1. Purpose of the Dissertation

The present dissertation consists of eleven articles which as a whole form a comprehensive study of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa (hereafter JUB), a Vedic prose text in the category of philosophical texts called Upaniṣads. As its title states, the JUB belongs to the Jaiminīya school of the Sāmaveda ‘the knowledge (veda) of sacred ritual chants (sāman)’ — the collective name for the whole chanting traditions including texts and performances — which, together with other three Vedas (Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Atharvaveda), constitute the orthodox religious canons in ancient India. The Vedic canons consist of two literary genres: the basic collections, called Saṃhitās, of the ritual hymns (r̥c), chants (sāman), and formulae (yajus); and the explanatory texts, Brāhmaṇas by name, describing the procedures and the meanings of various rituals including the Soma sacrifices (i.e. the ritual complexes with the plant Soma as the central offering substance). To the explanatory texts are appended special texts of mysterious or speculative character as their independent supplements or final chapters, entitled Āranyakas or Upaniṣads. The JUB is one of the texts of this kind, appended to the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa of the same school. Among the texts of this kind, which more or less reflect a profound shift of Vedic ritual and textual orientation from action to meaning, the JUB occupies an important position as one of the texts which opened the doors to philosophy. As will become clear in the dissertation, the JUB is the earliest of the texts which were produced as Upaniṣads in the history of Vedic literature. The main purpose of the present dissertation is to elucidate the ritual and textual backgrounds of the formation of this first Upaniṣad in the Sāmavedic chanting traditions, and to trace within this particular text how philosophical speculations were developed from ritual speculations — speculations on the ritual procedures and acts including Sāmavedic chants — in the priestly school of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, through its ritual and textual relationships with other schools not only of the Sāmaveda but also of the other Vedas.
2. Importance of the Research

It is one of the distinctive features of Indian philosophy that it has one of its origins in Vedic ritual culture. It was in the Upaniṣads belonging to respective Vedic ritual schools and traditions that Indian philosophy began to take definite shape. In the history of the Upaniṣads, two fundamental questions are how the early Upaniṣads were produced from the background of the Brāhmaṇa ritual literature textually and philosophically, and what are the chronological and intertextual relationships among the early Upaniṣads and their constituent parts. To study the Upaniṣads on these two points, essential research materials are the three earliest Upaniṣads, namely, the JUB of the Jaiminiya Sāmaveda, the Brhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad of the Vājasaneyi Yajurveda, and the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad of the Kauthuma-Rāṇayaniya Śāmaveda. Among them, the JUB has been often excluded from Upaniṣads proper, because it is not included in the prevalent classification of Upaniṣads basically according to Vedāntic traditions, and because it is usually classified by present scholars into the category of (sub-)Brāhmaṇas or Āraṇyakas. [The classification of the JUB as a Brāhmaṇa or an Āraṇyaka is based on its ritual-oriented contents as well as its peculiar title, Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa. This title is in fact derived from the name of a section (“the brāhmaṇa ‘section’ of upaniṣad”) in the large JB including the JB proper, Jaiminiya-Ārseya-Brāhmaṇa, and JUB (see Article 3, Chap. 3), but has been misunderstood as the title for an intermediate text between Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads.] Partly for the reason of this exclusion from Upaniṣads, and partly on account of its Sāmavedic special contents, the JUB has not been studied seriously by either Upaniṣadic scholars or Vedic ritual scholars (see 3. Previous Studies). However, as a transitional text with characteristics both of a ritual text and a philosophical text, the JUB significantly represents the earliest phase in the history of the Upaniṣads. And as a text which shows abundant relations — textual, ritual and speculative — with preceding and succeeding texts both inside and outside the school to which it belongs, it affords important clues for tracing the great passage from ritual to philosophy in ancient India.

3. Previous Studies

It was in 1894 when H. Oertel published the first edition of the JUB with an English translation and notes (see [12] in References). This edition was based on the manuscripts of unknown Sāmavedic texts including the JB and JUB discovered by A. C. Burnell in South India. Although Oertel’s work represents the highest achievement at the initial stage of studies on the Jaiminiya texts, it could not escape from the limitations of both the manuscript materials and the Sāmavedic knowledge which he could use for editing and translating it. Oertel’s edition
was reproduced in Devanāgarī script in 1921 ([13]), and was incorporated with a few emendations and many notes on words and phrases in the Gandhi Memorial Edition of the Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads published in 1954 ([8]) under the title of Jaiminiya-Upaniṣad. In 1967, B. R. Sharma published another edition of the JUB ([16]), using several new manuscripts as well as Burnell’s manuscripts. His edition provides not a few different and better readings, but regrettably reduces its value due to inconsistency in its treatment of materials.

The contents of the JUB have been studied only partially after the above-mentioned translation and notes by Oertel (1894 [12]) as well as the extracts published by him beforehand (1893 [11]). H. Lüders (1916 [9]) examined the parallel passages JUB 3,1–2 and ChU 4,3, and ascertained the chronological priority of the former to the latter. J. A. B. Buitenen (1955–56 [2], 1959 [3]) clarified the connection of the sacred syllable om with Śāma Vedic chants on the basis of the JUB. A. Parpola (1982 [15]) investigated the abnormal textual divisions of the JB and JUB, together with their Śāma Vedic backgrounds. I. C. Deshpande (1980 [6]) and W. Howard (1987 [7]) studied the JUB from the Śāma Vedic point of view and collected the information on the gāyatrī-sāman in it. H. W. Bodewitz (1986 [1]) analysed the first section of the JUB and elucidated the philosophical speculations there.

4. Methodology of Investigation

As a comprehensive study of the JUB, the dissertation covers its ritual, philosophical, and textual problems. Firstly, I have made a special study of Śāma Vedic chants and other ritual elements mentioned in the JUB to identify the concrete ritual facts underlying the text, and to define the ritual functions, symbolisms, and speculations on the basis of which the JUB was composed. Secondly, I have analysed passages on the secret significance of ritual performances in order to elucidate especially the development of speculations on the attainment of the heavenly world as a ritual effect into speculations on rebirth after death. The development in this direction is one of the most important contributions of the JUB to Indian philosophy, and proves close connections of Vedic rebirth theories with Vedic ritualistic ideologies. Thirdly, for the sake of unraveling the process of formation and development of the text, I have distinguished several strata within it, and explored the relationships of the strata with each other and with corresponding strata of other texts both inside and outside the school. In connection with the text, I have also traced its transmission through the ages to ascertain the forms and states in which the JUB has been handed down in the history of Vedic traditions. In connection with the textual transmission of the JUB, I have collected a large number of manuscripts of the JUB including many unknown manuscripts as well as those used by Oertel and Sharma. I have made
full use of them for the present study in order to research the JUB on the basis of its highly reliable text.

5. Contents of the Dissertation and Relations of the Articles

The dissertation consists of eleven separate articles concerning various aspects of the JUB, and consequently it is better to classify the articles into groups and to rearrange them within the groups not in chronological order but according to the content so that they will represent properly their relations with each other as well as their positions in the whole dissertation. Corresponding to the above-mentioned three approaches — ritual, philosophical and textual — to the JUB, the articles can be classified into the following three groups (the bibliographical details of the articles will be given in 6. Summary of the Articles):

1. Sāmavedic ritual background of the JUB

   Article 1: “On the unexpressed gāyatra-sāman in the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.”
   Article 3: ‘On the Formation and Transmission of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.”
      Ch. 1. The sāman tradition as a background of the JUB.

2. Ritual and philosophical speculations in the JUB

   Article 4: “The Bahispavamāna Ritual of the Jaiminīyas.”
   Article 5: “The Gāyatra and Ascension to Heaven (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 1,1–7; 3,11–14).”

3. Textual formation and transmission of the JUB

      Ch. 2. The formation of the JUB, Ch. 3. The transmission of the JUB.
   Article 7: “Three Notes on the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3,1–5.”
   Article 8: “A Common Passage on the Supreme Prāṇa in the Three Earliest Upaniṣads (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2).”
   Article 9: “The Brahman Priest (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3,15–19).”
   Article 10: “The Brahman Priest in the History of Vedic Texts.”
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Article 11: “Kena-Upaniṣad (= Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 4,10 [4,18–21])”
(in Japanese).

The first three articles (Articles 1–3) are concerned with the Sāmavedic ritual background of the JUB. The first article demonstrates that one particular chant called gāyatra-sāman, especially its unexpressed (anirukta) form, is the main theme of the JUB. The second article traces the changes of the gāyatra-sāman in the history of the Sāmavedic texts from the Pañcavimśa-Brāhmaṇa to the JUB for the purpose of answering the question why the Jaiminīyas chose this particular sāman as the main theme when they composed their first Upaniṣad. The third article (in its first chapter) explains that the difference in the treatment of the gāyatra-sāman between the JUB and ChU reflects the difference in the importance of this particular sāman within the chanting traditions to which the JUB and ChU belong.

The next three articles (Articles 4–6) deal with the ritual and philosophical speculations in and behind the JUB. The fourth article describes the opening laud (bahispavamāna-stotra) in the Soma sacrifices, in which the gāyatra-sāman is sung, and elucidates the central symbolism underlying this ritual act, on which are based the following speculations on the gāyatra-sāman in the JUB. The fifth article compares two passages on the ascension to the heavenly world by means of the unexpressed form of gāyatra-sāman in the first and third chapters of the JUB (1,1–7; 3,11–14) to make clear the difference in the basic ideas behind the similar speculations in the different strata of the text. The sixth article expounds the development of speculations on the gāyatra-sāman into rebirth theories as early forms of the well-known devayāna and pitrāyāna theory.

The remaining five articles (Articles 7–11), together with the second and third chapters of the third article, treat various problems about the formation and transmission of the JUB. The second chapter of the third article explains the textual formation of the JUB and its relationships with other texts inside and outside the Jaiminīya school. The third chapter of the same article discusses the transmission of the JUB through the post-Vedic period up to the present. The seventh article scrutinises the opening section of the third chapter of the JUB (3,1–5) to probe for a later stratum of the text. The eighth article analyses all the versions of a common passage in the three earliest Upaniṣads (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2) to determine the chronological relationships among the versions. The ninth article compares the passage on the functions of the Brahman priest in the JUB (3,15–19) with its parallel passages in other Brāhmaṇaṣa and Upaniṣads to find the textual and ritual relationships of the Jaiminīyas with other schools. The tenth article, as a development of the ninth article, extensively examines the passages on the two main functions of the Brahman priest and traces the process through
which his office was established in the history of Vedic texts and schools. The last, eleventh
article presents a critical edition of the KenaU portion of the JUB (4,18–21) on the basis of
manuscripts of the JUB, and discusses the position of this portion in the JUB, especially its
relations to the succeeding portions (4,22–26; 27–28).

5. Summary of the Articles

Article 1:

"On the unexpressed gāyatra-sāman in the Jaiminiya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa." Journal of In-

This article ascertains the main ritual theme of the JUB by identifying two obscure words
in the text, anṛça sāman ‘verseless chant’ and aśartra sāman ‘bodiless chant’. The former
word occurs in a passage of conflict between the gods and the Asuras (1,15–16), where it is
told that this special chant, by means of which the gods attained the heavenly world, should be
sung at the morning Soma-pressing, but not at the other two Soma-pressings. The latter word
is found in a dialogue between the king Keśin Dārbhya and his deceased uncle (3,29–31), in
which the uncle who does not have his body tells his nephew that a Brahman made him shake
off his body by singing the udgīthā with the bodiless sāman.

The three Soma-pressings in the Soma sacrifices are accompanied with a certain number
of lauds (stotra) by the chanter priests, in which some verses are sung with the replacement of
the main part by repeated monosyllables: o vā o vā o vā hum bhā o vā. The replacement by
the monosyllables, which is called anirukta gāna ‘unexpressed chanting’, takes place only in
verses chanted in the melody of the gāyatra-sāman, that is, in all the verses of every laud at
the morning pressing and in the first three verses of the first lauds at the midday and evening
pressings. This fact leads us to identify the anṛça sāman and aśartra sāman as the unexpressed
form of the gāyatra-sāman in the Soma sacrifices.

The unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman is recorded in its full form or fragmentary
forms in various places in the JUB, including the two passages which end with genealogical
lists of teachers (vaṃśa) (3,38–42; 4,11–17), where this special sāman is treated as a
divine doctrine handed down from the gods to the sages. The ending words of the second
passage clearly show that the gāyatra-sāman is the main theme of the JUB as follows: saisā
śāityāyanī gāyatrasyopaniṣad evam upāsitavyā “This Śāityāyani’s Upaniṣad of the gāyatra(-
sāman) should be worshipped thus” (4,17,2).

Article 2:

Between the two early Upaniṣads of the Sāmaveda, JUB and ChU, a fundamental difference exists with regard to their attitudes toward one particular sāman called gāyatra. The gāyatra-sāman, especially its unexpressed form, is the main theme of the JUB (see Article 1), while it does not have any special significance in the ChU in spite of the close textual parallelism of the two texts. Since the JUB chronologically precedes the ChU, whose first four chapters are modelled upon the JUB, there arises the question of why the Jaiminīyas chose this particular sāman as the main theme when they composed the first Sāmavedic Upaniṣad. To answer this question, the present article traces the changes of the gāyatra-sāman in the history of Sāmavedic texts. The texts concerned here are the PB and Śaḍvimsa-Brāhmaṇa of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda, the JB and JUB of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda.

The gāyatra-sāman is used for all the verses of every laud (stotra) in the morning pressing service, and for the first three verses of the first lauds in the midday and third pressing services. In connection with the first laud called bahispavamāna-stotra, the Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣad explain the gāyatra-sāman in detail but in different ways. For the gāyatra-sāman in the first laud, the PB gives a brief explanation (PB 6,8–7,1), in which this sāman occurs in a relatively simple form. The JB has much longer explanation for the gāyatra-sāman of the bahispavamāna-stotra (JB 1,87–104; 111–115; 259–273; 315–321). The text can be divided into two parts: [1,87–96; 111–115] and [1,97–104; 259–273; 315–321]. The first part offers almost the same explanation as the PB. The second part is exclusively concerned with the dhurs, which are the modified forms of the gāyatra-sāman adopted in the first six verses of the bahispavamāna-stotra and in some verses of the next ājya-stotras. To the six dhurs of the bahispavamāna-stotra, the JB gives the following special names: 1. retasyā, 2. gāyatrī, 3. triṣṭubh, 4. jagatī, 5. anuṣṭubh, 6. paṅktī. In spite of their metrical names, except the first, retasyā, the dhurs have many more features than simple metrical modifications. In the present article, I have collected the information on the dhurs in the JB and reconstructed them on the basis of it. The ŚaḍvB describes the six dhurs in a remarkably similar way to the JB, but more concisely (2,1–3). This supplementary Brāhmaṇa shows that the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas secondarily adopted the dhurs there under the influence of the dhurs established by the Jaiminīyas in the second part on the gāyatra-sāman of the bahispavamāna-stotra in the JB. The Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas have preserved the dhurs in their Śrautasūtras (LŚŚ 7,12–13 = DŚŚ 21,3–4). The dhurs of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas are also reconstructed in the article.
The Jaiminīyas, however, again developed a new way of chanting the gāyatra-sāman, that is, the unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman with repeated monosyllables: o vā o vā o vā hum bhā o vā. Since this special gāyatra makes its first appearance in the JUB as a secret doctrine, it can be concluded that the Jaiminīyas composed the JUB primarily in order to introduce, and explain the significance of, the new unexpressed form of the gāyatra. This unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman has been handed down in the Jaiminīya traditions as the unique form of the gāyatra-sāman used in the Soma sacrifices up to the present, and the JUB itself has been treated as the authority for it.

**Article 3:**


1. The first chapter of this article deals with the difference in the sāman traditions which underlie the JUB and ChU. The ChU has so many passages parallel to the JUB that they look “comme une variante de JUB” (Renou, *JAOS* 73, p. 140, n. 3). A closer examination, however, reveals not only the chronological posteriority of the ChU to the JUB, but also a fundamental difference in content between them. The JUB centers its speculations on the unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman (see Article 1) which is first introduced in the JUB (see Article 2). The ChU, in contrast, does not specify the gāyatra as its subject, nor does it make the slightest reference to the unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman.

This thematic difference between the two Upaniṣads is connected with a difference in the sāman traditions of the two schools to which the Upaniṣads belong. The latter difference is known from the vratas (observances to follow when studying Vedic texts) of Śāmavedic students and the sāmans to be studied during the periods of the respective vratas. The Gṛhyasūtras of both Śāmavedic schools order the aupaniṣada-vrata as one of the vratas. The Āraṇyakāna of the Kauthumas, nevertheless, does not record the sāmans to be studied during the period of that vrata, while the Jaiminīya-Āraṇyakagāṇa assigns to the aupaniṣada-vrata nineteen sāmans which include the gāyatra as the last one. This fact indicates that the Jaiminīyas give special importance to the gāyatra as the sāman into which students are initiated at the final stage. The Jaiminīyas’ creation of the first Śāmavedic Upaniṣad on the subject of the gāyatra influenced the rival school to compose their own Upaniṣad, i.e., the ChU, after the model of the JUB. But on account of the difference in the sāman traditions, especially with regard to the gāyatra, the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas remodelled the original speculations on the gāyatra-sāman into the speculations on sāmans in general or at least the sāman unspecified.
2. The second chapter explains the textual formation of the JUB and its relationships with other texts inside and outside the Jaiminīya school, which can be summarised as follows:

- The JUB consists of three independent parts: 1–3; 4,1–17; 4,18–28. The first two parts end with different genealogical lists of teachers (vanśā).
- JUB 1–3 borrows much from the JB (especially from the Agniśṭoma-portion 1,66–364).
- JUB 1–3 can be further divided into two strata, 1–2 and 3, according to the contents.
- JUB 1,60–2,12, BĀU 1,3, and ChU 1,2 are parallel passages in this chronological order (see Article 9). Besides this, the first four chapters of the ChU have many parallels with the JUB, while the BĀU shows no clear relationships with the JUB except with JUB 4,18–21 (KenaU).
- JUB 1–3 shows, in many places, close relationships with Aitareya texts.
- JUB 1–2 does not have textual relations with the KauŚītakins. A contact with them is first seen in JUB 3,4,5 (see Article 8).
- JUB 4,18–21 (KenaU), 22-26, and 27-28 are later appendices, probably collected there for educational purposes (see Article 12).

In the process of the formation of the JUB and the related texts, they underwent parallel developments in mutual relationships over a long span of time. The earliest stratum of the JUB (1,1–2,15), for example, has textual connections with the Aitareyas, and a contact with the KauŚītakins is first seen in the next stratum (JUB 3,4,5 ∼ Śāṅkhā 1,5). The later texts of the KauŚītakins show direct influences of the Jaiminīyas. Probably the Rgvedic school related with the Śāmavedic Jaiminīyas was changed from the Aitareyas to the KauŚītakins in the later stage of the formation of the JUB.

3. The third chapter discusses the transmission of the JUB. In the post-Vedic period, the KenaU portion of the JUB (4.18–21) was classified as an authentic Upaniśad by Vedāntins. But according to Śāṅkara’s commentary on the KenaU, it was still considered to be a part (allegedly, the beginning part of the ninth section) of the text which, from his explanation, covered the JB, the JĀrṣB, and the JUB. At the same time, as is explicitly stated by Śāṅkara in his commentary on the Brahmāsūtra on the distinction between JUB 4,1–17 and the KenaU portion, and by Bhavatrāta in his commentary on the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra on two Gāyatra-Upaniśads (i.e. JUB 1,1–3,42 and 4,1–17), the three parts of the JUB (1,1–3,42; 4,1–17; 4,18–28) were treated as independent texts. It is not certain when the three texts came to be considered to form a single book under the name of Talavakāra-Upaniśad-Brāhmaṇa or Jaiminīya-Upaniśad. In the Jaiminīya school, the JUB has been handed down up to the present as a text to be studied for the period of the aupaniśada-vrata. Unlike the ChU, the JUB has not been acknowledged
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to be an Upaniṣad by Vedāntins except the KenaU portion, so that it has been kept within the small circle of the Jaiminīya tradition and has not attained any popularity outside the school.

Article 4:

The bahīṣpavamāṇa-stotra ‘the outdoor laud for [the Soma] which is purifying itself’ is the first of a certain number of lauds chanted by the three chanter priests (udgāṭr, prastotr, pratihartr) on the main day in the Soma sacrifices. As its name states, this laud is chanted not in the sadas hut where the other lauds are chanted, but outdoors at the northeastern border of the sacrificial place. Why is only the first laud to be chanted outside at that place in particular? This article gives an answer to this question, which is closely connected with the central ritual symbolism underlying the Soma sacrifices. For this purpose, it describes every ritual act of the bahīṣpavamāṇa-stotra on the basis of all the available materials including the Jaiminīya texts (JB, JUB, JŚ, Bhavatrāta’s commentary on JŚ), which were not used by Caland and Henry in their description of the Agniṣṭoma ([5]). The article also provides an annotated translation of the bahīṣpavamāṇa-stotra part of the JŚ.

In the ritual symbolism of the Soma sacrifices, the sacrificial place represents the heavenly world in which the main ritual acts are to be performed, and the boundary of the sacrificial place is regarded as that between the heavenly world and this world. As the opening ritual on the main day of the Soma sacrifices, the bahīṣpavamāṇa-stotra consists of several meaningful ritual acts including the creeping northwards by the sacrificer and the priests up to the cātvāla pit at the northeastern border of the sacrificial place, which pit is symbolically identified with the sun as the entrance to the heavenly world; the chanter priests’ chanting the bahīṣpavamāṇa-stotra near the cātvāla pit after the creeping; the sacrificer’s bestriding the northern boundary of the sacrificial place; and the priests’ lifting up their arms. Those acts of the bahīṣpavamāṇa-stotra as a whole symbolise the procession to the heavenly world, where the sacrifice of the divine Soma will be held, and where the sacrificer and the priests will partake of the Soma together with the gods. On this ritual symbolism are based the JUB’s speculations of the ascension to the heavenly world by means of the unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman (see Article 5 below).
Article 5:
“The Gāyatra and Ascension to Heaven (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 1,1–7; 3,11–14).”

To the unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman, which is called aśarīra gāyatra ‘bodiless gāyatra’ (body = verse), the JUB gives the following philosophical significance: by reason of its bodilessness, it makes a person for whom it is sung go beyond the mortality of his corporeal existence and attain immortality in the heavenly world. Among the passages on the bodiless gāyatra in the JUB, the two sections 1,1–7 and 3,11–14 describe the whole process of leading a person to the heavenly world. The two passages show a striking parallelism in their structures, under which they conceal the shape of the bodiless gāyatra. Every paragraph of both passages corresponds to each of the following divisions of the gāyatra-sāman: o vā / o vā / o vā / hum bhā / o vā. Both the passages narrate almost the same process of ascension to the heavenly world step by step by means of each division of the bodiless gāyatra, and at the end of the process they have in common a dialogue between the deity (probably the sun) and the person who has ascended.

In spite of their parallel structure and similar content, however, they show a fundamental difference in the basic ideas on which they built up their ascension theories. In brief, the speculation in 1,1–7 was developed from the ritual symbolism of the procession to the heavenly world at the bahispavamāna-stotra in the Soma sacrifices (see Article 4), while that in 3,11–14 was based on the crematory concept of a deceased person’s going up with smoke from the crematory ground to the other world.

Article 6:

This article analyses the passages on rebirth in the JUB which shed new light on the early history of the formation of the well-known theory of the devayāna and the pitrōṇa, the two paths, one of which a person follows after his death.

The devayāna and pitrōṇa theory originated in the concept of ascension to the heavenly world ritually or posthumously which has been developed within Vedic ritual speculations. The opening passage of the JUB (1,1–7) describes the sacrificer’s heavenly ascension to attain immortality by means of the unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman (see Article 5). As in the earlier versions of the devayāna and pitrōṇa theory found in the JB (1,17–18; 46; 49–50;
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cf. KauśU 1), this passage also includes the following dialogue between a deity as the heavenly gatekeeper (probably the sun) and the person who has ascended to the heavenly world: To the deity who is driving away [every person], saying: “You have done this evil on earth. You must not pass here,” he should say in reply: “You saw what I did. You are the doer of that [deed]” (JUB 1,5,1–2). Here the dialogue has the same intention as the dialogues in the JB: to examine whether the person knows his identity with the supreme being. The JUB has another passage of the sacrificer’s going to the heavenly world by means of the same unexpressed form of the gāyatra-sāman (3,11–14). This passage, however, describes the ascension as a rebirth after death, as follows: “Thus [by means of the third o vā of the gāyatra-sāman], [the priest] makes him (the sacrificer) thrive with the faith with which they lay him in the fire: ‘This one will be born from this [fire into the other world] (cf. ChU 5,9,2),’ and gives him the world into which he is born [after death]” (JUB 3,11,7). The passage also adds a dialogue between the sun and the deceased (JUB 3,14,1–5), which is exactly the same as the dialogue in JB 1,18. Undoubtedly, the JUB borrowed the dialogue from the JB, because it is told in both texts that if the person gives a wrong answer to the sun, the sun returns the self (ātman) to him, though the sending of the self to the sun has been related beforehand only in the JB, not in the JUB. These two passages in the JUB on the heavenly ascension by means of the gāyatra-sāman (1,1–7; 3,11–14) probably belong to different strata in the text, and the latter seems to be a later development as a combination of the concept of heavenly ascension as a ritual effect in the former passage and the speculations on rebirth after death developed in connection with the Agnihotra and the funeral rite in the JB.

In the devayāna and pitryāna theory, the deceased is said to go through various temporal and spatial entities such as the day and the moon. The earlier version of this theory in the JB (1,49) narrates only one path for the deceased instead of the two separate paths in the later versions. According to it, the deceased goes from the crematory fire to his final goal (the sun), through the following entities: the smoke, the night, the day, the half-month of the waning moon, the half-month of the waxing moon, the month, the seasons, the father and the grandfathers, and finally the sun. In the later versions in the BĀU (BAUK 6,2,15-16 = SBM 14,9,1,18-19) and the ChU (5,10), the entities are divided into two opposing groups, bright and dark, which form the devayāna (the path to the gods) and the pitryāna (the path to the fathers) respectively. For what purpose does the deceased pass through the temporal and spatial entities? In Vedic texts, day and night represent the finite and recurring time of this world, while the year symbolizes the eternity of the heavenly world. This symbolism may suggest that the deceased’s journey through the temporal entities means his gradual transition from the
finite temporal world to the eternal timeless world. But this is not the original meaning of the deceased’s passing through the entities, which include not only temporal but also spatial ones. The JUB has a passage which seems to preserve the original meaning of the deceased’s journey through the entities (3,20–28). According to it, the deceased visits the following entities and regains his vital functions from each of them: the earth, the fire, the wind, the intermediate region, the quarters, day and night, the half-months, the months, the seasons, the year, the heavenly Gandharvas, the Apsarases, the sky, the gods, the sun, and the moon. Here the deceased’s journey through the entities represents the gradual process of his bodily recovery after death by getting back every vital function which has been deposited in the corresponding cosmic entity. In the later devayāna and pitryāna theory, however, the entities through which the deceased passes are limited mostly to temporal ones, and, as a result, the central meaning of the deceased’s journey through the cosmic entities looks to be shifted, from the deceased’s gradual recovery of his lost body on the way to his final destination, to the deceased’s gradual transition from this temporal world to the eternal yonder world.

According to the established devayāna and pitryāna theory, the person who follows the pitryāna finally returns to be born again on earth (as a form of transmigration). The return from the other world to this world is not clearly mentioned in the earlier versions of the theory. In this respect, also, the JUB represents the intermediate stage of the formation of the theory. The present passage in the JUB (3,20–28) ends with the noteworthy statement that the deceased who has reached the moon or the sun as the world of Brahman can be born, if he wishes, again on earth (3,28,4).

Article 7:


This article examines the opening section of the third chapter of the JUB (3,1–5), especially its relations with other texts. The section consists of three portions: 3,1–2 on vāyu and prāṇa, 3,3–4 on uktha, and 3,5 on yukti.

JUB 3,1–2 is parallel to, and must be a source of, ChU 4,3. Both passages comprise the same teaching on the supreme vāyu ‘wind’ and prāṇa ‘breath’ into which all the cosmic entities and the vital functions enter respectively. JUB 3,1–2, which just before has four successive parallel passages on the supreme prāṇa (1,60; 2,1–2; 2,3–9; 2,10–12) (see Article 9), takes up again the supreme vāyu and prāṇa as the subject, and puts forward the sāman as the linking concept with which the two supreme beings are identified. ChU 4,3, however, as a secondary version combined with the episode of Raikva (ChU 4,1–2), uses the gambling word saṃvarga
‘one who rakes up all (as the sole winner)’ as an epithet common to vāyu and prāṇa to insert the teaching into a context full of gambling imagery.

JUB 3,3–4 brings up uktha ‘recitation’ as its main topic. The uktha here should be interpreted as the mahad uktha recited in the Mahāvrata rite, because the JUB inserts, in 3.4,5, the formulae to be uttered by the Hotr in the Mahāvrata prescribed in the Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka and Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra. The present passage has close connections with Rgvedic texts of both the Aitareya and Kauṭitaki (Śāṅkhāyana) schools.

JUB 3,5 refers to yuktı ‘yoking’ as a kind of mental concentration performed by the chanter priest immediately before the bahispavamāṇa-stotra in the Soma sacrifices. According to the text (3.5,4–5), it consists of regulation of breath and concentration of the senses of seeing and hearing in order to yoke the laud (stoma) which is said to spread in the atmosphere before chanting. The yuktı here is probably the same action that Bhavatrāta refers to by the same word in a supplementary verse at the end of his commentary on the chapter on the bahispavamāṇa-stotra of the JS as follows: catuścēṣṭaiśkacēṣṭā vā yoktā yuktir iti śrutau pavamāne ‘tra tām kuryād udgātā prasavopari // “That which consists of four actions or one action, mentioned as yuktı ‘yoking’ in the Śruti text, the Udātṛ should perform here at the pavamāṇa-stotra after the permission [by the Brahman priest]” (ed. Shastri: 44,7–8).

Article 8:

“A Common Passage on the Supreme Prāṇa in the Three Earliest Upaniṣads (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2).” Zinbun: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, Vol. 34 (2), 2000, pp. 51–86.

This article analyses the unique long passage on the supreme prāṇa that the three earliest Upaniṣads have in common (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2) to determine the textual relationships among all the versions. The passage in question appears repeatedly in succession in the middle of the JUB in the form of four different versions (1,60; 2,1–2; 2,3–9; 2,10–12), while it is placed at or near the beginning of the BĀU and the ChU. Of the six versions, the BĀU version consists of the largest number of constituent portions as follows:

1. Prologue
2. The vital functions and prāṇa’s superiority
3. Correspondence between the vital functions and the cosmic entities
4. The kingship of the supreme prāṇa
5. The supreme prāṇa is Ayāśya Āṅgirasa
6. The supreme prāṇa is Brhaspati
7. The supreme prāṇa is the sāman
8. The sva and suvarṇa and pratiṣṭhā of the sāman
9. The abhyāroha of the pavamāna-stotras
10. Epilogue

The six versions have the following corresponding portions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>JUB 1,60 (1,18,5):</th>
<th>1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUB 2,1–2 (2,1,1–2):</td>
<td>1 2 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUB 2,3–9 (2,2–3):</td>
<td>1 2 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUB 2,10–12 (2,4,1–3):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀU</td>
<td>BĀUK 1,3 (ŚBM 14,4,1):</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td>ChU 1,2:</td>
<td>1 2 4 5 6 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The article expounds each portion of the passage with a translation of all the versions in the three Upaniṣads. A full analysis of the passage in question reveals the textual and chronological relationships among its six versions as follows:

- There are close textual relationships between JUB1 (1,60) and JUB3 (2,3–9), and between JUB2 (2,1–2) and JUB4 (2,10–12). Of each pair of versions, the latter version is based on the former one. The four versions were produced in the same order of the text as a textual development within the JUB, i.e., first JUB1, second JUB2, third JUB3 on the basis of mainly JUB1 and partly JUB2, finally JUB4 on the basis of mainly JUB2 and partly JUB3.
- The BĀU version (1,3) is closely parallel to, and must be later than, the final version in the JUB. From the fact that the portions included only in the BĀU version are found before the present passages in the JUB, it may be inferred that the author of the BĀU version knew the JUB, at least, its first two chapters which contain the four versions near the end.
- The ChU version has a close relationship with the BĀU version. It is highly probable that the ChU version was made as the latest one after all the other versions had already come into existence.

**Article 9:**


The JUB contains a passage on the functions of the Brahman priest (3,15–19), which has closely parallel passages in many Vedic texts. According to the correspondence of their constituent parts, the parallels form three groups: AB–KB–GB, ŚB–JB, JUB–ŚadvB–ChU. As to the relations between the groups, the first and the second halves of AB correspond to ŚB and JUB respectively. It is likely that JUB reflects a later extension of the AB passage which is the
earliest of all the parallels. The *prāyaścitta*, i.e. expiations for ritual faults, is the topic of these passages. The absence of parallels in the Black Yajurveda accords with the fact that the Black Yajurvedic texts do not make a clear statement of the *prāyaścitta* performed by the Brahman priest.

In contrast to the *prāyaścitta*, the other function of the Brahman priest, the *prasava*, i.e. permission to the other priests to perform ritual acts, is assigned to him in all the Vedic schools. But the form of his permission differs among them. The main difference lies in the use or disuse of the special formulae called *stomabhāga* in his permission given to the three chanter priests. The formulae are used in the schools of the Black Yajurveda, the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda, and the Atharvaveda, but not in the other schools. The lack of use of the formulae in the Aitareyas, the Jaiminīyas, and the Vājasaneyins shows that these three schools have close relationships, both textual and ritual.

**Article 10:**


This article is a development of the preceding, ninth article as an in-depth study of the office of the Brahman priest. A study on a special subject of this kind defines more clearly the place of the JUB in Vedic ritual and textual history.

The main functions of the Brahman priest in Śrāuta rituals are to give the *prasava*, i.e., the permission to the other priests for their performing ritual acts, and to perform the *prāyaścitti* (or *prāyaścitta*), i.e., the expiations for ritual faults. The assignment of these two functions to the Brahman priest is not the same among Vedic ritual texts. The passages concerning these two functions of the Brahman priest in the texts from the Yajurveda-Śaṁhitās to the Śrāutasūtras reveal a gradual process through which the office of Brahman priest was established in the history of Vedic texts and schools.

As far as the functions of the Brahman priest in Śrāuta rituals are concerned, they have been established through the following process (related texts in [ ]):

1. The Brahman had only the function of giving the *prasava* with the *stomabhāga* formulae in the Śaṁhitās of the Black Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇa of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda [TS, KS, PB].
2. The Brāhmaṇas of the Aitareya and Kauśītaki Rgvedas, the White Yajurveda and the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda prescribed the *prasava* without the *stomabhāgas*, and innovated the
Brahman’s *prāyaścitti* by means of the sacred utterances (*bhūr, bhuvas, svar*) [AB, KauṣB, ŚB, JB, JUB]

3. The Kauthuma-Rāṇāyaṇiya Sāmavedins, keeping the *prasava* with *stomabhāgas*, borrowed the Brahman’s *prāyaścitti* from the JB and the JUB [ṢaṅvB, ChU]

4. The Brāhmaṇa of the Atharvaveda adopted the *prasava* with the *stomabhāgas* from the KS and the Brahman’s *prāyaścitti* from the AB, and connected the Brahman’s office to their own Veda [GB]

5. Finally, most of the Black Yajurvedic Śrautasūtras adopted the *prāyaścitti* by means of the sacred utterances [BaudhŚS, VādhŚS, ĀpŚS, HirŚS, VaikhŚS, MānŚS]

It was in the period of the Yajurvedic Śaṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇaṣ when the Brahman clearly appeared as a priest who assumes distinctive functions. The office of Brahman priest, in its early stage, was limited to the function of superintending the whole ritual proceeding by the side of the sacrificer and giving final permission to the other priests for their performances. The expiations for ritual faults were not originally included in the functions of the Brahman, but were introduced into the Brahman’s office in some schools at the period of the late Brāhmaṇaṣ. The same expiations were finally adopted in most of the schools in their Śrautasūtras. The Atharvavedins, on the basis of their special connection with the Purohita, ascribed the office of Brahman to themselves inside their circles so as to establish themselves as an authorised Vedic group in charge of a particular priesthood. This exclusive connection of the Brahman priest with the Atharvaveda, however, was not approved in wider circles, as shown by the fact that the details of the Brahman’s office are prescribed in most of the Śrautasūtras of all the Vedas.

**Article 11:**


The KenaU is a small Upaniṣad belonging to the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda. It forms a part of the fourth chapter of the JUB (4,18–21), and, at the same time, has been handed down as an independent Upaniṣad with commentaries by Śaṅkara etc. This article presents a critical edition of the KenaU on the basis of manuscripts of the JUB, and examines the position of this Upaniṣad in the process of formation of the JUB.

The KenaU (JUB 4,18–21) consists of two parts: 1–2 (4,18–19) in verse and 3–4 (4,20–21) in prose. The former part is an aphoristic text on the supreme Brahman beyond and behind the sense organs, containing verses and phrases parallel to those in the BĀU and the Īśā-Upaniṣad,
not, however, in the context of the Ātman as the latter Upaniṣads, but in the context of the Brahman (KenaU 1,2 ∼ BĀU 4,4,18; KenaU 1,4 ∼ ĪśāU 10; KenaU 1,5–9 ∼ BĀU 3,4,1–2 etc.; KenaU 2,4 ∼ ĪśāU 11; KenaU 2,4–5 ∼ BĀU 4,4,13–14). The latter part is a mythical story of the transcendent Brahman as a yaksā, probably based on the use of the word yaksā ‘miraculous phenomenon’ for the supreme being in the AV, BĀU, etc. (AV 10,2,32cd = 10,8,43cd; 10,7,38; VSM 34,2 [Śivasamkalpa 2]; ŚBM 11,2,3,5 = ŚBK 3,2,5,3; ŚBM 14,8,5,1 = BĀUK 5,4).

After the KenaU (JUB 4,18–21), the JUB adds two more portions at the end of the text (4,22–26; 27–28)). The first portion is a collection of fragmentary speculations on the five breaths (prāṇa, apāṇa, vyāṇa, samāṇa, udāna), enumerations of virtues, mental preparation for death (quoted in the Pitrmedha section of the unpublished Vādhula-Gṛhyaśūtra recently found by Y. Ikarī), etc. The second one is a short passage on the meaning of the sāvitrī formula and on the way of reciting it. It is noteworthy that 4,18–21 (KenaU) and 4,22–26, which form two neighbouring portions, contain the same sentences of the teacher’s giving an ādesa ‘instruction’: tasyaśa ādesaḥ ‘As to that, there is this instruction’ (4,21,4 [KenaU 4,4] ∼ 4,24,12), and of a dialogue between the pupil and teacher who asks for and teaches an upaniṣad ‘doctrine’ respectively: upaniṣadam bho brūhīti. uktā ta upaniṣat. ... vāva ta upaniṣadam abrūmeti “ ‘Tell [me] the upaniṣad, sir.’ ‘The upaniṣad has been told thee. We told thee the upaniṣad about ...’ ” (4,21,7 [KenaU 4,7] ∼ 4,23,6). Both portions also have enumerations of virtues like dama ‘restraint’ in similar sentences (4,21,8 [KenaU 4,8] ∼ 4,25,3).

The Gṛhyaśūtras prescribe a formal request for teaching by the pupil to the teacher (pupil: sāvitrīn bho anubrūhi ŚāṅkhGS 2,5,11; ĀpGS 4,11,8; BhārGS 1,9: 9,1; BaudhGS 2,5,39. Cf. KauṣGS 2,3,7; ĀśGS 1,21,4; HirGS 1,6,10; ĀgGS 1,1,3: 10,2; GobhGS 2,10,38), and a ceremonial dialogue between the teacher and pupil at the beginning of every lesson or unit in the Vedic learning (pupil: ... bho anubrūhi, teacher: ... te ’nubravīmi ŚāṅkhGS 2,7,1ff. ∼ KauṣGS 2,4,1ff. Cf. ŚāṅkhGS 4,8; 6,3. pupil: adhihi bhoh at every kāṇḍa VārGS 5,24–25). The dialogue in the two portions in question seems to reflect such a ceremonial dialogue between the teacher and pupil performed at the teaching of an upaniṣad at that (pre-Gṛhyaśūtra) time. It is probable that these two portions were composed as a set of texts with the common sentences of the teacher’s giving an ādesa and of the dialogue between the pupil and teacher as a textual device for providing uniformity to the texts. Thus, the KenaU portion (4,18–21) and its succeeding portion (4,22–26), together with the final portion on the sāvitrī formula (4,27–28), must be later appendices to the JUB, collected there probably for educational purposes as three teaching units (to be compared with BĀU 5–6, TU 1, and Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad).
Summary

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>JSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀgGS</td>
<td>Āgnivesyā-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>JUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpGS</td>
<td>Āpastamba-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>KausB or KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td>Āpastamba-Śrutasūtra</td>
<td>KausŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀśvGS</td>
<td>Āśvalāyana-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>KausU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā</td>
<td>KenaU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀU</td>
<td>Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀUK</td>
<td>Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>LŚS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhGS</td>
<td>Baudhāyaṇa-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhŚŚ</td>
<td>Baudhāyaṇa-Śrutasūtra</td>
<td>ŠadvB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārGS</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>ŚāṅkhaŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td>Chāndogya-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>ŚB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DŚŚ</td>
<td>Drāhyāyana-Śrutasūtra</td>
<td>ŚBK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>(Kāṇva recension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GobhŚŚ</td>
<td>Gobhila-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>ŚBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HirGS</td>
<td>Hiranyakesī-Grhyasūtra</td>
<td>(Mādhyandina recension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HirŚŚ</td>
<td>Hiranyakesī-Śrutasūtra</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĪśāU</td>
<td>Īśā-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>VādhiŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JĀṛŚŚ</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Āṛṣeya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>VāraŚŚ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>Vaiḥkhaṇasa-Śrutasūtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Jaiminiya-Saṃhitā or Sāmaveda (Jaiminiya recension)</td>
<td>VSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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