

REVIEWS

SAṆKARŚAKĀṆḌA of Jaimini with the *Bhāṣya* of Devasvāmin, edited critically with Introduction and Appendices by S. Subrahmanya SASTRI, University of Madras, 1965, pp. xiii + xxxviii + 260, Price Rs. 3-0-0.

A critical edition of the *Saṅkarśakāṇḍa* Chapter I (text only) was brought out by K. V. SARMA as V. J. Series—18 with an Introduction, critical notes, an Appendix, and the *Sūtra* Index in March 1963; and ever since that date scholars in the *Mīmāṃsā Śāstra* in particular have been eagerly awaiting the appearance in print of the whole work. This expectation has been in a way fulfilled by Shri S. Subrahmanya SASTRI, Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras, by bringing out an edition of the full text of this *Kāṇḍa* (all the four chapters) together with a well-known commentary on it—the *Bhāṣya* of Devasvāmin.

Besides the original *sūtras* and the *Bhāṣya* thereon by Devasvāmin, the edition contains an Introduction (in English and also in Sanskrit) discussing relevant topics and also giving the contents of the whole *Kāṇḍa*, by analysing the subject matter *adhikaraṇa* by *adhikaraṇa*. In the end are given three Appendices, containing (i) Index of *Sūtras*, (ii) Index of citations, and (iii) Index of *Saṅkarśakāṇḍa* *sūtras* quoted in other works.

For a long time the authenticity (or rather genuineness) of these four chapters itself was questioned; and it is only recently that a strong case has been made for the *Saṅkarśakāṇḍa* to be admitted as a genuine portion of the work of Jaimini. The present edition of this work together with an ancient commentary on it can be said to have decided the question finally, though that does not mean that all problems concerning this work have been finally settled.

The most important among these problems yet awaiting final solution is the settling of the text of the *sūtras*. There is a good deal of disparity between the *sūtras* in this work and those in the other twelve chapters (usually accepted as the only genuine chapters) of Jaimini's work (and also other kindred *sūtra* works). Some peculiarities of this work have been noticed by the editor; and a few more can be easily gathered by a glance through the edition. The main source of difficulty, however, in this respect, arises out of the fact that in all the available MSS. the *sūtras* and the *bhāṣya* are so mixed up that it becomes often very difficult, if not altogether impossible to distinguish and determine the exact text and extent of the *sūtras*. In some MSS., only the *adhikaraṇasūtras* are given, so that the difficulty arises regarding the remaining *sūtras* of the *adhikaraṇa*, which in the commentary are mostly represented by their *pratīkas* only. Unfortunately no MS. containing the complete *sūtras* text in full, has been found; and this makes the settling of the *sūtrapāṭha* all the more difficult.

The editor has explained the criteria on the basis of which he has tried to restore almost all the individual sūtras and thus arrived at the full text of the *sūtrapāṭha*. In spite of his best efforts, however, the *sūtrapāṭha* cannot be said to have been finally settled. Thus, for example, at I. 2.3 the editor has adopted the reading *lingāc ca* as against the *sūtrapāṭha* MS reading *lingadarśanāc ca* (given in the foot-note). Apparently there seems to be some confusion regarding these two readings in the mind of the editor; and this has resulted in the curious phenomenon that out of a dozen places given in Appendix A for the sūtra *lingadarśanāc ca*, six are found to read *lingāc ca*. Similarly at I. 3. 19 the editor in a foot-note notices reading *guṇāptikārāt* as the reading of the *sūtrapāṭha* MS; but without giving any thought to it he has chosen to read the sūtra as *guṇavikāro hi*, on what authority it is hard to understand. The MS reading referred to above could well have been adopted with a slight emendation as *guṇadvikārāt*. One more case of what may be described as unjustified editorial activity is found at I. 4.42 where the editor has added a whole clause, namely, *yathā śūrpena juhōti iti*, though it is altogether absent in the SP MS. The emendation at I. 3. 49, however, is quite legitimate, though the same can hardly be said of the emendations made and readings adopted in several other places.

A word must also be said about the editing of the bhāṣya, which appears to be the only ancient commentary that is available in full at present. Here the most intriguing point is the remark at the beginning of the commentary on III. 2. 1.

Shri SASTRI'S view (Introduction p. v), concerning this remark is 'that they must be the words of the scribe who copied the whole work; who not finding the bhāṣya of Devasvāmin upon that *pāda*, would have copied the bhāṣya of Bhavadāsa for that portion alone'. Here one must first try to determine what portion actually constitutes the bhāṣya of Bhavadāsa.

A careful perusal of the passage in question will clearly show that the remark we are now considering has occurred (and been printed even in this edition) just at the beginning of the commentary on III. 2. 1; and this naturally leads one to think that by the words *asmin pāde*, the writer must be referring to III. 2 only. This view (which appears to be shared by the editor also), however, is not correct. The author of the remark, whoever he is, has made quite clear the limits of the Bhavadāsiya bhāṣya by quoting the sūtra from where it (the bhāṣya) commences and by declaring that it runs upto the end of that *pāda*. This clearly shows that the bhāṣya under discussion pertains to that *pāda* where the sūtra mentioned by him (namely *apūrvāt tathā some*) is found. Now since that sūtra is found (in the edition under review) in III. 1 (after sūtra 29?), it follows that the Bhavadāsiya bhāṣya mentioned in the above remark must be the bhāṣya from III. 1. 29 (or 30?) up to the end of that *pāda*. In the light of this situation now we can understand that the remark *asmin pāde* etc. pertains to the *pāda* just ended (and not one just commenced). This

also explains why the remark has come just at the beginning of III. 2.] fact, the proper place for this remark would be at the end of the bhāṣya on III. 1. 44 which is referred to by the words *ā pādasamāpteh* in that remark. The editor seems to be quite aware of this fact that the sūtra *apūrvā* et is in III. 1 and not in III. 2. But he is misled by the position of the remark under discussion which appears in MSS under III. 2. 1. Hence it is that he has remarked: This sūtra is not found in this *pāda* (i. e. in III. 2) but found in *pāda* 1 (i. e. III. 1). To convey the proper significance of the remark under discussion, the editor would have done well to print it at the concluding sentence of the bhāṣya on III. 1. 44, or better still, to have relegated it to a foot-note with an apt remark. It is not part of a bhāṣya at all! By the way, this also would show that the sūtra, *apūrvāt tathā some*, presents a problem which has not been properly handled in this edition. For, the editor has merely relegated it to a foot-note, without clarifying its position in any way.

On going through the bhāṣya itself one finds there a few misprints which, however, can be easily corrected and hence need not detain us here. There are, however, several places where the editor could do nothing better than leave the text in a laconic condition.

All this, however, does not minimise the value of the work under review, which has its own importance, not only in the field of *Mīmāṃsā* but even in that of *Śrauta* ritual. The editor deserves hearty thanks from scholars interested in these fields in particular for having provided them with a practically complete edition of this important work with a good Introduction and useful Appendices.

—G. V. DEVASTHAL