Different manuscripts of the Brhaddevata bear out that this work is composed by Saunaka. According to these manuscripts, the BD. begins with the following wording: atha saunakiya brhaddevatapramabhah. Similarly, the colophon of some of the manuscripts read the following wording: iti saunakiya brhaddevata samadita. All of these manuscripts are utilized by Rajendralal Mitra and Macdownell, in their respective editions of this work.

Venkata Madhava, the famous commentator of the Rgveda ascribes the BD. to Saunaka, while commenting on the RV. I. 147. 3, he cites three verses from the BD., which deal with the legend of Dirghatama, and in the beginning of these verses, he says, atha saunakah. Also in his commentary on the RV. I. 164.2, he quotes one sloka from the BD. and ascribes it to Saunaka saying iti Saunakah, at the end of that sloka. The verse is found in the BD. (IV. 33). After Venkata Madhava, Sadgurusisya, the famous commentator of the Sarva. of Katyayana has attributed this work to Saunaka and says that Saunaka composed as many as ten works on different aspects of the Rgveda. Moreover, this commentator further says that Saunaka, who composed these works, was a teacher of Asvalayan, to whom the Asvalayana Grhya Sutra, the Asvalayana Srauta Sutra and the fourth Aranyaka of the Aitareya Aranyaka are ascribed. Sadgurusisya narrates a legend according to which Saunaka himself had composed a Srauta Sutra but his pupil (Asvalayana) composed a Srauta Sutra of the Rgveda and presented it to his teacher (Saunaka) for correction. The teacher was highly pleased with the composition of his student and tore his
own Sūtra Sūtra in to a thousand pieces. He declared that the Āśvalāyana Sūtra Sūtra will be the only Sūtra Sūtra of the Ṛgveda. This view is also supported by the Āśv. G.S. and the Āśv. S.G. because at the end of these two works the author says homage to Saunaka. From this evidence, it is clear that Saunaka to whom the BD. is ascribed was the teacher of Āśvalāyana.

On the other hand, Macdonell does not accept the above mentioned traditional view because on the basis of some internal and external evidence, he says that the BD. is not composed by Saunaka but by some teacher of his school. This teacher was not separated from him by a long interval of time. Macdonell's view is based on the following internal evidence. The author of the BD. speaks of himself in the first person. After paying homage to the seers of the Ṛgveda, the author of the BD. says, "I shall state the deities of the hymns, verses and hemistiches of the Ṛgveda." In these cases the author seems to be addressing to some one, because at least twice the words śrnu and vācyaśmi are used in the BD. in different places. Besides this, the author of the BD. mentions the name of Saunaka in fifteen different verses. If the author is speaking of himself in the first person should he say, "This is the view of Saunaka?" Moreover, the name of Saunaka is mentioned along with other Vedic scholars such as Yāska, Bhāguri and Sāktaśya etc. Had this treatise been composed by Saunaka himself, he should not have mentioned his own name along with other teachers. It is also impossible for any ancient
Indian scholar to attach the epithet acārya with his own name. But, in the ED, the word Acārya Saunaka is found in so many places. Not only this, the ED contains three clear pieces of evidence to show that the views of Saunaka are not shared by the author of this work. First, the author of the ED says that in the RV. VIII. 36. 13-15, Indra, the Maruts and Brhaspati are praised. But, here the view of Saunaka is also cited according to which, Indra is the deity of these mantras. Secondly, the author of the ED is of the view that the RV. X. 98 is a red proceal narrative (avahanam prati akhyānam) but according to Saunaka, this hymn is a legend. Thirdly, Saunaka says that the entire hymn (RV. I. 125) is seen by Kaksīvats but the author of the ED is of the view that the second mantra of this hymn is seen by Dirghatama. In the above mentioned three verses, Saunaka and the author of the ED are distinguished. On the basis of these points, it can be said that the ED is not composed by Saunaka, whose name is mentioned again and again in the ED.

Further, Macdonell says that the Devatānukramaṇi is also ascribed to Saunaka, though this anukramaṇi is not extant yet it is known from its ten quotations found in Saḍgurusīgya's commentary. It was undoubtedly an index of deities. He adds that the Devatānukramaṇi was anterior to the ED, because the epic matter in the ED is an addition to the said anukramaṇi. If Saunaka had composed this anukramaṇi why should he reproduce the same work in another form exactly, with the same object, viz. to give a serial account of the deities of the Ṛgveda. On the above
mentioned internal and external evidence, Macdonell gives his hypotheses that the BD. is not a composition of the same Saunaka, whose name is mentioned fifteen times in this work.

Now the problem is, if this work is not composed by Saunaka then why is it attributed to him? Before replying to this question, I shall make an attempt for the identification of Saunaka and for determining whether the works ascribed to him are the compositions of one and the same person or not. In this respect the statement of Sadgurusigya is very helpful. According to this commentator of the Sarvanukramani, Saunaka composed ten treatises on the Rigveda, including the Pratisakhya, the BD. and the Yajvidhana. From the introductory stanza of the Pratisakhya, the view is supported that Saunaka is the author of this work (the Rkprá). Then Visnuntra, a commentator, of the Rkpra. says that Saunaka Chryapati, who composed the Rkpra. was called Sastravatara by the inhabitants of the Naimisaranya. From the above mentioned two views, it seems that Saunaka, who composed the Rkpra. and the BD. was called Sastravatara and Chryapati. But this evidence is not enough to identify the author of the BD. and the Rkpra. because the word Saunaka is a patronymic form of the word Sunaka and this word is found even in the Atharvaveda. In this Veda, this word occurs in plural number and is mentioned along with Agastya, Kanva, Kutsa, Garga, Mudgala and Ayajkas. From this reference it is clear that even at the time when the Paip. Sams. of the AV. came into existence so many Saunakas were there. Besides this Sambhata, the name of Saunaka and Saunakas occur in so many Vedic and post-Vedic works.
In the Satapatha Brahmana, names of two Saunakas are mentioned. First, in this Brahmana, a discussion on the full-moon and new-moon sacrifice between Svaidayana Saunaka and Uddalak Aruni is given. Then Indrota Daivapa Saunaka is said to have performed sacrifice for Janamejaya, the son of Parikṣita.

According to the Jaiminiyopanisad Brahmana the amṛta gāyatra was given (taught) to Indrota Daivapa Saunaka by Kaśyapa, by Daivapa Saunaka to Dṛpti Indrota Saunaka and by Dṛpti Indrota Saunaka to Kulusa Pracinayogya. So one more Saunaka is added here. In the Mundakopanisad a Saunaka is said to be a pupil of Amgaṇa. In the Chandogyaparaniṣad, two more Saunakas are found: Atidhana to be a teacher and Kapecya Saunaka, a Brāhma-carin.

So in the Vedic literature, the names of at least five Saunakas are mentioned and all of them are related with different sects of knowledge.

In the Epic and Purānic literature, Saunaka has become almost a legendary figure. The Mahābhārata says when Janamejaya was performing the famous Sarpa Satra, Kulapati Saunaka was performing a Dwādaśavārṣika Satra. According to the Viṣṇupurāṇa, Sātanika, the son of Janamejaya, got ātmapadesa from Saunaka. Then the Matsya Purāṇa says that Saunaka related the biography of Yayati to Šatanika. The Vaiyu Purāṇa contains the following account of Saunaka: During the reign of Adiśma Kuśa sarvasastravisārdha, Saunaka was present in the long term yajña performed by the seers of the Vaimīśārya. All these references reveal that during the Epic period Saunaka had become either a legendary figure or this designation was given to every head of
some Saunaka institution of the Vedic studies. Most probably this title was given to the head of this institution because this view is supported by the Vedic evidence as discussed below:

Though it cannot be denied that Saunaka is a patronymic form of Sunaka yet it can be seen that those who are related with this institution have got two surnames viz. their family name and the name given by this institution. Indrota Daivapa Saunaka, Androta Saunaka and Kapaya Saunaka are the names, which support this idea. If Saunaka is their family name, then why should Daivapa be attached with Indrota, which is already a patronymic form of Devapi? Similarly in the case of Androta Saunaka, which is certainly a patronymic form of Indrota why Saunaka should be attached with his family name. Same is the case with Kapaya. This word is a patronymic form of Kapi. Moreover, in the ancient Indian literature we do not find the tradition of attaching two surnames with an individual. Therefore, it is certain that the word Saunaka is a title given by some institution of Vedic studies probably to the head of this institution. This idea is also supported by the Mahabharata, where Saunaka is said to be the Kulapati of some institution as cited below:

lomahargana putra ugrasravah stutah paurniko
naimisaranyo saunakasyakulapeter dvadasa varése satra.
"Mbh. I. I. 1."

So it can be stated that Saunaka was a designation of the Kulapati of some renowned school of Vedic studies. It is not certain whether this school was known as the Saunaka School as stated by the western scholars or not.
As discussed above, different Śaunakas are mentioned in different Vedic works and their connection with different brahmanas of knowledge is also referred to therein. This refers to the study of all the four Vedas in this school. As the name of Śaunaka is found in the Śat. Brāh., so it is clear that in this institution the Yajurveda was studied. The Atharvaveda has got a Śaunaka recension of its Śatihitā and the Pippalāda Śatihitā was also studied in this institution because the name of Śaunaka has also been mentioned in this Śatihitā. So far as the Ṛgveda is concerned the contribution of this school to this Veda cannot be ignored. Therefore, all the four Vedas were studied in this institution. In order to make the above discussed statement more evident I will discuss whether all the works ascribed to Śaunaka are composed by one and the same person or not.

The Indian tradition ascribes so many works to Śaunaka but Sadgurusisyaya ascribes only ten works to Śaunaka. These works are: The Ārsānukramanī, The Chandonukramanī, the Devatānukramanī, the Anuvākanukramanī, The Sūktānukramanī, The Ekgidhāna, the Pādavidhāna, the Ekpratisākhya, the Bhaddevatā, the Śaunaka Saṁti. On the other hand K. Sambaśīva Sāstri who edited the Śaunakīya ascribes twenty-five works to Śaunaka. In the introduction of the Śaunakīya Mr. Sāstri attributes the following works to Śaunaka but he does not mention the source of this statement:

The Anuvākanukramanī, The Ārsānukramanī, the Āyuṣhomapadhati, the Ugrarathṣāntiprayoga, the Udakaṣāntipratisāra bandhaprayoga,
But the ascription of these works to Saunaka is doubtful because in the English version of the introduction he ascribes twenty three works while in the Sanskrit version ascribes twenty five works. On comparing this list with the list of Saunaka's works given by Saungurisya we see that so many works which are ascribed to him are not Vedic works at all. For example 'the Sanyasaavidhi', the Vishudharmo, and the 'Ekadandisanyasaavidhi'. Moreover on the basis of language and style all these works cannot be ascribed to a single author. If we compare the language and style of the HD. and the Saunakiyam we shall see that the former is pure Vedic work whereas the latter seems to influenced by the Vaisnava Agama literature, because in the Saunakiyam so many names of lord Visnu are mentioned which are not found in the HD. The language of both the works hints towards the fact that there might have been a very long interval between the composition of both the works. Even the Caturadhyayika is not ascribed to
Saunaka by Sadgurusisya. There seems to be a tradition that the works ascribed to Saunaka must get popularity.

Out of all the above mentioned works which are attributed to Saunaka, only the Rkprā, the BD. and the Rgvidhāna are very important as these works present a detailed study of three aspects of the Ṛgveda viz. phonetics, mythology and the ritual application of its mantras. A comparative study of all these works will help us in ascertaining the probable authorship of the BD. Moreover, this study will enable us to settle the chronology of these works.

First of all I shall take up the Rkprā. and the BD. for their comparative study. Though the Rkprā. and the BD. belong to two different branches of Vedic studies i.e. phonetics and mythology yet the contents of twelve slokas of the BD. are clearly similar with thirteen passages of the Rkprā. The ideas discussed in these passages can be analysed into two parts i.e. discussions regarding some grammatical rules and discussion regarding the relationship of various deities with different metres.

First the discussion relating to the some grammatical phenomenon - Both the Rkprā. and the BD. say that there are four parts of speech (or four kinds of words or morphemes) viz. noun, verb, preposition and particle. Though in both the works the idea is the same yet the style is completely different because the BD. expresses this idea through an anāṣṭup verse but the Rkprā. presents it in a sūtra. Moreover in the Rkprā.,
This theory is attributed to the Grammarians but in the B.D., any such statement is not found. The B.D. also refers to three tenses in the same verse to which the Rkprā. does not make any reference. Moreover, the order of these parts of speech is also given in a different order in both the works i.e., in the B.D., the order is upasarga, nipāta, nāma and ākhyāta whereas in the Rkprā. the order is, nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga and nipāta. Both the texts are cited below:

B.D., I. 33-40:

upasarganīnātā ca nāma nāmākhyātārā upasarga nipātā
cā khyātām ityāpi. bhūtam bhāvyam bhavīṣyam ca puṃān
stri ca napuṃsaṃ. evam prakṛtyo mantrāḥ sarvavedeṣu
sarvasāḥ.

Rkprā. XII, 17:

nāmākhyātārā upasarga nipāta
ca bhūtam bhāvyam bhavīṣyam ca puṃān
stri ca napuṃsaṃ. evam prakṛtyo mantrāḥ sarvavedeṣu
sarvasāḥ.

The B.D. gives a detailed definition of noun whereas the Rkprā. defines noun in a very concise way. The definition given by the B.D. is "the uttered sound by which we here apprehend a substantive, when connected in the (correct) disposition of syllables is called noun by the thinkers. The definition of noun given by the Rkprā. differs from above definition. This treatise defines noun in the following way. By which a being (substance i.e., sattva) is designated is called noun. In this way we see that the definition of noun given by B.D. is a refined one whereas the definition of noun given by the Rkprā. is primitive. This definition given by the former in an anustūp verse but the latter defines noun in sutra style. The wording used by the both works is completely different from each as the only one word 'nāma' is common. Both these definitions have a narrow sphere because the Rkprā. does not refer to 'dravya), and
the BD, concentrates only at the substance (dravya). Both the texts are cited below:

**BD., I. 42**

savden-occarateneha yena tannāma
dravyam pratīyate. tadakṣaravidhan yenābhiddadhāti
yuktam nāmetyāhurmanisīnaḥ sattvam.

**RkHz. XII. 18**

Now the definition of a verb as given by the RkHz is "that part of speech is called a verb by which we denote a becoming (bhāva) and which contains a root. The BD. gives two definitions of verb. The first definition is verb is that part of speech which has becoming as its fundamental meaning and which has six modifications. The second definition given by the BD. is that notion is termed as verb which is connected with many actions and which has three phases of becoming i.e. earlier, being and later (past, present and future)." So the definition of verb as given by the BD. covers the definition given by the RkHz. Also this definition is further elaborated in the BD. as it refers to the six modifications of the verb. In this way the BD. defines a verb in a refined way whereas in the RkHz, the verb is defined in a primitive way. Moreover, the language and the style in both the works is completely different from each other. Only two words are similar in both the definitions i.e. bhāva and ākhyāta. Both the texts are quoted below:

**BD. II. 121**

bhāva pradhānasākhyātām
sad viṅkāra bhavanti te

**RkHz. XII. 19**

tadākhyātan yena
bhāvan sadhātu

**BD. I. 44**

kriyāsu bavvisabhisamśritoyah
pūrva paribhūtā ihaika eva.
kriyābhinivṛtti vaśena siddha
ākhyāta satdema tamarthamāhuḥ
The third part of speech discussed by both the works is 'preposition (upasarga). The Rkprā. studies these prepositions in detail. It says "pra, abhi, a, para, nir, dur, anu, vi, upa, apa, sam, pari, pratī, ni, ati, adhi, su, ut, ava and api" are twenty prepositions which in combination with the other two (noun and verb) express a meaning. In the same context the BD. says "twenty prepositions are to be recognised by the reason of their connection with verbal action for they differentiate the meaning in inflections of nouns and verbs. The BD. further cites Sākatāyana's view that acha, śrad and antar are also prepositions because they are connected with action." So the total number of prepositions comes up to twenty-three. The Rkprā. does not make any such statement but as is stated above it enumerates all the prepositions whereas in the BD. no such enumeration is found. In both the works only four words are common i.e. upasarga, vimśati, nāma and ākhyāta. As far as the language and style is concerned there is no similarity in both the works. For comparison both the texts are cited below:

**BD. II. 94-95**

&rsquo;upsaragāstū vijñeyāḥ\nḥriyāyagena vimśatih.\nviyogyaṇti ta hyartham\nnāmāksāyātavibhaktiṣu.\nacha śradantarītyayetan\nācāryāḥ sākatāyanaḥ\nupasargān kriyāyogān\nmene te tu tryoḍhikāh.\n
**Rkprā. XII. 20**

prabhya para nirdurana\nvypāpe sam pari pratī\nyatyadhi saudavai.\nupasarga vimśatirarthā\nvacakāh. sahetarabhyām.

The fourth part of speech as discussed by both the works is particle (nipāta). The Rkprā. says that a particle completes a pāda. On account of the occurrence of these particles
are of two kinds viz. meaningless and significant. The particles found in the metrical and non-metrical literature cannot be definitely enumerated, as these are so many. The BD contains a detailed discussion regarding these particles.

First the BD says that the particles are used for two purposes i.e. connecting actions and for the sake of comparison. Also these are used for the purpose of completing defective verses, those particles which are used for completing defective verses are meaningless. According to the BD, i.e., na, cid, and nu are used in the sense of comparison. Regarding the number of these particles the BD says that there does not exist any definite enumeration of these particles as these are so many.

From this discussion it is clear that the BD deals with this part of speech in detail whereas the Ākṣara discusses this part very precisely. There is no similarity in the language or in the style of both the works. Both the texts are shown below:

**BD. II, 82-90**

uccāyosesu gārthesa nipatāh
samudāhrtāh, karmopāsyamahartha
ca kvacīcesu pavyakārañjat.
unānām pūnārthāva
pādaṇām apare kvaśī
gitakāre sa graṁtheṣu
pūnārthāstvanarthaḥ.

**Ākṣara, XII, 26**

nipatāngarthaḥ sa
samudāhrtāh, karmopāsyamahartha
ca kvacīcesu pavyakārañjat.
unānām pūnārthāva
pādaṇām apare kvaśī
gitakāre sa graṁtheṣu
pūnārthāstvanarthaḥ.

This discussion reveals that there are so many differences in both the works. Now I shall take up the second similar portion in both the works, i.e., the relationship of various deities with various metres. The Ākṣara discusses this portion very briefly whereas in the BD, this portion is discussed in detail. The Ākṣara says that Gayatri metre belongs to Agni and other
seven metres belonging to various deities are discussed in two verses of the Šrīveda. According to these two Šrīvedic mantras, Gāyatri belongs to Agni, Uṣṇikta to Sāvitrī, Anuṣṭup to Soma, Brhati to Bhṛṣpati, Virāt to Mitra-Varuna, Tristup to Indra, Jagati to Visvedevas. Regarding these seven metres the BD. does not state that the relationship of seven deities with seven metres is discussed in the Šrīveda but enumerates them in accordance with the tradition i.e. Gāyatri is connected with Agni, Uṣṇikta with Sāvitrī, Anuṣṭup with Soma, Brhati with Bhṛṣpati, Paṅkti and Tristup with Indra and Jagati with Visvedevas. Virāja with Mitra and Śvarāja with Varuna. The Ṛkprā. connects Paṅkti with the Vasus and Atishandas with Prajāpati, Vichandas with Vayu, Dvipadas with Purusa and Kapadas with Brahma. But in the BD. Paṅkti is related with Indra whereas in the Ṛkprā. it is related with the Vasus. Both the views are discussed in detail in the chapter XI, below.

This study reveals that there are so many differences in both the works which indicate that both the works are not composed by one and the same author. Had both the works been composed by one author there might have been similar language and style in both the works. But it is not. The BD. is composed in a metrical style whereas the Ṛkprā. is in a Sūtra style. In the above dealt comparative study of both the works major differences have been shown. Some other differences are also there as the Ṛkprā. says that the Paṅkti metre belongs to the Vasus whereas in the BD. this metre is said to be belonging to Indra.
Similarly according to the Rgveda X.130, 4-5 which is referred to by the Rkprä, virat metre belongs to Miträvaruna whereas in the BD. Viräja belongs to Mitra and Svaraja to Varuna.

Why should one and the same author give such contradictory views in two different works? Moreover the author who is briefly dealing with every kind of word (pada) in the Rkprä, why should he go in detail in the BD. In all it’s grammatical discussions the BD. closely follows the language and style of the Wirukta. But the Rkprä does not follow the Wirukta. Moreover, the Rkprä, deals with the phonetics of the Säisirlya recension of the Rgveda.

Rkprä, Intro. 7.
asa jañärthamidamidam uttaratra vakṣya Sāstramakhilam Säisirlya.

But the BD. does not make any such statement. In the BD. name of Säunaka is mentioned again and again but in the Rkprä, his name is mentioned only once. But the introductory stanza is not authentic because Uvāta, the commentator of the Rkprä, does not comment on this stanza. If this stanza is interpolated later on then it is certain that the ascription of the Rkprä, to Säunaka is also doubtful. However, we are least concerned with it but it is almost clear that the Rkprä, and the BD. are not composed by the same author. Moreover there seems to be a considerable interval of time between the composition of both the works. As from the language and style of the Rkprä, one can easily say that the Rkprä, is definitely anterior to the BD. So both the treatises are composed by two different authors at different times.
Now I shall discuss whether the BD. and the Rgvidhana are composed by one and the same author. The ancient Indian tradition ascribes the authorship of the Rgvidhana to Saunaka. The second stanza of the Rgvidhana says "Saunaka communicated the rules for the rites, which have been seen by the seers, with regard to the mantras and to those who have seen them, in due order, according to the redaction of the traditional collection of the Vedic text." Then Sadgurusiva ascribes the Rgvidhana to Saunaka. Moreover the Rgvidhana shares one complete sloka, one half sloka and and three padaas with the BD. All these passages are cited below.

First half of the first verse of the BD. is shared by

the Rgvidhana as is cited below:

BD. I, 1.
\[ \text{mantradrghbyo namaskrtvā samāmnāya upurvasah} \]

Rgvidhana I, 1.
\[ \text{Namaskrtvā man trasṛghbyah} \]

Rgvi. I, I, 2.
\[ \text{samāmnāya upurvasah} \]

This half sloka is shared by both the works and the Rgvidhana seems embeded it in two slokas. In these two verses of the Rgvidhana only three words are similar with the BD. rest of the wording is completely different in both the works.

There is another sloka of the Rgvidhana the wording of which is shared by the BD.

BD. VIII, 32-33.
\[ \text{yathāvmedhah kraturāt sarvari prepanodanaḥ. tathāhamarṣanam brahma sarvari prepanodanaḥ.} \]

Rgvidhana IV, 24,2.
\[ \text{yathāvmedhah kraturāt sarvapāpa pāpanodanaḥ. tathāhamarṣanam sūktam sarvapāpa pāpanodanaḥ.} \]

These two half slokas of the BD. are adopted by the Rgvidhana and reproduced as one sloka. Moreover some changes
are also made by the latter as brahma is replaced by sūktam and the word sarvapūrṇapāranodana which is used twice in the BD. is substituted by the word sarvatpāraṇapāranodana.

There are three padas, which are common in both the works. These are verbatim identical in the BD. as well as in the Rgvidhāna. These padas are shown below:

**BD. VII. 21**
sāksaraṁ tu sāntyartham

**Rgvi. III. 5, 6,**

sāksaraṁ tu sāntyartham

**BD. VII. 123**
sūryai bhāvavṛttam tu.

**Rgvi. III. 22, 3,**

sūryai bhāvavṛttam tu.

**BD. VIII. 7**
brhaspate pratīty etad.

**Rgvi. IV. 1, 5,**

brhaspate pratīty etad.

All the above cited passages are word to word identical.

On the basis of the above cited evidence one say that both the BD. and the Rgvidhāna are composed by one and the same author. But there are certain pieces of evidence on the basis of which these do not seem to be the compositions of one and the same author.

First of all the different mss. of the Rgvidhāna begin with homage to Ganesa. Even one manuscript begins with the following wording "om namah śrīgrūpvasoṃdāgaurīśanapatīnām." This manuscript ends with the following wording "om namah śaunakāya. om Šaunakāya namah." Whereas in the BD. we do not find salutation to Ganesa, Govinda and Gaurl it appears that the Rgvidhāna was composed when the tradition of mangālācarana in the beginning of every composition was started. This view is further supported by the subject matter of the first two verses of the Rgvidhāna, because in the first verse of the Rgvidhāna...
the author pays homage to Brahma, the self existent and protector of the universe. Then the same verse the author pays homage to the seers of the Rgveda. In the earlier literature we find that paying homage to Brahma, Visnu etc. in the beginning of any composition does not exist there, as in the N., the ED., the Rkpr. no sign of such tradition is found. This tradition might have been started during the puranic period.

A close study of the Ngvidhana reveals that this treatise is quite near to the Vaisnava sect and it contains so many epic characteristics. For example the application of the Purusa sukta (RV. X, 30) for begetting a son is given in epic style and the application of this hymn for worshipping Lord Visnu is now to the vedic literature. In the ED. we do not find such a method of worshipping lord Visnu. Moreover in the Ngvidhana so many names of Visnu are found and most of them are not found in the Vedic literature such as Janardhana, Kesava, Narayana, Madhava, Govinda, Madhusudana, Trivikrama, Vaman, Hrsikesa, Padmanabha, Damodar, Hari.

In the Ngvidhana there is a direct hint to idol worship (paying homage to Saligrama) but in the ED. there is no hint to idol worship. Moreover in the Ngvidhana the name of Narada is mentioned. Here Narada is said to have told the method of the ritual application of the RV. X. 30 for begetting a son.

There is one clear evidence which proves that the ED. and the Ngvidhana are not composed by one and the same author. The evidence is while giving the ritual application of the RV. X. 3-9 the
Rgvidhana says that Indra killed the son of Tvastr who was a seer and a prince. The ED, also narrates the same legend but does not say that Tvastr's son was a prince. It simply says that he was son of Tvastr and nephew of the Asuras. If both the treatises were composed by one and the same author why should he give such a self contradictory statement? This shows that both the works are not composed by one and the same author.

The common passages are certainly borrowed by the Rgvidhana from the ED, from the above discussion it is clear that epic peculiarities of the Rgvidhana place it near to the epic period. But the ED, is certainly a pre-epic composition. Now it is certain that the ED, and the Rgvidhana are not composed by the same author.

So it is decided that the Akra, the ED, and the Rgvidhana cannot be ascribed to one and the same author. These are the compositions of three different authors. All those three authors might have been designated as Saunaka because of their being related to the Saunaka school. But due to lack of evidence we can not definitely speak of their original and family names.
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