this work is manifestly of a supplementary nature, a portion of it may perhaps be old, and may once have formed part of the Sarphitã, considering that the latter consists of seven ashṭakas, instead of eight, as this term requires, and that certain essential parts of the ceremonial handled in the Brāhmaṇa are entirely wanting in the Sarphitã. Attached to this work is the *Taittirīya-āraṇyaka,@@*1 in ten books, the first six of which are of a ritualistic nature, while of the remaining books the first three (7-9) form the *Τaittirīyopanishad@@*2(consisting of three parts, viz. the Sikshãvallï or Saṃhitopanishad, and the Änandavallï and Bhpguvallï, also called together the Vāruṇī- upanishad), and the last book forms the Nārāyaṇīya- (or Yājñikī-) upanishad.

The *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā,* the identity **of** which with the original Kālāpaka has been proved pretty conclusively by Dr L. v, Schröder, who attributes the change of name of the Kālāpa-Maitrāyaṇīyas to Buddhist influences, consists of four books, attached to which is the *Maitri-* (or *Maitrāyaṇī) upanishad.@@*3The *Kāṭhaka,* on the other hand, consists of five parts, the last two of which, however, are per­haps later additions, containing merely the prayers of the hotar priest, and those used at the horse-sacrifice. There is, moreover, the beautiful *Kaṭha-* or *Kāṭhaka-upanishad,@@*4 which is also, and more usually, ascribed to the Atharvaveda, and which seems to show a decided leaning towards Sãnkhya-Yoga notions.

The defective arrangement of the Yajus texts was at last remedied by a different school of Adhvaryus, the Vãjasaneyins. The reputed originator of this school and its text-recension is Yājña- valkya Vājasaneya (son of Vājasani). The result of the rearrangement of the texts was a collection of sacrificial mantras, the *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā,* and a Brāhmaṇa, the Ś*atapatha.* On account of the greater lucidity of this arrangement, the Vãjasaneyins called their texts the White (or clear) Yajurveda—the name of Black (or obscure) Yajus being for opposite reasons applied to the Charaka texts. Both the Sarphitã and Brāhmaṇa of the Vājasaneyins have come down to us in two different recensions, viz. those of the *Mãdhyandina* and *Kāṇva* schools; and we find besides a considerable number of quotations from a Vājasaneyaka, from which we cannot doubt that there must have been at least one other recension of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa. The difference between the two extant recensions is, on the whole, but slight as regards the subject-matter; but in point of diction it is quite sufficient to make a comparison especially interesting from a philological point of view. Which of the two versions may be the more original cannot as yet be determined; but the phonetic and grammatical differences will probably have to be accounted for by a geographical separation of the two schools rather than by a difference of age. In several points of difference the Kāṇva recension agrees with the practice of the Ṛik-saṃhitā, and there probably was some connexion between the Yajus school of Kānvas and the famous family of ṛishis of that

name to which the eighth maṇḍala of the Ṛik is attributed.

The *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā@@*5 consists of forty adhvãyas, the first eighteen of which contain the formulas of the ordinary sacrifices. The last fifteen adhyāyas are doubtless a later addition—as may also be the case as regards the preceding seven chapters. The last adhyãya is commonly known under the title of Vãjasaneyi-saiphitã (or Iśāvāsya-) upanishad.@@6 Its object seems to be to point out the fruitlessness of mere works, and to insist on the necessity of man’s acquiring a knowledge of the supreme spirit. The sacrificial texts of the Adhvaryus consist, in about equal parts, of verses (rich) and prose formulas (yajus). The majority of the former occur likewise in the Rik-saṃhitā, from which they were doubtless extracted. Not infrequently, however, they show considerable discrepancies of reading, which may be explained partly from a difference of recension and partly as the result of the adaptation of these verses to their special sacrificial purpose. As regards the prose formulas, though only a few of them are actually referred to in the Rik, it is quite possible that many of them may be of high antiquity. \*

The *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa,@@*7 or Brāhmaṇa of a hundred paths, derives its name from the fact of its consisting of 100 lectures (adhyãya), which are divided by the Mãdhvandinas into fourteen, by the Kāṇvas into seventeen books (kāṇḍa). The first nine books of the former, corresponding to the first eleven of the Kāṇvas, and consisting of sixty adhyãyas, form a kind of running commentary on the first eighteen books of the Vāj.-Saṃhitā; and it has been plausibly suggested by Professor Weber that this portion of the Brāhmaṇa may be referred to in the Mahābhāshya on Pāṇ. iv. 2, 60, where a Śatapatha and

a Shashṭi-patha (*i.e.* “ consisting of 60 paths ”) are mentioned together as objects of study, and that consequently it may at one time have formed an independent work. This view is also supported by the circumstance that of the remaining five books (10-14) of the Mādhyandinas the third is called the middle one (madhyama); while the Kāṇvas apply the same epithet to the middlemost of the five books (12-16) preceding their last one. This last book would thus seem to be treated by them as a second supplement, and not without reason, as it is of the Upanishad order, and bears the special title of *Bzihad-* (great) *äranyaka@@*8 the last six chapters of which are the Bphadãranyaka-upanishad,@@9 the most important of all Upani- shads. Except in books 6-10 (M.), which treat of the construction of fire-altars, and recognize the sage Sãnçlilya as their chief authority, Yājñavalkya’s opinion is frequently referred to in the Śatapatha as authoritative. This is especially the case in the later books, part of the Bphad-āraṇyaka being even called Yājñavalkīya-kāṇḍa. As regards the age of the Śatapatha, the probability is that the main body of the work is considerably older than the time of Pāṇini, but that some of its latter parts were considered by Pāṇini’s critic Kātyāvana to be of about the same age as, or not much older than, Pāṇini. Even those portions had probably been long in existence before they obtained recognition as part of the canon of the White Yajus.

The contemptuous manner in which the doctrines of the Charaka- adhvaryus are repeatedly animadverted upon in the Śatapatha betrays not a little of the *odium theologicum* on the part of the divines of the Vãjasaneyins towards their brethren of the older schools. Nor was their animosity confined to mere literary war­fare, but they seem to have striven by every means to gain ascendancy over their rivals. The consolidation of the Brāhmanical hierarchy and the institution of a common system of ritual worship, which called forth the liturgical Vedic collections, were doubtless consum­mated in the so-called Madhya-deśa, or “ midland,” lying between the Sarasvatī and the confluence of the Yamunā and Gangā; and more especially in its western part, the Kuru-kshetra, or land of the Kurus, with the adjoining territory of the Panchālas, between the Yamunã and Gangã. From thence the original schools of Vaidik ritualism gradually extended their sphere over the adjacent parts. The Charakas seem for a long time to have held sway in the western and north-western regions; while the Taittirīyas in course of time spread over the whole of the peninsula south of the Narmadā (Nerbudda), where their ritual has remained pre-eminently the object of study till comparatively recent times. The Vãjasaneyins, on the other hand, having first gained a footing in the lands on the lower Ganges, chiefly, it would seem, through the patronage of King Janaka **of** Videha, thence gradually worked their way westwards, and eventu­ally succeeded in superseding the older schools north of the Vindhya, with the exception of some isolated places where even now families of Brahmans are met with which profess to follow the old Sarphitãs.

In *Kalpa-sūtras* the Black Yajurveda is particularly rich ; but, owing to the circumstances jus indicated, they are almost entirely confined to the Taittirīya school. The only Śrauta-sūtra of a Charaka school which has hitherto been recovered is that of the Mānavas, a subdivision of the Maitrãyaçiïyas.

The *Mānava-śrauta·sūtra@@*10 seems to consist of eleven books, the first nine of which treat of the sacrificial ritual, while the tenth contains the Śulva-sūtra; and the eleventh is made up of a number of supplements (*pari-śishṭa*). The *Mānava-gṛihya-sūtra@@*11 is likewise in existence; but so far nothing is known, save one or two quotations, of a *Mānava-dharma-sūtra,* the discovery of which might be expected to solve some important questions regarding the de­velopment of Indian law. Of sütra-works belonging to the Kaṭhas, a single treatise, the (*Chārāyaṇīya-) Kāṭhaka-gṛihya-sūtra,* is known; while Dr Jolly considers the *Vishṇu-smṛiti@@*12*α* compendium of Iaw, composed in mixed sūtras and ślokas, to be nothing but a Vaishṇava recast of the Kãthaka-dharma-sütra, which, in its original form, seems no longer to exist. As regards the Taittirīyas, the Kalpa- sūtra most widely accepted among them was that of Āpastamba, to whose school, as we have seen, was also due our existing recension of the Taittirîya-sarphitã. The *Āpastamba-kalpa-sūtra* consists of thirty *praśna* (questions); the first twenty-five of these constitute the Śrauta-sūtra;@@13 26 and 27 the Gṛihya-sūtra;@@14 28 and 29 the Dharma-sūtra;@@15 and the last the Śulva-sūtra. Professor Bühler has tried to fix the date of this work somewhere between the 5th and 3rd centuries **B.c. ;** but it can hardly yet be considered as definitely settled. Considerably more ancient than this work are the
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