

reviewer sometimes as unduly harsh. For instance, Zydenbos claims that 'iconic representations of the Tīrthankaras and other holy persons are often mistaken for representations of the Buddha, also by persons who ought to know better' (p. 39) and mentions a book on Hinduism which uses a photograph of the part of Gommateśvara of Shravanabelgola on its front cover. One might indeed query the choice of the photograph but the author or the publisher cannot be accused of ignorance, for the back cover of the book clearly acknowledges that the photograph is a 'giant Jain image from Shravana Belgola'.

Notwithstanding this minor quibble, the book is engaging, persuasive and highly accessible. The only problem which mars the book is the slightly confusing, mixed use of italics, diacritical and non-diacritical words. As a book aimed largely at general readership a decision to simplify transcription may be sensible. However, some names, concepts and technical terms are rendered with diacritics while others are not; there does not appear to be any consistency (for example, Vardhamana Mahāvīra on p. 26). There are also signs that the book was hastily edited, for typographical and suspected encoding conversion errors are conspicuous. For example, opening and closing double quotation marks appear as ô and ö respectively, while ö in German appears as Ñ and ä as Ī throughout the book.

As Zydenbos openly acknowledges, this book is a stepping stone for more detailed introductory books. Yet, considering the length of the book (just over a hundred pages long), whatever introductory information he provides is informative and can only add to its usefulness. But the real value lies in the later section of the book, which can be taken as the author's exhortation to scholars and traditional pundits in both India and outside to engage with the modern world intellectually: for academics to communicate the fruit of their research in accessible language to non-specialists for a wider and better understanding; for Jain teachers and practitioners to demonstrate the intellectual and religious values of Jainism as a fully fledged world religion to the wider world for what they are. Zydenbos exemplifies what he advocates through this highly accessible book. It is hoped that it reaches a wide audience both in India and beyond and stimulate further interest in Jainism.

*Wolfson College
Oxford*

Tomoyuki KONO

J. Ouseparampil, *Bhartrhari's Vākyapadīya Kanda-1*, Pune: published by the author, 274 Pp. Rs. 400 (US\$ 15). (Hardback)

The book under review is presented by J. Ouseparampil after his long research on the *Vākyapadīya* and articulated freely through translations, notes, remarks and explanations of the main issues. The text Brahmakaṇḍa is presented there in a coherent style. He has presented the text correctly with a new interpretation altogether as he claims in Preface. The present author is bold enough to criticize

and comment on the earlier authors on the *Vākyapadīya*. He says that there are authors who have claimed that it is very difficult to study Bhartṛhari. Here the present author very boldly says: “Such authors are completely ignorant of what a text is. Again it is contended, Bhartṛhari belongs to the Advaita tradition (who said that Bhathhari is an Advaitin) and hence to understand Advaita we have to learn Saṃkara, Rāmānuja and others as well as their commentators. Finally we will not be able to learn Bhathhari, because practically we have to master all the Indian literature before we start learning him. They make the study of the text a vicious circle”. (p. 23)

Here, the author is very bold and examines these authors from his own interpretations. He says that, “issues may be the same in other texts but perspectives are different in different texts”. (p. 23) It is true but as I know in Indian tradition of sentence analysis, the views of earlier authors must be quoted, referred, discussed and interpreted. It is a discussion or presentation in totality. Unless one author be he a Grammarian, a Naiyāyika or a Mimāṃsaka, it is impossible to argue in favour or against one issue without referring to the previous theories and arguments of those theories. This exactly has happened in the case of Bhartṛhari. As a matter of fact, he points out that the issues and perspectives are missing in their works i.e. the commentators on the *Vākyapadīya* and of Subramania Iyer, and Ousearampil has raised those in the present book. To me, this needs further research and also a perspective of understanding the tradition of language analysis in totality.

As the author claims: “Bhartṛhari is not one who takes a concept from here and another from there and makes a theory of language which is a mixture of all the concepts borrowed. He has a system of thought and in that system the meaning of a word will be different from what it has in another system. Concepts are to be understood in the particular system. The *Vākyapadīya* is not a *khichdi* (mixture) of Indian systems.” (p. 50) Well no sensible scholar would claim to be such working on Bhartṛhari. Bhartṛhari never made such a collection of thoughts of Indian systems on philosophy of language, but as his *purvapaksa*, he would refer certainly to those views.

The present author has rightly said that he has consulted the translations of K.A. Subramaniya Iyer and K. Raghavan Pillai and further says that “Both of them did not follow the issues under discussion and did not present the text. Therefore, I have in most cases changed the translation in the light of my understanding. My translation is neither literal nor free but it is intelligible and authentic.” (p. 46) It is true that, the author seems to be truly spirited since he has engaged in this work quite a long period of time. This is the outcome of his long and hardworking research. His above view is put into scrutiny and those working again in this field will accept or reject his thesis as he frequently claims almost in every page.

The author has divided the text into four parts as follows: (i) Experience of language (I.1-43), (ii) Theory of language (I.44-117), (iii) Practice of language (I.118-146), and (iv) Theory of error (I.147-155). He has put forth his arguments of the text as coherently and meaningfully as far as possible without interference

from other texts or ones own preconcieved notions. The present author claims that he has given a new interpretation of the *Vākyapadīya*. The newness in all his aspects is well given by him. He claims that he has succeeded in bringing out two important aspects i.e. issues and interconnection. He has sufficiently given justification what he is going to do and what methodology he has followed as an independent one.

He has given some points why Bhartṛhari was not studied for a long time — “without understanding these functional differences and without even mentioning the issues under consideration in the *Vākyapadīya* all the studies are done. Then it is easy to say what has been said above as the reasons for not studying”. (p. 79) Here it seems that the author finds out some reason why Bhartṛhari is not studied properly. This opinion is one sided and needs some more explanations from the author.

The author has given 37 points under some subtitle crucial points followed in the study where he articulates his design for his study on the *Vākyapadīya* and points out how he differs from other predecessors on this book. This is the novelty in this book and scholars will appreciate such an attempt. Here, he agrees that Bhartṛhari is a monist but different from others, which he questioned earlier (p. 22). Here he agrees with the view of Gaurinath Sastri (p. 33), as it is seen in most of the cases. The author is more subjective than becoming objective in his approach.

Another specific feature of the book is that he has often compared Bhartṛhari with Kant, Frege, Russel, Wittgenstein, and Moore in Appendix 1 (p. 245) and how we can interact with the Western thought. This is no doubt praise worthy and novelty in the book. The author needs appreciation for that. He has raised specific issues and compared with other Western philosophers e.g. Bhartṛhari and Wittgenstein (p. 242) in Appendix 2. The main issues are also discussed here in a comparative manner. This enhances the beauty of such a beautiful text on the aspects of the philosophy of Language. For this I congratulate the author. These two Appendices open up new vistas for the study on Bhartṛhari not only for Indian scholars but for the Westerners too. This is a sort of challenge as he puts forth in this book.

The reactions and comments will show the perspectives of study on Bhartṛhari’s philosophy of language. The book contains a bibliography and two indices, viz. Index of *karikas* and Index of words, which will help scholars for easy reference. The book is neatly printed. Above all, this is a welcome addition in the field of the study of philosophy of Language. Let there be many such additions on further chapters on the *Vākyapadīya* by the present author.

Utkal University
Bhubaneswar

Subash Chandra DASH
