

The Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa--A genuine Supplement to the

Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Śāstra

The *Samkarṣa Kāṇḍa*, or the *Samkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* (henceforth abbreviated as *Sk.*) as it is otherwise known, is traditionally recognised as a Supplement to the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Śāstra*. It has all along remained a sealed book to modern scholars. Mr. M. L. Sandal, in the Introduction to his English translation of the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Sūtras* (S. B. II. Series, Vol. 1. pp. x-xii), says that *Sk.* is a spurious work. He observes:

(In the *Sk.*) there are no adhikaraṇas and the Sūtras are meagre; it is an apocryphal portion of the Mīmāṃsā, most probably palmed off by Khaṇḍa-deva as genuine..... It has a commentary called *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, by Bhāskara, son of Gambhira. (i).

All the writers of the Mīmāṃsā have characterized Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā as containing twelve chapters. (ii).

Strange to say that the *Sk.* is not mentioned by Alberuni and Abul Fazal. The latter has given the contents of the twelve chapters of Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā. For these reasons, I am of opinion that the *Sk.* is a spurious work. (iii).

The *Sk.* never found popularity amongst the students of Mīmāṃsā, and was, therefore, very properly consigned to oblivion. We do not find it mentioned in any ancient works prior to Rāmānuja in his *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* or Madhusūdana Sarasvati in his *Prasthānabheda*. (iv).

The style of the so-called Sūtras does not resemble that of Jaimini; it is so very curt and mutilated that one cannot make out anything without the help of Bhāskara's *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*. There are no adhikaraṇas which are the peculiar characteristics of Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā. (v).

The last sūtra in the fourth pāda of the fourth chapter, which is the 16th chapter in the work, ends with the word (phrase) 'यथा याज्यासंप्रैषः' which has been repeated twice) and imitated from the final endings in the *Sāṃkhyapravacana* or the *Vedāntasūtras*. (vi).

It is a valuable work in Mīmāṃsā literature and is more in the nature of the *Kalpa Sūtras*. It does not criticize any general principle as is done

* Evidently, Mr. Sandal is misinformed. See the citation from the *Samkarṣa Kāṇḍa* by Śaṅkara on *Vedānta Sūtras* III. 3. 43: तदुक्तं संकर्षे--

by Jaimini in his Mimāṃsā. The well-known twelve principles have been discussed in the twelve chapters by Jaimini; but, in the (present) work under description, there is a simple description of the post-sacrificial (?) minor ceremonies which really form the subject of the Śrauta part of the *Kalpa Sūtra*. In this view, which I take of the *Sk.*, it cannot be considered a supplement of Jaimini's Mimāṃsā. (vii).

Mr. Sandal's observations contain, no doubt, certain truths, which, if scrutinised, would reveal that some of them are misleading.

The term *Sk.* is generally understood to stand for a clear and comprehensive exposition of Vedic propositions which are found scattered in the various recensions of the Vedas¹ or those supposed to have been lost. Naturally, then, it has no *saṅgati*² which relates together the adhyāyas, pādas and adhikaraṇas. It is because of this characteristic that the *Sk.* has come to be regarded as a supplement to the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī* completing the twelve chapters of the latter by considering the topics left undiscussed therein. It is also *miscellaneous* in that it is based on both *upadeśa* and *atideśa* as are the *śānta* and the *prasaṅga* of the 11th and 12th chapters. For this reason, we cannot have strict *saṅgati* among topics in this kāṇḍa. This feature is therefore no argument against its authenticity. There can be traced, however, some relation (*saṅgati*) between the various parts of this Kāṇḍa such as *ākṣepa*, *apavāda* or *prasaṅga*. According to the printed commentary of Bhāskararāya, most of the pādas of these four chapters are known by different names indicative of the particular

1 Cf. सम्यक् निःशेषतया स्फुटतया च, कृष्टा आकृत्य विप्रकीर्णविदवाक्येभ्यः सङ्गृह्य निरीयन्त इति संकर्वच्युत्पत्तिः ॥

2 Bhāskararāya begins his commentary, *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, thus: एवं द्वादश-
लक्षणायाः प्रकृतिविकृतिभेदेन कतिपयान्वायान् संशोध्य, तैरेव न्यायैरितस्ततो विप्रकीर्णान्धेद-
वाक्यार्थान् दृपयेण सम्यक् निष्कृत्य निर्गोतुमेषा चतुर्ध्याध्यारभ्यते । अतएव संकर्षे न प्रत्यधिकरणां
सगत्यपेक्षा ॥ Appayya Dikṣita, in his *Kalpataru Parimala* (Nirnaya Sagar
Edn., p. 50) observes: धर्मविचारार्थं द्वादशलक्षणीं कृत्वा, तत्रासूत्रितान् कश्चिन्नयाया-
लालस्य, तत्संग्रहार्थं द्वादशलक्षणीशेषं संकर्षकाराडं कृतवतो महर्षिवरस्य जैमिनेः ॥ Elsewhere
in the same work, he characterises the *Sk.* thus: द्वादशलक्षणाद्यविचारितनानाविषय-
विचारितात्मकः तत्परिशिष्टः तन्त्रप्रसंगवदुपदेशातिदेशसाधारण्येन प्रकीर्णकः प्रवर्तितः ॥
op. cit., p. 898).

themes discussed in them—as can be readily seen from the following tabulation :—

Adhyāya	Pāda	Subject
xiii	4	यूपपादः
xiv	1	दृष्टकापादः
”	2	अवदानपादः
”	3	प्रेष ”
”	4	होम ”
xv	1	कालपादः
”	2	अग्नि ”
”	3	ग्रह ”
”	4	आर्षेयपादः वा वरणापादः
xvi	1	हौत्रकाध्याये समाधिपादः
”	2	निगदपादः
”	3	वषट्कारपादः

II

If this feature of the work had been properly understood, Mr. Sandal would not have remarked that in the *Sk.* there are no *adhikaraṇas* and that the *Sūtras* are meagre etc. Mr. Sandal complains that the *Sūtras* are “meagre.” He is evidently under the impression that the *Sūtras* printed in bold type in the edition of the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* represent the complete *Sūtras* constituting both the *pūrvapakṣa* and the *siddhānta* views in any given *adhikaraṇa*. But, the pity of it is that these are not at all complete *Sūtras* but only the first words of the first *Sūtras* generally in those *adhikaraṇas*. For example,³ in the printed text, we get the *Sūtra* of the first *adhikaraṇa*—‘अनुयजतीति’ but, the full *Sūtra* runs thus—‘अनुयजतीत्यनुवषट्कारश्चोचते’ which finally decides that the proposition ‘सोमस्याग्ने व्रीहोत्यनुयजति’ enjoins a new sacrifice to be performed after the Soma Yāga.

Again, Mr. Sandal’s statement that “it (the Saṃkarṣakāṇḍa) is an

3 For other instances see the Appendix at the end of this paper.

Apocryphal portion of the Mīmāṃsā, most probably palmed off by Khāṇḍadeva" is clearly wrong. The *Saṅkaraśakāṇḍa*, as a prakīrṇaka of the Mīmāṃsā Śāstra, was composed by Jaimini,⁴ the author of the *dvādaśalakṣaṇī*. It is referred to by Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the *Vedānta Sūtras* and has been commented upon by several great writers of the Mīmāṃsā Śāstra. According to Saṅkara, Rāmānuja and other Bhāṣyakāras, Bādarāyaṇa has cited in his Sūtra—प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तं (iii, 3. 43), the approval of the Siddhānta-view of the adhikaraṇa xiv, 2, of the *Sk*.⁵

On the authority of the *Prapañcahṛdaya*,⁶ it appears that the famous Vṛttikāra Bodhāyana wrote a Vṛtti on the *Sk*. This Vṛttikāra is identified with Upavaṛṣa.⁷ Tradition holds that Śabarasyāmin's

4 Vide the remarks of Appayya Dikṣita quoted already under f.n. ante. also. तदिदं (मीमांसाशास्त्रं) विशत्यध्यायनिबद्धं । तत्र षोडशाध्यायनिबद्धं पूर्वकाण्डस्य प्रथमविचारपरायणं जैमिनिकृतम् । तदन्यदध्यायचतुष्कमुत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रमुत्तरकाण्डस्य ब्रह्मविचारपरायणं व्यासकृतम् । *Prapañcahṛdaya*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, p. 39.

5 Saṅkara explains *Vedānta Sūtra*, iii, 3, 43, as follows :
तस्मात्पृथगेवोपगमनं प्रदानवत्—यथा, 'इन्द्राय राज्ञो पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालम् । इन्द्रायाधिराजाय । इन्द्राय स्वराज्ञो, इत्यस्यां त्रिपुरोडाशिन्यामिष्टौ, 'सर्वेषामभिगमयन्नवद्यत्यच्छ्वं वट्कार' मिति । एतौ वचनादिन्द्राभेदाच्च सहप्रदानाशङ्कायां, राजादिगुणभेदाद्याज्यानुवाक्याव्यत्यासविधानाच्च, यथा न्यासमेव देवतापृथक्त्वात्प्रदानपृथक्त्वं भवति । एवं तत्त्वाभेदेऽपि आध्येयांशपृथक्त्वादाध्यायनपृथक्त्वमित्यर्थः । तदुक्तं संकर्षे—'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' इति । तत्रतु, द्रव्यदेवताभेदाद्यागभेदो विद्यते । नैवमिह विद्याभेदोऽस्ति ॥

Rāmānuja in his *Sribhāṣya* explains : प्रदानवदेव, प्रदानवदावर्तनीयमित्यर्थः × × × तदुक्तं संकर्षे—'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' इति ॥

Srikanṭha has the following explanation :

इन्द्रप्रदानवद्यथा इन्द्राय राज्ञो पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालं..... स्वराज्ञो इति गुणभेदात्पृथक् पुरोडाशप्रदानम् । नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानादिति संकर्षे तथोक्तत्वात् ।

6 तस्य विशत्यध्यायनिबद्धस्य मीमांसाशास्त्रस्य कृतकोटिनामधेयं भाष्यं बोधायनेन कृतं तद्वन्धुब्राह्मणभयादुपेक्ष्य किञ्चित्संज्ञिसमुपवर्षेण कृतम् ॥

7 My revered Professor Mm. Vidyāvacaspati Prof. S. Kuppasvāmi Śāstrigal in his article—'Bodhāyana and Damañcārṇya : Two Old Vedāntins presupposed by Rāmānuja' (III Oriental Conference, Madras) has tried to establish the Bodhāyana-Upavaṛṣa identity. If this identity is acceptable, the Vṛtti known as *Kṛtakoti*, according to literary sources, belongs to Upavaṛṣa. Hence, the passage from the *Prapañcahṛdaya*

bhāṣya covers also the *Sk.*⁸ Bhavauāsa, one of the famous Vṛttikāras has written a bhāṣya or vṛtti on the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*, which is now unfortunately lost to us; and this also covers all the 16 chapters.⁹

Devasvāmin, probably the famous author of the bhāṣya on the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, has commented on the 16 chapters of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras*. His bhāṣya is described in the *Prapañcahṛdaya* as a beautiful summary of the bhāṣya of Upavaṛṣa,¹⁰ and is the only ancient commentary on this Kāṇḍa, now available in manuscript. Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita, a reputed author in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra* and other branches of knowledge, has also written a commentary, known as *Saṅkarṣa-nyāyamuktāvali*.¹¹ Lastly, Bhāskararāya has written his *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* on the model of Khaṇḍadeva's *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* on the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*. All these categorically accept the *Sk.* as genuine.

Now it is to be examined whether Khaṇḍadeva has commented on the *Sk.* If we take the opening verse in the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* of the *Sk.*

cited above, is to be interpreted in the sense that Bodhāvāna who is none other than Upavaṛṣa wrote a summary of his own Vṛtti and called it *Kṛtakoti*.

8 Contrary to this traditional view, the *Prapañcahṛdaya* holds that Sabarasvāmin has not commented on the *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa* and one *Saṅkarṣa* or *Saṅkarṣaṇa* has written a bhāṣya on it—

पुनः द्विकाण्डे धर्ममीमांसाशास्त्रे पूर्वस्य तन्त्रकाण्डस्याचार्यशबरस्वामिनातिसंक्षेपेण
संकर्षकाण्डं द्वितीयमुपेक्ष्य कृतं भाष्यम् । तथा देवताकाण्डस्यैव संकर्षेण (संकर्षणेन—ग. पाठः) ।
Prapañcahṛdaya, p. 39.

9 The *Prapañcahṛdaya* remarks on p. 39, भवदासेनापि कृतं जमिनीयभाष्यं
(षोडशाध्यायपरिमितं). *Devasvāmin* also in his bhāṣya on XV. 11, 1, says,

अस्मिन्वादे 'अपूर्वात्तथा सोमः' इत्यारभ्यापादपरिसमाप्तेः भावदासमेव भाष्यमिति ।

10 तदपि (उपवर्षभाष्यमपि) मन्दमतीन्प्रति दुष्प्रतिपादं विस्तीर्णत्वादित्युपेक्ष्य षोडशलक्षण-
पूर्वमोमांसाशास्त्रमात्रस्य देवस्वामिना अतिसंक्षिप्तं कृतम्. *Prapañcahṛdaya*, p. 39.

It is Devasvāmin's bhāṣya and not Sabarasvāmin's, which is constantly referred to by Bhāskararāya in his *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*; and references to an ācārya and vṛttikṛt found in Devasvāmin's bhāṣya and the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, might be in all probabilities to the famous Vṛttikāra Upavaṛṣa, who has commented on this Kāṇḍa.

11 This work is noticed by Dr. Hultzsch in his *Reports of South Indian Mss.*, vol. II, No. 1489,

प्रगम्य जैमिनिमुनि खण्डदेवकृताविह ।

अनुग्रहाय मन्दानां संप्रहोऽयं विधीयते ॥

authentic, then it is clear that Khaṇḍadeva has written a commentary on this Kāṇḍa, a summary of which has been afterwards written by Bhāskara-rāya. But the concluding verses in the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*—

खण्डदेवकृतभाट्टदीपिका लक्षणैः कतिपयैरसंभृता ।

इत्युदीक्ष्य युध भास्करामिचिद्-भारती वरिभरांबभूव ताम् ॥

अद्यावधि कृतिरेषा (आ)द्यन्तविहीनेति दीपिकाख्यासीत् ।

षोडशकलाभिरधुना परिपूर्णा भाट्टचन्द्रिकात्वमगात् ॥

gave us a different idea, viz. Khaṇḍadeva has *not* commented upon the *Sk.* We have got no tangible evidence as yet to prove Khaṇḍadeva's authorship of any works on this Kāṇḍa.

Mr. Sandal observes that "Bhāskara has dedicated his work in the name of his masters and called it *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* after the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* of his preceptor". That Bhāskara was the disciple of Khaṇḍadeva cannot be accepted. Evidences are available to prove that Khaṇḍadeva, the Mimāṃsā teacher of Perubhaṭṭa,¹² flourished in the beginning of the 17th century, while Bhāskara-rāya, son of Gambhīrarāya Dikṣita lived at a later age. If he were one of the disciples of Khaṇḍadeva, he would have certainly referred to his 'guru' in terms like 'pājya-pāda' as Sambhubhaṭṭa has done. From Bhāskara's concluding verses already cited, we are able to gather that he was a great admirer of Khaṇḍadeva and his works and as such, wrote his *Candrikā* a commentary on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* and a commentary on the *Saṅkarṣa sūtras*.

12 Khaṇḍadeva was the Mimāṃsā teacher of Perubhaṭṭa, the father of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, and not of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, as Mr. Sandal has observed in his Introduction, p. xi. The second and third verses in the beginning of the *Rasagaṅgādhara* clearly prove this view. The *yuccabda* in the second verse— सर्वविद्याधरो यः goes along with 'tucchabda' in the third verse— तं वन्दे परुभट्टाख्यं लक्ष्मीकान्तं महागुरुम्'. This Perubhaṭṭa, the husband of Lakṣmī, as Nāgeśa's Commentary notes, is undoubtedly the father of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, the author of the *Rasagaṅgādhara*, the Five Laharis, the *Bhāminīvilāsa* and other minor works.

13 It is possible that Bhāskara-rāya, the author of the *Saṅkarṣabhāṭṭacandrikā* is identical with the author of the *Candrikā* or *Candrodaya*, a commentary on

Mr. Sandal's arguments (2), (3), (4), and (5) do not contain sufficient evidences to prove that the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is a spurious work. We have already cited six authors of the *Pūrvāmīmāṃsā Śāstra* of whom at least *five* have undoubtedly commented upon this Kāṇḍa—a fact which would well prove its genuineness as a supplement to the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*. In the light of these, we cannot accept Mr. Sandal's conclusion which is based on the sole reason that Alberuni, Abul Fazal and Mādhava, the author of the *Sarva-darśana-saṅgraha* have not referred to it.

Mr. Sandal's sixth argument is that 'the style of the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is so curt and mutilated that without the help of the Commentary one cannot understand it' etc. All sūtras, as a rule, are curt and are not intelligible without a commentary.¹⁴ As for his opinion that they are *mutilated*, we are afraid that he is not in full possession of the sūtras. We have given in the Appendix some full sūtras which were collected and reconstructed from references.

Mr. Sandal's seventh argument supports our view. The repetition of the phrase यथा याज्यासंप्रैषः at the end of the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* clearly shows that the *Saṃkarṣa* closes the *Pūrvāmīmāṃsā Śāstra*; for, we do not find any such repetition in the last sūtra of the twelfth chapter. In this respect, Jaimini might have followed some of his predecessors in the field of Mīmāṃsā or some Kalpasūtrakāras. Mr. Sandal's observation that 'Jaimini has either followed the *Sāṃkhya-pravacana-sūtra* or the *Vedāntasūtra*' is baseless.

(1) There is a theory prevalent among scholars that the available *Sāṃkhya-pravacana-sūtras* are not the genuine sūtras of Kapila and they are the productions of Vijñānabhikṣu who flourished during the 14th century. Jaimini could not have any access to these sūtras.

the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*. It may also be said here that the same Bhāskararāya has composed a minor work on Mīmāṃsā—*Matvarthalakṣaṇāvicāra* and the *Vaidikaśā* in verse, both now preserved in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serf Sarasvati Mahal Library.

14 Compare:—

अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम् ।
अस्तोभमनवद्यच्च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः ॥

(2) In the *Vedāntasūtra* there is the repetition of the word at the end of each *pāda* and *adhyāya* and the whole *sūtra* is repeated at the end of the *Sāstra*. Such a practice is not followed.¹⁵

The *Samkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is a valuable work in the *Mīmāṃsā* literature and is more in the nature of the *Kalpasūtras*. Unlike the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*, the *Samkarṣa Kāṇḍa* has not got any separate principle to enunciate and, therefore, is a miscellaneous supplement. It attempts at a further application of the principles already enunciated in the twelve chapters, to other examples in the *Vedas*, which may not be otherwise easily intelligible. Even within many *adhyāyas* one and the same principle is enunciated and discussed with reference to different illustrations with a view to widening the application of the rule of interpretation in question to the vast field of the *Vedas* and other texts of unquestionable authority on the eternal *dharma*. In this sense it is a *Kalpasūtra* but there is this main difference that the *Mīmāṃsā* enquires whether this particular thing is to be accepted in this particular way, while all *Kalpasūtras* are generally mere compendiums of ritualistic informations found scattered in the various branches or recensions of the *Vedas*, all of which the *Vedic* students are not allowed or have no time to study.

III

Appendix

The *Sk.* consists of four *adhyāyas*, each *adhyāya* being subdivided into four *pādas*, and each *pāda* again subdivided into a number of *Adhikaraṇas* or *Nyāyas* as follows:—

Adhyāya	Pādas				Total
	1	2	3	4	
XIII	15	18	24	27	84
XIV	41	18	15	30	104
XV	25	36	20	14	95
XVI	13	19	22	10	64

Adhikaraṇas 347

¹⁵ According to *Devasvāmin's* *bhāṣya* on the *Sk.*, there is repetition of a word or of a phrase at the end of the second chapter (XIVth chapter) of the *Samkarṣa*. If this is reliable, this practice of the *Sūtrakāra* does not help us to definitely say whom he has followed.

The following full Sūtras constituting various Adhikaraṇas in the *Sk.* are collected and reconstructed from Appayya Dikṣita's *Vedānta-kalpataru-parimāla* and Vāsudeva Dikṣita's *Adhvarmīmāṃsākutūhala-vṛtti*.

(1) Adhyāya XIII. 1.1 अनुयजतीयनुवषट्कारः चोद्यते (V.K.P., N.S. Ed. p. 838).

- (2) Adhyāya XIII. 3.2 (1) सह कुम्भीभिरतिकामन्नाहेति स्रुकप्रत्याम्नायः श्रूयते
यथा पलाशस्य मध्यमेन पशुने जुहोति (पूर्वपक्षः)
(2) दारुपात्राणि कुम्भीभिर्विकल्पेरन् एकार्थत्वात्
(आशङ्का),
(3) पवृत्तस्य प्रदानस्य पात्रनिधानात् अपनयो यथा
पात्नीवतं पर्यग्निकृतमुत्सृजेत्, (सिद्धान्तः)।

[AMK, Vṛtti, Vanivilas Edn., Sri Rangam. Madras, p. 398].

- (3) Adh. XIII. 3 (1) तत्र शेषकार्याणि क्रियेरन् पात्रान्यत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) नापनीतेषु श्रुतत्वात् तत् व्याख्यातम् (सिद्धान्तः),

[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 398]

- (4) XIV. 2.2 (1) तत्र देवतानामादेशो न विद्यते अनाम्नात्त्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) विद्यते वा अन्यार्थदर्शनेभ्यः (सिद्धान्तः),
(3) आम्नातः प्रयाजेषु देवतादेशः, तस्य प्रतिषेधो वचनमितरेषु
(गुणसूत्राशङ्का),
(4) आम्नातो वैकेषां तद्दर्शयत्यमुष्मा अनुग्रहमुं यज (गुणसूत्राशङ्का-
निरासः)।

[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 160]

- (5) XIV. 2.14 (1) तेषां पृथक्कृतानां निरवदानं यथाऽन्येषां हविःपृथक्त्वात्
(पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) वचनात्सर्वेषां सह अवदीयेत (सिद्धान्तः)।

[VKP, p. 838].

- (6) XIV. 2.15 (1) तेषां पृथक्प्रदानं अवदानैकत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) नाना वा देवता पृथक्ज्ञानात् (नाना वा पृथक् ज्ञानात् ; नाना वा
देवतापृथक्त्वात्) (सिद्धान्तः),
(3) अन्यार्थप्रदर्शनाच्च (गुणसूत्रम्)।

[VKP, pp. 838—9]

- (7) XIV. 4.1 (1) देवतासंयोगेन चोद्यमाने प्रदान आहुतिः यथा लोके ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 390].
- (8) XIV. 4.2 (1) अदेवतासंयोगेन चोद्यमानेऽर्थगृहीता यथा भोजनचोदनायां
मनुष्ययोगः ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 288].
- (9) XIV. 4.3 (1) सूक्त्राको याज्याप्रस्तराहुतीरिध्मः प्रथम आहुतीनां ह्यते
इत्येतेन व्याख्यातम् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) प्रशंसा वा संस्कारः प्रस्तरस्य सन्निधानात् समिन्धनार्थं इध्मः
(सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 288].
- (10) XIV. 4.27 (1) ऋताषाट् ऋतधामेति यथार्थविनिष्कर्षोऽर्थग्रथकृत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) यथा समान्नानं वा (सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 150].
- (11) XIV. 4.28 (1) षड्भिर्जुहोतीति पर्यायवादो यथा सावित्राणि जुहोति ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 150].
- (12) XVI. 2.1 (1) (...) इत्यालेखनः (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) प्रकृतित इत्याश्रमरन्ध्रः (सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 269].
- (13) XVI. 4.10 (1) पशानुत्तमे प्रयाजे स्रुगादापनो न विद्यते संप्रेषितत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) विद्यते वा अन्यकालत्वात् यथा याज्यासंप्रैषो यथा यज्यासंप्रैषः
(सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 838].