

सर्वासां गिरिभूतानां पुण्यतोयनिवाहिनिम् ।
 तत् तदा देवदेवेशो नदीनां सम्भवं द्विजाः ।
 मानसं कथयामास सर्वासां गिरिगामिनाम् ॥ १० ॥
 ततः प्रफुल्लवदनो निकुम्भो मुनिसत्तमाः ।
 पुनः पृच्छन् महादेवं सरान्तं मुनिसत्तमाः ॥ ११ ॥
 तस्मै प्रदर्शयामास तुषितः पार्वतीप्रियः ।
 कूर्माचलस्य शिखरे सरोवरसमुद्भवम् ॥ १२ ॥
 स्वपादादातिशुद्धं वै जलं देवर्षिसेवितम् ।
 न च सा चापि तं विप्राः प्रोवाच भगवान् हरः ॥ १३ ॥

शिव उवाच ।

यावत् तोयं हिमाद्रौ वै सम्भूतं गणनायक ।
 तावन् मानसभूतं वै जानोहि गणनायक ॥ १४ ॥

व्यास उवाच ।

इति गौरीपतेर्वाक्यमाकर्ष्यं द्विजसत्तमाः ।
 दृष्ट्वा चापि सरस्यान्तं स लेभे परमं पदम् ॥ १५ ॥
 तत्र ये मानसीये वै जले स्नात्वा द्विजोत्तमाः ।
 संपूजयन्ति देवेशं मुक्तिं विन्दन्ति ते सदा ॥ १६ ॥
 पिण्डदानं प्रकुर्वन्ति ये तत्र मुनिसत्तमाः ।
 कुलानि ते ब्रह्मभुवं प्रापयन्ति शतानि वै ॥ १७ ॥
 गण्डकीलोहसरितोर्मध्ये वै द्विजसत्तमाः ।
 निमज्ज्य ये शिवं शान्तं ते यान्ति परमां गतिम् ॥ १८ ॥
 समातृकं भीमसुतं संभाव्य मुनिसत्तमाः ।
 मानसेशं हरं ये वै पूजयन्ति समाहिताः ॥ १९ ॥
 भुक्त्वा भोगान् सुविपुलान् शिवं यान्ति परत्र ते ।
 मयैतत् कथितं विप्रा मानसेशस्य वर्णनम् ।
 शृण्वन्ति ये शिवगृहं प्राप्नुवन्ति न संशयः ॥ २० ॥

इति श्रीस्कन्दपुराणे मानसखण्डे मानसेश्वरमाहात्म्ये पञ्चषष्ठितम-
 सोऽध्यायः ॥ ६५ ॥

१०. -a) ने१ सर्वासो (→सर्वासां). -d) ने२ ०निवाहिनाम् (→०निवाहिनोम्).
 १२. -a) ने१ तस्मै (→तस्मै). १३. -a) ने२ स्वपदा चाति शुद्धं वै, ने२
 स्वपादादति शुद्धं वै. -b) जल-(→जलं). १४. -b) ने२ हिमाद्रौ (→हिमाद्रौ)
 १५. -a) ने३ गौरी० (→गौरी०). -d) ने१ लभेत् (→लेभे). १९. -a) ने२
 समातृके (→समातृकं). २०. -b) ने२ मे (→ते).

पुराणम्

PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

Published with the financial assistance from the Ministry of Education,
 Government of India

VYĀSA PŪRNIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

ISSUED ON THE OCCASION OF THE
 VIIth WORLD SANSKRIT CONFERENCE
 LEIDEN, 1987



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
 FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Sub.—Inland Rs. 50/-

Foreign £ 5

There are possibilities that such idea was not utilized in practice in spite of Konark erotics. Thus Tantricism was definitely of a sober variety in the Sun-cult of early medieval and medieval periods.

VALIDITY OF THE PURANIC VIEW ABOUT THE NATURE OF VEDIC RECENSIONS

By

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

Sāmaśramin's assertions regarding the faulty character of Puranic view

While discussing the nature of Vedic recensions (*śākhās*) the celebrated Vedic scholar Satyavrata Sāmaśramin has asserted that the Puranic account of Vedic recensions (*veda-śākha-vibhāga*)¹ is untrustworthy on account of the following reasons² (*Vide Aitareyā-locanam*, pp. 119-126) :

(i) From some Puranic passages (Bhāgavata-p. 12. 6. 54-60; Viṣṇu-p. 3.4. 16-25) it appears that a *śākha* is a portion of a Veda (*vedāṁśa*). As the Bhāgavata-purāṇa is divided into twelve *skandhas* and each *skandha* into many *adhyāyas*, so the one Veda has been divided into four parts (i. e. the four Vedas) and each part into sub divisions (called *śākhās*). As the readings and contents of each *adhyāya* of the Bhāgavata-p. are different from those of other *adhyāyas*, so the *mantras* and contents of each *śākhā* are

1. Though '*śākhā*' means 'a *saṁhitā* along with its *brāh-mc.ṇ*' (मन्त्रब्राह्मणसमुदायात्मिकां शाखाम्, Medhātithi on Manu 2. 165) yet here the word stands for the *saṁhitā* only. The Purāṇas speak of *śākhās* as 'संहितानां विकल्पकाः' (Viṣṇu-p. 3.6.15). Cp. the expression संहिताभेद (Viṣṇu-p. 3.6.3) in connection with *śākhās*. The expressions सर्वशाखाप्रत्यय and सर्वब्राह्मणप्रत्यय used in the Mīmāṁsā philosophy also show that the word *śākhā* may well refer to the *saṁhitā* only.
2. Following statements of Sāmaśramin are worth noticing : तदेवं पुराणवर्णितं शाखाविभागमतं प्रेक्षावतां वेदविदुषां स्यादुपेक्षणीयम् (p. 122); तस्मात् पौराणिकः शाखाभेदो मन्वादिमतविरुद्धः (p. 124); एवं च यदुक्तं विष्णुपुराणभागवतयोः तत्सर्वं शाखापदार्थज्ञानविहीनत्वावेदकमेव (p. 126).

in a personal communication. Even this discovery will not compensate for the absence of an image of Saura-Śakti in Tantric pose.

different from those of other *śākhās* of a Veda. Thus it follows that as the reading of one chapter of a *skandha* of the Bhāgavata-p does not mean the reading of a whole *skandha*, so the reading of one *śākhā* of a Veda does not mean the reading of one whole Veda. All this is against the established view of Vedic tradition. That *śākhās* of a Veda are not different portions may be known from Anukramaṇi of Śaunaka which says that most of the *mantras* in the Śākala and the Bāskala *śākhā* (of the Ṛgveda) are the same though the order of the *mantras* is different in a few places. A perusal of the extant *śākhās* of each of the four Vedas would show that the *śākhās* cannot be regarded as different portions of a Veda.

(ii) The Puranic authors were not well-informed of Vedic matters. That is why the well-known Śāṅkhāyanī *śākhā* has not been mentioned in the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

(iii) Since according to the Purāṇas all the *śākhās* of a Veda constitute the Veda (*śākhās* being the portions of a Veda), the study of a Veda would mean 'to study all the *śākhās* of a Veda'—an act which is highly impossible. This is against the Manusmṛti, which enjoins that a person should study the entire Veda (*kṛtsna veda*) (2.165). (A period of 12 years is given for this study by Manu 3.1 and other Dharmasāstra works).

(iv) The assertion of the Kūrma-p. (Pūrva. 51) that Vyāsa alone composed all the recensions of the Vedas (like the composition of the eighteen Purāṇas) is not accepted by the Vedic tradition.³ (The verses quoted by Sāmaśramin occur in the Ven. ed. of the Kūrma-p. 1.52. 19-20).

Validity of Puranic authors' views about Vedic matters

Before showing the validity of the Puranic views about the nature of Vedic recensions, we want to submit that there are strong grounds to believe that Puranic authors were intimately acquainted with Vedic matters. Following examples may be considered in this connection :

3. It has also been stated by Sāmaśramin that the wrong view about the nature of Vedic *śākhās* found in the Sanskrit dictionary Vācaspatyam (शाखा वेदैकदेशः) and in the Bengali Viśvakośa by Nagendra Nāth Basu is due to the mistaken idea of the Purāṇas that a *śākhā* is a वेदपरिच्छेदविशेष वेदांश (p. 122).

(i) While describing vows, worship etc. the Purāṇas quote a large number of Vedic *mantras* and mention the names of many *sūktas*, *anuvākas*, *adhyāyas* of the Vedas. All of these *mantras* etc. are found to occur in the Vedic works⁴ (some however occur in the Sūtra works).⁵

(ii) Puranic descriptions of the sacrifices (along with the mention of *stomas* etc.) are found to follow the Sūtra works.

(iii) Definitions and characteristics of the three kinds of *mantras* and of the *brahmaṇa* are found to be based on the authoritative works of Vedic tradition.⁶

(iv) The Purāṇas often speak of many views (concerning *dharma* etc.) and remark that they are held by the Vedas. Almost all of such views are found in the Vedic works.⁷

(v) The Purāṇas contain many tales or stories (*ākhyāna* etc.) which are said to be based on the Vedas. All of these stories are found to occur in the Vedas. It is however needless to say that these tales in the Purāṇas are in more or less exaggerated forms since the Vedic matter was augmented by adding new materials to serve the purpose of the Puranic authors.

That the Purāṇas contain such pieces of information about the *śākhās* as show the trustworthiness of Puranic views about the nature of Vedic *śākhā* is proved by the following facts :

4. In my पुराणगतवेदविषयक सामग्री का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन (Ch. II. sec. 3 and 5) it is shown that *sūktas*, *anuvākas*, *sāmans* etc. mentioned in the Purāṇas do occur in Vedic works. In a separate monograph we shall show that *mantras* quoted in the Purāṇas also occur in the Vedic works.
5. There are however corrupt readings in the printed editions of the Purāṇas on account of which it becomes sometimes difficult to identify them or to trace them in Vedic works. As for example Śiva-p. 5.51.47 mentions जननीसूक्त which must be corrected to रजनीसूक्त (= रात्रिसूक्त).
6. See पुराणगतवेदविषयक सामग्री का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन, Ch. I, sec 2-3.
7. *Ibid.* Ch. IV, Sec. 5.

(i) The total number of *śākhās* of each Veda as given in the Purāṇas is found to be the same as stated in various authoritative works.⁸

(ii) The names of a large number of *śākhās* as given in the Purāṇas are also found in the works belonging to Vedic tradition.

(iii) Epithets of *śākhākāras* as given in the Purāṇas are found to be corroborated by the works belonging to Vedic tradition.⁹

Non-Puranic character of *śākhāvibhāga*

It is to be known that the subject of Vedic *śākhā* does not fall under any of the five¹⁰ or ten¹¹ characteristics of the Purāṇas. It is not included even in the materials called *ākhyāna*, *upākhyāna*, *gāthā* and *kalpaśuddhi* (or *kalpajokti*),¹² which were incorporated in the Purāṇa afterwards.

This shows that *śākhāvibhāga* does not bear the character of those subjects that are naturally suited to the works of Puranic nature. It can be observed that the enumeration of *śākhās* is neither

8. *Ibid.* Ch. III, Sec. 1.

9. As for example the Purāṇas inform us that the Śākhākāra Śākapāni was the author of a work on Nirukta (Vāyu-p. 60.65; Viṣṇu-p. 3.4.33; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 1.35.3)—a fact mentioned in the works like Yāska's Nirukta (4.3). Similarly the epithet *padavittama* is given to the *śākhākāra* Śākalya in Vāyu-p. (60.53) and Brahmāṇḍa-p. (1.35.1). That Śākalya was the author of the *padapāṭha* of the Ṛgveda is an established fact (See Nirukta 6.28).

10. Sarga, pratisarga, vaṁśa, manvantara and vaṁśyānu-carita or vaṁśānu-carita. For the elucidation of these, see the article पुराणलक्षणानि in Purāṇa Vol. I, No. 2.

11. Sarga, visarga, vṛtti, rakṣā, antaras, vaṁśa, vaṁśānu-carita, saṁsthā, hetu and apāśraya (Bhāg. 12.7.9). Bhāg. 2.10.1 contains a similar view. See also Br. Vai. 4.131.6-10.

12. आख्यानैश्चाप्युपाख्यानैर्गाथाभिः कल्पशुद्धिभिः ।

पुराणसंहितां चक्रे पुराणार्थविशारदः ॥

(Viṣṇu-p. 3.6.16, Vāyu-p. 60.21; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 1.34.21). see my पुराणगतवेदविषयक सामग्री का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन; भूमिका, p. 21.

useful (as it serves no secular purpose like the *vaṁśa*-lists in the Purāṇas) nor attractive to those authors of the Purāṇas who were votaries of different sects. That is why the section on *śākhāvibhāga* is found only in a few Purāṇas, namely the Bhāgavata (12. 6-7), the Vāyu (Ch. 60-61), the Brahmāṇḍa (1.34-35) and Viṣṇu (3.4-6). The Agni contains a very brief account (271.1-10) and the Kūrma (1.52) simply mentions the number of *śākhās* of each of the four Vedas without giving the names of the *śākhākāras*.

Thus it follows that the Puranic authors received the material of Vedic *śākhā* from the teachers of Vedic tradition and included it in the Purāṇa with a view to glorifying Vyāsa and his tradition. It is this purpose that prompted Puranic authors to include this subject. It is remarkable to note in this connection that Vyāsa's connection with the division of the Vedas and their recensions is not mentioned in the work of Vedic tradition, namely Nirukta, Bṛhaddevatā, Anukramaṇi etc.

It can thus be reasonably inferred that many meaningful expressions found in the Puranic chapters on *śākhāvibhāga* are likely to be found in ancient works. A perusal of the works of Vedic tradition lend strong support to our assumption.

Nature of Vedic *śākhās* as conceived by Puranic authors

Though the Puranic authors, while referring to a Veda and its recensions, use the word 'tree' and 'branches'¹³ respectively, giving rise to the wrong idea that *śākhās* are the different portions of a Veda (as found in the work of Sāmaśramin), yet there is a clear Puranic passage that removes the wrong idea by showing the true nature of Vedic recensions. The passage reads as under :

सर्वास्ता हि चतुष्पादाः सर्वाश्चैकार्थवाचिकाः ।

पाठान्तरे पृथग्भूता वेदशाखा यथा तथा ॥¹⁴

13. वेदद्रुमं वितपशो विभजिष्यति स्म (Bhāg. 2.7.36); वेदद्रुमश्च यं प्राप्य सशाखः समपद्यत . . . (Vāyu-p. 1.45); चक्रे वेदतरोः शाखा दृष्ट्वा पुंसोऽल्पमेघसः (Bhāg. 1.3.21); वेदास्ते शाखिनोऽभवन् (Bhāg. 1.4.23); यजुवेदतरोः शाखाः (Viṣṇu-p. 3.5.1; Agni-p. 150.27); etc.

14. As this verse occurs in the same section in which the division of the Vedas has been described it may be taken to be of utmost importance.

[Vāyu-p. 61.59; Brahmanḍa-p. 1.35.67 with the corrupt reading वृथाभूताः for पृथग्भूताः].

The verse says that all the four recensions of the original Purāṇasaṁhitā composed by the disciples of Vyāsa had four sections (*pādas*) each.¹⁵ They had the same subject matter and their difference lay in the difference of readings and not in the difference of contents as is found in the Vedic recensions.

The expression वेदशाखा यथा तथा is highly significant. *It undoubtedly shows that the śākhās of a Veda are not the different portions of the Veda, each having its own subject but are the variations of a Vedic text.*

Character of composition of the recensions

It is gratifying to note that besides the above-quoted general statement disclosing the real nature of Vedic recensions, there are such Puranic passages as vividly describe the process of composition of these recensions. From these passages it appears that the difference in recensions consists in the difference of accent, letters etc. as well as in the difference in the order of *mantras*, *sūktas* etc. The difference of purpose and similar other factors are said to be the causes of such changes.

These Puranic passages¹⁶ assert that one single Veda was divided into four by the sage Vedavyāsa in the Dvāpara yuga and further declare that these Vedas were variously arranged by the

15. See Vāyu-p. 61.57-61 and Brahmanḍa-p. 1.35. 63-69 for some details of these Purāṇa-saṁhitās. See also Viṣṇu-p. 3.6.17-19, Agni-p. 271.11-12 and Bhāgavata-p. 12.7.5

16. एको वेदश्चतुष्पादः संहत्य तु पुनः पुनः ।
संक्षेपादायुषश्चैव व्यस्यते द्वापरेष्विह ॥१०
वेदश्चैकश्चतुर्धा तु व्यस्यते द्वापरादिषु ।
ऋषिपुत्रैः पुनर्वेदा भिद्यन्ते दृष्टिविभ्रमैः ॥११
ते तु ब्राह्मणविन्यासैः स्वरक्रमविपर्ययैः ।
संहिता ऋग्यजुःसाम्नां संहितास्तैर्महर्षिभिः ॥१२
सामान्याद् वैकृताच्चैव दृष्टिभिन्नैः क्वचित्क्वचित् ।
(Matsya-p. 144.10-13a).

एको वेदश्चतुष्पादस्त्रेतास्विह विधीयते ॥१०
संरोधादायुषश्चैव दृश्यते द्वापरेषु च ।
वेदव्यासैश्चतुर्धा तु व्यस्यते द्वापरादिषु ॥११
ऋषिपुत्रैः पुनर्वेदा भिद्यन्ते दृष्टिविभ्रमैः ।
मन्त्रब्राह्मणविन्यासैः स्वरवर्णविपर्ययैः ॥१२
संहिता ऋग्यजुःसाम्नां संहन्यन्ते श्रुतर्षिभिः ।
सामान्याद् वैकृताच्चैव दृष्टिभिन्नैः क्वचित्क्वचित् ॥१३
(Vāyu-p. 58.10-13).

एको वेदश्चतुष्पादस्त्रेतास्विह विधीयते ।
संक्षयादायुषश्चैव व्यस्यते द्वापरेषु च ॥११
ऋषिमन्त्रात् पुनर्वेदाद् भिद्यन्ते दृष्टिविभ्रमैः ।
मन्त्रब्राह्मणविन्यासैः स्वरवर्णविपर्ययैः ॥१२
संहिता ऋग्यजुःसाम्नां संपठ्यन्ते महर्षिभिः ।
सामान्या वैकृताश्चैव दृष्टिभिन्ने क्वचित्क्वचित् ॥१३
(Brahmanḍa-p. 1.31.11-13).

एको वेदश्चतुष्पादस्त्रेतास्विह विधीयते ।
संक्षयादायुषश्चैव व्यस्यते द्वापरेषु सः ॥
ऋषिपुत्रैः पुनर्वेदा भिद्यन्ते दृष्टिविभ्रमैः ।
मन्त्रब्राह्मणविन्यासैः स्वरवर्णविपर्ययैः ॥
संहिता ऋग्यजुः साम्नां संहन्यन्ते मनीषिभिः ।
सामान्या वैकृताश्चैव दृष्टिभिस्तैः पृथक् पृथक् ।
(Linga-p. 1.39.57-59).

एको वेदश्चतुष्पादस्त्रेतास्विह विधीयते ॥४३
वेदव्यासैश्चतुर्धा तु व्यस्यते द्वापरादिषु ।
ऋषिपुत्रैः पुनर्वेदा भिद्यन्ते दृष्टिविभ्रमैः ॥४४
मन्त्रब्राह्मणविन्यासैः स्वरवर्णविपर्ययैः ।
संहिता ऋग्यजुःसाम्नां प्रोच्यन्ते परमर्षिभिः ॥४५
सामान्याद् वैकृताश्चैव दृष्टिभेदैः क्वचित्क्वचित्
(Kūrma-p. 1.29.43-46a; the cr. ed reads भेदाद् भिद्यन्ते in
verse 44 and सामान्याद् वैकृताच्चैव in verse 46a).

sons of the sages by changing the accent and letters and also by arranging the *mantras* and *brāhmaṇas* in various ways. Thus *samhitās* of each Veda were prepared, which were mostly similar, though in some places there were differences in them.

Though the readings of these passages are corrupt in many places, yet the sense is sufficiently clear. The words दृष्टिविभ्रम, मन्त्र-ब्राह्मणविन्यास, सामान्या and वैकृता and the use of the roots भिद् (भियन्ते) and सम् + हन् (संहन्यन्ते) are of utmost importance in determining the nature of composition of Vedic recensions. *These Puranic passages evidently falsify the view of Sāmaśramin.* It may be noted in passing that a comparison of the Puranic view as presented in these verses with Sāmaśramin's own view about the nature of Vedic *śākhā*¹⁷ would show that both the views agree in all essential points—a fact which cannot be denied.

Significance of the words *vṛkṣa* and *śākhā* in connection with *śākhā-vibhāga*

Now a question presents itself. If the Puranic authors are considered to be aware of the fact that the *śākhās* of a Veda are not different portions of the Veda, what is the relevance of using the words 'tree' and 'branches' at the time of referring to a Veda and its recensions? Is a branch not a portion of a tree?

We reply that the use of these two words is to be taken not literally but in a figurative sense. The significance of a simile is to be determined according to the intention of the author, or to the nature of the context or circumstances. Since the Puranic authors were aware of the real nature of Vedic *śākhās* (as shown above), the simile is to be interpreted in a way that is in consonance with this nature.

According to us the purpose of using the simile is to show (i) similarity and (ii) gradual appearance. To be explicit: As branches of a tree are similar to one another in many respects, so the recensions of a Veda are similar in their verbal form and con-

17. कालभेद-देशभेद-व्यक्तिभेदादिभिः अध्ययनक्रमोच्चारणादिभेदात् क्रमभेदाः पाठभेदाश्च सांपन्नाः, तत एव एकस्य वेदस्य बहुनामतो बह्व्यः संहिताः प्रसिद्धि गताः (Ai. Āto. p. 124).

tents. Again, as a branch comes out from another similar branch, so the *śākhā* of a teacher becomes the source of other similar *śākhās* composed by his disciples afterwards.¹⁸

Thus it is clear that *Sāmaśramin has misunderstood the significance of the simile of 'tree and its branches'*. Consequently his contention that 'as all the branches are the component parts of a tree and as each branch is different from other branches, so all the recensions of a Veda are, according to the Purāṇas, different portions of one and the same Veda' becomes baseless.

If a *śākhā* is regarded as a Veda (according to Vedic tradition) then what is to be conceived as the tree (branches presuppose the existence of a tree)? Puranic authors seem to think that the *samhitā* of each Veda, composed by Vyāsa, is to be regarded as the (original) tree, since all later *samhitās* (*śākhās*) are based on it. We may further add that whenever a *śākhā* gives rise to another *śākhā* (i. e. whenever the disciples of a *śākhākāra* sage compose new works on the basis of the *śākhā* taught by their *śākhākāra*-teacher) the original *śākhā* must be regarded either as a tree (in a secondary sense) or as a main branch. Puranic authors came to know of this fact and accordingly they used such words as *anuśākhā*, *pratiśākhā*, *carāṇa*, etc. to show the position occupied by a *śākhā* in connection with others (see Viṣṇu-p. 3.4.18; 3.4.25; 3.11.15; Bhāg. 12.6.52 etc). The original import of these terms remains to be determined.

A study of the relevant works reveal that the conception of tree is Puranic in character, since it is not to be found in the works of Vedic treating, which use the words *śākhā*, *bheda* and the like¹⁹ subjects.

18. Cp. अनुवदते कठः कलापस्य (Mahābhāṣya 2.4.3.). It shows that the Kaṭha *śākhā* is based on the Kalāpa *śākhā* and as such the former is mostly similar to the latter. Some teachers of Vedic tradition expressly declare that the *śākhā* of Śākalya was the source of five *śākhās* composed by his disciples.

19. Śabara says वृक्षस्थानीयस्य वेदस्य शाखा; (on MS. 2.4.17). Similarly Kumārila used the word वेदवृक्ष (एकस्य वेदवृक्षस्य बहुशाखैकवृक्षवत्) on M. S. 2.4.17. These show the validity of the Puranic conception of वेदवृक्ष in connection with शाखा.

Reasons for the non-mention of śākhās

Now the objection (raised by Sāmaśramin) that 'the well-known Śāṅkhāyana śākhā of the Ṛgveda has not been mentioned in the śākhā sections of the Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu Purāṇas—a point which shows the invalidity of the Puranic account of Vedic śākhās'—remains to be solved. We may further add that this śākhā has not been mentioned in the longer lists of śākhās given in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas.

Before stating the reasons for the non-mention we want to say that until critical editions of these Purāṇas, especially of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, are prepared, nothing can be said definitely regarding the non-mention of a particular śākhā.

Even if we accept that the Śāṅkhāyana śākhā has not been mentioned in these four Purāṇas, the reason for this non-mention is not difficult to conceive. It seems that the Puranic authors did not mention it deliberately as they considered it to be a work not belonging to the tradition of Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa.²⁰ The Puranic authors may be wrong in their supposition, but it cannot be denied that the non-mention is not due to the ignorance of the Puranic authors but to some definite notion.²¹

The Agni-p. in its brief account of śākhāvibhāga has mentioned the Śāṅkhāyana śākhā (272.2). (Sāmaśramin has also referred

20. Cp. the Puranic assertion that Vedas were divided many times by Vyāsas in former ages (manvantaras) (Līṅga-p. I. 7; Brahmāṇḍa-p. I. 35 and Viṣṇu-p. III. 3) and that the śākhāvibhāga in all ages is sama, similar (Viṣṇu-p. 3.6.32; Vāyu-p. 61.74; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 1.35.84). This may be taken to mean that the Puranic authors came to know of such śākhās as were not connected with the tradition of Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa.
21. That our assumption, namely 'Puranic authors did not mention those śākhās in their lists of śākhākāras which were not connected with the tradition of Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana Vyāsa', is not baseless may be proved from the non-mention of the Śvetāśvatara śākhā in these lists. The sage Śvetāśvatara is said to have lived in the Svāyambhuva manvantara (i.e. he lived long before Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa); see Kūrma-p. 1.14.23-50; Saura-p. 27.12-28. (The Puranic description of this sage is sectarian in character).

to this Agni-p. passage on p. 132). It is connected with the tradition with Vyāsa. This may prove that the Puranic lists of śākhākāras as found in the aforesaid four Purāṇas are not exhaustive. These should not be taken as absolutely correct.

The Kūrma view about the authorship of Vyāsa

It is true that according to Kūrma-p. 1.52. 19.20 (quoted as from the Chap. 51 by Sāmaśramin) Vyāsa is said to compose all the recensions of the four Vedas. According to us the Kūrma-view is to be taken in a figurative sense. The purpose of this statement seems to glorify Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa, the first author of the four-fold division of the Veda (in this manvantara), on the basis of which the śākhās of each Veda were composed by the sages belonging to his school. At the time of glorifying a great personality such figurative sentences are usually used by the Purāṇas; see Viṣṇu-p. 3.2.56 in which Vyāsa is said to be the author of the śākhās. The purpose of this verse is to glorify Viṣṇu, who appears in the form of Vyāsa. These secondary statements were taken afterwards as valid and later authors of the Purāṇas attributed the authorship of śākhās to Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana Vyāsa; Vide Skanda-p. Puruṣottama 46.11 (शाखासहस्रमतनोत् कृष्णद्वैपायनो मुनिः).²²

Questions arising from Puranic statements

In conclusion I want to submit that there arise some intricate questions from the Puranic statements regarding the division of the Veda and the composition of śākhās that require to be solved. Only two problems are given here by way of sample :

(1) The words ऋच्, यजुस्, सामन् and अथर्वन्, used in connection with the composition of the four Vedas, must mean the four kinds of mantras as the context shows. That the first three are the three kinds of mantras is well known (vide Mimāṃsā-sūtra 2.1.35-37).

22. Similar figurative statements are found regarding Puranic literature also. Though the Puranic authors were aware that one Purāṇa-saṁhitā was composed by Vyāsa and that several versions or redactions were prepared by his disciples, yet such statements in the Purāṇas are not wanting as declare that all the eighteen Purāṇas were composed by Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa.

Atharvan is not regarded as a kind of *mantra* like the ṛc etc. What is the characteristic of the *mantras* of the Atharvaṇ ?

(2) According to the Purāṇas Vyāsa composed the four Vedic *saṁhitās* by compiling the *mantras* only and he taught them to his four disciples. The Puranic view is valid so far as the Ṛk-saṁhitā is concerned. In the Śuklā-yajuḥ-saṁhitās there are a good number of *mantras* of the ṛc type. A few *mantras* of the Yajus type are found in the Atharva-saṁhitā also, Were these *mantras* incorporated in later times to fulfil some purpose ?

BOOK-REVIEW

Vimarsacintamaṇi (in Sanskrit)—By Padmabhūṣaṇa Pt. Baladeva Upādhyāya; Publisher : Sarada Samasthana, 37 B, Ravindra Puri, Varanasi-5; pages 385; price Rs. 80/-.

The book under review is a collection of essays (arranged in eight groups) on a variety of subjects concerning the field of Indian Culture and Sanskrit. The work is marked not only by much fresh information about a large number of authors and their works but also by new presentation of old facts. The treatment is descriptive, historical and critical and the language is lucid, graceful and easily understandable. The author, in most cases, has spared no pains in gathering the least bit of information. He has proved that compositions in Sanskrit can be made successfully even while treating a subject through the process of modern research.

Some of the important topics dealt with in the book are : Lives of Kṛṣṇa and Sāyaṇa; scientific basis of the views of Vedānta; Tāntrikī kalā; connection of the Bhojpurī language with the Mahābhāṣya; glory of Sanskrit; discussions on a few works, namely Vākyapadiya, Pārasika-prakāśa (a grammar of the Persian language in Sanskrit); Bṛhatsaṁhitā and its commentator, Hayata, a work on Arabian jyotiṣa, Bhakticandrikā, Bhaktiratnāvalī, Kāvya-lāṅkāra (of Bhāmaha), Vāṅmayārnava (a lexicon), Nāgānanda; a detailed survey of Sanskrit works of various schools composed in Vārāṇasi; informative reviews of a considerable number of books; memoirs of two savants, namely M. M. Gopinātha Kavirāja and M. M. Rāmāvatāra Śarman.

Often the book makes a pleasant and illuminating reading by informing the readers that kerosine oil is called Pārasika taila (p. 219), that Kālidāsa was called Gālidāsa in the Mongolian language (p. 39); that a library is called pustakāśrama in Cambodia (p. 225).

We thank the author for his careful effort in using the correct forms of a few words, as e. g. he has used the correct form ज्योतिष instead of the incorrect form ज्यौ तिष that is frequently used by modern scholars of Sanskrit. In a few places we however differ