

Chikafumi Watanabe, Michele Desmarais and Yoshichika Honda (eds.),
*Saṃskṛta-sādhutā, Goodness of Sanskrit, Studies in Honour of Professor
 Ashok N. Aklujkar*, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld (P) Ltd., 2012, xxiv + 591
 Pp. Rs. 1,800. (Hardback)

Saṃskṛta-sādhutā is a very fitting tribute to the versatile scholarship of Dr. Ashok Aklujkar, a leading Indologist with a unique blend of traditional Indian erudition and western perception. A massive volume extending over 590 pages, this Festschrift contains 33 articles by eminent scholars on various topics belonging to various disciplines. A cursory glance at the table of contents shows the area of Pāṇinian grammatical tradition as the first choice, whereas semantics appears at the second place. A subject like sentence meaning and an author like Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita have been attended to by more than one scholar. A few scholars (D. ACHARYA, T. WADA and C. WATANABE) have contributed by translating into English, perhaps for the first time, parts of some important texts in Sanskrit, while one scholar (Y. KAWAJIRI) has opted for a sample critical edition of Buddhist Sanskrit text. It must be made clear at the outset that it is not possible to discuss the contents of all the articles in this volume within the given space. I have, therefore, chosen some of them to offer flavor of this delicious feast.

In their essay “Ideology and Language Identity: a Buddhist Perspective”, S. BAHULKAR and L. DEOKAR have demonstrated how Buddhist ideology plays an important role in asserting identity. However, the remark that the use of incorrect Sanskrit by the Tantric masters was due not to their inability but to their intention to revolt against adherence to purity of language needs substantiation. Two essays by J. BRONKHORST (“Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and the Revival of the Philosophy and Grammar”) and M. DESHPANDE (“Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s Perceptions of Intellectual History: Narrative of Fall and Recovery of the Grammatical Authority”) provide a glimpse into the newly emerging approach initiated by Sheldon Pollock, to traditional Indian knowledge systems with a historical perspective. While BRONKHORST addresses the question to what extent Kaunḍabhaṭṭa can be regarded as a faithful interpreter of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, DESHPANDE provides a room for canons of literary criticism applied to dry grammatical texts, leading to the suggested meaning (*dhvani*) such as, for example, Bhaṭṭoji “views himself to be at the top of his field, a high profile scholar ...” (p. 175). Both these scholars, it appears, have followed the methodology of reading (too much?) between the lines for details on interpersonal conflicts, love and hate etc. It cannot be gainsaid that this approach to reconstruct intellectual history of the Indian knowledge tradition has provided a new research model for emerging generations of Indologists and has made the whole enterprise of Indological research all the more interesting because of its human, emotional touch. However, a note of caution for young researchers: This model deserves to be pursued only by veterans, or by those who have a good grounding in such texts. It is not a substitute for traditional philological approach; the latter is, rather, its prerequisite. M. CANDOTI in her article “The Role and Import of the Metalinguistic Chapters in the new Pāṇinian Grammar” presents a sincere attempt to search for the principles behind reordering of the Pāṇinian rules in the

later prakriyā works. Can we really set up patterns of reordering? Her article demonstrates that the attempt is a failure. She rightly concludes, “Grammar, therefore, generates not only the forms of the language but also, by the usage of some routines, its own metalanguage” (p. 98). M. DEOKAR has, in his essay, “Some Probable Sources of the Pali Grammarians with special reference to Aggavaṃsa” has shown with ample illustrations that the commentaries on Kātantra are the more likely sources of the Pali grammars than those which belong to Pāṇinian tradition. In his essay “Abstraction (*apoddhāra*) Theory and a Sentence Meaning: A Study of the *Vṛtti* on VP.2.39”, H. OGAWA addresses the question: Are the words in a sentence abstracted or independent meaningful units according to Bhartṛhari? He rightly concludes, after comparing the *Tikā* of Puṇyarāja and the *Vṛtti* on the verse 2.39 of the Vākyapadīya that the abstraction theory holds true also of words and that Puṇyarāja misses the point. T. FUJII approaches, on the other hand, the issue of sentence meaning from Mīmāṃsā point of view in his article, “Sentence Meaning as a Causal Process” and shows how sentence meaning is established by Kumārila as the relationship between bhāvanā and its three requirements, namely *sādhya*, *sādhana* and *itikartavyatā*. Another scholar to deal with Kumārila on a different issue is K. YOSHIMIZU. In his long essay, “Tradition and Reflection in Kumārila’s Last Stand against the Grammarians’ Theories of Verbal Denotation”, he observes that Kumārila’s apparent acceptance of the grammarians’ stand, namely, that the suffix is the principal, is a deliberate attempt on his part to depict himself as a scholar well-versed in Pāṇini’s grammar. This needs to be critically examined.

In her article “Some Observations on Buddhism and Lexicography”, L. DEOKAR makes an interesting remark about Amarasimha, the author of the *Amarkośa*: “Amara had to play down his Buddhist identity in order to make his lexicon acceptable to all quarters of society” (p. 148). M. DESMARAI has, in his essay, “Close relations: Pandits, Pedagogy and Plasticity”, made an attempt to apply the findings from the cognitive neurosciences to the pedagogical techniques of traditional Indian Pandits. He is of the opinion that this pedagogical tradition “capitalized in the healthiest possible way on the natural abilities of human brain, mind and body to change and to learn” (p. 211). He recommends application of some of these techniques to systems of education around the world. P. OLIVELLE warns students of Dharmasāstra to take a cautious stance while using these texts as a source of history. For he shows in his essay, “The Implicit Audience of Legal Texts in Ancient India” that the implied audience of the Dharmasāstra texts during and after Gupta period was not the common population of India but a thin elite slice of population. E. GEROW illustrates with the Bengal Vaiṣṇava Aesthetics how Alamkāraśāstra followed other śāstras in settling down as Mokṣaśāstra. S. POLLOCK’s excellent exposition of post-Abhinava development of Rasa concept shows, perhaps for the first time, that it was Bhānudatta, a 16th Century Sanskrit poet and a literary theorist, and not Abhinava, who influenced the development of Rasa theory from pre-modern period onwards not only in Sanskrit but also in vernacular tradition. Finally, S. SARMA draws, with the help of tools like emendation and his insight into the science of mathematics a poetic picture of an “Avid Mathematician and the Spurned Wife” based on a verse from

Dhammillahiṇḍī, a part of the well known Prakrit narrative Vasudevanhiṇḍī.

And there are many other essays by learned scholars, namely, K. ARJUNWADKAR, G. CARDONA, R. DAS, B. GILLON, P. GRANOFF, P. HAAG, K. HIRANO, J. HOUBEN, K. KANO, K. KEI, A. SHARMA, G. SPARHAM, R. TORELLA, T. UNEBE and V. VERGIANI, which give a reader new insight. The volume represents, in short, recent trends in research from translating and critically editing important Sanskrit texts to peeping into the author's workshop, to reconstructing social, cultural and more importantly, intellectual history of India.

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Pune

Saroja BHATE

James Benson (ed. and trans.), *Mīmāṃsānyāyasaṃgraha: A Compendium of the Principles of Mīmāṃsā*, Ethno-Indology: Heidelberg Studies in South Asian Rituals 5, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010, 905 Pp. € 148. (Hardback)

This volume contains a text edition of the *Mīmāṃsānyāyasaṃgraha* of Mahādeva Vedāntin together with an introduction, annotated translation, a separate summary of all twelve chapters, and of course, many indices and a good bibliography. The text edition is prepared for the first time from one complete, two almost complete, and two incomplete manuscripts. In the notes to the edition, Benson has recorded all, nearly one thousand, citations coming mainly from Vedic texts. Many of them he has identified, and whenever necessary has commented on their readings. In the introduction the editor has first presented a brief and apt account of the Mīmāṃsā system in order to provide a general background to the text he has edited. This account is very useful to all those who want to have a brief but comprehensive sketch of the system. He has also dwelt on important issues like the aim and procedures of Mīmāṃsā. The translation is lucid and clear, and comes with many notes referring to standard works on Vedic rituals which serves the purpose of a serious reader. This translation is all the more important because after Ganganath Jha's English translation of the Śābara Bhāṣya (1933-36) hardly any Mīmāṃsā text dealing with all its topics is fully translated. The translation is followed by a summary of all twelve chapters which facilitates the grasping of the theme of each chapter which runs through and binds all topics there. With all these merits, this book proves to be a praiseworthy contribution to the study of Mīmāṃsā and can serve as a good textbook for a comprehensive study of the whole system of Mīmāṃsā.

The *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* deal with more than nine hundred topics — nine hundred four according to the *Mīmāṃsānyāyasaṃgraha* — related to the analysis of Vedic rites and also the semantic analysis of Vedic sentences. From each of