

Initiation Rituals in Buddhism and Hinduism:

Maṇḍalapraveśa and Dīkṣā in the Bhūtaḍāmaratantras

FUJII Akira

1. Introduction

I have previously compared and contrasted the Buddhist (Buddhist *Bhūtaḍāmaratantra* / BBT) and Hindu (Hindu *Bhūtaḍāmaratantra* / HBT) versions of the *Bhūtaḍāmaratantra*.¹⁾ In this paper I would like to compare the descriptions of initiation rituals in both texts. The BT exists in both Buddhist and Hindu versions, each with the same title, and previous research has shown that the HBT was most likely created from the BBT. Some shared and unshared elements are found in both BTs. We would like to clarify specific examples of which elements are shared and which are not shared between the BBT and HBT, using the initiation rituals of both BTs as examples. This ritual is a part of the BBT that is presented as the *maṇḍalapraveśavidhi* in the *mahāmaṇḍalavidhi* in chapter 4. The chapter in the HBT corresponding to this description is chapter 6, where the *dīkṣāvidhāna* is presented after the drawing of the *mahāmaṇḍala*. First, we wish to look at the elements that are not shared.²⁾

2. Unshared Elements

The following four elements are not shared by both BTs: 1. names of initiation rituals; 2. use of the *vajra*; 3. encryption of mantras; and 4. use of technical terms. The first element that is not shared is the name of the initiation ritual. In the BBT it is taught as *athāto maṇḍalapraveśavidhir bhavati*, and in Buddhism it is called *maṇḍalapraveśa*. In contrast, the corresponding passage in the HBT has *atha dīkṣāvidhānaṁ ca vakṣye*, and even similar rituals are called *dīkṣā* in the HBT. Second, the HBT *dīkṣā* does not teach the use of the *vajra* in the rituals found in the BBT. In the BBT, the statement *vajram ullālya* is found, which refers to the actual use of a *vajra* in the ritual. However, the HBT does not have any corresponding practice. Next, the encryption of mantras has already been discussed in another article.³⁾ In the HBT, mantras are not given directly, and encrypted mantras are

used. Although the *vajra* as a ritual instrument is not found in the HBT, the word *vajra* corresponding to its use in the BBT is found in an encrypted mantra.

bījam hālāhalaṃ⁴⁾ grhya (⁵⁾krodha-[N3 13a1]bījam anantaram⁵⁾ /⁶⁾
 (⁷⁾bhayaṇ karālam ālikhya⁷⁾ sitāṅgaṃ⁸⁾ [N2 9b2] *kṣatajasthitam⁹⁾ //¹⁰⁾
 pralayāgnir¹¹⁾ mahājvālām¹²⁾ ābhāṣya manu-[Ba 19a3]m uddharet /¹³⁾

If we decipher this description, the mantra is “*om hūṃ vajra (vajra) phaṭ.*” This mantra corresponds to the BBT description of “*hūṃ vajra phaṭ.*” Fourth, terms such as *vajrācārya* or *samayadevatā*, which are used in the BBT, are not found in the HBT. The definition of the term *samayadevatā* is unclear, and so I would like to ascertain the definition here. Gellner (1992) points out that *samayadevatā* is taught in the visualization of Cakrasaṃvara. He writes, “the black six-armed Saṃvara, without consort or attendants; this is the Convention-Deity (*samayadevatā*).”¹⁴⁾ It is also noted that in later visualization, the already visualized *samayadevatā* is fused with the *jñānadevatā*. English (2002) describes the *samayadevatā* of the *Vajravārāhīsādhana* as follows: “The pledge deity is the imaginary form of the goddess created by the “pledge-holding” initiate through the self-generation.”¹⁵⁾ Here, too, union with the *jñānadevatā* is indicated. Sakuma (1993) mentions, besides the relationship between the *jñānasattva* and *samayasattva*, the relationship between the *samayamaṇḍala* and *jñānamaṇḍala* and the *samayacakra* and *jñānacakra*, and presents two patterns of union between the *jñānasattva* and *samayasattva*. In either pattern, the *jñānasattva* is working as an element drawn into the *samayasattva*. In view of the above references, the terms *samayadevatā* and *jñānadevatā* could be considered synonyms, similar to the relationship between the *samayasattva* and *jñānasattva*. If it is a concept for visualization, it can be assumed that the HBT intentionally did not use this terminology because it was unique to Buddhism.

3. Shared Elements

The following four elements are shared by both BTs: 1. the color of the garments and the use of masks; 2. union with the Wrathful Deity and *āveśa*; 3. the action of showing the *kuladevatā*; and 4. use of water. In both BTs, the color of the garments used during the ritual is blue. In the BBT, the teacher (*vajrācārya*) wears a blue crown and a blue robe. While some manuscripts of the HBT refer to the wise man (*śiṣṭa*) as the one who wears the

blue robe, others refer to the disciple (*śiṣya*), but in view of the correspondence with the BBT, it is reasonable to assume that it refers to the teacher. Next, I would like to look at the union with the Wrathful Deity and *āveśa*. Both BTs share the use of the *krodhamudrā*. In the BBT, when one chants *hūṃ vajra phaṭ*, the Wrathful Deity himself enters [into the chanter] (*svayaṃ krodhaḥ praviśati*). Then, by reciting the wrathful mantra of possession (*krodhāveśamantra*), *oṃ praviśa krodha krodha hūṃ 2 aḥ*, he makes the Wrathful Deity possess (*āveśa*) his disciple.¹⁶⁾ It is taught that the disciple possessed by the Wrathful Deity speaks of the past, the future, and the present, and he then throws a flower. In the HBT, after chanting *oṃ hūṃ bajra (vajra) phaṭ*, it is taught that the Wrathful Deity himself will be fulfilled. It is then stated that he “becomes Vajradhara himself” (*svayaṃ vajradharo bhūtvā*) and “becomes a *vajra* body” (*vajradeho bhaven*). Then he recites the mantra *oṃ praviśa krodhaṃ hūṃ śuddham*. After this we find the statement, “You should enter by this wrathful mantra” (*viśed anena mantreṇa krodhena*), and the correspondence with the BBT suggests that the earlier mantra was for the possession of the disciple. As described above, it can be said that both BTs share the process of the practitioner uniting with the wrathful deity and possessing the disciple.

(BBT) *evam*¹⁷⁾ *uccāritamātreṇa*¹⁸⁾ *svayaṃ krodhaḥ*¹⁹⁾ *praviśati*²⁰⁾ /²¹⁾ *tataḥ*²²⁾ *śiṣyaṃ*²³⁾ *praveśayet*²⁴⁾ /²⁵⁾ *tato*²⁶⁾ *mahānīlavastreṇa*²⁷⁾ *mukhabandhaṃ*²⁸⁾ *kṛtvā* /²⁹⁾ *krodhamudrāṃ baddhvā*²⁹⁾ *mūrdhni*³⁰⁾ *sthāpya* [G 8b4] *vajrodakaṃ mukhe* [T1 18b5] *dāpayet* /³¹⁾ *oṃ*³²⁾ *tiṣṭha*³³⁾ *siddhi*³⁴⁾ *hūṃ* /³⁵⁾ *anena* /³⁶⁾ *tu yāpayet*³⁶⁾ [A 27b4] /³⁷⁾ *oṃ*³⁸⁾ *praviśa krodha* /³⁹⁾ *hūṃ 2*³⁹⁾ *aḥ*⁴⁰⁾ /⁴¹⁾ *anena krodhāveśamantreṇa*⁴²⁾ *praveśayet*⁴²⁾ [T2 17a4] *hūṃkāreṇa*⁴³⁾ [A 27b5] *sumerum apy āvedhayet*⁴⁴⁾ /⁴⁵⁾ **aṭṭānāgatavartamānaṃ*⁴⁶⁾ *kathayati* /⁴⁷⁾

(HBT) [N3 13a2] *evam uccārite*⁴⁸⁾ *krodhaḥ*⁴⁹⁾ [Bo 21a4] *svayaṃ*⁵⁰⁾ *e*-[N1 16a4] *va *prasidhyati*⁵¹⁾ /⁵²⁾ *Baddhvā*⁵³⁾ *tu*⁵⁴⁾ [N2 9b3] *krodhinīm*⁵⁵⁾ *mudrāṃ*⁵⁶⁾ *śirasya*⁵⁷⁾ *āsya*⁵⁸⁾ *ca*⁵⁹⁾ *mūrdhani*⁶⁰⁾ [Ba 19a4] /⁶¹⁾ *svayaṃ vajradharo* [Bo 21a5] *bhū*-[N3 13a3] *tvā tāraṃ*⁶²⁾ *tiṣṭha*⁶³⁾ *dvayaṃ punaḥ* /⁶⁴⁾ *ābhāṣya pātayet toyaṃ vajrade*-[N2 9b4] *ho bhaven naraḥ*⁶⁵⁾ /⁶⁶⁾ *vi*-[Ba 19a4] *ṣārṇāt*⁶⁷⁾ *praviśa* /⁶⁸⁾ *krodhaṃ kūraṃ śuddham*⁶⁸⁾ *udīrayet*⁶⁹⁾ *viśed*⁷⁰⁾ *anena*⁷¹⁾ *mantreṇa*⁷²⁾ *krodhenābhyarcayet*⁷³⁾ *tridhā* /⁷⁴⁾

The term *kuladevatā* is shared by both BTs. This word is given in the context of the teacher showing the *kuladevatā* to the unmasked disciple in both BTs. In the BBT, it is stated that the disciple throws a flower onto the *maṇḍala* and then removes his mask to reveal the *kuladevatā*, but no description of this flower-throwing action is found in the HBT. However, Takashima (1984) shows that in Abhinavagupta's description of *samayadīkṣā* in

the *Tantrāloka* (hereafter TĀ) the disciple is blindfolded with a cloth and flowers are thrown on an altar.⁷⁵⁾ Similarly, in the kaula *dīkṣā* described in the TĀ, the manner in which the disciple blindfolds himself and throws flowers on the *sthaṇḍila* (altar) is described.⁷⁶⁾ Since this *dīkṣā* of the kaula also states that the *kula* of the disciple is determined after the throwing of the flower, I quote the relevant passage.

bhujau tasya samālokya rudraśaktyā praḍīpayet /
 tayaivāsyārpayet puṣpaṃ karayor gandhadigdhayoḥ // 188 //
 nirālambau tu tau tasya sthāpayitvā vicintayet /
 rudraśaktyākṛṣyamāṇau dīptayāṅkuṣārūpayā // 189 //
 tataḥ sa svayam ādāya vastraṃ baddhadṛṣīr bhavet /
 svayaṃ ca pātayet puṣpaṃ tatpātāl lakṣayet kulam // 190 //
 tato 'sya mukham uddhātya pādayoḥ praṇipātayet /
 hastayor mūrdhni cāpy asya devīcakraṃ samarcayet // 191 //⁷⁷⁾

This description in the TĀ indicates that the *kula* of the disciple is determined by the action of the masked disciple throwing the flower. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the HBT, which tells us to “take off the blue cloth and show the *kuladevatā*” (*nīlavastraṃ parityajya darśayet kuladevatām*), only omits the description of throwing flowers. Next, I would like to discuss the fourth shared element, the use of water. Both BTs teach the use of water in ritual, but in different ways. In the BBT, the wrathful mudrā (*krodhamudrā*) is formed and placed on the top of the disciple’s head, and *vajra* water (*vajrodaka*) is given to the mouth. Then it is indicated that the mantra is to be recited. In the HBT, on the other hand, the wrathful mudrā is placed on the top of the head, the mantra is recited, and water is poured (*pātayet toyam*). Here again I would like to look at the description of the *dīkṣā* of the kaula in the TĀ. This is the description before the previously quoted passage:

rudraśaktyā tu taṃ prokṣya devābhyāśe niveśayet // 187 //⁷⁸⁾

The order of the *dīkṣā* of the kaula is to throw the flower after sprinkling the disciple with water, and then to unmask him and check his *kula*. In the HBT, the procedure is also to pour water on the disciple, unmask him, and check the *kuladevatā*. The *vajra* water used in the BBT was changed in the *dīkṣā* ritual in the HBT into water poured on the disciple.

4. Conclusion

As we have seen above, it is assumed that the modifier who compiled the HBT on the basis of the BBT compiled it while avoiding technical terms specific to Buddhism. In other words, it is possible that it was compiled by someone who understood Buddhist doctrines and concepts. On the other hand, it is possible that the compilers simply did not use technical terms that they did not understand, but this is difficult to determine. As the correspondences between the BBT and the HBT that I have presented so far indicate, we may say that the rituals of *maṇḍalapraśeṣa* in Tantric Buddhism and *dīkṣā* in Hindu Tantrism are to some extent interchangeable rituals.

Notes

- 1) See Fujii 2020b for details on the BTs. 2) The Sanskrit text is given as appropriate, but the full Sanskrit text has not been included for reasons of space. The locations in each manuscript, the Tibetan translation, and the Chinese translation are as follows: BBT Skt. (G 8b2-8b5, T1 18b1-19a2, T2 16b6-17a6, A 27a3-28a2), Tib. (D 246a6-246b4, P 41a1-41a7, sT 58a1-58b1, Ph 205a7-206a1), Chi. (552c29-553a17); HBT (N1 16a1-16a7, N2 9a11-9b6, N3 12b7-13a5, Bo 20b7-21b2, Ba 18b11-19a7). 3) See Fujii 2020a. 4) Ba *halāhalaṃ*. 5) N1, Ba *krodha*-[Ba 19a2]*bījamataḥ param*; N2 *hūṃ hūṃ* / *bījagataḥ param*; Bo *hrāṃ hrauṃ bījamataḥ param*; M *kroṃ bījamataḥ param*. 6) N1, N2 //; Bo omits; Ba // 25 //. 7) N1 *bhayaṃ*-[N1 16a3]*karārṇabhāḥśyā*; N2 *bhayaṃkaraṇaṃ ābhāśyā*; Bo *bhayaṃkarārṇaṃ ābhāśya*; Ba *bhyaṃkarārṇaṃ ābhāśya*; M *bhayaṃkarārṇaṃ ābhāśya*. 8) N1, Bo *sitāṃga*; N2, Ba *sitāṃgaṃ*. 9) Emend. N3 *kṣatajasthitih*; N1 *kṣatajosthitam*; N2, Bo, Ba *kṣa*-[Bo 21a3]*tajasthitam*; M *kṣatajam sthitam*. 10) N2, M /; Bo omits. 11) N1, M *pralayāgni*; Bo *pralaṇagnir*. 12) N3 *mmahājvālām*. 13) N1 //; Bo omits; Ba // 26 //. 14) Gellner 1992, 289. 15) English 2002, 167. 16) In this text of the BBT, the object to be possessed is not clearly indicated as a “disciple,” but in the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha* the action of throwing flowers is explained after the *āveśa* into the disciple (Tanemura 2019). Since the BBT also describes the disciple’s flower-throwing action after this *āveśa*, it is reasonable to assume that the object of possession is the disciple. 17) T2 *evam*. 18) T1 *uccāri*-[T1 18b4]*tamātre*; T2 *uccāritamātreṇa*; A *uccāni*-[A 27b2]*tamātreṇa*. 19) T2 *krodha*; A *kroḍha*. 20) T2 *pravi*-[T2 17a2]*ṣati*. 21) T2 ∴. 22) T2 *tata*. 23) T1 *śiṣyāt*; T2 *śiṣya*. 24) T2 *pravesayet*; A *prareṣayet*. 25) T2 omits; A //. 26) T1, T2, A omits. 27) T1, A *nīlavastreṇa*; T2 *nīlavastrena*. 28) T1 *mukhabandhanam*. 29) T1 *krodhamudrādvā*; T2, A *kro*-[A 27b3]*dhamudrāṃ baddhā*. 30) T2 *mūrdhi*; A *mūrdhni*. 31) G omits; T2 ///. 32) G omits. 33) T2, A *ti*-[T2 17a3]*ṣṭa*. 34) T1 *siddha*. 35) T2 ///. 36) T1 *pāyet*; T2, A *sthāpayet*. 37) T2 ///. 38) T2 *tata om*; A *tataḥ om*. 39) T1 *hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ* 3; T2, A *hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ*. 40) G *āḥ*; T2 *a*. 41) T2 ///. 42) T1 *mantreṇa krodhāveśe mantreṇāveśayet* /; T2 *mantra krodhāveśamantreṇāveśayet*; A *mantraṇa krodhāveśamantreṇāveśayata*. 43) T2 *hūṃkārena*. 44) T1, T2, A *āveśa*-[T1 19a1]*jet*. 45) T2 omits. 46) Emend. G *atītānāgatavarttamānaṃ*; T1 *atīnāgatavarttamānaṃ*; T2

atītānāṃgatavarttamānaṃ; A atītānāṃgatavarttamānaṃ. 47) T1 /; T2 :. 48) N1 uccārito.
 49) Ba krodhe. 50) Bo śvayam. 51) Emend. N3 prasīdhyati; N1 prasiddhyati; N2, Ba praviśyati; Bo praviśyati; M pravekṣyati. 52) N1, Ba //; Bo omits. 53) N1, Ba badhvā.
 54) N2 illeg. 55) N1, Ba krodhanī; N2 krodhinī. 56) Ba mudrā. 57) Bo śiras.
 58) Ba āśya. 59) N1 na. 60) N1 mūrddhanī; N2 mūrddhnanī; M vakṣasi. 61) N1 //; Bo omits; Ba // 27 //. 62) N3 tāvaṃ; N2, Bo, M tāvat; Ba ttāvat. 63) Bo tiṣṭa.
 64) N2, M /; Bo omits. 65) N1 tarah. 66) N1 //; Bo omits; Ba // 28 //; M // 5 //.
 67) N3 viśārṇāt; N1 viśasmāt; N2 viśārṇān; Bo viśāṇā-[Bo 21a6]n; M visargāt. 68) N3 krodhaṃ kūrccam śuddha-[N3 13a4]m; N1 krodhakurvvan śuddhim; N2, Bo krodhaṃ kūrcaśuddham; M krodhakūrccayugmam. 69) N1, Ba //; Bo omits. 70) Bo, Ba viśod. 71) Bo ṛṇena.
 72) N1, N2, Bo, Ba mamtreṇa. 73) N3 krodhenābhyarcaye; N1 krodhemābhyarcyas; N2 krodhaṃ cābhyarjyayet; Bo krodhenābhyarcaye; Ba krodhaṃ cābhyarcayet. 74) N1, N2 //; Bo omits; Ba // 29 //. 75) Takashima 1984, 17. 76) Takashima 1992, 63. 77) TĀ 29: 188-191. An English translation of this passage is given in Dupuche 2003, 302-303. A corresponding description is found in the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra* (MV 11: 18-21). 78) TĀ 29: 187.

Abbreviations and Primary Sources

BBT Āśā Archives DP No. 3695 (A). Matsunami No. 274 (T1), No. 273 (T2). Bandurski No. Xc14/50 (G). T No. 1129. **HB**T NGMCP No. B134-12 (N1), No. B135-45 (N2), No. A167-6 (N3). Bhandarkar No. 295 (Bo). Baroda Acc. No. 9168 (Ba). **Mishra, G. R. 2016.** *Bhūta-Ḍāmaratantra*. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan (M). **TĀ** (*Tantrāloka*) **Shāstrī, M. K., ed. 1936.** *The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with Commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, no. 57. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press. **MV** (*Mālinīvijayottaratantra*) **Madhusūdan, K. S., ed. 1922.** *Sri Mālinīvijayottara tantram*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, no. 37. Bombay: Tatvavivechaka Press.

Bibliography

Dupuche, J. R. 2003. *Abhinavagupta, The Kula Ritual: As Elaborated in Chapter 29 of the Tantrāloka*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. **English, E. 2002.** *Vajrayoginī: Her Visualizations, Rituals, and Forms*. Boston: Wisdom Publications. **Fujii Akira 藤井明. 2020a.** “The Encoding of Mantras and Its Methods in Tantra: Focusing on Descriptions in the *Bhūtaḍāmaratantra*.” *IBK* 68(3): (137)-(141). ———, 2020b. “Indo mikkyō bunken ni okeru Bukkyō Hindūkyō kan no sōkoku to chōwa” インド密教文献における仏教・ヒンドウ教間の相克と調和. PhD diss. (unpublished), Toyo University. **Sakuma Ruriko 佐久間留理子. 1993.** “Sādāna-mārā ni okeru junyānasattva to samayasattva” 『サーダナ・マーラー』におけるジュニャーナサットヴァとサマヤサットヴァ. In *Indogaku Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* インド学密教学研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan. **Takashima Jun 高島淳. 1984.** “Tantrāloka ni okeru dīkṣā: Kashimīru Shivaha ni okeru inishieishon girei” Tantrālokaにおけるdīkṣā: カシミール・シヴァ派におけるイニシエーション儀礼. *Tōkyō Daigaku shūkyōgaku nenpō* 東京大学宗教学年報 1: 18-26. ———, 1992. “Dīkṣā in the Tantrāloka.” *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 119: 45-84. **Tanemura Ryūgen 種村隆元. 2019.** “Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgraha ni okeru āveśa ni tsuite” Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgrahaにおけるāveśaについて. *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 密教学研究 51: 31-53.

Key words *maṇḍalapraveśa, dīkṣā, Bhūtaḍāmaratantra, initiation ritual*

(Encouraging Research Fellow, Institute of Oriental Studies, Toyo University, PhD)