

SOME EDITORIAL NOTES ON SUCARITAMIŚRA'S COMMENTARY ON THE ŚABDĀDHIKARAṆA SECTION OF THE ŚLOKAVĀRTTIKA*

Taisei SHIDA

1. Introductory Remarks

1.1. The Mīmāṃsā theory of the eternality of sound

From the beginning the Mīmāṃsakas insisted on the eternality of sound and placed this theory at the core of their doctrine in the Tarkapāda. They regarded each phoneme as eternal (*śabdanityatā*), and further regarded the Vedic scriptures as an authorless revelation (*vedāpauruṣeyatā*). It was their contention that this doctrine of the eternality of sound and scriptures, coupled with another idiosyncratic doctrine termed the theory of intrinsic validity (*svataḥprāmāṇya*), served to establish the authority of the Vedic scriptures.¹

It is in *Jaiminīsūtra* (JS) 1.1.6–23 that the Mīmāṃsā school first refers to the theory of the eternality of sound. Frauwallner [1961] postulates that JS 1.1.6–23 belongs to a new layer of the JS. One of the reasons he proposes for this interpolation is the close contextual relationship that exists between JS 1.1.5 and 1.1.24.² He also assumes that the Mīmāṃsā doctrine of the eternality of sound was formulated under the influence of two preceding and prevailing streams of thought, namely the Grammarian's theory of *varṇasphoṭa* (but not

* At the 15th World Sanskrit Conference held in Delhi in January 2012, I proposed an estimated stemma on the basis of the collation of five testimonies among the seven available. Thereafter, having collated the remaining two testimonies, I proposed a stemma estimated from qualitative analysis at the 63rd Congress of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies held in July 2012, which was published as Shida [2013]. However, due to limitations of space, Shida [2013] contains only bibliographical information for each testimony, the stemma, and brief grounds for the stemma. Therefore, in this paper I put forward Sucaritamīśra's quotations and the collation data for the stemma shown in Shida [2013].

¹ Cf. Shida [forthcoming: §1.3].

² See Frauwallner [1961: 118.23–119.29].

padasphoṭa) and the Vaiśeṣika theory of category (*padārtha*).³

This hypothesis, however, should be examined in the light of further philological evidence, as not a few scholars have pointed out some controversy concerning the direction of influence that the Mīmāṃsā and Grammarian schools had on the theory of the eternality of sound.⁴ Moreover, another issue that requires careful examination — given the various positions taken by Mīmāṃsā polemicists — is how fully the Mīmāṃsā follow the Vaiśeṣika theory of category, especially on such points as whether sound (*śabda*) is a specific property of the ether (*ākāśaviśeṣaguṇa*),⁵ and whether the auditory faculty (*śrotra*) consists of the ether (*ākāśa*).⁶

1.2. Editorial situation of the Bhāṭṭa commentaries on *śabdādhikaraṇa*

I will now outline the editorial situation of the later commentaries, especially those of the Bhāṭṭa school, on this possibly interpolated part of the JS (1.1.6–23).⁷

● *Śābarabhāṣya*

Kataoka [2007] re-edited the relevant part with regard to the *Śābarabhāṣya*, which is the first extant commentary on the JS and is shared by both the Bhāṭṭa and Prābhākara schools.

● *Ślokavārttika* (SV)

Rāmaśāstrī Tailāṅga's edition covers the whole treatise and has been widely used. Other editions also exist which cover the text either partially or wholly, but the critical editing of all these published editions has been insufficient.⁸

³ Frauwallner [1961: 115, 14–17]

⁴ See Shida [forthcoming: fn. 26].

⁵ Frauwallner [1961] does not necessarily assert that Mīmāṃsā, at the time of the compilation of JS 1.1.6–23, adopts fully the Vaiśeṣika ontology regarding sound. (See Shida [forthcoming: fn. 27].) However, regarding the thesis of sound as being a specific property of ether, he argues that Mīmāṃsā took it unchanged from Vaiśeṣika. This view of sound as an ether's specific property is conserved in Prābhākara school while later Bhāṭṭa school regards sound as substance. I examined the origin of the Bhāṭṭa view of sound as substance in Shida [forthcoming].

⁶ As to Kumārila's deviation from Vaiśeṣika category on this point, see Shida [forthcoming: § 3.2.4].

⁷ Ōmae [1998] and Kataoka [2011b] explain in more detail the primary and secondary sources of the SV and its commentaries. Here, I focus on the editions which cover the *śabdādhikaraṇa* section.

⁸ See Shida [2013: fn. 1].

● Commentaries on the ŚV

Uṃveka's *Ślokavārttikatātparyāṭkā* (ŚVTṬ) is the oldest extant commentary but the manuscripts discovered cover only up to the end of the *sphoṭavāda* section, as does the published edition.

The published edition of Jayamiśra's commentary, *Śarkarikā* (ŚVŚ), covers from the *ākṛtīvāda* section to part way through the *sambandhākṣepaparihāra* section. Omae [1998] reports that the manuscript preserved in the Sarasvati Bhavana Library in Benares covers up to and includes some of the *śabdādhikaraṇa* section.⁹

As mentioned in Shida [2013], Sucaritamiśra's commentary, *Ślokavārttikakāśikāṭkā* (ŚVK), is covered in its entirety by a number of manuscripts, of which most cover several sections only, but the editions published from the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series cover from the beginning up to the end of the *sambandhākṣepavāda* section.¹⁰

Pārthasārathi's commentary, *Nyāyaratnākara* (ŚVN), has already been published in the above-mentioned edition by Tailaṅga. The ŚVN is the only published commentary which covers all of the ŚV and the *śabdādhikaraṇa* section.

Commentary (Author)	Date	Published chapter	Manuscript
ŚVTṬ (Uṃveka)	8C	PJS~SPH	PJS~SPH ¹¹
ŚVŚ (Jayamiśra)	???	AKV~SAP v. 39b	AKV~SNA v. 187 ¹²
ŚVK (Sucaritamiśra)	8-10C ¹³	PJS~SAV ¹⁴	complete
ŚVN (Pārthasārathi)	10-12C ¹⁵	complete	complete

⁹ Cf. Omae [1998: 28, n. 9].

¹⁰ Abbreviations for the sections of the ŚV(K) are as follows: PJS: *pratijñāsūtra*, CDS: *codanāsūtra*, NMS: *nimittasūtra*, PAS: *pratyakṣasūtra*, VKG: *vṛttikāragraṇtha*, NAV: *nirālanbanavāda*, SNV: *śūnyavāda*, AMP: *anumānapariccheda*, SBP: *śabdapariccheda*, UMP: *upamānapariccheda*, AAP: *arthāpattipariccheda*, ABH: *abhāvapariccheda*, CAV: *citrākṣepavāda*, SAV: *sambandhākṣepavāda*, SPH: *sphoṭavāda*, AKV: *ākṛtīvāda*, APV: *apohavāda*, VAV: *vanavāda*, SAP: *sambandhākṣepaparihāra*, CAP: *citrākṣepaparihāra*, ATV: *ātmavāda*, SNA: *śabdādhikaraṇa*, VAA: *vākyādhikaraṇa*, VPA: *veda[apauruṣeyatā]-adhikaraṇa*.

¹¹ Cf. Omae [1998: 27–28].

¹² Cf. Omae [1998: 28, n. 9].

¹³ Kataoka [2003: 16–18] considers the argument over the grasping of pervasion (*vyāpti-grahaṇa*) and posits Sucaritamiśra's floruit as coming after Śālikanātha and before Vācaspati. Moreover, Kataoka [2011a: 275–276] proposes hypothetical dates for Sucaritamiśra as 930–980 A.D.

¹⁴ **vol. 1:** from *pratijñāsūtra* to *pratyakṣasūtra* (PJS, CDS, NMS, PAS), **vol. 2:** from *vṛttikāragraṇtha* to *śūnyavāda* (VKG, NAV, SNV), **vol. 3:** from *anumānapariccheda* to *sambandhākṣepavāda* (AMP, SBP, UMP, AAP, ABH, CAV, SAP).

¹⁵ Cf. Sastri [1937]; Sastri [1991: 60–64].

In this context, I aim to edit Sucaritamīśra's commentary on the *śabdādhikaraṇa* section with reference to seven testimonies: three Malayalam manuscripts from southern India, one Devanagari manuscript from northern India, and three modern transcriptions.¹⁶

1.3. Significance of the edition of Sucaritamīśra's commentary

The problem of whether sound is eternal or not is one of the major philosophical problematic in Indian philosophy, and the polemics surrounding this issue have involved many schools. This is because the eternality of sound contradicts the core doctrines of other schools, such as the momentariness of everything advocated by Buddhism, or the theology of the Nyāya school, which admits the existence of an omniscient God as the composer of the Vedas. Thus, investigation into the controversy at that time surrounding the eternality of sound is of significance from the viewpoint of the history of thought.

It is unclear why publication of the fourth and the following volume(s) of the ŚVK has gone into abeyance until now, even though a fourth volume was once announced as 'in press.'¹⁷ Previous scholars might have paid less attention to the ŚVK than to Kumārila's treatises and other Mimāṃsā philosophers' independent works, at least in terms of their importance to the history of thought, because the ŚVK is at best a commentary. Nevertheless, there should be some significance, other than the accessibility of the text, in editing the unpublished section of the ŚVK which follows.

First of all, Sucaritamīśra might have revealed his own original views in the parts where he provides extremely long arguments. In the most part Sucaritamīśra makes a straightforward commentary on each verse of the ŚV, but he sometimes explains certain issues in considerable detail, even deviating from the usual style of a commentary. For example, he puts forth an elaborate commentary, in the so-called *vārttika* style,¹⁸ on SNA v. 97c–98b, or more specifically on the v. 98a: '*na tirodhīyate*,' where Kumārila negates the concealment of the ether in a wall.¹⁹ There Sucaritamīśra argues over the nature and the existence of the ether (*ākāśa*) and darkness

¹⁶ As to the details of each testimony, see Shida [2013: §§2–3].

¹⁷ Cf. Ōmae [1998: 29, n. 12]; Shida [2013: n. 3].

¹⁸ Cf. Bronkhorst [1990].

¹⁹ The commentary on this single verse amounts to 245 lines in my provisional working edition. This is extremely long compared to the average line number, 7.5. This number derives from the average for commentary lines from the beginning of the section up to just before this verse in the same working edition (i.e. 728 lines for 96.5 verses).

(*tamas*), the cognitive means (*pramāṇa*) for those two, and the substanceness of sound. In addition, it is precisely here that Sucaritamiśra explicitly states, probably for the first time among the Bhāṭṭa polemicists, that sound is a substance (*dravya*).²⁰ Considering that the late Bhāṭṭa school comes to admit the substanceness of sound and darkness,²¹ Sucaritamiśra might be posited as occupying a turning point where the school is modifying the Vaiśeṣika theory of category.

Sucaritamiśra also elaborates an even longer argument on the momentariness of things (*kṣaṇabhāṅga*) and on recognition (*pratyabhiññā*) in the commentary on v.426.²² If critically edited, this very long argument is also expected to offer philological evidence for the development of the doctrine of momentariness in the Buddhist logico-epistemic school, since the floruit of Sucaritamiśra is situated between that of Dharmakīrti and of Jñānaśrīmitra, i.e., just when the Buddhist logico-epistemic school was perfecting the doctrine of momentariness.

Definitive evidence for Sucaritamiśra's floruit has not been reported except for the reference to him by Jñānaśrīmitra; even the interaction of his thought with Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, Śālikanātha, and Vācaspati, as well with as the philosophers of the Buddhist logico-epistemic school and the Śaiva school, remain to be unraveled at a future date.²³ His quoting of other schools' texts is also likely to be evidence in constructing a history of thought in the last phase of the first millennium. For example, during my collation work I found quotations from Sadyojyotis' *Bhogakārikā* (BhK).²⁴ Although this fact itself does not reduce the possible range of the floruit of either Sucaritamiśra or Sadyojyotis,²⁵ it is nevertheless informative when sketching the world of thought at that time, since Sucaritamiśra quotes the BhK on at least four occasions when citing the Sāṃkhya position.

²⁰ Cf. Shida [forthcoming: §3.1].

²¹ Cf. Hiriyanna [1932: 324.15–19] [1960: 131.32–35]; Shida [forthcoming: fn. 2].

²² The commentary on this single verse amounts to even more than 300 lines in my working edition.

²³ Previous research assumed Sucaritamiśra's floruit as roughly around the tenth century. Apart from the evidence of the reference by Jñānaśrīmitra, Sucaritamiśra himself quotes Maṇḍanamīśra and might have known Śālikanātha (Cf. fn. 13).

²⁴ See quotations numbered as I), II), and IX) in the next section.

²⁵ Watson [2006: 111–114] argues that the dates for Sadyojyotis must be between 600 and 830, with the seventh or early eighth century being the most likely.

2. Verses Quoted by Sucaritamīśra

Sucaritamīśra offers a certain number of quotations from prose and verse, especially when elaborating on some special topics such as the cognitive means for the ether and darkness, the substantiality of sound, the momentariness of things, and the analysis of recognition. Among these quotations, listed below are verses for which the source is either newly identified or has not yet been identified.

I) ad v. 20c–21b

ajñe nary eva vijñānaṃ ^(a)*nānyatrety aniyāmakam* /
karmāpi nopapannaṃ tu tad anyatra sthitaṃ yataḥ //
^(a...a)-trety aniyāmakam] K₂GK₁^{pc}T_GT_AT_K; -trety niyāmakam SK₁^{ac}
 ≈ BhK v. 81c–82b.²⁶

II) ad v. 20c–21b, v. 113c–114b

prakāśo viṣayākāro ^(a)*devadvāro na vā kvacit* /
pumbodhavyaktibhūmitvād bodho vṛttir mater matā //
^(a)viṣayākāro] K₂^{pc}GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; viṣayāro K₂^{ac}
 = BhK v. 46.²⁷

III) ad v. 59c–60b

sāttvika ekādaśakaḥ ^(a)*pravartate* ^(b)*vaikṛtād ahaṅkārāt* /
^(a)ekādaśakaḥ] K₂GK₁ST_A; ekādaśakaṃ T_K ^(b)pravartate] K₂GK₁T_AT_K;
 pravarta[ta] S
 = Sāṃkhyakārikā v. 25ab.

IV) ad v. 98ab

yat tu nīlam ivākāśaṃ ^(a)*dṛśyate śuklavat kvacit* /
^(b)*bhrānti sā dṛśyamāna* ^(b)-^(c)*tvād bhaumataijasarūpayo* ^(c) //
^(a)-vākāśaṃ] K₂GST_G^{pc}TK; -vākāraṃ T_G^{ac}T_A; -vā+śaṃ K1 ^(b...b)bhrānti sā
 dṛśya-] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; sā bhrāntir dṛśya- S ^(c...c)-mānatvād bhauma-]
 K₂GK₁^{pc}ST_GT_A; -mānatvābhauma- K₁^{ac}; -mānatvabhauma- T_K (unmetrical)
 Source unknown.

²⁶ BhK v. 81c–82b p. 223: *ajñe nary eva vijñānaṃ nānyatrety niyāmakam / karmāpi nopapannaṃ tu tad anyatra sthitaṃ yataḥ* //

²⁷ BhK v. 46 p. 214: *prakāśo viṣayākāro devadvāro na vā kvacit / pumbodhavyaktibhūmitvād bodho vṛttir mater matā* //

V) ad v. 98ab

*tamaḥ khalu calaṃ nīlaṃ parāparavibhāgavat^(a) /
prasiddhadravyavaidharmyān navabhyo bhettum^(b) arhati //*

^(a) -vibhāgavat] K₂^{pc}GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; -vibhāvat K₂^{ac} ^(b) bhettum] K₂GST_GT_AT_K;
+ttum K₁

Source unknown.²⁸

VI) ad v. 98ab

chāyāyāḥ kārṣṇyam^(a) ity evaṃ^(b) purāṇe bhūguṇaśruteḥ /

^(a) kārṣṇyam] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; kārṣṭyam S ^(b) evaṃ] K₂^{pc}GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; evama
K₂^{ac}

Source unknown.²⁹

VII) ad v. 98ab

kṛṣṇā tu^(a) yāvatī chāyā^(b) ^(c) sā sarvā pāṛthivīṣyate^(c) / [iti]

^(a) tu] K₂GST_GT_A; ta K₁T_K ^(b) chāyā] K₂GST_GT_A; chā K₁T_K ^(c...c) sā sarvā
pāṛthivīṣyate] K₂GT_GT_A; sarvā pṛthivīṣyate. iti S; sarvapāṛthivīṣyata nati K₁;
sarpapārthi+vīṣyate. iti T_K

Source unknown.

VIII) ad v. 98ab

*varṇātmakāś ca^(a) ye śabdā nityāḥ sarvagatās tathā /
pṛthagdravyatayā^(b) te tu^(c) na guṇāḥ kasyacin matāḥ //*

^(a) ca] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; tu S ^(b) pṛthagdravyatayā] K₂GK₁^{pc}ST_GT_AT_K; pṛthag-
rgdravyatayā K₁^{ac} (unmetrical) ^(c) tu] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; hi S

Source unknown.³⁰

IX) ad v. 113c–114b

*indriyāṇi^(a) śrutis tvak ca^(b) cakṣur jihvātha^(c) nāsikā /
śabdādyaḥ locanaṃ teṣāṃ vṛttiḥ śabdādisannibhā //*

^(a) indriyāṇi] K₂GK₁^{pc}ST_GT_A; indriyās tu T_K; indriyā K₁^{ac} ^(b) ca] K₂GK₁^{pc}S^{pc}

²⁸ This verse is also quoted by Varadarāja (ca. 11C) in his *Sārasaṃgraha* (TRSS) ad TR (II v. 35c–36b, p. 133, 6–7). The latter half stanza of this verse is also quoted in *Nyāyapariśuddhi* (p. 314, 7–8) of Veṅkatanātha (ca. 12C).

²⁹ This half stanza is also quoted in the *Nyāyakandalī* of Śrīdhara (ca. 10C) with one and half stanza. NKaṇ p. 35.1–4: *na ca bhāṣām abhāvasya tamastvaṃ vṛddhasannatam / chāyāyāḥ kārṣṇyam ity evaṃ purāṇe bhūguṇaśruteḥ // dūrāsannapradīpader mahadalpacalācalā / dehānu-vartinī chāyā na vastutvād vinā bhavet //*

³⁰ This verse is quoted in the PrP (p. 324.4–5), ŚVK (ad *śabdādhikaraṇa* v. 98), *Tattva-vibhāvanā* (p. 10, 4–5.), a commentary by Rṣiputraparameśvara on *Tattvabindu* p. 10, and *Sarvadarśanaśaṅkha* (p. 92.18–19). As to the interpretation of this verse, see Shida [forthcoming: § 2.1].

$T_G T_A T_K$; *om. K₁^{ac} S^{ac} (c) jihvātha*] $GK_1 ST_G T_A T_K$; *jimhvātha K₂*
 $\approx BhK$ v. 25.³¹

X) ad v. 117c–118b

pramāṇavanty adṛṣṭāni ^(a)*kalpyāni subahūny api* ^(a) /
^(a...a) *kalpyāni subahūny api*] $K_2 GK_1 ST_G T_A T_K$; *bahūny api kalpanīyāny eva S*
 (unmetrical)
 $\approx Tantravārttika$ (TV) ad JS 2.1.5.³²

XI) ad v. 276

śabde prayatnaniṣpatter aparādhasya bhāgitā ^(a) /
^(a...a) *bhāgitā*] $K_2 GK_1 T_G T_A T_K$; *bhāgitvam S*
 $\approx JS$ 1.3.25.³³

XII) ad v. 276

abhiyuktā ^(a) ^(b)*hi ye* ^(b) *yatra* ^(c)*yatsambandha* ^(c) - ^(d)*prayojanāḥ* /
tatratyaguṇadoṣāṇām ^(e) *jñāne te 'dhi* ^(d) - ^(f)*kṛtā matāḥ* ^(f) //
^(a) *abhiyuktā*] GS ; +*bhiyuktā K₂*; *bhāviyuktā T_G T_A*; *ābheyuktā T_K*; +++++ K_1 ;
^(b...b) *hi ye*] $K_2 K_1 ST_G T_A T_K$; ++ G ^(c...c) *yatsambandha* -] $K_2 GT_G T_A$; *yatsamba-*
[ndha] - K_1 ; *yatsambandhu-* T_K ; *yannibaddha-* S ^(d...d) -*prayojanā ... 'dhi-*
 $K_2 GST_G T_A$; ++...++ $K_1 T_K$ ^(e) -*doṣāṇām*] $K_2 GT_G T_A$; -*śeṣāṇām S* ^(f...f) -*kṛtā*
matāḥ] $K_2 GSK_1^{pc} T_G T_A T_K$; *kṛtamata* K_1^{ac}
 Source unknown.

XIII) ad v. 276

^(a)*yathā ca padma* ^(a) - ^(b)*rāgādīn kācasphaṭika* ^(b) - *miśritān* ^(c) /
parīkṣkā viviñcantī ^(d) *sādhutvam api* ^(e) *te tathā* ^(e) //
^(a...a) *yathā ca padma* -] $K_2^{pc} GK_1 ST_G T_A T_K$; *yathā yathā ca padma* × K_2^{ac}
^(b...b) *rāgādīn kācasphaṭika* -] $K_2 ST_G T_A T_K$; *rāgādīn kācasphaṭi* +- K_1 ; *rā* ++ ...
 ++*ka-* G ; ^(c) -*miśritān*] $K_2 GST_G T_K$; +*śritān K₁*; -*miśritām T_A* ^(d) *viviñcantī*]

³¹ BhK v. 25 p. 209: *karaṇāni śrūtiś tvak ca cakṣur jihvā ca nāsikā / śabdāyālocanam teṣāṃ vṛttiḥ śabdādisannidhau* //

³² *Tantravārttika* (TV) ad JS 2.1.5, p. 399, 14–15: *pramāṇavanty adṛṣṭāni kalpyante subahūny api / adṛṣṭasatabhāgo 'pi na kalpyo hy apramāṇakah* //
 This verse is also quoted in *Vibhramavivēka* (K) v. 141, p. 15, (S) v. 142, p. 40: *pramāṇavanty adṛṣṭāni kalpyante subahūny api / saṃskārabhedahetūnām tattvaṃ naikāntataḥ sthitam* //
 This half stanza is quoted by Śucaritamīśra himself in the sections of *pratyakṣasūtra* and *śūnyavāda*, and also quoted by Vācaspati in the NVTṬ as follows: ŚVK ad ŚV *pratyakṣasūtra* k. 163, (E_K) I p. 238, 1–3: *astu vā pramāṇavanty adṛṣṭāni kalpyāni subahūny api, santi deheṣu prthivyādibhūtabhāgāḥ kṛtagandhādiprakāśanaśaktayaśceti varṇitam.*; *ibid.* ad ŚV *śūnyavāda* k. 179, II p. 164, 1b: *pramāṇavanti subahūny apy adṛṣṭāni kalpanīyāny eva ...*; NVTṬ ad NS 4.1.44, p. 586.12: *pramāṇavanty adṛṣṭāni kalpyāni subahūny api* /

³³ JS 1.3.25, (W) p. 12r.12–13: *śabde prayatnaniṣpatter aparādhasya bhāgitvam* /

$K_2GST_GT_K$; *viviñcanti* K_1T_K ; *vijānanti* S; *-rviviñcantī* T_A ^(e...e) *te tathā*
 $K_2GST_GT_A$; *te ta+* K_1^{pc} ; *te ta* T_K ; *ta+* K_1^{ac}
 \approx TV ad JS 1.3.27.³⁴

XIV) ad v. 426

^(a) *sandehaś ca kṛto yatra* ^(b) *bhavet sa pratihetunā* /

^(c) *nirṇayas tatra kartavyaḥ pratyakṣagamakādinā* //

^(a...a) *sandehaś ca kṛto yatra* $K_2GK_1T_GT_AT_K$; *sandehas tu yatra kṛto* S
^(b...b) *bhavet sa pratihetunā* K_1T_K ; *na bhavet sa pratihetunā* $K_2T_GT_A$
(unmetrical); *na +++...+hetunā* G ^(c...c) *nirṇayas tatra kartavyaḥ praty-*
akṣagamakādinā K_1ST_K ; *nirṇayas tatra kartavya* 'pratyakṣāvagamādinā K_2 ;
nirṇayas tatra kartavyaḥ pratyakṣāvagamādinā G; *nirṇayaḥ kartavyaḥ*
pratyakṣāvagamādinā $T_G^{pc}T_A$ (unmetrical); *nirṇayaḥ kartavyaḥ praty-*
akṣa×mādinā T_G^{ac} (unmetrical)

Source unknown.

XV) ad v. 426

rajataṃ grhyamāṇaṃ ^(a) *hi cirasthāyīti* ^(b) *grhyate* /

bhaviṣyacchuktikā ^(c) *jñānakālaṃ vyāpnoti tena tat* //

^(a) *grhyamāṇaṃ* $K_2K_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *grmhyamāṇaṃ* G ^(b) *cirasthāyīti* $K_2GK_1^{pc}$
 $ST_GT_AT_K$; *vacirasthāyīti* K_1^{pc} ^(c) *bhaviṣyacchuktikā* $K_2GT_GT_AT_K$; *bhaviṣya-*
chaktikā K_1S

Source unknown.³⁵

XVI) ad v. 426

^(a) *siddhā naḥ* ^(b) *pratyabhi-jñānāt kṣaṇabhaṅganirākṛtiḥ* ^(b) /

cirāciravibhāgena ^(c) ^(d) *bhinnābhāvās tridhaiva* ^(d) *tu* //

^(a...a) *siddhā naḥ* $K_1T_GT_K$; *siddhāntaḥ* ST_A ; *siddhāntaḥ naḥ* K_2G (unmetrical)
^(b...b) *-jñānāt...nirākṛtiḥ* GT_GT_A ; *-jñānāt kṣaṇa++nirākṛtiḥ* K_1 ; *-jñā++...++*
 K_2 ; *-jñānāt...kṣaṇabhaṅga+++tiḥ* T_K ; *-jñānāt...nirākṛteḥ* S ^(c) *-vibhāgena*
 $GK_1S^{pc}T_GT_AT_K$; *-vibhāge* S^{pc} ^(d) *bhinnābhāvās tridhaiva* $K_2GK_1T_GT_AT_K$;
bhinno bhāvostri[cai]va S

Source unknown.

³⁴ TV ad JS 1.3.27, p. 282, 5–6: *yathā ca padmarāgādīn kācasphaṭikamīśritān / parīkṣakā vijānanti sādhuṭvam apare tathā* //

³⁵ This verse is also quoted in *Bhāmatī* (BSŚBhBh) on BS 3.2.2, p. 692.

XVII) ad v. 441³⁶

sādrśyāt pratyabhijñānaṃ ^(a)*bhrāntir bhrānter vinaṣṭatām*^(a) /
^(b)*vadato 'tyanta*^(b)*-nirmūlaṃ*^(c) *bhaved anyonyasaṃśrayam* //
^(d)*yāvat tu*^(d) *pratyabhijñānaṃ spaṣṭaṃ*^(e) *dr̥ṣṭam abādhitam*^(f) /
tāvad vinaṣṭatānyatvasādrśyānām^(g) *asambhavaḥ* //

^(a...a) *bhrāntir bhrānter vinaṣṭatām*] T_GT_A; *bhrāntibhrānter vinaṣṭatām* K₂;
bhrāntaṃ bhrānter vinaṣṭatām T_K; *bhrāntir bhrāntir vinaṣṭatām* S;
bhrānti++++tām G ^(b...b) *vadato 'tyanta-*] K₂GT_GT_AT_K; *āvadato hy atyanta*
S (unmetrical) ^(c) *-nirmūlaṃ*] K₂GST_GT_A; *ni++* T_K ^(d...d) *yāvat tu*
K₂GST_AT_K; *yāvatu* T_G ^(e) *spaṣṭaṃ*] GST_GT_AT_K; *+ṣṭaṃ* K₂ ^(f) *abādhitam*] K₂ST_K;
abādhitā T_GT_A; *abādhitva* G ^(g) *-nyatvāsādrśyānām*] K₂GT_GT_AT_K;
-nyatvam īdrśyānām S
 Source unknown.

By analyzing these quotations, we may be able to find a new source for the chronology of thought, as we have already found in Sucaritamīśra's citation of Sadyojyotis. Even if the sources of his quotations cannot be identified, some of these may nevertheless continue to be thought of as possible citations from Kumārila's lost work, the *Brhaṭṭīkā*.

3. Collation Data for the Stemma of Testimonies of ŚVK

Shida [2013] proposed a presumptive stemma of the seven testimonies of the ŚVK along with an outline of the grounds for this, but limitations of space prevented any presentation of the collation data as evidence. I will now show the collation data, in order according to the argument made in Shida [2013].

3.1 Parental relationship between K₁ and T_K

T_K has the same lacunae as those in K₁ in many places, and it is likely therefore that T_K had K₁ as its only exemplar.

1) ad v. 46

ato na tannidarśanenāpi ^(a)*sajātīya*^(a)*-vyañjakatva-*^(b)*siddhir ity*
abhiprāyeṇāha^(b) — *pārthivānām iti*.

^(a...a) *sajātīya-*] K₂K₁ST_GT_AT_K; *sa+++* G ^(b...b) *-siddhir ity abhi-*] K₂GST_GT_A;

³⁶ A folio (f. 139) of K₁, which is supposed to cover the last part of the *śabdādihikaraṇa* section including these two verses and the beginning of the *vākyādihikaraṇa*, seems to be lost.

++++bhi- K₁; □□□□bhi- T_K

2) ad v.97c–98b

^(a) *ayam eva ca nimīlane^a* parihārah.

^(a..a) *ayam eva ca nimīlane*] K₂GST_GT_A; *aya+++[ni]mīlane* K₁^{pc}; *aya+++
[ni]limīlane* K₁^{ac}; *aya□□□nnimīlane* T_K

3) ad v.97c–98b

*ata eva yugapac chiraḥpādavedanānubhavo^(a) gamane tadanupa-
patteḥ^(b)*.

^(a) *-vedanānubhavo*] K₂GST_KT_A; *-vedanā+++* K₁; *-vedanā□□□□* T_K ^(b) *tad-
anupapatteḥ*] K₂GST_GT_A; *tadupapatteḥ* K₁T_K

4) ad v.97c–98b

*apām^(a) ca śtītasparśānumitānām bhūtejasoś ca^a prāṇabhṛtām
adṛṣṭavaśena naktam^(b) divam rūpodbhūtir vā hy^b āloka-mātratayā^(c)
prāṇinām^(d) vyavahāramātrānugunam^(e) tejo vartate^e*.

^(a..a) *ca śtītasparśānumitānām bhūtejasoś ca*] K₂K₁ST_GT_AT_K; ++...++ G ^(b..b)
divam rūpodbhūtir vā hy] K₂^{pc}GT_GT_A; *divam rūpe[dbhū]tidivāpy* K₁; *divam
rūpodbhūtīḥ divāpy* K₂^{ac}; *divam rūpe tūtimivāsyā-* T_K; *divavibhāgena
rūpodbhūtīḥ divā vā hy* S ^(c) *āloka-mātratayā*] K₂^{pc}GK₁ST_GT_A; *atra loka-
mātrayo* K₂^{ac}; *-āloka-mātratayā* T_K ^(d) *prāṇinām*] K₂GK₁ST_AT_K; *prāṇimām* T_G
^(e..e) *tejo vartate*] K₂GST_GT_A; *te+++vartate* K₁; *te□□ā vartate* T_K

Among these, the last set of collation data is the most suggestive of a parental relationship between T_K and G. This is because, due to the manuscript being eaten by worms, only the right part of the syllable ‘jo’ is legible in G, and this part, which is actually a part of ‘-o,’ is identical with ‘-ā’ in the Malayalam system. Probably this is why the T_K copied it as ‘□ā.’ This fact strongly suggests that T_K has G as its only exemplar.

3.2 Variant readings particular only to T_G and T_A

A postscript of the relevant volume of T_G records that T_G was once transcribed in 1921–22 from a manuscript and was checked against another manuscript in 1924.³⁷ The following collation data are parts of the text where T_G^{ac} and T_A, written in 1923, share variant readings particular only to these two. Thus it is highly likely that T_A is a copy

³⁷ Cf. Shida [2013: §3.1].

from T_G^{ac} .

5) ad v. 4

$tac^{(a)}$ *ca vede* ^(b) $pīṣyata ity ata āha^{(b)}$ — *nirmūlair iti*.

^(a) $tac]$ $K_2GT_GT_A$; $tadvac$ K_1ST_K ^(b..b) $'pīṣyata ity ata āha]$ $K_2GK_1T_G^{pc}$
 T_K ; $'pīṣyata ity āha$ $T_G^{ac}T_A$; $'pi bhaviṣyaty ata āha$ S

6) ad v. 6

nanu vyaktaya eva tāvad āhatyodakāharaṇādivyavahārakāraṇam ^(a),
na tu ^(b) *jātiḥ, amūrtatvāt*.

^(a) $āhatyodakāharaṇādi-]$ $K_2GK_1ST_G^{pc}T_K$; $āhatyodakādi-$ $T_G^{ac}T_A$ ^(b) $tu]$ K_2GK_1
 $T_GT_AT_K$; *om. S*

7) ad v. 11

yat punar vibhu na tadekadeśe kṛtsnam avagamyate — *yathā tad*
evākāśam ^(a) *niravaśeṣam eva* ^(b) *sūcī-* ^(b) *randhrabrahmāṇḍodarayor*
ākāśam ^(c) *na* ^(d) *kṛtsnabudhyā* ^(e) *grhyate*.

^(a..a) $niravaśeṣam eva]$ $K_2GT_GT_A$; $na niravaśeṣam api hi$ S ; $⊥paravaśeṣam eva$
 T_K ; $[ni]paravaśeṣam eva$ K_1^{pc} ; $[hi]paravaśeṣam eva$ K_1^{ac} ^(b..b) $sūcī-]$
 $K_2GK_1ST_G^{pc}T_K$; $sūpī-$ $T_G^{ac}T_A$ ^(c) $ākāśam]$ $GST_GT_AT_K$; $ākāśavam$ K_1 ; $ākā+$
 K_2 ^(d) $na]$ $GK_1T_GT_AT_K$; $+ K_2$; *om. S* ^(e) $kṛtsnabudhyā]$ $K_2GST_GT_AT_K$;
 $+tsnabudhyā$ K_1

8) ad v. 13

yady evaṃ kim ekabuddheḥ samādhānam ^(a), *ata āha* — *teneti*.

^(a) $samādhānam]$ $K_2GK_1ST_G^{pc}$; $sāadhanam$ $T_G^{ac}T_A$

9) ad v. 14

kasmān na bhrāntikāraṇam ^(a) *ata āha* — *kāmam iti*.

^(a) $bhrānti-]$ $K_2GK_1ST_G^{pc}$; $śrānti-$ $T_G^{ac}T_A$

10) ad v. 17

atrāparam ^(a) *sūtram* — *prakṛtivyākṛtyoś ceti*.

^(a) $atrāparam]$ $K_2GK_1ST_G^{pc}T_K$; $athāparam$ $T_G^{ac}T_A$

3.3 Possibility of a parental relationship between G and T_G

T_G , along with T_A , commonly reports a lacuna precisely where G also has a lacuna.

11) ad v. 35c–36b

yadi tu^(a) śabdānavasthānamātram^(b) hetur ucyate — na kaścid ākāśādivad ekaḥ śabdo^(c) 'vasthitah^(d), kiṃ tu karmakṣaṇā^(e) iva sadṛśā parāparotpattyā^(f) bahavaḥ^(c) śabdāḥ santanyanta iti.

^(a) tu] GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; + K₂ ^(b) -sthānamātram] K₂^{pc}GT_GT_A; -sthānam eva K₁ST_K; om. K₂^{ac} ^(c...c) 'vasthitah ... bahavaḥ] K₂^{pc}K₁ST_K; ++...++vaḥ G ^(d) 'vasthitah] K₂^{pc}K₁ST_K; sthitah K₂^{ac}; +++ G; □□□ T_GT_A ^(e) karmakṣaṇā] K₁ST_GT_AT_K; +++nā K₂; ++++ G ^(f) parāparo-] K₂ST_GT_A; parāvaro- K₁T_K

The collation data 19) also shows the possibility of a parental relationship between G and T_G.

3.4 Contamination of T_G^{pc} from K₂

The following collation data indicate where K₂ and T_G^{pc} share a reading while G and T_G^{ac} share a variant reading. These could suggest that G is the first exemplar for T_G, and that T_G is checked against K₂ or a similar unknown manuscript in the same recension.

12) ad v. 1

ato yātra vyavahāranityatā sādhyā, sā tāvad^(a) anityayor api śabdāsambandhayoḥ^(b) ^(c)sidhyaty eveti^(c) ^(d)niṣprayojanam nityatā-pratipādanam anārabdhavyam^(d) iti.

^(a) tāvad] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; bhaved S ^(b) śabdāsambandhayoḥ] K₂ST_GT_AT_K; śabda+bandhayoḥ K₁; śabdāsambandhayauḥ G ^(c...c) sidhyaty eveti] G^{pc}K₂K₁ST_K; siddhaty eveti T_GT_A; sidhyatyeti eveti G^{ac} ^(d...d) niṣprayojanam nityatā-pratipādanam anārabdhavyam] K₂K₁T_G^{pc}T_K; niṣprayojananityatāpratipādanam anārabdhavyam GT_G^{ac}T_A; niḥprayojanam anārabhyam S

13) ad v. 8

paratas tu pareśām trayāṇām viśeṣato bhaviṣyati, ādyānām tu viśeṣavyākhyā na kṛtā supratipādakatvāt^(a) parastāc ca vivariṣya-māṇatvād^(b) iti.

^(a) supratipādakatvāt] K₂GT_GT_A; [su]pratipādakatvāt K₁; supratipadatvāt S ^(b) vivariṣya-] K₂K₁ST_G^{pc}; vipariṣya- GT_AT_G^{ac}

14) ad v. 15

^(a)ayam abhiprāyaḥ^(a) — ^(b)nānyabhedo 'nya^(b) bhedā-^(c)vagamāyālam, na jātu^(c) bhinnadeśasthair ^(d)bhinnaiḥ pradīpair abhivyaḥja-^(d)^(e)māno ghaṭo ^(f)bhinnarūpatayā^(f)bhivyaḥjate^(e), ^(g)kiṃ tu^(g) ekarūpatayaiveti

nāntareṇa svābhāvikaṃ^(h) bhedaṃ bhedāvagatir⁽ⁱ⁾ upapadyeta iti^(j).

^(a...a) *ayam abhiprāyaḥ*] K₂K₁ST_GT_AT_K; a+++++yaḥ G ^(b...b) *nānyabhedo 'nya-*] K₂ST_GT_AT_K; *nānyabhedo+ G; na+nyabhedo nya-* K₁ ^(c...c) *-vagamayālam, na jātu*] K₂T_G^{pc}; *-vagamayālam. paśya, na jātu* K₁ST_K; *-vagamayālambanajātu* G; *-vagāmayālambanam jātu* T_AT_G^{ac} ^(d...d) *bhinnaiḥ pradīpair abhivyaḥya-*] K₂GS^{pc}T_GT_A; *bhinnair abhivyaḥya-* K₁T_K; *bhinnaiḥ pradīpair i[bhi]vyaya-* S^{ac} ^(e...e) *-māno ghaṭo bhinnarūpatayābhivyaḥyate*] GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; *-mā++... ++bhi-vyaḥyate* K₂ ^(f) *bhinnarūpatayā-*] GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *bhinnatayā-* S ^(g...g) *kiṃ tu*] G K₁ST_GT_AT_K; ++ K₂ ^(h) *svābhāvikaṃ*] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *bhāvikaṃ* S ^(i...i) *upapadyeta iti*] K₂GK₁^{pc}T_K; *upapadyata iti* K₁^{ac}; *upapadyate iti* S^{pc}; *upapadyeteti* T_GT_A; *i[śya]te iti* S^{ac}

15) ad v. 46

pradīpādayo^(a) 'pi na sajātīyasyaiva^(b) vyañjakāḥ^(c), kiṃ tu^(d) pārthivānām ghaṭādīdravyāṇām api^(d).

^(a) *pradīpādayo*] K₂K₁ST_G^{pc}T_K; *pratipādayo* G; *pratinipādayo* T_G^{ac}T_A ^(b) *sajātīyasyaiva*] K₂GS^{pc}T_GT_A; *sajātīyasya* K₁T_K; *sajātīyasyaivā* S^{ac} ^(c) *vyañjakāḥ*] K₂GK₁S^{pc}T_GT_AT_K; *vyañjakāḥ* S^{ac} ^(d...d) *pārthivānām ghaṭādīdravyāṇām api*] K₂^{pc}GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *pārthivānām api paṭādīdravyāṇām* S; *prārthivānām ghaṭādīdravyāṇām api* K₂^{ac}

16) ad v. 59c–60b

tanmate 'pi vibhutvād ahaṅkārasya, tatprakṛtīnīndriyāṇy^(a) api vibhūny eveti yuktam eva^(b) prāptitulyatvam iti.

^(a) *tatprakṛtīnīndriyāṇy*] K₂^{pc}K₁^{pc}ST_G^{pc}T_K; *taṃ prakṛtīnīndriyāṇy* GT_AT_G^{ac}; *tatprakṛtīnīndriyāṇy* K₁^{ac} ^(b) *eva*] K₂GK₁S^{pc}T_GT_AT_K; *eveti* S^{ac}

17) ad v. 62c–63b

sthīro vāyur iti nānumanyante^(a). calatvaṃ^(b) hi^(c) tasya svabhāvaḥ^(d).

^(a) *nānumanyante*] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *tenānumanyante* S ^(b) *calatvaṃ*] K₂^{pc}K₁S T_G^{pc}T_K; *valatvaṃ* K₂^{ac}GT_A; *[tva]valatvaṃ* T_G^{ac} ^(c) *hi*] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *om.* S ^(d) *svabhāvaḥ*] GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; *sva[bhā]vaḥ* K₂

18) ad v. 82c–83b

^(a)kayācid vivakṣayā^(a) kaścid eva saṃrambho^(b) janyate. tena ca^(c) kenāpi kiñcijjātīyena^(d) kasyacid eva kiñcidvarṇābhivyañjakasya^(e) preraṇaṃ^(f) kriyata ity^(g) abhiprāyeṇāha — syād iti.

^(a...a) *kayācid vivakṣayā*] K₂K₁T_K^{pc}T_G^{pc}; *kadācid vivakṣayā* GT_AT_G^{ac}; *kayācid eva vivakṣayā* S; *kayācid vipakṣayā* T_K^{ac} ^(b) *saṃrambho*] K₂GST_GT_AT_K;

saṃrabho K₁ ^(c) *ca*] K₂GST_GT_A; *om.* K₁T_K ^(d) *-jātīyena*] K₂^{pc}K₁ST_G^{pc}T_K;
-jātīyayena K₂^{ac}GT_AT_G^{ac} ^(e) *-varṇābhivyañjaka-*] K₂GK₁^{pc}ST_GT_AT_K; *-varṇa-*
bhivyañjaka- K₁^{ac} ^(f) *preraṇam*] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *dhvaneḥ preraṇam* S ^(g) *ity*] K₂GK₁ST_G^{pc}T_AT_K; *iti* T_G^{ac}

3.5 Possibility of a parental relationship between K₂ and G

● Replacement of 'da' for *avagraha*

K₂, which is written in Malayalam script, uses a symbol for *avagraha*, something rarely used in the Malayalam-script system. The following is the part where K₂ uses *avagraha*, and G reads 'da-' in the very same part, though this reading '*dadhiṣṭhānataḥ*' does not make sense. This could be because of the rare use of *avagraha* in the Malayalam manuscripts and the shape of *avagraha* here being similar to that of 'da.' Interestingly, T_G, the probable copy of G, and T_A, the probable copy of T_G, both have the reading '*tada-*,' which makes the meaningful syllables '*tadadhiṣṭhānataḥ*' through the minimum correction of inserting '*ta*.' This case implies the stream of transmission: K₂ → G → T_G (=T_A).

19) ad v.79c–80b

nanv astu śrotrasaṃskārapakṣe^(a) '*dhiṣṭhānataḥ*'^(b) *saṃskāra-*
niyamah^(c) *śabdāśrayasaṃskārapakṣe*^(d) *tu kiṃ vyavasthākāraṇam,*
ata āha — vyañjakānām iti.

^(a) *-pakṣe*] GK₁ST_A; *-pakṣo* T_K ^(b) '*dhiṣṭhānataḥ*] K₂K₁ST_K; *dadhiṣṭhānataḥ*
 G; *tadadhiṣṭhānataḥ* T_GT_A ^(c) *saṃskāraṇiyamah*] K₂GST_GT_AT_K; *sa++ra-*
ni++h K₁ ^(d) *śabdāśrayasaṃskārapakṣe*] K₂GT_GT_AT_K; *śabdāśrayasaṃskāra-*
pakṣayos tu S; *śabdāśra+++kārapakṣe tu* K₁

● Eyeskip in G

In the following case G makes an eyeskip in the very place where K₂ has similar syllables, i.e., '*saṃbhavāt*' and '*bhāvāt*,' in consecutive lines.

20) ad v.97c–98b

na, ^(a) *tamasy api bhāvāt*^(a), *asāntarālālokavicchinne*^(b) ^(c) *py*
andhakāre^(c) ^(d) *trāyaṃ nātreṭi*^(d) *bhedena budhyamānā*^(e) *ḍṛśyante,*
^(f) *tad asaty ākāṣe pratyakṣe na*^(f) *pratyakṣe na sambhavati.*

^(a..a) *tamasy api bhāvāt*] K₂G^{pc}ST_GT_A; *tamasy api bhāvāt etad abhiprāya* G^{ac}
 (eyeskip); *tasya vibhāvāt* K₁T_K ^(b) *asāntarālālokavicchinne*] K₂^{pc}T_GT_A;

asāntarālā+++cchinne G; *sāntarālālokavicchinne* K₂^{ac}K₁^{pc}; *sāntarālālo-*
kāvicchinne K₁^{ac}T_K; *sāntarāloke hi vicchinne* S^(c...e) 'py andhakāre] K₂G
 K₁^{pc}T_GT_A; *hy andhakāre* T_K; 'ndhakāre S^(d...d) 'trāyaṃ nātreṭi] K₂GK₁T_G
 T_AT_K; 'trāndhakāraṃ nātreṭi S^(e) *budhyamānā*] K₂GK₁S^{pc}T_GT_AT_K; *drśya*
budhyamānā S^{ac} (*eyeskip*)^(f...f) *tad asaty ākāṣe pratyakṣe na*] K₂GK₁^{pc}T_GT_A;
tad asaty ākāṣapratyakṣatve na S; *tad asmaty ākāṣe pratyakṣe na* K₁^{ac}; *tada*⊥
tyākāṣe pratyakṣe na T_K

● Replacement of 'ru' for 'ta'

In the following case G at first read 'ru' for 'ta,' where K₂ actually has the syllable 'ta' in a peculiar shape. Compared to another instance of 'ta' in the previous line of K₂, this particular 'ta' here is rather similar to 'ru.'

21) ad v. 89c–90b

kim idaṃ vīcītaraṅgavṛtṭyeti^(a).

^(a) *vīcītaraṅga-*] G^{pc}K₁ST_GT_AT_K; *vīcīruramga-* G^{ac}; ++[*ta*]ramga- K₂

● Replacement of 'nn-/n-' for 'rnn-'

In the following parts, where K₂ has a consonant cluster consisting of 'r' and a geminated 'n,' i.e. 'dr̥ṣṭir nna' (orthographically 'dr̥ṣṭir na'), 'kuḍyādibhir nnāśyate' (orthographically 'kuḍyādibhir nāśyate'), and 'ātmamanasor nnitya-' (orthographically 'ātmamanasor nitya-'), G merely reads 'n,' whether geminated or not, without the pre-consonantal 'r,' i.e., 'dr̥ṣṭin na' (orthographically 'dr̥ṣṭim na'), 'kuḍyādibhinnā-', and 'ātmamanaso nitya-'. These variant readings are probably because the pre-consonantal 'r' is faintly written in K₂. This could be further indirect evidence that K₂ is the exemplar of G.

22) ad v. 41

atas tadanuvarttinī śabdabuddhir api meghāndhakārārātrāv^(a) *iva vidyujjanitā* ^(b)*dr̥ṣṭir na*^(b) *ciram anuvartata iti.*

^(a) *meghāndha-*] K₂GK₁^{pc}ST_GT_AT_K; *maghāntandha-* K₁^{ac} ^(b...b) *dr̥ṣṭir na*] K₂K₁ST_K; *dr̥ṣṭim na* GT_GT_A

23) ad v. 97c–98b

ayam abhiprāyaḥ — astu tāvad ^(a)*ākāśaguṇaḥ śabdaḥ*^(a), *na tu kuḍyamadhye nāsti*, ^(b)*na hi tat kuḍyādibhir nāśyate*^(b) *nityatvāt, ...*

^(a...a) *-guṇaḥ śabdaḥ*] K₁ST_GT_AT_K; *-guṇaśabdaḥ* K₂G ^(b...b) *na hi tat*

kuḍyādibhir nāśyate] $K_2^{pc}K_1^{pc}S$; *naitat kuḍyādibhir naśyate* T_GT_A ; *na hi kuḍyādibhir nāśyate* $K_1^{ac}T_K$; *na tat kuḍyādibhir nnaśyate* K_2^{ac} ; *na hi ++dyādibhi[nnā]śyate* G

24) ad v. 97c–98b

yad āha — ^(a)*ātmamanasor nityatvāt* ^(b)*sarvagatatvāc ca* ^(c)*naitat kvacit kadācit* ^(e)*prerayitavyam iti*.

^(a...a) *ātmamanasor nitya-*] $K_2T_GT_AT_K$; *ātmamanaso nitya-* G ; *ātmanasor nitya-* K_1 ; *ātmavanmanaso 'pi nitya-* S ^(b...b) *sarvagatatvāc ca*] $K_2GK_1ST_GT_K$; *sarvagatatvāt sarvagatatvāc ca* T_A ^(c...c) *naitat kvacit kadācit*] $K_2GT_GT_A$; *naitat kvacit* K_1T_K ; *naivam tat kvacit* S

From these facts from 19) to 24), it seems likely that G has K_2 as its exemplar.

3.6 Possibility of a Malayalam exemplar for K_2

K_2 sometimes has its reading corrected ($K_2^{ac} \rightarrow K_2^{pc}$). Moreover, the corrections in the following cases suggest that the exemplar of K_2^{ac} was written in the Malayalam script, though such a manuscript is not confirmed as extant.

● Replacement of 'Co' for 'taCā'³⁸

In the following part, the reading '-yo' in K_2^{ac} is corrected into '-tayā' in K_2^{pc} . This might have been caused by an erroneous reading of K_2^{ac} , where 'ta,' preceding the consonant 'y,' and the post-consonantal '-ā' in its exemplar, are put together and read as a single vowel '-o.'

25) ad v. 97c–98b

apām ^(a)*ca śtasparsānumitānām bhūtejasoś ca* ^(a)*prāṇabhṛtām adṛṣṭavaśena naktam* ^(b)*divam rūpodbhūtir vā hy* ^(b)*āloka-mātratayā* ^(c)*prāṇinām* ^(d)*vyavahāramātrānugunam* ^(e)*tejo vartate* ^(e).

^(a...a) *ca śtasparsānumitānām bhūtejasoś ca*] $K_2K_1ST_GT_AT_K$; ++...++ G
^(b...b) *divam rūpodbhūtir vā hy*] $K_2^{pc}GT_GT_A$; *divam rūpe[dbhū]tidivāpy* K_1 ;
divam rūpodbhūtīḥ divāpy K_2^{ac} ; *divam rūpe tūtimivāsyā-* T_K ; *divavibhāgena rūpodbhūtīḥ divā vā hy* S ^(c) *āloka-mātratayā*] $K_2^{pc}GK_1ST_GT_A$; *atra loka-mātrayo* K_2^{ac} ; *-āloka-mātratayā* T_K ^(d) *prāṇinām*] $K_2GK_1ST_AT_K$; *prāṇinām* T_G
^(e...e) $K_2GST_GT_A$; *te++vartate* K_1 ; *te□ā vartate* T_K

³⁸ Here *et passim*, 'C' signifies any consonant.

● Replacement of ‘Cena’ for ‘Cau’

In the following case, the reading ‘-ntena’ in K_2^{ac} is corrected into ‘-ntau.’ This is probably because the right part of a diphthong ‘-au’ in the exemplar for K_2^{ac} was wrongly read as the syllable ‘na.’

26) ad v. 97c–98b

^(a) *ataḥ siddham asparśavattvād akriyāvattvānumānam^{a)}*, *chāyāyāṃ ca kriyābhrāntau^(b) nimittam uktam eveti na pratyakṣavirodhaḥ.*

^(a..a) *ataḥ siddham asparśavattvād akriyāvattvānumānam*] $K_2^{pc}T_GT_A$; *ataḥ siddham asparśavattvād akriyāvattvānumānamma* K_2^{ac} ; *atas siddham asparśavattvād akriyāvattva++mānam* G; *ataḥ siddham asparśatvād akriyātvānumānam* S; *ataddhimasparśatvād akriyānumānaṃ* $K_1^{pc}T_K$; *ataddhimasparśatvād akriyānumāmanaṃ* K_1^{ac} ^(b) *kriyābhrāntau*] $K_2^{pc}GK_1ST_GT_A$; *kriyābhrāntena* K_2^{ac} ; *kriyāśrāntau* T_K^{pc} ; *kriyāśrāventau* T_K^{ac}

The following collation data suggest that K_2 itself also has an exemplar written in the Malayalam script, though each datum is not conclusive on its own; for example, the similarity between ‘na’ and ‘sa’ is common to southern Indian scripts.

● Replacement of ‘na’ for ‘sa’

27) ad v. 97c–98b

sa^(a) hi gandhādisahacarito^(b) nārhaṭi^(c) teṣv asatsu^(d) bhavitum.

^(a) *sa*] $K_2^{pc}GK_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *na* K_2^{ac} ^(b) *-sahacarito*] $K_2GST_GT_AT_K$; *-sa[ha]+[rito]* K_1 ^(c) *nārhaṭi*] $K_2GK_1ST_GT_K$; *nahṭi* T_A ^(d) *asatsu*] $K_2^{pc}GK_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *anatsu* K_2^{ac}

● Replacement of ‘ṭhaC’ for ‘Ce’

28) ad v. 97c–98b

pārthivo^(a) hi nīlimā^(b) bhrāntair ākāśa āropyate^{b)}, *taijasam ca śuklatvam^(c)*, *prasiddhatadrūpatvād^(d) bhūtejasoḥ^(e).*

^(a) *pārthivo*] $K_2GST_GT_AT_K$; *[pā]+vo* K_1 ^(b..b) *bhrāntair ākāśa āropyate*] $K_2T_GT_A$; *bhrāntair āka++pyate* G; *bhrānter ākāśa āropyate* K_1T_K ; *bhrāntair ākāśādāropyate* S ^(c) *śuklatvam*] $K_1ST_GT_A$; *śukatvam* K_2G ; *śukatvam* K_2 ; *śukla[tvam]* T_K ^(d) *prasiddhatadrūpa-*] $GK_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *prasi+++pa-* K_2 ; ^(e) *bhūtejasoḥ*] $GK_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *bhūtejaseḥ* K_2^{pc} ; *bhūtejatha[sām]* K_2^{ac}

3.7 K_2^{ac} and K_1 share a reading while K_2^{pc} and G share a reading

In comparison to the closeness between K_2 and G, K_1 is farther from both of these manuscripts. That is why K_1 is sorted into recension

group α , and both K_2 and G into another group β .³⁹ However, several cases can be found, as follows, where K_1 and K_2^{ac} share a reading, while K_2^{pc} and G share a variant reading. These data suggest the possibility of contamination of K_2^{ac} from recension group α .

29) ad v. 20

prācye^(a) hi vinaṣṭe^(b) nave cānyasmiṃ jāte^(b) nedam^(c) tad evedam iti^(c)
^(d)pratyabhijñānam avakalpate^(d).

^(a) *prācye*] $K_2GST_G^{pc}$; *prāpye* $T_G^{ac}T_A T_K$; *pra[pye]* $K_1^{(b..b)}$ *nave cānyasmiṃ jāte*] $K_2GK_1T_G T_A T_K$; *śabde nave[nyasmiṃ jāte* $S^{(c..c)}$ *tad evedam iti*] $K_2^{pc}GS$; *tad eveti* $K_2^{ac}K_1T_K$; *tavedam iti* $T_G T_A^{(d..d)}$ *pratyabhijñānam avakalpate*] $GT_G T_A$; *pratyabhijñānam eva kalpate* T_K ; *pratyabhijñānam avaca kalpate* K_2 ; *pratyabhijñā[na]m avaka[lpate]* K_1 ; *pratisamdhānam avakalpate* S^{pc} ; *pratipratisamdhānam avakalpate* S^{ac}

30) ad v. 27c–28b

*yadā hi pūrvasmin sadrṣe ghaṭasantāne^(a) vilakṣaṇo mudgara-
 prahārādihetur^(b) upanipatati^(c), tadā^(d) vilakṣaṇena kapālādinā
 kāryeṇa^(d) jāyamānena sthūlo vināśo 'bhivyaajyate.*

^(a) *ghaṭasantāne*] $K_2^{pc}GST_G T_A$; *ghaṭe santāne* $K_2^{ac}K_1^{pc}T_K$; *ghaṭe santane* K_1^{ac}
^(b) *mudgaraprahārādi-*] $K_2GST_G T_A T_K^{pc}$; *mu[lga]raprahārādi-* K_1 ; *mudgarādi-
 prahārādi-* T_K^{ac} ^(c) *upanipatati*] $K_2GST_G T_A$; *upanipatatiḥ* K_1^{pc} ; *upanipatitaḥ*
 K_1^{ac} ; *upanivarititaḥ* $T_K^{(d..d)}$ *vilakṣaṇena kapālādinā kāryeṇa*] $K_2GK_1^{pc}S$
 $T_G T_A T_K$; *vilakṣaṇelādinā* K_1^{ac}

31) ad v. 46

*asyārthaḥ — sajātīyam eva rūpādīnām^(a) vyañjakam upalabdham^(b)
 yathā^(c) dīpādi rūpaṃ^(c) tamasi^(d) ghaṭādirūpāṇām vyañjakam iti^(e)
 kāṇādā manyante^(f).*

^(a) *rūpādīnām*] $K_2GK_1ST_G^{pc}T_A T_K$; *rūpānām* T_G^{ac} ^(b..b) *vyañjakam upalabdham*] $K_2GK_1^{pc}ST_G T_A$; *vyañjakaxpalabdham* K_1^{ac} ; *vyañjaka* \square *upalabdham* $T_K^{(c..c)}$
dīpādi rūpaṃ] $K_2K_1T_K$; *dīpādirūpā* $T_G T_A$; *dīvādirūpā* G ; *pradīpādi rūpaṃ* S
^(d) *tamasi*] S ; *tad dhi* $K_2GK_1T_G T_A T_K^{(e)}$ *ghaṭādirūpāṇām vyañjakam iti*] $K_2^{pc}GT_G T_A$; *ghaṭādirūpāṇām iti* $K_2^{ac}K_1^{pc}ST_K$; *ghaṭādirūpāṇām iki* K_1^{ac}
^(f..f) *kāṇādā manyante*] $K_1T_G^{pc}$; *kāṇādāḥ manyante* T_K ; *kākāṇādā manyante*
 $K_2GT_G^{ac}T_A$; *kāṇādāḥ* S

³⁹ Cf. Shida [2013: §3.2].

32) ad v. 53c–54b

syād etat — ādhārasaṃskāradvāreṇa śabdābhivvyaktis^(a) tadbhedāc ca saṃskāravasthethi.

^(a) *śabdābhivvyaktis*] $K_2^{pc}GT_GT_A$; *śabdābhivvyaktes* $K_2^{ac}K_1T_K$; *śabdo 'bhivvyaktas*
S

33) ad v. 55c–56b

syād etat — ^(a)nirbhāgasyaika^(a)-deśabodhāsambhavād^(b) agrahaṇam, ^(c)kṛtsnasya vā grahaṇam iti^(c).

^(a...a) *nirbhāgasyaika-*] $GK_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *nirbhā+++* K_2 ^(b) *-deśabodhāsambhavād*] $K_2^{pc}GST_GT_A$; *-deśāsambhavād* $K_2^{ac}K_1T_K$ ^(c...c) *kṛtsnasya vā grahaṇam iti*] $K_2GK_1^{pc}T_GT_AT_K$; [*vā*] *kṛtsnasya vā grahaṇam iti sakalo grhyata iti* S; ++...++ K_1^{ac} (eyeskip)

34) ad v. 97c–98b

evam hi pratyakṣasiddhe^(a) ^(b)nabhasi viphalam tadbhāvabhāva-prastutam^(b) anumānam^(c). syādetat — kuḍyādivaraṇābhāvāpekṣas^(d) tadbhāvabhāva iti. evam api tad evākāśaṃ bhaved ity ananumeyatvam^(e) eva, abhāvasya indriyakatvābhyupagamāt^(f).

^(a) *pratyakṣasiddhe*] $K_2GST_GT_AT_K$; *pratyakṣa[siddhe]* K_1 ^(b...b) *nabhasi viphalam tadbhāva-*] $K_2^{pc}T_GT_A$; *viphalam tadbhāva-* $K_2^{ac}K_1ST_K$; ++... ++dbhāva- G ^(c) *anumānam*] $K_2^{pc}GK_1ST_GT_AT_K$; *anumāna* K_2^{ac} ^(d) *kuḍyādivaraṇābhāvāpekṣas*] $K_2^{pc}GK_1^{pc}T_AT_K$; *kuḍyādivaraṇābhāvāpekṣas* K_2^{ac} ; *kuḍyādivaraṇāpekṣyābhāvāpekṣas* K_1^{ac} ; *dvārādiṣvāvaraṇābhāvāpekṣas* S ^(e) *ananumeyatvam*] $K_2^{pc}GST_GT_AT_K$; *anumeyatvam* $K_2^{ac}K_1$ ^(f) *-tvābhyupagamāt*] $K_2GK_1T_GT_AT_K$; *-tvopagamāt* S

4. Evaluation and Adoption of Readings from S

While investigating the manuscripts of the *sphoṭa* section, Ōmae [1998] judges that S contains some readings which can be accepted, but that in most cases the southern Indian recension has better readings. This evaluation of S can also be applied to the relevant section here, since S often has isolated variant readings. Some of them can be adopted as follows.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ The collation data 31) (d) is also a case where an isolated variant reading from S is to be adopted.

35) ad v. 56c–57b

*pūrvasmin pakṣe tāvad ākāśam eva^(a) śrotram^(b), tac ca sarvagatam, atas tulyā śabdaprāptiḥ sannikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭadeśavartinām^(c) śrotī-
nām^(d), tataś ca dūrabhāve 'pi śabdānām jñānam prasajyata eva.*

^(a) eva] K₂G^{pc}K₁ST_GT_AT_K; āhava G^{ac} ^(b) śrotram] GK₁ST_GT_AT_K; ++ K₂

^(c) sannikṛṣṭavipra-] K₂GK₁^{pc}T_GT_AT_K; sannikṛ[ṣṭam] vipra- S; satinni-
krṣṭavipra- K₁^{ac} ^(d) śrotīnām] S; śrotrānām K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K

36) ad v. 79c–80b

*yady api śabdasya^(a) tadāśrayasya cākāśasya^(b) na svato^(b) 'vayava-
bhedo deśabhedo^(b) ^(c)vā nirbhāgavibhutvābhyām^(c), tathāpi^(d) ye
śabdābhivyañjakā^(e) vāyavīyā dhvanayas, te hi^(f) bhinnāvayavāḥ
sāvayavatvād^(g) bhinnadeśās cāvibhutvāt^(g).*

^(a..a) tadāśrayasya cākāśasya] K₂^{pc}GST_GT_A; tadāśrayasyākāśasya K₂^{ac}

K₁^{pc}; tadāśrayatvasyākāśasya K₁^{ac}T_K ^(b..b) 'vayavabhedo deśabhedo]

S 'vayavābhedo K₁T_GT_AT_K; vayavāḥ bhedo K₂; vāyavā+ G ^(c..c) vā nir-

bhāgavibhutvābhyām] K₁^{pc}; vā nirbhāgatvavibhutvābhyām S; vā nibhāga-

vibhutvābhyām K₂G; vā vibhāgavibhutvābhyām T_GT_A; vā nirbhāgatu-

vibhutvābhyām K₁^{ac}; vāhirbhāgavibhutvābhyām T_K ^(d) tathāpi] S; tathā

K₁T_K; athāpi GT_GT_A; athā+ K₂ ^(e..e) vāyavīyā dhvanayas] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K;

vāyavas te S ^(f) hi] K₁ST_K; 'pi K₂GT_GT_A ^(g..g) bhinnadeśās cā-] K₂GST_G

T_AT_K; bhinnadeśā+ K₁

37) ad v. 97c–98b

*tac ca naivam, kāraṇakāraṇatvāt. kriyāhetur hi^(a) guṇaḥ prayatno^(a)
^(b) drṣṭavad ātmani^(b) vidyate, tasmāt kāraṇakāraṇam ātmā
prāṇādikarmaṇa iti. tato 'pi tadanumānam yuktam eva, na^(c) caivam
ākāśam iti katham anumīyeta^(c).*

^(a..a) guṇaḥ prayatno] GK₁T_GT_AT_K; guṇa+++++++ K₂ ^(b..b) drṣṭavad

ātmani] S; drṣṭam cātmani GK₁T_GT_AT_K; +++...++++tmani K₂ ^(c..c) caivam

ākāśam iti katham anumīyeta] K₁ST_GT_AT_K; caivam ākāśam iti ++++ mīyate

K₂; +++...++++mīyate G

“And that (= the appropriateness of the inference of the ether being based on the action of passing, just like the inference of *ātman* being based on the action of exhalation and inhalation) is not correct. Because [*ātman*] is the cause of the cause [of exhalation]. For the cause of an action [in general], which is effort (*prayatna*) as a property, exists in *ātman* just like an observed [thing]. Therefore, *ātman* is the [inherent] cause of the cause (i.e.

effort) of the action of exhalation. Based on this (= exhalation), too, the inference of that (= *ātman*) is precisely appropriate. But the ether is not so (= the cause of the cause of the action of passing through a wall etc.). Therefore, how is [the ether] to be inferred [from the action of passing].”

In this case also, the variant reading particular to S looks better, because there is no preceding word which can be anaphorically referred to by the neuter qualifier ‘*dr̥ṣṭam*,’ as attested in other testimonies.

On the other hand, there are difficult cases of whether or not to adopt a reading particular only to S, such as the following.

38) ad v. 97c–98b

tan na, atadvṛtteḥ. idaṃ ^(a)*khalu niṣkramaṇādi* ^(a)*karma śarīrādhikaraṇatvād* ^(b) — ^(c)*amūrtatvād ākāśasya* ^(c) — *na tāvad ākāśe vartate* ^(d). *na ca śarīre* ^(e) *vartamānam ākāśasya liṅgaṃ* ^(f)*bhavitum arhati* ^(f).

^(a..a) *khalu niṣkramaṇādi*] K₁ST_GT_AT_K; *kha+++maṇādi* G; *khalu nikramaṇādi* K₂ ^(b) *śarīrādhikaraṇatvād*] K₂GK₁^{pc}T_GT_AT_K; *śarīrādhikaraṇatvād* K₁^{ac}; *mūrtimatām karmādhikaraṇatvād* S ^(c..c) *amūrtatvād ākāśasya*] K₂GK₁^{pc}T_GT_A; *amūrtatvāc cākāśasya* S; *amūrtasatvād ākāśasya* K₁^{ac}T_K ^(d) *vartate*] K₂^{pc}GK₁ST_G^{pc}T_AT_K; *vartante* T_G^{ac}; *varttate karma śarīrādhikaraṇatvād amūrtatvād ākāśasya na tāvad ākāśe varttate* K₂^{ac} ^(e) *śarīre*] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *śarīrāntare* S ^(f..f) *bhavitum arhati*] K₂GK₁T_GT_AT_K; *bhavati* S

“It (= the action of passing [through a gate etc.] being the inferential mark of the ether) is not correct. Because of the non-existence [of the action of passing] in it (= the ether). As is well known, this action of passing does not inhere in the ether, because it has a body as its substratum, while the ether is incorporeal. And it is impossible [for this kind of action], being inherent in a body, to be an inferential mark of the ether.”

In this part, among several isolated variant readings which S particularly has, at least two readings seem to make sense: One is the insertion of the particle ‘*ca*,’ which makes a clear juxtaposition of the two parenthetic reasons ‘*śarīrādhikaraṇatvāt*’ and ‘*amūrtatvād ākāśasya*,’ and another is ‘*śarīrāntare*’ for ‘*śarīre*.’ Nevertheless, I would estimate readings from S in both cases as rather secondary.

Firstly, in the case of the former variant, the insertion of the

conjunctive particle 'ca' seems to make clearer sense if the two parenthetic causal phrases are actually in juxtaposition. However, from the viewpoint of sentence structure, these two phrases are not necessarily to be connected, precisely in parallel, to the main clause: 'the action of passing does not inhere in the ether.' This is because the first causal phrase 'because it has a body as its substratum (*śarīrādhikaraṇatvāt*)' does not express its subject, i.e., the action of passing, which is the subject of the main clause, while the second causal phrase 'while the ether is incorporeal (*amūrtatvād ākāśasya*)' does express its subject as the ether. Thus the first causal phrase is relatively closer to the main clause, and the second phrase is rather a supplementary explanation of why the action in general does not inhere in the ether: 'The action of passing, **insofar as having a body as its substratum**, does not inhere in the ether. **For the ether is incorporeal** (= the ether does not have a body).' Accordingly, these two causal phrases are not precisely in juxtaposition, and the particle 'ca' would not necessarily be required here, since the second causal phrase '*amūrtatvād ākāśasya*' can be regarded as a more parenthetic explanation.

Secondly, the latter variant reading, i.e., '*śarīrāntare*' for '*śarīre*,' is concerned with whether the word '*śarīra*' here refers to physical substance in general or to the corporeal (or even biological) body. Considering the first parenthetic causal phrase in the previous line: '*śarīrādhikaraṇatvāt*,' it seems to refer only to the corporeal body. In that case, the variant reading '*śarīrāntare*' could make sense only if it is interpreted as a non-restrictive Karmadhāraya compound, as follows: 'Insofar as [the action of passing] inheres **in the body, which is different [from the ether]**, it cannot be an inferential mark of the ether.' In this non-restrictive interpretation, there is little or even no substantial semantic difference between '*śarīre*' and '*śarīrāntare*.' This rather explanatory variant reading from S could be either original or secondary. Nevertheless, at this point in my editing work, I have hypothetically taken S's variant readings as secondary in general and have adopted the Southern manuscripts' readings in such cases.

5. Concluding Remarks

As part of the initial phase of the editing of Sucaritamiśra's commentary on the *śabdādhikaraṇa* section of ŚV, this paper presents

the verses quoted by Sucaritamīśra (§2), puts forward the collation data for the stemma estimated in Shida [2013] (§3), and outlines editorial policy regarding isolated readings from S (§4).

Further editorial work on this project can be expected to offer new sources for the chronology of thought in the last phase of the first millennium, such as the newly found quotation from Sadyojyotis. Even unidentified verses may continue to be thought of as possibly from a lost work ascribed to Kumārila.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- AP *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*, edited by Śrī Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988.
- JS *JaiminīmīmāṃsāSūtrapāṭhaḥ* of Jaimini.
- (W) *Mīmāṃsādarśanam*, edited by Kevalānanda Sarasvatī, Prājñā Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala, Wai 1948.
- (A) *Śrīmajjaiminipraṇītaṃ Mīmāṃsādarśanam*, 6 vols., edited by Subbāśāstrī, Poona: Anandāśramamudraṇālaya, 1929–34.
- TB *Tattvabindu* of Vācaspati Miśra with a Commentary *Tattvavibhāvanā* of Rṣiputra Parameśvara, edited by V.A. Ramaswami Sastri, Annamalai University Sanskrit Series No. 3, New Delhi: Navrang, 1991.
- TBTV *Tattvavibhāvanā* of Rṣiputra Parameśvara ad *Tattvabindu* of Vācaspati Miśra. See TB.
- TV *Tantravārttika* of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, see JS (A).
- TR *Tārkikarākṣā* of Varadarāja and his auto-commentary *Sārasaṃgraha*, with the Glosses *Niṣkaṇṭakā* of Mallinātha Kolācāra and *Laghudīpikā* of Jñānapūrṇa, edited by Vindhyeśvarīprasāda Dvivedin, *The Pandit* vol. 21–25, Vārāṇasi 1899–1903.
- TRSS *Sārasaṃgraha* of Varadarāja ad TR, see TR.
- NKan *Nyāyakandalī* of Śrīdhara with three Sub-commentaries, edited by Jitendra S. Jetly & Vasant G. Parikh, Vadodara: Oriental Institute, 1991.
- NPśu *Nyāyapariśuddhi* of Vedānta Deśika, edited by Vatsya Viraraghavacarya, Madras, 1978.
- NVTṬ *Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā* of Vācaspati Miśra, edited by Anantalal Thakur, New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 1996.
- PP *Prakaraṇapañcikā* of Śrī Śālikanātha Miśra, with a commentary *Nyāyasiddhi*, edited by Subrahmanya Sastri, Baranasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1961.
- BS *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa, with a commentary *Śāṅkara Bhāṣya* and sub-commentaries *Bhāmātī*, *Kalpataru*, and *Parimala*, edited by N.S. Anantkrṣṇa Śāstrī & V.L.S. Pāṇṣīkar, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1938 (2nd ed.).
- BSŚBhBh *Bhāmātī* of Vācaspati Miśra ad *Brahmasūtra Śāṅkara Bhāṣya*, see BS.
- BhK *Bhogakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with a commentary of Aghoraśiva's *Vṛtti*. See AP.
- VibhV *Vibhramaviveka* of Maṇḍana Miśra.
- (K) VibhV, edited by S. Kuppuswami Sastri & T.V. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Madras, 1932.
- (S) see Schmithausen [1965].
- ŚBh *Śābarabhāṣya* of Śābarasvāmin.
- (A) see JS (A).
- (F) ŚBh ad JS 1.1.1–1.1.5, see Frauwallner [1968].
- (K) ŚBh ad JS 1.1.6–23, see Kataoka [2007].
- ŚV *Ślokavārttika* of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa.
- (E_C) ŚV with a Commentary *Ślokavārttikanyāyaratnākara* of Pārthasārathi, edited by Rāmaśāstrī Tailanga, Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1898–1899.
- (E_K) ŚV with a Commentary *Ślokavārttikakāśikāṭikā* of Sucaritamīśra. Parts I and II: edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, Trivandrum: CBH Publications, 1990 (Reprint); Parts III: edited by V.A. Rāmasvāmi Śāstrī, Trivandrum: University of Travancore, 1943.
- (E_T) ŚV with a Commentary *Ślokavārttikatātparyāṭikā* of Umveka Bhaṭṭa, edited by S.K. Ramanatha Sastri, K. Kunjuni Raja, and R. Thangaswamy (rev.), Madras: University of Madras, 1971.
- SVK *Ślokavārttikakāśikāṭikā* of Sucaritamīśra.
- (E_K) see SV (E_K) (from *pratijñā* section up to *sambandhākṣepavāda* section).

- (K₁) *Śloka-vārttikakāśikāṭīkā* of Sucaritamīśra, Oriental Research Institute & Manuscript Library (ORI), University of Kerala, C.O.L. No. 1333, Palm Leaf, Malayalam script. From *sphoṭavāda* section up to *vedāpauruseyādhikaraṇa* section.
- (K₂) ORI, University of Kerala, C.O.L. No. 1779A, Palm Leaf, Malayalam script, 123 leaves. From *vanavāda* section v. 65 to *vedāpauruseyādhikaraṇa* section.
- (G) Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (GOML), Madras University, S.R. 1739 (R. 3610), Palm Leaf, Malayalam script, 311 leaves.
- (S) Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Varanasi, No. 29032, Paper, Devanagari.
- (T_A) Transcript, Adyar Library, Chennai, TR 66–7, No. TR 63361, Paper, Devanagari.
- (T_G) Transcript, GOML, Chennai, R. 3778, S.R. 2126, Paper, Devanagari.
- (T_K) Transcript, ORI, Kerala University, misplaced, likely that the catalogue number of this transcript is No. 337 in the handwritten catalogue, Paper, Devanagari.
- ŚVTṬ *Śloka-vārttikatātparyāṭīkā* of Uṃveka Bhaṭṭa, see ŚV (E_T).
- ŚVN *Śloka-vārttikanyāyaratnākara* of Pārthasārathi, see ŚV (E_C).
- ŚVS *Śārikā* of Jayamīśra
- (R) *Śloka-vārttikaśīkā* (Śārikā) of Bhaṭṭaputra-Jayamīśra, edited by C.K. Raja, Madras: University of Madras, 1946.
- (K) Sarasvati Bhavan Library, No. 93591, Paper, Devanagari.
- SK *Saṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, see Wezler and Motegi [1998].
- SDK *Sarvadarśana-kaumudī* of Mādhavaśaraṣvatī, edited by Sāmbaśiva Śāstri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. 135, Trivandrum: Rājākīyamudraṇayantrālaya, 1913.
- Secondary Sources:
- Bronkhorst J.
1990 “Vārttika”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 34: 123–146.
- Frauwallner, E.
1961 “Mīmāṃsāsūtram, I, 1.6–23”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5: 113–124.
1968 *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā*, Wien: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hiriyanna, M.
1932 *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Hiriyanna
1960(1949¹)
The Essentials of Indian Philosophy, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (1st ed. 1949)
- Kataoka K. (片岡 啓)
2003 “Keiken to Naisei” (経験と内省：遍充関係の把握方法をめぐる議論の変遷 [Experience and Reflection: Historical Development of the Argument on the Means of Grasping Invariable Concomitance]), *Nanto Bukkyō* (南都仏教 [Journal of the Nanto Society for Buddhist Studies]) 83: 1–32. (in Japanese)
2007 “A Critical Edition of Śābarabhāṣya ad 1.1.6–23: Śābdanīyatvādhikaraṇa”, *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 152: (29)–(79).
2011a *Mīmāṃsā Kenkyū Josetsu* (ミーマーンサー研究序説 [An Introduction to the Study of Mīmāṃsā]), Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press. (in Japanese)
2011b *Kumārila on Truth, Omniscience, and Killing, Part 2: An Annotated Translation of Mīmāṃsā-Śloka-vārttika ad 1.1.2 (Codanāsūtra)*, Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Ōmae, F. (大前 太),
1998 “Kumārila no Sphoṭa hihan: Śloka-vārttika Sphoṭavāda shō no wayaku (1)” (クマーリラのスポータ批判：『シュローカ・ヴァールティカ』「スポータ・ヴァーダ」章の和訳 (1) [Kumārila's Criticism of Vaiyākaraṇa's Theory of Sphoṭa: A Japanese Translation of the Śloka-vārttika, Sphoṭavāda (1)]), *Shimane kenritsu kokusai tanki daigaku kiyō* (島根県立国際短期大学紀要 [Bulletin of Shimane International College]) 5: 21–50. (in Japanese)
- Sastri, K.S.R.
1937 “Date of Pārthasārathimīśra and Sequence of his Work”, *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 13: 488–497.
- Sastri, V.A.R.
1991 “Introduction to *Tattvabindu* by Vācaspatimīśra with *Tattvavibhāvanā* by Rṣiputra *Paramaśvara*”, New Delhi: Navrang, pp. 1–149.
- Schmithausen, L.
1965 *Maṇḍanamīśra's Vibhramavivekaḥ: mit Einer Studie zur Entwicklung der Indischen Irrtumslehre*, Wien: Der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Shida, T.
2013 “On the Testimonies of the śabda[nīyatā]dhikaraṇa Section of the Śloka-vārttikakāśikāṭīkā”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 61(3): (50)–(55).

(forthcoming) “On the Source of Mīmāṃsā Theory of Sound (*śabda*) as a Substantial Entity (*dravya*)”, **Proceedings of the Japan-Austria International Symposium on Transmission and Tradition*.

Watson, A.

2006 *The Self's Awareness of Itself: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Arguments against the Buddhist Doctrine of No-self*, Wien: Nobili Research Library.

Wezler, A. and S. Motegi

1998 *Yuktidīpikā: the most significant commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā*, Alt- und neu-indische Studien 44, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Assistant Professor
The Hakubi Center for Advanced Research
Kyoto University
and
Visiting Scholar
Harvard-Yenchin Institute