

and briefly pointing out some implications the verse has, and in his *vivṛti* Utpaladeva develops themes hinted at the verse and gives multiple interpretations of the same verse, the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* is a word-for-word commentary and is devoted to presenting the doctrine of the Pratyabhijñā by analyzing the words used in the verse". Still this answer may not be satisfactory. For, it is also possible that, in the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī*, Abhinavagupta echoed or summarized what Utpaladeva had originally intended in his commentaries, or what he had mentioned plainly in his *vivṛti* which is almost lost. Even if the *vivṛti* is almost lost, we should try to distinguish the original idea of Utpaladeva and what Abhinavagupta developed. As a consequence, we can make clear the contribution that they made to the Pratyabhijñā as well as to the history of Indian Philosophy, and evaluate the Pratyabhijñā works.

This doxographic book, which is written by a specialist of the Pratyabhijñā, will give readers not only a proper appreciation of the philosophical tradition of India but also that of the doctrine of Pratyabhijñā, both because of the condensed summary in which the results of latest research are reflected and because of a mass of valuable information on the doctrine of the Pratyabhijñā.

Here is a list of errata: p. 14,31: (*vimarśinī*) > (*vivṛtivismarśinī*), p. 50,3: "because it is endowed-with-fire" > "because it is endowed-with-smoke", p. 61,2: *bhāvarupam* > *bhāvarūpam*, p. 82,3: Sāṃkhya.<sup>43</sup> > Sāṃkhya.<sup>3</sup>, p. 154,23: p. 151,1: Āsaṅga > Asaṅga, p. 170,28: the mens of valid knowledge > the means of valid knowledge, p. 246,8: *Sarvadārśanasamgraha* > *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*,

Reference:

Torella, Raffaele. 1979. "Due capitoli del *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*: Śaivadarśana e Pratyabhijñādarśana", *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 53(3/4): 361-410.

Japan Society for the Promotion of Science  
at Kyoto University

Yohei KAWAJIRI

\*\*\*\*\*

George Cardona, Ashok Aklujkar, and Hideyo Ogawa (eds.), *Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference: Studies in Sanskrit Grammars*, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2012, xii + 417 Pp. Rs. 995. (Hardback)

1. This work contains 16 articles pertaining to Sanskrit grammars. The plural 'grammars' indicates two more grammatical systems other than Pāṇini's one (though somehow related to Pāṇini): the *Śabdajyotsnā* and the *Līlātilakam*. Originally these are the papers presented at the *vyākaraṇa* section of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference held in Kyoto, Japan in September 2009.
2. Out of sixteen articles, three deal with one single concept / term viz., *pratyāṅga* (by Ashok Aklujkar, pp. 1-86), *vibhakti* (by Ram Karan Sharma, pp.

351-358), 'eke' (by Jaehyung Yi pp. 379-398). Four articles deal with the study of the particular technique of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, viz., Pāṇinian Feature (by Émilie Aussant, pp. 87-102), *asiddha* (by George Cardona, pp. 123-162), *Utsarga-apavāda* (by Peter M. Scharf, pp. 319-350), *adhikāra* (by Kalindi Shukla, pp. 371-378). Two articles focus on particular portion from the text. viz. A1.1.45 (by Hideyo Ogawa, pp. 289-318) and *suT*-insertion rules (by Boris A. Zakharyin, pp. 399-417). Two articles have historical and comparative viewpoint in their treatment to the topics. viz., *Prakriyā* grammars (by Maria Piera Candotti, pp. 103-122), Sancto Bartholomaeo and Sanskrit grammar (by Carmela Mastrangelo, pp. 259-270).

There are four articles which respectively deal with different system of Sanskrit grammar (by Shri Krishan Sharma, pp. 359-370), the *Gaṇapāṭha* from view point of textual criticism (by Malhar Kulkarni, pp. 213-258), extended application of Pāṇinian concept *abhihita* (by Akshar Bharati and Amba Kulkarni, pp. 195-212), contribution of later Grammarian (by Jan E.M. Houben, pp. 163-194), and extended application of the term *vyākaraṇa* (by Biliana Müller, pp. 271-288).

3. Setting an example for an editorial perfection, the book sheds light on several issues of Sanskrit grammar. In his elaborate article Aklujkar has checked all the occurrences of the term *pratyāṅga* in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and post Patañjali literature. He has arrived at a conclusion that *pratyāṅga* as a noun is different than *pratyāṅga* as an *avyayībhāva*. Patañjali has used the term as a noun. Even *pratyāṅga* as a noun shows development in its meaning. In the later literature the noun stands for 'every limb' or 'all limbs'. The article is encyclopedic as well as critical study of the term '*pratyāṅga*'. Aklujkar has also observed that the dictionaries and indices available at present contain some errors in their *pratyāṅga* listing. (p. 56).

In the compact article on the term *vibhakti* Sharma has considered several aspects of the use of this term. While considering the jurisdiction of the term *vibhakti*, he states on the basis of P.7.2.84 *aṣṭana ā vibhaktau*, that the term *vibhakti*, refers to a single ending, though it signifies triad (cf., P.1.4.104 *vibhaktiś ca*). I would like to propose a suggestion in this regard. Pāṇini has used *dvandva* compound as one of the techniques.<sup>1</sup> Through *dvandva* he implies disjunctive application of the each of the components to the *vidheya* (cf., P.1.2.46 *kṛttaddhitasamāsāś ca*. Each one is related to the term *prātipadikam* separately). On the contrary in non-*dvandva* construction the *vidheya* is related to all the items conjunctively (cf., P.1.2.45 *arthavadadhātur apratyayah prātipadikam*. All words are conjunctively related to the *vidheya*, *prātipadikam*).

In his article Yi has discussed the opinions of other scholars about the significance of the term 'eke' in *eke pracakṣate* in VP 3.9.1. To determine the meaning of 'eke' he has analyzed the entire Kālasamuddeśa in detail and taking the help of the commentaries thereon Yi establishes that the VP *kārikā* 3.9.1 propounds time as a substance, as an opinion of *eke* (*eke pracakṣate*). The analysis of the Kālasamuddeśa shows that the text deals with time on the assumption of time division. Thus the import of the *kārikā* and the matter that

follows it are in agreement with each other. Hence Yi holds that in the VP *kārikā* 3.9.1, Bhartṛhari has advanced his own view.

I would like to point out in this regard that the Sanskrit authors use the terms *apare*, *kecit*, and *eke* to mention different opinion. In fact in the *Vākyapadīya* we feel that Bhartṛhari is fond of compiling other opinions regarding the issue under consideration. While doing so he has used such terms. Normally the author refers to such opinions with these terms, which he neither refutes strongly, but he does not accept them sincerely.

Aussant has analyzed the *Līlātilakam* (A treatise of 14th century from Keral) and showed that the Pāṇinian technique is extensively used by the author to describe morphological and phonological characteristics of the *Maṇipravāla*. The *Maṇipravāla* is a peculiar mixture of 'keral *bhāṣā*' and Sanskrit. The style adopted is the *sūtra*-style. According to Aussant, the Sanskrit descriptive model could account for the *Maṇipravāla* due to its being hyper sanskritized variety. Referring to Freeman (1998: 41), she proposes that this hybridization of regional language with Sanskrit was authorized, regulated and claimed as a part of struggle against hegemony of the Pāṇḍya literary tradition. I sincerely maintain that this statement having historical bearing does need some explanation on the background of present topic.

With the elaborate treatment to P.8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*, Cardona argues that some rules of the *tripādī* section are not suspended with respect to preceding rule. This unsuspended status of the *sūtra*-s is known by implication. He doesn't accept the rearrangement of the *sūtra*-s to account for unsuspended status of these *sūtra*-s, rather he strongly accepts the traditional arrangement of the rules.

In his article "Rule selection in the Aṣṭādhyāyī", Scharf has pointed out four different principles to attempt rule precedence. He further states that while these principles appear to solve all of the cases considered, none of them by itself solved all of the cases. (p. 349). I would like to mention in this regard as follows. Two issues are involved in the case of *vipratīṣedha*. a) Precedence of either of the rules. b) Ordering of both of the rules. The type of *vipratīṣedha*, the type of rules involved (*sāvakāśa*, *niravakāśa* etc.) and the mutual relationship of the rules determine whether it is a case of precedence of either or the ordering, which further solves the conflict. He suggests that for the full examination of the problem a computational modeling of Pāṇini's grammar is required, hence he with his colleagues is working to develop the same, for which he deserves our congratulations.

After describing the technique of *adhikāra* and comparing with 'prāya' of Rgvedaprātīśākhya, Shukla draws the conclusion that it is the concept *prāya* of Rgvedaprātīśākhya, that motivated Pāṇini to device the *adhikāra* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Ogawa's article 'Bhartṛhari on A.1.1.45' is a very good example of integrated study of two pieces of the commentaries on two different texts. The issue dealt with in both places is *vākyasamjñā* view. The author of the article has concluded that Bhartṛhari's *vākyasamjñā*-view is in accordance with tradition.

Zakharyin starts his article with the problem about the grammatical identity of the form *samaskurvata* (*Taittirīya-samhitā* 6.2.3.1). He proposes that possible

way for solving the problem may be the assumption that in course of the evolution of Ancient Indo-Aryan, the initially different verbal roots *kr-* and *\*skr-* have later got merged (p. 411- 412). The *suT* insertion provision by Pāṇini (P.6.1.143–157) shows his linguistic intuition to deal with this unusual phenomena. In her article, Candotti has tried to discover the unknown links of affiliation in the *Prakriyā* grammars on the basis of the examples dealt with by those texts. However I would like to put my sincere query about the plural in the title phrase “First *prakriyā* Grammars”.

Mastrangelo gives very interesting account of the history of the studies on Sanskrit grammar in West. In this article she has introduced Paulinus’ Sanskrit grammars. – *Siddharūbam seu grammatical Samscrdamica* published in 1790 and *Vyākaraṇa seu locupletissima Samscrdamicae linguae institutio* published in 1804. These grammars refer to original grammar Siddharūbam, and the textual sources used for are from Pāṇinian tradition. Mastrangelo further points out that these grammars are proof of a local pronunciation of Sanskrit, influenced by Dravidian languages in the phonology (p. 267).

Sharma’s article on the *Śabdajyotsnā* introduces this grammar from all possible view points. This grammar is composed in 1945 A.D. by Pt. Bhiksharama of Kurukshetra. M. Kulkarni’s article is very exhaustive study of *rājadantādi gaṇa*, shedding light on the possible sources of this *gaṇa* and its development. His study is based on the manuscripts. He arrives at the conclusion that the source text of all manuscripts can certainly be shown to be pre-*Padamañjarī*. A. Kulkarni has examined a concept of subject in English grammar from Pāṇinian view point. Houben has pointed out Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa’s (1580-1650) special contribution towards Vedic grammar, through his interpretation and comments on P.1.1.13 and P.7.1.39.

Müller has attempted a morphological analysis of the language of hand gestures in Indian dancing. She has also considered a probable reason why the word *vyākaraṇa* was not used to denote the grammar of body language in Indian dance. The reason she has proposed is the etymological meaning of the term.

4. The articles collected in this book present all sided study of the topic under consideration. In a way it is a pathway to new researchers.

Note 1: Pataskar Bhagyalata, “Some observations about the compound structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī” *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 77(1-4), 1996 (ed. by R.N. Dandekar and S.D. Laddu, 1997), pp. 121-131.

Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala  
Pune

Bhagyalata PATASKAR

\*\*\*\*\*