

CHRISTOPHE VIELLE

From the *Vāyuprokta* to the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*: Preliminary Remarks towards a Critical Edition of the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*

A fresh look at some *Brahmāṇḍa* or *Vāyu Purāṇa* manuscripts enables now a better understanding of the *Purāṇa* which once replaced an earlier *Purāṇa* called *Vāyuprokta* and which itself later became more commonly known, or published, as either the *Vāyu* or the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*.¹ I hope to show here that the future and long awaited critical edition of this *Purāṇa* promulgated by *Vāyu* and dealing with the *brahmāṇḍa* must take it into account because of its two names and ‘double’ manuscript tradition. However, it is not the task of this paper to determine what could precisely be the textual content of this critical edition of the ‘classical’ *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. For that would mean a complete tracing and critical study of all the so-called *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* manuscripts as well as of all the quotations from either the *Vāyu* or the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* found in Sanskrit literature. The preliminary remarks here proposed, as well as the new table of concordance of the available material provided in Appendix 2, can nevertheless serve as a starting point for the further study.

1. The Lost Original *Purāṇa* Called *Vāyuprokta*

The earliest account about a *Purāṇa* called *vāyuprokta* is found in MBh 3,189.14:

sarvalokasya viditā yugasamkhyā ca pāṇḍava |
etat te sarvam ākhyātam atītānāgataṁ mayā |
vāyuproktam anusmṛtya purāṇam ṛṣīsamstutam || 14 ||

The computation of *yugas* is something known to everyone, ô son of Pāṇḍu: all this, the past and the future has been told to you by me, remembering the *Purāṇa* delivered by *Vāyu* which is praised by the seers.

¹ Without any further reference, the abbreviation VāP corresponds to the ‘Pune’ edition of the *Vāyupurāṇa* (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 49, 1905, reprinted 1983), and B&P to the ‘Bombay’ edition of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, i.e. the one issued at the Venkateśvara Press in 1935 and reprinted both by Motilal Banarsidass and by Krishnadas Academy (see Appendix 1).

The author of the Mārkaṇḍeyasamasyāparvan, a rather late *upaparvan* of the MBh (cf. Brockington: HdO, p. 142), thus knew a certain Purāṇa ‘delivered by Vāyu’, that he used in his description of the dissolution (cf. Prasad 1989: 119). According to Hopkins (1901: 49):

Taken altogether, the epic account seems to be an extended and exaggerated reproduction of that in the Vāyu Purāṇa [cf. *adhyāya* 58], but it is impossible to say whether it is really based on the extant text or not.

This is also the case for the similar kind of quotations found in *Harivaṃśa* 7: ... *ete maharṣayaḥ* ... *vāyuproktā mahāvratāḥ* (v. 11), *purāṇe kīrtitāḥ* ... (v. 19), *tāmasasya manor ete daśa putrā mahābalāḥ* | *vāyuproktāḥ* ... (v. 21; cf. Kirfel: PPL, pp. 255-256, 13, 22 and 24). These references obviously originate in the same *manvantara* section of the Purāṇa proclaimed by Vāyu in its earliest state. Yet, as Gail (1973: 328) has well observed, the fact that the VāP quotes ‘itself’ in the same manner (*vāyuproktā mahāsattvā rājānaḥ*, 31.19 = BḍP Calcutta ed. 32.19)² is sufficient to prove that the original *Vāyuprokta*, used by the former as a source, was a work clearly distinct from it. Without going so far as Sukthankar (1942: xv), according to whom ‘the evidence for establishing a relationship between the extant Vāyu and its old namesake to which the epic is indebted is lacking’, one can assume that the early Purāṇa called *vāyuprokta*, which was already in existence before the completion of both the *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṃśa*, must have been, at the least, completely reworked and widely enlarged before becoming the ‘classical’ *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (later known as the *Vāyu* or the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*). There remains nevertheless a hope that a close examination, at the level of higher criticism, of the VāP-BḍP common text when critically edited will enable us to get an idea of the nature and the extent of the older material³ coming from the original Purāṇa called *vāyuprokta*. It may not be so ‘irretrievably’ lost as Sukthankar may have thought (cf. Patil 1946: 4).

² *contra* the variant reading *vāyuvegā[h]* in BḍP 1,2,13.105; cf. also VāP 61.181 = BḍP 1,2,35.210: *ity antarāṇy [uttarāṇy VāP] evam ṛṣistutānām dharmātmanām divyadr̥śām manūnām* | *vāyupraṇītāny upalabhya dr̥śyam* [°ād BḍP] *divyaujaśā* [°ām BḍP] *vyāsasamāsayogaiḥ* ||

³ e.g. the allusion to the mysterious mischief of Purūravas in MBh 1,70.18-20 can be explained only by the introductory story told in VāP-BḍP 2 (vv. 14-23; cf. also VāP 1.185-192 = BḍP Calcutta ed. 1.181cd-189ab and the Trivandrum ms of the BḍP referred to below, much corrupted in BḍP 1,1,1.159bc-167ab), which means that this episode could have belonged to the original Purāṇa. The episode is famous for being alluded to already in *Arthaśāstra* (1.6) and Aśvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita* (11.15), and later on by Subandhu and Bāṇa in similar heroic lists. There is also in ManuSm 9.42 an interesting reference to some lost *gāthā vāyugītāḥ* that ‘people who know the past recite’, to compare with the numerous old ‘purāṇic’ *gāthās* or *ślokas* quoted in the VāP-BḍP.

2. The So-Called *Brahmāṇḍa* and *Vāyu* Purāṇas

After the successive observations by Wilson (1840: lii-liii), Pargiter (1922: 23-24, 77-78) and Hazra (1940: 17-19), and the detailed comparison made by Kirfel (PPL, pp. x-xix), it is granted as a fact that the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* – both *vāyuprokta*⁴ – ‘were originally one and the same, and that only at a later date they went, to some degree, their own ways’ (Rocher: HIL, p. 33). A critical look at the different editions of both Purāṇas, in regard to some of their respective manuscripts, makes the fact even more obvious. First, it must be recalled that the *Gayāmāhātmya* given at the end of the editions of the VāP (*adhyāyas* 105-112, or 43-50 in part 2), as well as the *Lalitopākhyāna* given at the end of the Bombay edition (1912) of the BḍP (3,4,5-44; see Appendix 1), were originally independent texts. Each of them was added by the editors of one or the other Purāṇa because both texts claimed to be ‘part of’ these Purāṇas and were famous⁵, despite the fact that they usually do not occur in the same manuscripts.

The different editions of the *Vāyupurāṇa* show very few variations in the text. That can be explained mainly by the following facts: 1) The text of the Calcutta/Bibliotheca Indica princeps edition, which is arranged in two parts (*prathama-/dvitīyakhaṇḍa*) and is based on six manuscripts, seems to have been more or less ‘copied’ by the Bombay/Veṅkaṭeśvara Press edition (divided into a *pūrva-* and an *uttarārdha*).⁶ 2) The text of the more extended Pune/Ānandāśrama edition, which takes into account the text of the princeps edition beside four other mss, seems to have been used as a model by the Vaṅgavāsī Press (Calcutta) edition, before being taken up again *verbatim* (variant readings included) by the Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan

⁴ cf. VāP 1.47, 2.2 and 37-45, 103.45 = BḍP 1,1,1.36, 2.2 and 38-45, 3,4,4.44, and the colophons of both. The half-verse *purāṇaṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi yad uktam mātariśvanā* (VāP 1.47cd = BḍP Calcutta ed. 1.45ab, BḍP 1,1,1.36cd), which occurs only once in the Bombay BḍP, is in the other versions repeated twice with noteworthy variant readings in the last *pāda*: *brahmoktaṃ* and *mārutam* (*vedasaṃmitam*) in VāP 1.11b and 4.12b, versus *brahmāṇḍam* in BḍP Calcutta ed. 1.9b and 4.12b (the half-verse, however, is omitted in the corresponding passage of *adhyāya* 4 in the Trivandrum ms of the BḍP referred to below; in the opening of *adhyāya* 3, which is a chapter entirely composed in *jagatī* metre, the same Malayalam ms interestingly substitutes a well fitting *vāyur uvāca* in place of *sūta uvāca* as in the VāP and Calcutta BḍP).

⁵ So Vācaspatimiśra in his *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* (15th century) when referring to the *Vāyupurāṇa* quotes in fact the *Gayāmāhātmya* most of the time (cf. Hazra 1938: 338-339 = 1940: 272-273).

⁶ e.g. the verses corresponding to the Pune edition 1.79-81 and 115 are both lacking in the Calcutta and Bombay editions (they are nevertheless translated by Tagare who, though basing himself on the Bombay edition, uses in fact also the Pune edition for supplying the ‘missing’ verses). The Bombay/Veṅkaṭeśvara Press edition of the VāP has, through its reprints (see Appendix 1), become much more used than the Bibliotheca Indica edition. This explains why the former has been preferred and the latter has been omitted in the table of concordance given in Appendix 2.

(Prayag) edition (see Appendix 1). These clear historical relationships between the different editions do not necessarily exclude the possibility that Hazra once took into account, when he wrote that

the Purāṇic Pāśupatas, who looked upon this work as highly sacred, preserved the purity of its text as far as possible for a long time and did not allow its contents to be worked upon and changed seriously until very late (Hazra 1962: 254).

However, a simple look at some descriptions of VāP manuscripts does not confirm this view, revealing that the text of the VāP mss sometimes differs considerably from the printed versions(s). Moreover, in one Southern Grantha ms from the Thanjavur Sarasvati Mahal Library⁷ as well as in one Northern Devanāgarī ms dated 1483 AD⁸, the VāP text is named as [the part?] dealing with the *brahmāṇḍa*,⁹ despite the fact that the former is said to depart ‘in very many respects’ from the printed text (e.g. many portions given in the ms are not found in the VāP editions), whereas the latter is described as corresponding ‘pretty closely to the text as edited’ (in the Bibliotheca Indica).

Turning now to the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, it must be stressed that the Bombay ‘standard’ edition of the work (see Appendix 1) is a very artificial one, as I have previously explained (Vielle 2002: 354). This edition in its first appearance professed to be based on several manuscripts (cf. Pargiter 1913: xxx). It is obvious that among these mss there was at least one exemplar of what I have called the ‘hybrid-type’ sub-family of the BḍP manuscripts. This hybrid sub-family has the specific feature of constituting the combination of two halves: 1) the BḍP that can be rightly called the *vāyuprokta* one up to *adhyāya* 20 of the Upodghātapāda (3rd part) and 2) the *adhyāyas* 61 to 98 of another, much later, work, i.e. the *Jaiminīyasamhitā*¹⁰ that claims to belong to the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, Madhyamabhāga. This sub-family of BḍP manuscripts is at the moment represented by three mss in Telugu script¹¹ and about 15 Devanāgarī ones, most of them from the 18th-19th centuries.¹² Moreover,

⁷ A copy of it, annotated by Burnell in 1871, is preserved in the British Library.

⁸ An India Office Collection ms collected by H. T. Colebrooke, now kept in the British Library.

⁹ *brahmāṇḍāvarta*; cf. the same final colophon of both: *iti śrīmahāpurāṇe vāyuprokte dvādaśasāhasryāṃ saṃhitāyāṃ brahmāṇḍāvartaṃ samāptam*.

¹⁰ The *Jaiminīyasamhitā* is a text that I am now critically editing (see Koskikallio & Vielle 2001: 89-90; Vielle 2002). For a 13th/14th-century dating of the JaiSa see Smets 2004; Vielle, forthcoming (b).

¹¹ An old one from the Oriental Institute, Baroda, and two mss from the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.

¹² These are kept in Thanjavur (among the four Sarasvati Mahal Library mss, no. 1612 is described as ‘very old’ by Burnell (1880: 192); there is also Burnell’s copy in the India Office Collection), Pune (BORI and Deccan College), Udaipur (Nathadwara Library), Jodhpur (RORI) and Varanasi (Saraswati Bhavan Library).

all the mss of this type that I have been able to examine have a long lacuna between *adhyāyas* 70 and 84 of their JaiSa portion, more precisely between what will become 30.55d (ending with *sarvān*) and 44.32a in BḍP 2,3, in the middle of the story of (Paraśu)Rāma. In the Bombay edition the long lacuna of the mss is filled up by a new composition (from 2,3,30.55d, i.e. just after *sarvān*, to 44.31d), full of tantric and *kṛṣṇabhakti* elements. Adalbert Gail has already proven this genuine interpolation to be modelled on the text of the very late *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*.¹³ I was previously inclined to think that this ‘new’ composition had been made by some pandit at the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press itself, like the rest of the editorial work done there.¹⁴ However, since that time I have found in the Asiatic Society of Bombay (Bhau Daji Collection) one Devanāgarī manuscript from the mid-19th century, being a JaiSa fragment (containing *adhyāyas* 68-97) of the hybrid-type (though without the preceding *vāyuprokta* portion). It is exceptional that this manuscript does contain the interpolation given by the Bombay edition, and at the place of the lacuna in the JaiSa portion (i.e. at the end of *adhyāya* 70, just after *sarvān* in v. 55d) there has been added: *iti śrībrahmāṇḍapurāṇe caturdaśaḥ*. One supposes this to mean ‘14 *adhyāyas*’, which would correspond to the number of missing chapters. It seems that the scribe decided to stop copying after the first 5 *śloka*s of chapter 84 and to go back in order to fill such an obvious gap in the story. So he placed there the new composition, starting with the words *duḥkḥapariplutān* to complete the previous truncated v. 55d (after *sarvān*) and then numbered the new first verses as 6 to 26 in the same *adhyāya* 70 (which will become more correctly 30.56-75 in the Bombay BḍP). After writing the new section from *adhyāya* 71 to 84.31 (i.e. from *adhyāya* 31 to 44.31), the 5 ‘original’ *śloka*s of *adhyāya* 84 (which will become 2,3,44.32-36 in the BḍP, where the first occurrence of the same 5 verses is logically omitted) were repeated, followed by the rest of the JaiSa portion. This unique manuscript, too, has clearly been used by the pandits of the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press. Anyway, what has precisely been the process

¹³ See Gail 1977: 131-137, 158-187, 193-194, 226, 233-236.

¹⁴ By ‘editorial’ work I mean the assimilating of JaiSa’s Madhyamabhāga with the *vāyuprokta* BḍP Upodghātapāda in the following way: chapter 61 of the JaiSa became the new *adhyāya* 21 and the missing part of the *vāyuprokta* BḍP was added to the end of the JaiSa portion, continuing from *adhyāya* 59 to the end; finally, a new Uttarabhāga with the *vāyuprokta* Upasaṃhārapāda, and a new Pūrvabhāga with both the *vāyuprokta* Prakriyā and Anuṣaṅga Pādas were created. See also Vielle 2002: 354-355, n. 51 about the obvious (at least in part) spurious nature of the testimony of NāP 1,109.1-29, on the BḍP double structure (4 *pādas*/3 *bhāgas*, cf. v. 3), and detailed content (with the vv. 19cd-20ab corresponding to the JaiSa portion), fitting so perfectly well with the BḍP. The NāP was edited at the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press in 1905, i.e. just one year before the BḍP (cf. the introduction of the 1906 edition where vv. 1-3 of the same NāP passage are, not surprisingly, quoted as authoritative!). In the same manner, the ‘comparatively late’ (Hazra 1940: 132) Gokaṛṇamāhātmya of the NāP (2,74) appears to have been textually modelled on the Gokaṛṇa story of the JaiSa as transmitted in a hybrid-type manuscript of the BḍP (JaiSa 93-95 = BḍP 2,3,56-58).

of the ‘making’ of the Bombay edition of the BḍP does not really concern us here. It is more important to remember that *adhyāyas* 2,3,21-58 in the Bombay edition of the BḍP do not belong at all to the *vāyuprokta* BḍP but come from the JaiSa, and that within this non-genuine portion itself, the portion from 2,3,30.56 to 44.31 does not belong to the original JaiSa but was interpolated therein very recently.

Two editions of the BḍP were also published in Calcutta. According to Maheshwari Prasad (1989: 70) who had the opportunity to compare them closely, ‘the text ... is fully identical in both these editions and there is also no difference in the manner of computation of verses’. My own examination of these rare books in Bengali script confirms that the Vaṅgavāsī Press edition is a mere copy of the previous edition issued at the Viśvakośa Office (see Appendix 1). The princeps edition adds a few variant readings in footnotes; the other one has the advantage in correcting the wrong numbering of chapters of its model (which has two *adhyāyas* no. 25). The Calcutta edition of the BḍP is very different from the Bombay one. Its text stops at the end of the second part (Anuṣaṅgapāda, *adhyāya* 71, cf. Appendix 2), and is much closer to the text of the VāP:¹⁵ nearly all the passages of the VāP¹⁶ which are absent from the Bombay edition of the BḍP are here present, and, on the other hand, BḍP 1,2,27, which is absent from the VāP, is also lacking in this edition. There remains *adhyāya* 25 of the VāP which is omitted here as in the Bombay BḍP, whereas 35.78-87, 36.1-16a and 70.1-28 in the Calcutta BḍP can be found nowhere else (at least in the editions).

If one leaves aside the numerous later texts (mostly *Māhātmyas*) claiming to be part of or extracted from the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*,¹⁷ it is a fact that manuscripts of the *vāyuprokta* BḍP are far from common. Already Wilson (1840: lii-liii) noted that ‘copies of what profess to be the entire *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* are sometimes, though

¹⁵ cf. the remark of Hazra (1940: 18, n. 23) comparing the VāP and the Calcutta BḍP editions: ‘there are variations in readings and numbers of verses in the corresponding chapters, as one may expect in any two Mss of the same *Purāṇa*’.

¹⁶ VāP 3, 10.68 to 24, 26, 30.79-321, 32, 34.58 to 42, 43.10 to 44, 45.21-66 and 48.

¹⁷ On this abundance of independent parts, cf. the remarks of Wilson (1840: liii), Burnell (1880: 190: ‘it does not appear that this *Purāṇa* has ever been found as yet; an immense number of *Māhātmyas* and the like are said to form parts of it’) and Aufrecht (1891: 387: ‘this *purāṇa* hardly exists in a complete body, but seems to be made up of a large number of *māhātmya*’). For a good list of the edited ones, see Natha & Chaudhuri 1938: 502-504; cf. also some additional titles in Rocher: HIL, pp. 159-160. Besides the *Lalitopākhyāna* already mentioned (numerous editions given in the EPB, s.v. BḍP, cf. Rocher: HIL, p. 158, notes 129-130), the most famous is probably the *Adhyātma-rāmāyaṇa* (see Rocher: HIL, pp. 158-160). However, according to Raghavan (1998: 24), ‘the assignment of this text to the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* seems to be a wrong extension of an account of its *Māhātmya* which is assigned to that *Purāṇa*’. A good number of such parts of the BḍP remain still unedited (see, e.g., Burnell 1880: 190 for a list of titles preserved in Thanjavur mss). The earliest ones may go back as early as the 10th century AD (cf. footnote 49 below). On the ‘parts’ of the BḍP, see also Vielle, forthcoming (b).

rarely, procurable'. Even in the rather short list of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*¹⁸ of supposed 'entire' (i.e. *vāyuprokta*) BḍP, a good number appear in fact to be either JaiSa or hybrid-type mss (the so-called BḍP Madhyamabhāga), or mss of some other texts (the so-called BḍP Uttarabhāga or Uttarakhaṇḍa). It can sometimes happen, however, that a *vāyuprokta* BḍP ms is wrongly listed as a *Vāyupurāṇa* in the catalogues. Such is the case with one of the William Jones mss, i.e. the W.6b (used as the 'eVā' by Pargiter 1913: xxxiii).¹⁹ This manuscript, according to its description and colophons, is in fact clearly a *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.²⁰ Nevertheless, pure *vāyuprokta* BḍP mss are very rare (maybe less than 15), and can be found in various places such as Dacca, Calcutta, Varanasi, Alwar, Bombay or Bonn. Among these few mss it is worthy of note that some have only the first two *pādas* (i.e. ending with the Anuṣaṅgapāda), as it is at least the case of one ms from Calcutta²¹, one from Jammu²² and one 'very old' in Malayalam script on palm-leaves from Trivandrum²³. The last ms, worn away in many places and with its beginning missing, presents – as far as examined – a text very close to the VāP and Calcutta BḍP (some examples given in the present paper). The 'half' *vāyuprokta* BḍP type could be relatively old according to its geographical dispersion.²⁴

This peculiar type may also be the origin of the very interesting Old-Javanese version of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.²⁵ The Old-Javanese BḍP, the composition of which can be assigned to about 1000 AD (cf. Gonda 1933; 1960: 261), is similarly limited to the content of the first two *pādas* of the VāP-BḍP. It consists largely of Sanskrit quotations followed by Javanese 'translations' and (or) explanations. Thus, it is a very valuable testimony for studying the textual tradition of the *vāyuprokta* BḍP. The majority of the Sanskrit quotations are found in the Bombay edition of the BḍP (most of them being also in the VāP as edited) and several of them are found only in the VāP and Calcutta edition of the BḍP, especially in the begin-

¹⁸ To be published in vol. 15 (in press).

¹⁹ This ms belongs to the Royal Society Collection deposited in the Indian Office Library, thus presently in the British Library.

²⁰ With variant readings sometimes closer to the corresponding passages in the *Matsya-purāṇa*; cf. Pargiter 1913: xiii-xiv.

²¹ AS, Indian Museum Collection, which may explain the Calcutta edition of the BḍP.

²² Sri Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, formerly Sri Raghunath Temple Collection, no. 3548; cf. Prasad 1989: 82, 99.

²³ ORI & ML no. 19214, formerly Palace Collection no. 197.

²⁴ Even if a widespread geographical dispersion is not necessarily a sign of earliness.

²⁵ I prefer to quote here the recent edition by Phalgunadi rather than the authoritative princeps edition by Gonda (see Appendix 1) for the simple reason that the former has divided the text into chapters (though there are no section divisions in the original), which makes the comparison with the Sanskrit versions much easier (cf. Appendix 2).

ning.²⁶ Moreover, a few quotations present variant readings, or are included in Javanese paraphrases, which both agree more closely with the same passages according to the *Matsyapurāṇa*.²⁷ But the Old-Javanese BḍP does not correspond to the entire content of the first two *pādas* of the VāP-BḍP. Even if one takes into account the shorter text of the Bombay BḍP alone, a good number of the *adhyāyas* in the latter (i.e. 2, 6-7, 10, 12, 20, 23-31, 37-38) are not referred to by Sanskrit quotations or by the Javanese text itself. It means that the Javanese author either had a shorter recension of the *vāyuprokta* BḍP before him or he made the deliberate choice to deal only with selected portions of it. Moreover, there are some changes in the order of the topics. These take place especially in the cosmographical/geographical section that corresponds to *adhyāyas* 15-22 of the Bombay BḍP and constitutes the end of the available Javanese text.²⁸ Interestingly, this last section mentions in its beginning ‘Lord Vāyu’ (*bhaṭṭāra Bāyu*) as the authority from whom the narrator has heard that lore. Before that, at the end of the section on the branches of the Veda (chapter 15, corresponding to the Bombay BḍP 1,2,35.70-205), it is surprisingly stated: ‘thus goes the story in the Prakriyāpāda of the *Brahmāṇḍasamhitā* as told by *bhagavān* Vyāsa’, although we should rather be here at the end of the *Anuṣaṅgapāda* according to our Sanskrit texts. This raises some questions about the more or less coherent state of the Sanskrit source used by the Javanese author. Nonetheless, the content and the quotations of the Old-Javanese version must be taken into account as early testimonies in the future critical edition of the classical *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.

3. The Classical *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*

It is time to go back to Kirfel’s views about the VāP-BḍP nucleus (‘Kern’) which corresponds with what I propose to call the ‘classical’ *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. In relation to the parts that are common to the VāP and BḍP as edited, Kirfel defended the thesis according to which it cannot be the result of a kind of gradual development and this common nucleus is, on the contrary, the work of a single compiler (‘Diaskeuast’, PPL, p. xvii). This compiler would have reworked a number of previously existing separate pieces into a coherent whole, composing an universal history on the basis of systematic chronological principles. Among these pieces, there would have been at least one earlier Purāṇa (the lost ‘original’ *Vāyuprokta* as I

²⁶ Chapters 1-2 of Phalgunadi’s edition are found only in *adhyāya* 1 of the VāP and Calcutta BḍP (cf. Gonda 1933: 222; 1960: 255). The beginning of the text in the Bombay BḍP appears to be rather corrupted.

²⁷ See Gonda 1960: 262-265; cf the case of the Jones/‘eVā’ ms referred to above (footnote 20).

²⁸ i.e. chapters 17-23. From an abrupt ending we can judge that the text is an incomplete one.

have called it before) and the *Harivaṃśa*²⁹. According to Kirfel (PPL, p. xviii), followed by Brinkhaus, the composition of the classical VāP-BḍP can be ascribed to the beginning of the 4th century AD, which would recognize this Purāṇa as the oldest available one (as it has often been said about the VāP, cf. Rocher: HIL, p. 285).³⁰

The common text of the VāP-BḍP allows us to assert that the classical *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* was similarly divided into four *pādas* (cf. Kirfel: PPL, p. xix). Let us quote VāP and BḍP (Calcutta ed.) 4.13-14³¹:

prakriyā prathamāḥ pādaḥ kathā³²vastuparigrahaḥ |
upodghāto 'nuṣaṅgaś ca upasaṃhāra eva ca || 13 ||
... | evaṃ hi pādāś catvāraḥ ... || 14 ||

and VāP 103.44-45 (≈ Bombay VāP 2,41.44-45) = BḍP 3,4,4.43-44:

prakriyā prathamāḥ pādaḥ ... |
anuṣaṅga upodghāta upasaṃhāra eva ca || 44 ||
evaṃ etac catuṣpādaṃ purāṇaṃ lokasaṃmatam |
uvāca ... vāyuh ... || 45 ||

This peculiar fourfold structure³³ is further confirmed by the testimony of the encyclopaedic *Viṣṇudharmottara* (about the 7th century AD), where the description of

²⁹ cf. Brinkhaus 2005 [this volume], and Vielle, forthcoming (a).

³⁰ Only the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* (or at least some parts of it) could be as old. There is no difficulty in considering with Kirfel (PPL) the VāP-BḍP textual group as belonging either to the 'TG [Textgruppe] I' (when it shares its text with the HV, as in 'Abschnitt' 2-4), or to the 'TG II' (when its text differs from the HV which forms in this case the main text of the 'TG I', as in 'Abschnitt' 1). But I am not at all convinced by Kirfel's views when he considers the same VāP-BḍP group either within the same 'TG II' (of the 'Abschnitt' 1) as the 'B'-type instead of the 'A' one (cf. Kirfel: PPL, pp. xxviii-xxxiii), or, elsewhere (Kirfel 1954: 45*-46*), as the 'TG II' instead of the 'TG I'. (In the latter case this distinction corresponds to the 'längere'/'kürzere' version in Kirfel 1931.) This would actually mean that the text of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (which is the main text to be taken into account in the respective 'TG IIA' and 'TG I') would have been anterior to the text of the VāP-BḍP (cf. also in Kirfel 1959), whereas it is almost clear that the ViP is posterior, being often a mere rewriting (by paraphrasing or shortening) of VāP-BḍP passages (cf. Vielle, forthcoming (a)), and including significant changes of meaning for theological reasons. We have to be very careful in the use of Kirfel's works (cf. thereon the important remarks of Schreiner 2002: 274): the 'Ur'-textgroups that Kirfel reconstructs by comparison are artificially extracted from the reality of the individual Purāṇas, which can lead us to forget the obvious historical relationships (borrowings etc.) between them. By reversing Gail's suggestion (1972: 52), I would say that it is not so much a 'complete critical comparison of all similar material in all Purāṇas (incl. MBh and Rām)' that we need first, but good 'critical editions of the individual Purāṇas', since the former cannot be relevant without being based on critically established texts.

³¹ 4.13-14 also in the Trivandrum ms of the BḍP; cf. BḍP 1,1,1.38cd-39.

³² Calcutta/Trivandrum BḍP: *krīyā*°.

³³ cf. also VāP 61.59 = BḍP 1,2,35.67 on the original *purāṇasaṃhitā* as *catuṣpādā* (cf. Pargiter 1922: 23-24); and VāP 32.59-67 = BḍP Calcutta ed. 33.57-65, where the *kṛta*-

‘the’ (unspecified) Purāṇa starts with nearly the same verses as in VāP 4.13-14 and 103.44-45:

*prakriyā prathamah pādah kathāvastuparigrahaḥ ||
upodghātānuṣaṅgau ca tathā saṁhāra eva ca ||
catuspādam hi kathitaṁ purāṇam ... ||* (VDhottP 3,17.2b-3)

This qualification, which ‘points definitively’ to the VāP-BḍP (Hazra 1958-63, I: 206), occurs here just before the more common definition of the Purāṇa as *pañcalakṣaṇa* (v. 4),³⁴ i.e. according to its five characteristics enumerated in the famous *śloka* which is also found in numerous other Purāṇas (cf. Kane 1962: 839, n.). Among these the *vāyuprokta* could be the earliest one if the authenticity of the same³⁵ *śloka* in VāP and BḍP (Calcutta ed.) 4.10cd-11ab could be confirmed. For the traditional extent ascribed to our Purāṇa, the number of 12,000 verses is given in the body of the text itself³⁶ as well as in the colophons of many VāP manuscripts.³⁷ The same number is given as the size of the *Brahmāṇḍa* in several lists of eighteen Purāṇas (probably starting with BhāgP 12,13.6d).

The earliest testimonies about the classical *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* seem to show that it was more commonly known and referred to as simply ‘the’ Purāṇa, as if it was the only one for a time and there was thus no need to name it more precisely.³⁸ Besides the previously quoted evidence of the VDhottP, the testimony of the early *Skandapurāṇa* (about the 6th-7th centuries) is worth of noticing, too. In the beginning of this work (SP 1.8-11) the author appears to refer to a specific Purāṇa to which the *Skanda* is supposed to constitute a sequel. Later, in SP 5, a more obvious allusion is made to this Purāṇa when the sacrificing seers are told to be taught by

yuga is symbolically identified with the Prakriyāpāda, the *tretāyuga* with the Anuṣaṅga-pāda, the *dvāparayuga* with the Upodghātapāda, and the *kaliyuga* with the (Upa)saṁhārapāda: *etad dvādaśasāhasraṁ caturyugam iti smṛtam || ... evaṁ dvādaśasāhasraṁ purāṇam kavayo viduḥ || ... yathā yugam catuspādam vidhātṛ vihitam svayam || catuspādam purāṇam tu brahmaṇā vihitam purā ||* See also VāP 65.2 ≈ BḍP 2,3,1.1 for *pādas* 2-3 given in the ‘right’ order. The case of VāP 100.2 ≈ BḍP 3,4,1.2, with Anuṣaṅga given as the third *pāda*, remains a bit problematic.

³⁴ On the expression *purāṇa pañcalakṣaṇa* in the *Amarakośa*, see Rocher: HIL, pp. 24-26.

³⁵ With the better variant reading *iti* instead of *caiva* (as in the Trivandrum ms of the BḍP, cf. also BḍP 1,1,1.37cd-38ab).

³⁶ See VāP 32.66 = BḍP Calcutta ed. 33.63, quoted above in footnote 33.

³⁷ See the one quoted above (footnote 9) and also at the end of BḍP 3,4,4.

³⁸ cf. also the Kambuja inscription of Veal Kantel (about 600 AD) which alludes to the deposit in a Śiva temple of a copy of the complete Bhārata along with the *Rāmāyaṇa* and ‘the’ Purāṇa (*rāmāyaṇapurāṇābhyām*) for perpetual recitation. The conjecture that the word here refers to our Purāṇa is reinforced by the fact that in the Indianized lands of South East Asia the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* seems to have been the only Purāṇa ever translated in a vernacular language (i.e. in Old-Javanese, cf. above and Ray 1984: 65-66).

Vāyu on a series of traditional topics. The list of these topics forms a kind of summary of contents of the VāP-BdP.³⁹ Similarly, in the first half of the 7th century Bāṇa does not give any specific name to the Purāṇa proclaimed by Vāyu whose musical recitation he attended in his village (*Harṣacarita* 3: *pavamānaproktam purāṇam papāṭha*). In the following *āryā* verse (with adjectives equally applicable to Harṣa through puns) this Purāṇa is said to be ‘sung by the *muni(s)*’, ‘very extensive’, ‘cleansing of sins’ (*pāvana*),⁴⁰ *vaṁśānugamavivādin* and ‘including all the Bharata under its sway’. In *Kādambarī*, too, two passages (with puns) refer to the same Purāṇa promulgated by Vāyu: ‘only in the Purāṇa, (there is) windy talk’ (*purāṇe vāyupralapitam*), and ‘like the Purāṇa in which the whole sphere of the earth is established according to its proper divisions’ (*purāṇam iva yathāvibhāgāvasthāpita-sakalabhuvanakośam*, cf. Kane 1962: 821-822).

A little later, from around the (second half of the) 7th to the 10th century, we find references to more than one Purāṇa in commentaries by learned authors. Despite the difficulty of identifying these purāṇic allusions or quotations (since the precise name of the Purāṇa is usually not given), the majority of these references can still be traced in the VāP-BdP.⁴¹ Such is the case in the commentaries by Kumārilabhaṭṭa (*ad Mīmāṃsāsūtra*), Śaṅkarācārya⁴², Viśvarūpa (*ad Yājñavalkyasmṛti*) and Medhātithi

³⁹ See Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998: 20-21; cf. SP 5.1, 4-9:

tan naimiṣaṁ samāsādya ṛṣayo dīptatejasaḥ |
divyaṁ sattraṁ samāsanta mahad varṣasahasrikam || 1 ||
 ...
teṣāṁ taṁ bhāvam ālakṣya mātariśvā mahātapāḥ |
sarvaprāṇicarah śrīmān sarvabhūtapravartakaḥ |
dadau sa rūpī bhagavān darśanaṁ sattriṇāṁ śubhaḥ || 4 ||
taṁ te dṛṣṭvārcayitvā ca mātariśvānam avyayam |
āsīnam āsane punye ṛṣayaḥ saṁśītavratāḥ |
papracchur udbhavaṁ kṛtsnaṁ jagataḥ pralayaṁ tathā || 5 ||
sthitim ca kṛtsnāṁ vaṁśāṁś ca yugamanvantarāṇi ca |
vaṁśānucaritaṁ kṛtsnaṁ divyamānaṁ tathaiva ca || 6 ||
aṣṭānāṁ devayonīnāṁ utpattiṁ pralayaṁ tathā |
pīṭhsargam tathāśeṣaṁ brahmaṇo mānam eva ca || 7 ||
candrādityagatiṁ sarvāṁ tārāgrahagatiṁ tathā |
sthitim sarveśvarāṇāṁ ca dvīpadharmam aśeṣataḥ |
varṇāśramavyavasthānaṁ yajñānāṁ ca pravartanam || 8 ||
etat sarvam aśeṣeṇa kathayām āsa sa prabhuḥ |
divyaṁ varṣasahasraṁ ca teṣāṁ tad abhiyāt tathā || 9 ||

⁴⁰ *pāvana* may stand for *vāyavīya* since *pavana* means *vāyu*, as underlined by Kane 1962: 822.

⁴¹ See Hazra 1935 [1985]: 304-305, 1940: 20-21; Kane 1962: 823-826.

⁴² e.g. Śaṅkara’s *bhāṣya* on *Brahmasūtra* 1.2.25 = VāP 9.120; 1.3.28 = VāP 9.63 / BdP 1.2,8.65; 1.3.30 = VāP 9.64-65 / BdP 1.2,8.66; 1.4.1 = VāP 4.27-28; 2.1.1 = VāP 1.205 (with the variant reading *nārāyaṇaḥ* as in BdP 1.1,1.74, versus *maheśvaraḥ* in VāP, BdP Calcutta ed. 1.200 and the Trivandrum ms of the BdP); and on BĀU 1.4.6 = VāP 9.116a. In addition, Śaṅkara sometimes quotes the ViP without naming it.

(*ad Manusmṛti*)⁴³. Vācaspatimiśra, the philosopher (middle of the 9th century), still refers to ‘the’ Purāṇa,⁴⁴ which he elsewhere more precisely calls the *Vāyupurāṇa* (the same quotation *ad Yogabhāṣya* 4.13) or the *vāyuproktam* [*purāṇam*].⁴⁵ The same author seems also to be the first to quote by name the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*.⁴⁶ Our Purāṇa must have been called *Brahmāṇḍa* before the 10th century, owing to the fact that the Sanskrit model of the Old-Javanese version was using this title. The occurrence of the name *Brahmāṇḍa* in the list of eighteen (*mahā*)*purāṇas* to the general exclusion of the name *Vāyu* betrays an even earlier common use of this name (cf. Pargiter 1922: 77-78). According to Hazra (1962: 246), ‘the tradition [of eighteen] originated not later than the first quarter of the seventh century A.D.’.⁴⁷ I would not be surprised if the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (3,6.21-23) was in fact the first to give (and even to create) this famous list that subsequently became traditional. It would explain the surprising last place ascribed therein to the *Brahmāṇḍa*.⁴⁸ The sectarian ViP appears indeed to have been cleverly composed (about the 6th century) following an intentional theological deviation from the classical *pañcalakṣaṇa* scheme (cf. Schreiner 2002), the one followed most closely by the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. Sometime before 1000 AD, the *Kūrmapurāṇa* remarks in its own list of eighteen (*mahā*-)*purāṇas* that ‘the *Vāyu*[*purāṇa*] (*vāyavīyam*), being known as the *Brahmāṇḍa* (*brahmāṇḍam iti saṃjñitam*), is enumerated as the eighteenth’ (KūP [CE] 1,1.15).⁴⁹

⁴³ e.g. *ad ManuSm* 1,55 ≈ VāP 102.76 / BḍP 3,4,3.55.

⁴⁴ Vācaspatimiśra *ad Sāṃkhyakārikā* 42 = VāP 53.120 / BḍP 1,2,24.149; cf. Kirfel 1954: 284, 135bc.

⁴⁵ Vācaspatimiśra *ad Yogabhāṣya* 1.19: untraceable verses, again quoted *ad Sāṃkhyakārikā* 44 as coming from ‘the’ Purāṇa; cf. also *ad Yogabhāṣya* 1.25 = VāP 12.33 and 10.65-66.

⁴⁶ Vācaspatimiśra *ad Yogabhāṣya* 2.32 = ViP 6,7.37-38; *ad* 3.49 = ViP 6,7.39.

⁴⁷ This approximate dating proposed by Hazra (1940: 4; cf. 1962: 246) can be accepted despite the fact it is based on the very slender evidence of the date of MtP 53 (in which the list occurs in detail, cf. below). The occurrences of the list in the MBh and the HV, which were already considered as very doubtful by Hazra (1940: 2-4), have been proven spurious by the critical editions of both texts.

⁴⁸ The critical edition of the ViP shows that Hazra (1940: 2, n. 20) was wrong to hold that the list in the ViP is an interpolation. Instead of the more common glossing expression *purāṇāni brahmāṇḍīni* found in later commentaries (and which is obviously based on the list of eighteen Purāṇas, where the *Brahmapurāṇa* figures always first, cf. ViP 3,6.20 and Rocher: HIL, pp. 32-33), the variant *purāṇāni brahmāṇḍādīni* occurs in the *Uttara-gītābhāṣya* (2.15-17) attributed to Gauḍapāda (7th century, but his authorship is doubtful). If this uncertain reading (cf. Hazra 1940: 4, n.; Rocher: HIL, p. 33, n. 12), happens to be confirmed (being a *lectio difficilior* a critical edition could well see it as *potior*), it would testify to a much more suitable place ascribed at an early date to the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* than the *para* one given in ViP 3,6.23.

⁴⁹ The *Brahmāṇḍa* is also mentioned in the list of eighteen *upapurāṇas* which appears for the first time in the KūP (see 1,1.19c; cf. Hazra 1958-63, I: 14-15 – MtP 53.59-62 names only four *upapurāṇas*). The list testifies to the existence at that time of at least

Moreover, in a passage from the second part of the KūP devoted to the Naimiṣa Forest, it is recalled by Sūta that ‘here, formerly, lord Vāyu recounted the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, [originally] declared by Brahmā, to the seers who were performing a sacrificial session’ (KūP [CE] 2,41.13).⁵⁰

Although we are, philologically speaking, still dealing with the same unique Purāṇa in the following centuries, it is nevertheless also clear that its two names became more and more distinctive: a work with a specific name cannot be but distinct from the one differently called. The duality is confirmed by the secondary occasional insertion of the *Vāyu*, in addition to the *Brahmāṇḍa*, to the list of eighteen *mahāpurāṇas*, e.g. in MtP 53.18, where the *Vāyu* occurs in place of the *Śiva*, followed by the *Brahmāṇḍa* (MtP 53.53-54)⁵¹. This chapter is also frequently quoted by the medieval *nibandha* writers from the 12th century onwards (cf. Hazra 1940: 279-288).

Already Alberuni, in his account of India (1032 AD), before quoting the list of eighteen Purāṇas according to the ViP (which is the Purāṇa that he most often uses), gives another list of eighteen as it was dictated to him by some pandit, and this list contains both the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa*. But the Arab author adds that he has seen by himself, in fragmentary state (i.e. as manuscripts), only three of these Purāṇas. Among them there was the *Vāyu*, to which he refers sometimes (cf. Hazra 1953

one secondary text claiming to be ‘part’ of, or a ‘complement’ to, the *Brahmāṇḍamahāpurāṇa* (cf. Vielle, forthcoming (b)). The precise identification of this text remains, however, conjectural, since no *Brahmāṇḍopapurāṇa* is drawn upon or referred to as such by any of the many commentators or *nibandha* writers known to Hazra (1958-63, II: 623-624).

⁵⁰ *atra pūrvaṃ sa bhagavān ṛṣiṇaṃ sattraṃ āsatām |*
provāca vāyur brahmāṇḍaṃ purāṇaṃ brahmabhāṣitam || 13 ||

⁵¹ *contra* the fallacious interpretation proposed by Hazra (1940: 13-15; 1953 [1985]: 249-255; cf. Rocher: HIL, p. 33, n. 17), who sets forth ‘the Śaiva character of the Vāyu’ for holding that the *śaiva* found in the majority of the lists (starting with the ViP – cf. also BhāṅP 12,13 and KūP) has to be there understood as meaning the *vāyavīya*. There was indeed no reason for such a substitution of names. On the contrary, in the very few cases where the *Vāyu* takes the place of the *Śiva*, the Śaiva dimension of the VāP is stressed (as in MtP 53.18; cf. also Revāmāhātmya = Revākhaṇḍa 1.33 referred to below). This fact betrays the secondary character of the ascription of the *Vāyu* to this place. Moreover, the detailed contents of the *Vāyu* as the fourth *mahāpurāṇa* are given only in the very late *Nārada-purāṇa* (1,95) – on the spurious nature of the NāP, see above footnote 14. This NāP passage describes a kind of conflated VāP containing 24,000 verses (versus the traditional extent of 12,000; the size of 24,000 verses, already attributed to the *Vāyu* in MtP 53, corresponds in fact with the traditional extent of the *Śiva* in the list used as source, cf. BhāṅP 12,13.2c). This conflated whole contains the independent Gayāmāhātmya and even the Māghamāhātmya, and has as its *uttarabhāga* the Revāmāhātmya (a text which is much the same as the Revākhaṇḍa ascribed to the SkP published in Bombay; as noted by Hazra [1940: 158, n.], the original ascription of this Māhātmya to the *Vāyu* is supported by the printed text itself [5.16 and 229.1] and explains why it is not described in NāP 1,104 on the *Skanda*).

[1985]: 255, n. 36), especially on cosmological matters (like *brahmāṇḍa*), without ever using the title *Brahmāṇḍa*. The testimony of the *nibandha* writers is also instructive here (cf. Hazra 1940: 269-275, 337).⁵² The Bengali Jīmūtavāhana (about 1100) quotes, on the one hand, from the *Brahmāṇḍa* verses that can be also found in the VāP, and, on the other hand, from the *Vāyu* verses that have not been traced. The Konkani king Aparārka (first half of the 12th century), in referring to nearly the same passages on *śrāddha* (i.e. VāP 74-82 / BḍP 2,3,9-19), ascribes them sometimes to the *Brahmāṇḍa*, sometimes to the *Vāyu*, giving in both cases a few additional verses that are not traceable in the editions. At the same time in Varanasi, Lakṣmīdhara on *śrāddha* quotes much more often from the *Vāyu* than from the *Brahmāṇḍa* (cf. Kane 1962: 896, 906). The Bengali king Ballālasena (second half of the 12th century) states in the introduction to his *Dānasāgara* that he did not draw upon the *Brahmāṇḍa* as *dānas* are absent there (in the same work he quotes the *Vāyu* once: VāP 80.59). In his *Adbhutasāgara* Ballālasena quotes more from the *Brahmāṇḍa* than from the *Vāyu* (= VāP 19), but the verses he ascribes to the former are either found only in VāP 19, and in the Calcutta BḍP (*adhyāya* 18), or are not found at all. The case of the South Indian author Devaṇabhaṭṭa (about 1200) is very similar to that of his esteemed predecessor Aparārka, with maybe more untraceable quotations from the *Brahmāṇḍa*. The same applies to Hemādri, active in the Deccan in the last third of the 13th century. Among his much more numerous quotations, equally distributed between the two names, some verses ascribed to the *Vāyu* can be found only in the BḍP,⁵³ and a few ascribed to the *Brahmāṇḍa* are found not in the BḍP but in the VāP. Sometimes the quoted verses are ascribed to the ‘*Vāyu-Brahmāṇḍa*’

⁵² Incidentally, the *nibandha* writers’ evidence will also prove that the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* and the *Vāyupurāṇa* cannot be considered as the respective names of the so-called ‘Southern’ and ‘Northern recensions’ of the same Purāṇa (*contra* Ray 1984). It is nevertheless worth noticing that the famous South Indian commentator Mallinātha (14th-15th centuries) appears to quote only the *Brahmāṇḍa* (e.g. *ad* Kālidāsa’s *Kumārasambhava*, *sarga* 1), and that most of the secondary works claiming to be part of the *Brahmāṇḍa* originate from South India. In the same manner, it is at this stage of the inquiry inaccurate to consider the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* and the *Vāyupurāṇa* as the two distinct names given respectively to the Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva versions derived from an originally non-sectarian Purāṇa (cf. Hazra 1940: 14-15, 18; 1962: 253-255, developed in Roy 1964; see also the critical remarks in Bonazzoli 1980: 56-57). For the few additional chapters (e.g. on Pāśupata yoga) and relevant variant readings of the VāP (e.g. 1.205 and 49.160-171, versus Bombay BḍP 1,1,1.74 and 1,2,19.168-180), which could betray such a sectarian differentiation, are found in the Calcutta BḍP exactly the same as in the VāP (cf. above and footnote 42). However, the obvious historical relationship of the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* with the Pāśupata tradition (as underlined by Hazra and, more recently, in Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998: 22) needs further investigation.

⁵³ Like in the case of Aparārka and Devaṇabhaṭṭa, and (in the middle of the 14th century) of Mādhavācārya, the Vijayanagara scholar.

when he recognizes them as common.⁵⁴ A good number of his untraceable verses from both the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Vāyu* refer similarly to chapters on various large donations.⁵⁵

There is no doubt that in the course of time our *Purāṇa* continued to receive further interpolations and sometimes suffered alterations in both parts of its bi-named manuscript tradition. The texts given by the *nibandha* writers often present supplementary verses, if not complete chapters, betraying the existence of much more expanded versions than the available edited ones. Some of these versions could still exist in manuscript forms. Beside the desirability of coming as close as possible to what could have been the text of the classical *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* in its earliest state,⁵⁶ one of the main reasons for the need of a critical edition is the capacity that would be thus given for exploring the richness of all these secondary textual developments.⁵⁷

Bibliography

- ADRIAENSEN, R., Hans BAKKER & Harunaga ISAACSON 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa, I: Adhyāyas 1-25*. Critically edited with prolegomena and English synopsis. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- AUFRECHT, Theodor 1891. *Catalogus Catalogorum*, I. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- BISSCHOP, Peter 2004. Śiva's āyatanas in the various recensions of Skandapurāṇa 167. In: Hans T. Bakker (ed.), *Origin and Growth of the Purāṇic Text Corpus*, with

⁵⁴ This incidentally proves that these writers do not just use indiscriminately two names for the one and same work. It is clear that they really mean two different works in these passages, even if, as it is here the case, they sometimes remark on the identity of both texts. For some examples of the numerous extracts of verses quoted by the *nibandha* writers with the mention of two or more *Purāṇas* as common sources, see Hazra 1940: 21, n.

⁵⁵ cf. Hazra 1940: 17, 19; *contra* the *brahmāṇḍam ... dānaśūnyam* of Ballālasena.

⁵⁶ From a comparative look at the concordance given in Appendix 2 it may already be concluded rather safely that *adhyāya* 27 of the Bombay BḍP (1,2) as well as 35.78-87, 36.1-16a and 70.1-28 of the Calcutta BḍP (the latter passage is also not in the Trivandrum ms of the BḍP), and *adhyāyas* 25 and 104 of the VāP did not belong to the text in its earliest state (VāP 104, obviously of very late origin, is not even found in all the mss used by the Pune editor). In the absence of any critical edition one has to be careful with the numerous portions found in the VāP and not in the Bombay BḍP (but definitely in the Calcutta BḍP), despite the valuable arguments in favour of the 'lateness' of some passages by Hazra (1940: 15-17) and Roy (1964). See also Gail 1977: 195 criticizing Kirfel PPL, pp. xiii-xv on the problem of the 'individuelle Sonderstücke' which cannot be *a priori* declared as interpolated. A close study of the textual relationship between the *vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* and the early *Skandapurāṇa* is being prepared by Peter Bisschop. His study will certainly shed new light on this problem.

⁵⁷ I wish to thank Greg Bailey for improving the English of this article.

- Special Reference to the Skandapurāṇa* (Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, 3.2): 65-78. Delhi: MLBD.
- BONAZZOLI, Giorgio 1980. Purāṇic paramparā. *Purāṇa* 22: 33-60.
- BRINKHAUS, Horst 2005. Duplicates in the Somavaṃśa account of the *Harivaṃśa*: early text-historical developments in the Harivaṃśaparvan. In: *DICSEP Vol. 3*: 363-387.
- BURNELL, A. C. 1880. *A Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore*. London: Trübner.
- EPB = *Epic and Purāṇic Bibliography (up to 1985)*, I-II. (PRP, 3.1-2.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992.
- GAIL, Adalbert J. 1972. Atri-Prabhākara: Eine textgeschichtliche Untersuchung. *WZKS* 16: 41-54.
- 1973. Zur Entwicklung des manvantara-Abschnitts im Rahmen der älteren Purāṇas. *ZDMG*, Supplement 2: 321-330.
- 1977. *Paraśurāma: Brahmane und Krieger. Untersuchung über Ursprung und Entwicklung eines Avatāra Viṣṇus und Bhakta Śivas in der indischen Literatur*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- GONDA, Jan 1933. Einige Mitteilungen über das altjavanische Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa. *Acta Orientalia* 11: 218-259.
- 1960. The Old-Javanese Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa. *Purāṇa* 2: 252-267.
- HAZRA, Rajendra Chandra 1935. Purāṇas in the history of smṛti. *Indian Culture* 1.4: 587-614 [Pages here quoted according to the reprint in Hazra 1985: 300-332.]
- 1938. The Vāyu-Purāṇa. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 14: 331-339.
- 1940. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Dacca: University of Dacca [Reprint: Delhi: MLBD, 1975.]
- 1953. The Problems relating to the Śiva-Purāṇa. *Our Heritage* 1.1: 46-68 [Pages here quoted according to the reprint in Hazra 1985: 246-281.]
- 1958-63. *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, I-II. (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series, 2 & 22, Studies 1 & 10.) Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- 1962. The Purāṇas. In: Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan *et alii* (eds.), *The Cultural Heritage of India*, II: 240-270. Calcutta: The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture.
- 1985. *Dr. R.C. Hazra Commemoration Volume. Selected Articles of the Late Dr. R.C. Hazra*, I. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust. [= *Purāṇa* 27.1]
- HOPKINS, E. Washburn 1901. *The Great Epic of India*. New York: Yale University Press.
- KANE, Pandurang Vaman 1962. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, V.2. (Government Oriental Series, B 6.) Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- KIRFEL, Willibald 1931. *Bhāratavarṣa (Indien): Textgeschichtliche Darstellung zweier geographischen Purāṇa-Texte nebst Übersetzung*. (Beiträge zur Indischen Sprachwissenschaft und Religionsgeschichte, 6.) Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- 1947. Rāmāyaṇa Bālakāṇḍa und Purāṇa: Ein Beitrag zur chronologischen Fixierung des ersten Buches. *Die Welt des Orients* 1: 113-128 [Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 76-91.]
- 1954. *Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude (Bhuvanavinyāsa): Die kosmographischen Traktate der Purāṇa's*. Versuch einer Textgeschichte. (Bonner Orientalistische

- Studien N.S. 1.) Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Bonn.
- 1959. *Zur Eschatologie von Welt und Leben: Ein purāṇischer Text nebst Übertragung in textgeschichtlicher Darstellung.* (BOS N.S. 5.) Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Bonn.
- KOSKIKALLIO, Petteri & Christophe VIELLE 2001. Epic and puranic texts attributed to Jaimini. *IT* 27: 67-93.
- NATHA, P. & J. B. CHAUDHURI 1938. *Catalogue of the India Office Library*, II.1: *Sanskrit Books*, I, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- PARGITER, F. Eden 1913. *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age.* Oxford: OUP.
- 1922. *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.* London: OUP.
- PATIL, Devendrakumar Rajaram 1946. *Cultural History from the Vāyu-Purāṇa.* Poona: Deccan College, Postgraduate & Research Institute [Reprint: Delhi: MLBD, 1973.]
- PRASAD, Maheshwari 1989. *Some Aspects of the Varāha-Kathā in Epics and Purāṇas.* Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan.
- RAGHAVAN, V. 1998. *Sanskrit Rāmāyaṇas other than Vālmiki's: The Adbhuta, Adhyātma, and Ananda Rāmāyaṇas.* Chennai: Dr. V. Raghavan Centre for Performing Arts.
- RAY, Anamika 1984. A Note on the Javanese Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa in the light of Prasat Kandalom inscription of Indravarman. *Purāṇa* 26: 63-67.
- ROY, S. N. 1964. Some late chapters of the Vāyu-Purāṇa. *Purāṇa* 6: 366-377.
- SCHREINER, Peter 2002. Five topics, three functions, one God: on the interrelatedness of Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa-material and trimūrti concept in the Viṣṇupurāṇa. In: *DICSEP Vol. 2*: 261-285.
- SIRCAR, Dines Chandra 1945. Text of the Puranic List of Peoples. *IHQ* 21: 297-314.
- SMETS, Sandra 2004. Le développement embryonnaire selon la Jaiminīyasamhitā du Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa: étude sur l'intertextualité. In: Eugen Ciurtin (ed.), *Du corps humain, au carrefour de plusieurs savoirs en Inde: Mélanges offerts à Arion Roșu par ses collègues et amis à l'occasion de son 80e anniversaire* (Studia Asiatica, 4-5): 313-330.
- SÖHNEN, Renate & Peter SCHREINER 1989. *Brahmapurāṇa: Summary of contents, with index of names and motifs.* (Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen, 2.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- SUKTHANKAR, Vishnu S. 1942. *The Āraṇyakaparvan (part 1), being the third book of the Mahābhārata, for the first time critically edited.* Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- VIELLE, Christophe 2002. An Introduction to the Jaiminīyasamhitā of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa. In: *DICSEP 2*: 337-357.
- VIELLE, Christophe, forthcoming (a). 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 Harivaṃśa. In: Petteri Koskikallio & Bruno Dagens (eds.), *Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*, 3.1: Purāṇas, Āgamas and Tantra. Delhi: MLBD.
- forthcoming (b). Transmission et recreation purāṇique: le cas du Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa. In: Gérard Colas & Gerdi Gerschheimer (eds.), *Transmission des textes en Inde.* Paris.

VRIES, J. D. L. de 1928. *Der Śrāddhakalpa im Harivaṃśa und in fünf anderen Purāṇen*. Bonn: Bonner Universitäts-Buchdruckerei.

WILSON, Horace Hayman 1840. *The Viṣṇu Purāṇa: a System of Hindu Mythology and Tradition, translated from the original Sanskrit, and illustrated by notes derived chiefly from other Purāṇas*. London: John Murray.

Appendix 1: Editions of the BḍP and the VāP

The Bombay Edition of the BḍP

- *atha brahmāṇḍamahāpurāṇam prārabhyate*, Mumbai: Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1906 (*śake* 1828 / V.S. 1963), 2 + 4 + 204 ff.; reprint: 1912 (*śake* 1834 / V.S. 1969), 2 + 6 + 273 ff. (= the same with Lalitopākhyāna added from f. 204 verso). [cf. EPB, nos. 1233 and 1236 – no. 1241 does not exist]
- Republished (typographically recomposed) by Kṣemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa, Mumbai: Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1935 (*śake* 1857 / V.S. 1992), 2 + 6 + 340 ff.; reprint: ed. K. V. Sharma, Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy (Chowkhamba), Krishnadas Sanskrit Series, 41, 1983, 2000², 43 pp. + 6 + 2 + 340 ff. + 180 pp. (= index of the beginnings of verses, also published separately as Krishnadas Sanskrit Series, 51); reprint: ed. J. L. Shastri, Delhi: MLBD, 1973, 1983², xvi + 295 pp. (= 1.5 ff./pp. + index of the beginnings of verses from p. 229). Trans. G. V. Tagare, 5 vols, Delhi: MLBD, 1983-84, AITM Series, 22-26. [cf. EPB, nos. 1252, 1260, 1262, 1263]

The Calcutta Edition of the BḍP

- Ed. Devendranātha Vasu (with Bengali trans. and notes by Nagendranātha Vasu), Calcutta: Viśvakośa Office, 1891-94 (B.S. 1298-1301), ‘parts 1-23’ bounded in one volume 1895 (B.S. 1302), 1 + 2 + 16 + 856 pp. (71 chapters wrongly counted as 70 because *adhyāya* no. 25 given twice). [cf. EPB, no. 1230]
- Ed. Pañcānana Tarkaratna (with Bengali trans.), Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1908 (B.S. 1315); reprint: 1989 (B.S. 1396), 1 + 2 + 355 pp. (71 chapters). [cf. EPB, nos. 1234-1235]

The Javanese version of the BḍP

- Ed. and trans. I. G. P. Phalgunadi, *The Indonesian Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, New Delhi: Sundeeep Prakashan, 2000. cf. also ed. and trans. J. Gonda, Bandung: Koninklijke Bataviaasch. Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 1932-33, Bibliotheca Javanica, 5-6 [= EPB, nos. 1248 and 1250]

The Calcutta Edition of the VāP

- Ed. Rājendralāla Mitra, Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1879-88, 13 fascicles bounded in 2 vols., Bibliotheca Indica work no. 85, 1880/1888, 4 + 2 + 7 + 540 and 10 + 4 + 659 pp. [cf. EPB, no. 7708]

The Bombay Edition of the VāP

- *atha śrīmadvāyumahāpurāṇam prārabhyate*, Mumbai: Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1895 (*śake* 1817 / V.S. 1952), 1933² (*śake* 1855 / V.S. 1990), 1 + 210 ff.; reprint: ed. V. Caturvedī, Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1983 (+ 107 pp. = index of the beginnings of verses). Trans. G. V. Tagare, AITM, nos. 37-38, 1987-88. [cf. EPB, nos. 7707 (with the wrong date 1867, i.e. the one of the creation of the publishing house wrongly given as the one of the first edition), 7712 and 7718]

The Pune Edition of the VāP

- Ed. H. N. Āpte, Pune, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 49, 1905 (*śake* 1827); reprint: 1983 (*śake* 1905), 6 + 453 pp. [cf. EPB, no. 7709 – no. 7706 which supposes a first edition in 1860 is almost impossible since this edition takes into account the Calcutta edition]
- Ed. Pañcānana Tarkaratna (with Bengali trans.), Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1910 (B.S. 1317). [cf. EPB, no. 7711]
- Ed. R. Tripāthī (with Hindi trans.), Prayag: Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan, 1950 (V.S. 2007), reprint: 1987 (*śake* 1909), 1 + 2 + 16 + 1139 pp. [cf. EPB, no. 7714]

Appendix 2: General Table of Concordance

Content (according to VāP)	VāP Pune	VāP Bom.	BḍP Cal.	BḍP Bom.	BḍP Jav.	Epic and Purāṇic parallels + synoptic editions
<u>Prakriyāpāda</u>						
<i>anukramaṇikā</i>	1 (205)	1.1 (185)	1 (201)	1.1 (174)	1/2	
<i>dvādaśavārṣikasatranirūpaṇam</i>	2 (45)	2 (41)	2 (45)	2 (48)		
<i>sr̥ṣṭiprakaraṇam</i>	3 (24)	3 (22)	3 (24)	/		
	4 (92)	4 (82)	4 (88)	3 (38)	2	Mk45 Kū Li PPL 44-53
	5 (54)	5 (50)	5 (52)	4 (34)	2	Li PPL 54-59
	6 (79)	6 (73)	6 (76)	5 (141)	3/4/5	Kū Li PPL 59-70
<u>Anuṣaṅgapāda</u>						
<i>pratisaṁdhikīrtanam</i>	7 (80)	7 (74)	7 (76)	6 (77)		PPL 71-78
<i>caturāśramavibhāgaḥ</i>	8 (209)	8 (198)	8 (202)	7 (195)		Mk49 PPL 79-101
<i>devādiṣṭīkathanam</i>	9 (122)	9 (114)	9 (116)	8 (66)	5	Li PPL 101-111
<i>manvantaravarṇanam</i>	10 (67)	10 (62)	10 (64)	9 (92)	6	Kū Li Sk10 PPL 112-120
<i>pāśupatayoganirūpaṇam</i>	10 (27)	10 (25)	10 (27)	/		Mk39
	11 (64)	11 (61)	10 (61)	/		Mk39
	12 (43)	12 (40)	11 (42)	/		
	13 (24)	13 (23)	12 (25)	/		
	14 (42)	14 (39)	13 (40)	/		
	15 (17)	15 (14)	14 (16)	/		
<i>śaucācāralakṣaṇanirūpaṇam</i>	16 (24)	16 (23)	15 (23)	/		Mk41 Li
<i>paramāśramavidhikathanam</i>	17 (8)	17 (7)	16 (7)	/		Mk41
<i>yatiprayaścittavidhikathanam</i>	18 (23)	18 (20)	17 (22)	/		Li
<i>ariṣṭanirūpaṇam</i>	19 (43)	19 (40)	18 (39)	/		Mk43 Li

Content (according to VāP)	VāP Pune	VāP Bom.	BḍP Cal.	BḍP Bom.	BḍP Jav.	Epic and Purāṇic parallels + synoptic editions
<i>oṃkāraprāptilakṣaṇanirūpaṇam</i>	20 (39)	20 (35)	19 (40)	/		Mk42 Li
<i>kalpanirūpaṇam</i>	21 (81)	21 (72)	20 (77)	/		
<i>kalpasamkhyānirūpaṇam</i>	22 (35)	22 (33)	21 (35)	/		
<i>māheśvarāvatārāyogaḥ</i>	23 (62)	23 (56)	22 (58)	/		Sk167
	23 (164)	23 (158)	23 (161)	/		Sk167
<i>sārvastavaḥ</i>	24 (35)	24 (34)	24 (35)	/		
	24 (54)	24 (54)	25 (61)			
	24 (78)	24 (76)	26 (75)	/		
<i>madhukaiṭabhotpattivināśa- varṇanam</i>	25 (92)	25 (90)	/	/		
<i>svarotpattinirūpaṇam</i>	26 (50)	26 (50)	27 (51)	/		
<i>mahādevatanuvarṇanam</i>	27 (60)	27 (60)	28 (62)	10 (88)		PPL 121-127
<i>ṛṣivamśānukīrtanam</i>	28 (39)	28 (38)	29 (40)	11 (44)	7	PPL 128-131
<i>agnivamśavarṇanam</i>	29 (49)	29 (49)	30 (49)	12 (53)		Mt51 PPL 131-135
<i>dakṣasāpavarṇanam</i>	30 (78)	30 (78)	31 (79)	13 (86)	8	Sk10 Br
	30 (243)	30 (241)	31 (240)	/		MBh12,274 Li Br
	31 (61)	31 (61)	32 (59)	13 (65)		
<i>yugadharmanirūpaṇam</i>	32 (67)	32 (64)	33 (65)	/		
<i>svāyaṃbhuvavaṃśavarṇanam</i>	33 (65)	33 (65)	34 (68)	14 (75)	9	Mk53 Kū Li Var BhuVi 77-86
<i>jambūdvīpavarṇanam</i>	34 (57)	34 (57)	35 (61)	15 (50)	17	Mt113 Mk54 Li, Var BhuVi 87-97, 100
	34 (16)	34 (16)	35 (26)	/		
	34 (23)	34 (23)	36 (38)	/		
	35 (47)	35 (47)	37 (49)	/		

Content (according to VāP)	VāP Pune	VāP Bom.	BḍP Cal.	BḍP Bom.	BḍP Jav.	Epic and Purāṇic parallels + synoptic editions
<i>bhuvanavinyāsaḥ</i>	36 (33)	36 (33)	38 (34)	/		
	37 (30)	37 (30)	39 (31)	/		
	38 (78)	38 (78)	40 (78)	/		
	39 (64)	39 (64)	41 (65)	/		
	40 (26)	40 (26)	42 (27)	/		
	41 (47)	41 (47)	43 (47)	/		
	41 (43)	41 (42)	44 (43)	/		
	42 (81)	42 (81)	45 (81)	/		
	43 (9)	43 (9)	46 (10)	15 (10)	17	Mt113 Li <i>BhuVi</i> 101-103
	43 (29)	43 (29)	46 (32)	/		
	44 (25)	44 (25)	47 (25)	/		
	45 (20)	45 (20)	48 (21)	15 (20)	17	Mt113 Li Var <i>BhuVi</i> 103-106
	45 (46)	45 (46)	48 (48)	/		
	45 (71)	45 (71)	49 (72)	16 (69)	18	Mt114 Mk57 Kū, Li Br Vm <i>BhuVi</i> 108-118, <i>BhāVa</i> 33-49, <i>IHQ</i>
	46 (37)	46 (37)	50 (39)	17 (37)	19	Mt114 Li <i>BhuVi</i> 119-125
	47 (80)	47 (80)	51 (83)	18 (84)	20	Mt121 <i>BhuVi</i> 126-136
	48 (43)	48 (43)	52 (44)	/		
	49 (186)	49 (186)	53 (199)	19 (197)	21	Mt122-3 Li <i>BhuVi</i> 137-164, 166-184
<i>jyotiḥpracāraḥ</i>	50 (57)	50 (57)	54 (57)	20 (58)		<i>BhuVi</i> 185-190
	50 (167)	50 (165)	55 (169)	21 (176)	22	Mt124 Li <i>BhuVi</i> 196-220

Content (according to VāP)	VāP Pune	VāP Bom.	BḍP Cal.	BḍP Bom.	BḍP Jav.	Epic and Purāṇic parallels + synoptic editions
	51 (76) 52 (99)	51 (76) 52 (99)	56 (76) 57 (99)	22 (84) 23 (108)	23	Mt125 Li <i>BhuVi</i> 221-241 Mt126-127 Kū Li <i>BhuVi</i> 242-246, 248-261
<i>jyotiḥsaṃniveśaḥ</i>	53 (123)	53 (123)	58 (123)	24 (152)		Mt128 Kū Li <i>BhuVi</i> 262-284
<i>nīlakaṇṭhastavaḥ</i>	54 (117)	54 (116)	59 (116)	25 (117)		Sk114
<i>liṅgodbhavastavaḥ</i>	55 (68)	55 (68)	60 (71)	26 (66)		
[<i>dārupraveśabhasmasnānavidhi</i>]	/	/	/	27 (129)		
<i>pitṛvarṇanam</i>	56 (94)	56 (91)	61 (91)	28 (100)		Mt141
[<i>yugasamḍhyāvarṇanam</i>]	57 (85)	57 (85)	62 (85)	29 (92)		Mt142
<i>yajñavarṇanam</i>	57 (40)	57 (40)	63 (40)	30 (48)		Mt143
<i>caturyugākhyānam</i>	58	58	64	31		Mt144, MBh3,186/189
<i>ṛṣilakṣaṇam</i>	(126) 59 (106)	(126) 59 (106)	(128) 65 (106)	(127) 32 (122)	10/11	Mt145
	59 (36)	59 (11)	65 (11)	33 (58)	14	Mt145
<i>mahāsthātīrthavarṇanam</i>	60 (62)	60 (62)	66 (63)	34 (68)	11/12	
<i>vedaśākhāpraṇayavarṇanam</i>	60 (14)	60 (14)	66 (14)	35 (4)	13	
<i>prajāpativaṃśānukīrtanam</i>	61 (186)	61 (186)	67 (189)	35 (211)	11/13/15	
<i>prṥthivīdohanam</i>	62 (193)	II.1 (190)	68 (193)	36 (227)	16	HV2/4-6 Śi Br Vi, Ag Kū Gḍ <i>PPL</i> 141-146, 233-248
<i>prṥthuvaṃśānukīrtanam</i>	63 (56)	2 (56)	69 (57)	37 (60)		HV2/6 Śi Br Vi Ag, Kū Gḍ <i>PPL</i> 147-152, 248-250
	/	/	70 (28)	/		
<i>vaivasvatasargavarṇanam</i>	64 (31)	3 (31)	71 (31)	38 (33)		

Content (according to VāP)	VāP Pune	VāP Bom.	BḍP Bom.	Epic and Purāṇic parallels + synoptic editions
<u>Upodghātapāda</u>				
<i>prajāpatiṣṭhānukīrtanam</i>	65 (120)	4 (120)	II.1 (125)	
	65 (39)	4 (39)	2 (32)	HV3 Śi Br Vi Ag Kū Gḍ <i>PPL 155-160</i>
<i>kaśyapīyaprajāsargaḥ</i>	66 (152)	5 (149)	3 (131)	<i>PPL 174-187</i>
	67 (47)	6 (47)	4 (37)	<i>PPL 188-192</i>
	67 (88)	6 (88)	5 (106)	Rm <i>PPL 193-203, RBP 119-123</i>
	68 (39)	7 (39)	6 (39)	<i>PPL 204-207</i>
	69 (355)	8 (347)	7 (479)	<i>PPL 208-209</i>
<i>ṛṣiṣṭhānukīrtanam</i>	70 (91)	9 (92)	8 (102)	HV4 Śi Br Vi Ag Li <i>PPL 226-230</i>
<i>śrāddhakalpaḥ</i>	71 (79)	10 (79)	9 (76)	HV11-13 Śi
	72 (50)	11 (50)	10 (52)	HV13 Śi Sk11 Mt Pd
	73 (73)	11 (63)	10 (68)	HV13 Śi Mt Pd
	74 (32)	12 (32)	11 (35)	
	75 (77)	13 (76)	11 (81)	
	76 (43)	14 (42)	12 (46)	
	77 (135)	15 (135)	13 (143)	
	78 (78)	16 (78)	14 (117)	
	79 (95)	17 (95)	15 (68)	
	80 (62)	18 (62)	16 (59)	
	81 (26)	19 (26)	17 (22)	
	82 (15)	20 (15)	18 (15)	
	83 (107)	21 (78)	19 (74)	
	83 (22)	21 (22)	20 (23)	

Content (according to VāP)	VāP Pune	VāP Bom.	BḍP Bom.	Epic and Purāṇic parallels + synoptic editions
<i>vaivasvatotpattivarṇanam</i>	84 (86)	22 (87)	59 (86)	HV8 Śi Br Mk106 Bhv <i>PPL 284-294</i>
<i>vaivasvatamanuṣṣavarṇanam</i>	85 (28) 86 (69) 87 (46) 88 (215) 89 (23)	23 (28) 24 (66) 25 (45) 26 (214) 27 (23)	60 (28) 61 (53) 62 (44) 63 (216) 64 (24)	HV9 Śi Br <i>PPL 299-303</i> HV9 Śi Br Rm <i>PPL 303-6, RBP 123-124</i> HV9-10 Śi Br Rm <i>PPL 306-338, RBP 114-116</i> Rm <i>PPL 338-339, RBP 117-118</i>
<i>somajanmavivaraṇam</i>	90 (49)	28 (49)	65 (50)	HV20 Br <i>PPL 349-354</i>
<i>candravaṁśakīrtanam</i>	91 (118) 92 (99) 93 (104) 94 (56) 95 (48) 96 (258)	29 (114) 30 (100) 31 (103) 32 (56) 33 (48) 34 (257)	66 (90) 67 (105) 68 (107) 69 (57) 70 (49) 71 (265)	HV21/App.1.6,6B Br MBh <i>PPL 355-368</i> HV21 (23)/ApI.7 Br <i>PPL 369-382</i> HVApp.I.7/22 Br MBh Li, Mt <i>PPL 383-397</i> HV23 Br Li Mt Pd <i>PPL 410-421</i> HV26 Br Li Mt Pd <i>PPL 422-431</i> HV27-9/24-5 Br Li Mt Pd <i>PPL 432-446, 449-463, 472-481</i>
<i>viṣṇumāhātmyam</i>	97 (203) 98 (126)	35 (203) 36 (125)	72 (195) 73 (126)	HV30 Mt Pd <i>PPL 482-506</i> HV31 Mt Pd <i>PPL 507-520</i>
<i>turvasvādivaṁśavarṇanam</i>	99 (464)	37 (458)	74 (278)	HV23/15 Br Mt <i>PPL 521-555, DKA 1-63, 87-88</i>
Upasamhārapāda				
<i>manvantaranisargavarṇanam</i>	100 (246)	38 (245)	III.1 (243)	HV7 Śi Br Mk94 <i>PPL 258-271</i>
<i>bhūrlōkādivyavasthāvarṇanam</i>	101 (355)	39 (355)	2 (316)	Sk183 <i>BhuVi 191-195</i>
<i>pratisargavarṇanam</i>	102 (135)	40 (135)	3 (113)	Vi Ag Br <i>Eschat 27-32</i>
<i>sr̥ṣṭivarṇanam</i>	103 (73)	41 (73)	4 (73)	
<i>vyāsasaṁśayāpanodanam</i>	104 (110)	42 (110)	/	

Abbreviations in the Concordance

BḍP Cal., Bom., Jav. = the Calcutta or Bombay editions and the Javanese version of the BḍP

VāP Pune, Bom. = the Pune or Bombay editions of the VāP

DKA = Pargiter 1913

IHQ = Sircar 1945

BhāVa = Kirfel 1931

BhuVi = Kirfel 1954

Eschat = Kirfel 1959

PPL = Kirfel: PPL (1927)

RBP = Kirfel 1947

Other works used for the table:

Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998: 21-22 (completed by Peter Bisschop,
cf. Bisschop 2004: 75-76)

Gail 1972: 41-54; 1973: 329; 1977: 10-13, 231

Hazra 1940: 15 (n. 19), 26, 96

Hopkins 1901: 48-49

Prasad 1989: 112-120

Söhnen & Schreiner 1989: Appendices 2 and 5

de Vries 1928