

as claimed by Prof. Wada. Finally, Section 4 refers to the contradiction in the diversified theories concerning the tribe of *Ho lo che*. It explains that *Ho lo che* belonged to "Doloyan Tümed" which was a otoy of "Tümed", and thus I present an opinion which may explain the reason why *Ho lo che* could have gained the strongest power in Kokonor.

An Introductory Study of the *Mīmāṃsā* :
Problems Relating to the *Saṅkarsa-kāṇḍa*

by Atsushi KANAZAWA

The present paper, consisting of three parts, is the first of a series of papers, not necessarily extensive but rather intensive, to be published on the subject of the *Mīmāṃsā*.

Part I deals with three papers considered by us to be of considerable importance in the historical study of the *Mīmāṃsā*, two of which were published simultaneously in the WZKS(1981), i.e.A. Parpola's "On the Formation of the *Mīmāṃsā* and the Problems concerning Jaimini" and R.W. Lariviere's "Madhyamamīmāṃsā — The *Saṅkarsakāṇḍa*."

Part II focuses in particular upon Parpola's rather original interpretation of the terms *Pūrve-Mīmāṃsā(-Sūtra)* and *Uttara-Mīmāṃsā(-Sūtra)*: these two compounds, frequently mentioned in Indological studies, are here considered in the light of their actual recorded usage, and Parpola's epoch-making hypothesis, all the more arresting when coupled with his interpretation of these terms, concerning the formation of the *Mīmāṃsā* is critically examined. As a result it is found that, considered historically, the grounds for his interpretation are quite tenuous, and we attempt to surmise the historical circumstances which led to the use of these two terms. We also touch on the view, reflecting a current in Indian cultural history becoming particularly marked from the 10th century A.D. onwards, that "the *Mīmāṃsā* consists of 20 chapters," and further suggest an approach to the various traditions relating to the *Saṅkarsa-kāṇḍa*(SK), this latter thought to be closely connected with the former.

In Part III we point out the blind spots of past research on the SK,

presented in a condensed form in Lariviere's paper. Some new material is given, and it is shown on the basis of concrete examples that the various traditions relating to the SK, Saṅkarṣaṇa-K, Devatā-K and Upāsanā-K, which up until today would appear to have been considered on the basis of the present text of the SK, are not all necessarily concerned with the present SK. It is also pointed out that when dealing with the traditions relating to the SK, it is necessary to give due consideration to its relationship with Viṣṇuism (particularly the Pañcārātra school), and that in regard to the appellation Saṅkarṣaṇa-K, one of the several alternative titles of the SK, one must not overlook the possible connection with the Saṅkarṣaṇa included among the four *vyūha*.