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Abstract A single Sanskrit commentary exists for the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatānta—the Padmāvatī of Mahāsukhavajra—the only palm-leaf witness of which is preserved in a late thirteenth-century manuscript in Kathmandu. The tantra is relatively late, unmentioned outside Nepal (and Tibet), and the only in-depth study to date examines only the first eight of its twenty-five chapters. No study or edition of the Padmāvatī exists. Here we present the first edition and translation of a complete chapter, the sixth paṭala, a section dealing mainly with transgressive sexual practices. Some of the ideas and pragmatic details presented by the author, Mahāsukhavajra, are unique in Vajrayāna literature.
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Introduction

The main topic of this article is Mahāsukhavajra’s commentary on the sixth chapter of the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatānta. To the best of our knowledge, no complete chapter of this commentary has been published so far. We present a critical edition of this text from the only available palm-leaf manuscript (without reference to the paper copies), accompanied by an annotated translation. Having realised that the
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text would be unintelligible without reference to the *tantra*, for the sake of convenience we decided to include that text too, as well as a previous translation. Since we disagree with many readings and interpretations, this can almost be viewed as a completely new translation.

A few words about how we co-authored this article. Samuel Grimes (SG) came to the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford to read for an MPhil in Classical Indian Religions. After the (much lamented) retirement of Prof. Alexis Sanderson, Péter-Dániel Szántó (PDSz) suggested several topics for the thesis. SG chose Mahāsukhavajra’s commentary, the *Padminī*, and we started reading the text together. An edition and translation of the present chapter eventually materialised as SG’s MPhil thesis, but the present article adds much new material and improves on the readings significantly. After having spent a year in Nepal, SG was accepted to read for a PhD at the University of Virginia, eventually hoping to publish the entire commentary with a translation and a more in-depth study. This article is therefore a kind of preview of that work; we therefore decided to keep the introduction as short as possible.

**The *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatāntra***

The first Western scholar to briefly describe the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatāntra* was Alexander Csoma de Körös (1836–1839, p. 368). He did not of course have access to the original Sanskrit, but of the Tibetan translation he says: “This is an excellent *tantra*, and in a good and easy translation.” The first Westerner to have read the Sanskrit text was most likely Brian H. Hodgson. He procured at least three copies of the text, of these he sent two to England; they can still be accessed at the Royal Asiatic Society and the Bodleian Library respectively. The sixteenth chapter of the text based on three manuscripts was published by Louis de la Vallée Poussin (1897). The first partial edition of the text, the first eight chapters out of twenty-five, was undertaken by Christopher S. George in his doctoral thesis (1971). An updated version of this appeared in publication in 1974, a pioneering work, which is still the cornerstone of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa studies. Full translations exist in both German (Gäng 1981) and French (Chazot et al. 2015), which, although very useful, can hardly be described as scholarly renderings. A full critical edition is yet to appear in print. Recently, Wiesiek Mical has produced a draft critical edition of the full text; we occasionally refer to this work with much gratitude to its author for sending an early version. Mical, aided by James Gentry and Andreas Doctor, has also produced a full English translation, which has appeared very recently on the website of the 84,000 Project (DhTC 2016) along with the Sanskrit. Unfortunately, we became aware of this too late to engage with it comprehensively.

The historical aetiology of the text is also a matter for future investigation. Its importance is beyond question: as mentioned by George (1974, p. 9), the work

---

1. Also cf. Amṛtānanda’s documents prepared for Hodgson, which copy freely from the *tantra*, Szántó (2012, I: 194).
2. In actual fact, this is an indirect translation from Newar by Delamotte from a manuscript by Ratna Bāhādūr Vajrācārya (1892–1956), which was transmitted to Dharma Gūruju (1898–1990), a man of peculiar status and reputation in Newar society.
enjoys great popularity in Nepal, where the eponymous deity “is worshipped daily in public and in household shrines of many Newar families.” Testimony to its popularity throughout the ages is the large number of surviving manuscripts. George speculates that “as many as one hundred fifty MSS of this text were copied throughout its history,” but he does not share his reasons for stating this. At any rate, he had access to no less than sixteen witnesses spanning more than six centuries and even so the list is not exhaustive; for example, he missed Rahul Sankrtyayan’s photographs of an old palm-leaf manuscript found in Tibet (Mical’s Gt), the Bodleian manuscript (Hodgson 2), and perhaps as many as a hundred more in Nepal. It would seem that there are no non-Nepalese witnesses of the text, and that there are no traces of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa worship in other places on the Indian Subcontinent. Nor is there any hard textual evidence for the tantra’s existence before the 13th century. George (1974, p. 5) found it likely that this date can be pushed back to about 1100 CE, but with palpable hesitation he settled on the date of the commentary’s (palm-leaf) Ms as the terminus ante quem (1297 CE, see below).

At the same time, he seriously underestimated the antiquity of the Tibetan translation (1974, pp. 11–12). Since he could not identify the translators, Ratnasīrī and Grags pa rgyal mtshan, he preferred to err on the side of caution and said: “Since the Derge edition was printed in the early 18th century, our translation is certainly prior to this date.” The duo was identified by van der Kuijp (2009, p. 29) and the possible dates narrowed down to 1293 or 1305 CE, with a strong preference for the former. This takes us back only four years. While fully aware that absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, these facts lead us to formulate the hypothesis that the text is a comparatively late Nepalese production. However, we hasten to point out that the deity of which Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa is a sort of upgrade, Acala, is indeed very old and commanding a widespread cult as far as Japan, where he is known as Fudō Myō-ō.

The tantra is a careful, thoughtful, and rather original composition, but some of its antecedents are clear. There are many echoes of the Hevajratantra, not to mention that scripture’s teaching on the Four Blisses, which is important for this text. There are also traces of the Catuspīṭhatantra, as pointed out by Szántó (2012, I: 211 and II: 16–18). We identify an incorporation from the Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa just below (ad 6.80–81). A careful study will doubtless identify many more sources inspiring the nameless author (authors?) of the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra. Compared to other items of the genre, this tantra is well organised and relatively clear. Its

3 We are aware that two statues have been identified as ‘Mahācaṇḍarōṣaṇa’ in India proper: one in Cave 10 in Panhale, and one at Ratnagiri (Deshpande 1986, pp. 46–50). As we point out immediately below, the cult of the deity Acala is old and widespread, and therefore these two statues cannot be used as evidence for the existence of the tantra in these two locations.

4 We must disagree with DhTC (2016, I.6), who date the translation to 1209 or 1197 CE. The Tibetan is not the Sa skya patriarch, but the translator from Yar klung. The same paragraph claims that the oldest witness of the tantra is from 1380 CE, but this is an error, as the date is George’s estimate.

5 This suspicion was first voiced to PDSz by Harunaga Isaacson, to whom many thanks. We note that DhTC (2016, I.2–3) came to a similar conclusion.

6 Also cf. DhTC (2016, I.5), citing Harunaga Isaacson’s list of several old tantric scriptures in which Acala figures.
primary charm lies in its outspokenness, but this quality may have hampered its study. As George points out (1974, p. 3), de la Vallée Poussin intended to publish an edition at one point, but this study never appeared. George concludes: “It seems clear that the intellectual climate for the investigation of such texts was much less favorable at his time than it is today.” We hope that we still live in such an intellectually tolerant environment.

The Padmāvatīnāmapañjikā of Mahāsukhavajra

The Padmāvatī, as we shall refer to it henceforth, is the only known commentary of the Candamahāroṣanatāntra in Sanskrit. It was not translated into Tibetan and we have only one, as we shall show below, now fragmentary, palm-leaf manuscript. We are aware of five further copies. Of these, currently we have access to two, which can be shown conclusively to be paper apographs.

The Palm-leaf Manuscript

The first to report the existence of and describe this rare source was Hara Prasad Śaśtri (1915, pp. 92–94), giving fairly copious extracts of the incipit and the explicit, as well as a transcript of the colophon. These extracts were transcribed and translated (we regret to say: inadequately) in Hartzell (2012, pp. 101–104, 161–162). George (1974, p. 6) essentially copied the catalogue’s description and sporadically mentioned the views of the commentator in the notes to his translation. We have the feeling that his study of the commentary was not exhaustive and, somewhat surprisingly, he never mentions the readings of the lemmata in his critical notes, in spite of the fact that this is by far the earliest textual evidence, even if fragmentary. George’s earliest manuscript of the mūla is estimated by him to date from ca. 1380 CE, whereas the date of the Padmāvatī Ms. is 1297 CE (Tuesday, March 19th, as verified by Petech 1984, p. 98).

The manuscript in its present state consists of 33 consecutively numbered folios. A superficial examination would determine that it is complete: there is a beginning, there is an end, and there are no missing folios. But this is not so. It is clear to us that the numeration, which is on the right margin, is secondary, that is to say, not the scribe’s. Folio 12 is definitely out of place and some text was lost between this and the next two leaves. This matter awaits a more thorough investigation. Conclusive evidence is provided by folios 30 and 31. The former contains text commenting on the 15th chapter and the latter begins with the commentary to chapter 19. The conclusion is inevitable: at some point several leaves were lost from the manuscript, and someone re-numerated it. With this in mind, we re-examined the left margin and did indeed discover occasional faint traces of numbers and letter-numerals. Unfortunately, the eraser did a pretty fine job. X-ray fluorescence imaging could no doubt reveal this original set. For now, we must be content with using the secondary numeration in our references. As an aside, we should note that, somewhat curiously, the same process seems to have happened to George’s ms. A (1974, p. 6).
Hara Prasad Śaṭstri calls the script ‘Newári’, whereas George ‘Newárī (Old Bhujimola)’. Given the sad state of Nepalese and East Indian palaeographical studies, we are very hesitant. We note, however, that the scribe uses not the śirorekhā, but the prṣṭhamātrā throughout, and his pa is more reminiscent of a Bengali/Maithili type. We cannot say with certainty that this is not the hand of an East Indian. That said, the manuscript was doubtless produced in Nepal (as the dating uses the Nepālasamvat, and mentions the reign of Anantamalla), but perhaps not necessarily by a Nepalese.

We do not have any conclusive evidence about the existence of other, independent copies of the Padmāvatī. SG was told that an exemplar is kept in a private collection in Nepal, but was not allowed to see it. We suspect that this is an apograph of the palm-leaf manuscript, because the owner mentioned the same date, 1297 ce. The two other mss. we have access to are from the Kyoto University Library (no. 38) and the IASWR collection (MBB-I-76, now in the University of Virginia Library, still not catalogued). These two are certainly apographs, but they were prepared before the folio loss in the palm-leaf manuscript. We cannot say anything at this point about the Baroda (Oriental Institute no. 13274) or the Nagoya copy (Buddhist Library Takaoka Ka4-2).

The Author

We do not know much about the author, Mahāsukhavajra. The colophon (Ms 33v) styles him a ‘great scholar’ (mahāpañḍita). The final verse (Ms 33r) reveals only that he wrote his commentary by the command of his guru (kṛtvā ... pañjīm guror ājñayā). Hardly conclusive evidence, but it is perhaps worth mentioning that the paradigmatic city for him seems to have been Pātaliputra (Ms 31r: nagaram iti pāṭaliputrādikam). We hope that a thorough investigation of realia in his commentary (materia medica, currencies, etc.) will yield better ideas about his provenance. The work is relatively rich in quotations; we expect to formulate better ideas about the possible timeframe this textual pool may reflect after a complete review. For now we must work with the assumption that he was a Nepalese scholar active in the 13th century ce. SG was told by an informant in Nepal that Mahāsukhavajra was also the author of the Candamahāroṣanatantra itself, and composed the texts concomitantly at the order of the king Anantamalla, who is mentioned in the Ms colophon. This claim is tentative: it may be a remnant of a largely forgotten Vajrācārya tradition, but it could also be a personal impression.

Some Background for Chapter 6

By the time the yogī reaches in his spiritual career the matters taught in chapter 6, he will have undergone the following. First, initiation (abhiṣekah). In order to gain this, he is introduced to the pantheon of the deities (maṇḍalam), a diagram drawn with coloured powders, which is described in chapter 2. The initiation ritual itself is

---

7 An apograph is also mentioned in DhTC (2016, I.8). We are not entirely sure what this refers to, perhaps the Baroda copy.
described in chapter 3. The first five initiations are those of Water (udaka°), Tiara (makuṭa°/imukuṭa°), Sword (khaḍga°), Noose (pāśa°), and Name (nāma°). This set is a little unusual, since the third and fourth are named after the main implements of the deity and not the standard ones, named after the general implements of the tantric Buddhist initiate, the Sceptre (vajra°) and the Bell (ghaṇṭā°). A further distinctive feature is that women are specified to receive the Vermilion (sindūra°) Initiation instead of that of the Tiara. The Secret (guhya°) Initiation follows: here the master copulates with a consort and the initiand is called in to consume the sexual fluids saved in cupped leaves. As an intermezzo, the initiand is called to secrecy threatened by a sword, is blindfolded, and is made to cast a flower on the diagram. Then the blindfold is removed and he is shown the mandalam. This is again unusual, since these procedures are normally performed before the Water Initiation, and it is not a sword, but a vajra-sceptre with which he is threatened. In the Wisdom (prajñā°) Initiation it is the initiand who unites with the consort, who is specifically stated to be the same as the one before. He is to experience the Four Blisses as explained to him by the guru beforehand (on these, see our note to 6.192–196). Once finished, he throws a feast for his fellow initiates (ganacakram). The text says that for women, this initiation is called that of Means (upāya°), another unique feature of this text. With the initiation successfully completed, the yogī has now gained the right and duty to practice. This is detailed in chapter 4 and more or less amounts to what is usually called the Stage of Generation (utpattikrama). The main point is to create and maintain identity with the deity. The next chapter teaches various mantras. Once identity with the deity has been mastered, the yogī becomes able to practice the Perfected Stage (nispannakramah/utpannakramah), and this is what the question of the Goddess refers to.

Although our two texts are not unique in their treatment of sexual practices, chapter 6 and its commentary are special, because we do not find such information presented with this kind of clarity and a luxury of details elsewhere. Mahāsukhavajra severely attacks those who would think that the sexual imagery is merely symbolic, so he is well aware of tantric initiates who treat such practices in a subliminal and non-literal way. The vehemence of his tone suggests to us that he may have lived at a time when those with antinomian interpretations of the tantras were being pushed out by those taking a symbolic approach, perhaps as a compromise to social norms. If this was indeed the case, but we should stress that this only our impression, Mahāsukhavajra may have been a ‘purist’ attempting to revive and maintain disappearing practices. We hope that more resources will come to light to reveal the socio-historical context.

---

8 Although the text specifically prescribes instructions for the initiation of women, it is ambiguous as to what they are to do in the guhyābhīṣekah. The male initiand’s task is clear: he brings a girl, with whom the guru, and then himself, copulate. The likeliest scenario is that the female initiand herself copulates with the guru, and this is considered her Secret Initiation. However, this is only a speculation on the part of the authors.

9 The tantra does not contain ritual prescriptions for the ganacakram. Also note that the Fourth Initiation (caturthābhīṣekah) is not mentioned.
Sanskrit Text

Note on the Apparatus

Our only witness (marked Ms) is National Archives, Kathmandu, Nepal 3-402/vi. bauddhatantra 19. This manuscript was first archived by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, under reel no. B 31/7. We read colour images of the original, which were commissioned by SG. The punctuation is our own, as is the regularisation of sandhi and avagrahas. We have implemented the standardisations usual for Nepalese/East Indian manuscripts: we distinguish between v and b, we degeminate after repha (e.g. sarva for sarvva), geminate where appropriate (e.g. sattva for satva), we do not always note confusion of sibilants (ś, s), we standardise homorganic nasals, etc. A + sign with spaces on both sides denotes a full aksara missing (e.g. the leaf is torn) or deemed illegible (effaced); A + sign without space on either or both sides denotes a partial loss of an aksara. We only mark folio changes; here r stands for recto, v for verso. We occasionally mark scribal or readers’ corrections: p.c. stands for post correctionem, a.c. for ante correctionem, i.e. after and before correction respectively. Our critical notes are corrections marked by corr. (in case of minor matters such as an ‘invisible’ virāma), emendations are marked by em. (in case of more serious mistakes such as an omitted aksara), and conjectures are marked by conj. (which are for the most part emendations about which we feel somewhat hesitant). We first print the mūla as given in George’s edition in bold; this is followed by his numeration in square brackets: note that George counts lines, not verses. We marked the lemmata in bold. Bracketed exclamation marks are placed in the mūla if we note a dissonance with the commentary or a reading we consider mistaken or not chosen well. These are explained in the notes to the translation. We skip two sections of the mūla, which are irrelevant for our discussion. We do not capitalise technical terms or proper names in the edition. We decided not to use the testimony of the two available apographs; they add nothing new textually as the palm-leaf manuscript was already damaged at the time of their preparation.
atha bhagavatī praśnjāpāramitā bhagavantaṃ gāḍham āliṅga padmena
vajragharṣaṇaṃ kṛtvā prāha || [6.1–2]

athetyādi l praśnjāpāramiteti dvesavajrī l sānvayeyam samjñā l prakṛṣṭam jñānāṃ
dvātraḥ sthānāṃ jñānam pāram prakṛṣṭaṃ svarasapavṛttām itā gata prāpteti
yāvai | praśnjāyāh pāram itā praśnjāpāramitā, sahañjānadajñānakāraṇatvāt + + + + h | gāḍham iti ni[16v]rbharam yathā bhavati l

nispannakramayogena bhāvanā kīdṛṣṭi bhavet |
yoginīṇaṃ hitārthāya pr āchitaṃ saphalikuru || [6.3–4]
nispannetyādi l ayam abhiprāyāh l pū + + kṣaṇaḥ hi bhāvanotpattikramāpekṣayā
jñāte (?) vi + + + + + nakrame + + + + + kartavyeti bhāvaḥ l

atha bhagavān āha ||
nispannakramayogastho yogī yogāikataparāḥ |
bhāvayed ekacittena mama rūpam aharniṣam || [6.5–7]
nispannakrama utpannakramah l ekacittetenādi l ayam arthaḥ l pūrvokta-
maitryādibhāvanākramanirapekṣo yogī jhātityākāravyogenaikacittena-advitiyacittena
krṣācālādi l rupenaṁnaṁ bhāvayet l svastriyam (see 6.8) ca dveṣava-
ījryādīrūpeneti bhāvah l aharniṣam iti rātrimdīnam l kṣaṇam apy anyacittena
na tiṣṭhed ity arthaḥ l

kalpayet svastriyam tāvat tava rūpeṇa nirbhāram |
gāḍhenaivātiyogena yathāiva sphaṭatām vrajet || [6.8–9]
sphaṭatām iti tadākāratadahāmkārayoḥ pravyaktatām l etac ca sādaranirantaradīrgha-
kālāhāryaśail sampadyate l tathā coktam—

bhūtaṃ va yadi vābhūtaṃ yad yad evātibhāvyate l
bhāvanābalanispattau tat sphaṭakalpadhīphalam19 l

jnānam] em., jnāna Ms.
10 0aṇanda] conj., 0aṇa° Ms.
11 pāram itā] em., pārār itā Ms.
12 0kāranaatvat] conj., 0kāranat+ā + Ms p.c., 0kāranat+ā + Ms a.c.
13 nirbhārāṃ yathā bhavatī] conj., ni + + + + + vati Ms.
14 kartavyeti] conj., + rtav+eti Ms.
15 krṣācālādi] em., krṣnaādi° Ms.
16 nisanim iti] corr., nisam miti Ms.
17 kṣaṇam apy] corr., kṣaṇam mapy Ms.
18 tat sphaṭakalpadhīphalam] em., sphaṭa tat kalpadhiḥ phalam Ms.
19
271 abhyaśayogena bhavanti pumṣām bhūtāny abhūtāni pūraḥṣhitāni |
272 kāmākulanām iva ramyārāmās[20] cittānuyātāna yoguyuktīḥ ||
273 mātaraṁ duhitaraṁ cāpi bhaginīṁ bhāgineyikām |
274 anyāṁ ca jñātinīṁ sarvāṁ ḍombiniṁ brāhmaṇīṁ tathā || [6.10–11]
275 mātaraṁ ityādi l mātrādiprajñāṁ apatityauvanāṁ eva ṭhrnīyāt l práyena
276 kila puruṣānāṁ mano yasmin[21] viṣaya evārypyate[22] tatraivātiśayena pravartate l
277 pravartitam api mano lokabhaṅyato vyāvartate tāiḥ l vyāvṛttikṛtam tu tūvraduḥkham te
278 'nubhavanti l dūkhāc cetasā bhavati vikṣipeḥ l tato 'pi samādhānābhāvāḥ l
280 na cādharmaṁ sambhāvyate, svaparāpakārābhāvāt l na ca + + + + sam + + + + + + + + +
281 + + +, mahāsukhānubhavārūpatvāt l etad eva svaparayor arthakaraṇam l tathā ca—
283 ato viparyayat pāpam sukhaduḥkhaṁphalām[26] tayoh ll
284 na ca prajñāviśeṣataḥ pāpam, tantrāntaravirodhād eva l tathā ca—
285 mātā bhaginī bhāgineyikā
286 ityādi l
287 yatra tu mātrādīśabdena caksurādy uktam tatra tv abhavyasattvebhayas tattvam
288 gopitam l anyathā caksurādiśabdān apahāya lokaviruddhamātrādīśabdā ye kṛtās te
289 connattapralāpā eva vyaktam upalaksyanta iti l
290 tatra mātā jananī, sapatnamātā, mātrāsvaṁ[27] acāryabhārāya ceti l duhitā janyā, bhraṛduhitā, samgrhīta[28] s āduhiśirkastrīparvaduhiṁ, acāryaduhitā ceti l bhaginī
dsālohitā mātrāsvaṁ[29] duhitā, acāryaduhitā ceti l āsāṁ eva suṁā bhāgineyikā l
293 caturvīḍhābhaya 'nyāḥ[30] sarvā eva vakṣyamāṇalakṣanāḥ[31] l

20 oṛāmāś] em., oṛāmā Ms.
21 yasmin] corr., yasmina Ms.
22 viṣaya evārypyate] em., viṣayaevārypyate Ms.
23 samādhānābhāvāt] em., samādhanām bhāvā Ms.
24 bhavatī] Ms p.c., bhavatī Ms a.c.
25 samarjati] em., samarctati Ms.
26 Harunaga Isaacson suggested three possible emendations: sukhaduḥkhaṁ phalaṁ/sukhaduḥkhe phalaṁ/sukhaduḥkhe phalaṁ.
27 mātrāsvaṁ] corr., mātrāsvaṁ Ms.
28 samgrhīta] em., samgrhīta Ms.
29 ośvasr] em., ośvasr Ms.
30 'nyāḥ] em., 'nyā Ms.
31 vakṣyamāṇalakṣanāḥ] em., vakṣamāṇalakṣanā Ms.
caṇḍāḷīṃ naṭakīṃ caiva rajakīṃ rūpajīvikām (!) |
vratīṃ yogiṇīṃ caiva tathā kāpālinīṃ punaḥ || [6.12–13]

rūpajīvikām ity agrāḥtāpanāṃ veśyāṃ l

anyāṃ ceti yathāprāptāṃ strīrūpeṇa suṣamṣhitāṃ |
sevayet suvidhāhena yathā bhedā na jāyate || [6.14–15]

yadi bhedāḥ syāt, tadā kim syād ity āha— bhed eva ityādī l

bhed eva kūpita caṇḍarāṣaṇo hanti sādhakam |
avīcāu pātayet tam ca khaḍgapāśena bhīṣayan ||
neha loke bhavet siddhiḥ paraloke tathaiva ca |
tasmā ca guptam atyantāṃ kartavyam nāpi gocaram |
ḍākinimāntravad gopyaṃ caṇḍarōṇasādhanam || [6.16–20]

nanu yady evam kimarthaṃ tarhy uktaṃ mahānarthāṃ32 janakam etat sarvam ity āha |
— atyantetādyā l

abhyaṃ(a) kartiyān arthe mayā buddhena bhāṣitam || [6.21]

ayam arthaḥ l rāgaṇay o yam, rāgaś cotpanno na parihartavya eva l

yadi vā sāksān naitac33 chakyaṭe, tadā tatpratikṛtāṃ dārvādinvitaṃ paṭalikhitaṃ |
vā sevayed iti l

etac ca viviktasthāna eva yuṣyata ity āha— mano'nvityādyā l

mano 'nukulake (!) deṣe sarvopadrvavārjeti |
pracchane tāṃ samādāya svacetoramyaṅkāminīṃ || [6.22–23]

pracchanna iti bhittipatałakapatāḍyāvṛte | samādāyeti34 grhītvā l svacetoramyaṅkaṃ |
iminīṃ iti tāsāṃ madhye yathāmanovāḥchitām l

buddho 'haṃ cācaḷāḥ siddhaḥ prajñāpāramitā priyā |
bhāvayet svasvarūpeṇa gāḍhena cetasā sudhiḥ || [6.24–25]

svasvarūpeṇeti pūrvoktarupam eva spāṣṭhayati l ayam arthaḥ l

upattikrāmākṛtadēvatā[17v]dvāreṇa varṇasamstāṇaḥ35 khaḍgakarthyā36 adikaracaraṇavainyā-
sādiyuktena na bhāvayet, kim tu yenaśa rūpeṇa svasya svasya varṇasamsthānādičaṃ
prakṛtisiddham, tenaiva 37 rūpeṇa bhāvayed iti l

nirjanam cāsramam kṛtvā yathālabdhānnavastukāḥ (!) |
bhāvayan nirbharamā dvābhyaṃ anyonyadvandvayogataḥ || [6.26–27]

yathetyādi l yathāprāptabhaṭktavanābhyyāṃ kāṃ sukham yasya sa tatha l idam
bhaktādi bhadram idaṃ neti na kuryād ity arthaḥ l dvandvayoga ālingenādiyogaḥ l

strīyaṃ prayakṣataḥ kṛtvā saṃmukhe copaveśya hi |
dvābhyyāṃ anyonyāraṇa gāḍham anyonyam īkṣayet ||
tato dhṛṣṭisukhāṃ dhāyaṇ tiṣṭhed ekāgramānaḥ |
tayā tatraiva vaktavyamā sukhoṭṭehāḥkaram vacaḥ || [6.28–31]

dhṛṣṭisukham iti l strīnām kilāṅgaprātyāṅgayor38 darāṇena mahad eva sukham
uptadaye l tato yayaiva mudrayā tat39 sukham utpannaṃ tayaiva mudrayā kāṣṭhavan
niṃcalaḥbhūya tat40 sukham cintayams41 tiṣṭhet katipayakṣaṇam ity arthaḥ l tataḥ
sabdasukham bhāvayet l tayetyādi l sukhoṭṭehākaram iti pūrvoṭpannasukham
adhikaṃ karotity arthaḥ l

tvaṃ me putro 'si bhartāsi tvāṃ me bhrāta pitā mataḥ |
tvāhaṃ jananī bhāyā bhaginnī bhāgineyikā ||
saptabhiḥ puruṣair dāsas tvāṃ me kheṭasaceṭakaḥ (!) |
tvāṃ me kapardakākṛitas tvāhaṃ svāmini mataḥ || [6.32–35]

tvaṃ me putro 'sītyādiślokaḍavayaṃ kākasvarena kahu(?)raṇa strī pāṭhet puruṣam
paśyantīti l tataḥ pūrvakramaṇaivala tadutpannasukham katipayakṣaṇam vicintya
tasyā bhaktīṃ kuryāt l

patec (!) caraṇayos tasyā nirbharam samputāṇjaliḥ |
vadet tatrēḍhaṃ vākyam sukhoṭṭehākaram param || [6.36–37]

patec cetyādi l nirbharam yathā bhavyat i

tvāṃ me māṭāpitur (!) bhāyā tvāṃ me ca bhāgineyikā |
bhaginiputraḥbhāyā (!) ca tvāṃ svasā (!) tvāṃ ca māmikā ||
tvāhaṃ sarvathā dāsas tiṃṣabhaṭhiparāyaṇaḥ |
pasya māṃ kṛpayā mātaḥ snehadṛṣṭinirikṣaṇaḥ || [6.38–41]

prakṛtisiddham, tenaivā] conj., prakṛti + + + naiva Ms.
oprātyāṅgayor] em., *prātyāṅgyo Ms.
tat!] corr., tata Ms.
tat!] corr., tata Ms.
cintayams] em., cintaya Ms.
351 tvanism me mātetyādīslokadvayaṃ pūrvavad yogaḥ pathet l svarābhāvāt tu sarvatra lālityena pāthaḥ kartavyaḥ l bhrātrādīmātrādīsabdās tu (see 6.32 and 6.38) sukhojjetakvenokta iti l
352 tataḥ sā pūrūṣaṃ śīśṭā (!) cumbayitvā muhur muhuḥ |
353 dadāti tryakṣaraṃ maste vaktre vaktṛrasaṃ madhayuḥ l
354 tryakṣaram iti samadhya suśiramuṣṭyabhinayam l vaktṛrasaṃ ślesmapindam
355 saśabdanaḥṣhajanitam l tad eva madhyuḥ iva, madhuskhajanakavatā l
356 padmaṃ coṣāpayet tasya darśayed netravibhramam (!) |
357 vaktre ca carcitāṃ dattvā kucena pīḍayed hṛdām (!) | [6.42–43]
358 padmaṃ iti bhagam l coṣāpayed iti yogiṣiro yoginiḥ hastam akrśyā svapadme
359 nipātayet l yāvac cīsaṇakriyānispattīḥ syāt tāvad yoginiḥ yogiṣirasi kṣanam kṣanam
360 vilambya tryakṣaraṃ dadyāt l tatas tadananta[18r]ram yogiṣira utthāpya yoginiḥ
361 netrabhramamaṃ katāksāṃ dadyāt l
362 sammukhaṃ tanmukhaṃ drṣṭvā nakhaṃ dattvā cītālaye (!) |
363 vadet tasyedṛṣṭaṃ vāyanaṃ bhakṣa vairocananamaṃ mama | [6.46–47]
364 tato yoginiḥ yoginām uttānena pātayet l tatas tanmukhe gudapadmaṃ arpya
365 yonipadmaṃ ca tryakṣarapurvakam bhakṣa vairocanam ityādikaṃ vadet l
366 yathāruciḥ aṣu praṇadyād iti l vairocanamaṃ guthām l
367 pibākoṣabhyajalaṃ putra sapitṛā dāsako bhava |
368 tava gosvāminī cāhaṃ mātā rājakūlīty (!) api | [6.48–49]
369 akṣobhyajalāṃ mùtram l yogy api tat sarvam śādaram grhnā niśceśṭībhūya
370 sukham eva cintayet l tataḥ sā punas tam utthāpya sapitreyādikaṃ vadet l
371 madiyaṃ caraṇaṃ gacchā śaraṇaṃ vatsa nirantaram |
372 mayā samvārdhito yasmāt tvam ānarghyam upāgataḥ | [6.50–51]
373 mayetyaḍī l mayeti mātrupūṇyā bālavasthāyāṃ payodharadugadhādinā paripālitaḥ l
374 ānarghyam amūlyam l viśīṣṭarūpātva ity āśayaḥ l
375 kṛtaṇī bhava bho vatsa dehi me vajraṇaṃ sukham |
376 tridālaṃ paṅkajaṃ paśya madhye (!) kiṃjalkabhūṣitam | [6.52–53]

42 tvam] em., tva Ms.
43 tu] em., ta Ms.
44 samadhya] conj., madhyā° Ms.
45 hastam] em., hastām Ms.
46 yathāruciḥ aṣu] conj., yathārūvyā Ms.
47 sādaram] em., sāradām Ms.
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379 kṛtam upakāraṁ jānātīti kṛtaṇaḥ | ayam abhiprāyaḥ | mayā paripālanena
tavopakāraḥ kṛtah, tvam apiṃdāmin pratyupakāram kurv iti | vajrajam iti vajraṁ
380 liṅgam, tena jātam | vajrāśphālanajātam ity arthaḥ | tridalām trīkoṇam | madhyetyādi | madhye kiṃjalkena māṃsa | vartikāsamūhena bhūṣītam |
381 aho sukḥāvatikṣetram raktabuddhopāsobhitam |
382 rāgiṇāṁ sukhaḍaṁ sāntaṁ sarvakalpa-pavivarjitaṁ | [6.54–55]
383 aho iti sukhaḥbhīvyaktau | sukham avati rakṣatīti sukhaḥvati, saiva kṣetram sthānam |
rakṣaṁ śoṇitam, sa eva buddhāḥ, tenopāsobhitam | bāhyasukhaḥvatikṣetram apy |
amitābhasobhitam bhavatīty arthaḥ | sarvakalpo grāhyagrāhakagrahaṇavikalpaḥ, 
tena varjitaṁ |
384 māṁ uttānena sampātya rāgavihvalamānāsām |
385 skandhe pādayuṇaṁ dattvā mamādhordhaṇaṁ nīrīkṣaya | [6.56–57]
386 skandha iti grīvāpārśvadvaye | adho bhagam | ārdhaṁ mukham |
sphuradvajram tataḥ padmamadhyarandhre pravesaya |
387 dehi dhāpasahasram tvam laksya(!)koṭīṁ athārbudam |
mādiye tridale padme māṃsavartisamanvite | [6.58–60]
388 svavajram tatra prakṣipya sukhaiś cittaṁ prapūjaya |
389 vāyu vāyu supadmaṁ me sārāt sārām anuttaram |
390 vajrasyāgreṇa sambuddhaṁ raktam (!) bandhukasāṃnibham | [6.61–63]
391 vāyu vāyu iti prasāṁsayaḥ | hādaṁ janayati | sāraḥ sukhaḥdikam, tasmād api sāraṁ mahāsukhatvāt |
392 bruvantīm iti tāṃ dhīyāyan stadbhībhyāyaikacetasā |
393 bhāvayet tajjakaṁ sauḥkaṁ niścalo gāḍha-cittataḥ |
394 tasmai (!) pratyuttaraṁ dadyād vilamba tvam priye kṣaṇam |
395 yāvat strīdehaṁ rūpaṁ kṣaṇamātraṁ vicintaye | [6.64–67]
396 strīm ekāṁ janaṇīṁ khalu trijagatāṁ satsaukhyadātrīṁ śivāṁ |
397 videśaḥ iha nindayaṁ mukhāraḥ ye pāpakarmasthitāḥ |
398 te tenaiva durāvagāhanarake raudre sadā duḥkhitāḥ |
399 krāndanto bahuvalhindagdhaṇavusās tiṣṭhanti kalpatrayam | [6.68–71]

48 māṃsa[<sup>]</sup> em., mātsa[<sup>°</sup>] Ms.
49 kṣetram apy[<sup>corr.</sup>] kṣetram masty Ms.
50 prasāṁsayaḥ[<sup>corr.</sup>] prasāṁsayaḥ[<sup>°</sup>] Ms.
51 sāraḥ sukhaḥdikam[<sup>corr.</sup>], sāro mukhaḥdikam Ms.

---

48 māṃsa[<sup>°</sup>] em., mātsa[<sup>°</sup>] Ms.
49 kṣetram apy[<sup>corr.</sup>] kṣetram masty Ms.
50 prasāṁsayaḥ[<sup>corr.</sup>] prasāṁsayaḥ[<sup>°</sup>] Ms.
51 sāraḥ sukhaḥdikam[<sup>corr.</sup>], sāro mukhaḥdikam Ms.
[18v] jananīm iti sukhasya jananāt l śivāṁ kalyāṇāṁ l kathāṁ strīnīdayā
narakagamaṇaṁ bhavatīti ced ucyate— aihikasukhasya jananyāh kila strīyāḥ,
pāralaukika[52] sukhasya cāta eva paramopakārīnyo[53] buddhajananyāḥ prajñāpārami-
tāsvarūpinīyāḥ l ata[54] evāsāṁ nindayā mahad apunyam[55] syāt l tato narakagatir
bhavati l yah punaḥ strīnīdayānyatra dharmo desītāḥ, sa punar laukika[56]
kāminītṛmatenābhayāsattvasya, na[57] tu lokottarakāminīprajñāpāramitādīrūpeṇa
bhavyasattvasyeti l na cābhavyasattvo laukikākāminīyāṁ lokottarakāminīrūpaṁ
parikalpayitum kṣamo vacanāṣatena'[58], heyopādeyaparījānābhāvāt tasyā l ata
evoktam—

prakāśayiṣye sattvānāṁ yathāsāyāvīśesātāḥ l
iti l
kim tu vācyo guṇāḥ strīnāṁ sarvasattvaparigrahah (!) l
kṛpā vā yadi vā raksā strīnāṁ citte pratiṣṭhitā ||

āstāṁ tāvat svajanāṁ paraṇaṁ api puṣṇāti bhikṣayā (!) l
sā ced evañrūpaṁ nāṇyathā (!) strī vajrayoginīyāḥ ||
āstāṁ tu darsanaṁ tasyāḥ spṛṣṭighṛṣṭīṁ (!) ca dūrataḥ l
yasyāḥ smaraṇamātṛena tatksaṇaṁ labhyate sukham ||
paṁcaiva viṣayāḥ strīnāṁ divyarūpeṇa saṁśītāḥ l
tāṁ udvāhitāṁ kṛtvā sukhaṁ bhuṣjanti mānavaḥ || [6.72–79]

udvāhitāṁ[59] vivāhitām l
tasmād bho doṣanirmukte sarvasadgūnaṇaṁdite |
puṇye puṇye mahāpuṇye prasādaṁ kuru me 'mbike || [6.80–81]
puṇya iti punyahetutvā l ayam arthaḥ l mahāsukhajñānānubhavah sakalapuṇyakāraṇam,
tasya ca kāraṇaṁ prajñāiva l ata evoktam—
yathā latāsambuddhātām phalaṁ puṣpaśamanvitam l
ekakṣanātta[60] sambodhīḥ sambhāradvayasambhūtā ll

iti l

52 pāralaukika°] corr., pāralokika° Ms.
53 oopakārīnyo] em., oopakārīnyām Ms.
54 ata[ Ms p.c., atah Ms a.c.
55 apunyam] em., apunyā Ms.
56 laukika°] corr., lokika° Ms.
57 oṣattvasya, na[ em., oṣattvasyāna Ms.
58 oāpi] em., oāmi Ms.
59 udvāhitām] em., udvāhitā Ms.
60 ekakṣanātta°] conj., ekakṣanāt Ms.
tatas tām gādhaḥ dṛṣṭvā svausoṭṭham dantena pīḍayet |
438 kuryāt sūkhodaya!()bandhaṃ bandhaṃ ca dolacālanam | [6.84]
439 svasya ¯tmana os˙t˙ham˙ Ms., sos˙t˙ham˙ Ms.
440 kuryāt sūkhodayam ityādy uddeśaḥ l
441 tatra paryaṅkamadhye tu striyaṃ cotkuṭakāsanām |
442 kṛtvā bāhuyugam skandhe svasya gādhena yojayaḥ || [6.90–91]
443 savyena ca kareṇaiva vajraṃ padme nivesayaḥ | [6.109]
444 savyena ca kareṇaivety arthatrayam sūcayati l tat prā + lāma + + h + + saha (?)
445 + + h + + l khadgamudrāṁ nīrnakhām ca (?) + praveśya vāmena mardayed
446 vāmāvartena, [19ṛ] punar daksiṇena daksiṇāvartena, yāvatsnigdhaṁ bhavati l
447 padmamadhyāṃ tato jihvāṃ prakṣipya saśabdālehanābhinayena tasyāṁ tryaksaram
448 śirasā pratīcchann avaliḥet katipayāsaṇam l tataḥ savyakareṇa vajraṃ gṛhiṭvā
449 padme praveśayet l evaśabdenāvayam arthaḥ pratijāprātīto 'vyayānām anekārhatvād
450 iti l tatreyam khadgumudrā— savyahastena muṣṭim drḍham kṛtvā madhyamātarjanyau
451 prasārayed iti l
452 cumbayec ca mukhaṃ tasyāḥ yāvadicchaṁ punaḥ punaḥ |
453 unnāmya vadanaṃ dṛṣṭvā yatheccchaḥ vākyakaṁ vadan || [6.124–125]
454 vākyakaṁ vadann iti kämọttejakaṁ gosvāminītyādikam (see 6.49) l
455 jihvāṁ ca cūṣayet tasyāḥ pībel lālāṁ mukhoḍhbhūtām |
456 bhakṣayec carcitāṁ dantamalāṃ saukhyaṁ vibhāvayet |
457 pīḍayed dantajihvām īṣad adharapidhānike | [6.126–128]
458 īṣad ity alpam l yathā vyathā na bhavatīty arthaḥ l
459 jihvayā nāsikārandhram śodhayen netrakoṇikām ||
460 dantakākṣāṁ ca tajjātaḥ malaṃ sarvaḥ ca bhakṣayet |
mastam netram galaṃ karṇaṃ pārśvam kakṣaṃ karaṃ stanam ||
cumbayitvā nakhaṃ dadyāt tyaktvā netradvayaṃ striyāḥ ||
mardayet pāṇinā cuḍacaṃ cuśayed damsayaṃ tataḥ | [6.129–133]
damsayed iti dantena l
svayam uttānīkāṃ kr̥tvā cumbayet sundaroḍaram ||
atraivāhaṃ sthitāḥ pūrvaṃ smṛtvā smṛtvā muhur muhuḥ |
hastena sparśayet padmaṃ vāyu sundaram iti bruvaṇ ||
dadyāc cumbanakhaṃ tatra paśyen nīṣkrṣya pāṇinā | [6.134–137]

nīṣkrṣyeti65 prakāṣya l
ghrātvā gandhaṃ ca tad randhraṃ śodhayed rasanayā striyāḥ ||
praviṣṭaḥ haṃ yathānena niḥśrtaś cāpī anekaśaḥ |
vadet tatrēṛśaṃ vāyamaṃ panthāyamaṃ nāsikarjūḥ ||
ayam eva śāṅgatēḥ panthā bhaved ajñānayogataḥ |
caṅḍarōṣaṇaśiddhes tu bhavej jñānaprayogataḥ || [6.138–142]
ajñānayogata laukīkākāmāsevāṃtataḥ l jñānaprayogata66 iti
pratipādyaṃnalokottarakākāmāseyogataḥ l
tataḥ padmagaṇaṃ śvetaṃ raktam ṣvahāturkṛṭaiḥ (!) |
bhakṣayeṣ ca mukhaṃ tasyāḥ sampaśyamuḥ ca punaḥ punaḥ || [6.143–144]
sotṛṣair iti kiṁcitsaṣuṣaṁkhaṇavatākuṇcane67 saṃdaiḥ l
sa nakhaṃ (!) corukaṃ kr̥tvā mardayet dāsavat padua |
mastake tryakṣaraṃ dadyād dhṛṇmadye laghumuṣṭikam ||
tataḥ cīrāt parān bandhān kuryād yogī samāhiṇaḥ |
ichhāyata dhīyakaṃ (!) tatra dadyāt saukhyaikamānasah |
yathecccham prakṣayena vā ṣaṅkṣet saukhyaikamānasah || [6.145–149]
yatheccham ityādi l tatrēkṣaraṇopāyas ṣtu kathaye l yadā maṁmulaiparyantaṃ
candro gantum utsahate paramāndante, tada muṭravegadhāraṇanāyayena vāyum
ākuṇcayet dhairyag69 kramaṇa nābhyaḍhāpaṛyantam śvasairōdham kr̥tvā ksana-
mātram l etac ca guruḥ svayam kr̥tvā darṣayet iti l etena na ksaraṇaṃ bhavati l
kṣarite cāliheta padmaṃ jānapāṭaprayogataḥ ||
bhakṣayeṣ padmagaṇaṃ śukṛaṃ śoṇitaṃ cāpi jihvāyā l

65 nīṣkrṣyeta] em., nīṣkupetya Ms.
66 prayogata] em., ṣyogata Ms.
67 ovatākuṇcana] conj., ovatāṅkukyana Mr.
68 tatrēkṣaraṇopāyas] em., tatrēkṣaropāyas Ms.
69 dhairyag] Ms p.c., dhairyre Ms a.c.
नासया नालिकायोगान पिबेत सामर्थ्यावर्धधये || [6.150–152]

प्रक्षाल्या जिह्याय दानाम प्रज्ञाम उत्थाप्या उमबायेत |
क्रोञ्क्र्या तताल पास्चाद भक्षयेन मत्स्याम्यासकाम ||
पिबेद दूग्धाम च मध्यमं व पुनाह कामप्रायर्धधये |
श्रमे जिर्याति (I) तपास्चाद ईच्छयेत तु सुक्ष्मिेभिः ||
पुनाह पुर्वक्रामेपावा दव्य्वाम अन्योन्याम अराहते |
अनन्येन्यायोगेना सधिताम च महासुक्माम |
चन्दरोशापादं (I) धाते जन्मातीं अत्रावित्य योगवित || [6.153–159]

सधितम इति रात्रिंदिवमः प्रबंध्य मे शिताम | चंदरोशापादं |
महामुद्रासधिहि धाते ग्रहनी त | त्रावितेति प्रत्ययुप्या एवा जन्माती इ |

रागिन्याम स्थिद्धानार्थाम मयायोगाह प्रकाशिताः || [6.160]

रागिन्याम कृमिमां | ये त्व अकृमिमां तेषाम पर्यतन्यायक्रमेना त्रिकलपासाम- |
क्ष्येयेना बोधिर इत्य अभिप्रयाहां विचिक्षाबहुलवत्वं तेषाम नासिमि धर्मे |
श्रद्धाहि स कृमिमां अपि येषाम स्रद्धाहि नास्ति | न तेषाम सिद्धिः अस्ति | एतर्योगवयंतीरकाः स्रद्धायािं नास्ति सिद्धिः | न ह ग्न्ततर्थिः जालम मथानियम, |
किम तु दादिः || पुन्द्धाम वा, तत्राविता तस्या भवादव वादसात्साक्तिबहावयायेच तेचति इ |

भूमाउ पादात्याले श्वाप्या वक्रे तिर्यक सुदिरघेका |
ार्धहृदरासानाः जीयेम एत त्रावीति कामसुक्खप्रादम || [6.169–170]

तिर्यक सुदिरघका इति हमसपकाकारे इ |

पुनाह धान्वासानाम क्र्त्वा स्वानानां तद्गुंडांतारे |
पातयित्व गुदाम तस्याह सम्भिलेन नासय्यािं चा || [6.177–178]
nāsayāpi ceti tatra nāsikāṃ prakṣipya gandham grhnīyāt l

tadutpannaṃ sukhaṃ dhyaśāc caṇḍaroṣaṇayogatāḥ l
tato mukho bhaved yogī sarvasaṃkalpavārjitaḥ || [6.179–180]

canḍaroṣaṇayogā niścalasamādhiḥ l mukto78 duḥkhān muktāḥ, paramasukhārūpatvāt l

virāgaraḥitaṃ cittaṃ kṛtvā mātrām (!) prakāmayet l
anurāgāt prāpyate puṇyaṃ virāgād agham āpyate || [6.181–182]

mātām iti yathoktaprajñām l agham pāpam l

na virāgāt paraṃ pāpam na puṇyaṃ sukhatāḥ param l
tataḥ ca kāmāje saukhye cittaṃ kuryāt samāhitaḥ || [6.183–184]

atha bhagavatī pramuditahṛdayā bhagavantaṃ namakṛtya abhivandyā caivam āha || [6.189]

bho bhagavan kiṃ nṛṇām eva kevalam ayaṃ sādhanopāyo 'nyeṣām api vā || [6.187–188]

bhagavān āha [6.189]

atrānuraktā ye tu sattvāḥ sarvadikṣu vyavasthitāḥ l
devāsmūrā nārā nāgās te 'pi sidhyānti sādhakāḥ || [6.190–191]

athaivaṣrutvā mahēsvarādayo devā gaurilakṣmiśacīrtyāḍidevaśīṃ grhītvā bhāvyāitum ārabdhāḥ || atha tatksaṇāṃ sarve tallavāṃ
tanmūhūrtakanām (!) caṇḍaroṣaṇapadam prāptā vicaranti mahītale tatra
dahēsvārō vajrānīkaratvāna siddhāḥ l vāsudevo vajranārāyaṇatvāna l
devandro vajrapāñītvāna l kāmadevo vajrānāgatvāna l evampramukhā
gāṅgānādibālukāsāmī devaputrāḥ siddhāḥ || [6.192–196]

tatksaṇāṃ ity adhimātrastattvāṣaṃandaksāna eva tattvādhikmatā l tallavāṃ iti
madhyasattvāsa paramāṇandaṃkṣaṇa eva tattvādhikmatā l tanmūhūrtam79 iti
mṛḍusattvāsa paramāṇaṃ pṛptā, viramāṇandapravēṣe, anayor madhye80
saḥjānandaksāna eva tattvādhikmatā iti l

vajrānīkarādinaṃ tu kathyaḥ rūpam l tatra vajrānīkarāvo dvibhaujakamukhāḥ
śvetavaro āhaṃkaputadhāro nirbhūṣaṇapāṇicamudrāśahito bhasmodhūhīlītavigrahas
trinetro vāmena kāpālakhatvāṅgadhārī daksinena damaṭudhārī sattvāparyaṅkī

78 mukto| em., yukto Ms.
79 tanmūhūrtam| corr., tanmūhūrtam Ms.
80 madhye| em., madhya° Ms.
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552 vrṣabhārūḍho vajragauryāṅgitas[81] taptacāmikaravāṃyaḥ nānālakṣāraḥ[20r]bhūṣitayaḥ
553 śoṣaśābdayā vāmahaśadāḥtarkatapadmayāḥ | vajranārāyaṇo garudārūḍhas[82]
554 caturbhujā nilo ratnamakuṭi sarvālakṣārabhūṣitāḥ sattvaparyāṅkī dakṣinena
555 ratnagadāyobhayakarac[83] vāmāna śaṅkhacakrodayobhayakaro vajralakṣmyā[84]
556 gauravaṃyaṅgito vajragaurīrūpayaḥ | vajrapāṇīr dvibhujāḥ sahasralocano
557 ratnamakuṭi sarvālakṣārakradhārī suvarṇavāṃro dakṣinena vajradhoro vāme tarjanīdhara
558 airāvānārūḍhāḥ sattvaparyāṅkī[85] vajragaurīrūpayaḥ vajrasācyāṅgitaḥ | vajrāṅgō
559 makaramukhavimāṇurūḍhāḥ sattvaparyāṅkī dvibhujākaṃkho
560 ratnamakuṭi sarvālakṣārakradhārīḥ pitavāṃrō dakṣine śaṅkārahārāḥ vāme kusumacāpadyarāḥ
561 vajragaurīrūpayaḥ vajrārūḍhāḥ[86] līṅgiṇatāḥ | tatra mahēṣvaro ’mitābhāśirasko
562 ’rdhacandraṇārūḍhārī | vāsudevo ’kṣobhyaśiraskāḥ | indro ratnasambhavāśiraskāḥ | vāme
563 kāmdevo ’mitābhāśiraskāḥ | evampramukhāḥ iti vajraṅkārttikavajraṅganapatyādayāḥ |
564 paṇca kāmamukhavimāṇurūḍhah | nānāmūrtiḥdharāḥ sarve bhūtā māyāvino jīnāḥ || [6.197–198]
565 paṇcetyādi | paṇca kāmā rūṣparasasparśa[88] sābdagandhāḥ[89] | kāmyante ’bhiṣasyanta
566 iti kāmāḥ, 90 ta eva guṇyante ’bhasyanta iti guṇāḥ, tair yuktāḥ[91] |
567 yathā paṇkodbhavaṃ padmaṃ paṇkadosaṇair na līpyate | tathā rāganayodbhūtā līpyante na ca doṣaṃkhāḥ || [6.199–200]
568 vastujuśesasya śaktim āḥ— yathetyādi | paṇkasya kardamasya doṣo
569 varnagandhādilakṣaṇaḥ |
570 ity ekal[93]![vīrākhya śrīcāṇḍamahārōṣaṇantre niśpannyogapatālaḥ saṣṭhāḥ ||
571 [6.201–202]
572 niśpannyogaprādhānaḥ[92] paṭalāḥ ||
573 iti saṣṭhapataṇalavākhyāḥ ll o ll
576

---

[81] gauryāṅgita[ Ms. p.e., ] gauryāṅgita[ Ms. a,c.]
[82] garudārūḍha[ ] em., garudārūḍhaḥ l Ms.
[83] odyotobhayakaro[ ] em., odyatābhayakaraḥ l Ms.
[84] olaṃkār[ ] em., olaṃkāra Ms.
[85] paryaṅkī[ ] em., paryaṅkiḥ l Ms.
[86] ovinārūḍhāḥ[ ] em., ovinārūḍhāḥ Ms.
[87] vajraṣaṃ[ ] conj., ratyaḥ Ms.
[88] sāpṛṣaḥ[ ] em., sāpṛṣā Ms.
[89] gandhāḥ[ ] em., gandha Ms.
[90] kāmāḥ[ ] em., kāmā Ms.
[91] yuktāḥ[ ] em., muktāḥ Ms.
[92] pradhānaḥ[ ] em., pradhānaṃ Ms.
3. Translation

We included George’s translation of the mūla (1974, pp. 65–78) in bold, printed here as prose, not free verse. We included some modifications, which are discussed in the notes. Minor changes (commas, changes to British English spelling, etc.) are not noted.

Then the Lady, Prajñāpāramitā, firmly embraced the Lord, and having rubbed the Vajra with the Lotus, said: [6.1–2]

[Now we turn to the chapter] beginning with Then. Prajñāpāramitā is Dvesāvajrī[1], the chief consort of the main deity, Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa]. This designation is meaningful (sānvayā). ‘Wisdom’ (prajñā), [examined via semantic analysis,] means a distinguished (pra° = prakṛṣṭam) gnosis (jñānam), [that is to say] the gnosis of Innate Bliss (sahajānanda).93 ‘The other shore’ (pāram) means distinguished state, [while] ‘gone’ (itā) means effortlessly attained, which amounts to ‘reached’.

Prajñāpāramitā [hence means] ‘reached the other shore of wisdom’, for it is a cause for the gnosis of Innate Bliss. †…† Firmly [is an adverb, i.e.] in such a way that it becomes intensive.94

What kind of meditation should be performed by the person practicing the Perfected Stage95? For the sake of the benefit to yoginīs, please fulfill my request. [6.3–4]

[As for the verse] beginning with The Perfected [Stage] (niṣpanna[krama ]95), the intended meaning is this: to be sure (hī), meditative cultivation [chara]ct erised by †…†96 is with reference to the Stage of Generation. †…† should be performed. This is the idea.

Then the Lord said:

The yogī who is situated in the yoga of the Perfected Stage should be devoted only to yoga. He should meditate day and night on my form with one-pointed mind. [6.5–7]

The perfected stage (niṣpannakramah) [is the same as what other traditions call] utpannakramah. [As for the passage] with one-pointed mind etc., the meaning is this: the yogī should meditate on himself as having the form of Black Acala or [any] other [ectype of Acala, depending on his affiliation,] with one-pointed mind, [that is to say,] with a mind focused on nothing else, by means of instantaneous

---

93 This is from a conjectured reading. We also considered sahajavayajñānam and the like, but the following passage suggests †ānanda for the problematic part. For the Blisses, see our note to 6.192–196.

94 Although our conjecture mapped unto some severely effaced akṣaras is somewhat tentative, this is perhaps the most likely gloss. Also cf. Mahāsukhavajra ad 6.36 below.

101 George uses the more customary but slightly inadequate rendering, “Stage of Completion”. We have modified this throughout.

106 We expect that the lacuna had something with ⁰lakṣanā.
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609 visualisation (*jhaṭityākārayogena*), the act of imagining something in the mind, without heeding the previously described meditative sequence beginning with the cultivation of the four brahmavihāras, the first of which is loving kindness (“*maitrī*”). The implication is that he should meditate on his woman as having the form of Dveṣavajrī or any other [Vajrī, depending on her affiliation]. Day and night her shape is loving kindness (ākāra) and identity (cahaṃkāra) of those respective (*tad*... *tad*) deities become manifest.

610 He should ardently consider his woman to have your form, until, with great and firm practice, it accordingly becomes perfectly clear. [6.8–9]

611 [He should visualise in such a way that it becomes] perfectly clear, [that is to say, in such a way that] the shape (ākāra) and identity (cahaṃkāra) of those [respective] (*tad*... *tad*) [deities] become manifest. And this is achieved by dedicated, uninterrupted, and lengthy repetitions. As it is said:

612 Whatever is very intensively meditated on, whether it is real or unreal, will give rise to clear and non-conceptual cognition when the meditation becomes powerful.

613 This is spelt out with a quotation, which we cannot trace in Sanskrit, in the commentary to the last chapter (Ms 33r): *bījenāpi vineti jhaṭityākārayogena | tathā coktam— yadvā jhaṭityōyogena vajradākhaḥ svayaṃ bhavet | bhāvyāvitāṁ viṇā bījam upapādukasatvatvavat | "[i.e.] by means of instantaneous visualisation. As it is taught: Alternatively, he should become Vajradākā by means of instantaneous visualisation, after having meditated [on it] without the seed[sylable], like the being which is spontaneously born.”.

614 See 4.7–8 ff. in George’s numeration. The point is that the Mahāyāna prelude and other gradual practices of the Stage of Generation (*attpattikramaḥ*) are not to be performed at this level.

615 We modified George’s translation “his own wife”, since it was probably not a requirement to formally marry the consort.

616 George here (1974, p. 66, n. 59) makes reference to the commentary; while he managed to capture the overall gist of the passage, it is based on a misreading of the manuscript (sphutatāṃ iti tadahaṃkārayoḥ). These three attributes of meditative cultivation are commonplace in non-tantric Buddhists texts and tantric authors adopt it almost automatically. On a tantric level, however, ‘lengthy’ is somewhat relative; for Buddhist and Śaiva testimonia in the two cited works: (Pseudo-)Padmāvajra’s *Advayavi-\vaṇaṇaropaṇiṇipādavyāvinīcaśavāsiddhi* (Samdhong Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1988, p. 218, which transmits *bala* in *pāda* c, and the even *pādas* in a corrupt form: *yad yad eveti bhāvyate and tasya sākalyāduḥ phalam*); and Sucaritamitra’s *Kāśikā* (Sambaśiva Sāstri 1926, p. 215, which too has *ātiḥbhāvyate and o bala*, but *diḥ phalam* in the last *pāda*).

617 These three attributes of meditative cultivation are commonplace in non-tantric Buddhists texts and tantric authors adopt it almost automatically. On a tantric level, however, ‘lengthy’ is somewhat relative; for one of the key strengths of deity-yoga is that achievement is reached quickly. We do indeed find the third item dropped, e.g. Pañcāraksāvīdhana, Śādhanamālā 206 (Bhattacharya 1928, p. 406), and even replaced with *dṛḍhāvēśāḥ, ‘a firm intentness’, e.g. TārodbhavaKurukullāśadhana, Śādhanamālā 172 (Bhattacharya 1928, p. 349). Note the usage of āvēśāḥ, which is primarily used for possession by deities and demons.

618 This is Pramāṇavārttika, Pratyakṣapariccheda v. 285 (= Pramāṇaviniścaya 1.31) slightly rewritten and somewhat garbled in transmission. The verse is quoted very often and with fluctuating readings, cf. Isaacson and Sflira (2014, pp. 169, 267) (we follow this translation with a slight modification to *pāda a*) and Kuranishi (2016, p. 54). We can add two more instances to the already rather exhaustive survey of Buddhist and Śaiva testimonia in the two cited works: (Pseudo-)Padmāvajra’s *Advayavi-\vaṇaṇaropaṇiṇipādavyāvinīcaśavāsiddhi* (Samdhong Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1988, p. 218, which transmits *bala* in *pāda* c, and the even *pādas* in a corrupt form: *yad yad eveti bhāvyate and tasya sākalyāduḥ phalam*); and Sucaritamitra’s *Kāśikā* (Sambaśiva Sāstri 1926, p. 215, which too has *ātiḥbhāvyate and o bala*, but *diḥ phalam* in the last *pāda*). Mahāsukhavajra seems to have recomposed *pāda a*, which is invariably transmitted as *tasmād bhūtām abhiśītām vā*. This is understandable, since *tasmād, ‘therefore’* would not have made much sense here. In the next two verse quarters, we find *ātiḥbhāvyate vs. abhiḥbhāvyate and *balaniśpattau vs. pariniśpattau* almost equally distributed in the testimonia. As for *pāda d*, it is evident that at some point in the transmission of Mahāsukhavajra’s text, *tat and sphuṭa* exchanged places. We cannot see any good explanation for this, unless either of these two words became at some point a marginal correction and was subsequently reinserted into the main body in the wrong place. There does not seem to be any legitimacy for the *visarga in *diḥ*, but this is somewhat disturbingly
Through the power of repetition, both real and unreal things appear manifest for
men, just like beautiful women for those tormented by lust. Verily, the practice of
yoga (yogayuktih) depends on the mind (cittanuyatā).\textsuperscript{104}

\begin{paracase}
\textit{Mother, daughter, sister, niece, and any other female relative,\textsuperscript{105} as well as a}

\textit{Ḍominī,\textsuperscript{106} \[the female \[relative of a\] Brahmin,\textsuperscript{107} [6.10–11]}

\[We now turn to the verse\] beginning with \textit{Mother}. [The yogin] should take a
consort (\textit{prajñām}) beginning with ‘mother’, but only one in which youth has not
yet faded.\textsuperscript{108} As everyone knows (kīla), men will become exceedingly engaged with
whatever object their mind is set upon. [Now,] although their mind is engaged, they
will turn it away [from that object, in this case women,] because of fear from society
(\textit{loka}). But [then] they will experience intense suffering caused by [this] turning
away. Because of [this] suffering, there will be a distraction (\textit{vikṣepah}) of mind, and
because of that [distraction] there will be a lack of composure (\textit{samādhānā}). And if
there is a lack of composure, there will be no achievement of the Great Seal
(\textit{mahāmudrā}) (i.e. the ultimate state).

Moreover, it should not be supposed that [engaging with women in such a way]
contradicts religion (\textit{adharma}), because there is no injury either to oneself or to
others. Nor is there †...†, because of its having the form of experiencing Great

\footnotesize{Footnote 102 continued
not the only time we see this form, cf. for instance the readings of Pseudo-Padmanyājra and Sucaritamiśra
just above, but also Ratnakūraśi’s \textit{Sarvaṇajñadī}
(Thakur 1957, p. 9, which also erroneously prints \textit{sphutā kalpa}), Vāgīśvarakūraśi’s \textit{Tattvaratnāvadakavivarana}
(Pandey 1997, p. 144), as well as the best manuscript
of Ratnakūraśi’s \textit{Padminī} (Ms, 22r), granted, \textit{ante correctionem}, and therefore justifiably not mentioned
in the critical notes in Kuranishi (2016). The main point is that an intensively cultivated concept or image
qualifies as direct perception (\textit{pratyakṣam}) of the yogic kind (\textit{yogī}), inasmuch as it is “clear” (which
essentially means the same as \textit{abhrāntam}, ‘non-erroneous’ in the standard definition of direct perception)
and “non-conceptual” (\textit{kalanopadham} in the standard definition).

\textsuperscript{103} Perhaps something like \textit{āparrāṇa ca} is missing here, otherwise Mahāṇukhavajra might create the
impression that the two verses are from the same source.

\textsuperscript{104} This is from the \textit{Vāksādha} of Sujanaśadvādana, \textit{Sādhanāmālā} 66 (Bhattacharya 1925: 135, where for
some reason \textit{pāda d} is printed as a long compound). Alternatively, one may understand \textit{yuktiḥ} as ‘logic’,
‘the way [yoga] works’.

\textsuperscript{105} Judging by his final sentence to this passage, we think that Mahāṇukhavajra might have taken
\textit{jāatiṇīm} in a weaker sense, such as ‘intimate friend’.

\textsuperscript{106} George has “female musician”, but this was not the only occupation associated with this group well
outside the caste system. He probably opted for this meaning, because he wanted \textit{rajākī} in the next line to be
a washerwoman. However, these were, as their name shows, dyers, although it is of course true that the
two occupations are related and probably also performed by the same people. We leave it to
ethnographers to establish whether \textit{dombas} are related to the Dom people. Elsewhere (Ms 15r),
Mahāṇukhavajra suggests that the primary feature of \textit{dombinīś} was their black skin colour (\textit{kṛṣṇakanyūm
iti dominīm}), and that there was considerable racism directed towards them (\textit{ibid.}: \textit{kṛṣṇakanyūdinām
lokaviruddhatvā; “[And the yogī should make love to them in such a way that nobody finds out,] for
black girls etc. are considered forbidden by society.”}.

\textsuperscript{107} George has “Brāhma”, which sounds male. At any rate, strictly speaking women do not possess
caste, because that status is inherited from the father’s side.

\textsuperscript{108} This point, that the consort should be young, is emphasised in several places in the commentary, e.g.
Ms 14v, 15r.}
Pleasure. On the contrary, this is producing [spiritual] profit both to oneself and to others. To explain:

Correctly producing [spiritual] profit to oneself and to others, one will gain merit. In the contrary case, [one will accrue] sin. The [karmic] fruit[s], pleasure and suffering, are [the result] of these two [respectively].

Nor is there sin from the type of consort [chosen], because that would contradict [what] other tantras [teach]. As said, amongst others:

The mother, the sister, the sister’s daughter,

As for [the scriptural and exegetical passages,] where [it is stated that] the words ‘mother’ etc. denote the eyes etc., those [seek to] hide reality from beings unworthy [for the practice of the esoteric path] (abhavya°). Were it otherwise, [namely] that some people removed the words ‘eyes’ etc. and replaced it with antisocial (lokaviruddha°) words like ‘mother’ etc., then it would simply be the case that these are the ravings of madmen.

Among these [mentioned consorts], mother can mean birth mother, stepmother, maternal aunt, or the wife of the master. Daughter can mean fathered

109 Achieving Great Pleasure is the same as achieving buddhahood, cf. Mahāsukhavajra (Ms 30v): buddhasiddhi mahāsukhasiddhi.
110 This contrast, adharma being injury (apakāraḥ) to both oneself and others and its opposite, i.e. dharma, being benefit (arthakaraṇam = upakāraḥ) to both oneself and others, might allude to standard definitions of these two terms.
111 We were unable to trace this verse.
113 What Mahāsukhavajra has in mind here is most likely a passage in Krṣṇa¯ca¯rya’s commentary of the Hevajratantra, the Yogaratnamālā, where the Buddhakapālalattra is quoted (Snellgrove 1959, pp. 155–156; Tripathi and Negi 2006, pp. 180–181; Farrow and Menon 1992, p. 270; for the Buddhakapāla quotation, see Luo 2010, pp. 29, 102). We give here the text slightly standardised and with our own translation, since that of Farrow & Menon is inadequate. […] mātrādāsābdaḥ pāncendriyāṇy abhidhiyante, tāni sabdaruraparāsaddhiḥ pariṇa kāmagnais tarpayet | iyam eva hi htaṁ sthānāṁ devināṁ niruttarā piṣeti | katham mātrādāyās cakṣurādaya iti cet | tathā coktam Buddhakapāle yoginītrante— […] bhaginī bhavēc cakṣur bhāginī vṛddhāṃ eva ca | janaṁ bhanyate ghrāṇam rasanā duhi tāthā | mano bhaved bhāryāḥ | sad etā pariṇāmaḥ mahāmudrāpradāyikāḥ || iti || “The words beginning with ‘Mother’ denote the five sense faculties. Those should be propitiated with the five objects of desire, viz. sound, sight, taste, etc. For there (i.e. in the ganacakra) it is this, which is the suitable unsurpassed worship of the goddesses. Now, if one were to ask: ‘How is it that [the words] mother, etc. [denote] the eyes, etc.?’ As it is taught in the yoginītrante [called] the Buddhakapāla: The sister is the eye, the niece is the ear, the birth mother is the nose, the daughter is the tongue, the mind [here: the sense faculty of the body, i.e. of touch] is the wife.” While Mahāsukhavajra strongly disapproves of this interpretation, he seeks to defend the authority of both scripture and co-exegete by claiming that they are shedding the truth from those unprepared.
114 We do not find the compound sapatnamāṭā elsewhere, the interpretation is therefore conjectural. Cf., however, our note to 6.38.
115 This is highly unusual, since the guru’s consort is off limits. Cf. Cittāvīśuddhīprakarana 129ab (Patel 1949, p. 9): guror aṭṭāma ca mudrām ca chāyām api na lañghayet | “He should not transgress his guru’s command, mount his consort, or even step over his shadow.” This is our interpretation, as we are not
daughter, brother’s daughter, the daughter from a previous marriage of a woman brought into wedlock together with her, or the daughter of the master. Sister can mean one related by blood, the daughter of a maternal aunt, or the daughter of the master. Niece means the daughter of any of these [previously listed]. Any other means those [different] from the four [just mentioned], who are defined below.

Caṇḍālī, dancer, dyer, and prostitute; holy woman, yoginī, and kāpālinī as well—[6.12–13]

Prostitute (lit. ‘she who makes a living of her body/beauty’) means a harlot who will not charge a fee [for taking part in the ritual] (āgrhītapaṇyām).

Footnote 115 continued convinced that Varghese (2008, p. 260) understood the line: “One should not transgress the commands of one’s preceptor, nor one should not (sic!) forget his mudrās, or even his shadow.” Also cf. Prajñopāyavinīcasayiddhi 2.14cd–15ab (Samdhong Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1988, p. 71): viheṭhayanti cātmanam ātamanaita durisāyāḥ | haraye gurumudrāyā ratnatrayadhanasya ca | “Wicked men bring misfortune upon themselves if they steal the guru’s consort or the wealth that belongs to Three Jewels.”

Note that we read this with the variant dhanaṣya, and not dharasya as in the constituted text. Also cf. the Dākinījālamāvraharasya (Samdhong Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1990, p. 11), a quotation from the [Dākinī]vajrapaṇjara: gurō chāyāṃ na langhayed [guru]patiṃ ca pādukā[ṃ] | ye laṅghayanti sammohāt te naraḥ kṣuradāhenāḥ || “He should not step over the guru’s shadow, mount the guru’s wife, or use his sandals. Those men who do [so] out of delusion, will go to the Razor-edged [hell].”

116 Again, we do not find this meaning in the standard dictionaries, but it is the most logical choice.

117 This is stated in a very roundabout way, and our interpretation is somewhat tentative.

118 Presumably sharing at least one parent.

119 In this case presumably one of more or less the same age with the yogī.

120 George translates this as “sweeper”, but once again we are dealing with an obscure marginal group with various occupations. Caṇḍālas are the par excellence untouchables. On how to gain such a woman, see the famous passage from Padmavajra’s Guhyasiddhi discussed in Sanderson (2009, pp. 144–145).

121 George’s “washerwoman” has already been discussed above.

122 This, George’s translation, is perhaps a bit too strong, but we left it as it is for lack of a better rendering. We think that it can be any woman undertaking a religious observance, e.g. a nun.

123 This time George’s “ascetic” is too narrow. The word means a female kāpālikā, i.e. probably a Śaiva.

124 In addition to these, later on we have widows, etc. Mahāsukhavajra, perhaps not without social prejudice, explains (Ms 29r): raṇḍāḥpatīśānyāḥ strīyāḥ | seyyāvajrapadmayogena | yatiṇyoḥbhikṣunīta-parsvinyādayāḥ | prāyaṇa kīla raṇḍādinām (em., raṇḍādinam Ms) idam eva satataṃ cetasi garjati: katham puruṣasamparko bhavat id | lokabhaye ca pūrṇaḥ ca pravaratante | saktasya tu yogino na lokabhayam asti | atas tena sevaniyāḥ || “Widows means those women, whose husbands are absent. Should be served means by uniting the Vajra with the Lotus. Female ascetics means [Buddhist] nuns, anchoresses, etc. As everyone knows, generally widows etc. constantly obsess over how they could make contact with men. But men do no act on this, because they fear society. However, a powerful yogī does not fear society, therefore he should serve them.” A ‘powerful yogī’ is an experienced one. Elsewhere (Ms 21r), ‘power’ (saktiḥ) is glossed as the magical capability to paralyse or kill. When the yogī is perceived to have gained these powers, he will not be vexed by society or royal authority, because they will fear him.

125 Note George’s slightly different and metrically correct reading, rūpajīvīkām.
Or else, whatever he may find fashioned into a woman’s figure: these he should serve in the proper way without disclosure. [6.14–15]

What will happen if there is a disclosure [of one’s participation in these practices]? [The Lord] explains [this in the next verse,] beginning with But if there is a disclosure.

But if there is a disclosure, Cāṇḍamahāroṣaṇa will be angered and slay the practitioner. And he will throw him into the Avīci Hell threatening him with a sword and noose. Nor will he obtain Success in this world or the next. Therefore, this must be kept very secret and not be made visible. Like the mantra of the Ḍākinī, the practice of Cāṇḍamahāroṣaṇa should be secret. [6.16–20]

Objection (nanu)! If this is so, then what is the point of teaching all this, which causes great misfortune? [This is] explained [with the next verse] beginning with Exceedingly.

And this has been explained by me, the Buddha, for the sake of those who are exceedingly passionate. [6.21]

The meaning is this: this [i.e. the body of practices advocated by this scripture belong to] the vehicle of passion (rāganayo). And once passion has arisen, it should never be avoided.

Or, if this [proves] impossible [to perform as prescribed, that is to say, if one cannot find a] flesh and blood [woman] (sākṣān), then one should rely on a likeness of

---

126 We modified George’s slightly ambiguous “Or whatever other he may receive with a woman’s figure.” This line is explained by Mahāsukhavajra just below.

127 Of course, the root sev has a strongly sexual connotation, as Mahāsukhavajra himself makes this clear elsewhere (Ms 29r), see three notes above.

128 The point here is that the practice should be performed observing strict secrecy (cf. 6.19–20). If it is divulged, great calamity will befall the yogī (cf. 6.16–18). We could not therefore agree with George’s interpretation of bhedaḥ here and in the next verse as “making any/makes a distinction”. The pāda yathā bheda na jāyate is an echo of Hevajratantra I.v.3 (Snellgrove 1959, p. 16), where the opposite situation is introduced by agupte, “[but] if it is not hidden”. We find the same collocation yathā bheda na jāyate in two early sources: Padmavajra’s Guhyasiddhi 6.94b (Samdhong Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1988, p. 47) and the Advayasaṃatāvijaya (Fan 2011, p. 164).

129 Perhaps more suitable than George’s “provoked”.

130 George has “and threaten him”; we modified this to a more correct rendering of the present participle.

131 Perhaps more correctly “his sword and noose”, since these are the two implements of the deity.

132 We are puzzled by this expression: which dākinī does the author of the mūla have in mind and why should her mantra be more secret than other spells?.

133 Here too we must disagree with George. His chosen reading is (in spite of two of his manuscripts suggesting otherwise) abhyantakāminiṃ, which he translates as “those who cherish the esoteric”.

134 Mahāsukhavajra presumably borrows this expression from the last verse of the present chapter. The more common expression is mahārāganaya, ‘the vehicle of great (or special) passion’, i.e. one in which common rāga is transmuted towards spiritual means, as alluded to immediately below, ad 6.160.

135 This explanation looks back at 6.14.
the [consort] (*tatpratikṛtim*), made of [a suitable substance] such as wood (*dāru*),

or painted on a cloth (*paṭa*).

And this should be performed only in an isolated place, [therefore the next verse] begins with *[Pleasing to the mind]*.

In a place pleasing to the mind where there are no disturbances, in secret, after having taken a lover who is agreeable to his mind, [6.22–23]

In secret means covered [from prying eyes by means of] a wall (*bhitti*), a screen (*paṭala*), a door-panel (*kapāta*), or [something similar]. **Having taken** means having grasped. **A lover who is agreeable to one’s mind** means any [woman] from among [those listed before,] whom his mind finds attractive.

“I am Buddha and the Perfected One, Immoveable, she is cherished Prajñāpāramitā,” thus the wise person should meditate with fixed thought, each one having their respective [divine] form. [6.24–25]

The [compound] **each one having their respective [divine] form** clarifies what has been stated already. The meaning is this: [the yogī] should not meditate observing the practice [of visualising] the deity as in the Stage of Generation, [that is to say visualising] the colour, the shape, the arms [with hands holding implements] such as the sword [and] the chopping knife, the legs, [and performing the] installation [of mantras on the body], and so on. Instead, he should [instantly] perform visualisation of himself and the consort in whichever colour, shape, etc. is naturally suited to him and his [consort].

---

136 *Consorts fashioned out of wood etc.* are also mentioned in Śrībhānu’s commentary of the *Vajrārāma*, a passage recycled in scripture, the *Sampūtoddhava* (Szántó 2016, p. 414). For a cultural history of (Western) sex dolls, see Ferguson (2010). Although the theme itself is not unknown in Classical literature, this work claims that the most direct antecedent can be found in cloth fornicatory dolls used by sailors on long voyages in the 17th c. (2010, 16 ff.). The study completely ignores pre-contemporary non-Western material, except stating that the Japanese adopted the concept from Dutch seamen and sometimes refer to these objects as *ducht[i] waifu*, ‘Dutch wife’ (2010, p. 27).

137 The lemma is somewhat unusual. George’s edition does not compound the first two words, which is probably a misprint.

138 Although George’s translation, “In a pleasing place” is perfectly fine, we changed it slightly to allign with how we translate the lemma of the commentator.

139 We translate the absolutive more literally than George’s “he should take”.

140 Again we translated more literally than George, who has “a woman who has desire”.

141 Or perhaps ‘a perfected one’, a *siddha*.

142 That is to say, Acala, the main deity otherwise called Candamahārosana.

143 Rather than simply “his” as George has it, since both the yogī and the consort assume divine forms.

144 This is the chief implement of the goddess.

145 This, somewhat free translation is the result of a relatively confident conjecture (*prakṛtisiddham, tenaiva for prakṛti + + + naiva*). The passage alludes to 4.78–89 (tr. George 1974, pp. 62–63), a teaching seemingly advocating that the deity-affiliation of practitioners can be established by their skin tone. Thus, those of dark complexion should cultivate themselves as black Acala, those fairer as white Acala, etc. To this, Mahāsukhavajra adds (Ms 14v–15r): *prakṛtisiddhā eva narā nāryā ca, kim tv anādyavidyāvāsanopahātāḥ | tadavidvāyāsanānāsanārtham tu devadevīhāvānā kriyate | bhāvanā ca prakṛtisiddhavārṇena*
And having made a lonely hermitage, and with food and clothing as obtained, they should meditate ardently by the practice of copulating with each other.  

[6.26–27]

[Now for the compound] beginning with As. [The compound yathālabdhaḥnaastraḥkaḥ is a bahuvrīhi meaning] he who [finds] pleasure (kaṃ), [that is to say] comfort (sukhaṃ), with the nourishment and the clothing as [he had] obtained [them]. In other words, he should not entertain [dichotomies such as] ‘this food etc. is agreeable’, ‘this [food etc.] is not [agreeable]’. Practice of copulation means the practice of embracing and so on.

He should bring the woman into his presence and seat her before him. Each should gaze steadily at the other, with mutual desire. Then, concentrating on the visual pleasure, he should remain with one-pointed mind. Just then she should utter the following speech, which arouses pleasure. [6.28–31]

[We will now explain the meaning of] visual pleasure. As everyone knows (kila), beholding the limbs and body parts of women produces great pleasure indeed. The meaning is that therefore he should remain (i.e. pause) for a few minutes contemplating that pleasure, after having become motionless like a log (kāśṭhavan), together with whichever consort who [is able through her beauty to give] rise to that [visual] bliss. He should then contemplate auditory pleasure [in a similar way].

[This is explained in the line] beginning with She. [Speech,] which arouses pleasure means [speech] which intensifies the previously arisen pleasure (i.e. the one obtained through sight).

Footnote 145 continued
śīghram eva sputatārā bhavati l tatsuḥūṭībhāvaḥ dhī mahāmudrāsiddhiḥ l “Both men and women are by their very nature accomplished, but they are afflicted by the imprints of beginningless ignorance. It is precisely in order to destroy these imprints of ignorance that the cultivation [of oneself] as gods and goddesses is performed. And [this] cultivation becomes exceedingly clear very quickly if [performed] according to one’s natural complexion. And when this becomes clear, one achieves the Great Seal.” Elsewhere (Ms 10r), it is suggested that the initiate has the option to either choose an ectype of Acala at will or to chose the one suited to his skin colour (svābhilāṣataḥ, svedehavarṇata vā). Normally this affinity is established by throwing a flower or a small garland on the maṇḍala or a copy thereof.

146 George has “he should meditate ardently—the two coupled with each other.” However, we interpret dvābhyaṃ ... bhāvayen as an ergative construction (also see 6.29, dvābhyaṃ ... ikṣayet), which might point to the fact that the author was thinking in Newar occasionally.

147 Mahāsukhavajra’s reading must have been this, and not George’s “vastuṣkaḥ, we therefore changed his translation mirroring that reading, “with whatever he has for food and property”. We suspect that the original author of the tantra did not think much of including the kan suffix as a verse filler, but this is an opportunity for the commentator to display some sophistication.

148 We translate more literally here; George has “enjoyable view”.

149 George has “each”, which might fit the context semantically, but it does not follow the grammar.

150 The limbs (āṅgaṁ/aṅgāni) are the head, the trunk, the arms, and the legs. What we here translate as ‘body parts’ for lack of a better English word (pratyāṅgam/pratyāṅgāni) include the forehead, the nose, the chin, the fingers, etc.
“You are my son and my husband; you are my brother and father. I am your
mother, wife, sister, and niece. Together with seven generations of your paternal
ancestors, you are my slave, my phlegm-eating lowly servant. I bought you
with cowrie shells; I am called your mistress.” [6.32–35]

The two verses beginning with You are my son should be recited by the woman
with a shrill intonation in the †...† scale while beholding the man. Then, after
having contemplated for a few minutes the pleasure arising from that (i.e. her voice
and words) in line with the process described previously, he should worship her.

He should fall at her feet ardently with his palms pressed together. Then he
should utter this speech arousing the highest pleasure. [6.36–37]

[This is explained] beginning with And he should fall [at her feet]. Ardently
means in a way that it becomes so (i.e. adverbial usage).

“You are my mother, my father’s wife, and you are my niece. You are my
sister, my son’s wife, you are my paternal aunt and maternal aunt. I am your
slave in all ways, keenly active in devotion to you. O Mother, look upon me with
kindness, casting a loving glance.” [6.38–41]

The two verses beginning with You are my mother should be recited by the yogī in
the manner stated before. In case [either or both] lack a melodious voice (svara°),
then the recitation should be performed with grace (lālityena). The words brother,
mother, etc. are taught with the aim of intensifying [the couple’s] pleasure.

---

151 This is a tentative translation, but perhaps more plausible than George’s “For seven generations you have been my slave”.
152 George discreetly avoids translating kheṭasa°. Ms Gt reads kheṭāsa°, which we correct to kheṭāśa°.
153 Or perhaps: ‘a single cowrie shell’. Cowries (kapardakaḥ) were used as coins of minute denomination (Gopal 1989, pp. 213–214). In other words, he is being told that he is a cheap slave.
154 Or perhaps: ‘I am to be addressed as “mistress” by you’.
155 We translate thus with some hesitation. The Pāṇiniyasikṣā 34c (Ghosh 1938, p. 72) lists kākasvaram (which Ghosh translates as ‘repressed tone’) as a fault in recitation. Perhaps the text means the voice of a crow, but the crow is considered unpleasant and inauspicious, so it is difficult to see how such an intonation could be construed as erotic. We have also considered emending to kāku°, in which case the verse would be recited in a slightly ironic, sarcastic, and therefore jestful (even ‘kinky’) tone. This would be more suited to the second verse, in which she describes the man as her slave, etc.
156 We are unaware of any musical scale called kahu or anything even remotely similar.
157 The presence of the enclitic ca in the lemma is somewhat surprising. Perhaps Mahāsukhavajra read a different version, e.g. *patec ca pādayos tasyā. We included the enclitic in the translation.
158 We disagree with George’s compounding mātā and pitur and therefore with his interpretation “You are my mother’s father’s wife”; cf. Mahāsukhavajra’s list of what ‘mother’ means ad 6.10 above.
159 George compounds bhagināputrabhārāya and translates as “my mother’s father’s wife”. His interpretation of svasā (correctly: svasā) as ‘sister’ is puzzling. Mānikā, a Sanskritised vernacular word, is not simply aunt, but maternal aunt.
Mahāsukhavajra’s *Padmāvatī* Commentary on the Sixth...

Then she, after having embraced the man,¹⁶⁰ should kiss him again and again. She places the Three Syllables on his head, and in his mouth, the juice of the mouth, honey.¹⁶¹ [6.42–43]

The Three Syllables [should be] accompanied with the gesture of a hollow fist.¹⁶²

The juice of the mouth means a globule of phlegm, expectorated loudly. The same is [said to be] like honey, for it gives rise to the pleasure [experienced when consuming] honey.

She should have him suck the Lotus, and show him rolling eyes. Placing lipstick on his mouth, she should press his heart with her breast. [6.44–45]

The Lotus means the vulva. She should have him suck means that the yoginī should draw the head of the yogī to her lotus grabbing him by the hand.¹⁶⁴ Until the completion of cunnilingus (*cūsanakriyā*)¹⁶⁰, the yoginī should from time to time rest [her hand] on the yogī’s head and bestow the three syllables.¹⁶⁵ Then, once that has been completed, the yoginī should lift the yogī’s head and should roll her eyes,¹⁶⁶ that is to say, she should look at him with sidelong glances (*kaṭākṣaṇa*).¹⁶⁷

In front of him, looking him in the face,¹⁶⁸ she should scratch him wherever appropriate.¹⁶⁰ She should speak to him in this way: “Eat my Vairocana!” [6.46–47]

¹⁶⁰ We favour the reading *śiśṭvā* over *śiśṭā*: George’s translation, “in the man’s embrace”, is modified accordingly.

¹⁶¹ We translate more literally than George, who has “sweet saliva”, also taking *madhu* as a noun, as does Mahāsukhavajra.

¹⁶² This is the result of a conjecture. Without the *sa* the text would be saying that the Three Syllables are a gesture, which seems absurd to us. The Three Syllables or the Triad of Syllables (*tryakṣaṇa*) is usually *om aḥ hūṃ*, cf. *om aḥ hūṃ ti tryakṣaṇaḥ* in the *Maitṣūrīśādhana, Sādhanamālā* 51 (Bhattacharya 1925, p. 107); *om aḥ hūṃ ti tryakṣaṇaḥ* in the *Kurukullāśādhana* of *Krṣṇa*, Sādhanamālā 181 (Bhattacharya 1928, p. 376); *om aḥ hūṃ sītanīlapāthıṭrāyakṣaṇāḥ cintayet* in the *Pratisarāśādhana, Sādhanamālā* 194 (Bhattacharya 1928, p. 396). George was seemingly puzzled by this reading, too (1974, p. 68, n. 60): “As explained in the Comm., this is a light blow on the top of his head with a partially closed fist. Why ‘Three Syllables’ is not explained.” Also see our note to 6.146 below. The corruption can be easily explained as a kind of haplography, since *sa* and *ma* look very similar.

¹⁶³ A very minor point: observing correct *sandhi*, this should be *piḍayaṇa dhṛdam*. We also suspect that this reading might be a corruption of *piḍayaṇa dṛṇham*. We feel a little hesitant here, because the expression usually means extricating one’s hand.

¹⁶⁴ The idea seems to be that she rests her hollow fist on his head from time to time, while reciting *om aḥ hūṃ*.

¹⁶⁵ Another minor point: Mahāsukhavajra’s *lemma* is missing the *vi*.

¹⁶⁶ This, as any reader of Indian poetry and *ars amatoria* will surely know, is considered a most erotic eye gesture.

¹⁶⁷ It is somewhat doubtful that this is what Mahāsukhavajra read.

¹⁶⁸ We favour Mical’s more metrical reading *nakhaṃ dattvocitālaye* over George’s *nakhaṃ dattvā cītālaye*. His translation, “she should pinch him on the chest”, has been modified accordingly. The appropriate places for scratching (breasts, cheeks, etc.) are listed in erotic guidebooks, e.g. *Nāgarasarvasva*, chapter 22 (Shukla Shastri 1994, pp. 85–87), but also in this chapter, see 6.131–132 below.
Then the yoginī should make the yogī lay down, facing upwards. Then she should place her anal lotus and her vaginal lotus in front of his mouth, recite the three syllables, and say Eat Vairocana! and so forth. [Then] she should quickly give [those substances to him] as she pleases.  

Drink the Aksobhya-water, O Son! Be a slave along with your father! I am your cow-girl as well as your royal mother. [6.48–49]

Aksobhya-water means urine. As for the yogī, he should take all that with reverence, become still [for a few minutes], and contemplate nothing but the pleasure [derived from ingestion]. Then she should make him rise once again and address [him the words] beginning with [Be a slave] along with your father.

Constantly take refuge at my feet, my dear. You were raised by me, hence your invaluable nature. [6.50–51]

[Now for the passage] beginning with By me. [You] have been brought up by me, assuming the shape of [your] mother, in your childhood with breast milk etc. [Hence your] invaluable, [that is to say,] priceless [nature, i.e. present state]. The implied meaning is [that by this fostering the yogī has assumed] a distinguished state.

Be grateful, O my dear, give me the pleasure born from the Vajra! Look at my three-petalled Lotus, decorated in the middle with stamen. [6.52–53]

Grateful is one who recognises a favourable deed. This is the intended meaning: I have done you a favour by bringing you up; now you should return the favour! Born from the Vajra means [this:] Vajra means penis; [born from] means brought about

---

170 The absolutive arpya is a slight blemish (lyap for ktvā). One could of course emend it to samarpya, but it is not out of the question that this reading is original and was inspired by the miśa, cf. 4.103–104.

171 We feel somewhat hesitant about the conjecture yathāruacy āśu for yathāruvā, but *yathāruvā is not attested for the indeclinable adverb yathāruci. However, it is not out of the question that this was indeed the reading, an idiosyncratic usage on the author’s part.

172 Understand aksobhyajaran as a karmadhāraya compound (“the water which is Aksobhya”) and not as George, a genitive tatpurusa (“water of Aksobhya”).

173 The instrumental pitra would have sufficed, sa⁰ is therefore probably a verse filler. Alternatively, emend to sapita. We hope this addresses George’s worries expressed in (1974, p. 68, n. 63) and improves his translation, “O Son, be a slave as well as a father!”.

174 George translates this as “formal wife”, but it is perhaps more likely that this in an allusion to a pastoral erotic setting, such as Kṛṣṇa’s sport with the gopīs.

175 We feel that an adverb to the present participle is more apposite here than an obscure adjective (“bestower of essence”) to the object, hence the emendation sādaraṃ for sāradam.

176 It would therefore seem that Mahāsukhavajra took the vocative putra with pibāksobhyajaran. We modified the translation accordingly.

177 Rather than George’s “gracious”.

178 We are more literal here than George’s “the pleasure of the vajra”.

S. Grimes, P.-D. Szántó
by that. The meaning is [the pleasure] born from the churning of the Vajra [in the Lotus]. **Three-petalled** means triangular. [As for the compound 179] beginning with **middle; decorated** in the middle with **stamen**, [that is to say] with a wick[-shaped] lump of flesh.

**Oh, it is the field of Pleasureful Heaven adorned with the Red Buddha, giving pleasure to the lustful, utterly devoid of all conceptualisation.** [6.54–55]

[The particle] **Oh (aho)** here expresses pleasure. The [buddha-field] Pleasureful (Sukhāvati) is so-called because it guards (avati), [that is to say] protects (rakṣati), pleasure. That itself is a **field**, [i.e.] a place. **Red** [here] means blood; that itself is a **buddha**; [the Lotus] is **adorned** by that. The meaning is that the external [buddha-field] called Sukhāvati, too, is adorned by Amitābha[, who is red]. All **conceptualisation** means the conceptualisation of object, subject, and perception; [the Lotus] is **devoid** of that.

**Alight on my reclining form; my mind trembles with desire. Place my two feet on your shoulder, and look me up and down.** [6.56–57]

**On [your] shoulder** means on the two sides of the neck. **Below** means her vulva. **Up** means her face.

**Then make the throbbing Vajra enter the opening in the centre of the Lotus.**

**Give a thousand strokes, one hundred thousand, ten million, one hundred million, in my three-petalled Lotus, adorned with a wick of flesh**. [6.58–60]

**The throbbing vajra** means the erect penis. **A thousand strokes** (dhāpa°) [: here] **strokes** [means] thrusts (āghāta°) [produced by] moving the hips; **a thousand** [of these], that is to say, many. This [i.e. a thousand] does not mean that one has to count them out [precisely]; and it should be understood that the same holds for **one hundred thousand** (lakṣa°) and the other [numbers].
Insert your Vajra and propitiate your mind with pleasures. \textsuperscript{184} Wow, wow! My Lotus is the essence of the essence, \textsuperscript{186} the very highest, and aroused by the tip \textsuperscript{187} of the Vajra, it is as red as the Banduka flower. \textsuperscript{188} [6.61–63]

[With the words] ‘Wow, wow’, [the consort] generates joy by praising [her Lotus]. \textbf{The essence} means pleasure and so on; \textsuperscript{189} [the Lotus is] the essence of that [essence], because of its [capability to bestow] Great Pleasure.

Concentrating on her speech, he should become motionless, with one-pointed mind. Without moving, he should meditate on the pleasure arising from that, with a fixed mind. Then he should answer her\textsuperscript{190}: ‘Wait a moment, my dear, that I may consider, for just a moment, your womanly form. \textsuperscript{191} Woman alone is the birth giver, the giver of true pleasure to the Three Worlds, the kind one. Those chattering fools engaged in evil action, who in this world disparage her out of hostility, will, by their action remain constantly tortured for three aeons in the fathomless \textsuperscript{192} Raudra Hell, wailing as their bodies burn in many fires. [6.64–67]

[Woman is here called] \textbf{birth giver}, for she generates pleasure. \textbf{Kind} means beneficial. Now, if one were to ask ‘How is it that one goes to hell by disparaging women?’, the following is stated. As everyone knows (\textit{kila}), women generate this-worldly (i.e. common) pleasure. But [they] also [generate] otherworldly (i.e. soteriological) pleasure. For this very reason, they produce the utmost benefit, since they give birth to buddha [s], inasmuch as they have the nature of Prajñāpāramitā/the perfection of wisdom. For this very reason, by disparaging them, there will be great demerit. And because of that one will go to hell. As for the religious teaching (\textit{dharma}) of disparaging women (\textit{strīnīndā}) proclaimed elsewhere, \textsuperscript{193} that is [intended] for beings unworthy [of the

\textsuperscript{184} Rather than George’s “offer your mind with pleasure”. This is perhaps an allusion to the Four Blisses.

\textsuperscript{185} George translates “O Air, Air!”, but this cannot be a vocative, which would have to be vāyo. The word is unusual, and we cannot find any parallels for it. Perhaps the meaning is more akin to English ‘wow!’.

\textsuperscript{186} George is right to translate \textit{sārāt sāram} simply as “quintessence”, but we had to accommodate the commentator’s gloss, hence the change.

\textsuperscript{187} George has “top”, presumably a misprint.

\textsuperscript{188} Although ultimately it does not affect the meaning, we think that the more likely reading is \textit{raktabandhūka}.\textsuperscript{a}

\textsuperscript{189} This is the result of a bold emendation, but we simply could not see any meaning in \textit{sāro mukhadākam}.

\textsuperscript{190} George’s edition has \textit{tasmai} for \textit{tasyai}, but the translation is correct, therefore this must be a misprint.

\textsuperscript{191} George’s interpretation of \textit{iha} is “now”; we disambiguated this.

\textsuperscript{192} The irregular lengthening of the second vowel in \textit{durīvagāha}\textsuperscript{a} seeks to avoid breaking the metre.

\textsuperscript{193} This is a reference to the what is sometimes referred to as \textit{āsaicbībhavānā}, a fine example of which is \textit{Bodhicaryāvatāra} 8.40 ff. (Steinkellner 1981, p. 96 ff.). Abhorring women is otherwise considered one of the fourteen basic trespasses (\textit{mudgappatiḥ}) in tantric Buddhism, cf. \textit{Mudgappatimarga} 9ab (Lévi 1929, pp. 266, 267); \textit{strīnīm prajñāsvabhāvānīm jugupayā caturdāśī l}; “Le quatorzième [scil. péché], c’est l’horreur des femmes, dont la nature propre est la Sapience.”.
esoteric path] (bhavya°), restricted to the body of this-worldly female lovers, and not for beings worthy [of the esoteric path] (bhavya°), who [use] the form of Prajñāpāramitā and other [goddesses to cultivate their] otherworldly female lovers. For it is impossible that an unworthy being should be able to superimpose the form of an otherworldly female lover onto a this-worldly female lover, even if told a hundred times. For they lack the expertise related to what should be avoided (heya°) and what should be adopted (upādeya°) [on the path]. And it is precisely for this reason that it is said:

I will teach [the Dharma] according to the particular dispositions of beings.¹⁹⁴

On the contrary, one should proclaim the virtue[s] of women! Whether it is compassion encompassing all beings or protectiveness [encompassing all beings], it is [there] in the mind of women.¹⁹⁵ Let us set aside [her] own people [for a moment]; she nourishes strangers with alms, too. If woman is so [i.e. has] pity on all, protects all, nourishes all, then she is not different from Vajrayoginī.¹⁹⁶ Let us set aside beholding her, and forget about her touch and embrace; even merely remembering her produces instant pleasure.¹⁹⁷ All five objects of the senses are established in women in a divine form.¹⁹⁸ Men, who take her as a wife, enjoy pleasure. [Ad 6.72–79]

Take her as a wife means taking into wedlock.

Therefore, O you who are faultless, adorned with all good qualities, O Merit,¹⁹⁹ Merit, Great Merit, favour me, O Reverend Mother” [6.80–81]

[The woman is addressed as] Merit, because [she] is the cause of merit. The point is this: experiencing the gnosis of Great Pleasure is the cause for all merit, and the

¹⁹⁴ This is Mahāyūrīnāmasaṁgīti 1.15ab (Tribe 1994, pp. 87, 230; we follow this translation with a slight modification). Although the invisible object there is the Litany (saṁgītiḥ) itself, here Mahāsukhavajra silently expands the semantic range to the entire Dharma. Alternatively, construe sattvānāṁ as a genitivus commodi (cf. Davidson 1981, p. 21), i.e. “I will teach [the Nāmasaṁgīti] the Dharma to beings, according to [their] particular dispositions.”.

¹⁹⁵ We conjectured “parigrahā for parigrahāḥ, and modified George’s translation: “On the contrary, one should say that women’s merit encompasses all living beings. Whether it be kindness or protectiveness it must be in the mind of women.” We do not see how merit could encompass all living beings, nor do we understand where ‘must be’ comes from.

¹⁹⁶ Here, too, we modify George’s rendering: “Friend or stranger, she nourishes him with food. The woman who is like that is none other than Vajrayoginī.” Note that nānyathā in the last pāda is unmetrical, it should be nānyā, since an Āryā verse-quarter cannot begin with long-short-long. That said, we should also note that the second pāda is faulty and we are not sure how to remedy this, perhaps bhūṣāyaḥ hi puṣṇāti.

¹⁹⁷ Once again we modify George, since we suspect that he did not fully grasp the idiomatic expression (aṣṭān . . . dūrataḥ). He translates: “Be it her look, touch, or rub—when far away, the mere remembrance produces pleasure at that instant.” We suspect that sprṣṭighṛṣṭim is a corruption of the dual nominative sprṣṭighṛṣṭi. We also disagree with translating ghṛṣṭih as ‘rub’ in light of Mahāsukhavajra’s gloss elsewhere (Ms 14v); kuru […] ghṛṣṭhaṃ dūtāgraṃ phāśām sātpadācāram ityarthā [].

¹⁹⁸ Here too we must disagree with George: “Woman, as object of the five senses, is endowed with a divine form.”

¹⁹⁹ George translates this as “Purity”. 
cause of that [experience] is none other than the consort (prajña). For this reason it is taught:

Just like the fruit born of the vine is endowed with a flower, perfect awakening achieved in a single moment is complete with the two equipments [of merit and knowledge].

Then, look[ing] at her fixedly, he should press his lip with his teeth. Making a gasping sound, the yogi should make her naked. [6.82–83]

His lip means his own lip.202

---

200 This is the result of a conjecture, which we explain in the next note.

201 This is Cittavīśuddhīprakaraṇa 98 (Haraprasād Śāstrī 1898, p. 183; Patel 1949, p. 7; Varghese 2008, p. 252), but the verse was also incorporated into the Candamahāroṣanatantra, chapter 13 (30cd–31ab in Mical’s numeration). It is also quoted in the Padmini (Ms 22r). The readings fluctuate wildly. The editio princeps has: yathā latāśamudbhātā phalapsasamanvitā | yathaikakasambodhī sambhārādvayavasyayā |. Patel’s edition (followed verbatim by Varghese) has yathā latā samudbhātā phalapsasamanvitā | tathaikakasambodhī sambhārādvayavasyayā |. The best Ms of the Padmini has a reading which is much closer to ours: yathā latāśamudbhātā phalām puspasamanvitam | tathaikakasambodhī sambhārādvayavasyayā |. The closest match is that of the Candamahāroṣanatantra itself. In Mical’s draft edition we have the same forms as here, except ekakṣaṇāc ca sambodhīḥ for pāda c. We did check the manuscripts and found that ekakṣaṇāc ca is indeed the reading of B (which, however, has phala°), as well as A, but in the latter this is the result of a correction, and ekakṣaṇāt was the original reading. This hypometrical reading is what we found in Grt, too. Supposing that the original reading was metricial, we find it much more likely that ekakṣaṇāt is a corruption of ekakṣaṇāc ca. Of course, it is equally likely that all these are simply corruptions of tathaikakṣaṇa°, the reading conjectured by Patel. However, it should be kept in mind that the attestation for Aryadeva’s text is very weak indeed. As Patel himself says (1949, p. xii): “The original MS. of the work is of palm leaves in old Newari script. As it is very defective, its transcription and the printed text [scil. Haraprasād Śāstrī’s (1898) editio princeps] based on it are not free from mistakes.” We do not have access to this manuscript, but we checked the Baroda transcript, and it does not help us either: yathā latāśamudbhātā phalapsasamanvitā | yathaikakasambodhīsamubhātā |. We lack the botanical expertise to establish which version is more correct. Āryadeva’s text seems to be saying that a vine appears together with both fruit and flower, in which case the vine is quick awakening, and its fruit and flower are the two equipments of merit (pūnya°) and knowledge (nānasambhāraḥ). However, the Candamahāroṣanatantra and Mahāsukhavajra seem to think that the fruit born of the vine is already endowed with a flower. Judging by Mahāsukhavajra’s argumentation just before the quotation, this would seem to mean that by cultivating wisdom (prajña, synonym for jīvān, but here punningly the consort, too), which is the cause of experiencing Great Pleasure, which in turn causes merit, one obtains the equipment of merit as well. If this is indeed his idea, it is certainly a somewhat unusual one. But the point perhaps is this: one needs to cultivate both equipments on the slower path, i.e. the pāramitānaya, but in the case of quick awakening, i.e. the mantranaya, this is not the case. Also cf. Mahāsukhavajra to chapter 13 (Ms 30r): prajñāpāramitā yuddhavājīyā samudbhātā phalām puspā samubhavat | atā eva yogī sīhram buddhavat phṛyam | stry eva prajñāpāramitā niḥsvabhāvānānājaniṣvayāt |. “The [passage] beginning with [from uniting] Wisdom and Means [teaches this:] the six Perfections [beginning with giving (dāna°) and ending in wisdom (prajña°)] become completed in a single place, the yoga of intercourse. And it is as a result of this that the yogi achieves Buddhahood swiftly. The Perfection of Wisdom is none other than the woman, for she generates the gnosis of there being no own nature [in phenomena, persons, etc.].”.

202 It is difficult to see why this gloss is given when the meaning is very clear. Perhaps it is the case after all that the Ms’s reading of the lemma, soṣṭhaṃ, is correct?
He should perform the “Pleasure-Evoking” position, and the “Swing-Rocking position,” [6.84]\(^{203}\)

[The passage] beginning with He should perform the “Pleasure-Evoking” [position (bandham)]\(^{204}\) is a brief outline (uddeśah),

Among those,\(^{205}\) in the middle of a bed, with the woman assuming the squatting seat, he should have her clasp her arms firmly together on his shoulders. [6.90–91]\(^{206}\)

[whereas the passage] beginning with Among those (tatra), [in the middle of a] bed is the elaboration (nirdeśah). All these [positions] should be demonstrated [by the master to the disciple]\(^{207}\) with a pair of small dolls (puttalikā\(^{2}\)) made of clay or beeswax.

Then he should insert the Vajra into the Lotus still with the left hand,\(^{208}\) [6.109]

[The words] Then […] still with his left hand teach three things. †…† having introduced †…† the gesture of the sword without nails\(^{209}\) he should rub counterclockwise with the left [hand], then clockwise with the right [hand], until [the vulva] becomes moist. Then he should place his tongue in the middle of the lotus and perform cunnilingus for a few minutes with a loud licking movement while accepting with his head her [repeated installation of] the Three Syllables [with the accompanying gesture]. Then, with his left hand he should grasp the Vajra and insert it into the Lotus. It is by the word still (eva) that [all this] is taught, for particles have many meanings. Here the gesture of the sword [is this]: he should clench his left fist firmly and spread out his [joined] middle finger and ring finger.

\(^{203}\) We skip the next five lines listing some more positions.

\(^{204}\) The lemma makes it clear that 6.84 did not have a compound, sukhodayabandhaṃ, as printed by George.

\(^{205}\) This tatra is a partitive, and not “Then”, as in George.

\(^{206}\) We also skip the next lines up to 6.123, with the exception of 6.109 which is glossed; these describe the positions in detail. These descriptions, as already noted by George (1974, p. 71, n. 65), are sometimes obscure and irrelevant for our article.

\(^{207}\) It would have been appropriate to be a bit more verbose here. We must have a subject change, since it is highly unlikely that it would be the yogī demonstrating the positions to his partner with dolls, instead of actually performing them with her.

\(^{208}\) We modified the translation, “with the right hand”. First, we think savyena here means with the left—this enhances the antinominan nature of the act. Second, we needed something to reflect the particle eva, because of the commentator’s unfortunately lacunose discussion.

\(^{209}\) This should mean that the two pointed fingers in the sword gesture should have the nails cut short so as not to hurt the Lotus. A parallel passage (Ms 13r) suggests that here the yogī should excite his partner by stimulating two channels within the vagina: viḍhūneneiti padmāntargatasavyavāmapārśvavartitoryor nādyor (em., nādyo Ms) nirnakmahadharmatarjanyangulidvayan jihvāy vā cālānena | […] praṇopayākṣaraṇaṃ bhavati | tatāh padmarandhraṃ snigdham bhavati |; “Properly means by stimulating the two channels situated on the right and left side inside the Lotus either with the middle finger and the ring finger, the nails of which are cut short, or with the tongue. […] Thence the aperture of the Lotus will become moist.” We probably had something similar in the passage which is illegible here.
He should kiss her mouth as much as he likes, again and again. Looking at her face after having lifted it\textsuperscript{210}, saying whatever words he likes, [6.124–125]

Saying words means [appellations which] intensify sexual desire, such as ‘cow-girl’ (gosvāminī). [These were explained before.]

he should suck her tongue, and drink the saliva of the mouth. He should eat the lipstick and waste of the teeth, meditating that it is pleasureful. And he should pinch the tongue gently with the teeth, and also the lips. [6.126–128]

Gently means slightly; the meaning [of this adverb] is that [he should pinch/bite her] in such a way that it does not cause pain (vyathā)\textsuperscript{211}.

With the tongue he should clean the holes of the nose, the corners of the eyes, and in-between the teeth; and he should eat all the waste produced from these [places].\textsuperscript{212} He should kiss the forehead, eye, neck, ear, side, armpit, hand, and breast; and scratch\textsuperscript{213} them with the exception of the woman’s two eyes. He should rub the nipple with the hand, suck, then bite. [6.129–133]

He should bite with the teeth.\textsuperscript{214}

Having the woman lie on her back, he should kiss her lovely belly, remembering again and again, “Here was I formerly situated.” He should touch the Lotus with the hand, saying, “Lovely, wow.”\textsuperscript{215} He should kiss and scratch, looking there having pried it with the hand. [6.134–137]

Having pried it means after having opened it (i.e. the Lotus).

Smelling the odour, he should clean with the tongue that hole of the woman.\textsuperscript{217} He should then say this kind of speech: “As I have entered through this, so too have I emerged numerous times.”\textsuperscript{218} This path, which is straight as the nose, if practiced without Knowledge, would be the path to the six states of rebirth. But

\textsuperscript{210} This is what unnāmya means, not George’s puzzling “lying down”.
\textsuperscript{211} We think that here ‘pain’ is intended, rather than ‘damage’, since slight wounds of lovemaking were not at all considered something to be avoided in love poetry and sexual guidebooks. Also cf. the next verse.
\textsuperscript{212} We improved George’s translation, which is “and the corners of the eyes. And he should eat all the waste produced from between the teeth.”.
\textsuperscript{213} Rather than “pinch”. We changed this throughout.
\textsuperscript{214} As opposed to with the lips?.
\textsuperscript{215} See our note on vāyu to 6.62 above.
\textsuperscript{216} We think this is what niśkṛṣya means, not George’s obscure “drawing down”.
\textsuperscript{217} This presumably means that he should extract the sexual fluids, which are then consumed in 6.143.
\textsuperscript{218} We are not entirely sure that the words of the yogī do not extend up to the end of 6.142, in which case 6.140a would be an intercalation in the direct speech. Alternatively, perhaps he should only think/call to mind, as in 6.135, the line 6.139 and recite 6.138b–142.
when practiced with Knowledge, it would be the Success of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa. [6.138–142]

Practiced without Knowledge means by serving it [i.e. the vagina of the consort] merely with this worldly desire. Practiced with Knowledge means using it by serving it with other worldly desire, as it is discussed [here].

Then, with sounds of ‘sot’ [issuing from his] mouth,²¹⁹ he should eat the white and/or the red of the Lotus, while looking at her face again and again. [6.143–144]

With sounds of ‘sot’ (sotkṛtaih) means with sounds of sipping in air with the mouth slightly open.

And, after scratching²²⁰ her thigh, he should rub her feet like a slave. He should place the Three Syllables on her forehead, [as well as] on her heart, accompanied with the gesture of a light fist.²²¹ Then the yogi should perform concentratedly those positions, after the “Variegated” position. Then he should thrust as many times as he wishes,²²² having his mind solely on pleasure. Optionally he may ejaculate or not. If he does ejaculate he should do so having his mind solely on pleasure.²²³ [6.145–149]

²¹⁹ George’s reading padmagataṁ svetam raktam va sukhasāktaiḥ translated as “converting it entirely to pleasure, he should eat the white and red of the Lotus” is very clever, but we beg to disagree. In the notes (1974, p. 41), he records four manuscripts reading mukhasotkṛtaih, and one more reading mukhasāktaiḥ, probably a corruption of the former. Mahāsukhavajra doubtlessly read the same, although it is a little bit unusual that he does not include mukha in the lemma. We cannot find any derivation of sukhasākty (i.e. a presumed analogue of agnisākty or bhasmasākty) anywhere in the literature, nor any parallels to the effect that the semen and the menstrual blood should be turned into sukham before consuming it at this stage. Mical opts for sukhasāktaiḥ, which is again very clever, but the context is not primarily erotic anymore. That said, we could not find parallels for the onomatopoeic sound sot either. Mahāsukhavajra, however, makes it clear (after a small emendation) that this is some kind of sipping sound (as one ingests the sexual fluids). As for ‘of the Lotus’, one should understand that ‘the white’ (i.e. semen) is not produced by the Lotus, it is only situated there at this stage, provided that the yogi has already ejaculated (which is described only in 6.149). If he has not, then we are dealing with another substance, which is also called ‘white’. As Mahāsukhavajra says elsewhere (Ms 15r): sukram iti strikāmadraṇam kevalaḥ yogikṣaritarasahasitam vah; “White means either the woman’s fluid [born from] arousal only, or [the same] mixed with the juice ejaculated by the yogi.” One should also note that George translated vah as ‘and’, which is perfectly possible. We would like to keep our options open.

²²⁰ George’s edition here probably contains a misprint, since sanakhaṁ should be a compound.

²²¹ We changed George’s “and a light blow of the fist on her heart”, because we find that here the kan suffix is meaningful. Cf. our note to 6.42; this is presumably where Mahāsukhavajra draws his interpretation from.

²²² We radically changed George’s interpretation (“He should pay attention to that with desire”), after having consulted Ms Gt, which reads dhāpakaṁ for dhāyakaṁ. For the meaning of this word, see 6.59 above.

²²³ We changed George’s translation: “he may secrete or not secrete, having his mind solely on pleasure”. We find that ‘secrete’ is perhaps not the most fortunate choice here and we also think that he slightly misunderstood the point.
[Now for the passage] beginning with Optionally. Concerning this matter, a method to hold back ejaculation (aksarana) is taught. When the Moon (i.e. semen) is able to reach up to the root of the jewel (i.e. the glans) at the end of [experiencing] Supreme Bliss, then [the practitioner] should contract the vital energy (vāyum) in the manner one holds back the urge to urinate, steadily (dhairyakramena)224 blocking the breath for a moment under the navel. The guru should teach this [to the disciple] by performing it himself. By this [method] there will be no ejaculation.

If he does [ejaculate], he should lick the Lotus on his knees. And he should eat with his tongue the white and read of the Lotus. And he should inhale it through a pipe in the nose, to increase his power. [6.150–152]

Beginning with [With] the nose, [the Lord] teaches another method. The point is this: sometimes he should lick the two substances (dhātu) (i.e. menstrual blood and semen) of Wisdom (prajñā) and Means (“upāya”) (i.e. the female and male practitioner) with his tongue. Sometimes he should draw [them] out from the Lotus with his mouth, place them in a vessel, insert a straw (nālikā)225, take note of his breath,226 and ingest it through his nostril, that is to say the aperture [beyond] the uvula (ghanṭikā). This is a synecdoche (upalakṣaṇam), therefore other [methods] too should be observed. [For instance,] one should place in a vessel both the blood of a menstruating woman and semen extracted with the hand-consort (karamudrā) (i.e. masturbation)227; he should then mix them with the ring finger and ingest them by using a straw as explained before. Beginning with power, [the Lord] teaches the fruit of the procedure[s]. The meaning is this: by constantly performing [these] procedure[s], there will be a great increase in the yogi’s strength, inasmuch as he will stop wrinkling, greying, and [even] death.

224 That is to say, releasing and blocking repeatedly. The word dhairyato is glossed elsewhere (Ms 13r) thus: dhairety antarāntarā vajracālanaśivārāmāna paramānandasaṅkham bhāvyaiti arthah | “Steadily means repeatedly moving and resting the Vajra, he should contemplate the pleasure of Supreme Bliss.”.

225 George’s choice, nālikā, is perfectly justified, but nālikā is perhaps more common. We left ‘straw’ in the translation, but this could be any kind of tube.

226 This expression alludes to chapter 22 of the Candraḥāroṣanatrantra, the vāyu-yogapatāla, which teaches techniques for the manipulation of winds (i.e. vital energies) through the subtle channels of the body.

227 These two options for ejaculation are also mentioned by Mahāsukhavajra in his commentary to chapter 13 (Ms 29v): tatras rāgaṇāsopadeśo vajrapadmasamayonyena sukrakṣaraśaṃ karamudrayā vā | “Among these, the teaching to quell passion [refers to] ejaculating semen either by means of uniting the Vajra and the Lotus, or by means of the hand-consort.” Another expression for karamudrā used by this author is karasundari (Ms 32r). Masturbation without ejaculation is not mentioned, but it is attested in the Kālacakra corpus, which usually advocates seminal retention in sexual yoga, e.g. Raviśrijñāna’s Gunabhāraṇī to a verse from the Laghukālacakrasūtra (5.121) incorporated into Anupamarakṣita’s Śādanāyoga (Sferra 2000: 115, 280): atha bimbadvārenā nāṇandasaṅkham bhavati, tādā padme vajradhvanir vā šanakaḥ kartavyah | atha striḥ na labhyate, tādā svakaraṃkalenaśālānaṃ kartavyam saukhyavṛddhihetoḥ pātahetoḥ na | “Or, if there is no pleasure of Bliss by means of the image (i.e. a visualised consort, jñānamudrā), then [the yogi should] insert the Vajra Thunder (i.e. the penis) into the Lotus slowly. Or, if a woman (i.e. a karmamudrā) cannot be obtained, then he should fondle [his penis] with the Lotus of his own hand, in order to intensify pleasure, but not for ejaculation.”.
After washing the Lotus with the tongue, he should have Wisdom stand up and he should kiss her. And, after having taken her on his lap, he should eat meat and fish. He should drink milk or wine, in order to increase his desire. After his fatigue has decreased, he should desire with pleasure, etc. And, in the foregoing manner, the couple should begin again with each other. By this repeated practice, Great Bliss is attained, and in this very lifetime the practitioner gains the state of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa. [6.153–159]

Attained means [that Great Bliss will be] present continuously, day and night. He gains, [i.e.] he achieves, the state of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa [i.e.] the achievement of the Great Seal. In this very [lifetime] means in the present incarnation.

I have disclosed this practice for the sake of giving Success to the lustful. [6.160]

To the lustful means to desirous ones. The implication is that for those who are without desire, there will be Awakening after three Uncountable Aeons (trikalpāsamkhyaśena) through the procedure of the mode of perfections (pāramitānaya) (i.e. exoteric Buddhism, the non-tantric Mahāyāna). Because of their numerous doubts (vicikitsā), they do not have faith (śraddhā) in this teaching (dharmē). But even desirous ones who lack faith will not succeed, nor will there be Success by having faith in any other practice than this. For if one desires ghee, one should not churn water, but curd or milk. For it is only there that [ghee] can be found and because of the nature of the [inherent] power of things (vastuśakti).

---

228 Here we changed George’s “after hugging her”. Drinking and eating are done by both, in spite of the singular. In fact, a line in the next chapter (7.8) explains that the woman should eat first, and the man should eat her leftovers (George 1974, pp. 31, 78).

229 This should be done in moderation, only to the extent that it achieves the desired effect. Mahāsukhavajra is against excessive drinking because it affects concentration and not because it is inherently sinful (Ms 29r): na hi madyapānāṃ satraṃ pāpāvahakam, jālādīpāṇe ‘pi tathā prasangāḥ | kim tu madajanakatvam eva tasya virūpakaṃ, tace naḥpapāṇena bhavati | vistarapāṇena tu vikṣepah sambhāyate | vikṣepāg ca pāpakarmasambhāvānā syāt |; “Surely, it is not drinking liquor per se which brings about sin, for we would have the absurd consequence that the same applies to drinking water and so on; its impropriety comes from causing intoxication, but that does not happen if one drinks moderately. However, drinking excessively might result in distraction, and distraction in turn may cause sinful acts.”

230 We find the form jīryati somewhat strange. Perhaps we should understand it to be a finite verb and not a locative present participle, in which case we must emend śrame to śrāman. We think this interpretation more likely than George’s “title of Candamahāroṣaṇa”.

231 Mahāsukhavajra’s lemma is at first glance hypermetrical. However, in this register it is perfectly possible that the reading is original and that it was pronounced *caṇḍarosṇa*. The ‘Uncountable’ is, in spite of its name, an actual number. On the various ways in which it is calculated, see Yong (2008).

232 We find the ca disturbing, because vastuśaktisvābhāvyā is not an additional reason but the technical designation of what was just explained.
Placing the soles of the feet on the ground, with the legs bent and making an oblique angle between them, this is known as the “Half-moon” seat, which gives the pleasure of desire. [6.169–170]

Obliquely stretched out means the [the two legs] like the wings of a duck.

Again, having her assume the “Bow” seat, he should have his face fall in the middle of her anus. He should also stroke her anus with his nose. [6.177–178]

Also with his nose means he should breathe in the odour after having placed his nose there.

He should contemplate the pleasure produced by that in [meditative] union [with Caṇḍa[mahā]roṣaṇa]. Then the yogī should be liberated, with all predilections abandoned. [6.179–180]

[Meditative] union [with] Caṇḍa[mahā]roṣaṇa means an unwavering absorption. Liberated means liberated from suffering, for [he will] have a form of Supreme Bliss.

Making his mind devoid of aversion, he should make love to his mother. By following lust, merit is obtained; from aversion demerit accrues. [6.181–182]

[His] mother means the consort defined above. Demerit means sin.

There is no greater evil than aversion, no greater merit than pleasure. And therefore he should concentrate upon the pleasure arising from desire. [6.183–184]

Then the Lady joyfully paid homage to the Lord, and praising him said this: [6.185–186]

O Lord, is this means of Success for human beings only, or is it for others, also? [6.187–188]
The Lord said: [6.189]

Those beings situated in all directions who are devoted to this, gods, demons, men, and nāgas, too, succeed as practitioners. [6.190–191]

Then, when they heard that, the gods, Maheśvara, etc., taking the goddesses Gaurī, Lakṣmī, Śacī, Rañī, etc., began to meditate. Then all of them, at that moment, at that minute, in that hour obtained the state of Canda[mahā]rōṣaṇa and roamed the earth. Mahēśvara succeeded, by the name of Vajraśaṅkara; Vāsudeva as Vajranārāyaṇa; Devendra as Vajrapāṇi; and Kāmadeva as Vajrānāṅga. Those led by these principal ones, godlings succeeded equal in number to the sands of the Ganges River. [6.192–196]

At that moment refers to the fact that a superior kind of being (adhimātrā) understands reality already in the moment of Bliss (ānanda). At that minute refers to the fact that an advanced being (madhyā) understands reality already in the moment of Supreme Bliss (paramānanda). In that hour refers to the fact that a beginner (mṛdus) understands reality only in the moment of Innate Bliss (sahajānanda), in between [the moments of] having achieved Supreme Bliss and entering the Bliss of Cessation. [Now I shall] explain the forms of Vajraśaṅkara and the others. Among these, Vajraśaṅkara has two arms and one face, he is white-coloured, wears a tiara [holding together his] dreadlocks, he is without adornments, [except] the five

241 We changed George’s ungrammatical “who are devoted to this. Gods, demons, men, and Nāgās (sic!), too,”. In light of the question it is somewhat suspicious that men (i.e. humans) are mentioned again.
242 We changed George’s translation in light of the commentary. He has “Then, at that instant, all of them, just at that very moment obtained the title of Candamahārōṣaṇa and roamed the earth.” Mahāsukhavajra’s lemma tannuḥārtam lacks the kan suffix. Note, however, that if we leave it, the passage from atha to mahātale is almost metrical: pāda a is faulty, unless one reads it with some kind of shwa sound/glottal stop between tat and kṣaṇam; pāda b is fine, if we retain the kan; pāda c should be pronounced with roṣṇa, which is not unprecedented in this chapter, cf. Mahāsukhavajra’s lemma of 6.159; and pāda d is again fine.
243 Or perhaps understand tatra as a partitive, ‘among them’.
244 Or perhaps ‘as/qua’; the same would apply to the others, too.
245 We modified George’s interpretation, “In the same way as these principal ones”.
246 Mahāsukhavajra’s view on how the Blisses are experienced in lovemaking is given in the commentary to the first chapter (Ms 3r). Bliss (ānanda) allows for a small amount of pleasure, experienced during foreplay, up to the moment of penetration. Supreme Bliss (paramānanda) is a greater degree of pleasure, experienced during the actual coitus, up to the moment of semen reaching the root of the glans. Innate Bliss (sahajānanda) is a supreme kind of pleasure, devoid of the concepts of subject-object-perception, that is to say, non-conceptual, which happens during the time semen travels from the root of the glans into the vagina. The Bliss of Cessation (viramānanda) is again conceptual, experienced after ejaculation, when the yogī, after a few moments of stillness realises ‘I have experienced pleasure’ (sukham bhūtum mayā). A short ancillary teaching (upadesāḥ) on the various points the yogī should direct his attention to during these moments is given in the commentary to chapter 3 (Ms 11r). Mahāsukhavajra then sides with what Isaacson & Sferra call “position A” regarding the order of Blisses, the other, “position B” being that sahajānanda is the fourth and viramānanda, possibly in a different sense (i.e. not ‘cessation’), is the third (2014, pp. 96–100).
embraced by Vajrarati, who is similar to Vajragauri. Among these, yellow-colored; in his right [hand], he holds an arrow, in his left, a flower bow; he is one face, [wears] a jeweled tiara, is embellished with various ornaments, and is sixteen years old; in her left hand she holds a red lotus. Vajranārayaṇa is mounted on Garuḍa, he is four-armed, dark blue, has a jeweled tiara, is adorned with various adornments, he sits cross-legged, mounted on [the elephant called] Airāvata; he is embraced by Vajragauri. Vajraṇāṇi has two arms, a thousand eyes, wears a jeweled tiara, bears various adornments, has the colour of gold, with his right [hand] he holds a vajra, with his left [hand] he points his index finger threateningly (tarjan), he sits cross-legged, mounted on [the elephant called] Airāvata; he is embraced by Vajraśaći who is similar to Vajraarati. Vajrāṅgā is mounted on a flying palace (vimāna) with dolphin (makara) faces on it, seated cross-legged, has two arms and one face, [wears] a jeweled tiara, is embellished with various ornaments, and is yellow-colored; in his right [hand], he holds an arrow, in his left, a flower bow; he is embraced by Vajraarati, who is similar to Vajragauri. Among these, Mahēśvara bears Amitābha on his head [in addition to] wearing a crescent moon. Vāsudeva holds Akṣobhya on his head. Īndra holds Ratnasambhava on his head. Kāmadeva has Amitābha on his head. Those led by these [principal deities] [denotes minor deities] such as Vajrakārttika and Vajraganapati.

Endowed with the five objects of desire, acting for the benefit of all beings, all these beings, having various corporeal forms are conquerors in disguise.

[6.197–198]

[As for the verse] beginning with Five: the five objects of desire (kāmāḥ) are sight, taste, touch, sound, and smell. They are called so (kāmāḥ), because they are desired (kāmyante), [that is to say,] wanted. The word gunāḥ is affixed to them, because they are repeated (guṇyante), [that is to say,] reiterated (i.e. desired again and

---

247 The five mudrās are the kāpālika bone-accoutrements, which are signs of that observance; the ash is the sixth (English 2002, pp. 158–159). The five (chaplet, earrings, necklace, armlets, girdle) are listed i.e. in the Hevajranātra I.viii.17 (Snellgrove 1959, p. 26), where they equated with the Tathāgatas; the precise correspondence is given in Hevajranātra I.vi.11–12ab (Snellgrove 1959, p. 18).

248 We conjectured that this goddess also has the prefix vajra to her name. This is otherwise called ‘sealing’ (mudram). The Tathāgatas act as ‘family chieftains’ (kulapatiṣayaḥ), and by adding them on the heads of other deities, their overlordship is displayed. We find it somewhat odd that the Tathāgata of paramount importance, Vairocana, is missing. The absence of Amoghasiddhi, while problematic, is perhaps less puzzling.

250 We reformulated slightly George’s translation, “Although involved with the desirous objects of the five senses, they act for the benefit of all beings. All these beings, having various corporeal forms, although in fact illusory, are conquerors.” He also prints the translation of 6.197 with the prose before. We do not think that māyāvin means that the beings themselves are illusory, but that they themselves project illusion, like magicians. If this is the case, the beings (bhūtāḥ) are the gods mentioned in the prose section before.
again). [Beings (bhūtāḥ)] are [endowed (‘upetāḥ) with them, that is to say,] conjoined with them.

1047 Just as the lotus, which emerges from the mud, is not smeared by defilements of the mud, likewise are they not smeared by defilements who are produced by the method of Lust. [6.199–200]

1050 Beginning with Just as, [the Lord] explains the [inherent] power of things. Defilements refer to the colour, smell, etc. of the mud, [i.e.] of the mire.

1052 Thus ends the sixth chapter, concerning the Yoga of the Perfected Stage, in the Reverend Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, called the Sole Hero. [6.201–202]

1054 The chapter [is called the chapter of the perfected stage, because] it has as its chief topic the Yoga of the Perfected [Stage].

1056 Thus [ends] the commentary of the sixth chapter.
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