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1. Introductory Remarks

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa’s \( \text{Ślokavārttika} \) (ŚV) is a sub-commentary on the ‘philosophical part’ (\( \text{Tarkapāda: 1st pāda of 1st adhyāya} \)) of the Mīmāṃsā basic aphorism, \( \text{Jaiminisūtra} \). The ŚV contains so many philosophical issues that were subsequently treated by other schools that it is one of the most important materials for studying the history of classical Indian thought. Rāmaśāstri Tailāṅga’s edition, published in 1898–99 and covering the whole treatise, has been widely used but is a so-called ‘local edition.’

On the other hand, commentaries on the ŚV are, with the exception of Pārthasārathi’s one, only partially edited. The reason for this is because some manuscripts of these treatises, such as the commentaries by Umveka and Jayamiśra, are only partially extant. However, as to Sucaritamiśra’s commentary, several sections in the latter part remain un-edited, even though the treatise is covered in its entirety by a number of manuscripts, most of which respectively cover several sections only. Against this background, I aim to edit the \( \text{sabdā-dhikaraṇa} \) (SNA) section of Sucaritamiśra’s commentary, the \( \text{Ślokavārttikakāśikātiκā} \) (ŚVK). In this paper, discussing an early phase of this editing work, I present a subjective analysis of the relationship between the testimonies.

2. Testimonies on the Relevant Section of the ŚVK

ŌMAE [1998] provides comprehensive bibliographical information on the primary and secondary sources of the ŚV and its commentaries. As he points out, the ŚVK has been edited up to the third volume, but later volumes have not yet been published. Depending largely on his work, but carefully rechecking which sections each testimony covers, I have confirmed at least the following manuscripts and transcripts cover the SNA section.

K, Oriental Research Institute & Manuscript Library (ORI), University of Kerala,
C.O.L. No. 1333, Palm Leaf, Malayalam script, 177 leaves, 60 cm × 5 cm, 10–11 lines/page. From SPH to VPA.

K₂

ORI, University of Kerala, C.O.L. No. 1779A, Palm Leaf, Malayalam script, 123 leaves, 20.5 inch × 2 inch, 10–11 lines/page. From VAV v. 65⁵ to VPA.

G

Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (GOML), Madras University, S. R. 1739 (R. 3610), Palm Leaf, Malayalam script, 311 leaves, 11 lines/page. The relevant section corresponds to fols. 220r, l. 8–273r, l. 1.

S

Sarasvati Bhavana Library, Varanasi, No. 29032, Paper, Devanagari. The relevant section corresponds to fols. 467v, l. 7–559v, l. 6.

T₄


T₅


T₆

Transcript, ORI, Kerala University, misplaced, likely that the catalogue number of this transcript is No. 337 in the handwritten catalogue, Paper, Devanagari. The relevant section corresponds to pp. 193–461, but some pages are missing.⁶)

3. Analysis of Each Testimony and the Phylogeny

For brevity, the target for analysis described in this paper is limited to a part of the text, from the beginning of the section to the commentary on v. 98b, which amounts to one-fourth of the entire section. It seems, nonetheless, to be a sufficient sample, in terms of quantity as well as quality, to account for the entire section.⁷) All the available testimonies (i.e., four old manuscripts and three modern transcripts) are collated and taken into account. Only a subjective analysis is conducted for now, leaving quantitative or statistic computation for a later phase of study.

The results of the analysis are shown in Fig. 1. Three archetypes (α, β, and γ) are assumed to characterize three recension groups of the extant testimonies. In the figure, solid lines with an arrow denote the parental relationship and are also used for connecting the testimonies of ante- and post-correction, written in the same material. Solid lines without an arrow denote the possibility of a parental relationship; two testimonies connected by this line share many variants, but it does not exclude the case, for example, that there could have been another material now lost which was the common exemplar. Dotted lines denote
the possibility of contamination (/network); two testimonies connected by this line sometimes share variants.

Henceforth, the characteristic feature of each testimony and mutual relations will be presented.

3.1. Three Kinds of Transcripts

**T_k**: T_k covers the commentary on the last verse of the CAP section, and whole sections of the ATV and SNA. T_k has been misplaced in the library; it might have been passed or loaned to a scholar. T_k has mūla text at the top of each page, suggesting that T_k might be the draft of the edition that was supposed to be published. T_k reports the lacunas in many places where K_i actually has those lacunas, and it is likely therefore that T_k had K_i as its only exemplar.

**T_G**: The transcript T_G, consisting of six volumes, covers the entire treatise. The postscript of each volume notes that T_G, once transcribed from a manuscript owned by Payyūr Bhaṭṭa of Kunnamangalam, was checked against another manuscript called ‘original.’ The colophon of vol. 5, which contains the SNA section, notes that this volume was transcribed
once in 1921–22 and checked against the 'original' in 1924. $T_G$ has numbering in the margin that seems to be the folio number of either of the two exemplars, and this number accords with $G$, at least in regard to the relevant chapter. $T_G$ and $T_A$ commonly report a lacuna in their exemplar and $G$ has the lacuna in that very part. From these facts, it is likely that $G$ is one of the exemplars of $T_G$. On the other hand, several cases are apparent where $T_G^{PC}$ and $K_2$ share a reading while $T_G^{ac}$ and $G$ ($= T_A$) share a variant reading. Thus, it might be the case that $K_2$ or another manuscript in the same recension $\beta$ is the so-called 'original' for $T_G$.

$T_A$: The transcript $T_A$, consisting of seven volumes, also covers the entire treatise. The colophon of vol. 7, which corresponds to the SNA section, notes that it was transcribed in 1923. It is highly likely that $T_A$ and $T_G$ occur in the parental relationship because these two transcripts share 1) the strange placement of last two sections (VAA and VPA) between the SNV and NAV, 2) incorrect paragraphization in many places, and 3) variant readings particular to only these two.

3.2. Three Kinds of Malayalam Manuscripts and a Devanagari Manuscript

$G$: $G$ is extensively damaged and most of the numbering in the margins is lost. Moreover, the folio order is terribly confused: Arabic number from 1 to 100 are used, but this numbering is wrong. Once I had neatly serialized the folio order on my PC, it turned out that $G$ covers from the beginning of the VKG section up to the end of the treatise and that there are no missing folio.

$K_2$: $K_2$ and $G$ share so many readings that they can, along with $T_G$ and $T_A$, be sorted into the recension $\beta$. Some collation data indicate the possibility that $G$ has $K_2$ as its exemplar. Some variant readings of the ante-correction of this manuscript ($K_2^{ac}$) suggest that $K_2$ itself also has an exemplar written in Malayalam script.

$K_1$: Compared to the closeness between $K_2$ and $G$, $K_1$ is farther from these two manuscripts. Thus, it can be sorted into another recension as $\alpha$. On the other hand, several cases are apparent where $K_1$ and $K_2^{PC}$ share a reading while $K_2^{PC}$ and $G$ share a variant reading. This suggests the possibility of contamination of $K_2^{ac}$ with recension group $\alpha$.

$S$: $S$, from the Sarasvati Bhavan Library, Benares, is the only complete manuscript of the ŚVK. ŌMAE [1998], investigating the SPH section, judges that $S$ contains some readings that can be accepted, but in most cases the southern Indian recension has better readings. I agree on this point in regard to the relevant section.
4. Concluding Remarks

Based on the collation work of the primary sources of the SNA section of Sucaritamiśra’s ŚVK, I have presented the initial results of a subjective analysis of the relationship among the testimonies: the conclusion at this time is illustrated in Fig. 1.

1) See ŌMAE [1998: 23]. Other editions also exist which cover the text either partially or wholly, but, all these published editions have not been sufficiently critically edited. KATAOKA [2011], writing a new edition on the CDS section of ŚV, offered more than thirty new readings from newly used manuscripts (see KATAOKA [2011: xxxviii]). The same situation probably applies to the SNA section; based on my own collation of the section using following three manuscripts, many variants are apparent and some of them seem better than those in the published edition, O: Bodleian Library of Oxford University, no. 520A (Wilson 325); B: India Office of British Library, no. 1449b (2149); B: India Office of British Library, no. 3739 (7976). 2) As to the section title, KATAOKA [2007: fn. 1, 2.] proposes the use of “śabdānityatvādhikaraṇa/śabdānityatādhičaraṇa” for the sake of clarity (even though he notes that “śabdādhičaraṇa” is historically a more authentic title) and in reference to Kumārila’s own expression of “śabdādhičaraṇe” (v. 355c). If referring to the title simply as “śabdādhičaraṇa,” it might be confused with another section on Jaiminisūtra 1.1.4a entitled “śabdapariccheda.” Incidentally, colophons of some testimonies of the ŚVK under scrutiny in this study refer to the last three sections as “śabdādhičaraṇam,” “vākyādhičaraṇam,” “vedādhičaraṇam,” respectively. Henceforce in this paper, I refer to the section title as šabdaśādhičaraṇa. 3) As reported by ŌMAE [1998: 29, n. 12], on the back cover of the Jaiminiyāsūtrārthasaṁgraha (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, no. 156), the publishing situation of the fourth volume of ŚVK was said as “In the press” [sic], but had not been published to date, and the library had no plans to publish it (personal communication). That situation is unchanged until now. 4) It should be noted that the testimonies listed up by ŌMAE [1998] are only those which cover the SNA section. 5) ŚASTRI [1939: 908–910] reports that K₂ starts from VAV v. 50. It is guessed that first several folios are lost after the publication of the catalogue. 6) Following pages are missing: pp. 157, 200, 203, 235, 270, 295, 296, 322, 323, 369, 371, 373, 376. 7) This part contains both a word-by-word commentary and an extremely long commentary, which is no less than Sucaritamiśra’s own opinion. 8) I received a copy of Tₓ data from Prof. Karin PREISENDANZ of Vienna University. The note accompanying this copy states that it was originally discovered by Prof. Sheldon POLLOCK in the early 1990’s in ORI. 9) Vols. 2 & 6 are bundled together and vol. 4 is numbered as vol. 3, pt. 2 as follows: Vol. 1: R2818 (S. R. 1446), from PJS section to NAV. Vol. 2: the former part of R3056 (S. R. 1643), SNV. Vol. 3 (pt. 1): R3233-1 (S. R. 1724), from AMP to AAP. Vol. 4 (/vol. 3, pt. 2): R3233-2 (S. R. 1725), from ABH to SAV. Vol. 5: R3778 (S. R. 2126) from CAP to SNA. Vol. 6: the latter part of R3056 (S. R. 1643), from VAA to VPA. 10) See RAJA [1946: ii]. 11) ŌMAE [1998], investigating the SPH section, also identifies G as an exemplar of Tₓ. However, similar number in other section
such as VAA does not necessarily accords with G. Thus the exemplar(s) of T_G might be different in each chapter. 12) Vol. 1: from PJS to NMS v. 2. Vol. 2: from NMS v. 3 to NAV. Vol. 3: SNV, VAA, and VPA. Vol. 4: from AMP to AAP. Vol. 5: from ABH to APV (APV is referred to as “ākṛti-granthe madhyamapariccheda” in the colophon). Vol. 6: from VAV to ATV. Vol. 7: SNA.
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