

referred to for the ground of her explanations as the complete Notes shows.

Last I shall add only my observation. In her explanation (p. 16), "... smell is its specific attribute, in the sense that both of these are inherently related while other properties residing in earth are related to it through conjunction, ..." conjunction in this explanation should be changed into inherence (*samavāya*) or a term other than conjunction as far as *samyoga* is rendered as conjunction in her explanation (p. 16). As a simple mistake, Page 41, line 4: "time self" should have a comma: "time, self".

Nagoya University
Japan

Katsunori HIRANO

Eliza Freschi, *Duty, Language and Exegesis in Prābhākara Mīmāṃsā: Including an Edition and Translation of Rāmānujācārya's Tantrarahasya, Śāstra-prameyapariccheda*, Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 17, Leiden: Brill, 2012, xxiii + 407 Pp. €131.00 / \$182.00. (Hardback)

For the Mīmāṃsakas, the Veda, being authorless and infallible, enjoins followers to perform actions such as sacrifice. Not a few theories have been proposed by the Mīmāṃsakas regarding why people, in line with the Vedic prescription, might undertake such actions: 'Because a prescriptive force promotes them (Kumārila), because one knows that they will lead to a desired result (Maṇḍana), or because they have to be done (Prabhākara)' (p. 45).

The subject of the book under review is the *Tantrarahasya*, written by the Prābhākara apologist Rāmānujācārya (ca. 15-17 c.), and in particular its fourth section entitled 'Śāstraprameyapariccheda.' The main issue requiring analysis in this section is the exhortative function of the prescriptive sentences in the scripture, with special focus on the meaning and the function of the 'exhortative verbal endings' (p. 15), such as the optative suffix, in Vedic prescriptive expressions. There, Rāmānujācārya establishes Prābhākara *niyoga* theory after having reconstructed and criticized various interpretations of Kumārila's verse (TV 2.1.1), which is the basic testimony on this issue for the Bhāṭṭa school as well as for Maṇḍana Miśra. In this regard, the relevant section of the *Tantrarahasya* can be viewed as positioned at the head of a process of the inter-Mīmāṃsā development of a theory on prescription.

In her book entitled *Duty, Language and Exegesis in Prābhākara Mīmāṃsā*, Dr. Eliza Freschi offers a compilation of her study of this fourth section of the *Tantrarahasya*. Her book consists of an edition, a translation, and comprehensive annotation of the Śāstraprameyapariccheda section of the *Tantrarahasya* (chap. 2–8), together with a discussion of the treatises and the chronology of Rāmānujācārya (chap. 1) and a glossary of the technical terms in Mīmāṃsā hermeneutics (appendix). Her book elucidates the development of the Mīmāṃsā argument for

the prescription theory — more precisely, its history — reconstructed from the perspective of Rāmānujācārya.

Chapters 2 to 7 comprise ‘a separate commentary in the form of a long introduction’ (p. XXIII). Each chapter analyzes, along with the *Tantrarahasya*, the views of opponents on prescriptive sentences (chap. 2), Prābhākara theory on *niyoga* and *apūrva* (chap. 3), the hierarchical structure of the rituals and the hermeneutic technical terms (chap. 4), the classification of prescriptions (chap. 5), the consistency of the prescription theory in terms of human desire and prohibited action (chap. 6), and the Prābhākara theory of sentence cognition (chap. 7). Through this elaborate introduction the author shows how these seemingly disparate topics are well organized in the fourth section of the *Tantrarahasya*.

Rāmānujācārya reconstructs various kinds of opposing views: Kumārila’s theory characterized by the double (or triple) layers of *bhāvanā*; Maṇḍana’s hedonistic interpretation, of which the core concept is ‘being the means of something desirable (*iṣṭasādhanatā*);’ and modified versions of multi-*bhāvanā* theory or the eclectic views lying between this and Maṇḍana’s argument. Despite the complexity of these matters, the author perfectly identifies and arranges each opponent’s view through careful cross-referencing with the treatises of Śālikanātha, Pārthasārathi, and others (chap. 2).¹ On the other hand, Prābhākara theory as depicted by the author (chap. 3) can be characterized as more deontological, a view rather oriented toward the deontic authority of the Veda: This theory sanctuarizes the scriptural sphere, that is, the sphere of what must be done (*apūrva*), which only the Veda can access and communicate.

Another remarkable achievement is the author’s deontological investigation from a Western approach (chap. 6). Freschi interprets Mīmāṃsā prescription theory through formal deontological language (pp. 60f., 124ff.), in order to examine the issue of whether the prescriptive system connotes the possibility of inconsistency. Given that all the human beings have desires, as presupposed by the Mīmāṃsakas, then some of them may have the desire to harm an enemy (d), and the Veda in fact prescribes a malefic ritual (*śyena*, ś) for such people. Thus, it comes down to one having to commit harm (*hiṃsā*, h), ‘hCd&Oś/d’ (p. 125), though harming in general is prohibited in the same Veda (~Ph), even while one must perform what is prescribed in the Veda (~P~ś). This results in a crisis of contradiction in the Vedic prescription system: ~(((d&Oś/d)V~ś)&~Ph&~P~ś/d). Here, the author introduces ‘the laws of commitment’ provided by von Wright, which regards this dilemma as a consequence of the performance of a forbidden act (= d, in this case): ((d&Oś/d)V~ś)&~Ph&~P~ś/d ⊃ ~Pd. In this way, we can reach a rather modest landing point regarding the Vedic prescription system that ‘one would not have to choose between failing to obey a prescription or performing violence against an enemy unless one had desired to perform violence’ (p. 126).

Chapter 8 is a new edition and translation of the text, each part on facing

¹ Freschi [2012b: p. 178ff.] also analyzes with graphical figure the complicated structure of the argument from opponents’ side.

pages in double spread. The edition is based on the collation of a palm-leaf manuscript written in Telugu script (abbreviated as M) and two preceding editions (abbreviated as OP and P). The author identifies M as used in a previous edition P, but notes that P's collation is insufficient. On the other hand, it remains unclear whether the first edition OP used M, since M's reading of the text sometimes improves on those of previous editions (p. 147f.).

In this new edition of the *Tantrarahasya*, while adopting M's peculiar readings the author proposes emendations to those readings along with considerable discussion (pp. 196,12, 242,3, 244,4, etc.).² However, the author's emended readings of other texts put forward in the introductory section of her work should be reconsidered, since some of the emended readings are attested in published editions: 'yannibandhanā' (p. 34, n. 16) is attested in both previous editions (A, PrP), and '°ādhikriyātmakaḥ' (p. 104, n. 14) is attested in a previous edition (Maṇḍana Miśra and Vācaspati Miśra 1978: p. 266,4) as well as in Stern (1988³: p. 1628,19). Also, an emendation of the *Vidhiviveka*'s reading into 'preṣaṇā'⁴ (p. 42, n. 24) seems to need further external evidence for its justification, or else it might just seem based on inculcation through later usage.

Though there are a few typos,⁴ inaccurate citations,⁵ errors of reference,⁶

² Though the reviewer could not gain access to the Telugu manuscript, readings from previous editions should be adopted in at least the following two cases: p. 198,2: *labhate* → *labhete* (cf. OP: 52,18, P: 47,6); p. 214,3: *abhidhīyate* → *abhidhīyata* (cf. OP: 54,15, P: 48,27). The following are just minor corrections of sandhi or punctuation: p. 256,2: *vidhipramāṇakatvāt* → *vidhipramāṇakatvād*; p. 258,4: *padārthāideśaḥ ataḥ* → *padārthāideśaḥ. ataḥ*; p. 262,3: *nārṣeyaṃ vṛṇīta* → "nārṣeyaṃ vṛṇīta"

³ Elliot M. Stern [1988] "Vidhivivekaḥ of Maṇḍanamiśraḥ, with commentary, *Nyāyakaṇikā*, of Vācaspatimiśraḥ, and supercommentaries, *Jusadhvaṅkaraṇī* and *Svāditaṅkaraṇī*, of Paramēśvaraḥ, critical and annotated edition: the pūrvapakṣaḥ", PhD thesis. University of Pennsylvania.

⁴ p. 7,20: *stricly* → *strictly*; p. 13,35: *Bhāvanātha* → *Bhavanātha*; p. 23, n. 6: *translitterating* → *translitterating*; p. 27,5: *interpret* → *interpretation(?)*; p. 86,5: *knowledge* → *knowledge*]; p. 106,1: *Vidhirasayana* → *Vidhirasāyana*; p. 127,15: *then* → *than*; p. 182,6: the paragraphing after 'darśanāt' seems unnecessary; p. 390,8: *Tupṭīkā* → *Ṭupṭīkā* (cf. p. 106, n. 17; p. 111, n. 28); p. 397,13: *Raishaku-gaku* → *Kaishaku-gaku*.

⁵ p. 36, n. 18: *cākhyāti* → *cākhyātī*; p. 36, n. 19: *tatrākhyāti* → *tatrākhyātī*; p. 102,25: *syntactical* → *syntactic*; p. 103,19: *fix* → *fixt*; p.106, n.17: *pūtīkāḥ prāpnuvanti* → *pūtīkāḥ kadācit prāpnuvanti*; p. 108, n. 21: *niyamavidhir aparatrā°* → *niyamavidhiḥ, paratrā°* (in Someśvara Bhaṭṭa 1984); p. 110, n.24: *vidhiḥ.* → *vidhiḥ parisaiṅkhyā vidhiḥ.*; p. 154, 2nd apparatus on 8–10: *abhidhābhāvanam* → *abhidhābhāvanām*; p. 162, 2nd apparatus on 7–164.4: *kṛtyarthatārūpakāryam ... kṛtyarthatārūpam ...* → *kṛtyarthatārūpakāryam ... kṛtyarthatārūpam ...*; p. 196, 2nd apparatus on 11–14: *karmo 'pi* → *karmāpi*; p. 209, n. 54: *pakṣeṣu* → *pakṣeṣu*; p. 242 3rd apparatus on 1–3: *ṭṛṭyoktā* → *ṭṛṭyoktā*; p. 248, 2nd apparatus on 1-3: °*karṭṛtāyā* → °*karṭṛtāyā*; p. 250, 2nd apparatus on 5–252.2: *samidho juhōtīty* → *samidho yajātīti*; p. 302, 2nd apparatus on 2–5: *pradhānyam tu* → *prādhānyam tu*; p. 312, 2nd apparatus on 9–10: °*praṇālikayā* → °*praṇāḍikayā*; p. 331, n.149: °*praṇālayā* → °*praṇālyā*; p. 362, 2nd apparatus on 3–10: °*aṅgayāgajanyānā, apūrvānām api ... jāyata nāsau* → °*aṅgayāgajanyānām apūrvānām api ... jāyate nāsau*; p. 362, 2nd apparatus on 3–364.1: *tatraikārthya, itī na vikalasambhava* → *tatraikārthyam itī vikalpasambhava*; p. 364 2nd apparatus on 1–6: *itarasya svīkṛtaprāmānya°* → *itarasya ... svīkṛtaprāmānya°* (or eyeskip?).

⁶ p. 33, n. 15: pp. 422–423 → p. 423; p. 36, n. 18: pp. 40, ll. 25–26 → p. 40, ll. 4–7; p. 36, n. 19: pp. 40, ll. 4–7 → p. 40, ll. 25–26; p. 101,8: Edgerton 1929, §64 → Edgerton 1929, p. 64, §§66–67; p. 102,29: Edgerton 1929, p. 233 → Edgerton 1929, p. 117; p. 102, n. 8: MNP 225–226 → MNP §§225–226; p. 102, n. 10: Edgerton 1929, p. 117 → Edgerton 1929, p. 233; p. 103,23: Edgerton 1929, pp. 117–118 → p. Edgerton 1929, p. 118; p. 103, n. 12: MNP 196, 198, 199 →

mistranslations,⁷ and inconsistencies in editorial policy,⁸ nevertheless, the contributions in Freschi's work are evident: in this first ever translation of Rāmānujācārya's *Tantrarahasya*, she has unraveled the complicated inter-Mīmāṃsā argument over the prescription theory through minute philological investigation. In addition, her succinct explanation of the technical terms in Mīmāṃsā hermeneutics (chap. 4), as well as the glossary supplied in the appendix, offer readers — even non-specialists — considerable help in better understanding Rāmānujācārya's thought. Furthermore, the internal cross referencing within her book is so sound and detailed a network that readers are unlikely to lose their way, even if struggling in the highly nested structure of Rāmānujācārya's argumentation. With these contributions, I believe Freschi's book gives us a bird's-eye perspective on the Mīmāṃsā argument on the Vedic prescription.

Kyoto University
Japan
 and
Harvard-Yenchin Institute
U.S.A.

Taisei SHIDA

MNP §§198, 199; p. 109, n. 21: Someśvara Bhaṭṭa 1984, p. 21 → Someśvara Bhaṭṭa 1984, p. 56 (or vol. 1 p. 21 in Someśvara Bhaṭṭa 1901–1909, ed. by Mukunada Śāstrī, Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Office.); p. 110, n. 24: Edgerton 1929, p. 135 → Edgerton 1929, pp. 135–136; p. 127,2: Freschi 2007, p. §4 → Freschi 2007, p. 56ff.(?) §4; p. 162, apparatus on 7–164.4: Pārthasārathi Miśra 1900, p. 47 → Pārthasārathi Miśra 1900, pp. 47–48; p. 204, 2nd apparatus on 8–10: NR, p. 238 → NR, p. 242; p. 206, 2nd apparatus on 6–208.1: NR, pp. 80–81 → NR, p. 80; p. 208, 2nd apparatus on 3–4: NR, pp. 80–81 → p. 83; p. 256, 2nd apparatus on 8–13: NR, p. 266 → NR, p. 267; p. 260, 2nd apparatus on 1: NR, p. 265 → NR, p. 266; p. 292, 2nd apparatus on 2: NR, p. 306 → NR, p. 305; p. 304, 2nd apparatus on 6–7, 8: NR, p. 52 → NR, p. 72; p. 328, 2nd apparatus on 5–7: NR, p. 262 → NR, pp. 262–263; p. 395,27: LXV → XLV; p. 397,8–9: 1st ed. 1962 → 1st ed. 1942.

⁷ p. 78,17–18&23: items generated by it → items generating it; p. 173,7: temporal duration (*krama*) → sequence (*krama*);

⁸ The policy of the explicit translation of pronouns, explained on p. XXIII, is not kept to consistently (e.g. p. 181ff). Also, in the edited text, the expression of idiomatical phrases, such as 'tathā hi/tathāhi,' should be standardized.