

REPRINTS
FROM
The Journal of Oriental Research
MADRAS



त म सो मा ज्यो ति र्ग म य

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS
MYLAPORE

AN APPEAL.

GENTLEMEN,

In making this appeal to you we wish to inform you that this is the **ONLY JOURNAL** in **SOUTH INDIA**, which is dedicated purely to advanced research in the field of Oriental Learning. We are receiving articles from eminent scholars all over India. Such a journal has an important place in the sphere of higher culture. Due prominence is given to all sides of Oriental Studies.

Moreover, we have undertaken the publication of many rare books which exist only in the form of manuscripts. Sanskrit renderings of *original Buddhistic works* preserved in the *Tibetan Language* are also published for the first time. A critical and readable English Translation of the "*Tolkappiyam*" with illustrations is being published. The articles published in this Journal cover the whole field of Oriental Literature—Linguistics, Philosophy, Literary Criticism, Astronomy, Dravidian Studies, Sastric Research, etc.

The Annual Subscription is fixed at **Rs. 6**, so as to be within easy reach of everybody. We request you to become subscribers and to help us in enlisting others.

Yours faithfully,

K. BALASUBRAHMANI AIYAR,

Managing Editor.

N.B. :—Orders may be sent either to

Mr. K. Balasubrahmani Aiyar, B.A., B.L.,

"The Ashrama," Luz, Mylapore.

or to

Mr. T. R. Chintamani, M.A., Ph.D.,

Manager & Correspondent,

5, North Mada Street, Mylapore, MADRAS.

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

Madras Oriental Series.

1. Vibhrama Viveka of Maṇḍanamiśra. Price As. 8.
2. Viṇāvāsavadattam (available only up to the end of the third act). Price As. 8.
3. Tolkāppiyam.—With English Notes and Translation.
Vol. I. Eluttatikāram. Price Re. 1.
Vol. II. Collatikāram. In the Press.
4. Madhyamakāvātāra of Candrakīrti,—Rendered into Sanskrit from Tebetan version. In the Press.
5. Tripādīnītinayanam of Murārīmiśra. In the Press.
6. History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and their relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit. Price Rs. 6.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SĀMAVEDA¹

W. Caland.

TRANSLATED BY

K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI, M.A.

*Professor of Indian History and Archaeology,
University of Madras.*

It is a fact that the Vedas in the main have come down to us in the condition of redactions wherein they were arranged by generation after generation from the earliest times of which we know. We know the Ṛg Veda (the Ṛk saṁhitā) only as divided into ten books, as *dāśtayaṣa ṛcaḥ*. The description, 'of ten existing', clearly referring to the above-mentioned division, occurs not only in the brāhmaṇas and sūtras belonging to the Ṛg Veda (Kauṣ. br., Śāṅkh. Śrs.), but also in the sūtras of the Sāmaveda (Lāṭy., Nidānasūtra) and of the Yajur Veda (Baudh., Āpast.). Again the division of the Sāma Veda and the Yajur Veda known to us is also known to the brāhmaṇas and the oldest sūtrakāras. Lāṭyāyana-Drāhyāyaṇa, *e.g.*, cite a sāmān from the 'dvandvas', and it is known how one of the divisions (parvans) of the āraṇyagāna bore the name dvandvaparvan, because the sāmāns were here given in pairs. From the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (II. 6. 2.) it even appears that not only was the division in three parvans known at the time of the redaction of this text, but also that the sāmāns therein were arranged in the manner that obtains in the gāna known to us. In the sūtras belonging to the Yajur Veda, we find quite a number of references to chapters (anuvākas); so the prescription often occurs that in this or that operation this or that mantra must be spoken beginning with such and such words from the saṁhitā and going 'to the end of the anuvāka.' Yes, from Baudhāyana (Śrs. X. 48) it is clear that even the numbering of the anuvākas was precisely the same as is known to us. Yet another proof

P. 2.

1. Verslagen en Mededeelingen Der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afdeeling Letter Kunde. Vierde Reeks, Negende Deel. Amsterdam. Johannes Muller, (1909) pp. 1-15.

that the Vedas have in course of time remained remarkably the same. In the tradition in which they have come down to us, the Vedas are properly speaking *disjecta membra* of one great whole. A Vedic sacrifice cannot be performed singlehanded by a follower of the Ṛg Veda or of the Yajur Veda or of the Sāma Veda. For that all the three Vedas are indispensable. Though each of the Vedas, spread over the whole extent of Hindustan, has had a more or less independent existence, it is yet the most remarkable thing to perceive how, if we join together the *disjecta membra*, a completely rounded off whole is obtained. This is clear from the reconstruction of the soma sacrifice in its simplest form, the *jyotiṣṭoma*. The texts of the Ṛg, Yajur and Sāma Veda related to this fit into each other like the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle. We are only very rarely in uncertainty as to where this or that operation must be inserted in the whole.

As now the Veda forms, from the time that it is known to us, a fairly closed and rounded whole, it is difficult to follow its earlier history and development. My studies of the texts belonging to the Sāma Veda will, I flatter myself, throw some light on the development of this Veda and clear up some points in its history that have so far remained obscure or unintelligible not only to me but to all students of this Veda. A summary of these researches, which will appear in another form elsewhere, may now follow.

The texts of the Sāma Veda, taken in the narrower sense, are:

P. 3. 1. The *Samhitā*, which contains a collection of verses mostly from the present Ṛg Veda, though at many points it presents variant readings. This *Samhitā* falls into three parts:

- (a) α the *pūrvārcika*
- β the *āraṇyakasamhitā*.
- (b) the *uttarārcika*.

2. The *gānas* or song-books, of which four have come down to us:

- (a) the *grāmageyagāna*
- (b) the *āraṇyagāna*
- (c) the *ūhagāna*
- (d) the *ūhyagāna*.

To the songs preserved in the *gānas*, the verses collected in the *Samhitā* serve as the foundation. Thus from a ṛk

(strophe) a sāmān (song) is made by the introduction of the musical notation, by certain alterations (drawing out, repetition) of the words and finally by all sorts of insertions, sometimes of more or less meaningless sounds and syllables, sometimes of entire sentences or lays (stobhas). If a Vedic student destined for a Sāma-singer wants to master his material, then he must, in addition to the songs set to music, naturally also memorise the strophes, which are as it were the 'mother's lap' (yoni) of the Sāmāns.

Now the drift of the pūrvārcika (with āraṇyaka saṁhitā) and the uttarārcika and of the first two song-books has so far been understood, though not on some points (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der Ind. Liter.* p. 143 ff.). Next to each strophe of the pūrvārcika (and the āraṇyakasaṁhitā) stands a song consisting of one part; each Sāmān carries a particular name, mostly derived from the name of the ṛṣi who had 'seen' it; the Sāmāns are preserved for us in the first two gānas. The arrangement of the yonis in the pūrvārcika is systematic; first come those dedicated to Agni, then to Indra and thirdly to Soma pavamāna; all are again grouped according to metre. The division and purport of the uttarārcika is on the other hand quite otherwise. In this part of the Saṁhitā we come across a great many stanzas of three verses (tṛcas), a fairly large number of stanzas of two verses (pragāthas), though also of more (four, six, seven, nine, ten and also of one). The purport of this collection of verses is purely practical: it is employed for singing in the many soma-sacrifices and in the melodies taught in the first two song-books. It has been observed that of most stanzas from the uttarārcika the first verse is also found in the pūrvārcika, and it is thence directly concluded that thereby it refers not only to the verse from this ārcika but also to the melody belonging to it as given in the first two song-books. To give one example: the first verse of the pragātha sv. II. 1.1.13 reads: *taṁ vo dasmaṁ ṛtūśahaṁ*; with this agrees a strophe (I.3.1.5.4) from the pūrvārcika; on this strophe are given in the grāmageyagāna five Sāmāns, of which the last is called the Naudhasa Sāma (grāmageya VI. 1. 37). Now, on the melody of this *Naudhasaṁ Sāma* must the three¹ verses, indicated in the uttarārcika as third pṛṣṭhastotra, be sung² in the jyotiṣṭoma.

P. 4.

1. By partial repetition two verses have been made three.

2. Cf. Caland-Henry, *l'agniṣṭoma* sec. 207, and cf. the Sāmāns in the Calcutta edition, pt. I, p. 487 with pt. III, p. 93.

If it is thus meant that the pūrvārcika contains some verses after whose sāmans (in grāmageyagāna and āraṇyagāna) some verse stanzas (contained in the uttarārcika) must be sung in the holy service, then we must expect: (i) that of all the stanzas (pragāthas, ṛcas, sūktas, etc.) set forth in the uttarārcika, the first verse must also occur in the pūrvārcika (or āraṇyaka-saṁhitā), so that by this indication will be decided by what melody that verse in question should be sung in the holy service, and (ii) that all song-modes, mentioned in the pūrvārcika grāmageya and āraṇyakasaṁhitā-āraṇyagāna shall also find application in the great soma-sacrifices. This, however, is decidedly not the case. Winternitz expresses himself about this as follows: "We usually assume that the uttarārcika is of later origin than the Ārcika. In favour of this supposition is the circumstance that the Ārcika knows of many 'yonis' as well as many song-modes, which do not occur in the songs of the uttarārcika, and that the uttarārcika contains many a song for which the Ārcika does not teach any song-mode. On the other hand the uttarārcika is yet a necessary complement of Ārcika: *this* is as it were the first, *that* the second course in the education of the Udgātar." The facts as stated by Winternitz being correct, the conclusion which we should draw therefrom according to him and others, *viz.*, that for the reasons stated the uttarārcika is later than the pūrvārcika, is altogether wrong as will appear presently. When I worked on the agniṣṭoma along with Victor Henry, now alas! no more, and came across the songs of the Sāma-Veda, I saw that the sāmans of the morning service (the prātaḥsavana) were found only in very late texts, the so-called prayogas, while all the songs of the midday and afternoon service (*mādhyamīnasavana*, *ṛtīyāsavana*), except one, were found in the third song-book, the ūhagāna, and that one in the fourth song-book, the ūhyagāna. What may be the reason for this? Why was it unnecessary to gather up the sāmans of the morning service in the ūhagāna, which yet seems to contain the songs as they were applied in practice? Simply because, as it seems to me after prolonged research, all the sāmans of the morning service were to be sung in the gāyatra-melody, and this melody might be supposed to be well-known. The Vedic student begins with this melody, composed in the sāvitrī metre (*tat svitur vareṇyam* etc.), and it is imparted in the Devatā-dhyāyabrāhmaṇa, while it is found as appendix to the edition of the grāmageyagāna (among the Jaiminīyas after the āraṇyagāna).

Everywhere then where in the *uttarārcika* stanzas or groups of strophes occur, of which the first is not mentioned in the *pūrvārcika*, the stanzas belong to the morning service, and no further indication of melody was necessary. Consequently, that 'the *uttarārcika* contains many songs (surely *yonis* is meant), for which the *Ārcika* (*viz.* the *pūrvārcika*) teaches no song-mode' is no ground for presuming a discord between the two texts.¹ That on the other side in the *pūrvārcika-grāmageya* (and *āraṇyakasaṁhitā-āraṇyagāna*) many *yonis* and melodies occur which have no connection with any in the *uttarārcika* is entirely correct. This is how matters stand. Besides the songs which are sung on the *yonis* of the *uttarārcika*, there were sung on numerous occasions,—*viz.*, in the placing of the sacred fire (the *agnyādheya*), in the *pravargya* ceremonial, in the *mahāvratā* and on other occasions—by the *udgātar* alone or by some of his acolytes some *sāmans*, and these (*i.e.* the *yonis* thereof) need not naturally be included in the *uttarārcika*, because they were all cut and dried and ready for the musical recitation. So also the *mahānāmnīs* which often as sung do service in the *prṣṭhastotras*. The evidence is thus lacking for our supposing that the *uttarārcika* is later than the *pūrvārcika*. And *a priori* we must expect that the *uttarārcika* is older than the *pūrvārcika*. Certainly the collected stanzas, which contain the *yonis* of the songs which are employed as a matter of fact in the rite, must be older than the collection which only serves to register the melodies, according to which the abovementioned songs were sung.

P. 6.

In the considerations urged so far, the last two song-books, the *ūha* and *ūhyagāna*, were only mentioned incidentally. Whoever desires to know something more of these turns in vain to the histories of literature. Weber alone states that they are connected with the second part of the *Samhitā*, but says: 'their reciprocal connection needs a still closer study' (*Vorles. Zur. Ind. Litt. gesch.*,² p. 70). Winternitz does not even mention the

P. 7.

1. If Winternitz himself might have expressed himself inaccurately and meant that *ūhagāna* and *ūhyagāna* contain different songs which, according to their denomination, do not occur in the first two *gānas*, even then he is wrong. Superficially judged he seems to be right, yet the denomination of the *Sāmans* of the *ūha*—and *ūhyagāna*, as given in the Calcutta edition, is sometimes wrong, sometimes jumbled.

names in his abovementioned work. Weber's remark that they are connected with the *uttarārcika* is partly correct. Before however proceeding to consider the nature of these *gānas* and their relation to the other *Sāma Veda* texts, I must say something on the *sūtras* of this *Veda*.

The *Śrautasūtra* of *Lāṭyāyana* is known and published, and now also a part of the *Drāhyāyaṇa*¹ which almost agrees with the first. The *Sāma-Vedins* possess yet a number of *sūtras*; for us only the *Maśakakalpasūtra*, the *Kṣudrasūtra* and the *Puṣpasūtra* are important. The *Maśaka-* *kalpasūtra* or *Ārṣeyakalpa* has not been so far studied: we are indebted to Weber for a detailed summary of its contents (*Verz. der Berl. Hss. deel I* under No. 297). A thorough study has taught me that this text deals with the *Soma-sacrifices* which are partly described in the *Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa* and the *Ṣadvīṃśabrāhmaṇa*, partly only mentioned, dealing in succession with the *gavāmayana*, the *ekāhas*, the *ahīnas* and the *sattras*. Now it is known that the different parts (*parvans*) into which the *ūha* as well as *ūhyagāna* are divided bear in succession, according to its contents, the names: *daśarātra*, *saṁvatsara*, *ekāha*, *ahīna*, *sattra*, *prāyaścitta* and *kṣudra*. Now the *Maśakakalpasūtra* is the driest sort of reading imaginable: it gives nearly exclusively, almost without any digression, the initial words of the couplets, on which this or that *sāman* is to be sung. All the *sāmans* mentioned in this *sūtra* occur precisely in the same order in the *ūha-* and *ūhyagāna*, now some from the first, and here and there some from the second *gāna*. As the *sāmans* mentioned in the *Maśakakalpasūtra* do not seem to contain each of the *parvans* of the two last *gānas* (but only reaching up to the *Sattra*), and thus do not comprise the so-called *prāyaścitta* and *kṣudraparvans*, I began to suspect whether the so-called *Kṣudrasūtra* of which Weber in his *Vorlesungen zur indischen Literaturgeschichte* (2nd ed. p. 92) only mentions the name and which he considers one of the latest offshoots of the *Sāma-Veda*, cannot perhaps be a text of the same kind as the *Maśakakalpasūtra*, and whether thus in this text should not be expected the practice of the *Sāmans* contained in the *prāyaścitta* and *kṣudra* books of the two last *gānas*. From the ms. of Colebrooke preserved in the India

P. 8.

1. This refers to *Paṭalas* 1-10 and 4 *sūtras* of 11 published by Dr. J. N. Reuter of Helsingfors in 1904. *Paṭalas* 11-15 have since been edited by Raghuvīra in the *Journal of Vedic Studies*, Vol. I. i. Jan. 1934, pp. 13-80,—Tr.

office it appeared that my surmise was correct, though I found at the same time that the style of this text differed in a remarkable manner from that of the Maśakakalpasūtra. Yet this text the old Hindu commentators held, as the citations show, to be an Ārṣeyakalpa.

As now the Maśakakalpasūtra and the Kṣudrasūtra, mutually connected, teach the application of the sāmans of the ūha- and ūhyagāna, pretty nearly in the order in which they are given in the two gānas, the conclusion is easily reached that these two song-books must have been known to the authors of these old sūtras, and that these gānas, wherein the sāmans were preserved which of old were applied in the rite, must be held to be the oldest, at least as older than the first two, which may be considered as a sort of index of melodies. In this opinion I am strengthened by the observation that in two places in the Maśakakalpasūtra the citations were of a peculiar style; thus all the sāmans mentioned were not indicated by their names, but by 'the sarūpa-song and the three following', 'the āśubhārgava-song and the five following.' This manner of indication was possible only when the author had this song-book before him. Yet now there arises another question: when the grāmageya- and āraṇyagāna aim at being a register of melodies arranged with the object that the sāmans therefrom were to be so sung in the holy service that the first verse of a stanza in the uttarārcika agreed with a verse of the pūrvārcika and a corresponding melody in the grāmageya or āraṇyagāna, where was the necessity for the ūha- and the ūhyagāna being put together? And on the other side: If of old the ūha- and the ūhyagāna had existed, preserving the songs for the holy service in a cut and dried manner, why then this fuss of the pūrvārcika-āraṇyakasaṁhitā with grāmageya- and āraṇyagāna? These last named texts were then to some extent superfluous. A solution of this difficulty, satisfactory in every way, has been found by a detailed study of the manner in which the sāmans are indicated in the Ārṣeyakalpa. In most cases the initial words of one or other stanza or of a verse from the uttarārcika are given, after which the name of the melody follows; without fail one finds the sāman on all verses of the stanza in question in the ūha- or the ūhyagāna. On some occasions a detailed specification is given, as e.g. Maś. K. S. IX. 9: *auśanasyarkṣu vaiśvajyotiṣam yat pra gāyateti*. The Sāman here mentioned is naturally found in our ūhagāna (XIX, 1.7, see

Sāma Veda Cal., Edn. Part III. p. 82). The words of the sūtra mean clearly: “(he sings) on the verses of the auśana sāmān the melody Vaiśvajyotiṣa, indicated by the initial words *pra gāyata*.” The verse indicated by these initial words is found only in the pūrvārcika (I. 6. 1. 5. 3), and the melody belonging to it is really the vaiśvajyotiṣa, to be found in grāmageyagāna XV. 2. 20 (B.I. part II, p. 132). The addition ‘indicated by the first words: *pra gāyata*’ was here necessary, because there are two other Sāmāns called vaiśvajyotiṣa, belonging to other yonis. If one compares the Sāmān from the ūhagāna with that from the grāmageyagāna, one finds that, excepting for some trifles, there is complete agreement between the two.

And Kṣudrasūtra I. 6 supplies a still clearer indication:

P. 10. ‘whoever wishes to find abundant means of subsistence, must sing the Kāleya Sāmān on the middle verse of the three existing verses, the stanza beginning with *indrā yāhi dhiyeṣitaḥ* being taken as first.’ The prescription leaves nothing to be desired by way of clarity, and one finds the song also with the prescribed order of verses in the ūhagāna: XXI. 2. 4. But, if this song-book had been known to the authors of the Ārṣeyakalpa, they would surely have given the prescriptions whereby they indicate the Sāmāns in another and shorter manner, and particularly would they have omitted from the last prescription the definition of the transposition of the verses. These are only two indications out of many on the basis of which we should conclude that the last two gānas are of a later time than the sūtras considered here. Also the names (prāyaścitta and kṣudra) of the last two parvans in the ūha- and ūhyagāna can be only explained on the supposition that the Kṣudrasūtra is older; the Kṣudrasūtra may have received its name in contrast with the more extensive Maśakakalpasūtra, and in the Kṣudrasūtra are also considered the prāyaścittas.

Decidedly the last two gānas are also later than the Śrauta-sūtras. That is self-evident. First these names do not occur in them even once. This nevertheless is no proof. Let us proceed. In the Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa (V. 4. 5,6) it is prescribed that the singer in the Mahāvratā must sing the Sāmān called Vasiṣṭhasya nihava on the Cātavāla, and that he must sing this on a verse directed to the Viśve devāḥ. Which verse is meant here does not appear from the words of the brāhmaṇa. The sūtra of Lāṭyāyana-Drāhyāyana therefore fills this gap (Lāṭy. III. 9. 12=

Drāhy. X, 1.11) by the provision: *viśve devā iti vasiṣṭhasya nihavam ūhet*, i.e., "he must change the vasiṣṭhasya nihava to (make ready to fit in, ūhet) the verse that begins with *viśve devāḥ*". The melody Vasiṣṭhasya nihava is composed on the verse *asāvi devaṃ gor ṛjīkam* (Sv. I. 4.1.3.1) and is found in grāmageyagāna VIII. 1.36 (Sv. Bibl. Ind. Part I, p. 629); the melody fitted on the verse *viśve devāḥ* etc. (ār. Sam. III. 9) is given in ūhagāna IX. 3.12. (Part V p. 602). Between the two sāmans there is full agreement except in the words. This passage alone is enough—one can mention still clearer proofs—to prove that the author of the Śrautasūtra did not know of the ūhagāna. The commentary at this point reads: "the words 'he must adapt (ūhet)' is aimless, because the reading (of this sāman, is known (Dhanvin naturally knew the ūhagāna !). That is indeed true, they say, but the ūha (gāna) is of a later age than this prescription." The text of the commentary, which surely has not been handed down quite correctly, must have had something like this sentence.

P. 11.

Over the question whether the ūha (by which term apparently was meant the song book known as ūh(arahas)yagāna as well as the ūhagāna known to us) was made by men or 'seen' by Ṛṣis, the old Hindus were already divided. The first chapter of the second prapāṭhaka in the Nidānasūtra, a text which from its style must be counted among the older works, is devoted to a discussion of this question. After the introductory words: *ṛṣikṛtaḥ svid ūhā 3 anṛṣikṛta iti vai khalu āhuḥ*, reasons are first set forth for the view that ūha does not have its origin from the seers, and then, apparently, all the grounds are refuted. From a metrical discourse on the Sāmaveda the following śloka is cited in the introduction to the Bibliotheca Indica edn. (Part I, p. 18):

*ūhagrantho' pauruṣeyaḥ pauruṣeyo' thavāgrimaḥ |
vedasāmasamānatvād vidhisārthatvato' ntimah ||*

If I am not mistaken, the meaning of these words is: 'Is the ūha(gāna) (and the ūhyagāna) not of human origin or is it? It is the first, in so far as it is in a similar case with the Sāma-Veda (the first two gānas, seen by the Ṛṣis and thus of divine origin); the second, in so far as it is meant for the rite (and the Kalpasūtras are made by men)''.

With the remark made above, that ūha- and ūhyagāna date from later times, agrees the finding of Konow on the Sāma-

P. 12.

vidhāna-brāhmaṇa. He has pointed out that in this old text no songs from the last two song-books are quoted.

But one may, with propriety ask, how now with this argument (above p. 8) which just now seemed to have such conclusive force exactly for the greater antiquity of the ūha? This ground need not be abandoned as against the conclusive evidence that the last two gānas as such were unknown to the older authors, because there may be found an explanation by which the contradiction may be cleared away. Thus it is probable that originally the text of the Maśakakalpasūtra enumerated successively all the Sāmans (which should be sung on one melody), but that later authors, who knew the ūhagāna have curtailed these passages.

Yet another question awaits an answer. Why (have) two song-books, ūha and ūhya, with precisely the same divisions next to each other? Their songs were in practice employed next to and by each other. Careful reflection has furnished the solution of this problem also. All the melodies which occur in the ūhyagāna as also their names one finds in the āraṇyagāna, while the melodies and names of the ūhagāna correspond with those of the grāmageyagāna. Besides ūhyagāna, the last song-book is also called rahasyagāna. In his day Burnell maintained that the designation ūhya(gāna) was an abridgement of ūharahasya(gāna); Konow, on the other hand (Sāmavidhāna Intro. p. 14) thought that the name rahasya only applied to the āraṇyagāna and not to the ūhya as well. Now it seems that the opinions of Burnell and of Konow are reconcilable; for rahasya is the same as āraṇya(gāna), and what we understand by ūhyagāna is simply the collection of songs changed and adapted to the melodies of the āraṇyagāna: rahasyagāna and ūhyagāna are really one and the same: the words differ, not the melodies.

P. 13. To turn finally to the name: the term ūha is clear; it means 'shifting, adaptation', and postulates a model to which the adaptation takes place. Well then, the prakṛti of ūha and ūh-(arahas)ya are, as we saw, the grāmageya- and the āraṇyagāna. As regards the names of these last books, there is not a single reason to adduce in favour of the modern theory (of v. Schroeder, Winternitz and others), that they are so called because the first named gāna contains songs sung in the sacrifices in the village, the second in sacrifices performed in the forest or the wilderness. That is a mere play of words with no single

reason given. For we have seen that the melodies of both the gānas are used by each other in all soma-sacrifices. Rather may the gānas be so called because one of them was studied in the village by the Sāma Veda student while the other (the āraṇyagāna) was studied in the wood, outside the parish. The introduction to this study was also a particularly severe observance.¹ The reason why this gāna should be studied outside the parish lies certainly in the greater holiness or danger of its melodies. I recall only the highly sacred Mahānāmnīs and the rudrasūkta employed in imprecations.

For all the reasons stated above one might visualise the origin of the Sāmaveda texts thus:

The holy service, the Soma sacrifice in its many forms, existed from of old. Since the beginning of human memory different songs were sung by the singer with his acolytes at particular moments in such sacrifices (in the gāyatra melody in the morning service), mostly based on stanzas of three verses. The words on which the songs used to be sung (their yonis) were collected early and compiled into one whole (*Samhitā*): the uttarārcika. In order that the study and memorising of the melodies may be rendered easy, likewise at a very early period, a double register was made up, the first one of the melodies; this was so arranged that one had only to take the first verse of a stanza and this became the carrier of the melody; then they added the Sāmans, which should be recited by some singers in some song-verses (stotriyas) in other ceremonies. So began the grāmageyagāna and āraṇyagāna, which were so divided that the more sacred and dangerous melodies were put together in a separate register (ār. gāna). Also the yonis of the song-books were brought together and so began the pūrvārcika and āraṇyaka-samhitā. Thereupon the traditional rite was fixed in the Ārṣeyakalpa, in connection with the brāhmaṇa, of which it is difficult to indicate the time of origin in this series. The Śrautasūtras began in connection with the extant literature (of the Sāmaveda). If now a chandoga knows his two gānas by heart and also knows which yonis he must use at one or other ceremony, it should be easy for him to make all the changes, to apply the ūha in all the

P. 14.

1. The Mahānāmnīkavrata of the Chandogas (*cf.* Jaim. Gr. Sū. I. 17), that is almost the same as the Sukriyavrata of the other Vedic schools.

cases as prescribed in the sūtras. But perhaps all kinds of *finesse* were quickly resorted to in order to prolong the ritual or make it more complicated, and so the chandoga needed to have in his head a great many rules in order to apply the ūha. All these rules were, if I am not mistaken, collected in one text ascribed to Puṣpa, the so-called Phullasūtra. I say 'perhaps'. For though indeed there is in existence an edition of the text of this sūtra, yet this work is so truly algebraical in arrangement and so full of all sorts of abbreviations and technical terms, that only a thorough study with a commentary at hand could give us the certainty whether my surmise regarding the purport of the

- P. 15. Puṣpasūtra is correct.¹ Again, they have later on combined all the rules of the Puṣpasūtra with the prescriptions of the sūtras and applied them, and produced two song-books, which may now be directly consulted by the chandoga in the holy service. The content of the ūha- and ūhyagānas forms thus the oldest part of the Samāveda, according to their form these two books belong to the youngest.

1. By the researches of Prof. R. Simon at Munchen, who is preparing an edition and elucidation of the Puṣpasūtra, it will become clear later if my hypothesis on the purpose of this text is correct. Questioned about this by me, Prof. R. Simon cannot give me a conclusive answer though he considers 'the basic idea thoroughly sound.' (Simon's edition has appeared in *Abhandlungen der K. Bayer Akademie der Wiss.* 1. Kl. XXIII Band. III Abt.—Tr.).

SELECT OPINIONS

Hermann Jacobi, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, 14th December, 1926.—I have perused your new Journal of Oriental Research with great interest. I heartily wish you success in your meritorious undertaking.

L. D. Barnett, School of Oriental Studies, London, 19th December, 1926.—It seems to me to be a good beginning to the enterprise which I hope will be very successful. Some of the matter is very good indeed.

J. Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany, 20th December, 1926.—This, evidently is a periodical of great promise, with every chance of success.

Q. Strauss, Professor of Sanskrit, Kiel University, 1st January, 1927.—Being very well pleased with the first number of your Journal of Oriental Research I ask you to enrol me as a subscriber.

Sir Richard Temple, Editor, Indian Antiquary, London, 6th January, 1927.—Your excellent Issue.

F. O. Schrader, Kiel, 9th January, 1927.—I have read with absorbing interest through the first number and find its contents quite satisfactory. . . . A journal of this kind has been undoubtedly a need in Madras since long.

Dr. Wilhelm Printz, Librarian, D. M. G. Halle, 14th January, 1927.—This fascicle contains many very interesting and scholarly written articles: a pretty start!

"Bombay Chronicle," 12th December, 1926.— The Quality of scholarship displayed is of a high order.

"Indian Review," November, 1927.—We welcome this new Quarterly of Oriental Research. The influence of Professor S. Kuppaswami Sastri, the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Presidency College, has been ceaselessly exercised in furthering the cause of such learning.

"New India," 20th December, 1926.— The design and the get-up of the Journal is very good, and we recommend the Journal to all lovers of research and scholarship.

"Hindu," 9th February, 1927.— The Journal will not merely maintain the high level reached in its first number but frequently transcend itself.

"Madras Mail," 21st January, 1927.— The contributions are from persons who have specialised in particular branches and show striking evidence of original work.

Dr. Sylvain Levi, Paris.— It deals with so many sides of Indian Science, and in such an interesting way. What I like most in it, is its genuine and regular Indian flavour, its proper 'Rasa'. Many of your contributors, if not all of them, know how to combine Pandit-learning and Western standards.

Dr. H. Luders, Berlin University.— I was greatly impressed with the high standard of scholarship, the originality of thought and the soundness of critical methods displayed in your contributions.

EDITORIAL BOARD

PRESIDENT

SIR P. S. SIVASWAMI AIYAR, LL.D., K.C.S.J., C.I.E.

MEMBERS

M.R.RY, V. V. SRINIVASA AIYANGAR, B.A., B.L.

„ P. V. NAGANATHA SASTRI, B.A., B.L.

„ K. G. SESA AIYAR, B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

PROFESSOR M. HIRIYANNA, M.A., L.T.

SIR ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI AIYAR, *Kt.*, B.A., B.L.

RAO BAHADUR K. V. KRISHNASWAMI AIYAR, B.A., B.L.

M.R.RY. C. A. SESHAGIRI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.

„ R. KRISHNASWAMI SASTRI, B.A.

„ DHARMAKSHAMANI

K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AIYAR, B.A., B.L.

„ T. CHANDRASEKHARAN, M.A., L.T., DIP. IN GERMAN AND
FRENCH.

„ T. R. CHINTAMANI, M.A., PH. D.

„ A. SANKARAN, M.A., PH. D., L.T.

„ VIDYASAGARA VIDYAVACASPATI P. P. S. SASTRI, B.A., (OXON.),
M.A., (MADRAS).

MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA VIDYAVACASPATI DARSANAKALANIDHI KULAPATI
PROF. S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI, M.A., I.E.S.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA, VIDYAVACASPATI DARSANAKALANIDHI KULAPATI
PROF. S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI, M.A., I.E.S.

M.R.RY. VIDYASAGARA VIDYAVACASPATI P. P. S. SASTRI, B.A., (OXON.),
M.A., (MADRAS).

„ A. SANKARAN, M.A., PH. D., L.T.

„ T. CHANDRASEKHARAN, M.A., L.T., DIP. IN GERMAN AND FRENCH,

„ DHARMAKSHAMANI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AIYAR, B.A., B.L.
Managing Editor.

„ T. R. CHINTAMANI, M.A., PH.D.

Correspondent.

All Communications should be addressed to the Correspondent, Journal of
Oriental Research, 5, North Mada St., Mylapore, P. O., Madras, South India.