



समीक्षा

***Bharṭṛhari* Language Thought and Reality**

Bharṭṛhari Language Thought and Reality, Proceedings of the International Seminar Delhi, December 12-14, 2003, Edited by Mithilesh Chaturvedi, Motilal Banarasidas Publishers Private Limited, Delhi, 2009. ISBN: 978-81-208-3399-9. pp. xxxii+615

“This volume is an outcome of the international seminar on *Bharṭṛhari: Language, Thought and Reality* held in New Delhi in December 12-14 2003 as a part of the centenary celebrations of Motilal Banarasidas”.(p.xxv) This statement in the ‘Editor’s Introduction’ makes it clear that this is a volume containing proceedings of a seminar, thereby giving a clue of it being a collection of papers devoted to several themes pertaining to various fields like Philology, Linguistics and Philosophy of Language related to *Bharṭṛhari* studies for last so many years.

A thematic arrangement of papers is possible for us to make. Although nothing more significant can be said about some of the papers of philological nature discussing- a) meanings of certain words appearing in the text of the *Vākyapadīya* as well as *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, b) historical reconstruction of arguments related to ideas stated by *Bharṭṛhari* and other post *Bharṭṛhari* texts, much can still be said about papers pertaining to various philosophical issues discussed by *Bharṭṛhari*. Indeed, there are seeds for future discussions on many such issues as found in articles in this volume, it needs hardly to be stated that the purpose of this volume and the seminar, of whose, this volume is an outcome, is indeed successful, namely, to keep the serious interest in *Bharṭṛhari* flourishing and possibly paves way for the next International Conference on *Bharṭṛhari*.

Aklujkar and Bronkhorst, investigate in their respective articles relation of Veda and *Bharṭṛhari*. Aklujkar points out that-“I have put forward evidence and reasoning to the effect that in authors like BH, who were well-versed in the Veda, the acceptance of the Veda could have been a consciously adopted and logi-

cally justified fiction that co-existed with a believer's reverence..."(p.53) (incidentally, this conclusion is not entirely captured in the "Editor's Introduction (p.xxxvi)). This conclusion becomes more highlighted when looked at in the light of the Marathi story, whose gist, Aklujkar, rightly reproduces. Wonderful reproduction and use of a classic Marathi story, indeed! Bronkhorst in his usual clinical way sifts the evidence available and concludes that "The very fact that *Bharṭhari* writes explicitly as a *Mānava-Maitrāyṇīya*... further supports the view that the *Mānava-Maitrāyṇīya* tradition was for him much more important than the other Upanishads".

Bharṭharian thought is characterized as 'perspectivism'. Cardona brings out a new dimension to this approach. He concludes while discussing VP 2.489 that "...to gain mature intellectual skill one must pay due attention to all the traditions of learning but that one should do this in order to be prepared to defend one's own tradition with a knowledge of what others have to say".(p.160) Indeed, "He (*Bharṭhari*) did innovate and present matters in new ways, but he is always a *vaiyākaraṇa* and a *Pāṇinīya*"(p.160).

Madhav Deshpande revisits the changing notion of *śiṣṭas* in *Bharṭhari* and points out the historical context that could have caused the shift.

Some papers in the collection deal with the interrelation of *Bharṭhari* and other schools of thought of Indian Philosophy. Filliozat shows how *Bharṭhari's* concept of time has influenced *śaiva siddhānta* philosophy. Ivanov states that *Bharṭhari's* position seems close not to *Advaita Vedānta* but to *Kashmir śaivism*. Rastogi, Torella and Radicchi also have conclusions which show similarity with the above statement. Houben points out how *Bharṭhari* is perceived by *Mallavādin* and how *Mallavādin's* works could be crucial in understanding *Bharṭhari* better.

Ogawa in an important article attempts to provide with a definition of *śakti* using several terms like *dharma* and *dharmin* etc. He concludes that- "we may say that *Bharṭhari's* arguments about the power is marked by his description of it through the introduction of the idea of service (*upakāra*)" (p.249). We may have to check whether the meaning 'service' as Ogawa takes it, applies in all the occurrences of the word *śakti* in VP.

Gillon in another important article points out that the *Bharṭṛhari's* rule (VP.3.7.81-82) about the expression of subject in Gerund constructions in Sanskrit rules out undesired sentences. Some basic assumptions in this paper and the ruling out of '12.2' are not entirely free from difference of opinion.

Kudo discusses the term 'vākyabheda' and concludes that in VP it does not mean the same thing as is meant in the context of Mīmāṃsā.

There are papers of Mukhopadhyay, Pradhan and Chakravarti who critically evaluate *Bharṭṛharian* thought from Philosophical view point. Also Patnaik, Tripathi, Chaturvedi and Das analyse *Bharṭṛharian* thought from the philosophical point of view.

Apart from Philology and Philosophy and language which are the home-grounds of *Bharṭṛhari*, the scholars are interested in studying *Bharṭṛhari* from the other angles namely Cognitive Philosophy and this is reflected in one of the two papers of Houben. He concludes (p.539): "Modern cognitive linguists and construction grammarians, on their part, may find to their surprise an extensive amount of investigations in *Bharṭṛhari's* work and in the *Bharṭṛharian* way of Paninian grammar that directly pertain to basic issues in their research program. A rapprochement between *Bharṭṛhari* studies and cognitive linguistics is therefore expected to be most fruitful and stimulating for both parties". Very well put. The problem that we see, however, in this approach is methodological. The fact remains that a researcher has to walk on a very thin rope to not to lose the sight of the philological base on the one hand and explain the meanings of certain statements of *Bharṭṛhari* and argue that they stand better explained when seen in the light of modern cognitive linguist on the other. This aspect needs to be concentrated upon in future.

Although, almost all the parts of *Vākyapadīya* seemed to be touched upon by many articles in this volume, some very important parts of *Vākyapadīya* are not at all touched in this volume, most important being the Concept of *Vṛtti* for which *Bharṭṛhari* devotes a largest section in the third book (and which has been studied earlier by the editor of this volume).

Yves Ramseier comes back to life after a long period in the form of an updated version of Bibliography of *Bhartṛhari* at the end of the volume. He, however, does not mention the website where the online version of his bibliography is available. Even though anitya, it may still be useful for those who live an anitya life.

Dr. Malhar Kulkarni,

Associate Professor,
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Indian Institute of Technology, Powai,
Mumbai-400076.
malharku@gmail.com