

*pe in J. R. 7
a la Bn*

ON THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE VAIKHĀNASAS

BY

W. CALAND

MEDEDEELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE AKADEMIE
VAN WETENSCHAPPEN, AFDEELING LETTERKUNDE
DEEL 65, SERIE A, N^o. 7

AMSTERDAM — 1928

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



135835

MEDEDEELINGEN
DER KONINKLIJKE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN
TE AMSTERDAM, AFDEELING LETTERKUNDE

RUBRIEK A: LETTEREN, WIJSBEGEERTE, GODGELEERDHEID

DEEL 53 (1922)

N ^o .	1	TJ. DE BOER, <i>De „Medicina Mentis“ van den arts Rāzī.</i>	f 0.30
„	2.	K. KUIPER, <i>Over de jongst-ontdekte fragmenten van den sophist Antiphon</i> „	0.40
„	3.	J. J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, <i>Over de beklemtoonde klinker in amour en enkele andere woorden</i>	„ 0.40
„	4.	H. VAN GELDER, <i>Iets over Grieksche eigennamen.</i>	„ 0.60
„	5.	J. HUIZINGA, <i>Een schakel in de ontwikkeling van den term Middeleeuwen?</i> „	0.40
„	6.	A. J. WENSINCK, <i>The oriental doctrine of the martyrs.</i>	„ 0.60
„	7.	PH. S. VAN RONKEL, <i>Maleische litteratuur van verre oorsprong</i> „	0.40
„	8.	N. VAN WIJK, <i>De plaats van Puškin in de letterkunde</i>	„ 0.40
„	9.	K. KUIPER, <i>Over de „Smeeelingen“ van Euripides</i>	„ 0.40
„	10.	J. J. A. A. FRANTZEN, <i>Over Middeleeuwsche school- en volkspoëzie</i> „	0.40
„	11.	J. J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, <i>Strofen in „Gormont et Isembart“</i> „	0.40
„	12.	A. J. WENSINCK, <i>Over een plan tot ontginning der Arabische traditie- litteratuur</i>	„ 0.30
„	13.	A. KLUYVER, <i>Vondel's „Roskam“</i>	„ 0.40

DEEL 55 (1923)

N ^o .	1.	B. FADDEGON, <i>De interpretatie der Kāthaka-Upaniṣad.</i>	f 0.30
„	2.	J. H. KERN, <i>De taalvormen van 't Middelenlengse gedicht Havelok.</i> . . „	0.30
„	3.	N. VAN WIJK, <i>Taalkundige en historische gegevens betreffende de oudste betrekkingen tussen Serven en Bulgaren</i>	„ 0.30
„	4.	A. J. WENSINCK, <i>New data concerning Syriac mystic literature.</i>	„ 0.40
„	5.	C. C. UHLENBECK, <i>Over een mogelijke verwantschap van het Baskisch met de Palaeo-Kaukasische talen</i>	„ 0.30
„	6.	A. J. BARNOUW, <i>Echoes of the Pilgrim Fathers' speech.</i>	„ 0.40

ON THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE VAIKHĀNASAS

BY W. CALAND

Of the literature belonging to the School of the Vaikhānasas the following works are, up to the present time, known to Western scholars:

1. In 1910 the first half of the Vaikhānasa-saṃhitā was published at Kumbakoṇam; as it is printed in Grantha-characters, it is inaccessible to a great many Scholars.

2. In 1913 the Dharmasūtra appeared in a rather uncritical edition, as a volume of the Trivandrum series.

3. In 1914 the Gṛhya-, dharmā- and pravara-sūtras were printed at Kumbakoṇam, equally in Grantha-characters; the work is now out of print.

4. In 1915 a treatise elucidating a part of the Gṛhyasūtra and called Sūtradarpaṇa appeared in Telugu characters at Kumbakoṇam.

5. In 1927 a critical edition of the Smārtasūtra (comprising the Gṛhya- and the Dharmasūtra) was issued in Devanāgarī characters by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Besides these printed works there was still accessible to Western scholars a copy of the Śrautasūtra belonging to the collection Haug, preserved at Munich. But this manuscript is of little value: it is a bad copy of a Grantha original, full of gaps, confused and bristling with faulty readings and clerical errors; moreover, it contains only a part of the whole.

This was all.

Now, a few months ago, Mr. Johan van Manen, general secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal at Calcutta, received a letter from Paṇḍit Pārthasārathi Ayyaṅgar at Ākulamannāḍu, a village in the Kistna district in Telugu land, asking him why among the numerous publications of the Asiatic Society

not one single book of the Vaikhānasas had been published. Mr. van Manen could answer him that just a few months before he wrote this letter, the Smārtasūtra of this śākhā had been issued as a publication of the Society; at the same time he informed the Paṇḍit that of this text an English translation with an ample introduction was going through the press, to be issued as a volume of the Society's works. Thereupon the Paṇḍit offered to put at the disposal of the translator a good many publications, smaller and larger, which all had to do with the texts of this same school. All these works were kindly forwarded to me by Mr. van Manen in order that I might study them and take profit from them for my English translation. I beg to express here my gratitude to the Paṇḍit and to Mr. van Manen, for, as it seems, the knowledge that these texts had been published in that remote village, had not reached any farther than this village: to Western scholars at least they seem to have remained absolutely unknown. The books sent over to me enable us to get a more intimate acquaintance not only with the older texts, but more especially with the texts which have been composed later than the Smārta- and Śrautasūtra.

It seems that in the neighbourhood of this village, at Īgāvāripāḷem and other places, whole settlements of Vaikhānasīyas are found; there every year a kind of year-book is issued in Telugu, the Śrīvaikhānasapattrika, provided with advertisements (e.g. *amṛtāṅjanam*, a kind of healing balsam; *candrodaya* a kind of *hēr āyil* i. e. hair oil; *elektrik pākeṭ sigār lait*, i. e. electric pocket sigar light). These books are illustrated, rather badly, with the portraits of several Vaikhānasapaṇḍits, with reproductions of Viṣṇu-temples, etc. No doubt these annuals contain much that is of interest for the knowledge of the Vaikhānasas, but — they are in Telugu!

Further, in the same district is issued a Vaikhānasagrānthamālā 'a garland of Vaikhānasa-books', the volumes of which series are indicated as 'flowers', *kusumas*. In this Granthamālā

one of the most welcome publications is the second half of the *Vaikhānasīyasamhitā* or *Mantrapraśna*. The four opening chapters of this text were already known (see above, n^o. 1). Since long I possess a copy of this same text in eight *praśnas*, copied for me from a manuscript of Mysore, but as this copy is rather bad and unreliable, we must be glad to possess now a good edition of this second part. It is printed in Telugu characters and, like the first part, provided with accents. The aim for which the first four *praśnas* were composed, is obvious: they contain the mantras which in abbreviated form are cited in the *Gṛhyasūtra*; in harmony with this the first half of the *Samhitā* is called the *śarīracatuṣṭayam*: the four chapters of mantras relating to the bodily welfare of the individual. In contrast with the first half the second part is designated as *daivikacatuṣṭayam*: the four chapters of mantras relating to the God, i. e. to the service, the *pūjā* of the God *Viṣṇu*. Now, just as the first four chapters run parallel with the *Gṛhyasūtra*, we ought to expect a text or more than one text, where the rites of *pūjā* are described, for which these last *praśnas* contain the mantras. It is very probable that these texts have been handed down and that they are now, at least partly, accessible. There is a *kalpa* attributed to *Marīci*, called *Ānandasamhitā*; this text has been edited as a volume of the *Vaikhānanāgranthamālā*; written in *ślokas*, it contains four *pañcikās*, on the whole twenty *adhyāyas*. In chapter *XLI* of this *Samhitā* we find a minute description of the daily worship of *Viṣṇu*: here each act is accompanied by a mantra and these mantras are, for the greater part in the order as they occur in the *Ānandasamhitā*, all given in the eighth or last book of the *Mantrasamhitā*.

In this *kalpa* occurs a long passage (*XVII. 36 sqq.*), which is of high interest, as we find here a full description of all the books pertaining to the *Vaikhānasas*. This passage, with some abbreviations and somewhat freely translated, runs as follows:

„At the time of Manu Svayambhū, at the beginning of the Kaliyuga, in a bright year, as the moon was in conjunction with the nakṣatra śravaṇa, in the month of Śrāvaṇa, at a monday on full moon, at the moment that the sun entered the Lion, Vikhanas came to Naimiśa and the Muni, joined by his disciples, proceeded at Naimiśa in the forest of Naimiśa to compose his Sūtra. The rites beginning with the ceremony performed on impregnation (*niṣeka*) and ending with the funeral rite (*śmaśāna*), contained in thirty-two praśnas, are designated as the rites of men; they are proclaimed by the Muni Vikhanas in one and a half crores (of ślokas, or unites of syllables amounting to a śloka). The rites beginning with the ploughing (*karṣaṇa*) and ending with the feast (*utsava*) are the rites for the God. The whole of this last rite as uttered by the Teacher (Vikhanas) was taken from his mouth by Kaśyapa, by Atri, by me (i. e. by Marīci) and by Bhṛgu. Taken as a whole, this rite for the God contains now four hundred thousand (ślokas). I shall now name these books one after another. By me (i. e. by Marīci) are composed eight Saṃhitās, together 184000 (ślokas): jayasamhitā, ānandasamhitā, saṃjñānasamhitā, vīrasamhitā, vijayasamhitā, vimalasamhitā and (vimānārcana)kalpa. By Bhṛgu are proclaimed in 64000 (ślokas the following ten books): khilakāra, khilādhikāra, purādhikāra, vasādhikāra, arcādhikāra, mānādhikāra, kriyādhikāra, niruktādhikāra, prakīrṇādhikāra and yajñādhikāra. By Atri are proclaimed four books (tantras) in 88000 (ślokas): pūrvatantra, viṣṇutantra, uttaratantra and mahātantra. Kaśyapa proclaimed in 64000 (ślokas) the satyakāṇḍa, the karmakāṇḍa, the extensive jñānakāṇḍa. Moreover Kaśyapa composed a work of 28000 (ślokas)¹. The base of these four kinds of texts (of these four Ṛṣis) is that Sūtra.”

¹) If this last work of Kaśyapa (perhaps the arcanākāṇḍa is meant, which is known to us as a separate text attributed to Kaśyapa) is excluded, we have $184000 + 64000 + 88000 + 64000 = 400000$.

From this passage we learn many important facts. The first is that the Sūtra proper of Vaikhānasa or Vikhanas contains 32 praśnas. This statement is repeated elsewhere, namely in the Commentary on a treatise called Sūtratātparyacintāmaṇi (this work is in course of publication, I am obliged to the editor P. Ayyaṅgar for sending me a copy of what has as yet been printed: 264 pages), where it is said that the Sūtra proclaimed by Vikhanas contains 32 praśnas and that this work is divided in smārta, śrauta, śulba, etc. Hence it results that the tradition of the manuscript of Madras, where the gṛhya- and dharmasūtra precede the śrautasūtra, is right, and equally that the smārta- and śrautasūtra are to be regarded as one whole with a continuous numbering of praśnas. Only the exact meaning of the word *ādi* at the end is uncertain: it must mean that the śulbasūtra was followed by some more materials.

As to the composers of the daivika-part of the Vaikhānasa-texts, we repeatedly meet with the statement that those four Ṛṣis: Kaśyapa, Atri, Bhṛḡu and Marīci were the pupils of Vikhanas. There is a very interesting statement, found twice in the Ānandasamhitā, that Vikhanas had five disciples, the four already mentioned and besides these Bodhāyana, but the last is said to have deceived his Teacher by transgressing the śāstra (*bodhāyano gurudrohī śāstravyutkramaṇād abhūt*, XIX. 19) and elsewhere (II. 79); „The great Muni deceived his Teacher: this first of Munis, being actually a pupil of Vikhanas, deserted the School of Vikhanas and went over to the School of the Taittirīyas.” Elsewhere¹⁾ I have surmised the possibility that Baudhāyana originally belonged to the Kāṇva-śākhā, but went over to the Taittirīyas. Can the author of the Ānandasamhitā have been acquainted with a similar tradition? But to return to the texts which treat of the daivika-part, it is not known to us, Western Scholars, whether the

¹⁾ See Introd. to my Edition of the Kāṇvīya Sat. br. page 100.

manifold texts that are enumerated in the passage cited above from the Ānandasamhitā, are all preserved, but at least two of them have been published: the Ānandasamhitā attributed to Marīci (in four parts) and the rather bulky Vimānārcanakalpa, equally attributed to Marīci. This work, comprising a hundred paṭalas, is throughout in prose; it describes the places of worship (*pūjā*) and the worship itself. It begins with the description of the preparing of the sacrificial ground: the ploughing: *karṣaṇa*, and practically ends with the feast: *utsava*¹⁾.

In these later books of the Vaikhānasas the author of the Sūtra, the founder of this sect, is highly extolled. He is nearly equalled to the God Viṣṇu himself, and, as the God, is represented four-armed, holding disc and conch and wearing the diadem (*kirīṭa*), his two other hands are held in the *abhaya*-posture. Thus he is counterfeited in the Vaikhānasa-patrika of the year 1922, standing before Viṣṇu who reposes on Nāgaśeṣa, the four-faced Brahman standing in the back-ground. The divine origin of Vikhanas is related twice in the Ānandasamhitā. In the first passage (adhyāya IV) Viṣṇu ordains Brahman to emit (to create) the beings movable and immovable, but the first outcome of this creation must be a Muni, in order that Viṣṇu may be honoured by men (*madarcanārtham*). On receiving this command Brahman stands a moment in reflexion, desirous to create such a Muni and immediately after this reflexion he made *viśeṣakhanana* i. e. *tattvārthaparicintana*, and in consequence of this *viśeṣakhanana* arose a mighty Ṛṣi, provided with the knowledge of the books of the Veda, even as a second Viṣṇu himself in person. In accordance with the manner of his coming into existence, namely the *viśeṣakhanana*, Brahman gave him the

¹⁾ The work is dividable into 9 parts: 1—4 *karṣaṇādipratīṣṭhānta*; 5—47 *arcana*; 48—49 *snapanā*; 50—54 *utsava*; 55—60 *avatāralakṣaṇakathana*; 61—75 *prāyaścitta*; 76—79 *anuṣṭhāna*; 80—92 *tattvajñānapradeśa* and 93—100 *śiṣṭamahimānuvarṇana*.

name Vikhanas. In the other passage (adhyāya XV), where the creation of Vikhanas is exposed, the beginning is nearly the same, but now Brahman is said to have been unable to create such a Sage and he takes recourse to Viṣṇu, whereupon Viṣṇu himself causes Vikhanas to come into existence. The God himself teaches him the Savitr-verse and all the sacred books: the veda, as it was before it was divided into four parts. Then Brahman emits the creatures. Finally Viṣṇu commands his son Vikhanas to call into existence other Munis to assist him, these are the Ṛṣis Bhṛḡu, Atri, Kaśyapa etc., who are now instructed in holy lore by Vikhanas.

It is in accordance with this tradition that in a certain treatise, which among the Vaikhānasas seems to be of great authority, viz. in the Vaikhānasasūtratātparyacintāmaṇi, the authenticity and highest authority of the Sūtra of Vikhanas are proved by ten points (*hetus*). The first is that this Sūtra has been proclaimed by Vikhanas, who is the efficient cause of the whole world (in so far as he is a direct emanation from Viṣṇu). The second is that this Sūtra has been the first of all Sūtras. The third is that it follows in all rites the authority of śruti (and not other Sūtras). The fourth is that all the sacred ritual acts are accompanied by mantras. The fifth is that the rite performed on impregnation is in this Sūtra the first of all the sacraments. The sixth is that it comprises the eighteen sacraments that relate to the welfare of the individual. The seventh is that it contains the whole collection of rites with the subsidiary ones (?). The eighth is that this Sūtra has been taken over by Manu and others. The ninth is that for the author of this Sūtra the sole cause of the whole universe viz. Nārāyaṇa, is the highest authority. The tenth is that all those who follow the rules of conduct laid down in this Sūtra are dearest to the Lord.

It is comprehensible that for a Vaikhānasiya these points are conclusive, for a neutral observer, however, they are far from convincing: partly they flatly contradict the facts known

from elsewhere, partly what is said here about the Vaikhānasasūtra may be maintained with equal right about many other Sūtras.

In the book from which this passage has been cited, there follow a great many citations from Śruti and Smṛti and Purāṇas to prove its authenticity. A Śruti, cited with predilection here and in other similar books is taken from the Taittirīya-āraṇyaka (I. 23): *āpo vā idam āsant salilam eva; sa prajāpatir ekaḥ puṣkaraparṇe samabhavat; tasyāntarmānasi kāmāḥ samavartata idaṃ sṛjeyam iti . . ; sa tapo 'tapyata, sa tapas taptvā śarīram adhūnuta; tasya yan māṃsam āsīt tato 'ruṇāḥ ketavo vātaraśanā ṛṣaya udatiṣṭhan, ye nakhās te vaikhānasā, ye vālās te vālakhilyāḥ*. Our author explains the word *nakhāḥ*, which he apparently reads '*nakhāḥ (anakhāḥ)*', as being identical with *akhana = vikhana*, with transposition of the syllables as in *kaśyapa*, which would stand for *paśyaka*! According to another treatise (Sajjanasambhava, page 14) the word *kha* in *nakha* is, according to the author of Nighaṇṭu, used with the meaning of *indriya*, so that *nakha* should signify „having no organs of sense”, „not being subject to the working of the organs of sense”. About this fantastic explanation nothing need be said.

The tendency to extoll Vikhanas and the Vaikhānasaśākhā is very striking in an interesting account of the Veda and its branches or schools (*vedānukramaṇa*), found in the second chapter of the Ānandasamhitā. According to this tradition Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana divided the Veda into four parts and handed over to his four pupils each of these Vedas: to Jaimini the Sāmaveda, to Sumantu the Atharvaveda, to Gālava the Ṛgveda and to Kuśāgradhī (called in the sequence also Kuśabuddhi) the Yajurveda. The Sāmaveda was given over by Jaimini to Sukarman, who handed it down to ten pupils, each of whom gave it to a hundred, so that the Sāmaveda exists in one thousand śākhās. The Atharvaveda was given by Sumantu to his five pupils, who on their turn handed it over

each to two disciples, so that the Atharvaveda was finally handed down in ten branches. The Ṛgveda was given by Gālava to his two pupils Śākala and Bāṣkala and these two handed it over to four disciples; finally the Ṛgveda was split up into twenty-four śākhās. The Yajurveda was given by Kuśāgradhī to five pupils, one of whom was Yājñavalkya, but the Teacher caused him to vomit the Veda that he had learned from him, and a Ṛṣi in the form of a tittiri-bird swallowed it, mixed as it was with sand; hence this Veda is called Taittirīya. But Yājñavalkya obtained from the Sun another Veda (the Śukla Yajurveda), which was propagated by seven disciples: Kaṇva, Kuśika, Aurva, Śānti, Tapasa, Kaṭha and Vimala. Each of these handed it over to two pupils, so that finally the White Yajurveda consisted of fourteen branches. The remaining four pupils of Kuśāgradhī: Suvarṇa, Jābāli, Vaidala and Suhr̥t, who had received the Yajurveda (of Tittiri no further mention is made), handed this Veda over each to ten pupils, the first of whom was Sucira and the last Kuśala. These taught this Veda to fifty pupils, etc. and finally the Black Yajurveda comprised 101 śākhās; as stated in the sequence 59 śākhās belong to the Vaikhānasas, 27 to the Taittirīyas and 15 to the Vājasaneyins. Then there follows a verse, which seems to contradict the disposition as it was given above:

„The great collection of the Vedas before their dispersion (into the four: Ṛg-, Sāma-, Yajur-, Atharvaveda), that is regarded as the Vaikhānasa-branch of the Yajurvedatree”¹⁾.

¹⁾ Here the verse runs thus:

*vedānāṃ vyasanād yaṃ tu prāg rūpam militaṃ mahat |
tāṃ tu vaikhānasīm śākhāṃ yajurvedataror viduḥ ||*

The verse runs in one of the Vaikhānasapattrikas:

*vedānāṃ vyasanād arvāk prāg rūpam militaṃ tu yat |
tāṃ tu vaikhānasīm śākhām iti vedavido viduḥ ||*

The Vaikhānasas believe, in fact, that the whole of the Veda, before its division into four, was handed down to Vaikhānasa (Vikhanas), see above, page 7.

Thereupon follows a *kāṇḍānukramaṇa* of this *mūlaśākhā*, i. e. the contents of the five parts of the Taittirīya books as arranged for the study of this Veda. In the main it agrees with Baudhāyana (see my paper „Über das Baudhāyanasūtra”, page 32).

The next portion consists of an enumeration of the Sūtras that belong to each Veda. Three of the Ṛgveda: Śaunakīya, Śākalya and Āśvalāyana. Two of the Sāmaveda: Jaiminīya and Drāhyāyana. Three of the Atharvaveda: Paiṭhīnasa, Āgastya and Pāṇinīya. Fifteen of the Yajurveda: Bodhāyanīya, Śaṇḍīlya, Āgastya, the Pañcakāṭhaka ¹⁾, the Vaikhānasa, Bharadvāja, Satyāśāḍha, Śākala, Mādhyandina, Kauṇḍīnya, Lokākṣita, Kusīdaka, Kātyāyana, Vādhūla and Āgniveśyaka.

Follows the rather bewildering statement that the six Sūtras composed by Vaikhānasa, Bharadvāja, Satyāśāḍha, Śākala, Āpastamba and Bodhāyana follow in the wake of Vaikhānasa. This means probably no more than that the Sūtras of Bharadvāja up to Baudhāyana are borrowed from or taken over from the Vaikhānasa (!).

For the greater part this exposition of the Vedic schools conflicts with the facts known from elsewhere; as to the Vaikhānasa-sūtra e. g., the facts are put topsy turvy: it is exactly this collection that has been proved to be the youngest or latest of all!

A different enumeration of Sūtras is found in Chapter VI of the same (Ānanda) saṃhitā. Here we find as first nine Sūtras: Bodhāyana, Āpastamba, Satyāśāḍha, Gārgeyina, Āgastya, Śākalya, Āśvalāyana, Śāmbavīya and Kātyāyana, as later nine: Vaikhānasa, Śaunakīya, Bhāradvāja, Yājñavalkya, Jaiminīya, Vādhūla, Mādhyandina, Kauṇḍīnya and Kauśikīya. A similar list of Sūtras, equally divided into *pūrvāṇi* and *aparāṇi*, occurs in the book Smṛtiratnākara printed at Mysore in Telugu-script, page 13, where this passage is cited from the Āgnivai-

¹⁾ This means probably the Kāṭhakaḡṛhya in 5 pañcikās.

śyasūtra; here we have Drāhyāyaṇa in stead of Gārgeyina, Agniveśya in stead of Yājñavalkya and Kauṣītaka in stead of Kauśikīya.

In this connection another point may be mentioned. According to the introductory verse of the Commentary on the Śrautasūtra ¹⁾ the Vaikhānasas are identical with the Aukheyas. Now there is a śloka (13) in the VIIIth Chapter of the Ānandasamhitā:

aukheyānām garbhacakraṃ nyāsacakraṃ vanaukasām |
vaikhānasān vinānyeṣām taptacakraṃ prakīrtitam ||
 and *ib.* (śl. 28):

aukheyānām garbhacakradīkṣā proktā mahātmanām.

The commentary on the first passage declares the Aukheyas to be identical with the Vaikhānasas and this must be right, as exactly for the Vaikhānasas this ceremony of *garbhacakra* (and not the imprinting on the two arms of the disc by means of a heated iron: the *taptacakra*) is required. The *garbhacakra* (see Ān. samh., ch. 10) or *antastāpa*, must be effectuated whilst the mother is pregnant: after the sacrifice of the mess of rice at the Viṣṇubali the mark of the disc is imprinted on the remmants of this mess and this the pregnant woman must eat. As to the Aukheyas, in the tabular schema given in the Vaikhānasapatrika of 1922, Aukheya and Aukhya are recorded on one line with Vaikhānasa and other Sages, who are said to have received the undivided Veda directly from their father Brahman.

In my introduction to the translation of the Vaikhānasa-smārtasūtra I advanced the thesis, that the author of this text was either himself a Tamil or perhaps a Mayalāyī Paṇḍit, or that at least his language is influenced by Tamil (or Malayālam), and this is in harmony with the tradition that this text was composed somewhere in Southern India. In

¹⁾ See my paper: Brāhmaṇa- en Sūtra-aanwinsten in Verh. der Kon. Ak. v. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk. Ve R. IVe dl. pag. 475 and Introduction to my translation of the Vaikh. smārtasūtra, page I.

the now attainable books some facts seem to point to the same conclusion, viz. that at least some of these books originated from the land of Coḷa i.e. Coromandel.

In the fifth Chapter of the Ānandasamhitā the following tale is imparted by Nārada to Śuka.

„Hear from me a secret, ancient event that took place in Coḷamaṇḍala. In former times there lived with his mother an adherent of Vikhanas, an infant, a suckling (still) and not (yet) speaking. After his father had gone to heaven, this boy dwelt in a certain town and in this town were many Devalas¹⁾. These, hearing that he was instructed by his mother in the service (*pūjā*, of Viṣṇu), and not supporting this, reviled the boy. The king of that city hearing this dispute in details, being void of discernment and unwise, gave Hari over to the Devalas. Thereupon that great and mighty Lord Viṣṇu was angered. He addressed that king in his sleep: „The Devalas are not entitled to my *pūjā*: let them keep silence”. Thus addressed by Hari in his sleep, the king, esteeming the command of the Lord as much as a straw, called the Devalas together, imparted to them what had happened to him in his sleep and was also repeatedly incited by them. As he was partial to the Devalas he again came together with them and decided to perform the *pūjā* for Viṣṇu with the Devalas. On the following day he came in the morning joyfully, together with the Devalas, to the lofty house of Viṣṇu, determined to perform the *pūjā* for Viṣṇu. But whilst they endeavoured to open that big door, their efforts, through the might of Hari, were in vain: all the people stood there as if seized by a miracle, they stood outside as if bound by ties, as if drawn by a spell; nobody was able to remove a foot from the spot. The king, whose mind was overcome by terror,

¹⁾ Ānandasamh. II. 23:

*avaikhānasajātī yo yadi saṃpūjayed dharim |
sa vai devalako nāma sarvakarmabahiṣkṛtaḥ ||*

seeing the plight they had come into, went on foot to the place where that Vaikhānasa-boy was. He called him, begged him respectfully to accompany him, brought him to the temple, told him all that had happened to him in his sleep and how inconsiderably he had acted himself. Having told him everything, he enjoined him to open quickly the door, whilst he addressed him thus: „Most excellent of men, forgive what I did in ignorance. I have come into this plight through the bad conduct of the Devalas. Taking thee, who art cherished by the cooling eye of the Lord, for a common boy of little might, I have come through my selfishness and foolness into such a plight. In my sleep the Lord has carefully shown me the unworthiness of the Devalas to honour the Highest Self, but I, drunk with the drunkenness of my power, am brought into such a plight. A great misfortune has come to pass here: my body trembles, my soul is confused, my blood is dried up, my body sweats, my eyes whirl round, my ears are deaf. In short, my boy, my breath *samdigdhasthitimān dhruvam*. Thou, who art the vessel of Hari's favour, have mercy and release me soon from grief". Thus addressed the boy calmly bowed his head to the king, opened the door and entered into (the temple), full of splendour through the favour of Viṣṇu. In their midst he shone through Viṣṇu's might, as the moon freed from an eclipse, as the sun with fierce rays. Having entered (the sanctum) and having to the best of his powers, in the way as a child would do it, performed the holy service of the God, he spoke, when he stood alone (before the God): „O Father, o creator of the world, enjoy the food". Being propitiated in this manner the God Hari, in all his lustre and with all his attributes, addressed, whilst all were hearing him, that best of men (viz. that boy) with human voice: „I have enjoyed the food, my son". Thereupon he caressed the child with his hands, whose fingers were (still) smeared (with the remnants of the food) and said again: „From this time onwards only those who are sprung from a Vaikhānasa

may honour me so as to please me, but if my *pūjā* is effec-
tuated by Devalas, I shall not remain longer, but go far away
on the earth. But a bad man who censures me and the God
Vaikhānasa shall go as long as moon and sun will be seen,
to the dreadful hell". After these words the God Nārāyaṇa
(who had shown himself) in visible form, disappeared".

A second passage where Coromandel is mentioned, is
found in the same Saṃhitā (XVII. 49 ff.). It is told that Viṣṇu
in the form of the two Ṛṣis Nara and Nārāyaṇa¹⁾ came to
the Badarīgrove and that the Muni Vikhanas, hearing of his
descent, came to the God to whom he made adoration. „Since
that time, wherever the Lord of the Gods appears on earth,
in order to watch over the world in an adorable form, the
king, who belongs to each of these regions, prevails upon
us so that we, Vaikhānasa-brāhmins, with children and grand-
children, with the assistance of our Teacher adore the husband
of Lakṣmī. Having reached the big village called Śrīpuṇḍra,
the righteous highminded king of Coḷa brought there the
dispersed worshippers of Viṣṇu, and there they shall be
settled"²⁾.

Where this Śrīpuṇḍra is to be located and what event is
alluded to here, is unknown, but perhaps the Vaikhānasa-
paṇḍits of Madras are able to throw light on these points.

¹⁾ *kvacit kālāntare viṣṇur naranārāyaṇāv ṛṣī |*

badarīṣaṇḍam āsādyā etc. In the following śloka he is designated
as *naranārāyaṇātmaka*.

²⁾ I subjoin the text:

tadā prabhṛti deveśo lokasaṃrakṣaṇāya vai |
yatra yatraiva bhūmyāṃ tu arcārūpeṇa vidyate ||
tatra tatratyabhūpeṇa cānunītās tadājñayā |
vayaṃ vaikhānasā viprāḥ putrapautrādibhiḥ saha ||
ārādhayāmo lakṣmīsam ācāryānugrahāt tathā |
śrīpuṇḍrākhyam mahāgrāmaṃ saṃprāpya tadanantaram ||
coḷabhūpeṇa cānītā dhārmikeṇa mahātmanā |
sthāpitāśca bhaviṣyanti viśṛtā viṣṇuṣūjakāḥ ||

So much is certain, that here Coromandel is designated as a home of the Vaikhānasas.

Finally some observations may be made about the Mantrasaṃhitā, which now lies complete before us. The greater part of it agrees with the texts of the Taittirīyas: whole chapters of these texts are given in full, so that one might be tempted to surmise that for practising the rites of the Vaikhānasasūtra the knowledge of the Taittirīya-texts was not required. On the other hand, the Śrautasūtra clearly presupposed the knowledge of these same (Taittirīya-) texts. How is this discrepancy to be explained? Either we must suppose that the Smārtasūtra and the Śrautasūtra were originally different works, composed perhaps by different authors, or we might assume that in the Mantrasaṃhitā all the mantras from the Taittirīya-books were repeated in full, in order to have them all at hand in the sequence of their use in the rites. The Mantrasaṃhitā must have been composed either contemporaneously with the Smārtasūtra, or, what is more probable, at a later time; if we admit the last alternative, we understand why some mantras, which in the Smārtasūtra are indicated by their opening words, are missing in the Saṃhitā, perhaps because the author of the Saṃhitā overlooked them; besides, some shorter passages occurring in the Sūtra have found a place in the Saṃhitā as mantras! Now, if the Mantrasaṃhitā is either contemporaneous with or later than the Sūtra, we must infer that this book also is comparatively late and belongs to the post-Christian era. In harmony with this supposition we find mentioned in it „the four-toothed Vināyaka (i. e. Gaṇeśa) with crooked face”, the son of Vinatā and Kaśyapa as the conveyance of Viṣṇu, who is represented as wearing the śrīvatsa-mark and the name of whose sword is Nandaka. To Viṣṇu is sacrificed as Varāha, as Nārasimha, as Vāmana trivikrama. The whole first Chapter of Praśna V smacks of later, paurāṇic tradition. Among those parts of the Saṃhitā that are new and not found elsewhere

there are long sūktas; the most remarkable of these is the ātmasūkta. But it is to be regretted that these new parts are mostly very difficult to understand. This may partly be caused by corrupt tradition: many mantras taken from the Ṛksaṃhitā, the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā and other, not-Taittirīya texts, are given in such a corrupted tradition, that they simply admit of no interpretation at all. I close by translating an interesting passage on the holiness of the Cows:

„Holy are these Cows, whose horns are Indra and Viṣṇu, whose head is Brahman, whose back is Rudra, whose hairs are the Seers, whose breast is Kārttikeya, whose tail is the holy river-bank, whose belly is the earth, whose eyes are Moon and Sun, whose hairs on the tail are the Vidyādhara, whose udder is the sea, whose nipples are the rivers, whose limbs are the hills, whose bones are the mountains, whose blood is Mitra and Varuṇa, whose flesh is Agni, whose urine is the Ganges, whose hoofs are the serpents, whose nose is Jyeṣṭhā, whose teeth are the winds, whose tongue is Sarasvatī, whose throat is the Lord of poets, whose dung is the holy land”. With this passage, which certainly must have parallels in some Purāṇa, we may compare Baldaeus, Afgoderij der Oost-indische Heijdenen, page 192 of the edition by Dr. A. J. de Jong.

I hope to have proved that these texts, although they are the latest offshoots of the Vedas, are nevertheless of high interest, and it is to be hoped that the Vaikhānasaśāstra Paṇḍits of Southern India may endeavour to unearth and publish the other Saṃhitās and Kalpas of Atri, Bhṛḡu and Kaśyapa. They must be of paramount significance for our knowledge of Vaiṣṇavism, more especially of Vaiṣṇavism as it is professed by the Vaikhānasaśāstras.

ADDENDUM ON PAGE 11, LINE 6

The śloka cited from the beginning of the Vyākhyā to the Vaikhānasaśāstrasūtra runs:

*yena vedārthavijñāya lokānugraha-kāmyā |
praṇītaṃ sūtram aukheyam tasmai vikhanase namaḥ ||*

DEEL 57 (1924)

N ^o . 1.	J. J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, <i>Turoidus</i>	f 0.30
" 2.	C. W. VOLLGRAFF, "Ἐπιφοῶς ἐς γὰλ' ἔπειτον (Over den oorsprong der dionysische mysteriën).	" 0.40
" 3.	J. P. B. DE JOSSELIN DE JONG, <i>Het Negerhollandsch van St. Thomas en St. Jan</i>	" 0.30
" 4.	W. CALAND, <i>Over Ziegenbalg's „Malabarisches Heidenthum“</i>	" 0.30
" 5.	H. PERNOT, <i>Remarques sur les Évangiles</i>	" 0.30
" 6.	J. VÜRTHEIM, <i>Europa</i>	" 0.30

DEEL 59 (1925)

N ^o . 1.	J. J. G. VÜRTHEIM, <i>Rhadamanthys, Ilithyia, Elysion</i>	f 0.30
" 2.	J. VAN GINNEKEN, <i>De oorzaken der taalveranderingen</i>	" 0.30
" 3.	F. M. TH. BÖHL, <i>Volksetymologie en woorüspeling in de Genesis-verhalen</i>	" 0.40
" 4.	N. VAN WIJK, <i>Zur Komposition des altkirchenslavischen Codex Suprasliensis</i>	" 0.50
" 5.	D. PLOOIJ, <i>De Commentaar van Zacharias Chrysopolitanus op het Dialessaron</i>	" 0.30
" 6.	A. J. WENSINCK, <i>The Second Commandment</i>	" 0.30
" 7.	D. C. HESSELING, <i>Evangelinos Apostolidis Sophoclis néo-helléniste</i>	" 0.30
" 8.	PH. S. VAN RONKEL, <i>Bericht aangaande de jongste aanwinst van Maleische handschriften in het buitenland (Cambridge)</i>	" 0.30
" 9.	C. C. UHLENBECK, <i>Nieuwe woorden in het Blackfoot</i>	" 0.30

DEEL 61 (1926)

N ^o . 1.	G. G. KLOEKE, <i>Reflexen van Hollandsche expansie in de huidige Nederlandsche dialecten</i>	f 0.40
" 2.	N. G. H. DEEN, <i>Over taalverwantschap, meeningen en vragen</i>	" 0.40
" 3.	J. VAN GELDER, <i>Naar aanleiding van Hirt's „Ueber den Ursprung der Verbalflexion im Indogermanischen“</i>	" 0.40
" 4.	J. J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, <i>Sur un préfixe français „réel“</i>	" 0.40
" 5.	J. VAN GINNEKEN, <i>De erfelijkheid der klankwetten</i>	" 0.40
" 6.	A. W. M. ODÉ, <i>Das schwache Präteritum in den germanischen Sprachen</i>	" 0.40
" 7.	C. W. VOLLGRAFF, <i>Argivisch Kabola</i>	" 0.40
" 8.	W. CALAND, <i>Over het Vaikhānasasūtra</i>	" 0.30
" 9.	A. G. VAN HAMEL, <i>De accentuatie van het Munster-Iersch</i>	" 0.40

DEEL 63 (1927)

N ^o . 1.	D. C. HESSELING, <i>La plus ancienne rédaction du poème épique sur Digénis Akritas</i>	f 0.50
„ 2.	TJ. DE BOER, <i>Maimonides en Spinoza</i>	„ 0.50
„ 3.	A. W. M. ODÉ, <i>Reflexe von „tabu“ und „noa“ in den indogermanischen Sprachen</i>	„ 0.50
„ 4.	D. PLOOY, <i>Traces of Syriac Origin of the Old-Latin Diatessaron</i>	„ 0.50
„ 5.	W. DE VRIES, <i>Is uu voor oe Holland in- en uitgevoerd?</i>	„ 0.60
„ 6.	C. C. UHLENBECK, <i>Baskisch elkar</i>	„ 0.30
„ 7.	A. KLUYVER, <i>Over de woorden kabeljauw en bakeljauw</i>	„ 0.50
„ 8.	H. VON ARNIM, <i>Platons Dialog „Thrasymachos“</i>	„ 0.50
„ 9.	C. C. UHLENBECK, <i>Algonkisch-klinkende woorden in het Wiyot</i>	„ 0.50
„ 10.	A. G. VAN HAMEL, <i>Een Iersch kettingsprookje</i>	„ 0.40
„ 11.	F. MULLER JZN., <i>„Augustus“</i>	„ 0.60
„ 12.	R. VAN DER MEULEN, <i>De naam van den Mammouth</i>	„ 0.50

DEEL 65 (1928)

N ^o . 1.	N. VAN WIJK, <i>Die Čechisch-polnischen Uebergangsdialekte und die ältern Beziehungen des polnischen Sprachgebietes zum Čechisch-Slovakischen</i> f	0.50
„ 2.	A. W. DE GROOT, <i>Instrumental Phonetics. Its value for linguists</i>	„ 0.60
„ 3.	W. DE VRIES, <i>Intervocaliese d in het Gronings. De ui van „stuiten“</i>	„ 0.60
„ 4.	D. C. HESSELING, <i>Een eigenaardig gebruik van het futurum in het Nieuwe Testament (Ev. Matth. 27, 4 en 24; Handelingen 18, 15)</i>	„ 0.40
„ 5.	C. G. N. DE VOOYS, <i>Apostelspelen in de Rederijkerstijd</i>	„ 0.60
„ 6.	D. C. HESSELING, <i>Het Perfectum in het postklassieke Grieks; overblijfsels in de taal van heden</i>	„ 0.60
„ 7.	W. GALAND, <i>On the sacred books of the Vaiḥhānasas</i>	„ 0.50