

# INDOLOGICA TAURINENSIA

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SANSKRIT STUDIES

VOLUME XXXIX

2013

EDIZIONI AIT

Publisher: Comitato AIT, corso Trento 13 – 10129 Torino (Italy)  
Email: [irmapiovano@cesmeo.it](mailto:irmapiovano@cesmeo.it); [info@cesmeo.it](mailto:info@cesmeo.it)  
Printer: Edizioni ETS, Pisa (Italy)  
Annual Subscription (1 issue): € 30,00  
Electronic version: [www.indologica.com](http://www.indologica.com)  
Sole Agents: Comitato AIT

Copyright © 2013 Comitato AIT per la promozione degli Studi sull'India e sul Sud-Est  
Asiatico  
Irma Piovano (President) - Saverio Sani (Vice President) - Victor Agostini (Secretary).  
corso Trento 13 - 10129 Torino (Italy)  
C.F. 97651370013 – R.E.A. Torino, n. 1048465 – R..O .C., n. 14802

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Torino N. 4703 del 21/7/1994  
I.S.N.N. 1023-3881

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

GIACOMO BENEDETTI <i>The figure of the Ṛṣi in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa</i> .....	p.	9
KAPIL KUMAR BHATTACHARYYA <i>Science communication in the Indian perspective: insights from the Indian experience</i> .....	p.	67
HORST BRINKHAUS <i>Sūryavaṃśa - Somavaṃśa - Harivaṃśa</i> .....	p.	83
KLAUS KARTTUNEN <i>India as a mirror of otherness in the classical and medieval West (The establishment and development of an idea of India, of a myth called India)</i> .....	p.	95
TAKAHIRO KATO <i>Bhāskara's concept of jñānakarmasamuccaya</i> .....	p.	137
FRANK KÖHLER <i>RV 3.26: poetry and the multifarious nature of Agni</i> .....	p.	155
NATALIA R. LIDOVA <i>Rasa in the Nāṭyaśāstra – Aesthetic and Ritual</i> .....	p.	187
GIANNI PELLEGRINI <i>Dream and Khyativāda: a Survey on analogies and differences</i> .....	p.	213
ALEXANDRA R. ZINOVYEVA <i>Heteroglossia and Code-switching in Śūdraka's Mṛcchakaṭika</i> ”: Why does the theatre director speak different languages? .....	p.	237
<i>List of contributors</i> .....	p.	257

## REVIEWS

- HARI DUTT SHARMA, *Glimpses of Sanskrit Poetics and Poetry*. Raka Prakashan, Allahabad, 2008 (Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat) ..... p. 263
- VASUGUPTA, *Gli aforismi di Śiva con il commento di Kṣemarāja (Śivasūtravimarśinī)*, a cura di Raffaele Torella, Milano, Adelphi (Piccola Biblioteca 641), 2013 (Bettina Baumer) ..... p. 267

TAKAHIRO KATO

BHĀSKARA'S CONCEPT  
OF *JÑĀNAKARMASAMUCCAYA*\*

**0. Introduction**

Bhāskara is one of the earliest commentators on fundamental texts, such as the *Upaniṣads*, the *Brahmasūtra* (hereafter BS), and the *Bhagavadgītā*,<sup>1</sup> but he has been almost neglected for a long time. Despite his possibly important position in the history of Vedānta thought, previous studies have clarified little more than certain basic facts: he was a Vedāntin,<sup>2</sup> he was probably active a few decades after Śaṅkara,<sup>3</sup> and his doctrine is to be characterized as *bhedābheda*<sup>4</sup> ontologically and *jñānakarmasamuccaya* soteriologically.

According to Bhāskara, the concept that the combination of knowledge and ritual activities will lead to liberation is the authentic conception of the *Brahmasūtra*, which is very different from that of Śaṅkara, who advocated that knowledge alone is the efficient means to liberation.<sup>5</sup> This study has two purposes. The first is to explore the general concept of Bhāskara's *jñānakarmasamuccaya* (hereafter JKS), especially

---

\* This is an expanded version of the paper read at 15th World Sanskrit Conference held in Delhi in January 2012. I would like to express my thanks to all the participants on the Philosophy panel of the conference who provided me with a lot of useful comments. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24820008.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Sarma 1933.

<sup>2</sup> See for example Ingalls 1967.

<sup>3</sup> See for example van Buitenen 1961.

<sup>4</sup> See for example P.N. Srinivasachari 1934. I have discussed Bhāskara's ontological concept *bhedābheda* in an article. See Kato 2012.

<sup>5</sup> For further details about the difference in soteriological views between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara, cf. Kato 2009.

focusing on his commentary on the BS.<sup>6</sup> This study is inspired by the argument discussed in a conference volume *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity*.<sup>7</sup> This volume discusses the relationship between *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* and *Uttaramīmāṃsā*, mainly focusing on Kumārila and Śaṅkara. Connected to this topic, the second purpose of this paper is to add a new perspective to this discussion from Bhāskara's point of view, and to reevaluate the relationship between *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* and *Uttaramīmāṃsā* in the context of JKS.

## 1. Basic concept of JKS

Bhāskara is known for his idea that a combination of knowledge and rituals leads to the highest goal, that is, liberation (*mokṣa*). This idea is in complete opposition to Śaṅkara, who insisted that knowledge alone was the means to liberation.<sup>8</sup> According to Bhāskara, the idea of JKS is the intention of the author of the BS.

BSBhbh 3.6–7: *atra hi jñānakarmasamuccayāt kṣemaṣrāptiḥ sūtrakārasyaḥbhipretā |*

For, here, the intention of the author of the *sūtra* is that liberation is attained through the combination of knowledge and ritual activities.

Bhāskara realized the significance of rituals, while simultaneously emphasizing that simply being engaged in rituals is not sufficient to attain liberation.

---

<sup>6</sup> This study is based on a new critical edition prepared by the present author, since the first edition of Bhāskara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* has been held in disrepute as being poorly edited since its publication in 1915. A posthumous edition by the hand of the late Prof. J.A.B. van Buitenen and some recently identified MSS have been consulted for this new edition. See Kato 2011, Introduction.

<sup>7</sup> *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity*, ed. by Johannes Bronkhorst, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi.

<sup>8</sup> Regarding the difference in soteriological approach between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara, see Kato 2009.

BSBhbh 6.4–7: “*tad yatheha karmajita (ChU VIII.1.6.)*”  
*iti kevalasya karmaṇaḥ kṣayitvam ucyate na*  
*jñānasahakāriṇaḥ | tathā ca śrutiḥ “sa ya ātmānam eva*  
*lokam upāste na hāsya karma kṣīyata (BĀU I.4.15.)” iti |*  
*svataḥkṣaṇikasyāpi karmaṇo jñānaraśavidhasyākṣaya-*  
*phalatvān “nā” “kṣīyata” ity ucyate |*

The passage “and as here in this world [the possession of a territory] won by action”<sup>9</sup> [of the ChU] teaches that [what is gained by] ritual alone comes to an end but [what is gained by ritual] along with knowledge does not. Also the *śruti* says: “And if someone venerates his self alone as his world, that rite of his will never fade away.” This means that the ritual activity, though itself not lasting, has imperishable fruits when it is being blended with the flavor of knowledge (=combined with knowledge). Therefore it is said, “never” “fade away.”

Likewise, knowledge alone cannot lead us to liberation. It was more important to Bhāskara to have a complete knowledge of rituals, in order to combine them correctly with Upaniṣadic knowledge.

BSBhbh 3.8–9: *karmaṇi cāparijñāte vidyāyāḥ kena*  
*samuccayaḥ kena neti vibhāgo na śakyate vaditum*  
*heyopādeyapratipattiyabhāvāt |*

As long as ritual is not entirely understood, it is not possible to tell with which [ritual] Upaniṣadic knowledge (*vidyā*) should be combined and with which it should not, since one cannot know [which ritual] should be abandoned and which should be carried out.

This statement was made in response to an opponent who insisted that one could attain the highest goal without performing or even knowing about rituals. This statement, presumably by Śāṅkara, was unacceptable to Bhāskara, since he held the view that enquiry into *jñāna (uttaramīmāṃsā)* remains incomplete without the enquiry into *karman (pūrvamīmāṃsā)*.

<sup>9</sup> Olivelle 1998: 275.

This is a common view among those who advocate JKS, and it can probably be traced back to one of the oldest commentators, Upavarṣa, whose commentaries on both the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* (hereafter JS) and the BS are lost and are known only by his name, which is mentioned in Śabara's commentary on the JS (hereafter JSŚbh), Śaṅkara's commentary on the BS (hereafter BSŚbh), and Bhāskara's commentary on the BS (hereafter BSBhbh).<sup>10</sup>

### 1.1 Bhāskara's idea of karman

Bhāskara categorized *karman* into three types.

BSBhbh 8.7: *karma ca trividham | kāmyaṃ nityaṃ  
naimittikaṃ ca |*

Ritual activities are divided into three categories:  
optional, obligatory, and occasional.

He further discussed what kind of *karman* one should perform.

BSBhbh 3.9–11: [...] *kāmyaṃ pratiṣiddhaṃ ca heyam  
nityena karmaṇā samuccaya itī pratipādayituṃ śakyate |*

[...] it is possible to explain that optional and prohibited rituals should be abandoned and that [Upaniṣadic knowledge] should be combined with obligatory ritual.

Bhāskara argued that optional rituals caused by desires such as “one who desires heaven should sacrifice (*svargakāmo yajeta*),”<sup>11</sup> or “one who desires a son should sacrifice (*putrakāmo yajeta*),”<sup>12</sup> should be abandoned and that obligatory rituals, which do not originate out of desire, such as “one should

<sup>10</sup> JSŚbh *ad* I.1.5 (cf. Verpoorten 1987: 7, BSŚbh 125.10; 424.2, BSBhbh 6.19–20; 62.16–7; 63.2–3; 124.28).

<sup>11</sup> ĀpŚŚ X.2.1, etc., cf. BSBhbh 8.6.

<sup>12</sup> BhārŚŚ III.7.16, etc., cf. BSBhbh 8.6.



perform obligatory rituals as long as one lives,”<sup>13</sup> should be performed.

## 1.2 Bhāskara's idea of jñāna

“*Karman*,” as intended by Bhāskara was, as we have seen above, obligatory rituals (*nityakarman*) that are to be performed regularly. In what way, then, did he understand the term “*jñāna*”?

BSBhbh ad III.3.1: *prathamam tāvad vākyād  
brahmasvarūpaviṣayam jñānam utpadyate | tac ca  
prameyarūpāvacchedakam  
ghaṭādiviṣayapratyakṣādijñānavat | idam tūpāsanam  
nirñīte vastutattve paścāt kriyate yathā gurum upāste  
rājānam upāsta iti | jñātasvarūpasya gurvāder  
upāsanam bhavati | tac ca vidhigamyam |*

In the first stage, knowledge of the true nature of the absolute arises from an [Upaniṣadic] statement. And this [knowledge] determines the form of the object of cognition like knowledge of a pot and so on through [the means of valid cognition such as] perception. And in the second stage, once the true nature [of the object] has been adequately ascertained, veneration (*upāsana*) has to be done just as “he venerates his teacher” and “he venerates the king.” The teacher etc. can be venerated when his true nature [of being “a teacher”] is known. And this [veneration] is known from [Vedic] injunction.”

Bhāskara set up two kinds of knowledge and took a gradual approach to *jñāna*. In contrast to Śāṅkara, who insisted that knowledge of the absolute is all that is needed for liberation,<sup>14</sup> Bhāskara adds a few more very important steps to liberation.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. BSBhbh 8.9.

<sup>14</sup> Śāṅkara's soteriology is often characterized by the passages such as “*vidyaiva*” (Upad 1.1.6.), “*jñānaiva*” (Upad 1.17.7.). This idea is introduced by Bhāskara as a view of a *pūrvapakṣa* — identified as Śāṅkara — who states “*kevalād eva jñānān muktiḥ*” (BSBhbh: 31.15); “*kevalād eva jñānād atraiva puruṣārthasiddhiḥ*.” (BSBhbh ad III.4.1.)

Even if we know the true nature of the absolute, it is not our highest goal. We need to venerate knowledge (*upāsana*) and combine this with obligatory ritual. Bhāskara’s usage of “knowledge” in the context of JKS is connected to “veneration” of the absolute *brahman*, which itself is knowledge and is identified as such. The fact that Bhāskara sometimes used the compound “combination of ritual and *upāsana*” instead of JKS<sup>15</sup> also shows that *jñāna* and *upāsana* were interchangeable terms to him.<sup>16</sup> Another significant point in his understanding of Upaniṣadic knowledge is that he related *upāsana* to injunction (*vidhi*). This idea can be seen from his frequent references to Upaniṣadic sentences that contain injunctions such as “one should venerate (*upāsīta*).”<sup>17</sup> It is a matter of discussion whether Śāṅkara thought that “liberation is the result of the mere confrontation with the relevant Upaniṣadic statements,”<sup>18</sup> or whether it could only be attained by those who fulfilled “the preliminary requirements,”<sup>19</sup> since his attitude towards *karman* and other preconditions differs much in his different works.<sup>20</sup> According to Bhāskara, however, it is obvious that liberation is never accidental. It is preceded by the prerequisite, which is, performing the obligatory rituals that are prescribed by injunctions, followed by the repeated veneration of knowledge.

## 2. Interpretation of the Upaniṣads

### 2.1 JKS in the Upaniṣads

The term Vedāntin is applied to those who engaged in an investigation of the Vedānta, that is the *Upaniṣads*. Their

---

<sup>15</sup> For example, “*karmopāsanayoś ca samuccayo*” (BSBhbh 5.3.), “*samucityopāsanam*” (BSBhbh ad III.3.57.)

<sup>16</sup> Olivelle conceptualizes that the term “*upāsana*” means “venerate X as Y” which can be rephrased by “recognize X as Y” in the upaniṣadic context. Bhāskara must have known the concept of *upāsana* and used the terms “*jñāna*” and “*upāsana*” interchangeably. (Olivelle 1998: 24–25.)

<sup>17</sup> For example, BSBhbh 171.4. (ChU I.1.1.)

<sup>18</sup> Bronkhorst 2007: 43.

<sup>19</sup> Bronkhorst 2007: 45.

<sup>20</sup> cf. Bronkhorst 2007: 43–51.

principles, therefore, are often referred to as the “hermeneutics of the *Upaniṣads*,” in particular contrast to the “hermeneutics of the Vedas”<sup>21</sup> of the Mīmāṃsaka. The earliest works that exposed the hermeneutics of *Upaniṣads* are *Brahmasūtra* and its principal commentaries. These constitute a group of works of orthodox Vedānta in a narrow sense. As a strict Vedāntin, Bhāskara understood the purport of the *Upaniṣads* through the interpretation of the BS. Bhāskara of course regarded the statements of the *Upaniṣads* as an authority that justifies traditional ideas, such as the concept of JKS. Here, we see some examples.

BSBhbh 6.6: “*sa ya ātmānam eva lokam upāste na hāsya karma kṣīyata* (BĀU I.4.15.)”  
 BSBhbh ad III.4.26: “*tam etaṃ vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇā vividiṣanti yajñena dānena tapasānāśakena* (BĀU IV.4.22.)”

Bhāskara noted the combination of *jñāna* (i.e., verbs *upās* and *vid*) and *karman* (i.e., *karman* and *yajña*) here. These are comparatively clearer cases, where the *Upaniṣads* directly refer to these two elements. There are some other cases where Bhāskara explained JKS, even though the relationship between *jñāna* and *karman* is not very clear:

BSBhbh ad III.4.26: *tathā hi “kurvann eveha (ĪU II.)” “kriyāvān (MuU III.1.4.)” iti ca samuccayaṃ vidhatte*

For example, in the statements such as “just performing rituals in this world” and “one who performs rituals,”<sup>22</sup> [the *Upaniṣad*] prescribes the combination [of *jñāna* and *karma*].

<sup>21</sup> “alten Schule der Veda-Interpretation,” “Schule der Upaniṣad-Interpretation” (Vetter 1979: 125.)

<sup>22</sup> Olivelle translates the word “*kriyāvān*” as “an active man,” but we translate it this way subject to Bhāskara’s interpretation that the combination of knowledge and rituals (*kriyā*) is meant here.

Here, Bhāskara argued that the *Upaniṣads* prescribe combination of *karman* and *jñāna*. This is how his hermeneutics of the *Upaniṣads* functions. He not only understood and followed the teachings of the *Upaniṣads*, but also interpreted them in order to authorize his concept of JKS.

## 2.2 Vidhi in the Upaniṣads

Bhāskara's understanding of Upaniṣadic knowledge, as seen above in relation to the concept of "*upāsana*," derives from relating Upaniṣadic sentences to an injunction (*vidhi*). This idea can be seen from his frequent references to Upaniṣadic sentences that contain injunctions such as "one should venerate (*upāsīta*),"<sup>23</sup> "one should hear (*śrotavya*),"<sup>24</sup> and so on. His uniqueness stands out when we refer, again, to Śaṅkara, who was comfortable with the denotative knowledge, "that you are (*tat tvam asi*)." This formulation of knowledge is clearly illustrated in association with two kinds of Upaniṣadic sources: denotative and injunctive.

BSBhbh 4.18–5.3: *ko 'sāv ātmety apekṣāyām svarūpāvabodhaparāṇi "idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ayam ātmā (BĀU II.4.6 = IV.5.7.)" "sa ya eṣo 'nimaitadātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ (e.g., ChU VI.8.7; 9.4; 10.3.)" ityādīni prativēdāntaṃ pravartante | vidīte cātmatattve pratyayāvṛttīlakṣaṇaṃ tadupāsanaṃ upadiśyate "nididhyāsītavyo (BĀU II.4.5; IV.5.6.)" "vijñāya prajñāṃ kurvīta (BĀU IV.4.21.)" iti |*

With regard to the enquiry: "What is the Self (*ātman*)?" there are statements in every *Upaniṣad* such as "all that is nothing but this self,"<sup>25</sup> "the finest essence here --- that constitutes the self of this whole world,"<sup>26</sup> and so on, which serve to teach the true nature [of *ātman*]. When the nature of *ātman* is known, then the veneration of it,

<sup>23</sup> For example, BSBhbh 171.4. (ChU I.1.1.)

<sup>24</sup> For example, 4.9. (BĀU II.4.5; IV.5.6.)

<sup>25</sup> Olivelle 1998: 129.

<sup>26</sup> Olivelle 1998: 253.

which is characterized by the repetition of knowledge, is taught as follows: “[on which] one should concentrate,”<sup>27</sup> “by knowing [that a very wise Brahmin] should obtain insight for himself.”<sup>28</sup>

Upaniṣadic statements on knowledge are divided into two categories: the identification of oneself with the absolute and the veneration of the knowledge of the identification. Bhāskara's interpretation of the second category here (*upāsana*) as being prescribed in the form of injunctions (*vidhi*) shows that he took the purport (*abhiprāya*) of the *Upaniṣads* as the practice in the form of meditative veneration or ritual activities.

BSBhbh 32.3–4: *yadi ca nityaprāpto mokṣaḥ syād  
āyatnena siddhatvāt sarvo loko mucyeta*

Further, if liberation is eternally attained, everyone would be liberated because [liberation] would manifest itself effortlessly.

According to Bhāskara, therefore, the state of liberation is not something that is always there, but needs to be attained through human efforts. The assumption that everyone can attain liberation “effortlessly” (*āyatnena*) was unacceptable to Bhāskara. In other words, he did not admit that there is an element of chance in attaining liberation. On the contrary, he concluded as follows:

BSBhbh 24.12: *sa (=prayatna) eva ca sādhyatvād  
vākyaṛtho lokavedayoḥ*

Since this effort is an object to be accomplished, it is the meaning of sentences both in Vedic and in ordinary language.

Bhāskara stressed the importance of “effort” (*prayatna*), both in the phase of *karman* and *jñāna* (*upāsana*), which is one of the distinctive characteristics of his JKS.

---

<sup>27</sup> Olivelle 1998: 69.

<sup>28</sup> Olivelle 1998: 125.

### 3. Unity of pūrva and uttara mīmāṃsā

#### 3.1 Jaimini's sūtra and Śabara's bhāṣya quoted by Bhāskara

In his commentary on the BS, Śaṅkara often referred to the JS as the grounds to support the position of a *pūrvapakṣa* and his own arguments.<sup>29</sup> Śaṅkara named Śabara as the author of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* (BSŚbh, pp. 423–424), and of a passage stated in the JSŚbh (BSŚbh, pp. 120–121). Bhāskara also often quoted passages from Jaimini and Śabara's bhāṣya as his authority (*pramāṇa*). Here are some examples:

##### Example 1

BSBhbh 103.3: *teṣāṃ hi śrautasamārteṣu karmasv adhikāra itī ṣaṣṭhe 'dhikāralakṣaṇe* (JS VI.1.1–3.)  
*sthāpitam* |

Because it has been established in the section Qualification of Sacrifice in the 6th *adhyāya* of the JS that they are qualified for the ritual activities prescribed in *Vedas* and *Smṛtis*.

##### Example 2

BSBhbh 147.13–15: *anyo'nyavirodhe ca śrutyanusāriṇī smṛtir upādeyā | śrutau ca cetanaṃ jagadbījam uktam | tadviruddhā smṛtir apramāṇam | tad uktam pramāṇalakṣaṇe* “*virodhe tv anapekṣam syād asati hy anumānam* (JS I.3.3.) *itī* |

When [two *smṛtis*] contradict each other, the one that agrees with the *śruti* should be accepted. And [here] in the *śruti* it is stated that the sentient being is the origin of the world. The *smṛti* which disagrees with this [statement] is not an authority. Therefore it is said in the section on Authority [of *śruti* and *smṛti*]: “When there is

<sup>29</sup> As far as I could ascertain from the text, Śaṅkara quotes the JS sixteen times in his BSŚbh. Of these sixteen, five cases (see BSŚbh: 10; 12) are quoted as a part of the argument of *pūrvapakṣa*, four (see BSŚbh: 13; 23; 306; 452) are introduced as a part of the argument of *siddhānta* and the other seven (BSŚbh: 181; 399; 408; 419; 422; 453) are given as a basis that supports *siddhānta*'s view.

conflict [between *Veda* and *smṛti*], the *smṛti* should be disregarded; because it is only when there is no such conflict that there is an assumption [that the Vedic text supports *smṛti*].<sup>30</sup>

#### Example 3

BSBhbh ad III.3.26: *tad uktaṃ bādhalakṣaṇe* “*api tu vākyaśeṣaḥ syād anyāyatvād vikalpasya vidhīnām ekadeśaḥ syād*” (JS X.8.4.) *iti* |

Therefore it is said in the section regarding Exclusion: “In reality, it should be taken as a supplementary statement; because giving an option is most improper; it should therefore be taken as a part of the injunctions.”<sup>31</sup>

#### Example 4

BSBhbh ad III.3.33: *tad uktaṃ śeṣalakṣaṇe* “*guṇamukhyavyatikrame tadarthatvān mukhyena vedasamyoga*” (JS III.3.9.) *iti* |

Therefore, it is said in the section on Subsidiary Sacrifices: “When the primary and the subsidiary belong to two different Vedas, the Vedic characteristic of the subsidiary is to be determined by that of the primary.”<sup>32</sup>

#### Example 5

BSBhbh ad III.3.43: *tad dhi liṅgaṃ prakaraṇād balīyaḥ | tad apy uktaṃ śeṣalakṣaṇe* “*śrutiliṅgavākyaṃ prakaraṇasthānasamākhyānām samavāye pāradaurbalyam artha- viprakarṣād*” (JS III.3.14.) *iti* | *pūrvasya balīyastvam uktam* |

The implied meaning is indeed more valid than the context. Therefore, it is also said in the section on Subsidiary Sacrifices: “Among ‘Direct Assertion,’ ‘Indicative Power,’ ‘Syntactical Connection,’ ‘Context,’ ‘Place,’ and ‘Name,’ that which follows is weaker than

<sup>30</sup> Jha 1933: 92.

<sup>31</sup> Jha 1936: 2030.

<sup>32</sup> Jha 1933: 441.

that which precedes; because it is more remote from the final objective.”<sup>33</sup>

#### Example 6

BSBhbh ad III.3.49: *tad uktam bhedalakṣaṇe “aveṣṭau yajñasamyogāt kratupradhānam ucyata”* (JS II.3.3.) *iti* |

Therefore, it is said in the section on Difference: “In regard to the *Aveṣṭi*, what is asserted is the injunction of the sacrifice itself; because of the connection of the (previously enjoined Rājasūya) sacrifice (with the Kṣatriya only).”<sup>34</sup>

Bhāskara was well versed not only in the JS, but also in the hermeneutics of Pūrvamīmāṃsakas, while he criticized the idea of *mīmāṃsakas*, which frequently appears as the position of *pūrvapakṣa*.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, Bhāskara regarded the JS and Śābara's *bhāṣya* as being as authoritative as the BS. Here is an example of where Bhāskara treated Śābara on equal terms with the BS.

BSBhbh 24.3–9: *na ca niyogasya vākyārthatve mīmāṃsāyām bhāṣyākṣaram śārīrake vā sūtrākṣaram sūcakam asti | bhāvanāyās tu puruṣaprayatnarūpāyā vācakam bhāṣyākṣaram sūtrākṣaram ca vidyate | bhāṣyākṣaram tāvat “ye prāhuḥ kim api bhāvayed iti te svargakāmapadasambandhāt svargaṃ bhāvayed iti brūyur”* (JSSbh ad II.1.1.)<sup>36</sup> *iti bhāvārthādhikaraṇe spaṣṭam | sūtrākṣaram api “kṛtaprayatnāpekṣas tv”* (BS II.3.42.) *iti* |

There is no syllable (=word) in the commentary of the [*pūrva-*] *mīmāṃsā* or in the *śārīraka*[-*mīmāṃsā-*] *sūtra* (= the BS) which points out that the order [of the sacrifice] is the meaning of the sentence. There is, on the other hand, a syllable (=word) both in the commentary

<sup>33</sup> Jha 1933: 449.

<sup>34</sup> Jha 1933: 275.

<sup>35</sup> He often refers to “*mīmāṃsaka*” (BSBhbh: 10.9; 18.14; 111.2 etc.) and “*mīmāṃsāyām*” (BSBhbh: 7.16; 9.13; 24.4 etc.), and introduces the opinion of the *pūrvamīmāṃsaka*.

<sup>36</sup> v.l. *ya āhuḥ*



and in the *sūtra* [of the *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā*] which expresses [directly] the *bhāvanā* in the form of the human effort [as the meaning of the sentence]. First of all, here is [an example of] the syllable (=word) in the commentary, which is evidently said in the section on The Word denoting Activities: “those words that express the idea that ‘one should make something come about’ would be just those which, when combined with the term ‘desirous of heaven,’ would express the idea that ‘one should make heaven come about.’”<sup>37</sup> Also here is a syllable (=word) in the BS, “But [the Lord] expects the effort to be made [by the human beings].”

In other places, Bhāskara quoted many passages the sources of which are not traceable, and most of which are found in Śabara's commentary.<sup>38</sup> These quotations are not found in BSŚbh, which indicates that Bhāskara accepted the authority of the JS and Śabara, and that he owed much more to the methodology of *pūrvamīmāṃsā* than Śaṅkara does.

### 3.2 Bhāskara's reference to *pūrvamīmāṃsā*

As Kane pointed out, Śaṅkara refers to “*prathamatantra*,” “*prathamakāṇḍa*” etc. as *pūrvamīmāṃsā*.<sup>39</sup> In other places, Śaṅkara used the terms “*pūrvasmin kāṇḍe*.”

BSŚbh *ad* III.3.44: *tad apy uktaṃ pūrvasmin kāṇḍe*  
“*śrutilingavākyaprakaraṇasthānasamākhyānāṃ*  
*samavāye pāradaurbalyam arthaviprakaṛṣāt* (JS  
III.3.13.)” *iti* |

It is conceivable from these references that Śaṅkara assumes that there is a “*pūrva*” and “*uttara*” relationship between the two

<sup>37</sup> Jha 1933: 169.

<sup>38</sup> See for example BSBhbh: 8.9; 47.13; 113.10–11; 128.7–8; BSBhbh *ad* III.3.26; 3.39; 3.40; 3.49; 4.33; 4.34; 4.41; 4.45; IV.1.4; 4.12.

<sup>39</sup> Kane 1960: 1160, cf. also Bronkhorst 2007: 7.

different systems of thought.<sup>40</sup> Bhāskara also used the term “*prathamatantra*,” which refers to the JS.

BSBhbh ad I.3.10: *prathamatantrasiddhatvāc cātra  
sphoṭanirākaraṇaṃ niṣphalaṃ syāt |*  
BSBhbh ad I.3.28: *tasya cānupapattir uktā  
prathamatantra ity atra nocyate |*

Further, Bhāskara used the word “*prathamapāde*,” apparently with reference to the first *pāda* of the first *adhyāya* of the JS.

BSBhbh 9.20–21: *yadi punar ekatroktaṃ pramāṇam  
anyatrāpy ucyeta punaruktam eva syāt | ata  
evopavarṣācāryeṇoktaṃ prathamapāda “ātmavādaṃ tu  
śārīrake vakṣyāma” iti |*  
BSBhbh 111.5–6: *atra vadāmaḥ --- vedasya tāvat  
prāmāṇyaṃ prathamapādoktena nyāyena  
vācyavācakasambandhanityatvād...*  
BSBhbh 205.6–7: *sugatena sarvajñenoktam iti cet tasya  
sarvajñatvam asiddham iti prathamapāde sthitam |*  
BSBhbh 208.17–18: *prathamapāde  
pratyakṣādiprāmāṇyanirūpaṇaṃ codanāprāmāṇya-  
siddhyartham yat tad udae viśīrṇaṃ syāt |*

In the first example here, it is interesting that Bhāskara thought that Upavarṣa did not deal with the investigation of *brahman* in *pūrvamīmāṃsā* (=ekatra) but in *uttaramīmāṃsā* (=anyatra) in order to avoid the fallacy of *punarukti*. This means that Bhāskara at least regarded *pūrva*- and *uttara*-*mīmāṃsā* as a single unit, and therefore tried to interpret them as a consecutive system of knowledge. From this evidence we can conclude that both Śāṅkara and Bhāskara recognized the sequential relationship between the *karmakāṇḍa* and the *jñānakāṇḍa* and regarded these two *kāṇḍas* as constituting one system of knowledge.

<sup>40</sup> For example, the term “*pūrvottaramīmāṃse* (BSBhbh ad I.1.4.)” indicates that he recognized a continual relationship between two different systems of thought.

#### 4. Concluding Remarks

a. Bhāskara defined JKS as the combination of Upaniṣadic knowledge and the obligatory rituals. According to Bhāskara, *jñāna* means the learning of the *Upaniṣads* and the veneration of knowledge.

b. Bhāskara construed the statements of the *Upaniṣads* to justify his idea of JKS by way of applying exegetical principles that are characteristics of Pūrvamīmāṃsakas. He correlated Upaniṣadic statements with an injunction urging us to make an effort to perform rituals and venerate knowledge. Therefore the effort (*prayatna*) is the purport of the Upaniṣadic sentences.

c. Both Śāṅkara and Bhāskara regarded the *karmakāṇḍa* and the *jñānakāṇḍa* as forming a coherent intellectual system. Their standpoint is shared by other Vedāntins and is therefore considered orthodox. Bhāskara, compared with Śāṅkara, more frequently quotes passages from Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* and Śabara's *bhāṣya*, and considers them as authoritative as the BS.

d. In addition to its general meaning, that is, the combination of knowledge and rituals, Bhāskara's concept of JKS refers to the unity of the *karmakāṇḍa* and the *jñānakāṇḍa*, in terms of his hermeneutics of the Upaniṣadic sources.

#### Texts and Abbreviations

ĀpŚS	<i>Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra, The Śrautasūtra of Āpastamba</i> , ed. by Richard Garbe, Asiatic Society, Calcutta, 1882–1902.
BĀU	<i>Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad</i> , in <i>Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads</i> , vol. I, ed. by V. P. Limaye and R. D. Vadekar, Poona, 1958.
BhārŚS	<i>Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra, The Śrauta, Paitṛmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bhāradvāja</i> , ed. by Chinamani Ganesh Kashikar, Vaidika Saṃsodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 1964.
BhGBhbh	<i>Bhagavadgītābhāṣya by Bhāskarācārya</i> , ed. by D. Subhadropādhyāya, Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā

- 94, Varanasi, 1965.
- BS *Brahmasūtra*
- BSBhbh *Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya* (see Kato 2011).
- BSBhbh(Dv) *Brahmasūtra with a Commentary by Bhāskarācārya*, ed. by V. P. Dvivedin, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 20, Varanasi, <sup>1</sup>1915 (<sup>2</sup>1991).
- BSŚbh *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Śaṅkara, Text with *Tippanis*, revised by Wāsudeo Laxmaṇ Shāstrī Paṅsīkar, Nirṇayasāgar Press, Bombay, 1915.
- ChU Chāndogya-Upaniṣad, *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, vol. I, ed. by V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar, Poona, 1958.
- ĪU Īśā-Upaniṣad, *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, vol. I, ed. by V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar, Poona, 1958.
- JKS *jñānakarmasamuccaya*
- JS *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, see JSŚbh below
- JSŚbh *Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya* of Śabarāsvāmin, I–VII, ed. by K.V. Abhyankar, G.A. Jośi et al., Ānan-dāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona, 1970–76.
- MuU *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad*, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, vol. I, ed. by V. P. Limaye and R. D. Vadekar, Poona, 1958.
- ŚV *Ślokavārttika*, with the commentary *Nyāyaratnākara* of Śrī Pārthasārathi Miśra, ed. and rev. by G.S. Rai, Varanasi, 1993.
- ŚVK *Kāśikā on the Ślokavārttika*, *Mīmāṃsā Ślokavārttika* with the Commentary *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamīśra, 2 vols, ed. by Sāmbaśiva Śāstri, CBH Publications, 1990 (Trivandrum, <sup>1</sup>1913).
- TU *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad*, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, vol. I, ed. by V. P. Limaye and R. D. Vadekar, Poona, 1958.
- Upad Śaṅkara's *Upadeśasāhasrī*, critically ed. with Introduction and Indices, by Sengaku Mayeda, The Hokuseido Press, Tokyo, 1973.
- v.l. *varia(e) lectio(nes)* = variant reading(s)

## References

- Bronkhorst 2007, Johannes Bronkhorst, "Vedānta as Mīmāṃsā," *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity*, ed. by Johannes Bronkhorst, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi.
- Ingalls 1967, Daniel H.H. Ingalls, "Bhāskara: the Vedāntin," *Philosophy East and West* 17, pp. 61–7, 1967.
- Jha 1933, Ganganatha Jha, *Shabara-Bhāṣya I*, Adhyāyas 1–3, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda.
- Jha 1934, Id., *Shabara-Bhāṣya II*, Adhyāyas 4–8, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda.
- Jha 1936, Id., *Shabara-Bhāṣya III*, Adhyāyas 9–12, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda.
- Kane 1960, Pandurang Vaman Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol.V, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, <sup>2</sup>1977.
- Kato 2009, Takahiro Kato, "Ritual, Knowledge and Liberation in Vedānta," *Horin* 15, pp.55–70. Eko Haus der Japanischen Kultur, e.V., Düsseldorf.
- Kato 2011, Id., *The First Two Chapters of Bhāskara's Śārīrakamīmāṃsābhāṣya*, Dissertation vorgelegt der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg.
- Kato 2012, Id., "Bhāskara's concept of *bhedābheda* and his critique of *avidyā* (in Japanese)," *Studies in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism* 19, pp. 61–72, The University of Tokyo.
- Nakamura 1950, Hajime Nakamura, *Shoki no Vēdānta tetsugaku*, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.
- Nakamura 1983, Hajime Nakamura, *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*, Part 1 (English translation of Nakamura 1950), Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, <sup>2</sup>1990.
- Olivelle 1998, Patrick Olivelle, *The Early Upaniṣads*, Annotated Text and Translation, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Sarma 1933, B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma, "Bhāskara — A Forgotten Commentator on the Gītā," *Indian Historical Quarterly* 9, pp. 663–77.
- Srinivasachari 1934, P. N. Srinivasachari, *The Philosophy of Bhedābheda*, Madras, 1934.
- van Buitenen 1961, J.A.B. van Buitenen, "The Relative Dates of Śāṅkara and Bhāskara," *Adyar Library Bulletin* 25, pp. 268–73.
- Vetter 1979, Tilmann Vetter, *Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śāṅkaras*, Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, Wien.