

The LINGUINDIC Project presents:

UNDERSTUDIED TEXTS AND AUTHORS FROM THE INDIAN LINGUISTIC TRADITION

A two-day workshop at Wolfson College, Oxford
27 – 28 June 2022

Speakers and provisional titles:

- Émilie Aussant, Paris:
'Extended Sanskrit Grammar' – An understudied development of *Vyākaraṇa*
- Jim Benson, Oxford:
Title to be confirmed
- Radha Blinderman, Harvard:
The evolution of *kriyāviśeṣaṇas* and their relation to *avyayas*
- Maria Piera Candotti, Pisa:
Nārāyana and certain classes of compounds
- Giovanni Ciotti, Hamburg.
The need for a new critical edition of Anantabhaṭṭa's commentary on the *Śuklayajurvedaprātiśākhya*
- Victor D'Avella, Oxford:
Title to be confirmed
- Sibylle Koch, Oxford:
Title to be confirmed
- John Lowe & Jim Benson, Oxford:
The theory of negation in the later *Vaiyākaraṇa* tradition
- Yiming Shen, Oxford:
Kṛtya suffix teachings in the *Samanvayadiś*, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and the *Kātantrasūtra*
- Małgorzata Wielińska-Soltwedel, PAS Warsaw:
To Study or not to Study: On Three Grammarians of the Bengali Pāṇinian School

Workshop schedule:

MONDAY 27 JUNE

9.00-9.30	<i>Tea/coffee</i>
9.30-10.30	Talk 1
10.30-11.00	<i>Tea/coffee</i>
11.00-12.00	Talk 2
12.00-13.00	Talk 3
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00-15.00	Talk 4
15.00-15.30	<i>Tea/coffee</i>
15.30-16.30	Talk 5
18.00-19.00	<i>Drinks Reception</i>

TUESDAY 28 JUNE

9.00-9.30	<i>Tea/coffee</i>
9.30-10.30	Talk 6
10.30-11.00	<i>Tea/coffee</i>
11.00-12.30	Talk 7
12.30-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14:00-15:00	Talk 8
15:00-15:30	<i>Tea/coffee</i>
15.00-16.00	Talk 9

Abstracts:

“Extended Sanskrit Grammar” – An understudied development of *Vyākaraṇa*

Émilie Aussant, Paris

The history of language description can be seen as a major, more or less successful, effort to adapt linguistic tools initially shaped to describe or represent a (very) small number of languages: of the thousands of languages known in the world, only a few have produced reflexive linguistic tools (i.e. tools which describe the language in which they are composed); this is the case for Arabic, Chinese, Greek and Sanskrit. Indeed Classical Sanskrit grammar (*vyākaraṇa*) came to play a central role in the grammaticisation of several languages other than Sanskrit: Dravidian languages, Middle and Modern Indo-Aryan languages, Old Javanese, Persian, Sinhalese, Tibetan but also, albeit in a much more *ad hoc* manner, languages more distant from South and South-East Asia like Algonquian languages and Buryat. Five years after the publication of the special issue of the journal *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 39.2 (“La Grammaire Sanskrite Étendue”), the time has come for a second survey of works carried out on this fascinating and yet still understudied topic. The talk will be particularly focussed on some recently (re)discovered specificities of the “Extended Sanskrit Grammar” which make it possible to renew, at least in part, the thinking on the Extended Grammars phenomenon.

Towards a new edition of the *Padārthaprakāśa* of Anantabhaṭṭa

Giovanni Ciotti, University of Hamburg

Anantabhaṭṭa (or Anantācārya) was a scholar hailing from Vārāṇasī and belonging to the Kāṇva school of the White Yajurveda. He was particularly active during the first half of the 17th century, a prolific author who wrote on matters concerning the Vedas and *dharmaśāstra*. Among his works we find the *Padārthaprakāśa*, a commentary of the *Śuklayajurvedaprātiśākhya*. This commentary is heavily indebted to another commentary of the same *mūla*, namely the *Māṭṛmodaka* of Uvaṭa (12th century ca.). The *Padārthaprakāśa* reproduces almost verbatim ample parts of Uvaṭa's text, but contains significant additions and variations.

The text has been fully edited and published for the first time in 1934 by C. Kunhan Raja. However, the editor explicitly points out in the Preface that the work had been started by another scholar, namely Pandit V. Venkatarama Sarma, who had to quit the project. As a result, the edition could not be prepared with the necessary care and textual problems are numerous. This is already clear right from the prefatory section of the *Padārthaprakāśa*, if one compares it with the version of the the same text found in Fritz Gelpke's doctoral dissertation published in 1929.

So far I have been able to access one more manuscript of the full text, namely ms 40.B.31 held at the the Adyar Library of Chennai. This clearly offers better readings, thus suggesting that materials for a new and improved critical edition of the *Padārthaprakāśa* await to be explored.

The role of phonetic description in *prakriyā* grammars

Maria Piera Candotti, Pisa

The three main *prakriyā* grammars (*Prakriyākaumudī*, *Prakriyāsarvasva* and *Siddhāntakaumudī*) assign an important role to the description of certain phonetic features in the introductory part of their grammars. In these passages are seemingly gathering miscellaneous material that, at least from a strictly Pāṇinian point of view, should not belong to the descriptive tasks of grammar. The presentation will analyse in comparative terms the phonetic descriptions of the three authors highlighting their differences in terms of content but also, and above all, in terms of their specific purpose and role in the broader context of linguistic description.

Kṛtya* suffix teachings in the *Samanvayadiś*, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and the *Kātantrasūtra

Yiming Shen, Oxford

I study the *kṛtya* section of the *Samanvayadiś*, a Sanskrit grammatical treatise mainly dealing with syntax from Kashmir possibly dated to around 1100 AD, and compare it with the *kṛtya* teachings in the Pāṇinian and Kātantra systems, shedding light on the historical development and inheritance of ideas between different schools in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition.

The theory of negation in the later *Vaiyākaraṇa* tradition

John Lowe & Jim Benson, Oxford

The correct understanding of negation is an important philosophical and linguistic question. While the theories of negation in Indian philosophical systems such as *Navya-Nyāya* and *Mīmāṃsā* have been well studied (among many others, for example, Matilal's *The Navya-Nyāya doctrine of Negation*, HOS 46, 1968), the theory of negation developed by the later *vaiyākaraṇa* tradition, which set itself in direct competition with *Nyāya* and *Mīmāṃsā*, remains underexplored. We report on a detailed study and comparison of at least ten discussions of negation by Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, Kaṇḍabhaṭṭa, and Nāgeśa. We establish in broad terms the grammarians' theory of negation, and we compare and contrast this with the competing views of the *Naiyāyikas* and *Mīmāṃsakas*. We further identify and trace theoretical differences not only between the three grammarians, but even between different works of each author.