

Preface

The object of this book is to provide Sanskrit readers and students of Indian philosophy with a reliable text and an annotated translation of the *codanāsūtra* section of Kumārila's *Ślokavārttika*.¹ The general importance of this Mīmāṃsā work in the history of Indian philosophy is quite well known, and recent studies have begun to show in more detail just how influential Kumārila's thought was on his contemporaries and his successors.²

But what need is there for a new edition of this text, when many have already been published? As I will demonstrate in the introduction, none of the previous editions can be called critical. Leaving aside for the moment the matter of the critical application of editorial judgment in weighing the evidence, they also do not systematically report exactly what the evidence is, even when manuscripts have apparently been consulted. Information as to which manuscripts have actually been collated and what their readings are is often not given, or only haphazardly so. Therefore readers are left unable to determine whether an accepted reading is based on manuscript evidence, a conjecture by an editor, or something else. To make matters worse, some of the editions do not seem to have been made on the basis of manuscripts at all. As will be shown in the introduction, such editions are more or less copies of previous editions, but with additional errors and typographical errors.

Scholars doing serious study in this field are already well aware that they must compare several editions of the *Ślokavārttika* to avoid being misled by the idiosyncratic errors of any particular one and to be aware

¹ Its original, unabridged name is *Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika*, because its author, i.e. Kumārila, himself calls it *Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika* in the opening section. *Ślokavārttika pratijñā*, v. 2cd: *tatprasādāt kariṣye 'haṃ mīmāṃsāślokavārttikam*. "By the grace [of my teacher] I will produce the *Mīmāṃsāślokavārttika*." However, I henceforth use the abridged form *Ślokavārttika* simply for convenience of reference as well as in accordance with the customary practice of majority of modern studies.

² See, e.g. Krasser [1999], Moriyama [2006] and Eltschinger [2007].

of possible better readings. Taber [2005], for example, has used five editions in his study of the *pratyakṣa* chapter. One simply cannot designate one of the many editions as the best one. They all have some defects; these need to be sifted out and their good qualities need to be combined. But consulting all the editions, determining their relationship, and evaluating their readings is a time-consuming and heavy task for all but full-time Mīmāṃsakas.

Furthermore, as is shown in this book, even consulting all the existing editions is not enough to ensure that we have arrived at better or the best possible readings. As should be almost needless to say, since the editions do not provide detailed information on the manuscript evidence, independent examination of the manuscripts is still essential. This would be the case even if they did not prove to have any “new” readings, that is, readings not already “available” in one of the editions. But in fact, as was to be expected, they indeed regularly contain readings, apparently unknown to previous editors, that deserve consideration and that often can be determined to be better.

In order to evaluate the text of the *Ślokavārttika* as available so far, in the introduction I will investigate each previous edition in detail. It can be shown, for instance, that Dvārikādāśaśāstrī’s edition (designated as D), which is popularly used these days because it is easily available and because it contains the entire *Ślokavārttika*, whereas some of the older editions are out of print and others are incomplete, is an edition that should be used only with great caution. As the editor himself states in the introductory note in Sanskrit (*prāstāvikam*), this edition is mainly based on the old Chowkhamba edition C¹. Many of the footnotes simply repeat those in the C¹.

To illustrate the nature of the edition D, let me present an interesting example. In *Ślokavārttika codanā* v. 126c, Dvārikādāśaśāstrī reads *bauddhavākyānām*, and has a footnote reporting a variant *vedavākyānām* as a *mu- pā-*, i.e. a reading in a published edition (**mudritapustakapāṭhaḥ*), most probably referring to C¹, though this is not made explicit. The original, correct reading is in fact *vedabāhyānām*, as found in the Pandit edition (P) and the Madras edition (M) as well as all five manuscripts that I have collated. C¹ seems

to have miscopied *vedabāhyānām* as *vedavākyānām* (paleographically similar), and Dvārikadāsaśāstrī, as well as the three editions C², G and T, simply inherited this mistake. Making matters worse rather than better, Dvārikadāsaśāstrī (possibly as a result of what he learned from his guru, as he mentions him (*gurumukhāc chrutarūpeṇa*) as one of his sources for the text) overcorrected *vedavākyānām* to *bauddhavākyānām*. (See also my introduction p. xxxv and the critical apparatus on v. 126c in my edition.)

For the present edition I have consulted five manuscripts and seven published editions. Ideally, no doubt, I should have consulted all the extant manuscripts preserved in India and other countries. For practical reasons, however, I stopped at a point that I felt provided me with enough information for a reliable text. Otherwise I might never have finished my work; readers would not have seen even this result (which of course I do not claim to be absolutely definitive), and would have lost the chance to further improve on it; and I might have wandered around India and the globe for the rest of my life searching for ever more manuscripts as a *tapasvī sannnyāsī*. Taking the search for foundations to an extreme only leads one to infinite regress, as Kumārila has already pointed out.

It is true that the number of consulted manuscripts is somewhat limited. But it is not the case that the number of manuscripts is the most important thing, nor is the examination of manuscripts alone sufficient to solve all textual problems. To evaluate manuscript readings, and to conjecture other readings where they all prove unsatisfactory, requires the exercise of critical judgment, augmented by the study of the doctrinal system and of the text's author, as well as consideration of the help offered by other sources such as commentaries and testimonia. I have done my best to do this, and to make this edition a critical one also in these respects.

One of the most basic requirements of a critical edition is of course to honestly report the evidence (manuscript readings first of all, and then relevant material from other texts) that supports the text that one has adopted as well as the evidence that conflicts with it. None of the previous editions seems to have even tried to do this. The present edition

is in a sense simply the result of an attempt to do the most basic, correct and necessary thing. On the basis of this solid ground the text is then translated with necessary annotations.

The genesis of the present work has a long history inseparably connected with my Sanskrit *vidyārthī* career. During my two years' stay from 1995 to 1997 in Tirupati, Pondicherry and Madras, during which I dedicated myself to reading through the entire *Śābarabhāṣya* with the traditional pandits Prof. N.S. Rāmānuja Tatācārya and Prof. J. Veṅkaṭarāman, I occasionally also read various other works by myself, i.e., not only ritual-exegetical texts of Karmakāṇḍa but also philosophical *tarka* texts. One of them was Kumārila's *Śloka-vārttika*. In reading through this work, written by a man with a highly philosophical mind, I soon found that the second chapter dealing with Vedic injunctions (*codanā*) contains many influential discussions of far-ranging philosophical subjects, including truth and omniscience, that one might perhaps not have expected to come across in such a chapter.

During my stay at Wolfson College, Oxford, as a Michael Coulson Research Fellow (1998/99), I collated the *Śloka-vārttika* manuscripts preserved in the Bodleian Library. This was the first time I was able to check two original manuscripts directly. This encouraged me to set out to produce a new edition.

It was only after I submitted my doctoral thesis dealing with the Mīmāṃsā theory of *bhāvanā* in 2001 that I came back from the ritualistic *prameya* field to the philosophical *pramāṇa* domain. Most fortunately, I had a chance to read through the *codanāsūtra* chapter while at the same time checking my preliminary English translation with Prof. H. Isaacson, who was a guest scholar at the International Institute for Buddhist Studies in Tokyo at that time. Thanks to his generosity of his time, I finished rereading most of the chapter. It is mostly due to his encouragement that I decided to do the entire work in English rather than in Japanese.

From 2001 to 2004, while working as a research associate at the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, I concentrated on solving various problems concerning this chapter. I soon realized the impor-

tance of investigating the relationship between Kumārila's two works, i.e. the *Śloka-vārttika* and the lost *Bṛhaṭṭīkā*. It also became necessary to study Dharmakīrti's earlier works. Thus I became busy for a period of time with studying and writing various articles on related issues.

In 2003 I returned wholeheartedly to the original plan of producing an edition and an English translation. Thanks to the fellowship program of the Ministry of Education and Science, Japan, I was able to take a sabbatical to do research as a visiting scholar at the Department of South Asia Studies, University of Pennsylvania. There I was lucky to receive an enormous amount of help from the veteran Sanskritists of that university. I met with Prof. G. Cardona, Dr. E. Stern and Prof. H. Isaacson almost every week to work through my draft. I had never dreamed to have the opportunity to work with three such mature Sanskritists in one room.

Prof. Isaacson has been supportive of my project from the beginning. I should mention that he also spared some time for me in Groningen in the summer of 2004, despite the fact that he was on a tight schedule with the Groningen *Skandapurāṇa* project and various other things.

In 2004, thanks to Prof. E. Steinkellner, the Austrian Academy of Sciences accepted my plan to undertake a project at the institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia. There I restarted working on the *codanāsūtra* chapter, being supervised by Dr. H. Krasser, this time with the clear aim of publication. I finalized collating the published editions and the collected manuscripts, adding testimonial information and so on, and thus established the present form of the edition.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. H. Isaacson for substantially supervising my entire project purely out of his interest in reading this Sanskrit text and sharing its beauty with a colleague. It was his generosity and enthusiasm that encouraged me to undertake and carry through this task. He also went through the final draft and corrected my English. I also thank Prof. G. Cardona and Dr. E. Stern for their suggestions during the reading sessions in Pennsylvania. I would also like to thank Prof. J. Nemec for correcting the English of some portions of this work.

Prof. Arlo Griffiths was very kind to go through the draft, spending considerable time and energy in 2005 during his summer holiday in Pune, and gave me many valuable suggestions. Also I should not forget to mention the name of Prof. A. Sanderson, who generously allowed me to join many of his classes while I stayed in Oxford in 1998/99 and inspired my interest in various fields of Sanskrit with his vast knowledge and lively *unmīlita* mind. Prof. D. Goodall and Prof. H. Isaacson, then residents of Bridge Street in Oxford, stimulated me in regular reading sessions held at their house in Bridge Street and elsewhere, continuing even at the airport cafe before I left England on July 8, 1999. (On that particular occasion the text selected was the *Meghadūta*.)

Prof. S. Einoo and the late Prof. K. Kamimura were understanding supervisors, generously letting me pursue my own goal during the period I worked at the Institute of Oriental Culture at the University of Tokyo. I thank all of the helpful staff members there, in particular Prof. A. Tanaka, the institute's director, for letting me work in an atmosphere ideal for research and allowing me to take a one-year leave in Pennsylvania.

It was the interest of Prof. E. Steinkellner in this work that enabled me to concentrate on finalizing it in Vienna. At this point I would like to express my gratitude to the Austrian Science Fund (Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, FWF) for providing the funds in the framework of the project "Religion und Philosophie in brahmanischer Orthodoxie" for my stay at the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Science, enabling this long project to finally find its form as this manuscript. Dr. H. Krasser kindly went through the draft at various stages and gave me valuable suggestions. I thank Ms. Cynthia Peck-Kubaczek for kindly reading through the draft and checking my English. Dr. A. Watson provided valuable help by spending considerable time going over the Summary section, and also gave several suggestions on various parts of the draft. I should also mention the names of Prof. Sh. Katsura, Prof. M. Inami and Dr. V. Eltschinger, who generously gave me their time to answer my questions concerning Dharmakīrti. Dr. T. Shida was helpful regarding a number of bibliographical references, and Dr. M. Kitada

helped acquire manuscripts from Kolkata. I am also grateful to Prof. D. Goodall, Dr. S. Vasudeva and Dr. K. Harimoto for their help regarding the Devanāgarī fonts. I thank Ms. K. Hosono for acquiring an original copy of the Chowkhamba edition (C¹). Prof. J. Taber kindly supplied me with a copy of the revised version of the Chowkhamba edition (C²), which finally allowed me to incorporate it into the work in the summer of 2005. Dr. T. Tomabechei very generously spent much time with me in order to solve various problems of the typesetting during my short stay in Vienna in the summer of 2007.

I am indebted to the following libraries and institutes for giving me permission to consult manuscripts: the British Library, London; the Bodleian Library, Oxford; and the Asiatic Society, Kolkata. I also thank the Toyota Foundation (1998) and the Mitsubishi Foundation (2002) for funding that enabled me to carry out part of this study.

Last but not least I reserve special thanks for my Mīmāṃsā guru, the late Prof. J. Veṅkaṭarāman, for inspiring me to continue my studies of Mīmāṃsā.

Fukuoka, January 2011

Kei KATAOKA

