CHAPTER - I

Origin and Development of Māṁśa Philosophy

Māṁśa - References in the Vedic Texts
The Prominent Schools of Māṁśa;
Jaimini, Upārā́śa, Bhavacāsa, Ājñātavān, Bhartā́mitra
The Role of Pṛrvamāṁśa;
Māṁśa in Kerala
Indian Philosophy is generally called Dārānas. It branches into two, namely Ēstikadārānas and Nīstikadārānas. That which accept the authority of Vedas is Ēstika (orthodox) and that which does not accept it is Nīstika (heterodox). The six dārānas namely Śīmkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Pārva Māṁṣa; and Uttara Māṁṣa are Ēstika dārānas. And the systems of Cārvaka, Buddha, Jaina etc., are Nīstikas. Of these, the Pārva Māṁṣa; and Uttara Māṁṣa; are based on the Vedic texts. The Pārva deals with Karmakīnda and Uttara deals with Mokṣakīnda of the Vedas. According to Indian thought the four Puruṣārthas namely Dharma, Artha, Kṣma and Mokṣa are the principal goals in life.

The Māṁṣa school of Indian Philosophy got the place of highest honour in the Ēstika dārānas or the Brahmanical philosophies. It is the strongest propounder of supersenseous matters like post-mortem existence, other worlds, acts and their results etc., which
forms the main basis of the ethical, religious and philosophical teachings of the Brahmanical philosophies. Māmāmsī is closely related to the Vedas. It has provided the principles of vedic interpretations which are held in high esteem even at present. Since it conducts discussion of Vedavyākyas, it came to be termedVyākhyāstra also. As an aid to achieve its main purpose of interpreting the Vedas and explaining the ritualistic acts, it has developed its own philosophy, logic, psychology and this has contributed a lot to the stock of Indian thoughts. It also offered some maxims which serve as rules of guidance in all walks of Indian life. Even today the Hindu literature and law does not violate the maxims fixed by Māmāmsī. Thus Māmāmsī has greatly influenced Indian literature, Culture and life.

The word ‘Māmāmsī’ is derived from the root ‘Man,’ means ‘to know’ with the desiderative suffix, ‘Sar’ and means “a desire to know” or “an enquiry” or “investigation.” The object of desire to know, enquiry or investigation here is Dharma or religious duty. It is also calledDharmamāmsī or Karmamāmsī. It undertake discussion about the problems relating to ritualistic acts. Jaimini
gives this meaning to the áṣṭra in the opening sūtra of Māṃsā, which makes the beginning of the enquiry into Dharma.

The term ‘māṃsā’, epistemologically meaning ‘desire to think’ is used to signify a consideration, examination or investigation of the vedic texts because it provides an insight to Vedas, the eternal truth.

The Māṃsā system owes its origin to the practical needs arising in connection with the performance of ritualistic acts. The Ígvedic Aryans believed in the fulfilment of their desires through prayers to gods. In course of time the prayers were accompanied by offering to the Gods and the methods and manners of making the offerings most applicable to the Gods became rather complicated. The clarification is found in the Brāhma, a literature and it was further elaborated in the sūtra literature.

The explanations could not satisfy all the queries and reconcile all tradition of sacrificial performance. Hence, many preceptors, laid down various rules for the clarification of various intricacies of the sacrificial rituals. The Māṃsā sūtra of Jaimini compiled
and systematized these principles of Vedic interpretations prevailing in different circles just as Bararaya, a systematized the spiritual teachings of the Upaniṣads. In this way, the early Māṃśakaśaikṣa aims at interpreting the sacred texts, and the science of interpretation and rituals reaches its peak at their hands. Besides the Māṃśakaśaikṣa texts gives a mystic meaning to the rituals with a philosophical justification and thus are not confined to the explanation of sacrificial performances.

The aim of Pṛva Māṃśakaśaikṣa is to investigate into the nature of Dharma. Pṛva Māṃśakaśaikṣa discusses about pramanas and prameyas. In this connection the contribution made by Pṛva Māṃśakaśaikṣa for the concept of Veda-Apaumāyartha and Svaparmāya are valuable. So it is called as system of philosophy or ‘dārśana.’

Pṛva Māṃśakaśaikṣa also gives authoritative rulings as sacrificial matters such as adhikṣara, īga, atidega, śha, bīcha, tantra etc. and fixing the correct procedure and nature of sacrifices. (Karma and Karma) So Pṛva Māṃśakaśaikṣa is also called ‘Karma Māṃśakaśaikṣa.’
Pārva Māṁśa is also called ‘Vākyayāstrī’ because it evolves the rules of interpretation or Nāyās for interpretation of vedic passages.

For the importance of the Māṁśa it is said that knowledge comprises mainly eighteen branches; fourteen of them instrumental to the attainment of Dharma and Mokāsa and the remaining four to that of Artha and Kṛma. The first fourteen are the Vedas, the six Vedāṅga Māṁśa, Nyāya, Purāṇa and Dharmaśāstra (+Pāṇini, Āśvaghoṣa, Saṅkara and Vyasa). Among these fourteen branches, Māṁśa is the most important as the others depend on it for determining the truth dealt with in the Vedas.

On the origin of Māṁśa there are two views expressed in the ‘Jainayāstrīrthasaṅgraha’ of Pāṇḍita Paramārṣya. Vyasa classified the Vedas into four, and composed Mahābhārata and Puraṇa, which contain the essence of Vedic knowledge. Having found Māṁśa in oral tradition alone, he thought that the future
generation would find it difficult to study the subject in the absence of a basic work and so he enjoined his most beloved disciple Jaimini to compose an authoritative work on Māṃsā in śṭra style. Jaimini was a great sage well versed in all branches of knowledge. Vyāsa further told Jaimini that he himself would write such a book on Uttaramāṃsā. Jaimini realizing fully the difficult nature of the task, obeyed his teacher and composed the Māṃsāśṭras comprising twelve chapters.

There is another tradition connected with the origin of the śṭra. This is called Guruparvakāmyaṁakā (handed down through a chain of teachers). According to this tradition, Brahman or Mahēyāra instructed Prajāpati in Māṃsā and though a number of preceptors such as Prajāpati, Indra, Ēditya, Manu, Vasiṣṭa, Parīśara and Kāṇḍavaipaṭya, the śṭra was handed down to Jaimini. Jaimini wanted to purify it and composed his śṭtras in which the Nyāyaśastra are correctly presented.

The word Māṃsā is used as early as Taittirīya saṁhitā, Aitareya Ēra, yaka, Bṛhadīra, yaka Upaniṣad and also in Chīnḍogya Upaniṣad.
1. In Aitareya Ṛānyaka - 3.3.12

Here the Vedic text itself has paraphrased. ‘Mñymsante’ as ‘Vicrayanti.’

2. In Taittirīya Samhitā - 7.5.7.

Here, the context is some ritual (that of ‘utsarginmayana’ which is the ‘vikṛti’ of ‘gavmayana’) here it is being considered that whether some day is to be left out or not. And the decision is yet, the day of newmoon a full moon are to be left out.” Thus the word ‘Mñymsinte’ is used in the sense of considering something which is doubtful and coming to a certain conclusion about it.

3. In Chāndogopaniṣad (5.11.1)
This means that the great Vedic priests gathered and considered about the issue as to what is the soul and what is the ultimate reality. There are many more references like this from which it understand that the word mamsa means knowing the truth after having considered the pros and cons of the issue about which there is the doubt.

Mamsa: References in the Vedic Texts

In most recensions of Vedas the Sannanta root Mamsa is found used either as a noun or verb in the combined sense of desire for knowledge and of discussion. The Taittiriya Samhita of KṚṣṇa-ayurveda understands the term mamsante in this sense:

Thus VII-5-7-1 says “...”

VI.2.6.4—“...” has the word “mamsanter” used in the sense of discussion. II.5.3.7 introduces a doubtful point with the words—“Brahma[dina] vadanti” without saying the word ‘Mamsante.’ The Tātra, yajurveda, of Śrīveda also supports the same view: Thus VI.5.9—has a passage with the word “mamseta”...
and in the XXIII.4.2, the form mimamseran is employed: “ªÉ&
In the Kautàvatkasûstra of the Êgveda, the verb ‘mànimsante’ and the noun ‘mànims;’
xxvi-2 and 3 use the words ‘mànims’ and ‘mànims;nte.’ In XXIII - 4 of the same brahma,a the word
‘mànims;’ is found used in the sense of discussion, “+lÉÉiÉ& {ÉÊ®úvÉÉxɺªÉè´É
In the Kanva recension of the áatapathbràhma,a of the white Yajurveda the word ‘mànims;’ is used ‘SaîÂmànànimsaiva.’”

The word mànims; is frequently seen in UpaniÀads. This word
also occurs in the ChàndogyopaniÀad of Sàveda V.II.10 and
the Taîtirîyâ UpaniÀad of Black Yajurveda.11 Similarly the words
‘mànims;te,’ ‘mànims;’ are found in some of ancient
Dharmasûtras. for example, the Bodhîyana VîjiÀêchâmasûtras
I-4-10 and XII - 2 use the word ‘mànims;nte’ in the sense of
discussion. The reference from the brjma, as and smrtis given above, show clearly that the later vedic period witnessed discussion of many topics of a doubtful nature, and analysis of their pros and cons leading to final conclusions.

From the ‘Mahbhjya’ of Patanjali (150 B.C.), it is clear that m%mms doctrines were well developed and embodied in aphoristic literature. The references to Nyyavitsanaya (II.4.8.13) and Nyyavid (II.6.14.13) indicate that m%mms as a system must have been elaborated before the time of ‘pastamba.’ And since Jaimini refers to over half of a dozen j%c%ciras - presumably m%mmsj%c%ciras are may legitimately conclude that this science must have been systematised long before his time.

In this connection, a brief account of the development of the M%mms system may be stated. The late scholar M%mms ratna V.A. Paragur%ma%j%stri wrote a detailed history of M%mms%j%stri in his valuable introduction to the edition of Tattvabindu. According to him Jaimin%c%yas%stra may be assigned to about 300 B.C. Prof. Jacobi places the M%mms%sf%tris between 300-200
B.C. Dr. Damodar Vīṛu Garge (his litation in áabarabhaĀya - a study) says that the extent Jaimin¥yāsétra falls into the earlier part of the árauta sétra period (ie., about 500 B.C. Jaimini’s Pērva Mēm¡ms¡; Sétras contain sixteen chapters, the last four of which are generally known as Sa ‘karÀak; ’a. Boddhjyana, UpavarÀa and Êcarya Sundarap¡ndya wrote commentaries on the Jaimin¥yāsétras. á¡bárav¡min wrote a commentary called á¡bárap¡h¡Āya in which he criticize the views of the different schools of Buddhism. He raised the Pērva Mēm¡ms¡ to the status of an independent system. Bhartmitra, who followed áabara in his commentary on the Mēm¡ms¡ sétras rejected some of his innovations and upheld earlier views of the Vattik¡r¡. Kumarila Bhatta and Pradhakaraguru are the two great Mēm¡ms¡ Philosophers, whose contributions enriched the system and led to its branching off into two schools popularly known as, the Bh¡¶¶a school and the Pr¡bh¡kara school.

The Prominent Schools of Pērva Mēm¡ms¡ :-

After á¡bárap¡h¡Āya Pērva Mēm¡ms¡ have been classified into three main groups on the basis of the variation in their thinking. Kumarila Bhatta, Pradhakara Migra and Mur¡ri Migra are the three
famous propounders of these schools. The livingness and continuity of the \textit{\v{S}\i str} can be proved from this fact.

\textbf{Bh\i tta School of M\i m\i ms\i j}

Kumarila Bhatta (700 AD) was the propounder of the Bhatta school of M\i m\i ms\i j. Comparatively more Mimamsakas have followed the Bhatta school. As a result there is comparatively more literature of this school in M\i m\i ms\i j system. The famous Mimamsaks, Mandana Mi\i jra, Umveka, Vacaspati Mi\i jra, Sucarita Mi\i jra, Parthasarati Mi\i jra, Paritosha Mi\i jra, Bhatta Soneswara, Bhavadeva, Khandadeva etc. have adorned and enriched this school.

Kumarila Bhatta was one of the earliest teachers of M\i m\i ms\i j. He was against Buddhism. Kumarila recognizes six pramanas - Perception, Inference, Comparison, Testimony, Presumption and Non apprehension. He also recognize five categories - substance, quality, action, community and negation. Kumarila admits eleven substances - Earth, Water, Light, Air, Weather, Time, Space, Self, Manas, Darkness and Sand (Var\,a).
Kumarila wrote a monumental work entitled ‘Bhāhattāka’ of which ālokavṛtttika is only a digest. ālokēkatha, Pṛthasṛathī Miṇa, Somēyarahaḍa and others refer to it which is lost. Kumarila wrote ‘Tantravṛtttika’ and ‘Tīptāka’ also. ālokavṛtttika deals with the first part of the first chapter known as Tarkapāda and has great philosophical importance. Sucharitamiṇa wrote a commentary entitled ‘Kīvika’ on it (1100-1100 A.D.). Umekalāṭā (670-750) also wrote a commentary on it. Pṛthasṛathimīṇa (1050-1120) wrote a commentary known as ‘Nyāyaratnākara.’ He wrote ‘Nyāyaratnāla’ and ‘Tantraratnā’ and also ‘āśtradāpikā’ which is a popular manual of the Bhāṭṭa school. Ramakāśaṭā (1700 A.D.), Somarathikā Dixita (1600 A.D.) and Sudarṣancārya wrote commentaries on āśtradāpikā, Yuktisnehaprapāndral, Mâyakhanilika and āśtradāpikā prakāśa. Maṇimīṇa (680-750 A.D.) an eminent deciple of Kumarila wrote ‘Vidhiviveka,’ ‘Vibhramaviveka,’ ‘Bhjivanj Viveka,’ ‘Brahmasidhi,’ ‘Sphoṭasidhi’ and ‘Māyāmys; śetrāṅkara, ś.’ He supported the theories of Kumarila and criticized those of Pradhakara. Vīcāpate Miṇa (800-900 A.D.) wrote ‘Nyāyaka, ika,’ a commentary on ‘Vidhiviveka’ and ‘Tattvabindu.’
Prabhakara School of Māṁsāj

Prabhakara Miṣra was the founder of this school of Māṁsāj. He was born in South Kerala at Ponnani Taluk, in áukapura Village. He was the famous disciple of Kumarila. Although he does not hail before Kumarila, he is definitely contemporary with him. According to Dr. Ganganath Jha, Prabhakara Miṣra is nearer to the views of Sabaraswamin and obviously a follower of his. Language of Prabhakara is very simple and he does not have many followers. Mainly áalikanath Miṣra, Nandeswara, Ramanujacharya are considered and are mentioned as followers of him.

Prabhakara wrote an explanatory work on Sabara’s MāṁsājĀya, namely; ‘Bḥati’ or Nibandhana. Another famous work was ‘Laghvī or Vivarna.’ áalikanjha Miṣra (690-760 A.D.) wrote a commentary known as ‘Ijavimal japacika,’ on Bḥati a popular manual of the Prābhajkara school. Bhavarathadhatta (1150 AD.) wrote ‘Nayaviveka’ in which he summarised the works of áalikanjha. Ramnijcijrya (1750 A.D.) wrote a commentary called ‘Nayakaratna’ on Nyāyaratnamāla and ‘Tantrarahasya’ which deals
with the views of Prābhakara school. Prabhakara’s doctrine is also called Gurumata.

Prabhakara reject non-apprehension and admits five pramanas. He recognizes eight categories - Substance, quality, action, community, inherence, number, potency and similarity. He also regards sound as a quality of aether and darkness as absence of light.

Murari Miṣra’s School of Māmāṁsā

The third school of Pārva Māmāṁsā is Murari Miṣra’s. It was so popular and well-established in his period, that it gave rise to a popular maxim. But whatever may be the reason, the school could not progress much and survive for long. Only one treatise of this school called Tripadāntīya is available today. No followers of this school are known now. However, the views of this school have been vehemently criticized and refuted by the opponent Nāyikāyas in the context of establishing ‘paraḥ-pramāṇa.’ So it can be inferred that there must have been some favourable period when this school was very much established and was definitely at its peak.
Upto the third decade of this century very little was known about Murari Miśra. His commentary on Jaiminīya Sūtra were published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras (JORM) and Annals of Oriental Research Institute, Pune (AORI). The Adhikaranaś are the only direct source to know his views on various important philosophical and logical concepts. Because no other works of Murari Miśra himself or any commentaries on any of these fragments have seen the light of the day yet. There are not more manuscripts even to collate with. These facts make it very difficult to edit this text.

The fundamental text of Pārva Māmś is the sutras of Jaimini which consists of twelve chapters. In it Jaimini offered a systematic presentation of logic, epistemology, and philosophy of Pārva Māmś. Āśvarṣvāmi wrote an elaborate commentary, popularly known as ‘āśvarṣvāya’ on Jaiminīya Sūtras. Which is available completely. The Jaiminīya Sūtras interpreted in detail and logically analysed by Āśvara. This gave a logical foundation to the philosophy of Pārva Māmś. This is the reason why Āśvarṣvāya became the most authoritative and basic text of Pārva Māmś.
This ájbarabháya was commented upon further by Kumarila and Prabhakara, the two great exponents of the first two schools of Pérva Māmśas. Both of them offered two different and independent interpretations of ájbarabháya. Although both these schools have a long tradition, still the Bhatta school enjoys better tradition comparatively. Even up to 16-17 century, scholars have contributed to the Bhatta schools. But do not find many texts to represent the Prabhakara tradition.

Such is not the picture with regard to the third school of Pérva Māmśas. Scholars have no knowledge of any tradition of this school. It is indeed very much disappointing that neither any complete work of the founder of this school, nor any works of his followers representative of the doctrine of Murari Miśra has been handed down to us. But definitely there was a Murari Miśra who held views different from both the schools of Kumarila and Prabhakara. Because over the above the popular saying, ‘mur; reÅ tritiyaÅ panth;Å’ in many philosophical text like the ‘Tattvacintma, I of Gangeśopādhyāya’ and in some other texts.
This further points out that the doctrine of Murari had such an impact over the philosophers of his days that they had to take into cognizance his doctrine before propounding their own doctrine, on various topics. In other words Murari appearing here and there as a péravapakÀin on various philosophical - logical texts of Indian philosophy until 1928. In 1928 one fragment of Murari’s work was published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras. The text was Arthav¡d¡dhikarana, am. It forms a part of the Tripad¡ntinyayam (ie. the Arthav¡d¡dhikarana, the mantr¡dhikarana and the smœtyadhikarana, a) of murari edited by S.K. Ramanathasastri of the University of Madras. The text discussed three topics, occurring in the second and the third p¡da of the first chapter of Jaimin³yas£tra. In the following year another adhikarana ie., ‘Ek¡da¿¡dhikara, a’ appeared in the Annals of The BORL.19 Pune. This text dealt with the topic occurring in the first adhikara, a of the 11th chapter of Jaimin³yas£tra. This was edited by Uresh Misra of Allahabad University.
Earlier Māṃsaśakṣīs

Jaimini

Sage Jaimini is the founder of Pṛvacāndā Māṃsaśakṣa. It is difficult to say the period of Jaimini. His śāstras may however, be assigned to about 300 B.C. He did not originate the teachings, but for the first time reduced to write the traditional interpretations that had long been in the memory of man. Very little is known of his life aside from the tradition that he was a pupil of Bṛdarṣya, a, founder of the Vedanta system. His actual date is quite unknown, however, his style of writings assigns him the śātra period which extended from 600–200 B.C.

The Pṛvacāndāntra tells that an elephant crushed to death Jaimini, the author of Pṛvacāndā śātras. While giving the Vidyāvanga, the śīravindaśabdra, it mentions Jaimini as the disciple of Pṛṣṭhārya Vṛṣṇa.

Jaimini is also credited with another work—Chandogyapavicta—probably a ritualistic work of the Kalpasūtra character. To him are also ascribed a Ārautasūtra and a Grhyasūtra.
The first basic work on Pārva Māṃsā available now is Māṃsāsāstra of Jaimini. However it was not the Jaimini who initiated the system of Pārva Māṃsā. This is obvious from the fact that in the Māṃsāsāstra itself Jaimini has referred to other teachers who preached the principle of Pārva Māṃsā before him. Same time he has disagreed with their positions and hence has referred to their views as the pārvapakṣa while in other places, he is agreed with their views and hence they occur in such cases in the Sīdhyāra.

From this it is clear that Jaimini is not the first teacher of Pārva Māṃsā. He is preceded by many other Māṃsākṣas whose views were quite significant.

In the 1st subchapter of 1st chapter he refers Badarāyaṇa.

“...The relation of the word with its meaning is innate. Instruction is the means of knowing it. (ie. Dharma), which is
infallible regarding all that is imperceptible. It is a valid means of knowing as it is independent according to Badarayana.

He also refers Kamukayana in the Sūtras XI.1.1.57 MS XI.1.58 MS XI.1.63.

LIvukiyana - MS. VI. 7.37
Kairiijini - MSVI.7.35, IV.3.17
Aitiçiyana - MS. III.2.43, III.4.24, VI.1.6.
Bjdrari - MS. III.1.3, VI.1.7, VIII.3.6, IX.2.33.
Etreya - MS IV.3.18, VI.1.26, V.2.18.
Etmaratya Etlekhan - MS. VI.5.16, VI.5.17.

From all these it can be assumed that (1) Jaimini has quite a rich tradition of Māṃśika thought as his background. (2) It was an essential topic of discussion in those days of prominence of the ritual culture.

Though Pārva Māṃśika Sūtras is based on Jaimini’s Māṃśika Sūtras yet Jaimini was not the first thinker of this system. He himself has referred to some teachers preceding him eg: Badarayana, Kamukiyana, Atrey, Etlekhan, Bjdrari, Aitiçiyana, LVukiyana,
Kṛṣṇaṇjanini. Even before these thinkers occasional discussions of the Māṇḍūkya type are found in the Brāhmaṇas, as themselves and some what later in the Ārautasūtras in a more systematic way. It seems that as the technicalities of the sacrificial rituals became more and more complicated, doubts began to crop up as to the correct method of performing the sacrifices and the correct interpretation of the vedic texts enjoying sacrifices. In the course of time this led to the formulation of rules according to which the vedic texts were to be interpreted. Not one but several attempts at the formulation of such rules must have been made in the remote past and as a result several systems must have appeared simultaneously and successively which are gradually discarded save Jaimini’s system which alone survived.

The date of Jaimini is not settled. His work is extremely little of what now understand by the term ‘philosophy.’ But since it make an attempt to defend by arguments the supreme authority and eternality of Vedas, it is definite that it belonged to an age when heterodox thinkers, like the Buddha, who challenged the claims of
the followers of Veda and casting serious doubts about the real
spiritual value of the sacrifice, had made their appearance and
organized themselves into powerful groups. But the highly
developed anti-Vedic metaphysical schools like Yogachara and
Madhyamika had not yet appeared.

In fact the whole system of Māṁśa has been systematically
arranged only in the ‘Māṁśa Sūtras’ of Jaimini. Before that this
system must have existed orally, in a scattered manner. Therefore
the present system of Māṁśa can be accepted as the contribution
of Jaimini. Although the contribution of the commentators like,
Bhartmitra, Upavarsa and Bhavadasa are worth mentioning after
Māṁśa Sūtras.

Jaimini’s Pṛvamāṁśa Sūtras contain sixteen chapters, the
last four are generally known as Sa karākṣa. The first four
chapters are more popular than the last four. The first chapter deals
with all pramāṇas on dharma; the second the bheda, the difference
between the dharma and the other; the third a āgatva; the fourth the
prayojya prayojakahya; the fifth the kama, i.e., sequence between kaman and kaman; the sixth, the adhikjra – the qualifications of a sacrificer etc; the seventh and eighth the atideja (the application and assimilation of one kaman on the similarity of the other); the nineth fha; the tenth byaha, the eleventh and twelfth, tantra and prasa ga respectively. These constitute the most important part of Māmīmsa system.

The last four chapters, áa karākanda also known as Devatīdhyya. Major portion of it deals about the devatas in vedic sacrifices. Upavarāa, Bhavadīsa Devasvāmin, Rajacīdamani Dīkāita and Bhiskarciya have commented on Sangarākṣa. Unfortunately the full śutra text is not available.

Upavarāa (B.C. 100 – A.D. 200)

The earliest commentator on the Jaiminīyasūtras is Upavarāa. He wrote commentary on the twenty chapters of Pārvamanīms; and Uttaranīms; śutras. So he known as Vāttikara. ájarasvāmi refers to him as Bhagavīn.
The date of UpavarÀa is difficult to settle. It is possible only to lay down the limits within which he must have lived. áabarásvarmin lived about AD.200 quotes UpavarÀa and this gives the latest limit. UpavarÀa mentioned and refuted the doctrine of samud¡ya¿abda of the grammarians; in the history of Sanskrit grammar Patañjali enunciated the doctrine of sho¶a¿abda. This would prove that Vettikara UpavarÀa must be subsequent to Patañjali. Hence he may be assigned to the period from C. 100-B.C. to AD.200.

Bhavad¡sa (A.D. 100-200)

Bhavad¡sa is subsequent to UpavarÀa and before á¡barasv¡mi. Bhavad¡sa wrote a vätti on sixteen chapters of the Pèrvamàm¡ms¡ which is not available. It is a summary of UpavarÀa’s Vätti on Màm¡ms¡sàtras.

á¡barasv¡mi (A.D. – 200)

Bh¿Ày¡ written by á¡bara is the earliest extant commentary on Jaimini’s sàtras in the Bh¿Ày¡ style. It is on the twelve adhyayas of Pèrvamàm¡ms¡. In XII.2.11. he refers to the Sa JàrÀ but it is not known whether he wrote bh¿Ày¡ on it. His work is an important
source book for the reconstruction of the earlier aspects of this system of philosophy.

**Bhartṛmitra (AD. 300-600)**

Bhartṛmitra introduced many āpaśidhantas into the system of Pārvamāṃśas; and thus made it an aesthetic one. According to M.M.S. Kuppusvami āstrikal, Prabhakara was not perhaps the founder of the Prabhakara school of Karma Māṃśas; which must have been represented in the ante-Kumarila period by writers like Bhartṛmitra.²³

On the authority of Yamunacarya’s siddhitraya, a many scholars opine that Bhartṛmitra has commented on the Vedanta ṝētras of Bṛdarṣya, a. But there is no further evidence to substantiate that view.²⁹ Bhartṛmitra may be placed between āharasyāmin and Kurarilabhatta (A.D. 300-600).

**The Role of Pārva Māṃśas**

Vedas are divided into four, Samhitās, Brāhmaṇa, Ātra, Yaka and Upaniṣads. Brāhmaṇa describes a large number of Yajñīs; the
details of the performance of these yagas are also given. However, these are not described in an organised way, it is difficult to distinguish in different sacrifices the main and subordinate positions, procedures etc. There are some conflicting statements also. There are also differences among different á¡kh¡s for the same items and procedures. Probably the priests reconciled these at the time of performances by discussion. At the time of Brahma, as the performance of sacrifices was very often and priests were quite conversant with it. At this circumstances árautas£tras were formulated to describe the procedure of the sacrifices. Baudh¡yana and Ápastambha árauta s£tras of Yajurveda give a fairly good account of major sacrifices.

The árauta s£tras approach is descriptive. These describe the details of the sacrifices step by step following the procedure of the sacrifice. These do not discuss the rational underlying the introduction of certain items for procedures. They are just a diary of performances (In a section called ‘Paribh¡Âa s£tras’ some technical points are explained). A full discussion and interpretation
of the statements in the Brhma, as connected with the sacrifice is not found in árautasétras. Jaimini’s sétras of Párvá Mmms; do it.

"Vedas are the means to comprehend Dharma. Mmms; is an aid to interpret Vedas.

Purpose :-

The purpose of Mmms; is to inquire into the nature of Right action (Dharma). The basic premise of Mmms; is that action is the very essence of human existence. Without action knowledge is fruitless; without action happiness is impossible, without action human destiny cannot be fulfilled; therefore, right action (Dharma) is the pre-requisite of life.

All actions are said to have two effects, they are external and internal. One manifest and the other potential, one gross and the other subtle. The internal effect is eternal, regarded as being, while the external effect is transitory. Actions are therefore the vehicles for planting the seeds of life to come.
On this basic premise Māmāsā examines all actions enjoined in the Veda. For this purpose, it divides the Veda into two broad divisions; Mantra and Brāhmaṇas and classified into contents under five different headings.

1. Injunctions (Vidhi)
2. Hymns (Mantra)
3. Names (Nimadheya)
4. Prohibitions (Nīśedha)
5. Explanatory Passages (Arthavijā). It then explains the method of interpreting every grammatical rule and literary device employed and of analysing all Vedic ritual and ceremonies into their two fundamental sorts, principle and subordinate. Māmāsā is therefore a general summary of the rules for the interpretation of Vedic texts.

Scope :-

Māmāsā accepts the philosophical concepts of other systems, it does not enter upon any philosophical analysis of the Ultimate reality, Soul and Matter, as the interrelation of one to the other. But
its entire interpretation is depending upon their existence. Its basic premise of right action is proved and defended by the means of knowledge taught by the Nyäya Vaiśeṣika division, all the effects of right action would be meaningless without the analysis of the evolution consciousness taught by the Śrīkhyā-Yoga division, however it makes specific use only of those factors that are needed for its special problems. For example: it shows that Verbal testimony (āabda) is the only means of right knowledge that can be used to discover the nature of the invisible effects of the action, and that all other means of right knowledge are necessary only to refute opponents. Although Māmśa does not enter into any philosophical analysis of the universe, it welcomes all philosophical discussions that will further an understanding of right action as enjoined in the Veda.

The soul concern of Māmśa is salvation, not liberation. It argues that salvation cannot be achieved by knowledge alone, for the soul must first exhaust its potentialities through actions as a seed fulfills itself through growth. No amount of contemplation
will enable man to arrive at ultimate goal of human destiny, therefore, the emphasis is on the ethical side of life rather than on the philosophical. All arguments are based on the premises that the soul by definition must survive this earthly manifestation. The actions to pursue and the rewards to follow are enjoined in the Veda and interpreted by Māmāsāj.

The importance of Māmāsāj is testified by its present day effect, for no part of the daily life of the Hindu is without the influence of the teachings of Māmāsāj. All rituals and ceremonies depend upon it; all moral conduct is guided by it. All Hindu law is founded upon it. Māmāsāj breaths life into the very super-structure of Indian Culture.

Māmāsāj in Kerala :-

Maharathapadhyaya Dr. Uresh Miya says, “it is a matter of great satisfaction that the tradition of the study of Māmāsāj and also of the performance of sacrifices has been preserved in the South by the sincere votaries of Vedas.” It is true that South India especially Kerala has a great tradition of the study of Māmāsāj ājāstra.
has a good history of learning of Māmāsā, and ritualism was once the outstanding feature of the cultural life in ancient Kerala. Many traditional account of the performance of sacrifices in ancient days, have come down to us. There is a story connected with the spread of Buddhism in Kerala and the attempt made by the Māmāsakṣas to arrest it. There is another tradition recorded by Uddāsa āśtra in his ‘Kokilasandeha,’ regarding the introduction of the Bhātta School of Māmāsā into Kerala. While acquainting the bird messenger with the whereabouts of the Kottayam royal family in Malabar, the poet says that it was Hariçandra a scion of the family, who caused the followers of Kumarila to be brought to Kerala.

There were eighteen Sabhās in ancient Kerala. Among of them Chowannoor sabhā was a centre for the studies on āstras including the Māmāsā āstra. The awards like Paṁpathnam, Taṁiyiltetnam etc., were instituted by Kerala kings for the development of the studies on different āstras especially on Māmāsā and Vedantī.
ájljs and Sabhímañhís, the higher education centres of Ancient Kerala and competitions for students like Kadavallfr anyonyam and Revathi Pattath¡nám were helped the growth of Mámjs; in Kerala.

ájljs and Sabhímañhís

ájljs were the higher education centres in South Kerala, where Brahmin boys were sent for higher studies after the preliminary education given in the village temples. Food and accommodation for the students were provided in these centres. The famous ájljs of ancient Kerala were; the Kínthallfr (Trivandrum), Pírthivajíkharapúrám (Cap company), Thírvalla and Mòzhikkulam. The Vedas, Vedàngas and Darçanas were taught in these centres.

The higher education centres of Malabar region known as Sabhímañhís. For the study of Vedas and Vedic rituals Karmi mañhís are there. Two of them are functioning even now in Trissur and Thírn¡vaya.

For teaching ástrís like Mámjs; Nyiýa and Vyikarana, ástrímahís are there. The Covvannfr, Edakkulathfr, Kumbala
and Udayatungeswara were the ájstra ma¶h¡s. Among them the Kumbala and Edakkulathfr are functioning even now.

For teaching Advaita Vedanta Sanyasi ma¶h¡s were functioned. They began to function after ári áankara.

All these Sabh¡ma¶h¡s were functioned as ancient universities and discussions were conducted on various subjects.

**Kadavallfr Anyonyam :-**

Kadavallfr Anyonyam and Revati Pattatt¡nam were the competition for the scholar students who completed 12 years of studies. These were conducted and patronised by the then rulers.

Kadavallfr is a Vishnu temple at Kunnamkulam. This temple is the venue for this vedic competition. The competition is mainly between the scholars of Trissur and Thiruv¡va Karmima¶h¡s. It is conducted at night on 30th of Tul¡m of Kollam era. The winners were honoured by presenting cash awards and other prizes. The Payyfr Bhattas were permanent members among the panel of judges. Even now this competition is being conducted every year with wide spread publicity.
Revathi Pattatt\nam :-

Revathi Pattatt\nam is a highly scholarly å¡stric debate conducted in temples. It also known as Taliyil \nam, because it conducted at the temple of Tali of Calicut under the patronage of the Zamorin of Calicut. Traditionally it begins on Revati star of Tul\mand ends on Tiruv\tira star. The Bhatta M\ma\ms\js, Pr\j\kara M\ma\ms\js, Vedanta and Vy\karana are the subjects for competition. The winner is given the honourable title ‘Bhatta’.

These two å¡stric competitions contributed much to the ritualistic tradition of Kerala.

M\ma\ms\ks of Kerala :-

Bhavad\sa (2\nd cen. A.D.), one of the early commentators on Jaimin\ya set\zas is believed to be a son of Kerala. Prabhakaraguru is believed to be a Keralite. Cidananda Pa\,dita, the author of ‘Nititattv\vibh\va’ and Bhav\l\vi\u, the author of the ‘Nayatt\vasangraha’ were the two M\ma\ms\ks of Kerala in the 13\rd and 14\th centuries, respectively. Many of the members of the Pay\fr Bhava family who flourished during AD. 1300-1550 were
great Māṁśākṣas and they cultivate the Māṁśastra with great devotion. Most of them were proficient in all the six systems of Indian Philosophy but their main contributions are in the field of Bhāṇṭākṣas. It is said that in this family a rule is enforced that only those who brought new treatise on Māṁśa would be allowed to participate in the ārya ceremony when all the sons of a father assembled at their family house. This self imposed duty and its observance bear testimony to the devotion with which the Payyār Bhatta family promoted the study of Māṁśa (both Purva and Utara).

The family of Payyār Batta is at present situated near Porkkalam, about sixteen miles to North West of Trissur. In the fifteenth century Ubbandāṣṭrikal gives the exact location of their house as slightly to the east of Porkkalam (Pa, akhala in Sanskrit).

The three Parameṣvara and one Vasudeva were great Māṁśākṣas in the family. Parameṣvara I is called
Māyāmsakacakravartti by Uddanda āstri. His works are the ‘Nyāyasamuccaya’ and the two commentaries called ‘JuĀudhvankara,’ and ‘Svaditankara,’ on Nyāyaka, ika of Vacaspati Miśra. Parameśvara II was also a great scholar and he wrote commentaries on Mandanamīra’s ‘Sphotasidhi’ and ‘Vibhramaviveka.’ Parameśvara II is the author of ‘Jaiminīya Sētr;rstrasangraha,’ a valuable commentary on Jaiminīyasētras. Parameśvara II had a scholarly brother named Vasudeva whose contributions are more literary than scientific. Vasudeva’s known māyāmsak work is ‘Kumarilayuktimyla.’

Melputhēr Matadatta, father of the famous Melputhēr Nirjiya, abha was well versed in the school of Māyāms, particularly in the Bhaṭṭa school. Professor S. Venkitasubrahmany Iyyer, however argues that the unpublished ‘āarvamata sikhṇṭa;stra,’ in all probability a work of this author. Melputhēr Nirjiya, a Bhaṭṭa was not only a great grammarian and poet but also a famous Māyāmsak. The ‘Mīna’ portion of the ‘Mīnāmeyodaya’ written by him is a unique work in Māyāms;
¿¡stra. It deals with the epistemology of Bhatta school. V.A. Rama Swami á¡stri has stated that Nír¡ya, abhatta also wrote ‘Nibandhana’, a commentary on the Tantrav¡rttika. Nír¡ya,a Pa, dita, another mâmms¡ scholar and younger contemporary of Nír¡ya,a Bhatta wrote the ‘Meya’ portion of ‘M¡nareyodaya.’

Certain other Mâmms¡ works produced in Kerala are noticed by Dr. P.K. Narayana Pillai in his introduction to Jaimin¥yasÈtr¡rthasamgraha. They are ‘Mângalat¡ka’ on the ‘NÊtitattv¡vibh¡va’ by one NÉlaka,Íha, ‘Kim¡rilanatapany¡sa’ written by a disciple of one Subrahmanya. The Praneya Pir¡ya,a by Damodara, ‘Gurusammatapad¡rth¡Ä of unknown authorship and the ‘Gurusammatapadartha samgraha’ dealing with the eight pad¡rth¡s of Pr¡th¡kara.

The term Mâmms¡ has been used from time inmemorial. Therefore the mature age of ¿¡stra is noncontroversial. In the beginning of K¡¿ika, Sucarita Mi¿ra has mentioned the old and long tradition of saying ‘ÈÀ¨É½äþ·É®úÉ ´ÉÉ ¨ÉÒ¨ÉÉÆºÉÉÆ |ÉVÉÉ{ÉiªÉä |ÉÉä´ÉÉSÉ |ÉVÉÉ{ÉÊiÉÊ®úxpùɪÉ, <xpùÉ +ÉÊnùiªÉɪÉ* (It means The Mâmms¡ was told by Brahma or áiva to
Prajipati, then Prajipati to Indra, And by Indra to Editya). According to Púrthasráthá Miśra commentary on Nyáyaratnakara - Māmśmś; is also conveyed by Aditya to Vasiṣṭha, Vasiṣṭha to Parjñāra, Parjñāra to Kraṇāda, advaitya and by him to Jaimini.

In the ancient times, a learned man in society, who was fully acquainted with the Dharmasastras acceptable to brahmana grāndhas, was expected to be sincerely following and performing the vedic rituals as per his family tradition. Later in the course of time, the attitude changed and so also the faith of the people, causing a natural slackening in the performance of Vedic rituals. Therefore, a widely acceptable systematic means supported with solid evidence, was searched for, for the eradication of controversial and for the doubt-free involvement of the people in Yagas and other Vedic rituals. As a visible result, the ‘Māmśmśastra’ was originated.

Modern students of Indian Dārāṇas do not, as a rule, study the Pārva Māmśmś; as a separate system. Grammar has its life-long devotees, the Nyāya and Vedanta have their specialists but Pārva Māmśmś; is without any such ordent and enthusiastic adherents.
The neglect into which it has fallen may be traced to three principle causes. The sacrificial system of Vedas, the main theme of Pärva Māṃśā; being no longer in force, it is though necessary to study the āstra that chiefly deals with it. Secondly the Māṃśā is regarded as less attractive and magnificent than some of the other systems of Indian Philosophy. Lastly the doctrine of Māṃśā have been largely discussed in other systems, and so the students think that by studying any such system he will have an adequate knowledge of Māṃśā. As a matter of fact, it is only the principles of interpretation of Pärva Māṃśā, that still continue to attract attention. Because there are in evidence in almost all the branches of Sanskrit literature and are indispensable to the interpretation and proper understanding of many an abstruse and ambiguous text. This general and continued neglect has resulted in the growth and prevalence of various erroneous notions about the doctrines and characters of the Pārva Māṃśā; so much. So that even its title to be considered as a Darṣāna has often been called in question.

But, the Pārva Māṃśā; has the right to demand greater attention from the students of Indian Philosophy. The Māṃśā and the Nyāya; are systems that had their origin far back in the dim
past. There is evidence that the Nayyāyikas, the Mīmamsakas and the Buddhists were long engaged in controversies with one another. There have not had the opportunity of ascertaining how the Mīmamsaka doctrines were represented in the works of Buddhists school. But in the works of Mīmamsakas as well as those of the Nayyāyikas, the tenets of the ritual systems have been freely attacked and discussed. The school of Navya Nyāya, the works of which throw much light on the doctrines of the Mīmamsa; owes its development mainly to its criticism and discussions of these Mīmamsa; doctrines. But however elaborate these discussions are, one cannot always rely on them for a correct representation of the views which are criticized and refuted. Apart from the fact that in the heat of controversy, things are scarcely seen in their proper perspective, it is impossible to gain an accurate and systematic knowledge from imperfect representations.
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