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Introduction

The Cakrasamvara tantra (CS) is a principal tantra of the Cakrasamvara scriptural cycle, which is one of the largest collections of Buddhist Yoginī tantra literature from the early medieval South Asian world. The Cakrasamvara tradition was imported into neighboring areas such as Nepal, Tibet, and Bhutan, and has functioned as one of the most important sources in the formation of religio-cultural systems in these areas. Its thought and practice are also maintained “in other regions influenced by Tibetan Buddhism, including Mongolia, Russia, China, and elsewhere,” notes David B. Gray, the author of the book under review, “as Tibetan lamas have been living and teaching in diaspora.” (p. xv.)

Gray’s study aims at providing the first critical translation of the CS, richly annotated and accompanied by analyses of its contents and contexts. A critical edition of the CS is not included, which some may regard as a shortcoming, but Gray’s critical edition of the CS is forthcoming as a companion volume to his study.

1 Outline

Gray’s study consists of six parts: (1) an introduction into the study of the CS (pp. 1–152); (2) an annotated critical translation of the CS (pp. 153–384); (3) Sanskrit-Tibetan-English and Tibetan-Sanskrit-English glossaries (pp. 385–392); (4) a Conspectus Siglorum listing
the Sanskrit manuscripts (Skt mss) that Gray used for his translation (pp. 405–408); (5) a bibliography (pp. 409–436); and (6) an index of Sanskrit, Tibetan, and English terms (pp. 437–447).

Part one provides a general introduction into the study of the CS. Gray presents the textual materials which he used for his translation and explains his translation methodology. This part also includes analyses of several important aspects of the CS and its background, such as the classification of tantra literature, dates when the CS and some other tantras belonging to the Cakrasamvara scriptural cycle were compiled, the contents of the CS, and the scriptural and ideological contexts within which the CS was compiled and used. It is regrettable that Gray does not provide a full textual and contextual study of Śaiva-Buddhist interrelations, especially since he upholds the idea that “the Buddhist Yoginitantras were significantly influenced by Śaiva Kāpālika practices” (p. 8, n. 19). But this omission may also reflect the stance that we should avoid drawing hasty conclusions on this complex issue, for he says that “the undoubtedly complex relationships that exist between Śaiva and Buddhist tantric textual traditions will only be determined conclusively once all of the surviving texts have been critically edited and published” (p. 9, n. 19). This position may be controversial because efforts to create critical editions and efforts to determine textual relationships are not separate from each other – they are to be concurrently made and reciprocally associated. But we should not ignore that this first part of Gray’s study provides much information on the contents and contexts of the CS and the Cakrasamvara scriptural tradition, which is no doubt useful for anyone interested in Tantric Buddhism.

Part two, the annotated critical translation, is the main part of the study. Gray’s translation is based on his unpublished critical edition of the CS. This edition chiefly relies on three Skt mss of the CS, on Tibetan translations of the CS, and on eleven Indian commentaries along with some Tibetan commentaries. It also makes use of Kalff’s edition of selected chapters of the Abhidhānottaratantra (Kalff 1979), and of Skt mss of this work which contains many parallel passages and is therefore quite useful for recovering the text of folia that are missing from the extant Skt mss of the CS. The
text of the CS as edited by Gray is partially recorded in the annotation. In his footnotes, he also adduces various interpretations from the commentaries, which makes this book not only the first critical translation of the CS but also a useful guidebook for comparative studies of its commentarial literature.

In short, Gray’s study is the first full translation of the CS, it serves as a guide to its commentarial literature and provides much textual and contextual information on the Indian Cakrasamvara tradition. This makes it a ‘must-read’ for students and scholars who research the Indian Cakrasamvara tradition in particular and Indian and Tibetan Tantric Buddhism in general. However, it is also beset by problems. In the following I would like to focus on problems in dating the tantras of the Cakrasamvara scriptural cycle and problems of Gray’s translation of the CS and the materials used for it. I shall then turn to the analyses of the origin myths of Heruka and his mandala, and of the structure and functions of the Triple Wheel mandala.

2 Dating the tantras of the Cakrasamvara scriptural cycle

Gray notes that a precise dating of the CS and other tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition is currently a difficult task (p. 11 and 20), but nevertheless offers a hypothesis of his own.

2.1 Date of the CS

Gray argues that it is likely that the CS was compiled in the eighth century, for the following reasons: (a) The CS mentions the names of Buddhist scriptures that can be dated in the late seventh century or the first half of the eighth century, such as the Sarvatathāgatabhāsā-saṁgrahasūtra, Guhyasamājatantra, Vajrabhairavatantra, Śrī-paramādyatantra, and the Sarvabuddhasamāyogatantra. (b) It is known from Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism that Jayabhadra composed his Cakrasaṁvarapañjikā, the oldest commentary of the CS, used for it.

---

1 Throughout his study, Gray spells the title of this tantra with ‘samāyoga’. However, ‘samāyoga’ (full title: Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinijālāsa mvaratantra) is more commonly used, and very likely also correct.
during the early- to mid-ninth century. (c) In his Nāmasamgītiṣkā, Vilāsavajra (mid- to late-eighth century), quotes one pāda and one word from the CS: glang chen ko rlon gos su gyon (/ zhes pa ni dpal 'khor lo bde mchog gi rgyud las te), and keng rus (ni dpal bde mchog 'khor lo'i rgyud las so). (pp. 11–14.)

Given that Tāranātha’s account is ambiguous and may be unreliable, Vilāsavajra’s very short quotations appear to be the only evidence to support Gray’s hypothesis that the CS was already active in the eighth century. Gray correlates Vilāsavajra’s glang chen ko rlon gos su gyon and keng rus respectively with hasticarmāvīruddham ca in chapter 2 of the CS (where the actual reading is hasticarmāvāruddham ca) and kaṅkāla in chapter 48. However, the former correlation is problematic. Vilāsavajra’s work is a commentary on the Nāmasamgīti, and the Sankrit of the pāda in question in the Nāmasamgīti is gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛ, which cannot be found in the CS. Vilāsavajra might have read the pāda in the CS freely and related it to the pāda in the Nāmasamgīti freely on this basis, but this is certainly not conclusive evidence. The Sanskrit source of keng rus in the Nāmasamgīti is, indeed, kaṅkāla. But this, too, is insufficient evidence. Clear and extensive parallel passages along with a reference to the name of its source text would certainly be more decisive.

There is also a problem regarding the name of the tantra to which Vilāsavajra refers. Although Vilāsavajra calls the scriptural source of the pāda and word in question dPal 'khor lo bde mchog gi rgyud or dPal bde mchog 'khor lo'i rgyud, which in Sankrit is Śrīcakrasaṃvaratantra, we should bear in mind the possibility that this tantra may have previously been named Herukābhidhāna rather than Cakrasaṃvara. This is suggested by the change of its name in its chapter 51. In chapters 1 to 50 it calls itself Herukābhidhāna (iti śrīherukābhidhāne ...). However, in chapter 51, that name is said to refer to the large scripture of one hundred thousand verses from which this tantra was selected, and the name of this tantra is given as Cakrasaṃvara (śrīcakrasaṃvaram nāma mahā-

---

2 Nāmasamgīti: Ādāraśajnānam, 3d.
3 Nāmasamgīti: Ādāraśajnānam, 1c.
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yojinitantraratāja). As I shall argue below, it is very likely that chapter 51, together with several verses of chapter 50, was not included in the oldest version of this tantra: it was added to the oldest version after Jayabhadra, who was active after Vilāsavajra.4

Gray’s analysis of Vilāsavajra’s references is thus somewhat problematic. However, we cannot deny the possibility that some form of the CS existed in the age of Vilāsavajra because, as Gray stresses, Vilāsavajra surely mentions a tantra named ‘Cakrasamvaratantra’ and distinguishes it from the Sarvabuddhasamyogatantra, by which he refers to the Sarvakudhasamāyogatantra. It is also possible that the Cakrasamvaratantra mentioned by Vilāsavajra is a work different from the CS – a work that did not survive.

One should also bear in mind the possibility that the date of compilation of the CS is not so long before (or might even be very close to) the date when Jayabhadra was active. I would here like to call attention to four remarks about the historical stages of the compilation of the CS and of Jayabhadra’s commentary that I made in 20015 and that are not sufficiently taken into consideration in Gray’s study. They may be of some help for future studies about the date of compilation of the CS.

[1] There were several different versions of the CS, some of which Gray mentions. Gray overlooks, however, that these can be roughly divided into two: (a) a shorter version that contains chapters 1 to 49 and the first half of chapter 50 (= 37a3 of the Vadodara ms)6 of the extant CS and (b) a longer version that contains all chapters, from 1 to 51.

[2] The shorter version is very likely to be older than the longer, and Jayabhadra is very likely to have used one of the oldest texts that belong to it. The text that Jayabhadra used does not know the

---

4 However, there is also the possibility that this tantra was called Cakrasamvara from the outset because Jayabhadra, the oldest commentator on this tantra (or at least the commentator who used the oldest version of this tantra), refers to it under that name. See also Sugiki 2001 for further discussion of the titles Herukabhidhāna and Cakrasamvara.


6 See below p. 513 for the Sanskrit ms of the CS.
chapter divisions given in the extant CS; in fact, it gives no chapter
divisions at all. Furthermore, Jayabhadra’s commentary does not
mention parts that are not contained in the shorter version. It is
quite unlikely that Jayabhadra intentionally skipped commenting
on these parts because they provide instructions into the system
of the internal Heruka mandala, which is a main doctrine of the
Cakrasamvara tradition. They also introduce other systems that are
highly Buddhist Mahāyānic and make the CS more Mahāyānic.7

[3] The shorter version (and also Jayabhadra’s commentary) is
devoid of a clear idea of internal Cakrasamvara holy sites corre-
sponding to their external forms. This idea first appears in the last
half of chapter 50 of the extant CS and is in the Cakrasamvara
tradition generally accompanied by such terms as bāhyādhyātma-,
sabāhyādhyātma-, or the like. It became one of the principal ele-
ments in the practice of ‘the creation stage’ (utpattikrama), i.e., the
visualization of the Heruka mandala in the Cakrasamvara tradition
after the CS. After the addition of the last half of chapter 50
and of chapter 51 to the shorter version (i.e., after the compilation
of a text that belongs to the longer version), commentators of the
CS began to freely read this idea into some passages in chapters
that had already been present in the shorter version, and terms like
bāhyādhyātma-, sabāhyādhyātma-, or the like then came to be in-
serted into the shorter version, too.

[4] The addition of the last half of chapter 50 and of chapter
51 to the shorter version can be dated between Jayabhadra and
Kambala because Kambala, unlike Jayabhadra, comments on the
last half of chapter 50 of the CS, although very briefly. Both Jayab-
hadra and Kambala very likely lived before the compilation of the
Vajradākatantra, which was likely composed around or after the
late ninth century.

---

7 One could object that the commentary on the CS by Bhavyakīrti, who
is clearly one of the later commentators, also does not mention parts that
are not contained in the shorter version. However, this does not invalidate
my hypothesis because Bhavyakīrti’s commentary very closely follows
Jayabhadra’s, as Gray also points out (p. 22).
2.2 Dates of the tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition that were compiled after the CS

Gray’s approach to dating the tantras belonging to the Cakrasamvara tradition that were compiled after the CS can be summarized as follows: The Abhidhānottaratantra preserves Śaiva readings dating to the ninth century, some of which are older than readings found in the CS. However, the compilation of the final form of the Abhidhānottaratantra cannot predate the CS because the CS mentions the Abhidhānottaratantra under the title cakrasamvara. Furthermore, neither the Abhidhānottaratantra nor the CS contain technical Buddhist terminology relating to the perfection stage (niṣpannakrama), which became popular in and after the ninth century.\(^8\) By contrast, other tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition such as the Samvarodayatantra, Vajradākatantra, and Dākārnava- vatantra contain Buddhist terminology relating to the perfection stage. For these reasons, the Abhidhānottaratantra may be dated to the eighth century, but definitely not to before the CS. Many of the tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition appear to have been composed after the Abhidhānottaratantra (p. 20.)

This analysis of the Abhidhānottaratantra is, however, highly problematic. It is indeed true that the Abhidhānottaratantra often preserves Śaiva readings of the early medieval age, but the same can also be said of other tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition. Moreover, Gray’s idea that the Abhidhānottaratantra does not contain technical terminology relating to the perfection stage is hard to accept. As I argued in 1999, the Abhidhānottaratantra (like the Vajradākatantra, the Samputodbhavatantra, the Dākārnava-vatantra, and other texts of the Cakrasamvara tradition that can be dated around or after the late ninth century) clearly introduces the subtle-body system centered on the inner channels and inner circles connected with the doctrine of Four Blisses (caturāṇanda), evidently under the influence of the Hevajra subtle-body system (from around the ninth century). The Abhidhānottaratantra also gives

\(^8\) By “technical Buddhist terminology relating to the perfection stage,” Gray appears to refer to the psychosomatic subtle-body system centered on the inner channels (nāḍī), inner circles (cakra), and the like.
instructions on psychosomatic meditation based on the subtle-body system, in which the inner fire or light and the inner ambrosia are visualized to move inside and outside of the practitioner’s body. Furthermore, the Abhidhānottaratantra contains instructions of psychosomatic meditation that are closely related to Lüyipāda’s Mahāyoga system and Kṛṣṇācārya’s Olicatuṣṭaya or Alica tuṣṭaya system, which were regarded as instructions to the perfection stage in Lüyipāda’s and Kṛṣṇācārya’s schools, respectively.9 It should also be noted that the Abhidhānottaratantra gives instructions on the internal Heruka maṇḍala. One of these can be regarded as a developed version of instructions given in Lüyipāda’s Cakrasamvarābhisamaya (presumably last half of the ninth century), the Samputodbhavatantra, the Vajradākatantra (both probably late ninth to tenth century), and several other ritual or meditational texts (i.e., vidhi or sādhana texts) belonging to the Cakrasamvara tradition. (The final section of this paper contains a discussion on the internal Heruka maṇḍala taught in these scriptures.)10

It is therefore unlikely that the date of the Abhidhānottaratantra is as early as Gray believes, and it is impossible to maintain his clear dividing line between the date and contents of the Abhidhānottaratantra and those of the Samputodbhavatantra, the Vajradākatantra, and other tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition. Gray’s intention, although not clearly stated, may be to say that the oldest parts of the Abhidhānottaratantra were compiled in the eighth century, and that these refer to the passages that have parallels in the CS, which does not contain technical Buddhist terminol-

9 For details on the teachings of the Abhidhānottaratantra in relation to Kṛṣṇācārya’s and Lüyipāda’s systems, see Sugiki 1999 and 2007. The contents of Lüyipāda’s Mahāyoga system were already analyzed by Munenobu Sakurai in an earlier paper, although he did not mention the textual relationship between Lüyipāda’s works that teach the Mahāyoga system and the Abhidhānottaratantra (Sakurai 1997). Draft editions of two passages that explain the subtle body system and psychosomatic meditation based on it from the Abhidhānottaratantra are provided in Sugiki 2007. Since this book may be difficult to access from outside Japan, these passages are presented in an appendix to the present paper.

10 For details on the historical development of the internal Heruka maṇḍala, see Sugiki 2003b and 2007.
ogy concerning the perfection stage. Even if that is so, a similar problem occurs as in his suggestion to date the CS in the eighth century. There also remains the question whether all parallel passages of the CS found in the other tantras of the same tradition (such as the Samputodbhavatantra, the Vajradakatantra and others) can be determined as being later than those found in the Abhidhanottaratantra. (As I mentioned above, readings that can be considered to be old and early-medieval Śaivic are also found in those tantras.) There is currently simply no conclusive evidence that proves the Abhidhanottaratantra existed in the eighth century.

As in the case of the CS, there appear to have been several stages in the compilation of the other tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition. There also appear to have been complex mutual references to texts between the compilers of those tantras. Finally, in order to carefully develop a plausible hypothesis on the dates of the tantras belonging to the Cakrasamvara traditions, we must also take the relationship between Śaiva and Buddhist tantras into consideration – and this, as mentioned above, is a point that Gray unfortunately neglects.

3 Gray’s translation of the CS and the materials used for it

3.1 Problems in the selection of materials

A Sanskrit edition of the CS, together with Bhavabhāṭṭa’s commentary, was published by Pandey in 2002 (henceforth CS-P). Although this edition should be respected as a pioneering achievement, it is very problematic, as many scholars in this field have pointed out; Gray also accurately shows problems in Pandey’s edition. For his own critical edition of the CS (that awaits publication), Gray used three Skt mss of the CS, which Pandey also used: an old palm-leaf ms owned by the Oriental Institute in Vadodara (accession no. 13290), and two recent copies of it. Correctly recognizing that the latter are copies of the palm-leaf ms., Gray uses the palm-leaf ms as the main basis for his edition and translation.

In addition to these manuscripts, Gray also made use of other texts and supporting materials: Tibetan translations of the CS,
mss and eds, as well as Tibetan translations of eleven Indian commentaries, some indigenous Tibetan commentaries, as well as Skt mss and the Skt ed of the *Abhidhānottaratantra*. Among the commentaries, he frequently favors Jayabhadra’s *Cakrasamvarapañjikā* and Bhavabhaṭṭa’s *Cakrasamvaravivṛtti*, and also, in some passages, Vajrapāṇi’s *Laghutantratikā*. He also attaches much importance to Kambala’s *Herukasādhananiḥdi* and Viravajra’s *Padārthaprapakāśikā*. These commentaries are favored or considered to be important for the following reasons: (a) Skt mss or Skt eds of Jayabhadra, Bhavabhaṭṭa, and Vajrapāṇi’s commentaries are available. (b) Jayabhadra’s commentary is the oldest among the surviving commentaries of the CS. (c) Kambala’s commentary is also relatively early. (d) Many later commentators of the CS rely on Jayabhadra’s or Kambala’s commentaries. (e) Bhavabhaṭṭa’s commentary quotes many words and phrases of the CS, although he sometimes emends these in the act of quoting. (f) Kambala’s and Viravajra’s commentaries give detailed explanations of rituals that are described only briefly in the CS. And, as I mentioned earlier, the reason for using the *Abhidhānottaratantra* is that it preserves old readings and contains many passages that have parallels in the CS and is hence quite useful for recovering material that is missing from the extant Skt mss of the CS.

These materials, however, do not suffice for a fully critical edition and translation of the CS. Most of the supporting materials are new paper mss or Tibetan translations. Gray did not use two older palm-leaf mss of Jayabhadra’s commentary, which preserve older and better readings than the new paper mss he used. Neither did he use a Skt ms of Kambala’s commentary, which is also an old palm-leaf ms, but only used a Tibetan translation of this commentary. Finally, Gray did not make effective use of Skt mss or Skt eds of Buddhist and Śaiva texts that have parallel or similar passages,

---

11 A draft-version of the Skt ed of whole text of Jayabhadra’s commentary based on these two palm-leaf mss has been published in Sugiki 2001. I plan to publish the finalized edition in the near future.

12 I have prepared an as yet unpublished Skt ed of whole text of Kambala’s commentary based on this palm-leaf ms.
such as the *Vajradākatantra*, the *Samputodbhavatantra*, the Śaiva tantras which Alexis Sanderson mentions in his series of papers that analyze textual relationships between Śaiva Vidyāpītha tantras and Buddhist Yogini tantras (such as the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the *Brahmayāmala*, and the *Tantrasadbhāva*),

13 the Śaiva *Vīṇāśikhatantra*,

14 and other related texts. These materials are not only truly helpful in creating a critical edition and translation of the *CS*; they are actually indispensable for recovering missing passages of the *CS* that cannot be reconstructed, or only in an unsatisfactory manner, from the *Abhidhānottaratantra* and Jayabhadra’s, Bhavabhaṭṭa’s, and Vajrapāṇi’s commentaries. Let us look at some relevant cases.

13 Draft versions of the Skt eds of chapters 1, 7, 8, 14, 18, 22, 36, 38, 42, 44, 48 of the Sanskrit *Vajradākatantra* have been published in Sugiki 2002, Sugiki 2003a, and Sugiki 2008. I have also prepared as yet unpublished draft versions of other chapters of this tantra.


15 The *Vīṇāśikhatantra*’s instruction on the *vetālasādhana* (Skt ed, 190cd–193) contains a passage that is very similar to or identical with those of the *CS*, the *Vajradākatantra*, and the *Herukābhuyadayatantra*. See Sugiki 2008 for details and references. I express my heartfelt thanks to the reviewer of this article that was published in the journal *Tantric Studies* (The Center for Tantric Studies, University of Hamburg) who suggested that I check carefully the *Vīṇāśikhatantra*’s passage in question before submitting the final version of paper. I would like to add here that the verse *mahāśākhamayam kuryād athavā kacchapasya tu* of the *Vīṇāśikhatantra* (Skt ed, 113cd) is also a parallel of the *CS*’s *mahāśākhamayam kuryād abhedyaṃ kacchapaṃ sāh* (Skt ms, 25a3–a4).

16 For example, the *Catuspīṭhatantra*, the *Samvarodayatantra*, the *Dākārnavatantra*, Lūyipāḍa’s *Cakrasamvarābhīṣamaya*, and Krṣṇācārya’s *Cakrasamvarasādhana*. Lūyipāḍa’s *Cakrasamvarābhīṣamaya (= Bhaga-vadabhīṣamaya)* have been published in Sakurai 1998. The Skt ed of the whole text of Krṣṇācārya’s *Cakrasamvarasādhana* has been published in Sugiki 2000, which also contains a list of parallel passages found in the *CS* and Krṣṇācārya’s *Cakrasamvarasādhana*.
3.2 Textual problems and problems of translation

Gray recovers pāda 3a of chapter 26 (whose folia are missing from the Skt mss of the CS) as 'tam dūṭīṃ sarvasiddhidam' from one of the two paper mss of Jayabhadra’s commentary (p. 265, note 4). He mentions that the text in question is improperly declined, as Bhavabhatta notes in his commentary (tam iti tāḥ, dūṭī dūṭayah, CS-P: 483) (p. 265, note 4), and translates “These messengers bestow all powers” (p. 265). However, the text can be recovered from the two palm-leaf mss of Jayabhadra’s Cakrasamvarapāñjikā and the two palm-leaf mss of the Vajradākatantra as ‘tam dūṭīṃ sarvasiddhidām,’ “that female messenger bestowing all supernatural effects [or accomplishments].” Jayabhadra comments that ‘tam dūṭīṃ sarvasiddhidām’ should be read as tā dūtyah [sarvasiddhidāḥ, TS], which means ‘those female messengers bestow all supernatural effects [or accomplishments].’ Though not optimal, this is at least clearer and more natural than Gray’s tam dūṭīṃ sarvasiddhidam, and is likely to be the older version because the sources are older than those used by Gray. The whole verse 3 may be recovered from the Brahmayāmala, Jayabhadra’s commentary, Kambala’s commentary, the Vajradākatantra, and Bhavabhatta’s commentary as follows: tam dūṭīṃ sarvasiddhidām darsanāt sparsānāt tathaḥ cumbanāvagāhanān nityam (metrically bad) yogapīṭhe viśeṣataḥ.[19]

---

[17] Pandey’s reconstruction of the verse in question is ‘tam dūṭī tu sattvārthasiddham,’ which except for ‘tu’ is based on the text quoted in Bhavabhatta’s commentary.


As for verse 2ab of chapter 27, whose folia are also lost, Gray favors the reading given in one of the two paper mss of Jayabhadra's commentary and reconstructs 'grāme grāme vṛajanti ca dūtayo (rūpalakṣaṇam, TS),' translated as “The messengers travel from town to town. [As for their] physical characteristic[s], …” (p. 271, n. 4). Pandey, on the other hand, recovers this verse as ‘grāme grāme vṛajanti ca dūtayo rūpalakṣaṇam.’ Indeed, one of the two palm-leaf mss of Jayabhadra’s Cakrasaṃvaraṇaṅkī20 supports Gray’s reconstruction. However, Pandey’s reconstruction is better than Gray’s because it is confirmed by older sources. It is fully confirmed by the other palm-leaf ms of Jayabhadra’s Cakrasaṃvaraṇaṅkī, the palm-leaf ms of the Abhidhānottaratantra, and Bhavabhāṭṭa’s Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti.21 The corresponding verse in the Skt ms of the Brahmyāmala reads grāme grāme vratam tasya devatārūpalakṣaṇam,22 which is closer to Pandey’s reconstruction than to Gray’s grāme grāme vṛajanti ca. The text Pandey reconstructed means: ‘He (= the practitioner) travels (vṛajanti tasya: vṛajanti is vṛājan) from village to village. [In these villages, the] female messengers [show their] physical characteristic[s to him].’ In this context, the one who travels is not a messenger but a practitioner. The comments on this verse by Jayabhadra, Kambala, and Bhavabhāṭṭa also support this interpretation.

Gray translates pāda 6a of chapter 41, whose folia are also lost, as “[They are:] in Kulutā (better: Kulatā, TS)23 and [Maru], …’.24

---

20 Jayabhadra’s Cakrasaṃvarapaṇjīkā, Skt ed 27.1 and the footnote there.
23 ‘Kulatā’ is more common in Buddhist Cakrasaṃvara scriptures than Gray’s ‘Kulutā.’ See also Bhavabhāṭṭa’s comment on this pāda, kulaṭāyāṃ iverādīna (CS-P, 547).
24 Pandey’s reconstruction of this text is as follows: kulaṭāyāṃ vivikte ca. However, vivikte is not attested in any surviving Sanskrit sources that are closely related to this pāda.
He put ‘Maru’ in brackets because “the Sanskrit text here is not preserved, and the Tibetan translations list the variant mgon pa (PM 239a, SL 130b), which is unattested elsewhere.” (p. 330, n. 10).\footnote{Gray goes on to state that “several verses down, however, marudeṣe is attested by Bhavabhata (CS-P, 548).” However, this ‘marudeṣe’ is a quotation not from the passage in question but from another passage of the CS (41.10b).} However, for the word in question, we find ‘araṇya’ in Jayabhadrā’s commentary, which is very likely derived from the word ‘araṇyese’ that appears in a parallel passage found in the Śaiva Tantrasadbhāva.\footnote{Jayabhadrā’s Cakrasamvarapañjikā, Skt ed, 41.2 (aranyam marubhūmiḥ). The Tantrasadbhāva, Skt ed, Sanderson 1995: 100, n. 20 (kulūtāyām aranyeṣe).} The passage that includes pāda 6a provides the archaic list of Cakrasamvara holy sites that is derived from a corresponding Śaiva list, such as the one found in the Tantrasadbhāva. We may thus recover pāda 6a from the Tantrasadbhāva and from Jayabhadrā’s commentary as ‘kulatāyām aranye ca,’ and the translation should be ‘[They are:] in Kulatā, Aranya, …’

Gray translates verse 10ab of the same chapter as “The six yoginīs are in Kulutā (better: Kulatā, TS), and the six mothers are in the land of Maru” (p. 331–332). He appears to have followed Pandey’s reconstruction ‘ṣaḍ yogīnyah kulatāyām marudeṣe saḍ mātarāḥ.’ However, the last pāda must be ‘marudeṣe ca mātarāḥ,’ (not saḍ but ca,) which can be recovered from the palm-leaf mss of the Tantrasadbhāva (araṇyese ca mātarah), Jayabhadrā’s commentary (mātarah [: no saḍ]), Kambala’s commentary (marudeṣe ca mātarah), the Vajradākatantra (marudeṣe ca yā mātarāḥ), and Bhavabhata’s commentary (mātarah iti [: no saḍ]).\footnote{The Tantrasadbhāva, Sanderson 1995: 100, n. 20. Jayabhadrā’s Cakrasamvarapañjikā, Skt ed, 41.3. Kambala’s Herukasādhananidhi, my unpublished Skt ed (: Skt ms, 70a4). The Vajradākatantra, Skt ed, 18.4. Bhavabhata’s Cakrasamvaravivṛti, Skt ms, 127a4 (: Skt ed, 488).} The Tibetan translations of the CS (mya ngam yul na ma mo rnams) also support this reconstruction, and no old sources support Pandey’s and Gray’s ‘marudeṣe “śaḍ” mātarāḥ.’ The translation should therefore be corrected to: ‘the mothers are in the land of Maru.’ It is
very likely that Gray, as well as Pandey, misread Bhavabhāṭṭa’s ‘ṣaḍ yoginya ityādi / … vajravārāhyāmīnīyādayaḥ saṭ / mātarā iti saptamāṭīṛrūpāḥ marudeṣe’ /’ (Skt ms, 127a2–a4).28 But the word saṭ in this passage is not the number modifying mātarāḥ; it refers to ṣaḍ yoginīḥ, i.e., the six yoginīs beginning with Vajravārāhi and Yāmīnī.29

There are also cases where Gray creates unnatural translations, some of which appear to have been caused by unnecessary or incorrect emendations of manuscript readings. Some examples follow. The Vadodara ms of the CS 4a5 (: Skt ed, 3.17ab) reads sarvā kīṅkarī tasya sādhakasya na saṃśayah,30 ‘all [the dākinīs] are female servant[s] of that adept; no doubt.’ Gray translates: “There is no doubt regarding anything done by that adept.” (p. 175.) He does not explain how he emended the Sanskrit text.

A further example is CS 4b1–b2, where the Skt ms reads:

esa yogavarah śreṣṭhah sarvayogesu cottamaḥ / yah kāṅkṣisyate kaścit sa devāsuraṃānuṣān / abhīhūya gamisyaty atra maṇḍale yo bhiṣiktah / sarvatantroktasādhakah 31

‘This is the supreme yoga, the most excellent, and it is the highest among all yogas. Anyone who wishes [this supreme yoga] will go, conquering gods, titans, and men. [The one] who was initiated in this maṇḍala is the adept of what is taught in all tantras.’

Gray translates: “This yoga is the most excellent, the highest among all yogas, which can kill anyone, gods, titans or men. The adept who has been taught all tantras, and who has been initiated in the

28 Pandey’s edition of this line reads ṣaḍ yoginya ityādi / … vajravārāhi yāmīnīyādayaḥ saṭ mātarā iti / saptamāṭīṛrūpāḥ marudeṣe / (CS-P, 548).
29 See also Jayabhadrā’s comment on ṣaḍ yoginīḥ and mātarāḥ: saṭ yo-ginyo vajravāhyādīcanḍikāntāḥ // mātarāḥ kākāśīyāyāḥ // [Skt ed, 41.3]
30 Pandey’s edition reads sarvā kīṅkarīḥ tasya sādhakasya na saṃśayāḥ.
31 For yah kāṅkṣisyate kaścit, which is supported by Bhavabhāṭṭa’s commentary, Kambala’s commentary reads yah kāṅkṣisyatīnīyaṁ (Sktms, 11b6–b7). For atra maṇḍale yo ‘bhiṣiktah sarvatantroktasādhakah, Kambala’s commentary reads atra maṇḍalaḥ bhiṣiktah sarvatantroktasādhanaḥ (Skt ms, 11b7). These variant readings are also acceptable.
mandala, will go forth, conquering.” (p. 176.) Again, he does not adduce his version of the text.

The Skt ms of CS 4b7–5a1 reads tato jñātvā bhāvayen nityāṃ siddhis tathāgatavaco yathā, “therefore, should he know and always visualize [the mandala], [there will be] accomplishment (or supernatural effect), as taught by the Tathāgata.” Gray translates, again without adducing the text: “Knowing thus, one should always meditate on the powers taught by the Tathāgata.” (p. 180.)

The Skt ms of the CS 26a3–a4 (: Skt ed, 34.7) reads esate cakrodbhāsam kuryād yathākramam sarvasiddhiḥ>prasādha-kah,32 ‘he seeks the radiance of the wheel. Should he practice [this wheel] in due succession, [he] accomplishes all supernatural effects (or accomplishments).’ Gray reads esate cakrodbhāsam as esa te cakrodbhāsam and emends to esa tricakrodbhāsam by misreading Bhavabhāṭṭa’s comment on the word esate33 and by favoring the reading of one of the paper mss of Jayabhadra’s commentary, which is not attested in other materials; he then translates as “He should successively make the Three Wheels radiant. This is the accomplishment of all powers.” (p. 311 and n. 15 on that page.)

4 Origin myths of Heruka and his mandala

Heruka is the highest deity of the Cakrasamvara tradition. Hence, researching the origin myths of Heruka and his mandala has been a main concern of scholars studying this tradition. Gray unpacks the history of Indian versions of this myth mainly on the basis of the Sarvabuddhasamāyogatantra, the Sarvatathāgataatattvasamgraha, and Indrabhūti’s commentary on the CS.

32 For cakrodbhāsam, Kambala reads cakranirdiṣṭam. For the whole line, Bhavabhāṭṭa reads esate cakranirdiṣṭam sarvasiddhipradāyakam. (CS-P, 528. I corrected Pandey’s esa te into esate.) Pandey’s edition reads esa te cakranirdiṣṭam sarvasiddhiprasādhakam / cakrodbhāsam tathā kuryād yathākarmānurūpatah //

33 Following Pandey’s edition (CS-P, 528), he reads Bhavabhāṭṭa’s esate mṛgayate, an explanation of the meaning of the word esate, as esa te mṛgayate, which makes less sense.
According to Gray, the myth in the Sarvabuddhasamāyogatantra described the birth of Heruka as a generation through yogic heat via controlled breathing. Heruka burns the triple world and Hindu deities such as Rudra, Mahādeva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, etc., reduces them to ashes, and restores or reanimates them. Although these Hindu deities are roasted in Heruka’s process of cosmic cleansing, this does not mean that they are vilified. They are rather portrayed as victims of a cosmic disorder in which Māras (the traditional Buddhist villains) are active and which is the result of the inevitable process of karmic conditioning. However, the version of the myth that eventually came to predominate portrays Śaiva deities as the perpetrators of cosmic disorder. The myth in the Sarvatathā-gatattattvasamgraha (which is a story of Vajrapāni’s subjugation of Mahādeva and Mahādeva’s conversion to Buddhism) and the myth found in Indrabhūti’s commentary on the CS are examples of this version. The myth in Indrabhūti’s commentary is especially important because many Tibetan versions of Heruka’s origin myth contain the story of the origin of the Cakrasamvara Heruka maṇḍala, and Indrabhūti’s commentary on the CS is the only known Indian text that presents a complete version of the myth. It is a likely source of the Tibetan versions.

Gray provides a translation of the whole text of the myth as it is introduced in Indrabhūti’s work and analyzes its content, using the Tibetan versions in support for his analysis. He then argues that the myth represents the adoption of non-Buddhist elements and that these elements are at the same time subordinated within a Buddhist cosmic hierarchy. The myth is therefore clearly a reaction to Hindu tripurāntaka myths.

Gray’s portrayal of the history of Heruka myths is acceptable, and it is beneficial to those who are interested in this topic. His discovery that the myth in question occurs in Indrabhūti’s work is no doubt a great contribution to the study of the Cakrasamvara tradition; I myself had completely overlooked it. However, he would have been able to paint a fuller picture by also considering the version of this myth that is found in Nāropāda’s ’Khor lo bde mchog
gi rnam par 'phrul pa (*Cakrasaṃvara-viśvakarman)*;[34] Nāropāda’s version is as likely a source of the Tibetan representations of this myth as Indrabhūti’s. Although some descriptions differ in the two versions, Gray’s analysis of Indrabhūti’s version can also be applied to Nāropā’s: both versions represent the adoption of non-Buddhist elements and subordination of these elements within a Buddhist cosmic hierarchy. However, Nāropāda’s version should also be considered because its explanations of the origination of the Heruka *mandala* and of the subjugation of non-Buddhist deities are more detailed than those given in Indrabhūti’s version. In comparison to the latter, Nāropāda’s version lends itself more naturally to the interpretation that the myth represents the adoption of non-Buddhist elements, and their subordination within Buddhist cosmic hierarchy, and need not be complemented with information taken from Tibetan versions.

Let us examine the contents of Nāropāda’s version briefly. [35] The beginning scene of the myth in Nāropāda’s version can be summarized as follows:

During the era of Kali, (1) a deity from the Thirty-three Heaven, (2) Gandharva, (3) the chief Yakṣa and (4) his attendant (*g’yog*), (5) the chief Rākṣasa and (6) his attendant, (7) the chief Nāga and (8) his attendant, and (9) the chief Asura and (10) his attendant, transforming themselves into twenty-four Bhairavas or ‘awful deities’ (*drag po*), each took a consort; they then captured twenty-four sites located on the Jambū continent: (1’) four sites classified as *pīṭha*, (2’) four sites classified as *upapīṭha*, (3’) two sites classified as *kṣetra*, (4’) two sites classified as *upakṣetra*, (5’) two sites classified as *chandoha*, (6’) two sites classified as *upachandoha*, (7’) two sites classified as *melāpaka*, (8’) two sites classified as *upamelāpaka*, (9’) two sites classified as *śmaśāna*, and (10’) two sites classified as *upaśmaśāna*, respectively. The four-bodied, four-natured, and four-faced Mahādeva, who resides on the summit of Mt. Meru with his four goddesses and his four secret goddesses, became the lord of these Bhairavas at their request. They

---

[34] This work is preserved in the Peking edition of Tibetan Tripitaka, Otani University catalogue 4628.

terrorized the people living on the Jambū continent and brought this world to a state of degeneration.

The cosmic disorder was primarily a result of the inevitable process of karmic conditioning (i.e., the arrival of the Kali era). In this era of cosmic disorder, Śaiva divinities in Bhairava forms changed the Jambū continent – with the twenty-four sites in its center – into a Śaiva mandala, took control of it, and caused it to be in an unwholesome situation. The myth subsequently explains how the Heruka mandala originated and how Śaiva divinities were subjugated through enjoyment (longs spyod pa), dissolution (thim pa), and control (dbang du byas pa), which are only briefly mentioned in Indrabhūti’s version:

Unhappy about this unwholesome situation, the Samyaksambuddha came down from the Akaniṣṭha Heaven to the summit of Mt. Meru in order to subjugate these awful divinities. The Samyaksambuddha manifested himself as an experiential-body divinity (longs sku) with one face, two arms, a white complexion, and the nature of Vajradhara, and he took Samantabhadrī (kun tu bzang mo) as his consort. He then transformed himself into the divinity named Heruka, who had a dark complexion, four faces, and twelve arms, and who took Vajravārāhī as his consort. Subsequently, Heruka and Vajravārāhī created twenty-four pairs of male and female heroic divinities who came to be those of the triple wheels (i.e., the origination of the Cakrasaṃvara Heruka mandala). Each stage in the entire process of the manifestation of the Heruka mandala as described above reflected a particular characteristic of each of the five Tathāgatas (i.e., Vairocana, Amitābha, Ratnasambhava, Amoghasiddhi, and Akṣobhya). These Buddhist divinities conquered Mahādeva and his retainers, and, subjugating them, (1) made them objects of enjoyment through sexual assemblage and by making ornaments of their bones (= enjoyment), (2) effected the disintegration and incorporation of their consciousnesses (= dissolution), and (3) took control over their bodies, words, and minds (= control). In these steps of the process, the male and female Śaiva divinities were subjugated along the paths of anger and sexual passion respectively. Assimilating the essence of the Śaiva

---

36 The text does not expound the particular characteristic of each of the five Tathāgatas. They commonly symbolize the five kinds of gnosis and the five aggregates.
divinities by the incorporation of their consciousnesses and the orna-
mentation of their bones, the Buddhist divinities then took over the
twenty-four sites on the Jambū continent. Heruka then created four
female divinities as gate-keepers, and created four other female di-
vinities in addition (i.e., the eight dākinīs of the samayacakra portion
of the Cakrasamvara Heruka mandala). These eight female divini-
ties conquered and subjugated Kinnaras of both sexes found at sites
located in eight directions surrounding the above twenty-four sites
formerly controlled by the Śaiva divinities.

Although the twenty-four pairs of Buddhist divinities established
themselves at the twenty-four sites, they had not yet attained Buddhist
enlightenment. Hence, they ascended Mt. Meru. Asked by them to
give instructions on Buddhist truth, and receiving their various o-
fferings and hymns, the Samyaksambuddha at the summit of Mt. Meru
produced the various tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition.

As described in this myth, the summit of Mt. Meru and the Jambū
continent were taken over by Buddhist divinities, and the good
Buddhist dharma (i.e., tantras of the Cakrasamvara tradition)
was brought to this world. The Samyaksambuddha’s act of cos-
mic cleansing was completed. It should be noted that the Buddhist
divinities did not sweep away the Śaiva elements in this process,
but instead assimilated the Śaiva essence into their cosmos. This
is demonstrated by Buddhist divinities’ taking over of the Śaiva
mandala consisting of Mt. Meru and the twenty-four sites, which
resulted in its change into Buddhist Heruka mandala, and by the
enjoyment, dissolution, and control process, through which the
bodies, words, and minds of the Śaiva divinities became constitu-
ents of their Buddhist counterparts. These processes therefore rep-
resent the adoption of non-Buddhist elements and their subordina-
tion within a Buddhist cosmic hierarchy.

5 The structure and functions of the Triple Wheel *mandala*

Tantras belonging to the Cakrasamvara tradition describe many
varieties of *mandalas*. Among them, the most popular and widely
used for practice is the Heruka *mandala* consisting of five con-
centric wheels, i.e., the Great Bliss Wheel (mahāsukhacakra),37 the Mind Wheel (cittacakra), the Speech wheel (vākcakra), the Body Wheel (kāyacakra), and the Pledge Wheel (samayacakra). The Great Bliss Wheel, on which Heruka, his consort Vajravārāhī, four dākinīs, and four skull-bowls are depicted, is located at the center of this mandala.38 The Great Bliss Wheel is surrounded by three concentric wheels, the Mind, Speech, and Body Wheels. These three are collectively called ‘the Triple Wheel’ (tricakra), and twenty-four holy sites and twenty-four coupled deities (i.e., twenty-four pairs of dākinī and vīra) assigned to these holy sites are depicted on them (i.e., eight holy sites with eight couples on each wheel × 3 = twenty-four holy sites with twenty-four couples.) They are surrounded by the Pledge Wheel, on which eight dākinīs reside.39 This Heruka maṇḍala can be roughly described as having two forms, external and internal, and the deities and holy sites that constitute this mandala symbolize traditional Mahāyānic or Indian concepts such as the triple world (sky, earth, underground), the three bodies of the Buddha (trikāya), the five elements (pañcabhūta), the ten spiritual levels (daśabhūmi), the ten perfections (daśapāramitā), the ten kinds of gnosis (daśajñāna), the eight vows (āṣṭasamaya), the thirty-seven conditions that contribute to awakening (sapta-trimśad-bodhipākṣikadharma), and so forth.40 The CS per se does not introduce the fully developed form of the Heruka mandala, but explains its prototypical form,41 as Gray duly notes (p. 55, 58).

37 Gray names this circle ‘gnosis wheel’ (jñānacakra) (p. 55), but it is more commonly called ‘great bliss wheel’ (mahāsukhacakra) in the Buddhist Cakrasamvara tradition.

38 Heruka and Vajravārāhī are situated at the center of the Great Bliss Wheel. They are surrounded by four dākinīs (i.e., Dākini, Lāmā, Khaṇḍaroṇa, and Rūpinī) and four skull bowls in the cardinal directions and quarters, respectively. The four skull bowls are not explicitly mentioned in the CS.

39 The four gate-keeper dākinīs Kākāsīyā, Ulūkāsīyā, Śvānāsīyā, and Śūkarāsīyā reside in the four directions and four other dākinīs, Yamadādhi (Yamadādhi is more common than Gray’s Yamadāhī, p. 55 n. 169), Yamadūti, Yamadāṃṣrini, and Yamamathani, are in the four quarters.

40 For details of the structure and symbolism of this Heruka mandala, see also Sugiki 2003b, 2007, and 2009.

41 For details of the prototypical form of the Heruka mandala in the CS,
After describing the structure of the Heruka *maṇḍala* as above, Gray focuses his analysis on the structure and function of the Triple-wheel part of the Heruka *maṇḍala* and its doctrinal contexts. Since the CS does not explain every detail in full, Gray further relies on other sources, in particular on the *Abhidhānottaratantra*, the *Yoginīśamcāratantra*, the *Samvarodayatantra*, Umāpatideva’s *Vajravrāhīṭsādhana*, Lüyipāda’s *Bhagavadabhisamaya* (= *Cakrasamvarābhisamaya*), Atiśa’s *Abhisamayavibhaṅga*, Abhayākaragupta’s *Āmnāyamaṇḍaratī*, and Bu-ston’s *bDe mchog nyung ngu rgyud kyi spyi rnam don gsal*.

I will now examine Gray’s portrayal of the Triple Wheel, i.e., the twenty-four *Cakrasamvara* holy sites beginning with Pulirimalaya and ending with Kulatā, and the coupled deities assigned to the twenty-four sites. The examination will focus on two points: (1) the mapping of the twenty-four *Cakrasamvara* holy sites and (2) the development of systems of the twenty-four internal holy sites.

### 5.1 The mapping of the twenty-four holy sites

Gray explains the geographical locations of the twenty-four *Cakrasamvara* holy sites on the Indian continent on the basis of Bu-ston’s *bDe mchog nyung ngu rgyud kyi spyi rnam don gsal* (notes on pp. 329–333), and their remapping over Kathmandu Valley and Tibetan and Mongolian areas on the basis of Abhayākaragupta’s *Āmnāyamaṇḍaratī* and some earlier studies on the topic (pp. 70–71). The twenty-four *Cakrasamvara* sites, which originally referred to the twenty-four sites on the Indian subcontinent, were remapped over areas outside India – such as Kathmandu Valley, Tibet, and Mongolia – during the process of transmission of the *Cakrasamvara* tradition from India to those outside areas. This interpretive flexibility was an essential factor in the transformation that the tradition had to undergo as it crossed regional boundaries. Abhayākaragupta’s definition of the nature of the *Cakrasamvara* holy sites – any sites, including Tibet and China, where living hu-
man female dākinīs resided could be regarded as Cakrasamvara holy sites – functioned to legitimate their remapping.

Gray’s account manages to capture an important aspect of the expansion of the Cakrasamvara tradition, but it deserves to be supplemented by a consideration of how Indian texts of the Cakrasamvara tradition prior to Abhayākaragupta discuss the mapping of the Cakrasamvara holy sites in India.\(^{42}\) While the instructions given in most of these texts are fragmentary, Nāropāda’s *Yul nyi bcu bshi’i rgyu mtshan bstan pa*\(^{43}\) gives detailed instructions and is very likely the most important Indian source for Tibetan versions like Bu-ston’s *bDe mchog nyung ngu rgyud kyi spyi rnam don gsal*, which Gray used.

Nāropāda identifies geographical locations of sites that are given unnatural or obscure names by the Cakrasamvara scriptures: Himālaya is Mt. Kailāsa, Pretapurī (also called Pretādhivāsinī) refers to the valleys located on the border between India and Tibet, Grhadevatā (which, as Sanderson argued, was originally a name of the deity of the site Saurāṣṭra in the Śaiva Tantrasadbhāva) is Li yul, which may refer to Khotan. Suvarṇadvīpa is located on the coast of west India,\(^{44}\) but some say that it is in east China, and Nagara refers to Lāṅkāpura, the land of rākṣasa, but some say that it is an area around a monastery standing on the border of Kaśmīra and northwest India.

However, other Indian sources give different information on the geographical locations and features of the Cakrasamvara sites, which indicates that there were different maps of them. For example, Arbuda has been identified with Mt. Abu in modern Rajasthan since it was mentioned in the Mahābhārata, but it is identified with Takṣaśilā by Nāropāda. There are three different descriptions of the geographical location of Nagara according to

\(^{42}\) For details of the following analyses, see Sugiki 2006, 2007, and 2009.

\(^{43}\) This text is preserved in Peking edition of Tibetan Tripitaka, Otani University catalogue 4628 (the same catalogue number as Nāropāda’s *Khor lo bde mchog gi rnam par ’phrul pa* mentioned above).

\(^{44}\) Generally, Suvarṇadvīpa refers to the island in the ocean off the south tip of India, often Sri Lanka.
Nāropāda as mentioned in the previous paragraph; but according to the Yoginījālatantra (and the two commentaries on the Hevajra-tantra by Kāñhapāda and Ratnākaraśānti), Nagarā refers to Pāṭaliputra (east India). Finally, Nāropāda describes many of the twenty-four sites as sites whose center is formed by sacral stones such as stone līṅgas of various shapes and stone dharmodayas. (The stone līṅgas conform in shape to the body parts which the Cakrasamvara scriptures equate with external holy sites.) These stone līṅgas and dharmodayas are very likely to be a Buddhist recasting of Śaiva śivalīṅgas and yonis. But many other authors, including Abhayākara-ragūpta, regard goddesses or living human dākinīs as sacral centers of the holy sites.

While the Indian compilers of texts belonging to the Cakrasaṃvara tradition attempted to pinpoint a specific geographical location and to define a specific feature for each individual site, they did not always reach a consensus. It is therefore likely that the locations and features of these sites were flexible rather than fixed. This suggests that the list of names of the twenty-four Cakrasamvara holy sites in India was rather idealized, serving as a symbolic framework along which individual sites were arranged, to a certain extent, according to the respective compiler’s preference. This is also supported by other facts. First, as Sanderson pointed out, the list of twenty-four Cakrasamvara sites was produced in the process of the Buddhist redaction of the Śaiva list of holy sites. Second, although the CS provides a list of the sites in question, it does not per se give any clear descriptions of their actual geographical locations, or, for that matter, of the practice of actual pilgrimage to them. In terms of practice the CS rather focuses on the visualization or contemplation of the holy sites in the form of a mandala. Only later scriptures, such as Nāropāda’s work, consider them in terms of geographical locations.

Attention should also be paid to the change of descriptions from the CS to the Saṃvarodayatantra with regard to the travel of the Cakrasamvara practitioner. In the CS, the places where the practitioner travels in search for dākinīs are described as ‘villages’
(grāma), and these are not yet defined as the twenty-four Cakrasamvara sites. The Saṃvarodayatantra, on the other hand, defines these locations to be the twenty-four sites. This change of description could result from an attempt to interpret these holy sites as a symbolic framework, mapped to sets of villages or towns in areas that were actually controlled by Cakrasamvara Buddhists, or at least accessible to them. Gray argues that Indian Cakrasamvara Buddhists emphasized the internal practice of the twenty-four sites (i.e., meditational practice of the body mandala, in which all the sites are visualized in one’s body), and that this may have reflected the political reality that Buddhists did not have control over many, or any, of them (pp. 68–70). But his explanation covers only half of the history of the theology of these holy sites because it ignores that Indian Cakrasamvara Buddhists eagerly attempted to map them to the human body and to map and remap them over the Indian continent already before Abhayākaragupta.

Interpretive flexibility regarding the mapping of the twenty-four Cakrasamvara holy sites was already, and often, the hermeneutic stance of Indian Cakrasamvara Buddhists prior to Abhayākaragupta; it is not exclusively linked to the tradition’s subsequent transmission to areas such as Kathmandu Valley, Tibet, and Mongolia. Abhayākaragupta’s statement that any sites where living dākinīs reside can be regarded as Cakrasamvara holy sites should be understood in this hermeneutic context of Indian Cakrasamvara Buddhism, as well as in the context of the tradition’s transmission from India to its outlying areas. Finally, I would like to make a small suggestion concerning Abhayākaragupta’s mention of Tibet and China. Gray states that “the mention of Tibet and China is surely not accidental, as these were major destinations for its (= the Cakrasamvara tradition’s, TS) transmission, of which erudite Indian Buddhists such as Abhayākaragupta were certainly aware (p. 70).” This may be correct, but it is also possible that Abhayākaragupta merely followed Nārapāda, who had mentioned Tibetan

---

45 See again the passage grāme grāme vrajan tasya dūtayas rūpalakṣaṇam discussed in section 3.2 of this paper.

46 The Saṃvarodayatantra, 9.
and Chinese Cakrasamvara sites in his Yul nyi buṣi'i rgyu mtshan bstan pa, and the Vajraḍākatantra, which, together with the Dākārṇavatāntra, defined Bhoṭa (i.e., Tibet) as one of the Cakrasamvara holy sites.

5.2 The development of systems of twenty-four internal holy sites

The twenty-four Cakrasamvara holy sites have both external and internal forms. In the internal practice of the twenty-four holy sites, these sites are visualized at various places in the practitioner’s own body. The collective body of these twenty-four holy sites is nothing other than the highest deity, Heruka. Hence, the practitioner, through the visualization of the internal holy sites, experiences an identification with Heruka as his or her innate Buddha nature.

As Gray mentions, the meditational practices of internal holy sites are often seen as the highest form of practices centered on holy sites in the Cakrasamvara tradition (pp. 68–70). The Cakrasamvara Buddhists were very eager to develop a system of internal holy sites and created many varieties of such a system. However, Gray’s portrayal of the system of internal Cakrasamvara holy sites covers only half of the tradition (which may well have been his intention).

As I argued in 2003, a more comprehensive view suggests that the theories regarding the internal Heruka mandala comprised of the twenty-four sites developed in two stages, with Gray’s portrayal being limited to the first: (1) the stage of the internalization of the twenty-four holy sites (i.e., the Triple Wheel), which symbolize the daśabhūmi and daśapāramitā, and (2) the stage of the internalization of the entire Heruka mandala including the twenty-four holy sites (i.e., the Great Bliss, Triple, and Pledge Wheels), which symbolizes the saptatrimśadbdhīpāksikadharma as well as the daśabhūmi and daśapāramitā.\[48\]

\[47\] Sugiki 2003b; see also Sugiki 2007.

\[48\] Note that in some texts, the trikāya, the daśaṁāna, the tryodaśabhūmi, and some other concepts traditionally taught in Mahāyāna Buddhism are internalized along with the daśabhūmi, daśapāramitā, and saptatrimśadbodhipāksikadharma.
The Cakrasaṃvara literature describes a variety of forms of the internal Heruka maṇḍala. They can be classified into five types. The first type appears in the last half of chapter 50 of the CS. The second type is introduced in the Abhidhānottarottaratana, the Vajradākatantra, the Samvarodayatantra, the Sampūtodbhava-
tantra, Lūyīpāda’s Cakrasamvarābhisaṃaya, Jayabhadra’s Cakra-
samvarasādhana, and so forth. The third type can likewise be found in the Abhidhānottaratana, as well as in Dhīmat’s Cakra-
samvarodayamanḍalopāyiṇī and Kumārakalahaṃsapāda’s Sam-
vararahasyanāmasādhana. The fourth type appears in Atiśa’s Abhisamayavibhaṅga, Prajñāraksita’s Abhisamayapaṇḍijīka, Tathā-
gatavajra’s Abhisamayavṛtti, Abhayākaragupta’s Cakrasaṃvarā-
bhisaṃaya, and Śubhākaragupta’s Abhisamayamaṇjarī, which,
except for the last two, are commentaries on Lūyīpāda’s Cakra-
samvarābhisaṃaya. The internal Heruka maṇḍala given in the
Yoginīśamcāratantra can also be considered as of this fourth type.
The fifth type is described in Dārikapāda’s Cakrasaṃvarasādhana,
Ghanāpāda’s Cakrasaṃvarasādhana and Kāyamanḍalābhisaṃaya,
Kṛṣṇācāya’s Cakrasaṃvarasādhana and Vasantarūpā, and in the
Jñānodayatantra. The versions of the first and second types of the
internal Heruka maṇḍala emerged in the first stage of development,
whereas the third, fourth, and fifth types developed in the second.

Let us see the five types of the internal Heruka maṇḍala in de-
tail. The following elements constitute instructions of this maṇḍala:

(i) Basic philosophy:
A somatic philosophy that enlightenment can be obtained
through one’s own body: one’s body is a means for attaining
enlightenment.

(i) Internalized objects:
(i-1) Twenty-four holy sites and twenty-four coupled deities
(i.e., the Triple wheel), which are equivalent to the daśabhūmi
and the daśapāramitā.
(i-2) Thirty-seven coupled and single deities (i.e., the whole
maṇḍala including the Triple wheel), which are equivalent
to the saptatriṃśadbhūtābhisaṃaya as well as the daśa-
bhūmi and the daśapāramitā.

(ii) Body counterparts:

(ii-1) The channels (nāḍī) together with their corresponding body ingredients (dhātu), and body sites (sthāna etc.) where the channels are seated.

(ii-2) Heruka’s supernatural form: Heruka’s four faces and the objects in Heruka’s twelve hands, and the external Vārāhī.

(ii-3) The four principal circles (cakra): the mahāsukhacakra in the head, the saṃbhogacakra in the throat, the dharma-cakra in the heart, and the nirmāṇacakra in the abdomen; and the eight gates of the body (i.e., the eight orifices: right and left ears, right and left eyes, right and left nostrils, mouth, and anus).

(iii) Methods for actual practice (i.e., meditation):

Meditational process for visualization of the internal Heruka maṇḍala.

All five types of the internal Heruka maṇḍala share the somatic philosophy (the factor (0) above) which legitimizes the internal practice of the Heruka maṇḍala. But the five types are distinguished from each other by the elements (i), (ii) and (iii) as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First type</td>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>(unclear)</td>
<td>(unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second type</td>
<td>(i-1)</td>
<td>(ii-1)</td>
<td>Described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third type</td>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>(ii-1) and (ii-2)</td>
<td>Described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth type</td>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>(ii-1) and (ii-3)</td>
<td>Described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth type</td>
<td>(i-2)</td>
<td>(ii-1)</td>
<td>Described</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first and second types internalize the twenty-four holy sites and the twenty-four coupled deities (i-1) and therefore can be said to aim at the somatic application of the somatic philosophy focuss-
ing on the daśabhūmi and daśapāramitā. Unlike the second type the first type gives no explanation for (ii) and (iii) even though it argues that the twenty-four holy sites should be practiced internally. Put in another way, the system of the first type remains idealized. This idealized system, however, functions as a foundation for the second type. The systems of the third, fourth, and fifth types are in turn based on the second type with regard to the Triple-wheel part of the mandala. For this reason, the idealized system of the first type can be defined as the prototypical form of the internal Heruka maṇḍala. The second type attaches the elements (ii-1) and (iii) to this prototype; in the second type channels, body ingredients, and body sites are equated with the twenty-four dākinīs, the twenty-four vīras, and the twenty-four sites on the Triple Wheel, respectively.

The third, fourth and fifth types internalize the element (i-2). Their aim can be described as the somatic application of the somatic philosophy focussing on the saptatrimśadbdhipāksikadharma along with the daśabhūmi and daśapāramitā. This shift from (i-1) to (i-2) seems to have some relation to the development of an external five-wheeled Heruka maṇḍala in the scriptures of the Cakrasaṃvara tradition composed after the CS.

The third type applies the concept of (ii-1) for the internalization of the Triple Wheel, and applies (ii-2) for the internalization of the Great Bliss Wheel and the Pledge Wheel. The fourth type, on the other hand, introduces the concept of (ii-3) for the internalization of the Great Bliss Wheel and the Pledge Wheel. The fifth type applies the concept of (ii-1) not only for the internalization of the Triple Wheel but also for the internalization of the Great Bliss Wheel and the Pledge Wheel.

As noted above, the historical development of internal forms of the Heruka maṇḍala began in its first stage with the internalization of the twenty-four holy sites/the daśabhūmi and daśapāramitā (i.e., the Triple Wheel). This was followed by the internalization of the whole maṇḍalasaptatrimśadbdhipāksikadharma along with the daśabhūmi and daśapāramitā (i.e., the Great Bliss, the Triple, and the Pledge Wheels).49 The significance of the instruction in the

---

49 However, it should be noted that the arrival of the third, fourth, and
internal Triple-wheel Heruka mandala given in the CS (i.e. the first of the five types), is that it provides the basic conceptual framework for Cakrasamvara systems of practice of the internal Heruka mandala, around which the later and more elaborate types were developed.

Conclusion

Criticizing the work of others is a relatively easy task, whereas producing original studies is difficult. Although Gray’s pioneering study on the CS has some problems, it is nevertheless a significant contribution to the study of Indian Buddhist Yogītantra literature, for the reasons I mentioned in the first part of this article: This is the first full translation of the CS; with its copious annotation, Gray’s study can serve as a guidebook to the commentaries on the CS, and it provides much textual and contextual information on the Indian Cakrasamvara tradition in general. Together with the book under review, Gray’s critical edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan CS, announced as a companion volume, will hopefully further promote the study of Tantric Buddhism.
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Appendix: draft editions of two passages from the Abhidhānottaratantra that explain the subtle body system and psychosomatic meditation based on it

These passages were originally presented in Sugiki 2007 and are reproduced here because this paper may be difficult to access from outside Japan. These are not the only passages that explain the system in question in the Abhidhānottaratantra, but they are sufficient to validate my analysis in section 2.2 above.

Two special conventions are used in the text:

*virajaṃ [→ viramaṃ]: all manuscripts read virajas, but this is likely to be a later emendation or corruption; the reading viramaṃ is more likely to be original.

*ekam [= prathamaṃ]: while the reading outside the brackets (here: ekam) is irregular, or its meaning is obscure, it is nevertheless deemed to be the original reading (and, hence, acceptable in the context of the edited work). However, it should be regarded as equivalent to the term given in brackets.


catuḥsandhyānuṣṭheyam¹ caturānandanandanam² / nābhūrtpadmas tanau madhye³ jihvāmule śiropari // ānandam paramam⁴ caiva *virajaṃ [→ viramaṃ]⁵ sahajam⁶ tathā / catuḥṣāṣṭidalam⁷ *ekam [= prathamaṃ]⁸

¹ catuḥsandhyā-] IASWR; catusandhyā Matsunami 10 and 12.
³ tanau madhye ] IASWR; tanumadhye Matsunami 10. tanumadhye Matsunami 12.
⁴ paramam ] IASWR; paramām Matsunami 10 and 12.
⁵ The third of the Four Blisses (caturānanda) is generally named virama. (The Four Blisses are: ānanda, parama-ānanda, virama-ānanda, and sahaja-ānanda.)
⁶ sahajam ] Matsunami 10 and 12; om. IASWR.
⁷ catuḥṣaṣṭi- ] Matsunami 10 and 12; catusaṣṭi IASWR.
⁸ The intention of this phrase is that the first inner circle connected with ānanda, the first Bliss, is of the shape of a lotus with sixty-four petals. Hence, I
dvitīyam⁹ aṣṭadalam uttamatam // tritīyam¹⁰ sōḍaśadalam caturtham
dvātrimśaddalam¹¹ / vārāhī nābhimūlastham¹² sahajam¹³ herukottamam // *
caturāryasatyatām bhāvyām [→ caturāryasatyatā bhāvyā]¹⁴ sandhyākāleṣu²⁵ *yoginām [→ yoginā]¹⁶ / duhkham nirmāṇacakram tu
samudayo dharmacakrayoḥ // nirodham sambhogacakram¹⁷ mārgam ca-
va mahāsukham / evam sandhyā¹⁸ anuṣṭhānam kṛtam yogasunīṣcitam //

The Abhidhānottaratrantra. Skt mss: IASWR I-100 83b1–b5, Matsunami 10 78a1–5, Matsunami 12 89b3–90a2. This passage is closely
related to Kṛṣṇācārya’s Olicatuṣṭaya or Ālicatuṣṭaya system. There
are two versions of the Olicatuṣṭaya or Ālicatuṣṭaya system: the ver-
sion taught in Kṛṣṇācārya’s Vasantatilaka and the version taught in
the same author’s Olicatuṣṭaya or Ālicatuṣṭaya. The former version
is closely related to instructions of psychosomatic meditation given
in the Sampuṭodbhavatantra and Vajradākatantra, and the latter
version is to the passage edited below. (For details, see Sugiki 1999
and 2007.) A similar passage also appears in Vanaratna’s Rahasa-

note that the word ekam means prathamam or first in this context.

⁹ dvitīyam | IASWR and Matsunami 12; dvitīyam Matsunami 10.
¹⁰ tritīyam | IASWR; tritīya Matsunami 10 and 12.
¹¹ dvātrimśad- | Matsunami 12; dvātrimśa IASWR, dvātrimśa Matsunami 10.
¹² In Sugiki 2007 I emended -sthaṃ to -sthā because it is vārāhī who resides at
the base of the navel region. However, -sthām is acceptable because it is possible
to read this line as: ‘Vārāhī, [who is] the Innate (sahajam), resides at the base of
the navel region. Heruka [, who is also the Innate, resides at] the upper place (i.e.,
the head).’
¹³ sahajam | Matsunami 10 and 12; saha IASWR.
¹⁴ caturāryasatyatā bhāvyā ... yoginā is grammatically better and makes bet-
ter sense in this context. (A Yogin should conceive the nature of the Four Noble
Truths in all the times [i.e., the four sandhi connected with the four inner circles
connected with the Four Blisses].)
¹⁵ -kāleṣu | IASWR and Matsunami 10; kāla Matsunami 12.
¹⁶ See note 14.
¹⁷ sambhogacakram | em.; sambhogikacakram IASWR. sambhogacakre
Matsunami 10 and 12.
¹⁸ sandhyā | IASWR; sandhyām Matsunami 10. sandhyām Matsunami 12. (In
Sugiki 2007 I edited as sandhyām.)
Having burnt the Sugatas residing on the movement from the navel circle to the heart circle. The meaning of this line is:

\[
\text{śda k\text{ḥ} th dh}
\]

This line explains the process of the Jñānaraśmi or Jñānavahanā’s upward movement from the navel circle to the heart circle. The meaning of this line is: ‘Having burnt the Sugatas residing on the samyacakra (i.e., the dharmacakra in the heart), …’ Hence, dagdhvā is better.

From samyacakra to *dagdhā[→ dagdhvā] (inside the brackets) | blurred in IASWR.

What resides on the sambhogacakra (i.e., the cakra in the throat) is the sound OM, which is here referred to with upāyaṃ.

Generally the psychosomatic fire of gnosis is named Jñānavahanā, Jñānāgni, or Jñānaraśmi appears to be acceptable. Both the phrases manthamanthana and manthyamanthana can be found in Buddhist esoteric scriptures, but the latter is better. Generally the psychosomatic fire of gnosis is named Jñānavahanā, Jñānāgni, or Jñānaraśmi appears to be acceptable.

\[
\text{ṃṭa -gatena} | \text{Matsumani 10; gate IASWR and Matsumani 12.}
\]

\[
\text{marmodghāṭana -} | \text{em.; ma (five or six letters blurred) IASWR. mmodghāṭana Matsumani 10. mmodghāṭana Matsumani 12.}
\]

Hence, niṣṛṣṭya is better than niṣṛṣṭya, another possible emendation of niṣṛṣṭya.

\[
\text{ṃṭa} | \text{Matsumani 10 and 12; mṭā LASPWR.}
\]

\[
\text{kanakadhara -} | \text{Matsumani 10 and 12; kanakakalajalena IASWR.}
\]

\[
\text{ṭāndhrena -} | \text{IASWR and Matsumani 12; jārandhara Matsumani 10.}
\]

\[
\text{ṃṭa} | \text{Matsumani 10 and 12; dāghdāṇā IASWR.}
\]

\[
\text{ṃṭa} | \text{Matsumani 10; mandala (or readable as mandale?) Matsumani 10.}
\]
bhavatī[^37] //
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Skt ms(s). Sanskrit manuscript(s).
Skt ed(s). Sanskrit text(s) critically edited.
IASWR. Mss on microfilm copies kept at the [recently defunct] Institute for the Advanced Studies of World Religions, Stony Brook, NY. Catalogue numbers according to: Christopher S. George and Mānabajra Bajrācārya, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts. A Title List of the Microfilm Collection of The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions*. Stony Brook 1975.
NGMPP. Mss on microfilm copies kept at National Archives in Kathmandu. Reel numbers according to Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project.
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