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As has been reported in various international meetings and in the Indo-Iranian Journal (Adriaensen 1994), a team at the University of Groningen (consisting of R. Adriaensen, H. Isaacson and the present author) is currently working on the critical edition of the oldest extant text that calls itself Skandapurāṇa. Apart from the passage discussed below there seem to be few textual links between the vulgate Skandapurāṇa and the text we are presently editing. The oldest document on which this edition is based is a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript dating from AD 810 (our siglum S1). It contains a Skandapurāṇa (further referred to as SP) that does not yet consist of khaṇḍas. Of this text three recensions are known. The oldest recension is the one found in three (incomplete) Nepalese palm-leaf MSS (our sigla S1, S2, S3, jointly S)2. A later recension is found in a MS that in its colophon calls itself the Revākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa (our siglum R), but that is entirely different from the printed Revākhaṇḍa3. The third and probably latest recension is found in MSS that in their colophons style themselves as the Ambikākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa. Of these we have collected four manuscripts (our sigla A1, A2, A3 and A4, jointly A)4. Our edition aims at reconstructing the S recension as far as possi-
ble, while the variants of the R and A recensions will be presented each in a separate critical apparatus. The editio princeps of the SP was prepared by Kṛṣṇa Prasāda BhaṭṭarāI and appeared in Kathmandu in 1988 (our siglum E). For further details concerning the mentioned MSS and editions the reader is referred to our publication in IIJ 37.

The aim of the present study is to illustrate the value of our text for the investigation of Sanskrit literature and the mythology of Hinduism by discussing a text passage in adhyāya 13. This chapter is concerned with the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī. Four more texts appear to be relevant to this topic; they are discussed below and, together with the passage in SP 13, presented at the end of this article. In the four critical apparatuses I have only given those variant readings that may be significant for the comparison of the texts.

The myth of the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī is well known to Indologists from many Sanskrit texts as well as from numerous works of art⁵. It is all the more surprising that the version of this myth that occurs in the printed texts of the Brahmapurāṇa (abbreviated as BP; in the critical apparatus siglum Bpur), the Lingapurāṇa (abbreviated as LP) and the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa (abbreviated as MKh; in the critical apparatus siglum Mkh) of the vulgate SP, in which Pārvatī is allowed to choose her husband in a svayamvara, has attracted little attention of researchers of Puranic literature and Śaiva mythology; at least we have neither found a reference to it in the secondary literature which we have consulted directly, nor in the indices of the unsurpassed Tübingen ‘Epic and Purānic Bibliography’ (Stietencron 1992). The myth of Pārvatī’s svayamvara is, however, discussed by some historians of Indian art in order to explain images of a (lying) woman with child⁶. It is this svayamvara version of the holy wedding that is found in adhyāya 13 of the SP. In addition to the four texts mentioned, a cryptic passage in the Dronaparvan of the Mahābhārata (MBh) appears also to be of relevance, although it does not at first sight deal with Pārvatī’s ‘self-choice’.

---

⁵ For an elaborate survey the reader may be referred to the MA thesis of Ms. Martina Stoye (Freie Universität Berlin): ‘Die textlichen Grundlagen zu Darstellungen der Hochzeit von Śiva und Pārvatī in der indischen Kunst’, which is as yet, however, unpublished. I am grateful to Ms. Stoye for sending me her thesis and to Professor Adalbert Gail who drew my attention to this work.

⁶ My attention was drawn to this by the (unpublished) MA thesis of Ms. Britta Zehmke (Freie Universität Berlin), who was so kind as to send me her work: ‘Die liegende Frau mit Kind in der indischen Steinplastik’. B. Zehmke refers to the work of Bhattachari 1929, Sanyal 1935, Agrawala 1964 and Joshi 1989. These publications were not available to me. Zehmke’s investigation, however, makes it clear that the motif of the ‘lying woman with child’ can hardly have anything to do with Pārvatī’s svayamvara.
We may start our investigation by having a closer look at this chapter (173) of the Dronaparvan. After the death of Drona and the shattering of the Kauravas, Arjuna asks Vyāsa who was the man with the lance who marched in front of him and caused such havoc on the battlefield. Vyāsa answers that Arjuna had seen Śaṃkara; Vyāsa reveals Śiva’s nature in a famous eulogy, in which, among other things, reference is made to his retaliation against the gods when he is not allowed his share in the sacrifice (MBh 7.173.37–51). Then Vyāsa broaches another subject. He tells how the gods asked Śiva to break the power of the three cities of the asuras and how Śiva accomplished this by one three-pronged arrow when an auspicious (astronomical) conjunction of the three heavenly cities had occurred (ib. 52–58). The next śloka makes a very harsh transition. Apparently without any connection with the fore-going the text proceeds (59):

‘After herself placing the little child with five tufts of hair on her lap, Umā, as she wished to know (who he was), asked the gods “who is this?”’ (bālam ankaagatam kṛtvā svayam pañcasiṣṭham punaḥ / umā jī-

jiśamānā vai ko ’yam ity abravit surān //)

This verse is directly followed by another one, not less bewildering in its abruptness (60): ‘The lord immobilized the arm of the infuriated Śakra that held the vajra; this bountiful god, lord and ruler of the entire universe’ (bāhum savajram sakrasyā kruddhasyaṭambhayat prabhuh / sa esa bhagavān devah sarvalokesvarah prabhuh //).

Two themes are juxtaposed here which, on first sight, seem to have very little to do with one another: (1) Śiva’s transformation into a little child and (2) his immobilisation of Indra who, it would seem, leads the gods in an act of aggression. The origin of both themes can be traced back to the Brāhmaṇa literature and a short survey of their evolution may help to clarify the text.

Discussing the function of the brahmān priest, the Kausitaki Brāhmaṇa teaches (6.8.8–6.9.4):

‘Then, when the gods thereupon performed the sacrifice, they put the fore-portion (prāśītra) aside for Savitṛ; it cleft his hands. They restored to him two golden (hands). Therefore he is celebrated as “the one with golden hands”. They put it aside for Bhaga; it gouged out his eyes. Therefore they say “Bhaga is blind”. They put it aside for Pūṣan; it knocked out his teeth. Therefore they say “Pūṣan is without teeth, gruel is his share”. These gods said, “Indra is the most powerful, the strongest of the gods; put it aside for him”. They put it aside for him.'
He appeased it with (his) holy power (brahman). Therefore one says, “the brahman is Indra”.8

The same theme is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa with some significant changes. Here ‘the god who rules the animals’ (yō ṣaṁ devāḥ paśūnāṁ ēṣe [ŚB 1.7.4.3]), i.e. Rudra, is asked by the gods to pierce Prajāpati, who is the sacrifice, because he had abused his daughter9. Rudra pierces him with the lance (śalyā). When the lance is torn out again, the gods offer that portion of Prajāpati, i.e. of the sacrifice, that has come out with the lance – that is the fore-portion of the sacrifice (prāṣitrā), intended for the brahmān priest – to Bhaga etc.: ‘Bhaga looked at it; it burnt his eyes. And so indeed it happened. Therefore they say “Bhaga is blind”. They said, “it has not yet become appeased here, put it aside for Pūsān”. They put it aside for Pūsān. Pūsān ate from it; it knocked out his teeth. And so indeed it happened. Therefore they say, “Pūsān is without teeth”. Therefore they prepare the rice pudding (cαrū) that they make for Pūsān from ground rice, just as for a person without teeth.”10

Brhaspati next passes it on to Savitr who appeases it: ‘What is the fore-portion (prāṣitrā), that is originally this. When he cuts off the fore-portion, he metes out exactly that part of the sacrifice that has been pierced, that belongs to Rudra11.

Thus Rudra partly takes over Indra’s position as the god to whom this dangerous first portion of the sacrificial offering belongs; unlike Indra, however, he does not ‘appease’ it (this function is taken over by Savitr), but, on the contrary, he is seen as the cause of the mutilation of the sacrifice and consequently of the gods.

---

8 atha yatra ha tad devā yajñām atanvata | 8 | tat savitre prāṣitrām parijahruḥ | 9 | tasya pānīt pariṣccheda | 10 | tasmai hirāmnayau pratidadhuh | 11 | tasmād dhīraṇyapānīr iti stutāḥ | 12 | tad bhagāya parijahruḥ | 13 | tasyākṣiṇī nirjaghaṇā | 14 | tasmād āhur andho bhagā iti | 15 | tat pūsēne parijahruḥ | 16 | tasya dāntāṃ parovāpā | 17 | tasmād āhur adantakah pūsā karambhāhāga iti | 18 | te devā ucūḥ | 19 | indro vai devānām ojīṣṭho balīṣthas tasmā etat pariḥarateti | 1 | tat tasmai parijahruḥ | 2 | tat sa brahmānaṁ śamayām cakāra | 3 | tasmād āhendro brahmēti | 4 |

9 Rudra himself is the issue of this abuse, see KB 6.1 (below p. 10). He avenges the incest by piercing his begetter, Prajāpati, i.e. the sacrifice (Depert 1977: 267f.).


11 tad etān nidānena yāt prāṣitrām [8] sā yāt prāṣitrām aradvātī | yād evātrāviddhaṁ yajñāsya yād rudriyam tad evaśān nirmimite (ŚB 1.7.4.8–9).
The theme returns in the Sauptikaparvan 18 of the Mahābhārata, where it is connected with Śiva’s exclusion from the sacrifice in general. When the gods have divided among themselves their share (bhāga) in the sacrifice, Rudra seizes his bow, and runs towards them. Cosmic phenomena come to a halt. Sacrifice (yajña) is shot in the heart while fleeing to heaven in the form of an antelope (mṛga). The gods are baffled.

The infuriated Tryambaka cut off (vyāsätayat) the arms of Savitr, (and knocked out) the eyes of Bhaga and the teeth of Pūṣan with the point of his bow (dhanuskoti). Then the gods and āṅgas of the sacrifice ran away all together; some rolled about on that very spot and became as if they breathed their last. But after he had put that entire (assembly) to the rout, Śitikaṇṭha laughed, arrested the point of the bow and halted the gods. Thereupon the cry (vāc) uttered by the immortals snapped the string of his bow and, due to the shock, O king, the bow, its string broken, quivered. Thereupon the gods along with sacrifice approached the foremost of the gods, who was without bow (now), and took refuge; and the lord showed compassion.

Chapter 32 of the SP, followed by i. a., the Linga- and Śivapurāṇas, applies the theme to the description of Śiva’s exclusion from Dakṣa’s sacrifice. Here Indra and Viṣṇu are added to the group of explicitly mentioned gods that fall victim to the anger of Śiva, in this case represented by his factotum Haribhadra. The arms raising their weapons are immobilized (stambhana), just as the other inhabitants of heaven are said to be transfixed.

And Haribhadra, inflamed and without dismay, immobilized Śakra’s hand when he raised (it); and likewise (he immobilized the hands) of the other gods. (And) before (their) eyes he, with anger on his face, knocked out Bhaga’s eyes and Pūṣan’s teeth, striking with the point of (his) bow. And without dismay he immobilized that dreadful discus of Viṣṇu, which shone like the apocalyptic sun, and it, (remaining) in his hand, did not move (forth). So much for Śiva’s mutilation of the gods.

The origin of the other theme, viz. Śiva’s transformation into a little child, can also be traced back to the Kauṣitaki Brāhmaṇa, in

12 Cf. TS 2.6.8.3: devā vai yajñād rudrām antārayant sā yajñām avidhyat tām devā abhi sāmagacchanta kālpātām na idām itī, and SB 1.6.1.1–8.
13 Cf. AB 3.33.5; see also MBh 12.274.34–35, where Dakṣa’s sacrifice, after having been destroyed, assumes the form of an antelope and is pursued by Śiva into heaven.
15 Bh 32.47–49; cf. LP 1.100.15–17, 28–30 and ŚiP, Rudrasamhitā 2.37. 34–36, 54f.
which Prajāpati begets a (grand)son through his four sons and daughter Usas (KB 6.1–3). This infant (?), ‘of a thousand eyes, of a thousand feet, with a thousand fitted (arrows on his bow)’\(^{16}\), asks his (grand)father to bestow upon him eight names.\(^{17}\) A new version of this myth is found in the Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa\(^{18}\), which tells that at the dawn of creation, in the first kalpa, Mahādeva Rudra engendered a son in his own likeness (ātmanas tulyam sutam). This little ‘blue-red’ boy (kumāro nilalohitah) appeared in the lap of Brahmā and cried (ghorada) terribly (ghoram). He asked Brahmā to give him a name, and Brahmā names him Rudra. The child kept crying until altogether eight names – the same as given to Prajāpati’s son in the KB and SB – were given to him, the final one being Mahādeva. Thereupon the ‘blue-red’ boy requested Brahmā to bestow a domain (sthāna) or body (tanu) to each name, which resulted in the following combinations: Rudra obtained the sun, Bhava the waters, Ādīva earth, Iśā wind, Paśupati fire, Bhima ākāśa, Ugra the initiated brahmin, and Mahādeva the moon. In this way the divine, primordial child in Brahmā’s lap was made to personify Śiva’s cosmic dimension, his eight embodiments (aṣṭamūrti), encompassing the entire phenomenal universe.

When we return to the two verses in the Dronaparvan, we may observe that it is probably this primordial, cosmic child that sits in Umā’s lap (MBh 7.173.59); his five tufts of hair (pañcaśikha) may symbolize his embodiment of the five elements that build the material world. This being so, one may rightly ask what, if any, is the function of the appear-

---


\(^{17}\) This incestuous son of Prajāpati is ‘this great god possessed of eight names, who is composed of eight folds’ (sa eso śtanāmā [49] aśtadhā vihito mahan devaḥ [50] [KB 6.3.49–50]), i.e. Mahādeva/Rudra, whose eight forms (aṣṭamūrti) are described in KB 6.2–3 (cf. SB 6.1.3.8–18). Apparently, the 6th adhyāya of the KB does not make a connection between this myth of the birth of Rudra (6.1–3) and the second section (6.4–11) dealing mainly with the function of the brahmān priest, in which context the myth of the sacrifice of the gods and their injury by the prāśītra is described (see above p. 7f.). The underlying connection, however, becomes clear when the SB version is taken into consideration. It is Rudra, the son of Prajāpati, i.e. the sacrifice, who procures (and i s) the first issue of the sacrifice, the ‘fore-portion’, or, in the words of the Brāhmaṇa, ‘[the portion] that belongs to Rudra’ (rudriya [SB 1.7.4.9]). The underlying identity seems to be that Rudra, son of Prajāpati’s seed, is the first issue (prāśītra) of Prajāpati’s (self-)sacrifice. If we keep this identity in mind the relevance of the statement that introduces the concluding part of adhyāya 6 of the KB becomes clear (6.10.7–8): ‘Prajāpati once emitted the sacrifice; he emitted seed by installing the sacrificial fire’ (pra- jāpatir ha yajñām saśraj [7] so ‘gnyādheyaena reto ‘srjata [8]).

\(^{18}\) PPL 121–127, i.e. Vāyupurāṇa 27 and Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 1.10.
ance of the cosmic child in Pārvatī's lap at this junction of Tripura's destruction? And why do the infatuated gods, represented by Śakra, to whose rescue Śiva had just come and to whose wish, viz. the destruction of the triple city of the asuras, Śiva had just complied, why do these gods try immediately to kill their benefactor, from which evil they are only kept by the child's magic powers (MBh 7.173.60)? Even if we accept, as we are supposed to do, that the gods were struck by blindness (MBh 7.173.61), it is hard to see why the sight of Umā with a child on her lap immediately provoked such aggression, exactly at the moment when the world is rescued from a demonic threat. And what is she doing there anyway? And how is it possible that Umā herself, mother of the world, apparently does not recognize the child? Brahmā is the only one who recognizes Śiva and bows for him (MBh 7.173.62), whereupon Śiva undoes his spell (63). Evidently we are concerned with a conflation of at least three myths – Śiva's destruction of Tripura, his appearance as the cosmic child, and the gods' assault on him and their subsequent immobilisation – which, since they are all concerned with Śiva's majestic powers, were somehow, rather awkwardly, combined in the MBh text, making the latter prone to further involuntary corruption.

The relevance, alluded to earlier, of the svayamvara myth in SP 13 for the exegesis of the MBh passage at issue becomes evident when we study this myth in more detail. The events leading to the svayamvara in SP 13 are told in SP 12. In short the story is as follows: In SP 12.1–20 Brahmā prophesies that Pārvatī (Umā) will obtain a husband of her choice when she stops practising tapas. Pārvatī ceases her tapas and resorts to the asoka tree that has grown at the entrance of her dwelling. Hara (Śiva) approaches her in the form of an ugly dwarf, who announces that he wishes to marry her. Thanks to her yogic powers Pārvatī perceives that Śaṅkara has come to her and says that he should ask her father. Śiva, still in disguise, asks Himavat for the hand of his daughter, but Himavat, recognizing Rudra, becomes uneasy and foolishly, due to a curse, declares that he already intended to hold a svayamvara for his daughter. Śiva returns to Pārvatī, tells her about her father's intention and is about to take his leave, when Pārvatī assures him not to despair, since she will choose him. If he has any doubt, she will choose him right there. Pārvatī plucks a flowering branch from the asoka tree and laying it on his shoulder says 'you have been chosen by me'.

19 Nilakantha's commentary does not really help: teṣu ca vardhamānesu rudro bālavād rāgadesvāśūnyo brahmavidyāparanāmnyā umāyā vaśaṃ bhavati etad uttra pradarśyate ī.

20 SP 12.21–63 continues with several other things, among which another myth in which Śiva puts Pārvatī to the test. He assumes the form of a
In SP 13.1–27 Himavat, though aware of the engagement of his daughter with Devadeva, proceeds to organize the \textit{svayamvara}, considering that, after all, it would bring him most honour if Paramesāna would be chosen in front of all the gods. The latter, headed by Indra, assemble in the house of Himavat. Pārvatī enters the arena in a \textit{vimāna} and takes a garland of flowers to place at the feet of the man of her choice (SP 13.28). At that very moment, in order to test his bride to be (\textit{devyā jijnāsayā}), Śiva assumes the form of a child in her lap (SP 13.29). Due to her yogic powers she recognizes the god to whom she had pledged her word and is pleased (SP 13.30–31). When the gods, however, see the maiden of the wedding contest with a child in her lap they, understandably enough, are bewildered, fly into passion and try to attack him (SP 13.32). Śiva repels the assault by immobilizing and mutilating the offenders (SP 13.33–38). Brahmā is the only god who sees through Śiva’s disguise, and he informs the other gods about their mistake (SP 13.39–50). The gods take refuge with Śiva (SP 13.51). Śiva is pleased and lifts the spell (SP 13.52). He assumes his supreme form, seen by the gods only after receiving a divine eye (SP 13.53–54), and is elected by Pārvatī as her husband (SP 13.56), after which the wedding is celebrated. The cosmic order, sealed by Śiva’s and Pārvatī’s holy wedlock, is confirmed.

It is clear that the SP story of Pārvatī’s \textit{svayamvara} combines the two mythological themes at issue, viz. (1) Śiva’s taking the form of a little child (in Pārvatī’s lap), and (2) Śiva’s immobilisation/mutilation of the gods, though now applied in a situation in which revenge of the incest or exclusion from the sacrifice is no longer the direct cause of his anger. In contrast with the MBh text, however, the encompassing myth of Pārvatī’s \textit{svayamvara} unites these two themes into a new, meaningful and logical whole. Pārvatī stands the test, as one would expect, and does not need to ask who the child is; the ignorant gods, however, go astray. Not recognizing Śiva, they are embarrassed by the child’s presence at the \textit{svayamvara}. They become angry and consequently are immobilized/mutilated. When their delusion is removed by Brahmā, they have no choice but to recognize Śiva’s superiority and to accept that he is Pārvatī’s choice. In this way the Śaiva cosmic order proved to be superior to the ancient world represented by the Vedic gods. The latter were crippled and, to bring out the contrast – and this distinguishes the Epic and Puranic versions from those of the Brāhmaṇas – this was effected by the supreme lord in the form of a newly born child.

crocodile who has seized a child. Pārvatī liberates the child by giving her \textit{tapas} away to the crocodile, who reveals his true nature.
The Brahmapurāṇa, Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhanda tell basically the same myth as SP 13. In the BP the svayamvara episode forms part of the 'story of Umā and Śaṃkara' (umāśaṃkarayoh punyām kathām [BP 34.55]), which the BP has taken over from the SP in its entirety. The BP follows the text of the SP rather closely, showing only minor variants – often adaptations due to the fact that Brahmā has supplanted Sanatkumāra as the narrator – in addition to occasional omissions and corruptions. From the latter it is clear that the BP is the borrower, the SP the 'original'. The borrowed chapters in the BP, viz. 34.56 to 38.12 (= SP 11.1 to 15.12) fit neatly in between the preceding passage borrowed from the Sāmbapurāṇa (BP 29–33) and the succeeding passage borrowed from the Mahābhārata and Vāyu-purāṇa (BP 39–40).

The situation is somewhat different in the case of the LP and MKh. These two texts show a greater distance to the SP, having numerous omissions, additions and transpositions, whereas they are marred by textual corruptions, due to which the story has become more difficult to follow, especially in the MKh. A comparison with the SP may help to restore its meaning. It ensues from a collation that the LP is closer to the SP and that the text of the MKh goes back to an original that must have been related to the text as found in the LP.

No such close correspondence is found between the MBh and SP, but there are some indications that, at the time the MBh passage at issue was composed, the myth of Pārvatī’s svayamvara was not wholly unknown. It might actually have been the source whence the diaskueust derived both themes, namely Śiva (Rudra) as a child and the injury of the gods, unified by Pārvatī’s pivot role. These may have

---

21 See the Appendices 4 and 5 of the edition of Schreiner and Söhnen. Though it has been known since long “that the Brahma..., as presently edited, is nothing more than a loose ‘conglomeration of portions belonging to different periods and written by different hands’” (Rocher 1986: 155), until now the source of the chapters 34 to 38 has not been identified. I am grateful to Mss. Zehmke and Stoye (see above p. 6n. 5f.), whose MA theses drew my attention to this BP passage. While I was preparing this article for the press, it was brought to my notice that at least fragments of the (original) Brahmapurāṇa quoted by Laksmidhara are found in a manuscript in the Jammu & Kashmir Government Research Library (Srinagar, MS No. 1346), the title of which is written as ā. pu, taken to mean Ādipurāṇa. The cover of this fragment the title mārāndamāhātmya has been written in another hand. The fragment itself is without colophon. The text has been edited by Ikari (1994), who also gives a concordance with the corresponding passages in the Krtya-kalpataru and Krtyaratnakara where the text is quoted as Brahmapurāṇa. The same fragment corresponds partly with the text of the Nilaamatapurāṇa.

22 The connection between (the child) Rudra and the mutilation of the gods is not completely new, since it underlies the myth of Prajāpati’s (self-)
been lifted out of their context and incorporated in the eulogy of Rudra to illustrate his greatness. With the destruction of Tripura they evidently lack any intrinsic relation.

To facilitate a comparison I have presented the five text traditions in four parallel columns (see p. 24ff.). The BP version is not given a column of its own; its variant readings are given in the critical apparatus ad the text of SP\textsuperscript{23}. The text of MBh 7.173 actually recurs in MBh 13.145; the major variant readings of the reprise have been given in the apparatus (the sigla are those of the Critical Edition). The text of SP is basically a reconstruction of the S recension, though it should be taken into account that for the passage at issue only S\textsubscript{2} is available. The sequence of \textit{ślokas} in the LP and the MKh of the Venkāṭēśvara (and Vaṅgavāśī) Press editions has been adapted to the SP and this already yields a slight improvement of the story line.\textsuperscript{24} Significant variant readings of the Vaṅgavāśī editions of the LP and MKh have been either accepted in the text or presented in the apparatus.\textsuperscript{25}

When we turn our attention again to MBh 7.173.59 we see in the apparatus that a part of the Southern Recension inserts before this

\begin{itemize}
\item sacrifice and Rudra's birth (see p. 10n. 17). Though the two myths are structurally akin, the trait-d'union between both themes changes from the sacrifice, i. e. Prajāpati, in the Brāhmaṇas to Pārvatī in the epic and Purāṇas.
\item\textsuperscript{23} If one of the variant readings of the BP text that are presented in Schreiner and Söhnen's edition corresponds with SP, the other readings are ignored. Occasionally, if these variant readings resemble the SP reading, they are also given in the apparatus with siglum Bpur.
\item Occasionally the Venkāṭēśvara edition of the MKh gives a variant reading – \textit{i}r\textit{a}h p\textit{a}th\textit{a}h – which is noted in the apparatus. The commentary of Ganeśa Nātu in the Venkāṭēśvara edition of the LP has also been presented in the apparatus.
\item\textsuperscript{24} One may recall Friedhelm Hardy's dictum (Hardy 1983: 592) to the effect that "any analysis solely based on \textit{one} printed edition of a \textit{Purāṇa} will be one-sided or even distorted". It would be better still, and generally of greater significance (as too often the printed editions appear to be related to one another), to consult the MSS of the Purāṇa at issue. It is obvious that here practical considerations impose a limit. I am very grateful to my colleague H. Isaacsen for having taken the trouble to look at a MS of the LP in the Bodleian Library (MS Wilson 100). According to Isaacsen "this MS does not look very old and has a large number of mistakes, but very strikingly it agrees in some places more closely with the SP than the printed Līṅgāpurāṇa does". The significant variants are given in the apparatus of LP with siglum MS\textsuperscript{Bod}. The variant readings of another Līṅgāpurāṇa MS in the National Archives of Nepal (No. 6/3393) dated NS 837 (= AD 1717), available on a microfilm of the NGMPP in Berlin (Reel A 1392/6), are also presented in the apparatus with siglum MS\textsuperscript{Nep} (it concerns the folios 195v to 196v). I am grateful to Prof. A. Wezler, by whose kind offices this microfilm was placed at my disposal.
\end{itemize}
verse a significant hemistich (1460*): ‘Listen to another event, O Dhanamjaya, (which happened) at Pārvatī’s sva-yamvara’ (devyāḥ sva-yamvare vrītam śrṇusvānyad dhanamjaya /). The insertion of this hemistich may have been prompted by the harsh transition from the Tripura battle scene to Śiva’s transformation into a child. Since this hemistich is only found in the Telugu and some of the Grantha MSS, it may be secondary and not have formed part of the original MBh text, but, all the same, it could represent a reminiscence of the original context to which the myth told in the following verses might have belonged.

Another significant variant is found ad 59c. This reading, although the editors of the Critical Edition have relegated it to the apparatus, is supported by a substantial part of the northern and southern MSS as well as by some of the MSS at MBh 13.145.30c, and would correspond much better with the story as told in SP. According to this reading Śiva changes into a little child ‘to test Umā’ (umām jijnāsamāno, subject Śiva), corresponding to SP 29a (BP 36.28a) devyā jijnāsayā (`in order to test the Goddess’), which has a greater intrinsic probability than Umā openly acknowledging her ignorance: umā jijnāsamānā. The editors of the MBh may have been tempted into accepting this, probably corrupt version of 59c in the critical text on account of the fact that the MBh text as we have it does not explicitly state that Umā stands the test and recognizes Śiva and because Śiva as the subject of abraviño in 59d seems rather odd as we would expect ko ‘ham iti. However, also the reading of 59d is far from certain. That Umā’s knowledge of the child’s true nature was (originally) taken as understood may be deduced not only from the fact that the gods altogether ignore her question, but also from the fact that only they manifest their ignorance in the story that follows (MBh 7.173.61).26 And neither does Brahmā, who knows the truth, inform Umā; on the contrary, Umā, together with Śiva, is the object of veneration in verse 63, directly after Brahmā’s discovery in verse 62. The conclusion seems inevitable that verse 59 as a whole is corrupt beyond reliable restoration and a wavy line under the entire verse in the édition would not have been superfluous. The (later) Lingapurāṇa and the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa have replaced the (probably) original feature of ‘Umā’s trial’ by the traditional platitude that it is just Śiva’s game (krūḍāṛtham [LP 1.102.28d, MKh 2.25.100d]).

Due to textual corruption MKh 101–102 has become difficult to understand, which may have led the pundits of the Venkatesvara Press to their note given in the apparatus ad 100cd–101. The tasya in

26 Significant may be also that Pārvatī takes the child on to her lap (59ab), but the reading of the entire verse 59 is uncertain.
MKh 102b and tasyā in LP 29d lack an obvious antecedent (SP reads devyā). The two pādas MKh 101cd make the impression of an interpolation, the connection of which with the immediate context is difficult to determine. The relevance of the word jaya is obscure and may point to another context, perhaps the exegetical tradition concerning the famous verse that opens the Mahābhārata and, for instance, the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa27.

In SP 34–38 (BP 36.33–36ab), LP 31–39 and MKh 104–110 (missing in MBh) the theme of the mutilation of the gods is worked out, adding to the immobilized Indra other victims such as Bhaga (not in LP) and Pūṣan (not in BP), known as such already from the Brāhmaṇa literature. A very striking elaboration is presented in SP 36, which is without parallel in the MKh and significantly different in LP, whereas BP (36.36cd) has omitted the second remarkable hemistich (SP 36cd). The deluded Viṣṇu angrily shakes his head, whereupon Śiva makes his hair fall out. I have not succeeded in finding any reference to Viṣṇu’s baldness in Sanskrit literature and we may have here an idiosyncrasy of the ancient Skandapurāṇa text.28 That this extreme Śaivism was hard to swallow for later redactors of the text may follow not only from the adaptation in the Līṅgapurāṇa, where Viṣṇu’s head is immobilized instead of made bald, and the omission of this verse or half of it in the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa and in the Brahmapurāṇa, but also from the interpolations in the R and A recensions of SP ad 39ab (only in R) and ad 50cd, in which Viṣṇu’s role is mitigated when it is said, that Nārāyaṇa has known from the start that it was Śiva who fooled the gods29.

Then in MBh 62, SP 39–40 (BP 36.36cd–39ab), LP 40–41 and MKh 111–112ab Brahmā sees what Śiva’s game is and starts praising him. Of the five ślokas that follow in SP 41–45 (BP 36.39cd–44ab) and LP 42cd–47, in which Brahmā reveals Śiva’s true nature and coaxes him into undoing his spell, the MKh has retained only one (112cd–113ab), while the Northern Recension of the MBh includes three different, though appropriate verses after 62, relegated to the apparatus by the editors. The effect of this is that according to the text of the Critical

27 nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya naram caiva caiva narottamam / devāṃ sarasvatīm caiva tato jayam udīrayet.//

28 The only exception is the hymn in praise of Śiva after his wedding, which is borrowed by the BP and in which obeisance is paid to Śiva as kṛṣṇakeśākāśārīne, clearly a reference to the episode under discussion, since the same verse praises him also as pūṣno dantahārya and bhaganeśtramiṇipātaya (SP 14.9 = BP 37.9). The SP refers again to Viṣṇu’s loss of hair in Bh 32, p. 201,20f.

29 This uprating of Viṣṇu’s position is consistently found throughout the R and A recensions.
Edition the gods never are informed about the true nature of the child, which again makes it unlikely that, in spite of that, they suddenly are able to satisfy (*praśādayām āsura*) Umā and Rudra in verse 63.

The next passage, SP 46–47 (BP 36.44cd–45) and LP 48–49, has also been transmitted incompletely in the MKh (113cd–114). The equivalent of SP 46 and LP 48, in which Brahmā turns to the gods, has been omitted, as a result of which the text has become unintelligible as it is no longer clear who are addressed. The corruption may have had its starting point, however, in the alternative Sandhi *mūdhā stha* for *mūdhāḥ stha* (SP 13.47a), which we find in the SP manuscript S₁ and the Venkaṭēśvara edition of LP. Although Kātyāyana ad Pāṇini 8.3.36 allows the elision of the final *s* before a sibilant followed by a voiceless occlusive and this practice is found regularly in manuscripts, the loss of the hiatus between *mūdhā* and *stha* in handwriting (reflected in the Venkaṭēśvara edition of the LP) may have caused that the verbal second plural indicative ('you are fools') was no longer understood, which gave rise to the nominal *mūdhās tu* (A₁,₃) and *mūdhāḥ ca* in BP and MKh. The vocative *devatāḥ* in SP was accordingly interpreted as a nominative and the nominative plural masculine of the subject, *sarve* ('you all'), was taken as attributive to *devatāḥ* and adjusted to a nominative plural feminine, *sarvās* ('all the deities') in BP, LP and MKh. The second plural indicative *na budhyatha* ('you do not understand' [SP 47b]) corrupted to *na budhyata* (already in the A recension of SP), which we should interpret as an augmentless imperfect in order to avoid the absurd imperative 'you should not recognize'. In short, the transcriptive and intrinsic probability of the corruptions point to successive stages, of which the MKh represents the last. Thanks to the SP we are now in the position to understand what the BP, LP and MKh were supposed to convey.

SP 48–49 show the acquaintance of Brahmā (and the authors of the ancient Skandapurāṇa) with the symbolic meaning of the child as the embodiment of Śiva's cosmic dimension, which meaning is now revealed to the Vedic gods. In addition to epithets such as *kapardimat*, *ātman*, *aja* etc., we encounter seven of the eight names of the *aṣṭamūrti*; only Bhava appears to be missing or is substituted by another name such as Śāmkara or Devadeva (cf. SP 4.17–20). This revelation of the child's eightfold nature has become lost in the course of transmission as the omission of these two verses in BP, LP and MKh attests (cf. LP 106.23f.). The absence of the child’s qualification as *pañcaśikha* in LP 28d and MKh 100d should probably be viewed in the same light. At the instance of Brahmā the still petrified gods turn their minds towards Śarva (*praśemur manasā śarvam* [SP 51, BP 36.47, 30 Cf. *Wackernagel* 1896: 342 (§287b).]
LP 52)], whereas a minor textual inconsequence in the MKh permits them to bow (pranatāh) at that as well (MKh 115ab). The Māheśvara-khaṇḍa then inserts a stotra, in which the gods apologize for their behaviour (MKh 115cd–121ab), which does not occur in the other versions and therefore may be considered an accretion. In MBh 63, SP 52 (BP 36.48), LP 53 and MKh 121cd–122ab the texts converge again: the satisfied Śiva restores the gods to their normal condition. With this ends the episode in the MBh, which continues with its eulogy of Rudra.

In SP 56 (BP 36.52cd–53ab), LP 61cd–62ab and MKh 134cd–135ab Devī finally chooses Śiva as her husband by placing the wreath at his feet. In the next verse(s) the gods express approval by exclaiming 'hail, hail!'. The words saha devyā in LP 63a (MKh 136a) could be construed with sarve devāh in 63c (MKh 136c), which would imply that the Goddess is herself honouring instead of being honoured as is the case in SP 57. Apart from the fact that the Sanskrit construction is rather cumbersome, this does not fit the situation, all the less so, since taking saha devyā with the subject of namaś cakruḥ would normally

---

31 The reading of BP 36.52a, MSNep and MKh 134a, menire, looks like a corruption (metathesis) of the text as found in SP and LP, whereas the reading of LP 58d seems a corruption of the reading as found in MKh 134b, possibly caused by LP's transposition of this hemistich. Our placing of this hemistich after 61ab, however, does not solve the problem (note that MSNep reads digōvarāh to avoid the awkwardness). LP 61c has preserved the no doubt correct reading hrṣṭā of SP 56a, while MKh reads drṣṭā (134c), echoing the mistaken conception underlying LP and MKh, viz. that the Goddess has only just now, after receipt of a supreme eye, seen her future spouse.
entail that the Goddess is also part of the subject of *samprocya* in LP 62c and MKh 135c, which, however, is undesirable as it is totally inappropriate. If, on the other hand, we take *saha devyā* with the object clause LP 62d and MKh 135d, this would also result in an awkward construction (*tayā* along with *saha devyā*). In short, we may conclude that the reformulation and elaboration of the final verses in LP and MKh is rather unfortunate and illustrates once more the value of the SP for the understanding of these two Purāṇas as printed.

Summarizing, we may say that the corruptions and elaborations in the second part of the text which is without counterpart in the MBh confirm the tentative conclusion reached above, viz. that the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa represents a later version of the myth as told in LP, whereas the wording of the latter deviates again from the text as preserved in the ancient Skandapurāṇa, without improving upon it, however, in any respect. On the contrary, the collation clearly shows that the corresponding text portions of the Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhaṇḍa successively derived from an archetype that represented a corrupted version of SP. The Brahmapurāṇa version of the myth is an independent copy of the SP text, which does not seem to have a direct connection with the archetype from which the Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhaṇḍa derived. Corruptions and omissions show the dependency of the Brahmapurāṇa on SP and not *vice versa*. The textual distortions that the Brahmapurāṇa has in common with the Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhaṇḍa, notably in the passages SP 35–38 and SP 48–49, seem to point to a slightly altered version of the S recension of SP that is not, or only partly represented in our MS material.

The wording of the SP, in its turn, does not show direct dependency on the MBh, but nevertheless elucidates it considerably, since it preserved the context from which the verses in the MBh may have been borrowed. We thus have stumbled upon a layer in the process of composition of the MBh that has been transmitted incompletely – and consequently incomprehensibly – in the MS tradition of the epic. One explanation of this phenomenon could be that in the course of this MS transmission, at an early stage, for one reason or another a significant text passage had been lost and that only the Telugu and Grantha traditions preserved a vestige thereof. However, the hemistich MBh 7.1460* (*ad* 7.173.58; see above p. 15) makes the impression of being secondary, i. e. of being an explanatory interpolation. A copyist of the

32 The commentary of Ganaśa Nātu is equally ambiguous on this point, although it seems most natural to me that he construes *saha devyā* with the subject. The *daṇḍa* after *sirobhiḥ* is misplaced anyway.
Telugu and Grantha lines of transmission may have known the myth through the Purāṇa tradition. On the other hand, the textual incongruity at issue could itself have been caused by an early infelicitous interpolation in the text of the Dronāparvan. The interpolator may have known the myth of Pārvatī's svayāmvara and may have carelessly used elements of it to embellish the eulogy of Śiva, an example of what I elsewhere have called ‘composition-in-transmission’. If this were the case, it probably was a very early interpolation, not only because the passage is found in all major MSS, but also in the reprise in book 13. A third possibility is that a diaskeuast who worked on the Dronāparvan composed his text by drawing upon disparate texts and that one of these texts contained the myth of Pārvatī's svayāmvara. In this connection the question arises how we should conceive of the nature of this text, a question that may also be formulated as follows: how did the redactor of this part of the Dronāparvan proceed? Did he have written texts at his disposal or did he collect his material from memory, that is, was he acquainted with a corpus of orally transmitted mythology out of which corpus he selected those parts that he could use? In view of the Vedic roots of two of the themes of the svayāmvara myth, it seems likely to me that the myth of Pārvatī's svayāmvara circulated before it found its place in the SP, or in its garbled form in the MBh for that matter. Whether this circulation had an oral or written basis, or was actually an interplay of the two, is a question that has a direct bearing on our understanding of the process of composition of the Mahābhārata itself, a question that falls beyond the scope of the present investigation.
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SKANDAPURĀṆA 13.28–57 AND ITS PARALLELS

A Critical and Synoptic Edition
बालमाधवां कृत्वा
स्वयं पद्मानिनः पुनः।
उमा जिज्ञासामान्ये
को यमित्यंग्रीत्सुरानः॥ ५९

मासां प्रगृहं देवाणां तु
स्थितायां देवसंसदि।
श्रीकैरागेते देवेऽः॥ २८

देवाय जिज्ञासता शम्भुरः
भूता पद्मानिनः गिनः।
उत्सङ्गतं संसूरः
वृक्ष सहस्व विनः॥ २९

अक्ष्माद्वध तं देवी
गिनः पद्मानिनः स्थितम्।
श्रीता योगसमाधानाज्
जाहे च प्रसीतसङ्गः॥ ३०

अथ तस् श्रुतां कथा
काशित्रासातंकता।
निवृतेऽव तदव स्वदी
कृत्वा हुदिं सनवे तु॥ ३१

* T, G₂—₄ insert: देवाय: श्रवं सवे वृश्चिकः पुनः। 59a श्रुताः। हृदा D₄,₁,₄ T G₂—₄ M₃,₅ 59ab ] तं श्रवंसवे
हृदा श्रावे पद्मानिनः पुनः। MBh 13.145.30ab 59c ] उमा जिज्ञासामान्ये देवे S K₃ D₁,₈ G₁ M₁,₁,₃ and ad MBh 13.145.30c D₁,₁,₂,₄,₆,₈—₁₀ T₁, उमा जिज्ञासामान्ये: G₂, 59d ] को यमित्यंग्रीत्सुरानः: G₃, श्रावे: को यमित्यंग्रीत्सुरानः: D₄—₉ ad MBh 13.145.30d 59d सुरानः] स तत्र B₂, तत्व MBh 13.145.30d ( हृदा: D₁₀ T G₁,₄) After 59 N inserts: अस्तुपत्तिः श्रावे बृक्तेऽव प्रहुदिः॥ (= MBh 13.145.31ab) 28d उपागेते: ] उपागेते B₉ 30a अथ] एव B₉ 30c योगसमाधानाज्] तं समवे-भावानाज् B₉ 30d जाहे ] जगृहे B₉ गि रे B₉ 31b काशित्रासातंकता।] कन्नूर्ति प्रायः B₉ *संसूरः] से *संसूरितम् R B₉ (B₉ संसूरम्), *संकल्पा ( *कुला A₁) A 31c निवृतेऽव] निवृत्वा च B₉ (B₉ निवृत्वेऽव) 31d हुदिं सनवे तु] सा हुदिं तं मिन्दुम B₉
Parvati's Svayamvara

Lingapurana 1.102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पार्वती'स स्वयम्वर</th>
<th>माहेश्वरकंड अध्याय 2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>चामरासकहलताभिर</td>
<td>चामरासकहलताभिर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दिव्यस्वीभिष संतुता</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मालां गृह्वा जया तस्यौ</td>
<td>मालां गृह्वा सा तस्यौ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सुरुसमुज्जवाम्</td>
<td>सुरुसमुज्जवाम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बिजया व्यजन गृह्वा</td>
<td>एवं तस्यं स्तिथतायं तु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्तिथतायं देवसदिद</td>
<td>स्तिथते लोकत्रये तदा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रीमूर्त्तित्वा महादेवं</td>
<td>श्रीमूर्त्तित्वा महादेवं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कौदायं वृषभवजं</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उत्सङ्गुज्जलसुसो</td>
<td>उल्लङ्गुज्जलसुसो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बभूव भगवान्वेव</td>
<td>बभूव भगवान्वेव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29ab</td>
<td>जयेति यत्पद व्यांते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>तस्य सत्यार्थमिथ्यः</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27a गृह्वा जया तस्यौ | गृह्वा सा तस्यौ |
MSAd 27cd गृह्वा स्तिथता | गृह्वा स्तिथता |
MSAd 100cd–101 ] The editor remarks: अस्य साभोक्ष्यायेऽ यथापदस्तव्यं नायाज्ञाते |
MSAd Ad 28 the commentator Ganeśa Nātu |
MSAd 101d दैवरकः | दैवरकः Venk. Ed. The पदास 101cd are clearly an accretion.
Mahābhārata 7.173

Skandapurāṇa 13 (Bṛ 36.27–54)

tatto dṛṣṭā śīśu deva
devam utdsūrvarthīnaṃ.
kā āryamāṇaṃ sannidhā
cuṣṭāsūramadānaṃ II 32
kōṣāmakāryatīta
bāhuśūkṣmaṃ vṛthaka.
s bāhuḥśūkṣmaṃ tītā
tathēva samsthitaṃ II 33
sattvamātaṃ vijñānena
devedanām śāmyaṇa.
vaṃ kṣetraḥ nā shākak
bāhuḥ chātiṣyataḥ n ch II 34

bhūgo nām tatō dev
āvidvā: kāmavye bālī.
udāśyam muśalantīṃiṃ
ekṣetramājñgamihāṃ:

tatvāyam bhāsavāhū
tathēvasūkṣmaṃtvadā II 35
śīr: prakṛtyanvayagnyā:
sakṣojitamvīkṣita,
tatvāyam śīrāśaṃ dev:
śālītyaṃ prakārā ā II 36

60ab ] svāṃ svāṃ sthīmyaṃsāṃ nā bāhuḥ pārśvapāmāṃ II
MBh 13.145.31cd After 60ab N inserts
eight sūkṣmas that elaborate on 61 and 62 (not in
MBh 13.145)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liṅgapurāṇa 1.102</th>
<th>Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अथ दृश्या शिशुः देवास्</td>
<td>अथ दृश्या शिशुः देवास्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तस्या उत्सववित्तमम् 29cd</td>
<td>तस्या उत्सववित्तमम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>को विमर्शेति समन्नयः</td>
<td>को विमर्शेति समन्नयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भूषयुभि समगताः</td>
<td>भूषयुभि समगताः 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वजः माहार्यस्तात्तयः</td>
<td>वजः माहार्यस्तात्तयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बाहुमुखाय वृजः 30</td>
<td>बाहुमुखाय वृजः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स बाहुरुक्तस्तात्तयः</td>
<td>स बाहुरुक्तस्तात्तयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तथाव समपुर्वितः</td>
<td>तथाव समपुर्वितः 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्तम्भेति शिशुरुपेण</td>
<td>स्तम्भेति शिशुरुपेण</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>देववेन लीलया 31</td>
<td>देववेन लीलया</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वजः क्षेत्रं न श्राक</td>
<td>वजः क्षेत्रं न श्राक 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बाहु चातिष्ठतत्वं तथा 132ab</td>
<td>बाहु चातिष्ठतत्वं तथा</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

चकार स्फुटिते छ ते 109cd

| शिरः प्रक्ष्मयवनिष्ठ्युष्य् | चक्रमुखाय संस्थितः 36cd |
| तस्यापि शिरसो बालः | तस्यापि बालः |
| स्थिरवत्त्व प्रकार हृ | स्थिरवत्त्व प्रकार हृ |
| वजः क्षेत्रं न श्राक | वजः क्षेत्रं न श्राक 37 |
| बाहुबालितं न च | बाहुबालितं न च |

29d तस्या | तथा MS\textsuperscript{Nep} 31a उद्धरणः | 102b तस्य | तस्य conj. | 37d वेंक. Ed. | 109c भग्य | भग्य conj.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पृष्ठ</th>
<th>दन्तान्द्रशन्दन्ते</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>शर्मसैक्षत्त मोहितः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तस्यापि दशना: पेतुरु</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इश्मात्रत्य शम्भुनर 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>यमस्य स्तम्भितो दण्डस्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेजो वृष्ण: सशो: प्रभा</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बल वायोस्तप्तान्येषा</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| तत्स्तत्ववविवीकसाम् |
| बलं तेजः योगं च |
| तथेवास्तम्भव्यं: 38 |
| अथ तेषु स्थतेषेवं |
| मन्दुमल्लु सुरेषु 39ab |

| 61d | तत्स्तत्ववविवीकसाम् |
| न संबुधिरे चैनं |
| देवास्तं भुवनेश्वरम् |
| सप्रजापतिः: सर्वं |
| बालाकृतिश्रुश्रभम् 61 |

<p>| 37cd | A reads these pādas after 38 38ef |
| Bpur reads these pādas after 35 39b 39h 39j |
| S.E., B R Bpur | After 39ab R inserts: |
| नारायणल्लु शर्मं लेप्ता तां ऊळ्ळा तिहति लीलया |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lingapurāṇa 1.102</th>
<th>Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पूषा दन्तान्ध-शन्दन्तैर्</td>
<td>पूषा दन्तान्ध-शन्दन्तैर्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बालमेघं बोधित्।</td>
<td>बालमेघं बोधित्। 108cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत्स्यावि दशनः पुत्रृ</td>
<td>तत्स्यावि दशनः पुत्रृ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दृष्टमात्रस्य सम्भवनाः। 38</td>
<td>दृष्टमात्रस्य सम्भवनाः। 109ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विन्धः शकि तथा क्षेत्रं</td>
<td>विन्धः शकि तदा क्षेत्रं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न शासक तथास्थितिः। 32cd</td>
<td>न शासक तथोपस्थितः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>यमो। दण्डः खर्जः। च</td>
<td>यमो। दण्डः खर्जः। च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निर्भितसं बिनिपुर्णः।</td>
<td>निर्भितसं बिनिपुर्णः। 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वर्णो नागाश्रं च</td>
<td>पांशं च वर्णो राजा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भजयर्द्वे समेचनः। 33</td>
<td>भजयर्द्वे समेचनः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सीमो गदां भनेश्वर</td>
<td>सीमो गुड़ भनेश्वर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दण्डः दण्डभूता वरः।</td>
<td>गदां सुमहरू इद्राम्। 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इवाननश तथा शूलं</td>
<td>नानायुक्तानि बादित्या</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तीक्ष्मयुक्त्यं संस्थितं। 34</td>
<td>मुसलं बसवस्था।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>रूपन्त शूलमात्या</td>
<td>महाभोगानि शास्त्रणि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मुखं समिर्तं सवे</td>
<td>तारकायां दानवः। 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>देवनाश्वं दिवेकसः। 35</td>
<td>स्तम्भितता देवदेवन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तथायथे च दिवेकसः। 36ab</td>
<td>तथायथे भूवनेश्वरे। 108ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बलं तेजश्च योगं च</td>
<td>बलं तेजश्च योगं च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तथेवात्मनम्बिस्तुषु।</td>
<td>सवधं गणं भूषं।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अथ तेषु स्थितेश्वर</td>
<td>अथ तेषु स्थितेश्वर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मन्युमल्लु सुरेश्वरी। 39</td>
<td>मन्युमल्लु सुरेश्वरी। 110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38c दशनः | दशनः MSNp 32c शकिं | तथा क्षेत्रः | क्षेत्रः तथा शाकिः MSNp 39c एव | एव MSNp 39d मन्युमल्लु | श्लिबद्धेन MSNp
32c सर्वेः | सर्वेः जगहेः भूषः।| 108b तपायने। तथा न Vang. Ed. 110a
39c पोषां। योगं च conj.
30

H. Bakker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahābhārata 7.173</th>
<th>Skandapurāṇa 13 (Bpu 36.27–54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अथावेद्य ततो ढ्रामः</td>
<td>ढ्रामः परसपविग्नो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द्वाः च स महेष्वरम्</td>
<td>ध्यानमास्याय सादरम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अयं श्रेष्ठ इति ज्ञाता</td>
<td>बुबुधे देवदेवेशाम्</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

बबबे तं पितामहः || 62

अस्तुवचः पितामहः।

पौराणिकः सामागमिते: पुष्पाश्रयं दुःस्वाममिथभिः।

अजस्त्वममरो देव ढ्रामः हत्ति विभु: परः।

प्रभाणपुरुपस्तववं ढ्रामः भैये तदकस्यम्।

अमृतं परमाला च ईशरः कारणं महत्।

ढ्रामः कृत्तकुते: ढ्रामः

सर्वसंस्कर्मेषः || 42


लव यहो भूनस्वाल्या लव गतिलं पराप्यम्।

लव भवस्य महादेवस्य धामम परमं पदम्।

लव वर्षिन्ति धामम जगान्त्वहराजङ्गम्।

भगवन्नृत्तमयेष तोकनाध जगलते।

प्रसाद कुल शकुनि लवा कोभारितम् हे॥ ३ व्यास उच्चाः।

पद्योनेवः: शुचि ततः प्रसादो महेषः।

प्रसादाधिभुविसे शूचि बालस्माधिनरमेलेः || 3


मुनिभाषाय मोक्षस्वतः देव न शक्ति:॥ १ अमरो महादेव वत्सः च व्यायामः।

महासरण महाकल्यां लवमकल्याः प्रभो॥ २
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द्रव्य समस्विनो
ध्यानमालकाय शंकरम्।
बुधः देवमीशानम्
उमोतस्ते तमस्विनीतम्॥ ४०
स बुधः देवमीशाने
शीघ्रमुन्याय विस्मितः।
ववदे चरणो शाम्भोर्
अस्तुस्व वितामहः॥ ४१
पुराणे सामसगीते:
पुष्याःपुष्याःनामभिः।
ब्रह्म त्यं सबलोकानां
प्रकृतेश प्रवर्तकः॥ ४२
बुधिन्त्यं सबलोकानाम्
आहंकारस्विनीशः।
भूतानामिनिभयाऽन
त्वमेवेश प्रवर्तकः॥ ४३
तवाः दक्षिणाःदस्तात्
सृष्टि पूर्वः पुराणमः।
वामहतामभावाहो
देवो नारायणः: प्रभुः॥ ४४

40d) उमोतस्तुसमस्विनीं MSRād. Ad 40 Ganeśa Nātu comments: परस्विनो द्रश्य ध्यानमालकाय उमोतस्तु आस्विना तमस्वेते ईशान तर्किण्याः वर्ते देवे बुधः हल्यायः॥ 41a स बुधः महत् MSmr 42b पुराणे पुष्याःपुष्याः Ad 42 Ganeśa Nātu comments: पुराणे ग्राम्योः सामसगीते: सामाग्मवेश्रित्यः॥
Mahābhārata 7.173  Skandapurāṇa 13 (Bpur 36.27–54)

इयं च प्रकृतिर्देव
सदा ते सुधिकारणम्।
पलीर्पण समास्याय
जगत्कारणमागता॥ 43
नमस्तुभ्य संदेशान
देवयाशेव सदा नामः।
प्रसादात्तब देवेश
नियोगाम मया ज्ञातः॥ 44
देवायास्त इमे सुधा
मृदुस्त्वचोगोमोहितः।
कुरु प्रसादनेतथा
यथापूवः भवन्त्यमे॥ 45

तत् एवं तदा ब्रह्मा
विज्ञाय परमेश्वरम्।
स्तम्भितानस्वेदवास्तानू
इमाह महापुरुषः॥ 46
मुद्रा: स्थः देवता: सर्वेः
नैनुः कुप्यथ शकरम्।
देवदेवमहायात्
समस्वोर्पतिकारणम॥ 47
अयं वहान महादेवः
शास्त्रों भीमः कपिदिमान्।
उद ईशान आत्मा च
अजः शंकर एवं च॥ 48

अहंकर्मेव न जानामि चेष्टा यत् महेश्वर।
कथं विद्विश्च कित्र विद्वशं गम्भीरं गहनास्तिकः॥ 3
43a देव । SE, देवी R ABpur  44a
संदेशान । महावर Bpur  44b । देवशा कै
सहितायो व Bpur  45a । देवे । SAE, तु
इमे R, तु औम: Bpur  45b । मोहितः: ।
मायाय Bpur  46a तदा ब्रह्मा । अहं विना
Bpur  46d आह महापुरुषः । चाहत तदोक्ष्यान
Bpur  47a मुद्रा: स्यः । S, मुद्रा स्या सः,
मृदुस्त्वैः A1,3, मृदुस्त्वैः A2, । ते R, मृदुस्त्वैः Bpur
सर्वेः । सर्वो Bpur  47b कुप्यथ: । SRE, कुप्यथ
A Bpur  47cd–49cd om. Bpur
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हयं च प्रकृतिर्देवी
सदा ते सुषिकारण।
पशुपं समास्थाय
जवालकारणमार्गत। 45

नमस्तृयं महादेव
महादेव्येष नमो नमः।
प्रसादतव देश
नियोगः मया प्रजः। 46

deva-daśatlum īma: sūtra
muddatapraṇamahita:।
कृष्ण प्रसादमेधाता
वथापूव्व भविष्यमे॥ 47

सूत उवाच।
विवाहीवं तदा श्रीमा
देवदेवं महेश्वरम्।
संस्कृतात्त्वदा तेन
भगवानाः पदयः॥ 48

मूदा: स्थ देवता: सवाँ
नैव वृङ्गत शकरम्।
केतासिहायातां
सबदेवनमस्तृतम॥ 49

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

नमस्तृयं महादेव
महादेव्येष नमो नमः॥ 112cd
प्रसादतव बुधाविदृष्टि
जगदेतिध्रवति।

मूदाच देवता: सर्वाः
नैव बुधतं शकरम्॥ 113

महादेवमहायातं
सबदेवनमस्तृतम॥ 114ab

45b *कारण [ *कारणम् MS\textsuperscript{Nep} 47a

हस्त: ] मया MS\textsuperscript{Nep} 47d हसे ]
हे MS\textsuperscript{Nep} 48c संस्कृतात्त्वदा
स्तवमिहायातां महासम् 49a मूदा: स्थ [
Muddatapraṇam Venk. Ed., Muddatapraṇam MS\textsuperscript{Nep} Ad 49ab

Ganapāśa Nātu comments: सवाँ देवता: शकरं
न मुदाचार्यो मूदा मूदातुः सहिष्नुने बर्तमाना
हस्ते॥ 49c *आयातं [ *आयातं

Vang. Ed.

113a बुधाविद् ] बुधाविद् conj. 113cd ]

The editor remarks: किमि शिराः अध्यात्मज्ञानः. The reading of these two pādās
is no doubt a corruption of SP 47ab, but due to
the fact that the change in those addressed (from
Śiva to the gods) has been omitted in the M\textsuperscript{Nep}
(i.e. the equivalent of SP 46) a 'correct' reading
would make a rather awkward transition.
देवदेवः पर् धाम
ईशः पञ्चपति चति।
जगा\(s\)महा जयदत्
जगा\(s\)संस्थितकरणम्\(\text{II} 49\)
गच्छवत् शरण \(\text{श्रीकृष्ण}^2\)
एतमेवामरेशरा।

सार्थं मयेव देवेन्त
परमात्मानमव्ययम्\(\text{II} 50\)

ततस्त्त स्मिव
तपेत्व विद्वितौकसः।
प्रणेमुमनसा शरै
भावशुद्धेन चेतसा\(\text{II} 51\)

---

50b एतम् \(\text{रस}^2\) एवम् \(S_2\), एवम् \(B^w\)
एवामरेशराः। एव \(\text{महेंशरम्} B^w\) After
50 R and A insert:

\(\text{पर्वस्ते} \text{स्मिवहि} \text{विद्वरुपः}\)

51c शरै \(\text{S} E B^w\), सर्वे \(R\), सर्वे \(A_{1,2}\), सर्वे \(A_3\)
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गच्छध्यं शरणं श्रीः
देवः श्रणपुरोगमा:।
सनातनायणकाः सर्वेः
मूलिभ: शकरं प्रभुम्॥ 50
साधे मयेव देवेशं
परमात्मानमीशरम्।
अन्या हैवल्या च
प्रकृत्वा सहः सत्तमम्॥ 51
तत्र ते सत्तमितास्तेन
तथेऽव सुरसत्तमा:।
प्रेम्युभुम्ननसा सर्वेः
सनातनायणकाः प्रभुम्॥ 52

यदि जीवितमिच्छ्वत॥ 114cd

तत् संब्रमसंपन्नास्

तुढ़ु: प्रणः सुरः।
नमो नमो महादेव
पार्थ पार्थ अगतपते॥ 115
दुराचारान्यवानस्मान्
आत्माणोऽपरायणाः।
अहो नश्यत नो मैये
जानन्तस्त्व भाविनीम॥ 116
भार्यामुन्या महादेवै
तथाघ्न्यम समागता:॥ 117ab

50b शक्* ] शक* Venk. Ed. 51b
परमात्मान् ] परमात्मः Venk. Ed. (hypo-
सत्तमम् ] सत्तमम्) उत्तम MS<sup>np</sup>

तत: प्रसादयामासुरः
उमारूढ़ च ते सुराः ।
अभववम पुनराहुः
यथाप्रकृति वर्षिः॥ ६३
तेषाः प्रसन्नो भगवान्
सप्तीको वृषभजः ।
देवानां निदश्याहैं
दक्षयज्ञविनाशनः॥ ६४

अथ तेषां प्रसन्नो दृश्यः
देवदेवो महेश्वरः ।
यथापुर्वः चकाराशु
देवतानां तनूस्तदा॥ ५२

63b उमारूढ़। तदा स K1-3 D1,4-8 63cd।
ब्रह्म स तदा ग्राहत्वहन्तुर्यया पुराः॥ MBh
13.145.34cd
Parvati's Svayamvara

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

युक्मेताश्यस्माकं
राज्य गृह्वेत चाचुराः। ॥ 117cd

खेलामहविव्रा बुद्धिर्
अस्माभि: किं शृं तत्तिवद्।

अभ वा नो न दोषो विन्दि
पश्चात् हि वयं यत:। ॥ 118

त्वैव पतिना सर्वं
प्रेरिता: कृमेहें विभो।

ईश्वर: सर्वभूतानां
प्रतिस्वं परमेश्वर:। ॥ 119

भ्रामयस्यवित विशं
यन्त्रार्बद्व लक्ष्मियाः।

ऐन विभाविदा मुखः:
समायाता: स्वयंवरम्॥ 120

tस्मै पशुनां उत्सर्वे
नमस्तुप्रय त्रिसीद:।

अथ तेषां प्रसन्नो श्रृः
देवदेवस्त्रयाबकः।

यथपूर्वः चकाराशु
वचनाद्वृत्तम्: प्रभु:॥ 53

तारकामुखा देत्या:
संकृद्वास्त्र ग्रोचिरेः॥ 122

53b] देवदेवो महेश्वरः MS Bod

120ab ] cf. Bhag. Gītā 18.61cd 120c

विभाविदा ] विभाविदा हैं पा। (Venk. Ed.)
तत एवं प्रवृत्ते तु
सर्वदेवविवारणे।
वपृश्चार देवेशस्
स्वतं परमहृदातम्।
तेजसा यस्य देवास्ते

चरुप्राधे यन्त्रमुम ॥ ५३

५३० यस्य | SRE, तस्य A B^p | देवास्ते ]
ते भवताय [ B^p ५३१ ] चरु: सर्वेद्नयीलवन्
B^p
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liṅgapurāṇa 1.102</th>
<th>Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>को सयम्भु महादेवो&lt;br&gt;न मन्यामो वयं च तत्म्।</td>
<td>वयं महादेवप्रभावेन&lt;br&gt;देत्याना घोरकर्मणाम।&lt;br&gt;वयं यथं प्रभावो हि&lt;br&gt;देवदेश्युः फाल्गुन।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत: प्रहण्वर्तो रसी&lt;br&gt;हुकार लीतया व्यवहार॥ 123</td>
<td>कथ्मीच्छविवकार्यसूर&lt;br&gt;तस्मादन्युः मुच्यते।&lt;br&gt;असंशयं विमूढःवाते&lt;br&gt;पश्चातः पुरा महान॥ 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत: एवं प्रकर्णे तु</td>
<td>तत: सत्तुमानाः स&lt;br&gt;सुरैः पदमुवादिभि॥ 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सवैदेविन्दराणाम्।</td>
<td>वपुष्कार देवेशः&lt;br&gt;अयं यथं प्रभावः।&lt;br&gt;तेजसा तत्व देवस्यते&lt;br&gt;सेन्द्रचन्द्रिविाकरः॥ 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वपुष्कार देवेशः:</td>
<td>समाध्याघः&lt;br&gt;सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अयम्यं परमम्भुतम्॥ 54</td>
<td>समाध्याघः&lt;br&gt;वसूविषे च देवाः।&lt;br&gt;चब्रुप्राप्यन्नभुमुः॥ 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेजसा तत्व देवस्यते&lt;br&gt;सेन्द्रचन्द्रिविाकरः:।</td>
<td>सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सेन्द्रचन्द्रिविाकरः:।</td>
<td>सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>समाध्याघः&lt;br&gt;सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
<td>सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
<td>सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चब्रुप्राप्यन्नभुमुः। 56ab</td>
<td>चब्रुप्राप्यन्नभुमुः। 56ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54a प्रस्फो | प्रस्फो MS<sup>শ</sup> Ad 54 Ganeśa<br>Nātu comments: सवैदेविन्दराणां सवैदेविपरः<br>प्रृयामारामतर्यं। Ad 55 Ganeśa Nātu comments: तव शिवस्य तेजसा सवाराणागकास्यभा॥ 55<br>चब्रुप्राप्यन्नभुमुः। 56b | प्रायः बिभो: MS<sup>श</sup>
Mahābhārata 7.173

Skandapurāṇa 13 (Bp 36.27-54)

तेम्यः परमकं ब्रह्मः
स्वपुरुषिः शिविरमिति.
प्रायदत्यरमदेवेषा:

अपश्यंस्ते तदा प्रमुन्म ॥ 54

tे हृद्रा परमेश्वरं
तृतीयेश्वराधारिषम् ॥

भ्राता नेमिरे तृप्ति
सर्व एव सुरेश्चा: ॥ 55

तस्य देवी तदा हृदा
समक्षं त्रिविकलासम्।
पादयो: स्थायामास
खङ्गालाममिति पुते: ॥ 56

54a परमकं ] स परमम् Bp 54c
*देवेषा ] *देवेषम् Bp 54d प्रभुम् विभुम्
Bp 55c ] श्रावण्यं नेतिरे देवा: 56a
हृदा ] S A1-3 E Bp, हृद्द A4, (इ) हर
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lingapurana 1.102</th>
<th>MahaSvarakanda 2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तेय्यः परमं चन्द्रः</td>
<td>तेय्यः परतमं चन्द्रः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सन्दुः च शकिमत्।</td>
<td>सन्दुः च शकिमत्।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ददायःपातिः सर्वं</td>
<td>ददायःपातिः सर्वं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भवायाऽशाचलस्य च।</td>
<td>भवायाऽशाचलस्य च।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लभ्या चन्द्रेन्द्रदाया</td>
<td>लभ्या रुप्रासदेन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इन्द्रविष्णुरोगणा।।</td>
<td>इन्द्रविष्णुरोगणा।।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सम्यकः सयस्यक्षः</td>
<td>सम्यकः सयस्यक्षः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तपस्यन्महेश्वरम्। 58ab</td>
<td>तपस्यन्महेश्वरम्। 131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ससुः पुण्युःष्टः च  | ततो जयुः मुनयः  |
| सेचेष्टः सिद्धचारणः।। 59 | पुण्युःष्टः च सेचेष्टः।  |
| देवडुःभो देवडुः  | मुनुः तद्व देवडुः  |
| तुडुःसःनयः प्रभुः।। 132 | जुगुःन्यावेसधुः  |
| जुगुःन्यावेसधुः  | नजुःसःनयःप्रगणः।  |
| नजुःसःनयःप्रगणः।। 60 | मुनुःसःनयःः सर्वः  |
| मुनोदाम्बा च पावती।। 61ab | मुनोदाम्बा च पावती।। 133 |
| ब्रह्मः नेनिरे तृणी  | ब्रह्मः नेनिरे पृणी  |
| भवानी च गिरीष्करः।। 58cd | भवानी च गिरीष्करः।  |
| तस्य देवी तद्व दुःष्टः  | तस्य देवी ततो दुःष्टः  |
| समां विबधोक्ताम्।। 61cd | समां विबधोक्ताम्।। 134 |
| पादयोः स्पर्शयामाः  | पादयोः स्पर्शयामाः  |
| मालं द्वियोः सुगंधिनिम्।। 62ab | मालं द्वियोः सुगंधिनिम्।। 135ab |

56cd | तेय्यः परतरं चन्द्रः स्वपुरुःसन्धनःकमाः
MS® | 56d | 56b | 56a | शकिमत् | शकिमान्
MS® | 57b | 57a | 57c | च चलस्य
Venk. Ed. | Ad 57 Ganesh Nātut comments:
अभायः | जगाजन्यः | प्रकृति | परिधः | 59b | समाता | *सहमा | MS®
61a | मुनुः | मुनुः | MS® | 58c | नेनिरे |
61b | नेनिरे | MS® | 58d | गिरीष्करः | दिनीष्करः |
MS® | Ad 61-62ab Ganesh Nātut comments:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skandapurāṇa 13 (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Purāṇa 2.5.1-54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>साधु साधिति संप्रोच्यं</td>
<td>देवतास्ते पुनविभुम्य।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>देव्या नमः</td>
<td>शिरोभृततांतामिते: ॥ ५७</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57b देवोऽस्ते | सर्वे देवा: Bṛhāraṇyaka Purāṇa 2.5.1-54
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liṅgapurāṇa 1.102</th>
<th>Māheśvarakhāṇḍa 2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>साधु साधिष्ठिति संग्रोष्य</td>
<td>साधु साधिष्ठिति संग्रोष्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तया त्रैव चार्चितम् 62cd</td>
<td>तया तत्र चविवितम् 135cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सहु देव्या नम्भकृ:</td>
<td>सहु देव्या नम्भकृ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शिरोभृंहूलालिनि:</td>
<td>शिरोभृंहूलालिनि:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वं सन्ध्वुक्ता देवा:</td>
<td>सर्वं सन्ध्वुक्ता देवा:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वं सन्ध्वुक्ता देवा:</td>
<td>सर्वं सन्ध्वुक्ता देवा:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सय्योरगरावः 63</td>
<td>सय्योरगरावः 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

सर्वं श्रेलाचित्रमुखः: गणपा: मुमुर्वहर्ष्या भूतिर्पर्यः। इत्य देवी विविषाकां समक्ष सत्य श्रव्य पाद्यसात्मक्षी माणा स्थाप्यायामसेव्यामेश्यायः। Ad 62cd–63 Ganeśa Nātu comments: तया पाद्यप्रेत अहिरं माणसमपेशने पुरुषित जिन साधु साधिष्ठिति संग्रोष्य त्रैव तत्वित्वक वाश्ये देव्या सहु भृंहूलालिनि: शिरोभृंहूलालिनि:। सर्वं देवा: होऽ्र मन्भकृतिः पुरुषेचेताय: 63b: सत्वालिनि: ] *तत्वालिनि: MSιν

135d चविवितम् चार्चितम् conj. 136d च मुदा। सतिः: ह* पा* (Venk. Ed.)