



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Inclusivism revisited: the worship of other gods in the Śivadharmasāstra, the Skandapurāṇa and the Nīśvāsamukha

Bisschop, P.C.; Mirnig, N.; Rastelli, M.; Eltschinger, V.

Citation

Bisschop, P. C. (2019). Inclusivism revisited: the worship of other gods in the Śivadharmasāstra, the Skandapurāṇa and the Nīśvāsamukha. In N. Mirnig, M. Rastelli, & V. Eltschinger (Eds.), *Tantric communities in context* (pp. 511-537). Wien: VÖAW. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3280948>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3280948>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Inclusivism revisited: The worship of other gods in the *Śivadharmasāstra*, the *Skandapurāṇa*, and the *Niśvāsamukha*

Peter Bisschop

Inclusivism has been famously described by Paul Hacker as a “typically Indian thought form,” defined as “claiming for, and thus including in, one’s own religion what really belongs to an alien sect” (HACKER 1995: 244).¹ The term was used by Hacker in particular, though not exclusively, to characterise certain tendencies of modern Hinduism and to criticise a perceived Hindu rhetoric of tolerance towards other religions. Hacker further added that the inclusivist method “was employed especially by such religious groups as felt themselves inferior to their environment” (HACKER 1995: 245). In his contribution to the volume “Inklusivismus: Eine indische Denkform” (1983), Albrecht Wezler has argued that it may rather reflect a struggle for power between a new and an old form of religion, giving expression to an inversion of power relationships.² Such an understanding of inclusivism would make sense in the case of Śaivism, since it appears com-

¹ See also HACKER 1983: 12: “Inklusivismus bedeutet, daß man erklärt, eine zentrale Vorstellung einer fremden religiösen oder weltanschaulichen Gruppe sei identisch mit dieser oder jener zentralen Vorstellung der Gruppe, zu der man selber gehört. Meistens gehört zum Inklusivismus ausgesprochen oder unausgesprochen die Behauptung, daß das Fremde, in irgendeiner Weise ihm untergeordnet oder unterlegen sei. Ferner wird ein Beweis dafür, daß das Fremde mit dem Eigenen identisch sei, meist nicht unternommen.” For a critical, highly subjective and downright distortive review of Hacker’s scholarship and all scholars following in his wake, see BAGCHEE and ADLURI 2014, who argue that it is contaminated by Hacker’s personal underlying Evangelical motivations.

² See WEZLER 1983: 90: “(...) daß der ‘Inklusivismus’ als Versuch der Legitimierung wesentlich darin besteht, daß sich die Minderheit einer ‘neuen’ Glaubensgemeinschaft der Übermacht der etablierten Traditionen dadurch zu erwehren trachtet, daß sie die real gegebenen Machtverhältnisse umkehrt, d.h. für sich selbst den Anspruch auf Höherwertigkeit erhebt und das ‘Alte’ in sich ‘hineinnimmt.’”

paratively late on the scene and as such, perhaps more than others, had to secure itself a position among the dominant religious traditions of the time.

The inclusivist tendencies of Śaivism have been noted by Alexis Sanderson in particular with reference to the Mantramārga:

It elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism, the religion of the king manifest in his initiation, his consecration, and his royal temples, thus mirroring and validating the incorporative structure of the state's power.³

An inclusivist attitude has also been recognised by Judit Törzsök in her article “Icons of Inclusivism” (TÖRZSÖK 2003), in which she identifies an inclusivist model in the *maṇḍalas* of early Śaiva Tantras, elaborating on the findings presented in an earlier article by SANDERSON (1986) on the inclusivist *maṇḍalas* of the Trika school of Śaivism. These studies use the term inclusivism in a neutral manner, without the ideological connotations of Hacker's use of the term.

While inclusivist tendencies have been clearly identified in the case of Tantric Śaivism, the traditions of lay Śaivism have received less attention so far.⁴ The present paper proposes to examine, through three examples representative of the lay, non-Tantric Śaiva perspective, whether the inclusivist model is limited to Mantramārga Śaivism alone or is in fact representative of a broader line of thinking in Śaivism. It does so by looking at the representation of the worship of other gods than Śiva in three early Śaiva texts: the *Śivadharmasāstra*, the *Skandapurāṇa*, and the *Niśvāsamukha*.

³ SANDERSON 2009: 301–302.

⁴ Hacker has studied the incorporation of Vaiṣṇava mythology in the Śaiva Purāṇas in his study of Prahlāda (HACKER 1959). On this basis Hacker writes: “Aber immerhin ist mir in denjenigen Stellen śivaitischer Purāṇen, die Gegenstand meiner Untersuchung waren, aufgefallen, daß hier offensichtlich der Śivaismus die unterlegene Religion ist. Wie ich schon sagte, ist der Inklusivismus ein Mittel des Unterlegenen oder des noch Schwachen, des noch in Entwicklung Begriffenen, sich durchzusetzen, sich Geltung zu verschaffen. Die śivaitischen Purāṇen, die ich gesehen habe, machen das deutlich, in manchen Fällen sogar überdeutlich. Die viṣṇuitischen sind ganz anders, sie sind weder inklusivistisch noch tolerant.” (HACKER 1983: 17). This conclusion needs to be reconsidered given that Hacker mainly based himself on Śaiva Purāṇas that can be safely dated to early medieval times, that is to say, a period in Indian history during which Śaivism was actually the dominant party (see SANDERSON 2009).

In varying degrees, the approaches towards other gods in these three texts may be regarded as inclusivist, in the sense that they recognise and teach the worship and existence of other gods but that they do so from a hierarchical perspective, in which the true and ultimate master is Śiva and their power derives from him. The inclusivist stance of early Śaivism may tell us something about the position from which Śaivism started and thus add to a study of Śaivism, and by extension Tantra, in its socio-historical context.

The *Śivadharmasāstra*

The *Śivadharmasāstra* is the first of what grew to be a corpus of eight texts in total, collectively known as the *Śivadharmasāstra* and transmitted as such in a number of palm-leaf and paper manuscripts from Nepal: 1. *Śivadharmasāstra*, 2. *Śivadharmottara*, 3. *Śivadharmasamgraha*, 4. *Śivopaniṣad*, 5. *Umāmaheśvarasamvāda*, 6. *Uttarottaramahāsamvāda*, 7. *Vṛṣasārasamgraha*, and 8. *Dharmaputrikā*.⁵ The *Śivadharmasāstra* is most probably a product of North India and may be tentatively dated to about the sixth to seventh centuries CE.⁶ The work consists of twelve chapters in total and is addressed to a community of lay Śiva worshippers, betraying no influence of Tantric teachings. It is specifically concerned with the methods for installing and worshipping Śiva in the form of the *liṅga*. A characteristic feature of the *Śivadharmasāstra*'s teachings is its notion that those who are exclusively devoted to Rudra are veritable Rudras on earth.⁷

They who always worship Rudra, are no ordinary men (*prakṛti-mānuṣa*).
They are Rudras descended from Rudraloka. There is no doubt about it.⁸

⁵ Manuscripts of the first two works also survive outside of Nepal. The transmission of a Śivadharmasāstra corpus consisting of eight works appears to be limited to Nepal. For more details, see DE SIMINI 2013: 157–161, who proposes to understand the Nepalese manuscripts as “corpus-organizers.”

⁶ See BISSCHOP 2014: 139, n. 13, for references regarding different dates that have been suggested for the composition of different parts of the text.

⁷ On this, see MIRNIG in this volume.

⁸ ŚiDhŚ 1.16:

ye 'rcayanti sadā rudraṃ na te prakṛtimānuṣāḥ |
rudralokāt paribhraṣṭās te rudrā nātra saṃśayaḥ || 16 ||

16ad] Omitted in P2 • 16a *ye 'rcayanti*] C K1 K2 N Ś, *arcayanti* P1 ; *sadā rudraṃ*] C K1 N P1, *mahārudra* K2, *mahārudraṃ* Ś • 16c *rudralokāt*] C K1 N P1 Ś, *rudraloka°* K2 • 16d *nātra*] K1 K2 N P1 Ś, *nānātra* C (unmetr.).

We come across references to other gods in the text, but these are as a rule placed in a relation of strict dependence on Śiva. Thus we are taught in two passages that the gods acquired their position as god through worship of different types of *liṅgas*. The first passage follows after the famous myth about the origin of the *liṅga*, in which Brahmā and Viṣṇu attempt to find its end, but do not succeed in locating it.⁹ After several verses teaching that everything ultimately rests in the *liṅga*¹⁰ and that by installing a *liṅga* one installs everything, we are informed of the following:

All quotations of the *Śivadharmasāstra* in this article are from my own draft edition of the text. For this I have used six manuscripts and the “edition” of the Śivadharm corpus by NARAHARINATH (1998), which appears to be a transcript of a Nepalese manuscript. I have not referred to the most recent edition by JUGNU & SHARMA (2014), since its readings are practically all identical to my manuscript P1. The manuscripts come from different parts of the Indian subcontinent and thus give us some insight into the transmission of the text, but they reflect only a limited sample of the actual surviving manuscripts. As a general policy I have given preference to the readings of K1, an eleventh-century Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript in good condition written by a careful scribe. I am very grateful to Florinda De Simini for having provided me with colour photographs of K1 and Ś. The list of sigla can be found at the end of this article.

⁹ For a study and translation of the Liṅgodbhava story of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, see KAFLE 2013.

¹⁰ One verse in this section (ŚiDhŚ 3.17) deserves special attention because it is quoted in the Buddhist *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*:

*ākāśaṃ liṅgaṃ ity āhuḥ prthivī tasya pīṭhikā |
ālayaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ liyanāl liṅgaṃ ucyate || 17 ||*

17c ālayaḥ] C K1^{pc} K2 P1, ālayaṃ K1^{ac} N • 17d liyanāl] C K1 K2 N, layanāl P1.

The verse is missing in P2 and Ś due to loss of several *pādas* in this part of the text. In the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra* the verse is quoted in connection with Maheśvara’s appearance from Avalokiteśvara’s forehead. Avalokiteśvara predicts that Maheśvara will be active in the Kali age (text and translation of KVSū 265, 4–6 as given by ELTSCHINGER 2014: 84, n. 198):

*bhaviṣyasi tvam maheśvara kaliyuge pratipanne | kaṣṭasattvadhātusamutpanna
ādideva ākhyāyase sraṣṭāraṃ kartāraṃ | te sarvasattvā bodhimārgeṇa viprahīṇā
bhaviṣyanti ya iḍṛṣaṃ prthagjaneṣu sattveṣu sāṅkathyaṃ kurvanti || ākāśaṃ liṅgaṃ
ity āhuḥ prthivī tasya pīṭhikā | ālayaḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ liyanāl liṅgaṃ ucyate ||*

O Maheśvara, you will be [active] when the Kaliyuga arrives. Born as the foremost of the gods in the realm of suffering beings, you will be called the creator and the agent [of the world]. All beings who hold the following discourse to/(among) ordinary people will be deprived of the path to enlightenment: “It is said that space is [Maheśvara’s] *liṅga*, [and that] the earth is [his] pedestal; it is the receptacle of all beings, [and it is] because [they] merge(/fuse) [into it that it] is called *liṅga*.”

- Brahmā acquired the state of Brahmā by worshipping a stone (*śailamaya*) *līṅga*.
- Indra acquired the state of Indra by worshipping a crystal (*maṇimaya*) *līṅga*.
- Dhanada (Kubera) acquired the state of Dhanada by worshipping a golden (*hemamaya*) *līṅga*.
- The Viśvedevas acquired the state of Viśvedevas (*viśvatva*) by worshipping a silver (*raupya*) *līṅga*.
- Vāyu acquired the state of Vāyu by worshipping a brass (*pittalasaṃbhava*) *līṅga*.
- Viṣṇu acquired the state of Viṣṇu by worshipping a sapphire (*indranīlamaya*) *līṅga*.
- The Vasus acquired the state of Vasus by worshipping a bell-metal (*kāṃsika*) *līṅga*.
- The two Aśvins acquired the state of Aśvins by worshipping an earthen (*pārthiva*) *līṅga*.

Following a lead by DANIELLOU (1960: 352), who quotes the verse and attributes it to “the Skandapurāṇa,” REGAMEY (1971: 431, n. 49) and STUDHOLME (2002: 28–29) searched in vain in editions of the *Skandapurāṇa* to trace it. We can now safely say that the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* most probably quotes it from the *Śivadharmasāstra*, whose main teaching is, after all, *līṅga* worship. This quotation then would have implications for the dating of the text and attest to the work’s impact on non-Śaiva communities. ELTSCHINGER observes that this passage is not represented in the Gilgit manuscripts of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, because of lack of folios, but he argues that “considering that the only known significant divergence between the Nepali and the Gilgit version concerns a very neatly delineated section (Sarvanīvaraṇaviṣkambhin’s quest for the *ṣaḍakṣarī vidyā*), I see no compelling reason to doubt the presence of this passage in the textual tradition reflected in the Gilgit manuscripts” (ELTSCHINGER 2014: 84, n. 198). This would give us an *ante quem* date of 630 CE for this verse, as the two Gilgit manuscripts are dated to before 630 CE (METTE 1997: 7, following the dating of von Hinüber). It would then most probably have been in existence by the end of the sixth century, if not earlier. Interestingly, the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* adopts a strong inclusivist approach to the “Hindu” gods (Candra, Āditya, Maheśvara, Brahmā, Nārāyaṇa, Sarasvatī, Vāyu (?), Dharaṇī (= Pṛthivī), and Varuṇa), presenting them as having originated from different body parts of Avalokiteśvara: *caḥṣuṣoś candrādityāv utpannau, lalāṭāṇ maheśvaraḥ, skandhebhya brahmādayaḥ, hṛdayān nārāyaṇaḥ, daṃṣṭrābhyāṃ sarasvatī, mukhato vāyavo jātāḥ, dharaṇī pādābhyāṃ, varuṇaś codarāt* (KVSū 265, 1–3). STUDHOLME (2002: 37–41), following the suggestion by REGAMEY (1971: 429), argues that this idea was modelled on the Rgvedic “Puruṣasūkta.”

- Varuṇa acquired the state of Varuṇa by worshipping a quartz (*sphāṭika*) *liṅga*.
- Agni acquired the state of Agni by worshipping a jewel (*ratnamaya*) *liṅga*.
- Sūrya acquired the state of Sūrya by worshipping a copper (*tāmra*) *liṅga*.
- The Buddha acquired the state of Buddha by worshipping a golden (*jambūnadamaya*) *liṅga*.
- The Arhat acquired the state of Arhat by worshipping a flower *liṅga* (*puṣpaliṅga*).
- Soma acquired the state of Soma by worshipping a pearl (*muktāphala*) *liṅga*.¹¹

¹¹ ŚiDhŚ 3.20–33:

brahmā pūjayate nityaṃ liṅgaṃ śailamayaṃ śubham |
tasya saṃpūjanāt tena prāptaṃ brahmatvam uttamam || 20 ||
śakro 'pi devarājendro liṅgaṃ maṇimayaṃ śubham |
bhaktiā pūjayate nityaṃ tenendratvam avāpa saḥ || 21 ||
liṅgaṃ hemamayaṃ kāntaṃ dhanado 'rcayate sadā |
tenāsau dhanado devo dhanadatvam avāptavān || 22 ||
viśve devā mahātmāno raupyaṃ liṅgaṃ manoharam |
yajanti vidhivad bhaktiā tena viśvatvam āpnuvan || 23 ||
vāyuh pūjayate bhaktiā liṅgaṃ pittalasaṃbhavam |
vāyutvaṃ prāptavān tena anaupamyaguṇānvitam || 24 ||
indranīlamayaṃ liṅgaṃ viṣṇur arcayate sadā |
viṣṇutvaṃ prāptavān tena adbhutaikasanātanam || 25 ||
vasavaḥ kāmśikāṃ liṅgaṃ pūjayanti vidhānataḥ |
prāptās tena mahātmāno vasutvaṃ sumahodayam || 26 ||
aśvinau pārthivaṃ liṅgaṃ pūjayantau vidhānataḥ |
tena tāv aśvinau devau divyadehaṃgatāv ubhau || 27 ||
sphāṭikāṃ nirmalaṃ liṅgaṃ varuṇo 'rcayate sadā |
varuṇatvaṃ hi saṃprāptaṃ tena vṛddhibalānvitam || 28 ||
liṅgaṃ ratnamayaṃ puṇyam agnir yajati bhāvitaḥ |
agnitvaṃ prāptavān tena tejorūpam aninditam || 29 ||
tāmraliṅgaṃ sadākālaṃ bhaktiā devo divākaraḥ |
triṣkālayajanāt tena prāptaṃ sūryatvam uttamam || 30 ||
buddhenāpy arcitaṃ liṅgaṃ jambūnadamayaṃ śubham |
tena buddhatvam āpnoti sadāśāntam avasthitaṃ || 31 ||
ārhatas tu sadākālaṃ puṣpaliṅgārcanāt param |
tenārhatvam avāpnoti yogaṃ cāpi sudurlabham || 32 ||
muktāphalamayaṃ liṅgaṃ somaḥ pūjayate sadā |
tena somo 'pi saṃprāptaḥ somatvaṃ satatojjvalam || 33 ||

20ab] These and the previous *pādas* are omitted in Ś • 20c *sampujanāt tena*] Σ, *sampujanād eva* Ś • 21c *bhaktiā pūjayate nityam*] C K1 K2 N, *apūjayad yadā bhaktiā* Ś, *kr̥tvā pūjayate nityam* P1, – *tyā pūjayate nityam* P2 • 21d *tenendratvam avāpa saḥ*] C K1 K2^{pc}, *tenendram avāpa saḥ* K2^{ac} (unmetr.), *tenendratvam avāpa sa* N, *tadā śakratvam āpnvān* Ś, *tena śakratvam āptavān* P1 P2 • 22a *hema°*] Σ, *haima°* P2 • 22b *dhanado 'rcayate sadā*] Σ, *dhanadenārcitam yadā* Ś • 22d *avāptavān*] C K1 K2 N P1, *avāpnuyāt* Ś, – *ptavān* P2 • 23b *raupyam*] Σ, *raupya°* C ; *manoharam*] C K1 K2 P1 P2, *manoramam* N Ś • 23c *yajanti vidhivat bhaktiā*] C K1 N, *apūjayan yadā bhaktiā* Ś, *yajante vidhivat tena* P1, *yajante vidhivat bhaktiā* P2 • 23d *tena viśvatvam āpnuvan*] K1 K2 N, *tena viśvatvam āpnuyāt* C, *viśvedevatvam āpnuyuh* P1 Ś, *tena viśvatva* – – P2 • 24a *vāyuh pūjayate bhaktiā*] C K1 K2^{ac} N P1, *vāyu pūjayate bhaktiā* K2^{pc}, *apūjayad yadā vāyur* Ś, – – *pūjayate bhaktiā* P2 • 24b *°saṃbhavam*] Σ, *°jam śubham* P1 • 24c *prāptavān tena*] C K1 N, *tena saṃprāptam* K2 Ś P1 P2 • 24d *anaupamyaguṇānvitam*] C K1 N, *āṇaupamyaguṇāvaham* K2, *anaupamyam guṇāvaham* Ś, *anaupamyaguṇāvaham* P1 P2 • 25a–d] This verse occurs after 21 in P1 • 25b *viṣṇur arcayate sadā*] C K1 K2 N, *viṣṇur yat samapūjayat* Ś, *viṣṇuh pūjayate sadā* P1 P2 • 25c *viṣṇutvam prāptavān tena*] Σ, *samāsasāda viṣṇutvam* Ś • 25d *adbhutaikasanātanam*] C K1, *arcitena sanātanam* K2 N, *adbhutaikaṃ sanātanam* Ś, *so 'dbhutaikaṃ sanātanaḥ* P1, *so tdbhutaikaṃ sanātanam* P2 • 26a *vasavaḥ*] Σ, *vasubhiḥ* Ś ; *kāṃsikaṃ liṅgaṃ*] C K2 P2, *kāṃsikaṃ liṅgaṃ* K1, *kāsikaṃ liṅgaṃ* N, *kāṃsyaṃ liṅgaṃ tu* Ś, *kṣaṇikaṃ liṅgaṃ* P1 • 26b *pūjayanti vidhānataḥ*] Σ, *pūjitaṃ saṃvidhānataḥ* Ś • 26cd] C K1 K2 N P1, *mahātmabhis tataḥ prāptaṃ vasubhis tair mahodayaṃ* Ś, *prāptās tena mahātmāno vasutvam ca mahodayam* P2 • 27a *aśvinau*] Σ, *aśvibhyām* Ś • 27b *pūjayantau*] C N P1 P2, *pūjayaṃto* K1, *pūjayanti* K2, *pūjitaṃ saṃ*° Ś • 27d *divyadehaṃgatāv*] K1 N, *divyandehaṃgatāv* K2, *divyaṃ dehaṃgatāv* C, *divyadehaṃgatāv* Ś P1, *divyaṃ dehaṃgatāv* P2 • 28a *sphaṭikaṃ*] Σ, *sphaṭikaṃ* N ; *nirmalaṃ liṅgaṃ*] Σ, *siddhaliṅgaṃ tu* Ś • 28b *varuṇo 'rcayate sadā*] Σ, *varuṇenārcitam yadā* Ś • 28c *varuṇatvam hi saṃprāptaṃ*] C K1 K2 N P1, *varuṇatvam tadā prāptaṃ* Ś, *tena tad varuṇatvam hi* P2 • 28d *tena vṛddhibalānvitam*] C K1 K2 N, *teneha vibhāvānvitāḥ* Ś, *tena ṛdhyā samanvitam* P1, *prāptaṃ ṛdhyā samanvitam* P2 • 29a *liṅgaṃ ratnamayaṃ puṇyam*] C K1 K2 N, *bhāvitenāgninā liṅgaṃ* Ś, *liṅgam annamayaṃ puṇyam* P1 P2 • 29b *agnir yajati bhāvitaḥ*] C K1 K2 N P1, *piṣṭam annamayaṃ yadā* Ś, *agnir abhyarcya bhāvitaḥ* P2 • 29c–32d Omitted in P2 • 29c *prāptavān tena*] C K1 K2 N P1, *tena saṃprātaṃ* Ś • 29d *tejorūpam aninditam*] C K1 N, *tejorūpasamanvitam* K2 P1 Ś • 30a *tāmra°*] C K1 K2 N P1, *tāmraṃ* Ś • 30c *triṣṭhālāyajanāt tena*] K1, *triṣṭhālāyajanāntena* C^{ac}, *triṣṭhālāṃ iṣṭavān tena* C^{pc}, *arcanena sadākālam* K2, *triṣṭhālāṃ yajanāt tena* N, *trikālāṃ yajate tena* P1, *atyantya tena ca sadā* Ś • 31–32] Omitted in P1, while Ś has these verses after 33 • 31a *buddhenāpy arcitaṃ*] C K1 N, *budhe-na cārcitaṃ* K2, *buddhenābhyarcitaṃ* Ś • 31b *jambū°*] C K1 K2 Ś, *jambu°* N • 31c *buddhatvam āpnoti*] C K1 N, *buddhatvam āpannas* K2, *buddhatvam āpannam* Ś • 31d *avasthitaṃ*] C K1 N, *manaḥsthitam* Ś • 32a *ārhatas tu sadākālam*] K1 N, *ār-hantas tu sadākālam* C, *aharntas ca sadākālam* K2, *arhadbhis sarvadā bhaktiā* Ś •

The text continues to state that the Nāgas, the Rākṣasas, the Piśācas, the Guhyakas, and the Mātr̥s each attained the highest position by worshipping *liṅgas* made of different materials as well (*Śivadharmasāstra* 3.34–39). It is noteworthy that the two verses on the Buddha and Arhat are missing in the manuscript from Pondicherry (P1), while the Srinagar manuscript (Ś) has them after Sūrya and Soma.¹² Whether this is due to accidental loss of text or in fact represents an early addition in the transmission of the text cannot be said with certainty at this state of research,¹³ but it attests to the perceived boundaries of Brahmanical religion, which would not normally include the spiritual masters of the Buddhist and Jaina communities. This is no isolated case, for, as will be discussed below, there is another instance in the *Śivadharmasāstra* where references to the Buddha and the Arhat appear to have been added in the transmission of the text.

I have referred to this list in all its repetitiveness because it reflects, in my opinion, a clear strategy to drive home the idea of the utter dependence of all the gods on the worship of the *liṅga*. A second passage expressing a similar idea occurs in chapter 9, following a description of the worship of the *liṅga*:

By this precept (*vidhi*) all the gods reached the state of godhead (*devatva*). Devī acquired the state of Devī, Guha acquired the state of Skanda, Brahmā acquired the state of Brahmā, Viṣṇu acquired the state of Viṣṇu, Indra acquired the state of Devarāja, the Gaṇas

32b *puṣpaliṅgārcanāt*] C K1 K2 N, *puṣpair liṅgārcanaṃ* Ś • 32c *tenārhatvaṃ avāpnoti*] C K1 N, *tenārhatatvasamprāpto* K2, *tenārhatvaṃ samāsādyā* Ś • 32d *yogaṃ cāpi sudurlabham*] C K1 K2 N, *yogaḥ śāntaḥ sudurlabhaḥ* Ś • 33cd *tena somo 'pi samprāptaḥ somatvaṃ*] C K1 N P1 P2, *tenāsau so pi somatvaṃ prāptavān* K2, *tena saṃpūjitenāptaṃ somatvaṃ* Ś • 33d *satatojjvalam*] Σ, *mahad uttamam* Ś.

¹² Note that the formulations relating to the worship by the Buddha and the Arhat are also slightly different. While the text tends to use present tense to refer to the continuous worship by the gods and past participle or perfect to refer to the acquiring of their respective positions, for the Buddha and the Arhat we find past tense used to refer to their worship (indicating that they are no longer alive?) and present tense to refer to the acquiring of their respective positions.

¹³ It would require more research into the surviving manuscripts and a proper understanding of their transmission.

acquired the state of Gaṇa, the sages obtained liberation, and the Mothers Motherhood.¹⁴

While these passages convey the idea that all the gods obtained their respective position by worship of the *liṅga*, they do not teach the worship of the gods themselves. One can, however, infer their relatively high status at the time of composition of the text from the fact that they need to be mentioned at all. A different case is chapter 6 of the text.

This chapter is the lengthiest of the entire text, covering more than 250 verses, and consists of a long invocation of all cosmic powers and deities for appeasement (*śānti*). The extensive *mantra* takes us from the inner circle around Maheśvara, which includes Nandīśa, Vināyaka, Mahākāla, Ambikā, Mahāmahiṣamardinī, Bhṛṅgiriṭi, and Caṇḍeśvara, to Brahmā and Viṣṇu, followed by the Mothers, to a host of other deities and powers.¹⁵ It is a veritable inventory of cosmic power and gives a good impression of the pantheon of gods at the time. Each god is invoked in his or her own sphere and their worship is recognised with a standard formula asking for peace. Similar invocations are known from other sources, such as the *Brhatsaṃhitā* (BrS 48.55–70) and the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* (ViDhP 2.22), but what distinguishes this *mahāśāntimantra* from others is not only its wealth of detail, but in particular a tendency conforming to what we

¹⁴ ŚiDhŚ 9.16–17:

anena vidhinā devāḥ sarve devatvam āgatāḥ |
devī devītvam āpannā guhaḥ skandatvam āgataḥ || 16 ||
brahmā brahmatvam āpanno viṣṇur viṣṇutvam āgataḥ |
indraś ca devarājatvaṃ gaṇāś ca gaṇatām gatāḥ |
munayo mokṣam āpannā mātaro māṭṛtām tathā || 17 ||

16a *devāḥ*] K1 N P1 P2 Ś, *saṃmyak* C, *saṃmyak* K2 • 16b *sarve devatvam āgatāḥ*] K1 K2 N P1 P2, *sarvadevatvam āgatā* C, *sarvadevatvam āgatāḥ* Ś • 16cd–17ef] These eight *pādas* are omitted in K2 • 16cd] These two *pādas* are omitted in Ś • 16d *guhaḥ*] K1 N P1 P2, *guhya* C ; *āgataḥ*] K1 N P1 P2, *āgatāḥ* C • 17b *viṣṇur*] K1 N Ś, *harir* C P1 P2 ; *āgataḥ*] C N P1 P2 Ś, *āgatāḥ* K1 ; After this P1 repeats 16ab • 17c *indraś ca devarājatvaṃ*] K1 N P1 P2 Ś, *indroś ca devarājyvatvaṃ* C • 17d *gaṇāś ca gaṇatām gatāḥ*] C K1 N P1 P2, *gaṇeśaiś ca gaṇeśatām* Ś • 17ef] These two *pādas* are omitted in C, P1 and P2, while Ś has instead: *nandī caiva vidhim kṛtvā nanditvaṃ samupāgataḥ* • 17f *tathā*] K1, *gatāḥ* N.

¹⁵ For an introduction to this chapter and an overview of the various gods invoked, see BISSCHOP 2014. See now also Bisschop 2019, for an edition, translation and study of the chapter.

have already identified so far. Almost each and every deity is invoked, at the end of their invocation, with one or more adjective expressing their devotion to Śiva or Rudra. A significant exception concerns the gods that belong to the inner circle. Among these, only Nandīśa and Bhṛṅgiriṭi receive such an adjective. Thus Nandīśa is described as “constantly devoted to the worship of Śiva, solely intent upon contemplation of Śiva” (ŚiDhŚ 6.14ab: *śivārcanaparo nityaṃ śivadhyānaikatatparaḥ*),¹⁶ while Bhṛṅgiriṭi is said to be “the son of Rudra, a great hero, whose mind is solely given to Rudra” (ŚiDhŚ 6.25ab: *rudrātmajo mahāvīro rudraikāhitamānasah*).¹⁷

The absence of these adjectives in the case of the other members of Śiva’s inner circle suggests that they were held to be so close to Śiva that there was no need to make their devotion to Śiva explicit.¹⁸ The moment the *mantra* turns to other deities in the pantheon, however, the use of adjectives expressing their devotion is fairly consistent and conspicuous. Two examples may suffice: Brahmā, who is described as “seated on a lotus, resembling a lotus, with four lotus-heads, bearing a water-jar, fortunate, worshipped by gods and Gandharvas,” is said to be “solely intent upon contemplation of Śiva” (*śivadhyānaikatatpara*) and “steeped in the reality of Śiva” (*śivasadbhāvabhāvita*),¹⁹ while Viṣṇu, who is “seated on Garuḍa,

¹⁶ This is the reading of K1, K2 and N. P1 has: *śivadhyānaikaparamaḥ śivabhaktiparāyaṇaḥ*. These two *pādas* are missing in C, P2, and Ś.

¹⁷ 25a *rudrātmajo*] Σ, *rudrātmaja* C ; *mahāvīro*] C K1 N Ś, *rudrabhakto* P1 • 25b *rudraikāhita*°] K1 N, *rudraikagata*° C K2 P1 P2 Ś.

¹⁸ Some adjectives express a family relation: Kārttikeya (*kṛttikomāgni-rudrāṅgasamudbhūtaḥ surārcitaḥ*, ŚiDhŚ 6.11cd); Vināyaka (*rudrasya tanayo devo nāyako 'tha vināyakaḥ*, ŚiDhŚ 6.17cd). On the significance of these epithets expressing a family relation of Vināyaka and Bhṛṅgiriṭi, see BISSCHOP 2010: 243–246.

¹⁹ ŚiDhŚ 6.28–29:

padmāsanah padmanibhaś caturvadanapaṅkajaḥ |
kamaṇḍaludharaḥ śrīmān devagandharvapūjitaḥ || 28 ||
śivadhyānaikaparamaḥ śivasadbhāvabhāvitaḥ |
brahmaśabdena divyena brahmā śāntiṃ karotu me || 29 ||

28a *padmāsanah padmanibhaś*] C K1 K2^{pc} N P1 P2, *padmāsanapadmanibhaś* K2^{ac} (unmetr.), *padmāsano mahāpadmaś* Ś • 28b °*paṅkajaḥ*] Σ, °*paṅkaja* C • 28c °*dharah*] Σ, °*dharām* C • 28d *deva*°] Σ, *siddha*° P2 • 29a *śiva*°] Σ, *śive* N ; °*paramah*] C K1 K2 N, °*nirataḥ* Ś P1 P2 • 29b *śivasadbhāvabhāvitaḥ*] K1 K2 N Ś P1, *śivaṃ sambhāvabhāvinaḥ* C, *śivasadbhāvakovidaḥ* P2 • 29c *divyena*] Σ, *davyena* C • 29d *brahma*] K1 Ś P1 P2, *brāhma*° C, *brahma* K2 N ; *śāntiṃ*] Σ, *śānti* C.

with four arms, bearing conch, discus, and maze, dark, dressed in yellow clothes, of great power and strength,” is said to be “endowed with the favour of Śiva” (*śivaprasādasampanna*) and “engaged in contemplation of Śiva” (*śivadhyānaparāyaṇa*).²⁰ While this remains a consistent feature of the *mantra*, the author has introduced a great variety of adjectives to express the same idea, which again illustrates that this was central to the *mantra*’s composition. I have drawn up the following inventory, organised around different names of Śiva, just to give the general idea:²¹

- Śiva: *śivabhakta* (104c, 106c, 107c, 114c, 184c, 204a, 211a, 214c), *śive bhakta* (108c, 118c), *śivabhaktipara* (67c, 136a), *śivabhaktiparāyaṇa* (148f), *śivabhaktisamanvita* (80b), *śivabhaktisamutsuka* (89d), *śivārcanarata* (40a, 117c), *śivārcanapara* (14a, 147c, 156c), *śivapūjāpara* (119c, 198c) *śivapūjāparāyaṇa* (34b, 148d, 204b), *śivapūjāsamudyukta* (69c, 71c, 75c, 86c), *śivapūjāsamutsuka* (211b), *śivapūjārcane rata* (111d, 211d), *śivapūjājapodyukta* (83c), *śivadhyānaparāyaṇa* (31b), *śivadhyānaikatatpara* (14b), *śivadhyānaikaparama* (29a), *śivadhyānaikamānasa* (147d, 190d), *śivadhyānena sampanna* (80a), *śivadhyānārcanodyukta* (155c),

²⁰ ŚiDhŚ 6.30–32:

tārksyāsanaś caturbāhuḥ saṅkhacakraḡadādharaḥ |
śyāmaḥ pītāmaradharo mahābalaparākramaḥ || 30 ||
yajñadehottamo devo mādhave madhusūdanaḥ |
śivaprasādasampannaḥ śivadhyānaparāyaṇaḥ || 31 ||
sarvapāpaprāmāthakaḥ sarvāsuraṇikṛntakaḥ |
sarvadā śāntabhāvena viṣṇuḥ śāntiṃ karotu me || 32 ||

30a *tārksyāsanaś*] C K1 K2 P1 P2, *tārksyāsanaś* N, *tārksyārūḡhaś* Ś • 30b *°gadādharaḥ*] Σ, *°gajādharā* C • 30c *°radharo*] Σ, *°rādhāro* C • 30d *mahābala-parākramaḥ*] K1 K2 N Ś, *mahābalaparākramām* C, *vanamālāvibhūṣitaḥ* P1 P2 • 31a *°dehottamo*] K1 K2 N Ś, *°devottamo* C P1 P2 • 31c *°prasādasampannaḥ*] K1 K2 N Ś P2, *°prasādasampanna* C, *°praṇāmaparamaḥ* P1 • 31d *°dhyānaparāyaṇaḥ*] Σ, *°dhyānaikatatparaḥ* P1 • 32a *sarvapāpaprāmāthakaḥ*] K1, *sarvapāpaprāmāsthāno* C, *sarvapāpaprāśamaḥ* N, *sarvapāpaprāśamano* K2 Ś, *śivārcanaparo nityaṃ* P1, *śivārcanaparaḥ śrīmān* P2 • 32bc Omitted in C K2 P1 P2 Ś • 32d *viṣṇuḥ*] Σ, *viṣṇu* K2 ; *śāntiṃ*] Σ, *śānti* C.

²¹ Reference is made to the stem ending of the adjectives. The verse numbers and readings refer to my draft edition of *Śivadharmasāstra* 6. I do not report variants in this list.

śivadhyātr (204a), *śivapadārcanapara* (150c), *śivapādārcane rata* (167b, 190b), *śivapādābjapūjaka* (179b), *śivaikāhitamānasa* (40b, 92b), *śivapraṇāmaparama* (80c), *śivasmaranabhāvita* (83d), *śiva-sadbhāvabhāvita* (29b, 162b, 187d), *śivaprasādasampanna* (31a, 152c, 204c), *śivadharmaparāyaṇa* (86b), *śivatejaḥsamāyukta* (126e), *śivājñānuvidhāyin* (132f, 136b, 151f, 235b), *śivacodita* (142d).

- Rudra: *rudrabhakta* (38a, 52a), *rudrabhaktiyuta* (206d), *rudrārcanapara* (105c, 192c), *rudrārcanarata* (38b, 57a, 89b), *rudrārcanasamāyukta* (206e), *rudrārcāhitamānasa* (52b), *rudrārcanaparo-dyukta* (196c), *rudrapūjāpara* (169b, 208c, 215c), *rudrapūjārcane rata* (220b), *rudrapraṇāmananasa* (59c), *rudrapraṇāmanirata* (220a), *rudrapraṇāmaparama* (206c), *rudraparāyaṇa* (217d), *rudraikāhitacetaska* (61c, 220c), *rudraikāhitamānasa* (25b), *rudrapradhyānanirata* (63c), *rudrapādārcane sakta* (183b).
- Other names: *haraparāyaṇa* (181b), *harapādārcaka* (202c), *harapādārcane rata* (98b, 175b, 194b), *harapādanatottama* (194d), *haradhyānaikaparama* (194c), *harārcanapara* (200c), *mahādevārcane sakta* (136a), *mahādevānubhāvita* (136b), *maheśvarapara* (158a), *maheśapādapūjaka* (158b), *maheśārcanabhāvita* (122b), *parameśārcanarata* (65c), *parameśvarabhāvita* (95b), *iśānārcanatatpara* (115d), *paśupater nata* (177b).
- Special constructions: *arcayantī sadā śivam* (44b), *śivaṃ sampūjya yatnena* (67c), *arcayanti sadākālaṃ devaṃ tribhuvaneśvaram* (141cd), *iśānaṃ pūjayanty etāḥ sarvakālaṃ subhāvitāḥ* (145ab), *pūjayataḥ sadā śivam* (149d), *pūjayanti sadākālaṃ rudraṃ bhuvanānāyakam* (151cd), *hātakeśvaradevasya nityaṃ pūjāparāyaṇaḥ* (160cd), *bhāveṇa ca pareṇāśu yajante sarvadā śivam* (164ab), *sarvabhūtapatiṃ devaṃ parameśaṃ maheśvaram, pūjayanti sadā nadyaḥ* (187ac).

This list of adjectives clearly reflects a hierarchical and inclusivist model, in which all and everything is dependent upon Śiva. The chapter ends with a *jaya* invocation to Śiva (ŚiDhŚ 6.236–242). The final epithet in this section once again reminds us that he is the object of praise of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Indra (ŚiDhŚ 6.242c *brahmaviṣṇuvindravandyāya*). The hierarchical

model underlying this *mantra* perfectly mirrors that of early medieval kingship, which involves many types of *sāmantas* all empowered by their loyalty and devotion to the supreme ruler. This shared model, as Sanderson has argued, may well have been one of the keys to the success of Śaivism and its popularity among early medieval rulers (SANDERSON 2009). It comes as no surprise to encounter it here in the context of a *śānti* invocation that played a prominent role in ritual kingship.

As before, some manuscripts expand the pantheon to include also the heads of Buddhism and Jainism. In these manuscripts we come across a couple of verses that invoke the Arhat and the Buddha, again followed by the significant specification that they are “only thinking about the knowledge of Śiva” (*śivajñānaikacintaka*), “intent upon union with Śiva” (*śivayogena bhāvitaḥ*), and “devoted to the knowledge of Śiva” (*śivajñānaparāyaṇa*).²² It remains to be studied when, where, and in what context

²² After ŚiDhŚ 6.32d (in N and Ś, but not in C, K1, K2, P1, and P2):

arhan devaḥ śāntarūpī piñchakañcukapāñikaḥ |
digvāsā malapañkaś ca saumyacittaḥ samāhitaḥ || 1 ||
saṃvṛttalocanaḥ śāntaḥ śivajñānaikacintakaḥ |
śāntiṃ karotu me śāntaḥ śivayogena bhāvitaḥ || 2 ||
jīṇḍriyaḥ samādhistaḥ pātracīvarabhūṣitaḥ |
varadābhayaḥ pāñiś ca jñānadhyānarataḥ sadā || 3 ||
yogaḍṛṣṭisamāyuktaḥ śivajñānaparāyaṇaḥ |
śāntiṃ karotu me buddhaḥ sarvasattvahite rataḥ || 4 ||

1ab] Ś, *ārhanataḥ śāntacetaśkaviśvātman viśvayātitaḥ* N • 1c *digvāsā malapañkaś*] N, *digvāsāḥ kṛttivāsaś* Ś • 1d *°cittaḥ*] Ś, *°citta* N • 2a *saṃvṛtta°*] Ś, *saṃvartta°* N • 2d *°yogena bhāvitaḥ*] N, *jñānaikatānvitaḥ* Ś • 3b *°bhūṣitaḥ*] Ś, *°bheṣitaḥ* N • 4a *°ḍṛṣṭisamāyuktaḥ*] Ś, *°ḍṛṣṭiḥ sadāyuktaḥ* N • 4b *°jñānaparāyaṇaḥ* Ś, *°jñānena bhāvitaḥ* N • 4c *buddhaḥ*] conj., *deva* N, *bauddhaḥ* Ś.

These verses are followed in N and Ś by two more additional invocations, to Vijayā and cows:

pītavarṇena dehena hāreṇa suvicitriṇā |
sarvāṅgasundarī devī vijayā jayakāriṇī || 5 ||
śivārcanaratā nityaṃ śivapūjāparāyaṇā |
dharitṛī lokamātā ca nityaṃ rakṣaṃ karotu me || 6 ||
kṣīrodād utthitā gāvo lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā |
prīṇayanti sadā devān viprāṃś caiva viśeṣataḥ |
nityaṃ tu devatātmānaḥ kurvantu mama śāntikam || 7 ||

5c *devī*] Ś, *devi* N • 5d] N, *jayā vijayakāñkṣiṇī* Ś • 6b *°pūjā°*] Ś, *°jāpya°* N • 7a *utthitā*] Ś, *utthito* N • 7d *viprāṃś*] N, *viprās* Ś • 7e *tu*] N, *ca* Ś.

these additions were made. They express a more overarching inclusivist model that also incorporates Buddhism and Jainism into the fold.

The *Skandapurāṇa*

The early *Skandapurāṇa*, although it likewise addresses the Śaiva laity, is a text with a very different character.²³ It is a Purāṇa, whose main framework of narratives is mythological, and it is as such within the narration of myth cycles that we come across references to other gods. The *Skandapurāṇa* has less to say on their actual worship, although a number of myths clearly indicate an attempt to take up position against another religious tradition, most notably Vaiṣṇavism. There are no references to Buddhism or Jainism in the text.

A good example expressing the competition between Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism is the myth of Kṣupa and Dadhīca (SP 31). It starts with a dispute between Kṣupa, a devotee of Viṣṇu, and Dadhīca, a devotee of Śiva, about whether the Kṣatra or the Brahman is supreme. A battle ensues, in which Dadhīca proves victorious, even when he comes under the attack of Viṣṇu himself. He is after all protected by Śiva. As so often in the *Skandapurāṇa*, the story is told to extoll the holiness of a particular sacred site, in this case the Śaiva site of Sthāneśvara (Thanesar), said to be the place where the enmity between Kṣupa and Dadhīca was stopped (*sthita*).²⁴ Stories such as this may well reflect actual, historical struggles between different religious communities. Rather than inclusivist, this myth suggests an antagonistic agenda of worship of Śiva to the exclusion of all other gods. However, we come across several passages in the text that indicate a more inclusivist model. Thus it is said that Śiva granted half of his body to Viṣṇu, creating the Hari-Hara or Viṣṇu-Śaṃkara form, and that one who

²³ For a recent historical study of the *Skandapurāṇa*, situating the text in sixth-to-seventh century North India, see BAKKER 2014.

²⁴ SP 31.105–106:

dadhīca uvāca

yasmāt sthitam idaṃ vairam varadānāt tava prabho |
iha tasmāt tava sthānam nāmnaitena bhavaty aja || 105 ||
deva uvāca

sthāneśvaram iti khyātam nāmnaitat sthānam uttamam |
bhavitṛ krośaparyantaṃ nānāpuspalatākulam || 106 ||

See BAKKER 2007 for the historical connections between Sthāneśvara (= Thanesar) and Pāśupata Śaivism.

worships Śiva-Viṣṇu will reach the highest goal.²⁵ The hierarchical model is obvious: it is Śiva who grants Viṣṇu half of his body and not the other way around.

Another case concerned with Śiva's relation to Viṣṇu within a geographically defined area is the conclusion of the myth about the destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice, which ends in a unique manner in the *Skandapurāṇa*. After Dakṣa's sacrifice has been destroyed, Śiva proceeds to Mount Mandara and is followed by Viṣṇu and Brahmā. Not far from Bhadreśvara,²⁶ the place where he sets off, he tells Viṣṇu to stop. Viṣṇu does so, while bowing to the lord's feet and hanging onto the branch of a mango tree (*āmra*). The place where this event took place is called Kubjāmra and is expressly referred to as a prosperous holy field of Viṣṇu, yielding the results of the donation of a thousand cows.²⁷ The site can be identified at the confluence of the Candrabhāgā and Gaṅgā rivers in Rishikesh and still has an old Viṣṇu temple (the Bharata Mandir). The tradition about Kubjāmra is also known from local sources and hints at an old centre of Viṣṇu worship

²⁵ SP_{Bh} 121.20–21:

tasya devaḥ svayaṃ śūlī tuṣṭaḥ prekṣya tathāvidham |
śarīrārdham dadau tasmai tad abhūd viṣṇuśaṃkaram || 20 ||
ya imāṃ śṛṇuyān martyaḥ sadā parvasu parvasu |
arcayec chivaviṣṇuṃ ca sa gacchet paramām gatim || 21 ||

See also SP 21.37ab (in a hymn of praise): *viṣṇor dehārdhadattāya tasyaiva varadāya ca |*.

²⁶ Bhadreśvara is the place from where Śiva and Pārvaṭī were watching the destruction of Śiva's sacrifice by Haribhadra, Bhadrakālī, and the Gaṇas, also referred to as the hermitage of Raibhya (Raibhyāśrama). For more details see BAKKER 2014: 174–181, who identifies it with the archaeological site “Vīrabhadra,” “on the high bank of the Rambhā, near its confluence with the Gaṅgā [...] 20 km northeast of the Dakṣeśvara temple, i.e. Kanakhala, the spot where Dakṣa's sacrifice is supposed to have taken place” (BAKKER 2014: 178).

²⁷ SP 32.143–147:

evam astv iti sa procya mandaram cārukandaram |
jagāma bhagavān charvaḥ somo gaṇasatair vṛtaḥ || 143 ||
devāpi rājñā sahitās tasmin sthāne yathāsukham |
tasthur brahmā ca viṣṇuś ca jagmatur devaprṣṭhataḥ || 144 ||
sa gatvā stokam adhvānam ubhābhyāṃ sahitāḥ prabhuḥ |
nātidūre tataḥ prāha tiṣṭha viṣṇo mahābala || 145 ||
yasmād āmraṃ samālambya tasmin deśe sthito hariḥ |
nirīkṣamāṇo deveśaṃ deśas tasmād abhūd asau || 146 ||
kubjāmraḥ iti khyāto viṣṇoḥ kṣetraṃ samṛddhimat |
punyaṃ nivartanāny aṣṭau gosahasraphalapradam || 147 ||

(BAKKER 2014: 181–183). The *Skandapurāṇa* appears to acknowledge this, but explains its existence through reference to the destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice and thus incorporates a contemporary local site of Viṣṇu worship within its own inclusivist narrative.²⁸

Throughout the text, the other gods are depicted in a position of complete dependence upon Śiva. This is expressed for example in several cases in the narrative, where they form part of or are incorporated in Śiva's body. And while the existence of Viṣṇu's *avatāras* is acknowledged, Phyllis Granoff has shown that the *avatāra* accounts in the *Skandapurāṇa* come with a new and inclusivist message: "it is Śiva who gives Viṣṇu the task of slaying demons; it is also Śiva who releases Viṣṇu from his animal form so that he will be ready to assume another form when required" (GRANOFF 2004: 124). The inclusion of Viṣṇu's *avatāra* stories, which originally be-

²⁸ The *Skandapurāṇa* attests to good knowledge of the local geography of the area. Another site in the vicinity is explained with reference to the same narrative mentioned above. When Brahmā continues to follow him after Viṣṇu has stopped at Kubjāmraka, Śiva tells him to turn back and himself enters the sky. Brahmā thereupon makes a circumambulation. The spot is called Brahmāvarta and described as a holy place, where, upon dying, one reaches Brahmaloaka (SP 32.149–152):

nātidūraṃ tato gatvā bhūyo devaḥ pitāmaham |
nivartety abravīd vyāsa gaganam ca samāviśat || 149 ||
tasmin viyadgate deve brahmā prāñjalir unmukhaḥ |
pradakṣiṇam samāvṛtya praṇāmya prayayau tataḥ || 150 ||
yasmāt tatra haram tena kurvatā vai pradakṣiṇam |
āvartaḥ svaśarīrasya prakṛtaḥ puṇyakarmaṇā |
tasmāt sa deśo vikhyāto brahmāvarteti śobhanaḥ || 151 ||
aśvamedhaphalaṃ tatra snātaḥ prāpnoti mānavaḥ |
sādhayitvā caruṃ cātra bhojayitvā tathā dvijam |
prāñān parityajya tato brahmalokam avāpnuyāt || 152 ||

Bakker has suggested the possibility that this Brahmāvarta may be identical with "the early historical mount at Shyampur Garhi, ca. 6 km west of VBA [Vīrabhadra] on the Golapani (Goila Nala), a small tributary of the Ganges" (BAKKER 2014: 184). The story seems to attest to the integration of a site originally connected to the worship of Brahmā. After the events relating to the coming into being of Kubjāmraka and Brahmāvarta are over, Viṣṇu and Brahmā go back and Brahmā installs a *līṅga* dedicated to Paśupati at Bhadreśvara, performs *pūjā* there, and bathes in the Bhadrakarnāhrada, after which he returns to heaven (SP 32.153–154):

tato 'bhyetya suraiḥ sārdaṃ brahmā viṣṇupuraḥsaram |
bhadreśvare paśupater mahimānam athākarot || 153 ||
sa līṅgaṃ tatra samsthāpya pūjāṃ kṛtvātibhāsvarām |
bhadrakarnāhrade snātvā saha devair divaṃ yayau || 154 ||

longed to Vaiṣṇava circles, reflects a deliberate narrative strategy of the authors of the text, aimed at integrating other cults and traditions under the broad umbrella of Śaivism.

Two chapters in the text deal with more mundane matters and give rules for the actual worship of Śiva. Chapters 27 and 28 contain material that shows, if not actual textual parallels, great correspondences in style and content to the literature of the *Śivadharmā*. Again we encounter the model of including all other gods within Śiva, for example in SP 27.42, where all holy places and temples (presumably of all deities) are said to rest in Śiva's two feet.²⁹ Most relevant for the present purposes is SP 28.20–23. While this passage occurs within a section that deals with Śiva worship, the text allows for and incorporates the worship of other gods as well:

Now, for the sake of the respectful offering (*argha*) in [rites] for the gods or for the ancestors, he satisfies the ancestors, as well as the sages and all the gods, for thirty thousand years, by [offering oblations of] white mustard seeds, and obtains a magnificent form, and is worshipped by cowgirls in the Cow-world for one Manu-period. For all the gods, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and the sages, make [themselves] present in [this] oblation: know that it has come forth from them! One who knows this great secret, O Devī, he is a great ascetic. Due to its miraculous power one is born rich, with a pleasing appearance, provided with the qualities of intelligence and beauty, for a million years.³⁰

²⁹ SP 27.42 (Śiva speaking):

yāni lokeṣu tīrthāni devatāyatanāni ca |
pādayos tāni suśroṇi sadā saṁnihitāni me || 42 ||

³⁰ SP 28.20–23:

siddhārthakair athārghārtham daive pitrye 'thavā punaḥ |
triṁśad varṣasahasrāṇi tarpayet sa pitṛṇ api || 20 ||
ṛṣiṁś ca sarvadevāṁś ca rūpaṁ cāpnoti puṣkalam |
manvantaram ca goloke gokanyābhiḥ sa pūjyate || 21 ||
sarve devās tathā viṣṇur brahmā ṛṣaya eva ca |
kurvanty arghe hi sāmniidhyam tebhyas tad viddhi niḥṣṛtam || 22 ||
guhyam etat paraṁ devi yo vetti sa mahātapāḥ |
tasya prabhāvāj jāyeta dhanavān priyadarśanaḥ |
prajñārūpaṅair yuktaḥ saṁvatsaraśatāyutam || 23 ||

Aside from this one passage, however, we come across few other rituals that involve any other god but Śiva.³¹ Overall, we can conclude that the primary teaching of the *Skandapurāṇa* is Śiva devotion, at the expense of everything else. It is a staunch Śaiva text. The only other deities whose worship is expressly acknowledged are Devī and the Gaṇas, but they are worshipped as, respectively, wife and servants of Śiva.

The *Niśvāsamukha*

The *Niśvāsamukha* is again a very different type of text, but it attests to similar notions as the *Śivadharmā* and has much to say on matters of lay religion. The *Niśvāsamukha* stands at the threshold of Tantric literature. It forms the introduction to the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* and introduces the Mantramārga teachings of the main work by presenting it as the revelation of Śiva's fifth face.³² The *Niśvāsamukha* addresses the relation between the Tantra teaching of the Mantramārga and other forms of religion by introducing a model in which Śiva emits five streams of knowledge from his five faces. The inclusivist model is most apparent here: all religious practice derives from the teachings of Śiva in the end. The western face teaches the Laukika or mundane religion, the northern face the Vaidika or Brahmanical religion, the southern face the Ādhyātmika or system of knowledge of the self, and the eastern face the Atimārga or Pāśupata doctrine and practice. The upper, Īśāna face, however, teaches the ultimate knowledge, that of the Mantramārga.³³

³¹ A rare exception is SP 28.9, which prescribes offering foods to the gods and ancestors for a year:

*saṃvatsaram tu yo bhuṅkte nityam eva hy atandritam |
nivedya pitṛdevabhyah prthivyām ekarād bhavet || 9 ||*

³² For the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, see GOODALL 2015, which presents a critical edition with annotated translation of the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, and *Nayasūtra*. Not yet included in this edition is the extensive *Guhyasūtra*. The *Niśvāsamukha* is the subject of the PhD thesis by Nirajan Kafle at Leiden University (KAFLE 2015). All citations are from Kafle's edition.

³³ NiMukh 3:196cd: *paścimenaiva vaktreṇa laukikam gaditam sadā*; NiMukh 4:41: *vedadharmmo mayā proktaḥ svarganaīśreyasaḥ paraḥ | uttareṇaiva vaktreṇa vyākhyātaś ca samāsataḥ ||*; NiMukh 4:42: *ādhyātmikam pravakṣyāmi dakṣiṇāsyena kīrtitam | sāmukhyaṁ caiva mahājñānam yogaṁ cāpi mahāvrate ||*; NiMukh 4:131ad: *atimārggam samākhyātam dvihprakāram varānane | pūrveṇaiva tu vaktreṇa sara-hasyam prakīrtitam |*; NiMukh 4:135: *pañcamenaiva vaktreṇa īśānena dvijottamāḥ | mantrākhyam kathayiṣyāmi devyāy gaditam purā ||*. For this model of the five

The largest part of the *Niśvāsamukha* is reserved for the Laukika religion, covering the first three out of the total of four chapters of the text. It includes various religious practices, such as digging wells and setting up parks, pilgrimage, fasting, following observances, and religious suicide, under this heading. Although the Laukika religion described in the text primarily relates to the worship of Śiva, the category is in fact broader and also includes the worship of other deities. Thus we find in the section on pilgrimage not only reference to many important Śaiva centres, but also to pilgrimage sites dedicated to Viṣṇu, such as Śālagrāma and Mathurā (NiMukh 3.31–32).

Most interesting for the present purposes is an elaborate passage that promotes fasting on different days of the year (NiMukh 3.60–195). Each *tithi* is associated with a particular deity as follows: Brahmā (first), Agni (second), Kubera (third), Gaṇeśa (fourth), Nāgas (fifth), Skanda (sixth), Āditya (seventh), Śiva (eighth), Mahādevī (ninth), Yama (tenth), Dharma (eleventh), Viṣṇu (twelfth), Anaṅga (thirteenth), Parameśvara (fourteenth), Pitṛs (full and new moon).³⁴ The text prescribes fasting and worship of the deity, accompanied by the invocation of twelve names of the deity, on the days in question for a year. Thus, for example, Viṣṇu should be worshipped for a year on the twelfth *tithi* of both halves of the month with the names: 1. Keśava, 2. Nārāyaṇa, 3. Mādhava, 4. Govinda, 5. Viṣṇu, 6. Madhusūdana, 7. Trivikrama, 8. Vāmana, 9. Śrīdhara, 10. Hṛṣīkeśa, 11. Padmanābha, and 12. Dāmodara.³⁵ Various fruits of this worship are listed, depending on the gradation and kind of worshipper. By worshipping Viṣṇu with these names for a lifetime, accompanied by the gift of various substances and objects, one reaches the world of Viṣṇu.³⁶ In the same manner, worshipping Agni with his twelve names for a lifetime will get one to the world of Agni, worshipping Skanda will get one to the world of Skanda, etc.

teachings in the *Niśvāsamukha* and subsequent Śaiva literature, see the lemma *pañca vaktrāṇi* by Diwakar ACHARYA in *Tāntrikābhidhānaśoṣa* III (GOODALL & RASTELLI 2013: 358–359).

³⁴ For a useful survey of the *tithis* and their presiding deities in Brahmanical literature, see EINO 2005.

³⁵ NiMukh 3.126c–138b.

³⁶ NiMukh 3.139c–141b:

*yāvajjīvaṃ samabhyarcya puṣpāṇi ggandhāṇi sugandhakāṇi || 139 ||
bhakṣyabhojyaṇi ca dhūpāṇi ca cchatradhvajavitānakāṇi |
hemajair bhūṣaṇair ddivyair mmaṇiratnavicitrakāṇi || 140 ||
vastraiḥ pūjāṃ vicitrāṇi ca kṛtvā viṣṇupadaṃ vrajet |*

Now, for most of the gods mentioned, the text does not provide guidance specific to each different month of the year. The only exceptions concern Śiva, who is associated with the eighth and the fourteenth day of each half of the month,³⁷ and Viṣṇu, associated with the twelfth day of each half of the month.³⁸ In their case, for each month specific instructions are given, along with the mention of the reward of the fast and the worship at each individual month. In other words, these two deities are treated on a different level from the other gods mentioned. While it is not surprising that this should be the case for Śiva in a Śaiva text, it is quite revealing that Viṣṇu gets special treatment as well. This no doubt reflects the prominent position of Viṣṇu worship at the time, but it may also be due to the origin of the practice. In fact, the only parallel that I am aware of for this practice of the worship of a god with twelve names on set days of each month, with the exception of Śiva,³⁹ concerns Viṣṇu. For we find the same notion in the *Viṣṇudharma* and several Vaiṣṇava passages in other texts as well.⁴⁰ It appears then that the recitation of twelve names originally belonged to the worship of Viṣṇu alone and was subsequently expanded, as attested in the *Niśvāsamukha*, to include other gods as well. Overall we can conclude that, of the three texts discussed, the *Niśvāsamukha*'s attitude is the most open

³⁷ NiMukh 3.92–106b and NiMukh 3.146–150. The twelve names to be used on the eighth *tithi* are: Śaṅkara, Devadeva, Tryambaka, Sthāṇu, Hara, Śiva, Bhava, Nīlakaṇṭha, Piṅgala, Rudra, Īśāna, and Rudra. The twelve names to be used on the fourteenth *tithi* are: Hara, Śarva, Bhava, Tryakṣa, Śambhu, Vibhu, Śiva, Sthāṇu, Paśupati, Rudra, Īśāna, and Śaṅkara. Specific instructions relating to each month are only given for the eighth day of the month.

³⁸ NiMukh 3.126c–138b.

³⁹ ŚiDhŚ 10 has a similar passage on fasting and worshipping Śiva with different names in twelve successive months on the eighth and fourteenth day. The list of names for the eighth day of the month is given as follows: Śaṅkara, Śambhu, Maheśvara, Mahādeva, Sthāṇu, Śiva, Paśupati, Ugra, Śarva, Tryambaka, Īśvara, and Rudra (ŚiDhŚ 10.17–31). Note that the list is different from the one in the *Niśvāsamukha*, suggesting that this was not yet a standard practice. No list of names is given for the fourteenth day of the month.

⁴⁰ The same set of twelve names of Viṣṇu with reference to the twelve months from Mārgaśīrṣa to Kārttika occurs in ViDh 5.23–26, MBh 13 App. I, no. 12 and MBh 14 App. I, no. 4, ll. 2998ff., BrS 105.14–16 (the two MBh passages in particular show close correspondence).

See also GONDA 1970: 71–72, referring to *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 14.2.2.12 (on twelve names and the fullness of the year). The observance of a fast on the twelfth day, while worshipping Viṣṇu with his respective name, on twelve successive months is referred to as *nakṣatrapuruṣavratā* in several Purāṇas. See SHASTRI 1969: 188, n. 1.

and inclusivist. It certainly expresses a less antagonistic attitude than the *Skandapurāṇa*.

Conclusion

In this brief survey of three early sources on lay Śaiva religion, I have focussed on those passages that address the worship or existence of other gods than Śiva. The passages attest to an inclusivist model that allows for the worship of other gods, but with the underlying message that their power and position ultimately stems from Śiva. This is the case for the *Śiva-dharmaśāstra*, which teaches that the gods obtained their position as gods from the worship of the *liṅga*. The model of cosmic power, as expressed in particular in the text's *śāntimantra*, mirrors the earthly model of early medieval kingship with its system of *sāmantas*, *mahāsāmantas*, and *mahārājas*. The *Skandapurāṇa*, by contrast, shows a more antagonistic attitude, with many stories revolving around the opposition between Śiva and the other gods. This may well reflect a moment in time when Śaivism moved from a position on the sides to a position in the centre, but it may also be characteristic of narrative literature in general. Its inclusivism is more aggressive, as it first of all involves the denigration of the other gods before they are reinstated in their respective domain. If we are looking for a parallel from Indian kingship, it brings to mind the model of the *digvijaya*, as famously expressed in Samudragupta's *Allahabad Pillar Inscription* and chapter 4 of the *Raghuvamśa*, with its image of defeat and subsequent reinstatement of regional kings, following the conquest by a new and more powerful ruler on the scene. Finally, the *Niśvāsamukha* provides the most perfect inclusivist model, with its concept of Śiva's five faces teaching the five different streams of religion, where the highest stream, that of the Mantramārga, is reserved for the upper, fifth face. It forms the introduction to the earliest surviving Śaiva Tantra, the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, and as such provides the transition from the previous religious traditions to the new ritual system for centuries to come. There is no antagonistic attitude here, it rather reflects a strong belief in the supremacy of the lord Śiva who himself happily teaches the worship of other gods to Devī.

Finally, when talking about inclusivism, it should not be forgotten that there is always an exclusivist aspect involved as well. This aspect gets little notice in Hacker's work. This exclusivism may not always be addressed explicitly, but it is there nonetheless. Thus it is noteworthy that all three texts do not engage with the non-Brahmanical religions of Jainism and

Buddhism. They reflect a common shared Brahmanical model of religion which had integrated local forms of religion such as goddess and Nāga worship, but whose pantheon does not include Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, Tīrthaṅkaras, or Arhats.⁴¹ As such, this is not inclusivism in Hacker's limited use of the term, since the deities involved in fact all form part of a well-established Brahmanical tradition, to which Śaivism aligns itself. The inclusivism encountered here is not a case of "claiming, what really belongs to an alien sect," but rather seems to reflect a more general Brahmanical perspective on what constitutes religion.⁴² The only exception that in

⁴¹ The situation appears to be different in the case of Vaiṣṇavism, where, for example, the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* tells of Viṣṇu's production of a heresiarch called Māyāmoha, who deludes the Asuras with his heretic doctrines, first disguising himself as a Jaina ascetic and then as a Buddhist monk. Subsequently the Buddha was integrated into the standard list of Viṣṇu's *avatāras*. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, as Vincent Eltschinger has observed, gives much attention to the denigration of the *pāṣaṇḍas*, who are seen as a sign of the Kali age (ELTSCHINGER 2014: 57–66). This attitude is shared by the *Viṣṇudharma*, which is full of statements on avoiding contact with *pāṣaṇḍas* (in particular ViDh 25), who, as ViDh 105.37–40 makes quite clear, are none other than Buddhists, Jains, and the like:

pāṣaṇḍabhūtam atyarthaṃ jagad etad asatkṛtam |
bhaviṣyati tadā bhūpa vṛthāpravrajitotkaṭam || 37 ||
na tu dvijātiśuśrūṣāṃ na svadharmānupālānam |
kariṣyanti tadā śūdrāḥ pravrajyālingino vṛthā || 38 ||
utkocāḥ saugatās caiva mahāyānaratās tathā |
bhaviṣyanti atha pāṣaṇḍāḥ kapilā bhikṣavas tathā || 39 ||
vṛddhāḥ śrāvakanirgranthāḥ siddhaputrās tathāpare |
bhaviṣyanti durātmānaḥ śūdrāḥ kaliyuge nṛpa || 40 ||

Also noteworthy is Varāhamihira's *Brhatsamhitā*, which includes descriptions of the Buddha and the "god of the Arhats" in the section on the iconography of deities (BrS 58.44–45):

padmāṅkitakaracaraṇaḥ prasannamūrtiḥ sunīcakeśaś ca |
padmāsanopaviṣṭaḥ piteva jagato bhavati buddhaḥ || 44 ||
ājānulambabāhuḥ śrīvatsāṅkaḥ praśāntamūrtiś ca |
ḍigvāsās taruṇo rūpavāṃś ca kāryo 'rhatāṃ devaḥ || 45 ||

⁴² Similar criticism has been voiced by Wezler regarding the usage of the term "inclusivism" to describe the interactions between Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism: "Ist die Annahme, daß die Mythenüberlieferungen beider zu irgendeinen Zeitpunkt, 'ursprünglich', in dem Sinne strikt śivaitisch bzw. viṣṇuitisch waren, daß der Gott des konkurrierenden Glaubens in ihnen nicht nur keine Rolle spielte, sondern auch gar nicht vorkam? Muß nicht angesichts der letztlich vedischen Herkunft beider Traditionenströme vielmehr davon ausgegangen werden, daß die zentrale göttliche Gestalt des einen von Anfang an auch in dem anderen nicht nur vorkam, sondern auch eine

fact proves the rule are the two passages about the Buddha and Arhat in the *Śivadharmasāstra* for which the manuscript evidence is ambiguous. Most revealing, however, is a short line in the *Niśvāsamukha*, where Śiva tells Devī that he has taught five paths only and that “those different from them are following the wrong path” (NiMukh 1.56d: *ato 'nye kupaṭhe sthitāḥ*). What these wrong paths are the text does not say, but it is not difficult to imagine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sigla for the edition of the *Śivadharmasāstra*

- C University Library of Cambridge, Add. 1645, palm leaf, dated [Nepāla] Saṃvat 259 (1139–40 CE). Available online: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01645/1>
- K1 National Archives, Kathmandu, 3/393, microfilmed by the NGMPP: A 1082/3, palm leaf, dated [Nepāla] Saṃvat 189 (1069 CE)
- K2 National Archives, Kathmandu, 5/841, microfilmed by the NGMPP: B12/4, palm leaf, apograph dated by another hand: [Nepal] Saṃvat 315 (1194–95 CE)
- N Yogin Naraharinath, *Śivadharmasāstra Paśupatimatam Śivadharmamahāśāstram Paśupatināthadarśanam*. Kathmandu : Bṛhadādhyātmikaparīṣada, saṃvat 2055 (1998 CE).
- P1 Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), T 32, paper transcript, dated June 26, 1959. Copied from a manuscript belonging to Kilvelur. Available online: http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/IFP/transcripts_data/T0

gewisse, wenn auch nachgeordnete, Rolle spielte? Und, wenn letzteres richtig ist, kann man dann eigentlich von ‘Inklusivismus’ im wörtlichen Sinne sprechen? [...] Das Wesentliche an dem Phänomen, das Hacker ‘Inklusivismus’ nennt, läge dann in der weiteren Ausgestaltung und Zuspitzung einer mit der Entstehung der jeweiligen Sekte bereits gesetzten Glaubensüberzeugung von der uneingeschränkten Suprematie des ‘eigenen’ Gottes, wobei der Prozeß der Verteidigung und der ‘ideologischen’ Durchsetzung dieses Anspruchs eine besondere Dynamik dadurch erhalten hätte, daß dieses Konkurrenzverhältnis über Jahrhunderte hin fortbestand und zu gleichartigen, die Auseinandersetzung vielleicht gar eskalierenden theologischen Reaktionen auf beiden Seiten führte.” (WEZLER 1983: 82).

- 032/PDF/T0032.pdf, accessed November 17, 2015.
- P2 Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), T 72b, paper transcript of manuscript 75429, written in Grantha script, belonging to the Adyar library, Chennai. Available online:
http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/IFP/transcripts_data/T0072/PDF/T0072.pdf, accessed November 17, 2015.
- Ś Oriental Research Library, Srinagar, Acc.no. 1467, Śārādā paper manuscript.

Primary Literature

Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra (KVSū)

Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra. In: *Mahāyānasūtrasaṃgraha. Part 1*. Ed. P.L. Vaidya. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1961, pp. 256–308.

Niśvāsamukha (NiMukh)

See KAFLE 2015.

Bṛhatsaṃhitā (BṛS)

Varāhamihira's Bṛhat Saṃhitā with English Translation, Exhaustive Notes and Literary Comments. 2 vols. Ed. R. Bhat. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

Mahābhārata (MBh)

The Mahābhārata. 19 vols. Crit. Ed. V.S. Sukthankar et al. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1927–1959.

Viṣṇudharma (ViDh)

Viṣṇudharmāḥ. Precepts for the worship of Viṣṇu. 3 vols. Ed. R. Grünendahl. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983–1989.

Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa (ViDhP)

Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa. Ed. Ś. Kṣemarāja. Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, 1912.

Śivadharmasāstra (ŚiDhŚ)

Draft edition Bisschop.

Skandapurāṇa (SP)

See ADRIAENSEN & BAKKER & ISAACSON 1998; BAKKER & ISAACSON 2004; BAKKER & BISSCHOP & YOKOCHI 2014.

Skandapurāṇa (SP_{Bh})

Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ. Ed. K. Bhaṭṭarāī. Kathmandu: Mahendraratnagranthamālā, 1998.

Secondary Literature

- ADRIAENSEN, R. & BAKKER, H.T. & ISAACSON, H. 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume I. Adhyāyas 1–25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BAGCHEE, J. & ADLURI, V.P. 2014. The passion of Paul Hacker. Indology, orientalism and environment. In: J.M. Cho, E. Kurlander, D.T. McGetchin (eds.), *Transcultural Encounters between Germany and India*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 215–229.
- BAKKER, H.T. 2007. Thanesar, the Pāśupata Order and the Skandapurāṇa. Studies in the Skandapurāṇa IX. *Journal of Indological Studies* 19, pp. 1–16.
2014. *The World of the Skandapurāṇa. Northern India in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- BAKKER, H.T., & ISAACSON, H. 2004. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume IIA. Adhyāyas 26–31.14. The Vārāṇasī Cycle. Critical Edition with an Introduction, English Synopsis & Philological and Historical Commentary*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BAKKER, H.T. & BISSCHOP, P.C. & YOKOCHI, Y. 2014. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume IIB. Adhyāyas 31–52. The Vāhana and Naraka Cycles. Critical Edition with an Introduction and Annotated English Synopsis*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- BISSCHOP, P. 2010. Once again on the Identity of Caṇḍeśvara in Early Śaivism: A rare Caṇḍeśvara in the British Museum? *Indo-Iranian Journal* 53, pp. 233–249.
2014. Invoking the Powers that Be: The Śivadharmas' Mahāśānti Mantra. *South Asian Studies* 30.2, pp. 133–141.
2019. *Universal Śaivism. The Appeasement of All Gods and Powers in the Śāntyadhyāya of the Śivadharmasāstra*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- DANIÉLOU, A. 1960. *Le Polythéisme hindou*. Paris: Buchet/Chastel.
- DE SIMINI, F. 2013. *Ritual Aspects of Manuscript Transmission in Premodern India: a Historical Study of Vidyādāna through Textual Sources. With a First Critical Edition and English Translation of Śivadharmottara's Chapter Two 'On the Gift of Knowledge.'* PhD Thesis, Università degli Studi di Torino.

- EINOO, Sh. 2005. Ritual Calendar. Change in the Conceptions of Time and Space. *Journal Asiatique* 293.1, pp. 99–124.
- ELTSCHINGER, V. 2014. *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics. Studies on the History, Self-understanding and Dogmatic Foundations of Late Indian Buddhist Philosophy*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- GONDA, J. 1970. *Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- GOODALL, D. 2015. *The Nīśvāsātattvasaṃhitā. The earliest surviving Śaiva tantra. Volume I. A critical edition & annotated translation of the Mūlasūtra, Uttarasūtra & Nayasūtra*, edited in collaboration with A. Sanderson & H. Isaacson, with contributions of N. Kafle, D. Acharya & others. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO, Hamburg: Asien-Afrika Institut.
- GOODALL, D. & RASTELLI, M. 2013 (eds.). *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa III. Ṭ-PH. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique / A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature / Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- GRANOFF, Ph. 2004. Saving the Saviour. Śiva and the Vaiṣṇava Avatāras in the Early Skandapurāṇa. In: H. Bakker (ed.), *Origin and Growth of the Purāṇic Text Corpus. With Special Reference to the Skandapurāṇa. Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, Vol. 3.2*. Delhi: Motilal Barnasidass, pp. 111–138.
- HACKER, P. 1959. *Prahlāda. Werden und Wandlungen einer Idealgestalt. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hinduismus*. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz.
1983. Inklusivismus. In: G. Oberhammer (ed.), *Inklusivismus. Eine indische Denkform*. Wien: Institut für Indologie, pp. 61–91.
1995. Aspects of Neo-Hinduism as Contrasted with Surviving Traditional Hinduism. In: W. Halbfass (ed.), *Philology and Confrontation. Paul Hacker on Traditional and Modern Vedānta*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 229–255.
- JUGNU, Sh. & SHARMA Bh. 2014. *Śrīmad Śivadharmapurāṇam. Śaivadharmasammata upapurāṇa. Mūlapāṭha aur Mohanabodhinī Hindī ṭīkā sahita*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
- KAFLE, N. 2013. The *Liṅgodbhava* Myth in Early Śaiva Sources. In: N. Mirnig, P.-D. Szántó, and M. Williams (eds.), *Puṣpikā. Tracing Ancient India Through Texts and Traditions: Contributions to Current Research in Indology*. Volume 1. Oxford, Havertown: Oxbow, pp. 241–263.

2015. *The Nīśvāsamukha, the Introductory Book prefacing the Nīśvāsattattvasaṃhitā. Critical Edition, with an Introduction, Annotated Translation. Appended by Śivadharmasaṅgraha 5-9*. PhD thesis at Leiden University.
- METTE, A. 1997. *Die Gilgitfragmente des Kāraṇḍavyūha*. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- NARAHARINATH, Y. 1998. See siglum N.
- REGAMEY, C. 1971. Motifs vichnouïtes et śivaïtes dans le Kāraṇḍavyūha. In: *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- SANDERSON, A. 1986. Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir. In: A. Padoux (ed.), *Mantras et diagrammes rituels dans l'hindouisme*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, pp. 169–207.
2009. The Śaiva Age. The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. In: Sh. Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, pp. 41–350.
- SHASTRI, A.M. 1969. *India as Seen in the Brhatsaṃhitā of Varāhamihira*. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- STUDHOLME, A. 2002. *The Origins of Oṃ Maṇipadme Hūṃ*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- TÖRZSÖK, J. 2003. Icons of Inclusivism. In: G. Bühnemann et al. (eds.), *Maṇḍalas and Yantras in the Hindu Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 179–224.
- WEZLER, A. 1983. Der Inklusivismus-Begriff Paul Hackers. In: G. Oberhammer (ed.), *Inklusivismus. Eine indische Denkform*. Wien: Institut für Indologie, pp. 61–91.