

nary human being belonging to a *pratiloma* caste, being the narrator of the Purāṇas. Pargiter is undoubtedly wrong in his thesis. The mythical Sūta sprang out of the sacrificial fire of the first king of the earth, Pr̥thu. He was therefore a venerable sage and *ayoniḥ*. He first chronicled the story of Pr̥thu. The Sūtas who were the narrators of the Purāṇas and chroniclers of the kings, belonged to this family of the sage and were sages themselves. Thus it can be asserted without any fear of contradiction that the Purāṇas were narrated in different places by the sages who were known as Sūtas, being themselves versed in Vedic literature.

Based on this untenable theory Pargiter had built up another theory styling these Purāṇas as belonging to a distinct Kshatriya tradition. On this western scholars began to speak of the Kshatriya literature, a Parivrājaka literature as distinct from Brahmanic literature. Surely these are imaginary theories, which have no legs to stand on. According to the Hindu tradition the Purāṇas are the fifth Veda, and those who follow it are followers of the Vedic school. Even in the Vedic literature there are Kshatriya sages and families to whom hymns are addressed. Taking the Ṛgveda, for example, nine families are mentioned of which the three, viz., Vaivasvata, Aila, and Cākshusha are Kshatriyas. There are again hymns in the Veda whose authorship is assigned to Vivasvān, Manu, Purūravas, Yayāti, Māndhātā, Viśvāmitra, etc., names which are ever the pride of not only the Kshatriya community but of all communities. From these several references is it proper to term this portion of Vedic literature as Kshatriya literature? So there is no justification either taking the Sūta to be an ordinary man, or the classification of Sanskrit literature as Brahmanical or Kshatriya.

From this digression we shall revert to the topic under discussion. By the time of the Atharvaveda Samhitā (v. 19.9 : 11.7.24), the Purāṇas had assumed some inde-