

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA
XLIII:6

THE LITERATURE AND STUDY
OF
THE JAIMINĪYA SĀMAVEDA
IN RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

BY
ASKO PARPOLA

HELSINKI 1973

ISBN 951-95073-5-3

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Kirjapaino Oy Helsinki 1973

Preface

This paper¹ reproduces in much revised form a lecture "On the study of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda" delivered on the 27th of March, 1971, at the Silver Jubilee of the Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute at Madras. It seems useful to make available in print a fresh and fairly comprehensive survey of the present state of Jaiminīya studies, because recent research has considerably enlarged our knowledge. My intention is not to replace but to supplement the admirable synthesis by Louis Renou (1947).² In outlining the work done, I have taken the opportunity to make a few critical remarks, suggestions and additions. The main purpose, however, is to direct attention to the many texts — and new materials on previously known texts — and other aspects of the Jaiminīya studies that have recently been brought to light, and to indicate what sort of publications can be expected in the near future. It is hoped that the paper will provoke interest in this field which gives, as will be seen, scope for further research.

I should like to thank also here all those persons and institutions from whom I received help, support and hospitality during my Jaiminīya studies in India, which were made possible by the Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies sponsoring the project. I want particularly express my gratitude to Thiru A. Subbiah, Thiru V. S. Tyagaraja Mudaliar, Thiru R. Ramakrishnan, Thiru I. Mahadevan and Dr. R. Panneerselvam; Professor Lokesh Chandra, Professor V. Raghavan, Professor E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma, Thiru R. Nagaswamy, and Professor J. F. Staal; Dr. K. Raghavan Pillai, Dr. Parameshvara Unni, Professor B. J. Sandesara, Dr. Umakant Shah, Thiru N. Kandaswamy Pillai, and Professor R. K. Parthasarathi. Of all the Jaiminīyas, who were most cooperative, I want to mention particularly Sri M. Itti Ravi Nambudiri, Sri N. Nilakanthan Akkitiri, Sri P. Tuppan Nambudiri, Thiru T. Rajagopala Aiyangar, Thiru R. Ramanuja Achariyar, Thiru R. Narasimhan, Thiru S. Nambi Rajan, Sri K. N. Sahasranama Aiyar, Sri K.S. Srinivasa Aiyar, and Sri K. R. Tiruvenkatanatha Vadhyar. They all have made important contributions. My best thanks are due also to Mr. Wayne Howard for his help specified below.

¹ The paper was written in the autumn of 1972 ("last year" below refers to 1971) but while correcting the galley proofs in February 1973 I could make a few additions and take into regard the latest developments.

² Mention may also be made of the earlier or partial surveys by Caland (1905, 1907, 1922), Veda Vyasa (1930), Tsuji (1948), Lokesh Chandra (1950), Frenz (1966) and Parpola (1968b).

Contents

Preface	3
I. The study of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda	5
1. Introductory: the acute need for the rescue of traditions	5
2. Brāhmaṇa texts	6
3. Gṛhya texts	12
4. Śrauta texts	14
5. Saṃhitā texts	16
6. History of the Jaiminīya śākhā	22
II. Synopsis of the extant Jaiminīya literature traced by 1972	25
III. Bibliographical references	29

I. THE STUDY OF THE JAIMINIYA SĀMAVEDA

1. Introductory: the acute need for the rescue of traditions

The history of the studies in the Jaiminiya Sāmaveda illustrates, firstly, the possibilities that India still offers for finding unknown cultural treasures, and, secondly, the conditions that threaten the continuity of the ancient traditions. It is still possible to make such revolutionary finds in India as were those of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra and Bhāsa's dramas some fifty years ago, but they must be made very soon. On my part, I here wish to emphasize the acute need for a systematic and extensive collecting of ancient traditions in India, and to appeal to all institutions and individuals who could change the present situation.

During the last century and sometime afterwards, European and Indian scholars as civil servants travelled in villages for the purpose of purchasing and copying manuscripts. As a result, libraries such as those in Poona and Madras could regularly, at few years intervals, issue catalogues of new accessions, and enormous amounts of manuscripts were collected. An idea is provided by the bulky volumes of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* by V. Raghavan which is now in the process of publication, and yet this work deals only with Sanskrit texts. However, much remains to be found, and particularly in such neglected fields as, for instance, the Tamil manuscripts that have hardly been cared for since U.V. Swaminatha Aiyar's pioneering efforts which saved much of the ancient Caṅkama literature from destruction. But even in the domain of Sanskrit, important texts can still be recovered.

For a long time there has scarcely been any such systematic collecting of manuscripts as previously, although the need for it in the present age of drastic social change is more acute than ever before. Already too many private libraries, after the death of their owners, have been thrown into rivers by the widows and the new generation that has lost interest in the old traditions which no more guarantee social respect or livelihood. It is difficult for an outsider to criticize the allotment of money that the Government of India is spending on the promotion of Sanskrit studies — described in detail in *Sanskrit in India*, a 500-page publication released by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in 1972. However, it seems to me, that at the present moment the collecting of manuscripts deserves a much higher

Avery, Hopkins, Bloomfield and Perry prepared a transcribed copy of the grantha manuscripts. Whitney excerpted the grammatical material of the text, which was incorporated in his later publications, but made only a short direct report on the Brāhmaṇa in 1883. Whitney here emphasized the insufficiency of the manuscripts for a critical edition, adding another sample in the form of a translation of the Cyavana legend [3,120—128], some comparisons with the other Brāhmaṇas, and linguistic notes.

On the basis of Whitney's transcript, Hanns Oertel undertook editing the least corrupt passages. The most extensive portion published by Oertel, with an English translation and notes, is the entire Jaiminīya Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa, which appeared in 1894. The only interest of the devanāgarī transcript of Oertel's edition published in Lahore in 1921 by Rāma Deva lies in the introduction on the Sāmavedic literature by Bhagavad Datta. The JUB, too, has come out in a recent edition by B. R. Sharma in 1967, with new manuscripts, an introduction and an index. Sharma has on purpose omitted the Kena Upaniṣad [= 4,18—21], but has by mistake also left out the two further anuvākas dealing with the prāṇas and the sāvitṛī¹ [= 4,22—28], which do not belong to the Kena Upaniṣad. Yet the JUB has undoubtedly originally ended at 4,17, which closes with the words *saiṣā śāṭyāyanī gāyatrasyopaniṣad*² *evam upāsitavyā*. Even in this portion, there appears to be two layers, since the third adhyāya ends with a vaṃśa (3,40—42), which is paralleled by another vaṃśa at the end (4,16—17).

In seven series of "Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature" and other papers, mainly published in the *Journal of American Oriental Society* between 1893 and 1909, Oertel edited, translated and discussed at great length also numerous passages of the Brāhmaṇa proper. His comparisons of the legends were not confined to parallels elsewhere in the Indian literature but extended also abroad. Even in a later paper, "Volkstümliche Erzählmotive im Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa", he returned to the theme. The legend of Cyavana, translated by Whitney, was subjected to a very extensive comparative study by E. W. Hopkins in his paper "The Fountain of Youth" in 1905, and in 1949 it was newly edited by Lokesh Chandra. Oertel also used the JB material in his researches on the Sanskrit grammar, of which particular mention may be made of *The*

¹ The Jaiminīyaprayogavivaraṇa (see below, p. 13) on p. 310 f. partly reproduces the sāvitṛī anuvāka calling it *upaniṣadabrāhmaṇam*.

² The name *gāyatrasyopaniṣad* is used of the JUB (besides *asmad upaniṣadgrantha*) even by Bhavatrāta, who also refers to the *adhyāya* division as it is known to us (JŚS-vṛtti, p. 41, 84). Cf. Caland 1914: p. 74: JUB . . . "dessen erster Teil (I—IV. 17), beiläufig bemerkt, den Namen *gāyatrasyopaniṣad* trägt (vgl. IV. 15. 3 und IV. 17. 2)". — On *śāṭyāyanī*, cf. below, p. 9 f.

Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Brāhmaṇas (1926). Oertel published in 1934-5 a separate paper on "Roots and verb-forms from the unpublished parts of the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa". The mantra material of the JB was excerpted by Oertel (very incompletely, as Lokesh Chandra showed in 1950) for Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* that appeared in 1906.

Meanwhile, Caland prepared his own transcript of the Burnell Mss. of the JB. In 1914 he published emendations to Oertel's publications. A year later came out a longer, very important study in Dutch, entitled, "Over en uit het Jaiminīya-brāhmaṇa". Caland published here a number of new extracts with Dutch translations and comments. In the first part of the work, he dealt with the contents, the language, and the relative position of the JB in the Vedic literature. The JB is closely related with the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, numerous parallel passages having been pointed out already by Oertel. The relation between these two texts, as well as that between the JB and the other great Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda, the Tāṇḍya or Pañcaviṃśa or Mahā-Brāhmaṇa, are naturally in the focus. In his translation of the last mentioned text, Caland in 1931 returned to its relation with the JB, while Keith's reviews (1920, 1932) contribute valuable criticism particularly on this point.

Oertel had also enlarged the collection of quotations from the Śāṭyāyanakam, to which Burnell had called attention. Caland now added many more, and from more ancient sources, showing that many of them can be traced as such or almost literally in the JB, while others are paraphrases or have no parallel. A still more comprehensive (but still incomplete) collection was supplied in 1935 by Oertel's pupil Batakrishna Ghosh in his thesis *Collection of the Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas*, which consists mainly of Śāṭyāyanaka quotations. One cannot attach too great an importance to quotations (for these can be shown to be inexact in cases where they refer to known Brāhmaṇas) and the variants are here of minor importance (Renou, 1947: § 95). However, as Renou (1947) has shown, the Vedic literature offers many parallels to such slightly different duplicate versions. In any case, it is certain that the text and the school was in most ancient times named according to Śāṭyāyani, the most prominent teacher in the JB. At the beginning of the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra, Śāṭyāyani is quoted side by side with Tāṇḍya, the authority whose name is connected with the Great Brāhmaṇa of the rivalling school of the Kauthumas. The title of the JUB as preserved in the text itself, Śāṭyāyanī Gāyatrasyopaniṣad, is also convincing evidence to this effect. In contradistinction to Śāṭyāyanakam, Śāṭyāyaninām (scil. śruti), etc., the name of Jaimini, or his epithet Talavakāra 'musician' in the teacher list of JGS 1,14, is never found in the ancient texts, but only in later commentaries, prayogas and manuscripts (see Lokesh Chandra, 1950: p. viii-ix). This clearly shows that Jaimini's name became associated with the śākhā only at a later

date; this association, which poses its own problems, is dealt by me separately in a forthcoming paper entitled, "Mīmāṃsā, Jaimini, and Sāmaveda". The manuscript "stated to be Śāṭyāyana Brāhmaṇa in the first leaf of the manuscript which contains a list of the several works that are contained in the big volume" and described as such in 1931 by T. R. Chintamani, is in fact only a portion of the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (Parpola 1968a: p. 91 n. 1).

In this connection mention may also be made of the unpublished Śāṭyāyana-sūtra which deals with the expiations of the domestic ritual. Caland (1920) was the first to draw attention to the text. As he remarks, it must be fairly old as the (likewise unpublished) Gṛhyapariśiṣṭa (ascribed to Drāhyāyana) apparently refers to it, confirming its attribution to Śāṭyāyana.¹ However, as Caland (Ms.) has also noticed, the text is often identical to the very letter with the Bhāradvāja-Gṛhyasūtra, where for instance, the first chapter is found entire in 3,18 with only trivial variae lectiones. Is it possible that the text was already early attributed to Śāṭyāyani only on account of the quotation from the Śāṭyāyani-Brāhmaṇa occurring right at the beginning (cf. BhārGS 3,18)? In texts of one's own school it is customary not to mention the Brāhmaṇa by name, but to refer to it simply with *iti, iti hi (brāhmaṇam) bhavati, ity āha, iti śruteh*, etc. — On the Śāṭyāyana-Brāhmaṇa and -Sūtra see now also Bodewitz 1973: p. 11f.

In 1919 Caland published 212 selections from the JB, which make roughly a third of the whole, most being accompanied by a German translation, besides critical and exegetical notes; of the indexes, that of proper names takes the entire text into consideration. This book, *Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa im Auswahl*, remained the standard reference work for a long time. The Brāhmaṇa section of the indispensable Vedic Word Concordance, *Vaidika-Padānukrama-Koṣa*, which came out in 1935—1936, records the words occurring in this selection only. But it is hoped that the revised edition of this second part of the great work which has recently been announced will incorporate the rest of the material as well.

Like Whitney, Caland considered the manuscript material insufficient for a critical edition of the entire text. In the 1920'ies Veda Vyāsa of the Punjab University took pains in finding more Jaiminīya manuscripts. He was successful in his efforts, and planned to edit the whole JB, sending a sample of the first chapters out in 1928. However, a short paper printed in 1930, where he communicated the discovery of the new Jaiminīya manuscripts

¹ Supplementing Caland, I give here the exact references from the manuscripts accessible to me: 1,11 *śāṭyāyaniproktāni prāyaścittāni*; 2,17 *śāṭyāyanaproktāni gṛhyaprāyaścittāni*; 2,35 *śāṭyāyaniproktasarcvīṣṭasānti*; cf. also 1,16 *śāṭyāyanisamīritāh*, and 1,11.18 *bhagavān śāṭyāyaniḥ*.

(now in Hoshiarpur?) and some new quotations of Jaiminīya texts, remained his main ¹ contribution. The new manuscripts were utilized by Raghu Vira for an edition of the entire first book, which appeared in 1937, while those of the Burnell collection and one belonging to the Oriental Institute in Baroda were used by his son Lokesh Chandra in his partial edition of the second book (2,1—80) from 1950. The last mentioned edition, a thesis in the Utrecht University, was accompanied by a survey of the previous work on the text, a number of emendations, notes and indexes. In 1954 came out the complete text of the JB edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra (reprinting part of the latter's earlier introduction), who in 1955 published together also a separate paper on the textual criticism of the first book.

The Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa has not ceased to interest indologists. It is impossible to be exhaustive here with regard to all works where it has been taken into account, for many scholars have drawn from its rich contents. In the following I shall mention a few publications more directly dealing with it; the forthcoming third volume of R. N. Dandekar's *Vedic Bibliography* may contain a few more references that have escaped my attention.² The entire JB was taken into account by Wilhelm Rau in his important monograph *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt* (1957). The same scholar has translated a number of passages from the JB (suggesting also emendations) in his paper "Fünfzehn Indra-Geschichten" (1966). Rau has also supervised two theses on the JB, that by Albrecht Frenz on the verbs in the JB (1966), and another by Dieter Schrapel (1970a), dealing with a short passage of the text (2,371—373) and its syntax; a stray note on a detail was published elsewhere (1970b). Karl Hoffmann has taken the text into regard in several linguistic studies, and written four papers specifically on the textual criticism of the JB (1960—1970). I have studied the division of the JB (1968a: p. 48—49). Henk Bodewitz, who in 1969 published a paper on "Der Vers vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo . . . (JB 1,18; 1,50; KauṣUp 1,2)", is preparing a thesis of the agnihotra section (1,1—65). — This important contribution by Bodewitz came out in January 1973. Besides an English translation and very detailed and comprehensive exegesis it comprises a lengthy study (pp. 211—343) of the "Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra".

A translation of the JB is a task of primary importance. The recent studies

¹ On the basis of the evidence adduced by Bodewitz (1973: p. 3 and 8 f.) Raghu Vira's 1937 edition appears to be essentially based on the collation sheets of Veda Vyasa, who had completed the entire first book.

² Frenz (1966: p. xix) mentions Johanna Narten's studies in the verb forms, and Bodewitz (1973: p. xv) notes translations of stray passages of the agnihotra section by S. Lévi, K. F. Geldner, J. Hertel, and A. Frenz. Also Oertel 1951b and Kuiper 1957 deal with the JB.

have made it clear that a new critical edition is also desirable,¹ and this is all the more justified as new manuscript material has been found.² Lokesh Chandra possesses two bundles of previously unused palm leaf manuscripts.³ Last year I traced in Pāññāl, in Kerala, five bundles of JB Mss. (all in Malayālam script and on palm leaves), apparently comprising the entire text. Bodewitz (1973: p. 8) makes mention of "two transliterated copies of JB. mss. made by E. Krishna Warriess 13.12. '33; 15.1. '34; 12.3. '34) which were acquired by Utrecht University Library some years ago", comprising "portions of the second book (2,1—340; 2,1—333; '1—37' = 2,334—370)".

In the textual criticism of the JB, and for Vedic studies in general, a context concordance to the JB would be very helpful. This is obviously a task for the computer; the text of the agnihotra section has already been put in machine-readable form by the writer and Mrs. Setsuko Bergholdt of the Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies. The purpose is to make also a statistical-grammatical analysis.⁴

3. Gṛhya texts

In 1905, Caland published the Gṛhyasūtra of the Jaiminīya śākhā with extracts from Śrīnivāsa Adhvarin's commentary called Subodhinī, and a mantra index. The introduction (in Dutch) dealt with the Sāmavedic schools and the Jaiminīya literature, the manuscripts of the JGS, the value of the commentary (listing also its JB quotations), and the relation of the JGS to the other Jaiminīya texts as well as to the Sāmavedic Gṛhyasūtras of Gobhila and Khādira. Caland also pointed out significant ties with the Baudhāyana-gṛhyaparīśiṣṭa. I have tried to establish the relation to Gobhila and Khādira more precisely by showing that the JGS is the oldest (1968a: p. 70). Caland's edition, which was based on two Burnell Mss. and two others subsequently procured for the Government Oriental Mss. Library in Madras, appeared in a second edition in Lahore in 1922, with its introduction translated

¹ See especially Hoffmann 1960.

² The identity of the manuscripts used by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra has been discussed especially by Rau (1953), Gampert (1958), Frenz (1966: p. xv f.), Schrapel (1970a: p. xiii) and Bodewitz (1973: p. 3 and 8 f.; cf. also the loose sheet with the dissertation "Stellingen"). In 1971 I traced one previously unknown JB manuscript in the village of Koṭuntirappuḷli; mentioning this to J. F. Staal, I was informed by him that this is probably the same manuscript that was borrowed for the 1954 edition from this village through the mediation of Sreekrishna Sarma.

³ Cf. Frenz 1966: p. xvii. Bodewitz has now examined a microfilm of one of the Mss.: "It almost completely agrees with the Burnell mss. . . In the new Indian manuscript even the same omissions and evident mistakes are found" (1973: p. 8).

⁴ Such analysis is needed also for the purpose of fixing the external and internal chronology of the JB; cf. also Bodewitz 1973: p. 10.

into English, and with the addition of an English translation of the text. Though Caland in 1905 knew that the JGS was quoted in 1893 by R. G. Bhandarkar through the mediation of Kasturi Rangacharya in Madras, he did not come to know that the latter had actually published the JGS and the Subodhinī commentary as early as 1898 in Madras.

More information about the ḡṛhya ritual of the Jaiminīyas was made available in the very detailed Jaiminīya-Prayogavivaraṇa (in Tamil and Sanskrit) by A. Raṅgasvāmi Aiyāṅgār, which appeared in eight fascicles in Kumbhakonam in 1923. The compiler, as I came to know in India last year, was an authority in his own right among the Jaiminīyas, and he appears to have used all available sources for his unfortunately unfinished work. Since the publication is hardly known more than by name, it may be useful to reproduce here its headings:

Page 1 *sandhyāvandana-prayogaḥ* [in the following the word *prayogaḥ* will be indicated with the hyphen only], 7 *upakramah*, 10 *mādhyaṅnikam*, 12 *sāyamsandhyāvandanam*; 14 *yajñopavīṭadharaṇam*, 16 *śrāvaṇakālanirṇayaḥ*, 20 *upākaraṇam*, 20 *mahāsaṅkalpam*, 52 *āśīrvādaḥ*; 53 *pārvaṇaśrāddha-*, 103 *saṃkalpaśrāddha-*, 110 *sodakumbhādiśrāddha-*, 130 *bhuktasāmāni*, 134 *abhiśravaṇasāmāni*, 152 *bhokṭṛsāmāni*, 152 *ṛtuśānti-*, 165 *āśīrvādaḥ*, 172 *ṛtuśāntisūktāni*, 185 *payahaḥpunyāhasāmāni*, 187 *pumsuvana-*, 192 *nāndīmukhābhīyudayaśrāddha-*, 195 *pratisarabandha-*, 196 *śimantonnayana-*, 202 *udakaśāntisāmāni*, 216 *jātakarma-*, 225 *prasūtikāḡṛhapuṇyāhavācana-*, 228 *pun्यāhasāmāni* 233 *nāmakaraṇa-*, 238 *upanīṣkrāmaṇa-*, 240 *annaprāśana-*, 242 *aṅkurārpaṇa-*, 247 *cauḷa-*, 252 *upanayana-*, 263 *pālāśayāga-*, 266 *upanayanāśīrvādaḥ*, 269 *brahmacāridharmāḥ*, 274 *utsarga-*, 277 *avakīrṇivrata-*, 280 *gaudānikavrata-*, 284 *vrātikādivrata-*, 295 *gaudānikavratasāmāni*, 298 *vrātikavratasāmāni*, 302 *ādityavrātikavratasāmāni*, 308 *aupaniṣadavratasāmāni*, 310 *aupaniṣadabrāhmaṇam* [cf. above, p. 8 n. 1], 311 *mahānāmnikaṛk*, 312 *sākvaraparvasāmāni* [ends abruptly].

Four other, much smaller prayogas have been recently published by the Jaiminīya paṇḍits T. Rājagopāla Aiyāṅgār (1970), R. Narasiṃhan (1970), and K. S. Śrīnivāsa Aiyar (1964 and n.d.).

In the preface (in Tamil) to his Jaiminīya-Prayogavivaraṇam, Raṅgasvāmi Aiyāṅgār mentions as his sources "all the texts, like the Jaiminīyagṛhyasūtra with the bhāṣyas of Bhavatrāta and Śrīnivāsādhvarin, the Taruṇāgnihoṭrikārikā, and the Anukramaṇikā". In addition comes, of course, the tradition of the actual performance.

In 1968 I pointed out a reference to a commentary by Bhavatrāta on the JGS in Jayanta's verses at the end of Bhavatrāta's JŚS-vṛtti; last year brought to light not only Raṅgasvāmi's confirmation but even manuscripts. If the quality of this commentary is of the same standard as that of Bhavatrāta's vṛtti on the Śrautasūtra, there is every reason to publish it. In fact, the amount of other new material now available on the JGS would call for a new edition of the text, for it also comprises not only new Mss. of the

text and Śrīnivāsa's commentary, but even other previously unknown ancillary treatises: the Taruṇāgnihotrikārikā (mentioned by Raṅgasvāmi Aiyāṅgār, and extant in Mss.), the Jaiminīyagr̥hyasūtrakārikā by Bālāgnihotrin (different from the preceding), and the Jaiminīyagr̥hya(prayoga)-kārikā by Vinatānanda or Vainateyakārikā, as well as Jaiminīyagr̥hyaprayoga and Prayogasāra by the last mentioned author — I have not yet been able to make out whether these three are different works, nor whether the Jaiminīyagr̥hyaprayogaratnamālā (in the Madras Government Oriental Mss. Library) is identical with any of them (on a 'fly leaf' the last mentioned text bears the title Śrīnivāsakārikai); further, there is an anonymous Jaiminīyagr̥hyamantravṛtti, and a collection of palm-leaf manuscripts with prayogas on all the saṃskāras, with titles such as (*Jaimuni* [!]) *sāma upanayanam*, ~ *vivāham*, ~ *ekādaśe 'hani vidhi, aparam*, etc.

4. Śrauta texts

Caland's pupil Dieuke Gaastra published as her thesis in 1906 the Śrautasūtra of the Jaiminīyas [JŚS], as it was available in two Mss. of the Burnell collection. This text, which she also translated into Dutch and furnished with an introduction and a word index, has an archaic character. But strangely it was much shorter than the other Sāmavedic Śrautasūtras, dealing mainly with the agniṣṭoma sacrifice only; indeed, it was called in one of the Mss. *agniṣṭomasya jaiminisūtram*. A short kārikā on the agniṣṭoma according to the Jaiminīya śākhā that was also available in the Burnell collection, and printed by Gaastra as an appendix, was practically the only accessory material that she could use. In addition came only — apart from the other Jaiminīya and parallel texts of the other schools — a few quotations, mainly in Dhanvin's commentary on the Drāhyāyaṇa-Śrautasūtra.

Gaastra pointed out that the text forms a rounded whole, and that the repetition of the last word at the end shows it to be no fragment only. Yet, "it is quite possible that more texts have existed on the śrauta ritual of the Jaiminīyas", she concluded, referring also to the mention of a Jaiminisūtra-pariśeṣa in Dhanvin on DŚS 3,4,14.

A commentary on the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra, by Bhavatrāta, was first mentioned in public by Veda Vyasa in his paper read at the Fifth All-India Oriental Conference in 1928. The text of this commentary was made accessible in print by Premñidhi Śāstri only in 1966. Although several manuscripts of the work had turned out in the meanwhile, the edition is, unfortunately, based on one single manuscript and leaves a great deal to be desired. Bhavatrāta's Vṛtti, completed by Jayanta (who was his pupil, nephew, and son-in-law), is an excellent piece of work, abounding in detailed information,

besides being very old. Bhavatrāta and his father Mātṛdatta (authors of commentaries on even Kauṣītakin and Hiraṇyakeśin texts) are praised by Daṇḍin in Avantisundarikathā. It was interesting, last year, to visit the places in Kerala where Bhavatrāta and his relatives lived, and to record many legends and traditions concerning them, still well remembered by the Nambudiris.

The Bhavatrāṭīyam, as the commentary also is called, explains not only the Agniṣṭomasūtra, but also two other lengthy and previously unknown texts, called Kalpa and Paryadhyāya, both ascribed to Jaimini. The latter is also called Pariśeṣa, and is the text quoted by Dhanvin (cf. above) with the words *tathā ca sūtrapariśeṣe jaimininoktam*. The actual sūtras of these texts are, however, not included in Bhavatrāta's work, who cites their initial and final syllables only. Shortly before Bhavatrāta's commentary was published in 1966, I detected an old and totally unknown Jaiminiya text in the descriptive catalogue of the T.M.S.S.M. Library in Thanjavur, where it had been miscatalogued as Maśaka's Kalpa and thus avoided earlier attention. I was now able to identify this as the missing sūtra text of the Kalpa and Paryadhyāya portions. A Prayogavṛtti by Candrasekhara Bhaṭṭārya, which has been preserved in the same codex together with this rather fragmentary and old manuscript, quotes passages from these texts and is very helpful in restoring parts of the missing ten folia that unfortunately are lacking in the beginning of the text manuscript. A paper on this discovery, on Bhavatrāta's Vṛtti, and on other ancillary śrauta texts of the Jaiminiyas was published in 1968. In another publication from the same year (1968a), I have dealt with the relation of the JŚS to the other Śrautasūtras of the Sāmaveda. Lāṭyāyana seems to have had access to it while composing his own sūtras, which were later slightly modified by Drāhyāyaṇa, many of his changes betraying adoption of the Jaiminiya practice. Also in the JŚS there seems to be evidence for close ties with the Baudhāyana school (Parpola 1968a, b). New manuscripts of the agniṣṭomasūtra as well as other material having become available, I have undertaken a critical edition of the entire JŚS. In spite of my intensive searches, no more manuscripts of the previously unknown sūtra portions have turned out, but of the important commentary of Bhavatrāta, which of course must be assessed in detail, there are now three new manuscripts in addition to those mentioned in 1968.

Other unpublished Jaiminiya śrauta texts, of which there are now manuscripts, are Kuraṅgarāja's Kratudīpikā, Śrīnivāsa Adhvarīndra's Ādhānapūrvāgniṣṭomaprayoga¹ and Sarvānukramaṇī (dealing with the darśapūrnāmāsa, ādhāna, agnihotra, and iṣṭiprāyaścittas), and the anonymous Ādhā-

¹ Partly published in Śrautakośa II, cf. below, p. 18.

nāgniṣṭomasāmāni, Agniṣṭomasāma, and Atirātrasāma. The Ms. Burnell 499b (Keith 1935: no. 4722) of the India Office Library motivates its giving the liturgy of the prāyaṇīya atirātra by stating that it has not been established in the Śrīnivāsiya-Prayogadīpikā nor in the Kerala-Kārikā: the latter apparently refers to the kārikā at the end of Bhavatrāta's Vṛtti on the Agniṣṭomasūtra. Finally, the Śrautādhānakriyākrama by Kumāraguruśiṣya might be a Jaiminīya text, as it follows immediately after the Jaiminīya Agniṣṭomasūtra in a codex in Trivandrum (11784).

As the Kalpa portion of the previously unknown sūtra text is the Jaiminīya counterpart of the Maśakakalpa of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas, and as the Paryadhīyāya portion includes among other things a Pratihārasūtra, ascribed to Ābhiśreṇya (instead of Jaimini), it is clear that a comprehensive knowledge of the Jaiminīya Gānas is a necessary requirement in the editing of the Śrautasūtra.

5. Saṃhitā texts

After a preliminary report in Dutch in 1906, Caland published in 1907 an account of the Jaiminīya Saṃhitā, as it was known to him from Burnell's manuscripts. This book included an abbreviated edition of the Ārcikas (recording the text of the songs), which gave the first and last words of the verses and their deviations from the corresponding Kauthuma texts. The full text was printed in devanāgarī characters by Raghu Vira in 1938 with the title, *Sāma Veda of the Jaiminīyas*. There are now many new manuscripts of the Jaiminīya Ārcikas available, both in public libraries and in private possession. A padapāṭha and a catalogue of the stobhas are still missing; the Stobhapadam in the Trivandrum library (Ms. 13753) may, however, be a Jaiminīya text.¹

Caland's *Jaiminīya Saṃhitā*, however, contains a great deal more than an edition and detailed analysis of the Ārcikas. After an important exposition of the texts of all the Sāmavedic schools (which he published in somewhat revised form again in 1931), Caland also deals with the Jaiminīya Gānas, their extent, divisions and the names of the sāmans, and the relation of the Gānas to the Ārcikas and the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Gānas. The Jaiminīya Grāmegeya-Gāna and Āraṇyaka-Gāna (making together the Pūrva- or Prakṛti-Gāna), of which there are three manuscripts in the Burnell collection, had been transcribed by Caland, who now published corrections and variant readings from the JGrG to Burnell's edition of the Jaiminīya Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa, and gave a handy index to the JĀrG. Further control of the Gānas

¹ This conjecture is based on the fact that the ms. is written in Malayālam letters, for all Kerala Sāmavedins are Jaiminīyas.

is provided by a late Jaiminīya text also found in the Burnell collection, the Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam by Sabhāpati. In one passage Sabhāpati enumerates the names of the Gāna divisions and the numbers of sāmans they comprise. This short list, reproduced by Caland (p. 20), has been our only source regarding the Uttara-Gāna until recently.

Caland did not want to publish the Gānas, because the available manuscripts showed two different kinds of musical notation, in the form of syllables, which he was unable to understand. Richard Simon, who in 1913 published an important paper on the musical notations of the Sāmaveda, explaining for the first time the syllabic notation of the Rāṇāyanīyas, could only state that the Jaiminīya notation is entirely different from that of the Rāṇāyanīyas, and gave a few specimens of it in addition to that published by Burnell in 1869. Veda Vyāsa in 1928 pointed out that there are Mss. of the Prakṛti-Gāna also in Baroda and Lahore, with the remark, "bulky volume the exact significance of which depends upon the key to its notation" (p. 297).

Even Burnell had observed the modern practice of Jaiminīya chanting (1877). Some sample recordings of the JGrG and JĀrG were made in the thirties by Arnold Bake, who in a short report (1935) noted that the text was in accordance with Caland's transcript, and that the Nambudiri way of singing is entirely different from the Sāmavedic practise elsewhere, and makes a very archaic impression.¹ Jaiminīya chant was next time recorded by J. A. B. van Buitenen in 1956 (Staal 1961: p. 67) and J. F. Staal in 1957. Staal's study *Nambudiri Veda Recitation*, which appeared in 1961, contains an analysis of all these recordings and confirms Bake's observations concerning the Nambudiri chant of Kerala. Staal proposes two chief variations in Tamilnadu, one in the Thanjavur [and Tiruchi] district[s], and another nearer to the Kerala frontier in Pālghāt and in the Tirunelveli district, even if these two last mentioned places are widely separate. Besides previously unknown technical terms used by the Jaiminīya Nambudiris, Staal also gives a list of their existing families, and the first extensive samples of the Jaiminīya Gānas, as well as an important bibliography. The examples include seven sāmans of the previously unknown Jaiminīya Uttara-Gāna, transcribed from the Nambudiri chant, giving thus an idea of its relation to the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Uttara-Gāna. Staal made further recordings in 1962, describing this field tour of his in a report published in 1963, and included samples of the Jaiminīya chant in the plate on *The Four Vedas*, which he published, with an introduction, together with John Levy in *ASCH Mankind Series* (Album No. AHM 4126).

¹ Bake's comparison of the Nambudiri Sāmaveda with the songs of the Todas was criticized in 1942-43 by V. M. Apte.

Another fruit of Staal's researches in 1962 was his publication in 1968 of "The twelve ritual chants of the Nambudiri agniṣṭoma". An introduction deals with the present-day performances of the Vedic sacrifices in South India, and some previously known technical aspects. The stotras, whose text is quoted also in their Ārcika form with references, are reproduced (without notation) in the form in which they are chanted at the sacrificial performances, with indication of the bhakti divisions, the stobhas, and the aniruktagāna. Also the viṣṭutis, modes of constructing the required number of stotra verses from a single tristich and the methods of indicating them with wooden sticks, have been explained with reference to the Kauthuma-Rāṇyāniya practice and the Nambudiri tradition, illustrated with photographs. Staal's informant Itti Ravi Nambudiri has afterwards discovered some errors in his information concerning the viṣṭutis, and given me his corrections. Also the old Jaiminiya sources explaining the viṣṭutis have in the meantime become accessible in the previously unknown last portion of the Śrautasūtra. The agniṣṭoma chants according to the Jaiminiya Sāmaveda have been published, with notation, also in the second volume of the *Śrautakośa* in 1970 by the Vaidika Saṃsodhana Maṇḍala. The sources utilized here comprise the text of the sāmans written down from his own chant by Itti Ravi, said wholly to agree with Staal's text, a manuscript of the Jaiminiya agniṣṭomaprayer kept at the Oriental Institute, Baroda [= Śrīnivāsa Adhvarin's Ādhānapūrvāgniṣṭomaprayer], and Caland's transcript of the Pūrvagāna, which was used to check the notation of the prayer.

The Jaiminiya notation has remained a mystery to most scholars. The key to it has, however, existed all the time, and was even known to Burnell and Caland, namely, the Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam by Sabhāpati. Also a text called Sāmālakṣaṇam, which belongs to the Burnell collection and has been described by Keith (1935: p. 44) as "a brief treatise explaining in Sanskrit and Tamil the notation used in the gānas of the Jaiminiya school of the Sāmaveda", was referred to, but not studied, by Caland and Staal. It is a modern gloss on the corresponding passage of the Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam. In the introduction to his JĀrṢB edition (p. xiv), Burnell actually gave the Sanskrit names of four notational syllables that had been orally explained to him, mentioning also that there are 16 simple signs. In 1962, V. Raghavan dealt in some detail with the 32 svarabhedas and the accompanying hand movements which were shown to him by a Jaiminiya Sāmavedin from Pālghāt (Koṭuntirappuḷli), who also gave him a copy of the Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam. On my visit to Koṭuntirappuḷli last year, the notation was explained to me by K. N. Sahasranāma Aiyar and K. R. Tiruveṅkaṭanātha Vādhyār, and in Śrīrangam I photographed the corresponding hand movements as shown by R. Narasiṃhan. These photographs, that will be published in due course, do

not however adequately reproduce the complicated movements, and one of the most important tasks of the immediate future is to make a movie film of the movements with accompanying sound recording. I have also traced new manuscripts of the Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam. In the Burnell collection there are also a few stray passages in addition to the above mentioned Sāmala-
kṣaṇam relating to the svarabhedas. Pending the publication of the Dhāra-
ṇalakṣaṇam and a more detailed study, it may be useful to present here the
traditional list of the svarabhedas and their names:

ka = *avarohaḥ*, *avarohaṇam*
ca = *udgamaḥ*
ṭa = *yānam*
ṭa = *āvartah*, *āvrttah*
pa = *kṣepaṇam*
ya = *marśanam*

ga = *avaruhya kṣepanam*
ja = » *marśanam*
ḍa = *udgatya kṣepaṇam*
ḍa = » *marśanam*
ba = *yātvā (sam)kṣepaṇam*

gha = » *(-abhi)marśanam*
jha = *āvartya kṣepanam*
ḍha = » *marśanam*
dha = *kṣepana-marśanayor aikyam*
bha = *mardah*, *mardanam*

kha = *anvaṅgulimarda(nam)*, *anvaṅgu-
līyam*
cha = *uccair upakramya uttānam*
ṭha = *nīcair* » »
ṭha = *(kevalam)* » »
pha = *madhyamā-aṅgulīya-avarohaḥ*

pla = *anāmikā-avarohaḥ*
ṅa = *kaniṣṭhikā-udgamaḥ*
ṅa = *anāmikā-udgamaḥ*
ṅa = *kaniṣṭhāyās samudgatya-anvaṅguli-
mardanam*
na = *yātvā-anvaṅgulimardanam*
la = *avaruhya yānam*
va = » *āvartah*
ha = *udgatya yānam*
ḷa = » *āvartah*
kra = *kruṣṭah*
sa = *tarjanī-(abhi)marśanam*
tra = *kaniṣṭhikā-(abhi)marśanam*

The order is the traditional, and the 16 basic svarabhedas have been printed in bold face. The list comprises 33 notes, though Sabhāpati makes mention of the number 32, and speaks of 16 'unyoked' and 16 'yoked' svaras. The note *ṅa* was actually not explained in Koṭuntirappuḷli, but is included in the Sāmala-
kṣaṇam and in Sabhāpati, and it would indeed be strange if this akṣara was left unused when new ones had to be created from ligatures (*kra*, etc.). Some consonants of the alphabet are reserved to indicate divisions etc.: *ṣa* is used before and *śa* after a svara to mark its end (*avasāna*) for noteless syllables (*varṇaśeṣa*), while *ra* marks the end of a *pada* (i.e., *parvan*; the vowel, if *a* is not used throughout, indicates the number of notational syllables occurring in it), and *ma* the end of a *sāman* or a *stotriyā* verse. The vowels are used to indicate numbers (*a* = 1, *ā* = 2, *i* = 3, *ī* = 4, *u* = 5, etc.)¹, which in their turn indicate the number of text syllables to which

¹ According to Wayne Howard's information the long *ṛ* is excluded, and the anusvāra and the visarga preceded by the short *a* are added at the end, which makes altogether 13 vowels.

the respective note belongs. The Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam actually records in this way the entire notation of the Prakṛtigāna, without citing the text (only the name and the first parvan of each sāmān is given): this hitherto unknown main portion of the work — the short text that has so far been known is only the introduction — forms thus a very valuable complement to the Gāna mss., where particularly the musical notation has presented difficulties. The latter give the notation either separately after each parvan, or place the notes under the respective text syllables. Following the latter system, I give below as a specimen¹ the first sāmān (*gautamasya parkaḥ*) of the JGrG²:

o	gnā	i	/	ā	yā	hi	vā	i	/				
ta	ta	śa	ri		thya		cā	śa	ri				
							(<i>cya</i>)						
tā	yā	i	tā	yā	i	/	gr̥	ṇā	no	ha	vyā	dā	/
	<i>ṭya</i>			<i>ṭi</i>	<i>śa</i>	<i>ri</i>		<i>cya</i>	<i>śa</i>			<i>ci</i>	<i>ri</i>
								(<i>cā</i>)					
tā	yā	i	tā	yā	i	/	nā	i	ho	tā	/		
	<i>ṭya</i>			<i>ṭi</i>	<i>śa</i>	<i>ri</i>			<i>ki</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>rā</i>		
sā	tsā	i	bā	au	ho	vā	/	hī	ṣī	//	l	//	
<i>ṭa</i>	<i>ṭa</i>		<i>khya</i>			<i>śi</i>	<i>rī</i>	<i>kha</i>	<i>śa</i>	<i>rā</i>	<i>ma</i>		
	(<i>ṭya</i>)		(<i>khā</i>)										

Sabhāpati gives also indications of the number of 'tremblings' (*cakita*), pitch, and length of the various svarabhedas. A detailed decipherment of the notation must be based on comparison of the Gāna notation with the oral tradition in its Tamil variation. This notation and the hand movements were unknown to Bhavatrāta, who only mentions the six tones (*kruṣṭa*, *prathama*, *dvitīya*, *ṭṛtīya*, *catūrtha* and *mandra*) and a simple way to indicate them with the fingers (JŚS Vṛtti, p. 258). Even today, the system of hand indications prevailing in Kerala is much simpler than the one used by the Tamil Jaiminīyas, as will appear from a description to be published elsewhere with photograph illustrations: in Kerala the entire hand is swung up and down apparently

¹ Many sāmāns with the musical notation have been printed in A. Raṅgasvāmi Aiyāṅgār's *Jaiminīya-Prayogavivaraṇam*, and in *Śrautakośa* II.

² Cf. Burnell 1869: p. 49, and Staal 1961: p. 76 and 84. As regards the *variae lectiones*, I am omitting here obvious blunders, but have recorded those showing that the long *ā* can also be written by ligaturing the consonant with *ya*: *cā* = *cya*, etc. (thus also orally explained to Howard). For the vowels of the *rephas*, I have no authority beyond the first three recorded by Burnell l.c., and in the second parvan I am emending the text by excluding *ca* before *cā/cya* against all the sources.

to mark the pitch, and a finger code only marks the visarga and other textual details about which there could be doubt.¹ Another means of understanding the Tamil notation is a comparison with the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyaṇīya notation, provided that in the oral tradition the sāmans compared are approximately alike.²

A plan to edit the Jaiminīya Gānas brought J. F. Staal for the third time in 1970—71 and me for the first time in 1971 to India. The main aim was the recovery of material on the Uttara-Gānas. It turned out that Śrī Itti Ravi Nambudiri, who had been the main Jaiminīya informant in Kerala of both Bake and of Staal on his previous tours, knew only part of the text, and that the man who knew the rest had died recently. However, with the tape-recorder presented to him by Staal, Itti Ravi has subsequently recorded the entire text that he has reconstructed with the help of his pupils. The recordings of the Uttara-Gāna, comprising fifty hours, have been bought this year jointly by the Department of Philosophy of the University of California at Berkeley and the Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies in Copenhagen. Even the Pūrva-Gāna has recently been recorded in its entirety by Itti Ravi and a pupil of his for E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma.

Manuscripts of the Gānas, including the Uttara, are also available: Itti Ravi and one of his pupils have written down (without the svaras) the chant from their memory. The Uttara-Gāna consists, according to Itti Ravi, of the Ūha-Gāna comprising 8 *pattus* [= Skt. *daśatis*] divided into 77 *ōttus* and making together 812 sāmans, 509 of which are on tristichs and 303 on single verses, and of the Ūṣāṇi, the secret chants, in 16 *ōttus* comprising together 159 sāmans. If we compare these figures with the information of the Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam, we notice a great difference, for according to Sabhāpati the Ūham comprises 1802 sāmans and the Rahasyam 356 sāmans, which together with the 1523 sāmans of the Prakṛti make the grand total of 3681 sāmans. The number of the sāmans of the Prakṛti-Gāna is almost the same in Kerala.³

¹ The system resembles that of the Vājasaneyins described in the Śikṣās and by J. E. B. Gray (1959: p. 510 f.).

² An illustration may be useful. Without checking the oral tradition, I have compared the notations of a few sāmans in the beginning of the Grāmegeyagāna: *avaroha* corresponds with a 'descent' (from the *prathama* to the *dvitīya* tone) in the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyaṇīya notation, *udgama* with an 'ascent' (from the *dvitīya* to the *prathama*); *yāna* could be 'going' forth on the same tone, *āvarta* 'turning' from one tone to another and back again several times (*caturtha* and *pañcama* in my examples), while *kṣepaṇa* seems to correspond to a temporary descent from a prakṛti tone to a vikṛti tone (2₃2) and *marśana* to a similar ascent (2₁2), and *anvaṅgulimarda* (in which the thumb glides over the first joints of the pointer and the following fingers) is paralleled by the *svāra* (e.g., 3₂₃₄₅).

³ I cannot give here the details, but would like to point out in passing some interesting

However, if 509 is multiplied by three for the tristichs, as one should according to Itti Ravi, the Ūha-Gāna comprises in Kerala 1821 sāmans.

From the house of Itti Ravi's neighbour in Paññāl I discovered a palm leaf manuscript of an Ūhaprastāva, which provides useful means of control. It is most fortunate that two manuscripts of the Uttara-Gāna, with the syllabic notation, have been preserved in Tamilnadu where the living tradition is restricted to a small selection of sāmans. It may be hoped that these manuscripts will soon become accessible. As there also are several new manuscripts of the Pūrva-Gāna, too, in the libraries of Hoshiarpur, Baroda (three Mss., one including also the beginning of the Ūha-Gāna), and Trivandrum, as well as in the private libraries of the Jaiminīyas in South India, there is indeed a happy contrast between the situation now and Staal's statement in 1961: "the only known manuscripts of the J GG and ĀrG are Burnell's B 497 and B 61—62 in the India Office Library . . . No manuscripts of the J UG and RG are known to be available" (p. 74). In the edition of the Gānas also the lakṣaṇagranthas compiled in recent years by Itti Ravi would be useful, while the information concerning the sāmans and the Gānas which is comprised in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa and the śrauta texts is of the greatest importance.

6. History of the Jaiminīya śākhā

Burnell collected his manuscripts from the Thanjavur, Tiruchirappalli and Tirunelveli districts of the present Tamilnadu,¹ while Veda Vyāsa's agents were active in Kerala. Bake recorded samples from Tirunelveli and Kerala. Raghavan (1957 and 1962) has given important information on the geographical distribution of the Jaiminīya school, including a traditional list of villages, supplied to him by informants in Śrīrangam, and supplemented this by his own observations on the textual evidence relating to their history. K. Rāmavarma Rāja in 1910 noted that in Kerala "the Sāmaveda is, indeed, confined to a dozen or two households only, all of which belong to the school of the Jaiminīyas" (p. 630); Staal (1961) communicated details supplied by Itti Ravi (p. 86). Some epigraphic references to the Talavakāra school have been collected by Veda Vyāsa (1930) and Renou (1947), who also deals with variations in the division of the Ārcikas. In Kerala the sixth and seventh khaṇḍa of the third kāṇḍa (the bṛhati section of the Aindram) comprise nine and eleven verses respectively, and not ten each, as in Caland's edition, and similarly in two other cases; the khaṇḍas are numbered consecutively throughout, and in the latter part of the Dvādaśāham and in the Uttaram there are many cases where a number of khaṇḍas in Caland's edition have been joined into one large khaṇḍa; the Āraṇyakam is curiously placed in the Uttara Ṛk, between the Dvādaśāham and the Uttaram portions.

¹ Oppert (1880—85) has in his lists of the manuscripts in the private libraries of South India given also some valuable details: cf. Rau 1953.

the Caraṇavyūha and the Purāṇic genealogies (cf. also Tsuji 1948). One of my major objectives last year was, apart from tracing oral tradition and manuscripts, the collection of whatever detailed information was available on the distribution, history and practices of the Jaiminīya school. Many names of individuals, their genealogies etc. covering the most recent time, and place names and local legends were assembled, but this material should be supplemented by an assessment of the sthalapurāṇas and the inscriptions of the places traced. Here I shall only state that the traditions of Kerala and Tamilnadu represent two separate branches that have stayed apart in their nucleus areas well over a thousand years. In Tamilnadu this nucleus area is the Cōla country (with the temples of Chidambaram, Thanjavur and Śrīrangam as the great centres), the communities in Tirunelveli (attested epigraphically in the 16th century) and in Pālghāt representing emigrations from this area. So far the Jaiminīyas have not been traced outside Kerala and Tamilnadu (excepting very recent emigration); E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma has, however, communicated to me a reference to Mysore that awaits checking.

This picture emerging from historical material agrees with and confirms the musicological analyses so far done. The history of the Jaiminīya school, the relations of the Jaiminīyas and their subgroups to the other branches of the Sāmaveda, and particularly the musical notation of the Tamil Jaiminīyas can soon be expected to receive new light from this direction. Last year extensive recordings of as many different Jaiminīya singers as possible, along with representatives of other Vedic schools throughout India, were collected for a musicological analysis by Wayne Howard of the Indiana University who also made an independent study of the hand movements. It is indeed a most fortunate thing to have a musicologist working on the Sāmaveda. He will have much to do. — In February 1973 Howard informs me that he has over 250 pages of musical transcriptions of Sāmavedic chanting ready. He has kindly placed at my disposal his information on the hand movements (*kai-lakṣaṇa*) as explained in Koṭuntirappuḷḷi, and sent me also other material: besides the list of his recordings (1972) and copies of all Jaiminīya (and some other) recordings, I now have from him a transcription of Itti Ravi's recording of the *gautamasya parkaḥ* and an analysis of its tonal patterns, as well as a collection of examples of the *udgama* svāra. "It is quite evident that more than one musical phrase may be associated with the symbol *ca* (or *cā*, *ci* etc.). Moreover, this is true of most or all of the symbols", he writes. Yet with one exception (the note remains the same) there is in all these examples an ascent from a lower note to a higher. Moreover, a too accurate transcription may also be somewhat misleading. I have examined Howard's tonal patterns for the first parvan of Itti Ravi's *gautamasya parkaḥ*, for my material on the hand movements (cf. above, p. 20 f.) relates

to this very bit and provides an external check. Howard has already noted that the tonal patterns of *gnā* resemble those of *o*, as indeed the corresponding hand movements are identical. In fact both bear the notational syllable *ta*, and my feeling is that we can establish a full concord between them and the hand movements of this *vacana*, which according to Itti Ravi are subdivided into 4 (*ādisvara*) + 12 + 12 units, if we simplify the notation and take into account the variations of the several different recordings (reproduced by Staal 1961: p. 84). I would suggest the following scheme for this parvan, marking the highest note with 1, the next lower note with 2, and a low note of broader scale with 4, the length of the note with italics, and a wavering tone of optional length with lower case numbers:

I 42	II 42	III 42	IV 42
V 1412 ₁₂₁₂ . .	VI 1412	VII 142	
VIII 1412 ₁₂₁₂ . .	IX 1412	X 142	
XI 1412 ₁₂₁₂ . .	XII 1412	XIII 142	
XIV 1412 ₁₂₁₂ . .	XV 1412	XVI (2) avasāna	
XVII–XXVII = V–XVI			

II. SYNOPSIS OF THE EXTANT JAIMINĪYA LITERATURE
TRACED BY 1972

In the following systematic list an attempt is made to record the names of the texts (and their main divisions) as they are found in the manuscripts or texts, or used by the present-day Jaiminīyas. Viewing the entire corpus, it seems fairly complete, there being at least some ancient text on all the obligatory Sāmavedic topics. Future accessions of new titles of primary importance can therefore hardly be anticipated. Yet for instance a pada-pāṭha might turn out; all newly found prayogas and lakṣaṇagranthas have not yet been examined, either.

1. Saṃhitā texts

<i>Ṛk [Ārcika]</i>	<i>Sāma [Gāna]</i>
<p><i>Prakṛti ṛcaḥ</i></p> <p>[<i>Chanda ārcika</i>]</p> <p><i>Āgneyam</i></p> <p><i>Aindram</i></p> <p><i>Tadvo</i></p> <p><i>Bṛhatī</i></p> <p><i>Asāvi</i></p> <p><i>Indrapuccha</i></p> <p><i>Pavamānam</i></p>	<p><i>Prakṛtisāma, (Yoni-)Chandas [Pūrva-Gāna]</i></p> <p><i>Grāmageya-Gāna</i></p> <p><i>Āgneyam</i></p> <p><i>Aindram</i></p> <p><i>Tadvo</i></p> <p><i>Bṛhatī</i></p> <p><i>Asāvi</i></p> <p><i>Indrapuccha</i></p> <p><i>Pavamānam</i></p>
<p><i>Āraṇam, Āraṇyakam</i></p>	<p><i>Āraṇam, Āraṇyaka(-Gānam), Candrasāmāni¹</i></p> <p><i>Vrata-parvan</i></p> <p><i>Arka-parvan</i></p> <p><i>Dvandva-parvan</i></p> <p><i>Śukriya-parvan</i></p>

¹ Could this name prevalent in Kerala (cf. Staal, 1961: p. 85) be a corruption from *chandasyāni* (contrasted with *ūhasāmāni* in Bhavatrāta's JŚS Vṛtti, p. 83)? Itti Ravi could not explain the name.

<i>Ṛk</i> [<i>Ārcika</i>]	<i>Sāma</i> [<i>Gāna</i>]
(as <i>pariśiṣṭas</i> : <i>śakvaryaḥ</i> or <i>mahānāmnyaḥ</i> , with <i>purīṣapadāni</i>)	(as <i>pariśiṣṭas</i> : <i>Śākvara-parvan</i> <i>Aupaniṣadaṃ parva</i> (incl. <i>gāyatram</i>)
<i>Uttara ṛk</i> [<i>Prākṛtam</i>] <i>Gāyatram</i> <i>Agniṣṭomaḥ</i> <i>Atirātraḥ</i> <i>Prathamam . . . daśamam ahaḥ</i> ¹ [<i>Vaikṛtam</i>]	<i>Uttara-sāma</i> [<i>Uttara-Gāna</i>] <i>Ūham, Ūha-Gānam</i> <i>Dvādaśāham</i> <i>Ekāham</i> <i>Ahīnam</i>
	<i>Ūṣāṇi, (Ūha-)Rahasyam</i>

Later texts:

Dhāraṇalakṣaṇam by Sabhāpati

Ūhaprastāvam

Recent lakṣaṇagranthas: *Sāmalakṣaṇam* etc. and those by Itti Ravi Nambudiri

2. Brāhmaṇa texts

<i>Śātyāyanakam</i> , <i>Śātyāyani-Brāhmaṇam</i> [quotations only]	<i>Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇam</i> , <i>Talavakāra-Brāhmaṇam</i> , <i>Sāma-Brāhmaṇam</i>
	<i>Mahābrāhmaṇam</i> <i>Agnihotri</i> (1,1–65) <i>Agniṣṭomam</i> (1,66–364) <i>Dvādaśāham</i> (3,1–386) <i>Mahāvratam</i> (2,1–80.371–442) <i>Ekāham</i> (2,81–234) <i>Ahīnam</i> (2,235–333) <i>Satram</i> (2,334–370)

¹ Instead of *pañcamam* (etc. up to *daśamam*) *ahaḥ*, Caland's edition records the titles as *pañcamo* (etc.) '*dhyāyāḥ*'.

(*Śālyāyanī Gāyatrasya*) *Upaniṣad*(-*Brāhmaṇam*)
includes: *Kena-* or *Talavakāra-Upaniṣad*

Ārṣeyam

Later texts: Jayanta's *Vṛtti* on the Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa

3. Śrauta texts

Śrautasūtra, Kalpasūtra, Kalpabrāhmaṇam

(*Agniṣṭomasya Jaimini-*)*Sūtram*

Kalpa

Stomakalpa

(*Sāmakalpa*)

Prakṛtikalpa, Prākṛta

Samjñā(kalpa)

Vikṛtikalpa, Vaikṛta

Paryadhyāya, Pariśeṣa

(includes, i.a., rules of chanting [cf. LSS 6,9–7,8],

Pratihārasūtra by *Ābhiśrenya*,

Gavām ayanam, incl. *mahāvratam*,

Viṣṭutis)

Later texts: *Jaiminīyaśrautasūtrabhāṣya* by Bhavatrāta (and Jayanta),
Bhavatrāṭiyam, etc.

includes: *Agniṣṭomakārikā*, by Bhavatrāta, copied by Mādhava,
(= *Keraḷakārikā*?, cf. above, p. 16)

Prayogavṛtti by Candrasekhara Bhaṭṭārya Pañcāgni

Vainateyakārikā by Vinatānanda

Ādhānapūrvāgniṣṭomaprayoga by Śrīnivāsa Adhvarīndra

Prayogadīpikā » »

Sarvānukramaṇī » »

Kratudīpikā by Kuraṅgarāja

(*Śrautādhānakriyākrama* by Kumāraguruśiṣya?)

Ādhānāgniṣṭomasāmāni

Agniṣṭomasāma

Atirātrasāma

[*Prāyaṇīyātirātrakalpa*]

4. *Gṛhya texts*

Jaimini-(-Gṛhya)-Sūtram

Pūrvam (on domestic ritual)

[*Uttaram* (thus Caland) or *Aparam* (generally used of *pitṛmedha* texts)]
(mainly on burial and ancestor worship; includes chapters on omens
and planet worship not commented upon in Śrīnivāsa's commentary)

Later texts:

Jaiminīyagṛhyasūtrabhāṣya by Bhavatrāta

Jaiminisūtravyākhyā Subodhinī by Śrīnivāsa Adhvarin

Taruṇāgnihotrikārikā

Jaiminigr̥hyasūtrakārikā by Bālāgnihotrin

Jaiminigr̥hya(prayoga)kārikā by Vinatānanda, *Vainateyakārikā*

Jaiminigr̥hyaprayoga »

Prayogasāra »

Jaiminigr̥hyaprayogaratnamālā by Vinatānanda, or Śrīnivāsa Adhvarin?

Jaiminīyagṛhyamantravṛtti

Palm-leaf prayogas from Tamilnadu (*Jaimunisāma upanayanam*, etc.)

Palm-leaf prayogas from Kerala (seen but not examined)

Jaiminīyaprayogavivaraṇam by A. Raṅgasvāmi Aiyāṅgār

Recently printed prayogas (p. 13)

III. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

I. Publications

Abbreviations:

- BSOAS = *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*
IJ = *Indo-Iranian Journal*
JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JRAS = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
MededAkadAmst. = *Verlagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde*
MSS = *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*
SVS = *Sarasvati Vihara Series*
VerhAkadAmst. = *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde*
WZKM = *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

- AIYANĠĀR, T. RĀJAGOPĀLA, 1970, *Jaiminisāma (talavakāraśākhināṃ) sandhyāvandanaprayogaḥ* [in Sanskrit and Tamil], Śrīraṅgam; printed also anonymously with the title *Jaiminīyasandhyāvandanam (yajñopavitadhāraṇavidhiḥ pariṣecanavidhiś ca)* [excludes the preface, *brahmayajñaprayogam* and *amāvāsyatarpaṇam* of the first mentioned edition].
- AIYANĠĀR, A. RAṆGASVĀMI, 1923, *Śrī-Jaiminīya-prayoga-ivaraṇam*, 8 fasc. [in Sanskrit and Tamil], Kumbakonam.
- AIYAR, K. S. ŚRĪNIVĀSA, 1964, *Jaiminisāmaveda trikālasandhyāvandanam samidādhānam ādityanamaskāram mutalāyava* [in Malayalam characters], Pālghāt.
- , n.d., *Jaiminīya śrāddhaprayogaḥ* [ditto], Pālghāt.
- APTE, V. M., 1942—3, "Sound-records of sāmāgānas. A prospect and retrospect", *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 4, p. 296—314.
- BAKE, ARNOLD A., 1935, "The Practice of Sāmaveda", *Proceedings of the seventh All-India Oriental Conference*, p. 143—155, Baroda.
- BHANDARKAR, R. G., 1893, "History of Child Marriage", *ZDMG* 47, p. 143 ff.
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE, 1906, *A Vedic Concordance*, (Harvard Oriental Series, 10), Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- BODEWITZ, HENK W., 1969, "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo . . .* (JB 1,18; 1,50; KauṣUp 1,2)", *XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 27. Juli 1968 in Würzburg, Vorträge*, hrsg. von Wolfgang Voigt (ZDMG, Supplementa I), Teil 3, p. 843—848.
- , 1973, *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1—65*. Translation and commentary, with a study: *Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*, (Diss. Utrecht; *Orientalia Rheno-Trajectina*, 17), Leiden.

- BURNELL, ARTHUR COKE, 1869, *Catalogue of a collection of Sanskrit manuscripts*, Part I, Vedic manuscripts, London.
- , 1876, *The Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa (being the fourth Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda)*, The Sanskrit text (transcription) edited together with extracts from the commentary of Sāyaṇa, introduction and index of words, Mangalore.
- , 1877, [a letter], *The Academy* 12, p. 317, col. 3 (Sept. 29).
- , 1878a, *The Jaiminīya text of the Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*, edited in Sanskrit, Mangalore.
- , 1878b, *A Legend from the Talavakāra or Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma-Veda*, Mangalore. Reprinted in: *Atti del Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti*, Vol. II, p. 97—111, Firenze 1881, and in: *The Indian Antiquary* 13 (1884), p. 16—21.
- , 1879, "A New Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma Veda", *The Academy* 15, p. 126, col. 2—3 (Feb. 8).
- , 1881, [a letter], *The Academy* 20, p. 496, col 2 (Dec. 31).
- CALAND, WILLEM, 1905, *De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminīyagrhyasūtra*, (Verh-AkadAmst., Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 6, No. 2), Amsterdam.
- , 1906, "Eene onbekende recensie van den Sāmaveda", *MededAkadAmst.*, 4 Reeks, Deel 7, p. 300—304.
- , 1907, *Die Jaiminīya-Saṃhitā mit einer Einleitung über die Sāmavedaliteratur*, (Indische Forschungen, 2), Breslau.
- , 1914, "Emendationen zum Jaiminīya-brāhmaṇa", *WZKM* 28, p. 61—77.
- , 1915, "Over en uit het Jaiminīya-brāhmaṇa", *MededAkadAmst.*, 5 Reeks, Deel 1, p. 1—106.
- , 1919, *Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl*, (VerhAkadAmst., Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 19, No. 4), Amsterdam.
- , 1920, "Brāhmaṇa- en Sūtra-aanwinsten", *MededAkadAmst.*, 5 Reeks, Deel 4, p. 461—498 (p. 475 f.).
- , 1922, *The Jaiminīyagrhyasūtra belonging to the Sāmaveda*, with extracts from the commentary edited with an introduction and translated for the first time into English, (The Punjab Sanskrit Series, 2), Lahore.
- , 1931, *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, The Brāhmaṇa of twenty-five chapters*, translated, (Bibliotheca Indica, Work 255), Calcutta.
- CHINTAMANI, T. R., 1931, "The Śāṭyāyana Brāhmaṇa", *Journal of Oriental Research* 5, p. 296—298.
- COLEBROOKE, HENRY THOMAS, 1805, "On the Védas or Sacred Writings of the Hindus", *Asiatic Researches* 8, p. 369—476.
- FRENZ, ALBRECHT, 1966, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, (Diss. Marburg), Marburg.
- GAASTRA, DIEUKE, 1906, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het vedische ritueel. Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra*, (Diss. Utrecht), Leiden.
- GAMPERT, V., 1958, [Review of Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, 1954], *Archiv Orientalní* 26, p. 170.
- GHOSH, BATAKRISHNA, 1935, *Collection of the Fragments of lost Brāhmaṇas*, Calcutta.
- GRAY, J. E. B., 1959, "An Analysis of Nambudiri Ṛgvedic Recitation and the Nature of the Vedic Accent", *BSOAS* 22, p. 499—530.
- HOFFMANN, KARL, 1960a, "Textkritisches zum Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa", *IJ* 4: 1, p. 1—36.
- , 1960b, "Ved. ucchvaṅkā-, ucchlaṅkhā-, Pāli ussaṅkha-", *IJ* 4: 2—3, p. 111—118.
- , 1965—6, "JB. vanākakṣāh", *IJ* 9: 3, p. 199—202.

- », 1970, "Die Weltentstehung nach dem Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", MSS 27, p. 59—67.
- HOPKINS, EDWARD WASHBURN, 1905, "The Fountain of Youth", JAOS 26: 1, p. 1—67.
- HOWARD, WAYNE, 1972, "Catalogue of Recordings made in India by Wayne Howard, December 1970 — December 1971, Fulbright-Hays Grant" [Xerocopy].
- JANERT, KLAUS LUDWIG, 1965, *An Annotated Bibliography of the Catalogues of Indian Manuscripts*, Part 1, (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 1), Wiesbaden.
- KEITH, ARTHUR BERRIEDALE, 1920, [Review of Caland, 1919], BSOAS 1: 4, p. 176—180.
- », 1932, [Review of Caland, 1931], JRAS 1932, p. 697—700.
- », 1935, *Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakṛit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, Vol. 2, Brahmanical and Jaina Manuscripts, Oxford.
- KUIPER, F. B. J., 1957, "Ucch(1)añkha-, m., Jaim. Br. II. 370³", IJ 1: 4, p. 311.
- LOKESH CHANDRA, 1949, "The Cyavana-Vidanvat legend in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa", JAOS 69, p. 84—86.
- », 1950, *Jaiminiya Brahmana of the Samaveda II. 1—80 (Gavamayana)*, (Diss. Utrecht; SVS 21), Nagpur.
- », 1955, "Brāhmaṇica", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 35, p. 67—72 (also separately, Nagpur 1955); also in: *Summary of Papers, Sixteenth All-India Oriental Conference*, p. 233—235, Lucknow 1951.
- »: see Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra.
- NARASIMHAN, R., 1970, *Śrī Jaimini Sāmaveda amāvāsyādi tarpaṇa vidhi, Śrīraṅgam*.
- OERTEL, HANNS, 1893, "Extracts from the Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa, parallel to passages of the Ṣatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and Chāndogya-Upaniṣad", JAOS 15, p. 233—251.
- », 1896, "The Jaiminiya or Talavakāra Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa: Text, translation, and notes", JAOS 16, p. 79—260.
- », 1897, "Contributions from the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa Literature. First Series: Parallel passages from the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa to fragments of the Čālyāyana Brāhmaṇa", JAOS 18: 1, p. 15—48.
- », 1898, "Contributions . . . Second Series: I. Saramā and the Paṇis, II. The Ritual of Burial according to the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, III. Indrasya kilbiṣāṇi", JAOS 19: 2, p. 97—125.
- », 1899, "[Contributions . . . Third Series:] The Jaiminiya Brahmana version of the Dirghajihvi legend", *Actes du onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes, Paris 1897*, Sect. 1, p. 225—239, Paris.
- », 1902, "Contributions . . . Fourth Series: Specimens of verbal correspondances of the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa with other Brāhmaṇas", JAOS 23: 2, p. 325—349.
- », 1905, "Contributions . . . Fifth Series: I. Indra in the guise of a woman (JB.ii. 78), II. A Greek parallel to a Hindu popular belief, III. The legend of Svarbhānu (JB. i. 80—81), IV. Indra, in the guise of a monkey, disturbs the sacrifice (JB.i. 363), V. The Lex talionis in the other world. (A parallel to JB.i. 43.)", JAOS 26: 1, p. 176—196.
- », 1906, "Additions to the Fifth Series of Contributions from the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (JAOS xxvi. 176 ff.)", JAOS 26: 2, p. 306—314.
- », 1907, "Contributions . . . Sixth Series: The story of Uśanas Kāvya, the three-headed Gandharvan, and Indra", JAOS 28:1, p. 81—98.
- », 1909, "Contributions . . . Seventh Series: I. Prajāpati creates the worlds. (JB.i. 357—358), II. Ceremonies connected with the atirātra sacrifice. (JB.i. 208—213), III. Why the mule is barren. (JB.i. 67), IV. The contest of Indra with Tvaṣṭr's

- son. (JB.ii. 153—157), V. Prajāpati creates the four castes. (JB.i. 68—69), Index", *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 15, p. 155—216.
- », 1926, *The Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Brāhmaṇas*, I. The Disjunct Use of Cases, (Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1: 18), Heidelberg.
- », 1934—35, "Roots and Verb-forms from the Unpublished Parts of the Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *Journal of Vedic Studies* 1: 2, p. 129—168; 2: 2, p. 121—195; also numbered consecutively, pp. 1—115.
- », 1951a, "Volkstümliche Erzählungsmotiven im Jaiminiyabrāhmaṇa", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 69, p. 26—28.
- », 1951b, "Ai. *vilābā* für *vaḍabā* und *vāgarā* für *vāgurā*", *ibid.* 69, p. 29—30.
- OPPERT, GUSTAV, 1880—85, *Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of Southern India*, compiled, arranged, and indexed, I—II, Madras.
- PARPOLA, ASKO, 1968a, *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries. An English translation and study*, I: 1, General Introduction and Appendices to Vol. I, (Diss. Helsinki; Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 42: 2), Helsinki.
- », 1968b, "On the Jaiminiyaśrautasūtra and Its Annexes", *Orientalia Suecana* 16 (1967), p. 181—214.
- RAGHAVAN, V., 1949—, *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, 1—, (Madras University Sanskrit Series, 18, 26, 28—31,—) Madras.
- », 1957, "Present position of Vedic chanting and its future", *Bulletin of the Institute of Traditional Cultures (Madras)*, 1957, p. 48—69.
- », 1962, *The present position of Vedic recitation and Vedic saḥkas*, Kumbhakonam.
- RAGHU VIRA, 1937, *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda, Book I*, edited, (SVS 2), Lahore.
- », 1938, *Sāma-Veda of the Jaiminiyas*, edited, (SVS 3), Lahore.
- RAGHU VIRA and LOKESH CHANDRA, 1955, "Studies in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (Book I)", *Acta Orientalia* 22, p. 54—74; *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres*, hrsg. von Otto Spies, (Bonner orientalische Studien, Neue Serie, 3), Bonn 1955, p. 255—276.
- », 1954, *Jaiminiya-Brahmana of the Samaveda*, Complete text critically edited for the first time, (SVS 31), Nagpur.
- RAJA, K. RAMAVARMA, 1910, "The Brahmins of Malabar", *JRAS* 1910, p. 625—639.
- RĀMA DEVA, 1921, *The Jaiminiya or Talavakara Upanishad Brahmana*. Devanagari text with indexes. Prepared from the edition, in Roman script of Shri Hanns Oertel. With an introduction on the history of Samaveda literature, by Bhagavad Datta, (Dayānanda Mahāvīdyālaya Samskr̥ta-granthamālā, 3), Lahore.
- RAṄGĀCĀRYA, KASTŪRI, 1898, *Jaiminiḡrhyasūtram. Śrīnivāsāddhvarikṛtasubodhiny-ākhyavyākhyāsahitam*, pariṣkr̥tam, Madras.
- RAU, WILHELM, 1953, [Review of Lokesh Chandra, 1950], *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 1953: 5/6, col. 273—275.
- », 1957, *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt*, Wiesbaden.
- », 1966, "Fünfzehn Indra-Geschichten", *Asiatische Studien* 20, p. 72—100.
- RENOU, LOUIS, 1947, *Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda*, (Cahiers de la Société Asiatique, 9), Paris.
- SASTRI, PREMĪDHĪ, 1966, *Jaiminiya-śrauta-sūtra-ṛpti of Bhavatrāta*, edited, (Śata-Piṭaka Series, 40), New Delhi.
- SCHRAPEL, DIETER, 1970a, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva und anderer lexikalisch-syntaktischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa nebst zahlreichen Textemendationen und der*

- kritischen Übersetzung von Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa 2,371—373 (Gavāmayana I)*, (Diss. Marburg), Marburg.
- »—, 1970b, "JB. madhvaṣṭhīlā svāsiktā", MSS 28, p. 105—108.
- SHARMA, BELLIKOTH RAMACHANDRA, 1967, *Jaiminīyārṣeya-Jaiminīyopaniṣad-Brāhmaṇas*, critically edited, (Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series, 5—6), Tirupati.
- SIMON, RICHARD, 1913, "Die Notationen der vedischen Liederbücher", WZKM 27, p. 305—346.
- ŚRAUTAKOŚA, 1970, Vol. II, Sanskrit Section, Part I, Agniṣṭoma with Pravargya, Poona.
- STAAL, JOHAN FREDERIK, 1961, *Nambudiri Veda Recitation*, (Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, 5), 's-Gravenhage.
- »—, 1963, "Report on Vedic rituals and recitations", *Year Book of The American Philosophical Society* 1963, p. 607—611.
- »—, 1968, "The twelve ritual chants of the Nambudiri agniṣṭoma", *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*, p. 409—429, The Hague.
- »—, 1971, "Some Vedic Survivals. Report on research done in India, Dec. 1970-March 1971, A.I.I.S. Grant" [stencilled].
- STAAL, J. F., and JOHN LEVY, n.d., *The Four Vedas*. Introduction and Notes by J. F. Staal, Recordings by John Levy and J. F. Staal, (ASCH Mankind Series, Album No. AHM 4126), New York.
- TSUJI, NAOSHIRŌ, 1948, "An outline of the extant Sāmaveda-literature. I: Saṃhitā", *Collection of Linguistic Treatises* 1, p. 1—37 [in Japanese].
- VISHVA BANDHU, 1935—1965, *Vaidika-Padānukrama-Koṣa, or A Vedic Word-Concordance*, 1—5 (The Shantakuti Vedic Series, 1—15a), Lahore and Hoshiarpur.
- VEDA VYASA, 1928, *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇam*, edited [8 pages only], Lahore.
- »—, 1930, "The literature of the Jaiminīyas", *Proceedings and Transactions of the Fifth Indian Oriental Conference November 19—22, 1928*, Vol. I, p. 292—298, Lahore.
- WHITNEY, WILLIAM DWIGHT, 1885a, "On the Jāiminīya- or Talavakāra-Brāhmaṇa", *American Oriental Society: Proceedings at Boston, May, 1883*, p. cxliv-cxlviii, in: JAOS 11; reprinted in: *The Indian Antiquary* 13 (1884), p. 21—24.
- »—, 1885b, *The Roots, Verb-forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. A Supplement to his Sanskrit Grammar, (Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken, Band II, Anhang II), Leipzig.

2. Manuscripts

Detailed enumeration and description of the manuscripts of the Jaiminīya texts must be left for a later publication. However, in the following I am giving a list — which should be fairly exhaustive — of the public libraries with Jaiminīya manuscripts (in addition come the transcribed copies by Caland kept at the Utrecht University Library). Their catalogues are accessible through Janert (1965).

Baroda: The Oriental Institute, M. S. University.

Hoshiarpur: The Viśveśvarānand Vedic Research Institute.

London: The India Office Library.

Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.

» The Government Oriental Manuscripts Library.

Mysore: The Government Oriental Library.

Thanjavur: Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library.

Trivandrum: The Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala.

