

Reprinted with permission from the University of Vienna,  
Institute for South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.  
Back issues of the Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies  
are available for sale at [www.univie.ac.at/istb](http://www.univie.ac.at/istb)  
and at [www.istb.univie.ac.at/ger/benutz/wzks/wzks.html](http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/ger/benutz/wzks/wzks.html)

## MADHYAMAMĪMĀMSĀ — THE SAṆKARṢAKĀṆḌA

By Richard W. Lariviere, Philadelphia

The names for the divisions of the Mīmāṃsāsāstra are well known: Pūrva- and Uttaramīmāṃsā, Karma- and Brahmamīmāṃsā, etc. So are most of the authors and commentators well-known, but there is one portion of the Mīmāṃsāsāstra which has been the source of some confusion and dispute both among authors of Sanskrit philosophical treatises and among scholars who have written on this text. This is the so-called Saṅkarṣa- or Saṅkarṣaṇakāṇḍa (hereafter SK). That the entire Mīmāṃsā corpus was to be considered as a unit — the Kṛtsnaśāstra — has long been recognized by the writers of Hindu philosophy and by scholars<sup>1</sup>. The characterization of the two branches of Mīmāṃsā as *uttara* and *pūrva* is most common. What is not always clear, however, is the number of chapters ascribed to these two branches. Pūrvamīmāṃsā is most often characterized as *dvādaśalakṣaṇī* — the Mīmāṃsā of twelve chapters. There are also several instances where it is characterized as *ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇī*<sup>2</sup>. Similarly, the Vedānta or Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtras are most often considered to be composed of four Adhyāyas, but they, too, have had another four chapters added to their numbers from time to time<sup>3</sup>. The Mīmāṃsākṛtsnaśāstra is spoken of as consisting of twenty Adhyāyas<sup>4</sup>, and the four chapters which are

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, GANGĀNĀTHA JHĀ, Pūrva Mīmāṃsā in its Sources, Benares Hindu University, Vārāṇasī: 1964, p. 1—10; and Śaṅkara on Brahma Sūtra 3.3.43.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., Rāmānuja, Śrībhāṣya, Bombay Sanskrit Series No. LXVIII, edited by VĀSUDEVA ŚĀSTRĪ ABHYĀṆKAR, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay: 1914, p. 2; or Seśvara Mīmāṃsā of Vedāntācārya, Śāstramuktāvalī No. 16, edited by P. B. ANANTĀCĀRYA, Sudarśana Press, Conjeevaram: 1902, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See the Sarvamatasamgraha, edited by T. GAṆAPATI ŚĀSTRĪ, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. 62, Government Press, Trivandrum: 1918, p. 10; and Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha, edited by M. RAṄGĀCĀRYA, Government Press, Madras: 1909, p. 2—3.

<sup>4</sup> S. K. AIYANGAR, Viṃśaty-Adhyāya-Nibaddharṇ-Mīmāṃsā-Śāstra, in: Woolner Commemoration Volume, edited by MUHAMMAD SHAFI, Meher Chand Lachhman Das Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. 8, Lahore: 1940, p. 1—6; and: Editorial, Journal of Indian History, volume XV, part 2 (August 1936) p. 261—264. In these two articles AIYANGAR discusses an inscription (No. 76 of 1932—33) from Anur in Chingleput District belonging to the reign of Rājārāja

occasionally added either to the Pūrva- or Uttaramīmāṃsā are those of the SK, or as the Sarvamatasamgraha describes it — the Madhyamamīmāṃsā<sup>5</sup>.

The name of this section of the Mīmāṃsā corpus is given variously as *saṅkārṣa*-, *saṅkārṣaṇa*-, *devatā*-, or *upāsana-kāṇḍa*. Various explanations are given for these names and the explanations reflect some of the confusion which is found in connection with the SK. There are authors who feel it is called *saṅkārṣa*- or *saṅkārṣaṇa-kāṇḍa* because it draws together (*saṅkṛṣṭ*) the remaining topics of the Karmakāṇḍa of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā. Others claim that it is so named because it was composed or commented on by an Ācārya of that name. The designations *devatā*- and *upāsana-kāṇḍa* are because of its subject matter. In his commentary on the SK Devasvāmin offers the following explanation for the term *saṅkārṣa*<sup>6</sup>:

*siddhair etaiḥ prasāṅgāntaiḥ śrutiyogaṃ pradarsāyan |*  
*lakṣaṇāni śrutiṃś caiva saṅkārṣyūtha jage munih ||*

“Explaining the joining of the texts with the established principles ending with *prasāṅga* (i.e. the first twelve chapters of the Mīmāṃsāsūtras) the sage then brought together the rules (*lakṣaṇāni*) and the texts and then recited them.”

Ānandagiri in his Nyāyanirṇaya on Śaṅkara's Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 3.3.43<sup>7</sup> offers this explanation for *saṅkārṣa*: *saṅkārṣyate karmakāṇḍastham evāvasiṣṭam karma saṅkṣipyocyate iti saṅkārṣo devatākāṇḍam*. “The Devatākāṇḍa is called *saṅkārṣa* because it is said that an act which is left out of the Karmakāṇḍa is condensed (*saṅkṣipyate*) and collected (*saṅkārṣyate*).” This line of reasoning is followed by Devasvāmin who says that scattered rules are collected in this work<sup>8</sup>. Some texts seem to imply that the title SK is based on the allegation that a

in the year 999 A. D., in which Mīmāṃsā is twice referred to as the Mīmāṃsā of twenty chapters. See also Sarvamatasamgraha, *loc. cit.*; Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha, *loc. cit.*, and Prapañcahṛdaya, edited by T. GAṆAPATI ŚĀSTRĪ, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. 45, Travancore Government Press, Trivandrum: 1915, p. 38, the text is given below.

<sup>5</sup> Sarvamatasamgraha, *loc. cit.*, also Mīmāṃsāpādukā of Vedānta Deśika verse 37 and the commentary thereon by Ācārya Kumāra Śrī Varadācārya (Kumāra Vedānta Deśika) in Mīmāṃsāpādukāparitrāṇa, edited by UTTAMUR T. VĪRARĀGHAVĀCĀRYA, Ubhaya Grantha Māla, Madras: 1971, p. 299—300.

<sup>6</sup> Saṅkārṣa Kāṇḍa of Sage Jaimini with the Bhāṣya of Devasvāmin, edited by S. SUBRAHMANYA ŚĀSTRĪ, (Reprinted from the Annals of Oriental Research) University of Madras: 1965, p. i. This verse is misprinted in the text — p. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Nyāyanirṇaya of Ānandagiri, edited by Paṇḍita ŚRĪ CHOTUPATI ŚĀSTRĪ, Venkateśvara Press, Bombay: 1892, p. 1138.

commentary was written on the Sūtras by an Ācārya named Śaṅkarṣa: ... *devatākāṇḍātmikādhyāyacastrūṣṭayavatī. iha bhāṣyakāraḥ saṅkarṣaḥ*<sup>9</sup>. Other texts claim that the Sūtras of the SK were actually written by Śaṅkarṣaṇācārya: ... *uktiphalaadātrīsamkarṣaṇācāryapraṇītopāsanakāṇḍam*<sup>10</sup>. This is a more satisfactory rationalization for the name *saṅkarṣa* than the suggestion above that the text is named for its commentator. That would be unusual, indeed.

It may be noted in this last text that the SK is not mentioned by that name, but is called the *upāsanakāṇḍa*. The description of the contents of the SK given in the Sarvamatasaṃgraha indicates clearly that the work of which it is speaking treats *upāsana*:

*tatra prathame 'dhyāye sarveṣāṃ mantraviśeṣāṇāṃ devatātattvapratipādane tātparyam iti pratipāditam. dvitīye vidhyarthavādāder vedāśeṣasya mantradevatāśeṣatvam upapādyate. tṛtīye devatātattvam sveccāvigrahatvādiguṇāguṇālaṅkṛtam iti darsitam. caturthe tattādevatāprasādādatatallokaveśavibhūṣaṇaiśvaryaṇandavāptilakṣaṇaṃ devatopāsana-phalaṃ nirṇītam. evam madhyamamīmāṃsā sarvadevatātmano hareḥ pratipādiketi saṅkṛtābrahmaparā bhavati.*

“In the first chapter the ‘purpose’ of all special mantras in propounding the essence of *devatās* is given. The second explains the fact that deities invoked by mantras are what is left of the Veda after *vidhi*, *arthavāda*, etc. In the third, the adornment of the essence of *devatās* with no qualities or with qualities such as incarnation at will, etc. is illuminated. The fourth determines the benefits of worshipping *devatās* — such as attaining power and joy from the splendor of residing in the

<sup>8</sup> Śaṅkarśakāṇḍabhāṣya of Devasvāmin, *loc. cit.*: *prakīrṇayuktatvāc ca nyāyasya*. Appayya Dikṣita says in *Vedāntakalpataruparimala*, edited by ANANTAKRṢṂA ŚĀSTRĪ, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay: 1917, p. 50: *tatrāsūtrī-tān kāṃścin nyāyān ālakṣya tatsaṅgrahārtham dvādaśalakṣaṇīm śeṣaṃ saṅkarśakāṇḍam api kṛtavato maharṣivarasya bhagavato jaiminer . . .*; and p. 838: *yady api saṅkarśakāṇḍo na devatāvicārīthaṃ, pravartitaḥ, kiṃ tu dvādaśalakṣaṇyāvicāritānānāvīṣayanyāyavicārātmakas tatpariśiṣṭaḥ tantraprasaṅgavadūpadeśā-tideśasādhāraṇyena prakīrṇakah pravartitaḥ.*

<sup>9</sup> Sarvamatasaṃgraha, *loc. cit.*, also the Prapañcahṛdaya, *loc. cit.*, text given below. See also the strange passage of the Śaṅkaradigvijaya (mentioned below) where Śaṅkarṣa and Patañjali are described as joint authors of the *madhyam kāṇḍam*.

<sup>10</sup> Praṇavamīmāṃsā by Vidyāraṇya in a unique manuscript in the Library of the Bhārata Itihāsa Saṃśodhaka Maṇḍala in Pune, Ms. no. 39/358. The passage occurs in folio 3a. This work has been edited and translated by PATRICK OLIVELLE and will be appearing in the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Also, see Sarvasiddhāntasaṃgraha Śloka 21 given below.

various heavens by the grace of the various *devatās*. So, the middle *Mīmāṃsā* is the teaching of Hari as the essence of all deities. It is devoted to the Brahman which has qualities.”<sup>11</sup>

The *Prasthānabheda* of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī<sup>12</sup> says clearly that the *devatākāṇḍa* treats *upāsana: tac ca devatākāṇḍasamjñāya prasiddham apy upāsanaḥkhyākarmapratipādakatvāt karmamīmāṃsāntargatam eva*. RĀMA MIŚRA ŚĀSTRĪ, the editor of Bhāskara-rāya's commentary on SK the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, in announcing its imminent publication also referred to it as the *upāsana-kāṇḍa*<sup>13</sup>. The Śaṅkaradigvijaya of Vidyāraṇya<sup>14</sup> describes Śaṅkarāṇa and Patañjali as the authors of the *madhyam kāṇḍam* also called the *upāstiyogakāṇḍa*. The commentary by Dhanapati Suri gives yet another name to this work — the *devatākāṇḍa*.

*devatākāṇḍa* is a very common gloss for *saṅkarāṇa*<sup>15</sup>. The Sarvasid-

<sup>11</sup> Sarvamatasamgraha, p. 41—42. Compare this with the description found in the *Prapañcahrdaya*, *loc. cit.*: *tathā devatākāṇḍasya prathamādhyāye sarveṣāṃ mantraviśeṣānāṃ devatātattvapradarsāne tātparyam iti pradarsitam. dvitīyādhyāye vidhyarīhavadānām adheyānāṃ mantradevatāvīśeṣatvam. tṛtīyādhyāye devatātattvam svecchāvīgrahatvādiguṇāguṇālanākṛtam. caturthādhyāye devatāphalaṃ satkarmaṇām apavargādhikārīṇas tādātmyalakṣaṇam apavargaphalam iti.*

<sup>12</sup> *Prasthānabheda*, published by T. K. BĀLASUBRAHMANIAM AIYAR, Śrī Vani Vilāsa Press, Śrīraṅgam: 1912, p. 11.

<sup>13</sup> *Śāstradīpika* of Pārthasarāthi Miśra, edited by RĀMA MIŚRA ŚĀSTRĪ, Reprint from the Paṇḍit, E. J. Lazarus and Co., Benares: 1891, note, p. 758: *mīmāṃsāsāstrasya upāsana-kāṇḍavyākhyānasvarūpam adhyāyacatuṣṭayam avaśīsyate, yathoktam ācāryapādaiḥ śrībhāṣye 'samhitam etac chārīrakam jāminīyena ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇeneti. tad api yathāsamayaṃ prakāśayīṣyāmaḥ' iti.*

The *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* was published in the Paṇḍit and it seems to have been reprinted, but I have not seen the reprint. The text is scattered through volumes 14, 15, and 16 of the New Series, but this text is not noticed in the table of contents of the various fascicles — the introduction, title page, and *Pratīka* index are printed in volume 16.9 (September 1894). The rest of the text is found as follows:

volume 14. 11 (November 1892), p. 569—584 through 13. 2. 12.

volume 14. 12 (December 1892), p. 625—640 through 13. 4. 18.

volume 15. 2 (February 1893), p. 73—88 through 14. 2. 4.

volume 15. 3 (March 1893), p. 129—144 through 14. 4. 18.

volume 15. 4 (April 1893), p. 185—200 through 15. 2. 12.

volume 15. 5 (May 1893), p. 241—256 through 15. 4. 6.

volume 15. 6 (June 1893), p. 297—312 through 16. 2. 19.

volume 15. 7 (July 1893), p. 353—369 to the end.

<sup>14</sup> *Ānandāśrama* No. 22, Poona: 1891, p. 19—20.

<sup>15</sup> This is the gloss given by Ānandagiri, *loc. cit.*; Anubhūti Svarūpa in *Prakāṭhāvivarāṇam* (on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3.3.43), edited by T. R. CHINTĀMAṆI, Madras University Sanskrit Series No. 9, University of Madras: 1939,

dhāntasamgraha explains this title in this way<sup>16</sup>:

*bhavaty uttaramīmāṃsā tv aṣṭādhyāyī dvidhā ca sā |  
devatājñānakāṇḍābhyāṃ vyāsaśūtraṃ dvayoḥ samam || 20 ||  
pūrvādhyāyacatuṣkeṇa mantravācyātra devatā |  
saṅkarṣaṇoditā taddhi devatākāṇḍam ucyate || 21 ||*

“The Uttaramīmāṃsā on the other hand consists of eight chapters; and it is also divided into two parts under the head dealing (respectively) with deities and with the wisdom (of true philosophy). Both these divisions of the Uttaramīmāṃsā have alike had their *sūtras* (aphorisms) composed by Vyāsa. In the first four chapters here (in the Uttaramīmāṃsā) the deities referred to in the mantras are (given as) described by Saṅkarṣaṇa. For this reason it is called *devatā-kāṇḍa* (i. e., the part dealing with the deities).”<sup>17</sup>

The text does not attempt to explain how or what Saṅkarṣaṇa explained about the deities which was subsequently set down by Vyāsa in the Uttaramīmāṃsā.

In any case the designations *saṅkarṣa*, or *saṅkarṣaṇa*, *devatā*, and *upāsana* seem to have been interchangeable in various texts. Whether or not all these designations referred to the same set of *Sūtras* is another question. K. V. ŚARMĀ, who edited a single, incomplete manuscript of the SK<sup>18</sup>, is troubled by the contents of the SK in the *Prapañcahrdaya*<sup>19</sup>, and he claims that there may have been “an *Upāsana Kāṇḍa* (called also *Devatā-Kāṇḍa* or *Daivīmīmāṃsā*, which terms are used also for the SK) recognised by some Vaiṣṇavite schools of philosophy...”<sup>20</sup>. He is correct in wondering at the contents as

p. 895; Amalānanda Sarasvatī in *Vedāntakalpataru* (again, on BSbhāṣya 3.3.43), edited by ANANTAKRṢṆA ŚĀSTRĪ, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay: 1938, p. 838; and Govindānanda in the *Ratnaprabhā* (on BSbhāṣya 3.3.43), edited by DHUNDIRĀJA ŚĀSTRĪ, Kāśī Sanskrit Series No. 71, Benares: 1929, 1931, p. 830.

<sup>16</sup> Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha, *loc. cit.*, Śloka 20 and 21.

<sup>17</sup> M. RANGĀCĀRYA's translation.

<sup>18</sup> Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa *Sūtras* of Jaimini, Vishveshvaranand Indological Series — 18, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur: 1963.

<sup>19</sup> Text given above note 11.

<sup>20</sup> ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. 18. In the ‘Index of Papers Submitted to the All-India Oriental Conference Sessions I to XII (1919–1944)’, compiled by K. VENKATEŚVARA ŚARMĀ (AIOC, Poona: 1949) there is a paper noted in the following way: “[Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa] The Daivī-mīmāṃsā (summary), B. Krishnaswāmy Rao. XI Summaries, 85–86”. This summary is not in the proceedings and transactions of the eleventh meeting, and I have not been able to see the paper. Another very interesting passage is the comment of Jayatīrtha on Madhva's *Anuvyākhyāna* 1.81 which refers to a *Devaśāstra*; SUZANNE SIAUVE reports the comment in this way: ‘...Deva-Śāstra, texte

described in the Prapañcahr̥daya, for this description has nothing whatever to do with the contents of the SK as revealed by the incomplete edition of ŚARMĀ and the two commentaries which have so far been published<sup>21</sup>. His allusion to Vaiṣṇava sects puts one in mind of the ending of the description of the contents of the SK given above from the Sarvamatasamgraha (a text which none of the writers on the SK seems to have known): "So the middle Mīmāṃsā is the teaching of Hari as the essence of all deities."

ŚARMĀ and SUBRAHMAṆYA in the titles of their works attribute the authorship of the SK to Jaimini. ŚARMĀ<sup>22</sup> says: "Authorities, both late and ancient, have, when context required them to speak on the authorship of the SK, mentioned Jaimini as its author." His enumeration of the "authorities" seems to bear him out — Rāmānuja<sup>23</sup>, Parāśarabhaṭṭa in the Tattvaratnākara<sup>24</sup>, Vedānta Deśika<sup>25</sup>, Appayya

---

inconnu qui commence d'après Jayatīrtha par les mots "athāto daivī (jijñāsā?)"; le dernier sūtra en serait: *tam brahmety ācakṣate* "on l'appelle brahman". Les deux derniers sūtra, d'après Jayatīrtha, sont l'œuvre de Bādarāyaṇa (Nyāya Sudhā 277b, 1 [Dharwar edition]).' (La voie vers la connaissance de Dieu [Brahma-Jijñāsā] selon l'Anuvyākhyāna de Madhva, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie N° 6, Pondicherry: 1957, p. 23 A. 3.)

<sup>21</sup> See notes 6 and 11. The edition of Devasvāmin's commentary has a list of the complete Adhikaraṇasūtras at the beginning along with a translation of them. The actual provenance of these Sūtras (it is nearly impossible to disentangle them from the commentary alone) is doubtful, however, since the editor, S. SUBRAHMAṆYA ŚĀSTRĪ, does not clearly identify the other manuscript sources from which he has gleaned the full Adhikaraṇasūtras. He says only that he had access to a "paper manuscript" of Bhāskaraṛāya's Bhāṭṭacandrikā which contained full Adhikaraṇasūtras (unlike the edition of the Bhāṭṭacandrikā which only has the Pratīkas) and a single palm leaf manuscript of the Sūtras alone which extended up to the end of the first Adhyāya. It is not possible to know from S. SUBRAHMAṆYA ŚĀSTRĪ's description whether or not his manuscript of the full Sūtras was the same as that used by ŚARMĀ in his edition.

<sup>22</sup> ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. xiv.

<sup>23</sup> Śrībhāṣya, *loc. cit.*, where he approvingly quotes the Vṛttikāra to the effect that the Mīmāṃsā of Jaimini consists of sixteen Adhyāyas. See below, note 35.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. GERHARD OBERHAMMER, *Materialien zur Geschichte der Rāmānuja-Schule 1. Parāśarabhaṭṭas Tattvaratnākaraḥ*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien, Heft 14, Vienna: 1979, p. 78 and 256; also cited by VIDVAN SO. NARASIMHĀCĀRYA, *Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba and the Bhāṣya of Dhūrtasvāmī and the Vṛtti of Agnicit*, Mysore Sanskrit Series 11/85, Mysore: 1945, p. lv (introduction), text given below.

<sup>25</sup> *Seṣvaramīmāṃsā*, *loc. cit.*, where the same passage of the Vṛttikāra is quoted.

Dīkṣita<sup>26</sup>, Śambhubhaṭṭa<sup>27</sup>, the Prapañcahr̥daya<sup>28</sup>, and the Prasthānabheda<sup>29</sup>. This is the opinion of a number of scholars as well<sup>30</sup>.

This is not the unanimous opinion of all "authorities", however. The Sarvamatasamgraha<sup>31</sup> attributes the authorship to Vyāsa as we have seen above. In that passage the SK is said to be a part of the Uttaramīmāṃsā. The Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha<sup>32</sup> also places the SK in the Uttaramīmāṃsā corpus, but it ascribes the authorship to Śaṅkarāna via Vyāsa. There is one manuscript of the Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha which has a different reading. This manuscript substitutes *śaṅkareṇodita* for *śaṅkarāśodita* and it has a commentary which explains *śaṅkara* as *śiva*<sup>33</sup>.

Another name which is posited as the author of the SK is mentioned by Vedāntācārya in the Seśvaramīmāṃsā<sup>34</sup> where he seems to imply that there are three authors of the Mīmāṃsā corpus:

*sa jayati jaiminir ādau jayati punaḥ kāsakṛtsno 'pi |*  
*nārāyaṇāvātāro jayati paraṃ bādarāyaṇaḥ śrīmān ||*

Shortly after this introductory verse<sup>35</sup>, however, Vedāntācārya approvingly quotes this passage of the Vṛttikāra: *saṃhitam etac chārīrakam jaiminīyena ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇeneti śāstraikatvasiddhiḥ*, which seems to imply that in his opinion Jaimini was the author of the SK. There is another mention of Kāsakṛtsna as an author of Mīmāṃsāsūtras in a quote from the Tattvaratnākara found in the Tattvavārttika<sup>36</sup>:

<sup>26</sup> See note 8.

<sup>27</sup> Prabhāvalī, edited by N. S. ANANATAKṚṢṆA ŚĀSTRĪ and V. L. S. PANSIKĀR, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay: 1921, p. 43.

<sup>28</sup> Prapañcahr̥daya, *loc. cit.*

<sup>29</sup> Prasthānabheda, *loc. cit.*

<sup>30</sup> DAMODAR VIṢṆU GARGE, Citations in Śabara-Bhāṣya, Deccan College Dissertation Series 8, Deccan College Post-Graduate Research Institute, Poona: 1952, p. 4; S. K. AIYANGAR, Vimsaty, etc. (s. note 4), p. 3; K. C. CHATTERJEE, Kāsakṛtsna, Indian Historical Quarterly 8 (1932), p. 225; DHUNDIRĀJA ŚĀSTRĪ, *op. cit.* (s. note 15).

<sup>31</sup> Sarvamatasamgraha, *loc. cit.*

<sup>32</sup> Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha, *loc. cit.* This work is attributed to Śaṅkara. EGDELING, Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, part I, London: 1887, p. 789, says that this work is wrongly attributed to Śaṅkara, but he offers no explanation for his view.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. vii.

<sup>34</sup> Seśvaramīmāṃsā, *ed. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2—3.

<sup>36</sup> Cited in ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. xvi; also CHATTERJEE, *op. cit.*, p. 225. See also S. KRṢṆASVĀMĪ AIYANGAR, Editorial, JIH, *loc. cit.* (s. note 4) and OBERHAMMER, Materialien, cited above, note 24.

*karmadevatābrahmagocarā sā tridhodbabhau sūtrakārataḥ |  
jaiminer muneh kāsakṛtsnato bādarāyaṇād ity ataḥ kramāt ||*

In spite of these verses, and in spite of the fact that Kāsakṛtsna is recognized by Patañjali as a great Mīmāṃsaka<sup>37</sup>, it seems unlikely that Kāsakṛtsna should be considered the author of the SK.

ŚARMĀ<sup>38</sup> claims "authorities, both late and ancient" have named Jaimini as the author of the SK; however, it should be obvious that there are more "late" than "ancient" authorities who have made this assertion. It should be equally obvious that the testimony of such late authorities is not conclusive when those authorities are speaking of the authorship of a text which is centuries earlier than them, and which may not have been directly available to them. The strongest evidence for Jaimini's authorship are Devasvāmin's attribution in his commentary and the colophons at the end of the chapters of the unique, incomplete manuscript of the SK. In light of this testimony it seems reasonable to proceed on the assumption that Jaimini was indeed the author of the SK.

The Prapañcahrdaya gives a list of commentators on the SK<sup>39</sup>:  
*tasya viṃśatyadhyañyanibaddhasya mīmāṃsāsāstrasya kṛtakoṭināmadhe-  
yaṃ bhāṣyaṃ bodhayanena kṛtam. tad granthabahulyabhayād upekṣya  
kiñcīt saṃkṣiptam upavarṣeṇa kṛtam. tad api mañdamatīn prati duṣ-  
pratipādam vistīrṇatvād ity upekṣya ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇapūrvamīmāṃsāsāstra-  
mātrasya devasvāminātisaṃkṣiptam kṛtam. bhavadāsenāpi kṛtam  
jaiminīyabhāṣyam. punar dvikāṇḍe dharmamīmāṃsāsāstre pūrvasya  
tantrakāṇḍasyācāryaśabarasvāminātisaṃkṣepeṇa saṃkarṣakāṇḍam dvi-  
tīyam upekṣya kṛtam bhāṣyam. tathā devatākāṇḍasya saṃkarṣeṇa.*

The first of the commentators mentioned here, Bodhāyana, the author of the commentary called Kṛtakoṭi, cannot be dated with any degree of certainty. UMEŚA MIŚRA and JHĀ have guessed at a date "before the Christian era"<sup>40</sup>, but nothing more specific than that. In chapter 27 of the Mañimekhalai there is a discussion of *vaidika* systems of philosophy under the rubric *pramāṇavāda*. There are three sets of *pramāṇas* given there: one attributed to Vedavyāsa and having ten *pramāṇas*, one attributed to "Kṛtakoṭi" and having eight *pramāṇas*, and one set enumerating the six *pramāṇas* of "the present time"<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> Mahābhāṣya on 4.1.4, 4.1.93, and 4.3.155. See the Mīmāṃsāpādukāpari-  
trāṇa, *loc. cit.* (s. note 5), where the Madhyakāṇḍa is described as being "either  
*jaiminīya* or *kāsakṛtsnīya*".

<sup>38</sup> ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. xiv.

<sup>39</sup> Prapañcahrdaya, *loc. cit.*

<sup>40</sup> JHĀ, *op. cit.*, p. 14 and appendix p. 15.

<sup>41</sup> This last is attributed to Jaimini by S. KRṢṆASVĀMĪ AIYANGAR, Mañi-  
mekhalai in its Historical Setting, Luzac and Co., London: 1928, p. 57—58.

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR contends, on the basis of the Prapañcahrdaya passage, that the Kṛtakoti of the Maṇimekhalai had become the name by which the author of the Kṛtakoti is now known, and he further says that the original name of the author of this Kṛtakoti was Bodhāyana<sup>42</sup>. AIYANGAR does not explain how an author comes to be called by the name of his work (why not *kṛtakotikāra*, for example?), but goes on to claim that the man Kṛtakoti was the Vṛttikāra who is cited by later Mīmāṃsakas<sup>43</sup>. This identity of Vṛttikāra and Bodhāyana was guessed at by JACOBI<sup>44</sup>, as well, but the consensus seems to be that the second commentator on the SK listed in the Prapañcahrdaya, Upavaṛṣa, is the Vṛttikāra<sup>45</sup>. There is, however, some reason to believe that Bodhāyana and Upavaṛṣa may have been the same man<sup>46</sup>. V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ has estimated Upavaṛṣa's date as somewhere bet-

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61—62.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62—67. In the *Vaijayantī*, edited by G. OPPERT, Madras Sanskrit and Vernacular Text Publication Society, Madras: 1893, p. 95 Śloka 154 of the Brāhmaṇādhyāya of the Bhūmikāṇḍa says — *halabhūtiḥ upavaṛṣaḥ kṛtakotiś ca saḥ* "Halabhūti, i. e. Upavaṛṣa, is the composer of the Kṛtakoti".

<sup>44</sup> HERMANN JACOBI, The dates of the philosophical sūtras of the Brahmins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31 (1911), p. 1—29 = *Kleine Schriften*, volume 2, Steiner, Wiesbaden: 1970, p. 559—587.

<sup>45</sup> A. B. KEITH, *The Karma-Mīmāṃsā, The Heritage of India Series*, Association Press, Calcutta: 1921, p. 7—8; V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, Old Vṛttikāras on the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras, *Indian Historical Quarterly* 10.3 (1934), p. 431—452; and JHĀ, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>46</sup> S. KUPPUSWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, *Bodhāyana and Dramiḍācārya, Two Old Vedāntins presupposed by Rāmānuja*, Proceedings and Transaction of the Third Oriental Conference, Madras... 1924, Law Printing House, Madras: 1925, p. 465—473; and T. R. CHINTĀMANĪ, The Date of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya and Some of his Predecessors, *Journal of Oriental Research* 3.1 (1929), p. 53. VAN BUITENEN, *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha*, Deccan College Monograph Series No. 16, Poona: 1956, p. 18—24 treats the question of Bodhāyana or Upavaṛṣa as the Vṛttikāra. He denies the identity of the two, but in general his conclusions are stated with more certainty than the presented evidence supports. His interpretation of Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 3.3.53 — *ata eva bhagavato upavaṛṣeṇa prathame tantrā ātmāstitvābhidhānaprasaktāu śārīrake vakṣyāma iti uddhāra uktaḥ* — is suspect. He seems to feel that this must mean that Upavaṛṣa knew a single "context" (p. 20) composed by Jaimini which contained both the Karma- and Śārīrakasūtras. As a plausible support for this interpretation he cites Sureśvara's strange statement in the *Naīṣkārmyasiddhi* 1.91 (Col. JACOB's edition, Bombay: 1891, the *sambandhokti* on p. 54—55) that Jaimini was the author of both the Pūrva- and Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtras. This is reaching too far. It is much more likely that Upavaṛṣa meant what he said — *śārīrake vakṣyāmaḥ* — "we will explain this (in our commentary) on the Śārīraka", i. e. in the concluding portion of the Mīmāṃsākṛtsnāśāstra.

ween 100 B. C. and 200 A. D.<sup>47</sup>, but aside from this, little is known of Upavarṣa and little more can be said of his views; and, like Bodhāyana, nothing substantial may be said of his commentary on the SK since it is not known to exist.

The order of the next two commentators as given in the Prapañcaḥṛdaya must be reversed since Devasvāmin mentions Bhavadāsa in his commentary<sup>48</sup>. Not much is known of Bhavadāsa. He is mentioned by Kumārila and Pārthasārathī Miśra in the Ślokavārttika 62—64 and the commentary of Nyāyaratnākara (on Śloka 33)<sup>49</sup>. Appayya Dīkṣita in Vedāntakalpataruparimala<sup>50</sup> says: . . . *saṅkarse nānāpradānādhikaraṇasyānyārthapradarśanāc ceti guṇasūtram bhāṣyakṛta bhavasvāminetthaṃ vyākhyātam*.

It seems possible that this Bhavasvāmin would be our Bhavadāsa since there is no record of a Bhavasvāmin having commented on the SK. In a note to his translation of the Ślokavārttika<sup>51</sup>, GANGĀNNĀTHA JHĀ equates Bhavadāsa with Vṛttikāra, but in light of his opinion mentioned above (cf. note 45) that Upavarṣa is the Vṛttikāra, it must be assumed that he meant only that the author of the comments presently being discussed in those Kārikas of the Ślokavārttika was

<sup>47</sup> V. A. RĀMĀSWĀMI ŚĀSTRĪ, *op. cit.*, p. 434. Someśvara in the Nyāyasudhā, edited by MUKUNDA ŚĀSTRĪ, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares: 1909, p. 632, says that Kumārila refers to Upavarṣa as *mahābhāṣyakāra*. P. V. KĀṆE, Gleanings from the Bhāṣya of Śabara and the Tantravārttika, Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 26 (1921—23), p. 84 denies that either Bodhāyana or Upavarṣa is the Vṛttikāra, and he claims, without much evidence, that the Vṛttikāra was much earlier than Upavarṣa. See also KĀṆE, Vedānta Commentators before Śaṅkarācārya, Proceedings of Fifth Indian Oriental Conference, volume II, Lahore: 1930, p. 937—953.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Devasvāmin's Bhāṣya on SK 3.2.1., *ed. cit.*, p. 132 where he claims to have reproduced a portion of Bhavadāsa's commentary: *asmin pāde 'apūrvāt tathā somaḥ' ity ārabhyāpadasamāpteḥ bhavadāsam eva bhāṣyam iti*. The editor, S. SUBRAHMANYA ŚĀSTRĪ at pages v—vi claims that this mention of Bhavadāsa is not the work of Devasvāmin, but that it is an insertion by a copyist who did not have the commentary of Devasvāmin on this particular Sūtra. That is possible, but it does not seem likely in the context of the commentary. E. FRAUWALLNER, Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens, Heft 6, Vienna: 1968, p. 107—113 identifies Bhavadāsa as the Vṛttikāra mentioned by Dignāga. His theory of why the proper name of the Vṛttikāra is lost (p. 113 — he attributes it to the superceding impact of Śabara) is a reasonable one.

<sup>49</sup> See the edition by RĀMA ŚĀSTRĪ TAILANGA, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 11, 12, 15—21, 24, Benares: 1898—99.

<sup>50</sup> Vedāntakalpataruparimala, *ed. cit.*, p. 839.

<sup>51</sup> Ślokavārttika, Bibliotheca Indica No. 146, Calcutta: 1901, p. 116.

Bhavadāsa<sup>52</sup>. Bhavadāsa, too, falls into that dark period of Pūrvamīmāṃsā chronology known only as “pre-Śābara”<sup>53</sup>.

At last, with Devasvāmin we have an extant commentary. If he is taken to be the same Devasvāmin as the writer on Dharmaśāstra, then he may be dated to the 11th century A. D. based on KĀṆE’s eminently logical reasoning<sup>54</sup>. KĀṆE, however, says that there are not sufficient data available to establish this identity<sup>55</sup>, while S. SUBRAHMANYA ŚĀSTRĪ<sup>56</sup> and V. A. RĀMASVĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ<sup>57</sup> dismiss KĀṆE’s doubts and flatly state their belief that the two Devasvāmins are identical. In fact, the two were the same man. Devasvāmin is quoted by Hemādri on *parvasandhikālanirṇaya* in Caturvargacintāmaṇi<sup>58</sup>: *yadi pūrvāhṇe parvasandhiḥ samāpyeta tato nītarām eva ca śobhanam, yadi punar aparāhṇe rātrau vā tad āharuṣya śvobhāte yāga iti*. Devasvāmin’s SKbhāṣya on Sūtra 3.1.7 reads: *yadi pūrvāhṇe sambhavyeta tato nītarām śobhanam. yadi āharuṣya śvobhāte yāgaḥ kartavya iti*. There seems little doubt but that the Devasvāmin of Caturvargacintāmaṇi and that of SKbhāṣya were the same author. This means that Bhavadāsa must be considerably earlier than Devasvāmin, perhaps by as much as 900—1000 years<sup>59</sup>.

Next, the Prapañcahṛdaya tells us that Śābarasvāmin left out the SK when writing his commentary of the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras. This view is not universally agreed upon. UMEŚA MIŚRA<sup>60</sup> simply says that he did write a commentary on the SK as is clear from the way he cites the SK at 10.4.32 and 12.2.2. K. C. CHATTERJEE<sup>61</sup> seems to agree with UMEŚA MIŚRA and states that it is a fact that Śābara wrote such a commentary, although he offers no evidence for his opinion. RĀMA

<sup>52</sup> This has caused some confusion in the past; see S. RĀDHAKRISHNAN, *Indian Philosophy*, volume 2, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London: 1927, p. 376—377 note 6; and S. KRṢṆASVĀMĪ AIYANGAR, *Maṇimekhalai*, p. 62.

<sup>53</sup> P. V. KĀṆE, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, volume 5 part 2, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona: 1962, p. 1197 says that Bhavadāsa’s date is 100—200 A. D. but with very little evidence.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, volume 1 part 2, p. 591—593.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 593.

<sup>56</sup> S. SUBRAHMANYA ŚĀSTRĪ, *op. cit.*, p. ix.

<sup>57</sup> In his edition of the *Tattvabindu* by Vācaspatimiśra with *Tattvavibhāvana* by Rṣiputra Parameśvara, Annamalai University Sanskrit Series No. 3, St. Joseph’s Industrial School Press, Trichinopoly: 1936, p. 58—59.

<sup>58</sup> *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, edited by Paṇḍit YAJÑEŚVARA SMṚTIRATNA and Paṇḍit KĀMĀKHYĀ NĀTH TARKAVĀGIŚA, *Bibliotheca Indica* No. 72, volume 3 part 2, Calcutta: 1895, p. 324.

<sup>59</sup> This would agree with KĀṆE’s date for Bhavadāsa, see note 53.

<sup>60</sup> UMEŚA MIŚRA, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>61</sup> K. C. CHATTERJEE, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

MISRA ŚĀSTRĪ in his introduction to Bhāskara-rāya's SKbhāṣya<sup>62</sup> claims that the quotations in that commentary are from Śabara's lost commentary, but ŚARMĀ has traced these quotations to Devasvāmin's commentary<sup>63</sup>. S. SUBRAHMAṆYA ŚĀSTRĪ<sup>64</sup> says that Śabara, Kumārila, and Prabhākara found Devasvāmin's commentary so complete that they had nothing to add, and it is for this reason that we have no commentaries on the SK from those authors. If, as we have suggested, Devasvāmin is from the 11th century then it is impossible that this could be the reason for there being no commentary from Śabara *et. al.* GARGE<sup>65</sup> hedges and his opinion on this matter is not clear. K. V. ŚARMĀ<sup>66</sup>, however, is quite correct in his view that there is no evidence that Śabara wrote a commentary on the SK. Śabara's mention of the SK in his Bhāṣya is a certain acknowledgement of the existence of the SK, but the words *iti saṅkarṣe vakṣyate* (10.4.32) and *iti saṅkarṣe vakṣyati* (12.2.2) should not be interpreted to mean *iti (mayā) saṅkarṣe (bhāṣye) vakṣyate*, but as ŚARMĀ suggested<sup>67</sup> *iti saṅkarṣe (sūtrakāreṇa jaiminīnā) vakṣyate*.

As we have seen, the Sarvamatasamgraha and the Prapañcahrdaya claim that a commentary on the SK was written by Saṅkarṣaṇa. NARASIṂHĀCĀRYA<sup>68</sup> also says that such a commentary was written by such a person, and he goes on to say that the author of the commentary has given his name to the text itself. This is pure conjecture. There is no other evidence to support the existence of a commentary on the SK written by a Saṅkarṣaṇa. The claim by the Sarvamatasamgraha and the Prapañcahrdaya that there was such a commentary should also be dismissed as conjecture, or more likely as a misunderstanding of the tradition of the SK.

There is some reason to believe that Govinda wrote a commentary on the SK. Hemādri<sup>69</sup>, again, quotes a statement made by Govindopādhyāya on the SK (*tathā saṅkarṣaṇakāṇḍe govindopādhyāyenoktam* ...). Since there is no extant commentary on the SK by Govinda, it is difficult to know which Govinda is being quoted here. The editor of the Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha, M. RAṄGĀCĀRYA, gives excerpts from an

<sup>62</sup> RĀMA MISRA ŚĀSTRĪ, *op. cit.*, p. 6 of his introduction — see note 13.

<sup>63</sup> ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. xix.

<sup>64</sup> S. SUBRAHMAṆYA ŚĀSTRĪ, *op. cit.*, p. iv.

<sup>65</sup> GARGE, *op. cit.*, p. 4—5.

<sup>66</sup> ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. xiii—xiv.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xv.

<sup>68</sup> NARASIṂHĀCĀRYA, *op. cit.* (s. note 24), p. lxii—lxiii.

<sup>69</sup> Caturvargacintāmaṇi, *loc. cit.*

unpublished commentary on that work which posits a possible identification of our Govinda. The comments are on I.22 which is:

*bhāṣyam caturbhir adhyāyair bhagavatpādanīrmitam |  
cakre vivaraṇam tasya tad vedāntam pracakṣate ||*

“A commentary (thereon) in four chapters has been composed by the venerable teacher. The explanatory commentary which he produced in relation to that (other part of the Uttaramīmāṃsā) is spoken of as Vedānta.”<sup>70</sup>

The excerpts from the commentary are: *bhagavatpādaḥ śrīmān śaṅkarācāryaḥ gurugovindabhagavatapūjyaḥ. asya devatākāṇḍasya bhāṣyam sūtrāṇām vyākhyānam bhagavatpādanīrmitam ity āha. uttaracatuṣkasyāpi bhāṣyam ācārya praṇītam ity āha. tasyottaracatuṣkasya vedāntasūtrasya vivaraṇam sārīrakabhāṣyam yac cakre tal lokaḥ vedāntam iti pravadaṅtīty arthaḥ*<sup>71</sup>.

Thus the *bhagavatpāda* is, according to the commentator, none other than Śaṅkarācārya's teacher, and it is explicit that the commentator feels he wrote a commentary on the Devatākāṇḍa as well as on the Vedāntasūtras. There is no evidence to confirm or deny the claim since none of the writings of Śaṅkara's teacher on the SK are preserved. Moreover, it is necessary to be cautious about ascribing a commentary on the SK to Śaṅkara's teacher based only on the disparate testimonies of the commentator on the Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha and Hemādri.

The commentary of Bhāskararāya, the Bhāṭṭacandrikā, has been edited and published<sup>72</sup>. It quotes the commentary of Devasvāmin extensively<sup>73</sup>. This text gives only the Pratīkas of the Adhikaraṇasūtras, a fact which caused M. L. SANDĀL to denounce it as spurious<sup>74</sup>. GARGE<sup>75</sup> also claims that this was “not an authentic work”, but he seems to have based his conclusions on a poor reading of JHĀ's opinions of the work. JHĀ did not expressly doubt the authenticity of the Bhāṭṭacandrikā<sup>76</sup>, but he did admit of being puzzled by the editor's

<sup>70</sup> Sarvasiddhāntasamgraha, *ed. cit.*, p. 3—4, RAṄGĀCĀRYA's translation.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. vii.

<sup>72</sup> See note 13.

<sup>73</sup> See note 62 and 63. RĀMA MĪSRA ŚĀSTRĪ attributes the quotation in Bhāṭṭacandrikā to Śabara, but ŚARMĀ has shown that they are from Devasvāmin.

<sup>74</sup> SANDĀL's doubts about the authenticity of the SK are found in the introduction to his translation of the Mīmāṃsā Sūtras: Sacred Books of the Hindus, Volume 27, Allahabad: 1925.

<sup>75</sup> GARGE, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>76</sup> JHĀ, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

description of the work as the *upāsanakāṇḍa*<sup>77</sup> when the published *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* seemed to have so little to do with *upāsana*. Bhāskara-rāya's date has been given as ca. 1700—1760 by V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ<sup>78</sup> and it has been pointed out by him and others that the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* was intended to be a completion of Khaṇḍadeva's commentary on the *Purvamīmāṃsāsūtras*; indeed, it was M. L. SANDĀL's position that the SK was a likely forgery by Khaṇḍadeva or by Bhāskara-rāya<sup>79</sup>. Such an extreme suggestion is unnecessary in light of the published text of the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*.

Another commentator on the SK was probably Rājacūdāmaṇi Dīkṣita (1580—1650 A. D.)<sup>80</sup> who is said to have written a commentary called *Śaṅkaraśamuktāvalī*, *Nyāyamuktāvalī*, or *Śaṅkaraśanyāyamuktāvalī*. A commentary with the last title was reported by HULTZSCH in 1896<sup>81</sup> but the manuscript has never been published. It is apparently incomplete (35 palm leaves) and ends, according to the colophon, with the fourth Pāda of the first Adhyāya. There is little room for doubt concerning the authenticity of the tradition that Rājacūdāmaṇi wrote a SKbhāṣya since he and his commentators mention it themselves<sup>82</sup>. V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ also raises the possibility that Vāsudeva Dīkṣita may have written a commentary on the SK<sup>83</sup>. While it is true that he often cites the SK and Devasvāmin's Bhāṣya by chapter and verse in the *Adhvaramīmāṃsākutūhalavṛtti*<sup>84</sup>, there is no other evidence for a SKbhāṣya composed by Vāsudeva Dīkṣita. There is one other interesting text which was noticed by OPPERT<sup>85</sup> in 1880 — the *Śaṅkaraśaṅgātravicāra* — which is described only as a *Mīmāṃsā* text with no mention of the author.

The doubts expressed by SANDĀL and GARGE about the authenticity of the SK can no longer be entertained at all, and SANDĀL's objections

<sup>77</sup> Quoted in note 13 above.

<sup>78</sup> V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

<sup>79</sup> M. L. SANDĀL, *op. cit.*, p. viii.

<sup>80</sup> V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, *Tattvabindu* (s. note 57), p. 122—124.

<sup>81</sup> E. HULTZSCH, *Reports on Sanskrit Manuscripts in Southern India*, No. II, Government Press, Madras: 1896, manuscript no. 1489 — from the collection of Kodaṇḍarāma Śāstrī at Tiruvisainallur.

<sup>82</sup> ŚARMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

<sup>83</sup> V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, *Tattvabindu*, p. 141.

<sup>84</sup> *Adhvaramīmāṃsākutūhalavṛtti*, edited by S. KUPPUSWAMY ŚĀSTRĪGAL, Vānī Vilāsa Press, Śrīraṅgam: 1907—1908, p. 150, 160, etc.

<sup>85</sup> OPPERT, *Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of Southern India*, volume 1, Government Press, Madras: 1880, manuscript no. 5692 — in the possession of Aṅṅasvāmī of Śrīvalliputtur.

have been refuted point by point twice<sup>86</sup>. The SK as printed by S. SUBRAHMANYA ŚĀSTRĪ, ŚĀRMĀ, and RĀMA MIŚRA ŚĀSTRĪ is a genuine Mīmāṃsā work, and most probably composed by Jaimini. The name of the work which has caused so much speculation is no doubt based on the verb *saṅkṛṣ* as Devasvāmin<sup>87</sup> and Ānandagiri<sup>88</sup> have suggested. It is a “drawing together”, a “collecting” of various points important for the ritual which were not included in the first twelve Adhyāyas of the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras. If that is so, then how does one explain the statements of other writers that there was a commentator or even an author named Saṅkarṣa(ṇa) who is responsible for the name of this work? How does one account for the nearly identical descriptions of the contents of the four chapters of the SK in the Sarvamatasamgraha and the Prapañcahrdaya, but which have nothing to do with the contents of the SK as it has been published? Why is a text which treats the details of *yajña* referred to as the *upāsana-* or *devatā-kāṇḍa*?

The most obvious answer to these questions and to the confusion in general about the SK is that the text simply cannot have been commonly studied for a very long period in its history. It is, after all, not cited often and then not very extensively. The reasons for this neglect can only be guessed at — perhaps its miscellaneous nature made it less appealing. Certainly, the fact that Śabara barely acknowledges it, and Kumārila, and Prabhākara ignored it altogether was an important factor in its subsequent neglect. Once the text had fallen into the far reaches of dark memory, the confusions arose. It never was lost, obviously. Devasvāmin (11th c.), Bhāskaraṛāya (18th c.), and, probably, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita (16th—17th c.) all knew the SK, and their commentaries were known and cited by others (for example, Vāsudeva Dikṣita who cites the SK and Devasvāmin’s commentary by giving the Adhyāya, Pāda, and Adhikaraṇa by the numbers<sup>89</sup>). Yet,

<sup>86</sup> V. A. RĀMASWĀMĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, The Saṅkarṣa Kāṇḍa — A Genuine Supplement to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra, Indian Historical Quarterly 9 (1933), p. 290—299; ŚĀRMĀ, *op. cit.*, p. ix—xiv.

<sup>87</sup> See notes 6 and 8, above.

<sup>88</sup> See note 7, above.

<sup>89</sup> See note 84, above. R. G. BHANDARKAR, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the Year 1883—1884. Government Central Press, Bombay: 1887, p. 27—32 speaks of the Āpastambasūtradhvanitārthakārikā by Trikaṇḍamaṇḍana Bhāskara Miśra, son of Kumārasvāmin. In this description he notes that there is mention of the SKbhāṣyakāra (folio 26a line 4 of this manuscript no. 21 of 1883—1884) and SK (23a, line 1 and 27b, line 3). This work was edited by TARKĀLANKĀRA BHATṬĀCĀRYA, Bibliotheca Indica No. 140, Calcutta: 1903, but in this edition there is no mention of the SK, the SKbhāṣya, or its author.

access to the SK and knowledge of it cannot have been very common. Vedānta Deśika (14th c.) refers to it as the *madhyaḥ kāṇḍas ca hūptasthitiḥ*<sup>90</sup> and Meghanādārisūri (14th c.) refers to it and adds: *devatākāṇḍas tv asmābhir dṛṣṭacarah; atas tatprakriyā mṛgyā*<sup>91</sup>. ŚARMĀ, RĀMA MIŚRA ŚĀSTRĪ, and S. SUBRAHMAṆYA ŚĀSTRĪ have found this work and published it, but having the text of the Sūtras and two commentaries has not resolved all questions which are connected with the SK. There is still the possibility that a work on *upāsana* will be discovered which conforms to the descriptions of it in the Sarvamatasamgraha and in the Prapañcahṛdaya and which would explain the citations of Saṅkarṣaṇasūtras which are nowhere to be found in the published SK<sup>92</sup>. Until then, the questions about the various points of confusion which have been raised in the preceding paragraphs can only be answered by conjecture.

<sup>90</sup> Mīmāṃsāpādukā, *loc. cit.* (s. note 5).

<sup>91</sup> Nayaprakāśikā of Meghanādārisūri, edited by V. ANANTĀCĀRYA and V. KRṢṆAMĀCĀRYA, Madras Book Depot, Madras: 1936, p. 238.

<sup>92</sup> For example, the Spandapradīpikā of Utpalācārya, edited by GOPINĀTH KAVIRĀJ in: Yogatantra Granthamāla, volume 3, Vārānasiya Sanskrit Viśva-vidyālaya, Vārānasi: 1970 at p. 109:

*anyac ca saṅkarṣaṇasūtreṣu:  
svātmaikanisṭham cidrūpaṃ bhāvabhāvapariskṛtam |  
svasaṃvedanasamvedya prakṛtyātītagocaram ||  
iyam yoniḥ smṛtā vipra mantrāṇāṃ pratyayātmikā |  
te mantra varṇarūpeṇa sabāhyābhyanteroditāḥ ||  
naiṣkālīkapadāvasthāḥ karaṇānīva dehinām |  
prayuktāḥ sarvakāleṣu siddhyante vīryayogataḥ ||*

and at p. 115:

*saṅkarṣaṇasūtreṣv api:  
yenedaṃ dṛṣyate viśvaṃ draṣṭā sarvasya yaḥ sadā |  
dṛṣyaś carācaratve yaḥ sa viṣṇur iti gīyate ||*

These Ślokas make poor Sūtras.