

Vol. VIII, No. 2]

[July, 1966

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA

[Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department]

*With the financial assistance from the Ministry of Education,
Government of India*

VYASA-PURNIMA NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Subs.—Inland Rs. 12,

Foreign £ 1, \$ 3

ORIGINAL PURĀṆA SĀMĪTĀ

By

V. S. AGRAWALA

[अत्र मूलपुराणसंहिताया उत्पत्ति-स्वरूप-विस्तारादिविषये विवेचनं कृतम् । महर्षिणा वेदव्यासेन वेदसंहितानां पुराणसंहितानां च संकलनं कृत्वा शिष्येभ्यस्तासामध्यापनं कृतम् । पुराणसंहितास्तु व्यासात् प्राक्कालत एव प्रचलिता आसन् सूतैश्च तासां प्रवचनं कृतम् । सूतानां रोमहर्षणः प्रमुख आसीत् । व्यासः रोमहर्षणसाहाय्येन मूलपुराणसंहितायाः संग्रहं कृतवान् । एषा मूलपुराणसंहिता षड्भ्यः शिष्येभ्य अध्यापिता । तेषु शिष्येषु काश्यपः सावर्णिः शांशपायनश्च पुराणसंहितायाः प्रथमकर्तारो बभूवुः । इमाः पुराणसंहिताः चतुष्पादा आसन् । तत्र प्रथमे प्रक्रियापादे सर्गवर्णनम्, द्वितीये अनुषङ्गपादे देवर्षीणां ब्रह्मर्षीणां च वंशवर्णनम्, तृतीये उपोद्घातपादे मन्वन्तरवर्णनं राक्षसिवंशवर्णनञ्च चतुर्थे उपसंहारपादे च प्रतिसर्गवर्णनमासीत् । एषा चतुष्पादव्यवस्था वायुब्रह्माण्डपुराणयोः अद्यापि दृश्यते । कालान्तरेण मूलपुराणसंहितायामनेके नवीनविषया अपि समाविष्टाः, येन पुराणसंहिताया विस्तारो बभूव । अत्र वायुपुराणविषयाणां समालोचनं कृत्वा, मूलवायुपुराणसंहितायाः स्वरूपं निर्धारितं प्रक्षिप्ताध्यायानामपि पृथक् स्वरूपं प्रदर्शितम् । तत्रैवं निर्धारितं मूलवायुपुराणमेव मूलपुराणसंहिताऽत्र स्वीकृता ।]

The compilation of the Purāṇa Sāmhītā is traditionally attributed to Krishṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa. He also accomplished a similar literary task in respect of the mass of Vedic mantras which in course of time had become divided into many schools. Their names for each Veda are listed in the Charaṇa-Vyūha and several Purāṇas. The credit is given to Vyāsa for organising the Sāmhītā texts of the four Vedas through his four pupils viz. Paila for Ṛigveda, Vaiśampāyana for Yajurveda, Jaimini for Sāmaveda and Sumantu for Atharvaveda. Here we are concerned with what Dvaipāyana Vyāsa undertook to do with respect to the transmission of the Purāṇa Sāmhītā.

We are indebted to the Vāyu Purāṇa and the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa for a precise statement of how Dvaipāyana Vyāsa as an institution accomplished the difficult and important task of originating the Purāṇa Sāmhītā. The two texts are as follows :—

षट्शः कृत्वा मयाप्युक्तं पुराणमृषिसत्तमाः ॥
 आत्रेयः सुमतिर्धोमान् काश्यपो ह्यकृतव्रणः ।
 भारद्वाजोऽग्निवर्चाश्च वासिष्ठो मित्रयुश्च यः ।
 सावर्णिः सौमदत्तिस्तु सुशर्मा शांशपायनः ।
 एते शिष्या मम ब्रह्मन् पुराणेषु दृढव्रताः ।
 त्रिभिस्तिस्त्रः कृतास्तिस्त्रः संहिताः पुनरेव हि ।
 काश्यपः संहिताकर्ता सावर्णिः शांशपायनः ।
 मामिका च चतुर्थी स्यात्सा चैषा पूर्वसंहिता ।
 सर्वास्ता हि चतुष्पादाः सर्वाश्चैकार्थवाचिकाः ।
 षाठान्तरे पृथग्भूता वेदशाखा यथा तथा ॥
 चतुःसाहस्रिकाः सर्वाः शांशपायनिकामृते ।
 लोमहर्षणिका मूला ततः काश्यपिकाऽपरा ।
 सावर्णिकास्तृतीयास्ता यजुर्वाक्यार्थमण्डिताः ।
 शांशपायनिकाश्चान्या नोदनार्थविभूषिताः ।
 (Vāyu, 61. 55-61)

षट्शः कृत्वा मयाप्युक्तं पुराणमृषिसत्तमाः ।
 आत्रेयः सुमतिर्धोमान् काश्यपोऽकृतव्रणः ॥
 भारद्वाजोऽग्निवर्चाश्च वासिष्ठो मित्रयुश्च यः ।
 सावर्णिः सौमदत्तिश्च सुशर्मा शांशपायनः ॥
 एते शिष्या मम प्रोक्ताः पुराणेषु धृढव्रताः ।
 त्रिभिस्त्र कृतास्तिस्त्रः संहिताः पुनरेव हि ॥
 काश्यपः संहिताकर्ता सावर्णिः शांशपायनः ।
 मामिका तु चतुर्थी स्याच्चतस्रो मूलसंहिताः ॥
 सर्वास्ता हि चतुष्पादाः सर्वाश्चैकार्थवाचिकाः ।
 षाठान्तरे वृथाभूता वेदशाखा यथा तथा ॥

चतुःसाहस्रिकाः सर्वा शंशपायनिकामृते ।
 लौमहर्षणिका मूला ततः काश्यपिका परा ॥
 सार्वर्णिका तृतीयाऽसावृजुवाक्यार्थमण्डिता ।
 शंशपायनिका चान्या नोदनार्थविभूषिता ॥

(Brahmaṇḍa Purāṇa II. 35. 63-69)

The Vāyu gives a list of 27 teachers who had inherited the Purāṇa lore from Brahmā upto Krishṇa Dvaipāyana. This list is as follows :

ब्रह्मा ददौ शास्त्रमिदं पुराणं मातरिश्वने ।
 तस्माच्चोशनसा प्राप्तं तस्माच्चापि बृहस्पतिः
 बृहस्पतिस्तु प्रोवाच सवित्रे तदनन्तरम् ॥
 सविता मृत्यवे प्रादान्मृत्युश्चेन्द्राय वै पुनः ।
 इन्द्रश्चापि वसिष्ठाय सोपि सारस्वताय च ॥
 सारस्वतस्त्रिधाम्ने च त्रिधामा च शरद्वते ।
 सरद्वतस्त्रिविष्टाय सोन्तरिक्षाय दत्तवान् ॥
 वर्षिणे चान्तरिक्षो वै सोपि त्रय्यारुणाय च ।
 त्रय्यारुणो धनञ्जये स च प्रादात्कृतञ्जये ॥
 कृतञ्जयात्तृणञ्जयो भरद्वाजाय सोप्यथ ।
 गौतमाय भरद्वाजः सोपि निर्यन्तरे पुनः ॥
 निर्यन्तरस्तु प्रोवाच तथा वाजश्रवाय च ।
 स ददौ सोमशुष्माय स ददौ तृणबिन्दवे ॥
 तृणबिन्दुस्तु दक्षाय दक्षः प्रोवाच शक्तये ।
 शक्तेः पराशरश्चापि गर्भस्थः श्रुतवानिदम् ॥
 पराशराज्जातुर्कर्णस्तस्माद् द्वैपायनः प्रभुः ।
 द्वैपायनात्पुनश्चापि मया प्रोक्तं द्विजोत्तमाः ॥

(Vāyu 103. 58-66)

Separating Brahmā and Vāyu as mythical names we have a list of 25 teachers for whom a period of 500 years may be allowed counting 20 years for each generation from the time of Uśanas to that of Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. That was the pre-Samhitā stage of Purāṇa transmission. Its chronological position is problematical but a tentative supposition may be 1500 B. C.—1000 B. C. or even somewhat earlier.

We find from several versions e.g. in Linga Purāṇa ch. 64. that Parāśara in the above list occupied an important position so far as Purāṇa Samhitā was concerned ; and it appears that Vyāsa himself owed his knowledge of the Purāṇas to Parāśara. It is said that Vasishṭha had a son named Śakti whose posthumous son was Parāśara. His pupil was Jātūkarṇa and his disciple was Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa (पराशराज्जातुर्कर्णस्तस्माद् द्वैपायनः प्रभुः Vāyu 103.66). Probably Jātūkarṇa was a senior fellow student of Vyāsa and the two learnt the Purāṇa from Parāśara. Vyāsa's role in this literary activity was two-fold : firstly, his relationship with the bards who were the traditional custodians of the Purāṇas and secondly, with the authorship of the Purāṇa Samhitā in a precise literary form.

MŪLA SAMHITĀ

Vyāsa found that the material of the Purāṇas was in the hands of the Sūtas or bards. Their number seems to have been quite large and they were connected with many families and royal houses and they went about in their round meeting people with the object of imparting to them what they knew of the ancient genealogies, ballads and anecdotes. They were also invited for this purpose and held recitations. This institution of the bards was an ancient one referred to in the Yajurveda (Śatarudriya Book XVI. 18, 26 as *Sūta Kṣattrā*). The most important person of this class in the time of Vyāsa was Romaharshana or Lomaharshana. He was well versed in the material that had been orally handed down. He was taken into confidence by Vyāsa to collaborate in organising this branch of knowledge in a systematic manner and to continue what the Sūtas were already doing in the

form of Kathā recitations. The work of collaboration between Dvaipāyana and Lomaharshaṇa seems to have been on this pattern that Vyāsa supplied the Vedic material of Purāṇic lore since the Purāṇas also existed in the time of Vedas and the Purāṇa knowlege is mentioned there by name. This is clearly specified in the Vāyu stating that Vyāsa undertook the substance of the Vedic subject mater to incorporate the same in the Purāṇic corpus सर्ववेदार्थघटितां व्यासः पौराणिकीं कथां Vāyu 104.20. This material seems to have appertained to various creation myths of the Ṛig-veda and other Saṁhitās. The Sūta, on the other hand, contributed his portion in the form of dynastic lists and genealogies of Ṛishis and kings.

This was the Mūla Saṁhitā or the original Purāṇa Saṁhitā at which Dvaipāyana himself seems to have worked. The Vishṇu Purāṇa ascribes its authership to Romaharshaṇa and says that this formed the Mūla Saṁhitā which was the original of the three subsequent Saṁhitās giving the form of definite texts by Kāśyapa, Sāvārṇi and Śaṁśapāyana. This seems to have contained mostly the topics and subjects forming the Purāṇa tradition and was of the nature of that class of literature which, according to Paninian definition, was styled as '*tena proktam*' (IV.3.101). Lomaharshaṇa being instructed in this manner by Vyāsa as teacher continued the recitations of the Purāṇa Saṁhitā as other members of his class had been doing from much earlier times. Dvaipāyana and Lomaharshaṇa may be credited with the *pravachana* of the Mūla Purāṇa Saṁhitā in a manner that the *Prokta* technique of book-making implied. It was the cultivation of a new branch of knowledge by an eminent teacher who imparted its instructions to his disciples or members of his school. His own son named as Lauma-harshaṇi Sūta became an adept in this art. The house-holders assembled at Naimishāraṇya and known as Naimishīyāḥ besided under the leadership of Śaunaka to listen to a prolonged recitation of the Purāṇa Saṁhitā from the mouth of Lomaharshaṇa. The Mūla-Saṁhitā was styled as Lomaharshaṇikā Saṁhitā. It is problematical how far that Saṁhitā was in the form of verses. It rather seems to have consisted mainly of

the topics on which Lomaharshaṇa expaliated for the delectation of his Naimishīya audience. We know from other sources that the progress of the twelve year session was interrupted during its ninth year (Tāṇḍya* 25.6.5). The thread was later on taken up on the banks of the Sarasvatī in Kurukshetra by some other Sūta.

The next approach of Romaharshaṇa in fulfilment of his obligation was more of an academic nature i. e. teaching the Mūla Saṁhitā i. e. the Lomaharshaṇikā Saṁhitā or the Purāṇic lore to regular students who studied as an integral subject or branch of learning and on the tradition in schools similar to that of the Vedic schools. Romaharshaṇa admitted six pupils or students for this purpose to whom he imparted the mūla-saṁhitā as his Brahmachārins. They were Brahmachārins students under him, whose term of admission coincided with the period in which they learned the subject. For this special purpose we are envisaging some arrangement as implied in Pāṇini's rule तदस्य ब्रह्मचर्यम् (V. 1. 94), The names of these six students are recorded in both Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa together with their Gotra names as follows :

1. सुमति आत्रेय (i.e. of Atri Gotra)
 2. अकृतव्रण काश्यप (i.e. of the Kaśyapa Gotra)
 3. अग्निवर्चाः भारद्वाज (i.e. of the Bharadvāja Gotra)
 4. मित्रयु वासिष्ठ (i.e. of the Vasishṭha Gotra)
 5. सौमदत्ति सार्वणि (i.e. of the Sāvārṇa Gotra)
 6. सुशर्मा शांशपायन (i.e. of the Śaṁśapa Gotra)
- (also Viṣṇu III. 6. 17-9 षट् शिष्यास्तस्य चाभवन्, 17)

* ते ह सप्तदशेभ्य एवाध्युत्तस्थुस्त उ होचुर्यो नः प्रजायामृध्यातै स एतत्सत्रं समापयादिति । तदेतत्समीप्सन्तो ब्राह्मणास्सत्रमासते ।

(टी०) ते नैमिशीयाः सप्तदशेभ्य एव सप्तदशस्तोमकेभ्यस्त्रिभ्यः भवत्सरेभ्यः सप्तदशं समाप्यैवाध्युत्तस्थुः सत्रादुत्थिता आसन् । तउह एते खलु तदेवमूचुः—यो दीक्षितो नोऽस्माकं प्रजायां पुत्रपौत्रादिलक्षणायां ऋध्यातै यज्ञाङ्गैः समुद्भस्यात् स एतत् सत्रं एकविंशवर्षत्रयमप्यनुष्ठाय समापयेदिति ।

एतावताऽस्य नवसंवत्सरानुष्ठानं विद्यते । तथाऽपि साधनसमृद्धावप्यनापदि सप्तदशेभ्य उत्थापनं कुर्यादित्युक्तं भवति । यस्माद्यो नः प्रजायामृध्याता इति नैमिशीयैरुक्तं तस्मादित्यर्थः । तत्सत्रं समीप्सन्तः समापयितुमिच्छन्तो ब्राह्मणा द्वादशसंवत्सरमेव सत्रमासते (इति ताण्ड्यमहाब्राह्मणे सायणाचार्यविरचिते माधवीये वेदार्थप्रकाशे) ।

It is said that Romaharshaṇa made six divisions of his Mūla Purāṇa Saṁhitā and taught his six pupils each one of them. Evidently this Mūla Saṁhitā had not yet taken the form of a book but consisted mainly of large number of topics and subjects. Their exact nature is not indicated. The *Pañchalakṣhaṇa Purāṇa* is a later attempt to give some idea of what the Mūla Saṁhitā comprised, but the same seems to have been of a fluid nature in which floating topics and themes from earlier and contemporary traditions were admitted with a certain amount of freedom. The details of the corpus depended on the interest of the listeners and the competence of the bards to comply with their wishes. The method of the interlocutors and narrators which is always recorded in the Purāṇa therefore played an important part in the organising of the subject matter.

PARA-SAMHITĀ

Of the six students of Romaharshaṇa only three became the regular authors of the Purāṇa Saṁhitā texts. These were firstly Kāśyapa, secondly Sāvārṇi and thirdly Śāmsāpāyana. The other three viz. Sumati Ātreya, Mitrayu Vāsishṭha, Agni-varchas Bhāradvāja seem to have been of a less marked calibre and did not launch upon any literary venture.

The literary activity of the three pupils comes under the category of *Kṛte granthe* (IV. 3. 87) of Pāṇini as coming next to 'tena proktam'; this is clearly mentioned in the Vāyu Purāṇa. काश्यपः संहिताकर्ता i.e. he gave it the form of a regular text or book. Thus there were two stages in the art of book-making, viz., the cultivation of a branch of knowledge by a master mind or original thinker and secondly, its treatment in the form of a book. These two stages were distinguished as 'tena proktam' and 'adhikṛitya kṛite granthe'. The teacher who mastered the subject and gave it the form of a regular book was the real *grantha-kartā*. Such was the status of Kāśyapa who is mentioned as Saṁhitā Kartā. The style of Kāśyapa's work was simple and it consisted of *Vākya*s or sentences having some topics for their meaning (ऋजुवाक्यार्थमण्डिताः). This appears to signify that these Saṁhitās

were in a versified form, in a very simplified style as we find in several places in the extant older Purāṇas. The Saṁhitā texts of these three authors have been distinguished as परसंहिता to show their difference from the मूलसंहिता.

The Saṁhitā text of Kāśyapa Akṛitavraṇa became famous as *Kāśyapikā*, the Saṁhitā of Sāvārṇi Saumadatti as *Sāvārṇikā* and the third one of Śāmsāpāyana as *Śāmsāpāyanikā*. These three were regular Saṁhitā's which took the form of text or books consisting of ślokas, of which the common source was the Mūla-Saṁhitā of Romaharshaṇa.

The extent as to the number of verses of these regular texts is given as 4000 ślokas each. This held good in the case of Kāśyapikā and Sāvārṇikā but the extent of the शांशपायनिका was some what different. What exactly it was is not said but in the Liṅga Purāṇa (64.122) we read of six thousand verses (षट् सहस्रान्वितम्) as the Purāṇa text in the initial stages when these compilations were being done and that may have been the number in the शांशपायनिका संहिता.

THE THEORY OF PĀṬHĀNTARA

The reason why one Mūla Saṁhitā became transformed as three Para-saṁhitās in the hands of Kāśyapa, Sāvārṇi and Śāmsāpāyana is so clear and precise that any modern diaskuest could not wish for anything better. It is said that there was no essential difference between them but their distinction was rooted in variant readings or repetitions : पाठान्तरे पृथग्भूता वेदशाखा यथा तथा. The comparison with the Vedic Śakhās which were distinct from each other owing to their variants of words and phrases or repetitions of Mantras here and there is quite apt and graphic. In order to give a clear idea of the one Purāṇa Saṁhitā becoming three-fold in the hands of three disciples who had studied the subject from a common teacher.

एकार्थवाचिकाः—

This statement is quite happy and initiates us more intimately into the inner nature of the three subsequent Saṁhitās. They were treating of the same topics or expressing the same meaning

or declaring identical themes (एकार्थवाचिकाः). The uniformity of significance was the most distinguishing feature of authorship for the three Saṁhitās. What this subject matter (एकार्थ) was we are left to conjecture and we may not be far from the truth if we discover these topics from the nature of the earlier (वंश) Purāṇic text. Cosmogony (सर्ग) and genealogy were essentially two such subjects. The other two appear to have been Manvantara descriptions and pratisarga or dissolution. Thus Sarga and Pratisarga became one pair and Manvantara and Vamśa another pair of the subjects treated. For this reason the original Saṁhitās consisted of four pādas or a four-fold divisions and for following this scheme they were known as चतुष्पादाः

(‘चतुष्पादं पुराणं तु ब्रह्मणा विहितं पुरा’ Vāyu, 32. 67.)

The चतुष्पाद division is preserved only in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas.

These are named as :—

प्रक्रिया प्रथमः पादः कथ्यवस्तुपरिग्रहः ।

उपोद्घातोऽनुषङ्गश्च उपसंहार एव च ॥ Vāyu 4. 13.

प्रक्रियापाद
अनुषङ्गपाद
उपोद्घातपाद and
उपसंहारपाद

These more or less correspond to the पञ्चलक्षणपुराण definition as follows :—

1. प्रक्रियापाद i. e. creation corresponds to *Sarga*; prakriyā implying सृष्टिप्रक्रिया. Chs. 1-6 in Vāyu are so named. The original topics under this head seem to have dealt with एकार्णवविधि, हिरण्यगर्भ or हिरण्याण्ड and the birth of ब्रह्मा from the golden egg. These three were Vedic topics enunciating the metaphysics of creation and were recast by Purāṇic writers in their own mould and definitions.

2. अनुषङ्गपाद—अनुषङ्ग literally implied connected matter i. e. the subjects connected with the first portion of सृष्टिविद्या. It

included the birth and genealogies of ब्रह्मर्षिः, देवर्षिः and राजर्षिः but the last topic was transferred to the उपोद्घात division.

In the Vāyu the अनुषङ्ग division extends from Ch. 7 upto 58 with a supplementary portion of six chapters (59-64) added later on. At the end of its 58th ch. the Vāyu states :—

अनुषङ्गः समाख्यातः सृष्टिसर्गं निबोधत । (58. 126).

At the end of ch. 64 the same is repeated as follows :—

इत्येष वै मया पादो द्वितीयः कथितो द्विजाः । (64. 31)

The description of the देवयोनिः seems to have formed part of देवादि सृष्टि and came under this pāda.

3. उपोद्घातपाद

It seems to correspond to the मन्वन्तर division of the Purāṇas together with the dynastic lists of Solar and Lunar dynasties and the achievements of individual kings like Māndhātā, Hariśchandra, Purūravas and Yayāti who also were dovetailed under Vamśa. This seems to have been the subject styled उपोद्घात or the beginning and continuation of the genealogies.

The subject of Manvantaras specially स्वायम्भुव and वैवस्वत is found in three places in Vāyu viz. ch. 21, 61-62 and 85-89. This may be due to careless redaction and interposition of exotic material in place which do not conform to the context.

४. उपसंहार

This was the same topic as प्रतिसर्ग treating of the destruction of the worlds and to withdrawal of creation into its source. The Vāyu names this frankly as प्रतिसर्ग (ch. 102).

THE PAÑCHALAKṢAṆA

The number of topics of the Purāṇas is generally put as पञ्चलक्षण viz. सर्ग, प्रतिसर्ग, वंश, मन्वन्तर and वंशानुचरित (Vāyu 4. 10-11 ; Matsya 53-64).

These subjects seem to have been quite compact to cover the pages of a single book of modest size, i. e. four thousand ślokas in extent. It is possible to recover it from the extant oldest

Purāṇas, like the Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa etc. In course of time the number of topics was increased considerably from five to ten and from ten to hundred or more as found in the मत्स्य (Ch. 53 and 290) भागवत (II. 10. 1-6) and the अहिर्बुध्न्यसंहिता (XI. 31-56). According to the Nārada P. (Ch. 92-109) this list includes several hundred topics for all the eighteen Purāṇas.

ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT VĀYU PURĀṆA :

It is necessary to examine closely the contents of the present Vāyu Purāṇa to recover the Mūla Saṁhitā of about 4000 ślokas. We may proceed by eliminating such chapters as appear on the surface to bear the stamp of a later date or subsequent redaction, which are as follows :—

INTERPOLATIONS

PRAKRIYĀ PĀDA

Chapter	Subject
1.	Anukramanikā (a long ch. of 205 ślokas giving the contents of the Purāṇa).

ANUSHANGA PĀDA

8.	Chatuṣśrama vibhāga
11.	Pāśupatayoga
12.	Yogopasarga
13.	Yogaiśvarya
14-15.	Pāśupatayoga
16.	Śauchāchāra
17.	Paramāśramavidhi
18.	Yati Prāyaśchitta
19.	Arishṭanirūpaṇa
20.	Omkāraprāptilakṣhaṇa
23.	Maheśvarāvātāra yoga
24.	Śarvastava (Śivastotra by Viṣṇu)
25.	Madhukaiṭabh-otpatti
26.	Svarotpattiḥ

27. Mahādevatānu-varṇanam (A description of the 8 names of Śiva and of the 9th as Kumāra).
32. Yugadharmā
- 34-53. Jambūdvīpa, Bhuvanakośa, Jyotish-prachāra.
54. Nilakanṭhastava
55. Lingodbhava.
29. Agnivamśa—A concocted genealogical tree of the family of Fire which was improved by some Vedic scholar during Gupta times. The idea was inspired by the Sūrya and Chandra-Vamśa list. It is a compilation of 49 names of fire arranged as a family tree. It is also found in Matsya P. and also in the Epic.
56. 'Pitṛivarṇanam
57. Yajñavarṇanam
- 58-64. Chaturyugākhyāna
Rishi Lakṣhaṇa Veda Śākhā Purāṇaśākhā,
Mahāsthana tīrtha, Pṛithivīdohana.
- 71-87. UPODGHĀTA PĀDA
Śrāddha
- 97-98. Viṣṇumāhātmya
- UPASAMHĀRA PĀDA
101. Bhūrloka divyāvasthā
104. Vyāsasamśayopanodanam.
- 105-112. Gayāśrāddha.
103. Śṛiṣṭivarṇanam—A repetition of the description of creation in later terminology importing the agency of the 3 guṇas and three devas.

The above statement of the spurious material extending over 80 adhyāyas appears to be very near the truth with a probable margin of 10%. The broad topics relating to Pāśupata yoga, Aṣṭāṅga Yoga, Bhuvanakośa, Śrāddha, Gayā Māhātmya are undoubtedly later fabrications and cannot in any manner be ascribed to the Mūla-saṁhitā. Besides the subject-matter being

of a later stratum some of these chapters are missing in manuscripts and their number of verses is quite long. The size of the original chapters is usually much less in their number of ślokas. Thus we may re-arrange the Chatuṣpāda Mūla Purāṇa Saṁhitā as confined to the following topics and chapters as far as possible to retrieve them from the present recension of the Purāṇa.

Original	
I. PRAKRIYĀ PĀDA	
Chapters	Subjects
2.	Dvādaśavārshika Sattva
3.	Prajāpatisṛiṣṭi
4-6.	Sṛṣhtiprakaraṇam (Account of creation).
II. ANUSHANGA PĀDA	
7.	Pratisamdhi-varṇanam
9.	Devādisṛiṣṭi
10.	Dakshavaṁśa
21-22.	Kalpanirūpaṇam
28.	Ṛṣhivaṁśa (genealogy of the Ṛṣhis)
30.	Dakshaśāpa
31.	Devavaṁśa
33.	Svāyambhuvavaṁśa
III. UPODGHĀTA PĀDA	
65.	Prajāpativaṁśa
66-69.	Kāśyapīya Prajāsarga
70.	Ṛṣhivaṁśa
88-89.	Vaivasvatamanuvaṁśa
90-95.	Somavaṁśa
96.	Vishṇuvaṁśa (A corollary of the Somavaṁśa subsequently added)
99.	Turvasvādivaṁśa
IV. UPASAMHĀRA PĀDA	
100.	Manvantarāṇisarga (should be carried to Upodghāta)
103.	Pratisarga-varṇanam.

Thus we have for the Mūla-Purāṇa Saṁhitā or the Romaharṣaṇikā Saṁhitā or the Saṁhitā-text as constituted of 4000 ślokas, a text comprised of about 30 chapters. The Saṁhitā produced under the authorship of Kāśyapa named Kāśyapikā may have been a simple modest text of this nature. The number of Adhyāyas may have been a little more but we think we are not far from the truth in arriving at the names of topic and the selection of subjects that were included in the four pādas of the Kāśyapikā Saṁhitā.