Introduction

The Battle Continued

The previous volume culminated in Hiraṇyākṣa's capture of the Earth (Pṛthivī) and his conquest of the entire world (SP 95). Hiraṇyākṣa had taken over as king of the Daityas after the death of his brother Hiraṇyakaśipu at the hands of Viṣṇu in his manifestation as the Man-Lion (Narasimha). A prolonged battle between the Asuras and the Devas ended with Hiraṇyākṣa's victory. The final chapter described his rule in accordance with the *dharma* and the prospering of his kingdom as a result. The situation of the gods could hardly be more hopeless.

The present volume continues this storyline and tells how Viṣṇu manifests in the form of the Boar (Varāha) in order to kill Hiraṇyākṣa. This Varāha cycle takes up the major part of the text included here (SP 96–110). The *Skandapurāṇa* expands upon the known version of the Varāha myth by adding a sequel in which Viṣṇu holds on to his Boar form and produces a son named Vṛka (SP 109–110). This son ravages the forest of Skanda's dwelling at Gaurīkūṭa. Skanda puts an end to Viṣṇu's Boar manifestation and thus causes Viṣṇu to return to his natural form.

After the termination of his Varāha manifestation, Viṣṇu requests that Śiva teach the gods the Pāśupata observance. Devī remains behind on Mt Mandara and instructs the goddesses on the merits of donations and observances (SP 111–112.72). She then explores Mandara's forest with them. Here she encounters a young *aśoka* tree, which she decides to adopt as her son. At that moment Andhaka and his entourage arrive at Mandara. Andhaka declares his desire for Devī but is warned off by Prahlāda. Next, the Asuras chance upon the Seven Sages (Saptarṣi), who are visited by the gods Dhātṛ, Vidhātṛ and Kṛtānta. The sages ask them about the future affairs of the Devas and the Asuras.

Of the topics included in this volume, two had already been identified in the synopsis of the Anukramaṇikā in SP I: 'the slaying of Hiraṇyākṣa' (SP 2.15c: *hiraṇyākṣavadhaś caiva* → SP 107) and 'the arrival [of Andhaka] at Mandara' (SP 2.21b: *mandarāgamanaṃ tathā* → SP 112.82–92). To this we may add 'Andhaka's catching sight of Devī' (SP 2.17d: *devyāś*

cāndhakadarśanam → SP 112.82–92).¹ Moreover, the topic of ‘Devī’s hundred forms’ (SP 2.18b: *devyāś ca śatarūpatā*) seems to have inspired a revision of SP 112 in the RA recension.²

The Varāha Cycle

The Varāha cycle starts in SP 96 with a description of Hiraṇyākṣa’s glorious rule. Agni is expelled and a new Agni is installed in his place. The Mantras and Yajña follow the new Agni. The gods no longer receive their offerings and are in a despondent state. Brahmā advises them to bide their time and take up residence in the bodies of Hiraṇyākṣa’s subjects through yoga. When four *yugas* have passed, Hiraṇyākṣa notices what is going on. He starts slaying his own people and dries up all the waters by means of yoga.³

The next chapter (SP 97) sees the gods once again looking for Brahmā’s help. He tells them that the power of Hiraṇyākṣa’s *tapas* has run out and that they should beseech Viṣṇu to take up the form of the ‘Man-Boar’ (Naravarāha). Brahmā refers to a set of conditions that recalls the Narasiṃha myth: he cannot be killed by a man, a god or an animal, nor on earth, in fire, in the sky or in the worlds (SP 97.9–10). A structural link with the earlier Narasiṃha cycle (SP 70–71) is thus established, further highlighted by the identification of the Boar manifestation as a hybrid (Naravarāha).⁴ The gods follow Brahmā’s advice and proceed to Mt Śveta, where they praise Viṣṇu with a lengthy hymn (SP 97.15–30). Viṣṇu is pleased and promises to slay the Daitya, but he calls for the gods’ help since he cannot do it on his own. This request sets the tone for the rest of the narrative, in which Viṣṇu structurally comes across as dependent and not in control.

SP 98 tells of the fashioning of the Boar’s body by the gods. All the gods infuse him with their power and take up residence in his limbs. The Boar rises up with his massive body. An important simile compares his form to the one Madhusūdana took up in the past when he lifted up the Earth as Svayambhu (SP 98.20), thus distinguishing between the earlier cosmogonic form and the present Daitya-slaying form. Śiva is asked to strengthen Viṣṇu with his *tejas*. He promises the gods that Viṣṇu will

1 Alternatively, this may be taken the other way around as ‘Devī’s catching sight of Andhaka’ (cf. SP I, 62: ‘Devī’s vision of Andhaka’). Both Andhaka episodes are narrated once again in more detail in SP_{Bh} 130.2–41 (see below, p. 20), to which the Anukramanikā may by extension also be considered to refer.

2 See below, p. 28.

3 This prequel to the Varāha cycle is not known from any other source.

4 The only other text to refer to Viṣṇu’s Varāha form in this way is the *Viṣṇu-dharmottarapurāṇa* (VDhP 1.53.13–14). See n. 137 on p. 53.

slay the Daitya after his *tejas* has entered him. Brahmā performs an elaborate rite of protection and Varāha sets out for the great Ocean. A lengthy description of Varāha's journey through the Ocean follows (SP 99), in which he encounters, among others, the Nāga Ananta. A Daitya serving as a sea guard catches sight of him and hastens back to the city to inform Hiraṇyākṣa of the coming of Varāha.

SP 100 starts with a description of bad omens in Hiraṇyākṣa's city. Prahlaḍa tells Hiraṇyākṣa about a dream he has had in which a man-boar seized Hiraṇyākṣa. The latter tells Prahlaḍa that he himself had a dream in which Śiva told him to give up his kingship. The Asuras are having an argument about what to do when a Dānava arrives, in haste, introducing himself as Nala the seaguard. He informs Hiraṇyākṣa about the arrival of the Boar. Prahlaḍa remarks that this is no ordinary boar, but Viṣṇu in disguise. Hiraṇyākṣa expresses delight at the arrival of his brother's killer and instructs the Daityas and Dānavas to find him.

The Daityas and Dānavas find the Boar and ask him why he has come (SP 101). Varāha feigns ignorance, but they attack him. Varāha slays them all. One Asura manages to escape and returns back to Hiraṇyākṣa's capital (Aśmakapura) to inform the king of what has happened (SP 102). Next, Vipracitti, Prahlaḍa and others are dispatched to fight the Boar. In the meantime Varāha has reached Aśmakapura. He circumambulates the city anticlockwise and breaks the southern gate, a clear portent of Hiraṇyākṣa's upcoming death. The Asuras at the gate start attacking him. Varāha tells the Asuras to put up a just fight (*dharmayuddha*), but Prahlaḍa expresses his disagreement. They all attack the Boar (SP 103). Varāha comes out victorious and scares away the Daityas and Dānavas. The next chapter (SP 104) sees them attack once more, but Varāha once again conquers them all. Vipracitti and Varāha engage in combat with each other and Varāha hurls Vipracitti atop Hiraṇyākṣa's palace. Hiraṇyākṣa wants to know who could have possibly done this and Vipracitti tells him about the Boar, begging Hiraṇyākṣa to leave the city. Hiraṇyākṣa wants to hear nothing of it and prepares himself to fight.

The description of the fight between Varāha and Hiraṇyākṣa takes up three chapters (SP 105–107). Hiraṇyākṣa sets out in full armour and encounters Varāha not far from the city (SP 105). He paralyses him with a volley of arrows and the gods have to revive Varāha with *mantras*. Varāha tries to attack Hiraṇyākṣa's chariot, but he is bound with snakes and struck harshly by the Daityas. Garuḍa releases him from the snakes. Attacking Hiraṇyākṣa once more, Varāha is struck in the heart and falls to the ground. This time he is strengthened by the sages and the gods, who fill him with their *tapas*. Varāha and Hiraṇyākṣa provoke each other and fight once again (SP 106). Varāha destroys Hiraṇyākṣa's chariot, but

the latter hits him with the weapon of stupification (*mohanāstra*), which is removed with *mantras* by the gods. More fighting follows, until Hiraṇyākṣa hurls a spear, reciting ‘homage to Rudra!’ The spear strikes Varāha in the heart, leaving him as good as dead (SP 107). This time Śiva himself revives Varāha with his *tejas*. Varāha tears out the spear and strikes Hiraṇyākṣa in the heart with it. The two end up abandoning their weapons and begin a long wrestling match. When, after many thousands of years, Hiraṇyākṣa is weakened, a voice from the sky instructs Varāha to strike the Daitya with the *cakra* of Maheśvara. Varāha calls to mind the *cakra*, which appears before him in all its majesty. He hurls the *cakra* at Hiraṇyākṣa and decapitates him.

Having killed Hiraṇyākṣa, Varāha goes in search of the Earth (SP 108). He finds her held captive under the Śaṅkha mountain. After freeing her, he re-establishes her in her proper place, and hands over the three worlds to Indra. With this, Varāha’s job should be over, but he expresses a desire to enjoy his Boar form a little longer. The gods agree and go home. Varāha has a party with Vedic Apsarases who have taken on the form of female boars.

The last two chapters of the Varāha cycle form a sequel to the myth of the manifestation of Varāha. A son named Vṛka is born (SP 109). This son is a menace and ravages the forest of Kārttikeya near Gaurikūṭa on the Himavat. A Gaṇapa of Skanda called Kokavaktra holds him to account and takes him captive. Meanwhile Skanda returns from a visit to Śiva on Mandara and is shown the prisoner. He orders him to be tortured in public. Nārada sends word to Varāha, who goes there in anger. Fighting with Skanda, he ends up being struck in the heart by his spear (SP 110). He leaves behind his Boar body and becomes Viṣṇu again. Heading for Śiva’s abode, Viṣṇu praises him and requests that the god teach him the Pāśupata observance. Śiva promises to do so and goes to Mt Meru, taking leave of Pārvatī.

Devī’s Instructions to the Goddesses

While Śiva is away teaching the Pāśupata observance to the gods, Pārvatī remains behind on Mt Mandara. There she is approached by the Mothers of the World (*lokasya mātaraḥ*). They ask her about *dharma*. Devī first instructs them in the *dharma* of making donations (SP 111). In the next chapter (SP 112), she teaches the goddesses about the merits of fasting. Both donating (*dāna*) and fasting (*upavāsa*) are taught from the perspective of a male agent. In the final part of her instruction, Devī addresses the question of what a woman can do. Starting from the principle that a woman’s duties lie with her husband, she tells the

goddesses that a woman can perform the *dharma* as well, but only if her husband allows her (SP 112.67–72).⁵ Both chapters have been quoted extensively in a number of medieval Dharmanibandhas. These citations provide much insight into the nature and transmission of the text.⁶

There are two issues relating to the audience of Devī's instructions on donation in SP 111 that reveal the early stage of the text's redaction process. At the beginning of the chapter, we are told that the goddesses attended on Devī when Deva had gone to heaven, and asked her about *dharma*. Devī starts to instruct the goddesses at SP 111.9. Thus it is clear that Devī is the speaker, while the goddesses are the addressees of the following teaching. However, the goddesses are addressed with the feminine vocative plural only at SP 111.9b (*svratāḥ*), and then again near the end of the chapter, at SP 111.94d (*devatāḥ*),⁷ SP 111.95c (*devyaḥ*) and SP 111.96c (*mahābhāgāḥ*).⁸ In between, the feminine vocative singular is used frequently, indicating that it is a singular goddess who is the addressee of the teaching. This is the case not only in the available manuscripts of the S recension—significantly R, A and SP_{Bh} have changed these readings into a vocative plural or replaced it with another word—but also in some of the quotations in the Dharmanibandhas.⁹ Furthermore, the use of the second-person imperative singular (*śṛṇu* and *śṛṇusva*) likewise indicates that just one goddess was the original recipient of instruction. These imperative singulars not only occur in the S manuscripts, but also frequently in R and A, and receive support from the Dharmanibandha testimonia.¹⁰ Thus, except for the beginning and end, which incorporate the chapter in the *Skandapurāṇa*'s narrative, the addressee of the instruction in SP 111

5 This teaching is in line with other statements about a woman's duty in the text. Cf., e.g., SP 52.21–25 and SP_{Bh} 158.80–87. Following this section, R and A insert a long passage about the observance for women (*strīvrata*). See below, p. 23 f.

6 See below, p. 29 f.

7 Some of the vocatives (*devatāḥ*, *svratāḥ* and *mahābhāgāḥ*) could of course also be the masculine vocative plural, but the context requires taking them as a feminine.

8 In SP 111.91d the fem.voc.pl. *svratāḥ* appears in all available manuscripts except A₇ (the verse is omitted in A₇). We have, however, emended it to *svratāḥ* (masc.nom.sg.) based on the reading in the *Dānasāgara* and the fact that the fem.voc.sg. appears in SP 111.92.

9 The fem.voc.sg. is used in SP 111.16c (*devi*), SP 111.16d (*śubhe*), SP 111.26b (*śubhānane*, supported by DS), SP 111.27b (*devi*), SP 111.30b (*śucismite*), SP 111.36c (*devi*), SP 111.41c (*devi*, supported by DS), SP 111.43b (*śubhe*), SP 111.57c (*devi*, supported by AYS, DK, DS and HeDKh), SP 111.64c (*devi*) and SP 111.92c (*devi*).

10 The imperative singular *śṛṇu* occurs in SP 111.22d (in all manuscripts, supported by DK, DS, KR and DKK), SP 111.33d (in all manuscripts) and SP 111.60b (in all manuscripts, DK and HeDKh). The middle imperative singular *śṛṇusva* (actually *tac chr̥ṇusva*) is used in SP 111.37d in S₂S₃ (*tac chr̥ṇudhva* in S₁), while R and A have the imperative plural, *tac chr̥ṇudhvam*.

is a single goddess.¹¹ This strongly suggests that the original instruction came from an external source and was incorporated here, with the beginning and end added in order to smoothly connect it with the immediate context. We are not able to identify this external source; it may not have been a written source but part of an oral tradition. However, the setting in which someone teaches *dharma* to a goddess reminds us of many such instructions of Śiva to Pārvatī. Although the instruction of *dāna* here is purely Brahmanical, with no specific Śaiva elements, a possible source would be a text like the Śivadharmas.¹²

There is one more issue relating to the addressee in this chapter. This concerns SP 111.78c, in which Vyāsa is the one addressed, in a reading supported by S₂S₃ and A.¹³ This vocative occurs in a passage that describes in detail the individual parts of a donated cow as consisting of all cosmic divinities (SP 111.69cd–79). This recalls a similar description of the bull when he became Śiva’s vehicle (SP 33.116–134) and of Varāha when his form was produced by all the gods (SP 98.1–18). No feminine vocative singular appears in this passage. It seems likely that this part was composed separately by one of the authors of our text, referring to the *Skandapurāṇa*’s usual addressee Vyāsa, and that it was inserted here during the process of redaction.

The Andhaka Cycle Continued

After Devī has finished her instruction, the Mothers (Mātṛs) propose to explore Mandara’s forest. When Devī encounters a young *aśoka* tree with its blossoms bending down toward her, she decides to adopt the tree as her son, if Deva allows her when he returns (SP 112.73–81). Devī’s submissive attitude is in line with the conclusion of her own teaching, in which she had stressed the need for women to get the approval of their husband in the performance of *dharma*. The adoption ceremony of the *aśoka* tree itself is taken up again only much later in the text, in SP_{Bh} 158–162.

The scene is crudely interrupted by the arrival of Andhaka and his forces, who have come to Mandara from Pātāla. Andhaka stares at De-

11 Note that this does not apply to SP 112, where Devī continues to instruct the goddesses and where the plural is used throughout.

12 The two earliest texts of the Śivadharmas, which eventually grew into a corpus of eight texts as found in palm-leaf manuscripts surviving from Nepal, are the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*. There may, however, have been more texts like this dedicated to specifying the rules and regulations of lay worship of Śiva. See Bisschop 2018, 1–27, for an introduction to the corpus and to the *Śivadharmasāstra* in particular.

13 S₁ is not available for this passage, while R has *devyaḥ* and the *Dānasāgara* quotation has *madhye*.

vī, but he is warned by Prahlaḍa that she is none other than the wife of Śiva and that he should bow down to her. While not explicitly stated, this warning serves as a portend of Andhaka's downfall, for he had earlier received a boon that he could only be killed if he would not bow down to the Mother of the World (SP 74.23).¹⁴

Devī disappears and the Daityas start wandering around Mandara. They spot the Seven Sages (Saptarṣi) at a waterfall and eavesdrop upon them. The sages notice their arrival and decide to go elsewhere (SP 112.99–102). At this moment, somewhat out of the blue, the gods Dhātṛ, Vidhātṛ and Kṛtānta arrive.¹⁵ Welcomed by the sages, they report that they have come from Brahmāloka. They tell the sages about their visit to Kaśyapa at the request of Brahmā. There Dhātṛ had informed Kaśyapa about the future affairs of the Devas and Asuras, which Kaśyapa was concerned about, being the ancestor of both sides. The sages express their desire to hear about this as well and Kṛtānta is charged with telling it. With the announcement that he will narrate it all to them the volume comes to an end.

The Incorporation of Vaiṣṇava Mythology

In the Introduction to SP IV, we have briefly touched upon the question of how Vaiṣṇava mythology is incorporated into the *Skandapurāṇa*.¹⁶ The authors of the text have taken great effort to integrate and expand upon several of the most celebrated myths of Viṣṇu's manifestations, and they have done so in a systematic manner. To understand the position of some of this material in the text as a whole, it is necessary to look beyond the confines of the present volume.

The first thing to note about Viṣṇu's manifestations is their order of narration. While the usual order of the *prādurbhāva* lists includes Varāha before Narasiṃha,¹⁷ in the *Skandapurāṇa* the order is reversed. This is because the dynastic line of the Daitya kings is the main principle guiding the narration of events (Table 1). As in the eighteen-day battle of

14 Cf. also SP_{Bh} 130.23, where Prahlaḍa reminds Andhaka of the conditions of the boon that he has received. This forms part of a much more elaborate description of the fight between Andhaka and Pārvatī, likewise set on Mandara. It is not clear to what extent these two episodes refer to the same event; this may very well reflect different layers of textual composition. See below, p. 20.

15 It is not clear from the text if the Asuras are still present or if the sages have already moved elsewhere. This is rather important in view of what Kṛtānta has to say about the future affairs of the Suras and Asuras in the chapters that follow.

16 SP IV, 6–7.

17 See Brinkhaus 1992 and 1993.

the *Mahābhārata*, the *Skandapurāṇa*'s narrative is structured around the successive leaders of the opposing army. In the case of the *Mahābhārata*, these are the four generals of the Kaurava army, whose names provide the titles of the epic's four battle books.¹⁸ In the case of the *Purāṇa*, the leaders are the Daitya kings.

Table 1: The Daitya dynasty

Hiraṇyakaśipu	(slain by Narasiṃha)
↓	
Hiraṇyākṣa	(slain by Varāha)
↓	
Andhaka?	(defeated by Śiva)
↓	
Prahlāda	(defeated by Viṣṇu)
↓	
Virocana	(slain by Indra)
↓	
Bali	(tricked by Vāmana)

The conflict between the Devas and the Asuras starts with the first Daitya king, Hiraṇyakaśipu, the eldest son of Kaśyapa and Diti. He is crowned king of the Daityas but seizes Indra's position. As a consequence he gets killed by Viṣṇu in the form of Narasiṃha (SP 70–71). Hiraṇyakaśipu's younger brother, Hiraṇyākṣa, takes over, plotting revenge, and defeats the gods. He is slain by Viṣṇu in the form of Varāha (SP 73–108).

There is some ambiguity as to who is the next Daitya king: Prahlāda or Andhaka. The one who is explicitly identified as such is Prahlāda, Hiraṇyakaśipu's son (SP_{Bh} 113–115).¹⁹ His defeat at the hand of Viṣṇu is linked to the Amṛtamanthana myth, in which Viṣṇu steals the nectar of immortality (*amṛta*) in the form of the bewitching woman Mohinī. Defeated by Viṣṇu after waging many battles, Prahlāda finally hands over the rule of the Daityas to his son Virocana (SP_{Bh} 116.1–13).²⁰ Virocana gets killed in the Āṭi-Baka battle (SP_{Bh} 116.1–13ab). Viṣṇu does not

18 *Bhīṣmaparvan* (MBh 6); *Droṇaparvan* (MBh 7); *Karṇaparvan* (MBh 8); *Śalyaparvan* (MBh 9).

19 SP_{Bh} 113.2: *bhaviṣyaty asurāṇāṃ tu hiraṇyakaśipoḥ sutaḥ | indro mahābalo vidvān prahlādo 'surapuṅgavaḥ ||*.

20 Prahlāda's defeat in battle by Viṣṇu is announced in SP_{Bh} 113.3. According to SP_{Bh} 115.49cd–50ab, he left the battlefield with the Dānavas after he was defeated by Viṣṇu. SP_{Bh} 116.1–2 states that he handed over rule to Virocana after engaging in hundreds of battles. For the stealing of the *amṛta* by Mohinī, see SP_{Bh} 113.55–65.

play a role in this battle; instead, Virocana is slain by Indra (SP_{Bh} 116.3d: *mahendreṇa*). Following Virocana's death, his son Bali is consecrated king. He conquers the three worlds but is tricked by Viṣṇu, in the form of Vāmana, who returns the kingship to the gods by taking his celebrated three strides (SP_{Bh} 116.13–117.20). After this there are yet more Devāsura wars, but there is no more mention of a dynastic succession of Daitya kings.²¹

The position of Andhaka in this dynasty is somewhat obscure. After the death of Hiranyākṣa the line seems, at first sight, to return again to that of the elder brother, through Hiranyakaśipu's son Prahlaḍa.²² Andhaka, on the other hand, being the son of Hiranyākṣa, would also be a possible claimant to the throne.²³ While no mention is made of his installation as king of the Daityas, there are some indications that Andhaka took over before Prahlaḍa. For a start, when Prahlaḍa is introduced as king of the Daityas in SP_{Bh} 113.2, Kṛtānta, who is speaking to the Seven Sages, uses the future tense (*bhaviṣyati*). This suggests that somebody else must have been ruler at the time. It makes sense that this is Andhaka, introduced in the preceding chapter as arriving at Mt Mandara in the company of many Daityas, including Prahlaḍa, who warned him about Pārvatī. Moreover, later in the text, when the Andhaka cycle is resumed (SP_{Bh} 130), Andhaka is referred to twice as king of the Daityas.²⁴ Significantly, in the speech that follows, Prahlaḍa addresses him three times as king of the Dānavas.²⁵ In SP_{Bh} 116.86, in a speech of Bali to Prahlaḍa, he

21 Up to this point, the SP has followed the lineage of Daityas taught in the Vamśa part of the *Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa* (PPL 165.66–70ab). According to PPL 165.70cd, Bali had one hundred sons, the eldest of whom was Bāṇa, but there is no mention of his rule in our text. The war recounted after the defeat of Bali in the SP is the Tārakāmaya war, in which the Asura leaders are Tāraka and Maya, two Dānavas. There is no mention of a Daitya king. At the time of the Tārakāmaya war, the Saimhikeyas were slain by Jāmadagnya (SP_{Bh} 121.37–64), but he is not identified as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu as in other Purāṇas. The slaying of the Saimhikeyas is followed by the killing of Kālanemi by Keśava (SP_{Bh} 122.1–13). This ends the Tārakāmaya war. After this the text continues with the Dhvaja war.

22 There are different traditions about the succession in other early texts. Compare, for example, ViP 1.20.32, where Prahlaḍa takes over after Hiranyakaśipu has been slain by Narasiṃha: *pitary uparatim nūte narasiṃhasvarūpiṇā | viṣṇunā so 'pi daityānām maitreyābhūt patis tataḥ ||*. According to HV App.1 No.42B ll.33–34, Bali takes over after Hiranyakaśipu has been slain: *taṁ drṣtvā nārasimhena hiraṇyakaśipuṁ hatam | daityā devavadhārthāya balim indraṁ pracakrire ||*.

23 Their natural rivalry as potential heirs to the throne may explain some of the animosity between Prahlaḍa and Andhaka. They are often found to be in disagreement about the course of action to be adopted. The following argument about Andhaka's position in the dynasty draws on Dokter-Mersch, forthc.

24 SP_{Bh} 130.2a, 130.5a: *daityendra*.

25 SP_{Bh} 130.8a: *dānavendra*; SP_{Bh} 130.12c: *dānavānām adhipati*; SP_{Bh} 130.13b: *dānaveśvara*. Also, in the rest of this same chapter, Andhaka is referred to by such an appellation: SP_{Bh} 130.30b: *dānaveśvara*; SP_{Bh} 130.33c, 130.39a: *dānavendra*.

states that neither king (*rājan*) Hiranyakaśipu, nor Hiranyākṣa, nor his son (*tatsuta*) Andhaka attained complete happiness. In the next verse (SP_{Bh} 116.87) he refers to Prahlāda as his grandfather (*pitāmaha*). Finally, in SP_{Bh} 172, where Prahlāda is king of the Daityas, his strength is compared to that of other famous Daityas of the past. Here Andhaka is mentioned in the same line as the Daitya kings Hiranyakaśipu and Hiranyākṣa.²⁶ All of this hints at Andhaka's position in between Hiranyākṣa and Prahlāda. Prahlāda would then have taken over as king after Andhaka was impaled and burned on Śiva's *śūla*, an event that is narrated much later in the text (SP_{Bh} 155). It is quite likely that the ambiguities surrounding Andhaka's position as king of the Daityas are the result of Andhaka's insertion into the lineage of the Daityas.²⁷

Returning to the subject of Viṣṇu's manifestations, three of the above-mentioned episodes concern bodily manifestations of Viṣṇu: Narasiṃha, Varāha and Vāmana. The defeat of Prahlāda by Viṣṇu himself, Virocana by Indra and Andhaka by Śiva do not fit into this scheme. The three myths concerned with Viṣṇu's manifestations, by contrast, share a common structure that is unique to the *Skandapurāṇa*. The first two are hybrid forms and their hybridity is emphasized. In both cases, Viṣṇu is not willing to give up his body after he has accomplished the task of slaying the Daitya king. Śiva forces him to abandon his Narasiṃha form by trampling him in his own Śarabha manifestation (SP 71.48–72), while Śiva's son Kārttikeya causes Viṣṇu to give up his Varāha form by striking him with his spear (SP 110.10–15). The final manifestation of Vāmana is a special case, but once more involves a situation in which the manifestation continues to exist after he has accomplished his task. Viṣṇu naturally cannot hang on to the Vāmana form because of the parameters of the myth that involve the dwarf's expansion to cosmic dimensions. Instead, a unique episode has been added in which an Asuric Evil (Pāpmā) enters Viṣṇu due to his excessive pride and the abandonment of his *svadharma*. This turns him into a dwarf again (SP_{Bh} 117.28–31). A purificatory pilgrimage is required to release him from sin (SP_{Bh} 118–121). At the very end, Viṣṇu performs the *mahāvratā* and after twelve years reaches union with Śiva,

The use of *dānavendra* is ambiguous though: is it the equivalent to *daityendra* here? Note that Hiranyākṣa is sometimes referred to as a *dānava* as well. The text is not consistent in this regard (see SP IV, 79, n. 223).

26 SP_{Bh} 172.50–51.

27 Andhaka does not yet figure in the Daitya lineage in the *Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa*. According to PPL 166.72–73ab, Hiranyākṣa had five sons: Utkara, Śakuni, Bhūta-saṃtāpana, Mahānābha and Kālanābha. There is no mention of Andhaka as a son of Hiranyākṣa. The *Skandapurāṇa* is the first text to give an account of his life story. See SP IV, 9, and Yokochi forthc., for a comprehensive account of the structure of the *Skandapurāṇa* and the insertion of the Andhaka cycle in the text.

being granted half of his body. He thus becomes Viṣṇuśaṃkara (SP_{Bh} 121.16–20).

Two narrative lines come together in this intricate plot: on the one hand the theme of the dynastic succession of the Daitya kings, and on the other hand the motif of Viṣṇu's manifestations. The line of the Daitya kings comes to an end with Viṣṇu's manifestation as Vāmana and the return of the three worlds to Indra through Viṣṇu's three giant steps. Each of the three manifestation myths includes an episode about an afterlife that is in need of termination.²⁸ Through this plot structure, the authors of the *Skandapurāṇa* have furnished Viṣṇu with a unique trajectory, in which he reaches his final destiny by being granted half of Śiva's body. This happens after his performance of the *mahāvratā*. This 'great observance' is nothing other than the Pāśupata observance.²⁹ In other words, Viṣṇu has been turned into a true Śiva devotee and reaches the goal that is the ultimate destiny of the Pāśupata liberation seekers: union with Śiva (*śivasāyujya*).

To a contemporary audience, the granting of half of Śiva's body to Viṣṇu would no doubt have brought up the image of Harihara, a well-known icon at the time.³⁰ The *Skandapurāṇa* provides this icon with a remarkable theological interpretation, through the elaborate narrative structure of Viṣṇu's manifestations culminating in his union with Śiva.³¹

Other allusions to Viṣṇu's iconography are in evidence in the Varāha cycle, the subject of the present volume, as well. Thus, Varāha's body

28 It may be observed that the three manifestation myths are distributed across different myth cycles. The Narasimha myth is in the Skanda cycle, the Varāha myth in the Varāha cycle within the Andhaka cycle, and the Vāmana myth in the Devāsura war cycle. The three myths thus function as connective knots that tie the different myth cycles together.

29 SP_{Bh} 121.18–20: *sa cātha kṛtarakṣas taṃ sarvadharmāvahanṃ śubham | yogaṃ yantraṃ vrataṃ caiva paramaiśvaryaśādhanaṃ || yat tat pāśupataṃ divyaṃ vidhānaṃ sārvaśāntikāṃ | tac cīrtvā dvādaśa samāḥ paramaiśvaryaṃ āptavān || tasya devaḥ svayaṃ sūlī tuṣṭaḥ prekṣya tathāvidham | śarīrārdhaṃ dadau tasmai tad abhūd viṣṇuśaṃkaram ||*. For 121.18a, S₂ and S₃ more or less read *pañcārthaṃ kṛtarakṣantaṃ*, while S₁ has *sañcārthakṛtarakṣantat*; the text can be emended to *pañcārthaṃ kṛtarakṣaṃ tat*. On the Pāśupata *mahāvratā*, see also Bakker 2014, 152–153.

30 On the iconography of Harihara, see Adiceam 1966, Agrawala 1970 and Lavy 2003. Particularly interesting in connection with the SP's integration of Harihara with Viṣṇu's manifestations is a Gupta-period pillar from Kutari (Allahabad district), now in the Allahabad Museum. Its four sides depict, respectively, Harihara, Varāha, Vāsudeva(?) and Vāmana. See Chandra 1970, 90–91, plates LXVIII and LXIX.

31 Significantly, SP_{Bh} 121.21 concludes with a *phalaśruti* and an enjoinder to worship 'Śivaviṣṇu': *ya imaṃ śṛṇuyān martyaḥ sadā parvasu parvasu | arcayet chiva-viṣṇuṃ ca sa gacchet paramāṃ gatim ||*. The inclusion of this *phalaśruti* highlights the significance of this episode in the composition of the text.

is explicitly identified as the Naravarāha ‘Man-Boar’ (SP 97.11). This recalls the popular imagery of Varāha represented as a man with a boar’s head, most famously the Gupta-period Varāha of Cave 6 at Udayagiri.³² The *Skandapurāṇa* graphically describes how Varāha carries the Earth ‘like an elephant with a lotus plant dangling from his tusk’ (SP 108.14). This simile brings to mind, in addition to the image from Udayagiri, the standing Varāha from nearby Eran, in which the tender Earth is shown hanging from Varāha’s tusk by her arm.³³ The *Skandapurāṇa* also uniquely refers to the *argha* offering made by the Ocean before Varāha dives in to rescue the Earth. The image of the personified Ocean holding a water vessel in his hands can be seen on the side walls of the Varāha relief at Udayagiri and may well be linked to this episode.³⁴ Overall, the narration of the *Skandapurāṇa* is strikingly visual.³⁵

The Varāha cycle also contains some tantalizing references to what appear to be historical place names and deities. A striking example is the name Nandivardhana ‘Increasing Joy’, which is uniquely used as an appellation of Varāha in the *Skandapurāṇa*. It occurs altogether twenty-two times in the Varāha cycle, a clear marker of its significance. The use of this epithet becomes all the more intriguing in combination with the narrative line of Varāha heading out to Hiranyākṣa’s capital, which is called Āsmakapura ‘City of Stone’. This juxtaposition conjures up the name of the capital of the Eastern Vākāṭakas, Nandivardhana (present Nagardhan), and their latent enemies, the Āsmakas.³⁶ One of the famous icons from the Vākāṭaka kingdom is the enshrined theriomorphic Varāha on Rāmagiri (Ramtek).³⁷ Could there perhaps be a veiled allusion to this? On the other hand, Varāha in the *Skandapurāṇa* has the form of a man-boar, which is not known from the Vākāṭaka realm. Another, somewhat comparable case is Varāha’s fight with a Gaṇa of Kārttikeya by name of Kokavakra ‘Wolf-faced’. Two deities named Śvetavarāhasvāmin and Kokāmukhasvāmin are known from the late fifth-century Dāmodarpur copperplates from Bengal.³⁸ It is uncertain to what extent the authors of the text used these names simply because they happened to be available to them, or if they used them strategically with a more specific purpose in mind.

Further insight into the text’s frame of reference for Viṣṇu is provided by the gods’ hymn of praise (*stotra*) in SP 97.15–30. The string of epithets

32 Williams 1982, 43–46, plate 37.

33 Frontispiece. See also Williams 1982, 91, plates 126, 127.

34 See n. 175 on p. 59.

35 See also Dokter-Mersch 2020.

36 See Bakker 1997, 35–39.

37 See n. 197 on p. 65.

38 See n. 257 on p. 79.

included in this eulogy provides a rich overview of the various identities, roles and narratives associated with his divine persona. These include his various embodiments—not only the manifestations treated above, but also, e.g., Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana, Rāma (Dāśarathi) and Rāma (Jāmadagnya), Dattātreyā, Dāmodara and Kapila—celebrated deeds performed in the past, such as the slaying of Śakuni, Dhundhu, Madhu, Kaiṭabha and others, as well as references to his physical appearance, the various weapons held in his hands and more abstract notions associated with the god (e.g., sacrifice, yoga and truth).³⁹ Of particular interest, in view of the composition of the text, are several unique epithets that express Viṣṇu's dependence on Śiva (e.g., *mahādevapriya* 'dear to Mahādeva', *rudrārdharūpa* 'having the form of half of Rudra', *maheśvaragaṇa* 'the Gaṇa of Maheśvara' and *rudradattavara* 'who received a boon from Rudra'). These epithets fit within the larger paradigm that emphasizes Viṣṇu's devotion and dependence, while at the same time allowing him to perform the grand deeds for which he is recognized.

How should we interpret this intensive engagement with Viṣṇu's persona in the text? The conflict between the Devas and Asuras has long been identified as the central theme of Vedic and post-Vedic mythology,⁴⁰ but the kind of full-scale narration of this conflict as we find it in the *Skandapurāṇa*, through the lengthy description of a series of battles between the Devas and each of the successive Daitya leaders, had not been done before. The Purāṇa breaks new ground by retelling a number of earlier myths and integrating them into an overarching and comprehensive model. In doing so, the authors of the *Skandapurāṇa* focused in particular on the role of Viṣṇu, who is consistently portrayed as the slayer of demons (*daityaghna*), fighting on behalf of the gods.⁴¹

While there is nothing new about this role of Viṣṇu in itself, it is in the integration of his successive manifestations within the larger narrative frame of the succession of Daitya kings that the *Skandapurāṇa* presents a new model for viewing the role of Viṣṇu's manifestations and thereby of Viṣṇu himself. The incorporation and appropriation of narratives detailing the exploits of Viṣṇu's manifestations in a Śaiva text may hint at religious competition, but the *Skandapurāṇa*'s engagement with these narratives first of all reflects a strategic awareness of the cultural importance of these myths. In order to capture the audience's attention and present their case, the authors had to engage with and address the narratives and

39 For further details, see the notes in the synopsis *ad loc.* A detailed analysis of the various epithets is given in Dokter-Mersch, *forthc.*

40 See e.g. Brown 1942, Kuiper 1975 and Doniger O'Flaherty 1976, 57–93.

41 See SP 71.72, where Śiva, after he has slain Narasiṃha in the form of the Śarabha, grants Viṣṇu the boon of being a slayer of demons and tells him to return to his original state.

gods that mattered most in the Brahmanical milieu in which they were operating. Effectively, what they have done is to explain how, while Viṣṇu is certainly engaged in combatting Asuras, he is put to the task and made successful in it by Śiva. The one who ultimately controls it all, the transcendent director behind the scenes, is Śiva, husband of Pārvatī, the master of everyone and everything.

The Composition of the Second Part of SP 112

The second half of SP 112 (SP 112.73–115) in many ways constitutes the most complex part of the text included in this volume and requires special attention. In this section we first of all discuss the three episodes included in this part of the text and how they provide insight into the composition and architecture of the *Skandapurāṇa*. As will be shown, they serve as connective episodes that introduce a very large part of the remainder of the text, taking the reader all the way up to SP_{Bh} 163, where the Skanda cycle will be resumed. Next, we address the significant changes that have been introduced in the RA redaction of this part of the text.

Three Connective Episodes

The second part of SP 112 consists of three independent episodes, though narrated in sequence (see Table 2 on p. 24 for a tabular overview).

Episode A (SP 112.73–81): After receiving Devī's instructions on *dharma*, the goddesses are satisfied and invite her for a walk around the forest of the Mandara mountain. As they take in the beautiful scenery, Devī sees a young *aśoka* tree in blossom and decides to adopt it as her son with permission from Deva upon his return. The story is resumed in SP_{Bh} 158; the ritual of the adoption of the tree as her son is narrated in SP_{Bh} 158–162.

Episode B (SP 112.82–92): Ill omens occur, followed by the arrival of Andhaka and his retinue at Mandara. Andhaka finds Devī surrounded by the goddesses and stares at her without paying respect. Prahlāda warns him, saying that she is Umā, the consort of Deva. Devī disappears together with the goddesses. The extensive Andhaka myth proper is narrated in SP_{Bh} 130–157.

Episode C (SP 112.93–115): Wandering around Mandara, Andhaka spots some sages in conversation. Prahlāda tells him that they are the

Seven Sages (Saptarṣi) and proposes eavesdropping upon them. The sages become aware of their presence and decide to move elsewhere, reproaching the Asuras' greed for kingship. Just then, Dhātṛ, Vidhātṛ and Kṛtānta arrive. They report that they have paid a visit to Kaśyapa, at the command of Brahmā, and told him about the future affairs of the Devas and Asuras, and that Brahmā subsequently sent them to Mandara to see Devī. The Seven Sages request that the trio tell them about these future affairs as well as their message to Devī. Hereafter, Kṛtānta starts his narration, which forms the subject of SP_{Bh} 113–129. We refer to these future affairs of the Devas and Asuras as the Devāsura war cycle.⁴² The second question, regarding their message to Devī, is not followed up in the subsequent part.

As can be observed from the above, all three episodes function as preludes to the narratives told after this chapter, in the reverse order: Episode C is connected with the immediately following narration (SP_{Bh} 113–129), Episode B with the subsequent Andhaka myth (SP_{Bh} 130–157) and Episode A with the story of the *aśoka* tree's adoption as a son (SP_{Bh} 158–162). Thus, the second half of SP 112 figures as a sort of showcase of what will be narrated after this chapter and before the resumption of the Skanda cycle in SP_{Bh} 163, the cycle that was suspended at the end of SP 72.

A closer look, however, reveals that the relationship of each episode with its corresponding main narrative is quite complex. First of all, Episode C is well connected with the immediately following Devāsura war cycle, but Kṛtānta is mentioned only once as the narrator of this cycle, in SP_{Bh} 113.1, when Vyāsa asks Sanatkumāra to tell him what Kṛtānta told the sages. Moreover, the appearance of the Seven Sages and the arrival of Dhātṛ, Vidhātṛ and Kṛtānta are very abrupt, and there is no intrinsic connection with the preceding Episode B. The only connection relates to the content of their talk, for the Asuras' presence triggers their conversation about the nature of the Asuras' enmity with the Devas. This could

42 Many battles between the Devas and the Asuras are related in the text, for example, the lengthy one leading up to Hiraṇyākṣa's victory covering SP 78–95. On the other hand, we refer to SP_{Bh} 113–129 as 'the Devāsura war cycle' because a succession of seven wars between the Devas and the Asuras forms its basic structure and it thus constitutes a myth cycle proper. The Devāsura wars treated in these chapters are the following: 1. the Amṛtamanthana war (SP_{Bh} 113–115); 2. the Āṭibaka war (SP_{Bh} 116.1–13ab); 3. the Vāmana war (SP_{Bh} 116.13cd–121.22); 4. the Tārakāmaya war (SP_{Bh} 121.23–122.16); 5. the Dhvaja war (SP_{Bh} 125); 6. the Hālāhala war (SP_{Bh} 129.1–18); and 7. the Andhakāraka war (SP_{Bh} 129.19–46). This Devāsura war cycle may well have been inspired by the listing of twelve Devāsura wars in PPL 489.71–85: Nārasimha, Vāmana, Vārāha, Amṛtamanthana, Tārakāmaya, Āḍivaka, Traipura, Andhakāra, Dhvaja, Vārtra, Hālāhala and Kolāhala. See Yokochi forthc.

trigger the reader's interest in the various wars between the Devas and the Asuras.

What is intriguing here, and potentially confusing, is that the embedded Devāsura war cycle concerns future events. In the case of the embedding of one narrative into another narrative frame, the embedded narrative usually relates to what happened before, a past event, but here the narrative is explicitly connected with the future.⁴³ Thus, the temporal relationship, in terms of narration, between the events told in the Andhaka cycle and those in the Devāsura war cycle is accounted for and made clear. Therefore, it seems likely that Episode C was composed independently and incorporated here in order to link the preceding narrative with the Devāsura war cycle that follows, as well as to explain to the reader the temporal relationship of the events narrated in the two cycles. In conclusion, we can identify the embedding of a narrative of future events within a higher narrative frame as one of the unique narrative methods employed in the process of redacting the *Skandapurāṇa*.⁴⁴

Episode A appears to be a real prelude to the story of Devī's adoption of the *aśoka* tree as her son, narrated in SP_{Bh} 158–162. First of all, the event related in Episode A, viz. Umā's discovery of a young *aśoka* tree

43 SP 112.109b and SP 112.112b mention *bhaviṣyam*, and SP 112.115b *yathābhaviṣyam*, which we take as a noun, not an adverb.

44 The Devāsura war cycle is in fact not the only case in the *Skandapurāṇa* in which a future event is embedded. The Andhaka cycle (SP 73–157, which includes the Varāha and the Devāsura war cycle within it) is mostly a future affair from the perspective of the Skanda cycle, in which it is embedded, because Skanda, though not yet born by the end of SP 72, features in SP 109–110, and the Gaṇas called Skandas, Viśākhās, Śākhas and Naigameśas, as well as Skanda himself, join the battle between the Gaṇas and Andhaka's demon army narrated in the Andhaka cycle. Viśākha, Śākha and Naigameśa are manifestations of Skanda. Skandas (plural) are mentioned in SP_{Bh} 130.67cd–69ab, Viśākhās in SP_{Bh} 130.69cd–71ab, Śākhas in SP_{Bh} 130.71cd–73ab, Naigameśas in SP_{Bh} 130.73cd–75ab, and the single Skanda with his retinue in SP_{Bh} 130.80. Each of them is mentioned on occasion, as the battle takes place, in the subsequent chapters. The fact that these events lie in the future from the perspective of the narrative at hand is, however, not made explicit and it may rather be due to confusion at the time when the Andhaka cycle was redacted and embedded in the Skanda cycle. In SP 72.130, the gods ask Śiva to stop Andhaka from continuing to practice severe asceticism (*tapas*), using the present tense, and Śiva promises that he will kill him in the next verse. If we follow this indication, Andhaka's *tapas*, narrated in SP 74, takes place before Skanda's birth. However, as pointed out in SP IV (p. 9 and p. 53, n. 116), this passage, or rather the last part of SP 72 (SP 72.127–140), of which it forms part, is secondary. It is likely that the Andhaka cycle was originally composed independently of the Skanda cycle, and in the Andhaka cycle Skanda is assumed to be there as Śiva's son. The secondary passage, SP 72.127–140, which was added in order to link both cycles, has led to a confusion of their temporal relationship. In the case of Episode C, on the other hand, we are not only told that the next narrative concerns the future, but also why these future events can be told at this moment in time.

and her resolve to adopt it as her son with Śiva's permission, is told by her to Śiva in SP_{Bh} 158.70–72. Her account exactly corresponds to the content of Episode A, except for the detail that milk flowed out from Umā's breasts when she saw the tree (SP_{Bh} 158.72). Secondly, Episode A and the main narrative share a unique epithet of Umā, Devadevī.⁴⁵ Thus it seems that Episode A and the corresponding main narrative were composed as a coherent story by the same author.

Here we encounter a problem. Episode A is incorporated in the Andhaka cycle, and the corresponding main story, SP_{Bh} 158–162, is told immediately after it, in one and the same sequence. Umā is, however, said to be *aputrā* 'without a son' on several occasions in the story of the *aśoka* tree,⁴⁶ while SP_{Bh} 158.74 and SP_{Bh} 162.127 refer to the gods' preventing her from having a son,⁴⁷ which clearly refers to their request that Śiva not have a son, the eventual Skanda, from Umā herself (SP 72.89–92). Skanda, however, features in the Andhaka cycle, so that this statement of Umā being childless contradicts the story line of the Andhaka cycle.⁴⁸ The allusion to the gods' intervention suggests that this *aśoka*-tree story is closely associated with the Skanda cycle and was originally included between the start of the Skanda cycle (SP 72.1–126) and the main Skanda myth in SP_{Bh} 163–165. Thus the location of Episode A here does not fit very well with the temporal sequence of the immediate context. It may have been included here because Śiva's absence, which is a precondition of Episode A, is mentioned at the end of SP 100 (SP 100.30–31). In addition, the *dharma* of women (*strīdharmā*) related by Devī to Deva in SP_{Bh} 158.80–87 is similar in content to SP 112.67–72ab, in the last part of Devī's instruction to the goddesses. It seems to indicate that part of this teaching was composed in tandem with Episode A and the main story of the adoption of the *aśoka* tree, expanded upon later during redaction, incorporating material from an external source.⁴⁹

45 The epithet occurs at SP 112.79a, SP 112.84c, SP_{Bh} 158.69a, SP_{Bh} 169.26d and SP_{Bh} 171.34b. Its occurrence in SP 112.84c in Episode B may have been influenced by the preceding Episode A (see the argument below regarding Episode B). We are not certain why the epithet also appears later on, in SP_{Bh} 169 and 171.

46 SP_{Bh} 158.63a, SP_{Bh} 158.74c and SP_{Bh} 162.69a. Episode A does not mention that she is *aputrā*, but the expanded version in the RA recension refers to it (SP_{RA} 112.3.16a).

47 SP_{Bh} 158.74: *devaiḥ putraphale kṣipte sa hi me tarupotakaḥ | tuṣṭiprado hy apu-trāyāḥ putrako bhavitānagha ||*; SP_{Bh} 162.127: *devair yac cāpi muṣitam iṣṭaputra-phalaṃ purā | tan me sarvaṃ vyapagataṃ prāpyāśokataruṃ sutam ||*.

48 See n. 44 on p. 18.

49 See p. 8 above. Moreover, the teaching that a good son (*satputra*) delivers his ancestors from hell, found in SP_{Bh} 158 and SP_{Bh} 162, suggests a connection between the story of the *aśoka* tree's adoption and the Naraka cycle of SP 35–52.

The relationship between Episode B and the corresponding main narrative is the most problematic. The introductory portion of the battle between Andhaka's army and Śiva's Gaṇas, featuring in SP_{Bh} 130.2–41, can be summarized as follows.

While Andhaka is wandering around Mt Mandara with his retinue, after having conquered all the gods, he encounters Devī by chance and desires her to be his wife, totally obsessed with her. Prahlāda warns him that he will destroy all the Asuras if he disrespects the Mother of the World and consort of Deva. But Andhaka refuses to listen and tries to touch her. When Devī registers his lustful intentions she orders her Gaṇas, headed by Somanandin, to attack him. Andhaka defeats them. Then Devī herself assaults him with bow and arrows. When he counterattacks her, she wields the trident. At that moment Deva interferes and tells her that he is the one who should punish Andhaka. Devī disappears and Deva orders Nandin to gather the Gaṇas.

This introduction partly overlaps with the content of Episode B (Andhaka's lust for Devī and Prahlāda's warning) and partly contradicts it (Andhaka's fight with her Gaṇas and herself before her disappearance). Therefore, it may well be that Episode B was composed independently of the main Andhaka myth, in the form of an abridged version of the introduction, in order to give a glimpse of what would be narrated later.

The reference to this introductory portion of the Andhaka myth in the 'table of contents' (Anukramaṇikā) of SP 2 further complicates matters. The topic of Andhaka's catching sight of Devī (or of Devī's catching sight of Andhaka) is mentioned in SP 2.17d (*devyāś cāndhakadarśanam*) and Deva's arrival is mentioned in SP 2.19a (*devasyāgamanam*). Thus the topics mentioned in between, in SP 2.18, would most probably refer to the events in this portion. The following four topics are listed in SP 2.18: the encounter between Nandin (Śailādi) and the Daitya(s) (*śailādidaitya-saṃmardo*), Devī's taking on of a hundred of forms (*devyāś ca śatarūpatā*), Devī's granting of boons (*āryāvarapradānam ca*), probably to Nandin, and the praise of Nandin (*śailādistava eva ca*), which is either a eulogy to him or a eulogy to Devī by him. None of these elements are found in Episode B or in the corresponding passage of the RA recension (SP_{RA} 112.3.17–56), nor in the introductory portion in SP_{Bh} 130. In the end this may not be all that surprising, because the Anukramaṇikā, in general, does not correspond exactly to the contents of the *Skandapurāṇa*; it seems to be rather a sort of blueprint for the entire composition.⁵⁰

50 Törzsök 2004, 26–28. In her words (p. 27f.), 'the *anukramaṇikā* represents a theoretical list of subjects which the writer(s) or redactor(s) of the *anukramaṇikā*

Attention should now be drawn to the *Vāmanapurāṇa*. This Purāṇa shares many topics with the *Skandapurāṇa*, such as the *Skandapurāṇa*'s main storyline, comprising Śiva's marriages with Satī and Umā, Skanda's birth and his conquest of Tāraka, Umā's change of complexion and the birth of Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsini,⁵¹ and finally the Andhaka myth. Furthermore, some topics of the *Vāmanapurāṇa* find a parallel with material found only in the RA recension.⁵² A detailed comparison of both Purāṇas would require a separate study. Here it should suffice to notice that the *Skandapurāṇa*, probably in an early form or predecessor of the RA recension, was one of the important sources for the *Vāmanapurāṇa*.⁵³

The Andhaka myth of the *Vāmanapurāṇa* is narrated in a very similar manner as in the *Skandapurāṇa*, though much more briefly. VmP 33.15–47 corresponds to the separate prelude, Episode B, in the *Skandapurāṇa*. The main story of the battle between Andhaka and Śiva is narrated in VmP 37–44,⁵⁴ which does not include the introduction, except for the repeated warning by Prahlāda. As a consequence the prelude is more easily connected with the main story. The story of the prelude, VmP 33.15–47, runs as follows.

Andhaka comes to Mt Mandara with his retinue and catches sight of Devī, staring at her in fascination. Prahlāda warns him, explaining who she is, but Andhaka gets angry and rushes to her with his army. Nandin obstructs them but he is hit by Andhaka's blow. On seeing this, Devī manifests a hundred forms (goddesses).⁵⁵ When they assail him, Andhaka does not counterattack them, thinking that they are only young women, and is struck to the ground. Seeing him fallen, Devī disappears with her hundred forms. The Asuras, enraged, attack Nandin, who defeats them and returns to Devī. She sends out her manifestations (*mūrti*) all over the world to take up an abode on earth as they like. Andhaka goes back to the underworld, brooding over her.

would have ideally included in the purāṇa, but which has never corresponded to any stage of the actual text.'

51 The ensuing fight between Vindhyavāsini and the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha in VmP 29–30, on the other hand, is modelled after the *Devīmāhātmya* rather than the *Skandapurāṇa*.

52 Yokochi 2004, 92–94. One noteworthy instance is Vināyaka's birth, for which see Törzsök 2004, 19–24.

53 See also Bakker 2021, for various parallels between the Mahākapāla myth of Kurukṣetra in the SP and the VmP's *Saromāhātmya*.

54 This contains a sub-narrative of king Daṇḍa in VmP 37.19–40.19, told by Prahlāda as a warning to Andhaka, which has no parallel in the SP.

55 VmP 33.34: *śailādiṃ patitaṃ dr̥ṣṭvā dhāvamānaṃ tathāndhakam | śatarūpābhavad gaurī bhayāt tasya durātmanaḥ ||*.

As this summary shows, two topics mentioned in the Anukramaṇikā of the *Skandapurāṇa* are found here: 1) the fight between Nandin and the demons, and 2) Devī's taking on of a hundred forms. The topics of Devī's granting of boons and the praise of Nandin, however, are not included. How should we interpret this phenomenon? One possible scenario would be that the Anukramaṇikā of the *Skandapurāṇa* exerted some influence on the composition of the *Vāmanapurāṇa*, just as it did on the RA recension.⁵⁶ Another option, which may be more likely, is as follows. A version of the Andhaka myth, including all the motifs mentioned in the Anukramaṇikā, was known among the Paurāṇikas when the redaction of the *Skandapurāṇa* took place, and the Anukramaṇikā was composed as a sort of blueprint. The composers of the *Vāmanapurāṇa* may well have known this version and incorporated some motifs from it as a separate prelude in their own telling of the myth. The composers of the Andhaka myth of the *Skandapurāṇa*, on the other hand, may have preferred to narrate the introduction in a briefer manner, even if they were aware of a richer version as suggested by the Anukramaṇikā, possibly because they intended to bring into focus the battle between Andhaka's army and Śiva's Gaṇas, which takes up many chapters in the *Skandapurāṇa*'s version of the Andhaka myth. Thus the difference between the topics listed in SP 2.18 and the three versions of the actual narrative—Episode B, the introduction to the Andhaka myth in SP_{Bh} 130, and the corresponding story in VmP 33—demonstrates how the composers of each version dealt with the material in accordance with their own aims and the requirements of its position in the work at hand.

To summarize the argument advanced above, Episode A was probably composed together with the main story of the *aśoka* tree's adoption narrated in SP_{Bh} 158–162 to form its prelude. Furthermore, both Episode A and the main story appear to have been closely associated with the Skanda cycle originally. Their current connection with the Andhaka cycle is probably the result of the process of tying the different parts together. Episode B, on the other hand, was composed independently from the main Andhaka myth, and probably inserted in its current position in order to give a glimpse of the upcoming Andhaka myth. Episode C, finally, was also introduced here, not just to link the immediately following Devāsura war cycle with the Andhaka cycle, but also to make the temporal relationship between both cycles clear. Although the relationship of each

⁵⁶ The Anukramaṇikā most probably triggered the addition of some material at the time of the major revision that led to the RA recension, but continued to do so afterwards as well. Topics mentioned in it but not included in the main text of an earlier form of the SP gave rise to the composition of new material. See Törzsök 2004, 26–28, for the addition of the story of Śiva's ashes; for the addition of SP_{RA} 112.1, see the discussion below, p. 28.

episode with the corresponding main narrative may be different, the three episodes in sequence function as a preview to prepare the reader for all that comes after, before the main storyline resumes much later with the Skanda cycle. The second half of SP 112, consisting of three brief and highly diverse episodes, may look confusing at first glance, but it provides good insight into the editorial techniques involved in the process of redacting the *Skandapurāṇa*.

The Revision of SP 112 in the RA Recension

The second half of Adhyāya 112 also offers valuable insight into the production and transmission of the RA recension of the *Skandapurāṇa*. At the end of Devī's instruction to the goddesses in Adhyāya 112, the RA recension diverges radically from the S recension. After SP 112.72, the RA recension adds two more pādas, a closing verse in a longer metre, and a colophon that indicates the end of the conversation between Umā and the goddesses.⁵⁷ This is followed by two additional chapters, which have been edited and presented in our edition as SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2. Of these additional chapters, neither the last portion of SP_{RA} 112.1 (112.1.40–colophon) nor any of SP_{RA} 112.2 are found in the A manuscripts. It is uncertain whether these part have been lost in the A recension or if they were added later in the R recension. Hereafter, the RA recension resumes the storyline found in the S recension at SP 112.73, although the text of the RA recension is much expanded. This part is printed in our edition as SP_{RA} 112.3. Near the end of the chapter, at SP 112.106ab, which corresponds to SP_{RA} 112.3.87cd, the S recension and the RA recension meet again and more or less share the same text up to the end. Table 2 gives an overview of the relationship between the different recensions of Adhyāya 112. The second part of this chapter, SP 112.73–115, is divided into three segments in accordance with the content.⁵⁸

The question arises as to whether the accretion and expansion in the R and A recensions were done simultaneously or at different times. A first clue to answer this question may be found in the expansion of SP_{RA} 112.3. As has been observed elsewhere, the major revision that brought the ancestor of the RA recension into being is marked by a special group of epithets referring to Vyāsa as 'the son of Kālī' (Kāleya, Kālinandana,

⁵⁷ The title of the preceding part as given in the colophon is probably *umāsāvitṛyādī-saṃvāda*, following the reading in R. The variants in the A manuscripts seem to be corrupted from this. See the apparatus of SP 112.72.

⁵⁸ See the summary above, p. 16.

Table 2: Adhyāya 112 in the S, R and A Recensions

Content	S Recension	R Recension	A Recension
Devī's instruction of <i>ekabhakta</i> etc. to the goddesses	SP 112.1–72	SP 112.1–72 with 6 additional pādas and colophon	
<i>strīvrata</i> (Śatarūpā tells Devī about Brahmā's instruction to Sāvitrī)	—	SP _{RA} 112.1.1–49 with colophon	SP _{RA} 112.1.1–39
<i>devīśokaparihāra</i> (Mālinī shows Devī the beauty of the forest to console her)	—	SP _{RA} 112.2.1–25 with colophon	—
Devī walks with the goddesses on Mandara and finds an <i>aśoka</i> tree → SP 158–162	SP 112.73–81 (9 vs.)	SP _{RA} 112.3.1–16 (16 vs.)	
Ill omens, appearance of Andhaka with his demons, his lust for Devī, and Prahlāda's warning → Andhaka myth (SP 130–157)	SP 112.82–92 (11 vs.)	SP _{RA} 112.3.17–56 (40 vs.)	
Seven sages in conversation, arrival of Dhātṛ, Vidhātṛ and Kṛtānta, and the question about the future events of the Devas and Asuras → Devāsura war cycle (SP 113–129)	SP 112.93–115 (23 vs.) with colophon	SP _{RA} 112.3.57–97 (41 vs.) with colophon	

Kālīja etc.).⁵⁹ These epithets occur five times in SP_{RA} 112.3,⁶⁰ which strongly suggests that SP_{RA} 112.3 was composed at the time of the major revision, although some passages may have been added or changed later.

Do the new colophon after SP 112.72 and the additional material found in SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2 also go back to the major revision? To answer this question, we need to examine the colophons in the R and A recensions. The first additional colophon, after SP 112.72, is shared by both recensions, as mentioned above, but the Sanskrit numbering of the chapter as *ekādaśottaraśato dhyāyaḥ* ‘the 111th chapter’ is found only in the A recension.⁶¹ The two colophons at the end of SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2 are found only in R and without any title name; the text from SP_{RA} 112.1.40 to the end of SP_{RA} 112.2, including the two colophons, is not preserved in the A recension. In the last colophon at the end of Adhyāya 112, **A** has another chapter numbering, identifying it as *dvādaśottaraśatatamo dhyāyaḥ* ‘the 112th chapter’, while its title, *saptarṣisamāgama* or *sapta-*

59 Bisschop 2006, 7–8. For the major revision of the RA recension, see Harimoto 2004, 41–43 (Fig.1 provides a good overview).

60 They are Kālinandana (112.3.19d; 112.3.38d), Kāleya (112.3.20c, only in **A**; 112.3.41a) and Kālīja (112.3.48d, only in **A**).

61 This should in fact be the 112th chapter (*dvādaśottaraśato dhyāyaḥ*). This reduction of one number in the chapter numbering starts at the colophon of chapter 70 and is probably due to an error in counting there. The Arabic numbers found in the colophons in some of the A manuscripts are neglected here because it is likely that they were added after the hyparchetype of the A recension.

r̥ṣisamāgamana, is shared by the R and A recensions. Thus, according to its chapter numbering, the A recension divides Adhyāya 112 into two chapters, while the R recension divides it into four chapters. Was this chapter numbering in the colophons made in the hyparchetype of the A recension or even earlier? The hyparchetype of the A recension did not have the text from SP_{RA} 112.1.40 to the end of SP_{RA} 112.2, so it would have been natural to number the remaining two colophons in this way. However, evidence from other parts of the text suggests that the chapter numbering of the A recension was made prior to the hyparchetype.

Colophons containing chapter numbering in Sanskrit are occasionally found in the A recension. The colophon of Adhyāya 70 refers to it as the 69th chapter (*ekonāsaptatitamo 'dhyāyaḥ*); here the 69th for the 70th is probably due to a mere error. Some portions of the succeeding chapters, including the colophons of Adhyāyas 93, 98 and 103, are lost in the A recension, probably due to the loss of a folio or some verses in the hyparchetype of the A recension.⁶² According to the colophon of Adhyāya 104 in the A recension, this is the 103rd chapter, and the colophons of the successive chapters, SP 105–111, have the Sanskrit chapter numbering of the actual chapter number minus one. This means that the Sanskrit chapter numberings in the colophons were written before the hyparchetype of the A recension, because the loss of text including some colophons in the hyparchetype did not affect the numbering. Taking into account that adding colophons is more common in intentional modification than reducing colophons, it is plausible that the RA recension originally divided SP 112 into two chapters by adding a new colophon after SP 112.72, and that it was subsequently divided into four chapters in the R recension alone through the addition of two more colophons. The fact that the two early colophons (one after SP 112.72 and the other at the end of the chapter) share almost the same title in R and A, while the other two, later colophons (at the end of SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2) found only in R do not have any title, lends further support to this conclusion.

Moreover, we may assume that the division of SP 112 into two chapters goes back to the major revision of the RA recension, because the content of SP 112 is clearly divided at SP 112.72, which is where Devī's instruction (continued from the previous chapter) ends. It would have been natural, therefore, to divide the chapter here when the second part was expanded. If this is the case, was the division of SP 112 into two chapters and the accretion of SP_{RA} 112.1 and/or SP_{RA} 112.2 done at the same time?

There are several reasons to answer this question negatively. First, although it rests only on negative evidence, we have not yet found any

⁶² SP 93.20c–94.18d, SP 98.47–colophon and SP 103.39e–194.11b are lost in the A recension.

quotations from SP_{RA} 112.1 in the Dharmanibandha literature. Secondly, since the subject of SP_{RA} 112.1 is the observance for women (*strīvrata*), if this part had existed when SP 112 was divided into two chapters, it would have been more reasonable context-wise to place the new colophon after this part, rather than before it. But the strongest reason is the following. The RA recension adds two pādas after SP 112.72, before the closing verse and the new colophon. In these two pādas, Devī asks the goddesses what else they would like to hear.⁶³ This question offers a segue into SP 112.73–74, in which the goddesses reply that Devī has already told the *dharma* of great merit sufficiently, after which they invite her to take a walk in the forest. At the beginning of SP_{RA} 112.1, however, Devī asks Sāvitrī to tell her the observance for women, which is not compatible with Devī's question in the two additional pādas after SP 112.72. This is also the case for the beginning of SP_{RA} 112.2, which connects smoothly with the end of SP_{RA} 112.1 but not with the additional two pādas after SP 112.72. Thus, it is unlikely that SP_{RA} 112.1 and/or SP_{RA} 112.2 were inserted at the same time that the two additional pādas, accompanied by the closing verse and colophon were, added after SP 112.72.

Nor does the current beginning of SP_{RA} 112.3 connect smoothly with the question in the two additional pādas. As mentioned above, the question seems to anticipate a reply like the one found in SP 112.73–74, so it may be supposed that, when the text after SP 112.73 was expanded into the current SP_{RA} 112.3, the beginning would have been closer to the S recension and would have had a passage similar to SP 112.73–74. A clue to the later revision of this part is provided by the presence of one of the special epithets of Vyāsa, Kālinandana, in SP_{RA} 112.2.24b. Furthermore, pāda d in the same verse refers to Śailādi (i.e. Nandin) as a companion of the goddesses. Nandin was mentioned as their companion in SP 112.78d⁶⁴ and in SP_{RA} 112.3.20b and SP_{RA} 112.3.23–24, while another Gaṇa, Bhṛṅgiriṭi, features in SP_{RA} 112.2.7–8, where he seems to be confused with Nandin. These two points suggest that SP_{RA} 112.2.24 belongs to the text of the major revision. This means that this verse was most probably included at the beginning of SP_{RA} 112.3 when the text after SP 112.73 was expanded, with a new colophon added before it. Later, when the new material in SP_{RA} 112.1 and/or SP_{RA} 112.2 was inserted, the beginning of SP_{RA} 112.3 was revised in order to make it fit into the new context, and the verse was moved to the end of the additional material.

63 This is based on the reading in **A**. The variant in **R** looks corrupt, but can be emended to *ato bravīmi kiñcānyac chrotuṃ icchatha śobhanāḥ*, which makes it similar in meaning to **A**.

64 See n. 307 on p. 90.

To sum up, we may hypothesize the following three stages from the major revision to the present R and A recensions.

Stage 1: At the time of the major revision, the second half of SP 112 (112.73–115) was expanded and a new colophon was placed after SP 112.72, along with two additional pādas and one closing verse in a longer metre. As a result, SP 112 was divided into two chapters. SP_{RA} 112.3 represents more or less the expanded text, corresponding to SP 112.73–115, but the beginning was probably closer to the surviving text of the S recension. It would have included a passage similar to SP 112.73–74 and SP_{RA} 112.2.24.

Stage 2: Between the major revision and the hyparchetype of the R and A recensions, entirely new material was incorporated after the colophon added in Stage 1. This material would have contained most of SP_{RA} 112.1.1–39 as well as something more, since SP_{RA} 112.1.39 occurs in the middle of Brahmā's speech to Śatarūpā. At the least, some extra verses ending their conversation and resuming the storyline of the conversation between Devī and the goddesses on Mandara would have been necessary. Part of this is preserved in the R recension in SP_{RA} 112.1.40–112.2.25, but another part of it is lost.⁶⁵ The beginning of SP_{RA} 112.3 was modified accordingly.

Stage 3: Some more material, along with the two new colophons (at the end of SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2), was added in the R recension after the split of the R and the A recensions. As a result, Adhyāya 112 was divided into four chapters in the R recension. In the hyparchetype of the A recension, on the other hand, some verses were lost after SP_{RA} 112.1.39.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ It is not impossible that most of SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2 was added at this stage, excluding both the two colophons at the end of SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2 as well as the closing verses before the colophons (SP_{RA} 112.1.50 and SP_{RA} 112.2.25). But we suppose that only the material about the *strīvrata* was inserted at this stage, and that the part with the motif of Umā's depression due to her separation from Śiva and her consolation by the goddesses (SP_{RA} 112.1.49cd–112.2.23) was a further addition, made in the next stage. There are two reasons for this: firstly, the addition of two more colophons without any addition or expansion of the text in the next stage is unlikely; and secondly, the Mandara forest is depicted not only in SP_{RA} 112.2 but also in SP_{RA} 112.3.2–8, and these two passages are somewhat redundant, though the verbal expression in both passages is very different.

⁶⁶ This does not mean that there is no loss of verses in the R recension or no additions in the A recension. SP_{RA} 112.1.6–7, which is missing in R, may have been added in the hyparchetype of the A recension, and some pādas that resume the main story of Umā and the goddesses were clearly lost in the R recension (SP_{RA} 112.2.49ab). But here we are dealing with the modification of the text on a larger scale.

A significant outcome of the above analysis is that the modification of the text—not only minor changes of formulation, but also major changes such as the accretion of new material and the expansion and revision of an earlier text—continued even after the major revision in the transmission of both recensions. This can serve as an illustration of how a Purāṇa may undergo continuous changes during its various stages of transmission over time. More specifically, it cautions us to be careful in dealing with passages found only in the R and A recensions, for while some parts may be ascribed to the major revision, others may have been added at a later time.

Finally, an intriguing point concerning the relationship between the Anukramaṇikā (SP 2) and the RA recension must be noted. It has already been pointed out elsewhere that several subjects mentioned in the Anukramaṇikā are not treated in the S recension but are found only in the RA recension.⁶⁷ In adding new material, the redactors of the text at the time of the major revision appear to have taken up several of the untreated subjects from the Anukramaṇikā. This is also the case in SP_{RA} 112.1. The topics mentioned in the Anukramaṇikā are not always listed systematically in their order of appearance in the text, and so they can be difficult to identify. Nevertheless, the subject of Devī's taking on a hundred forms (*devyāś ca śatarūpatā*), referred to in SP 2.18b, is most probably related to the Andhaka myth, because SP 2.17d refers to Andhaka's catching sight of Devī (*devyāś cāndhakadarśanam*).⁶⁸ The author of SP_{RA} 112.1 seems to have been inspired by SP 2.18b and introduced Śatarūpā, the only daughter of Brahmā, in the newly added section. However, it is highly unlikely that the topic originally intended in SP 2.18b was the appearance of the goddess Śatarūpā, for this episode of Umā's multiplication of herself into a hundred forms, while not featuring in our *Skandapurāṇa*, is known from the version of the Andhaka myth told in the *Vāmanapurāṇa*. It was no doubt this episode that the author of the Anukramaṇikā had in mind.⁶⁹ The word *śatarūpatā*, however, was sufficient to trigger the invention of a new framework, namely the conversation between Brahmā and his daughter Śatarūpā, which served to introduce the additional material of the *strīvrata*. Thus, the Anukramaṇikā included in SP 2 not only exerted an influence upon the major revision, but also continued to do so in the transmission of the text afterwards.

67 SP I, 43f.; Harimoto 2004, 45f.; Törzsök 2004, 26f.

68 Furthermore, SP 2.18a, SP 2.18cd and SP 2.19ab also seem to refer to episodes belonging to the beginning of the Andhaka myth, though not all of them are narrated in our text. See above, p. 20.

69 For the *Vāmanapurāṇa*, see above, p. 21.

Dharmanibandha Citations of Devī's Teachings

Devī's teachings to the goddesses in SP 111 and SP 112.1–72 are quoted extensively in several Dharmanibandha works. Before embarking on a discussion of these citations, the other citations by Dharmanibandha authors may be summarized in brief. The *Adbhutasāgara* of Ballālasena and his son Lakṣmaṇasena quotes five passages from the text included in this volume: SP 100.3ab and SP 100.3cd, SP 107.3cd–4, SP 107.27, and the set of SP 107.28ab, SP 107.29ab and SP 107.30ab. Furthermore, mention should be made of two quotations from SP 78, which were not listed as testimonia in our edition of SP IV.⁷⁰ The quotations that these two royal authors have collected from the *Skandapurāṇa* are from different parts of the text, wherever ill omens are related before or in the midst of battles. This indicates that Ballālasena and Lakṣmaṇasena, or the scholars who worked under their names, were very familiar with the content of the text.

In addition, we would like to add one more quotation from the descriptions of hells, cited in the *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru*, that was not incorporated as testimony in SP II B. The citation consists of SP 47.14ab and SP 49.9cd.⁷¹

Regarding the Dharmanibandha citations of Devī's teachings to the goddesses in SP 111 and SP 112.1–72, except for the passages that embed the teaching into the main narrative and those that concern ritual procedures, most of her teachings are cited either under the subject of donation (*dāna*), in the case of SP 111.11–94 and SP 112.49–50, or that of religious observance (*vrata*), in the case of SP 112.2–37. Of the eight Dharmanibandha works identified as testimonia in our edition,⁷² five have already been discussed in the Prolegomena of SP I: the *Dānakāṇḍa* (DK) and *Vratakāṇḍa* (VK) of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara, the *Dānasāgara* (DS) of Ballālasena, Aparārka's commentary on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* (AYS), the *Kṛtyaratnākara* (KR) of Caṇḍeśvara, and the *Dānakhaṇḍa* (HeDKh) and *Vratakhaṇḍa* (HeVKh) of Hemādri's *Caturvarga-*

70 SP 78.7cd is quoted on p.378 and SP 78.8ab on p.480 of the *Adbhutasāgara*, with the variant *śakranandana* for *śaktinandana*. The quotation of SP 78.8ab is preceded by three unidentified pādas on p.479.

71 Both hemistiches are quoted together on p.463 of the edition of the *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* (*kapilā yasya goṣṭhe syād anagner brāhmaṇasya ca | sa yāti dustaraṃ ghoram narakam tat tamomayam ||*). The second hemistich was not identified as 49.9cd in the Prolegomena of SP I (p.7, n.22).

72 There may be more testimonia but, if so, it is more likely that they would have quoted the text indirectly through one of the earlier works mentioned here. The argument advanced in the following pages supports our earlier assumption that Caṇḍeśvara, in the 14th century, was the last Dharmanibandha author who had direct access to the *Skandapurāṇa*.

cintāmaṇi.⁷³ For this volume, three more testimonia have been identified.⁷⁴ The oldest and most important addition is the *Samayapradīpa* (SaPra) of Śrīdatta Upādhyāya, who flourished in Mithilā before Caṇḍeśvara.⁷⁵ The second addition is the *Dānavivekoddhyota* (DVU), one of the sections of the *Madanaratnapradīpa*, which is an extensive digest on *dharma* composed under the patronage of King Madanasimhadeva in or near Delhi in the first half of the 15th century.⁷⁶ The last one, the *Dānakriyākaumudī* (DKK) of Govindānanda Kavikaṅkaṇācārya, though late—it is ascribed to the first half of the 16th century⁷⁷—is interesting because of Govindānanda's location, Bengal, which is where the oldest two manuscripts of the R and A recensions come from.

In this section, we first investigate the interrelationship of these eight authors, particularly the question of whether they quoted from the text directly or indirectly through each other's works. Next we consider if the first-hand citations provide testimony as witnesses to the modifications that the text of the *Skandapurāṇa* was undergoing during its transmission.

First, however, in order to illustrate the interdependence of the eight Dharmanibandhas with respect to their citations of Devī's teachings in the *Skandapurāṇa*, we list here the individual passages and their citations.

SP 111:

- 1–10: No testimony
- 11–15: DS
- 16–21: No testimony
- 22–23: DK, DS, DKK, KR, HeDKh
- 24: DS, DKK, KR
- 25: DS, DKK
- 26: DS
- 27–29: No testimony
- 30–32 (except for 31cd): DK, HeDKh
- 33–35: No testimony
- 36: DK, HeDKh
- 37ab, 38ab, 39ab: DK

⁷³ SP I, Prolegomena, pp. 6–13.

⁷⁴ We thank Amandine Wattelier-Bricout for providing information on the additional testimonia.

⁷⁵ Kane I, 759–763. According to Kane, Śrīdatta probably composed his works in Mithilā between 1275–1310 AD. One of the works referred to by Śrīdatta is Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru*, while, conversely, his *Samayapradīpa* is mentioned by Caṇḍeśvara in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* (Kane I, 762).

⁷⁶ Kane I, 804–809. The *Madanaratnapradīpa* refers to the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, the *Kṛtyaratnākara* and Hemādri (Kane I, 808).

⁷⁷ For the date, location and works of Govindānanda Kavikaṅkaṇācārya, see Kane I, 882–889.

- 37cd, 38cd, 39cd: No testimony
 40–41: DS
 42–44: DK, HeDKh, DVU, DS, KR
 45–48: DS, DKK, KR
 49: DS (twice), KR
 50–51: DS, KR
 52: DS, DKK, KR
 53: DK, HeDKh, DVU, DS, KR (twice)
 54: DS, KR
 55–56: KR
 57: AYS, DK, HeDKh, DVU, DS, DKK, KR
 58: DK, DS (twice), DKK (twice), KR
 59: KR
 60–66: DK, HeDKh (66abcd also in DVU)
 67–68: AYS, DK, HeDKh, DS
 69–79 (except for 77bc): DS
 80–86: AYS, DK, HeDKh, DS (84 and 85cd only in DS)
 87: DK, HeDKh, DS
 88–93: DS
 94: DS, DKK
 95–96: No testimony

SP 112.1–72:

- 1: No testimony
 2–12: VK, KR (3cd, 6 and 12 also in SaPra; 4cd and 10 only in KR;
 7 only in VK)
 13–18: VK, SaPra (16cd and 17 only in SaPra)
 19: VK, HeVKh, SaPra
 20–26, 28, 30, 32, 34: VK, HeVKh
 35abcd, 36, 37ef: VK, HeVKh, SaPra
 27, 29, 31, 33, 35ef and 37abcd: No testimony
 38–48: No testimony
 49–50 : AYS, DK, HeDKh (twice)
 51–72: No testimony

From this list, the relationships between these Dharmanibandha works become more or less clear. First, the *Dānakriyākaumudī* quotes SP 111.22–25, SP 111.45–48, SP 111.52, SP 111.57–58 and SP 111.94, which are all quoted by the *Dānasāgara*. Although some of the same verses are also quoted by Lakṣmīdhara and Caṇḍeśvara, taking into account the place of composition of the *Dānakriyākaumudī* it seems very likely that Go-vindānanda used the *Dānasāgara* of Ballālasena for these citations. This

conclusion is supported by the fact that SP 111.58 is quoted twice in both works, once together with SP 111.57 and once independently. Because the R and A recensions have been transmitted in Bengal, the possibility that Govindānanda consulted a *Skandapurāṇa* manuscript directly cannot be excluded,⁷⁸ but there is no strong evidence for this, at least not in these chapters.

Next, the case of Aparārka deserves attention because he is a contemporary of Lakṣmīdhara, although the two authors were active in different regions of the subcontinent: ‘Aparārka appears to be the *nom de plume* of the Śilāhāra king of Aparāditya (or a group of pandits under his auspices), who ruled in the Konkan between AD 1110–1140 and maintained contacts with Kashmir; he was thus a contemporary of Lakṣmīdhara, who worked at the court of the Gāhaḍavāla king of Vārāṇasi, Govindacandra (Kane I, 663–669).’⁷⁹ From Devī’s teachings, Aparārka quotes SP 111.57, SP 111.67–68, SP 111.80–83, SP 111.85ab, SP 111.86⁸⁰ and SP 112.49–50 in his commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, all of which are also quoted by Lakṣmīdhara in the *Dānakāṇḍa* of his *Kṛtyakalpataru*. Attention should be drawn to SP 111.80cd, where Aparārka and Lakṣmīdhara both share a reading entirely different from that of the *Skandapurāṇa*.⁸¹ Because neither this reading nor anything resembling it is found in any of our SP manuscripts, it is very unlikely that Aparārka and Lakṣmīdhara independently consulted an SP manuscript that by chance had this reading; it is more probable that one borrowed it from the other.⁸² Lakṣmīdhara quotes extensively from the *Skandapurāṇa* on several subjects and it is

78 In SP 111.47c, the DKK has a reading (*sarvakāmasamṛddhaḥ san*) very close to that of the A recension (*sarvakāmasamṛddhaḥ sa*), compared to the variants found in the other SP manuscripts and the citations in the DS and the KR, but this is too little to lead to any substantial conclusion.

79 SP I, Prolegomena, 6–7. For Aparārka, see Kane I, 713–723. For the date and location of Lakṣmīdhara, see now also Brick 2015, 5–11; according to him, Lakṣmīdhara would have been based at Kanauj. It seems more likely, however, that he would have worked at Vārāṇasī, as his *Tīrthavivekanakāṇḍa* provides detailed information on the many sacred sites in Vārāṇasī and not on Kanauj. Govindacandra’s reign commenced after 1109 and ended before 1168 AD.

80 SP 111.83, SP 111.85ab and SP 111.86 are quoted in a sequence with attribution to the *Matsyapurāṇa*. But this quotation comes immediately after that of SP 111.80–82 and some words in SP 111.80–82 are glossed after SP 111.86. Therefore it is almost certain that the line *matsyapurāṇe* before the quotation of SP 111.83 is a secondary, mistaken addition made after the composition of the AYV.

81 The AYS and DK read *mṛdubandhena badhnīyād antaḥślakṣṇena rajjunā* | ‘One should tie [the cow] with a rope that is bound softly and smooth inside (i.e. on the side of the rope attached to the cow’s neck).’

82 The possibility that the reading in the AYS is the result of contamination under the influence of the DK during transmission can be excluded, because Aparārka comments on the word *rajjunā* after quoting SP 111.86 (p. 296: *rajjunā rajjve-tyarthah*).

evident that he had direct access to the text; by contrast, Aparārka's quotations from the *Skandapurāṇa* are few in number—in fact, only the above-mentioned ones from SP 111 and SP 112. Thus, Aparārka most probably quoted them from Lakṣmīdhara's *Dānakāṇḍa* without consulting a manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa* directly.⁸³

The next work, in chronological order, is the *Samayapradīpa*. Śrīdatta quotes SP 112.3cd, SP 112.6, SP 112.12, SP 112.13–19, SP 112.35abcd, SP 112.36 and SP 112.37ef. All these citations, with the exception of SP 112.16cd–17, are also quoted by Lakṣmīdhara in the *Vratākāṇḍa*, and the omission of this passage in the edition of the *Vratākāṇḍa* is very likely due to eyeskip.⁸⁴ Even so, in view of his time and place, Śrīdatta might have been able to utilize a manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa*. In this regard, it is worth noting that the order of SP 112.13 and SP 112.14 is inverted in the RA recension and the *Samayapradīpa* compared to the order in the S recension and the *Vratākāṇḍa*. This could suggest that the author of the *Samayapradīpa* directly consulted a manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa* closer to the RA recension than that used by Lakṣmīdhara. In this case too, however, it is difficult to determine, because the inverted order (14 followed by 13) is more logical and the inversion could have taken place independently. Since the *Kṛtyakalpataru* is mentioned in the *Samayapradīpa*, it is certain that Śrīdatta relied on Lakṣmīdhara's work for his composition. Whether he also consulted the *Skandapurāṇa* directly or not cannot be concluded on the basis of the small number of citations from SP 112.

The dependence of Hemādri's *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* on Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru* has already been discussed in the Prolegomena of SP I.⁸⁵ As has been pointed out there, the extensive quotations from SP 111 and SP 112 in the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* are all found in the *Dānakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*. Those from SP 112 in the *Vratākāṇḍa* of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* are also found, without exception, in the *Vratākāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*. There are several clues that Hemādri borrowed these from Lakṣmīdhara. For example, SP 111.31cd

83 In SP 112.50d, though just a minor variant, both the AYS and the DK have *edhate* for *aśnute*. Furthermore, in SP 111.85a, the variants found in the DK and the AYS are closer to each other than to the other readings. For different opinions on the date of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* and its relationship with another commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, Vijnāneśvara's *Mitākṣara*, see Brick 2015, 7–11. The likelihood that Aparārka borrowed quotations from the DK may make some contribution to this debate, though the relationship between Aparārka's commentary and the *Mitākṣara* is also the subject of controversy. According to Derrett (1973, 50), Aparārka's commentary 'has an affinity with the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, which its author(s) may have used.'

84 SP 112.16c and SP 112.18a both begin with *sa tena karmaṇā*.

85 SP I, 10f.

is omitted in both works,⁸⁶ while the above-mentioned distinctive reading of SP 111.80cd in the AYS and the DK is also shared by the *Dānakhaṇḍa*. A similar situation applies for SP 112.21cd, where an entirely different reading is shared by the *Vratakāṇḍa* and the *Vratakhaṇḍa*.⁸⁷ In SP 112.24b, the *Vratakāṇḍa* and the *Vratakhaṇḍa* both repeat the reading of SP 112.23b.⁸⁸ Thus, as far as concerns the citations of SP 111 and SP 112, we can safely conclude that Hemādri borrowed them from Lakṣmīdhara's earlier work. However, there is one small clue that suggests that Hemādri may have used a source other than the *Kṛtyakalpataru*. Hemādri quotes SP 112.49–50 twice in his *Dānakhaṇḍa*, once on p. 600 and another time on p. 868 of the edition. The second citation is more or less identical with that of Lakṣmīdhara (DK 14.1.37–38), but the first one deviates from it, and its variants show correspondences with the readings found in R and/or the S manuscripts.⁸⁹ Though a trivial point, this suggests that Hemādri may have quoted the passage on p. 600 from a source other than the *Dānakāṇḍa*. This hypothesis receives further support from several considerably longer passages quoted from Adhyāyas 158 and 162 in the *Dānakhaṇḍa* that are not found in the *Dānakāṇḍa*, nor in any other early extant Dharmanibandha.⁹⁰ Hence, one might conclude that Hemādri consulted the *Skandapurāṇa* directly. However, it seems very unlikely to us, for the attributions to the *Skandapurāṇa* in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* are imprecise, moderately speaking.⁹¹ This would not have been the case if

86 This omission is shared with the R and A recensions.

87 Interestingly, this reading, common to both the VK and the HeVKh, is almost identical to SP 112.56cd, which is not cited in either work.

88 There are other shared minor variants in both texts for SP 111.30d, SP 111.32ab, SP 111.36c, SP 111.62d, SP 111.63cd (this is close to the reading in S₁), SP 111.65b, SP 111.66f, SP 111.85a, SP 112.19, SP 112.26b and one of the two occurrences of SP 112.50d.

89 For *tarpayitvā* in SP 112.50a—a reading that the DK and the HeDKh share on p. 868 of the edition—the HeDKh reads *tārayitvā* on p. 600, which is the reading of R. More importantly, for SP 112.50d, the HeDKh has *āsnute* on p. 600, which is shared by all the available manuscripts (verses 49–50 are missing in the A recension), while the DK, the SaPra and the citation of the HeDKh on p. 868 read *edhate*.

90 In addition to SP_{Bh} 158.44cd–45ab, SP_{Bh} 158.47ab, SP_{Bh} 158.65, SP_{Bh} 158.68, SP_{Bh} 162.57–64ab and SP_{Bh} 162.67–68 (S_{PI} 11, notes 38 and 39; 'p. 1053' in n. 39 should be 'p. 1052'), SP_{Bh} 158.44ab, SP_{Bh} 158.49–50, SP_{Bh} 158.54 and SP_{Bh} 158.56–57 are also quoted in the *Dānakhaṇḍa* (44ab preceded by eight unidentified pādas on p. 1050 and the others on p. 21) but not in the *Dānakāṇḍa*. For the Dharmanibandha citations from these two chapters, see also Wattelier-Bricout 2019. An edition and study of these chapters is under preparation for her doctoral thesis (Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris 3).

91 In the *Dānakhaṇḍa*, there are a number of passages attributed to the *Skandapurāṇa* that actually contain quotations from other sources. A telling example concerns chapters 100 (*rasadhenudānam*), 102 (*śarkarādhenuḍānam*), 103 (*madhu-*

he had had an understanding of the overall shape and content of the *Skandapurāṇa*. From this we may conclude that Hemādri did not know the text himself, but that he had access to some passages through a source other than the *Dānakāṇḍa*. This source may have been a lost Dharmanibandha, or a collection of *dharma*-related passages copied from various Purāṇas. If he used something like the latter in compiling his extensive work, it could explain the widespread misattributions of citations in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*.⁹²

The *Dānavivekodyota* of the *Madanaratnapradīpa* quotes SP 111.42–44, SP 111.53, SP 111.57 and SP 111.66abcd, all of which are also found in Lakṣmīdhara's *Dānakāṇḍa* and Hemādri's *Dānakhaṇḍa*. Since the *Madanaratnapradīpa* refers to both works as its sources, it is safe to conclude that the *Dānavivekodyota* borrowed these citations from either of the two works. Comparison of the readings of the quotations in the three works reveals that the *Dānakhaṇḍa* was the primary source of the *Dānavivekodyota*.⁹³

The last work to be examined is the *Kṛtyaratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara. The relationship between the works of Caṇḍeśvara and Lakṣmīdhara,

dhenudānam), 104 (*kṣīradhenudānam*) and 105 (*dadhidhenudānam*) of the *Varāhapurāṇa*. These five chapters are quoted in their entirety with attribution to the *Skandapurāṇa* (HeDKh pp. 423–431). Even more intriguing are the eleven or twelve passages (one of them only partly identified) quoted from the *Śivadharmottara* (three from chapter 3, four from chapter 4, two from chapter 7, and three from chapter 12) and attributed to the *Skandapurāṇa*. On the other hand, a quotation attributed to the *Śivadharmottara* is actually found in chapter 10 of the *Śivadharmasāstra*. There may have been confusion between the *Skandapurāṇa* and the *Śivadharmottara* because both texts share similar traits, being targeted at lay Śaiva devotees and closely associated with the Pāśupatas. All the same, the attributions of the *Skandapurāṇa* in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* are unreliable. Some of the wrong attributions seem to have made their way from the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* to later Dharmanibandhas, such as the *Madanaratnapradīpa*. This misattribution may apply not only to the *Skandapurāṇa* but also to other Purāṇas.

92 Such a collection may have been made by the people who worked under him, or it was already transmitted in a form available at the time. For what such a work might look like, compare the many misattributions to Purāṇas in an anonymous collection of Vārāṇasīmāhātmyas in a 12th-century palm-leaf manuscript from Vārāṇasī, now in the collection of the Kaiser Library in Kathmandu (Bisschop 2016, 113–115).

93 Though a minor point, both the DVU and the HeDKh read *prabhur* for *yakṣo* in SP 111.44d. In SP 111.53bcd, the DVU has a very different reading from that of the SP and all the other quotations. This might mean that the DVU had access to another source, but this cannot be determined without a proper critical edition of the text. The DVU seems to have borrowed from the HeDKh several quotations along with their misattribution to the *Skandapurāṇa*, e.g. VarP 103–105 and some passages from the *Śivadharmottara*, the latter as mentioned in n. 91 on p. 34. For the dependence of the DVU on the HeDKh, see also Wattelier-Bricout 2019, 104, n. 32.

as well as Ballālasena, and the question of whether or not Caṇḍeśvara had direct access to the *Skandapurāṇa* have already been discussed from various angles by Törzsök (2004) and Harimoto (2004, 2006).⁹⁴ Both agree on the principal conclusion that Caṇḍeśvara consulted the *Skandapurāṇa* while also utilizing both of his predecessors' works.⁹⁵ The citations from SP 111 and SP 112 support this conclusion. Of the citations in the *Kṛtyaratnākara*, those that are not found in the *Dānakāṇḍa* or the *Vratākāṇḍa* are SP 111.24, SP 111.45–52, SP 111.54–56 and SP 111.59. From among these, SP 111.24, SP 111.45–52 and SP 111.54 are quoted by Ballālasena in the *Dānasāgara*, so the remaining unique citations in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* are only SP 111.55–56 and SP 111.59.⁹⁶ In the *Dānasāgara*, however, the citations of SP 111.24, SP 111.45–52 and SP 111.54 are divided into six passages in accordance with the subjects dealt with and distributed across the text; on the other hand, the *Kṛtyaratnākara* quotes SP 111.22–24 and SP 111.42–59 in one sequence.⁹⁷ This would have been impossible if Caṇḍeśvara had not had the original text of the *Skandapurāṇa* at his disposal.⁹⁸ Alternatively, it might be assumed that the *Dānakāṇḍa*, which quotes SP 111.22–23, SP 111.42–44, SP 111.53 and SP 111.57–58 in one sequence (DK 19.62–69), originally had a longer citation that included all the citations in the *Kṛtyaratnākara*, but that some of the verses were lost during the transmission of the *Dānakāṇḍa*. The likelihood of this hypothesis has been significantly reduced by the publication of the critical edition of the *Dānakāṇḍa* by David Brick (2015).⁹⁹

94 See also SP IV, 13–18. Kengo Harimoto kindly shared his unpublished research report on the same subject based on SP 111 and SP 112, to which we owe some of the following observations.

95 Caṇḍeśvara used the *Samayapradīpa* as well.

96 In addition, in the quotation of SP 112.2–12 in the VK and the KR, SP 112.4cd and SP 112.10 are missing in the VK and SP 112.7 in the KR. Since SP 112.2–12 states the rewards of the practice of *ekabhakta-vrata* in each month from Mārgaśīra to Kārttika and since the VK quotes the passage in one sequence, the loss of SP 112.4cd and SP 112.10 is certainly secondary. Hence, this case is not considered here.

97 SP 111.53 is cited twice in the wrong place, first after SP 111.44 and secondly after SP 111.48. The first misplacement is probably due to the influence of the DK, in which SP 111.53 is cited immediately after SP 111.44. The second one may either stem from a manuscript of the SP that Caṇḍeśvara was able to consult or may have taken place independently during the transmission of the KR. In the second occurrence, the KR reads *ātmānaṃ* instead of *āsanaṃ*, thus changing the offering of a seat to the offering of the donor himself. Whether this represents an intentional change on the part of Caṇḍeśvara in order to avoid repetition of the same verse or a secondary one by a scribe cannot be determined in the absence of a critical edition.

98 Harimoto 2006, 26.

99 Harimoto (2006) also reached a negative conclusion on the hypothesis of an original version of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* that would have contained more complete citations,

Different from the case of Hemādri, who was attached to the Yādava court of Devagiri in the south, Caṇḍeśvara was based in Mithilā, which formed part of northeastern India (including Nepal). Here the *Skandapurāṇa* was well known, at least by the end of the 12th century; all three recensions have been transmitted in the area. Furthermore, the attributions to the *Skandapurāṇa* in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* are very precise. Of the 17 citations of the *Skandapurāṇa*, all but one are identified in our *Skandapurāṇa*, including text found only in the RA recension.¹⁰⁰ This suggests that Caṇḍeśvara was well acquainted with the *Skandapurāṇa*. In conclusion, it is most likely that Caṇḍeśvara had direct access to one or more manuscripts of the *Skandapurāṇa*.

So far we have identified with some certainty three works as first-hand testimonia: the *Dānakāṇḍa* and the *Vṛatakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataṛu*, Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara* and Caṇḍeśvara's *Kṛtyaratnākara*.¹⁰¹ Can these three sources, as witnesses to the text, tell us more about the historical development of the *Skandapurāṇa*? Previous studies have already demonstrated that all of them had access to some version of the text that was brought into being by the major revision that gave rise to the RA recension. Thus they are witnesses to an early stage in the formation of the RA recension.¹⁰² The same also follows from the comparison of Lakṣmīdhara's and Caṇḍeśvara's citations in two respects: the readings of both authors, when available, are generally closer to each other than to the R or A recension, and these shared readings are in several cases closer to the S recension than to the R and A recensions.¹⁰³ The citations from SP 111 and SP 112 more or less confirm both points.

after examining an old manuscript of the *Śrāddhakāṇḍa* dated April 5, 1176 AD. If the date of this manuscript is correct, on which Harimoto expresses some doubt, it would be very close to the time of composition of the text.

100 The only unidentified citation (p. 405 of the edition) has a variant reading attributing it to the *Padmapurāṇa*, which is probably original.

101 As mentioned above, there is a fair possibility that Śrīdatta Upādhyāya may also have consulted the SP directly, in view of the date and location of composition of the *Samayapradīpa*. However, because its citations are limited in number and all are also quoted in the *Vṛatakāṇḍa*, we do not include it in the following argument.

102 That all three Dharmanibandha authors quote some parts or verses found only in the RA recension and that they thus seem 'to have access to a version of SP that was closer in at least some important respects to our R and A recensions than to the Nepalese recension (p. 9)' was already pointed out in SP I, 7–9, 12f. Bisschop (2002) first established that Lakṣmīdhara consulted the text of the SP following its major revision. For an overview of the position of the major revision in the historical development and transmission of the SP, see Harimoto 2004.

103 See Törzsök 2004, Harimoto 2004 and 2006, and SP IV, 13–18 on this and the following argument. An early version of the RA recension is also reflected in the passages borrowed from the SP by the *Āvāntyakhaṇḍa* of the SkP (Yokochi 2004).

The omission of some passages may demonstrate more clearly that the three testimonia represent a middle stage between the S recension and the extant R and A recensions. For example, the omission of SP 111.31cd is shared by **RA** and the *Dānakāṇḍa*, and that of SP 111.75bc (preserved not only in the S recension, but also in R) by **A** and the *Dānasāgara*, while SP 111.14cd–15 and SP 111.84cd are preserved in the *Dānasāgara* though missing in **RA**. Furthermore, while SP 111.24ab is fairly corrupt in **RA**, the text found in the S recension is well preserved in the *Dānasāgara* and the *Kṛtyaratnākara*. As for the terms of address to a single goddess in the main part of SP 111, the words expressing a fem.voc.sg. are mostly changed to the fem.voc.pl. or replaced by other words in the RA recension. In some cases the testimonia agree in this with the RA recension but in others they retain the vocative singular.¹⁰⁴ In SP 111.58d all three share their reading with the S recension (*bhuvī jāyate*) against **RA** (*jāyate bhuvī*). Among the three testimonia, as will be argued below, the *Dānasāgara* is the closest to the RA recension. Even so, in addition to the above-mentioned cases, there are a few instances in which the *Dānasāgara* (as well as the *Kṛtyaratnākara*) shares the reading with the S recension against the RA recension.¹⁰⁵ The citations in the *Kṛtyakalpataru* often have the reading of the S recension, sometimes in conjunction with those of the *Kṛtyaratnākara* or *Samayapradīpa*. In SP 111.80b, SP 111.82d, SP 111.82f and SP 111.86c, the *Dānakāṇḍa* has the reading of the S recension, while the *Dānasāgara* by and large agrees with the RA recension. In SP 112.8a and SP 112.9a, the shared readings of the *Vratakāṇḍa* and the *Kṛtyaratnākara* correspond to the S recension against **RA**,¹⁰⁶ and in SP 112.14c and SP 112.15c, the *Vratakāṇḍa*, the *Samayapradīpa* and the S recension share their reading against **RA**.¹⁰⁷ Concerning the order of verses of SP 112.13–14, as mentioned above, the RA recension and the *Samayapradīpa* invert the order, which is more logical, but the *Vratakāṇḍa* retains the order found in the S recension. As for the readings shared with the RA recension against the S recension, we may refer to SP 111.83d (*bhayāt*

104 In SP 111.36c *devyo* (for *devī*) is more or less shared by **RA** and DK; in SP 111.43b *śubham* (for *śubhe*) is attested in R, DK, KR and DS; in SP 111.92c *devyo* (for *devī*) is shared by **RA** and DS. The fem.voc.sg., however, is retained in the DS for SP 111.26b and SP 111.41c, and in the DK and DS for SP 111.57c (see n. 9 on p. 7).

105 E.g., in SP 111.24d *dhanadhānyavān* for *dhanavān sukhī* in **RA**, and in SP 111.48d *bhogavān* for *bhagavān* in **RA**.

106 The readings *āṣāḍham ... māsam* (SP 112.8a) and *śrāvaṇe ... māse* (SP 112.9a) are shared by VK, KR and the S recension, while **RA** have *āṣāḍhe ... māsi* and *śrāvaṇam ... māsam*.

107 In SP 112.14c, VK, SaPra and the S recension have *pārthivasamo* for *pārthivo mahān* in **RA**; in 112.15c, VK, SaPra and the S recension have *sa suvarṇānām* for *āśvamedhānām* in R (missing in **A**).

in DK and DS), SP 112.7c (*śreṣṭho* in VK), SP 112.9b (*tathaivācarate* in VK and KR) and SP 112.26a (*yo bhunkte* in VK). SP 112.26b is a special case, in which we consider *labhet* supported by RA and the *Vratākāṇḍa* to preserve a reading closer to the original than the S recension's *bhavet*.

As for more particular matters, such as whether the variations between the readings of Lakṣmīdhara and Caṇḍeśvara reflect some development or modification in the RA recension, however, nothing definite can be said.¹⁰⁸ Rather, it may be next to impossible for several reasons. Concerning the Dharmanibandhas, occasional variant readings are reported in the citations in the available editions of each work. That there must actually be many more is shown by Brick's critical edition of the *Dānakāṇḍa*.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, the Dharmanibandha authors, at least Lakṣmīdhara and Caṇḍeśvara, sometimes intentionally changed the readings of the citations;¹¹⁰ thus, the readings of the citations do not necessarily reflect the source texts from which they were quoted. Concerning the *Skandapurāṇa*, as argued by Yokochi in the Introduction to SP III,¹¹¹ the manuscripts of the text soon after the major revision may have represented various degrees of contamination, between the older form of the text before the revision, which would have been closer to the S recension, and the newly revised form of the text, which became the ancestor of the RA recension. In other words, the distribution of variant readings may not be diachronic but synchronic. Moreover, the date of composition of each Dharmanibandha work may not correspond to the historical stage of the text quoted, at least with respect to minor changes of reading; a manuscript of the *Skandapurāṇa* consulted by Caṇḍeśvara could actually have been older than one at Lakṣmīdhara's disposal.

Nevertheless, we can add one observation on the basis of the citations from SP 111 and SP 112 in the three mentioned works: the readings in the *Dānasāgara* on the whole seem to be comparatively closer to those of the R and A recensions.¹¹² This most probably has a spatial rather

108 For example, in SP IV, 16, we state that '[t]he citations of the Kaumudīmahotsava, however, suggest that concerning some minor points, the text cited by Lakṣmīdhara is sometimes slightly closer to the S recension than the one cited by Caṇḍeśvara.' The same cannot be verified in the citations from SP 111 and SP 112.

109 See Brick 2015, 249, regarding Aiyangar's earlier edition: '[m]ost importantly in this regard, they (= his manuscript collations) omit the majority of all variant readings.' In cases where one of the variants cited in the available editions is close to the reading of a manuscript of the SP, we have reported this in the register of testimonia in the apparatus of our edition.

110 For some instances in the Kaumudīmahotsava, see SP IV, 15f. The reading *suśobhanam* in the DK instead of *śucismite*, a feminine vocative referring to the narrative setting, in SP 111.30b is an example of intentional omission of a narrative element in the source text. On this phenomenon in general, see De Simini 2015.

111 SP III, 53f.

112 For instance, SP 111.40c (*bhogī* in R and DS for *bhāgī*), SP 111.74b (*nīyamā* in A

than a temporal explanation. The *Dānasāgara* was composed in Bengal, where the RA recension was transmitted, leading to the hyparchetype of the R and A recensions and surviving in the two oldest extant manuscripts of both recensions (R and A₇). It is possible, therefore, that the *Dānasāgara* and the two recensions share some readings that reflect a regional version of the RA recension, a version in terms of occasional minor variant readings.

Editorial Policy

The critical edition follows the model and principles established in the previous volumes of the *Skandapurāṇa*.¹¹³ There is, however, one major difference, and this concerns the text after SP 112.72.

Presentation of the Revision of Adhyāya 112

As discussed above, the RA recension has revised the text of Adhyāya 112 and introduced entirely new material after SP 112.72. This material has been edited separately and is presented after the main text as SP_{RA} 112.1 and SP_{RA} 112.2. For SP 112.73–115, the situation is slightly more complex. In this case, the RA recension shows textual correspondences with the S recension, but with major expansions. To allow for consecutive reading of the revised text of the RA recension, this part of the RA recension has been edited separately as well (SP_{RA} 112.3). Passages that occur in only one of the two recensions (e.g. the entirety of SP_{RA} 112.2, which is only present in R) are printed in a smaller font.

The main text of SP 112.73–115 has been constituted on the basis of the S recension, but for those verses that have a parallel in R and of A the variants are given as usual in the apparatus of the critical edition. The verses that have been added in the RA recension, on the other hand, are identified in the R and A registers with reference to the verse numbers of

and DS for *yamāni*; R has *yamaś ca*), SP 111.75c (*ṛc* is included in the compound in **A** and DS), SP 111.77bc (omitted in **A** and DS, though preserved in R), SP 111.80b (*sarvalokanamaskṛtām* in **RA** and DS for *sarvair hastadvayena tu*), SP 111.82d (*sarvalokābhayāya ca* in DS, *sarvalokodbhavāya ca* in R, and *sarvaloka-hitāya ca* in **A** for *sarvadevanamaskṛtām*), SP 111.82f (*śubhāya gām* in R and DS, *śubhāya tām* in **A** for *śubhām iti*), SP 111.86c (*dhanavān rūpavāṃś caiva* in **RA** and DS for *rūpavān dhanavāṃś caiva*) and SP 111.93b (*-m acetanam* in **A** and DS for *-m acetasam*; R has *viketanam*).

113 See SP IV, 24, n. 57–58, for a comprehensive overview of references to the relevant sections relating to editorial principles in the previous volumes.

the edition of SP_{RA} 112.3. Correspondingly, the apparatus to the edition of SP_{RA} 112.3 includes a layer with references to the underlying parallels in the main text. This allows the reader to easily identify where and how the text of the RA recension has been expanded. The apparatus of both editions includes the text constituted in the *editio princeps* of Bhaṭṭarāi, who has conflated the text of the different recensions.¹¹⁴ When a reading of Bhaṭṭarāi follows the reading of the S recension, this is indicated in the apparatus of SP_{RA} 112.3 with a sign indicating derivation (<).

The preparation of a critical edition of text on the basis of the R and A recensions alone confronts the editor with major challenges due to the text's poor state of transmission.¹¹⁵ Although the goal of our edition in this case has been to reconstruct the hyparchetype of the RA recension to the extent that this is possible, we have often been forced to adopt readings that are simply the most intelligible or those that we think point in the right direction. Unintelligible text placed between crux marks sometimes follows the reading of R and sometimes that of A, depending upon which reading we consider most likely to be closer to the original. The choice between two equally possible readings is often arbitrary. The reader will also encounter comparatively more emendations and conjectures in the edition of the RA recension. The situation in SP_{RA} 112.2 is different, because this part only survives in the R recension.

The synopsis of the text of the RA recension differs somewhat from that of the main text. On the whole, we have kept it briefer and refrained from commenting upon every textual problem, of which there are many. The many descriptive portions that characterize the text of the RA recension, including a large number of similes, have only been summarized concisely. The main aim of the synopsis of the RA recension is to give the reader general guidance on how we have understood the text and to draw attention to some of its characteristic features.

Metrical, Grammatical and Syntactical Anomalies

The text edited in this volume again shows numerous deviations from 'standard' (Pāṇinian) Sanskrit. These have been listed and categorized below in accordance with the principles of presentation adopted earlier (see the references in SP IV, 25–29). While not laying a claim to being exhaustive, we hope that eventually these lists will be of use for writing a grammar of the *Skandapurāṇa*. References are to the verse numbers of the main text of the critical edition, except for those followed by RA

114 For his edition, Bhaṭṭarāi used S₁ and S₂ of the S recension and A₃ of the A recension.

115 See Bisschop 2006, for a similar situation and the challenges involved.

between square brackets. These refer to the three additional editions of the second half of chapter 112 in the RA recension (SP_{RA} 112.1, SP_{RA} 112.2, SP_{RA} 112.3).

1. Metre

- hypermetrical reading: *bhagavan varāharūpasya* 109.25a;¹¹⁶ *prapitāmahānīś ca lokeṣu* 111.28c.¹¹⁷
- irregular ma-Vipulā: *apaśyan saptarṣīn siddhān* 112.94c.
- *-ṛ-* metrically treated as *-ri-*: °*samṛddhaṃ* 111.47c.
- *-ri-* metrically treated as *-ṛ-*: *triloka*° 112.2.11c[RA].

2. Sandhi

In addition to double sandhi and lack of sandhi or irregular sandhi between pādas, all of which are quite common in the text, the following deviations from the rules of sandhi occur.

- *-a+e-* becomes *-e-*: *evetya* 97.14a.
- *-au+a-* becomes *-au* with elision of *a-*: °*sau* 'sureśvaraḥ 103.16b.
- *-as+ā-* becomes *-o* with elision of *ā-*: *so* 'pyāyitas 105.37a; *so* 'pyāyita° 107.7a; *so* 'hvayed 109.29d;¹¹⁸ *tvatto* 'tmanas 109.37c; *tato* 'tmānam 112.41c.
- *-ṛ-* at the beginning of a word treated as *ri-*: 'sau ṛṣi° 108.34a; *sevyamāno ṛṣibhis* 98.51a; *sarvai ṛṣibhiḥ* 105.41b.
- lack of sandhi in a pāda: *tvayā ume* 112.2.13d[RA]; *devadeve adhiṣṭhite* (conj.) 112.3.15b[RA].
- double sandhi within a compound: *apsaropagītena* 111.32c.
- hiatus-breaking *m*: *hata-m-ity* 97.43e; *śvāpada-m-ity* 100.38b; *māsa-m-eka*° 112.10ab; *divi-m-ūrjitaḥ* 112.56d; *tulā-m-api* 112.1.23b[RA].
- hiatus-breaking *r*: *megheṣu-r-ati*° 112.2.25d[RA].
- avagraha at the beginning of a pāda: 'ṇḍajaiś 112.2.9b[RA].

3. Nouns, pronouns and adjectives

- *a*-stem formation: *duṣṭacetasaḥ* 96.30b; *jalaukasaiḥ* 99.9d; *brahma-sadam* 112.38a (acc.).
- *-in* for *-i*: *śauriṇe* 97.26d; *baddhapṛṣṭheṣudhī* 105.1c.

¹¹⁶ Here *bhaga* makes one *guru* syllable.

¹¹⁷ Here *prapi* makes one *guru* syllable.

¹¹⁸ Alternatively, this may be irregular sandhi of *so* before a voiced consonant.

- *-i* for *-in*: °*dvārim* 102.2a.
- *-i* for *-ī*: *patnayo* (fem.nom.pl.) 111.6c
- °*rājan* at the end of a compound: *daityarājānam* 100.53c, 107.23a, 107.24c.
- °*ātma* at the end of compound: *jītātmā[s]* (fem.nom.pl., conj.) 112.2.23a[RA].
- nominative plural for accusative plural: *āpo* 104.3c; *patnyaḥ* 104.57c; *devadundubhayo* 108.28c; °*koṭyaḥ* 111.46a; *gāvo* 112.46b; *añjalayaḥ* (conj.) 112.3.10c[RA]; *sakhyaś* 112.3.20c[RA]; *kathayanto* 112.3.62b[RA].
- genitive for dative: *vipracittēś* (with $\sqrt{kṣip}$) 103.36e.
- dative for genitive: *tubhyaṃ* in the meaning of genitive (m.c.) 109.35a.¹¹⁹
- case change of enclitics of personal pronouns: *te* in the meaning of accusative 101.14c, 109.12d; *me* in the meaning of instrumental 110.21b.
- masculine for feminine: *caran* (pr.pt.) for *caratī* 112.1.3c[RA].
- masculine for neuter: *imaṃ deśam* 101.11c; *indriyān* (acc.pl.) 104.7d; *taṃ* for *tat(?)* 107.24a; *taṃ āpatantaṃ* (subj. *cakra*, acc.) 107.33a; *dahann iva* (subj. *cakra*) 107.35d¹²⁰; *taṃ ... upayāntaṃ* (subj. *cakra*, acc.) 107.36a; *rūpam ... imaṃ* 112.3.11a[RA].
- neuter for masculine: *yamāni* 111.74b; *idaṃ dharmaṃ* 112.68b.
- feminine for masculine: *balim ... śubhām* 100.60d.
- *devata* as a masculine noun: *devataiḥ* 100.19b, 104.40b, 105.40b; *te devatāḥ* 105.39a; *devatān* 112.3.93a[RA].¹²¹
- *pataye* (masc.dat.sg.) for *patye* 112.70c in the meaning of a husband.
- *svayaṃbhus* (masc.nom.sg.) for *svayaṃbhūs* 98.20a.
- *lakṣmī* (fem.nom.sg.) for *lakṣmīḥ/lakṣmīs* 98.9b, 111.4c.
- *anumatī* (fem.nom.sg.) for *anumatīḥ* 111.5d.
- *kuhū* (fem.nom.sg.) for *kuhūḥ* 111.5c.
- *tiryak* (masc.nom.sg.) for *tīryaṇ* (conj.) 100.34a.

¹¹⁹ Cf. *mahyaṃ* instead of *mama* (m.c.) 28.43a (SP II A, 208); GES 10.3.4, p. 332.

¹²⁰ See SP III, 21 and SP IV, 28, for similar cases of the construction of a pr.pt. with *iva*.

¹²¹ This usage is very common in the text (see SP III, 68; SP IV, 26).

- *mūrdhnan-* for *mūrdhan-*: *mūrdhnany* (loc.sg.) 103.30d.¹²²
- *trṣṭup* for *triṣṭup* (m.c.) 111.75a.
- *śivipiṣṭa-* as an orthographic variant for *śipiviṣṭa-* 97.23a;¹²³ *tripiṣṭapa-* for *triviṣṭapa-* 111.11d, 111.96d.
- *avasavyaṃ* for *apasavyaṃ* 102.32c.¹²⁴
- *apāhastā°* for *apahastā°* 107.13c.
- *añjanī* for *āñjanī* 112.1.24a[RA].
- *sarīsrpām* for *sarīsrpāṇām* 112.3.38d[RA]
- *danudaitya°* for *dānavadaitya°* 102.16a; *ditidānavāḥ* for *daitya-dānavāḥ* 103.17b.¹²⁵
- *yathāśaktiā* for *yathāśakti* 111.93c, 112.1.47d[RA].
- *bhinnakrama* compound: *sarittadāgāvaṭaśuṣkapalvalaṃ* for *śuṣka-sarittadāgāvaṭapalvalam* 96.34c.
- rare vocabulary: *kampana* as the name of a weapon 101.26b; *kṣi-pana* ‘throwing’ 104.27d (attested in combination with prefix *pra-*, *ut-* or *ni-*); *praverita* ‘cast, hurled’ (denominative from *vera/vela*? Cf. GES, p.6) 104.55b; *vṛṣṭi* used for *ṛṣṭi*(?) in *śaravṛṣṭitomaraṭ* 102.38a (-v- may be used to break hiatus).

4. Irregular *taddhita* formation

- *gāṇāpatyam* for *gāṇapatyam* 112.57d.
- *taddhita* without *vṛddhi* of the first syllable: *maheśvaram* for *māheśvaram* 106.14b; *sarvakāmikam* for *sārvakāmikam* 110.28b; *rudrān ... gaṇān* for *raudrān ... gaṇān* 112.43c; *devāsuraṃ* for *daivāsuraṃ* 112.108c.

5. Verbal forms, inflections and derivatives

- change of class: *upāsanta* for *upāsata* (II → I) 96.26c; *upāsate* for *upāste* (II → I) 112.1.43b[RA]; *naśantu* for *naśyantu* (IV → I) 100.45c, 104.46a; *anvacinvata* for *anvacinuta* (V → I) 108.6d, 108.7d; *samāsarjat* for *samāsrjat* (conj.; VI → I) 107.38a; *akurvātām* for *akurutām* (VIII → I) 107.14a; *akurvanta* for *akurvata* (VIII → I) 96.2c, 96.3c, 109.47c; *snāyet* for *snāyāt* (II → IV) 112.42a; *upayujyanti* for *upayunḥanti* (VII → IV) 111.38b; *ghnata* for *hata* (II → VI) 101.18b, 101.19b.

¹²² Cf. SP IV, 26.

¹²³ Cf. SP IIB, 45, n. 107.

¹²⁴ *avasavya-* also occurs in 27.67c and 87.36c.

¹²⁵ Cf. AiGr II.2, 118f.

- secondary ending for primary ending in indicative present: *tiṣṭhāma* 96.21c, 97.3f; *prapaśyāma* 97.3e; *jīvāma* 100.21c; *manyadhvaṃ* 103.6a; *abhidravata* 101.7b; *ghnata* 101.18b, 101.19b.
- *sama-* for *sam-* as preverb: *samayojaya* (m.c.) 112.2.6d[RA] (*sam-abhāvayantam* for *saṃbhāvayantam* in 85.31b).
- future imperative (or secondary ending for primary ending): *karīṣyāma* 99.21d, 102.14d; *paśyāma* 100.31e; *jeṣyāma* 110.28c; *vetsyata* 101.21a.
- change to *seṭ* stem: *nayīṣyati* for *neṣyati* 100.25d, 100.26d; *nayīṣyāma* for *neṣyāma(h)* 101.14c.
- present used with imperative meaning: *saṃtyajāmo* 103.8c; *jānīmaḥ* 112.3.68a[RA].
- future used with optative meaning: *yotsyate* 100.19b.
- causative without causative meaning: *'vartayanta* 96.26a; *yodhayāma* 103.8d; *dāpayet* 111.62b; *pradāpayet* 112.46d.
- *jagāma* used with causative meaning: 99.27c.
- *parasmaipada* for *ātmanepada*: *'tvarat* 99.26b; *jāyati* 111.13d; *āsevet* (conj.) 112.63c.
- passive with *parasmaipada* ending: *drśyanti* 100.48a; *stūyati* 112.2.11b[RA].
- irregular form of *ātmanepada* present participle: *cālayāno* 98.23b; *kṣobhayāno* 99.9b; *pūjayānaṃ* 99.22a; *nādayāno* 103.39e, 109.4c; *dārayānau* 103.43c; *drāvayānaṃ* 104.12a; *drāvayāno* 104.16d, 105.33b; *cūrṇayāno* 104.20c; *krodhayāno* 106.8d; *ādaśānaṃ* 107.43a; *saṃdaśānam* 107.43b; *bhīṣayāno* 108.6c.
- augmentless imperfect: *pūjayat* 99.20b; *saṃnahyanta* 102.18c; *'vacūrṇayad* 102.34d; *saṃcodayat* 105.10a; *saṃpracodayat* 105.11b; *avekṣata* 105.20c; *paribhramat* 106.1d; *avalokayata* 106.2b; *avekṣanta* 108.10c; *upatiṣṭhanta* 108.24a; *praveśayat* (m.c.) 109.21d; *yātayanta* 109.32d; *pravepata* (m.c.) 109.44b; *utsrjat* 110.3c; *anvavekṣata* 112.85d; *abhīpaśyata* 112.3.17d[RA].
- irregular placement of augment: *apraiṣīt* 104.9d; *vyanivartata* 110.7d.
- aorist with augment in prohibition: *mā pramādam agā daitya* 102.4a.
- imperfect for present(?): *aveṣṭayat* 112.2.18b[RA].
- perfect for present(?): *papau* 112.2.12d[RA].

- absolutive I for II: *proktvā* for *procyā* 98.50a.
- absolutive II for I: *agaṇya* for *agaṇayitvā* 110.11a.¹²⁶
- absolutive in the meaning of infinitive: *gatvā* 104.55d.
- $\sqrt{pru} \rightarrow \sqrt{plu}$: *plavate* 103.26b; *pluta* 106.2a.¹²⁷
- $\sqrt{mrś} \rightarrow \sqrt{mrṣ}$: *amṣyamānaṃ* 104.14a.
- *'tikrāmate* for *'tikrāmati* or *'tikramate* 97.13d.
- *jñāpta-* for *jñapta-*: *ājñāpto* 112.108a, *samājñāptāḥ* 112.105c.¹²⁸

6. Syntax

- lack of concord in gender: *tānūritān ... āyudhāni* 104.4ab; *etāmiś cānyāmiś ca subahūn ... nimittāni bhayadāni* 105.20; *śūla* (masc./neut.) referred to by *tat* (acc.) in 106.32a and *taṃ* (acc.) in 106.33a.¹²⁹
- lack of concord in number: *abhāsata* for a plural subject (conj.) 112.1.50b[RA].
- absolutive and participle directly connected:¹³⁰ *nihatya ... avapāśitān* 101.3ab; *samāśvāsyotthitaṃ* 104.24a; *nivṛttaṃ ... cakram akṛtvā kāryam ...* 110.8ab; *kṛtvāñjalim ... avasthitam* 112.79f; *vitatya ... vyavasthitam* 112.2.15c[RA]; *śrutvā vyākulasya* 112.3.56ab[RA].
- nominative sentence inside a list of names in genitive plural: *viśvedevāś ca ye kecīt sādhyās tathaiva ca* 112.11ab.
- irregular syntax in compound: *... karacaraṇaiḥ svamuktaśāstrair damṣṭrābhīr nakhamukhadāritās ...* 101.30ab (all the instrumentals and *nakhamukha*^o within the compound are connected with *°dāritās* as the second member of the compound); *śilāmaṇimayāñ chubrāñ chātakumbhamayāñ | haritālamayāmiś cānyāmiś tathā mānaḥśilā-calān |* 109.5abcd (all the adjectives and *mānaḥśilā*^o within the compound qualify *°acalān* as the second member of the compound); *tilapātrāṇi ... kṛṣṇānāṃ* for *pātrāṇi kṛṣṇānāṃ tilānām* 112.49.

¹²⁶ The negative prefix is treated as a preverb. Cf. GES 9.7.2 (b).

¹²⁷ Cf. SP III, 72f.

¹²⁸ The form *jñāpta-* also occurs in SP 33.114a, 33.115f, 63.13a, 70.8a and 70.19a.

¹²⁹ Cf. *taṃ* referring to the same *śūla* in 107.1a (acc.) and 107.10a (acc.); *tat* in 107.32a may be in the meaning of *tatas*.

¹³⁰ This syntax of the absolutive or gerund can be found in various genres of Sanskrit literature (Speijer 1886, §380.2), but it is not in accordance with its principal usage. We include it here to draw the reader's attention to this syntactical feature and provide some instances.