

Mahāsukhavajra’s *Padmāvātī* Commentary on the Sixth Chapter of the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra*: The Sexual Practices of a Tantric Buddhist Yogī and His Consort

Samuel Grimes
&
Péter-Dániel Szántó

1. Introduction

The main topic of this article is Mahāsukhavajra’s commentary on the sixth chapter of the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra*. 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 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 *Padmāvātī*, 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.

1.1 The *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra*

The first Western scholar to briefly describe the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* was Alexander Csoma de Kőrös (1836–1839: 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.¹ 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

¹ Also cf. Amṛtānanda’s documents prepared for Hodgson, which copy freely from the *tantra*, Szántó 2012, I: 194.

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, Chazot & Delamotte 2015)², 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: 9), the work 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.³ Nor is there any hard textual evidence for the *tantra*’s existence before the 13th century. George (1974: 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: 11–12). Since he could not identify the translators, Ratnaśrī 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: 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.⁴ While fully aware that absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, these facts lead us to formulate the hypothesis

² In actual fact, this is an indirect translation from Newar by Delamotte from a manuscript by Ratna Bāhādur Vajrācārya (1892–1956), which was transmitted to Dharma Guruju (1898–1990), a man of peculiar status and reputation in Newar society.

³ We are aware that two statues have been identified as ‘Mahācaṇḍaroṣaṇa’ in India proper: one in Cave 10 in Panhale, and one at Ratnagiri (Deshpande 1984: 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.

that the text is a comparatively late Nepalese production.⁵ 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.⁶

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 & 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 primary charm lies in its outspokenness, but this quality may have hampered its study. As George points out (1974: 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.

1.2 The *Padmāvātīnāmapañjikā* of Mahāsukhavajra

The *Padmāvātī*, as we shall refer to it henceforth, is the only known commentary of the *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* 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.

1.2.1 The Palm-leaf Manuscript

The first to report the existence of and describe this rare source was Hara Prasad Śāstri (1915: 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 2002: 101–104, 161–162. George (1974: 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 *Padmāvātī* Ms. is 1297 CE (Tuesday, March 19th, as verified by Petech 1984: 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

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.

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: 6).

Hara Prasad Śāstri calls the script 'Newāri', whereas George 'Newārī (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 *śirorekḥā e*, but the *prṣṭhamātrā e* 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 *Padmāvātī*. 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.⁷ 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).

1.2.2 The Author

We do not know much about the author, Mahāsukhavajra. The colophon (Ms 33v) styles him a 'great scholar' (*mahāpaṇḍita*^o). 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 Pāṭalīputra (Ms 31r: *nagaram iti pāṭalīputrādikam*). 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 *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* itself, and composed the texts concomitantly at the order of the king Anantamalla, who is mentioned in the Ms colophon. This claim is tentative:

⁷ An apograph is also mentioned in DhTC 2016: I.8. We are not entirely sure what this refers to, perhaps the Baroda copy.

it may be a remnant of a largely forgotten Vajrācārya tradition, but it could also be a personal impression.

1.3 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 (*abhiṣekaḥ*). 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 described in chapter 3. The first five initiations are those of Water (*udaka°*), Tiara (*makuṭa°/mukuṭa°*), Sword (*khadga°*), 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.⁸ 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 *maṇḍalam*. 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 Blissesses 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 (*gaṇacakram*).⁹ 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 (*utpattikramah*). 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 (*niṣpannakramah/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

⁸ Although the text specifically prescribes instructions for the initiation of women, it is ambiguous as to what they are to do in the *guhyaḥabhiṣekaḥ*. 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 *gaṇacakram*. Also note that the Fourth Initiation (*caturthābhiṣekaḥ*) is not mentioned.

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.

Finally, we would like to acknowledge and thank several people for their kind help: the Warden and Fellows of All Souls College, the staff of the National Archives in Kathmandu, the organisers and participants of the SOAS Sanskrit Reading Room (May and October 2017), the organisers and participants of the Vikramaśīla Workshop in Tokyo (November 2017), Csaba Dezső, Harunaga Isaacson, Berthe Jansen, Christopher V. Jones, Kei Kataoka, Jonathan Katz, Kenichi Kuranishi, Izumi Miyazaki, Nawang Thokmey, and Richard Widdess.

2. 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*, *ṣ*, *s*), we standardise homorganic nasals, etc. A + sign with spaces on both sides denotes a full *akṣara* 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 *akṣara*. 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 *akṣara*), 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 prajñāpāramitā bhagavantaṃ gāḍham āliṅgya padmena
vajraghaṣaṇaṃ kṛtvā prāha || [6.1–2]**

athetyādi | **prajñāpāramitēti** dveṣavajrī | sāvayeyam samjñā | prakṛṣṭam jñānam¹⁰
prajñā, saha-jānanda¹¹ jñānam | pāram prakarṣam svarasapravṛttam itā gatā prāpteti
yāvat | prajñāyāḥ pāram itā¹² **prajñāpāramitā**, saha-jānanda-jñānakāraṇatvāt¹³ + + + +
+ ḥ | **gāḍham** iti ni[16v]rbharam yathā bhavati¹⁴ |

**niṣpannakramayogena bhāvanā kīdrśī bhavet |
yoginīnām hitārthāya pṛcchitaṃ saphalīkuru || [6.3–4]**

niṣpannetyādi | ayam abhiprāyaḥ | pū + + kṣaṇā hi bhāvanotpattikramāpekṣayā jñāte

¹⁰ jñānam] *em.*, jñāna Ms

¹¹ °ānanda°] *conj.*, °ānva° Ms

¹² pāram itā] *em.*, pārar itā Ms

¹³ °kāraṇatvāt] *conj.*, °kāraṇat+ā + Ms *p.c.*, °kāraṇāt+ā + Ms *a.c.*

¹⁴ nirbharam yathā bhavati] *conj.*, ni + + + + vati Ms

(?) vi + + + + + nnakrame + + + + + kartavyeti¹⁵ bhāvaḥ |

atha bhagavān āha ||

**niṣpannakramayogastho yogī yogaikatatparaḥ |
bhāvayed ekacittena mama rūpam aharnīsam || [6.5–7]**

niṣpannakrama utpannakramaḥ | **ekacitttenetyādi** | ayam arthaḥ |
pūrvoktamaitryādibhāvanākramanirapekṣo yogī
jhaṭityākārayogena **aikacittena** dvitīyacittena kṛṣṇācalādi¹⁶ rūpeṇātmānam **bhāvayet** |
svastriyaṃ (see 6.8) ca dveṣavajryādirūpeneti bhāvaḥ | **aharnīsam** iti¹⁷ rātrīṃdinam |
kṣaṇam apy¹⁸ anyacittena na tiṣṭhed ity arthaḥ |

**kalpayet svastriyam tāvat tava rūpeṇa nirbharām |
gādhenavātiyogena yathaiva sphuṭatām vrajet || [6.8–9]**

sphuṭatām iti tadākāratadahaṃkārayoḥ pravvyaktatām | etac ca
sādarānirantarādīrghakālābhyāsaiḥ sampadyate | tathā cuktam—

bhūtaṃ vā yadi vābhūtaṃ yad yad evātibhāvvyate |
bhāvanābalaniṣpattau tat sphuṭākālpadhīphalam¹⁹ ||

abhyāsayogena bhavanti puṃsām bhūtāny abhūtāni puraḥsthitāni |
kāmakulānām iva ramyarāmās²⁰ cittānuyātā nanu yogayuktiḥ ||

**mātaram duhitaram cāpi bhaginīm bhāgineyikām |
anyām ca jñātinīm sarvām ḍombinīm brāhmaṇīm tathā || [6.10–11]**

mātaram ityādi | mātṛādiprajñām apatitayauvanām eva gṛhṇīyāt | prāyeṇa kila
puruṣāṇām mano yasmin²¹ viśaya evārpyate²² tatraivātīśayena pravartate | pravartitam
apī mano lokabhayato vyāvartate taiḥ | vyāvṛttikṛtaṃ tu tīvraduḥkhaṃ te 'nubhavanti |
dukhāc cetaso bhavati vikṣepaḥ | tato 'pi samādhānābhāvāḥ | samādhānābhāvāt²³ tu na
mahāmudrāsiddhir bhavātī²⁴ |

na cādharmaḥ sambhāvvyate, svaparāpakārābhāvāt | na ca + + + + sam + + + + + + + +
+ +, mahāsukhānubhavarūpatvāt | etad eva svaparayor arthakaraṇam | tathā ca—

[17r] samyak svaparayor arthaṃ kurvan puṇyaṃ samarjati²⁵ |

¹⁵ kartavyeti] conj., + rtav+eti Ms

¹⁶ kṛṣṇācalādi] *em.*, kṛṣṇālādi° Ms

¹⁷ °nīsam iti] *corr.*, °nīsaṃ miti Ms

¹⁸ kṣaṇam apy] *corr.*, kṣaṇam mapy Ms

¹⁹ tat sphuṭākālpadhīphalam] *em.*, sphuṭā tat kalpadhīḥ phalam Ms

²⁰ °rāmās] *em.*, °rāmā Ms

²¹ yasmin] *corr.*, yasmīna Ms

²² viśaya evārpyate] *em.*, viśayaivārpyate Ms

²³ samādhānābhāvāt] *em.*, samādhānām bhāvā Ms

²⁴ bhavātī] Ms *p.c.*, bhavatī Ms *a.c.*

²⁵ samarjati] *em.*, samarcchati Ms

ato viparyayāt pāpaṃ sukhaduḥkhaphalam²⁶ tayoh ||

na ca prajñāviśeṣataḥ pāpaṃ, tantrāntaravirodhād eva | tathā ca—

mātā bhaginī bhāgineyikā

ityādi |

yatra tu mātrādiśabdena cakṣurādy uktaṃ tatra tv abhavyasattvebhyas tattvaṃ
gopitam | anyathā cakṣurādiśabdān apahāya lokaviruddhamātrādiśabdā ye kṛtās te
conmattapralāpā eva vyaktam upalakṣyanta iti |

tatra **mātā** jananī, sapatnamātā, mātrṣvasā²⁷, ācāryabhāryā ceti | **duhitā** janyā,
bhrātrduhitā, saṃgrhīta²⁸ saduhitṛkastrīpūrvaduhitā, ācāryaduhitā ceti | **bhaginī**
sālohitā mātrṣvasṛ²⁹ duhitā, ācāryaduhitā ceti | āsām eva sutā **bhāgineyikā** |
caturvidhābhyo 'nyāḥ³⁰ sarvā eva vakṣyamāṇalakṣaṇāḥ³¹ |

caṇḍālīṃ naṭakīṃ caiva rajakīṃ rūpajīvikām (!) |
vratinīṃ yoginīṃ caiva tathā kāpālīnīṃ punaḥ || [6.12–13]

rūpajīvikām ity agrhītapanyām veśyām |

anyām ceti yathāprāptām strīrūpeṇa susaṃsthitām |
sevayet suvidhānena yathā bhedo na jāyate || [6.14–15]

yadi **bhedaḥ** syāt, tadā kiṃ syād ity āha— **bhede tv** ityādi |

bhede tu kupitāś caṇḍaroṣaṇo hanti sādhakam |
avīcau pātayet taṃ ca khaḍgapāśena bhīṣayan ||
neha loke bhavet siddhiḥ paraloke tathaiva ca |
tasmāc ca guptam atyantam kartavyam nāpi gocaram ||
ḍākinīmantravad gopyam caṇḍaroṣaṇasādhanam | [6.16–20]

nanu yady evaṃ kimarthaṃ tarhy uktaṃ mahānartha³² janakam etat sarvam ity āha—
atyantetyādi |

abhyanta(!)kāmīnām arthe mayā buddhena bhāṣitam || [6.21]

ayam arthaḥ | rāganayo 'yam, rāgaś cotpanno na parihartavya eva |

²⁶ Harunaga Isaacson suggested three possible emendations: sukhaduḥkhaṃ
phalam/sukhaduḥkhe phalam/sukhaduḥkhe phale.

²⁷ mātrṣvasā] *corr.*, mātrṣvasā Ms

²⁸ saṃgrhīta°] *em.*, saṃgrahīta° Ms

²⁹ ṣvasṛ°] *em.*, ṣvasrū° Ms

³⁰ 'nyāḥ] *em.*, 'nyā Ms

³¹ vakṣyamāṇalakṣaṇāḥ] *em.*, vakṣamāṇalakṣaṇā Ms

³² mahānartha°] *em.*, mahānanva° Ms

yadi vā sāksān naitac³³ chakyate, tadā tatpratīkṛtiṃ dārvādinirmitāṃ paṭalikhitāṃ vā sevayed iti |

etac ca viviktasthāna eva yujyata ity āha— **mano'nvityādi** |

**mano 'nukūlake (!) deśe sarvopadravavarjite |
pracchanne tām samādāya svacetoramyakāminīm || [6.22–23]**

pracchanna iti bhittipaṭalakapāṭadyāvṛte | **samādāyeti**³⁴ ḡḥītvā |
svacetoramyakāminīm iti tāsāṃ madhye yathāmanovāñchitām |

**buddho 'haṃ cācalaḥ siddhaḥ prajñāpāramitā priyā |
bhāvayet svasvarūpeṇa gāḍhena cetasā sudhīḥ || [6.24–25]**

svasvarūpeṇeti pūrvoktarūpam eva spaṣṭayati | ayam arthaḥ |
utpattikramakṛtadevatā[17v]dvāreṇa
varṇasamsthāna³⁵khadgakartry³⁶ādikaracaraṇavinyāsādiyuktena na bhāvayet, kiṃ tu
yenaiva rūpeṇa svasya svasya varṇasamsthānādikam prakṛtisiddham, tenaiva³⁷ rūpeṇa
bhāvayed iti |

**nirjanaṃ cāśramaṃ kṛtvā yathālabdhānavastukaḥ (!) |
bhāvayen nirbharaṃ dvābhyām anyonyadvandvayogataḥ || [6.26–27]**

yathetyādi | **yathā**prāptabhaktavasānābhyām **kaṃ** sukhaṃ yasya sa tathā | idaṃ
bhaktādi bhadram idaṃ neti na kuryād ity arthaḥ | **dvandvayoga** āliṅganādiyogaḥ |

**striyaṃ pratyakṣataḥ kṛtvā saṃmukhe copaveśya hi |
dvābhyām anyonyarāgeṇa gāḍham anyonyam īkṣayet ||
tato drṣṭisukhaṃ dhyāyan tiṣṭhet ekāgramānaḥ |
tayā tatraiva vaktavyaṃ sukhottejaḥkaram vacaḥ || [6.28–31]**

drṣṭisukham iti | strīṇāṃ kilāṅgapratyaṅgayor³⁸ darśanena mahad eva sukham
utpadyate | tato yayāiva mudrayā tat³⁹sukham utpannaṃ tayaiva mudrayā kāṣṭhavan
niścalībhūya tat⁴⁰sukhaṃ cintayams⁴¹ **tiṣṭhet** katipayakṣaṇam ity arthaḥ | tataḥ
śabdasukhaṃ bhāvayet | **tayetyādi** | **sukhottejaḥkaram** iti pūrvotpannasukham
adhikaṃ karotīty arthaḥ |

**tvam me putro 'si bhartāsi tvam me bhrātā pitā mataḥ |
tavāhaṃ janānī bhāryā bhaginī bhāgīneyikā ||
saptabhiḥ puruṣair dāsas tvam me khetasaceṭakaḥ (!) |**

³³ naitac] *corr.*, netac Ms

³⁴ samādāyeti] *em.*, samādāpeti Ms

³⁵ °samsthāna°] *em.*, °samsthāne Ms

³⁶ °kartry°] *corr.*, °kartty° Ms

³⁷ prakṛtisiddham, tenaiva] *conj.*, prakṛti + + + naiva Ms

³⁸ °pratyaṅgayor] *em.*, °pratyaṅgayo Ms

³⁹ tat°] *corr.*, tata Ms

⁴⁰ tat°] *corr.*, tata Ms

⁴¹ cintayams] *em.*, cintaya Ms

tvam me kapardakakrītas tavāhaṃ svāminī matā || [6.32–35]

tvam me putro 'sītyādiślokadvayaṃ kākasvareṇa kahu(?)rāgeṇa strī paṭhet puruṣaṃ paśyantīti | tataḥ pūrvakrameṇaiva tadutpannasukhaṃ katipayakṣaṇaṃ vicintya tasyā bhaktiṃ kuryāt |

**patec (!) caraṇayos tasyā nirbharaṃ sampuṭāñjaliḥ |
vadet tatredr̥ṣaṃ vākyam sukhottejaḥkaram param || [6.36–37]**

patec cetyādi | nirbharaṃ yathā bhavati |

**tvam me mātāpitur (!) bhāryā tvam me ca bhāgineyikā |
bhaginīputrabhāryā (!) ca tvam svasā (!) tvam ca māmikā ||
tavāhaṃ sarvathā dāsas tīkṣṇabhaktiparāyaṇaḥ |
paśya mām kṛpayā mātāḥ snehadṛṣṭinirikṣaṇaiḥ || [6.38–41]**

tvam⁴² me mātetyādiślokadvayaṃ pūrvavad yogī paṭhet | svarābhāvāt tu⁴³ sarvatra lālityena pāṭhaḥ kartavyaḥ | **bhrātrādīmātr**ādiśabdās tu (see 6.32 and 6.38) sukhottejakatvenoktā iti |

**tataḥ sā puruṣaṃ śliṣṭā (!) cumbayitvā muhur muhuḥ |
dadāti tryakṣaram maste vaktre vaktrarasam madhu || [6.42–43]**

tryakṣaram iti samadhya⁴⁴suśiramustyaabhinayam | **vaktrarasam** śleṣmapiṇḍam saśabdakanṭhajanitam | tad eva **madhv** iva, madhusukhajanakatvāt |

**padmam coṣāpayet tasya darśayen netravibhramam (!) |
vaktre ca carcitam dattvā kucena pīḍayed hṛdam (!) || [6.44–45]**

padmam iti bhagam | **coṣāpayet** iti yogiśiro yoginī hastam⁴⁵ ākr̥ṣya svapadme nipātayet | yāvac cūṣaṇakriyāniṣpattiḥ syāt tāvad yoginī yogiśirasi kṣaṇam kṣaṇam vilambya tryakṣaram dadyāt | tatas tadananta[18r]raṃ yogiśira utthāpya yoginī **netrabhramam** kaṭākṣam dadyāt |

**sammukham tanmukham dṛṣṭvā nakham dattvā cittālaye (!) |
vadet tasyedr̥ṣam vākyam bhakṣa vairocanam mama || [6.46–47]**

tato yoginī yoginam uttānena pātayet | tatas tanmukhe gudapadmam arpya yonipadmam ca tryakṣarapūrvakam **bhakṣa vairocanam** ityādikaṃ vadet | yathārucy āśu⁴⁶ pradadyād iti | **vairocanam** gūtham |

**pibākṣobhyajalam putra sapitrā dāsako bhava |
tava gosvāminī cāhaṃ mātā rājakūlīty (!) api || [6.48–49]**

⁴² tvam] *em.*, tva Ms

⁴³ tu] *em.*, ta Ms

⁴⁴ samadhya°] *conj.*, madhya° Ms

⁴⁵ hastam] *em.*, hastām Ms

⁴⁶ yathārucy āśu] *conj.*, yathārūvyā Ms

akṣobhyajalaṃ mūtram | yogy api tat sarvaṃ sādaraṃ⁴⁷ gr̥hnan niśceṣṭībhūya
sukham eva cintayet | tataḥ sā punas tam utthāpya **sapitretyādikaṃ** vadet |

madīyaṃ caraṇaṃ gaccha śaraṇaṃ vatsa niraṇtaram |
mayā samvardhito yasmāt tvam ānarghyam upāgataḥ || [6.50–51]

mayetyādi | **mayeti** māṭṭrūpiṇyā bālāvasthāyāṃ payodharadugdhādinā paripālitaḥ |
ānarghyam amūlyam | viśiṣṭarūpatvād ity āśayaḥ |

kṛtajño bhava bho vatsa dehi me vajrajaṃ sukham |
tridalaṃ pañkajaṃ paśya madhye (!) kiñjalkabhūṣitam || [6.52–53]

kṛtam upakāraṃ jānātīti **kṛtajñaḥ** | ayam abhiprāyaḥ | mayā paripālanena tavopakāraḥ
kṛtaḥ, tvam apīdānīm pratyupakāraṃ kurv iti | **vajrajaṃ** iti vajraṃ liṅgam, tena jātam
| vajrāsphālanajātam ity arthaḥ | **tridalaṃ** trikoṇam | **madhyetyādi** | **madhye**
kiñjalkena māṃsa⁴⁸vartikāsamūhena **bhūṣitam** |

aho sukhāvatīkṣetraṃ raktabuddhopaśobhitam |
rāgiṇāṃ sukhadaṃ śāntaṃ sarvakalpavarjitam || [6.54–55]

aho iti sukhābhivyaktau | sukham avati rakṣatīti **sukhāvati**, saiva **kṣetraṃ** sthānam |
raktaṃ śoṇitam, sa eva **buddhaḥ**, tenopaśobhitam | bāhyasukhāvatīkṣetraṃ apy⁴⁹
amitābhaśobhitam bhavatīty arthaḥ | **sarvakalpo** grāhyagrāhakagrahaṇavikalpaḥ, tena
varjitam |

mām uttānena sampātya rāgavihvalamānasām |
skandhe pādayugaṃ dattvā mamādhordhvaṃ nirīkṣaya || [6.56–57]

skandha iti grīvāpārśvadvaye | **adho** bhagam | **ūrdhvaṃ** mukham |

sphuradvajraṃ tataḥ padmamadhyarandhre praveśaya |
dehi dhāpasahasraṃ tvam lakṣya(!)koṭim athārbudam ||
madīye tridale padme māṃsavartisamanvite | [6.58–60]

sphuradvajraṃ stabdhaliṅgam | **dhāpasahasraṃ** dhāpasya kaṭicālanāghātasya
sahasraṃ bahutvāt, na tu saṃkhyākṛtam | evaṃ **lakṣādikaṃ** api bodbhavyam iti |

svavajraṃ tatra prakṣipyā sukhaiś cittam prapūjaya ||
vāyu vāyu supadmaṃ me sārāt sāram anuttaram |
vajrasyāgreṇa sambuddhaṃ raktaṃ (!) bandhūkasamṇibham || [6.61–63]

vāyu vāyv iti praśaṃsayā⁵⁰hlādaṃ janayati | **sāraḥ** sukhādikaṃ⁵¹, tasmād api **sāraṃ**
mahāsukhatvāt |

⁴⁷ sādaraṃ] *em.*, sāradaṃ Ms

⁴⁸ māṃsa°] *em.*, mātsa° Ms

⁴⁹ °kṣetraṃ apy] *corr.*, °kṣetraṃ mapy Ms

⁵⁰ praśaṃsayā°] *corr.*, prasamśayā° Ms

⁵¹ sāraḥ sukhādikaṃ] *conj.*, sāro mukhādikaṃ Ms

bruvantīm iti tām dhyāyan stabdhībhūyaikacetasā |
bhāvayet tajjakam saukhyam niścalo gāḍhacittataḥ ||
tasmai (!) pratyuttaram dadyād vilamba tvam priye kṣaṇam |
yāvat strīdehagam rūpam kṣaṇamātram vicintaye || [6.64–67]

strīm ekām janānīm khalu trijagatām satsaukhyadātrīm śivām
vidveśād iha nindayanti mukharā ye pāpakarmasthitāḥ |
te tenaiva durāvagāhanarake raudre sadā duḥkhitāḥ
krandanto bahuvahnidagdhavapuṣas tiṣṭhanti kalpatrayam || [6.68–71]

[18v] **janānīm** iti sukhasya janānāt | **śivām** kalyāṇām | katham strīnindayā
narakagamanam bhavatīti ced ucyate— aihikasukhasya jananyaḥ kila striyaḥ,
pāralaukika⁵² sukhasya cāta eva paramopakāriṇyo⁵³ buddhajananyaḥ
prajñāpāramitāsvarūpiṇyaḥ | ata⁵⁴ evāsām nindayā mahad apuṇyam⁵⁵ syāt | tato
narakagatir bhavati | yaḥ punaḥ strīnindayānyatra dharmo deśitaḥ, sa punar
laukika⁵⁶ kāmīnīrūpamātreṇābhavyasattvasya, na⁵⁷ tu
lokottarakāmīnīprajñāpāramitādirūpeṇa bhavyasattvasyeti | na cābhavyasattvo
laukikakāmīnyām lokottarakāmīnīrūpam parikalpayitum kṣamo vacanaśatenāpi⁵⁸,
heyopādeyaparijñānābhāvāt tasya | ata evoktam—

prakāśayaṣye sattvānām yathāśayaviśeṣataḥ |

iti |

kiṃ tu vācyo guṇaḥ strīṇām sarvasattvaparigrahaḥ (!) |
kṛpā vā yadi vā rakṣā strīṇām citte pratiṣṭhitā ||

āstām tāvat svajanam parajanam api puṣṇāti bhikṣayā (!) |
sā ced evaṃrūpā nānyathā (!) strī vajrayoginyāḥ ||
āstām tu darśanam tasyāḥ sprṣṭighrṣṭim (!) ca dūrataḥ |
yasyāḥ smaraṇamātreṇa tatkṣaṇam labhyate sukham ||
pañcaiva viśayāḥ strīṇām divyarūpeṇa saṃsthitāḥ |
tām udvāhitām kṛtvā sukham bhuñjanti mānavāḥ || [6.72–79]

udvāhitām⁵⁹ vivāhitām |

tasmād bho doṣanirmukte sarvasadguṇamaṇḍite |
puṇye puṇye mahāpuṇye prasādam kuru me 'mbike || [6.80–81]

puṇya iti puṇyahetutvāt | ayam arthaḥ | mahāsukhajñānānubhavaḥ
sakalapuṇyakāraṇam, tasya ca kāraṇam prajñāiva | ata evoktam—

⁵² pāralaukika°] *corr.*, pāralokika° Ms

⁵³ °opakāriṇyo] *em.*, °opakāriṇyām Ms

⁵⁴ ata] Ms *p.c.*, ataḥ Ms *a.c.*

⁵⁵ apuṇyam] *em.*, apuṇya Ms

⁵⁶ laukika°] *corr.*, lokika° Ms

⁵⁷ °sattvasya, na] *em.*, °sattvasyāna Ms

⁵⁸ °āpi] *em.*, °āmi Ms

⁵⁹ udvāhitām] *em.*, udvāhitā Ms

yathā latāsamudbhūtaṃ phalaṃ puṣpasamanvitam |
ekakṣaṇāṭṭa⁶⁰ sambodhiḥ sambhāradvayasambhṛtā ||

iti |

tatas tām gāḍhato dr̥ṣṭvā svauṣṭhaṃ dantena pīḍayet |
kurvan śītkāraḥ yogī tām ca kuryād vinagnikām || [6.82–83]

svasyātmana oṣṭhaṃ **svauṣṭham**⁶¹ |

kuryāt sukhodaya(!)bandhaṃ bandhaṃ ca dolacālanam | [6.84]

kuryāt sukhodayam ityādy uddeśaḥ |

tatra paryaṅkamadhye tu striyaṃ cotkuṭākāsanām |
kṛtvā bāhuyugaṃ skandhe svasya gāḍhena vojayet || [6.90–91]

tatra paryaṅketyādi nirdeśaḥ | etac ca sakalaṃ mṛnmayena⁶² madanamayena vā
puttalikādvayena darśayet |

savyena ca kareṇaiva vajraṃ padme niveśayet | [6.109]

savyena ca kareṇaivety arthatrayaṃ sūcayati | tat prā + lāma + + +ḥ + + saha (?) +
+ḥ + + | khaḍgamudrāṃ nirnakhāṃ ca (?) + praveśya vāmena⁶³ mardayed
vāmāvarttana, [19r] punar dakṣiṇena dakṣiṇāvarttana, yāvat snigdhaṃ bhavati |
padmamadhyam tato jihvām prakṣipyā saśabdalehanābhinayena tasyās⁶⁴ tryakṣaram
śirasā pratīcchann avalihet katipayakṣaṇam | tataḥ **savyakareṇa vajraṃ** gr̥hītṛvā
padme praveśayet | **evaśabdenaivāyam** arthaḥ pratipādito 'vyayānām anekārthatvād
iti | tatrayam khaḍgamudrā— savyahastena muṣṭim dṛḍhaṃ kṛtvā madhyamātarjanyau
prasārayed iti |

cumbayec ca mukhaṃ tasyā yāvadiccham punaḥ punaḥ |
unnāmya vadanam dr̥ṣṭvā yatheccham vākyakam vadan || [6.124–125]

vākyakam vadan iti kāmottejakam **gosvāminīyādikam** (see 6.49) |

jihvām ca cūṣayet tasyāḥ pibela lālām mukhodbhūtām |
bhakṣayec carcitam dantamalaṃ saukhyaṃ vibhāvayet ||
pīḍayed dantajihvām īṣad adharapidhānike | [6.126–128]

īṣad ity alpam | yathā vyathā na bhavatīty arthaḥ |

jihvayā nāsikārandhraṃ śodhayen netraṅṅikām ||

⁶⁰ ekakṣaṇāṭṭa°] *conj.*, ekakṣaṇāt Ms

⁶¹ svaṣṭham] *em.*, soṣṭham Ms

⁶² mṛnmayena] *corr.*, mṛtmayena Ms

⁶³ vāmena] *conj.*, vāme Ms

⁶⁴ tasyās] *em.*, tasyā Ms

dantakakṣāṃ ca tajjātaṃ malaṃ sarvaṃ ca bhakṣayet |
mastaṃ netraṃ galaṃ karṇaṃ pārśvaṃ kakṣaṃ karaṃ stanam |
cumbayitvā nakhaṃ dadyāt tyaktvā netradvayaṃ striyāḥ ||
mardayet pāṇinā cuñcaṃ cūṣayed daṃśayet tataḥ | [6.129–133]

daṃśayed iti dantena |

svayam uttānikāṃ kṛtvā cumbayet sundarodaram ||
atraivāhaṃ sthitaḥ pūrvaṃ smṛtvā smṛtvā muhur muhuḥ |
hastena sparśayet padmaṃ vāyu sundaram iti bruvaṇ ||
dadyāc cumbanakhaṃ tatra paśyen niṣkr̥ṣya pāṇinā | [6.134–137]

niṣkr̥ṣyeti⁶⁵ prakāśya |

ghrātvā gandhaṃ ca tad randhraṃ śodhayed rasanayā striyāḥ ||
praviṣṭo 'haṃ yathānena niḥsr̥taś cāpy anekaśaḥ |
vadet tatredr̥śaṃ vākyāṃ panthāyaṃ nāsikarjuḥ ||
ayam eva ṣaḍgateḥ panthā bhaved ajñānayogataḥ |
caṇḍaroṣaṇasiddhes tu bhavej jñānaprayogataḥ || [6.138–142]

ajñānayogato laukikakāmasevāmātrataḥ | jñānaprayogata⁶⁶ iti
pratipādyamānalokottarakāmasevāyogataḥ |

tataḥ padmagataṃ śvetaṃ raktaṃ vā sukhasātkṛtaiḥ (!) |
bhakṣayec ca mukhaṃ tasyāḥ saṃpaśyaṃś ca punaḥ punaḥ || [6.143–144]

sotkṛtair iti kiṃcitsasusīramukhavātākuñcana⁶⁷ śabdaiḥ |

sa nakhaṃ (!) corukaṃ kṛtvā mardayed dāsavat padau |
mastake tryakṣaraṃ dadyād dhṛṇmadhye laghumuṣṭikam ||
tataś citrāt parān bandhān kuryād yogī samāhitaḥ |
icchayā dhyāyakaṃ (!) tatra dadyāt saukhyaikamānasaḥ ||
yathecchaṃ prakṣaren no vā kṣaret saukhyaikamānasaḥ | [6.145–149]

yatheccham ityādi | tatrākṣaraṇopāyas⁶⁸ tu kathyate | yadā maṇimūlaparyantaṃ
candro gantum utsahate paramānandānte, tadā mūtravegadhāraṇanyāyena vāyum
ākuñcayed dhairya⁶⁹ krameṇa nābhyaadhaḥparyantaṃ śvāsanirodhaṃ kṛtvā
kṣaṇamātram | etac ca guruḥ svayaṃ kṛtvā darśayed iti | etena na kṣaraṇaṃ bhavati |

kṣarite cālihet padmaṃ jānupātaprayogataḥ ||
bhakṣayet padmagam śukraṃ śoṇitaṃ cāpi jihvayā |
nāsayā nalikā(!)yogāt pibet sāmartyavṛddhaye || [6.150–152]

⁶⁵ niṣkr̥ṣyeti] *em.*, niṣkupyeti Ms

⁶⁶ °prayogata] *em.*, °yogata Ms

⁶⁷ °vātākuñcana°] *conj.*, °vātānkucana° Ms

⁶⁸ tatrākṣaraṇopāyas] *em.*, tatrākṣaropāyas Ms

⁶⁹ dhairya°] Ms *p.c.*, dhairye Ms *a.c.*

nāsayetyādi⁷⁰ prayogāntaram āha | ayam arthaḥ | prajñopāyadhātudvayam kadācij
jihvayālihet | kadācit padmān mukhenākṛṣṭam bhājane samsthāpya nālikām⁷¹
prakṣipyā śvāsam jñātvā nāsikayābhyavaharet | ghaṅṭikārandhreṇety arthaḥ |
upalakṣaṇam etat, tenāparam api boddhavyam | rajasvalā⁷² raktam
karamudrākṛṣṭasukram ubhayaṃ bhājane samsthāpyānāmikayā sammardya pūrvavan
nālikā⁷³ yogenābhyavahared iti | [19v] prayogaphalam āha— **sāmarthyetyādi** | ayam
arthaḥ | satata⁷⁴ prayogakaraṇād valipalitavyādhirṣṭyunāśanād yogino
mahāsāmarthyavṛddhir bhavatīti |

prakṣālya jihvayā padmaṃ prajñām utthāpya cumbayet |
kroḍīkṛtya tataḥ paścād bhakṣayen matsyamāṃsakam ||
pibed dugdham ca madyaṃ vā punaḥ kāmāpravṛddhaye |
śrame jīryati (!) tatpaścād icchayet tu sukhādibhiḥ ||
punaḥ pūrvakrameṇaiva dvandvam anyonyam ārabhet ||
anenābhyāsayogena sādhitam ca mahāsukham |
caṇḍaroṣapadam (!) dhatte janmany atraiva yogavit || [6.153–159]

sādhitam iti rātriṃdivaṃ prabandhena sthitam | **caṇḍaroṣapadam**
mahāmudrāsiddhiṃ **dhatte** grhnāti | **atraiveti** pratyutpanna eva janmani |

rāgiṇāṃ siddhidānārthaṃ mayā yogaḥ prakāśitaḥ | [6.160]

rāgiṇāṃ⁷⁵ kāminām | ye tv akāmināḥ teṣāṃ pāramitānayaakraṇa
trikalpāsamkhyeyena bodhir ity⁷⁶ abhiprāyaḥ | vicikitsābahulatvāt teṣāṃ nāsmiṃ
dharma śraddhāsti | kāminām api yeṣāṃ śraddhā nāsti, na teṣāṃ siddhir asti |
etadyogavyatirekaśraddhayāpi nāsti siddhiḥ | na hi ghṛtārthinā jalaṃ mathanīyam, kiṃ
tu dadhir⁷⁷ dugdham vā, tatraiva tasya bhāvād vastuśaktisvābhāvvyāc †ceṣṭi |

bhūmau pādātale sthāpya vakre tiryak sudīrghake |
ardhacandrāsaṇaṃ jñeyam etat kāmasukhapradam || [6.169–170]

tiryak sudīrghaka iti haṃsapakṣākāre |

punar dhanvāsaṇaṃ kṛtvā svānaṇaṃ tadgudāntare |
pātayitvā gudaṃ tasyāḥ saṃlihen nāsayāpi ca || [6.177–178]

nāsayāpi ceti tatra nāsikāṃ prakṣipyā gandhaṃ grhnīyāt |

tadutpannaṃ sukhaṃ dhyāyāc caṇḍaroṣaṇayogataḥ |
tato mukto bhaved yogī sarvasaṃkalpavarjitāḥ || [6.179–180]

⁷⁰ nāsayetyādi] *em.*, nāsetyādi Ms

⁷¹ nālikām] *em.*, nālikāyām Ms

⁷² rajasvalā°] *corr.*, rajaḥsvalā° Ms

⁷³ nālikā°] *em.*, nalikā° Ms

⁷⁴ satata°] *em.*, sa tat Ms

⁷⁵ rāgiṇāṃ] *em.*, rāgiṇā Ms

⁷⁶ bodhir ity] *em.*, bodhicitty Ms

⁷⁷ dadhir] *em.*, dadhi° Ms

caṇḍaroṣaṇayogo niścalasamādhiḥ | mukto⁷⁸ duḥkhān muktaḥ, paramasukharūpatvāt
|

virāgarahitaṃ cittaṃ kṛtvā mātrāṃ (!) prakāmayet |
anurāgāt prāpyate puṇyaṃ virāgād agham āpyate || [6.181–182]

mātām iti yathoktaprajñām | agham pāpam |

na virāgāt paraṃ pāpam na puṇyaṃ sukhataḥ param |
tataś ca kāmaje saukhye cittaṃ kuryāt samāhitaḥ || [6.183–184]

atha bhagavatī pramuditahr̥dayā bhagavantaṃ namaskṛtya abhivandya caivam
āha || [6.185–186]

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

bhagavān āha | [6.189]

atrānuraktā ye tu sattvāḥ sarvadikṣu vyavasthitāḥ |
devāsurā narā nāgās te 'pi sidhyanti sādhakāḥ || [6.190–191]

athaivam śrutvā maheśvarādayo devā gaurīlakṣmīsacīratyādidevatīm ḡhītvā
bhāvayitum ārabdhāḥ || atha tatkṣaṇam sarve tallavam tanmuhūrtakam (!)
caṇḍaroṣaṇapadam prāptā vicaranti mahītale | tatra maheśvaro
vajraśaṅkaratvena siddhaḥ | vāsudevo vajranārāyaṇatvena | devandro
vajrapāṇitvena | kāmadevo vajrānaṅgatvena | evaṃpramukhā
gaṅgānadībālukāsamā devaputrāḥ siddhāḥ || [6.192–196]

tatkṣaṇam ity adhimātrasattvasyānandakṣaṇa eva tattvādhigamāt | tallavam iti
madhyasattvasya paramānandakṣaṇa eva tattvādhigamāt | tanmuhūrtam⁷⁹ iti
mṛdusattvasya paramānande prāpte, viramānandapraveśe, anayor madhye⁸⁰
sahajānandakṣaṇa eva tattvādhigamād iti |

vajraśaṅkarādīnām tu kathyate rūpam | tatra vajraśaṅkaro dvibhujai kamukhaḥ
śvetavarṇo jaṭāmakuṭadharo nirbhūṣaṇapañcamudrāsahito bhasmoddhūlitavigrahas
trinetro vāmena kapālakhatvāṅgadhārī dakṣiṇena ḍamarudhārī sattvaparyaṅkī
vṛṣabhārūḍho vajragauryaḷiṅgitas⁸¹ taptacāmīkaravarṇayā nānālamkāra[20r]bhūṣitayā
ṣoḍaśābdayā vāmahastadhṛtaraktapadmāyā | vajranārāyaṇo garuḍārūḍhas⁸²
caturbhujō nīlo ratnamakuṭī sarvālamkārabhūṣitaḥ sattvaparyaṅkī dakṣiṇena
ratnagadodyatobhayakaro⁸³ vāmena śaṅkhacakrodyatobhayakaro vajralakṣmyā⁸⁴
gauravarṇayāḷiṅgito vajragaurīrūpayā | vajrapāṇir dvibhujah sahasralocano

⁷⁸ mukto] *em.*, yukto Ms

⁷⁹ tanmuhūrtam] *corr.*, tanmūhūrtam Ms

⁸⁰ madhye] *em.*, madhya° Ms

⁸¹ °gauryaḷiṅgitas] Ms *p.c.*, °gauryaḷiṅgitas Ms *a.c.*

⁸² garuḍārūḍhas] *em.*, garuḍhārūḍhaḥ | Ms

⁸³ °odyatobhayakaro] *em.*, °odyātābhayakaraḥ | Ms

⁸⁴ °lakṣmyā] *em.*, °lakṣmā Ms

ratnamakuṭī sarvālaṃkāradhārī suvarṇavarṇo dakṣiṇena vajradharo vāme tarjanīdhara
airāvaṇārūḍhaḥ sattvaparyāṅkī⁸⁵ vajragaurīrūpayā vajraśacyāliṅgitaḥ | **vajrāṅgo**
makaramukhavimānārūḍhaḥ⁸⁶ sattvaparyāṅkī dvibhujaikamukho ratnamakuṭī
sarvālaṅkārabhūṣitaḥ pītavarṇo dakṣiṇe śaradharo vāme kusumacāpadharo
vajragaurīrūpayā vajraratyā⁸⁷ liṅgitaḥ | tatra **maheśvaro** 'mitābhaśirasko
'rdhacandradhārī | **vāsudevo** 'kṣobhyaśiraskaḥ | **indro** ratnasambhavaśiraskaḥ |
kāmadevo 'mitābhaśiraskaḥ | **evampramukhā** iti vajrakārttikavajraganapatyādayaḥ |

pañcakāmaguṇopetāḥ sarvasattvārthakārahāḥ |
nānāmūrtidharāḥ sarve bhūtā māyāvino jināḥ || [6.197-198]

pañcetyādi | pañca kāmā rūparasasparśa⁸⁸ śabdagandhāḥ⁸⁹ | kāmante 'bhilaṣyanta iti
kāmāḥ,⁹⁰ ta eva guṇyante 'bhyasyanta iti guṇāḥ, tair yuktāḥ⁹¹ |

yathā paṅkodbhavaṃ padmaṃ paṅkadoṣair na lipyate |
tathā rāganayodbhūtā lipyante na ca doṣakaiḥ || [6.199-200]

vastuviśeṣasya śaktim āha— **yathetyādi** | **pañkasya** kardamasya **doṣo**
varṇagandhādilakṣaṇaḥ |

ity ekala(!)vīrākhye śrīcaṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantre niṣpannayogapaṭalaḥ ṣaṣṭhaḥ ||
[6.201-202]

niṣpannayogapradhānaḥ⁹² paṭalaḥ ||

iti ṣaṣṭhapaṭalavyākhyā || o ||

⁸⁵ °paryāṅkī] *em.*, °paryāṅkīḥ | Ms

⁸⁶ °vimānārūḍhaḥ] *em.*, °vināmārūḍhaḥ Ms

⁸⁷ vajraratyā°] *conj.*, ratyā° Ms

⁸⁸ °sparśa°] *em.*, °sparśā° 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: 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 Dveṣavajrī[, the chief consort of the main deity, Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa]. This designation is meaningful (*sānvayā*). ‘Wisdom’ (*prajñā*)[, examined via semantic analysis,] means a distinguished (*pra*^o = *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]^o)**, the intended meaning is this: to be sure (*hi*), meditative cultivation [chara]cterised 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 (*niṣpannakramaḥ*) [is the same as what other traditions call] *utpannakramaḥ*. [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 visualisation

⁹³ This is from a conjectured reading. We also considered *sahajānvayajñānam* and the like, but the following passage suggests ^o*ānanda*^o 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.

⁹⁵ George uses the more customary but slightly inadequate rendering, “Stage of Completion”. We have modified this throughout.

⁹⁶ We expect that the lacuna had something with ^o*lakṣaṇā*.

(*jhaṭṭiyākārayogena*),⁹⁷ not heeding the previously described meditative sequence beginning with [the cultivation of the four *brahmavihāras*, the first of which is] loving kindness (°*maitrī*°).⁹⁸ 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** is the same as night and day. The meaning is that he should not think of anything else even for a moment.

He should ardently consider his woman⁹⁹ to have your form, until, with great and firm practice, it accordingly becomes perfectly clear. [6.8–9]

[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 (°*ahaṃkāra*°) of those [respective] (*tad*°...°*tad*°) [deities] become manifest.¹⁰⁰ And this is achieved by dedicated, uninterrupted, and lengthy repetitions.¹⁰¹ As it is said:

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.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ This is spelt out with a quotation, which we cannot trace in Sanskrit, in the commentary to the last chapter (Ms 33r): *bījenāpi vineti jhaṭṭiyākārayogena | tathā cōktaṃ—yadvā jhaṭṭiyogena vajradākaḥ svayaṃ bhavet | bhāvayitvā vinā bījam upapādukasattvavat ||*; “**Even without the seed[-syllable]** [i.e.] by means of instantaneous visualisation. As it is taught: Alternatively, he should become Vajradāka by means of instantaneous visualisation, after having meditated [on it] without the seed[-syllable], like the being which is spontaneously born.”

⁹⁸ 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 (*utpattikramaḥ*) are not to be performed at this level.

⁹⁹ We modified George’s translation “his own wife”, since it was probably not a requirement to formally marry the consort.

¹⁰⁰ George here (1974: 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 (*sphuṭatām iti tadahaṃkarayoh*).

¹⁰¹ These three attributes of meditative cultivation are commonplace in non-tantric Buddhist 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. *Pañcarakṣāvīdhāna*, *Sādhanamālā* 206 (Bhattacharya 1928: 406), and even replaced with °*ḍṛḍhāveśaḥ*, ‘a firm intentness’, e.g. *TārodbhavaKurukullāsādhana*, *Sādhanamālā* 172 (Bhattacharya 1928: 349). Note the usage of *āveśaḥ*, which is primarily used for possession by deities and demons.

¹⁰² 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 & Sferra 2014: 169, 267 (we follow this translation with a slight modification to *pāda a*) and Kuranishi 2016: 54. We can add two more instances to the already rather exhaustive survey of Buddhist and Śaiva testimonia in the two cited works: (Pseudo-)Padmavajra’s *Advayavivaraṇaprajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* (Samdhong Rinpoche & Dwivedi 1988: 218, which transmits °*bala*° in *pāda c*, and the even *pādas* in a corrupt form: *yad yad eveti bhāvayate* and *tasya sākalyadhīḥ phalam*); and Sucaritamīśra’s *Kāśikā*

[And:]¹⁰³

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 (*yogayuktiḥ*) depends on the mind (*cittānuyātā*).¹⁰⁴

Mother, daughter, sister, niece, and any other female relative,¹⁰⁵ as well as a Ḍombinī,¹⁰⁶ [the] female [relative of a] Brahmin,¹⁰⁷ [6.10–11]

(Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī 1926: 215, which too has °*ātibhāvyate* and °*bala*°, but °*dhīḥ phalam* in the last *pāda*). Mahāsukhavajra seems to have recomposed *pāda a*, which is invariably transmitted as *tasmād bhūtam abhūtam vā*. This is understandable, since *tasmād*, ‘therefore’ would not have made much sense here. In the next two verse quarters, we find *atibhāvyate* vs. *abhibhāvyate* and °*balaniṣpattau* vs. °*pariniṣpattau* 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 *sphuṭā*° 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 °*dhīḥ*, but this is somewhat disturbingly not the only time we see this form, cf. for instance the readings of Pseudo-Padmavajra and Sucaritamiśra just above, but also Ratnakīrti’s *Sarvajñasiddhi* (Thakur 1957: 9, which also erroneously prints *sphuṭā kalpa*°), Vāgīśvarakīrti’s *Tattvaratnāvalokavivarāṇa* (Pandey 1997: 144), as well as the best manuscript of Ratnarakṣita’s *Padminī* (Ms, 22r, granted, *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 (*pratyakṣam*) of the yogic kind (*yogī*°), inasmuch as it is “clear” (which essentially means the same as *abhrāntam*, ‘non-erroneous’ in the standard definition of direct perception) and “non-conceptual” (*kalpanāpoḍham* in the standard definition).

¹⁰³ Perhaps something like **aparam ca* is missing here, otherwise Mahāsukhavajra might create the impression that the two verses are from the same source.

¹⁰⁴ This is from the *Vāksādhana* of Sujanabhadra, *Sāadhanamālā* 66 (Bhattacharya 1925: 135, where for some reason *pāda d* is printed as a long compound).

Alternatively, one may understand °*yuktiḥ* as ‘logic’, ‘the way [yoga] works’.

¹⁰⁵ Judging by his final sentence to this passage, we think that Mahāsukhavajra might have taken **jñātinīm** in a weaker sense, such as ‘intimate friend’.

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 *rajakī* 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 *ḍombas* are related to the Dom people. Elsewhere (Ms 15r), Mahāsukhavajra suggests that the primary feature of *ḍombinīs* was their black skin colour (*kṛṣṇakanyām iti ḍombinīm*), and that there was considerable racism directed towards them (*ibid.*): *kṛṣṇakanyādīnām lokaviruddhatvāt*; “[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.”

[We now turn to the verse] beginning with **Mother**. [The yogin] should take a consort (°*prajñām*) beginning with ‘mother’, but only one in which youth has not yet faded.¹⁰⁸ As everyone knows (*kila*), 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 (*loka*°). But [then] they will experience intense suffering caused by [this] turning away. Because of [this] suffering, there will be a distraction (*vikṣepaḥ*) of mind, and because of that [distraction] there will be a lack of composure (*samādhāna*°). And if there is a lack of composure, there will be no achievement of the Great Seal (*mahāmudrā*°) (i.e the ultimate state).

Moreover, it should not be supposed that [engaging with women in such a way] contradicts religion (*adharmāḥ*), because there is no injury either to oneself or to others. Nor is there †...†, because of its having the form of experiencing Great Pleasure¹⁰⁹. On the contrary, this is producing [spiritual] profit both to oneself and to others.¹¹⁰ 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].¹¹¹

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,¹¹²

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.¹¹³

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

¹⁰⁸ This point, that the consort should be young, is emphasised in several places in the commentary, e.g. Ms 14v, 15r.

¹⁰⁹ Achieving Great Pleasure is the same as achieving buddhahood, cf.

Mahāsukhavajra (Ms 30v): *buddhasiddhiṃ mahāsukhasiddhim*.

¹¹⁰ This contrast, *adharma* being injury (*apakārah*) to both oneself and others and its opposite, i.e. *dharma*, being benefit (*arthakaraṇam* = *upakārah*) to both oneself and others, might allude to standard definitions of these two terms.

¹¹¹ We were unable to trace this verse.

¹¹² Most likely *Hevajratāntra* II.vii.11ab (Snellgrove 1959: 88). Also cf. *Mahāmudrātilaka* 23.28 (Ms 49r), *Vajradākatantra* 1.48 (Sugiki 2002: 91), *Abhidhānottara* 48/51.18 (Chandra 1981: 246).

¹¹³ What Mahāsukhavajra has in mind here is most likely a passage in Kṛṣṇācārya’s commentary of the *Hevajratāntra*, the *Yogaratanmālā*, where the *Buddhakaṭāpantra* is quoted (Snellgrove 1959: 155–156; Tripathi & Negi 2006:

Among these [mentioned consorts], **mother** can mean birth mother, stepmother¹¹⁴, maternal aunt, or the wife of the master¹¹⁵. **Daughter** can mean fathered daughter¹¹⁶, brother's daughter, the daughter from a previous marriage of a woman brought into wedlock together with her¹¹⁷, or the daughter of the master. **Sister** can mean one related by blood¹¹⁸, the daughter of a maternal aunt, or the daughter of the master¹¹⁹. **Niece** means the daughter of any of these [previously listed]. **Any other** means those

180–181; Farrow & Menon 1992: 270; for the *Buddhakaṭāla* quotation, see Luo 2010: 29, 102). We give here the text slightly standardised and with our own translation, since that of Farrow & Menon is inadequate. [...] *mātrādisabdaiḥ pañcendriyāṇy abhidhīyante, tāni śabdarūparasādibhiḥ pañca kāmagaṇais tarpayet | iyaṃ eva hi tatra sthānaṃ devīnāṃ niruttarā pūjeti | kathaṃ mātrādayaś cakṣurādaya iti cet | tathā coktaṃ Buddhakaṭāle yoginītantra—[...] bhaginī bhavec cakṣur bhāgineyī śrotram eva ca || janānī bhanyate ghrāṇaṃ rasanā duhitā tathā | mano bhaved bhāryā | śaḍ etā varā divyā 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 *gaṇacakra*) 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 *yoginītantra* [called] the *Buddhakaṭāla*: 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 shielding the truth from those unprepared.

¹¹⁴ We do not find the compound *sapatnamātā* 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.

Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa 129ab (Patel 1949: 9): *guror ājñāṃ ca mudrāṃ ca chāyām api na laṅghayet* |; “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 convinced that Varghese (2008: 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. *Prajñopāyavinīścayasiddhi* 2.14cd–15ab (Samdhong Rinpoche & Dwivedi 1988: 71): *vihetḥayanti cātmānam ātmanaiva durāśayāḥ | haraṇe 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 °*dhanasya*, and not °*dharasya* as in the constituted text. Also cf. the *Ḍākinījālaśamvararahasya* (Samdhong Rinpoche & Dwivedi 1990: 11), a quotation from the [Ḍākinī]vajrapañjara: *guroś chāyām na laṅghayed [guru]patnīm ca pādukā[m] | ye laṅghayanti saṃmohāt te narāḥ kṣuradhāriṇaḥ ||*; “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.

[different] from the four [just mentioned], who are defined below.

Caṇḍālī,¹²⁰ **dancer, dyer,**¹²¹ **and prostitute; holy woman,**¹²² **yoginī, and kāpālīnī**¹²³ **as well—**¹²⁴ **[6.12–13]**

Prostitute¹²⁵ (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] (*agr̥hītapan̄yām*).

Or else, whatever he may find fashioned into a woman’s figure:¹²⁶ **these he should serve**¹²⁷ **in the proper way without disclosure.**¹²⁸ **[6.14–15]**

What will happen if there is a disclosure [of one’s participation in these practices]?

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: 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 *kāpālīka*, 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): *raṇḍāḥ patisūnyāḥ striyaḥ | sevyā vajrapadmayogena | yatinyo bhikṣuṇītāpasvinyādayaḥ | prāyeṇa kila raṇḍādīnām* (em., *raṇḍādīnam* Ms) *idam eva satatam cetasi garjati: katham puruṣasamparko bhavaty iti | lokabhayāc ca puruṣā na pravartante | śaktasya tu yogino na lokabhayam asti | atas tena sevānyāḥ* |; “**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 not 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’ (*śaktiḥ*) 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, **rūpajīvikām**.

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 *bhedāḥ* here and in the next verse as “making any/makes a distinction”. The *pāda yathā bhedo na jāyate* is an echo of *Hevajratāntra* I.v.3 (Snellgrove 1959: 16), where the opposite situation is introduced by *agupte*, “[but] if it is not hidden”. We find the same collocation *yathā bhedo na jāyate* in two early sources: Padmavajra’s *Guhyasiddhi* 6.94b (Samdhong Rinpoche & Dwivedi 1988: 47) and the *Advayasamatāvijaya* (Fan 2011: 164).

[The Lord] explains [this in the next verse,] beginning with **But if there is a disclosure.**

But if there is a disclosure, Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa will be angered¹²⁹ and slay the practitioner. And he will throw him into the Avīci Hell threatening¹³⁰ him with a sword and noose.¹³¹ 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,¹³² the practice of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa 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 (atyanta°).**¹³³

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*).¹³⁴ 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*),¹³⁵ then one should rely on a likeness of the [consort] (*tatpratīkṛtim*), made of [a suitable substance] such as wood (*dāru°*),¹³⁶ or painted on a cloth (*paṭa°*).

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 *ḍākinī* 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) **abhyantakāminām**, 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.

¹³⁶ Consorts fashioned out of wood etc. are also mentioned in Śrībhānu’s commentary of the *Vajrāmṛta*, a passage recycled in scripture, the *Samputodbhava* (Szántó 2016: 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 *datch[i] waifu*, ‘Dutch wife’ (2010: 27).

And this should be performed only in an isolated place, [therefore the next verse] begins with [Pleas]ing to the mind.¹³⁷

In a place pleasing to the mind¹³⁸ where there are no disturbances, in secret, after having taken¹³⁹ a lover who is agreeable to his mind,¹⁴⁰ [6.22–23]

In secret means covered [from prying eyes by means of] a wall (*bhitti*°), a screen (*°paṭala*°), a door-panel (*°kapāṭa*°), 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,¹⁴¹ Immoveable,¹⁴² she is cherished Prajñāpāramitā,” thus the wise person should meditate with fixed thought, each one having their¹⁴³ 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 knife¹⁴⁴, 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].¹⁴⁵

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 it 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 Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa.

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: 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 nāryaś ca, kiṃ tv anādyavidyāvāsanopahatāḥ | tadavidyāvāsanānāsanārthaṃ tu devadevībhāvanā kriyate | bhāvanā ca prakṛtisiddhavarṇena śīghram eva sphuṭatarā bhavati | tatsphuṭībhāvād dhi mahāmudrāsiddhiḥ* | “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

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.¹⁴⁶
[6.26–27]

[Now for the compound] beginning with **As**. [The compound **yathālabdhānnavastrakaḥ**¹⁴⁷ 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 pleasure¹⁴⁸, **he**¹⁴⁹ **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 parts¹⁵⁰ 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 (*kāṣṭhavan*), 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).

“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

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, svedehavarṇato 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 **dvābhyāṃ ... bhāvayen** as an ergative construction (also see 6.29, **dvābhyāṃ ... 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 °**vastukaḥ**, 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 (*aṅgam/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.

ancestors, you are my slave,¹⁵¹ my phlegm-eating¹⁵² lowly servant. I bought you with cowrie shells¹⁵³; I am called¹⁵⁴ your mistress.” [6.32–35]

The two verses beginning with **You are my son** should be recited by the woman with a shrill¹⁵⁵ intonation in the †...†¹⁵⁶ 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]**¹⁵⁷. **Ardently** means in a way that it becomes so (i.e. adverbial usage).

“You are my mother,¹⁵⁸ 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.¹⁵⁹ 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**,

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: 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 *Pāṇinīyaśikṣā* 34c (Ghosh 1938: 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 *bhaginīputrabhāryā* and translates as “my mother’s father’s wife”. His interpretation of *svasā* (correctly: *ṣvasā*) as ‘sister’ is puzzling. *Māmikā*, a Sanskritised vernacular word, is not simply aunt, but maternal aunt.

mother, etc. are taught with the aim of intensifying [the couple's] pleasure.

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 heart¹⁶³ **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 hand¹⁶⁴. Until the completion of cunnilingus (*cūṣaṅakriyā*^o), 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 (*kaṭākṣaṃ*).¹⁶⁷

In front of him, looking him in the face,¹⁶⁸ **she should scratch him wherever**

¹⁶⁰ We favour the reading **śliṣṭvā** over **śliṣṭā**; 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*^o 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 (*tryakṣaram*) is usually *oṃ āḥ hūṃ*, cf. *oṃ āḥ hūṃ iti tryakṣaram* in the *Mañjuśrīsādhana*, *Sāadhanamālā* 51 (Bhattacharya 1925: 107); *oṃ āḥ hūṃ iti tryakṣareṇa* in the *Kurukullāsādhana* of Kṛṣṇa, *Sāadhanamālā* 181 (Bhattacharya 1928: 376); *oṃ āḥ hūṃ sitanīlapītatryakṣarāṇi cintayet* in the *Pratisarāsādhana*, *Sāadhanamālā* 194 (Bhattacharya 1928: 396). George was seemingly puzzled by this reading, too (1974: 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 **pīḍayed dhṛdam**. We also suspect that this reading might be a corruption of **pīḍayed dṛḍham**.

¹⁶⁴ We feel a little hesitant here, because the expression usually means extricating one's hand.

¹⁶⁵ The idea seems to be that she rests her hollow fist on his head from time to time, while reciting *oṃ āḥ hūṃ*.

¹⁶⁶ Another minor point: Mahāsukhavajra's *lemma* is missing the **vi**^o.

¹⁶⁷ This, as any reader of Indian poetry and *ars amatoria* will surely know, is considered a most erotic eye gesture.

¹⁶⁸ It is somewhat doubtful that this is what Mahāsukhavajra read.

appropriate.¹⁶⁹ She should speak to him in this way: “Eat my Vairocana! [6.46–47]

Then the yoginī should make the yogī lay down, facing upwards. Then she should place¹⁷⁰ 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.¹⁷¹ **Vairocana** means faeces.

Drink the Akṣobhya-water¹⁷², O Son! Be a slave along with your father!¹⁷³ I am your cow-girl¹⁷⁴ as well as your royal mother. [6.48–49]

Akṣobhya-water means urine. As for the yogī, he should take all that with reverence¹⁷⁵, 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 with¹⁷⁶ **[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.

¹⁶⁹ We favour Mical’s more metrical reading **nakhaṃ dattvocitālaye** over George’s **nakhaṃ dattvā cittālaye**. 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: 85–87), but also in this chapter, see 6.131–132 below.

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 *mūla*, cf. 4.103–104.

¹⁷¹ We feel somewhat hesitant about the conjecture *yathārucy āśu* for *yathārūvyā*, but **yathārucyā* 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 **akṣobhyajalaṃ** as a *karmadhāraya* compound (“the water which is Akṣobhya”) and not as George, a genitive *tatpuruṣa* (“water of Akṣobhya”).

¹⁷³ The instrumental **pitṛā** would have sufficed, **sa°** is therefore probably a verse filler. Alternatively, emend to **sapitā**. We hope this addresses George’s worries expressed in 1974: 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 **pibākṣobhyajalaṃ**. We modified the translation accordingly.

Be grateful¹⁷⁷, O my dear, give me the pleasure born from the Vajra¹⁷⁸! 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 by that. The meaning is [the pleasure] born from the churning of the Vajra [in the Lotus]. **Three-petalled** means triangular. [As for the compound¹⁷⁹] 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.¹⁸⁰ [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 flesh¹⁸¹. [6.58–60]

The **throbbing vajra** means the erect penis. **A thousand strokes (dhāpa^o)¹⁸²** [here] **strokes** [means] thrusts (*°āghāta^o*) [produced by] moving the hips; **a thousand** [of

¹⁷⁷ Rather than George's "gracious".

¹⁷⁸ We are more literal here than George's "the pleasure of the vajra".

¹⁷⁹ A very minor point, but we think that Mahāsukhavajra read **madhyakiñjalka^o** and not **madhye kiñjalka^o**. Alternatively, consider his *madhyetyādi* an erroneous double *sandhi*.

¹⁸⁰ Instead of George's sentence, "Peace beyond all imagination, giving pleasure to the lustful."

¹⁸¹ Although still slightly obscure, we opted for this rendering and not George's "bound round with flesh".

¹⁸² It is noteworthy that this word does not occur in our standard dictionaries. Turner 1962-1966: 384, 'dhapp' no. 6729 lists a number of close meanings in Pañjābī, Kumāunī, Oṛiyā, Hindī, and Nepālī, positing a possible Proto-Muṇḍa derivation. The word is perhaps an onomatopoeic vernacular word Sanskritised by the anonymous author. Alternatively, it is possible that the word is a corruption of *dhāya*, in which case cf. Newar *dhāya/dhāya* (Jørgensen 1936: *sub voce*): 'to beat', 'to knock'.

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°)**¹⁸³ and the other [numbers].

Insert your Vajra and propitiate your mind with pleasures¹⁸⁴. **Wow, wow!**¹⁸⁵ **My Lotus is the essence of the essence,**¹⁸⁶ **the very highest, and aroused by the tip**¹⁸⁷ **of the Vajra, it is as red as the Banduka flower.**¹⁸⁸ [6.61–63]

[With the words] ‘**Wow, wow**’, [the consort] generates joy by praising [her Lotus]. **The essence** means pleasure and so on;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 her¹⁹⁰: “**Wait a moment, my dear, that I may consider, for just a moment, your womanly form.** [6.64–67]

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 world¹⁹¹ **disparage her out of hostility, will, by their action remain constantly tortured for three aeons in the fathomless**¹⁹² **Raudra Hell, wailing as their bodies burn in many fires.** [6.68–71]

[Woman is here called] **birth giver**, for she generates pleasure. **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 (*kīla*), 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

¹⁸³ Although perhaps unusual for East Indian manuscripts, George’s **lakṣya°** does seem to be attested in this sense.

¹⁸⁴ Rather than George’s “offer your mind with pleasure”. This is perhaps an allusion to the Four Blissess.

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!’

¹⁸⁶ George is right to translate **sārāt sārām** simply as “quintessence”, but we had to accommodate the commentator’s gloss, hence the change.

¹⁸⁷ George has “top”, presumably a misprint.

¹⁸⁸ Although ultimately it does not affect the meaning, we think that the more likely reading is **raktabandhūka°**.

¹⁸⁹ This is the result of a bold emendation, but we simply could not see any meaning in *sāro mukhādīkam*.

¹⁹⁰ George’s edition has **tasmai** for **tasyai**, but the translation is correct, therefore this must be a misprint.

¹⁹¹ George’s interpretation of **iha** is “now”; we disambiguated this.

¹⁹² The irregular lengthening of the second vowel in **durāvagāha°** seeks to avoid breaking the metre.

demerit. And because of that one will go to hell. As for the religious teaching (*dharmo*) of disparaging women (*strīnindā*) proclaimed elsewhere,¹⁹³ that is [intended] for beings unworthy [of the esoteric path] (*abhavya*°), 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

¹⁹³ This is a reference to the what is sometimes referred to as *asucibhāvanā*, a fine example of which is *Bodhicaryāvatāra* 8.40 ff. (Steinkellner 1981: 96 ff.). Abhorring women is otherwise considered one of the fourteen basic trespasses (*mūlāpattiḥ*) in tantric Buddhism, cf. *Mūlāpattisaṃgraha* 9ab (Lévi 1929: 266, 267): *strīṇāṃ prajñāsvabhāvānāṃ jugupsayā caturdaśī*; “Le quatorzième [*scil.* péché], c’est l’horreur des femmes, dont la nature propre est la Sapience.”

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

¹⁹⁵ We conjectured °**parigrahā** for °**parigrahaḥ**, 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 ***bhikṣayā hi puṣṇāti**.

¹⁹⁷ Once again we modify George, since we suspect that he did not fully grasp the idiomatic expression (**āstāṃ ... dūrataḥ**). He translates: “Be it her look, touch, or rub— when far away, the mere remembrance produces pleasure at that instant.” We suspect that **sprṣṭighrṣṭim** is a corruption of the dual nominative **sprṣṭighrṣṭī**. We also disagree with translating *ghrṣṭiḥ* as ‘rub’ in light of Mahāsukhavajra’s gloss elsewhere (Ms 14v): *kuru [...] ghrṣṭim āliṅganacumbanādikam ity arthaḥ* |.

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 cause of that [experience] is none other than the consort (*prajñā*). For this reason it is taught:

Just like the fruit born of the vine is endowed with a flower, perfect awakening achieved²⁰⁰ in a single moment is complete with the two equipments [of merit and knowledge].²⁰¹

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”.

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

²⁰¹ This is *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa* 98 (Haraprasād Śāstrī 1898: 183; Patel 1949: 7; Varghese 2008: 252), but the verse was also incorporated into the *Caṇḍamahāroṣanatantra*, chapter 13 (30cd–31ab in Mical’s numeration). It is also quoted in the *Padminī* (Ms 22r). The readings fluctuate wildly. The *editio princeps* has: *yathā latāsamudbhūtaṃ phalapuṣpasamanvitam || yathaikakṣaṇasambodhiḥ sambhāradvayasamṃyutā |*. Patel’s edition (followed *verbatim* by Varghese) has *yathā latā samudbhūtā phalapuṣpasamanvitā | tathaikakṣaṇasambodhiḥ sambhāradvayasamṃyutā ||*. The best Ms of the *Padminī* has a reading which is much closer to ours: *yathā latāsamudbhūtaṃ phalaṃ puṣpasamanvitam | tathakalakṣeṇasambodhiḥ sambhāradvayasambhṛtā ||*. The closest match is that of the *Caṇḍamahāroṣanatantra* itself. In Mical’s draft edition we have the same forms as here, except *ekakṣaṇāc ca sambodhiḥ* 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 Gt, too. Supposing that the original reading was metrical, we find it much more likely that *ekakṣaṇāt* is a corruption of *ekakṣaṇātta*°, rather than *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 Āryadeva’s text is very weak indeed. As Patel himself says (1949: 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 latāsamudbhūtaṃ phalapuṣpasamanvitam | yathaikakṣaṇasambodhisambhāradvayasamṃyutam ||*. 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 (*puṇya*°) and knowledge (*jñānasambhārah*). However, the

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

His lip means his own lip.²⁰²

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 (*uddeśaḥ*),

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 (*nirdeśaḥ*). All these [positions] should be demonstrated [by the master to the disciple]²⁰⁷ with a pair of small dolls (*puttalikā°*) made of clay or beeswax.

Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra 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 (*prajñā*, synonym for *jñānam*, 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): *prajñopāyetyādinā suratayoga evaikasmin śaṭ pāramitāḥ pūritā bhavanti | ata eva yogī śīghram buddhatvaṃ prāpnute | stry eva prajñāpāramitā niḥsvabhāvajñājanikatvāt |*, “The [passage] beginning with [from uniting] **Wisdom and Means** [teaches this:] the six Perfections [beginning with giving (*dāna°*) and ending in wisdom (*prajñā°*)] become completed in a single place, the yoga of intercourse. And it is as a result of this that the yogī 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*, **soṣṭham**, is correct?

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,

sukhodayabandham, 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: 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.

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 nails²⁰⁹ 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.

He should kiss her mouth as much as he likes, again and again. Looking at her face after having lifted it²¹⁰, **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 pleasurable. 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*)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

²⁰⁸ We modified the translation, “with the right hand”. First, we think **savyena** here means with the left—this enhances the antinomian 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: *vidhāneneti padmāntargatasavyavāmapārśvavartinyor nāḍyor* (em., *nāḍyo* Ms) *nirnakhamadhyamātarjanyaṅgulidvayena jihvayā vā cālanena* | [...] *prajñopāyākṣaraṇaṃ bhavati* | *tataḥ padmarandhraṃ snigdhaṃ 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.

²¹⁰ This is what **unnāmya** means, not George’s puzzling “lying down”.

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.

[places].²¹² He should kiss the forehead, eye, neck, ear, side, armpit, hand, and breast; and scratch²¹³ 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.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!”²¹⁵ He should kiss and scratch, looking there having pried it²¹⁶ 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.²¹⁷ He should then say this kind of speech: “As I have entered through this, so too have I emerged numerous times.”²¹⁸ This path, which is straight as the nose, if practiced without Knowledge, would be the path to the six states of rebirth. But 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 thisworldly desire. Practiced with Knowledge means using it by serving it with otherworldly desire, as it is discussed [here].

Then, with sounds of ‘sot’ [issuing from his] mouth,²¹⁹ he should eat the white

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.”

²¹³ Rather than “pinch”. We changed this throughout.

²¹⁴ As opposed to with the lips?

²¹⁵ See our note on *vāyu* to 6.62 above.

²¹⁶ We think this is what *niṣkr̥ṣya* means, not George's obscure “drawing down”.

²¹⁷ This presumably means that he should extract the sexual fluids, which are then consumed in 6.143.

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.

²¹⁹ George's reading *padmagataṃ śvetaṃ raktaṃ vā sukhasātkṛtaiḥ* 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: 41), he records four manuscripts reading *mukhasotkṛtaiḥ*, and one more reading *mukhasātkṛtaiḥ*, probably a corruption of the former. Mahāsukhavajra doubtlessly read the same, although it is a little bit unusual that he does not include *mukha*^o in the *lemma*. We cannot find any derivation of *sukhasātkṛ* (i.e. a presumed analogue of *agnisātkṛ* or *bhasmasātkṛ*) 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 *sukhasītkṛtaiḥ*, 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

and/or the red of the Lotus, while looking at her face again and again. [6.143–144]

With sounds of ‘sot’ (sotkr̥taiḥ) 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 yogī 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]

[Now for the passage] beginning with **Optionally**. Concerning this matter, a method to hold back ejaculation (*akṣaraṇa*^o) 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 (*dhairyakrameṇa*)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]

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 yogī 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): *śukram iti strīkāmadravaṃ kevalaṃ yogikṣaritarasasahitaṃ vā* |; “**White** means either the woman’s fluid [born from] arousal only, or [the same] mixed with the juice ejaculated by the yogī.” One should also note that George translated *vā* as ‘and’, which is perfectly possible. We would like to keep our options open.

²²⁰ George’s edition here probably contains a misprint, since **sanakhaṃ** 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 **dhāpakam** for **dhyāyakam**. 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.

²²⁴ That is to say, releasing and blocking repeatedly. The word *dhairya*^o is glossed elsewhere (Ms 13r) thus: *dhairyety antarāntarā vajracālanaviśrāmeṇa paramānandasukhaṃ bhāvayed ity arthaḥ* |; “**Steadily** means repeatedly moving and resting the Vajra, he should contemplate the pleasure of Supreme Bliss.”

Beginning with **[With] the nose**, [the Lord] teaches another method. The point is this: sometimes he should **lick** the two substances (*dhātu*^o) (i.e. menstrual blood and semen) of Wisdom (*prajñā*^o) and Means (*°upāya*^o) (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 (*nālikāṃ*)²²⁵, take note of his breath,²²⁶ and ingest it through his nostril, that is to say the aperture [beyond] the uvula (*ghaṅṭikā*^o). 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*^o) (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 yogī's strength, inasmuch as he will stop wrinkling, greying, and [even] death.

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,²²⁸ he should eat meat and fish. He should drink milk or wine, in order to increase his desire.²²⁹ After

²²⁵ George's choice, *nalikā*^o, 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 *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra*, the *vāyuyogapaṭala*, 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): *tatra rāganāśopadeśo vajrapadmasaṃyogena śukrakṣaraṇam 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 *karasundarī* (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. Raviśrījñāna's *Guṇabharaṇī* to a verse from the *Laghukālacakratantra* (5.121) incorporated into Anupamarakṣita's *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga* (Sferra 2000: 115, 280): *atha bimbadvāreṇa nānandasukhaṃ bhavati, tadā padme vajradhvanir vā śanakaiḥ kartavyaḥ* | *atha strī na labhyate, tadā svakarakamalenollānaṃ kartavyaṃ saukhyavṛddhihetoḥ pātahetor na* |; "**Or**, if there is no pleasure of Bliss by means of the image (i.e. a visualised consort, *jñānamudrā*), then [the yogī 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."

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: 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 madyapānamātraṃ pāpāvāhakam, jalādīpāne 'pi tathā prasāṅgāt* | *kiṃ tu madajanakatvam eva tasya virūpakam, tac ca nālpapānena bhavati* | *vistarapānena tu vikṣepaḥ sambhāvyaḥ* | *vikṣepāc ca pāpakarmasambhāvanā syāt* |; "Surely, it is not drinking liquor *per se*

his fatigue has decreased,²³⁰ 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.²³¹ [6.153–159]

Attained means [that Great Bliss will be] present continuously, day and night. **He gains**, [i.e.] he achieves, **the state of Caṇḍa[mahā]roṣaṇa**²³² [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 (*trikalpāsamkhyeyena*) through the procedure of the mode of perfections (*pāramitānaya*) (i.e. exoteric Buddhism, the non-tantric Mahāyāna).²³³ Because of their numerous doubts (*vicikitsā*°), they do not have faith (*śraddhā*) in this teaching (*dharme*). 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†²³⁴ because of the nature of the [inherent] power of things (*vastuśakti*°).

²³⁵**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

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 **śramaṃ**.

²³¹ We think this interpretation more likely than George’s “title of Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa”.

²³² 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 *caṇḍaroṣ’na°.

²³³ The ‘Uncountable’ is, in spite of its name, an actual number. On the various ways in which it is calculated, see Yong 2008.

²³⁴ We find the *ca* disturbing, because *vastuśaktisvābhāvya* is not an additional reason but the technical designation of what was just explained.

²³⁵ We skip lines 6.161–176, with the exception of 6.169–170, which are glossed. This passage deals with various postures (*paryāṅkam*) and seats (*āsanam*).

there.

He should contemplate the pleasure produced by that in [meditative] union [with Caṇḍa[mahā]roṣaṇa.²³⁶ Then the yogī should be²³⁷ 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 mother²³⁸. 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.²³⁹ And therefore²⁴⁰ 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,²⁴¹ succeed as practitioners. [6.190–191]

Then, when they heard that, the gods, Maheśvara, etc., taking the goddesses Gaurī, Lakṣmī, Śacī, Ratī, etc., began to meditate. Then all of them, at that moment, at that minute, in that hour obtained the state of Caṇḍa[mahā]roṣaṇa and roamed the earth.²⁴² There,²⁴³ Maheśvara succeeded, by the name of²⁴⁴

²³⁶ We changed George's translation, "He should concentrate that the Pleasure produced by that is from the joining with Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa." First, we do not think that 'pleasure' here has any technical meaning, therefore capitalisation is not required. Second, George took the *tasil* suffix as an ablative, but this is not always the case.

²³⁷ Or simply 'is/will be'.

²³⁸ George's **mātrām** must be a misprint.

²³⁹ George (1974: 77, n. 70) voices a certain uneasiness concerning his interpretation of *virāgaḥ* as 'aversion' rather than 'absence of lust'. We fully sympathise with this, but prefer the latter perhaps a little bit more.

²⁴⁰ Rather than "then".

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 Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa and roamed the earth." Mahāsukhavajra's lemma **tanmuhūrtam** lacks the *kan* suffix.

Vajraśaṅkara; Vāsudeva as Vajranārāyaṇa; Devendra as Vajrapāṇi; and Kāmadeva as Vajrāṅga. Those led by these principal ones,²⁴⁵ 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 (*adhimātra*^o) understands reality already in the moment of Bliss (*ānanda*^o). **At that minute** refers to the fact that an advanced being (*madhya*^o) understands reality already in the moment of Supreme Bliss (*paramānanda*^o). **In that hour** refers to the fact that a beginner (*mṛdu*^o) understands reality only in the moment of Innate Bliss (*sahajānanda*^o), in between [the moments of] having achieved Supreme Bliss and entering the Bliss of Cessation.²⁴⁶

[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 *mudrās*, [and] his body is smeared with ash,²⁴⁷ he is three-eyed, with his left [hand] he holds a skull bowl [with] a skull staff (*°khaṭvāṅga*^o) [propped against his left shoulder], with his right [hand] he holds a rattle-drum (*ḍamaru*^o), he is sitting cross-legged, mounted on a bull; he is embraced by Vajragaurī, who has the colour of molten gold, is adorned with various kinds of ornaments, and is sixteen years old; in her left hand she

Note, however, that if we leave it, the passage from **atha** to **mahītale** is almost metrical: *pāda a* is faulty, unless one reads it with some kind of *shwa* sound/glottal stop between **tat**^o and **°kṣaṇam**; *pāda b* is fine, if we retain the *kan*; *pāda c* should be pronounced with **°roṣ’ṇa**^o, 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 Bliss is experienced in lovemaking is given in the commentary to the first chapter (Ms 3r). Bliss (*ānandaḥ*) allows for a small amount of pleasure, experienced during foreplay, up to the moment of penetration. Supreme Bliss (*paramānandaḥ*) 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 (*sahajānandaḥ*) 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 (*vīramānandaḥ*) is again conceptual, experienced after ejaculation, when the yogī, after a few moments of stillness realises ‘I have experienced pleasure’ (*sukhaṃ bhuktaṃ mayā*). A short ancillary teaching (*upadeśaḥ*) 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 Bliss, the other, “position B” being that *sahajānandaḥ* is the fourth and *vīramānandaḥ*, possibly in a different sense (i.e. not ‘cessation’), is the third (2014: 96–100).

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

holds a red lotus. **Vajranārāyaṇa** is mounted on Garuḍa, he is four-armed, dark blue, has a jeweled tiara, he is adorned with various adornments, he is seated cross-legged, with his two right hands, which are raised, he holds a jewel and a mace, in his two left hands, which are [also] raised, he holds a conch shell and a discus; he is embraced by a Vajralakṣmī, who is white [but otherwise] similar to Vajragaurī. **Vajrapāṇi** 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 (*tarjanī*^o), he sits cross-legged, mounted on [the elephant called] Airāvaṇa; he is embraced by Vajraśacī who is similar to Vajragaurī. **Vajrānaṅga** is mounted on a flying palace (*vimāna*^o) with dolphin (*makara*^o) 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 Vajraratī²⁴⁸, who is similar to Vajragaurī. Among these, **Maheśvara** bears Amitābha on his head [in addition to] wearing a crescent moon. **Vāsudeva** holds Akṣobhya on his head. **Indra** holds Ratnasambhava on his head. **Kāmadeva** has Amitābha on his head.²⁴⁹ **Those led by these [principal deities]** [denotes minor deities] such as Vajrakārttika and Vajraṇapati.

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.²⁵⁰
[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 *guṇāḥ* is affixed to them, because they are repeated (*guṇyante*), [that is to say,] reiterated (i.e. desired again and again). [**Beings (bhūtāḥ)**] are [**endowed (upetāḥ)**] with them, that is to say,] conjoined with them.

Just as the lotus, which emerges from the mud, is not smeared by defilements of²⁵¹ the mud, likewise are they not smeared by defilements who are produced by the method of Lust. [6.199–200]

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.

²⁴⁸ We conjectured that this goddess also has the prefix *vajra*^o to her name.

²⁴⁹ This is otherwise called ‘sealing’ (*mudraṇam*). The Tathāgatas act as ‘family chieftains’ (*kulapatayaḥ*), 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.

²⁵¹ George has “in”; we translate more literally.

Thus ends the sixth chapter, concerning the Yoga of the Perfected Stage, in the Reverend Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, called the Sole²⁵² Hero. [6.201–202]

The chapter [is called the chapter of the perfected stage, because] it has as its chief topic²⁵³ **the Yoga of the Perfected [Stage].**

Thus [ends] the commentary of the sixth chapter.

²⁵² George prints **ekala**° for the more common form, **ekalla**°.

²⁵³ We emended here to °*pradhānaḥ* in spite of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Of the surviving chapter-colophons, sixteen have °*pradhānaṃ*, and only three °*pradhānaḥ* (one being the result of a correction). Chapter 2 has °*pradhānatvāt*.

Bibliography

Unpublished

Caṇḍamahāroṣanatantra — draft critical edition by Wiesiek Mical from (A) Royal Asiatic Society London, Hodgson no. 46, ff. 46 palm-leaf, incomplete, undated, ca. 14th c.; (B) National Archives Kathmandu 3-687 = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project A 994/4, ff. 48 palm-leaf, complete, dated *Nepālasamvat* 547 = 1427 CE; (Gt) Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Xc 14/43-45, ff. 47 palm-leaf, incomplete, undated, perhaps 13th or 14th c.; and the *Padmāvātī* Ms.

Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa — (Baroda transcript) Oriental Institute Baroda, Acc. No. 13288, ff. 6 paper, incomplete, undated, modern.

Padminī — (Ms) Buddhist Library Nagoya, Takaoka CA 17, ff. 49 paper, complete, dated *Nepālasamvat* 762 = 1642 CE.

Mahāmudrātilaka — (Ms) draft critical edition by Péter-Dániel Szántó from the *codex unicus*, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz Orientabteilung Hs. or. 8711, ff. 57 paper, complete, dated *Nepālasamvat* 947 = 1827 CE from an exemplar dated *Nepālasamvat* 324 = 1204 CE.

Editions, studies, reference works

Bhattacharya 1925 — Benoytosh Bhattacharya, *Sādhanamālā Vol. I*. Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 26, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Bhattacharya 1928 — Benoytosh Bhattacharya, *Sādhanamālā Vol. II*. Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 41, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Chandra 1981 — Lokesh Chandra, *Abhidhānottara-Tantra: A Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal reproduced by ~ from the Collection of Prof. Raghuvira*. Śata-piṭaka Series: Indo-Asian Literatures Volume 263, New Delhi.

Chazot, Chazot & Delamotte 2015 — Eric Chazot, Pascal Chazot, Evelyne Delamotte, *Le Tantra de Chandamahārosana*. Éditions du Rocher, Monaco.

Csoma de Kőrös 1836–1839 — Alexander (Sándor) Csoma de Kőrös, “VII. Analysis of the Gyut Ka-Na,” *Asiatic Researches*. 359–388.

Davidson 1981 — Ronald M. Davidson, “The Litary of Names of Mañjuśrī: Text and Translation of the Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti,” Michel Strickmann (ed.), *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R. A. Stein. Vol. I*, *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* 20, Institut Belge des hautes études chinoises, Bruxelles, 1–69.

Deshpande 1986 — M.N. Deshpande, *The Caves of Panhāle-Kāji (Ancient Prañālaka): An art historical study of transition from Hinayana, Tantric Vajrayana to Nath Sampradaya (third to fourteenth century A.D.)*. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 84. Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi.

DhTC 2016 — The Dharmachakra Translation Committee at <http://read.84000.co/#UT22084-080-015/title>

English 2002 — Elizabeth English, *Vajrayoginī: Her Visualizations, Rituals, & Forms. A Study of the Cult of Vajrayoginī in India*. Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism, Wisdom Publications, Boston.

Fan 2011 — Muyou Fan, *Advayasamatāvijaya: A Study Based upon the Sanskrit Manuscript Found in Tibet*. Series of Sanskrit Manuscripts & Buddhist Literature 2, Research Institute of Sanskrit Manuscripts & Buddhist Literature, Beijing.

Farrow & Menon 1992 — G.W. Farrow & I. Menon, *The Concealed Essence of the Hevajra Tantra*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi.

Ferguson 2010 — Anthony Ferguson, *The Sex Doll: A History*. McFarland & Company, Jefferson NC/London.

Gäng 1981 — Peter Gäng, *Das Tantra des Grausig-Groß-Schrecklichen*. Stechapfel Verlag, [West] Berlin.

George 1971 — Christopher S. George, *The Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, Chapters I-VIII*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

George 1974 — Christopher S. George, *The Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, Chapters I-VIII: A Critical Edition and English Translation*. American Oriental Series volume 56, American Oriental Society, New Haven, Connecticut.

Ghosh 1938 — Manomohan Ghosh, *Pāṇinīya-Śikṣā or the Śikṣā-vedāṅga [sic!] ascribed to Pāṇini (being the most ancient work on Indo-Aryan Phonetics). Critically edited in all its Five Recensions with an Introduction, Translation and Notes together with its two Commentaries*. University of Calcutta, Calcutta.

Gopal 1989 — Lallanji Gopal, *The Economic Life of Northern India, c. A.D. 700–1200*. Second, revised edition. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi.

Haraprasād Shāstrī 1898 — Mahāmahōpādhyāya Haraprasād Shāstrī, “The discovery of a work by Āryadēva in Sanskrit,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* Vol. LXVII. Part I, pp. 175–184.

Hara Prasad Śāstri 1915 — Mahamahopādhyaya Hara Prasad Śāstri, *Catalogue of Palm-leaf & Selected Paper MSS. Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal, Vol. II*. Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta.

Hartzell 2012 — James F. Hartzell, “The Buddhist Sanskrit Tantras: “The *Samādhi* of the Plowed Row”,” *Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies* 3/14, 63–178.

Isaacson & Sferra 2014 — Harunaga Isaacson & Francesco Sferra, *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreyaṇātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla, Critical*

Edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with English Translation and Reproductions of the MSS. Manuscripta Buddhica 2, Asien-Afrika-Institut Universität Hamburg & Università Degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Napoli.

Jørgensen 1936 — Hans Jørgensen, *A Dictionary of the Classical Newārī*. Historisk-filologiske meddelelser 23/1, Levin & Munksgaard, København. Reprint: Tiwari’s Pilgrims Book House, Kathmandu, 1989.

Kuranishi 2016 — Kenichi Kuranishi, “A Study on Scholarly Activities in the Last Period of the Vikramaśīla Monastery: Quotations in Ratnarakṣita’s *Padminī*,” *Oriental Culture* no. 96, 49–61.

La Vallée Poussin 1897 — Louis de La Valée Poussin, “The Buddhist “Wheel of Life” from a New Source,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (new series) 29, 463–470.

Lévi 1929 — Sylvain Lévi, “Autour d’Aśvaghōṣa,” *Journal Asiatique* 215, 255–285.

Luo 2010 — Luo Hong, *The Buddhakapālatantra Chapters 9 to 14 Critically edited and translated*. Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region no. 11. China Tibetology Publishing House/Centre for Tantric Studies (AAI), Beijing/Hamburg.

Pandey 1997 — Janardan Pandey (ed.), *Bauddhalaghugranthasaṅgraha*. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 14, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi. [The Sanskrit Text was first published in Dhīḥ 21 (1996): 129–149.]

Patel 1949 — Prabhubhai Bhikhabhai Patel, *The Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa of Āryadeva: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*. Visva-Bharati, [Shantiniketan].

Petech 1984 — Luciano Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750–1482). Second, thoroughly revised edition*. Serie Orientale Roma LIV, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Roma.

Samdhong Rinpoche & Dwivedi 1988 — Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (eds.), *Guhyādi-Aṣṭasiddhi-Saṅgraha*. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 1, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi.

Samdhong Rinpoche & Dwivedi 1990 — Samdhong Rinpoche & Vrajvallabh Dwivedi (eds.), *Dākinījālasaṃvararahasyam* [sic!] *By Anaṅgayogī*. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 2, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi.

Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī 1926 — Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī (ed.), *The Mīmāṃsāśloka-vārtika with the Commentary Kāśikā of Sucaritamīśra, Part I*. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. XC/Śrī Setu Lakṣmī Prasādamālā no. II, University of Travancore, Trivandrum.

Sanderson 2009 — Alexis G. J. S. Sanderson, “The Śaiva Age—The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period,” in Shingo Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series 23, Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, 41–349.

Sferra 2000 — Francesco Sferra, *The Śaḍaṅgayoga by Anupamarakṣita with Raviśrījñāna's Guṇabharaṇīnāmaśaḍaṅgayogaṭippaṇī: Text and annotated translation*. Serie Orientale Roma LXXXV, Istituto Italiano per L'Africa e L'Oriente, Roma.

Shukla Shastri 1994 — Babulal Shukla Shastri (ed.), *Mahamati Padmashri's Nāgar Sarvawam With Jagadgyotirmall's Sanskrit and Pandit Babulal Shukla Shastri's Anāvīlā Hindi Commentary*. Eastern Book Linkers, Delhi.

Snellgrove 1959 — D.L. Snellgrove, *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study, Part 2: Sanskrit and Tibetans Texts*. London Oriental Series volume 6, Oxford University Press, London.

Steinkellner 1981 — Ernst Steinkellner, *Śāntideva: Eintritt in das Leben zur Erleuchtung (Bodhicaryāvatāra): Lehergedicht des Mahāyāna aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt*. Eugen Diederichs Verlag, Düsseldorf–Köln.

Sugiki 2002 — Tsunehiko Sugiki, “A Critical Study of The Vajradākamahātantrarāja (I)—Chapter. 1 and 42.—,” *The Chisan Gakuho/Journal of Chisan Studies* no. 65, 81–115.

Szántó 2012 — Péter-Dániel Szántó, *Selected Chapters from the Catuspīṭhatantra, Vol. I Introductory study with the annotated translation of selected chapters. Vol. II Appendix volume with critical editions of selected chapters accompanied by Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary and a bibliography*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford.

Szántó 2016 — Péter-Dániel Szántó, “Before a Critical Edition of the *Samputa*,” *Zentralasiatische Studien* 45, 397–422.

Thakur 1957 — Anantalal Thakur (ed.), *Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī (Buddhist Nyāya Works of Ratnakīrti)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series Vol. III, Kasiprasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna.

Tribe 1994 — A.H.F. Tribe, *The Names of Wisdom: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Chapters 1–5 of Vilāsavajra's Commentary on the Nāmasaṃgīti, with Introduction and Textual Notes*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford.

Tripathi & Negi 2006 — Ram Shankar Tripathi & Thakur Sain Negi (eds.), *Hevajratāntram With Yogaratnamālāpañjikā of Mahāpaṇḍitācārya Kṛṣṇapāda*. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series 65, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi.

Turner 1962-1966 — *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. Oxford University Press, London.

van der Kuijp 2009 — Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp, “On the Vicissitudes of Subhūticandra's *Kāmadhenu* Commentary on the *Amarakoṣa* in Tibet,” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 5, 1–105.

Varghese 2008 — Mathew Varghese, *Principles of Buddhist Tantra: A Discourse on Cittavisuddhi-prakarana of Āryadeva*. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, New Delhi.

Yong 2008 — Bhikṣu Jin Yong, “How Large is One Asamkhyeya,” *Vajra Bodhi Sea* 462, 42–44.