

NIKUMBHA'S CURSE UPON VĀRĀṆASĪ AND DIVODĀSA'S FOUNDING OF NEW KĀŚĪ: ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE PURĀṆIC TEXT CORPUS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE *HARIVAMŚA*

Christophe Vielle

Université Catholique de Louvain

The legendary episode of the curse upon Vārāṇasī by a certain Nikumbha and the founding of the “new” Kāśī,¹ or capital of the Kāśī people, by King Divodāsa has already been studied by Hans Bakker from a mythological and historical perspective² on the basis of the Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa “TGI” (i.e. Textgruppe I) version (in the 4th “Abschnitt” = Vamśānucarita). This “Ur-purāṇic” artificial version was reconstructed by Willibald Kirfel (1927: 372,25–378,72) from, on the one hand, the double account found in both the *Brahmapurāṇa* (BrP 11.39–54 and 13.66–75) and the *Harivamśa* (HV Appendix I, no. 7, ll. 56–156, and 23.57–68) and, on the other hand, the common text of the *Vāyu-purāṇa* and *Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa* (VāP 92.23–68, BḍP 2.3.67.25–72).³ Between Kirfel and Bakker, however, both Rajendra Chandra Hazra (1940: 145–156) and Walter Ruben (1941: 248, 341) showed the lateness and compilative character of the *Brahmapurāṇa*,⁴ which is for the concerned passages a mere copy of the *Harivamśa* (see below). Furthermore, in 1969–1971 P.L. Vaidya published his critical edition of the *Harivamśa*, which dropped the first and longest of the two accounts found in the HV vulgate. Contrary to Kirfel's view, the HV critical edition clearly proves the PPañc long

¹ I wish to heartily thank Petteri Koskikallio for his careful critical reading of the first version of this paper (2003), as well as Simon Brodbeck for his improvement of the second one (2010).

² Bakker 1993 (s.v. “cycle of myths II”, nos 1–8) and Bakker 1996: 34 (see Bakker & Isaacson 2004: 189–190). No. 9 in Bakker 1993, artificially placed at the end of the “cycle of myths II” and corresponding to an episode of Kṛṣṇa's life told in the ViP (and BhP), is irrelevant here.

³ For all textual comparisons, see Appendix I.

⁴ As Söhnen and Schreiner (1989: xxxi) remind us in the introduction to their edition of the BrP: “it is not justified to quote the BrP as a testimony for critically reconstructing an ‘older’ version of those passages which the BrP has in common with MBh, HV or ViP” and [n.: “As assumed by W. Kirfel and those who followed him”] “there never was a ‘HV-BrP-Kern’ (core)”.

account – corresponding to HV Appendix I, no. 7 – to be an expanded secondary version of the story told in a concise form in HV 23.⁵ More surprisingly, the close study by Horst Brinkhaus (2005) of genealogical duplicates in the HV shows that even the HV interpolation is prior to the VāP/BdP rewriting.

In the following, I shall thus start from the shortest and probably the earliest version of the legend, as found in the *Harivaṃśa* (HV 23.57–68), explaining and comparing it with the Vedic and epic (especially MBh 13.31) accounts on Divodāsa and Pratardana. Then, I shall examine the shorter HV version’s relationship to the longer variant told in HV Appendix I, no. 7, before studying the borrowing from the HV-conflated text by the redactor(s) of the “classical” *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (abbr. VāBdP). As I have tried to show elsewhere (Vielle 2005) and as will be confirmed here, the VāBdP appears to be our earliest available specimen of purāṇic literature, followed in the sixth–seventh centuries CE by the sectarian *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* and *Skanda-purāṇa*.⁶ Moreover, it will be demonstrated here that the “para-epic” *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* comes at least prior to the ViP, the latter having in this case obviously borrowed some details peculiar to it. I hope that such a focus on the precise relationships between the *Harivaṃśa* and the earliest Purāṇas concerning one of their common PPañc (Vaṃśānucarita) portions will shed some concrete light on the complex question of the origin and growth of the purāṇic text corpus.

1. HV 23.57–68 AND THE EPIC AND VEDIC ACCOUNTS ABOUT DIVODĀSA AND PRATARDANA

The short account about the Kāśi line of kings in HV 23⁷ begins with the eponym Kāśika or Kāśya,⁸ Sutahotṛ’s son, and goes through Dīrghatapas, Dhanvantari, and Ketumant, up to Bhīmaratha. Bhīmaratha is generally regarded as the father of Divodāsa (cf. HV 368*, and Divodāsa called Bhaimaseni in MBh 5.115.1), but here the name must rather be understood as the one of Divodāsa himself,⁹ famous as a “remover of all the *rākṣasas*” (*sarvarakṣaḥpraṇāśanaḥ*, 57d).¹⁰ It is

5 Following Kirfel’s view, the editors of the BrP also consider the concise version as a “shortened and partly confused repetition” (Söhnen & Schreiner 1989: 33, n. 13). Yet, this is partly due to the fact that the shorter version appears in BrP 13 in a more corrupted form than its HV model.

6 For the dating of the SkP, see Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998: 5; for the ViP, see Vielle 2002: 345 n. 23.

7 The passage is omitted in mss K3, D1.3 and T3; see also below.

8 Different variants of the name in 23.54c and 23.55c.

9 Cf. also Aśvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita* 14.107 and VāP 92.23.

10 And not “of all the *kṣatriyas*”, as in the variant reading used by BrP 13.67b!

then stated¹¹ that at that time one *rākṣasa*, Kṣemaka by name, was dwelling in Vārāṇasī [which had been made/was therefore] empty (v. 58). And it is explained that she (viz. the city of Vārāṇasī) had indeed (previously) been cursed by the wise (and) high-minded (*matimatā... mahātmanā*) Nikumbha (59ab), who had uttered the following curse: “let [the city] be deserted for a thousand years” (*śūnyā varṣasahasraṃ vai bhavitrīti*, 59cd). As the city was cursed, Divodāsa founded another (unnamed) beautiful city at the boundary of the country on the bank of the Gomatī river (v. 60). He founded (or dwelled in) [the new city] after killing the hundred sons of Bhadraśreṇya (v. 61).

Then follow four verses in which it is very difficult to recognize who is who.¹² I give here a tentative translation, which also contains a new interpretation of the text:

The son of Divodāsa was the heroic king Pratardana. Two sons were born to Pratardana: first, Vatsa, [who was] actually a Bhārgava (v. 62), and, secondly, Alarka, the royal prince,¹³ the [one who became] king, a humble one (*saṃnatimān*) on the earth; and it is he, the lord of the earth, who took (viz. received/came into possession of) the heritage of the Hehaya (= belonging to Bhadraśreṇya or to his heir) (v. 63). The paternal heritage, which had been taken (“seized”; cf. v. 61) by Divodāsa by force, was (again) taken by the magnanimous Durdama, the son of Bhadraśreṇya. This (= Durdama) had indeed been spared by Divodāsa through compassion, as he was a mere child (v. 64). And it is [by] the lord named Aṣṭāratha (= Pratardana), son of Bhīmaratha (= Divodāsa), by this *kṣatriya* wishing to end the conflict,¹⁴ that it was fought over¹⁵ with him (*tasya* = Durdama),¹⁶ when the sons (of Durdama and/or of Aṣṭāratha/Pratardana, which would mean Alarka) were (still) infants (v. 65).

11 Omitted in BrP 13.

12 Already Wilson (1840) in his notes to ViP 4.8 speaks about “obscure informations” and “scanty and ill-digested notices”; see the comments by Söhnen and Schreiner (1989: 33 n. 8–13) about the corresponding passage in BrP 13.

13 This is an important point in my translation: I understand each of these two *pādas*, which are concluded by *ca*, as naming and qualifying one of the two sons of Pratardana. Yet, as we will see below, all the other versions consider that the two sons of Pratardana were Vatsa “and” Bhārga/Garga (cf. also the variant reading *bhārgas tathā* ad verse 62d), and that Alarka was the “son of the (son of Pratardana who became) king”, namely, of Vatsa (cf. also the variant reading *vatsaputraḥ* ad verse 63a).

14 See Langlois’s translation, contra Wilson’s “desirous of destroying his foes”.

15 Note the impersonal use, contra Wilson’s “[the country] was recovered”.

16 According to Wilson, the commentator of this HV passage (Nīlakaṇṭha?) also understands in verse 65 Bhīmaratha and Aṣṭāratha as the respective epithets of Divodāsa (as in v. 57 above) and Pratardana, and *tasya* as *durdamasya*.

Alarka is then described as the Kāśi king, brahmanical and the one of truthful promises (*satyasamgara*), who during sixty thousand and sixty hundred years was endowed with youth and beauty; [he was] the propagator of the Kāśi race who, due to the favour of Lopāmudrā, acquired the longest life (v. 66–67). At the end of [his] vigorous age, after the killing of the *rākṣasa* Kṣemaka, the lord settled (again) in (or founded again) the beautiful city of Vārāṇasī (v. 68). There follows a list of kings descending from Alarka (v. 69–71ab), which concludes with the following sentence: “To Vatsa [belonged] the Vatsa country (*vatsabhūmi*), (which is also called) the Bhārga/Bhrgu country¹⁷ by [the fact that he was a] Bhārgava” (*vatsasya vatsabhūmis tu bhārgabhūmis tu bhārgavāt*, 71cd). According to my interpretation, this statement has to be linked with verse 62d, thus giving logically a brief account of the collateral line (viz. that of the Bhārgava Vatsa, the first son of Pratardana and the (half-?)brother of Alarka).

The Alarka of our story appears rather different from the character bearing the same name in the *Mahābhārata* and who is involved in a long narrative/didactic passage of the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* (CE ch. 18–39 = 20–44 [Bibliotheca Indica ed.] / 18–41 [Veṅkaṭeśvara Press ed.]). In the latter passage, the exemplary *rājaraṣi* Alarka (cf. MkP 16.12–13, 17.33 = 19.37 BI/17.43 VP) is given as the son of the heroic Ṛtadhvaja Kuvalayāśva, who himself is a son of King Śatrujit. But he is clearly not the Kāśi king. In the best case, he is a neighbour or vassal of a Kāśi ruler (cf. the reference to the banks of the Yamunā in MkP 19.110 = 22/20.6 BI/VP, and of the Gomatī in MkP 20.90 = 23.91 BI/21.93 VP). The Kāśi king himself, unnamed, even militarily intervenes against Alarka in the course of the story. In the epic, no genealogy is given concerning Alarka. In MBh 3.26.12, it is simply stated that he “was a good and truthful man, king of the Kāśis and Karūṣas, who gave up his kingdom and wealth”.¹⁸ MBh 14.30.1ff. introduces Alarka as a *rājaraṣi* who learned the supreme bliss of yoga.¹⁹ *Rāmāyaṇa* 2.12.5 alludes to the fact that he gave his two eyes to a brahmin. Yet, the same is said of Kāśipati Pratardana in MBh 12.226.20 (Pollock 1986: 349, n. 5).

About Pratardana, the warrior-like son of Divodāsa through Yayāti’s daughter Mādhavī,²⁰ it is stated in the *Mahābhārata* (MBh 13, App. I, no. 14A, ll. 10–11 = Bombay ed. 13.137.5) that he gave his own son to a brahmin. This could be a reminiscence of the mysterious “Bhārgava” son of Pratardana in HV 23.62.

17 Note the variant reading *bhrgubhūmi* in Ñ2 V3 D6 M1–3.

18 Note the fact that he leaves the mundane life at the end of the story in the MkP 39 (44 BI / 41 VP).

19 Cf. the lengthy passage in MkP 34–38 (39–43 BI / 36–40 VP) where Dattātreya teaches yoga to Alarka.

20 Cf. MBh 5.115.15, 120.6–7.

Furthermore, MBh 12.49.71 states that Pratardana's son Vatsa was brought up among calves (*vatsailḥ*) in a cowpen, which might constitute one more element related to the lost legend regarding the same son. Lopāmudrā, who increases the life of Alarka, is well known as the wife of the sage Agastya in the MBh (3.94.21, 95.2ff.) and as a *dharmajñā* and *brahmavādinī* *apsaras* in the BḍP (1.2.33.19–20, not in the corresponding chapter 59 of the VāP). Finally, VāP 65.96 and BḍP 2.3.1.100 list Vatsas as one of the seven minor *gotras* of the Bhārgavas. From this statement it is possible to infer that Vatsa was the eponym of this Bhārgava *gotra*.

It must be noted that the version of the war between the Hehayas and the Kāśis as alluded in HV 23 is not easily compatible with what is told in MBh 13.31.²¹ In the *Vītahavyopākhyāna*, it is exposed how, like the famous Viśvāmitra of yore, the *rājaraṣi* Vītahavya²² attained brahminhood (*brāhmaṇya*). Here, against all the other accounts, Hehaya and Tālajaṅgha are introduced as two *rājas* (brothers?) born in the family of Śaryāti,²³ and both of them are said to have been rulers of the Vatsa country (*vatsesu*; MBh 13.31.6–7). The hundred sons of Hehaya/Vītahavya, much inclined to fighting, attacked the Kāśi king Haryaśva, Divodāsa's grandfather, and slew him in a battle between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, before going back to their own city in the Vatsa country (31.8–12). Similarly, they defeated King Sudeva, Haryaśva's son. King Divodāsa, Sudeva's son, then built at the command of Indra the city of Vārāṇasī, which became a prosperous place between the Gaṅgā and the southern bank of Gomatī (31.13–18). Again attacked by the Hehayas, Divodāsa, issuing forth from the city, fought for a thousand days, but after having lost all his army and people, he was finally forced to flee to the *ṛṣi* Bharadvāja's hermitage (31.19–25). Bharadvāja promised to help Divodāsa, and a sacrifice (*iṣṭi*) "in order to get a son" (viz. a *putreṣṭi*, as glossed by Bakker) was performed. As a result of the sacrifice, the heroic Pratardana was born as Divodāsa's son and endowed with the *ṛṣi*'s *tejas* (31.26–32).²⁴ Installed as *yuvarāja*, Pratardana marched against the sons of Vītahavya, crossed the Gaṅgā, conquered their city and slew them all (31.33–40).

21 See the "cycle of myths I", nos 1 and 3, in Bakker 1993: 23.

22 Vītahavya is also the name of a Janaka king of Videha in VāP 89.22 = BḍP2.3.64.23 (cf. PPañc 339,98). The identification by Pargiter (1910: 38, n. 3; 1922: 155), followed by R. Morton Smith (1973: 156–158), of Vītahavya with the Vītihotras or King Vītihotra (cf. PPañc 420,50 and 421,55) of the Haihaya race is very doubtful.

23 For Śaryāti, the son of Manu, cf. PPañc 299,1 and 305,25.

24 The structure of the story peculiar to MBh 13.31 is broken by Bakker (1993: 23), when he, rather artificially, includes in the same "cycle of myths I" (no. 2) a chapter (MBh 5.105) extracted from the famous story of Gālava (MBh 5.104–121), which presents a very different account of the birth of Pratardana through Mādhavī (without any mention of Bharadvāja's role). There is a similar problem in no. 4, where the MBh references to Vārāṇasī as a place sacred to Śiva are gathered in the same "cycle".

King Vītahavya fled to the *āśrama* of Bhṛgu, who assured him of his protection. When Pratardana ordered the king to surrender, Bhṛgu declared: “There is no *kṣatriya* in this hermitage; here all are brahmins” (31.41–49). So, Pratardana returned home, while, as a consequence of Bhṛgu’s statement, Vītahavya became a *brahmarṣi*. Due to this incident, Vītahavya’s son Gr̥tsamada and all their lineage also became brahmins (31.50–64).

In the version told in MBh 13.31, one can hear echoes of the Vedic tradition on the famous Bharata king Divodāsa/Atithigva.²⁵ Macdonell and Keith (1912, I: 15) have rightly observed about this character that he “was already an ancient hero in the earliest hymns, and was becoming almost mythical”. Already in ṚV 4.26.3 and 4.30.20, Indra helps Divodāsa to destroy the forts of his enemies,²⁶ while ṚV 6.16.5 and 6.31.4 attest to the close relationship of King Divodāsa and the poet Bharadvāja by mentioning them together.²⁷ In the *Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa* (PB 15.3.7), Bharadvāja appears as Divodāsa’s *purohita* who helps the king by finding out a mantric means of rescue when Divodāsa is – like in the MBh – hemmed in by various enemies. In the *Kāṭhakaśaṃhitā* (21.10 = KpS 50.1), it is the same Bharadvāja who, as *purohita*, gives Pratardana the kingdom. This Pratardana is called Daivodāsi ‘Divodāsa’s son’ in *Maitrāyaṇīśaṃhitā* 3.7.7 and in *Kauṣītakiabrāhmaṇa* 26.5, as well as in the *Anukramaṇī* (ad ṚV 9.96) of Śaunaka. The *Anukramaṇī* (ad ṚV 10.179) also presents him as the “Kāśi king” (*kāśirāja*) along with Śibi Auśīnara and Vasumanas Rauhidaśva (= his two royal half-brothers in MBh 5.114–116 and 120). In the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* (3.1), Pratardana Daivodāsi is said to have gone to Indra’s world through his heroic death in battle. In the *Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa* (3.245–248), this time the *purohita* Bharadvāja helps King Kṣatra, Pratardana’s son, in the same manner as he did Divodāsa, provoking Indra’s coming and help when the king was surrounded by the ten kings at the great battle.²⁸ Vītahavya is the name of a prince mentioned already in the Ṛgveda along with Bharadvāja (ṚV 6.15.2–3) and as a contemporary of Sudās (ṚV 7.19.3), “though in both passages it is possible to understand the word as a mere adjective” (Macdonell & Keith 1912, II: 316–317). In the PB, however, Vītahavya

25 According to ṚV 6.61.1, the king was the son of Vadhryaśva by Sarasvatī; he is mysteriously called Kaśojū in ṚV 1.112.14, while in *KāṭhakaS* 7.1.8 he bears the same epithet Bhaimaseni as in MBh 5.115.1.

26 It is to be noted that in the MBh the same god orders the king to build a new capital.

27 The close relationship between Divodāsa and Bharadvāja is further attested in medical texts, where the medical tradition is supposed to have been transmitted from Indra either to King Divodāsa (*Suśrutasamhitā* 1.1.2 and 16) or to the *ṛṣi* Bharadvāja (*Carakasamhitā* 1.1.3–5).

28 In this JB passage, Kṣatra, the son of Pratardana, replaces Sudās Pajavana, the “son of Pijavana”, as the grandson of Divodāsa in the famous battle of the ten kings, as alluded to in ṚV 7.18.23–25; see Witzel 1995: 333–337, 340.

Śrāyasa is introduced as an ancient king who had a thousand sons (PB 25.16.3),²⁹ and as a man who was once *niruddha* (apparently “in banishment”) before being firmly established (PB 9.1.9). In this last occurrence, “the scholiast [Sāyaṇa] explains him as not a king but a ṛṣi” (Macdonell & Keith 1912, II: 317). In the Vedic tradition, “Bhārgava” Ḡṛtsamada (cf. KB 22.4), to whom many hymns of the second *maṇḍala* of the ṚV are ascribed, appears to have no connection with Vītahavya or with Divodāsa's family. However, Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's *Vedārthadīpikā*, in its introduction to the second *maṇḍala*, quotes Śaunaka's *ṛṣyanukramaṇa*,³⁰ where Ḡṛtsamada is represented as having originally been the son of Śunahotra of the race of Āṅgiras but afterwards the son of Śunaka of the race of Bhṛgu.³¹

If we now sum up the data collected from the Vedic literature, the MBh and HV 23, we may at the least say that a rich mytho-heroic cycle was/became attached to the character of King Divodāsa and his son Pratardana. Even between MBh 13.31 and the HV passage, there are, despite the differences, a few interesting common features.

First, there is the fight of King Divodāsa with the hundred sons of a king called Hehaya (= Vītahavya) or belonging to the Hehaya race (Bhadraśreṇya). Secondly, it is said that the lineage of Bhārgava brahmins settled in the Vatsa country sprung from one of the two *rāja/kṣatriya* brothers (MBh: Hehaya and Tālajaṅgha; HV: Vatsa and Alarka), whereas the Kāśi kings had rather close relationships with the Āṅgirasas (see below for HV 23). It may be suggested that the differences between the traditions arose from the fact that the HV version represents the standpoint of the *kṣatriyas*/kings of Kāśi (according to which the Bhārgava Vatsas are a mere collateral branch of the Kāśis), whereas the MBh version represents the standpoint of the brahmins/Bhārgavas of the Vatsa country (who, in ascribing their *kṣatriya* origin directly to Manu's son Śaryāti, proclaim their independence from the Kāśi kingdom). Anyway, just as there was no need to postulate several Vedic Divodāsas, there is no need to postulate two epic/purāṇic Kāśi kings named Divodāsa (I and II) to solve such “discrepancies”³² – as Pargiter (1910: 38–41; 1922: 153–55) and R. Morton Smith (1973: 150–156) did from their historicistic or euhemeristic points of view. In my opinion, we are

29 Cf. also TS 5.6.5.3, KS 22.3, JUB 2.6.11.

30 Even if the wording of the extant *Āṛṣānukramaṇī* (2.2–3) is slightly different; see Tokunaga 1997: 218.

31 Cf. the genealogical data in HV 23.50–54 and App. I, no. 7, ll. 11–15 = PPañc 369,3–5.

32 There is, moreover, the third “Pañcala” *rājarṣi* Divodāsa, the son of the Āṅgirasa *brahmaṛṣi* Vadhryaśva by the *apsaras* Menakā (reminding of Divodāsa as the son of Vadhryaśva by Sarasvatī, according to ṚV 6.61.1). This third Divodāsa is presented as the twin brother of the famous Ahalyā and the ancestor of Bhārgava *kṣatriya*-brahmins (see Pargiter 1918: 239–242; cf. PPañc 548,86–94a from VāP and MtP only, since now *377 and *378 in HV 23).

here dealing with the same mytho-heroic characters,³³ even if they have entered the pseudo-historical genealogies by different means.

2. THE EXTENDED VERSION: HV APPENDIX I, NO. 7, LL. 56–156 AND VĀP 93.23–68 / BḌP 2.3.67.25–72

As Söhnen and Schreiner (1989: xxxi) wrote in the introduction to their edition of the *Brahmapurāṇa*, “the HV must be considered our only and oldest testimony for the transition from Epic to Purāṇa”. Ruben (1941: 248) already declared that the “H[arivaṃśa] really is a supplement to and an imitation of the MBh” and, at the same time, that the “H[arivaṃśa] is rightly called the oldest Purāṇa”. The late K.P.A. Menon (2002: 27), however, nuanced the second assertion in saying:

In its earliest form Harivaṃśa might not have qualified to be counted as a Purāṇa. With the Era of Itihāsa coming to an end and with the evolution of a new genre of literary composition in the form of Purāṇa Harivaṃśa might have been subsequently transformed into that form.

This is, in fact, what Brinkhaus has convincingly demonstrated on the basis of a close study of the text of the critical edition of the HV.³⁴ In particular, he points out how some interpolated passages testify to the HV’s “late epic/early purāṇic” growth and the text’s progressive transformation into a conflated (“vulgate”) form. The conclusions of his latter study (Brinkhaus 2005) about two Paurava genealogical passages in HV 23 – which offer expanded “duplicates” in the HV Appendices I, nos 6B and 7 – are of very great importance here. Contrary to his starting working hypothesis, according to which the interpolations formed by the two appendices were borrowed from the “VāP-BḌP kernel” – which can now more accurately be called the “classical” *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*³⁵ – Brinkhaus surprisingly proved in both cases the indebtedness of the VāP/BḌP common text to the passages interpolated into the HV!

Focusing on App. I, no. 7, which takes place after ch. 21 in several HV mss,³⁶ it is interesting to observe the significant change of place of the Kāśi royal family within the Somavaṃśa genealogy. In Chapter 23, Kāśika/Kāśya’s father Sutahotr

33 On the concept of “mytho-heroic cycle” (or “heroic mytho-cycle”), see Vielle 1996.

34 For his strong hypothesis, at the level of higher criticism, on what could have been the Ur-HV, or “kernel” (core) of the HV as the *khila* of the MBh, see Brinkhaus 1990; 2002: 159–160.

35 On the early *purāṇa* called *vāyuprokta* or the “classical” *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, see Vielle 2005.

36 M4 is supposed to contain the interpolation (forming its ch. 26), even if the collation of that ms. appears to have been forgotten from the critical apparatus of App. I, no. 7!

is introduced as the son of Vitatha³⁷ (i.e. within the Paurava line). But in App. I, no. 7, the father of Kāśa/Kāśya (cf. ll. 13/17) becomes Sunahotra, the son of Kṣatravṛddha, and the latter has to be structurally understood as being precisely the same son of Āyu who in 21.11d was called Vṛddhaśarman.³⁸ The genealogy of Kṣatravṛddha/Vṛddhaśarman,³⁹ the ancestor of the Kāśi kings, is thus logically given after the genealogies of his brothers Raji (ch. 21.12–37), Rambha (childless), and Anenas,⁴⁰ and before the genealogy of the eldest brother Nahuṣa (ch. 22),⁴¹ Āyu's son, who was Yayāti's father. In this case, line 168 corresponding to 23.72ab (see above) becomes meaningless (even with the lectio *bhārgave*). But, on the other hand, this new placement fits much better than the previous one with the commonly accepted mytho-epic account of Pratardana as the son that Divodāsa had with Mādhavī, the daughter of Yayāti.

The main aim of the author of the interpolated passage was apparently to add within the Kāśi genealogy: 1) the Vaiṣṇava-orientated story of the origin of Dhanvantari,⁴² and 2) the Śaiva-orientated story of the curse placed upon Vārāṇasī. Both of these myths were presumably borrowed or elaborated from other source(s). Besides these two new stories, the text corresponding with ch. 23 was also slightly rewritten.⁴³ So, Divodāsa becomes clearly the son of Bhīmaratha (l. 57), and he is no longer described as a *rākṣasa*-killer (cf. l. 58). There follows the allusion to the emptiness of Vārāṇasī occupied by the *rākṣasa* Kṣemaka in consequence of Nikumbha's curse (ll. 59–62). The founding of, or at the least the dwelling in, a new city on the bank of Gomatī river by Divodāsa took place after he had killed the hundred sons of Bhadrāśreṇya (ll. 63–66). After this, there follows an added line (l. 67), which explains that “this kingdom/realm (viz. where the new capital was settled) which originally belonged to Bhadrāśreṇya was seized by him (Divodāsa), who was more powerful”. Then, as an answer to King Janamejaya's question concerning the reason for the curse and the identity of Nikumbha, it

37 Vitatha was Bharata's successor, though actually the son of the Āṅgīrasa Bharadvāja. Cf. 23.50–53, a passage that explains the conclusive v. 72ab with the better lectio difficilior var. M2 *bhārate*: “These are the sons of Āṅgīras born in the Bhārata family.”

38 See Pargiter 1922: 85, n. 6; cf. PPañc 369,2, MBh 1.70.23 (mistranslated by Van Buitenen) and ViP 4.8.2; Söhnen & Schreiner 1989: 28, n. 1, and Brinkhaus 2005: 364 n. 8; contra e.g. Smith 1973: 147–148, 161. Attention must be paid not to confuse this Kṣatravṛddha/Vṛddhaśarman with Kṣatradharma, the last descendant of Anenas (cf. HV App. I, no. 7, l. 9).

39 App. I, no. 7, l. 10b: *kṣatravṛddhasya me śṛṇu*; l. 170a: *ity ete kāśayaḥ proktā[ḥ]*.

40 App. I, no. 7, ll. 1–10a: *rambho 'napatyas tatrāśīd vaṁśaṁ vakṣyāmy anenasah* (line 1) ... *anenasah samākhyātāḥ* (line 10a).

41 Cf. App. I, no. 7, l. 170b: *nahuṣasya nibodhata*.

42 On Dhanvantari, see Gray 1922.

43 The changes occur already in the beginning of the Kāśi line, where some characters have been added.

is told at length (ll. 68–138) how Śiva sends his *gaṇa* Nikumbha, how the latter puts the curse upon Vārāṇasī and the origin of the holy place called Avimukta (on which, see below §3). After the story, the genealogy continues again. First there is an added transitional line (l. 139), saying that “the son of Bhadrāsreṇya was famous under the name Durdama”.⁴⁴ The next sentences (taken from ch. 23) are put in a more understandable order, and the problematic v. 65ab is omitted. This (Durdama) indeed had been spared by Divodāsa, thinking that he was only a boy (l. 140). After obtaining the heritage of Hehaya, the king (Durdama) took back his paternal heritage seized by Divodāsa by force (ll. 141–142). [It was made] by this magnanimous Durdama, son of Bhadrāsreṇya, by this *kṣatriya* desirous of ending the conflict/destroying his foes (ll. 143–144).⁴⁵ Pratardana was the son of Divodāsa by Dṛṣṭadvatī (who is she?); it is this son (viz. Pratardana), (still) a boy, who again fought with him (viz. Durdama) (ll. 145–146). The two sons of Pratardana were Vatsa and Bhārga (various readings for the latter), and Vatsa’s son was Alarka, defined here as the father of Saṃnati (ll. 147–148). Alarka is the Kāśī king about whom the traditional *śloka* is sung (ll. 149–152).⁴⁶ His life is increased by Lopamudrā (ll. 153–154).⁴⁷ Alarka kills the *rākṣasa* Kṣemaka at the end of the period of the curse (*śāpasyānte*) and the beautiful city of Vārāṇasī is rebuilt (*punar*) (ll. 155–156).

Next I turn to the text of the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (VāBḍP). Even if, following Brinkhaus’s conclusions, the *vāyuprokta* version appears to be based on the extented/vulgate version of the HV, it is far from being a mere copy of the HV’s text. For example, in the account of the lineages of Āyu’s five sons the order of the sons has been changed. In the HV, Raji is the first, followed by Rambha, Anenas, Vṛddhaśarman/Kṣatravṛddha, and finally Nahuṣa, but in the VāBḍP the lineage of Kṣatravṛddha⁴⁸ is given as the first, followed by that of Raji, and finally the lineages of Anenas and Nahuṣa are listed.⁴⁹ Surprisingly, Kirfel (1927: 369–384) also adopted this new order, even against the BrP-HV evidence.

44 Cf. the same line in the account of the Hehaya race, *394, l. 1.

45 Cf. BrP 11.48, which transforms this sentence without a verb into the fact that “by him” *vairasyāntaḥ* [...] *kṛtaḥ*.

46 Since l. 152, corresponding to 23.67ab, fits better with the next line, D1 T1.3–4 G3–5 insert after l. 151 the star-passages **9, which is the same half-*śloka* as found in the ViP.

47 The last (added) line corresponds with the widely attested line *373 in HV 23.

48 Cf. BḍP 2.3.67.2–3 and the “eVā” quoted by R. Morton Smith (1973: 147). The name is corrupted in the available editions of the VāP. On the very interesting “eVā” ms. (first thus referred to by Pargiter 1913: xxxiii, and then by Smith 1973), see Vielle 2005.

49 The *pādas* containing the name of Rambha (described as *anapatya*), preceding the name of Anenas, have become more or less corrupted. Cf. PPāñc 383,1 and the “eVā” ms. in Smith 1973: 160–161.

Furthermore, the VāBḍP sometimes follows in its account the wordings of HV 23 rather than the one of App. I, no. 7, despite the fact that it omits the account of the Kāsi line in the Paurava genealogy. This fact indicates that the author(s) of the VāBḍP had both HV versions available (as noted by Brinkhaus 2005: 372). For example, BḍP 2.3.67.26⁵⁰ combines HV App. ll. 57–58 and 23.57c in order to avoid the repetition of the name Divodāsa; VāP v. 24b / BḍP v. 27b has *purā*, which is a variant peculiar to HV 23.58b; and line 154 of the App., which is absent in HV 23 (except as *373), does not appear in the VāBḍP either. Among the most significant changes in comparison with the HV Appendix version is the dropping of lines 65–67 and replacing them before line 140, after the account of the curse (as did Kirfel 1927: 376–377). Moreover, lines 141–143 are omitted and line 144 is displaced after lines 145–146. Thus, the passage can be understood in two contradictory ways: “that boy, the *kṣatriya* desirous of destroying all enmity/ending the hostility, the son (of Bhadrāśreṇya, viz. Durdama, or of Divodāsa, viz. Pratardana), fought with him (Pratardana or Durdama) again” (the same sequence is adopted by Kirfel).⁵¹ In line 147, Pratardana’s son Bhārga becomes Garga, and line 149, now a bit redundant, is omitted.

The dependence of the *vāyuprokta* version from HV App. I, no. 7 appears obvious also in the story of the curse by the *gaṇa* Nikumbha. In this passage, the readings of the HV are often better: for example, *nikumbham idam abravīt | gaṇeśvara* (App. ll. 88b–89a) versus *gaṇeśaṃ kṣemakam [...] abravīt | gaṇeśvara* (“eVā” in Smith 1973: 151; cf. VāP 92.36cd–37a, BḍP 2.3.67.40, and PPañc 373,40). The latter variant creates confusion between the *gaṇa* (Nikumbha) and the *rākṣasa* (Kṣemaka). Variant readings ad App. l. 89a, such as *rākṣaseśa* (V1 B1.2) or *rākṣasena* (given by Bhatta 1995: 259, n. 3: “from HV I.29”, but not found in the critical apparatus), may explain the confusion in the VāBḍP. It is worth noting that in its *Vārāṇasīmāhātmya*, the early Skandapurāṇa (ch. 26–31), which presents itself as a sequel to the VāBḍP,⁵² avoids the confusion by simply saying that after Nikumbha’s trick and curse the empty Vārāṇasī was occupied by *mṛgas* (SkP 26.63d) and much later (both chronologically and in the text itself) repopulated by Alarka (cf. SkP 30.64–65 ≈ MtP 180.68).⁵³

⁵⁰ = VāP 92.23ef for the second half.

⁵¹ The fanciful interpretations of this passage by Smith (1973: 154–155) can be left aside.

⁵² Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998: 20–22. The SkP is not much interested in royal genealogies, however. This may explain why there is no mention at all of the *rākṣasa* Kṣemaka in the SkP, since in the VāBḍP it is not in the excursus about Nikumbha but in the genealogical accounts before and after it that the only two allusions to the *rākṣasa* occur.

⁵³ See Bakker 1993: 24–28 and Bakker 2004 for the study of the *Vārāṇasīmāhātmya* of the SkP.

The Viṣṇupurāṇa follows the structure of the VāBḍP account closely, being a kind of retelling of it. Also, it adopts the same order for the lineages of Āyu's five sons (cf. ViP 4.8–9).⁵⁴ Within its concise prose rendering, however, it alludes only very briefly to the story of the origin of Dhanvantari (with its Vaiṣṇava flavour) and does not mention at all the (Śaiva) story of the curse by Nikumbha. On the other hand, the following few details are added concerning Pratardana, Vatsa, and Alarka (CE 4.8.6–8). Pratardana was victorious over his foes, namely, the Bhadrāśreṇya family, in consequence of which he was called Śatrujit (6: *sa ca bhadrāśreṇyavaṃśavināśād aśeṣāḥ śatravo 'nena jitā iti śatrujī abhavad*). The son of Pratardana's was called Vatsa because he was much loved by his father who used to call him: "boy! boy!" (7: *tena ca prītimatātmaputro vatsa vatsety abhihitas tato vatso 'sāv abhavad*). Vatsa got (also) the name of Ṛtadhvaja because of his thorough honesty; because he had a horse called Kuvalaya, he was also known on this earth as Kuvalayāśva (7: *satyaparatayā ṛtadhvajasaṃjñām avāpa | punaś ca kuvalayanāmānam aśvaṃ lebhe tataḥ kuvalayāśva ity asyāṃ pṛthivyāṃ prathitaḥ*). And this Vatsa's son was Alarka (8: *tasya ca vatsasya putro 'larko nāmābhavad*, followed by the *śloka* traditionally "sung" about him ≈ PPañc 377,70ab + a second half peculiar to the ViP: *alarkād aparo nānyo bubhuje medinīm yuvā*).⁵⁵ It is easy to see that all the supplementary names given by the ViP to Pratardana (viz. Śatrujit) and to Vatsa (viz. Ṛtadhvaja and Kuvalayāśva) come from the passage in the MkP dealing with the *rājarṣi* Alarka, the son of Ṛtadhvaja Kuvalayāśva and grandson of Śatrujit (see above). Despite this clever attempt of syncretism by the author(s) of the ViP, the exemplary king Alarka of the MkP is, as we have seen, neither the son of Vatsa nor the grandson of Pratardana!

Finally, I would like to add the following four remarks on the relationship between the different accounts:

1) The (erroneous) statement that Vārāṇasī "previously" (*pūrvam*) belonged to the Hehaya king Bhadrāśreṇya seems to have first taken place in the text of App. I, no. 7 (**4, many mss) and was borrowed from there to HV 23 (*369, with one line more, only supported by Dn and the G. edition). The origin of this detail can be found in the VāP (ch. 94) / BḍP (2.3.69) account of the Hehaya race, where it is said that Bhadrāśreṇya (probably due to a misunderstanding of

54 Yet with some further confusion of names, because Kṣatrapṛddha is given as the first son, but also as the fourth (instead of Anenas, in 4.9.14).

55 The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (9.17.6), which obviously uses the ViP here, adds the name Dyumant for Pratardana, but misunderstands his model while attributing the names Ṛtadhvaja, Kuvalayāśva, and even Vatsa to the same Pratardana, rather than to his son. In his commentary on the ViP (followed by Wilson), Śrīdhara (c.1400 CE) (mis)understands this as the BhP (see also his commentary on the BhP passage).

the previous account of the war with the Kāśi kings) was “the king of Vārāṇasī, as it has already been stated” (*vārāṇasyadhiṣṭhā rājā kathitaḥ pūrva eva hi*).⁵⁶ Note that the similar half-verse found in the *Matsyapurāṇa* (43.11: *vārāṇasyām abhūt rājā kathitaḥ pūrvam eva tu*) is obviously meaningless, as there is no previous statement about Bhadrāsreṇya (here named Rudrasreṇya). Thus, it can safely be concluded that the MtP has in this case borrowed from the VāBḍP.

2) The widely attested⁵⁷ passage *392/394 in HV 23, which adds in the Hehaya genealogy the kings Sāhañja (founder of the city of Sāhañjanī), Mahiṣmān (founder of the city of Mahiṣmatī), Bhadrāsreṇya, Durdama, and Kanaka, appears to be anterior to the corresponding text of VāP (94.5–8ab) / BḍP (2.3.69.5–8ab). Yet, the VāBḍP version has suppressed the references to the founding of the cities (cf. PPañc 411.5–8ab) at the same time as it has added the reference to Bhadrāsreṇya's kingship in Vārāṇasī (see remark 1 directly above).⁵⁸

3) The fact that four HV mss (K₃, D_{1.3}, T₃), all containing the App. I, no. 7 interpolation, omit the “original” short account in ch. 23 about the Kāśi line of kings can easily be explained by their wish to avoid such an obvious contradiction (see Brinkhaus 2005). In the case of D₁, however, the scribe has tried to combine both accounts in repeating the wording of Chapter 23 within the text of App. 7, as shown in the Concordance table (see Appendix I below). The case of K₃ betrays a stronger influence by the VāP/BḍP textual structure, since App. 7 is here (as in K₁) placed after 21.11, namely, at the same place as in the VāBḍP.

4) In the passages concerned here, in the case of both the shorter and the longer accounts, it is confirmed that the late BrP is a mere (and often corrupted) copy of the HV vulgate version. The fact that the passage of BrP ch. 11 corresponding to HV App. I, no. 7 omits both stories of the origin of Dhanvantari and the curse on Vārāṇasī may be explained by the deliberate choice of the BrP author to drop these two excursus, as it was already the case in the ViP for the second one. He did it each time precisely at the layer of interlocution in which the question introducing the excursus was asked. He also logically suppressed the four verses alluding to the story of the curse found in the subsequent shorter account of HV 23 (cf. BrP ch. 13).

⁵⁶ VāP 94.6cd / BḍP 2.3.69.6cd; cf. PPañc 411.6 = HV 23 *393 (supported only by Ś₁ K_{1.2.4} B₂ D_n G₃), MtP 43.11, etc.

⁵⁷ Supported by Ś₁ (partly), as well as by K Ñ_{2.3} V B D T G M₄ – viz. missing only from Ñ₁ and M_{1–3}.

⁵⁸ Note also that both editions of the VāP and BḍP have in v. 7 the reading *durmado nāma parthivaḥ* (see also Kirfel 1927: xxii, no. 4), the same as in var. M₄ ad *394, l. 1b. The easy change of Durdama into Durmada is also attested in var. G₂ ad App. I, no. 7, l. 139, and in var. G M_{1.2}, etc. ad ViP 4.11.4. It is used in a distinctive manner in the JaiSa portion examined below (§3), where the Hehaya prince Durdama is the second reincarnation of the *gandharva* Dumada.

Since, however, nothing really conclusive can be said about the Purāṇas that still need a critical edition (viz. the VāBḍP and the MtP), a provisory conclusion of this intertextual study is at least that the story about the Śaiva *gaṇa* Nikumbha cursing Vārāṇasī is a bit older than Bakker thought (5th or 6th century CE, according to him; 1993: 21; 1996: 32–34). There are indeed good reasons for ascribing the composition of the VāBḍP to the beginning of the fourth century CE (Kirfel 1927: xviii; Brinkhaus 2005: 372; Vielle 2005: 543). Even before that time, the story had already occurred within the *Harivaṃśa* “conflated version”, namely, maybe about the 3rd century CE at the least. When Kālidāsa in *Raghuvamśa* 2.35 presents Kumbhodara, the lion servant of Śiva, as being “the friend of Nikumbha”, he seems to allude to the same character of the *gaṇa* as in our episode (known to the poet from HV App. I, no. 7, and/or the VāBḍP), as the Keralan commentator Aruṇagirinātha (early 15th century) understood it (Iyer 1983: 161–162; Bhatta 1995: 258–259).⁵⁹ But what is even more noteworthy to me is the fact that a tradition about a curse placed upon Vārāṇasī by a certain wise and noble character (a *brahma*- or *rāja*-ṛṣi?) called Nikumbha, as alluded in the “original” HV ch. 23, is still older than the episode involving the Śaiva *gaṇa*. What precisely that early tradition related to Vārāṇasī (around the beginning of

59 It is possible that Aruṇagirinātha (himself copied by Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita) relies here on the unpublished *Dīpikā* of Dakṣiṇāvartanātha. Here is the text of his *Prakāśikā*, including the variants of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, summarizing the “MBh” account (which means either the HV version from a M4 type ms. having App. I, no. 7, or the MBh really, where, within the *Rājadharmā* section, in a portion dealing with *caitya-vṛkṣas* not to be felled, in a star-passage that all the S mss have, 12.69.40 *163, one *śloka* (ll. 4–5) alludes to the destruction in Vārāṇasī of the forces of Saudāsa [to be corrected in Saudeva = Divodāsa, cf. MBh 13.31.15 and 26] by Nikumbha the *mahēśvaragaṇeśa*; see Bakker & Isaacson 2004: 190 n. 7): *anena “purā kila vārāṇasyāṇi caityavṛkṣe nikumbho nāma gaṇaḥ prativasati sma | taṃ ca vṛkṣaṃ kāśīrājaḥ [cf. bhṛtāḥ NP] kuto ’pi hetoḥ chedayām āsa | sa kupito rājānaṃ saprakṛtikam [cf. saprajāmātyaṃ saputrapitṛbāndhavam NP] svatejasā dadāha” | iti mahābhārataprasiddham itihāsam dṛṣṭāntayan paramēśvarānubhāvopabṛṃhiteṣu sarvapuruṣakārā viphalībhavanti dyotayati*. Following Bhatta’s interpretation of Kālidāsa’s allusion (Bhatta 1995: 258–259 on *Raghuvamśa* 2.35; see already Iyer 1983: 162), “this sends the warning to Dilīpa that he too may have to face a similar consequence if he interferes to release the cow from the clutches of the lion viz. Kumbhodara”. About Kālidāsa’s *pāda*, here should be stressed the fact, contra Bhatta (1995: 258–259) who himself relies on Nandargikar’s edition, that actually Vallabhadeva’s commentary, according to the text of the Kashmirian manuscripts (cf. Goodall & Isaacson 2003), does read *nikumbha-mitram* (and not *nikumbha-tulyam*, “equal to N.”, as read by Aruṇagirinātha, Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, and Sarvajñāvanamuni, a variant that does not need to be considered as better, as did Iyer and Bhatta), and does identify this Nikumbha with one famous *gaṇa* (*nāma prakāśye | nikumbhākhyasya gaṇasya prakhyātātāt tanmāitryā praśamsā*), not with Pārvaṭi’s lion (as stated by Nandargikar). As Goodall and Isaacson have convincingly argued in their edition, the non-Kashmirian manuscripts purporting to transmit Vallabhadeva’s commentary, being the ones that have been hitherto consulted by editors such as Nandargikar, do not really do so.

our era?) was, unfortunately, remains unknown to us, even if we cannot doubt that the HV redactor had something in mind.⁶⁰

3. A NEW VERSION: JAISA 2–15

There exists, however, another version of the story of the curse put upon Vārāṇasī by an angry sage⁶¹ and of the war between the Kāśis and the Hehayas, and it is found in the *Jaiminīyasaṃhitā* of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (JaiSa), a later purāṇic work preserved in Kerala, where it was composed sometime around 1300 CE (see Vielle 2002; 2005; 2008; 2011–2012; 2014; and *forthcoming* for the edition of *adhyāya* 1–15). Here is a summary of *adhyāya* 2, which introduces the epic narrative of the war between the Kāśis allied with the Kosalas, on the one side, and the Hehayas on the other (Chapters 3–15).

After the genealogy of the Ikṣvāku dynasty provided in ch. 1, within which King Vasumanas is presented as the son of Haryaśva and Mādhavī, under whom the conflict started with the Hehayas conducted by Bhadraśreṇya (1.59–61b), the royal interlocutor (King Hiraṇyanābha, of the solar race) asks the sage Jaimini to tell more about the origin of the conflict between the Hehaya king Bhadraśreṇya and the Ikṣvāku king Vasumanas (2.1–2). The long answer begins with the lunar genealogy from Āyu to Bhadraśreṇya and a brief account of the conquests, marriages and descendance of the latter (2.3–21). There follows a focus on the Kāśi king Divodāsa and the city of Vārāṇasī (2.22–23) with two verses about the Avimukta sacred place (2.24–25; see below) and two verses explaining that the prosperous city of Vārāṇasī had been formerly (*purā*) founded by the *rākṣasa* Kṣemaka, himself killed by Divodāsa who was then dwelling in the place (2.26–27). There comes the “Vedic” *ṛṣi* (*maharṣi*, *muni*) called Kumbhaka, who, in the company of his wife and his sacred cow, installs his hermitage near the city and performs the domestic sacrifices (2.28–37). In the meantime, a large drought strikes the whole country (except the hermitage) and there occurs the unintentional stealing of the sage’s cow (in fact, she had followed a group of cows to the

60 Does Aśvaghōṣa in *Buddhacarita* 20.117 (Chinese and Tibetan versions) refer to the same (man) Nikumbha when he says: “the lord of men [i.e. king], Nikumbha, resiling from the Law [*dharma*] in this world of delusion, entered the earth in Kāśī” (translation E.H. Johnston)?

61 Note that the motif of the angry sage willing to curse Vārāṇasī is found in the MtP (180.164, 185.16–42, within a section entitled *Avimukta-tīrtha-māhātmya*). The circumstances are very different and not related to the Vamśānucarita context. It involves the character of Veda-Vyāsa, who is about to pronounce a curse but prevented from doing so by Śiva. SkP 30.61 also alludes to this coming to Vārāṇasī of the same “Vedic” and *yogin* Vyāsa but without referring to such a curse threat (see Bakker 1993: 27 and 23, who sees the curse by the *gaṇa* Nikumbha as the possible “implementation of an ‘earlier’ curse by Vyāsa”).

city), leading to the interruption of the sacrifice and Kumbhaka's terrible curse upon the city (2.38–59). King Divodāsa, after examining the omens, decides to leave Vārāṇasī and found a new city on the bank of the Gomatī river. When the building has already started, the hundred sons of Bhadraśreṇya come there, too, because they wanted to reach the place of the former capital of the Hehayas (i.e. the one founded by King Dharmanetra, which was in existence before the founding of Māhiṣmatī). A great battle ensues, with the consequent killing of the hundred sons and the complete defeat of Bhadraśreṇya by Divodāsa (2.60–89). The new city of Kāśī is then founded (2.90–94) and Divodāsa has with Mādhavī a son called Pratardana (2.95). Later on, Bhadraśreṇya has another son called Durdama, given as the reincarnation of a *rākṣasa* (killed by Vasumanas, 4.58–5.36), who himself was the reincarnation of the *gandharva* Durmada (cursed by the *apsaras* Urvaśī, 3.10–4.54). The conflict between, on the one hand, Bhadraśreṇya, Durdama (firstly spared by Divodāsa because a mere boy) and his son Kanaka, reinforced for a while by an army of *rākṣasas* (led by the son of Kṣemaka, who had once been killed by Divodāsa), and, on the other hand, both the Kosala lords Vasumanas and his son Tridhanvan, and the Kāśī lords Divodāsa, Pratardana (the half-brother of Vasumanas), and his son Vatsa, continues for a long time, until the final death of the Hehaya king and his son in battle (Chapters 6–15).

Despite the numerous literary (*kāvya* and *kathā*) embellishments by its learned and imaginative author, the main authoritative source of the JaiSa for the passage about Vārāṇasī in its ch. 2 can easily be traced: it is HV ch. 23, as found in the critical edition (viz. from a manuscript of the M1-3 type having not after ch. 21 the *adhyāya* corresponding to App. I, no. 7, with the Śaiva excursus), more precisely verses 57–62 and 63–65 (since Alarka as the son of Vatsa is not concerned here), but with some variants peculiar to the Malayalam manuscripts. The most striking one is the unique variant M1 *kumbhakena* instead of *nikhumbena* in v. 59b, which explains perfectly well the name of the sage (cf. *matimant... mahātman*, HV v. 59ab) in the JaiSa. Moreover, the var. M (etc.) *purā* in 58b (cf. also the var. M3 *etasminn antare kāle* in 58a) explains how it was logically understood that the *rākṣasa* Kṣemaka was dwelling in Vārāṇasī “beforehand”, before being killed by the famous “killer of all the *rākṣasas*” (*sarvarakṣaḥ-praṇāśanaḥ*) Divodāsa (whereas, as we have seen, Kṣemaka is in fact killed later in the HV; cf. v. 68b). The wording is sometimes exactly the same, bearing witness to the obvious borrowing (e.g. JaiSa v. 22a *etasminn eva kāle tu* = HV v. 58a; 22c *divodāsa iti khyātaḥ* = 57c; 26a–c *purīm vārāṇasīm tāṃ tu... niveśayām āsa purā* ≈ 58b–d; 26b *kṣemako nāma rākṣasaḥ* = 58d; 59cd with the curse *tasmāt sahasraṃ varṣāṇāṃ śūnyā bhavatu sā purī* ≈ 59cd; 74ab about the founding of the new town on the bank of the Gomatī,

sa tatra nagarīm ramyām viṣayānte mahīpatiḥ ≈ 60cd; cf. also 8.23cd *bālo 'yam iti... visasarja tam* and 15.51ab *divodāśena yaḥ pūrvaṃ bālo 'yam iti* ≈ 64ef).

There remains the problem of the JaiSa two “extra” verses dealing with Avimukta, which run as follows: “Not far from that [city of Vārāṇasī] there is a place, sacred in all the worlds, which purifies from all the sins, dedicated to Śiva from whom it bears the name Avimukta (*yasyāvidūre sumahat kṣetraṃ sarvāghanāśanam | śaivaṃ tad avimuktākhyam sarvalokanamaskṛtam*, v. 24). There dwells, fully visible, the divine Lord Śiva, for the help of his devotees through the power of the name Avimukta” (*yasmin vasati deveśaḥ sākṣāt pratyakṣataḥ śivaḥ | upakārāya bhaktānām avimuktasamākhyayā*, v. 25). As Peter Bisschop has noticed (pers. comm.), remarkably the JaiSa distinguishes Avimukta from Vārāṇasī itself (2.24a: *yasya+avidūre*: “not too far away from which”), which points to an earlier date (of the used source); while later on the whole town is generally identified as the *kṣetra* Avimukta, here the sanctuary Avimukteśvara seems to be referred to specifically. It is also noteworthy that Avimukta is not identified here as the cremation ground (*śmaśāna*) of Vārāṇasī, as is usually the case in later sources (cf. already MtP 184; the earlier MkP 8.106–117, which describes the *śmaśāna* in length, does not identify it with Avimukta). This feature is in fact common with the HV App. I, no. 7 / VāBḍP accounts, as well as the original SkP (but not its later recensions; see Bisschop 2002: 238–239; Bakker 2006). According to Bisschop, it is difficult to not compare JaiSa v. 24d–25a with HV App. I, no. 7 l. 134: *yasmin vasati vai devaḥ sarvadevanamaskṛtaḥ* (= VāP 92.59cd; cf. PPañc 376.62ab, BḍP 2,3,67.62cd with the var. *vased bhāvo*, and eVā apud Morton Smith 1973: 151 with the var. *vasaty eṣa pinākadhṛk*). So, it is possible that our author also had a look at a HV manuscript of the M4 type (containing the interpolated passage) or that the text of HV ch. 23 he used had a few additional verses on Avimukta. To add something on the Avimukta holy place in relationship with Vārāṇasī appears in fact as a kind of *locus communis*: such an interpolation on Avimukta (distinct from Vārāṇasī referred to just before) as the place “where by the sight of Śiva one is purified even after having slain a brahmin” is found in Northern manuscripts of the MBh (3.82.69 *419: *avimuktaṃ samāśādyā tīrthasevī kurūdvaha | darśanād devadevasya mucyate brahmahatyayā*); *Jābāla-Upaniṣad* 1–2 gives a symbolic explanation of Avimukta (linking sacred places with parts of the body), located in the middle of the Vārā and Nāsī [rivers] (quoted by Śaṅkara BSBh 1.2.32; a parallel passage is in KūP 1.29.59–62 CE, as noted by Bakker 2006 n. 19); the *Bṛhatkathāślokaṣaṃgraha* (21.2cd) evokes the connection with a pun, “Vārāṇasī, the holy city because of its inseparability from Avimukta” (*avimuktāvimuktatvāt puṇyā vārāṇasī purī*). Avimuktaka is also listed among the seven Śaiva *kṣetras* in the *Bṛhaspati[-nīti]-sūtra* (3.122), a Southern text probably a bit earlier than the JaiSa (see Vielle 2014: 22). It looks as if the JaiSa

author had deliberately wished to add here a sort of “touristic” pilgrimage note (he does the same on several other occasions).

It can also be observed here and elsewhere in the JaiSa that for the Vamśānucarita, beside the HV the author also uses the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (which itself in this matter paraphrases the VāBḍP account most of the time). However, sometimes the JaiSa author has misread, misunderstood, or reinterpreted his source. A good example is in JaiSa 15.54–55, at the very end of the section concerned here, when the two half-brother kings, Pratardana of Kāśī and Vasumanas of Kosala, come on the battlefield to congratulate the victorious Vatsa (son of Pratardana): “And they declared: ‘since by you alone so many enemies have been defeated, you, Vatsa, you will become famous under the name of Śatrujit’ (*abrūtāṃ ca tvayaikena bahavaḥ śatravo jītāḥ | tasmāt tvaṃ śatrujin nāmnā khyāto vatsa bhaviṣyasi*, v. 54). From that time this hero of great *tejas*, destructive of all his enemies, was famous in the world under the name of Śatrujit” (*tataḥ prabhṛti lokeṣu khyātaḥ śatrujid ākhyayā | babhūva sa mahātejāḥ sarvaśatrunibarhaṇaḥ*, v. 55). This *nirukti* is obviously based on the passage of the ViP (4.8.6–8) examined before (see above §2 and n. 55), which proposes to reconcile the different data of the VāBḍP and the MkP. As we have seen, the ViP, on the basis of the supposedly same character of Alarka, makes an equation between Pratardana and the MkP Śatrujit, and between Vatsa and the MkP Ṛtadhvaja Kuvalayāśva (son of Śatrujit and father of Alarka). The problem is that in ViP 4.8.6, the name Śatrujit with its explanation concerns Pratardana (cf. Śrīdhara ad loc. and ad BhP 9.17.6), not Vatsa, as it becomes in the JaiSa.

ABBREVIATIONS OF PRIMARY SOURCES

- BḍP [Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa] *Atha Brahmāṇḍamahāpurāṇaṃ prārabhyate*. Mumbai: Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1906.
- BhP [Bhāgavata-Purāṇa] *The Bhāgavata [Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa]: Critical Edition*. 4 vols. Ed. H.G. Shastri. Ahmedabad: B.J. Institute of Learning and Research, 1996–1998.
- BrP [Brahma-Purāṇa] *Sanskrit Indices and Text of the Brahmapurāṇa*. Ed. P. Schreiner & R. Söhnen. (Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen 1) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.
- HV [Harivaṃśa] *The Harivaṃśa, Being the khila or Supplement to the Mahābhārata: For the First Time Critically Edited*. 2 vols. Ed. P.L. Vaidya. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1969–1971.
- JaiSa [Jaiminīya-saṃhitā of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa]. See VIELLE *forthcoming*.
- KūP [Kūrma-Purāṇa] *The Kūrma Purāṇa: Critically Edited*. Ed. A.S. Gupta. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1971.
- MBh [Mahābhārata] *The Mahābhārata [For the First Time Critically Edited]*. 19 vols. Ed. V. Sukthankar et al. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933–1966.

- MkP [Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa] *The Critical Edition of the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇam*. 2 vols. Ed. M.L. Wadekar. Vadodara: Oriental Institute, M.S. University of Baroda, 2011. [References with BI and VP refer respectively to the Bibliotheca Indica and Veṅkaṭeśvara Press previous editions].
- MtP [Matsya-Purāṇa] *Śrīmaddvaipāyanamunipraṇītaṃ matsyapurāṇam*. Ed. H.N. Āpte. (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 54) Pune: Ānandāśrama, 1907.
- PPañc [Purāṇa-Pañcalakṣaṇa]. See KIRFEL 1927.
- SkP [Skanda-Purāṇa]. See ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER & ISAACSON 1998; BAKKER & ISAACSON 2004.
- VāBḍP The common text of the BḍP and VāP; see VIELLE 2005 (Appendix 2: General Table of Concordance).
- VāP [Vāyu-Purāṇa] *Mahāmuniśrīmadvyāsapraṇītaṃ vāyupurāṇam*. Ed. H.N. Āpte. (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 49) Pune: Ānandāśrama, 1905.
- ViP [Viṣṇu-Purāṇa] *The Critical Edition of the Viṣṇupurāṇam*. 2 vols. Ed. M.M. Pathak. Vadodara: Oriental Institute, M.S. University of Baroda, 1997–1999.

REFERENCES

- ADRIAENSEN, Rob, Hans BAKKER & Harunaga ISAACSON 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa*, I: *Adhyāyas 1–25, Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BAKKER, Hans 1993. Early Mythology Relating to Vārāṇasī. In: R.P.B. SINGH (ed.), *Banāras (Vārāṇasī): Cosmic Order, Sacred City, Hindu Traditions. Festschrift to Prof. R.L. Singh*: 21–28. Varanasi: Tara Book Agency.
- BAKKER, Hans 1996. Construction and Reconstruction of Sacred Space in Vārāṇasī. *Numen* 43: 32–55.
- BAKKER, Hans 2004. The Structure of the *Vārāṇasīmāhātmya* in *Skandapurāṇa* 26–31. 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 3.2): 1–16. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- BAKKER, Hans 2006. The Avimuktakṣetra in Vārāṇasī: Its Origin and Early Development. Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa*, VI. In: J. GENGNAGEL & M. GAENZLE (eds), *Visualizing Space in Banaras: Images, Maps and the Practice of Representation*: 23–39. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- BAKKER, Hans & Harunaga ISAACSON 2004. *The Skandapurāṇa*, IIA: *Adhyāyas 26–31.14: The Vārāṇasī Cycle*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BHATTA, C. Panduranga 1995. The Influence on the Mahābhārata on Kālidāsa in the Light of the Views Expressed by the Commentators. In: S.P. NARANG (ed.), *Modern Evaluation of the Mahābhārata (Prof. R.K. Sharma Felicitation Volume)*: 257–265. Delhi: Nag Publishers.

- BISSCHOP, Peter 2002. On a Quotation of the *Skandapurāṇa* in the *Tīrthavivekanakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru*. *Studies in the Skandapurāṇa V. Indo-Iranian Journal* 45: 231–243.
- BRINKHAUS, Horst 1990. Zur Entstehung und textgeschichtlichen Entwicklung des *Harivaṃśa*. In: W. DIEM & A. FALATURI (eds), 24. *Deutscher Orientalistentag 1988 in Köln: ausgewählte Vorträge*: 415–425. Stuttgart: Frans Steiner.
- BRINKHAUS, Horst 2002. The Division into Parvans and the Bhaviṣyaparvan of the *Harivaṃśa*. In: M. BROCKINGTON (ed.), *Stages and Transitions: Temporal and Historical Frameworks in Epic and Purāṇic Literature. Proceedings of the Second Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, August 1999*: 157–176. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- BRINKHAUS, Horst 2005. Duplicates in the Somavaṃśa Account of the Harivaṃśa: Early Text-historical Developments in the Harivaṃśaparvan. In: P. KOSKIKALLIO (ed.), *Epics, Khilas and Purāṇas: Continuities and Ruptures. Proceedings of the Third Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, September 2002*: 363–367. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- GOODALL, Dominic & Harunaga ISAACSON 2003. *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa with its Earliest Commentary: The Raghupāñcikā of Vallabhadeva. Critical edition, introduction and notes*, I. (Groningen Oriental Studies 17) Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- GRAY, Louis H. 1922. The Indian God Dhanvantari. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 42: 323–337.
- HAZRA, Rajendra Chandra 1940. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Dacca: University of Dacca. (Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975.)
- IYER, S. Venkitasubramonia 1983. Textual Criticism of *Raghuvamśa* on the Basis of Aruṇagirinātha's Commentary. *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal* 21: 151–168.
- KIRFEL, Willibald 1927. *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa: Versuch einer Textgeschichte*. Bonn: Kurt Schroeder.
- MACDONELL, Arthur A. & Arthur B. KEITH 1912. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, I–II. London: John Murray.
- MENON, K.P.A. 2002. The Spread and Fate of the *Harivaṃśa* in India. [Abstract.] *Third Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, September 2–7, 2002. Second Circular, Programme, Abstracts*: 27–28. Dubrovnik.
- PARGITER, F. Eden 1910. Ancient Indian Genealogies and Chronology. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1910: 2–56.
- PARGITER, F. Eden 1913. *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*. Oxford: OUP.
- PARGITER, F. Eden 1918. The North Pañcala Dynasty. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1918: 229–248.
- PARGITER, F. Eden 1922. *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*. London: OUP.
- POLLOCK, Sheldon I. 1986. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki, An Epic of Ancient India, II: Ayodhyākāṇḍa*. Princeton: PUP.

- RUBEN, W. 1941. The Puranic Line of Heroes. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1941: 247–256, 337–358.
- SMITH, R. Morton 1973. *Dates and Dynasties in Earliest India. Translation and Justification of a Critical Text of the Purāṇa Dynasties*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- SÖHNEN, Renate & Peter SCHREINER 1989. *Brahmapurāṇa: Summary of Contents, with Index of Names and Motifs*. (Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen 2) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- TOKUNAGA, Muneo 1997. *The Brhaddevatā: Text Reconstructed from the Manuscripts of the Shorter Recension with Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Indices*. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co.
- VIELLE, Christophe 1996. *Le mytho-cycle héroïque dans l'aire indo-européenne, I: Correspondances et transformations helléno-aryennes*. (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 46) Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- VIELLE, Christophe 2002. An Introduction to the *Jaiminīyasaṃhitā* of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. In: M. BROCKINGTON (ed.), *Stages and Transitions: Temporal and Historical Frameworks in Epic and Purāṇic Literature. Proceedings of the Second Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, August 1999*: 337–357. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- VIELLE, Christophe 2005. From the *Vāyuprokta* to the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*: Preliminary Remarks Towards a Critical Edition of the *vāyuprokta Brahmanḍapurāṇa*. In: P. KOSKIKALLIO (ed.), *Epics, Khilas and Purāṇas: Continuities and Ruptures. Proceedings of the Third Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, September 2002*: 535–560. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- VIELLE, Christophe 2008. La date de la *Jaiminīyasaṃhitā* du *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*: une confirmation épigraphique du début du XIV^e siècle AD. *Indologica Taurinensia* 34: 311–323.
- VIELLE, Christophe 2011–2012. Ravivarman Kulaśekhara the Yādava and Sagara the Son of Yādavī: Real and Ideal Kings in Matrilineal Kerala. In: S. BRODBECK & J. HEGARTY (eds), *Genealogy and History in South Asia* (Religions of South Asia 5(1–2), special issue): 365–387.
- VIELLE, Christophe 2014. How did Paraśurāma Come to Raise Kerala? In: K. VELUTHAT & D.R. DAVIS (eds), *Irreverent History: Essays for M.G.S. Narayanan*: 15–32. Delhi: Primus Books.
- VIELLE, Christophe *forthcoming*. *La Jaiminīyasaṃhitā du Brahmanḍapurāṇa, Madhyamabhāga, adhyāya 1–15: Introduction, édition et traduction*. (Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain) Leuven: Peeters. [A preliminary version of the work was presented as a habilitation dissertation at the Université Catholique de Louvain in 2007.]
- WILSON, Horace Hayman 1840. *The Vishṇu Purāṇa. A System of Hindu Mythology and Tradition*. London: Oriental Translation Fund Committee.
- WITZEL, Michael 1995. Ṛgvedic History: Poets, Chieftains and Politics. In: G. ERDOSY (ed.), *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia: Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 1): 307–352. NY: De Gruyter.

HV ch. 23	BrP ch. 13	HV App. I no. 7	BrP ch. 11	VāP 92 / BḍP 2,3,67	PPañc
divodāsasya putras tu vīro rājā pratardanaḥ	= 67cd	≠ l. 145	= 49ab	= 64ab / 67cd	377,67ab
pratardanasya putrau dvau vatso bhārgava eva ca 62	= 68ab	≈ l. 147	= 50ab	≈ 65cd / 69ab	377,68cd
M1-3 putrau vai					
alarko rājaputraś ca rājā samnatimān bhuvi	≈ 68cd	≠ l. 148	= 50cd	= 66ab / 69cd	377,69ab
M4 etc. vatsa- (for rāja-) M2.3 tu (for ca)		≈ **8.1 (D1)	(dif. BV)		
hehayasya tu dāyādyam hṛtavān vai mahīpatiḥ 63	= 69ab	≈ l. 141 / **8.1a	= 47ab	()	[377,661ab]
M3 etc. dāyādam					
ājahre pitṛdāyādyam divodāsahṛtaṁ balāt	= 69cd	= l. 142 / **8.1b	= 47cd	()	[377,661cd]
M1-3 divodāsair (for divodāsa-)					
bhadraśreṇyasya putreṇa durdamena mahātmanā	= 70ab	= l. 143 / **8.1c	= 48ab	()	[377,661ef]
divodāsena bālo hi ghṛṇayā sa visarjitaḥ 64	≈ 70cd	≈ l. 140	= 46cd	= 63cd / 67ab	377,66cd
M2.4 bālye tu M3 dharmātmā (for bālo hi) M4 etc. vivarjitaḥ					
aṣṭāratho nāma nṛpaḥ suto bhīmarathasya vai	= 71ab	= () / **8.2	()	()	()
M4 om. 65ab					
tena putreṣu bāleṣu prahṛtaṁ tasya bhārata	≈ 71cd	≈ l. 146 / **8.3	≈ 49cd	≈ 64cd / 68ab	377,67cd
vairasyāntaṁ mahārāja kṣatriyeṇa vidhitsatā 65	≈ 72ab	= l. 144 / **8.3a	≠ 48cd	≈ 65ab / 68cd	377,68ab
M2 vivitsatā					
alarkaḥ kāśirājas tu brahmaṇyaḥ satyasamgarah	= 72cd	= l. 149	≈ 51ab	()	[377,69cd]
*372 (K1): alarkaṁ prati rājānaṁ śloko gītaḥ purātanam		≈ l. 150	= 51cd	≈ 66cd / 70ab	377,69ef
ṣaṣṭiṁ varṣasahasrāṇi ṣaṣṭiṁ varṣaśatāni ca 66	= 73ab	= l. 151	= 52ab	= 67ab / 70cd	377,70ab
*373: tasyāśīt sumahadrājyaṁ rūpayauvanaśālinaḥ	= l. 154		= 53cd	()	[378,71cd]
yuvā rūpeṇa sampanna āśīt kāśikulodvahaḥ	= 73cd	= l. 152	≈ 52cd	= 67cd / 71ab	377,70cd

HV ch. 23	BrP ch. 13	HV App. I no. 7	BrP ch. 11	VāP 92 / BḍP 2,3,67	PPañc
lopāmudrāprasādena paramāyur avāpa saḥ 67	= 74ab	= l. 153	= 53ab	≈ 67ef / 71cd	377,71ab
M4 avāptavān			(var. V)		
vayaso 'nte mahābāhur hatvā kṣemakarākṣasam	≈ 74cd	≈ l. 155	= 54ab	= 68ab / 72ab	378,72ab
M1-3 mahābāho					
ramyāṃ niveśayām āsa purīm vārāṇasīm nṛpaḥ 68	= 75ab	≈ l. 156	= 54cd	≈ 68cd / 72cd	378,72cd