

THE SAṆKARŚAKĀṆḌA

Introduction

THE Saṅkarśakāṇḍa, containing four chapters with four Pādas in each chapter, forms the latter part of Pūrvamīmāṣā. The former part otherwise called Tantra Kāṇḍa consists of twelve chapters. The author of the entire Śāstra was sage Jaimini. It is also claimed that together with the four chapters of Bādarāyaṇa's Brahmasūtras, Mīmāṁsā is one Śāstra with 20 chapters. Śrī Rāmānūja lays emphasis on this. Śrī Saṅkara also gives some support to this view when he says: "Now existence of an Ātman different from body has been explained in the beginning of the Śāstra in Pāda I". But he condemns the unity of the two Śāstras in unequivocal terms in 1.1.4, saying "if the purpose of the Śāstra is *niyoga* or effort it has already been explained in the Pūrvakāṇḍa and the beginning of a different Śāstra will be futile." There are no two opinions regarding the authorship of Jaimini in respect of the whole of Pūrvakāṇḍa. Bādarāyaṇa, Dhūrta Svāmin, Śabara Svāmin, Saṅkara, Rāmānūja, Śrīkaṇṭha and others have quoted some of the sūtras.¹

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NAME SAṆKARŚA

To elucidate the term Saṅkarśa Devasvāmin quotes an old verse :

सिद्धैरेतैः प्रसङ्गान्तैः श्रुतियोगं प्रदर्शयन् ।

लक्षणानि श्रुतीश्रैव सङ्कथ्याय जने मुनिः ॥ (1-1-1)

(After having discussed many śruti-texts in the twelve chapters ending with Prasaṅga the sage brought together the topics and

(1) Saṅkara, Rāmānūja and Śrīkaṇṭha -

नाना वा देवताप्रयत्नत्वात् (Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya - 3-3-43)

Dhūrta svāmin दीक्षणीयाभिघार्येत (Prapāṭhaka 10)

Śabara तथा च वक्ष्यति etc., 10-4-32, and तथा च वक्ष्यते 12-2-11

Devasvāmin इदं चोत्तमसूत्रे मङ्गलाभिघारिपदं प्रयुक्तमाचार्येण ।

तस्मादौ अयशब्दधर्मशब्दौ मङ्गलार्थौ अन्ते विद्यत इति पदं मङ्गलार्थम् ।

śruti passages for discussion). Ānandagiri, the famous commentator on Śaṅkara's Bhāṣyas, explains the word thus:

सङ्कल्पते कर्मकाण्डस्यैवावशिष्टं कर्म संक्षिप्योच्यते इति सङ्कल्पो देवताकाण्डम् ।

(under B. S. 3-3-43) (Since rules of interpretation relevant in the Tantrakāṇḍa but left out, are herein brought together in one place, it is called Saṅkarṣa.) Devasvāmin indicates this view when he says "Nyāyas are scattered here and there in this work" (1. 1. 1.)

DEVATAKĀṆḌA

This Kāṇḍa is also known by the name of Devatakāṇḍa.* Answering the question as to how it came to be called Devatakāṇḍa, Appayya Dikṣita says that though Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa is a collection of Nyāyas pertaining to Karmas relevant both in the Upadeśa and Atideśa Śaṅkas (chapters 1 to 6 and 7 to 12) it is called Devatakāṇḍa since there are numerous adhikaraṇas dealing with deities in it. Saying thus he quotes ten of them.† Vedānta Deśika says thus in Śatadūṣaṇī (p. 19): "Devatakāṇḍa has been accepted by the author of Śrī Bhāṣya as a supplement to Karmakāṇḍa as is inferred from his quotations from Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa like, "It has been said in Saṅkarṣa etc." Quoting two sūtras supposed to be the last two Sūtras of that Kāṇḍa Śrī Deśika continues.‡ The Devatādhikaraṇa of the Tantrakāṇḍa which rejects body etc., for the deities is intended only to glorify the Karmas. When Vedic rituals themselves have the potency to bestow the fruits of the rituals for the performer Jaimini thinks that there is no necessity to accept embodied deities. Thus the unity of the two Sāstras is also preserved".

Sri Narasimhachari, the editor of Āpastamba's Śrāuta Sūtras with Bhāṣya (Mysore edition) says in his Introduction. "Appayya Dikṣita, completely denying the collection of Sūtras called Devatakāṇḍa, accepted by Advaitins upto the time of the *Ratnaprabhā* and equally accepted by Viśiṣṭādvaita authors right from the Bhāṣyakāra, says that Devatakāṇḍa

(2) प्रकीर्णयुक्तत्वाच्च न्यायस्य (1-1-1)

(3) Amalananda - Ānandagiri and Anubhūti Svārūpa सङ्कल्पो देवताकाण्डम्
(under for Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 3-3-43) (4) Vide Index C.

deals only with discussions about Karma. It is true that there are discussions about Karma also in Saṅkarṣa. But since Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja have quoted from Saṅkarṣa it is plain that the main feature in Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa is discussion about deities. Because the nature etc., about deities not discussed before is the main purport, it is called Devatakāṇḍa. Since a person called Saṅkarṣa or Saṅkarṣaṇa wrote a Bhāṣya upon it, it is called Saṅkarṣa or Saṅkarṣaṇa. Because the name Saṅkarṣa does not indicate the subject it deals with, Rāmānanda and Prakāṣārthakāra have explained the term as Devatakāṇḍam. The author of *Prapañcahrdaya* also calls it Devatakāṇḍa. Though Saṅkarṣaṇa wrote a Bhāṣya on it, it was thrown to the background, as Śabarasvāmin ignored it and Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Guru, the great exponents of Mīmāṃsā, did not care to write commentaries on it. But, being connected with the Tantrakāṇḍa, the portion dealing with Karma alone survived. The portion dealing with deities was purposely suppressed by those who had a tendency towards atheism.

As the work existed till the time of Rāmānanda with the disappearance of the part dealing with deities, Ānandagiri had to coin some derivation to the word Saṅkarṣa-सङ्कल्पते etc.), but at the same time accepted the old expression of *Devatakāṇḍa*."

All this has to be examined again in the light of the discovery of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa containing four chapters with Devasvāmin's Bhāṣya thereon, now published for the first time. From the words of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja we cannot conclude that there was a portion of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa which deals exclusively with deities since the Sūtra quoted by them pertains only to Karma and is traceable in the present text. Moreover, if there was such a part then the theory that the whole Mīmāṃsā contains 20 chapters will not stand since that part will cover more chapters. Further, if Jaimini accepts an embodied deity in that Kāṇḍa, how can he reject body etc., for deities in chapter 9 of the Tantrakāṇḍa. It may be said that it was the commentator Śabara who rejected body for deities and not Jaimini since there is no Sūtra to that. But it is against the nature of Śabara, nay, of all the Bhāṣyakāras, to go against the Sūtras and if he actually went against the Sūtras he would have expressed the same plainly. Moreover, Bādarāyaṇa referring

to Jaimini's views regarding deities says: "Jaimini considered non-eligibility of Deities in regard to Upāsanas, since it is not possible with regard to Madhuvidyā and since the words *āditya*, *soma*, etc., signify only the luminous bodies in the sky." (B. S. I-3-31, 32.) If Jaimini accepted embodied deities, how could Bādarāyaṇa refer to Jaimini like this? Devasvāmin the present author of the Bhāṣya on Saṅkarṣa holds the view that Jaimini did not accept embodied deities.⁵ Regarding the suggestions that the Kāṇḍa attained the name Saṅkarṣaṇa or Sāṅkarṣaṇa from the name of the author Saṅkarṣaṇa who wrote a Bhāṣya on it, we have to consider whether there is any work at all which is called by the name of the commentator. In Sūtra literature particularly, the work derives its name from the name of the author, or at times from the subject it deals with, and never from the name of the commentator. Further the author of Prapañcahṛdaya (11th century) a work which enumerates all the works of the Mīmāṃsā Śāstra, both available and non-available, says, "In Mīmāṃsā is laid down rules of interpretation for the former and latter parts of the Vedas. It consists of twenty chapters. Of these the first sixteen chapters deal with the discussions about Dharma and the rest with Brahman. Bodhāyana wrote a Bhāṣya on them called *Kṛīakokṭi*. As this was a very voluminous work, Upavaṛṣa wrote a smaller commentary on them called *Vṛtti*. As this was also found difficult for ordinary intellects, Devasvāmin wrote a brief Bhāṣya on the whole Śāstra. Again Śabarasvāmin wrote a Bhāṣya on the Tantrakāṇḍa alone (Ch.1-12) omitting Saṅkarṣa. Bhavadāsa also wrote a Bhāṣya on Jaimini's Sūtras".

We do not see an author by name, Saṅkarṣaṇa mentioned here as having written a Bhāṣya on a part of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa. To say that the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa was ignored by Śabara is contradictory to fact. We have got two quotations from Śabara. (Vide Appendix c.) It may be that Śabara, Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara did not write commentaries on it. But since they had nothing more to say beyond what Devasvāmin had said, they kept silent

(5) ननु निरस्तं विग्रहादिपञ्चकं ; न पुनस्तन्निरासोऽधिकरणार्थः न देवतातः फलं न देवताप्रयुक्ता धर्माः न च स्वरूपेण देवता कर्मण्यङ्गमाव प्रतिपद्यते इत्यधिकरणार्थः । (S. K. P. 204). Here Devasvāmin accepts the rejection of body etc., for deities in chapter 9.)

Later writers like Pārthasārathimīśra, Appaya Dikṣita, Vasudeva Dikita, Śambhu Bhaṭṭa and others have profusely quoted from the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa. When so many authors have quoted from this Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa we do not understand how it escaped the notice of Śrī Vedānta Deśika. Śrī Deśika himself does not assert that the two Sūtras he quotes as the last Sūtras of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa do genuinely belong to that work. He says that it is the tradition of the knowers of truth "इति तत्त्वविदां सम्प्रदायः". If Jaimini himself had said that the word *Brahman* denotes Viṣṇu there would not have been much controversy among the Vaiṣṇavas, Śaivas, and Advaitins about the exact meaning of the word *Brahman*. Devatakāṇḍa could not have been suppressed by those who had a faith in tradition and traditional works. Those who preserved the other chapters of Mīmāṃsā had the same regard for the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa also. Ānandagiri did not invent a derivation for the word Saṅkarṣa, but he only quoted the derivation mentioned by Devasvāmin, the commentator of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa.

Thus Śrī Appayya Dikṣita's interpretation of the word *Devatakāṇḍa* seems to be genuine.

COMMENTARIES ON THE SAṅKARṢAKĀṆḌA

According to the *Prapañcahṛdaya* Bodhāyana, Upavaṛṣa, Devasvāmin and Bhavadāsa seem to have written commentaries on the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa. But Devasvāmin's Bhāṣya alone withstood the wrath of time. In Chapter III. i we find in the present text the words "अस्मिन् पादे 'अपूर्वत्वात्तयासोमे' इत्यारम्य आपादपरिसमाप्तेः भावदासमेव माष्यम्". The author of these words could not be Devasvāmin as taken by some. When Devasvāmin himself was able to write his own Bhāṣya upon that Pāda, he would never incorporate another author's work in his Bhāṣya. These words must rather be the words of the scribe who copied the whole work. Not finding the Bhāṣya of Devasvāmin upon that Pāda, he would have copied the Bhāṣya of Bhavadāsa for that portion alone. This is common in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Ramayana* manuscripts where for different sections commentaries of different authors are copied in the same codices. Thus Pāda I of Chapter III of the present work is the Bhāṣya of Bhavadāsa, while the rest is the Bhāṣya of Devasvāmin.

Hemādri (1230-1300) mentions a commentary on the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa by Govindopādhyāya.⁶ Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita (1580-1650) also wrote a commentary as Saṅkarṣa.⁷ But these commentaries are not available to us. Fortunately another commentary by Bhāskararāya (1700-1760) very valuable though brief, is available in many libraries. It was also printed in the Pandit Series of Banares. Bhāskararāya was an ardent admirer of Khaṇḍadeva and his *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* which is a critical summary of Śābara's Bhāṣya and its commentaries. *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* extends only from Pāda 2 of Chapter I to the end of Chapter 12. Thus it has neither beginning nor end. So to make up this deficiency Bhāskararāya wrote summaries of these portions on the model adopted by Khaṇḍa Deva and made it complete. He says at the end of his work:

खण्डदेवकृतमाहृदीपिका लक्षणैः कतिमिरसम्भृता ।
इत्युदीक्ष्य बुधमास्करामिचित् मारती बरिमराम्भूव ताम् ॥
अद्यावधि कृतिरेषा आद्यन्तविहीनेति दीपिकाख्यासीत् ।
षोडशकलाभिरधुना परिपूर्णा माहृचन्द्रिकात्वमगात् ।

SANKARṢAKĀṆḌA SŪTRAS

In the available manuscripts of Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa the Sūtras are so mixed up with the Bhāṣya that it was generally considered that the extraction of the Sūtras from it was impossible. But with the help of a paper manuscript of Bhāskararāya's *Bhāṭṭa Candrika*, in which the whole Sūtras of each Adhikaraṇa is given in full kindly lent to me by Professor Raghavan, I began the work of editing Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa Sūtras with the Bhāṣya. There was also another palm leaf manuscript of the Saṅkarṣa Sūtras alone extending up to the end of Chapter I in the same collection in the Sanskrit Department which also has been used in the edition. This latter was useful in editing Ch. 1. For editing the remaining chapters, I had the advantage of the *Bhāṭṭa-candrika* manuscript which gave Adhikaraṇa Sūtras in full. The problem of extracting the Guṇa Sūtras from the Bhāṣya had to be solved in this way. In the Bhāṣya text the words like "इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः" "वाच्यदः पक्षे व्यावर्तयति" etc. indicated the

Siddhānta Sūtras which followed. The words एतेन व्याख्यातं indicated Sūtras of new Adhikaraṇas which were introduced on the model of the previous Adhikaraṇas. The words लिङ्गमपि भवति following लिङ्गाच्च indicated that लिङ्गाच्च are Sūtras. The words इष्टकाविवृद्धौ किं प्रकृतानामेव etc., following इष्टकाविवृद्धौ तद्व्याख्यातं indicated that the previous passage is a Sūtra. Some Sūtras which are very lengthy give rise to the doubt whether they are Sūtras or the Bhāṣya text. e. g. गायत्री etc., (4-3-16). But here the words क्रमेते अनुवादाः etc., in the end show that the previous passage is a Sūtra. Such long Sūtras can be accepted in Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa on the model of उपसम्मितां etc., (1-4-54) a Sūtra according to the Sūtrapāṭha itself. Real difficulty was felt in many other Sūtras, e.g., य इन्द्रियकामो वीर्यकामः स्यात् (4-4-6) and अभित्वा शूर (4-4-7). Here the words of the Bhāṣya in the end सूत्रद्वयं अविद्यमानपूर्व-पक्षमपि etc., came to my rescue since it shows that the passages above are Sūtras. यद्ब्रूयात् (4-3-29) is another example. Here *Bhāṭṭacandrika* gives only the beginning of the Sūtra. But since the passage is not complete up to अपोदिताश्च I decided that the Sūtra ended with that word and the remaining portion is the Bhāṣya. The subject matter of these two lines concurs with that given by *Bhāṭṭacandrika*

There are however some peculiar features in the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa Sūtras not observed in the earlier 12 chapters or in the *Brahma Sūtras*. They are :

1. तेन मन्यामहे (1-4-53) and 3-1-35
2. चित्रया यजेत पशुकाम इत्युक्त्वा (Ch. 2-4-6)
3. अर्धशब्देन विधीयन्ते 2-4-27
4. अपेन्द्रद्विषतः अयमपि तत् न सोमस्य धर्मः पशूनामस्ति 3-4-14

Here the words मन्यामहे, उक्त्वा, विधीयन्ते, अयमपि are peculiar to Saṅkarṣa Sūtras.

From these peculiarities we cannot decide that they are not Sūtras, since there is clear evidence to show that they are Sūtras. The Sūtra नानार्थानां समासवचने 3-3-31 is repeated again (3-3-37)

There is as a rule the repetition of the last word of the last Sūtra at the end of each chapter and repetition of the whole Sūtra

(6) तथा सङ्घे गोविन्दोपाध्यायेनोक्तम्—चतुर्वर्गचिन्तामणिः Vol. 3, p. 324

(7) Report on Skt. mss. in South India, Vol. II No. 1489, p. 69

in the end in the *Brahma Sūtras*. But no such rule is followed in all the 16 chapters of *Pūrvamīmāṃsā*. The last word of the last Sūtra in Ch. II and the last two words of the last Sūtra in *San̄karṣakāṇḍa* alone are repeated. The repetition in chapter II is according to the *Bhāṣya* a sign of the completion of the chapter, while the repetition of the last Sūtra is a sign of the completion of the *Śāstra*.

THE BHĀṢYA

The *Bhāṣya* of *Devasvāmin* resembles the *Bhāṣya* of *Śabara*. Being old and out of use for a very considerable period, the correct text of the work has not been preserved. We find from the work of *Bhāskararāya* (18th Century) that it was read and taught in his time but later it was neglected by scholars who were satisfied with the first twelve chapters for *Mīmāṃsā* and the last four for *Vedānta*. Altogether four manuscripts are available. 1. One belonging to Malabar; 2. the second to the University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum; 3. the third to Madras Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library and the fourth belonging to the Adyar Manuscripts Library, a manuscript which originally belonged to *Śantiniketan*. The manuscript of the Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library which is a transcript of the Malabar Manuscript, formed the basis of the work. Other manuscripts were compared. All manuscripts seem to be of the same origin, since variations are very few and wherever there is lacuna in one manuscript, we find the same lacuna in others also. The Sūtra नाना वा देवतापुस्तकात् which is quoted in all *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣyas* is absent in all manuscripts though it is found in the *Bhāṭṭacandrika* of *Bhāskararāya*. In a few places the *Bhāṣya* is in such a mutilated condition that it is not possible to find out the correct reading. However with the aid of *Bhāṭṭacandrika* which deals with each *Adhikaraṇa* clearly expressing the purport of each Sūtra I was able to make out a clean text though imperfect in some places. I have suggested correct readings in rectangular brackets and indicated the surplus words by circular brackets.

WORKS REFERRED TO IN THE BHĀṢYA

Devasvāmin, the author of the *Bhāṣya*, quotes the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras* profusely but not *Śabara's Bhāṣya* thereon. He quotes a *Vṛttikāra* in 4-2-10. This *Vṛttikāra* might be *Upavarṣa* who

is often quoted by *Śabara* and whose *Vṛtti* is said to have comprised, all the 20 chapters of *Mīmāṃsā*. Quotations from Vedic texts are numerous. Most of these are from *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* and *Brāhmaṇa*. These have been traced in Appendix B. But quotations from other *Śākhās* have yet to be traced.

DEVASVĀMIN

Devasvāmin has also written commentaries on *Śrauta-Sūtras* and *Gṛhya Sūtras* of *Āśvalāyana*. His *Gṛhya Sūtra Bhāṣya* has partly been published by the late Dr. C. Kunhan Raja in the Adyar Library Series. His *San̄karṣakāṇḍa Bhāṣya* has been quoted by *Hemādri* (12th cent.), *Appayya Dikṣita* and other later writers but not by any earlier authors. Hence Dr. P. V. Kane concludes that he must belong to the 11th century of our era. According to *Prapañcahr̥daya* (11th century) however he precedes *Bhavadāsa* who is quoted by *Śabara* (2nd Century).

My thanks are due to the curators of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras and the University Oriental Manuscripts Library, Trivandram, and to the Librarian, Adyar Manuscripts Library, Madras, who kindly lent me the manuscripts of *San̄karṣakāṇḍa* in their charge for editing this rare work. I am specially grateful to Dr. V. Raghavan, Professor and Head of our Department for lending me the manuscripts in his custody and helping me with his valuable suggestions at every step. Lastly I thank the Syndicate of the Madras University for including this work in the Madras University Sanskrit Series.

University of Madras }
1-1-1965 }

S. SUBRAMANYA SASTRI