

allusions to theistic Samādhi as a variant of the preceding one (YS i.23–28; cf. p. 177 note 156: YS i.23–29); (3) a treatment of meditation of the Samāpatti ('In-eins-fallen' = Aneignung; see pp. 177–81) type (YS i.41–50); and (4) a discussion of meditative concentration (*saṃyama*) in the Aṣṭāṅga-Yoga (YS ii.54–iii.7; cf. p. 209 where iii.8 is also included). Since these 'Text-groups', which are analysed in detail together with the corresponding parts of the *Vyāsabhāṣya* on pp. 135–230, are regarded by him as integral parts of the YS discussing various paths of meditation or meditational structures, O. differs from J. W. Hauer (*Der Yoga*, Stuttgart, 1958) and also, it seems, from E. Frauwallner (compare his own previously expressed views in *WZKS* 9 [1965], pp. 98–118). Historically, O. adds, these 'Text-groups' may derive from different traditions; but although the latter might well have been treated in special texts, these cannot be reconstituted by merely taking the YS apart (p. 135). O.'s treatment here of the question of the composition of the YS – which appears to take account of criticism expressed by F. Staal (*The study of mysticism*, Berkeley, 1974) against atomization of the YS – is convincing. Its applicability too to a number of problems we encounter elsewhere in the study of Indian thought is of course evident.

Pointing out the occurrence of *śraddhā*, *vīrya*, *smṛti*, *saṃādhi* and *prajñā* both as a series of factors in *asamprajñātasamādhi* (YS i.20) and as a group of five *indriyas* in Buddhist thought, O. thinks that this parallelism is more likely to be due to a common source than to borrowing from Buddhism (p. 141 note 36); see also L. de La Vallée Poussin, *MCB* 5 (1937), p. 228. He furthermore contrasts (p. 142) the conception of *śraddhā* found in the *Vyāsabhāṣya* with that in the *Milindapañha* where two aspects of *saddhā* are recognized, viz. a 'subsidence' in serene clarity (*sampasāda*) and an upward 'leaping' (*sampakkhandana*) of confidence; and O. argues that the absence of the latter aspect in the conception of the *Vyāsabhāṣya* is seen not only in the fact that it is not mentioned in its explanation of *śraddhā* but also in the fact that the *Bhāṣya* refers to the separate presence of a certain 'desire' as needful for *vīrya*. However, it should be noted that 'desire' (*chanda*: *abhilāṣa*) is listed also in the Buddhist Abhidharma as a *citta-mahābhūmika* accompanying all states of mind, including such where *śraddhā* is present as a salutary *mahābhūmika*. – For the *Vyāsabhāṣya*'s interpretation of *vitarka* and *vicāra* in i.17 as respectively a *sthūla-ābhoga* and a *sūkṣma-ābhoga*, O. compares their definitions in the Abhidharma as coarse *manojalpa* having the function of searching (*paryeṣaka*) and subtle *manojalpa* having the function of investigating (*pratyavekṣaka*); but here again he does not postulate direct borrowing from Buddhism (p. 149 note 60). – Concerning the theistic form of meditation in the YS, O. (unlike Hauer) characterizes it as being subordinate to the Nirodha-type (p. 162); and he brackets out the question of an *unio mystica* (p. 178 note 158). The *īśvarapranidhāna* of YS i.23 embraces, he observes, the full religious praxis of the old theistic tradition consisting of asceticism, *mantra*-recitation and ritual; and it is thus analogous to the praxis of the Āgamic tradition he studied earlier (p. 164). But the mythological conception of God known from the Tantra is radically demythologized by the Yogin, who knows God as a transcendent spirit of a special kind (*puruṣaviśeṣa*) (pp. 165, 172 f.): he knows Him as the helper of man and understands Him as the supreme Teacher (*guru*, i.26) of the way of salvation (pp. 163, 165). The theistic value of Kriyāyoga is also upheld (against Hauer) (p. 164–5). The *praṇava* – i.e. the syllable *OM* – also serves, in i.28, to express God in demythologized form, rather than in the mythologically conceived and believed in form known to tradition (p. 172). – Concerning the Samāpatti-type of meditation, O. sees it as differing essentially from the Nirodha-type with its 'reductive' procedures (p. 179; cf. pp. 155, 157 f.), and as having to do rather with constancy (*sthiti*, 'Beständigkeit'). The term *kṣīṇavṛtti* in YS i.41 would thus refer to this *sthiti*, rather than to *cittavṛttinirodha*; here all *vṛttis* are not in fact excluded (p. 181). The structural model is a cognitive one here (pp. 183, 188 f.). – Finally, *saṃyama* differs from both the Nirodha-type and the Samāpatti-type of meditation. For the Aṣṭāṅgayoga the structural model is, at least in part, a therapeutic one, as in the case of the four Noble Truths of Buddhism (p. 210). *saṃyama* is essentially concerned with the acquisition of miraculous knowledge (e.g. *paracittajñāna*, basically a power), rather than with the liberating knowledge of

Sāṃkhyistic Yoga (pp. 212–14). These miraculous powers go back to a period when the mythic-magic thought of the Yoga schools had not yet been 'humanized' by the reflection characteristic of both Sāṃkhyistic Yoga and Buddhism (p. 223). The seventh *yogāṅga*, *dhyaṇa*, is interpreted also as recollection of tradition (p. 228).

It has not been possible to retrace here the whole of Gerhard Oberhammer's complex and dense analysis of Yogic meditation and spirituality in its various forms, and the preceding lines have simply called attention to a number of points of interest in this book and to the method of treatment adopted. O. writes (p. 11) that, while maintaining the conscious distance necessary in scientific work and reflection, he has sought to avoid what he terms the alienation of archivistic description. Although his treatment is practically never explicitly comparative or dependent either on phenomenological philosophy (see however p. 198 note 240 on eidetic inspection) or theological categorizations, his approach to the phenomenology of Yogic spirituality is clearly informed by a concern with issues currently under discussion among both theologians and philosophers. For Indology an encounter with such contemporary currents of thought should prove fruitful, as the present book shows. O. has refrained from injecting into his study the personal/impersonal dichotomy, and the opposition between 'natural' and other mysticism used and abused by R. C. Zaehner. And his criterial use of the concept of scriptural revelation beside faith is certainly important for Hinduism. — Misprints are few. Apart from *komplimentär* for *komplementär* (p. 67), the following ones have been noted: *cāryapāda* for *caryāpāda* (p. 71), *saṃyagniruddha* for *samyag°* (p. 100), *turyatīta* for *turyātīta* (p. 124), *sthimīta* for *stīmīta* (p. 137), and *parsati* for *passati* (p. 147).

By providing new approaches and insights and stimulating serious discussion based on careful phenomenological analyses and typological studies of comparable traditions, Gerhard Oberhammer's book will no doubt contribute very considerably to giving traditional Indian studies a useful new impetus.

London

D. SEYFORT RUEGG

A. J. Alston, *Śaṃkara on The Absolute*. A Śaṃkara source-book. Volume I. London, Shanti Sadan, 1980. IX, 259 pp. £3.50.

According to the preface, "The present volume is the first of a projected series of six which aims to bring together the most important texts of Śaṃkara in a systematic and digestible form . . . the work consists mainly of groups of Śaṃkara's texts in translation, interspersed only by a few passages from the anthologist designed to draw attention to the main features of the material to come, somewhat in the manner of programme notes at a concert." The first chapter gives a historical introduction: Sources of Śaṃkara's doctrine: his life and works (pp. 1–61). Chapters 2, 3, and 4 contain selections of texts of Śaṃkara relating respectively to the doctrine of nescience (pp. 62–114), knowledge of the absolute (pp. 115–167) and the absolute as being, consciousness and bliss (pp. 168–235). Each of these three chapters is divided into four sections, each section containing a brief introduction and selected passages. A bibliography lists (I) Texts of Śaṃkara and (II) Other authors and works quoted. A conspectus of the contents of the six volumes is to be found at the end of the volume. The titles of volumes II–VI are: Śaṃkara on the creation, Śaṃkara on the individual soul, Śaṃkara's refutation of rival views, Śaṃkara on discipleship and Śaṃkara on the path to enlightenment.

In his introductory chapter Alston sketches the development of the Vedānta doctrines before Śaṃkara, Śaṃkara's dates, life and works, and Śaṃkara's school. With regard to the problem of the authenticity of the works ascribed to Śaṃkara, Alston refers to the work done

by Paul Hacker and other scholars who have followed his method, and accepts as authentic the Upadeśasāhasrī and the commentaries on the following works: the Brahmasūtras, the Bhagavadgītā, the Adhyātma Paṭala of the Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra and nine Upaniṣads. Although he admits the authenticity of the Vivaraṇa on the Yogabhāṣya, this work is not taken into account “partly [why partly?] because it expounds a system which in his Advaita works Śaṅkara emphatically rejects” (p. 48). Alston omits Śaṅkara’s commentary on the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, although it is included by Hacker in his list of Śaṅkara’s authentic works (WZKSOA, 12–13, p. 147 = *Kleine Schriften*, p. 241), and is one of the sources quoted by Alston in his work.

Although Alston shows himself fully informed of recent research on Śaṅkara and the Vedānta, he does not discuss one of the fundamental presuppositions of his enterprise, i.e. the unity of Śaṅkara’s thought as expressed in his works. Paul Hacker, and in more recent years Tilmann Vetter, have tried to distinguish different stages in the development of Śaṅkara’s thought. A systematic anthology arranged according to the main topics of Śaṅkara’s philosophy assumes a unity of thought which cannot be tacitly admitted without further proof. In his defence Alston could have pointed to the fact that the study of the development of Śaṅkara’s thought so far is based on only a few of his works and that much more work has to be done before a convincing picture of his philosophical development emerges. It is even possible that Alston’s anthology may assist this line of research by bringing together texts which, when analyzed carefully, bring into relief differences in Śaṅkara’s treatment of important philosophical themes.

Alston’s work will certainly be of benefit to the non-specialist reader because it enables him to become acquainted with Śaṅkara’s thought in a systematic way which is more familiar to Western readers. He will find Alston’s introduction and introductory comments to the different sections helpful. The same applies to the notes which are to be found at the end of each chapter. However, specialists will be somewhat disappointed when they compare Alston’s translations with the original texts. In his preface Alston remarks: “The translations here offered are somewhat free and aim at fidelity to the sense of the text rather than at philological exactitude” (p. IV). It is rather difficult to make a distinction of this kind between fidelity to the sense of the text and philological exactitude. I wonder whether in this way it is possible to do full justice to the richness of Śaṅkara’s thought. Alston certainly has not succeeded in reproducing the sense of the text faithfully because his renderings are often far too approximative and sometimes entirely wrong. Let me quote two examples. On p. 161 Alston translates a passage of Śaṅkara’s commentary (*pada*) on the Kenopaniṣad (I.3 and 4). In explaining Kena I.3 Śaṅkara writes: *vācā hi śabda uccāryamāṇo ’bhidheyam prakāśayati yadā, tadābhidheyam prati vāg gacchatīty ucyate*. Alston translates: “For we speak of speech ‘attaining’ some matter when words are pronounced through speech and they throw some light on it.” Swāmī Gambhīrānanda whose translation of eight Upaniṣads is listed in Alston’s bibliography translates: “When a word, as expressed by the organ of speech, reveals its own idea, speech is said to go to its object.” Undoubtedly, this translation correctly renders the sense of the text, although one would have preferred to see *abhideya* rendered with the same equivalent in both occurrences. A word, when uttered, *reveals* its meaning and does not “throw some light on it”. On pp. 177–184 Alston translates a long extract from Śaṅkara’s commentary on Taittirīya Upaniṣad II.1, a text of the greatest importance for the understanding of Śaṅkara’s thought and which in recent years has been analyzed and studied by several scholars. In many instances Alston’s rendering is not adequate; for instance, on p. 182 Alston translates: “But if they [i.e. the terms “Reality”, etc.] retain their meaningfulness they can be used to mark the Absolute off from things having contradictory characteristics”. The Sanskrit text has: *satyādy-arthair arthavattve tu tadviparīṭadharmavadbhyo viśeṣyebhyo brahmaṇo viśeṣyasya niyantrtvam upapadyate*. Of course, *viparīṭa* does not mean ‘contradictory’ but ‘contrary’. Swāmī Gambhīrānanda translates this passage in the following way: “But if they are meaningful, as having the senses of truth etc., they can justifiably differentiate their substantive

Brahman from other substantives that are possessed of opposite qualities.” This translation is not very beautiful but it brings out the sense of the passage. The same passage has also been translated by Richard De Smet (‘Langage et connaissance de l’Absolu chez Çamkara’, *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, 52, 1954, p. 66), J. A. B. van Buitenen (*Rāmānuja’s Vedārthasaṃgraha*, Poona, 1956, p. 59), Madeleine Biarreau (‘La définition dans la pensée indienne’, *JA*, 1957, p. 380), D. Seyfort Ruegg (*La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra*, Paris, 1969, p. 390) and J. M. van Boetzelaer (*Sureśvara’s Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtikam*, Leiden, 1971, p. 62).

All the texts quoted by Alston have been translated once or several times into English. New translations are only justified if they are an improvement on existing ones. It is not sufficient to render more or less the sense of the text, because it is only possible to fully understand Śaṃkara’s thought in all its complexity by the greatest possible philological exactitude. For instance, Thibaut’s translation of Śaṃkara’s bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtra is an excellent piece of work and does not distort the sense of the text. However, Renou rightly pointed out that it is possible to give a much more exact rendering. Renou writes: “Thibaut a rendu le sens avec une parfaite justesse Néanmoins on peut sur bien des points améliorer la terminologie, on peut surtout serrer le texte de plus près que n’a fait notre devancier, qui se préoccupait de fixer exactement la suite des idées plutôt que d’adhérer dans toutes ses sinuosités à la teneur originale” (*Śaṅkara. Prolégomènes au Vedānta*, Paris, 1951, p. II). Although Renou remarks that Thibaut has rendered the sense with a perfect accuracy, he contradicts himself to a certain extent by pointing out that Thibaut did not attempt to follow all the ‘sinuosités’ of the original text. It is only by doing exactly this that one is able to do full justice to Śaṃkara. That this is possible, even in the case of a more difficult text such as Maṇḍanamīśra’s Brahmasiddhi, has been shown by the admirable translations published in recent years by Madeleine Biarreau and Tilmann Vetter. It is, of course, quite possible to reproduce the arguments used by Śaṃkara without translating as exactly as possible the texts to which one refers, but this is not possible without understanding the original text in all its intricacies. If, in translating Śaṃkara, one does not want to make the effort to improve upon existing translations, it is much better to make use of the best of them, even if the English style of some of the translations published in India is not always very idiomatic.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Joseph E. Schwartzberg, *A Historical Atlas of South Asia*. Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 382 pages consisting of XXXIX front matter, 150 pages of maps, 154 pages of text, and 48 pages for the index. Map section includes 144 color plates and 14 black-and-white plates. Trim size: 13" × 16". \$ 150.00.

In 1961 Charles Lesley Ames (1884–1969), a Minnesota businessman, donated his library to the University of Minnesota. In 1908 Ames had read W. H. Fitchett’s *Tale of the Great Mutiny* and begun collecting books on India. By the time of its transfer to the university, his library comprised 80,000 items, including some 700 maps. The acquisition of this collection suggested to two professors of the University of Minnesota, geographer Jan Otto Marius Broek and historian Burton Stein, the idea of creating a historical atlas of South Asia. The South Asia Historical Atlas Project was officially launched on 16 September 1964 and the final draft of the text was delivered to the press in December 1976. Schwartzberg, who joined the atlas project in December 1964 and brought it to its successful conclusion, sketches the history of the project in his preface and acknowledges help received from many quarters.

The atlas consists of two parts, the first containing maps, photographs and graphs (pp. 1–

149), and the second the text (pp. 151–266). Both parts are divided into fourteen sections. A very extensive bibliography (pp. 267–304) and an index (pp. 305–352) complete the atlas. The first section deals with the physical setting: physiography, climate and vegetation. The second illustrates the prehistory by means of maps and photographs. The following six sections (3–8) deal with the history of India from the earliest period up to 1947. Post-independence political history is traced in section nine. The two following sections depict modern social and cultural evolution and modern demographic evolution. Settlement patterns are studied in section twelve. Section thirteen includes toponymic reference maps and index maps for reference materials (gazetteers, large- and medium-scale topographic maps, ethnographic studies, fiction in English on life in South Asia). The last section (14) is entitled ‘a geopolitical synopsis’, and contains maps representing the maximum territorial extent of nearly one hundred dynasties or other political powers.

For students of ancient India the most important sections of this atlas are sections three and four, entitled respectively ‘From the Vedic through the Classical Age’ and ‘Kingdoms and Regional Cultures of the Eighth through the Twelfth Century’. The text of the third section comprises 25 pages, each divided into two or three columns. It explains the methods employed in preparing the maps and at the same time gives a brief conspectus of the history of India during a period of seventeen centuries from about 1000 B.C. to the end of the 7th century. The introduction to this section explains that it was not possible to utilize fully primary and secondary sources in several languages (Dravidian languages, old Persian, Greek, Latin, German, French and Russian). With regard to secondary sources, publications in English and Hindi seem to have been the main sources of information, and this probably explains some unsatisfactory aspects of the text and the corresponding maps. A great deal has been written on the history of India during the Vedic and Classical periods, but few of these publications can be utilized without critical examination. On p. 162a it is said that according to many scholars the Great Bhārata battle took place about 900 B.C., but on p. 164b it is stated that ‘nor, for that matter, can we declare with certitude that its [i.e. the Mahābhārata’s] alleged battle of annihilation on the plain of Kurukṣetra really took place.’ The text does not explain that the Great Bhārata battle and the battle on the plain of Kurukṣetra are one and the same, and that very few critical scholars believe in the historicity of this battle, let alone are willing to believe in the possibility of determining its date. On p. 163b the text mentions the Bhojas and Daṇḍakas of Dakṣiṇā Padā (the Southern Country). It is not clear from where the term *dakṣiṇā padā* is taken. Among the secondary sources listed is the *Vedic Index* by Macdonell and Keith (London, 1912). According to those two scholars *dakṣiṇā padā* ‘with southward foot’ (Rgveda X. 61, 8) refers to the place where the exile goes on being expelled (vol. I, p. 337). However, it is necessary to point out that this term occurs only once and that its meaning is far from being clear. In his notes on X. 61 Renou wrote: “*dākṣiṇā padā*, ‘du pied droit’ (?); *dākṣiṇā* “sud” n’est attesté qu’à partir de l’AV. (possiblement pour l’adv. *dakṣiṇatās* 15, 6)”, cf. *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, tome XVI (Paris, 1967), p. 137. On p. 163b the Puruṣa Sūkta (RV X. 90) is said to date from the 10th century B.C. One wonders where the authors have found this date. One of the most misleading parts of this section is the subsection on India as revealed by Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Among the primary sources of this section are mentioned Puruṣottamadeva, Somadeva Bhaṭṭa and Vāṇama (sic). It is rather surprising to see that authors who lived in the twelfth, eleventh and seventh century A.D. are considered primary sources for knowledge of India in the late 5th or early 4th century B.C. (for this date see p. 167c). Among the secondary works V. S. Agrawala’s *India as known to Pāṇini* (Lucknow, 1952; 2nd ed., Varanasi, 1963) is the first book mentioned and the information given in this subsection seems to have been taken entirely from Agrawala’s book. Although the authors of the atlas take care to separate the information found in Pāṇini’s work itself from that found in the *Gaṇapāṭha* in compiling a table listing the “Nature of Politics Noted in Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and its Supplement, the *Gaṇapāṭha* (sic)” (cf. p. 168a), they have not been aware of the fact that many names listed in this table are not found in Pāṇini’s work but in the Kāśikā. For instance, Pāṇini mentions the

Ṛṣi Praskaṇva (VI.1.153), but a country Prakaṇva is only found in the Kāśikā. Herodotus tells of a people called Parikanioi which, according to Konow, lived in modern Ferghāna (cf. Agrawala, p. 50). It is on the basis of evidence of this kind that Agrawala arrived at the conclusion that Pāṇini's geographical horizon extended to Ferghana in Central Asia! The Asuras are mentioned only in the Gaṇapāṭha. Without the slightest hesitation Agrawala identifies them with the Assyrians (p. 449) and, accordingly, the name Asura (Assyrians) is duly marked on map III.B.2. On p. 168b the distinction made by the authors of the atlas between military groups that were permanently settled and bands of roving predators is based upon Agrawala's remarks on *vrāta*: "The Kāśikā defines *Vrāta* as a *saṅgha* living by violence (*utsedha-jīvinah saṅghā vrātāḥ*, V.3.113). Pāṇini refers to *Vrāta* in a two-fold sense, the other being depredation or physical violence by which those people made their living (*Vrātena jīvaṭi*, V.2.21), from which they were known as *Vrātinah*." (p. 441). Agrawala fails to explain the first sense of *vrāta* and does not give any justification for his rendering of *utsedha* as 'violence'. He seems to have overlooked the fact that the Kāśikā itself explains it by *śarīra* (V.2.21: *utsedhaḥ śarīram, tadāyāsena ye jīvanti te utsedhajīvinah*), cf. Louis Renou, *La grammaire de Pāṇini*, fasc. 2 (Paris, 1951), p. 90: "le mot *vrātam* "travail manuel" (?)." Happily, the other subsections of this section are more satisfactory, although the user of this atlas must be aware of the fact that there is very little reliable geographical and historical information available on India during this period. It is a pity that the text has not been revised by a competent scholar who would also have taken care to correct the misspellings of Sanskrit words and names.

The atlas is the product of the work of scholars of different disciplines: historians, geographers, sociologists and cartographers. Both the maps and the text contain an amazing amount of information which is clearly presented. For many years to come this atlas will be of immense help to all those who are interested in some way or other in the history of South Asia, and Professor Schwartzberg and his collaborators deserve our warmest thanks for this splendid work.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Richard Simon, *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Rüdiger Schmitt (Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 20). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1979. X, 956 pp. DM 148, —.

Richard Simon (1865–1934) is mainly known for his studies of ancient Indian music and his critical edition of the *Amaruśataka* (Kiel, 1893). His first publication was devoted to a study and edition of the introduction to Rāmakṛṣṇa's commentary on Pāraskara's Gṛhyasūtra: *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der vedischen Schulen* (Kiel, 1889) which is reprinted in its entirety (pp. 3–117). Three older commentators, mentioned by Rāmakṛṣṇa, are Karka, author of commentaries on Kātyāyana's Śrautasūtra and Pāraskara's Gṛhyasūtra, Reṇuka (whose commentary on Pāraskara's Gṛhyasūtra was composed in 1266) and Harihara. They were studied by Simon in his 'Ueber einige Commentatoren zu Sūtren des weissen Yajurveda' (SBAW, 1895, pp. 605–650) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 298–343. In 1890 Simon published a study of the śloka in Pāli based on an examination of 600 verses in the Dhammapada, Thera- and Therīgāthā and the Jātaka book: 'Der Čloka im Pāli' (ZDMG 44, 1890, pp. 83–97) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 118–132. Simon's edition of the *Amaruśataka* has been reprinted (pp. 133–291) together with his "Nachträge zum *Amaruśataka*" (ZDMG 49, 1895, pp. 577–582) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 292–297. All the other publications reprinted in this volume relate directly or indirectly to Indian music.

In the domain of Vedic music Simon's most important publication is his edition and translation of the Puṣpasūtra (München, 1908) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 470–768. Simon's work was

reviewed by Caland who did not agree with him on the relation of the Uttaragāna to the Puṣpasūtra (DLZ, 1909, Nr. 30, Sp. 1883 ff.). Simon examined the relations between the Arṣeyakalpa (published by Caland: *Der Arṣeyakalpa des Sāmaveda*, Leipzig, 1908), the Puṣpasūtra and the Uttaragāna in his article 'Bemerkungen zum Arṣeyakalpa und Puṣpasūtra' (ZDMG 63, 1909, pp. 730–738) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 769–777. Caland's reply ('Zum Arṣeyakalpa und Puṣpasūtra', ZDMG 64, 1910, pp. 347–348) received only a brief reaction from Simon: 'Schlussbemerkung zum Arṣeyakalpa und Puṣpasūtra' (ZDMG 64, p. 602) = *Kl. Schr.* p. 778. These chronological problems were discussed by Caland again in his introduction to his translation of the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa (Calcutta, 1931). In a recent study Asko Parpola shows himself in full agreement with Simon with regard to the anteriority of the Uttaragāna to the Puṣpasūtra (*The Śrautasūtras of Lātyāyāna and Drāhyayāna and their commentaries*, Vol. I: 1, Helsinki, 1968, pp. 74–76). In 1913 Simon edited and translated the Pañcavidhasūtra which explains how the singing of each verse is divided by the three priests, the *prastotar*, the *udgātar* and the *partihartar*: *Das Pañcavidhasūtra* = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 779–862. In 1923 he published a translation of Lātyāyāna VI, 10–VII, 13 which deals with the same topic (ZII 2, 1923, pp. 1–33) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 905–937. In an article, published in 1913, Simon studied the notations of the *gānas* by the Kauthumas, the Rāṇāyanīyas and the Jaiminīyas: 'Die Notationen der vedischen Liederbücher' (WZKM 27, pp. 305–346) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 863–904.

Although most of Simon's publications relate to Vedic music, he did not neglect the later tradition. He published the text and an analysis of the Saṃgītadarpaṇa by Dāmodara, an author who lived after Kallinātha (about 1450) whom he quotes: 'Quellen zur indischen Musik. Dāmodara' (ZDMG 56, 1902, pp. 129–153 and 262–292) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 347–402.

The Rāgavibodha, written in 1609 by Somanātha, contains fifty tunes for the *vīṇā* (5th viveka, verses 37–166). In 1904 Simon published an autographed edition of these fifty tunes: *The musical compositions of Somanātha* (Leipzig, 1904) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 407–444. The 23 signs (*saṃketa*) used by Somanātha for his notations were studied by him in 'Die Notationen des Somanātha' (SBW, 1903, pp. 447–469) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 445–469. The chronology of the musical literature was studied in the last article published by Simon: 'Zur Chronologie der indischen Musikliteratur' (ZII 2, 1923, pp. 153–166) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 938–951. Finally, one must mention two brief articles: a study of a passage in Kallinātha's commentary of Śārngadeva's Ratnākara: 'The Successor of Deva Rāya II. of Vijayanagara' (JRAS, 1902, pp. 661–663) = *Kl. Schr.* p. 344–46; an explanation of two musical terms in the Śisupālavadha: 'Māgha, Śisupālavadha II, 90' (ZDMG 57, 1903, pp. 520–523) = *Kl. Schr.* pp. 403–406.

Rüdiger Schmitt, the editor of this volume, has added several indices (1. Indische Namen; 2. Indische Werktitel; 3. Sachregister; 4. Wortregister (Sanskrit); 5. Stellenregister). According to his preface Simon planned to contribute to the 'Grundriss' a book on ancient Indian music. It is much to be regretted that Simon was unable to execute this task for which he was so well qualified. However, one must welcome the fact that all his publications on Indian music have now been made so much more accessible by this publication. It is a pity that von Glasenapp's obituary on Simon (ZDMG 89, 1935, p. 255–259) has not been reprinted in this volume, because it makes clear that Simon left much unpublished work in the form of copies, collations and translations of manuscripts.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Helmuth von Glasenapp, *Von Buddha zu Gandhi*. Aufsätze zur Geschichte der Religionen Indiens. Zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 8. September 1961 im Namen seiner Schüler herausgegeben von Volker Moeller, Wilfried Nölle und Joachim-Friedrich Sprockhoff. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1962. 289 pp. DM 76. —.

Helmuth von Glasenapp, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert und Volker Moeller. Mit einem Nachtrag zur Helmuth von Glasenapp Bibliographie von Zoltán Károlyi (Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 18). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1980. XIV, 557 pp. DM 74. —.

Helmuth von Glasenapp (8.9.1891–25.6.1963) published in 1915 his first book, *Die Lehre vom Karman in der Philosophie der Jainas nach den Karmagranthas dargestellt*. His last book, *Meine Lebensreise*, was published posthumously in 1964. A detailed bibliography of all his writings was published by Zoltán Károlyi in 1968 as the second volume of the Glasenapp-Stiftung (cf. *III* 14, pp. 255–256). Many of his books have been regularly reprinted, but his articles can only be found in major libraries. Thirteen articles and one independent publication (*Von Buddha zu Gāndhī*. Tübingen, 1934) were reprinted in 1962 as a tribute to von Glasenapp on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. This volume contains only a small selection of his work. It is therefore greatly to be welcomed that another and larger selection has now been published by the Glasenapp-Stiftung. Both volumes complement each other and for this reason it seems appropriate to include also *Von Buddha zu Gandhi* in this review as it has not been announced previously in the *III*.

The *Kleine Schriften* reprints twelve articles and five independent publications: *Die Lehre vom Karman in der Philosophie der Jainas, nach den Karmagranthas dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1915); *Religiöse Reformbewegungen im heutigen Indien* (Leipzig, 1928); *Indien in der Dichtung und Forschung des deutschen Ostens* (Königsberg, 1930); *Vedānta und Buddhismus* (Wiesbaden, 1950); *Zwei philosophische Rāmāyaṇas* (Wiesbaden, 1951). Particularly welcome is the reprint of von Glasenapp's dissertation, which explains the very complicated Jaina doctrine on karman. The detailed index of technical terms is extremely useful. In his study on the two philosophical Rāmāyaṇas von Glasenapp analyses two works, the *Yogavāsiṣṭha-Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*, to which little attention had been paid in the West, although they have enjoyed great popularity in India. It is one of the great merits of von Glasenapp's work that his studies extended to relatively neglected areas of research. In this connection mention must be made of four articles reprinted in *Von Buddha zu Gandhi*: *Das Triṣaṣṭilakṣaṇamahāpurāṇa der Digambaras* (first published in 1926 in the Festgabe Jacobi), *Über vier purāṇische Nachbildungen der Bhagavadgītā* (first published in 1927 in the Festgabe Garbe), *Lehrsätze des dualistischen Vedānta (Madhvas Tattvasaṃkhyāna)* (first published in 1916 in the Ernst Kuhn volume) and *Die Lehre Vallabhācāryas* (*ZII* 9, 1933–1934, pp. 268–330). The article on Madhva was followed by a detailed study of Madhva's philosophy: *Madhva's Philosophie des Vishnu-Glaubens* (Bonn u. Leipzig, 1923).

Von Buddha zu Gandhi, in which von Glasenapp's publications are arranged systematically, contains eight articles on Buddhism. In 'Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Dharma-Theorie' (*ZDMG* 92, 1938, pp. 383–420) von Glasenapp tried to prove that the *dharma* doctrine was already found in early Buddhism (cf. also his *Nachwort* to the 13th edition of Oldenberg's *Buddha*, Stuttgart, 1959, pp. 477–484). Even if one cannot accept his theory, his article certainly remains worth reading.¹ In the *Kleine Schriften* his article on the origin of the *dharma* theory is reprinted (*WZKM* 46, 1939, pp. 242–266). The same volume contains two articles relating to Tantrism: *Tantrismus und Saktismus* (*OAZ*, N.F. 12, 1936, pp. 120–133); *Ein buddhistischer Initiationsritus des javanischen Mittelalters* (*Tribus*, N.F. 43, 1952/1953, pp. 259–274). One regrets that his article on the origin of the Vajrayāna (*ZDMG* 90, 1936, pp. 546–572) has not been reprinted likewise. Von Glasenapp has always paid much attention to the relations between Indian religions, cf. 'Jaina-Buddhist parallels as an auxiliary to the elucidation of early Buddhism' (first published in the Belvalkar Felicitation Volume, Banaras, 1957), 'Der Buddhismus in der Vorstellungswelt der Hindus' (first published in 1954 in the Festschrift Weller) and 'Die Polemik der Buddhisten und Brahmanen gegen die Jainas' (first published in 1951 in the Schubring Festschrift). The first two are reprinted in *Von Buddha zu Gāndhī*, the last one in the *Kleine Schriften*.

The *Kleine Schriften* contains a detailed index which will be very welcome. It would have been even more useful if it had also included *Von Buddha zu Gandhi*, which has no index. The studies published in both volumes manifest the depth and the range of von Glasenapp's scholarship. It is good to see that so many of his articles and other publications have now become more accessible. It is to be hoped that some of his other publications which have long been out of print will also be reprinted, for instance *Unsterblichkeit und Erlösung in den indischen Religionen* (Halle, 1938) and *Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens* (Halle, 1940). The *Kleine Schriften* contains a reprint of his article on Schopenhauer and India (*Schopenhauer-Jahrbuch* 36, 1955, pp. 32–48), but his long article on the problem of god in Schopenhauer and in the metaphysical systems of the Indians (*ibid.* 28, 1941, pp. 151–195) is not reprinted.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTE

¹ A detailed summary of it was made by Kanakura Enshō in 1939: 'Bukkyō ni okeru hō no imi' (*Bukkyō Kenkyū*, III, 4). It is reprinted in his *Indo tetsugaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*. I. *Bukkyōgaku-hen* (Tōkyō, 1973), pp. 105–122. Kanakura's article is not mentioned by Károlyi.

Mikkyō daijiten. Kaiteizōhō [Great dictionary of Tantrism. Revised and enlarged.] Kyōto, Hōzōkan, 1979. Vol. I, *a-ke* (XVI pp. + pp. 1–490), vol. II, *ko-jine* (pp. 491–1014), vol. III, *shihā-ta* (pp. 1015–1575), vol. IV, *chi-he* (pp. 1575–1984), vol. V, *ho-n* (pp. 1985–2335); *ho-i* (pp. 2337–2347), vol. VI, *sakuin-nenpyō*, 4 + 90 + 24 + 4 + 70 + 2 + 9 + 115 + 107 pp., 2 plates, 218 ill. (63 pp.). Yen 66.000.

The *Mikkyō daijiten* was first published in three volumes in 1931–1933. The most recent edition published in 1979 is a reprint of the revised and enlarged edition which appeared in 1968–1970. The dictionary itself has remained unchanged, but volume V contains a small supplement (pp. 2337–2347). Several important additions are to be found in the index volume. The first addition consists of three parts: 1. Genealogies of Tantric schools (*Mikkyō hōryū keifu*), pp. 1–32; 2. Pictures of 383 mudrās with an index (*Mikkyō inzushū – sakuin*), pp. 33–65; 3. A bibliography of articles on Mikkyō from the beginning of the Meiji period to the end of 1965 (*Mikkyō kankei shūyō ronbun mokuroku*), pp. 66–90. The bibliography is arranged systematically in thirteen sections (1. Texts; 2. History; 3. Temples; 4. Doctrine; 5. Maṇḍala; 6. Dhāraṇī, bīja, mudrā, mantra; 7. Rituals; 8. Shūgendō; 9. Tachikawa school; 10. Ryōbu shintō; 11. Taimitsu; 12. Tantra; 13. Art). In each section the articles are listed in chronological order. The bibliography is selective, and is more detailed for the publications of the Shōwa period (1926–1965). The second addition consists of two parts: 1. A chronological table of the history of Mikkyō (*Mikkyō nenpyō*), pp. 1–90; 2. A chronological table of the Chinese translations of Tantric texts (*Mikkyō kyōten kanyaku nenpyō*), pp. 91–107.

The index volume of the *Mikkyō daijiten* is extremely useful for the study of Sino-Japanese Tantrism. Its importance was pointed out by Paul Demiéville in the *Bibliographie bouddhique*, Tome VI (Paris, 1936), p. 16. In the original editions the third volume contained the concluding part of the dictionary itself and a series of indices which were explained by Demiéville. The original edition contained only 20 plates. The new edition contains two plates in colour and 63 plates with 218 pictures in black and white.

For more than forty years the *Mikkyō daijiten* has remained the only major Tantric dictionary. An entirely new Tantric dictionary was published in 1975 (cf. *IJJ* 18, 1976, pp. 320–321). This latter dictionary is called *Mikkyō jiten* but, whereas the *Mikkyō daijiten* is primarily a dictionary of Mikkyō, the Sino-Japanese tradition of Tantrism, the *Mikkyō jiten* is a dictionary of Tantrism because it incorporates not only Mikkyō but also Tantrism in India, Tibet, Nepal, etc. Like the great *Bukkyō daijiten* in 10 volumes, the *Mikkyō daijiten* is an encyclopaedia rather than a dictionary. For the study of the Sino-Japanese tradition of Tantrism it is an indispensable standard work which is not likely to be replaced in the near future. Since its original publication in 1931–1933 Japanese specialists in Tantrism have become more and more interested in the study of Indian Tantrism on the basis of Sanskrit texts and Tibetan translations and especially since the second world war, much progress has been made in this field. However, the study of Indian Tantrism is still in its infancy and it is not very likely that in the near future it will be possible to compile a comprehensive dictionary of Tantrism with all its ramifications.

We must be extremely grateful to the scholars who made such important additions to the index volume of the *Mikkyō daijiten* and to the Hōzōkan publishing company for having reprinted this revised edition in six splendid volumes.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Hartmut Walravens (Hrsg.), *Kleinere Schriften von Berthold Laufer*. Teil 2: Publikationen aus der Zeit von 1911 bis 1925 (*Sinologica Coloniensia* 7). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1979. 2 Bde, LIII, 1–828 pp.; 829–1625 pp. DM 168.—.

The first part of Laufer's *Kleinere Schriften* comprised works published between 1894 and 1910 (cf. *IJJ*, 20, pp. 129–130). This second part contains a selection of Laufer's publications in the years 1911–1925 and a few additions to the first part. In the first part the editor reprinted all of Laufer's writings during the period 1894–1910 with the exclusion of those which had been reprinted already. According to Walraven's bibliography Laufer's publications in the years 1911–1925 amount to 180 (nos. 137–316). About half of them are reprinted in these two volumes (pp. 319–1604). Regrettably not reprinted are the many articles which Laufer contributed to the *T'oung Pao* (nos. 149–151, 176–178, 183–187, 199–205, 209–212, 235). Tibetologists will be particularly disappointed not to find here such important articles as 'The application of the Tibetan sexagenary cycle' (*TP*, 14, 1913, pp. 569–596), 'Bird divination among the Tibetans' (*TP*, 15, 1914, pp. 1–110), 'Was Odoric of Pordenone ever in Tibet?' (*TP*, 15, 1914, pp. 405–418) and 'Loan-words in Tibetan' (*TP*, 17, 1916, pp. 403–552). Also not reprinted is Laufer's translation of the *bTsun-mo bka'i t'añ-yig* (*Der Roman einer tibetischen Königin*, Leipzig, 1911) which has become a bibliographical rarity. However, one must welcome the fact that Laufer's work on the *Citralakṣaṇa* has been reprinted notwithstanding its size (pp. 540–740).

Laufer's productivity in this period is truly amazing. Apart from numerous articles and reviews, he published several books of which the most important are his book on *Jade* (Chicago, 1912) and the *Sino-Iranica* (Chicago, 1919). Both books testify to the range and depth of Laufer's scholarship during the most productive period of his life. It is not surprising to see that they have been reprinted several times. In the years 1908–1910 Laufer was in charge of the Mrs. T. B. Blackston Expedition to China and Tibet, and in the following years he published many contributions to the study of Chinese art which are reprinted here with the exclusion of

several monographs reprinted elsewhere (*Notes on turquois in the East*, Chicago, 1913; *Chinese clay-figures*, Chicago, 1914; *The beginnings of porcelain in China*, Chicago, 1917).

Tibetan language and literature and Chinese art are only two of the many subjects studied by Laufer. Two articles which date from 1911 concern 'King Tsing, the author of the Nestorian inscription' and 'The introduction of vaccination into the Far East'. Other articles deal with 'Cardan's suspension in China' (No. 215), 'The vigesimal and decimal systems in the Ainu numerals' (No. 221), 'Concerning the history of finger-prints' (No. 233), 'Multiple births among the Chinese' (No. 260) and 'The introduction of tobacco into Europe' (No. 300).

In 1908 Laufer was appointed curator of the Field Museum in Chicago, where he remained until his death in 1934. Henry Field, who took up his duties as Assistant Curator of Physical Anthropology in 1926, contributes a lively description of Laufer as curator (pp. XX–XXVII). The personality of Laufer in earlier years of his life emerges clearly from his correspondence with Franz Boas (1858–1942). The latter for many years acted as a fatherly friend to Laufer and tried to promote his career in every way possible, even though Laufer himself did not always make the task easy. In 1898–1899 Laufer was the leader of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition to Sakhalin and the Amur region, and in 1901–1904 he was in charge of the Jacob H. Schiff expedition to China. His letters to Boas give much interesting information on these two expeditions and the often difficult conditions in which he was obliged to work. The letters from Laufer to Boas and Boas to Laufer (pp. 1–286) are followed by the correspondence between Erwin von Zach (1872–1942) and Laufer (pp. 286–301).

Dr. Hartmut Walravens, the editor of these two volumes, deserves our gratitude for his publication of Laufer's letters and *Kleinere Schriften*. His task is not yet completed for a third part will be required for the publication of Laufer's works in the last period of his life (1926–1934) and of those published after his death. This part will probably also include the detailed index announced by the editor in the preface to the first part. Let us hope that, after the publication of the third part, the publishers may be persuaded to reprint in an additional volume some of the books and articles which had to be omitted from the second part of the *Kleinere Schriften*.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Christopher H. B. Reynolds, *Sinhalese. An introductory course*. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London 1980, 319 S.

Zu den bekannten Einführungen in die gesprochene singhalesische Sprache¹ (spoken or colloquial Sinhalese) ist eine neue getreten. In den Grundzügen war C. H. B. Reynolds "Course" schon im Jahre 1967 fertiggestellt; die nun vorliegende überarbeitete Fassung hat der Verfasser im Jahre 1978 abgeschlossen.

Das Lehrbuch "is intended to give a general introduction to the [spoken] language in a form which can be used, if necessary, without a teacher" . . . It "is designed for westerners, and therefore gives much fuller comment and explanation than any existing course known to the compiler . . . It should provide an essential introduction to further study of the language and its literature" (Preface). Das Lehrbuch soll im folgenden auch gemäß den Zielsetzungen und Ansprüchen seines Verfassers beurteilt werden.

Zunächst zum Aufbau: Dem eigentlichen Lehrgang ist ein Kapitel vorangestellt, in dem die Grundregeln der Aussprache knapp dargelegt werden ("Introduction" S. 1–9). Der Stoff des folgenden Lehrgangs ist auf 31 Lektionen aufgeteilt worden (S. 10–271). Am Anfang jeder

Lektion werden Vokabeln eingeführt, die dem häufiger vorkommenden Wortschatz entstammen. Sie sind ausgewählt nach den Erfordernissen des grammatischen Teils, welcher folgt. In diesem jeweils untergliederten Teil werden – stufenweise und aufeinander aufbauend – die Elemente der Grammatik – Morphologie und Syntax – eingeführt. Von Anfang an werden auch, soweit nötig, die Gebrauchsbedingungen der eingeführten Vokabeln behandelt. Der folgende dritte Teil enthält jeweils Übungsstücke für die Übersetzung vom Singhalesischen ins Englische (= A) und umgekehrt (= B). Zu A und B werden reichhaltige Übersetzungshilfen gegeben, die Hinweise zur Syntax und zur Idiomatik enthalten, ferner Sacherklärungen zum Wortschatz. Übersetzungen der englischen Sätze ins Singhalesische, welche der Kontrolle dienen, werden gesondert in einem späteren Abschnitt (S. 272–301) zusammengefaßt. Die singhalesischen Laute, Wörter und Sätze der Lektionen werden durchweg in Umschrift mit lateinischen Buchstaben und den notwendigen Spezialzeichen wiedergegeben. Die Umschrift stellt einen Kompromiß dar zwischen den tatsächlichen Lautungen und den Schreibungen, die sich bei einer Transliteration des geschriebenen colloquial Sinhalese ergeben würden. Die Lektionen 1 bis 17 enthalten zusätzlich eine Einführung in die singhalesische Schrift, in der auch die in Lehnwörtern aus dem Pāli und Sanskrit vorkommenden Zeichen und Ligaturen berücksichtigt worden sind. Diese Einführung befriedigt nicht recht. Das liegt weniger daran, daß in dem Buch nur handgeschriebene Zeichen der geschriebenen Schrift (d.h. nicht die Zeichen der Druckschrift²) reproduziert worden sind, die teils wegen ihrer Kleinheit, teils wegen ihrer Undeutlichkeit nur schwer lesbar sind (besonders krass trotz der beigegebenen Transkription in dem abschließenden Text S. 143 f.). Es kommen in den Schriftproben vielmehr mehrfach singhalesische Wörter vor, deren Bedeutung dem Lernenden nicht erklärt wird. Gravierend macht sich bemerkbar, daß in dem Lehrbuch überhaupt auf eine systematische Behandlung des Verhältnisses von tatsächlich vorkommender Schreibung und gesprochener Sprache (= Aussprache) verzichtet worden ist. Vereinzelte Hinweise zur schriftsprachlichen Schreibweise (s. dazu unten) können da nur unzulänglich Abhilfe schaffen. Sehen wir von Lehn- und Fremdwörtern einmal ab, so unterscheidet sich die Schreibung der Wörter der gesprochenen singhalesischen Sprache doch auch in vielerlei Hinsicht von der Schreibweise, die sich ergäbe, wenn anstelle der von Reynolds für die Wiedergabe von Lauten, Formen, Wörtern und Sätzen gewählten Transkriptionszeichen die entsprechenden Zeichen des singhalesischen Alphabets eingesetzt würden.

Den Schluß des Lehrbuchs bildet ein Glossar (S. 302–319). Mit Hilfe der Hinweise bei den Wörtern des Glossars sind die Stellen zu finden, an welchen ein Wort eingeführt ist und/oder seine Bedeutung(en) und Verwendungsbedingungen behandelt worden sind.

Reynolds "Course", reich an Material und Erklärungen, ist sehr wohl geeignet, in die gesprochene singhalesische Sprache einzuführen, wenn dies mit Hilfe eines des Singhalesischen Kundigen geschieht. Daß das Lehrbuch durchweg auch zum Selbststudium dienen könne, erscheint zweifelhaft. Mit der Einführung in die Schrift dürfte der Autodidakt aus den genannten Gründen Schwierigkeiten haben. Er wird sich auch zusätzliche Beispiele zur Verdeutlichung bestimmter grammatischer Regeln wünschen (z.B. S. 79 zum Gebrauch von *nemeyi*; S. 95 zur Veränderung des Stammsilbenvokals in der Vergangenheitsform; S. 120 zur Verwendung von *baṇ*; S. 171 zum Gebrauch von *hamba venavaa*; S. 236 zur *vena anik* nach *æra*). Der Text S. 143 f. bleibt ohne jeden Kommentar; es ist der einzige zusammenhängende Text, den das Lehrbuch bietet. Anstelle der ohne jeden inhaltlichen Zusammenhang nebeneinanderstehenden Beispielsätze der Übungsstücke hätten die jeweils zu verdeutlichenden grammatischen Regeln wenigstens hier und da in zusammenhängenden Texten (Dialogen, Beschreibungen, Erzählungen) exemplifiziert werden können. Die Darstellung des grammatischen Stoffes ist nicht immer übersichtlich. Mehr Raum hätte auf jeden Fall auf die Hauptunterscheidungen im System der Verben verwendet werden sollen. Dies betrifft die Unterscheidungen sowohl nach formal-morphologischen Kriterien (Verben auf *-anavaa*, *-inavaa* und *-enavaa* sowie die Klasse der Verben mit unregelmäßiger Bildung des Präsens- und Präteritalstammes) als auch nach semantischen Gesichtspunkten. Auf S. 94 werden zunächst nur zwei Konjugationstypen unterschieden; auf S. 102 werden sodann die Involitiva auf *-enavaa* trotz andersartiger Bildung ihrer Vergangen-

(II) On page 52 (paragraph 7.8) the author points out the difficulty involved in interpreting the rule: *tumarthacca bhāvavacanāt* (2. 3. 15), if one were to accept Patañjali's view of *bhāva* (action) as the meaning of the suffix *tum*. In this context the following comments in the *Bālaṃanoramā* deserve to be noted:

(Here the *Kaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣita has the gloss thus: *bhāvavacanāś ceti sūtreṇa yo vihitas tadntāc caturthī syāt.*) . . . *avyayakṛto bhāve iti tumuno bhāve eva vihitatvena tumarthakasya pratyayasya bhāvavacanatve siddhe punar bhāvavacanagrahaṇam sūtraviśeṣa-parigrahaṇārtham ity āha – bhāvavacanāś ceti. bhāve ityadhikṛtya ye ghañādipratyayā vihitās te kriyārthakriyāyām upapadabhūtāyām bhaviṣyati syur iti tadarthaḥ.* etc. (*tādṛśabhāvādhikāra-vihitapratyayāntād – ity ayam artho bhāvavacanād iti padasya. bhāvādhikāra-bahirbhūta-tumunṇvulāvitīsūtravihitapratyayāntāt – pācako vrajātītyādaḥ caturthīvāraṇam bhāvavacanād iti padasya prayojanam*). These expressions within brackets are mine, which are supplied in the light of further explanations in the *Bālaṃanoramā*, *Kāśikā*, and the *Nyāsa*. In this traditional interpretation too there is no redundancy in having both the words *tumarthāt* and *bhāvavacanāt*, as the meanings and purposes served by the two are different. Later on in the same context the *Bālaṃanoramā* has: *bhāvavacanād iti kim? pācako vrajati. paktum vrajātīty arthaḥ. tumunṇvulāv iti ṇvul. tasya tumarthakatve 'pi bhāve ityadhikāre vidhyabhāvāt na caturthī.* The author does not make any reference or comments about the *Bālaṃanoramā*, particularly in this context.

(III) In the Note 52 about the sentence from the *Svapnavāsavadatta*: *āryaputraḥ iha āgatya . . . saṃmānitā bhaveyam* it is said "if *tvā* denotes agent, as seen in the original paninian system, the nominative *āryaputraḥ* is perfectly justified." Here it would be better if it is made clear as to what is the agent of the *saṃmānanakriyā* (to be construed with the *saṃmānitā bhaveyam*). If it is *āryaputraḥ*, then there seems to be the violation of the principle of the shared *kāraḥ* (noted in *pradhānetarayoh* and supported by Pāṇini's rules also).

(IV) On page 94 (lines 10–11) the author says thus: "Actually Kaiyaṭa's explanations appear to be paraphrases of passages in the *Padamañjarī*". This statement seems to require modification, because Kaiyaṭa is believed to be earlier than Haradatta and so it would be Haradatta that utilized the passages of Kaiyaṭa. Śrīś Chandra Chakravarti in his Introduction to the edition of the *Nyāsa* (p. 22), and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka in his *Samskṛta-vyākaraṇa-śāstrakā -itihāsa* think Haradatta to be later than Kaiyaṭa.

University of Toronto

T. VENKATACHARYA

Bernfried Schlerath, *Sanskrit Vocabulary*. Arranged according to word families with meaning in English, German and Spanish. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1980. IX, 216 pp. Dgl. 48, —.

In his preface Schlerath remarks that the acquisition of vocabulary is largely neglected in the teaching of Sanskrit, and that the principles of word-formation are not usually regarded as a part of the grammar of Sanskrit. The basic rules of word-formation are explained by him in three pages dealing with *Ablaut*, the development of IE *ə* in Sanskrit, *saṃprasāraṇa* and the *kṛt* and *taddhita* suffixes.¹ The vocabulary contains nearly all words which occur in the grammars of Gonda, Perry and Stenzler. Schlerath suggests that the vocabulary should be learned little by little, concurrently with the grammar, and be used as a work of reference for the translation of the exercises in the three grammars referred to. According to him, his work covers more or less the basic vocabulary of the Pañcatantra, Hitopadeśa, Kathāsaritsāgara and the Mahābhārata.

A serious student who has the courage to study carefully the 216 pages of this vocabulary will undoubtedly obtain a better insight into the formation of Sanskrit words. One must, however, express serious doubts about the willingness of students to undertake such a task in addition to

the learning of Sanskrit grammar and the reading of exercises. Schlerath's book can certainly be helpful in explaining in class the rules of word-formation. A student who uses it for his own study will often be unable to find a word. Schlerath's book would have gained much in usefulness if he had added an alphabetical index of words at the end. If set in small type, this would not have substantially augmented the number of pages.

The vocabulary was composed in Mexico and this explains probably not only the fact that the meanings are given also in Spanish, but also why sometimes explanations are given only in Spanish, for instance: *ajra*- m. pasture, field // Weide, Feld // pasto ("a donde se conduce el ganado"), campo. In several places Schlerath refers to Mayrhofer and Wackernagel, works which are usually not used by students. In indicating the meanings Schlerath has probably made much use of Monier-Williams' dictionary. In some cases he could have corrected the meanings given in it by referring to recent studies such as, for instance, Emeneau's article on *kila*, *khalu* and *nūnam* (*IJJ* 11, pp. 241–266). The *IJJ* is referred to on p. 136, n. 1 (for a second root ²*math*- "to rub" cf. Narten, *IJJ* 4, 1960, 121 sqq.). Schlerath gives as only English equivalent for *kila* 'indeed'. It would have been better to render it with 'it is said' (cf. Emeneau, *IJJ* 11, p. 244).

Most elementary grammars give a list of preverbs but without indicating that they are not only used in forming verbal compounds but also in forming nominal compounds. It would have been useful if Schlerath had indicated this clearly. It must be rather confusing for a student to find, for instance, *ni*, *nis* and *vi* only designated as adverbs: *ni* (adv.) down; *nis* (adv.) out, forth, away; *vi* (adv.) separated from one another, off, away. Other preverbs are listed without any further qualification: *apa* away, off, on the outside of; *ava* down from, off; *ud* up, upwards, on, over, above. Reading these meanings, a student would probably expect to find *apa*, *ava* and *ud* used both as adverbs and as pre- or postpositions. On p. 3 Schlerath quotes *ati* as *ati*^o, indicating that it occurs as first member of a compound. However, *sam* is written *sam*- (prefix expressing conjugation). On p. 110 he writes ^o*pārśve* and ^o*pārśvam* but on p. 195 we find *-sakha*- at the end of compounds: accompanied by. Elsewhere ^o is used to indicate letters which have to be supplied, for instance, p. 23 *uttama* (*ud*-^o; superl.).

Schlerath's work is the only one of this kind and, for this reason, one would like to see it appear in a revised edition and provided with an index. In such a form it would certainly render useful services to both teachers and students.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTE

¹ P. vii, note 3 correct 3.2.1.1 to 2.1.1.

J.-M. Verpoorten, *L'ordre des mots dans l'Aitareya-brāhmaṇa* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. CCXVI). Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1977. 438 pp. 75 fr.

Le premier monographe consacré à l'étude de l'ordre des mots dans un brāhmaṇa est le travail de Delbrück paru en 1878: *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa dargestellt*. Comme le rappelle M. Verpoorten dans son introduction, plusieurs savants se sont occupés du problème de l'ordre des mots dans les brāhmaṇa mais sans en faire l'objet principal de leurs recherches. Ce sont surtout les travaux d'A. Minard qui sont riches en observations précieuses sur l'ordre des mots, en particulier, dans le Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa: *La subordination dans la prose védique* (Paris, 1936); *Trois énigmes sur les cent chemins*, I–II (Paris, 1949–1956).

L'Aitareya-brāhmaṇa (236 pages dans l'édition d'Aufrecht) est un texte beaucoup plus court que le Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa. C'est pourquoi M. Verpoorten a pu en faire un dépouillement pratiquement exhaustif (cf. p. 30, n. 42). Il explique que son choix de ce brāhmaṇa a été déterminé par les considérations suivantes: "Il est moins monumental que le ŚB, et aussi moins étudié; il présente une prose moins savante et vraisemblablement plus ancienne que celui-ci; enfin, il est moins technique que le *Pañcaviṃśa* par exemple" (p. 33, n. 55).

M. Verpoorten se sert du vocabulaire traditionnel et n'ajoute que peu de termes neufs. Il emprunte à la terminologie d'A. Martinet le terme "monème". Les monèmes autonomes incluent verbes, substantifs, adjectifs et adverbes, les monèmes fonctionnels les particules, les prépositions, les conjonctions, les pronoms et la négation *na*. Le nom "enclitique de phrase" désigne parmi les monèmes fonctionnels les particules de phrase et pronoms, qui se placent isolément ou en groupe, juste à la suite du monème, autonome ou fonctionnel, qui amorce la phrase et leur sert, peut-on dire, d'appui (p. 31). Quand plusieurs monèmes fonctionnels suivent le mot qui ouvre la proposition, le premier d'entre eux est dit occuper "l'enclise absolue", les autres "l'enclise relative". L'auteur distingue deux espèces de position initiale, l'initiale absolue et l'initiale relative. Un mot occupe l'initiale relative s'il suit un mot qui figure obligatoirement à l'initiale absolue. S'il s'agit d'un monème fonctionnel ou un verbe, cette localisation est nommée "enclise de phrase", mais, s'il s'agit d'un monème autonome, elle s'appellera "position initiale relative" ou "position médiane", selon que l'attaque de phrase est formée d'un (ou de plusieurs) monème(s) fonctionnel(s), ou d'un seul monème autonome (p. 33). Ajoutons que le verbe qui occupe l'enclise de phrase est qualifié d' "enclitique de phrase" (p. 33, n. 53). Il s'agit surtout du verbe copule et des déclaratifs. Vu l'importance que l'auteur attache à la position occupée par ces catégories de verbes, on s'étonne de ne pas les voir étudiées à part dans son livre. Le premier chapitre étudie la place du verbe mais en se concentrant sur les trois positions (finale, initiale et intérieure) que le verbe peut occuper. Le verbe déclaratif est étudié dans les chapitres sur le discours direct et sur les citations mais ici l'accent est mis sur la position du discours direct et des citations. En ce qui concerne l'enclise de phrase du verbe copule l'auteur ne signale que très peu d'exemples, (p.ex. § 52/4, § 103/3-4, § 120/3) qui ne suffisent pas pour prouver que l'enclise de phrase est le lieu naturel du verbe copule. Dans presque tous les exemples donnés pour illustrer la proposition prédicative verbale (§ § 47-52) le verbe copule (*as-* or *bhū-*) occupe la position finale.

Le livre de M. Verpoorten est divisé en vingt-cinq chapitres consacrés aux catégories grammaticales (verbe, substantif, adjectif, pronom, particules, préposition, etc.). Les derniers chapitres traitent du discours direct (XXII), des citations (XXIII), de l'ellipse (XXIV) et de la variation (XXV). La conclusion résume les caractéristiques principales de l'ordre du mot dans l'AB. Comparant l'AB aux autres brāhmaṇa l'auteur montre que les ressemblances sont très grandes et les divergences minimales.

Dans chaque chapitre l'auteur essaie de déterminer d'abord l'ordre normal et ensuite les écarts par rapport à la norme. Il donne toujours des exemples pourvus de traduction. Si l'ordre est normal, le nombre des exemples est limité. Il est plus élevé quand il s'agit d'illustrer des positions qui ne sont pas habituelles. Evidemment, l'attention de l'auteur se porte surtout sur les exceptions à la règle pour lesquelles il présente, autant que possible, des explications. Ce n'est pas toujours facile de déterminer pourquoi la règle n'a pas été suivie. L'auteur procède avec circonspection et se contente d'ajouter le mot "inexplicable" après un exemple si une solution ne s'offre pas. Quelquefois l'auteur est peut-être trop prudent. A propos de *sa/ta* l'auteur remarque que sa position normale est en tête de phrase. Dans § 295 il donne plusieurs exemples dans lesquels *sa/ta* est à l'enclise de la principale: I 1 9: *asyāṃ vāva sa na pratitiṣṭhati / yo na pratitiṣṭhati*: III 40 5: *oṣadhibhis taṃ bhiṣajyanti / yaṃ bhiṣajyanti*. Il est évident que les mots *asyāṃ* et *oṣadhibhis* sont mis à l'initiale pour les mettre en relief. D'autre part, l'ordre des mots dans la subordonnée relative peut avoir contribué à déterminer l'ordre des mots dans la principale par la force du parallélisme.

L'auteur a pris la peine de traduire tous les exemples. Ses traductions ont l'avantage de

montrer, de manière concrète, comment il analyse les exemples qu'il donne. Quand on consulte la traduction de Keith, on verra que l'auteur n'est pas toujours d'accord avec lui. Malheureusement, il s'est abstenu d'ajouter des notes ou des commentaires pour justifier ses traductions. Citons quelques exemples. P. 200, VIII 26 7: *annam evāsmā etad ūrjasvac chaśvad bhavati* 'Ainsi sa nourriture est fortifiante et toujours nouvelle'; Keith: 'verily thus for him food is ever full of strength'. P. 251, III 9 7: *ya u eva praiśān varṣīyaso-varṣīyaso veda / sa u eva tān sādhiyo veda* 'Celui qui connaît des injonctions de plus en plus longues connaît celles qui sont de plus en plus rentables'; Keith: 'he who knows the directions as ever greater, knows them better'. P. 232, VII 19 3: *sa āptaḥ parastān niruddhas tiṣṭhañ jñātvā svāny āyudhāni / brahmopāvartata* 'Lui, épuisé, resté en arrière (?), immobile, reconnaissant ses propres armes, se retourna vers le pouvoir sacré'; Keith: 'it being obtained and blocked from above standing, recognising its own weapons went up to the holy power'. Dans le passage précédent il est dit que le *brahman* et le *kṣatra* poursuivent le sacrifice. Le *kṣatra* n'arrive pas à l'attraper (*tam kṣatram ananvāpya nyavartata*) mais le *brahman* le poursuit et l'attrape (*athainam brahmānvait, tam āpnot*). Keith traduit *tam āpnot* par 'he obtained it' and *āptaḥ* par 'obtained'. Il faudrait peut-être mieux traduire partout par 'overtake'. En tout état de cause, *āp-* doit avoir le même sens en *tam āpnot* et en *sa āptaḥ*, et on ne voit pas comment *āpta-* pourrait être rendu par 'épuisé'.¹

L'étude de l'ordre des mots ne peut pas être entreprise sans tenir compte de leur fonction. C'est surtout le cas en ce qui concerne les particules qui jouent un rôle important dans la prose védique. Par exemple, l'auteur consacre dix-sept pages à une étude du mot *eva* et, dans la conclusion, il distingue onze fonctions essentielles. A la suite de cette étude sur *eva* l'auteur examine *eva tat* et montre que cette expression qui n'a pas retenu l'attention des savants qui se sont occupés de la prose brahmanique, sert pour indiquer le résultat de l'acte rituel. Le livre de M. Verpoorten est ainsi plein de remarques judicieuses et suggestives. Une étude exhaustive de ce genre n'aide pas seulement à mieux comprendre l'agencement de la phrase mais aussi à mettre en lumière la pensée ritualiste qui s'y exprime.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTE

¹ Pour la traduction de *parastān niruddhas* voir PW s.v. *parastāt* (2): "*parastān nirudhyātiṣṭhat vorn den Weg vertretend.*"

T. Venkatacharya, *The Rasārṇavasudhākara of Simhabhūpāla*. Critically edited with introduction and notes (The Adyar Library Series, vol. 110). Madras, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1979. CXXXII, 524 pp. Rs. 110, AUS \$20.00, US \$22.00, £10.00.

The *Rasārṇavasudhākara* was published in Telugu characters in 1895 and in Devanāgarī in 1916 by T. Ganapati Sastri in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. However, it has not received much attention from scholars. For instance, it is not mentioned in Renou's chapter on dramaturgy in the second volume of *L'Inde classique* (Paris-Hanoi, 1953, pp. 118–124). Ganapati Sastri's edition is based on six manuscripts, but does not give a very correct text. It is therefore greatly to be welcomed that T. Venkatacharya has now published a critical edition of this important work which was quoted by Sanskrit authors such as Mallinātha, Kumārasvāmin, etc. (cf. p. CXXX). The author is King Simhabhūpāla II of the Recarla family. His capital Rājācala, referred to as Rācakonḍa in the *Historical Atlas of South Asia* (Chicago, 1978), is situated in the Nalgonda

district about 40 miles from Hyderabad. In his introduction Venkatacharya gives a history of the Recarla family, quoting from N. Venkataramaniah's introduction to his edition of the *Velugōṭivāriṃśāvali* (Madras University, 1939). Venkatacharya explains the name Recarla as being a regionalized form of the word *rājācala* (p. lxvi). According to Venkataramaniah, Siṃhabhūpāla must have ascended the throne some time after 1381 AD, the date of the latest inscription of his father Anapōta (p. lxxvi).

For his edition Venkatacharya has consulted eleven manuscripts, seven of which are in Telugu characters and four in Grantha characters (cf. pp. xii–xiv and xxxvii–xlii). In his lengthy introduction he deals with many topics related to the RAS [= Rasārṇavasudhākara]: IV. Some Telugu and Sanskrit titles (*birudas*) found in the RAS (pp. lxxviii–lxxxiii); V. The five *arthopakṣepaka*-s (introductory scenes) and the question of *aṅkabahirbhāva* of the *viṣkambhaka* and the *praveśaka* (pp. lxxxiii–xciii); VI. The *saṃdhiniyama* and *kramaniyama* of the *saṃdhyāṅga*-s and the position of the *saṃdhyantara*-s (pp. xciii–xcix); VII. The type of *prahasana* to which the *Bhagavadajjuka* belongs (pp. xcix–cii); VIII. On Rudraṭa mentioned in the *Rasārṇavasudhākara* (pp. cii–cxi); IX. Is Bahurūpamiśra later than Siṃhabhūpāla? (pp. cxi–cxix); X. The meaning of the word *vāsaka* in *Vāsakasajjā* or *Vāsakasajjikā*; XI. The *raṅgaprasādana* or the *raṅgaprasādhana* (pp. cxix–cxxiv); XII. Correct readings in the new manuscripts of the RAS, and the incorrect ones in TSS edition (pp. cxxiv–cxxvi); XIII. Names of authors and works mentioned in the RAS (pp. cxxvi–cxxix); XIV. Some works and writers quoted in the RAS without mentioning the names (pp. cxxix–cxxx); XV. RAS quoted by others (p. cxxx). The RAS quotes many verses which have almost all been identified by the editor. They are listed in the index of illustrative and other verses (pp. 491–515).

The edition of the text is accompanied by many notes which not only list variant readings but also contain explanations and references to other works on dramaturgy. The work consists of four *vīlāsa*-s, the contents of which are listed in detail in the *viṣayānukramaṇi* (pp. xv–xxxvi).

In 1969, T. Venkatacharya published an edition of the *Daśarūpaka* with Dhanika's *Avaloka* and Bhaṭṭaṇṣiṃha's *Laghutikā* (The Adyar Library Series, vol. 97). The edition of the RAS could not have been entrusted to better hands. It is a great pleasure to welcome this excellent edition which has been beautifully printed by the Adyar Library. The RAS has not yet been translated into English. The only translation available at present is a Telugu translation published by Bulusu Venkataramaniah in 1950 (cf. p. xi). Professor Venkatacharya would oblige the world of scholarship greatly by translating this text which he knows better than anybody else.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Monika Jordan-Horstmann, *Sadani. A Bhojpuri Dialect Spoken in Chotanagpur*. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1969. XX, 196 pages, bibliography, maps.

One of the most promising areas of research in New Indo-Aryan linguistics at the present time is that of the four languages -Maithilī, Magahī, Bhojpurī, and Sadānī – that belong to the Bihari subdivision of the Hindi group of languages. Several fascinating and as yet little-investigated features of these forms of speech will have to be thoroughly looked into before a satisfactory understanding of the grammatical evolution of the contemporary Indo-Aryan languages of northern India can be reached. Among these features are: the presence of a numeral classifier – which is a trait of all the Bihari and Eastern Hindi languages east of a line running from north to south through the districts of Kheri, Unnao, and Fatehpur in Uttar Pradesh; the use of as many as three alternate forms for nouns and adjectives; a weakened distinction of number and gender; and an interesting verbal system.

The obvious linguistic importance of the Bihari languages did not pass unnoticed in the

nineteenth century and valuable pioneering work was done by Kellogg in his *Grammar of the Hindi Language* (1875), by Hoernle in *The Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian (Arya-Indian) Languages* (1880), and especially by Grierson in two works, *Seven Grammars of the Dialects and Subdialects of the Bihārī Language* (1883–1887) and *An Introduction to the Maithilī Dialect* (1909). Unfortunately, in spite of this good start, very little further study was done on this well-prepared foundation. Aside from a small number of brief grammars meant for non-academic use, by the end of the sixth decade of this century only two linguists had attempted a detailed description of a language in this group. One of these was S. Jha, the author of *The Formation of the Maithilī Language* (1958), and the other was Udai Narain Tiwari, who wrote *Bhojpurī Bhāṣā aur Sāhitya* (1954) and *The Origin and Development of Bhojpurī* (1960). This neglect has largely been due to the fact that, except for Maithilī, none of these languages were able to develop literary traditions in the pre-modern period. Their geographical position has meant that they have been in the past and continue to be today so overshadowed both in the spheres of literature and of politics by Standard Hindi and Urdu to the west and Bengali to the east that they have been held in disdain by their own speakers as rustic tongues unworthy of polite usage or serious attention. Even some scholars have seen them as mere variants of either Hindi or Bengali. It, therefore, was with a great deal of pleasure that Monika Jordan-Horstmann's book on Sadānī was welcomed by those interested in Bihari languages. Since the publication of this book other grammars of Sadānī have been written in Hindi, in particular S. K. Gosvāmī's *Nāgpurī Bhāṣā* (Patna: Bihār Rāṣṭrabhāṣā Paṛiṣad, 1976), but it remains the only easily available study of Sadānī in a European language. For this reason a review of the book is essential, even though unforeseen circumstances have delayed the review for several years.

The book begins with an introduction of 18 pages followed by a section each on phonology (pp. 19–40), morphophonemics (pp. 41–52), and morphology (pp. 53–104) and closes with thirty-six pages of Sadānī texts and their English translations. There is also a glossary of Sadānī words (pp. 142–175), a summary of basic information about Sadānī, a table giving the Kaithi script, and an excerpt from the 1961 Indian census listing mother tongues with number of speakers for each.

In her introduction the author deals with the social and historical aspect of Sadānī: its number of speakers, its location, its name, and its general linguistic relationship. She also gives a brief survey of previous work done on Sadānī and finishes with an explanation of the nature of her own study. Since she has limited herself mainly to the speech of a single Sadānī speaker (p. 18), though she did have access to one other speaker, some tape recordings, and written materials, her results are naturally quite restricted. Her reliance on one person seems also to have given her the mistaken impression that "Sadānī . . . ceases to be a still productive language" (p. 14) and that it "is [being (?)] gradually replaced by Hindi, the State language of Bihar" (p. 186). In fact, Sadānī is a healthy, vigorous language with an important role to play as a lingua franca in southern Bihar (as the author also notes on pp. 181–182). In the years since this book was written Sadānī has even seen a modest literary flowering with the publication of such collections of stories, poems, and plays as *Nāgpuriyā (Sadānī) Sāhitya* (Ranchi, 1964) by P. S. Navrangī [P. S. Nowrangī], Shravan Kumār Gosvāmī's *Dū Dāir Bīs Phūl* (Students' Book Depot, Ranchi, 1971), and Vacandev Kumār's *Ek Jhopā Nāgpurī Phūl* (Ranchi University, 1976). As a result of this new interest in Sadānī as a literary vehicle there is a definite tendency for speakers of Sadānī to regard it as an independent language and not as a dialect of Bhojpurī.

The treatment of both the phonology and morphophonemics is exhaustive and clear and the system of transliteration is adequate and harmonises well with the usual method of romanisation used for Standard Hindi. The chapter on morphology also is sound, though the explanations are all too often expressed in language too tangled to be immediately intelligible. For example, on p. 74 the author says about the verb *rah*: "The original meaning of *rah* in its non-preterite use is 'to remain'. In Sadānī *rah* means either 'to be' or 'to remain'.

important doctrine. As for the *trisvabhāva* theory (p. 13ff.), the question may arise as to whether Ratnākaraśānti differs slightly from the classical formulation found for example in Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā* (21–22; *paratantrasvabhāvas tu vikalpaḥ pratyayodbhavaḥ/niṣpannas tasya pūrveṇa sadā rahitatā tu yā/ /ata eva sa naivānyo nānanyaḥ paratantrataḥ/*). In his explanation of the topic of *prāptiniryāna* in Chapter i (pp. 12–14 of the Sanskrit text) Ratnākaraśānti writes: *kalpitesv anabhiniveśābhyāsaniṣṭhāyām tad abhiniveśajanmanaḥ paratantrasya sarvathā nivṛttau sarvākāraññatā bodhisattvena prāpyata iti samudāyārthaḥ// . . . tasmāt paratantrēnāpi svabhāvena bodhisattvo na prāpnoti . . . // . . . 'evam' iti kalpitenā svabhāvena 'eteṣām' iti paratantrārūpānām yā 'asvabhāvatā' śūnyatā, 'sānabhinirvṛttir' iti, sa pariniṣpanna-svabhāvena ity arthaḥ//* Both difference and non-difference of *śūnyatā* from the *paratantra* is then negated (as in Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikā* 22ab). At all events, Ratnākaraśānti has been understood by some commentators as so to speak devaluing the *paratantra*, even though he has explained it as *abhāvasvabhāva* 'having the self-nature of *abhāva*' in contradistinction to the *kalpita* explained as *asvabhāva* (p. 13 of the Sanskrit text); and he has been accordingly considered to be one of the main sources for the theory of the 'void of the other' (Tibetan *gžan ston*) which puts forward a special, positive theory of reality where it is the *pariniṣpanna* (rather than the *paratantra*) that is the ground of emptiness.² — But as remarked by Jaini (Introduction, p. 20–21), Ratnākaraśānti does not advocate the *ekayāna* theory in his discussion of the topics of *viśayapratīnīyama* and *vyāpti* in Chapter ii (p. 22 of the Sanskrit text), where he mentions only those Śrāvakas who turn towards Awakening (*bodhiparinātika*, in contradistinction to those who are *samaikāyana* and seek only tranquillity) as achieving the *samyaksambodhi* of a *buddha*. Evidently, therefore, he followed the *trīyāna* theory of the Vijñānavādins rather than the *ekayāna* (see D. Seyfort Ruegg, *Théorie du tathāgatagarbha et du gotra*, pp. 200, 203 n. 1; cf. p. 210).

Students of the Prajñāpāramitā literature and historians of the Yogācāra will both be indebted to Professor Jaini for deciphering and publishing the text of this very important work according to the two available manuscripts, and to Professor Yamada for his valuable textual notes drawn from the Tibetan translation which is indispensable for establishing a critical Sanskrit text.

London

D. SEYFORT RUEGG

NOTES

¹ In his valuable book *La réfutation bouddhique de la permanence des choses et la preuve de la momentanéité des choses* (Paris, 1976), K. Mimaki has asserted (p. 3) that Ratnākaraśānti's *Antarvyāptisamarthana* depends on the *Kṣāṇabhaṅgasiddhi* of Ratnakīrti, who was a disciple of Jñānaśrīmitra. But even if it is true that a *typologically* earlier form of the *antarvyāpti* doctrine is to be found in Ratnakīrti's work, chronological considerations appear to make it most unlikely that he was the teacher of Ratnākaraśānti, as Mimaki has asserted (p. 54); see the present reviewer's remarks in *JIP* 1 (1970), pp. 305–6. At all events, contrary to Mimaki's hypothesis (in his note 198), Ratnakīrti has not been explicitly named anywhere in the *Antarvyāptisamarthana*. Moreover, Ratnākaraśānti seems to have been the contemporary of Ratnakīrti's master Jñānaśrīmitra.

Earlier publications touching on Ratnākaraśānti are by G. Tucci (on a Sanskrit fragment of a Tantrik commentary in *Asiatica*, Festschrift F. Weller, Leipzig, 1954); Y. Kajiyama (on the *Antarvyāptisamarthana*, in *IBK* 7, 1 [1958], pp. 364–360, and *Bukkyō-shigaku* 8/4 [1960], pp. 219–238); and the present writer (in the article in *JIP* 1 cited above). On the *Sārottamā/Sāratamā* and the *Śuddhimatī*, a commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, see our *Théorie du tathāgatagarbha et du gotra* (Paris, 1969). These earlier publications are additional to those referred to by Jaini in his Introduction to the book under review. — Recently, outlines

of Ratnākaraśānti's *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* and *Madhyamālamāropadeśa* have been published respectively by S. Katsura (*IBK* 25, 1 [1976], pp. 487–484) and O. Hayashima (*IBK* 26, 2 [1978], pp. 1012–1008).

² See our *Théorie* . . . , pp. 36f., 61, 101, 139.

Heidrun Brückner, *Zum Beweisverfahren Śaṅkaras. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion von dr̥ṣṭāntas im Br̥hadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya und im Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya des Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda* (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde Serie B: Asien. Band 5). Berlin, Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1979, 251 pp. DM 28,—.

Dr. Heidrun Brückner's careful investigation of the form and function of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* in Śaṅkara's two great commentaries not only shows the importance of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* in his work but also some of the fundamental characteristics of his philosophical thought. The *dr̥ṣṭānta* is one of the five members (*avayava*) of the syllogism in the Nyāyasūtras. Śaṅkara quotes from the Nyāyasūtras but adopts a system of reasoning with only three members. The proposition (*pratijñā*) must be proved by reasons (*hetu*) and examples (*dr̥ṣṭānta*). When the proposition has been proved, it can be repeated in the form of a conclusion (*upasaṃhāra* or *nigamana*) (cf. pp. 51–52). Śaṅkara himself explains the conditions which must be fulfilled by the *dr̥ṣṭānta*. It must be taken from ordinary experience and be generally accepted as true. There must be a correspondence between the *dr̥ṣṭānta* and that which is explained by it (*dārṣṭāntika*). The *dr̥ṣṭānta* cannot be used to prove something which is contrary to knowledge obtained by other sources of knowledge (cf. pp. 57–58). The term *dr̥ṣṭānta* occurs 52 times in the ChUBh (Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya) and 76 times in the BĀUBh (Br̥hadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya). The author examines in detail twenty-two examples of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* in the BĀUBh. Of the conclusions formulated by her, the most important is probably the following: "Der *dr̥ṣṭānta* – und ganz besonders der von der śruti verwendete *dr̥ṣṭānta* – ist gültiges Erkenntnismittel für metaphysische Verhältnisse und kann somit Dinge verständlich machen, die durch andere Erkenntnismittel nicht zugänglich sind, d.h. kann das Unbekannte mit Hilfe des Bekannten beleuchten" (p. 94). The author also examines the linguistic formulation of the *dr̥ṣṭānta*, and analyses two long passages of the ChUBh (II. 23.1 and VIII. 12.1) in order to show the function of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* in Śaṅkara's reasoning. Also all the instances of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* of the serpent and the rope in the ChUBh are discussed by her and compared with the use of the same *dr̥ṣṭānta* by Bhartṛhari and Dignāga. An appendix contains translated extracts (pp. 167–216) and the indices list the *dr̥ṣṭānta*-s in both commentaries. In her final conclusion the author points out that *dr̥ṣṭānta* is used by Śaṅkara to eliminate all ideas of multiplicity and to emphasize the existence of a uniform substratum. The *śruti* teaches the unity which is demonstrated by means of reasons and examples which convey that which is inaccessible to ordinary experience.

Dr. Heidrun Brückner's book is inspired by Paul Hacker's work on Advaita Vedānta which has been influential in giving a new direction to Vedānta studies in Europe and Japan, as can be seen from publications by Sengaku Mayeda and Tilmann Vetter. It is to be hoped that in due course Hacker's work will also exercise its influence in India itself.

Dr. Brückner's book is a very useful addition to the existing literature on Śaṅkara. It is to be hoped that she will extend her research to the Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, from which she has already collected the *dr̥ṣṭānta*-s, and to Śaṅkara's other works. It will then become possible to see to what extent his use of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* agrees with that of other Vedānta philosophers. For only through detailed studies of this nature can a deeper insight be obtained into the philosophy of the Advaita Vedānta.

It is obvious that the author has studied Śaṅkara's two commentaries very carefully. In one place, for instance, she rightly points out that the existing reading is not correct (cf. p. 207,

n. 1). However, it is not possible to read *'virodhād* instead of *virodhād* in the following passage: (ChUBh p. 495.18–20): *ya eṣo 'kṣiṇi puruṣo dṛśyata iti cchāyāpuruṣa eva prajāpatinoktaḥ/ svapnasuṣuptayoś cānya eva/na paro 'pahatapāpmatvādilaṅkaṇo virodhād iti kecin manyante*. P. 211: “Mit [der Aussage] *Der puruṣa, den man im Auge sieht* (ChU VIII, 7, 4) ist von Prajāpati nur der Reflexions-puruṣa gemeint. Und das ist ein anderer als der des Traumes und der des tiefen Schlafes. Es ist nicht der Höchste, der durch die Tatsache gekennzeichnet ist, dass er das Übel abgeschlagen hat usw., weil [dann] kein Gegensatz bestünde.” According to Śāṅkara’s opponents the reflection *puruṣa* is not the supreme self because there is a contradiction between the two, cf. Ānandagiri’s commentary (p. 496.5–6): *apahatapāpmatvāder avasthāvatt-vasya ca mitho virodho hetvarthaḥ*. On p. 209, n. 1 the author proposes to read *nivartitavijñānam* and translates “dessen Erkennen . . . abgebracht worden ist.” According to her, a variant reads *nivartitāvijñānam*. However, the text has *nivartitāvivikejñānam* and the variant reads *nivartitāvivekavijñānam*. Both the reading adopted by the author and her rendering are unacceptable.

It is, however, necessary to make one important reservation in recommending Dr. Brückner’s book. Both the BĀUBh and the ChUBh have been translated by Indian scholars, the former by Svāmī Mādhavānanda, and the latter by Ganganatha Jha. Although the translations are listed in the bibliography, the author does not seem to have made sufficient use of them. Svāmī Mādhavānanda’s translation is in general very good. Jha’s English is less readable and his translation is not always very careful. Nevertheless, it is wrong not to take notice of his interpretation which is based upon a long experience of Indian philosophical texts. There are several passages which were undoubtedly better rendered by these two scholars than by Dr. Brückner. It is only possible to point this out by quoting the Sanskrit texts and the translations given by Dr. Brückner and the above mentioned scholars.

The expression *-vyatirekeṇa*, ‘apart from, over and above’, has been misunderstood by the author, who renders it as ‘verschieden’ or ‘unterschieden’. For instance BĀUBh 623.25–26: *na ca svacchasyābhāvyavyatirekeṇa haritanīlalohitādīlakṣaṇā dharmabhedāḥ sphaṭikasya kalpayitum śakyante*. P. 92: “nicht eine Vielfalt von Attributen des Kristalls, bezeichnet als grün, blau, rot usw., angenommen werden darf, die von seiner Transparenz-Natur verschieden wären.” Svāmī Mādhavānanda translates (p. 680): “yet no one can imagine that crystal has any other attribute but its natural transparency, such as green, blue or red colour.” BĀUBh 566.10–12: *nanu nāsty eva dhiyā samānam anyad dhiyo 'vabhāsakam ātmajyotiḥ/dhīvyatirekeṇa pratyakṣeṇa vānumānena vānupalambhāt*. P. 183: “Ist es nicht so, dass es ein anderes, der Vorstellung ähnelndes ātman-Licht, das der Erhellende der Vorstellung wäre, gar nicht gibt? Denn mittels einer von der Vorstellung unterschiedenen Wahrnehmung oder Schlussfolgerung erkennt man nichts.” Svāmī Mādhavānanda (p. 617): “We say there is no such thing as the light of the self similar to the intellect and revealing it, for we experience nothing by the intellect either through perception or through inference.” BĀUBh 570.22–23: *ghaṭavac cakṣurgrāhyatve 'pi pradīpasya cakṣuḥ pradīpavyatirekeṇa na bāhyam ālokaśthānīyaṃ kimcit kāraṇāntaram apekṣate*. P. 186: “Obwohl die Lampe – wie der Topf – Gegenstand der Sehkraft ist, erfordert die Sehkraft, da sie von der Lampe verschieden ist, keinerlei anderes, äusserliches Mittel, das an Stelle des Lichtes (im anderen Falle) stünde.” Svāmī Mādhavānanda (p. 622): “But though the lamp, like the jar, is perceived by the eye, the latter does not require any external means corresponding to the light, over and above the lamp (which is the object).” The meaning of *vyatirikta* is not ‘getrennt’ but ‘different from, other than’. According to the Buddhist idealist a pot or a lamp is nothing but consciousness, cf. BĀUBh 571.10: *tasmān nāsti bāhyo 'rtho ghaṭapradīpādir vijñānamātram eva tu sarvaṃ*. In the beginning of this passage he remarks: *nanu nāsty eva bāhyo 'rtho ghaṭādīḥ pradīpo vā vijñānavyatiriktaḥ* (571.5). P. 187: “Ist es nicht so, dass ein äusserer Gegenstand, ein Topf usw. oder eine Lampe, getrennt vom Bewusstsein gar nicht existiert?” Svāmī Mādhavānanda (p. 622): “We say there is no external object like the jar etc. or the lamp apart from consciousness.”

In translating three passages of the Chāndogyaopaniṣadbhāṣya the author has not sufficiently

taken into account the interpretations found in Jha's translation. ChUBh 327.5–6: *yad api bījopamarde 'nikuro jāyamāno dr̥ṣṭo 'bhāvād eveti tad apy abhyupagamaviruddhaṃ teṣām*. P. 190: "Wenn sie behaupten, dass man den Schössling erst entstehen sieht, nachdem das Saatkorn zerstört ist, so ist ihre Folgerung trotzdem falsch, dass er aus blosser Nichtsein [entsteht]." Jha (p. 300): "It is true that the sprout is seen to appear only after the seed has been destroyed. But even this instance would not be compatible with the doctrine that 'it is from Negation alone that things are produced'." The expression *abhyupagamaviruddha* has also been wrongly translated in 327.9–10: *atha tad asty avayavavyatiriktaṃ vastubhūtaṃ tathā ca saty abhyupagamavirodhaḥ*. P. 191: "Und wenn es sich so verhält, dass es ein von den Teilen verschiedenes, existierendes Ding gibt, dann ist ihre Behauptung widersprüchlich." Jha (p. 300): "if there is such a positive entity apart from the constituents, – then this goes against their doctrine (that there is no positive entity)."

In the following passage *na tv etad asti*, 'but this is not the case', has been misunderstood. P. 328.14–16: *yady abhāvād eva ghaṭa utpadyeta ghaṭārthinā mr̥tpiṇḍo nopādīyeta/ abhāvaśabdabuddhyanuvṛttiś ca ghaṭādaḥ prasajyeta na tv etad asty ato nāsataḥ sadutpattiḥ*. P. 191: "Wenn das Tongefäss aus dem Nichtseienden hervorginge, dann brauchte einer, der ein Tongefäss haben wollte, keinen Tonklumpen. Ausserdem folgte daraus ein Fortbestehen des Wortes und der Begriffsvorstellung von etwas Nichtvorhandenem mit Bezug auf das Tongefäss usw., nicht jedoch [die Vorstellung] "Dieses existiert"; deshalb entsteht das Seiende nicht aus dem Nichtseienden." Jha (p. 301): "If the jar were to be produced out of Negation, then it would not be necessary for the man desirous of making a jar to seek for Clay. It would be possible too, in that case, for the jar and other objects to be conceived and spoken of as negations (non-entities). But neither of these two contingencies happens. Hence, we conclude that it is not true that 'Being is produced from Non-Being'."

In the second passage of the Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya the opponent (the Vṛttikāra according to Ānandagiri) claims that everybody can become a brahmasaṃstha by fulfilling the condition of resting in Brahman. According to him brahmasaṃstha is a word of which the meaning is clearly expressed by the word itself, whereas the meaning of words with a conventional meaning (*rūḍhiśabda*), such as *yava* and *varāha*, is known only by convention. P. 116.9–11: *na ca yavavarāhādiśabdavad brahmasaṃsthaśabdaḥ parivrājake rūḍhaḥ/brahmaṇi saṃsthitinimittam upādāya pravṛttatvāt/na hi rūḍhiśabdā nimittam upādadata/sarveṣāṃ ca brahmaṇi sthitir upapadyate*. P. 199: "Ausserdem hat der Ausdruck "brahmasaṃstha" nicht wie die Wörter "yava", "varāha" usw. eine nicht aus der Etymologie ableitbare Bedeutung, die auf den Wandermönch [begrenzt wäre], weil es gebraucht wird, wenn die Bedingung eines Aufgehens im brahman gegeben ist; denn Wörter mit einer aus der Etymologie ableitbaren Bedeutung bedürfen keiner zusätzlichen Erklärung. Und das Ruhen im brahman ist [im Prinzip] für alle möglich." Jha (p. 106): "nor is the connotation of the term 'resting firmly in *Brāhman*' rigidly restricted by convention to the *Wandering Mendicant only*; like such ordinary words as 'Barley, Boar' and the like; as its use is based entirely upon the fact of 'resting in Brahman' (which is what it literally connotes); while words that have their use dependent entirely upon convention do not have their use dependent upon any such connotation of the term, (etymologically). Then again, it is possible for all men to 'rest in Brahman'." However, Śāṅkara maintains that the term brahmasaṃstha is to be restricted to the paramahaṃsa, cf. p. 122.16–17: *tathehāpi brahmasaṃsthaśabdō nivṛttasarvakarmatatsādhanaparivrāḍekaviśaye 'tyāśramiṇi paramahaṃsākhya vṛtta iha bhavitum arhati*. Śāṅkara points out that it is not sufficient to live in a house in order to become a *gṛhasṭha*, but that one only becomes a *gṛhasṭha* by entering the stage (*āśrama*) of *gṛhasṭha*. A word like *gṛhasṭha* has both an etymological and a conventional meaning. The technical term for such a word is *yogarūḍha*, cf. L. Renou, *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*, II (Paris, 1942), p. 64: "yogarūḍha mot "dont le sens est traditionnel (ou conventionnel, v. *rūḍhi*), tout en ayant une connexion (étymologique régulière)", ex. *paṇkaja* - 'lotus', dérivé de *paṇka* + *ja* 'né dans la vase'." P. 122.11–16: *yat punar uktaṃ rūḍhiśabdā* (ed. *rūḍhaśabdā*) *nimittam nopādadata iti/ tan na/gṛhasṭhatakṣaparivrājakādiśabdadarśanāt/gṛhasṭhitipārvirājya-*

takṣanādinimittopādānā api gr̥hasthaparivrājakāv āśramaviśeṣe viśiṣṭajātīmāti ca takṣeti rūḍhā dr̥śyante śabdāḥ/na yatra yatra tāni nimittāni tatra tatra vartante/prasiddhyabhāvāt. P. 204:

“Was weiter gesagt worden ist, dass [nämlich] Wörter mit aus der Etymologie ableitbarer Bedeutung keiner [weiteren] Erklärung bedürften, das ist nicht [zutreffend], weil man Wörter wie “gr̥hastha”, “takṣan”, “parivrājaka” usw. kennt. Obwohl sie [etymologische] Erklärungen haben, [nämlich] das Leben in einem Hause, den Sachverhalt des Umherwanderns, das Zimmern usw., beobachtet man, dass die Wörter “gr̥hastha” und “parivrājaka” in dem Sinne eine nicht aus der Etymologie ableitbare Bedeutung haben, dass es sich um Menschen in einem bestimmten Lebensstadium handelt, und das Wort “takṣan” in dem Sinne eine solche nicht hat, dass einer gemeint ist, der einer bestimmten Kaste angehört; [aber] es ist nicht so, dass diese Wörter überall dort Anwendung finden, wo diese [etymologische] Erklärungen zutreffen, weil darüber kein allgemeines Einverständnis besteht.” Jha (p. 113): “It has been argued that “words whose connotation is fixed by convention do not depend upon other considerations (as those of etymology and the like)”. – But that is not right. Because we find many such words as (a) ‘Householder’ (*Gr̥hastha*), (b) ‘Wood-cutter’ (*Takṣā*), (c) ‘Wandering Mendicant’ (*Parivrājaka*) and the like; as a matter of fact, even all these terms have their connotations dependent upon (a) *the act of living in the House*, (b) *the act of wood-cutting*, and (c) *the act of wandering about in search of food* (which acts are etymologically signified by the terms); and yet they are found to have their connotations fixed by convention, as applying to persons in the two life-stages (of *Householder* and of *Wandering Mendicant*) and to a particular caste, that of the *wood-cutter*. But it does not follow from this that those terms are applicable anywhere and everywhere where the said conditions may be present [i.e. by merely *living in a house* one does not become a *Householder*, nor does he become a *Wandering Mendicant* merely by wandering about in search of alms]; because such is not the recognised connotation of the terms.” In several instances the meaning of well-known terms is not known to the translator. For instance she renders *upanyasya* by “erklärt worden ist” (p. 212) and *upanyāsa* by ‘Demonstration’ (p. 212). Also wrong is her translation of *prāptau satyām* by “Und [wenn] ferner [die Aussage] zutrifft” in the following passage in which she wrongly changes *yuktaḥ* to *ayuktaḥ*. P. 497.13–15: *jāgratsvapnayoḥ bhūtāni cātmānam ca jānātīmāni bhūtāny ayam aham asmīti/prāptau satyām pratiṣedho yuktaḥ syān nāha khalv ayam ity ādi.* P. 213: “Und [wenn] ferner [die Aussage] zutrifft: “Im Wachen und im Traume erkennt er sowohl den ātman als auch die Wesen als: diese sind die Wesen, dies bin ich” dann wäre die Negation: *nāha khalv ayam* . . . (ChU VIII, 11, 1) usw. unrichtig.” Jha’s translation is free but correct (pp. 473–474): “Then again, it has been asserted that “during the waking and dreaming states, the man does not know thing[s], as ‘these things’ nor does he know the Self, as ‘I am This’.” – There could be room for this denial – ‘In Truth, he does not rightly know himself etc.’ or (xi.1 above), – only if the contingency denied were with[in] the bounds of possibility.” A *prāpti* is a provisional and wrong conclusion.

On p. 208 *gamyamānasya* is translated by ‘zugänglich’ instead of by ‘cognised’. P. 491.18–19: *tac charīram asya samprasādasya trīsthānatayā gamyamānasya.* P. 208: “Der Körper gehört diesem, dem samprasāda, der dadurch zugänglich ist, dass er drei Zustände hat.” Jha (p. 468): “this Body is the *abode of the Being* in restful sleep, who is cognised in these states (of waking, dream and deep sleep).” The *samprasāda* is cognised as having these three states, cf. Ānandagiri’s explanation: *jāgratsvapnasuṣuptākhyasthānatrayasambandhitvena* (p. 492.9–10) ‘as being connected with the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep.’

P. 499.2: *tato gurutarasya pramāṇāntarasyānupapatteḥ.* P. 214–5: “denn es gibt kein davon verschiedenes stärkeres Erkenntnismittel.” Jha (p. 475): “Because there is no Means of Cognition, superior to (more reliable than) the Vedic text.”

Peter Zieme und György Kara, *Ein uigurisches Totenbuch*. Nāropas Lehre in uigurischer Übersetzung von vier tibetischen Traktaten nach der Sammelhandschrift aus Dunhuang British Museum Or. 8212 (109) (*Asiatische Forschungen*, Band 63). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1979. 347 pp. DM 88,-.

MS British Museum Or. 8212 (109) contains four Uigur texts translated from Tibetan originals. The texts belong to the cycle of Cakrasaṃvara and are based upon traditions connected with the teachings of Nāropa (1016–1100). The first text (A, lines 1–236) deals with the existence between death and rebirth (*antarābhava*, Tib. *bar-do*), death, the path to buddhahood and rebirth. The title of the Uigur version is rendered as “Der Dharma, der von den mit einfältigem Sinnesvermögen ausgestatteten Lebewesen der Reihenfolge nach verwirklicht und verstanden werden kann.” The third text (C, lines 1012–1297) is entitled “Das zu befolgende Ritual der sechs dhyānas der Caṇḍālī” (Tib. **Gtum-mo'i bsam-gtan drug-la 'khrīd-pa'i 'cho-ga*) and describes the first five of the six doctrines (*chos-drug*) of Nāropa (1. *gtum-mo*; 2. *sgyu-lus*; 3. *rmi-lam*; 4. *'od-gsal*; 5. *'pho-ba*; 6. *bar-do*). The fourth text (D, lines 1298–1430) deals with the six offerings (*mčhod-pa*) to Cakrasaṃvara. The most interesting text is the second, entitled “Die Instruktion der tiefen Lehre, die vier Arten von Reihen dem Weg entsprechend zu befolgen” (B, lines 236–1011). The name of the author is mentioned in the colophon: Dharmadhvaja or Čhos-kyi rgyal-mchan (1108–1176) from Čog-ro (cf. George N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, Part one, Calcutta, 1949, pp. 386–387). The original Tibetan text does not seem to have been handed down but the authors were able to discover a parallel text written by Sa-skyā chen-po Kun-dga' sñiñ-po (1092–1158). According to them the title is *Rim-pa bži lam-du sloñ-ba* and the text is nr. 7 in the first volume of the *Sa-skyā-pa'i bka'-bum* (Tokyo, 1968). However, the title is *Rim-pa bži-pa'i gdams-ñag* and the text is nr. 42 (pp. 249–254).

The third text was translated by Arya Ācārya from Qamīl (Hami) and written down in 1350 by Sarīy Tutung from Üč-lükčüng (Lukchun near Turfan). The other texts have no colophon but according to the authors the first three texts were written by the same scribe. Zieme and Kara have already published two volumes with Uigur texts translated from the Tibetan (*Fragmente tantrischer Werke in uigurischer Übersetzung*, Berlin, 1976; *Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas “Tiefer Weg” von Sa-skyā Paṇḍita und der Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*, Berlin, 1977). The present volume is of great interest not only to specialists in Uigur, but also to students in Tibetan Buddhism, because it contains translations of original Tibetan texts which must have been popular in the fourteenth century. The second text was written in the twelfth century by Čhos-kyi rgyal-mchan and, most probably, the other three texts belong to the same period. It is to be hoped that it will be possible to discover the Tibetan texts translated by the Uigur translators. However, the text of the *Rim-pa bži lam-du sloñ-ba* must have been very close to the text used by the Uigur translator and it is therefore possible to compare the Uigur translation with it, as has been done by the authors. The text of the *Rim-pa bži lam-du sloñ-ba* is reproduced in the notes to the translation of the Uigur texts and partly translated. It would have been very useful if the authors had given a complete and annotated translation of the Tibetan text. Of course, the main purpose of this publication is the edition and translation of the Uigur text, but it is not easy to see how the Tibetan text was translated into Uigur without comparing the Tibetan text in its original wording, or in translation, with the Uigur version. In many instances, the authors reproduce the corresponding Tibetan text but do not translate it. Specialists in Uigur who do not know Tibetan will be unable to compare the Tibetan original with the Uigur translation. However, they will not even obtain sufficient help from the passages translated, because the Tibetan text has often been misunderstood by the translators. In several instances the Uigur translation is closer to the original than the translation of the Tibetan text would suggest. Sometimes one has the impression that in translating the Uigur text the translators have not taken sufficient account of the Tibetan text. It is, of course, a hazardous undertaking for somebody who is not a specialist in Uigur to criticize the translation of the Uigur text, but it may be useful at least to indicate that, in some

places, the Tibetan original points to a different interpretation of the Uigur text. It must then be left to specialists in Uigur to decide whether it is indeed possible to arrive at an interpretation of the Uigur text which is more in accordance with the Tibetan text. It is a great help for an outsider to make use of the excellent glossary which contains all the words of the Uigur text accompanied by translations and references to the text (pp. 195–279). One regrets only that the authors have not added a Tibetan–Uigur vocabulary as was done in a previous publication (*Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas "Tiefer Weg"*, etc., pp. 72–79). One hopes that the authors plan to publish Tibetan–Uigur and Uigur–Tibetan vocabularies which comprise the equivalents found in the three volumes of Uigur translations of Tibetan texts which they have published.

The Tibetan text in the Sa-skyapa'i Bka'-bum is beautifully reproduced and very legible, but nevertheless the authors have often misread the text. The following misreadings and misprints have to be corrected: p. 100 *rluñ rgya'o* – *rluñ rgyu'o*; *rluñ bar byed-do* – *rluñ rgyu-bar byed-do*; p. 90 *mñams-na* – *ma ñams-na*; p. 101 *lña-bču-gčig-pa* – *lña-bču-rca-gčig-pa*; p. 112 *dbyibs rtogs-ste* – *dbyibs rtogs-pa ste*; *bstan-pa lta-bu* – *bstan-pa lta-bur*; p. 115 *gñis-pa sdus-te* – *gñis bsdus-te*; p. 116 *rdubs-pa'i* – *rñubs-pa'i*; p. 118 *dpe-pyad* – *dpe-byad*; p. 120 *rluñ-la dpye-na* – *rluñ-la dbye-na*; p. 128 *bčan-thabs-su* – *bcan-thabs-su*; *žuñ-dbyuñ btañ* – *žud dbyuñ-ba dañ*; p. 130 *rnam-pa bži* – *rnam-pa bži ni*; p. 131 *lus lčib* – *lus lči-ba*; *dri-čhu'i nañ-du rluñ* – *dri-čhu'i nañ-du čhu'i rluñ*; p. 136 *Sgra-čan-gyi* – *Sgra-gčan-gyi*; p. 138 *bčom-ldan-'das-pa* – *bčom-ldan-'das drug-pa*; p. 141 *rca mduñ* – *rca-mdud* (same correction, p. 143, p. 145 twice); p. 142 *rmi-ba dañs* – *rmi-ba dañ*; p. 143 *kha gyen-du byed* – *kha gyen-du phye-ba*; p. 145 *kha bye-ste* – *kha phye-ste*; *gnañ 'byed-pa'i* – *gnad 'byed-pa'i* (twice); p. 146 *dbe-bar gšegs-pa* – *bde-bar gšegs-pa*; *žug-te* – *žugs-te*; *de yan-čhad* – *de yan-čhad-du*; *byas-na sa dag-pa* – *byas-nas dag-pa*; p. 148 *cha phra-mos* – *čha phra-mos*; p. 150 *sprin bdeñs-pa* – *sprin deñs-pa*; p. 154 *'byuñ-ab* – *'byuñ-ba*; p. 155 *šdom-pa'i dpa'-bo dañ dpa'-bo dañ dpa'-mor* – *šdom-pa'i dpa'-bo dañ dpa'-mor*; p. 157 *sems-kyi thig-les* – *sems-kyis*; p. 158 *ño-bo ñid-du 'gyur-bq ste* – *no-bo ñid-du gyur-pa ste*. Words and passages have been omitted: p. 84 before Rim 71a3–6 add Rim 71a3 *šes-bya rgyud-kyi rim-pa dañ/bsgom-bya sñags-kyi rim-pa dañ/skye-ba ye-šes-kyi rim-pa dañ/mthar-thug gsañ-ba'i rim-pa'o*// (cf. Uigur 253–256); *bži-ste* – *bži/gžan snañ-gi rtags rnam-pa bži-ste*; p. 142 *las sna-chogs 'grub-pa dañ/nam-mkha'i la* – *las sna-chogs 'grub-pa dañ/nam-mkha'i rluñ nag-po nam-mkha'-la*; p. 146 *yon-tan bšad-yin-la* – *yon-tan bšad-pa'o*//*da ni skye-chul ye-šes-kyi rim-pa ston-pa ni/yon-tan či-byuñ thams-cad gžan-gyi rgyud-kyis bsdus-pa'i yon-tan yin-la*; p. 159 *ño-bo ñid-kyi sku'o* – *ño-bo gčig-tu gyur-pa ni ño-bo ñid-kyi sku'o*. On p. 125 the authors read *byas-pa'am sgom-čhen min-pa čig-la*, "jemandem, der kein Ausführender (der Tugenden) oder kein grosser Meditierender ist". This translation is, of course, impossible because *byas-pa* is not equivalent to *byed-(pa)-po*. In the reproduction one can still see vague traces of the vowel *i*. For *byas-pa* one must read *byis-pa*, 'an ignorant person'.

The translations of passages of the Tibetan text are often far from correct and elementary mistakes are common. On p. 80 the Tibetan text has *kham-s-gsum rgyu dañ mi-rgyu dañ*, "that which moves and which does not move in the three worlds, i.e. all that is animate and inanimate in the three worlds". The expression *rgyu dan mi-rgyu* corresponds to Skt. *carācara*. The Mongolian translation follows the Tibetan text but adds the genitive suffix: *γurban yirtinčü-yin bitüküi kiged üli bitüküi*. The translation given is completely wrong: "Die drei Welten, die offenbare sowie die nicht offenbare." On p. 85 *dkar-lam me-ba* is rendered by "der weisse Weg (*dkar-lam*) wie Feuer (*me-ba*?)." One must, of course, read *dkar lam-me-ba*, "white and clear" (cf. Jäschke's *Tibetan-English Dictionary* s.v. *lhañ-ñe*¹). On p. 87 *'čhi-kha-ma'i gdams-ñag*, "instruction in dying" (cf. Jäschke, p. 169b: *'čhi-kha-ma* 1. adj. dying; 2. sbst. the dying) is rendered by "eine tiefe Mutter-Lehre vom Sterben". On p. 90 the Tibetan text has *rgyu*, 'cause' and *rkyen*, 'condition': *srog-ñin-pa'i rluñ-gis rgyu byas/ma-rig-pas rkyen byas-nas nam-mkha' las brag rdib-pa lta-bu'i sgra'i snañ-ba 'byuñ-ba*, "it is due to the *prāṇa* wind as cause and to the nescience as condition that there arises the idea of a sound like that of a rock falling

from the sky.” This is rendered as follows: “dann bewegt sich der Wind des Erhaltens des Lebens, und durch die Wirkung der Unwissenheit erscheint die Auffassung des Tons vom Himmel herabgestürzter Felsen.” The Uigur translation agrees with the Tibetan Text. *Rgyu byas*, literally ‘made the cause’ is rendered by *tīlḍaṛ qīlīp*² and *rkyen* by *basudḍi* ‘Helfer’ (see also line 719) which corresponds exactly to the meaning ‘co-operant cause’ given by Jäschke to *rkyen*. The Buddhist terminology seems to be unfamiliar to the translators. The Tibetan text mentions four Māras (cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, New Haven, 1953, p. 430b)³. The fourth Māra is the *devaputramāra* “Māra, the son of the gods” (Tib. *lha'i-bu'i-bdud*). On p. 148 the authors render *lha'i-bu'i-bdud btul-ba*, “The devaputramāra is subdued”, by “das Niederwerfen der Māra-Dämonen durch den Göttessohn.” According to Indian medicine there are 72.000 veins in a human body (cf. J. Jolly, *Medicin*, Strassburg, 1901, p. 44). The same number is mentioned in Buddhist texts and also in those connected with Nāropa, cf. H. V. Guenther, *The Life and Teaching of Nāropa* (Oxford, 1963), p. 55. However, on p. 96 the translators render *ston-phrag bdun-ču-rca-gñis* (72000) by 1072 (the same mistake is found in Das's *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1902, p. 1006a). It is not feasible to enumerate all the errors made by the translators but one wonders how it is possible to translate *bya-ro-gi gdon*, ‘crow's face’ (*kākamukha*), by ‘Geiergesicht’ (cf. p. 99) and *bsams-pa cam-gyis*, “by thought alone”, by “soviel wie man wünscht” (p. 151).

It would be difficult to rely on the translations from the Tibetan which are given in the notes when studying the Uigur text. It may perhaps be useful to specialists in Uigur to mention a few passages where the Tibetan text may be helpful for the understanding of the Uigur text. On p. 150 the Tibetan text has *phyi-rtags-su 'byuñ-ba lñas mi chugs-so*, “as to the outer sign the five elements do not harm.” The authors translate “Was die äusseren Zeichen betrifft, so treten die fünf Elemente nicht ein.” It is obvious that they have failed to see the difference between Tibetan *chugs-pa*, “to do harm”, and Tibetan *'chugs-pa*, ‘to go into’. The Uigur text is translated as follows: “als äusseres Zeichen wird man für die fünf Elemente ungehindert.” The Tibetan text suggests a different translation for *bīṣ maxabud-larqa* (line 884), i.e. “by the five elements”. The following passage is missing in the Uigur text: *gzugs-kyi phuñ-po-la 'byuñ-ba lñas mi gnod-pa'o*, “Die Anhäufung der (sichtbaren) Formen beschädigt die fünf Elemente nicht.” This translation is nonsense and shows a complete ignorance of Tibetan grammar. The meaning is: “the five elements do not harm the *rūpaskandha*.” On p. 101 the Uigur text has *tamīr-lar qan* (lines 384 and 392) which corresponds to Tibetan *rca'i rgyal-po*, “the king of the veins”. It is not clear why the authors translate *qan* by ‘Blut’ and not by ‘king’, although they give a correct translation of the Tibetan text. On p. 90 the Tibetan text has *dam-chig ma ṇāms-na bskyed-rjogs ma-bsgoms kyañ mkha'spyod-du 'gro-ste*, “If one's vow is unbroken, one will walk in the sky even though one has not accomplished the processes of *bskyed* and *rjogs* (*utpatti*- and *utpannakrama*).”⁴ To *dam-chig ma ṇāms-na* corresponds in Uigur *tan-γarī-γ čixšapad-ī-γ arḍmasar* (lines 319–320) “und auch wenn man das Gelübde und die Gebote nicht auf sich nimmt.” Tibetan *ma ṇāms-na*, “if unbroken”, corresponds to *artamasar* and not to *arḍmasar*. Of great importance in Nāropa's doctrine is the division between the path (Tib. *lam*) and the fruit (Tib. *'bras-bu*).⁵ On p. 101 the authors quote the following passage: *Na-ro čhen-po'i bžed-pa-yis/Le'u lña-bču-rca-gčig-gi//bya-ba thams-čad mḍor bsdus-na/lam dañ 'bras-bu gñis yin-te/*, “Wenn man alle Dinge der 51 Kapitel nach der Rede des grossen Nāropa zusammenfasst, wird es zweifach: der Weg und die Frucht.” The meaning of this passage is: “In the doctrine of Nāropa all the rites of the fifty-first chapter, when summarized, are twofold: the path and the fruit.” To the path belong the four Bodies: p. 155 *lam sprul-pa'i sku 'byuñ-ste*, “The path: the transformation body is produced”; p. 156 *lam čhos-kyi sku rgyud-la skye-ste* “The path: the dharma-body is born in the mind (lit. mental series, Skt. *saṃtati*, *saṃtāna*, cf. Edgerton, *op. cit.*, s.vv.; La Vallée Poussin, *JA*, 1902, II, pp. 275 and 283)”; p. 157 *lam loñs-spyod rjogs-pa'i sku rgyud-la skye-ste*, “The path: the body of complete enjoyment is born in the mind”; p. 157–8 *lam bde-ba čhen-po'i sku rgyud-la skye-ste*, “The path: the body of great bliss is born in the mind”. The Uigur translation renders

in all four instances *lam* with *yol* (lines 920, 931, 944, and 956) but the translation given is “(Auf) diesem Weg” (920) and “auf einmal” (931, 944, and 956). The authors read *bulup* in line 920 and *bolup* in line 957, but in both cases the Tibetan has an intransitive verb (*’byuñ-ste* and *skye-ste*). It is difficult to understand lines 435–438 in the translation from the Uigur: “Was den grossen Guru Nāropa betrifft, (so hat er gesagt:) Die Adern alle sind in einem einzigen Menschen vollkommen vorhanden. Auch die Paṇḍitas geruhten zu sagen, dass die einzelnen Teile nicht anders denn als Adern erkennbar sind.” This passage is quite clear in the Tibetan text: *slob-dpon gnas-lha rig-pa grub-thob čhen-po dpal Na-ro-ta-pa’i gsuñ-gis rca de thams-čad kyañ gañ-zag gčig-gi lus-la chad-ste/panḍita de-rnams thams-čad-kyis kyañ rca’i phyogs-re las ma rtogs-pa yin gsuñ*, “The teacher, the knower of the five sciences (*vidyā-sthāna*, cf. Edgerton, *op. cit.*, s.v.), the *mahāsiddha*, Śrī-Nāropa declared that all those veins are complete in the body of a single individual. All those paṇḍitas understand nothing but a single part of the veins.” It is therefore obvious that *tip yarliqdi* refers to Nāropa: “As to the great teacher Nāropa, he said: ‘All those veins are complete in a single person . . .’”

The Uigur translator does not seem to have understood the following sentence (*paṇḍita de-rnams . . .*). It is of particular interest to note passages in which the translator has misunderstood the Tibetan text. On p. 149 (lines 859–860 and 870) the Uigur text has *yogačari-niṅg tüzülmäklig köngül-dä* which is translated as “In dem harmonischen Sinn des Yogācāryas.” The corresponding Tibetan text has *rnal-’byor ṇams-kyi snañ-ba las* (read *la*), “in the mental idea of the yogins.” In line 650 the Uigur translator rendered *ṇams-kyi snañ-ba* with *köngül*. In line 976 *tüzülmäk tözlüg* renders Tibetan *mñam-pa ñid* (Skt. *samatā*) in *mñam-pa ñid-kyi ye-śes* (Skt. *samatāññāna*) ‘The knowledge of sameness.’ In translating *ṇams-kyi snañ-ba* with *tüzülmäklig köngül* the Uigur translator has confounded Tib. *ṇams*, ‘mind’, with *mñam*, ‘same’.

The Tibetan text can be useful in determining the meaning of Uigur words. On p. 98 the authors discuss the expression *yüü-lüg-bol-* which they translate everywhere by ‘zusammentreffen’. This meaning is not confirmed by the Tibetan text. For instance, on p. 112 the Tibetan text has: *lte-ba’i rca’i yal-ga-rnams gyes-pa gdugs kha gyen-la bstan-pa lta-bur yod-pa* “the branches of the veins of the navel are spread out and are like a parasol which is turned upwards.” Tib. *kha gyen-la bstan-pa* means ‘turned upwards’. The authors read wrongly *gdugs-kha* and add that, possibly, *bstan* stands for *bsten*. The expression *kha gyen-la* (or *thur-du* ‘downwards’) *bstan-pa* is well-known. A variant is *gyen-du blta-ba*, lit. ‘looking upwards, i.e. turned upwards’ (cf. p. 144). Tibetan *kha* means ‘opening, mouth’, but in the expression *kha gyen-la bstan-pa*, it has the meaning ‘front side, face’ (cf. Jäschke, p. 34b: 3. the front side, face, *kha lhor ston-pa* or *lta-ba*, ‘to be directed southwards’). In the Uigur translation *šilip aγiši üsđün yüü-lüg bolup turur* (444–5) corresponds to Tibetan *gdugs kha gyen-la bstan-pa lta-bur yod-pa*, “are like a parasol which is turned upwards”. Uigur *aγiš* is a literal translation of Tibetan *kha*. There seems to be no reason to doubt that Tibetan *gyen-la bstan-pa*, “turned upwards” is rendered in Uigur with *üsđün yüü-lüg bolup*. This passage suggests a meaning ‘to be turned (or directed) towards’ for Uigur *yüü-lüg bol-*. This is confirmed by other passages, for instance, p. 139 Tibetan *rce-mo gyen-du bltas-te* “The points are turned upwards”; Uigur *uuč-lar-i yoqaru örü yüü-lüg bolmaq* (747–8). The authors translate this by “Die Spitzen . . . oben zusammentreffen”, but the meaning must be the same as that of the Tibetan text. See also p. 144 Tibetan *rce-mo gyen-du blta-ba* “the points are turned upwards”; Uigur *uči yoqaru yüü-lüg bolup turur* (806–7). There is one passage in which the Tibetan and Uigur texts are not identical, but this is probably due to a misunderstanding of the Tibetan text by the Uigur translator. On p. 117 the Tibetan text has *thig-le ’phel-bas g-yon-gyi rca la-la-nā’i nañ-na/ā-li bču-drug-gi chul-du mgo thur-du bstan-nas gnas-pa*, “because the drops are increased, they are in the left vein, Lalanā, with their heads directed downwards in the manner of the sixteen āli (vowels).” The corresponding Uigur text has *baš-lar-i töpün yüü-lüg bolup* (501–2) “of which the heads are turned upwards”. However, in lines 512–3 the same Uigur text corresponds to Tibetan *mgo gyen-du bstan-nas* ‘the heads turned upwards’. In another passage (lines 807–808) the Uigur text has *tinlaγ-lar-niṅg yüräk uči alđin* < ’w > *töpün yüü-lüg bolup* < *bolup* > *turur*,

“Die Herzspitzen der Lebewesen treffen unten mit dem Scheitel zusammen.” The corresponding Tibetan text has *sems-ñan-gyi sñiñ rce-mo thur-du blta-ba-ste*, “the points of the hearts of the living beings are turned downwards.” Probably *alḍin* has been omitted in line 502.

It is to be regretted that the authors of this interesting publication have been unable to make sufficient use of the Tibetan text. For the understanding of Mongolian or Uigur texts translated from the Tibetan it is indispensable to have a good knowledge of Tibetan and of Buddhist terminology and doctrines and their Indian background. Without this knowledge it is not possible to fully understand such texts. It is very much to be hoped that in their further study of Uigur texts translated from the Tibetan the authors will be able to obtain the help of a scholar who is able to explain Tibetan texts and the Buddhist doctrines found in them.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTES

¹ See also G. Uray, ‘The Suffix -e in Tibetan’, *AOH* III (1953), p. 235: “*lham-me* ‘illuminated, clear, distinct’.”

² In the transcription of Uigur words no account has been taken of diacritical marks and other graphic peculiarities of the manuscript.

³ The four Māras are explained in a passage of Asaṅga’s *Śrāvakabhūmi* which was edited and translated by Alex Wayman (*IJ* 3, 1959, pp. 112–113). Wayman’s edition has to be corrected in some places but his text is by far preferable to that found in Karunesha Shukla’s edition of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* (Patna, 1973, pp. 343–345). For the Chinese translation see Taishō vol. 30, p. 447a15ff (and not 449a22f., as indicated by Wayman).

⁴ On these two *kramas* see D. L. Snellgrove, *The Hevajratāntra*, vol. 1, (London, 1959), pp. 139–140; R. A. Stein, *La civilisation tibétaine* (Paris, 1962), pp. 149ff. (the Sanskrit equivalents are not always correctly indicated by Stein).

⁵ For the Sa-skyapa doctrine of path and effect see Musashi Tachikawa, ‘A Note on the Path-Effect Doctrine of the Sa skyapa’, *Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies* 20 (1974), pp. (8)–(7), and the introduction (in Japanese) to his translation of the Sa-skyapa chapter in Thuḥu bkwan’s *Grub-mthaḥ: A study of the Grub-mthaḥ of Tibetan Buddhism*, vol. 1 (Tokyo, 1974), pp. 18–32.

REVIEWS

Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung / The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II). (Abh.d.Ak.d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Phil. -hist. Kl., Dritte Folge, Nr. 117). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980. 193 pp. DM 66,-.

The second symposium on Buddhist studies was held in Göttingen on July 4th–7th 1976. The theme of the symposium was the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition. The present volume contains the papers read at the symposium and a report on the discussions which followed the lectures (pp. 182–189). The problems relating to the linguistic character of the early Buddhist tradition have been discussed for more than one hundred years and, as Heinz Bechert remarks in his introduction, the contributions to this symposium show that there are disagreements of opinion among the experts.

One of the points of disagreement is the interpretation of the famous passage of Cullavagga V.33 on the recitation of Buddhist texts by the Yameḷutekulā brothers. Brough (Sakāya Niruttiyā: Cauld kale het. pp. 35–42) rejects Norman's explanation of *chandaso* as from *chanda-* in the sense of "wish, desire". According to him, MI *chanda-* derives from Skt. *chandas-*. Brough translates *chandaso* as "in the manner of the Brahmanical religious texts". So far I feel myself in complete agreement with Brough. However, I am unable to share his opinion that this means "into Sanskrit". I believe it is not possible to explain this passage without taking into account the many other passages on the recitation of Buddhist texts. Some of them have been translated and studied by Sylvain Lévi (*JA*, 1915, I, pp. 401–447). Others are to be found in the article *bombai* by Demiéville in the *Hôbôgirin* (fascicules I–II, 1929–1930, pp. 93–95). According to these texts the Buddha forbids the reciting or chanting of Buddhist texts in the way in which Vedic texts are recited or chanted. The Chinese versions which are parallel to Cullavaggā V.33 speak of two brahman brothers expert in Vedic chanting. Only the Dharmagupta Vinaya does not mention Vedic chanting. Sylvain Lévi translates: "Je désire que Bhagavat nous permette d'arranger les textes sacrés dans le beau parler des gens du monde" (*op. cit.*, p. 442). Brough translates: "in accordance with the fine language (texts?) of the world" (p. 39). It is certainly necessary to translate the word *lun* "treatise, text". The "texts in the fine language of the world" are undoubtedly the Vedic texts.

Cullavagga V.33 and the parallel Chinese versions refer to Vedic chanting, and the interpretation of *chandas* given by Helmer Smith and Louis Renou is fully confirmed by the texts quoted by Sylvain Lévi and Demiéville (cf. Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I, Louvain, 1958, p. 611).

Brough discusses the names of the brahmans. The name Utsāha is found in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptas and the Vinayamāṭṭkā. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins has Gova and Yava. Brough tries to explain both the name of the first brahman in the Pāli text, Yame, and the name of Yava as derived from a hypothetical *Java with the meaning "strength". Brough writes: "It is then possible that in these four versions *Java and Utsāha are used as approximate synonyms for the same personal name." Is it likely that in different versions of a story synonyms are used for a personal name? One would rather expect to find distorted forms of the same name or entirely different names as is usually the case.

In his paper (Ardha-Māgadhī, pp. 17–23) Ludwig Alsdorf examines two groups of stanzas in the Uttarajjhayaṇa-Nijjuttī and the Maṇipaticarita written in a metre called Māgahiyā, Māgadhikā. The language of these stanzas is true Ardhamāgadhī because it has two of the three characteristics of Māgadhī: nominative singular in -e; and *l* instead of *r*. According to Alsdorf

these remains of New Ardhamāgadhī support Lüders's hypothesis regarding Old Ardhamāgadhī as the language of the oldest Buddhist tradition.

K. R. Norman (The dialects in which the Buddha preached, pp. 61–77) discusses the two following questions: (a) Were the sources which Buddhaghosa followed correct in calling the Buddha's language Māgadhī? (b) Why was the language of the canon, and of Buddhaghosa's commentaries thereon, called Māgadhī? According to Norman Buddha taught in the Old Māgadhī dialect which was spoken in a small area of Magadha with all three typical characteristics, viz. *-e*, *l* and *ś*, while elsewhere in Magadha Old Ardha-Māgadhī was spoken with only two of these features, viz. *-e* and *l*. Pāli, the language of the Theravāda canon, akin to Māgadhī and spoken somewhere in Magadha, was called 'Māgadhī' when Buddhism was introduced into Ceylon. It is perhaps not surprising to see that Norman's attempt to justify calling the language of the canon Māgadhī did not meet with universal approval (cf. p. 185).

In her paper (La langue primitive du bouddhisme, pp. 43–60) Colette Caillat emphasises "that what is termed 'langue primitive du bouddhisme' is really but the result of our reconstruction schemes; moreover, that only fragmentary aspects are generally considered, and conclusions are drawn mostly from partial analysis" (p. 57). She draws attention to several facts relating to morphology and stylistics which deserve to be taken into consideration in studying the language of the oldest Buddhist tradition.

Gustav Roth examines the "Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition" (pp. 78–93). He points out several correspondences between the Prākṛit of the Mathurā inscriptions (e.g. forms in *-are* for any oblique singular case-form) and the Prākṛit underlying the scriptures of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. Roth also finds traces of Śaurasenī (the particle *dāni*, absolutes in *-ya*) and of Māgadhī/Ardhamāgadhī (absolutes in *-yāṇam*, the particle of address *haṃgho*).

In a supplement Roth gives an edition of the complete text of the Patna Dharmapada (pp. 93–135). He points out the specific features of the language of the text and remarks that this language is a western type of Prakrit very close to Pāli. Recently the text of the Patna Dharmapada has also been published in India, by N. S. Shukla, as *The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada* (Patna, 1979). It is very useful to have two different editions of the same text in order to discover which akṣaras are difficult to distinguish in the manuscript. Roth's promised study of the script of the manuscript of the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya has not yet appeared and no facsimile editions of manuscripts of the Patna collection have been published so far. A facsimile edition of the manuscript of the Patna Dharmapada would certainly be very desirable because in both editions there remain a number of difficulties. In the first folio, three lines in Tibetan are written in dBu-med. Champa Thubten Zongtse reads: (1) *chos-ldan ṣab[s] kyis gsuñs-pa dañ* (2) *chos kyi cho-ga bdud-rē'i cho-ga* (3) *ṣes bya ba gzuñ ṣhad brgyad grags-pa*. Roth gives the following tentative translation: "(1) That which is said by Dhārmika-pāda and (2) the way of the Dharma [which is] the way of the nectar [i.e. of the doctrine of the Buddha], (3) so it is known as a work [that comprises] eight principles." Shukla's edition has *bcom-ldan-'das* instead of *chos-ldan ṣab[s]*, *ṣhig* instead of *cho-ga* and *brgya-phag lha'o* instead of *brgyad grags-pa*. This certainly makes more sense: "Said by the Bhagavat and called the Dharmapada, the Amṛtapada. The extent of the text is five hundred [stanzas]." In Shukla's edition verse 120 begins with the following line which is not found in Roth's edition: *tathavidha śamaṇā prabhūtapraṃñā*. In Shukla's edition there are two verses beginning with *sukhāmāni bhūtāni*. The second is missing in Roth's edition: *sukhakāmāni bhūtāni / yo daṇḍena na vihiṃsati // āttano sukham eṣāṇo / precca so labhate sukhaṃ* (cf. Roth No. 204). In 121b Shukla has: *na candanaṃ tagaraṃ vāhlikaṃ vā*; Roth: *na candanaṃ vāhṇikaṃ vā*.

It is easy to confuse *bh* and *t*. In 12b Roth has: *yo dhammaṃ abhivattati*; Shukla: *yo dhammaṃ ativattati* (cf. Dīghanikāya, vol. II, p. 182, 1.14). According to Wayman's tables (*Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi manuscript*, 1961, pp. 5–8) there is no difference at all between *ba* and *va*. In the language of the text *dv-* > *b-*, cf. 11b *bitīyatā*. Roth mostly prefers a *v*, cf. 141a: *tahna-vitiyo puruṣo*, 333a: *śraddha-vitiyaṃ*. Rather similar are *ya* and *pa*. In 41a Roth

writes: *yadā yayesu dhammesu*. Pāli Dhammapada has: *yadā dvayesu dhammesu*. One wonders whether it is not possible to read *payesu* and to suppose the following development: *dvayesu* > *bayesu* > *payesu*. Roth reads *ñāpyā* (110b, 147d, 190b), but elsewhere *ñāyyā* (312a, 313a) and *nyāyyā* (338d). One wonders whether it is really possible to distinguish between *-py-* and *-yy-* in the manuscript. Certainly difficult to distinguish are *ma* and *sa*. In 376e Roth reads *tathā-m-iccheya*, whereas Shukla reads *tathā siccheya* which corresponds to Udānavarga XXIX. 40e *tatra śikṣeta*.

One could give many more examples of the problems one encounters in reading these two editions of the Patna Dharmapada. Some can probably easily be solved by consulting the manuscript. For instance, does the manuscript have in 116a: *vāñijena va bhayaṃ mārggaṃ* (Roth) or *vāñijo va bhayaṃ mārggaṃ* (Shukla)? Roth has carefully indicated parallels which are very useful for the study of the text. No parallel is given by him for 212: *saṃyattā sugatiṃ yānti / doggaṭṭiṃ yānti asaṃyyatā // māssu viśāsam āpādi / iti bindu* (Shukla: *viññu*) *samaṃ care*; but see Gāndhārī Dharmapada 325: *sañadu sukadi yadi / drugadi yadi asañadu // ma sa viśpaśa avaja / ida vidva samu cari*.

Ernst Waldschmidt's contribution (Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas, pp. 136–174) consists of three parts: (I) General Remarks on the Āgamas. Re-edition of the Mahāsamājasūtra; (II) The Language of the Ch'ang-a-han-ching and Dharmaguptaka texts; (III) Two different Versions of the Ekottarikāgama.

In the Gilgit manuscript of the Bhaiṣajyavastu there are eight references to sūtras in the four āgamas. Of these eight references five indicate chapters (*nipāta*) of the Madhyamāgama. Waldschmidt shows that these five sūtras are found in the corresponding chapters of the Chinese translation of the Madhyamāgama. A Sanskrit fragment of the Saṃyuktāgama contains the end of a sūtra, an uddāna with six Sūtra titles, and the beginning of a sūtra. All eight sūtras are found in the same order in the Bhikṣuṇīsaṃyukta of the two Chinese translations of the Saṃyuktāgama. In his *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon* (Leipzig, 1932, pp. 149–206) Waldschmidt published an edition of the Mahāsamājasūtra. In the last twenty years a number of Ms. fragments have been identified as belonging to this sūtra. In the introduction to the revised edition and translation of the sūtra, Waldschmidt points out that the Chinese Dīrghāgama contains a version of the sūtra and that the introduction is also found in the two Chinese Saṃyuktāgamas. The version of the sūtra in the Chinese Dīrghāgama agrees with the Pāli text, but the correspondence between the Chinese Saṃyuktāgamas and the Sanskrit text is much closer.

In II, Waldschmidt studies the language of the Dharmaguptaka texts on the basis of transcriptions of it found in the translation of the *Mahāsamājasūtra* in the *Ch'ang-a-han ching*, and of two Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia. The first of these contains a small fragment of the *Prātimokṣa*. The language shows some prakritic elements. The second one is written in a much more sanskritized language. Waldschmidt concludes: "An older linguistic stage is perhaps perceptible in the metrical parts of the Chinese translation of the Mahāsamājasūtra in the Dīrghāgama and in the scarce remnants of the Dharmaguptaka Prātimokṣa, whereas the Dharmaguptaka Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra fragment reads almost like Buddhist Sanskrit."

In III, Waldschmidt compares Central Asian fragments of the *Ekottarikāgama* with the corresponding texts in Pāli and in Chinese. He shows that "the Sanskrit text is conform with the Pāli text in substance, only in wording there are differences. On the other hand, there is a considerable contrast with the corresponding Sūtras of the Tsêng-i-a-han-ching."

In 'Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period' (pp. 175–181) Akira Yuyama examines a passage in Bu-ston's *History of Buddhism* on the languages used by the different Buddhist schools. His translation is not an improvement on Obermiller's translation and his remarks on the meaning of *rgya-chen-po'i skad* and *bar-mar 'don-pa'i tshig* are nothing more than gratuitous speculations.

Heinz Bechert, the editor of this volume, has contributed an introduction in English (pp. 11–16) and methodological reflections (Allgemeine Bemerkungen zum Thema "Die Sprache

der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung", pp. 24–34). Bechert remarks (pp. 13–14): "It is highly probable that there is linguistic diversity already in the earliest tradition, so that there we cannot speak of one particular 'language of the earliest Buddhist tradition'." He adds that these views were already formulated by Mrsg. Lamotte in his *Histoire du bouddhisme* (Louvain, 1958, p. 608): "Il est naturel qu'au cours de ses tournées de prédication à Rājagṛha, Śrāvastī, Vārāṇasī, Vaiśālī, Kauśāmbī, etc., le Buddha ait enseigné les vérités saintes dans le ou les parlers en usage parmi les Māgadha, Kosala, Kāśī, Vṛji, Vatsa, etc., parlers qui peuvent être considérés comme des variétés de la 'langue sainte' (*āryāvāc*) ou encore de la 'langue du pays du milieu' (*madhyadeśavāc*).". More than fifty years before Lamotte Ernst Windisch had written: "Wenn Buddha in Magadha die Māgadhi sprach, so wird er sie doch gewiss nicht genau so wie ein Eingeborener gesprochen haben. Aber Buddha wanderte umher in weitem Umkreis und lehrte auch in Benares, Kosambi, Sāvattihī, Vesālī. Er wird sich unwillkürlich überall mehr oder weniger dem Dialekte der Gegend angepasst haben" ('Ueber den sprachlichen Charakter des Pali', *Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Orientalistes*, I, Paris, 1906, p. 283).

Misprints are very few. The following have come to my notice. P. 8, Alsdorf passed away on March 25, 1978 (not 1975). P. 11, read E. W. A. Kuhn for E. A. W. Kuhn (also p. 24). P. 55, note 55, fourth line from below, read voir for voi,. P. 63, 7th line from below, read all for als; 4th line from below, read Buddha- for Buddhal. P. 89, line 2, read *brāhmaṇassa* for *brāmaṇassa*; line 22, read 'nor revile him' for 'not revile him'. P. 93, 5th line from below, read translation for translation. P. 96, line 12, read Varga for Verga, P. 101, line 4, read *Samma-sambuddha-dēsitam* for *Samma-sambuddha-seṣitam*? P. 124, verse 302b, read *dhanam* for *shanam*? P. 125, verse 307, read Uv 11.10 for Uv 21.10. P. 140, line 22, read T.I.24 for T.I.2.

The contributions to this volume give an excellent idea of the complexity of the problems relating to the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition. It becomes more and more hazardous to advance an all-embracing theory based on a limited amount of information as has so often been done in the past. The papers and the discussions show clearly that many more detailed studies have to be undertaken before it will become possible to construct a theoretical framework which does not do violence to the facts. We must be very grateful to Heinz Bechert for having organized this symposium and for having published the results with so little delay.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

R. Ananthakrishna Sastry, *Viṣṇusahasranāma* with the Bhāṣya of Śrī Saṃkarācārya. Translated into English in the light of Śrī Saṃkara's Bhāṣya (Adyar Library General Series No. 8). Adyar, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1980. XXX, 475 pp. Rs 40.00; AUS \$7.00; US \$8.00; £3.50.

Ananthakrishna Sastry's translation of the *Viṣṇusahasranāma* was first published in 1901. A revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1926 and was reprinted in 1927. This new edition not only contains the English translation but also the Sanskrit text of Śaṅkara's *Bhāṣya*. Ananthakrishna Sastry's translation has been revised by A. G. Krishna Warriar and A. A. Ramanathan.

Both the *Viṣṇusahasranāma* and Śaṅkara's *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotrabhāṣya* are very popular works. Two recent editions are listed by Mario Piantelli in his *Śaṅkara e la rinascita del Brāhmanesimo* (Fossano, 1974, p. 291): *Viṣṇusahasranāma*, with extracts of Śaṅkarabhāṣya, edited by Svāmin Vimalananda, Tirupparaitturai, 1965, and *Viṣṇusahasranāma*, with the *bhāṣyas* by Śaṅkarācārya and Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, edited with English translation by K. E. Parthasarathy, Madras, 1966. Another translation was published by P. Sankaranarayana in 1978 in Bombay.

In his introduction to the 1926 edition, Ananthakrishna Sastry remarked that "many doubted the authenticity of the work" (p. xxi). In his preface to the present edition, Krishna Warriar writes: "The rare merit of Śaṅkara's commentary on the VSN (Viṣṇusahasranāma) is that there is a singular unity of purpose between it, reputedly the earliest commentary from his pen, and his acknowledged masterpiece the Brahmasūtrabhāṣya" (p. xiii). He does not indicate where it is stated that this *Bhāṣya* is the earliest commentary written by Śaṅkara. Western scholars who have made a critical study of the authenticity of the works ascribed to Śaṅkara do not attribute the *Bhāṣya* on the VSN to him, although, as far as I know, this work has not been studied in particular, cf. A. J. Alston, *Śaṅkara on the Absolute* (London, 1980, pp. 48–50) who refers to studies by Hacker and Mayeda.

The translation is not always carefully checked. For instance, in the *pūrvapīṭhikā* p. 6: *yad vihāyāparaḥ panthāḥ nṛṇāṃ nāsti* is rendered by "for going there is no other path". P. 7: *mucyate janmasaṃsārabandhanāt itīdaṃ upalakṣaṇam itareṣāṃ phalānāṃ api* is rendered by: "Freed: from all other effects, also". P. 9: *pūjāvīṣeṣabhūtam* is rendered by "form the last part of the worship". In the same section the Sanskrit text and the English translation do not always correspond, cf., for instance, pp. 16–21 and 38–42. Not all quotations are translated in their entirety and the translation of the commentary leaves out explanations which are perhaps considered less important by the translator, for instance, p. 92: *prapañcarūpeṇa bhavatīti, kevalaṃ bhavatīty eva vā bhāvaḥ / bhavanam bhāvaḥ sattātmako vā //*. Translation: "Bhāvaḥ. The absolute Existence. He expands himself as the universe; or remains as pure existence." Undoubtedly, these imperfections will be corrected in a future edition which will certainly be required before long. As are all the editions of the Adyar Library, this work has been carefully printed. It is provided with two indices, one of the thousand names and one of quotations.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

J. Harmatta (ed.), *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979. 339 pp. \$ 29.50.

J. Harmatta (ed.), *Studies in the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979. 162 pp. \$ 14.00.

Both the *Prolegomena* (Pr.) and the *Studies* (St.) contain a series of articles relating to sources on the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia. The only information provided on the aim of these two volumes is found on the dustjacket. According to the text on the dustjacket of Pr., the General Conference of UNESCO in 1966 adopted a resolution to launch a project for the study of the civilizations of Central Asia, and the principal aim of this volume is to put forward the problems connected with sources, to outline the geographical and chronological limits, and to define the methods of their collection. Pr. seems to be the result of a conference held in Budapest on 25th April 1973 on "Problèmes des sources sur l'histoire de l'Asie Centrale de l'époque achéménide jusqu'à la conquête arabe." This much can be gathered from indications found scattered in Pr. (cf. p. 119, note *, p. 199, p. 261, n. 1 and p. 275). According to the original plan, the battle of Talas (751 A.D.) was to be the upper chronological limit of the Collection of Sources but the Conference decided to extend this limit up to the turn of the 1st millenium A.D. (p. 275, note *). It is not possible to discover whether all the papers published in Pr. were read during the conference and to what extent the different authors were asked to fulfil a specific task. The text on the dustjacket of Pr. says that "these studies provide an introduction to the problems of the historical sources of pre-Islamic Central Asia." It would have been helpful for the reader if the editor of Pr. had explained the exact purpose

of this volume in a preface. Do we have to guess that Pr. was meant to contain contributions introducing problems connected with sources in different languages and that St. is the first volume of a series of studies devoted to the examination of those problems? According to the subtitles of Pr. (Collection of the sources for the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia) and St. (Collection of the sources on the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia, Series I, Volume II), both volumes form part of a major undertaking to publish sources on the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia. Probably Series I will contain studies on the sources and series II the publication of the sources. It is to be hoped that the editor(s) of future volumes will give more information on this project. One wonders whether, for instance, it is their intention to publish only unpublished sources or also sources which have not been satisfactorily edited.

The Prolegomena are divided into twelve sections dealing with: I. Greek and Latin s. [= sources]; II. Byzantine s.; III. Old Iranian s.; IV. Middle Iranian s.; V. Old Indian s.; VI. Aramaic s.; VII. Syrian s.; VIII. Arabic s.; IX. Chinese s.; X. Tibetan s.; XI. Numismatic s.; XII. Archaeological s. From an introduction to the problems of historical sources one is entitled to expect a survey of the available sources, an evaluation of their value, a report on the work which has been done regarding the edition and the study of the sources and, finally, an outline of future tasks stressing the most urgent desiderata. Moreover, in the case of Central Asian studies such an introduction has to take into account that, as stated on the dustjacket, sources on the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia are written in over twenty languages. The study of Central Asia is not a single discipline but a conglomerate of different disciplines. It is therefore very desirable for specialists in one discipline to be informed about the study of sources in other disciplines.

The Prolegomena do not provide a complete introduction as outlined above, because many contributions are more concerned with the study of specific problems than with introducing the sources and the problems connected with them. In the absence of any preface or explanation by the editor, it is of course not possible to know the exact purpose of this volume and it would therefore be unjust to reproach the authors for not having fulfilled a task which perhaps was not expected of them. However this may be, it is to be hoped that future volumes of this series will supplement the information given in Pr. in order to provide a full survey of the sources on pre-Islamic Central Asia.

The Prolegomena contain 28 articles and the Studies 18 articles. It is of course not possible to list the titles of all 46 articles; we must limit ourselves to mentioning a few which are of special interest to readers of this journal. J. Harmatta has contributed to Pr. an article entitled 'Sogdian Sources for the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia' (pp. 153–165) in which he discusses the date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters. According to Henning (*BSOAS* 12, 1948, pp. 601–615), these letters were written in 312–313 A.D. The second letter mentions that Lo-yang was burnt. This happened in 190, in 311 and in 530–532–534. Henning wrote: "We can unhesitatingly exclude the events of the sixth century from consideration, on the general grounds given above. This leaves us with 190 and 311. The choice is made easy: in 311 Lo-yang, and with it the power of Chin, is destroyed by the Hsiung-nu: in the Sogdian Letter the Hüns are mentioned as the adversaries of the Chinese. As there can thus hardly be a doubt that the Letters were written in or shortly after 311, reference is made in what follows to events pertaining to that period only" (*op. cit.*, pp. 603–604). The colophon of the second letter indicates the date: 'the year 13 of the Lord of *cyrδsw''n*'. Henning proposed to explain *cyrδsw''n* as a transcription of Chiu-ch'üan, the old name of Su-chou. The Lord mentioned in the date was the governor-general of the province of Liang, Chang Kuei, who had been appointed in 301 and who died on 8th July 314. His thirteenth year is the year 313. Harmatta proposes an entirely different explanation for *cyrδsw''n*. According to him it is a transcription of Chin. *tzu* ('this', cf. Giles no. 12346) *liu* ('six', Giles no. 7276) *hsün* ('a period of ten years'. Giles no. 4864). The 13th year of the Lord of the current Cycle of Sixty is the year 196, the first year of the cycle being the year 184. Harmatta does not give any references for the use of *tzu liu-hsün* in the meaning 'this current cycle' and Enoki has already indicated his doubts

regarding this explanation (cf. *Tōhōgaku*, No. 59, 1980, p. 136). Also the addition of the word 'Lord' seems very strange. Henning pointed out that the word 'Lord' (MR'Y) is elsewhere preceded by a place-name (*op. cit.*, p. 611). For this reason Henning tried to explain *cyrδsw'n* as a place-name, (not as the name of a king as stated by Enoki, *loc. cit.*). Henning proposed his explanation as a pis-aller. His explanation of *cyrδsw'n* may be wrong but it may still be true that this letter was written after 311. The same remark applies to Harmatta's theory. Even if his explanation of *cyrδsw'n* proves unacceptable, it may still be true that this letter was written not long after the burning of Lo-yang in 190.

Harmatta advances several arguments for his dating of the Letters. He remarks "that a Chinese paper document found in Lou-lan and dated to 312 shows a much later production technique than the paper of the "Ancient Letters", or that along the Chinese limes west of Tun-huang only documents originating from the Han period have been found" (p. 159). This second point is studied in great detail by him in 'The Archaeological Evidence for the Date of the Sogdian "Ancient Letters"' (St. pp. 75–90). Furthermore, Harmatta points out that "the Hiung-nu also played a part at the end of the 2nd century in the worried times of the fall of the Later Han Dynasty" (p. 159). Henning gave only a partial translation of the second letter (lines 5–23, 28–38, and 61–63). Harmatta provides a complete translation and even fills in some of the gaps in the text, for instance in line 14 where Henning translates: "Moreover then the [] by the [Hū] ns." In a note Henning adds: "Moreover then the [Emperior was taken prisoner and led into captivity] by the [Hū] ns" or some such words may well have stood in this line." Harmatta translates: "Then came the Hiung-nu (*xwn*) – so it is said – and joined the Chinese" (p. 162). It is to be hoped that both Sinologists and specialists in Sogdian will examine closely the new evidence presented by Harmatta in these two articles.

In 'La formation quadripartite des tribus perses' (Pr., pp. 73–83) R. Ghirshman "présente . . . les résultats des premières recherches sur les Perses à partir du moment où – leurs tribus non encore unies – ils arrivent, au milieu du VIII^e siècle à l'Est de Suse" (p. 73). In another article, 'Les daivadâna' (St. pp. 7–18), Ghirshman draws attention to a building discovered by D. Stronach south of Hamadan in ancient Media which had been filled with shale chips and covered with chips and mud. According to him this building is one of the temples of the ancient Iranian pantheon destroyed by Xerxes when suppressing a revolt in Media. Whereas Ghirshman tries to shed new light on Darius *daiva* inscription (XPh), Harmatta re-examines the Vth column of DB in 'Darius' expedition against the Sakā tigraxaudā' (St. pp. 19–28). Harmatta quotes the text of DB V 21–30 as revised by Cameron, Kent's restoration and Dandamaev's restoration (*Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta Narodov Azii* 61, 1963, pp. 176–177), and proposes a new restoration from which he concludes that "the record on Darius' expedition against the Sakā tigraxaudā belong [sic] to the historical sources on Ancient Central Asia" (p. 28). M. A. Dandamayev studies the 'Data of the Babylonian documents from the 6th to the 5th centuries B.C. on the Sakas' (Pr. pp. 95–109). He points out that the *Gimirri*, mentioned in the Babylonian texts, must be central Asian Sakas subjugated by the Persians under Cyrus II and Darius I. Three articles concern the Avesta. B. Schlerath examines the importance of the Avesta as a source for the history of Central Asia (Pr. 'Das Avesta als Quelle für die Geschichte Zentralasiens', pp. 85–87) and concludes that 'die wenigen und isolierten awestischen Textstellen die sich auf Realien beziehen oder die als Reflexe von Fakten der politischen Geschichte angesehen werden können, nicht geeignet sind, in ein Corpus der Geschichtsquellen Zentralasiens aufgenommen zu werden' (p. 87). In 'Das Avesta in der Persis' (Pr. pp. 89–93) K. Hoffmann suggests that perhaps "der Versuch, den ostiranischen Zarathustrismus in Persien anzusiedeln, um ein religiöses und politisches Gegengewicht gegen das medische Magiertum zu entwickeln, bereits vor der Machtübernahme des Darius vom persischen Adel unternommen wurde" (p. 92). J. Kellens rejects the historicity of the Kayanians in 'L'Avesta comme source historique: la liste des Kayanides' (St. pp. 41–53). According to him *kauui-* is not a monarch: "Sans cette dernière [la tradition zoroastrienne tardive] et l'image qu'elle donne de Vištāspa, rien ne permettrait de faire du kauui avestique autre chose qu'un homme de religion" (p. 46); "Rien non plus ne perme

de faire un roi de Vištāspa . . . Le plus simple n'est-il pas de conclure que Vištāspa est un kauui comme les autres, mais qu'à la différence des autres, il a adhéré au message du prophète?" (p. 47). With regard to *xšaθra-* Kellens remarks that "*xšaθra-* n'est pas le pouvoir encore moins l'empire ou le règne, mais tout simplement la capacité à disposer de quelque chose, à en user selon sa volonté" (p. 48). In only two passages of the Yašts does it refer to political power (10,109 and 5,130). Kellens concludes: "les héros qui se succèdent dans les Yašts, pour autant qu'ils ne soient pas du cycle des Gāthās, appartiennent à la vieille mythologie indo-iranienne. Voici qu'ils s'ordonnent en série chronologique, qu'ils s'enracinent dans la terre d'Iran, qu'ils revêtent des caractères royaux . . . L'Avesta est un mauvais document historique si on attend de lui un témoignage, qu'il ne donne pas, sur l'Iran pré-zoroastrien. C'en est un excellent si on y cherche le reflet de la société iranienne contemporaine de la rédaction de ses parties constitutives." (p. 51).

Two articles examine the Iranian names found on the Elamite tablets from Persepolis. Manfred Mayrhofer rejects attempts to find traces of an *-nh-* dialect: 'Zur Frage nicht medisch-persischer Personennamen in Persepolis' (Pr. pp. 111–118). R. Schmitt's article is entitled: 'The Medo-Persian names of Herodotus in the light of the new evidence from Persepolis' (St. pp. 29–39). In another article Schmitt studies the Iranian names attested in the Persika by Ktesias who lived at the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon: 'Die Wiedergabe iranischer Namen bei Ktesias von Knidos in Vergleich zur sonstigen griechischen Überlieferung' (Pr. pp. 119–133).

Middle Iranian sources are studied by several scholars. Ph. Gignoux underlines the necessity to give priority to the indigenous sources in the study of Western Iran (Pr. 'Problèmes de distinction et de priorité des sources', pp. 137–141): "Il y a donc, pour l'histoire de l'Iran occidental, une hiérarchie des sources à respecter, et comme les sources indigènes sont surtout des inscriptions, une priorité des textes épigraphiques sur les textes historiques provenant de traditions étrangères ou postérieures" (p. 140). In 'Problèmes d'interprétation historique et philologique de titres et noms propres sasanides' (St. pp. 107–112) Ph. Gignoux shows how an inscription on a seal helps to explain a phrase in a Pahlavi text and points out how widespread was the use of the title *driyōšān jādag-gōv ud dādvar*, 'défenseur et juge des pauvres'. Furthermore, Gignoux lists a series of proper names consisting of *dvandvas* of two names of divinities as found in Pahlavi sources, and traces the existence of this category of names in Old Iranian. W. Sundermann examines the historical importance of the hagiographical literature of the Manichaeans in Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian: 'Die mittelpersischen und parthischen Turfantexte als Quellen zur Geschichte des vorislamischen Zentralasiens' (Pr. pp. 143–151). In another article Sundermann ('Ein Bruchstück einer soghdischen Kirchengeschichte aus Zentralasien?', St. pp. 99–105) examines a Sogdian MS from Turfan which Olaf Hansen had considered to be of importance for the history of Central Asia. According to Sundermann, "C 3 = T II B 40 handelt somit von der Begründung eines Klosters in der Umgebung von Arrajān in der Provinz Fārs durch Yōhannān Dailomāyā Ende des 7. oder Anfang des 8. Jh. Als eine Quelle für die Geschichte Zentralasiens kommt dieses Fragment nicht in Frage." (p. 105). Bo Utas examines the historical value of four Pahlavi texts in 'Non-religious book Pahlavi literature as a source on the History of Central Asia' (St. pp. 119–128).

In his article 'Buddhistische Moral in aramäo-iranischem und griechischem Gewande' (Pr. pp. 189–196) H. Humbach studies the Asoka inscriptions in Aramaic script from Gandhara and Kandahar: 'Im folgenden komme ich nun auf meine früheren Bemühungen um die Inschrift von Taxila, die Inschrift vom Laghman-Fluss und die Bilingue von Kandahar zurück, gebe einige mir in diesem Zusammenhang relevant erscheinende Nachträge und ergänze sie durch Bemerkungen über die grosse unilingue griechische Inschrift von Kandahar.' (p. 190). In a postscript Humbach lists publications which appeared since May 1973, including those relating to Laghmān II discovered by G. D. Davary in 1973.

R. E. Emmerick underlines the historical importance of religious Khotanese texts and the necessity of publishing facsimiles of the texts not included in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* or already published elsewhere: 'The historical importance of the Khotanese

manuscripts' (Pr. pp. 167–177). Of great importance for the history of Khotan and other regions of Central Asia are the Tibetan sources of which G. Uray presents a very detailed survey which contains exhaustive bibliographical information: 'The Old Tibetan Sources of the History of Central Asia up to 751 A.D.; A Survey' (Pr. pp. 275–304). Uray indicates the place of these sources in the Tibetan literature and examines in more detail geographical problems connected with the names of the main rivers in Khotan and a passage of the "Catalogue of the Principalities". B. N. Mukherjee's article 'Kharoshthī Documents of Shan-shan and the Kushāna Empire' (St. pp. 91–97) tries to refute Brough's thesis regarding the incorporation of the kingdom of Shan-shan in the Kuṣāna empire around the middle of the second century A.D. ('Comments of third-century Shan-shan and the history of Buddhism', *BSOAS* 38, 1965, pp. 582–612).

Both the Prolegomena and the Studies are of great interest for all those interested in the history of Central Asia. We look forward to future volumes in this series and hope that they will give detailed information about plans for the collection of the sources.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Piotr Klafkowski, *The Secret Deliverance of the Sixth Dalai Lama as Narrated by Dharmatāla*. Edited from the *Hor chos-'byuñ* by Dharmatāla and Translated into English, with an Introduction and Comments (*Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde* (Heft 3). Wien, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 1979. VI, 93 pp. Ö.S. 200. —.

Chinese and Tibetan sources related that the Sixth Dalai Lama, Tshañs-dbyaṅs rgya-mtsho, died in 1706 on the way to China near Kun-dga'-nor, a small lake south of Lake Kukunor.¹ However, a different story is found in the *Hor chos-'byuñ* written in 1889 by Dam-chos rgya-mtsho or Dharmatāla. According to Dharmatāla, the Sixth Dalai Lama did not die in 1706 but continued to live in secrecy for another forty years. After having made secret pilgrimages to Central Tibet, Khams, India and Nepal in the years 1706–1716, he remained most of the time in the land of the A-lag-sa where he died in 1746. Dharmatāla's source concerning the secret life of the Sixth Dalai Lama in the years 1706–1746 is the *Thams-cad mkhyen-pa Nag-dbañ Chos-grags dPal-bzañ-po'i nam-par thar-pa phul-du byuñ-ba'i mdzad-pa bzañ-po'i gtam-sñan lha'i tambu-ra'i rgyud-kyi sgra-dbyaṅs* written by A-lag-sa No-mon Han Nag-dbañ Lhun-grub Dar-rgyas in the Fire Ox Year. The author, No-mon Han, must have been born in 1714/1715 and the Fire Ox Year must be 1757 (cf. Klafkowski, pp. 20 and 55). No-mon Han's work was recently published in a facsimile edition by Ngawang Gelek Demo.²

Klafkowski's work consists of three parts: a preliminary report on Dharmatāla's Chronicle, of which he has prepared a complete translation; an English translation of ff. 151b–162a of Dharmatāla's work containing the biography of the Sixth Dalai Lama; and a critical study of the truth of the story told by Dharmatāla and his source, No-mon Han's work. Klafkowski announces a romanized edition of No-mon Han's work together with a study of it. On p. 63 Klafkowski mentions that a detailed study of the same work by Yonten Gyatsho will also be published in the near future. It is to be hoped that these studies of No-mon Han's work will make it possible to evaluate critically the story of the secret life of the Sixth Dalai Lama. On pp. 60–63, Klafkowski quotes accounts of the death of the Sixth Dalai Lama by contemporary scholars. He does not refer to Yu Dawchyun's *Love Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama* (Peiping, 1930) which relates legends told by Tibetan lamas in Peking concerning the disappearance of the Sixth Dalai Lama and his life on the Wu-t'ai shan and in Alashan (pp. 34–35). Yu Dawchyun must have learned these legends in Peking in the nineteen-twenties. In his *dPag-bsam ljon-bzañ*, Sum-pa mKhan-po writes that the Sixth Dalai Lama died in 1705 near Lake Kukunor. According to Klafkowski,

the fact that Sum-pa mKhan-po does not mention the secret life of the Sixth Dalai Lama may partly be explained by the short time-lapse – two years – between the “real” death of the Sixth Dalai Lama in 1746 and the writing of the *Re'u-mig* in 1748. However, in “The Annals of Kukunor”, completed in 1786, Sum-pa mKhan-po writes that Tshañs-dbyañs rgya-mtsho died in 1706 at Kun-dga'-no'ur.³ Sum-pa mKhan-po must have been particularly well informed about the history of the Kukunor region and Mongolia in the first half of the eighteenth century. If there is any truth in the story of the secret life of the Sixth Dalai Lama, one has to explain Sum-pa mKhan-po's silence in this respect.

Klafkowski is rather critical with regard to the majority of existing translations from the Tibetan. According to him “it is possible to reproduce Tibetan in English with the word order fairly close to the original one” (p. 15). He prefers to preserve “the entire Tibetan flavor” in English and to translate, for instance, *stobs kyi 'khor lo bsgyur* not as “universal emperor” but as “the one who holds the wheel of force”. He does not explain why he translates *bsgyur* as ‘holds’ and not as ‘turns’. Alas, Klafkowski's translation is not always correct, and in some instances seriously distorts the meaning of the text.

Sections 46–50 are translated by him as follows:

- (46) Now (while talking) about these (things), some said many different things about Gyalwa Tshangyang Gyatsho, Pad-dkar 'Dzin-pa and Gyalwa Kelzang Gyatsho, that all the three of them lived at the same time and therefore they (i.e. the authenticity of their incarnations) were doubtful. There were many rumours concerning these (questions). However, in fact there were no doubts about them, which can clearly be demonstrated by the following (evidence):
- (47) by the first Stage of Perfection [Tib. *sa* = Skt. *buddhabhūmi*], in an infinitely short time [*skad cig ma gcig*], each of them could be seen as a hundred Buddhas displaying a hundred bodies, each of these having one hundred disciples, totally twelve hundred different qualities.
- (48) by the second Stage of Perfection, each of them could be seen as one thousand Buddhas, rest as above [*bas de dag ston* substitute a thousand everywhere];
- (49) by the third Stage of Perfection, each of them could be seen as one hundred thousand Buddhas, (all of whom) could make manifestations, give teachings etc. If such high qualities can be reached by the three Bodhisattvas, there is no reason why Ārya Avalokiteśvara (who is the essence of them all) should not have such qualities.
- (50) Therefore, there were three different manifestations of the Great All-Knowing One (the Great Fifth Dalai Lama); moreover, there will be hundreds of thousands more. There are no objections to it, and there should not be.

The Tibetan text as romanized by Klafkowski is:

- (46) (one syllable unclear) 'di la kha cig rgyal ba tshañs dbyañs rgya mtsho ðaṅ pad dkar 'dzin pa ye šes rgya mtsho/rgyal ba bskal bzañ rgya mtsho gsum cig char du sdom (read: 'dzom, PK) pa'i don la rtogs pa byas te cal col sna tshogs smras kyañ de'i skyon med de/
- (47) sa ðaṅ po pas skad cig ma cig la sañs rgyas brgya mthoñ pa nas lus brgya ston pa/ lus re re la 'khor brgya ston pa sogs kyi yon tan brgya phrag bcu gñis ðaṅ/
- (48) sa gñis pa bas de dag stoñ ðaṅ/
- (49) gsum pa bas brgya stoñ 'gyur sogs kyi yon tan de dag thob na 'phags pa sryan ras gzigs la lta ci smos pa'i phyir ro/
- (50) des na rgyal dbaṅ thams cad mkhyen gzigs chen po'i sprul ba gsum 'byuñ bar ma zad brgya stoñ sogs 'byuñ kyañ 'gal ba (321) gcig kyañ med do/

I would like to propose the following translation:

(46) With regard to the fact that rGyal-ba Tshañs-dbyañs, Pad-dkar 'dzin-pa and rGyal-ba bsKal-bzañ rgya-mtsho all three lived at the same time, some made speculations and talked all kinds of nonsense. However, there is nothing wrong with it.

(47) One who resides in the first stage has twelve hundred qualities: in a single moment he sees a hundred Buddhas, makes appear a hundred bodies and makes appear with each body one hundred groups of followers, etc.

(48) One who resides in the second stage [read: *sa gñis pa pas*] (sees) a thousand (Buddhas).

(49) One who resides in the third stage has such qualities as a hundred thousand transformations, etc. How much more (does) Ārya Avalokiteśvara (have these qualities)?

(50) Therefore it is not at all contradictory when there are not only three manifestations of the Great All-Knowing and Seeing rGyal-dbañ, but even when there are a hundred thousand (manifestations), etc.

The text of Section 55 is: *spyir na rgyal ba'i dbaṅ po sku 'phreñ sñā phyi rnams dan/khyad par gsum pa nas drug pa'i bar gyi skyabs mgon rnam pa bži ni rañ cag sog po'i 'gro ba la bka' drin gñal du med pa me tog phog pa'i lha skal lta bu yin pas tshul de śes nas gsol ba 'debs dgos pa yin no/*. Klafkowski translates: "In general, all the former and later incarnations of Gyalwa Rinpoche, and particularly the Four Guardians from the Third to the Sixth, each of them, were of unimaginable kindness to all our sentient beings of Sog. We place the offering flowers with that part of the gods [note 108 – Meaning: We offer flowers to Avalokiteśvara as symbolized by these four of his manifestations.] . We must understand it (clearly) about them (i.e. their importance) and why it is so necessary to pray (to them)." Klafkowski's translation of *me tog phog pa'i lha skal* is nothing more than a wild guess. It is clearly stated in the text that the kindness (*bka' 'drin*) of the four Dalai Lamas was like *me tog phog pa'i lha skal*. The exact meaning of this expression is unknown to me. Probably it means something like "the divine blessing of the falling (?) flowers".

It is to be hoped that Klafkowski will carefully examine his translation of Dharmatāla's work before publishing it. It is by far the best to indicate each time a translation of a passage is only tentative, and not be tempted into creating the impression that the text is everywhere obvious to the translator.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTES

¹ Cf. L. Petech, *China and Tibet in the Early XVIIth Century*. Second Edition, Leiden, 1972, p. 17.

² Ngawang Gelek Demo (ed.), *The Secret Biography of the Sixth Dalai Lama* (Gedan Sungrab Minyam Gyunphel Series, Vol. XVII). New Delhi, 1970.

³ Cf. Ho-Ching Yang, *The Annals of Kokonor* (Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, Volume 106). Bloomington, 1969, pp. 22 and 45.