Florinda De Simini

When Lachmann's Method Meets the Dharma of Śiva. Common Errors, Scribal Interventions, and the Transmission of the Śivadharma Corpus

Abstract: The tradition of the so-called Śivadharma corpus is still largely unexplored. Scholars have so far identified a large number of manuscripts, including some very early specimens, but the relationships between them, as well as the possibility of classifying these manuscripts into groups and families, still need to be systematically assessed. However, recent critical studies of some texts of the corpus have sparked interest in the topic of their transmission. On the basis of two case studies selected from the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Umāmaheśvara-rasaṃvāda*, this article aims at presenting some of the advantages and limits of applying the genealogical-reconstructive method to the study of the manuscripts of the Śivadharma corpus.

This is an improved and enlarged version of a paper presented in the panel 'The Transmission of Sanskrit Texts', organized by Cristina Pecchia at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference (Bangkok, June 28–July 2, 2015). I deeply thank her for inviting me to participate in the panel, as well as for the suggestions she gave during the preparation of this article. I would also like to express my gratitude to the editors of this volume, Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo, and Camillo Formigatti, for giving me the opportunity to publish my paper in their book. Furthermore, I would like to use this opportunity to thank Peter Bisschop, for reading chapter 12 of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* with me in winter 2013, as well as my friends and colleagues at the University of Naples who helped me organize the *World Philologies* seminars in the spring terms of 2015 and 2016, and those who took active part in them, above all Antonio Manieri, Amneris Roselli, Serena Saccone, and Francesco Sferra. Parts of the findings expounded in the following pages have been discussed with them during those meetings, which have generally inspired the writing of this essay. Moreover, I am very grateful to Francesco Sferra for the additional comments he was willing to share with me before the submission of this article. Finally, I thank Kristen de Joseph for her help in revising the English text.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110543100-017,

1 The Dharma of Śiva and the method of Lachmann

The ongoing critical edition of the works of the 'Śivadharma Corpus', as well as the reconstruction of their transmission history,[1] have confronted scholars with the study of a complex yet hitherto little-examined textual and manuscript tradition. Amid the progress of the first, current projects on this topic, several factors have emerged that highlight not only the relevance of this research to the history of early and medieval Śaivism (not to mention the Indian religious landscape in general), but also its contribution to our knowledge of the dynamics regulating the composition and transmission of texts, both locally and to geographically and culturally distant areas. The study of the transmission of the Śivadharma corpus can thus offer important methodological insights on how to select and apply the rules of textual criticism to the critical editing of texts that are transmitted and used in different regional contexts — where they nourished the local cults of Śiva and the growth of Śaiva institutions — and whose manuscripts have regularly served not just as carriers of texts, but also as supports of worship.[2]

For the transmission of the Śivadharma corpus is based on an imposing and varied body of manuscripts, counting ca. 85 specimens (according to a rough estimate), which were produced continuously from an early period — the earliest manuscript, N^{K}_{A12}, being palaeographically dateable to the 9th century — until the 20th century. Being particularly prominent in Nepal, this tradition is moreover strongly translocal, as it is attested in several different regions, such as (mainly) Kashmir, Bengal, and Tamil Nadu. This means that the texts were studied and transmitted in areas of different languages and manuscript traditions. Such consideration is not equally true of all the works, however, as the tradition presents a very clear-cut bifurcation between the two earliest works, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* — which were also studied and transmitted outside Nepal — and

1 For a brief introduction, I refer the reader to De Simini and Mirnig 2017 below. In-depth considerations on specific aspects of the Śivadharma corpus, especially concerning the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*, are found in Bisschop 2014 and forth., De Simini 2016a and 2016b. The scholars who are active in this field recently discussed the initial results and prospective outcomes of their research during the 'Śivadharma Workshop. Manuscripts, Editions, Perspectives' (Leiden University, 26–30 September 2016).

2 I refer the reader to De Simini 2016a for considerations on the ritual uses of manuscripts of the Śivadharma corpus (and, more generally, on the attestations of this practice in Sanskrit texts). Details on the manuscript tradition of the Śivadharma corpus, with special reference to the Nepalese materials, are given in De Simini 2016b, on which the following introductory lines are mostly based.

the remaining six (seven if we also include those attested only in one manuscript), which have so far been found, with rare exceptions, exclusively in Nepal and, at least in the earliest phases of their transmission, only in multiple-text manuscripts (henceforth MTM) transmitting the entire corpus. Such manuscripts were thus most likely the contrivance of the communities inhabiting the Kathmandu Valley. A further element that is emerging as a key factor in achieving a historical understanding of the transmission of these works is the scope of their secondary tradition, which finds expression in numerous quotations and reuses. From this point of view, the *Śivadharmottara* in particular is proving to have enjoyed a high level of popularity, as attested by the multiple reuses, with or without attribution, that have been traced so far in the main areas where the text was transmitted.[3] Moreover, the composition of Śivadharma works also entailed the reuse of other works, as shown by the many borrowings from the *Niśvāsa* that are evident in the *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*,[4] or by the parallels between the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, the *Lalitavistara*, and the *Mahābhārata* that are now emerging.[5]

Making sense of this vast array of primary sources, to which the preceding lines have just provided a brief and partial introduction, is the challenge faced by those who work on these texts, and who must necessarily do so with a philological approach. Such an approach, as firmly established by a long tradition of scholarship, requires — among other things — that a systematic *recensio* help clarify inasmuch as possible the genealogical links between the manuscripts, in order to select the appropriate specimens in preparing an edition. This genealogical-reconstructive technique, based on the method of identifying common 'monogenetic' errors — namely, the non-original readings that cannot be produced independently by different scribes[6] — is what is typically designated by the widely debated but still rightly iconic expression 'the method of Lachmann'.[7] My use of this expression in

3 On the reuses of the *Śivadharmottara*, see De Simini 2016a, especially Appendix 2, containing tables of parallels between the *Śivadharmottara* and the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa*s, the *Devīpurāṇa*, the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, and the *Uttarakāmika*.

4 See Kafle 2015.

5 On this topic, cf. below and De Simini and Mirnig 2017 in this volume.

6 The distinction between monogenetic and polygenetic errors — the latter of which are variants that do not really account for the genealogical relationships of the manuscripts, and are therefore to be disregarded in a reconstructive study — can be credited to Pasquali; see Trovato 2014, to which I refer the reader for a general introduction to genealogical textual criticism, with both a historical and a descriptive approach, as well as further bibliography on related subjects.

7 On this, see Timpanaro 2003, which gives an account of the debate regarding what constitutes this method, as well as the actual contribution of Karl Konrad Lachmann (1793–1851) and his contemporaries to the method.

the title and throughout the article is not meant to suggest that this is the most suitable approach in our case, but only to evoke the necessity of making the *recensio* phase the pillar of a philological study also in the case of the transmission of the Śivadharma corpus. This is crucial with respect to critically editing the texts, not least because it provides a fundamental tool for a more detailed reconstruction of the history of the tradition.

In this essay, I will present two case studies, selected from different parts of the Śivadharma corpus, in which the presence of macroscopic inconsistencies — the 'separative' and 'conjunctive' errors of the European tradition of textual criticism — suggests the possibility of tracing families of manuscripts, and thus speculate on their genealogical links and transmission history. In the first case (2), the study of the last chapter of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* allows us to consider the parallels and discrepancies characterizing the different regional traditions in which the text has been transmitted, and to assess their contribution to the reconstruction of the work; on the other hand, the analysis of the final part of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* (3) enables us to shift the focus to the Himalayan region, and to the work of composition and preservation that surrounded the Śivadharma corpus in the intellectual communities of medieval Nepal. At the same time, these two case studies will also highlight the limits of applying the genealogical-reconstructive method to the study of a textual tradition that, because of our still-limited knowledge of the materials, and because of certain features inherent to this and other South Asian manuscript traditions, escapes mechanical reasoning and unambiguous categorization.

2 Rudra's descents to earth

The 12th and last *adhyāya* of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* is a miscellaneous chapter that sets out the behavioral norms of Śaiva devotees and *śivayogin*s.[8] Since this is the concluding chapter of the text, it also gives a brief account of the transmission of the Śivadharma's teachings, as well as exhortations concerning the preservation, recitation, and worship of the manuscripts of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. Moreover, this chapter devotes ten stanzas to listing the so-called 'five ogdoads' (*pañcāṣṭaka*), five groups of eight extramundane worlds (*bhuvana*s) that correspond to pilgrimage sites on earth. Besides being relevant to the assessment of some doctrinal points emerging from the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, chapter 12 also offers a strong case for examining the textual transmission of this work, for a study of its internal consistency allows us to identify at least two relevant cases in which the sequence of the stanzas is disrupted, and which a broader knowledge of the manuscript tradition enables us to classify as monogenetic errors. Attempting to reconstruct the genesis of these mistakes allows us not only to surmise what could most likely have been the archetypical stanza arrangement of chapter 12, but also to better appraise the position, in the history of the textual transmission, of the later layers of the tradition — represented by the Kashmiri and South Indian manuscripts — compared to the bulk of the early Nepalese materials.

From a reading of chapter 12 on the basis of Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts ranging from the 11th and 12th century to more recent specimens, we can derive the sequence of topics reported in the summary below. More specifically, this arrangement is reflected (with small differences concerning a few missing or added *pāda*s) by N^{K}_{82} (dated to 1069 CE), N^{C}_{45} (dated to 1138–39 CE), N^{K}_{7} (dated to 1170 CE), N^{C}_{94} (undated, 12th century), N^{K}_{3} (dated to 1201 CE), N^{K}_{11} (dated to 1396 CE), and N^{K}_{25} (dated by the catalogue to 1928–29 CE, though this date is unverified and seems unlikely, as the manuscript looks much earlier). These are also among the manuscripts that I used for the first collation of this chapter, which resulted in the following sequence of topics:[9]

---

8 The manuscript tradition calls this 'Chapter on the Primary and Secondary Branches of the Devotion to Śiva' (*śivabhaktyādyaśākhopaśākhādhyāya*): the first verse of the text refers to these two 'branches', although nowhere in the chapter is it specified what they really consist of. Note that a very similar title is given to chapter 28 of the *Lalitavistara* as transmitted in N^{Ko}_{77}, which however deals with different topics (see De Simini and Mirnig 2017, 615).

9 See De Simini 2013, Appendix 1. Although I had checked most of the palm-leaf materials to verify several dubious points, the only manuscripts that I consistently used in collating the

Stanza 1	Introduction
Stanzas 2–27	Miscellaneous rules of conduct for Śaiva devotees on the topics of *liṅga* worship, specific food and drinks to avoid, as well as rules of purity (such as rules on impure acts to avoid, or correct behaviour during rituals)
Stanzas 28–40	Characteristics and conduct of the *śivayogin*s. Aspects of their asceticism
Stanzas 41–46	Main characteristics of *dāna*; different types of gifts
Stanzas 47–48	Rules for fasting
Stanzas 49–51	Definition of *tīrtha*s as the 'places of Rudra's descents'; merits of those who donate and finance construction works at these sites
Stanzas 52–84	Miscellaneous section on *dāna*: definition of the *śivabhakta* as the main recipient of gifts; praise of the donation of food to the Śaiva devotees; merits of those who give several everyday objects to the *śivayogin*s, or offer services to them (see this section at stanzas 66–84)
Stanzas 85–91	Powers of Rudra's rosary
Stanzas 92–95	Merits of donating and/or offering services to the *śivayogin*s
Stanzas 96–103	Rules for the veneration and recitation of the Śivadharma. Merits of those who listen to the teachings of the Śivadharma and venerate its manuscripts
Stanzas 104–109	Concluding remarks: five typologies of people within the Śaiva community. Merits of those who protect the gifts; merits of those who teach, practice, and protect the Dharma
Stanzas 110–19	The 'five ogdoads'
Stanzas 120–121	Praises of those who donate and finance construction works at the *tīrtha*s; characteristics of the recipients
Stanzas 122–123	Concluding remarks: the exposition of the 'fivefold Śivadharma' is declared to be over.

This is also the arrangement found in later Nepalese paper manuscripts, such as N^{K}_{57} (dated to 1742–43 CE), N^{K}_{42}, and N^{W}_{16} (both undated), as well as in the edition by

whole chapter were N^{C}_{45} (then C45); N^{K}_{57} (then N/C57), which is a Nepalese paper manuscript; N^{K}_{12} (then N/B12); and P^{T}_{32} (then T32), a Devanāgarī paper transcript of the IFP.

Naraharinatha 1998, based on the most recent Nepalese tradition, and in the Bengali paper manuscript B^{C}_{99}, dated to 1682–83 CE. When I first collated the manuscripts of chapter 12 of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, I could not access the manuscripts from the collection of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta in their entirety, but I can now confirm that the text of chapter 12 is also transmitted in this order by N^{Ko}_{52}, whose date can be traced to the 12th century on palaeographical grounds.[10] The table of contents given above is thus supported by a significant number of testimonia, among which the majority of the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. However, on closer inspection, this structure turns out to be only one of the possible variants in which chapter 12 has been transmitted, one that is most likely secondary with respect to the order that the stanzas must have had in their archetypical version. From this point on, I will refer to the structure given above as 'version A' of chapter 12, and append the siglum A to the stanza numbers that refer to this arrangement.

One of the main problematic points in this chapter is the position of the ten stanzas containing the list of the ogdoads, which corresponds to $12.110–119_{A}$. Here the stanzas follow a first set of concluding remarks ($12.99–109_{A}$), and seem to introduce the very final verses of the whole work, which ends at stanza 12.123_{A}:[11]

10 For information on this manuscript, see Shastri 1928, 723–744.

11 The text of chapter 12 of the *Śivadharmaśāsastra* reproduced in this article is a transcript from manuscript N^{C}_{45}. I chose this manuscript because I wanted to account for the state of the text in the 12th century, since many of the early specimens transmitting version A are dateable from the 12th century onward, when this had apparently become the best-known arrangement of the topics in chapter 12. Manuscript N^{C}_{45}, which is dated to 259 NS (1139 CE) on fol. 247r[L6], transmits this chapter on fols. 34v[L4]–38r[L3]; high-quality pictures of this manuscript and a full catalogue record are available on the website of the Cambridge Digital Library, at the following link: https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01645/1 (last accessed: 10/10/2016). I have standardized the text of my transcripts to reflect the orthography usually adopted in the edition of Sanskrit texts, thus for instance avoiding the use of homorganic nasals or that of double plosives after -r-.

Śivadharmaśāstra 12.110–123A: (fols 37v[L3]–38r[L1]) *bhastrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭir avimuktaṃ mahālayam | gokarṇaṃ bhadrakarṇaṃ ca suvarṇākṣo 'tha dīptimān* || 110_{A} [L4] *sthāṇvīśvaraś ca vikhyātas triṣu lokeṣu viśrutaḥ | sthānāṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ rudrakṣetraṃ mahodayam | bhastrāpadādisthāṇvantaṃ rudrasāyojyakāraṇam* || 111_{A} *chagalaṇḍo duraṇḍaś ca mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaram | kālañjaraṃ śaṃkukarṇaṃ sthaleśvaraḥ sthuleśvaraḥ* || 112_{A} *pavitrāṣṭakam ity etan mahāpuṇyābhivardhanam | mṛtāḥ pra*[L5]*yānti tatraiva śivasya paramaṃ padam* || 113_{A} *gayā caiva kurukṣetra<ṃ> nakhalaṃ kanakhalaṃ tathā* | (c.m.) *vimaleśvaro 'ṭṭahāsaṃ mahendraṃ bhīmam aṣṭakam* || 114_{A} *etad guhyāṣṭakaṃ nāma sarvapāpavimocanam | gatvā tu puruṣaḥ śrīmān prāpnoti śivamandiram* || 115_{A} *śrīparvataṃ hariścandraṃ jalpam āmratikeśvaram | madhyamaṃ ca mahākālaṃ kedāraṃ bhairavaṃ tahā* || 116_{A} *etad guhyātiguhyaṃ ca aṣṭakaṃ parikīrtitam | saṃtārya tu pitṝn sa*[L6]*rvān śivaṃ yānti paraṃ padam* || 117_{A} *amreśvara<ṃ> prabhāsaṃ ca naimiśaṃ puṣkaraṃ tathā | āṣāḍhiḍiṇḍimuṇḍiś ca bhārabhūtiṃ bhavāntakam | nakulīśvaro <'>tha*

> Bhastrāpada, Rudrakoṭi, Avimukta, Mahālaya, Gokarṇa, and Bhadrakarṇa, as well as the splendid Suvarnākṣa, (110A) / And that one known as Sthāṇvīśvara, famous in the three worlds: this ogdoad of sites (*sthānāṣṭaka*) has to be known as the field of Rudra, conferring great fortune. [The group] that begins with Bhastrāpada and ends with Sthāṇv[īśvara] causes the [attainment of] identity with Rudra. (111A) / Furthermore, Chagalaṇḍa and Duraṇḍa, Mākoṭa, Maṇḍaleśvara, Kālañjara, Śaṅkukarṇa, Sthaleśvara, Sthuleśvara: (112A) / This [has to be known as] the pure ogdoad (*pavitrāṣṭaka*), where great merits are more and more increased. Those who die right there go to the supreme seat of Śiva. (113A) / Moreover, the ogdoad [including] Gayā, Kurukṣetra, Nakhala, as well as Kanakhala, Vimaleśvara, Aṭṭahāsa, Mahendra, Bhīma: (114A) / This [has to be known] as the secret ogdoad (*guhyāṣṭaka*), [which] enables liberation from all sins. Having gone [there], a fortunate person reaches the abode of Śiva. (115A) / Śrīparvata, Hariścandra, Jalpa, Āmratikeśvara, along with Madhyama, Mahākāla, Kedāra, as well as Bhairava: (116A) / This is renowned as the extremely secret (*guhyātiguhya*) ogdoad. Having saved all the ancestors, [those who die there] go to the supreme abode of Śiva. (117A) / Amareśvara and Prabhāsa; Naimiśa, as well as Puṣkara; Āṣāḍhi and Diṇḍimuṇḍi; Bhārabhūti, which annihilates transmigration, as well as the one known as Nakulīśvara, the great inner [place]: (118A) / [This] inner ogdoad (*pratyātmikāṣṭaka*) [is] the field of Rudra connected with the desire of good; all those who die there go to the supreme abode of Rudra. (119A) / The one who makes these things — [such as] gifts, a dwelling place, a pit well, a park, a temple — in the *tīrtha*s will gain an undecaying fruit. (120A) / Patience, absence of envy, pity, truthfulness, generosity, morality, asceticism, learning: this is indicated as the supreme eightfold feature of the recipient. (121A) / Thus this fivefold *Śivadharma* has been expounded, for the sake of Dharma, wealth, desire, and liberation, out of compassion towards all beings. (122A) / Everybody in all situations sees auspicious things [that are] very difficult to attain, [but] everyone obtains a positive destiny, and happiness will be there for everyone. (123A)

Mentions of *aṣṭaka*s as groups of eight supramundane worlds (*bhuvana*) are very frequent in tantric literature. Among these, the *pañcāṣṭaka* represents the lowest level, its worlds corresponding to actual pilgrimage sites on earth; the lay devotee who dies there will reach the corresponding eponymous paradise after death.[12] According to Goodall, the *pañcāṣṭaka* is actually an earlier, not exclusively tantric feature.[13] Among the evidence that he quotes in support of his hypothesis is that the *Sarvajñānottara* distinguishes the nature of these five groups by stating, only for the names of the *pañcāṣṭaka*, that they also correspond to *tīrtha*s on earth; and that

---

vikhyātas tathā pratyātmiko mahān || 118A (c.m.) *pratyātmikāṣṭakam* [38rL1] *kṣetraṃ rudrasya hitakāmikam* | *tatra yānti mṛtāḥ sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam* || 119A *dānāny āvasathaṃ kūpam udyānaṃ devatālayam* | *tīrtheṣv etāni yaḥ kuryāt so 'kṣayaṃ phalam āpnuyāt* || 120A *kṣamāspṛhā dayā satyaṃ dānaśīlaṃ tapaḥ śrutam* | *etad aṣṭāṅgam uddiṣṭaṃ paraṃ pātrasya lakṣaṇam* || 121A *iti pañcaprakāro <'>yaṃ śivadharmaḥ prakīrtitaḥ* | *dharmārthakāma*[L2]*mokṣārthaṃ sarvabhūtānukampayā* || 122A *sarvatarāṃ tu durgāṇi sarvo bhadrāṇi paśyati* | *sarvaḥ sugatim āpnoti sarvasya ca bhavec chivaḥ* || 123A.

12 See Goodall 2004, 314, n. 620, and Sanderson 2003, 403–404.

13 Goodall 2004, 315–316, n. 620.

the non-tantric *Śivadharmaśāstra*, in the above-mentioned passage, does not link these sites to *bhuvana*s, most likely because this account is archaic and predates the notion of a correspondence between *tīrtha*s and supramundane paradises. Sanderson also observes that 'there is nothing specifically Mantramārgic about the list itself', arguing that at least six of the sites of the *pañcāṣṭaka* are clearly Pāśupata.[14] On the basis of the evidence provided by the original *Skandapurāṇa,* a text that is culturally and chronologically close to the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, and by other textual sources, Bisschop has argued that possibly all of the sites mentioned in the *pañcāṣṭaka* originally belonged to the Pāśupata tradition.[15]

A first textual problem arising from the passage quoted above is that the stanzas immediately following the text on the ogdoads are redundant with respect to other stanzas in the same chapter: stanza 12.120_A is almost identical with 12.51_A,[16] and stanza 12.121_A is perfectly identical with 12.52_A. Stanza 12.120_A ($\simeq 12.51_A$) is closely connected with the preceding list of holy sites, since it refers to the high merits gained through the performance of *dāna* and the building of artifacts in the *tīrtha*s. The purpose of listing the characteristics of the proper recipients at 12.121_A could, at the same time, be related to the topic of *dāna*, which has just been brought up. The same contents admittedly seem to blend much better into the general context of the stanzas surrounding 12.52_A, since there the verse was inserted within a section illustrating the features of *dāna* and its components. At any rate, stanzas $12.110–121_A$ do not appear to connect seamlessly with the following $12.122–23_A$, but rather seem to break the continuity between the latter stanzas and those immediately preceding the passage on the ogdoads. Verse 12.122_A, which opens with a concluding *iti* (note that *iti* had already occurred with the same function at 12.99_A), introduces the proper end of the work, where the Śivadharma — which here corresponds to the title of the work — is defined as *pañcaprakāraḥ*, '[endowed] with five aspects', and the devotees are assured that happiness is awaiting them. This reference to a fivefold classification of the Śivadharma could be puzzling to a reader, as there are no other mentions of this in the whole text. While in the

14 Sanderson 2003, 405 and n. 201. Here he identifies Āṣāḍhi, Diṇḍimuṇḍi, Bhārabhūti, Lakulīśvara/Nakulīśvara, Amareśvara, and Prabhāsa as Pāśupata sites. The first four, used as toponyms in the text, actually correspond to the proper names of the last four incarnations of Śiva at Kārohaṇa (modern Kārvān, Gujarat), the alleged site of the Pāśupata revelation.

15 Bisschop 2006, 27–34. In his survey, Bisschop also highlights, among other things, that the lists of the *pañcāṣṭaka* sites occurring in textual sources are arranged in different orders; moreover, the original *Skandapurāṇa* does not present the *pāñcaṣṭaka* as a structured list, yet still mentions the majority of these sites.

16 *Śivadharmaśāstra* 12.51_A: (fol. $35r_{[LL2–3]}$) *ārāmāvasathaṃ kūpa*$_{[L3]}$*m udyānaṃ devatāgṛham | tīrtheṣv etāni yaḥ kuryāt so 'kṣaya*<ṃ> *labhate phalam* || 51.

Śivadharmottara the doctrine of the 'five great sacrifices' (*mahāyajña*) — a Śaiva revision of those of the Brahmanical tradition — becomes a rather relevant doctrinal point (see especially chapter 3 of the work),[17] which could therefore justify a possible (though never expressly attested) attempt to include it in the definition of the work itself,[18] this categorization does not seem to have emerged yet in the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. There are only a few possible explanations why the *Śivadharmaśāstra* is defined as 'fivefold' — if, that is, we rule out the possibility that the 'five aspects' in 12.122$_A$ consist of the four *puruṣārtha*s and the 'compassion towards all beings' mentioned in the same stanza, which function respectively as the objectives and the motivation that prompted the composition of the work. In stanza 12.40$_A$ the text lists the five characteristics of asceticism (*tapa*s), which, however important, do not seem relevant to the definition of a text mainly addressed to lay practitioners.[19] Two more references to a fivefold classification occur in close proximity to the conclusion of chapter 12$_A$: one is precisely the list of five ogdoads, which in version A of the chapter occurs closest to the definition of the Śivadharma as *pañcaprakāraḥ*, while the other is the reference to the 'five categories' that, according to stanza 12.105$_A$ff., reflect the main social roles in the spreading and practice of Dharma within the community of *bhakta*s. These five categories include those who teach, those who give advice, those who practice the Dharma, those who enable these activities, and those who are in charge of their protection. This subdivision, centred on the practice of dutiful behaviors, seems much more fitting as a reference for the concluding definition of the Śivadharma as being divided into five categories, and induces us to shift our attention to the verses immediately preceding the passage on the ogdoads:[20]

---

17 The 'five great sacrifices' according to chapter 3 of the *Śivadharmottara* are: the *karmayajña*, also known as *karmayoga*, corresponding to ritual; *tapas*, namely askesis; *svādhyāya,* here identified with the repetition of the *śivamantra*; *dhyāna,* the continuous meditation on Śiva; and, finally, the *jñānayajña*/*jñānayoga*.

18 The *Śivadharmottara* defines the *jñānayoga*, one of the five great sacrifices, as *pañcaprakāraḥ* (3.14), since it consists of five different activities, namely teaching, studying, explaining, listening, and meditating (*adhyāpanam adhyayanaṃ vyākhyā śravaṇacintanam*, *Śivadharmottara* 3.14ab).

19 *Śivadharmaśāstra* 12.40$_A$: (fol. 35v$_{[L5]}$) *brahmacaryaṃ japo maunaṃ kṣāntir āhāralāghavam* | *ity etat tapaso rūpaṃ sughoraṃ pañcalakṣaṇam* || 40; 'Chastity, muttering prayers, silence, patience, continence as regards food: this is the fivefold aspect of asceticism, difficult to perform. (40)'

20 *Śivadharmaśāstra* 12.103–109$_A$: (fol. 37v$_{[LL1–3]}$) *yāvad asyopadeśena śivadharmaṃ samācaret* | *tāvat tasyāpi tat puṇyam upadeṣṭaṃ na saṃśayaḥ* || 103$_A$ *upadeśaṃ vinā yasmād dharmo jñātuṃ na śakyate* | *na ca kartum avijñāya tasmāt tulyaṃ phalaṃ tayoḥ* || 104$_A$ *upadeṣṭānumantā ca ka*$_{[L2]}$*rtā kārayitā ca yaḥ* | *kṛtānupālakaś caiva pañca tulyaphalāḥ smṛtāḥ* || 105$_A$ *kartur atyadhikaṃ*

> As long as one practices the Śivadharma in accordance with his teaching (*scil.* that of Candrātreya), so long is his merit also taught, there is no doubt [about it]. (103_A) / Since the Dharma cannot be known without teaching, nor [is it possible] for one who ignores [the Dharma] to do [anything], for this reason these two (*scil.* the one who teaches Dharma and the one who acts according to it) gain a similar fruit. (104_A) / The teacher and the adviser, the agent and the one who provokes the action, as well as the one who protects what has been done:[21] according to tradition, [these] five share a similar fruit. (105_A) / [The one] who protects what has been done [gets] a merit [that is] superior to [that] of the performer. Since a temple disappears quickly if it is not protected, for this reason [one] has to protect [it] with every effort (106_A) / And protection would [even] be superior to the gift of the objects taught above, [like] land, jewels, horses, elephants, cattle, gold, and so on, [or even] clothes. (107_A) / And [the one] who protects the gift [will get] a merit superior to [that of] the donor, because what is left unprotected disappears quickly. (108_A) / For this reason, [one] should teach the Dharma and practice it oneself, should cause [others] to practice [it], give advice, as well as protect what has been done by others. (109_A)

This section, due to its generic character and the exhortations to teach the Dharma and protect the results of dharmic actions, could serve perfectly as the conclusion of the entire text and, as such, could easily be connected with the last two stanzas, $12.122–23_A$. In stanza 12.99_A the particle *iti* introduces the typical final statements ($12.99–102_A$) that state the title of the work, its approximate length, and the identity of its mythical expounders.[22] Related to this are the exhortations to teach and protect the Śivadharma, as already stated in stanzas $12.97–98_A$. It is at this point that the *Śivadharmaśāstra* inserts the small group of stanzas translated above ($12.103–109_A$), dealing with the great merits conferred on one who protects somebody else's actions, a possible reference to the lay sponsors who are supposed to protect the Śivadharma and promote its spreading. The transition from the preceding stanzas

---

puṇyaṃ tat kṛtaṃ yo 'nupālayet | yasmād āyatanaṃ kṣipraṃ nāśaṃ gacchaty apālitam | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena kurvīta anupālanam || 106_A *bhūmiratnāśvanāgānāṃ gohiraṇyādivāsasām | bhavet pūrvopadiṣṭānāṃ dānāc chre*[L3]*yo 'nupālanam* || 107_A *dātur atyadhikaṃ puṇyaṃ dattaṃ yaś cānupālayet | apālitaṃ tu tad yasmāc chīghram eva praṇaśyati* || 108_A *tasmād upadiśed dharmaṃ svayaṃ cāpi samācaret | kārayed anumanyeta kṛtam anyaiś ca pālayet* || 109_A.

21 The first two *pādas* of this stanza are very closely reminiscent of *Bhagavadgītā* 13.22: *upadraṣṭānumantā ca bhartā bhoktā maheśvaraḥ | paramātmeti cāpy ukto dehe 'smin puruṣaḥ paraḥ* || 22. In the *Bhagavadgītā*, this corresponds to the definition of the functions of the supreme *puruṣa* within the material body, where the *puruṣa* is said to be 'Supervisor and adviser, supporter, enjoyer, great overlord, as well as supreme self'. Although the first *pāda* of stanza 105_A is almost identical with *Bhagavadgītā* 13.22a, and the construction of the *pādas* is similar overall, I don't believe it possible also to connect the two stanzas thematically, as the contexts appear to be very different.

22 For a digression on the traditional accounts of the transmission of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and other works of the corpus, see De Simini 2016b, 263–268.

happens smoothly, mediated by the reference to Candrātreya, the alleged compiler of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, and to the duty of disseminating and protecting the text whose composition has just been evoked. It thus seems possible, although admittedly not compelling, to connect the *pañcaprakāraḥ* of 12.122$_{A}$ with this sketch of the different functions in the practice of Dharma within the community that the *Śivadharmaśāstra* is addressing, rather than to the following five ogdoads. The whole group of stanzas, 12.110–21$_{A}$, when read in the context of the preceding and following verses, starts and ends quite abruptly, with no clear connection with what precedes or follows. Given the miscellaneous nature of this chapter, the absence of straightforward links with the surrounding verses does not, in and of itself, constitute evidence for the misplacement of a portion of the text. To this purpose, it is more relevant to observe that some of the scribes who copied the manuscripts transmitting version A of the chapter — for instance N^{K}_{82}, N^{K}_{7}, or N^{C}_{94} — marked the starting point of the list of ogdoads with a symbol, or a pair of double *daṇḍa*s, separating this passage from the rest of the chapter.[23] This can be read as a hint that somebody, at a certain point, felt that the *pañcāṣṭaka* passage did not fit in, at least not with the preceding stanzas. Among the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts, there is one that even drops this passage completely, namely N^{K}_{12}, which omits not only the list of *aṣṭaka*s, but also the two redundant stanzas 12.120$_{A}$ and 121$_{A}$ (see fol. 48$_{r[L1]}$). This manuscript is not dated, but a note found immediately after the end of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* states that it was copied from an exemplar produced in 1194–95 CE (315 NS).[24] It is not entirely surprising that, with respect to the passage on the ogdoads, this manuscript stands out as an exception among the Nepalese tradition, for ongoing critical work on the texts shows that, in several cases, the readings of N^{K}_{12} are in agreement with those attested in the later South Indian manuscripts. In the study of the transmission of Śivadharma works, the passage on the ogdoads falls into the category of those significant, though not yet systematically known, inconsistencies whose study can help scholars bridge the two opposed sides of the manuscript tradition, thus proving extremely important in the attempt at a genealogical reconstruction.

The southern tradition of the Śivadharma corpus is still little known, with several specimens having been identified only very recently. Their total number has

23 See, for instance, N^{K}_{82}, fol. 40v$_{[L4]}$ff.: the beginning of the list is marked by a pair of double *daṇḍa*s with an *akṣara* in between. This symbol occurs again at the very end of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, fol. 41r$_{[L2]}$ff., marking the end of the chapter as well as the beginning and the end of a short succession of praises to the deities. 12.121 is omitted; see also N^{K}_{7}, fol. 44v$_{[L4]}$, or N^{C}_{94}, fol. 40v$_{[L6]}$, which mark the starting point of the list with pairs of double *daṇḍa*s.

24 See De Simini 2016b, 256, n. 57.

grown to ca. 20 manuscripts transmitting either the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara* together, or only one of the two, alone or together with texts that are not included in the Nepalese corpus, or even just a chapter or a fragment from these texts.[25] As the first phase of locating and identifying the materials is still ongoing, our study must therefore necessarily be limited only to some representative examples; in spite of this, the selected cases allow us to make important deductions concerning the transmission of the text, which will have to be verified against those manuscripts that prove significant in the history of the Śivadharma tradition. Of the manuscripts to which I have access, I have selected two as case studies for the southern tradition. One is G^{L}_{40}, a Grantha manuscript from the former van Manen Collection of the Leiden University Library, dated to 1830 CE. The other is the Pondicherry paper transcript P^{T}_{32}, deriving from a palm-leaf manuscript in Grantha script preserved in the library of Sri Nataraja Gurukkal in Kilvelur (Tamil Nadu). Occasionally, I will examine other paper transcripts with reference to specific points.

If we compare the order of the stanzas in version A to the one attested in G^{L}_{40} and P^{T}_{32}, to which I will refer as version D, two major differences emerge. One is that stanzas 12.110–121$_{A}$, just like in N^{K}_{12}, are not in fact located in the end of the chapter. However, while N^{K}_{12} lacks these stanzas completely, the two South Indian manuscripts place them immediately after 12.50$_{A}$. A second difference from the Nepalese tradition lies in the addition and omission of stanzas, with the most substantial addition being located at the very end of the chapter (and of the work). These two manuscripts, while inserting the passage on the ogdoads in the middle of the chapter, also avoid the redundancies of stanzas 12.51–52$_{A}$, which are completely omitted here. The arrangement of chapter 12 according to the two manuscripts is summed up in the following table, where additional stanzas are marked with a star, their number corresponding to the actual position that these hold in each individual manuscript:

25 An introduction to the non-Nepalese manuscripts of the Śivadharma can be found in De Simini 2016b, Appendix II. The ongoing work of Marco Franceschini, presented at the 'Śivadharma Workshop. Manuscripts, Editions, Perspectives' (Leiden) on September 30, 2016, as well as of those scholars active at the Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO — Dominic Goodall, S. A. S. Sarma, and R. Sathyanarayanan — continues to reveal new specimens.

P_{32}^{T}	G_{40}^{L}
12.1–5$_{A}$	12.1–50$_{A}$
12.6ab*	12.110–119$_{A}$
12.6-8$_{A}$	12.60ef*
12.10ab*	12.51–81$_{A}$
12.9–19ab$_{A}$	12.86–99ab$_{A}$
12.20–22ab$_{A}$	12–57cd$_{A}$
12.23cd*	12.105cd–106cd$_{A}$
12.22cd–35ab$_{A}$	12.107
12.37cd*	12.108cd-109$_{A}$
12.35cd–44$_{A}$	12.122$_{A}$
12.48cd-49ab*	12.115–132*
12.45–49$_{A}$	12.123$_{A}$
12.54cd-55*	12.134–137*
12.50$_{A}$	
12.110–121$_{A}$	
12.54–55$_{A}$	
12.53$_{A}$	
12.56–59ab$_{A}$	
12.77ab*	
12.59cd–60$_{A}$	
12.73ab$_{A}$	
12.62cd–64ab$_{A}$	
12.82ab*	
12.65–72$_{A}$	
12.76$_{A}$	
12.74–75$_{A}$	
12.77–82$_{A}$	
12.84$_{A}$	
12.100cd–102ab*	
12.83$_{A}$	
12.85–87$_{A}$	
12.89cd-97ab$_{A}$	
12.115ab*	
12.97cd-106cd$_{A}$	
12.107–109$_{A}$	
12.122$_{A}$	
12.129*–148ab*	
12.123$_{A}$	

Even just a cursory glance suffices to show that P_{32}^{T} is the most aberrant of the two, due to its larger number of additional stanzas and omissions. However, despite these omissions, both manuscripts follow the order of the topics as found in version A, with one substantial difference in the position of the ten stanzas on the ogdoads, which in the southern manuscripts follow immediately after 12.50_{A}. This position of the ogdoad passage is not surprising once we recall that, in version A, stanzas $12.120–21_{A}$, concluding the ogdoad list, were identical or almost identical with $12.51–52_{A}$. Moreover, stanzas $12.49–50_{A}$, immediately after which the two southern manuscripts insert the group of stanzas starting with 12.110_{A}, contain a reference to the sacred places of Rudra's descents:[26]

> A water flow visited by seers — knowers of all the treatises, intent on asceticism, whose senses are subjugated — and by gods: this is called a *tīrtha* on Earth. (49) / [One] should define the places of the descents of Rudra as sacred places. Identity with Rudra [is granted] to the people who die in these fields of Śiva. (50)

As pointed out by Bisschop,[27] the notion of the *śiva*° or *rudrāvatāra*s originated in a Pāśupata milieu and was not widely known in Indian religious literature, with the exception of Pāśupata-influenced Purāṇas and the Pāśupata work *Ātmasamarpaṇa* of Viśuddhamuni: these texts list 28 *avatāra*s of Śiva occurring in different time periods, and ending with Nakulīśa/Lakulīśa, additionally giving for each of them the names of the pupils who spread the Śaiva teachings imparted in those places. According to this view, the complete list of 28 *avatāra*s is a later doctrinal evolution than the story of the four incarnations of Śiva at Kārohaṇa, for all the sources attesting the complete list of *avatāra*s are later than the original *Skandapurāṇa*.[28] The *Śivadharmaśāstra* lacks any lists of *rudrāvatāra*s, but still shows knowledge of them in these two stanzas, which might be a hint that the text reflects a phase in

26 *Śivadharmaśāstra* $12.49–50_{A}$: (fol. $35r_{[L2]}$) *ṛṣibhiḥ sarvaśāstrajñais taponiṣṭhair jitendriyaiḥ* [em.; jitendriyaḥ Cod.] | *devaiś ca sevitaṃ toyaṃ kṣitau tīrthaṃ tad ucyate* || 49 *rudrāvatārasthānāni puṇyakṣetrāṇi nirdiśet* | *mṛtānāṃ teṣu rudratvaṃ śivakṣetreṣu dehinām* || 50.

27 Bisschop 2006, 41–44, points to the following Purāṇic occurrences of lists of *rudrāvatāra*s (p. 41): *Vāyupurāṇa* 23.127–130; *Kūrmapurāṇa* 1.51.5d; *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.7.31c and 1.24.35cd–39ab; *Śivapurāṇa Śatarudrasaṃhitā* 4.27– 30, and *Vāyavīyasaṃhitā* 2.9.2d.

28 The only exception is the *Vāyupurāṇa*, as an early version of this work was certainly known to the redactors of the *Skandapurāṇa* (Bisschop 2006, 18), although the section on the *avatāra*s in the *Vāyupurāṇa* was apparently a later adjunct. The occurrence of the names of the four incarnations of Śiva at Kārohaṇa as toponyms may be a hint that the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, like the original *Skandapurāṇa*, ignored the later theology of the 28 *avatāra*s, while it was aware of the more archaic story of the spread of the Pāśupata teachings.

which this doctrine was still undeveloped. The only information that the text provides is that the 'places of the descents of Rudra' had become *tīrtha*s, and that dying there was considered very auspicious — just as it was in the case of the *pañcāṣṭaka*. Therefore, placing the stanzas on the ogdoads after the mention of the *rudrāvatārasthāna*s, like the South Indian manuscripts do, would be perfectly suitable to the context. This, along with the repetition of 12.51_{A} and 12.52_{A} as $12.120–21_{A}$ in the Nepalese tradition, can be considered an indication that the most likely place for the 10 stanzas on the *pañcāṣṭaka* to occur is exactly between 12.50_{A} and 12.51_{A}, which is where the two southern manuscripts have them. This means that two late manuscripts, one of which is a Devanāgarī paper transcript, preserve the text in what seems to be a more pristine condition, at least as regards this specific point. The corruption that had interfered with most of the Nepalese tradition from the 11th century until modern times does not appear in these much later specimens, which however have features that clearly distinguish them from all northern manuscripts, such as the addition of the final stanzas, which mostly consist of invocations to Śiva. Nevertheless, the southern tradition is very diversified: among the paper transcripts of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* we find some that confirm this arrangement, like P^{T}_{514}, a paper transcript copied from T^{A}_{15}, a manuscript in Telugu script now preserved in Adyar;[29] and others that are rather aligned with version A, like P^{T}_{72} and P^{T}_{860}, which are nonetheless endowed with characteristics that are specific to the southern transmission.[30]

29 This manuscript starts the enumeration of the *aṣṭaka*s at its stanza 12.52cd, soon after the mention of the *rudrāvatārasthānāni* (12.51). The list concludes with a hemistich (12.64ab in P^{T}_{514}) missing both in the Nepalese manuscripts and in P^{T}_{32}, but available in G^{L}_{40} (see P^{T}_{514}, p. 144): *puṇyāṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ śivakṣetrasya lakṣaṇam*. The last *aṣṭaka* is thus called a *puṇyāṣṭaka*. This addition may depend on the corruption of verse $12.119a_{A}$ (12.62c in P^{T}_{514}), where the name *pratyātmikāṣṭaka* is given as *pratyaṣṭakam idaṃ*. Like in G^{L}_{40}, this additional hemistich (*puṇyāṣṭakam idaṃ* ...) is connected with 12.51_{A}ff., while 12.122_{A} (*iti pañcaprakāro 'yaṃ* [...]), at the end of the chapter, is preceded by 12.109_{A} (*kārayed anumanyeta* [...]).

30 P^{T}_{72}, copied from the Grantha manuscript G^{A}_{29}, reproduces the list of *aṣṭaka*s at the end of the chapter, in the same position as version A. On the other hand, 12.119_{A} is followed by other stanzas, not all of which are available in the manuscripts transmitting version A (P^{T}_{72}, p. 153): *pratyaṣṭakam idaṃ kṣetraṃ rudrasyāpi ca kāmadam* || 122 *tatra yānti mṛtās sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam* | (=12.119_{A}) *puṇyāṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ śivasāyujyakāraṇam* || 123 *tīrtheṣv eteṣu yaḥ kuryāc chrāddhaṃ yajñaṃ tapo japaḥ* | (=$12.120cd_{A}$) *snānaṃ dānaṃ vrataṃ karma sokṣayaṃ phalam āpnuyāt* || 124 *kṣamā spṛhā dayā satyaṃ dāna śīlaṃ tapaḥ śrutam* | *etad aṣṭāṅgam uddiṣṭaṃ paraṃ pātrasya lakṣaṇam* || 125 (=12.121_{A}) *dharmārthakāmamokṣārthaṃ sarvabhūtānukampayā* | (=$12.122cd_{A}$) *kartā kārayitā mantā prerakaś cānumodakaḥ* || 126 *iti pañcaprakāro 'yaṃ śivadharmaḥ prakīrtitaḥ* || (=$122ab_{A}$). Note that the addition of hemistich 12.126cd, immediately before the definition of the Śivadharma as *pañcaprakāra*, contributes to understanding the latter as a reference to the five functions that had been described in the stanzas immediately preceding the passage on the ogdoads,

On the other hand, the Nepalese tradition too is not consistent in the transmission of chapter 12 of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. The study of the earliest testimonia of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, still unavailable during the first collation of chapter 12, has permitted significant advances in the understanding of this chapter's transmission, and thus of the work in general. One of these early manuscripts is N_{28}^{K}, a multiple-text manuscript (MTM) that only transmits a limited number of works of the corpus; this manuscript is not dated, but its script suggests the late 10th to early 11th century as the most likely period for its production.[31] A further crucial piece of evidence for the transmission of the text is provided by N_{77}^{Ko}, dated to 1036 CE (156 NS),[32] and thus the earliest dated manuscript transmitting the Śivadharma corpus, though also in this case in a slightly different version.[33] N_{28}^{K} and N_{77}^{Ko}, although transmitting the same stanzas as Version A, attest to a completely different arrangement of the verses of chapter 12, both as regards the position of the passage on the ogdoads (where N_{28}^{K} and N_{77}^{Ko} are much closer to the late southern transmission), and that of the numerous stanzas on *dāna* in the same chapter. While these two manuscripts respect the stanza sequence

---

and which are now summed up in this hemistich. This is not the end of the chapter, as 12.127ab (=122ab$_A$) is followed by the same benedictory verses that we find in G_{40}^{L} and P_{32}^{T}. This transcript therefore shares one feature with all of the southern manuscripts, and another feature only with some of them, namely G_{40}^{L} and P_{514}^{T}, that is the adjunct of the final hemistich on the *puṇyāṣṭaka* (note that the variant reading attested in P_{72}^{T} also adds the information that this *puṇyāṣṭaka* is the cause of the attainment of identity with Śiva), along with the corruption of *pratyātmikāṣṭakam* into *pratyaṣṭakam idaṃ* (see 12.122c =12.119a$_A$). Moreover, P_{72}^{T} reproduces the verse *iti pañcaprakāro 'yaṃ* (=12.122$_A$) twice, once after the list of *aṣṭaka*s and once immediately before it, as 12.112ab. This happens also in P_{860}^{T}, copied from G_{42}^{Ch}, which, like P_{72}^{T}, can be associated with version A, from which it is however separated by this and other variants in the arrangement of the stanzas. The list of ogdoads in P_{860}^{T} ends as follows: *pratyātmikāṣṭakam idaṃ kṣetraṃ rudrasya kāmikam | tatra yāti mṛtāḥ sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam* || (=12.119$_A$) *puṇyāṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ śivakṣetrasya lakṣaṇam | dānāny āvasathaṃ kūpam udyānaṃ devatālayam* || *tīrtheṣv eteṣu yaḥ kuryāt so 'kṣayaṃ phalam āpnuyāt |* (=12.120$_A$) *kṣāntiḥ spṛhā dayā satyaṃ dānaṃ śīlaṃ tapaḥ śrutam* || *etad aṣṭāṅgam uddiṣṭaṃ paraṃ pātrasya lakṣaṇam |* (=12.121$_A$) *iti pañcaprakāro 'yam śivadharmaḥ prakīrtitaḥ* || (=12.122ab$_A$). This transcript, therefore, does attest a correct reading for 12.119$_A$, since it gives *pratyātmikāṣṭakaṃ* instead of the *pratyaṣṭakam idam* attested in P_{72}^{T} and other manuscripts. In spite of this, it preserves the verse *puṇyāṣṭakam idam* [...], introducing an anomaly in the transmission of the names of the *pañcāṣṭaka*. Like the manuscripts transmitting version A, P_{860}^{T} preserves the redundancy of 12.120–121$_A$.

31 On the peculiarity of this manuscript as regards the number of works it transmits and further considerations on its earliness, see De Simini 2016b, 244ff. as well as below, § 3.

32 See De Simini and Mirnig 2017 for text and translation of the colophon; Petech 1984, 36, verifies the date given in the final colophon as July 6, 1036.

33 The particular version of the Śivadharma corpus transmitted by this manuscript is the main topic of De Simini and Mirnig 2017.

12.1–41$_A$, they connect 12.41$_A$ directly to 12.58$_A$; at this point the text proceeds uninterruptedly until 12.74$_A$, then goes back again to 12.42$_A$. This means that in manuscripts N_{28}^{K} and N_{77}^{Ko}, the passage on the ogdoads (vv. 12.110–121$_A$) follows 12.50$_A$ and is followed by 12.53–54$_A$, just like in the South Indian manuscripts. The sequence 12.53–57$_A$ is respected, with small omissions, but these stanzas are then followed by 12.75$_A$-109$_A$, after which in both manuscripts the text ends with stanzas 12.122–23$_A$.

As dry and little appealing this whole discussion of stanza arrangement may sound, it helps in disclosing an important aspect of the transmission of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. Before reviewing the structure of chapter 12 according to N_{28}^{K} and N_{77}^{Ko}, we should observe that this arrangement is not only attested in these two earliest specimens of the corpus but also, with a few minor differences, in a late-12th century Nepalese manuscript, namely N_{15}^{O}, dated to 1187 CE (307 NS).[34] Among the vast array of Nepalese manuscripts attesting the *Śivadharmaśāstra*, these three are the only ones in which the topics of chapter 12 are given in the order shown in the table below:

N_{28}^{K}	N_{77}^{Ko}	N_{15}^{O}
12.1–41$_A$	12.1–41$_A$	12.1–5$_A$
12.58–63cd$_A$	12.58–72$_A$	12.5ef*
12.64–74$_A$	12.74$_A$	12.6cd$_A$
12.42–44$_A$	12.42–44$_A$	12.7–41$_A$
12.62*	12.61*	12.58–74$_A$
12.45–50$_A$	12.45–50$_A$	12.42–43$_A$
12.110–121$_A$	12.110–121$_A$	12.46ab$_A$
12.53–54$_A$	12.53–57$_A$	12.44$_A$
12.56–57$_A$	12.75$_A$	12.62*
12.75–106ab$_A$	12.78–109$_A$	12.45–50$_A$
12.108cd–109$_A$	12.122–123$_A$	12.110–121$_A$
12.122–123$_A$		12.53–54$_A$
		12.56–57$_A$
		12.75–96cd$_A$
		12.106ab*
		12.96ef–106cd$_A$
		12.107–109$_A$
		12.122–123$_A$

34 On this manuscript and its dated colophon, see De Simini 2016b, 253–254. Please, note that in this publication the manuscript was wrongly referred to as Or. B 125; thanks to Yuko Yokochi, I am now aware of the proper shelf mark, which is reported below (see References).

Although N^{O}_{15} omits more stanzas, the sequence of the verses and of the topics remains mostly the same as in manuscripts N^{K}_{28} and N^{Ko}_{77}. These three manuscripts present the reader with a different version of chapter 12, to which I will refer as version P. The variation in the arrangement of the stanzas, and at the same time the consistency shown by the three manuscripts, is such that it cannot simply be arbitrary, but is revealing of the existence of a direct genealogical link between these manuscripts. Therefore, along with the position of the stanzas on the ogdoads, the arrangement of the stanzas on *dāna* constitutes another significant separating error in the transmission of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*. Now, while the stanzas on the ogdoads seem to be in good order after 12.50$_{A}$, the structure of version P breaks the inner coherence of the stanzas about gifting, especially because it interrupts the sequence of donations addressed to the *śivayogin*s in 12.66–84$_{A}$. This is evident if we compare the text of the stanzas corresponding to the points at which the two versions differ: [35]

Version A	**Version P**	**Version A**
[He] who would feed a Śaiva devotee, the best among the twice-born, during the *śrāddhā* rituals and so on, having saved seven members of his lineage, is exalted in the world of Śiva. (57$_{A}$) / At this point, what's the use of so much talking? Donate food to the Śaiva devotee! When the Śaiva devotee is fed, in that case Śiva is actually fed. (58$_{A}$)	[He] who would feed with devotion a twice-born Śaiva devotee, during the *śrāddhā* rituals and so on, having saved seven members of his lineage, is exalted in the world of Rudra. (57$_{A}$=74$_{P}$) / Having donated a *yogapaṭṭa* and the sacred thread to the *śivayogin*, [he] obtains the fruit of the gift of one hundred pairs of garments. (75$_{A}$=75$_{P}$)	Having donated the required toothbrush to a *śivayogin*, in Heaven he will be granted a beautiful town furnished with gorgeous women and enjoyments. (74$_{A}$) / Having donated a *yogapaṭṭa* and the sacred thread to the *śivayogin*, [he] will obtain the fruit of the gift of one hundred pairs of garments. (75$_{A}$) / Having donated to the *śivayogin*s a vessel for alms, well made, [consisting] of clay,

35 *Śivadharmaśāstra* 12.57–58$_{A}$: (Fol. 35r$_{[LL4–5]}$) *śivabhaktaṃ dvijaśreṣṭhaṃ yaḥ śrāddhādiṣu bhojayet | kulasaptakam uddhṛtya śivalo*<ke> *ma*$_{[L5]}$*hīyate* || 57$_{A}$ *bahunātra kim uktena śivabhaktaṃ tu bhojayet | śivabhakto yadā bhuṅkte sākṣād bhuṅkte tadā śivaḥ* || 58$_{A}$.
Śivadharmaśāstra 12.57$_{A}$; 75$_{A}$ = 74–75$_{P}$: ($N^{K}_{28,}$fol. 47r$_{[L5]}$) *śivabhaktaṃ dvijaṃ bhaktyā yaḥ śrāddhādiṣu bhojayet | kulasaptakam uddhṛtya rudraloke ma*$_{[L5]}$*hīyate* || 57$_{A}$ *yogapaṭṭopavītāni nivedya śivayogine | vastrayugmasahasrasya dattasya phalam āpnute* || 75$_{A}$.
Śivadharmaśāstra 12.74–76$_{A}$: (Fol. 36v$_{[LL4–5]}$) *dantadhāvanam uddiṣṭaṃ nivedya śivayogine | divyastrībhogasaṃyuktaṃ divi ramyaṃ puraṃ labhet* || 74$_{A}$ *yogapaṭṭopavītāni nivedya śivayogine | vastrayugmasahasrasya dattasya phalam āpnuyāt* || 75$_{A}$ *mṛdvaṃśālābudārvādisukṛtaṃ bhaikṣabhājanam | nivedya śivayogibhyaḥ sadā* $_{[L5]}$ *sattraphalaṃ labhet* || 76$_{A}$.

Version A	Version P	Version A
		bamboo, bottle-gourd, wood, and so on, [he] will always obtain the fruit of a Soma sacrifice. (76$_A$)

Both stanza 12.57$_A$ and stanza 12.75$_A$ are much better connected with their contexts — which are the importance of donating food to Śaiva devotees and the list of objects to donate to *śivayogin*s — in the arrangement given by version A. This last section amounts to 19 contiguous stanzas in version A. The same is true if we observe the position of stanza 12.58$_A$, which according to version P should immediately follow 12.41$_A$:[36]

Version A	Version P
What is both desired and excellent, and what could be obtained in a proper manner, this is exactly what has to be donated to a [person] endowed with good qualities; thus is the [main] rule about gifting. (41$_A$) / [When one] would give land measuring one thousand *nivartana*s and so on, bestowing all kinds of grains, furnished with water, this is called a gift of land (*bhūmidāna*) (42$_A$)	What is both desired and excellent, and what could be obtained in a proper manner, this is exactly what has to be donated to a [person] endowed with good qualities; thus is the [main] rule about gifting. (41$_A$) / At this point, what's the use of so much talking? Give food to the Śaiva devotee! Because the Śaiva devotee eats, after eating he directly becomes Bhava. (42$_P$=58$_A$)

The arguments asserting the misplacement of stanzas 12.110–121$_A$ on the ogdoads are admittedly more compelling than those concerning the position of the stanzas on *dāna*. However, if we accept that the order of these verses in version P is indeed less consistent, as it seems to break the internal sequence of some groups of stanzas, we come to the conclusion that version A preserves the stanzas on *dāna*

36 *Śivadharmaśāstra* 12.41–42$_A$: (Fol. 35v$_{[LL5–6]}$) *yad yad iṣṭam visiṣṭaṃ ca nyā*$_{[L6]}$*yaprāptaṃ ca yad bhavet | tat tad guṇavate deyam ity etad dānalakṣaṇam* || 41$_A$ *nivartanasahasrādyāṃ sarvasasyaprarohinīm | dadyād bhūmiṃ jalopetāṃ bhūmidānaṃ tad ucyate* || 42$_A$.
Śivadharmaśāstra 12.41–42$_P$: ($N^K_{28_c}$ Fol. 35v$_{[LL5–6]}$) *yad iṣṭam ca visiṣṭaṃ ca nyāyaprāptaṃ ca yad bhavet | tat tad guṇavate deyam ity etad dānalakṣaṇam* || 41$_A$ *bahunātra kim uktena śivabhaktaṃ prabhojayet | śivabhakto yato bhuṅkte bhuṅktvā sākṣād bhaved bhavaḥ* || 42$_P$.

in a (seemingly) correct order, though not the stanzas on the ogdoads; version P, on the contrary, transmits the stanzas on the ogdoads in what should have been their pristine position, while introducing some illogical changes to the order of the stanzas on *dāna*. Version D, for which we have so far identified only southern specimens, is the version that seems to have preserved the most accurate stanza sequence for chapter 12, as regards both the passage on the ogdoads (where it complies with version P) and the order of the stanzas on *dāna* (corresponding to the one given in version A). These deductions are drawn exclusively on the basis of the previous considerations regarding these two separating errors, without considering the further question of omissions and adjuncts that characterize version D more distinctively than any other version of the chapter identified so far.

There is a further question that we need to address before drawing any conclusions, albeit provisional, on this point of the transmission of the text, namely what role to assign to the two known Śāradā manuscripts. The Śāradā tradition so far consists only of these specimens, which do not show significant internal variation. In brief, their main characteristics with reference to chapter 12 is the addition of stanzas, both in the middle and at the end of the chapter, which are not available in other specimens — neither those from Nepal nor those from the South — and can therefore be considered specific to the Śāradā tradition; barring a few omissions, the two Śāradā manuscripts reproduce the same arrangement as in the Nepalese manuscripts of version P, as illustrated by the table below:

$Ś^{B}_{87}$	$Ś^{S}_{67}$
12.1*	12.1*
12.1–41$_{A}$	12.1–41$_{A}$
12.58–59ab$_{A}$	12.58-59ab
12.44cd*	12.44cd*
12.60–61$_{A}$	12.60–61$_{A}$
12.47*–50*	12.47*–50*
12.62–63cd$_{A}$	12.62–63cd$_{A}$
12.64–66ab$_{A}$	12.64–66ab$_{A}$
12.67cd–68$_{A}$	12.67cd–68$_{A}$
12.66cd$_{A}$	12.66cd$_{A}$
12.69–71$_{A}$	12.69–72$_{A}$
12.74$_{A}$	12.74$_{A}$
12.42–44ab$_{A}$	12.42–44$_{A}$
12.63*	12.65*
12.45–50$_{A}$	12.45–50$_{A}$
12.110–114ab$_{A}$	12.110–114ab$_{A}$
12.74cd*	12.76cd*

$Ś^{B}_{87}$	$Ś^{S}_{67}$
12.114cd–116$_{A}$	12.114cd$_{A}$
12.77ab*	12.117ab$_{A}$
12.117ab$_{A}$	12.115cd$_{A}$-116ab$_{A}$
12.118–119$_{A}$	12.79*
12.80*–81*	12.117ab$_{A}$
12.120–121$_{A}$	12.118–119$_{A}$
12.53–57$_{A}$	12.82-83*
12.75–80ab$_{A}$	12.120–121$_{A}$
12.82–83$_{A}$	12.52–57$_{A}$
12.96*	12.75–83$_{A}$
12.84–90ab$_{A}$	12.98*
12.103cd–104*	12.84–90$_{A}$
12.91ab$_{A}$	12.106*
12.105cd*	12.91ab$_{A}$
12.91cd–96ab$_{A}$	12.107cd*
12.96ef–98$_{A}$	12.91cd–96ab$_{A}$
12.113–125*	12.96ef–98$_{A}$
12.101–106ab$_{A}$	12.115-126*
12.106ef–108$_{A}$	12.101–106cd$_{A}$
12.134–137*	12.107–108$_{A}$
	12.135-137*

The stanzas on the ogdoads are characterized by the insertion of extra verses, in which different *tīrtha*s are also mentioned; verses that are shared with the other versions are at times rephrased, a rephrasing that in certain cases is clearly the result of corruption.[37] These two manuscripts can therefore be associated with

37 Following is a diplomatic transcript of the relevant stanzas as transmitted in $Ś^{B}_{87}$. The variant readings attested in $Ś^{S}_{67}$ are noted in square brackets; additional verses that are not available in versions A, P, and D are marked with a star following the *daṇḍa*: [L6] *rudrāvatārasthānani puṇyakṣetrāṇi nirdiśet* | *mṛtānāṃ teṣu rudratvaṃ śivakṣetreṣu dehi*[L7]*nāṃ* | *bhastrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭir avimuktaṃ mahāpadam* [mahālayaṃ $Ś^{S}_{67}$] | *gokarṇaṃ rudrakarṇaṃ ca suvarṇākṣo tha* [°ākṣaś ca $Ś^{B}_{67}$] *dīptimān* | [L8] *sthāneśvaraṃ tu vikhyātaṃ triṣu lokeṣu viśrutam* | *sthāṇvaṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ tatra kṣetraṃ mahodayaṃ* | *bhastrāpadādi*[L9]*sthāṇvādirudrakṣetrādikārakam* [rudradayojya° $Ś^{S}_{67}$] | *chāgalāṇḍaṃ durāṇḍaṃ ca sahā vā maṇḍaleśvaram* | *kālāñjaraṃ śaṅku*[L10]*karṇaṃ sthāneśvaram iti smṛtam* | *pavitrāṣṭakam etat śrimahāpuṇyābhivardhanam* | *mṛtāḥ prayānti tatraiva* [L11] *śivasya paramaṃ padam* | *gayā ca kurukṣetraṃ ca tathānyā nikhilābhisuḥ* | *tatra kanakhalaṃ daivaṃ bhukti*[L12]*muktiphalaśucam* [°pradam $Ś^{S}_{67}$] | *vimalaṃ cāṭṭāhāsaṃ ca māhendraṃ bhī* ... [... bhī $Ś^{S}_{67}$] *māṣṭakam* | *etad guhyātiguyākhyam aṣṭakaṃ pari*[L1]

version P, but the addition of a substantial number of new verses that are not attested anywhere else induces us to consider this a Kashmiri variant of version P, just like we had a southern variant of version A.

The misplacement of the passage on the ogdoads must have been an early error, since it appears in the Nepalese tradition already in the 11th century: our manuscript from the second half of the century, $N^{K}_{82,}$, attests to this interference, while the manuscripts from the first half do not. This is not to suggest that the mistake necessarily originated in this century, but only to give a time frame for its attestations. We should also recall that the two manuscripts attesting version P that are dated or datable up to the first half of the 11th century each transmit a different variant of the corpus that won't be attested in the later tradition. Thus, both versions A and P are attested in the earlier manuscripts of the collection, with N^{O}_{15} being the only post-12th century Nepalese manuscript attesting version P. This version, while transmitting a seemingly correct arrangement of the stanzas on the ogdoads, also differ from version A as far as the order of the stanzas on *dāna* is concerned; as observed above, the order of the stanzas on *dāna* in version P appears to be illogical with regard to the organization of the contents, to the point that one might argue that this particular arrangement had originated, in its turn, as a misplacement. Regardless of the fact that the order of stanzas in the section on *dāna* as given in version P is incorrect, this situation suggests that the manuscripts transmitting the two versions could go back to two different models. The Nepalese manuscripts that fall into these two groups behave rather consistently: those that transmit the stanzas on the ogdoads in the end of the chapter do not attest to the misplacement of the stanzas on *dāna*, and vice versa, the three that correctly preserve the stanzas on the ogdoads after the reference to the *rudrāvatārasthāna*s propose a different arrangement — or, better, a disarrangement — of the stanzas on *dāna* in the same chapter. Such consistency in the transmission of two extensive variant readings can only imply the existence of two distinct models.

---

kīrttitam | *udgatvā puruṣaḥ śrīmān prāpnoti śivamandiram* | *śrīparvataṃ hariścandraṃ mahākālacanaṃ* [°kālardhanaṃ $Ś^{S}_{67}$] [L2] *tathā* | *ādārukeśvaraṃ* [āmrātakeśvaraṃ $Ś^{S}_{67}$] *caivaṃ kedarabhairavaṃ tathā* | *janmeśaṃ saptam eśaṃ* [saptadaiśaṃ $Ś^{S}_{67}$] *ca sarvaduḥkhapuṇyāsaram* |* *ati*[L3]*guhyāṣṭakaṃ vidyād etam mokṣapradāpakam* | *amareśaṃ prabhāsaṃ ca naimiṣaṃ puṣkaraṃ tathā* | *aṣāḍhaṃ ḍiṇḍipiṇḍa*[L4]*khyaṃ bhārabhūtim* [°bhūmim $Ś^{S}_{67}$] *ataḥ param* | *nakuleśam athākhyātaṃ vidyāś cātrāṣṭakaṃ śivam* | *guhyāṣṭakam iti khyātaṃ rudra*[L5]*syāmitatejasaṃ* | *tatra yānti mṛtās sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam* | *sthānāny etāni yatnena vrajed yogī śiva*[L6]*vratī* |* *itūmā sāsya te yena rudrāṇāṃ kṣetram uttamam* |* *yatra yatrāthavā deśe yena yena maheśvaraḥ* |* *rūpeṇāste* [L7] *mahāpuṇyaṃ tat tat kṣetraṃ sumokṣadam* |* *dānāny āvasathaṃ kūpam udyānaṃ devatāgṛham* | *tīrtheṣv etāni yaḥ ku*[L8]*ryād akṣayaṃ labhate phalam* |.

If we accept that the correct order of the stanzas on the ogdoads is the one reflected in versions P and D, while a more correct arrangement of the section on *dāna* is reflected in versions A and D, it turns out that the latter, only represented by southern specimens, is the only version to have preserved both sections in what could be their proper position. We are therefore faced with a situation where, with regard to the two variants in question, late Grantha and Telugu manuscripts transmit a version that could be closer to that of the archetype, prior to the emergence of the two interferences that would have heavily affected the transmission of chapter 12 since its early history. This consideration only applies to the general structure of the contents, as a common pattern of omissions and additions closely links the manuscripts transmitting version D to the regional southern tradition. One possibility is that the Indian regional transmissions and the Nepalese transmission separated early, before the first manuscript(s) reached Nepal, thus certainly before the 9th century. The most significant evidence that so far seems to suggest that the Nepalese and the Indian traditions must have developed independently after the first split is the flourishing of the corpus, of which we find no trace outside Nepal, where it played by contrast a key role also in the manuscript transmission. While it is possible that the stanza order of version D may depend on an older hyper-archetype, given its commonalities with versions A and P, only an accurate study of the variant readings in the text will enable scholars to confirm and enrich this reconstruction, or on the contrary to draw a completely different picture. At the same time, the hypothesis of a scribal conjecture that restored the correct position of the stanzas on the ogdoads in manuscripts following version D might always remain unconfirmed; as I will try to argue with the next example, the ghost of contamination has haunted the transmission of the Śivadharma corpus since early times, getting in the way of modern philological studies.

3 *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* in the making

The 'Conversation between Umā and Maheśvara' (*Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*) is typically transmitted as the fourth work in the Nepalese MTMs of the Śivadharma corpus. It is first attested in two early 11th-century specimens, N^{K}_{28} and N^{Ko}_{77}, and since then transmitted uninterruptedly in palm-leaf and paper manuscripts of the

Śivadharma corpus up to modern times.[38] Like the other works of the corpus, with the exception of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*, the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* appears to only be attested in Nepal. The study of its transmission thus offers the opportunity to narrow our focus from the vast South Asian area, with its diverse local traditions and scripts, to the Nepalese region. The case that will be examined in the next pages suggests that the composition of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* was still in progress during the first stages of its manuscript transmission, thus providing a clue that this work may indeed have been composed in Nepal; at the same time, scribes have not only facilitated the transmission of this text, but also seem to have modified it significantly, for reasons that might have been connected to the contexts in which the text was used.

As I have already pointed out elsewhere,[39] a relevant disruption in the transmission of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* consists in how the Nepalese manuscripts appear to have divided the work into an uneven number of chapters. As a matter of fact, several manuscripts transmit the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* as a work divided into 22 chapters, the final chapter consisting of only 16 stanzas that usually lack the explicit designation of 'chapter 22', being set off simply with final *iti*. Such is the division of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* according to N^{C}_{45} (which however has significant lacunas in this point), N^{C}_{94}, N^{C}_{02}, N^{K}_{82}, N^{K}_{7}, N^{K}_{10}, N^{K}_{11}, and N^{K}_{25}, to which I will hereafter refer as 'group V'. Note that all these manuscripts also turn out to transmit version A of *Śivadharmaśāstra* chapter 12, although this information cannot be verified for N^{C}_{02} and N^{K}_{10}, which lack the *Śivadharmaśāstra* entirely. In this group we should also include Naraharinatha 1998. Once we compare the structure of the final portion of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* as in group V with the one attested in N^{K}_{28}, possibly the earliest manuscript to attest the corpus and, thus, the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* itself, some major differences

38 The works of the Śivadharma corpus have also been used independently of the MTMs in which they are transmitted, a practice that in later times resulted in some of these works being transmitted as single-text manuscripts originating from the dismemberment of a former MTM (see De Simini 2016b, 260ff.). The title list of the NGMPP enumerates only four paper manuscripts with the title *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* that don't seem to be part of a larger manuscript. These are (listed by microfilm number): A 305–4, of only ten folios; E 723/14, of 33 folios; A 471–40, of 25 folios; and F 6–8, of eight folios. The catalogue information provided is too scarce to let us conclude beyond doubt that this *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* was indeed the same work (or a fragment of the same work) as in the Śivadharma corpus. As a matter of fact, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* is a very generic title, which could rather denote a category or subgenre of texts, as shown by its various attestations in the *New Catalogous Catalogorum*.

39 Some of the considerations contained in the following lines are alluded to in De Simini 2016b, 246, n. 34.

emerge. In the following lines, I will describe this comparison by using one manuscript as representative of the entire group V, namely N_7^K, a complete palm-leaf manuscript dated to 1170 CE.[40] The first relevant discrepancy emerging from a comparison between N_7^K and N_{28}^K is that the latter, in which the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* is also positioned as the last work in the corpus, concludes the work at chapter 20. The contents of chapter 20 in the two manuscripts are otherwise consistent, barring a few concluding verses absent from N_{28}^K:

N_{28}^K: (fol. 191v[L3]) *prakāsitāni sarvāṇi dharmāṇi vividhā • ni ca | eṣa te paramaṃ yoga<ṃ> mayā tatvam udāhṛtam || ○ || iti mahābhāratasāntiparvaṇi dānadharmeṣu u[L4]māmahesvarasaṃvāde viṃsamo <'>dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ || ✻ || samāptaṃ umāmahesvarasaṃvādaṃ* (sic!) ||; '[…] and all the manifold teachings have been disclosed. That supreme *yoga* has been illustrated by me to you according to truth. Thus ends the 20th chapter in the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, belonging to the teachings on gifting in the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. The *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* is concluded.'	N_7^K: (fol. 185r[LL2–3]) *prakāśitā • ni sarvāṇi dharmāṇi vividhāni ca || yo <'>sau ca ratidharmātmā sa yāti paramāṃ gatiṃ | rudra • jñānāni puṇyāni bhāṣitāni purāṇi ca || arcitā vācakā ye ca likhāpaya[L3]ti śraddhayā | sarve* {yā} *yānti pāraṃ sthānaṃ yatra vāso* [vā a.c., vāso p.c.] *niraṃjanaḥ || etan te paramaṃ yogaṃ ma • yā tatvaṃ udāhṛtam || || umāmaheśvarasamvāde viṃśatimo <'>dhyāyaḥ* ||; '[…] and all the manifold teachings have been disclosed. / And the one who finds pleasure in the Dharma, he heads to the supreme path. The meritorious and ancient [fields of] Rudra's knowledge have been expounded: / The worshipper and [those] who recite, [as well as the one who] has [knowledge] copied with faith, all go to the supreme seat, where the pure abode is. / That supreme *yoga* has been illustrated by me to you according to truth. / [Thus ends] the 20th chapter in the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*'.

The general tenor of these verses, which declare that all the teachings have been disclosed and, in the version given by manuscripts of group V, praise the role of those who worship and disseminate the text, seems to comply perfectly with the concluding remarks of the work. However, N_{28}^K is the only extant manuscript in which chapter 20 actually concludes the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*. A further peculiarity of N_{28}^K is that the colophon of chapter 20 mentions the 'teachings on gifting' of the *Mahābhārata*'s *Śāntiparvan*, which is a phrasing actually used to refer to the so-called 'Section on the Teachings on Gifting' (*Dānadharmaparvan*), corresponding to chapters 1 to 166 in the critical edition of the *Anuśāsanaparvan*, the 13th division of the *Mahābhārata*. This attribution, which does not have parallels

40 On this manuscript, see De Simini 2016c.

in any of the extant chapter rubrics of the work, therefore seems to reconnect the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* with the *Mahābhārata*, which does contain a section that depicts a dialogue between Umā and Maheśvara exactly in the *Anuśāsanaparvan*, in chapters 127 to 134 of the critical edition, that is still within the *dānadharma* section. As Mirnig and I have argued in a further contribution to this volume (see chapter 18, 587ff.), the composition of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, along with that of the *Lalitavistara* transmitted in N_{77}^{Ko} (containing substantial parallels with the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*), seems indeed to have taken inspiration from the *Anuśāsanaparvan*. In particular, we have shown that chapter 20 of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, parallel to chapter 25 of the *Lalitavistara*, contains a parallel of about 14 verses to the so-called *Vaiṣṇavadharmaśāstra*, a text that is transmitted in the South as a sub-portion of the *Āśvamedhikaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (see De Simini and Mirnig 2017, p. 628). However, in NGMPP A 27/2, the early Nepalese manuscript that preserves the *Vaiṣṇavadharmaśāstra* dated NS 169 (= 1049 CE), the title of the text is indeed given as the *Dānadharma*. This would indeed comply with the attribution that we find in the final rubric of *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* chapter 20 in N_{28}^{K}, which thus shows that the agents involved in the transmission of the work were aware that part of this chapter derived from a different work, and that the reference to the 'teachings on Dharma' is meant to indicate the *Vaiṣṇavadharmaśāstra* rather than the modern sub-division of the *Anuśāsanaparvan*.

The chapter rubrics of the manuscripts belonging to group V miss this connection, while on the other hand they link the contents of chapter 21, which is absent from N_{28}^{K}, to another work:

> (N_{7}^{K}, fol. 187v[L3]) || || *bhagavato gītapurāṇe dharmaguhya* (sic!) *gajendramokṣaṇam umāmaheśvarasaṃvāde*: • *ekaviṃśatimo* <'>*dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ* || ||
>
> [Thus ends] the freeing of the king of the elephants [expounded] in the secret of Dharma (read: *dharmaguhye*), [which is] the *Purāṇa* of the hymns of the Lord; the 21st chapter in the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* is concluded.

While the first part of chapter 21 (stanzas 1 to 63) centres on the topic of musical notes (*svara*), the last part (corresponding to stanzas 64 to 78) indeed recounts the story of the liberation of the king of the elephants (*gajendramokṣaṇa*).[41] This

41 According to this story, the king elephant, after leading his herd into a lake, gets his foot caught by a crocodile. They are thus engaged in a fight for a thousand years until the elephant, showing his devotion to Viṣṇu by offering a lotus flower to the god with the tip of his trunk and

famous episode of Vaiṣṇava inspiration is also narrated, in a more comprehensive form, in other Purāṇas, most notably in *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 8, with which the scribal tradition of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* most likely reconnects this chapter of the work.[42] However, no notable textual parallels can be traced between this section of chapter 21 and the *gajendramokṣaṇa* episode as expounded in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, while on the other hand direct textual borrowings connect this part of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* with *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.194, where the same story is narrated.[43] Other selections of Vaiṣṇava inspiration include the few stanzas that form the next and final chapter, chapter 22, as found in the manuscripts

---

chanting a *stotra*, is freed by the direct intervention of the god. In his previous life, the king elephant had been the king Indradyumna, a great devotee of Viṣṇu who had been cursed by the sage Agasti. The version of the story narrated in the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* is rather short, and proceeds from the story of another curse and animal rebirth, namely that of the crocodile that assaults the king elephant. This crocodile is actually the *gandharva* Hahāhuhū who had been cursed by the sage Devala and turned into a crocodile. The chance to recount this story is given by the mention of the seven *gandharva*s in stanza 21.63 in connection with the seven musical notes (*svara*), which are the topic of the preceding stanzas in chapter 21. The brief account of the *gajendramokṣaṇa* episode is concluded with the liberation of the king elephant and the crocodile, each under the curse of a different sage.

42 The *gajendramokṣaṇa* episode of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* is also transmitted as a separate text: see, for instance, manuscripts NAK 6/99, NGMPP A 1114–17, or NAK 6/2124, NGMPP A 1117–2. The catalogue of the NGMCP lists 71 microfilms under the title g*ajendramokṣaṇa*, although it is possible that they contain texts belonging to different Purāṇas. *Gajendramokṣaṇa*, for instance, is also the title of a short work that presents itself as part of the *Mahābhārata*'s *Śāntiparvan,* and is transmitted either as a single work (UP Coll. 390, item 2664) or together with other devotional works (see Cambridge UL Or.1818). However, this episode cannot be traced in the current edition of the *Mahābhārata*. I managed to verify that the text transmitted in the Cambridge manuscript Or.1818 mostly corresponds to chapter 67 of the *Viṣṇudharma*. The catalogue information and the color pictures of this manuscript can be found at the following link: https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-01818/1 (last accessed: 5/1/2017).

43 The following textual parallels can be identified by comparing the corresponding sections of the two works:

1) *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.194.18ab: *tasmin sarasi duṣṭātmā virūpo 'ntarjaleśayaḥ* | = *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* 21.68cd (N^{K}_{7} 187r[L4]): *tasmin sarasi duṣṭātmā virūpo 'ntarjaleśayaḥ*;
2) *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.194.22cd–23: *salilaṃ paṅkajavane yūtamadhyagato vrajam* || 22 *gṛhītas tena raudreṇa grāheṇāvyaktamūrtinā* | *paśyataḥ sarvayūthasya krośataś cātidāruṇam* || 23 = *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* 21.70ab, 71 (N^{K}_{7} 187r[L5–6]): *salile paṅkajavane yūthamadhye gatas sukhī* | [...] [L6] *gṛhītas tena raudreṇa grāheṇādṛśyamūrtinā* || *paśyantīnāṃ kareṇūnāṃ krośantīnāś ca dāruṇam*;
3) *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.194.26cd: *vyathitaḥ sa nirudyogaḥ paścimām āgato daśām* || 26 = *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* 21.72cd (N^{K}_{7} 187r[L6]): *vyathitas anirudvegaḥ paścimām agamad diśām*;
4) *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.194.27cd–28ab: *jagāma śaraṇaṃ viṣṇuṃ tuṣṭāva ca parantapaḥ* ||

of group V: in this short chapter, Maheśvara refers to the ten *avatāra*s of Viṣṇu (22.7–13), and praises Viṣṇu as the maintainer of the triple world. These verses then conclude with a further request from the Lord to the Goddess as to what else she would like to hear from him. His spouse poses no further questions, but a conversation between the two again provides the frame narrative for the next work in the corpus, variously called *Uttarottarasaṃvāda, Umottarasaṃvāda*, and the like. As shown in De Simini and Mirnig 2017, the verses forming chapter 22 of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* are also traceable in *Umottarasaṃvāda* 7 and *Lalitavistara* 33, where they are inserted in a context that seems more suitable to the understanding of these stanzas. Chapter 22 of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* thus seems to have been composed entirely on the basis of pre-existing materials, and thus to belong to a second phase in the composition of the work, in which this has been expanded by the addition of two more chapters.

In the case examined in the preceding paragraph, we observed a clear chronological split between the two earliest manuscripts, N_{28}^{K} and N_{77}^{Ko}, and the rest of the Nepalese tradition, with the sole exception of the 12th century Oxonian manuscript N_{15}^{O}, which could be associated with the two early 11th-century specimens. This situation changes radically as concerns the final chapters of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda,* for N_{77}^{Ko} transmits the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* in 22 chapters, corresponding to those of N_{7}^{K}. However, as pointed out above and argued in full detail in De Simini and Mirnig 2017, the same manuscript also contains an additional work, the *Lalitavistara*, which partly reproduces the text of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* (only up to chapter 19), while also showing contaminations from the *Mahābhārata* and *Umottarasaṃvāda*. This can be interpreted as a further sign that, in manuscripts from the first half of the 11th century, both the formation of the corpus and the composition of some of its works — particularly the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* — were still regarded as an ongoing process. Concerning N_{15}^{O}, this manuscript is also consistent overall with the manuscripts of group V, although it adopts a different criterion for the division of the chapters, which number 23 here. However, the variation in the numeration of the chapters depends in the first place on a different internal subdivision of the contents of

---

27 *gṛhītvā sa karāgreṇa sarasaḥ kamalottamam* | = *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* 21.73 (N_{7}^{K} 186r[L6]–187v[L1]): *jagāma manasā* [187vL1] *devaṃ śaraṇaṃ madhusūdanaṃ* | *pragṛhya puṣkarāgreṇa kāñcanaṃ kamalottamam* ||;

5) *Viṣṇudharmottara* 1.194.50cd–51ab: *mokṣayāmāsa ca gajaṃ pāśebhyaḥ śaraṇāgatam* || 50 *sa hi devalaśāpena hāhā gandharvasattamaḥ* | = *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* 21.76 (N_{7}^{K} 187v[L2]): *mokṣayāmāsa ca gajaṃ pāśebhyaḥ śaraṇāgataḥ* | *sa hi devalaśāpena hāhā gandharvasattamaḥ* ||. Note that the last *pāda* also has a loose parallel in *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 8.4.3cd: *mukto devalaśāpena hūhūr gandharvasattamaḥ* || 3.

chapter 9,[44] and not on the insertion of new materials; furthermore, the scribe of N^{O}_{15} mistakenly labelled 'chapter 23' what should have been chapter 22. As a consequence, chapter 23 of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* in N^{O}_{15} corresponds to chapter 21 in N^{K}_{7}, including the colophon with the reference to the '*bhāgavato gītapurāṇam*' (see N^{O}_{15}, fol. 197r[L3]). After chapter 23, N^{O}_{15} adds the same 16 stanzas as N^{K}_{7}, on the *avatāra*s of Viṣṇu, and likewise simply concludes the work with *iti*. A reader of the text, or a scribe who used this manuscript, must have found this solution annoying, or must have seen another manuscript of the corpus in which those 16 stanzas were designated as 'chapter 22'; therefore, he added a final rubric to this portion where he mistakenly designates this section as 'chapter 22' (fol. 197v[L4]), unaware (or forgetful) of the fact that the previous chapter of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* in this manuscript already bore the number 23. Another possibility is that this is a clumsy attempt made by the scribe in order to somehow fill the gap existing in N^{O}_{15} between chapter 21 and 23.

Therefore, as concerns the structure of the final chapters of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, the case of manuscript N^{K}_{28} is truly unique, since this manuscript turns out to be the only one transmitting an earlier version of the corpus, as well as of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, lacking some of the materials found in all the other specimens. On closer inspection, though, N^{K}_{28} might be regarded as slightly less exceptional in the history of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*'s transmission, since at least one other manuscript stands out from the bulk of the Nepalese tradition precisely due to the peculiarities concerning the composition and transmission of the final portion of this work. This is N^{K}_{3}, a palm-leaf manuscript dated to 1201 CE, the first year of the reign of Arimalla (1200–12016 CE),[45] which transmits the eight standard works of the Śivadharma corpus. Various factors make this manuscript relevant to the transmission history of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* and, more generally, to the philological study of the composition of the Śivadharma corpus. Firstly, N^{K}_{3} divides chapter 9 into two shorter chapters, just like N^{O}_{15}, breaking the text approximately at the same point.[46] As a consequence, the numeration of the following chapters is altered, so that group V's chapter 20 corresponds to chapter 21 in N^{K}_{3}. The copyist of N^{K}_{3} — whose name was Haricandra, as we learn from the final colophon (fol. 276r[LL3–4]) — appends to chapter 21 the same rubric that was only available for chapter 20 in N^{K}_{28}, in

44 See fol. 175v[L5], where chapter 9 is split into two at stanza 9.25.

45 On this king, see Petech 1984, 80–82.

46 See fol. 166r[LL1–2]. The chapter is interrupted at stanza 9.26. I take the opportunity here to correct my earlier observation, according to which it was chapter 20, not chapter 9, that had been divided into two parts in this manuscript (see De Simini 2016b, 246, n. 34).

which the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* was linked to the '*Dānadharma* of the *Śāntiparvan*'.[47] The two manuscripts thus share a peculiarity that is not attested anywhere else in the tradition, a circumstance that makes one suspect that they could indeed be somehow linked, just like we might hypothesize a connection with N^{O}_{15} due to the unique chapter division that it shares with N^{K}_{3}. Most likely, manuscript N^{K}_{3} was the product of a complex contamination of different branches of the tradition, while at the same time reflecting strong authorial intervention. This becomes clear when we consider the case of group V's chapters 21 (on music and the liberation of the king elephant) and 22 (on the *avatāra*s of Viṣṇu) as transmitted in manuscript N^{K}_{3}.

Immediately following N^{K}_{3}'s chapter 21, which corresponds to chapter 20 in group V, we encounter a short chapter 22, called *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya* (see colophon at fol. 183r$_{[L2]}$), which is not available in any of the other manuscripts. This additional chapter is certainly the most macroscopic variant distinguishing N^{K}_{3} from the entire tradition, and we might thus surmise that this chapter was either composed by the copyist Haricandra specifically on the occasion of the production of N^{K}_{3}, or that it belonged to N^{K}_{3}'s lost exemplar, which has also remained disconnected from the rest of the tradition. Moreover, as shown by the table in the Appendix containing the diplomatic transcription of this chapter, 26 out of the 29 stanzas forming the *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya* have literal parallels in three chapters of the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. Barring a few blunders and grammatical inconsistencies, which characterize this manuscript overall, the parallels of the *Śāntiparvan* are so close that one might assume that the *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya* was in fact modelled on the former. In this case, too, the *Mahābhārata* thus functioned as a direct source of content and stanzas for the composition of a new chapter of the work.

Haricandra's work did not finish with the insertion of this new chapter, for the *Bhīṣaṇādhyaya* is followed by chapter 23, which is nothing but an abridged version of group V's chapter 21, extending only up to stanza 21.30. After this, the text skips everything else up to the conclusion at 21.78, which means that it also skips the story of the *gajendramokṣaṇa* and, coherently, avoids any reference to it in the final rubric. Moreover, Haricandra also avoided copying the concluding chapter of group V, namely the short chapter 22 mentioning Viṣṇu's *avatāra*s, which we suspected to be a later addition to the work. In brief, most of the textual materials that were absent from the early N^{K}_{28}, but attested everywhere else, are carefully avoided by those who were responsible for the production of manuscript

47 Fol. 182r$_{[L2]}$: *iti mahābhārate śāntiparvvani dānadharmaḥ* || || • *iti umāmaheśvarasaṃvāde ekaviṃśatimo* <'>*dhyāyaḥ* ||.

N_3^K. The professional who worked on this manuscript or on its exemplar, given its date and features, must have certainly been aware of other manuscripts of group V, but then decided to intervene in a very prominent way by deleting some materials, introducing new ones, and thus altering the conclusion of the text. In the vast body of Nepalese manuscripts of the Śivadharma corpus, I could so far identify only one that presents the same chapter division, and transmits the same text as N_3^K, namely a rare case of a single-text manuscript of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, identified with the NGMPP reel-number E 1804-9. This is a late paper manuscript in Devanāgarī script that almost certainly belonged to a former MTM, as we can deduce from the *siglum śi-dha-ca* (=*śivadharmacarita*) running on the left margin. N_{84}^K shares exactly the same chapter divisions of N_3^K, including the reference to the *Śāntiparvan* in conclusion of chapter 21, the addition of the *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya*, and the shortened version of chapter 21 transmitted as chapter 23. Before the final stanza of this chapter, N_{84}^K adds *c.* 3 stanzas that are not available in N_3^K.

The reasons behind such a choice must remain speculative for now, as we still know little of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*'s textual history. One would be tempted to argue that a copyist might have found the presence of the Vaiṣṇava materials in group V's chapters 21 and 22 to be inappropriate for the conclusion of a Śaiva work, such as the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* is purported to be, and thus set about deleting and replacing them. We know that the coexistence of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava materials is one of the most striking features of the *Lalitavistara*, and to a certain extent also characterizes the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, to the point that one could surmise that the two works were composed precisely with the idea of balancing the two cults (see De Simini and Mirnig 2017). At any rate, N_3^K retains without problem the contents of other Vaiṣṇava chapters of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* — such as, for instance, chapter 4, on the *vaiṣṇavayoga* — so we cannot hypothesize that the copyist of N_3^K conducted a systematic purge of all the Vaiṣṇava materials contained in the work. On the other hand, one could also surmise that the reasons underlying the removal of portions of text from the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* transmitted in N_3^K — or in its lost exemplar — were merely philological. We observed how the verses forming chapter 22 of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* are also attested in chapter 7 of the *Umottarasaṃvāda*, where they seem to be in their original context, with respect to both their internal references and syntactical connections. At the same time, the scribal tradition had consistently attributed the story of the *gajendramokṣaṇa* to a *bhagavato gītāpurāṇa*, possibly identifiable with the *Bhagavatapurāṇa*, a text that, unlike the *Mahābhārata*, is not used as a source of verses and topics in the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* and that — at least in the version known to us today — does not actually have literal parallels to that portion of the Śivadharma corpus. A scribe

might thus have expunged the final chapters of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* of apparent interferences in the transmission of the text; at the same time, the philological zeal of the person who intervened in the text did not restrain him — or one of his colleagues — from introducing a chapter that, in light of our current knowledge of the manuscript tradition, is not attested anywhere else, and thus seems to have been composed with the purpose of replacing the missing chapter. However, unlike the portions that were removed, this chapter had been duly composed following the model of the *Mahābhārata*, coherently with further examples from the same work.

One last factor to consider in order to fully assess the production of this manuscript and the editorial choices that might have been made by its copyist Haricandra (or the copyist of the exemplar he was using) is that, as observed above, N_3^K was penned in the first year of the reign of Arimalla, the founder of the early Malla dynasty, who is praised in the colophon with his full royal titles, including explicit statements of his devotion to Śiva Paśupati.[48] The same colophon also specifies that the manuscript was produced with the aim of granting material and immaterial benefits to its sponsor, called Somadeva, and his family. Therefore, N_3^K was not only charged with the responsibility of transmitting the texts of the Śivadharma corpus, but was also endowed with two main kinds of agency: on the one hand, the celebration of a political power whose coming marks a significant change in the political history of medieval Nepal; on the other, the protection and spiritual welfare of a wealthy sponsor, a function that Nepalese manuscripts have served since early times. Those who were responsible for the production of N_3^K were thus well aware that their work was not just aimed at the transmission of the Śivadharma corpus, but that their choices in dealing with the manuscript as a carrier of text must also be assessed against the ideology that surrounded the manuscript as an object of power and a protective tool.

48 For a transcript and study of the colophon of this manuscript, see De Simini 2016b, 255, and Petech 1984, 80.

4 Conclusions: 'Gegen die Kontamination ist kein Kraut gewachsen'[49]

Two main types of conclusions can be drawn from the above case studies with respect to the linkage of the different manuscripts and the methodological consequences this has. In the first place, the case of *Śivadharmaśāstra* chapter 12 highlights the existence of regional variants in the transmission, characterized by the inclusion or omission of specific groups of stanzas that might be absent from other variants, as well as by different internal arrangements. The general consistency of the Nepalese tradition is affected either by the presence of subgroups that transmit a certain variant — such as the case of version P, variously linked to the Kashmiri tradition — or by a deliberate alteration that can be attributed to a scribe or other party involved in the transmission process. Moreover, the links that connect the manuscripts within a subgroup may become weaker as we extend our analysis to other parts of the corpus. Therefore, when we work on different sections of the corpus, we find that there are different links to be established. For instance, while manuscripts N^{K}_{28}, N^{Ko}_{77}, and N^{O}_{15} can certainly be considered related on the basis of their common errors and shared variants in the arrangement of the stanzas of *Śivadharmaśāstra* chapter 12, this connection dissolves once we observe the structure of the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*. On this point, N^{Ko}_{77} and N^{O}_{15} can be associated with the 'mainstream' version of the Nepalese corpus, while N^{K}_{28} again diverges. The latter manuscript indeed qualifies as very unique, since once we dig into it we are able to find other cases in which its stanza arrangement does not comply with any of the other manuscripts. One such example is the structure of chapter 11 of the *Śivadharmaśāstra*: N^{K}_{28} skips from stanza 28 of the mainstream version to 69, moving back to stanza 29 only after stanza 106. If the uniqueness of this manuscript, which also transmits a shorter version of the corpus, may also somehow be related to its earliness, of which we have no further proof than its script, then we must also accept that N^{K}_{28} may belong to a different branch than the entirety of the Nepalese tradition. The fact that in chapter 12 of the *Śivadharmaśāstra* N^{K}_{28} shares with N^{Ko}_{77} and N^{O}_{15} both a correct reading (the position of the stanzas on the ogdoads) and a likely wrong one (the arrangement of the stanzas on *dāna*), while not sharing the other macroscopic variants that we took into consideration, makes one suspect that there are cases of contamination internal to the Nepalese tradition.

This is also hinted at by the case of N^{K}_{3}, a manuscript that respects version A in the transmission of *Śivadharmaśāstra* chapter 12, and that one would easily discard

49 Maas 1957, 31.

from a collation due to the high number of corrupted readings and overall bad state of the text it transmits. Nonetheless, this manuscript turns out to provide an illuminating example of the open attitude that a scribe could have towards this tradition, to which they felt entitled, under certain conditions, to add and subtract text as they pleased. Although in many cases we notice that the scribes of the Śivadharma corpus were copying mechanically from their exemplars, the possibility that the text could be altered on purpose, or on the basis of the reading transmitted by another exemplar, was certainly there, and it is the principle that inspired and authorized somebody to add two more chapters to the 20-chapter *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* of N^{K}_{28}, or to divide chapter 9 of the same text into two chapters, as we see in N^{K}_{3} and in N^{O}_{15}. These examples suggest that we are likely to encounter many more such interventions in the tradition as we proceed with our critical work on the corpus.

A mechanical copying process thus alternated with a non-mechanical one in which copyists assessed the text and made decisions concerning its transmission. Philologists know that this attitude leaves the door open to the horizontal contamination of the tradition, which is one of the reasons why some manuscripts appear to be very close, to the point of suggesting a genetic link, but only inasmuch as we consider just one single segment of text. Another option that we should consider is that contamination might also have occurred if the scribes working on a MTM copied the works from different manuscripts. We don't know much about the copying process of these manuscripts, but we do know from codicological and paratextual features that the works belonging to the MTMs of the corpus could and were used independently of each other,[50] so we cannot rule out the possibility that single blocks from different MTMs were also employed as exemplars for the production of a new block of another MTM. The genealogical-reconstructive method will help us clarify this and other points, especially once we are able to systematically extend our considerations to all the works of the corpus.

The extant southern manuscripts, produced at a much later date due to the well-known defects that undermine manuscript transmission in such a hot and humid climate, otherwise prove immensely useful in the reconstruction of the history of the tradition, once again confirming that the latest layers in the transmission might in fact still preserve traces of a much earlier text. If we were to consider the southern materials as just ancillary to the Nepalese manuscripts, we would no longer be able to apply the criterion of the 'peripheral areas'[51] to philology in order to evaluate a reading.

50 See De Simini 2016b and 2016c.

51 On Lachmann's introduction of this linguistic criterion in his edition of the New Testament — a concept later theorized by Bartoli and the proponents of neolinguistics at the beginning of the 20th century — see Pasquali 2014, 8.

From a methodological point of view, the so-called 'method of Lachmann', with its rebuttal of some of the practices that were widespread in Humanist philology — such as the acceptance of a vulgate version of the text, as well as the criterion of the *codex optimus*, and its focus on a rigorous *recensio* of the manuscripts — certainly offers some principles that turn out useful also in the study of the transmission of the Śivadharma corpus. At the same time, the features of this tradition, from the abundance and chronological distribution of its attestations to the likelihood of horizontal contamination, make it less suited to a process of mechanical *recensio* — of the sort that the reconstruction of a stemma presupposes — and better suited to a so-called 'open' or non-mechanical one. Scholars are thus presented here with a situation that is closer to the one envisaged by the post-Lachmannian philologist Pasquali, who highlighted the role played by the study of the history of the tradition that accompanies the reconstruction of a stemma. The author, in his analysis of contaminated traditions (see his 1934 study, reedited in 2014), proposed to rely on what he calls an open recension, a technique that proves useful in the case of traditions for which no definitive stemma can be proposed — as the tradition of the Śivadharma will probably prove to be. This is based on the principle that, during *recensio,* all manuscripts must be collated, while in the phase of *editio* the choice of the best reading cannot happen mechanically — nor on the basis of fixed criteria such as the genealogical stemma, the majority rule, or that of the 'best' manuscript — but necessarily has to happen by assessing each reading in terms of the principles established by the editor on the basis of the history of the tradition. The collation of the manuscripts and the choice of the best reading must therefore be preceded by a precise assessment of the place that can be assigned to each manuscript or group of manuscripts in the transmission of the text, and the impossibility of reconstructing a complete stemma can be replaced by the awareness of which forms the text assumed at different stages of its transmission. Thus the combined application of the genealogical-reconstructive method and the method of the open recension to the study of the complex transmission of the Śivadharma corpus — whose 'vulgate' text (Naraharinatha 1998) is furthermore deeply unreliable — not only promises the possibility of achieving a better understanding of the texts and the production of better critical editions, but also offers an important methodological contribution to the way we study Sanskrit texts and their transmission, enriching our knowledge and practice of philology and textual criticism.

References

Abbreviations

ALRC	Adyar Library and Research Centre
ASC	Asiatic Society of Calcutta
BHU	Benares Hindu University
Bodl.	Bodleian Library
CUL	Cambridge University Library
GOML	Government Oriental Manuscript Library (Chennai)
IFP	Institut Français de Pondichéry
LU	Leiden University
NAK	National Archives of Kathmandu
NGMPP	Nepalese-German Manuscript Preservation Project
ORL	Oriental Library of Srinagar
UP	University of Pennsylvania
WL	Wellcome Library

Manuscripts*

Sigla	Accession Number	Date
B^{C}_{99}	CUL Add.1599	1682—83 CE
G^{A}_{29}	ALRC 75429	
G^{Ch}_{42}	GOML 2442	

* For the manuscripts of the Śivadharma corpus, I have used the system of sigla that was agreed upon during the 'Śivadharma Workshop. Manuscripts, Editions, Perspectives'. According to this system, the first letter in the siglum denotes the script in which the manuscript is written (N for Nepālākṣara, G for Grantha, etc.); the first superscripted letter is for the place where the manuscript is kept (K stands for Kathmandu, C for Cambridge, Ko for Kolkata, L for Leiden, O for Oxford, A for Adyar), while the subscribed number indicates the last two figures of the microfilm or accession number.

Note that the Śivadharma manuscripts held at the Cambridge University Library are all photographed and catalogued in Vergiani, Cuneo and Formigatti 2011–14. Information on some of the manuscripts catalogued by the NGMPP can be found at the following link: http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/Main_Page (last accessed: 20/12/2016). The paper transcripts of the IFP can be downloaded from the website of the Muktabodha library (http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/access_page.htm; last viewing: 12/1/2017). The manuscript of the Wellcome Institute is described in Wujastyk 1985. The two Śāradā and the Telugu manuscripts are just mentioned in the lists of the holdings of the respective libraries, without description. Neither the Leiden nor the Bodleian Śivadharma manuscript are described in catalogues.

G^{L}_{40}	LU II.40	April 22, 1830 CE
N^{C}_{02}	CUL Add.2102	*12th century
N^{C}_{45}	CUL Add.1645	1139—40 CE
N^{C}_{94}	CUL Add.1694	*12th century
N^{K}_{A12}	NAK 5-892 (NGMPP A 12/3)	*9th century
N^{K}_{3}	NAK 5–737 (NGMPP A 3/3)	January 4, 1201 CE
N^{K}_{7}	NAK 1–1075 (NGMPP B 7/3)	January 4, 1170 CE
N^{K}_{10}	NAK 1/1261 (NGMPP A 10/5)	
N^{K}_{11}	NAK 5–738 (NGMPP A 11/3)	1395–96 CE
N^{K}_{12}	NAK 5–841 (NGMPP B 12/4)	date of the exemplar: 1194—95 CE
N^{K}_{25}	Kesar 218 (NGMPP C 25/1)	
N^{K}_{28}	NAK 6–7 (NGMPP A 1028/4)	*late 10th /early 11th century
N^{K}_{42}	NAK 2–153 (NGMPP A 1042/1)	
N^{K}_{57}	Kesar 597 (NGMPP C 57/5)	1742—43 CE
N^{K}_{82}	NAK 3–393 (NGMPP A 1082/3)	May 24, 1069 CE
N^{K}_{84}	E 34612 (NGMPP E 1804-9)	
N^{Ko}_{52}	ASC G 3852 (cat. No. 4085)	*12th century
N^{Ko}_{77}	ASC G 4077 (cat. No. 4084)	July 6, 1036 CE
N^{O}_{15}	Sansk. A 15 (R)	June 1187 CE
N^{L}_{16}	WL ð 16 (I–VIII)	
P^{T}_{32}	IFP T32	June 26, 1959
P^{T}_{72}	IFP T72	March 9, 1963
P^{T}_{514}	IFP T514	
P^{T}_{860}	IFP T860	
$Ś^{S}_{67}$	ORL 1467	
$Ś^{B}_{87}$	BHU C1087 (cat. No. 7/3986)	
T^{A}_{15}	ALRC 66015	

Secondary sources

Bisschop, Peter (2006), *Early Śaivism and the Skandapurāṇa. Sects and Centres* (Groningen Oriental Studies XXI), Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

Bisschop, Peter (2014), 'Invoking the Powers that Be: the Śivadharma's Mahāśānti Mantra', in *South Asian Studies*, 30.2: 133–4.1.

Bisschop, Peter (forthcoming), *Universal Śaivism. The Śivadharma Appeasement of All Gods and Powers*.

De Simini, Florinda (2013), *Ritual Aspects and Manuscript Transmission in Premodern India: A Historical Study of Vidyādāna Through Textual Sources. With a first critical edition and English translation of Śivadharmottara's chapter two "On the Gift of Knowledge"*. Università di Torino, Facoltà di Studi Orientali. Unpublished PhD Dissertation defended on May 29, 2013.

De Simini, Florinda (2016a), *Of Gods and Books. Ritual and Knowledge Transmission in the Manuscript Cultures of Premodern India* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 8.), Berlin: De Gruyter. Also available online as an open-access publication at the following link: https://www.degruyter.com/viewbooktoc/product/472498 (last accessed: 20/12/2016).

De Simini, Florinda (2016b), 'Śivadharma Manuscripts from Nepal and the Making of a Śaiva Corpus', in Michael Friedrich and Cosima Schwarke (eds), *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and*

Multiple-Text Manuscripts (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 9), Berlin: De Gruyter, 233–286. Also available online as an open-access publication at the following link: https://www.degruyter.com/viewbooktoc/product/476788 (last accessed: 20/12/2016).

De Simini, Florinda (2016c), 'Long Live the King (and His Manuscripts!). A Story of Ritual and Power from Medieval Kathmandu', in Andreas Janke (ed.), *Manuscripts of the Month 2015/16*. Hamburg, Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures. Available online at the following link: http://www.manuscript-cultures.uni-hamburg.de/mom/2016_01_mom_e.html (last accessed: 20/12/2016).

De Simini, Florinda, and Nina Mirnig (2017), 'Umā and Śiva's Playful Talks in Detail (*Lalitavistara*): On the Production of Śaiva Works and their Manuscripts in Medieval Nepal. Studies on the Śivadharma and the *Mahābhārata* 1', in Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo and Camillo Formigatti (eds), *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages: Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 14), Berlin: De Gruyter, 587–653.

Goodall, Dominic (2004), *The Parākhyatantra. A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta* (Collection Indologie 98), Pondichéry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Goodall, Dominic (2011), 'The Throne of Worship. An 'Archaeological Tell' of Religious Rivalries', in *Studies in History*, 27.2: 221–250.

Kafle, Nirajan (2015), *The Niśvāsamukha, the Introductory Book of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā. Critical Edition, with an Introduction, Annotated Translation Appended by Śivadharmasaṅgraha 5–9*. Universiteit Leiden, Unpublished PhD Dissertation defended on October 15, 2015.

Naraharinatha, Yogi (1998), *Paśupatimatam: Śivadharmamahāśāstram, Paśupatināthadarśanam*. Kāshṭhamaṇḍapaḥ [Kathmandu]: Bṛhadādhyātmikaparishadaḥ.

Maas, Paul (1957), *Textkritik*. Leipzig: Teubner [3rd revised edition; first edition: 1927].

Pasquali, Giorgio (2014), *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo. Premessa di Dino Pieraccioni*. Firenze: Casa Editrice Le Lettere [first edition: 1934].

Petech, Luciano (1984), *Medieval History of Nepal (c. 750–1482)* (Serie Orientale Roma LIV), Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Is.Me.O.), [first edition: 1958].

Sanderson, Alexis (2003), 'The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers. Part I', in *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 90–91: 349–462.

Shastri, Haraprasad (1928), *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection Under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. V: Purāṇa Manuscripts*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Timpanaro, Sebastiano (2003), *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*. Torino: UTET Libreria [first edition: 1963].

Trovato, Paolo (2014), *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lachmann's Method. A Non-Standard Handbook of Genealogical Textual Criticism in the Age of Post-Structuralism, Cladistics, and Copy-Text*. Foreword by Michael D. Reeve. Padova: libreriauniversitaria.it. Storie e Linguaggi.

Vergiani, Vincenzo, Daniele Cuneo, and Camillo Formigatti (2011–14), *Cambridge Digital Library, Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts*: http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/sanskrit.

Wujastyk, Dominik (1985), *A Handlist of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*, vol. 1. London: The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine.

Appendix: The Text of the *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya* alongside Parallels from *Mahābhārata's Śāntiparvan*

Manuscript N_3^K, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* chapter 22, *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya*. Diplomatic Transcription	***Mahābhārata's Śāntiparvan***
22.1–6 ≈ *Mahābhārata* 12.242.12–17	
Fol.182r[L2] *idaṃ śāstra*<ṃ> *likhi*[L3]*taṃ paṭhitan datta*<ṃ> *vyākhyāta*<ṃ> *śrotavyan karttavyaṃ* | *sarvveṣāṃ ślokasaṃkhyānāṃ navaśataṣoḍhādhika*<ṃ> *likhitaṃ* ||	
	vyāsa uvāca [...]
tān nadīśatasrotyāni mithyālobhapravāhinī | *paṃcendriyagrāhavatī manaḥsaṃkalparodhasāṃ* || 1	*sarvataḥsrotasaṃ ghorāṃ nadīṃ lokapravāhinīm* | *pañcendriyagrāhavatīṃ manaḥsaṃkalparodhasam* || 12
bhūtadrumas tṛnaś cchanna kāmakrodhasarīśṛpā | *satyatīrthānṛtaḥ kro*[L4]*dhaḥ ṣaḍkāśaridvarāṃ* || 2	*lobhamohatṛṇacchannāṃ kāmakrodhasarīsṛpām* | *satyatīrthānṛtakṣobhāṃ krodhapaṅkāṃ saridvarām* || 13
avyaktam aprabhā śīghraṃm ahorātrāṅ gavāhiṇīṃ | *pratar aśvanadī buddhyā dustarātmākṛtātmabhiḥ* || 3	*avyaktaprabhavāṃ śīghrāṃ dustarām akṛtātmabhiḥ* | *pratarasva nadīṃ buddhyā kāmagrāhasamākulām* || 14
saṃsārasāgarāmāyāṃ yonipātanadustarāṃ | *tamo marjjanadīn tāta jihvāvarttān durāsadāṃ* || 4	*saṃsārasāgaragamāṃ yonipātāladustarām*| *ātmajanmodbhavāṃ tāta jihvāvartāṃ durāsadām* || 15
yā taranti kṛtā prajñā dhṛtimantro maṇīṣiṇaḥ | *nātīrthasarvvatomuktā vipūtātmātma*[L5]*viśuci* || 5	*yāṃ taranti kṛtaprajñā dhṛtimanto manīṣiṇaḥ* | *tāṃ tīrṇaḥ sarvatomukto vipūtātmātmavic chuciḥ* || 16
uttamā buddhim āsthāya brahmabhūto bhaviṣyati | *saṃkīrṇṇasarvaśe kleśā prasaṃnātmā na kalāṣaḥ* || 6	*uttamāṃ buddhim āsthāya brahmabhūyaṃ gamiṣyasi* | *saṃtīrṇaḥ sarvasaṃkleśān prasannātmā vikalmaṣaḥ* || 17

Manuscript N_3^K, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* chapter 22, *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya*. Diplomatic Transcription	***Mahābhārata's Śāntiparvan***
v. 22.7 ≈ *Mahābhārata* 12.290.55	
krodhaḥ satvena cchidyanti kāmaṃ saṃkalpavarjanāt | satvasaṃsevanā nidrām aprasādā bhayaṃ tathā | chidanti pañcamāsvāsaṃ laghvāhārataya-ṣarā || 7	*chindanti kṣamayā krodhaṃ kāmaṃ saṃkalpavarjanāt | sattvasaṃśīlanān nidrām apramādād bhayaṃ tathā | chindanti pañcamaṃ śvāsaṃ laghvāhāratayā nṛpa* || 55
vv. 22.8–18 ≈ *Mahābhārata* 12.29.60–70ab	
rāgyajanasubhāgatvāṃs tāmasāś ca yathāvi[Fol.182vL1]*dhiṃ | anyāś ca satvatāgaṃdhāṃ svarggadehaṅgam āśritāṃ* || 8	*rājasān aśubhān gandhāṃs tāmasāṃś ca tathāvidhān | puṇyāṃś ca sāttvikān gandhān sparśajān dehasaṃśritān* |
cchitvetāj jñānaśāstreṇa tapodaṇḍena bhārataḥ | atha duḥkhodakaṃ ghoraṃ cintāsokamahāhradaṃ || 9	*chittvāśu jñānaśastreṇa tapodaṇḍena bhārata* || 60 *tato duḥkhodakaṃ ghoraṃ cintāśokamahāhradam* |
vyādhimṛtyumahāgrāhyatamamoham apāragaṃ | tamaścakrarajomīnaṃ velācāryam anuttamaṃ || 10	*vyādhimṛtyumahāgrāhaṃ mahābhayamahoragam* || 61 *tamaḥkūrmaṃ rajomīnaṃ prajñayā saṃtaranty uta* |
snehapaṅkajarāduḥkhasparśadīpam anuttamaṃ | karmāśāyaṃ satyavī[L2]*riṃ sthiravratatirakṛtaṃ* || 11	*snehapaṅkaṃ jarādurgaṃ sparśadvīpam ariṃdama* || 62 *karmāgādhaṃ satyatīraṃ sthitavratam idaṃ nṛpa* |
hiṃsādeśānānāratnamāyāmohamahoragaṃ | nānāprītimahāratnan duḥkhajvarasamīranaṃ || 12	*hiṃsāśīghramahāvegaṃ nānārasamahākaram* || 63 *nānāprītimahāratnaṃ duḥkhajvarasamīraṇam* |
naikatīkṣṇamahāvarttantīkṣṇavyādhijarārujaṃ | asthisaṃghātasaṃghāṭ śleṣmaphenam arindamaḥ || 13	*śokatṛṣṇāmahāvartaṃ tīkṣṇavyādhimahāgajam* || 64 *asthisaṃghātasaṃghāṭaṃ śleṣmaphenam ariṃdama* |
dānamuktodakaṃ bhīmaśronidahradadhidhrumaṃ | amitokraṣṭanirghośaṃ nānāratnasu[L3]*dustarāṃ* || 14	*dānamuktākaraṃ bhīmaṃ śoṇitahradavidrumam* || 65 *hasitotkruṣṭanirghoṣaṃ nānājñānasudustaram* |
romanāśrujalekhāraṃ saṅgabhyām aparāyaṇāṃ | punar ājamanālokaṃ putrabandhanapatṛṇaṃ || 15	*rodanāśrumalakṣāraṃ saṅgatyāgaparāyaṇam* || 66 *punar ājanmalokaughaṃ putrabāndhavapattanam* |

Manuscript N_3^K, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* chapter 22, *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya*. Diplomatic Transcription	***Mahābhārata's Śāntiparvan***
ahiṃsāsatyamaryādaṃ prāṇatyāgamahormiṇaṃ | velātyāgam anātītaṃ sarvvabhūtadayodadhiṃ || 16	*ahiṃsāsatyamaryādaṃ prāṇatyāgamahormiṇam* || 67 *vedāntagamanadvīpaṃ sarvabhūtadayodadhim* |
mokṣadurllābhaviṣayaṃ vaṭavāmukhagauravaṃ | taraṃti svatayaḥ sukhāyā na yānena bhārataḥ || 17	*mokṣaduṣprāpaviṣayaṃ vaḍavāmukhasāgaram* || 68 *taranti munayaḥ siddhā jñānayogena bhārata* |
tatvā ca dustaraṃ sa[L4]rvvavisanti vimalaṃ nabhaḥ | atha tāsu kṛtīsakhyāsūryo vihati rasmibhiḥ || 18	*tīrtvā ca dustaraṃ janma viśanti vimalaṃ nabhaḥ* || 69 *tatas tān sukṛtīn sāṃkhyān sūryo vahati raśmibhiḥ* |
vv. 22.19–26 ≈ *Mahābhārata* 12.179.8–15	
nasyaṃdhyai<r> yo hi nīhārād vāyur ucchvasi sigrahā | nasyete koṣṭhabhedatvād agni<r> paśyaty abhojanāt || 19	*naśyanty āpo hy anāhārād vāyur ucchvāsanigrahāt | naśyate koṣṭhabhedāt kham agnir naśyaty abhojanāt* || 8
vyādhivranañ ca viśleṣair medhanī cāṣaryate | pīḍyate <'>nyatare teṣāṃ saghātaṃ yadi pañcadhā || 20	*vyādhivraṇaparikleśair medinī caiva śīryate | pīḍite 'nyatare hy eṣāṃ saṃghāto yāti pañcadhā* || 9
tasmin pañcatvam āpaṃno jīvakam anu[L5]dhāvati | kiṃ veda yadi jīvitaṃ śṛṇoti ca bravīti vā || 21	*tasmin pañcatvam āpanne jīvaḥ kim anudhāvati | kiṃ vedayati vā jīvaḥ kiṃ śṛṇoti bravīti vā* || 10
eṣo gau paralokeṣv ātārayisyanti mām iti | yo datvā mṛyate jantuṃ sa gau kān tārayiṣyati || 22	*eṣā gauḥ paralokasthaṃ tārayiṣyati mām iti | yo dattvā mriyate jantuḥ sā gauḥ kaṃ tārayiṣyati* || 11
gau capratigṛhīṣaś ca dātāś caiva samaṃ yadā | iheva vilayaṃ yānti kutas teṣāṃ samāgamaṃ || 23	*gauś ca pratigrahītā ca dātā caiva samaṃ yadā | ihaiva vilayaṃ yānti kutas teṣāṃ samāgamaḥ* || 12
vihagair upayuktasya śailāgrapatitasya kā | nagninā yo pa[Fol.183L1]yuktaś ca kutaḥ saṃjīvina punaḥ || 24	*vihagair upayuktasya śailāgrāt patitasya vā | agninā copayuktasya kutaḥ saṃjīvanaṃ punaḥ* || 13
yadi chiṃnasya vṛkṣasya mūlaṃ na pratirohati | bījānasya pravarttante mataḥ kva punar eṣyasi || 25	*chinnasya yadi vṛkṣasya na mūlaṃ pratirohati | bījāny asya pravartante mṛtaḥ kva punar eṣyati* || 14
bījamātraṃ purā sṛṣṭiṃ pade parita varttate | mṛtāmṛtā praṇaṣyanti bījābījaṃ vivarddhati || 26	*bījamātraṃ purā sṛṣṭaṃ yad etat parivartate | mṛtā mṛtāḥ praṇaśyanti bījād bījaṃ pravartate* || 15

Manuscript N_3^K, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda* chapter 22, *Bhīṣaṇādhyāya*. Diplomatic Transcription	***Mahābhārata's Śāntiparvan***
duṣkramā durāścaivamalasadvyāsanākulāḥ | viṣayādibhir mātrāntā tamasā gādhagāmiṇī || 27	
ahaṃkārāva[L2]*rttamūḍhā buddhijñānavisarppinī | tṛguṇaṃmīnaharaṇī bhūtendriyapuṭīkṛtā* || 28	
taṭaiś ca suviśāleś ca avyaktaḥ kṛtamekhalāḥ | evaṃ sā parikhā bhūmi śivatattveṣu saṃsthitāḥ || 29	
iti umāmaheśvarasaṃvāde bhīṣaṇādhyāyaḥ dvāviṃśatimaḥ ||	