
The Kālacakra Tantra on the Sādhana and Maṇḍala:

A Review Article

THE KĀLACAKRA TANTRA: THE CHAPTER ON SĀDHANĀ, TOGETHER WITH THE VĪMALAPRABHĀ COMMENTARY, TRANSLATED FROM SANSKRIT, TIBETAN, AND MONGOLIAN, Introduced and Annotated by VESNA A. WALLACE. (Treasury of the Buddhist Sciences Series, Tengyur Translation Initiative). New York, The American Institute of Buddhist Studies, Columbia University Center for Buddhist Studies, and Tibet House US, 2010.

The *Kālacakra Tantra* was the last Buddhist *tantra* to appear in India, before the disappearance of Buddhism there, roughly a thousand years ago. This is the third book on *Kālacakra* by Vesna Wallace. We must be very grateful to her for another helpful contribution to our knowledge of this complex system. Her first one, *The Inner Kālacakratantra: A Buddhist Tantric View of the Individual* (New York, 2001), provides an overview of the whole system, drawing on all five chapters of the *Kālacakra Tantra*. Her next one, *The Kālacakratantra: The Chapter on the Individual together with the Vimalaprabhā* (New York, 2004), presents a translation of the second chapter of the *Kālacakra Tantra* along with the indispensable *Vimalaprabhā* commentary thereon. The *Kālacakra Tantra* is written entirely in the *śṛgḍharā* metre, in which the length of every syllable is regulated. When a complex system is presented in a complex metre, we have a text that is hard to understand in the extreme. It would be almost incomprehensible without the full and detailed *Vimalaprabhā* commentary.

Dr Wallace's third book on *Kālacakra*, the book under review, presents a translation of the fourth chapter of the *Kālacakra Tantra* along with the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary thereon. This chapter and her previous translation of Chapter Two are the only chapters of these texts so far published in English translation. This fourth chapter is on the *Kālacakra* meditation practice, or *sādhana*. Here, the elaborate *Kālacakra maṇḍala* with all its 722 deities (according to the count current among Gelugpas) is described in full detail. This is to be visualised in meditation. So this chapter, whether directly or indirectly, forms the basis of all the *Kālacakra* practice texts, or *sādhana*s, ever written. The *Kālacakra Tantra* is the core text of a system of much importance and influence. The present Dalai Lama has given the public *Kālacakra* Initiation more than thirty times, throughout the world. So the *Kālacakra Tantra*, and this chapter in particular, is likely to have an unusually large readership. For this reason, a careful review is warranted.

The task of reviewers of translations of Sanskrit texts for academic journals is much like that of proofreaders. They must carefully compare the translation with the original Sanskrit text. They are called upon to pass over in silence the thousands upon thousands of well-translated words and phrases and sentences, and take note only of those that might be improved or refined. It is in this way that our knowledge advances. Merely praising a book does not

advance scholarship. The resulting review, therefore, will necessarily be very one-sided. This is a very difficult text, and there are many problems to be solved in translating it. No one can solve all of them the first time through. Once the hard groundbreaking work of translation has been done, a reviewer can then come in and with comparative ease offer suggestions for improvement. That is what I have done. It is worth trying to understand this text as accurately as we can. My suggestions follow.

p. 11, title: “The Great Exposition on the Location, Protection, and Disclosure of Sins”. *sthāna-rakṣā-pāpa-deśanādi-mahoddeśah*. The word “etc.” (*ādī*) is omitted after “Sins”. (This also occurs on pp. ix, 4, and 25.) In the title, “The Great Exposition on the Location (i.e., the places for practice), Protection, Disclosure of Sins, etc.”, the “etc.” brings in such additional topics as the purification of the mouth (*vaktra-śuddhi*), rejoicing in the merits of others (*punya-numodanā*), and the definition or characteristics of emptiness (*śūnyatā-lakṣaṇa*).

I will be using hyphens in my citations of Sanskrit in order to show exactly how I understand the word breaks. These are not in the printed texts, and the printed texts are customarily cited without them in order to show exactly what is there. But in the printed texts themselves it has become customary for editors to introduce spaces showing word breaks, where the *devanāgarī* script allows. These are not in the manuscripts, where everything is written together. So the use of hyphens in Romanised text only takes farther the usually helpful process of showing word divisions that the editors of printed texts have already established.

p. 12, line 18: “Here, in the splendid garden of the southern Malaya [mountains], in the town of Kalāpa”, *iha śrīmati kalāpa-grāma-dakṣiṇa-malayodyāne*. The word “south” (*dakṣiṇa*) refers to the Malaya garden or park that is located to the south of the town of Kalāpa, rather than to the southern Malaya mountains. See *Vimalaprabhātīkā*, vol. 1, 1986, p. 26, line 20: *kalāpa-grāma-dakṣiṇena malayodyanam*, “To the south of the town of Kalāpa is Malaya park”.

p. 13, verse 1: “and four [higher initiations]—the vase and secret initiations, and the wisdom and gnosis initiations—” *kumbhaguhyābhiṣekaḥ prajñājñānābhiṣeko . . . caturthaḥ*. The word “fourth” (*caturtha*) may be used as the actual name of the fourth initiation, also called the “word” initiation. This should be: “the vase and secret initiations, the wisdom and gnosis initiation, and the fourth [initiation]”.

p. 14, lines 18–20: “The day is the sun, uterine blood, and lotus; . . . the night is the moon, semen, and *vajra*”. *dinaṃ sūryo rajo vajraṃ bhāva-bhedair niśā śasī | śukraṃ padmaṃ . . .* The words “lotus” and “*vajra*” should be reversed: “The day is the sun, uterine blood, and *vajra*; . . . the night is the moon, semen, and lotus”.

p. 16, line 2 (and following): “astrological houses”, *lagna*. The *lagna* is the astrological rising sign or ascendant. It is the sign of the zodiac that appears to be rising on the eastern horizon at any given moment of the day or night. So there are twelve of these in twenty-four hours. These are not the same as the astrological houses. For the astrological houses in Indian astrology, the term *bhāva* is used.

p. 18, footnote 57: “The Tibetan translation reads the word ‘adept’ (*sgrub pa po*) in the genitive instead of in the instrumental”. After briefly noting that the typo “*sgrub*” should be corrected to “*sgrub*” in the Tibetan word for “adept”, Sanskrit *sādhaka*, and that a *sādhaka* is likely to be only a “practitioner” of the *sādhana* and not yet an adept, we get to the main

point. It would seem that the genitive ending here, “*yi*” instead of the instrumental ending, “*gis*” is merely a typographical error found only in the blockprint of Bu-ston’s edition of the *Kālacakra Tantra* (*The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, edited by Lokesh Chandra, Part 1 (ka), 1965, folio side 138 as numbered in this reproduction, line 7).

Now that the collated Kangyur published in China has become available, we can easily check eight editions at once: the sDe-dge, gYung-lo, Li-thang, Pe-cin (or Peking), sNar-thang, Co-ne, Khu-re (or Urga), and Zhol (or Lhasa) editions. The collated Kangyur has the instrumental “*gis*” here, with no variants reported (vol. 77, p. 190, line 14). Similarly, the collated Tengyur published in China allows us to quickly check the *Kālacakra Tantra* as it is found repeated in the Tengyur in the sDe-dge and Co-ne editions. The collated Tengyur, too, has the instrumental “*gis*” here, with no variants reported (vol. 6, p. 133, line 16). The Jonang edition of the *Kālacakra Tantra* annotated by Phyogs-las rnam-rgyal, which has recently become available in a nicely typeset edition in the Jonang Publication Series, also has the instrumental “*gis*” here (vol. 17, p. 110, line 9). So the genitive “*yi*” found in the blockprint of Bu-ston’s edition appears to be only a typographical error.

To clinch the case, we are now able to check a reproduction of a manuscript in cursive (*dbu med*) script of Bu-ston’s edition, published in the 7-volume Paltseg Kalachakra Commentary Series (part of the 17-volume set, *Phyag bris gces btus*, Beijing, 2007). There we find the instrumental “*gis*” (vol. 2, folio side 138 as numbered in this reproduction, line 5). Thus, neither the Tibetan translation (if we may speak of “the” Tibetan translation) nor Bu-ston’s annotated edition of this translation has the discrepancy noted; it is a mere copyist’s error in the blockprint of his edition.

Regarding the blockprint of Bu-ston’s edition, which is the Tibetan translation used by Dr Wallace, a difficulty with the references arises. The references given in the footnotes include the folio numbers of the blockprint, which is a very helpful feature. However, these are not the folio numbers of the reproduction that is listed in the bibliography, which was edited by Lokesh Chandra and published in the Śata-piṭaka Series, New Delhi, 1965. This puzzled me for a while, as I tried to check the references. The only other reproduction I knew of was one that the Dalai Lama’s Office had done, perhaps in the late 1980s. I had obtained a copy from them in January, 1991. It consists of much of the five Kālacakra volumes, rearranged. It was done in loose-leaf format, and without publication data, but to each folio side was added a number. Upon checking, I see that this is the reproduction used by Dr Wallace.

To match the folio numbers of the more widely available 1965 reproduction in the Śata-piṭaka Series, 474 must be added to the numbers given by Dr Wallace in the footnotes. This is because in the 1965 reproduction, the *sādhana* chapter starts on the folio side numbered 475, while in the Dalai Lama’s Office reproduction, the *sādhana* chapter starts on the folio side numbered 1. So for folio side 20 as given in the footnotes, one must go to folio side 494 in the 1965 reproduction. The same thing is true of Dr Wallace’s earlier translation of the second or *adhyātma* chapter. But that chapter starts on the folio side numbered 305 in the Dalai Lama’s Office reproduction, and thus in Dr Wallace’s footnotes, but starts on the folio side numbered 1 in the 1965 reproduction. It must also be noted that both of these *Vimalaprabhā* chapters are found in volume 2 of the 1965 reproduction, while the bibliography lists only volume 1, Śata-piṭaka Series vol. 41.

p. 19, footnote 61: In the mantra, one “*hrāḥ*” is missing. There should be four of these. This mantra is found in the printed Sanskrit edition, vol. 2, p. 35, line 24.

p. 19, line 5: “pericarp” *karṇikā*. The translation of *karṇikā* as pericarp has been in use since Horace Hayman Wilson’s pioneering Sanskrit-English Dictionary in the early 1800s, and has been adopted in the subsequent standard Sanskrit-English dictionaries of Monier Monier-Williams and Vaman Shivaram Apte. The texts make it clear that the *karṇikā* is the central portion of a lotus flower, not including the petals (e.g., *Vimalaprabhā*, 3.45, p. 51, line 15: *kamala-tri-bhāga-karṇikāyām aṣṭa-dalāni varjayitvā*). But if you look up “pericarp” in English language reference books available today, this is not what you find. This always caused me to wonder, and I kept looking for a more accurate English term for it. Wilson in his 1840 translation of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, besides pericarp (2.2.37), had also used “seed-cup” for it (2.2.9). This described it accurately enough, but did not come into use as a translation term. Finally, a few years ago I contacted botanist Steven Miller of the University of Wyoming, who kindly gave me a full explanation.

In brief, the central portion of most flowers consists of their female parts, and the most accurate collective or general term for these is the gynecium (or gynoeceum). In the case of the lotus and a small number of other flowers, a botanically correct term for the central portion is the receptacle. Since gynecium is as obscure to most readers as pericarp, I have chosen to adopt “central receptacle” for *karṇikā*, adding the adjective “central” for clarity.

p. 20, line 2: *śpṣṣka*. The footnotes 65 and 66 here explain that “The letter *f* here marks a modification of *visarga*, called ‘*upadhmanīya*’ (‘on breathing’), which is pronounced before the letters *pa* and *pha*”; and that “The letter *x* marks here a modification of *visarga*, called ‘*jihvāmūlīya*’ (‘formed at the root of the tongue’) and pronounced before *ka* and *kha*”. I see no need to coin new transliterations for these forms of the *visarga*, *f* and *x*, when the standard transliteration for the *visarga*, *h*, works perfectly fine. Since in the Sanskrit text these forms of the *visarga* are always indicated by giving them with a following *p* or *k*, there can be no possible confusion as to what is meant. That is, the *upadhmanīya* is always listed as *hp*, and the *jihvāmūlīya* is always listed as *hk*. So there is no need to transliterate these as *fp* and *xk*. This string of letters can simply be transliterated as: *śpṣṣhka*.

p. 27, verse 8, line 4: “and the pavilion”, *pañjaram vā*. First we note that “and” should be “or” (*vā*). This seemingly trivial thing becomes significant here in instructions for meditation, where one may visualise either this or the *kūṭāgāra*, the “multi-storied palace”. The basic and standard meaning of *pañjara* found throughout the Sanskrit writings is a “cage” and it will retain something of this idea even when used as an architectural term. This is lost in its Tibetan translation, *gur*, meaning “tent”. In descriptions of the *maṇḍala* visualisation found in Buddhist tantric texts it is sometimes compounded with *bandhana*, literally a “binding” and commonly a “prison” (e.g., *Hevajra Tantra*, 1.3.3: *pañjara-bandhana*, Tibetan, *gur bcing ba*; also in the *Sādhanamālā*). So we get the idea that it keeps inside what is inside, and by extension, that it keeps outside what is outside. Indeed, as shown by the title of the text, *Śani-vajra-pañjara-kavaca* (from the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*), it may be seen as a kind of “armour” (*kavaca*), or protection. The Buddhist tantric *Abhisamayamañjarī* specifically speaks of the *rakṣā-pañjara*, the “*pañjara* of protection” (Sarnath, 1993, p. 8, lines 13, 15).

I have never found a clear definition of *pañjara* in relation to *maṇḍala* architecture, but it is always described as being on top of the walls. The various *sādhanas* found in the *Sādhanamālā*

give the same sequence for visualising a *maṇḍala*. The vajra-ground (*vajra-bhūmī*) is below; then come the vajra-walls (*vajra-prākāra*), and above these is the *vajra-pañjara*. So it seems to be a kind of roof, possibly a dome. David Snellgrove, perhaps influenced by its Tibetan translation (*gur*, “tent”), translated it as “canopy” in his pioneering 1959 translation of the *Hevajra Tantra*. But a few of the *sādhana*s in the *Sāadhanamālā* give a group of six items in the sequence of visualising the *maṇḍala*, adding three more to the three already stated (Benoytosh Bhattacharyya (ed.), pp. 424, 487, 491). After the *pañjara* comes the *vitāna*, “canopy”, followed by the *śara-jāla* and then the *jvālānārka*. So a canopy of some sort is above or beyond the *pañjara*.

Prasanna Kumar Acharya’s extensive *Dictionary of Hindu Architecture* (London, 1934) does not help us here, under *pañjara*. But under *śikhara*, he gives just what I would imagine the *pañjara* to be: “a spherical roof rising like an inverted cup (Latin *cupa*) over a circular, square or multangular [*sic*] building”. The *pañjara* must be a roof of some kind, and I take it as a domed roof having the connotation of a protective sphere.

p. 30, line 16: “‘O king’ is an invocation”. *rājann iti saṃbodhanam*. I would translate this as: “‘O king’ is a vocative”.

p. 32, lines 2–4: “The five pure colors correspond to the five collections, beginning with ethical discipline and the like”. *śīlādi-pañcabhiḥ skandhaiḥ pañca-varṇaṃ viśodhitam*. I take the past passive participle *viśodhitam*, “purified”, as the verb-form that goes with the instrumentals in all of the verses that are quoted here, rather than as an adjective modifying *pañca-varṇaṃ*, the “five colours”. So I understand this as: “The five colours are purified by the five collections, . . .” That is, the five colours are the purification of the five collections. This, of course, is the language used here and throughout this text to say that an element or deity of the *maṇḍala* symbolises an element of the outer or inner world. In this case, it is saying that the five colours of the *maṇḍala* symbolise the five collections. The construal of *viśodhitam* as a verb-form rather than an adjective here is confirmed by the Tibetan translation: *tshul khrims la sogs phung po lngas | kha dog lnga ni nam sbyangs pa* (Bu-ston edition, folio side 490, line 4, and Peking and sNar-thang editions; or *mam par dag* in the sDe-dge and Co-ne editions; collated Tengyur, vol. 6, p. 762, line 2). There is no word for “correspond to” anywhere in these verses, but was added by the translator as being implied.

p. 32, line 5: “fences” *prākāra*. While *prākāra* can mean “fence” I think it must be understood in its more usual meaning of “wall”. In relation to the Kālacakra *maṇḍala*, there is a threefold wall and a fivefold wall. When the visualisation of the *maṇḍala* is first described, in the previous chapter 3, verse 23 (*Vimalaprabhāṭīkā*, vol. 2, p. 23, lines 13–14), we read: *tato rāṣṭra-rakṣārthaṃ rāṣṭra-sīmāyāṃ pañca-prākāraṃ bhāvayet*. “Then, for the sake of protecting the realm, one should visualise a fivefold wall at the boundary of the realm”. If the Great Wall of China was a fence, it could hardly have protected the realm from the Mongol horsemen.

That “wall” rather than “fence” is intended here is confirmed by the use of the word *bhitti* for this in verse 20, and by the use of the compound, *prākāra-bhitti*. The word *bhitti* means “wall” (not “fence”), and the compound *prākāra-bhitti* is used in descriptions of Indian temples to specify that a surrounding wall or enclosure wall is meant, as opposed to just a wall, such as of a building or a partition wall. This compound is used in the present chapter, in the *Vimalaprabhā* on verses 20 and 33, where it is declined in the locative case: *prākāra-bhittau* (Sanskrit edition, p. 163, line 27, p. 164, line 3, and p. 169, line 11). It was

translated into Tibetan as a *ṣaṣṭi* or genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound: *ra ba'i rtsig pa la*. We can hardly take this as “on the wall of the fence”, so Dr Wallace translates this as “on/at the wall of the enclosure” (pp. 48, 58).

We see “fence” used frequently in translations made from the Tibetan. It would seem that the Sanskrit *prākāra* and its Tibetan translation *ra ba* overlap at opposite ends of their respective meaning spectrums. Thus, while *ra ba* can mean “wall”, its more usual meaning seems to be “fence”. In footnote 25 here, I do not understand the sentence, “The Derge edition reads, ‘*rab gsum*,’ instead of ‘*rab bkral gsum*’”. All editions read *ra ba gsum* (collated Tengyur, vol. 6, p. 762, line 3; Bu-ston, folio side 490, line 4).

p. 32, lines 5–8: “The three fences in the *maṇḍalas* of the mind, speech, and body correspond to the three vehicles, to the five spiritual faculties of faith (*śraddhendriya*) and the like, and to the five powers (*bala*), faith and so on”. *tri-prākārās tri-yānaiś ca pañca-śraddhendriyādibhiḥ | śraddhādibhir balaiḥ pañca citta-vāk-kāya-maṇḍale*. We know that the mind *maṇḍala* is surrounded by a threefold wall, and the speech and body *maṇḍalas* are each surrounded by a fivefold wall. The word *pañca*, “five”, in the second line refers to these latter two. It is a nominative, and cannot modify the instrumental *balaiḥ*, “powers”. This sentence is saying: “The three walls [are purified] by the three vehicles, and the [two sets of] five [walls] [are purified] by the five spiritual faculties, faith and so on, and by the powers, faith and so on, [respectively,] in the *maṇḍalas* of mind, speech, and body”.

p. 32, line 9: “pavilions”, *vedikā*. On p. 27, *pañjara* was translated as “pavilion”, while on p. 12, *maṇḍapa* was translated as “pavilion”. But *vedikā*, *pañjara*, and *maṇḍapa* are not synonyms. These three were at these places in the *Kālacakra Tantra* and *Vimalaprabhā* translated into Tibetan respectively as *kha khyer* (Peking, sNar-thang eds.) or *stegs bu* (sDe-dge, Co-ne eds.), *gur*, and *khang bzangs* (Peking, sNar-thang eds.) or *sgo khyams* (sDe-dge, Co-ne eds.). Of these three, the *maṇḍapa* is commonly a kind of open pavilion having columns or pillars, and I did not comment on it at its occurrence on p. 12. There, however (Sanskrit (ed.), p. 149, line 21), its placement at the limit or boundary (*avasāne*) of the eastern doorway of the *Kālacakra maṇḍala* house shows that it is an attached entrance hall rather than a separate pavilion “near” the eastern gate (as *avasāne* was there translated). This is typical of many Indian temples. I have already commented on the *pañjara*.

Although the *vedikā* is reported to have once been a hall or pavilion in which the Vedas were read (P. K. Acharya, *A Dictionary of Hindu Architecture*, pp. 564, 567), it is not a pavilion in Buddhist texts. There it is generally described as a railing, such as going around a *stūpa* (Acharya, pp. 567–568; A. K. Coomaraswamy, “Indian Architectural Terms”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, XLVIII (1928), p. 273; F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*). But in Buddhist tantric texts, the *vedikā* is not a railing, either. There it is essentially a platform, a narrow platform. This brings us closer to the central meaning of *vedikā* as an altar. In the *Kālacakra maṇḍala* the *vedikā* is like a walkway or sidewalk that goes along the bottom of a wall, and that happens to provide a place for the deities to sit or stand. I do not know of an English word that means this.

The term *vedikā* has sometimes been translated as “plinth” since a projecting foundation at the base of a wall is a meaning of plinth. However, I do not see the *vedikā* as a plinth, since the foundation of a wall is not its function, and other words are used for a plinth in Indian architecture (Acharya, *op. cit.*: *janman*, *upāna*, *pāduka*; Coomaraswamy, *op. cit.*: *adhiṣṭhāna*,

ālambana). Jeffrey Hopkins has used “apron” for it in the 1985 book, *The Kālachakra Tantra: Rite of Initiation*, p. 78. This would be in the sense of “a small area adjacent to another larger area or structure” (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*, tenth edition).

So how do we know that the *vedikā* is a narrow platform rather than a pavilion? We know this because it is described in the *Vimalaprabhā* as being half the width of the door (2.156, vol. 1, p. 253, line 25), or twice the width of the walls (3.39, vol. 2, p. 47, line 6). The “measure of the door” (*dvāra-māna*) is a basic unit of measurement in the construction of the Kālacakra *maṇḍala*.

p. 32, line 11: “jewelled strips of fabric”, *ratna-paṭṭikā*. The *ratna-paṭṭikā* in *maṇḍala* architecture is not a strip of fabric. In the Kālacakra *maṇḍala* the *ratna-paṭṭikā* (Tibetan, *rin chen snam bu*) is, as stated by Edward Henning, a “jewelled frieze running around the length of the wall and overhanging it” (“Maṇḍala literalism”, www.kalacakra.org). This is not to be confused with the *devatā-paṭṭikā*. For this, see below.

p. 32, footnote 32: “The Sanskrit *Ka* manuscript and Dwivedi’s edition read, ‘*kravaśīṣaka*’ instead of ‘*kramaśīṣaka*’”. Actually, Dwivedi’s edition reads “*kavaśīṣaka*” (p. 157, line 4).

p. 35, lines 2 and 16: “sounds”, *svarāḥ*. These thirty-two and sixteen “sounds” are “vowels” as *svara* must be translated here, and as it is translated shortly hereafter on p. 36, line 17, and p. 37, line 2.

p. 35, line 4: “on the moon disc, or on the discs of the moon, sun, and Rāhu”, *candra-sūrya-rāhu-maṇḍalopari candra-maṇḍale*. There is no word for “or” in the Sanskrit or Tibetan here. I would not mention such a small thing, except that a controversy arose over whether Kālacakra stands on three or four seats here. See: *Ornament of Stainless Light: An Exposition of the Kālacakra Tantra*, by Khedrup Norsang Gyatso, translated by Gavin Kilty (Boston, 2004), pp. 326–331, where this line is quoted on p. 329.

p. 35, lines 5–10: “The thirty-two [signs] are a pentad of the first digit of the moon . . . a pentad of the second digit of the moon . . . a pentad of the third digit of the moon”. *prathamakalā-pañcakam . . . dvitīya-kalā-pañcakam . . . tṛtīya-kalā-pañcakam*. I understand these thirty-two [vowels, rather than signs] as pentads of the first five digits of the moon, the second five digits of the moon, and the third five digits of the moon.

p. 35, line 13: The *l* and *r* should be long *l̄* and *r̄*.

p. 35, line 15: “*ah̄*”; and note 53: “The Tibetan reads, ‘*āh̄*’”. As we saw with footnote 57 on p. 18, only the reading found in the blockprint of Bu-ston’s edition is being reported for the Tibetan. The collated Tengyur reports “*ah̄*” here for all four editions: sDe-dge, Pe-cin (Peking), sNar-thang, and Co-ne (vol. 6, p. 763, line 12). Similarly, for the *Vimalaprabhā* as it is found repeated in three editions of the Kangyur, the collated Kangyur reports “*ah̄*” here for all three: sDe-dge, Li-thang, and Khu-re (or Urga) (collated Kangyur, vol. 99, p. 476, line 19). Likewise, the printed Jonang edition of the *Vimalaprabhā* has “*ah̄*” here (vol. 20, p. 17, line 17). The Seventh Dalai Lama’s full-length Kālacakra *sādhana*, found in his *Collected Works*, volume VIII, as reprinted in Gangtok, 1976, also has “*ah̄*” here (folio side 329, line 3). The blockprint of Bu-ston’s edition is alone in having “*āh̄*” here (Part 2 (kha), folio side 492, line 1). That it is only a typographical error in the blockprint is proved by the reproduced manuscript of Bu-ston’s edition, where we find “*ah̄*” (vol. 3, folio side 243, line 2).

p. 35, lines 16–17: “These thirty-two signs of a great man are within a degree of the latitude of the moon”, *etāni dvātriṃśan-mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇāni candrāṃśe*; and from footnote

54: “The Tibetan reads, ‘*aṅga*’ (*yan laḡ*) instead of ‘*aṃśa*’”. That is, “limb” or “body” instead of “part” or “degree”. Here in the printed Sanskrit edition is a footnote giving the variant reading “*candrāṅge*” as occurring in “*ga. ca. bho.*” The abbreviations “*ga.*” and “*ca.*” refer to the two old palm-leaf manuscripts used in preparing this edition, and “*bho.*” refers to the Tibetan translation in the sDe-dge edition. When we see the combination of these three oldest sources agreeing in a footnote giving a variant reading, it is almost invariably the correct reading. The other readings found in the later paper manuscripts are almost always incorrect, however reasonable they may have appeared to the copyists and editors at the time. A new edition is underway by the editors at the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, and these later readings will no doubt be corrected.

So I believe that “*aṅga*” is the correct reading here instead of “*aṃśa*”. The phrase “*candrāṅgam*” occurs in verse 2 of this chapter, where it refers to “the single Kālacakra”, as translated by Dr Wallace on p. 14, line 6. In the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary thereon, this phrase is glossed as “*ekāṅgam*”, showing that *candra*, “moon”, is one of the characteristic word-numbers used in Kālacakra, standing for *eka*, “one”. This is explained a little farther on by the translator in a footnote (81) to verse 12, on p. 39. She has translated “*candrāṅgam*” in the commentary on verse 2 as “a single body” (p. 16, line 1). I think that this is the correct translation of the correct reading, “*candrāṅge*”, here as well: “These thirty-two signs of a great man are on a single body”; i.e., the body of Kālacakra. Probably a double meaning is intended here, because the corresponding thirty-two vowels sit on the *candrāṅga*, literally the “body of the moon”.

p. 35, line 25 (and footnote 58): “*ṣṣa*”. As stated in the footnote, Dwivedi’s edition omits “*ṣṣa*”. However, it has been restored in not quite the right place in the translation. The order of this class or *varga* should be: *ssa, hṣṣa, śśa, ḷḷka*.

p. 37, footnote 67: “The Tibetan translation misses the following: . . .” It is only the blockprint of Bu-ston’s edition of the Tibetan translation that misses this line. This line is found in the Tengyur editions of the Tibetan translation. It is also found in the reproduced manuscript of Bu-ston’s edition, vol. 3, folio side 244, lines 6–7.

p. 37, line 13: Between “four faces” and “twelve eyes” the words “three necks” (*tri-gṛvām*) are missing.

p. 37, verse 11: “whose legs are in the *ālīḍha* [pose] and whose very playful feet are on the hearts of Rudra and Anaṅga”, *rudrānaṅga-dvayor hṛt-sulalita-caraṇālīḍha-pādam*. I do not think that feet or legs are spoken of twice here, with the synonymous words *caraṇa* and *pāda*. The word *pāda* is here a metrically required substitute for *pada*, the normal word for “pose” or “posture” in these texts. Like for many such words used in Kālacakra, this meaning is not found in our dictionaries. As the translator pointed out in footnote 70 on this page, “The Tibetan translation reads, ‘whose very playful feet are in the *ālīḍha* pose’”. The Tibetan word for “pose” here is *stabs*, coming immediately after *g.yas brkyang*, or *ālīḍha*, where it clearly translates *pāda*. We see this same metrical lengthening in this phrase elsewhere in the verses of the *Kālacakra Tantra* (3.35b, 3.88b, 4.66c, 4.135b). But in the prose commentary, unless quoting the verse, it is always *pada*; and even twice in the verses, where the placement allowed, it is *pada* (4.68b, 4.109b). For *pada*, and for *pāda* as metrically lengthened, we find the same Tibetan translation, *stabs*, in this context of describing poses or postures.

The oldest extant source describing these postures is Bharata's *Nāṭya-śāstra*, which is referred to by name in verse 69 of this chapter of the *Kālacakra Tantra*. In the *Nāṭya-śāstra* they are called *sthāna* rather than *pada* (chapter 11, verses 50 ff.). The term *sthāna* was retained for them in the later *Samgīta-ratnākara* as well (chapter 7, verses 1017 ff.). But like Buddhist tantric texts, some other Hindu texts use *pada* for them (e.g., *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, *Citrasūtra*, 3.39). The *Nāṭya-śāstra* describes six of these: *vaiṣṇava*, *samapāda*, *vaiśākha*, *maṇḍala*, *ālīḍha*, and *pratyālīḍha*. Five of these are used in *Kālacakra* (4.66–68, 109), omitting *vaiṣṇava*, while a different sixth one is added, called *lalita* (4.69).

The term *sulalita* found here in verse 11, however, is likely to be largely a metrical filler in the difficult middle segment of the verse line, where six short syllables in a row are needed. In describing feet in the *ālīḍha* posture, as it does here, I would take *sulalita* in its meaning of “very graceful” rather than “very playful”. Besides the fact that *Kālacakra* is here trampling on the hearts of Rudra and Anāṅga, which does not seem very playful to me, the *rasa* or sentiments that are associated with this posture are the *vīra* or heroic and the *raudra* or fierce (*Nāṭya-śāstra*, 11.68). The *ālīḍha* posture is to be used to portray aggressiveness, shooting arrows at enemies, etc. (11.69).

p. 40, footnote 90, on the word “hatchet”, saying: “Sanskrit texts read here ‘*paśu*’, literally meaning ‘cattle’, ‘an animal’. This use of the word *paśu* for a hatchet indicates that this type of weapon was used mostly for butchering animals”. Actually, they read *paraśu* (or the variant spelling *paraśū*), meaning an “axe” or “hatchet”.

p. 40, verse 14: “*khaṭvāṅga* with smiling faces”, *khaṭvāṅga-vikasita-mukham*. The *khaṭvāṅga* is an implement that is supposed to have originated as the leg (*aṅga*) of a bed (*khaṭvā*), on which three severed heads are usually mounted. It would seem incongruous for these heads to be smiling. The word *vikasita* normally means “opened”, like when a flower blooms. It is used in this text in the phrase *vikasita-vadana* (verses 10, 176, and 193 of the present chapter, and verse 117 of the second chapter), which has duly been translated as “opened mouth”. Here, however, it would seem similarly incongruous for these heads to have opened mouths. For a question like this we would turn to the annotations of Bu-ston.

The translator gives Bu-ston’s annotation to this phrase from the verse as it is repeated in the *Vimalaprabhā*, in footnote 92 on p. 41, as: “Bu ston [22]: ‘Three smiling vajra faces’”. The Tibetan text of the *Vimalaprabhā* here is “*khaṭvāṅga rnam par rgyas pa’i kha*”, on which Bu-ston’s note is: “*ni rtse mo’i rdo rje kha gyes pa*”. Something seems amiss. We do not see “three” here, nor do we see “smiling”. Bu-ston appears to be saying that the *vajra* at the top has an opened mouth. We know that *khaṭvāṅgas* usually have either a *vajra* or a trident at the top, above the three heads. So Bu-ston’s note would assume that this *khaṭvāṅga* has a *vajra* at the top, and be saying that the prongs of this *vajra* are opened or separated at the end. This is what a wrathful *vajra* has as opposed to a peaceful *vajra*, whose prongs join at the end. I was quite unsure of this interpretation, because I have not yet come across a description of a wrathful *vajra* in Sanskrit texts to see if *vikasita* is used to describe it, and I have no familiarity with how the Tibetan gloss, *gyes pa*, is used in native Tibetan. This same gloss for *rnam par rgyas pa* (*vikasita*) is also given in the annotated Jonang edition by Phyogs-las rnam-rgyal (vol. 20, p. 21, line 12). So I asked Tibetan translator Gavin Kilty about the meaning of this.

Gavin Kilty replied that *gyes pa* does mean separated here, and is used, for example, to describe how the channels separate out again and again to make 72,000. So, he explained,

this gloss is saying that the root meaning of *rgyas pa*, “expand”, here has the sense of “separate out”, *gyes pa*. Therefore, it does refer to the prongs of the *vajra* separating out at the top. He added that Dr Wallace was probably thinking of *dgyes pa*, “delighted, pleased” for her “smiling”.

p. 41, line 16: “origination” *praveśa*. To this, footnote 94 is added: “Bu ston [22] ‘origination’”. The word *praveśa* was translated into Tibetan here as *rab tu zhugs*, which Bu-ston glosses by adding: *pa ste rdzogs par bskyed*. This gloss was translated into English as “origination”. The glosses of Bu-ston are extremely helpful, if not indispensable. The same thing is true of Sāyaṇa’s commentaries on the Vedas. But the gloss is not the text. When Horace Hayman Wilson produced the first English translation of the *Rgveda*, he necessarily drew heavily upon Sāyaṇa’s commentary. He was later criticised for giving in it translations of Sāyaṇa’s glosses of Vedic words rather than translations of the Vedic words themselves. I do not think that *praveśa* “entry”, can per se be translated as “origination”, but only glossed as referring to that.

p. 44, verse 18: “ambrosia” *amṛta*. In the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary here, *amṛta* is translated as both “nectar” and “ambrosia” (p. 45, lines 1–2). As we know, in Greek and Roman mythology ambrosia is the food of the gods, while nectar is the drink of the gods. So the question is whether *amṛta* is a solid or a liquid. In one meaning of *amṛta*, there are two solids and three liquids among the five *amṛtas* spoken of in *Kālachakra Tantra* 2.125: feces, urine, semen, blood, and human flesh. Pills can be made with these (4.169). The five *amṛtas* are explained differently in two commentaries on the *Hevajra Tantra* (1.2.20), as curds, milk, ghee, cow urine, and cow dung (Kāṇha’s *Yogaratanmālā*, Snellgrove (ed.), p. 111, line 19), or as milk, curds, ghee, honey, and sugar (Vajragarbhā’s *Hevajra-piṇḍārtha-ṭīkā*, or *Ṣaṣṭhasrikā-hevajra-ṭīkā*, Malati J. Shendge (ed.), 2004, p. 54, line 9). Perhaps this led David Snellgrove to translate *amṛta* as “ambrosia” in his 1959 translation of this text. But there and here, these substances are largely symbolic (see *Vimalaprabhā* on 4.113, and on 5.127, vol. 3, pp. 69, 72). The more central meaning in Kālacakra hardly differs from the standard meaning in Hindu mythology, where *amṛta* is the nectar of immortality, a liquid. In the latter two of the four parts of the Kālacakra *sādhana*, *amṛta* is a liquid that flows (*sravate*) in the form of drops (e.g., *Vimalaprabhā* on 4.110, quoting the *mūla-tantra*, p. 205, line 9: *sravate bindu-rūpeṇa amṛtam*). Therefore, I think “nectar” is more appropriate than “ambrosia” as the translation of *amṛta*.

p. 44, verse 18: “In Pītā’s right hands there are, in sequence, a conch, a flute, a *damaru* [*sic*], and a jewel”. The order of the last two should be reversed: “a jewel and a *damaru*” *sa-maṇi-ḍamarukaḥ*. This is confirmed in the commentary. On a typographical note, *damaru* is given throughout the book without the diacritic, *damaru*.

p. 45, verse 19: “The black and white [deities] on the moon and the red and yellow [deities] on the sun are present in the intermediate directions”. *kr̥ṣṇā śvetendu-mūrdhni tv atha vidīśi gate rakta-pīte ṛka-mūrdhni*. The meaning of Sanskrit sentences such as this depends on where one places the implied “is/are”. To get the required meaning, explained in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary on this and the following verse, we must place these as follows: “The black and white [deities] are on moon [discs], but also [the goddesses] present in the intermediate directions; the red and yellow [deities] are on sun [discs].” Besides the exception made for the goddesses in the intermediate directions, who are to be placed on moon discs,

an exception is also made for the gods in the cardinal directions. These are to be placed on sun discs, says the *Vimalaprabhā* on verses 19 and 20.

p. 46, footnote 110: “Bu ston [26]: ‘The palace of gnosis’”. In this review, I am comparing the Sanskrit text, and only occasionally looking at Bu-ston’s Tibetan annotations. I happened to check this one (26 should be 25, corresponding to folio side 499 in the 1965 reproduction). It reads: *shes pas gzhal yas khang yang*. This refers to a palace, but does not mention gnosis.

p. 47, line 10: “Above is Uṣṇīṣa [sic], who is dark in color . . .”; and p. 48, line 23: “who is dark like Akṣobhya” *śyāma*. While *śyāma* does often mean “dark” my impression is that it is normally used in Kālacakra in its meaning of “green”. The Tibetan translation here, *ljang khu*, “green”, supports this. On another typographical note, it so happens that the diacritic is missing on the “i” in Uṣṇīṣa here. But missing diacritics on the countless Sanskrit words in this book are remarkably rare.

p. 48, bottom paragraph: “Here, the black and white, or the eastern and northern, male and female deities who stand above in the east and north, must be placed on the disc of the moon”, *ūrdhvasthās candra* . . .; and p. 49, top: “Likewise, the red and yellow, or the southern and western, male and female deities who stand below, are on the discs of the sun”, *adhastāc ca*. This leaves out a lot of deities. For the proper meaning, we need a *ca*, “and”, in the Sanskrit text after *ūrdhvasthās*, thus saying: “and those who stand above”. We have a *ca* after *adhastāc*, and this must be included in the translation: “and those who stand below”. That is, those deities in the east, in the north, and above the *maṇḍala* should be placed on moon discs, while those deities in the south, in the west, and below the *maṇḍala* should be placed on sun discs.

In 2010, an excellent old palm-leaf manuscript of the *Vimalaprabhā* was reproduced by Lokesh Chandra in the book, *Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet* (Śata-pitaka Series, vol. 629, New Delhi). This is as good as the old palm-leaf manuscript, preserved at the Asiatic Society Calcutta, which was also once used in Tibet, and is designated as *ca* in the printed Sanskrit edition. Although I have long had a microfilm of the Calcutta manuscript, I will refer to this book since it is available for anyone to check. In using this book, one must note that the folio sides without numbers are placed out of order. Five folio sides are reproduced on each page. So I will cite this book by page number and first through fifth folio side on that page.

Sure enough, on p. 79, second folio side, line 3, we find our needed *ca*: *ūrdhvasthās ca candra* . . . So the Sanskrit edition must be corrected, p. 164, line 8, and the English translation emended accordingly. While doing so, there is an extra “east” and “north” that should be deleted, p. 48, bottom paragraph. Also, footnote 122 on p. 48, saying that the Tibetan translation reads “below” instead of “above” should be cancelled. I only checked this after finding the Sanskrit *ca*, but the Tibetan translation in Bu-ston’s edition reads: *‘dir shar dang byang dang steng na gnas pa*. I understand this as: “Here, located in the east, the north, and above, . . .”

p. 49, verse 21: “[A male deity], who has an emblem in the palm of his first right hand, has a *mudrā* without a lotus”. *yaḥ cihnaṃ yasya savye prathama-kara-tale sāsya mudrābja-hīnā*. Besides the fact that all the deities hold an emblem (*cihna*) or implement (*āyudha*) in their first right hand, I do not think the word *mudrā* is here referring to a female partner. So there would also be no need to assume only a male deity as the subject. I think that *mudrā*, “seal” or “stamp”, is here being used to mean the primary *cihna*, “emblem” or “sign” of a deity. When

the deities are generated in the *sādhana*, from a seed-syllable and then an emblem, we find that the emblem they are generated from is usually the implement that is held in their first right hand. So I understand this as: “The emblem that is in the palm of the first right hand of a particular [deity] is the seal (*mudrā*) of that [deity], except for a lotus”. The lotus is excluded.

p. 52, verse 25: “With the exception of eight goddesses, Dhūmā and the others, sometimes in the lotus of the Lord of Jinas there is a splendid wheel in the centre, which consists of twenty-five [deities], O king”. *aṣṭau dhūmādi-devīr jinapati-kamale varjayitvā kadācit | śrī-cakraṃ garbha-madhye bhavati narapate pañcaviṃśātmakam ca*. The *śrī-cakra*, “splendid wheel” or “glorious circle”, is glossed here in the *Vimalaprabhā* as the *citta-maṇḍala* or “mind *maṇḍala*”, the centremost of the three individual *maṇḍalas* that together comprise the Kālacakra *maṇḍala*. It is always there. I understand this sentence as: “And when leaving aside the eight goddesses, Dhūmā and the others on the lotus of the Lord of Jinas, the glorious circle inside the inner chamber comes to consist of twenty-five [deities], O king”.

The *Vimalaprabhā* commentary adds, as translated on p. 52, bottom lines: “Thereafter, although the Divine Lord has joined in, it becomes like in the glorious [*Guhya*]samāja”. *upaviṣṭo 'pi tadā bhagavān bhavati śrī-samājavat*. I think we must take the *api* here in its meaning of “also” rather than “although”. I understand this as: “Then, the Bhagavān also being settled in [or included], it becomes like in the glorious [*Guhya*]samāja.” This apparently has reference to what must have then been a standard Guhyasamāja *maṇḍala* consisting of twenty-five deities, although the thirty-two deity Guhyasamāja *maṇḍala* became standard later in Tibet.

We may deduce from the annotations of Phyogs-las rnam-rgyal (vol. 20, p. 29) that the Kālacakra mind *maṇḍala* is here being said to consist of twenty-five lotuses. On each of these is a pair of deities, male and female. We know that there are eight pairs of *tathāgatas*, twelve pairs of *bodhisattvas*, and four pairs of *krodha-rājas*, or wrathful protectors. Then, making twenty-five, is the central eight-petalled lotus on which stand Bhagavān Kālacakra and his consort, surrounded by the eight goddesses, Dhūmā and the others. These are each on a petal of the central lotus, and thus are left out of the count.

Regarding this, the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary explains, as translated on p. 53, top two lines: “There is no mistake here because of its being without a lineage”. *atra doṣo nāsti niranvayatvāt*. It is not that there is no “mistake” here, but rather that there is no “fault” (*doṣa*) here in teaching this. The reason given for this brings in an important term in Kālacakra, *niranvaya*, a term that was subject to various interpretations. This is however too large a topic to introduce here; suffice to say that Bu-ston’s edition and the Peking and sNar-thang editions of the Tengyur translate *niranvaya* as *rigs med pa*, “without lineage” here, or following Ronald M. Davidson’s *Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṃgīti* translation, “without causal connection”, while Phyogs-las rnam-rgyal’s Jonang edition and the sDe-dge and Co-ne editions of the Tengyur here translate *niranvaya* as *ris med pa*, “without partiality” or “without following one line”.

The verse concludes, as translated on p. 52: “For the sake of initiation, the *maṇḍala* lacks the outer circle due to the power of the families”. *sekārthaṃ maṇḍalaṃ vai bhavati kula-vaśād bāhya-cakra-prahīṇam*. It may be clearer to directly account for the *bhavati* by translating *bhavati prahīṇam* as something like “becomes devoid of” rather than just “lacks”. Only the deities of the mind *maṇḍala* are needed for granting initiation, not the deities of the speech and body *maṇḍalas*. It is not that the latter are not there, only that they are not needed. So I understand

this sentence, still awkward in expression because of the original being metrical, as: “For the sake of initiation, the *maṇḍala* becomes devoid of the outer [two] circles [i.e., *maṇḍalas*] due to the power of the families”.

p. 53, lines 21–22: “in accordance with the natures of the body, speech, and mind” *citta-vāk-kāya-svabhāvena*. As we often see in the prose *Vimalaprabhā*, the word order given is intentional. Here it is intended to correspond to that of the three circles in the first part of the sentence. So the translation should follow the literal order: “in accordance with the natures of the mind, speech, and body”.

p. 54, verse 26: “On the eight petals of the lotuses outside [the mind *maṇḍala*] there are *yoginīs*, *Carcikā* and the others, . . . and are accompanied by their eight respective goddesses of the eight directions”. *bāhye cāṣṭāṣṭakenāṣṭasu kamala-daleṣv aṣṭa-dig-devatībhīr | yoginyāś carcikādyāḥ*. The first clause must be moved to the end of the sentence in order to get the required meaning. It is not *Carcikā* and the other seven who are on the eight petals of the lotuses. Rather, they are each at the centre of a lotus and are each surrounded by a group of eight goddesses on the eight petals of each of the eight lotuses. So this sentence should be rearranged and modified to read: “Outside [the mind *maṇḍala*] there are *yoginīs*, *Carcikā* and the others, . . . and are accompanied by the eight groups of eight goddesses in the eight directions on the eight petals of the lotuses”.

As always, the translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary will have to be adapted accordingly. Additionally, line 20 on this page includes an emendation by the translator: “*Carcikā* . . . is on the eastern petal”. As stated in footnote 146 thereon, “Dwivedi’s edition and the Tibetan translation read, ‘lotus’ instead of ‘petal’”. In fact, “lotus” is quoted directly from the verse itself, and is correct. So “lotus” must be restored in place of “petal” following the Sanskrit text and Tibetan translation.

p. 56, lines 4–5: “*Kaumārī* has a jewel and a goad” *kaumāryā ratnaṃ pāśaḥ*. This is a mere slip, and should be: “*Kaumārī* has a jewel and a noose”.

p. 56, fourth paragraph: “In the petals of the lotuses of *Carcikā* and the others – where the goddesses of the petals of *Carcikā* and the others are to be known as turning toward the right, or toward the east and so forth – *Bhīmā* is on the first petal, . . .” *carcikādi-kamala-daleṣu pūrvādi-dakṣiṇāvartena carcikādināṃ patra-devyo veditavyāḥ, tatra prathama-patre bhīmā*. The phrase, “or toward the east and so forth” is not glossing “turning toward the right” but is giving necessary additional information. As such, it will need to be translated differently. I take *pūrvādi* here in its basic meaning as “beginning in the east” rather than its usual paraphrase as “the east and so forth”. Also, in agreement with the translator’s footnote 151 on this page, we must correct *yatra* “where”, in the Sanskrit edition (p. 168, line 2) to *patra*, “petal”. But the “where” is still in her translation, making a subordinate clause for what should be the main verb of the sentence, *veditavya* “are to be known”. So I understand this sentence as: “On the petals of the lotuses of *Carcikā* and the others, the goddesses of the petals of *Carcikā* and the others are to be known, turning toward the right beginning in the east. Of these, on the first petal is *Bhīmā*”. Then follow seven more names, going clockwise around the lotus in sequential order.

p. 57, line 4: *Suparamavijayā* is just *Vijayā* here in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary. The *suparama* is probably just an addition in the *Kālacakra Tantra* verse to fit the metre, as it is in the middle segment of the line that requires a string of short syllables.

p. 58, line 8: Suparamaturitā is just Turitā here in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary.

p. 58, line 11: Śāśadharadhavanā should be Śāśadharavadanā.

p. 58, bottom two lines: “in the right and other sections of the eastern gate”, *pūrvadvārasya savya-bhāgāḍau*. The text is not speaking of sections of a gate as the locations for the twelve lotuses of the body *maṇḍala*, but rather the sections of the *maṇḍala* going all the way around. Like before, as noted regarding a similar phrase on p. 56, we must here take *ādi* as “beginning with” rather than “and other”. I understand *savya-bhāgāḍau* as “in the sections beginning on the right (of the eastern gate)” rather than “in the right and other sections (of the eastern gate)”. Again, this has much relevance when enumerating deities in sequential order (*yathā-saṃkhyam*) going around the *maṇḍala*, as follows here in the text.

p. 60, verse 36 (and *Vimalaprabhā*, p. 62, line 2): “The ten lunar days of *caitra* . . .” *vasu-kara-tithayaḥ*. When word numbers are used together, like here, they are to be read backwards, not added together. Thus, *vasu*, the (eight) Vasus, or eight, and *kara*, “hand”, or two, are to be read as twenty-eight, not as ten. So “the twenty-eight lunar days of *caitra*” are spoken of here. Then in this verse, “the two *pūrṇās*” are added to the twenty-eight lunar days, making the thirty days of the month. Although “*Pūrṇā* is a name of the fifth, tenth, and fifteenth lunar days”, as stated in footnote 158, it is here the latter; i.e., the new moon and full moon days.

p. 61, footnote 162: “the day of the new moon . . . It is the twenty-fifth day of the dark half of every lunar month”. Correct “twenty-fifth” to “fifteenth”.

p. 62, lines 5–6: “Their names . . . end with *vajras*”, *vajrāntaṃ nāma*. This should say, “Their names . . . end with *vajrā*”; that is, their names are *ñā-vajrā*, *ñī-vajrā*, *ñṛ-vajrā*, etc.

p. 62, lines 10–11: “They are the secondary female deities because they move to the locations of the others”. *āsāṃ para-sthāna-gamanād anunāyikātvam*. The deities in the *maṇḍala* are stationary. The Sanskrit word here is not a verb, but rather is a noun, *gamana*, “the moving” or “the going”. More literally, the second clause says “because of their moving or going to the location or place of another” something they have already done. This is saying that, in the case of Mārīcī for example, although she is yellow and belongs to the Vairocana family in the west, she has taken her place in the east as the consort of black Nīladaṇḍa, of the Amoghasiddhi family.

p. 62, lines 12–13: “Therefore, the families of the east and other directions move toward the location of Vajraśṛṅkhalā and the others”. *ata āsāṃ pūrvādi-kulaṃ vajraśṛṅkhalādīnāṃ gamanam abhimukha-sthāne*. The families do not move. This obscure sentence pertains to what implements or weapons are held in the hands of the secondary female deities. Literally, it says: “Therefore, the family of these [goddesses] beginning in the east is the going of Vajraśṛṅkhalā and the others to a facing place”. That is, although Vajraśṛṅkhalā is located in the west, she holds the implements characteristic of her own family, that of Amoghasiddhi in the east. Specifically, she holds the same ones held by the corresponding male deity in the east, Nīladaṇḍa. Similarly, although Bhṛkuṭī is located in the north, she holds the same implements held by the corresponding male deity of her own jewel family in the south, Ṭakkirāja. Thus it goes, beginning in the east and proceeding clockwise, with the other goddesses as well.

p. 63, lines 15 and 31: “Karkoṭa”. This name is “Karkoṭaka” in both the *Kālacakra Tantra* verse and the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary.

p. 63, lines 17–19: “Atinīlā has a skull and a bell. Raudrākṣī has a *nāga*’s noose and a *khaṭvāṅga*. It is likewise in the case of Nīladaṇḍa, Ṭakkirāja, Mahābala, and Acala, . . .” It would be helpful to add a note here explaining that Nīladaṇḍa holds the same implements in the same hands as does Vajraśṅkhalā, Ṭakkirāja holds the same ones as Bhṛkuṭī, Mahābala holds the same ones as Mārīcī, and Acala holds the same ones as Cundā.

p. 64, line 1, etc.: “Vāsuki and Śaṅkhapāla are in the southern fire *maṇḍalas*”, etc., *dakṣiṇe vahni-maṇḍale*, etc. The *nāgas* Vāsuki, etc., are here described as sitting in the various directions on lotus seats on pairs of individual *maṇḍalas* of the elements. The translation would be clearer if given more literally as “in the south, on fire *maṇḍalas*”, etc.

p. 64, line 25: “forty-five million *bhūtas*”, *sārdha-tri-koṭi-bhūta-*. This should be “thirty-five million *bhūtas*”.

pp. 64–65, verse 40: “A red *preta*, [and seven more creatures] are the seats of Cāmuṇḍā and the others, respectively, in the cardinal and intermediate directions of the lotus” *rakta-pretaṃ . . . cāmuṇḍādeḥ krameṇa prabhavati kamalāny āsanaṃ dig-vidikṣu*. As noted regarding verse 26 on p. 54, the eight main goddesses of the speech *maṇḍala* are each on their own lotus; they are not on petals of a central lotus. This latter idea seems to have influenced the translation here. What is being said may be seen from the *Vimalaprabhā*’s statement introducing this verse: *idānīm cāmuṇḍādīnāṃ kamalāsānāny ucyante*, “Now, the lotus seats of Cāmuṇḍā and the others are stated” (rather than “the seats of Cāmuṇḍā and the others in the lotus”). These are the eight individual lotus seats (*kamala-āsana*, Tibetan, *padma’i gdan*) of Cāmuṇḍā (another name of Carcikā) and the other seven main goddesses of the speech *maṇḍala*, namely, the eight creatures listed here, a red *preta*, etc.

This fact makes it necessary to modify the translation of the sentence in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary given in lines 8–9 of p. 65 as: “The goddesses, Cāmuṇḍā and the others, are on the eight petals” *aṣṭa-daleṣu cāmuṇḍādi-devyah*. As the Tibetan translation shows, *‘dab ma brgyad la tsa muṇḍi la sogs pa’i lha mo rnams so* (Bu-ston (ed.), folio side 513, line 5), this should be understood as: “The goddesses of Cāmuṇḍā and the others are on the eight petals”. The eight goddesses of Cāmuṇḍā that are on the eight petals of her lotus have been named in verse 29 of this chapter of the *Kālacakra Tantra*, and earlier in the *Vimalaprabhā* on verse 63 of chapter 3: Bhīmā, Ugrā, etc. Likewise, the eight goddesses on the eight petals of each of the lotuses of the other seven main goddesses of the speech *maṇḍala* have been named here in verses 30–33, and earlier in the *Vimalaprabhā* on 3.63–64.

Similarly, the translation of another sentence here on p. 65 should be modified, the sentence in lines 12–13: “These are, in sequence, the seats within the cardinal and intermediate directions of the lotus” *iti krameṇāsanaṃ kamalasya dig-vidikṣu*. The phrase “of the lotus” should go with “the seats”. Thus: “These are, in sequence, the lotus seats in the cardinal and intermediate directions”.

Then, the phrase in line 15 bringing in the deities of the body *maṇḍala*, “a red *preta* is a seat in the lotus of Nairṛtya” would be clearer as, “a red *preta* is the lotus seat of Nairṛtya” (*nairṛtya-kamalāsanaṃ rakta-pretaṃ*). We cannot here go into the question of whether such a deity is located directly on a lotus, which is mounted on one of these creatures, or whether such a deity is mounted directly on one of these creatures, which stands on a lotus. Suffice to say that the Gelugpa tradition accepts the former, and depicts them this way in their sand *maṇḍalas* and paintings, while the Jonangpa writer Phyogs-las rnam-gyal

accepts the latter, and the revised Jonang translations of the Kālacakra texts reflect this understanding.

p. 65, footnote 178: “Daitya is another name for Viṣṇu”. Actually, Daitya is another name for Nairṛtya, also called Rākṣasa. Viṣṇu is a different deity in Kālacakra.

p. 65, verse 41: “a heron”, *kruñca*; with footnote 180 saying that the Tibetan and Mongolian translations read, “a crane”. The existing Sanskrit-English dictionaries are notoriously unreliable for specialised words such as this. Monier-Williams gives “a kind of snipe, curlew”. V. S. Apte repeats Monier-Williams’ curlew, and adds to it the much larger heron (“a curlew, heron”). The *kruñca* or *krauñca*, made famous by the story from the beginning of Vālmīki’s *Rāmāyaṇa*, has at long last been accurately identified thanks to the work of K. N. Dave and Julia Leslie. Julia Leslie showed that the one described in the *Rāmāyaṇa* story is the Indian Sarus Crane, in her article, “A Bird Bereaved: The Identity and Significance of Vālmīki’s *Krauñca*” (*Journal of Indian Philosophy*, XXVI (1998), pp. 455–487). She also drew on K. N. Dave’s *Birds in Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi, 1985), which shows that while it can denote other large water-birds such as flamingoes, storks, and herons, “in later literature, *krauñca* tends to denote specifically the Common Crane” (Leslie, p. 458). It would seem that the Tibetan translation, and the Mongolian translation made from the Tibetan translation, got it right.

p. 67, verse 43, first sentence: “The eight [goddesses] in the interior, who are in the sky and at the base of the verandah, are to be placed beneath the portals” *garbhe ṣṭau vedikāyāṃ gaḡana-tala-gate toraṇādho niyojyo*. This line of the verse is referring to the twelve goddesses of worship or offering goddesses (*pūjā-devī*) spoken of in the previous verse. These are located in the *garbha*, the “inner chamber” which in relation to the Kālacakra *maṇḍala* is a specific term for the mind *maṇḍala*, rather than a general term for the “interior” (see *Vimalaprabhā* on verse 36 of chapter 3). Eight of these are “on the *vedikā*” (locative, *vedikāyāṃ*), a narrow platform running along the bottom of the walls. This term was discussed above, at its occurrence on p. 32, line 9. There in the book it was translated as “pavilion” as it is again in the commentary just preceding the present verse (p. 66, bottom line), and in the second line of the present verse. But here in the first line of this verse, and in the commentary on the second line of this verse, it is translated as “verandah”. Two more of these goddesses are located “in the sky” (*gaḡana*), that is, above the *maṇḍala*, and two more are located “at the base” or “bottom” (*tala*), that is, below the *maṇḍala* (not the base “of the verandah”). However, the goddesses above and below the *maṇḍala* cannot be shown above and below in a two-dimensional representation such as a particle *maṇḍala*, commonly a sand *maṇḍala*. Therefore these four are to be represented there as “beneath” (*adhaḥ*) the “portals” (*toraṇa*), or “arches” as *toraṇa* was translated on pp. 29–31. So I understand this line as: “In the inner chamber [the mind *maṇḍala*], eight [goddesses] are on the *vedikā*, and those who are located in the sky and at the bottom [of the *maṇḍala*] should be placed beneath the *torāṇas*”.

The *Vimalaprabhā* commentary hereon explains this using contrast, although this is not reflected in the translation on p. 67, lines 16–19: “Certain goddesses who are in the sky and at the base within the sand *maṇḍala* should be displayed beneath the eastern and western portals. During meditation, the guardians of the directions and the others are in the previously mentioned locations” *rajo-maṇḍale gaḡana-tala-gatā devyo yāḥ kāścit tāḥ pūrvāpara-toraṇādho darśanīyāḥ | bhāvanāyāṃ punar dikpālādayo yathokta-sthāna eva*. I understand this as: “In a

particle *maṇḍala*, whichever goddesses are located in the sky and at the bottom [of the *maṇḍala*] should be displayed beneath the eastern and western *torāṇas*. But (*punar*) in meditation, the guardians of the directions and the others are [to be visualised] just in their places as stated”. The contrast between where these deities should be placed in a particle or sand *maṇḍala* and where they should be placed in a visualised *maṇḍala* makes clear what is meant in the first line of the verse. The reference to the guardians of the directions additionally provides a clear example. The guardians of the “above” direction, Uṣṇīṣa and consort Atinīlā, are visualised in the *sādhana* above the mind *maṇḍala*, while in a sand *maṇḍala* they are represented by an additional lotus at the eastern door of the mind *maṇḍala*.

A correction is required in the next sentence of the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary as translated in lines 19–20: “The four, Samantabhadra and the others, are on the right of the gates”. This must say, “on the left of the gates”, *dvārasyāvasavye*. The reason for this statement here in the *Vimalaprabhā* is that the blue and green colours of the four *bodhisattvas*, Samantabhadra, Vajrapāṇi, Śabdavajrā, and Dharmadhātuvajrā, might place them below and above the *maṇḍala*. But instead, they are to be placed to the left of the four doors of the mind *maṇḍala*, respectively. It may not be superfluous to note that in the Kālacakra *maṇḍala* left and right are always from the standpoint of the central deity, whose four faces face the four doors: *sarvatra vāme bhagavataś catur-mukha-bhedataḥ* (*Vimalaprabhā* on 3.59, p. 61, lines 9–10).

p. 67, verse 43, second sentence: “*Dhāraṇīs* are on the porch”, *dhāriṇyaḥ paṭṭikāyām*. This line of the verse is not talking about the *dhāraṇīs*, if by this is meant mantric formulas as we must assume in the absence of a glossary. The word here is *dhāriṇī*, Tibetan *gzungs ma* rather than just *gzungs*, which latter is the normal translation of *dhāraṇī*. We do not find *dhāriṇī* in our dictionaries in the sense used in Kālacakra, so we must find its meaning in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary. There on verse 62 of chapter 3 we read (Sanskrit (ed.), p. 63, line 16): *garbha-vedikāyām anekāḥ pūjā-devatyo dhāriṇyaḥ samastā lekhyāḥ*, “On the *vedikā* of the inner chamber [the mind *maṇḍala*], the many offering goddesses, the *dhāriṇīs*, are all to be drawn”. So *dhāriṇī* is an offering goddess, *pūjā-devatī*. This seems to be a more general term than *pūjā-devī*, which is used specifically for the twelve offering goddesses of the mind *maṇḍala*. We may assume that the *dhāriṇīs*, meaning “bearing” or “holding”, get their name from bearing or holding offerings.

These goddesses are on the *paṭṭikā*, which was translated here as “porch”. This is another word that is not found in our dictionaries in the sense used in Kālacakra. It is glossed as *vedikā* here in the *Vimalaprabhā*: *paṭṭikāyām vedikāyām iti*. The word *vedikā* is yet another that is not found in our dictionaries in the sense used in Kālacakra. But as discussed above, the *vedikā*, and therefore also the *paṭṭikā*, is a narrow platform that runs along the bottom of a wall. This sense of *paṭṭikā* apparently derives from its meaning of a “strip”. As derived from the idea of a “strip” or “band” we also have in the Kālacakra *maṇḍala* the decorative *ratna-paṭṭikā*, or “jewelled frieze”, at the top of a wall, discussed above at its occurrence on p. 32, line 11. This is to be distinguished from the kind of *paṭṭikā* spoken of here, called the *devatā-paṭṭikā* in the *Vimalaprabhā* introducing verse 3.46, on which deities stand or sit. The *Vimalaprabhā* on verse 3.43 specifically speaks of the *dhāriṇī-paṭṭikā*, as we have here, saying: *vedikā śvetā sā ca dhāriṇī-paṭṭikā | raktā tad-upari ratna-paṭṭikā*, “The *vedikā* is white, and that is the *dhāriṇī-paṭṭikā*. Above that is the red *ratna-paṭṭikā*.” So the *dhāriṇī-paṭṭikā* is the *paṭṭikā* specifically for the offering goddess deities, and this is the *vedikā*. We may deduce from other

references that the *vedikā* goes along the outside of the walls (3.39–41), while the *paṭṭikā* for the main deities goes along the inside of the walls (later note: Edward Henning informs me that the *paṭṭikā* is separated from the walls by a small space).

The second part of the second sentence of this verse was translated as: “*pratīchās*, who are associated with the family of snakes (*phaṇi*), are in the pavilion”. I have already mentioned that “pavilion” here translates *vedikā*, which will need to be modified. So will the phrase, “who are associated with the family of snakes”, *phaṇi-kula-sahitāḥ*. This is saying “along with”, rather than “who are associated with”. The family of snakes is the group of ten *nāgas* who are on the *vedikā* of the body *maṇḍala* along with the *pratīchās*.

In the third sentence of this verse, to be consistent with the other names here, the name “Pauṣṭikā” should be “Pauṣṭike[cchā]”.

p. 68, verse 44: A few words in this verse that are relevant to the meaning of the names of the goddesses have been omitted in the translation. One of these, *kāye*, “on the body”, has been accounted for in footnote 189, giving the meanings of the names: “Desire for Scratching the Body”. This is scratching in the sense of scratching an itch. Another, *payasi*, “in water”, would go with “Desire for Swimming”. A third, *śayane*, “on a bed”, becomes quite relevant in reference to “Desire for Lying”. This is not desire for telling lies, but rather is desire for lying down on a bed.

p. 68, line 15: “Likewise Vādyecchā” etc., “are on the eastern and other verandahs”, *pūrvādi-vedikāyām*. Like similar phrases with *ādi* discussed above, this should be “are on the *vedikā* beginning in the east”.

p. 68, line 17: Between “Vaiṣṇavī” and “Plāvanecchā” a line is missing: *aṅge malecchā vārāhī-janyā | nṛtyecchā kaumārī-janyā | āsanecchā raudrī-janyā*. “Malecchā, on (or in regard to) the body, is born from Vārāhī. Nṛtyecchā is born from Kaumārī. Āsanecchā is born from Raudrī”. The descriptive word, *aṅge*, “on (or in regard to) the body”, is not part of the name, Malecchā (desire for dirt, or impurities, or impure bodily secretions). So this name need not be written “[Aṅga]malecchā” as it is in verse 44 here. Similarly, like these descriptive words in the verse that are declined (*kāye*, *aṅge*, *payasi*, *śayane*), so the descriptive *vadana-gata*, “found in the mouth”, that is given undeclined in a compound, is not actually part of the name, Kaphotsarjanecchā. It is found in the middle segment of the verse line, where a string of short syllables is required. So again, this name need not be written “Vadanagatakaphotsarjane[cchā]” as it is in verse 44 here.

p. 68, verse 45: “The activities of the eight, Cāmuṇḍā and the others, are *icchās* of those born from *krodhas* on the earth. They are Saṃtāpe[cchā]”, etc. *cāmuṇḍādy-aṣṭa-kṛtyāny api ca bhūvi-tale krodhajānām tathēcchā, santāpe*, etc. The first part of this line is referring to the last seven *icchās* or desire goddesses listed in the previous verse and the eighth given in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary thereon. These must be carried down to form the first part of this sentence, which then goes on to bring in the next group of *icchās*, or personified desires. So this line says: “[The eight last-named personified desires] are the activities of the eight, Cāmuṇḍā and the others; and so also on the surface of the earth the *icchā* [goddesses] of the wrath-born [guardian deities] are Saṃtāpe[cchā]”, etc. The *Vimalaprabhā* on the previous verse lists which of these eight last-named *icchā* goddesses is born from which of the eight main goddesses of the speech *maṇḍala*, Cāmuṇḍā and the others. On this verse, it lists which of ten of the *icchā* goddesses named here is born from which of the ten wrathful

guardian female consort deities, here called *krodhaja*, the “wrath-born” (cp. *Vimalaprabhā*, 3.151). It then goes on to list two more *icchā* goddesses, who are born from two of the *pracaṇḍā* goddesses. These are continued in the following verse 46. That is why in verse 46 *Ucchiṣṭabhakte*[*cchā*] is called the fifth, even though coming in a long list of *icchā* goddesses, and being the third one listed in this verse. She is the fifth of those born from the *pracaṇḍā* goddesses.

p. 70, lines 12–13: “Similarly, in the external pavilion within the external *maṇḍala*, whatever other activity of sentient beings there is . . .” *evaṃ bāhya-maṇḍale bāhya-patyām aparām api yat kiñcit sattva-kṛtyam*. The phrase, *aparām api*, “also the other” goes with what precedes it rather than what comes after it. So it does not refer to “other” in “whatever other activity”, but rather goes with the preceding *bāhya-patyām*. The reading *bāhya-vedyām*, found in the verse that is being glossed here (see footnote 194 on p. 69 of the translation), does not change the meaning, since the outer *paṭṭikā* is the *vedikā*. As discussed above, this is the narrow platform going along the bottom of the walls on the outside of the walls. In the mind *maṇḍala*, the *pūjā-devīs* or offering goddesses stand on it; in the speech *maṇḍala*, the *icchās* or desire goddesses stand on it; and in the body *maṇḍala*, the *praticchās* or counter-desire goddesses stand on it. These latter two groups of goddesses have just been described. So this sentence is saying: “In this way, in the outer *maṇḍala*, on the outer *paṭṭikā* [where the *praticchās* stand] and also the other [the outer *paṭṭikā* of the speech *maṇḍala* where the *icchās* stand], whatever activity of sentient beings there is . . .”

It is worth noting that the indeclinable *evam*, taken by me as “in this way”, was given in the translation as “similarly”, one of its stock meanings that is not applicable here. What is being said here is not similar to what was said above. The same thing occurs in the verse here (46), where the indeclinable *tatas* was translated in a stock meaning, “afterward” rather than its applicable meaning, “therefore”. This is frequent with indeclinables throughout the translation.

p. 70, verse 47: “in the environment, in the body, elsewhere, and in expansion and contraction”, *bāhye dehe pare ca spharaṇa-nidhanate*. Here in the first seven-syllable metrical unit we have one of the most characteristic phrases and ideas of the whole Kālacakra system: in the outer (*bāhye*), or in the environment, in the body (*dehe*), or in the inner, and in the other (*pare*), here translated as “elsewhere”. The “other” refers to the Kālacakra *maṇḍala*, as reiterated in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary here, and as more famously stated in a verse apparently from the lost *mūla Kālacakra Tantra* quoted in the *Vimalaprabhā* on 3.55 (p. 57, lines 18–19): *yathā bāhye tathā dehe yathā dehe tathāpare | trividhaṃ maṇḍalaṃ jñātvā ācāryo maṇḍalaṃ likhet*, “As in the outer, so in the body; as in the body, so in the other. Having understood the threefold *maṇḍala*, let the teacher draw the *maṇḍala*”.

p. 72, footnote 200: “Dwivedi’s edition reads ‘*ali kali*’ instead of ‘*āli kālī*’”. The contrast is presumably to Biswanath Banerjee’s *Critical Edition of Śrī Kālacakratānta-rāja* (Calcutta, 1985). It is always necessary to consult this edition, because the verses of the *tantra* as given in Dwivedi’s edition of the *Vimalaprabhā* were mostly based on a single paper manuscript. Upon checking this, we see that it does read “*āli-kālī*”. But this is a silent emendation on the part of Banerjee. He has no note here giving variant readings. Yet one of the manuscripts he used, preserved in the Cambridge University Library, forms the basis of the 1966 edition by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, and this edition has “*api kali*” here. The point is that the

syllables are short, not long. That the original reading is “*ali-kali*” is confirmed in the old palm-leaf manuscript from Narthang reproduced by Lokesh Chandra in *Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet* (Śata-piṭaka Series, vol. 81. New Delhi, 1971), folio side 139, line 6. This, of course, is because of the metre, which requires short syllables here in the middle segment of the *pāda* or metrical foot. The meaning remains unchanged: these are the vowels and consonants of the Sanskrit alphabet.

The same thing is seen in the very first verse of the *Kālacakra Tantra*, in the middle segment of *pāda* d, *kaliyugasamaye*, where it appears to say, “at the time of *kali-yuga*”, the dark age. But the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary makes it clear that this is to be understood not as *kali-yuga-samaye*, but rather as *kali-yug-a-samaye*, and is talking about the consonants (*kali*) and the vowels. See *Vimalaprabhāṭikā*, vol. 1, p. 46. John Newman translated this phrase as, “the A collection that possesses the KA line” (*The Outer Wheel of Time*, PhD thesis, 1987, p. 319), and well explained this in a later footnote (p. 381).

p. 73, line 13: “the threefold speech has the [*ka-ṣa*] contraction (*pratyāhāra*)”, *vāg api trividhā pratyāhāreṇa*. Why the “[*ka-ṣa*]”, we may wonder. A little farther in the commentary on this verse, p. 74, line 14, we read, “Here, a collection of all the consonants is the syllable *kṣa*”. *atra sarva-vyāñjana-samūhaḥ kṣa-kāraḥ*. To this, footnote 212 is added: “According to Bu-ston [46], the syllable *kṣa* is a contraction of all the consonants, which begin with *ka* and end with *ṣa*”. This is like the well-known *pratyāhāra* or abbreviation used in Pāṇini’s system of grammar to represent all the consonants, *hal*. But for the threefold speech here, we would expect not just the *ka-ṣa pratyāhāra* representing all the consonants. The vowels would also have to be included. We would expect something like the *pratyāhāra* used in Pāṇini’s system to represent the whole alphabet, *al*.

In Pāṇini’s system, *pratyāhāras* are made from the fourteen Śiva-sūtras, which are usually given at the beginning of his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Although *pratyāhāras* from this system are quoted in the *Vimalaprabhā* (e.g., on 1.5, vol. 1, p. 56, line 3), for *pratyāhāras* in *Kālacakra*, a rule and nine *sūtras* different from the Śiva-sūtras are given in the commentary on verse 8 of chapter 1 (p. 60, lines 27–31). Bu-ston adds a note here identifying the source of this rule for *pratyāhāras* as the *‘jam dpal gyi byā ka ra ṇa*, or *Mañjuśrī-vyākaraṇa* (Bu-ston, part 1, folio side 441, line 2). Its text, the *Mañjuśrī-śabda-lakṣaṇa*, does not seem to have survived in the original Sanskrit, but is preserved in Tibetan translation in the Tengyur (see: Pieter C. Verhagen, *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet*, vol. 1, Leiden, 1994, pp. 126–129, 199–200, 300–304).

p. 73, lines 18–19: “Thus, the syllable *oṃ* is the *praṇava*. The heart is called a ‘lotus’” *evaṃ oṃkaraḥ praṇavaḥ | hṛdayam ucyate kamalam iti*. Here is a good example of where the punctuation in the printed Sanskrit edition should be corrected on the basis of the Tibetan translation: *de ltar oṃ yig pra ṇa ba ni snying por gsungs te padma’o*. This shows that there should be no *daṇḍa* after *praṇavaḥ*. In India, one would not normally need to be told that the syllable *oṃ* is the *praṇava*. This is saying: “Thus, the syllable *oṃ*, the *praṇava*, is called the heart; i.e., the lotus”. The point is that the *oṃ*, consisting of the letters *a*, *u*, and *ma*, is being compared in this verse with a lotus, consisting of the bulbous root and stalk, the petals and filaments, and the central receptacle with its moon and sun seats.

p. 74, lines 10–12: “Thereafter, one should immediately observe their bodies, which have become the nature of the circle of the *maṇḍala*” *tatas teṣāṃ svakāyān maṇḍala-cakra-svabhāvī-bhūtān jhātīti paśyēt*. Here in the *Vimalaprabhā* the meditator has just been instructed to draw all sentient beings into the *maṇḍala*, initiate them, and transform them into *maṇḍala* deities.

The words used for this are *dhyāyāt*, the standard word for meditation in general, so “one should meditate on”, here applied to a visualisation, and *bhāvayet*, the favored word in tantric writings for the visualisation type of meditation, so “one should meditate on” in the sense of “one should visualise”. Now comes the sentence using the word *paśyet*, the standard word for seeing, so “one should see”; but where the clear implication is “one should picture”, or “one should visualise”, not merely see or observe. So I would construe this sentence as: “Thereafter, one should visualise that their own bodies have instantaneously become of the nature of the circle of the *maṇḍala*”.

p. 74, lines 15–16: “According to this suggestive rule, he who has the first name has consonants and should do all this” *tena jñāpakena yasya yat prathamam nāma tasya vyañjanam tena tat sarvaṃ kartavyam*. We must try to make sense of this. There are always questions of what a pronoun refers to. Here we have several pronouns. The so-called *yat-tat* correlative of a relative pronoun and a demonstrative pronoun, widely used in Sanskrit, is not used in English. Here it is doubled, making the Sanskrit phrase even more awkward for us in English. Very literally, it says, “According to this suggestive rule, what first name of who/what, its consonant, with that all this/those should be made”. The idea seems to be that all subsequent names should be made with the consonant of the first name. This is what we see in the following paragraph that gives thirty-two seed-syllables of various deities corresponding to the thirty-two marks of a great person. All of these seed-syllables begin with the conjunct consonant “*kṣ*”.

That the demonstrative pronoun *tasya* should here not be correlated with the relative pronoun *yasya*, but rather should be construed separately, is supported by the Tibetan translation. The Sanskrit words *prathamam nāma tasya vyañjanam*, literally “first name, its consonant”, are translated into Tibetan in Bu-ston’s edition as *ming gi gsal byed dang po*, meaning the “first consonant of the name”. The genitive pronoun *tasya* has here been merged into the genitive noun *ming gi*, “of the name”. With *tasya* out of the way, or construed separately, we are left with the demonstrative pronouns *tena tat* to correlate with the relative pronouns *yasya yat*. These make a nice *yat-tat* correlative. When construed in this way, this sentence gives the idea or sense stated by me above.

p. 74, line 20: “*Kṣ!*” should be “*Kṣha*”; line 21: “*kṣ!!*” should be “*kṣhā*”. In both cases, this is the conjunct consonant *kṣ* plus the letter *h*, not merely an alternate transliteration of *k* plus *ṣ*. The mantras as given in the printed Sanskrit edition cannot be fully relied on, because they are often based on inaccurate late paper manuscripts. The readings of the more accurate old palm-leaf manuscripts are sometimes not recorded or are recorded incorrectly in the notes that give variant readings. The old Tibetan translations preserve the seed-syllables in transliteration more accurately, clearly showing the letter *h* here, where it is considered to be one of the semi-vowels. The mantras in general, however, have many scribal errors in the Tibetan blockprints, and these must be allowed for. When several different editions of the Tibetan texts can be checked, as is now possible, and when these agree with the old palm-leaf Sanskrit manuscripts, the correct form of the mantras can in most cases be established with a high degree of certainty. Mantras are of fundamental importance in the Kālacakra system, and their accuracy is crucial to it.

p. 75, line 1: “Then, having generated in detail every single male deity with every single seed syllable within the private organ of the goddesses, one should emanate them”, *atha vistarataḥ pratyekaika-bījēna devī-guhye pratyeka-devatām niṣpādya utsrjet*. The deities spoken of

here as being generated are not only male but also female, and they are generated in the private organ or secret place of one particular goddess only, Viśvamātā. I understand this sentence as: “Now, in detail: Having generated each deity with each individual seed syllable in the secret place of the goddess, one should emanate them”.

p. 76, lines 24–28: “Having perceived the blue-coloured syllable *hūṃ* in the fluid of the moon as shining and causing purity, he transforms the *vajra* from that [*hūṃ*] and diffuses it by means of that [syllable]. [Seeing] himself generated, the Divine Lord, a *yogī*, has the *vajra* jewels and the tiara with the Lord of Jinās, and is embraced by the wisdom [being] as before”, *tatra candra-drave hūṃ-kāraṃ nīla-varṇaṃ dṛṣṭvā sphurad amala-kāraṃ tena pariṇataṃ vajraṃ tena sphāritam iti niṣpannam ātmānaṃ yogī bhagavān vajrālankāra-yukto jina-pati-mukūṭaḥ prajñayālīngitāś ca pūrvavat*. At the time the four goddesses sing their song to awaken the Bhagavān Kālacakra, he is supposed to have previously melted into a drop of moon fluid or *bodhicitta*. He arises from this drop of moon fluid in three stages. First is the syllable *hūṃ*, which then transforms into a *vajra*, and this *vajra* in turn becomes the completed or perfected (*niṣpanna*) full form of Kālacakra. This is how all the deities arise, being a general rule in *tantra* that is applicable everywhere (*Vimalaprabhā*, 4.73, p. 187, lines 24–25): *evaṃ bījena cihnotpādaḥ, cihnena devatotpādaḥ sarvatrāvagantavyo yogīneti tantra-niyamaḥ*, “Thus, from a seed [–syllable] arises an emblem; from an emblem arises a deity. This should be understood by the *yogī* everywhere. It is the rule in *tantra*”. So the translation of the clause, “he transforms the *vajra* from that [*hūṃ*] and diffuses it by means of that [syllable]”, should be modified.

Because the passive construction is used so often in Sanskrit, and by comparison is used so little in English, some translators routinely change passive constructions into active constructions. However, there are times when this does not work out satisfactorily. Sometimes the passive verb-forms do not imply an active agent, which is supplied by the translator as “he” etc. I understand this clause as being such a case. So rather than “he transforms the *vajra* from that [*hūṃ*]” we would have simply, “transformed from that [*hūṃ*] is a *vajra*”, *tena pariṇataṃ vajraṃ*. This idea could be expressed in an active construction as: “that [*hūṃ*] transforms into a *vajra*”.

The next part of this clause, translated as “and diffuses it by means of that [syllable]” is also a passive phrase in Sanskrit, *tena sphāritam*. But besides this, there are also other issues here. I understand *sphāritam* to mean “emanated” or “manifested” in the Kālacakra writings, where we find *nidhana*, “destruction”, used in a contrasting pair with the cognate *spharaṇa*, “creation” or “manifestation” or “emanation”. This is not the idea that one gets from “diffuse”, as *sphāritam* is translated here, or “expand”, as its cognates are translated in the next couple verses. So we would have “emanate” rather than “diffuse” in meaning, and the passive “emanated” rather than the active “diffuses” in form. We must now take the pronoun *tena* as “from that”, like in the previous phrase, rather than as “by means of that”, and we must take it as referring to the *vajra* rather than to the syllable. So I understand the phrase *tena sphāritam* as “emanated from that [*vajra*]”. For what is emanated from that, we must bring in the rest of the Sanskrit phrase.

The Sanskrit phrase, *tena sphāritam iti niṣpannam ātmānaṃ*, shows us that what is emanated from the *vajra* is *ātmānaṃ*, “himself” and he is now *niṣpannam*, “generated” as “completed” or “perfected”. Bhagavān Kālacakra is now generated in his full and finished form, complete with *vajra* ornaments (*vajrālankāra*), a crown (*mukūṭa*), in embrace with his wisdom consort

(*prajñāyāliṅgita*), etc. So as expected, here in the third stage Bhagavān Kālacakra is “emanated from that [*vajra*]”, which in turn was “transformed from that [*hūṃ*]”. In the lines quoted above, the translation of the words *niṣpannam ātmānam* was placed at the beginning of a new sentence: “[Seeing] himself generated, . . .”

Earlier in the preceding sentence quoted above we find the phrase, “shining and causing purity” (*sphurad amala-karam*), describing “the blue-coloured syllable *hūṃ*”. In this oft-repeated phrase, *amala-karam* is consistently translated into Tibetan as *dri ma med pa'i 'od zer*, “immaculate rays of light” and taken as the object of *sphurad*, “radiating” or “shining”. I see no compelling reason to override this and translate it instead as “and causing purity”, so I take this phrase as: “radiating immaculate rays of light”.

The sentences quoted above began with, “Having perceived the blue-coloured syllable *hūṃ*”. If Bhagavān Kālacakra is seeing or perceiving the syllable *hūṃ*, how is he at the same time emanating from it? Because, as discussed in my comments regarding p. 74, lines 10–12, words for “seeing” in these writings sometimes have the sense of “picturing” or “visualising”, not just seeing or perceiving. The verbal *dr̥ṣṭvā* used here, “having seen” occurs twice in this long Sanskrit sentence, the first time in the first part of it that was not quoted above. In the translation, this long Sanskrit sentence is broken into smaller sentences, as required for English. In the earlier part of it, Bhagavān Kālacakra “perceives the entirety of the three realms, characterised by desire, form, and formlessness, as similar to an illusion” (p. 76). This first occurrence of *dr̥ṣṭvā* was translated into Tibetan as *gzigs nas* (Bu-ston (ed.), fol. 522, line 6), while the second occurrence of *dr̥ṣṭvā* was translated as *bltas te* (fol. 522, line 6). It would seem that the Indian pandit and Tibetan translator team understood these to be somewhat different in import. In seeing that the three realms are similar to an illusion, Bhagavān Kālacakra is perceiving this. In seeing the syllable *hūṃ*, he is picturing this.

As discussed in the above six paragraphs, I understand all these lines as: “There in the moon fluid, having seen (or pictured) a blue-coloured syllable *hūṃ* radiating immaculate rays of light, [picturing] a *vajra* transformed from this [*hūṃ*], and [picturing] himself emanated from that [*vajra*], thus generated as perfected, the *yogī*, the Bhagavān, has *vajra*-ornaments, has the Lord of Jinas on his crown, and is embraced by the wisdom [consort], as before”.

The long Sanskrit sentence just discussed, found in the commentary to verse 49, actually pre-glosses the coming verse 51. There in the translation we find some of the same issues. The first two lines of this verse are translated (p. 82) as: “Hearing that song, perceiving the entire three worlds as illusory, and expanding his shining and pure emblem, the *vajrī* creates [the *maṇḍala*]” *gītaṃ śrutvā sa vajrī tri-bhuvana-sakalaṃ tv indrajālopanam vai, dr̥ṣṭvotpattiṃ karoti sphurad amala-karam sphārayitvā svā-cihnam*. The word *sphārayitvā* is translated as “expanding”. As noted above with the cognate word *sphārita*, there translated as “diffuses”, these words mean “emanate” or “manifest” in Kālacakra. Keeping in mind the three stages mentioned above, it is not that he has expanded his emblem (*cihna*), the *vajra*, but rather has emanated it. As also noted above, the phrase *sphurad amala-karam*, there translated as “shining and causing purity” and here translated as “shining and pure” is better translated as “radiating immaculate rays of light”. Then, regarding the last phrase here, “the *vajrī* creates [the *maṇḍala*]”: The *vajrī* does not here create the *maṇḍala*, but rather he “arises” *utpattiṃ karoti*. It is in the last line of verse 51 that, after arising, he creates the *maṇḍala*. I understand these two lines as: “Hearing [their] song, and perceiving the entire three worlds as being like an illusion, he, the *vajrī*,

arises, having emanated his emblem radiating immaculate rays of light". That is, from the *vajra* that he emanated, which radiates immaculate rays of light, he arises.

The last line of verse 51 is translated as: "Moreover, O king, the entire generation of the *maṇḍala* is by means of the wisdom and method [beings]" *prajñopāyena rājan punar api sakalam maṇḍalotsarjanam ca*. Here we carry down the *karoti* from the phrase in the second line, *utpattiṃ karoti*, "arises", making the corresponding verb phrase here, *utsarjanam karoti*, "generates". It is here that he generates the *maṇḍala* (*maṇḍalotsarjanam*). The point of this line is not to say how he generates the *maṇḍala*, but to say that he generates the *maṇḍala*. This is missed when an implied "is" is placed before the dependent clause "by means of the wisdom and method [beings]" as the verb of the sentence. Also, I see no indication that "wisdom and method" refers to "beings" here. It is glossed here in the *Vimalaprabhā* as *prajñopāya-samāpattiyā*, "by the attainment of wisdom and method", which was so translated on p. 82. Then, here at the beginning of the second part of the *sādhana*, the indeclinable *punar* is used in its meaning of "again" rather than "moreover". The commentary leaves no doubt about this, saying *pūrvavat*, "like before", so this last line is saying: "And again, O king, he generates the entire *maṇḍala*, by wisdom and method". It is only after first arising, by way of the three stages mentioned above, that the *vajrī* can generate the *maṇḍala*, and he now does so.

The sequence spoken of in this verse is made clear in the song of the four goddesses, immediately preceding it, quoted from the lost *mūla Kālacakra Tantra* in the *Vimalaprabhā* commentary on verse 50. Each of the four individually requests him to "arise" from dissolution or "get up" from this kind of sleep, using the imperative verb, *uttha*. Each of them also requests him to "desire me" (*mām*), using the imperative verb, *kāma*. Then together, they request him to "emanate" or "manifest" the triple *maṇḍala*, using the imperative verb, *sphārayasva*. Again, this cognate word is translated as "expand". However, it is not that he is being exhorted here to "expand the *maṇḍalas* of the body, speech, and mind" (p. 81), but rather that he is being exhorted to once again "emanate the *maṇḍalas* of body, speech, and mind".

We cannot leave the song of the four goddesses without noticing another translation issue. As recognised in the annotations by Bu-ston, the verses of this song make reference to the kinds of "result" or "fruit" (*phala*); and indeed, *Kālacakra Tantra* verse 50 speaks of "*sama-sukha-phala-de*". The *Mahāvīyutpatti* (2271–2277) lists five of these: *niṣyanda-phala*, *adhipati-phala*, *puruṣakāra-phala*, *vipāka-phala*, and *viśaṃyoga-phala*, and these are found in the *Abhidharmakośa* (2.56 ff., 4.87 ff.), the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (part 2, chap. 4, near beginning); the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra-vyākhyā* (17.31), the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Wogihara (ed.), p. 102, line 16 ff.; Dutt (ed.), p. 72, line 12 ff.), etc.; so the Indian Buddhist audience of the *Kālacakra Tantra* would have been familiar with them. Here in the *Vimalaprabhā*, like in the *Hevajra Tantra* (2.4.56–58), only four are given, adopting three of these five, *niṣyanda*, *vipāka*, *puruṣa(kāra)*, and using a different name for a fourth, *vaimalya*, rather than *viśaṃyoga*. So the translations of these terms in the song of the four goddesses must be altered.

In the first verse of the song of the goddesses, *niṣyande yoginām sthitā* does not mean "present in the *yogīs*' emission" (p. 81), but rather refers to the *niṣyanda-phala*, the "natural outcome result". In the third verse, *puruṣe yoginām sthitā*, does not mean "present in the spirit of *yogīs*", but rather refers to the *puruṣakāra-phala*, the "man-made result". Although

Sāṃkhya terms and ideas are used in the Kālacakra writings, *puruṣa* does not here mean “spirit” as it does in Sāṃkhya. The translations of the second and fourth verses, speaking of *vipāke* and *vaimalye*, also referring to “results” (*phala*), must likewise be altered.

p. 76, lines 28–31: “Furthermore, because of the newborn child’s cry at spiritual awakening, one should emanate a *maṇḍala* that is of the nature of the body, speech, and mind and that consists of wisdom and method”. *punaḥ prajñōpāyātmakena citta-kāya-vāg-dharmena maṇḍalotsarjanaṃ kuryāj jātasya bālakasya prabodhākrandanād iti*. This sentence comes immediately after the long sentence discussed at length above. Like in the translation of the similar last line of verse 51, also discussed above, the import and intent of the Sanskrit is lost in the translation of this sentence. The meaning “furthermore” for the indeclinable *punar*, like the meaning “moreover” given for it in verse 51, is not applicable here. The indefinite article “a” before *maṇḍala* should be made the definite article “the”. The *sādhana* is being described, and we are at the beginning of the second part of it. Here Bhagavān Kālacakra has been reawakened by the song of the four goddesses just prior to once again emanating the threefold *maṇḍala*, like he did in the first part of the *sādhana*. In the previous sentence he has arisen from a syllable *hūṃ*, and then a *vajra*, and is now in full form. Now, says the text, he should again (*punar*) generate or emanate the *maṇḍala* (*maṇḍalotsarjanaṃ kuryāt*).

This brings us to the end of the translation of the second section of the fourth chapter of the *Kālacakra Tantra* and *Vimalaprabhā*, and this review has gotten too long. It is time to conclude. We have seen that if one does not take full account of the description of the *maṇḍala* given in the third chapter, significant errors of interpretation occur in the translation of the description of the *sādhana* given here in the fourth chapter. Similarly, we have seen that if one does not take full cognizance of what is happening in the *sādhana* here in this chapter, significant errors of interpretation again occur in the translation. There is much involved in translating even a single Sanskrit sentence from this complex system, and this gives us a perspective on translating a text that has thousands of difficult sentences. If one wants to complete the translation, it is not always practical to deal with all the problems of translation that each of these poses. This is where reviews come in and can make their contribution to the understanding of these texts.

When the Buddhist texts were translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan around a thousand years ago, this was usually accomplished by a translation team consisting of an Indian pandit who had been taught the text and a native Tibetan translator. We do not have this luxury today. We must do the best we can using the avenues now available to us, and try to support each other in this difficult work in whatever ways possible. I am personally very grateful to Dr Wallace for her tremendous labour in making this translation, thereby opening up access to the core texts of the important Kālacakra system.

DAVID REIGLE
International Kalachakra Network