

REVIEWS

The Sphoṭanirṇaya (Chapter XIV of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra) of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Critical Notes by S. D. JOSHI. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit. Class C, No. 2.), Pp. v, 243. Poona : University of Poona. 1967.

Sphoṭa has long been a fascinating subject to scholars and the bibliography on it is extensive; see D. S. Ruegg, *Contributions à l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne* (Paris, 1959) 123-5; J. F. Staal, *Philosophy East and West* 10.56-7 (1960). A brief but lucid presentation of the history of Indian thinking on the subject, including selections from the major discussions in the grammatical literature, has been a desideratum. DR. JOSHI has produced an informative work which goes a long way in meeting this need and which shows the results of thoughtful consideration of one of the more difficult subjects in the Indian grammatical traditions. The bulk of the work consists of the text of the 14th chapter of the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* (95-112) accompanied by a translation and extensive notes (113-230) and preceded by a long introduction (1-91). A preface (i-iii), a bibliography (231-5), and an index (237-43) complete the book. The subject matter is rich. In his Introduction alone, Joshi deals with Patañjali's views on *varṇa* (for which Joshi uses the term *phoneme*, though with a caveat; see p. 19, fn. 19), *sphoṭa* and *dhvani* (2-20); devotes considerable space to Bhartṛhari's views on *sphoṭa* and *dhvani* (20-55); considers the opinions of later grammarians (55-61), ritualists (62-70), and logicians (70-3); outlines the classifications of *sphoṭa* (73-91); and includes an overly brief discussion of Indian views on semantics (86 ff.).

Joshi's treatment of these subjects is worthy of extensive discussion. In the space of a short review I can do little more than touch on aspects of his Introduction which I think are of general interest, hoping my discussion will stimulate others to read the book with the careful attention it deserves.

It will be useful to give a *survey*, starting with the grammarians' views on *śabda*. As is well known, Patañjali (*Mahābhāṣya* I.1.10-11 [ed. Kielhorn]) says of *śabda* that it is that by means of which, when articulated (revealed; *Pradīpa* I.7 [Rohatak ed.]: *prakāśitena*), the understanding of a meaning arises: *yenōccāritena...sampratyayo bhavati* /¹ Two aspects of *śabda* are clearly distinguished: the abstract *śabda* and its concrete representation in articulated sounds. Only when there occurs an articulated instance of a *śabda*

¹ The discussion in *Bh.I* 1. 10-11 is specifically about the item *go* 'cow', and I have generalized the formulation in accord with the *Bhāṣya* on *vt.* 2 ad 1. 1. 63.

is a meaning conveyed ; for the meaning to be conveyed, the *śabda* must be perceived (*upalabdhi*) ; cf. vt. 2 ad 1.1.68 with *Bhāṣya* (I.173. 4-7). The communication situation can be viewed from two angles, that of the speaker and that of the hearer. From the speaker's viewpoint one says that the use of words results from the intention of the speaker to convey a meaning ; *Bh.* ad 2.3.50 (I.464.15-6 ; cf. *Bh.* ad 2.1.1 [I.362.17-21]) : *na hi śabdakṛtena nāmārthena bhavitavyam/ arthakṛtena nāma śabdena bhavitavyam* ; cf. *Pradīpa* ad 2.3.50 (II.822-3) : *arthasya pratipipādayiṣyā viśayīkaraṇākaraṇābhyāṃ śabdasyoccāraṇānuccāraṇalakṣaṇau bhāvābhāvāvityarthaḥ/* From the listener's point of view, one considers that the articulation of a given linguistic item results in the understanding of a certain meaning by the listener, while the absence of that item is correlated with the absence of that understanding, so that the particular meaning is ascribed to the item in question and the item is said to be the cause of understanding the meaning. This is the method of *anvaya* and *vyatireka*, dealt with by Joshi on pp. 5-6 ; see also Cardona, 'Anvaya and Vyatireka in Indian grammar' (appearing in the V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume) § § 3-3.3. These questions are dealt with also by Bhartṛhari. In *Vākyapadīya* (henceforth *VP*) 1.56ab (*viśayatvam anāpannair śabdairnārthaḥ prakāśyate*) he says that *śabdā*s which have not been grasped do not convey their meanings ; and *VP* 1.57ab (*ato'nirjñātārūpatvāt kimāhetyabhidhiyate*) is a direct reminiscence of the *Bhāṣya* on vt. 2 ad 1.1.68. In *VP* 1.44 (*dvāvupādānaśabdeṣu śabdau śabdavidō viduḥ/ eko nimittam śabdānāmaparo'rthe prayujyate*) Bhartṛhari distinguishes two aspects of meaningful items in the communication situation : the underlying cause (*nimitta*) of *śabdā*s and the immediate conveyors of meaning. Here again, as is clear from Harivṛṣabha's *Vṛtti* and Vṛṣabhadeva's *Paddhati*, there are the two viewpoints of the speaker and the hearer. From the speaker's point of view the *nimitta* is the substratum by virtue of which the articulated sounds are meaningful, while the latter, when grasped by the speaker are the immediate conveyors of meaning ; *Vṛtti* (101.5-7, 102.1-2 of K.A.S. Iyer's edition [Poona, 1966]) : *eko nimittam śabdānām/yadadhiṣṭhānā yadupāśrayā yadādhārāḥ śrutayaḥ pratyāyyamartham pratipadyante tasya nimittatvam/aparo'rthe prayujyate/kāraṇavyāpārāttu pratilabdhavikriyāviśeṣaḥ śrotrānupātī prakāśakabhāvena nityam pratyāyya-paratantro'rtheṣu prayujyate* /¹ From the listener's viewpoint the sequentially

1 The interpretation given here seems best in accord with the *Vṛtti*, which speaks of the substratum (*adhiṣṭhāna*, *upāśraya*, *ādhāra*,) of the articulate sounds (*śruti*) as the *nimitta*. It is also in accord with *VP* 1. 46cd (*..śabdo'pi buddhiṣṭhaḥ śrutinām kāraṇam prīhak*), which speaks of the *śabda* situated in the intellect (*buddhiṣṭha*) as the cause (*kāraṇa*) of articulated sounds. Cf. also Joshi 40: '... one word is said to be the cause of articulate sound...' This is also the interpretation given by PT. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śukla in his commentary (Varanasi, 1961) ad *VP* 1.44, evidently based on the *Vṛtti*. Raghunātha Śarma, in his commentary (Varanasi, 1963) ad *VP* 1.44, (p. 100), on the contrary, takes the *nimitta* to be the *dhvanirūpaḥ śabdaḥ* which is the cause of the revelation of the *śabda* (*abhivyaktinimittam*). Similarly, M. Biardeau,

articulated sounds are the *nimitta* of the non-sequential *śabda* in the intellect of the listener, whereby meaning is conveyed; cf. the verse cited by Harivṛṣabha (102.6-7): *avibhakto vibhaktebhyo jāyate'rthasya vācakaḥ/śabdastatrārtharūpātmā sambhedamupagacchati*; and note also Vṛṣabhadeva's comment (102.22): *śrotrapekṣayaitadeva viparītam*.¹ Now, apart from the *laukika* meaning of a *śabda*, which is of course the norm in communication (cf. *VP* 1.54), any *śabda* can be considered a name (*saṃjñā*) whose denotatum is itself (*VP* 1.60). Hence, the question of *sphoṭa* can be considered apart from *laukika* meanings. The abstract *śabda*, qua expression, is what is called *sphoṭa*, while the sequential articulated sounds constituting the instances of *śabdas* are called *nāda* (*VP* 1.49) or *dhvani*.

As noted, the sequence *VP* 1.44 and following concentrates on *śabda* qua expression, distinguishing between abstract *śabda* and articulated instances. The same is done for non-meaning-bearing units. Here again it is useful to begin with the *Mahābhāṣya*. In an oft-cited and often misunderstood passage, Patañjali (*Bh. ad śivasūtras* 3-4 [1.25.23-26.2]) takes up the *sūtra* *krpo ro laḥ* (8.2.18). This rule should provide not only for *l* to replace *r* but also for *ḷ* to replace *r* in the root *krp*. In order to have the *sūtra* provide for both replacements Patañjali interprets it as making a statement about *sphoṭa* (*sphoṭamātram nirdiśyate*) stating merely that an *l*-sound replace an *r*-sound. Now, it was generally recognized that *r* contained *r*; *Bh. ad* 8.4.1 (111.452.5): *yo'sāvṛkāre repḥaḥ*; cf. *Atharvaprātiśākhya* (ed. W. D. Whitney) 1.37, *Ṛkprātiśākhya* (ed. M. D. Shastri) 13.34, *Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya* (Benares ed.) 4.146. Similarly, *ḷ* contains *l*. Patañjali thus considers that Pāṇini uses *r* and *l* in his rule as instances to represent the types *r* and *l*, whether within *r* and *ḷ* or not cf. *Pradīpa* I.90-1: *antarbhūtānantarbhūtareṣhalakāravyaṅgyaṃ sāmānyaṃ sthānyādeśabhāvenāśriyate* / The reasoning is obviously similar to that used by Patañjali when, in his discussion of vt. 17 of the *paspaśā* (1.13.19-20), he says: *ākṛtyupadeśātsiddham*..

Théorie de la connaissance et philosophie de la parole (Paris, 1964) 364, though she cautiously qualifies *VP* 1.44 as a '*sūtra* sibyllin'. Brough, *TPS* 1951.37, correctly says, 'Here the "underlying cause of words" is clearly to be interpreted as the abstract sound-pattern which underlies instances of the utterance of the word... But I think he misses the point when he goes on to say that 'the other which this utterance reveals is the *sphoṭa*, which in turn gives rise to the meaning.'

1 Commentators and editors usually consider that the *Vṛtti* ad *VP* 1.44 states three separate views; thus Raghunātha Śarma (see fn. 2); K.A.S. Iyer, *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti*, Chapter I. English Translation (Poona, 1965) 52-3, *Vākyapadīya*.. Kāṇḍa I (Poona, 1966) 101-2; M. Biarreau, Bhartṛhari, *Vākyapadīya Brahmakāṇḍa*.. (Paris, 1964) 89. I have here only stressed the two clearly opposed views. I may also note in passing that A. Aklujkar, in an unpublished paper ('The Brahma-kāṇḍa Vṛtti') which he has generously allowed me to read in typescript, would emend the reading of the text of the *Vṛtti* so as to state only two *pakṣas*.

avarṇākṛtirupadiṣṭāsarvamavarṇakulam grahīṣyati /¹ Kaiyaṭa (*Pradīpa* I. 49) comments on this: *upāto' pi viśeṣo nāntariyakatvājjātīprādhānyavivakṣāyāṃ na vivakṣyate* / Kaiyaṭa's comment that the indispensable (*nāntariyaka*) particular (*viśeṣa*) is stated even when reference to the general is intended, together with his earlier comment, is of interest in view of Bhartṛhari's comment on *Bh. I. 26. 2 sphoṭamātram nirdiśyate* (*Mahābhāṣyaṭikā* [ed. V. Swaminathan, Banaras, 19-65] 89)²: *ākṛtyupadeśo' yamityuktaṃ bhavati, tatrākṛtinirdeśe nāntareṇābidhānamākṛtiṃ pratipadyata iti nāntariyakam dravyam pratipattavyamiti dravyanirdeśe śrutasya dravyasya kāryayogitvamiti ākṛtyāśrayasyesaṃ prayojanam anturbhūtānantarbhūtaryorephayoḥ pratipattiyartham* / In the *Vākyapadīya* Bhartṛhari also speaks of revealers (*vyāñjaka*) of *varṇas* as well as of *padas* and *vākyas*; see *VP* 1. 88 and cf. *VP* 1.101, 2. 20-1.

Joshi discusses these points ably, although he omits, as far as I can see, references to the *Bhāṣya*'s discussions of communication from the speaker's viewpoint as well as Bhartṛhari's comment on Patañjali's statement *sphoṭamātram nirdiśyate* / The author also ably covers (26-9) the different views concerning the relation between *sphoṭa* and *dhvani*, although here it might have been well to point out that the views given in *VP* 1.75-101 and *VP* 1.102-6 are opposed in that the former come within the *nityapakṣa*, while the latter come under the *kāryapakṣa*.

Joshi rightly and importantly stresses (35) that for Bhartṛhari *sphoṭa* is not used uniquely with reference to the 'meaning-conveyor word'. This is worth emphasizing in view of the influence exerted by J. Brough's article 'Theories of General Linguistics in the Sanskrit Grammarians' (*TPS* 1951.27-46), wherein Brough maintains that for Bhartṛhari, as for later grammarians, *sphoṭa* was (34) 'simply the linguistic sign in its aspect of meaning bearer (*Bedeutungsträger*).'³ Joshi has correctly seen that Bhartṛhari stands closer to Patañjali in his concept of *sphoṭa* than to later grammarians, who, concentrating on semantic questions, viewed *sphoṭa* as the meaning bearer and not an abstraction including sound types as well as meaning bearing signs. An index of the shift of emphasis is the use of the term *varṇasphoṭa*. As Joshi notes (46, 73-4), this term cannot originally have referred, as it does in later grammarians, to affixes and bases to the exclusion of non-meaning-bearing sound types.

1 The *Bhāṣya* passage occurs in the context of the claim that the *śivasūtras* are intended to teach correct articulations. It is objected (vt. 17) that in this case all varieties of vowels should be listed in the *śivasūtras*, to which the retort is that this is an *ākṛtyupadeśa*. The procedure involved (cf. also vt. 7 ad 1.1.69) differs from Pāṇini's in providing that the *śivasūtras* are, without rule 1.1.69 (*aṇuditsavarṇasya cāpratyayaḥ*), a type listing, while Pāṇini lists the sounds and then states rule 1.1.69, whereby the sounds listed are terms standing both for themselves and for sounds homogeneous with them.

2 Abhyankar's edition was unavailable to me at the time I was writing this review.

There are a few places where I think Joshi might have been clearer in his presentation, but it would be cavilling to dwell on these. There is, nevertheless, one discussion of his which could lead to misunderstanding. He takes up (15-6) Patañjali's discussion of the *sūtra* 'krpo ro laḥ' and correctly notes that Patañjali 'has used the term *sphoṭa* to denote the phonetic species.' Joshi goes on (16) : 'Here it should be noted that, according to Patañjali, the two sounds, consonantal *r* and the *r*-element in the vocalic *ṛ*, which may not be phonemically distinguishable, belong to the single *sphoṭa*.' Later (18), he says : 'The term *sphoṭa* is not used by Patañjali primarily with reference to the non-distinctiveness of phonemes that exists [read *exist* ?] in the language system, but it is restricted to the same class of varied spoken sounds, whose distinctiveness may not be grasped by the listener. This is suggested by his phrase *ra-śruterla-śrutirbhavati*. In other words, according to Patañjali, the distinction between the consonantal *r* and the *r*-element in the vocalic *ṛ* is not perceived auditorily and it is not relevant for grammatical analysis.' The emphasis on phonemics and distinctiveness is, in my opinion, misplaced. When Patañjali speaks of *sphoṭa* and then says *raśruterlaśrutirbhavati* he is simply contrasting the abstract *r* with its instances as articulated sound (*śruti*), *r*, whether in isolation or within *ṛ*. There is no more emphasis on non-distinctiveness here than in the case of the *ākṛtyupadeśa* whereby *a* would denote the vowel type *a* including *ā* and nasalized vowels. While I am certain that Joshi realizes the main import of Patañjali's discussion (cf. his citation of Kaiyaṭa, p. 16 ftn. 18), his presentation is unfortunate in that his language is so close to the language used by other scholars, who, stressing phonemics, have committed errors. Brough (op. cit. 37) says : 'It is of interest to observe that Patañjali realised that for the phonology of Sanskrit it is convenient to regard *r* and *ṛ* as belonging to the same phoneme.' This is not what Patañjali was getting at. Nor was Patañjali trying to show what Ruegg (op. cit. 50) attributes to him : '*ṛ* et *!* seraient pour ainsi dire des allophones du même auquel se réfère le *sphoṭa*.'

In sum I think Joshi has produced a book which merits serious consideration. His presentation of a difficult subject is in general clear and insightful. If in places I remained with the feeling that matters were not completely clarified, I would attribute this principally to two factors : the very slipperiness of the subject matter and the author's eagerness to fit Western terminology to Indian materials. In spite of Joshi's caveat (p. 19. ftn. 19), *phoneme*, *distinctiveness* and other such terms are not only used by him, their conceptual background has had an effect on his way of looking at the original discussions. Nevertheless, an attempt has to be made to make the thoughts of Indian grammarians easily comprehensible to Western linguists and Joshi's desire 'to set forth the ancient Indian theories through the medium of modern linguistic terminology and idiom,

OJ14

so that the Introduction should evoke interest....among non-Sanskritist linguists' is laudable.

GEORGE CARDONA

Purañjanacarita-nāṭaka of Kṛṣṇadatta Maithila: Critically edited with Introduction, Variation—Footnotes and Index by SHRI SADASHIVA LAKSHMIDHARA KATRE, M.A., Curator, Scindia Oriental Institute, Vikrama University, Ujjain. Published by Vidarbha Saṁsodhana Maṇḍala, Vidarbha Sāhitya Mandira, Nehru Mārga, Nagpur-1. Pages viii + 78 + 80; 7.4" × 5"; price Rs. 3=00.

This Sanskrit play was first brought to notice in 1938 A.D. by Shri S. L. Katre in his *Marāṭhī* article entitled "*Devājīpanta Choraghode yāñceṁ eka Vāñmayasmāraka*" in the *G. S. Sardesai Smāraka Grantha*. Thereafter it was first edited by Miss Nilam Solanki and published by the Charotar Book Stall, Anand in 1955; but, as rightly pointed out by Shri Katre, that edition had several draw-backs, the most glaring one being the identification of the author with Kṛṣṇamiśra, the renowned writer of the well-known allegorical drama *Prabodha-candrodaya*, who flourished seven centuries before Kṛṣṇadatta Maithila! The present edition is a critical edition worth the name.

The *Purañjanacarita* is an allegorical drama in five Acts based on *Bhāgavata-mahāpurāṇa* IV. 25-29 where the episode of Purañjana is narrated by Nārada to king Prācīnabarhiṣ, at the close whereof he furnishes a spiritual interpretation of the entire story, its characters, places, etc. [*Vide Bhāgavata. IV. XXIX. 2-24.*]. The dramatist has introduced six new characters and some deviations from the original story are also met with, but not without dramatic significance. The innovations also are conducive to good dramatic effects. Otherwise, the poetic fancies etc.—and in some cases even the actual wordings—of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* are followed and a few verses also are quoted with slight constructional changes.

The plot may be summarized thus: Purañjana (the Individual Soul) selects as his residence a city with nine gates etc. and falls in love with Purañjanī, the lady of the city. In sensual revelries and hunts he forgets his mission of searching for his long missing friend Avijñātalakṣaṇa (the Supreme Soul). Once the city being successfully attacked by the enemies Caṇḍavega, Jarā, Bhaya, etc., Queen Purañjanī also deserts King Purañjana, who, too, flees away. During his flight he is changed to a woman named Vaidarbhī through mysterious causes and forthwith marries Malayadhvaja, the Prince of Vidarbha! Navalakṣaṇā, a Kāmadhenu, promises to help her in finding out her casually separated husband and takes her across the turbulent river to the Śeṣācala Mountain where at the close of her hymn to Veñkaṭeśa-Keśava Avijñātalakṣaṇa enters and through His grace Purañjana realizes his real nature and gets re-united with Him.