

(JAOS 124.1, 2004, pp. 181-182). Book ends with Index locorum (pp. 248-254) and a Bibliography (pp. 255-270).

I shall add only some of my observations because the length of the review has its limits. The author did not pay attention to the development of Tamil language nor to the difference between the language of Caṅkam and that of Bhakti poetry. One is Old Tamil, the other is Middle Tamil but there would be no linguistic difference between them in case that both literatures belonged approximately to the ninth century. Caṅkam literature hardly shows any knowledge of Hindu gods while Bhakti poetry is imbued with love towards Śiva and Viṣṇu. Aesthetic feelings in Caṅkam differ from those found in Kāvya despite some common conventions which might have had the sources in the folk literary substratum found in the floating literature of Deccan. The poetical atmosphere is different, there is no elaborate concept of *tiṅaiturai* to be found in Kāvya. Tieken mentions the *Tolkāppiyam* and the *Cilappatikāram*, but he is not concerned with dating those works as well as the *Maṇimēkalai* or the *Tirukkuraḷ*. And when did Kampan's write his *Irāmāvatāram* or Tamil *Rāmāyaṇa*? If Caṅkam belongs to the ninth century how to date other Dravidian literatures? Tieken is more concerned with Puṛam than with Akam which is much more present in Caṅkam. When he says that *muktaka* is of Tamil origin how can he date Caṅkam so late? Preserved Sanskrit *muktakas* of Bhartṛhari and Amaru are in no way comparable to poems of Caṅkam. So how could Sanskrit Kāvya have made such a substantial influence on old Tamil literature? I see no argument for Sanskrit and Prākṛit literature being models for Tamil poetry. There was no Nāṭya in old Tamil literature and Puṛam in many ways differs from Mahākāvya. Bhakti poetry was *per definitionem* a religious poetry while Sanskrit Kāvya literature belonged to the realm of profane literature ...

Though in my opinion this book suffers from a basic methodological flaw i.e. preconceived theory which does not take obvious facts into consideration, the book is worth reading. It brings many interesting data, insights and through its provocativeness can impel the reader to further study of the rich and stimulating Old Tamil literature.

University of Zagreb
Croatia

Klara Gönc MOAČANIN

Anna-Pya Sjödin, *The Happening of Tradition: Vallabha on Anumāna in Nyāya-tīlavati*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: South Asian Studies 1, Uppsala: Uppsala University, Interfaculty Units, 2006, 195 Pp. US\$ 55. (Paperback)

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (or Navyanyāya) scholars who flourished from the twelfth century to the fourteenth century have enjoyed minimal attention from modern researchers who aim to draw out the history of this school. One of the main

reasons for this seems that they have often been viewed as merely existing in the shadows of two major thinkers, that is, Udayana and Gaṅgeśa. Some research has been done to trace the ridge between these two high mountains, especially in terms of the question regarding at which place the transition from the old (*practīna*) Nyāya school to the new (*navya*) school is to be located. However, Sjödin's work is one of the few which focuses on a *specific* scholar or work of this period.

Sjödin shines a spotlight on Vallabha, a Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika/Navyanyāya scholar who, typically, lived in this "shadow" period. Primarily dealing with the *anumāna* chapter of Vallabha's *Nyāyalīlāvati*, she makes Vallabha's thought clear, especially regarding the epistemological aspect of inference. The work consists of the transliterated Sanskrit text, its translation and analysis, which follow an introductory explanation of her methodology. The *anumāna* chapter of the *Nyāyalīlāvati* is of small size, and thus, the work of translation itself is also comparatively small. And, as the author herself notes, the text used for the translation is not critically edited with manuscripts. These features may disappoint some researchers, especially those who expect a strict philological achievement. However, I am convinced that the ultimate contribution of this book is remarkable, as it offers several aspects that philological works, theoretically, cannot.

Sjödin divides the text into four sections, i.e., *anumāna*, *vyāpti*, *tarka*, *parāmarśa*, the last three of which are, in her opinion, arranged by Vallabha according to the process of inferential knowledge itself. She investigates each section, with breadth and depth, referring often to relevant supporting texts and secondary sources. Her investigation makes the whole structure of *anumāna*, as described by Vallabha, clear, and it must be noted that this book is, as mentioned above, almost the first work that deals with a specific scholar or text of this period.

As detailed as Sjödin's investigation of Vallabha's *anumāna* theory is, she explicitly states that she does not intend to lead to any conclusions regarding the historical location of Vallabha or his *Nyāyalīlāvati* nor to provide any philosophical evaluation of it. This is based on her principle regarding research of Indian philosophy, which is revealed in the introduction and throughout her work.

When Sjödin faces a Sanskrit text as her object of research, she is very aware of her own standpoint as an agent of research. she declares, before presenting her translation, that "all translation is interpretation" referring to Gadamer's hermeneutical statement. Against the background of this assertion, she sees a trend in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika/Navyanyāya research history, in which, according to her, researchers have been apt to judge or evaluate Indian philosophy from "American/European" philosophical discourse. Sjödin quotes statements of some researchers, where they subconsciously put Indian logic into subaltern status through interpretation using the terms or points of view of hegemonic (American/European) discourse, and eventually she concludes that "mimetic translation" has been the cause of the limitations of previous research.

Sjödin also implies her concern about the present academic situation in which the word "school" or "tradition" is apt to be uncritically used among

researchers, especially those who are committed to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika or Navyanyāya. Researchers who unreflectively use these terms run the risk of conveying the assumption that there were indeed some static and essential groups or streams which correspond to the modern usage of the terms. Referring to some scholars who expressed their awareness of this problem as the exception, she eventually declares her standpoint on this matter, which is one of her main concerns in this book. As she says:

The interest of this study is ... to read the text from the point of view that tradition is an open-ended dynamic non-essentializable process that could be understood as negotiated and constituted in one single, particular text, and in relation to other particular texts. (pp. 28-29)

From this perspective, Sjödin, throughout the work, tries to make clear the “tradition” of the *anumāna* theory of the *Nyāyatīlāvati* not by carving out its shape in terms of western discourse, but by constructing its appearance through locating short but plural threads which may be connected with surrounding texts. Deconstructing the dogmatic idea that a noun (i.e., the word “school” or “tradition”) should have a specific and static entity to which it corresponds, she views objects (i.e., Vallabha’s *anumāna* theory) as essentially dynamic, drawing out their relationships with other things and avoiding the imposition of prejudiced notions. In this sense, her standpoint as a research agent may, as it were, be called anti-Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika although her research object is a Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika text.

Her perspective penetrates her whole work and its thoroughness is worthy of praise. Even after modern achievement in historical science, the idea that there were “schools” or “traditions” or “developments of thought” still seems to exist behind researchers’ actions when drawing lines from one text to another. With the clear illustration of her methodology and its thorough application to the reading of texts, Sjödin succeeds in making researchers confirm the importance of their own self-awareness as *interpreters*.

Under the present situation of dramatic change, as more Asian civilizations re-strengthen their presence, new perspectives on non-European/American discourse will be required. In this sense, Sjödin’s pioneering work, even if it is in a preliminary stage, should be carefully read by all researchers: not only those who are committed to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika/Navyanyāya research but also those who work on Indian thought in general.

* For a more detailed discussion of the book, see my earlier review submitted to *Philosophy East and West*, which is scheduled for publication in vol. 59, no. 3, 2009.

Nagoya University

Takanori SUZUKI
