

I may here mention that there are four supplementary chapters of the Mimānsā which go under the name of the Sankarṣa kāṇḍa. It consists of the chapters, Pādas and sūtras as follows :—

Chapter	Pādas				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
XIII	15	18	24	27	84
XIV	41	18	15	30	104
XV	25	36	20	14	95
XVI	12*	19	22	10	63
Grand total ...					346

There are no Adhikaraṇas and the Sūtras are meagre ; it is an apocryphal portion of the Mimānsā most probably palmed off as genuine by खांडदेव the writer of भाट्टदीपिका. It has a commentary called भाट्टचन्द्रिका by भास्कर son of गंभीर.

This apocryphal portion is known under the name of संकर्षकांड and is said to have been commented upon by शबर. No commentary of शबर has yet been found. There is no doubt that रामानुज has referred to संकर्षकांड while commenting upon III. पाद 3 of the Rāmānuja school Vedānta Sūtras, He quotes “नाना वा देवता वृषकत्वार ;” refers to it. we find this सूत्र in the mutilated form in Sūtra 15 of chapter XIV. Pāda 2 of संकर्षकांड. The writer of the commentary called वेदान्तप्रदीप, who belongs to that school has also referred to it. It cannot be said with certainty that the संकर्षकांड or संकर्षकांड referred to by the Rāmānuja school commentators is the same as published in the “Paṇḍit” the monthly publication of the Benares Sanskrit College. What puts one in doubt is that Rāmānuj has referred to बोधायनवृत्ति, has quoted in the commentary on Sūtra 1 of the Vedānta Sūtra “संहितवेत्तकारिक जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षेणेति शास्त्रैकत्वविद्धिः” (“This शास्त्रिक शास्त्र has been collected by Jaimini and is characterised with sixteen chapters and is therefore one Śāstra”), has said that by virtue of the Ṣaṭkas and chapters, there is a division of the anterior and posterior Mimānsās and has quoted the first Sūtra of

\* There is one Sūtra added at the end ; if it is counted, there will be 13 Sūtras in this Pāda.

the Mimāṃsā and the last Sūtra of the Vedānta in order to show that the two together form one body of the Śāstra.

Further, all the writers on the Mimāṃsā have characterised जैमिनी's No mention of संकर्षकांड नीमांसा as containing 12 chapters. See भाषवीयन्यायमाला, अर्थ संग्रह, नीमांसा न्याय प्रकाश, नीमांसा परिभाषा and सुबोधनी.

मधुसूदन सरस्वती the writer of प्रस्थानभेद says in connection with the twelve chapters of the Mimāṃsā after giving their contents मधुसूदन सरस्वती refers to it. “ तथा संकर्षणकांडमन्वायचतुष्टयात्मकं जैमिनिप्रणीतम् । तत्रदेवताकांड संज्ञया प्रसिद्धमधुपाचनारुच्य कर्मप्रतिपादनात्वात्कर्मनीमांसात्तर्गतमेव. ’

“ Similarly संकर्षणकांड consisting of four chapters was compiled by जैमिनि. That being known under the title of देवताकांड and dealing with the subject of sacrifice, is included in the Karma Mimāṃsā ”.

No mention of it in सर्वदर्शनसंग्रह The writer of the Sarvadarśana Sangraha has given a summary of only twelve chapters of the Mīmāṃsā.

From the conflicting views, it appears that the Sankarṣa Kāṇḍa was once रामानुज time. regarded a separate treatise but not a part of Jaimini's Mimāṃsā consisting of twelve chapters. It formed a separate book and was passed off as the genuine work of Jaimini by the interested persons. Rāmānuja was born in 1127 A. C. ; we find संकर्षकांड referred to by him for the first time ; मधुसूदन सरस्वती gave a detailed account of it.

Strange to say that the संकर्षकांड is not mentioned by Alberuni and Abul Fazal. The latter has given the contents of the twelve chapters of Jaimini's नीमांसा. For these reasons, I am of opinion that संकर्षकांड is a spurious work. Further I am of opinion that the work as it exists in the present form is either the work of खंडदेव or भास्कर. The latter after mentioning the incomplete commentary of खंडदेव says. Alberuni and Abul Fazal do not mention it.

भास्कर or खंडदेव appear to be the author. “ आसीत् षोडशलक्षणी क्षुतिपदा याधर्मनीमांसिका । संकर्षणवचतुर्धनाय विधुर कालेन साजायत ॥ गायत्री त्रिपदात्मिकेव विदुषैरद्यापि पापयते । तांपूर्वमतनोच्छेनेणमहा गम्भीरजो भास्करः । ” “ That धर्मनीमांसा containing the Vedic texts had sixteen characteristics ; the 4th part called संकर्षकांड was lost in course of time : even now like गायत्री having 3 feet, it is constantly read. Bhāskara, son of गम्भीर with great labour brought it to completion. ” Bhāskara seems to be a great admirer of खंडदेव and dedicated the work in the name of his master and called it भाट्टचन्द्रिका after भाट्टदीपिका of his preceptor ; I think he was his contemporary.

Khaṇḍa Deva is said to be the preceptor of जनन्याय त्रिगुली the author of गङ्गा लहरी, रसगङ्गाधर, भावनीबिलास &c. The latter lived in the reigns of Shah Jehan and Aurangzeb. खंडदेव must have flourished in the reign of Shah Jehan as he is said to have died in 1635 by Keith.

The *चक्रवर्तिका* never found popularity amongst the students of the *Mīmāṃsā* and was therefore very properly consigned to oblivion. We do not find it mentioned in any ancient works prior to *राधाशुक्ल* or *ननुसूदन चरकवती*. The editor of the 'Paṇḍit' believing it to be a genuine work of Jaimini did well in publishing it and putting it before the *Mīmāṃsā* reading public.

The style of the so called *Sūtras* does not resemble that of Jaimini ; it is so very curt and mutilated that one can not make out anything without the help of *भास्कर*'s *भाट्टबन्धिका*. There are no *अधिकरण*s which are the peculiar characteristics of *जैमिनी*'s *नीतिसार*. Each chapter has 4 *pādas* as shown in the above table.

The last *Sūtra* in the 4th *Pāda* of the 4th chapter which is called the 16th Chapter in the work, ends with the word ".....*वशात्* *वशात्* *वशात्*" which has been repeated twice and mutilated from the final endings in *Sāṅkhya Pravaçhana* or the *Vedānta Sūtras*.

It is a valuable work in the *Mīmāṃsā* literature and is more in the nature of the *Kalpa Sūtra*. It does not discuss any general principle as is done by Jaimini in his *Mīmāṃsā*. The well-known twelve principles have been discussed in the twelve chapters by Jaimini, but in the present work under discussion, there is a simple description of the post-sacrificial minor

ceremonies which really form the subject of *Śrauta* part of the *Kalpa Sūtra*. In this view which I take of the *चक्रवर्तिका*, it can not be considered a supplement of *Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā*.