

In Part A II, the Tibetan artist Namgyal Gonpo Ronge has provided line-drawings of 19 of the 79 deities, as well as of all bodily postures (*āsanas*), hand positions (*mudrās*), and attributes mentioned in the *sādhana*s. The text accompanying the sections dealing with *āsanas* and *mudrās* is trilingual: German, English, and Tibetan. The section on *āsanas* is of particular interest, as six works (Tibetan translations of Sanskrit texts as well as original Tibetan works) have been consulted, and the descriptions of *āsanas* (including four which are not mentioned in the *sādhana*s of the *Ba-ri-brgya-rca*) quoted. — Indexes covering all the information contained in this part of the work are provided.

Ursula Toyka-Fuong, *Die Kultplastiken der Sammlung Werner Schulemann im Museum für Ostasiatische Kunst, Köln*, 196 pp. (Volume B).

Dr. Ursula Toyka-Fuong's work is a detailed iconographic description of 63 metal statues¹ from the collection of Tibetan religious art assembled by Professor Werner Schulemann (former professor of pharmacology in Bonn) and now in the possession of the Museum für Ostasiatische Kunst in Köln.

Although many of these statues have been described in a well-illustrated exhibition catalogue, *Buddhistische Kunst aus dem Himalaya*, Köln 1974, the approach of Dr. Toyka-Fuong is new, her intention being to apply to an actual iconographic material the analytic grid presented in Part A1 by Dagyab. In this, she is, as far as I can judge, entirely successful. Her study is a masterpiece of clear analysis and lay-out. Each object is presented on a left-hand page with short comments to twenty headings relating to its physical description; on the facing right-hand page is a black-and-white photo of the object. Moreover, the right-hand page can be pulled out, disclosing two more pages, one containing comments to the description, the other providing the author's own line-drawings of profile and various decorative and iconographic details of the object in question. Thus, the reader has, for each object, three pages of description and a photo, in all, four pages spread out, a lay-out which makes the book exceptionally convenient to use. (Since only two of these four pages are numbered, the book in reality contains 126 pages in addition to the 196 which are numbered.) The principles of description and general lay-out of the book may serve as a model for future studies. Although the folding-out pages obviously entail extra costs of production, this is more than justified in view of the convenience this offers the reader.

The two parts of the series *Ikonographie und Symbolik des tibetischen Buddhismus* which have appeared so far, will be indispensable in any Tibetological library and to any serious student of Tibetan art and iconography. The publishers and printers are to be warmly congratulated on producing a technically flawless and aesthetically attractive set of volumes, and the authors, the artist and editor on providing an

exceptionally clear path into what the editor rightly terms “den Dschungel der tibetischen Ikonographie”.

NOTES

¹ Tibetan metal statues are frequently styled “bronzes”; metallurgic analysis has shown, however, that actual bronze is extremely rare in Tibetan metal statues, which (apart from the occasional silver statue) consist of brass, or somewhat less frequently, of almost pure copper.

University of Oslo

PER KVAERNE

Wilhelm Halbfass, *Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara* (Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 9). Reinbek, Dr. Inge Wezler, Verlag für orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1983. 140 pp. DM 26,—.

Halbfass's *Studies* comprise three chapters: 1, Kumārila on Ahimsā and Dharma (pp. 1–26); 11. Human Reason and Vedic Revelation in the Philosophy of Śaṅkara (pp. 27–84); 111. Śaṅkara and Kumārila on the Plurality of Religious Traditions (pp. 85–105). An appendix is entitled: Notes on the “Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa” (pp. 106–131).

In the first chapter, Halbfass analyses Kumārila's views on the relationship between dharma and ahimsā. According to Kumārila, sacrificial killing is legitimate because it is prescribed as an integral part of a positively enjoined ritual. Ahimsā itself is only valid insofar as it is scripturally enjoined. Dharma consists in specific injunctions (*vidhi*) and prohibitions (*pratiśedha*). Common acceptance (*lokaprasiddhi*) is not a source of dharma because there is considerable disagreement in this regard. For instance, for the “liberators from saṃsāra” (*saṃsāramocaka*), *hiṃsā* means merit. Halbfass quotes several texts relating to the *saṃsāramocaka*-s, and discusses other religious traditions presented as advocating the idea of meritorious, religiously-motivated killing. He draws attention to a reference to “the sacred text of the Thags” (*thakaśāstra*) in Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* (p. 392), the oldest extant reference to this sect.¹

H.-P. Schmidt argued that the world-view of the Vedic “ritualists” themselves provided the original basis and background for the notion of ahimsā and that this ritual-ahimsā theory was the ultimate source of the later renunciatory-ahimsā theory. Halbfass asks whether it does not seem more likely that external factors contributed to these developments, which subsequently led to a sharp and explicit conflict between ritualism and ahimsā as two basically different ways of religious orientation.

The second chapter is the result of critical reflection on recent studies of Śaṅkara's philosophy by T. Vetter, H. Brückner and S. Mayeda. Halbfass firmly rejects any separation of domains between *yukti/tarka* and *śruti/sāstra* in Śaṅkara's philosophy. Reason (*yukti/tarka*) has its legitimate role under the guidance of, and in cooperation with, *śruti*. The Veda authorizes a certain limited use of human reasoning. Examples (*dṛṣṭānta*) and inferences (*anumāna*) are only used as didactic devices and do not add proof and validity to the teachings of the Veda.

Halbfass pays particular attention to the meaning of *anvayavyatireka* in the philosophy of Śaṅkara and Sureśvara. According to him, *anvayavyatireka* has to do with positive and negative concomitance, deals with constants and variables, with the co-occurrence and non-co-occurrence of various types of phenomena — words, meanings, entities or events. In Sureśvara's philosophy its essential function is to separate the self from anything that is not the self, but only the Vedic texts can bring about the liberating knowledge of the self.

In the third chapter, Halbfass explains the attitudes of Śaṅkara, Kumārila and other philosophers (Jayantabhaṭṭa, Bhartṛhari) with regard to the plurality of religious traditions. For Śaṅkara the Veda is the criterion and measure of legitimacy and orthodoxy, and non-Vedic traditions are to be rejected. Kumārila also rejects all traditions which claim an extra-Vedic legitimacy, but he admits that they can have certain actual "historical" roots in the Veda, especially the *arthavāda* sections of the Veda, and in the Upaniṣads. Jayantabhaṭṭa does not rely on the *vedamūlatva* principle as applied by Kumārila, but on "acceptance by the great (and/or many) people" (*mahājanaparigṛhītatva*), whereas the concept of common acceptance (*lokaprasiddhi*) plays a more positive role in the thought of Bhartṛhari, whose system, however, remains a closed, thoroughly Veda-oriented system.

In his notes on the Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa, Halbfass points out that the Vivaraṇa quotes and refutes Kumārila, that with regard to sacrificial *himsā* it adopts tenets criticized by Kumārila and incompatible with views expressed by Śaṅkara, and that it is much more scripture-oriented than the Yogabhāṣya or even Vācaspati's Tattvavaiśāradī. Remarkable are its elaborate criticism of Vijñānavāda and its argumentation in favour of the existence of an unchanging witness or spirit (*puruṣa*).

As to the vexed question of the authorship of the Vivaraṇa, Halbfass remarks that it had a special and probably unique relationship with Kerala, but that it is unlikely that it was written by a Śaṅkara who lived in the fourteenth century as maintained by S. K. Rāmanātha Śāstrī, who edited a section of the Vivaraṇa as appendix to his edition of Maṇḍanamīśra's Sphoṭasiddhi (Madras, 1931). Halbfass disagrees with Wezler's opinion that the text of the Yogabhāṣya as known to Vācaspati clearly shows vestiges of an influence exercised on it by the Vivaraṇa.

Halbfass's studies deal with some fundamental problems in the history of Pūrvamīmāṃsā and Uttaramīmāṃsā. His work is based upon a careful philological

investigation of the relevant texts and a critical examination of the views expressed by other scholars. This small and unpretentious book is an important contribution to the study not only of Vedānta philosophy but of Indian thought in general because the author is keenly aware of the particular characteristics of Indian thinking which are often overlooked by modern Hindu authors and Western Scholars.

NOTE

- 1 Written ca. 900 A.D. according to Halbfass (p. 96).

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Joachim Deppert (ed.), *India and the West*. Proceedings of a Seminar Dedicated to the Memory of Hermann Goetz (South Asian Studies No. XV). New Delhi, Manohar, 1983. Vertrieb durch Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden, DM 46,-.

According to the preface, this book presents a selection from the papers read during a seminar held on February 25–28, 1982, in the frame of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Max Müller Bhavan, New Delhi. The seminar was dedicated to the memory of Hermann Goetz (1898–1976) and it was organised around the two main themes of his work: that significant research into Indian art history is only possible in collaboration with indology, comparative religion and philosophy, archeology, history, ethnology, sociology, and the general history of civilization; and that India in all her manifoldness is not at all to be isolated from, but put into the context with, the West.

Hermann Kulke characterizes the life and work of Hermann Goetz (pp. 13–23) and A. Ranganathan writes on 'The Relevance of Coomaraswamy and Goetz to the History of Ideas – Some Aesthetic Considerations' (pp. 25–43). By far the longest contribution is Joachim Deppert's article, entitled 'East or West – The Precedent: The Aryan Schism' (pp. 45–138), the main theme of which is indicated in the following words: "The antagonistic direction – the Veda to the Indian east, the Avesta to the Iranian west of Afghanistan – portend more than a *fait accompli* imposed on the cultural diffusion by random topographical features calling upon migrators in virtue of easy access. They epitomize the fundamental, the conscious and subconscious attitudes of the two Aryan cultures against each other, governed by mutual contradictions and suspensions in terms of complementary couples, of binomials yoked together by mutual inversion or negative determination of pole and generic antipole, like east/west" (pp. 51–52). Deppert's article is written in

the same vein as his book *Rudras Geburt* (Wiesbaden, 1977) and it is an impossible task to indicate even the main lines of his arguments. The headings of the main section of his article (II The Indo-Iranian Schism, pp. 51–102) may give some idea of the contents: a. Pure and Useful/Impure and Noxious Animals; b. The Agent of the Schism and the Gods; c. "The Farmer and the Cowman Should be Friends"; d. Mothers and Fathers, Incest and Exogamy; e. Heavens and Day, Underworld and Night; f. Avestan Dualism and Vedic Monism; g. Cremation and Exposure; h. Short Linear Time and Long Cyclic Time.

The other articles published in this volume are the following: R. N. Mehta, 'Urban Centres of Western India and the Western World' (pp. 139–148); Lokesh Chandra, 'Hellenistic Echoes in the Legend of Kṛṣṇa' (pp. 149–154); Klaus Fischer, 'Interrelations between East and West in the Light of Newly Discovered Gāndhāra Sculptures' (pp. 155–158); Karl Jettmar, 'Westerners beyond the Great Himalayan Range. Rock Carvings and Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley near Chilas' (pp. 159–164); Vasundhara Filliozat, 'Vijayanagar and Portuguese Chronicles' (pp. 165–171); Ebba Koch, 'Jahangir and the Angels: Recently Discovered Wall Paintings under European Influence in the Fort of Lahore' (pp. 173–195); Heimo Rau, 'The Image of India in European Antiquity and the Middle Ages' (pp. 197–208); Heidrun Brückner, 'Revelation and Argumentation. Some References to the Relation of *śruti* and *tarka* in Śaṅkara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya*' (pp. 209–220); N. S. S. Raman, 'Indian and German Idealism' (pp. 221–235); Günther D. Sontheimer, 'The Mallāri/Khaṇḍobā Myth as Reflected in Folk Art and Ritual' (pp. 237–251); T. K. Oommen, 'Towards Reconciling Traditional and Modern Values: The Indian Experiment' (pp. 253–263).

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Louis Ligeti (ed.), *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies*, commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, vols. xxix/1–2). Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984. Volume 1, 387 pp.; Volume 2, 440 pp. \$88.00

In 1784 Csoma de Kőrös was born in the village of Kőrös. These two volumes are published in memory of this great pioneer in the field of Tibetan and Buddhist studies. His work is well-known, but for the study of his life, those who are unable to read Hungarian have had to rely on the biography published by Theodore Duka in 1885. In a recent article Bernard Le Calloc'h draws attention to studies written in Hungarian on Csoma de Kőrös since 1885.¹ One of the authors he

mentions is Elek Csetri, who has here contributed an article on 'Csoma de Kőrös's Life Before His Oriental Journey' (pp. 143–158). Since the publication of Duka's book much information seems to have been discovered concerning the life and the activities of Csoma de Kőrös. It is to be hoped that this information will be made accessible in English in a new biography. Another desideratum is a bibliography of publications relating to Csoma de Kőrös with a short analysis of those written in Hungarian.

These two volumes include 46 articles written by scholars from 17 countries. The articles are published according to the alphabetical order of the names of the scholars: Volume 1. Beckwith – Kychanov; Volume 2. Ligeti-Zieme. It is perhaps useful to arrange these contributions according to topics as follows: *Tibetan grammar and lexicography*: Kun Chang and Betty Shefts Chang, 'The Spoken Tibetan Verb *KḷP*' (pp. 131–142); A. Róna-Tas, 'Some Remarks on the Vowel System of Spoken Tibetan' (pp. 215–235); G. Kara, 'A Sbra-nag Glossary in Grum-Grzimajlo's Travels' (pp. 321–362); Roy Andrew Miller, 'Linguistic Devices and Techniques in the First Tibetan Grammatical Treatise' (pp. 175–195); R. E. Emmerick, 'Tibetan Lexical Notes' (pp. 207–210); Alice Sárközi, 'A Tibeto-Mongolian Manuscript of Lexicographical Explanations to the *Rgyud-bži*' (pp. 249–279). *Tibetan manuscripts and literature*: L. S. Savitsky, 'Tunhuang Tibetan Manuscripts in the Collection of the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies' (pp. 281–290); Helmut Eimer, 'Zur Stellung des Narthang-Druckes in der Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur' (pp. 199–205); Alex Wayman, 'The Interlineary-type Commentary in Tibetan' (pp. 367–379); Christopher I. Beckwith, 'A Hitherto Unnoticed Yüan-Period Collection Attributed to 'Phagspa' (pp. 9–16); Anne-Marie Blondeau, 'Le "découvreur" du *Maṇi bka'-'bum* était-il bon-po?' (pp. 77–123); Sh. Bira, 'Some Extracts from Sh. Damdin's Manuscript Copy of the *Hu-lan deb-ther*' (pp. 59–75); László Lorincz, 'Märchen, Sagen und Schwänke vom Dach der Welt (Tibetische Tiermärchen und Dre-mo Märchen)' (pp. 117–127). *Tibetan nīti literature*: Géza Bethlenfalvy, 'The *Śatagāthā* Attributed to Vararuci' (pp. 17–58); Michael Hahn, 'Zu den Quellen einiger Strophen aus Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*' (pp. 251–266); T. Malanova, 'On the Sanskrit Subhāṣita-Literature in Tibet' (pp. 141–151). *Buddhist Philosophy*: Judit Fehér, 'Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* – Arrival and Spread of *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika* Literature in Tibet' (pp. 211–240); Christian Lindtner, 'Bhavya's Controversy with Yogācāra in the Appendix to *Prajñāpradīpa*, Chapter XXV' (pp. 77–97); Marek Mejor, 'A Contribution to the Biography of Vasubandhu from Tibetan Sources' (pp. 159–173). Zoltán Horváth, 'Structure and Content of the *Chad-ma rigs-pa'i gter*, an Epistemological Treatise of Saskya Paṇḍita' (pp. 267–302). *Tantrism*: G. M. Bongard-Levin, 'A New Fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhāraṇī*' (pp. 125–129); L. S. Kawamura, 'Thus Have I said – A Preliminary Study of the Tantra' (pp. 363–375); Lokesh Chandra, 'Vaipulya

Sūtras and the Tantras' (pp. 99–115). *Tibetan music*: Alice Egyed, 'Notes on the Origin of Tibetan Religious Music' (pp. 191–198). *Tibetan medicine*: G. Somlai, 'Preliminary Investigation of a Tibetan Medical Chart' (pp. 313–319). *History of Tibet*: Alexander W. Macdonald, 'Religion in Tibet at the Time of Srong-btsan sgam-po: Myth as History' (pp. 129–140); Turrell V. Wylie, 'Khubilai Khaghan's First Viceroy of Tibet' (pp. 391–404); H. E. Richardson, 'Reflections on *Translation of a Tibetan Passport Dated 1688 A.D.* by Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, 1833' (pp. 211–214); A. S. Martinov, 'The Sa-skya Episode in the Nepal Campaign of 1791–1792' (pp. 153–158).

Tibetan chronology: Géza Uray, 'The Earliest Evidence of the Use of the Chinese Sexagenary Cycle in Tibetan' (pp. 341–360); Zuiho Yamaguchi, 'Methods of Chronological Calculation in Tibetan Historical Sources' (pp. 405–424); Ramon Prats, 'Tshe-dbañ-nor-bu's Chronological Notes on the Early Transmission of the *Bi ma Sñiñ thig*' (pp. 197–209); Yoshiro Imaeda, 'Memento chronologique (*bstan-rtsis*) du calendrier bhoutanais' (pp. 303–320). *Tibetan geography*: Elena de Rossi Filibeck, 'Names of Known and Less Known Places in Yer pa' (pp. 237–247); Wang Yao, 'Study on the Names and the Location of the *Skya Ring* and the *Sngo Ring*, Two Big Lakes at the Source of the Yellow River' (pp. 361–365). *Tibetan law*: Dieter Schuh, 'Recht und Gesetz in Tibet' (pp. 291–311).

Mongolian studies: Louis Ligeti, 'La version mongole des *Douze actes du Bouddha*' (pp. 7–76); Manfred Taube, 'Nachlese zum Mongolischen Turfanfragment des *Bodhicaryāvatāra*' (pp. 327–339); Magdalena Tatár, 'Nature Protecting Taboos of the Mongols' (pp. 321–325).

Tangut studies: Mary Ferenczy, 'The Formation of Tangut Statehood as Seen by Chinese Historiographers' (pp. 241–249); E. I. Kychanov, 'From the History of the Tangut Translation of the Buddhist Canon' (pp. 377–387).

Uigur studies: K. Czeglédy, 'The Foundation of the Uyghur Kingdom' (p. 159–163); Peter Zieme, 'Indischer Schlangenzauber in uigurischer Überlieferung' (pp. 425–440). *Nanchao*: Ilkidó Ecsedy, 'Nanchao: an Archaic State Between China and Tibet' (pp. 165–189).

NOTE

¹ 'Les biographies d'Alexandre Csoma de Kőrös', *JA*, 1984, pp. 403–423.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

T. C. H. Raper (ed.). *Catalogue of the Pāli Printed Books in the India Office Library*. Revised by M. J. C. O'Keefe. London, The British Library, 1983. IV, 80 pp. £12.00.

The present catalogue includes about 1600 titles of Pāli texts and translations from Pāli. In the preface M. O'Keefe writes that the collection is strong in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century text editions. During the period 1867–1948 the (Indian) Press and Registration of Books Act made it possible for the Library to acquire by copyright acquisition any work printed or lithographed in India and Burma. Except for the period 1796–1802, Ceylon was governed by the Colonial Office, not by the East India Company or its successors. Although the India Office Library does not have a copy of every Pāli text published in Theravāda countries since 1836, the year in which appeared Turnour's edition of the Mahā-vaṃsa, chs 1–20, there is probably no other library which possesses such a large collection of Pāli texts and translations.

The texts are arranged according to title (with cross-references from alternative titles), author, editor, compiler, series, commentary, commentator. Texts published in journals or included in books are not listed, with the few exceptions probably due to the fact that the library possesses offprints. For instance, under Dhammapada one finds P. S. Dhammarama's edition and translation which appeared in volume LI of the *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* (not *de l'Extrême-Orient* as written in the catalogue). Under Kamma-vācā only one text is mentioned, one published in Chittagong in 1912. One is surprised to note the absence of Spiegel's edition published in Bonn in 1841. As to Thai editions of the Tipiṭaka, only one edition is mentioned in the catalogue: Pra Tripiṭaka Syāmaratṭha. Published as a memorial to King Rāma VI. Sinhalese characters (sic!). 45 vols. 25 cm. Bangkok 1931. According to René Lingat the first volumes of this edition were published in December 1925 and the last in August 1928 (*Bibliographie bouddhique*, 1, Paris, 1930, p. 8). A few non-Pāli texts published by the Pali text society are included, cf. Maṇicūḍāvadāna and Vimalakīrtinīrdesa (sic!). There are a few misprints in German titles: p. 7 Buche der Charaktere; p. 13 Worte der Wahrheit; p. 17 Die Reden Gotambo Buddhos. On p. 25 Tuxen's translation of a number of Jātakas is mentioned twice, once as *Æventyr fra det gamle Indien* and once as *Eventyr fra det gamle Indien*.

This catalogue is extremely useful for Pāli scholars who will be particularly interested in the many Burmese and Ceylonese editions of Pāli texts which it contains. One of the desiderata of Pāli studies is the compilation of bibliographies of Pāli texts published in Europe, India and the Theravāda countries. With the help of this catalogue it will be possible to trace many texts which are practically unknown outside their country of origin. We must be grateful to the India Office Library for having undertaken to publish this catalogue and to Mr. T. C. H. Raper (1922–1979) and Mr. M. J. C. O'Keefe for having edited the entries from the card catalogue.

Siglinde Dietz, *Fragmente des Dharmaskandha, Ein Abhidharma-Text in Sanskrit aus Gilgit* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist., Kl., Dritte Folge Nr. 142). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984, 104 pp., 14 pl. DM 64.00.

A Gilgit manuscript in the library of the Scindia Oriental Museum in Ujjain contains fragments of three different texts: the Dharmaskandha (19 folios), the Ekottarāgama (9 folios) and the Lokaprajñapti (6 folios). The fragments of the Dharmaskandha were identified by Jikidō Takasaki and edited by Sudha Sengupta in *Buddhist Studies in India* (Delhi, 1975), pp. 137–183. Siglinde Dietz's edition of these fragments is based upon a careful study of the manuscript and a comparison with the corresponding Chinese text. The 38 pages of this manuscript contain about 17.7% of the entire text.

Siglinde Dietz describes the script, orthographical particularities, hybrid forms, etc. on pages 9–15. She refers for a more detailed study of its language to an article, 'Untersuchungen zur Schulzugehörigkeit der in Ujjain liegenden Gilgit-Fragmente', to be published in *Schulzugehörigkeit von Sanskrit-Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*.

In the next chapter Siglinde Dietz refers to Frauwallner's study of the Dharmaskandha and analyses the contents of the Sanskrit fragments. She points out that three Sanskrit quotations from the Dharmaskandha are to be found in the Abhidharmakośavyākhyā and the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya.

The main part of this publication is an annotated edition of the Sanskrit fragments with references to the Chinese translation and Sudha Sengupta's edition (pp. 24–88). The 420 notes contain a kind of running commentary relating to points of interest in the text such as quotations, restorations of missing syllables and words, Pāli parallels, differences between the Sanskrit text and the Chinese translation, etc.

The remaining chapters comprise a concordance of the pages of the fragments with Sengupta's edition and the Chinese translation, a list of the quotations, an index of names and words and a list of abbreviations. The fragments are reproduced on fourteen plates most of which are, alas, too dark to be read.

Siglinde Dietz's excellent edition makes it possible to obtain a good idea of the original text of this important Abhidharma text. The notes are very helpful for the study of the text. It is interesting to see that the Sanskrit text and the Chinese text do not always agree. For instance, in note 255 Siglinde Dietz draws attention to the reading *Asaṃjñīsattvasaṃgrhītā Brhatphalāḥ*, which she translates as "die Brhatphala-[Götter], die von den Asaṃjñīsattva-[Göttern] beherrscht werden". She adds: 'Diese Lesart ist wahrscheinlich die korrekte; denn vgl. Abhidh-k II 199: 'Dans le ciel des Brhatphalas se trouve une place surélevée qui est le séjour des Inconscients (d.s Asaṃjñīsattva)'." Neither in this place (14 r 3) nor in 7 v 8

does the Chinese text have anything corresponding to *Asaṃjñīsattvasaṃgrhīta*. It is difficult to accept the translation “beherrscht” for *saṃgrhīta*. According to the doctrine of the Abhidharmakośa, the Asaṃjñīdeva-s are a subdivision of the Bṛhatphaladeva-s. This doctrine is that of the Vaibhāṣika masters of Kaśmīr, cf. Mahāvibhāṣā ch. 154 (T. 1545, p. 784b5ff.): “In what place are the Asaṃjñīdeva-s included? The śāstrācārya-s of Kaśmīr say: ‘They are included in the Bṛhatphaladeva-s’.”; Abhidharmadīpa (ed. P. S. Jaini, Patna, 1959), p. 91: *asaṃjñīṣu / asaṃjñīsattvā nāmā bṛhatphaladevanikāyasamgrhītā dhyānāntarikāvat*. It is therefore likely that an error has crept into the Sanskrit text of the Dharmaskandha, because the *asaṃjñīsattva*-s are included in the *bṛhatphala*-s and not vice versa.

Misprints are very rare: p. 26, line 12 read *avidyāgato* for *avidāgato*; p. 81, line 8 read *prayogam* for *pryogam*.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Günther Grönbold, *Der buddhistische Kanon. Eine Bibliographie*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1984. 70 pp. DM 38,—.

According to the preface, Grönbold’s catalogue has as its aim to stimulate Buddhologists to pay more attention to the history of the formation of the Buddhist canon. The introduction gives some information on the compilation of the canon in India, the Theravāda countries, China, Korea, Tibet, Mongolia, Japan and Vietnam.

The bibliography is divided into five sections: 1. Editions of the Buddhist canon; 2. Old catalogues of the canon; 3. Modern catalogues of the canon; 4. Catalogues of the Tibetan Bon canon; 5. Secondary literature. An appendix contains a list of the libraries which hold blockprints and manuscripts of the Tibetan canon. The index comprises proper names of authors.

It is of course not possible to expect a bibliography of the Buddhist canon to be complete or without mistakes. The particular strength of this bibliography is its extensive coverage of the Tibetan materials, in which task Dr. Helmut Eimer has cooperated. One of the very few items that can be added to this section is Taishun Mibu’s *A comparative list of the Tibetan Tripitaka of Narthang edition (Bstan-ḥgyur division) with the Sde-dge edition*, which was published in cyclostyled form in 1967; 111, 142 pp. Japanese title: *Taishō daigaku shozō chibetto daizōkyō naruta-ban ronshobu mokuroku*. Mibu’s list includes also the Peking Tanjur. Not mentioned is Bunkyō Sakurabe’s article on the compilation of the Ratnakūṭa section: ‘Chibetto-

yaku Daihōshakukyō no kenkyū', *Ōtani Gakuhō* XI, 3 (1930), pp. 134–175 (514–555). In the *Bibliographie bouddhique* (11, no. 110) Serge Elisséeff wrote that Sakurabe tried to show that the entire Ratnakūṭa was translated from Chinese texts. This is not the case. According to Sakurabe, texts nos. 7, 13 and 14 were translated from the Chinese by Chos-grub and nos. 11, 14, 17 and 20 were also probably translated from the Chinese (cf. p. 170). For other articles by Sakurabe, see *Bibliographie bouddhique* 1, no. 76; 11, no. 109, and VI, no. 182. For an article by Taishun Mibu on the Sūtra and Vinaya sections of the Kanjur, see *Bibliographie bouddhique* XXIV–XXVII, no. 648.

Rather disappointing is the information given on the Chinese canons. It seems that one of the main sources is Nanjio's catalogue (cf. no. 149). For instance, the author of the *Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* is called San-yu (Nanjio: Sañ-yiu), whereas according to the Wade-Giles transcription used in this bibliography his name is Seng-yu (cf. no. 94). The bibliography lists the *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais* (no 155), but gives references only to Nanjio's catalogue (cf. nos. 94–107). The *Shōwa Hōbō sōmokuroku* is said to be the catalogue of the Taishō Tripiṭaka (no. 157). As a matter of fact it is the title of the catalogue section of the Taishō Tripiṭaka published in three volumes (vols. 98–100) in 1929 and 1934. The title of the Japanese catalogue of the Taishō Tripiṭaka is *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō sōmokuroku* (Tokyo, 1930; revised edition Tokyo, 1969). On this catalogue see P. Demiéville, *Bibliographie bouddhique* IV–V, no. 50, and *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais*, avertissement, p. 4. It is to be hoped that in a future edition references will be made to the *Taishō Tripiṭaka* and to the *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais*. Many important works relating to the Chinese Tripiṭaka are listed in the *Supplément au quatrième fascicule du Hōbōgirin* and in the *Avertissement* of the *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais*.

In the introduction it is said that the first catalogue of the Chinese canon was compiled in 518. No mention is made of the catalogue compiled by Tao-an in 374 (cf. Erik Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, Leiden, 1959, pp. 30–31; Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China*, Princeton, 1964, pp. 97–98). The history of the different editions of the Chinese canon is complicated and one wonders which sources have been used for the information given on these editions (nos. 24–44). The bibliography lists Demiéville's article on the printed editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon published in 1924 (no. 229), but not his appendix to Paul Pelliot's *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine* (Paris, 1953), pp. 121–138: 'Notes additionnelles sur les éditions imprimées du Canon bouddhique' (reprinted in *Choix d'études bouddhiques*, Leiden, 1973, pp. 223–238).¹

Important for the study of the Tangut canon is Tatsuo Nishida's *Seigo-bun Kegonkyō*, vol. I (Kyoto, 1975); II (Kyoto, 1976); III (Kyoto, 1977). Volume one contains an introduction on the translation of Buddhist texts in the Hsi-hsia

kingdom (pp. 1–28) and volume three a bibliography of Hsi-hsia translations of Buddhist texts (pp. 1–59). A catalogue of Tangut manuscripts and blockprints in the Institute of the Peoples of Asia in Leningrad was published in 1963: *Tangutskie rukopisi i ksilografy. Spisok otoždestvlennyx i opredelennyx tangutskix rukopisej i ksilografov kolekcii Instituta Narodov Azii AN SSSR*, Moskva, 1963, 171 pp. See further Luc Kwanten and Susan Hesse, *Tangut (Hsi Hsia) Studies: a Bibliography* (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 137), Bloomington, 1980; E. I. Kychanov, 'From the history of the Tangut translation of the Buddhist canon', *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies*, vol. 1 (Budapest, 1984), pp. 377–387. Not mentioned is the first edition of the Pāli canon in Thai writing published in 39 volumes in 1894–1895 (for a list of titles see C. R. Lanman, *JAOS, Proc.* April 1895, p. ccxlv).² For the Pāli canon in Burma see also W. B. Bollée, 'Some less known Burmese Pāli texts', *Pratidānam* (The Hague, 1969), pp. 493–499 and his review of M. H. Bode, *The Pali Literature of Burma* (London, 1966), *IJ* 11 (1968–9), pp. 311–318; Oskar von Hinüber, Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma, *NAWG, 1. Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Jahrgang 1983, Nr. 3. For the Pāli canon in Thailand see Oskar von Hinüber, 'Pāli manuscripts of canonical texts from North Thailand – a preliminary report', *Journal of the Siam Society* 71 (1983), pp. 75–88.

NOTES

¹ Pelliot's book is listed (see No. 338) but Demiéville's contribution is not mentioned.

² See also No. 372.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Robert A. Hueckstedt, *The Style of Bāṇa*. An Introduction to Sanskrit Prose Poetry. Lanham—New York—London, University Press of America, 1986. XVI, 212 pp. Bound \$26.00; Paper \$12.75.

In 1853 Albrecht Weber compared Bāṇa's prose to a jungle ("ein wahrer indischer Wald").¹ In the introduction to her translation of the Kādambarī, C. M. Ridding wrote that in Bāṇa's work the sense of proportion, the very foundation of style as we know it, is entirely absent.² V. Raghavan remarked that Bāṇa often forgot proportion and sometimes indulged endlessly in *utprekṣā*.³ It is one of the main purposes of Hueckstedt's work to prove that these opinions are entirely unjustified. According to him Bāṇa's style must not be judged by Western standards. He pays particular attention to the different ways in which Bāṇa varies the length of the sentence and the number of figures of speech according to the subject, the context and the effect he intends to achieve.

In the first chapter Hueckstedt examines the beginnings of stories and shows that the length of the first sentence is proportional to the length of the story. Moreover, a long story usually begins with an elaborate description but in a short story the storyteller is not allowed to delay the action. In the next chapter Hueckstedt has collected all sentences which begin with a verb and concludes that they are used in two basic contexts: to express swift or continuous action or to depict desired or feared action. The third chapter is devoted mainly to an analysis of one very long sentence in the second chapter of the Harṣacarita in which Bāṇa describes the royal gateway. Hueckstedt divides this sentence into ten sections and shows that they are arranged according to a logical plan and suggest Harṣa's heroism in different ways, the *rasa* of *vīra* being the one predominant throughout the Harṣacarita. He analyses the clauses which constitute the sections and the figures of speech which Bāṇa uses.

In the following chapter, Hueckstedt surveys the various types of character descriptions in Bāṇa's works. In some instances a character is described limb-by-limb from head to toe or from toe to head, in others descriptions are very brief.

Hueckstedt formulates seven rules which Bāṇa seems to have followed (pp. 104–105). The most important one is probably the second: "The length of a sentence describing a character is equivalent to the size of a character in a painting or sculpture. Characters should be described at a length appropriate to their relative importance in the particular scene." The arrangement of clauses and words is the subject of Chapter Six. Hueckstedt remarks that Bāṇa knows how to organise groups of clauses, and the words within clauses, in order to get the maximum amount of suggestion from them. The two following chapters deal with *yamaka* and *anuprāsa* and with rhythm respectively. The last two chapters examine the style of Bhūṣaṇabhaṭṭa, the author of the Uttarabhāga of the Kādambarī, and

the style of Subandhu, the author of the *Vāsavadattā*. As to the borrowings from Subandhu by Bāṇa, Hueckstedt suggests that Bāṇa was in awe of Subandhu when he wrote the *Harṣacarita*. Later he wrote the *Kādambarī* to rival Subandhu. He rightly remarks that much more work will have to be done before we have any idea what syntactic constructions, *topoi*, and comparisons were stock-in-trade at a certain period.

Hueckstedt's work is original and stimulating. In the light of his work one will certainly read Bāṇa's works with different eyes. Bāṇa has found in him a spirited defender who knows how to present his case. Every future student of Bāṇa's style will have to take into account the arguments which Hueckstedt brings forward.

It is a pity that in one respect Hueckstedt's work is rather disappointing. He quotes many passages of Bāṇa's works, but his translations are not always very adequate. Hueckstedt remarks that the four classical *gadyas* had found sympathetic, though often inept translators by 1913 (i.e. C. M. Ridding's translation of the *Kādambarī*, the translation of the *Harṣacarita* by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, J. J. Meyer's translation of the *Daśakumāracarita* and Louis H. Gray's translation of the *Vāsavadattā*). However, Hueckstedt's translations from the *Harṣacarita* do not compare favourably with the translation by Cowell and Thomas. In the description of the royal gateway in Chapter Two of the *Harṣacarita* the following sentence occurs: *kaiścīd aṅgulīlikhitāyāḥ kṣīter vikīryamāṇakaranakhakiraṇakadambavyājena sevācāmarāṇīvārpayadbhiḥ* (Hueckstedt p. 75, 3–5). Cowell and Thomas translate: "Others seemed to present chowries in obsequious service under the form of the rays issuing from their nails, which were thrown back from the ground which was scratched by their bare fingers." (p. 48).⁴ Hueckstedt renders *aṅgulī* by "toe" and explains in a note that he does not know of one instance where the word *karanakha* denotes "toe" rather than "finger", and suggests replacing *kara* by *carana*.

In the same passage the suppliant asks: *bhadra bhaviṣyati bhuktāsthāne dāsyati darśanam paramēśvaraḥ* (p. 75, 19–21). Hueckstedt renders this as follows: "When His Majesty will have reached the state of having eaten, sir, will the Supreme Lord grant audience?" In his edition of the *Harṣacarita* (Delhi, 1965. Other editions are not at my disposal) Kane reads: *bhadra, adya bhaviṣyati bhuktāsthānam dāsyati darśanam paramēśvaraḥ*, but in a note mentions another reading: *bhuktvāsthāne*, the one which Cowell and Thomas have followed: "Good sir, will it be to-day? Will the great lord give an audience in the hall after he has dined?" (pp. 48–49). On p. 111 Hueckstedt renders *kācarakāca* by "brown glass". Both Cowell and Thomas (p. 230) and Kane (p. 215) render it by "glass-like crystal". In the same passage Hueckstedt renders *vikarṇena kṛṣṇāhinā* by "a black snake that had ears sticking out". According to the big Petersburg dictionary the only place in which *vikarna* has this meaning is Atharvaveda 5.17.13.⁵ Here, of course, *vikarna* means

“having no ears”. Still in the same passage the *śabara* youth is said to be: *ayaḥsāram iva girer vindhyasya galantam*, which Cowell and Thomas render by “like a melting block of iron from the Vindya” (p. 232). Hueckstedt makes him swallow the iron essence of Mt. Vindhya (p. 112).

In the description of Harṣa’s elder brother it is said that he has “fixed downcast eyes” (Cowell and Thomas, p. 166). Hueckstedt renders the well-known expression *stimitanayana* by “wet eyes” (p. 116). On p. 142 Hueckstedt quotes the following passage: *vilulitakusumaśekhhararajasi rājacakre*. He renders *kusumaśekhara*, “chaplet of flowers”, by “the tips of their flowers” without taking into account Kane’s note: *vilulitam kusumaśekhhararajah yasya*, “the pollen in the chaplets on the head of which was shaken (or tossed about)” (pp. 177–178). In Chapter Eight there is a long description of trees in which occurs the following clause: *katipayadivasasūtakukkuṭikuṭīkṛtakuṭajakoṭarāḥ*. Cowell and Thomas translate: “the hollow trunks of the Kuṭujas were tenanted by the hens with their new broods” (p. 234). Hueckstedt has: “Where wild hens filled the holes in kuṭaja trees after having been gone a few days” (p. 189). The next clause is: *caṭakāsaṃcāryamānavācācātakairakriyamānacātavah*. Cowell and Thomas translate: “While the young sparrows uttered their cries as they were tended by the mother-birds (p. 234). Kane renders *saṃcāryamāṇa* by “being taken from one tree to another”. Hueckstedt has: “young sparrows chased cuckoos and filled the air with their pleasant songs”. In the same passage occurs the expression *pāṭalamukhakīṭa* “red-mouthed insects” (cf. Kane, p. 220). Hueckstedt has: “insects, whose heads were in the trumpet flowers” (p. 190).

Kern contributed many words and meanings from the Kādambarī and the Harṣacarita to the small Petersburg dictionary. Scharpé has given a list of all references to the Kādambarī in the small Petersburg dictionary and Schmidt’s *Nachträge*, adding references to Peterson’s edition as being more accessible than the one used by Kern.⁶ A similar list comprising the references to the Harṣacarita would be useful, because Kern refers to an edition of the Harṣacarita published in 1876 which is found in very few libraries. One of the meanings given for *proṣita* by the small Petersburg dictionary is “heimgegangen, gestorben”, with a reference to Harṣacarita 153.9.⁷ In the description of Harṣa’s elder brother he is said to be: *digbhāgam iva proṣitadikkūñjaraśūnyam*, which Cowell and Thomas render as “like a quarter of the heavens vacant through the exile of its sky elephant” (p. 166). The same interpretation is given by Kane (p. 119). However, Hueckstedt translates: “like a region without its guardian elephant, which was dead” (p. 116). If Kern’s rendering of *proṣita* is based only upon this place, it has to be rejected. It would certainly be useful to carefully examine the references to the Harṣacarita in the small Petersburg dictionary and to check that Kern’s interpretations are correct in all instances.

Hueckstedt is careless not only in his translations, even though he remarks that the appendices which comprise texts and translations are addressed primarily to Sanskritists, but also in his criticism of Speijer's interpretation of *asti*. He writes: "Speijer's interpretation of this use of the word *asti* as having the sense of a particle meaning "well" is not as attractive as the tenth definition given in the small *Petersburg Wörterbuch* under the root *as*: "so ist es, es ist der Fall, es kommt vor, dass". " (p. 26). Hueckstedt refers to Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, p. 234, para. 311.2 (p. 24, note 1). In that same section Speijer wrote: "Sometimes it has the force of 'it happens that'"! The book contains many misprints, especially in the romanised Sanskrit texts. The most troublesome are probably the following ones: P. 113, line 5 from below: *śabalīkṛtakā*. Read *śabalīkṛtakāyam*. P. 118, line 4: *sāvajanunnamita*-. Read *sāvajñam unnamita*-. P. 175, line 9 from below: *vaṣaṭkurvanti*. Read *vaṣaṭkurvati*. P. 176, line 2 from below (Sanskrit text): *ananyajām uplavāsu*. Read *ananyajāmuplavāsu*. P. 188, line 1: *cāṭakair akriyamāṇa*-. Read *cāṭakairakriyamāṇa*-.

NOTES

¹ Cf. Hueckstedt, p. 12.

² *The Kādambarī of Bāṇa* (London, 1896), p. xviii.

³ *Studies on Some Concepts of the Alamkāra Śāstra*. Revised edition (Adyar, 1973), pp. 89–90.

⁴ Cf. Kane p. 121: "The vanquished kings, being deeply engrossed in sad thoughts and having nothing to do, drew lines on the ground with their nails."

⁵ Whitney renders *virikarṇa* by "wide-eared", cf. *Atharva-veda Samhitā* (H.O.S. 7, 1905), p. 249.

⁶ A. Scharpé, *Bāṇa's Kādambarī* (Leuven, 1937), pp. 398–446.

⁷ Cf. M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1899), p. 691a: "deceased, dead, Hcar".

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Götter und Mythen des indischen Subkontinents. (Wörterbuch der Mythologie. Erste Abteilung: Die alten Kulturvölker, Band V). Unter Mitarbeit von Heinz Bechert, Hermann Berger, Jozef Deleu, Günter Grönbold, Volker Moeller, Martin Pfeiffer, Kamil V. Zvelebil herausgegeben von Hans Wilhelm Haussig. Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 1984. XV, 1040 pp., 65 pl., 6 maps. DM 450.—.

The present work is the first to give a comprehensive survey of the gods and myths of the Indian subcontinent and Sri Lanka in the form of a dictionary. It comprises the following contributions: Volker Moeller, 'Die Mythologie der vedischen Religion

und des Hinduismus' (pp. 1–203); Jozef Deleu, 'Die Mythologie des Jinismus' (pp. 205–284); Günter Grönbold, 'Die Mythologie des indischen Buddhismus' (pp. 285–508); Heinz Bechert, 'Mythologie der singhalesischen Volksreligion' (pp. 509–656); Martin Pfeiffer, 'Mythologie der indischen Primitivvölker' (pp. 657–772); Hermann Berger, 'Mythologie der Zigeuner' (pp. 773–823); K. V. Zvelebil, 'Mythologie der Tamilen und anderer drawidisch sprechender Völker' (pp. 825–950); Inge-G. Dickmann und Konrad Fischer, 'Sach- und Namenregister' (pp. 953–1040). In his preface (pp. VIII–XV) Heinz Bechert introduces the work and outlines the nature of the contributions, which differ greatly according to their topics and the present state of scholarship. It seems that the selection of the materials has been left mostly to the discretion of the contributors. In the contributions by Volker Moeller and Günter Grönbold much space is given to iconography. According to Bechert neither iconography nor symbolism have been included in later contributions. It is also necessary to note that the first part was published as early as 1965 and the last only in 1982. As Bechert remarks, scholarship has made much progress during this period. It would therefore have been useful if the date of each contribution had been indicated. Only Zvelebil's contribution carries a date (1974).

Each contribution is preceded by an introduction followed by a bibliography and a description of the plates. The work contains six maps, most of them accompanied by detailed explanations. Almost all articles contain detailed bibliographical information. In other respects there are great differences in the way the contributors have treated their respective topics. The introductions by Volker Moeller, Jozef Deleu and Günter Grönbold are brief. Heinz Bechert and Kamil Zvelebil were forced to venture into largely unknown territory and to rely a great deal on their own researches, whereas Volker Moeller and Günter Grönbold were faced with a quite different problem: how to incorporate as fully as possible the results of the research done in the fields of Vedism, Hinduism and Indian Buddhism. Bechert remarks that the contribution by Volker Moeller would be better entitled as "Die Mythologie der vedischen Religion und des arisch-sanskritischen Hinduismus" because his treatment of Hinduism is complemented by Zvelebil's study of the mythology of the peoples who speak Dravidian languages. However, even taking into account this limitation which has not always been observed (see for instance the entry on Aiyanār, pp. 36–37), one cannot but feel that an adequate treatment of the mythology of the Vedic religion and Aryan-Sanskrit Hinduism would only have been possible if much more space had been given to this topic. Moreover, it would probably have been preferable to have divided it between two authors, one for the Vedic religion and one for Hinduism. Even taking into account it is probably Volker Moeller's contribution that was published in 1965, it is far from reflecting the state of scholarship even twenty years ago. For instance, the Vedic

part of the article on Aja ekapād refers only to Roth, PW, and to P. E. Dumont's article (*JAOS* 53, 1933 without page reference) and is as follows: ““der ungeborene Einfluss”; nach Roth, PW auch “der einfüssige Treiber, Stürmer”. Wohl ein atmosphärische Gottheit (s. RV 10, 65 u. 66). Seine Bestimmung ist nicht eindeutig. AV 13, 1 sagt von ihm, dass er den beiden Welten Beständigkeit gab. Das Taittirīya-Br. (3, 1, 2, 8) erwähnt, er habe sich im Osten erhoben.” Probably Paul Horsch's article (Aja Ekapād und die Sonne, *IJJ* 9, 1965–6, pp. 1–31) appeared too late to be consulted. In any case it is obvious that it is difficult to say something meaningful about Vedic Aja Ekapād in a mere five lines.

In his introduction, Heinz Bechert explains that it has been the purpose to present in the first place factual information (*Sachinformation*), and that great importance was attached to the documentation, whereas little attention was paid to the interpretation of myths and theories about myths. This is of course a very reasonable and acceptable point of view for a handbook. However, in the domain of the Vedic religion there are very few facts, and even less is there a *communis opinio* with regard to the meaning of the principal myths and most of the gods. It is, of course, not possible, or even advisable, to report all the theories and explanations given since Roth more than a century ago, but neither is it possible to present a picture of the state of scholarship on Vedic religion without referring to the different interpretations proposed by leading Vedic scholars in recent times.

The present dictionary is a work of immense value because much of the information it contains is not easily found in other publications. Apart from Volker Moeller's rather disappointing contribution, one cannot but have praise for what has been achieved by the team brought together by Heinz Bechert. Without doubt only specialists in the different fields will be able to appreciate fully the difficulties the contributors faced. Full praise is also due to the publisher for having produced a book which will be a lasting treasure in every library.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Pritam Singh, *Sikh Concept of the Divine*, GND University, Amritsar, 1985, v, 223 p., Rs 60.

Mūl Mantra was the name of the Seminar organized in 1973 “on various aspects of the Sikh doctrine of the Ultimate Reality”. It is also a very appropriate name for the present edition of the revised papers of that Seminar. Ten papers (1–127) deal with each one term of the Mūl Mantra. In the second part are given considerations of a more general type and comparisons with the Bible, the Quran, Tao and

Indo-Iranian Journal 30 (1987).

REVIEWS

G. M. Bongard-Levin, M. I. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja, *Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz central'noj Azii*, vypusk 1. Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie i kommentarij (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka, LXXIII, 1; Bibliotheca Buddhica, XXXIII). Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka', Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury, 1985. 285 pp. 3 r. 50 kop.

It is a pleasure to welcome this volume of the Bibliotheca Buddhica which contains much new manuscript material for the study of Buddhist Sanskrit texts. The present publication comprises an edition of six fragments of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra by Bongard-Levin, an edition of the text of a terminological work, called Dharmaśārīra, also by Bongard-Levin, and Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja's edition of 85 leaves and fragments belonging to seven different Central Asian manuscripts of the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra.

The book contains an English translation of the table of contents (p. 8) and a summary (pp. 174–176) which will be of limited help to scholars who do not read Russian. It will therefore probably be useful to give some more information without repeating the contents of the English summary.

The preface presents a brief history of the discoveries of manuscripts in Central Asia by Russian scholars at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. The authors mention in the first place the contributions made by N. F. Petrovskij, who was Russian consul in Kashgar from 1882 to 1903, and by Serge Ol'denburg (1863–1934) to whom are due the first editions of Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia in the last decade of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century. Since that period little attention has been paid to these manuscripts and it is only recently that their study was taken up again by V.S. Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij (1927–1956), who published several Sanskrit and Tibetan documents and who prepared a description and card-index of the Central-Asian manuscripts in Sanskrit, Khotanese, Kuchean and Tibetan.

The detailed description of the Central Asian Manuscript Fund of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences which is jointly written by both authors (pp. 14–21) is very useful. Of the eleven collections the most important is the Petrovskij collection, which contains 582 items (251 Sanskrit paper manuscripts, leaves and fragments written in Brāhmī script; 23 documents on wood of which 20 are in Sanskrit and written in Brāhmī script; two manuscripts in North-Western Prakrit and written in Kharoṣṭhī script; 297 paper manuscripts

in Khotanese and written in Brāhmī script of which 59 manuscripts and fragments contain Buddhist texts, etc.). The authors explain how the different collections were built up. They distinguish five kinds of documents:

(1) Manuscripts written in three different Brāhmī scripts (Indian, Upright and Slanting Central Asian) and containing texts in Sanskrit, Khotanese and Kuchean. They date from the fifth to the ninth centuries.

(2) Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts (Dharmapada and economic documents) written on birch-bark and wood in North-Western Prakrit and dating probably from the first century to the second half of the third century.

(3) Uigur manuscripts in cursive and semi-cursive scripts and Uigur blockprints dating from the thirteenth and or fourteenth centuries. The Uigur manuscripts from Tun-huang were probably copied in the period from the ninth to the eleventh century.

(4) Tibetan manuscripts from the eighth century (documents on wood), and manuscripts dating from the ninth to the eleventh century (Tun-huang and Khara-Khoto).

(5) Chinese manuscripts from Tun-huang (fifth to eleventh century) and from Khara-Khoto (eleventh to twelfth century).

The Central Asian fund contains about 700 items, about one third (50 items) of which has been published. The authors announce further publications of Sanskrit and Khotanese texts. They have added three tables which list all publications relating to the Sanskrit, Khotanese and Kuchean manuscripts and fragments (pp. 22–36).

Of the six Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra fragments edited by Bongard-Levin, five had already been identified by Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij. Bongard-Levin points out that only two other fragments are known: one edited by F. W. Thomas in 1916 and another edited by J. Takakusu in 1916 and recently studied in great detail by Akira Yuyama.¹ According to Bongard-Levin, the six fragments date from the sixth and seventh centuries. Bongard-Levin gives a brief description of each fragment, followed by the edition and translation of it. The notes deal with graphical and grammatical particularities and refer to the Tibetan translation and Dharmakṣema's Chinese translation. Corresponding passages in the Derge edition of the Kanjur, and the Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon, are indicated in a table and also in the description of each fragment. All fragments of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra and of the other texts edited by the two authors are reproduced in facsimile.

In his introduction Bongard-Levin remarks that a detailed comparison with the Tibetan and Chinese versions has still to be carried out. He received help from several Russian scholars in the study of these versions. It would have been useful if the edition of each fragment had been accompanied by an edition of the

corresponding Tibetan text. There are two Tibetan versions (one made from the Sanskrit, the other from the Chinese) and three Chinese versions, the so-called Northern version translated by Dharmakṣema (Taishō no. 374), the so-called Southern version which is based upon this version (Taishō no. 375) and Fa-hsien's version (Taishō no. 376).² FUSE Kōgaku compared the Southern and Northern versions but no detailed study of all five versions has been made.³ The text of the fragments agrees almost entirely with that of the Tibetan version made from the Sanskrit, but differs considerably from that of the Chinese translations made by Dharmakṣema and Fa-hsien. It is of course not possible to examine each fragment in detail, but a few remarks will probably suffice to show some of the problems connected with the study of these fragments. Bongard-Levin has carefully transliterated the texts of the fragments, but it is not clear why he does not always transcribe the *vigraha* which is written in the manuscripts by *ḥ*. For instance, he writes *vainayikavaśahaitoh* (fragment 1 R 1), but *mahānāgāḥ*: (R 4). The scribe did not observe the sandhi rules very carefully and the fact that *mahānāgāḥ* is followed by *mahā-* is no reason not to write *mahānāgāḥ*. Aksaras which are missing are added in square brackets but Bongard-Levin does not indicate aksaras which are for the most part legible. For instance, in fragment 1 (V 7) he reads *parighītacāryā[cārinah]*, but one can clearly read the *ca* and *i* of *cārinah*. Moreover, the *ṇ* is written *nn*.

In R 7 of the first fragment, Bongard-Levin writes [*mahā*] *yanaparamaguhyaka-
[śūnyatā] vacana* and in a note he remarks that *śūnyatā* is restored on the basis of the Tibetan translation. The akṣara which Bongard-Levin thinks to be *-tā* or *tva* is for the most part legible. The top part is undoubtedly an *n* and not a *t*. Probably one must read *ndhā* because a part of the loop of the *dh* can still be seen. Most probably the text has *sandhāvacana*, a term which is often to be found in the Mahāparinirvānasūtra.⁴ The Tibetan translation has *dgoṅs-pa'i tshig*.

A more detailed study of the fragments requires not only a comparison with Dharmakṣema's version but also with that of Fa-hsien. For instance, in R 4 of the first fragment one reads *mahāśūnyatādhigatasvārthā*, which Bongard-Levin renders as follows: "they had obtained their goal — the great śūnyatā." Dharmakṣema's translation has: "they possessed completely the wisdom of the void" (p. 366a22), but Fa-hsien's translation is more detailed: "they possessed completely the wisdom of the void. They had obtained their own advantage" (p. 852a24—25). Fa-hsien's translation seems to be based upon a Sanskrit original which must have been something like: *mahāśūnyatādhigamasamanvagatā adhigatasvārthāḥ*.

Toda remarked that in the Kashgar manuscript of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra, *anusvāra* is often omitted and many wrong *anusvāras* are found.⁵ Fragment 1 V 1 has: *bhagavanta śatasahasrakrtvah pradaks [inī] krtya . . . Bhagavanta* is certainly a careless spelling for *bhagavantam*. In a note Bongard-Levin refers to Edgerton's Grammar (18.7), but this paragraph relates to a nom. sg. masc. *-nta* in verses and

not to an acc. sg. masc. *-nta* in prose. It is necessary to distinguish as far as possible between wrong or careless spellings and genuine Buddhist Hybrid forms.

The second fragment was published in 1981 by Bongard-Levin⁶ There are several surprising differences in the readings of the two editions. In the 1981 edition, Bongard-Levin read *pūjāpurassarāḥ* (V 6) but in the present book, *pūjāpurapsarāḥ*. The latter form is undoubtedly the one found in the manuscript. In other instances, however, the 1981 edition has the correct readings and the present one wrong readings: R 6 *tasthu* — *tasnu*; V 7 *krtvā bhagavantam* — *krtva bhagavanta*. Also in the same line *ivāśokappallavarāgam* is preferable to *ivāśokapallava rāgam*. It is the rising sun which causes the redness of the branches of the Aśoka tree, cf. Tibetan: *ñi-ma 'char-ka'i 'od-kyis śiñ mya-ñan-'tshañ-gi lo-ma thams-cad dmar-lam-mer snañ-bar byed-pa / de-bžin-du . . .* (Derge Tha 13b6–7). In R 7 Bongard-Levin proposes to read *mahāyānakā* [*śyapa?*] because the Tibetan translation mentions Mahākāśyapa. However, *mahāyānakā* corresponds to Tibetan *theg-pa chen-po 'dod-pa* (Derge Tha 13b1), Sanskrit *mahāyānakāmāḥ*.

It is not always possible to agree with Bongard-Levin's interpretation. For instance, in fragment 5 R 4 the text reads: *katham vā sūtranāmadhārakāsamkhyā gacchamti*, "Or, how are they reckoned among those who keep in memory the name of the sūtra?" (Tib. Derge Tha 51a2–3: *ji-ltar mdo-'di'i miñ 'dzin-pa'i grañs-su gtogs-pa lags*). Bongard-Levin translates: "Or, how are they included in that huge number of those who keep in memory the name of the sūtra?"

The other text edited by Bongard-Levin he entitles Dharmāśarīrasūtra, but in the text itself the title mentioned is Dharmāśarīram cf. 5 V 3: *dharmāśarīram nāma samāpta*. The manuscript consists of five leaves and is complete apart from some damage to a few leaves. A fragment of another Dharmāśarīra was published in 1904 by H. Stöner.⁷ The Dharmāśarīra contains lists of Buddhist terms, and is similar to such texts as the Dharmasamgraha, Mahāvyutpatti and Arthaviniścayasūtra. According to Bongard-Levin the text of the manuscript corresponds closely to that of a Dharmāśarīra translated into Chinese by Fa-hsien at the end of the tenth century (Taishō no. 766), but the differences between the two are considerable. Bongard-Levin did not give a translation of the text, but indicated the corresponding categories in the Dharmāśarīra from Idikutśahri, the Dharmasamgraha, the Mahāvyutpatti and the Arthaviniścayasūtra. Interesting is a passage which describes the dharma: *dharmo hi paramārthatau anabhilapya anaksara anudāhāra arthāpī avidarśana . . .* (4 V 1–2). It is difficult to make any sense of *arthāpī* and Bongard-Levin's suggestion to read *anarthāpī* (note 50) is not very helpful. The text ends with the usual formula: *āptamanā bhiksū bhāsitam abhyānandat* (sic). Bongard-Levin writes: *āptamanābhikṣūbhāsitam abhyānandat*, but in a note he remarks that it is also possible to read *āptamanābhiksū bhāsitam*, to consider *abhyānandat* a mistake for *abhyānandan* and to interpret *bhiksū* as a

n. pl. This is of course the only interpretation possible, but it is difficult to see why Bongard-Levin wants to write *āptamanābhikṣū* as a compound.

The introduction to the edition of leaves and fragments of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra by M. I. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja consists of a history of the study and the edition of the texts of the SP [= Saddharmapundarikā] and a description of the leaves and fragments from the Petrovskij collection and the Lavrov collection (pp. 78–92), followed by two tables, the first indicating the concordance of the leaves and fragments with the Bibliotheca Buddhica edition, and the second the concordance with the Kashgar manuscript.

In her survey of the history of the study of the SP, Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja refers to the Kashgar manuscript of Petrovskij, but without taking into account Emmerick's remarks on this manuscript: "Most of these fragments form part of a single MS. from the region of Khotan, and its very existence is owed to the joint donation of several Khotanese patrons."⁸ According to V.-D. [Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja] the Kashgar manuscript was written no later than the fifth century, but in his recent edition of the Central Asian manuscripts H. Toda writes that it was written in the ninth or tenth century.⁹ The history of the discovery of this manuscript is not very clear. Both Bongard-Levin and V.-D. state that it was given in 1910 by Sir G. Macartney, British Consul-General in Kashgar, to the Russian Academy of Sciences (cf. pp. 17 and 78). However, according to V.-D. a photocopy was made in the beginning of this century and put at the disposal of Kern and Nanjio for the edition of the SP in the Bibliotheca Buddhica. Willy Baruch quotes from an article written by Ol'denburg in 1904 which I have not been able to consult. According to this article, the previous winter Ol'denburg had received from Petrovskij manuscripts found in Khotan. Among these manuscripts were fragments of eight different manuscripts of the SP. One of these fragments (sic) contained more than two hundred leaves. With the agreement of Petrovskij he would send all fragments to Kern.¹⁰ In his book, Toda quotes Hoernle's note on the fragments 142 and 148 edited by Lüders as applying to the entire Kashgar manuscript, but this is not certain. It is to be hoped that our Russian colleagues will be able to clarify the history of the Kashgar manuscript.

In his preface to the facsimile edition of the Kashgar manuscript, H. Bechert distinguished a Nepalese-Kashmirian recension and a Central Asian recension. According to V.-D., in the first centuries of our era there was only one recension diffused in India and Central Asia. At the time of the Sanskrit renaissance the text of the sūtra was revised, some repetitions omitted, and the grammatical forms unified. The text obtained a more severe and laconic appearance. This revised text, which came into being at the time of the formation of Mahāyāna, was propagated in Northern India. It was selected for translation into Chinese by Kumārajīva and his school who belonged to a higher class of translators in comparison with their

predecessors. In Central Asia the unrevised, much older text continued to be diffused. Only much later did the revised text become known in Eastern Turkestan. According to V.-D., this revised Nepalese-Gilgit recension is to be found in one fragment belonging to the M. I. Lavrov collection (manuscript 7). V.-D. remarks that if this hypothesis is correct, it supports Bechert's view that both recensions of the SP originated in India. However, Bechert referred to two different Central Asian versions, one including the Devatta chapter, the other, represented by the Farhād-Bēg manuscript, lacking the Devadatta chapter.¹¹

V.-D. writes that the Otani collection is in Japan and contains six leaves and fragments from three manuscripts. Yuyama has collected all the available information on this collection in his bibliography.¹² According to Toda, the Otani collection is now kept in the Peking Library.¹³ A careful study of these fragments is an urgent desideratum.

The leaves and fragments edited by V.-D. belong to seven different manuscripts which are carefully described. According to V.-D., manuscripts 1–5 are written in calligraphic upright Central Asian Brāhmī script and date from the sixth century. Only three fragments belonging to manuscripts 6 and 7 are written in a more cursive script and date from the seventh-eighth centuries. Manuscript 7 consists of a single fragment and belongs to the M. I. Lavrov collection. The manuscripts contain six colophons appended to chapters 5, 6, 7, 10, 13 (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, chapter 12) and 21. Two names of donors are mentioned in Khotanese colophons: Intula and Ilānta.

In order to show the differences between the Gilgit-Nepalese and Central Asian recensions, V.-D. compares the text of pp. 103.13–106.7 (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*) with the corresponding text of manuscript 6. V.-D. indicates that chapters 1–10 and 14 (number of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* edition) are complete both in the Kashgar manuscript and in the leaves and fragments edited by her. Between the two there are only unimportant differences as indicated in the notes which follow the edition of the texts. There is also agreement between the Kashgar manuscript and the other manuscripts with regard to the fragments of chapters 11, 24 and 26. A number of leaves and fragments contain passages missing in the Kashgar manuscript. Probably some of these fragments were used by Kern. Toda remarked that a number of variant readings from “O” given in Kern's footnotes are not to be found in it and may have been taken from a different Central Asian manuscript or manuscripts.¹⁴

The manuscripts are transliterated in the orthography of the original. An asterisk marks akṣaras which have been omitted by the scribe by mistake, and square brackets are used to indicate akṣaras which are either illegible or lost. The notes give the variant readings of the Kashgar manuscript. The tables make it possible to find the corresponding passages in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* edition and in the

Kashgar manuscript, but it would have been easier for the reader if these indications had also been given in the text itself as, for instance, has been done by Toda in his edition of the Central Asian manuscripts of the SP.

There are two indexes: an index of names and a terminological index. Both indexes are divided into two parts, the first relating to the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra and the Dharmaśarīrasūtra, the second to the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.

We must be grateful to G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorob'eva-Desjatovskaja for having made accessible these important Central Asian manuscripts. It is to be hoped that we may soon see the publication of the second volume.

NOTES

- ¹ *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. 1. Koyasan Manuscript. Tokyo, The Reiyukai Library, 1981.
- ² See Yuyama, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–14; Paul Demiéville, 'Le bouddhisme. Les sources chinoises', *L'Inde classique* II (Paris, 1953), p. 451.
- ³ FUSE Kōgaku, *Nehan-shu no kenkyū*. Tōkyō, 1942. Second edition, Tōkyō, 1973.
- ⁴ See fragment 5 R 9 and Yuyama, *op. cit.*, p. 18, line 1.
- ⁵ *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts Romanized Text* (Tokushima, 1981) p. xiii.
- ⁶ *JIABS* 4, 2 (1981), pp. 7–16.
- ⁷ 'Zentralasiatische Sanskrittexte in Brāhmīschrift aus Idikutśahri, Chinesisch-Turkistan I', *SBAW* 1904, pp. 1282–1290.
- ⁸ 'Some Khotanese Donors', *Mémorial Jean de Menasce* (Louvain, 1974), p. 383.
- ⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. xii.
- ¹⁰ *Beiträge zum Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (Leiden, 1938), pp. 7–8.
- ¹¹ *Über die 'Marburger Fragmente' des Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Göttingen, 1972), pp. 15–16.
- ¹² *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (Canberra, 1970), pp. 30–33.
- ¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. lvi.
- ¹⁴ *Notes on the Kashgar Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (Tokyo, 1977), p. 37.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Otto Stein, *Kleine Schriften*, Herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm (Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 25), Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmGH, 1985, XXV, 663 pp. DM 94,—.

Otto Stein's first publication was devoted to a comparative study of Megasthenes' account of India and Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra: *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya* (Wien, 1921). His last publications appeared in 1938. On 21 October 1941, Otto Stein and his wife Gertruda were transported to Lodz where they were probably killed

in the spring of 1942. Otto Stein was born in 1893 and at the age of 45 an end was put to his scholarly activities. This volume of his *Kleine Schriften* shows at the same time how much he had achieved and how much more he could have done if he had been able to escape to England before the Germans occupied Prague in March 1939.

After his first publication, Otto Stein continued his study of Megasthenes and Kautilya. For Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* he wrote a long article on Megasthenes which was published in 1931. Apart from some smaller contributions, he also wrote for the same work the articles on Taxiles (1934) and Nysa (1937). In many articles he makes use of the Arthaśāstra. Of special importance in this respect are his article on the *śāsanādhikāra* (*ZII* 6, 1928, pp. 45–71) and a series of articles in which he compared the information regarding fortifications and town-planning in the Arthaśāstra and the Śilpaśāstras ('Arthaśāstra and Śilpaśāstra', I–IV, 1935–1938, *ArchOr* VII, pp. 473–487, VIII, pp. 69–90; VIII, pp. 334–356; X, pp. 163–209).

Otto Stein's excellent knowledge of Greek enabled him to write several articles based on Greek sources: 'Die Wundervölker Indiens bei Skylax' ('Επιρύμβιον Heinrich Swoboda, 1927, pp. 311–319); 'Māyā in a Greek Papyrus?' (*JPTS* 1924–27, pp. 251–257); 'Indien in den griechischen Papyri' (*Ind. Prag.* 1, 1929, pp. 34–57); 'Klearchos von Soloi' (*Philologus* 86, 1930, pp. 258–9); 'Graeco-Indian Notes' (*BSOS* 7, 1933, pp. 55–68). He made use of both Greek and Indian Sources in his long article on Σῦριξ and *suruṅgā* (*ZII* 3, 1925, pp. 280–318; 4, 1926, pp. 345–347).

Another special interest of Otto Stein's was the study of Indian numerals, cf. 'The Numerals in the Niya Inscriptions' (*BSOS* 8, 1936, pp. 763–779); 'The Numeral 18', (*The Poona Orientalist* 1, 1936, pp. 1–37; 2, 1937, pp. 164–165). The index lists all passages in which numbers were studied by Stein.

Many other fields of study attracted Stein. He examined Sanskrit texts: 'Über zwei Ausgaben der Saptaśatī' (*WZKM* 33, 1926, pp. 252–274; 34, 1927, pp. 6–29); 'Ein Yogaprahasana' (*Ind. Prag.* 1, 1929, pp. 9–33); wrote on epigraphy: 'Yavanas in Early Indian Inscriptions' (*Indian Culture* 1, 1935, pp. 343–357); and studied the Trikāya doctrine in the Pāli canon: 'Notes on the Trikāya-Doctrine' (*G. Jhā Commemoration Volume*, Poona, 1937, pp. 389–398).

In a series of three articles, Stein critically examined publications by Indian scholars (S. C. Sarkar and V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar) on the early social history of India and on the polity of the Mauryas: 'Neuere Forschungen zur altindischen Sozialgeschichte, Rechts- und Staatsrechtswissenschaft'; (*ArchOr* 3, 1931, pp. 49–86; 5, 1933, pp. 246–269; 6, 1934, pp. 15–49). Many other publications relating to almost all branches of Indology were reviewed by Stein. They are all listed in the bibliography and some of the most important ones are reprinted in this volume.

Excluded from the *Kleine Schriften* is Stein's monograph on Megasthenes and Kauṭilya and his contributions to Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie. Also excluded are a number of mostly shorter articles, his *Jinist Studies* (published in 1948 after a delay of 25 years!) and most of his reviews. It would have been easy to double the size of this volume, as it is, a selection had to be made. One would have welcomed a reprint of his article on the Trikāya Doctrine and of his review of B. C. J. Timmer's book on Megasthenes (*DLZ*, 1934, Sp. 1688–1692), but we must be grateful for all this volume contains. Friedrich Wilhelm has added a detailed bibliography and collected what information he was able to discover about Stein's tragic end. Very useful are the indexes (Sanskrit, Greek and index rerum).

On p. XIV under 1929: *Obituary Notices*, one must correct Sénart to Senart (this common error is to be found in Stein's article); on pp. XIX and XXII, Lévy to Lévi; and on p. XXII Macdonnel to Macdonell. According to the *Bibliographie bouddhique* (VI, Paris, 1936, Nos. 386, 401, 426, 616), Otto Stein contributed reviews or notices to the *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike*, Leipzig (I, nos. 513, 514, 515, 518). These are not included in the bibliography.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

J. A. F. Roodbergen, *Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭāpatha on the Kirātārjunīya, I–VI*. Part One: Introduction, Translation and Notes. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1984. XI, 578 pp. 185,— guilders.

As Roodbergen explains in his introduction, the first part of his study of Mallinātha's commentary on the first six cantos of the Kirātārjunīya comprises a translation of Mallinātha's commentary, an explanation of Mallinātha's notes on points of grammar and poetics, and three appendices on *śabdālaṃkāra*-s, *arthālaṃkāra*-s and on standard expressions of the commentator. Part two will consist of the indexes, including those of the quotations, and of a preliminary study of Mallinātha, his date and his procedure, especially his different ways of using compound-*vigraha*.

Roodbergen's translation of the stanzas is essentially based upon Mallinātha's explanations. The translation of each stanza is followed by a translation of Mallinātha's commentary and by notes. Roodbergen points out that the notes deal with more general questions, such as the *alaṃkāra*-(s) used in a particular stanza, or with points of enough importance in the commentary to warrant

discussion. The footnotes contain discussions on points of grammar, references to *alamkāraśāstras*, identifications of quotations, critical discussion of translations by Pangarker, Cappeller and Kale, study of the realia occurring in the text or the commentary, discussions of variant readings, etc. The footnotes number more than 2500, and the fact that they are not placed at the foot of the page but in a separate section (pp. 369–525) makes it very difficult to consult them together with the text to which they refer. It would have been easy to print the footnotes immediately following the translation of the commentary on each stanza. It is perhaps much more expensive to print the footnotes as footnotes but in this case it is difficult to see why the publisher has not adopted such an arrangement, which would have been so much more agreeable for the reader.

As can be expected from a specialist in vyākaraṇa, Roodbergen's notes contain detailed references to Pāṇini and his commentators. They give the full derivation of grammatical forms. Furthermore, the notes extend to all matters of relevance to the text itself and to Mallinātha's commentary. The great number of notes testifies to the immensity of this task. No scholar before has tried to do something similar, even on a much more modest scale. In his introduction Roodbergen promises a translation of the remaining part of the commentary. It is very much to be hoped that he will be able to carry out this plan. As many matters have been dealt with already in the notes to the first six cantos, the study of cantos 7–18 will probably not reach the same dimensions.

Roodbergen's translation is based upon the 1954 Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press edition but he has also consulted the 1889 edition of the same press. He rightly remarks that the choice of an edition was not a matter of great importance since he was not concerned with the textual tradition of Mallinātha's commentary. Roodbergen's notes show that a critical edition of it would be very desirable.

For instance, in the commentary on 5.1, the 1889 edition has °*phala aunnatya*°, but the 1954 edition has °*phalaviśiṣṭaunnatya*°. The 1847 Calcutta edition has °*phalaviśiṣṭā aunnatya*°. Roodbergen follows the 1889 edition because it presents the *lectio difficilior* (p. 483, n. 9). It is only by consulting manuscripts that it will be possible to see whether the readings of the 1847 Calcutta edition and of the 1954 edition are found in manuscripts or are due to editors tampering with them, as suggested by Roodbergen.

Roodbergen's bibliography does not mention F. W. Thomas' review of Cappeller's translation (*JRAS*, 1917, pp. 869–877). One would like to have had Roodbergen's opinion on Thomas' suggestion to see in *ādeśam iva* (3.30) a grammatical allusion.¹

We hope that the publication of the second part of this great work may be expected in the not too distant future. Once completed, Roodbergen's work will be an indispensable standard work for the study of commentaries on kāvya texts.

NOTES

¹ Renou approved of Thomas' suggestion, cf. 'Sur la structure du kāvya', *JA* CCXLVII (1959), p. 65, n. 11. Paul Thieme does not refer to this stanza in his article on *ādeśa* in: *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1968, pp. 715–723.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

W. M. Callewaert – Shilanand Hemraj, *Bhagavadgītānūvāda*. A Study in Transcultural Translation. New Delhi, Biblia Impex, 1983. xvi, 399 pp. Rs 120.

Two hundred years ago Wilkins's translation of the Bhagavadgītā appeared. According to the authors of this book, from 1785 to March 1982, 273 English translations have been published. A grand total is reached of about 1,891 translations in about 75 languages, 1,412 of which are translations into Indian languages (pp. 113–115). It is greatly to the credit of the authors to have compiled such a comprehensive bibliographical survey, which includes not only translations but also editions of both text and commentaries.

The introduction gives some information about Biblical translations and about bibliographies, concordances and indices of the Bhagavadgītā. A more complete listing of these latter works would have been welcome. For instance, in the course of this work the authors make mention of bibliographies compiled by translators of the Bhagavadgītā (see, for example, p. 303). There are also more indices than the ones mentioned. For instance, some time ago I received a copy of an index, *atha śrīmadbhagavadgītāslokāntargatapadānām akārādivarṇānukramah*, which occupies pp. 483–518 of an Indian edition and which I have been unable to identify here.

Chapter one deals with the original text of the Bhagavadgītā: oral transmission, written transmission, text emendation, editions, manuscripts, Belvalkar's critical edition, the Kashmir recension, divisions of the Gītā, etc. The authors seem to put much confidence in the so-called critical edition, and probably not all scholars would agree with the following statement: "Although the classical Gītā is substantially in agreement with it [i.e. the critical edition], subsequent translations of the BG-text as such should be better than the hundreds which were published before the critical edition appeared." (p. 13). They are clearly unaware of the fact that quite a few scholars have expressed serious doubts about the value of the critical edition.

The second chapter is entitled "A dynamic equivalence translation" and contains a number of reflections on translating an "inspiring" text such as the Gītā: "In

other words, the work of translating begins with a recapturing of the insight which entered the consciousness of the 'seer' and which he communicated to his disciples, so that they too could participate in his experience" (p. 51). Probably no serious scholar would ever be prepared to claim that he has recaptured this original insight! The authors distinguish a Dynamic Equivalence translation and a Formal Equivalence translation and conclude that for an Indian text a Dynamic Equivalence translation is most appropriate, fitting well with the Indian tradition and setting (p. 84).

Chapter three examines commentaries on the Gītā both in Sanskrit and in vernacular languages, and contains an alphabetical list of Sanskrit commentaries. As the authors refer to several recent commentaries in Indian languages, it would have been appropriate to mention at least some translations into other languages which contain detailed notes and commentaries, for instance those by Hill, Zaehner and Tsuji.

The three remaining chapters present a bibliographical survey of translations into Indian languages, into English and into other languages. Information is given on the different languages into which the Gītā is translated and, in order to illustrate the ways in which the Gītā was translated, renderings of verses 1.1 and 2.47 are given in several sections. The supplementary bibliography (pp. 342–385) is meant to complete the lists of Gītā editions, commentaries and translations found in the respective chapters. In addition it lists many books and articles relating to one or more aspects of the Gītā. A very good general index is added (pp. 386–399).

The authors have modestly characterised their work as being limited to some introductory remarks and to a substantial survey of translations (p. 48). They indicate that the survey can be used for research in two directions: for a study of translations of the Gītā in the early 19th century in both Indian and non-Indian languages; or for a study of translations made into one language, focussing one's attention on the development of that language over two centuries. As to how far this second approach would be useful for the study of modern Indian languages, that must be decided by specialists. A chronological study of translations made in one or more languages might be of some interest for the history of Bhagavadgītā studies; it is therefore a pity that the bibliographies have been listed in alphabetical order and not in chronological order, although this is partially remedied by historical surveys.

Opinions of other scholars are profusely quoted, sometimes rather uncritically. For instance, the authors write: "S. P. Gupta and K. S. Ramachandran summarize recent opinion as follows: 'The Mahābhārata war is a reality and not a myth . . . Astronomical calculations favour 15th century B.C. as the date of the war, etc.'" (p. 62). When they express their own opinion, it is not always possible to subscribe

to it. On p. 246 the authors remark that a modernized, scholarly approach is found in the translations of S. Radhakrishnan, E. Wood, J. Mascaro, R. C. Zaehner, E. Deutsch, A. Bahm, A. L. Herman, E. G. Parrinder, A. T. de Nicolas and others. A rather mixed bag, to say the least!

It would be unreasonable to expect a work of such scope to be without omissions and errors, but, as far as one can judge by incidental checking, they seem to be surprisingly few. It is to be hoped that the authors will try to keep their bibliographical files up to date and publish supplements from time to time. Recently a bibliography of the Gītā appeared by Ram Dular Singh, *Bhagavad Gītā rendered in the languages of the world* (Calcutta, 1984), which perhaps contains some supplementary information. No doubt the Gītā will continue to be translated and studied and bibliographical tools, if well done, will always be welcome. Most welcome of all would be a history of Bhagavadgītā studies which would take into account only those translations and studies which possess any scholarly value, probably a very small fraction of the publications enumerated by Callewaert and Hemraj.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Siegfried Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit – Pali – Prakrit* (A History of Indian Literature, III, 1). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1984, VIII, 307 pp. DM 128,—.

Lienhard's *History of Classical Poetry* is a comprehensive study of kāvya literature in Sanskrit, Pāli and Prākṛit. For many years Lienhard has studied kāvya and apart from the chapters of his book which have already been published in periodicals (cf. p. V), a whole series of publications testifies to his long-standing interest in this branch of Indian literature.¹

The first chapter serves as a general introduction to the book. Lienhard explains that it deals with poetry which is partly epic, partly lyrical and written entirely in verse, entirely in prose, or in verse and prose alternately. Formally it embraces two main categories: poetry of the major form (*mahākāvya*), and poetry of the minor form (*laghukāvya*) whose important relative is single stanza and short poems (p. 2). Lienhard excludes not only theatre (*nāṭaka*), but also those works whose aim is not in the first place literary (p. 3). In the following sections of the first chapter Lienhard studies the poetic process, the poet, the training of the poet, the creative process, readers and critics, and original and imitative writing. It is not easy for the Western reader to appreciate a kāvya poem in the way a traditionally-

educated Indian scholar is able to do. As Lienhard points out, the reader *par excellence* is the learned connoisseur familiar with kāvya and the theory of kāvya. However, his penetrating analysis of the main characteristics of kāvya, of the training and practice of the poet, and of his technique, will be a great help in understanding the norms which guided the composition of kāvya literature.

In the last two sections of the first chapter, Lienhard deals with the classification, periods, chronology and extent of kāvya literature. He points out that a division into periods is of little relevance for the history of kāvya literature, which remained largely homogeneous throughout its long history. These considerations determine the structure of Lienhard's book. Only the beginnings of kāvya are regarded as constituting a separate period (chapter II). Chapter III is devoted to *laghukāvya*, chapter IV to *sargabandha*, chapter V to prose and chapter VI to *campū*.

It is not possible to follow in detail Lienhard's study of the kāvya literature. He has been able to present a great amount of information without resorting to lists of titles and authors. Well-chosen quotations in Sanskrit and English translation illustrate the nature of the works discussed. The space allotted to individual works is proportionate to their aesthetic value. The essential bibliography is given in the notes. Lienhard's intimate knowledge of the works discussed enables him to illuminate many aspects hitherto neglected. It is difficult to single out a chapter or section because Lienhard has almost always something new to say. Although it is probably no more than a personal impression, one would like to mention in particular the chapter on *laghukāvya*, and especially, the sections on the single-stanza (*muktaka*).

Lienhard has not much to say about the commentaries, although they form an integral part of the kāvya tradition. A few words on such famous commentators as Vallabhadeva and Mallinātha would have been useful in explaining their importance for the understanding of kāvya literature.

Lienhard's book is an important contribution not only to the history of Indian literature but also to a better understanding of a branch of literature which has not always been appreciated according to its own norms by Western scholars. We must be grateful to him for having painted such an attractive and instructive picture of the Indian kāvya literature.

Let me end with a few minor points. On p. 55 a line seems to have been dropped after "On the other hand the classical poetry that gradually arose was non-mythological in character and considered that its" (lines 14 and 15 from the bottom).

P. 97: Āryāsaptasatī is rendered as 'Fifty (poems) in the Āryā (metre)'.

P. 108, n. 153: Add to the translations of the Ṛtusamhāra, R. H. Assier de Pompignan, *Meghadūta-Ṛtusamhāra*. Paris, 1938.

P. 114, n. 173 (last line): read p. 171, note 51.

P. 132: Lienhard states that the Buddhist hymns are the oldest, dating back to the 1st century B.C., but does not explain to which hymns he refers.

P. 133: For a bibliography on Nāgārjuna's four hymns, see Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti, 'Nāgārjuna's Catustava', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 13 (1985), pp. 1–54.

P. 134: for the Mañjuśrījñānasattvasya Paramārthanāmasaṅgīti, see Ronald M. Davidson, 'The Litany of Names of Mañjuśrī', *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 20 (1981), pp. 1–69.

P. 135: Lienhard mentions Feer's edition of the Pañcagatidīpana (not -dāpana). The correct title is Pañcagatidīpanī, cf. Paul Mus' edition in *La Lumière sur les Six Voies* (Paris, 1939). The Anāgatavaṃsa which is mentioned on the same page has also been edited by Ernst Leumann in *Maitreya-samiti*, Teil II, Strassburg, 1919, pp. 177–226.

P. 152: on the *prahelikā*, see also Ludwik Sternbach, *Indian Riddles*. Hoshiarpur, 1975.

On p. 165, the word 'no' has been dropped: there are *no* Tibetan and Chinese translations of the Saundarananda.

P. 193, no. 120: read M. B. Emeneau for M. B. Emmeneau.

P. 239: Kantaka is not a fellow prisoner of Apahāravarman but his jailer.

NOTES

¹ Cf. p. 23, n. 66; p. 49, n. 140; p. 73, n. 24; p. 74, n. 33; p. 121, n. 193.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

W. Zwalf (ed.), *Buddhism: Art and Faith*. London, British Museum Publications Ltd., 1985. 300 pp. £12.50

Buddhism: Art and Faith is the catalogue of an exhibition in the British Museum displaying 422 items from the collections of the British Museum and the British Library and from a few other institutions in Great Britain. There have been many exhibitions of Buddhist art but, as far as I know, not one which showed so many manuscripts from the Theravāda and Mahāyāna countries in Asia. The largest section is devoted to the scriptures and their transmission. The ninety items in this section give a vivid impression of the richness of the Buddhist literature, and of the great number of materials, scripts and languages used in the course of the

centuries. However, it is not only in this section but also in many others that one finds items which are of great interest to the student of Buddhist literature. The section on the early cult monuments in India begins with a fragment of Asoka's sixth Pillar Edict. Beautiful illuminated manuscripts from Nepal and Tibet are reproduced in colour. An interesting item is a scroll of yellow silk which contains the text of a passport issued in 1775 by the Third Panchen Lama, Blo-bzañ dPal-ldan Ye-śes (1738–80). The text is in Tibetan with interlinear Mongolian translation. It is a pity that the reproduction contains only part of the text. The description does not mention whether the Tibetan text and the Mongolian translation have been edited and translated. Many other manuscripts and prints, some illustrated, some not, are to be found in the sections on Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand and Cambodia, Central Asia, China and Japan.

It is probably only in England that it is possible to collect such a great number of written and printed documents from the third century B.C. up until the nineteenth century. No less impressive is the collection of art objects in this exhibition, some well-known and many times reproduced, other less well-known. The catalogue will be treasured by all those who have been able to visit the exhibition. The fact that all the items are illustrated (many in colour) and described will be a consolation for those who have not been so fortunate. This catalogue is an excellent introduction to both Buddhist art and Buddhist scriptures. No effort has been spared to place the items in their context. A general introduction and introductions to all sixteen sections serve this purpose. Very useful are the maps, the bibliography and the detailed index, which is also a glossary of the expressions unexplained in the catalogue. W. Zwalf and his collaborators deserve our great gratitude for this splendid publication.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Jürg Hedinger, *Aspekte der Schulung in der Laufbahn eines Bodhisattva*. Dargestellt nach dem Śikṣāsamuccaya des Śāntideva (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie, Band 17). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1984. XVI, 178 pp. DM 26,—.

The Śikṣāsamuccaya has not received much attention from scholars although it contains a great number of extracts from texts which have not been preserved elsewhere in the Sanskrit original. For this reason Jürg Hedinger's book is to be welcomed. The main part of his study is an analysis of chapters 11–13 of the Śikṣāsamuccaya which deal with life in the forest and meditative practices: 'III. Das Leben in der Wildnis' (pp. 37–47); 'IV. Die Schulung der geistigen Prozesse'

(pp. 49–96); ‘V. Die Anwendung der Achtsamkeit’ (pp. 97–139). The introductory chapter gives some information on Śāntideva, his work and his place in the history of the Madhyamaka school. Useful is the analysis of the structure of the Śikṣāsamuccaya. The next chapter gives a brief survey of the contents of the first ten chapters. Chapters 14–19 are briefly discussed in the sixth chapter of Hedinger’s book: ‘VI. Die weiteren Stadien der Bodhisattvalaufbahn’ (pp. 141–161). The book concludes with an English summary (pp. 165–168), a bibliography (pp. 169–173) and a Sanskrit index (pp. 175–178).

In his recently published Danish translation of the Bodhicaryāvatāra, Christian Lindtner writes the name of the author in the form Śāntadeva.¹ He prefers this form because it is found in Atiśa’s Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā.² The manuscript on which Bendall’s edition is based does not contain the name of the author.³ In her book on Śāntideva which is full of misinformation, Amalia Pezzali writes that in this manuscript the author is wrongly mentioned as Jayadeva.⁴ The same information is found in Yamada’s *Bongo butten no shobunken*, to which she refers in a note.⁵ In order to prevent this statement from being repeated in future publications it is necessary to point out that in his catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library, Bendall wrote: “From the reference to the work in Wassiliew’s Tāranātha p. 208, it would seem that the work was compiled by Jayadeva in or about the 7th century A.D.”⁶ In the introduction to his edition of the Śikṣāsamuccaya, Bendall remarked that the Tibetan translation attributes the work to Ži-ba lha or Śāntideva.⁷ He also pointed out that Atiśa’s Bodhimārgapañjikā transcribed his name as Śān-ta-de-ba.⁸ The name Śāntideva is given in two of the three manuscripts used by Minaev for his edition of the Bodhicaryāvatāra.⁹ Moreover, the same form is found in Prajñākaramati’s Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā.¹⁰ Finally, it is found also in a manuscript which contains a life of Śāntideva and was published by Haraprasād Śāstri.¹¹ In view of the fact that not one Sanskrit manuscript has the form Śāntadeva, it seems preferable to keep the form Śāntideva.

A complete translation of the Śikṣāsamuccaya by Bendall and Rouse was published in 1922. Hedinger appears very critical of this work (cf. p. XIV). He also quotes (in German translation) the opinion of the editors of *Buddhist Texts through the Ages* (Oxford, 1954, p. 12), to which Edward Conze contributed a translation of several extracts from the Śikṣāsamuccaya (nos. 127, 130, 133, 151–154, 168, 170–173): “An English translation appeared in 1922, but it is very carelessly done.” It is true that this translation is far from satisfactory, but most of the blame belongs to Rouse who translated the greater part of the text after Bendall’s death in 1906. Several extracts were also translated by M. Winternitz.¹² Chapter 11 was translated into Dutch by Jacob Ensink, and chapters 1 and 2 into Japanese by M. Yamazaki.¹³ Amalia Pezzali mentions a translation

of the entire text into Japanese by G. Nakano.¹⁴ She adds that this translation is based upon the Sanskrit text. However, Nakano's translation is made from the Chinese version. Nakano remarked in his introduction that this version is difficult to understand and that he often had to consult the Sanskrit text and the English translation in order to understand it.¹⁵ This version was carefully studied by U. Wogihara.¹⁶

Although Hedinger takes care to point out the mistakes made by Bendall and Rouse, his own translations are full of mistakes. Moreover, there are many spelling errors in Sanskrit words, wrong references and other traces of great carelessness. It inspires very little confidence, for instance, to read on p. 2 *Prāsaṅghika*, and to find the same form repeated on p. 8. On p. 41 he quotes the form *bāhyagatacitta*. However, the text has *bahirgatena cittena* (Ś = Śikṣāsamuccaya, ed. Bendall, p. 197.5). This word occurs in an extract from the Ratnamegha and not from the Ratnakūṭa as stated in note 37. In note 39, the reference to B., p. 197,4ff should be to B., p. 198, 1ff. On p. 59 Hedinger quotes the word *anaṅga* instead of *anaṅgaṇa*. On p. 229.14, the text has *viṣamayā jīvati*. In a note Bendall says: "So MS. Read *viṣamatayā*?" Hedinger notes: "Ms. lesen *viṣamatayā*" (p. 109, n. 55). On p. 231.2 the text has *ghaṭṭanāsahiṣṇuḥ*. Hedinger misreads this as *ghaṭṭnā* (p. 113, n. 89). On p. 115 several lines of the text seem to have disappeared after "soll der Körper vom Bodhisattva betrachtet werden." On p. 170 one finds the name Böhtlink.

In quite a few instances the translation by Bendall and Rouse is correct and that of Hedinger wrong. For instance, on p. 212 the text mentions three antidotes against hatred: *dveṣasya maitrī pratipakṣaḥ / apriyasatvādarśanam ca / tena vā saha bhojanādyekārthatayā prītyutpādanam*. Rouse translated: "For hatred, benevolence is the antidote, and not to see those that are disagreeable; or by encouraging the pleasure that comes from association in such matters as meals." In his translation Conze changed "those that are disagreeable" into "Unpleasant people". Rouse's translation is correct apart from the fact that he does not render *tena saha*: "not to see an unpleasant being or by producing pleasure through association with him in such matters as meals". In a note, Hedinger quotes the German rendering of Conze's translation and the translation by Rouse without noticing that Conze follows Rouse in his rendering of *bhojanādyekārthatayā prītyutpādanam* (p. 80, n. 153). He writes: "Wenn man hingegen bhojana für bhoga nimmt und artha dem p. 19 erwähnten anartha entgegenstellt, ergibt sich, dass Besitz zu priti führen kann." Rouse correctly translated *caryāpratipanna* (Ś. 212.13) by "begun their religious practices". Hedinger translates "die den Bodhisattvawandel bereits praktiziert haben", and in a note explains that this refers to Bodhisattvas who have already cultivated the pāramitās for a long time (p. 82, n. 162). Rouse translated *pārśvapārśvaka* (Ś. 228.13) by "side and ribs" whereas Hedinger has "Rippengegend" (p. 106). Rouse correctly translated

vedanānubhavaḥ proktaḥ by “Sensation has been defined as experience”. Hedinger translates *vedanānubhava* as a compound “Wahrnehmung eines Gefühls” (p. 121). That *vedanā* is *anubhava* is explained in the Abhidharmakośa (I. kārikā 14). Rouse translated *upadrutapradrutānavasthitapracārasya* (Ś. 235.9) by “thought moves to and fro, never abiding”. Hedinger has “nicht feststehend ist, da er, kaum bedrängt, schon geflohen ist” (p. 129). Rouse rendered *pariṇāmayati* (Ś. 236.3) very well by “directing . . . towards”. Hedinger has “sich entwickelt” (p. 130).

It seems superfluous to continue with listing the mistakes made by Hedinger, but it is perhaps useful to point out that in reading and translating the Śikṣāsamuccaya it is absolutely necessary to consult the Tibetan translation. In his edition Bendall often refers to the Tibetan translation, but he seems to have consulted it only when the text appeared to be difficult to understand. On p. 233.6 the text has *sarvapāpākṣaṇopapanneṣu satveṣu*. Rouse translated: “beings who are in any of the misfortunes of sin”. Hedinger, who seems to believe that a compound can be translated in any way whatsoever, renders it as “Wesen, die infolge von Missetaten (pāpa) in sämtliche ungünstige Wiedergeburten (akṣaṇa) geraten sind” (p. 120). Instead of *pāpa* the Tibetan translators read *apāya* (*ñan-son*) and one must correct *sarvapāpā-* to *sarvāpāyā-*. On p. 230.3 the text has *jīvitenaśvāsaprāpto*. Rouse translated “he takes comfort by his life”. Hedinger has “hat er Unbesorgtheit um das Leben erlangt”. The Tibetan version has: “he does not show confidence in his life” (*srog-la bag mi-ston-par’gyur-te*). This proves that one must read *jīvite ’nāśvāsaprāpto*.

It is not always as easy to correct the Sanskrit text on the basis of the Tibetan version, but the latter can be helpful in showing that the Sanskrit text is corrupt. For instance, on p. 212.16–17 the Sanskrit text reads: *tatra satvārambanāyāḥ [i.e. maitryāḥ] pūrvam priye satve hitasukhopasaṃhārān na dhyānam abhyasya / tatsame maitrīm upasaṃharet*. Hedinger paraphrases this as follows: “Wenn die Wesen zum Objekt genommen werden, solle der Bodhisattva, der noch keine Versenkung (*dhyāna*) praktiziert habe, zunächst einem ihm lieben Wesen das Glück des Heils (*hitasukha*) vermitteln und dann die Güte auf eben dasselbe Wesen richten: (p. 82). For *hitasukhopasaṃhārān na dhyānam abhyasya* the Tibetan version has: *phan-pa dan bde-ba ñe-bar bsgrub-par bsam-par goms-par byed-ciñ*, “exercising the thought of bestowing benefit and happiness” (*hitasukhopasaṃhārāśāyam abhyasya?*).

The Śikṣāsamuccaya is useful also for the study of Sanskrit texts which have been preserved in the Sanskrit original because it sometimes contains better readings. For instance, the Śikṣāsamuccaya contains on p. 233 a long extract from the Kāśyapaparivarta which corresponds to sections 97–102 in von Staël-Holstein’s edition.¹⁷ In section 98 this edition has *vitathaviparyāsapatitayā samtatyā* but the Śikṣāsamuccaya has *vitathapatitayā samjñayā*. Both the Tibetan version of the

Kāśyapaparivarta and that of the Śikṣāsamuccaya render *vitathapatitayā samjñayā* (log-par žugs-pa'i 'du-śes-las). Three of the four Chinese versions in von Staël-Holstein's edition all have *samjñā* and not *saṃtati*. The Han translation is based upon quite a different Sanskrit text. It is therefore very probable that the original Sanskrit text of the Kāśyapaparivarta had *vitathapatitayā samjñayā*. Two of the four Chinese versions render *vitatha* by *tien-tao* "upside down", which usually renders *viparyāsa*. In this case *tien-tao* certainly corresponds to *vitatha*. It is probable that *viparyāsa* in the text of the Kāśyapaparivarta is a later addition in order to explain *vitatha*.

In section 101, the Kāśyapaparivarta reads *cittam hi kāśyapa rasārāma rasabhojyaceṭīsadṛṣam*. The Śikṣāsamuccaya has *cittam hi kāśyapa rasārāmam rathāvaśeṣabhokṛceṭīsadṛṣam* (Ś. 234.14). In his translation, Rouse corrected *rathāvaśeṣa-* to *bhaktāvaśeṣa-* in accordance with the Tibetan version which has *zas-kyi lhag-ma*. Hedinger has the strange idea that Rouse corrected *-bhokṛ* to *-bhakta-* and remarks: "Korrektur von B./R. unnötig, da tib. zas- auch für bhuḥ-, bhokṛ- u.ä. stehen kann" (p. 126, n. 175). The text of the Kāśyapaparivarta has *rasabhojya-ceṭīsadṛṣam*, but the Tibetan version *zas-kyi lhag-ma za-ba'i bran-mo dan mtshuṅs-so* (*bhaktāvaśeṣabhokṛceṭīsadṛṣam*). The Chinese Chin version of the Kāśyapaparivarta corresponds also to *bhaktāvaśeṣabhokṛceṭīsadṛṣam*. Weller translated the relevant passage as follows: "Der Gedanke haftet am Geschmack, weil (er) sich wie eine Dienerin an übrig gebliebener Speise freut".¹⁸ However, the Sung translation has: "Mind is as a vile female slave because he desires the taste of the remains of food." Is it possible that due to the influence of the preceding *rasārāma* the word *rasa* was added at a later stage? However, both *rathāvaśeṣa-* (for *bhaktarasāvaśeṣa-*?) and *rasabhojya-* seem to be corrupt readings, and it is difficult to restore the original text. As to *rasabhojyaceṭī-*, Weller translates "einer Dienerin, die an schmackhaften Genussmittels [nascht]" and adds in a note that he understands this expression as a Śākapārthiva compound.¹⁹ Weller does not quote the text of the Śikṣāsamuccaya, to which he refers only with regard to section 98 (cf. p. 118, note 20).

NOTES

- ¹ *To Buddhistiske læredigte* (København, 1981), p. 12, n. 6.
- ² 'Atiśa's Introduction to the Two Truths', *JIPh* 9 (1981), p. 212, n. 5.
- ³ Cecil Bendall (ed.), *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (St.-Petersburg 1897–1902), p. III.
- ⁴ *Śāntideva, Mystique bouddhiste des VIIe et VIIIe siècles* (Firenze, 1968), p. 74.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 113.
- ⁶ This passage is quoted by Amalia Pezzali, p. 73.
- ⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. III.
- ⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. XII, n. 3.
- ⁹ I. Minaev, 'Spasenie po učeniju pozdnějšix buddistov', *Zap. Vost. Otd. Imp. R. Arxeol.*

Obṣṣestva IV (1890), pp. 153–54. No name of author is mentioned in the manuscript described by Cowel and Eggeling, cf. E. B. Cowell and J. Eggeling, 'Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society (Hodgson Collection)', *JRAS*, N.S. 8 (1876), p. 13.

¹⁰ L. de La Vallée Poussin (ed.), *Prajñākaramati's Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Cāntideva* (Calcutta, 1901–1914), p. 342.6.

¹¹ Cf. J. W. de Jong, 'La légende de Śāntideva', *IJJ* 16 (1975), p. 170.

¹² Cf. *Der Mahāyāna-Buddhismus nach Sanskrit- und Prākṛitexten* (Tübingen, 1930), p. VI for a list of the extracts translated.

¹³ Jacob Ensink, *De grote weg naar het licht* (Amsterdam, 1955), pp. 76–86. Second edition (Amsterdam, 1973), pp. 99–108. For Yamazaki's translations see *IJJ* 28 (1985), p. 80.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

¹⁵ *Kokuyaku issaikyō*, Yuga-bu 11 (Tōkyō, 1935), Introduction (Kaidai), p. 3.

¹⁶ 'Contributions to the Study of the Śikṣāsamuccaya derived from Chinese Sources', *Muséon*, N.S. V (1904), pp. 96–103, 209–215; VII (1906), pp. 255–261.

¹⁷ Cf. *The Kāṣyapaparivarta*, ed. A. von Staël-Holstein (Shanghai, 1926), p. XVI.

¹⁸ 'Kāṣyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht', *MIO* XII (1966), p. 412.

¹⁹ *Zum Kāṣyapaparivarta*. Heft 2: Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Textes (Berlin, 1965), p. 121, n. 10.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Raniero Gnoli (tr.), *Testi buddhistici in sanscrito* (Classici delle religioni N. 42. Sezione prima, diretta da Oscar Botto: Le religioni orientali). Torino, Unione tipografica – editrice Torinese, 1983. 662 pp. L. 48.000

In 1972 Raniero Gnoli published a complete translation of Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka* in the series *Classici delle religioni* (cf. *IJJ* 18, pp. 298–300). The present volume contains translations of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna texts. The title *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts* refers to the fact that all texts translated in this volume were originally written in Sanskrit, although, apart from a few quotations, the Sanskrit texts of the Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra and the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra have not been preserved. Other texts translated by Gnoli are the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra, the Śālistambasūtra, the Vajracchedikā, the Prasannapadā (Chapter 24), the Prajñāpāramitāpiṇḍārtha, the Bodhicaryāvatāra, the Jatakamāla (chapters 14, 24, 28, 30 and 31), the Śatapañcāsatka, the Prajñāpāramitāstotra, the Guhyasamājantra (Chapters 1, 2 and 5), and the Tattvajñānasamśiddhi. In his translations of the Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra and the Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra, Gnoli closely follows Lamotte's translations without however referring to reviews in which some of the latter's renderings have been queried.¹ Gnoli has also included in this volume a rendering of Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikās which he had already published in 1961 together with translations of the Vighrahavyāvartanī and the Four Hymns

in a book which I have not been able to see. It is not therefore possible to compare the two translations to see whether Gnoli has made any changes in his later translation. At all events, he certainly does not seem to have taken into account the readings of a recent edition of Nāgārjuna's work which was published in 1977.² Also, in 1975 Yūkei Matsunaga published a new edition of the Guhyasamāja-tantra which is not mentioned in Gnoli's bibliographical note.³ The book does not contain a list of abbreviations. Most of them will be easily understood by the specialist, but some may be rather puzzling for the general reader. For instance, p. 41 refers to the MPPS attributed to Nāgārjuna (ed. cit., pp. 1061–65). The work referred to is of course Lamotte's translation of the Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra: *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, tome II (Louvain, 1949).

In the introduction (pp. 1–34), Gnoli explains the main doctrines of Mahāyāna Buddhism, of the Madhyama and Vijñānavāda schools, of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti and of the Vajrayāna. This book does not, however, contain any Vijñānavāda texts, nor works by Dignāga and Dharmakīrti. It is to be hoped that Gnoli will fill this gap in a future volume of this series. This beautifully printed volume will be greatly welcomed by all those who know and admire the excellence of Gnoli's translations.

NOTES

¹ Cf. *OLZ* 65 (1970), Sp. 72–83; *IJJ* 22 (1980), pp. 254–256.

² Nāgārjuna, *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāh*. Madras, The Adyar Library and Research Centre. See also *IJJ* 20 (1978), pp. 25–59, 217–252; Akira Saitō, 'Textcritical Remarks on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* as Cited in the *Prasannapadā*', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 33 (1985), pp. 846(24)–842(28).

³ 'The *Guhyasamāja-tantra*: A New Critical Edition', *Kōyasan daigaku ronsō* 10 (1975), pp. 1–130.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Michael Balk, *Prajñāvarman's Udānavargavivaraṇa*. Transliteration of its Tibetan version (based on the xylographs of Chone/Derge and Peking) (Indica et Tibetica. Arbeitsmaterialien A). Bonn, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1984. Volume One, 5, XII, 554 pp.; Volume Two, 4,555–1088 pp. DN 150.00

The Udānavargavivaraṇa (UVV) is a voluminous commentary on the Udānavarga.

Indo-Iranian Journal 30 (1987).

It was written about 800 A.D. and translated into Tibetan in the eleventh century by Janārdana and Śā-kya blo-gros., Michael Balk explains in his introduction that the translators of the Udānavarga were guided in their rendering of the text by the explanations given in the UVV, the Sanskrit text of which they must have had at their disposal. He quotes two examples and refers to his forthcoming Ph.D. thesis for a detailed study of the relationship between the Tibetan translation of the Udānavarga and the UVV.

Balk's edition of the UVV was originally prepared for his private use, and in his introduction he briefly sets out the principles he has followed in editing the text and preparing the indices (Tibetan, Sanskrit, verses). His edition is based upon the Peking and Chone editions. From p. 525 onwards the Derge edition has also been consulted. Balk points out that his edition is basically a copy of the Peking edition. At the bottom of the page the variant readings of the Chone and Derge editions are given. It is therefore easy for the reader to adopt readings other than the ones found in the text. It is perhaps useful to give an example. In his translation of the Udānavarga (London, 1883) Rockhill often refers to the UVV in his notes. On p. 119, n. 2, he writes that the UVV mentions "a Brahman by the name of Utaṭarga, who knew all the theories (sīdhanta) of the three Vedas, of the Pradjnāparamita, of Agni". The passage referred to by Rockhill is as follows: *u tka ta rga žes bya ba'i bram ze'i rigs byed gsum pha rol tu phyin pa šes rab med* (CD *me*) *dan 'dra bas grub pa'i mtha' thams cad mthoñ ba* (712.24–26). Rockhill misunderstood this passage, which says that Utaṭarga had mastered (*pāramiṅgata*) the three Vedas and had understood all the philosophical systems by means of his fire-like intelligence. It is obvious that one must adopt the reading *me* which is found in the Chone and Derge editions and probably also in the Narthang edition which Rockhill consulted in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Without the help of Balk's edition it would have been a laborious task to find out how Rockhill arrived at this strange interpretation of this passage.

A few checks taken at random show that inconsistencies have not always been avoided. For instance, the name *ka pi na chen po* is twice written in this way (683.23 and 867.23) but once as *ka-pphi-na chen po* (1018.17), although the reading *ka pi na* is found in the Peking edition. In the index one finds *śa śthi dza na sad ka*, but the text itself has *śa świ dza na sad ka* (718.28). The first two words of a verse on p. 719 (line 29) are *bśaṅ gci* but the index has *bśad gci*. These small flaws do not impair the usefulness of this edition which is beautifully typed and so much easier to read than the Tibetan blockprints. Prajñāvarman is also the author of commentaries on the Viśeṣastava¹ and the Devātiśayastotra. A publication of these two works in the series *Arbeitsmaterialien* would be very welcome.

NOTE

¹ On this text see Leonard Zwillig, 'The *Viśeṣastava* of Udbhaṭṭasiddhasvāmin', *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism* (Delhi, 1979), pp. 407–414.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONK

Hartmut Walravens (ed.), *Kleinere Schriften von Berthold Laufer*. Teil 3: Nachträge und Briefwechsel (Sinologica Coloniensia, Band 13). Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985. VII + 500 pp. DM 145,-.

Part three of Laufer's *Kleinere Schriften* contains a catalogue of Laufer's Phonographic recordings from China (made in 1901 and 1902) and from Tibet and Bengal, facsimiles of the Chinese texts, and studies of the Tibetan and Bengal texts by Christoph Cüppers (pp. 111–135) and Rahul Peter Das (pp. 136–139) respectively. The major part of this volume consists of letters from Laufer and to Laufer from the archives of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago (pp. 141–500).

In an editorial note, Hartmut Walravens explains that those of Laufer's papers for the years 1911–1924 not included in Part Two (cf. *IJJ* 24, pp. 68–69) will be published by Dr. Lokesh Chandra, and that the texts for the years 1925–1934 will be published in microform by C. Bell Publishers (P.O. Box 700 221, 2 Hamburg 70, W. Germany). The next volume (3.2) will contain an index of Laufer's publications included in the three parts of the *Kleinere Schriften* as well as those to be published by Dr. Lokesh Chandra and by C. Bell Publishers.

Laufer's manifold interests are reflected in his correspondence with scholars, art-dealers, etc. Apart from a number of letters from W. Grube written in the years 1895–1897, almost all letters date from the period 1913–1933. One of the most interesting letters is undoubtedly the one written by Pelliot (No. 249) in which he claims the right to point out errors:

Mon seul intérêt et mon seul souci, dans la vie scientifique, est le progrès de nos études qui ne peut s'obtenir que par des notions de plus en plus précises et exactes. Nous nous trompons tous, moi comme les autres, et je n'ai jamais hésité à me rectifier. . . . la science est faite de précisions, et, quand nous avons fait un effort loyal pour les atteindre, il n'y a pas de honte à nous être trompés et que quelqu'un nous le dise.

It is a pity that we do not have Laufer's answer, but the fact that Pelliot wrote again a few months later shows that his frank and generous letter seems to have restored good relations.

There are quite a few printing errors, especially in the letters written in French. The most disturbing one is Schraeder for Schroeder (no. 274), i.e. Leopold von Schroeder (1851–1920). In his notes to the letters, Hartmut Walravens gives some useful information on Laufer's correspondents. The date of death of several scholars is not indicated. Karlgren died in 1978,¹ A. I. Ivanov in 1937,² Robert Shafer in 1969,³ and Dubs also in 1969.⁴ The dates of A. D. Rudnev are 1878–1958.⁵ J. R. Ware was born in 1901.

NOTES

¹ Cf. *Annual Newsletter of the Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies*, no. 13 (1979), pp. 3–24.

² Cf. *Vostokovedenie v Leningradskom universitete* (Učenyje zapiski Leningradskogo ordena Lenina gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A. A. Zdanova, No. 296; Serija vostokovedčeskix nauk, Vyp. 13, Leningrad, 1960), p. 34.

³ Cf. Robert Shafer, *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*, Part 5 (Wiesbaden, 1974), p. IX.

⁴ Cf. Derk Bodde's obituary, *JAOS* 90 (1970), pp. 633–634.

⁵ Cf. *Vostokovedenie v Leningradskom universitete*, p. 61.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Burmese Manuscripts, Part 2. Compiled by Heinz Braun and Daw Tin Tin Myint with an introduction by Heinz Bechert (Verzeichnis der orientalistische Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII, 2). Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985. XVI, 302 pp. DM 147, –.

Part 1 of *Burmese Manuscripts* was published in 1979 (cf. *IJJ* 23, 1981, pp. 238–239). This second part describes a collection of Burmese manuscripts in the 'Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek' in Göttingen, and 22 other manuscripts (Nos. 156–436). The oldest manuscript is dated 1715 A.D. The introduction points out that the collection in the 'Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek', which was assembled by a colonial officer during the pre-war period, unlike most collections of Burmese books, does not consist mainly of copies of canonical Pāli texts and aṭṭhakathās, but contains a wide range of non-canonical Pāli works, mostly of nissayas, with a fair number of original Burmese works of prose and verse literature. Of special interest are two manuscripts belonging to the Völkerkunde-Museum of the von Portheim-Stiftung in Heidelberg: an illuminated book on the history of King Vijaya of Ceylon, and a record of the royal palace of the kings of the Kun³bhoñ period from the time of King Vhañphrūrhañ (1763–1776 A.D.) up to the reign of King Sipo (1878–1885 A.D.)

The principles of cataloguing are the same as in part 1. According to the introduction, part 3 will be arranged in a similar way but the extracts from the manuscripts will be abbreviated. Part 3 will also contain a classified index of all texts described in parts 1–3. With the publication of part 3 an important tool for the study of Burmese literature will have become available. Heinz Braun and Daw Tin Tin Myint have rendered an excellent service to Burmese studies by the publications of this second part of the catalogue of Burmese manuscripts in Germany.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

is attributed to Zoroaster! P. 56, the translation "in accordance with asha" is not given as problematic, as it should be. P. 48, the parenthesis should be closed after *magus*, not after *magu*. P. 62, read Artaxerxes II. P. 47, line 8 from bottom, read *anairya*. P. 91, why couple *Pompeios* (Greek) with his epithet *Trogus* (Latin)? In chapter six, "Under the Seleucids and Arsacids", one misses a paragraph or two on the Nimrud Dagh Greco-Iranian syncretism. P. 104, the Julian calendar is attributed to the emperor Julian. P. 106 and p. 121, why write *Shabuhr* with b, in the Arabic fashion? P. 111, line 8, read *these*: line 14 bottom, *Elchaisites* seems strange as derived from *Elchasaïos*. P. 123, line 14, read *withhold*. P. 142, Taq i Bustan is not near Hamadan, but very near Kermanshah; line 17 bottom read *devastating*. P. 160, 7 bottom, *fairly*. P. 169, 3, *Pahlavi*. P. 171 (twice) and p. 175, *Muzaffarid(s)*. P. 183, 7 bottom, *fermented*, not *fomented*. P. 198, 2 bottom, *principal*; not *principle*, P. 233, 1, read Grignaschi.

Despite all these minor defects, this book is, and will probably remain for some time, the best concise introduction to Zoroastrianism.

54, Avenue de l'Observatoire
Liège, Belgium

JACQUES DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN

The Group of Discourses (Suttanipāṭa) Vol. I. Translated by K. R. Norman. With alternative translations by I. B. Horner and Walpola Rahula. Pali Text Society Translation Series No. 44. London: The Pali Text Society, 1984, viii + 190 pp.

This new translation of the Suttanipāṭa into English is the fourth after those made by M. C. Swamy (London, 1874), V. Fausböll (1881) and R. Chalmers (1932), and the second to Rev.'s knowledge in any language after Nyanaponika's German version (Konstanz, 1955) to be supplied with a full commentary planned by Norman for a subsequent volume as we learn from Mr. Gombrich's Foreword, there being no Introduction. By separating translation and notes which many readers perhaps do not require Norman deviates from the practice adopted in his *Elders' Verses* and makes a review of the present volume difficult before the appearance of its companion. The translation is followed by different versions made by the late Miss Horner and by the Ven. Dr. Rahula after reading Norman's typescript. This material seemed worthwhile to be published which, however, was hardly possible in its form of loose marginal or separate remarks. The solution found by Dr. Collins was to add them as alternatives at the end of Norman's translation of each *sutta*.

Heidelberg

W. B. BOLLÉE

C. E. Godakumbura, assisted by U Tin Lwin, with contributions by Heinz Bechert and Heinz Braun, *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts* (Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish collections, Vol. 2, part 1). Copenhagen, The Royal Library, 1983. XXI, 153 pp., 12 pl. Danish Kroner 350,-.

With the publication of this volume all Pāli manuscripts in Danish collections have now been carefully catalogued and described. George Coedès described the manuscripts from Thailand (cf. *IJJ* 20, p. 322), and Godakumbura those from Ceylon (cf. *IJJ* 25, pp. 152–53). In recent years more attention has been paid to Pāli manuscripts from Burma, Cambodia and Thailand, and this catalogue will be extremely useful for a future history of Pāli literature in these three countries.

The catalogue was prepared by the late C. E. Godakumbura and U Tin Lwin, the Professor of Pāli at the University of Mandalay. After the death of Godakumbura, the galley-proofs were entrusted to Heinz Bechert, who completed and edited the catalogue with the help of Heinz Braun. The catalogue describes 44 Pāli manuscripts in Cambodian or Khmer script, and 66 Pāli and bilingual Pāli-Burmese manuscripts written in Burmese script. In his introduction, Heinz Bechert points out that the collection contains a considerable number of valuable and rare texts. One will find in this introduction a brief description of the collection (pp. XVII–XX).

The Cambodian collection contains a manuscript of the Sivajayyajātaka, the contents of which are analysed in detail (pp. 17–35). The Vessantaradīpanī is a voluminous super-commentary on the Vessantarajātaka, written by Sirimaṅgala Mahāthera in 1317 or 1318 (pp. 15–17). A manuscript entitled Ṭikā-bahūni contains stories relating to each of the eight Jayamaṅgalagāthā (pp. 43–47). The Okāsalokadīpanī and the Mahākappalokasaṅṭhānapaññatti are two cosmological texts (pp. 53–54). The Vaṃsamālinī is a historical epic based on the Mahavāṃsa (pp. 54–55). Among the grammatical texts are three texts based on the Gandhābharāṇa (pp. 57–59).

The Burmese collection contains ten Kammavācā texts (pp. 62–69), and nissayas on the Mahāvagga, the Cūlavagga, the Cūlavagga section of Buddhaghosa's Samantapāsādikā, and the Pārājika section of the Vinaya (pp. 69–74). A codex contains the Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī, Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-ṭikā, Dhammapada, Subodhālaṅkāra, Abhidhānappadīpikā and Vuttodaya (pp. 75–79). The Khuddasikkhābhīnava-ṭikā was written by Saṅgharakkhita in the thirteenth century (pp. 79–82). The Vinayasāra-gaṇṭhi is an explanation in Burmese of difficult points in the Vinaya written by Munindasāra in 1801–1802 (pp. 83–85). The Burmese collection further contains a manuscript of the Līnatthappakāsinī, the commentary on

the *Papañcasūdanī*, written in 1780, 1782 and 1775 (pp. 88–92), a nissaya on the first four vargas of the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* (pp. 92–95), and two nissayas on the *Aṭṭhasālinī* (pp. 105–107). *Ṭikā kyō* nissaya is the Burmese translation of Sumaṅgala Thera's *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-ṭikā* on Anuruddha's *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* (pp. 114–116). In addition there are several manuscripts of the *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa* and other grammatical texts (pp. 122–138).

This beautifully printed and illustrated catalogue will be welcomed by all students of Pāli literature, who owe a debt of gratitude to C. E. Godakumbura, U Tin Lwin, Heinz Bechert and Heinz Braun for their contributions to this work.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

A. K. Warder, *Introduction to Pali*. Second edition (with corrections and additions). Paperback. London, The Pali Text Society. Distributed by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley, 1984. 464 pp. \$4.95.

Warder's *Introduction to Pali* was first published in 1963. A second edition with corrections and additions was published in 1974. The paperback edition is a reprint of the second edition. The publication of this book as a paperback for such a modest price is to be welcomed. The second edition seems to be a reprint of the first edition with the addition of six pages (459–464) which contain additions to the vocabulary of the lessons, additions to Pali-English Vocabulary, additions to English-Pali Vocabulary, and keys to passages for reading and Pali sentences and to passages for retranslation into Pali. As far as one can see, only a few corrections have been made in the text itself. It is to be hoped that a future reprint will be carefully revised, or at least contain a few additional pages with corrections, in order to make this introduction even more useful for the student. Some statements and explanations need to be corrected. On p. 98 it is said that finite verbs are not negated by adding the prefix *a* or *an*. On p. 136, the following sentence from the *Aggañña* suttanta (D III.89.14–15) is quoted: *atha agārāni upakkamimṣu kātum tass' eva asaddhammassa paṭicchādanattham* = then they went into houses in order to do the purpose of concealment of just that evil. T. W. Rhys Davids rendered this sentence correctly as follows: "they set to work to make huts, to conceal just that immorality" (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, part III, p. 85). On pp. 149 and 214, *vittūpakaraṇa* is explained as a combination of *vitti* and *upakaraṇa*. In several instances the meanings given in

the vocabularies have to be corrected: p. 192, *vālo* 'wild animal'; p. 318, *upadahati* 'torment, worry'. The following form is left unexplained: p. 244.12, *vuṭṭhahanti* (cf. p. 93). Further one must mention *chandas* 'will' (p. 191), *caturāsīti* 'eighty' (p. 260) and the following misprints: p. 132| sixth line from below, *pathamaṃ* p. 149 second line from below *adhigato*; p. 252.10, proceeding. On p. 232 it is said that in the Dīgha only the irregular 1st person singular *āhañchaṃ* is found, but according to the CPD, s.v. *āhanati āhañham* or *āhanhi(ṃ)* is to be found in D II.72.6: *āhañh' ime*, but *āhañchaṃ* in other texts.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG