelfth chapter. There is also a great difference in content and size between the first and the second half of the G. Chapters 13—17 are much longer and, moreover, describe many rituals. Finally, the *Uttaratantra* recapitulates the teachings and the rituals in fifty-two questions and answers. Everything mentioned here is already found in the first half of the G. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that, originally, the first half of the G. was a complete text in itself.

With regard to the doctrines, the *sādhana*-s and the construction of the maṇḍalas of the anuttarayogatantra-s, both the father and mother Tantras are based upon the *Tattvasaṃgraha*. An intermediary position between the *Tattvasaṃgraha* and the G. is occupied by the *Māyājālatantra*, which is extant in a Chinese translation (T. 890) and in two Tibetan translations (Tōhoku nos. 466 and 833). The second translation represents a different and later text. A commentary on the G. (Tōhoku no. 1909) quotes from the *Guhyagarbha* (Tōhoku no. 832), which is based upon the *Māyājālatantra*. This indicates a close relation between the G. and the *Māyājālatantra*. The maṇḍala of the *Māyājālatantra* comprises a group of five Buddhas with Vairocana as the central figure, whereas in the G. the central figure is Akṣobhya as in the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, a yogatantra. The four *śakti*-s of the maṇḍala of the *Māyājālatantra* are not found in the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, but their names are mentioned in other yogatantras. The maṇḍala of the *Māyājālatantra* comprises also two groups of four *krodha*-s. Ten *krodha*-s are found in a text translated in Chinese in the Sung period (T. 891) and in a collection of maṇḍalas composed in the eleventh century, the *Niṣpannayogāvalī*. Both the four *śakti*-s and the ten *krodha*-s are found in the G. The *Māyājālatantra* clearly represents a transitional stage between the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, a *yogatantra*, and the *Guhya-samāja*, an *anuttarayogatantra*.

In the past the G. and the *Tathāgataguhyasūtra* were considered to be identical,

an error that has persisted for a long time, although it was pointed out long ago by Thomas Watters in a note to Bendall's edition of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (St. -Petersburg, 1897—1902, p. 274 n.). Bhattacharya assumed wrongly that the G. was written by Asaṅga in the fourth century. In recent years the date of the G. has been studied by Wayman, Tucci and Hadano. According to the tradition of the Shingon school in Japan the G. corresponds to the fifteenth text of the *Kongōchōkyō* as described by Amoghavajra (T. 869). However, a comparison of Amoghavajra's description with the G. shows that the correspondence is limited to the title, the place of preaching and the teachings found in chapter five of the G. At the time of Amoghavajra (700—750) the G. had not been composed yet. The G. was translated into Chinese in 1002 and into Tibetan at about the same time. The lower limit for its composition is around 1000 A. D. In order to determine its date more precisely it is necessary to study the works of Jñānapāda who, according to Hadano, lived in the period 750—800. Although Jñānapāda wrote works relating to the G., this does not allow us to assume the existence of the G. at that time, because the relations between a text and the *sādhana*-s and commentaries belonging to a particular school are not easy to determine. In some cases the text was written first and the *sādhana*-s and commentaries later. It also happened that on the basis of several *sādhana*-s a text would be written. Finally, a commentary expressing the opinions of a certain school was sometimes used as a basis for the fabrication of a text. In Jñānapāda's works are found three verses of the G. which express some of its fundamental ideas. It is not possible to determine whether these verses were quoted by Jñānapāda from the G. Although it is therefore not certain that by 800 A. D. the G. had already taken its present form, it must have existed in that period as an independent text, or at least in such a form that it provided sufficient basis for the formation of the text.

In several respects the teachings of the *Uttaratantra* are more advanced than those of the *Mūlatantra*. The two *krama*-s are not mentioned in the *Mūlatantra* but are first found in the *Uttaratantra* (verse 84). The *Uttaratantra* adds a fourth *abhiṣeka* to the three *abhiṣeka*-s (*kalaśa*, *guhya* and *prajñājñāna*). The doctrine of the fourfold *upāya* is further developed in the *Uttaratantra*. In the *Uttaratantra*, the *vajracatuṣka* (*śūnyatābodhi*, *bījasamhṛta*, *bimbaniṣpatti*, *akṣaranyāsa*) and the yoga in six members (*ṣaḍaṅgayoga*: *pratyāhāra*, *dhyāna*, *prāṇāyāma*, *dhāraṇā*, *anusmṛti* and *samādhi*) form the basis of the practice of the *anuttarayoga*.

There have been two translations of the *Uttaratantra*, an old and a new. The Kanjur contains only the new translation, but most of the verses of the old translation are quoted in Viśvamitra's commentary. There are differences in terminology between the two translations, but the old translation must have been partially revised on the basis of the

new translation. There are also several discrepancies in the teachings of the two translations. In the new translation each of the four *upāya*-s is preached in four chapters, the *mahāsādhana* in chapters 5, 9, 17 and 13, the *sādhana* in chapters 4, 16, 8 and 12, the *upasādhana* in chapters 6, 2, 10 and 14 and the *sevā* in chapters 7, 3, 11 and 15 (verses 25—28). In the old translation the *upasādhana* is preached in chapters 6, 2, 15 and 14 and the *sevā* in chapters 7, 1, 3, 10, 11 and 5. In the old translation chapter 1 is mentioned and chapter 5 occurs twice, at the beginning and at the end. The second difference concerns the definition of the word *tantra* (verses 34—35). In the old translation the three divisions of the *tantra* into *ādhāra*, *prakṛti* and *asamhārya* are not considered to be *upāya*, *hetu* and *phala*. It divides the *tantra* into *ādhāra*, *prakṛti* and *prabheda* and these three are considered to indicate divisions in the content of the G. Finally, there is a great difference between the two translations in the treatment of the two *krama*-s, which do not have in the old translation the same importance as in later periods. Differences between an old and a new translation are not always due to the fact that the text used by the translators of the old translation is older than that used by the translators of the new translations. The differences between the two are sometimes caused by differences in the traditions of the schools. However, in the case of the *Uttaratantra* the differences between the old and the new translations are certainly due to the fact that the text used to make the old translation represents an earlier stage of development. This is shown clearly by the testimony of Bu-ston, by the terminology, by the fact that Viśvavimītra quotes several *tantras* which were current at the time of the old translation and, finally, by the fact that the old translation gives less weight to the four *upāya*-s and the two *krama*-s which later were considered very important in *anuttarayoga* Tantrism.

The next section (IV. 3) is entitled the *Ākhyānatāntras* and the *Ārya* school ('Phags-lugs). Among the *Ākhyānatāntras* of the G. the most important are the following four: *Samdhividyākaraṇatantra*, *Vajramālātantra*, *Caturdevīparipṛcchātantra* and the *Vajrasamuccayatantra*. To the 'Phags-lugs belong two *sādhana*-s, the *Pinḍikṛtasādhana* and the *Pañcakrama* which describe the *utpatti*- and *sampannakrama*-s. The Sanskrit text of both texts was published by de La Vallée Poussin (*Études et textes tantriques. Pañcakrama*. Gand-Louvain, 1896). To the 'Phags-lugs belongs also a commentary on the G. written by Candrakīrti, the *Pradīpoddhyotana* of which the Sanskrit text has been preserved.

The exegetical principles of the *Pradīpoddhyotana* are called the seven *alaṃkāra*-s: 1. *upodghāta* (*saṃjñā*, *nimitta*, *karṇ*, *pramā*, *prayojana*); 2. *nyāya* (*santāna*, *nidāna*, *nirukti*, *hetu*); 3. *ṣaṭkoṭika* (*neyārtha*, *nītārtha*, *saṃdhyābhāṣā*, *nāsaṃdhyā*,

yathāruta, naruta) ; 4. *caturvidhākhyāyikā* (*akṣarārtha, samastāṅga, garbhin, kolika*) ; 5. *dvividhabheda* (*satravyākhyāna, śiṣyavyākhyāna*) ; 6. *pañcapudgala* (*utpala, puṇḍarīka, padma, candana, ratna*) ; 7. *satyadvayavinirṇaya*. Of special importance are the third and the fourth principles, which have recently been studied by Ernst Steinkellner. M. briefly explains the seven *alaṃkāra*-s and then attempts to explain why this system was developed and why it was considered so important in the 'Phags-lugs. The 'Phags-lugs school was created some time after the formation of the *Mūlatantra* and taught many doctrines and practices which are not found in the *Guhyasamājatantra*. The system of the seven *alaṃkāra*-s was created in order to legitimise the interpretation of the *Guhyasamājatantra* in the 'Phags-lugs. Moreover, in the later Tantric period many Hindu elements and especially *śākta* doctrines were incorporated into Buddhist Tantrism. The system of the seven *alaṃkāra*-s served not only to proclaim the superiority of the exegesis of the 'Phags-lugs but also to demonstrate the orthodox Buddhist character of the teachings of the tantras. M. mentions that in recent years Tantrism has more and more come to be considered as the necessary consequence of Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is in this connection important to see how in Buddhist Tantrism, Buddhism and Tantrism were joined together, and in order to understand this it is necessary to give some attention to the system of the seven *alaṃkāra*-s.

One of the Ākhyānatāntaras of the Guhyasamāja, the *Vajramālātantra*, contains 68 chapters. Of special interest is the relation between the *Vajramālātantra* and the *Pañcakrama*. A comparison of chapters 1—67 of the *Vajramālātantra* with the *Pañcakrama* shows that there is no relation between the two and that the *Vajramālātantra* is therefore not the scriptural basis for the system of practice described in the *Pañcakrama*. However, the 68th chapter of the *Vajramālātantra* is closely related to the *Pañcakrama*. Several verses of the *Pañcakrama* are also found in the *Vajramālātantra* (*Pañcakrama* IV, 8, 9, 11 ; IV, 19—21 ; I, 16—24 ; not identical but similar : I, 4—6). M. shows that it is very likely that the verses IV, 19—21 were taken from the *Pañcakrama* by the author of the *Vajramālātantra*. According to the present text of the *Pañcakrama*, verses I, 16—24 are a quotation from the *Vajramālātantra*. In the oldest commentary on the *Pañcakrama*, the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, only verses 19—23 are explained. Moreover, these same verses are found in the *Sambarodayatantra*. The *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* also does not explain the verses quoted from the *Caturdevīparipṛcchātantra* and the *Advayasamatāvijayamahāyogatantra* in chap-

7 'Remarks on Tantric Hermeneutics', *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Memorial Symposium* (Budapest, 1978), pp. 445—458.

ter I of the *Pañcakrama*. Another commentary, the *Vajrajapaṭikā*, does not explain the verses quoted in chapter I from the *Samdhivyaṅkaraṇatantra*, but only explains the *mantra* syllables *om*, *āḥ* and *hūm* (cf. *Pañcakrama* I, 42—43). The original text of the first chapter of the *Pañcakrama* must have been expanded later by several quotations from the *Samdhivyaṅkaraṇatantra* (12—13), the *Vajramālātantra* (16—18 and 24), the *Advayasamatāvijaya* (59—66), etc., The 68th chapter of the *Vajramālātantra* must have been composed after the *Pañcakrama*. Although the *Ākhyānatantras* are generally considered more authoritative than *sādhana*-s and commentaries, this example shows how an *Ākhyānatantra* is fabricated in order to legitimise the teachings of an already existing *sādhana* text.

In the next subsection (IV. 3. 5) M. examines the relation of the *Vajrajñānasamucayatantra* (V.) with the *Pañcakrama* and the *Pradīpoddhyotana*. In explaining the three *jñāna*-s, V. is less complete than the *Pañcakrama* and does not mention all the original forms (*prakṛti*) found in the *Pañcakrama*. However, this does not mean that V. is later than the *Pañcakrama*. The author of V. must have known the complete system of the *Pañcakrama*. He mentions only some representative *prakṛti*-s and refers to the others by adding 'etc.'. The second chapter of the *Pañcakrama* deals with the three *jñāna*-s but does not quote V. V. must have been composed after the *Pañcakrama*.

The *Pradīpoddhyotana* is based upon the *sādhana* system of the 'Phags-lugs as found in the *Pinḍikṛtasādhana*, the *Pañcakrama*, etc. It was therefore composed in a later period. The main theme of the *Pradīpoddhyotana* is the group of seven *alaṃkāra*-s. In the first half of V., the most important of these seven, the third and fourth, are explained, and the names of all seven and their subdivisions are found in the second half of V. However, V. is never quoted by name in the *Pradīpoddhyotana*. V. is a very brief text containing only four and a half leaves. The explanations of the third and fourth *alaṃkāra*-s in the first half of V. are found to be incomplete when compared with the explanations found in the *Pradīpoddhyotana*. The second half of V. is more detailed than the *Pradīpoddhyotana* with regard to the names of the seven *alaṃkāra*-s and their subdivisions. The first chapter of V. has no colophon but the second chapter contains a colophon. The second chapter must have been added later, which lead to the omission of the colophon of the first chapter. It is obvious that the first half of V. was composed before the *Pradīpoddhyotana*. However, the first half of V. did not contain a detailed explanation of the seven *alaṃkāra*-s, and for this reason the second half was later added. This part must have been composed after the *Pradīpoddhyotana* was written. The first half of V. was composed not long before the *Pradīpoddhyotana* and this ex-

plains why this text is not quoted in the *Pradīpoddhyotana* as a scriptural authority.

The *Śrījñānavajrasamuccaya* (Tōhoku no. 450) is similar to V. but much more detailed. It contains many teachings which are not found in V. It must therefore have been composed after V. M. summarises the results of his studies in the texts of the 'Phags-lugs by indicating the order in which the texts are composed: 1. *Vajramālātantra* chapters 1—67; 2. *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* and the *Pañcakrama* in its original form; 3. *Vajramālātantra* chapter 68; 4. The *Pañcakrama* in its present form; 5. The first half of the *Vajrajñānasamuccayatantra*; 6. *Pradīpoddhyotana*; 7. The second half of the *Vajrajñānasamuccaya*; 8. *Śrījñānavajrasamuccaya*.

The *Mūlatantra* and the *Uttaratantra* of the *Guhyasamāja* were composed around 800 A. D. The 'Phags-lugs flourished around 1000 A. D. Between 800 and 1000 many new doctrines and practices arose in the 'Phags-lugs, and in order to legitimise them it was necessary to fabricate *Ākhyānatantra*-s or to make additions to existing *Ākhyānatantra*-s.

In the last section of Chapter IV (IV. 4) M. studies the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Ma.), the Sanskrit text of which was published in three volumes by Gaṇapati Sāstrī (Trivandrum, 1920, 1922 and 1925). Ma. was characterised by Jean Przyluski in the following way: "C'est une sorte d'encyclopédie qui traite, sous forme de sermons, des sujets les plus variés: iconographie, rituel, astrologie, etc..."⁸ The Sanskrit text contains 55 chapters, the Tibetan translation 37 and T'ien-hsi-tsai's Chinese translation (T. 1191) 28. Moreover, there are Chinese translations of several other chapters (41, 50, 51 and 55). M. compares the different texts in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese.

Ma. has been studied by Indian and Western scholars. M. relates briefly the opinions of Bhattacharya, Snellgrove and Dutt on the date of Ma. before discussing in greater detail the opinion expressed by Przyluski. Przyluski compared three Chinese translations of a text relating to the mantra of Mañjuśrī (T. nos. 1181, 1182 and 956) with chapter 14 of Ma. However, chapter 9 is much closer to T. 1181 and 1182, which were translated in 702 and 703. This chapter must therefore already have been in existence at the end of the seventh century. The 41st chapter of Ma. (*Garuḍapaṭalaparivarta*) was translated into Chinese by Amoghavajra. However, the second half of Amoghavajra's trans-

8 'Les Vidyārāja. Contribution à l'histoire de la magie dans les sectes Mahāyānistes', *BEFEO* 23 (1923), p. 301. Przyluski's study is based on the first volume only of Gaṇapati Sāstrī's edition (cf. pp. 302—303). This has been overlooked by Matsunaga, who reproaches him for not having studied the relations between the Sanskrit text of chapter 41 and the corresponding Chinese translation.

lation is full of Tantric expressions which are not found in other translations of that period. Moreover, in Kūkai's catalogue the Chinese translation is said to consist of only three folios. Amoghavajra translated only the first half, and the second half was added later. The Sanskrit text of Ma. comprises three chapters (50—52) dealing with rituals relating to Yamāntaka. The corresponding Chinese translations (T. 1215, 1216) and another Yamāntaka text translated by Amoghavajra (T. 1214) must be compared with the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation of chapters 50—52 of Ma. The comparison shows that the first Chinese translation (T. 1215) is different in character from the other two (T. 1216 first part and second part) and from T. 1214. The three Chinese translations are attributed to Amoghavajra, but only the first (T. 1215) can have been translated by him. In the other two Tantric characteristics are much more prominent. There are also differences between all four Chinese texts with regard to the person of the preacher and the person or persons to whom the text is preached. Chapters 50—52 of Ma. must be later than chapters 4—46 and T. 1214, and must have been composed in different periods. They constitute a later addition to Ma. The historical chapter 53 (*Rājavāka-
raṇa-parivarta*) mentions the Pāla king Gopāla, who probably reigned about 750 A.D. This chapter must have been written in the same period.

Finally, M. points out that it is necessary to study carefully the contents of Ma. in order to determine its position in the history of Tantrism and, in a wider perspective, in the history of Indian culture. However, at present there are many uncertainties which make such an undertaking practically impossible. Furthermore, Ma. contains many materials relating to geography, history, astronomy, mathematics, etc., and it will be a task for the future to study the text from the points of view of the natural and human sciences. Studies of this sort will also contribute to the clarification of the historical development of the text.

* * *

It is of course impossible to give a complete survey of the contents of a book in which so many difficult problems are studied. Matsunaga's book shows clearly how complicated the historical development of Tantric rituals and texts is. In the past, many scholars have not hesitated to express very definite opinions about the historical development of Tantrism in India and about the dates of texts without undertaking a detailed study of the available evidence. It is impossible to study the history of Tantrism in India without consulting the Chinese translations of Tantric texts. For the study of relations between texts it is absolutely necessary to take into account Sanskrit texts, Chinese translations and Tibetan translations. It is the great merit of this book that it has made full use of all the materials available. In these studies of the formation of Tantric texts, Matsunaga

has concentrated his remarks on some of the most important tantras. It is to be hoped that his work will stimulate research along the same lines on other Tantric texts. The amount of Tantric literature is enormous. Many Sanskrit manuscripts have not yet been edited. Several hundreds of texts were preserved in Chinese translation and many more in Tibetan translation. It is still impossible to gain an exact idea of the amount of exegetical literature written by Tibetan scholars since the introduction of Tantrism into Tibet up to the present day. Little is known about the relations between Buddhist Tantrism and Hindu Tantrism in India and about the development of Tantrism in Tibet. Since the publication of Louis de La Vallée Poussin's *Bouddhisme. Études et Matériaux* (London, 1898), Tantric studies have made much progress, thanks to the work done by scholars in Japan, India and the West, but we still have a long way to go before a true picture of Tantrism in all its complexity can emerge. We must be grateful to Matsunaga for having made such an important contribution towards this distant goal.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong.