was the tendency of speculation, even regarding the rite, amongst Vedic priests, a tendency which seems to clearly parallel an exploitation of liturgical orthodoxy and sacrifice "*se ipsum contentum*"; nevertheless, these are the end results of long, intellectual investigation, interesting but not of fundamental importance to the comparative historian. The author overshadows the social aspect of the problems and this leads to a rather 'rarefied' overall reasoning.

Quite rightly Oguibénine gives primary importance to the "Vedic word theory"; the word is effective, creative and destructive, it enlightens and it rules men and gods: at the heart of much Vedic speculation there remains that special word that is the name. There is no doubt that the theory is fundamentally based on a rather banal form of 'nominal realism' (*Hallpike 1979, chap. IX*), which has developed in the wake of a complicated reference design, on various levels, through the (re)discovery of links and correlations between different words/symbols/things; in this perspective, it is perfectly true that many Ṛgveda hymns can be read on different levels. It does not require much imagination to see that such a refined evolution was determined by the creation of a 'literary' tradition and a class of specialists. The typological comparison, however, leads us to believe that this class probably had functions, of a socially recognised nature, which went beyond the production of liturgical texts. On the other hand the sacrifice generally has meanings and functions which go beyond the purely religious (*de Heusch, 1985*).

Clearly out of legitimate choice of perspective, Oguibénine neglects these aspects, rather limiting his attention to the so-called 'verbal contests', brilliantly studied by F. B. J. Kuiper. And yet it is within these contests — though divorcing the sense of literary competition- that the most evident social tensions are revealed, dividing individuals and groups. I wrote elsewhere (*Incontri Linguistici* **8**, 1982—83, pp. 11 ff) what I thought it possible to retrieve of this social *ars dicendi* and therefore I shall not repeat myself here: I shall, however, repeat that the 'social' can only be explained in terms of the 'social'. From this point of view, the way the author tackles the problem of the *dakṣiṇā*, though certainly polished, does not get to grips with the *structural* aspects of the complex phenomenon.

Quite rightly, Oguibénine calls our attention to the semantic structure, on several levels, of the Vedic hymnology, already well dealt with by L. Renou ('cow' = 'word', etc.). In general, the problem presents itself as an interaction of symbolic codes; in such cases it is always difficult to distinguish texts in which the interaction was consciously pursued by the author and those in which it is *our* opinion that this occurred. An opinion is not a fact. Apart

from the cases that Oguibénine quotes and comments upon (with which I humbly agree) the author's proposals would have received more credit if the bases for the general criteria the distinction was made upon, had been confirmed. I believe that certain parameters — at least as a working hypothesis — can be proposed: very often the ṛṣi — in the hymns that have been preserved up to now, leaving aside the conditioning that may have determined the constitution of *this saṃhitā* instead of others — seems to fix his attention on cosmogonic facts, on how history was made, on a Varunian *lato sensu* environment (cosmic mountain, primordial waters, etc.). F. B. J. Kuiper (*IIJ* **8**, 2, 1964) dealt masterfully with all this.

As regards the comparative, more strictly Indo-Europeanist aspects of the work, the author generally shows admirable caution. The problems raised by comparative and/or reconstructive practice are too complex to be even simply summarised here, therefore I limit myself to making mention of that which, in my opinion, is one of the most frequent conditionings: comparison is generally regarded as acceptable inasmuch as the languages involved in the cultural equations are, in fact, related. The transfer from a linguistic environment to a cultural environment — however legitimate — is not to be considered a *fact* rather a *possibility* where the dividing line between resemblance due to historical reasons and typological resemblance is very ambiguous (the case regarding Pindar dealt with by Oguibénine [p. 173] is a good example of such ambiguity).

Once more, then, B. Oguibénine has provided scholars with excellent material for thought and study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

de Heusch, Luc: *Sacrifice in Africa*, Manchester University Press, 1985.
Hallpike, C. R.: *The Foundations of Primitive Thought*, Oxford, 1979.

Università di Trieste FRANCO CREVATIN

Ditte König, *Das Tor zur Unterwelt*. Mythologie und Kult des Termitenhügels in der schriftlichen und mündlichen Tradition Indiens (Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 97). Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH., 1985. XII, 391 pp. DM 66,—.

The subtitle expresses exactly the scope of this study of the termite hill. Ditte König has consulted an impressive range of Sanskrit sources and of anthropological

works as is obvious from the bibliography which occupies no less than 45 pages. It lists primary sources (i.e. mainly Sanskrit texts), secondary literature, and collective works, encyclopaedias and dictionaries. In her introduction she stresses the importance of close cooperation between indology and ethnology for the study and interpretation of myths, customs and rituals of folk religion. Her work is arranged systematically, and in each section she quotes from both Sanskrit texts and anthropological literature. It is only in one section of the final chapter (Schlussfolgerungen) that the cult of the termite hill is considered in historical perspective: 7.3. Der Termitenhügelkult im Laufe der Jahrhunderts (pp. 259–261). As regards the primary sources, the author limits herself almost entirely to Sanskrit sources. Two Pāli texts are quoted (Dīghanikāya and the Jātaka book) and one Marāṭhī text (Bāl Bhartī, Marāṭhī pustak dusre, Pune, 1977). However, the rich narrative literature in Prakrit has been completely disregarded. The same applies to texts in modern Indo-Aryan languages and in Dravidian languages. It is, of course, unreasonable to expect scholars to be competent in so many languages, but it is strange that the author has not found it necessary to justify or to explain the exclusion of these sources from her otherwise very comprehensive study. The author seems to have a high regard for the work of Eliade, who is quoted innumerable times in the course of her book. In her introduction she writes: "Der Religionshistoriker und Soziologe Eliade stellte mit seinen Arbeiten eine Verbindung her zwischen Soziologie, Ethnologie, Indologie und Religionsphilosophie, wobei die Ergebnisse seiner Untersuchungen die Methode bestätigen" (p. 2). Nobody would be willing to deny the great merit of Eliade, but one feels a bit uneasy in seeing him treated as the ultimate authority in matters religious.

Ditte König's work is divided into seven chapters: 1. Ameisen und Termiten; 2. Eigenschaften von Ameise und Termite, sowie deren Beziehung zu Wasser, Gold, Sonne, Berg, Dämonen, Tiger und Regenbogen; 3. Verwendung in der Medizin; 4. Riten und Omina; 5. Die Verehrung von Gottheiten bei – und die Askese in Termitenhügeln; 6. Schlange und Termitenhügel; 7. Schlussfolgerungen. It is not necessary to describe the contents of each chapter in more detail because the reader will find at the end of the book a very clear and useful English summary (pp. 383–388). In the final chapter the author examines some themes which are important for the understanding of the meaning of the termite hill. One of the most interesting sections is the one on the termite hill as symbol of the *vana* (pp. 261–263). The author points out that the termite hill belongs to *vana* territory, as it is often mentioned in connection with such 'unheimlichen Orten' as cross-roads, cremation grounds, temples, ruins, etc. She remarks that all these places have a relation to the numinous and to death (p. 105). However, it is important to note the ambivalence of the termite hill, as of other sacred symbols. It is therefore not entirely justified to consider it as belonging exclusively to *vana* territory.[1]

On p. 101, Ditte König mentions that the Muria believe that a man becomes a tiger by circumambulating an ant-hill seven times. H.-J. Pinnow has translated a Kharia legend in which a king becomes a tiger by rubbing his body against a termite hill.[2]

A few corrections are necessary. The Meghadūta is not a drama (cf. p. 91). Read Kalpadrumakośa for Kalpadrukośa (p. 282). JHA, Ganganatha for ITTA, Ganganatha (p. 306) and Zieseniss for Ziesemiss (p. 328).

Ditte König has made a clear and systematic arrangement of the great mass of material she has brought together. Very useful are the excellent indexes: index of primary sources, index of Indian terms and index of topics and names. The reader will learn much from this interesting and stimulating book.

NOTES

[1] On *vana* and *ksetra* the author refers to an article to be published by Sontheimer. She does not mention an article published in 1976 by Charles Malamoud: 'Village et forêt dans l'idéologie de l'Inde brâhmanique', *Archives européennes de sociologie* **XVII** (1976), pp. 3–20.
[2] '"Der Wertiger" und andere Geschichten in Kharia', *IIJ* 9 (1965–66). p. 57.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Christopher Chapple, *Karma and Creativity*. Albany, N.Y., State University of New York Press, 1986. xii, 144 pp. Paper $9.95; cloth $29.50.

According to the preface: "This book provides a tour through several texts of Indian religious traditions that discuss human action in a positive light. These include portions of Vedic and Upaniṣadic literature, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Yoga Sūtra*, the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, and, most importantly, the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*." Christopher Chapple is the author of an unpublished doctoral dissertation: *The Concept of Will (Pauruṣa) in the Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Fordham University, 1980) and the editor of Swami Venkatesananda's *The Concise Yoga Vāsiṣṭha* (cf. *IIJ* 28, p. 308). An appendix (2) comprises a translation of Yogavāsiṣṭha II, 4—5 and II, 7. According to Chapple the quality of Vihāri-Lāla Mitra's translation of the Yogavāsiṣṭha is poor (p. 122, n. 27).[1] Undoubtedly this translation is not perfect, but it is certainly infinitely better than Chapple's so-called translation. Let me quote two examples: 1. *na yatnenāpi mahatā prāpyate ratnam aśmataḥ* (II.5.23cd). Chapple: "Greatness is not obtained by effort any more than a jewel from sand." Vihāri-Lāla Mitra: "No pains can bring out a gem from a stone." 2.

dainyadāridryaduḥkhārtā api sādho narottamāḥ / pauruṣeṇaiva yatnena yātā devendratulyatām (II.7.8). Chapple: "Though once afflicted, poverty stricken, and distressed, the holy one who is best of men by creativity and effort became similar to the god Indra." Vihāri-Lāla Mitra: "There have been many weak, poor and miserable men, who have by means of their manly exertions become equal to Indra himself." Caveat emptor!

NOTE

[1] In his introduction to Swami Venkatesananda's *The Concise Yoga Vāsiṣṭha*, Chapple remarked that it is very poor (p. X, n. 2).

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Hans Bakker, *Ayodhyā* (Groningen Oriental Studies, Vol. I). Groningen, Egbert Forster, 1986. XIX, 181; XLIV, 471; 117 pp., 18 plates, 7 maps, 2 figures.

Hans Bakker's *Ayodhyā* studies the development of Ayodhyā as a sacred centre. In the first part he studies the history of Ayodhyā from 600 BC to the middle of the eighteenth century. Part II contains an edition of the three versions of the Ayodhyāmāhātmya. Part III includes several appendices such as interpolations in the Ayodhyāmāhātmya, the Hindu festival calendar of Ayodhyā according to the Ayodhyāmāhātmya, concordances, bibliography and indexes.

Since he has already presented some of the main results of his study in an article published in this journal ('Ayodhyā as a place of pilgrimage', **24**, 1984, pp. 103—126), it is not necessary to give a detailed survey of the content of Bakker's work. In the introduction he distinguishes three text-groups — S, BP, and OA — and points out the importance of a scrupulous comparison of these three versions which each represents a specific stage in the development of Ayodhyā. He has divided the text of the Ayodhyāmāhātmya into 83 chapters, almost all of which deal with individual tīrthas. Each chapter comprises three sections: introduction, text and commentary. The commentary deals with textual problems, whereas the introduction deals with textual evidence, the topography of the tīrtha, specific features distinguishing the tīrtha from other places, assessment of the content and the modern situation.

Part one compares the relative chronology of the three versions as

established in the introduction to part two, with historico-religious and literary developments in North India during the second millennium AD, and compares the topographical information found in the three versions with other independent textual and archaeological evidence. The author shows how the gradual Rāmaization of Viṣṇuism in Ayodhyā is reflected in the three recensions of the Ayodhyāmāhātmya, of which S probably was composed at the end of the 13th or the 14th century and OA at the end of the 16th or in the 17th century. The first chapter of part one deals with the history of Sāketa/Ayodhyā from 600 BC to AD 1000. The author examines the problem of the identification of Sāketa with Ayodhyā. He points out that Sāketa is mentioned in texts of a semi-scientific or factual nature, whereas Ayodhyā occurs in texts which have basically a fictional character. According to him, the identification of Ayodhyā with Sāketa was the result of a process of reification of the realm of the saga, a process which was finally consolidated by the removal of the royal court of the Guptas from Pāṭaliputra to the old Sāketa or to the newly-established quarter by its side, henceforth known as Ayodhyā, during the reign of either Kumāragupta I or Skandagupta (AD 415—467). For the history of Sāketa/Ayodhyā the author has collected information from literary sources, from archaeological remains and from numismatic sources. Religious developments up to the eleventh century are studied in the next chapter. The following chapters deal mainly with the religious developments in the second millennium and above all with the development of the Rāma cult. One of the most important sources is the Agastyasaṃhitā, which, according to the author, was probably composed in Benares in the twelfth century. The author gives a synopsis of its contents and in particular of the rāmaite metaphysics and the praxis of worship of Rāma in chapters five and six (pp. 67—118). Chapter seven examines the growth of the cult of the name of Rāma during the 13th-16th centuries. The last two chapters deal with the development of Ayodhyā as a sacred centre from the thirteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, with special reference to the Ayodhyāmāhātmya and the pilgrimage rituals as specified in the Ayodhyāmāhātmya.

In his preface, the author mentions the 'lowlands of culture', namely those fascinating manifestations of human faith that lie on the outer fringes of highbrow religion, but have a direct appeal to the masses. His work is a penetrating study of the religious history of Ayodhyā on the basis of the widest possible collection of materials available. In Hinduism, the lowlands and highlands are so closely intertwined that it is hardly possible to study them separately. Most historical studies of Hinduism have dwelt upon its higher manifestations. Bakker shows how, by a close examination of one

māhātmya in all its textual variations, one can arrive at a much more direct observation of the historical reality of Hinduism. His work is not only very valuable for the mass of detail it contains but also for its relevance to the study of other Indian texts which have developed along similar lines, as well as for the study of Hinduism in general.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas* (A History of Indian Literature II, 3). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1986. VII, 282 pp. DM 120.-

On p. 2 of his book, Ludo Rocher quotes with approval V. Raghavan's remark that "the Purāṇas form the largest part of the writings in Sanskrit, a most voluminous and bewildering mass". Rocher's book is an extremely useful guide to the Puranic literature and the scholarly publications relating to it. Part I, Puranic literature is divided into two sub-sections: 1. Purāṇa studies, and 2. The place of the purāṇas in Indian literature.

The first sub-section presents a survey of purāṇa studies and scholarship from their inception, more than one and a half centuries ago, down to the present day. Rocher remarks that today the purāṇas can no longer be considered neglected (p. 6). Probably even for those who are familiar with purāṇa studies, the mass of bibliographical information in this volume will be a surprise. However, it remains a moot point whether in this case quantity is a guarantee of quality. However that may be, Rocher shows clearly the different trends in purāṇa studies and makes some very judicious comments. He points out how, for instance, Wilson's opinions, such as his belief in the existence of a class of purāṇas which were much earlier than the one he found preserved in his manuscripts, have influenced purāṇa studies.

In the second sub-section of the first part, Rocher studies the nature of the puranic texts. In 2.1.1 (puranic textual tradition) he tells how puranic materials have been treated with great freedom by Indian editors and translators. In 2.1.2. (The Sūta) Rocher remarks that "the principal reason why puranic — and epic — stories can be treated with such a high degree of freedom is that, fundamentally, they do not belong in books." Here Rocher touches upon the fundamental problem which faces every student of puranic literature and which, for instance, is reflected in the existence of different recensions of the purāṇas (see 2.1.3: Different Recensions of Purāṇas). This problem is especially important in connection with the

recently-published critical editions of purāṇas. On p. 99 Rocher remarks: "It goes without saying that, once one looks at purāṇas as a purely oral tradition, as a tradition that is solely carried forward by individual story-tellers, and which is, therefore, authorless and anonymous, as a tradition only parts of which have accidentally been committed to writing, — it goes without saying that in that case critical editions based on the standard rules of textual criticism make little sense." Rocher refrains from stating his own opinion and refers the reader to an article by Thomas B. Coburn.[1] It is necessary to point out that Rocher perhaps does not entirely do justice to the opinions of scholars who upheld the primary importance of the oral tradition, because, from the time purāṇas were first noted down and circulated in the form of manuscripts (and more recently in printed form), oral and written traditions have coexisted. In this connection it will be necessary to examine carefully the dates and circumstances in which the purāṇas were first noted down, a topic to which Rocher does not pay any special attention.

The oral tradition is even more important with regard to the way puranic materials are to be studied. For instance, in two famous articles, Lüders compared different versions of the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga story. Rocher writes: "Lüders showed that, as far as the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga episode is concerned, the story as presented in the Padmapurāṇa is to be placed in between an older version of the Mahābhārata and the text as it has come down to us." (p. 84).[2] In a recent study of the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga story, Ja. V. Vasil'kov examines Lüders's work and remarks that Lüders has applied a method of textual study which was developed for the study of written texts, to texts which represent a more or less adequate fixation of an oral tradition.[3] According to Vasil'kov, there is no original text in the case of an oral story and it is necessary to study all known variants.

If one agrees with the remarks made by Vasil'kov, it is obvious that in the field of puranic studies new methods have to be applied and that much of the work done so far is only of very limited usefulness. Through his careful and lucid survey of puranic studies and their main results, Rocher shows clearly what has been done in the past. Extremely useful also is his survey of the individual purāṇas in Part 2 of this work. It is to be hoped that his book will stimulate scholars to develop new and better methods for the study of this important branch of Indian literature.

NOTES

[1] 'The Study of the Purāṇas and the Study of Religion', *Religious Studies* **16** (1980), pp. 341—352.

[2] See also p. 210.
[3] 'Zemledel'českij mif v drevneindijskom èpose (Skazanie o Riš'jašringe)', *Literatura i kul'tura drevnej i srednevekovoj Indii* (Moskva, 1978), pp. 99—133 (cf. pp. 99—104 for his criticism of Lüders).

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Wolfgang Morgenroth (ed.), *Sanskrit and World Culture.* Proceedings of the Fourth World Sanskrit Conference of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies Weimar May 23—30, 1979 (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients 18). Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1986, 766 pp., 7 pl.

At the Fourth World Sanskrit Conference in Weimar 153 papers were read. The present volume contains 119 papers in English, French, German and Russian. It is of course not possible to list the titles of all the papers. According to the preface the main subjects of the conference were: 1. Sanskrit and Humanistic Sciences; 2. Sanskrit and Ancient History of India; 3. Role of Sanskrit in South Asia, especially India; 4. Role of Sanskrit in the World, especially in Central Asia, South East Asia and Europe. The subjects were mostly dealt with in plenary sessions. Subjects treated in the sections comprise: 5. Linguistics (General Linguistics, Sanskrit, Middle-Aryan, Indian Grammarians); 6. Philosophy and Religion (Veda, Buddhism/Jainism, Hinduism); 7. Science and Medicine; 8. Poetry (Epics, Classical Poetry, Narrative Literature, Poetics); 9. Archaeology and Art History. When one sees the great variety of the topics dealt with, one wonders whether it would not be advisable in future conferences to select a very limited number of themes and to invite prominent scholars to introduce them.

In this conference the socialist countries were well represented and especially with regard to the subjects dealt with in the plenary sessions. It is also interesting to note that in some fields the number of papers was extremely limited. For instance, there are only three papers on Buddhism and one on Jainism. Filliozat writes that Vedic studies seem nowadays to be less promising than a century ago and predicts a new future for them by looking for traces of the Veda in the development of Indian thought up to the present (cf. p. 18). However this may be, and I believe that many Vedic scholars would not share his point of view, it is encouraging to see twelve papers in the Vedic section, two of which deal with the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā (Karl Hoffmann and Sri Dukhisyama Pattanayak). The section on Sanskrit lexicon comprises five interesting papers: Bernhard Forsmann, 'Ein etymologischer Beitrag zum Vedischen: *ūrú-*'; Jean Kellens, 'La racine

sanscrite *kamp* à la lumière des faits iraniens'; Siegfried Lienhard, 'Sanskrit *kapi* and *kareṇu*'; Wilhelm Rau, 'Die Brennlinse im alten Indien'; Gyula Wojtilla, 'Some Problems of the Sanskrit Terminology of Agriculture'. In the sections on Middle Indo-Aryan there are papers by Colette Caillat, 'Grammatical Incorrections. Stylistic Choices, Linguistic Trends — With Reference to Middle Indo-Aryan', and by K. R. Norman, 'The Dialectical Variety of Middle Indo-Aryan'. It is certainly not necessary to mention other titles since undoubtedly every Sanskrit scholar will consult this volume and find a number of papers of special interest.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Oskar von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick* (Öst. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. Sitzungsber. 467 Band — Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprache und Kulturen Südasiens Heft 20). Wien, Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986. 209 pp. ÖS 350,—; DM 50,—

In his preface, von Hinüber points out that Richard Pischel's *Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen* (Strassburg, 1900) and Wilhelm Geiger's *Pāli. Literatur und Sprache* (Strassburg, 1916) are at present largely antiquated, and that it is not superfluous to summarize the results obtained in the last seventy years.

Von Hinüber uses the term older Middle-Indian to designate both Pāli and Prākṛt with the exclusion of Apabhraṃśa. He also includes in his work epigraphical Middle-Indian, Gāndhārī and Buddhist Sanskrit.

Von Hinüber's work is divided into four parts: Introduction (pp. 19—24), Sources (pp. 25—56), Middle-Indian Languages known from literary texts (pp. 57—70) and Historical Grammar of Middle-Indian (pp. 71—200).

Von Hinüber expresses the hope in his preface that in a not too distant future his overview will be superseded and replaced by a new "Geiger" and a new "Pischel". He remarks that it would be possible to write a work replacing Geiger's grammar, but that a new grammar of Prākṛt languages cannot be expected in the near future. However, it seems unlikely that von Hinüber's overview will be repaced unless von Hinüber himself undertakes this arduous task. Let us hope that von Hinüber will publish from time to time supplements incorporating new results and references to recent literature.

In the last twenty years, von Hinüber has made important contributions

to the study of Middle Indo-Aryan and his intimate knowledge of the many problems involved in the study of Middle Indo-Aryan is evident everywhere in his book. His knowledge of the literature is amazing and he seems to have studied even the most obscure publications relating to Middle Indo-Aryan. The chapter on the sources shows clearly their multiplicity. They comprise inscriptions and literary texts. The inscriptions are subdivided into Aśoka inscriptions, more recent inscriptions and coins and seals; the literary texts into religious texts (Buddhist and Jain) and secular texts. The latter comprise narrative literature, poetry, theatre, indigenous grammars and dictionaries (Pāli grammars, Prākṛt grammars and Prākṛt dictionaries).

As can be expected from a scholar such as von Hinüber, his book is much more than a summary of the results obtained over the last seventy years. His personal views are clearly put forward and defended, and he does not hesitate to recognize when he has been wrong in the past. Von Hinüber's book contains within a small compass such a mass of materials that it is not possible to go into details. Undoubtedly scholars will continue to refer to his book for a long time to come, either to confirm or to reject the views he expresses, and also to elaborate on the basis which he has laid for the future study of Prākṛt grammar. His book belongs to the rare class of publications which can be said to be truly indispensable. We can but be grateful to von Hinüber for having written this work which marks an epoch in the history of Prākṛt studies.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

David Smith, *Ratnākara's Haravijaya.* An Introduction to the Sanskrit Court Epic. Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1986. vii, 322 pp. Rs 200.

Ratnākara's Haravijaya is a Sanskrit court epic written in Kashmir in the ninth century A.D. According to David Smith it is the longest of the *mahākāvyas*, with fifty cantos (*sargas*) and 4351 verses. Probably very few Sanskrit scholars have taken the trouble to read the Haravijaya or even a few cantos of it. The histories of Sanskrit literature do not have much to say about it. Winternitz devotes only a few lines to the Haravijaya, and even Lienhard in his book on *kāvya* literature does not add much to the information given by Winternitz.[1] Neither Winternitz nor Lienhard say anything about the poetic qualities of the Haravijaya. In 1890 Jacobi showed that the Haravijaya contains 'unmistakable borrowings' from Māgha's Śisupālavadha.[2] David Smith does not deny the borrowings but

disagrees with Jacobi about Rantākara's inferiority (pp. 9—11). Even more unfavourable opinions on the merits of the Haravijaya were expressed by Richard Schmidt in 1915 and by A. B. Keith in 1928. David Smith states that his own judgement is at variance with the opinions of Schmidt and Keith. His book is a spirited defense of Ratnākara's poem. In the first three chapters David Smith studies what he calls the essential features of the court epic. Ratnākara's own view of his poem is studied in Chapter Four. Chapter Five is devoted to the structure of the poem. The following three chapters examine three groups of characters: the *gaṇas*, Śiva's followers, the women and the gods and goddesses. Chapter Nine studies the role of symbols in the Haravijaya. Ratnākara's use of the *śleṣa* is examined in Chapter Ten, and in Chapter Eleven, David Smith offers his 'tentative conclusions' about the merits of the poem.

In Chapter Two David Smith remarks that 'there is a danger that the study of Sanskrit poetry may be hindered by the stress that recent writers have put upon poetics'. According to him 'the form of the *mahākāvya*, as it had developed beyond Kālidāsa, did not appeal to what may be called the New School of poetics'. These critics found fault with the descriptive elements of *mahākāvya* and the undue use of *alaṃkāras* which lead to the destruction of *rasa*. David Smith states that 'the *mahākāvya* has its own inner logic as an art form, but this was not perceived by the poeticians'. How difficult it is for a Western scholar in the twentieth century to arrive at a proper appreciation of *kāvya*, is shown by the fact that David Smith quotes approvingly a verse which Ingalls considers to be a rather frigid example of the use of figured speech, although he fully recognises the importance of Ingalls' contributions to the understanding of *kāvya*.

Chapter Three is entitled 'Kings, Courts, and Poets' and examines the connections between *kāvya* and the society which gave rise to it. David Smith touches upon many topics as can be seen from his own words: 'Let me state what exactly I do hope to show in this chapter. Beginning with the origins of *kāvya*, we shall see the importance of eulogy in *kāvya*. Eulogy itself can only be understood by appreciating the Indian view of kingship, which is presented here mainly with material from *kāvya*. I then look behind the ideology to discern considerable insecurity in court circles. I suggest that *kāvya* provides a sense of security. In this, *kāvya* is analogous to ritual. Having looked at *kāvya* as cause I then see it as effect, the product of court idleness: play, irresponsible creativity. Thus far, we have the two sides of the same coin. *Kāvya* works hard to produce order; at the same time, it is free to create disorder. I then take up another line of argument, and suggest that *kāvya* is in some sense an updating of the Vedas, and,

possibly, an attempt to displace their authority. Finally, I take a look at the statue of the poet.' It is, of course, hardly possible to deal adequately with all these things in less than fifty pages. For instance, the picture given of the activities of the king is definitely one-sided. David Smith remarks that, since the kingdom was run by Brahman ministers, the king should be left entirely free to please himself. If one consults other sources such as the epic, not to mention Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (cf. the chapter on the duties of the king I.19), one obtains an entirely different picture of the activities and duties of the king.[3] For instance, as Hopkins points out, one of his most important duties was to act as judge. It is difficult to obtain an accurate idea of the activities of kings, but I believe that even from purely literary texts it is obvious that the king was not left entirely free to please himself. Although it is not possible always to accept Smith's statements in this chapter, one encounters many remarks which one would like to quote. For instance, Smith writes: 'Virtually all the images employed in *kāvya* are strikingly stereotyped and the general tendency of *kāvya* is towards celebration, confirmation and consolidation. The irregular and shifting world is fixed, is given ballast by the orderliness of *kāvya*'. Smith devotes only a few pages to the poet. Perhaps he could have given more emphasis to the relationship of the poet with his audience. *Kāvya* was undoubtedly written and not orally composed as was most of the older Sanskrit literature. Its audience was restricted to a small circle of connoisseurs capable of appreciating the technical skill of the poet. It is interesting to compare the function of *kāvya* at the Indian court with that of Latin poetry in imperial Rome.[4]

The first three chapters take up the first third of David Smith's book. The remaining chapters examine different aspects of Ratnākara's Haravijaya. In his introduction he remarks that his 'procedure has been principally that of reading and re-reading the poetry, "living with it" in F. R. Levis' words, until the Haravijaya has taken on for me a definite shape and character which further readings serve only to strengthen'. It is undoubtedly superfluous to analyse these chapters and it must be left to the reader to follow the author in his voyage of exploration. One of the pleasures of reading these chapters is the skill with which David Smith translates the many verses which he quotes. It would be too much to ask him to translate the entire Haravijaya, but a translation of several cantos would be very welcome. In his final chapter David Smith writes: 'The *Haravijaya* is great in scope. Its symbolism, given weight by Ratnākara's emphatic joy in images and conventions used only sparingly by other poets, and increased by his original ("ad hoc") symbols, provides depth of meaning.' However, he is not without reservations: 'It cannot be denied that the poem is too long, but it is good

poetry. It is not beautiful poetry, except in so far as "Exuberance in Beauty".' Here again one is faced with the problem of determining our criteria in making a judgement about Sanskrit poetry. On p. 58 David Smith mentions 'Ingalls' concern with his own canons of literary evaluation', but he does not explain explicitly which, according to him, are the proper canons of evaluation.[5] David Smith stresses repeatedly that the Haravijaya has to be appreciated as a whole (cf. pp. 5, 127 and 305). It is certainly much easier to admire single verses than an entire poem, especially one which comprises 4351 verses! However that may be, there is no doubt that David Smith's book will be enjoyed by all lovers of Sanskrit poetry even if they are unable to share in all respects his enthusiasm for the Haravijaya.

NOTES

[1] M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*. Dritter Band. Leipzig, 1922, p. 70; Siegfried Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry*. Wiesbaden, 1984, p. 199.
[2] 'Ānandavardhana and the date of Māgha', *WZKM* **4** (1890), pp. 263—244.
[3] E. W. Hopkins, 'The Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India', *JAOS* **13** (1888), pp. 125—135.
[4] Cf. Kenneth Quinn, *Texts and Contexts. The Roman Writers and their Audience* (London, 1979), pp. 35—36: 'The relationship between the writer and his audience exerts a powerful influence on the form literature took in the latter part of the Preclassical and in the Classical period. It is an early instance in western literature of the interaction of criticism and creative writing. In the Postclassical period Roman literature becomes a court literature. There is a return to a form of public performance, the recital given by the writer of his works. But it is an artificial kind of public performance corrupted by preciosity and rhetoric.'
[5] Ingalls is the scholar most quoted by David Smith as shown by the index, which, however, does not refer to this passage.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Michael Hahn, *Der grosse Legendenkranz* (Mahajjātakamālā). Eine mittelalterliche buddhistische Legendensammlung aus Nepal. Nach Vorarbeiten von Gudrun Bühnemann und Michael Hahn herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Michael Hahn (Asiatische Forschungen, Band **88**). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1985. V,72,760 pp. Leinen DM 120.—.

The Mahajjātakamālā (MJM) is one of the lengthiest texts in the whole of Buddhist literature. In 1912, E. Lang gave a summary of the contents and edited chapters 4 and 5.[1] Lang planned to edit the entire text, but he perished in 1911. Hahn's edition of the text is based upon three manuscripts, the most important of which is a manuscript belonging to the

National Archives in Kathmandu (MS B). The two other manuscripts (MSS P and T) are copies of MS B. Manuscript B comprises 335 leaves, but the following leaves are missing: 22—36, 250—262, 265—272 and 301—320. The text as edited comprises 50 chapters and 9277 stanzas, whereas the complete text consisted of 52 chapters and about 11,000 stanzas. The MJM is not an original work, but is based upon older texts which were used by the compiler. In his introduction, Hahn gives a general characterisation of the MJM and indicates the sources used. The main sources used by the compiler were the Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka, the Jātakamālās of Āryaśūra, Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadaṭṭa, and the Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā. Chapter 49 is based upon a version of the Maṇicūḍa legend. The contents and sources of the MJM are studied in detail by Hahn in the fourth section of his introduction (pp. 22—66). In the previous section, 'Zur Einordnung der MJM in das Genre der buddhistischen Erzählungsliteratur' (pp. 10—22), he describes the development of Buddhist literature from the Avadānaśataka and Karmaśataka (first century A.D.) up to Kṣemendra's Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā (11th century A.D.). Of particular interest are Hahn's remarks on the Jātakamālās of Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta, on which texts he has published several important studies. The same section contains a bibliographical survey of the medieval collections of Buddhist literature which have been preserved in Nepal. Hahn remarks that "Dieser Komplex der mittelalterlichen buddhistischen Erzählungsliteratur ist noch weitgehend unerschlossen und daher bezüglich vieler wichtiger grundlegender Fragen ins Dunkel gehüllt." To the bibliographical information on the Kalpadrumāvadānamālā, one can add an edition of chapter 25 (Ṣaḍdantāvadāna).[2]

As mentioned before, chapters 4 and 5 were edited by Lang but only on the basis of one manuscript (MS P). Two chapters have been edited by Ratna Handurukande, chapter 45 and chapter 49.[3] Her editions are based upon the same manuscripts as those used by Hahn. Handurukande is more inclined to correct the readings of the manuscripts, whereas Hahn only rarely proposes corrections in his notes. In his edition of the text, Hahn adds between brackets missing akṣaras, such as *anusvāra*-s and *visarga*-s. In several instances Hahn seems to have been more successful in deciphering the readings of his manuscripts. In a few instances the readings given by Handurukande are preferable, as, for instance, in 49.12: *bhaveyaṃ* (Hahn: *bhaveya*) *bhūpatiḥ*, and in 49.20: *saṃcareyaṃ* (Hahn: *saṃcareya*) *jagaddhite*. It is, of course possible that the *anusvāra* is not found in the manuscripts, but in that case it ought to have been added between brackets.

Hahn's careful edition of the MJM makes known an interesting specimen of medieval Buddhist narrative literature. In his introduction Hahn

announces further studies on parts of the MJM and a partial or complete translation. He also announces the publication of a grammar of the MJM which will also include a study of the graphical peculiarities of the Nepalese manuscripts of the MJM. In recent years no scholar has done more for the study of Buddhist literature than Michael Hahn. This latest publication gives evidence of the energy with which he pursues his research in this branch of Buddhist studies. All students of Buddhist literature will be obliged to him for this beautiful publication.

NOTES

[1] 'La Mahajjātakamālā', *JA* 1912, pp. 511—550.
[2] J. W. de Jong, 'The Sanskrit text of the Ṣaḍdantāvadāna', *Indologica Taurinensia* **VII** (1979), pp. 281—297.
[3] *Five Buddhist Legends in the Campū Style* (Bonn, 1984), pp. 196—206; 'The Maṇicūda Study', *Buddhist Studies* **V** (1976), pp. 309—168.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Wilhelm Siegling, *Ein Glossar zu Aśvaghoṣas Buddhacarita* (Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde der Universität Göttingen Nr. 3). Göttingen, 1985. XIV, 89 pp.

According to the introduction by Ernst Waldschmidt, Wilhelm Siegling (1880—1946) read the Buddhacarita in 1906 with Richard Pischel. Siegling prepared a translation of the Sanskrit text, copied Wenzel's transcript of the Tibetan translation and compiled a Tibetan-Sanskrit-German glossary. The glossary is written on about 1270 cards which have been reproduced photomechanically. It is arranged according to the order of the Tibetan alphabet and the Tibetan words are written in Tibetan script. For each Tibetan word the Sanskrit equivalent(s) are given and the meaning in German. The references are to E. B. Cowell's *editio princeps* (Oxford, 1893). Wenzel's transcript is based upon the London Tanjur. This refers most probably to the Narthang edition of the Tanjur in the India Office Library. Siegling seems also to have consulted a copy of the Peking edition of the Tanjur in Leningrad.

In 1926—1928 Friedrich Weller published an edition and translation of the Tibetan text of the Buddhacarita which has been very useful to E. H. Johnston in editing the Sanskrit text (Calcutta, 1935). Weller's edition of the text is also based on the Narthang edition of the Tanjur, and it is only

in one of his latest publications that he was able to use four editions of the Tanjur: Derge, Chone, Narthang and Peking.[1] Johnston has made some use of the Peking edition of the Tanjur. In his preface he writes: "For a few troublesome passages I have consulted the Peking edition of the Bibliothèque Nationale, not used by Dr. Weller, and which sometimes has better readings." It is a pity that neither Weller nor Johnston was able to use the Derge edition, which in several instances contains better readings. For instance, in IV. 29ab the Sanskrit text has: *madenāvarjitā nāma taṃ kāścit tatra yoṣitaḥ*. The Tibetan translation in the Narthang edition reads: *rnam-par sgeg-bcas gźon-nu rgyags-pas ma-yaṅs de-rnams 'ga'*. In Siegling's glossary one finds under *yaṅs-pa* the following entry. "ma-yaṅs = ? (skt. āvarjita!) Bc IV, 29." Weller has pointed out several instances in which *rnam-par spaṅs-pa* is written for *rnam-par yaṅs-pa*.[2] In IV.29b, Derge and Chone have *ma spaṅs-pa* but Narthang and Peking *ma yaṅs-pa*. *Ma spaṅs-pa* (*avarjita*) confirms the reading of the Sanskrit text (*āvarjita*), which has been misunderstood by the Tibetan translators. *Ma yaṅs-pa* would correspond to Sanskrit *anāyāta*. Weller is of the opinion that *ma yaṅs-pa* is based upon a different Sanskrit reading, something which I find difficult to accept in view of the fact that *spaṅs* and *yaṅs* have been confounded in other places. It is also not possible to agree with Weller when he suggests that *madenānāyāta* can be rendered by "ungehemmt ob ihrer Berauschtheit".[3]

In V. 87c the Sanskrit text has: *aruṇaparuṣatāram antarikṣaṃ*. In Weller's edition of the Tibetan translation one finds: *śiṅ-rta 'dren-pas gzi-ñams skar ldan-par snaṅ-la*. Siegling was puzzled by the rendering of *aruṇa* by *śiṅ-rta 'dren-pa* but this can be easily explained, for the dawn is the charioteer of the sun (*sūrasūta*). As to *skar ldan-pa*, Siegling suggested that Cowell's reading °*bhāram* ought to be changed to °*tāram*.[4] Moreover, one must read *skar-ldan bar-snaṅ-la*.[5]

These few examples may suffice to show the necessity for carefully examining the Tibetan translation in order to explain difficulties in its interpretation. It is the great usefulness of an index that it helps very much to bring out these difficuties. For this reason one must be grateful for the publication of Siegling's work, even though it is not complete as Nobel already pointed out in 1928 (cf. Vorwort) and the German text is not always easy to decipher. His glossary will render great service so long as we do not have an index based upon Johnston's edition of the Buddhacarita, nor a new edition of the Tibetan translation.

In his preface, Waldschmidt describes Siegling's life and activities and draws attention to his study of the Mātṛceṭa-Stotras. He mentions that F. Bernhard had undertaken a critical edition of the Sanskrit fragments, but

that after his death his notes could not be found. It is to be hoped that someone will undertake the critical edition of these fragments which Siegling and Bernhard have not been able to bring to completion.

NOTES

[1] *Untersuchung über die textgeschichtliche Entwicklung des tibetischen Buddhacarita.* Berlin, 1980.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 27.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 30.
[4] This correction had already been proposed by Böhtlingk in 1894.
[5] Cf. R. O. Schrader, *Kleine Schriften* (Wiesbaden, 1983), p. 332.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Paul J. Griffiths, *On Being Mindless: Buddhist Meditation and The Mind-Body Problem.* LaSalle, Illinois, Open Court Publishing Company, 1986. xxii, 220 pp. $24.95.

Paul Griffiths' book deals with the Attainment of Cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*) in Indian Buddhism. The first chapter examines the Theravāda tradition according to the Nikāyas and to Buddhaghosa. The second chapter, The Attainment of Cessation in the Vaibhāṣika Tradition, is based mainly on Vasubandhu's Abhidharmakośabhāṣya and the commentaries by Sthiramati and Yaśomitra. The third chapter deals with the Yogācāra tradition according to Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. The fourth chapter, The Attainment of Cessation and the Mind-Body Problem, summarizes the results of his study with regard to the relationship between the mental and the physical.

In the introduction, Griffiths remarks that he originally conceived his work as an historical and exegetical study of a set of Indian Buddhist controversies about certain kinds of meditational practice. However, in the process of research and writing his work received another dimension as an exercise in cross-cultural philosophizing. Griffiths writes that 'where it seems appropriate I shall not hesitate to offer critical assessments of both the arguments presented in those [i.e. Indian Buddhist] traditions and of the truth of the premisses involved therein'.

Griffiths' work is intended to be of use not only to Buddhist scholars but also to philosophers interested in the mind-body issue and to historians of religion concerned with the study of soteriological practices and of altered

states of consciousness. For this reason he has kept the use of technical terminology to a minimum. Almost all technical terms and the titles of texts are given in English.[1] A glossary comprises the more important technical terms, and the first part of the bibliography lists in English alphabetical order the texts referred to in the text and the notes. Information is also given there on the contents of the texts, on translations and studies. In each of the first three chapters the author gives a lucid introduction to the different traditions (Theravāda, Vaibhāṣika and Yogācāra) which will be very useful for the non-specialist. The notes and appendices are meant in the first place for specialists. They contain among other materials discussions of such problems as, for instance, the existence of one or two Vasubandhus, and the texts of all translated passages. Appendix A gives a scheme of the Path of Cultivation (*bhāvanāmārga*) according to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, Appendix B contains an annotated translation of the section of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya dealing with the re-emergence of mind from the attainment of cessation (Pradhan 1975: 72.19—73.4; Pradhan 1967: 72.16—73.4), and Appendix C a translation of the eightfold proof of the store-consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*) in the Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya (11.18—13.20), a passage first translated into Japanese by N. Hakamaya in 1978.

In the first chapter Griffiths examines the Theravāda tradition according to which there is no mental activity whatsoever in the attainment of cessation. He shows that by the time of Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla the attainment of cessation was not given an especially prominent place as a soteriological goal. Griffiths analyses the philosophical problems connected with the Theravāda concept of the attainment of cessation, and hereby prepares the ground for a better understanding of the debates between the schools recorded by Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmakośabhāṣya. One of the main points discussed is the emergence from the consciousness of cessation. He succeeds very well in demonstrating that this problem is closely connected with several important Buddhist doctrines: the dualism between mental and physical events, the doctrine of impermanence which makes it difficult to account for various types of continuity and the doctrine of causality. In his final chapter Griffiths arrives at the following conclusions: 'First, the mental and physical are categories of events which are phenomenologically irreducibly different. Second, these events are not attributes or properties of any substance; to give an account of their causal functions and interrelations is to give an exhaustive account of what there is in the world. Third, certain kinds of causal interaction between the mental and the physical are envisaged, but no event of one class may ever come

into existence solely as the result of the occurrence of an event of another class. In sum, we have a non-substantivist event-based interactionist psycho-physical dualism.'

'In his book Griffiths has dealt with an important problem which has many ramifications but he has wisely resisted the temptation to leave the main track. The texts are well chosen and competently translated and discussed.[2] The greatest attraction of the book is the philosophical skill with which he interrogates his texts and discloses consequences of which the authors were probably unaware. Griffiths shows himself capable of interpreting difficult texts in Pāli, Sanskrit and Tibetan, and his knowledge of the secondary literature not only in English but also in German, French and Japanese is impressive.[3] One is particularly glad to see that he has made good use of the work of one of the most prominent scholars of the younger generation in Japan, Noriaki Hakamaya.

In a few places Griffiths' interpretation is capable of improvement. On p. 7 he translates a passage of Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Majjhimanikāya: '"Sense organs are purified" means that when actions are being performed the sense organs are, as it were, wearied, hindered and soiled in regard to those things with which they come into contact, and in regard to the clarity [with which they perceive] external objects' (*indriyāni vippasannāni ti kiriyamayapavattasmiṃ hi vattamāne bahiddhā āramṁaṇesu pasāde ghaṭṭentesu indriyāni kilamanti upahatāni makkhitāni viya honti . . .*). In a note Griffiths explains that *pasāda* here refers to the capacity of the sense-organs to clearly perceive external organs. The passage translated mentions the five [sensory] clarities (*pañca pasādā*). He also remarks: 'the phrase "those things with which they come into contact" translates *ghaṭṭentsu* rather freely. A more literal translation would be "those things which cause obstructions to them".' It seems to me impossible to translate *ārammaṇesu pasāde* as two unrelated locatives 'in regard to things and in regard to the clarity'. Would it not be better to take *ārammaṇesu . . . ghaṭṭentesu* as a locative absolute and *pasāde* as an accusative plural: 'when objects affect the [sensory] clarities'?

On pp. 99—100 Griffiths translates a passage of Sthiramati's commentary on the Triṃśikā: 'when there is a condition for the arising of a single wave in a great flood of water only a single wave occurs; and when there is a condition for the occurrence of two or three or many waves, then just so many occur. [In such a case] it is not that the great flood of water streaming along ceases to exist; it is simply that there is no sense in designating it as such' (*. . . na ca tasyodakaughasya srotasā vahataḥ samucchittir bhavati / na paryupayogaḥ prajñāyate*). The meaning of *paryupayoga* has been correctly

determined by Sylvain Lévi, who gave the following translation: 'Et de cette masse d'eau qui s'écoule en courant, il n'y a pas d'interruption, on n'en connaît pas l'épuisement'.[4]

NOTES

[1] Griffiths renders Mahāvibhāṣā as 'The Great Book of Options' but in Buddhist texts *vibhāṣā* designates an extensive commentary, cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* s.v. Demiéville rendered Mahāvibhāṣā as 'Grande Exégèse (*L'Inde classique*, tome II, Paris 1953, p. 444).

[2] On p. 126 Griffiths discusses the scholastic affiliation of Vasumitra who, according to de La Vallée Poussin and Lamotte, was probably a Sautrāntika. Griffiths writes: 'I can find no hard evidence to support this view and much to suggest that it is incorrect'. He has overlooked de La Vallée Poussin's remark: 'Mais, au quatrième siècle, les Sautrāntikas établirent le "subtil Manovijñāna". Comme les Sautrāntikas du quatrième siècle s'opposent aux Dārṣṭāntikas, on les nomme Sautrāntikas-branche' (*Siddhi*, p. 222).

[3] There are a few misprints in the titles of German and French publications. P. 194: Bareau, Les Premières conciles bouddhique; p. 195: Bühnemann, Eine Beweis; p. 198: Hardy, Ein Betrag; p. 202: Lamotte, Le Traité de la grande vertue de sagesse; p. 203: May, Etudes Asiatique; p. 207: Silburn, Le discontinue. No misprint, alas, is the use of *continuua* as plural of *continuum* (p. 71, etc.).

[4] Sylvain Lévi, *Matériaux pour l'étude du système Vijñaptimātra* (Paris, 1932), pp. 103—4. See also Étienne Lamotte, *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* (Louvain, 1935), p. 185: 'Cependant l'eau du fleuve ne souffre dans son courant ni interruption ni épuisement'.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

H. E. Richardson, *A Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions* (James G. Forlong Series, no. XXIX). Royal Asiatic Society, 1985. V, 185 pp., 16 pl. (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 84,— guilders).

From 1949 onward H. E. Richardson has published early Tibetan inscriptions belonging to the reigns of Khri Sroṅ-lde-brtsan (755—c. 794 A.D.), Khri Lde-sroṅ-brtsan (c. 800—815 A.D.) and Khri Gtsug-lde-brtsan (815—836 A.D.). One of the most important inscriptions is that which contains the text of the Sino-Tibetan treaty of 821/822 A.D. and which was first published by H. E. Richardson in 1952. In the same year Paul Demiéville described it as "un des monuments épigraphiques les plus insignes de l'Asie" and expressed his regret that this inscription had never been properly studied.[1] In 1978 H. E. Richardson published a new edition and translation of this inscription.[2] For this new edition he made use of a collection of copies which had belonged to the Ka-thog lama Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbaṅ Nor-bu (1698—c. 1755).[3] The Corpus contains a third edition of

this important text which is practically identical with the second edition as far as the text of the inscription is concerned; however, Richardson has added a few comments on the historical setting while omitting most of the notes on the translation.

Other inscriptions in this volume are published for the second or third time. In his introduction Richardson remarks that, "although it is hoped that the texts may be regarded as definitive, no such claim is made for the translations." Richardson has studied these inscriptions for more than thirty years and has taken account of the progress made in the study of early Tibetan texts during this period. It will be difficult to improve upon his interpretations, although, of course, work in such a difficult field can never be considered to be definitive.

A great advantage of the present corpus is the vocabulary, which will be very useful in the study of early Tibetan texts. In his notes Richardson discusses the meaning of many obscure words and expressions. On p. 35 he comments upon the expression *staṅs-dbyal* and refers to several texts in which it occurs. To these references it is possible to add the Tibetan version of the Rāmāyaṇa. In the text which Balbir edited, *staṅs-dbyal* is found twice, cf. l. 2.: *ra ma na staṅs dbyal*; l. 143: *ra ma na staṅ dbyal*.[4] Balbir translates it as "l'éminent Ramana", but here also *staṅs-dbyal* means "husband and wife". This expression is also found twice in another version of the Rāmāyaṇa story, cf. A l. 326: *rgyal po ra ma na mched staṅs dbyal*; A l. 438: *rgyal po ra ma na daṅ lha mo si ta staṅs dbyal*.[5]

With this corpus H. E. Richardson has done a great service to Tibetan studies for which all Tibetologists will be grateful. It is a pleasure to congratulate him on the publication of this splendid book in the year of his eightieth birthday.

NOTES

[1] *Le concile de Lhasa* (Paris, 1952), p. 32 note.
[2] *JRAS* 1978, pp. 137—162.
[3] Cf. H. E. Richardson, 'A Tibetan Antiquarian of the XVIIth Century', *Bulletin of Tibetology* **IV**, 2 (1967), pp. 5—8.
[4] *L'histoire de Rāma en tibétain* (Paris, 1963), pp. 39 and 44.
[5] J. W. de Jong, 'The Tun-huang manuscripts of the Tibetan Rāmāyaṇa story', *IIJ* **19** (1977), pp. 82 and 88.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG

Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Supplement VI: XXII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 25. März 1983 in Tübingen. Ausgewählte Vorträge herausgegeben von Wolfgang Röllig. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH., 1985. 444 S. m. 23 Abb., 2. Falttaf., 62 Abb. auf 30 taf., kt. DM 220,—.

Iranian studies are represented in this volume by one article (F. Thordarson, Bilinguismus in der Entwicklung des Ossetischen, pp. 221–224) and one summary (R. E. Emmerick, Khotanese bāljse, p. 225). The complete text of Emmerick's communication is published in *MSS* **45** [Festgabe für Karl Hoffmann II] (München, 1985), pp. 39–53.

Indian studies are much better represented by six articles and twelve summaries in Fachgruppe 8: Indologie, three articles and five summaries in Fachgruppe 9: Buddhismus, and five articles in Fachgruppe 14: Kunst und Archäologie. P. Thieme discusses RV 10.86, which he explains as a burlesque recited during the bridal night as a fertility spell (Bemerkungen zum Vṛṣākapi-Gedicht [RV 10.86], pp. 238–248). M. Witzel shows the importance of studying scribal mistakes based on local pronunciation and on misreadings, and the geographical spread of texts which are transmitted in not more than one or two regions of India as in the case of the Paippalāda-saṁhitā of the Atharvaveda. He suggests that Gujarat was the medieval-centre of the Paippalādins but that their tradition must have become extinct between ca. 1250 and 1431, and that from 1431 until c. 1700 the Śaunaka-Saṃhitā was transmitted in Gujarat by one family (Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṁhitā, pp. 256–271). Harry Falk examines the origin of the *sattra* sacrifice which he compares and contrasts with the *śrauta* sacrifice. According to Falk, the *sattras* continue the traditions of the festive occasions during which the greater part of the *sūktas* of the Rg were composed (Zum Ursprung der sattra-Opfer, pp. 275–281). J. L. Brockington distinguishes several stages in the development of the Rāmāyaṇa (Rāma der Rechtschaffene, pp. 249–255). B. Banerjee believes that Śūdraka flourished between the first and second century of the Christian era and that there seems to be no reason why the drama should not be ascribed to a person named Śūdraka, who was a king (Śūdraka, the author of the Mṛcchakaṭikam, pp. 285–289). M. Hahn presents a survey of research on the Tibetan nīti texts and discusses the following four texts: Prajñāśataka, Prajñādaṇḍa, Janapoṣaṇabindu and Āryākoṣa (Die indischen Nītiśāstras im tibetischen Tanjur, pp. 227–237).

A. Mette studies two Tibetan translations of texts relating to the Aśoka legend: the *Mya-ṅan-med pa'i sgo-nas klu btul-ba'i le'u* (Derge No. 4197) and the *ku-na-la'i rtogs-brjod* (Derge No. 4145) (Zur tibetischen Überlieferung der Aśokalegende, pp, 299–307). J. P. McDermott has interpreted the Sādhīna Jātaka (494) as

evidence for a case against the transfer of merit. M. Hara shows that King Sādhīna's refusal to accept gifts is in accordance with the *kṣatra-dharma* which forbids him to do so (A Note on the Sādhīna Jātaka, pp. 308–314). The purpose of M. Nihom's article is to show that Buston's opinion regarding the classification of the Saṃpuṭatantra was influenced by the politics of central Tibet (Buston, Politics and Religion, pp. 315–324).

B. N. Mukherjee tries to prove that the iconography of Mahiṣāsuramardinī was influenced by the concept of Mother goddesses in West Asia including Iran (Foreign Elements in Iconography of Mahishāsuramardinī – The War Goddess of India, pp. 404–413). In another article he makes an attempt to decipher the Shell Script (A Clue to the Decipherment of the So-called Shell Script, pp. 415–421). Horst Brinkhaus carefully traces the development of Hariharihārivāhana Lokeśvara in Nepal in the light of the opposition between Buddhism and Hinduism (Hariharihārivāhana Lokeśvara in Nepal, pp. 422–429). Wibke Lobo explains the figure of the man with the bow on Gandhāra reliefs of the flight of the Buddha as Indra, rejecting Foucher's interpretation of him as Māra (Der Bogenträger in den Weltfluchtdarstellungen der Gandhāra-Reliefs, pp. 430–437). J. Bautze describes a mural painting of 22 rulers and princes of Kota and identifies the rulers with those represented on Hendley's portraits of Kota rulers (Zuordnungsfragen bei Kota-Malereien, pp. 438–444).

Almost any Indologist will find in this volume one or more articles of interest to him in his own field of research, but I am afraid that very few will be willing or able to acquire a copy of it. The previous volume, of almost similar size, was priced at DM 98,–. If the price of subsequent volumes continues to rise at the same rate, even many libraries will be hesitant to buy them. One wonders whether it is not possible to use a cheaper process of printing and to publish several volumes, each one comprising one or a few of the related 'Fachgruppen' only.

Australian National University J. W. DE JONG