



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Review of Hidas, G. (2019) A Buddhist ritual manual on agriculture: Vajratuṇḍasamayakalparāja—critical edition and translation

Silk, J.A.

Citation

Silk, J. A. (2020). Review of Hidas, G. (2019) A Buddhist ritual manual on agriculture: Vajratuṇḍasamayakalparāja—critical edition and translation. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 63(1), 78-93.
doi:10.1163/15728536-06301005

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3455034>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Gergely Hidas, *A Buddhist Ritual Manual on Agriculture: Vajratuṇḍasamayakalparāja—Critical Edition and Translation*. Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 145 pp. Print: ISBN 978-3-11-061765-8; Open Access: e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-062105-1; e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-062049-8; ISSN 2510-4446. € 42.95.

One sometimes has the sense that recent years have seen a significant change in scenery in the study of Indian religions, chiefly Indian Buddhism, particularly with the increasing attention being paid to newly available, or long overlooked, primary sources in Sanskrit (or—see below—something approaching Sanskrit). These range, chronologically speaking, from the newly discovered Gāndhārī materials to the perhaps a millennium later (largely but far from exclusively tantric) sources, many of which have lain undisturbed for a century or more in libraries in Europe and Japan, and others of which became known to modern scholarship more recently, largely through the efforts of the now dormant Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project. (I leave aside for the moment the truly momentous promise held by the still almost completely inaccessible riches of Sanskrit manuscripts from Tibet; title lists create among some scholars an almost Pavlovian drooling response, but the manuscripts themselves remain out of reach.) One recent small corner of this new attention belongs almost exclusively to the author of the work here under review, Gergely Hidas (hereafter GH), who in addition to the *Vajratuṇḍasamayakalparāja* has so far published on the *Mahāpratisarā-Mahāvidyārājñī*,¹ *Mahāsāhasrapramardanasūtra*,² and *Mahā-Daṇḍadhāraṇī-Śītavatī*,³ and who promises in short order an edition of the *Dhāraṇīsamgraha*.

The present somewhat misleadingly titled edition and translation is, while certainly a Buddhist ritual manual (*kalpa*), in fact not much concerned with agriculture in any meaningful sense. (For this one might see instead the works of Gyula Wojtilla,⁴ known to and referenced by GH, needless to say.) It is rather

1 Most centrally *Mahāpratisarā-Mahāvidyārājñī: The Great Amulet, Great Queen of Spells. Introduction, Critical Editions and Annotated Translation*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan, 2012.

2 “Rituals in the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanasūtra*.” In *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India Through Texts and Traditions*, ed. Nina Mirnig, Péter-Dániel Szántó and Michael Williams. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2013: 225–240.

3 “*Mahā-Daṇḍadhāraṇī-Śītavatī*: A Buddhist Apotropaic Scripture.” In *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages: Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations*, ed. Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo and Camillo Alessio Formigatti. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017: 449–486.

4 In the first place, perhaps, *History of Kṛṣiśāstra*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 2006, rev. O. von Hinüber IJ 50.1 (2007): 83–85, and *Kāśyapīyakṛṣisūkti: A Sanskrit Work on Agriculture*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010, rev. O. von Hinüber IJ 57.1–2 (2014): 137–140.

perhaps best classified as a guide to the subjugation or suppression of Nāgas, here clearly embodied forces of cruel nature, sending down (or withholding) rain, lightning and other threats to crops (hence the reference to agriculture), and thus to human livelihood.

The Tibetan tradition, at least, classifies the text as a *kriyā* tantra, although the utility of this category is questionable, since a huge number of works are therein included.⁵ In the Derge canon some 306 texts are placed in this category (Tōh. 502–808), most of them *dhāraṇī* texts. Of those somehow attested in Sanskrit a now out-dated but still extremely useful accounting was given in the scandalously truncated series *Bongo Butten no Kenkyū*.⁶ The majority of texts seem to be known in Sanskrit only from their *dhāraṇīs*, which were more than once gathered into collectanea, but some popular *dhāraṇī* texts exist in Sanskrit in fuller form, including for instance the *Ṣaṇmukhadhāraṇī*,⁷ *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī*,⁸ *Vasudhārādhāraṇī*,⁹ *Aparimitāyurjñāna*,¹⁰ *Amoghapā-*

5 On the contested subject of classification from Tibetan perspectives, see J. Dalton, “A Crisis of Doxography: How Tibetans organized Tantra during the 8th–12th centuries.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 28 (2005): 115–181.

6 Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥, Matsunaga Yūkei 松長有慶, and Isoda Hirofumi 磯田熙文. 1989. *Bongo Butten no Kenkyū* IV: *Ronsho-hen* 梵語仏典の研究 IV 密教經典篇 [A descriptive bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist literature: Vol. IV: The Buddhist Tantra] (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 61–175. This offers an accounting of the Sanskrit sources then known, and what seems to be the *dhāraṇī* of the *Vajratuṇḍasamayakalparāja* is noted (p. 174) as follows: *Vajratudā(tuṇḍā?)bhipada-dh[āraṇī]*, with reference to a *Bṛhaddhāraṇīsaṅgraha* in the Durbar library. The manuscripts which form the basis of the presently reviewed edition are not mentioned.

7 Katsumi Mimaki. “La *Ṣaṇmukhī-dhāraṇī* or ‘Incantation des SIX PORTES’, texte attribué aux Sautrāntika (I): Introduction.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 25.2 (1977): 29–36. Id. “La *Ṣaṇmukhī-dhāraṇī* or ‘Incantation des SIX PORTES’, texte attribué aux Sautrāntika (II): Textes et Traduction”. *Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西蔵学会会報 23 (1977): 9–13.

8 Unebe Toshiya 畛部俊也, “Bonbun *Bucchō Sonshō daranikyō* to shoyaku no taishō kenkyū” 梵文『仏頂尊勝陀羅尼經』と諸訳の対照研究 [*Sarvagatipariśodhana-Uṣṇīṣavijayā nāma dhāraṇī*: Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations, along with Japanese Translation]. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū ronshū* 名古屋大学文学部研究論集 61 (2015): 97–146.

9 Padmanabh S. Jaini, “*Vasudhārā Dhāraṇī*: A Buddhist work in use among the Jains of Gujerat.” In Shri Mahavir Jaina Vidyalaya Golden Jubilee Volume, Part 1 (Bombay: Shri Mahavir Jaina Vidyalaya, 1968): 30–45.

10 Max Wallesser. *Aparimitāyur-jñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtram: Nach einer nepalesischen Sanskrit-Handschrift mit der tibetischen und chinesischen Version herausgegeben und übersetzt*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1916, Band VII, 12. Abhandlung (Heidelberg: Carl Winter’s Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1916).

śaḥṛdaya,¹¹ *Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchādhāraṇī*,¹² and even the *Prajñāpāramitāḥṛdaya*! Such sūtras are classified as tantras because of the presence of a *dhāraṇī*, something which no doubt applies also to the placement here of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtrendrarāja*. Others conform perhaps more closely to common-sense notions of tantric texts, and of these not so many are so far available in Sanskrit, these including, however, the *Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī*,¹³ *Mañjuśrīnāmāṣṭaśataka*,¹⁴ *Amoghapāśakalpa*,¹⁵ *Dvādaśadaṇḍakanāmāṣṭaśatavimalikaraṇā* (*Śrīmahādevīrīyākaraṇa*),¹⁶ *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*,¹⁷ *Kurukūlakalpa*,¹⁸ *Siddhaikavīratāntra*,¹⁹ *Bhagavatisvedāmbujā*, and *Bhūtaḍamaratantra* (the last two remain unpublished).

It must be said at the outset that, like a number of Buddhist texts belonging to this and other scriptural genres, logical and grammatical coherence is frequently sorely lacking here, so much so that, disturbingly often, it is rather hard to locate a thread, and one has the impression much more of a randomly dumped together collection of passages than of a smooth narrative. GH has bravely attempted both to edit the not very coherent sources and to render the resulting established text into English, not his mother tongue, and he must be thanked and applauded for his effort. I would certainly have had a very hard time, and perhaps an impossible one, in reading the Sanskrit without his

- 11 R.O. Meisezahl. "The *Amoghapāśaḥṛdaya-dhāraṇī*: the early Sanskrit manuscript of the Reiuji critically edited and translated." *Monumenta Nipponica* 17 (1962): 265–328.
- 12 Anukul Chandra Banerjee. *Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchā: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1941).
- 13 Takubo Shūyo 田久保周譽. *Bonbun Kujaku Myōōkyō* 梵文孔雀明王經 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 三喜房仏書林, 1972).
- 14 Rolf W. Giebel. "The One Hundred and Eight Names of Mañjuśrī: The Sanskrit Version of the *Mañjuśrīkumārabhūta-aṣṭottaraśatakanāma* Based on Sino-Japanese Sources." *Indo Ronrigaku Kenkyū* インド論理学研究 3 (2011): 303–343. Cp. Ryūjō Kambayashi. "Laudatory Verses of Mañjuśrī." *Journal of the Taishō University* 6–7/2 (1930): 243–297.
- 15 Being edited by the Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai (密教聖典研究会)/Research group on the Buddhist Tantric Texts at Taishō University in Tokyo.
- 16 See Seishi Karashima, "Some Folios of the *Tathāgataguṇajñānācintyaṣayavatāra* and *Dvādaśadaṇḍakanāmāṣṭaśatavimalikaraṇā* in the Kurita Collection." *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* 27.1 (2017): 11–44.
- 17 See Martin Delhey. "The Textual Sources of the *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (*Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*), With Special Reference to Its Early Nepalese Witness NGMPP A39/4'." *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* 14 (2012): 55–75.
- 18 J. Ś. Pāṇḍeya, Rare Buddhist Text Series 24 (Sarnath, 2001).
- 19 Published, again, by the Taishō University team in 1995: Chpt. 1 in *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō* 大正大学総合佛教研究所年報 15: 366–349 (*sic*), 16: 1–9, 17: 1–18, 2 and 3 in *Bongo Bukkyō Bunken no Kenkyū* 梵語佛教文献の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō shorin 山喜房佛書林): 1–19; J. Ś. Pāṇḍeya, Rare Buddhist Text Series 20 (Sarnath, 1998).

guidance. That said, narrative aside, if there is a coherent underlying ritual system expressed in or underlying the text, which would make its structure more comprehensible, this too is not evident, and GH has not elucidated any such scheme; given the apparent absence of any expository literature, this is understandable, but does make comprehension a real challenge sometimes. GH does refer briefly (pp. 28–29) to modern practices, but does not indicate whether this text—which exists in Tibetan translation (see below)—is ever used by the modern Nepalese or Tibetan ritual specialists to whom he refers. In fact, it is one of the peculiarities of the present work that GH rarely makes an effort to elucidate the Buddhist content of the text, even failing to notice the (to me strikingly rare) Buddhist technical terms found here and there.²⁰

GH's introduction to his edition and translation is rather terse. He begins with a catalogue of previous possibly relevant studies, almost entirely without discussion: it is little more than a bibliographic list. The fifth portion of the introduction is titled "Contexts," and here a number of quotations from primary (in translation) and secondary sources are given. They focus on references to Nāgas (and sometimes lack any proper reference: one example among several is n.50, which cites a Sanskrit passage from the *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* without any reference [the passage is in fact found in T. Gaṇapati Śāstri's 1925 edition, 11.462,8–11]). The passages are given either sparse or no commentary or contextualization, and for instance a passage from a so far unpublished Dunhuang Tibetan ritual rainmaking manual (in the translation of Sam van Schaik) is followed by another from the *Rājatarāṅginī* (pp. 15–16). The lack of references also makes it impossible to follow the author's discussion of *maṇḍala/maṇḍalaka* (p. 25), which refers to several texts without any specific citation.

The edition is based on five manuscripts, three of which contain only a portion of the text. As far as I can discern from the notes (despite the considerations in a short paragraph on p. 34, no stemma is offered), all belong to the same lineage, although all are also extremely faulty from the perspective of normative Sanskrit. Given that the very sentence structures are often irregular (one example: 58.1–2: *acchaṭikāṁ dattvā trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau śabdaṁ śrūyate*, in which the agents of the two verbal phrases are not the

20 As another indication of his minimalist annotation, GH refers for botanical names to the dictionary of Monier Williams. One could certainly argue that exact identifications of plants mentioned in the text is both not central to its intent and probably impossible, but this granted, it is inexplicable that a serious scholar would resort to Monier Williams given, for instance, the easy accessibility of even an online source such as <http://iu.ff.cuni.cz/pandanus/>. If one were to offer botanical identifications at all, these should at least have a better basis than Monier Williams.

same), it is hard if not impossible to decide how much of this is due to poor manuscript transmission and how much to an originally nonstandard text (not implying, I hasten to add, any assumption of a single Ur-text, of course). I think we do not have enough data here to know whether we should refer to the language as Aīśa, but the possibility of Middle Indic substrate influence is strong. The closest the author comes to discussing the relation of his sources is a note (34n142) which reads in full: “Out of c. 1400 variants the following groups of manuscripts have the highest occurrence: BCD 159, BCDE 111, AE 105, BD 82, BDE 64, ACDE 58, AC 57, DE 52, BC 50, BE 39, AD 37.” Without consideration of the *nature* of the variants, this is not very helpful. The author also hides in a note what should have been in the main text (34n143): “I have been unable to explain why this longer portion is missing in manuscripts B and C. While B transmits the beginning of the text there is a long omission thereafter. C is incomplete but it is notable that what survives begins precisely where the lacuna in B ends. Interestingly, the incomplete E also lacks the first half of the text with the exception of a single folio.” After all of this, we learn that (p. 34): “The primary method of producing a main text was to make editorial decisions on the basis of orthography, grammar, syntax and context, with the help of the Tibetan translation in various places. When there was a choice between variants in manuscript groups AE and BCD, usually the latter was preferred.” No reason is given for the latter preference. While I assume that the author has correctly deciphered his manuscripts (I have not checked), given that he has not offered any remarks about his view of the grammar of the text, it is not possible for a reader to understand how he might have made editorial decisions on this basis. Like many Buddhist texts, one must read this one too with a rather loose conception of Sanskrit grammar, but certainly there are reasons for some choices. For instance, GH repeatedly prints expressions such as *varṣadhārā-m-utsrjanti*. Since we find, however, *varṣadhārāḥ*, for instance (64.23), it is evident that the reasoning was **varṣadhārāḥ utsrjanti* > **varṣadhārā utsrjanti* > *varṣadhārā-m-utsrjanti*, with *-m-* as a hiatus bridger, but GH does not make this argument explicit. Elsewhere he may well similarly have had an idea or principle in mind (he could hardly have edited without one), but he nowhere shares such notions. Even if he simply decided to give up on the idea of finding a coherent grammar in the text (an understandable and tempting idea, given what the sources look like), this should have been discussed.

A positive apparatus makes it possible to see easily upon which manuscripts the edition is based at any given point, although some graphic representation of the coverage of the extant sources would have been helpful for an overview. The translation very helpfully faces the Sanskrit, which however could have been more finely divided into sections, some of which span three pages or so.

A word is necessary here about the above mentioned Tibetan translation. GH clearly states that his knowledge of the Tibetan is thanks to the help of two colleagues, Gergely Orosz and Péter-Dániel Szántó, but when he refers in his notes to “Tib.,” with only one or two exceptions he does not actually cite the Tibetan term(s) in question, and he never offers a single reference. It is therefore impossible, without taking recourse oneself to a Kanjur edition, to make use of the Tibetan translation to check, or perhaps suggest emendations to, the edited Sanskrit text or the translation thereof. This is at the least very inconvenient, and given the difficulty of the text, a serious problem. If, as seems clear, GH himself does not read Tibetan, a collaborative publication would have been an excellent idea. At the very least, references to the correlation between passages in the Sanskrit edition and the Tibetan editions (Derge and sTog) consulted by his collaborators would have been most welcome.

GH gives a list (p. 35) of “silent standardizations,” among which are long and short vowels, retroflex and dental nasal and so on, but sometimes it appears that he does cite such differences as variants. (On the first page of the edition [p. 38] we find the note -mānuṣaṣadā] *corr.*; -mānuṣapadā A, -mānuṣoparṣadā B, -mānuṣaṣadā D, in which as far as I can see the adopted reading differs from that of D only in the length of a single vowel; it may be cited here because of the other readings, both of which are erroneous.) More problematic is that, although he offers corrections, emendations and conjectures, nowhere is it made clear what the intended distinction is between these, and my study of the notes failed to make it clear to me. On p. 52, for instance, we find jāmbudvīpe] *em.*; -dvīpī AD, alongside -rakṣitā] *corr.*; -rakṣi AD. Why is the first an emendation and the second a correction? On p. 68, we find -balinā] *conj.*; -balinānā AD. So here we find three sorts of changes distinguished somehow by the editor which are nevertheless to my eye of nearly the same type. Finally, in this regard, no indication is given about the punctuation (use of daṇḍa) of the Sanskrit, which perhaps follows one manuscript (?), but is often as printed so erratic as to be not only useless but even misleading. It must be often corrected.

Below I offer two sets of notes, the first of which goes through the edition and translation, pointing out what I think are oversights or other errors. In the second, while I do not make observations solely on the often rocky English, which is however often overly literal, there are places where the English might give the wrong impression of the meaning of the Sanskrit, and I have commented on some of these instances. As examples which I have not singled out, the Sanskrit text alternates (seemingly without rhyme or reason) between present and future verbs, which are translated as such by GH, though it seems to me that we should understand most verbs in such contexts in the future. Gerund

+ gerundive clauses are rendered ‘having x-ed, y should be done,’ or the like, whereas the basic rules of Sanskrit grammar demand that the final verb govern the gerund, which here requires then ‘one should x, and one should y.’ I also do not note below instances in which the meaning is not really altered by the clumsy English (e.g., “He sacrificed fire oblations” or “the spell-master ... should abide by friendliness.” Some are more egregious than others: “Throwings should be made to the sky.”).

One remark is needed on the Open Access publication of the book. (Rather than the publisher’s website it may be better to access it via <http://oapen.org/search?identifier=1006581>.) In line with requirements of European Research Council funding, under which the research which resulted in the book was carried out, the book is available as Open Access for free download. This is a very good thing. However, it is offered under a CC-BY-NC-ND license, Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike-NoDerivatives, the single most restrictive form of Open Access licensing. And this is not a good thing at all. While it is likely that this was not GH’s choice but a format decided upon by the London-based ERC project itself, “Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State,” or simply imposed without discussion by the publisher, the result, as I understand it, is that no modifications are permitted, and therefore I would not be permitted to take GH’s Sanskrit text and redo it by, for example, altering the above mentioned punctuation, not to mention make different editorial choices, and I could not do this even if I were fully to attribute all credit to him. It might even be that I would be forbidden under this license to translate the text, although there does not yet appear to be any relevant case law. Given its restrictiveness, I cannot understand what is to be gained by publishing academic work under this kind of license.

Below I offer specific comments on the text and translation. In the following, given the sometimes overly large divisions which GH imposed on the text, I instead cite the Sanskrit by page and line, and refer to the corresponding facing English (on the recto).

38.5: °rāja° is omitted in Eng.

38.9: tasya brāhmaṇasya, omitted in Eng.

40.16: śīghraṁ not as adj. “rapid,” but adv. “rapidly.” Later in the text this is correctly rendered.

42.22: maitrīsattvasaṁnāhena bhavitavyam, “He should have the armour of a friendly being.” While I am not certain about the analysis of the compound, since I doubt that maitrīsattva can be taken as an adjectival karmadhāraya (I suggest ‘the armor of friendliness toward beings’), the allusion here is surely to the notion of the (mahā-)saṁnāha-saṁnaddha, namely a common metaphorical expression for the bodhisattva who buckles on the armor of his practice.

44.3–5: yatrāyaṃ hṛdayadhāraṇī rakṣāyāṃ kṛtāyāṃ paritrāṇaṃ parigrahaṃ paripālanaṃ sīmābandhaṃ maṇḍalabandhaṃ, “Wherever this heart-*dhāraṇī* is used for protection, [there is] rescue, shelter, safeguard and the sealing of the boundaries and sealing of the *maṇḍala*.” Here *maṇḍala* should be understood rather as district.

44.16–17: saktupramukhā mahābalipūrvam sthāpayitavyā, “Preceded by a great offering barley-meal should be placed as foremost.” I do not understand this English, and in any event, to what is saktupramukhā meant to refer?

44.22–23: khadirakīlakā ca hṛdayasthā sakalaṃ nikhantavyam, “Stakes made of khadira wood should be driven into the ground over their heart completely.” This is quite unclear because of the lack of reference to those whose heart should be covered. Is it perhaps the hearts of the above-mentioned Nāga effigies? Be that as it may, I think that sakalaṃ goes with the gerundive, thus “should be driven completely into the ground.”

46.18–19 and *passim*, constructions like yāvat kīlakaṃ noddhriyate are not “Until the stake is driven out” but “As/so long as the stake is not drawn out.”

48.15: sarve pralayā bhaviṣyanti, “They will be destroyed.” Read “They will all be destroyed.”

50.2: This raises a particularly acute problem in the text of a mantra, perhaps more visible in other similar texts of the same genre, for which more manuscripts are available, but also here with only a few. A vl is cited as follows: micili] D; micile A. I do not doubt that GH, who has read many similar works, has a sense of how mantras work, but it would be very helpful if he would share his ideas for favoring one reading over another in such cases. In other texts, we sometimes encounter quite staggering variations in the wording of such mantras in the available manuscripts, and it would be good to have some touchstone, such as—even arbitrarily—choosing readings attested in a Tibetan translation (in which mantras are as a rule transcribed).

52.5: sarvasasyapatrapuṣpaphalapalāśasukhasamvardhikā bhaviṣyāmaḥ, in which °palāśa° is omitted in the translation (later in §2.3 it is rendered “foliage”).

52.6–8: asya bhagavan vidyā maharṣihṛdayam udakabhājanām aṣṭottaraśa-tavārāṇ parijapya pūrvābhimukhaṃ sthitvā ṛṣimaunayā caturdikṣu prakṣep-tavyam, “O Bhagavān, having recited the Great ṛṣi heart[-mantra] spell into a water-pot 108 times facing east, one should scatter [the water] in the four directions with ṛṣi-silence.” Rather: “O Bhagavān, one should recite the Great ṛṣi heart[-mantra] spell into a water-pot 108 times, and facing oneself toward the east should scatter [the water] in the four directions with ṛṣi-silence.”

52.11 and *passim* for equivalent constructions: sahaprayuktamātreṇa, “Upon reciting this.” I wonder about this construction (which should perhaps be

printed saha prayuktamātreṇa? Also: pravṛj as 'recite'? Exert oneself is more likely). Now, it is true, as for instance Speyer says (*Sanskrit Syntax* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1886] §78), that the instrumental of time "not rarely ... coincides with [the conception] of the *time, after which* something is happening." This with mātra could suggest "just as soon as this had been ~," "no sooner had this been ~." For Pāli, however, as von Hinüber states (O. von Hinüber. *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pali besonders des Vinaya-Pitaka*. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beihefte neue Folge 2 [Munich: J. Kitzinger, 1968]: 142), it generally indicates "eine Handlung mit dem Verlauf einer Zeitspanne ausgeführt wird." This is perhaps further clarified when, in a most useful study on usage in the Epic ("Limitation of Time by Means of Cases in Epic Sanskrit." *The American Journal of Philology* 24.1 [1903]: 1–24), E. Washburn Hopkins says (p. 10), "the epic instrumental usually indicates accompanying (temporal) means, which necessarily implies the end of the whole time," which he clarifies (p. 11) with "the notion of 'time after' is suggested but not expressed by the instrumental," further suggesting that "*kālena mahatā paścāt* ... means ... not 'after a great while' but 'afterwards in the course of a great while.'" As he further explains, then, the sense is that the action spoken of takes place *during* the instrumental expression. Therefore, returning to the ritual in our text, if this specification can be applied here, the sense would be that the result of the action spoken of, that is the application of oneself toward the recitation spoken of in the preceding clause (evaṃ sapta vārāṇ parijaptavyam), will take place not *after* the recitation but *during* it. Therefore: "Precisely while one is applying oneself [to the recitation]," and so similarly in other instances elsewhere in the text.

56.2: ṛddhyanubhāvena, "an indication of great supernatural power," which I do not understand; is not the term a bahuvrīhi based on a dvandva?

56.11: utpala is not a blue lotus, but as is well known, it is a water lily.

56.12: nānāmatsyamakaratinṅgilaśiśumārābhramaranānājāladirūpā, "various fish, Makaras, Timiṅgilas, alligators, bees and various other water-born beings." Assuming that we are justified in actually identifying these names with real creatures, first, alligator is impossible, since it is only the crocodile which is found in India. However, if Jean Philippe Vogel ("Errors in Sanskrit Dictionaries." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20.1 [1957]: 561–567) is correct (pp. 561–564), then it is the makara which is the crocodile, in which case we are probably left to identify the śiśumāra, a term which does indeed refer in many cases to a crocodile, here instead as the Gangetic dolphin. (On the word and its complications see the detailed discussion of H. Lüders, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 21 [1942] 61–81 [a portion of "Von indischen Tieren"], followed by a short etymological remark by P. Thieme in

the same issue of the journal, pp. 418–420, “*Śiṃśumāra*, ‘Schnabeldelphin.’”) Next, *bhramara* means “bee” (in GH’s index “bumble bee”) but here this can hardly be correct. Perhaps the Tibetan translation would be of help, but in any event, bees are not water-born beings. It may be that the text contains an error; that we should understand some other type of flying creature, or that in total we are dealing with a sort of (so far unidentified) stock list (in part, note for instance *Carakasamhitā* 1,27.40, in which *śiṃśumāra* occurs between *matsya* and *timīṅgila*), in which case seeking strict identifications may be a misguided quest; moreover, if indeed the list is taken over, then we perhaps do not need to worry too much that bees are not water-born creatures. See now Klaus Karttunen, “*Bhramarotpītādharah: Bees in Classical India.*” *Studia Orientalia Electronica*, 107 (2015), 89–134. Retrieved from <https://journal.fi/store/article/view/52400>. Nothing is mentioned there about bees as water creatures, however.

56.21: *maitryālabanayā*, this may be a technical term, since *matrī* can have three objects or *ālabana*: beings (*sattva*), things (*dharma*) or no particular object (*anālabana*). See É. Lamotte, *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 2 (Louvain: Université de Louvain; reprint, 1970): 1245n2 and 1250ff.n1.

58.11: *bhagavatā ūrṇākośād raśmih pramukteti*, “The Bhagavān released rays from the treasure of hair.” First, rays must be rays of light, but second, *ūrṇākośa* is a standard equivalent of *ūrṇa* (perhaps *kośa* here is something like ‘pod’); see Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953) sv *ūrṇa* [hereafter BHSD].

60.18–19: *atidāruṇāni bhagavan mahābhayāni loke utpannāni | yad utānāvṛṣṭidurbhikṣakāntārāḥ*, “O Bhagavān, extremely frightening great dangers have arisen in the world. Namely, drought, famine, calamities.” (See also 60.23: *durbhikṣakāntārāpraśamanārthāya*.) The word *kāntāra* appears often together with at least *durbhikṣa* (see for example a passage in *Arthaśāstra* 4.12.38), and is generally understood to mean “forest,” and in Pāli *kāntāra* has the sense of a dangerous region, wilderness or desert. It is true that Edgerton (BHSD sv), while taking it (perhaps wrongly) primarily as ‘famine,’ also speculates that it may more broadly mean ‘troubles, difficulty, disaster.’ A question then is how we understand the compound, and if it means, as GH renders, ‘calamity,’ then we must understand *vṛṣṭi* + *durbhikṣa* (*dvandva*) = *kāntāra* (appositional *kar-madhāraya*); I think this is less likely than to take it as a three member *dvandva*, in which *kāntāra* has the sense of another dangerous situation, namely a trek through a challenging wilderness. It would be particularly interesting in such a case to consult the Tibetan translation.

62.12–13: *atha bhagavān nāgāvalokitenā sarvatathāgatāvalokitenā vyavalokya sarvanāgaparśan saṃnipātyaivam āha*, “Then the Bhagavān, having taken

a look with a Nāga-look and a look of all Tathāgatas, addressed the whole Nāga assembly-gathering.” Setting aside the omission of *saṃnipātya*, the expression *nāgāvalokita* is well known and indicates that rather than turning his head a buddha rotates his entire body (Lamotte, *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 24 [Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1980] 2318n1, citing Pāli *nāgāpalokitam apaloketi* [DN 11.122,4; MN 1.337,3] and Sanskrit *dakṣiṇena sarvakāyena nāgāvalokitenāvalokayati* [from the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*]). (Cp. BHS D sv *avalokita*.) Given this, I think we must understand *sarvatathāgatāvalokitenā* as a gloss, in the sense:—that is, the look of all Tathāgatas. Furthermore, there is evidently some play here in that the Bhagavān is addressing Nāgas.

64.9–10: *smaraṇamātrayāpi bhagavan nitya vidyārājā vyaṃ sarve varṣadhārā-m-utsrjāmaḥ*, “O Bhagavān, by the mere recollection of this spell-king we will all send down rain showers.” The *nitya* (read *nityaṃ*?) has been skipped; it would seem to mean: “By the mere constant recollection” If we were to take *nitya*[ṃ] with the finite verb, this would imply constant rain, which is of course not a good thing. Here as so often the word order is odd for Sanskrit prose.

64.16: *yadi bhagavan na tena rātriṃdivena upacāraavidhinā vidyādhareṇa kṛtena sarvajambudvīpe varṣadhārā-m-utsrjāmahe sarvasattvānāṃ paripālānārthaṃ*, “O Bhagavān, if we do not send down rain showers for the protection of all beings in the entire Jambudvīpa after the spell-master has performed [rituals] according to the offering manual a night and a day.” It seems correct that *rātriṃdivena* is connected with the actions of the spell-master; the actions of the speakers are motivated (inst.) by those of the spell-master who—if GH is right—performs rituals. However, I do not understand why this performance should be limited to one day and night; the expression (more normally in adverbial accusative, rather than inst., as far as I can see) seems to be generally used in the sense of ‘constantly,’ or as we might say, ‘day and night.’ So, “If, impelled by the constant performance by the spell-master in accord with his offering manual, we do not”

64.20–21: *tadā bhagavann asmākaṃ sarvam agnījvālāyā sakalabhavanāny ādīpyante*, “Then, O Bhagavān, all our residences will blaze up by fire-flames.” Evidently *sarvam* has been skipped: “completely.”

64.23: *tadā vyaṃ bhagavan sarvam āśu āśu varṣadhārāḥ pramucyāmaḥ*, “Then, O Bhagavān, we all release rain showers quickly and speedily.” There are at least two possibilities here, the better of which is that we print *sarva-m-āśu*, on the understanding that from **sarve āśu sandhi* produced *sarva āśu*, and then -m- was, as elsewhere, inserted as a hiatus bridger. Otherwise we must take *sarvam* as adverbial.

66.8–9: *kālena kālaṃ sasyapuṣpaphalāni niṣpādayiṣyanti*, “They will ripen all flowers and fruits duly at the proper time.” GH was perhaps influenced by the vl he quotes, *sasya-*] D; sa A, and may have taken *sa* = *sarva*, but if we are to follow the printed text we must replace ‘all’ with ‘crops.’ This is another good example where we would wish to consult the Tibetan translation.

68.1–2: *candanam raktacandanam surabhicandanam padmakam kuṅkumam cūrṇayitvā vāsanair okiratavyam*, “Having ground sandal, red sandal, fragrant sandal, padmaka wood and saffron, it should be scattered along with fumigation.” Here GH offers a rare note: “*Vāsanair* may also refer to residences or clothes.” I do not know what is intended by the translation “along with fumigation,” or by the note, but given that *ava√kṛ* is frequently construed with the pl. inst., evidently the meaning is that one should shake these powders into the air as perfumes. In any event, I do not think the “along with” is correct here.

68.11–12: *śuklabaliṃ nānārasavidhānam yathāsaṃvidyamānam sthāpayatā puṣpāvakīrṇam kartavyam*, “Having placed a white offering of what is obtainable with an arrangement of various juices, flowers should be scattered.” Rather, “with the variety of flavors available.” Incidentally, perhaps, *śuklabali* appears along with *māmsarudhirabali* as one of three in a passage from the *Amogha-pāśakalparāja* (Taishō University Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai, codex unicus from China, 73a 5–6) cited by R. Mayer, “Rethinking Treasure (part one),” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 52 (2019): 162–163n89. It seems likely that *śukla* here refers to milk products, alongside the meat and blood offerings (*māmsarudhirabali*), which may be applicable in our text as well.

70.2: *śīrṣarogā bhavanti*, “They will have head diseases,” correctly as ‘headache’ at 92.3.

72.7, 15: In the notes the following readings and emendation are offered: *rañjayitavyam*] D; *vajrayitavyam* A; *tarjayitavyam*] *em.* Szántó; *vajrayitavyam* A, *varjayitavyam* D. While the choice or reading in the first case and the emendation in the second may be correct, at the very least some discussion is needed given the original manuscript readings in the two cases.

76.8–9: *sarvabuddhadharmavisaṃvādakā bhavemaḥ | trailokyavisaṃvādakā* (sic punctuation, which evidently misled GH), “We will be adversary to the teaching of all Buddhas. Disappointing the Three Worlds, ...” Rather “We will be liars (? traitors?) to all the buddhas and their teachings, liars to the whole triple world.”

78.1–2: *anekadevagaṇāḥ samāgatāḥ mahatā paṇṣadā bodhisattvagaṇāḥ samāgatāḥ*, “Many Deva multitudes assembled with a great assembly, multitudes of Bodhisattvas assembled.” I believe that *mahatā paṇṣadā* must be taken with what follows.

78.10: bhagavānś ca nānāraśmikoṭīniyutasahasrasamalaṁkṛtakāyaḥ, “The Bhagavān had a body ornamented with a net of ten million million thousand rays.” nānā here must indicate a multitude of colors. I do not know the basis of GH’s “net.”

78.11–12: sūrya ivāvabhāsan dvātriṁśallakṣaṇadharāḥ aśīti-anuvyañjanaḥ, “He was brilliant like the Sun, displayed the thirty-two marks of beauty and the eighty minor marks of beauty.” I am not familiar with any Buddhist tradition which considers the thirty-two major and eighty minor marks on the body of a buddha as marks of beauty. However, of course the Buddha’s body is resplendent and beautiful, and adorned with these marks, and perhaps this is the idea that GH wished to convey?

84.11–14: sahasmaraṇamātreṇeyam bhujaḡādhipateḥ sarvanāgamaṇḍalikā saputradārāsāmātyapavarā sapārśadyāśīviṣasītavalāhakān vāyuvalāhakān sāmāgrībhāveṇa tathāgatavacanānujñātā tathāgatasamayādhiṣṭhānena, “O Serpent chiefs, merely upon calling to mind, all Nāga rulers along with their sons, wives, chief ministers and retainers [shall ward off] venomous snakes, cold spells, clouds, winds and clouds entirely by the authorization of the Tathāgata’s word, with the empowerment of the vow of the Tathāgatas.” Instead of “merely upon calling to mind,” with ayam we should understand (as above) “While it is being called to mind.” In the terms sītavalāhakān and vāyuvalāhakān, the repetition of °valāhaka suggests that rather than a repetition of “clouds” we have compounds, cold clouds and windy clouds (?).

94.12: etenaiva mantreṇa, omitted in Eng.

96.9–10: anāvṛṣṭikāle mantra cīrikāṁ likhya, “At the time of drought the mantra should be written on strips of cloth.” The spelling cīrika seems to mean the insect cricket, while in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit cīraka means a strip (of cloth or bark). Should we understand a compound *mantracīraka?

96.14–15: anyāni ca sarvatra kalpavidyāsādhanaṁ | pūrvokta eṣa mantraḥ, “Everywhere in other kinds of ritual instructions which involve spells the previously mentioned one is the mantra.” This translation makes no sense. For anyāni GH reports anyāni] BCD; anāvṛṣṭi AE, and if we follow this and understand anāvṛṣṭi as a locative, we might get “And when it does not rain, everywhere the ritual instruction, spell and meditative rituals spoken of previously refer to this mantra.” This too, I confess, is hard to understand.

98.19: nāgaparyāṅkamudrā bandhayitavyāḥ, “A Nāga cross-legged hand gesture should be made,” without comment. A nāgamudrā is known, but this expression here seems to be otherwise unattested.

102.3–4: nava kulālaṁ kumbham ādāyāsprṣṭaṁ tatra madhye sthāpayitavyam, “Having taken a new unused potter’s pot, it should be placed there in the middle.” First, should we read navakulālakumbham? Even setting this aside,

I am unsure, because evidently in the language of this text terms which are nevertheless governed by absolutes can evidently appear also after them in a sentence, though of course not always, so perhaps: “One should take a new potter’s pot and place it, untouched, there in the middle.”

104.6: sarvājñām bho vidyādhara kiṁ kariṣyāmīti, “Listen, O spell-master, what is your command?” Something has gone wrong here. It is not really clarified by the note “sarvājñām] *em.* Szántó; sarvajñā A, sarvajñām BCDE.” If sarva is to be kept, then we have something like “all of your commands,” then perhaps even (taking the form as a pl. gen.), “Among all of your commands, what should I do?”

104.13–14: tataḥ kīlakam uddharitavyam | tatraivāhāraḥ kartavyaḥ | sarvanāgā vaśyā bhavanti, “then the stake should be driven out. They should eat together there. All Nāgas are subdued.” Contextually this makes no sense, and āhāra does not mean to eat together, but at best to eat. However, perhaps: “Then the stake should be drawn out, and it [the stake, or stakes as a collective] should be brought right there, and consequently all Nāgas will be subdued.” But the reading itself seems to me problematic.

104.14: yathā yathā kāma karaṇīyāni svāni gr̥hvat prativasanti, “As he wishes his own things to be done, he dwells as if he was at home.” This of course makes no sense. I have no good suggestion, but as it stands at the very least the translation is incoherent.

108.4: pṛthivīrasa is rendered with “earth-sap,” which is not wrong, literally, but ignores the occurrence of this term in a variety of Buddhist texts. In Pāli we find paṭhavīrasa, but also probably the same as rasapathavī, the latter of which refers to the “tasty or sweet earth” that appears in the evolution of the world in the *Aggaññasutta*. The term and concept certainly require further study.

110.10–12: caityabhūto 'yaṁ pṛthivīpradeśeti bhagavan dhārayiṣyāmahe | ya-trāyaṁ mahākālparājā pracariṣyati tatreyam vajratuṇḍā dhāraṇī pracariṣyati | tatra vayan bhagavan satatasamitam tathāgatacaityasamam dhārayiṣyāmaḥ, “This region has become like a *caitya*—O Bhagavān, we will consider it like that. Wherever this Great King of Manuals will circulate, there this Vajra Beak *dhāraṇī* will circulate. O Bhagavān, we will always consider that place to be similar to a Tathāgata *caitya*.” GH refers in a note to the famous paper of G. Schopen of 1975 on the term caityabhūta, but does not notice the literature which followed this, especially of late. In regard to the way in which °bhūta is to be understood, it is at the very least interesting that here °bhūta and °sama are structurally parallel.

116.6: vāmahastena maṇiratnaparigrhīta, “[The Garuḍa] should hold ... jewels and gems in the left [hand].” Somewhat surprisingly, GH did not recognize

the term *maṇiratna*; I am not sure whether this should be understood here to refer to the so-called wish-fulfilling gem, *cintāmaṇi*, or simply to a gem.

116.14–16: *nāgabhavanāsare sthāpya dhūpaṁ dattvā trīṇi vārāṇ mantraṁ japatā sarṣapaṁ bhavanamādhye okiratavyam*, “Having placed it at the Nāga residence lake, and offered incense, mustard seeds should be thrown into the middle of the residence after reciting the mantra three times [into each seed].” GH seems to have read rather *japtvā* (?), which is not cited as a vl in his apparatus, but as it stands *japatā* is a present participle in the inst., just what is required as agent of a gerundive. As it stands we should translate: “One must place it in the Nāga residence lake, offer incense and, while reciting the mantra three times [into each seed], throw mustard seeds into the middle of the residence.”

126.10: *taijaska*: at least as far as I can see, this form from *tejas* is not otherwise found.

128.7–9: *ayaṁ śapatha vidyādhareṇa uccaśaraṇe vā parvate vā sapta vārāṇ pūrvābhimukham uccasvareṇa uccārayitavyam*. There seems to be some play here with the repetition of *ucca*, unremarked upon by GH, despite his note on *uccaśaraṇa*, which reads only “Compare *uccaśaraṇa* with *uccasara* [2.27] *uccaśarasi*, *ūrdhvasarasi* [4.1] and *uccasthāna* [1.13] [3.15] [5.6].”

Regarding issues which may relate more to the English than to GH’s actual understanding of the text, we might simply cite a few examples:

38.4: The English beginning with “namely the producer of virtue” refers to Dharma, not to the Bhagavān, as is clear in Sanskrit but ambiguous in English.

38.16: *nāgaplavanavegena* is rendered with “the intensity of swaying,” but perhaps convulsions is better.

38.20–21: *sa ca bhagavantam śaraṇam trāṇam parāyaṇam gaveśya vipralāpaṁ kartum ārabdhaḥ*, “He started to cry out seeking refuge, defence and a last resort at the Bhagavān.” Rather: “Seeking refuge, defence and a last resort [resort from others?] from the Bhagavān, he began to lament.”

42.4 and *passim*: when in apposition with *buddha* or equivalent, *bhagavat* is rendered “glorious,” which I do not understand. Here *namo bhagavate śākya-munirājāya* is at the very least unexpected as “Veneration to the glorious king Śākya-muni.”

42.18: in a sequence, *tādayāmi* is rendered “I stroke back,” correctly “I struck back,” but I do not understand why the whole sequence is placed in the past tense.

56.16: *jīvitavirodham*, “their lives were obstructed,” perhaps rather threatened?

68.20 (and below, thrice, *mutatis mutandis*): *eṣa prathamo vidhiḥ*, “This is the first manual.” Here *vidhi* must mean technique.

98.13–14: na ca hiṃsayitum na śaktāḥ | tṛṇapatram api kadācana, “They cannot even ever cause harm to leaves of grass.” Rather: “They cannot cause harm even to leaves of grass [or perhaps more likely: grass or leaves?] at any time.”

98.20–21: eṣa mudrā sarvanāgānām sahapravartitamātreṇa sarvanāgāḥ pīḍitā bhaviṣyanti, “This is the hand gesture for all Nāgas. Merely upon reciting, all Nāgas will be suppressed.” Rather: “This is the hand gesture for all Nāgas. Precisely while it is being recited all Nāgas will be tormented.”

102.11–12: atha brāhmaṇarūpako yam ājñāpayati tat sarvaṃ karoti, “What he commands from the one in the form of a Brahmin he does that all.” This English is not much aided by GH’s (rare) grammatical note, “Note that *brāhmaṇarūpako* should most likely be understood as an accusative.” Understanding rather as a nom., might it be perhaps “[The nāga] in the shape of a Brahmin does everything [the mantrin] commands”?

116.18: taptavālukā mūrdhni śirasi paṭiṣyanti, “Hot sand will fall on their heads and skulls.” I think both terms mean simply head, not skull.

Jonathan A. Silk

Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

J.A.Silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl