

**Reprinted from *Acta Asiatica* No. 57 (1989)  
with the permission of the Tōhō Gakkai.**

Notes on the Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa: Under Stimulus from  
the Article by Lariviere\*

KANAZAWA Atsushi

Today research on the Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa (SK) ought to present a rather complex aspect. This should be no problem as long as one confines oneself to research on the contents of the SK as it is presently available together with the commentaries by Devasvāmin and Bhāskaraṛāya.<sup>1)</sup> But the moment one starts to tackle such questions as its “designation,” “author,” “commentators” and “position in the history of Indian philosophy,” one will encounter various unexpected difficulties. In other words, it may frequently be the case that the researcher will proceed with his discussion without having been able to clearly establish the meaning of the word “Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa” or without any clear grasp of what he is actually discussing.

*Sūtras* from the present SK are quoted twice, together with the reference “*Saṅkarṣe*,” in Śabarasvāmin’s *Bhāṣya* on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* (MS),<sup>2)</sup> and this fact in itself guarantees the authenticity of the present SK. In addition, Śaṅkara himself cites another *sūtra* from the present SK in his commentary on the BrS III. 3. 43, also together with the word “*Saṅkarṣe*.”<sup>3)</sup> Hence, provided that these passages in the currently available *Śābara-Bhāṣya* and *Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya* do not represent later interpolations, it is to be assumed that subsequent scholars of the Mimāṃsā school and Vedānta school, who would have nurtured their own ideas through the works of Śabara and Śaṅkara respectively, would have as a matter of course set their eyes on this “*Saṅkarṣe*” and the accompanying quotations. But strangely enough, in the former

---

\* The present paper represents a translation of our “Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa o meguru shomondai—Mimāṃsā kenkyū josetsu” Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa をめぐる諸問題—Mimāṃsā 研究序説 (An introductory study of the Mimāṃsā: Problems relating to the Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa; *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋學報, Vol. 67, Nos. 3-4, March 1986, pp. 356-322), Section III (pp. 340-331), together with the accompanying notes (pp. 328-323).

1) SK<sup>1</sup>, SK<sup>2</sup> and SK<sup>3</sup>. SK<sup>1</sup> is accompanied by Bhāskaraṛāya’s (18th c. A.D.) commentary *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*; SK<sup>2</sup> represents the only manuscript, although incomplete, of *sūtras* alone; and SK<sup>3</sup> is accompanied by Devasvāmin’s (11th c. A.D.?) commentary. Details on Devasvāmin are uncertain. Cf. R. W. Lariviere, “Madhyamamimāṃsā—The Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa,” WZKS, Bd. 25, 1981, pp. 179-194; P. K. Aithal, “Devasvāmin: A Forgotten Jurist?,” *Indology and Law*, (Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 106-119.

2) Cf. MD, vi, p. 387, ll. 14-15; vii, p. 165, ll. 23-24.

3) Cf. BrSSBh<sup>1</sup>, p. 839, l. 3; BrSSBh<sup>2</sup>, p. 756, l. 3.

school they were completely ignored.<sup>4)</sup> In the case of the latter school, on the other hand, the same *sūtra* would be quoted with considerable conscientiousness, when compared with the former school, time and again,<sup>5)</sup> and there were even instances where brief explanatory comments were added on “*Saṅkarṣe*,” the apparent title of the source of these *sūtras*. Furthermore, Rāmānuja, who composed the commentary *Śrī-Bhāṣya* on the BrS from the Viśiṣṭādvaita viewpoint, differing from that of Śaṅkara, also quotes the same verse at the same place as Śaṅkara together with the reference “*Saṅkarṣaṇe*.”<sup>6)</sup> In addition to the above three *sūtras*, a considerable number of *sūtras* to be found in the present SK have also been retrieved from other works.<sup>7)</sup> One may assume that the authors of these works were able to refer directly to a version of the SK presumably identical with that currently available or that they were fairly reliably informed about it. Thus research on the SK today should be developed on the basis of the information provided by these works, and we believe that there is a need for the “designation,” “author,” “commentators” and “position in the history of Indian philosophy” of this SK to be questioned and clarified. But it would appear that even those works that quote *sūtras* from the present SK and thereby directly guarantee its authenticity are not necessarily of any assistance in answering these demands. Of course, the material for elucidating these various problems concerning the SK is not limited to that noted above, and as a matter of fact a large amount of additional material has been discovered, reported on and discussed.<sup>8)</sup> Among this material, that which has until now provided the most abundant information on the SK is the following passage in the anonymous *Prapañcahṛdaya* (PH).<sup>9)</sup>

- i) *tatra sāṅgopāṅgasya vedasya pūrvottarakāṇḍasambhinnasyāśeṣavākyaṛthavīcāraparāyaṇaṃ mīmāṃsāsāstram| tad idaṃ viṃśatyadhyāyanibaddham|*

4) There are, nevertheless, some scholars in later times who do occasionally mention the SK, such as Someśvara who refers to it in his commentary on Kumārila's TnV (NS, p. 145, l. 27).

5) The various commentaries on the BrS almost invariably quote the same *sūtra* as that quoted by Śaṅkara (i.e., SK II. 2. 36).

6) Cf. SriBh ad BrS III. 3. 42: SriBh<sup>1</sup>, ii, p. 734, ll. 1-2.

7) Cf. V. A. Ramasvami Sastri, “Further Light on Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa,” *Siddha Bharati*, II (Hoshiarpur, 1950), pp. 102-105; SK<sup>2</sup>, Appendix; SK<sup>3</sup>, Appendix C; etc.

8) Cf. Lariviere, *op. cit.*

9) Cf. Kanazawa, “Prapañcahṛdaya shiron” Prapañcahṛdaya 試論 (A tentative study of the *Prapañcahṛdaya*), *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要, No. 44, March 1986, pp. 398-377. In this paper the writer points out that the PH, which had previously never been made the subject of any study, contains a not inconsiderable number of quotations from the *Prapañcasāratāntra*, and he also discusses the possible date of its composition.

*tatra ṣoḍaśādhyāyanibaddhaṃ pūrvamīmāṃsāsāstram pūrvakāṇḍasya dharmavicāraparāyaṇaṃ Jaiminikṛtam| tadanyadadhyāyacatuṣkam uttaramīmāṃsāsāstram uttarakāṇḍasya brahmavicāraparāyaṇaṃ Vyāsakṛtam| tasya viṃśatyadhyāyanibaddhasya mīmāṃsāsāstrasya kṛtakotīnāmadheyam bhāṣyam Bodhāyanena kṛtam| tad granthabāhulyabhayād upekṣya kiñcit samkṣiptam Upavarṣeṇa kṛtam| tad api mandamatīn prati duṣpratipādam vistīrnatvād ity upekṣya ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇapūrvamīmāṃsāsāstramātrasya Deva-svāminātisamkṣiptam kṛtam| Bhavadāsenāpi kṛtam Jaiminīyabhāṣyam| punar dvikāṇḍe dharmamīmāṃsāsāstre pūrvasya tantrakāṇḍasyācārya-Śabarasvāminātisamkṣepena saṅkarṣakāṇḍam dvitīyam upekṣya kṛtam bhāṣyam| tathā devatākāṇḍasya Saṅkarṣeṇa| brahmakāṇḍasya Bhagavat-pādaBrahmadattaBhāskarādibhir matabhedenāpi kṛtam| (PH, p. 38, l. 14-p. 39, l.12)*

Together with a schematic outline of the Mīmāṃsā, this passage contains a concise account of the position, author, commentators and contents of the SK. It is no exaggeration to say that, among researchers who have up until now undertaken to write something on the history of the Mīmāṃsā, there is not one who has not shared in the benefits of this work. The fact that the *Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha* (SSS) and *Sarvamatasamgraha* (SMS), from which the following two passages are taken, have also been valuable sources of information is attested to by the many existing studies.<sup>10)</sup>

ii) *viṃśatyadhyāyayuktā sā pratipādyārthato dvidhā|  
karmārthā pūrvamīmāṃsā dvādaśādhyāyavistrā||17||  
asyaṃ sūtram Jaiminīyaṃ Śābaram bhāṣyam asya tu|  
mīmāṃsāvārttikam Bhāṭṭam Bhāṭṭācāryakṛtam hi tat||18||*

.....

*bhavaty uttaramīmāṃsā tv aṣṭādhyāyī dvidhā ca sa|  
devatājñānakāṇḍābhyaṃ Vyāsasūtram dvayos samam||20||  
pūrvādhyāyacatuṣkena mantravācyātra devatā|  
Saṅkarṣaṇoditā tad dhi devatākāṇḍam ucyate||21||*  
(SSS, pp. 2-3)

10) Although the dates of the PH, SSS and SMS are not clear, we here wish to briefly touch upon the relationship between these three works. Rāmānuja (11th-12th c. A.D.) is mentioned in neither the PH nor SSS; the PH mentions Devasvāmin (11th c. A.D.?), who wrote a commentary on the SK; the SMS also contains a quotation which would appear to derive from the SSS; the SMS refers to Rāmānuja; the author of the SMS may be considered to have been acquainted with both the PH and SSS; and although the PH does not mention Rāmānuja, there are reasons for believing that it postdates (or was contemporaneous with?) Rāmānuja. Cf. n. 9).

- iii) *evaṃ pūrvottarakāṇḍātmanā bhinnasya vedasyādhyayanavidhipariḡhītat-  
vād vivakṣitārthatvena niścitasyārthavicārāya mīmāṃsāsāstram pravṛttam/  
tac ca viṃśatyādhyāyaparimitam kāṇḍatrayātmakam bhavati/ tatra  
pūrvamīmāṃsā dvādaśādhyāyāmitā karmakāṇḍaniṣṭhā/ tatsūtrakarttā  
Jaiminiḥ/ . . . uttaramīmāṃsā tu dvirūpā saguṇanirguṇabrahmaniṣṭhā  
aṣṭādhyāyāmitā Vyāsaḥpranītā/ tatra saguṇabrahmaniṣṭhā devatākāṇḍātmi-  
kādhyaīyacatuṣṭayavati/ . . . evaṃ madhyamamīmāṃsā sarvadevatātmano  
hareḥ pratipādiketi saguṇabrahmaparā bhavati/ jñānakāṇḍātmikā tu  
nirguṇabrahmaniṣṭhā/ sāpi caturādhyāyāmitā/ . . . prati karmakāṇḍam  
pravṛttam/ . . . prati devatākāṇḍam pravṛttam/ . . . adhikṛtya brahma-  
kāṇḍam pravṛttam . . ./ (SMS, pp. 10–11)*

In his recent paper “Madhyamamīmāṃsā—The Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa,”<sup>11)</sup> which gives the impression of having summarized all previous research on this enigmatic SK, R. W. Lariviere writes as follows: “In any case the designations *saṅkarṣa*, or *saṅkarṣaṇa*, *devatā*, and *upāsana* [sic] seem to have been interchangeable in various texts. Whether or not all these designations referred to the same set of Sūtras is another question.”<sup>12)</sup> It is the examination of this “other question” that constitutes the primary objective of the present paper. It is, in other words, a question of whether or not the SK, Saṅkarṣaṇa-kāṇḍa, Devatā-kāṇḍa and Upāsana-kāṇḍa (and also Madhyama-kāṇḍa), alluded to in various works as if they referred to the same work (or parts of the same work), do actually all signify the same work (or parts of the same work). In a word, we wish to devise a means to determine the truth of the variously recorded traditions, and at the same time we shall present some new material and also briefly state our views on methodological questions relating to the historical study of the Mīmāṃsā.

Even on the basis of the material that has been made available to date, the present writer is of the opinion that it should be considered that there definitely did exist a work called the SK, Saṅkarṣaṇa-K, Devatā-K or Upāsana-K other than the present SK. This may be assumed to be so even if one takes into account the fact that the people who have left records of the SK may in fact have been transmitting erroneous information on this work without actually having seen the work in question. It is possible to look upon the SK that was in the minds of the authors of the PH and SMS, both works which today provide us with important information on the SK but which are unfortunately anonymous, as having been different from the present SK. Both

11) Cf. n. 1.).

12) Lariviere, *op. cit.*, p. 183, ll. 17–20.

describe the SK as consisting of four chapters, as does the present SK. Although i) gives Devasvāmin as the commentator, when one considers that both these works describe the contents of the four chapters in similar terms, it is probably more natural to regard it as a work differing from the present SK.<sup>13)</sup> (Or is one to consider that they are based on a commentary or exposition grounded in a standpoint completely different from that of Devasvāmin?)

There is, in addition, as is noted by Lariviere,<sup>14)</sup> a work from which “*sa viṣṇur āha hi*” is quoted together with the designation *Deva-śāstra* in Madhva’s *Anuvyākhyāna*.<sup>15)</sup> Judging from the comments of S. Siauve, who edited and translated this text, and of Lariviere who remarked upon it, this *Deva-śāstra* would seem to begin, according to the commentator Jayatirtha (to whom the present writer has yet unfortunately been unable to refer), with “*athāto daivī (jijñāsā?)*” and, following “*sa viṣṇur āha hi*,” to end with “*taṃ brahmety ācakṣate*.”<sup>16)</sup> These three *sūtras* are, needless to say, not to be found in the present SK. However, K. V. Sarma, the editor of SK<sup>2</sup>, has already given us a precise description of the latter two of these three *sūtras*.<sup>17)</sup> According to Sarma, these two *sūtras* were preceded by a *sūtra* reading “*ante harau taddarśanāt*.” As is only to be expected, Sarma adds the comment that “the authenticity of this and the next two *sūtras* as to whether they really belong to the ‘present’ Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa is doubtful.”<sup>18)</sup> Yet Lariviere, who ought to have been aware of this comment by Sarma, while noting and commenting on the passage in Siauve’s above-mentioned work, did not attempt to consider it in conjunction with Sarma’s comment. In this regard, M. Itō too has the following comment to make: “Furthermore, in his *Śatadūṣaṇī*, p. 15<sup>1-2</sup>, and *Tattvāṭikā*, p. 44<sup>9-11</sup>, he [=Vedāntādeśika] holds that there were three *sūtras* not to be found in the extant S. K. in the *upasaṃhāra* of the present work [=S.K.]. The final *sūtra*, “*taṃ brahmety ācakṣate*,” would seem to link up rather smoothly with the first *sūtra* of the *Brahmasūtra*, and referring to the Pūrva- and Uttara-mīmāṃsā as the Kabandha- and Rāhu-mīmāṃsā (*Adhikaraṇasārāvalī*, p. 24<sup>8-11</sup>; *Paramatabhaṅga* II, pp. 245-246), he emphasizes their unity. The clarification of whether or not they represent an interpolation by him [=Vedāntādeśika] must await further careful ex-

13) For details on the content of the present SK, see SK<sup>3</sup>, pp. x-xlii. Cf. PH, p. 41, l. 18-42, l. 3; SMS, p. 10, ll. 14-20.

14) Lariviere, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-184, n. 20.

15) Cf. AnuV, p. 23, ll. 7-8.

16) Compare these with the present SK. Cf. SK<sup>3</sup>, pp. 1, 220.

17) SK<sup>2</sup>, Appendix, p. 18, ll. 5-11.

18) *Ibid.*, p. 18, n. 1.

amination in the future.”<sup>19)</sup> The three *sūtras* here alluded to by Itō are those cited above, namely, “*ante harau taddarśanāt,*” “*sa viṣṇur āha hi*” and “*taṃ brahmety ācakṣate.*” Vedāntadeśika’s own words are as follows: “*evaṃ tarkite karmaṇi saṅkarṣaṇakāṇḍe caturlakṣaṇyā tattatkarmārādhyadevataiva svarūpa-bhedaguṇaprakarṣaiḥ nirākṛṣyata| tatsamāptau ca, ‘ante harau taddarśanāt,’ ‘sa viṣṇur āha hi,’ ‘taṃ brahmety ācakṣate taṃ brahmety ācakṣate’ iti vicārayiṣyamānam upacikṣpya (upakṣipyata) iti tattvavṛddhāḥ|.*”<sup>20)</sup> Itō does not appear to have taken note of Lariviere’s comment, and confronted with the same situation as Sarma, he closes simply with the comment that “the clarification of whether or not they represent an interpolation by him must await further careful examination in the future.”<sup>21)</sup> It is interesting to note the three different reactions of Lariviere, Sarma and Itō. In connection with the SK, also known as the Devatā-K, Lariviere evinces an interest in what is referred to as the *Deva-śāstra*, while Itō links the Saṅkarṣaṇa-K mentioned by Vedāntadeśika (i.e., the above three *sūtras*) directly to the present SK. The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that a work containing the above four *sūtras* and designated by Madhva as the *Deva-śāstra* was connected by Vedāntadeśika with the title Saṅkarṣaṇa-K. It would seem reasonable to assume that there did exist a work which, according to Jayatirtha, clearly dealt with the subject of *daivī*, was able to link up directly with an inquiry into *brahman*, and, in addition, could be called the Devatā-K or Saṅkarṣaṇa-K, differing completely from the present SK. May we not consider that there definitely did exist a work called the *Deva-śāstra*, beginning with *athāto* and ending with the reiteration of an identical phrase, even though only four *sūtras* from it have been retrieved to date? (Or are we still to posit the existence of a version of the SK differing from the present SK and containing these four *sūtras*?)<sup>22)</sup> Rather than point to the present SK, the SK and Devatā-K as described in the PH and SMS may in fact correspond to this *Deva-śāstra*. In particular, the explanation “*sarvadevatātmano hareḥ pratipādiketi saṅgābrahmaparā bhavati*”<sup>23)</sup> in the SMS would seem to be in perfect consonance with these four *sūtras*. It may also be pointed out that the fact that not one single *sūtra* from the present SK has been found among

19) Itō Michiya 伊藤道哉, “Saṅkarṣa-Kāṇḍa ni tsuite” Saṅkarṣa-Kāṇḍa について (On the Saṅkarṣa-Kāṇḍa), *Ronshū* 論集, No. 11, 1984, p. 175b, ll. 2-10.

20) TT, p. 44, ll. 9-11. Cf. *Śatadūṣaṇi* (UVG, 1974), p. 15, ll. 1-2.

21) This would appear to be based on Itō’s mistaken reading of (or his not having read) the above quotation from Vedāntadeśika.

22) As a matter of fact, S. Subrahmanya Sastri had already made a clear statement on the three *sūtras* in question prior to the three writers mentioned here. Cf. *Ābhogaḥ-Kalpataru-Vyākhyā* by *Lakṣmīṅśimha* (Madras, 1955), pp. xix-xx.

23) Cf. quotation iii) above (p. 34).

the works of Vedāntadeśika,<sup>24)</sup> who today through his many works provides us with valuable information on the SK, Saṅkarṣaṇa-K, etc., probably indicates that he did not have direct access to the present SK, and it is also possible that he knew of the above *Deva-śāstra* too only at second hand. Both the expressions “*Saṅkarṣa*”<sup>25)</sup> and “*Saṅkarṣaṇa-K*”<sup>26)</sup> appear in his works, and there are also quotations from works referred to as the “*Saṅkarṣaṇa-Saṃhitā*”<sup>27)</sup> and “*Sāṅkarṣaṇa*,”<sup>28)</sup> which would appear to be related to these. It should not be possible for one to incorporate into research on the present SK the various references by Vedāntadeśika to the SK without answering the question of whether or not these all refer to the same work.

In addition, Lariviere<sup>29)</sup> informs us that there is a work given as the source of a quotation in Utpalācārya’s *Spandapradīpikā* which is referred to by the expression “*Saṅkarṣaṇasūtreṣu*.”<sup>30)</sup> The four verses quoted are also not to be found in the present SK. Lariviere merely makes the comment that “these Ślokas make poor Sūtras.”<sup>31)</sup> If, however, one takes account of the fact that a *sūtra* from the present SK is referred to in the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* as “*Saṅkarṣaṇasūtra*,” as is evidenced by the passage “*kratvaṅgatvaṃ vā cityetvaṅge nopapadyate*’ (SK I i 15) *iti Saṅkarṣaṇasūtram tu kratvapūrvopayogābhiprāyaṃ vyākhyeyam*” quoted by K. V. Sarma,<sup>32)</sup> it is certain there existed yet another work able to be designated as the SK.<sup>33)</sup>

At the start of his *Padārthādarśa* (PA), a commentary on the *Śāradātilaka*, Rāghavabhaṭṭa (15th c. A.D.), famed as a commentator of Kālidāsa’s *Abhijñānaśakuntala*, makes the following statement. This is a passage which has not yet been reported on in studies on the SK.

iv) *tatra sarvāsu śrutiṣu kāṅḍatrayaṃ karmopāsanābrahmabhedena/ tatra karmakāṅḍam Jaiminīprabhṛtibhiḥ samyaktayā vivṛtam/ idam upāsanā-kāṅḍam Nārādādibhiḥ, brahmakāṅḍam bhagavadVyāsādibhir iti smṛ(śru)-*

24) Cf. SK<sup>3</sup>, p. v, ll. 3-5.

25) AS, p. 34, l. 7.

26) TT, p. 44, l. 9.

27) SPR, p. 115, l. 4; SRBh, p. 32, l. 25-p. 33, l. 1; *ibid.*, p. 75, l. 22. Cf. F. Otto Schrader, *Introduction to the Pañcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā* (Madras, 1916), pp. 15-16, etc.

28) SRBh, p. 89, l. 29. This probably corresponds to the *Saṅkarṣaṇa-Saṃhitā*.

29) Lariviere, *op. cit.*, p. 194, n. 92.

30) Although Schrader discusses the relationship between this Utpalavaiṣṇava and the various *saṃhitās* of the Pañcarātra school, he does not seem to touch on the *Saṅkarṣaṇa-sūtra*. Cf. Schrader, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19. (The present writer has not yet, however, been able to refer to the works of Utpala.)

31) K. K. Handiqui clearly considers it to be a work belonging to Viṣṇuism. Cf. K. K. Handiqui, *Yāśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur, 1968, pp. 363-364.

32) SK<sup>2</sup>, p. xii, ll. 11-12.

33) A work of the Pañcarātra school?

*timūlakatā asya pratyakṣopalabdihā/... tatra karmakāṇḍe sarvau'py  
adhikāri/ mumukṣor api tattvajñānaparyantaṃ svacittaśuddhyartham  
pratyavāyaparihārārtham ca karmakarane'dhikārasambhavāt/ tadvad  
upāsanākāṇḍe'pi/ yataḥ sākāropāsanātaḥ svargādi bahu phalaṃ bhavati  
kramato muktiś ca, karmakāṇḍāt tu svargādiphalaṃ bahutaravyayā-  
"yāsena bhavati/ brahmakāṇḍān muktir api ādaranairantaryadīrghakālābh-  
yāsasādhyā'nekeṣu janmasu tādr̥ṣeṣv eva gateṣu bhavati/ "anekajanmasaṃ-  
siddhāntato yāti parāṃ gatim" iti vacanād ata etad upāsanākāṇḍam  
evāgamaśāstrātmakaṃ garīya iti siddham/ (PA, p. 1, l. 34- p. 2, l. 11)*

After a perusal of a passage such as this, anyone like Lariviere familiar with studies on the SK would consider that what is here called the Upāsanā-K refers to our SK, and he would doubtless regard the above brief explanation of the Upāsanā-K as referring to the present SK. Finally, he would conclude that yet another riddle had been added to the question of the author of the SK. In previous studies on the SK, summarized in Lariviere's paper, various views ascribing the authorship of the SK to Jaimini, Vyāsa, Kāśakṛtsna and Saṅkarṣa(ṇa), etc., have been examined.<sup>34)</sup> Lariviere himself rejects the view ascribing this work to Kāśakṛtsna, although without giving any clear reasons for doing so, with the words "it seems unlikely that Kāśakṛtsna should be considered the author of the SK"<sup>35)</sup> and, relying above all on the authority of Devasvāmin, a commentator of the present SK, states that "it seems reasonable to proceed on the assumption that Jaimini was indeed the author of the SK."<sup>36)</sup> In the case of Itō, he contents himself with the following reasonable but vague explanation: "Although views have been current ascribing its authorship to Jaimini, Vyāsa or Kāśakṛtsna, it is of course not at all possible to consider that any of these should have composed the S.K. It was, after all, probably compiled by the Mimāṃsā school at a time not all that long after the [compilation of the] *Jaiminisūtra*."<sup>37)</sup> By way of contrast, our above quotation records a view that would attribute the Upāsanā-K (=SK?) to Nārada. Who would this Nārada have been? Can he, for example, be equated with the Nārada who is specifically mentioned by Śambhu Bhaṭṭa in the statement "*evam vaiṣṇavam Nāradaḍibhiḥ kṛtam*"<sup>38)</sup>? Lariviere, who is also a student of the *Nārada-Smṛti*, would no doubt promptly say, "It seems unlikely that Nārada should be considered the author of the SK." Is

34) Cf. Lariviere, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-186.

35) *Ibid.*, p. 186, ll. 4-5.

36) *Ibid.*, p. 186, ll. 18-17.

37) Itō, *op. cit.*, p. 175a, ll. 7-12.

38) PrA, p. 44, lc., ll. 13-14. Cf. PBheda, p. 23, l. 5.



it advisable, after all, to consider the ascription to Nārada in the PA as being based on the erroneous information passed on by an author who had never actually seen the work in question? But in his introduction (Bhūmikā), Sri Mukunda Jha Bkashi (Vakhsi?), the editor of this PA, paraphrases this passage ever so unconcernedly in the following manner: “. . . *yatra karmakāṇḍam pūrvamīmāṃsādau, Jaiminyādibhiḥ/ upāsanākāṇḍaṅ ca pañcarātrādau Nāradaḍibhiḥ jñānakāṇḍaṅ cottaramīmāṃsāyām Vyāsādibhir upavarṇitam/.*”<sup>39)</sup> Namely, “the Karma-K was expounded by Jaimini, etc., in the PM, etc., the Upāsanā-K by Nārada, etc., in the Pañcarātra, etc., and the Jñāna-K by Vyāsa, etc., in the UM.” As this clearly shows, the passage in question does not concern the work SK, also known as the Upāsanā-K, but should have been interpreted as referring to the Nārada who as leader of the Pañcarātra school, etc. (⇒Vaiṣṇava), which was founded in connection with the Upāsanā-K of the Vedas. But even so this does not mean that we can immediately reject it as being unrelated to the SK. It indicates that, in accordance with their content, the Vedas are subdivided into three parts, namely, the Karma-K, Upāsanā-K and Jñāna-K (or Brahma-K), and that these were expounded by Jaimini, Nārada and Vyāsa respectively. The structure of the contents of the passages which we quoted earlier (i), ii) and iii)) is in essence identical with that of this example. It is only the manner of dividing the Vedas, which constitute the primary object of inquiry in the Mīmāṃsā, that differs, and there is also the difference of Pañcarātra and SK. On the basis of this, too, it is possible to automatically draw the conclusion that the Pañcarātra and SK are identical. Even though designations such as SK or MM may not be used when referring to the “scholastic system” created or the “works” composed by Nārada, etc., in regard to the Upāsanā-K of the Vedas, this too may be described as one view of the Mīmāṃsā. This tripartite division of the Vedas as an object of inquiry into the Karma-K, Upāsanā-K and Jñāna-K is not limited to this example alone and may also be frequently met with in other works.<sup>40)</sup> This merits our attention in connection with the fact that

39) ST, Bhūmikā, p. 1, ll. 24-26.

40) “*karmopāstijñānakāṇḍa vedeṣv iva mata iha/*” (GG, p. 1, l. 11); “*ye devayānapitryānādibhedena karmopāsanājñānakāṇḍabhedena jñānavijñānasamyagjñānabhedena vā viśvena vyavahārikajivena carṣanā vikalpitā ye tripathāḥ trayāḥ panthānaḥ santi, . . .*” (TPUV, SU, p. 1, l. 12-p. 2, l. 1); “. . . *karmopāsanājñānakāṇḍaprakāśakaiḥ . . .*” (SiUV, SU, p. 97, l. 5); etc. This type of threefold classification concords, for example, with the threefold classification of *karmayoga*, *jñāna-yoga* and *bhakti-yoga* in the *Bhagavadgītā*. When considered in this connection, the commentary on the *Śāṅḍilya-Bhakti-Sūtra* by Svapneśvara (10th-11th c. A.D.?), who discusses the relationship between the Bhakti-K and the Jñāna-K, Brahma-K, etc., and the relationship between the Bhakti-Mīmāṃsā and Karma-Mīmāṃsā, is also of considerable interest. Cf. SBSSBh, pp. 70, 158, 246, 249, 250.

the SK is sometimes referred to by the designation Upāsanā-K.

It is probably also no mere coincidence that the name Pañcarātra should have cropped up here in connection with the Upāsanā-K, for today it is not possible to discuss the Pañcarātra without reference to Sañkarṣaṇa<sup>41)</sup> (not Sañkarṣa), one of the members of its renowned four-*vyūha* theory.<sup>42)</sup> In connection with the Upāsanā-K, we have now come up with a Pañcarātra that would appear to be linked to the SK, also frequently termed the Sañkarṣaṇa-K. That being the case, what then is the relationship between the present SK of the Madhyama-Mīmāṃsā and the Sañkarṣaṇa of the Pañcarātra?<sup>43)</sup> Although it would be hardly surprising to find that there might have been some confusion even between Sañkarṣa and Sañkarṣaṇa, it does come as a considerable surprise to find that in SK studies to date virtually no connection has been suggested between Sañkarṣa or Sañkarṣaṇa and the Sañkarṣaṇa of the Pañcarātra, and this in spite of the fact that it was readily surmisable that the SK or traditions relating to the SK often bore a close relationship to Viṣṇuism,<sup>44)</sup> and also in spite of the fact that the meaning of the word “Sañkarṣa” or “Sañkarṣaṇa” among the designations of the SK is by no means clear—namely, it has not even been possible to determine whether it is a mere common noun expressing the nature of this *kāṇḍa*, as is clearly the case in, for example, the statement “*sañkarṣyate karmakāṇḍastham evāvaśiṣṭam karma samkṣīpyocyate iti sañkarṣo devatākāṇḍam*”<sup>45)</sup> by Ānandagiri of Śāṅkara’s school, or whether it is the name of a person as in the case of Jaimini and Śāṅkara, and whether Sañkarṣa-K<sup>46)</sup> was the original name of the SK or whether the name Sañkarṣaṇa-

41) These are generally known as Vāsudeva, Sañkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. While Sañkarṣaṇa is on the one hand treated within Viṣṇuism as one of the four *vyūhas*, it has also been pointed out in various studies that he has, alongside with Vāsudeva, etc., a rather long history as an independent object of worship in the form of a Sañkarṣaṇa cult. Cf. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems* (Strassburg, 1913), pp. 3-4, etc.; R. N. Dandekar, “The Beginnings of Vaiṣṇavism” (IT, Vol. III-IV, 1975-1976, pp. 169-186), p. 174ff; etc.

42) Cf. Schrader, *op. cit.*, etc.

43) In this connection the question of whether or not there did exist historically a person (or deity) by the name of Sañkarṣaṇa and connected with the Mīmāṃsā is also of considerable interest. We would, for example, like to draw attention to the satirical play *Āgamaḍambara* by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (9th c. A.D.) which might be described as a unique “summary of doctrines.” The protagonist Sañkarṣaṇa (!) of this drama, who “may have corresponded to someone in reality,” is a man of religion belonging to the Pañcarātra school and, what is more, he is described as “*mahāmīmāṃsaka-Sañkarṣaṇaḥ*” (AD, p. 56, l. 15). Cf. *ibid.*, p. xxiv, ll. 14-18; p. xxviii, ll. 7-12.

In addition, there are also examples where the views of the Pañcarātra school would seem to have been linked to the Sañkarṣaṇa-K. Cf. SDSS, p. 41, ll. 12-20; p. 40, ll. 12-13; p. 42, l. 2; p. 48, ll. 6-7.

44) Cf. S. K. Aiyangar, “Viṃśaty-Adhyāya-Nibaddham Mīmāṃsā-Śāstram,” *Woolner Commemoration Volume* (Lahore, 1940), p. 3, ll. 36-38.

45) NN, BrSSBh<sup>2</sup>, p. 756, l. 35.

46) Or simply Sañkarṣa without Kāṇḍa?

K be more appropriate. In contrast to Ānandagiri and others<sup>47)</sup> who would attach a particular meaning to the “Saṅkarṣa” of the SK, there are in fact some who attribute the origin of this title to the name of the author. The PH gives the title as Saṅkarṣa-K and attributes it to Jaimini, yet holds that the commentary was written by Saṅkarṣa or Saṅkarṣaṇa.<sup>48)</sup> An even clearer testimony to the view that Saṅkarṣa represent the name of a commentator is to be found in the SMS.<sup>49)</sup> Furthermore, the SSS quoted above may be said to be, like the SMS,<sup>50)</sup> somewhat singular in that it identifies the Devatā-K with the Uttara-Mimāṃsā (UM),<sup>51)</sup> and in regard to the author too it provides a rather unusual view. In the words of Lariviere, “it ascribes the authorship to Saṅkarṣaṇa via Vyāsa.”<sup>52)</sup> Where does this *ācāryapāramparya* of Saṅkarṣaṇa→Vyāsa have its origin? There is probably a need to consider, for example, its relationship to the following tradition which was fostered within Viṣṇuism, namely: “*Brahmā Maheśvarāya Maheśvaraḥ Saṅkarṣaṇāya Saṅkarṣaṇo Nārādāya Nārado Vyāsāya Vyāso lokebhyaḥ prāyacchad iti . . .*”<sup>53)</sup> If, with this tradition as a premise, one were to regard, as do the SMS and

47) Cf. Lariviere, *op. cit.*, p. 180; SSA, i, p. 40, ll. 17-18; etc.

48) There is also the following variant to our quotation i) in regard to the phrase “*tathā devatākāṇḍasya Saṅkarṣeṇa/*,” namely: “*tathā devatākāṇḍasya Saṅkarṣaṇena/*” A. Parpola gives for this a new interpretation, differing completely from all other interpretations to date, when he writes, ‘I would like to adopt the latter reading and offer the following translation: “Similarly, leaving out the Devatākāṇḍa, a commentary upon the Brahmakāṇḍa was composed by . . .”’ (Parpola, “On the Formation of the Mimāṃsā and the Problems Concerning Jaimini” WZKS, Bd. 25, 1981, p. 154, n. 37). Reading this passage “*tathā devatākāṇḍasya saṅkarṣaṇena brahmakāṇḍasya . . . kṛtam/*,” Parpola interprets the word *saṅkarṣeṇa* (or *saṅkarṣaṇena*), which had previously been considered to record Saṅkarṣa or Saṅkarṣaṇa as a commentator of the Devatā-K, as a mere adverbial phrase meaning “leaving out,” and he then seeks to incorporate it within the following sentence referring to the commentator of the Brahmakāṇḍa. This interpretation of Parpola’s is, however, a mere flight of the imagination which can on no account be accepted. In the passage in question, which discusses the commentators of the Tantra-K, Devatā-K and Brahma-K, the commentaries are first broadly divided into the Pūrva-Mimāṃsā-Śāstra (=Dharma-Mimāṃsā-Śāstra) and Uttara-Mimāṃsā-Śāstra, with the former being clearly designated as the Tantra-K and Devatā-K and the latter as the Brahma-K. Hence, although in regard to the commentator of only the Tantra-K among the Pūrva-Mimāṃsā-Śāstra (=Śābarasvāmin) an expression to the effect of “omitting” (*upekṣya*) the Devatā-K (=SK) is meaningful, in the case of the commentator of the Brahma-K the expression “leaving out” (*saṅkarṣaṇena*) specifically the Devatā-K from among the Pūrva-Mimāṃsā-Śāstra would be totally meaningless. On the basis of the text of the PH as it stands at present, the only possible interpretation would appear to be the conventional one, namely, that the commentary on the Devatā-K was composed by Saṅkarṣa (or Saṅkarṣaṇa). It seems probable that the anonymous author of the SMS who wrote “*iha [=Devatā-K] bhāṣyākāraḥ Saṅkarṣaḥ/*” (SMS, p. 10, ll. 13-14) paraphrased this section of the PH (?) after having interpreted it in the same manner as we have.

49) Cf. n. 48).

50) The quotation in the SMS, p. 15, ll. 19-20, corresponds to SSS, p. 6, ll. 10-11. Cf. n. 10).

51) Cf. *śloka*s 20-21 of our quotation ii).

52) Lariviere, *op. cit.*, p. 185, ll. 7-8.

53) HGU, VU, p. 404, l. 23- p. 405, l. 1.

SSS, the SK as belonging to the UM composed by Vyāsa (=Bādarāyaṇa),<sup>54)</sup> it should be little cause for surprise whether the authorship of the SK be ascribed to Saṅkarṣaṇa, Nārada or Vyāsa. Then again, the newly discovered *Praṇava-mīmāṃsā*, which was first announced and examined by Lariviere<sup>55)</sup> and then published forthwith together with a translation and notes by P. Olivelle,<sup>56)</sup> has as follows: “. . . kramamuktiphala-dāṭṭṛSaṅkarṣaṇācāryapraṇī-topāsanākāṇḍam . . .”<sup>57)</sup> Lariviere makes the comment that “the SK is not mentioned by that name, but is called the upāsanākāṇḍa [*sic*].”<sup>58)</sup> But this source informs us that not the Saṅkarṣa(ṇa)-K but the Upāsanā-K was composed by Saṅkarṣaṇācārya (and not Saṅkarṣaṇa). One might compare the “*krama-mukti*” which here characterizes the Upāsanā-K with “*kramato muktis*” which was mentioned as one of the distinguishing features of the Upāsanā-K in iv) above. It is true that the name given in iv) was not that of Saṅkarṣaṇācārya but that of Nārada. If, however, one calls to mind the above-mentioned mechanism, taking into account, namely, the lineage of the founders of Viṣṇuism (. . . → Saṅkarṣaṇa → Nārada → Vyāsa), one could say that the content of the *Praṇava-mīmāṃsā*, invoked by Lariviere as a new piece of material on the SK, accords not so much with the present SK but rather with the content of iv).

In view of our above inquiries, we believe that it should have become clear that the various traditions relating to the SK, Saṅkarṣaṇa and Upāsanā-K, which up until now would all seem to have been considered in relation to the present SK, do not necessarily concern the one and the same SK, and that therefore the many discrepancies to be found in these traditions can no longer be all regarded simply as the products of erroneous traditions transmitted by people who had never actually set eyes on the present SK. For the future, we feel an acute need for the further discovery and accumulation of new historical evidence relating to the SK and for research to be undertaken from a broader viewpoint not restricted to the field of Mīmāṃsā studies alone.

N.B. All underlines in this paper have been added by the writer.

54) There is a marked tendency to equate the Vyāsa renowned as author of the *Mahābhārata*, etc., with Bādarāyaṇa from about the tenth century A.D. onwards.

55) Lariviere, *op. cit.*, p. 181, l. 3ff and n. 10.

56) P. Olivelle, “Praṇavamīmāṃsā: A Newly Discovered Work of Vidyāraṇya,” ABORI, 62, 1981, pp. 77-101.

57) *Ibid.*, p. 84, l. 13. Cf. Lariviere, *op. cit.*, p. 181, ll. 4-5.

58) Lariviere, *ibid.*, p. 181, ll. 8-9. But in point of fact there are no grounds whatsoever for linking this Upāsanā-K to the present SK.

## Abbreviations

- ABORI: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.*  
AD: *Āgamaḍambara*, Darbhanga, 1964.  
AnuV: *Anuvyākhyāna*, ed. & tr. by Suzanne Siauve, Pondichéry, 1957.  
AS: *Adhikaraṇasārāvali*, Ubhaya Vedānta Granthamālā 1974.  
BhD: *Bhāṭṭa Dīpikā of Khāṇḍadeva with Prabhāvali of Shambu Bhāṭṭa*, ed. by N. S. Ananta Krishna Sastri & Vasudeva Laxmana Sastri Pansikar, Bombay, 1921.  
BrS: *Brahma-Sūtra*; v. BrSSBh<sup>1</sup> & BrSSBh<sup>2</sup>.  
BrSSBh: *Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya*; v. BrSSBh<sup>1</sup> & BrSSBh<sup>2</sup>.  
BrSSBh<sup>1</sup>: *BrSSBh with Other Commentaries*, Bombay, 1938.  
BrSSBh<sup>2</sup>: *BrSSBh with Other Commentaries*, Delhi, etc., 1980.  
CSG: *Chatusslokihashyam, Sthothraratnabhashyam, and Gadyatrayabhashyam*, ed. by Chettaloor V. Srivatsankacharyar, Madras, n.d.  
GG: *Gaṇeśagitā with Nilakaṇṭha's Ṭikā*, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, No. 52, 1906.  
HGUV: *Hayagrivopaniṣad-vyākhyā by Śrī Upaniṣad Brahma-Yogin*; v. VU.  
IT: *Indologica Taurinensia*.  
MD: *Mīmāṃsādarśana*, 7 pts, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, No. 97, 1970-1975.  
MS: *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*; v. MD.  
NN: *Nyāyanirṇaya*; v. BrSSBh<sup>2</sup>.  
NS: *Nyāyasudhā*, ChSS 14, 1902-1909.  
PA: *Padārthādarśa*; v. ST.  
PBheda: *Prasthānabheda*, ed. by A. Weber, Berlin, 1850.  
PH: *Prapañcaḥṛdaya*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 45, 1915.  
PrA: *Prabhāvali*; v. BhD.  
SBSSBh: *Śāṅḍilya Bhakti Sūtra with Svapneśvara Bhāṣya*, ed. & tr. by Swami Harshananda, Mysore, 1976.  
SDSS: *Ṣaḍdarśanisiddhāntasaṅgraha*, Thanjavur, 1980.  
SiUV: *Sitopaniṣad-vyākhyā of Śrī Upaniṣad-Brahma-Yogin*; v. SU.  
SK: *Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa*; v. SK<sup>1</sup>, SK<sup>2</sup> and SK<sup>3</sup>.  
SK<sup>1</sup>: *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa or the Last Four Chapters of Jaimini, with the Commentary Called Bhāṭṭa Candrikā, of Bhāskara[-rāya]*, ed. by Rama Misra Sastri, The Pandit, 14-16 (New Series), 1892-1894.  
SK<sup>2</sup>: *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa Sūtras of Jaimini*, ed. by K. V. Sarma, Hoshiarpur, 1963, V. I. Series 18.  
SK<sup>3</sup>: *Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa of Sage Jaimini with the Bhāṣya of Devasvāmin*, ed. by S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Madras, 1965.  
SMS: *Sarvamatasāṅgraha*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 62, 1918.  
SPR: *Śrī Pañcarātrarakṣā*, Adyar Library Series, Vol. 36, 1967 (2nd ed.).  
SRBh: *Stotraratnabhāṣya*; v. CSG.  
SriBh: *Śribhāṣya*; v. SriBh<sup>1</sup>.  
SriBh<sup>1</sup>: *SriBh with Bhāṣyārtha Darpaṇa of Abhinava Deśika*, 2 pts, Ubhaya Vedānta Granthamālā 1963-1964.

- SSA: *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana*, 4 pts, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Nos. 47, 48, 58 & 61, 1916-1918.
- SSS: *Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha*, Madras, 1909.
- ST: *Śāradātilaka with Padārthadarśa*, Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 107, 1963.
- SU: *The Śākta Upaniṣad-s with the Commentary of Śrī Upaniṣad-Brahma-Yogin*, ed. by A. Mahadeva Sastri, Adyar Library Series, Vol. 10, 1950 (1st ed., 1925).
- TnV: *Tantravārttika*; v. MD.
- TPUV: *Tripuropaniṣad-vyākhyā of Śrī Upaniṣad-Brahma-Yogin*; v. SU.
- TT: *Tattvatikā*, Ubhaya Vedānta Granthamālā 1974.
- VU: *The Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣad-s with the Commentary of Śrī Upaniṣad Brahma-Yogin*, Adyar Library Series, Vol. 8, 1979 (2nd ed.).
- WZKS: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*.