Introduction

The traditions that have evolved around the worship of the god Śiva show a remarkable tendency and capacity to absorb other cults, deities and principles. This point is well illustrated by the subject of the present study, a lengthy mantra, addressed to all gods and powers, for the pacification (*śānti*) of any malevolent influences. Running through the invocation is the underlying notion that all worldly and cosmic power is ultimately dependent upon and oriented towards Śiva. I refer to this ideology as ‘Universal Śaivism’. At the time the mantra was composed, the worship of Śiva and his aniconic form, the *liṅga*, had been popular for several centuries, but in contrast to Brahmanism, Buddhism or Jainism, it had no recognisable canon, nor had Śaivism developed into an organised religion with well defined roles of ascetics, priests and laity. This period then sees an intensive production of texts, culminating in an overarching conception of Śaivism as the religion dedicated to and taught by Śiva. The composers of these texts participated in and adapted already existing models to create their normative vision of Śaivism from what must actually have been a plurality of practices on the ground.

The mantra that forms the subject of this study is part of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, a text belonging to the corpus of lay Śaiva literature generally referred to as Śivadharmā ‘Religion of Śiva’. It is taught in the *Śivadharmasāstra*’s sixth chapter, also going under the name of *Śāntyadhyāya* ‘Chapter on Appeasement’. The Śivadharmā had long been neglected by scholars, though it has arguably played a crucial role in the formation, development and institutionalisation of Śaivism, making it a key text for the study of the religion’s social and ritual formations.¹ The *Śivadharmasāstra* is the first text that systematically targets and integrates

¹ For a long time the Śivadharmā was known almost exclusively through Hazra’s two summaries of the first two works of the corpus, the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śiva-*

the growing body of lay devotees of Śiva, offering them a distinctive social system and model of religious practice and ritual.² While its main teaching centres around the *liṅga* cult, running through the text is an attempt to integrate and subsume all other religious traditions under the heading of 'Śaivism'.

The core of this book consists of a critical edition and annotated translation of the *Śāntyadhyaṃya*. The edition aims to provide the reader with an overview of some of the main variations in the transmission of the mantra, including manuscripts from regions as far apart as Nepal, Kashmir, Bengal and South India. The annotated translation draws attention to the rich data contained in the mantra and also includes translations of passages that do not occur in the main constituted text, being found only in certain lines of transmission. The large number of variant readings, including lengthy additional passages, are indicative of the mantra's intensive use over time and reveal much about the values and motives of the communities engaged in its transmission. These changes attest to the fact that the text has been a living tradition across the Indian subcontinent for many centuries.

In the remainder of this introduction I address several aspects con-

dharmottara (Hazra 1954, 1956). This situation has changed significantly in recent years. The full text of the corpus was first published by Naraharinātha in 1998, while over the past few years several scholars have started to work on individual parts of the corpus or referred to them in their studies. See, in particular, Acharya 2009; Bisschop 2010, 2014; De Simini 2013, 2016a, 2016b, 2017; De Simini & Mirnig 2017; Goodall 2011; Kaffle 2013, 2015; Magnone 2005; Sanderson 2003/04, 2012/13; Schwartz 2012. An edition of the *Śivadharmasāstra* alone, based on a single manuscript in the Adyar Library, has been published more recently as well (Jugnu & Sharma 2014). The *Śivopaniṣad*, which also forms part of the Śivadharm corpus, was already published much earlier but was not recognised as such, being included in a collection of Upaniṣads (Kunhan Raja 1933).

² The last few decades have seen major advances in the study of Śaivism, culminating in Sanderson's influential study 'The Śaiva Age' (2009), in which he has shown, on the basis of extensive textual and epigraphic evidence, how Śaivism came to be integral to the religious landscape of early medieval South and Southeast Asia. Most of the groundbreaking scholarship in the field has been on the Tantric or initiatory forms of Śaivism. For two recent surveys, see Hatley 2010 and Goodall & Isaacson 2011. The lay, non-initiatory forms of the religion, by contrast, have received considerably less attention, with the significant exception of the work done in the framework of the critical edition of the *Skandapurāṇa*. In addition to the volumes of the critical edition and various related studies, see Bakker 2014 for the historical context of the composition of the *Skandapurāṇa*.

cerning the composition and transmission of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, and its *Śāntyadihyāya* in particular, in order to position the text within the historical development of Śaivism.

The section ‘The Śivadharma’ briefly introduces the Śivadharma text corpus, with a specific focus on the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. A crucial step towards putting the text into context is to establish, as far as possible, its time of composition. The *Śivadharmaśāstra*’s anonymous character makes this a difficult task. I have assembled the main body of available evidence that may help us locate the text in place and in time. As I will argue, the *Śāntyadihyāya* in particular provides some important clues to its date of composition or redaction. I conclude that the *Śāntyadihyāya* was most probably composed in North India towards the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century at the latest. To what extent this date also applies to other parts of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* remains to be evaluated.

The section ‘The *Śāntyadihyāya*’ commences with an overview and discussion of the principles behind the order and organisation of the mantra. Here I also draw attention to the rich body of iconographical data contained in the mantra and take up the question of its ritual use. The available evidence indicates that the *Śāntyadihyāya*’s mantra was used for a variety of purposes in different regions of the Indian subcontinent over a long period of time, but always with a view to appeasing external forces, be it for oneself or for the benefit of the kingdom.

The section ‘Introduction to the Edition’ sets out the principles of the text edition. With at least 80 known surviving manuscripts from different parts of the Indian subcontinent, editing the *Śivadharmaśāstra* presents a major challenge. The edition of the *Śāntyadihyāya* does not aspire to reconstruct an urtext underlying all the variation, let alone strive for completeness. Its goals are more modest. I have made a careful and representative selection of manuscripts from different parts of the Indian subcontinent that should give the reader insight into the wide distribution of variations. As a methodological principle I have followed the readings of the oldest Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts, mainly to provide an anchor against which the other readings can be read and compared. On the basis of regional distribution, four main groups of manuscripts may be distinguished: those from Nepal, Bengal, Kashmir and South In-

dia. There is as yet no manuscript evidence that there was an independent recension of the text in Bengal, but there are clearly recognisable features that allow us to distinguish different recensions of the text in Nepal, Kashmir and South India. On the other hand, there is a lot of evidence for contamination, which makes drawing up of a stemma a hazardous task — if not an impossible one, at least for now. More future work on other parts of the Śivadharmā may help us develop a more informed understanding of the individual lines of transmission of the text.

Two appendices conclude this book. The first gives an overview of several known single-text manuscripts of the *Śāntyadhyāya*, along with composite manuscripts in which the chapter has been included in a bundle together with selected passages from other texts. The second appendix gives a transcript and translation of a Sanskrit commentary on the *Śāntyadhyāya*. This is to be found in a unique Malayalam manuscript in the Trivandrum Manuscript Library, which contains the text of the *Śivadharmasāstra* followed by a *pratīka*-style commentary (*Śivadharmavivaraṇa*) on the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*.

The larger aims of this study are twofold. First, it intends to contribute to an understanding of the position of the *Śivadharmasāstra* in the socio-historical formation of Śaivism as an institutionalised religion. While it seems doubtful that the lay devotees of Śiva who form the target audience of the *Śivadharmasāstra* were organised in any systematic way, the authors of the text clearly intended to provide a blueprint of a complete and unified Śaiva society.³ Secondly, the edition aims to contribute to the development of a set of methodological principles for the critical edition of texts belonging to the Śivadharmā corpus. The principles adopted for editing the *Śāntyadhyāya* are set out below, not only with reference to the *Śāntyadhyāya* but also with a view to possible future editions of other parts of the corpus.

The Śivadharmā

The collective name ‘Śivadharmā’ refers to a corpus of anonymous Śaiva texts of uncertain origins, written in Sanskrit. Texts belonging to the Śivadharmā expound the rituals, activities and attitudes of devotion to be

³ This becomes clear in particular from *Śivadharmasāstra* 11 and 12.

adopted by devotees of Śiva. It is prescriptive rather than descriptive. The corpus expanded over time with the addition of a number of new texts, which makes the Śivadharmā into an ideal sourcebook for studying the historical development of Śaivism.

The most commonly encountered order of the texts found in Śivadharmā manuscripts is the following:⁴

1. *Śivadharmasāstra* 'Treatise on the Religion of Śiva'
2. *Śivadharmottara* 'Supplement on the Religion of Śiva'
3. *Śivadharmasaṃgraha* 'Compendium on the Religion of Śiva'
4. *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* 'Dialogue Between Umā and Maheśvara'
5. *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda* 'Great Dialogue of Questions and Answers'
6. *Śivopaniṣad* 'Mystery of Śiva'
7. *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha* 'Compendium on the Essence of the Bull [of Dharma]'
8. *Dharmaputrikā* 'Daughter of Dharma'⁵

About 18 such corpus manuscripts survive in the form of old palm-leaf manuscripts from Nepal, in addition to many later paper manuscripts. This tradition of eight Śivadharmā texts is, however, unique to Nepal. From outside of Nepal only manuscripts of the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* survive, mostly transmitted as separate works.

There can be no doubt that the text heading the corpus, the *Śivadharmasāstra*, is also historically the first of the Śivadharmā texts. It is the most archaic, both in form and character, and provides the model for the *Śivadharmottara* that follows, which expands upon many of the

⁴ For a thorough study of the corpus manuscripts and corpus organisation of the Śivadharmā, see De Simini 2016a.

⁵ N₄₅^C, an eleventh-century Nepalese palmleaf manuscript in the Asiatic Society of Calcutta (G 4077), is unique in that it includes a longer text called *Lalitavistara* — not to be confused with the Buddhist text of the same name — instead of the *Dharmaputrikā* as the last text of the corpus (De Simini and Mirnig 2017). For the list of sigla of the manuscripts of the Śivadharmā used in this book, see p. 52.

topics introduced in the *Śivadharmasāstra*. Each text consists of twelve chapters.⁶ After this, the relative chronology of the different texts that make up the corpus is less easy to determine. The third text in the corpus, the *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*, is the first to attest to the influence and impact of Tantric religion; it has been shown that it integrated large parts of the *Niśvāsamukha*.⁷ The *Śivopaniṣad* emphatically presents itself as the third text of the Śivadharmasāstra, after the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*, but it did not come to occupy this position in the corpus manuscripts and may in fact have been a relatively late addition.⁸

The *Śivadharmasāstra* is sometimes also referred to as *Śivadharmasāstra*, but to distinguish it from the Śivadharmasāstra corpus at large I refer to the individual text as *Śivadharmasāstra*. This is the title given in the colophons of the majority of manuscripts. In origin it was an individual work and that is how it will be treated in this study.

The Teaching of the *Śivadharmasāstra*

The *Śivadharmasāstra* is introduced in the opening verses as a dialogue between the divine sage Sanatkumāra and Śiva's foremost Gaṇa Nandikeśvara. At the request of Sanatkumāra, Nandikeśvara instructs Sanatkumāra and the sages dwelling on Mount Meru in the worship of Śiva.⁹

⁶ See also De Simini 2013: 34–35, 54–55.

⁷ See Kafle 2015: 61–72. This was first noticed by Anil Kumar Acharya, who edited the first three chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṃgraha* for his PhD thesis at Pondicherry University (Acharya 2009). The *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* consists of five books: *Niśvāsamukha*, *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra* and *Guhyasūtra*. The *Niśvāsamukha* most probably belongs to the latest layer of the collection (Goodall et al. 2015: 22).

⁸ See De Simini 2016a: 237–239.

⁹ Sanatkumāra is well-known from the *Mahābhārata* and Purāṇic literature as the firstborn son of Brahmā. He also plays a prominent role in the *Skandapurāṇa*, for in that text it is Sanatkumāra who teaches Vyāsa about Śiva's mythology. Nandikeśvara is a distinct Śaiva figure, likewise known from the *Skandapurāṇa*. The *Skandapurāṇa* recounts the story of how Nandīśvara, also known as Nandin, became Śiva's favourite Gaṇa (SP 20–25). Moreover, the *Skandapurāṇa* contains a section of Śivadharmasāstra-like teachings that are put into his mouth (SP 27–28). These two chapters of the *Skandapurāṇa* are introduced by a question of Vyāsa concerning Śiva's teachings to Devī when she asked him about the benefits that his devotees receive from their devotional activities. Sanatkumāra tells Vyāsa that he once put the same question to Nandīśvara. He then reports to Vyāsa the dialogue between Śiva and Devī. This *Skandapurāṇa* episode matches the frame story of the *Śivadharmasāstra* and indicates that Nandīśvara was

Nandikeśvara tells him that the teaching that he is about to expound was originally revealed by Śiva himself to Pārvatī, Skanda (Ṣaṇmukha), Nandikeśvara and the other gods.¹⁰ In other words, the Śivadharmā gives rules for the worship of Śiva that ultimately come from the mouth of the deity himself. This format of the teaching corresponds to Sanderson's definition of Śaivism in his seminal article 'Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions':

The term Śaivism here refers to a number of distinct but historically related systems comprising theology, ritual, observance and yoga, which have been propagated in India as the teachings of the Hindu deity Śiva. A Śaiva is one who practices such a system. (Sanderson 1988: 660)

The frame story of the *Śivadharmasāstra* matches the paradigm of Tantric teachings. Śaiva Tantras characteristically start with a section on the 'descent of the Tantra' (*tantrāvatāra*), which serves to explain how the esoteric teachings originally uttered by the deity have reached human ears.¹¹ Significantly, the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, the earliest surviving Śaiva Tantra, is likewise transmitted through the mouth of Nandikeśvara. In the opening verses of the *Niśvāsamukha*, Nandikeśvara initiates the sages and introduces them to the five streams of knowledge as they had been originally revealed by Śiva to Devī (*Niśvāsamukha* 1.1–29). While the teachings of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* and other Tantras are esoteric instructions requiring initiation, those of the Śivadharmā are open to all Śiva's devotees. It is devotion (*bhakti*) that is key and Nandikeśvara represents the quintessential Śaiva devotee.¹²

In the first chapter Nandikeśvara introduces the nature and power of Rudra–Śiva devotion. A striking feature of his introduction is the notion that people who are exclusively devoted to Rudra are veritable Rudras on earth. His devotees are set apart from the rest of humankind:

held to be a teacher of the Śaiva religion at the time. However, although SP 27–28 is very similar in content, there are no significant textual parallels between the two texts (SP IIA: 197).

¹⁰ ŚiDhŚ 1.10–11 (draft edition Nina Mirnig): *śrūyatām abhidhāsyāmi sukhopāyaṃ mahatphalam | paramaṃ sarvadharmāṇāṃ śivadharmāṃ śivātmakam || śivena kathitaṃ pūrvam pārvatyaḥ ṣaṇmukhasya ca | gaṇānāṃ devamukhyānāṃ asmākaṃ ca viśeṣataḥ ||*.

¹¹ See Oberhammer 1994 and TAK III, s.v. *tantrāvatāra*.

¹² On devotion and Śaivism, with some references to the Śivadharmā, see Ganesan & Sathyanarayanan 2010–11.

*ye 'rcayanti sadā rudraṃ na te prakṛtimānuṣāḥ |
rudralokāt paribhraṣṭās te rudrā nātra saṃśayaḥ ||*¹³

They who always worship Rudra, they are no ordinary men. They are Rudras who have come down from Rudraloka. There is no doubt about this.

This also finds expression in a much-cited idea that would come to have a long afterlife in Tantric traditions, but that seems to be voiced here for the first time:

*nārudraḥ saṃsmared rudraṃ nārudro rudraṃ arcayet |
nārudraḥ kīrtayed rudraṃ nārudro rudraṃ āpnuyāt ||*¹⁴

One who is not Rudra cannot call to mind Rudra. One who is not Rudra cannot worship Rudra. One who is not Rudra cannot praise Rudra. One who is not Rudra cannot attain Rudra.

The *Śivadharmasāstra* consists of 12 chapters in total. The titles of the colophons, as given in the *editio princeps* of Naraharinātha, are as follows:

1. *Śivabhakti* 'Devotion to Śiva'
2. *Śivadharmapraśnādhyāya* 'Chapter of Questions on the Religion of Śiva'
3. *Liṅgotpatti* 'Origin of the Liṅga'
4. *Āyatanādhyāya* 'Chapter on the Temple'
5. *Śivārcanadravyavidhi* 'Rules on the Substances for the Honouring of Śiva'
6. *Śāntyādhyāya* 'Chapter on Appeasement'
7. *Pūjādharmā* 'Practice of Worship'
8. *Śivādānaphalādhyāya* 'Chapter on the Fruits of Gifts to Śiva'

¹³ ŚiDhŚ 1.16 (draft edition Nina Mirnig).

¹⁴ ŚiDhŚ 1.24 (draft edition Nina Mirnig). In the context of Tantric worship, variants of this verse (*nādevo devam arcayet | nāśivaḥ śivam arcayet*) are cited to express that one has to ritually identify oneself with the deity before one may worship the deity. Cf. Goodall et al. 2005: 13. See also Davis 1991. The *Śivadharmā* expresses a more general attitude of *bhakti*.

9. *Śivalīngamahāvratā* 'Great Observance of the Śivalīnga'
10. *Upavāsagopradānavidhi* 'Rules on Fasting and the Gift of a Cow'
11. *Śivāśrama* 'Discipline of Śiva'
12. *Śivabhaktyādyasākhopasākhādhyāya* 'Chapter on the Primary and Secondary Branches of Devotion to Śiva'

The text addresses the concerns of lay devotees of Śiva and provides them with a range of activities to express their devotion, including gifting, undertaking observances and, most important of all, worshipping the *līṅga*. The bulk of the work may be characterised as a manual for *līṅga* worship.¹⁵ It is not surprising therefore that the only narrative part of the text should be concerned with the popular myth of the origin of the *līṅga* (chapter 3). In fact, as Kafle 2013 has argued, the *Śivadharmasāstra*'s version is quite likely one of the earliest versions of the myth. Significantly, the theme of the origin of the *līṅga* was also singled out for representation on the painted wooden covers of several of the surviving Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts, which display the *līṅga* flanked by Brahmā and Viṣṇu, as well as a range of other gods worshipping different *līṅgas*.¹⁶ This configuration closely follows the model of chapter 3, which, after telling about Brahmā and Viṣṇu's failed attempt to find the end of the *līṅga* and their subsequent worship of it, mentions that other gods acquired their respective position by worshipping *līṅgas* made of different materials.¹⁷ The final two chapters of the text set out the blueprint for an ideal Śaiva society.

The Date of the *Śivadharmasāstra*

As with so much anonymous literature from premodern India, dating the *Śivadharmasāstra* is a major challenge. Yet, in order to appreciate

¹⁵ The chapters dealing with the *līṅga* cult form the subject of the FWF project 'The Śivalīnga Cult on the Eve of the Tantric Age: A Study and Critical Edition of the *Śivadharmasāstra*'s Chapters 1–5 and 7–9' by Nina Mirnig (Vienna).

¹⁶ For an example, see Mookerjee 1946, referring to manuscript G 4077 in the Asiatic Society (our siglum N₇₇^{Ko}). The first cover shows the *Līṅgodbhava* and the second shows various gods worshipping different *līṅgas*.

¹⁷ For details, see Bisschop forthc. a.

the text's position and significance in the history of Śaivism and Indian religion at large, it is crucial to get a proper sense of the time, place and circumstances of its composition. As I will argue, the *Śāntyadhyāya* in particular provides several important clues.

Earlier Attempts

The first author to have tackled the issue of the date of the *Śiva-dharmaśāstra* was R.C. Hazra (1954: 15). After listing the quotations of the *Śivadharmasāstra* in medieval Dharmanibandha literature and observing that the text has to be earlier than the *Śivadharmottara*,¹⁸ Hazra states the following:

So, the *Śiva-dharma* can by no means be dated later than 700 A.D. The fact that the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* mentions the *Śiva-dharma* in one of its original chapters and that the Nakṣatras have been mentioned in the latter work in the order from Kṛttikā to Bharaṇī tend to indicate that the *Śiva-dharma* was composed earlier than 550 A.D. From the mentioning of the Buddha and the Ārhata as worshipping Śiva-liṅgas and of the names of the zodiac signs (Rāśi) it appears that the *Śiva-dharma* was written later than the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti*. So, this work is to be dated between 200 and 500 A.D.; and this early origin of the work explains why it is totally free from Tantric influence.

This argument is spurious. The listing of the Nakṣatras in the 'old' order from Kṛttikā to Bharaṇī, rather than from Aśvinī to Revatī, does not allow us to date the text earlier than 550 CE. While it may be true that the listing from Aśvinī to Revatī became the standard after Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, this does not mean that all subsequent texts necessarily followed this order. As a glance at the list of Nakṣatras provided by Kirfel (1967: 138–141) on the basis of the *Nakṣatrakalpa*, the *Garuḍapurāṇa*

¹⁸ Hazra dates the *Śivadharmottara* to before 800 CE. His arguments for the date of the *Śivadharmottara* are given in another article, dedicated to the *Śivadharmottara* (Hazra 1956: 46–49). There he argues that the *Śivadharmottara* must have been composed much later than the *Śivadharmasāstra* because of its references to Tantra. He furthermore writes that it cannot be dated earlier than 700 CE because of its mention of the use of the Nandināgarī script in chapter 2 of the *Śivadharmottara*. This particular issue will be addressed below. His argument for dating it before 800 CE rests on a series of quotations in Dharmanibandha literature and the fact that the *Vāyavyāsaṃhitā* of the *Śivapurāṇa*, which he dates between 800 and 1000 CE, knows the text.

and the *Matsyapurāṇa* illustrates, the ‘old’ order from Kṛttikā to Revatī remained in use in texts also after the composition of the *Brhatsaṃhitā*. Hazra’s argument about the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* is difficult to follow, but a date before 200 CE is impossible at any rate.

Hazra furthermore argues that the opening verse of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, which is shared with Bāṇa’s *Harṣacarita*, does not need to be taken into account, because it does not occur in all manuscripts of the text and ‘might have been added to it sometime between 650 and 1000 A.D.’ (Hazra 1954: 16). This is true. The opening verse of the *Harṣacarita* is found only in Nepalese manuscripts of the *Śivadharmasāstra*.¹⁹ Its presence may provide important evidence for a Nepalese recension of the text.²⁰

As so often in Hazra’s method of dating texts, the arguments rest on a series of suppositions about the dating of other works that requires reconsideration. Since Hazra, few scholars have attempted to date the text, although it is generally agreed that both the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* reflect an early ascetic (Atimārga) milieu of Śaivism and most probably predate the development of Tantric Śaivism.²¹

The second work of the corpus, the *Śivadharmottara*, has received some more attention in recent years. Magnone (2005: 588–591) argues that it is a late South Indian work and even goes so far as to suggest that it would be a Vijayanagara-period text because of the prescription of the use of Nandināgara characters in chapter 2 of the text. This argument has rightly been refuted by Dominic Goodall, who has drawn attention to the existence of an early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript (NAK 5-892, NGMPP A12/3) ‘in a script that might be of the eighth or ninth century AD’ (Goodall 2011: 232, n. 33). This fragmentary manuscript provides the text a *terminus ante quem* in the eighth century. Goodall furthermore adds the following observations on the date of the text:

¹⁹ The only exception is a manuscript in the Cambridge University Library in Bengali script (Add. 1599 = B₉₉^C), but this manuscript most probably derives from a Nepalese source (see below, p. 59). Cf. also De Simini 2016b: 193, n. 497.

²⁰ It is noteworthy that the *Harṣacarita* verse was commonly cited also in early medieval inscriptions from the Kannada-speaking area of the Indian subcontinent (Griffiths & Southworth 2007: 371–372).

²¹ This is the argument advanced by Sanderson (forthc.: 8): ‘The *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* were produced when initiatory Śaivism was restricted to ascetics or at least in the context of that form of Śaivism.’ Bonazolli (1993) criticises Hazra’s early dating, but he does not provide an alternative.

Hazra, who has produced an article that characterises the *Śivadharmottara*, the second work of that corpus, argues that it was probably composed between 700 and 800 AD [...] The first work of the *Śivadharmasāstra*-corpus that unmistakably shows evidence of Tantric influence is the *Śivadharmasāgraha* [...] and that work seems both later than the *Śivadharmottara* and at the same time unlikely to be much later than eighth century AD, since the evidence of the seventh-century *Svāyambhuvasūtrasāgraha* suggests that the form of the Mantramārga that the *Śivadharmasāgraha* reflects (that of the *Guhyasūtra* of the *Nīśvāsa*) had by then been far superceded in doctrine, ritual and in terms of social religion. In short, the date of the *Śivadharmottara* is still unknown, but if I had to guess I would be inclined to place it at least a century earlier than does Hazra. (Goodall 2011: 232, n. 33–34)

Goodall thus proposes a seventh-century date for the *Śivadharmottara*. The time of composition of the *Śivadharmasāstra* would necessarily have to precede it.

Before we continue, a few words should be added here about the *Śivadharmottara*'s provision of the use of 'Nandināgara' characters:

He should have the Book of Śiva written with characters in the Nandināgara style, that are quadrangular, with even tops, not too thick nor too thin, their parts well filled, smooth, not too far separated [from each other] nor joined together, characterised by vowel signs, *anusvāras*, conjuncts, short and long signs, etc.²²

As observed by Goodall,²³ rather than to a Southern script, the description points to a Northern script, written with ink on the palm leaf instead of incised into the palm leaf and then subsequently inked as is the custom in South India. As for the meaning of the label 'Nandināgara', two options present themselves. The first one, proposed by De Simini (2016b: 113), would be to take it as a derivative of the town called Nandinagara. Nandinagara features in the *Mahāmāyūrī*'s list of places where different deities reside: *nandī va nandinagare* 'And Nandin in Nandinagara'.²⁴ It

²² *Śivadharmottara* 2.40–41 (edition De Simini 2013): *caturasraiḥ samaśīrṣair nāti-sthūlair na vā kṛṣaiḥ* (corr.; *kṛṣaiḥ* Ed.) | *sampūrṇāvayavaiḥ snigdhaiḥ nātivicchinna-saṃhataiḥ* || *mātrānusvārasaṃyogahrasvādīrghādīlakṣitaiḥ* | *nandināgarakair varṇair lekhaḥayec chīvapustakam* ||.

²³ In a message to the Indology list server in January 2010: http://list.indology.info/pipermail/indology_list.indology.info/2010-January/033994.html.

²⁴ Correcting the edition's *va* to *ca*, as suggested by De Simini 2013: 53, n. 185.

also features in several Buddhist donative inscriptions in Prakrit.²⁵ Nandinagara has been identified with modern Nadner (Hoshangabad district, Madhya Pradesh), an ancient town in eastern Malwa on the banks of the Narmadā river.²⁶ Nandināgara would then be the characters ‘used in the Town of Nandi’. A second option, which does not necessarily exclude the first, would be to connect it to Nandin, also named Nandīśvara or Nandikeśvara, who is the teacher of the Śivadharmā. A script with the name Nandināgara would certainly be fitting for writing down the words spoken by Nandin.²⁷

Goodall’s arguments for a seventh-century date of the *Śivadharmottara* find support from Sanderson (forthc.: 7, n. 11), who points out that the *Śivadharmottara* has been quoted by name by the Śvetāmbara Jain scholar Haribhadra in his *Aṣṭakaparakaraṇa* (4.2–3):²⁸

dikṣā mokṣārtham ākhyātā jñānadhyānaphalaṃ ca sa |
śāstra ukto yataḥ sūtraṃ śivadharmottare hy adaḥ ||
pūjāyā vipulaṃ rājyaṃ agnikāryeṇa sampadaḥ |
tapaḥ pāpaviśuddhyartham jñānaṃ dhyānaṃ ca muktidaṃ ||

Initiation is said to be for the sake of liberation, and that (liberation) is the fruit of knowledge and meditation. It is declared [to be such] in the treatise. For there is the following rule in the *Śivadharmottara*:

‘By worship [one obtains] an extensive kingdom, by the fire sacrifice [one obtains] riches. Austerity is for the sake of purification of sin. Knowledge and meditation grant liberation.’

The verse quoted by Haribhadra can be identified with *Śivadharmottara* 3.60.²⁹ Jain tradition knows of two authors named Haribhadra: Haribhadra Virahāṅka and Haribhadra Yākinīputra. The author of the *Aṣṭakaparakaraṇa* can be attributed to Haribhadra Yākinīputra, who

²⁵ See Lüders’s list, nos. 176, 472, 536, 563 and 852 (*Epigraphia Indica* 10, appendix).

²⁶ See Misra & Sharma 2003: 138 for a summary of excavations carried out in 1986–87, 1987–88 and 1993.

²⁷ This Nandin is a Gaṇa close to Śiva and not to be confused with Śiva’s Bull. See Bhattacharya 1977.

²⁸ Translation mine.

²⁹ Numbering of the e-text based on the edition of Naraharinātha. The first line is identical, but the second line is phrased differently in the *Śivadharmottara*: *japena pāpaśuddhiḥ syāj jñānadhyānena mucyate*.

most probably lived in the eighth century.³⁰ This would fit the dating of the *Śivadharmottara* proposed by Goodall.

A Quotation in the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*

An important clue for the date of the *Śivadharmasāstra* may be found in a Buddhist text, the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*. The context is an episode in the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* in which Avalokiteśvara produces several Brahmanical deities from different parts of his body. The most important deity and centre of attention is Śiva Maheśvara, to whom Avalokiteśvara delivers the following speech:

O Maheśvara, you will be there when the Kaliyuga arrives. Born as the primary god (*ādideva*) in the realm of wretched beings you will be called Creator and Agent [of the world]. All beings who hold the following discourse among the common people (*prthagjana*) will be deprived of the path to awakening (*bodhimārga*): ‘Space they say is the *liṅga*, the earth its pedestal (*pīṭhikā*). It is the dwelling (*ālaya*) of all beings. Because of merging (*liyanāt*) into it, it is called “*liṅga*.”’³¹

The verse cited here by the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* is *Śivadharmasāstra* 3.17:³²

³⁰ On the two Haribhadrās, see Williams 1965.

³¹ *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* 265.4–8, with corrections by Eltschinger (2014: 84): *bhaviṣyasi tvaṃ maheśvara kaliyuge pratipanne | kaṣṭasattvadhātusamutpanna ādideva ākhyāyase sraṣṭāraṃ kartāraṃ | te sarvasattvā bodhimārgaṇa viprahīṇā bhaviṣyanti ya idrṣaṃ prthagjaneṣu sattveṣu sāṅkathyaṃ kurvanti || ākāśaṃ liṅgaṃ ity āhuḥ prthivī tasya pīṭhikā | ālayaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ liyanāl liṅgaṃ ucyate ||*. Translation mine.

³² Earlier authors (Regamey 1971 and Studholme 2002: 19–20, 28–29) tried in vain to trace this verse in the *Skandapurāṇa*, following a wrong lead by Alain Daniélou. Studholme in particular has a long argument about the influence of what he calls ‘the *Skandapurāṇa*’ on the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* on the basis of very slim evidence. He is not aware of the original *Skandapurāṇa* and its relation to later Khaṇḍas, assembling his materials from different Khaṇḍas and treating them all as one text. There can be no doubt that the Khaṇḍas from which he is quoting are all post-*Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*. Studholme was guided towards the *Skandapurāṇa* because Regamey had identified a verse on the *liṅga* in the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* in Daniélou’s anthology *Polythéisme Hindou* (Studholme 2002: 28). According to the information supplied by Daniélou, the verse came from the *Skandapurāṇa*, but he did not provide any reference for it. The verse as given by Daniélou has two variants: *sarvadevānāṃ* and *lāyanāl*. According to Studholme, following Regamey, the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* ‘changes *lāyanāl* to *liyanāl*, a unique Buddhist hybrid word derived, like the other, from the Sanskrit root *li-*, “to

*ākāṣaṃ liṅgam ity āhuḥ prthivī tasya pīṭhikā |
 ālayaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ liyanāl liṅgam ucyate ||*

While the verse is not explicitly attributed to the *Śivadharmasāstra*, there is no particular reason to doubt that the Buddhist author would have cited it from our text. The main teaching of the *Śivadharmasāstra* is *liṅga* worship and it is quite likely that the text was recognised as an important document of the burgeoning lay Śaivism by the author of the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*.

This naturally brings up the question of the date of the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*. Eltschinger observes that, although the passage is not represented in the Gilgit manuscripts due to lack of folios, ‘considering that the only known significant divergence between the Nepali and the Gilgit versions concerns a very neatly delineated section (Sarvanīvaraṇaviṣkambhin’s quest for the *ṣaḍakṣarī vidyā*), I see no compelling reason to doubt the presence of this passage in the textual tradition reflected in the Gilgit manuscripts.’³³ This would yield an *ante quem* date of 630 CE for this verse, as the two Gilgit manuscripts are dated to before 630 CE.³⁴

The Evidence of the *Śāntyadhyāya*

The *Śāntyadhyāya* has several descriptions of deities that, taken together, provide important pointers for the time of composition of the text. In an earlier study I have argued that the invocation of two deities in particular, Vināyaka and Bhṛṅgin, includes information that seems hard to square with a date much before the beginning of the seventh century (Bisschop 2010: 244–246). Both Vināyaka and Bhṛṅgin are invoked in the *Śāntyadhyāya* as sons of Rudra.³⁵ The figure of Bhṛṅgin does not make his appearance in literary sources before the *Skandapurāṇa*, dated to the sixth to seventh century, while Vināyaka (Gaṇeśa) appears to be adopted as a member of Śiva’s family around the same time as well.³⁶ Other aspects

dissolve” (Studholme 2002: 19–20). The form *liyanāl* was in fact a conjecture for the edition’s *lilayā* by Regamey. In any case, there is no need to assume Buddhist hybridisation here, as the presence of the same form in the *Śivadharmasāstra* shows.

³³ Eltschinger 2014: 84, n. 198.

³⁴ Cf. Mette 1997: 7.

³⁵ Vināyaka: *rudrasya tanayo* (ŚiDhŚ 6.17a); Bhṛṅgin: *rudrātmajo* (ŚiDhŚ 6.25a).

³⁶ For details, see the notes to the translation at ŚiDhŚ 6.15–17 and 6.24–25.

of the *Śāntyadihyāya* point in a similar direction. Most important in this respect is the lore of astronomy and astrology (Jyotiḥśāstra) included in the text.

For a start, the *Śāntyadihyāya* has to be later than the fourth century, because in the invocation of the planets it follows the order of the seven days of the week — Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus and Saturn (ŚiDhŚ 6.110–118) — that was introduced in India during the fourth century.³⁷ Furthermore, the text includes descriptions of the appearance of the pseudoplanets Rāhu and Ketu (ŚiDhŚ 6.119–121). Material representations of all nine planets (Navagrahas), including Rāhu and Ketu, have only been documented from 600 CE onwards. Varāhamihira (first half of the sixth century) is generally considered to be the first Jyotiṣa author to refer to the full group of nine planets.³⁸ Recent work on the *Gārgīya-jyotiṣa*, however, has shown that this text attributed to Garga was drawn upon by Varāhamihira, and Garga also describes the Navagrahas.³⁹ On the other hand, the order of presentation of the planets in the *Gārgīya-jyotiṣa* (Moon, Rāhu, Jupiter, Venus, Ketu, Saturn, Mars, Mercury and Sun) is different from the standard one ending in Rāhu and Ketu that we first find in Varāhamihira.⁴⁰ The *Śāntyadihyāya*'s detailed description of the nine planets in the standard order would suggest a sixth-century date for this part of the text at the earliest.⁴¹ There is a major caveat here, however, for the oldest of the manuscripts available for the *Śāntyadihyā-*

³⁷ Pingree 1965 and Yano 2004.

³⁸ Cf. Kochhar 2010: 'identification of Rāhu or Ketu with a planet in a text prior to Varāhamihira would be an exercise in anachronism' (Kochhar 2010: 296).

³⁹ See Geslani, Mak et al. 2017: 165–166 ('Garga's Treatment of the Planets').

⁴⁰ Bill Mak has argued that '[s]ince the seven weekdays in India, as in the Hellenistic tradition, do not include Rāhu and Ketu, the inclusion of the two pseudoplanets appears to be Varāhamihira's compromised attempt to bring the Garga tradition up to date' (Geslani, Mak et al. 2017: 165, n. 40).

⁴¹ It is, however, not impossible that the notion of nine planets was first developed in Purāṇic circles before scholars like Varāhamihira started to adopt it in their astronomical system. In this connection it should also be noted that several Purāṇas have references to the Navagraha. These may provide important clues for dating Purāṇas as well. An example would be ViP 2.12.16–23, which refers to the chariots and horses of the nine planets. A passage like this in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* does not necessarily mean that the entire text has to be later than the sixth century, but that at least this part of the text may be later. For more details on the development of the Navagraha, see n. 70 on p. 166.

ya (N_{45}^C) precisely omits the invocation of Ketu (120–121),⁴² while the wide variety of readings found in the other manuscripts suggests that the invocation of Ketu may have been added independently at different moments in the transmission of the text. If so, this would rather point to an original time of composition when Ketu had not yet come to be included among the Navagrahas.

A late sixth or post-sixth century date is suggested by the invocation of the Dikpālas. The text includes the canonical list of eight Dikpālas and their cities — Indra in Amarāvati, Agni in Tejovati, Yama in Vaivasvati, Nirṛti in Kṛṣṇā, Varuṇa in Śuddhavati, Vāyu in Gandhavati, Kubera in Mahodayā and Īśāna in Yaśovati — and has detailed descriptions of each of them. The available textual and material evidence points towards the seventh century as the time when this set of eight became standardised.⁴³

On the other hand, there are also several archaic elements in the mantra, such as Śiva's being four-headed (ŚiDhŚ 6.4c) and the listing of the Nakṣatras in the old order from Kṛttikā to Bharanī (see p. 10). These can, however, also survive in texts of a later date and do not therefore establish a *terminus ante quem*. In short, the above features suggest that the text may have been composed towards the end of the sixth century at the earliest. In the light of Goodall's dating of the *Śivadharmottara* to the seventh century, the Atimārga milieu of the text and the quotation in the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*, it will not have been much later than this.⁴⁴ The *terminus ante quem* is the date of the incomplete *Śivadharmottara* manuscript, which was most probably written in the early ninth century.

⁴² See n. 82 on p. 168.

⁴³ For details, see n. 52 on p. 161.

⁴⁴ The Atimārga milieu of the *Śivadharmasāstra* is indicated by the descriptions of the activities of the *śivayogins* in chapter 12 of the text, which, for example, makes frequent reference to bathing in ashes. That the *Śivadharmottara* too was composed in an Atimārga environment is evinced by the references to the *pāśupata* and the *mahāvratadhara* as the highest recipients of gifts (12.203–207), as well as by the prescription of the installation of an icon of Lakuliśvara (ŚiDhUt 2.146–147). See De Simini 2016b: 51–53, for these references. Cf. also below, p. 20.

References in Inscriptions

The oldest inscriptional records referring to the Śivadharma come from Southeast Asia. The recently published ‘Stela from Khuê Trung’ (C. 211), dated 899 CE,⁴⁵ suggests that the Śivadharma was known in the Campā kingdom. This inscription, belonging to the reign of the first of several kings named Śrī Jayasiṃhavarman in the history of Campā and dedicated to a foundation for Śiva in the form of Mahārudra, introduces a list of servants (*sevaka*) to the king who are said to be *śivadharmmaparāyaṇāḥ* ‘devoted to Śiva’s Law’ (face B, stanza IV). The first of them, named Śrīkalpa, is an *ācārya* and is said to be *śivadharmabhāg* ‘an adherent of Śiva’s Law’ (face B, stanza V). While *śivadharmma* could arguably just refer to the Śaiva religion in general, it seems plausible, given what we know about the extensive spread of the Śivadharma and the use of the term, that it refers more specifically to the teachings of the Śivadharma.

The first two texts of the Śivadharma corpus were also known in ancient Cambodia. A tenth-century inscription in Old Khmer from Pràsət Robaṅ Romās (K. 150)⁴⁶ cites a verse from the *Śivadharmasāstra* on the sharing of merit, which is attributed explicitly to the ‘Sacred Law of Śiva’ (*vrah śivadharmma*):

upadeṣṭānumantā ca karttā kārayitā ca yaḥ |
*kṛtānupālakaś caiva pañca tulyaphalāḥ smṛtāḥ ||*⁴⁷

The one who teaches, the one who approves [of the teaching], the agent of the action and the instigator of the action, as well as the one who protects what has been done: the five are taught to share an equal fruit.

Furthermore, another Sanskrit inscription from Cambodia (K. 834),⁴⁸ possibly datable to the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–1050 CE), attests to knowledge of the *Śivadharmottara*. As Sanderson (forthc.: 7, n. 11) points out, the *ṣaḍaṅgavidhi* ‘rite of six elements’ said to be performed by the king in stanza 38 of the inscription must refer to the worship prescribed for the king in *Śivadharmottara* 1.80–90. He has also drawn attention

⁴⁵ Griffiths et al. 2012: 263–270.

⁴⁶ *Inscriptions du Cambodge* 5: 191–194.

⁴⁷ This is *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.104 in De Simini’s edition (2013, appendix 1). A second verse is cited after this one, which is, however, not from the *Śivadharmma*.

⁴⁸ *Inscriptions du Cambodge* 5: 244–269.

to parallels with passages from the *Śivadharmottara* in the Angkor Wat inscriptions identifying the sinners who go to different hells.⁴⁹

The epigraphical evidence from the Indian subcontinent itself comes from South India from a somewhat later period, and concerns gifts to support the public recitation of the *Śivādharma*. Several inscriptions from the Cōla period in the Tamil-speaking South, beginning with an inscription dated to the reign of Rājendra Cōla (1012–44 CE), refer to public recitations of the text.⁵⁰ However, most important for the present study is an inscription from Karnataka, dated to Śaka 1079 (1157 CE), on a stone close to the northwestern wall of the Praṇaveśvara temple at Tālagunda.⁵¹ It reports the donation of a village called Hiriya Tagulatti as an *agrahāra*. The epigraph attests to detailed knowledge of the *Śivādharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*.⁵² The Tālagunda inscription refers specifically to the recitation of the *Śivādharma*'s *Śāntyadihyāya* and thus provides important evidence on its use (see p. 48).

Purāṇas and Other Testimonia

A survey of the *Śivādharmasāstra*'s testimonia falls outside of the scope of the present study. Several Śaiva Purāṇas, including the *Śivapurāṇa*, appear to have made use of the text, but more systematic work is needed in this direction. Hazra (1954, Appendix I) has collected and identified a number of quotations attributed to the *Śivādharma* or the *Śivādharmasāstra* by medieval Dharmanibandha authors.⁵³ All these texts, however, postdate the earliest surviving manuscripts, and while they do evince

⁴⁹ For other evidence that the *Śivadharmottara* was known in ancient Cambodia, see Sanderson 2003/04: 422–423.

⁵⁰ See De Simini 2016b: 187, n. 483, for references. Furthermore, the second part of an inscription from Kuṛgōḍ / Kuṛugōḍu (Bellary district, Karnataka) dated to Śaka 1103 (1181 CE) reports, as part of a list of donations on the occasion of the grant of an *agrahāra* by the Sinda ruler Rachamalla II, a donation for the public recitation of 'the *Śivādharmapurāṇa*' or 'the *Śivādharma* and the Purāṇa(s)' (EI 14, inscr. 19, l.46; De Simini 2016b: 186–187).

⁵¹ *Epigraphia Carnatica* 7, Skt 185.

⁵² See the discussion in De Simini 2016b: 190–198.

⁵³ The quotations identified by Hazra are from chapters 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. The thirteenth-century author Hemādri, minister of the Yādava king of Devagiri, in particular cites extensively from the *Śivādharmasāstra*. See also De Simini 2016b, on citations and adaptations of portions of text from the *Śivadharmottara*.

the text's spread and influence, they do not help in narrowing down the time of composition of the text. It is also worth noting that the Śivadharmā appears to have had a remarkable influence on the formation of Viraśaivism, as attested in medieval works from South India.⁵⁴

Aside from the earlier mentioned verse cited in the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*, a verse quoted by the Pāśupata author Kauṇḍinya in his commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra* is important for considering the date of composition of the text as well. In his lengthy commentary on *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.9, in the section where he discusses the Pāśupata concept of purity (*śauca*), Kauṇḍinya cites a verse in praise of the merit of bathing in ashes:

*yaḥ snānam ācaren nityam āgneyaṁ saṁyatendriyaḥ |
kulaikaviṁśam uddhṛtya sa gacchet paramāṁ gatim ||*⁵⁵

He who continually observes the Fiery Bath, with his senses in check, will rescue his lineage to the twenty-first generation and reach the highest state.

This verse corresponds almost verbatim with *Śivadharmasāstra* 11.24, where it features in a long section praising the practice of bathing in ashes.⁵⁶ What is striking about the verse is that it addresses the concerns of a non-ascetic devotee of Śiva, in that it refers to the rescuing of one's ancestors. The ascetic has left behind his family duties and should be free of debts, and so should have no concern for this. This suggests

⁵⁴ Viraśaivism displays several important shared concepts, including the characteristic distinction between the *jaṅgama* and the *sthāvara liṅga* addressed in *Śivadharmasāstra* 2 and 3. Moreover, several Viraśaiva works, such as the *Candrajñānāgama*, the *Kriyāsāra* of Nilakaṇṭhaśivācārya (between ca. 1350 and 1530), the *Siddhāntasikhāmaṇi* of Śivayogin (ca. 13th or early 14th c.), the *Śrikarabhāṣya* of Śrīpati (ca. 1400) and the *Liṅgadhāraṇacandrikā* of Nandikeśvara, quote extensively from the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*. For the dates of these authors, see Sanderson 2012/13: 84. Similarly, Śaiva Siddhānta authors from earliest times have referred to the teachings of the Śivadharmā (e.g. Rāmakaṇṭha *ad Kiraṇatantra* 6.11d–12; Goodall 1998: 375–76) and there are indeed many similarities between the two traditions. For an example from a later period, see the many references to the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* in the works of two South Indian Śaiva Siddhāntins, Nigamajñāna I and Nigamajñāna II (16th c.; Ganesan 2009).

⁵⁵ *Pañcārthabhāṣya* p. 30, ll. 1–2.

⁵⁶ Numbering according to the draft edition of Nirajan Kafle. Kauṇḍinya reads *uddhṛtya* instead of *uttārya*.

that the verse belongs to the kind of non-initiatory Śaiva milieu of the Śivadharmā. However, the question of whether Kauṇḍinya really cites it from our text, or from an unknown earlier source, must remain open. Kauṇḍinya may be dated to around the fourth or fifth century, which does not tally with the dates discussed above. The parallel may rather hint at the fact that parts of the *Śivadharmāśāstra* were composed on the basis of earlier, no longer surviving sources.

I have found three parallels for (parts of) the *Śāntyadhyāya* in other texts. These may be considered testimonia for the text, if it can be shown that they have indeed been borrowed from the *Śāntyadhyāya*. The first concerns three verses on the offering of *bali* to the Rudras, Mātṛs and Gaṇādhīpas (53–55). These verses occur, with some variations, in *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 7.33–35, and in *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (ĪśgP), *Sāmānyapāda* 14.178–180ab = *Mantrapāda* 28.96cd–98 = *Kriyāpāda* 15.4–16ab. The second passage concerns the lengthy invocation of the Gaṇas in the ten directions (56–75). A very similar invocation occurs in ĪśgP, *Mantrapāda*, 30.84, which gives a mantra meant to accompany the scattering of *bali* in the ten directions. While this is not a literal or direct quotation, the wording of the mantra in Īśānaśiva's text clearly goes back to that of the *Śāntyadhyāya*. That Īśānaśiva had access to the Śivadharmā becomes clear from his explicit citations from the 'Śivadharmā' at *Kriyāpāda* 11.18–20 and at *Kriyāpāda* 13.115. The *Mṛgendra* belongs to the early Śaiva Siddhānta scriptures, but represents a later stage among them (Goodall 1998: LVIII). The date of the Keralan Īśānaśiva, author of the *Siddhāntasāra*, more commonly known as *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, remains uncertain (Sanderson 2012/13: 23, n. 84). While these testimonia do not allow us to narrow down the time frame of the composition of the text, they do attest to the influence of the text on the Śaiva Siddhānta.

By far the most important and extensive parallel, however, is to be found in six chapters of the first *parvan* (*Brāhmaparvan*) of the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* (BhavP 1.175–180). These chapters form part of a wholesale borrowing of the *Śivadharmāśāstra*, in which practically the entire work has been incorporated and revised in order to make it fit into a Saura context. The *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* has long been known for its creative copying of earlier texts, including the *Manusmṛti* and the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*,⁵⁷ but its adap-

⁵⁷ See, e.g., Hazra 1940: 167–173, László 1971 and Sternbach 1974.

tation of the *Śivadharmasāstra* is in many respects the most extraordinary in terms of scope and wording. The part entitled ‘Description of the Sauradharmas’ (*sauradharmavarṇana*) starts at BhavP 1.151. Śātānīka tells Sumantu that he has heard many Dharmas, including the Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva Dharmas, but now he wants to hear the Saura Dharma.⁵⁸ What follows — the moment Sumantu starts speaking — is taken verbatim from the *Śivadharmasāstra*, but with all references to Śiva and his cult systematically replaced by Sūrya and his cult. A verse from the first chapter of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, cited earlier (ŚiDhŚ 1.16, p. 8), may serve as an example:

ye 'rcayanti sadā rudraṃ na te prakṛtimānuṣāḥ |
rudralokāt paribhraṣṭās te rudrā nātra saṃśayaḥ ||

They who always worship Rudra, they are no ordinary men. They are Rudras who have come down from Rudraloka. There is no doubt about this.

In BhavP 1.151.19 this has become:

stuvanti ye sadā bhānuṃ na te prakṛtimānuṣāḥ |
svargalokāt paribhraṣṭās te jñeyā bhāskarā bhuvi ||

They who always praise Bhānu, they are no ordinary men. They should be known as Bhāskaras who have come down to earth from Svargaloka.

In this way, the entire *Śivadharmasāstra* has been systematically incorporated and rewritten. Even the myth of the ‘origin of the *liṅga*’ (ŚiDhŚ 3) has been taken over, but turned into a Saura version that culminates in the gods’ vision and worship of Sūrya (BhavP 1.153).

The *Śāntyadhyāya* parallel itself starts with an introductory narrative that has no counterpart in the *Śivadharmasāstra*. Garuḍa tells his brother Aruṇa, Sūrya’s charioteer, that he is without wings due to the curse of a *brahmavādinī*.⁵⁹ He wishes to know the means to regain his

⁵⁸ Cf. BhavP 1.151.8–9: *śrūtā me bahavo dharmāḥ śrūtismṛtyuditās tathā | vaiṣṇavāḥ śaivadharmāś ca tathā paurāṇikāḥ śrūtāḥ || śrotukāmo hy ahaṃ vipra sauraṃ dharmam anupamam | bhagavan sarvadhanyās te sauradharmaparāyaṇāḥ ||*.

⁵⁹ This must refer to the Śaṇḍili episode (MBh 5.11.1–18), in which Garuḍa loses his wings, becoming like a ball of flesh, for despising a brahmin ascetic woman named Śaṇḍili in a dream.

wings.⁶⁰ Aruṇa instructs him to worship the Sun and perform the fire rite (*agnikārya*), but Garuḍa answers that he cannot do this because of his mutilated state. He requests that his brother perform the fire rite called *mahāśānti* for his sake.⁶¹ Aruṇa agrees to do so, saying that the Sun had performed it for him before.⁶² After this there is a first brief parallel with the two opening verses of the *Śāntyadhyāya* (BhavP 1.175.14–15 = ŚiDhŚ 6.1–2).⁶³ Next Aruṇa gives ritual instructions on the lighting of the fire, the accompanying invocation, and the ceremony of a hundred thousand oblations (*lakṣahomavidhi*). The rite, along with the *śānti* invocation, is to be performed for Sūrya by a Bhojaka priest.⁶⁴ Following the lengthy mantra, divided over six sub-chapters, the narrative is resumed again at BhavP 1.180.40. Because of Aruṇa's recitation, Garuḍa retrieves his wings and becomes whole again thanks to the grace of the Sun.⁶⁵ The chapter ends with an account of the transmission of the mantra: Sūrya → Aruṇa → Garuḍa → the Bhojakas of Śākadvīpa → Vyāsa.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ BhavP 1.175.5–7: *sarvapatravihīnaṃ me sarvarogavivarjitam | śāpena brahma-vādīnyāḥ paśyāṅgaṃ dvijasattama || evaṃ mattasya me tāta kiṃ kāryam avaśīsyate | yenāhaṃ karmaṇā kalpo bhaveyaṃ patravān punaḥ || tan me brūhi khagaśreṣṭha prapannasya khagādhipa | yat kṛtvā kalpatāṃ prāpya pūjayāmi divākaram ||*

⁶¹ BhavP 1.175.8–11: *aruṇa uvāca | pūjayasva jagannāthaṃ bhāskaraṃ timirāpa-ham | sūryāgnikāryaṃ satataṃ śuddhacittaḥ samācara || mahāśāntikaraṃ khyātāṃ sarvopadravanāśanam | grahopaghātahantāraṃ śubhakāryaṃkaraṃ param || garuḍa uvāca | nāhaṃ śakto 'smi vai kartuṃ pūjāṃ dinakarasya ca | na cāgnikāryaṃ śaknōmi kartuṃ vikalatāṃ gataḥ || tasmān me kuru śāntyartham agnikāryaṃ khagādhipa | mahāśāntir iti khyātāṃ śāntaye mama svrata ||*

⁶² BhavP 1.175.12–13: *evam eva yad āttha tvaṃ vainateya khagādhipa | akalpas tvaṃ na śaknoṣi mahāvīyādhiprapīḍitaḥ || ahaṃ karomi te putra śāntaye pāvakārcanam | yat kṛtaṃ mama cārkeṇa purā śāntidam ādarāt ||*

⁶³ All the parallels with the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* are given in the upper register of the apparatus of the critical edition.

⁶⁴ BhavP 1.175.35c–36ab: *kṛtvaivam agnikāryaṃ tu bhojako bhāskarāya vai || śāntya-rthaṃ sarvalokānāṃ tatha śāntikam ācaret |* On the identity of the Zoroastrian Bhojakas, to be distinguished from the non-Zoroastrian Magas, see von Stietencron 1966: 236–247, 264–272. According to von Stietencron, the Bhojakas did not enter India before the second half of the sixth century and so this part of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* must be dated at least after this. See also Bakker 2014: 67.

⁶⁵ BhavP 1.180.40–42: *evaṃ hi kurvataḥ śāntim aruṇasya mahīpate | śreyase vainateyasya garuḍasya mahātmanaḥ || etasmīn eva kāle tu suparṇaḥ patravān abhūt | te-jaśā budhasaṃkāśo valena hariṇā samaḥ || sampūrṇāvayavo rājan yathāpūrvaṃ tathā-bhavat | prasādād devadevasya bhāskarasya mahātmanaḥ ||*

⁶⁶ BhavP 1.180.60–62: *sūryabhakte sadā deyaṃ sūryeṇa kathitaṃ purā | aruṇasya*

Throughout the mantra, all references to devotion to Śiva (*rudrārcanapara*, etc.) have been systematically replaced by expressions of devotion to Sūrya (*sūryārcanarata*, etc.). Here and there the order of verses has been revised and many of the invocations have been extensively rewritten or extended. Not surprisingly, the first deity to be invoked is not Śiva but Sūrya, who heads the list of the Navagrahas (BhavP 1.175.36cd–50 = ŚiDhŚ 6.110–122). In the same vein, the invocation ends not with a *jaya* to Śiva but with a *jaya* to Sūrya (BhavP 1.180.35–39 / ŚiDhŚ 236–242). The new narrative context has been taken into account too, and so there are occasional vocatives addressed to Garuḍa, for whose benefit Aruṇa recites the mantra, while the first person references of the original mantra have been changed into the second person. There are, however, a few slips where the original first person still remains, revealing the direction of change.⁶⁷ The text has suffered from quite a few cases of accidental loss of verses.⁶⁸

It is hard to put a date on the time of borrowing. The *Brāhmaparvan* is generally considered to be the oldest part of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. Indeed many of the verses quoted in the Dharmanibandha literature can be traced in this *parvan* (Hazra 1940: 167–173, 331–335), although Hazra also concludes that ‘it is the result of a recast to which its prototype was subjected’ (Hazra 1940: 171). Regarding the borrowing of the *Śāntyadhyāya*, however, it is to be noted that the text transmitted in the extant version of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* suggests a relatively early version of the text overall. None of the additional invocations found in some of the manuscripts appear in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*’s version, while its wording at the individual verse level often tends to agree with what appear to be the oldest

mahābāho garuḍasyāruṇena ca || garuḍena purā proktaṃ bhojakānāṃ mahātmanām | sūryaśarmasukhādīnām śākadvīpe mahīpate || taiś cāpi kathitaṃ puṇyaṃ muner vyāsasya dhūmataḥ | tenāpi kathitaṃ puṇyaṃ sarvapāpabhayāpaham ||

⁶⁷ Strikingly, these only appear in chapter 178: BhavP 1.178.17c, 1.178.19b, 1.78.27c, 1.178.40c, 1.178.42c, 1.178.47b.

⁶⁸ E.g. the invocations of the Gaṇas from the southwest to the north (ŚiDhŚ 6.62–69); Vāyu and Kubera among the Dikpālas (ŚiDhŚ 6.93–98); Śanaīścara and Rāhu among the Navagrahas (ŚiDhŚ 6.118–119); Vāsuki and Mahāpadma among the Nāgas (ŚiDhŚ 6.168–169; 6.176–177); the second group of rivers (ŚiDhŚ 6.189–190); Vibhāṇḍaka and Pūrṇabhadra among the Yakṣas (ŚiDhŚ 6.201–202; 6.205–206); the Yoginīs, Ḍākiṇīs and Bhūtas in the last set of invocations (ŚiDhŚ 6.219–225).

readings of the text in the Śivadharma manuscripts.⁶⁹ Perhaps most significantly, it uniquely agrees with the oldest manuscript N^{Ko}₇₇ in omitting the lengthy section on Viṣṭi, the Tithis and the Yogas (ŚiDhŚ 6.123–136). This may very well reflect an early stage of transmission of the text.⁷⁰

The Evidence of the Manuscripts

The definite *terminus ante quem* is provided by the evidence of the surviving manuscripts. The earliest surviving Śivadharma manuscript is a fragmentary manuscript of the *Śivadharmottara* (NAK 5-892, NGMPP A12/3). Its script, which may be labeled 'Licchavi', is remarkably similar to the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa* that is dated 810 CE (NAK 2-229, NGMPP B11/4). Unfortunately, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* is not included among the 42 surviving folios and it cannot be established with certainty that the two works were already copied together in a bundle (De Simini 2016a: 214). In any case, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* must have been composed before the *Śivadharmottara*. The earliest surviving manuscript that does contain the *Śivadharmaśāstra* is NAK 6/7, NGMPP A1028/4. This may be dated to the end of the tenth century or early eleventh century on palaeographical grounds. Like other Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts, this is a Śivadharma corpus manuscript, although it does not yet contain all texts belonging to the corpus (De Simini 2016a: 219–222). Unfortunately this manuscript is incomplete and lacks a large part of the beginning of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, including the *Śāntyadhyāya*. The earliest surviving manuscript that includes the *Śāntyadhyāya* is a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript now at the Asiatic Society in Calcutta, G 4077 (siglum N^{Ko}₇₇ in the present edition), dated [Nepāla] Saṃvat 156 (1035–36 CE).

The Provenance of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*

In his survey of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, Hazra speculated about the possible provenance of the text:

The occurrence of the text of the *Śiva-dharma* mostly in Newari mss. of Nepalese paper and the mention of the Devikā, a small river in Southern

⁶⁹ See the notes on the translation for further details.

⁷⁰ See below, p. 55.

Kashmir, and of the Candrabhāgā as a highly sacred river, seem to point to Southern Kashmir or the Northern Punjab as the place of origin of the *Śiva-dharma*. (Hazra 1954: 16)

There are two elements to Hazra's argument: a text-external one and a text-internal one.

As for the text-external evidence, Hazra rightly points to the existence of the early manuscripts from Nepal. Approximately 18 palm-leaf manuscripts, written from the early ninth to the end of the fourteenth century, are known to survive (De Simini 2016a: 213–214). The number of subsequent paper manuscripts from Nepal easily doubles this figure. This is an exceptionally large number of manuscripts and it attests to the popularity of the *Śivadharmā* in Nepal through the ages. It does not, however, tell us that the text was also composed there, for it is largely due to climatic conditions that such early palm-leaf manuscripts have survived there and not in other parts of the subcontinent. In fact, the two earliest texts of the corpus, the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*, were distributed widely in the South as well. Some 20 palm-leaf and paper manuscripts from South India, written in Grantha and Telugu script, have been identified.⁷¹ Furthermore, there are at least three manuscripts from Kashmir written in Śāradā script, two manuscripts written in Bengali script and several manuscripts written in Malayalam script (De Simini 2016a: 250–253). Copies of the first two texts of the corpus thus survive from across the Indian subcontinent, in particular from the border regions. The situation is different for the other texts belonging to the corpus, for these are only found in Nepal, suggesting that the corpus organisation of eight texts would have taken place in Nepal.

Referring to two rivers mentioned in the text, Hazra argues for an origin in southern Kashmir or the northern Punjab. The argument is based on the mention of two rivers, Devikā and Candrabhāgā, in a listing of rivers in the *Śāntyadihyāya* (ŚiDhŚ 6.186–192). Although the list covers rivers from across the Indian subcontinent, also including, for example, a southern river like the Kāverī, there is indeed a noticeable presence of rivers from the northwestern part of the subcontinent. On the other hand, the mention of two minor rivers in the northeast, the Nairañja-

⁷¹ Presentation by Marco Franceschini at the *Śivadharmā* workshop held at Leiden University, 26–30 September 2016: 'The transmission of the *Śivadharmā* in Tamil Nadu'.

nā (near Bodhgayā) and the Varuṇā (near Vārāṇasī), also deserves to be taken into account.

Finally, mention may be made of a verse from chapter 11, which possibly indicates that Śaiva religion was not yet the norm and that the text was targeted specifically at newly aspiring Śaiva rulers:

*sudūram api gantavyaṃ yatra māheśvaro janaḥ |
sa ca yatnena draṣṭavyas tatra sannihito haraḥ ||*⁷²

Even if one must search far and wide, where there are people devoted to Maheśvara, one must strive to see them, for there Hara is near.

The *Śāntyadhyāya*

The *Śāntyadhyāya* is the longest chapter of the *Śivadharmasāstra*. Consisting essentially of an extensive mantra along with the fruits of reciting or hearing it, the *Śāntyadhyāya* has a markedly different character from the rest of the text. The mantra invokes a plethora of gods and cosmic powers for appeasement (*śānti*). Each deity is invoked in his or her own sphere, but always in relation to Śiva. It is from Śiva that they derive their power. The *Śāntyadhyāya*'s invocation of all gods and powers does not stand on its own, but forms part of a long tradition of listing and invoking of cosmic powers. Sadovski, who has studied many of these lists and catalogues in Indo-Iranian traditions of oral poetry, observes the following:

By *cataloguing* the universe, worshippers try to find an underlying matrix system — but also to magically *re-shape* and *re-create* it over and over again. That is why the *logic* of arrangement of conceptual catalogues and their items in Indo-Iranian ritual poetry can shed light on the systems of motives, values and priorities of the worshippers and societies concerned.⁷³

This observation holds true for the *Śāntyadhyāya* as well. One way of looking at the mantra is by reading it as a catalogue of the cosmic powers recognised by the target community of the text. The question then arises: what are the principles of organisation of the invocation and what do they tell us about the values and priorities of its composer(s)?

⁷² ŚiDhŚ 11.51 (draft edition Nirajan Kafle).

⁷³ Sadovski 2013: 153, italics original.

Order and Organisation of the Mantra

In order to establish the principles behind the selection and organisation of the mantra, we may first of all look at the general order of the deities and powers invoked. The structure of the mantra, as established in the main text of the edition, is as follows:⁷⁴

- Maheśvara
- Umā
- The Inner Circle
 - Kārttikeya
 - Nandiśa
 - Vināyaka
 - Mahākāla
 - Ambikā
 - Mahāmahiṣamardanī
 - Bhṛṅgiriṭi
 - Caṇḍeśvara
- Brahmā
- Viṣṇu
- Mātṛs
 - Brahmāṇī
 - Rudrāṇī
 - Kaumārī
 - Vaiṣṇavī
 - Aindrī

⁷⁴ There are numerous cases of additions and omissions in this list in the various manuscripts. These are discussed in the notes accompanying the translation. The list given here represents the main text of the edition.

- Vārāhī
- Cāmuṇḍā
- Lamboṣṭhī
- All Mātṛs
- Rudras, Mātṛs and Gaṇādhipas
- Gaṇas
 - East
 - Southeast
 - South
 - Southwest
 - West
 - Northwest
 - North
 - Northeast
 - Below
 - Above
- Dikpālas
 - Indra in Amarāvātī (E)
 - Agni in Tejovātī (SE)
 - Yama in Vaivasvatī (S)
 - Nirṛti in Kṛṣṇā (SW)
 - Varuṇa in Śuddhavātī (W)
 - Vāyu in Gandhavātī (NW)
 - Kubera in Mahodayā (N)
 - Īśāna in Yaśovātī (NE)
- Devas in the Seven Worlds

- Devas in Caves, Forests etc.
- Four Goddesses
 - Sarasvatī
 - Śrī
 - Jayā
 - Aparājita
- Navagrahas
 - Sūrya
 - Soma
 - Aṅgāraka
 - Budha
 - Bṛhaspati
 - Śukra
 - Śanaiścara
 - Rāhu
 - Ketu
- Viṣṭi
- Tithis
 - Amāvāsī to Pūrṇamā
- Yogas
 - Viṣkambha, Prīti, Āyusmant, Saubhāgya, Śobhana, Ati-
gaṇḍa, Sukarman, Dhṛti, Śūla, Gaṇḍa, Vṛddhi, Dhruva,
Vyāghāta, Harṣaṇa, Vajra, Siddhi, Vyatīpāta, Variyas,
Parigha, Śiva, Siddhi, Sādhyā, Śubha, Śukla, Brahman,
Aindra, Vaidhṛti
- Nakṣatramātr̥s

- East: Kṛttikā, Rohiṇī, Mṛgaśīrā, Ārdrā, Punarvasu, Puṣyā, Aśleṣā
- South: Maghā, Pūrvaphālgunī, Uttaraphālgunī, Hastā, Citrā, Svātī, Viśākhā
- West: Anurādhā, Jyeṣṭhā, Mūlā, Pūrvāṣāḍhā, Uttaraṣāḍhā, Abhijit, Śravaṇā
- North: Dhaniṣṭhā, Śatabhiṣā, Pūrvabhādrapadā, Uttara-bhadrā, Revatī, Aśvinī, Bharaṇī
- Rāśis
 - East: Meṣa (Aries), Siṃha (Leo), Dhanu (Sagittarius)
 - South: Vṛṣa (Taurus), Kanyā (Virgo), Makara (Capricorn)
 - West: Mithuna (Gemini), Tulā (Libra), Kumbha (Aquarius)
 - North: Karkaṭa (Cancer), Vṛścika (Scorpio), Mīna (Pisces)
- Seven Sages (Ursa Major)
- Sages of Great Vows
 - Kāśyapa, Gālava, Gārgya, Viśvāmitra, Manu, Dakṣa, Vasiṣṭha, Mārkaṇḍa, Pulaha, Kratu, Nārada, Bhṛgu, Ātreya, Bharadvāja, Aṅgiras, Vālmīka, Kauśika, Kaṇva, Śākalya, Punarvasu, Śālaṅkāyana and others
- Wives, Daughters and Sons of the Sages
- Siddhas, Gandharvas, Apsarases, Vidyādhara, Garuḍas
- Daityas
 - Namuci, Śaṅkukarṇa, Mahānāda
 - Mahājambha, Hayagrīva, Prahlāda, Anuhlādaka, Tāraka, Agnimukha, Kālanemi, Mahotkaṭa
 - Virocana, Hiraṇyākṣa, Suparva, Sulomaka, Mucukunda, Sukunda, Revataka
- Wives, Daughters and Sons of the Daityas

- Eight Nāgarājas
 - Ananta
 - Vāsuki
 - Takṣaka
 - Karkoṭaka
 - Padma
 - Mahāpadma
 - Śaṅkhapāla
 - Kulika
- Other Nāgas
- Wives, Daughters and Sons of the Nāgas
- Rivers
 - Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Narmadā, Gomatī, Kāverī, Varuṇā, Devikā
 - Candrabhāgā, Godāvarī, Sarayū, Gaṇḍakī, Kauśikī, Sarasvatī
 - Nairāñjanā, Śoṇa, Mandākinī, Saṃnihitā
 - and others
- Yakṣas
 - Mahāvaiśravaṇa
 - Maṇibhadra
 - Suviroma
 - Pāñcika
 - Vibhāṇḍaka
 - Dhṛtarāṣṭra
 - Pūrṇabhadra
 - Virūpākṣa
- Other Yakṣas

- Wives, Sons and Daughters of the Yakṣas
- Mountains
- Oceans
- Entourage of Bhairava
 - Rākṣasas
 - Yoginīs
 - Bhūtas
 - Pretas
 - Piśācas
 - Grahās
- All Deities

After the announcement of the topic (1–3), the chapter opens with two verses addressed to the main object of devotion, referred to as Maheśvara ‘Great Lord’ (4–5). The next four verses are addressed to his wife Umā (6–9).

The text continues with the members of Śiva’s inner circle: Kārttikeya, Nandīśa, Vināyaka, Mahākāla, Ambikā, Mahāmahiṣamardanī, Bhṛṅgiriṭi and Caṇḍeśvara (10–27).⁷⁵ The distinction between Umā on the one hand and Ambikā on the other is not made explicit, but one distinctive feature of Ambikā is that she is addressed as ‘Mother of the Troops’, something not said of Umā. In her benevolent appearance Ambikā is the exact opposite of Mahāmahiṣamardanī, who is invoked after her. Several of the members of the inner circle — Nandīśa,

⁷⁵ This group calls to mind the circle of eight Gaṇapatis in later Tantric sources. However, the standard list does not include Mahāmahiṣamardanī but has Vṛṣa instead. Cf. Goodall, s.v. *gaṇapati*, *gaṇeśa*, in TAK II: ‘Variations in the order and form of the names occur; essentially they appear to be Śiva’s Paurāṇika household: his wife (Umā), sons (Gajavakra and Skanda), mount (Vṛṣa), watchmen (Nandin and Mahākāla), and close devotees (Abala/Bhṛṅgin and Caṇḍa).’ Three sources used for the edition (E^N , P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T) add Vṛṣa after the invocation of Caṇḍeśvara. Several of the single-text manuscripts of the *Śāntyadhyaṅya* that I have checked transmit the Vṛṣa invocation as well; see p. 189 f. There is a similar addition in $\acute{S}_{67}^S$, but there the additional verses refer to Kṛṣṇa and are preceded by two verses addressed to the Gaṇa Ghaṇṭākarma.

Mahākālā, Ambikā, Bhṛṅgiriṭi, and Caṇḍeśvara — are characterised as ‘three-eyed’. This iconographic feature reflects their closeness to Śiva and sets them apart from the deities that follow.

After Śiva’s inner circle, the two other main male gods of Brahmanical Hinduism are invoked: Brahmā and Viṣṇu (28–32).⁷⁶ No mention is made of Viṣṇu’s *avatāra* forms.

The mantra next continues with the Mātṛs (33–55). There is no unanimity about the number of these Mother goddesses. Several manuscripts have the standard seven Mothers (*saptamātṛkā*), Brahmānī, Rudrānī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Aindrī, Vārāhī and Cāmuṇḍā, but most of the Nepalese manuscripts add an eighth one, the much less known Lamboṣṭhī. Furthermore, compared to other lists of the Mothers and sets of surviving sculptures, the text reverses the common order of Aindrī and Vārāhī, invoking Aindrī before Vārāhī.⁷⁷ While the addition of Lamboṣṭhī as eighth Mother may well be an early addition in the Nepalese transmission of the text, it is possible that the group of eight is original because it is analogous to other groups of eight that we find throughout the mantra, such as eight Dikpālas, eight Nāgarājas and eight Yakṣas. Thus it is also conceivable that Lamboṣṭhī was removed by later scribes by the time the set of seven Mothers had become canonical. Iconographically, Lamboṣṭhī appears as the fat counterpart of the emaciated Cāmuṇḍā. The invocation of the Mātṛs concludes with the invocation of all Mothers collectively (50–52). Reference is made to the offering of *bali* to the Rudras, Mātṛs and Gaṇādhīpas, a hint at the ritual background of the mantra (53–55).

The Mātṛs are followed by the Gaṇas (56–76). They are invoked in separate groups, in accordance with the directions where they reside,

⁷⁶ Following these invocations there is a significant addition in E^N and Ś₆₇^S, which includes Arhant, Buddha, Jayā / Vijayā, the Earth (Pṛthivī) and the Cows. N₅₈^K has a similar addition, invoking Arhant, Buddha, Vṛṣabha and the Five Cows in Śivapura. The addition clearly reflects an attempt to expand the pantheon by incorporating the founders of Jainism and Buddhism, with some more deities added to the fold (Bisschop forthc. a). It should be noted, however, that Arhant and Buddha are not entirely foreign to the text, for they feature in another part of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. In ŚiDhŚ 3.31–32 they appear in a list of deities who have received their status from worshipping Śiva’s *liṅga*. The addition features in only two of the single-text *Śāntiyadhyaṇya* manuscripts that I have been able to check; see p. 189 f.

⁷⁷ Some later manuscripts have tried to repair this. See n. 36 on p. 155.

moving clockwise from east to northeast, followed by the lower and upper parts of the cosmos. In each case reference is made to the vertical division of the cosmos. The stereotypical phrasing of each set leads to a curious statement in the case of the Gaṇas residing in the lower and upper parts of the cosmos, for they are likewise said to be dwelling 'in heaven, in the sky, on earth and in the bottom of the nether region'. It is hard to imagine a lower or upper part of the universe again subdivided into heaven, sky, earth and nether region. The section on the Gaṇas is concluded with an instruction to provide *bali* offerings to the Gaṇas, which provides another clue to the ritual use of the mantra.

The text next returns to the theme of the directions, with invocations addressed to the eight Dikpālas 'Guardians of the directions' (77–101). These include fairly elaborate descriptions of their splendid cities of residence: Indra in Amarāvati, Agni in Tejovati, Yama in Vaivasvati, Nirṛti in Kṛṣṇā, Varuṇa in Śuddhāvati, Vāyu in Gandhāvati, Kubera in Mahodayā and Īśāna in Yaśovati. Like the previous section, it is arranged in a clockwise order from east to northeast.

After the invocations of the Guardians of the directions follow four verses addressed to the celestial gods in the seven worlds, Bhūloka, Bhuvarloka, Svarloka, Maharloka, Janarloka, Tapoloka and Satyaloka, as well as those dwelling in wild places on earth: on mountains, in caves, strongholds and forests (102–105).⁷⁸

Four more verses follow, each addressed to a single goddess: Sarasvatī, Śrī, Jayā and Aparājītā (106–109). While the previously mentioned groups were deities associated with the wild, these four goddesses are protective deities of the civilised world.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Several sources (N_{58}^K , $\hat{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T , E^N) include a few additional verses providing more information on the appearance of the gods in these seven worlds. The additions occur in different places in the text and are different in wording, suggesting that they have been added by scribes at different stages in the transmission of the text.

⁷⁹ Compare *Arthaśāstra* 2.4.17, which mentions shrines for Aparājita, Apratihata, Jayanta, Vijayanta, Śrī etc. to be built in the centre of the city. It is noteworthy that the order of the deities in this part of the text partly resembles that seen in a section on the iconography of the gods in the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*. From Vdhp 3.50 onwards we find the eight Dikpālas, followed by several gods not found in our text, continued by Sarasvatī (3.64), Śeṣa (not in our text), Tumburu and his four sisters (3.66) and the Navagrahas (3.67–68). Manuscript $\hat{S}_{67}^S$ adds Jayā and Aparājītā to Vijayā and Jayantī, thus completing the full group of four sisters of Tumburu (Goudriaan 1973).

The mantra next includes a long section addressed to celestial powers (110–152). It is a veritable encyclopaedia of astronomical and astrological lore. There can be little doubt that it was composed by somebody with good training in Jyotiḥśāstra. It speaks of the Śaivas' attempts to engage with and take over the specialisms of rivalling ritualists.⁸⁰ The section begins with an invocation of the Navagrahas: Sūrya (Sun), Soma (Moon), Aṅgāraka (Mars), Budha (Mercury), Br̥haspati (Jupiter), Śukra (Venus), Śanaīścara (Saturn), Rāhu and Ketu (110–121).⁸¹ The order of the seven planets follows the temporal order of the days of the week, which has been in use in India since the fourth century. A remarkably detailed depiction of the iconography of the Navagrahas is given. After a concluding verse (122), in which all the planets are requested to provide peace, Viṣṭi is invoked in eight appearances (123–125). Viṣṭi is one of the 11 Karaṇas, artificial units of a half of a lunar day, and generally regarded as the most dangerous one. None of the other Karaṇas are mentioned, which makes this invocation stand out among the various lists that surround it.⁸² The 15 Tithis, the lunar phases of the moon's course, are up next, beginning with Amāvāsī, the night of the new moon, and ending with Pūrṇamā, the night of the full moon (126–132).⁸³ The Tithis are followed by the 27 Yogas, the lunisolar alignments, each one of them mentioned by name (133–136). These are again followed by the 28 Nakṣatra-mātr̥s, the lunar mansions, usually simply called Nakṣatras. They are arranged from east to north, in the old order from Kṛttikā to Bharaṇī (137–147). The Nakṣatras are followed by the 12 Rāśis, the zodiac signs, again arranged from east to north, in accordance with the trigon (*trikoṇa*) system (148–151).⁸⁴ The astronomical section ends with the Seven Sages

⁸⁰ See Sanderson 2004.

⁸¹ The invocation of Ketu is absent in N_{45}^C , while its wording shows remarkable variation in the different manuscripts. On the possible implications for the date of composition of the *Śāntyadihyāya* and its transmission, see above, p. 17.

⁸² Note that $N_{77}^{K_0}$ and the parallel in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* omit this invocation of Viṣṭi, as well as those of the Tithis and the Yogas that follow (see below, p. 55). Two manuscripts show an attempt to link Viṣṭi to the other Karaṇas: N_{58}^K introduces a list of ten Karaṇas before Viṣṭi, while N_{45}^C adds the other six movable Karaṇas after 136.

⁸³ In P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T the verses dealing with the Tithis have been rewritten in such a way that the name of the deity presiding over each Tithi is included as well.

⁸⁴ There are some ambiguities in the transmission of this part of the text. For more on the trigon system, see n. 93 on p. 172. $\hat{S}_{67}^S$ adds a passage that includes the Saṃkrāntis,

(*sapta ṛṣayaḥ*), i.e. the constellation of Ursa Major, including Dhruva, the polar star (152).

The mention of the Seven Sages seems to have triggered the next section, which lists more sages (153–155). Twenty-one sages (Ṛṣis) of great vows (*mahāvrata*) are invoked by name: Kāśyapa, Gālava, Gārgya, Viśvāmitra, Manu, Dakṣa, Vasiṣṭha, Mārkaṇḍa, Pulaha, Kratu, Nārada, Bhṛgu, Ātreya, Bharadvāja, Aṅgiras, Vālmika, Kauśika, Kaṇva, Śākalya, Punarvasu and Śālaṅkāyana. Many of them are famous Vedic sages, although this particular list is not found elsewhere. Their wives, sons and daughters are invoked as well (156).

Next follow other classes of demigods: first, the Siddhas, Gandharvas, Apsarases and Garuḍas, all invoked as collective groups (157–158). These are all beings who have their natural abode in the sky. Next the text takes us to the underworld and from there it works its way up again to the level of the earth. First are listed the Daityas, who live in the nether region (Pātāla), as is indicated by the fact that they are said to be devoted to Haṭakeśvara, the name of Śiva in Pātāla. They are addressed by name and divided into three groups (159–164):⁸⁵

1. Namuci, Śaṅkukaṛṇa, Mahānāda
2. Mahājambha, Hayagrīva, Prahlāda, Tāraka, Agnimukha, Kālānemi, Mahotkaṭa
3. Virocana, Hiranyākṣa, Suparva, Sulomaka, Mucukunda, Sukunda, Revataka

As in the case of the sages, the demons' wives, daughters and sons are invoked as well (165).

The next section takes us to the eight serpent lords (Nāgarāja): Ananta, Vāsuki, Takṣaka, Karkoṭaka, Padma, Mahāpadma, Śaṅkhaṇḍa and Kulika (166–181). Each Nāgarāja is invoked in elaborate detail, with much attention paid to their individual iconography. Other Nāgas — in

the sun's transitions from one Rāśi to another, in accordance with the seven days of the week.

⁸⁵ These are not known as separate groups from other sources, but the order of names shows similarities to lists of demons dwelling in different layers of the Pātāla according to Purāṇic accounts. There these demons inhabit ever lower regions of the Pātāla. See n. 102 on p. 175.

the sky, in heaven, on earth, on mountains, in caves and forts and in the nether region — are also invoked, as well as the Nāgas' wives (182–184), daughters and sons. The Nāgas are addressed as being 'assembled here', another reminder of the ritual use of the mantra. Uniquely in the text, a *śrutiphala* concludes the section on the Nāgas (185).

Next we reach the earth, ground level so to say, with the invocation of the rivers. Seventeen rivers are mentioned by name, followed by an invocation of all rivers, flowing on earth, in heaven or in the sky. As in the case of the Daityas, the rivers are divided into three groups (186–192):

1. Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Narmadā, Gomatī, Kāverī, Varuṇā, Devikā
2. Candrabhāgā, Godāvarī, Sarayū, Gaṇḍakī, Kauśikī, Sarasvatī
3. Nairāñjanā, Śoṇa, Mandākinī, Saṃnihitā

The first group shows some overlap with the traditional group of seven rivers (*saptanadī*): Gaṅgā, Yamunā, Sindhu, Narmadā, Godāvarī, Kṛṣṇā and Kāverī.⁸⁶ The presence of the Varuṇā, a minor river flowing past Vārāṇasī, in this group is striking. Noteworthy about the last group is the mention of Nairāñjanā, a name otherwise attested only in Buddhist literature, and Saṃnihitā, a *tīrtha* (or river?) in Kurukṣetra.⁸⁷

Next are addressed the eight Yakṣa lords: Mahāvaiśravaṇa, Maṇibhadra, Suviroma, Pāñcika, Vibhāṇḍaka, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Pūrṇabhadra and Virūpākṣa (193–208). These are beings that are naturally associated with the earth as well. This group of eight Yakṣas is not known as a distinct set from other sources. Their invocations are rich in iconographical details. Other Yakṣas, on earth, on mountains, in caves and in forts, in the sky and in the nether region, as well as the Yakṣas' wives, sons and daughters, complete the list (209–213).

An invocation of the earth's mountains and its oceans follows (214–215). No individual mountains or oceans are mentioned.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Cf. Eck 2012: 168.

⁸⁷ See notes *ad loc.* There is some variation in the individual river names among the different manuscripts, while N_{58}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ and P_{32}^T add some more rivers. Moreover, N_{58}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T also invoke *tīrthas* and lakes.

⁸⁸ Several manuscripts, however, identify the seven mountains of the earth, add a list of the eight islands and give the names of the seven oceans. See n. 124 on p. 183.

The final group of invocations again introduces a new topic, creatures of terrifying character and appearance: Rākṣasas, Yoginīs, Bhūtas, Pretas, Piśācas and Grahas (216–234). Each group is depicted as the entourage of Śiva in his Bhairava aspect. This section stands out from the rest of the text in terms of its formulaic structure.

All these and other deities following the command of Śiva are once again requested to bestow peace to Śiva's devotees (235). A set of exclamations of victory to Śiva (236–242) follows. The chapter concludes with statements about the benefits of reciting and hearing the mantra (243–256).

All in all, the mantra is organised around Maheśvara, who is accompanied by his wife Umā and members of his inner circle, from which it expands to include an elaborate pantheon of gods and powers. One invocation naturally leads to another, as with the collective Mothers followed by the collective Gaṇas, or the constellation of the Seven Sages at the end of the astronomical section followed by other groups of sages. A general organising principle running throughout the mantra relates to divisions of space and time. The latter aspect is particularly noteworthy. The mantra integrates the astronomical and astrological lore of the period and puts it to use in a Śaiva religious setting. Additions made throughout the transmission of the text show that later copyists were concerned with adding powers they thought were missing, thus displaying a tendency towards completeness. These additions attest to the mantra's active use over time.

Iconographical Aspects

Given the importance of naming in ancient India (Gonda 1970), it is striking that the mantra does not engage with the different names of the gods. As a rule only one name is singled out as the main subject of address. By contrast, the invocations are remarkably rich in matters relating to iconography. The author of the mantra has endeavoured to call to mind and visually represent the various deities invoked. While it is not an iconographical text per se, there is much that should be of interest to students of Indian art history.⁸⁹ In several cases, the mantra provides us

⁸⁹ Available early textual sources on iconography are limited and much of the scholarship is based on post-twelfth century texts from South India (e.g. the highly influential

with the earliest known detailed description of the visual appearance of a deity. A few noteworthy features of the iconographies of the gods may be mentioned here. Further details are discussed in the notes accompanying the translation.

First of all, a clear distinction can be made between deities belonging to the inner circle and those who do not belong to Śiva's immediate entourage. As mentioned above, several members of the inner circle are qualified as being three-eyed (*trinayana*, *trinetra*). As close relatives of Śiva they share in the god's iconography. Thus, for example, Umā is strikingly said to bear the sickle of the moon (7b). These Śaiva marks do not apply to any of the other deities, with the unsurprising exception of the Mātṛ Rudrāṇī (36b) and the Dikpāla Īśāna (100c). All other deities are mainly characterised by an attitude of total devotion to Śiva.

The mantra pays particular attention to the skin and clothes of each deity, yielding important information on their colourful appearance, which is often lost in the surviving sculptures of the period. Their skin colours are treated in a systematic manner. For example, the appearance of the Dikpālas is presented as follows (99–101): Indra (gold), Agni (blazing charcoal), Yama (sapphire), Nirṛti (dark), Varuṇa (pearl), Vāyu (copper), Kubera (splendorous), Īśāna (pearl). A similar colour scheme, with some variations, is also applied to the corresponding Gaṇas of the different directions (56–75). The iconography of the Gaṇas of the directions, which is encountered hardly anywhere else, follows that of the guardians of the directions. Thus, the ones in Indra's direction hold thunderbolts in their hands, those in Agni's ladles, those in Yama's sticks, etc.

The mantra contains one of the earliest known textual descriptions of the Mātṛs (33–49). The formulations in this section suggest that the description of their bodily appearance may not have been based on existing sculptures, even though they were around at the time, but are rather modelled on the iconography of the corresponding male deities men-

work of Rao 1914–16). An important early source is *Brhatsaṃhitā* 58, on the installation of images. Frequently quoted in secondary literature are *Matsyapurāṇa* 93 and 249–261, *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* Khaṇḍa 3 and *Agnipurāṇa* 2.167, but the date of these passages is by no means certain and in any case later than the *Śivadharmasāstra*. A recent addition to the corpus of literature from North India are two chapters on iconography from the Śaiva *Devāmata*, edited with notes by Ślaczka (2016).

tioned earlier in the text. The wording in their invocations is clearly inspired by those of their male counterparts. It serves as a reminder that a textual description need not necessarily be related to a material form. Five of the Mātṛs have a male counterpart in the text (Brahmāṇī, Rudrāṇī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī and Aindrī), but the other three (Vārāhī, Cāmuṇḍā and Lamboṣṭhī) do not. So it stands to reason that their portrayals are more independent. Two features are noteworthy: the reversal of the usual order of Aindrī and Vārāhī, and the unique mention of an eighth goddess, Lamboṣṭhī. In appearance she resembles the South Indian goddess Jyeṣṭhā.⁹⁰

While the invocations of the deities are generally accompanied by iconographic descriptions, the text's treatment of cosmic powers is considerably less detailed. A distinction can be drawn between personified and non-personified powers. The astronomical part of the mantra is revealing in this respect. It begins with the Navagrahas. These include celestial bodies, but they form a well-established set of deities as well. As a consequence the mantra gives quite a bit of information on their bodily appearance and their attributes. The same is not the case for the astronomical powers that follow, including the Karaṇa Viṣṭi, the Tithis, Yogas, Nakṣatramātṛs, Rāśis and Ursa Major (*saptarṣi*). On the other hand, even here the text displays a tendency towards deification, as is illustrated by the unique naming of the Nakṣatras as Nakṣatramātṛs 'Lunar Mansion Mothers'.

Why is it that the mantra pays so much attention to the bodily appearance of the gods? It is quite conceivable that these descriptions were included to vocalise and call to manifestation the deities who were not present in the *śānti* ritual in a material form. The mantra may then have served as an aid for visualisation and manifestation.⁹¹

Universal Śaivism

After the invocations of the members of Śiva's inner circle there is a significant change in the form of address of the deities. From Brahmā onwards, each deity is invoked with an accompanying qualification

⁹⁰ For more on the text's treatment of the Mātṛs, see n. 34 on p. 154.

⁹¹ Compare in this connection the elaborate visualisations of the daily prayer to the enthroned Śiva in Aghoraśiva's twelfth-century *Pañcāvaraṇastava* (Goodall et al. 2005).

(*viśeṣaṇa*) that draws attention to the deity's devotion to Śiva. As the following inventory of such adjectives and other references to devotional attitudes illustrates, this is a key feature of the composition of the mantra:

- Śiva: *śivabhakta* (104c, 107c, 114c, 184c, 204a, 211a, 214c), *śive bhakta* (106c, 108c, 118c), *śivabhaktipara* (67c, 136a), *śivabhaktisamanvita* (80b), *śivabhaktisamutsuka* (89d), *śivārcanarata* (40a, 117c), *śivārcanapara* (14a, 147c, 156c), *śivapūjāpara* (119c, 198c), *śivapūjāparāyaṇa* (34b, 148d, 204b), *śivapūjāsamudyukta* (69c, 71c, 75c, 86c), *śivapūjāsamutsuka* (211b), *śivapūjārcane rata* (111d, 211d), *śivapūjājapodyukta* (83c), *śivadhyānaparāyaṇa* (31b), *śivadhyānaikatatpara* (14b), *śivadhyānaikaparama* (29a), *śivadhyānaikamānasa* (147d, 190d), *śivadhyānaikasampanna* (80a), *śivadhyānārcanodyukta* (155c), *śivadhyātṛ* (204a), *śivapādārcanarata* (150c), *śivapādārcane rata* (167b, 190b), *śivapādābjapūjaka* (179b), *śivaikāhitamānasa* (40b, 92b), *śivapraṇāmaparama* (80c), *śivasmaranabhāvita* (83d), *śivasadbhāvabhāvita* (29b, 162b, 187d), *śivaprasādasampanna* (31a, 152c, 204c), *śivadharmaparāyaṇa* (86b), *śivatejaḥsamāyukta* (126e), *śivājñānuvidhāyin* (132f, 136b, 151f, 235b), *śivacodita* (142d), *śivayogapara* (148f).
- Rudra: *rudrabhakta* (38a, 52a), *rudrabhaktiyuta* (206d), *rudrārcanapara* (105c, 192c), *rudrārcanarata* (38b, 57a, 89b), *rudrārcanasamāyukta* (206e), *rudrārcāhitamānasa* (52b), *rudrārcanaparodyukta* (196c), *rudrapūjāpara* (169b, 208c, 215c), *rudrapūjārcane rata* (220b), *rudrapraṇāmanas* (59c), *rudrapraṇāmanirata* (220a), *rudrapraṇāmaparama* (206c), *rudraparāyaṇa* (217d), *rudraikāhitacetaska* (61c, 220c), *rudraikāhitamānasa* (25b), *rudrapradhyānanirata* (63c), *rudrapādārcane sakta* (183b).
- Other names: *haraparāyaṇa* (181b), *harapādārcaka* (202c), *harapādārcane rata* (98b, 175b, 194b), *harapādanatottama* (194d), *haradhyānaikaparama* (194c), *harārcanapara* (200c), *mahādevārcane sakta* (136a), *mahādevānubhāvita* (136b), *maheśvarapara* (158a), *maheśapādapūjaka* (158b), *maheśārcana-*

bhāvita (122b), *parameśārcanarata* (65c), *parameśvarabhāvita* (95b), *īśānārcanatatpara* (115d), *paśupater nata* (177b).

- Special constructions: *arcayantī sadā śivam* (44b), *śivaṃ saṃpūjya yatnena* (67c), *arcayanti sadākālaṃ devaṃ tribhuvaneśvaram* (141cd), *īśānaṃ pūjayanty etāḥ sarvakālaṃ subhāvitāḥ* (145ab), *pūjayanti sadā śivam* (149d), *pūjayanti sadākālaṃ rudraṃ bhuvananāyakam* (151cd), *hātakeśvaradevasya nityaṃ pūjāparāyaṇaḥ* (160cd), *bhāvena paramēṇāśu yajante sarvadā śivam* (164ab), *sarvabhūtapatiṃ devaṃ parameśaṃ maheśvaram pūjayanti sadā nadyaḥ* (187ac).

The invocations display a model of Universal Śaivism, in which the power of all and everything ultimately rests upon Śiva, to whom all gods and powers are devoted as a consequence. This dependence of all cosmic power on Śiva can be considered the overall message of the mantra. The universe is, as it were, Śaivised. The hierarchical model expressed here perfectly mirrors that of early medieval Indian kingship, which involves many types of *sāmantas* all empowered by their loyalty and devotion to the supreme ruler. Sanderson (2009) has argued that this shared model may well have been one of the keys to the success of Śaivism and its popularity among early medieval rulers. It comes as no surprise to encounter it here in the context of a *śānti* invocation that would have played an important role in ritual kingship. On the other hand, the model was certainly not restricted to Śaivism alone, for other religious traditions of the time likewise sought to integrate all cosmic order under the rule of one god or divine principle.⁹²

⁹² Probably the most famous example is the *Bhagavadgītā*, whose theology of Kṛṣṇa, integrating a polytheistic understanding of the world in a monotheistic model, has been designated by Malinar as a form of ‘cosmological monotheism’ (Malinar 2007: 237–241). As Schreiner has argued, the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* may likewise be read as a theological document that brings all divine and cosmic order under the rule of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa (Schreiner 2013: 621–650). For further examples, see Bisschop forthc. a. The same attitude is also clearly manifested in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*’s adaptation of the mantra, in which all references to Śiva *bhakti* have been systematically replaced by references to Sūrya *bhakti*.

Use of the Mantra

The *Śāntyadhyāya* belongs to an extensive body of liturgical literature dedicated to the appeasement or pacification (*śānti*) of all cosmic power to secure the welfare of the kingdom. Within the Vedic tradition, *śānti* rites were particularly associated with the *Atharvaveda*, which is where we find some of the earliest elaborate *śānti* mantras.⁹³ Another tradition that has played a key role in the development of the Brahmanical model of *śānti* is the astronomical-astrological lore of *Jyotiḥśāstra*. The inclusion of the *Śāntyadhyāya* in the Śivadharmas is indicative of the Śaivas' engagement with the roles of the Atharvavedic *purohita* and the court astrologer.⁹⁴

In style and composition the *Śāntyadhyāya* invites comparison to two Brahmanical texts: *Brhatsaṃhitā* 47 and *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* 2.22.⁹⁵ The first concerns a mantra that forms part of the so-called 'bath of prosperity' (*puṣyasnāna*), a rite of kingship, while the second is to be recited at the 'royal consecration' (*rājyābhiṣeka*).⁹⁶ The *Viṣṇudharmottara* prescribes a lengthy mantra of 185 verses for the last consecratory act of the *rājyābhiṣeka*, requesting all deities and powers to consecrate the king. Starting with Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, the mantra addresses a host of powers, ranging from the four Pāñcarātra *vyūhas* (Vāsudeva,

⁹³ Cf., e.g., *Atharvaveda Śaunakasaṃhitā* 19.9. For studies on the historical formation and development of *śānti*, see Hoens 1951; Kane 1930–62, V.2: 719–814; Geslani 2012. See also the *Śāntikāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara's voluminous *Kṛtyakalpataru*.

⁹⁴ On this subject, see Sanderson 2004.

⁹⁵ ViDhP 2.22 has a parallel in AgnP 2.167.

⁹⁶ Both mantras have been the subject of a recent study by Geslani (2012) on the incorporation of *śānti* rites in the formation of the Purāṇic *abhiṣeka*. Geslani argues that the form of the royal consecration (*rājyābhiṣeka*) found in the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* originated from Atharvavedic ritual manuals such as the *Śāntikalpa* and the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa*. This concerns in particular the introduction of a *śānti* rite at the start of the ritual, the so-called *aindrī śānti*. The *aindrī mahāśānti* described in the *Śāntikalpa* forms one of 30 variants of *mahāśānti* rites meant to appease potential powers and ward off dangers in various situations. It was particularly suited to the concerns of kingship. Ritually prepared waters (*śāntiyudaka*), already mentioned in earlier Atharvan texts such as the *Kauśikasūtra*, empowered by specific groups of mantras (*mantra-gaṇa*), play a central role in this appeasement rite. The five sets of mantras prescribed (*śarmavarman*, *aparājita*, *āyusya*, *abhaya*, *svastyayana*: 5.3.5) are the very same sets of mantras employed by ViDhP 2.19.4–5 during what ViDhP 2.19.1 calls the *paurandārī śānti* (Geslani 2012: 337).

Samkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha) to various sets of deities and sages, as well as astrological conjunctions, abstract principles, texts, places of pilgrimage and rivers. *Brhatsaṃhitā* 47.54cd–60ab includes a much smaller mantra to be recited at the king's *puṣyasnāna*. The invocation is uttered by the king's *purohita* and also commences with Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, before moving on to the Sādhyas, Maruts and other deities, and includes astronomical principles such as the Nakṣatras and the Muhūrtas, as well as other units of time. The two mantras are clearly related and provide a powerful conclusion to the ritual. By comparison, the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*'s mantra appears to be an extended version of the mantra taught by Varāhamihira in the *Brhatsaṃhitā*. Noteworthy is the inclusion of the four Pāñcarātra *vyūhas*, following the invocation of the Hindu trinity of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. This is in line with the Pāñcarātra background of the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*.⁹⁷

In addition to these two Brahmanical sources, the composition of the mantra also shares many features with the strings of spells and incantations that one may find in the Buddhist Dhāraṇī literature.⁹⁸ A particularly striking case is offered by the *Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī*. According to the introductory narrative of this 'Great Peahen' spell, the *Mahāmāyūrī* was given by the Buddha to Ananda to provide help for a monk suffering from a snakebite. The spell was used for a range of protective purposes and was highly popular across Asia for many centuries. Six early Chinese translations of the text exist, ranging from the fourth to the eighth century.⁹⁹ The spell includes long strings of invocations to a host of classes of deities and powers, in which each deity is individually mentioned by name. Some of these lists, such as the well-known catalogue of Yakṣas, are very extensive.¹⁰⁰ Certain sections of the spell display remarkable correspondences with parts of the *Śāntyadihyāya*. Particularly striking are the invocations to the Nakṣatras, which, as in the *Śāntyadihyāya*, are listed in four groups of

⁹⁷ On the VDhP's Pāñcarātra ideology, see Inden 2000.

⁹⁸ See Hidas 2015, for an introductory survey of Dhāraṇī Sūtras.

⁹⁹ See DesJardins 2002, for an integrated study of the *Mahāmāyūrī*. On the changes and expansion of the text reflected in the different Chinese translations, see Sørensen 2006 and Overbey 2016. I refer here only to the Sanskrit text.

¹⁰⁰ For the catalogue of Yakṣas, see Lévi 1915 and Sircar 1971/72.

seven in accordance with the four directions where they are located.¹⁰¹ A comprehensive study of these correspondences falls outside the scope of the present study, but they do show that we are dealing with a shared phenomenon that extends across religious boundaries.

While the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara* both include the *śānti* mantra in royal consecration rites, the *Śāntyadhyāya*'s scope and appeal is much broader and in this sense somewhat more akin to that of the Dhāraṇī literature. As stated in the concluding section of the text, the mantra is meant to ward off dangers in general and bring about welfare to the land and the people. Whereas the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* repeatedly refer to the *abhiṣeka* of the king with the refrain *ete tvām abhiṣiṅcantu* 'may these consecrate you', the *Śāntyadhyāya*'s refrain has a first-person subject: *śāntiṃ kurvantu me sadā* 'may they always bestow peace on me'.¹⁰² Furthermore, the text makes no reference to an *abhiṣeka* nor hints at the involvement of a priest. The concluding verses of the *Śāntyadhyāya* rather state the fruits of recitation of the mantra in very general terms:

One aiming for a girl acquires a girl, one aiming for victory acquires victory, one aiming for wealth obtains wealth, one aiming for sons obtains many sons, one aiming for knowledge acquires knowledge, one aiming for union obtains union. (244)

Results relating to the success of the kingdom are, however, also mentioned:

A man who should enter battle, having heard this auspicious chapter, will conquer his enemies in battle and be honoured with fortunes. (246)

He enjoys [his kingdom] for an undecaying time, with his orders not rejected. He is not overpowered by diseases and thrives with sons and grandsons. (247)

¹⁰¹ To give one example, the invocation of the seven Nakṣatras in the east runs as follows: *kṛttikā rohiṇī caiva mṛgaśīrārdṛā punarvasuḥ | puṣyo maṅgalasaṃpanno 'śleṣā bavati saptamī || ity ete saptanakṣatrāḥ pūrvadvārikāsthitaḥ ye pūrvām diśaṃ rakṣanti paripālayanti, te 'py anayā mahāmāyūryā vidyārājñyā svāter bhikṣor mama sarvasatvānāṃ ca rakṣaṃ kurvantu, guptiṃ paritrāṇaṃ parigrahaṃ paripālanaṃ śāntiṃ svastyayanaṃ daṇḍaparihāraṃ śastraparihāraṃ viśadūṣaṇaṃ viśanāśanaṃ sīmābandhaṃ dharaṇibandhaṃ ca kurvantu, jīvatu varṣaśataṃ paśyatu śaradaśataṃ* (*Mahāmāyūrvidyārājñī*, pp. 50–51). This listing of the Nakṣatras invites comparison to that of the Nakṣatramātr̥s in the east in ŚiDhŚ 6.137–139.

¹⁰² There are several variations on this phrase throughout the text.

While these verses indicate that the mantra was not meant for royal purposes alone, chapter 2 of the *Śivadharmottara* provides important evidence that it did acquire a prominent place in the Śivadharmas's conception of royal ritual. This chapter describes an elaborate ritual called 'the gift of knowledge' (*vidyādāna*).¹⁰³ The 'gift of knowledge' first of all concerns the teacher's instruction of the Śaiva religion to lay devotees of Śiva, but most importantly it refers to the ritual donation of a manuscript to a Śaiva guru along with the support for its recitation. The chapter gives a fascinating account of how to copy a manuscript, a sort of Sanskrit philology *avant la lettre*, in which one is allowed to make corrections on the spot if one sees fit to do so, and describes a lengthy ritual in which the donor is a king who has the copied manuscript paraded through the royal capital before finally handing it over to the Śaiva guru at the temple of Śiva (ŚiDhU 2.59–60). The scene that follows is relevant to putting the *Śāntyadihyāya*'s mantra into context:

To secure pacification (*śāntyartham*) for the cows, brahmins, the kings and the towns in the kingdom, the most excellent reciter should recite one chapter [from the book].

The best reciter of books is proficient with the characteristics of metre, a true poet, has a sweet voice, is a knower of the art of the Gandharvas and clever.

Rising up the guru should then sprinkle the king a little with appeasement water (*śāntitoya*) on the head and then also the people present there.¹⁰⁴

There can be little doubt that the manuscript from which a chapter should be read is in fact a copy of the Śivadharmas and that it is the *Śāntyadihyāya* that should be recited on this occasion.¹⁰⁵ The ritual

¹⁰³ This chapter of the *Śivadharmottara* has been the subject of an extensive study, accompanied by a critical edition and translation, by Florinda De Simini in the context of her PhD dissertation on the subject of *vidyādāna* (De Simini 2013). Citations of the text are from her edition. See also De Simini 2016b.

¹⁰⁴ ŚiDhU 2.61–63: *śāntyartham ekam adhyāyaṃ gobrahmaṇamahibhṛtām | rāṣṭriyanagarāṇām ca vācayed vācakottamaḥ || chandolakṣaṇatattvajñaḥ satkavir madhurasvaraḥ | gāndharvavid vidagdhaś ca śreṣṭhaḥ pustakavācakaḥ || śāntitoyena rājānaṃ samutthāya gurus tataḥ | śirasy abhyukṣayed iṣat tatrasthaṃ ca janāṃ tataḥ ||*

¹⁰⁵ The Śivadharmas here may have included both the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*. See also De Simini (2016b: 204–205), who, however, keeps open 'the possibility that the text of the donated manuscript and the one recited during the procedures for appeasement may or may not be the same'.

described does not appear to be a *rājābhīṣeka* as such, but is a more general pacification rite meant for the entire population of the kingdom headed by the king. Central to the ritual is a book, a copy of the Śivadharmā, handed over to the Śaiva guru. In this way, the welfare and success of the kingdom came to be grounded in the king's donation of a copy of a Śaiva scripture to the Śaiva guru.

Aside from specifications in the text itself, we may also acquire information about the mantra's actual use from epigraphic records. Most important is the previously mentioned Kannada inscription from Tālagunda, which provides detailed procedures for the recitation of the *Śāntyadihyāya*:

From month to month, on the eighth and fourteenth lunar days, on the new- and full-moon days and on the festive days (*parvan*) that are called the *Vyatipātayoga* and the *Sanikramaṇa* [conjunctions], after performing the constant and occasional worships, the teachers of the *śāstras*, having recited the *Śāntyadihyāya*, the sixth [chapter] of the *Śivadharmā*, in due succession, having made *maṇḍalas* on the eight sides of the god, by means of the *mantra* from this [text] placing the offering of food, will be blessing the king who rules the country, [addressing a benediction] to the cows, the Brahmins, and to the sponsor of the rite. And during the year [in] the *mahāparvans*, which are the two equinox days, the two solstices, on the day of the eclipses of moon or sun, on the full-moon days of Āṣāḍha, Kārttika, Māgha, and Vaiśākha; thanks to the merits of worship on each of these days, the fruit of six months will be bestowed. In these *parvans*, having erected thousands of platforms to the god, having performed the proclamation of a meritorious day, the inhabitants of the schools (*śāstrakhaṇḍikas*), having, by means of colours, drawn three *maṇḍalas* called the *vidyāmaṇḍala*, the *gurumaṇḍala* and the *śiva-maṇḍala*, having revered them, they will be reciting the *Śāntyadihyāya*.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ Translation De Simini 2016b: 196. EC 7, Skt 185, ll. 69–74: *tiṅgaḷ diṅgaḷoḷ 2 daṣṭami 2 caturddasīyamāvāsye pārnamāsye vyatipātasamkramaṇav emba parbbam-gaḷalu nityanaimittikapūjeyam mādi śāstradupādhyāyaru śivavarmmadāreneya śānt-yādhyāyamṇ japamgeydalli hēḷda kramadiṇ dēvareṇṭudikkinoḷ maṇḍalavam mādiy alliya mantradiṇ baliyan ikki deśava aḷva kṣatriyanumaṇ gōbrāhmaṇarumaṇ ya-jamānanumaṇ harasivaru mattam varṣadoḷage baha mahāparvamaṅgaḷ 2 ḍayana 2 viśu sōmasūryyagrahaṇav āśāḍakārttikamāghavaiśākhada puṇṇnamigaḷal oṇḍom-dudivasada pūjey āṇṇrutimṅgaḷa phalaman iḡuv āparbbamgaḷoḷ dēvargge sahasra-gaḍḍugeyam prāraṁbhasi puṇṇyāhavācaneyam mādi śāstrakhaṇḍikadavaru raṁ-gadoḷ vidyāmaṇḍaḷagurumaṇḍaḷaśivamaṇḍaḷav emba maṇḍaḷatrayaman uddha-*

De Simini (2016b: 196–197) has shown that the inscription includes many references to technical terminology relating to the *vidyādāna* as described in the *Śivadharmottara*. It attests to that text's spread in medieval Karnataka. The inscription indeed takes up several aspects of this chapter, but it is also worth noting that recitation of the mantra is not restricted to one particular moment in time, viz. the moment of donation of the manuscript, but that it was to be recited on a range of powerful days on the ritual calendar. The inscription thus attests to the use of the mantra in a variety of ritual settings across history. Indeed, as late as 1676–77 CE (Nepal Saṃvat 796) we come across a reference to the public recitation of the *Śāntyadihyāya* in a document from Nepal recording the events of the year (Regmi 1966: 322).

The use of the text for recitational purposes is also evinced by the existence of various manuscripts of the *Śāntyadihyāya* as single texts or in bundles with other texts (see Appendix I). One of the manuscripts (NGMPP, A 1174/14), a bundle of Stotras and Stavas, reports for example its recitation together with the *Devīmāhātmya*. Another manuscript (NGMPP, A 1158/8 = N₅₈^K) transmits the *Śāntyadihyāya* along with the *Sāttvatabādhaprasāmana*, a prayer from the *Viṣṇudharma* against afflictions, while another (NGMPP, I 54/4) starts with a *nyāsa* and introduces the text with the words 'now the mantra to say next'.

Finally, the *Śivadharmavivaraṇa* (see Appendix II) provides a few small hints as well. The start of the commentary states that the *Śāntyadihyāya* is meant to ward off obstacles (*antarāya*) that may present themselves to the worshipper. The concluding statement of the commentary indicates that it formed part of the 'daily worship' (*nityapūjā*) of the Śiva devotee. This attests to its broader use on a daily basis.

Introduction to the Edition

The manuscript situation of the Śivadharmā is complex and editing the text presents a major challenge. At the moment of writing, a total of more than 80 manuscripts of texts belonging to the Śivadharmā have been identified, but this number may easily be expanded as more work

risiṣy arccisi śāntyadihyāyamam japisiwaru vēdakhaṇḍikada nālvaruṇ 4 praśasta kaḷaśaṃga.

is being done on the dissemination of the text.¹⁰⁷

To avoid confusion among different scholars working on individual parts of the corpus and in order to allow for the addition of more manuscripts in future editions of texts belonging to the Śivadharmā corpus, a standardised way of referencing the manuscripts is required. In the present edition I have therefore adopted a set of principles for forming the sigla, which may be followed by current and future editors of the corpus:¹⁰⁸

1. The first element is a capital letter, which stands for the script used, e.g. B = Bengali, D = Devanāgarī, G = Grantha, M = Malayalam, N = Newari, Ś = Śāradā, T = Telugu. The only exception concerns the paper transcripts from Pondicherry. In order not to confuse these with the Devanāgarī manuscripts proper, capital P = Pondicherry is used as first element. To refer to an earlier edition of the text we use capital E = Edition.
2. The second element is a superscripted capital letter in italics, referring to the place where the manuscript is currently located. Thus: C = Cambridge, K = Kathmandu, L = Leiden, O = Oxford, S = Srinagar, V = Varanasi. To avoid possible confusion with other places that begin with the same letter, two places are referred to by two letters: Ch = Chennai, Ko = Kolkata. The Pondicherry transcripts again form an exception: T = transcript. For the edition of Naraharinātha we use N = Naraharinātha.
3. The third element is a subscripted two-digit number (except in the case of the Pondicherry transcripts, where we allow for three digits). This refers to the last two digits of the manuscript's reference number in the library collection where it is located, e.g. 67 = Srinagar 1467, 99 = Cambridge Add. 1599. Because the NGMPP

¹⁰⁷ For a detailed survey of the transmission of Śivadharmā corpus manuscripts in Nepal, see De Simini 2016a. A separate survey of *Śivadharmāśāstra* and *Śivadharmottara* manuscripts in South India is under preparation by Marco Franceschini. A first survey was presented by him at the Śivadharmā workshop held at Leiden University, 26–30 September 2016: 'The transmission of the Śivadharmā in Tamil Nadu'.

¹⁰⁸ This set of principles is the outcome of a meeting between Florinda De Simini, Dominic Goodall, Nirajan Kafle, Nina Mirnig and myself at the Śivadharmā Workshop held at Leiden University, 26–30 September 2016.

reel numbers will often be more familiar to scholars working with these manuscripts, we rather refer to the last two digits of the first part of the reel number in the case of these manuscripts, e.g. 82 = A1082/3.

The objectives of the present edition of the *Śāntyadhyāya* are modest. It aims to give the reader an insight into the transmission of the *Śāntyadhyāya* across space and time, without, however, striving for completeness or claiming to reconstruct an underlying original text. Our present understanding of the composition and transmission of the *Śivadharmasāstra* is still in its infancy and the lines of transmission are exceptionally complex.¹⁰⁹ In the notes accompanying the translation, attention is drawn to potentially significant variants, omissions, revisions and additions. General principles of selection are discussed in the sections on the transmission in Nepal, Bengal, Kashmir and South India.

The selection of sources has been guided by a combination of practical and scientific concerns. Given the large number of early palm-leaf manuscripts surviving from Nepal, each one of them hundreds of years older than any of those from the rest of the subcontinent, preference has been given to these manuscripts, both in terms of the selection of manuscripts and in the constitution of the text. From among the available Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts, I have selected five manuscripts that seemed to offer the most potential.¹¹⁰ These comprise the oldest surviving manuscript to include the *Śāntyadhyāya*, three eleventh- to twelfth-century *Śivadharmasāstra* corpus manuscripts and a Malla-period manuscript in which the *Śāntyadhyāya* has been included in a bundle with portions from other texts. From the rest of the subcontinent, I have included the readings of a seventeenth-century paper manuscript in old Bengali script, a paper manuscript in Śāradā script and two paper transcripts from Pondicherry. Finally, I have also reported the readings of the editio princeps by Naraharinātha.¹¹¹ A list of sources and the sigla

¹⁰⁹ See De Simini 2017, for an attempt to classify the manuscripts into groups and families, primarily on the basis of the transmission of *Śivadharmasāstra* 12; she highlights the presence of horizontal contamination in the transmission of different parts of the text, making the reconstruction of a stemma inherently problematic.

¹¹⁰ De Simini 2016a provides a detailed survey of the *Śivadharmasāstra* manuscripts from Nepal.

¹¹¹ There exists another, more recent edition of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, published

used in the edition is given below.

Sources for the Edition

N_{77}^{Ko} Asiatic Society, Kolkata, G 4077. Palm leaf, Newari script, dated [Nepāla] Saṃvat 156 (1035–36 CE).

Contains: *Śivadharmasāstra* (47 fols.); *Śivadharmottara* (65 fols.); *Śivadharmasaṃgraha* (58 fols.); *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* (35 fols.); *Śivopaniṣad* (22 fols.); *Umottara* or *Uttarottaratantra* (fols. 23–42, 46–49); *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha* (52 fols.); *Lalitavistara* (30 fols., fol. 28–38).¹¹²

Śāntyadhyāya covers fols. 12b–22b in Roman numbering (images 17–25).¹¹³

N_{45}^C University Library of Cambridge, Add. 1645, 247 folios. Palm leaf, Newari script, dated [Nepāla] Saṃvat 259 (1139–40 CE).¹¹⁴

Contains: *Śivadharmasāstra* (fols. 1r–38r); *Śivadharmottara* (fols. 38r–87r); *Śivadharmasaṃgraha* (fols. 87r–132r); *Śivopaniṣad* (fols. 132r–150v); *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* (fols. 150v–180v); *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda* (fols. 180v–201v); *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha* (fols. 201v–238v); *Dharmaputrikā* (fols. 238v–247r).

Śāntyadhyāya covers fols. 12r–19r (images 25–39).

N_{82}^K National Archives, Kathmandu, 3/393, 274 folios. Microfilmed by

under the name of *Śivadharmapurāṇa* in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series: Jugnu & Sharma 2014. The readings of this publication show remarkable similarity to the readings of P_{32}^T . The preface of the edition mentions, however, that it was based on a manuscript from Adyar (Jugnu & Sharma 2014, ix), while P_{32}^T was copied from a manuscript in Kilvelur. I have not reported its readings.

¹¹² Following the description in Shastri 1928: 718–723.

¹¹³ The first folio is displaced in the images. The first three syllables, *nandike-*, are on image 18a, from which the text continues on image 17b (with the first syllables covered by another folio). From there the text continues to 18b. One folio is lost in between folios 16b and 17a (image 19).

¹¹⁴ Available online: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01645/1>. For a transcription of the colophon on folios 247r–247v, see the online record: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01645/496>

the NGMPP, A 1082/3.¹¹⁵ Palm leaf, Newari script, dated [Nepāla] Saṃvat 189 (1069 CE).¹¹⁶

Contains: *Śivadharmasāstra* (fols. 1v–41r); *Śivadharmottara* (fols. 1v–52v); *Śivadharmasaṃgraha* (fols. 1v–57v); *Umā-maheśvarasaṃvāda* (fols. 1v–32v); *Śivopaniṣad* (fols. 1v–19r); *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha* (fols. 1v–46r); *Dharmaputrikā* (fols. 1v–12r); *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda* (fols. 1v–24r).

Śāntyadhyāya covers fols. 23v–27v (images 14–29).

N₁₂^K National Archives, Kathmandu, 5/841, 142 folios. Microfilmed by the NGMPP, B12/4. Palm leaf, Newari script, apograph(?) dated by another hand: [Nepāla] Saṃvat 315 (1194–95 CE).¹¹⁷

Contains: *Śivadharmasāstra* (fols. 1v–47r); *Śivadharmottara* (fols. 48v–109v); *Śivadharmasaṃgraha* (fols. 110r–150v*). Incomplete.

Śāntyadhyāya covers fols. 14v–24r (images 2867–2875). One folio is missing, covering the text from *muniḥ* in 154b to *nadyaḥ* in 187c.

N₅₈^K National Archives, Kathmandu, 1/1376, 28 folios. Microfilmed by the NGMPP, A 1158/8. Palm leaf, Newari script, dated Bhādrapada [Nepāla] Saṃvat 522 (August–September, 1402 CE).

Contains: *Śāntyadhyāya* (fols. 1v–20v); *Sattvabādhāpraśamana* (fols. 1r–5v in letter numerals).

For more details, see p. 191 below.

¹¹⁵ Thanks to Florinda De Simini, I have been able to work on the basis of high quality colour photographs of this manuscript.

¹¹⁶ The date is recorded on the final colophon of the *Dharmaputrikā* (12r): *navottarāśītiyute śate bde āśāḍhaśuklasya tithau tṛtiye | śrīśaṅkarākhye jayati kṣi-tendre śrīyaṅgalasayottaraṭollake yaḥ | dharmāśayaḥ satkulalabdhajanmā guṇapriyo rāghavasūhanāmā | jñānaprakāśaṃ śivadharmasāstraṃ śubhapraṭiṣṭhaṃ kṛtavān samagraṃ | karttur etena puṇyena bhūyāl lakṣmīr anuttarā | trailokyapūjitaṃ śaivaṃ vākyam jayati sarvadā |*. The first verse is an *upajāti*, the second *anuṣṭubh*. See also Pettech 1984: 46: ‘Written at Kathmandu, of which Yaṅgala was the southern section, corresponding to the Dakṣiṇakoligrāma of Licchavi times. The date corresponds to May 24th, 1069.’

¹¹⁷ Cf. De Simini 2016a: 230, n. 57, with reference to the date given on folio 47v: *saṃvat 315 anyādr̥ṣṭapustake saṃvatsarapramāṇaṃ dṛṣṭvā likhitaṃ ||*; ‘year 315. Having seen [this] date (lit. ‘year measurement’) in another examined manuscript, [it] was copied [here].’

B^C₉₉ University Library of Cambridge, Add. 1599, 80 folios. Paper, Bengali script, dated Śāka Saṃvat 1604 (1682 CE).¹¹⁸

Contains: *Śivadharmasāstra* (fols. 1v–37v); *Śivadharmottara* (fols. 1r–43v).

Śāntiyadhyāya covers fols. 12v–18v (images 26–38).

Ś^S₆₇ Oriental Research Library, Srinagar, 1467, 38 folios. Paper, Śāradā script. *Śivadharmasāstra*, but the text is named *Śivadharmacarita*.

Śāntiyadhyāya covers fols. 12r–19v (images 12–20).

P^T₃₂ Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), T 32, 156 folios. Devanāgarī paper transcript of a manuscript belonging to Kīvalūr. *Śivadharmasāstra*.¹¹⁹

Śāntiyadhyāya covers fols. 48–76.

P^T₇₂ Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), T 72b, 155 folios. Devanāgarī paper transcript of manuscript 75425, written in Grantha script, belonging to the Adyar Library, Chennai. *Śivadharmasāstra*, although the text is ascribed to the *Śivadharmottara*.¹²⁰

Śāntiyadhyāya covers fols. 50–76.

E^N Yogī Naraharinātha, *Śivadharmasāsupatimatam Śivadharmamahāśāstram Paśupatināthadarśanam*, Kathmandu, Saṃvat 2055 (1998 CE).

Śāntiyadhyāya covers pages 27–44.

The Transmission in Nepal

N^{Ko}₇₇ is the oldest manuscript available for the *Śāntiyadhyāya* and, if only for this reason, deserves special attention.¹²¹ The manuscript belongs

¹¹⁸ Available online: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01599/1>.

¹¹⁹ Available online: http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/IFP/transcripts_data/T0032/PDF/T0032.pdf.

¹²⁰ Available online: http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/IFP/transcripts_data/T0072/PDF/T0072.pdf.

¹²¹ As mentioned above, there exists an earlier Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of the *Śivadharmasāstra* (NGMPP A 1028/4), which may be dated to the end of the tenth or early

to the collection of the Asiatic Society of Kolkata and is dated 1035–36 CE, in the colophon of the *Lalitavistara*, the last text included in this codex. N_{77}^{Ko} has several unique features that set it apart from all the other manuscripts used.¹²² Most striking is the last of the eight texts in the bundle. In contrast to the rest of the Nepalese tradition, the text included here is not the *Dharmaputrikā*, but a longer work named *Lalitavistara*, not to be confused with the Buddhist text of the same name.¹²³ Compared to the main text constituted in the edition, it has two striking and unique omissions, both in the astronomical section: it lacks the invocation of Ketu in the Navagraha section (120–121) and it omits a lengthy section on Viṣṭi, the Tithis and the Yogas (123–136).¹²⁴ These omissions may well point to an earlier stage of transmission of the text, but it is difficult to assess in the absence of further manuscript evidence. The possible implications for the dating of the *Śāntyadhyāya* have been discussed above (p. 17). N_{77}^{Ko} has five additional omissions shared with some of the manuscripts: 14ab (with N_{45}^C , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{72}^T), 32bc (with N_{45}^C , N_{12}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T), 142ab (with N_{12}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T), 210ab (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T) and 242ad (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{72}^T). Some of these may be due to eye-skip, but their wide spread suggests that they would already have taken place early in the transmission of the text because these omissions are shared by manuscripts from different parts of the Indian subcontinent. They are in remarkable agreement with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T , all manuscripts that are not from Nepal. N_{77}^{Ko} has two small additions shared with some of the other manuscripts: two pādas after 206b (absent only in N_{82}^K and B_{99}^C) and two pādas after 217d (with E^N , P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T). On the level of individual readings, the picture is somewhat similar. There are striking parallels with P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T , and to a lesser extent with N_{45}^C and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$. Lastly it should be observed that N_{77}^{Ko} has many trivial errors, such as lengthening of -a, dropping of *anusvāra* and *visarga* and dropping of syllables, as well as other bad readings of its own. The text is not transmitted in good shape.

N_{45}^C is one of several Śivadharmas manuscripts in the collection of the University Library of Cambridge. It is a complete Nepalese palm-leaf

eleventh century, but it is incomplete and lacks most of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, including the *Śāntyadhyāya*.

¹²² See also De Simini 2017: 521–522.

¹²³ On the Śivadharmas' *Lalitavistara*, see De Simini & Mirnig 2017.

¹²⁴ The latter section is lacking in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* parallel as well.

manuscript, containing all eight texts traditionally associated with the Śivadharmā in the Nepalese tradition. The manuscript is dated 1139–40 CE, in the colophon of the *Dharmaputrikā*. Although it may be an old manuscript, the text shows many scribal errors. Of all the manuscripts used, N_{45}^C contains the most trivial errors, as a quick glance at the apparatus reveals.¹²⁵ Its position in the transmission of the text is not easy to identify. Together with the four other early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts used (N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{82}^K , N_{12}^K , N_{58}^K) it lacks the significant addition after 27d discussed below. However, along with the non-Nepalese manuscripts used ($\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T) it lacks the two verses on the goddess Lamboṣṭhī (48–49).¹²⁶ The manuscript has a few accidental omissions as well: 9b–10d; 14ab (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ and P_{72}^T); 86ab; 240ad; 244ef (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$). There are also several additions. It adds a significant passage of 14 pādas after 213d, which is only partly shared in content, but not in wording, with N_{58}^K (18 pādas), B_{99}^C (22 pādas by a later hand), E^N (4 and 14 pādas) and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ (18 pādas). After 238d it adds four pādas that are uniquely shared with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$. It also has a number of additions of its own: two pādas after 132b; two pādas after 132d; eight pādas after 136d; two pādas after 147d; two pādas after 149b; two pādas after 151d; six pādas after 153d. The large number of unique additions indicates that, although N_{45}^C may be an early manuscript, it does not transmit a securely established early version of the text. On the level of individual readings, it is striking that a number of variants are shared with P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T , but also, in other cases, with N_{77}^{Ko} and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$.

N_{82}^K , a manuscript from the National Archives Kathmandu dated 1069 CE, is the second oldest manuscript used for this edition. It preserves a very good state of the text and it has been used as the principal source for the constitution of the text. Like N_{45}^C it contains all eight texts of the Śivadharmā corpus. The manuscript is written in a very good hand with few scribal errors. It does not have any unique additions. The same holds true for N_{12}^K , another very good early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript from the National Archives in Kathmandu, containing

¹²⁵ I have tried to report the text of the manuscript as precisely as possible, but it should be noted that N_{45}^C does not always distinguish between *śa*, *sa* and *ṣa*, nor between *ṇa* and *na*.

¹²⁶ The special case of B_{99}^C will be discussed below. Unfortunately, because of the loss of a folio, N_{77}^{Ko} is not available for this part of the text.

all eight works belonging to the corpus. N_{12}^K is dated towards the end of the twelfth century (1194–95 CE). N_{82}^K and N_{12}^K have many readings in common, although both have readings of their own as well.¹²⁷ In general the readings of N_{82}^K are closer to those of E^N , which appears to be a transcription of another Nepalese manuscript. The text of N_{82}^K is remarkably close to B_{99}^C . A passage for which the manuscript support is limited is 32bc, two pādas that are only found in B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K , N_{58}^K and E^N . It is quite possible that these two pādas were dropped at an early stage of the transmission of the text due to eye-skip. Another crucial passage is 120–121, the invocation to Ketu: these eight pādas are found in N_{82}^K and supported by N_{45}^C , N_{58}^K , B_{99}^C and E^N . Instead of this, N_{12}^K has four different pādas that are partly shared with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T . Significantly, these are precisely the two pādas missing in N_{77}^{Ko} , as discussed above. Could this indicate the introduction of Ketu at the end of the Navagraha list at two independent moments in time? The omission of 142ab in N_{12}^K , shared with N_{77}^{Ko} , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T , suggests some shared stage of transmission of the text of these manuscripts. N_{12}^K has one unique omission: 209d–210a. A significant passage for assessing the position of N_{82}^K is the addition of two pādas after 206b in all manuscripts except for B_{99}^C and N_{82}^K . It provides important evidence for their close relation and their unique status vis-à-vis the other manuscripts.

N_{58}^K , a manuscript from the National Archives Kathmandu dated 1402 CE, takes up a special place in the edition, for it is the only one that contains the text of the *Śāntyadihyāya* isolated from the rest of the Śi-vadharma. As such it provides important evidence for the independent transmission of the *Śāntyadihyāya*. Being dated more than 200 years after the other Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts used, it also attests to a more developed form of the text. It has only two omissions within the main text: 103ad (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$) and 125. The latter omission is preceded by a six-pāda verse (124) that forms a complete rewriting of the four-pāda verse found in the rest of the manuscripts. The manuscript contains the following passages for which it has already been shown that support of the manuscripts is comparatively limited: 14ab (with N_{82}^K , N_{12}^K , E^N , B_{99}^C);

¹²⁷ De Simini 2017 reaches a very different conclusion regarding the position of N_{12}^K in the transmission of ŚiDhŚ 12. In her analysis, ‘this manuscript stands out as an exception among the Nepalese tradition’ (p. 516). This is not corroborated by the evidence of ŚiDhŚ 6.

32bc (with N_{82}^K , B_{99}^C , E^N); 48–49 (with N_{82}^K , N_{12}^K , E^N , B_{99}^C); 142ab (with N_{45}^C , N_{82}^K , E^N , B_{99}^C); 242ad (with N_{45}^C , N_{82}^K , N_{12}^K , B_{99}^C , E^N). The manuscript has a large number of additions, including a number of unique ones: two pādas after 13b; 34 pādas after 32d (partly shared with E^N and $\acute{S}_{67}^S$); two pādas after 47a (partly shared with P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); two pādas after 76d; two pādas after 101b; two pādas after 102d; 20 pādas after 104d (with $\acute{S}_{67}^S$); two pādas after 110d; two pādas after 113d (with P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); eight pādas after 122d; two pādas after 149b (different from addition in N_{45}^C , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); six pādas after 151f; four pādas after 191d (partly shared with $\acute{S}$); eight pādas after 192d (last four pādas shared with $\acute{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); two pādas after 194d; two pādas after 206b (shared with all except N_{82}^K , B_{99}^C); 18 pādas after 213d (parts are shared with N_{45}^C , B_{99}^{Cpc} , E^N , $\acute{S}_{67}^S$), and four pādas after 229d. Like P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T discussed below, it places 41a–42d after 44d. In general the manuscript preserves many good readings and it provides us with a glimpse of the open and fluid transmission of the text in Nepal.

E^N stands for the printed text of the Śivadharmā by Yogī Naraharīnātha. Published in Kathmandu under the title of *Paśupatimata*, this is a somewhat curious publication, partly typed, partly handwritten and provided with a partial commentary. No mention is made of the manuscript used and no variants are reported. According to the information kindly provided by Diwakar Acharya (personal communication), it may have been based on a Devanāgarī manuscript from the time of Raṇa Bahādur Shah (1775–1806). Its readings are often in remarkable agreement with those of B_{99}^C and N_{82}^K , to a lesser extent with N_{12}^K . There are a number of cases where B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K and E^N , sometimes backed up by N_{58}^K , are in agreement against all the other manuscripts consulted. Attention has already been drawn above to 32bc, two pādas uniquely found in B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K , N_{58}^K and E^N . Furthermore, the significant verses 48–49 are uniquely shared by B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K , N_{12}^K , N_{58}^K and E^N , while 120–121 are found only in B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K , N_{58}^K and E^N . The above cases indicate that the manuscript used by E^N transmits a version of the text closely related to that of B_{99}^C and N_{82}^K . This conclusion is also borne out by the number of unique readings shared by B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K and E^N . A telling example is 109c, where only B_{99}^C , N_{82}^K and E^N have the reading *rudrasutāparājita*, while N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{45}^C , N_{12}^K , N_{58}^K and $\acute{S}_{67}^S$ share the hypermetrical variant *aparājītā rudraratā* and P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T have *(a)parājītā śive bhaktā*. While this might suggest that the text in E^N represents an old form of the text, such a conclusion is invalidated by several additions found in E^N ,

some of which are shared by other manuscripts and some of which are unique. It is also conceivable that Naraharinātha was in fact using more than one manuscript and conflated the text. The additions found in E^N are as follows: 12 pādas after 27d (partly shared with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T); 30 pādas after 32d (partly shared with N_{58}^K and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); two pādas after 91b; four pādas after 105d; four pādas after 121d; four pādas after 213d and fourteen pādas after 214d (partly parallel with N_{45}^C , N_{58}^K , B_{99}^{Cpc} and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, which add, respectively, 14, 18, 22 and 18 pādas after 213d); two pādas after 217d (with N_{77}^{Ko} , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T). The fact that some of these additions are shared with other manuscripts, in particular $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, indicates that Nariharinātha did not compose them himself, but must have found them in his manuscript(s). E^N omits the following pādas: 50cd; 58a–59d; 94cd; 174cd; 199a–200d; 212ab. These are all unique and most probably accidental omissions.

The Transmission in Bengal

The transmission in Bengal is represented here by a single manuscript in the collection of the University Library of Cambridge (B_{99}^C).¹²⁸ The manuscript is written in Bengali script on yellow dyed paper and is dated Śāka Saṃvat 1604 (1682 CE). It is complete and contains the text of the first two works of the corpus, the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*. Its readings are very good and, as already indicated above, overall very close to those of N_{82}^K . In this connection it is relevant to note that the manuscript was in fact bought in Nepal (by D. Wright in 1873–76).¹²⁹

For a start, all the pādas present in N_{82}^K are shared with B_{99}^C . The only exception is 227a–229d, but these pādas have been added later in the margin. For the rest not a single pāda is missing. The same observation holds true for those pādas, such as 32bc, 48–49 and 120a–121d noted

¹²⁸ The only other known manuscript in Bengali script is in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal: G 9967, described in Shāstri 1928, 714–715. It is a manuscript of the *Śāntyadhyāya* alone and is dated Śāka 1563 (1641/42 CE). I do not have access to it, but from Shāstri's brief transcription of the beginning and end of the manuscript it appears that its readings are overall quite close to B_{99}^C . According to the line following the colophon it was written in the town of the Kāṣṭamaṇḍapa, i.e. Kathmandu, in Nepal: *śāke 1563 śrāvaṇakṛṣṇadvādāśyām śanau nepāle kāṣṭamaṇḍapanagare svārtham alekhi śrīraghudevaśarmmaṇetidik*. This points to a link with the Nepalese transmission, as in the case of B_{99}^C .

¹²⁹ <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01599/1>

above, for which support from other manuscripts is limited. Moreover, the omission of two additional pādas found in all other manuscripts used after 206b is shared only with N_{82}^K . This points to a very close relation.

As for additional passages, B_{99}^C has only one additional passage compared to N_{82}^K — after 213d, partly shared with N_{45}^C , N_{58}^K , E^N and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ — but this is one that has been added by a later hand. For the rest B_{99}^C follows the text of N_{82}^K throughout.

On the level of individual readings the correspondences are also remarkable. Aside from the many readings where B_{99}^C and N_{82}^K are in agreement and supported by one or more other manuscripts, and in particular E^N , there are several instances where both manuscripts uniquely share or point to the same reading. Some examples of uniquely shared readings are the following: 40a, 45a, 104b, 113c, 186c (not adopted), 193d (not adopted), 200a (not adopted), 200b (not adopted) and 242d. On the other hand, B_{99}^C also has a few readings of its own, some of which are shared with other manuscripts: 108b (with N_{58}^K , E^N), 112ab (with N_{45}^C , N_{12}^K , E^N), 121ab (eye-skip), 123b (with N_{12}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T), 124d (with E^N), 144a (with N_{12}^K , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T), 164a, 185c (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{58}^K , E^N , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T), 210d. While it is conceivable that these have resulted from carelessness, the fact that some of these readings are shared with other manuscripts indicates that a different manuscript than N_{82}^K itself must have been its exemplar. That said, the text transmitted in B_{99}^C is remarkably close and must have been based on a Nepalese manuscript very similar to N_{82}^K . Overall we can conclude that there is as yet no evidence for an independent Bengali recension of the text.¹³⁰

The Transmission in Kashmir

$\dot{S}_{67}^S$, a manuscript in the collection of the Oriental Research Library in Srinagar, is one of three known Śāradā manuscripts of the *Śivadharmasāstra*.¹³¹ It has many unique variants. Although it comes from the other

¹³⁰ On the other hand, the extensive use that the *Devīpurāṇa*, by all accounts composed in Bengal, has made of the *Śivadharmottara* would suggest its spread to Bengal as well. See De Simini 2016b: 73–80.

¹³¹ The two other Śāradā manuscripts known to me are: 1. ORL 913, *Śivadharmacarita*, in the Oriental Research Library of Srinagar; and 2. BHU 7/ 3986, *Nandikeśvarasaṃhitā Śivadharmasāstra*, in the Benares Hindu University.

end of the subcontinent, it has a remarkably large number of shared readings with the Southern manuscripts P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T .

The additions in $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ are as follows: two pādas after 6d; two pādas after 18d; 16 pādas after 27d (partly shared with E^N , P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T); 30 pādas after 32d (partly shared with N_{58}^K and E^N); two pādas after 36b; two pādas after 76d; 20 pādas after 104d; six pādas after 108d; 16 pādas after 151f; two pādas after 171b; four pādas after 191d (partly shared with N_{58}^K); four pādas after 192d (with P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T); 18 pādas after 213d (only partly parallel in content with N_{45}^C , B_{99}^C and E^N); six pādas after 235d; four pādas after 238d (with N_{45}^C); four pādas after 241d (shared with N_{58}^K , P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T); two pādas after 256d (partly shared with P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T).

As can be observed from this list, $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ has a large number of unique additions, indicating a separate line of transmission. Some additions are shared with other manuscripts, in particular P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T . A few of them are, however, also shared with N_{45}^C , N_{58}^K and E^N . Its omissions display a somewhat similar pattern: 14ab (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{45}^C and P_{72}^T); 25cd; 32bc (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{45}^C , N_{12}^K , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); 48a–49d (with N_{45}^C , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); 50c–52b; 57ab; 71a–72d; 80ab; 103ad (with N_{58}^K); 142ab (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{12}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); 145cd; 154ad; 156ad (with P_{72}^T); 158a–159b; 166cd; 172cd; 197ad (with P_{72}^T); 210ab (with N_{77}^{Ko} , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T); 220cd; 242ad (with N_{77}^{Ko} , P_{72}^T); 244ef (with N_{45}^C). In three cases $\dot{S}_{67}^S$ reverses the order of the verses: 8cd after 6d; 35ab after 35d; 240ad after 241d. The overall pattern suggests a contaminated transmission.¹³²

The Transmission in Southern India

For the transmission of the text in the South, I have restricted myself to two paper transcripts from Pondicherry: P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T .¹³³ The text in both manuscripts is in relatively good shape. The two manuscripts clearly point to a Southern recension of the text. This is easily shown by comparison of shared additions, omissions and revisions. The same is also con-

¹³² See also De Simini 2017: 525–527.

¹³³ The study of the Southern manuscripts of the Śivadharmas is still in its infancy and the present observations must therefore be considered preliminary. Marco Franceschini (University of Bologna) is currently engaged in a study of the transmission of the manuscripts of the *Śivadharmasāstra* and *Śivadharmottara* in the South. In his presentation, ‘The transmission of the Śivadharmas in Tamil Nadu’, at the Śivadharmas workshop at Leiden University (26–30 September 2016) he presented an overview of ca. 20 manuscripts (palm-leaf and paper) from South India. See also De Simini 2017: 516–520.

firmed by the readings of the Malayalam manuscript of the *Śivadharmavivaraṇa*, which shares several common features with P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T (see Appendix II).

The following shared additions are found in P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T : two pādas after 2d; 12 respectively 14 pādas after 27d (partly shared with E^N and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); two pādas after 47e; two pādas after 47f; two pādas after 80b; two, respectively four pādas after 84b; 12 pādas in P_{32}^T after 102d, respectively 14 pādas in P_{72}^T after 103d; two pādas after 123d; two pādas after 127d; two pādas after 149b; four pādas after 185d; four pādas after 192d (with N_{58}^K , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); two pādas after 217d (with N_{77}^{Ko} , E^N); four pādas after 235d; four pādas after 241d (partly parallel with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); four pādas after 256d (partly parallel with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$). The readings in these additional passages show some variations, but overall they clearly reflect the same recension of the text.

The shared omissions are as follows: 32bc (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{45}^C , N_{12}^K and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); 48a–49d (with N_{45}^C and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); 112ad; 129ab; 142ab (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{12}^K and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); 156ad; 210ab (with N_{77}^{Ko} , $\dot{S}_{67}^S$). The following textual revisions are found in both manuscripts: 41a–42d is placed after 44d (with N_{58}^K); 120a–121d is replaced by four pādas (compare N_{12}^K and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$, but with different readings); 131c–132d is replaced by two pādas.

There can be little doubt about their common origin, but it is striking to note that several of these additions and omissions are shared with the *Śāradā* manuscript ($\dot{S}_{67}^S$), and sometimes supported by N_{77}^{Ko} .

Aside from shared readings, both manuscripts also have additions and omissions of their own. In P_{32}^T the following additions occur: two pādas after 85d; two pādas after 96b; two pādas after 186d; two pādas after 230d; two pādas after 244f. The omissions in P_{32}^T are as follows: 15ad; 87a–89d; 108ad; 133c–134b; 165ad; 194cd; 223cd. Two passages are replaced: 159c–161b follows after 162d and 229a–230d is found before 223a. P_{72}^T has only one addition (six pādas after 159b) and the following omissions: 14ab (with N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{45}^C and $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); 22ad; 53cd; 59c–65b; 104ad; 148af; 197ad (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$); 228a–229b; 242ad (with $\dot{S}_{67}^S$). Finally, 20a–27d is placed after the additional passage following 27d.

These unique features show that the readings of P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T do not derive from one and the same exemplar, but already reflect a longer history of transmission. A similar conclusion is borne out by comparison of the variations of readings on an individual level. P_{32}^T in particular shows

a number of unique additions and alterations of the text.¹³⁴

Compared to the other manuscripts used, I have been less strict in reporting the variants of P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T . Thus, I have refrained from reporting *ante correctionem* readings and also the many cases where P_{32}^T and P_{72}^T apply final *sandhi* to the *pāda* boundaries (*-aḥ* for *-o* etc.).

The Critical Apparatus

The critical apparatus of the edition of the *Śāntyadhyāya* consists of three layers. The bottom layer is a positive apparatus, showing first the quoted portion of the reading adopted in the main text, followed by a lemma-sign and the sources of the text that support the adopted reading, separated by a comma, after which are given the variants and their attestations. The order of listing of the sources is as follows: N_{77}^{Ko} , N_{45}^C , N_{82}^K , N_{12}^K , N_{58}^K , S_{67}^S , P_{32}^T , P_{72}^T , E^N . To save space and make the apparatus more accessible to the reader, sigma-signs have been used to indicate where different manuscripts belonging to the same group share the same reading. The layer above the bottom layer reports omissions and additions in individual sources of one or more *pādas* in comparison to the main text of the edition. If there are different additional *pādas*, these are separated by a bullet. The same layer also occasionally reports the loss of folios in individual sources. The top layer is reserved for testimonia of the text. The symbols and abbreviations used in the apparatus are given below.

Symbols and Abbreviations in the Apparatus

Σ Reading in all sources, with only one or two variants.

K^Σ Reading in all Kathmandu manuscripts.

N^Σ Reading in all Nepalese manuscripts.

P^Σ Reading in both Pondicherry transcripts.

□ Indicates a gap left by the scribe (if the gap is large a number is used to indicate number of syllables; e.g. □[-4-]□).

¹³⁴ As mentioned above (n. 111 on p. 52), the readings of P_{32}^T are remarkably close to the text of the *Śivadharmasāstra* published in Jugnu & Sharma 2014.

- En-dashes indicate a lost or illegible syllable in the manuscript.
- () Parentheses enclose syllables that are poorly legible in the manuscript.
- + + Plus-signs enclose syllables that have been added in the manuscript.
- < > Angular brackets enclose syllables that have been deleted in the manuscript.
- A bullet is used to separate lemmas within the same *pāda*.

conj.	conjecture	em.	emendation
ac	before correction	pc	after correction
om.	omit(s)	i.m.	in the margin
unmetr.	unmetrical	hypermetr.	hypermetrical

For the sigla see pp. 52 above.