



HAL
open science

Three Chapters of Śaiva Material Added to the Earliest Known Recension of the Skandapurāṇa

Judit Törzsök

► **To cite this version:**

Judit Törzsök. Three Chapters of Śaiva Material Added to the Earliest Known Recension of the Skandapurāṇa. 12th World Sanskrit Conference, 2003, Helsinki, Finland. pp.17-39. hal-00632845

HAL Id: hal-00632845

<https://hal.science/hal-00632845>

Submitted on 16 Oct 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Three chapters of *śaiva* material added to the earliest known recension of the *Skandapurāṇa**

Judit Törzsök

The early *Skandapurāṇa* (SP)¹ offers a unique opportunity to investigate the ways in which a purāṇic text became enlarged throughout the centuries, for the same core text has come down to us in different recensions from different periods. The earliest known recension (S) preserved in Nepalese manuscripts can be dated to before the date of the oldest manuscript, i.e. to before 810 AD. This version became altered and cut down in some places, but on the whole much enlarged in two later recensions, which were handed down in manuscripts as the *Revākhaṇḍa* (R) and *Ambikākhaṇḍa* (A) of the *Skandapurāṇa*. The only manuscript of the R recension dates from 1682, while the four manuscripts of the A recension are all later (and more corrupt). It seems, however, that a recension closely related to the hyparchetype of the R and A recensions was known to Lakṣmīdhara, the author of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, which means that this redaction was in existence in some form before 1100 AD. It must also be noted that R and A roughly follow the Nepalese S recension with occasional omissions and additions² until chapter 162 according to Bhaṭṭarā's edition of 1988 (SP_{Bh}). It is after this chapter that much new material and expanded stories appear in the R and A MSS. All these texts have practically nothing to do with what is commonly known, printed and translated as the *Skandapurāṇa* (SkP),³ apart from occasional borrowings, some of which are dealt with in Yokochi's article in this volume.

In what follows, a few differences between the early or Nepalese recension and the R and A recensions will be discussed as examples of some of the ways in which a particular *purāṇa* came to be rewritten in the course of its history. One could of course argue that in spite of the manuscript evidence, the longer R and A represent an earlier stage of the text and that the Nepalese S recension

*I am grateful to Dr Alex Watson, who kindly took the trouble to correct my English and to comment on the contents of this paper. I hope I have not added too many new mistakes and inconsistencies in this last version.

¹For the first edition of the text, under the name *Ambikākhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*, see SP_{Bh}. For the identification of the text with the early *Skandapurāṇa*, a discussion of the recensions and related questions, see the Prolegomena in SP vol. I., some of whose main points are summarised below.

²The situation is not the same in the two later recensions, and the R manuscript has a long omission not shared by the A MSS. For more details, see Harimoto's article in this volume.

³Printed for example by the Venkatesvara Press in 7 volumes in Bombay, 1910 and reprinted several times by Nag Publishers in Delhi.

has lost or excised some passages.⁴ While this is theoretically not impossible, most details point in the opposite direction, and it is one of the aims of this study to explore a few such details. At the present state of research, it is not possible to give a full account of the problem. However, it is to be hoped that as investigations concerning the different recensions progress, enough evidence will be accumulated to reconstruct the history of the *Skandapurāṇa*.⁵

A long section of the chapters added to the core text of S by the R and A recensions deals with various stories of *śaiva* mythology and ritual. These chapters are to be found at the beginning of where R and A start adding a large amount of new material. It is a distinguishing feature of these extra chapters that while the speakers formally remain Sanatkumāra and Vyāsa as before, the actual stories are often told by Śiva to Devī. Some of these narrative parts focus on Devī's desire to have children, and reading these passages one is tempted to speculate on whether this is the reason why the name *Ambikākhaṇḍa* was given to one of the recensions later in the course of the transmission.⁶ Whatever the case may be, these passages contain not only much interesting material for purāṇic textual studies, but also some important elements for the history of śaivism.

The three chapters of this section of additional *śaiva* material analysed below represent a sample. On the one hand, they demonstrate how the corpus grew and, on the other, provide some evidence to determine the position of the *Revā-* and *Ambikākhaṇḍa* recensions in the transmission.

1 The birth of Gaṇeśa (*vināyakotpattiḥ*)

The addition of a chapter on Gaṇeśa in R and A is not wholly unexpected.⁷ The birth of Gaṇeśa is a popular purāṇic story, which is nevertheless conspicuously absent in some demonstrably early *purāṇas* (in the *Vāyupurāṇa* for instance), just as it is in the earliest known recension of the *Skandapurāṇa*. Gaṇeśa himself is also left out of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*, and his role as the scribe of the epic is most probably a later addition.⁸ As numerous studies on Gaṇeśa have shown, this god is a relative late-comer in mythology, even if his cult and image may be dated from around the fourth century of the common era.⁹ It seems that the textual history of Gaṇeśa in the *Mahābhārata* repeated

⁴It has been mentioned in SP vol. I. p. 44 that some of the additional material is likely to be old and to have been lost, perhaps accidentally, in a hyparchetype of the Nepalese MSS.

⁵Bisschop's article in this volume presents convincing evidence for the relative lateness of the bulk of the R and A recensions compared to the S recension. See especially his argument about the recurrent vocative of Vyāsa as son of Kālī in R / A as opposed to S.

⁶For a discussion on the titles of the R and A recensions, see Harimoto's article in this volume.

⁷For this chapter in the MSS, see fol. 253v4-255r7 in R; 266v1-269r3 in A₁; 428v2-431v9 in A₂; 166v10-167v16 in A₃; 222r6-223v6 in A₄. For a description of these MSS, see SP vol. I. pp. 34-35.

⁸The first to draw attention to this problem was Winternitz 1898, p. 382.

⁹For some shorter surveys, see A.K. Narain 1991, Dhavalikar 1991 and Rocher 1991. For useful references and additional details, see also Hazra 1948 and Krishan 1999.

itself in the *Skandapurāna*, and later redactors of the text felt that Gaṇeśa could not be omitted from it.

Let us note here that Gaṇeśa appears not only in the chapter under discussion, which narrates his birth, but also in some subsequent stories of the R and A recensions. He figures in the long narrative on Skanda's exploits as Skanda's elder brother. In fact, he even attempts to block Skanda's consecration as commander-in-chief,¹⁰ but is then propitiated by Skanda, who kneels down before him. In the end, Gaṇeśa blesses Skanda with his trunk and gives his consent to the consecration. This chapter as well as the mention of Gaṇeśa as Skanda's elder brother¹¹ show that Gaṇeśa needed to be established as a respectable member of Śiva's family.¹²

The most important myth in which and through which Gaṇeśa rises to prominence is of course the story of his birth. The appearance of this story in the later recensions of the *Skandapurāna* is itself an interesting phenomenon. But a closer study of the text also shows that the R and A recensions seem to transmit a relatively early version of the birth of Gaṇeśa.

The summary of the story is as follows. Śiva comforts the dejected Devī and promises her to beget a child. He then plunges into deep thought and a dwarfish, elephant-like creature arises before him. He bows down in front of Śiva, but lifts up his trunk again and again because he is afraid of snakes entering it. He also pays homage to Umā. When the goddess touches him to make him rise, milk starts flowing from her breasts. Umā asks him to introduce himself, but out of bashfulness, he remains silent. Therefore, Umā requests Śiva to explain who the creature is. Śiva gives a somewhat enigmatic reply, in which he points out that because Umā was abandoned by her husband, she was given this child;¹³ and since the child was born without the husband present (*nāyakena vinā*),¹⁴ he is called Vināyaka. Moreover, since his nose is as long as an elephant's trunk, he shall become the king of elephants. Then Śiva bestows his grace upon Vināyaka: he will be immortal, invincible and the like; and he will be able to fulfill wishes. He is also predicted to consume alcohol and meat, and to become a favourite of women, children, cows and the twice-born. He will be worshipped with meat and alcohol offerings, flowers, fragrances etc. In return,

¹⁰The chapter receives the title *Skandābhiṣekavyāsedha* in the colophons, and is to be found on fol. 233v7 ff. in A₄.

¹¹Gaṇeśa is called Skanda's elder brother, *skandāgraja*, also in *Liṅgapurāna* 1.105.30.

¹²Let us note that a Gaṇeśa accompanied by Śiva and Kumāra is depicted in Dun Huang, on the western wall of Mogaoku Cave 285. There are two inscriptions on the northern wall, dated 538 and 539 AD. According to Dr Kouki Yamagishi, to whom I am grateful for this information, the images may be dated somewhat earlier than these inscriptions. Thus, it seems that as early as the beginning of the sixth century Gaṇeśa was associated with Śiva's family. The material on the caves was published in China, between 1993 and 1998. The ISBN of the relevant volume is 7534405572, in which one can also read some introductory remarks by Duan Wenjie on this particular cave. I should also like to thank Y. Yokochi for drawing my attention to this painting.

¹³*vinākṛtā nāyakena yat tvaṃ devi mayā śubhe / eṣa tatra samutpannas tava putro 'rkasaṃnibhaḥ // 25 //*

¹⁴*nāyakena vinā jāto yasmād eva gajānanaḥ / so 'smād vināyako nāmnā bhaviṣyati sureśvari // 26 //* (so 'smād em : so smān R : so smad A₁A₃A₄: sā smad A₂)

he will bestow wealth, sons and wives as well as all kinds of enjoyments upon the worshipper. When Devī touches the child again, Śiva starts a new speech to describe Vināyaka's supernatural powers. He will be able to bestow good health and heavenly life upon his worshippers; but those who do not respect him, as well as various categories of contemptible people who do not lead a dharmic life, shall be possessed by Vināyaka and suffer. The last verses of the chapter describe Vināyaka as the leader (*nāyaka*) of all *gaṇas*,¹⁵ calling him a *graha* (a possessing demon), who can act against such demons.¹⁶ The *śrutiphala* at the end promises that those who read this story shall become *gaṇeśvaras* of the Goddess.¹⁷

There are three elements in this Gaṇeśa myth which suggest that it is perhaps one of the earliest versions. Firstly, the fact that he is always called Vināyaka in the text points to a relatively early date, when he was not yet considered the lord of the *gaṇas par excellence*. He was associated with the possessing demons called *vināyakas*, who are mentioned for instance in the *Mānava Gṛhyasūtra* (2.14).¹⁸ This consistent use of the name Vināyaka also ensures that there is no confusion of terms. For the core part of the *Skandapurāṇa* shared by all the recensions always employs the word *gaṇeśa* / *gaṇeśvara* to denote a rank, and not as a proper name. Secondly, his early association with the *vināyaka* demons remains prominent here. The end of the chapter names him a 'grasper' (*graha*), and it is also noteworthy that he is not yet associated with the removal of obstacles in particular.¹⁹ Being a demon, his propitiation involves impure substances, such as wine and meat. Thirdly, there is an interesting detail at the beginning of the myth, describing his appearance. It is mentioned that he seems to lift his trunk several times as if afraid of snakes.²⁰ Apart from being an unusual explanation of

¹⁵58a: *vināyakah sarvagaṇeṣu nāyako ...*

¹⁶59b: *grahaṃ grahāṇām api kāryavairiṇam*

¹⁷*vināyakasyemam anuttamodbhavaṃ śubhodayaṃ yaḥ paṭhatiḥa harsitaḥ / gaṇeṣu sarveṣu sa vittadapriyo gaṇeśvaras te bhavitā gaṇeśvari* (gaṇeśvari R : gaṇeśvaraḥ A₁A₂A₃: gaṇeśvara A₄)

¹⁸For a list of other occurrences and more details on the problem, see Hazra 1948, pp. 263-268.

¹⁹This is unlike in some other stories, such as in that of the *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.105, in which he is created to remove the obstacles of the gods.

²⁰*vibabhau sa namyamāno nāsayā ripunāśayā* (nāsayā conj. : nāsamā A : yā nā*yā R) / *nāgabhogabhayād bhūmiṃ sṛjamāna ivāsakṛt // 11 //* ('bhayād em. : 'bhayā codd.) (Isaacson suggests that *sṛjamāna* is corrupt and first conjectured *tyajamāna*, which he later found unconvincing himself. Bisschop has conjectured *mṛjamāna*, which is not fully satisfactory either in Isaacson's opinion. Yokochi and myself find that *sṛjamāna* may not be idiomatic but is possible.) Note also the paronomasia : *nāsayā* / 'nāśayā. After a quick reading of the whole of A₄ and some parts of R, it seems to me that the frequent use of word repetitions or paronomasias such as *nāsayā* / 'nāśayā may be a distinctive feature of the R and A recensions. It is commonly facilitated by the deity being qualified by an adjective or addressed with a vocative suitable to the context. See e.g. in the *Vināyakotpatti* chapter: *wāca girijāṃ vākyam vākyasragdāmabhūṣaṇaḥ* (5cd); *tasyaivaṃ cintayānasya bhūtaṃ bhūtapater mahat* (9ab); *taṃ bhūtaṃ bhūtanātheśi kas tvam ity abravīt umā* (15cd); *pativratā prāha patiṃ patiṃ dānavadevayoḥ* (17cd); *sarvaśo me mahān harṣaḥ saṃjāto jātibhāvana* (20ab); *kapole ghrāya vaiyāghrīm idaṃ vacanam abravīt* (23cd); *nṛṇāṃ ca loke lokeśi nityaṃ guṇasukhāvahaḥ* (38ab); *tatraivaṃ mānavā dhanyā dhanārthaṃ dhanadārcite* (39ab); *tam evaṃvādinaṃ devaṃ śarvaṃ sarvasurādhipam* (45ab); *sā taṃ pramathavṛndānāṃ nāyakaṃ*

an iconographic feature, the up-curling trunk, it also has an interesting parallel. One of Gaṇeśa's often cited, earliest datable appearances in Sanskrit literature is found in the opening verse of Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava* (late 7th or early 8th century), which also calls him Vināyaka.²¹ The verse invokes the protection of the shakings of Vināyaka's head. These shakings happen while Śiva dances; Nandin's beating of the drum attracts Skanda's peacock, the peacock frightens the Lord of Snakes, who then contracts itself and rushes into Vināyaka's trunk.²² It may be of course merely accidental that our *Skandapurāṇa* has a similar image of the trunk and the snake, but it is by no means a common purāṇic image, and I have found no other parallel to it. Now this parallel is not significant on its own and obviously, it cannot be used to date the R and A recensions. However, coupled with other evidence it may be helpful at some point to define the nature of these recensions and the circumstances of their production.

Finally, some purāṇic parallels must be mentioned. Just as in the *Matsyapurāṇa*'s account of Vināyaka's birth, which is also probably a relatively early version, the god is born with his elephant head, instead of being given one later.²³

As for the etymology of the name Vināyaka, I have found only one parallel: the account of the *Vāmanapurāṇa* (28.41-42). However, apart from the etymology, the *Vāmanapurāṇa*'s story is not related textually to our *Skandapurāṇa*. It must also be noted that the *Vāmanapurāṇa* has a curious version of the narrative in that it presents two explanations of the birth simultaneously and the chapter gives the impression of having undergone much cutting and pasting. Y. Yokochi has drawn my attention to the fact that there are some other parallel stories shared by our *Skanda*- and the *Vāmanapurāṇa*, although the wording is never exactly the same. Thus, it seems that the *Vāmana* was somehow influenced by our *Skanda*, but without borrowing from it in a direct way. The

vai vināyakam (48ab); *pūjayiṣyanti ye cainaṃ mānavā mānavārcite* (53ab) However, more examples from other chapters and a statistical comparison would be needed to confirm this statement.

²¹The other, earlier, occurrence (of the late 6th or early 7th century perhaps) can be found in the second opening verse of the fourth Uchhvāsa of the *Harṣacarita*. See also A.K. Narain 1991, p. 31. Narain says in note 126 that the elephantine face is not explicitly mentioned in the *Mālatīmādhava*, but it seems to me that the whole image, particularly the snake taking refuge in Vināyaka's 'nose' and the bees flying up from his temples, implies that Vināyaka has an elephant's head.

²²*sānandaṃ Nandi-hastāhata-muraja-ravāhūta-kaumāra-barhi-trāsān nāsāgra-randhraṃ viśati Phaṇi-patau bhoga-saṃkoca-bhāji / gaṇḍoḍḍīnālīmālā-mukharita-kakubhas tāṇḍave Śūla-pāṇer vaināyakyas ciraṃ vo vadanavidhutayaḥ pāntu cūtkāravatyah //* For a translation, see M.R. Kale 1967, p. [1].

²³*Matsyapurāṇa* 154.501-505, using the expression *naraṃ cakre gajānanam*. Here, the goddess fashions Vināyaka from the unguent rubbed on her body (*udvartanaka*), Gaṅgā makes his body grow huge and Pitāmaha appoints him as the leader of *vināyaka* demons. In the subsequent verses, the story in which the Goddess adopts the Aśoka tree as a son is also related, which is a topic treated in *SP_{Bh}* chapter 158. Moreover, the goddess then adopts a *gaṇeśa* called Vīraka, while Vināyaka is not called *gaṇeśa*. There is another passage in the *Matsyapurāṇa* on Vināyaka (260.52-55ab in a chapter on *pratimālakṣaṇa*), which gives his iconography; but that passage is independent of the birth story and probably belongs to a different text layer.

conclusion to be drawn is that the relation of the *Skanda* and the *Vāmana* would deserve further investigation.

2 The story of Śiva's ashes (*bhūtyutpattiḥ*)

Like many chapters of this section, this one starts with Pārvatī's question.²⁴ She asks her husband why he prefers being covered with ashes rather than various kinds of sandalwood paste. In his reply, Śiva relates the story of a sage who practised extreme asceticism. Once the sage cut his finger with a *darbha* grass and saw that instead of blood, vegetable juice (*śākarasa*) was flowing from the wound. Overwhelmed with joy, he started dancing and shouting, thus terrifying everybody; therefore, Śiva, disguised as a brahmin, came to see him to stop his 'madness of asceticism' or 'pride about his asceticism' (*tapomada*). There is a short conversation between the god and the sage, after which Śiva demonstrates that his own body is so much dried up due to his *tapas* that instead of blood, ashes flow from it. The sage realises that this brahmin must be Śiva himself, and the god reveals his real form. The sage worships Śiva, and the god in turn makes him a Lord of the Gaṇas (*gaṇādhipa*). But he is still not satisfied and asks Śiva to favour the ashes [by wearing them or bathing in them].²⁵ Thus, to please the sage, Śiva takes the best of possible baths, i.e. the ash-bath;²⁶ and ever since, Śiva is covered with ashes, while the ash-bath becomes the most supreme type of bath for men. A long praise of the ash-bath follows the story until the last lines of the chapter, which mention that this is the story of Śiva's ashes and repeat the merit of the ash-bath.

There are three main points for which this chapter is of particular interest: it is a unique adaptation of the story of Mañkaṇaka; it deals with one of the topics mentioned in the contents chapter (*anukramaṇikā*) but left untreated in the earliest recension; and two of its *ślokas* are cited by Lakṣmīdhara.²⁷

Although the sage is not named in this version, the myth is clearly identifiable with what is otherwise known as the story of the sage Mañkaṇaka. The oldest version of this story is probably the one in the *Mahābhārata* (3.81.97-118 and 9.37 33-50),²⁸ which was taken over almost word for word in the *Padma-* and *Vāmanapurāṇas*.²⁹ The *Skandamahāpurāṇa*'s two versions (SkP 6.40.27-52

²⁴For this chapter in the MSS, see fol. 242r1-244r1 in R; 407v16-411v9 in A₂; 158v2-159v16 in A₃; 213r2-214v5 in A₄. In A₁, the first 14 verses seem to have been lost, and we have the text only from 15 on fol. 250r1. The chapter ends on fol.252v1.

²⁵*bhūter anugrahaṃ deva kuru bhūtimatām vara* (deva A : caiva R). Note the vocative chosen to fit the context.

²⁶In Śiva's words, who relates the story: *tato 'haṃ tasya viprasya priyārthaṃ supriye tadā / snātaḥ snānavariṣṭhena snāneneṣṭhena sundari (snāneneṣṭhena R : snānānnaṣṭhena A)*. A does not yield much sense, but R seems to mean that the god takes the bath the sage wishes him to take.

²⁷These citations have been identified by P. Bisschop, who has kindly drawn my attention to them.

²⁸The two passages are textually related and represent two variants of basically the same text.

²⁹See *Padmapurāṇa* 1.18.134-159 and *Vāmanapurāṇa Saromāhātmya* 17.1-23. For a list

and 7[1]. 270.1-46.) are different, but they also use the *Mahābhārata*'s wording to some extent and are not related to the text of our *Skanda*. What all these passages have in common³⁰ is that the reason why they are told is to glorify a sacred place, the Saptasārasvatatīrtha.

The retelling of the Mañkaṇaka myth in the *Skandapurāṇa* shows another way in which the redactors worked in certain cases. Taking a well-known story, they transformed it to suit their purpose and context. Since the point of the story became the explanation of Śiva's ashes and the glorification of the ash-bath, the localisation of the events became negligible, and perhaps even possibly distracting; thus, we are no longer told where the sage resides. His name is also omitted, possibly for the same reason, to dissociate the story from its original and to place it in a less specific context.³¹

The topic of this chapter raises another question. This theme, namely the origin of Śiva's ashes (*bhasmodbhavaḥ*),³² figures in the contents chapter (*anukramaṇikā*) shared by the different recensions,³³ while its treatment is definitely missing in all manuscripts of the earliest known recension, S. This situation of the contents chapter in the *Skandapurāṇa* is different from what is commonly observed in purāṇic or epic material; for in most epic or purāṇic texts it can be proved that the *anukramaṇikā* was compiled and added retrospectively, after the redaction of the bulk of the text, as is the case with the *Mahābhārata*.³⁴ In our SP, by contrast, some topics (Śiva's ashes, his crescent moon, the story of Devasenā etc.) are promised in the earliest recension but are treated only in the later R and A recensions.

Now, if the R and A recensions contain an additional chapter that corresponds to a contents item already listed in the earliest recension, does this imply that the longer R and A recensions go back to an earlier original and that the Nepalese manuscripts have handed down a shortened or less complete text? Although an affirmative answer would be a tempting solution to the problem, a number of elements suggest that this is not the case. Chapters such as the one on Gaṇeśa-Vināyaka – who is never mentioned in the Nepalese recension and is also missing from the contents chapter – point to a later date for the bulk of the material added in R and A.³⁵ It should also be considered that the

of various versions, see *Kūrmapurāṇa Pariśiṣṭam* 2. (p.793). The story also appears in *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.34.

³⁰Including the textually unrelated passage in *Vāmanapurāṇa Saromāhātmya* 36.45-58.

³¹The story and its relation to other versions of the Mañkaṇaka myth would deserve more than these cursory remarks. However, the purpose and scope of the present study being different, such an analysis must be postponed to when the text of these *śaiva* chapters is established. I intend to produce a critical edition of the *śaiva* chapters added by R and A, before the chapter on the birth of Skanda (*Skandajanmādhya*).

³²Let us note that the *anukramaṇikā* uses the common word *bhasman* for ashes, while the chapter treating this subject in R and A appears to prefer the words *bhūti* / *vibhūti*. This stylistic difference may again suggest that the additional chapters in R and A come from a different writer or redactor and possibly from a different period.

³³R has a lacuna there, but the contents chapter was most probably there originally. For S, only one manuscript is available, but again, the other S manuscripts have a lacuna at this point, and they probably contained the passage.

³⁴See e.g. Brockington 1998, p. 135.

³⁵It is interesting to note that in the *Bhairavotsava* chapter as cited by Lakṣmīdhara (p.417),

ash-bath chapter forms part of the long section in which the actual speakers are Śiva and the goddess, therefore it is highly probable that the ash-bath story was composed together with the other stories there, which include the unlisted myth of Gaṇeśa etc. Moreover, as Bisschop points out in this volume, Vyāsa's epithet as son of Kālī, which is missing in S but recurs in many added passages throughout the text of R and A, strongly supports the same relative dating of the recensions.

One could of course further argue that each chapter should be examined separately; and that since textual references to the ash-bath can be dated much earlier than the appearance of Gaṇeśa and since the Mañkaṇaka chapter does not contain the above mentioned vocative of Vyāsa, it may have been omitted, accidentally or deliberately, in the Nepalese recension, rather than added to it later. Yet, there is no sign of accidental omission (such as incomplete text segments), and there is no reason why it should have been deleted on purpose by a redactor given that it is kept in the contents chapter. The excision of a passage on the ash-bath by S would be all the more surprising as the S recension has many *pāśupata* elements. Thus, while the topic of the Mañkaṇaka chapter may go back to an old theme, its presence in our *Skandapurāṇa* may not be as old as the subject matter itself.

Nevertheless, even though the chapter on ash-bath appears to have been added in a later phase of the SP transmission, it could be the case that it was taken over, fully or partially, from another, older, text. Here, I do not intend to date the material or the topic itself – which would be very tentative in any case – but rather its presence in our *Skandapurāṇa*.

Moreover, it must also be kept in mind that the contents chapter cannot be taken for a precise list of contents. For even if one enumerates all the additional material in the R and A recensions, there are still many untreated topics mentioned in the *anukramaṇikā*. Thus, while the *anukramaṇikā* is shared practically by *all* recensions, all listed topics are found in *none* of them. Therefore, it is a distinct possibility that the *anukramaṇikā* represents a theoretical list of subjects which the writer(s) or redactor(s) of the *anukramaṇikā* would have ideally included in the *purāṇa*, but which has never corresponded to any stage of the actual text. This ideal *Skandapurāṇa*, which would contain all the titles listed in the contents, existed probably only in the mind of the writer or redactor of the contents list, if it ever existed at all.

On the other hand, it is much more likely that such an imprecise contents list prompted later redactors to include additional material. And these later contributors were not worried about repeating some discussions. For another

Pārvatī once receives the vocative 'mother of the big-bellied (i.e. of Gaṇeśa)' (*lambodarāraṇī*). The word is also transmitted by Caṇḍeśvara, who glosses it with *vināyakamātaḥ*. This line and some subsequent ones are omitted in A, probably accidentally, while R is very corrupt here and transmits *dattayathāraṇī*. If we accept Lakṣmīdhara's and Caṇḍeśvara's reading, the presence of this vocative shows that RA probably included Vināyaka at various levels of the text. Since this vocative of the goddess is neither very common, nor particularly appropriate in the context of the *bhairavotsava*, it may be used by the author or redactor to confirm Vināyaka's presence throughout the text. It also suggests, although by no means proves, that Lakṣmīdhara's version may have included the Vināyaka chapter in some form.

subject, the explanation of why Śiva has a black throat, happens to figure twice in the text of the R and A MSS: once in a chapter shared by all the recensions,³⁶ and then once again, in one of the *śaiva* chapters added in R and A.³⁷

An important detail about the chapter on Śiva's ashes is that it also contains four lines cited by Lakṣmīdhara.³⁸ These lines provide further evidence to demonstrate that a recension closely related to the hyparchetype of the R and A recensions was in existence by 1100. But they also show that Lakṣmīdhara had a text which was in some details different from RA. As for the choice of these two verses, it is noteworthy that Lakṣmīdhara quotes the first and the last *śloka*s of the long eulogy of the ash-bath; therefore it is not inconceivable that he had approximately the same passage in front of him as R and A, out of which he decided to give the beginning and the end as a kind of sample. The first verse states that the ash-bath bestows the merit of visiting holy places such as Kanakhala or Prayāga, and it agrees almost word for word with the transmitted text of the R and A MSS.

*punyaṃ kanakhale yac ca prayāge yac ca sundari /
tat phalaṃ sakalaṃ devi bhūtisnāne vidhīyate //*

The editors have chosen to accept and print *dine dine* for *vidhīyate*, but they have recorded the variant *vidhīyate* in 8 manuscripts, and this variant agrees with the transmitted text of R/A as well as with the wording of the same citation as given in Caṇḍeśvaras's *Gṛhastharatnākara*.³⁹ There is only a small difference between Lakṣmīdhara's citation and the text of R/A, to be found at the end of the first line. While the edited text of Lakṣmīdhara has *yac ca sundari*, the Revā MS transmits *yad athāpi vā* and the Ambikā MSS read *yad athāpi ca*. But this rather insignificant divergence would not be grounds enough to argue that Lakṣmīdhara's recension was really different from RA.

Looking at the second quotation, however, it is undeniable that R and A have a different text. The passage states that even impure or careless people are saved from being hurt or afflicted by demons, if they are in contact with ashes. Lakṣmīdhara's text reads as follows in the edition:

*ucchiṣṭaṃ vā pramattaṃ vā naravāhananandite /
bhūtisprṣṭaṃ hi na naraṃ dharṣayanti vināyakāḥ //*

In R and A, the following first line can be reconstructed, which is practically identical with Lakṣmīdhara's:

³⁶Chapter 114 in SP_{Bh}.

³⁷In the extra passage of R/A (for which see fol. 212r1-213r1 in A₄), the second explanation of the black throat is coupled with a topic promised in the contents but left untreated in S: the explanation of why Śiva wears the crescent moon on his head. Thus, while R and A have managed to supply a promised but previously untreated topic in their versions, it resulted in some repetition, in a second story about Śiva's black throat. For other thematic repetitions in R and A, see Bisschop's article in this volume.

³⁸See KK, NK, p.54.

³⁹Identified in the Prolegomena to SP vol. I. p.12, see GR, p. 204.

ucchiṣṭaṃ vā pramattaṃ vā naravāhanavandite /⁴⁰

But the second line differs in these two recensions.

R: *bhūtisparsān na hiṃsanti rākṣasā dāruṇā api* //

A: *†bhūtisyānṭna vihiṃsanti rākṣasā dāruṇā api* //

Even if the change of the verb could be accounted for through a corruption of the *hi* element, the replacement of Vināyaka demons by *rākṣasas* – or the replacement of *rākṣasas* by Vināyakas – cannot be explained on paleographical grounds and is probably the result of deliberate rewriting.⁴¹

This divergence between Lakṣmīdhara’s text and the Revā and Ambikā recensions raises two inter-related questions: which of them is primary and what was the reason for the change.⁴²

As the longer passage on the *Bhairavotsava* will show, Lakṣmīdhara seems to have had a slightly shorter and probably earlier version of that chapter than Caṇḍeśvara or our R and A MSS. Therefore, it is quite likely that he had in fact a slightly shorter and earlier recension not just of that chapter, but of the whole of the *Skandapurāṇa*. This may point to the fact that his *vināyakas* represent the primary reading. On the other hand, one cannot rule out the possibility that it was either Lakṣmīdhara or a transmitter of his text who changed the ‘cruel *rākṣasas*’ to *vināyakas*. Therefore, the question cannot be decided on such grounds; changes may have been introduced at any point and by anybody.⁴³ As for the meaning and possible motivation for the change, it seems to be more probable that, given the increased prominence accorded to Vināyaka-Gaṇeśa in the newly created passages, one of the scribes or redactors found it more appropriate to refer to *rākṣasas* in the context of bad demons and changed the text accordingly.

Naturally, at this stage, all this remains a matter of speculation. Nevertheless, while the text Lakṣmīdhara had in front of him was a recension closely

⁴⁰This vocative is better, for the Goddess is often called ‘She Who Is Worshipped By Kubera’, see e.g. in the *Vināyakotpatti* chapter, verse 39b: *dhanadārcite*.

⁴¹It must be noted that R’s version retains more of Lakṣmīdhara’s, which is a feature that was emphasised by P. Bisschop 2002, p. 234 when he examined the citation on Avimuktaka. However, I find that R is not just less corrupt than A, but is closer to Lakṣmīdhara’s text in other respects. This would need further investigations, but some of the following examples may be used to prove this point (all are taken from the *Bhairavotsava* chapter): *tasyāś cintayamānāyā* in R and Lakṣmīdhara, against *tasyā vicintyamānāyā* in A; *hṛdayāmbusamudbhavā* in R and Lakṣmīdhara against *hṛdayāmbujasaṃbhavā* in A; *uṣṇārttām* in R and Lakṣmīdhara against *uṣṇām / usrām* in A; *rājamārgeṣu* in R and Lakṣmīdhara against *ratimārgeṣu* in A; *kulastrīṇām* in R and Lakṣmīdhara against *duhitṛṇām* in A; *paṭhed vipro dvijadevasaṃsadi* in R and Lakṣmīdhara against *paṭhen nara dvijasadevasaṃsadi* in A. While in a few cases one could argue that R may be just trying to purify or rationalise the text in the same way as Lakṣmīdhara, this argument is not applicable in all the above cases.

⁴²These questions are inter-related because one of the criteria to be fulfilled when one tries to find the primary reading is that the change to what is considered to be secondary should be explicable.

⁴³One must also add that a number of deliberate changes may occur simply when a scribe or redactor is sure he has a corrupt reading in his exemplar.

related to RA, which justifies the preparation of one single edition based on these two recensions,⁴⁴ we must be aware of the fact that what we reconstruct from R and A will be in many ways different from Lakṣmīdhara’s text. A number of the ways in which the reconstruction of RA will be different from Lakṣmīdhara’s recension can be best illustrated by the example of the chapter on the feast of Bhairava, the *Bhairavotsava*.

3 The feast of Bhairava and Udakasevikā, including the story of their birth (*utpattiḥ*)

This chapter⁴⁵ provides a unique opportunity to compare our R and A recensions of the *Skandapurāṇa* with two long citations of dated Dharmanibandha authors: one by Lakṣmīdhara from Varanasi at the beginning of the 12th century⁴⁶ and one by Caṇḍeśvara who wrote his work in Mithilā and/or Nepal, in the first half of the 14th century.⁴⁷ Since it is not very likely that the transmission of Lakṣmīdhara’s *Kṛtyakalpataru* or Caṇḍeśvara’s *Kṛtyaratnākara* has been heavily conflated with the readings of the MSS of the *purāṇa*,⁴⁸ the citations are likely to give independent evidence about the state of the text at two given periods. As our *Skandapurāṇa* became almost completely forgotten a few centuries after Lakṣmīdhara’s time, it is even more unlikely that Lakṣmīdhara’s or Caṇḍeśvara’s citations were much conflated with the evidence of manuscripts other than the manuscripts of these Dharmanibandha works. Nevertheless, this does not exclude other changes: Lakṣmīdhara or Caṇḍeśvara themselves or any of the copyists may have recast some passages, and corruptions must have also crept in during the transmission of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* and the *Kṛtyaratnākara*.⁴⁹

⁴⁴As Bisschop 2002, p. 237 concludes.

⁴⁵See fol. 251v3-253v4 in R; fol. 263r5-266v1 in A₁; fol. 425r3-428r16 in A₂; fol. 165r8-166v10 in A₃; fol. 220r10-222r6 in A₄.

⁴⁶On Lakṣmīdhara, see e.g. P.V. Kane, vol. I. p. 687ff. For the citation, see KK, NK, pp.413-421.

⁴⁷For a discussion and survey, see SP vol. I. pp. 7-13. For the citation, see KR, pp. 386-395.

⁴⁸It is not unreasonable to assume that most scribes of Dharmanibandha texts would not work as philologists and that they would not always compare the readings of their text with various purāṇic MSS. They do, however, check readings occasionally.

⁴⁹Some corruptions in the manuscript tradition of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* can be reconstructed from the evidence of the R and A MSS, as Bisschop 2002, pp. 233-234 showed with reference to an example in which R has the correct [']*vimuktake* for Lakṣmīdhara’s corrupt *vimuktaye* according to the edition of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*. Ideally, one should of course prepare a critical edition of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* to make such comparisons, as Bisschop remarks thereon. Let us note here that some linguistic features have probably been changed deliberately, either by a Dharmanibandha author or by a scribe in the transmission, in order to purify the Sanskrit of our text. One such purāṇic feature that Dharmanibandha authors may have corrected is the frequent use of the dative pronouns – especially *mahyam* – for the possessive genitive in predicates, as in the following example about Pārvatī’s worries: *cintā samabhavan mahyaṃ na putro duhitāpi vā* (R/A) vs. *cintā samabhavat tasyā na putro duhiteti vā* (Lakṣmīdhara). Cf. the same kind of change in a passage which is shared by R/A and Caṇḍeśvara’s text, but not by Lakṣmīdhara’s. Here, Caṇḍeśvara or a scribe in the transmission may have made a similar ‘correction’ of the Sanskrit of our *purāṇa*: *mānasy asi sutā mahyam* (R/A) vs. *mānasy*

The situation is further complicated by the fact that Caṇḍeśvara admits having based his work on Lakṣmīdhara's.⁵⁰ Indeed, many citations and even glosses are suspiciously the same in the two works. However, the chapter I examine below was transmitted in a longer version by Caṇḍeśvara, with many added verses, which largely corresponds to the text preserved in R and A.⁵¹ This suggests that Caṇḍeśvara had independent access to the text or at least parts of the text.⁵² The citation of the *Bhairavotsava* given by Caṇḍeśvara is thus closer to the hyparchetype of R and A than that of Lakṣmīdhara. This fact strengthens the hypothesis that the text became further expanded from what Lakṣmīdhara had, and that most of this expansion had happened already by Caṇḍeśvara's time.

The first part of the chapter relates the story of the birth of Uda-kasevikā and Bhairava. Uda-kasevikā is Pārvatī's daughter, born while the goddess was reflecting on the fact that she had no offspring. Uda-kasevikā is born from the water of Pārvatī's heart (*hṛdayāmbu-* perhaps meaning her tears?), which explains her name "Servant of Water". At this point in the story, the R and A MSS have an extra passage compared to Lakṣmīdhara's citation. This short addition appears with variants in Caṇḍeśvara's citation of the *Skandapurāṇa* as given in the *Kṛtyaratnākara* and it has therefore been reprinted in the edition of Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru*. Oddly, three lines of the extra verses have been printed as part of Lakṣmīdhara's version in spite of the evidence of the manuscripts of that text, while a further ten lines have been given in a footnote. This additional passage gives more details about Uda-kasevikā's appearance, describing that she rises from mud, is ugly and has her hair unbound. There is also a short conversation between Uda-kasevikā and Pārvatī. Next, Pārvatī mentions the feast of Uda-kasevikā, and another passage is added to what Lakṣmīdhara has by the R and A recensions, most of which corresponds again to Caṇḍeśvara's citation. This passage gives more details about the feast: people will be disguised as madmen and will rejoice. The celebrations are to take place in autumn, after the Indramahotsava. Then, in a passage shared by all recensions, it is related that the terrible desire (*kāmo bhairavaḥ*) of Śiva and Pārvatī became personified as Bhairava and took Uda-kasevikā's hand. At

asi mama sutā (Caṇḍeśvara).

⁵⁰On this, see e.g. P.V. Kane, vol. I. p. 786.

⁵¹See also SP vol. I. p. 12.

⁵²Harimoto argues in this volume (in Part 3 of his paper) that Caṇḍeśvara may not have had direct access to the SP and that he may have only copied text cited by Lakṣmīdhara, for all their extracts from the SP correspond in a rather suspicious way, with very small differences. He points out that in some SP citations, Lakṣmīdhara's work transmits passages in which some *śloka*s were certainly omitted from the original, probably accidentally, but were retained in Caṇḍeśvara's work. This implies, he reasons, that Caṇḍeśvara could well have copied all his citations of the SP from Lakṣmīdhara at a point when Lakṣmīdhara's citations were still not truncated. Harimoto concludes that even in the case of the *Bhairavotsava* chapter, it is possible that Lakṣmīdhara's shorter text is simply corrupted and reduced by the transmission, and that it served as Caṇḍeśvara's source when it was still in its complete form. Yet, as Harimoto admits upon examining the contents of the passages in question, the extra verses in the *Bhairavotsava* chapter are more likely to have been added after Lakṣmīdhara's recension than to have been lost from it.

Pārvatī's question, this Bhairava explains how he was born and that he is to take Udakasevikā as his wife. A small extra passage is again inserted in R and A as well as in Caṇḍeśvara's text, after which the newly-born couple bow down respectfully to the two deities, who summarise the event in a different metre, in Svāgatā. Interestingly, both R/A and Caṇḍeśvara seem to signal that a sub-chapter ends here. The R/A MSS have a little caption showing that the story of Udakasevikā's and Bhairava's birth ends here (*udakasevikābhairavotpattiḥ*). Caṇḍeśvara adds a full colophon (*skandapurāṇe bhairavotpattir nāmādhyaḡyaḥ*) and then a new speaker indication (*sanatkumāra uvāca*) at the same place.

The main subject of the second part of the chapter is a detailed description of the festivities of Bhairava. Various short passages are omitted either by the A or by the R recension as compared to Lakṣmīdhara's or Caṇḍeśvara's text, but on the whole, an eclectic reconstruction based on our MSS would run quite closely to the text given by the Dharmanibandha authors, with very few exceptions amounting to single lines. After a definition of the time when the festivities should take place and some words on their *raison d'être*,⁵³ some details of how people should perform the celebrations are given. Wherever Bhairava goes, everybody starts behaving madly or like drunkards. Just as gods enter the twice-born, so too Bhairava shall enter people. They shall wear various ornaments, but shall also be smeared with ashes, urine, faeces etc. Even children, women and the elderly shall participate in the feast. People shall behave without any restraint, singing, dancing, without shame; and they shall abuse each other, ride on dogs, wear clothes of the untouchable castes and the like. Men shall do whatever they want to with Udakasevikā. At the end of the festival, people shall declare Bhairava to be dead and throw his straw effigy into a pond or a river. They shall also smear buildings with ashes and mud and the cities will be as if inhabited by thieves. Everybody shall be purified of all sins. The chapter ends with a *śrutiphala*.

As mentioned above, a cursory comparison of the R and A recensions on the one hand, and the citations in Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru* and in Caṇḍeśvara's *Kṛtyaratnākara* on the other, shows that our MSS transmit a recension close to the slightly expanded one available to Caṇḍeśvara, and not the shorter recension given by Lakṣmīdhara.⁵⁴ It is important to note that all these relatively longer extra passages are to be found in the first half of the chapter, which describes the birth of the goddess Udakasevikā and her would-be husband, Bhairava. It is probably due to this expansion of the first half of the chapter that we find the above mentioned small caption⁵⁵ in the R and A MSS and the colophon in Caṇḍeśvara's citation to indicate the end of the birth-stories. This phenomenon

⁵³The festivities take place after the festival of the god of love (*kāmamahotsava*), and Śiva explains that women's hearts are attached to *liṅgas*, and men's to *bhagas*. Moreover, he declares the world to be qualified by or made up of *liṅgas* and *bhagas*. It seems that the festival of Bhairava is in fact at the beginning and at the end of Udakasevikā's festivities, if we follow Lakṣmīdhara's interpretation.

⁵⁴As it is remarked in SP vol. I. pp. 8-13.

⁵⁵The caption and Caṇḍeśvara's colophon has already been pointed out in SP vol. I. p. 12 note 45).

of the caption in the MSS is interesting in that it shows how the expanded first half is on the way of becoming a separate chapter, but is not yet independent enough to deserve a colophon. Moreover, it shows once again the tendency of the R and A recensions to develop ‘birth-stories’ or stories of origin – entitled *°utpattiḥ*.⁵⁶

As for the second part, both the R and A MSS have different omissions of several *ślokas* compared to Lakṣmīdhara’s text. This points to two important conclusions, if we accept that Lakṣmīdhara’s text is likely to be devoid of additions. One, already made by P. Bisschop, is that one needs both the R and the A recensions to establish a meaningful text, and one that is the closest possible to what Lakṣmīdhara had. The other conclusion is that where the R and A recensions differ from each other in omitting a short passage, that passage is likely to be old and to have been omitted more or less accidentally in one of them.⁵⁷

Naturally, such omissions may not always be purely accidental. In addition to the usual explanations, it is also possible that some *ślokas* became irretrievably and irreparably corrupt in one recension, and that redactors perhaps got tired of repairing them. Such may be the case with a few *ślokas* whose unintelligible remnants can be found in R, but are omitted in A.⁵⁸ On the other hand, new material had perhaps less time to become corrupt in the transmission and may have a better chance to survive in some cases.

Finally, it must be emphasised again that our reconstruction of RA will remain different from what Lakṣmīdhara or even from what Caṇḍeśvara had in front of him. And these differences affect not only the wording, but in some cases the meaning, too, as the following examples show.⁵⁹

1.

L/C: *yaḥ kāmo bhairavaś cāsīd bhagavatyā bhavasya ca /*
(bhairavaś cāsīd L : bhairavasyāsīd C)
sa mahābhairavo bhūtvā kanyāṃ gṛhya kare sthitaḥ //

R/A: *yaḥ kāmo bhairavas tv āsīd bhagavatyā bhavasya ca /*
sa pumān bhairavo bhūtvā kanyāṃ gṛhya kare sthitaḥ //

⁵⁶On the story-telling tendency in R/A, see also Bisschop’s article in this volume.

⁵⁷This assumption would go against certain general principles such as that accidental omissions usually disturb the metre. Yet, in most cases I cannot see any particular reason why a redactor would omit the lines in question on purpose.

⁵⁸I am aware that this statement is not only hypothetical, but may sound absurd. However, this is the only explanation I can propose for the fact that R, which generally appears somewhat less faithful to its original than A and more inclined to remedy textual corruptions, still has two *ślokas* cited by Lakṣmīdhara, albeit in a very bad state.

⁵⁹In the passages below, L denotes Lakṣmīdhara’s text according to the edition, and C is used for Caṇḍeśvara. I have quoted only major variants in the R and A MSS. Orthographical variants are also ignored. The references are as given in notes 45, 46 and 47.

2.

L/C: *gāyantaś ca pranṛtyantaḥ kurvanto 'vinayāni ca*
R/A: *nṛtyamānā gāyamānāḥ kurvanto 'tibhayān api*
(*kurvanto tibhayān api R : sarvato bhibhayān api A*)⁶⁰

3.

L/C: *udasevikayā martyāḥ kariṣyanti yathāmanah*
(*°manah L : mama C*)
R/A: *dakasevikāṃ ca te martyāḥ kūrḍiṣyanti yathāmarāḥ*⁶¹

4.

L/C: *muhūrtenaiva svajanā nirlajjavatvam upāgatāḥ*
R/A: *muhūrtenaiva svajanāḥ samaśīlatvam āgatāḥ*⁶²

5.

⁶⁰In the first half of this line, I suspect that the Dharmanibandha author(s) tried to purify the Sanskrit of our *purāna* and replaced the middle participles by active ones. Moreover, it is quite likely here that in fact Lakṣmīdhara's purification was adopted by Caṇḍeśvara, for otherwise it would be a rare coincidence that the wording should be exactly the same. The difference at the end of the line is more important for the meaning. L/C describes that people behave in an ill-mannered or improper way, while R says they create extreme terror (? in the plural). L/C's reading is definitely more suitable in the context, and the change is explicable paleographically. However, *'vinayāni ca* would not be very easy to conjecture from the readings of R and A without the evidence of L/C. Oddly, the word is in the neuter, which is quite irregular. It is surprising that the neither of the Dharmanibandha authors has made a small correction here to the masculine, which is, on the other hand, present in the R/A transmission. On the other hand, the word used in R/A *atibhayān api* should rather be in the neuter *atibhayāni ca*. Given the combined evidence of the R/A MSS and the citations, one could emend or conjecture to *'vinayān api*. R/A may be trying to avoid the reference to illicit behaviour.

⁶¹Here R and A seem to preserve more of what may have been the original reading. They describe mortal humans who frolic with Udaśevikā, as the immortal gods would. L/C replace the somewhat infrequent verb 'to frolic' (*kūrḍ-*) with a simple 'to do' (*kr-*), and L has 'as they wish' (*yathāmanah*) against C's rather nonsensical reading. R/A's contrast of *martya-amara* seems better. Moreover, the expression *yathāmarāḥ* is quite frequent in the text. Note that *kūrḍanī* is also the name of the festival in honour of Kāma. The first half is hypermetrical in R/A, and may be emended to have the instrumental, which would be more suitable with the verb used.

⁶²This line, stating that relatives become 'equal' (according to R/A) or 'shameless' (according to C/L), comes after some lines which say that sons are no longer sons to their fathers etc. during the festivities. Perhaps R/A's words are slightly more appropriate in the context, which appears to refer to incestual behaviour, but L/C is also good. One could suppose a corruption as well as a deliberate change, but it seems better to maintain that we have two irreducible recensions, L/C and RA.

L/C: *rājaveṣāntyaveṣās ca ...*
R: *rājaveṣā vyādhaveṣā ...*⁶³

6.

L: *nāpitānām ca veṣeṇa mandānām atha cāpare ...*
C: *nāpitānām ca veṣeṇa nagnānām api cāpare ...*
R/A: *nāpitānām ca veṣeṇa naṭānām api cāpare ...*⁶⁴

7.

L: *anye tu puruṣā devī devaveṣavibhūṣitāḥ /*
kāvyaṇi śrāvayanto hi te hr̥ṣyanti yathāmarāḥ //

C: *anye tu puruṣā devī devaveṣavibhūṣitāḥ /*
kāvyaṇi śrāvayanto 'pi hr̥ṣyanti ca yathāmarāḥ //

R/A : *sarvābharaṇasaṃpūrṇā rājayogyānarās tadā /*
dīvyān gandhān sugandhāmś ca anye tatrāvahanti hi /
(tatrāvahanti A : tatra vadanti R) //
siñjīṭair bhūṣaṇaiś cānye aṭiṣyanti yathāmarāḥ A
*(aṭiṣyanti A : pāṭiṣyanti R)*⁶⁵

As is shown in the above citations, the differences between R/A and the citations of the Dharmanibandha authors should not always be seen as corruptions of the R and A recensions, even if both of these recensions are in a rather bad state of transmission. It is possible that the text of the *Skandapurāṇa* had several recensions already in Lakṣmīdhara's time; and in spite of the fact that

⁶³A is not available for a passage of 6 lines including this one, which describes how people disguise themselves in royal clothes, clothes of various low castes etc. But since these lines are cited by both Dharmanibandha authors, they are likely to have been present and were perhaps accidentally dropped in A. R may be inventing the hunter disguise (*vyādhaveṣa-*) instead of the low caste one (*antyaveṣa-*), but they are synonymous to some extent in this context. Isaacson has suggested that R may be trying to purify the Sanskrit of the text and to avoid what looks like a double *sandhi* (i.e. *rājaveṣā ntyaveṣās ca*) in L/C. In any case, it would again involve too much interference to reduce the two different readings to one.

⁶⁴The textual problems of the passage which describes how people should disguise themselves continue. In the first half, all our texts agree that people can wear barber's clothes at the festivities. In the second half, Lakṣmīdhara envisages the clothes of fools or of the sick, Caṇḍeśvara has the clothes of the naked (an odd expression), and R/A transmit 'actors' clothes'. Although textual corruption is likely to have occurred here, it is difficult to see in which direction, and again it may be wiser to maintain all readings as meaningful variants of various periods.

⁶⁵While these lines appear at the same place in the chapter, they are totally different in R/A compared to L/C, except for the last two words. This is yet another passage where it is obvious that RA represents a different recension, in spite of the fact that the chapter as a whole corresponds mostly to the citations of the Dharmanibandha authors.

the early *Skandapurāṇa* was largely forgotten after the fourteenth century, the Revā and Ambikā recensions continued to develop after Lakṣmīdhara's, and even after Caṇḍeśvara's time. Now it is our task to write the story of their *utpatti*.